OCT 17 1946

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 91—PART 13

OCTOBER 15, 1945, TO DECEMBER 21, 1945

(PAGES A4295 TO A5814)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1945

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

IOWA LIBRARY
FEDERAL DEPOSITORY

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Appendix

Address by Gen. Mark W. Clark on Accepting Award of the Italian-American Labor Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very unusual and historically significant address delivered by Gen. Mark W. Clark at the Columbus Day celebration of the Italian-American Labor Council on October 12, 1945, at the Hotel Biltmore, New York City. I had the great privilege of being present on this memorable occasion and heard the address of General Clark when accepting this year's "four freedoms" annual award of the Italian-American Labor Council.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Antonini, distinguished guests, it is with great pride that I accept this year's "four freedoms" award of the Italian-American Labor Council. It is a real satisfaction to attend a gathering of a group which is contributing much to friendship between two great countries. In accepting your award, I fully realize that I merely represent the American soldiers whom I had the privilege to command, and who, by their individual and collective acts of bravery, made possible the liberation of the great land of Italy.

Day before yesterday as I looked out from the window of my airplane and saw the shores of America ahead, my mind went back to the day, more than 450 years ago, when a great and daring Italian, standing on the deck of a tiny ship, caught his first sight of a new world. I thought with gratitude of the home for free people which the discoveries of Christopher Columbus gave to humanity; and I was proud to recollect that my country had permitted me to work, in the Old World, for the reestablishment of freedom and democracy.

In discussing Italy today one can very easily become entangled with the political side of the question. I will leave that to the diplomats and will be sufficiently diplomatic myself tonight to stick to my knitting and discuss the military side of the picture.

Let me now tell you something of the Italian campaign. First, I could have accomplished nothing in the rugged terrain of Italy had it not been for you American mothers and fathers, brothers and sisters, and relations who raised and unselfishly sent to me the magnificent American soldiers, who made our great victory in Italy possible. Never did a commander have more to be proud of than I, in leading into battle the men you sent to me.

On September 9, 1943, these men in my Fifth American Army, the first American troops to land on the continent of Europe, officially returned the call of Christopher Columbus when we landed at Salerno.

The Germans accepted our challenge and on the 13th of September counterattacked with everything they had and drove a wedge all the way to the sea. It was only the determination of these forces—my gallant British comrades as well as my splendid Americans—that prevented our being pushed into the Mediterranean.

Then came Naples, the crossing of the Volturno, the hard times at Cassino, and the landing at Anzio. I had been directed to land at Anzio in the hope that a flank threat to the enemy would force his withdrawal. This was not the case. He again accepted the challenge and moved down many divisions from northern Italy. You know the months of desperate struggle that continued on this restricted beachhead. But later, in the 1944 spring offense for Rome, Anzio—a thorn in the enemy's side—proved most useful and gave us an ideal jump-off position which led to the capture of the Italian capital.

I well remember the picture of our tired doughboys marching through the streets of Rome amidst the wild applause of the Italian people. I heard of one GI saying as he approached the ancient Roman ruins of the Colosseum, "Gee, do you suppose we caused all that damage?" We were very proud that this beautiful Italian city, first of the Axis-dominated European capitals to be liberated, could be spared damage.

At that time my son Bill was about to become a first classman at West Point. I waited for many weeks after the fall of Rome to hear from him, hoping that he, too, would share my pride in our great accomplishment. Finally a letter case. I tore it open anxiously and it read something like this: "Dear Dad, June has finally come and I am now a first classman. I know you will be pleased to know that we licked the Navy in baseball the other day. It was a great game.

"I have been made a sergeant and my class standing this year, I am sure, will please you. Now that I am a first classman we get weekend privileges in New York." He went on to tell me of the good-looking girls he had met in this fair city and of his anticipation of the good times to come while he was a first classman. There was not a single word about our capturing Rome, and I was greatly disappointed until I came to the end of the letter and there at last was a postscript which read as follows: "By the way, Dad, I see you're doing all right, too."

After Rome the action was fast. The Germans retreated in disorder to the formidable Gothic position in the Appennines. About this time, as you will remember, half of my Fifth Army was ordered away from our front to prepare for the invasion of southern France. I often wonder how far and fast we might have gone had those troops remained. They were troops flushed with victory. I do not believe that they could have been stopped. It was when we were confronting this mountain stronghold that your president, Mr. Antonini, came to visit me. I remember taking him to a forward observation point, high up in the mountains where we could see the fertile Po Valley and the city of Bologna. We had looked longingly at this prize objective and I hoped that perhaps some layman, who saw the situation for the first time, might suggest a new plan of action but that was not the case. No matter how long you looked at Bologna and no matter how thin you sliced it, it was still "boloney."

Winter came and further troops were withdrawn for the European battle. Shortages of ammunition and replacements developed. Snow and ice not only made progress by foot practically impossible, but almost entirely stopped the fine air support which we had always received from our Allied Air Forces. It was finally decided to stop the attack and rest our troops, and get ready for what we hoped to be the final spring offensive. It was about this time that General Alexander took over the Mediterranean theater and I assumed command of the Fifteenth Army group which comprised all the ground fighting forces in Italy, my own old Fifth and the British Eighth Armies.

As spring approached, we made our plans. We must not let the 25 German divisions and the 4 Fascist Italian divisions fighting on their side get away and intervene in the great battles being fought elsewhere, or withdraw undefeated into Hitler's Alpine redoubt. Our job was to smash these German armies in the Po Valley. In planning this battle my great concern was to see that all of the forces of the Fifth and Eighth Armies attacked with everything they had.

For this final battle we had 10 major nationalities. There were Poles, Canadians, Italians, New Zealanders, British, Palestinians who formed a Jewish brigade—Indians, Americans, white and colored; Americans of Japanese origin, South Africans, and Brazilians. It was truly a polyglot army. By this time we had well organized the Italian partisan army which stood poised in the Appennines, in the Alps, and the Po Valley between, ready to strike in coordination with the regular troops. For months from my headquarters we communicated by radio with these partisan bands. We parachuted supplies, food, ammunition, and even jeeps into their mountain hideouts. We gave each little group its instructions and cautioned all to hold back for the crucial moment. It has been a great satisfaction to me in this final battle that the Italian civilians by their

understanding cooperation, the Italian organized army by its splendid valor, and the Italian resistance groups who freed 200 towns and cities, contributed so much to the liberation of their own country. From the time that we landed at Salerno, I never heard of a major sabotage effort against our troops. The people were with us.

You know what happened in our final battle. The 25 tough, well-trained German divisions—after bitter resistance—were completely destroyed. We destroyed them south of the Po River. We killed thousands of them and destroyed great quantities of their equipment. When the German commander came to me to surrender, he told me, with tears in his eyes, that only remnants of his proud armies had escaped to the north, with no equipment, and with but one mad desire—to get back into Germany.

Sometimes we are tempted to exult over this great victory. But always there returns to me the solemn recollection that it was dearly won. Our gallant dead in many a mountain valley will always have our reverent gratitude for the victory they made possible.

In this campaign the great industrial northern Italy, with its productive Po Valley, was saved with relatively little damage. The great cities of Bologna, Turin, Milan, and Venice were in our hands. Genoa, the proud birthplace of the man whose memory we honor today, was in good shape except for port facilities. The recovery of this mighty industrial north in good condition means a great deal to the future of Italy. I again traveled through this area as far south as Rome only within the last 10 days and I was pleased to note a great revival in activity, in signs of life, in lightened expressions on the faces of people. I think Italy is on the mend. She has many trials and unhappy days ahead, but I am convinced that her present leaders are completely determined forever to destroy fascism, to rebuild their ideals of democracy, and to restore Italy to its rightful place in the community of peace-loving nations. This task will call for discipline of the highest sort—the government of his own life by every patriotic Italian in the best interests of his country. Such self-discipline is the democratic equivalent for the cruel repressions of dictatorship. Free government cannot survive without it. Let us in America give an example of this to our Italian friends.

With determination to succeed in the new ways of peace as we did in war—with tolerance and understanding each for the other—with the comradeship born of mutual dangers and sacrifices—and in reliance on that Divine guidance without which man's greatest efforts are feeble, let us Americans with our Italian brethren overseas and men of good will everywhere look forward to a bright tomorrow.

Address by Luigi Antonini, President of the Italian-American Labor Council, on the Presentation of the "Four Freedoms" Annual Award by the Italian-American Labor Council to Gen. Mark W. Clark

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by Luigi Antonini, president of the Italian-American Labor Council, on October 12, 1945, at the presentation of the "four freedoms" annual award to Gen. Mark W. Clark.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For nearly 4 years, we celebrated Columbus Day while the guns of war were thundering. This is the first Columbus Day of peace—since that fateful year of 1941. I greet you heartily on this memorable occasion, as mankind begins to dig out of the rubble and ruins of total war and gropes and strives to reach the highways leading to a world of peace and plenty.

This is more than a gala occasion. It is even more than a day set aside for celebrating an immortal event of the past. This is a truly historic occasion—for the future. On this dias are seated men who have already made much history—and from whom history still has much to hear and mankind much to benefit.

Highly renowned Americans are joined with us tonight in our climax of a year crowded with endeavors for the triumph of democracy and justice. Through their courage and capacities, they have won the undying esteem and gratitude of our country. Through their valor and vision, through their vibrant idealism and vigorous intelligence, they have enshrined themselves in the hearts of all the downtrodden and liberated, of the liberty-loving people in all lands.

Our guests and speakers are men who were indispensable to America's history on the fields of war. They are now entrusted with new high responsibilities by our country; they are now discharging these duties in a manner and spirit that can only assure and speed the day of humanity's decisive and lasting triumph on the fields of peace. They are, in the finest sense of the word, citizens of the world.

As we read the news and listen to the radio commentators these days, we are bound to get a feeling that the tasks of peace may, in many respects, be even more difficult than those of war. Think of the deadlock and stalemate—to put it charitably—of the recent first conference of the Council of Foreign Ministers. Thus I speak to you tonight of the trials and tribulations of the Italian people at this critical juncture of history not so much out of our high respect for the memory of the glorious Genoese mariner, nor even in token of our very inadequate appreciation of his epoch-making achievements for human progress. It is history that has chosen Italy to be the crucible of our solemn purposes and sacred promises in war and the first testing ground of our principles and plans in peace.

To the Italian-American Labor Council, Americanism is an ideal, a principle, a conviction, a way of life. That is why we have always hoped and worked to have the strongest members of the United Nations allow and assist the land of our forebears to become a mighty fortress of democracy in turbulent Europe and a pillar of peace in the edifice of international security. We had believed that it would be relatively easy to arrive at a peace settlement with the new Italy which rendered decisive contributions to its own liberation as well as to the common victory. We had always felt that democratic Italy, though momentarily in dire straits, was in nobody's sphere of influence. In spite of everything that has happened and has not happened, we still firmly believe that the best interests of every European power demand equitable relations with more than 45,000,000 people of Italy. And at the very foundation of all our hopes and faith that the land of our forefathers would soon return to her rightful place of honor in the community of democratic nations was the genuine and warm sympathy of the American people for the people of Italy.

We were sure that for the sake of world democracy and prosperity, Italy would be offered a generous peace—yes, a better peace. But what do we find now? The Italian people who destroyed the Fascist dictatorship and joined our side in the war are being offered a very bitter peace. These revolutionary changes in Italy were not maneuvers of expediency in the fashion of Balkan Nazi-minded generals who became turncoats when the handwriting on the wall for Germany could be read by even the most politically illiterate. There is not now in all Europe a government that is led by forces more devoted to democracy than is the Italian Government of today. At the helm of the present Italian Government are men who saw the inherent evil in fascism from the very outset. They fought it consistently and courageously. Let those statesmen who are now sitting in judgment on these heroic anti-Fascist fighters—especially those statesmen who judge them unfairly and harshly—recall and realize that these democratic leaders of the new Italy never trafficked with totalitarianism in any shape, manner, or form. These architects of a free and democratic Italy never did sign a commercial treaty with Mussolini, or a military accord, or even nonaggression pact with Hitler.

The peace and prosperity of all Europe and the entire world can only be undermined and destroyed by imposing a punitive peace on the Italian people—by forcing them to pay crushing reparations, making a mockery of their national sovereignty and dismembering their domain in utter contempt of the Atlantic Charter.

Liberty-loving America is the last and best hope of freedom-loving Italy. It is up to our country to set the pace in having the big powers realize that the Italian people were the first victims and not the last villains of Mussolini's Fascist tyranny and aggression. It is primarily up to us, citizens of the new world discovered by Columbus, to get the big powers to understand that they are signing a peace treaty, not with the ghost of Mussolini, but with the resurgent spirit of Garibaldi, Mazzini, Matteotti, and the dynamic idealism of their successors, Parri, Silone, Cianca, Modigliani, Faravelli, Sforza, Lussu, Carandini, Ruini, Saragat, Tarchiani, De Gasperi, and their democratic colleagues.

Thanks to the decency and generosity of the American people, the task of safeguarding and strengthening the reborn democracy of Italy has not waited for the slowly grinding wheels of diplomacy held down by the system of single-nation veto power in international peace conferences. As Secretary of State Byrnes has declared, our country has already "contributed several hundred million dollars for the relief of the Italian people. Their condition is deplorable. We must continue to help them." These are good words—well and timely spoken. In the campaign for the relief and rehabilitation and the democratic regeneration of the new Italy, our Council has spared no efforts, morally and materially. Towards this end, we have provided to the best of our ability, food, clothing, medicines, aid in the rebuilding of bona fide free trade unions, assistance to the herois fighters for freedom in the darkest days of the struggle, and help to the genuine friends of democracy and unswerving foes of all dictatorship.

And now we are launching a new endeavor. We are about to build a home for the most innocent and helpless victims of the terrors of fascism-nazism and the horrors of war. Tonight's proceeds are to go to a fund for the establishment of a home for orphaned children in Italy. This home will be dedicated to the memory of the prime architect of victory, that resplendent figure of American and world history, the one to whom we

made just 1 year ago tonight the "four freedoms" award. I speak of our beloved late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It is most appropriate, indeed that his memory should be honored by the rise of an institution which shall help save and build up for Italian democracy strong and devoted sons who shall make and mould out of their motherland a beacon of culture and civilization and a bulwark of human liberties and progress.

It is most fitting that this year's "four freedoms" award of the Italian-American Labor Council should be made to another great American whose magnificent military genius, broadness of social and political vision, and depth of human sympathy have contributed so decisively to the liberation and resurgence of democratic Italy—as well as to our understanding and appreciation of her true and full role in winning the war and building the peace.

Letter From the President on the Occasion of the Presentation of Award to Gen. Mark W. Clark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, President Truman's message to the Columbus Day celebration of the Italian-American Labor Day Council at the Hotel Biltmore on October 12, 1945, on which occasion the Italian-American Labor Council presented its annual "four freedoms" award to Gen. Mark W. Clark. The message is embodied in the presentation remarks of Mr. Luigi Antonini, which I desire printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY MR. LUIGI ANTONINI PRESENTING THE ANNUAL "FOUR FREEDOMS" AWARD TO GEN. MARK W. CLARK

Tonight, the Italian-American Labor Council makes this year's "Four Freedoms" Award to a most illustrious son of the American people, Gen. Mark W. Clark, liberator of Italy from the barbarous yoke of nazism. About a year ago, I was on a mission to Italy for the American Federation of Labor. There, under the murderous fire of the Nazi legions, he was my host and I was his guest. It was there and then, in the glaring light of battle fire, that I saw clearly his truly American spirit, his genuinely American way of treating and leading his brave and superb army. Indelibly impressed in my memory, in my mind and heart, are the enthusiasm which he generated, the encouragement which he so ably gave, and the brilliance with which he directed his troops in smashing the Gothic line. This rare combination of qualities is the key to his peerless and triumphant leadership in the longest fight waged by our troops on the continent of Europe.

And on no other battlefield in the world were there massed such huge fighting forces of so many different nationalities, races, creeds, color, and language. Here in Italy there was built an invincible fighting front of the United Nations, inspired and united by devotion to the cause of freedom. This welding of Americans, British, Australians, Africans, New Zealanders, Indians, Poles, Brazilians, French, Negro and Japanese Americans, and Italians demanded the highest capacities of generalship and statesmanship and the firmest faith in humanity. Fortunately for our country, for the people of Italy, and the cause of world democracy, Gen. Mark W. Clark, in command, fully and brilliantly met all these most exacting requirements. His accomplishments bore out our most fervent aspirations and highest aims. It is these outstanding achievements which led our council to select Gen. Mark W. Clark as the recipient of this year's "four freedoms" award. General Clark has well earned the title of liberator of Italy, for he is a fighting champion of the "four freedoms."

I can think of no better way of opening the ceremonies of the night than by presenting to you a letter just sent me by the President of the United States Harry S. Truman. The letter reads:

OCTOBER 1, 1945.

DEAR MR. ANTONINI: It is especially fitting that the Italian-American Labor Council has selected Columbus Day as the day for the presentation of its annual "four freedoms" award to Gen. Mark W. Clark.

General Clark has rendered superb service in the liberation of the Italian people. Soldier, statesman, and humanitarian, he deserves the thanks of all people of Italian blood in this country for all that he has done for the beloved homeland and for those liberated from the heel of the oppressor.

Columbus had vision and courage when he fared forth on the voyage which gave the world two new continents. I have full faith that Italians of the present day will face the heavy task of rehabilitation with the same faith and courage. Please extend to General Clark my hearty congratulations and my warmest greetings to all who gather in his honor.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Yes, and on my visit to Italy a year ago today I found in General Clark a truly American general in the best sense of the word. History has had its generals. There were Genghis Khan and Radeski. And there were also George Washington and Giuseppe Garibaldi. You know, even in our country we have generals and generals. But General Clark is far more than a superlative soldier. He is a real general, a grand leader of men facing their supreme test, and a magnificent human being, fine, fearless, and forceful on the field of battle, keen in appraising and quick to appreciate the dynamic social forces and deep-going social changes.

When we honor Gen. Mark W. Clark tonight we pay tribute to our Nation and the glorious Army which gave him to the freedom-loving world. I am profoundly stirred with joy and gratitude as I now pin on you, General Clark, the "four freedoms" medal and offer this resolution and plaque of honor and esteem to you for rendering such immeasurable services to the resurrection of liberty in Italy and to the cause of freedom and democracy throughout the world.

Looking Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH H. BALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Looking Ahead," delivered by me on Wednesday, October 10, 1945, before a meeting of the Independent Voters of Illinois, at Winnetka, Ill. The address deals with domestic and foreign policy issues.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

We of the United States face two great tasks in the decade immediately ahead.

One is to exercise strongly and wisely the leadership which has been thrust upon us in developing agencies of government on the world level which can and will resolve peacefully the inevitable conflicts among nations and prevent a third great war from destroying our civilization.

The second is to develop and make effective in our domestic affairs policies and programs which will bring to reality the greater opportunities, abundance, and freedom for the individual which modern science and industry have placed within our grasp.

Events of recent weeks have made it clear that while the United Nations have won the war completely, we still have achieved only a precarious beachhead in the long fight to make the peace just and secure.

Any lingering complacency that the ratification of the San Francisco Charter solved the problems of peace for good was dispelled by the circumstances surrounding the breakup of the Council of Foreign Ministers meeting in London.

Secretary of State Byrnes' report to the Nation on that conference last week is a tremendously important document. It reached a new high in official frankness in reporting to the Nation the facts of an extremely unpleasant situation. If the American people are to support a strong and realistic foreign policy, the first requisite is that they know the facts upon which it is based.

The Secretary's report made it clear that, despite the conferences at Moscow, Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam, we and the Russians still are not agreed on the basic principles to be applied in the peace settlements. Or at the very best, we do not agree on the interpretation or application of those principles. It appears clear that the procedural questions on which the conference broke up technically, were merely a subterfuge to cover up differences over the substance of the peace treaties under discussion. Particularly involved were the questions of what constitutes an interim government broadly representative of all democratic groups in a country, and what are the requisites to a free election.

It is quite understandable that such differences should arise. Russia does not have any political democracy as we define the term, and free elections are nonexistent there. Our concessions in Poland are ample proof that we are not attempting the impossible task of imposing our ideas of democracy on the whole world. But there is a point beyond which we cannot go in making concessions to Russia's fears without making a mockery of the cause for which we fought and won the war—the freedoms and rights of people.

I support wholeheartedly the policy laid out by Secretary Byrnes, of continuing to seek basic agreements on these principles. It is only as we achieve a minimum of such agreements, hammered out in the give and take of conferences on specific issues and thoroughly understood in both their interpretation and application, that we will breathe life and reality into the framework for preserving peace established at San Francisco. That machinery is strong. I think if we try hard enough we can make it adequate to the task. But it will not function at all unless the major powers, on whom the major responsibility rests, are in substantial agreement on the principles by which it should operate.

It is futile to gloss over or disregard these real and unpleasant differences on principle which are cropping up. That will not solve

them, but merely aggravate them. The only way they can be solved is to bring them out into the open where we know what we are about, and where public opinion can function effectively to help a solution.

Neither can I subscribe to the idea that the atomic bomb, and other weapons nearly as destructive, already have made the United Nations organization obsolete, and that we must immediately junk it and begin work on the Charter of a full-fledged world government.

In the first place, establishment of a full-fledged world government is obviously impossible without that agreement on basic principles which we have been discussing, and which we are still far from achieving. And secondly, with nationalism as strong in every country as it obviously is today, and with the cement of common danger in war removed, it would take years, instead of the months it took the nations to agree on the United Nations Charter, to agree on a world constitution, if they ever could agree.

We and the world dare not wait that long. It is imperative that we proceed to establish as soon as possible the machinery on which we have agreed and then bend all our efforts toward making that machinery fully effective.

There has been recently quite a debate, albeit somewhat one-sided, as to what we and Britain and Canada should do about the atomic-bomb secret. Some want the secret turned over to Russia immediately as an evidence of good faith. The majority of Americans seem to think otherwise.

The debate indicates the danger of a piecemeal approach to the over-all problem of peace. The atomic bomb cannot be considered separately from other armaments and other secret weapons—and each major nation has a few of the latter. And the question of armaments in turn must be integrated into all other international relationships, economic and political.

Leadership in securing the peace has been thrust upon the United States. The mere fact that nearly all nations are looking to us for help to prevent famine and pestilence as well as long-term loans for economic rehabilitation would force us into that position of leadership even if our great military power had not already placed us there.

We are interested primarily in assuring peace in the world. We are convinced that peace can be achieved only if minimum principles of justice, democracy, and freedom are made enforceable throughout the world. I do not believe that we should now bail out the world with our money and goods with no questions asked. We had a disastrous experience along that line after the first great war when our contributions were used to prepare for the second conflict.

I think that in every situation and on every negotiation we should insist on a quid pro quo in the form, not of vague and general promises to do something in the indefinite future, but of specific settlements of specific issues which recognize and apply those minimum standards of justice and decency which we are convinced are essential to future peace. We should not, and I think our past record is proof that we will not, be dictatorial or intransigent in our approach. But we cannot prevent another great war by merely accepting grand statements of purposes that always turn out to mean something different to the other fellow when the times comes to apply them.

We should be perfectly willing to agree to a free and complete interchange of all scientific knowledge, including that on atomic energy, among all the United Nations, but we should insist on safeguards that would make certain the exchange was complete.

When we extend economic help to Britain I want to see, before the loan is made and not afterward, a just settlement of the Palestine question on the basis of the Balfour Declaration. The way the British Colonial Office has evaded and reneged on its clear obligations under that declaration is not only a disgrace to the cause of human freedom for which we fought the war, but an affront to the first victims in that war. If the British Government cannot control its own colonial office, then perhaps it is time to make Palestine a mandate of the United Nations instead of a British mandate.

But while clearing up some of these less justifiable aspects of British imperialism, it might be a good idea for us to reexamine the plans in high quarters to make the Pacific an American lake by grabbing bases all over the place. I have yet to hear a convincing argument on how American bases 7,000 miles from our homeland will make us any more secure, unless we intend to fight the moment any nation makes a move toward flanking those bases, and certainly they would contribute most to international peace if they were international bases. We are sure of our nonaggressive intentions, of course, but isn't it understandable that China and Russia, seeing us plan formidable bases 7,000 miles from California but only a few hundred miles from their shores, might not see it quite that way?

That does not mean that we can or should disarm or let our military strength deteriorate. Like every Member of Congress, I am deluged with demands that demobilization of our armed forces be speeded up. That is understandable, and, as a matter of fact, the demobilization is going as rapidly as can be expected—at the rate of nearly 50,000 men a day. What has concerned me is the attitude back of many of the messages I receive—to the effect that now the war is over there is no further need for us to have a strong armed force.

Have we forgotten so soon that aggressors respect no argument but force? Have we forgotten that because England was weak, Chamberlain had to capitulate at Munich? Are we so soon forgetting our obligation to the 250,000 men who gave their lives to win this war to see to it that it does not happen again?

Until the United Nations organization is set up and functioning, until it has proven its adequacy by experience, we dare not be some so weak that our voice raised against aggression or injustice will be impotent, as it was in 1931 and 1936. Whatever our natural haste to get the boys back home, let's for the sake of the sons of those boys, not go so far or so fast that the tragic record of appeasement of the warmakers during the 1930's becomes possible again.

Our task here at home, of achieving greater prosperity and fuller opportunities and freedoms for all people, will be much easier if we solve the international problem. For only as we are assured of international stability and peace, can the scientific and industrial forces making for prosperity be fully released. Conversely, if we must plan our domestic policies in the shadow of ever-threatening international war, our task is tremendously more difficult, if not impossible.

I think there is general agreement in the United States as to the domestic goal we seek. Some call it prosperity, some an economy of abundance, more recently it is labeled full employment. I would define it a little more exactly as a society in which every individual who puts forth a reasonable effort can enjoy a decent and comfortable standard of living and in which he has the greatest possible degree of political and economic freedom. While we agree on the goal, we are far from agreeing on the means to achieve it—particularly the Federal policies and programs which are most likely to help get us there. Let's discuss briefly the question of means to achieve that goal, particularly with reference to economic security for the individual and freedom for the individual.

A good start for such a discussion is this quotation from the Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive to these ends, it is the right of the people to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

Even today, 169 years later, that is radical political philosophy. It still represents a goal toward which we are moving, but which we have not yet achieved completely. We recognize that the authors of the Declaration were not talking about arbitrary equality of men and women because they knew that individuals are not equal in abilities or capacities. They were talking about equality of rights and opportunities for the individual.

It is significant that in the Declaration of Independence there is no mention of economic security. Unquestionably, its authors knew that economic security is sought by every individual; in fact, it was a far more pressing problem then than now. But I believe they also recognized that complete economic security is to a large degree incompatible with freedom for the individual, and that is why they did not emphasize it, either in the Declaration or our Constitution.

While we have come to take individual freedom and equality of rights almost for granted, I think our record in this war shows that we hold freedom more precious than life itself, and certainly far more important than economic security. The basic issue in this war was between democracy and tyranny, between freedom and slavery for the individual.

It is my own conviction that only individuals who are strong, with trained minds and healthy bodies, can be truly free. They have the best security of all, that which comes from inner confidence of their own ability to meet whatever may come.

Our emphasis, therefore, in seeking greater opportunities and freedom should be on measures and policies which will strengthen the individual and free his mind from fear by giving him knowledge, training and health. The highest freedom of all for the individual is freedom from fear, the confidence that he can and will measure up to any test that may come and remain true to his own inner creed.

One of the great issues we must meet is racial discrimination. We cannot blink the fact that millions of Negroes in our country are treated as second-class citizens. They do not have equality of rights and they are not given the education and training that would assure them equality of opportunity.

We must by Federal legislation protect the civil rights of Negroes, their right to vote and their right to a just trial when accused of crime. We must also give them equality of opportunity, immediately through some agency such as the Fair Employment Practice Commission, but over the years through a tremendous improvement of health and educational standards for Negroes.

I think any psychiatrist would agree that fear is at the basis of the white supremacy doctrine in the South. The whites are afraid of what may happen to them if Negroes are given the equal rights and opportunities guaranteed them by the Constitution. They are afraid they might not be able to compete. They are fearful of reprisals for long years of repression. They are really insecure and their freedom is seriously curtailed because fear plays such a prominent part in determining their actions and attitudes. The only way to overcome fear of that kind is to face it squarely and beat it. The only way the white people in the South will ever prove to themselves and the world that

they are free of fear is to give the Negroes real equality and see what happens.

Our biggest job in the next decade is to make as sure as is humanly possible that all citizens of this great democracy do start even in life, which is the only way they can have equal opportunities. That means equal educational opportunities for all, without regard to financial position, and also health standards as nearly equal for all as we can make them. Both of these objectives must be sought primarily by working with children and young people. It is a slow and almost impossible job to educate and free the mind of an adult individual who has grown up in ignorance and fear. Likewise, it is a slow and difficult job to give healthy bodies to adults if the proper foundation has not been laid in childhood.

There is a real danger today that we will place so much emphasis on economic security for masses of people that we achieve it at the expense of freedom for the individual. We have a tendency to confuse economic security with freedom. Actually, the most secure individual in our society is a prisoner serving a life sentence, but he is hardly free. The people of Germany in the early thirties were so intent on achieving economic security that they permitted their liberties to be liquidated without even a fight.

Our whole concept of freedom includes a willingness to assume the obligations and risks inherent in it. It was men and women imbued with that concept who left the safe and civilized East to push west across the wild mountains and untamed prairies who built our railroads, our mines, our great factories, who in the past 5 years invented, produced, and used the weapons that won this war. Every time in history when men and women have turned over to an outside agency all their individual responsibilities and risks, whether to a Julius Caesar, a feudal baron, an Adolf Hitler, or an omnipotent state, they have also relinquished their individual freedoms.

The easiest and to some the most logical way to achieve economic security for all would be for the Government to take over and operate all our economic institutions. But our experience with even the mild economic controls we've had during this war has proven that government could not wield such complete economic power without becoming tyrannical and liquidating individual freedoms. Our economy is so vast and complicated and our people so individualistic that only the most ruthless control would make such a system work.

One great contribution which the capitalistic system and private enterprise make to freedom is that they offer the individual a choice of many thousands of different ways of making a living with many thousands of potential employers. Government control of all employment would liquidate that freedom of choice. But government does have an obligation to see to it that the trend toward monopoly which is inevitable and inherent in a capitalistic system does not result in drastic curtailment of this freedom of choice.

Our laws against monopolies need to be strengthened and more vigorously enforced. We should provide more funds for enforcement and then insist on vigorous prosecutions. We can and should, in our tax laws, give smaller and medium-sized businesses every reasonable incentive. The consent decrees by which several antitrust suits were settled during the war may have been a necessary expedient, but we should now insist on no further compromise with monopoly.

In a field about which I speak from experience, that of newspaper publication, the present trend toward mergers and chain ownership of great newspapers is a serious threat to freedom in this country. It does two things. First, it limits seriously the choice of employers for the individual who has chosen newspaper work as his vocation. If, for instance, he finds it impossible to work with a clear conscience for one newspaper of a large chain and resigns, he is not likely to find employment with any other newspaper in that chain. His choice of employers is limited and the economic pressure for conformance regardless of conviction is increased. Second, this concentration limits the freedom of access of the people to information about what is happening in the world. No newspaper is completely objective and neither is any newspaperman. Even in the choice of what is to be printed, an editorial policy must be followed and the news which reaches the public is selected, usually with a large degree of objectivity and adherence to standards, but often with the intention of influencing public thinking toward a specific policy. The greater the concentration of ownership of these means of communication with the public, the less freedom the public has to read all sides of any given issue. That is one more reason why our controls on monopoly cannot be too strict.

The role of social or economic security in our system is important, but must be kept subordinate to preserving and expanding the freedoms and opportunities of the individual. As I see it, the role of social security is to adequately care for the inevitable casualties in a competitive capitalistic economy, but not to furnish a high guaranteed standard of living to everyone regardless of the effort and contribution made by the individual.

Just as government has had to step in and protect individual rights and opportunities and the public interest against great concentrations of economic power in management of industry, so, I believe, government must step in and protect individuals and the public against the concentration of economic power in great unions. It is no more right for unions or their leaders to arbitrarily and irresponsibly deprive individuals of their opportunity to work and produce than it is right for an employer to do so, but it is being done, as we all know. The tendency in some unions to impose artificial restraints on production, to trample roughshod over the rights of minorities in their own ranks, and to disregard completely the public interest must be checked. They are destructive of individual freedom and harmful to the Nation's welfare.

This may sound like radical doctrine to some, or reactionary doctrine to others. Frankly, labels interest me far less than finding a sound and intelligent solution to our problems. The fact is that the great majority of us are conformists. We make many if not most of our decisions in life under the spur of fear: fear of economic insecurity or fear of social ostracism. To a degree that fear motivates all of us and it is dominant in some of us.

I believe there is a real danger that in striving for economic security, particularly through government, but also in the policies of industry and great labor unions, we may finally achieve security for all at the expense of freedom for the individual. In other words, we will leave little or no opportunity for leadership, no chance for the nonconformist, whether he be crackpot or genius. To make our democratic system work, we must have leadership—men and women who are willing to fight and risk all for new ideas and ideals. In industry, it has been the nonconformist looking for a better way to do things who has contributed most to our progress. In our social and political life, it has been the nonconformist, willing to challenge the old shibboleths and prejudices, who has been the spark plug of our progress. If the time ever comes when leadership, men and women who differ from the mass and have new ideas, have no alternative but conformance or starvation, then we will have lost our freedom.

We can best guard against that eventuality by keeping our sights always on our primary goal: the fuller achievement of equal rights, freedoms, and opportunities for all individuals. We seek, not just jobs, any kind of jobs, for 60,000,000 Americans, but 60,000,000 opportunities for free Americans to work and produce.

Western Mining Activity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. P. CARVILLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. CARVILLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Nevada State Journal of September 28, 1945, and also a letter I received from W. Clifford Dunham relating to mining activity in the West.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nevada State Journal of September 28, 1945]

NEVADA MINES NOW PRODUCE 22 MINERALS—WIDE VARIETY LISTED BY STATE'S 102 OPERATORS

CARSON CITY, September 27.—Nevada's 102 mining operations are now producing 22 different kinds of mineral wealth, including such things as diatomaceous earth, dumortierite, turquoise, and vermiculite, it was revealed here today.

The major products, judging from the number of men employed, are copper, lead, tungsten, gypsum, and zinc, in that order. The 10 copper mines, with their 1,875 workmen, alone employ more than half of the State's 3,421 miners, but the others are distributed among a wide variety of operations.

Among the more unusual jobs in the State's mining industry are those held by four men producing tin, four others producing turquoise, and five who are turning out dumortierite.

As of the close of 1945 fiscal year, 18 gold mines were in operation with the comparatively small total of 84 men thus employed. Recently, however, the termination of the war has boosted both the number of gold and silver mines in operation and the number of men employed in this form of mining.

Following is a list of the number and type of Nevada mines in operation and the men employed in the production of the minerals produced:

Product	Number of operators	Number of men
Barium	2	13
Brucite	1	27
Clay	2	4
Copper	10	1,875
Diatomaceous earth	3	44
Dumortierite	1	5
Fluorspar	2	41
Gold	18	84
Gypsum	4	188
Lead	22	477
Limestone	3	48
Magnesite	1	10
Manganese	1	7
Quicksilver	3	44
Silica sand	3	53
Silver	2	9
Talc	3	22
Tin	1	4
Tungsten	10	257
Turquoise	1	4
Vermiculite	1	10
Zinc	5	187
Not reported	3	8
Total	102	3,421

ANAHEIM, CALIF., *October 10, 1945.*

Senator CARVILLE,

Washington, D. C.

HON. SENATOR CARVILLE: While making examinations of mines and mining throughout Wyoming and Utah during the past 3 years, I have made several observations and would like to pass this information on to you to aid in the passage of your bill. These examinations have taken place while I have been both examining engineer and project engineer for the Bureau of Mines.

These findings are very limited but no doubt the same facts will be found in many once active mining districts or in many potential districts.

I have made a careful study of one large mining district in Beaver County, Utah, and one in Tooele County, Utah, on base metals. One nonmetallic mining district in Crook County, Wyo., was studied for the production of only one ore.

All mining districts are started from the production of high-grade monobase metal ore; that is a pure copper or lead ore carrying high values in gold or silver, or both. Later these ores become complex and the smelter penalties for gangue minerals or zinc content make the operations unprofitable. Since most of the operators are unable to cope with this condition by milling their ore the properties are closed down and soon the boom camps become ghost camps.

During the war with the benefit of the bonuses paid on metals, many of these camps have been given new life through the work of lessees. Now that the war is over and the payment of a bonus will soon be terminated, most of the leases will be dropped and these lessees added to our unemployed list. Most lessees do not like to work on a daily wage basis. Many of them are prospectors at heart and want to work for themselves.

Now in these districts above mentioned, I can give you some data on the potential tonnages of ore and potential mines that can operate with the number of men now employed and the number who can be employed if an outlet for their ore is furnished, or if they receive some encouragement.

Below is a list of the areas.

Area	Number of mines	Tons production		Men employed		Metals produced
		Present	Postwar	Present	Postwar	
Beaver County, Utah	38	135	545–1,760	67	577–1193	Lead, Zinc, Copper.
Do	10	20	105–385	13	100–216	Fluorite
Tooele County, Utah	14	17	112–390	12	55–172	Lead, Zinc, Copper.
Crook County, Wyo	4	0	60–190	7	24–64	Fluorite.

These figures show what can be done and would be produced if there were mills to concentrate the ore which can be mined in these areas. There are no mills in the areas at present and if no custom mill is put in the area before the bonus goes off, practically all the men now employed will be added to the unemployed list and the small present production decrease.

These mills could be constructed through RFC Government loans or by private parties, or operated as cooperative mills under supervision of the Bureau of Mines.

There are many areas throughout the western United States where similar mining conditions exist and many men could be employed with a great increase to our natural resources.

These areas noted are only a few of perhaps many in Utah and Wyoming and Nevada that would give employment to many men and increase taxable property in the States.

Something must be done to encourage the development and exploration of our mineral resources which are the very foundation of American industry.

Respectfully,

W. C. DUNHAM,
Geologist and Mining Engineer.

British Advised To Take Notice of Feeling Concerning Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Lowell Mellett entitled "British Advised To Take Notice of Feeling Concerning Palestine," which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of October 14, 1945:

BRITISH ADVISED TO TAKE NOTICE OF FEELING CONCERNING PALESTINE

(By Lowell Mellett)

It is inconceivable that those who make British policy know the extent of the ill will developing in this country as the result of their behavior in the matter of Palestine. Word has come that President Truman's proposal for the immediate removal of 100,000 Jews from the concentration camps and makeshift miseries of Germany to Palestine has met with an unfavorable reception in London. And there is no indication that the new Labor government will alter the policy established by the Chamberlain government toward the Jewish homeland.

Now in this country is a British financial mission, seeking a $5,000,000,000 loan. Negotiations with our State Department are said to have progressed satisfactorily and very soon an agreement on terms may be presented to Congress for its approval. Whatever the merits of the proposal, and however well it may be argued that assistance to our late ally would work to the benefit of our own country, it might be worth while for this British mission to examine the strength of some of the existing prejudices against Britain.

They will find that the prejudice resulting from the British default on its moral commitment in the matter of the Jews is a very strong prejudice, one capable perhaps of upsetting their hope of monetary aid. It is deeply rooted in Congress.

The last formal action on the subject occurred a year ago, when a resolution was offered asking the British Government to make good the Balfour Declaration, approved by President Wilson, reopen Palestine to Jewish immigration, and permit the building of the contemplated Jewish commonwealth. This resolution was held up at the request of the administration because of the war. The thing for the British to note, however, is the authorship of the resolution—Senators WAGNER and TAFT, two men ordinarily as far apart as the poles. When these two agree on any important policy it can safely be labeled American policy. They still agree in this instance and both are pressing for action, as are many other Members.

If other evidence is required to prove the depth of American feeling, it can be found in a letter to President Truman, signed by a majority of the Members of the Senate and House. It can be found in a petition from the Governors of 40 States and in resolutions adopted by 33 State legislatures during the past 2 years; likewise in resolutions of the A. F. of L. and the CIO, and the individual pronouncements of 818 labor leaders and 2,000 university presidents and professors.

There is no point in discussing the merits of the issue. Rightly or wrongly, opinion in this country has jelled. The case for the Arabs has been discounted in the light of the showing they made during the war, both as friends and as enemies, and their obvious impotence in these days of mechanized warfare. Junketing Congressmen, after visiting the Near East, are convinced that the Arabs never could have been more than a minor nuisance even when the British situation was really precarious.

The case for the Jews has been made as eloquently by British statesmen as by American. Churchill's charge that Chamberlain's repudiation of the Balfour Declaration was "a plain breach of a solemn obligation," is well known in this country. So, too, is the position taken by the Labor Party before the recent election. "There was a strong case before the war," said a party resolution. "There is an irresistible case now, after the unspeakable atrocities of the cold and calculated German Nazi plan to kill all Jews in Europe. * * * The Arabs have many wide territories of their own; they must not claim to exclude the Jews from this small area of Palestine, less than the size of Wales."

So the financial mission might bestir itself to have this American prejudice removed by action in London, before the question of the loan reaches Congress. If any such loan should carry a condition that the British first be required to keep their word to the Jews of the world—and to the American Government—a smell would thereby be attached to British statesmanship likely to last a long, long time.

A Blow to Communism

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, during the past week people throughout our Nation and the entire world, of all religious faiths and creeds, received news that, in my opinion, has been transcended in importance only by the joyous tidings of VE- and VJ-days. I refer to the thorough denunciation of communism and return to God and religion of the former president and managing editor of the Daily Worker, the official newspaper of the Communist Party in the United States.

This event should bring into clearer perspective the truth that religion and recognition of God is the real bulwark of our life and country. When a Communist, particularly a leader and one of such intimate connection with that un-

American pagan ideology as a member of the Communist National Committee, turns his back on his party and its teachings, it is certainly an appropriate time for every citizen of our land, whether Protestant, Jew, or Catholic, to realize that without religion and recognition of God the people of this Nation and the world are lost.

Our forefathers founded our free and liberty-loving United States of America upon the recognition of the existence of a supreme being. One simply cannot be a Communist and hold to be self-evident the truths set forth in the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal, that they are endowed, by the Creator, with certain inalienable rights, and that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I have always been bitterly opposed to communism and always will be, and will fight every Communist encroachment upon our American way of life. Everyone in our land possessing the slightest degree of common sense has known all along that communism cannot solve our, or the world's social problems. But it is vitally important that every man, woman, and child in America know that this former chieftain abandoned communism because it is as he says inherently antireligious; because it cannot work as a basis for the solution of economic ills, and because it destroys individualistic thinking and makes mere puppets of its disciples.

Communism has often been aptly described as a wolf in sheep's clothing. By blatantly advocating some principles which are really democratic and just and of benefit to the man who labors by the sweat of his brow, Communists seek to hide the fact that they are, as Louis F. Budenz, the former Daily Worker managing editor, declares, irrevocably set upon the ending of the religion of Catholic, Jew, and Protestant in this country and determined to cultivate ruthlessness and lust for power and warfare against moral principles. How serious and hostile the communist movement really is is evidenced by Budenz's statement that communism "aims to establish tryanny over the human spirit" and "is an unending conflict with religion and true freedom."

When some of us here in this House oppose and delay humane and progressive social measures, such as proper social security, the antilynching bill, the bill to abolish poll tax, to create full employment, the bills to establish a fair minimum wage, to establish a Fair Employment Practice Committee, and to give to the veteran the rights and privileges he has justly earned, we are really playing right into the hands of the Communist leaders who loudly advocate and falsely claim credit for such legislation, but who really haven't the slightest interest in such bills other than to cloak the un-American intents of their anarchistic bosses. As a Member of Congress I am always amused when Communist officials arrogantly demand that I vote for social and just labor legislation that no one could induce me to vote against. Certainly we do not need a Communist to reiterate the words of the senior Senator from New York that we must be committed to maintenance of world peace, jobs, and prosperity, with special emphasis upon the needs of returning veterans, development of our productive capacity to bring a higher standard of living, slum clearance and low-rent housing, speeding up of reconversion, keeping the cost of living on an even keel, reduction of the causes of industrial strife by industrial justice and continuation of the fight against racial and religious discrimination.

Finally, I must remind the citizens of this country of every religious belief—Protestant, Jewish, and Catholic—that we should feel indebted to Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, Catholic educator and one of communism's most articulate foes, for his success in converting Mr. Budenz, his wife, and three daughters to the Catholic faith and renunciation of the Communist movement. In severing his association with this Godless movement and after accepting a professorship in economics at Notre Dame University, the former Communist Party stalwart said:

> Reason and faith have led me to this happy step. Communism and Catholicism are irreconcilable. * * * With deep joy I wish to announce that by God's grace I have returned fully to the faith of my fathers, the Catholic Church.

Child-Care Centers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

"Whereas the sudden cessation of hostilities and the announcement of the Federal Government of the rather abrupt withdrawal of financial assistance for the operation of child-care centers has left no machinery nor sponsorship for carrying on this important program during the transition period immediately ahead; and

"Whereas so many of the mothers of children cared for in these centers are the wives of men still in the service, or widows of men who lost their lives in the service, and are therefore responsible for earning the livelihood for their families; and

"Whereas a considerable number of the women whose children are served in child-care centers came from other parts of the country to work in the war industries of this area; and

"Whereas the sudden enforced abandonment of child-care centers will cause irreparable damage and hardship: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the City Council of the City of Los Angeles urge the Members of Congress from Los Angeles County, and the Senators from California to give their support to the continuation of financial assistance from the Federal Government for the operation of necessary child-care centers in order to meet the present emergency."

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a complete and correct copy of resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Los Angeles, at its meeting held October 3, 1945.

[SEAL] WALTER C. PETERSON,
City Clerk.

What Shall We Do With the Atomic Bomb?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the nations of the world are greatly concerned over the effect of the development of the atomic bomb as it pertains to future progress and world peace. Extended deliberation and solemn thought should be given by the Congress on any legislation dealing with the atomic bomb because our country's attitude today may influence world history for centuries.

I wish to hereby extend, for the consideration of Congress, a timely editorial written by H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary Post Tribune, Gary, Ind.:

WHAT SHALL WE DO WITH THE ATOMIC BOMB?

What to do with the atomic bomb continues to be one of the leading topics of the day and it will doubtless continue to be. It has presented a new problem to the world and that problem will not have been settled until satisfactory controls have been set up.

What are those controls? No one can say now. The problem is so new and the threat so vast, controls cannot be contrived in the time we have had. Many want to turn the bomb over to an international alliance, others would share it with other nations, while some would keep it for ourselves.

There are difficulties with all proposals. There is no international alliance or league stable enough to take charge of and provide security against this new danger. If the secret is made public, then the bomb may become a threat to world peace in the near future. If we keep it to ourselves, there is reason to believe other nations will be able to duplicate it within a reasonable time.

Therefore, it is evident careful consideration must be given to our policy. That means we shall do nothing with it for the present. The work of development will go on so that all other nations, no matter when they start to duplicate the bomb, will always find themselves some years behind us.

This is a nice position to be in for the moment, but it is hardly likely we shall be satisfied to keep it long. For it cannot help but create feeling against us even as it also develops the respect we call fear. That is hardly the attitude we wish to create in the world. It is not the attitude of democracy.

This means we must look forward to sharing our secret with our friends at least, and possibly with everyone. When that time shall come must depend on world affairs, but it is not impossible the bomb itself may become our best bargaining agent. What we want is a peaceful world, and we might trade the bomb for it.

Even though we fill a unique place in the world in that we are generally admired, we should be very careful not to let the bomb wear away that feeling. Russia may show more resentment than any other nation because Americans criticize her more than any other nation. Then the Russians, because of their isolation, are more suspicious than any other people.

Let's not let them think we are using the bomb as a threat, but rather that we hold it in trust for a peaceful world, and when that world can be properly organized the bomb and all the information we shall have obtained will be turned over to it to insure world progress and solidarity.

Oscar S. Cox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, in early 1941, Mr. Oscar Cox, then associated with the Treasury Department, appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee in its historic consideration of the Lend-Lease Act. As the principal author of the Lend-Lease Act, Mr. Cox made one of the great contributions to victory.

In the years that followed he was successively general counsel of the Lend-Lease Administration, Assistant Solicitor General of the Department of Justice, General Counsel and, finally, Deputy Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration. In those years the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee came to know Mr. Cox personally and to appreciate fully his great talents as a public servant. Mr. Cox's departure from the Government should be a matter of regret for all those who believe that the Government requires men of ability and imagination.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, as testimonials of Mr. Cox's contribution to Government service, I include editorials which appeared in the New York Times of October 6, 1945, and the Washington Post of September 14, 1945, and a newspaper story in the Chicago Sun of September 29, 1945, describing his achievements:

[From the New York Times of October 6, 1945]

YOUNG MAN IN WASHINGTON

In the resignation of Oscar S. Cox as Deputy Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration, which takes effect today, the Government loses another of the able young men with whom President Roosevelt surrounded himself. Less well known than some of the others, Mr. Cox was one of the ablest. It was he who dug up the 1892 statute permitting the Government to lease munitions of war to other countries. On this was based the famous H. R. 1776, the Lend-Lease Act.

Mr. Cox joined the Roosevelt administration in 1938 as an assistant to Treasury Counsel Oliphant after a successful career as an assistant corporation counsel of New York City. In the latter post he directed investigations that added $200,000,000 to utility company property assessments in New York City. In Washington he moved from the Treasury to the Office of Production Management, then to the Lend-Lease Administration as general counsel, to the Justice Department as Assistant Solicitor General, and finally to his last position as Deputy Administrator of FEA. He served well in all of them. His liberal ideas and his persuasive voice will be missed in Washington.

[From the Washington Post of September 14, 1945]

SERVICES RENDERED

If the history of the war could be written with due regard for truth, it would be found that behind the figures and fronts of the men in the news were aides who contributed mightily both to their principals' public reputations and to victory. The aides might be called the second line on the domestic front. One of the most significant figures in this list, Oscar S. Cox, Deputy Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration, has just resigned from Government service. Seven years ago, the 32-year-old Mr. Cox, fresh from the corporation counsel's office in New York, put his brilliant talents and his progressive convictions at the Government's disposal. First he served Secretary Morgenthau at the Treasury. There he quickly earned attention by his knowledge of the law and the lore of Government procedure, and he united his erudition to an unflagging zeal and an imaginative resourcefulness. Moreover, he never forgot that politics is the art of the possible.

Perhaps Mr. Cox's greatest contribution was his spadework on the inception and acceptance of the lend-lease expedient. It was Mr. Cox, who, when the administration was troubled about ways and means of giving full aid to the democracies, dug up an old 1892 statute which allowed the Government to lease munitions of war to other countries. Here was a precedent for resolving the administration's dilemma. It had been done before, and, in the exigencies of those parlous days when Hitler was stopping up one American access to Europe after another, it could be done again. The idea having been accepted by his chiefs, Mr. Cox went to work on the writing of a lend-lease bill, the famous H. R. 1776, with results that are now history. That he helped to make such history must be a great satisfaction to Mr. Cox, and we wish him success in his essay in private law practice commensurate with his achievement in the public service.

[From the Chicago Sun of September 29, 1945]

INSIDE STORY OF PREPAREDNESS—GOAL OF 50,000 PLANES WAS SET BY F. D. R. IN ERA OF ISOLATIONIST SECURITY

(By Thomas F. Reynolds)

WASHINGTON.—Hitherto undisclosed information revealed today that President Roosevelt began moving toward the annual production goal of 50,000 fighting planes for America and its allies as early as 1938 while the United States still was relaxing in fancied isolationist security.

But the late President, branded a warmonger for attempting to arouse the Nation by his quarantine speech in the fall of 1937, was unable to translate the plans into concrete requests for almost 2 years.

When the President did ask Congress to approve and authorize such a program in the spring of 1940, the isolationist press branded it absurd and even Thomas E. Dewey, his Presidential opponent 4 years later, said publicly that it was beyond possibility of realization.

The long-range preparedness vision of the late President was revealed today by officials interested in straightening out the record now that the $42,208,000,000 lend-lease program is being shut down and its liquidation entrusted to the State Department.

They indicated that in fairness to the former President, his early work should be made known—especially in view of the fact that the same isolationist groups who blocked his early moves now are attempting to make the charge that he left this country unprepared for the tremendous task which broke out on Pearl Harbor day.

A careful review of hitherto censored memoranda reveals that the late Herman Oliphant, then general counsel for the Treasury, first sounded the administration alarm on production difficulties inherent in the threat of war which Mr. Roosevelt had pointed out to the Nation.

That was in the spring and summer of 1938—even before the late Neville Chamberlain, then British Prime Minister, had made his deal for "peace in our time" with Hitler at Munich. Oliphant was encouraged to put a staff to work on those long-range problems by Mr. Roosevelt and the then Secretary of Treasury, Henry Morgenthau, Jr.

Key man on this staff was a young lawyer, Oscar Cox, who later was to draft the Lend-Lease Act. In the fall of 1938, Oliphant came up with data to show that if war did break out, this country would have to assume that sooner or later it would be involved. On this data, Oliphant concluded that the only possible insurance policy would be to step up airplane production to 50,000 planes annually.

Morgenthau, Oliphant, and Cox, by memoranda and personal conversation, put the 50,000-plane idea before Mr. Roosevelt. He was impressed, and consented to permit work on it to continue. But he told the planners that it would be impossible for him to make any such proposal at that time to a Congress which even then was trimming minor defense appropriations.

The timing was wrong, he said. And it was not until May 1940, when the German Wehrmacht was running wild through France, and England was virtually defenseless, that he was able to present the plan to Congress—to be met even at the eleventh hour by incredulity and amazement.

The goal, of course, was achieved and surpassed.

The work done by Oliphant's staff, notably Cox, formed the genesis of lend-lease, an unparalleled weapon by which this country traded goods, guns, machines, and dollars for fighting services of its allies and victory.

This work also enabled England in its desperate hours prior to lend-lease to find weapons which encouraged it to stand for critical months alone against Germany.

The work started on the assumption of Oliphant's staff that the systems of World War I would not work—first, that no private firm could be purchasing agent here for the Allies, as was J. P. Morgan in the First World War; and, second, that the Allies were going to be desperately short of dollars to buy American weapons.

This staff pioneered the way into purchasing by Anglo-French air missions which began buying a few planes here when the war broke out in September 1939.

And it went to work on problems of standardization, arguing for freezing of certain plane models to enable producers to swing toward mass production. It went into the problem of ammunition for small arms—the question of British use of 30.3 rifle shells as against the United States .30-caliber rifle.

In 1940—a full year before lend-lease—when France was falling and Britain was in desperate need of arms, the mechanics of purchase here were breaking down. The question was whether the United States would choose to insist on formal dollar payments and see Hitler astride the British Isles, or take drastic action.

It was Cox at that critical hour who found an old 1892 statute which permitted the Secretary of War to lease certain properties for up to 5 years. That broke one bottleneck and limited types of war matériel were made available.

Then, after Dunkerque, Britain was desperately in need of rifles, pistols, and small-arms ammunition, because the escape from Dunkerque had stripped its surviving troops of all equipment and its beaches were virtually defenseless. The United States had ample supplies in warehouses. But the State Department ruled that the United States could not provide them to Britain because this country still was neutral and to do so would violate international law.

The State Department ruled that was legal. The private firms hurried the weapons to Britain. They included 500,000 rifles, quantities of 75-millimeter cannons that were growing obsolete, Lewis and Browning machine guns. And Britain armed its reorganizing army and its civilians and stood firm.

Then, in the fall of 1940, Mr. Roosevelt determined to meet the problem head-on and ordered Morgenthau to cut red tape and make this country the actual arsenal of de-

mocracy. Cox was put to work drafting once again.

He drafted the original Lend-Lease Act in 20 minutes, basing it on the old 1892 statutes and the Pittman resolution permitting shipments of arms to Latin-American countries. That draft went to Morgenthau, who had his Treasury lawyers go over it quickly.

Again Cox was called in to break the bottleneck. He found that while the Government couldn't sell the weapons, private companies could do so with full legality.

Furthermore, he found that much of the ammunition and many of the guns were growing aged and the War Department would not be averse to seeing the material replaced with new ammunition and weapons. So the crucial weapons were traded in to private companies such as United States Steel Export and others, which undertook to replace them for the War Department with new weapons.

It then was all very simple.

It went through revisionary examinations in the War and Navy Departments, was shown to congressional leaders who approved after minor revisions. Cordell Hull, Henry L. Stimson, the late Frank Knox, and Morgenthau then initialed it—all within the space of a few hours in 1 day as it was hurried from department to department by messenger.

Then it was rushed to the White House, President Roosevelt studied it for 10 minutes, then leaned back in his chair and slapped his desk.

"Boy—that's it," Mr. Roosevelt said.

Although the drafting was done by legal experts, it was Mr. Roosevelt personally who took over the task of explaining the move to the American people and to Congress. While preparations were quietly going ahead in Congress for reception of such a move, Mr. Roosevelt went for a short sea trip. On his return, he was told that preparations were ready.

He met correspondents at the White House and in December, 1940, began the press conference that now is historic.

"When your neighbor's house is on fire, you lend him a fire hose," said the President of the United States.

Ambassador Patrick Hurley and Chinese Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the recent settlement between Chiang Kai-shek and Mao Tse-tung is a tribute to the diplomatic ability and statesmanship of our Ambassador to China, the Honorable Patrick Hurley. While the agreement reached between the Kuomintang and Communist Parties has not brought about complete accord between the two factions, it has, nevertheless, laid a firm foundation for eventual settlement of China's internal problems. The success achieved so far has been due, in large part, to the untiring efforts of Pat Hurley, who has had to surmount tremendous difficulties in bringing these two groups together. Due, in large part, to his persistence and skill the chances for unity in China are greater now than ever before. It is with confidence that we look forward to Ambassador Hurley returning to his post in China where, we hope, an eventual and complete reconciliation of all Chinese elements will take place. This is not only necessary but desirable so that China will become internally strong and thus be able to assume the responsibilities and the obligations that go with a great power. When this position is achieved China then will become, in reality, a bastion for peace in Asia and the world.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection, I would like to insert in the RECORD an article by Barnet Nover covering the present situation in China and the part played by Ambassador Hurley. Mr. Nover is one of the outstanding newspaper commentators in the country today, and his work always shows a realistic understanding of the problems he discusses and a background of scholarly research. Under unanimous consent, the article referred to, follows:

STEP TOWARD UNITY

(By Barnet Nover)

CHUNGKING AND THE CHINESE REDS

It would be rash to assume that the agreement which the central Chinese Government has just concluded with the Chinese Communists eliminates for good all sources of actual or potential conflict between them.

The differences between Chiang Kai-shek and the Reds are altogether too deep-seated and of too long standing to be wiped out overnight by any paper pledge by both elements to live at peace with one another and work together for the common good of the nation.

Certainly, the signing of the agreement does not in and of itself mean that China is now truly united, not in our meaning of the term, anyway. Basically, the agreement only establishes and legalizes a state of truce between the central government and the Chinese Communists. Out of that truce, however, real peace and unity may evolve. If that happens, the Chungking pact will prove to be a very important milestone in China's national life.

It can be more than that. It can also prove to be one of the foundation stones of peace in the Far East.

One important reason why at recurring intervals over a period of more than a hundred years the Far East has been a great international storm center is that during the entire period China has been weak. Being weak she has been a prey both to internal rivalries and foreign pressures.

The Sino-Japanese War that began in 1937 and that led, 4 years later, to Pearl Harbor, was only the last of a series of conflicts whose root cause was China's inability to defend herself.

Before China can grow strong enough to insure her security against external attack she must first achieve unity. By the same token, any situation that inhibits such unity or delays its achievement makes for international turmoil.

During recent years there has been a great deal of criticism of American policy vis-à-vis China. This criticism has come most vehemently from those who have argued that in supporting Chiang Kai-shek we were putting money on the wrong horse. They have favored granting direct support to the Chinese Communists on the ground that the Yenan regime was more honest, more democratic, more of a people's regime than the government at Chungking.

This pressure was resisted, and with good reason. Not only, with all its faults, was the Chungking Government the duly constituted goverment of China, so recognized not only by us but by all the other United Nations, including Russia, but in giving direct support to the Chinese Communists we would have been feeding the fires of civil war in China.

Instead, repeated efforts were made by American emissaries to bring Chungking and the Chinese Communists together. These efforts got nowhere for a long time, and all the while Chungking and Yenan were preparing as well as they could for what many regarded as the inevitable struggle between them. Both sides were reckoning on the gains to be derived from Japan's ultimate collapse and from the support they hoped to get from the outside to make themselves supreme in China.

In order to find a solution of China's internal difficulties it became clear that an understanding had first to be reached by outside nations having the greatest direct interests in what happened in China. This meant, particularly, Russia and the United States.

The full story of the efforts made by the United States to reach an understanding with Russia regarding the Far East has yet to be told. When it is told it will reflect credit on American diplomacy, not least on the efforts made by Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley.

Before going to China as American Ambassador, General Hurley visited Moscow and had long conversations with Marshal Stalin and Foreign Commissar Molotov on the subject of Chinese affairs. At that time he sought and received assurances from the Russian leaders of the Soviet Union's determination to avoid fishing in China's troubled waters by giving aid to the Chinese Communists. On a later occasion, General Hurley helped persuade the Kremlin to enter into conversations with the Chinese Government for a settlement of the issues outstanding between them.

General Hurley's efforts to bring Chungking and the Chinese Communists together were the corollary to the efforts he had made at Moscow. A good deal of credit for the easing of Russian-Chinese and Chungking-Yenan tensions certainly belongs to him.

The question remains how well the present Chungking agreement will be carried out. By no means all differences between Chungking and the Communists have been disposed of, even on a truce basis. It is clear, however, that each side has made concessions to the other.

Chungking has agreed to democratize the central regime and end the present one-party dictatorship. The Chinese Communists, for their part, even while insisting on the appointment of the governors of four northern provinces and the retention of a large military force, have agreed to recognize Chungking's paramountcy in principle at least and accept, again at least in principle, the nationalization of all military forces in China. How well this agreement is carried out will determine how speedily real unity will be achieved in China. At least a start has been made.

California's Postwar Problems Are a National As Well As a Local Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, all Members of Congress are vitally concerned about the postwar employment problems and reconversion in whatever

State we may come from. I think, however, it is safe to say that the problem in California is more complex and difficult than in any other State in the Union.

There are several distinct reasons:

First, California is overpopulated due to expanded war industries.

Second, California's climate is so desirable and attractive that people coming there during the war do not want to leave.

Third, California needs peacetime industrial expansion and the manufacture of basic materials in order to keep her increased population employed.

Southern California, of which Los Angeles County is the metropolitan center, will suffer the most unless industrial peacetime manufacturing is expanded to provide employment for its surplus population. The labor, raw materials, cheap hydroelectric power, factories, transportation facilities, and consumer markets are available, but we are fighting against the severe competition of eastern manufacturing centers.

The Kaiser steel plant in Fontana is struggling against eastern steel manufacturers for its existence. The war left two mammoth modern synthetic rubber plants in Los Angeles County which must be kept operating. It also left one of the most modern aluminum extrusion plants as well as some of the largest shipbuilding and repair plants together with the largest airplane manufacturing plants, and numerous smaller factories which can readily be converted into peacetime production.

Los Angeles County has the finest equipped rail and harbor facilities in the West. All of these facilities can and must be used to provide labor with suitable employment, and to supply the West and the foreign-trade markets with peacetime products. Otherwise our great hydroelectric plants will go begging for wheels to turn, and our mammoth industrial factories will become ghostly monuments and labor will go begging for jobs, seeking relief from the State and counties unless suitable legislation and proper future planning is laid out now to prevent economic deterioration.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the attached article from the Los Angeles Daily News:

CALIFORNIA'S THREE CHOICES

It is easy to blow wise over California's postwar unemployment problem. What is hard is to discover means of solving it.

Thus, though the storm warnings are out—plain for all except the blockhead fringe to see and heed—the problem of maintaining nearly 3,500,000 civilians in employment continues to baffle the State's—and the Nation's—top experts.

In the wake of Government development of war industries, 1,800,000 people have come to California since 1940.

If these new residents are going to find places in the State's peacetime economy, a tremendous expansion of industrial and agricultural production will be required.

As stated by the University of California's bureau of public administration, the State has three choices: increased production, a permanent burden of unemployment relief, or reduction of population.

Since increased production offers the only long-range solution if the Pacific West is to realize its full destiny, the problem is what can be done to bring about increased industrial activity.

To plan and carry out greater production during wartime was comparatively easy. In the first place, as Samuel C. May, director of the Berkeley campus' public administration bureau has noted, "the airplane plants and shipyards did not develop in California under normal competitive conditions. They came to California," May reminds us, "because the Federal Government under its war powers planned and directed their location, financed their construction, and contracted for purchase of their entire output."

In other words, Uncle Sam set up business in our midst and the people came out in droves to work for him.

It was all great stuff while it lasted. But now, about to be thrown back upon the self-reliance of local communities, the State government, and private business war workers facing continuing cut-backs are experiencing an understandably queasy feeling.

Where we go from here is therefore the big question.

Looking at the over-all national economic picture, the average observer certainly has little cause for optimism over the West's immediate industrial future.

Technological advances in all employments since 1939 have whittled a good 10 percent off the Nation's labor force. Trades and services, unfortunately, cannot absorb every displaced factory and agricultural worker. Hence, Professor May, taking into account a reasonable population loss, estimates that, despite some degree of expansion in trades and services, California will still have 1,050,000 unemployed by 1947.

What has happened has been a great economic mutation. A region formerly supported by a tourist industry, agriculture, and light manufacturing, has as a result of the war become industrialized. Factory smoke and orange blossoms are now the mix of California's air. The result is, as Fortune magazine says, that "the West now has an industrial population that only industry can employ."

To employ this population in a peacetime consumer economy, May estimates, would require an initial capital outlay investment for plant and equipment of at least $6,500,000,000.

This figure represents three times as much, he says, "as the annual average capital expenditures for plant and equipment as were invested over any 3-year period of the boom 1920's for the entire United States."

Because public works is at best only a stopgap measure, and because unemployment relief, if long continued, would burden the entire economy, the answer to continuing employment in California is extensive investment in what Henry Kaiser calls "seed" industries.

Where to obtain—or from whence to attract—such great sums of capital as are needed is the crux of the problem.

Converting to peacetime production existing wartime plants and facilities presents a difficult undertaking. Unlike eastern heavy industry—notably motors, cars, rails, steel, and electrical machinery—California's airplane plants and shipyards, as well as its Fontana steel enterprise, cannot be converted to manufacture of civilian goods without far reaching and costly alteration. While eastern industry returns to the functions for which it was originally established, the Pacific coast faces the challenge of building an almost entirely new industrial structure.

Money to build this structure is not available in sufficient amounts locally. Thus, as May indicates, "California's immediate future will depend upon whether this capital will flow into expansion of eastern concerns * * * or whether it can be encouraged by favorable conditions to come to California."

Past efforts in this direction have not been particularly successful. Eastern industry generally resists regional competition, maintains close tie-ups with eastern banking and credit concerns.

Consequently, California has but one way out of the postwar maze: assistance and planning by the Federal Government.

California, however, cannot maturely appraise its future or determine the extent and direction of Federal assistance in a happy-duck attitude of resistance to realities. The "everything is going to turn out all right" philosophy won't avert what Fortune aptly terms "Predated disaster."

It is obvious, therefore, that Californians—and westerners generally—should have a considerable stake in the objectives of the Murray-Patman full-employment bill. It is also natural that they should look with interest and hope to the many other measures now before Congress aimed at steering the American economy toward peace and plenty. Prosperity for the Nation as a whole gives California a better chance to catch up with its labor force.

Fundamentally, however, larger-scale development of western resources and production, the elimination of discriminatory practices such as unfair basic point prices and monopolistic restraints, and the encouragement of investment in western business and industry through Government-guaranteed loans—these are the guideposts to California's postwar future.

It is not an easy road. "Work pile" programs will soften the transition shock. Federal aid will smooth the way. But the really tough job of building a firm economic foundation for the West's expanded population is going to take a lot of perserverance.

Now is the time to hammer relentlessly at the task of creating a healthy economy for the State and the Nation.—R. E. G. H.

Who's Right—and Who's Wrong?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

WHO'S RIGHT—AND WHO'S WRONG?

In September, Socony-Vacuum offered its employees a 15-percent increase in pay. Added to increases previously given since 1941, this made a total increase, in both hourly wages and weekly take-home pay, ranging from 32 to 38 percent since that date.

The offer was accepted by the great majority of our employees. It was rejected by the union holding contracts with 4 of our 15 refineries, representing less than 10 percent of the company's total employees.

The union called a strike in violation of the provisions of the War Labor Disputes Act and of the no-strike clause in the contracts.

The Government summoned a conference between 11 oil companies and the union officials. This conference failed to reach an agreement. The Secretary of Labor then proposed that the dispute be submitted to arbitration—but the proposal limited the arbitration to the difference between the company's offer of 15 percent and the union's demand of 30 percent.

In view of the grave inconvenience caused the public by the strike, Socony-Vacuum expressed its willingness to arbitrate on any fair basis.

We stipulated that the arbitrator should consider what is a fair increase in wage rates,

without reference to the company's voluntary offer or the union's demand. The Secretary of Labor's proposal provides that arbitration should determine what increase should be given employees in excess of 15 percent. This was and still is the only difference between the Government's position and the company's.

It is not arbitration at all when the arbitrator begins by giving to one party half of what that party demanded.

We asked also that the arbitrator should be mutually acceptable. The arbitrator subsequently named by the Secretary is entirely acceptable to us.

We have repeated to the Secretary of Labor our willingness to accept the decision of the arbitrator as to the wage to be paid.

Socony-Vacuum did not decline arbitration.

B. BREWSTER JENNINGS,
President, Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc.

Ireland's Case Before the International Tribunal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions which were unanimously adopted at a meeting held recently at the Hotel Astor in New York City under the auspices of the Clan-na-Gael of New York and Bronx Counties. I feel that our Government should exert every influence to obtain an impartial hearing of Ireland's case before the international tribunal which is to be set up to establish peace and justice throughout the world. The Partition Act passed by the British Parliament should be promptly repealed if we mean to do justice to the small nations of the world:

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The resolutions which follow were unanimously adopted at a meeting held under the auspices of the Clan-na-Gael of New York and Bronx Counties, N. Y., in the Hotel Astor, New York, on Sunday evening, September 16, 1945:

"Whereas Thomas Davis, the Irish patriot, poet, philosopher, and publicist, to whom this meeting of citizens of Irish blood is paying a tribute of affectionate remembrance on the centenary of his death, detested bigotry and intolerance and devoted his great talents in the years of his mature manhood to the noble work of uniting in the bonds of friendship the people of Ireland and establishing, through that union, an independent and distinctively Irish nation, under the government of which all its citizens, regardless of their racial origin, creed or class, would enjoy equal rights; and

"Whereas we believe, as Davis believed, that sectarian hatred is an evil thing and that when it is fomented and practiced for the purpose of oppression or to impede the progress of a people toward freedom it is doubly reprehensible; Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we draw the attention of the executive department of the Government of the United States, of our representatives in both Houses of Congress and of our fellow citizens to the grave injustice which was done to the people of Ireland by the Partition Act which was passed in the British Parliament in 1920 and to the evils which have resulted from the dismemberment of Ireland; and be it

"*Resolved*, That we denounce the government set up in six counties of northeastern Ireland, after the partition of the ancient Irish Nation, as a bigoted military despotism, which has oppressed and penalized the Catholic people of that area, because of their religious beliefs, which continues to violate every one of the 'four freedoms' and which has been enabled and encouraged to continue its acts of oppression by subsidies received from the British Imperial Treasury; and be it also

"*Resolved*, That we appeal to the Government of the United States, which shares responsibility for the keeping of the pledges regarding human rights and human freedom given to the world by the United Nations during the progress of the war, to insist that those pledges be kept, and we request our Government to withhold financial aid, part of which may be used for the purpose of oppression, from any foreign government that violates those solemn promises; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we request the United States Government to use its powerful influence to obtain an impartial hearing of Ireland's case before the international tribunal which it has been announced will be set up to establish peace and justice everywhere throughout the world."

Sincerely yours,

JAMES REIDY.

Port Efficiency—Key to Increased Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Thomas E. Lyons, executive secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Department of Commerce, before the annual meeting of the American Association of Port Authorities, Palmer House, Chicago, Ill., October 11, 1945:

On October 11, 1940—just 5 years ago today—I addressed a meeting of the Association of Atlantic Marine Terminal Operators in New York. At that time our country was at peace but war clouds were gathering and we had already initiated an active national defense program. At the New York meeting I pointed out the difficulties of carrying on international trade with a large segment of the globe already at war. I also referred to the increased responsibilities which port authorities and terminal operators would have to assume as the war spread into other world areas. In my talk I listed some of the new and unfamiliar commodities which we would require from distant lands for our defense program and urged port officials to gear their facilities to handle this vitally important traffic.

That our ports and terminals have done a fine job in preparing for war admits no doubt. Records of the movement of troops, war materials, lend-lease, and commercial cargoes through our ports to the various world theaters will go down in history as even a greater achievement. Irrespective of these achievements, our ports cannot afford to rest on their oars or bask in this reflected glory. Even today, while our harbors are handling the debarkation of soldiers and war materials, port officials must inventory terminal equipment in the light of peacetime needs and plan a course of replacement which will assure proper port facilities in the postwar world.

One lesson that the war has taught us is that as a nation we are no longer self-sustaining and that we are dependent on other world areas for essentials of everyday life. We also have learned that if we are to develop our export trade in proper proportion to our domestic economy we must in turn increase our imports. Students of foreign trade, both in and out of the Government, have given considerable study to the question of our postwar foreign trade. While they are not in agreement as to the dollar values of this trade, all agree that it will be substantially greater than the banner year of 1929.

The Department of Commerce believes that an export trade of well over $10,000,000,000, with imports at $6,000,000,000, are possible postwar goals for the United States and that these goals can be achieved if proper measures are taken. In dollar terms, this would mean a level of trade at least double what it was in 1929 and three times what it was in the years just preceding the war. In terms of employment, it would mean about 5,000,000 jobs directly related to export trade as compared with less than 2,500,000 before the war. These figures would be associated with a gross national product not far below $200,000,000,000, and a national income of, say $165,000,000,000.

Although values are important in measuring foreign trade, port authorities who have the responsibility of providing cargo facilities are more concerned with commerce when expressed in tonnage. Last year the Department of Commerce published a study setting out our exports for the years of 1929 and 1937 as twenty-nine and one-tenth million and twenty-three and eight-tenths million cargo tons, respectively. Our imports for these identical years total twenty-five and twenty-four and eight-tenths million tons, respectively. Postwar tonnage estimates are set out as thirty-four million tons—exports, and thirty-three million tons—imports. In other words, according to the Commerce Department study, postwar export tonnage will be 17½ percent over 1929 and 42 percent greater than in 1937. Import tonnage estimates for the postwar period run approximately 33⅓ percent higher than either 1929 or 1937. These figures relate exclusively to dry cargoes—the class of traffic in which port authorities and terminal operators have particular interest.

During the war rapid strides were made in the field of air transport and figures of cargoes carried appear impressive, especially when stated in values. Within the past fortnight we have seen a cargo ship of the air, the *Globester*, circle the world in 6 days. Later on we may expect many more such argosies of the air. While this development is spectacular and important I think we can still feel confident that the bulk of our international commerce when calculated on a weight basis, will continue to move by surface ships—at least as long as our seaports are operated efficiently and economically.

Although there are many phases of our foreign trade which merit discussion, I will limit my remarks to two important developments—both resulting from the war—which I think vital to our port and shipping interests.

The first development concerns the Government's program for stock piling strategic and critical materials which must be obtained abroad. Authority for stock piling of materials and metals is contained in the Surplus Property Act of 1944. Section 22 of this act lists 24 commodities which have been designated as "Strategic Metals and Minerals." These commodities include—copper

lead, zinc, tin, magnesium, manganese, chromite, nickel, molybdenum, tungsten, mercury, mica, quartz crystals, industrial diamonds, cadmium, fluorspar, cobalt, tantalite, antimony, vanadium, platinum, beryl, graphite (and to which may be added aluminum or any other minerals or metals in such quantities or amounts as the Army and Navy Munitions Board may determine to be necessary for the stock pile authorized by the act of June 7, 1939). A report of the Army and Navy Munitions Board and published as Senate Document No. 5, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, entitled "Strategic Materials" contains a current list of strategic and critical materials. Group A of this list relates to materials for which stock piling is deemed the only satisfactory means of insuring an adequate supply for a future emergency. In addition to setting out the critical and strategic commodities, the list also contains footnotes concerning special storage and handling requirements for some of this material.

For obvious reasons, actual quantities of individual items cannot be revealed. I am permitted, however, to state the aggregate tonnage involved. The present program calls for the stock piling of 37,311,510 short tons of metals—a figure equal to the total import tonnage for all United States ports in 1936. The stock piling of vegetable oils (fats and oils), which are also included in group A, will total 274,000 short tons.

It occurs to me that our smaller ports might furnish the logical solution for the handling and storage of a considerable part of this tonnage.

The second development relates to the realinement of trade, which is bound to result from the defeat of the Axis countries. Germany and Japan and, to some extent, Italy had developed extensive trade relations with other world areas. Japan dominated the Far East trade, while Germany had built up substantial trade interests with South America and other world areas. For the present, at least, the Axis countries have lost this trade. Their merchant marine have ceased to exist. A recent dispatch from Japan stated that only 35 ships remained of her strong prewar merchant fleet, which was reported to have consisted of approximately 2,500 ships of 6,000,000 gross tons.

Prewar trade figures of the Axis countries were quite impressive. Let me point out some of the high lights, especially in the Far East, an area which should be of especial interest, not only to our Pacific ports but to the ports of the Atlantic and Gulf as well.

The total foreign trade of the Far East countries of Korea, Manchuria, Siam, China, India, and of the Pacific islands and continents (the Netherlands East Indies, Malaya, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand) was approximately $5,500,000,000 in 1936 and $6,500,000,000 in 1937, divided as follows:

	Imports	*Exports*
1936	$2,418,856,000	$3,035,518,000
1937	2,761,157,000	3,681,564,000

The Axis countries participated in this trade with totals of $1,333,333,333.33 in 1936 and $1,500,000,000 in 1937, or about 24 percent of the total trade for both years. Japan's share of the Axis totals for these years was 79.6 and 75.9 percent, respectively, with Germany's percentages 17.4 and 18.9 and Italy's 2.8 and 5.3 for these periods. (See table I.)

The external trade of these Far East areas thus approximated 20 percent of the foreign trade of the entire world for these years, which was about $25,000,000,000 and $31,000,000,000, respectively.

In 1936, on a weight basis, nine so-called colonial products exported from far eastern areas to Axis countries, including Japan, amounted to 9,750,000 tons. (See table II.) Tnis figures, approximated in tons, the total import traffic of Boston, Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New Orleans for that year. Much of this now frustrated trade must seek new channels of distribution. Our own ports can glean a fair share if they are able to provide the necessary storage and marketing facilities. During the same year (1936) Germany sent merchandise valued at more thar $200,000,000 to Latin America. German shipments to 12 of the larger Latin-American countries totaled a million and a quarter metric tons. Although these figures are incomplete, they indicate the huge trade between Axis countries and other world areas just prior to the outbreak of the war. Much of this trade may perforce find its way to this country. However, the chances of this temporary windfall remaining after former Axis countries resume normal commercial activities depends to a considerable extent on the services and facilities which our ports provide.

As a substantial part of the frustrated colonial trade would not be intended for domestic distribution, some arrangements would of necessity have to be made to free this traffic from burdensome customs restrictions while enjoying a temporary haven here. In the past our bonded warehouse laws have not proved conducive to the development of this class of trade. On the other hand foreign-trade zones offer full freedom for the holding of colonial products until a foreign market has been found. These advantages have been amply demonstrated in the New York foreign-trade zone since its opening in 1937. A number of other ports, including New Orleans and San Francisco, are scheduled to establish foreign-trade zone facilities as soon as war conditions permit. Let us hope in planning construction of these foreign-trade zones that the respective port authorities will keep a weather eye on this lucrative international trade which will soon be seeking haven in our ports.

TABLE I.—*Foreign trade of the Far East and Australasia with the former Axis countries*

[In thousands of United States dollars [1]]

Country	Japan		Germany		Italy	
	1936	1937	1936	1937	1936	1937
Korea:						
Imports	187,605	210,792	299	572		
Exports	150,001	164,080	3	638		
Total	337,606	374,872	302	1,210		
Manchuria:						
Imports	152,197	188,170	3,907	5,183	487	319
Exports	69,238	80,583	15,054	17,690	114	793
Total	221,435	268,753	18,961	22,873	601	1,112
Siam: [2]						
Imports	12,497	12,727	2,086	2,673		
Exports	1,461	2,297				
Total	13,958	15,024	2,086	2,673		
China:						
Imports	45,242	44,065	44,328	42,933	3,603	2,900
Exports	30,710	25,292	11,752	21,743	1,017	2,052
Total	75,952	69,357	56,080	64,676	4,620	4,952
India: [2]						
Imports	81,257	79,560	45,911	45,366	7,448	4,531
Exports	82,116	113,439	35,659	37,877	13,168	19,055
Total	163,373	192,999	81,570	83,243	20,616	23,586
Netherlands East Indies:						
Imports	48,300	68,420	16,551	22,990	1,482	4,015
Exports	20,350	23,430	8,372	15,400	2,254	7,095
Total	68,650	91,850	24,923	38,390	3,736	11,110
Malaya:						
Imports	18,956	23,477	5,251	7,711	438	1,487
Exports	28,131	35,213	8,694	27,070	1,487	14,412
Total	47,087	58,690	13,945	24,781	1,925	15,899
Philippines:						
Imports	13,264	16,102	3,467	4,144	71	134
Exports	8,393	10,015	1,896	1,811	964	1,179
Total	21,657	26,117	5,363	5,955	1,035	1,313
Australia:						
Imports	24,552	19,860	14,637	18,841	2,179	2,034
Exports	69,303	38,338	9,294	16,744	2,705	21,060
Total	93,855	58,198	23,931	35,585	4,884	23,094
New Zealand:						
Imports	5,027	6,386	2,934	3,813	177	696
Exports	6,095	12,277	1,068	3,603	7	40
Total	11,122	18,663	4,002	7,416	184	736
Summary:						
Imports	588,897	669,559	139,371	154,226	15,885	16,116
Exports	465,798	504,964	91,792	132,576	21,716	65,686
Total	1,054,695	1,174,523	231,163	286,802	37,601	81,802

GRAND TOTALS

	1936	1937
Imports	$744,153,000	$839,901,000
Exports	579,306,000	703,226,000
Total foreign trade with the Axis countries	1,323,459,000	1,543,127,000

[1] Converted from the native currencies at the average of exchange rates for the year.
[2] From reports of the fiscal years nearest to the calendar years 1936 and 1937.

TABLE II.—*Leading products of the Far East and Australasia shipped to the Axis countries in prewar years*

Product	Countries of origin	1936 shipments
		Short tons
Soybeans	Korea and Manchuria	1,109,000
Other oil seeds, including copra	Korea, Manchuria, China, India British and Netherlands East Indies, Philippines.	481,000
Vegetable oils	do	481,000
Vegetable oilcake, and meal	Manchuria, Korea, China, Netherlands East Indies, and Philippines.	1,130,000
Iron ore	China, India, Malaya, and Philippines	4,701,000
Other ores and metals	do	1,021,000
Textile fibers (cotton, jute, hemp, silk, and wool).	Australia, New Zealand, Manchuria, Korea, China, India, Netherlands East Indies, Philippines.	942,000
Rubber	Netherlands East Indies, Malaya, and India	95,000
Sugar	Netherlands East Indies	219,000
Total		9,737,000

White Artists Only

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of Sunday, October 14, 1945, entitled "White Artists Only":

WHITE ARTISTS ONLY

In his letter to Representative POWELL, made public yesterday, President Truman deplored the racial discrimination which barred Hazel Scott from the D. A. R.'s Constitution Hall in Washington, but said he couldn't interfere with "a private enterprise." He probably couldn't, but the D. A. R. is not altogether private. It exists under a congressional act of incorporation, for the purpose, among others cited, of "securing for all mankind the blessings of liberty." It has the right to deposit its collections, if it can't find room for them elsewhere, in the Smithsonian and National Museums. It is privileged to make an annual report to the Smithsonian's secretary, who transmits it to Congress, which customarily causes it to be printed in the Government Printing Office. The D. A. R. certainly has some responsibility toward the citizenry at large, including those of races not represented in its membership.

The D. A. R. can't be an exclusive social club and also a public institution. It can't shut out large numbers of good Americans and expect to be venerated by those and other good Americans. It can't stand for the American patriotic tradition and close its doors to the descendants of Crispus Attucks, first American to fall in the Boston massacre, and Peter Salem, said to have fired the shot that killed Major Pitcairn, the British officer who started the Revolutionary War. It can't point to an unbreakable segregation rule, for in January, 1943, under pressure of public opinion, it broke that unbreakable rule and permitted Marian Anderson to sing in Constitution Hall. It can't consistently, with a membership descended from revolutionists, hang its case for segregation, as the executive committee tries to do, on "prevailing custom."

The ladies of the D. A. R. are responsible for many good works, as any reader of their annual reports (see S. Doc. No. 251, Government Printing Office, 1945) must realize. But their good works will not help them much in popular esteem if they cater to an unworthy and unpatriotic prejudice.

Army Air Pilots Held in Service To Aid Private Line?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from one of my constituents, who is now a member of the Air Transport Command in China, which deserves the attention of every Member of Congress, and particularly of the members of the Military Affairs Committee. It is my intention to present this letter to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee and ask that he request the War Department to investigate the plight of this young man, and many others like him, who are being kept in that far-away wilderness, according to the statements made in my constituent's letter, for the purpose of aiding in the establishment of a privately owned air line.

The letter is as follows:

SIR: I am connected with the ATC here in China. The ATC for your information is the part of the armed forces connected with the Air Corps that is the one that delivers the goods to the fighting men on time and in quantity. We are not the fighters although we do our share of dying along with the others. Hundreds of men are war victims in cases of deaths and wounds, but to this date there never has been one single complaint from us. Today, however, we have a complaint that should, to our belief, be brought up in the Congress, asking why we as citizens and soldiers pro tempore, are to be kept here in China and in India to foster the financial well-being of an air line.

This is the first time that we have ever found reason to complain of the actions of the men who lead us and direct us.

It seems that the purpose of us remaining here in China and the Far East is to see to it that a small group of big businessmen may make a success out of an air line that will put no money in the pockets of the many, but only into the hands of a few.

We have been told by the powers that be, that the reason we are to remain in the CBI is that the military necessity is such that we must stay there until the civilian air lines might come over and take these bases under their wings. The military necessity is to be set by the theater commanders and must I presume coincide with the contracts that have been let by the Government for these companies to take over. I would like to know since when does the Army go into the business of fostering private interests? I can understand the Army protecting something that already has been established, but not something that is the dream of a few industrialists.

We have just gotten through listening to the radio telling us that all men in the States with 37 or more points with 1 year's service in the Army will not have to come overseas. Also that men 34 or over with 1 year's service also will not have to come over and have a share of misery with us. Just what is it that says we in the ATC seem to be in a different branch of the service altogether than that of any other branch? All other branches are sending men home that are over 35 years of age, points, length of service and other reasons, but we in the ATC will not be sent home until the minds of a few men are made up. Regulations are drawn up for the men in the Army as well as the heads of the Army to be obeyed, and although a regulation came out that men over 35 years, and those with points would be released at once. Those orders are not being carried out by the ones responsible for those orders to be carried out. Why?

As long as a war emergency existed, I and hundreds of men like me were willing to stay here and see the thing through. Now that it is over, we want to come home and see our loved ones once more.

I don't suppose that I only will be the only one to protest the treatment we are receiving over here now, and I wish to raise my voice in protest over the means the ATC is using to encourage a private company to establish their air line over here and not worry over the feelings and security of the soldier who fought and won his war over in this theater under the most trying conditions.

The men in the ATC that operated in China and India did so without any fanfare or glory being shown them; they performed duties under conditions that have never been undergone by any army of ours in history. They fought under conditions that compared and at times surpassed those of the Infantry and other men of action. We worked in the steaming jungles, flew in any kind of dirty weather, endured the terrible monsoons that even the movies can never hope to imitate, lived in huts and tents that were no bar to rodents and snakes of all descriptions, ate food that natives of the country would not eat themselves, fought night and day against the greatest scourge of mankind, the mosquito carrying malaria. How many hundreds of men now are lying in hospitals with this dread disease that may remain with the man as long as he shall live?

The man who was called "rear echelon!" was also bombed and strafed with no means to fight back other than to depend on the fighters on the fields to give them some sort of protection. No battle stars for China; no points on account of this. Points awarded for battle stars for men who took a trip now and then over the "hump." Every other outfit in the Army who served in China received battle-participation credits in the form of points; but although the ATC was along with them in the same theater, they have not gotten one single point or credit for the action they have seen. Why? Did the bullets and the bombs have a particular branch of the service marked on them? No.

CONCLUSION

According to the head of the Chinese Government, the American soldier in China did a magnificent job in helping the Chinese defeat their and our ruthless enemy. He said we participated in many battles and were under fire from many sources, but we came through and did the job. What further proof does the War Department need to see if we in the ATC earned the right to share in the benefits of battle awards that other outfits have to their credit?

Sir, I hope you will find the time to see if something can't be done to help us get

home and see our loved ones again, as all of us feel we have done our job and should be shown some form of thanks for the deeds we have done and the sacrifices we have made.

Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERKELEY L. BUNKER
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to take issue with the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] who, on September 27, made some statements in his extension of remarks with regard to silver.

I realize full well the responsibility which rests upon his shoulders to endeavor to protect the interests of his constituents. However, I do not agree that the responsibility of any Member of this body requires, nor do I believe the House should condone, the presentation of ambiguities or misstatements of fact in discharging his duties as a representative of his people.

Of course, we are all aware that the manufacturers and retailers of jewelry and silverware, many of whom reside in or near the Congressman's district, derive considerably greater profit from the manufacture and sale of articles containing silver than do the producers of the ores in which silver is found in my State.

The gentleman would have us believe that the silver in the Mexican peso has a normal value of 20 cents. He neglected to state that the exchange rate of the Mexican peso with the dollar has been for several years, and still is, almost 60 percent below parity. The result of this devaluation of the peso reduced its melting point to the low level of 53.3 an ounce for the silver it contains. The Mexican Government is calling in these pesos in order to melt them down and recirculate them at a higher melting point, so as to give to the silver content of these pesos a proper value under the newly established price of 71.11 cents an ounce for foreign silver.

I disagree that, to quote the gentleman, "This price dislocation caused by the OPA has created havoc all over the world, especially in those countries where silver is the standard metal for money." I insist that this new price is a step in the right direction as it restores to the peoples of the countries who believe in silver money a portion of the lost value resulting from the demonetization of silver beginning in 1873, which constituted one of the great economic crimes of modern history.

It is inferred by the gentleman from New York that silver is not as precious as it is cracked up to be. The preciosity of silver is determined by its production ratio in relation to gold, which at present is less than 7 to 1. Unfortunately, the price of silver has fallen to a ridiculously low level because of pressure exerted by international manipulations where it now rests at a ratio with gold of about 50 to 1. This discrepancy must, and will be corrected.

He states that silver is not essential as a base for currency and that any metal with the full weight of American faith and American resources behind it can pass for currency. I would like very much to exchange with the gentleman a bar of pig iron for a bar of silver with or without the stamp of the United States Government on it. The gentleman states that silver is worth far less than 71.11 cents per ounce, but he fails to give any reason. The fact that the price was raised to that figure in order that his jewelry constituents could obtain it, indicates that it is worth at least 71.11 an ounce. I expect to see the price of silver advance until it reaches $1.29 an ounce, its normal and proper value.

I call his attention to the fact that since the recent adjustment of the price of foreign silver to 71.11 cents an ounce, that the silver in the dollar is actually worth 55 cents, while the gold that backs each Federal Reserve note dollar is worth only 25 cents.

I take issue with the gentleman when he states that "the Treasury has 2,000,000,000 ounces of idle silver." If he will examine the daily statement of the Treasury, he will find that the Treasury has less than 500,000,000 ounces of silver that is not already being used as money; and I wish to point out that approximately 200,000,000 ounces of this so-called idle silver is now in the process of being coined for currency issue in the United States. The gentleman will also be interested to know that a small portion of this so-called idle silver is being set aside for the manufacturers of high-priced jewelry and silverware which will give to the constituents a handsome profit.

In connection with the gentleman's miscalculation of 2,000,000,000 ounces of idle silver he stated that "this vast horde is daily mounting." It would seem to me to be a very simple matter for the gentleman to learn the facts by calling the Treasury Department before making such a gross misstatement. The Treasury is not now acquiring any silver and has not acquired any for over 3 years.

Of course, the gentleman's chief interest lies in aiding his constituents to purchase silver for the manufacture of jewelry and silverware, for he states that "The Silver Purchase Acts should be scrapped and any silver beyond currency needs should be sold to jewelers, manufacturers, and silversmiths at intrinsic values," and that silver should compete with other metals like copper, lead, and zinc. What a ridiculous statement, after silver has served as money throughout the world for thousands of years.

The gentleman states that "manufacturers cannot use up our supply of domestic silver" and that there is "no need to import silver." If there had been no need to import silver, the OPA would not have raised the price to 71.11 cents an ounce. That is the same price at which his jeweler friends have been purchasing domestically mined silver for the past 3 years. Furthermore, there is not enough domestically mined silver being produced to supply our Treasury with current requirements for silver coinage, or the trade with enough silver to keep his constituents producing their goods on a full-time basis.

Team Play Won Brooklyn, N. Y., Its Veterans' Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Walter B. Gunnison in the Brooklyn Eagle of Sunday, October 14, 1945, concerning the new 1,000-bed facility which is to be presently erected in Brooklyn by the Veterans' Administration.

The entire Brooklyn delegation in this House as well as Senators WAGNER and MEAD worked as a team in obtaining this much-needed hospital for the veterans of our community. The successful result was pleasant news not only to our congressional delegation but to every Brooklynite and organization who aided and cooperated in the project.

TEAM PLAY WON BROOKLYN ITS VETERANS' HOSPITAL

(By Walter B. Gunnison)

Remember the old fairy story about the beautiful castle that disappeared into the ground?

Word got around that if someone played enough music of the right kind, the building would rise again.

So all the best musicians showed up and tried their talents and their luck, but nothing happened.

Then one day someone dreamed up the idea of everybody playing together. That's one version of the birth of orchestras. At any rate, they struck up a melody and as they played the castle rose slowly and majestically, more beautiful than ever.

Brooklyn got its veterans' hospital through team play, and some observers, in marking the victory, have remembered the old nursery tale. However, in Brooklyn's case it took more than one melody to turn the trick. It took a lot of hard playing and a whole repertoire of tunes.

Monday was the red letter day in the history of the hospital project. President Truman gave the nod and Gen. Omar Bradley, head of the Veterans' Administration, gave out the good word. The hospital, a $6,000,000 structure with room for 1,000 beds, will be constructed on a site in Fort Hamilton.

The money has been earmarked and this time the whole thing is official, something that the veteran can put his finger on. The date hasn't been settled yet, but the start is just around the corner.

The site will be in one corner of the 140-acre reservation overlooking the Narrows. Not far away is the tower of Poly Prep. In another direction is Dyker Beach Park and

the Belt Parkway. Off in the distance is Coney Island, with its crazy profile against the sky.

The hospital will rise and stand as a symbol of community effort which was crowned with success after long years of struggling, political intrigue, name calling, bitterness, recriminations, false predictions. The same years, however, were marked by patient driving by veterans and their organizations.

The need for the hospital became apparent in recent years with startling clarity. These were war years and men were coming home with battle wounds and strange diseases. Their numbers were piling up like a wet piece of snow rolling down a hill.

Back in their civilian clothes, they joined their mates from the previous war in making long treks to the Bronx, where the only hospital for their needs was available. The crush in the Bronx was so great that in some cases the veterans who got there too late one day were sent back to Brooklyn and told to come back later. It was nobody's fault. That's the way things were.

Choosing the Fort Hamilton site and making it stick was something like catching a moth with one hand. It was like watching a circus chariot race. The white horses were sure to win, but they didn't come through until the home stretch.

That's the way it was with the Fort Hamilton site. It was in one day and then it was turned down the next day by the War Department. Other sites would be mentioned, but all concerned stuck to their preference for Fort Hamilton.

It was appropriate in a way that the announcement of the site was made by General Bradley. He was the head of an Army group that did things in Normandy and France and Germany, many of which tactics were considered impossible in the textbooks.

The hospital project got really hot the night of September 20 at a dinner in Brooklyn to Jean A. Brunner, national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Representative JOHN J. ROONEY, one of the speakers, revealed that the Brooklyn congressional delegation had had an audience with General Bradley the same day. General Bradley had let it be known that the site had been picked. There were a few other things to be ironed out, however, before the site could be revealed. In any event, it was to come from President Truman.

The Brooklyn Eagle reported the Fort Hamilton site about a week later. It was confirmed this past Monday by General Bradley, with the approval of President Truman.

Through the years, the Eagle has left its columns open to the struggle of veterans and their leaders for the hospital. A year ago a series of articles in the Eagle described the facilities offered in the Bronx and the hardships of Brooklyn veterans required to travel great distances to get there.

The articles were praised by veterans' organizations and credited with having spurred the drive for the facility here.

From the start, the Fort Hamilton site, which will be turned over to the Veterans' Administration by the War Department, was considered a logical spot for the facility. Situated in a staging area at the reservation, the property overlooks the waters of the Narrows.

During the war the recreation areas at Dyker Beach were thrown open to the soldiers at the fort, including a baseball field and golf course. The assumption is that Commissioner Robert Moses would give his blessing to the use of the park by men requiring treatment at the hospital.

The section, which is bordered by Cropsey Avenue Extension, Dyker Beach, and the Belt Parkway, is quiet. On summer evenings, men will be able to watch the twinkling lights of Coney and the tower of the Half Moon Hotel, which looms something like a minaret.

A symbolic gathering of eight veterans' organizations will hold a dinner to mark the winning of the hospital on October 28 in the Columbus Club. It is hard to pick out individuals for special acclaim in connection with the project, but here are some of those who will attend the dinner:

Department Vice Commander Vincent D. Cronin, of the American Legion; Harold Burke, chairman of the Veterans of Foreign Wars veterans' hospital committee; Frank D. Schroth, publisher of the Eagle; Miles F. McDonald, candidate for district attorney on the Democratic ticket; City Councilman Joseph T. Sharkey; and the Brooklyn Representatives, John J. Delaney, Joseph L. Pfeifer, Eugene J. Keogh, Andrew L. Somers, James J. Heffernan, John J. Rooney, Donald L. O'Toole, Leo F. Rayfiel, and Emanuel Celler.

House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee Reports on Economic and Political Conditions Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint news release:

JOINT PRESS RELEASE FROM CONGRESSMEN KARL E. MUNDT, REPUBLICAN, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, AND FRANCES P. BOLTON, REPUBLICAN, OF OHIO, MEMBERS OF SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2, HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, WHO ARRIVED HOME SUNDAY FROM A 63-DAY TRIP THROUGH 20 EUROPEAN, ASIATIC, AND AFRICAN COUNTRIES IN WHICH THEY MADE SPECIAL ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL STUDIES IN CONFORMITY WITH HOUSE RESOLUTION 315

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 16.—Two members of Subcommittee No. 2 of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Congressmen KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, South Dakota, and FRANCES P. BOLTON, Republican, Ohio, returned to Washington by plane from Paris, Sunday, after making a 63-day study of economic and political conditions in 20 countries of Europe and the Near and Middle East. They told reporters here today they were preparing reports to be submitted direct to President Truman and to the House Foreign Affairs Committee on a number of vital, complicated, and controversial matters.

"The most striking and impressive reaction we received from the countries visited," the two committee members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee said here today, "was the almost total confidence they have in America's good intentions and their vast expectations for our economic assistance and our political and military leadership. These hopes for American aid and assistance are so tremendous that they exceed the possibility that any single great power could measure up to their expectations. As a consequence this almost childlike faith in the capacity of the United States to produce miracles is a bit terrifying since some measure of disappointment and disillusionment is inevitable. Our leaders must make clear in some way that our good intentions and our earnest desires to be helpful must after all be limited to our financial capacities. Otherwise, if we permit foreign governments to expect too much too long, we shall find ourselves in a position where the very great storehouse of good will which we now have will be deteriorated by the bitterness which always grows out of disillusionment. A little more frankness now will forestall charges of bad faith at some more distant date."

Congressmen MUNDT and BOLTON stated they had not yet had sufficient time to analyze their notes sufficiently to complete the reports they expect to make to the President and to their committee, but on certain matters their findings have already crystallized into specific recommendations. Among the recommendations they propose to make to both the executive and legislative branches of Government as a result of their investigations abroad are the following:

(1) AMERICAN OUTPOSTS

The State Department representatives who are serving as foreign officers in our legations and embassies abroad are an able, courageous, and well-informed group who almost uniformly are doing a great piece of work for the United States. In many cases our foreign staffs are inadequately housed in poor offices entirely nonrepresentative of the dignity of the United States, and the resultant cost in loss of prestige for America far excels any savings we may make by utilizing inferior buildings in out-of-the-way locations.

Of even greater importance, however, is the fact that the reports and recommendations which these on-the-spot foreign officers file with our State Department are not given sufficient consideration in Washington. Too frequently it appears our foreign policy in this country grows out of the proposals of pressure groups within America rather than being developed out of the reports coming from our diplomatic representatives abroad who are actually on the scene and whose communications contain first-hand and accurate information on conditions abroad. It is our recommendation that American foreign policy should be based on reports from our representatives abroad rather than built to conform with the demands of pressure groups here at home.

(2) MANDATES

It appears obvious that the system of mandating semiindependent countries to single mandatory powers has failed. Too often, the mandatory power comes to look upon its mandate as a potential colony and to develop for itself special economic, military, and political advantages. It is our recommendation that wherever a country requires outside assistance and support in the form of the so-called mandates set up after World War I that these mandates be administered jointly by the Great Powers, so that none can secure for itself special advantages at the expense of the other. This will also make it easier for mandated areas to secure their independence since all selfish reasons for continuing the mandate will have been eliminated.

(3) MILITARY GOVERNMENT

In Berlin and Vienna we found the joint controls of the four occupying armies operating much more successfully than we had expected. They are still somewhat inefficient and awkward due to language difficulties and differences in political and economic emphasis, but the areas of agreement among them are surprisingly large. Generals Eisenhower and Clark in Berlin and Vienna deserve rich credit for doing a remarkably satisfactory job under difficult circumstances. The experience the Big Four are getting in working together may well develop a pattern for joint administration and cooperation which can be transferred to areas requiring the assistance of foreign governments in the future in order to develop the strength and stability necessary in certain areas for complete independence.

We recommend, however, that the present policy of dividing Germany and Austria into four separate zones be discontinued as soon as possible. Instead, a central administration should be set up for each country so that the difficulties, inconsistencies, and controversies now prevailing as a result of trying to establish policies for the four separate pieces of pie into which each country has been carved can be eliminated. Rather than having separate zones of authority with rival policies and competing programs, the Big Four should agree at the top on over-all programs for denazification, reeducation, and the permanent disarmament of enemy countries. A start in the direction of unified rather than isolated controls has been made in Vienna. It should be extended to all areas of all occupied countries.

(4) FOREIGN POLICY

Throughout the 20 countries we studied, we found need for the enunciation and clarification of our prevailing American foreign policy. Too much confusion and uncertainty exists abroad as to what actually comprises our foreign policy and as to our basic attitudes toward ex-enemy and friendly powers. We believe there is immediate need for the development and declaration of a positive, understandable, and consistent foreign policy for the United States. This policy should then be pursued with considerably more persistence and firmness than is presently observable.

Before entering into agreements for economic aid and before recognizing the new governments being set up in war-ridden countries we should define what we mean by honest elections, freedom of press and communications, free speech, free religion, and freedom to dissent. At the moment, we find America giving recognition to some postwar governments which deny these freedoms while we withhold recognition from other governments because of their denial. Unless our foreign policy displays more consistency than that, it is certain to lack the force and influence which it is important we exercise in the reestablishment of sanity, stability, and solvency in this very troubled postwar world.

(5) UNRRA

Part of the responsibility with which we were charged by Congress was to study the operations of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration abroad. We regret that we cannot bring back a more encouraging report on what we observed.

The need for relief and rehabilitation among the liberated areas of the world is so acute and so vast that anything less than candor in an evaluation of UNRRA would be unconscionable. Candor requires us to report that except in Greece, we found UNRRA to be operating with far less efficiency than the needs require.

In some UNRRA offices abroad over 20 different languages are being spoken by the members of a single staff. In some offices the dministrative head of UNRRA is a national of a country which contributes nothing to the supplies which are being distributed so his country is unaffected by any waste or extravagance which occurs. In some offices, UNRRA officials simply requisition supplies but lack all authority in determining the method or manner of their distribution. Granted the best of intentions on the part of all officials, it is impossible to get efficiency and economy under such conditions.

What actually appears to be happening is that UNRRA has become a great experiment in international administration, but no matter how noble its objectives it is operating so awkwardly and the mastering of the inevitable difficulties attaching themselves to so cumbersome an experiment is so slow that this experiment is today being paid for in human misery, in suffering, disease, and in actual starvation in the liberated areas.

It may be too late at this tardy date to develop an adequate substitute for UNRRA. If it is too late, certainly corrective steps should be taken to make positive that UNRRA supplies are not diverted into channels never intended for their use, to see to it that those who provide UNRRA relief have the necessary controls to determine the manner in which it is administered and, above all, to provide that at least in the top administrative posts the personnel be selected from among the Nations making the most substantial contributions to its support.

(6) LEND-LEASE

Both in connection with lend-lease and in the disposal of surplus war supplies abroad, substantial dividends can be secured for American taxpayers if the administration will sharply step up without further delay its program of disposing of unneeded supplies and equipment.

Great storage areas of unused war supplies and equipment—much of it with a definite civilian-purpose value—are scattered throughout the war zones and in friendly countries. There is great need for these supplies at this time by countries trying to rehabilitate their economies. By selling these surplus war supplies now and by selling unused lend-lease equipment and supplies still in the name of the United States, a substantial financial return can accrue to this country which will reduce our over-all war costs. Such a program will also give real assistance to friendly nations badly needing this material and evidencing a readiness to buy now for cash.

Furthermore, we can now sell for the coin of the realm and utilize this foreign currency to good advantage in supplying our own troops in these foreign areas. If we continue delaying the disposition of these supplies, we will encounter the problem of dollar shortages and payment difficulties since our need for foreign currencies will be less real, once our armies have evacuated all but the enemy countries.

(7) RUSSIA

Russia is a vast nation with an almost unpredictable potential. We spent almost 2 weeks in that country. The biggest deficiency in Russia at the moment seems to be lack of motivation. Its people are busy and its factories are operating, but they appear to be working in slow motion.

However, we found no apparent desire or demand anywhere in Russia to move away from what is today the Russian version of communism. There seems little more likelihood of Russia adopting the methods of our free enterprise system than there is of our adopting the techniques of Russian communism. Russian communism is today actually much closer to State capitalism than it is to "one for all and all for one" Marxism. Russian political leaders do not deny this; in fact, they desire to have their system recognized as a Russian phenomenon.

This Russian experiment operates as a police state with numerous political police readily observable. It permits no opposition party and no opposition press. It punishes its political prisoners. It is a vast laboratory of central planning combined with central prodding. It has a privileged class of government and military leaders, together with certain other favored groups. It appears to be developing the new isolationism whereby foreigners are discouraged from studying and observing the Russian techniques or from reporting through uncensored press channels on the Russian experiment.

We found the average man on the street and on the farm in Russia to be friendly and courteous. He is fond of America. He approves of our merchandise, our movies, our books, our products, and our techniques. He has no hostility toward either our country or our methods. He admires our achievements.

Russia is placing a commendable emphasis on education and her political leaders and her scientists are men of real ability.

As we came to understand it, the weakness of our American policy toward Russia is that we apply a double standard of political and diplomatic morality toward her in our official attitudes. This double standard should be dropped. All of our Russo-American policies should work both ways and apply equally in both countries. We should accord the Russians every courtesy, consideration, freedom, and confidence that they accord us—and no more. We should treat their visiting nationals and their missions to America precisely in the same manner in which they treat our nationals in Russia. Our dealings with Russia should be friendly but firm.

Russia is obviously and energetically extending her economic, political, and military influence into all the peripheral countries on her border with varying degrees of success except in Turkey where the Turks have withstood all Russian expansionist policies. We should have a decision among the Big Five at once as to whether the world is to be divided into spheres of influence or not. We believe it should not be so divided. If it is not to be so divided, however, instead of granting Russia carte blanc authority in such areas as Bulgaria, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Poland, and the like, we should transplant to these countries something analagous to the four-power administrative or supervisory systems now operating in Germany and Austria.

At present our military missions in the Balkan countries for example are serving largely only as reporters without newspapers, although the orders issued to the conquered countries are made out in the name of the Allied Control Commission. Frequently, however, our American military command never sees these orders until they appear in the newspapers as established mandates. This situation should not endure. We should not permit our country to have responsibility designated to it unless we are permitted to exercise commensurate authority. This is not now the case. This was a United Nations war. It was a United Nations victory. If peace is to endure it must be a United Nations peace. If it is to be a United Nations peace it follows that at least the major participants in the victory must have something to say about the machinery and methods to be employed in establishing stability and solvency and in rehabilitating the areas devastated by war. Today this situation does not exist in many defeated countries and among several of our war-ridden allies. Unless prevailing policies are changed in this connection conditions are likely to get much worse before they begin getting better.

Finally, we believe we can have peace with Russia and that we can work with that great country in the common interest of all humanity provided (1) neither country engages in expansionist policies not authorized by the other and (2) neither country treats the other in a manner which would prove unacceptable were the same policies reversed and applied to it. The differences in our political and economic ideologies need prove no barrier to lasting peace provided we utilize realism in our relationships with Russia.

(8) PALESTINE

In troubled Palestine, we found three sides to the controversy eager to present their views instead of only two as we had anticipated. Our committee took transcribed testimony in Jerusalem from the leaders of the Jewish, Arab, and Christian factions.

We found the situation in Palestine to be tense, strained, and dangerously explosive.

Conditions are such that it is indicated that bloodshed may easily arise either from hastily considered, abrupt action or from sustained, stubborn inaction through refusal to face up to the basic facts in the perplexing Palestine problem.

It would be unfair to all concerned—especially to the persecuted Jews who have already suffered so greatly in Europe—to simply dump thousands of defenseless Jewish immigrants into Palestine at this time to run the hazards of new abuses from a new group unless we are willing to send American soldiers along to maintain order by force. Even this action would appear certain to provoke armed attacks and uprisings by the Arabs of the countries of the Near and Middle East.

The Palestine situation is one which requires careful, unbiased study and a solution which will cure more hardships and heartaches than it creates. We have transcribed notes fully covering the complex and conflicting viewpoints of all factions in Palestine who actually live in the country and desire to make it their permanent home. We are going to make these hearings available to our committee and to Congress with the hope that they will be helpful in pointing toward a solution to this long-standing problem which will avoid bloodshed, eliminate persecution, and promote justice.

Look Who Throws Stones at Pearl Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times of September 24, 1945:

LOOK WHO THROWS STONES AT PEARL HARBOR

The isolationists are in full cry again. They have emerged from their storm cellars, revitalized by the vitamins of an article in Life magazine and a series of charges by John T. Flynn, professional grouser. The gist of the charges are that President Roosevelt knew that war was coming, and that he maneuvered us into the conflict to pull Britain's chestnuts out of the fire.

The isolationists are falling over their own arguments and getting into a fearful and ludicrous snarl in their effort to discredit the former President and give some face to their own discredited positions. Of course, the President knew the war was coming and coming directly at us. From the moment Japan joined the Axis, the stage was set for a two-front war against America, a war that both documents and admissions by Japanese officials have revealed was being planned for more than 30 years. It was to Mr. Roosevelt's everlasting glory that he did what he could against the hampering tactics of the isolationists to keep our outpost in Europe from collapsing. And our only outpost was Britain before we got into the war.

Tojo has admitted that he planned the war in the Pacific and brought it upon his people. The resurgent isolationists make no mention of these proofs of Axis premeditation of war. In fact they are fatally inconsistent. A the moment they are charging that Mr. Roosevelt knew war was impending and did nothing to warn the commanders at Pearl Harbor. On the other hand, before the war they were infuriated by the preventive steps represented by lend-lease, the repeal of the neutrality law, and the 50-destroyer deal.

Had Kimmel and Short, for instance, at Pearl Harbor followed the policy of the isolationists, they would have ridiculed any warning of Japanese attack had it been sent to them. They would have given all their military personnel a holiday and would have set themselves to pen a diatribe against the warmongering of Mr. Roosevelt, with various hackneyed observations about the roasting of chestnuts.

No, the isolationist assailants of Mr. Roosevelt cannot have it both ways. They were the men who did their best to make a Pearl Harbor of the entire United States. They were the men who scoffed at Mr. Roosevelt's warnings. They were the ones who, despite the guns pointed at our heads by the Axis Nations, told us this was not our quarrel and that the enemy could not cross the British Channel, let alone the Atlantic Ocean. When we realize how close the German scientists were to perfecting the atomic bomb, such counsel is clearly seen as a prescription for national suicide.

Now the isolationists are busily attempting to invite public forgetfulness of their own stupidity by trying to make the man who was most alert to our danger the scapegoat for Pearl Harbor.

So far no one has charged that Mr. Roosevelt, even if the Japanese code had been broken, had any knowledge that the Japs meant to strike at Pearl Harbor. Guam, or Singapore was the more logical inference.

There is, of course, one transparent fallacy in the arguments of the isolationists and political witch-hunters. They are charging that Mr. Roosevelt wanted to precipitate us into the war. Yet that could have been accomplished just as readily if the Japs had attacked us at Pearl Harbor and we had been ready for them as it was when they attacked us in a state of unpreparedness.

Consequently Mr. Roosevelt would have served his alleged motive just as well by transmitting the information he was supposed to have as he would by withholding it.

Another highly questionable aspect of this isolationist-political smear campaign is the effort to make a great martyr out of Thomas E. Dewey. Dewey refused to use alleged information that the administration had broken the Japanese code, it is contended. His forbearance is presented as an act of patriotism so great that his Presidential prospects were sacrificed forthwith. Politicians know, more than anyone else, the flimsy flimflam of such a contention. Had Dewey told the Japanese that the administration had broken their code, he would have brought down upon his head a torrent of censure. After having promised to keep the war out of the campaign, he would have furnished the enemy with the greatest aid and comfort. It would have been political suicide and he and his advisers knew it.

The public, of course, knows who prepared this Nation for victory and it knows also who would have laid the basis for defeat. The louder the detracters of President Roosevelt yammer about Pearl Harbor, the more clearly the public will remember.

Feeder Cattle Are Too High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. A. C. Hanson, of Lyon County, in my congressional district, recently wrote an article relating to the high prices of feeder cattle, which appeared in the October 6, 1945, issue of Wallace's Farmer and Iowa Homestead. Mr. Hanson is not only a prominent farmer but he is also a member of the Board of Supervisors of Lyon County, Iowa. His own views and experiences as set out in the article, together with a report on interviews with other northwestern Iowa farmers relating to cattle-feeding prospects, make interesting and informative reading. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the article which is as follows:

The other day, I was sitting in a commission company office in the Sioux Falls, S. D., stockyards. A cattle feeder friend from near Lester, in my home county of Lyon, walked in. After exchange of greetings, I inquired:

"What are you doing, Bill—looking for feeder cattle?"

"No. I have 50 head of cattle ready to sell," he replied. "As to buying replacements, the way the picture looks to me right now I think I am going to let the other fellow feed the cattle this winter."

At a chance meeting with another feeder from northeast Lyon county, this reply came to my inquiry: "I am waiting awhile to buy any cattle. They are too high right now."

Another feeder near my home town of Inwood (southwest Lyon) placed an order a few weeks ago with a Sioux City commission firm. The other day he called and had the order canceled. He said, "Don't buy unless I call you again."

These opinions expressed by men in different parts of Lyon county seem to be rather typical of a hesitant attitude that prevails among a majority of cattle feeders in northwest Iowa. The reasons are several.

The labor situation is still acute, and some men who have had a hard year want a chance to relax and ease the strain for a few months.

Feed costs are high. The supplies of old corn are above the average of recent years, but at this writing the new crop is still at the mercy of the weather, and at its best cannot make yields anywhere near those of last year.

The price of feeder cattle is still considerably above last year, although most feeders expect lower prices inside of a few weeks, especially on medium to plain cattle.

Two feeders from this area have just returned from a trip into the range areas of Nebraska, Wyoming, and South Dakota. They give an interesting report on the present attitude of the range cattlemen. These range men are all quite aware of the subsidy on killer cattle and are trying to add that to the cost of feeders.

At one cattle sale, these Iowa feeders saw a drove of 3-year-old 1,300-pound steers bid up to $14.15 per hundredweight. The sale was held up a bit while the owner was consulted.

He informed the auctioneers that if the buyers would add the amount of the subsidy (50 cents), he would sell. This made the price $14.65, and the cattle were sold that way.

Thus far, I have referred mainly to opinions that emphasize the negative side of the question whether to feed or not. Not all feeders are pessimistic.

A feeder across the line in Sioux County, Iowa, put in 60 head of 1,000-pound feeders a few weeks ago. He buys medium to plain cattle with weight.

In his opinion, the possibility of a good cattle market in the spring will be better than in December, because reconversion to civilian production will have been accomplished by that time and employment will be higher.

On our farm, we nearly always feed a carload or two of western lambs in the early fall, and delay putting cattle in the feed yard until October or later.

This year, our schedule will be about as usual, except that we are guessing right now that medium quality steers and heifers can be bought at more attractive prices in December or late November.

Our final plans will be influenced by what happens to the corn crop, and perhaps by the date when our son in the Army arrives home.

The cattle-feeding game is fascinating. It seems that once a feeder has turned out a few truckloads of profitably fed cattle that it is hard to resist the temptation to get in again.

For that reason, I predict that some feeders who now say they will not fill their feed lots this year will change their minds, especially if the 1945 corn crop matures.

But on the whole it seems this is a good time to be cautious. Especially does it seem wise to consider feed supplies and avoid overstocking on the grades of cattle that call for a long feeding period.

Those who follow a consistent policy of feeding the best year after year will probably not make any radical change in their programs this year. It does seem, however, that the feeder of medium quality cattle may be in the safest position.

Compulsory Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Need for Conscription," which was published in the Bottineau (N. Dak.) Courant of March 21, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO NEED FOR CONSCRIPTION

After the war is over, we see no further need for the conscription of young men into the armed forces. We do believe that the United States should maintain a good sized Army and Navy—but we are convinced that all the needed men can be had by voluntary enlistments. Many of the men in the forces now will want to remain there after the war to make it their life profession. Other young men are waiting for the day when they can enlist in the forces, and these two groups will supply enough men for the forces.

Here is what the Presbyterian Tribune of December 1944 has to say:

"As a substitute for universal military training and conscription, a good many otherwise intelligent and socially minded people are attracted, indeed fascinated, by proposals that we should adopt compulsory national service. The argument runs that it would be a marvelous thing for our youth—some would include young women—on becoming 17 or 18 to have a year of work outdoors, have their health defects corrected, be taught how to keep well, learn to mingle with all and sundry, learn to read and write if illiterate or otherwise have educational defects remedied, learn discipline which American youth assertedly knows nothing about, and receive instruction in the principles of democracy and Americanism—all of course at Federal Government expense and under military direction."

Volumes might be written on this fantastic proposal, but the main point can be stated in very few words. In the first place, it is unfortunately true that a good many American young people suffer from the material and spiritual handicaps just mentioned. What to do then? Let them go on growing to young manhood or womanhood thus handicapped? This is to suggest that home, church, school, and local community should abdicate their functions. Surely what we should do is repent of our past neglect and see to it that in the future these institutions which are basic to a democratic and a Christian society do their job.

In the second place, to suggest that in a year of compulsory national service the neglect of our children and youth can be made good is plainly ridiculous. It is safe to say that no educator or psychologist or religious leader in his right mind would ever have made or entertained such a suggestion unless he had in the back of his head the idea of preparedness for another war. If we do want universal military training and conscription, let us settle that issue on its merits as the military men, who for their part don't want what they call Eleanor frills, insist. Let us not be duped by our own fuzzy thinking into adopting military conscription under the guise of national service or trusting to a patent medicine to put our young people on their feet after they have been betrayed by home, church, and school.

Democracy Is the Golden Rule Applied to Self-Government—Democracy Demands That the Unfortunate Be Built Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of having been granted unanimous consent so to do, I am pleased to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this date the splendid editorial from the Hynes-Clearwater Journal, published at Hynes, Los Angeles County, Calif. This prosperous, progressive community is in the Eighteenth Congressional District of California, which I have the honor to represent in this House. It was published in the newspaper above noted under date of Thursday, September 6, 1945, and the author of the editorial is the editor of the publication. The community of Hynes is in the heart of one of the most prosperous, progressive, and patriotic dairy-producing districts in the Nation. And unstintingly this whole area did one of the grandest jobs in the Nation toward the winning of the war.

SELF-GOVERNMENT LESSON

(By W. Kee Maxwell)

If you would see a successful democracy in miniature, seek out a busy corner in a city and watch a traffic cop at work. Here one lone man, by the outstretching of his hand, holds in check the motor cars of the well-to-do and the footsteps of the walking poor. Huge automobiles which might easily run him down halt and tarry for his signal to pass. Mobs of pedestrians who might easily overcome him stand patiently awaiting his word. What is the source of that individual strength to which the multitude bows without murmur or complaint?

He wears a uniform which symbolizes the organized authority of the people. His strength is the common sense of the mass translated into order. And the secret of cheerful acquiescence of the crowd is simply this: That each conserves his own good by conserving the good of all the others.

There is democracy in essence. The basic lesson which every member of any self-governing nation must learn—and practice in all his relations as a citizen—is the lesson of the busy corner and the traffic cop. By acknowledging, in principle and practice, the rights of the other fellow, the citizen makes his own rights safe.

To understand the vital truth of this idea it is only necessary to imagine what chaos would result at the busy corner with the traffic officer killed or driven from his post and the host of pedestrians and motorists each striving by force for his own advantage without regard to others. Confusion and disaster, with safety for none, would be inevitable.

There is an erroneous conception of democracy at large in America today under which certain groups and elements ignore the common good in their zeal for their own selfish interests. They would make the state their particular benefactor and servitor at the expense of other groups and elements. They would sacrifice the general welfare to their own privilege. Smarting under what they choose to regard as injustices, they attain political solidarity for the purpose of enforcing their will through the exercise of their balance of power in elections. Their mode of procedure is both offensive and defensive—to favor those who will serve their interest and undertake the defeat of those who oppose them. Followed to its logical consummation, this procedure would result in dictatorship by a particular group, serving its own ends with the remainder of the people wholly subservient and bearing the financial cost of this favoritism.

The menacing thing to our democracy is that the success or partial success of one group in advancing its interests inspires similar attempts on the part of other groups. With government with blocs gaining the upper hand, government for the greatest good of the greatest number degenerates into a perpetual contest between these blocs to make the state an agent of their own aggrandizement. Subdivision follows division; and the ultimate end is ruin, with violence superseding the orderly practices of democratic government.

The highest ideal of the state as yet conceived is to provide equality of opportunity and equality before the law. And the highest conception of citizenship is that which takes least from the state and gives most to it. To make this distinction clear, it is only necessary to contrast the soldier who gives his all in his country's service with the parasite who preys upon the public treasury.

Democracy does not demand that the fortunate be torn down, but that the unfortunate be built up. Democracy does not ask in behalf of one group at the expense of another group or of the common mass. Democracy, as Theodore Parker said long ago, does not say that I am as good as you, but that you are as good as I am.

The uniformed man at the busy corner is there to serve you, but only as he serves every other citizen. He is there to protect your rights, but only as he protects the rights of the other fellow. If he makes a special concession to you, he lets down the bars for concessions to others—with the certain result of lost authority and general chaos.

Democracy is only the Golden Rule applied to self-government. You can't expect the other fellow to observe his end of it unless you take care of your own.

Mr. Speaker, as the import of this strong, timely editorial so amazingly gets down to where people really live, I desired that a larger circle of Americans have the benefit of its clear and constructive analysis and application to the fundamentals of an enduring democracy.

Prospects for a Reasonably Sane World Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following special feature article by Mr. Ben E. Atkins in the Gazette, of Gastonia, N. C., of October 13, 1945:

The prospects for a reasonably sane world order, taken all in all, look a lot better now than they did even 30 days ago. We've got a long way to travel still, of course. We are just beginning to build the foundations of what we hope will be a durable peace, and we mustn't be impatient.

The attitude of America, more than the attitude of any other nation taken as a whole, is inclined toward impatience and snap judgment. We've got to get away from that.

We can afford to be a little impatient in our personal affairs, or even in our national affairs. We can afford snap judgment in our internal economy, because when mistakes are made we can always start over again and try something else. That's the way our Government has been built, by an honest system of trial and error. When we try something and it doesn't work, we chuck it and start off in another direction. All in all it has worked pretty well in America. We have often rushed in where more cautious nations would have feared to tread. We have suffered a lot of bumps and bruises. We have paid for our mistakes. But we have always managed to come out on top.

But this business of trying to build a democratic and a peaceful world is a far more complicated and a far more dangerous business than that of trying to build a system of Government for a single country.

We are taking the lead, but we are going to have to go easy. Many of the members of the World Security League are simply not going to be rushed into anything. They are going to insist that as many details as possible be sifted out before any one single issue is signed and sealed.

And that will be the best way. That's why we are going to have to check our speed, hold our tempers, and control our innate impatience. No matter how slowly and carefully the delegates go about building the World Security League, mistakes are going to be made. Probably some pretty big ones. Steps are going to have to be retraced. A lot of bloody noses and injured sensibilities are going to have to be salved and bound up before any real coordination among the United Nations is really achieved.

But things do look better.

The Allied commander in Japan is finally getting down to the fundamentals of the Potsdam declaration. The Japanese at last are beginning to realize that they have been defeated and that they are taking orders from their conquerors. The signs point to a true reformation in Japan, or at least a major effort at such a reformation. In that, too, we will be forced to go slowly, trying to show the Japanese mind simply and convincingly what we are trying to do, why we are trying to do it, and why it will be the best thing for them after the reformation has been completed.

Things look better in Germany, particularly since Allied seizure of the great war industries of I. G. Farben. But in Germany, too, we have a slow job.

This reformation business is something altogether new to us, and for that matter to the entire world. Maybe it isn't going to work, but our job is to do everything within our power to try to make it work and to make it stick.

The job of serving as political-moral-economic missionary to millions of people scattered over the face of the earth who don't speak our own language is a terrifying job when you get to thinking about it. And the most important job we have ever undertaken in our history.

Our work seems to be having some effect in places far removed from the zones of occupation.

Things are happening in Fascist-dominated Argentina. Just what they mean is not yet altogether clear, but on the surface the overthrow of the Peron dictatorship and the calling of a national presidential election look like steps in the right direction from the United States point of view. Whether political conditions in Argentina will really improve, none of us yet knows. We must simply wait and see.

In Spain, Fascist-loving Franco is promising his constituents broader civil rights and more personal freedom than they have hitherto enjoyed.

Franco, of course, is a treacherous little squirt, and we can't afford to take him at his word. The chances are that he is making these gestures in an effort to gain some favor with the United Nations Organization, which so far has denied him a seat at the conference table, and which in all likelihood will continue to deny him entrance.

Here, too, we must just wait and see what happens.

The big fly in the ointment just now seems to be the misunderstanding, or rather lack of understanding, between Russia, Britain, and the United States.

I believe, however, that this big fly can and will be fished out in due time.

The encouraging signs, we must admit, are small ones, and widely scattered. But they are encouraging signs nevertheless. And I think you will see them multiply and grow more encouraging as the work of organizing the world for peace and security progresses.

At least we are not moving backward. We are not standing still. We are moving forward, falteringly and gradually though it may be.

B. E. A.

A Boost From the Home Town for H. R. 3939, To Eradicate Cancer and Polio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THURSDAY STUDY CLUB,
La Crosse, Wis., October 9, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEVENSON: Thursday Study Club of La Crosse, Wis., heartily endorses your efforts toward the appropriation of a fund for the prevention, control, and cure of cancer and infantile paralysis.

We are very proud that one of our townsmen has had the foresight to draft and present this outstanding bill before Congress at a time when the attention of Congress is focused toward so many different problems.

We feel that you should be highly commended for your stand on this vital problem. Thursday Study Club pledges its support to you to secure the successful passage of bill H. R. 3939.

Yours very truly,
MRS. GLEE M. HETHERINGTON,
Secretary.

Great Britain Helps Delay Return of American Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, Great Britain is again demonstrating the fact that that country knows how to take care of herself. As a part of that program, vessels now being used to bring soldiers of the United States back from Europe, are being taken back by Prime Minister Clement Attlee's Government, because the British want to use them. As a result there will be a loss of shipping space for at least 125,000 of our soldiers for the next 3 months.

Note the following news item from the Washington Post for Sunday, October 14, 1945:

BRITISH TAKE GIANT LINERS FROM YANKS

LONDON, October 12.—Withdrawal of the *Queen Elizabeth* and the *Aquitania* from the United States ferry service threatened today to prevent thousands of American soldiers in Europe from getting home for Christmas as planned.

It was announced in Commons that the two huge British vessels which have carried more than 91,000 troops across the Atlantic since VE-day under lend-lease arrangement will be returned at once to their Cunard Line owners for the repatriation of British troops.

The British action, which the United States Army indicated was a surprise, came as a jolt to thousands of Americans "sweating it out" for transportation home. It was stated officially that transfer of the two liners would mean a loss of shipping space for at least 125,000 men during the next 3 months.

An Army statement said an unspecified number of American Victory ships were to be traded temporarily to the British for continued use of a third liner, the *Queen Mary*.

SIXTY-FIVE THOUSAND YANKS CAUGHT

The troops scheduled to come home on the *Queen Elizabeth* and *Aquitania* included 80-point men who fought in Europe. There were no guesses as to when 70-point men may get shipping.

British Minister of War Transport Alfred Barnes, announcing the liners' transfer, explained that the surrender of Japan had made the reallocation necessary.

WILL CARRY CANADIANS

It was reported the *Queen Elizabeth* soon would start carrying Canadians homeward and that the *Aquitania* would be used, at least temporarily, to transport Australian soldiers to their homes.

Around Red Cross and officers' clubs the news hit heavily.

Capt. Bill Frishman, Washington, D. C., said he was "tired and mad about the whole business" after waiting 3 weeks for transportation.

A 90-point Eighth Air Force ground crewman, Sgt. Robert Rous, of Baltimore, said he had been alerted for shipment home since July. Now, he declared, "I'm going to get up on a soap box and tell people a thing or two when I get home—if I get home."

AMERICAN PEOPLE SHOULD KNOW GREAT BRITAIN SHARES RESPONSIBILITY FOR DELAY

Mr. Speaker, if there is any paramount reason why our noble ally should take steps to cripple and make impossible the return of our American soldiers from European battlefields, I am sure all of us would like to have the facts. I note in the news items that the orders to withdraw the *Queen Elizabeth* and *Aquitania* from this ferry service caused quite a little surprise among our Army men in Europe. It ought to surprise and shock a lot of our people here who like to do everything for everybody else, and neglect America and America's problems. Frankly, I think this is just another example of cold-blooded, selfish business procedure on the part of Prime Minister Clement Attlee's government. He may be a liberal but in this case there is nothing liberal about the attitude toward the United States or its soldiers who fought to make the world safe for whom?

TRANSFER OF DESTROYERS IN 1940

Memory is sometimes short, but I would like to remind Prime Minister Clement Attlee, of the Labor Government, that back in 1940 Great Britain was desperately in need of boats. It is an ugly fact, but still a fact, that the British Empire had to have help, and needed it right away. President Roosevelt, with customary generosity, made what some people thought was a Christmas present of 50 destroyers owned by the United States Government. These destroyers were built with money raised from the taxpayers of this country, the fathers of sons and wives of husbands who are now in Europe trying to get home after the war is over. Probably Great Britain will be glad to put those destroyers in condition, and as long as she cannot furnish this country with the *Queen Elizabeth* and the *Aquitania* she will return the destroyers in good condition, we can then use those boats to bring back a few of our soldiers who have now been the forgotten men, so far as Great Britain is concerned. This is a happy suggestion for our State Department to work out.

Federal Labor Relations Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Needed, a Federal Labor Relations Policy," delivered by me over the radio from Philadelphia, Pa., on October 9, 1945. The address deals with Senate bill 1171, the Federal industrial relations bill which the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], former Senator Burton, of Ohio, and I introduced.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED: A FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS POLICY

Production stoppages, due to labor disputes, are slowing down reconversion seriously. At the same time Congress, under considerable pressure from organized labor, is devoting major attention to legislation aimed to cushion the shock of reconversion unemployment by extending unemployment compensation benefits and to set up economic planning for full employment.

If the public welfare demands that the Federal Government seek to achieve postwar full employment opportunities, as I believe it does, then it is only common sense that the Government must be concerned with every factor which interferes seriously with that objective. Widespread stoppages of production due to labor disputes certainly is such an interference.

It is increasingly apparent that present statutes and agencies—the National Labor Relations Board, the War Labor Board, and the Department of Labor Conciliation Service—however strengthened by Presidential directives or requests, are inadequate to handle the situation or prevent the wave of stoppages from growing. What is needed is an adequate, fair, and understandable Federal labor relations policy written into law and applying equally to both parties. In an effort to meet that need, I joined with two other Senators last June to introduce Senate File 1171, the Federal Industrial Relations bill. The other two authors are Senator Carl A. Hatch, of New Mexico, and Senator Harold H. Burton, of Ohio, now Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

As you perhaps know, the leaders of organized labor are violently, one might almost say hysterically, opposed to the bill. They seem to oppose any legislation in this field, for that matter. Both the AFL and CIO in their publications have blasted S. 1171 almost daily since its introduction. Because they have misrepresented the legislation so completely, I welcome this opportunity to tell you what it would do.

The original drafting was done by a voluntary committee of lawyers who spent more than a year in the task. The committee was headed by Donald R. Richberg, Washington attorney who helped draft the Railway Labor Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act. Collectively, members of the committee had had 200 years of experience in labor relations, representing employer, employees, and Government. With that background they drafted a bill which they believed would adequately protect the great public interest in this field, while at the same time treating both interested parties, labor and management, fairly and impartially.

The bill was revised extensively in a series of conferences with the three Senators before it was introduced. We purposely did not consult either management or labor, who will have their opportunity to be heard in committee, before its introduction. We were generally familiar with their viewpoints, we were concerned primarily with the public interest, and we did not want a bill that was either pro-labor or pro-management.

Three fundamental principles are embodied in the bill. First is that both management and labor, in the public interest, should exhaust all reasonable procedures for peaceful settlement of their controversies before resorting to strike or lockout. Second is that both parties should be made responsible under law for fulfilling collective bargaining contracts which they sign. And third is that neither management, through discrimination, nor a union through a closed shop contract and a closed membership, should be permitted to monopolize job opportunities for any particular group.

The machinery to make these principles effective consists of two Federal boards. A Federal Labor Relations Board of five members appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate would administer all Federal activities aimed at settlement of labor disputes. An Unfair Labor Practices Tribunal of three members, likewise appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, would perform all quasi-judicial functions under the revised Wagner Act. It would determine when either employees or employers had been guilty of unfair practices and take action through the district courts to stop them. The two agencies would utilize the same staff as much as possible and the present conciliation service be under the direction of the Federal Labor Relations Board, so as to unify all these activities. We separated the mediation and quasi-judicial functions of the Government because experience has shown that the same agency which must find one of two parties guilty or not guilty of unfair practices, will not afterward be accepted by the other party as an impartial mediator in a dispute.

Disputes are divided into three main categories and procedures established for handling each. The first category is disputes over representation: where rival unions claim to represent a majority of employees or where the employer questions whether any union has a majority. These would be settled as they now are, by election and certification by the Federal Labor Relations Board.

The second category of disputes is those arising over interpretation or application of an existing collective bargaining agreement or over discipline. No strike or lockout would be permitted over such controversies. If the collective bargaining contract did not provide itself for final arbitration of such disputes, as most good contracts do, the Board would direct both parties to refer the dispute to a Board of Adjustment, consisting of an equal number of members appointed by the union and by the employer with an impartial chairman named by the Board. The decision of this Board of Adjustment would be final and binding on both parties, enforceable in Federal district court.

The Kelsey-Hayes Wheel Co. strike, which grew out of the disciplinary discharge of three employees after a War Labor Board finding that they had beaten up a foreman on the job, and has thrown 50,000 persons out of work, would fall into this category and would be outlawed if S. 1171 became law. A strike or lockout over such a minor issue, where the facts can be easily ascertained and a fair solution found, violates every rule of common sense and we believe should be prohibited.

The third and major category of disputes is those arising over the terms of a proposed collective bargaining contract. More detailed procedures, all proven by experience, are required in such controversies. First it is made the duty of both parties to bargain collectively, and either party must fix a date for a conference within 10 days if one is requested by the other party. If conferences between the parties fail to bring an agreement, either party may request the Federal Board to intervene, or if the Board finds it necessary it may intervene on its own volition. Normally the Board would first send a conciliation commissioner to try to bring the parties together, and if that failed, the Board itself would attempt to mediate the dispute. Conciliation and mediation are simply the efforts of an impartial third party to bring about an agreement between two other parties who are engaged in a controversy. Many times simply by persuading both parties to think twice and giving them a little time to cool off, such efforts succeed.

If mediation failed to settle the dispute within a reasonable time, in most cases not more than 30 or 60 days, that would end the Federal activities in most cases and both parties would be free to take whatever action they pleased. However, if the dispute was in an industry of major importance, say the automobile industry, the Board would try one other step. A special fact-finding commission would be named, either by the Board

or the President, which would have at least 30 and not more than 60 days in which to hold hearings on the dispute and file a report of its findings of fact and recommendations for settlement.

During all of these procedures and for 30 days after the Fact Finding commission had filed its report, both parties to the dispute would be required to maintain the status quo. The union could not strike, and the employer could not lock out his employees or make any change in wages or working conditions without consent of the union or the Board. Once these procedures had been exhausted, both parties would be free to take any action they desired

This requirement, which is the heart of the bill, would be enforced in one or all of three ways. First the Federal Board could seek an injunction in Federal court to restrain a violation, which then would become contempt of court punishable by jail or fine. For that purpose and that only, the Norris-LaGuardia Act prohibiting Federal injunctions in labor disputes is suspended by the bill. The second enforcement method would be through civil suits for damages by either party suffering loss through a violation. Such civil actions are authorized by the bill. The third method is an amendment to the Wagner Act making a violation by either party an unfair labor practice subject to the jurisdiction of the Unfair Labor Practices Tribunal.

In addition to a standard voluntary arbitration section, S. 1171 also provides that where the Federal Board makes a finding that the public health and safety would be endangered by a prolonged stoppage, it may vest the Special Fact Finding Commission with the powers of a Board of Arbitration, its settlement of the dispute to be binding on both parties for not to exceed 2 years and enforceable in Federal court. While this is not a vital part of the bill, I think that again common sense dictates some such provision. In both the threatened oil-workers strike, which would hit at a vital fuel supply, and the elevator operators strike in New York City, we have seen in recent weeks two cases where Government tried to force compulsory arbitration, but on a completely hit-or-miss basis. Let's recognize the clear fact that we cannot permit, and Government will take some action to prevent, a prolonged stoppage of vital supplies or services, and provide a democratic, orderly method of settling the disputes which are inevitable in these industries.

The Federal Board's jurisdiction would be limited to disputes threatening a substantial interruption of interstate commerce. Controversies involving fewer than 20 employees or essentially of a local nature would be left to State jurisdiction. Speedy action is essential in this field, and loading a Federal Board's docket with small, local cases is one sure path to delay.

The third principle of the bill, prohibiting any monopoly of job opportunities, is embodied in a revision of the unfair labor practices of the Wagner Act, making them apply to employees as well as employers, and writing in a new provision on the closed shop. S. 1171 would *not* prohibit a closed-shop contract. Such a contract, entered into voluntarily, would be legal and binding unless and until the Tribunal, after a thorough investigation, found either that the contract was not wanted or approved by a substantial majority of the employees covered by it, or that the union was a closed union, restricting its membership arbitrarily and thereby denying job opportunities to all except a privileged few.

Briefly, that is the bill which labor leadership charges would enslave labor. Actually, it imposes fewer obligations and restraints on unions than does the Railway Labor Act, which certainly has not enslaved the railroad brotherhoods.

The Federal Government, recognizing that the public interest was involved in the employer-employee relationship, has imposed many restraints and obligations on the employer. The Government has protected and encouraged labor's right to organize. Today, labor leaders wield as great economic power as any captain of industry ever boasted. Their actions vitally affect the welfare of millions of people inside and outside their membership. Yet there is nowhere in our Federal statutes any provision requiring these leaders to give the slightest consideration to the impact of their actions on the general public. So far as the law is concerned they are completely unrestrained and irresponsible. Some of them publicly admit their inability to fulfill contracts which they themselves have signed.

That kind of a situation is not democratic, it is not law and order. It is complete chaos, and until it is remedied by legislation, it is futile to even hope to achieve full employment in this country.

If that is also your conclusion, contact your own Congressman and Senators and urge them to support Federal labor-relations legislation.

Compulsory Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which appeared in the Progressive, published at Madison, Wis., on the 12th of March last, entitled "Wake Up, America!"

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAKE UP, AMERICA!

DEAR SIRS: Already in this Congress there have been introduced two bills which would thrust peacetime compulsory military training upon the United States. The bills referred to are H. R. 1306 and S. 701.

These bills are grossly contrary to the principles for which our boys are fighting, bleeding, and dying. When these boys have finished their cadaverous task, they expect to return to the society they were compelled to leave. They also expect to obtain, in the shortest possible time, jobs which will enable them to raise families, to acquire the necessities and luxuries of life in addition to making a definite contribution to society.

The peace, for which these boys are fighting, must be a permanent, durable peace. This is probable only by the complete elimination of those forces, both existing and potential, which are pernicious to this cherished objective. One of those potential forces is the compulsory peacetime conscription proposal.

This pseudo-panacea to protect us from future aggressors would be the primary step toward a third world holocaust, because:

1. It would make America a military despot such as has produced disastrous results in Europe throughout the centuries;

2. It is the dictatorship method for solving unemployment which led this Nation directly to war, and which, if employed in peacetime, will lead us to wreck, ruin, and revolution;

3. It is the wrong education for peace. Our society cannot be improved by compulsory training in the ways of violence;

4. It would grant the state control over personal conscience. This is brazenly exemplified by the imprisonment of more than 4,000 conscientious objectors, who, under the draft law, were specifically exempt from combat service because of religious training and belief. This is another of the many circumventions of the law by the New Deal evaders.

Wake up, America! The time for action is now. We must work ceaselessly to defeat this insidious proposal lest we sell our democratic birthright for a mess of military pottage.

ROBERT C. TUETING.

CINCINNATI, OHIO.

If Time Is of the Essence Why Not Save It?

REMARKS
OF
HON. MARION T. BENNETT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in consideration of proposals to streamline Congress and increase the effectiveness of its works, consideration should be given to the amount of time wasted in calling and answering vocally to the roll. This could be accomplished by mechanical means, as it is in some State legislatures, with considerable saving to the taxpayers.

The roll was called 281 times in the last Congress. It takes about 45 minutes to call the roll of 435 names. That means 12,645 minutes were consumed or, putting it another way, 210 hours and 45 minutes. Broken down into 5-hour legislative days that means we sat here 42 days just for roll calling.

What would that saving of 42 legislative days each year mean? Without undertaking to answer the question in complete detail here are a few things to consider.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD must be printed each day Congress is in session. The Government Printing Office tells me that it costs an average of $5,000 per day to print the RECORD. For 42 days that would be $210,000. There were 181 days on which the RECORD was printed last year at a cost of $900,000. This cost would be cut almost one-fourth.

The calendar cost $75,000 at the last session, an average of about $415 per day, or $17,388 for 42 days.

There are many other documents, bills, and resolutions which must be printed on those days Congress sits in session. Untold savings could be effected in printing alone.

It is also pertinent to note that we might be able to reduce some of the number of highly paid personnel in the House. We have three reading clerks who call the roll. Two are paid now at a rate of $7,989.96 per year each, and the third gets $5,489.96. We have a tally clerk who is paid $7,989.96, and his assistant gets $5,489.96. The Journal Clerk is paid $7,989.86, and his assistant gets $4,108.60 per year.

Obviously, all of these jobs could not be abolished. We would still need at least two men to read the bills. We

would need a tally clerk and a journal clerk but around $17,000 per year could be saved on salaries paid at present for help which could easily be dispensed with.

Obviously such a proposal as I suggest would require some readjustment in habits so far as the Members are concerned but such is in order. I doubt that 42 legislative days could be saved for it would only be fair to Members in their offices to furnish a 15-minute warning by the bells before a vote. However, the savings which could even then be effected are considerable.

A readjustment which would be required as a byproduct of this development would be that Members would have to be assigned to definite seats in this House. It is about time these hard benches were declared surplus and turned over to some prison or museum specializing in primitive instruments of torture and some decent seats, at least as comfortable as those in the gallery, were provided. If this could be done maybe Members would stay in their seats and the decorum of the House would improve.

My resolution would authorize and direct the Accounts Committee to investigate this matter and upon favorable report empowers the Architect of the Capitol to receive bids, to purchase and install a mechanical or electrical device to record the roll of the House, paying for it out of the contingent fund. This is 1945. The membership of this House is much larger than it was in 1789. Let us adapt ourselves to the requirements of the times. It is in the public interest. Time is of the essence.

In Honor of Pfc Paul E. Davis

REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, since the cessation of hostilities we have witnessed many celebrations in honor of our illustrious fighting men. Great aggregations have greeted our military leaders, the titular heads of the various branches of our armed forces.

But the war was not won alone by the generals, the admirals, and other top officials of our military organizations. It could not have been won without the heroic and valorous action of our privates. Of course, it takes both officers and privates to win a battle, and many more privates are required than officers to win a war. A proper appraisal of the value of the services would doubtless result in more acclaim and credit being given to privates than to officers.

I have taken this occasion to pay tribute to a great private, Paul E. Davis, of Fairland, Ottawa County, Okla., the first enlisted man to enter Tokyo.

Mr. Speaker, Private First Class Davis served in Troop D, Twelfth Regiment, First Cavalry Division, in the United States Eighth Army. He was wounded during 75 days of bitter fighting against the Japanese in the Luzon campaign in the spring of 1945. Davis served 27 months in the Pacific theater of operations. He participated in the Philippine Islands campaign which resulted in the recapture of Manila by Gen. Douglas MacArthur's forces last February.

Private Davis was born and reared in the neighborhood of Fairland, a prosperous little city of the right name in a rich agricultural section of northeastern Oklahoma, where he attended the public school. He worked on a farm in his native neighborhood until he enlisted soon after Pearl Harbor. He has lived with his maternal grandmother, Mrs. Emma Crotzer, now 82 years old, since infancy. Incidentally, Grandmother Crotzer has eagerly watched and waited for the return of her grandson. She has received many letters from him asking her to "live till I get home." Would that Mrs. Crotzer could be in Washington today with her grandson whose services and achievements we are privileged to honor on this occasion. She would know that her life has not been in vain and that she has given to this country a great heritage, a character and a personality who set out to achieve and has succeeded. I feel that more credit is due to Mrs. Crotzer than to anyone else for exerting the influence over the life of a mere country lad that has developed into a man who is now a national hero. We pay our most respectful homage to this noble woman and her efforts and accomplishment.

Post No. 2688, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Miami, Okla., posted a reward of $1,000 for the first American serviceman to enter Tokyo, and that sum has been paid to Paul E. Davis. In further recognition of this signal feat, the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, on the occasion of his first official call upon the President of the United States, presented Private Davis to the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States.

Private Davis has the ambition, as soon as he is released from the service, to continue his agricultural pursuits. We bespeak for him success and happiness. The determination which won for him the honor in his military work should inspire in him that spirit of persistence which will spell success in any line of endeavor.

Bringing Our Soldiers and Sailors From Overseas Back Home

REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, our soldiers and sailors yet in the service and who want to come home are greatly disturbed over the fact that many of our ships, of every kind and type, are being sent back to participate in the Navy Day exhibit, at New York, and are not available for transporting our boys back to the United States. So many of our boys are at the very threshold of securing their discharges, upon their return to our country, but they are advised there is no transportation for them to be returned to the United States. It is a sad commentary for us to behold the rush of our ships to New York for exhibit, on Navy Day, while our boys sit idly by, on some deserted island, wanting to come home—yet there is no available space upon the ships remaining in the service to bring them. Our gallant fighting forces have done their job—they did it well—and it undoubtedly appears to them they are the forgotten men of this war, when our ships available for transport service are sent to New York, from far-flung South Pacific ports, and from the European waters, to participate in an exhibit. I have received many letters from our men still in the service upon this subject. One soldier, now serving on Guam, who is married and has three children, and who has been in the service for almost 4 years, wrote as follows:

> Everyone here is made despondent over the Navy Day deal in the States. There was a notice posted upon the bulletin board regarding that exhibit. It is almost too late now to do anything about it, because we learned last night that 48 ships had left Guam to participate in that big show. We cannot understand that policy, and it is too bad that they would take all of those ships back to the States for that big Navy show when they need all of them here to get the men back home.

Mr. Speaker, there is ample time in which to celebrate Navy Day, or any other day, after our boys have been brought back home. Many other letters have been received by me from our servicemen upon this same subject. Our servicemen want to come home, and those that are not now needed, and many hundreds of thousands of them are not needed for any purpose now, should be provided with transportation immediately so they may be returned to their homes and to their families, their businesses and their jobs. I am unalterably opposed to the celebration of Navy Day, at this time, and I am opposed to any other celebration which will cause ships available for transport duty to be taken out of service, while we still have soldiers and sailors in the service on foreign soil and who are ready to return to the United States. We want to get these boys back home at the earliest possible moment. Yet, under the present plan of the Navy to bring untold hundreds of ships back to the port, at New York, to celebrate Navy Day, there will be many thousands of our boys left on desolate and deserted spots, all over the world, awaiting transportation back home. They will be compelled to remain in those desolate spots for weeks because of this planned exhibit.

Mr. Speaker, I have just read an article from one of our leading newspapers, with a date line of October 8, with the following headline: "Third Fleet ships moving through Canal to Atlantic." The article further related that the vanguard consisted of two carriers, one battleship, two

cruisers, and six destroyers. It took 11 hours for the vanguard of the mighty Third Fleet to pas through the Canal. The entire operation, the Navy said, for the entire Third Fleet, would require some 4 days to pass through the Canal.

I am wondering how many soldiers and sailors, ready for discharge, that mighty fleet could return to our country during a period of several weeks' time? They could bring one group, and return into the South Pacific for others, and untold thousands of homesick and war-torn veterans could be brought back home, while those ships are parked along the Atlantic seaboard for exhibition.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that I am unalterably opposed to such exhibitions, as the Navy Day proposed for this year, while our boys are waiting overseas to be brought back home. Let us first bring our boys back home, and then if the Navy wants to celebrate, let the celebration proceed. However, until our boys are returned home from the battle fronts all over the world, let us refrain from all celebrations and let us use every ship, of every type, to bring our boys back. The boys want to come home, and we want them brought back home at the very earliest moment. When they arrive home, that will be the happiest day of their lifetime, and all America can then celebrate.

UNRRA

REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, after observing with a congressional committee so many countries in a state of economic, social, political, and spiritual chaos, it was a delight to know that the United Nations had given serious consideration to the relief and rehabilitation problem, a problem which the war intensified and a problem on which future peace and order so heavily depends.

UNRRA was created during the war so that it might recruit and train its personnel, assemble equipment and supplies, and be ready for the tremendous job which it would be expected to increasingly assume as we approached the end of hostilities.

Considering the fact that UNRRA recruited its personnel under very adverse conditions while manpower was being channel into the direct war effort and the fact that supplies and equipment were assembled from a rationed market with a very definite lack of priorities, I commend the organization on its accomplishments. Now that both the European and Pacific wars have ended this necessary competition will be greatly relieved and UNRRA should continue to strengthen and improve its efficiency in helping the millions of cold and hungry victims of the war to find themselves again. The task, though staggering in size, is most worthy and UNRRA now holds the key position of actively teaching by application the democratic concept.

While other ideologies are in the process of expansion throughout the world and some of them by force the United Nations may find that military victory is only an empty illusion if they miss the mark on plans and the execution of those plans for the world of tomorrow. An agency such as UNRRA, which assists people in relieving their adversity, may by so doing inspire the confidence and admiration of the individuals so relieved and fortify them against radical leaders. Free peoples are not continuously cold, hungry, and destitute, and conversely cold, hungry, and destitute peoples are not much impressed with a verbal explanation of freedom.

As we strengthen and support UNRRA we strengthen and support a great movement which is working effectively at the job of spreading the desire for freedom and is thus reducing the power of the appeal of radical organizers. UNRRA has proved itself to be worthy of careful consideration and adequate support.

Red Cross Aid to Surviving Jews Succeeded Where Others Failed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Murray Frank, entitled "Red Cross Aid to Surviving Jews Succeeded Where Others Failed," which appeared in the Jewish Advocate, Boston, Mass., Thursday, October 4, 1945:

RED CROSS AID TO SURVIVING JEWS SUCCEEDED WHERE OTHERS FAILED

(By Murray Frank)

WASHINGTON.—The general policy of Red Cross relief is to distribute supplies on a nonsectarian basis, and let the chips fall where there is the most urgent need for them.

In line with this policy, the American Red Cross has assisted thousands of Jews in Europe, while not undertaking relief programs exclusively for Jews. Thus many Jews who are alive in Europe today have been aided by the Red Cross in their struggle for survival in Nazi-occupied Europe. Thus, many Jews have benefited in recent months since their liberation from the Nazi concentration and slave-labor camps.

Mr. George Korson, foreign editor, and Mr. Melvin A. Glasser, assistant director of civilian relief of the American Red Cross in Washington, have made available to this correspondent interesting reports of recent date depicting in some measure the activities and the extent of assistance rendered to inmates of liberated concentration camps.

In the 10 months between September 1939 and June 1940 the American Red Cross provided about a million dollars' worth of food, clothing, and medical supplies which were distributed to the general population in Poland, including the Jewish population.

After the outbreak of the war in 1939, the International Red Cross succeeded in getting Germany to accord civilian internees the same status and treatment as that given prisoners of war. But attempts to obtain similar status for inhabitants of concentration camps were unsuccessful. The German Government would not even allow representatives of the International Red Cross to visit these camps. But in several instances the joint relief commission of the International Red Cross was given permission to send relief shipments into some of the camps. Thus, Red Cross records relate of medical supplies reaching the Jews of Riga, the Jews in the Theresienstadt ghetto, and in the camps of Westerborg and Vught in the Netherlands.

The basic responsibility for the care of displaced persons and liberated inmates of concentration camps rests with the military authorities, but Red Cross relief activities were coordinated with the supply programs of the Army. Consequently, under the direction of the military authorities, the Red Cross has been extending its assistance in recent months to the people in the concentration camps by organizing medical care and facilities, repatriation services and the distribution of clothing.

FIRST AID AT BERGEN-BELSEN

In the camp at Bergen-Belsen, 12 teams of British Red Cross workers, including doctors, went in immediately after the camp was liberated to work with the inmates, most of whom were Jews. The American Red Cross, working closely with the British Red Cross, sent into Bergen-Belsen 16,000 garments soon after liberation and later followed up with an additional shipment of 100,000 garments, which were distributed to a number of camps throughout the American zone.

American Red Cross staff members were also among the first to visit the Buchenwald camp arriving there only a day after it was liberated. Many thousands of Jews were found among the inmates of this camp. The Red Cross representatives brought with them supplies of cod-liver oil, soap, and other items; and shortly thereafter, large quantities of clothing for the internees reached Buchenwald.

Similarly, the Dachau camp, containing many Jews, was visited by Red Cross workers soon after its liberation and a quick survey of relief needs was made. In the first week of Dachau's liberation, shoes and clothing were brought in from Red Cross stocks found in Hungary. In addition, a large quantity of prisoner-of-war parcels sent by the American Red Cross was discovered in this area, since there had been a number of prisoner-of-war camps there, and these parcels were promptly routed to Dachau and distributed to the liberated internees.

In reading reports by Red Cross field representatives, describing conditions in the camps, I was primarily interested in what was being done for the survivors in the first days and weeks after liberation.

Here is an account, taken from an American Red Cross report, of the first activities at Dachau:

"Immediate arrangements were made for the field supervisor and field representative—of the Red Cross—attached to headquarters to go to Weimar the following morning. The field representative picked up half a ton of soap and cod-liver oil 8 miles north of Frankfort at a German military hospital where they had been uncovered by the American Red Cross. * * * Next morning we drove out to the camp (Dachau) immediately after breakfast, unloaded our supplies. * * *"

BASIC DUTIES

"An American medical unit came in the following morning and set up in the SS hospital to care for the sick. Delousing arrangements were made. The Germans had sabotaged the water supply and the camp had been without water for several days, but water was being brought in in large wagons

and a water-point was being established. Abundant food supplies were being brought in by the Army, but great care was being exercised in gradually increasing the ration because of the prolonged starvation the prisoners had undergone. Representatives of each nationality were chosen and lists made up of internees; arrangements for screening as rapidly as possible were made. * * *

"We went on to the camp hospital. There men lay on pallets on the floor, 12 to 20 in a room. They were as thin as the bodies we had seen stacked up, and seemed scarcely more alive. Yet, when they saw that we were Americans, they lifted their heads and smiled; some even waved. I doubt if many of them will see home again; they are so far gone it seems impossible that they could be brought back to life once more."

Excerpts from a Red Cross report on Buchenwald about a month after liberation, read:

"It was hard to tell where the American Red Cross was needed most but it was obvious that the sick deserved attention immediately. * * * Nearly one-third of the camp were seriously ill—the others could have used hospitalization. * * * There had been only one hospital previous to the arrival of the American Army—mainly erected by prisoners who stole boards and bricks at the risk of their lives to add an ell here, a room there. Officially it had little medicine and such contraband supplies as they managed to acquire were used mainly to save the children, as it was understood that they came first. The hospital was a magnificent monument to the spirit of the prisoners and their will to live, but as a medical institution it was totally inadequate. The Army set aside the barracks formerly occupied by the SS guards as a second hospital, and American medical personnel aided in staffing it. But the new hospital needed beds, mattresses, blankets, linen, bedpans, wash bowls, and almost any other item of equipment you might name. The patients lacked eating utensils, drinking glasses, pajamas, and clothes in which to leave the place. * * *"

RESOURCEFULNESS

"Within a week practically all patients had a bed, mattress, pillow; toweling and sheeting had been acquired, sewing machines were being brought in. So many of these patients had completely shrunken digestive systems that food was a grave problem and the ARC field representatives made daily checks in the kitchen and among patients to report the greatest needs and worst complaints—it took some time to get an edible bread for instance, as there was no yeast in the area and the sour bread was not fit for the well, let alone the ill.

"The 1,000 children had existed, under the SS, solely by virtue of the work they did, as all children over 10 worked from 8 to 16 hours daily in the factories. The prisoners, therefore, purposely falsified the records to make it appear that there were far fewer boys in the camp than was actually the case, and the youngsters spent most of their time in hiding.

"At first (when the Allied armies moved in) it was hard to persuade the youngsters to move from their hideouts, and the buildings were unnaturally quiet for some days after they moved in. They refused to play outdoors and showed little elation over such things as the chocolate ration which the field representatives managed to collect from the soldiers in nearby camps. Their new clothing, which field representatives had made in clothing factories which they started, made a great impression upon them. The smart little suits and caps which replaced the prison stripes worked a miracle. Two weeks after they had moved to their new home, outdoor games were going on full tilt in front of their buildings and you could hardly hear yourself think in their halls. The children's program has been an unqualified success.

"The prison garb was a great deterrent to the morale of the well prisoners and so the field representative assigned to this job * * * started a series of clothing factories, drawing on the large stores of cloth, using displaced persons as tailors in charge of requisitioned German workers. The one American Red Cross trailer worked overtime carting shirts and trousers back to camp. The field representative kept an anxious eye out for thread, needles and buttons wherever they went. At first it was a race to see whether there would be enough clothing for the departing groups, but after the factories got into their stride, there was plenty for camp and for the dependent Buchenwald colonies in the TB home and similar places. * * *

"About a month from the date that American Red Cross arrived on the scene many of the prisoners began leaving. The hospital patients have decreased to 2,500 and many of these will be able to leave soon. The amazing thing is that, after years of malnutrition, mistreatment, and a corresponding loss of health and confidence, they could still hold a May Day celebration that included a Coney Island booth with balls to throw at the heads of Hitler, Goering, Goebbels, etc., and a barker who was worthy of any sideshow."

Recovery, however, is still a long way off for the many who are broken in health and spirit. The majority refuse to return to their old homes in eastern Europe to live amidst the mass graveyards of their closest ones, the ruins of their homes, and the animosity of the local population which in certain areas seems to be carrying forth the policy of extermination of the Jews where the Nazis have left off.

Solution of the problem of these thousands will require intensive help, not alone from Jewish groups and organizations but also from national and international governmental agencies, such as the Red Cross, UNRRA, and the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees.

Working Together for the Common Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the forty-fifth annual convention of the Rhode Island State branch of the American Federation of Labor, at the Narragansett Hotel, Providence, R. I., and broadcast over Station WEAN, Sunday, October 7, 1945:

My friends, I want to talk to you about an expression which is making the rounds whenever the talk turns to the subject of industrial relations. It is, "Working together for the common good." You have read it, I know—you have heard it from the lips of public speakers and radio commentators. It has been presented as the cure for all our ills—it has been described as the answer to our present-day problem of industrial unrest.

While it might appear to some to be overplayed—I want to affirm to you, my friends, that I believe it is the only way out for all Americans. Working together for the common good will set us on a path toward a richer and happier life—toward the enjoyment by all of the many great benefits the future holds in store.

It would be folly for me to attempt to skirt the important issues of the hour. It would be cowardly for me to stand here and preach platitudes when I know, and you know, the screaming thought of the moment is how in God's name are we going to win for ourselves and our children the peace and freedom and prosperity for which we hunger.

Daily the press carries denunciations of American labor unions for their dastardly activities in scuttling reconversion. Our own newspaper denounces even the right to strike and pleads for the repeal of the Smith-Connally Act, the legislation for which it stumped so mightily when it thought trade unions were about to be hung, drawn, and quartered.

Nowhere in the pages of this paper will you find one column, one paragraph, one word which would intimate that in the arena of economic conflict perhaps the man at the machine has a cause which should be heard.

Never a whisper for the man and woman who made the tools of war and who still must provide meat and bread from a steadily dwindling pay envelope. Sarcastically, he is pushed aside. His losses are his own, the editor enchants, and his losses are of far less consequence than the infinitely greater losses that industry faces.

That is the bond of cooperation we have served up to us by those who pompously pretend a paternal interest in our future.

Working together for the common good calls for decency in the treatment of the problems of all of us. It is unjust to refer deliberately to the interests of the workingman as opposed to the interests of the Nation as a whole. Are not the working men and women of the country the parents who gave the men who fought and died—the men whose blood has saturated the beaches of Europe and Asia. The sacrifices of these heroes will never be forgotten. Yet these great economic apostles who would put father against son—and family against family—in their mad effort to paint labor as an enemy of the veteran—they forget—or they never knew—that the anguish and heartache borne by the mother at home was often a far greater pain than that suffered by the wounded soldier on the battlefield. And that mother, in her intense happiness at the return of her soldier son, is not permitted to forget for a moment the daily struggle to make both ends meet.

The unrest which exists throughout the country today should not be, were it not for those who see in the transition from war to peace a glowing opportunity to cement their personal interests—even though it be at the sacrifice of the common good.

Why 's there unrest? Because working men and women are chiselers, some say. The man who is raising a family—paying rent, buying clothes, and fighting prices, in order to keep food in the ice box—he is branded a scoundrel and a humbug because he seeks work at a trade which he has spent a lifetime in learning. A man who has a family to feed cannot wax enthusiastic over a job at 40 cents an hour. Nor can a skilled mechanic give humble thanks for a caretaker's job.

Why has the present unrest been permitted to continue—slowing the flood of production to a mere trickle at a time when the world thirsts for the products of our factories? It continues because there are still employers who sit like a god on an Olympus of profits, growing angry as they see far below them on a plane of mechanized monotony, the distant employees, like rebellious children who refuse to offer sacrifice.

They'll say I'm a demagog for talking thus, but look at the record.

My office was swamped with mail from industrialists who bitterly condemned the suggestion that the Federal Government should provide assistance by way of unemployment compensation during the transition period.

Why did they protest? You know—as well as the press knows—if we provide a family man with $25 a week while he is out of work—through no fault of his own—then industrialists will be compelled to pay him a decent living wage for his gainful toil.

But do they honestly declare that to be the reason for their blind opposition? Certainly not. They profess a paternal interest in us. They declare we are not worthy of such consideration. The working men and women of America—the very men and women who contributed so much toward compiling the greatest production record in history—who gave their sons to America—who bought bonds, who paid taxes, who went without in order to feed our Allies, and who are even yet asked to give more; these men and women are branded sluggards and dolts; they would rather live in the gutter like dogs on $25 a week than live in the sun like men on a decent living wage—gained from honest labor.

They are told their Government must not help them, for thus lies the road to dictatorship. When they turn to their Government for consideration, the Government which organized and regimented their lives during the war, they are met with a sneer and told to go fight the battle of economic rivalry on whatever crumbs they can garner—their Government refuses to entertain their plea.

Some profess this is as it should be. Workingmen should be denied a hearing. They should be dragooned into whatever occupation their overseers shall determine. This in America after a war which was fought—we believed—to provide for all peoples a new conception—a new understanding—of the brotherhood of man.

And what about the other side of the picture? How did the Federal Government treat the problems of industry? You remember this when you read in the daily paper the bitter denunciations of a Federal Government that would help the workingman. When you are told that any form of assistance from the Federal Government means the end of democracy and the dragooning of all men in our society, you recall that it was not so many years ago that industry in this country held your Government by the throat and wrung from it every last ounce of assistance that could be had before it was willing to even discuss cooperation in the manufacture of the needed tools for defense.

Industry has had its profits during the war. The record discloses that never in history has there been a more profitable period than that through which we have just passed. Industrial profits, even after taxes, have been the highest of all time. And now taxes are to be reduced in order to add substantially to the tax credit allowed industry out of war contracts—an allowance to pay the costs of reconversion.

But was that sufficient assistance from government? Not by a jugful.

In June of 1944 the Federal Government tendered more substantial help to private industry—to tide over the perils to be faced in the days of reconversion. The Federal Government insured adequate compensation in the termination of war contracts; it included expenses for removing and storing materials; profits were allowed on uncompleted portions of war contracts; interim financing was provided for plus interest on all settlement claims.

This for industry is eminently fair, and does not threaten democracy, despite the fact that it provides hand-outs from the Federal Government. But let someone advocate something decent for the man who labors and is out of a job through war-contract terminations, and all the skies go blood red, democracy shakes to her very foundations, and the Republic staggers toward utter ruin and destruction.

Yes, cooperation for the common good is what is needed. Not, what we have today—on the one hand excuses and justifications for economic royalists who are just as reactionary today as they were in 1929 when their greed brought their house of cards tumbling around their ears—and on the other hand nothing but ridicule and vilification for the member of a union who seeks to fight the battle for survival with no weapon in his arsenal except the right to strike. That weapon he is bluntly told, he must not use—because it is more important that we have luxuries—than bread and milk.

The American people know what it wants. Some call it peace of mind. Some call it by various names. Some may be hard pressed to put their tongue to any single definition. But down in your heart of hearts you know that the backbone of what we call the American way of life is the American home. That little piece of this earth in which is concentrated all the hopes and dreams of the American man and woman.

There are just two things that go to make that home a success—a genuine respect for God—and economic security. Destroy either and you destroy the American home. Then you can really begin to prepare for the destruction of our society which has been promised every time labor unions have taken up the cudgels to fight for that security.

Cooperation for the common good is more than desirable—it is vital. Those who would serve their country well can be about the job by putting an end to their generation of class hatred and bigotry—and fostering in its place a genuine feeling of working together to gain the common goal.

During recent years labor unions have come of age. They have grown to maturity and they will not be cast into the discard. They are a factor in American industrial life and intelligent manufacturers and businessmen recognize that fact.

I have always insisted that with every right gained by labor there has been a corresponding responsibility. I still maintain that position. I insist the labor unions must shoulder the responsibilities that go with their newly won position. They must make a genuine contribution to the ordering of American life if they are to survive. But I also maintain you can't hold a man against the wall by the throat and lecture to him about his duties to society.

American industry must recognize that it also has responsibilities to society as well as the rights which it so loudly declaims at every opportunity. American industry has a social responsibility to the men who produce the products from which profits are derived—and to the merchants and businessmen who must depend on that producer for their livelihood. The piling up of huge profits is no longer the be-all and end-all of industrial operations.

Industry stands to gain most, in the long run, by full employment at decent wages. Full employment will produce an expanding economy wherein all can enjoy the outpourings of our tremendous industrial empire.

Let those who preach the cause of industry—who seek for industry the power of life and death over our economy—think for a momen on the swinging pendulum to which they like to refer. Let them look at events throughout the world—look at the day-to-day picture of developments at home. Those who plead for the protection of private enterprise—and let me say labor unions are well in the forefront among those who want private enterprise to thrive and flourish—those who wish to see American industry function free from all controls, save those which are dictated by an honest conscience—they can best serve their cause by insisting that industry shoulder its responsibilities and begin to pull its part of the load in this democracy of ours.

If industry will do that, then industry in America shall have the powerful voice in the shaping of its own destiny. American industry can lead us to even greater heights than we have yet been able to attain.

But if industry, in its blind selfishness, shall refuse to recognize its proper obligations to society, then other hands will seize the reins—others will determine the destiny of private enterprise.

The working men and women of America seek economic security. Their program is clear. It is positive. Members of labor unions cannot enjoy that security alone. It must—it shall—benefit all.

Industry has the opportunity to cooperate for the common good. Its cooperation will guarantee its survival.

It is cooperation or chaos.

Opium Drive Efforts Are Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ray Tucker in the Hibbing (Minn.) Daily Tribune of Monday, October 1, 1945:

OPIUM-DRIVE EFFORTS ARE FAILURE

(By Ray Tucker)

Washington officials privately report an amazing lack of progress in their almost single-handed crusade to stamp out the world-wide opium evil as a consequence of a conflict involving those lands where production of the drug is a major source of revenue. Save for the Chinese, our allies and former enemies have shown themselves to be most uncooperative.

Britain and the Netherlands, for instance, proclaimed that they would abolish the trade after they had recaptured their possessions in the Far East and the Southwestern Pacific. But England refused to close 6,000 opium shops in India during American troops' presence in that country, despite repeated requests by our Army officials.

London has reneged on her promise to wipe out the business in recaptured Burma, with the result that our State Department has forwarded several sharp notes reminding her of past pledges.

The fate of the Judd resolution, adopted by Congress, which proposed that opium-producing nations restrict the crop to the minimum required for medical and scientific purposes, is illuminating. It was proposed by Representative WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota, a former medical missionary in the Far East, and was wholeheartedly approved by the men on Capitol Hill.

Copies of the declaration, which was approved by Congress in July of 1944, were transmitted to the Governments of Great Britain (on behalf of India and Burma), Iran, Afghanistan, Russia, Turkey, Yugoslavia, China, and Mexico.

The only nation which agreed to carry out the proposal to ban the growth of opium entirely was Afghanistan.

The United States has waged a 40-year war at The Hague and Geneva for elimination of the illicit traffic. Our immediate concern is selfish as well as humanitarian. The global conflict, which saw our soldiers serving in many strange lands, has brought the problem right to our doorstep.

Although few of our men succumbed to the opium habit in the Far East, Army files list numerous incidents of a tragic nature, mostly in India. But the great fear is that returning soldiers and our occupation forces may be subjected to temptation unless their access to the demoralizing drug is prevented by international cooperation.

Every great war since the Crimean, when opiates were first used for medical purposes on a large scale, has witnessed the spread of this evil among demobilized and civilian populations. There is also the danger that smuggling of the stuff into this country will be attempted in a big way unless world-wide controls are established.

The Japs utilized opium in their conquered countries as a weapon. Although they had banned the trade on the home islands because of its bad effect on national vigor and life, they propagandized the use of opium among temporarily enslaved subjects in order to weaken their powers of resistance. It is now estimated that there are at least 32,000,000 addicts in the regions which they overran in the months after Pearl Harbor.

Tokyo Rose, however, blamed the British for this abomination. In a December 2, 1944, radio address, recorded by American monitors, she recalled that England had foisted the drug on China for the sake of revenue, even fighting the famous Opium War to gain her ends. Then Tokyo Rose went on to say:

"Japan suppresses this trade. England perpetuates it. I ask you—which is the enlightened nation? Which is the Christian nation? Which nation seek to benefit the peoples of the Far East?"

The United States, having failed to persuade other major nations to join us in the movement to stamp out the opium evil, intends to use its military power and occupation forces to this end.

Narcotic Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger has lectured at all the schools for training of our civilian governors and our military overlords. He has given them the history of the drug problem in the territory which they will control. Based on Mr. Anslinger's experience and knowledge, the War Department has issued the following directive on this subject:

"It will be the policy of all American expeditionary forces under American command, immediately upon the occupation of a part or the whole of any of these territories, to seize all narcotic drugs intended for other than medical and scientific purposes which they may discover, and to close existing opium monopolies, opium shops, and dens."

Unfortunately, United States troops will not exercise authority in the blackest spots—Iran, Burma, India, Indochina, and Macao, a Portuguese island off the coast of China. All we can do is to set an example for our allies and former enemies.

Assurance of a Lasting World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a radio talk which I delivered yesterday with relation to my bill authorizing our representative on the Security Council to promptly use our armed forces to suppress any breach of the peace, when such action is deemed necessary by other members of the Security Council and has the approval of the President of the United States:

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to talk this afternoon about a resolution which I introduced in the House of Representatives on Thursday. If my resolution is adopted, or if its provisions are adopted in other legislation, I shall feel that our district will have helped vitally toward making the United Nations Charter work and so assure a lasting world peace.

I think that we all feel a measure of security because the groundwork for peace was started during the terrible days when victory was far off, when victory was, indeed, doubtful. I think we all feel a deep pride in the courage that was displayed by peace-loving nations who were then fighting for their very existence, but who believed it important that their best talents be put to work on the structure of international good will. That work has been going on since August of 1942 when the Atlantic Charter was declared. It may be many years before we really see our hopes and aspirations bearing fruit. We all realize that there will be much give and take, much compromise, many heart-breaking hours of disappointment and frustration. But we realize, too, that a dogged persistence at the monumental task to which we have set ourselves will and must pay dividends. We dare not give up, ever. If we are set back at one turn, we must go back onto the course and try again, try other plans, but keep going.

We have learned that peace is not a static thing. Once achieved it will not flourish by itself. It must be constantly nurtured, constantly coaxed. No man of good will may relax on this job.

The resolution I just introduced is similar to one I presented to the Congress last March. Briefly, it authorizes our representative on the Security Council to immediately call out our armed forces when our leading allies deem it necessary, in order to stop at the outset any attempt by any nation against another which threatens the peace of the world. In such an event, our armed forces would act as a riot or police squad. A comparison would be the responsibility of the peace organization in any city. A quarrel may break out in a neighborhood. It could spread to a riot if the police were compelled to seek the consent of the city council before they could intervene.

It is all right for us to talk now and say that Japan could have been and should have been stopped in Manchuria. Yes, America was ready then, but there was no international organization of which we were a part which was ready to take the necessary drastic measures. The Ethiopian invasion could have been halted. But again, we—and when I say "We," I mean the democratic nations of the world—did not have the courage of our conviction that the Ethiopian war should have been stopped in the talking stage. We had plenty of warning. In fact, the invasion was postponed for months on account of the rainy season.

We could have stopped Hitler at Austria. We could have stopped him at Munich. We could have stopped Japan in China at the outset, but we had neither the international organization, nor the international force, nor the international courage to stop the murder. Not until it became slaughter did our righteous wrath break the bonds of our isolation and compel us to take our proper role in attempting to restore decency to the world.

Atolls and hills, islands and villages we hardly knew existed, whose names even now are unpronounceable to many of us, places far away from our familiar surroundings, have been stamped on American history with the blood and the limbs and the bodies of our young men.

To be sure, had we been in a position to have taken the necessary police action during the several years which preceded Pearl Harbor, and assuming that the police action would have prevented this war, we would have lost men. But we would not have ruined an entire generation.

In the years to come, many a family will wonder whether it would not have been better for their soldier to have been killed in battle than to have come back a wreck of humanity unable to piece himself together.

But today I do not want to dwell on the past nor on the fearful incidents that will come from the past. We have a job to do and we must keep our minds and our thoughts and our hearts on the future, determined that in every way possible we will prevent war from now on.

During my campaign for reelection a year ago, I stated my conviction that the resolution I have introduced must be adopted as a means to prevent another war. Many people had written and consulted with me urging that I give this measure my advocacy. Last March I introduced a preliminary resolution. I am frank to admit that my resolution was vague in the specific details as to how the goal could be reached. But today we know definitely what we want.

In April our delegates met with those of 50 other nations at San Francisco to work out and draw up the provisions of the United Nations Charter. Two months later the United Nations adjourned their conference, presenting to the world a document which is forming the basis of an international organization—an organization which, if properly directed, will be the structure of good cultural, social, and economic relations between all the members of the community of nations, with the ultimate result of lasting harmony and understanding.

The Charter has 111 articles. In order to make the Charter a living document, special action must be taken to implement most of its provisions. In our democracy legislation will have to be enacted by the Congress to implement many of them. In that way the Charter will, time and time again, be given back to the people of this country through their representatives in Congress for study.

My resolution deals specifically with articles 42 and 43 of the Charter. Article 42 definitely calls for the use of "air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security." Such action would be taken only when the Security Council decided that measures short of the use of armed forces were not adequate to meet a threatening situation effectively. We must not wait for Congress to debate—and then vote.

But under no circumstances may any action, under the requirements of my resolution, be construed as an act of war, nor may any such action be construed as in any way abrogating or altering the constitutional right of the Congress of the United States to declare war.

I repeat that measures taken under my resolution by our representative must be construed merely as preventative measures, in the nature of police action, which is deemed necessary to keep the civil peace. We want to prevent immediately aggravations that will lead to war between any two nations, because we have learned that war between two nations does lead to war between many nations.

My resolution requires that our representative must at all times be in constant touch with the President and act under his instructions. The President must immediately apprise the Congress of any measures or actions taken in accordance with my resolution for the furthering of the agreements we make under the provisions of articles 42 and 43 of the Charter.

Some people tell me that the atomic bomb has changed things so that the mere use of our armed forces will not allay war, because a nation or a part of it can be wiped out by an aggressor before we could take the necessary steps. My answer to them is that we must remember tnat our representative on the Security Council and his aides, working in conjunction with the representatives of other nations and their aides, will at all times be wise to what is going on in other countries so that we and they will be forewarned and know in advance what warlike volcanoes are likely to be erupted. That is

the great advantage in our being an active participant in a world organization.

Second, we must proceed on the assumption that the atomic bomb will be outlawed just as poison gas was outlawed. In any event, an international police organization is imperative, and I wish to repeat the provision of article 42 of the Charter, which states that the use of air, sea, or land forces, as may be necessary, shall be used to maintain or restore international peace and security. We have to be prepared immediately for any incident that may occur. There must be no question of our constitutional right. In numerous instances in the past, our President has intervened with armed force, but always he has been subject to severe criticism and the question as to whether he had the constitutional authority arose. It is high time that we put an end to that doubt, so that the entire world will henceforth know that we are acting in accordance with the will of the American people.

We must always remember with pride that the United States led in creating the Security Council. In working out the provisions of the Charter, we emphasized the importance of quick action by the Big Five in order to be able to solve problems and make decisions speedily. The purpose of my resolution confirms the stand we took at San Francisco in that regard.

This legislation would not be needed by our Allied Nations. Their government set-up is different. But we, a democracy at all times, have a President who is elected by the people every 4 years and always accountable to them. Our representative on the Security Council merely carries out his considered judgment and his decisions which are reached after his constant consultation with the elected and appointed leaders of our Government.

In the keeping of the peace, to my mind, the obligations which the leading Allied Nations assume under the Charter provisions which call for an international police force, are paramount. No world war ever started as a world war. It is the small war that should be put down and then it does not grow into a world war.

The passage of my bill will declare to the world that we mean what we say when we announce our unalterable determination that our every power will be used to prevent another war of whatever size or compass. It will declare to the world that we have moral strength behind the leadership we displayed in pointing the path for others to follow us in developing a world organization wherein the family of nations may work together as our United States do. The sooner this resolution is adopted, the better. Now is the time, now when our people are confused and worried over the apparent frustration of our initial steps to reach complete harmony with our allies in working out the peace.

In a nutshell, ladies and gentlemen, the purpose of my resolution is to put out the incipient fires of war before they get started.

Moral and Spiritual Recovery From War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Herbert Hoover entitled "Moral and Spiritual Recovery From War," at the seventy-fifth anniversary of Wilson College, Chambersburg, Pa.:

We have ended a bloody and horrible era of history. It has been a war in which the enslavement, the starvation, and killing of women, children, and civilian men have returned to the levels which we thought had gone by a thousand years ago.

America has emerged as the most powerful of nations if we wish to use that power. In any event, we now have the opportunity to give leadership in a new era for humanity. What the distant future of this new era will be depends much upon our institutions of higher learning. They must mold the leadership of the Nation.

But beyond this the war has imposed upon you who are enjoying the privileges of this institution, and all the men and women of our colleges, an immediate responsibility to the American people such as you have never hitherto known.

We hear much about the reconversion of economic life from war to peace. We hear little about reconversion of our intellectual, moral, and spiritual life from the shock of war to a life of peace. Yet that is the first necessity if civilization itself is to recover.

Surely if the new era upon which we enter is to be an era of progress it must rest upon the rebirth of truth and justice and tolerance. It must rest upon intellectual and spiritual freedom and upon a live public sensitiveness to wrong and a resentment of brutality. The redemption of mankind will depend upon those who can give intellectual, moral, and spiritual leadership in these immediate years.

To indicate how much reconversion we need in this field we should frankly examine some examples of the degeneration of our ideals during this war. Such an appraisal will not be popular with those whose war emotions still drown their reason, although I shall speak with restraint. Yet facing these facts is the first step to redemption. And now is the time to face them.

THE DEGRADATION OF TRUTH

Let us examine what has happened to truth. It is the first fatality of any war. And total war results in the mass slaughter of truth. Propaganda is one of the weapons of war. And propaganda is at best but half truth. It tells only one side. Its justification is that strategy requires that the enemy be misled. Morale at home in war also requires a boost of spirit by suppression of some things and emphasis on others. War controls are used to cover up blunders and failures. Another taint of untruth still hangs heavy in the air. One of Lenin's principles of propaganda was to confuse vocabularies. At one time America had simple and well-understood expressions, such as self-government, independence of nations, democracy, personal freedom, and liberalism. The war leaves us with these phrases stuffed with perversions of truth.

Exploitation of emotion, regimentation of the press and confusion are not operations in pure intellectual honesty. And these practices leave an imprint of the usefulness of lies. The consequence is that the habit of the war-perfected skills of government propaganda are carried over into peace. There is no national permanence in falsehood. There will be no lasting integrity in citizens unless there be intellectual honesty in government.

THE DEGENERATION OF JUSTICE

The war has temporarily injured something in our ideals of justice. Our righteous indignations at the crimes which brought this war and the brutalities of the enemy have clouded our vision of justice.

Justice demands that the men responsible for this must be punished. It requires that the military castes and their weapons be destroyed and be kept destroyed.

But justice also requires that we do not visit on the children of millions of Germans and Japanese the sins of their fathers. Nor can we justly indict and punish 200,000,000 people. Vengeance and revenge are not justice. Measures which reduce the economic life of coming generations to the low levels of an agricultural state are neither justice nor good policy. That will create gigantic cesspools of hate, poverty, and conspiracy against the world. There is no such thing as a "hard peace" or a "soft peace." It must be a just peace if we are to restore justice in the world. And without justice there is no peace.

THE GROWTH OF BRUTALITY

We have lost something in our sensitiveness to brutality. For instance, before the war we protested in deep indignation the bombing of children, women, and civilian men by the Japanese at Nanking, the Russians at Helsinki, the Germans at Warsaw and London. We said war must be confined to clashes of armed men, not the killing of civilians. Yet did we not wind up the war by killing tens of thousands of women and children at Hiroshima and Nagasaki? Even if we grant that it was necessary, it is not a matter to exult over.

Thousands of people are still being committed to concentration camps in eastern Europe without a semblance of justice or compassion. Under the name of reparations men are being seized, and prisoners are being worked under conditions reminiscent of Roman slavery. Yet we have become so habituated to brutality that we are tolerating it with little protest.

THE DEGENERATION OF FREEDOM

We have lost something of our ideals of freedom. We went into the war under the persuasion of such ideas as the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter. This was to be our second and last crusade to free the world from domination, from despotism, from imperialism, from brutality, from fear. Our banners have always proclaimed the freedom and the rights of nations and of men.

Now we find hundreds of millions of human beings breathe less independence, less liberty, less freedom from fear than before we started on this crusade. Their successful rescue at that time was the justification of our first crusade. Can we honestly say that we have not surrendered these peoples on the altar of appeasement?

THE LOSS OF TRAINED MINDS AND SKILLS

The war has brought us a loss in our intellectual life from another direction. In our lists of dead are a multitude who would have given intellectual leadership to our people. Of those who survived, the draft and diversion to war have cost us the equivalent of six annual crops of young men trained in the professions and the arts. I regret to say that, after the interruptions of war, too small a part of them are returning to colleges for training. Worst of all, by continuing the draft of boys between 18 and 21 since the war has ended we are destroying still another crop. There will sometime be a shortage in scientists, teachers, doctors, engineers, lawyers, and our leaders in the humanities. It is not even intelligent of our military forces to continue depriving our future defense of these skills.

OTHER DEGENERATIONS

I will not dwell on more examples of our moral, spiritual, and intellectual losses. I could rail against the rise of nationalistic and group selfishness. I could bewail the decrease of compassion which distinguishes christianity. I could deplore the growth of intolerance. I could expand upon the impairment of the whole cultural structure of the world. I could emphasize the loss of faith in our American system of life.

However, these degenerations in ideals and standards, this insensitiveness to wrong are common to all wars. We have recovered from them before and we can recover from them again if we have wisdom and courage.

The immediate danger to the world is a sense of frustration in America at the failure of our crusade for freedom and our continued moral and spiritual losses from the war. For from frustration can come bitter isolationism.

THE WAR IS NOT ALL LOSS

And do not get the idea that I am saying the consequences of the war are all bad. The war involved questions of national defense. We made important scientific discoveries, especially in the manipulation of the atom. The heroic deeds of America's sons and daughters have added to the glory of the Nation. They have enriched our traditions of valor. The war resulted in the extirpation of three of the festering sores of military aggression in the world. We have a start at world cooperation to at least maintain military peace.

But I am not here discussing our world situation. I am concerned with the recovery of our own American intellectual and moral and spiritual standards from their war degeneration.

THE PART OF OUR EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Some one may say that for regeneration of moral and spiritual ideals we should again return to the Sermon on the Mount. That is right, but the responsibility for the idealism of America does not rest alone on the Church. It rests also upon our institutions of higher learning, for such institutions have loyalty to standards as vital as to patriotism itself. They also have the responsibility to proclaim truth and tolerance, to insist upon justice, to awaken a sensitiveness to wrong, to selfishness, to brutality.

Indeed, without these values, there can be no successful reconversion of even the economic world from war to peace. Adam Smith taught that all material wealth comes from the earth with its increment of value from labor and skill. But he mostly overlooked the most important asset of nations without which no amount of soil or mines or labor can produce lasting wealth. That indispensable asset is moral and spiritual; it is integrity, justice and a willingness to unselfish cooperation of its citizens.

LEADERSHIP

It is a commonplace to say that in this complex modern civilization no nation can survive without leadership. And by leadership I do not speak of public life alone. We must have leadership in every branch of life from the shop foreman to the President. We must have leadership among the neighbors and in the home.

One of the riches of American life is the vast reservoir of leadership in the people. But leaders are not found like queen bees. Neither does heredity produce them and certainly bureaucracy does not do so. It is our educational system rooted in the whole people upon which we must depend to develop leaders. That is, the mechanism of free men through which youngsters with qualities of mind and character are promoted from the whole people and trained for leadership. From here must come the constant stream of young men and women who will refresh our ideals.

No doubt there are men and women who rise to leadership without the full help of our colleges. But our national supply would be poor indeed if we had to depend upon this method.

But an intangible corruption has come into our concepts of leadership during the past few years. It is dinned into us that this is the century of the common man; that he is going to do this and demand that. The idea seems to be that common man has come into his own at last. Certainly he is a good vote-getting attachment.

Thus we have developed a cult of the common man. I have not been able to find any definition of who this common man is. Most American men, and especially women, will fight if called common. Likewise, in humility, we refer to ourselves as made from common clay, but we get mad when anyone says our feet are made of clay.

However, whoever this political common man is, I want him to have all the unique benefits of the American way of life, including full opportunity to rise to leadership. But if we are to have leadership in government, in science, in education, in the professions, and in the home, we must find and train some uncommon men and women.

The only seriously objectionable part of this deification of the common man is the implication that mediocrity is an ideal, that the uncommon man is to be discredited or discarded.

Let us remember that the great advances have not been brought about by mediocre men and women. Rather they were brought about by distinctly uncommon men and women with vital sparks of leadership—men and women like St. Francis of Assisi, and Florence Nightingale, and Abraham Lincoln. Many of these great leaders were, it is true, of humble origin, but that was not their greatness.

The most gigantic experiment of this cult of all history was the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia. It is from the fumes of this cauldron that we mostly get these ideas. But one of the humors of sociology—if there is humor in it—is that the most recent phase of the revolution in Russia is a frantic search for the uncommon man. And he is given privileges and payment relatively to other citizens far more than America offers today.

There is no identity whatever between mediocrity and popular government—although that is what many of our bubble blowers are trying to put over on the American people.

The essence of our American system is that the best are to be selected for public responsibility and public service. It is also the essence of our economic life, our spiritual life, our educational institutions.

We have a recent and powerful example. In the command of our military forces and our scientific forces during the war we searched and found the uncommon men and women. They proved that they could give leadership without being dictators or Fascists or endangering popular government.

Despite this curious cult who erect antagonisms to the uncommon man, I am confident it will not confuse our educational institutions. Our sure hope of recovery in the moral and spiritual world is the wealth of uncommon men and women among our people. And it is our educational institutions that will promote and train them.

CONCLUSION

To sum up, may I say that the colleges have a great obligation courageously to restore our moral and spiritual losses from the war, to renew our ideals of freedom, to regain our sensitiveness to wrong, and to provide the Nation with renewed supply of trained leadership. Unless we rebuild this new era on these foundations, it means the war has been lost. It means more. It means that civilization is lost. I am convinced that our educational institutions are equal to this, the greatest of tasks.

Science in Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "Science in Democracy," by Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, president, Radio Corporation of America, at the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, Pa., October 5, 1945:

America, to be first in peace and first in war, must be first in science.

To achieve this, we must have democracy in science as well as science in democracy.

The essence of science is freedom to question and to experiment, with an opportunity to draw conclusions, unrestricted by any forces that would hamper liberty in thinking. The realm of study, investigation, and development must be free. Whether in politics or in science, it is the keynote of democracy that people must be free to think, free to discuss, and free to try their ideas in practice. To impose the opposite is tyranny.

That is one of the great lessons of World War II. We should not embrace victory merely as a triumph and let it rest as such in history books. We should study its lessons to cultivate progress and to safeguard the future. With peace comes the vivid truth that to be strong in this modern world a nation must have science ever ready to march with its Army, to sail with its Navy, and to fly with its Air Force. Indeed, some products of science, such as an atomically-powered missile, must be ready to fly through the air instantly, unattended by sailor, soldier, or pilot; guided to its target by push-buttons in a control room far away.

Such an alliance of science and military power can be achieved most effectively under the democratic form of government. The fate of Germany and Japan is evidence enough. Despite an earlier start by Germany in the creation and development of scientific weapons of war, the democracies were able to outdistance the enemy in this domain. If there be any doubt, let the doubter look to radar and atomic power. Developed and harnessed by democracy, they searched out the enemy and wiped out despotism. Our scientists gave their best voluntarily, while those of the Axis Powers worked under duress. Democracy, unhampered by prejudices and obsessions about race and creed, was able to utilize the knewledge and brain power not only of its own scientists but of many who had been ruthlessly banished from their homelands by the dictators.

FREEDOM TO PIONEER

For many years past, scientists from foreign lands have come to our shores and settled here so that they could study and experiment free from oppression, free from commands, and free from regimentation. Prominent among them we find Tesla, Steinmetz, Pupin, Einstein, Michelson, Zworykin, Fermi, and many others. Here they found the environment conducive to study and research, to free exchange of ideas, to experiment and discovery. Our Nation has profited by their endeavors, and science has advanced.

America, the cradle of liberty, is also the cradle of invention. The list of our native scientists and inventors is a shining roll of honor. As a result, thousands of wartime scientific accomplishments helped to turn the tide of victory for the United Nations and thus rescue democracy from those who would destroy it. Scientists in democracy must continue to pioneer on an ever-expanding scale. We must be as daring in peace as in war. We must follow our vision with the same confidence if we are to cross new frontiers of progress. Through new products, processes, and services that science can create, we should gain a fuller life, increased employment, improved health, and national security. We must cultivate our natural talents and resources to meet the promise of science if we are to develop its endless opportunities for securing a higher standard of living for the masses of people everywhere.

VIGOROUS POLICY NEEDED FOR SCIENCE

It is imperative, therefore, that the United States maintain a vigorous national policy for the promotion of science. Statesmen, philosophers, and religious leaders have led in the past—now scientists must join them in the vanguard of civilization. In the future, freedom and science must walk together, hand-in-hand as the spearheads of peace.

For this purpose, every phase of technology should be explored and developed. Every scientist or embryo scientist must be encouraged, if America is to remain unsurpassed in peace and unconquerable in war.

The national security of the United States demands that military scientists and industrial scientists continue their cooperation; for peace and security rise and fall with science.

We have but to read the dramatic stories of the life and death race between the scientists of the United Nations and of Germany, to realize how narrow was the margin during the earlier periods of the conflict. It was frightening, even after the war had ended, to find how nip-and-tuck the race had been between German and American scientists in harnessing atomic power, rockets, radar, bombsights, tanks, and other implements of war. It behooves America, therefore, to develop its scientific capital, to protect and to encourage science in times of peace, if the principles and traditions of this country are to survive.

SCIENTIFIC TALENT MUST BE CULTIVATED

Today we survey a world that has emerged from the most terrible war in history; a war in which science, like a global flame thrower, spread death and destruction around the earth. From now on, no nation is immune. No nation can be protected by oceans or mountains, forts, frontiers, or isolation. Victory in any future war may be determined by the skill of scientist against scientist. No physical barrier will limit the battlefields. The victor will be the one best fortified by science and development, by discovery and invention, and by use of scientific weapons in the hands of the ablest fighters.

Science that saved democratic civilization in World War II must now be used for peace. This calls for training young Americans with an aptitude and an interest in science and invention. Therefore, democracy must promote scientific education, not only for the development of weapons, but for the creation of employment, for the production of more abundant crops, for increasing national health, and for developing new wonders in atomic energy, electronics, chemistry, and physics that will make for good living and eliminate poverty and disease throughout the world. America must cultivate its reservoir of youthful scientific talent along with development of its natural resources.

War gave tremendous impetus to scientific research. We must keep it moving in the right direction—toward progress in peace. In our land the power behind it will come from the training of future scientists—from the high schools, colleges, laboratories, and workshops of America.

Just as we have succeeded in releasing atomic energy from uranium, we must release the energy from the minds of our youth. In the fertile brains of American boys and girls are the master keys to the future. We must stimulate and encourage youth, if this Nation is to have health, prosperity, and security. With its natural interest in science, youth is one of America's greatest national resources. The figment of an idea may be more revolutionary than the fission of an atom.

Great industrial laboratories will be built, splendidly equipped and on sites conducive to clear thinking; but they will be worthless, no matter how great the funds behind them, if trained men of research do not work within their walls. There is no substitute for brains. Men, not tools, are the lifeblood of research.

ENLISTING SCIENTISTS FOR PEACE

We stand on the threshold of revolutionary developments that call for thousands of trained scientists. We need them more and more to convert to the uses of peace, the scientific achievements of the war, which victory has made available to us.

When war came, the manpower requirements of peace were pushed aside. War drafted scientists, teachers, and students with little question of future needs. Scientific and prescientific schools emptied their classes into the training camps of the armed forces. Industry and education responded alike to that draft of men.

Now the war is over. Peace is the order of the day. And peace, to meet our national needs, should have the priorities that were given yesterday to the demands of war. Subject only to urgent military necessity, peace should have the right to recall, for the great national service of science, the trained men, and the young recruits it gave up to the war.

But no mere return of our potential scientists from the armed forces can meet the pressing needs of the hour. You cannot recruit scientists through draft boards. They must be recruited through years of training in colleges and universities. If we are to meet the needs of tomorrow, we must enroll now, in our scientific schools and laboratories, an army of students for the 4 to 6 years of college and postgraduate work that is necessary to produce trained scientists. Nothing less will give our Nation the scientific preparedness we must have for the march of science in peace as well as in war.

VALUE OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

At the end of the First World War, it was vividly apparent that scientific research also was a vital factor in our industrial progress. As a result, it grew tenfold between 1920 and 1940. Within the past two decades, in television alone the radio industry spent more than $20,000,000 on research. That investment has called for faith, for initiative, and for young men with new ideas. Now we are on the threshold of a new postwar industry. Television is destined to become a utility in the American home and a revolutionary force in world-wide communications. It will bring visual entertainment to the homes of rich and poor alike; it will flash letters, documents, and pictures around the world while the television eye in factories will enhance safety and speed industrial processes.

In radio, each forward step leads to something new. From radio principles and television techniques sprang another new wonder, so miraculous that it is called a sixth sense—radar. But this, too, required research on a wide basis.

Unified research on a national scale that cost $2,000,000,000 produced the atomic bomb. Scientists themselves were amazed at the speed of the development. They thought it possible but believed it would require 20 years or more to achieve results. Their calculations, however, did not take into account the impact of war which produces speed, direct action, and concentrated effort.

Peace also can benefit from concentration on certain pressing problems. For example, what would result from even $100,000,000 wisely spent on cancer research? If research produced a cure for cancer, it would save more lives than were lost in the war.

SCIENCE REVEALS AN INVISIBLE WORLD

Research into the unknown is a great adventure. It should be encouraged if American scientists are to blaze new trails in life, as the electron miscroscope has done in revealing the miscroscopic world which surrounds us. From a study of the infinitesimal organisms and elements, from the unseen rays and waves which permeate our bodies, we may find the answer to our future in the Atomic Age. The tiny, invisible things of life are only beginning to reveal their importance. The electron is the key to the world of the infinitesimal.

We have long associated power with great size but we are now beginning to realize that tiny invisible things, such as the electron and the atom, are the nuclei around which our very existence whirls. We are beginning to see that the atomic structure is a universe in itself, like the one in which our earth revolves around the sun. We see before us a new universe of power—the power of protons, electrons, deuterons and neutrons. When the atom is smashed terrific energy is released. Scientists tell us that when a lone neutron, with only a thirtieth of a volt of energy behind it, strikes the core of a uranium atom, 200,000,000 electron volts of energy shoot out.

HARNESSING UNIVERSAL POWER

The release and control of atomic energy represents a new and successful attempt by man to tap nature's great source of universal power. Let us envisage nature as a huge safe on which there is a combination lock. Inside this giant structure there are many chambers, one of which contains atomic power. Man, thus far, has learned only the combination to the safe and found the key to a single chamber. He has yet to find the keys to many other chambers which will unlock the secrets of nature that may astonish and change the world.

Now the scientist has stepped out from the darkness of military secrecy into a spotlight that focuses the eyes of all the world upon him. The people in whose name he achieved victory look upon him as a giant endowed with magic powers for good or evil. But it is he who creates and it is they who must decide how his handiworks are to be used—for construction or destruction?

With the perspectives now unveiled, humanity may look forward to a future of terror, or a future of security and abundance. If we desire the latter to be our destiny, then all nations must decide to live in harmony in "one world." Such decision would be helped if the social sciences moved forward at a faster pace. They should not lag so far behind the physical sciences, as they have in the past. The statesman, the politician, the scientist, the spiritual leader, the teacher, the industrialist, and the labor leader must carry their new responsibilities to society, in the light of these momentous developments. Each must do his part towards curing the causes of conflicts and preventing misuse of the new forces now at a man's disposal. Only thus can we preserve the freedom and democracy for which our sons and daughters fought and gave their lives.

THE USE OF SCIENCE

On August 5, 1945, the earth was spinning in an orbit of destruction. Science threw a mighty switch and released the atomic bomb. The world gasped! Almost in the twinkling of an eye mankind moved out from the dark clouds of war into the promising sunshine of peace.

In the wake of war there are many new ideas and discoveries, which can be applied to our every-day life. In some instances, however, science ran far ahead of man's readiness to provide practical safeguards that would confine their uses to peacetime purposes. Atomic energy is one disturbing illustration. Further development is bound to release the great potentialities of atomic energy for use in industry, heat, light, power, and transportation. But the atomic units that one day may power hundreds of thousands of peaceful automobiles and airplanes, also could be used in war.

Nor can it be safely assumed that atomic bombs necessarily will come only from the skies. They might come from submarines or ships, or even from land artillery. In fact it is conceivable that smaller and better

atomic bombs, as small as baseballs, might be plants by saboteurs at strategic places and there remain hidden until such time as an enemy decides to strike. A secret radio signal transmitted from a distance might be used to detonate such bombs and spread havoc far and wide.

Science races time, and man in his efforts to survive and to progress is in the race with both. Now, as man surveys the maze of possibilities which technology created in the heat of warfare, he faces the great tasks of converting and confining them to peacetime utility.

As we sit at home and watch the Tigers play the Cubs on the screen, or watch dancers in the studio at Radio City, television—for example—looks like an emissary of peace. But like other wonders of science, television too, if man so chooses, may be applied to war. Television in peace has fascinating aspects; in war terrifying!

TELEVISION IN WAR

Since the war ended, Gen. H. H. Arnold, commanding the United States Army Air Forces, has revealed that flying rockets which can be directed to targets far beyond the horizon are a definite possibility; no longer a dream. Television gives them an eye. From a distance, radio controls them in flight. So deft, so all-seeing is this control, that from the launching site, the operator can guide the winged missile as if he were inside its shell. If he sees that it is not going to hit the target, he can turn it quickly; he can even make it loop-the-loop. The very thought of thousands of these television-eyed monsters of destruction coming up over the horizon of the sea as a storm cloud may well cause us to shudder. They might be loaded with warheads of atomic power, some to strike and wipe New York off the map, while others guided westward to turn Pittsburgh, Detroit, Chicago, and other cities into death and dust. No longer is the suicide flier needed; television can do his task—and more.

We have the testimony of another great airman, Air Chief Marshal Sir Arthur Harris, of Britain, who recently said, "War in the future is in the hands of the scientists. * * * Just as you had the old knight in armor leveled by the first man who got hold of a gun, now you have gotten to a stage where a country could win a war despite its size. It could win, however small it was, provided it had the scientific resources and brains to obtain mastery of the new weapons. If you couple the atomic bomb with the projected missile you have something with possibilities that hardly bear contemplation. The whole world is now in the range of this weapon."

I tell you the bomber with a television eye is no myth; neither is the radio-controlled rocket.

TELEVISION IN PEACE

It rests with man how television, atomic power, electronics, and all the other forces of science are to be used. In man's will lies the answer to the future influence of science on the world. If harnessed for useful purposes the world will go into an era of wonders never before believed possible. Man will be able to look around the world by television, with the same facility that he now listens around the world by radio. Historic events such as the Japanese surrender on board the battleship *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay will no longer encircle the earth only as sound. They will be seen and heard as sight and sound in tandem.

Nor should we think of television only as an optic nerve over which entertainment and information flow pictorially, for it has many other uses which may even dwarf its performance in the home and theater. Wherever transport needs vision, television will help to provide it. The airplane will see by television and radar; so will ships on the seven seas. Similarly, wherever industry needs an eye, television will provide it. It will watch over industrial processes and machines; it will go into places the human eye cannot reach. Fireproof eyes will be put into furnaces to scan chemical reactions. Tunnels will have these radio eyes as will conduits and mines.

COMMUNICATIONS IN THE FUTURE

Several days ago a prominent communications official from Europe called at my office. We talked of communications and the future. I could see that the threat of competition between radio and plane bothered him. In reading the news that a plane had flown a film from Iwo Jima to Washington in 30 hours he saw an ominous cloud darken the future of electric communications. Most certainly planes would pick up speed and deliver mail even faster.

Then I told him I had no fear for the future. Radio traveling 186,000 miles a second is faster than any aircraft or even a mail-carrying rocket. A radio signal circles the globe in one-seventh of a second. Before a mail-laden plane could get off a runway in Australia, radio could be delivering mail from Melbourne in Washington or London. Furthermore, radio could televise an important scene or event, anywhere, so that all the world might see it instantly and simultaneously. Radio travels with the speed of light. Television is light and radio combined.

I told my friend that in the future a person will write a letter or a message that will be put on a belt moving in front of a television eye. In a split second that letter or message, exactly as written, will appear in England, South Africa, or China. There it will be automatically reproduced by a photographic process for delivery in minutes—not hours as required by even the fastest airplane.

My friend began to smile. His conception of the future of communications was changing. He was startled when I told him that eventually we may be able to take a sealed letter or document and flash it across the hemispheres without opening the envelope. That, again, is a television possibility—and it's not fantastic. If X-rays can look through the human body and through steel, why should it not be possible for the television eye to look through a paper envelope? This would make possible a radio mail system.

SCIENCE AND SECURITY

Atomic energy, radar, electronics, television, jet propulsion, plastics, and airplanes are the craftsmanship of scientists. They are the architects of our future. It is not war alone but also science that transformed the world within the past 6 years. The chief effect of the two atomic bombs was not on the two Japanese cities which they destroyed, but on the human mind. As science reconverts to peace, the evidence of all this will become clear. War was a potent force in the crucible of destiny.

In war, we used science to defend democracy, to defeat its enemies, and to destroy their false philosophies. In peace, democracy must advance the use of science for a better life and make its benefits available to all.

While we strive to obtain these benefits, we must not neglect the problem of preserving peace by adequate preparedness. For the dangers which face all of us from the new forces released by science, must not be ignored. We should adjust our military and industrial establishments to proper peacetime proportions as quickly as possible; but we must maintain them at a level that safeguards our national security.

Our Nation must not dissipate the moral and physical strength it now possesses in a world that is far from stabilized. Other nations, too, will benefit from our earnest efforts to substitute world peace for world war, if America is prepared with trained men and modern means to meet the perils of the terrifying forces science has discovered. If we fail in this, democracy will fail.

Let us, therefore, recognize the twin necessities of science in democracy and democracy in science.

Let us see to it that in our new-won freedom, the scientist retains his liberty to think, to speak, and to work unfettered. Let us teach our youth the great responsibilities of science and encourage them to travel its highways of progress. Let them be bold in thought and daring in pursuit of the vision of their dreams.

At the same time, let us not ignore the fact that the dangers mankind faces, call for vision, courage, exploration, and action not only in physical sciences but also in the political and social sciences. For all the world is now one neighborhood and the best guaranty for our own security and prosperity is the security and prosperity of our neighbors as well.

Democracy in its hour of triumph demands that America be strong and help to make science a useful servant, not the master, of mankind.

Army Discharge Policy at Clovis Army Air Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from a Montana serviceman now stationed at Clovis Army Air Field. I am calling attention to the deplorable situation which he describes to the House for its consideration and then I am taking the matter up with the War Department. I feel that this situation needs investigation, and I shall request that measures be immediately instituted to correct the position these boys are in so that they will receive all possible consideration at the earliest possible moment. Under unanimous consent, the letter referred to follows:

CLOVIS ARMY AIR FIELD,
Clovis, N. Mex., October 6, 1945.

Representative MIKE MANSFIELD:

DEAR SIR: I am writing you in hopes that you may be able to put pressure in the right places to cause this Army to discharge us more rapidly.

We have been through this war, we have put in plenty of time in combat overseas; now this war is over, we who are eligible for discharge have done our job and did it cheerfully, although it wasn't very pleasant. Now we want back in civilian life that we may be of some use to ourselves and our fellow men.

Some few days ago the statement was made over the radio that all men of over 85 points by the VE-day count had been discharged. If this is true, how can the Army account for at least 100 men still on this base as yet that have not been released? Many have over 100 points and have dependents. They have no "bad time" to make up. Why are they still here?

There are far more men here than are needed. There are at least five men for every job here.

If they are going to discharge by the point system, why isn't it done fairly? There are many men in the 70-point bracket that al-

ready have been released, but as yet very few in the 80-point bracket, not to mention the men that have over 85 points that are still here. This whole Second Air Force, and this base especially, needs an investigation.

There is no reason why they can't let us out faster. They didn't seem to have any trouble getting us in the Army at the rate of several thousand a day!

There has been some very underhanded business going on here. For instance, if you slip the right man in base headquarters a $20 bill, he will have you out of here in a week's time; that is done very regularly here! Why is it that officers are given preference over enlisted men for discharge? The base I am to be separated from, if I am ever released, is now crowded with a bunch of officers, so we enlisted men just have to wait.

The morale here is the lowest I have ever seen it either in the States or overseas. It will take very little more of this Army's wasting time and foolishness to start some mass desertions. There aren't many of us that wouldn't "go over the hill" either if it would do any good toward getting an investigation made of this jumbled-up discharge system.

We are only wasting our own time, the time this Nation needs, by being kept hanging around here doing nothing, waiting to be released.

I am not signing my name to this because, from things I have seen happen on this base and in the Second Air Force, I know it would mean the guardhouse for me if Colonel Morgan, the base C. O., should ever find I wrote a letter like this to my Representative.

I can assure you on my word of honor every statement I have made in this letter is the truth and can be proven.

Yours respectfully,

A STAFF SERGEANT FROM MONTANA.

Must We Continue Diplomatic Collaboration With Fascism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, newspapers throughout the country are replete with editorials denouncing Franco Fascist Spain, calling attention to the Fascist ideology of its government. Under Franco all liberal thought is suppressed; freedom of speech, religion, and assmebly are abolished. There are no elections in Spain. One political party is permitted, the Falange. There is a close intertie between Spain's falange and the colonels' government in Argentina. Many Argentine officers were trained in the German Army. Spain and the Argentine today are the asylum for hundreds of Nazi emigrés.

I have a resolution pending in Congress, to wit, H. R. 312, which would, if enacted, express the will of Congress that diplomatic relations with Spain should be forthwith severed. When I started this crusade some years ago there was practically no support for such a move in America, outside of liberal circles. Today most of the daily papers recognize that we are placed in an anomalous, if not ludicrous, position in the eyes of the democratic world by continuing to give economic and diplomatic support to Franco. Hundreds of editorials in most of the daily press of America have urged the severing of such diplomatic relations, and have bitterly denounced the Franco Fascist Government. Some typical editorial expressions pertinent to this subject matter are as follows:

From the Christian Science Monitor of Boston, September 28, 1945:

LET'S MAKE IT CLEAR

If publication of the Roosevelt letter to Norman Armour, Ambassador to Spain, last March is intended to clarify American policy toward General Franco, it comes too late to achieve maximum effect. In fact, there is a distinct possibility that the move may simply cause the mists around American policy to shift a little, instead of dispersing them.

While President Roosevelt did in this letter register opposition to the Franco regime, the very fact that the United States was at that moment sending a new Ambassador to Madrid gives us some measure of the opposition. It consisted of private statements against the Spanish dictatorship, but not enough public censure or direct political and economic pressures to help the Spanish people to liberate themselves.

When President Roosevelt wrote that the United States did not intend to interfere in Spain's domestic affairs, he was expressing a correct policy of nonintervention approved by many. But the Spanish Government had given the United States plenty of cause to withdraw diplomatic recognition, if not to apply sterner measures.

Coming so soon after Russian denunciations of General Franco, publication of the Roosevelt letter seems intended to show that the United States has not lagged behind Russia in opposition to the Spanish fascism.

But even at this moment new questions arise. There are reports that Latin-American countries have been preparing to demand a diplomatic break between the Americas and General Franco when the Inter-American Conference meets next month at Rio de Janeiro. There are also reports from Washington describing publication of the Roosevelt letter as a move to forestall these demands.

Let us hope the reports are mistaken. To correct them, the State Department could take steps now to withdraw recognition from Madrid and to make clear that United States policy aims at a return of the Spanish Republic.

From the Wyoming State Tribune, Cheyenne, Wyo., October 2, 1945:

ONE RUSSIAN DEMAND

Even those who completely disagree with other Russian demands may lend sympathetic ear to the assertion of the acting Soviet Ambassador to the United States, Nikolai Novikov, that the United Nations should force the removal of Generalissimo Franco as head of the Spanish government, and furthermore, should try him as a "war criminal."

Instead, it may be presumed in the light of the past, that the larger of these nations, other than Russia, will continue to coddle the murderous little friend of Hitler and Mussolini.

So abstruse may be the ways of "diplomacy."

From the Daily Independent, Ashland, Ky., September 11, 1945:

SPAIN'S FUTURE LEADER

After Franco, who? One reason why this pro-Axis dictator has been able to keep hold of the Spanish Government has been the disunity of his opponents. Now they seem really to be getting together under the leadership of Juan Negrin, the last prime minister of the Republican government. A conference in Mexico has effected an agreement of factions, including the vital question of the handling of money which the exiled Republicans were able to salvage when they fled.

Negrin presided over this conference, and has been accepted as the choice to start the new government off when Franco is dispossessed. After that he will resign to permit an election, but he may well be asked to continue until things get started.

Negrin is an able man of liberal views. Under him it is unlikely that Spain would ever be subject to President Truman's reproof, "We do not like Franco or his government."

Problems of Reconversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Sunday Star of October 14, 1945:

SOUTHEASTERN OIL AND AFFILIATES,
Jacksonville, Fla.

To All My Friends:

Much is being said and written about the problems of reconversion. Can we maintain full employment? And can we keep the industrial machine rolling in high gear?

Well, former President Franklin D. Roosevelt once observed, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself!" How true. And how timely.

If the problems of the future appear great, it should be remembered that any job—no matter how big—can be done if sufficient persistence and determination are employed and the willingness exists to pay the price in energy for its accomplishment.

If one says it cannot be done, it is he who cannot do it. He is licked before he starts. And paradoxically, while he is saying it can't be done, someone already is doing it. What a lot of people need these days is a good swift kick in the can'ts.

No task is particularly difficult if it is divided into small jobs. The experience of difficulty tends to strengthen the mind even as physical labor strengthens the body. We all agree—that quitters never win—but winners never quit.

If the elevator to success is not running, then we must climb the stairs. We must never fear failure to the extent that we are unwilling to take a chance. Our greatest glory is not in avoiding falls—but in rising every time we fall. All of us are entitled to a quota of mistakes which go to make us qualify as human beings. A good man does not blame failure but he is absolutely merciless toward lack of effort.

So let us keep faith in ourselves. Let us always remember that the future holds nothing for those who have lost faith. Pessimists are never in demand—never become leaders.

THE LEADER

If you think you are beaten, you are.
If you think you dare not, you don't.
If you'd like to win, but think you can't,
It's almost a cinch you won't.
If you think you'll lose, you're lost.
For out in the world we find
Success begins with a fellow's will—
It's all in the state of mind.
If you think you're outclassed, you are.
You've got to think high to rise:
You've got to be sure of yourself before
You ever can win a prize.
Life's battles don't always go
To the strongest or fastest man—
But sooner or later the man who wins
Is the man who thinks he can.

It is absolutely proper to accept with serenity the things that cannot be changed. But by all means let's have the courage to try to change the things that can and should be changed.

Don't be afraid to criticize. * * * Where all think alike no one thinks very much. Democracy gains in strength and wisdom from the clean criticism and eternal vigilance of its citizens.

God Bless America! So say we all. And God bless that symbol of glorious democracy—the loud heckler at the back of the hall—even though we may totally disagree with him.

Let us continue to fight for those things in which we believe, always remembering that it is not the size of the dog in the fight but the size of the fight in the dog. Let us not be judged by what has been given us in life but rather by the fortitude we bring into it.

We live in a Nation where opportunities are virtually unlimited. Take a man with a strong hand, a pair of overalls, a few ideas and a willingness to work * * * this man can grow big doing big things; or he can grow big doing small things in a better way.

But as Henry Dodd put it: "The reason many of us do not recognize an opportunity when we meet it is that opportunity usually goes around in overalls looking like hard work."

Each of us becomes the product of his own efforts. Every man writes his own destiny and, as the great Thomas A. Edison said: "Everything comes to him who hustles while he waits!"

Your affairs, even as mine, are but the lengthened shadows cast by you and me and those with whom we are associated. If the pattern does not please us, then it is up to us to change it. Only action will change the shape of a shadow. Wishing and thinking will not.

The pent-up demand for every conceivable kind of merchandise is going to be great during the next few years. We cannot complain about the business outlook. But for each of us to obtain a share of his business we must roll up our sleeves, grit our teeth, and pitch in there and fight.

Apropos of pitching in—the best way in the world to learn how much a fellow has "on the ball" is to make the going tough for him. Either he will take it with a grin and come back for more or he will fold up.

Remember Elbert Hubbard's poem:

The tree that never had to fight,
For sun and sky and air and light;
That stood out in the open plain,
And always got its share of rain;
Never became a forest king,
But lived and died a scrubby thing.

This is equally true of men. And the only successful way for any of us to get along in this world is to take the bit in our teeth and solve our own problems. Our hopes and our plans may not necessarily materialize in the manner we desire because as James Barrie wrote:

"The life of every man is a diary in which he means to write one story, and writes another; and his humblest hour is when he compares that volume as it is with what he vowed to make it."

We should start now, to do the things we know we should do. Then we soon would spell "now" backwards. The best time is to start today—the best place—right where we are.

Luck or chance need not rule a man's destiny—his fate depends upon his character. If he is strong, he can overcome circumstances; if he is weak, circumstances will overcome him.

I, for one, believe in the eternal verities, that honest effort always wins its reward and that the success of any businessman or individual is assured if the inspiration to succeed is never allowed to die. And inspiration will never die unless we lose faith in ourselves.

The answer to our reconversion problem and what the future holds in store for you and for me is:

What will you and I make it?
It is entirely up to us!

Sincerely,

GORDON DUKE.

Celler Introduces Bill To Amend Communications Act of 1934—Bill Designed To Protect Radio From Overcommercialization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934.

The bill is designed to reenforce the basic congressional intent expressed as far back as 1925. The ether is a public medium and its use must be for public benefit. The use of radio channels is justified only if there is public benefit. The dominant element for consideration in the radio field is, and always will be, the great body of the listening public, millions in number, country-wide in distribution.

Today there are more than 900 standard broadcasting stations, more than 600 of which are affiliated with one or more of the four national networks. These more than 600 stations utilize 95 percent of the nighttime broadcasting power and over 55 percent of the day broadcasting time is taken by national networks programs. By 1943 over $307,000,000 was grossed from time sales of all broadcasters in this country. The cost of a single hour of full network coverage runs as high as $25,000. In 1943, 144 advertisers provided 97.2 percent of the national network's revenue.

We will do well to consider the questions carefully whether the air waves which are public property and only licensed to operators in the public interest shall be permitted to become merely an adjunct of big business, and whether it is socially wise to permit the neglect of regional interests to continue.

Reading carefully the opinion of the FCC in the matter of the transfer of the control of the Crosley Corp. to the Aviation Corp., one can easily see that the FCC felt it had not acted in a manner consonant with the public interest in permitting the transfer to the Aviation Corp. The majority opinion based its decision on a lack of congressional authority to do otherwise.

Today FM makes possible the development of thousands of new stations. The excessive use of these and existing stations for commercial advertising purposes must be curbed so that in fair measure the listening public can find in radio a greater intellectual maturity. Programs of cultural and educational value, particularly regional needs, have been insufficiently developed. Radio is in danger of being consumed by the profit fever. It must be remembered that operators of radio stations are licensed and thus hold the position of trustees for the benefit of the public at large. For example, the educational program Invitation to Learning was carried by only 39 of the 136 stations which could have had use of it; National Radio Pulpit was carried by 60 stations and rejected by 79; the Chicago Roundtable was rejected by 84 out of 139 stations and Labor for Victory, the only labor program carried on any of the major networks was rejected by 104 out of 139 stations. For these reasons, I have included in the bill the following:

The Commission shall fix percentages of time (commonly known as sustaining time) to be allocated during each part of the broadcast day by each class of broadcast stations or by each broadcast station, without charge, for particular types or kinds of nonprofit radio programs or for particular types or kinds of nonprofit activities; and such percentages of sustaining time shall be set forth as conditions of operation in each broadcast station license.

Another phase of the bill concerns itself with excessive prices paid in the transfer of stations. I know of one case where a station was sold for 1,543 times its net income. Stations with assets of about $50,000 have been sold for $500,000. Such uncontrolled prices make it possible for only those of great wealth to operate stations and tend to keep the control of radio in the hands of a select few. It is an unbalanced and unhealthy condition for so vital a medium as radio which has tremendous force in the molding of public opinion and public taste. The bill I have offered, therefore, includes the following:

No transfer or assignment shall be approved in which the total consideration to be paid for the broadcast property, tangible and intangible, exceeds the fair value of such property: *Provided*, That such fair value shall not exceed double the depreciated cost value of the tangible broadcast property transferred or assigned.

Application for renewal licenses are made every 3 years. Too often the renewals are granted automatically. There should be a reexamination for each renewal application to determine whether the public interest is best being served by its present operators. Each renewal should be subjected to rigid investigation and any citizen who wishes to do so should be allowed to raise his voice in opposition or register his complaint. Furthermore, any person or entity desiring to function on the wavelength involved should have the right to appear and present his case. If he can demonstrate his ability to operate the station to a greater degree in the public interest, renewal of the application to the current licensee should be refused and the privilege granted to the new applicant. I have included such requirement in the bill. Such requirement would galvanize all station owners into conducting and supervising the activities of their station in a manner that will be consistent with the public medium philosophy indicated by Congress when it

carefully considered the Communications Act of 1934.

The bill further includes an amendment to section 303 by adding a new subsection whereby the FCC shall "prescribe the form of any and all accounts, records, and memoranda to be kept by broadcast stations. Any and all financial reports filed with the Commission shall be open for public inspection." The first sentence is identical with the provisions applicable to the telephone and telegraph companies. Certainly what applies to these public utilities should likewise apply to radio. The Commission presently does not require how and in what manner the reports shall be filled out. Some of the accounts now filed would not be acceptable under an approved system of accounting. The reports filed now are simply received by the Commission with no comments except that the Commission publishes aggregated accounts, summarizing types of broadcast, power used, and so forth. But the report published by the Commission is not designed to cover any individual station. The public is entitled to know how much the trustees of public property are making. The air waves and radio channels are public property and only loaned to private entities for a specific purpose and for a specific time.

I have a good word to say for the various chains and other independent stations. They have done a good job. They have made excellent progress, but I am sure that the operators themselves will be the first to deny that they have reached the ultimate in the improving of radio broadcast. I want to give praise where praise is due. Constructive criticism should not be deemed baneful. Both radio operators and the public can profit from the passage of the bill I have offered.

It most certainly is not my purpose to advocate in any way government ownership of radio. I want no truck with such government ownership. The best example of such government ownership is the British Broadcasting Company, and American radio most emphatically does not suffer by comparison. The sprightliness, the ingenuity, the variety, and inventiveness of American broadcasts cannot be matched by BBC. I believe that radio operation belongs in private industry, but I likewise believe that private operation must be cognizant of its failings and help in remedying them.

A copy of the bill I have offered follows:

A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended

1. Amend section 307 (d) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Before filing any application for renewal of a broadcast station license, a licensee shall cause to be published at least three times, in a daily newspaper of general circulation published in the community in which such station is licensed, a display advertisement in such form as the Commission shall prescribe, setting forth his intention to file a renewal application, the date on which the existing license expires, and a statement in the form prescribed by the Commission that others seeking the same channel must file application before that date in order to receive competitive consideration, and that anyone desiring to oppose the renewal must file his reasons with the Commission in writing at least 30 days before such date."

2. Amend section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by adding at the end thereof a new subsection, as follows:

"(bb) With respect to broadcast matters, 'public interest' includes the interest of all listeners within the service area of the broadcast station or stations concerned; and no finding of 'public interest' shall be made in any broadcast matter unless the Commission finds that excessive use of the station has not been made and will not be made for commercial advertising purposes."

3. Repeal subsection (c) of section 307 of the Communications Act of 1934, and insert in lieu thereof a new subsection (c), as follows:

"(c) The Commission shall fix percentages of time—commonly known as sustaining time—to be allocated during each part of the broadcast day by each class of broadcast stations or by each broadcast station, without charge, for particular types or kinds of nonprofit radio programs or for particular types or kinds of nonprofit activities; and such percentages of sustaining time shall be set forth as conditions of operation in each broadcast station license."

4. Amend section 303 by adding at the end thereof, a new subsection (s), as follows:

"(s) Prescribe the form of any and all accounts, records, and memoranda to be kept by broadcast stations. Any and all financial reports filed with the Commission shall be open for public inspection."

5. Amend subsection (b) of section 310 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by adding at the end thereof the following:

"No transfer or assignment shall be approved in which the total consideration to be paid for broadcast property, tangible and intangible, exceeds the fair value of such property: *Provided*, That such fair value shall not exceed double the depreciated cost value of the tangible broadcast property transferred or assigned."

Soriano Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, in certain speeches I have discussed the career of Col. Andres Soriano, who has been a favorite of General MacArthur. Soriano is a Spaniard, active in the Falange before Pearl Harbor in the Philippines; later an officer in the Philippine Army, after becoming a Filipino citizen, and now a citizen of the United States. The New York daily newspaper PM on October 8 discussed graphically the most recent developments in reference to this most remarkable, if not incredible, figure:

FRANCO'S LOSS IS OUR "GAIN"

WASHINGTON, October 8.—Col. Andres Soriano, one-time backer of Franco in Manila before the war and once dreamed of becoming a Spanish duke under a restored monarchy, is now an American citizen.

This happy event took place in Washington last Friday in district court with the aid of a "very high recommendation" from General MacArthur, on whose staff Soriano has served since the Philippine invasion. Presumably when Soriano took the oath he didn't give the fascist salute that he once gave in Manila back in the day when he was Franco's honorary consultant there and was one of the chief fund-raisers for the Spanish dictator.

This new American citizenship comes as a result of Soriano's service in the United States Army on MacArthur's staff, although he fought a good chunk of the war at his suite in the Hotel Shoreham. It comes, too, at the ducky moment when it will be much more pleasant to have his huge property holdings in the Philippines under the protection of the United States flag than subject to the vagaries of Philippine political developments.

Colonel Soriano has been somewhat unstable in his citizenships. He started life as a Spanish subject, although born in the Philippines. Then, suddenly in 1941, at a time when the United States was freezing the assets of Axis nationals, he became a Filipino citizen after some legal gyrations that still are a subject for debate in the Philippines. It was Manuel Roxas, ex-collaborator with the Japanese and now president of the Filipino Senate, who got him his Filipino citizenship.

Deliverance or Doom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, I offer the article entitled "Deliverance or Doom," by Dr. E. M. Langer, research associate of physics, California Institute of Technology, which appeared in Collier's weekly for September 29, 1945:

DELIVERANCE OR DOOM

(By Dr. E. M. Langer)

All of us who have given real thought and careful imagination to an atomic age have made one common blunder. We have assumed it would be the hope and horror of future persons; we never dreamed that we, ourselves, would be asked by the newspapers and magazines for which we work to sit down and write, "Here it is. We must now do thus and so." And in that all-too-real circumstance, I feel a sense of shock that mingles with elation over having lived, myself, to see the day. It is a great day.

A committee of scientists and statesmen, appointed by President Truman, is formulating a plan for the new age. Every fact of the present situation is known to that committee. Nothing more is known to me than what had been discovered before the war and what has been told since the atom bombing. So this discussion is offered with reservations. It is a first, exploratory set of suggestions which may give rise to others more informed and therefore more germane. But it will show, I think, not just the peril which confronts humanity. It will give some estimate of the hope that lies ahead of us and some notion of how we human beings, who depend so desperately upon our foresight, may devise plans big enough and rational enough to make atomic energy the instrument of deliverance rather than of doomsday.

World reaction to the atomic bomb has been too largely limited to a feeling of terror and too little concerned with the greater problems and the greater possibilities of the new force. Atomic energy is only incidentally a military weapon. As a source of power it will be more important to human beings than all the wars recorded.

In Collier's, more than 5 years ago, Dr. R. M. Langer, of California Institute of Technology, predicted this day in detail. Here are a few of the things he said in that widely quoted article:

"The foundations of the happy era have already been laid. The driving force is within our grasp. * * * On the basis of how you live today you cannot make a chart of how you will live tomorrow. You must draw a wholly fresh picture, for the face of the earth will be changed. The destructive potentialities of U-235 make it imperative that the citizens of the future be better educated than they are now with respect to their social responsibilities."

The replanning of our world should begin for you as you read this, if you have not already begun. We still need more facts concerning all aspects of the situation. But the one fact in our possession—the reality of the bomb, when viewed in the light of the history of science—is enough to guarantee that the energy of the atom will be available—and soon. The only question is how soon. Sir James Chadwick, head of the British experts who helped to develop the bomb, has stated that atomic energy will be commercially available to us in a period closer to 10 years than 50. He ought to know.

From the standpoint of our future prosperity, our abundance, our very existence as individuals and as a species, and not merely from a military standpoint, it is to the utmost advantage of every person alive to do what he can to see that this energy is made available as soon as possible.

We know that three major problems confront us: Atomic energy as a weapon, atomic energy as a power supply, and the possible hazard implicit in all atom-splitting experimentation. Let us consider them one by one.

1. The most mistaken idea in the public mind today is that "atomic energy is our secret." Its secrecy is about equal to that of next year's models of automobiles. The basic principles were known everywhere before the war began. Scientists from numerous nations engineered the bomb by applying those principles. But many nations worked upon the practical application of atomic energy before the war, and during it, and their scientists are continuing to do so now. The industrial organizing that manufactured our bombs was a putting to work of facts everybody knew.

2. It is unreasonable to assume that scientists will never find means to release the energy in the atoms of substances other than uranium. Every single atom is theoretically capable of energy release—the atoms in this paper, the atoms in your hand. Thus the monopoly of uranium-bearing ores—widely believed to be a "protection" against atom-bomb danger—will give us at best only temporary protection. Furthermore, uranium-bearing ores are widely distributed. Many sources lie in and on the earth, as yet undiscovered. So there is no way to control uranium sources, even if such control would assure a lasting monopoly of the raw materials from which atomic energy is produced.

3. Although we required three hidden cities to produce the bomb, it must not be thought that such gigantic facilities will always be needed for the production of atomic energy. It is more logical to assume that, in the future, devices for the release of that energy may be produced by comparatively small factories and laboratories.

4. The military value of atomic fission is so enormous that no successful method of destroying the discovery or of forbidding further experiment can be devised or enforced. Any attempt to stop research would merely encourage its secret performance somewhere by persons who hoped to achieve world conquest at the expense of nations which had deliberately disarmed themselves. Our recent experience with Germany and Japan makes that fact unmistakable.

5. The suggestion of some scientists and experts that large industries, and perhaps even cities, will have to go underground not only involves fabulous expense and a change in the way of human life but also fails to consider the nature of the new force. In its inevitable refinements, it will be the perfect agent for sabotage. Not just a factory, but a city or a subterranean labyrinth will be subject to total destruction by a small object. Every passage, duct, conduit, doorway, flume, chimney, airway, water pipe and other route of entrance to an underground city would be vulnerable, and every loaded train or truck, every box, suitcase, tire, or even human being would have to be minutely examined, every minute, even in peacetime. This perpetual risk of losing a whole underground city and all the people in it as a result of one instant of inattention or error seems to make the cost of entombing our cities or big factories utterly unreasonable.

The whole psychology of attempting a defensive attitude toward atomic threat seems to me in error. The only possible security lies in the solution of human problems—the problems of the agents who will from now on control the new energy.

These five points sum up to one: We have knowledge of a terrible weapon which we can neither long withhold from others nor abolish from the world. Whatever happens to us, atomic bombs are here to stay. The argument against the use of this instrument on humane grounds will wither—as such arguments have always died away. Every nation, from now on, can justly say, "America is a decent nation—and America used the atomic bomb."

In this military connection another point is worth raising. With radar direction or direction by suiciding patriots, and with stratospheric rockets that travel at thousands of miles an hour, the axiom about a defense for every offense becomes increasingly tedious. It is still the chief tenet of many an old soldier—although, if it holds true, why are half the cities of Europe flat? Granting, even, that a defense against such formidable methods of assault is devised—the radar gun, for example—what then? Some rockets would get through. And beyond that defense lie the certain-to-be-invented, still less imaginable new forms of attack. It would be sane to assume, I think, that the new era will revise the hypotheses of any future war—reducing it to mere atomic slugging, to the ability of a people to take it. For the bomb will sire the atomic torpedo, mine, rocket, jet plane, death ray, and God knows what else.

OIL AND COAL NO LONGER FUELS

But as atomic energy becomes commercially available, public concern will shift to immense and immediate new problems. We must consider the likelihood that the new energy will supplant familiar forms; that much has already been hinted by the President's announcement of the bomb. Coal may ultimately be mined only for the chemicals in coal tar and no longer for fuel. The oil wells of the Nation may one day be needed for lubrication, but not for gasoline. In place of great dams and immense hydroelectric plants there will be small, neat, energy-producing buildings. All this, probably in your lifetime. But who will reimburse losers in such developments—and how? Can a debt-laden nation hope to meet such widespread industrial obsolescence without panic or inflation or the socialization of all its property? It can if we plan as a people.

It is reasonable to assume that atomic energy will become available in small but enormously powerful units. Units which will heat, cool, and air-condition a home for a decade without a refill. Units which will result in an automobile with a fuel supply built in for the life of the car. Units which will make air transportation so cheap, and of such long range, that all passengers and most freight will take to the airways—ultimately stranding railroads, ships, and trucks.

This talk—anxious, excited, hopeful—is going the rounds today. It is logical talk. But it is also inadequate talk—and almost childish. The potential future is much bigger. For we cannot really predict what will be discovered by principles still unknown—principles known only to exist. We cannot yet hope to imagine what we will accomplish even in a decade, now that we can experiment on our earth with facts and conditions which were but theory yesterday. For, suddenly, we command temperatures thousands of times as hot as any antique furnace of a year ago, energies which used to be but guesses concerning the interior of stars, matter in new forms and the means of changing it, electrical current with an amperage of millions, rays and neutron streams which might make new orders of vegetation—or sweep a city with cancer, for that matter—and pressures of the order of a hundred million pounds per cubic inch.

How then can we guess the things that factories, laboratories, and corporations will be mass producing for you and me even in 1950?

At the moment, we stand where Benjamin Franklin stood with his key and kite in relation to electricity. Could Franklin, that day, have predicted radio? Or television? Radar? Or the electron microscope? We are that blind, and our future is proportionately that much more prodigious. Which is still, doubtless, an understatement.

We could, of course, undertake to hold back such developments in America simply to protect our investments in existing facilities and plants. What then? For one certainty, we would fall swiftly behind the rest of the world. We would sit by and watch others progress. England, for example, is already governed by a party pledged to socialize the coal mines. If those mines become useless—that party can and surely will socialize atomic energy. England today shares our knowledge of the atom and is undoubtedly at this very moment planning to nationalize its energy production.

Russia has a system which will permit of no other economic application of atomic energy. The Scandinavian nations will certainly use it on a nationalized basis. In order to compete in world markets for commodities produced by atomic energy, and in order to satisfy domestic demands, the United States will be compelled as a minimum to keep pace with every possible new step of applied atomic science.

Any plans, Federal or private, which would lead to a situation wherein the British or the Russians or the Danes, or anybody, excel us in mechanical assets or in comforts, luxuries, health or riches, are plans that might as well be dropped cold today. Such plans won't work. Americans are not a people to tag behind the world.

Moreover, since the industrial development of atomic energy will run parallel with and greatly affect military applications, we have a final reason for a swift shift from the old to the new. We shall have to change over to be certain that we are as secure as any other nation—which may not be saying much.

From such glimpses it is evident not only that the bomb is here to stay but that the application of atomic energy to industry and to everyday life should, and likely will, occur as fully and as rapidly as is possible in this country. That means the boldest planning, the most intense realism, the willingness of every person who has a property stake in the Nation to exchange it for a new and different stake, if necessary. It means the loss of capital wealth. It also means the eventual creation of many thousand times the capital wealth lost. It doesn't mean "no work for

coal miners." Rather it means far more work for them—better, cleaner, more interesting work.

A WARNING AGAINST EXPLOITATION

An industry which sets itself in the path of such inescapable revolution, or one which tries selfishly to corner any part of the energy principles for mere exploitative profit, will be literally endangering the whole people of America—in many different ways. And it will be robbing you and me of our chance to witness and enjoy the wonder of a new age that began in the tragic, all too familiar way—by death in Japan. No battle of titan corporations for control of atomic-energy methods or patents can be permitted. Such a struggle would risk our place among nations and our hope of plenty.

That is what we shall risk if we try to use the atom to set up for ourselves a period of greedy prosperity, of isolationist luxury—a society bent upon pleasure and lacking point, purpose, dignity, and awareness. We have been very close to that dismal moral prospect for a long time.

There is still a third problem related to the new knowledge—a problem often discussed by scientists before the discovery of atomic fission—and since, only vaguely mentioned. As the experiments continue, and as atoms other than uranium are split—which they will be—it is conceivable that a disintegrative chain might leap from laboratory material to the furniture, or the earth, and so turn our planet instantaneously into a diffuse globe of radiant heat and light.

I do not know enough physics to suggest a proper gage of the danger of such a fantastic accident. Perhaps no physicist yet knows enough, either. But as long as there is even a hypothetical danger of a slip that would turn us all to gaudy dust, we are utterly dependent upon one another.

Since there is a permanent if remote chance that a new Hitler—a decade from now, or 50 years or a thousand—can threaten the whole earth with vaporization as an alternative to slavery, the need for human cooperation is plain enough. And that is just one possibility. We are, remember, in the Benjamin Franklin stage of our new era; the radar stage is yet to come. The rays, pressures, temperatures, powers, and killing agents to be discovered and harnessed are in the same scale as the possible benefits which we can have—which it is our common right to achieve—instead of universal extinction.

IDEAS FOR A WORLD-WIDE PLAN

With all these facts and suppositions in mind, I have outlined some steps in a tentative plan. This is not to be regarded as a final plan or as a plan I necessarily would want enforced. To make my own plan final even for myself I would need more facts. My purpose here is twofold: to show that we Americans can deal with the atomic present in a rational and intensely hopeful way; and to show the magnitude required in such a design rather than the details of the design itself. Here are the steps:

1. That science be internationalized. That the interchange of scientific information be made automatic and subject to no national restriction whatever. The internationalization of science may have to be delayed briefly in a reorganizing world, but the interval should be held to a minimum. To a year, for example. This would give everyone—and therefore ourselves—many advantages.

Only by this means, for instance, can we protect ourselves from the danger of new secrets—new tyrannies in preparation—new disasters breeding in laboratories inaccessible to men of good will.

2. The bringing of scientists into Government on a par with say, lawyers, statesmen, soldiers, labor, and business. This is vital, because scientists alone can fully comprehend the data upon which all future human existence will depend. What untaught Congressmen or generals say about the new atomic age, what editors or statemen say, will not make sense where it refers to scientific fact unless scientists agree. And all the facts of our lives from now and forever will depend on scientific knowledge of many abstruse kinds.

3. The formation, by all nations jointly, of a permanent international committee which will include representatives of all major provinces of common living and all major branches of science to act as an advisory body to the whole planet. On this committee the best minds of the earth would serve. The judgments, suggestions, statements, and criticisms made by this committee would be published and broadcast periodically for all people in all nations.

It is past time for us to form such a body. We have world banks and international chambers of commerce and leagues of nations arranged by diplomats. Now, we must have a world chamber of intelligence. Such a committee would not govern—it would merely make fact, truth, and common sense available to man. This I told to be the one possible means of expressing and effecting our interdependence in a world that has shown so little intelligence—a world of separate sovereignties.

In science, economics, sociology, psychology, business, labor, and so on—the leaders by and large already have world knowledge and world-wide contacts. To a chamber of intelligence they would bring no meaningless provincialism. Many would already be known to one another. The waste and blunders made by the purely local man in our Congress—and there are many such—would be avoided here.

A chamber of intelligence would furnish the nucleus from which every nation and every human being could learn to live with and to benefit from the atomic nucleus.

4. That America take the lead at once in these affairs. All we have is the opportunity for a gesture. A gesture of sharing information which will make other nations strong—which will show them we do not fear them—and which will end their present terrifying reason to fear us. As realistic diplomacy it would repay us forever, and it is intensely realistic because its alternative is to fight everybody now.

In this connection, a hypothetical human possibility ought to be considered, I think. Suppose a few of the scientists who know all of our new and thus-far secret data come to resent—as free men, as opinionated human beings—whatever secret disposition might be made of the knowledge? Suppose such persons decide a policy of secrecy, or of controlled exploitation, is robbing humanity of benefits to which it is entitled? Suppose then, that these individuals decide their loyalty to man is greater even than their loyalty to this Nation? Can they not turn over their knowledge to any other nation—or to the world at large? Undoubtedly they can.

5. The internationalization of science and the sharing of atomic knowledge is recommended on a still higher plane. To whom can it rightly belong, except to all the people? Principles are involved here, not patentable gadgets. Trade competition cannot involve principles. Knowledge of the nucleus of the atom cannot be regarded simply as a business opportunity. Special military applications—like the bomb—might be kept secret if they could, although we are faced with a kind of knowledge which will slip through the uncomprehending surveillance of all Government agents and all soldiers. Special devices for the uses of atomic energy might be patented, but not principles. For this is a force. An idea. A set of laws.

6. That the committee, now studying the social and political as well as the scientific aspects of the new energy, present at once as many of the relevant facts as can be told without giving the blueprint for bomb manufacture. The American public must know those facts now, because it will decide, as usual, what the Nation will do about them. If decisions made in conference today do not satisfy the requirements of the American people tomorrow, they will be reversed, and at great expense and trouble.

Every individual and every group must be made informed and brought into the picture. That is the definition of our society. It is, indeed, the duty of every person and every organization to demand the basic knowledge and the logical hypotheses. Until we are informed, none of us can operate intelligently. A people capable of making great decisions is not one to live in fear and ignorance.

7. The economic cost of atomic development will be prodigious. It can be borne only by a rich nation or by a socialistic nation. We are rich and we do not want to become socialistic. The American taxpayers invested $2,000,000,000 in the bomb. That is far less than they invested in other war ventures which were less important and less promising. But it gave the public actual ownership. And atomic energy must stay nationalized.

No corporation and no cartel can claim that its capital investment made the bomb. And the bomb principles were discovered mainly by professors and academic researchers. Nationalization will not cost one businessman one cent.

No corporation and no cartel can afford the money that must be spent, in the years that begin now, to develop all phases of atomic energy. The original $2,000,000,000 was a trifle. What we got for it was equivalent to purchasing the continent of North America for a nickel. To obtain quickly the stupendous benefits that are within our very hands, much more money must be spent at once. Money of the magnitude of $10,000,000,000 a year. Peace is worth that, isn't it? Abundance is worth that, isn't it? Power for every man, always, in endlessly increasing amounts, is worth that, isn't it? Such a sum is still only a minor fraction of the cost of the latest war. It would be a mere jot in the cost of any future war.

But only as a whole people can we invest sums like ten billions a year in a project that will have so many long-range aspects. This idea is not new to us. We own the fleets and the air force and the Army equipment. We are pretty good in the war business—we won. We ought to be able to see that we can also win in the peace business. We are in the public-health business. We are in the post-office business. We need to add one more, the power business of the future. It is too big for corporations. Several million times too big. It is big enough to challenge every soul in this Republic.

PREVIEW OF OUR ATOMIC FUTURE

If we American people own our atomic power, we can make a national profit on energy, we can supply ourselves at rates so cheap it would be unbelievable today. With that profit, we could reimburse the owners of business that will gradually become obsolete as atomic energy replaces them. We could finance transitions from coal and electricity to atomic energy. We could erase the war debt. And we could finally use atomic power, a universal necessity, to replace taxation—supplying funds for mammoth projects undertaken in the interest of common people.

Suppose we do not nationalize atomic energy? In that case we will be competing with socialistic nations for world markets in which to sell goods and services produced by that energy. Russia is such a nation. Britain is becoming such a nation. And Britain has the necessary information. I doubt that our corporations would be able to meet the prices and the advances possible to such nations. I believe nationalization of atomic energy alone will solve that problem for us.

At the same time it will keep the rest of our capitalistic system the way it has been.

We thrive on capitalistic competition. And I believe, myself, that socialism is tyranny.

Still another factor is involved here. If atomic energy is not nationalized, it will instead become corporate property. Corporations will use it for profit. They will be more interested in making that profit than in new experiment, replacement of still usable equipment, and so on. They will fall behind the science of socialistic nations—of Communist countries and of countries with any future form of national socialism. That has happened before in this country. In any war from today on, falling behind in research would be fatal. We wouldn't be given time to convert industry—to study and then imitate the weapons of other nations.

This thing is everybody's business. We must own it, finance it, through it maintain the strength that means security and by it become a nation superrich in truth, in dreams and in property.

The carrying out of such plans as these will require boldness, absolute integrity, complete political unselfishness and perpetual guts. And the carrying out of such plans will be hazardous. But I think all other hazards are immeasurably greater.

For we, who have gone so far in two centuries, now own infinity and eternity. We have become the people physically most powerful on earth. Upon what we have deeply believed and upon the new beliefs we shall find, man's fate depends. For 50 years, or thereabouts, we have gravely defaulted. Some of us have lost hope. Many of us have put our faith in looking backward. Still more of us have been unable to discern in the future a proper heritage for Americans—a thing of sufficient challenge and possibility to give us endless incentive and the dignity that belongs to a race which pays its respects alike to Thomas Jefferson and Paul Bunyan.

This is the dream we yearned for. This is the long chance—and the main chance. This is the superlative responsibility which, if shouldered, promises a paradise men can make with their own hands and their own minds. For this opportunity, the globe is everywhere marked with white crosses of our young dead. That is what they fought to earn. That is what they gave to you.

This, somehow, magnificently, is us!

The Mission of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, during my service in the Congress of the United States, I have watched almost daily with increasing interest the general trend of influences in the Congress. It is obvious that the Congress is an institution that must bow to the will of influences.

It has long been my contention that the Congress, however, must bear in mind always that it is one of the three bodies of Government created under the Constitution and that it must at all times preserve its functions. All too often Congress sacrifices its position before the people while this group or that, within Congress, yields to the influence of economic pressure groups, or perhaps yields to political influence from the administration, or gives great consideration to the question of reelection. These are all natural human qualities.

It is my personal belief that the Congress of the United States should at all times bear in mind that it has an important mission, and that is to serve all of the people of the United States, not some special group or some special section.

The tax bill which came to the floor of the House last week from the Ways and Means Committee was a suggestion of great statesmanship on the part of the membership of that committee. It came out with unanimous report and by and large it was fought out on the floor and supported by the membership.

This is an illustration of what Congress must do in many instances. It must think of itself as a unit in the interest of the national well-being. It must submerge political ambition sometimes, and certainly it must check off the influences of economic blocs, while it drives steadfastly toward a goal of accomplishment. That goal of accomplishment must be a greater service for all of the people of the United States of America.

The distinguished gentlemen of the Ways and Means Committee are deserving of the Nation's congratulations for their unanimity of action and purpose on the tax measure recently passed by this House.

All too often the Congress is bitterly condemned by editorial writers and commentators. This is an easy thing to do because condemnation against the Congress does not get an editor in any trouble.

Nevertheless, it is well for the Members of Congress, and especially the lower body, to take due notice of editorial comment throughout the Nation. Times without number Members of the Congress have been criticized because of failure to join hands, not as Democrats or as Republicans, but as Congressmen inspired to render to the Nation a service, and a service that is beneficial to all the people.

Under unanimous consent I ask permission to include herewith an editorial written by Kenneth W. Simons, of the Bismarck Tribune, Bismarck, N. Dak. While in many respects, I am not in complete accord with what he writes here, nevertheless I do feel that he does point the way for a more complete action on the part of Congress in the interest of the people. The author of this editorial is regarded in the northwest section of the United States as among the foremost editorial writers.

CONGRESS SHOULD DO IT

When the Committee for Economic Development was organized in 1942 it set out as its guiding principle that any policy recommended should be "from the standpoint of the general welfare."

To date it has done an outstanding job, bucking the selfish interests of various groups in doing so. There have been no hidden hooks or jokers in the various CED proposals, whereas, in contrast, the suggestions of those who would serve only their own interests are full of them, even though all claim to be interested only in the general welfare.

Analysis of the various CED proposals and of the manner in which they were arrived at also brings out the fundamental weakness of Congress. This is its subservience to lobbies. Of whom was Congress thinking, for example, when it lifted all controls on housing costs? Was it thinking of the average citizen who wants to invest in a home or was it thinking of those who see huge profits in the present strong demand for housing? Was the approach of Congress truly objective?

The answer, in all honesty, seems to be "No."

What Congress needs is an objective approach rather than a political approach. It could and should employ its own experts to advise it what is best for the Nation. It could hire economists and technicians just as the CED has done.

The fact is that what should be the strongest of the tripartite sections of our Government is really the weakest. We are trying to run an atomic-age government with a "horse and buggy" legislative system. The two things just do not go together.

Yet an alert and vigorous Congress is the real hope of the people. It—with the courts—stands as the bulwark of the people's liberties. There is no substitute for it. But it must do its job more effectively or it will, eventually, find itself in the discard. It can do a better job if its Members have a real will to do so.

Proposals for reorganizing—streamlining—the Congress are many. Almost any one of them would be better than what we have now. And any intelligent Congressman or Senator should know it.

But, regardless of the form of organization, the most single desirable end is that Congress learn to see things objectively; that it have a policy of its own and not take its policy second-hand from self-seekers and lobbyists.

The latest proposal of the CED is the establishment of a President's Committee on Full Employment and a Joint Congressional Committee on Full Employment. These would be expected to recommend to Congress measures "to deal with the many problems involved in achieving a prosperous and stable economy."

The main difference between the CED and other organizations is that it seeks, first of all, full employment and advocates steps necessary to achieve that end. The others usually seek high profits or—in the case of some labor organizations—special advantages. Full employment is only an incident—if it is considered at all.

The proposed committee system would, of course, by-pass the present bunglesome, cumbersome organization of Congress and enable it to provide some sort of leadership in the public interest. This is an end devoutly to be wished.

Can Congress Save Itself?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I am including as part of my remarks an article published in the Saturday Evening Post and reprinted in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch by Henry F. Pringle which has to do with the subject of reorganizing the Congress. It follows:

The Seventy-ninth Congress faces an issue as grave as any in the history of the Federal Legislature. The issue is whether Congress can modernize its archaic machinery and thereby regain its historical position of power without which the democratic process will fail.

A handful of men in the House and the Senate have long been aware of the impending catastrophe. Together with private citizens, they have been working for years to prevent it. Their efforts have culminated in the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

What happens to its recommendations will be the test. The worn-out rules, the entrenched privileges, the petty jealousies, and the hollow traditions of the supposedly coordinate legislative branch of the Government may combine to defeat all suggested changes.

HALF CENTURY BEHIND TIMES

Congress, burdened with enormous problems, first of the depression and then war, is understaffed, underpaid, and overworked. It has been ridiculed by the public and kicked around by the executive departments. Its machinery, largely fashioned in 1890, is 50 years out of date.

Congress has largely abdicated its legislative as well as its supervisory duties. Bills are drafted in the White House or some agency, instead of by the lawmakers of Capitol Hill, and are enacted under Executive pressure.

Congress is so afraid of public opinion that salaries of $3,000 and less are paid for work for which the executive agencies give $8,000 without hesitation. Congress spends roughly $16,000,000 on itself each year, about what the Department of Agriculture uses for travel alone.

Congress is still a horse-and-buggy remnant in an age of automobiles, airplanes, and atomic bombs. The peril grows that this frustrated collection of overworked legislators may become permanently, as Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, has warned, "merely a timid and formal appendix to bureaucracy."

A PROGRAM OF ACTION

Opinions differ, in and out of Congress, on how to prevent this. Nearly everybody agrees that the reforms will come step by step, and not through sweeping changes. The consensus would appear to be that Congress cannot serve the nation adequately until the following things have been done:

1. Reorganize the committee structure of Congress.
2. Lift from the shoulders of Members most of their nonlegislative duties.
3. Improve liaison between the two Houses, and between Congress and the executive branch.
4. Increase salaries or expense allowances of Members.
5. Provide Members and committees with adequate research staffs.
6. Evolve some substitute for the seniority system of selecting committee chairmen.

An effective Congress is utterly impossible without drastic reorganization of its committees. The present clutter is senseless, overlapping, and confusing. Few Congressmen even know how many exist.

Congressmen cannot possibly attend all the meetings. Unable to familiarize themselves with the subjects under discussion, committee members vote by proxy along party lines. It is common for them to hurry from committee room to committee room, distributing proxies, and then attend the hearing which they regard as the most important.

The committee system, having evolved with the years, has no relation to the branches of the executive. It has virtually no relation to anything. The House has three committees on pensions. It apparently operates on the theory that a flood never has any relation to a river; the Rivers and Harbors Committee and the Flood Control Committee work separately.

EVILS OF SENILITY SYSTEM

It won't be so easy to abolish the seniority, often called the senility, system. Advancement by seniority alone keeps men too old for their jobs in committee posts on which the operation of Congress depends. It blocks the progress of younger, more able Congressmen.

Certainly amended rules should strip from committee chairmen some of their arbitrary powers. Today they can block legislation at will. As Congressmen HERTER has pointed out, a one-third minority in a committee should be sufficient to place legislation before the House.

Congress will doubtless agree that more adequate research and technical help should be supplied both to the Members and to their committees The added cost is utterly insignificant. A mere $83,000 is now paid in both Houses for lawyers to help draft legislation. The Department of Agriculture alone spends $1,600,000 for its legal staff.

WARNING BY MEDICAL OFFICER

None of these reforms will help very much, however, unless Congress divests itself of unessential business. One is governing the District of Columbia. A committee in each house—the great BILBO is chairman on the Senate side—must pass on the most trivial subjects. Last spring, the profound question of an 8-foot increase in the height of a hospital had to be thrashed out while such matters as postwar conversion were shelved.

The alternative to change in the organization of Congress is chaos. In their own interest alone the Members should act swiftly to cut down unnecessary burdens. Senator Maloney served on 23 committees. In pressing for the resolution which created the joint committee, the Senator last December described the overwhelming burden he was carrying. Seven weeks later he died of a heart attack.

During the committee's hearings, Dr. George W. Calver, medical officer of the Capitol, warned that the congressional pace must be slowed down. He made it clear that additional heart attacks and nervous breakdowns would surely come unless Members watched their health more carefully. Perhaps the doctor has frightened the boys into taking some action this fall or winter.

Dock Workers and CIO Seamen Delay Return of American Soldiers From Europe

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, one argument or excuse for delay in demobilizing the Army has been the claim that there is a shortage of ships. Boats are just not available to return men from Europe in greater numbers. This handicap, however, is now faced with a still greater obstacle in the return of our soldiers.

NEW YORK HARBOR SHIPPING PARALYZED

Government officials charge that the strike of the dock workers in New York Harbor is responsible for tying up boats in the harbor. This means that American soldiers in Europe will have to stay there until the dock workers get ready to work. In all fairness, we cannot blame this condition on the Army officers.

SOLDIERS' RETURN DELAYED BY STRIKE

Here is what the Washington Post, October 13, 1945, says:

Return home of 15,000 American troops, eagerly waiting in European ports, is being delayed by the tying up of ships in New York Harbor's longshoremen strike, Government officials charged last night. * * *"

Sixteen Liberty and Victory ships, fitted as troop transports, are among the more than 350 ships immobilized by the harbor tie-up.

Other newspapers have carried the same information, and the statements have not been denied. Late Saturday afternoon newspapers indicated that a change of heart had taken place among those responsible for the strike, and the Times-Herald of Washington, D. C., carries an item, in part, as follows:

READY TO CONFER WITH ARMY—DOCK STRIKERS AGREE TO SERVICE SHIPS FOR RETURN OF VETERANS—STEP TAKEN AFTER GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS APPEAL TO UNION TO FREE VESSELS IN NEW YORK

Longshoremen, whose 12-day strike has paralyzed New York shipping, announced early today they would begin immediately servicing ships engaged in supplying the armed forces abroad and returning troops to this country

These statements, Mr. Speaker, are based on facts, for so far as I know there has been no denial, and the dock strikers are charged with delay in returning these troops. I just want the folks back home to know where the blame rests. The situation is further complicated by developments that took place yesterday, Sunday, October 14, 1945. Note the following headlines and news item from the Times Herald:

CIO SEAMEN BLOCK END OF SHIP TIE-UP—REFUSE WORK UNTIL ALL DOCK HANDS RETURN—TROOP REDEPLOYMENT DELAYED BY DISPUTE

A back-to-work movement among striking A. F. of L. longshoremen at New York's harbor was threatened with curtailment by the National Maritime Union (CIO) as the 13-day dispute continued to paralyze shipping and interfered with troop deployment. Approximately 2,000 of the estimated 35,000 strikers reported to the piers for work yesterday. But the CIO maritime union said it would refuse to provide steam to work the winches aboard the ships until all the longshoremen agree to end the 13-day tie-up.

SECRETARY OF WAR PATTERSON COMMENTS

Then, here is a short quotation from a statement by Secretary of War Patterson, showing what results from all this:

Every day lost in turning ships around is delaying the homecoming of thousands of soldiers who have been engaged for several years in combat duty in Europe.

All of us would like to know who is responsible for this dastardly condition, this "stab in the back" of men in our armed forces in Europe, and this unpatriotic refusal to help bring them back home, so they can be discharged from the Army, and return to their families.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE STRIKES

I do not know of anyone more capable of telling us who is responsible for these

strikes than Mr. Joseph P. Ryan, president of the A. F. of L. International Longshoremen's Association. Mr. Ryan gave an interview on October 12 in New York City, and openly charged that the Communists, working through others, were the ones who created the strike situation, and the strikes that followed. The Times-Herald, Washington, D. C., news item is as follows in the October 13 issue:

A. F. OF L. EXECUTIVE SAYS UNITED STATES REDS BACK DOCK STRIKE

(By Charles Gotthart)

NEW YORK, October 12.—The story of the Communist plot behind the New York waterfront strike that has converted the world's busiest port into a "ghost harbor" was told for the first time today by Joseph P. Ryan, colorful president of the A. F. of L. International Longshoremen's Association and arch enemy of communism.

"Communists inspired by Communist-dominated CIO unions have seized this opportunity in another effort to infiltrate into the ILA and gain a dominating position thus far repulsed by loyal American A. F. of L. members," he declared.

PART OF LONG EFFORT

"It is part of an effort carried on for years, uninterrupted by the war years and notwithstanding labor's pledge against strikes during wartime—a pledge our union faithfully maintained.

"The Communists are trying to dishonor our longshoremen and discredit their war record, which has been praised by the Navy. One of their motives is to further the Communist movement in Italy—to prevent the shipment of supplies to that stricken country and thus lay the ground work for a Communist uprising there.

"As usual, they wrap themselves in a false cloak of Americanism. There is unmistakable evidence that the port tie-up is the work of Communists."

SAYS TRIO DIRECTS STRIKE

In an interview openly disclosing what hitherto had been referred to as outside influences, Ryan asserted that Communist agitation behind the strike was directed by Joseph Curran, president of the Communist-dominated CIO National Maritime Union; Ferdinand C. Smith, NMU secretary repeatedly exposed as a Communist supporter, and Harry Bridges, west coast CIO water-front czar whom the Roosevelt administration saved from deportation as an undesirable alien and Communist.

"Communists distributed thousands of handbills printed by the CIO among the longshoremen whom we were trying to get back to work—urging them to remain out and prolong the strike as we were attempting to end it," Ryan said.

In pinning the Communist label on the outside influences, Ryan was joined by Eugene Sampson, business agent of one of the ILA locals who has swung to Ryan's support after having originally led a rank-and-file uprising.

The foregoing news item states things in clear and unmistakable language. Mr. Ryan has nothing to conceal. He does not hesitate to put the guilt on the Communists, or, perhaps, their fellow travelers. We would expect such depredation from the Communists, for, after all, they seek to destroy our country and our flag, and our free institutions. Did I hear you say, "I though that was what our boys in Europe thought they were fighting to preserve?"

WHAT CAN BE DONE TO AVOID DELAYS IN RETURNING OUR SOLDIERS

Naturally, everyone with a son, husband, father, or brother now in our armed forces in Europe wants to know what can be done to get these boats in operation again. The delay is not justified. Well, we still have an executive branch of the Government. It administers the laws. The President of the United States is still Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. He still enjoys emergency war powers, for up to date he has not officially declared the war at an end. The President or his representatives can act. If necessary, the Army and the Navy can operate the ships. They did it when they had to face the fire of battle, and death and destruction. That was the time when the ringleaders on the water front were enjoying peace and prosperity in the safety of New York Harbor. The situation calls for drastic action by our Chief Executive. Suppose you tell the President, whose address is "The White House, Washington, D. C.," what you think about this interesting subject. I predict that he will listen, and take appropriate action.

Freedom Works Two Ways—We Are Always Free For Something as Well as From Something

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of having been granted unanimous consent so to do, I am pleased to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this date the splendid editorial, This Thing Called Freedom. It is printed in the Compton Journal under date of October 16, 1945, which is one of the strongest and ablest publications in the great Eighteenth Congressional District of California, which I have the honor to represent in this Congress. The city of Compton, Los Angeles County, Calif., is the second largest community in the Eighteenth Congressional District in the terms of population, and is one of the most thriving, progressive, patriotic communities in the Nation.

THIS THING CALLED FREEDOM

America and the world has passed through the awful ordeal of universal war, and victory in our time has been won. We have paid a price for that victory—a price in American money and tears and blood. It was not destined to come in the lifetime of those who sacrificed most selflessly for it. These were the men and women who gave their lives in order that those now living might experience this glory of human spirit.

Many of them died when hope of a victorious peace was dim: Americans at Bataan; Russians at Moscow and Stalingrad; British and Canadians at Dunkerque; Chinese on a hundred lost battlefields; the noble men and women of the European underground resistance who died by starvation, torture, and the firing squad. The free peoples of the world cannot repay them; can only accord them an eternal peace in honor with all who have died in the name of liberty through mankind's troubled history.

The atrocities of war are easy to remember and difficult to forget. The things for which those sacrifices were made will be more difficult to remember.

We say we have fought for freedom.

Freedom works two ways. We are always free for something as well as from something.

Let us remember what freedom for self-seeking bought us after the last war. It bought us unemployment, bitterness, strikes, class conflict, race hatred, and war.

Why not use freedom for something different, this time, and win through to a different result? Why not use freedom to build teamwork? Here is the only thing which, in the long run, can bring us happiness at home, peace in industry and security between nations. Here is a greater chance for pioneering than there was for any of the men who crossed our continent or built our industry.

Why not use freedom, this time, for renaissance? Renaissance in art, literature, drama. Renaissance in our underlying ideas about business and the professions. Why not bring freshness out of sameness? Why not employ our energies and talents for creative ends instead of prostituting them for a sensation, or for notoriety or gain?

Why not use our freedom, this time, to work changes in the hearts and minds of people—changes which can turn fear into security, confusion into certainty, and thus really change the conditions under which people live?

Why not, in short, use freedom to remake the world instead of trying to make something from it? If we think only that the world owes us a living we will surely go on living in hot water. But if we think what our living can give to the world then, perhaps, it will not come crashing down again around our ears.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial appears as striking a keynote of thought and action, and I wish all the readers thereof to have the benefit of its splendid interpretation and emphasis.

Steamship Companies in Air Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, there has recently come to my attention an article entitled "Steamship Companies in Air Transportation," written by the late Col. Edgar S. Gorrell, president of the Air Transport Association of America. Colonel Gorrell served as Chief of Staff of our Air Forces during the First World War and was recognized as an outstanding authority on aviation matters. Believing his article on this timely subject will be of interest to the Members, I am inserting it at this point in the RECORD:

STEAMSHIP COMPANIES IN AIR TRANSPORTATION

The major purpose of this article is to comment on one prepared by Paul Hodges, execu-

tive assistant of the Matson Navigation Co., and published in the January 15, 1945, issue of American Aviation. Mr. Hodges' thesis was that the Civil Aeronautics Board, in issuing certificates for international air transportation, should treat steamship companies equally with other applicants. All the steamship companies ask, according to Mr. Hodges, is that the "circumstance of being steamship companies, rather than some other kind of company, be not held against them" in certificate proceedings. This is made to sound insignificant and to cause the unthinking promptly to assent. Actually, of course, they seek a complete reversal of congressional policy as expressed in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. In addition, they seek to impose upon the Board, which is responsible for the development of air transportation, a requirement that it ignore a fundamental disability of a large group of applicants for new international routes.

The steamship companies, by virtue of being steamship companies, are basically disqualified to undertake the responsibility of developing air transportation. Air and surface transportation are competitive. The area of competition is now very limited, to be sure, but it should be the objective of every air-line operator, through improvements in service and reductions in costs, to broaden this field of competition to the maximum extent and as quickly as possible. Within a few years after the war it looks as if the air lines will be able to compete successfully with the steamship companies for first- and second-class passenger traffic and for a very small amount of highly valued or emergency cargo. Even if the air line were operated by a steamship company, the air line would probably get a good portion of this traffic, but this is a very limited market on which to expect to develop air transportation as this Nation must develop it. Our international air transport fleet would be a very small one if this were all it had to carry. The expansion of air transportation will be dependent upon the trade and travel stimulated by the benefits of this new mode of transportation—benefits which will not in all cases be immediately apparent to every traveler and businessman to whom they might be valuable. It is at this point that the steamship-operated air line would fail. It would do so for two reasons.

IMPARTIALITY WON'T DEVELOP AIR TRANSPORT

In the first place, the steamship management would be responsible to its stockholders for a large investment in surface vessels and would necessarily exercise the utmost care in guarding the integrity of that investment. Even assuming that the management would not deliberately set out to retard the development of its air line, it certainly could not be expected to make the tremendous efforts that will be required to expand the air transport market when those efforts might be thought to reduce the value of its much larger stake in surface facilities. This conflict of interest could not fail to produce overcaution and indecision when precisely the opposite characteristics are essential to success in overseas air service.

The second reason that the steamship company would fail in the development of the traffic required by its air line is because of the innate tendency of steamship men to think in terms of slow and relatively cheap ocean transport, and to regard as immutable the travel habits and methods of doing business which have grown up around, and have been adjusted to, steamship service. There is good reason to fear that air transportation, if left to them, would be made to fit that mold rather than being given freedom to realize its full potentialities. If people retain their present travel habits and if businessmen continue to conduct their businesses and ship their cargo in the same way they always have, the available traffic for air transport will be very limited. The objective of the air-line operator must be to demonstrate to the public the benefits of air travel and to convince businessmen that profits may be made through the use of air transportation even though the actual transport rates are high. It seems quite impossible that this type of contribution to the development of air transportation and to the wider distribution of its benefits would be made by a steamship operator. The best that can be expected of the steamship operator is that he will be completely neutral as between the two forms of transportation. This is the best that Mr. Hodges had to offer. He gave assurances that the ocean carriers would not restrain aviation in favor of their surface operations and said that it would be just as advantageous for the steamship company to carry passengers on its air line as on its steamships. Air transportation will not advance far under such a regime because the development of this very speedy and comfortable, but highly expensive, form of transportation requires more than impartiality. It requires the effort and initiative and imagination which can only be provided by an independent management which is convinced of the superiority of air transportation and is determined to persuade the traveler and the shipper that it is right.

This country has the finest air transportation system, the best transport aircraft, and the largest aggregation of operating experience of any nation in the world. These are of immense value to our national security, prestige, and trade, and they were not acquired through the observance of strict neutrality. This development has not been achieved under managements which felt that if people were going to travel they could go by air or rail or ship or bus, and it did not matter much which. It is attributable to the pounding of pavements in search or air-line business—when there was very little—by men who had to fill the airplanes or go broke. These men created business where no business had been before, and if international air transportation is to develop as it should, the same efforts will have to be continued in the international field.

AIR-LINE OPERATIONS COMPLETELY DIFFERENT

Mr. Hodges revealed his fundamental misconception of the air transport problem when he referred to air transport as "a newcomer in the trade," the trade presumably being overseas transportation. Air transportation is just not the same "trade" that he is discussing, or at least it should not be so regarded. The trade he is talking about is the carriage of passengers and goods at 11 knots an hour in a large vessel on the surface, at an average cost of about 2 mills a ton-mile. Air transportation is the carriage of passengers and goods at 250 miles an hour in a small vessel in the air, at 15 cents or more a ton-mile. Air transportation is a revolutionary change from transport by ship and it must be conducted and sold entirely differently. Certainly the actual operation of a steamship line and the air line are completely different. No integration is possible here. The carriage of traffic by air would present an entirely new problem to a steamship line and it is equally, if perhaps not so obviously, true that the sale of this traffic is completely different also.

A limited amount of air-line traffic can be gotten by merely operating the air line, but air transport cannot live and develop on the driblets that would be produced that way. The air-line traffic man must depart completely from the methods prevailing in surface carriage and develop new markets for himself. As an example advantage must be taken of the possibility of persuading the American public to spend a week-end vacation in London, or a 2 weeks' vacation in Switzerland. This market has never been available to the steamship. Completely new thinking will have to govern the sale of cargo transportation by air because it will be necessary in many cases to alter methods of doing business. Air transport is not the same trade as steamship operation and it would be disastrous to the development of the business if it fell into the hands of those who were predisposed to think it was.

COMPETITION MEANS SURVIVAL

In seeking to determine the role of the steamship in air transportation, the objective should be to meet the needs of both air transportation and the surface merchant marine. As has been said, a percentage of the overseas passenger business will go to the air without the exercise of much initiative by those who are responsible for running the air line. It would be most unfortunate if the management of a steamship company also owning an air line should decide to carry passengers by air and to cease its efforts to attract steamship passenger business, for if we are to have a well-rounded merchant marine it must include passenger as well as freight vessels. If the steamship companies are provided with air lines this might well be the result, and Mr. Hodges' assertion that an impartial attitude would be maintained as between the two forms of transportation indicates that this is more than a possibility. Impartiality is just as bad for the proper development of the merchant marine as it is for the proper development of air transportation. Even for passengers, ocean travel has many advantages. As Admiral Land has said:

"To many persons a sea voyage provides an unequaled opportunity for relaxation, social life, and the benefits to be derived from sea air. Appetite-giving ozone and the iodine in the salt spray are not inhaled 10 and 15 thousand feet above the surface of the sea. There will be ships for these people.

"Although I will not argue against air transportation's superiority over surface transportation in certain fields, I will argue that we are going to need just as many ships to carry on world commerce as though the airplane still did not travel over great bodies of water. In fact, I believe that we'll need more ships, because the airplane will develop interior regions of countries which hitherto have been difficult to reach by any other transportation."

If there is no easier way to retain the passenger business the steamship companies will undoubtedly be impelled through air competition to make the most of these advantages, and these efforts will not only provide a better and more varied service for the patron but they will also aid in providing the country with the surface merchant marine which it must have. If the steamship companies, on the other hand, are permitted to acquire their new competitor there will be little incentive for them to create these improvements. It should always be remembered that large grants of public funds are given our steamship operators for the purpose of developing and maintaining the surface merchant marine required by our national interest. With those funds comes responsibility for bending every effort to carry out this public policy.

As Mr. Hodges pointed out, one thing on which we can all agree is that this Nation needs "a sound, adequate merchant marine of the air and sea which will keep the American flag flying high and far in international competition." This is a great objective but he espouses the worst possible method of achieving it, a method which would deprive both air transport and the surface merchant marine of the vigorous, energetic management which must characterize both of them if the objective is to be attained.

Report on Visit to Army Separation Centers at Jefferson Barracks, Mo., and Fort Sheridan, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, a congressional committee composed of WILLIAM C. COLE, of Missouri; CHARLES B. HOEVEN, of Iowa; JAMES I. DOLLIVER, of Iowa; and ALBERT M. COLE, of Kansas, visited the separation centers at Jefferson Barracks, Mo., on September 28 and 29, 1945. This separation center is under the direction of Brig. Gen. George D. Shea, and is being conducted in a competent and efficient manner.

A total of 5,668 officers and men were discharged at this center during August, while a total of 16,492 officers and men were discharged during September. It is hoped to discharge between 1,400 and 1,600 men each day on and after about the 10th day of October. That rate of discharge cannot be increased to any large extent unless additional housing is provided, and additional trained personnel are made available for the medical and financial departments. The center is operating 7 days a week, approximately 10 hours each day.

The committee was advised that every effort was being made to discharge men within from 44 to 48 hours. In talking to individuals at random, the committee learned that most of the men were being discharged very promptly, although a few cases were brought to our attention where men were being retained for as much as 5 days. The officers in charge of the separation personnel explained this by stating that in some few instances men had to wait for their service records to catch up with them, and in other instances delay was occasioned by the necessity of X-ray retakes or the necessity of medical or dental attention. We found only one X-ray machine in operation and another ready to be installed, which apparently caused some of the delay. The officers in charge of the separation personnel were most cooperative in every way, and conducted our committee through every separation operation, and they freely answered all questions which were propounded of them.

Our committee next visited the separation center at Fort Sheridan, Ill., on September 30, 1945. This separation center, under the direction of Brig. Gen. J. T. Pierce, is also being operated in a very efficien. manner. The separation rate at this center as of September 30 was about 1,475 officers and enlisted personnel each day, operating on a 7-day-week schedule. In the separation center in strictly processing positions there are 148 officers, 2,383 enlisted personnel, and 197 civilians, for a total of 2,728.

The peak load has also been reached at this center, and men are being released very promptly with very few being retained for more than 44 to 48 hours. The efficiency of this center is partly due to the fact that they have adequate facilities in every department and a background of experience in operation work. The committee heard very little or no complaint from the men themselves. The officers in charge of separation personnel were most courteous to members of the committee, and we came away impressed with the businesslike manner in which the center was being conducted.

Steps Taken for the Benefit of the Members of the United States Armed Forces in France

REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House will recall that several months ago I complained about the terrific financial beating our men and women in the service in Europe were taking because of the fact that in France, in particular, they were receiving their service pay in devalued French francs. Since that time the War Department, through its financial division, has been negotiating with the French Government in an effort to arrive at a more equitable method of paying our troops abroad.

Some progress has been made, and I have just been furnished with a brief report of the results as far as France is concerned. For the information of the House, I therefore ask unanimous consent to include the report with my remarks.

STEPS TAKEN FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN FRANCE

In the spring of 1945, M. Rene Pleven, French Minister of Finance and National Economy, at meetings held with the Secretary of the Treasury, conferred with representatives of the United States War and Treasury Departments to consider the problems which had been of concern to the United States Government relative to the general welfare and purchasing power of members of the armed forces of the United States. At that time, an agreement was reached on the broad principles of a program intended to provide more entertainment facilities, greater availability of nonrationed goods on special terms, and some special mechanism for generally improving the purchasing power of members of the armed forces of the United States in France. It was further agreed that the War and Treasury Departments would appoint representatives to work out the details of the program in Paris, in cooperation with the American forces in France and with the French Government.

As a result of these negotiations conducted in Paris by representatives of the War Department General Staff and the Treasury Department, the Government of France has put into operation the following program:

In order directly to increase the purchasing power of the members of the armed forces of the United States in France, the French Government placed at the disposal of the American Government a substantial number of francs for distribution to members of the armed forces of the United States. The distribution of these francs is being accomplished as follows:

Eight hundred and fifty francs per month on each pay day for those who are permanently stationed in France.

Eight hundred and fifty francs upon entering France for those who come from outside of France and are on leave in France.

Eight hundred and fifty francs to any individual arriving in any staging or assembly area in France from a unit outside of France.

Eight hundred and fifty francs to any officer who arrives in France on temporary duty, under competent orders, exceeding 11 days, but such officer will not be eligible for another issuance of 850 francs until he has accumulated 30 days' temporary duty in France.

Eight hundred and fifty francs to any enlisted man who comes into France on temporary duty, but such enlisted man will not be eligible for another issuance of 850 francs until he has accumulated 30 days' temporary duty in France.

Substantial price reductions, ranging from 9 to 40 percent, on articles made in France sold at the Army post exchanges; entertainment and refreshments at greatly reduced prices at centers already opened or to be opened with French Government cooperation; price reductions ranging from 11 to 42 percent on gifts purchased in French shops when exported to an address outside France by the soldier purchaser; and, at no cost to members of the armed forces of the United States, conducted tours to many places of historic and scenic interest in France, starting from the major leave or assembly areas. A partial refund of the prices paid, prior to the agreements, for local purchases in France by the Army Exchange Service will be made to the Army Central Welfare Fund.

Distribution of the adjustment francs went into effect at the end of August when all other features of the above program were already in active operation in certain sections of France and were being actively expanded.

Atomic Bomb

REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago there was printed in the Washington Post a communication signed by Justice Roberts, Bishop Tucker, Robert J. Watt, of the American Federation of Labor, and a number of other eminent people. The article reads as follows:

FOR PEACE BY LAW—A COMMUNICATION

The first atomic bomb destroyed more than the city of Hiroshima. It also exploded our inherited, outdated, political ideas.

A few days before the force of nature was tried out for the first time in history, the San Francisco Charter was ratified in Washington. The dream of a League of Nations, after 26 years, was accepted by the Senate.

How long will the United Nations Charter endure? With luck, a generation? A century? There is no one who does not hope at least that much luck—for the Charter, for himself, for his work, and for his children's children. But is it enough to have peace by luck? Peace by law is what the peoples of the world, beginning with cur-

selves, can have if they want it. And now is the time to get it.

Everyone knows that the Charter is only a beginning. It does not guarantee peace. Yet the hopeful and passionate words of Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco created one very real danger: that millions of Americans will relax and believe that by ratification a machinery has been set up to prevent another war.

We think it our duty to warn the American people that this is not so. The Charter is a tragic illusion unless we are ready to take the further steps necessary to organize peace. Coming east from San Francisco, President Truman said in Kansas City: "It will be just as easy for nations to get along in a republic of the world as it is for you to get along in the Republic of the United States. Now when Kansas and Colorado have a quarrel over the water in the Arkansas River they don't call out the National Guard in each State and go to war over it. They bring a suit in the Supreme Court of the United States and abide by the decision. There isn't a reason in the world why we cannot do that internationally."

These were historic words, pointing our road to a future far beyond San Francisco.

For thousands of years men have learned that wherever there is government by law there can be peace, and where there is no law and no government, human conflicts have been sure. The San Francisco Charter, by maintaining the absolute sovereignties of the rival nation-states, thus preventing the creation of superior law in world relations, resembles the Articles of Confederation of the Thirteen Original American Republics. We know that this confederation did not work. No league system ever attempted in human history could prevent conflict between its members. We must aim at a Federal constitution of the world, a working world-wide legal order, if we hope to prevent an atomic world war.

It happens that at this anxious moment of our history a small book has been published, a very important book, which expresses clearly and simply what so many of us have been thinking. That book is the Anatomy of Peace, by Emery Reves. We urge American men and women to read this book, to think about its conclusions, to discuss it with neighbors and friends, privately and publicly. A few weeks ago those ideas seemed important but perhaps reachable in the future. In the new reality of atomic warfare they are of immediate urgent necessity, unless civilization is determined on suicide.

In his last address, which he did not live to speak, Franklin Roosevelt wrote words which were his political testament: "We are faced with the preeminent fact that if civilization is to survive we must cultivate the science of human relationship—the ability of all peoples of all kinds to live together and work together in the same world at peace." We have learned, and paid an awful price to learn, that living and working together can be done in one way only—under law. There is no truer and simpler idea in the world today. Unless it prevails, and unless by common struggle we are capable of new ways of thinking, mankind is doomed.

Owen J. Roberts, former Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States of America; Senator J. W. Fulbright; Senator Claude Pepper; Senator Elbert D. Thomas, Chairman, Military Affairs Committee; the Right Reverend Henry St. George Tucker, Presiding Bishop, Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America; the Reverend Edward A. Conway, S. J.; Dr. Louis Finkelstein, President, Jewish Theological Seminary; Mortimer J. Adler, Professor of Law, University of Chicago; Charles G. Bolte, Chairman, American Veterans' Committee; Gardner Cowles, Jr., Publisher; Prof. Albert Einstein; Dorothy Canfield Fisher; Albert D. Lasker; Thomas Mann; Lt. Cord Meyer, United States Marine Corps Reserve, Veteran Adviser to Commander Stassen at San Francisco; Christopher Morley; Carl Van Doren; Mark Van Doren; Walter F. Wanger, Motion-Picture Producer; Robert J. Watt, International Representative, AFL.

Bureaucracy Strangles Wisconsin Cheese Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as an extension of these remarks a statement presented today by L. E. Kopitzke, president, and George L. Mooney, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Cheese Makers' Association, to a conference of the Wisconsin congressional delegation and officials representing the United States Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration. The seriousness of the situation which confronts the Wisconsin cheese industry today cannot be overemphasized. I feel so strongly on this subject that I deem it not only advisable but imperative that I call the attention of this Congress and of the Nation to the problems and ask for immediate action in the direction of their solution.

The production of cheese is one of the principal industries of Wisconsin. It is an industry that the people of the State of Wisconsin are proud of. We are proud of the great contribution that it has made in the war effort.

Today, however, Mr. Speaker, bureaucracy strangles the Wisconsin cheese industry. It is being hampered at every turn by agencies of the Federal Government, and, unless immediate steps are taken to relieve this industry from the shackles which have been placed upon it by the bureaucrats, we shall see its slow but sure death.

The meeting which took place today is neither the first occasion upon which these problems have been brought to the attention of the appropriate Government agencies, nor is it the first occasion upon which the industry has been advised that the departments are conscious of the problems and are discussing them. May I make it clear, however, that sympathy does not give relief and sympathy will not solve the problems.

The administration persists in giving lip service to the desire to solve the various problems incident to reconversion, but, if its treatment of the Wisconsin cheese industry is an example of the way in which it is going to handle the reconversion problems in other industries, I cannot help but be pessimistic about the future.

Here, Mr. Speaker, in the words of Mr. Kopitzke and Mr. Mooney, on behalf of the Wisconsin Cheese Makers' Association, men who know what they are talking about, is the way the reconversion problems of the Wisconsin cheese producer are being handled:

Representing the Wisconsin Cheese Makers' Association, we speak for over 1,000 members representing about 1,200 out of less than 1,600 cheese factories in Wisconsin.

Wisconsin manufactures about 50 percent of the Nation's cheese and exports over 95 percent of its product. This was true before and during the war.

We believe, therefore, that the Wisconsin cheese industry calls for national consideration and sympathetic treatment. This statement is all the more true, because Wisconsin produced about 50 percent of the Nation's Cheddar cheese, of which 50 percent was required set-aside for lend-lease and other governmental requirements.

Many emergency regulations affecting cheese, adversely affected Wisconsin's milk producers and cheesemakers. In spite of this, the production of Wisconsin cheese was maintained, and exceptional credit should be given to the manufacturers of Cheddar cheese. The last statement may need further clarification.

Cheddar cheese production was maintained by the cheese factories in spite of—

1. The price competition without any protection, plus the additional work involved in the reports and regulations affecting Cheddar without affecting other types. Important were the Cheddar subsidy reports. These were not required of any other style of cheese, the price of which has been advanced to meet the low ceiling on Cheddar plus the Cheddar subsidy.

It should be added here that this has, for 3 years, conveyed to the consumers a false criterion of nutritional value of Cheddar cheese, placing it 3¾ cents per pound below its true value. This in the face of no justified excluse for continuing the subsidy after all other cheeses were raised to a price equivalent to Cheddar plus subsidy. The subsidy should have been removed and the price correspondingly increased.

2. Denial to Wisconsin cheesemakers of proper mark-up for direct sales on the "service wholesaler" and "retail" basis.

(a) Wisconsin factories were denied the service wholesaler mark-up if the premises of the purchaser were more than 50 miles from the factory or warehouse of the seller.

(b) Retail sales (of Cheddar) were limited to 5 pounds maximum. This prevented the sale of the customary Long Horn, Daisy, etc., direct to consumers.

(c) Sale on the moisture basis carried an inducement to make "large style" Cheddar, but which automatically limited their sale to United States agencies or to a processor. Result, Wisconsin production shifted from 32 percent small styles to about 6 percent small styles under this pricing system. This percentage still prevails.

(d) Price orders prohibited mark-ups for aged or cured cheese which practically, or completely took aged Wisconsin cheese off the market. This is verified by the United States Department of Agriculture reports for the past 2 or 3 years on available aged natural Cheddar cheese.

(e) Favorable prices granted other types of cheese adversely affected the historic production of nationally established types.

For example: Unexplained price increases in Asiatic cheese, within 90 days, killed the production of brick and munster type of cheese. This hit directly at the Dodge County area in Wisconsin for years producing 85 percent of the Nation's total output. That condition arose early in 1945 and still prevails.

(f) Limitation order W. F. O. 92, was in fact a prohibition order which said anybody manufacturing any cheese other than Cheddar can manufacture any type presently enjoying a price advantage. Statistics will show the results of that order. Manufacturers of Cheddar were prohibited from making any other type. This one order entitled Cheddar manufacturers to an even break in price ceilings, so that they could meet price competition for milk at a profit and produce the only type required set-aside for the Government. This statement may be met with the challenge that cheese manufacturers in other States have not been complaining. That may be true. Why? Because the most unfair price provision of any order placed a price on Wisconsin cheese below that produced in any other State.

No other dairy product was so priced, therefore, Wisconsin, the largest milk-producing State in the Union, with the Nation's lowest ceiling price on cheese, made Wisconsin cheese the easy victim of other competitors for milk.

Result: The Cheddar cheesemakers of Wisconsin were (and are) compelled to pay more for their milk than did the Cheddar manufacturers of any other State, and, still more important, the manufacturers of every other State received substantially more for the Cheddar cheese than did the Wisconsin manufacturer. In support of these representations I attach tables of prices paid milk producers in Cheddar-producing States as reported to DPMA by the manufacturer, and also the prices that DPMA paid the manufacturer for the cheese.

With Wisconsin producing 50 percent of the Nation's Cheddar, and the Government allegedly inducing increased production, it is hard to understand the reasoning that promulgated this penalty-pricing on Wisconsin, and harder still, to understand continued refusal to correct it.

(g) Failure to allow for cost or aging and curing cheese in price ceiling has caused it to disappear from the market.

On numerous occasions we have presented our general complaints to the proper Federal officials during the past 3 years without any basic success.

Peculiar is the fact that we have discovered no opposition to our complaints, just plain refusal to do anything about it.

May I quote from a feature article appearing in the Capital Times of Madison, July 25, 1945, and written by Miles J. McMillan. Referring to complaints lodged with the Office of Price Adiminlstration, he says: "Of the 10 allegations made OPA is said to have admitted that 7 were wholly or partially substantiated and to have pledged action to remove faults as quickly as possible." That may carry some satisfaction, but little relief after 3 years under them, and at the same time expected to meet the declared goals of war production.

In another part of the article he makes this statement: "The plus system of determining transportation costs, which are considered in the determination of the price ceilings, benefits the processors who manufacture cheese principally outside of the State of Wisconsin. The benefits arise from the fact their transportation costs are based on the fiction that they ship from Plymouth, Wis. OPA found this allegation of discrimination partially correct and granted the faults of the Plymouth-plus formula, but believes it better than any alternative so far proposed. The question is still under consideration."

The alternative we offered was by price increase or subsidy, or both, and only one-half cent per pound to match the price break at the State line. There is no other alternative and it is workable and practical, and certainly demanded to remove the inequities involved.

Continuing, the article says: "In addition to these charges, the antitrust division alleged that allowances for the assemblying of American cheese were inadequate; that regulations discriminated against distributors; that factory distributors were being discouraged; that penalties on substandard foreign type cheeses were unreasonable."

IN CONCLUSION

Our enemies have surrendered—requirements for dairy products are decreasing in the face of an increased production of milk. The free flow of these products should be permitted when surplus is more threatening than inflation. Fear should prompt action and not inaction.

Our today's large markets are short on cheese generally and entirely without natural Cheddar cheese. (USDA daily reports for October.)

Nearly 95 percent of Wisconsin's Cheddar cheese is sold on the moisture basis and therefore cannot find its way to the retail trade.

We respectfully urge the immediate removal of the Cheddar subsid, and all present controls over the cheese industry, thus permitting prices to seek their own levels on the basis of supply and demand, coupled with a direct Government payment to the farmer in addition to his return, if necessary, to maintain a support price.

These recommendations not only have the support of the officers and members of the Wisconsin Cheese Makers' Association, but of the industry generally throughout the Nation.

It is our opinion the Congress can and will speed these needed measures.

DAIRY PRODUCTS MARKETING ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Chicago, Ill.

Average prices paid, exclusive of subsidy, by cheese manufacturers per butter-fat pound during the month of December 1944—by States

Alabama	.567
Arkansas	.578
California	.615
Colorado	.615
Idaho	.611
Illinois	.595
Indiana	.625
Iowa	.600
Kansas	.602
Kentucky	.556
Michigan	.601
Mississippi	.587
Minnesota	.627
Missouri	.592
Montana	.530
Nebraska	.543
New Mexico	.640
New York	.575
North Carolina	.610
Ohio	.609
Oklahoma	.588
Oregon	.658
Pennsylvania	.590
South Dakota	.573
Tennessee	.595
Texas	.568
Utah	.602
Washington	.640
West Virginia	.510
Wisconsin	.623

NOTE.—Reproduced by Wisconsin Cheese Makers' Association, Apr. 24, 1945. The national average outside of Wisconsin is .593.

TABLE OF PRICES PAID F. O. B. CHEESE FACTORY OR SHIPPING POINT BY DPMA, AUGUST 1943

Under present OPA ceiling prices Cheddar cheese is 23¼ cents per pound to which is added a transportation factor commonly known as Plymouth plus which is 115 percent of the carlot freight rate from Plymouth, Wis., to the point of sale. The following table sets out the price per pound over Wisconsin (base price 23¼ cents) as paid by Dairy Products Marketing Association:

	Cents per pound over Wisconsin
Wisconsin: All points	0
Minnesota: Pine Island	.54
South Dakota: Milbank	.87
Montana: Missoula	2.19
Idaho: Pocatello	2.19
Oregon:	
Portland	2.19
Tillamook	2.34
Washington: Seattle	2.19
California: Oakland	2.19
Iowa:	
Cedar Rapids	.53
Des Moines	.65
Illinois:	
Petersburg	.47
Valley City	.52
Missouri:	
Springfield	.65
Aurora	.90
Koskonong	1.12
Kansas: Witchita	1.00
Arkansas: Bentonville	1.04
Texas:	
Round Rock	1.46
Alice	1.70
Michigan:	
Escanaba	.43
Detroit	.55
Indiana: Warsaw	.50
Ohio:	
Belle Center	.60
Bremen	.66
New York: Lowville	.80
Tennessee: Nashville	.91
Mississippi: Columbus	1.16
Georgia: Atlanta	1.25

Inaction in Labor Disputes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the section of the country from which I come is not only disturbed but genuinely alarmed and angry, about the strike situation, not only in Michigan, but all over the land. The cold weather in Michigan is approaching, many of the coal bins are empty, and the fuel oil storage tanks are far from full. With the mines operating normally and with the usual production of oil, there would be little difficulty, provided adequate transportation were available. However, with many of the oil producers and the refineries closed because of labor trouble, with the coal mines practically out of commission because of strikes, and with transportation stymied because of labor disagreements, the outlook for the winter is indeed discouraging.

It is all very well to point out these things. The case has been diagnosed. What the people want is somebody in authority to do something about it. Just who in authority can do something about it? If there are those in authority who can do something about it, why do they

not act? That is what the people want to know. They want action, not talk.

Nationally, the responsibility rests with the President and his administration and the Congress.

A forthright, courageous demand by the President, addressed to management and organized labor, supplemented by a statement to the Congress indicating what additional authority, if any, he needs at the moment, will, in my judgment, get results. Surely a majority of the Congress will support the President in an energetic, constructive, and fearless program to bring about the termination of present labor disputes.

A new formula should be written at once, to become operative at once, whereby those who, individually or collectively, deliberately plan to bring distress and suffering to our people would be held responsible for their acts—both management and labor.

Our people are not demanding that any of the legitimate and equitable rights of organized labor be taken away. Organized labor is protected by law; therefore, it should be responsible under the same law. There must be responsibility all along the line and legislation to that end is bound to be placed upon the statute books. There must be justice for all and special privilege to neither labor or management.

My people are demanding that the Congress take effective action if the President will not. This reconversion period is no time for labor troubles or anything else that impedes, interferes with, or stops reconversion of our industry to a job-making economy.

Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an editorial in the Monroe (Mich.) News which well expresses the way many of our people feel. In short, action is expected and the President apparently does not appreciate the seriousness of the present strikes. The editorial is as follows:

INACTION

The Truman administration's record of dealing with, and attitude toward, the rash of post VJ strikes is growing less and less impressive. While on a political holiday and fishing trip the President, at a press conference, delivered the off-hand remark that widespread strikes have followed after every major war. So has untold misery in devastated regions, but it can be remedied by prompt action.

Significantly, in his home State of Missouri, President Truman was criticized for not staying in Washington and doing something about strikes by members of the legislature, who had to walk through a picket line as a strike held up work on sidewalk repairs. A good many people feel as do the legislators.

There are strikes and strikes. A work stoppage in an industry is not as a rule of immediate public concern. But a labor dispute tha interferes with vital public functions, such as transportation, communications, power, fuel, or food is an entirely different matter.

Governor Dewey moved promptly and effectively to halt a dispute that stalled vertical transportation in New York skyscrapers. Yet no one has as yet acted to halt a strike of New York dock workers which is interfering with the most vital transportation service in the country today. The longshoreman's strike is preventing the dispatch of ships to Europe to pick up and return homebound American servicemen, and it is keeping food supplies for the Army and for the relief of Allied nations from being shipped. A somewhat similar dispute on the west coast is tying up shipping to the Pacific.

How can Mr. Truman complacently fish in Reelfoot Lake and make speeches about the TVA while high-point men are being held in France and England and Guam by a labor dispute?

Federal efforts are now concentrated on a coal strike. Miners are idle at a time when the maximum production of coal is essential. With the best efforts of every available miner, Secretary Ickes has asserted that coal supplies for the winter will be short, and we are obligated to ship coal abroad. Unless France and other European countries receive some imported coal this winter Army officers predict increasing unrest. In Germany the returning United States commander of the Berlin garrison says fuel is the greatest problem. Yet th miners remain idle and Washington seems unconcerned.

Only the subterfuge of seizure by the Navy halted the oil strike after it was borne home to Washington that all production might cease if workers did not get gasoline for their cars. And nothing has as yet been done to prevent the telephone workers from carrying out their threat to desert the switchboards and leave the country helpless.

Must such strikes be tolerated merely because the administration adheres to the belief that they are an incidental aftermath of war? Mr. Truman would do his party and his political cause far more good by resuming the return of servicemen and the production of coal and preventing paralysis of the Nation's communication system than by going fishing in the border States.

War Equipment Will Be Given to Hospitals and Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave given me to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an article which appeared in PM on September 17, 1945, written by Gordon H. Cole, with relation to the discharge of surplus goods to hospitals and schools on a free basis. I think Mr. Cole's article is provocative and the recommendations contained in it deserve the serious consideration of every Member of Congress.

WAR EQUIPMENT WILL BE GIVEN TO HOSPITALS AND SCHOOLS—POOR DISTRICTS TO GET MATERIALS THEY CANNOT BUY

(By Gordon H. Cole)

WASHINGTON, September 17.—Army and Navy equipment worth billions of dollars is being earmarked for immediate postwar service in hospitals and schools of the Nation's poorer communities.

Robert A. Hurley, member of the Surplus Property Board, revealed today that the finishing touches are being put on a vast program to distribute, virtually cost free, much of the material and equipment left over from the war.

Everything from complete hospitals to the latest athletic equipment will be available to counties, schools, charities, labor unions, and other nonprofit institutions that can show:

That they could not afford to buy such equipment through normal trade channels.

That they will provide necessary building and staff to use the material correctly.

NOMINAL COST

Recipients of military surpluses under this program will be asked to pay only a nominal sum, to cover the cost of shipping.

"Any community," Hurley explained, "that cannot afford adequate hospital facilities will be able to get a complete hospital for the cost of the building and the staff.

"Any school," he continued, "can have equipment for health clinic, including X-ray machines, if the school board could not afford to buy the equipment, but can provide a doctor."

Hurley said that many people advocated either dumping the surplus into the ocean or holding and selling it over several years in quantities small enough so that it would not wreck the various consumer goods industries.

MARKET FOR PARTS

"Our idea," Hurley said, "is to use surplus military property as economic seed corn." He explained:

"We feel that most of this material can be put to immediate use without injuring industry. On the contrary, we feel that if we can plant a new hospital in a community that couldn't normally afford it, the community then will keep up the hospital and replace the drugs and pharmaceuticals as they are used.

"Likewise, if we put a motion-picture projector or a radio in a classroom, the school will keep the equipment repaired and replace parts as they wear out.

"In this way, military left-overs can be used not only to raise standards of health and education, but to create new markets for industry."

Hurley said that Congress envisioned such program as possible when it wrote into the law governing disposal of surplus-property provisions permitting sale, lease, or donation of surpluses to any public, nonprofit, educational, or charitable organization.

TWO PROGRAMS

Two separate programs, one covering health the other education, have been worked out during the last 6 mo ths, Hurley said, principally by Jonas Reiner, former Assistant Administrator for the Board.

The regulations in their final form are being circulated among interested Government agencies and are scheduled to be adopted formally when the Board meets tomorrow.

Hurley said that the Board has designated Dr. John W. Studebaker, United States Commissioner of Education, to set up a staff to administer the education program, and Dr. Thomas Parran, Surgeon General, to handle the health program.

Here are the outlines of the health program:

Doctors: More than 20,000 doctors in the armed services have no established private practice. The Surplus Property Board has asked Parran to designate communities which have the greatest need for doctors and dentists. Physicians leaving the armed forces who will agree to set up practice in these needy communities will be able to lease all their equipment at nominal fees.

Hospitals: By cooperating with States, their political subdivisions and nonprofit institutions, the Surplus Property Board hopes to aid in establishing small health centers in areas completely without modern medical facilities. The Board has the equipment to furnish and equip the hospitals. The local authorities must furnish the staff to man the hospital.

School clinics: The Board hopes to foster the use of Army surplus rolling hospitals, which have been renamed "health mobiles," as a means of bringing the best medical care to children and their families in rural areas

where there are no local medical facilities Health mobiles are complete hospital units, equipped with examination equipment, X-ray, and operating tables.

FOR LABOR UNIONS

Labor clinics: The Board proposes to provide medical equipment and drugs to labor unions and other nonprofit institutions that will set up clinics and provide physicians.

Distribution of drugs: A program is being worked out for the distribution of the vast Army and Navy stores of drugs and pharmaceuticals to combat communicable diseases. Of some drugs, Hurley said, the Army and Navy now have more than ever was produced before in history. Officials say that the present supply of penicillin may be sufficient virtually to wipe out venereal disease.

Sanitary equipment: The Board expects surplus military equipment sufficient to permit many of the poorer communities to launch sanitary programs, install new sewers and water systems. The Board will have drainage equipment, sprays, oils, and other material for fighting insects and pests. Quantities will be sufficient to permit what Hurley described as "undreamed-of improvements in health standards."

These surpluses, Hurley explained, will be "distributed for a fraction of their cost, not on the basis of use, but on the basis of real need." Those communities that have nothing will get first choice on the surpluses.

SCHOOL PROGRAM

The school program is just as vast in its scope. Here are the details:

Lunches: Under the National School Lunch Act the Government makes food available for hot lunches in the schools. But children who need hot lunches most are those living in communities that lack funds to set up kitchens. The Surplus Property Board has or will have knives, forks, refrigerators, carving blocks, pots, pans, stoves and all other equipment to set up kitchens so that an estimated 12,000,000 children can get at least one properly balanced meal a day.

Visual aids: The Army and the Navy have hundreds of motion-picture projectors with sound equipment, millions of feet of educational film which will be distributed to schools on the basis of need.

Audio aids: All surplus electronic equipment, broadcasting stations, radio receivers, walkie-talkies—enough to put a radio in every classroom in the Nation—will be made available to the schools. The Board also will distribute its linguaphone type equipment to aid language students under this program.

Physical education: Athletic and physical education equipments from the Army and the Navy will be made available to the children in schools which could never afford the paraphernalia of modern sports. The schools will have to provide teachers and coaches.

Libraries: The Surplus Property Board will have millions of books that were printed for Army, Navy special service force. To get a complete library, a community will have to provide a building and librarian.

Manual training: The Surplus Property Board plans to make available to trade schools and to the Nation's high schools surplus hand tools, machine tools, material to teach industrial crafts. This, Hurley suggested, would bring industrial skills into rural areas.

Scientific research: The Board has for disposal about $60,000,000 worth of laboratory and research equipment, scientific instruments used by the Office of Scientific Development. These will be made available to schools, colleges and nonprofit research institutions.

The Surplus Property Board has made funds available to the United States Commissioner of Education and to the Surgeon General to enable them to carry out their part in the program, namely:

To work out the necessary criteria to determine relative need.

To establish organizations at State levels to assist State, county and local organizations to establish or expand public health facilities.

To make recommendations as to the material required for each program.

Returning Soldiers

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House once more to some of the things that are going on that are holding up the soldiers from coming home. Let me read a letter I received from a lieutenant stationed in Manila. It says:

This island is so congested with Army personnel with nothing to do that one hears nothing but gripes and bitterness because we can't get home.

About getting home, the lieutenant goes on to say:

When we came into the harbor here there were 496 ships laying out there, some of them for months, and the people here can't understand; neither can I.

They were in transit for 53 days. The letter goes on to say:

We were only 800 miles out of Panama on surrender day, with 17,000 more miles to go, but the trip had to continue. We had a lot of trouble with the ship. It stopped several times, and one time it stopped on the Equator for 48 hours The ventilators, fans, lights, and water went off, and the merchant marines filled canteens for a dollar each.

The entire letter follows:

MANILA, *September 29, 1945.*

I finally made the trip, and what a trip it was; 53 days from Leghorn, Italy, to here and now I want to fly home. From what we who came here from Europe can see, this theater is in just about as big a mess as it can be. We don't even get mail. This island is so congested with Army personnel with nothing to do that one hears nothing but gripes and bitterness because we can't get home. We debarked here September 15 and now it locks as though we'll sit until after the first of the year since we just heard on the radio that the shipping quota is filled up until then. When we came into the harbor here there were 496 ships laying out there, some of them for months and the people here can't understand it; neither can I. Is Congress doing anything to help get people back home or is it only "hot air" which we read in the paper and hear from the radio. We were only 800 miles out of Panama on surrender day with 17,000 more miles to go but the trip had to continue. We had a lot of trouble with the ship. It stopped several times and one time it stopped on the Equator for 48 hours. The ventilators, fans, lights, and water went off but the merchant marines filled canteens for a dollar each. The ship was run by the merchant marines and they even refused to feed us for 24 hours because it was too hot to work while the ventilators were off. When we finally did get fed it was the Army who prepared and served the food and the marines weren't in sight. They sold sandwiches to the GI's for 50 cents and halves of chickens for $1.50. The food was Government property put on the ship for the passengers. The officers and men came to the conclusion that the merchant marines are a lousy outfit and wonder why the things they do are allowed to go on unexplained. My friend Scottie is also sitting over here twiddling his thumbs and wants to get home to restart his practice. He's been in the Army 42 months but it doesn't look as though he's got a half a chance of going home. Manila is badly damaged and in the same filthy condition as all the Italian port cities. This is the rainy season now; it rains most of the time and sure is hot even though it is the coolest season of the year.

We haven't been doing much sightseeing because of danger from the Japs who are still sticking in the hills nearby. * * *

If you could see the waste over here your eyes would pop.

Civil-Service Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I desire to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter received from one of my constituents relative to the civil-service policy. I believe this subject is of the greatest importance to all of us and for that reason I am inserting it in the RECORD at this point. I have deleted the name from this letter for reasons known to all of us. The letter follows:

Hon. J. HARRY McGREGOR,

House of Representatives.

DEAR HARRY: Since an effort is now being made to reorganize Government departments, I have some suggestions that I would like to submit to you for your consideration before you present them to Mr. RAMSPECK who, I suppose, is the man that will more or less watch out for the civil-service policy within the framework of any organization program.

In my observations covering many years of employment with the Government I have come to the conclusion that an employee, assigned to an administrative policy-making position (nonpolitical) should be limited to a definite period of 10 to 12 years of duty in that position. During this time the new appointee is able to establish an up-to-date progressive policy and to maintain work standards. It becomes a natural habit to accept things as is as time goes on and hesitate to do something that may be new or different. A periodic change will fit closely with the natural progressive changes that normally occur in 10 to 12 years. Also, a change will put new blood, new ideas, and a new spirit into an organization. It will have a tendency to create and instill a keen competitive spirit within the personnel when each employee realizes the future possibilities of attaining a higher position after a normal period of faithful and efficient employment.

All Federal career employees should have an opportunity to achieve their ambitions of reaching the top, therefore, no employee, regardless of his position, has the right to hold a public position beyond a reasonable period or at any time consider the job as his to hold as long as he wishes. Present Government policy permits this to be possible

today by extension of service beyond my suggested limit.

To promote full postwar employment and opportunity, I suggest the United States Government establish compulsory retirement after the employee has established 35 years of service and attained the age of 60. This length of service enables the employee to receive the full benefit of the Ramspeck Retirement Act which is half pay for the best paid five-consecutive-year period of employment. No employee is so important that he or she cannot be replaced, and I believe when statements are made that an employee cannot be replaced, they are, in most cases, based upon close friendship and not the fact that there is no one qualified to fill the position. This suggestion is not the question of whether the incumbent can still carry on and do a good job, but is a way to establish an opportunity to the rank and file to move up a step, therefore creating vacancies down the line and for the hiring of new employees. This practice will give the organization new life and extend more opportunity. Rank-and-file employees (those employees not holding or never have held a policy-making position) should be permitted to continue work until the age of 65.

In conclusion I suggest the following: (1) All administrative policy-making positions (nonpolitical) be limited to a period of 10 to 12 years and the appointee to hold office for that length of time, providing he is efficient. Also, no exceptions made for extension of his appointment; (2) to promote full employment, no employee in class (1) above to be carried on the pay roll beyond the time that full retirement benefits has been reached and no exceptions be made for anyone. Any person having completed an assignment under (1) but has not reached retirement age should be transferred to another assignment until retirement age is reached without any reduction in salary.

Sincerely yours.

Disposal of the Big and Little Inch Pipe Lines

REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I believe every Member of the House received from the Surplus Property Administration a mimeographed release on the subject of the disposal of the Big and Little Inch pipe lines. It includes a letter from the Surplus Property Administrator to Mr. L. K. Davies, Deputy Petroleum Administrator.

I would only like to point out to the House two things in that letter. In the first place, the Surplus Property Administrator stated that it had been hoped that these lines would not be drained and taken out of operation until after they had a chance to dispose of them in some proper way. It is obvious the chance for the Government to lease the lines on a basis advantageous to the Nation and as common carriers will be greatly reduced the moment the lines are drained.

In the second place, Mr. Symington says:

Under these circumstances, the Surplus Property Administration has no alternative but to acquiesce in your program. You will understand, of course, that such acquiescence is not intended as reflecting any opinion on what action should be taken in the light of possible shortages of oil on the east coast in the immediate future, a matter which is completely outside the jurisdiction of this Administration.

It is not difficult to guess what the opinion of the Surplus Property Administrator would have been if he had expressed it. And, for my part, I am in hearty agreement with him.

Resolutions of the American Legion, Department of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 15, 1945.

The Honorable THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. D'ALESANDRO: I acknowledge the receipt of your communication of September 21, 1945, enclosing a copy of resolutions adopted at the convention of the American Legion, Department of Maryland, held in Baltimore, Md., on August 23, 24, and 25, 1945.

Thank you for your courtesy in transmitting these resolutions for the attention of the officers of the Department of State.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BYRNES.

At the convention of the American Legion, Department of Maryland, held on the 23d, 24th, and 25th days of August 1945 at Emerson Hotel, Baltimore, Md., the following resolutions were adopted:

"Whereas the Allied Nations fought World War I to preserve democracy in this world, in which war many members of the American Legion alongside the sons of other nations, devoted their energy, their health, and wealth, to save the United States of America and other lands and peoples of the world from enslavement by and tyranny of the undemocratic and imperialistic forces; and

"Whereas the United Nations fought World War II to liberate subjugated peoples, occupied lands and invaded countries from aggressor nations, in which war, likewise, members of the American Legion, alongside the sons of other nations, devoted their energy, their health and wealth, to save the United States of America and other lands and peoples of the world from ravishing by and cruelty of the totalitarian and inhuman dictators; and

"Whereas the war-making forces of the reactionary countries were successfully defeated in this the most excruciating war, and the United Nations are about to meet at the peace conference table, to establish once and for all times a just, lasting, and durable peace; and

"Whereas at the close of this war many lands were liberated and the peoples of these lands were given opportunity to establish governments of their own choosing, while at the same time there are lands, peoples, and countries, to whose soil the war came not because of any fault of theirs, yet such lands, countries, and peoples are still under a foreign rule, influence, and domination, and are not permitted to be free and independent, and to establish democratic governments; and

"Whereas it is unjust and inhuman to appease any power, be it even a member of the United Nations, at the expense and sacrifice af small unculpable nations; and

"Whereas a lasting peace in this world cannot prevail, unless it is based on true justice and restoration of freedom and independence to all lands and peoples who were self-governing before the Fascists and Nazi started the annexations rolling; and

"Whereas the Atlantic charter proclaimed and the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations 'reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women, and of the nations, large and small': Be it

"*Resolved*, That the American Legion, Department of Maryland, in convention assembled, hereby voices its opposition against the forceful annexation of small countries by large countries, which small countries were helpful and sympathetic with the United Nations' cause, and which small countries are able and willing to join the United Nations in upholding the principles of freedom, justice, and democracy, and to adhere to the cause of lasting peace; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That these resolutions, when adopted by this convention, be offered to the ensuing national convention of the American Legion for adoption; and be it still further

"*Resolved*, That these resolutions, when adopted by the national convention of the American Legion, that copies thereof be forwarded to the heads of the governments of the countries which are members of the United Nations, to the Members of the Congress of the United States, to the ensuing Council of Foreign Ministers, scheduled to convene in London, England, where the cause of many lands and countries will be deliberated; and to the press."

Opening of Overseas Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL R. LEWIS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, although orders were issued to discontinue censorship of mail from members of the armed forces, apparently some sort of censorship, or at least partial censorship, is continuing through the device of opening letters from servicemen in the Navy. This practice, I think, is outrageous and should be stopped immediately. Letters of servicemen should be held as sacred from prying eyes certainly as letters of civilians. I have a letter from a constituent, as follows:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN LEWIS: Since discontinuance of the censorship of mail from members of the armed forces, I have received several letters from my boys in the Navy which have been tampered with. Some of this tampering has been done with an evident attempt at concealment. Today I received one which had been opened without any attempt at concealment and had been resealed with transparent tape. In no case was there a censor's mark on the envelope.

A family friend received a letter today from her husband in a different part of the Pacific

which had also been opened. This leads me to suppose that the practice is general.

No amount of espionage now will keep the truth about conditions in the Navy from being made public. Men who have already received their discharge are taking care of that. In the meantime, is there anything that can be done to protect citizens of the United States from this unwarranted snooping into personal correspondence?

I sincerely trust that this warning to those who tamper with the mail from overseas will be sufficient to see that this practice is stopped immediately. If such a practice is continued, I think the Naval Affairs Committee should be asked to make a complete investigation of this situation, and I shall do it.

The MacArthur Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John O'Donnell:

(By John O'Donnell)

WASHINGTON.—In that first-rate writing job that Chief of Staff General Marshall has turned out in his current report on how we won the war is the solemn account of American deaths in battle.

It cost the Nation 201,367 deaths in battle to win this latest war. (We won our freedom with 4,044 battle deaths in the long-drawn-out 6 years and 8 months of the Revolution. On the European fronts in World War II we lost a total of 160,045 Americans, in the Pacific, 41,322.

And here is a surprising contrast in the figures. In the fighting in north Africa, Italy, France, and Germany, manpower from the United States bore the brunt of battle. The enemy battle dead, Germans and Italians, amounted to 373,600.

Roughly, this works out to seven German or Italian dead to one American, figuring the preponderance of Americans in action compared to their allies.

Seven to one is a surprising figure. But look at the actual battle deaths in the Pacific. General MacArthur's victory cost us the lives of 41,322 Americans from Pearl Harbor to the finish when the Japs signed the surrender. But the Japs in the meantime lost, in counted battle dead, 1,219,000.

Now this works out to about one American dying for around 20 Japs—making allowances for Australian and Chinese casualties. And it's all the more astounding when you take into account the fierceness of the battles. The report of General Marshall reveals that while we killed 1,219,000 Japs and permanenty disabled 240,000, only 41,464 prisoners were taken.

On the European fronts, in addition to the 373,600 enemy battle deaths, the enemy lost 85,000 in permanently disabled but—and here's the big but—we took 8,108,983 prisoners. And of this huge number only 3,404,949 were disarmed enemy forces that surrendered en masse after the complete German collapse.

The figures seem to bear out the claim of MacArthur's admirers that he won his battles at the cheapest cost in American lives of any general in the field—in this war or any other war our country has ever fought.

All the way up on the long road from New Guinea to Manila, MacArthur was a spendthrift with shells and bombs; a miser with the lives of his troops.

The battle figures seem to bear out the wisdom of the MacArthur strategy:

"Never a costly frontal attack. The basic principle of military strategy is when and where. It's the art of precise timing and surprise. It's the principle of enveloping the flanks of the enemy, of getting behind the enemy and interdicting his lines of supply and communication. It's the art of then pouring down on the enemy everything you have in the way of artillery fire and air bombardment and strafing, of saturating the trapped enemy with bomb and shell and then—and only then—of sending your men in to clean up an exhausted and beaten foe, of never making your troops pay the price in blood of a frontal attack against a strong prepared position."

Postwar Employment With a Question Mark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a very pertinent radio talk written and broadcast by Fraser S. Gardner on his veterans' radio program For the Veteran, last December 11, 1944, over radio station WINX in Washington, D. C. Mr. Gardner is nationally known as an authority on veteran affairs, is a past national officer of major veteran organizations. Among other veteran offices now held, he is the commander of the Ernie Pyle Chapter of the DAV and national employment officer of the Army and Navy Union. He conducts the original veterans' radio program, For the Veteran, which he inaugurated in April of 1944, as producer and commentator.

At the close of the war, eight to twelve million men will have risked their lives, broken up their families, suffered economic, physical, and psychological injury to help maintain the freedoms of America. They have looked to us, here at home, to provide them with the means to win it—the guns, the transports, the equipment. When they turn homeward, victorious, they will look to us and to the new and powerful resources of rich America for jobs. They will look to us for the way back—back to a normal productive life in the environment of peace and security. They will not find it in a mustering-out pay check, a preferential rating for nonexistent jobs, or even in generous unemployment allowances. They will find it in the same way as their civilian neighbors, in an expanding economy that provides good jobs for all employables, not because they are veterans, but because they are men.

As news of Allied victories pour in from our battle fronts and the beginning of the end comes in view, some legislative, labor, and social groups have and are, hastening plans for easing the servicemen back into civilian life. A veteran is now entitled to his old job back for 1 year, priority on Government openings, if any, readjustment allowances during certain periods of unemployment, aid in training for and placement into new jobs, and some guaranty on risk capital in a business, home, or farm. Federal, State, and community activities have been initiated to help him find gainful helpful employment, and organized labor has liberalized union regulations and requirements for easy admission of the veteran.

So far all the programs for employing the returned serviceman in our industries are predicated on the general assumption there will be a job for him to do. And, so far, of course, that has been true and the majority of our veterans have chosen to go into war industries. Meanwhile, management and labor, as well as local and Federal governments are taking steps to help the veteran find the kind of job he specifically wants. Most of these steps involve some form of veteran preference, either State, Federal, or both.

But, the economic future of the veteran cannot be solved solely through preferential treatment and Government aid. The jobs have got to be there. The crux of the problem lies in planning for an economy of abundance, a prosperous America.

I am sure you realize a long-time job of all-inclusive postwar planning confronts us in addition to the problems of demobilization and industrial reconversion, and that we must start such total planning here and now. In the course of the war we have geared our economy to an unprecedentedly high level of production and we cannot—we must not—sink back into a lower level of production without inviting unemployment and economic stagnation. In the postwar years, therefore, we must achieve peacetime enterprise and the production of consumer goods and services on a wholly new scale.

It is my supposition that this country will be unable to utilize in the questionable period ahead anywhere near the amount of products which we are now manufacturing for war purposes. In fact, an enriched standard of living and full peacetime employment cannot be achieved wholly by the production of things. As one suggestion, the approach to them can be greatly aided, however, through an expansion of the social services which make for a fuller and healthier community existence, medicine, education, recreation, religion, child care, youth programs, and the like. And these can be supplemented, of course, by soundly conceived projects for the development of our natural resources, the harnessing of rivers to promote navigation, irrigation, and power, the construction of bridges, highways, and harbors, the conservation and exploitation of soil and forests and mineral reserves. Stimulation of small business, civic development, and public works, full use of America's gigantic productive resources, incentive taxes, expansion of foreign markets, low tariffs—all these and more are necessary to assure the veteran sustained suitable employment. A healthy over-all economy will obviously provide a healthier chance for the returning soldier than a sick economy with preferential treatment. Most veterans instinctively sense this fact. Some 3,000,000 servicemen are members of organized labor unions; millions more are members of families which include civilian workers. Many of them recognize the economic and social pitfalls of a preferred class in society, who are able to get jobs only at the expense of a noncombatant's employment.

They don't want to be fed from a nursery bottle. They want an equalized chance in a growing and busy economy.

Disabled veterans should, of ccurse, be entitled to extra protection and preferences for both public and private employment. Pensions are still not large enough for a handicapped veteran and his dependents to live on without outside income.

Disabled veterans have the most to fear from a scarcity economy and unemployment, because they are, for the most part, marginal employees, the last to be employed and the first to go when contraction begins. Their only hope for a decent income and a job, unless preference for them can be really effective, lies in an expanded economy for America, with jobs for all. But, even though we might be successful in securing effective preference for the employment of veterans, disabled or able-bodied, the welfare of any one group of Americans is inevitably linked up with the welfare of all other groups of Americans, and, therefore, we must strive to cooperate together toward the objective of full, useful employment for all Americans.

As I see it, we face a momentcus choice in the postwar period. Having experienced full employment during the war, the American people will not tolerate protracted heavy unemployment again. If they cannot get reasonably full employment in one way they will try to get it in another. Thus, the choice appears to be whether we shall achieve our goal by general planning and general management of our economy, creating general conditions in which the people will make their own jobs through private enterprise, or whether failure to do so in that way will lead us into detailed control and management of all our economic activities.

If we are to do it by the general conditions we create, we must do adequate planning to that end and do it now.

We must plan the general management of our economy, or perforce, we shall be planning the management of business. Sustained full employment will not just happen.

Who Said Tobacco Had Not Been Sent Under Lend-Lease? Who Said This Crop Had Not Cost the United States Treasury a Dollar?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following note and official table from the Foreign Economic Administration shows that 632,559,497 pounds of tobacco costing $243,713,696 have been shipped under lend-lease. Whether the United States tobacco production should have been increased by one-fourth or one-third during wartime, when food was needed, is for you to decide.

One fact is evident, and that is that if this manpower and fertilizer used for tobacco had been expended on corn, we would have had more feed and more food.

There might have been and there could have been fat back where none is available now, if the manpower and fertilizer had been directed to food production.

United States lend-lease exports of unmanufactured tobacco

[2601.00 through 2618.00]

Country	In pounds				
	1941	1942	1943	1944	January-June 1945
Total unmanufactured	88, 526, 652	183, 183, 870	232, 663, 524	82, 107, 946	46, 077, 505
United Kingdom	79, 558, 033	165, 676, 325	197, 904, 410	75, 420, 646	38, 049, 242
Australia	8, 288, 593	10, 083, 491	24, 252, 030	127, 765	4, 005, 577
New Zealand	680, 026	2, 050, 835	5, 048, 270	2, 333, 519	1, 178, 722
India		4, 722, 268	2, 776, 435	4, 215, 928	2, 542, 128
Other countries		650, 004	2, 682, 379	10, 089	301, 836
	In dollars				
Total	23, 030, 999	51, 213, 743	101, 771, 475	42, 684, 546	25, 012, 933
United Kingdom	21, 111, 283	47, 026, 865	88, 092, 558	39, 443, 713	20, 822, 681
Australia	1, 786, 191	2, 185, 592	9, 642, 721	46, 127	2, 108, 471
New Zealand	133, 525	597, 118	1, 907, 383	1, 097, 627	607, 853
India		1, 236, 254	969, 973	2, 091, 779	1, 336, 396
Other countries		167, 914	1, 158, 840	5, 300	137, 532

General Patton's Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from my friend and constituent, Hon. Sam M. Johnston, attorney, Mobile, Ala., commending General Patton.

It is as follows:

MOBILE, ALA., *October 2, 1945.*

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANK: Everyone would like to hear your voice ringing upon the floor of the House in denunciation of the calumniators of General Patton.

It is hard to believe that a soldier of General Patton's merit can be completely undermined by a bunch of carping critics at home, whose only contribution to world events is the discord which they pour into the public mind. Scandalmongers, keyhole peepers, and armchair strategists are licensed to use the radio networks of this country to tear down reputation, character and virtue on every side; but if a soldier in the field, entitled to the accolades of his countrymen for courage, leadership, and tenacity, makes an innocent allusion to the Democratic and Republican Parties, he is held up to public ridicule and scorn.

The morning's press in a news item states that the Harrison report was entirely false, and that Jews in Germany are being treated with consideration and fairness. Yet, General Patton has suffered keenly from the backwash of this irresponsible report.

The President should exercise better wisdom than to be constantly sending overseas investigators to pry into and check the actions of proven commanders in the field. It conduces to nothing but indecision, lack of confidence, and fear to follow one's better judgment, on their part. If ever a Nation had splendid and capable leadership during a war, America has. In the whole history of warfare, it has never been equaled; and it strikes me that it is about time for us to do homage to such noble and gallant leadership, instead of attempting by every art and wile to establish some defect in it.

Our mutual friend, William C. Taylor, who has just entered my office, concurs 100 percent in the views expressed in this letter.

Sincerely your friend,

SAM M. JOHNSTON.

National Housing Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a certified copy of resolution file No. 82812, in which the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee goes on record in favor of bill S. 1342 and urges its early enactment into law:

File No. 82812

Whereas bill S. 1342, amending the existing National Housing Agency laws, has been introduced in the United States Senate, which, among other things, covers research into building costs and methods with the object of lowering costs, also contains provision for land assembly over long periods of amortization for better ratio of land to building costs and also changes the cost per dwelling units from the present $5,000 per unit to $1,250 per room, which would make it possible if the act were passed to complete the sixth ward housing project without change; and

Whereas the passage of this bill would stimulate and improve all housing developments, public and private, in Milwaukee from the lowest subsidized projects up to and including economic redevelopment projects; and

Whereas the passage of this bill would materially expedite the completion of the sixth ward housing project now contemplated and other redevelopment projects: Therefore be it

Resolved, By the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, that it hereby favors bill S. 1342, which establishes a national housing policy and provides for its execution and hereby urges its representatives in the Senate

and House to use their best endeavors to have said bill enacted into law;

Resolved further, That duly certified copies be sent to Senators LA FOLLETTE and WILEY, and Congressmen WASIELEWSKI and BIEMILLER.

The Constitution and the FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport (La.) Times of October 14, 1945:

THE CONSTITUTION AND THE FEPC

(The Times is indebted to one of Shreveport's learned jurists—a student of the Constitution for many years—for the judicial data in the following editorial.)

"The Constitution was not formed merely to guard the States against danger from foreign nations, but mainly to secure union and harmony at home."

These words were not written by a politician or a propagandist of any sort but by the second Chief Justice of the United States, Roger B. Taney, in a decision wherein he spoke for a unanimous Supreme Court. He was not supported by the Court alone, but by the Declaration of Independence, which charged, among other wrongs perpetrated by the King of England: "He has excited domestic insurrection amongst us." Justice Taney also was supported by the Constitution of the United States, whose preamble proclaims that it was ordained and established, "in order to insure domestic tranquillity."

Does the Fair Employment Practice Committee (or any other proposal to establish social relations unpleasant to either white or colored citizen) secure union and harmony, and insure domestic tranquillity? Or, does it tend to "excite domestic insurrections amongst us?"

Another famed Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Mr. Holmes, only recently retired from the bench, said in an opinion without a dissent: "Constitutions are intended to preserve practical and substantial rights, not to maintain theories."

Fifty years ago, a Republican justice (Brown), in a case coming up from Louisiana, said:

"Legislation is powerless to eradicate racial instincts or to abolish distinctions based upon physical differences, and the attempt to do so can only result in accentuating the difficulties of the present situation."

And again:

"The argument also assumes that social prejudices may be overcome by legislation, and that equal rights cannot be secured to the Negro except by an enforced commingling of the races.

"We cannot accept this proposition."

In that case the Court spoke of its reasonableness as determined "with reference to the established usages, customs, and traditions of the people." And that judge, Justice Brown, was born in Massachusetts.

The people of the South can and will stand upon that conclusion reached by the Supreme Court as to "enforced commingling of the races."

And, in support of the Constitution, and following the reasoning of distinguished judges who had sworn to support the Constitution, we say to the Senators and Representatives who have taken this same oath, "You and we cannot accept the proposition which others are trying to force upon us."

The "slavery argument" would have to be run "into the ground to make it apply to matters of intercourse or business," to quote a judge named to the bench by President Grant—Justice Bradley.

There is a clause in the Declaration of Independence which should be pondered by those who, having sworn to support the Constitution, took vicious pride in speciously violating it. That clause is the one best known to students, but flouted or forgotten by predatory politicians, who justify any offense against the Constitution that may serve to place them or keep them in office. It refers to the inalienable rights—the "natural rights" they are called by some, and often termed "the fundamentals" by others.

The special clause we refer to reads:

"Whenever any form of government becomes destructive of those ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it."

Fortunately, in our republican form of government, the same result can be achieved by defeating traitors to the Constitution.

In a recent case Supreme Court Justice Jackson, who carried the interstate-commerce power to the limit and even beyond by holding that a man had no right to eat the wheat he had raised beyond his quota, said, in the Flag Salute case:

"One's right to life, liberty, and property, to free speech, a free press, freedom of worship and assembly, and other fundamental rights, may not be submitted to vote; they depend on no elections."

No judge ever has held that the fourteenth amendment created any rights.

The most staunch champion of the rights of emancipated slaves was Justice Harlan, and he quoted in a noted case the following language of a distinguished law writer, Cooley:

"It is a part of every man's civil rights that he be left at liberty to refuse business relations with any person whatsoever, whether the refusal rest upon reason, or is the result of whim, caprice, prejudice, or malice.

"With his reasons neither the public nor third persons have any legal concern.

"It is also his right to have business relations with anyone with whom he can make contract, and if he is wrongfully deprived of this right by others, he is entitled to redress."

And in another case that same justice said:

"Whether one person will permit or maintain social relations with another is a matter with which government has no concern."

Mr. Cooley did not mean social equality. There is a great difference between social relations and social equality. The first refers to association brought about by the ordinary relations between men; the other to a status in society which distinguishes classes.

Every burden that has been laid on business under the commerce power has been attributed to "the general welfare," and to "protection against the evils which menace the health, safety, morals, and welfare of the people."

A case can be made for laws limiting hours of labor, for wage laws, for regulations to secure proper work conditions, and—mark this—for laws fixing standards of work and workmen on State and Federal contracts. Should anyone ask why? As the last, the answer is:

"Like private individuals and business, the Government enjoys the unrestricted power to produce its own supplies, *to determine those with whom it will deal,* and to fix the terms and conditions upon which it will make needed purchases." (Quoting Justice Black.)

We have emphasized one phrase in italics above. Now to paraphrase: "Like the Government, private individuals and business enjoy the unrestricted power, * * *" etc., as quoted above.

Must not everyone admit that when the right of the Government is based upon the equality of right it has with private individuals and business, that private individuals and business also may "determine those with whom it will deal?"

Tne above quotation is from an opinion of the Supreme Court with a majority as at present constituted.

Need our argument go further?

Demand for 30 Percent Wage Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Mr. C. E. Wilson, president of the General Motors Corp., to which he attached copy of a letter he wrote Mr. W. P. Reuther, vice president, International Union, UAW-CIO, October 3, 1945:

GENERAL MOTORS CORP.,
Detroit, Mich., October 4, 1945.

Representative FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOYKIN: You probably have read in the public press of the demands made by the UAW-CIO for a 30-percent basic wage increase and of the position taken by General Motors with respect to these demands. This dispute is more than an ordinary collective bargaining quarrel. It is a national problem. For this reason I am enclosing copies of our letter to the union and of a public statement made through the press.

Our country faces critical problems today. The aftermath of war must be recognized. Inflationary forces are rampant in the land. The problem of getting the people of our country back to productive peacetime work must be solved.

Strikes are threatening reconversion and peacetime production. General Motors is singled out for attack. I am enclosing a copy of a Detroit newspaper dated September 14, 1945, showing this extreme position the union is taking. The monopoly power of unions is being used as a tool of aggression to promote industrial strife rather than to safeguard the rights and equities of workmen.

When the Congress passed the National Labor Relations Act to promote industrial peace, it could hardly have conceived such a development.

Great responsibility rests upon the shoulders of the men who are guiding the destinies of our Nation. Important decisions must shortly be made.

I hope this information will be helpful to you in analyzing the situation and in arriving at a sound solution of the problems our Nation confronts. If there is any additional information I can give you on this subject, please let me know.

Very truly yours,

C. E. WILSON,
President.

OCTOBER 3, 1945.

Mr. W. P. REUTHER,
Vice President,
International Union, UAW-CIO,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR SIR: We have carefully gone over the demands made by your union for 52 hours' pay for 40 hours' work. This is a 30-percent increase in basic wage costs.

Our agreement with your union before the war called for a basic work week of 40 hours with overtime premium for hours worked in

excess of 40 hours. This was not changed during the war and is still in effect. General Motors expects to follow its usual practice regarding overtime work and will operate more than 40 hours per week in plants where requirements of the customers and the availability of material make this desirable.

Work on reconversion, construction, and modernization of plants has been scheduled at 48 hours per week or more so that employees temporarily laid off can be reemployed more quickly.

Bottle-neck operations also have been working overtime to hasten car and truck production. If many of our suppliers' plants were not on strikes, which have held up needed parts and material, more of our laid-off employees would now be working.

Our electromotive plant at LaGrange, Ill., which had no important reconversion problem, but which your union has closed by strike, has been and is scheduled at 48 hours per week.

Your demands, if granted, would result in more than 67 hours' pay at present rates for 48 hours of work in plants working on such schedules.

While the guns were still smoking and the echoes from atomic bombs could still be heard, your union made these demands for excess wages on the assumption that they could be paid from past profits or from assumed future excess profits, or that they could be earned from current operations with prices frozen at substantially 1942 levels. These assumptions are not sound.

Your charge that General Motors made excessive profits during the war is not true. The average yearly net profit in dollars earned during the war was less than the average prewar net profit, although sales and employment doubled. Dividends paid to stockholders also averaged less than those paid before the war in spite of doubled sales volume, employment, and pay rolls.

General Motors cannot and will not use money saved up for many years for the purpose of modernizing and expanding its plants, and for providing more good jobs, to pay excess wages for work not performed. This money cannot be spent twice. Neither will excess wages be currently paid from presumed future excess profits when a realistic forecast of costs shows there will be no such excess profits.

Nor can we pay from current income the increased wages demanded when the present OPA policy holds prices at substantially 1942 levels, especially in view of the fact that there have been important increases in wages and operating costs since 1942.

Furthermore, there is no provision in the present OPA pricing formula for increasing prices to compensate for the additional cost that would be incurred if wages were increased at this time.

While your union states that it is against inflation, your demands are definitely inflationary and your union is responsible for trying to start an inflationary spiral of increasing wages, costs, and prices.

Inflation is the worst of all economic diseases. It reduces the value of money in terms of what money will buy. It reduces the value of the savings of the people. It undermines security. It underwrites depression. It destroys confidence. It creates unemployment.

The threat of run-away inflation really comes from three sources: First, the wartime and current deficit spending of our Government; second, the pent-up demand for goods and services to a point where some are willing to pay excess prices, even in black markets, to satisfy their impatient desires; third, the desires of selfish unions to take advantage of the situation and force unreasonable wage increases.

We shall resist the monopolistic power of your union to force this 30 percent increase in basic wages. Such an increase in our plants would soon spread to the plants of all our suppliers and would affect all elements of cost. Automobiles would shortly cost 30 percent more to produce. Prices to customers would have to be raised 30 percent. If wage raises in automobile plants forced such increases in car prices, the market for automobiles would be restricted. Fewer cars would be sold; fewer people would be able to afford and enjoy them, and fewer workers would be employed in making them.

While your union may have the power by coercion to close our plants and those of our suppliers with or without the approval of a majority of the workmen it is not clear that your union can or will live up to its agreements. The sanctity of union agreements is in question at this time. While the strike record in General Motors during the war has been better than the average, it is not too good; and we have plants in General Motors closed right now through unauthorized strikes in violation of our agreements with the CIO.

Your union is threatening to strike the entire automobile industry. General Motors has been singled out as a target, and we and our employes are to be discriminated against by your so-called labor blockade policy, in your attempt to enforce your unreasonable demands on the entire automobile industry. Some plants have already been closed, and shipments of material from the plants of many of our suppliers have already been stopped by the strikes of your union.

In the interest of all the people of our country, a sound and equitable solution must be found that will put people back into productive work and create more good jobs, thereby fulfilling the expectations of all Americans following the war. We have made sound plans and are ready to do our part in achieving this important objective. In its desire to obtain more than its share in such a future, your union is doing its best to destroy the possibilities of that future.

The clean-up, the mopping-up, the reconversion following the war still require hard work, patience, and understanding on the part of all of us. A solution for the problem must be found that is fair, not only to our 400,000 employees, but also to our 426,000 stockholders, our 15,214 automobile dealers who have had no new cars for over 3 years, to the thousands of employees of our dealers, to our more than 10,000 subcontractors and suppliers and their employees, and to the more than 10,000,000 potential customers who are eagerly waiting for new cars and other new products they need so badly.

As part of your demands you have suggested that we take the initiative and develop industry-wide bargaining with your international union. We are not in a position to do this, and do not believe that it would be a sound development for our country even if we were. Our American system and the standard of living we have achieved are based on free competition. Industry-wide bargaining tends to disregard the peculiar or local interests of many groups of employees and of individual employers, to increase costs and prices, and to affect adversely the interests of the people as a whole.

We hope we will not have strikes in General Motors. Closed plants and no business will dissipate the capital we had planned to use to create better working conditions, to increase our capacity, and to provide more good jobs.

This dispute over the wage demands of your union is more than an ordinary collective-bargaining quarrel. It is a national problem. The interests of all Americans must be considered, and if strikes are called and our plants are closed, the strikes will be against the interest of all the people of our country as much as they will be against General Motors.

For all the above reasons, we reject your unreasonable demands.

Yours very truly,

C. E. WILSON,
President.

Jew—Gentile—Arab

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor:

JEW—GENTILE—ARAB

The Jewish-Palestine problem apparently at last is to be placed where it belongs—at the door of the United Nations Organization. Great Britain, ever pressed by Zionist outcry for establishment of a national home in Palestine, has lately been troubled by a renewed American disposition to urge (but refusal to unite in) Palestinian action favorable to the Jews, despite threatening Arab resistance. And Britain is reported to have wisely determined to place the responsibility on the Allies as a whole.

Certainly compassionate and understanding, as well as just, treatment is more than due those Jewish people who managed to survive the dark years of Nazi tortures and terrors. And firm steps need to be taken to eradicate the remnants of Nazi and anti-Jewish policy still rife in Poland, Slovakia, and other areas, where Jews are denied return of their property, deprived of UNRRA assistance, and otherwise persecuted. Many have an understandable horror of being returned to former Nazi-dominated lands. This decidedly calls for United Nations action.

But the UNO cannot force social assimilation or wipe out overnight hatred, prejudices, or the effects of ingrained modes of thought. And it is questionable whether Palestine is either a solution or a big enough solution to the Jewish "problem." Jews themselves are not united in considering Palestine the ideal answer. A responsible body of American Jewish opinion seeks for Jews only "equality of rights and obligations" with their fellow nationals in all countries.

The Arabs, who claim that Palestine has belonged to them for two millenniums, are willing to assume their share of additional immigrants if other nations will do the same. However, other nations clearly are not willing. Few, if any, European countries are ready to accept additional Jewish immigrants. Australia and South American countries, while inviting other immigrants to populate their vast unused lands, have not extended the invitation to Jews. Even in the United States, which has welcomed Pole, Greek, Italian, and Armenian, and assimilated them, there are still too evident expressions of feeling against the Jewish people.

Perhaps the Jews, as well as Christians, need to give more consideration to overcoming the world beliefs which underlie this attitude. What are these beliefs, held even by some who consider themselves free from any trace of anti-Semitism?

They charge the Jew, too often, with the love of money, forgetting his acumen and industry, which begin as virtues. Complaints of Jewish clannishness have obscured an admirable devotion to family and the genuine humanity of the Jewish people. What is criticized as cunning in the Jew is frequently excused as perspicacity in others. Moreover, both these traits in no small degree have been fostered among the Jews by the necessity for survival in a persecuting world.

Yet the Jews have much to do to prove the progress of individuals as well as of their people as a whole, beyond the grasp of human qualities that would not be commendable in any people, and perhaps from their years

of torment there may be learned one thing—that the Nazi delusions about a superior race should silence claims of any racial group to be "God's chosen people."

It is time that the so-called Jewish traits were disassociated from the Jewish race, as they have been successfully in individual instances. They never were inherent in any of God's children, and found no least expression in Christianity's most beloved Jewish character, Jesus. Christians can help by realizing this truth, and by themselves refraining from un-Christian treatment of their Jewish friends and neighbors.

In the long run, what really is needed is not so much a home for the Jews as a home for Christlike qualities in the hearts and thoughts of both Jew and gentile. These are the only real solvents of the "Jewish problem."

Constitutional Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Paul Jones, Federal district judge of the district court of Cleveland:

The search for a formula upon which to base the United Nations Charter so recently overwhelmingly approved by our Senate has brought about a renewed interest in, and appraisal of, the enduring value and benefits of constitutional government. The United Nations desired a charter of basic principles for their mutual protection and security and for the peace and welfare of the whole world. This in essence is not greatly different from that which the States of North America sought and obtained in the written charter adopted by them as the Constitution of the United States. Let me read the Preamble of our Constitution in support of what just has been said and as a reminder of its principles and objectives:

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

No one seriously can doubt but that for several years before the war's end we were being influenced away from representative government in the name of expediency. It was commonly asserted that constitutional government was outmoded; that it no longer served the social advances made and to be made by the people; that modern society required more speed than could be had under the orderly procedure of constitutional law. Thus bureaus and administrative law, by orders and directives, began largely to supplant the legal processes of earlier days and officials clothed with a little brief authority, with no responsibility to the people, were issuing orders for the disobedience of which severe penalties were to be applied.

Bureaucracy is wholly inconsistent with the idea of democracy. They are entirely incompatible. Government by bureaus, commissions, and committees is considerably at variance with the true concept of representative democracy. Bureaucracy has a subtle appeal. It seems to furnish more speedy and expeditious approach to the accomplishment of the governmental purpose than the slower methods of the democratic process. But bureaucracy grows by what it feeds on until its tentacles reach out into every phase of the citizens' life. It is a creeping paralysis which will, unless checked, destroy individual rights, and, as well, all sense of individual responsibility. The ultimate end will be the state in control of the people, rather than the people in control of the state as is provided by constitutional government. This is reactionary and leads to despotism.

You cannot make democracy work by resort to bureaucratic methods. Government by administrative or Executive order is not representative democracy. It is just plain dictatorship. It is a demonstrable fact that people of countries with the least interference in the private rights of the people by the state enjoy the greatest measure of the good things of life.

Nor should we be misled by proposals and promises of high-sounding virtue for the security of all from the cradle to the grave. It has been demonstrated in the world's history that human beings will not long endure hardships or make sustained effort for themselves if their sense of security is adequately fortified by a beneficent state. We do not want financial dependency upon government. We want government dependent upon us.

All of this regimentation, regulation, and so-called planned economy was not to be impeded by mere constitutional limitations. It was asserted in its support that the emergency required it even though the law did not allow it. During those years prior to the war and during the war this Constitution of ours withstood its greatest trial. No greater assault ever was made upon the integrity of its enduring principles than in those prewar years; but it has emerged triumphant, and despite some comment to the contrary, there has come with peace a definite trend and reaction toward constitutional government.

What is constitutional government as we understand it and under which we as a society of free people have prospered to a greater extent than any other nation on earth? The Constitution is not an inflexible and rigid set of rules. It is the embodiment of principles evolved out of man's long struggle for individual freedom. It has never been suggested that the Constitution has brought on any wars or revolutions or depressions. It has not been suggested that the Constitution has provided for any advantage of capital over labor, or for the reverse. It has not been suggested that the Constitution has provided for or permitted the exploitation of any group or race. The fact is that, fairly interpreted, the opposite is true. The Constitution is the guaranty that this shall not happen. It has proved adequate for any emergency, either through application of its existing provisions or when implemented by legislation as provided. It has been in the past adapted to the various crises of human affairs and adjusted to imperative national needs as they arose.

Constitutional government spells the American way of life—time and experience have shown that it holds forth the greatest hope for the benefit and welfare of liberty-loving people; the rule of the people through their chosen representatives; the rule of law and not the rule of men. No thoughtful man is opposed to change or fails to see or sense the need for improvement in the understanding of and provision for conditions requiring expanded constitutional service to the people, but such changes should come through considered amendment of the Constitution to meet such conditions and in the manner provided by the Constitution itself and not by the will or the mandate of the person or administration temporarily in power. Those who drafted the Constitution understood the probability of needed change and wisely made orderly provision for amendment so that the people might in future times further secure their rights, privileges, and liberties. They knew and understood man's long struggle for freedom from oppression not only by powerful foreign states but by the ambitious and greedy within our own society. They knew and understood that plausible men seeking to gain even sometimes laudable ends might take the shortest way, justifying the method in view of the asserted merit of the proposed objective; that inherent prejudice and zealous partisanship sometimes were mistaken for a sense of justice; that superficial mental gymnastics sometimes were substituted for sound legal reason. It was to preserve the rights and liberties of the people that the framers of the Constitution made provision against those and other types of attack or impairment. Thus they established what might popularly be called a representative democracy of limited powers and later made the reservation that powers not delegated to the Central Government were to reside in the several States or in the people. The three branches were to coordinate and check and balance each other as against excessive use of power or the abuse of it. Certainly the accomplishment of our country in resisting and overcoming the forces of destruction is the most outstanding test and argument for the kind of society which has developed under our type of constitutional government.

Unless all hope and prophecy for a better world are futile; unless all faith in man's capacity for self-government is without substance; unless man's aspirations for individual freedom cannot be reconciled with life in the world that is left after the war, our returning, victorious soldiers will have something to say about individual freedom under constitutional guaranties, for their eyes have seen the fearful horror let lose by the bare will of individuals responsible neither to law of God nor man, lusting for power and conquest under the pretense of need for a new world order. Just as we needed all-out unity for the successful prosecution of the war, so we shall need continuing unity for the preservation of constitutional freedom and order now that peace has come.

While no one can look into the seeds of time and say which way and what our growth will be, yet I entertain the justified hope and confidence that this ghastly baptism of fire through which we have passed, this great sacrificial duty performed for the world and for ourselves cannot help but leave its influence upon those of present and succeeding generations who shall give voice, service, and direction to the future greatness of a free people under a Constitution still virile and still the best hope of mankind.

Taxes Paid by Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
REFERENCE DEPARTMENT,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, September 7, 1945.

Hon. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FARRINGTON: This is in response to your request for a statement of the relative position of Hawaii and the various States

with respect to internal revenue collections during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945. We enclose two tables; one shows total collections and the other shows per capita collections in Hawaii, the several States, the District of Columbia, and Alaska.

Total collections of internal revenue in Hawaii increased more rapidly between 1944 and 1945 than collections in all States and Territories combined, the percentage of increase between 1944 and 1945 being 15.4 (Hawaii) and 9.2 (total).

The total internal revenue collected in Hawaii exceeded that collected in 14 States during the fiscal year 1945. The States are: Arizona, Arkansas, Idaho, Maine, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, and Wyoming. These States had also provided less revenue than that provided by Hawaii in fiscal 1944.

As shown in one of the tables attached, per capita collections of internal revenue in Hawaii were greater than per capita collections in 39 States (81.25 percent of all States) during 1945. Hawaii's rank was higher during 1945 than during 1944; in the earlier year per capita collections had been larger in Hawaii than in 36 States.

The States in which per capita collections were smaller than in Hawaii are: Alabama, Arizona,* Arkansas,* Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho,* Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine,* Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi,* Missouri, Montana,* Nebraska, Nevada,* New Hampshire,* New Jersey, New Mexico,* North Carolina, North Dakota,* Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota,* Tennessee, Texas, Utah,* Vermont,* Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.* Of the States in the list for 1945, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Rhode Island are new; collections of internal revenues in those States were larger per capita in 1944, but smaller in 1945, than in Hawaii. (An asterisk indicates that both total and per capita collections were smaller in the States than in Hawaii.)

Very truly yours,

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,
Director, Legislative Reference Service.

Total collections of internal revenue by the United States in each State, the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and the District of Columbia

FISCAL YEAR OF 1945

States and Territories:	*Total internal revenue collections*
Alabama	$253,910,581
Arizona	71,282,175
Arkansas	98,538,418
California	3,722,459,220
Colorado	226,947,256
Connecticut	875,705,289
Delaware	466,299,089
Florida	384,764,377
Georgia	418,996,774
Idaho	59,805,444
Illinois	3,766,335,176
Indiana	943,139,224
Iowa	321,171,180
Kansas	423,925,766
Kentucky	698,954,574
Louisiana	350,546,549
Maine	150,087,933
Maryland	848,696,129
Massachusetts	1,490,938,452
Michigan	2,579,823,895
Minnesota	651,966,415
Mississippi	91,060,203
Missouri	1,146,082,236
Montana	61,653,137
Nebraska	245,214,598
Nevada	33,862,404
New Hampshire	81,153,496
New Jersey	1,439,127,166
New Mexico	$37,685,763
New York	8,261,525,191
North Carolina	874,983,615
North Dakota	41,473,970
Ohio	3,055,951,071
Oklahoma	307,278,299
Oregon	318,918,695
Pennsylvania	3,712,318,582
Rhode Island	246,342,330
South Carolina	181,578,036
South Dakota	37,981,520
Tennessee	335,249,947
Texas	1,152,529,149
Utah	84,635,031
Vermont	52,495,261
Virginia	823,090,896
Washington	625,823,377
West Virginia	191,324,618
Wisconsin	916,168,247
Wyoming	29,410,348
Alaska	19,862,709
District of Columbia	415,128,315
Hawaii	173,999,227

Source: U. S. Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Per capita collections of internal revenue by the United States in each State, the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and the District of Columbia

FISCAL YEAR 1945

States and Territories:	*Per capita internal-revenue collections*
Alabama	$90
Arizona	112
Arkansas	56
California	426
Colorado	198
Connecticut	493
Delaware	1,643
Florida	163
Georgia	130
Idaho	113
Illinois	487
Indiana	276
Iowa	142
Kansas	239
Kentucky	266
Louisiana	138
Maine	189
Maryland	399
Massachusetts	358
Michigan	475
Minnesota	260
Mississippi	42
Missouri	319
Montana	133
Nebraska	202
Nevada	217
New Hampshire	178
New Jersey	345
New Mexico	71
New York	654
North Carolina	248
North Dakota	79
Ohio	447
Oklahoma	149
Oregon	263
Pennsylvania	402
Rhode Island	316
South Carolina	94
South Dakota	68
Tennessee	117
Texas	168
Utah	140
Vermont	169
Virginia	257
Washington	305
West Virginia	112
Wisconsin	308
Wyoming	114
Alaska	323
District of Columbia	448
Hawaii	360

Source: U. S. Bureau of Internal Revenue report on internal-revenue collections. Released Aug. 20, 1945.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a statement on Concurrent Resolution 95.

The President, desiring first-hand information on the state of the Hebrew people in Europe, dispatched an unbiased, competent observer to report to him. Thanks to this report and the prompt action of the President, conditions in these camps are now improved.

The Harrison report, however, went further. It pointed out the impossible position of the Hebrew people in Europe, expressed their overwhelming desire to go to Palestine, and recommended that they be taken there.

The first part of this report has been proved correct and the Army has taken action to remedy the conditions described. But will we have done full justice to a people that suffered most in our common war against the Axis by merely painting the walls of their concentration camps? Have we not a moral and legal obligation to help the Hebrew people in Europe to achieve a normal, productive existence in the land that is theirs?

A previous Congress—the sixty-seventh—unanimously declared its determination that Palestine should be restored as the homeland of the Hebrew people. Let this Congress, with equal humanity and equal unanimity, reaffirm this just determination. I urge this Congress to approve the Concurrent Resolution 95, urging the Executive to initiate steps to effectuate the immediate transfer of the Hebrew people from the concentration camps of Europe to the freedom of their homeland, Palestine.

An America Firster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, coming through the park in front of the Capitol on my way to the office this morning, I met four clean, intelligent-looking teenage Americans carrying small hand satchels. Thoughtlessly, I asked, "What is it, boys—basketball or football?" The youngest, just 18, with a twisted grin, answered, "I wish it was, but it's the Army for us."

Thousands like them, just rotting flesh and shattered bone, lie scattered throughout the world and, while conscription continues, hundreds of thousands of others, if some folks have their

way, will be sent to foreign lands to take over the tasks which the people of other nations should do for themselves.

Whether Churchill and Roosevelt planned to get into this war; whether we went into it because of a justifiable threat of an invasion; whether it was necessary for our own safety to aid Britain and Russia; whether we went in to carry the "four freedoms" to all the world; or whether we were pushed in by warmongers greedy for profits, or internationalists dreaming of a world peace, is at the moment not discussed.

Whatever may have been the reason, America went in. Billions of dollars and millions of tons of supplies were furnished. More than 12,000,000 young Americans sacrificed from 1 to 4 years of their lives. More than 1,070,000 young Americans suffered wounds or death.

The fighting is over, but neither the contribution of America's dollars, material or men has ceased. Conscription is still in force. Whatever America gained out of this war, you can figure as well as I. Already, future wars are in the making, we are told by General Patton and Chief of Staff General Marshall. We are being asked to send an armed force to join the British in opening Palestine. Our soldiers will be required to assist one faction in civil strife in China. It is hinted that a war with Russia is in the cards.

Are we to forever police the world; feed and clothe and set up in business the people of every nation which comes knocking at our door? Are we always to draft American boys to leave their homes, suspend their education, and spend a year, or 5 years, in foreign countries? If the internationalists, who take no part in the fighting, make no worthwhile sacrifice, have their way, that is just what we will do.

This brings me to the cause of the present outburst.

After Churchill forgot that he promised that Britain would do the job if we would furnish the tools and called upon us for millions of young, vigorous, life-loving American fighting men, Britain had the ships to transport them; to carry them across to the battlefields; but, now that the war is over, she refuses to let us use her ships to bring them home.

Today, the fighting over, thousands of Americans, waiting anxiously to return to their wives, their mothers, their homes—homesick boys—cannot get back because of a lack of ships.

This morning we learn that the *Queen Elizabeth*, capable of carrying 15,000 soldiers at a trip; the *Aquitania*, able to carry 8,500 men to America, have been repossessed by the British: can no longer be used by us; that your sons and husbands—23,500 of them—who expected to come to America on the return voyage of these two ships, must wait until shipping is available.

Plenty of ships to carry your sons and husbands to fight and perhaps to die, but none available to bring them home, because Britain wants to use them for the transportation of her own people, for the furtherance of her own trade interests. And to add to the delay, strikers in London and New York refuse to unload ships which might be used for the trip home. Put yourself in the place of the boy waiting on the dock.

The question I am asking you wives and mothers is this: Is it not about time that we begin, not only to think of, but to act in the interests of, America's sons and daughters?

I am an America Firster. I always have been; I hope I always will be, and if perchance St. Peter, if and when I meet him, asks me who I am and where I am from, my answer will be "an America Firster from the United States of America."

It is my hope that the "pinks" and the Reds, the internationalists, who have had altogether too much to say about the policy of our country, will now be thrown out of the Federal Government, and those who believe in our country, in our form of government, permitted to direct and guide her destiny.

Why Continue to Appease Falangist Fascism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, one of the leading dailies in my home State of Washington is the Seattle Star, published by the genial and very able Howard Parish, and edited by Cliff Harrison, one of the Nation's outstanding journalists. In a recent issue there appeared an editorial in which that newspaper summed up the situation with respect to Spain and Argentina and urged the imposition of economic sanctions. The editorial further points out that it is absurd that the United States and Great Britain should continue to foster and encourage the prolongation of power of the two loud-sounding and braying flunkies of the discredited Axis strutting mountebanks, Herren Hitler and Mussolini. The editorial is as follows:

OUR MILD AID TO LIBERTY

A few days ago an estimated 250,000 people in Buenos Aires joined in a demonstration for freedom and against the Argentine military dictatorship which, by restrictions, threats, and violence, maintains itself in power. Political and social differences were forgotten as marchers pledged their continuing support of the constitution and shouted "Death to Peron!"

On the same day a story from Washington said that wartime economic sanctions imposed by this country and Britain were up for review, and might be eased or abandoned.

The governments of these two dictator countries need coal and oil. They didn't get much of either during the war. Both items were scarce. There was little for export, and the bulk of whatever surplus there was logically went to friendly countries.

Now, though coal is still in short supply, oil is reasonably abundant. There seems to be no economic reason why increased shipments could not be made to the two countries. In fact, a good excuse could probably be found for doing so in Argentina's case, since our oil exports are being exchanged there for flaxseed and linseed oils, which are much needed here.

But there are urgent moral reasons why these curbs should be continued. Any relaxation would surely be interpreted by Franco and Peron, and by their countrymen who oppose them, as indicating a softer Anglo-American attitude. It would strengthen the dictators' hands. It would prolong the ordeal of freedom-loving people under their rule.

The situation in Spain and Argentina mocks the great military victory which the United States and Great Britain, with their allies, have won over dictatorship and tyranny. And it is a situation that has been fostered by the general mildness of British and American policy.

It may be hoped that these two powers will not take new steps to prolong the power of two pompous proteges of the defunct Axis. The resistance by Franco's opponents in and out of Spain, though nearly crushed, has not died. The wishes of the Argentine people are unmistakable. It would be a shame if we and Britain should now withhold the mild aid of limited economic sanctions from these people in their fight for liberty.

Statehood for Territories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jacksonville (Fla.) Journal of August 27, 1945:

STATEHOOD FOR TERRITORIES

Florida, in observing the one hundredth anniversary of its becoming a State, might well pause to give thought to two United States Territories which have made major contributions to the winning of this war, and which stand today where Floridians stood a century ago. Both Hawaii and Alaska have played major roles in this crisis, standing as bulwarks in the defense of the continental part of our Nation. Neither has ever had or wanted an independent national existence. Statehood is definitely in the cards for both.

One of the obstacles which has stood in Hawaii's path to statehood has been the large proportion of its population which consists of Americans of Japanese ancestry. But Riley H. Allen, editor of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, and a keen observer of Hawaiian life for a quarter of a century, shows dramatically how this picture has been put in a new light by the war.

"The two great changes have come about as a result of World War II," he says. "First, the Americans of Japanese ancestry have made so fine a record in combat and in other wartime duties that it has become a matter of national recognition. Our One Hundredth Infantry Battalion and our Four Hundred and Twenty-second Infantry Regiment—both of which are organizations almost entirely of Americans of Japanese ancestry, principally from Hawaii—were among the very best fighting in the European theater, and the One Hundredth Infantry Battalion has been called the most decorated unit in the American Army. The loyalty of these young Americans, and their readiness to face the enemy—not only in Europe but members of their own race, our Japanese enemy—have been well demonstrated.

"Second, the very large influx of war workers from the mainland has drastically

changed the population situation here. Our population growth shows a greater increase in Caucasians than of any other race, and the percentage of our population of Japanese blood is dropping noticeably in the scale. These two things—separately and together—tend to remove the fear that should this become a state the predominant political influence will be Japanese and will be exercised racially."

Hawaii has highly developed wealth and resources, a high quality of public education, and makes a greater tax contribution to the Federal Government than some States. It has a long tradition of democratic government.

Alaska, with its huge undeveloped natural resources, is opening up as a new land of opportunity and an inviting frontier for the young and enterprising. It is expected that large numbers of veterans will seek their postwar fortunes there. Statehood would greatly aid in the full development of this rich land.

Both Hawaii and Alaska are in fact today full-fledged partners in these United States. A prompt granting of statehood to them would be no more than recognition of that fact. There are considerable movements already started to do this in the coming session of Congress. The 48 present States should wish well to these movements, and look forward to an early welcome to two new sister States.

Polish Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very pertinent and interesting letter and excerpt indicating continued injustice against the gallant Polish people:

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
New York, October 8, 1945.

Hon. PHILIP JOSEPH PHILBIN,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: On September 25 we forwarded to you a resolution adopted at a meeting of 5,000 members of the Polish American Congress held at Manhattan Center in New York on September 23 of this year.

This resolution stated in part that we "demand the Congress of the United States to investigate officially: (1) the true situation of displaced persons from Russian-occupied countries." The enclosed clipping of the New York Times of October 5, refers only to displaced persons in American-occupied territory, and we are pleased to see that our principal commander in Europe has temporarily refused to send these persons against their will to another form of slavery.

Since his decision is only temporary, we again request of you in behalf of all Americans of Polish birth or descent in downstate New York, that you exert every effort so that our Government will protect these displaced persons from being forced into all the horrors of Communist dictatorship.

Thanking you for your interest and cooperation and asking for the favor of a reply, we are,

Very truly yours,

FRANCIS J. WAZETER,
President.

RUSSIA WOULD TAKE BIG PLANTS IN REICH—WANTS ALL OR MOST OF MACHINERY OF OPEL, OWNED BY GENERAL MOTORS, AND I. G. FARBEN—REPARATION PACT IS CITED—SOVIET ALSO SAYS POLES ARE "RUSSIAN" FOR PURPOSE OF FORCED REPATRIATION

(By Herbert L. Matthews)

LONDON, October 4.—Russia is demanding as part of her share of western Germany's reparations the Opel Motors Works plant, which used to be owned mainly by General Motors, and I. G. Farben, the chemical and dye trust that Senator HARLEY KILGORE claims is being groomed for the export trade, according to reports here which came from high foreign sources.

It is not that the Russians want to run these and several other internationally known industries, but they are reported to want all or most of the machinery and plants involved. One thing is certain and that is that Russian reparations demands over western Germany are arousing much friction with Britain and America.

It will be recalled that the Soviet Union under the Potsdam agreement receives "15 percent of such usable and complete industrial capital equipment in the first place from metallurgical, chemical, and machine manufacturing industries as is unnecessary for German peace economy" and "10 percent of such industrial capital equipment as is unnecessary for German peace economy."

RUSSIA ASKS FOR THE BEST

Both are to be removed from western zones of Germany. No break-down into details was made at Potsdam, so Russia is entirely within her rights in asking for what she pleases and naturally she is asking for the best, so that 10 or 15 percent quantitatively could be far more than that qualitatively.

The Opel works were not destroyed by bombing during the war and RAF pilots used to say that was because it was owned by General Motors. At any rate, this whole question of what constitutes reparations and what constitutes restitution was one of the hard-fought problems at the Council of Foreign Ministers just ended, and it was incidentally one of very few subjects upon which genuine progress was made.

The French led the fight, for they found that much industrial machinery that the Germans had plundered from France and set up in Germany were being taken away by the Russians as German reparations. In several keenly argued sessions, adequate definitions were drawn up, and Foreign Commissar Vyacheslaff Molotov gave assurances they would be respected.

QUESTION FOR REPARATIONS BODY

However, the break-down of the Council meeting meant, as Mr. Molotov flatly said in his press conference, that there were no decisions taken in London and that nothing that had been done was binding. That does not means Russia will go on seizing industrial plants partly owned by France, Britain, and the United States, but it is true that the whole question is thrown back on the Allied Commission on Reparations, which is under the Allied Control Council in Berlin.

So far as repatriation of Soviet nationals from outside the Russian zone is concerned the failure of the Council of Foreign Ministers to reach any agreement on the matter had its first fruit today in an attack by Col. Gen. F. I. Golikov, head of the Soviet organization dealing with reparations, who attacked the Allies today in a Pravda article that was broadcast.

"Organizations in the British, American, and French zones whose attitude is hostile to the Soviet Union are trying by every means to prevent us from repatriating Soviet people," General Golikov writes. "They are terrorizing and deceiving our people and spreading various slanders against our country."

The difficulty at the Foreign Ministers' Council was to answer the seemingly simple question, "Who is a Russian?" Mr. Molotov claimed that any person who lived in territory now claimed by the Russians, including Lithuanians, Estonians, Latvians, and Poles were Russian and should be repatriated by force if necessary. Britain, France, and the United States held that such people should have the right to choose their citizenship. No agreement was reached.

Echoes of the Council of Foreign Ministers are still being heard in London, although Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin along among the Big Five has refused to make any public pronouncement. He is saving that for Parliament, which reopens Tuesday. However, he gave his cabinet colleagues a survey of what happened at the cabinet meeting this morning.

Support for United States Secretary of State James F. Byrnes' compromise proposal for Big Three preliminary discussions, followed by a general peace conference, came today from the Australian Minister for External Affairs, Dr. Herbert V. Evatt, who issued a statement to that effect. He feels that the failure of the Council meeting was "by no means an irreparable setback," but he claimed that, being an extension into the postwar period of the Big Three arrangement of the war, it proved "almost unworkable."

"No one contests that the three great powers must take the leadership in the peace making," Dr. Evatt continued. "What was not fully demonstrated at the Potsdam meeting but has been demonstrated at the Council meeting is that the participation of other belligerents with the Three Powers is also indispensable to the peace making."

The five great powers, he said, "have no standing or functions in the new world organization except as members of a Security Council of 11 members," and he concluded by repeating Mr. Byrnes' proposal in slightly different form, pointing out that the United States and Britain had accepted the idea of a large conference of the five great powers plus other belligerents. "I believe that it will turn out to be acceptable to Russia also," he concluded.

Later, in answer to questions, he said that Eire as a neutral country should be excluded from the peace conference.

In connection with the Council of Foreign Ministers there is another report going around that comes from high quarters but needs checking. It is that Russia, both at San Francisco and here, suggested to the United States and Britain that the surest way to maintain peace in coming years was to have a binding military alliance among the Big Three committed to policing the world the way the Security Council's armed force is supposed to do for the United Nations Organization later on.

This at least would be consistent with the policy that Mr. Molotov pursued here of reducing the peace making to the Big Three.

UNITED STATES UPSETS YALTA TO PROTECT SOLDIERS

FRANKFORT ON THE MAIN, GERMANY, October 4.—Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, in an order amounting to temporary abrogation of one phase of the Yalta agreement, has instructed that American troops discontinue forcing Russian nationals to return home unless the United States Government rules otherwise.

The existence of the order, affecting 26,400 Russians still in the American zone of Germany, was disclosed today by commanders of displaced-persons camps. Questioned on reports that troops had fired over the heads or near the feet of some Russians to compel

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

them to board Soviet-bound trains, one officer said:

"Possibly for a time some of them were being pushed onto trains without our asking many questions, but that's all stopped now."

Many of those left in Germany have threatened to commit suicide if forced to go home, he added, and "we are not eager to risk the lives of American soldiers trying to make them go." He explained that some of the Russians might have hidden arms.

He described General Eisenhower's order as a "temporary abrogation of the Yalta agreement until Washington says specifically whether American troops must be used to make these people go back where they don't want to go."

The Big Three at Yalta agreed to expedite the repatriation of each other's nationals.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a telegram I have received from Jewish organizations in Chelsea, Mass.:

CHELSEA, MASS., *October 16, 1945.*
Congressman THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

In harmony with Jewry throughout the United States of America and other lands, our Congregation Agudath Sholom, of Chelsea, Mass., and its affiliated organizations has congregated to protest the British policy in regards to Palestine. We hereby bring to our beloved leader the sentiment and request of our people that we should intercede in behalf of transplanting the remnant of suffering Israel from the soil that absorbed the blood of the millions of their martyred brethren to their ancient homeland of Palestine.

MORRIS WOLPER, *President;*
Rabbi GERSHON ROMONOFF;
Mrs. IDA KRENTZMAN,
President Ladies' Auxiliary;
FRANK KLIGMAN,
President Brotherhood.

National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address I delivered over CBS on October 13, 1945:

National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week is being observed through the United States, first as an observance of the outstanding achievements of our handicapped people, second as a period of awakening for the whole country to our obligation and opportunity to open to disabled and handicapped people constructive employment and a chance to contribute to the Nation's welfare.

One need only mention such names as Beethoven, Milton, and Steinmetz to realize in how many cases in history people suffering from handicaps of one kind or another have not only overcome those handicaps but have actually used them as stepping stones to the achievement of true greatness.

Sometimes we think of handicapped people as different from others. This is wrong. What handicapped people want is the same thing everyone else wants, namely, to live like other people, to have worth-while jobs, to care for their families, and help build their country. It is primarily to make these facts clear that National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week was instituted by act of Congress.

I am proud to have been the author of the bill which set this week aside for these purposes.

In order to give the radio audience a clear conception of what the purposes of this week are I should like to read in full the proclamation issued by the President of the United States in connection therewith:

"Whereas the people of this Nation are determined to foster an environment in which those of their fellow citizens who have become physically handicapped can continue to make their rightful contribution to the work of the world and can continue to enjoy the opportunities and rewards of that work; and

"Whereas Public Resolution No. 176, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 11, 1945, provides in part:

" 'That hereafter the first week in October of each year shall be designated as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. During said week, appropriate ceremonies are to be held throughout the Nation, the purpose of which will be to enlist public support for and interest in the employment of otherwise qualified but physically handicapped workers':

"Now, therefore, I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, do hereby call upon the people of the United States to observe the week of October 7–13, 1945, as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. I ask the governors of States, mayors of cities, heads of the various agencies of the Government, and other public officials, as well as leaders in industry, education, religion, and every other aspect of our common life, during this week and at all other suitable times, to exercise every appropriate effort to enlist public support of a sustained program for the employment and development of the abilities and capacities of those who are physically handicapped."

It is altogether fitting and proper that this radio program should have been sponsored by the Disabled American Veterans for not only has this organization been at the very forefront in the task of seeing justice done to the men who have become disabled in the defense of their Nation against foreign enemies, but it has also done an outstanding job in bringing to the attention of the Nation the debt which it owes to all handicapped and disabled people. One of the finest programs that I know of aimed to enable returning veterans to take a worth-while hold on civilian life again is the program of the Disabled American Veterans whereby groups of veterans have been and are being trained in some of the colleges and universities of this country, notably at American University here in Washington, to become service officers of the DAV, and thus to dedicate their lives to helping to meet the needs of their other disabled comrades.

At the outset we may as well recognize that some actual barriers to the employment of disabled and handicapped people are today in existence. A part of the task of those of us who desire to open the way for our handicapped fellow citizens is to remove those barriers. One of these barriers is the fear of employers that under the Workmen's Compensation laws, if a disabled or handicapped person is employed and later becomes injured on the job, the public or private insurance fund which covers that employer's workers will be liable for excessive payments. As a matter of fact, as I shall show later, the accident rate among employed handicapped people is actually lower than among others. But in order to remove any possible obstacle, at least so far as disabled veterans are concerned, I offered an amendment suggested by the DAV to the GI bill of rights, which I have also introduced as a bill in the present Congress. It reads as follows:

"The purpose of rehabilitation is to restore employability lost by virtue of a material and permanent handicap due to service-incurred disability. The Administrator shall have the power and duty to cooperate with and employ the facilities of other governmental and State employment agencies for the purpose of placing service-connected disabled veterans in suitable gainful employment.

"To remove the prejudice against employment of honorably discharged veterans, having 10 percent or more service-connected disability, and to aid in securing employment of such veterans, where an injury or death of such veteran is incurred under such circumstances as to result in payment of benefits under State employees' compensation laws or by recovery from or settlement with or on behalf of the employer, the Administrator of Veterans Affairs shall reimburse the insurer or the fund from which such payment is made to the extent of the net loss suffered by such insurer or fund."

Such a measure has been on the statute books of Canada ever since very shortly after World War I. Were we to place such a measure on our statute books there would be not only no barrier against the employment of disabled veterans, but a positive inducement to their employment because there could be no losses either to the employer or to the compensation fund as a result thereof.

Before I go further with this broadcast I wish to make it clear that while it was Congress which passed the law to create National Physically Handicapped Week, and the President who signed the Proclamation officially designating it, the major credit for this accomplishment should go to the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped and the indefatigable work done by its president, Mr. Paul Strachan; and to the Disabled American Veterans and its outstandingly capable and devoted legislative representative in Washington, Mr. Millard Rice. Without the support of these two organizations and without the hard work done by these two men, it is altogether possible that National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week might never have become a reality.

It is quite impossible for me to acknowledge on this program the contribution of all the organizations, public and private, of the armed forces and the civilian governmental agencies, the employers, the labor organizations, and the civic groups which are today making so fine a contribution to the solution of this problem. I cannot refrain, however, from mentioning the splendid work being done by a House subcommittee under the chairmanship of Congressman AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, of Pennsylvania, which committee will in my judgement before it has completed its work be prepared to present to the nation a comprehensive picture of the whole problem of all our handicapped people and means toward its solution.

The Disabled American Veterans have estimated that there are some 400,000 service-connected disabled veterans of World War I,

and that there will be as many as two and one-half million disabled veterans of World War II. To these we owe a greater debt than to any other group of our citizens. Indeed in my view we owe them a debt prior to and superior to any we owe on war bonds or in any other direction. But the Disabled American Veterans itself has pointed out that it is not only to the men and women disabled in war that we have an obligation. For this organization composed entirely of disabled veterans has pointed out that without the outstanding contribution of physically handicapped workers in the mills and factories of our country, America's war production would have lagged substantially behind the high level which it achieved. In an official release prepared for use in connection with National Physically Handicapped Week, the Disabled American Veterans has brought together the most significant testimony to show how nearly impossible it would have been for us to have successfully prosecuted the war itself if we had not been able to tap the resources of skill and ability to be found among blind, deaf, and other handicapped people among our population.

The DAV cites, for example, a survey conducted by the United States Office of Education which sent questionnaires to somewhat over a hundred employers consisting of a cross section of American industry. Here is what that survey showed:

Out of 97 employees reporting on absenteeism, 53 found there was less absenteeism among handicapped people than there was among other people. Thirty-nine said it was the same for both groups, and only five reported that absenteeism was more among the handicapped.

With regard to the accident rate, which is most important, out of 87 employers reporting on this subject, 49 found the accident rate was lower among the handicapped, 36 said it was the same for both groups, and only 2 reported a higher accident rate for the handicapped than for those who did not have handicaps.

On the question of productivity, 105 employers answered that question. Twenty-five found that the output of the handicapped people was actually greater than that of the others. Sixty-nine reported that there was no difference between the two groups, and only 11 reported that it was lower among the handicapped.

In other words, the evidence is convincing that the handicapped people of the United States have produced as much or more per person than other people have been able to do. We have instances in connection with the war effort of the Nation where, for example, a certain company hired blind people after a little experimentation to do an inspection job and found that those blind people did this particular type of work better than sighted people had been able to do it.

In other instances we have whole departments of corporations which have been staffed entirely by people who are deaf, where it was found that those people could do that job better than others were able to do it.

It is not enough to provide compensation for disabled veterans or support for other handicapped people. It will not even be enough for Congress to pass legislation for dependents' allowances for disabled veterans though this should have been done long ago. Our handicapped people have earned the right not only to rehabilitation, training, and help but to honest-to-goodness jobs. Some have earned this through service in the armed forces where their disabilities have been incurred in defense of their Nation, others by the fine production record of many of their number during the war. The only way we shall be able to make good on our obligations to them is by united national effort. Those employers and those labor organizations which have gone out of their way to open job opportunities to handicapped people are entitled to the thanks and gratitude of the whole Nation. May their tribe increase, as I believe in time it will. But I hope most earnestly that every one of us will observe this week not only with word of mouth but also in our acts and in our hearts and that there will go out through this Nation, over the radio, in the press, and through the observances carried on in the communities of the country, a message to the disabled veterans and to the other handicapped people which will be a message of hope.

Demobilization Too Slow for Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning comes a letter, no doubt similar to many received by other Members, excerpts from which are as follows:

Now I have been relying on the point system for my release, and I feel that since you are the people's representative of your respective State, that it is your duty therefore to represent them and their interests in our National Government. There are thousands of soldiers here in the States, of which I am one, who feel this is not being done.

Now, if this letter so far has misled you to think that it is a letter of individual complaint, then let me assure you that it is not. The Army's current point system meets with our approval in many respects, but there is definitely something seriously wrong with speed in which Army personnel are being discharged by it. Let me state you a few facts that you may or may not know are existing in camps and air bases throughout the country. Those conditions are serious and definitely calls for some probing and investigation and, last but not least, some noticeable changes. We have been in three different bases from the north, and west coast, to our present location here in South Carolina, and a number of the men here concerned with this letter are and have been eligible for discharge for some time, while some are in my category of sixty-some-odd points. We have all been overseas for a period of time ranging from 4 months to 2½ years. I personally have 2 years overseas and 3 years in the service.

These men now eligible for release are being forced to wait for several more weeks before they will even be called for from their respective separation centers. Eighty- and ninety-point men are still going gradually through these centers and because of that slowness are holding up thousands of men with points ranging from 70 to 79 from being sent to and separated from these centers. These men know not when they will finally get out. They have no specified date to look forward to. It may and could very easily run into sometime in 1946.

Next month, November 1, the points I understand are supposed to drop to 60, enabling men in that class with 60 or more points to be discharged. It stands to reason at this rate a man with 63 points will not get out in November or December or January, but more than likely November of the following year.

We have absolutely no duties to perform here, and have done nothing since we reported back from our 30-day leaves. There is nothing to do. We are no longer needed in this group, field, or any other field. There is no necessity of our being forced to remain in the service doing nothing but bunk fatigue, when most all of us could be home with our families, wives, and jobs. Certainly we are all anxious to get out, but at the rate we are being released, it would be as well if we, each and every one, signed up for another 3 years. The war is over, Mr. Hoffman. There is certainly no excuse for making thousands of men suffer now, to enable some high-ranking officers to retain their present rank. It is imperative that these conditions be changed and that we be released on a much larger scale, if a serious national military situation is not desired. I am requesting you to see that there is immediate action taken to remedy these circumstances immediately.

The undersigned are the names of men who will verify all that I have written and whose desires and interest are the same as my own. We are sincerely expecting at least some consideration.

H. R. 3615

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in connection with the captioned bill, I wish to submit to the House a telegram I have received from Hon. James H. Davis, Governor of the State of Louisiana, which telegram I think is self-explanatory.

The telegram is as follows:

BATON ROUGE, LA., *October 16, 1945.*
Hon. HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr.,
House Office Building:

I am in favor of the adoption by House of Representatives HOWELL'S amendment to House Resolution 3615 and any other House legislation establishing national system of airports whereby Federal authorities would deal with the State instead of directly with local subdivisions, as this will enable our department of public works with its planning division to more adequately supervise and plan the proper construction of any new system of airports. You will recall that the Senate bill was amended in the Senate to make such provision. Your assistance and support in this respect would be greatly appreciated.

JAMES H. DAVIS,
Governor of Louisiana.

Secretary of War Robert Patterson Favors Single Department of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 17, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson before Senate Military Affairs Committee October 17, 1945:

INTRODUCTION

The subject matter of the proposed legislation, the unification of our armed forces,

is of prime importance to the people of the United States.

The maintenance of the future peace of the world will depend on the attitude and policies of the United States in world affairs, and also upon the measure of strength which the United States continues in the future to retain in order to lend vitality to those policies. Our people's undoubted desire is for a world at lasting peace. But their mere urge for peace will have no significance in a world that is conscious of power, without a ready and effective strength with which to back up that urge. The providing of that strength should be the keystone of our national policy.

After every great war, we see a popular revulsion. The inclination of the American people now is to blot out and forget the horror and brutality and privation of World War II. But we who have directly laid upon us the responsibility for the future security of our country cannot run away from that responsibility. We must constantly give our best thought and our unremitting effort to safeguarding the peace which has again been restored to the world.

POSITION OF THE SECRETARY OF WAR

In my opinion, the unification of our armed forces is an essential step in the development of a sound program for the future security of the American people. The adoption of such a system of organization of our armed forces is best calculated to maintain that security and the continuation of world peace. As Secretary of War, I wish to place on record my earnest advocacy of the principle of unification of the armed forces.

This position is not a new one on my part. I have consistently advocated a consolidation of the War Department and the Navy Department into one team. In April 1944, the Select Committee of the House of Representatives on Postwar Military Policy, generally referred to as the Woodrum committee, held hearings on proposals to establish a single department of the armed forces. At those hearings, I had occasion, as Under Secretary of War, to express my wholehearted approval of the joining together of the War and Navy Departments into a single military establishment, including as the three major coordinate forces the ground, the sea, and the air arms. Because of my then position as Under Secretary, charged with responsibility for procurement and supply for our Army of over 8,000,000 men, my discussion related primarily to the great assistance which such a unity would bring to industrial mobilization and planning, as well as to the manner in which it would eliminate duplication and excessive cost in research developments, procurement and other business functions. The select committee signed a report urging that the matter be kept under continued study, and commented favorably on the action of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in setting up in May 1944, a special committee to pursue the matter further.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

The special committee set up by the Joint Chiefs of Staff was composed of generals and admirals of long experience. It conducted hearings over a period of 10 months. It visited the European, Mediterranean, India-China, Pacific, and Southwest Pacific theaters of war. Its members talked on the spot with the theater commanders and the responsible ranking officers of our services throughout the world. The committee's report to the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended a single department of the armed forces. Three of the four members signed the report. One member submitted a minority report of nonconcurrence.

This report represents the dispassionate study of an able group of men, with professional military experience, who have available to them the best military and naval opinion in our entire services. It is the product of the thinking of those who in the field have borne the responsibilities of World War II. While there may be disagreement on various matters of detail included in the report, there should be only approval of the basic principle of service unification which it recommends. I am in favor of giving vitality to that basic principle through the prompt enactment of the necessary legislation.

LESSONS OF WORLD WAR II

The elementary lesson which we have learned from the hard experience of World War II is that there must be single direction of the Nation's land, sea, and air forces. While the foundation of our organization is three coordinate arms—air, land, and sea—these arms must operate as a single team under single direction, which has responsibility and final power of decision over all.

In 1941, when Germany and Japan declared war upon our Nation, we had two services, the Army and the Navy, each with its independent mission, its independent field of operation. No unified over-all command existed, short of the President himself. Our system was the same as it had been for 150 years. Each service had independently developed a type of organization that it believed essential, with little or no collaboration with the other service. Each service was tender on the point of its own prerogatives, not only in the ranks but in the higher command and staff levels. There was no way of compelling cooperation or the exchange of information, except through the interposition of the President himself.

In addition to the lack of unified direction of the armed forces we entered the war with our air power in the position of an auxiliary to our land and sea power.

We recognize now that the basic air power of the United States must be established as an arm of our national-defense coordinate with our land power and our sea power—all, of course, under supreme direction. We know that control of the air—our own and that of the enemy homelands—was essential to victory. The capabilities and requirements of basic air power are such that air power must be accorded coequal status with land and sea power and hence the Air Force must have the same degree of autonomy as the land and naval forces. Development and exploitation of our basic air power should be the major preoccupation of a coordinate component of a tripartite team—all under a single department of the armed forces.

The United States entered the war without adequate cooperation between its two armed services, without plans for a unified command in the field, and with its air power established as an auxiliary to the Army and Navy.

The history of the early pre-war and war period is a story of attempts to overcome these defects through makeshift arrangements. Within a month after the attack upon Pearl Harbor, the President moved to establish the Joint Chiefs of Staff, composed of the heads of the land, sea, and air forces, as an agency designed to exercise control over our military efforts on the basis of mutual consent. On the industrial, technological and scientific side, a multitude of joint boards and committees were formed in attempts to bring coordination in those fields. But mutual agreement fas for practical purposes the only means of getting things done; and it was not possible, even with the best will in the world, for these improvised organizations to function as well as we would have liked.

The United States had to learn the hard way. But we learned. We learned that team play brought success. We learned that any military effort of consequence required unified control to exploit the maximum capabilities of ground, sea, and air forces. The urgency of war imposed upon us, in every theater of war, the principle of a unified command for operations. MacArthur in the Southwest Pacific, Nimitz in the Central Pacific, Eisenhower in Europe were, both in name and in fact, supreme commanders. The sound instincts of the American people would not have tolerated a situation where the responsibility for military action in a theater of war was divided among land, sea, and air commanders. Had we ignored in the actual areas of combat the compelling principle of a sole, over-all authority, our efforts might have met with failure

But the unified direction so necessary to waging successful war was largely limited to the strategic and tactical employment of the major forces overseas. It did not, except in unusual instances, extend to the elimination of duplicating facilities and lines of supply overseas. And here in Washington there was no single military command.

To sum it up; We had single direction, single command, in the overseas theaters on strategy and tactics; we did not have single direction in those theaters on facilities and lines of supply; and we did not have single direction in the over-all military services, save by recourse to the President as Commander in Chief.

Now that peace has come once again, we must not forget, in devising ways and means to improve the organization of our forces, the lessons that we learned in the war just ended. I submit that the considerations that led us, under spur of necessity, to set up unity of authority in the field point, by every element of logic, to the establishment of unity of authority at headquarters in Washington.

REASONS FOR A UNIFIED COMMAND

Let me state simply the reasons that move me to advocate so strongly a unification of the military services.

1. Integration of our military program: The primary objective of our organization for war is to establish an integrated program of national security. Such a program must be based on the best available military thought, weighing the relative capacities and limitations of our sea, air, and land forces. From the deliberations of our senior military leaders there should evolve the basic military policy or posture which the Nation should assume in order to guarantee its security and peace. The military strategy to implement this policy and the allocation of responsibilities to the respective components of the armed forces must be worked out carefully to achieve an integrated balanced progrom. Only after such an integrated program is developed can there be any sound allocation of appropriated funds to the respective components. But these matters of policy, strategy, and budgetary allowances all require decision as between the capabilities and requirements of the major elements of the armed forces. These decisions can best be reached with soundness and dispatch by placing our armed forces under one head and in one department.

In the past, the separate departments have presented their separate views and requests before separate committees and subcommittees at separate times. There are obvious dangers in handling the national security on the basis of piece-meal presentations. The problem of national security is an over-all problem and should be studied and determined on an over-all basis. The merger of the Departments of War and Navy in a common department of the armed forces will give the Congress the great advantage of receiving and considering a single, coordinated, and comprehensive presentation of budgetary and other requirements for the national security.

2. Economy: The consideration of cost is of paramount importance. In time of peace and increasingly so with each succeeding year, the dominating factor will be money—the size and character of the military budget. The strength of our armed forces in time of

peace in the past has been controlled, not by forward planning or anticipated dangers, but by the size of the allowance for the services from the public funds.

Yet we are all agreed that the United States must now and for some future years maintain in constant readiness such military strength as will impress the leaders and professional soldiers of other nations that this Nation is really determined to achieve a lasting peace. This necessary strength must be maintained as economically as possible. We are all concerned that for each dollar spent for security we obtain as much security as that dollar can buy. Because of our high standards of living, our costs of maintaining an armed force are, man for man, the highest in the world. In the years to come, the expense will be far less that during the war, but it will still be large.

We ought not, then, to tolerate in our budget for national security any items that relate to those duplications that are inherent in a separation of the services, duplications that no joint board with equal representation of the Army and the Navy has been able to eliminate. We simply will not be able to afford two lines of supply, two hospital systems, two procurement agencies, two air-transport systems, where one will do the job as effectively and for less money.

We ought not to tolerate in our military budget overlarge sums for one purpose and insufficient sums for another which must inevitably result from a lack of a single direction over the planning of all the constituent service elements. Within the limits of our expenditures we must have a balanced security program. All the constituent elements should be given the strength which our best military planners under single direction assess as appropriate to their relative importance in an integrated security program.

The combination of the armed forces in a single department is businesslike and will bring economy. The savings will not perhaps be realized at once. But in the evolutionary process more and more ways can be found to combine services and facilities and procurement and the like, and out of these combinations major economies are certain to be realized.

And we must always have in mind that our modern warfare is not only total and global, but it moves in new realms of science and technology. There must be ample funds for technological research and development in the future years. The American people will not be willing to take from those funds merely to perpetuate wasteful practices in our traditional organization of a separate Army and Navy.

3. Efficiency: In the third place, it is my belief that the unification of the two services will promote efficiency in planning, in administration, and in operations.

In my appearance as Under Secretary before the Woodrum committee last year, I reviewed in detail cases of conflict, overlapping, and duplication between the War and Navy Departments in vital phases of the procurement program. There were conflicts for raw materials and production facilities. There were variations in methods for determining military requirements, uncoordinated research projects, lack of standardization of specifications, and many other unfortunate difficulties.

Under the existing organization of our services, each service maintains its own self-sufficient operating plant. Right here near Anacostia we have an Army depot and a Navy depot, an Army hospital and a Navy hospital, Army shops to service Army motor transport and Navy shops to service Navy motor transport, two adjoining air fields—one for the Navy and the other for the Army. Hundreds of similar examples can be referred to.

With a single department of the armed forces, the overlapping of physical facilities should be eliminated through proper allocations between the component forces, and the waste of time and effort in preparing separate plans would be avoided through the preparation of a single comprehensive security program.

4. Research and development: The advent of the atomic bomb, which has so stirred the imagination of everyone, forcefully impressed on all of us the necessity for a vigorous, well-directed program for the development of new weapons and of the means for defending against them. The outstanding development in modern warfare is the destructive force and the speed and range of the weapons that science and industry are making available. These weapons—and more will come—will profoundly influence military planning, strategy, and tactics. A form of organization that was suited to horse-drawn transport, to sailing vessels, and to firepower with a 2-mile rangs must be adjusted to the conditions that these weapons present. Full advantage cannot be taken of them, nor can the most effective measures of defense against them be developed, unless we have unified direction of our research and development program.

The cannon was first used by the Army of one nation which thus achieved great advantage over a surprised enemy. The military leaders of that nation were of course delighted with their discovery. They were, however, convinced that the function of the cannon was to scare the horse. Such a view persisted until it was exploded by an enemy which employed the cannon as a basic weapon in its own right—and turned the tide of battle. Had the prophetic voices of the potential artilleryman of the day been heard, it might have been otherwise, but these prophets were not then in the family of services.

And we came to see the cannon mounted on carriages, later on ships, and finally on airplanes. But there was no pooling of talent and knowledge among the services which employed the cannon. The men who sailed in ships developed their cannons and the men who fought on land developed theirs. The improvements discovered by one group were seldom shared by the other. Such a system, with all its inherent waste, worked reasonably well when oceans were barriers and while navies operated separately and armies fought alone.

But the weapons of today are no respecters of land or water barriers. Such weapons are used interchangeably on land or on sea. And the means employed for interception are common means, whether launched from the land or from vessels on the sea. The day is past when we can longer delay a welding of scientific-military research and knowledge. Such a welding, as I see it, can come only out of a straightforward unification of the military forces.

5. Organizational preparedness: When war came, it found us in a state of organizational unpreparedness. Much has been said about our lack of readiness in terms of trained manpower, ships, airplanes, guns, tanks, and critical materials. But relatively little has been said about our organizational deficiencies.

We had passed through the precious years of peace with two great establishments engaged in separate training programs which provided almost no indoctrination or preparation for team play. But we found that team play—the combined employment of air, land, and sea power—was vitally necessary. And so in war we had hastily to improvise the methods and procedures for unified direction and of employment of the armed forces in battle.

It should be obvious that the training and indoctrination of the Nation's security establishment should not be based on one organization in peace and another in war. Only by unified control can we hope to maintain a security force of constituent arms well versed in all of the elements of combined operations.

DISCUSSION OF CERTAIN OBJECTIONS

It will be said, I suppose, that no man can handle the job of secretary of the armed forces because of its size and complexity. It will be said that the organization will be too big, too unwieldly, and too diversified in its problems to operate effectively.

This argument is not impressive. In the industrial world, experience has proved otherwise. And the history of our national governments is filled with examples of the success of large organizations with concentrated authorities.

An over-all organization confines itself more firmly to policy decisions and delegates more extensively the operating functions. Size is a relative thing. One of Washington's generals might well have doubted that anyone could direct armies of the size and complexity of those that fought in the War Between the States. The United States has one Executive, the President, who is responsible for the entire management of the executive side of the Government. One man, the Secretary of the Treasury, is responsible for the vast and intricate financial policies of the Nation. One man, the Secretary of State, is responsible for the manifold and vital relationships of this Government with foreign nations. I think it reasonable to conclude that a single individual can, by proper organization and delegation of authority, effectively administer the country's armed services.

Again, you may hear it suggested that a single department of the armed forces would concentrate too much power in one man and that such power would tend to develop militarism. Can such a suggestion be made in real seriousness? Our safety from militarism does not rest on any fabric of multiplicity of departments dealing with military affairs. It rests upon the solid conviction of our people and upon the basic democratic principle that the leaders of our armed forces are subordinate to the civilian department head, and, through him, to the President, to the Congress, and to the people. Throughout our national life, we have concentrated authority over all our armed forces in the President of the United States and in his Cabinet officers. Frequently, the President has himself been a military man. There has not been the slightest threat to our democracy in the past from that institution. Nor will ther be any threat in the future from the creation of a single department to unify our military policies under a directing civilian head.

The point may be made that this is a proposal which would peremptorily discard the traditional organization of our military and naval forces—an organization with great traditions of long standing which has won for us a victory in two world conflicts. It might be argued that we would therefore reject a unified department of the armed forces.

I believe firmly in the great traditions of our fighting forces. Those traditions should be preserved in a unified Military Establishment. But the dead hand of tradition must never be allowed to obscure defects in a system or to prevent improvement in that system.

My time in the military service was spent in the Infantry. I have a pride in the traditions of the Infantry that will be an inspiration to me so long as I live. But I know that the Infantry alone does not win a war. It operates most effectively as part of a team, a team that comprises all the armed forces, a team under a single directing authority. I am certain that Infantry traditions will not be damaged by the creation of a single department of the armed forces.

The proposal before us does not suggest a merger of Army, Navy, and Air Force personnel into one huge force with consequent loss of identity among the members of the great services. On the contrary, there must

be preserved the maximum autonomy, consonant with efficiency and economy, for each of the three coordinate arms.

It may be put up to you, too, that coordination can be attained by leaving the two departments as they are, under separate command, but connected by a host of interlocking committees—top committees, middle committees, and bottom committees. I will concede that coordination by committees is better than no coordination at all. But in military matters action by committee is not the equivalent of action by a single authority. There should be in our Military Establishment a final voice that takes the full responsibility and determines the policy to be pursued. Someone has said that one poor commander is better than two good commanders sharing a command. That is an extreme statement, but it does point up the vital importance of having a single command. The same thought has been expressed in the statement that action taken by a council of war is likely to be the most ineffective action possible. In the War Department reorganization of March 1942, the greatest gain was the substitution of action by command for action (or inaction) by committees.

ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF A SINGLE DEPARTMENT

I shall not take your time to present now any particular plan for unity of the armed forces. That can be done later. The basic elements, as I see it, are these:

1. A single executive department of the armed forces, charged with the national security and comprising all of the services now separately included in the War Department and Navy Department.

2. A civilian head of this single department, who would be a member of the Cabinet with the rank of Secretary. To assist him in the performance of his duties, there would be a civilian Under Secretary, to act as his principal assistant, and there would be civilian assistant secretaries. To the assistant secretaries the Secretary would have authority to delegate the following, and other functions: Supervision over scientific research and development in weapons and equipment; supervision over procurement and planning for industrial mobilization; the handling of legislative matters affecting the national security; supervision over public relations and dissemination of information.

3. A Chief of Staff of the armed forces, the chief military adviser of the Secretary and responsible to the Secretary for all military matters.

4. Three major and coordinate branches: the Air, the Ground, and the Naval Forces to include the Marine Corps and the Fleet Air Arm, each with the maximum autonomy consonant with efficient and economic operation. Suitable provisions should be made for common supply and hospitalization.

CONCLUSION

I submit that the benefits which would be obtained from a single Military Establishment would be:

First, unity of over-all civilian and military direction—true unity of our security forces.

Second, full recognition that modern war is conducted in three elements—land, sea, and air—and that the respective land, sea, and air forces must be coordinate and subject to supreme over-all direction.

Third, single determination and direction of business and adminstrative policy, with resulting elimination of duplication and important savings in manpower, material, and money.

Fourth, centralized supervision and planning of scientific, industrial, and physical resources and development.

Fifth, preservation of the traditions of the existing forces, as coordinate divisions of a single department.

The adoption of such a plan, I firmly believe, will constitute a great step forward toward assuring the national safety in the years that lie ahead. Finally, I urge that you do not permit the great objectives of unification at this time to be obscured by a cloud of details. If we attain the objective, the details will fall into proper perspective and will be capable of ready settlement in the evolutionary process.

Cotton Has Export Bounty of $20 Per Bale—Cotton Appears to Enjoy Import Quotas as Well—Where Does the Good-Neighbor Policy Come In?—Where Does the Reciprocal Trade Come In?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, although our cotton friends may be exceedingly vocal about reciprocal trade treaties and great vocal promoters of a good-neighbor policy, their expressions and their legislation do not coincide. You will note that in 1940 the eighth year of the more abundant life, and after two campaigns with their hymn of hate about the Smoot-Hawley Act, they turn about face and put a limitation on imports. By limitation, I mean a limitation that is a near embargo. The near embargo will continue "unless changed by Presidential proclamation."

I presume Congress could change the situation if it so desired. All Representatives from cotton districts may vote for the reciprocal trade treaties, but that has not prevented them from enacting "fence me in" or "fence you out" legislation.

One hundred and twenty thousand bales as imports is about 1 percent of the United States production of ten to eleven million bales.

Is this near embargo an integral part of reciprocal trade or of a good-neighbor policy? The $20 per bale export bounty, where in the last 10 months over 600,000 bales were shipped under surplus disposal costing over $12,000,000, is also in this reciprocal trade-good-neighbor policy picture as well. Consider the women's clubs and the League of Women Voters that have been deceived by the New Deal in regard to the trade treaties and the good-neighbor policy.

I include the following letter and official table from the United States Tariff Commission:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION,
Washington, October 10, 1945.

The Honorable REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: I have your letter of October 1 requesting statistics on cotton production and imports from January 1, 1940, to date and information relating to the size of the cotton quotas and the date on which the quotas became effective.

Enclosed is a table entitled "Raw Cotton: United States Production, Imports for Consumption, and Annual Import Quotas, 1940–45."

Information relative to the date on which quotas became effective and concerning important changes in the quotas is given in the notes accompanying the table. You will observe that in several consecutive years imports were larger than the total of the annual quotas. An excess of imports of quota-type cotton over the total annual quotas would be possible in any one year because the quotas are not on a calendar-year basis. The excess in several consecutive years, however, is due to the importation of certain types of cotton, described in notes to the table, which are not subject to quota limitations.

The total figures for production in 1940 to 1943 differ slightly from the totals as recorded by the Bureau of the Census because, in order to show production of long-staple cotton more accurately, running bales of Sea Island cotton, which average about 400 pounds each, have been converted to equivalent 500-pound bales.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR B. RYDER,
Chairman.

Raw cotton: United States production, imports for consumption, and annual import quotas, 1940–45

Year	Cotton under 1⅛ inches	Cotton 1⅛ inches and longer	Total
	Production (running bales)[1]		
1940	11,614,236	682,746	12,296,982
1941	9,719,281	774,901	10,494,182
1942	11,633,218	804,631	12,437,849
1943	10,569,552	558,897	11,128,449
1944 [2]	11,491,000	348,000	11,839,000
1945 [2 3]			9,779,000
	Imports for consumption (equivalent 500-pound bales)		
1940	108,787	49,865	158,652
1941	221,173	93,120	314,293
1942	86,767	132,021	218,788
1943 [2]	43,457	93,604	137,061
1944 [2]	61,892	49,715	111,607
1945 (Jan.-July) [2]	49,532	75,855	125,387
	Import quotas for year beginning Sept. 20 [4] (equivalent 500-pound bales)		
	Cotton under 1⅛ inches except rough cotton [5]	Cotton 1⅛ or more, but less than 1 1/16 inches [6]	Total
1940	29,034	91,313	120,347
1941	29,034	91,313	[7] 120,347
1942	29,034	91,313	[7] 120,347
1943	29,034	[7] 91,313	[7] 120,347
1944	29,034	[7] 91,313	[7] 120,347
1945	29,034	[7] 91,313	[7] 120,347

[1] Bales of approximately 500 pounds each. Sea Island cotton was converted from bales of approximately 400 pounds to equivalent 500-pound bales; for this reason the total bales here shown is, in most years, slightly less than the total bales reported by the Bureau of the Census.

[2] Preliminary.

[3] Forecast as of Oct. 1, 1945. Crop Reporting Board, release of Oct. 8, 1945.

[4] The import quotas have been in effect since Sept. 20, 1939. Unless changed by Presidential proclamation, they remain the same for each succeeding quota year.

[5] Quotas on short-staple cotton are allotted by countries of origin and total 14,516,882 pounds. They cover cotton under 1⅛ inches other than harsh or rough cotton less than ¾-inch in staple length and chiefly used in the manufacture of blankets and blanketing, and other than linters.

[6] The quota on long-staple cotton (1⅛ inches and longer) amounts to 45,656,420 pounds. Originally allocated by countries, it was changed to a global quota effective July 29, 1942.

[7] Quota limitations have been suspended from application to cotton 1 1/16 inches and longer since Dec. 19, 1940.

Source: Production data compiled from grade and staple reports of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, except as noted; import data compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

Atomic Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 17, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., October 16, 1945.

The President, Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have received a number of communications which express the concern in the minds of Americans over the isolationist trend we seem to be reviving. I have felt it myself, in following the outmoded procedure used at the London Conference, and in recent statements relative to atomic power.

Those of us who have the responsibility of making judgments on this tremendous new development, have the fate of the world in our hands. The utmost caution is indeed necessary, in determining our position and avoiding premature judgments.

I feel that the scientists who have worked on and with this development must be given the fullest expression in determining our decision. They have not been allowed to speak. The military must of course be concerned with the national defense and present their case The ultimate judgment concerning the policy on atomic power must come from the people through their representatives in the National Legislature, after we have been thoroughly apprised of all the factors involved.

The trend toward isolation of any of our allies is a rebirth of the reaction which led us into this past war. I do not think that the American people will agree with those who are trying now, at the end of one world struggle, to throw us into another. It is a danger to be watched and considered in each evaluation pertaining to national and international problems.

The program you outlined on September 6, which I again pledge to support, will be as nothing if we allow the momentary superiority we have in atomic methods to lead us into international strife.

I thought I would express myself to you this way, in order that you may know the feeling of the residents of my district who have addressed me on the subject.

Kind personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

ELLIS E. PATTERSON.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 17, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
New York, N. Y., September 25, 1945.

Hon. PHILIP JOSEPH PHILBIN,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I have the honor of enclosing with this letter a copy of a resolution adopted unanimously by 5,000 Americans at a meeting at Manhattan Center, New York, held under the auspices of our organization last Sunday, September 23, protesting against the injustices being perpetrated upon Poland as a result of the weak policy of our Government toward Russia.

The resolution, you will please note, calls for a congressional investigation of not only the terrible hardships this policy is bringing upon Poland, but also the ultimate dangers involved therein to the United States.

Thanking you in advance for your cooperation and assuring you of our interest in your response to this letter, we are,

Yours for no more appeasement.

FRANCIS J. WAZETER,
President.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE RALLY "JUSTICE FOR POLAND" SEPTEMBER 23, 1945, AT MANHATTAN CENTER, NEW YORK

Americans of Polish descent recognize the President of the Republic of Poland and the Constitutional Polish Government in London as the only true and legal representation of the Polish State and Nation. This has been unequivocally stated in a resolution adopted by the Polish American Congress on March 9, 1945, and in a memorial of May 11, 1945, presented to the Government and Congress of the United States.

We, therefore, regard our Government's decision to recognize as the Government of Poland a Soviet-sponsored gang of Stalin's agents and pro-Soviet Quislings, who are not the representatives but the hangmen of the Polish people, as contrary to the ideals expressed in the Atlantic Charter, as well as to international law and to the interests of the United States.

United States appeasement of the Soviet dictatorship at Teheran and at Yalta placed a responsibility upon the American people in regard to the future of all nations of eastern and central Europe—among them Poland—our brave and martyred ally. And after the great injustice to Poland in the Yalta territorial settlement, the lone ray of hope in the Yalta promise of freedom in what remained of Poland, has not been fulfilled.

We see with deep sorrow that the United States Government—after having committed itself at Yalta to tacit approval of Soviet crimes in Europe—is now forced to use harsh methods against millions of men and women, who do not want to be slaves of red totalitarianism. Facts relative to the situation in the American zone in Germany reveal that our military authorities have adopted a policy toward these persons which should not and cannot be tolerated by the American people.

It is a policy of moral terror consisting of:

1. Separation of these displaced persons from all communication with the outside world (mail and financial aid from the United States are not permitted to them nor are American or Polish papers and books from America and England).

2. A severe limitation of individual liberty of these persons.

3. In many cases subordination to their former German persecutors is forced upon them.

4. In a few cases displaced persons have already been sent against their clearly expressed will to the Russian occupied Poland.

5. Representatives of independent American opinion are denied access to these displaced persons.

The above-stated facts show that our recent foreign policy leads logically, step by step, to the abandonment of traditional American standards of humanitarianism and freedom. We consider this a dangerous symptom of disintegration of the foundation of our democracy.

The American people should know the full truth: Therefore

Whereas the policy of our Government at Tehran and Yalta was a policy of secret, personal commitments still not fully known to the American people;

Whereas this policy made the nations of eastern and central Europe victims of our appeasement of Soviet Russia's dictatorship;

Whereas coresponsibility for the Soviet crimes thus has been placed upon the American people without our people being informed of the true facts; and

Whereas in further efforts to appease Stalin some of our noble American traditions are being disregarded: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, Americans of Polish birth or descent, representing all Polish-Americans in down-State parishes, clubs, organizations, and societies in the region south of Albany, including all of New York and Long Island and metropolitan New Jersey, gathered at Manhattan Center on September 23, 1945, under the auspices of the Polish-American Congress, down-State New York division, demand the Congress of the United States investigate officially:

1. The true situation of displaced persons from Russian-occupied countries.

2. The United States policy regarding Poland.

3. The secret commitments of the United States Government toward Russia.

4. The probable and foreseeable danger to the well-being and safety of the United States arising from the abandonment by our Government of the freedom-seeking peoples of eastern and central Europe to the tyranny of Soviet Russia.

Patrick W. McDonough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 17, 1945

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Patrick W. McDonough, of Oakland, Calif., owner of the McDonough Steel Co., is a product of the American system of free enterprise and a credit to it.

Mr. McDonough, starting from scratch, has made a great deal of money. Measured by the dollars and cents standard he has been an eminent success, but Mr. McDonough is also a human individual who does not like to see unnecessary hardships or suffering inflicted on people. He is no maudlin sentimentalist who preaches theory—he is a realist who has risen the hard way and he has suffered from the usual buffeting and hard knocks successful men receive on the way up He learned to rock with the punch, to absorb the blows without wilting under them.

Pat McDonough wants to pass this information on for the benefit of those who follow him. He has done this very well in his testimony before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert at this point in the RECORD an article that appeared in Labor on October 13, 1945:

SOLONS WERE STARTLED—EMPLOYER DECLARES HIGH WAGES MEAN BIGGER PROFITS—CALIFORNIA STEEL MAN DECLARES BOSSES NEVER WILLINGLY HIKE PAY; INCREASES ALWAYS WON BY UNIONS

Members of a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor got a remarkable lesson this week—from an employer—on why high wages mean lower costs.

The testimony, some of which literally startled the Senators, was given by Patrick W. McDonough, head of the McDonough Steel Co., Oakland, Calif., during hearings on the bill by Senator JAMES M. MEAD, Democrat, of New York, for establishment of a 65-cents-an-hour minimum wage in American industry now, with a 75-cent floor in 2 years.

Blunt spoken, McDonough described the 65-cent minimum as "just a pittance" and insisted it ought to be much higher.

"It's really not American to pay as little as 65 cents an hour," he declared.

In his own plant, which has been making invasion boats during the war, but in peacetime manufactures steel smokestacks, barges, and other steel products, the rock-bottom wage for unskilled labor is $1 an hour, McDonough revealed.

For years, he has had collective-bargaining relationships with the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, and he gave the union much of the credit for boosting wages in his plant and in other industries.

"Employers never raise wages unless they are forced to," McDonough frankly asserted. As proof he cited the experience of his industry.

"When I learned the boilermaking business 40 years ago, wages for practical boilermakers were 25 to 30 cents an hour," he said. "At present, a boilermaker gets $1.28 or more an hour.

"During those 40 years, not one of the increases in the industry was ever granted freely. They were always gotten by the union."

The steady advance in wages has cut costs, not hiked them, McDonough stressed.

WAGES UP, COSTS DOWN

He presented some convincing examples. On a particular type of tank, he said, wages paid workers were 30 cents an hour 30 years ago, but had risen to $1 an hour in 1940.

"Despite that, the labor cost on that tank has dropped from $120 to $80," he pointed out. In the boiler-making industry as a whole, though wages now are five times the level of 40 years ago, "the cost of product is less," he said.

Incredulous committee members asked McDonough how that was possible.

"It's no secret," he replied. "In my plant I pay men high wages and they work harder at their job. They are more interested in their work. Consequently, they produce more. Besides, when you pay high wages, you got to use your noodle and begin figuring out ways of doing the work cheaper, by mechanizing or otherwise.

HUNGRY MEN CAN'T PRODUCE

"It is indisputable that our country, which pays the highest wages in the world, has also the highest production per man. That's not a matter of some unknown economic law. High wages and high production are synonymous, just as a well-kept machine is more productive than a run-down one.

"People who don't have enough to eat or lack proper clothing aren't in a position to produce, and the only way they can attain a higher standard of living is to give them enough money so they can buy the necessities of life."

McDonough blasted the greediness of some of his fellow employers and contended that enactment by law of a higher minimum wage is essential to prevent cut-throat wage cutting. During the depression, he recalled, wages in his industry fell as low as 20 cents an hour in some plants.

BOSSES NEED PROTECTION

"There was no check on the avariciousness of the employer," McDonough recalled. "Everyone was damaged by those conditions, most of all the employer. He, too, needs protection from such unscrupulousness."

McDonough also drove home the point that high wages for the workers invariably mean high profits for the employer, too. "Profits absolutely increase with a raise in wages," he said.

As a final clincher, he revealed that his own plant earned a million dollars in profits annually during the war, after turning back a couple of millions to the Navy because of reduced costs—and even the million, he said, was too much.

Strengthening the Congress

REMARKS
OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch is running a series of editorials on the strengthening of the hand of the Congress and the improvement of some of our machinery to that end.

To my mind there is no problem of Government more urgent than the one to which the Post-Dispatch is directing its attention in these articles and to which many Members of this body have been addressing themselves. Never in all history has any parliamentary body carried responsibilities so heavy and so fraught with the possibility of great good or great ill for the future as does the American Congress today.

The task of equipping ourselves with the knowledge necessary to act with conviction and correctness upon these issues, the necessity of so arranging our work that we will have time for the all-important things and will not become lost in details of the job, and finally and most important, measures to strengthen the hand of Congress in its dealings with both the executive branch of the Government and also with pressure groups—these are the minimum essentials for those who care deeply about the continuing position of the Congress as a co-equal branch of the American Government.

I ask consent to include with my remarks herewith one of the series of Post-Dispatch editorials:

AN 1893 CONGRESS IN 1945

The tremendous size of the task of modernizing the machinery of Congress, and the formidable obstacles to be overcome before it can be achieved, are brought out in Washington comments on the Post-Dispatch editorial of last Sunday, A Letter to the Congress, urging action on this necessity.

Representative MIKE MONRONEY, cochairman of the committee now at work on reorganization, calls the editorial a challenge to do something about it before it is too late. Mr. MONRONEY, whose position is stated in our Mirror of Public Opinion today, says that, once the joint committee has made its recommendations, "only an informed public opinion can insure that needed reorganization is given proper attention and action."

So, on the word of a congressional leader exceptionally well informed on the problem, it is clear that this issue presents a challenge to both Congress and the public.

Representative ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, author of legislation to introduce on Capitol Hill the question hour for public officials, says: "I am afraid there is very little disposition on the part of the Members generally, particularly those who are chairmen of committees, to reorganize outmoded procedure. It is an alarming situation."

So Congress, this able Member fears, is not aware of the necessity for revising its archaic methods. Here again, the issue is viewed as a challenge.

Representative JOHN J. COCHRAN, of St. Louis, another of those deeply concerned with the inefficiency, undemocratic structure and creaking procedures of Congress, properly points out that the resolution creating the joint inquiry placed limitations upon what the special committee could do.

These restrictions, of course, will prevent the committee from recommending the sweeping changes that should be the long-range objective. However, as we pointed out last Sunday, there are many important reforms that come within the orbit of its authority. It can concentrate on those steps for the time being. If they are enacted—and that will be no easy job—the committee will have a large achievement to its credit and Congress will be far on the way to modern efficiency. After that much is accomplished, the campaign can be expanded to the further changes on the long-run agenda.

Desirable as a transition in one leap from horse and buggy to streamliner would be, there is the real danger that planning for too much will result in no achievement whatever. There is plenty of hard, step-by-step plugging to be done to move Congress from its present inertia and to prove publicly the necessity for putting its machinery into condition to cope with the demands upon it.

Mr. KEFAUVER's alarm lest change-resistant members balk at improvements that are minimum essentials is known to be widely shared both inside and outside Congress. This reluctance should stimulate the committee to frame a courageous report, going as far as its authority permits, rather than causing it to pull punches.

Some individual privileges and partisan advantages will fall if the committee recommends, and Congress enacts, the changes obviously required. Each change, however, will be for the greater good of the membership as a whole, for the strengthening of congressional authority to equalize its position in relation to the executive branch, and for the better execution of the public's business.

All are obvious steps: the consolidation of sprawling and overlapping committees; the development of stronger leadership and greater responsibility in both Houses; better liaison between Congress and the executive branch; enlarged staffs and improved research service to lessen the burden on individual members; better relations between Congressmen and constituents; abrogation of the custom (not a rule) that puts seniority ahead of competence in choosing committee chairmen, and the dozens of other important reforms on which action is possible.

Considered objectively, it is a strange thing that Congress, in a day of progress and change in a myriad other fields of endeavor, still clings to a system last revised in 1893. Such is the power of inertia, the dead weight of awesomely regarded precedent.

It will take a formidable demonstration to jolt the majority into action. That demonstration can come from inside Congress, on the part of Members who have concerned themselves with the problem, and it can come from the outside, from an enlightened and active public opinion.

In the last analysis, it is up to Congress itself—up to the committee to present the maximum program possible, up to its sponsors to push for action, up to the majority to vote its adoption. And the voice of an aroused public calling for these changes in the archaic system can be a mighty force in bringing them about.

The Atomic Bomb Is the Property of the American People, Paid for by Them, and It Should Be Held for Their Protection, and Not Given Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 17, 1945

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the atomic bomb is the property of the American people. Their Government is under the solemn duty to hold and to guard it in inviolate trust. At Oak Ridge, in Anderson and Roane Counties, in the Second Congressional District of Tennessee, under the supervision of Gen. Leslie R. Groves and his able staff of Army engineers, aided by 1,000 scientists, the ablest industrialists in the Nation, and 100,000 devoted men and women who were their colaborers, the atomic bomb was developed, manufactured, and completed. The cost of this vast, unprecedented, and complicated plant was $2,000,000,000.

So intricate and highly technical were the many processes by which this wellnigh impossible result was accomplished that those who performed the miracle were fearful to the very last that their efforts might result in failure. It is not an overstatement to say that no other nation in the world had or has the industrial ability, the manufacturing resources, the mechanical skill, and the scientific attainments to produce the elements of this bomb and to combine them successfully and to explode it with safety to those who used the bomb and with disaster only to our enemy.

Even the most wildly enthusiastic and eager givers-away of our resources say that the Russians could not make and use an atomic bomb in less than 5 years. Anyone who has gone through the complicated and heretofore unheard of plants at Oak Ridge may well doubt that Russia could construct, equip, and man such a plant. It would seem to be but the exercise of common sense and prudence that we hold inviolate the secret processes by which we made and assembled the elements of this bomb. The project and everything connected with it was guarded by the FBI, the Army, and by everyone who knew anything whatever about it. Anyone who might have attempted unlawfully to invade or pry into the premises or processes where the work was carried on would have been shot, or at least taken into custody and severely dealt with.

Why all the hullabaloo and hot haste to give it to the Russians? Have we not been generous with them? If the material assistance we have lavished on them has not made the men who control that country cooperative in our efforts to bring permanent peace to the nations of Europe and Asia, what grounds have we for jumping to the conclusion that their possession of this terrible weapon of destruction would change their mental processes and arbitrary and one-sided actions?

Self-defense is the first law of nature, and as long as we have this weapon no country is going to attack us. Even if Russia succeeds in making such a bomb, knowledge on her part that we have such bombs in countless numbers will deter her from using them against us. Besides that, Russia has no earthly cause for warring against us. Nor have we any reason for war with Russia.

We have the secret of the bomb, and we have the bomb in abundance. We are safe and the world is safe so long as we keep it under our control. And the Congress, for the people, is charged with the duty of holding the secret processes of its manufacture and the bomb itself.

I include as part of my remarks the following editorial of the Knoxville Journal:

UNIVERSAL POSSESSION OF WAR SECRETS HAS PROVED NO PREVENTIVE OF CONFLICTS BETWEEN NATIONS

There are two arguments advanced by proponents of sharing the atom bomb secret with all and sundry nations that seem to us particularly grounded on fallacy.

We are told that it is up to this country to immediately provide our friends and potential enemies with the bomb-production method in order, first, to allay suspicion of our intentions and, second, to prevent a new armament race based upon the perfection of the atomic process.

There is certainly nothing either in our knowledge of human nature or in the history of international relationships to indicate that suspicion of our intentions would be in the slightest allayed by giving out the atomic secret at this time. There is no record, for example, that the mastery of gunpowder manufacture by all warring nations contributed in the slightest to peace in that day. The same can be said for all other offensive or defensive weapons. As the information got around the world as to their manufacture they were fitted into the armament picture of each nation, but there is no indication that the knowledge thus scattered did anything for peace.

On the contrary, the quicker the information got around, the quicker armament races were started. What the various war departments throughout the world will do, immediately after they have the atomic secret well in hand, will be to undertake applying the new process to new weapons. They will do so on the theory of defense but the ideas perfected will also be adaptable for use in offense.

We remain unconvinced that there are safer hands for the awesome atomic process secret to be in than ours and that, even if other nations are able to perfect it within a period of years, the world will have gained at least that many years of peace.

Address of Hon. Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 17, 1945

Mr. LaFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address given by our respected colleague, Mrs. MARGARET CHASE SMITH, on October 12, 1945, in ceremonies marking the seventy-fifth anniversary of Wilson College in Chambersburg, Pa.

The gentlewoman from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] was awarded a doctor of laws degree by Wilson College, and her profound statesmanship as reflected by her serious and frank address testifies to the wisdom of Wilson College in conferring this degree of honor upon her.

The address follows:

The individual freedom enjoyed by citizens of a democracy such as ours carries with it the responsibility of not only thinking individually but also of "thinking out loud"—of making ourselves articulate together with those who share our beliefs and opinions. What I have to say on this important subject is keyed to four words: (1) democracy, (2) citizen, (3) think, and (4) articulate.

One of the best definitions of a democracy is "a government by the people, either directly or indirectly, through a system of representation and delegated authority periodically renewed." Democracy is the rule by the majority—theoretically the real majority but practically the articulate majority. Like everything else, we get out of government only what we put into it.

The fourteenth amendment to the Constitution defines citizen, but I like better the Webster comment: "A citizen as such is entitled to the protection of life, liberty, and property at home and abroad, but is not necessarily vested with suffrage or other political rights."

We of America are vested with suffrage and political rights by the Constitution, but many of us are not true American citizens in the full sense of the word because we do not fulfill our role as such; we do not exercise our franchise or most of our political rights and duties; we are content to "let the other fellow do it."

To "think" is to exercise the faculties of judgment, conception, or inference—to put our common sense into action. When the German people defaulted their thinking to Hitler, they surrendered their freedom. When we accept the statements and proposals of demagogs because we are too lazy to think and test their statements and proposals, we can blame no one but ourselves for subsequent events.

But thoughts, to be effective, must be disclosed. We must have confidence in our opinions and cherish the belief that they will guide others as well as ourselves. We should so proceed as to merit leadership and then not be timid about claiming it.

It is the articulate majority that runs a democratic government. But the articulate majority does not always represent the real majority. Quite often the real minority by "thinking out loud" makes itself the practical, effective, articulate majority.

For proof of this, one need only look at the Presidential election figures, where he will find that usually the victorious candidates and party not only have small margins of victory but poll considerably less than 51 percent of the eligible electorate.

Elections are the times when we establish a policy of government for the next 2 or 4 years—a policy that public officials whom we have elected are to follow. If maximum voting is combined with our two-party system there is a greater assurance of effectuating the will of the majority.

In contrast, the multiparty system of France before the war contributed greatly to her internal discord, made her a country against itself and an easy target for the militant dictatorship of Germany. The multiparty system resulted in a discordant and weak government by minority representatives

making the formulation of consistent government policy most difficult to attain.

Yes, in elections we should vote for policies on vital issues for the candidates are merely symbols and media of action. We must know our candidates and what they stand for, even at times force candidates and parties to reveal their positions on vital issues. The best time to exercise the pressure is before and during the election.

There are two ways to determine whether a candidate's views and opinions on vital issues agree with our own—(1) by his past record or (2) by his promises and professed position. Both are of value but the record tells a much more dependable story.

Too often votes are carelessly cast on personalities, really pseudo personalities, rather than on character. There was a startling instance of this not long ago in the election to Congress of a man of unknown ability and views, solely, it appeared, because his name was the same as America's best beloved humorist. This is rendered yet more ludicrous from the fact that he was not so registered as to be eligible to vote in the election in which he prevailed. And in the same State where this namesake election occurred a "Mae West" was nearly elected commissioner of charities and corrections.

How can citizens make candidates take a stand and express their beliefs and views on matters of vital interest? By participating in forums and public discussions such as this. They can organize or affiliate themselves with articulate groups that represent their views. They can get out the vote.

The best example of this is the controversial Political Action Committee of the CIO. Some complain that there is too much vote-getting activity among the members of such labor groups.

Even though the PAC of the CIO supported my opponent in the last election, I cannot agree with this view as long as the individual members of labor vote their own convictions and are not led into the political trap that all members of one party are anti-labor and all members of the other party are pro-labor. They should first examine the voting and performance record of each candidate. I think that the PAC with its get-out-the-vote technique has made a valuable and constructive contribution to American Government—a lead that other groups could well follow.

To those who complain about the PAC, I would say, do less complaining and make yourself "articulate" by doing the same thing that the PAC has done—get out the vote of those who agree with you in your opposition to the views of the PAC. The more effective and articulate groups like the vote-getting PAC, representing the various views of the electorate on vital issues, the greater the vote, the clearer the position of candidates, and the truer the democracy.

But the articulate action of a citizen, or group of citizens, must be constructive, must seek to improve, to build instead of destroy. There is not only too much silent or negative thinking; there is too much boisterous demonstration prompted by unenlightened partisanship. As I said before, we should think first, then make ourselves articulate—in other words, think before we speak.

We should not criticize unless we can offer something better, because if we cannot offer something better, it is a good sign that we are not well informed on, or have not thought enough about, what we are criticizing. Citizens should elect those they want rather than defeat those they dislike. In other words, we should make our articulation informed and positive, not ignorant and negative.

To summarize, the greatest contribution that citizens of a democracy can make to the preservation of peace is living up to the full meaning of their status as "citizens." They can best do this by (1) independent thinking, (2) making that thinking articulate by translating it into action at the polls, in the forums, and in everyday life, and (3) being constructive and positive in their thinking and articulation.

One GI Expresses His Thought in Verse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 17, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from a little city, Allegan, in the Fourth Congressional District in Michigan, this young man was one of the first to enlist. His opinion of the strikes is expressed in the following words:

SYMPATHETIC
(By Waldo H. G. Larsen)

My fox hole is full of water,
My seabag is full of mold,
But the weather here is really warm—
In the States you complain 'cause it's cold.

I eat chow three times daily
And don't need a ration book.
I only wish that Spam
Wasn't all our marines had to cook.

At night I have my own little bed,
I can make it up as I please.
There's plenty of room so I don't mind
The lizzards, chiggers, and fleas.

My work takes place in the great outdoors
Behind the firing range.
I wish that my next casualty
Would be a small marine for a change.

We pharmacist's mates travel for nothing,
Civilians pay money to roam,
We live in a different hole daily,
While they have only one home.

Keep a stiff upper lip, poor civilian,
Take this war on the chin like men.
If we're lucky enough to live to get back,
We'll take care of your troubles again.

Some folks strike for an ungodly wage
To procure their daily bread;
Think of the percent of the boys over here
Who can't draw pay—'cause they're dead!

Bottlenecks in the Discharge of Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 17, 1945

Mr. TABER. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent request granted me, I submit the following broadcast by me on the Columbia network last evening:

One of the problems that is distrurbing the American people most at this time is the problem of discharge from the armed forces of those men who are no longer needed because of cessation of hostilities and the approaching end of the war. What are some of the reasons why these men are not being more rapidly demobilized and what can be done to help that situation?

We all must recognize that the Army and the Navy need a certain number of doctors to examine the men who are up for discharge. We all know that they need a certain number of doctors to take care of those who are sick and wounded as a result of their service and to take care of the current operations of both services. Much progress is being made by the Army and the Navy in getting rid of bottlenecks that have interfered with discharges. For instance, since September 1, the discharge rate has increased in the Army from an average of 15,000 per day to an average of nearly 40,000 per day and those men who are coming in from overseas who are eligible for discharge are receiving their discharges more promptly. On the other hand, we have some other situations which are bothering us. For instance, today the Navy has 51,000 reserve officers not eligible for sea duty, and of these, 33,000 are known as specialists and 8,400 are Wave officers, and 10,000 are staff officers. A considerable portion of this last group are medical officers who cannot go to sea. With the end of the war, they should be able to get rid of almost all of these specialists and a failure to reduce that group is the thing that is tying up the discharge of a large number of Navy enlisted personnel. If you have a certain number of this type of officers around, you have a certain number of enlisted men involved with them and that is how the discharge of enlisted men is affected. It should be the object of the Navy to discharge these specialists just as rapidly as it can be done. The longer we wait, the longer this will be a bottleneck to the reduction in size of the enlisted personnel in the Navy.

There are a great many other things that cause bottlenecks. For instance, 20,000 men have been continued for 14 months in radar and sonar schools by the Navy when the Navy felt that they were not needed. Of these, only about 400 are enlisted in the Regular Navy and the rest are reserves. We might need the 400 in the school but the others are surplus and are being kept in the Navy 14 months just because of pressure from the outside. The Navy will not listen to pressure, and very properly so, for special privileges for a lot of things, but in this particular case it has listened to pressure to keep the thing going instead of releasing 20,000 men. The story appeared in the Washington Post a couple of weeks ago, and I have verified it.

In the Army in the continental United States there are presently approximately 500,000 officers and 2,875,000 men—nearly one officer for each five men. Of these 500,000 I am satisfied that 250,000 are rated not eligible for overseas. Outside of the settlement of contracts and renegotiation which might take 10,000 or 15,000 officers, and the doctors necessary for the discharge centers, these officers should be promptly reduced in number and that will result in the discharge of many more of the enlisted men.

I ran across this situation in the Army. In one camp over 4,000 men have been kept for the last 4 months with nothing to do. In other camps men are being given repeated furloughs because there is no place for them to stay in the camps. Nothing could be more demoralizing than this and a prompt reduction in the number that are in the camps in the United States ought to be made. Men who are not eligible for overseas duty and are not going to be kept in the Army for any particular purpose ought to be discharged. Men who have served long enough so that they would not be sent overseas again ought to be discharged. The 300,000 that the Army has in training and the 100,000 that they might need to prepare to go overseas and occupy the stations in this country should, of course, be kept, but the

rest should be discharged just as rapidly as possible. The sooner they are discharged the better for the Army.

I want to see an active, vigorous, fighting Army. I want to see the Army get rid, just as rapidly as possible, of those officers and men who are not going to be able to be an active part of the Army after the war is over. I want to see the Army and the Navy made up of effective fighting forces. After the last war a mistake was made in keeping a lot of over-age officers. We had lieutenants up to 60 kept in the Army in droves and they were there for 15 or 18 years after the first war was over before the picture was cleaned up. I do not want to see any such situation prevail this time. I want to see both services cleaned up just as quickly as it can be done. I think that there is the disposition on the part of the armed forces to do this. On the other hand, if it is not done, and right away, we are going to have delays in discharges of enlisted men and those delays are going to affect adversely the situation of the Army and the Navy in the future.

Efforts must be made at once to get rid of all surplus officers who are not really needed for the functions that the Army has to perform. I can see why it is necessary to maintain a certain number of men to operate the separation centers and a certain number of officers to go with them, but how there can possibly be any excuse at this time for the officer personnel running up to 18 percent of the enlisted personnel in the Continental United States is beyond any intelligent figuring. How the naval officer personnel in the Continental United States could on the 31st of July have been over 120,000 as against about 1,000,000 men at that time is beyond understanding. We are never going to get the men out of the service and have them properly discharged and functioning in civil life unless we limit the number of reserve officers on active duty that the Army and Navy can keep. If the Army and Navy will not do it themselves it is going to be necessary for the Congress to do it, and I hope that it will not require legislative process to do it, but it can be done.

I have wondered for a long time how much delay there was in the discharge of men as a result of political pressure. Each time a man overseas is shifted in his assignment as to the schedule of the boat he will come home on, the return of a great many other men is delayed. Every time a man is let out who has insufficient points by political pressure, the release of more than one other serviceman is delayed because it takes so long to adjust the situation that has been created by this operation. I notice that a University of Georgia football star with 41 points was recently released from the Army. This was in the Washington Star last Friday. Why the War Department feels obliged to listen to that sort of thing and to delay the release of the ordinary soldier is beyond understanding. That is the sort of thing that brings the wrath of the ordinary soldier down on the Army, and it is the sort of thing that brings the Army into disrepute in Congress.

I am in hopes that both the Army and the Navy will cease this irregular operation which delays the discharge of the ordinary fellow.

The Navy does not need now an officer personnel equal over-all to more than 8 percent of the enlisted personnel. The Army does not need now an officer personnel of more than 8 percent of its enlisted personnel.

The immediate reduction of the large excess of Reserve officers on active duty is the first requirement for the large reduction of enlisted personnel in both the Army and the Navy. The discharge of the enlisted men will come about at the same time.

The Congress must see that this is done.

Pit Props for Belgian Mines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 17, 1945

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following from the Savannah (Ga.) Morning News of October 13, 1945:

BELGIAN MINES PLACE $2,500,000 ORDER HERE—ALBERT ERNEST TO SUPPLY PROPS TO REOPEN COAL PITS, RELIEVE SUFFERING EUROPE—200 CARS PER WEEK TO LEAVE—ROADSIDE PICK-UP PLANNED—CONTRACT SIGNALIZES RENEWAL OF FOREIGN TRADE

The Belgian Government has contracted with Albert Ernest, president of Dixie Wood, Inc., to furnish $2,500,000 of southern pine pit props, for the coal mines of Belgium, it was announced yesterday.

The contract is between the Belgian Economic Commission, 1780 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, and Mr. Ernest personally and does not involve Dixie Wood, Inc., which is a corporation dealing mostly in wood for the paper industry.

Through the economic commission, the Belgian Government has agreed to purchase 125,000 long tons of the props, and Mr. Ernest stated that before the ink was dry his forest representatives began cutting the timber.

Delivery will begin at once to two assembly areas, Savannah and Mobile, Ala., he said.

The deal is the largest single contract between an individual and foreign governments or individuals in the history of the port of Savannah, according to Savannah shipping interests who pointed out that more than 20 large cargo vessels will be required to move the cargo to Belgium.

Mr. Ernest said that the Belgians will use the props to shore their coal mines, thus permitting resumption of the mining of coal in a nation sorely beset by a fuel shortage.

"With these pine logs from Georgia," Mr. Ernest stated, "we hope to warm the people of Belgium and Holland at Christmastime."

The contract, Mr. Ernest said, provides for shipment of 25,000 long tons per month for a period of 5 months, and he hopes to send the first shipment overseas from the port of Savannah, about November 15. He said he was informed at the Belgian Embassy in Washington that the material would be dispatched from shipside direct to the mines in Belgium, and that they would be in place in a day or two after arrival at port.

The pit props will be 6 to 10 feet in length of peeled pine about 8 inches in diameter.

"The price we will be able to pay will enable the farmers and small wood-lot owners to make shipments in small quantities at a substantial profit to them," Mr. Ernest said.

He said his organization would purchase the timber in any amount from one truck, or even a wagonload to a thousand or more truckloads.

The timber will begin moving from the forests of eastern Georgia and South Carolina, western Florida and Alabama, and Mississippi, at once.

A feature of the huge movement will be a pick-up system, Mr. Ernest said, explaining that arrangements are now being made for farmers and small woods owners to carry a wagonload or a truckload or two to the roadside, where Mr. Ernest's trucks will pick them up and carry them to the staging areas at Savannah and Mobile.

The cutting job alone, he said, would require 150,000 man-hours, and he said he wished to impress upon anyone engaged in the vast enterprise that "every tree felled may mean a life saved in the homeland of a gallant ally."

Mr. Ernest said that the southern forests were called upon to supply the mine props, because the Belgians, French, and Dutch feared to work their own forests because of the millions of booby traps and unexploded artillery shells in the forests of Belgium, France, and Germany. The terrible rail situation in Europe has rendered impossible the importation of the material from faraway Russia or other continental supply sources.

Movement of the logs to port will amount to 200 carloads per week, Mr. Ernest said, which, he pointed out, is about four or five ordinary freight trainloads.

Mr. Ernest said that he had established offices at the Liberty National Bank building in Savannah and at the Downtown Theater Building in Mobile to direct the operation.

This is a brand-new business for the South, Mr. Ernest said, adding that "it marks also the first positive resumption of foreign trade on a strictly cash basis between southern industry and European countries."

Mr. Ernest said he wishes to acknowledge publicly the assistance given to him and the southern forest operators by Secretary of Interior Harold Ickes, and Congressmen Frank Boykin, of Mobile, and Hugh Peterson, of Ailey.

Mr. Ickes was intensely interested because as Solid Fuels Administrator he is anxious to get the mines of Belgium in operation, so that we can end or reduce United States coal exports, until the American situation becomes normal.

To get the mines working again it was necessary to secure the timber to prop them up, and that's why the people of Belgium, Holland, and parts of France will be kept warm later this winter and for many winters to come.

Mr. Ernest's attorney in the transaction was Col. J. McHenry Jones, of Pensacola, Fla.

Home Buyers' Protection Necessary—Washington Daily News Calls for Action to Save Little Man From Shrewd Dealers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the October 10 issue of the Washington Daily News quotes from a letter received from a corresponding reader which reaffirms my own expressed fears on the coming inflation in the housing field unless steps are taken immediately to better police the price control of new homes than is now contemplated. I do not believe the information in the first part of the editorial is correct, to the effect that President Truman is trying to scuttle Mr. Bowles' plan. The remainder of the editorial is so timely and persuasive I am inserting all of it.

The editorial reads as follows:

HOME BUYERS' PROTECTION

As Ned Brooks, in an article on page 5 of this newspaper, reports that President Truman has intervened to scuttle Price Administrator Bowles' plan to impose price fixing

on homes, we believe this letter from a reader is timely. Our reader believes in the Government price, inspection, and financing controls over sale of homes in order to protect the buyer of moderate means.

"Wealthy people usually know how to protect themselves," he says. "But families that want homes costing less than $10,000 too often are at the mercy of shrewd builders and real-estate dealers. It's easy to say, 'Let the buyer beware.' But a buyer who has had no experience to teach him what to beware of needs better advice than he now gets.

"He can't afford high-paid private experts to tell him whether a house is worth what is asked for it, or whether the price represents only the builder's or seller's idea of what the traffic will bear; whether the house is soundly built; whether the financing plan is suitable to his income. He can't depend on local building codes for protection, because in many cases they have been rigged to compel use of needlessly expensive materials and construction practices.

"I hope most of the Government's wartime economic controls will be dropped soon. But there is need for more, not less, Federal control over the sale of homes. Home buyers are the foundation of stable Americanism. They reserve every protection the Government can give them."

We commend what this reader says to the earnest attention of the new Construction Industry Advisory Council, soon to meet in Washington at the call of the United States Chamber of Commerce. If the home-building industry wants freedom from Government control, we believe it must do a better job than it has ever done of controlling its own activities.

Many conditions are now favorable to the greatest, soundest building boom in this country's history. But the boom is not inevitable. If the home-building industry grabs for big, quick profits and neglects the huge market for good homes at low cost; if it allows home buyers to assume inordinate risk of disappointment and loss; if it fails to protect its own customers—then it will surely invite drastic Government controls. And it will kill its own best chance for prosperity.

UNRRA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 17, 1945

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I received today a very commendable and worthy though quite unusual petition. It is included as a part of my remarks. This petition shows that the citizens back home are concerned about the destitute millions of war-ravaged people all over the world. I strongly recommend the attitude of those who signed this petition to all of us, and again urge adequate support for UNRRA, the agency created by the United Nations for the sole purpose of doing this big relief and rehabilitation job.

As a Congressman who recently observed conditions in Europe and Asia, I find that the good points in UNRRA far outnumber the weak points. In peace we have a chance through UNRRA to fulfill an obligation to mankind which is an opportunity we cannot afford to miss.

If freedom and the right to live means enough to us to cause us to fight such a total war as we have just successfully completed in the defense of this principle, then certainly there is an obligation to make an honest attempt at applying the principle Why fight to retain a principle and then not even make an attempt to apply the things for which we fought? Hungry and destitute peoples endanger peace, but peoples enjoying some of the privileges of freedom will defend their position even with life itself.

The petition follows:

HIGH RIDGE, MO.,
October 14, 1945.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CARNAHAN: As Christians living in a land of relative freedom and plenty, we are deeply concerned about our hungry and homeless fellowmen in the war-ravaged countries of Europe and Asia. We urge you to lend your utmost influence toward having sent to them every ton of food and of clothing and of fuel that can possibly be spared from our own stores. As a token of our earnestness, we declare our willingness to have kept in operation whatever remains of the rationing program or to have restored whatever rationing may be necessary to achieve the desired ends.

We propose to give of our own time and money and energy in an effort to prevent starvation and to keep alive the spirit of hope among our brethren across the seas. We pledge you our support in whatever you may do to make of our Nation a good Samaritan among the stricken and sorely wounded nations of the world.

Your compatriots and fellow Christians.
Fred Delbruegge, A. J. Hunbler, Estelle Beavers, Lucille Lofinck, H. P. Baur, Ralph Wallach, George A. Werner, Edwin Nollman, Aug. Kieienhedar, Clara Boemler, Nelle Hefti, Anna C. Szofron, Mrs. E. Biehl, Wm. A. Nollman, I. W. Dautenbahn, John Szofron, Clarence M. Boemler, Mrs. Alvin Delbruegge, Ben E. Schroder.

All of the signers of this letter are residents of Jefferson County, Mo.

Mr. Speaker, I also include the following from the editorial page of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for October 14, 1945:

UNRRA OR WHAT?

The coming debate in Congress over a second $1,350,000,000 appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration will not seriously question the proposition that the United States should provide relief in Europe and the Far East, for that principle is pretty well accepted. It will question the proposition that UNRRA should be the agency in charge. In the long run, the two propositions may turn out to be the same.

President Truman has asked Congress to make $550,000,000 available at once, which, added to the $800,000,000 already supplied, will complete its initial commitment of $1,350,000,000 to UNRRA. Congress will also be asked to make a second appropriation of $1,350,000,000.

Several Members of Congress who toured Europe last summer were unfavorably impressed with UNRRA's work, and attacked it in statements ranging in violence to the assertion by Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, that the agency was "a cause of confusion," "a waste of manpower and money," and "should be abolished."

UNRRA has had its meed of abuse. Lord Strabolgi, in the House of Lords, wittier than Senator RUSSELL but no angrier, dubbed it "UNRRA the unready." The London Daily Express branded it a "top-heavy, muscle-bound bureaucracy." It has been continually compared, to its disadvantage, with the food commission headed by Herbert Hoover in the First World War.

UNRRA has boggled enough, in all patience. Its Director General Lehman may be somewhat less incisive and dynamic than a man needs to be to perform one task that is roughly the equal of all 12 tasks of Hercules. But consider that in less than 24 months it has drawn together a staff of 3,000 persons of 30 nationalities and set them to work all over the world. It is providing relief supplies, repatriation services and the first essentials of rehabilitation to the peoples of 7 countries, and operates 6 refugee camps in the Middle East for 40,000 persons. It has distributed more than a billion dollars' worth of supplies.

Consider that, while the Hoover commission was accountable to only one sponsoring nation, the United States, and could deal on a take-it-or-leave-it basis with the nations needing relief, UNRRA must work under the orders of 44 nations and cannot tell any nation to take or leave anything. It can operate in any nation only after that nation invites it. It depends on the military authorities for transportation of its supplies. As if that were not enough, it has had to struggle with political obstacles in several countries, such as Poland, Yugoslavia, and Greece.

The wonder is that UNRRA has accomplished anything, and the fact seems to be that for all its faults it has accomplished a great deal. Quite possibly it needs some reorganization and shaking up, but it is the only organization the world has to do the job, and now is no time to be throwing a going concern overboard and starting again from scratch. The Army, to which some critics would turn over UNRRA's functions, has neither the time nor the talents for the job. Relief and rehabilitation are civil affairs, and the Army has already shown its understandable ineptitude for civil administration. Representative HERTER, of Massachusetts, recently back from a European study of UNRRA, is offering some amendments—principally to encourage recipient nations to begin relying on themselves as quickly as possible, and to require publicity for the facts about relief—but he is persuaded UNRRA is the only agency equipped for the task.

When the expected clamor over UNRRA breaks, there are two reasons why it cannot, without heavy loss, be allowed too long to hold up the flow of funds.

The first reason is the great humanitarian need of the stricken nations, many millions of whose people will go cold and hungry this winter—even freeze and starve—in spite of all we can do. Coal and food must be supplied. Assistant Secretary of State Clayton has warned that the $550,000,000 remainder of our present commitment is required at once and that "a delay of even a few weeks will be extremely serious."

A second commitment of funds is needed immediately in order to keep the flow of supplies moving after the first appropriation is exhausted. For the supplies to be available in time, arrangements must be made very soon for their purchase, and that is what gives urgency to the request for Congress to make a brand-new appropriation of $1,350,000,000.

The second reason why Congress cannot afford to waste much time about the appropriation is plain self-interest. While the wheat crops have been reduced by half by the worst droughts of more than 20 years in Greece, Italy, and Rumania, the United States shore line bulges with surplus grain. Unless our surpluses go to help feed the world's needy, they may stay home to plague us in the form of depression prices for wheat, eggs, potatoes, and the lower grades of beef. And 90 percent of every nation's donations to UNRRA must be spent in purchases in the donor nation.

Conveniently, humanitarianism and self-interest both will be served by a single good deed. It is a deed worthy to be an act of Congress.

Army Should Regularize Overseas Shipments for Returning Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1945

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I have received literally hundreds of letters in the past few weeks denouncing the failure of the War Department to recognize its own point system for discharge. Apparently thousands of men overseas are being held at their stations while others with fewer points are shipped home.

The recent discharge of a former football star with only 41 points has given rise to a barrage of sharp criticisms of War Department policies.

There can be no justification for shipping men home out of turn, unless there is some emergency which warrants special consideration.

I call upon the War Department to investigate at once the procedures being used overseas in this connection.

Pipe Lines Versus Tankers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of Sunday, October 7, contains an article by Mr. Drew Pearson in which he deals extensively with the subject of the so-called Big Inch pipe lines extending from Texas to the North Atlantic seaboard. I desire to take issue with Mr. Pearson on one paragraph in the article. It is as follows:

Significant fact is that shipping oil east by pipe line is much cheaper than by tanker: nearly 28 cents a barrel for crude oil and 11 cents a barrel for gasoline. In contrast, rail shipment costs $1.60 per barrel from Texas to New York, while tanker shipment costs 60 cents per barrel.

I consider this paragraph so grossly erroneous in point of fact that it should not be permitted to go unchallenged. Certainly Mr. Pearson has been misinformed by someone.

Before the war, the normal shipment of oil and gasoline to the Atlantic seaboard was about 1,600,000 barrels per day. Approximately one-third of this was gasoline, and the other two-thirds was crude and fuel oil, the crude being generally converted into gasoline or kerosene at the eastern refineries. Practically all of it was shipped to the East by tanker ships.

The German submarine menace soon put a stop to tanker-ship operations for domestic use, and internal transportation had to be provided. No method was readily available. No pipe lines extended to the Atlantic; no inland waterway channel was available; and the railways had no tank cars; nor did they have any locomotives to spare for the gigantic operation.

Rationing was applied in the East, and every possible means of transportation was resorted to. More than 80,000 tank cars owned by the oil companies were turned over to the railroads, but they were generally in a more or less dilapidated condition from a long period of nonuse. Overhauling and repairing these cars was a big undertaking, and for many months about 2,000 at a time were constantly in the repair shops. More than a thousand new locomotives were required by the railroads.

The few tank barges available were put into operation. Gasoline was barged up the Mississippi and Ohio to Cincinnati, then hauled by rail to the Atlantic. Other shipments went over the Great Lakes, then through the Erie Canal and down the Hudson River. The comparatively small Plantation pipe line was extended from a point in North Carolina to Richmond, where the gasoline was taken over by barges for delivery to the northern seaboard. An 8-inch pipe line was laid across Florida from St. Joe to Jacksonville, through which about 26,000 barrels per day were moved. This gasoline went over the Intracoastal Canal from Texas to St. Joe, and at Jacksonville, was taken over by barges on the Atlantic intracoastal waterway for delivery to all points south of Wilmington, N. C.

All these methods of transportation combined could only supply a small proportion of the eastern needs. The two Big Inch pipe lines were installed, which were designed to move about 300,000 barrels of crude oil, and 235,000 barrels of gasoline per day. The pipe lines, the railroads, and the inland and intracoastal waterways together performed the job. The relative cost of transportation by the different methods is so well known to all who are familiar with it that there has been no room for controversy. I will give a few extracts from official documents, which show the opinions of our greatest transportation experts.

On page 17 of the digest of the hearing before the Temporary National Economic Committee as approved and published by the American Petroleum Institute, appears the following:

1. Lisle, an authority on tanker transportation, estimates the cost of transportation by various methods, as follows:

Per ton-mile:

Rail	$0.0083
Pipe line	.0032
Tanker	.00125

2. Pew introduced the following table showing the costs for the year 1937 of various methods of transportation to his company:

Per ton-mile:

Water	$0.00063
Barge	.00259
Rail	.0164
Crude pipe line	.00477
Gasoline pipe line	.00527
Trucks	.04873

3. Walsh introduced figures based on sworn figures of pipe-line operations filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission comparing the cost of transportation by various methods from group 3 to various destinations. The following is typical:

Costs per gallon, group 3 to Chicago:

Rail	$0.02805
Crude pipe line	.00636
Gasoline pipe line	.01202

On page 274, in the statement submitted by Howard Pew, president of the Sun Oil Co., appears the following:

TRANSPORTATION COSTS

The importance of the industry's specialized transportation system will be best illustrated by a comparison of transportation costs by different facilities. Our company employs all of them, and for 1937 I have tabulated the ton-miles and the costs of carriage by each facility. The figures follow:

Year 1937

Type of transportation	Ton-miles	Percent	Cost per ton-mile
Water	10,378,739,263	87.92	$0.00063
Railroad	244,358,433	2.07	.01640
Pipe line (crude)	744,174,990	6.30	.00477
Pipe line (gasoline)	372,992,210	3.16	.00527
Trucks	64,219,988	.55	.04873
Total	11,804,484,884	100.00	[1].00162

[1] Weighted average.

To recapitulate, the per-ton-mile truck-transportation cost is three times that by rail. Rail transportation in turn costs more than three times that by pipe lines; while it was over 26 times that by water.

On page 317, in the statement of Fayette B. Dow, showing comparative costs by the several methods of transportation is the following:

Approximate costs per ton-mile of 8.3 mills by rail, 3.2 mills by pipe line, and 1.25 mills by tank vessel appear in a recent publication.

These figures as to costs have been found by the Army engineers to be substantially correct. In a speech delivered by Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, at Corpus Christi, Tex., on April 18, 1942—embraced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 23, 1942—appears the following:

A moment ago I mentioned the specific problem of transporting oil of the Southwest to the consuming centers of the East and Northeast. This can be accomplished by tank car, by oceangoing tanker, by shallow-draft barge, and by pipe line. Ordinarily, the method of transportation chosen would be dictated by economic considerations. If it costs (as it does) 8 mills per ton-mile to move oil by rail, and 1¼ mills per ton-mile to move oil by deep-draft tanker, it goes without saying that most oil will move by tanker. And if it costs (as it does) 3 mills per ton-mile to move oil by pipe line, there never will be many pipe lines competing directly with deep-draft tankers. Those are considerations which enter normal peacetime decisions.

Further in the same speech General Reybold said:

A few moments ago I quoted some figures for the normal cost of moving oil by rail, by deep-sea tanker, and by pipe line. Let me complete that set of figures by stating that an average cost for the transport of oil by shallow-draft barge over long hauls is 2 to 2½ mills per ton-mile. You will recall that this is slightly in excess of the cost by deep-sea tanker; but below the cost by either pipe line or rail. In fact, the cost of barge transportation is so low as to be very attractive at any time. I am sure that, even under peacetime conditions, we would have witnessed a constant increase in oil traffic on inland waterways.

Maj. J. R. Parten, a man of great ability and wide experience in the transportation of petroleum, was Director of Transportation in the Office of the Petroleum Coordinator. He had charge of the construction of the Big Inch pipe lines. On page 218 of the hearings before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of May 18, 1942, he shows the costs per ton of critical steel of the different methods of oil transportation. He then says:

From the above it should be noted that the least efficient method in terms of the use of steel is steel barge expansion, although it may still be the cheapest method in money cost.

On page 221 appears the following colloquy:

Mr. PETERSON. I was very much impressed with your statement with reference to the movement of oil per ton of steel that would be used.

Major PARTEN. That was not true, I might say, prior to the war conditions. Tankers in normal times were more efficient than pipe lines prior to the war conditions. Tankers in normal times are more efficient than pipe lines.

On pages 228 and 229, the following:

Mr. CULKIN. This committee has heard that transportation by water is the lowest cost transportation; at least that is the history of it in the East, where, as you understand, there are certain types of specialized carriers; is not that true?

Major PARTEN. That is generally true.

Mr. CULKIN. You are departing somewhat from that theory, are you not?

Major PARTEN. We must, because we have lost our ocean transportation. We have no choice.

The Railroad Commission of Texas has supervision over railroad and pipeline transportation in that State. Col. E. O. Thompson for many years a member, and several times chairman of the commission, is a recognized authority on costs of transportation of petroleum. He agreed with the cost figures compiled by the Petroleum Institute. In the hearing before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors on May 18, 1942, on page 43, with reference to those figures, appears the following colloquy:

Mr. SMITH. Who prepared those figures that you gave, Colonel?

Colonel THOMPSON. Those figures were prepared for testimony before the TNEC in Washington in 1939, and they are found on page 274 in the testimony given before TNEC.

Mr. CULKIN. Who gave that testimony?

Colonel THOMPSON. That testimony was given by a man by the name of Pugh.

Mr. CULKIN. That is the Sun Oil Co.?

Colonel THOMPSON. Yes; the Sun Oil Co., but the testimony was compiled by the American Petroleum Institute and not by the Sun Oil Co.

Mr. CULKIN. Less than one-third of a mill per ton-mile?

Colonel THOMPSON. About that; yes.

Mr. MILLER. The figures on the cost of moving oil by these various methods as given by the Chief of Engineers are as follows: 8 mills per ton-mile by rail; 1.25 mills per ton-mile by deep-draft tanker; 3 mills per ton-mile by pipe line; and 2 to 2.50 mills per ton-mile by barge.

The CHAIRMAN. According to that the tanker is the cheapest, barge next, and pipe line next?

Colonel THOMPSON. Yes, sir; that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. And then rail is next.

Colonel THOMPSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It does not give it by highway truck?

Colonel THOMPSON. That will be still higher.

Mr. RANKIN. The cost of transporting oil by truck would be the highest, by railroad the next highest, by pipe line next, and water transportation would be the cheapest.

Colonel THOMPSON. Yes, sir.

In House Document No. 731, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, on page 8, is the following table of transportation costs:

13. Advantages of barge transportation over other transportation: Under normal conditions average unit costs of transporting oil, as reported by the National Petroleum Association, are as follows:
Mills per ton-mile:

By tank vessel	1.25
By pipe line	3.2
By rail tank car	8.3

This document was by Col. Earl North, former resident member of the Board of Engineers of the War Department, and later commandant at West Point Military Academy.

In Report No. 59 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, Senator Maloney, chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate Gasoline and Fuel-Oil Shortages, states, on pages 7 and 8, as follows:

Since Pearl Harbor, we have lost many tankers. At the same time the need for tankers to transport oil and gasoline to the fighting fronts has absorbed practically all of the tanker facilities which remain. For domestic civilian consumption we must rely on railroads, pipe lines, and inland waterways.

PIPE LINES

Pipe lines are much more expensive than tankers; railroad tank car movement is even more costly than pipe line.

On page 168 of the hearings before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for Civil Functions for 1944, Mr. George A. Wilson, Director of Transportation, Petroleum Administration for War, estimated the cost of transportation of oil through the Big Inch pipe line at 35 cents per barrel, and the war costs by tanker at 40 cents, but the prewar tanker costs at 21 to 23 or 24 cents. The following colloquy is recorded:

Mr. ENGEL. When these pipe lines are completed how will the transportation of this product by pipe line compare to rail transportation costs? Will it be less or more per barrel?

Mr. DAVIES. Well, the comparison as between pipe-line cost and tanker is this——

Mr. ENGEL. Yes; let us take that way first.

Mr. DAVIES. The comparison there is what? Mr. Wilson, what would you say it was?

Mr. WILSON. It would be about 35 cents a barrel on the 24-inch line, assuming full volume of operation, as against $1.65 average for rail.

Mr. ENGEL. And how much would it be by tanker?

Mr. WILSON. The total shipping charge by tanker is approximately 40 cents a barrel.

Mr. ENGEL. Forty cents a barrel?

Mr. WILSON. Yes.

Now, before the war the tanker cost varied between, say, 21 to 23 or 24 cents.

Mr. ENGEL. In other words, your present tanker cost is 40 cents a barrel?

Mr. DAVIES. That is the rate set by the Maritime Commission.

The above colloquy occurred in the testimony of Mr. Ralph K. Davies, Deputy Petroleum Administrator for War. The tanker operations in the domestic trade where convoys were not available had become practically impossible on account of the German submarine menace. Many tankers with their cargoes had been destroyed and hundreds of lives had been lost. Of course, the operation had become very costly, the 40 cents per barrel mentioned by Mr. Wilson being practically double the prewar cost.

On page 725, part 3, of the hearings before the Maloney Special Committee to Investigate Gasoline and Fuel-Oil Shortages, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, Mr. Joseph B. Eastman made reference to certain costs of rail transportation that should not be borne by the railroads. He said it was for facilities that would not be of benefit to the railroads after the war, because the movement would then go back to the tankers. The amount of these expenditures was approximately $10,000,000. His language on this point was as follows:

It is my own opinion that the Government ought to bear that cost, because it is a cost that will, in large part, not serve any necessary purpose after the war, because after the war the movement will certainly go back to the tankers.

Just as Mr. Eastman predicted, since the war the petroleum movement has gone back to the tankers. Major Parten, the promoter and builder of the Big- and Little-Inch pipe lines as a necessary war measure, realized that this would be the case, as his testimony shows. He stated, however, that the pipe lines would not become obsolete after the war, but would still be useful for natural gas, and possibly for other petroleum products.

The Lawyers' Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1945

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the sermon delivered by Rev. Francis J. O'Reilly, S. J., professor of philosophy of St. Louis University, and chaplain of the Catholic Lawyers Guild of St. Louis, on the occasion of the third annual Lawyers' Red Mass, October 12,

1945, at St. Louis University in St. Louis, Mo.:

"I do solemnly swear that I will support the Constitution of the United States and the State of Missouri; and that I will faithfully demean myself in my practice as an attorney and counselor at law to the best of my knowledge and ability, so help me God."

After a clerk of the supreme court of Missouri had notified you that you had successfully passed the bar examination, as an eager young attorney you were introduced to the court. A judge set before you the words which I just pronounced. As one of the truly solemn moments of your life, you took that oath of allegiance to the Constitution; the court, believing in the sincerity and seriousness with which you enunciated these words, allowed you to begin the sacred duty of practicing law in the State of Missouri.

This morning, as we assemble for our third celebration of the lawyers' red mass, it seems most fitting and proper that this oath should be chosen almost as the text of my sermon. Those are solemn, serious, and sacred words. By them you became a member of the only group in this country who by profession swear to support that great document by which these United States are legitimately constituted a democracy. This is in no sense of the word a political gathering; it is a religious assembly of men, men, who, by that oath, have dedicated their lives to the protection and propagation of law. This makes your duty in life a religious, and not a political duty.

For, dedicated under oath to support the Constitution of the United States, you have dedicated your lives to support a document which was conceived by religious ideals, which was brought forth by religious and God-fearing men, which has matured under the special protection of a divine providence which has ever blessed this land of ours, which will always remain healthy and strong as a successful instrument of government only as long as it is a way of life by which religious men are attempting to live. Irreligious men simply cannot live by our American Constitution. They must destroy it, change it, or at least circumvent it lest it prevent their ungodly machinations. For, the solid foundation of our American Constitution is the recognition of the fact that the law of God is the foundation of all law.

Our American Constitution rests its case before the bar of the nations of the world, and even before the judgment seat of God, with its famous Bill of Rights, guaranteeing the basic freedoms which make decent, human living possible among men and nations. The framers of our Constitution were wise enough, with a wisdom born of humility, not to speak of our Government granting these rights or conceding these freedoms. No, they dared to think of them as inalienable, which no government could grant nor no power on earth could ever take away; at best, they laid upon government as its primary function and responsibility to guarantee the protection of these rights. They could be that daring, because they were also logical enough to think first of these rights as an endowment, not by governments, not by men or groups of men, not even by nature, but as the endowment and inheritance which every man receives from his Creator. There is only one keystone in every arch; and, whether every American would admit it or not, it is a fact that the keystone of the beautiful arch which is our Constitution is God. You simply cannot escape it. Take God away as the foundation of all of our law and constitution, and what do you have left? Let us, then, quit talking about inalienable rights, let us discard the precious word "freedom," let us then even forget what right means. Freedom becomes the paternalism of a benevolent government at best, law becomes a politics which permits anything to serve its own purposes, and right, as its only foundation, becomes might—whether the might be military, economic, political, or social.

Thus, dedicated by oath to support the Constitution of the United States, you have not only dedicated yourselves to a work which rests solidly upon God; you have, even more, dedicated yourselves to an important work for God and for religion in this country. For, by profession, you are sworn to keep God, religion, and God's law in public and political life. Otherwise, you could never fulfill your sacred duty to support this Constitution which is the law of our land.

Thus, it is not surprising that a group of men, vowed to such a life and consecrated to such principles, should assemble to beg divine assistance in the fulfillment of the truly noble profession which is theirs. Thus, we are here this morning out of a sense of need. To do work pleasing to God, to achieve goals which are worthy of godly men, would be idealistic dreaming unless we would look to divine wisdom for guidance and to heavenly inspired fortitude for execution. Knowing, too, that we are engaged in a work for God, we come to Him for a special blessing for which our profession has all but given us a special right before God.

Thus, it is not surprising either that the Catholic Church has encouraged this Mass of the Holy Ghost for all engaged in the legal and judiciary profession. Thus, we understand why the hierachy of the United States has encouraged the formation of a Catholic Lawyers Guild in every diocese throughout the United States. That desire is about to be achieved in the archdiocese of St. Louis. Next month, on November 8, we shall have our first organization meeting. You are the men who have inspired our Archbishop to approve of our plans and constitution which will be presented to you that evening. You have proven that you want such an organization, for the simple reason that you have come to realize your own need for a closer cooperation with God and with Catholic principles in your professional life.

The Catholic Church is happy to give a special benediction upon those men who have consecrated their lives to the support of the Constitution of the United States. The Catholic Church would never want to see this Constitution changed. Its framers, perhaps, all unconsciously have woven a golden thread of Catholic thought into its pattern. The Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence, which together constitute the source of all our American political tradition, whether by accident or by an inspiring providence of God, are simply the expression of the best of Catholic political thought. The great St. Robert Bellermine could have written both of them.

With these thoughts in mind, then, realizing that God's blessing is upon your work, appreciating the need of God's help in executing it, here, in the presence of God, I am now going to ask you to stand and, repeating after me, phrase by phrase, in a body, renew that oath of allegiance to the Constitution which you solemnly took that day when you began your law career.

Ladies and gentlemen, will you all please rise.

(The lawyers then recited the oath in a body.)

A West Point for Diplomats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the Boston Post, Boston, Mass., on October 12, 1945:

WOULD TRAIN UNITED STATES DIPLOMATS—THOMAS DORGAN URGES WEST POINT FOR ENVOYS

Establishment of a West Point for diplomats, where carefully chosen young men could be educated and trained in international affairs, to implement American diplomacy toward solution of the problems which beset us in a warlike world, was proposed last night by Thomas Dorgan, clerk of the Suffolk Superior Civil Court.

Addressing the Winthrop Post of the American Legion Auxiliary at the Dugout on Hermon Street, Winthrop, Mr. Dorgan reviewed war and postwar developments, and then said:

"The best answer to all these vital problems would be a more careful selection of our diplomats. All the European nations have a diplomatic corps who are masters of international problems—their only concern is the benefit of their country—and they do a good job for their country, no matter who gets hurt in the bargain.

"Under our system, we appoint men to be ambassadors who, although very often brilliant men—and, of course, they have to be moneyed men—do not possess that worldly wisdom which is typical of European diplomats.

"We could very well establish a school, such as West Point and Annapolis, where carefully chosen young men could be educated and trained in international affairs. We are, from now on, an important factor in world politics and we need the best diplomats the Nation can produce."

Unemployment No Problem in North Dakota During Reconversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned to ask the question: Is not the promise so generously made by the propagandists of the CIO movement that we will soon have unprecedented numbers of unemployed in the United States a question that must be viewed in the light of propaganda?

At this date we are told long before the men have all returned from the armed forces that there are vast numbers of unemployed, and still in the midcontinental section of America, a section very important to the welfare of this Nation, there is today, as there has been during the war, great need for manpower. Certainly those who are returning from the armed forces are not returning, or not going into the midcontinental section of the Nation where help is very much needed.

Under the privilege of unanimous consent, I include herewith an article, a report of the committee of economic development for the State of North Dakota:

UNEMPLOYMENT NO PROBLEM IN NORTH DAKOTA DURING RECONVERSION

WASHINGTON.—A sampling of communities in North Dakota shows that unemployment

during reconversion apparently will not be a problem in that State.

The Committee for Economic Development (CED), an organization of businessmen recruited from the principal industrial centers of the Nation, undertook by telegraphic survey to determine just what the impact of peace will mean.

Replies from local CED chairmen and other officials, made public Sunday, are "generally encouraging" for North Dakota.

Replies from various towns and cities in the State include:

Banks (McKenzie County): This being a strictly ranching and farming district, our employment problems in past years have been seasonal. Our need of help will be amply supplied by our returning veterans. We do not expect, however, any unemployment to develop.

Bottineau: No unemployment in this community. We could use 50 workers in building trades.

Devils Lake: Practically no unemployment here now. Peak will come when defense workers and servicemen return.

Dickinson: Not over 30 unemployed now. Expect peak unemployment next winter. Workers of all kinds needed today.

Enderlin: There are no unemployed in Enderlin.

Grafton: Unemployment no concern this area. Community could use 600 to 800 workers.

Grand Forks: At the present time approximately 650 men could be placed in industrial employment in Grand Forks City and East Grand Forks and most jobs would be fairly permanent. Also could use from now to December 1 from 500 to 2,000 seasonal employees in agricultural pursuits.

Harvey: No unemployment.

Lisbon: We do not have any problem here at present as there are no unemployed. We are going to be able to absorb and take care of all that return to our county.

Minot: No unemployed and will not have any this winter or for several years because of the Garrison Dam and Missouri-Souris irrigation project construction.

Mott: Could use 200 men. Demand will increase.

Valley City: No unemployment. Completed survey shows 185 jobs available now.

Wahpeton: No unemployment. Could use 50 to 100 workers now.

Lts. Edward A. Silk and John J. Tominac

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1945

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I place in the RECORD the following remarks regarding First Lts. Edward A. Silk and John J. Tominac, two young men from Johnstown, Pa., who have been awarded the Nation's highest honor by having conferred upon them the Congressional Medal of Honor. It is only natural that we should be proud of these young men, who have distinguished themselves by gallantry by risking their lives for their country above and beyond the call of duty for the Nation which all of us so dearly love.

On Friday, October 12, First Lt. Edward A. Silk was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. Lieutenant Silk won this honor for storming a German fortress and single-handedly killing 4 of the enemy and capturing 12 others. President Truman, when conferring the Congressional Medal of Honor on Lieutenant Silk and 14 other soldiers, said:

When I look out and see these boys, I know I am looking at the greatest country on earth. They didn't think of themselves as heroes, probably didn't think there was anything unusual in what they did. They were doing their duty. They will help us take this Republic to world leadership where it belongs and has belonged for 25 years.

Lieutenant Silk returned to his home in Johnstown, Pa., on October 5 to see for the first time his infant daughter. No one but his wife knew that one of the country's outstanding heroes of World War II was returning home from the war front. He walked into his modest home and held in his arms for the first time his daughter, Judith Ann, and his two-and-a-half-year-old son, Jerry. Lieutenant Silk is a member of a family of 11 children. Their father died in 1918 and the children were reared in Mooseheart. Their mother passed away in April 1941, 3 days after Edward entered the armed forces.

Lt. John J. Tominac, Franklin Borough, Greater Johnstown, Pa., was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor in April 1945. Lieutenant Tominac, while fighting in Italy, led the first platoon of Yanks into Valmontone, thus assuring its capture from the retreating Germans. The soldier, who served as the platoon leader, ordered his platoon into the lead against the enemy. He then led one squad down the road into the Germans, going out ahead of a supporting tank. While the enemy scored direct hits on the tank, he manned its machine gun. Even though wounded in the shoulder, he continued with his platoon to attack the enemy.

Following his transfer to France in 1944, he was instrumental in the capture of 52 Nazi prisoners when the Sixth Army took Cleurie Quarry, a granite fortress on the Seventh Army front.

Lieutenant Tominac received the Congressional Medal of Honor from Lt. Gen. Alexander Patch at Nuremberg on April 22, 1945. He is married and a resident of Greater Johnstown, Pa.

Oleo Not Provided for Pilots or the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the effect of vitamin A on the human eyesight has long been known. World-famed nutritionists such as Dr. E. B. Hart, of Wisconsin, and others were consulted by the war authorities in regard to nutritional foods. The consumption of vitamin A was one example.

On September 26, 1945, I wrote the following letter to the Surgeon General, Dr. Thomas Parran:

SEPTEMBER 26, 1945.

DR. THOMAS PARRAN,
Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. PARRAN: In reading various newspaper articles all during the war I noted in many instances the stress placed on foods with a high vitamin A content as part of a pilot's diet.

Pilots have told me that they have always had plenty of butter and that they used it freely.

I have never heard mentioned in my conversations with pilots nor have I read in the newspaper articles any reference to the consumption of oleomargarine.

Would you be kind enough to give me the information as to whether oleomargarine was prescribed as part of the diet for pilots at any time during the war.

Sincerely yours,

REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress.

On September 28, 1945, I received the following letter from Dr. Parran:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
Washington, September 28, 1945.

HON. REID F. MURRAY,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: Your letter of September 26, concerning the use of oleomargarine by pilots has been received.

I am informed by the Surgeon General's Office of the Army that oleomargarine was not prescribed as part of the diet for pilots at any time during the war.

Very sincerely yours,

THOMAS PARRAN,
Surgeon General.

The fact that butter contains 11,000 to 18,000 international units of vitamin A and oleomargarine has only 9,000 international units of vitamin A injected into some of it, although not injected in all the oleomargarine made, was realized by the armed forces.

The point I wish to bring out is that the Oleo Trust did not have the ability to influence the medical profession so far as the armed forces were concerned. The false oleo propaganda, where they have been advertising that oleo had as much vitamin A as butter, is proving of little value.

A Matter of Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1945

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include editorials from two of the leading newspapers in my district regarding my bill, H. R. 4051, to wit: The Palm Beach Post and the Fort Lauderdale Daily News.

The Palm Beach Post adjudged this bill to be a matter of justice and comments on H. R. 4051 as follows:

A MATTER OF JUSTICE

Enlisted men in the armed forces have a good friend in Representative DWIGHT L. ROGERS.

The Sixth District Congressman believes they should receive equal treatment with commissioned officers in the matter of furlough or leave time. A bill he introduced in Congress to bring that about has received much favorable attention.

The Rogers bill would give enlisted personnel leave time equal to 2½ days per month, or 30 days per year. It provides that when an enlisted man or woman is discharged from the service, they shall be entitled to full pay and allowance of accrued leave that has not been used, at the rate of pay for the rank held at the time of separation from the service.

A retroactive clause in the measure provides that enlisted personnel discharged before its passage shall have 90 days after it becomes a law in which to file application for any pay that may be due under its provisions.

Commissioned officers already enjoy the benefits so that making them available to enlisted personnel can in nowise be regarded as a gratuity.

Opinions may differ as to the payment of bonuses but there cannot well be much disagreement over the injustice of the discrimination which Representative ROGERS is trying to have eliminated.

The Fort Lauderdale Daily News designates H. R. 4051 as a bill giving equal rights to all and comments as follows:

Recently Mr. ROGERS introduced H. R. 4051, a bill to grant to enlisted personnel of the armed forces certain benefits in lieu of accumulative leave.

The purpose of this bill is to provide for enlisted men furlough or leave time equal to 2½ days per month, or 30 days a year; it further provides that when GI Joe is discharged, he shall be entitled to receive reimbursement for full pay and allowance of accrued leave that he has not used at the rate of pay for the rank held at the time of discharge.

All this bill does is put the enlisted man on a plane to enjoy the same benefits as the commissioned ranks (officers).

The provision of this bill certainly is just and fair and accords the same and equal treatment to GI Joes to which they are entitled and should be given.

Study of Coal Resources Necessary—Minerals Vital to Our Economy—Funds Should Not Be Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the United States, as well as many other industrial powers of the world, has been developed around coal resources. Coal is the priceless ingredient that protects the economic health of the Nation and is essential in the production of steel and power—the two primary requirements of industrial strength. From the time that the first coal mine was opened in this country and the first iron furnace put into operation, our history and progress have been inseparable from coal.

No better example of the importance of coal in our national existence can be cited than the vital part coal played in World War II which has just ended. Millions and millions of tons of coal wrested from the earth kept our blast furnaces roaring and the wheels of industry turning, and provided chemicals, medicines, synthetic rubber materials, and hundreds of other essential products. Coal, perhaps more than any other resource, enabled the United States to prove again that it was a bulwark of strength and power against the forces of aggression in this world.

West Virginia produces almost one-fourth of the bituminous coal of the United States and is the leading bituminous-producing State of the Union. Coal is the life blood of our people and our industries. I have been closely associated with the problems of the industry for many years. I realize how much coal means to my State and to the Nation, and I am deeply concerned about the future of coal.

MUST STUDY ALL FEATURES

In boasting of the fact that America has enough coal to last 2,000 years at the present rate of consumption, we are prone to overlook some of the more unfavorable features in the coal picture. For instance, our reserves of high-grade coking coal needed for steel manufacture are none too plentiful and present a scarcity problem in the immediate future.

I include the following recent news story bearing directly on this point:

CUTS COKE FOR GAS USE

WASHINGTON.—The War Production Board today directed gas manufacturers to conserve byproduct coal through maximum operation of all facilities for the production of water gas.

Water gas is manufactured from oil and coke. This process, WPB officials said, results in smaller consumption of coke than other processes.

WPB also ordered gas manufacturers to make full use of other fuels where stand-by facilities are available.

Beginning October 15, industrial users of coke, including utilities, will be restricted to a 20-day supply. This restriction, WPB said, is in line with its policy of "taking any action necessary to prevent stock piling of scarce materials."

This country of ours is broad and spacious, and there are some areas where the production of coal is insufficient to sustain the population, resulting in the shipment of coal into these areas by long rail hauls. The many different kinds of special coals, both for generating power and for metallurgical uses, are not always close enough to existing or potential industries to encourage healthy industrial growth.

It is true that we have plenty of coal as far as quantity is concerned, but that certainly is no reason why we should fail to use it prudently, conserve some of the best coals for posterity, exact every possible unit of energy from our coals, and otherwise see that none of this valuable resource is wasted. In the history of the world, and in our own history, we have many examples of the unwise use of natural resources and the dire consequences that inevitably follow. We cannot afford to take chances with coal, the mainspring of our industrial economy.

My great concern about the future of coal springs from the knowledge that the Congress, in the urgency of cutting down wartime expenditures and restoring the Nation to normalcy, is soon to be asked by a committee to eliminate a small appropriation which provides funds for exploring sources of coking coals in the United States and finding new deposits of coal in critical areas. This money—about $375,000—had been appropriated to the Bureau of Mines, to continue its coal exploration work in 1946 and to add more valuable knowledge about coal to that already assembled, both during the critical years of the global conflict and during the preceding generation.

I believe there are numerous wartime activities of the Government which should be curtailed immediately—emergency offices and agencies that have been set up to perform a specific task, Government-owned factories and plants, and many other items for which the need has disappeared. Most of these projects were operated solely during the emergency and it was understood by all concerned that as soon as the war was over they should be liquidated.

EXPLORATION IS NEEDED

An inventory of American coal resources—begun years ago and still being worked on—and a wise use of coal resources throughout the years to come certainly is not to be considered as an emergency wartime expediency and something that should be dropped like a hot potato the minute peace returns. To wipe out this meager amount for coal exploration along with the cancellation of the vast plans for war plants and projects would, in my opinion, be a sad mistake. Coal, as the basis of our national economy in war and peace, deserves the best consideration from the Congress, and I sincerely hope that this small appropriation for coal exploration will not become a victim of the mass demands for cutting down wartime expenditures.

The appropriation for coal exploration which may come before this House in the near future is included in a 1946 appropriation passed by the Congress and entitled "Investigation of Deposits of Critical and Essential Minerals in the United States and Its Possessions." The bulk of the moneys appropriated under this bill was for work on many of the metals and minerals needed in war production, manganese, chromite, copper, lead, and many others. I know that there is a need for continued investigation of our coal deposits if we are to return to an orderly peacetime industrial scale and if the coal for synthetic fuels, chemicals, and dozens of other newly found uses is to be forthcoming.

It is well known that the Bureau of Mines, an old-line research agency with a reputation for integrity and producing results, has for more than three decades

devoted a large part of its work to cataloging our coal resources, testing the qualities, finding new uses for coal, and otherwise promoting the interests of this our greatest natural resource. Its staff of technologists was thus well prepared to assume a vital task during the war. The Bureau of Mines sought new sources of coking coal and deposits of coal in critical areas. The records will show many important achievements to its credit in this field, despite the limited funds available.

A number of exploration projects were under way at the beginning of the current fiscal year when the new appropriation of $375,000 was approved. Withdrawal of this money will result in immediate stoppage of all of these projects, the payment of heavy forfeits to contractors doing the drilling, and worst of all, a set-back to scientific and technical advancement—the very thing that our people are demanding.

ALASKA BEING TESTED

In Gunnison County, Colo., the Bureau of Mines is drilling holes to find coking coal suitable for the expanding steel industry of the West. In Lewis County, Wash., the Bureau is drilling and testing coal in an effort to provide additional coal supplies in a region notably short on low-cost coal. In Alaska—now and for many months past—the Bureau has explored many areas in the search for coal to sustain the armed forces in that region and to provide fuel and power for the coming industrial expansion of that great territory. Specific appropriations were made for an extensive survey of the Coosa in Alabama coal field, to find new coking coal to support the steel industry in the Birmingham district—our second greatest steel-producing area. Another project in North Carolina in the Deep River area is designed to find coal for local domestic uses, for there is very little coal mining in that section and most of it must be shipped in. In the Georges Creek Basin, near Frostburg, Md., two beds of coal have been practically exhausted and the Bureau plans to explore six other beds known to exist deeper down in the earth.

These are but a few of the representative projects which will be affected by a curtailment of funds. It is obvious that this type of work, while of great value to the war these past 4 years, also is of vital interest to the peacetime economy of the country and should be continued perhaps even on a larger scale than provided for in the 1946 appropriation which I expect to come before us for review in the near future.

All of us are familiar with the uses to which coal has been put in the building of our vast industrial empire. The three general classifications are for domestic fuel, for the production of heat and power, and as a source of gas, coke, and chemical products. For domestic heating, coals of almost any kind can be used, but I reiterate that there are many areas in the United States where coal has to be shipped in via long and costly rail haulages.

In generation of heat and power, a coal from which the greatest amount of heat can be obtained per dollar expended is desired. High-rank coals are not freely distributed throughout the country, and in many cases they have to undergo special preparation and be shipped hundreds of miles. Coal exploration of the kind I am discussing could possibly disclose many additional sources of coal for heat and power in regions closer to the industries needing them.

It is in the third category that special purpose coals are required—for gas, coke, and chemical products. These coals must be low in ash and sulfur content and capable of producing the carbonized product termed coke which is vital in producing iron and steel. It is in this field of endeavor that a long-range, wise exploration program will pay most dividends to the United States, by seeking out new sources of coking coals for the iron and steel industries springing up all over the country.

SYNTHETIC FUELS ARE COMING

In addition to the three foregoing common uses of coal, we are now on the verge of an era which may see a good portion of our gasoline and oil derived from coal, bringing new and heavy demands on the resources and calling for most exacting inventories of the types and quantities of coals in the United States. You are familiar with the synthetic liquid fuels program now being inaugurated in this country and with the Government's plans to build demonstration plants for the production of synthetic liquid fuels from coal, lignite, and other materials. The known reserves of petroleum are said to be about 13 years, and it has been accepted both by the Congress and the people that now is the time to begin laying the foundation for the time when we may have to depend upon coal to propel our vehicles and machines and to provide the lubricating oil for the wheels of industry. No one can say just how much coal will be needed to accomplish this purpose, but the total in tons could well reach into the hundreds of millions. Inasmuch as we have appropriated $30,000,000 for research in the technical aspects of how to make synthetic fuel, should we not realize that an inventory and classification of the various grades of available coal is essential? We know from past experience that the yield of gasoline per ton of coal varies widely in the different coal fields of America, and the Bureau of Mines has published the figures on about a dozen beds. But this is not enough. There are more than just a dozen coal fields in this country, and we should have the facts and figures on every one of them, ready and waiting against the time when we are ready to mine the coal and convert it into gasoline and oil. The coal exploration work of the Bureau of Mines fits into the synthetic-fuel picture very closely.

I could go into detail about how the widely separated industrial areas of the United States need this or that type of coal, and how the economy balance is tipped too far when costly imports are necessary, but I will not do so at this time. The greatly increased demand for fuels of all kinds has demonstrated beyond a doubt the need for locating and providing minable reserves of special-purpose fuels and for determining the quantities of coal in critical areas. Do not think for one minute that the end of the war has removed the need for such work, for I firmly believe that we shall need it more in peacetime if we are to maintain a healthy industrial picture. It is all well and good to say that we have enough coal to last us 2,000 years, but the minable reserves of coals and the purposes for which the coals are best suited must be determined in advance of the depletion of the high-rank coals, and if we do not do it, we are headed for trouble.

My remarks heretofore have concerned the immediate need for continuing the coal exploratory work and finishing up the projects now underway. Before closing, I wish to cite briefly two aspects of the situation which are closely related to the current work and at the same time are vitally important in the long-range coal program. One is the need for an over-all survey of coking coals in the Appalachian region, and the second is the desirability of a complete inventory of the quantity and quality of coals on the public domain.

The Appalachian region, where some high-rank coals have been exhausted, still is believed to be our greatest potential reserve of coking coals. However, there is a definite need for a complete survey to determine once and for all where these additional reserves are and what their qualities and quantities are. A survey of this type should be a part of a long-range Government program.

MUST DETERMINE THE SUPPLY

With regard to the millions of acres of public domain—Government-owned land—the United States has only a sketchy idea of the quantity and quality of the coals underlying the land. We know that there are large but undetermined reserves of coal in western public lands which are subject to leasing by the Government. By failing to inventory this coal, the Government not only is passing up a possible source of revenue, but it is also neglecting to give proper thought to the future of the Nation's industries which depend upon coal. As an example, on one coal exploratory project on public land in the State of Wyoming, the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey discovered approximately 12,000,000 tons of coking coal. This was in an area where the prevailing royalty was 15 cents a ton. Thus, the coking coal found there might provide the Government with a future income of $1,800,000.

The search for coals of all kinds and especially the coking coals, the Appalachian survey, and the inventory of public domain coal lands, all are a part of a program of great importance to the future welfare of the United States. Let us view this coal exploratory work not as an emergency wartime project, but as a long-range, peacetime program necessary for the industrial health of our great Nation. I hope that when the reduced appropriation bill for the Bureau of Mines comes before us, my colleagues will join me in supporting a continuation of the coal exploratory work.

The Atlantic Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Journal-American on September 21, 1945:

THE ATLANTIC ISLANDS

The current discussions in Washington, having the proposed lending to Great Britain of $6,000,000,000 as their object, should be broadened to include consideration of acquisition by the United States of some—perhaps all—of the strategic Atlantic and Caribbean islands which are vitally important to the security of the United States, but which are now British possessions.

The British delegation pleads that Britain is in most pressing need of the money.

While it does not acknowledge solicitation of the money as a gift, it acknowledges probable inability to repay if it should be tendered in the form of loans.

The frank intention of the British delegation is to persuade the United States that a very great American stake, in addition to the obvious British interest, is involved in letting Britain have the money—and thus to be relieved of the obligation to pay it back and of the humiliation of being unable to pay it back.

The head of the British delegation, Lord Halifax, in fact said in all candor:

"We have no intention of coming to the United States as suppliants, asking them to accept any arrangements to help us which they do not honestly feel to be in the best interests of the United States and the rest of the world."

If the British are sincere in this profession of concern for American interest, there is an honest and feasible way to prove it.

There are many British islands off the North and Central and South American shores which the United States needs for security and without possession of which the United States can never be entirely secure.

For that matter, there are numerous French and Dutch islands in the same region similarly vital to American security—and since the question of loans to France and the Netherlands will eventually arise, the proposal for American acquisition might very well be considered at the same time.

And there is the vital matter of Greenland in the north Atlantic, which is a Danish possession, and of Iceland—the latter being only nominally Danish, in reality, a republic.

None of these many important islands are capable of defense by their present owners in the event of war, as was demonstrated in the recent conflict.

Whenever it is in the interest of the United States that they be defended, the United States has to do it—and did do it in the last war at great expenditure of money and materials and manpower.

Now all of these nations are in as desperate need for American money in peace as they were for American help in war.

Why, therefore, does the United States not propose a deal for permanent American possession of the Atlantic and Caribbean islands, which otherwise will always be a constant menace to the United States?

Why, indeed, do not Britain and France and the Netherlands and Denmark themselves propose such a deal, since they need American money so badly, and since they could not hope to retain possession of the islands anyway in a war in which they did not have American help?

Let us take Lord Halifax at his word, and offer Britain financial assistance—if it must be done at all—in a form that will be "in the best interests of the United States."

For once, in any event, let the discussions of American financial assistance to foreign nations be conducted by American negotiators with due account of our American interest.

David Lawrence Supports Full-Employment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, few men in the United States enjoy more universal respect for their integrity and sincerity than the editor of the United States News, David Lawrence.

No problem except that of future peace is of nearly as much importance to the future of our country as that of maintaining full employment of the people of this Nation.

I therefore take great pleasure in including with these remarks Mr. Lawrence's editorial of October 19 in which he urges passage of the full-employment bill by the House:

FULL EMPLOYMENT

(By David Lawrence)

We had full employment and full production during the war and it meant full pay envelopes and full profits.

Having accomplished this for a destructive purpose, why can't we have it for a constructive purpose?

This is the basic urge back of the many and varied demands for full employment which has become a slogan for the left wing and a bugbear for the right wing.

Plainly the phrase deserves to be regarded with no such ambiguity. For full employment is a goal—not a formula. It is an objective. It must not be relegated, however, to that category of objectives which human society is always too preoccupied or too selfish to attain. It must become a part of our thinking—a realistic part.

The debate over full employment unhappily has been more concerned with implications and imaginary ills or benefits than with realities. We may start with the premise that the conservatives were frightened when they construed the plan as compelling them to furnish jobs even if they didn't have them to allocate and when they thought, alternatively, that we were about to enter another era of WPA boondoggling and leaf-raking.

SPONSORSHIP CAUSED SKEPTICISM

Possibly much of the alarm came because the CIO and other left wing organizations sponsored the full employment bills in Congress. But the conservatives sooner or later must get over the feeling that because the CIO sponsors something it must necessarily contain Marxian torture for the private-enterprise system. After all, the CIO and the AFL are interested in good salaries for their organizers and full-time officers and they have a huge business to maintain now—the business of collecting millions of dollars of dues. They have a stake in the private-enterprise system. Strikes and work stoppages cost them money, too. Their union business thrives on full employment because it means more dues from members.

Management, however, has a bigger stake in full employment than any other group. For full employment could mean a consumer purchasing power that would absorb a substantial part of the capacity of our machines. It could mean that we would have a surplus to spend in foreign countries, and this would tend to achieve the economic equilibrium for the world which is so much to be desired as a basis for international peace.

But conceding that everybody agrees on full employment as a goal, how shall we attain it? At the expense of our freedoms and liberties? At the expense of our solvency and national credit? Certainly not.

ECONOMIC SHIP NEEDS RUDDER

We know that totalitarianism can bring full employment and we know that, by analogy, the urge of national patriotism in war provides a submissiveness, if not a coercion, that represents the supreme will of the people. We have had economic planning during wartime, with some Government controls that would be obnoxious in peacetime.

The problem presents its dangers, to be sure, but it also presents a challenge. Is there not some way by which we can achieve full employment and yet not subject ourselves to the coercion of the State or the intrusion of governmental power into those fields of endeavor where initiative and incentive must remain if progress is to be made?

There is such a way. A nation which organized itself for maximum production in war can organize itself for peacetime prosperity. But unless all groups are willing to make certain concessions—as was the case during the war—there can be no blending of economic forces so as to produce full employment.

The concessions are relatively simple. They involve a friendly rather than a hostile attitude toward governmental guidance. Our economic system is like a fleet of ships. The fleet as a whole has a definite objective but all movements must be synchronized toward the goal.

The national Government can be the rudder of our economic system. It can keep the Nation from steering into the shoals of depression. It can guide the economic forces away from the rocks of economic anarchy. The national Government must, however, be fair and honest and be the umpire or mediator or judge—not the ally or tool of any group.

When one contemplates the vastness and the intricacy of our economic system, one wonders how the gears can ever mesh. Certainly unless all elements possess the desire for cooperation—and this means mutual concession—there can be no fitting of production into the consumption. It is not just a question of marketing the products we make nor is it a question of just increasing purchasing power so that the people will have the money to buy the goods.

Artificially created purchasing power is bound to bring in its wake ills worse than those sought to be cured. We cannot authorize public funds for nonproductive work. We cannot increase wages without some corresponding gain in output unless, of course, the wage scales are not commensurate with the production already being given.

We cannot select an arbitrary standard of living and decide that all economic forces must be united to achieve that standard. The Nation is too big to permit a minutely controlled economy. Full employment at high wages will bring its own improvement in the standard of living provided we put under wages a minimum consistent with human needs. Forty cents an hour is an obsolete minimum today.

We cannot, moreover, look at the idle machines and, bemoaning the fact that they are standing idle, urge that we must keep them going just for the sake of production. The "production for use" theory which the Socialists proclaim is predicated on the idea that the State operates all the machines and assesses the losses on the citizens as a whole. No form of State Socialism has been tried anywhere that didn't in the end point to totalitarianism and a State-control of individual liberties and freedoms.

VOLITION VERSUS COERCION

What we can do to achieve social objectives in America must be done by volition rather than by coercion. This merely means that the National Government as the spokesman for all the people can educate us all to the programs needed by industry and labor to attain full employment. This is a task of analysis—of introspection and statistical survey of our economic mechanism. This requires Government direction and funds—a trivial amount, possibly not a one-hundredth part of the sums we are paying in unemployment compensation by the States and Federal Government.

We knew little about our economic life before World War I. We made use in the postwar years of the lessons learned. We have learned much more this time and that is because the war lasted longer and we harnessed huge segments of economic power and directed them into productive channels. Our production job during the war is the marvel of all times. It really won the war for us and helped other nations to victory, too.

With this enormous capacity and skill, shall we go back to the prewar days and drift along on a hit-or-miss basis or shall we have a program? Who can provide the program?

The first step is to bring the representatives of large and small economic groups and interests together under Government auspices to study the things that make for full production and the things that repeatedly slow down or interrupt our economic machine.

A BALANCED ECONOMY

Sometimes it is maldistribution of workers. Sometimes it is maldistribution of credit. Sometimes it is the simplest thing in the world—lack of information about markets, both domestic and foreign. Sometimes it is monopolistic interference or unfair competition. There are dozens of factors that can eventually produce a catastrophe.

We cannot fix our minds on any one factor but must survey all factors. To say, for instance, that in every year the Federal Budget must be balanced even if it means eliminating certain vital functions of government is to put us in a strait-jacket which no private business would tolerate. Would any management accept from its owners the mandate that there must never be a deficit year? Would it be fair to place on any single business the responsibility for the failure of some other related business or industry which supplies the raw materials and which may be hit by something over which the first business has no control?

Nobody of responsible thought wants another WPA economy, yet in a time of widespread distress due to unemployment, political pressure compels the starting of WPA's. To prevent such extremes, it is better to plan ahead.

Democracy can be organized for efficiency in peacetime as well as in war. Organization can be democratic and self-controlled. But only government can provide the stimulus and the means for organizing the rudderless elements of our economic society.

Full employment can be attained by an American spirit of fair play and simple honesty applied to the facts of our economic life. The best agency to gather those facts and proclaim them each year is the Federal Government. That's what the full employment bill really means and that's why the House of Representatives should pass the Senate bill and help the American people take the first constructive step toward the building of a balanced economy.

Streamlining Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1945

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I would like to call the attention of the Congress to the excellent article on streamlining Congress published in the October issue of the magazine Tomorrow. This article was written by one of the foremost students of House organization, the Honorable JERRY VOORHIS, Member from the Twelfth District of California.

The article follows:

STREAMLINING CONGRESS

(By JERRY VOORHIS, Member of the House of Representatives, Twelfth District of California)

During the past few years it has become more and more evident that a new spirit of independence and initiative has been needed in Congress. This legislative body of our Government was never intended to depend so completely upon the direction and guidance of the Chief Executive as it has been doing over the past decade. As the lawmaking branch of the Government, the primary responsibility of Congress is to formulate as well as pass upon the statutes of the land. Yet in recent years Congress fell into the habit of either adopting or rejecting the President's proposals, without contributing to any considerable degree constructive proposals of its own. Thus, Congress became divided between the friends of the President and his enemies, and almost every issue was thrashed out, in part at least, on this unsound basis.

What was urgently needed in Congress was a new spirit, a spirit more in keeping with the true nature of democracy, a spirit requiring more effort and more devotion on the part of each individual member, and of Congress as a whole. With the growing realization that its rightful and normal official duties had been neglected, Congress already began to stir itself. Recently it has been taking preliminary steps toward increasing its own effectiveness and strengthening its position in the National Government.

Already, a special committee has been appointed, consisting of Members of both the House and Senate, to consider all proposals along these lines, and rather exhaustive hearings have already been held by this committee. In addition, a good deal of discussion has taken place on the floor of the two Houses, as well as in the public press, and a widespread public opinion has existed for a long time which demands that Congress organize itself more efficiently in order to meet the staggering load of problems and decisions it has to face.

With the present new administration, all these issues have been brought sharply into the foreground. What had been prior to that time a matter of good governmental policy has now become a matter of urgent necessity. For in this profound moment in world history, the duty of justifying parliamentary democratic government in the eyes of this and future generations rests squarely upon the shoulders of the Congress of the United States. That justification can be given only if Congress develops, on its own initiative and by its own effort, a constructive program for placing the United States in its proper position with the other nations of the world for the maintenance of future peace and for solving at home the insistent and complex problem of maintaining a full domestic market for as much goods as America can produce if all her people are employed. And these two great goals must be reached without the loss of the liberties which lie at the core of American political and social life.

Fundamental to all proposals for the streamlining or reorganization, or better, the strengthening of Congress, is the necessity of having Congress do its primary job as the national legislature of the United States. That job consists of much more than simple approval or disapproval of proposals made by the Chief Executive. It consists mainly in taking an over-all view of America's present and future problems, and devising the best possible legislative measures to meet those problems. The position of Congress in our National Government will ultimately depend upon how well Congress performs this task. And the issue is even deeper than that, because the heart of democratic government and the only ultimate protection of the people's constitutional liberties reside in the vigor of the national legislature. No dictatorship has ever tolerated a national legislative body. And no nation possessing a vigorous national legislature has ever yet been threatened with the loss of its people's liberty or the establishment of dictatorship. The stronger the position of the national legislature, the more secure will be, therefore, the traditional freedoms which we have always known.

Some idea of the magnitude of the task that confronts Congress will be obtained if we list some of the major problems with which it must deal in the next few years, as well as those problems which continue to arise year after year:

1. American participation in a world organization directed toward the maintenance of peace.
2. American foreign trade policy.
3. American cooperation with other nations in such fields as the relief of human destitution in devastated areas, the increase of the nations' food supply, the raising of standards of health, welfare, education and labor.
4. Present and future American military policy.
5. The question of island military bases.
6. The problem of the governments of colonial territories.
7. A fair, just, and generous provision for enabling the veterans of this war to make a worth-while readjustment to civilian life and to protect adequately the disabled among them in their right to a decent standard of living.
8. The absolute necessity of finding a reasonable answer to the problem of a national debt in excess of $300,000,000,000.
9. Development of a coordinated effective national social-security policy which can provide at least a minimum of health and decency for groups in our population who cannot or ought not to be employed, including the aged, widowed mothers and their children, the disabled, etc.
10. The whole field of future agricultural policy aimed to preserve the American family-sized farm and to assure to agriculture generally its fair share of national income.
11. Conservation and restoration of natural resources, such as the soil, water power, forests, etc.

12. The problem of dealing with the colossus of monopoly in both its domestic and international ramifications.

13. The development of a national policy of combating undernourishment, improving nutritional and health standards in all parts of the Nation, and expanding the market for agricultural products.

14. A well-devised policy to make certain that the technological advances of the war period result in the sort of expansion of American small enterprise and industrial activities which they should properly bring to the Nation.

15. Development of a simplified and coordinated, equitable, sound tax system which will not only raise necessary revenues but which will also contain elements of incentive to full employment and full business activity.

16. Over and above all these domestic problems is the overriding one of developing measures whereby a sufficient over-all volume of buying power in the hands of the people can be maintained, if necessary underwritten by the Government, so as to give a general assurance of full employment in America.

Even the foregoing list is, of course, inadequate. It omits the immediate problems of reconversion, such as the disposal of surplus property, the disposal of Government-owned war plants, the problem of contract termination, the immediate problem of demobilization, and all the rest of the difficulties of the immediate postwar period.

The magnitude of these tasks assumed by Congress is tremendous. Yet it is clear that this work must be done if the America we have known is to survive. It becomes apparent, therefore, that Congress must equip itself with adequate sources of information about all these matters. At present, congressional committees are dependent primarily upon two sources for that information—executive departments and so-called pressure or special interest groups. Valid as these two sources are, if Congress is to fulfill its manifold duties, it must be in a position to check data and add to it by means of independent sources of factual, scientific, and analytical information of its own. Individual Members cannot possibly do an adequate job in this field.

Each congressional office ought to include on its staff, then, at least one person able to devote most of his time to research work on legislative problems. Every committee of Congress should be staffed not only with a clerk, but with a competent attorney capable of acting in somewhat the same capacity as solicitors of executive departments, and with a reasonable number of research assistants for the committee. Aside from these, there must be a general congressional staff of highly trained and thoroughly competent people brought together in some such body as the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, which may be called upon at any time, either by committees or individual Members, for reports and analyses on any phase of a problem that Congress is trying to solve. There is no reason why the Legislative Reference Service cannot be transformed into such a general congressional staff. It will take money to do it, and it will take imagination on the part of Congress itself. Both can be made available.

The very magnitude of the congressional job, however, necessitates extreme simplification of machinery. This subject has been widely discussed and some of the answers to it are rather obvious. The clerk-hire allowances for Members of the House and Senate should be made sufficiently large so that each Member can afford the services of a person who might be known as an executive assistant and whose entire time would be devoted to what could be termed the representative functions of Members as distinguished from their legislative functions. For the altogether legitimate and extremely pressing demands of every congressional district upon Members of Congress to assist individual citizens, organizations, communities, or businesses in the working out of their problems with the Government are an integral part of the job of being a Representative today. Today such problems are vastly more numerous and complex than was the case only a few years ago. Such an executive assistant would have nothing to do with the work of passing legislation, but would concentrate on rendering services of a general nature to the congressional district. Thus the Member of Congress could devote himself, in a manner which at present is utterly impossible for him, to a more consistent and careful study of national problems and their proposed legislative solutions.

In addition, the number of committees should be reduced as much as possible, but not to such an extent that important phases of national life would be neglected. Detailed proposals for such a combination of committees, and reorganization of the committee structure, have been advanced by a number of Congressmen themselves. By way of illustration, there are at present five committees in the House of Representatives that deal with matters affecting war veterans. Obviously only one committee is needed, and it should be a major, not a minor, one.

H. R. 628, a bill introduced by the author of this article, covers not only the matter of providing adequate staffing of Congress, but also a proposed broadening of the functions of the regular standing committees of the House and Senate, which is, in my judgment, pretty close to the heart of the problem of modern democratic government. Briefly this proposal is that congressional committees should assume, in addition to their present function of reporting legislation to the House and Senate, the parallel and equally important task of continuously reviewing and supervising the administration of the laws Congress enacts and which result from bills reported by such committees.

The full importance of this proposal is not immediately apparent. In the first place, it would give to Congress, in the most logical manner possible, the means of seeing that the laws it passes are carried out in accordance with congressional intent. Under this proposal, it would be far more difficult for an executive agency to place its own interpretation upon language written into the law by the Congress, to impose arbitrary decisions upon the people, or to take to itself powers not duly granted by Congress.

In the second place, in the operation of such a system, there would inevitably be built up, both in Congress and in the executive agencies, an increased degree of understanding of the problems of each branch of government. Under this proposal also, very great progress would be made toward welding the legislature and executive into a true working team, with the right relationship existing between them.

The problem of administrative law, so closely connected with the task of making modern democracy function effectively without imposing arbitrary governmental restraints upon the people, might be largely solved in this way. Likewise, the congressional committee, confronted with the duty of overseeing the administration of the laws it had created, would find it absolutely essential to staff itself adequately for this purpose. And finally, granting to regular standing committees this logical function would remove the necessity of large numbers of special committees, thus making the job of each individual member somewhat simpler. Actually, many of these special committees have been set up for the purpose of investigating various executive agencies to determine whether they are doing their work properly, and also to act as a convenient forum for the airing of congressional dissatisfaction with the manner in which a given agency is conducting itself.

If Congress is to maintain its rightful position in the American form of Government, much more legislation should be conceived and drafted by Congress itself, and less of it should be handed to Congress from outside sources simply for congressional approval or disapproval. In short, if Congress is to be a true national legislature, it must be primarily responsible for national legislation. Obviously, this will require a programing of the work of Congress with a view to making the legislation to be acted upon fit into the pattern of the national needs of the United States.

For this purpose, there must be a steering committee in both Houses whose responsibility it shall be to make these decisions. There should be such steering committees in both the majority and minority parties. They should meet at regular intervals. At the head of the majority steering committee in the House there would, of course, be the Speaker and next to him the majority leader. With them should sit the chairman of the more important committees of the House of Representatives. The steering committees of the Senate should be organized in similar fashion. Before such committees, each Member of either the House or Senate should be able to come to appeal for the inclusion of particular legislation in the action program. The decision of the steering committees would thus constitute the judgment of the Congress as to the type and scope of legislation which would meet the needs of the Nation.

The minority steering committees would be composed of minority leaders in the House and Senate and the ranking minority members of important committees. The function of the minority steering committees would obviously be somewhat different from that of the majority, but it is to be hoped that there would be occasions when there could be agreement of both groups on matters of transcendent national importance. Furthermore, the advancement by such minority committees of their own program would have the healthy effect of giving the people of the United States continuous opportunity to judge the relative merits of the majority and minority programs.

These are a few of the important and urgent elements which are an integral part of this problem of streamlining Congress. In essence, the clarification of this problem is one of the functions of democratic government. Accordingly, if Congress would at its next session proceed to take some of the steps outlined here, it will have tackled the major part of the job of efficiently preparing itself for the most momentous decisions that perhaps any legislative body has ever been called upon to make in the history of the world.

Man's Relation to the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1945

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, a group of 75 distinguished students of rural life recently issued a statement Man's Relation to the Land, setting forth certain principles which the signers believe should underlie our national, State, and individual actions. The statement was made public on August 24, 1945, by Rt.

Rev. Msgr. L. G. Ligutti, National Catholic Rural Life Conference, 3801 Grand Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa; Dr. Benson Y. Landis, Committee on Town and Country Life, Federal Council of Churches, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York; and Dr. Gabriel Davidson, the Jewish Agricultural Society, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the full statement and commend it to the thoughtful consideration of the Congress in connection with legislative aids for the advancement of American farm life, and especially direct attention to the timely reference in paragraph 15 to help for returned veterans seeking opportunities on the land.

The statement follows:

MAN'S RELATION TO THE LAND—A STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES WHICH SHALL UNDERLIE OUR NATIONAL, STATE, AND INDIVIDUAL ACTIONS

We hold.

God created the world, of which the earth is a portion, with a purpose, and through His loving providence He maintains the world for the good of human beings. Therefore, all human beings possess a direct natural right to have access to created natural resources.

God's intention in creation is to enable man to live with dignity in accord with his noble nature and destiny, to develop his personality, to establish and maintain a family, and to be a useful member of society. Society exists to fulfill these aims.

THE GOOD EARTH

The land is God's greatest material gift to mankind. It is a fundamental source of food, fiber, and fuel. The right to use such elemental source of life and development is essential for human welfare. No law or contract is superior to natural law. A fundamental human right is not to be denied or rendered ineffective by any legal ordinances, apparent previous rights, or obligations.

STEWARDSHIP

Land is a very special kind of property. Ownership of land does not give an absolute right to use or abuse, nor is it devoid of social responsibilities. It is in fact a stewardship. It implies such land tenure and use as to enable the possessor to develop his personality, maintain a decent standard of living for his family, and fulfill social obligations. At the same time, the land steward has a duty to enrich the soil he tills and to hand it down to future generations as a thank offering to God, the giver, and as a loving inheritance to his children's children.

THE FAMILY AND LAND

Since the family is the primary institution, access to land and stewardship of land must be planned with the family unit in view. The special adaptability of the farm home for nurturing strong and wholesome family life is the reason for the universal interest in land use and rural welfare. A unique relationship exists between the family and the vocation of agriculture. The farm is the native habitat of the family. The family's welfare must therefore have the first consideration in economic and social planning. Throughout the history of the United States these fundamental principles have been worked out through National and State legislation, and they have been upheld by court decisions and popular acclaim.

LAND USE AND HUMAN WELFARE

Efficiency in land is not to be judged merely by material production but by a balanced consideration of the spiritual, social, and material values that redound therefrom to person, family, and society. The land is not to be a source of benefit to a favored few and a means of servile labor to the many.

Second only to making land available to the family is the responsibility of society to encourage and to educate the land stewards in the proper and most efficient use of the land and in such techniques as will make them masters of their own economic destiny.

THE TILLER'S RIGHTS AND DUTIES

The worker on the land and his family possess the first right to the fruits of their toil for a decent standard of living. Second to such right come the rights of any nonoperating owner and of the State. Rural people have the right to receive directly their just share of the economic, social, and religious benefits in organized society.

The stewards of the land owe sacred duties and obligations to God, the community, and humanity. A faithful and honest fulfillment of their responsibilities goes hand in hand with their rights and privileges.

SUGGESTED METHODS FOR THE PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF THE DECLARED PRINCIPLES ON LAND POLICY

1. Make use of the land an integral part of socio economic planning and thinking.

2. Insist that education for land stewardship and the productive home be outstanding features of rural education.

3. Emphasize a special program of enlistment and training in secondary, liberal arts, technical, and professional schools for professional service to the rural community.

4 Make the family-type farm operated by the owner a major objective of legislation and planning.

5. Reform the system of taxing land and improvements so as to facilitate access to natural resources, security of tenure, and proper land use.

6. Revise land sale and rental contracts, mortgage obligations, and other debt instruments so that no loss of ownership or insecurity of tenure be possible except through negligence or injustice on the part of the farmer-operator.

7. Discourage large land holdings as undemocratic and unsocial.

8. Where large-scale production is necessary and advisable, encourage the use of cooperative techniques with local ownership and management.

9 At all times encourage cooperatives as a means of intellectual, moral, and material advancement.

10. Where and when large-scale industrialized farming exists and requires employment of seasonal or year-round labor, demand for such labor group a living family wage, decent housing conditions, and collective bargaining.

11. Urge that wages and housing for the laborer on the small farms be decent and just. (Low wages and poor housing for the farm laborer tend to lower the reward and standards of living of the family-type farmer, bringing his own family labor into competition with the poorly paid hired hand.)

12. Extend social security provisions, particularly health, old-age and survivors' insurance, to farm people and other rural dwellers.

13. Develop locally owned and controlled business and industry in rural communities.

14. Encourage development of the "one foot on soil and one foot in city" type of living as greatly advantageous to the family when adequate cash income is secured from work in industry or commerce.

15. Make land settlement possible for returned soldiers and displaced war workers through proper financial and educational planning, provided qualified people so desire and sound arrangements can be made.

ALPHABETICAL LISTING

(All individuals signed in their personal capacities)

THE ROMAN CATHOLICS SIGNING

Rev. A. J. Adams, S. J., Campion High School.

Dr. Thomas J. Aroeneaux, South Western Louisiana Institute.

Frank Bruce, publisher, Milwaukee.

Mrs. Albert Eisele, Farm Homemaker—Rural columnist, Blue Earth, Minn.

Most Rev. William A. Griffin, D. D., bishop of Trenton.

Rev. George G. Higgins, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Prof. Emerson Hynes, St. John's University.

Rev. John LaFarge, S. J., editor, America.

Very Rev. Hubert Lerschen, regional director of rural life, Rayne, La.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. L. G. Ligutti, National Catholic Rural Life Conference.

Will Lissner, the American Journal of Economics & Sociology.

Rt. Rev. Donald A. McLean, professor, Catholic Uiversity of America.

Prof. William J. McDonald, Catholic University of America.

Most Rev. William T. Mulloy, bishop of Covington.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. John O'Grady, National Conference of Catholic Charities.

Most Rev. Edwin V. O'Hara, D. D., bishop of Kansas City, founder of National Catholic Rural Life Conference.

Rev. Charles Philipps, St. Mary's Church, Oakland, Calif.

Rev. Patrick T. Quinlan, regional director of rural life, Brookfield Center, Conn.

Rev. John C. Rawe, S. J., author and teacher, Ridge, Md.

Martin L. Salm, dairy farmer, Chilton, Wis.

Rev. Martin E. Schirber, O. S. B., dean, St. John's University, Collegeville, Minn.

Edward Skillin, Jr., editor, Commonweal.

Joseph J. Trainer, sales manager, Roller Bearing Co. of America.

Rev. Joseph V. Urbain, pastor, Millerville, Ohio.

Dr. Lydwine van Kersbergen, Grail Workers, Loveland, Ohio.

Rev. Leo R. Ward, Notre Dame University.

Most Rev. Charles D. White, bishop of Spokane.

Dorothy Willmann, the Queen's Work, St. Louis.

THE PROTESTANTS SIGNING

Dr. Joseph Ackerman, Farm Foundation.

Rev. O. O. Arnold, United Brethren in Christ.

James C. Baker, bishop, Methodist Church.

Dr. O. E. Baker, University of Maryland.

Rev. Edwin L. Becker, Disciples of Christ.

Rev. J. Burt Bouwman, Michigan Council of Churches and Christian Education.

E. R. Bowen, Cooperative League of the United States of America.

Rev. Leonard M. Bramm, Reformed Church in America.

Dr. Mark A. Dawber, Home Missions Council of North America.

Dr. William V. Dennis, Pennsylvania State College.

Rev. Francis A. Drake, Friends of the Soil.

Rev. Shirley E. Greene, Merom Institute.

Stanley Hamilton, Rural Life Association.

Rev. Hilda L. Ives, N. E. Town and Country Church Commission.

Rev. John B. Ketcham, International Council of Religious Education.

Dr. Benson Y. Landis, Committee on Town and Country.

Dr. Kathleen MacArthur, national board, Y. W. C. A.

Dr. Henry W. McLaughlin, Presbyterian Church in the United States.

Rev. I. W. Moomaw, Church of the Brethren.

Dr. Hermann N. Morse, Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

Rev. Donald F. Pielstick, Home Missions Council of North America.

Dr. Henry S. Randolph, Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

John H. Reisner, Christian Rural Fellowship.

Dr. Mark Rich, American Baptist Home Mission Society.

Rev. Clifford L. Samuelson, Protestant Episcopal Church.
Dr. Martin Schroeder, Midwest Synod, United Lutheran Church in America.
Dr. Rockwell C. Smith, Garrett Biblical Institute.
Rev. Claude J. Snyder, Evangelical and Reformed Church.
Rev. William H. Stauffer, Mennonite Church.
Dr. F. P. Stocker, American Moravian Church.
Dr. Thomas Alfred Tripp, Congregational-Christian Churches.
Dr. A. J. Walton, superintendent, department of town and country work, Methodist Church.
Rev. Ralph L. Williamson, New York State Council of Churches.
Rev. O. L. Willits, town and country department, Ohio Council of Churches.
Rev. Ralph L. Woodward, Yale Divinity School.

THE JEWS SIGNING

Dr Gabriel Davidson, Jewish Agricultural Society.
Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
Dr. Louis Finkelstein, Jewish Theological Seminary of America.
Richard S. Goldman, Jewish Agricultural Society
Rabbi Herbert S. Goldstein, Synagogues Council of America.
Rabbi Ferdinand M. Isserman, commission on justice and peace, Central Conference of American Rabbis.
Maurice Jacobs, Jewish Publication Society of America.
Dr. Isaac Landman, editor, Universal Jewish Encyclopaedia.
Dr. Solomon Liptzin, College of the City of New York.
Dr. Julian Morgenstern, Hebrew Union College.
Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, Jewish Institute of Religion.
Dr. Joseph Zeitlin, rabbi, Temple Ansche Chesed, New York.

Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1945

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, from the Economic Review, presented by the Chamber of Commerce of Puerto Rico June 1945, I have clipped an editorial.

For approximately 45 years the Puerto Rican people have been under what might be termed the control of the United States. We can look back to the experience of our original Thirteen Colonies with the mother country of England. From the pages of history we can read some of the things that were said at that time by our own people with respect to the treatment they received from England.

These are days in which we are maintaining vast armies, particularly in Japan and in Germany, in the hope of compelling some of the people in those countries to conform to some of our ideals and institutions. What success we shall have in Germany and Japan I am unable to say. At times many of us have some doubts about how far we shall go, and to what extent the American people will sufficiently interest themselves in the undertaking to make it a success.

Perhaps if we would give more real attention to that portion of our own family which is represented by 2,000,000 fine Puerto Ricans, we might get more satisfactory results from them, and perhaps the Puerto Ricans would have greater respect for our honesty, integrity, and fair-mindedness. The editorial which I submit for the RECORD is at least thought-stimulating at this particular hour when we speak and act in such broad terms with respect to peoples located outside the continental area.

The editorial follows:

Whether one considers the matter as a member of the Puerto Rican community or simply as an American citizen interested in the preservation of democracy and the American principles of government, the apathy with which the House of Representatives has received the report of the Bell committee on its investigation of social, economic, and political conditions in Puerto Rico excites rather disconcerting and disheartening reflections.

To us of Puerto Rico such apathy can have but one explanation: The indifference of the average Congressman toward the island and its affairs. The realization that this indifference is fundamentally the consequence of widespread ignorance concerning us cannot in any way minimize our natural chagrin and profound concern over a situation that constantly and adversely affects our legitimate interests and our relations with the mainland. Unquestionably we are in a very large measure responsible for such a state of affairs. Our government and our people should have made it their policy to acquaint the Members of Congress and the people of the United States with Puerto Rico, its people, its resources and potentialities, and the true mutual value of the relationship existing between the island and the mainland. We have failed to realize that ignorance breeds indifference, and must now admit that we are to blame for such apathy.

In all fairness we cannot very well impugn Congress if it has come to believe that Puerto Rico is a poverty-stricken pesthole beyond redemption. We have either overemphasized our poverty ourselves or abetted outsiders in grossly playing it up. It is no wonder that with notable exceptions everyone in Congress has a very distorted picture of the island.

Such indifference is certainly discouraging but we could not very well take offense at something we are mostly responsible for. What is really disconcerting about it is not so much its significance to us as Puerto Ricans with respect to the relationship existing between the Nation and ourselves, but the import of such indifference on the part of the representatives of the greatest democracy in the world. What must really and profoundly concern every public-spirited citizen in America is what such apathy suggests.

Woodrow Wilson once said that "Freemen need no guardmen," which is very true. But it is also equally true that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. In a democracy such as the American commonwealth, which depends upon a system of checks and balances between the three powers composing the government, it behooves the Congress as the direct representative of the Nation's electorate to exercise such vigilance; to see to it that the executive power follows and respects the principles of government on which the American democracy and the American way of life are founded.

The moment Congress neglects this paramount duty with complacency while the Executive, carried away by improper zeal, or oblivious of such principles, sets out to regiment every activity of society or individual initiative virtually surrounding its freemen with guardmen, the people are faced with a very real and serious threat to the principles on which their liberties are based.

The report of the Bell committee contains clear and conclusive indication, to say the least, that there is an American community, people by American citizens, where in open violation of the Organic Act a totalitarian form of government has been set up that is wholly inimical to the fundamental principles of American government.

How the House of Representatives can remain unperturbed by such a grave charge is something which to us seems inexplicable; all the more so in view of the fact that the Territories are the direct charges of Congress, who lacking direct representation must look to it for the adequate protection of the rights of their people.

As American citizens we must confess our inability to understand the House's failure to react to the very serious state of affairs disclosed by the report. To the cynical observer such apathy must appear as inconsistent with the declared motives of America in the present war. Obviously, the threat to the American principles of government and way of life from the inside should be and, we are sure, are of equal concern to the people of America as the outside menace which the Nation is fighting bitterly to destroy.

We find it impossible to conceive that the House of Representatives should treat such a question as that poised by the Bell committee report of May 1, 1945 (House Rept. No. 497) as a purely academic one. The members of the committee charged with the duty of conducting the investigation and reporting to the House, and who devoted considerable time and energy to the task certainly did not go about it as men who felt that they were dealing with an academic question.

Considering the gravity of the question involved and the seriousness of the situation revealed by the report, there can be little doubt that it constitutes one of the most important matters submitted to the consideration of the House of Representatives in particular and to the Congress in general. Its failure to act would indeed be not only a serious mistake but an inconceivable neglect of its duty to their fellow citizens in Puerto Rico.

FOOD DISTRIBUTION

The announcement recently made by the Secretary of the Interior in connection with the Department's so-called food program for Puerto Rico to the effect that the recent curtailment by Presidential order of the funds available for the some had made it necessary to increase the price of rice, codfish, and beans 1 cent per pound, is highly illuminating and significant. This food program is nothing less than a monopoly established here in violation of the law under various pretexts which have been advanced as circumstances seemed propitious. First, it was the shortage of shipping tonnage. When it became obvious that this argument could no longer be used, it was the alleged inability of private trade to supply the needs of the island. When it was shown the supply problem did not exist, then it was the matter of subsidization. With the virtual elimination of the alleged subsidy those responsible for the program now find themselves in a dire predicament. However, it is quite clear that they will not admit their utter failure and discontinue the socalled food program except by compulsion.

Back in April 1944 the Bell Subcommittee of the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, after an extensive and thorough study of the matter submitted a report (H. Rept. No. 1399, 78th Cong. 2d sess), strongly recommending that the Federal Government retire from that field of

endeavor because of the excessive cost of the program, its tendency to wipe out private enterprise, and because the shipping crisis had passed to such an extent that there was no longer any justification for its continuance.

Again referring to this program in its final report to the House (H. Rept. No. 497, 79th Cong. 1st sess.), the Committee on Insular Affairs has this to say: "Despite the strong recommendations and despite the assurances of private business that they could carry on the food importation and distribution satisfactorily without further governmental expenses, the Department of the Interior has continued to persist in handling its Federally financed program, although legislation has barred the usage of lend-lease funds in any way in this connection. * * * Subsequent study of the food problem has indicated that there now are adequate supplies of food stuffs and adequate shipping for Puerto Rican trade to assure successful supplying of Puerto Rico's needs through channels of trade. The subcommittee's early recommendation that food handling be returned to private business is hereby reaffirmed."

In spite of such strong recommendations and of the fact that the Department of the Interior has not attempted to contradict the conclusions arrived at by the Bell subcommittee, it has nevertheless continued to ignore the very strong condemnation of its actions and the recommendation that the so-called food program be immediately discontinued.

In so doing it has undoubtedly counted on the passive support given it by the indifference of public opinion here, which was bound to look complacently upon an activity regarding which it was supinely ignorant. The arguments advanced in its support have seemed all the more plausible since it had been sold on the idea that the program was designed to reduce the cost of basic food commodities here.

Those who are in a position to know had become convinced long ago that the real and fundamental purpose of the so-called food program was purely political and designed to carry out socialistic theories. Anyone reading the Bell committee's report is bound to arrive at the same conclusion, but unfortunately the report has received scant publicity and the majority of the people here are blissfully ignorant of the same.

But even to the uninitiated the recent announcement of the Secretary of the Interior is an eye opener. It has become quite obvious to everyone that an advance in price affecting stocks already in the Island and paid for prior to the reduction of the appropriation cannot be explained in the face of the oft repeated claim that the purpose of the program was to subsidize the food of the masses.

After a careful and dispassionate analysis of all the factors in the case we became convinced prior to the price advances recently announced that such subsidization could under no circumstances exceed $3,000,000 per annum. Obviously a subsidy of $1.50 per capita, or $7.50 per family per annum is incapable of solving or even contributing to the solution of any social or economic problem.

When it is considered, on the other hand, that the subsidy was being extended indiscriminately to everyone whether or not he needed it and, furthermore, that such scant and meager help was being extended at a terrific cost to the American taxpayer in response to no demand whatsoever from the people of the Island, who during the past 3 years have seen the most prosperous years of their lives, it becomes quite apparent that the subsidization argument bears no scrutiny and carries no weight.

The advance in prices recently announced definitely kills the argument.

Estimates made by the Chamber of Commerce of Puerto Rico conclusively establish the fact that the current wholesale prices of the Office of Supplies, of the CCC, which administers the food monopoly, allow a margin of profit that on the basis of the 1944 imports will produce an income of over three and a half million dollars per annum and that, with the single exception of codfish, regarding which the chamber did not feel that it had conclusive evidence as to price, the OS has now a fair and more than a fair margin of profit on every item still being handled by it, including rice.

Indeed, it is shocking to find that this agency, with the approval of OPA, is charging prices on which the margin of profit runs anywhere from 15 to 50 percent. Such margins are unheard of in the trade and greatly in excess of the margins that private trade is being allowed under existing ceilings. The reader will naturally ask what sort of subsidization is this that allows such outrageous profiteering.

We doubt that the list of excesses committed by the administration under extraordinary wartime powers and regulations reveals a more sorry episode than this arbitrary and irritating monopoly established by the Department of the Interior.

The Farmers' Stake in Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject The Farmers' Stake in Full Employment, which I delivered at Trenton, N. J., last Thursday before the convention of the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a privilege indeed to come to my neighboring State of New Jersey to pay my respects to your valiant leader, Jim Patton, and his courageous colleagues. It is refreshing to know men like Jim Patton, men who can and do understand the problems of our country as the problems of a whole people and not of a mere segment of our American life. I like Jim Patton because he sees clearly the vision of true American citizenship and refuses to segregate the interests of his group from the interests of all the people America is strong only when we subordinate our personal interests to the common interest. Jim Patton and his colleagues believe in a strong America.

I can remember pretty vividly the condition of agriculture when we saw agricultural prices collapse immediately following the last World War. The men who controlled farm prices then were interested in tax reduction for the rich. Andrew Mellon was more concerned about the tax burden of his millionaire friends than about supports for the price structure of agriculture. The three Presidents who served under him and a subservient Congress cut taxes, repealed appropriations, abolished price guarantees to farmers, and brought depression to the farmers 10 years before it caught up with the rest of the country.

I can remember very vividly the dark days of 1932. My sister purchased a Pennsylvania farm in the administration of Woodrow Wilson for cash, mortgaged it under Hoover, and redeemed it under Franklin Roosevelt. She could not meet expenses on the milk she sold because the steel workers of Pittsburgh had no money to purchase it. She could not purchase farm machinery and therefore was unable to help the steel mills open. This transfer of money from town to country and from farm to industrial workers is the key to our national prosperity. Herbert Hoover did not know that. He thought America lived on a one-way street. He let traffic move only in one direction and Andrew Mellon was the chief traffic officer. Jim Patton believes in two-way traffic. I have seen him in action in Washington. He believes fair wages for industrial workers brings prosperity to farmers and he believes high income to farmers brings work and fair wages to industrial workers.

In the past 11 years I have been amazed by the testimony of many farm leaders before congressional committees. One would expect these men to be men of wisdom who might envision the interdependence of all people under our American system of free enterprise. One would expect them to liken our economic system to the human circulatory system where blood moves from arteries to veins in a never-ending cycle of exchange but when these certain agricultural leaders get before a committee and testify for or against legislation a puzzled lawmaker must infer from their arguments that they believe in arteries only or in arteries clogged with clots of inactive capital. These men believe in economic thrombosis—that is, all except Jim Patton.

In the early days of my legislative experience I believed in getting the opinion of all the farm leaders. When the President called them to Washington to write a farm program many of us felt that representative men could and would write a program that would be satisfactory to all the farmers of the Nation. Some of the plans sounded a little crazy to many of us, but we accepted the proposals suggested and supported their legislation to a man—hoping thereby to solve agriculture's ills. Some of us city fellows thought surplus food should be purchased by the Government and donated to the hungry, undernourished children of the depression, but the farm leaders who came to Washington told us to "kill little pigs" and "plow down cotton." The very fellows who devised this plan and persuaded Henry Wallace to follow their advice are strangely silent now when their political bedfellows lambast the New Deal for policies of profligate waste, but their names are in the record and they hide only in the reactionary press where the truth of accusations never makes the headlines.

Jim Patton's policy is to get wages for industrial workers. They will provide abundant markets for all the food farmers will produce. His theory of economic freedom is adequate nutrition for all the people of the world. His ideal for economic security is abundant food for the underprivileged as an investment to protect the Nation against the support of tuberculosis sanitoria and the inefficiency of undernourished labor. He believes it to be the duty of government to provide universal nutrition on the same scale that government has furnished universal education. He is ridiculed by the same class of citizens who 100 years ago predicted that public education would bankrupt the Nation. We now know that public education is a national asset. Some day we will learn that universal nutrition will pay cash dividends also.

Forty million Americans are not properly fed today. If we were able to properly supply these people with the food they need our medical and dental bill would drop on a national scale. Our factory efficiency would increase, our schools would graduate more and better students, and our hospitals and sani-

toria, to say nothing of our mental and penal institutions, would shrink and shrivel to the point of insignificance. Possibly most important for the purpose of this discussion is the fact that adequate nutrition for these 40,000,000 people would require the peak production of American farms plus 8,000,000 acres; that is, our greatest war production and 8,000,000 acres beside. Prosperity for agriculture depends on prosperity for all of us. High wages and full employment provide a full-dinner pail and a satisfied stomach. We need 60,000,000 jobs to keep the farms of America producing to capacity.

I will not, I hope, be branded as a radical if I quote from the conservative Brookings Institution publication America's Capacity To Consume. The authors cited surveys made following the last World War which showed that families making $800 a year spent $400 for food, families with $1,300 annual income spent $500 for food, families with annual income of $1,800 spent $700 for food, and families with $2,700 income spent $900 for food. The study showed that 70 percent of our families made less than $2,500 in 1929. If the annual income of these people had been lifted to $2,500 they would have consumer 40 percent more food. This would have provided American farmers with between ten and fourteen billion dollars additional income. We need to find a way of feeding our own people well. Sixty million jobs and high wages will supply the money for adequate nutrition and agricultural prosperity.

When I speak of agricultural prosperity I understand that I am using a very relative term. We have never known real agricultural prosperity that is prosperity for all the farmers. When I speak of undernourished people I speak of both city and rural people. In fact, many farmers in America do not have enough to eat and in many cases farmers who eat enough in bulk find evidences of malnutrition in the teeth and bones of their children. Two hundred years of weathering and profligate farm practices have taken from the soil the very essentials of well balanced food. Proper interest in the restoration of fertility is a major responsibility of society. The annual expenditure of $300,000,000 in AAA payments during the past 7 years has been an investment in fertility as well as nutrition. Rural slums must be abolished. The underprivileged farmer must be the ward of the Government until he becomes a self-supporting, self-reliant, and self-sufficient member of society.

When we consider the war production years we assume that 6,000,000 farms produced standard quotas of food. This is by no means the case. Three million farms produced 90 percent of the food during these bumper years. These naturally received 90 percent of our agricultural income. Think of it—the other half of the farms of this country produced 10 percent and received 10 percent of the income. In analyzing these figures we find that only 313,000 farms are classified as large scale operations with total income of $4,000 or more while 2,818,566 farms are classified as family commercial farms. When these are divided by income groups we find that 375,973 farmers made between $2,500 and $4,000, 1,389,018 received between $1,000 and $2,500 income, and 1,053,575 showed an income of between $600 and $1,000. Two million nine hundred and twenty-five thousand part-time farmers received less than $600 annual income.

When we consider that less than three-quarters of a million farms earned $2,500 a year or over and about two and one-half million full-time farmers make less than $2,500 annually there is no difficulty in determing where our national interest lies. If agriculture is to survive and if we are to look confidently to the future for enough food we must adopt a national policy for the protection of the family-type farm. From our personal observation the lawyer who spends his excess cash to satisfy his love for the soil has no claim on the assistance of Government. The farmer who inherits a patrimony of fertility and stability has no need of support. The farmer who by thrift and experience has been able to accumulate a substantial backlog of security may ridicule the needs of the fellow who is lifting himself by the boot straps of success. But the fact remains that north or south, east or west, black or white, young or aged, we have no equality of opportunity in the field of agriculture today.

The young man who begins his agricultural experience in the field of tenancy makes a noble struggle. All the lease and tenancy practices are against him. He needs to own a farm but unless the tenant purchase or farm-ownership farm loans are extended beyond their present limits he is handicapped. Mortgage payments and unprotected markets together combine to dispossess him at a moment's notice. Price supports and liberal credit are necessary to prevent disaster when these young men attempt to get a foothold in life. A father of growing children views with dismay the combined effects of frost and drought in his struggle to provide for his flock. Crop insurance is a basic need of agriculture and especially the handicapped youthful operator. Who is to help when disaster threatens; when prices tumble around these brave souls; when economic security vanishes into thin air. Our forefathers came to American to enjoy religious freedom. They fought the Revolutionary War to guarantee us political freedom and now in this age of world unrest we owe it to our own people to provide economic freedom; freedom against want, freedom against monopoly, freedom from traditional standards of rental, tenancy, and crashing markets, freedom from the devastation of the law of supply and demand.

In this age of scientific development we have conquered many of the laws of Nature. In this age of economic development we have conquered the many superstitions of the ancients. In this age of social struggle we have come to believe in tolerance and brotherhood as a means of national and international safety. Having accomplished so much as a nation, it is unthinkable for us to suppose that we cannot harness the law of supply and demand as we have harnessed the law of gravity. We need not be slaves to any tradition. We have shown that we can direct the laws of Nature and economics as servants of mankind. We can and must overcome the handicaps of the family-type farm and we must utilize the agencies of government to do it.

Ten years of progress point the way to success. We have learned that we cannot trust the farm leaders who subscribe to the economic philosophy of Wall Street, the American Manufacturers Association, or Pew's Farm Journal. They are the fellows who would kill pigs in 1934 and then squeal to the high heavens in 1944. They are the fellows who plow down cotton in 1935 and plow down industrial production in 1945. They are the fellows who would accept fourth-class mail subsidies at the post office and condemn farm subsidies at the farmers' mail boxes. Our Government has found it necessary to go to the farmer himself for his version of needs. Through community elections and meetings we now secure public-opinion polls to guide our policy. The basic democracy of America speaks for farmers, and Jim Patton has his ear to the ground as he listens with us to the heartthrobs of America. The American farmer who toils for his family's welfare and the American worker who toils for his family's bread are partners. Their interests are inseparably welded together in a common interest. The focal point of their common interest is food.

Speech of Herbert Brownell, Jr., Before Advertising Club of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered on October 16, 1945, by Herbert Brownell, Jr., chairman of the Republican National Committee before the Advertising Club of Washington.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish simply to comment that what little I saw of that speech in the newspapers did not impress me, but I shall not object to its being printed in the RECORD.

Mr. WHITE. May I say, in response to the observations of the Senator from Kentucky that I have sometimes had a suspicion that he was not the best possible judge of the excellence of speeches?

Mr. BARKLEY. I always yield in that respect to the Senator from Maine, especially if it is a Republican speech.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

No greater glory inures to the citizens of any country in the world than to the American people in their right to participate in their own Government. The instances in which the exercise of that right has been specifically provided for in our Constitution are numerous and quite generally understood. There remain yet other cases, however, where the lack of such a specific provision has given rise to misunderstanding and, often enough, to very great confusion. An illustration is to be found in our dealings in the field of foreign relations.

The Supreme Court has held that the President is the sole organ to represent the United States in the sphere of negotiation in our external relations. The Constitution is completely silent on this point, yet no one would suggest on that account that there is no agent capable of acting or lacking the power to act as occasion may require. The Constitution specifically provides that treaties to bind the United States shall be made by and with the consent of the Senate. While all treaties represent agreement, it by no means follows that all agreements are treaties. Consequently, great discussion has attended attempts by our people to follow and understand when executive action resulting in agreement with another nation constitutes executive agreement or when that agreement must be submitted to the Senate for action by that body.

Yet other acts of the Chief Executive in the conduct of our foreign relations have precipitated controversy, and of late years vastly increased importance attaches to the conduct of our foreign affairs. There is bound to be conflict between a strong executive who insists upon prerogatives which he believes belong to his office and a Senate which attempts to assert its claimed responsibility in the same field.

The Constitution says that Congress shall make all needful rules and regulations regarding disposition of the property of the

United States, and certain assertive Members of that body inquire by what authority the President presumes to present to General de Gaulle an American C–54 airplane valued at several hundred thousand dollars. A heady Congress could insist upon a congressional investigation, but a President of similar attitude could refuse to appear before such a committee of investigation. Such an incident is offered simply as illustrative of the course that a determined conflict between the Congress and the Chief Executive could produce.

Parliamentary governments have not encountered any such impasse. The Prime Minister is constantly amenable to the inquiry of the parliamentary body. No better illustration of the extent of this power comes to mind than when the Parliament of Great Britain in the midst of the war called before it their own great leader, Prime Minister Winston Churchill. He was bound to defend himself under the circumstances which led to his appearance, and the whole incident high lighted the vast distinction between what can happen under our system of government and what did happen under the parliamentary system in Great Britain. The occasion was the loss of the *Prince of Wales* and the *Repulse,* which were sunk off Malaysia under attack by Japanese bombers, not long after Pearl Harbor.

Accordingly, Mr. Churchill appeared before Parliament on January 27, 1942. He pointed out that at the time of the Atlantic Charter Conference in August 1941 he and Mr. Roosevelt had discussed the problems likely to arise in the Far East. "What was the likelihood of the far eastern theater being thrown into the war by Japanese attacks?" he asked. "I will explain how very delicately we walked and how painful it was at times—how very careful I was that every time we should not be exposed singlehanded to this onslaught," he continued. After discussion of how he and Mr. Roosevelt appraised the rationale of the likelihood of Japan's conduct in this area, Mr. Churchill said:

"On the other hand, the probability since the Atlantic Conference at which I discussed these matters with President Roosevelt, that the United States even if not herself attacked would come into the war in the Far East and thus make the final victory assured, seemed to allay some of these anxieties; and that expectation has not been falsified by the events."

What were the questions resolved by the two Chiefs of State? At what point are the American people, at least through their Congress, entitled to information as to commitments made in their name by the President? Interestingly enough, the New York Sun, on January 28, 1942, editorialized on the paragraph from Mr. Churchill's address which I have just quoted. The Sun was of the opinion that Americans were caused "to look to Washington for enlightenment."

"On its surface this is a somewhat startling disclosure," said the Sun. "Does this mean that as long ago as the first fortnight in August the President and Prime Minister had an understanding not only that the United States would participate actively in the war but that participation would begin with some overt act in the Far East? If it does not, Mr. Churchill's allusion is scarcely intelligible; if it does mean that, elucidation of the mystery is something to which the American public is clearly entitled."

We know now that the Roberts commission gave us only such facts as it was permitted to glean with reference to conditions at Pearl Harbor on the morning of December 7, 1941. The joint committee of Congress to investigate the entire situation will find questions to exist which far antedate the events of that fateful Sunday.

Much has been said of late about General Marshall's most recent report concerning the events of the biennium from July 1, 1943, to June 30, 1945. As we consider the proper relationships between the Office of the Presidency and the Congress in that indefinite area of their overlapping authority in the international field, we might more appropriately turn to General Marshall's report for the biennium which terminated on June 30, 1943. In that comparatively neglected document we find much material which bears upon the point of our present inquiry. Let me quote a pertinent portion:

"During the late summer of 1941 arrangements were made for the improvement of the landing strips at Rabaul, Port Moresby, and Port Darwin, and the commanding general of the Philippines (Gen. Douglas MacArthur) was directed to deliver gasoline and bombs to these points and to Balikpapan in Borneo and Signapore in Malaysia. Deliveries to all but the last two points had been completed when the Japanese took the offensive December 7."

The reference to the "late summer of 1941" coincides with the date of the August meeting between Prime Minister Churchill and our President. It becomes perfectly evident that none of the points mentioned in General Marshall's report can be found on American soil. Clearly, our Nation had no right of its own to improve landing strips on the soil of other and sovereign nations, much less to deliver gasoline and bombs to such points throughout the fall months of 1941. Inevitably, therefore, top-level decisions were made between our Chief Executive and the representatives of other nations involved in the area described. Under what circumstances, for what consideration, with what commitments, the American people have never been told—unless Mr. Churchill told us.

As though sensing the persistent question in these respects, July 1942 brought us a partial answer with the publication entitled "How War Came," by Forrest Davis and Ernest K. Lindley. In announcing this piece the editors of the Ladies Home Journal said:

"The story of how and why this Nation—with no aggression in its heart—is now fighting for its life on all continents and on all oceans, is told in this semi-official report, revealed from files in the White House, the State Department, and other Government agencies, as well as from the lively recollections of those history-making men who actually took part in the events leading up to war."

I may remind you that Mr. Lindley is the biographer of President Roosevelt, and one of the trustees he named for the Hyde Park Foundation. Discussing the matter of Far Eastern policy considered at the time of the Atlantic Conference in 1941, the authors record:

"Churchill wished to meet the issue head on. He asked the President—as the British, Australians, and Dutch repeatedly had besought this Government before—to join in an ultimative declaration to Japan. For some time the other Pacific powers had sought to establish a deadline in the Far East, serving notice on the Nipponese Empire that thus far, and no farther, might they go; a deadline political as well as geographical, setting bounds to pressure on other states as well as to the enlargement of Japanese forces in Indo-China. While such a move entailed the risk of war, Churchill, mistrusting further procrastination, believed it might bring the Japanese to book."

The authors point out that Mr. Roosevelt lacked the constitutional capacity to make a commitment involving the possibility of automatic hostilities, and that only Congress can declare war. Mr. Roosevelt was said to believe in August "on evidence in the hands of the State Department, that war in the Pacific was a matter of weeks or months. Yet he knew the country's unreadiness. The President, therefore, temporized."

It is a well-known fact that the President may not be quoted directly without his permission. Messrs. Davis and Lindley then attributes to the President this question:

"'Wouldn't we be better off in 3 months?'

"Churchill agreed, still doubting, however, that such a respite would be forthcoming without concerted action now."

"'Leave that to me,' said the President, 'I think I can baby them along for 3 months.'"

It is to be hoped that the congressional committee, consisting of six members of the majority party, and four members of the minority party, will insist upon recognition of the congressional prerogative that the American people may yet find their answer in the facts.

Military decisions among the chiefs of state of Allied Nations in the prosecution of a war are entirely proper and within their appropriate powers, certainly, at least, so far as the United States is concerned. Political and economic decisions involving the fates of other nations and commitments in behalf of the United States with reference thereto fall into a completely different category. The distinction is such that congressional participation in America's future course cannot safely be denied. Respectful regard for our constitutional processes requires that much, and it is my fixed belief that the American people, speaking through their Congress, should be satisfied with no less. Political decisions independently arrived at by chiefs of state in secret meeting may or may not receive that support from the nation which the importance of such decisions must necessarily require.

In this connection I turn now to a matter of deep interest to the American people—the question of whether we shall have a peace conference dealing with Germany and, if so, what it will amount to.

Even before the United States entered the war Mr. Roosevelt had formed the habit of personal meetings with Mr. Churchill. Some day there will be disclosed the nature of the commitments, or moral obligations, or gentlemen's agreements which resulted. With our entry into the war meetings of the Big Three became historic landmarks. These meetings did much to correlate and synthesize the military effort of the United Nations. They contributed to the development of a general strategy which resulted in the crushing of the enemy. The three principals were accompanied by their leading military advisers, and the public emphasis was on the prosecution of the war.

But regardless of the emphasis, political decisions of enormous importance were made at these personal and secret meetings. Ad hoc decisions have fixed the destiny of nations. Many of these decisions are characterized as subject to eventual review by the peace conference, but decisions made during hostilities in accordance with elements of force and fact have a way of becoming immutable. The frontiers of Poland illustrate the case. The Curzon line has been fixed as the eastern frontier. The fate of East Prussia seems assured, a partition between the U. S. S. R. and Poland. Silesia and the territory west of the Oder fall to Poland. The three small Baltic nations have ceased to exist as nations.

A further instance, by decision, of the Big Three, a reparation commission was set up in Moscow on which Mr. Pauley represents the United States. Press reports state that within the zones of occupation machines and machine tools are being seized and evacuated. Thus the highly controversial question of Germany's industrial future is being decided by Executive act and that no peace conference in the future can undo what we are told is being done in act.

I think it is pertinent to add that the inexorability of these executive decisions is reinforced rather than mitigated by the San

Francisco Charter. Article 107 declares, "Nothing in the present Charter shall invalidate or preclude action in relation to any State which during the Second World War has been an enemy to any signatory to the present Charter, taken or authorized as a result of that war by the governments having responsibility for such actions." I bring in this reference to the Charter to demonstrate that there is little likelihood under its terms that the organization can bring about rectification of ad hoc decisions now taken.

In the past our wars have been followed closely by peace treaties, where the Senate was called upon to give its advice and consent to the terms. Thus in the past the people of the United States had an opportunity during the Senate discussion of expressing their views and approval or dissent to the way in which the Executive had terminated the conflict. In the present circumstances I see no immediate prospect of a peace conference. In the present circumstances I think it more probable that decisions will be taken in the future as in the past, by Executive determination only. Thus the administration will have assumed the sole responsibility for the terms of the major settlement of Europe, there will have been no expression of choice on the part of the American people, there will have been no advice and consent from the Senate as provided in the Constitution for international matters of this moment. This at the end of a war in which we have exhausted lives and wealth in a manner unprecedented in our history. These settlements are of vital concern to millions of our citizens, and someday, through the only political device remaining to us, in an election, the American people will express its satisfaction or dissatisfaction, will hold the administration to accountability.

Centennial Memorial Sermon at the Naval Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID I. WALSH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an inspiring sermon delivered by Chaplain W. N. Thomas, Chief of Chaplains of the United States Navy, at the centennial memorial service for graduates of the Naval Academy who have given their lives in line of duty while serving their country. The religious services which were largely attended were held on Sunday, October 7, 1945. The sermon is entitled "The Creative Force of the Great Dead."

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CREATIVE FORCE OF THE GREAT DEAD

"So Elisha died and they buried him. Now bands of Moabites were in the habit of raiding the land at the coming in of the year. And while they were burying a man, suddenly they saw a marauding band. So they cast the man in the grave of Elisha and went on. But when the man touched the bones of Elisha, he revived and arose and stood on his feet." (II Kings 13: 20 and 21.)

This strange story from the life of an ancient people is so remote from anything that we can conceive of as happening in our modern age that it may seem out of place in this service. Not only is the story told in the Bible, but Josephus relates it in his writings. It probably belonged to the folklore of generations and was recited by the firesides of homes, in the market places of villages and towns, and carried by pilgrim bands across the boundaries of provinces and kingdoms.

Elisha was a great man. He served at the court of six succeeding kings. The enemies of his country feared him. When they were tempted to invade the land, they thought of Elisha and changed their plans. It was said that he was worth more than a thousand generals. The people felt secure as long as Elisha was near. Then, the day came when the great patriot of indomitable spirit died.

But alien armies were still afraid of the land in which his body was buried, and his countrymen still believed that his spirit protected them. So, the story was told to friend and stranger of how a man who was dead touched the bones of Elisha, was revived, arose, and stood on his feet. It was their homely way of expressing a great truth which the centuries have affirmed—the creative force of the great dead.

No subject could be more appropriate for this day when we gather in these sacred walls to pay grateful tribute to the graduates of this Academy who, during the century of its existence, have given their lives in the service of their country. Yet, we cannot help but approach this hour, set apart from all the hours of a century, and dedicated to lives that are particularly sacred to us, with mixed emotions of sorrow and joy, humility and pride, and a consuming sense of inadequacy.

Other schools hold memorial services for their graduates—graduates who have gone out from the school. But, these belong to our firesides. They are fathers and husbands, friends and brothers—and sons. Their sacrifices make every inch of these grounds on which they once walked, hallowed earth. Their glory is beyond the poverty of our language. In the words of Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg, "It is beyond my poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it will never forget what they did."

The world does not forget what the great dead have done. Theirs is a creative force that revives, leads, inspires. Without them history would be as monotonous as the march of trading caravans across the desert. Therefore, they live. They must live because they silently reveal to us the creative elements of human character that defy circumstances and conditions, and grow more lustrous with the passing of the centuries.

The great dead live because their lives embody imperishable and indestructible components of life that are indispensable in the upward march of the race.

In the first place, they are alive in the creative force of their ideals. A French nobleman and philanthropist of the eighteenth century wrote the first rule of greatness when he said, "Great souls are not those who have fewer passions and more virtues than the common lot, but those only who have greater designs." As Lowell expressed it, "To have greatly dreamed precludes low ends."

As we mark the deeds of the great dead we soon discover that their deeds are great because their aims were great. Their ideals are the woof of their work. As these ideals are tested by a century of loyalty through alternating peace and war, they gather the allegiance of succeeding generations untill they are molded into high tradition, the legacy of the great dead.

Nothing is more real than the power of this intangible force. The difference in the value and the influence of the Naval Academy of 1945 and the school that opened its doors here 100 years ago is not primarily the difference in material equipment. It is the difference made by men who have proved, whatever the cost, the excellency of its purpose. And indeed, as we are the inheritors of their designs, they, in their day, built on the great purposes of those who lived before them.

In the classrooms of October 1845 there were silent teachers—Jones, Lawrence, Peary, Decatur. That they have never been absent since that beginning is written in the records of the century's heroic dead. One hundred and thirty years after James Lawrence, dying of battle wounds, set the standard with his famous words, "Don't give up the ship," that standard was reechoed by Howard Gilmore, as he lay mortally wounded on the bridge of his submarine, "Take her down."

The spirit of these and countless others is appropriately inscribed on the bronze doors of this chapel—Non sibi sed patria—Not for self but for country. The creative force of the great dead lingers through the motives by which they lived and for which they died.

In the second place, the graduates of the Academy who have given their lives in the service of their country live in the creative force of unselfish action. High resolves may be expressed in the eloquence of language: Great living can only be expressed in great deeds. In the words of Lord Lytton, "That man is great, and he alone, who serves a greatness not his own."

Measured by this exacting yardstick those on the roll of honor of this institution demand a "Well done." We would not paint them in saints' garments who like Francis of Assisi exchanged all their desires and possessions for penance and beggars rags. They were too human for that. But they met Shakespeare's challenge, "Be great in act as you have been in thought." Like saints they proved their faith by their works.

On the walls of this chapel are two examples of a unique nobility—the nobility of first place. The inscriptions on two plaques are strikingly similar. One reads. "Bagley, the first American officer who fell in the Spanish-American War." The other reads "Thomas, the first officer of any of the armed forces of the United States to lose his life in conflict in the World War." Would that we could call all the names of those who have exemplified Henry Ward Beecher's lines, "Greatness lies not in being strong but in the right use of strength."

It is fitting that they should be honored in this house of prayer in the dedication of the window, the Commission Invisible: "In reverent tribute to all the sons of their alma mater who in war and peace have realized her ideals of honor, courage, loyalty, and duty in the service of God and country this window is placed here."

We have mentioned the creative force of the ideals and the unselfish actions of the Academy's honored dead. There is still another, the creative force of their dying—the creative power of the supreme sacrifice. Kidd, and many after him in the war now about to fade into history, made it silently. On the base of this beautifully carved pulpit are two significant words—an appreciation, a memorial—and many of you thing of Young. Chandler's last words on the bridge of his ship were, "This is the price we pay." It is the price they all paid—the price of their ideals and their unselfish service. It is also a never-dying inheritance bequeathed by them to their school, their Navy, and their country.

As the figure of the Christ stands on the waters of the sea, in the window back of the altar, that symbolizes our faith in the God of goodness and justice, we dare to believe that this Man of Galilee, so perfect in

ideals, unselfish service, and great dying, accepts the companionship of our beloved dead who followed Him in proportion to their knowledge and strength.

You will forgive me if I close with a special reference to the young graduates who in the past 4 years have proved their right to wear the blue and gold. Time has not yet written their names among yesterday's great. In the language of Sala, they are "Heroes without the laurel and conquerors without the triumph." They went from these peaceful walks to the terrors of war, with their uniforms new and their insignia bright. With thousands of other young men, "theirs to do and to die." They did both in keeping with the century of traditions behind them. Russell Davenport in his great book, My Country, writes of an immortality that belongs to them.

"On the shore where the stiff white crosses
work a design for eternity,
And the infantry of sleep is forever enrolled
in silence,
And the lives of men are but numbers, and
an alien wind
Comes up to the beaches, caressing
The fallen sons of a distant country:
Here, at last the meaning of truth and freedom
Opens, unsealed, before the eyes of the Nations;
Where death has merged the memories of
Maine and Nebraska,
Of Indian fires in the desert, of bearded live
oaks,
The motion of Texas grass when the wind is
moving,
The dusty roads that lead to schools and
churches.
Here they merge like a stream—ranches and
orchards,
Court houses, banks, shops, railroads, and
factories,
Memories of faces, of lips parted with passion,
Of hands like sunlight on the nerves, of hair
fallen
Over the shoulders of someone beyond the
ocean.
Here in the name of freedom all have been
gathered
Into the perfect union of purposes united—
A brotherhood of men in the arms of death.

* * * * *

Open these graves to discover
The secret of liberty shoveled under the
earth.

* * * * *

The boys return to our hearts, like shadows
of ourselves;

* * * * *

To reinhabit the land where they cannot live.

* * * * *

Who are with her no more in the shape of
their hands and their faces,
But are in us forever a part of her being:

* * * * *

Let us live therefore, in the name of those
who have fallen,
That in our lives they may be resurrected:
Let us search for the light by which to find
them
Within ourselves and in one another.
Let us uncover the graves. Let us pray."

Almighty God, our Father, in whose holy keeping are the living and the dead; we thank Thee for the valor of those who have gone down to the sea in ships, for the glory of their deeds on the great waters, and for the everlasting benefits of their sacrifices. Help us to so live that we shall have a right to claim the noble franchise they have left to us—through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Analysis of Wisconsin Unemployment Compensation Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the October issue of the American Federationist which presents a critical analysis of the Wisconsin unemployment compensation law.

The article was written by Prof. Walter A. Morton, of the University of Wisconsin. In view of the fact that Wisconsin enacted the first unemployment compensation law in the Nation, it is important to analyze the Wisconsin experience.

I believe that this article, as well as the experience of other States, proves that we must have a single Federal system of unemployment insurance instead of the hodge-podge of 51 different systems which we have at the present time. Senate bill 1050, which the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and I have jointly introduced, along with a companion bill by Representative DINGELL in the House of Representatives, would bring order out of the chaotic State-by-State system which now exists, by establishing a single Federal system of unemployment insurance.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE "FUNCTIONAL" VIEW
(By Walter A. Morton)

(Because it was the only State with an unemployment compensation law prior to the enactment of the Social Security Act, Wisconsin long held a position of leadership in this field. In recent years, however, the situation has changed and today labor can no longer look to Wisconsin's unemployment compensation "experts" for leadership.")

Now that unemployment insurance has become an acknowledged institution in American life, we are likely to forget the conditions existing just prior to its enactment. At that time the unemployed worker had no right to compensation of any kind; when his resources were exhausted he was forced to go on relief.

It was therefore a great accomplishment, back in 1932, when the Wisconsin Legislature passed the first unemployment compensation act in the United States.

At the time the Wisconsin law was enacted many of its supporters believed it would be an effective device to save labor from the worst ravages of unemployment and to take the cost of relief off local units of government. Analysis of the statistics of Wisconson's Department of Public Welfare and Unemployment Compensation Department shows, however, that the law has failed in both these respects.

While it is hoped that the unemployment compensation system in Wisconsin will make a better showing during the postwar period, this hope may be dashed because of the opposition of the unemployment compensation department to a liberalization of benefits.

In the past there were three stops on the road to demoralization—unemployment, pauperization, relief. We have now inserted another stop, unemployement compensation, but upon its termination pauperization follows and relief is still the ultimate destiny of the jobless.

We should now go the whole way and try to avoid pauperization altogether by extending compensation for the entire period of unemployment. Instead of having three or four tops stops to pauper relief, we should block off the road completely and provide adequate unemployment compensation to cover all industrial unemployment.

During the war the Wisconsin unemployment compensation fund grew to $170,000,000. If the rates of contributions were maintained at the full 2.7 level which the Federal law permits, the fund should be ample. The present legislature and the Wisconsin Compensation Department, however, still look upon the Wisconsin law as a stabilization measure and have steadfastly opposed measures to make the law effective as a substantial aid to the unemployed.

EMPLOYERS' CONTRIBUTIONS CUT

The Wisconsin law has done little for the unemployed. Relief costs have been shifted to local communities, while the average rates paid by contributing employers have been lowered. In 1940 this rate was cut to 1.4 percent, which is only about half the maximum permitted by Federal law.

The Wisconsin Compensation Department, instead of paying only 6 percent of the cost of industrial unemployment in the State, should pay 100 percent of this cost. The pauperization principle should be completely annihilated. The unemployed should never again become a burden on the local community.

Up to now the Wisconsin act has been a great boon to the employer and as great a bane to the property taxpayer and the worker.

Some of the votaries of the Wisconsin theory of unemployment compensation have contended that they were fighting the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill simply because they were opposed to federalization. It is significant, therefore, that when they had an opportunity to throw their weight behind amendments to improve the Wisconsin law—with no question of federalization—they chose to stand against them and to use their influence for existing standards.

This may indicate that, in part at least, the opposition to Federal legislation is due to the desire not to raise present standards.

The amendments were sponsored by Assemblyman Mullen. He proposed to increase weekly benefits about 20 percent to make up for the higher cost of living, to make a $2 per person allowance for dependents up to $6 per week and to increase the maximum length of benefits to 40 weeks. He also sought to delete the cut in employers' contributions sponsored by the compensation department.

These proposals not only were a step in the direction of taking the relief burden off local governments, but they also embodied the philosophy that it is desirable to maintain purchas'ng power during a period of depression and to provide benefits on such a scale as will encourage a higher standard of living.

Opposition to the program which I have outlined as well as to the Mullen amendments is based upon a philosophy of social security which I do not share, but which, I think, should be understood in order to grasp the forces at work. This philosophy dominates unemployment compensation in Wisconsin. It is expressed by Miss Elizabeth Brandeis, in an article entitled "What Road Is Forward in Social Security?" appearing in Problems of the Postwar World, a book edited by Prof. T. C. T. McCormick.

This article states the unique philosophy underlying the Wisconsin law, which the author shows is at variance with that held

by other authorities, such as Sir William Beveridge, the Social Security Board, Senator Wagner, the A. F. of L. and the CIO.

Miss Brandeis espouses what she designates as the functional theory of social security.

It is a part of this theory that the responsibility for unemployment relief should not be unified but should be kept on a lower level than unemployment compensation.

In the words of Miss Brandeis:

"Proponents of a distributional approach of social security have been greatly concerned because relief payments, especially in some States, were so far below unemployment compensation benefits or WPA wages. From the functional point of view (i. e., the view of Miss Brandeis), such differences were necessary and desirable."

Now in applying this doctrine, let us remember that in some States minimum unemployment benefits are as low as $5 per week regardless of the size of the family. Under the functional theory, relief payments should be even less than this amount.

In Wisconsin the highest possible unemployment compensation rate is $20 per week. An unemployed person, regardless of the size of his family, would be asked to take a cut as soon as he went on relief. This would apparently be in conflict with the present relief law, which requires that families be maintained according to the prevailing standards of health and decency. Welfare administrators say that, in some cases at least, this actually requires higher expenditures than are received as unemployment compensation.

How is a family to get along when on relief on a smaller amount than is necessary when receiving unemployment compensation? Perhaps when they go on relief children cease to cry when hungry, or to suffer when cold or sick.

In truth, relief standards ought to be higher than unemployment compensation standards. For while on compensation families still have a little money left over from the recently ended period of employment, their clothes and furnishings are still in good condition, and they can take care of emergencies out of their own funds. But on the meager compensation they get, their savings diminish and then when unemployment benefits cease altogether, they must continue to spend whatever funds they have until they approach a state of destitution.

When their clothes are threadbare, the bin is empty, and the cupboard bare, they go on local relief.

Now when they get to this tragic state, according to the "functional" theory, they must be given even less than they received in the form of unemployment compensation. If there is anything designed to drive people to desperation, it is the application of these ideas. Just at a time when their vitality has been impaired and their spirits are low, we are told that we should push them down another notch in the scale.

For what purpose? What functions do such low standards serve? Who benefits by them? Or are we to sacrifice our fellow citizens simply for some peculiar obsession?

There is, indeed, a strange spirit of asceticism brooding over the functional theory but, peculiarly enough, it is not those who preach this austere gospel who practice it—that privilege they reserve for the unfortunate members of society.

Let us have done with such theories and accept the common-sense viewpoint. Our aim should not be to treat the unemployed niggardly, to press crowns of thorns down upon their heads, but to provide for them in accordance with the productive powers of society.

This is not to make unemployment attractive or to relax the rule that he who will not work shall not eat, but to assert that one who is willing to work but is denied the opportunity is entitled to live in such a manner as is made possible by the productive power of the Nation.

Depression is created by lack of effective demand. Why, then, should we depress demand further at the expense of the unemployed and accelerate the downward movement of the business cycle? Will this help other workers who still have jobs? Will it help farmers? Will it help professional men? In whose interest is such a policy proposed?

The concept of social security as a glorified slumming expedition by magnificent and well-meaning ladies ought to be relegated to the limbo of archaic ideas to make way for the enlightened economic and social philosophy which modern science has made possible of fulfillment. That this may also coincide with the ethical ideals of a Christian society is not the least of its merits.

A humane view of social security which also coincides with modern economic theory may need implementation by new laws and institutions, but new instruments without a new spirit are not enough.

An institution is justified by its function; it should not be an end in itself, merely a means of making a showing in its own terms or to provide pleasant tasks for those connected with it. The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath; and if, as I believe, the time has come when obsolete ideas, traditions, and values should give way to others more worthy of our loyalty, we can engage in the task of social reconstruction with confidence and pride.

World Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by George E. Sokolsky entitled "It Makes No Sense," published in the New York Sun of October 3, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

IT MAKES NO SENSE

How long can the failure of policy in Europe and Asia be covered up in widely publicized but meaningless platitudes? The meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers in London has failed to accomplish anything at all although it was essential that this meeting should succeed. It has failed because the United States and Great Britain desire a democratic, liberal solution of the territorial problems of Europe, and Soviet Russia pursues a strictly imperialistic course, holding what she has taken no matter what hardships, physical and spiritual, such occupation imposes upon the native population. The Patton incident is symbolic of the confusions of policy and purpose and the inability of a straight shooter to discover why a Communist is preferable to a Nazi, when they are a pair of a kind. The United States is told, in effect, to keep its nose out of the Balkans, but Soviet Russia demands a voice in the American management of the occupation of Japan, and Senator PEPPER's visit to Soviet Russia launches a campaign to encourage this country to lend Russia $6,000,000,000. There is no limit to what that country wants and no point at which it gives.

Then, in Asia, Americans discover, as though by accident, that half of Korea was presented to Soviet Russia. By whom? When? Apparently at Yalta, the apogee of appeasement, the American Munich. Half of Korea and all of Manchuria—because that country is dominated by its railroads—have been given to Soviet Russia for 5 days' fighting in the Japanese war. Then a vast campaign is conducted in the United States to malign General MacArthur, to lower his prestige among his own people, to give the impression that he favors Filipino Fascists and the Japanese, and he is booed by Communists in Madison Square Garden gathered to endorse Bill O'Dwyer for mayor of New York. Simultaneously comes the Russian demand for greater participation in the occupation of Japan. Who directed the booing of MacArthur in New York? Was it the ally who was demanding that his authority be circumscribed by a council and at the same time conducting a propaganda campaign to get this country to put up $6,000,000,000 of credit?

During the war, the United States was kept in ignorance for the sake of national security. The deals of Teheran and Yalta were covered by the opaque scum of national security. The horse trading at Potsdam was obscured by national security. But now we are at peace. Or are we? If we are at peace, why do we know so little about what is happening to our country, to its destiny, its dignity, its wealth, the lives of this and succeeding generations? Precisely why has this Council of Foreign Ministers at London failed? What is the complex of purposes that caused failure?

To say that London was just a dress rehearsal is to repeat a lie, for that meeting was called to write a peace treaty at least with Italy, Rumania, and Hungary. That could not be done. Why does not the President of the United States tell his people why nothing could be done at London? Why should we be kept in a roseate ignorance? The American people believe that this war is over, that the soldiers are coming home, that taxes will be reduced. But nothing is happening in world affairs to justify such an optimistic conclusion. But what is happening? Let Mr. Truman tell us.

Twenty million human beings are homeless. Twenty million innocent men, women, and children are homeless because they have been despoiled and abused by the politicians of Europe. They have a right to ask, How much longer? How long are those who were sacrificed on the altar of Hitler's pride and power to continue to be sacrificed in the struggle among the Big Three or the Big Five or the big anything? How long are people to die while politicians seek formulas to fool their own citizens?

Let us have an honest report on all this from the President—a report that will stand up before the facts that do creep out, as though by accident, from beneath the dunghill of propaganda.

The Drift Toward Chaos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Drift Toward Chaos," published in the Omaha (Nebr.) Morning World-Herald of October 15, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"THE DRIFT TOWARD CHAOS"

"In a world more broken than Americans realize" the English are "nearer than we in the drift toward chaos."

This simple statement with its implications makes unpleasant reading. It is contained in Anne O'Hare McCormick's report from London to the New York Times.

It is a bleak picture of postwar England that this outstandingly able and wise reporter affords us.

"She tells of "a people who live on rations and have to line up and stand waiting for every ration—food, shoes, the smallest article of clothing, an ounce of candy, a handful of cigarets. They queue up besides for newspapers, buses, places in lunchrooms, and suburban trains. London is one vast network of interwoven queues."

And what do they look like, these people standing for hours in line in the midst of a universal dearth, waiting for a chance to buy one of the simple necessities of life?

Here is the picture, in a paragraph:

"Certainly London today has the aspect of a proletarian capital. In appearance there is little to distinguish the rich, if there are any left, from the poor. All alike carry bags and bundles. All alike wear old clothes and talk of such things as sugar or makeshift curtain materials or the arrival of a ration of oranges."

Then this penetrating comment:

"There is not much inducement to keep up the capitalist system where most of the capital has disappeared. The people of Britain are nearer economic equality today than ever before."

The economic equality of a common poverty. The poverty of a society from which capital has all but disappeared—confiscated by taxation and shot away in war.

The process of confiscation has been under way for a long time—since years before the war. It explains why British industry sank year by year in efficiency and production. Why its techniques deteriorated, its machines became obsolete, why, as old wealth was exhausted, there came to be less and less of new wealth to divide. With capital bled white, the instruments and methods of production failed to keep pace with the needs of the people.

And so, with an exhausted capitalism—struck down by the powers of government—England has turned, as a last despairing recourse, to the ways of socialism. The means with which to finance the new order have been wiped out. But the ever-present help in time of trouble—the United States—remains.

The appeal is for the United States to do a large part of the financing—with a loan of $5,000,000,000, on top of the twenty-seven billions that went to England by way of lend-lease, and of the unpaid World War I debts.

The same appeal is coming from Russia—not only and for an even larger loan—but from practically every other European nation that is embracing communism or socialism, and those people are in quite as desperate condition as are the English.

Whatever else may be said of the situation, there is in it a wonderful compliment to American capitalism and free industry, which provided the dollars and the materials to win the war and is now urgently invited to provide the dollars and the materials to make the peace of Europe endurable.

Nor is this the whole of the strange situation.

For while an incessant propaganda at home urges that we give without stint, not alone to feed hungry Europe, but to reestablish its industry—on a Communist or Socialist basis—there are determined efforts to weaken, to strike down our own capitalist industry that has done the job. To turn, ourselves, to the onsweeping European system of economics and politics.

There is an old story about the drunk man trying to help another drunk man out of the gutter. He wasn't strong enough to do it. So he got down there into the gutter with him.

Regardless of how much we can do, should do, for Britain, Russia, and all the rest, should we join them in their political and economic gutter while trying to help them out of it?

It seems a fair question in a world of the utmost confusion—confusion of thinking as well as confusion of doing.

Poor old bedeviled Uncle Santa Claus.

The Race Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter to the distinguished columnist, Miss Dorothy Thompson, of New York City, written by Hon. W. Hume Logan, of Louisville, Ky. In this letter Mr. Logan, in a very clear, concise, and informative way, discusses a question of vital interest to the American people. Therefore, I as asking that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOUISVILLE, KY., *April 24, 1944.*

Miss DOROTHY THOMPSON,
New York City, N. Y.

DEAR MISS THOMPSON: Your letter of the 17th instant received.

Having been entertained many times by you over the radio, I am willing to concede your sincerity in your efforts to improve race conditions.

There is no problem in America with any race except the Negro, and the war naturally brings the two races closer together since they have a common enemy. In the North where the colored people are scarce, it is a theory; in the South where in some parts the colored race exceeds the white, it is a real problem. We people of the South who have lived with them for generations, are the ones to suffer if we handle the situation wrong. We know more about the colored people and their needs than the North will ever know. There are those in the North with the very best of intentions who want to be helpful to both black and white, who undertake to meddle with this problem and by doing so are making it much harder for the whites of the South to solve. They are exciting jealousy and envy which never helped a man, a nation, or a race.

Of course you know that the northern people brought the Negroes here from Africa and sold them in the South, and then in the Civil War freed them. Now, they want to tell us how to live with them.

If some chipmunk were to undertake to criticize you and tell you how to write and speak entertainingly, you would tell him to go soak his head, and correctly so. Now, the activities of the North on the race question come in the same category. The inference is either that the South is down on the Negro and has no sympathy with him, or that the people of the South are not intellectually competent to handle the problem, and need assistance from the know-it-alls of the North, when the facts are that the South has a deeper sympathy for the Negroes and are doing more for them of real benefit than are the people of the North.

Things such as sleeping in the same bed at a hotel that a Negro occupied the night before do not elevate the Negro nor benefit the whites.

Ninety-five percent of the money necessary to carry on the excellent system of public education for the Negroes is contributed voluntarily and willingly by the whites in the South; the buildings and appliances are equal to those occupied by the white children, so that their chances for an education are equal to those of the whites. In addition to these free public schools, the whites have supplied colleges, so that an ambitious Negro for a small fee can secure a higher education. It is the education that the Negro gets at these schools and colleges that raises his standard; the mere act of sitting by the side of a white child while getting an education does not elevate the Negro. It is what the Negro learns while in school and how he uses it that improves his condition.

The white people of the South are trying to instill a race consciousness into the Negro, a desire to improve and elevate the colored race, to take pride in doing so. The North is teaching the Negro false pride and a desire to associate with and socialize with the whites rather than with their own race. In other words, the whites of the South are putting up the money and supplying the means for the Negro to improve himself and his race, and it is up to the Negro to accept the challenge. You can lead a horse to water but you can't make him drink.

The white people give the colored employment and every opportunity to build up a business or profession among their own people. The colored race has made wonderful progress, but they have yet far to go. Booker T. Washington, George Washington Carver, and Paul Dunbar are outstanding examples of what an ambitious and energetic colored man can do within his own people to uplift his race.

In my opinion, the one race should never socialize with the other. It leads to intermarriage and finally to the absorption of the weaker race—a thing certainly not to be desired by a colored man who has pride in his race. Some years ago a traveling man in Detroit told me that he and several other white boys very much admired a beautiful young white lady of their acquaintance, and that a colored man was also paying her attention at the same time. The colored man pleaded his case successfully and the girl married him. Now, if the people of the North like that sort of thing, let them keep it to themselves, and not try to force it on the South.

Certainly, Miss Thompson, there are many ways in which you can employ your great talents that will please and uplift rather than exciting discord and degrading your own race.

In closing, may I suggest that the Federal Council of Churches drop politics, preach the Gospel, and follow the example of Paul, who said, "When I came among you I was determined to preach nothing but Jesus Christ and Him crucified."

With the very best of good wishes, I remain,

Yours sincerely,

W. HUME LOGAN.

Ernie Pyle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by Mr. J. Frank Lindsey on October 13, 1945, at Indiana Gamma of the Sigma Alpha Epsilon fraternity at Indiana University, on the occasion of the unveiling of a portrait of Ernie Pyle painted by Mathias Noheimer. This portrait was presented to Indiana Gamma by Mr. Frank B. Shields, of Indianapolis, a fraternal brother. Ernie Pyle was a member of Sigma Alpha Epsilon during his collegiate career at Indiana University.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Were Ernie Pyle present today he would be deeply embarrassed by these rites in his behalf. Throughout his life he held an innate and sincere distaste for any place in the spotlight of public acclaim. Humility and friendliness were outstanding traits of this red-headed farm boy from Dana, Ind., who became affectionately known as the Hoosier Vagabond. These traits formed the foundation for his journalistic greatness. In peacetime it was reporting for the common people that drove him to all corners of the earth, and in War II it was selfless service for the GI that held him steadfastly to his war-reporting job, though he hated war from the depth of his great soul. But Ernie Pyle was more than a writer, more than an artist. He was a friend who dropped in to sit by the fireside, or in the fox hole, and chat about simple, moving things. And when he left after a little while, his presence and his personality lingered on, making the lives of those he touched warmer, and richer, and better.

While World War I was developing, the same harassing conscience that sent him off to World War II as his contribution to the world struggle sent him in 1918 to the University of Illinois to join ROTC. The armistice cut short this episode in his life, and the urge to become a journalist sent him the next fall to Indiana University and Sigma Alpha Epsilon. Despite his shrinking-violet shyness, Ernie got around at Indiana. He was an outstanding leader in his fraternity, became editor of the Daily Student, senior yearbook Arbutus, and Smoke Up. He belonged to Sigma Delta Chi, journalistic fraternity; Aeons, leaders in scholarship and activities; Sphinx Club, a social organization of campus leaders; Cootie Club, composed of World War veterans and leaders; and the Boosters and Travelers Club.

Ernie had courage and resourcefulness, too. In the spring of 1922 the Indiana University baseball team went to Japan. So he decided to hitchhike to Japan. He did just that, and added China and Manila to his itinerary. While in the Philippines he became interested in an orphan Filipino boy. With cash limited to wages he received as a cabin boy on the *Keystone State*, he brought back the orphan boy to this country, educated him, and remembered him generously in his last will.

There was also auto polo. The Indiana band needed money for a football trip to Purdue. So he promoted an auto polo match. With two Fords stripped to the chassis, and two huge steel hoops bolted to the frame to protect the drivers from spills, or turn-overs, he and a student buddy drove Methuselah to a smashing victory and bruises—but for cash for the depleted band fund. In the field of sports during 1922 the university inaugurated the student-manager system, and Ernest T. Pyle became the first senior manager of football, for which he was awarded the varsity "I."

After leaving the campus at Indiana, Ernie plunged into newspaper work and went from reporter in LaPorte, Ind., to managing editor of the Washington News. An attack of flu in 1935 sent him to Arizona where he started writing travel pieces, and said a prominent editor, "They had a Mark Twain quality and they knocked my eyes right out." Between then and 1941 he covered, in company with "that girl," Geraldine Siebolds Pyle, 200,000 miles on five continents, crossed two oceans, and delved into every country in the Western Hemisphere.

Then came the war and once more the Pyle conscience set to work. It seemed to him there was occurring a "spiritual holocaust" and that to detour around an opportunity of sharing in the most momentous happenings was simply to be disinterested in living. "At first," says Time, "he tried to be more or less a conventional war correspondent, covering news as others did. The change began one day in Africa when the press corps was invited to meet Admiral Darlan. He was hurrying across an air strip to the interview when a swarm of Stukas swooped down, and began spattering bullets around him. He dived into a ditch just behind a GI. When the strafing was over, he tapped his companion on the shoulder and said, 'Whew, that was a close one, eh?' There was no answer. The soldier was dead. Pyle sat through the interview in a daze, went back to his tent and brooded for hours. Finally, he cabled his editor he could not write the Darlan story. Instead he wrote about the stranger who had died in the ditch beside him. For days he talked of giving up and going home. But when the shock wore off he knew for sure that his job was not with the generals, and their strategems, but with the little one-time drug store cowboys, clerks, and mechanics who had no one else to whom to tell their stories."

As author John Steinbeck explained it, "There are really two wars, and they haven't much to do with each other. There is the war of maps and logistics, or campaigns of ballistics, armies, divisions, and regiments—that is General Marshall's war. Then there is the war of homesick, weary, funny, violent, common men who wash their socks in their helmets, complain about their food, whistle at Arab girls, or any girls, for that matter, and lug themselves through as dirty a business as the world has ever seen, and do it with dignity and courage, and that is Ernie Pyle's war. He knows it as well as anyone, and can write about it better than anyone."

Well, on his way from the European war to the Pacific theater of operations, Ernie was caught long enough to be awarded the honorary degree of doctor of letters by his alma mater—Indiana University. He said he was scared stiff to wear that cap and gown and seemed truly relieved with the 2 hours spent in a warm and informal visit with his own Sigma Alpha Epsilon chapter. There he reminisced at length, reviewed trophies won during his day in school, and explored the house from dorm to dining room.

Then to the Pacific and the Great Beyond.

Millions of people at home have read his pieces avidly, wrote letters to him, prayed for him, telephoned their newspapers to ask about his health or safety. Abroad, GI's and generals sought him out, confided in him. Congress, the War Department, and the high command in the field rated him as a top morale builder, and scanned his columns for hints. The Nation, fellow citizens, and fellow newsmen heaped honors on him.

On a tiny isle in the far Pacific lie the mortal remains of Ernie Pyle. Of him it can be said he feared the sight of death, but wasn't afraid to die for the ideals of a free and rich life. His crusading spirit in behalf of the yearnings and aspirations of the common man of the world stands enshrined in the hearts of all members of Sigma Alpha Epsilon.

The Spirit of the Revolution: Equal Opportunity for All

REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have today regretfully introduced a bill to condition the tax exemption accorded to the Daughters of the American Revolution on their not denying the commercial use or rental of Constitution Hall by reason of race, creed, color, or national origin.

Remember what is inscribed on the Statue of Liberty, given us by France:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses, yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore:
Send these, the homeless, tempest tossed, to me:
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

The golden door is this democracy; this democracy that has grown up from 13 weak, sparsely populated colonies to the most powerful nation in the world. Today this democracy will be tested as never before in its history. If we meet that test we will give moral leadership to the peoples of the earth.

We cannot fail if we draw our source from the principles which have withstood the years and have carried us so far. We cannot fail if we are true to the spirit of our great Revolution. Our platform then and our platform now must be the same if we are to succeed in this perilous hour of mankind. True, we have never quite fulfilled the promise, but we have struggled toward it and we have come a long way.

We must now fulfill that promise.

The words sing out today as they did when in 1776 they were drafted by Thomas Jefferson:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

One can be justly proud to be a descendant of those who fought in that famous Revolution because it gave birth to this great Declaration, to the Constitution, to the Bill of Rights; yes, and to the pledge of allegiance to the flag: "one nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all," which we and

our children offered daily not only as a pledge but as a prayer wherever we gathered in these last terrible years.

Yes; one can be proud. As a child, I fed on that pride. My grandmother was an active member of the Daughters of the American Revolution from the State of Ohio. Much of the joy of her life came from her association with that organization. I remember one of the stories she used to tell of one of the first men who died in the Revolution—Crispus Attucks. He was a Negro.

One can be justly proud that those before them in direct line helped lay the foundation for this society of free men. But this pride is meaningless if the spirit and word is lost.

It is not easy to be freemen, for to be free you must afford freedom to your neighbor, regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin, and that, sometimes, for some, is very difficult. Freedom is not won on the battlefields. The chance for freedom is won there. The final battle is won or lost in our hearts and minds.

No; freedom is not easy, but it is infinitely precious.

We cannot legislate equality, but we can legislate, and we must legislate, as freemen, equal opportunity for all.

Disposal of Surplus Property to School, Health, and Hospital Organizations

REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, a year ago, October 1944, the Surplus Property Act of 1944 became law. That law clearly set forth that States and political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof would be given priority in the disposal of surplus property.

In the administration of this law, however, local governmental agencies not only have failed to receive priority but have actually been excluded from many sales and have even been asked to pay prices higher than those charged commercial customers. Section 13 implied that school, health, and hospital organizations would receive surplus materials at nominal prices. This provision of law has been ignored. Only now, after 1 year, does the Surplus Property Administration make the announcement that it is in process of compiling regulations to cover school, health, and hospital disposal. The pious hope has been expressed that these regulations will be ready in the near future.

The intent of Congress, Mr. Speaker, has been clearly flouted. I now read a memorandum on the subject which was prepared jointly by the commissioner of purchase of the city of New York and the superintendent of school supplies of the board of education of the city of New York:

Section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 states that the Surplus Property Board, now the Surplus Property Administrator, "shall take into consideration any benefit which has accrued or may accrue to the United States from the use of such property from any State, political subdivision." The section also states that surplus property shall be disposed of "so as to afford public and governmental institutions an opportunity to fulfill in the public interest their legitimate needs." Subdivision f of section 13 states: "The disposal of surplus property under this section to States and political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof shall be given priority over all other disposals of property provided for in this act except transfers under section 12."

We have the authority of purchasing agents throughout the United States that so far as local governmental units are concerned, surplus property disposal in this country simply does not exist. They are excluded from many sales; they are offered useless merchandise, they are asked to pay prices far higher than are charged commercial customers.

Section 13 implied that schools, health and hospital organizations would receive surplus materials at nominal prices. This provision of law has been completely ignored. No regulations giving effect to an implementing of the section have ever been issued by the Surplus Property Board.

In May, 8 months after the law was placed on the books, the Surplus Property Board adopted Regulation No. 2, which was supposed to provide priorities for governmental agencies. The National Institute of Governmental Purchasing demonstrated before a committee of the United States Senate on Thursday, October 4, that Regulation No. 2 had become a dead letter, and that a revision of this regulation issued by the Surplus Property Board 2 weeks ago completely nullifies section 13 of the law.

It was the intent of Congress that local governmental agencies be given priorities in the disposal of war surplus materials as provided in section 13. Failure of governmental agencies to comply with the intent of the law constitutes a challenge to Congress. What will the Members of Congress do to see to it that the communities which they represent receive the consideration to which they are entitled?

High-School Diplomas for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Second Lt. Hugh A. McNeill, Jr., of Billings General Hospital, Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind., under date of October 6, 1945, dealing with a plan for issuing high-school diplomas to veterans.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICE,
BILLINGS GENERAL HOSPITAL,
Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind., October 6, 1945.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senator from Indiana, Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: The Indiana State Department of Public Education, Dr. Clement T. Malan, superintendent, is doing something for the veterans that we feel should have widespread publicity. This is something concrete, something in the hand—not a promise or a plan on paper—this is here right now—a fact.

The State department of public education has made it possible for veterans to receive a high-school diploma and to date some 134 men and women from Billings General Hospital have received diplomas under this plan. Seventy-three of that number were out-of-State individuals who were given diplomas from Arsenal Technical High School in Indianapolis.

The plan is this: The soldier takes a general test, under strict supervision, and, if he passes, and his character and conduct are worthy, he is given the diploma either by his home-town high school or Arsenal Technical High. The individual must work for the honor; there is no diploma factory idea in the plan. The diploma is for work done and is recognized everywhere.

Everyone is enthusiastic about the plan and we at Billings General Hospital are more than grateful. The State of Indiana has earned the gratitude of all concerned, for they have put words into action, something badly needed these days.

Am not sure that I should be writing in this fashion, but since there is no security involved, no complaint to register, I see no harm in telling you about it that you may point out to others the manner in which your State moves to be of help to the veterans.

Enclosed is a copy of the Fifth Service Command News with a story and picture concerning the latest Purple Heart graduation. See pages 1 and 7. Sending a program and two pictures taken at the exercises.

Thanks and with all best wishes, I am
Sincerely yours.

HUGH A. MCNEILL, Jr.,
Second Lieutenant, MAC, Public Relations Officer.

Our Liberals and MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Liberals and MacArthur," published in a recent issue of the Washington Times-Herald. The editorial is self-explanatory and supplements the statement of the position which I took with respect to our foreign policy and in support of General MacArthur.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR LIBERALS AND MACARTHUR

Gen. George S. Patton, Jr., was removed recently from command of his famous United States Third Army and given charge of the paper Fifteenth Army. In plainer English, Patton was kicked out of his command in disgrace, after hanging up as brilliant a record in the German war as was hung up by any Allied commander of like rank.

Patton was removed and disgraced largely because "liberals" in the United States did not like the way he talked about his postwar job of running the military government of Bavaria. Patton openly said he was using petty civil service officials in the German towns regardless of their previous Nazi party connections, because they knew their little

jobs and he considered it essential to keep town and city machinery running.

The German ins and outs, said Patton, reminded him of the Republicans and Democrats at home. When Patton made that remark the liberal hunt for his scalp was on in full cry. The sensible thing to do when a man in such a position talks indiscreetly is for the President or Chief of Staff to send him a quite "don't talk so much, Georgie" message. But Patton was removed in disgrace, and our liberals rejoiced. Why?

Well, our liberals are trying to get the official scalp of Gen. Douglas MacArthur as Supreme Allied Commander in Japan; and it looks as if the same motives and hates are at work in MacArthur's case as were at work in Patton's.

United States "liberal" dislike of MacArthur goes back to the eviction of the bonus marchers from Washington in the Hoover administration. MacArthur was Chief of Staff at the time. He was ordered by the President to get the bonus marchers out, and he did it in orderly fashion and without killing anybody. Whether our "liberals" feel that MacArthur should have killed a lot of people, or have let the bonus marchers take over the Government, we don't know. But they have had it in for MacArthur ever since.

Their dislike of him has intensified manyfold since Bataan. Every time MacArthur took another long jump toward Japan, sewing up large Japanese forces in his wake, "liberal" hatred of him rose several degrees in temperature.

MacArthur and Nimitz between them were able to eliminate most of the old Army-Navy mutual dislike and get superb cooperation from all their forces for the winning of the Japanese war.

At last MacArthur led a big invasion army into Japan—the first time such a thing has happened in 2,000 years of Japanese history. More extraordinary still, he was able to accomplish this without firing a shot. Had the Japanese stood and fought in their home islands, we would have suffered hundreds of thousands of casualties, and might have been thrown out of Japan again.

Maybe our "liberals" are not satisfied with our World War II total of about 1,070,000 casualties, and would have liked several hundred thousand more. Whatever their reasons, they hate MacArthur more fiercely than ever, and are currently trying to get him removed and disgraced just as they got Patton.

MOSCOW VERSUS MAC ARTHUR

It may be coincidence, or it may not; anyway this "liberal" line agrees exactly with the Russian propaganda which has been building up against MacArthur since the Japs quit. Russia has grabbed huge hunks of eastern Europe, and won't even let Allied delegates into those areas to look around. Yet Russia, which played no part in bringing Japan to defeat, now is trying to cut itself into a share of the control of Japan. From there, obviously, the next step would be to demand a share in control of all those Pacific islands we took from Japan.

To get back to our "liberals"—we see them, then, attacking two of our best generals of World War II, and largely because these men were such good generals. Why? Is it the "liberal" conviction that when you get into a war you should try to lose it instead of win it, and therefore should keep your best fighting men from getting a chance to put out their best efforts?

"LIBERAL" OBJECTIVES

We think the pattern goes deeper than that. Looking over the "liberal" campaigns against MacArthur and Patton, with their technique of trying to label these great war leaders "Fascists," we think our "liberals" are out to overturn the American system and Government—just as are the American Communists from whom our "liberals" get so many of their ideas and so much of their strategy.

America Must Be on the Alert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Baltimore Sun:

COMMUNIST PARTY HERE REORGANIZED

(By N. T. Kenney)

WASHINGTON, October 17.—Evidence of the revival of the Maryland Communist Party was received by State congressmen today in the form of a letter asking abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The Communists in Maryland, along with those in the rest of the Nation, had disbanded as a political party some while back, and were in existence only as a sort of educational organization. Recently, however, the national group reinstated itself as a political group, threw out Earl Browder, its erstwhile leader, and started up again under the leadership of William Z. Foster.

Now, it appears, the Maryland group has re-formed, printed stationery, and is urging courses of action upon the Maryland legislators. Only two names appear upon its letterhead, one that of Albert E. Blumberg, as vice chairman, and the other Al Lannon, chairman.

RAN FOR GOVERNOR

Lannon signed the letter asking abolition of the House committee. Blumberg will be remembered as a long-time State Communist leader and as former Communist candidate for Governor.

The letter was reminiscent of the prewar statements of the local Communists. Drawn up in the form of a resolution, it claimed that the "Committee on Un-American Activities has shown itself from the outset to be a continuation of the infamous Dies committee."

"This committee," it continued, "by its subpenaing of leaders and members of the Communist Party, shows that it intends to follow the same path as the Dies committe, beginning by attacking the Communists, but extending its persecution to trade-unionists and progressives generally."

POLICIES ASSAILED

It deplored this tendency in this time both of national domestic crisis and "when our Government's foreign policy is taking a grave turn toward aggressive imperialistic expansion at the expense of the democratic peoples of the world."

"We believe the activity of this so-called Committee on Un-American Activities," it closed, "is part and parcel of the policy of reactionary forces in the United States to smash the labor and progressive movement."

Representative D'ALESANDRO, Democrat, of Maryland, lost no time in issuing a statement destined to show where he stood on the question.

"SINISTER" FORCES HIT

"There is abundant evidence," he said, "in the files of Congress to show that we have sinister and mischievous forces and influences within our borders seeking to inject into the minds of our children and less-educated adults destructive doctrines, and to incite rabid racial, social, and religious hatreds.

"Despite the fact that we enjoy the highest rights and privileges and the highest standard of living in the world, there are undesirable aliens in our country who would tear down these rights and privileges.

"America has too long closed its eyes to those who while enjoying the best that is in our land have been secretly plotting its downfall. The Communist, the Fascist, and Nazi in our midst, bent on spreading discontent, must be ferreted out and exposed.

CURB IS DEMANDED

"Freedom of speech, freedom of opinion, we must preserve. But the abuse of these liberties by those who are boring from within, and who seek only the destruction of the American way of life, must be curbed by a firm Government hand and by a sound public opinion."

Representative FALLON, Democrat, of Maryland, simply routed his copy of the Communist resolution to the Committee on Un-American Activities itself and informed the Communists he had done so.

LANNON IN MARYLAND ABOUT 3 YEARS

Al Lannon has been in Maryland about 3 years, identified with either the Communist Party or the Communist Political Association all of that time.

He came here from New York, where he was State organization secretary of the Communist Party for several years. When he first came here, he was secretary of the Communist Party. He later became president of the Communist Political Association, when the organization took the place of the party several years ago.

JOINED PARTY IN RUSSIA

Some months ago, when there was a reorganization, he became chairman of the Communist Party.

He was born in Brooklyn, N. Y., on September 14, 1907; was a seaman for 14 years, and joined the Communist Party in Russia, where he had gone on a voyage.

He figured in disputes with the Reverend John F. Cronin, S. S., in the spring of 1944 when Father Cronin said Communists were trying to control labor unions in shipyards and war factories.

Treatment of Veterans in Mental Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT CANNON
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas the newspapers throughout the Nation reported in July of this year the killing of two Navy enlisted men who were patients at St. Elizabeths Hospital, Washington, D. C.; and

Whereas said killings were presumably committed by attendants at this Government mental hospital; and

Whereas the newspaper PM had earlier exposed great violence and brutality at the veterans' mental hospital at Lyons, N. J.; and

Whereas the manager of the veterans' mental hospital at Northport, Long Island, N. Y., has testified to many acts of brutality committed by attendants at the institution under his control against helpless inmates; and

Whereas, the sworn statement of Basil H. Pollitt, a Miami attorney (who is a former special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States and who is also a past national judge advocate of the Marine Corps League), has revealed numerous instances of

terrible brutality by attendants against helpless inmates at St. Elizabeths Hospital and at Lyons, N. J., and also at the veterans' mental hospital at Perry Point, Md.; and

Whereas it is common knowledge among businessmen in the Miami area that numerous returning discharged World War II veterans take a job and then are unable to hold it for more than a few days or weeks, due to the mental strain caused by battle fatigue; and

Whereas it is the policy, not only of the American Legion but also of the other veteran groups, to make certain that these young men of World War II receive the very best care and treatment medically that a grateful Government can supply; and

Whereas the affidavit of Basil H. Pollitt proves that this intolerable condition of brutality by attendants to inmates of mental hospitals is not a new thing, but is a chronic condition of long standing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Harvey W. Seeds Post, No. 29, Department of Florida, American Legion, in meeting regularly held at the post home in Miami, Fla., on September 14, 1945, as follows:

That the House World War Veterans' Committee continue its investigations of acts of brutality committed against inmates who are veterans in Government hospitals and specifically that it widen the scope of its inquiry so to include St. Elizabeths Hospital.

That swift and stern punishment be meted out by the courts to all persons responsible for acts of brutality committed by Government employees against inmates of veterans' mental hospitals, no matter how high the rank or position of the guilty person may be.

That the House World War Veterans' Committee permit Basil H. Pollitt to testify in detail as to all the charges made by him in his sworn statement at as early a date as it may be practicable by the committee to hear him.

That copies of this resolution be sent to Gen. Omar Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, to the two United States Senators from Florida, to the Congressman from this congressional district, and to all members of the House World War Veterans' Committee.

Unanimously adopted this 14th day of September A. D. 1945.

J. MARTIN DEER,
Commander.
JERRY GANZ,
Adjutant.
LYNN M. SHAW,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee.

Socialization of Industry in England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a reproduction of the Round Table column by Wilbur J. Brons, published in the September 11, 1945, issue of the Chicago Journal of Commerce.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You can be sure that the recent speech of Herbert Morrison, Lord President of the Council of Britain's new Government, will not be widely reprinted in the press of this country. Nevertheless, Mr. Morrison's remarks deserve widespread circulation because they bear so directly upon our own major problem of the moment.

Morrison spoke at Leeds, Englands, before the National Conference of Labor Women. He received very little publicity from the American press associations, but several special correspondents—including one for whom the writer can vouch personally as a thoroughly objective reporter—cabled the substance of the speech.

The British cabinet member addressed himself to a fallacy which is becoming even more popular in this country than it has been in England. This is the somewhat infantile argument that the biggest problem of the peace will be to increase industrial efficiency so that the individual worker can pass more hours loafing in the sun. With this delightful buncombe goes the corollary premise that the chief obstacle in the path toward Utopia is backward management. Millions of Americans seem to have swallowed this nonsense hook, line, and sinker.

Mr. Morrison came right out in the open with a challenge to his country's new Labor Government, of which he himself is a part. He told the unions that their restrictions on production would have to come off. He warned them that the tendency toward shorter hours will have to be reversed, adding that the unions were 100 percent wrong in assuming that management owned all the blame for laggard industrial efficiency in Great Britain.

Socialization alone, he said, is no magic cure. It won't be enough for people merely to depend upon the Government to assure them larger participation in the fruits of production; workers themselves will have to produce the goods by which England hopes to raise her standard of living. In other words, if British workers have deluded themselves with the hope that a Labor Government means complete freedom from all industrial discipline, they are doomed to disappointment.

The speaker said as bluntly as he knew how that if the British people want more, they will have to produce more. And he warned that the socialized segments of industry in Britain cannot live on the proceeds of taxation of unsocialized industry because to attempt to do so would kill all incentive to produce.

As we remarked at the beginning of this discussion, Morrison's remarks deserve wider circulation in this country than they are likely to get. Some of our own Government agencies, including the Department of Labor, would do well to write to London for a copy of the speech and refer to it frequently when they are about to make some profound statement about how to improve living standards in the United States.

Full Employment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made this morning before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments by George S. Benson:

My name is George S. Benson. I am president of Harding College at Searcy, Ark. I am also chairman of the executive committee of the Arkansas Public Expenditure Council, a taxpayers' organization. I came here as a private citizen who is interested in the future of our country. I have been authorized by officers of the Arkansas Farm Bureau and by officers of many other Arkansas organizations to say that these organizations are in agreement with the principles of my testimony. I have been asked also to represent the Arkansas Public Expenditure Council.

With regard to the full employment bill recently passed by the Senate (S. 380), I wish to confine my testimony to three items in the bill.

First. This bill states in section 2 (c): "The Federal Government has the responsibility * * * to assure continuing full employment, that is, the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities, for all Americans able to work and desiring to work."

When Mr. Albert Goss, master of the National Grange, testified before the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate, he recommended that this be changed to read: "It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to pursue such consistent and openly arrived at economic policies and programs as will prevent monopoly and encourage economic returns to its citizens in approximate proportions to what each contributes to the general welfare, as the basic means of securing the highest level of consumption of consumer goods, and personal services, thereby assuring the highest level of employment opportunity through private and non-Federal investment and expenditures."

I should prefer amending it so as to read: "The Federal Government has the responsibility to assist always in providing conditions which will enable competitive private enterprise to provide at all times sufficient employment opportunities for all Americans able and willing to work."

In event it is not so amended, I would then suggest the change which I have just read, recommended by Mr. Goss.

Second. I would eliminate section (3), which provides that the program of the Federal Government shall provide for an income for the aged sufficient to enable them to maintain a decent and healthful standard of living, and promote the retirement from the labor force of the older citizens.

This section has come to your attention many times vested in various verbiage. It is probably best known as the Townsend plan.

Third. I would eliminate section 4, which requires Federal investment and expenditures for the purpose of providing full employment.

SOME GOOD FEATURES

In my opinion, this bill is neither wholly good nor wholly bad. It contains provisions which can help America reach new heights of prosperity for all of its citizens, and it also contains provisions which can destroy the main spring—that motivating force which has brought to America a measure of prosperity never attained by any other nation anywhere at any time.

Briefly, the bill provides three things, namely:

1. Cooperative planning.
2. A guarantee by the Federal Government that even though an individual is a lazy, untrustworthy drunkard most of the time, yet whenever he sobers up and looks for a job, one will be waiting for him.
3. An income for old people, usually called the Townsend plan.

I strongly approve of the principles behind the first item mentioned, "cooperative planning," which in this bill is called the national production and employment budget. My experience does not qualify me to discuss this portion of the bill in detail. I do hope, however, that you will see fit to retain these principles of planning and that Congress will create a Joint Committee on the National Budget.

Naturally, I am in sympathy with the idea of continuing full employment and want to see it assured in the fullest possible measure. I, therefore, wish to urge the elimination of section 2 (d) 3 known as the Townsend plan because I believe it would bankrupt the country, undermine the spirit of self-reliance, which is responsible for America's greatness, result in lower wages, and more unemployment. I suggest that this subject be referred to the groups in Congress and in Government who are studying social security.

I also urge the elimination of the statement that the Federal Government has the responsibility to assure continuing full employment for all Americans able to work and seeking work, and I urge the elimination of section 2 (d) 4 which underwrites public works and other Federal expenditures for the purpose of providing these jobs. I believe these sections would weaken national morale and actually prevent continuing full employment.

SLUR AT OUR BEST PEOPLE

Gentlemen, I believe that if Congress passed a bill stating that our Government has the responsibility of providing a job for everybody able to work and desiring to work, it would be resented by a majority of our citizens. It would be received as a direct, personal insult by every independent, self-reliant individual in this country, both native and naturalized.

I was born on a frontier farm in western Oklahoma, when our nearest railroad was 60 miles away. My father worked hard and the whole family worked. After finishing grammar school, I was granted permission to leave home, to attend high school and college. Neither one existed in our community. I had the privilege of earning my own way while acquiring an education. We all rejoiced in this, and our other opportunities. Not a member of the family thought Uncle Sam or anyone else owed us anything.

If somebody had spread a rumor in our community that my father was no longer willing to be personally responsible for himself and his family, that he thought the Government ought to accept the responsibility of providing him a job at good wages, he would have felt indignant. He would have been disgraced.

From my position as president of Harding College I know that whenever you place responsibility upon the Federal Government to provide jobs, you will be injuring American citizenship; injuring a constantly increasing proportion of them, just as much as if you cut off a leg and substituted a crutch. This is a strong statement but it is one which I can prove—one which I have seen demonstrated hundreds of times while serving as head of a college.

Most of the young people who attended Harding College during the great depression had to work for a part or all of their college expenses. They knew that finding a job after leaving college was their own responsibility. On the other hand, Harvard and Yale enrolled many sons of wealthy men, who felt confident that when they graduated, the responsibility of finding a job was dad's, not theirs. When these young men graduated in the midst of a long depression and dad couldn't get them jobs they were helpless, knowing neither how to find a job nor make one for themselves. Many of them were jobless for months; even years.

A POINT OF PRIDE

Do you know how many of the graduates of Harding College failed to find jobs or make jobs for themselves during the depression? Not a single one. Everyone who wanted to work found work or made work. Why could every Harding College graduate do this while many graduates of great universities could not? What was the difference? Simply this: We emphasized to our students every day the necessity of self-reliance, individual responsibility, and individual initiative. We did in student assembly and in classroom what was done in almost every American home in the days of Abraham Lincoln.

Suppose, however, that our students had been taught at home that it was the responsibility of dad or of Uncle Sam to find jobs for them, and we had not corrected this false teaching. What would have happened when they graduated in 1934 or 1938? They could not have earned a living; just as the person who has never tried to stand on his own feet can't walk. I wonder how many members of this committee understood at an early age that they would have to find their own jobs and earn their own living.

I cannot believe that any man would be a stronger, more capable, more self-reliant citizen for being taught in childhood that, regardless of what he did, the Government would always have a job for him; that no matter how often he was fired for drunkenness, for dishonesty, or for laziness, the job would always be there whenever he became disposed to return to work and was able to work.

For Government to assume the responsibility of providing a job for each and every individual is ridiculous and injurious.

It would create almost immediately a nation of dependent weaklings. It would destroy initiative, limit production, and reduce the national wealth.

Gentlemen, I say if this Congress tells the world that the American people are no longer self-reliant, tells the world that our two-fisted, two-legged upright Americans have accepted the old crutch upon which decadent civilizations have traditionally hobbled to their graves, it will administer the most damaging blow that this generation of mankind has ever sustained

These words are not guesses. I am not dreaming. The proof of these statements is available to everybody. If you want an illustration, look at the pathetic remnants of that sturdy race of Americans who were here when the Pilgrims landed. As wards of Uncle Sam, without a thing to worry about, they are moving through decadence toward extinction.

WHERE CAN IT STOP?

If this Congress announces to the world that it is the duty of the Federal Government to guarantee to all workers, continuing full employment, we must assume that by next year the Congress will be ready to make the guaranty all-inclusive by assuring every farmer, every merchant, every businessman, and every corporation a continuing annual profit. If not, why not?

Gentlemen, if you are considering such a fundamental change in our established philosophy—a change from self-reliance to dependence upon Uncle Sam, let us look for a minute at what we have achieved under our present way of life, and view what we would be giving up.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Self-reliance in America has developed the greatest wealth this world has ever known. For instance, at the beginning of World War II, the national income of America exceeded the combined national incomes of the six next highest countries. America's average per capita income was twice that of any other great country. We had more young people in high school and college than had all the rest of the world put together. Industrial wages in America in 1939 were twice as high as in England, Germany, or France, and five times as high as in Russia. Agriculture made use of abundant machinery, making it possible for one man to farm 100, 200, 300, and even 400 acres. An American farmer produces much more than he and his family can consume. He exchanges his surplus for manufactured things—clothing, an automobile, a telephone, a refrigerator, a radio. Both labor and agriculture in America have enjoyed the highest standards that wage earners and farmers ever have been known to experience.

In turn, industry has created material wealth in great abundance. The average American is richer than was Solomon, who with all his wealth, didn't have enough money to buy a daily newspaper. Solomon in all his glory had no electric lights, no telephone, no radio, no refrigerator. The royal chariot was horse-drawn.

TIE NOTHING TO FAMILY TREE

This singular American prosperity is not due merely to our heritage, excellent though it is. We are chiefly of European stock. Our unique achievements are not due merely to our varied natural resources, abundant as these resources are. The American Indians had the same resources for centuries without creating any considerable wealth. England, since the destruction of the great Spanish Armada, has not wanted for her share of the world's natural resources, yet even in England wages have never been more than half as high as the scale developed in our country. Russia has as wide a variety of natural resources, and twice the quantity that we possess. She has about 160,000,000 people and much more territory than we have. If it were merely a matter of resources, Russia would be paying higher wages than we, and would have attained a higher standard of living than America. But no—her wages are only one-fifth as high as ours and her standard of living correspondingly low.

IT IS OUR SELF-RELIANCE AND FREEDOM

What's different in America is our measure of individual initiative, freedom, and liberty. Under the freedom guaranteed by the American Constitution, each man is at liberty to dream his own plans and to materialize his own visions. Every man is free to set about fulfilling his aspiration. Moreover he is individually responsible for its fulfillment. Exceptional individuals, who have struck off from the beaten path and accomplished what no one else thought possible, are the men who have developed our American way of life. Henry Ford is a good example. When he resolved to pay $5 a day for common labor, other employers thought he was crazy. When he decided to make an automobile that farmers could afford to buy, people laughed at the idea. But Ford succeeded in making and selling the inexpensive automobile. He revolutionized private transportation in America. Just such accomplishments by free enterprisers have made America different and better.

No country with a government guaranty of jobs, which by its very nature requires a government-planned economy, ever has achieved an average per capita income half as high as America's. No country, using even a partially government-managed economy, has achieved income more than half as high as ours. Our self-reliance, our freedom, our liberties—these are the secret of our prosperity.

It was during the days of Athenian democracy that Greece attained her highest achievement. It was during the days of the Roman republic that Roman justice reached its zenith; when men sought Roman citizenship; bought Roman citizenship. It was following the Magna Carta that England developed her great empire. It was under a still greater measure of freedom, liberty, and self-reliance in the Western Hemisphere that man's highest economic achievements have been realized.

Gentlemen, I have mentioned some of the things which self-reliance and the system of free competitive private enterprise have created in this country. I should hate to see us take even one step in the direction of foreign philosophies. I do not want to see that foreign camel get even his nose under our tent. I know that when we accept, as a national policy, a statement by Congress

that Uncle Sam has the responsibility of providing jobs for all able to work and seeking work, we will have taken the first step.

THEN COMES REGIMENTATION

The second step follows naturally and certainly. In order to guarantee successfully, continuing full employment, any nation finally will be compelled to control production and consumption. This would mean telling each manufacturer and grower what to produce and how much. It would mean telling each consumer what to buy and how much. It would mean permanent price fixing and rationing. It would finally mean controlling the location of factories and the compulsory assignment of workers. It would mean telling our children what training they may get and what jobs they may enter.

This whole question is extremely real to me. It is not based upon hearsay or theories read in books. I witnessed extreme poverty during the 11 years I lived in China, poverty which was caused solely by governmental policies. There were ample natural resources but there was no opportunity for individual achievement. Men of means and vision buried their money in the ground instead of using it to make jobs and produce goods. It was necessary, therefore, to import coal, oil, and iron, even though all three lay in abundance beneath the soil of their own country.

From personal observation under 15 flags, it is plain to see that the chief hindrance to greater prosperity in every backward country is lack of individual freedom and individual opportunity. When I think of how regimentation and poverty go hand-in-hand, I am extremely anxious that the United States shall not take a single step in the direction of these foreign ideologies.

Gentlemen, I regard very seriously the trend already evident in this country toward state socialism; with our younger generation the following slogans are being constantly popularized: "Planned economy," "Production for use not for profit," "Guaranteed jobs and guaranteed wages," "Ceilings on incomes," etc. The youth of today are not being told frankly, however, that these ends can be attained only through Government control of industry, agriculture, and transportation. They are not being told that it means regimentation—the end of individual opportunity.

Gentlemen, this attack on our American way of life is more dangerous than the frontal attack made by the Axis Powers, which we crushed only with great loss of blood and treasure. Allow me to illustrate:

AN INSIDIOUS ENEMY

When our soldiers landed on Guadalcanal, they were attacked by Japanese bombers, naval guns, and land troops. All of these powerful weapons of opposition, our men succeeded in locating and in destroying.

But there was a very different enemy; one that came near defeating our men. I refer to mosquitoes and other small insects. These worked quietly, but with devastating results. Each bite appeared insignificant, but a parasite or virus was planted in the blood stream. Malaria, yellow fever, and other diseases followed and took their toll in life, destroying morale. These were the same enemies that defeated the French in their attempt to dig the Panama Canal. General MacArthur realized the seriousness of these little enemies and made a vigorous and successful campaign against them, and a war was won.

I believe we can properly compare the dangerous malaria mosquitoes to the insidious campaigns of those who would substitute production for use not for profit, guaranteed jobs, ceilings on individual incomes, etc., for free competitive private enterprise. If this bill were enacted in its present form, it would greatly help our most dangerous enemies.

You can imagine how in each community they would point out the comfortable home or the prosperous business of a man of character—someone who had started without capital and acquired financial independence through a life of toil, sobriety, and thrift—and say, "Now look at that man. He has no more right to that home or that business than you have. Congress is going to use his savings, and those of other men like him, for public works that will guarantee good jobs for all of you. You will not need to be thrifty or industrious You will not need to be honest or reliable. You won't even have to be a steady worker. You can drink, squander, and gamble. But any time you do want to work and are able to work Congress has guaranteed that a job will be waiting for you."

This bill in its present form would thus help the little enemies, boring from within. Just as jungle fever produces, first, indifference, then laziness, and, finally, death, a guaranty of jobs for all would first kill ambition, then produce laziness, and, finally, destroy the greatest economic order history has ever known.

THINGS WORTH HAVING

I want to see full employment, but I also want to see good wages and a progressively higher standard of living. I believe that if the good sections of this bill are retained and the changes discussed on pages 1 and 2 of this report are made full employment and a continually higher standard of living can be obtained. It is my firm conviction that America already has the possibilities of full employment, higher wages, and a higher standard of living than this Nation has ever experienced. I say this because we have—

1. Fifty-percent greater productive capacity than ever before.
2. Adequate raw materials.
3. Adequate labor.
4. The know-how.
5. The market.

But history shows that all of these have little value if we lose the spirit of self-reliance and individual initiative.

Continuing full employment must come through cooperation of all; through a feeling of mutual responsibility. Only two fundamental steps are required at this moment to make our superior private-enterprise system work so smoothly that we shall have an abundance of jobs, good wages, and a still higher standard of living than even America has yet known. This is what the American public wants and what it deserves.

1. First, we need the right taxes to make the most jobs and produce the most goods. The present tax structure which was created to take the profit out of war will certainly take the prosperity out of peace, unless it is revised.

2. Second, we must have improved industrial relations. Instead of creating discord, we must promote peace between capital, labor, and agriculture. Instead of fighting one another, they must be shown that their real objectives are identical. Not one of these three groups can profit for long at the expense of either or both of the others.

THINGS EVERYBODY WANTS

Agriculture can prosper only when labor is fully employed and able to eat well. Labor can prosper only when capital is encouraged to invest freely in good tools and equipment for higher and higher production per man-hour. Industry can prosper only when both labor and agriculture are able to buy lots of goods. So with identical objectives the three groups should sit down around a common table voluntarily and work out their mutual problems to their common interest. That is the American way. The Federal Government can create the atmosphere in which it will succeed.

With the proper tax structure and with industrial peace, private enterprise, founded upon American initiative and self-reliance, will function in this emergency better than any other system man has yet invented; assuring for our generation and for posterity the best living conditions that man has ever experienced. That will give us something far better than a Federal guaranty for full employment through a plan loaded with threats of state socialism and backed by a nation that would soon be in debt for its total intrinsic worth.

The responsibility of Congress is great in this emergency, with so many conflicting proposals being presented. May God give you wisdom to pilot safely through this crucial hour, the world's greatest Nation. May you ever keep in mind that individual freedom is God given. Only a free people can become or long remain a great people. It has been well said that "when a man becomes imbecile, his friends place him in an asylum. When a people grow decadent and imbecile, they place themselves in the hands of the state."

May we preserve freedom of individual opportunity, with prosperity for all, rather than turn into the road which leads to state regimentation with poverty for all—this is my prayer.

Controlling Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Controlling Atomic Energy," delivered by me on Tuesday, September 25, and broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Seven weeks ago the bomb-bay doors of a B–29 opened over Hiroshima and a few pounds of uranium encased in some steel gently swayed toward the ground. Before it landed this object exploded in the most fateful and terrible explosion that the world has ever known.

A previously unscarred city was leveled off, most of its population consumed in the blast. You have undoubtedly seen pictures of it in the news reels and the newspapers.

When we recovered from the impact of the news of this monster, our people began to think about the future of atomic energy in war and in peace.

What are we going to do about it?

Obviously, we must bring to the handling and solution of this problem our best intelligence, brains, and thought.

On how it is used, on how it is controlled, may well rest the fate of every man, woman, and child in America; in fact the very fate of our country will be involved in our decision.

Since I introduced the first bill into the Senate of the United States to deal with atomic energy, it might be helpful to you if I quickly reviewed my thinking and reasoning which resulted in the McMahon bill on the subject.

I do not claim perfection for this bill. It may well be improved on further study and consideration, which I am sure the Congress will give it. But I introduced it because I wanted to get started immediately, now, on the consideration of the most important, the most momentous, question of our whole national history.

The problem seems to me to be more easily considered if we divide it into two parts.

First, how is atomic energy to be used in America in peacetime?

Second, how are we going to prevent the power which we unloosed on Japan from being unleashed on us, to our destruction, by some future aggressor?

Let us examine first, as I did, the question of the peacetime use of atomic energy.

Every scientist with whom I have talked has sensibly refused to be nailed down to any predictions as to the date when peacetime use of atomic energy will be accomplished. And yet every one of them say they are certain that on some not too distant day atomic energy will be the source of all of our power, which will drive our trains, our autos, our ships, and our planes, heat our homes and run our factory machines.

Some guess this will happen in 5 years, some 10, some 25.

I am satisfied that we can't stand by and gamble America's economic stability on the fact that it won't be done, because the odds apparently are overwhelmingly in favor that it will. In fact, it must be done. The American people have already invested $2,000,000,000 in splitting the atom to destroy. That investment if turned into peaceful work could bring a fabulous return to the whole human race in health and prosperity.

It was immediately apparent to me, however, that the unregulated and uncontrolled displacement of coal, of oil, of gas, of hydroelectric power and steam as sources of our energy would wreck our economic system. Not only would the jobs of millions of Americans dissolve overnight, but the securities represented by now valuable properties would become worthless. Our banks and insurance companies would crash. Our system of free enterprise would collapse—in fact, it is difficult to see how we could maintain a free and solvent government in the absence of an orderly transitional period.

Obviously, then, atomic energy must not be turned loose to fall into private hands for unlimited private exploitation and gain. On the other hand scientific progress and invention which enhances the wealth and comforts of the people cannot and must not be hindered or delayed.

What's the alternative?

The only one that I am so far aware of is to create a Government board, which is representative of all the people, to control it.

I realize that a great many people claim that this would result in socialism and a socialized state. It would if we were to permit the Government board which I have proposed to engage in actual operation of Government factories with atomic energy. I do not provide for this, however, in the bill which I have suggested. I would vigorously oppose such a suggestion. I want atomic energy to be used in a free enterprise system. I have provided that the board shall be composed of a chairman to be appointed by the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. This board will have the power under the bill to develop, control, and supervise the use and application of atomic energy. It will be empowered to license its use on an equal basis to all comers. Frankly, I have been able to devise no other satisfactory way to handle this particular phase of the problem. I appreciate the fact that this Government board will have a tremendous power, but I would rather have this power in the hands of the chosen servants of the people whose will they would be obliged to carry out than in the hands of a predatory and grasping few over whom we would have little, if any, control. So much then for what we shall term the internal problem.

Now what shall our foreign policy be on atomic energy? There are so far three schools of thought. First, the United States should hold on to the atomic process and endeavor to maintain it in secrecy. The second school of thought, which is slightly more realistic, says, since you can keep the bomb secret for only a very short period of time, we should use this period in which to drive bargains, that is, to make the world accept our system and concepts of morals and beliefs. The third view of the matter, and the one to which I hold, says, since the secret is really not a secret, since three nations already are fully informed, since in 2 or 3 years practically every nation will know all about it, any attempt to use this weapon as a club to get other nations into line with what we stand for and believe in will fail. The very certainty that other nations will soon apply what is now supposed to be secret will lead them to resist bitterly even a short period of domination. The effort to bring to bear the very temporary power which America, England, and Canada now have in common would be bound to develop those very prejudices and passions and hates which would burst into flame as soon as the war-making power became equalized by other nations' application of the secret.

Now, I have tried to state the three widely held opinions on this vital problem. When I drew my bill, I rejected theory number one because we just can't lock up this atomic energy in a national lockbox. All scientists with whom I have talked agree that it is impossible to keep this business a secret. How in the name of common sense could we make any peacetime use of it and keep it a secret anyway? And does anyone believe that the American people would stand for the locking up of a possible source of wealth and comfort beyond the dreams of man? Obviously, then when people say let the United States keep it, they are unrealistic and talking utter nonsense to boot. The people who hold to the proposition that America should say "We've got the bomb and we are going to do as we please with it" are significantly enough the isolationists of yesterday. They have, however, been joined by some good people who have been more enlightened in the past. These are the people who are dissatisfied with the United Nations Organization as it is now set up in its infancy, although they are very much for it in principle and believe that it should be very much stronger. This group believes that we should use the temporary hour that is ours to strengthen the United Nations Charter.

I sympathize with the good intentions of these people but what do they really mean? They really mean that we should say to all nations, now you'd better adopt all our concepts of morals and economics or else. To be frank about it, that's an implied threat. The threat obviously is, you'd better do these things or else we'll use our temporary power on you. I know and you know that the American people would never accept such a program. All of us would like to see free speech and a free press and many others of our blessings enjoyed by the people of the world, but you could never get this country to set off atomic bombs and weapons of destruction in order to accomplish this purpose. The atomic bomb is not exactly an instrument of education.

When you make a threat you had better carry it out, and if you don't intend to carry it out, don't make the threat. Therefore, I adopted the proposition that we should turn over to the Security Council of the United Nations what we know about atomic energy in return for every member of the United Nations making available to us and to the other members of the Security Council all information and know-how that they might have on armaments and weapons of war.

I also provided, and this is very important, that the Security Council would have the right to inspect all plants and laboratories or operations in every country of the world to see whether the agreement was being kept.

I also provided that after the agreement was made it should not become effective until it was approved by the Congress of the United States. If we follow this proposal we will strengthen the organization of the United Nations. We will demonstrate our complete faith and trust, and by our good example, I would hope to dissipate the fog of suspicion and distress which is now being generated and which will inevitably arise to envelop us if we insist in attempting what is after all impossible, the holding to ourselves of the power to dominate the world. Let's be blunt about it. How would you feel tonight if some other nation had this weapon and announced that they were going to hold on to it? I am telling you that there would be the biggest convention of scientists called in Washington that the world has ever seen and that the National Treasury would be opened up overnight for 10 times the two billions that we spent on it. We would be literally scared to death.

Now, could any other nation say to the nations of the earth, "Oh, you need not be afraid of us, we will not make war. We will hold this power in trust for the betterment of people everywhere." Well, there are two things wrong with that.

First, it is not in the nature of peoples, least of all the people of the United States, to be willing to be subject completely to any foreign power; and, second, and I emphasize it again, they wouldn't be able to keep it for any length of time anyway. On the other hand, if we go through with my suggestion, as embraced in my bill, we will, in my opinion, be making the best of necessity. We will allay suspicion that we intend to dominate the world. We will demonstrate to the world that we intend to use our scientific gains for the betterment of people everywhere. We will strengthen collective security which is the only hope of permanent peace. We have given it lip service; this would be a practical demonstration of our sincerity, demonstrable proof of the greatest dimensions the world has ever known. If we can lead the way in turning atomic energy to the production of higher standards of living for the peoples of the world you can be certain that the atom bomb dropped on Hiroshima contained a guaranty of future peace as well as immediate destruction.

Back-to-Work Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Merritt Fields, executive manager, Indianapolis Association of Credit Men, and editorial comment by Mark Gray, dealing with back-to work propaganda, published in the Indianapolis Commercial of September 12, 1945.

There being no objection, the statement and comment were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"This country needs a new brand of propaganda—the kind that will cause people to go back to work."

Here is another editorial by Mr. Gray. In passing, these strikers, or rather strike leaders, wouldn't dare to tie this country up economically without administration backing. The politicians apparently think our Nation's credit can't be wrecked. It can. Let's do something about it. What do you say?

MERRITT FIELDS,
Executive Manager, Indianapolis Association of Credit Men, Indianapolis, Ind.

EDITORIAL COMMENT

(By Mark Gray)

This country needs a new brand of propaganda—the kind that will cause people to go back to work.

Political leaders of both parties have guessed wrong. They apparently believed that once the war was over that people would suffer because of a lack of employment.

That unemployment may come later on—as a result of the fact that not enough people are willing to work to make the job of business reconversion really effective.

The "guns and butter" slogan under which our war economy was conducted worked perfectly. We had plenty of guns and we also had plenty of butter.

The quantity of "butter" dished out to millions of people was so generous that many of these men and women no longer feel that it is necessary to work. And that attitude is not helping with the job of reconversion.

Every employer and almost all of the curbstone observers realize by this time that this "buttering" of war workers has created false values which will not and cannot be maintained under our peacetime economy.

And we are not referring to the trained and experienced industrial employees. They are going to get along all right. In fact, the best of them were on pay rolls and were drawing good money during the worst days of the depression of the 1930's.

We refer to the millions of workers who were promoted far beyond their abilities and who received pay out of all reason beyond their real worth.

The inefficient "hired girl" who took home $40 a week for serving as a back slapper in a woman's rest room in an industrial plant feels that she was underpaid before the war, and it will be a long time before she will be able to convince herself that a less remunerative wage is not an insult to her ability.

And this will remain true as long as politicians in high places propose to pay her more than she ever received in peacetime or will ever receive again for remaining home and grouching over the fact that the gravy train finally left the track of wartime generosity.

Since VJ-day our national propaganda has been aimed in the wrong direction. The politicians have made it known in no uncertain language that their hearts are bleeding for the hash slinger who became Suzy the riveter and that they believe she should be permitted to dip her hands into some public treasury merely because she can no longer be paid a weekly sum that she never was entitled to earn.

As a result of all of this misspent sympathy several million people throughout the country are refusing to accept jobs offering certain future employment and are storming the unemployment compensation offices in quest of money that will permit them to remain at home and to remain "mad at the world."

If we want to reestablish prosperity and security in this country the people should be induced to go to work. It should not be necessary to keep German war prisoners employed in order that the Nation's work can be done.

No one in the position of national leadership is telling these people the facts of life.

Instead, it is being proposed over and over again that Congress pass laws to provide that the inefficient can get something for nothing—or something out of the hides of useful citizens who work and try to pay the bills.

There is an indication that Congress may rebel against some of these plans. And if Congress does display some common sense in this emergency, it will be saving the country a lot of trouble later on.

Meanwhile, someone should be advising the people who have their hands out for any gift that Government will drop their way to go to work.

They should be told that there are jobs available. The people should accept those jobs and they should be told to "accept them or else."

Veterans' Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following release today by Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs:

General Omar N. Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, announced today that President Truman had approved locations for 19 new Veterans' Administration hospitals, and additions to 15 existing hospitals, and 4 existing domiciliary homes. The hospitals and the additions approved will provide altogether 15,276 new beds for Veterans' Administration patients. All will be of new fireproof construction of permanent type.

These beds are a part of the 29,100 bed program approved by President Truman on August 4, 1945, at which time approval was given to the program without commitment as to the location of any of the beds authorized.

Funds for the new hospitals and additions being announced will be requested for the current fiscal year (1946). The remainder of the program, which will be announced at a future date, will be requested for the 1947 fiscal year.

The location of the new hospitals will be in or near the cities designated on the attached pages. The additions will be made to hospitals already existing or to be built at the locations indicated.

(a) The new hospitals authorized are as follows:

	General medical and surgery	Tuberculosis	Neuropsychiatric
New Haven, Conn.	500		
Albany, N. Y.	1,000		
Buffalo, N. Y.	1,000		
Newark, N. J.	1,000		
Baltimore, Md.		300	
Washington, D. C.	[1] 750		
Gainesville, Fla.			1,000
Clarksburg, W. Va.	200		
Louisville, Ky.	750		
Decatur, Ill.	250		
Duluth, Minn.	200		
Southern Minnesota		200	
Iowa City, Iowa	500		
Omaha, Nebr.	500		
New Orleans, La.	500		
El Paso, Tex.			500
Oklahoma City, Okla.			1,000
Phoenix, Ariz.	200		
Cincinnati, Ohio	750		
Total	8,100	500	2,500
Total new hospitals, 11,100			

[1] A new 750-bed hospital replacing all or part of 325 beds now in Mount Alto.

(b) Additions to existing and authorized hospitals:

	General medical and surgery	Tuberculosis	Neuropsychiatric
Northampton, Mass.			314
Bedford, Mass.			400
Lebanon, Pa.			1,600
Atlanta, Ga.	133		
Downey, Ill.			164
Lincoln, Nebr.		[1] 20	
Minneapolis, Minn.	150		
Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	150		
Biloxi, Miss.	50		
Gulfport, Miss.			164
Tuskegee, Ala.			164
Salt Lake City, Utah	50		
San Fernando, Calif.		150	
Portland, Oreg.		150	
Roseburg, Oreg.			164
Total	533	320	2,970
Total additions at hospitals, 3,823			

[1] Gain of 20 beds by conversion; see Lincoln, Nebr., 2 (a) below.

(c) Additions to domiciliary facilities:

	Beds
Bath, N. Y.	100
Mountain Home, Tenn.	100
Bay Pines, Fla.	53
Dayton, Ohio	100
Total	353

2. That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be authorized to make the following conversions:

(a) From general medical and surgery to tubercular hospitals:

Batavia, N. Y.	294
Lincoln, Nebr.	280

(b) From tubercular to general medical and surgery hospitals:

Minneapolis, Minn. (beds in general medical and surgery hospital)	200

3. That the authority for a 140-bed addition to the Newington, Conn., hospital included in the general 1946 program be canceled.

It is understood that this authority permits the Veterans' Administration to make tentative site selections, but that it will submit to the Federal Board of Hospitalization for its consideration and appropriate recommendation to the President requests for authorization to acquire the specific sites for the 19 new projects enumerated above.

Silent Scientists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, the University of Chicago, which is located in the Second Congressional District of Illinois, which district I represent in Congress, is the scene of many interesting discussions on the atomic bomb and its potentialities. One of my personal friends at the University of Chicago wrote me recently on the subject, and, although I do not have permission to use his name, I am including in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD three pertinent paragraphs from his comments on the bomb the explosion of which was heard around the world:

As you are more aware than I, the question of control of the atomic bomb and the

control of future research are very important and very hot problems. Around here, where so much of the development of the bomb was carried out, the scientists—as well as other university members—are gravely concerned about the implications of the bomb, for they know too well what its potentialities are. The scientists also are concerned about the conditions under which they will conduct their research in the future. So are scientists all over the country.

There are bills pending in Congress, such as Senator JOHNSON'S, which would direct research from above, impose such secrecy as would prevent free exchange of scientific information, and do many other things—all based on the notion progress in such research can be confined to the United States. American scientists did not themselves make the bomb possible; theoretical work which was applied during the war to make the bomb was the product of international science, and it is no misstatement to say that the most important contributions were not made by American scientists. Sterilization of our scientists will fail to achieve the end in view; even worse, it will mean that we will be outstripped by other nations.

No scientist objects to the principle that the research has fundamental relation to the welfare of the Nation and its future safety, so that certain applications and methods must be safeguarded. There is, for instance, no desire by the scientists that the industrial process for production of plutonium should be announced, nor the amount that is being produced, nor any similar information. But control envisaged by some bills would go far beyond this, into the realm of abstract scientific research and its dissemination. It is that which the scientists do not want, and under which it will be difficult to get them to work.

Problems of Military Demobilization—Views of a Serviceman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a few excerpts from a letter which I have received from a serviceman, a distinguished lawyer from my State, who is now in Europe. He expresses his view in regard to certain problems of military demobilization.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRANKFORT ON THE MAIN, GERMANY,
September 7, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to pass on to you just a few observations as a long-suffering serviceman in Europe. It will be my effort to be very objective, because I recognize the immense nature of the problem. However, unless something is soon done by Congress to end our involuntary servitude now that hostilities have ceased, we see no chance of the speedy return to our homes that should now be possible. It is no idle talk that the military hierarchy fears the end of the honeymoon era—the day when the captain generals will be general captains. We cannot depend on the military to give those of us who are civilians in uniform our freedom as quickly as it should be given us. Until Congress acts forcibly directing the reduction of the military, and the release of those who have already served long periods away from home, it will not have fulfilled its obligation to us, because it is on Congress we rest our hopes, and justly because Congress passed the law by which we are here. Further, when we came into the service for the duration plus 6 months, we thought that the "duration" was something to be determined on a factual basis, not left to the whim and caprice of the Executive, as determined by the military. The war is over. The duration is over. The time is here when we should be able to plan for the future with the knowledge that certainly we should be separated from the service by a certain time without fail. No system of points can be universally fair. The one in operation now is definitely fallacious, perhaps as much as a result of inconsistent administration as in theory. In theory it is defective in that it fails to consider at all the relative hardship caused by protracted periods of overseas service. The twenty-fourth month overseas was worth only two points, no more than the first month. It is long absence from home and family which tears at the heartstrings of man, and incalculably frustrates him. Yet under the point system, men may be over here more than 3½ years without being able to go home. The only solution is 100-percent rotation and discharge of all men who have been overseas, and their immediate replacement by men who have never served away from home, and by volunteers, until the occupation problems have ended. It seems to have been completely overlooked that men without wives have families who vote, as well as the men themselves. They may also have fiancées or friends. I do not like to see any group favored over another. The time has come for all of us to be separated from the service without delay if we have served overseas or longer than 2 years.

The drain on the resources of the Nation that a large, unhappy army now causes is greater than the civil population of the United States should be long willing to bear. We are parasites on the efforts of others, for our supply, our compensation; and the day that we perform a useful or necessary function for the Nation has been ended. It is time to have us start producing rather than destroying, to start ending shortages instead of causing them.

Humanitarian Work of UNRRA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few statements for the RECORD about one of the most humanitarian and widely supported undertakings ever accomplished by the American people. I refer to last spring's Nationwide collection of clothing, shoes and bedding for overseas relief. I wish to bring this work to the attention of the Congress at this particular time because President Truman has said that the appalling conditions in Europe and the Far East justify a second appeal to the generosity of our people. Therefore, from January 7 to 31 the Victory Clothing Collection will make a concentrated effort to get 100,000,000 garments in addition to shoes and bedding for overseas relief.

Last spring's collection was a magnificent success. About $120,000,000 worth of clothing was collected, and collected at the phenomenally low cost of about one-fifth of a cent a pound. Seven thousand six hundred and seventy-one communities reported 150,000,000 pounds of clothing, shoes, and bedding contributed.

I take pardonable pride in the fact that the nonprofit corporation created to alleviate suffering overseas was directed by a State of Washington businessman, Dan A. West—and another State of Washington businessman and former resident was its very active national chairman—Henry J. Kaiser.

These two Washington businessmen are entitled to recognition by this House and by the country for the efficient, economical, and successful conduct of what appeared last spring to be a most fantastic undertaking.

This was an expenditure of UNRRA funds which had the active support of every family in America, for every family in America contributed its share toward the success of the United National Clothing Collection. The common sense of the American people, faced with a vast emergency relief problem, reduced a seemingly fantastic undertaking to the asking and answering of a plain question, "What can you spare that they can wear?"

The Honorable Herbert Lehman, Director General of UNRRA has declared that this clothing spared by the American people has formed the backbone of UNRRA's clothing-relief program. Now, UNRRA places a money value of from 75 cents to a dollar a pound on this clothing. But actually no one can estimate its value to the people who received it. It was worth its weight in—I was about to say in gold—but I will amend that and say it was worth its weight in that most precious of all substances today—plutonium. For who is to say what furnishes the atomic energy of man's spirit.

To 25,000,000 desperate victims of the devastation and horror of war, stripped of everything they possessed, having lost the fruits of their life's work, these clothes brought courage, a pledge of friendship and hope. What price have these? And what is the reciprocal rate of exchange on the gratitude and good will they have engendered?

Scientists say there is no defense against the awful destructiveness of the atomic bomb. No material defense. It behooves man to strengthen his spiritual defense. Surely the steadfast helpfulness and kindliness and humanity of the American spirit will generate its own energy of constructiveness.

I have seen letters from the bombed, looted, unhappy people of France, Greece, Yugoslavia, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Holland, and the Philippines. These were simply thank-you letters from the common man overseas and from his wife and his children to the common man and his wife and his children here in America. They reached toward each other regardless of political or national or other differences. They spoke of their homes, their babies, their hopes for the future, and they all blessed our already blessed land.

In the January collection contributors are encouraged to include friendly letters with their gifts of clothing as an expression of international good will.

I have seen pictures of smiling, happy children from Russia and Norway and Holland and China and many other war-devastated countries, wearing good, serviceable clothing sent from America.

I would like to append this copy of the auditor's report on the United National Clothing Collection, Inc.:

DELOITTE, PLENDER, GRIFFITHS & CO.,
New York, September 25, 1945.

To the Members and National Committee of United National Clothing Collection, Inc., New York 7, N. Y.:

We have examined the balance sheet of United National Clothing Collection, Inc. (a membership corporation) as at August 31, 1945, and the statement of revenue and expenses for the period from February 10 to August 31, 1945, have reviewed the accounting procedures of the corporation and, without making a detailed audit of the transactions, have examined or tested accounting records of the corporation and other supporting evidence, by methods and to the extent we deemed appropriate.

In our opinion, the accompanying balance sheet and related statement of revenue and expenses, together with the notes thereon, present fairly the financial position of the United National Clothing Collection, Inc., at August 31, 1945, and the results of its financial operations for the period then ended, in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles.

DELOITTE, PLENDER, GRIFFITHS & CO.

United National Clothing Collection, Inc., balance sheet as at Aug. 31, 1945

ASSETS

Cash on hand and at banks:	
On hand	$1,514.15
At banks	49,044.59
Total	50,558.74
Accounts receivable:	
Travel advances	1,172.76
Canadian National Clothing Collection	2,572.26
Community canning program	3,194.77
Sundry deposits	439.00
Total	7,378.79
Office equipment	699.25
Less reserve for depreciation	116.54
	582.71
Grand total	58,520.24

LIABILITIES

Accounts payable and accrued expenses:	
Accounts payable	3,600.05
Accrued expenses	6,131.64
Federal income tax withheld	1,623.15
Total	11,354.84
Excess of revenue over expenses, as per attached statement (see note)	47,165.40
Grand total	58,520.24

NOTE.—The agreement between the corporation and United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) provides that, upon termination of the activities of the corporation, any funds contributed by UNRRA which shall remain unexpended in the hands of the corporation shall be returned to UNRRA.

United National Clothing Collection, Inc., statement of revenue and expenses for the period from Feb. 10, 1945 (date of incorporation) to Aug. 31, 1945

Revenue:	
From United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration	$400,000.00
Personal contributions	566.50
Total	400,566.50
Expenses:	
Personal services	145,499.30
Living allowances	15,626.27
Printed matter, supplies, etc.	55,540.38
Publicity material and services	46,497.99
Postage	26,719.90
Office rent	6,803.00
Rental and repair of equipment	5,146.02
Telephone	11,448.94
Telegrams	10,598.94
Insurance	2,628.60
Freight and express	711.62
Transportation	9,336.19
Representation	4,591.45
Collection and warehousing	3,006.99
Legal, auditing, and incorporation fees	6,537.86
Depreciation of equipment	116.54
Miscellaneous	2,591.11
Grand total	353,401.10
Balance, being excess of revenue over expenses for the period	47,165.40

Note 1: This statement reflects certain revenue received and expenses incurred in anticipation of the formation of the corporation and in its behalf during the period from January 10 to February 9, 1945.

Note 2: Expenses of the character indicated below, relating to the national clothing drive, were not disbursed by the corporation and accordingly are not reflected in this statement:

(a) Salaries and certain travel expenses of personnel whose services were loaned to the corporation by United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

(b) Expenses incurred and borne by local clothing collection committees.

Let's Promote Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] recently submitted Senate Resolution 165 to create a Special Committee on the Promotion of American Activities. The resolution is now pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee. Comment upon the resolution of the Senator from Wisconsin has been made by former Congressman Samuel Pettengill in his syndicated release of October 18, 1945. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Pettengill's article on this subject be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S PROMOTE AMERICANISM

(By Samuel B. Pettengill)

How much did it cost us to educate a bombardier to drop a bomb on Berlin? Counting planes smashed up in training, etc., it is estimated that it cost $65,000. When peace comes, we get no further return on this investment.

In 1938, our States and cities spent $1,600,000,000 to run our public schools. For war we have spent $300,000,000,000, or 187 times as much as we spent for constructive living for millions of children. To kill our enemies we spent enough to run our hospitals for 751 years. And our enemies—what might they have done for themselves—and the world—with their cost of war?

Mules have far more sense than men. Geese are Solomons in wisdom compared with this two-legged maniac who works at fever heat on atomic bombs but doodles and yawns over the blueprints of peace. Except for his hallucinations he would never use the words "crazy as a loon" or "bats in his belfry." Loons and bats are not fools. They never butcher 20,000,000 of their kind to prove that the winners are all pious and the losers all wicked.

But even demented genus homo has fleeting moments when a loon doctor might call him rational. Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, illustrates what this creature, who is considerably lower than the angels, can do when his mind clears for a spell. Mr. WILEY proposes that the Senate create a committee to actively promote constitutional Americanism among school children and grown-ups alike.

The House of Representatives has a committee to investigate and expose un-American activities, a needed job certainly. But the Senator thinks we need to foster affirmative American activities. The two committees would complement each other, not overlap.

When I read Senator WILEY's resolution, my opinion of this bedlam world, inhabited by conceited "foolosophers," went up a couple of degrees. If the Senate, in a lucid interval, adopts his resolution, it will go up many more. I am certain that the First Congress, which met in 1789, and contained many of the patriots who founded this Republic, would pass it unanimously if they knew how Old World concepts of government were undermining the principles of freedom for which they left on the white snows of Valley Forge the red badge of courage.

Many splendid groups in our schools, patriotic societies, and veterans' organizations have for years been fostering love of country and pride in its institutions. But cunning influences have largely counteracted their work. What an encouragement it would be to every pro-American if his efforts were given public recognition and support by a permanent Senate committee to promote American activities.

As the Senator says, the Communists have resumed their black missionary zeal as a political party which has openly proclaimed "its deep hatred against all parliaments," that is, against republican forms of government. Congressman D'ALESANDRO, of Maryland, shows how Communists have been trying to proselyte men in our armed forces. They are everywhere. They color our news; intone their un-American hates over the radio; stir up strikes to make the American system look sour; engender race and religious prejudice to break our unity; and smear all who oppose them as Fascists.

But more dangerous, perhaps, than the gnawing of these rats is the complacency and

unawareness of millions of otherwise patriotic Americans who have been slyly taught by these very Communists to brand as red baiters or witch hunters those whose loyalty to the Constitution and the flag prompts them to expose the menace from within, which Abraham Lincoln once described. Lincoln was a contemporary of Karl Marx.

Senator WILEY, Godspeed to you and those of your colleagues who are on the alert. What a country this would be if we spent the tiniest fraction of what goes into war and death in giving every American West Point awareness of the free principles that made men great.

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

Control of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram sent by Mr. Ulric Bell, executive vice president, Americans United for World Organization, to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States:

The May bill for the Control of atomic energy contains provisions that are extremely dangerous to our democratic form of government. The restraints on the activities and personal freedom of scientists constitute a perilous step in the direction of totalitarianism. The restrictions are so sweeping that many scientists will be forced to give up their researches. The proposed legislation is sure to stimulate an atomic-armament race. In our opinion the May bill as it now stands is as pernicious as the worst of the decrees of the totalitarian states. We feel that you must speak out in favor of full and open hearings. Therefore we ask that you urge that the hearings be reopened and that the many scientists who have been directly and indirectly involved in atomic-energy researches be given an opportunity to testify.

AMERICANS UNITED FOR WORLD ORGANIZATION.
AMERICAN VETERANS' COMMITTEE.
FRIENDS OF DEMOCRACY.
INDEPENDENT CITIZENS COMMITTEE OF THE ARTS AND SCIENCES.
NATIONAL CITIZENS POLITICAL ACTION COMMMITTEE.
SOUTHERN CONFERENCE OF HUMAN WELFARE.

Wanted: A Pennsylvania Leo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able editorial entitled "Wanted: A Pennsylvania Leo," from the Philadelphia Record. The writer of this editorial calls attention to the fact that a retail dealer in South Dakota went into court challenging the constitutionality of a law imposing a special tax on margarine, and that the court held the margarine tax unconstitutional.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WANTED: A PENNSYLVANIA LEO

Somebody in Pennsylvania ought to emulate Leo Schmitt.

Leo was a retail dealer in a South Dakota town. He wanted to sell margarine.

But the legislature in his State, like the legislature in Pennsylvania, had passed a law imposing a special tax on margarine. The tax was so high that Leo couldn't afford to pay it. So he didn't sell margarine.

Leo wanted to sell this product, and his customers wanted to buy it.

So Leo went to court.

Judge R. C. Bakewell has just handed down a decision in which he holds that the South Dakota margarine tax is unconstitutional.

He said the tax was "an arbitrary and unauthorized legislative meddling with a natural and inherent personal privilege of the people."

And it certainly is.

The license fees imposed on the sale of margarine in Pennsylvania are not license fees at all. They are not designed to raise revenue or to pay for policing the purity of a product.

They were pressured through the legislature by the butter lobby and all efforts to repeal or reduce them have been scuttled by the butter lobby.

Even during the war, when butter was so scarce that many, many people couldn't buy it, the butter bloc, which swung its weight around in Harrisburg, managed to keep margarine from thousands of retail outlets.

The license fees imposed by Pennsylvania, as in South Dakota, are punitive taxes, designed to help one product to the detriment of another.

They have no place on the statute books. It is not the duty of the legislature to starve out one industry so another may profit by it.

But that is what the Pennsylvania Legislature did more than 40 years ago. And every legislature since has condoned that "arbitrary and unauthorized meddling."

Freedom of Discussion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a broadcast by Mr. Johannes Steel, dealing with the allegations, set forth in the broadcast, concerning direct and indirect censorship of radio commentators in America. I simply wish to say that I think it is particularly important that in these times of unrest and crisis we should not overlook the fact that if we are to preserve our freedoms in America, we must see to it that the channels of information are at all times free.

There being no objection, the text of the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, despite the fact that military operations have ceased on all world fronts, and despite the fact that the Office of Censorship has been abolished, and despite the fact that there is supposed to be a general relaxation of all censorship rules, freedom of discussion on the air and in the press is threatened more today than it ever was at any period during the war.

Pressures are making themselevs felt which are designed to eliminate liberal commentators from the air completely and to limit those commentators who remain on the air to the discussion of what is known as noncontroversial subjects.

These pressures, of course, are political. They emanate in every instance from reactionary politicians and the military. They are thoroughly undemocratic and entirely subversive of the fundamental principles embodied in the Bill of Rights.

This situation is more serious than has been generally realized. Here are some of the facts.

The so-called House Committee on Un-American Activities is preparing a drive to get all liberal opinion and independent thought eliminated from the air. A pressure campaign is being organized by that committee. The technique is the usual slander and smear technique of that committee, which begins by way of subpenaing the scripts of the broadcasts of the commentators and later the commentators themselves.

When they appear in Washington, they will be subjected to the usual star-chamber tactics. The opinions and the charges of the committee members will be widely quoted, while the people in the witness chair will have very little opportunity to bring their views before the public.

There will probably be private sessions from which the public is excluded, after which the committee may issue statements to the press, and if the usual practice of what was formerly known as the Dies committee is followed, then we may expect, of course, complete misquotations and falsifications of the record of the proceedings of these private sessions.

Among the commentators who are listed as the prospective victims of the committee in Washington and whose scripts are being looked at by the mental giants who make up the membership of the committee, of which Congressman RANKIN, of Mississippi, is the shining light, is also this broadcaster.

It can be stated authoritatively that the mere mention of the fact that this committee proposed to call one commentator on a small local station, not WHN, has already caused this man to be fired. The radio station immediately yielded to the pressure.

Obviously, the committee knows very well that such an investigation will be entirely fruitless, but it evidently feels that the mere fact of such an investigation might serve in the way of intimidation.

There is no reason why you, the public, should not let the members of the committee know what you think of their antics.

The drive of the House Committee on Un-American Activities is directly linked to a drive which is now being prepared by the National Association of Manufacturers.

The NAM has been quitely investigating—that's what they call it—the backgrounds, financial standing, biographies, sponsors, past and present, and the size of the audience of every independent and liberal commentator on the air.

The idea is said to be a plan designed to eliminate all liberal commentators from the air and to supplant them with men who

express views which are acceptable to the members of the National Association of Manufacturers.

There is reason to believe that this drive will tie in directly with the drive of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Here is a situation which needs a thorough public airing.

Not directly linked to this activity, but certainly of the same tendency is the resentment in certain Army circles against all comment on the social and political consequences of the release of atomic energy.

Today, the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Henry Wallace, the man who convinced President Roosevelt to go ahead with the experiments leading to the release of atomic energy, stated publicly that while the United States might stock up many more atomic bombs than other nations, we still would be the most vulnerable nation of all.

We have in these broadcasts based our views on the subject of the future of atomic energy in a peaceful world largely upon the publicly stated views of Secretary Wallace and former Secretary Stimson, as well as a number of leading scientists with whom we have talked on that subject.

We believe that the political and social views of Mr. Wallace are the only ones which are relevant.

We also believe that it is intolerable in a democracy that there should be any restrictions placed upon the dissemination of the views of Messrs. Wallace, Stimson, Compton, Langmuir, Shapley, and others by way of gumshoe intelligence intimidation.

This is particularly so since, by the wildest stretch of the imagination, there is no military secret involved here.

This commentator is forwarding a copy of this broadcast to all competent Senate and House committees for their consideration.

We are certain that the public and our listeners want the freedom of the air preserved and we know we can count on their support.

Problems of Quicksilver Producers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the San Francisco Examiner of September 15, 1945, relative to the problems faced by the quicksilver industry because of importations from Spain.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINERS FLAY "SQUEEZE PLAY"—SPAIN FLOODING QUICKSILVER MARKET, UNITED STATES INTERESTS SAY

Spanish politics and Yankee dollars are combining relentlessly to throttle an entire American industry and unless remedial action comes fast, California's quicksilver mines, producing 70 percent of the Nation's output will close tight by January 1.

The ancient and government-owned mines of old Spain, worked at wages which are equal to less than one-tenth those prevailing in California, are pouring their metallic product into the United States in volumes which cause local quicksilver men to shake their heads and mutter "dumping."

SUPPLY ON HAND

They point out, for instance, that in one month—July—imports of Spanish quicksilver totaled 19,000 flasks, and that the entire Nation used no more than 24,000 flasks in an entire year before wartime requirements sent consumption rocketing.

The July imports plus some 17,000 flasks already above ground, add up to 18 months' prewar needs and to the obvious closing down of the Nation's quicksilver mines—unless somebody does something.

PLEA SLATED

In hopes of doing that needed something, a group of producers of California, Nevada, and Oregon, representing some 60 percent of the entire production, have sent Sam Williston, president of the Oregon Mining Association, to Washington to try to save the industry.

He will attempt to remove the present glut by having the Government take the 36,000 flask surplus off the market and place it in a military stock pile—the need for which was gaudily demonstrated as America entered the war needing quicksilver so urgently that it gladly paid Spain the obviously hold-up price of $280 a flask.

MYSTERY ANGLE

Just why Spain began pouring mercury into America in 19,000-flask lots—or why America continues to export it in such lots at prices more than double the prewar price—are mysteries which the quicksilver miners of California do not profess to know.

But they are doing some shrewd guessing. One school holds that it is entirely a matter of Yankee dollars. They point out that in prewar days the Almaden mines and the Italian mines (knocked out by the war) combined in a cartel which operated on this principle: Depress the price until American mines can't operate at a profit and have to shut down; then raise the price until the desperate howls of American consumers cause American mines to reopen; then depress the prices again and repeat.

SQUEEZE PLAY

The July shipments, in the face of a surplus already on hand, may represent an attempt by the Spanish Government, now playing a lone hand, to resume the prewar squeeze, according to this school of thought.

Another school holds that it's all politics—Spanish politics. This faction points out that shipments of quicksilver furnish Spanish politicos with ready and lush dollar exchange.

HOPES DROWNING

Whatever the motives, the results are certain, according to worried operators of quicksilver mines. With the quicksilver market promising to expand manyfold as war-developed uses of the versatile metal are adapted to peacetime wants, the industry in California had hopes of many years of prosperity. Present conditions change this, however.

POW and Points

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following letter written by Mrs. Esther Markus, Chicago, Ill.:

CHICAGO, ILL., *October 12, 1945.*

Dear Mr. ROWAN: The record of your endeavors in Chicago on behalf of people's rights has long been history, and now, as the wife of a former prisoner of war in Germany, I am appealing to you. Perhaps you will recognize the validity of my appeal—

I understand that several weeks ago, a proposal was made in Congress for the discharge of former prisoners of war, but this proposal has not been furthered. In my opinion, I believe this decision should most definitely be passed by Congress.

My appeal to you is not wholly subjective. Since the Army granted my husband his 60-day furlough (which was extended by a stay in Gardiner Hospital), and his consequent 8-day stay in Florida for processing and reassignment, I have met many former prisoners of war, and I feel that somebody should speak up for this apparent "Lost Legion" of men, who because of their internment in horrible prison camps, have not been able to secure high scores entitling them to discharge, although rear echelon groups, who have never seen combat, or been anywhere near the zone of combat, are daily being given points for the activities of their advance units who have seen action.

The war is over, and we are eternally grateful for that—but for these prisoners of war it will be a mighty long time before the terrors of their brutal experiences will be forgotten. Every day spent in the Army now is but a needless reminder of a life that emotionally and psychologically links their thoughts with the miserable past. It will be a good long time before these boys will come back to their normal selves, and the only solution for them is to get back to a normal life, where they will not constantly be reminded of the war. Instead, they are being sent all over the country to camps, where they are ill-fit and ill-adjusted to meet their daily tasks, such as they are.

Former prisoners of war cannot and must not be placed in the same category as our other returned soldiers. Although they may not show apparent outward injuries, their injury is to the heart, soul, and mind. They just must be discharged immediately, so that they may adjust themselves to normal living, and in normal surroundings. Remember also that the period of adjustment of a former PW may by far exceed that of the usual returned soldier.

May I not have your help? Believe me, not only will I personally be grateful, but you will have the gratitude of countless thousands of other former prisoners of war and their families and next of kin.

I know I can count upon you, and shall be watching the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for results.

Thanking you, I am,

Most sincerely,

MRS. ESTHER MARKUS.

Atomic Energy in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave given me to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in

the New York Post on October 16, 1945, entitled "Atomic Energy in Congress":

ATOMIC ENERGY IN CONGRESS

It is possible that in about 2 years, other industrialized nations may develop atomic bombs a thousand times more potent than the one which vaporized Hiroshima.

Yet the politically slanted pretense of secrecy is being used to withhold the facts about the significance of atomic energy from the American people.

Hundreds of atomic scientists have repeatedly had their mouths shut by the threat of prosecution and jail. Under cover of this gag, there is a drive to railroad through Congress a bill which would govern the future of American industry and American science as both move forward to harness the atom.

The Johnson-May bill on atomic energy was given one single day of hearings by the House Military Affairs Committee. Only four witnesses were heard.

Yet the Johnson-May bill is so sweeping that it would in effect give us two Presidents instead of one; the first elected, and the second appointed and possessed of dictatorial powers practically unchecked by Congress, the Administration, or the people.

For as the bill was drawn, the Administrator of Atomic Energy would not be elected, would not be appointed by the President, would not be confirmed by the Senate.

WHAT'S IN THE BILL?

The Administrator would be appointed by a Commission on Atomic Energy. The Commission would be appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate. It would consist of nine members serving for 9 years, their terms staggered so that three members would be appointed every 3 years.

The members of the Commission could not be removed by the President except for particular cause. Unlike the heads of Government Departments, they would not change with an incoming administration, they would not reflect the popular mood as expressed in the choice of a new President. It would be a rare combination when a President could in a single term appoint a majority to the Commission, and thus control or remove the Administrator.

The Administrator, who as the bill was drawn, would likely be an Army or Navy big shot, could take over a plant as big as Willow Run without even letting Congress in on the secret. He could order the dismissal of employees of any Government agency for talking out of turn.

He could grant or refuse atomic licenses at his whim. There would be no appeal, and the absence of adequate safeguards could open the way to dangerous monopolies.

Nationalization should guarantee free and equal access to the productive, nonmilitary aspects of atomic energy, safeguarded by wide-open publicity and democratic control.

On the contrary, the Johnson-May bill would take control of atomic energy away from the people, load it with secrecy, and vest it in an unrepresentative and irresponsible official.

IT WON'T CONTROL THE BOMB

It would saddle us with a permanent peacetime censorship and end our scientific freedom. Scientists could get 30 years in jail or a fine of $300,000 for discussing everyday physics with each other.

They could not exchange information with their international colleagues—yet without contributions from Stockholm, Copenhagen, Birmingham, we could not have developed the atomic bomb. This attempt to lock up scientific knowledge would mean that America would rapidly fall behind other nations in research.

But fettering American science would not deter researchers abroad from the inevitable independent development of the atomic bomb. When that happens the Johnson-May bill, which demands such fatal sacrifices of our freedom, offers us no security.

The gagged scientists have tried repeatedly to warn us that there is no visible defense against the atomic bomb, and that our only hope lies in international control.

Unlike the far saner McMahon bill in the Senate, the Johnson-May bill makes no provision whatever for setting up international machinery to prevent the use of the atomic bomb and to control atomic energy.

The Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a radio address which I gave over radio station WDRC, Hartford, Conn., on October 7, 1945:

The atomic bomb has brought us headlong against a choice which we must make. Do we want full employment and peace; or do we want economic instability and war? Do we want a developing civilization or do we want to destroy civilization? You say "How foolish!" Of course everyone wants peace and prosperity. Truly, all over the world men and women are prayerfully hoping for jobs and for peace. And yet they are confronted with two compelling fears—the fear of unemployment and the fear of war.

Both these fears must be wiped from the face of the earth. Now don't say "Impossible." It not only can be done. It must be done. Doing it turns very largely on how we use our scientific knowledge. It is the men and women in the laboratories and in the libraries who can give us jobs and give us peace if we will only provide enough of them with adequate opportunities for training and for study, with adequate facilities for research, and, most important, if we will develop a national policy as to how we will encourage scientific research and how we will use scientific findings and inventions.

The discovery and the terrifyingly effective use of the atomic bomb has resulted in an almost grim determination to achieve peace. But it is typical that we speak almost always of the atomic bomb and seldom of atomic energy. It is the weapon of destruction which has seized our imagination. But there is an equally dramatic potential for peace and better living in atomic energy sanely used and wisely directed toward social ends. The balance of power between war and peace, between human well-being and devastating world tragedy, lies in how we encourage scientific research and how we formulate and administer a national and international policy as to the use of the findings of science.

We must not think of the atomic bomb as an isolated individual scientific discovery. It is one end result, a startling, dramatic and world stirring result, but yet only one result, of the great march of modern science. Science made it possible for the Axis with limited natural resources to wage war. And science made victory possible for us. But just because we were fortunate in being the first to discover the formula of atomic energy and the technique of manufacturing the bomb it does not follow that it is our secret or that it will be anybody's secret for very long. The Germans apparently were appallingly near to the discovery. Had they been a few months sooner or we a few months later the world situation today might be very different for you and for me. Nor could we count on having found a counter defense had they made the discovery first. We did not have a defense for V-2. Our only recourse there was to blast at the launching sites.

There is no way to keep the atomic bomb secret. The impression is far too general that only the United States can produce the atomic bomb. This is a new form of isolationism. We were told that the Atlantic Ocean protected us from war. We cannot afford to listen again to the voices which tell us that no enemy can harm us.

The only way the United States, Great Britain, and Canada could keep exclusive possession of the atomic bomb process would be to destroy all vestiges of modern science and technology—to muzzle every scientist. That would be the end of modern civilization.

The scientists who worked on the various projects where the bomb was developed have discussed the subject and have released memoranda which show almost complete unanimity in their main points. This is a typical statement from this group: "There is no secret to be kept. It has been known for 40 years that this form of energy exists. The principles required for its release have been the common property of scientists throughout the world for at least 5 years. Each one of the advanced civilized nations possesses scientists capable of working out the details required for the accomplishment. Each one of the advanced civilized nations has access to some of the resources required for the production of an atomic bomb. The only remaining secrets concern technological processes which any competent group of scientists anywhere can discover within a relatively brief time. It is a matter of only a few years at the most before any great nation can be producing atomic bombs, even if we do not tell them a single fact which they do not already know."

So we can't protect ourselves by locking away the secret because it won't be a secret for very long. And there is little sense in the off-the-cuff suggestion by some persons in public life that we disperse our cities and put our important factories underground. We are men, not moles. The scientists themselves suggest that the only alternative to disaster is to create a world commission which would control the manufacture and use of the bomb.

President Truman has recommended to the Congress that it enact legislation to fix a policy with respect to our existing plant and to the control of all sources of atomic energy and of all activities connected with its development and use in the United States. The policy would be administered by an Atomic Energy Commission, with members appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

President Truman further has stated that he will initiate conversations on international control as such action cannot be delayed until the UNO is functioning.

These are essential, immediate steps but they are not enough. We must always remember that the atomic bomb is only one outcome of scientific research. We must be prepared for future findings. We have created difficulties for ourselves because we had no policy in wartime in regard to the use of our scientific manpower especially as related to Selective Service. Now, if we are to have peace and if we are to have prosperity we must have a national policy as regards the use of all our scientific resources.

This need has been coming to the fore during recent months. Last June the House

of Representatives passed the May bill (H. R. 3440) which provided for an appropriation of $8,000,000 a year for the National Academy of Science. The academy would use this grant for contracts with educational, scientific, and industrial organizations for research of aid to national defense. This was a step in the right direction but too limited. National defense we must care for, but our real goal is full employment and peace. The Office of Scientific Research and Development now being liquidated did a magnificent war job. We must have an even better job done for peace.

The American economy has not provided stable full employment under modern conditions of high labor productivity and mass production. Even during the depression new industrial developments and an expanding labor force continued to raise the level of output needed for full employment. Thus, in 1939, although we reached the production level of 1929, there were 7,000,000 unemployed. Today we are faced with the task of creating millions of new job opportunities and of substituting a mass consumer market for the enormous war purchases of the Federal Government. We need a good 15,000,000 more jobs than we had in 1939. And science, wisely directed, can help private enterprise provide these jobs. To create new jobs we must make new, better, and less expensive products. We must have many new vigorous enterprises, and science can provide the impetus. Just remember that in 1939 millions of people were engaged in industries which did not even exist at the close of World War I—radio, air conditioning, rayon and synthetic fibers, and plastics are examples. More jobs, higher wages, shorter hours, more abundant crops, more production of manufactured goods, a higher standard of living are all possible if we will encourage scientific research and direct its results. Our success with discoveries and inventions in the war is ample proof of this statement.

The highest goal of scientific research is to improve the lot of mankind. It may well remove one great cause of war—the struggle for raw materials, for natural resources. Synthetic rubber is but one example of what I have in mind. Our children may well live to see a new definition of national wealth. It may well be that national wealth will be counted not in terms of natural resources but in terms of men and women of scientific training and in terms of laboratories. If any nation can make synthetic rubber, then what nation will exploit colonial peoples, will fight wars to gain natural rubber. Science may be our main road to peace.

The Federal Government has supported research in State institutions for 80 years under the land-grant college acts. This is not a new suggestion. But there is no agency in the Government charged with formulating or administering a national science policy. There are no standing committees of the Congress directed to this vital subject.

With our mounting demands for scientists both for teaching and for research we enter the postwar period with a serious deficit in our trained scientific personnel. During the war we have piled up a deficit of 150,000 young men and women who would have received the bachelor's degree in science and technology By 1955 we will have accumulated a deficit of 17,000 young students who would normally have had advanced degrees in science.

The Government can increase the flow of new scientific knowledge by the support of basic scientific research and by aiding through scholarships and fellowships the development of scientific talent. It takes many years to train a scientist so the start must be made now. And ability, not the size of the family checkbook, must determine who shall receive higher education in science.

There are several bills before Congress recommending Government encouragement of science. The Kilgore bill (S. 1297) and the Magnuson bill (S 1285) are the most important. Each would set up an independent Government agency—a National Science Foundation. It would not itself operate any laboratory or plant but through its support, private scientific, educational, and industrial organizations and governmental agencies would carry on research of benefit to national defense; to health and medicine; to conservation, development, and use of natural resources; and to small business enterprises. The Foundation would also provide scholarships and fellowships for promising young men and women. Further, it would develop a national policy for scientific research and scientific education. The original Magnuson bill would limit the foundation to work in mathematical, physical, and biological sciences. The Kilgore bill as now in committee print includes the social sciences. To my mind this is vital. I believe that even more emphasis should be placed upon encouragement of the social sciences than is done in the bill as it now stands. Peace and prosperity depend not only on our discovery and production of new products. They depend even more on how we use those products and on how we behave one toward the other in dealing with those products and inventions. While the social scientist cannot put two individuals or a community in a test tube and study their reactions under various circumstances he can do much to study and explain and learn how to direct human behavior. The development of personnel work in our war plants is definite recognition of this possibility. We can learn how to develop good reactions in a group.

For example, one of the most difficult and intangible problems before the world today is how the German and Japanese peoples may be educated to an understanding and appreciation of democratic government and peace. That is a job for the social scientist and one he could help solve if he had the proper facilities.

The Magnuson bill would have the National Science Foundation administered by a board of nine scientists appointed by the President. The Kilgore bill would have it administered by a board consisting of the Secretaries or their deputies of War, Navy, Justice, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, and the head of the Federal Security Agency. The Kilgore suggestion is by far the better, as it puts the actual scientific work in the hands of the specialists but places final responsibility for policy as to the use of the scientific findings upon men who represent the administration elected by the people and responsible to them.

These are not dramatic bills. They will not make the headlines. But they are very important. The full-employment bill, which is so much discussed and which should be passed, and passed promptly, expresses a policy as regards jobs. But we must have scientific research if private enterprise is to provide the required number of actual jobs. A sound national policy in regard to the encouragement of scientific research and the use of its findings, both in the natural and in the social sciences, will be an important factor in making possible the fulfillment of the two great desires not only of the American people but of the democratic peoples of the world—the desire for full employment and the desire for peace. Science properly supported and directed can wipe the fear of unemployment and the fear of war off the face of the earth. What will we do to make this possible?

Atomic Energy Is Not Too Hard To Understand—Read and See for Yourself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the revelation of atomic energy as an instrument of war which destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki in Japan has amazed and shocked the world and focused public attention on the unbelievable potentialities of atomic energy for war as well as for peaceful purposes.

To the average person without some scientific knowledge or training, atomic energy is a great mystery, beyond, understanding and something for only scientists, engineers, physicists, and mathematicians to deal with. The average person thus closes his mind and shuts himself out from any possibility of learning anything about atomic energy believing that it is something so new and terrifying, so deep and impenetrable that he thinks he could never grasp or understand what it is. Atomic energy is not new. It has always existed. All we have done is discover it. It is as old as the hills.

Can you imagine the utter amazement of the first man that discovered fire? He had less conception of what fire was or how to control it then than we have of atomic energy.

Think of the courage of Ben Franklin when he discovered electricity by flying a kite during a thunderstorm. He did not know then that he would not be electrocuted and he did not have the slightest idea that electricity would be used to light great cities, drive great power plants, heat homes, cook food and the thousands of other uses it has been put to.

We know what fire is and how to use and control it. We know how to use and control electricity but we still do not know what it is. Frankly, now should not we learn all we can about atomic energy instead of looking upon it as a monster of destruction but rather as a great gift to humanity for good, and a means to help mankind live better and happier?

I speak with some knowledge of science, having spent some years of my life before entering public service as an industrial chemist in metallurgy, manufacturing steel and aluminum, and in explosives, manufacturing nitroglycerine nitrocellulose—smokeless powder; trinitrotoluene—TNT; tetranitroanaline—TNA; and research work on nitro starch. You have to know what atoms and molecules are to do that kind of work. I am not appearing as an expert on atomic energy, but I have made up my mind I am going to add to what knowledge I have by reading all I can about it.

Let me tell you in layman's language what I know and have found out. It

may help you better understand and perhaps grasp some of the fundamentals of atomic energy.

First, atoms are very, very small, smaller than microbes. They are so small that 100,000,000 laid side by side would not measure an inch in length. Everything is made up of atoms—your clothes, food, your body, house, automobile—everything. All matter is made up of atoms—that is something to remember, because it means everything. Until very recently atoms were believed to be the smallest indivisible form of matter. That is the theory that science has believed for many years. Now we have found a way to split the atom and have discovered that the atom is composed of several particles. The two principal particles are called the nucleus or center, and carries a positive or plus charge. The nucleus in each atom is surrounded by electrons which carry a negative or minus charge, and continuously move around the nucleus like a planet moves around the sun. Now, the secret of atomic energy is to separate the nucleus from the electrons.

Let us take for example a plum. We will call the seed inside the plum the nucleus of the atom and the fruit around the seed the electrons. Now to release atomic energy, you must separate the seed from the fruit of the plum and when that is done great energy which causes tremendous heat is released. In fact, the energy is so great that it blows the nucleus out of other atoms that happen to be nearby and they in turn release great energy and heat and so on until the energy bumps up against some atoms that will not be separated or are not fissionable or radioactive or, in other words, are stable, and the energy wastes itself and the reaction stops. This is called a chain reaction. When atomic energy is released in a chain reaction in the presence of radioactive fissionable atoms without a moderator or neutralizer, you have the effect of an atomic bomb, which destroys everything in its presence with the tremendous energy and heat it releases.

Now, this is just what might have happened to the man who first discovered fire, if he had made his discovery in a great forest of heavy dry underbrush. The fire would have burned until it consumed all combustible material it came in contact with but finally it would burn itself out. Remember now that atoms are very, very small and that in, say a pound of radioactive or fissionable atom splitting material, there are billions and billions of atoms and if you can find the way to start just a few of those billions of atoms to split—just the same as lighting a match to set fire to a bunch of dry twigs—they in turn would release enough energy to split the others, thus producing tremendous heat and energy that would consume everything in the area where the reaction occurred, but if you can control and store up that heat and energy and use it when, as, and if, you needed it, just like storing electricity in a battery or steam in a boiler, you will have harnessed atomic energy and make it do whatever you want it to do.

Today we know of only a few elements that are highly radioactive and fissionable, uranium, polonium, thorium, protactinium, others may be discovered and then again we may find a way to make more common elements such as carbon, sulfur, or magnesium, radioactive and fissionable. Einstein stated the theory that matter can be converted into energy. That means all matter and is the basis upon which atomic energy has been developed. In other words, all matter can be converted into energy if you can find a way to split the atoms of all matter.

We Members of Congress should learn all we can about atomic energy and as quickly as we can. We will soon have to pass some legislation to establish the Nation's policy on how to control it. I hope what I have said will help you.

Are We Ready To Make This Our Century?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a thoughtful and well-prepared editorial from the Buffalo Evening News of October 15, 1945. The editorial is as follows:

ARE WE READY TO COME OF AGE, TO MAKE THIS OUR CENTURY?

The United States returns from the wars the world's most powerful Nation. Faced with crisis, we found unsuspected springs of strength, and no task proved too great for the American Leviathan. The world stage is set for this to be America's century. Economically and financially, we can cope with the problems of the major creditor Nation, because we are by long odds the world's greatest manufacturer of goods and services, capital and skills. But are we emotionally adjusted to the new role? In an international sense, is America ready to come of age?

Nations, like communities, find it hard to break the cake of custom. Britain's high-tariff mercantilism, which precipitated our War of Independence, persisted after she overturned Napoleon and began her great career as factory and bank for the world. She tried to face both ways, to favor the landed gentry with a high tariff on foreign grain at the same time that she filled Lancashire's cotton mills with workers at starvation pay. Not until 1846 did Sir Robert Peel win his fight to get rid of the corn laws. Britain then assumed her responsibilities as a great creditor power, and her golden age began.

There has been an almost identical lag in America's attitude toward foreign trade. Since Jefferson's 1807 Embargo Act, we have looked with favor on the export of the fruit of our labor, but have built tariff walls against the import of goods from abroad. In 1916 the United States became a creditor country, but has been loath to act as one until the closing stages of World War II. As a creditor country, we must eschew repetition of the blunders of the lush 20's, when we pipelined goods and gold to the rest of the world but erected the Hawley-Smoot tariff wall to prevent our customers from paying their debts.

The present Congress has gone a long way to avoid the repetition of this identical mistake. The passage of the Bretton Woods monetary measures, the extension and expansion of the Trade Agreement Act, the move to repeal the Johnson Act to prevent the sale here of the securities of any country in default in World War I debts represent great forward steps.

Prof. Percy W. Bidwell, formerly of the University of Buffalo, now with the Council on Foreign Relations, points out in Foreign Affairs that in the years of transition immediately ahead, imports can make three special contributions to our national well-being; imports of minerals and other foreign raw materials can diminish the drain on our natural resources; they can be used to break up monopoly situations and thus strengthen the forces for true free enterprise; the receipt of consumers' goods from abroad can educate the tastes of our buying public, thereby stimulating our domestic producers to improve the state of the arts.

America cannot function as a great creditor country without becoming hospitable to imports in a way we have never before. Unless we greatly expand our purchases abroad, we will be unable to maintain the great increase of exports without which our goal of full employment in an economy of abundance will collapse as soon as the economy has caught up.

Economically, America has come of age. But it remains to be seen whether we are emotionally prepared to exercise our enormous power with the self-restraint that its possession demands. If we do, this is the American century. If not, there may be self-frustrations and disappointments ahead.

Parcel Post to Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I am writing today to Jesse M. Donaldson, First Assistant Postmaster General of the Post Office Department concerning the criticism of our Italian people here in the United States concerning parcel-post restrictions to their native land, Italy. At the present time, packages may be sent to most all foreign countries, but there are discrepancies in the number of deliveries and the amount of weight of parcel-post packages.

I am informed that parcel post may be sent to some countries twice a month, but to Italy only once a month. The weight of the packages to some countries is 11 pounds, but to Italy only 4 pounds. Americans of Italian descent feel that they are being discriminated against. They would like to be able to send the 11 pounds per month, the weight alloted to other countries instead of the mere 4 pounds per month. It is a matter of record that they are doing more, proportionately, to relieve the distress of people in the mother country than any other group. Because of inflation, it is useless to forward or send money to Italy. The

people need clothes to withstand the hardships of the approaching winter. However, present parcel-post regulations prevent Americans from sending bulky clothing, like overcoats, which are desperately needed in Italy.

People here will do much to help the impoverished over there, if parcel-post limitations are revised upward to permit larger sized, individual shipments to Italy.

The Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thusrday, October 18, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, the atomic bomb is undoubtedly the most discussed question in the United States today, if not throughout the world. My native city of Chicago is intensely interested in this subject as evidenced by the increasing volume of mail which arrives daily on all phases of that matter. Among the most interesting communications received recently is one from Mr. Leonard I. Katzin, of 5511 South Kenwood Avenue, Chicago. Because of his very interesting comments on the atomic bomb I am including excerpts from his communication, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *October 9, 1945.*

The disclosure of the atomic bomb at Hiroshima and Nagasaki brought to the attention of the world a force of a new order of magnitude, and with it an overwhelming need for a reevaluation of the relationships between the peoples of the world, as well as reconsideration of traditional domestic policies. The Congress is busy now with these important points, for which the alternative to a wise decision is national and world-wide catastrophe.

The scientists who have, with full knowledge of the implications, worked on the development of this new force, atomic power, during the years of secrecy, continually have given serious thought to the consequences of their work. They are the persons best fitted to point out the directions and potentialities of future developments and uses of this new power. These scientists, whose views I am attempting to present to you here, uniformly are dismayed by the fact that much of the action and discussion related to the matter of atomic power and the atomic bomb are based upon a misunderstanding of some fundamental facts, and thus may be translated into dangerous policies.

The first of these misunderstandings is that there exists a fundamental secret which may be kept from the rest of the world. There are two possible places where such a secret might exist—the actual construction of the bomb itself, and the manufacture of the uranium-235 or the plutonium which constitutes the explosive charge of the bomb. With regard to the first point, there are a large number of possible ways of constructing a bomb and having it function successfully. Any team of competent nuclear physicists and explosives experts can devise several forms. One simple, obvious construction is pointed out in the Smyth report (official public report on atomic energy for military purposes) itself. In short, any secret of the construction of the atomic bomb used is a completely trivial one, whose knowledge is not fundamental nor even essential. The only secret of the atomic bomb was its existence prior to its public unveiling at Hiroshima.

Is there then a fundamental secret of the manufacture of the fissile (explosive) matter itself? It has been pointed out time and again that the principles of isotope separation on which the preparation of uranium-235 is based were well known and understood before the war, and that wartime developments consisted solely of working out technological details in great haste for wartime production of the isotope. True, the usefulness of the plutonium for atomic power was not known for certain before the war, but methods for making it were even then known to the world's scientists, and it is conjectured that the Germans had actually worked on its manufacture, with the aid of Norwegian "heavy water." Plutonium's usefulness is no longer a secret, and any competent nuclear scientist can point out the obvious ways of its manufacture. The Smyth report supplies additional useful facts. The remainder consists of details that may be worked out by others in the same manner that our scientists did, and perhaps the German scientists also. We needed only half a milligram—a sixty thousandth of an ounce—to enable us to design and build huge production plants. Where then is any fundamental secret of the atomic bomb or atomic power?

There being no fundamental scientific secrets involved, it is obvious that all that stands between any determined nation possessing the raw materials (which themselves are found in many places on the earth's surface) and finished atomic bombs are technological developments, and time. Here again there are important errors of understanding. It is not essential for successful production of atomic explosive material to invest two billions of dollars, and to run the whole gamut of engineering development of which we are so proud. We made such a huge investment because we were covering all the possible angles of approach, and developed many processes to plant scale before finally abandoning them for more immediately profitable approaches. As a result, we spent many times more than would be necessary for development of a single workable procedure. The nations of the world no longer have to go through the same selective agonies we did—we have already published the nature of the most successful methods of manufacture to be used. Even the plutonium development, which was the one real flight into the completely unknown, cost only 363 millions according to official figures. It should be clear that a nation desiring to develop production of fissile material need anticipate an investment of perhaps only a tenth of our total, or about 200 millions of dollars. Many nations are able to afford this.

Such a development does not need to take a great deal of time. We spent approximately 3½ years, from the beginning of the war to the testing of the first bomb in New Mexico. Almost a year of that time (up until the demonstration of the first chain reaction in December 1942) was spent on explorations to test whether the whole idea were actually feasible. Newcomers to the atomic field need not spend that period of uncertainty; they already know not only that the project is feasible, but the best lines of attack. It is sheer conceit to claim that no other nation can develop one of our successful processes (or even a different and better one) within the period of 2½ or 3 years, in which we divided our efforts among several.

When General Groves claims that the scientists mean that it would take 5 or 10 years for another nation to duplicate only our theoretical scientific information, and that they could never duplicate the necessary industrial and technological development, he totally misrepresents the scientist's position. We say that with no further help from us, other nations can have effective atomic bombs within a period of 2 or 3 years.

I hope that I have been able to transmit to you in its proper perspective the scientist's understanding of the situation. The erroneous statements which are current concerning the questions of secrecy and time and effort needed to produce atomic missiles give a false sense of security, and a false sense of the time we have to work out a solution. We say that the country does not have time to let things work out in their own way. Within 3 years' time at least several nations of the world will have at their disposal material for atomic bombs. What can we do now to anticipate the situation, and act wisely to prevent the possible world conflagration which an international dispute may then touch off?

Most sincerely yours,

LEONARD I. KATZIN.

Discrimination in Medical Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very significant article on discrimination in medical colleges, written by Frank Kingdon, which appeared in the October issue of the American Mercury.

Mr. Kingdon's article proves conclusively that the gross discrimination which now exists in our medical colleges is a serious matter which warrants the concern of the entire Nation.

I believe that this problem justifies a complete investigation by the Congress with a view to correcting this unfortunate situation.

Senate bill 1050, which the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and I have jointly introduced, along with a companion bill introduced in the House of Representatives by the gentleman from Michigan, Representative DINGELL, provides for a comprehensive national-health program which includes grants-in-aid for medical education and research and gives preference and priority to grants-in-aid with respect to projects for servicemen. This proposed legislation would help to expand opportunities for medical education. Our bill also contains provision for health insurance which would make it possible to utilize the services of more doctors—and pay them for these services. All these measures should be adopted to bring more adequate medical care to the American people.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISCRIMINATION IN MEDICAL COLLEGES
(By Frank Kingdon)

Leo, a bright and personable American lad, dreamed of becoming a great physician. He was the kind of boy who could expect to go far in any field, and assuredly there are easier ways of achieving success than the grueling study and practice of medicine. But Leo did

not think of his ambition in economic terms. He thought of it as a life-long dedication to the vocation of human healing.

After graduating from Thomas Jefferson High School, in New York City, he took his premedical course at the University of Ohio, and made an excellent scholastic record. In college, he became a member of the student council and the debating team, and also distinguished himself as a star track man. Upon graduation, he filed his first application for admission to a medical school and, in view of his record, he was confident of being accepted.

But his application was mysteriously turned down. He filed another, and another—at 87 schools—always with the same heartbreaking result. Though the rebuffs piled up, Leo kept trying. That fall he took his master of arts degree at Yale, receiving top honors. One of the professors, impressed by his mind and personality, made a personal effort to enroll him in a medical school, but without success. Not one of the schools had the courage to inform Leo frankly that he was being excluded because he was a Jew.

Frustrated everywhere, Leo gave up his dream of becoming a doctor, and the American people in all likelihood lost the potential services of a very able one. In a scientific domain upon which depends the health of the Nation, common sense would demand that strictly scientific criteria be applied in selecting personnel. Yet in Leo's case the criteria used had nothing to do with science.

His case, brought to light by a Nation-wide survey, unfortunately is not exceptional. It is typical, to the point of being commonplace, of systematic discrimination on racial and religious grounds enforced by virtually all medical schools in our country. The principal victims happen to be Jews, but the undemocratic system also strikes at other minority groups, particularly Catholics, Italians, and Negroes.

While the science of medicine is making magnificent progress, prejudice on a voodoo-doctor level prevails in the choice of its future practitioners. The wrong-name church or ancestry too frequently cancels out scholarship, personality, and natural talents in accrediting students to schools of medicine. Moreover, to the injury of exclusion for racial reasons, the schools add the insult of hypocrisy. Privately the medical deans acknowledge that they apply a quota system designed to keep out minority-group applicants. But not one of the 78 grade A medical colleges in the United States and Canada interrogated by questionnaire would admit this in writing, except the southern schools, which declared that they exclude Negroes. Even so, no school anywhere admitted that it uses the quota device to keep out other minority-group applicants.

II

The evidence of anti-Jewish discrimination is overwhelming. Although the annual applications for entrance by Jewish Americans has not declined, the number of Jewish students in medical schools has been reduced by, roughly, 50 percent in the last 20 years. Out of a total of 6,500 enrolled annually, only between 500 and 600 are now Jews. Even that figure is likely to be cut sharply if public opinion does not intervene quickly. The significance of the low figure emerges clearly when it is considered in relation to the number of Jewish boys seeking admission.

Every year, the survey disclosed, the medical colleges receive between 35,000 and 40,000 applications from about 14,000 individual students. Medical officials estimate that from 35 to 50 percent of the applicants—that is, from 5,000 to 7,000—are Jewish. Of the non-Jewish students, some 6,000 are admitted; of the Jewish applicants, only about 500 get in. In other words, 3 out of every 4 non-Jewish students are accepted, while only 1 out of every 13 Jewish students is given the chance to enter a medical school. These ratios do not have the slightest relation to mental equipment, natural aptitudes, and other rational, scientific standards of selection. By those standards alone, the Jewish applicants could reasonably be expected to rate the same proportion of admissions as the rest of the applicants.

During the last decade the total student body in the medical colleges has remained fairly constant, between 21,000 and 22,000. The number of doctors needed in the country, and hence the size of the student body, is estimated by the Association of American Medical Colleges. But while the total number of students has remained the same, or even increased slightly, the number of Jews among them has declined rapidly—this despite an increase of Jewish applicants. Slow at first, the decline has become precipitate in recent years. The class of 1937 included 794 Jewish students, the class of 1940 only 477—a 40-percent drop in 3 years.

Scholarship, of course, is not the only requirement of a competent doctor. Character, personality traits, emotional balance and integrity are vital considerations which the colleges seek to explore through oral interviews. Increasingly, however, this screening has been misused as a device for weeding out Jews, Catholics, and other undesirables, many of whom match or even surpass successful candidates for admission on the essential character standards.

To make matters worse, the war and postwar conditions have closed off access to foreign medical colleges, which in the past absorbed many of these unwanted Americans seeking to become physicians. Before the war, some 2,000 of our boys were studying in medical school in Scotland, Switzerland, France, and other countries, a big percentage of them drawn from our minority groups. In addition, many of the so-called grade B schools, to which Jewish and other victims of quota rules flocked out of necessity, have been closed down.

And while valuable human material for future medical contingents is cast aside recklessly for racial or religious reasons, alarms are being sounded in some quarters about a serious shortage of doctors in the near future. In a recent report issued jointly by the Office of Scientific Personnel and the American Council on Education, Dr. Victor Johnson, secretary of the Council on Medical Education and Hospitals, and Dr. Fred C. Japffe, secretary of the Asociation of American Medical Colleges, declared that today we have a shortage of 35,000 doctors and that we face a shortage of 19,000 doctors after demobilization.

III

The survey not only questioned the 78 accepted medical schools but examined their entrance blanks, studied confidential reports and documents, and conferred with leading physicians, medical officials, and laymen. This inquiry left no doubt that discrimination is not merely general but has been accepted and become entrenched. Educators have ceased being astonished by the practice. "I've just taken it for granted," one college professor observed, "that the Jewish students in my classes would be unable to enter a medical school. We've become hardened to this and no longer fight it."

It is even becoming difficult for boys with obvious Jewish names and addresses in centers of Jewish population, like New York City, to obtain application blanks. One Jewish student was told by the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Columbia University that it was "filled up until 1947," and is therefore "not taking any more applications." As an experiment, the boy's father asked a friend with a "good" name and "proper" address to write the same school. The answer came through quickly and said, in effect, that it was very happy to send him the application blank for admission to the medical school, and, indeed, would be pleased to consider him for the coming term.

Because the students of the College of the City of New York are preponderantly Jewish, graduates of that institution find it more and more difficult to obtain admission to medical schools. "Don't send your boy to City College if you want him to go into medicine," parents are now advised. Scholastically, the college measures up to most other such schools; only racial prejudice and planned discrimination can explain the difficulties which City College of New York men experience in seeking entrance into the medical schools of Cornell, Johns Hopkins, Dartmouth, Yale, Harvard, and other first-class colleges.

An analysis of the actual figures for graduates of City College desiring a medical career reflects the whole sordid picture. Of 190 City College graduates applying to medical schools in 1925, 58.4 percent were accepted. By 1941, the last prewar year, only 20 percent of the 115 applying were accepted. The rate of admission has gone down steadily since then. But here is the comparative table for City College of New York:

Year	Number of applicants	Total percentage admitted
1925	190	58.4
1927	205	53.0
1929	238	29.0
1932	279	24.0
1936	189	16.0
1939	122	15.0
1942	139	16.0
1943	139	15.0

The same general trend—an ever smaller percentage of admissions—is evident for Brooklyn College, Queens College, and other institutions that have a large percentage of Jewish, Italian, and other minority-group students.

The College of Physicians and Surgeons of Columbia University shows a typical picture of the same trend viewed from the angle of the medical school. The enrollment of Jewish students here dropped from 46.92 percent in 1920 to 6.4 percent in 1940. Here is the statistical table for the two decades at Columbia:

Year of admission	Enrollment	Total number admitted	Total percent admitted
1920	98	46	46.92
1923	103	26	25.22
1928	112	23	20.24
1934	91	13	14.17
1936	103	6	5.82
1938	95	4	4.20
1939	108	8	7.36
1940	124	8	6.40

At Long Island University,[1] the process of anti-Jewish discrimination has been somewhat slower but in the same general direction. The Jewish enrollment in its medical college, constituting 42.24 percent in 1932, declined to 26.50 percent in 1935, to 19.38 percent in 1938, to 14.14 percent in 1940. At Syracuse University the percentage of Jews in the total of new enrollments dropped from 19.44 in 1936 to 6 in 1942; though in this period the size of the freshman class increased from 41 to 50, the number of Jewish students among them decreased from 8 to 3.

At Cornell University, where 40 percent of the entering medical class a quarter of a century ago were Jewish, today only five percent

[1] Figures for Columbia, Long Island, and Cornell were obtained through private investigation. They are substantially correct although actual percentages may vary slightly from official records which are not available to the public.

of new admissions are Jewish. In 1941 Cornell enrolled only three Jewish students in a total class of 84.

New York University, indeed, is one of the few, perhaps the last, of the major medical schools, where the quota system is disregarded. From 40 to 50 percent of its medical enrollment are Jewish. But it is no secret that the university has been under pressure to conform to the prevailing pattern of discrimination.

IV

Practically every medical college, the survey showed, asks the applicant for his race or religion or both. Some of them inquire whether the student has ever changed his name. The University of Southern California, under race and descent, requires the candidate to check whether he is Anglo-Saxon, French, Germanic, Italian, Negro, Oriental, Scandinavian, Slavonic, or Spanish. The University of Virginia Medical School asks the applicant to state whether he is English, French, Hebrew, Italian, etc. Syracuse puts it this way: "In what denomination is your church preference?" The George Washington University, besides inquiring about race and religion, asks: "Have you ever registered at any school under a different name? If so, state it and name the institution."

Rejected in one place, students of the minority groups try others. Many of them spend up to $200 in application fees, which are not returned. Nearly all schools require a fee; the $5.00 charged by Johns Hopkins, Virginia, Minnesota, Georgetown, and Nebraska is the average, but fees as high as $10.00 are not unusual. In accepting and retaining fees from boys whose applications are automatically rejected on racial and religious grounds, many medical schools are in effect engaged in a profitable sideline. Boys desiring to become physicians who, in desperation, make multiple applications to 40 or 50 colleges, obviously make a large financial investment before being convinced that the wall of discrimination is too high to be vaulted.

School	Catholics	Italians	Negroes	Jews
Yale University	14	4	4	12
Tufts College Medical School	50	10	0	15
University of Illinois	20	5	1.5	41.80
University of Rochester	13	2	.6	6.0
Bowman Gray School of Medicine of Wake Forest College	1.5	0	0	1.5
The Hahnemann Medical College	31	9	0	9
Western Reserve University	21	8	1	15.5
Creighton University	54	18	0	4
University of Buffalo	36.47	10.91	0	10.91
Women's Medical College of Pennsylvania	15	5	.9	31.0
Syracuse University College of Medicine	17.8	4.5	0	12.7
Queens University at Kingston	13.67	2.16	0	5.4
Georgetown University School of Medicine	85	19	0	8
Boston University	50	15	3	20
University of Virginia	3	1	0	10

Sixty-five of the seventy-eight United States and Canadian medical schools listed as grade A by the American Medical Association responded to the inquiry. The first question was direct and simple: "Do you have a quota system in regard to minority groups such as—Catholics, Italian Americans, Negroes, Jews, any others?" Except in reference to Negroes, the answers were "No" without exception; 17 of the colleges, all in the South, acknowledged a quota system for Negroes.

Having denied that they enforce a quota system, the schools, of course, did not specify what their quota percentages are. On questions seeking information as to the proportion of minority-group students admitted in a normal prewar year (1940), the majority denied exact knowledge or asserted that the information was not available.

The conclusion, in the light of all the other facts, is that medical schools actually do apply a quota system but they do not care to admit it in writing.

One more-than-likely explanation for this hush-hush policy is the practical consideration that quotas, indefensible on scientific or democratic grounds, may actually run counter to constitutional guaranties nationally and to many State laws.

It should be recalled that these medical colleges are tax-exempt and in some cases supported by public funds. Whether directly helped financially from State budgets or not, the taxpayers everywhere contribute indirectly by exempting the institutions from taxes. Their obligation to treat all citizens on a basis of equality is therefore not only moral but in many instances legal. In New York, for example, section 4 of the tax law says:

"No education corporation or association that holds itself out to the public to be nonsectarian and exempt from taxation pursuant to the provisions of this section shall deny the use of its facilities to any person otherwise qualified, by reason of his race, color, or religion."

In New York, and in other States with similar provisions, the tax authorities should examine the validity of the tax exemption enjoyed by some educational institutions.

V

The excuse for imposing a quota system usually advanced is that there ought to be some correlation between the number of physicians of any racial or religious strain and the proportion of that race or religion in the general population. Since Jews constitute about 4 percent of the American population, their share of places in the medical schools, it is argued, should conform to that percentage. Thus Dean Willard C. Rappleye, head of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Columbia University, and an influential leader in medical education, has declared:

"There is a general belief that the representation of the various social, religious, and racial groups in medicine ought to be kept fairly parallel with the population make-up."

The same viewpoint is expressed, at least by implication, by Dr. Morris Fishbein, editor of the Journal of the American Medical Association. On October 7, 1939, he wrote in a letter:

"The case of the Jewish boys in medicine is particularly serious because they have overwhelmed the schools, and many schools turned them down simply because they are Jewish. There is no way to prove this, but it is obvious. At the same time, I wish to point out that somewhere between 15 and 20 percent of the doctors in this country in the practice of medicine are Jewish, and there is about 3.5 percent of the population in the same category."

The surface logic of this arithmetic collapses as soon as one subjects it to democratic or sheerly human, let alone scientific, tests. It assumes, to begin with, that our population consists not of Americans but of a vast number of racial and religious segments, each entitled to legal and human rights only in direct proportion to its size. It assumes absurdly, moreover, that Italian doctors should cure only Italians, Jewish doctors should cure only Jews; that the contribution of every social or racial element in the population to the progress of medical science should be limited through a racist bookkeeping.

The appropriate comment on this spurious and un-American arithmetic should be made by some Christian whose life has been saved by a Jewish doctor or vice versa; it should be made by non-Jews who have benefited from the discoveries of Paul Ehrlich, August von Wassermann, Otto Warburg, Waldemar Haffkine, Reuben L. Kahn, Abraham J. Rongy and other giants of modern medicine who happen to be Jews. We need only apply the same fantastic arithmetic to any department of American life to realize how ludicrous, antidemocratic and wasteful it would be; how it might drain every department of those very people most eager and most able to make the greatest contribution.

A list of some of the medical schools which have a rigid quota system, denied in words but applied in fact, would include the following:

Yale University School of Medicine.
Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine.
Harvard University Medical School.
Dartmouth College Medical School.
Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons.
Cornell University Medical College.
University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry.
Duke University School of Medicine.
Bowman Gray School of Medicine of Wake Forest College, N. C.
University of Virginia Department of Medicine.
Northwestern University School of Medicine.
Syracuse University College of Medicine.
Baylor University College of Medicine.

Some of the schools that have a policy of discrimination but are less rigid in its application include:

University of Chicago Medical School.
University of Maryland School of Medicine.
Boston University School of Medicine.
Wayne University College of Medicine.
Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, Mo.
University of Cincinnati College of Medicine.
University of California School of Medicine.
Jefferson Medical College of Philadelphia.
Temple University School of Medicine.
University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine.

Major medical colleges that come closest to a nonquota policy are unhappily few. The Medical School of New York University and the University of Illinois School of Medicine are the most important examples. Those not included in any of the above lists are mostly State universities or sectional colleges in the South or Midwest. They operate, in effect, on a strict quota system, but theoretically it is based on geographic distribution rather than on race or religion.

The result is about the same: There are, for example, few if any Americans of Jewish or Italian origin in the Kansas University medical school, the medical schools of North or South Carolina, Utah, or Texas.

Though some medical colleges may deny the facts revealed by this study, no one close to the picture of medical education in the United States can or will deny its basic truth. Few self-respecting educators are so deficient in the faculty of simple logic as to deny that the situation is a startling and dangerous violation of the theory and practice of democracy. In sorting out Americans on the basis of race and creed, the quota system is openly divisive instead of unifying; it accepts racism at the very moment when Americans of every race, creed, and color are fighting together to safeguard our democratic way of life.

There is no other reasonable, democratic answer to the questions posed by discrimination in medical education except to abolish it.

Fundamental Principles of Economic Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in reply to one of the many letters received in response to the publication of my article on money entitled "The Trouble With Silver," I have undertaken to further explain some of the facts concerning money. This letter from a gentleman in New York and my reply is inserted herewith:

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have just read your article, The Trouble With Silver, in the August 1, 1945, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I always read your remarks with deep interest.

It seems to me that the average person in this country has gotten smarter, or just more informed, since the days (81 years) of bimetallism. True, during the clear days bimetallism works all right—but when storm clouds begin to gather, wouldn't the smart, informed people be quick to convert their $1,000 of silver coin into gold coin? In other words, wouldn't Gresham's law still operate or attempt to operate? That law grew out of human nature, not economics, and human nature changes very slowly.

Sincerely,

EDWARD M. CAMPBELL.

Mr. EDWARD M. CAMPBELL,
The Union League Club,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. CAMPBELL: Thanks for your recent letter. In preparing and publishing the article on money entitled "The Trouble With Silver", an attempt was made to touch upon some of the important changes in the monetary system of this country and the effect of these changes on our national economy.

I am sure you will agree that money and finance are subject to the control of the principles of economic law and that the use of credit and money are interchangeable and in many cases closely intermingled—a fact that has the effect of confusing the issue. To reach any definite conclusion concerning the function of money, we must first determine the basic principles on which any monetary system is established. It may be that you will agree that the most important factor is the monetary unit of stable value with constant purchasing power. Any country to obtain such a stable monetary system must provide a currency that increases in volume evenly with the growth of population and commerce.

I quote from an old article taken from the New York Times under a Paris date line:

"Former Finance Minister Joseph Caillaux stated that for the sake of our producers and manufacturers, we sincerely hope the pound will soon be back on a gold basis. Of the world depression, he diagnosed the causes as, first, partitioning of nations by tariff walls and, second, the penury of monetary metals, and further stated there is only one remedy. It is not that there should be any redistribution of gold, as is being childishly suggested. Gold has its own law which it obeys. What must be done is that another monetary metal should be joined to it. Platinum has been suggested. I would prefer that silver, which was stupidly demonetized, should be rehabilitated."

In making response to your observation "the average person in this country has gotten smarter or just more informed," on the contrary, in considering the fundamental principles of economic law and the ultimate effect of the application of these principles on the several world monetary systems, it appears that the average person is less informed on the basic principles of money and has succumbed to the false propaganda. With regard to the operations of Greshams law. There is an old axiom embodying a fundamental principle—"Use creates demand and demand creates value." If the profit and financial control motif was removed as an influence in managing the national currency system so that our currency system could be established upon a plan that would conform to the principles of economic law, silver would be remonetized and would be "as good as gold" in supplying the money function—yea better—circulating in the channels of trade and business.

Don't forget that every foot of territory obtained by our Government in the continental United States—Louisiana, Florida, Texas, California, Northwest Territory, and Alaska—was acquired when silver was money and the United States was on a bimetallic basis.

Judging by the record and our national experience, we know that our national currency system failed disastrously "when storm clouds began to gather." The only thing left to the country in the way of finance was the collective credit of the American people and the taxing power of the Congress, which the Government was forced to draw upon to supply credit to fulfill the money functions by the establishment of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make private loans financed by the sale of United States bonds, a plan that put the Government in business in a big way. This program, coupled with the relief appropriation, left our country burdened with a $63,000,000,000 public debt before the war emergency which forced the Nation to undertake the financing of a world-wide war. The financial developments of recent years both in this country and abroad have demonstrated to my entire satisfaction the inadequacy of the single gold standard and the failure of any managed currency system to meet financial emergencies.

I reaffirm the statement made in my article on silver—that the only way the governments of the world will ever obtain a stable, adequate, workable money system is by the use of gold and silver under a bimetallic system—money standardized as to purity and weight.

Thanking you for the opportunity to explain my views on the vital issue of money, I am,

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

A Splendid Troublemaker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times of September 28, 1945:

A SPLENDID TROUBLEMAKER

Causing trouble for the government to which one is assigned is not usually regarded as the badge of high diplomacy, but as Ambassador Spruille Braden comes home from Argentina to assume an Assistant Secretaryship of State, it is to his everlasting glory that he has made things as hot as possible for the military dictators at Buenos Aires.

From first to last, Braden kept clearly in mind the ideal concept of his proper role as Ambassador. That role was to represent with all possible vigor the policies and ideals of his own Nation. He was a plumed knight of democracy in a land where officially democracy was anathema. Unlike many in our State Department, he did not deem it his function to make himself pleasing to the official hierarchy to which he was assigned. He was no gardenia diplomat to be taken into camp by the social lobbies. He did not become a bridge between dictatorial Argentina and democratic America. To his credit he did everything he could to knock the planks out of the bridge and to widen the abyss between the military usurpers and our Government in Washington. And this was all to the good. Our diplomats should be fearless, courageous, vociferous exporters of the American ideal of free government. Spruille Braden should become a pattern.

As we learn that Argentina has deemed it necessary to imprison 2 foreign ministers and 72 other prominent persons in Buenos Aires and to reestablish the state of siege which was lifted last August 17, we applaud Braden the more. He must have given aid and comfort to the popular forces of revolt. He was a splendid troublemaker for a government that has hampered and retarded the aspirations of free people throughout South America. Well done, Mr. Braden.

Plain Tax Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 17, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the tax bill, recently passed by the House of Representatives has produced many and different opinions respecting its provisions. An editorial appeared in the Washington Evening Star on October 17, upon this very question. This editorial is worthy of careful consideration upon this highly important subject, and I am submitting it herewith as a part of my remarks, and it is as follows:

Secretary Vinson does not pretend to be a student of semantics, but he gave an excellent lecture in that field when he appeared before the Senate Finance Committee the other day and showed how in the realm of taxation, as in domestic and international politics, words do not always mean what they seem to mean.

Speaking specifically of the "excess" profits tax and the "normal" individual income tax, Mr. Vinson made clear that both have been very misleadingly named, and he argued most persuasively for repealing them outright—and at once—because they were enacted originally only as wartime measures and can no longer be justified, now that peace is here.

Mr. Vinson's points on the "excess" profits tax may be summarized as follows: (1) To begin with, calling profits "excessive" does not actually make them "excessive"; (2) this levy was adopted primarily to keep war profiteering to a minimum; (3) it has no place in our peacetime economy; (4) it is "erratic and in many ways inequitable," giving to corporations with high prewar earnings or inflated capital structures a competitive advantage over new or expanding businesses not similarly situated as far as

taxing goes, and (5) since it inhibits planning and expansion, its repeal will stimulate production, create jobs, and thus benefit everybody.

As for the so-called normal tax, Mr. Vinson argues: (1) Far from being "normal," it is purely a war levy; (2) it has no peacetime justification because it is objectionable in that it violates the principle of adjusting taxation to differences in family status and according to ability to pay; (3) it is not a proper instrument for broadening the tax base, and in any event, even without it, there will be well over 30,000,000 taxpayers in 1946; (4) it is relatively nonproductive, creating complications for wage earners, employers, and the Government alike; and (5) its repeal will help reconversion by cushioning the transitional fall of purchasing power among low-income groups.

Secretary Vinson's views on a limited tax reduction of $5,000,000,000 for the calendar year 1946 cover more ground than this. But hi advocac of immediate repeal of the excess-profits tax and the normal individual tax constitutes his most important recommendation for promoting a "vital, invigorated peacetime economy" offering full employment and maximum production.

The House has already passed a bill which, in effect, eliminates the normal levy but which goes only 60 percent of the way on the excess-profits tax. Mr. Vinson's over-all argument seems so sound, however, that we must hope that the bill, when finally enacted, will follow his main suggestions.

Pooling Scientific Resources and Brains Is Bound To Win Against Most Dreaded Diseases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, after reading the following letter received from Mr. J. E. Bucheimer, of Baltimore, Md., every Member of Congress should be in sympathy with the purpose of H. R. 3939, which seeks to eradicate the scourge of cancer and infantile paralysis.

The purpose of my bill is to make possible the construction of many more research laboratories and institutes throughout this country, equipped with the most modern scientilc machinery and apparatus, where the keenest brains of the world may carry on independent research activity with the one purpose and determination in mind—the establishment of the causation and the cure of cancer and infantile paralysis.

If by the construction of laboratories and plants throughout the Nation, equipped with the most modern machinery, our scientists were enabled to discover how to harness atomic energy, surely with the aid of many more modern research laboratories and with the concentrated attention of the best scientific brains in the world, the scourge of dreaded diseases likewise should be conquered.

In the face of these scourges, mankind feels utterly helpless today. Is it not worth the effort and the expenditure of a mere fraction of the cost of the atomic bomb to make much greater the possibility of discovering the cure for cancer and polio?

Mr. Bucheimer's letter follows:

OCTOBER 13, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEVENSON: In reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD each day, I have noticed your outstanding endeavors to have your bill, H. R. 3939, passed, in an effort to stamp out cancer and infantile paralysis.

I especially consider this one of the greatest bills ever put before Congress. Just a year ago I lost my daughter Jeannette, age 17, from the effects of a sarcoma. After the test operation, advised by a number of doctors, her leg was amputated above the knee in an effort to save her life, but this action failed to save her. The doctors claim they do not know the cause of it and, therefore, have no cure, and that no one has ever lived when they are affected by it. Further, it seems that in almost every case this particular condition shows up in young people. She had every treatment known to medical science, and still she lost.

It is for this reason that I hope and pray that the men of our lawmaking body will rally around you in an effort to save and build up the bodies of our future Nation and, if God willing, stamp out the conditions entirely.

With best wishes for your success, I am
Very truly yours,

J. E. BUCHEIMER.

BALTIMORE, MD.

Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, unless this administration takes firm action concerning strikes, we may well find more and more people out of work because power-hungry labor racketeers have it in their power to deny the honest laboring man the right to work. There is no greater right than the right to work. It means the right to live and eat and have a home. Labor leaders are denying this right to countless numbers of our people today. Labor leaders have seized unusual powers. This power makes the individual member of a union a slave. He may be well paid but he cannot work, only when he is told to work. He is idle when he is told to be idle. He pays what he is told to pay. In other words, he is a slave to a few leaders who hold in the hollow of their hands the right of an individual to work and earn a living. Many of these honest laboring men have no voice in the running of these labor unions.

The present strikes and the attitude of the labor leaders are far removed from what we know as democracy. These labor leaders have a lust for power and money which far outweighs their interest in the welfare of their members. Union leaders can call strikes, make threats, levy assessments and dues without even trying to learn the will of the majority of the union members. There are workingmen, thousands of them, who pay their dues to their unions, far more each year than many of the country's better clubs dare ask of their own members.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for this Congress, if the administration will not do it, to enact legislation which will give the honest man the right to work. We must oppose those leaders of labor who in a large part are self-appointed and who work for their own selfish means. Organized labor has become of age. They should be accountable to industry and to people for their acts. They should respect contracts between their members and industry. When industry and labor lock horns and the wheels of machinery fail to move, then the public is the one that suffers. There are thousands of items which a hungry public needs but they cannot be produced when either labor or industry calls a strike.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this administration has it within its power to stop these strikes.

The people of America must work together or they can get no place in this reconversion period. It is time for action.

Statehood for Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include an address made by me to a gathering of approximately 1,000 members and friends of the Bronx council of the American Jewish Congress at the Waldorf-Astoria, New York City, on October 14 last, which follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, members of the Bronx division of the American Jewish Congress, ladies, and gentlemen, it would be most unusual for one with sentimental Irish blood in his veins not to be impressed by this demonstration of his fellow citizens of the Jewish faith. I feel deeply honored as the recipient of the Good Citizen Award made by the Bronx division of the American Jewish Congress. I trust that I not only have proved myself worthy, but I entertain the great hope that at no future time will the American Jewish Congress have reason to regret the award that has been given me here tonight.

Born and bred in New York and educated in the Catholic school system of the great Archdiocese of New York, from grammar school through university, it would indeed be strange if I did not believe in that great American principle—freedom of religion. I am not alone in that feeling. I have an abiding faith in the patriotism and Americanism of the people of this great city, and I am convinced that the feeling of prejudice and bigotry is confined to only a very minute percentage of our population. New York is great and big and gererous; its people are open-hearted, friendly, and kind and for the most part care not what their neighbors' religious beliefs might be. However, there are always some who, for mercenary reasons, strive to fan into flame the sparks of bigotry and prejudice that may here and there be found, and as an aid to their scheme they utilize the facilities of the United States

mails. It was with the idea of reducing to a minimum the dissemination through the mails of scurrilous and libelous literature, designating persons by race or religion, that I introduced H. R. 2328. The bill has had an unusually stormy time and has met with rather severe opposition. After extensive public hearings by a subcommittee, I was successful in having the bill reported favorably to the full committee, but there an unusual hazard was encountered. The chairman of the full committee reopened the hearings and after taking additional testimony had the bill referred back to the original subcommittee that had unanimously reported it out. The bill died in committee upon the adjournment of the Seventy-eighth Congress. In the present Congress, I again introduced the bill and I can assure you that we will either get action by the committee or seek to discharge the committe from further consideration of the bill by a petition to bring the bill to the floor of the House.

Important as this bill may be to minorities in the United States, there is a still more important issue that confronts the Jewish people. It has to do with the status of Palestine. To my mind it is a sad commentary on the efforts to secure international peace and amity to have one of the four great nations of the world break its pledged word. When the new Labor Government in Great Britain assumed office, Americans believed its preelection pledges with respect to Palestine would be kept. It is with regret that Americans have learned that the British Labor Government is not in disagreement with the policy of the white paper. The repudiation by the British Labor Party, when it came into power, of its preelection promise of a solution of the Palestine problem, while regrettable, is not, in the light of other circumstances, altogether surprising. The gratuitous insult by Harold Laski, one of the prominent leaders of the British Labor Party, to the religion of 30,000,000 American Catholics, indicates his attitude toward all religions and it is likely that as a policy maker of the dominant political party in Great Britain, his influence has been and will be felt—not on the side of justice and peace, but, rather, of hate and discord—the basic principles upon which British imperialism rests.

Americans must now realize that whether the British Government be Liberal, Conservative, or Labor, British imperialism still survives.

We Americans have little use for double talk—the language of international diplomacy. When the Sixty-seventh Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922, passed the resolution, later signed by President Harding, "that the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people," there was no equivocation. The ruthless persecution of the Jews in Europe had aroused the sympathies of the American people, and our Congress, by its resolution, sought to give expression to the deep-seated conviction of the people of the United States that all men are created equal and that freedom of religion is the inalienable right of every individual. The centuries have seen the tortuous trek of the Jews through the countries of the world, and have witnessed the persecutions that have relentlessly pursued them. Through the years and despite the persecutions the Jewish heart clung with deep-seated affection to Palestine—the home of Jewry and the birthplace of Christendom.

The world has too long denied the Jews their Palestine. It is time their right to their homeland be recognized. The hour has come when justice be done, when appeasement cease, and the doors of Palestine be opened as a haven to the millions of homeless Jews who are the victims of persecution.

Neither in the resolution of the Sixty-seventh Congress nor in the Balfour Declaration is there any intimation that there was to be a limitation of the number of Jews for whom Palestine might be a haven. Indeed, under article 6 of the convention between the United States and Great Britain, as proclaimed by President Calvin Coolidge on December 15, 1925, it specifically provides that the administration of Palestine "shall facilitate Jewish immigration under suitable conditions and shall encourage, in cooperation with the Jewish agency referred to in article 4, close settlement of the Jews on the land, including State lands and waste lands not required for public purposes.

The only restriction that was placed on immigration prior to the British white paper—and the only one that could possibly have ever been intended—was that the volume of immigration should not be so great as to exceed the economic capacity of the country to absorb such immigration. The reason for this was to prevent the immigrants from becoming a burden upon the community. This was sound policy.

To my mind, restriction of immigration, based on political considerations, as outlined in the British white paper, defeats the very purpose of the Balfour Declaration and the resolution of the Sixty-seventh Congress. While calling Palestine a haven for homeless Jews, it shuts the doors of that home against all but a minimum of Jewish refugees. Instead of becoming a center in which the Jewish people may take an interest and pride, on grounds of religion and race, Palestine, under the British white paper, becomes a community surrounded by a wall of politics, which bars the helpless and unfortunate Jewish refugees who, in their desperate need, seek succor amongst their coreligionists—and in vain.

It is most important for the peace of the world that we bring the great weight of our influence to induce Great Britain to fulfill the Balfour Declaration and to keep its solemn pledge to the United States and to the League of Nations when it assumed the obligations and responsibilities of the mandate over Palestine. We cannot look with confidence to future pacts and treaties if obligations incurred in the past are ruthlessly broken. The failure of the British Government to faithfully discharge its trust under the terms of the Palestinian mandate, which ratified the Balfour Declaration, augurs ill for the faithfulness and integrity of Great Britain at the peace table in the present world crisis.

Today as a nation that shed its blood and gave its riches that the world may live in peace, the United States has it within its power to insist that the British Palestinian policy as set forth in the white paper of 1939 be repudiated and that the doors of Palestine be opened to those Jews whose great and unconquerable desire has been to live in peace in their historic homeland. How long shall the United States exchange notes upon this question? How long shall the American Government and the American people be indifferent to the sufferings of the persecuted Jews of Europe?

President Truman, to alleviate at least in part the indescribable sufferings of Jews in the Axis and former Axis-occupied countries, has recommended to the British Government the immediate admission of 100,000 Jews into Palestine. I appreciate the efforts of our President, but we must face the stubborn fact that there can be no appeasement of British imperialism. Whether the new British Government will accept the recommendation of President Truman seems doubtful, but whether it does or not, the real question as to whether the doors of Palestine shall be closed to the Jews by the British until the Arabs give their consent that they be opened, remains unsolved. It would not long remain unsolved if the United States, giving expression of its displeasure with a nation that repudiates its pledges, refused economic assistance to Great Britain, and to that end I pledge you my best efforts.

Wincenty Rzymowski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, American diplomats and the Washington social-climbers set have reached a new low in their activities. Tuesday evening, from 5 to 7 p. m., the Washington so-called social set and some leaders in Government circles paid tribute and honor to a quisling. The entire so-called Polish Embassy, which consists of two quislings by the names of Wincenty Rzymowski and Janusz Zoltowski received yesterday what they considered to be the cream of the crop of American diplomats, foreign diplomats, and social climbers.

Conspicuously, no true American of Polish descent was either invited or present. This is a true indication of the attitude of all honest Poles throughout the world concerning the two quislings mentioned above. I am amazed that the American diplomats who were present, and the foreign diplomats who were present, as well as the American social climbers who were present, did not make an honest check of the so-called Polish Foreign Minister's record before they attended this social affair.

I am amazed that those social climbers who were present did not realize that in attending this function they were paying honor not only to a quisling and a Laval but they were paying honor to a man who is a literary outcast throughout the entire world.

This man, Wincenty Rzymowski, who poses as the Polish Foreign Minister, is known throughout the world not only as a quisling but as a literary outcast. In 1934 he was elected a member of the Polish Academy of Letters. In 1936 he was dismissed from membership because he had written a book one-third of which was stolen from the work of Bertrand Russell. As a plagiarist Wincenty Rzymowski ranks among the first order.

When the real Polish Government was in existence Wincenty Rzymowski was in favor of that government. When the Stalin puppet government was set up in Poland recently Wincenty Rzymowski was then a supporter of that government. He has no such thing as loyalty and patriotism in his heart and he will go down in Poland's history as among the quislings of the first order.

The social climbers who attended this affair should also have realized that Wincenty Rzymowski does not represent the 7,000,000 Poles who gave their lives for freedom in this war. He does not represent the 300,000 Polish troops all over the world who have no home to go to. These boys fought Hitler longer than any army or nation in the world. Wincenty Rzymowski does not represent a single one of them. Nor does Wincenty Rzymowski represent any of the remaining 20,000,000 freedom-loving people in Poland. Wincenty Rzymowski represents

only Molotov and Stalin and no other people. He is Molotov's and Stalin's mouthpiece disgracefully parading under the flag of Poland. He represents no one other than the plagiarists and the fakers and the quislings of Europe.

For a long time I have noted that Washington is filled with social climbers seeking nothing other than social prestige, but I never realized that the Washington social and diplomatic set would seek to gain such prestige by honoring a quisling and a plagiarist and the puppet of the two men who would like to destroy Poland completely.

So that the people of America may know what our social set and the diplomats of our country and the diplomats of other countries are doing, I wish to include in these remarks a newspaper article taken from the Times-Herald of October 17, 1945. I think the people of America should know what is going on, because this is the first step of the march of quislings to America posing as representatives of their own countries that they have stabbed in the back. It will not be long until another quisling who out-quislings Quisling will arrive in Washington. His name is Oscar Lange, and I will have more to say about him at a later date.

This Polish quisling, Wincenty Rzymowski, who stabbed Poland in the back and is parading under the flag of Poland, represents nobody but Stalin and came here to sign the United Nations organization. It is an insult to the brave and gallant nations who signed this organization to have a name like Wincenty Rzymowski on it. He does not represent Poland; he does not represent the Polish people. He represents nobody but himself. I consider it an insult to this noble world organization to have a man like that sign for any nation, let alone for a brave and gallant nation that lost 7,000,000 lives in this war fighting for our freedom and theirs.

No true Pole and no true American considered his acts as official and I am amazed that our State Department and some of our social set in Washington accept him as an official.

POLISH LEADER IS HONORED AT RECEPTION

(By Elizabeth Ford)

The entire Polish Embassy staff received yesterday with the Polish Foreign Minister, Wincenty Rzymowski, at the reception in his honor from 5 to 7. The entire Polish Embassy staff at the moment adds up to one man—the Chargé d'Affaires, Janusz Zoltowski.

Also included in the receiving line, however, were Mme. Rzymowski and Alexander Mierzejewski, secretary-interpreter to the chief of his country's foreign office, right on hand to welcome non-Polish speaking guests with an impeccable Oxford accent acquired at Cambridge.

LANGUAGES VARIED

Henri Bonnet, the French Ambassador, however, found his native language an international means of communication with Mr. Rzymowski; the British Ambassador and Countess Halifax stuck to English.

Arriving early at the first fete at the Polish Embassy in many months were Mrs. James F. Byrnes, who was accompanied by Mrs. Tom Connally; Miss Vera Bloom, the Surgeon General, and Mrs. Norman Kirk, the Marine Commandant, and Mrs. Vandegrift, and the Chinese Ambassador and Mme Wei.

Still others present were the Czechoslovakian envoy and Mme. Hurban, Mme. Hugues LeGallais, wife of the Luxemburg Minister; the Italian Ambassador, Alberto Tarchiani; the Portuguese envoy and Mme. de Bianchi; the Secretary of Commerce, Henry A. Wallace; Mrs. Robert Patterson, wife of the Secretary of War, and her son, Captain Patterson; Miss Pauletta Guffey, the Irish Minister, and Mrs. Robert Brennan, Mr. and Mrs. Edgar Morris, the Czechoslovakian Minister and Mme. Cervenka and many, many more.

ABLAZE WITH RIBBONS

Ablaze with campaign ribbons was Lt. Gen. Leonid Rudenko of the Soviet Army, who fought at Stalingrad; and with him was Maj. Gen. Alexei Chizhoe.

Earlier in the day, Secretary of State Byrnes had feated Mr. Rzymowski at luncheon at Blair House. Others present at this event were Minister Josef Olszewski, director of the political department of the Polish Foreign Office; Wladyslaw Nizinski, assistant chief of the Anglo-American section of the Polish Foreign Office; and Mr. Mierzejewski.

Still others were Senator TOM CONNALLY, Representative SOL BLOOM, Charge Zoltowski, Ben Cohen, Dr. Ludwig Reichman, Polish delegate to UNRRA; M. S. Szymczak, H. Freeman Matthews, Alger Hiss, Elbridge Durbrow, Francis B. Stevens, and R. D. Muir.

National Federation of Telephone Workers Protest NLRB Ruling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the following letter was signed by 35 members of the National Federation of Telephone Workers of Sidney, Nebr., and represents the views of a large majority of the employees of the telephone company at that place. I have no doubt it represents the views of a large majority of the telephone workers in Nebraska. It shows what a grave mistake was made when the National Labor Relations Board recommended the dissolution of this union in favor af a union affiliated with a national organization. If some governmental agency is to have the authority to order the employees of an industry to belong to a union favored by that agency, labor will never be able to bargain through representatives of its own choice. It will be under the autocratic domination of Government-favored labor bosses. This is a long way from American ideals. It goes far beyond the intent of Congress in setting up the National Labor Relations Board. The letter follows:

SIDNEY, NEBR., *October 6, 1945.*

A. L. MILLER,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MILLER: We, the undersigned, as members of the National Federation of Telephone Workers, having met in session this 5th day of October 1945, the aforesaid meeting being held as part of a national plan to protest the National Labor Relations Board's recent ruling ordering the dissolution of the Western Electric Employees Association of Kearney area, do hereby beseech and beg you to do all in your power to induce the NLRB to reverse the aforesaid ruling.

As you know the NFTW is an organization of several hundred thousand members and we believe is fully capable as a collective bargaining agency to properly represent its members.

We wish, at this time, to call your attention to the fact that all during the war no serious labor trouble between the members of the NFTW and management of the Bell Telephone operating companies occurred, nor during the entire existence of the NFTW.

This, we believe, is definite proof that the NFTW is capable as a bargaining agency and is instrumental in promoting harmony in the ranks of labor and management in the communications field.

Federal Aid Airport Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. KELLY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to say anything about the pending legislation before the House today. However, this is an important bill.

It recognizes that civil aviation has become of national importance.

It represents the first step in the past decade of aviation history toward the establishment of a long-range Federal-aid program for the construction of airports, and, as the Secretary of Commerce expressed himself before the committee, its importance cannot be overemphasized, for it will govern the development of the American airport system for many years to come.

There is no question in all our minds that the rapid expansion of civil aviation is particularly vital to our national well-being now and in the future. We need this legislation to strengthen our post-war economy, which will be greatly aided by new industries with important possibilities for growth. We need it if we are to utilize the great aviation resources—both human and technical—created by the war.

We know the great program and vast expense we endured to build a great air force during the war, whereas, the huge aircraft manufacturing industry produced aircraft products worth $19,000,000,000 in 1944. We have trained millions of workers in aviation skills.

Since the ending of the war, a sharp deflation of the aircraft industry has already begun, with the reduction of military demand following the end of war. Therefore, we must act promptly to foster the growth of civil aviation if we are to preserve as much as possible of this great store of technical ability from dissipation.

Aviation is a very important part of our defense. The cities of this Nation are very much concerned and interested in aviation—commercial aviation and aviation in general.

Therefore, it is only natural, in building airports, for an airplane has no value

if it does not have a place from which to take off and a place to land.

If it were not for the keen interest displayed by the large cities in aircraft expansion before the war, the Army and Navy would have been in a bad way and their program might have been held back a few years if they did not have the facilities accorded them by municipal airports.

Some Developments of Interest to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, among the many legislative problems which claim the attention of a Member of Congress are those that have particular interest to World War veterans.

VETERANS' HOSPITAL FOR NORTHERN MINNESOTA

Announcement was made today by Gen. Omar Bradley that a new veterans' hospital will be located in northern Minnesota and that this location has the approval of President Harry S. Truman. My office has cooperated with civic and other agencies in northern Minnesota and Duluth in calling to the attention of Veterans' Administration officials the need for a veterans' hospital in this section of the State. We have had a great many difficulties to overcome but the people in our section may be very proud of the success that has crowned their efforts. There has never been any question about the need for a new veterans' hospital in our section of the State.

Its location at Duluth, Minn., will make it possible for veterans from a large area to be hospitalized near home, so that friends and relatives may visit them without a lot of expense and time which has been necessarily incurred in the past.

TAX RELIEF FOR VETERANS

Prompt action should be taken by Congress to cancel taxes of veterans who have been in the service of their country for the past 2 or 3 years. Under present tax laws, tax payment has been deferred until 6 months after discharge. From time to time I get letters discussing this tax problem where either the veteran or his wife points out the hardship involved in making payment of taxes during the time that the man has been in service. I feel that all taxes on military incomes during the period of the war should be canceled. This would give relief in a vast number of cases. I know that various experts are studying the question and that congressional committees have discussed the problem. However, I do not think the matter is as difficult as some of them seem to claim. If we are agreed on the proposition of canceling these taxes, legislation to bring that about should be worked out without any trouble or delay. It ought to be done now. I shall support the proper kind of a bill giving veterans this relief.

EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS OF RETURNED VETERANS

I have just received a placard issued by the college from which I graduated in the year 1909. This is a small Midwestern college, Wabash College, located at Crawfordsville, Ind. The placard is headed, "Veterans! Are You Missing an Education?" It then proceeds to discuss a college preparatory course of 8 weeks which is intended to be of help to veterans who have been in the Army 3 or 4 years and who feel the need of getting reacquainted with the problem of again taking up school and college work. This prospectus shows that the tuition and the board and room for this course of study are paid for under legislation enacted by Congress for the benefit of World War veterans who make proper application and whose applications are accepted. As I understand it, these same opportunities are being offered in other colleges and I would urge veterans to investigate the situation at once and take advantage of these opportunities.

In this connection my attention has been called to one section of the law which limits educational benefits to men who were over 25 years of age at the time they entered service. I think that part of the law ought to be amended so that men, regardless of age, who have had technical training in the Army, may further their education along those lines regardless of age. I shall support such an amendment.

In conclusion we have in northern Minnesota a number of veterans' service officers and the different veterans' posts are always glad to discuss matters with returning veterans. In connection with the many matters in which veterans are interested they can get information from these different officials and different veterans' organizations. I urge you to consult them and if there is any information that I get or help that I can give from my Washington office, I shall be glad to have you call on me.

Regulations and conditions change from time to time and at the present moment, it will be interesting to veterans of World War II that surplus commodities so far as veterans are concerned are being handled through the Office of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. A branch office is located in the Christie Building at Duluth, Minn., and application for surplus war materials should be made there.

Can the Story of the St. Lawrence Waterway Be as President Truman Sees It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY L. TOWE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter sent me by Mr. John Kortes, of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, New Jersey State Legislative Board:

OCTOBER 5, 1945.

Hon. HARRY L. TOWE,
Member of Congress from New Jersey, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR HARRY: Can the story of the St. Lawrence waterway be as President Truman sees it?

In urging for this proposed legislation, the President points out the hydroelectric-power facilities of the proposed St. Lawrence waterway and power project. This writer has personally no objection to offer on that assumption, but to offer facts which will rebut to some extent the theory on power. "The maximum demand for electrical power in New York State on December 14, 1943, between 5 and 6 o'clock in the evening was 4,198,600 kilowatts, and there is an installed capacity in the State of 5,346,200 kilowatts, which left an additional excess capacity of 1,157,500 kilowatts, proving that there is no need for additional power." So says the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce in April 1944 in opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence project.

The President speaks about the number of jobs it would produce. First of all, how many jobs would the construction of the waterway create for Americans since nine-tenths of the project lies within the territory of the Dominion of Canada?

It robs Peter of more than enough to pay Paul! The disorganization of existing commerce and transportation will put more men out of work than the waterway will encourage or can possibly absorb. The reduced present transportation facilities will not benefit any consumer in the eastern seaboard.

Water-borne transportation via the St. Lawrence waterway would cost more than existing rates, due to the distance required to travel to and from the points involved from which it is claimed that consumer benefits would ensue. For example, the distance from Duluth to New York via St. Lawrence is 3,017 miles, via Lake and New York State Barge Canal (now used) is 1,397 miles; Buffalo to New York via St. Lawrence is 2,070 miles, via New York State Barge Canal is 504 miles; Chicago to New York via St. Lawrence is 2,924 miles, while via Lake and New York State Barge Canal is only 1,397 miles.

The President says "It will furnish lucrative employment to many thousands of our people." I ask that this statement be justified to corroborate with the reduction of transportation personnel now employed in existing facilities. If the losses are only equal to the amount of import, export, and coastwise shipping which is handled at the eastern seaboard now, that number represents 25 percent of those now employed on the present facilities, thereby involving untold thousands of unemployed that the seaway could hardly absorb in all its widespread and so-called enlarging world commerce, as the President pointed out.

The new bill does more than tear down bit by bit the concepts of the Constitution which now require a seaway and power project of this magnitude and international geographic location to be ratified by treaty between Canada and the United States. A two-thirds vote by the Senate is also required. The new bill, as drawn, takes but a mere majority of the Congress and thereby defeats the Constitution itself.

The President says further, "It will mean more jobs, more income, and a higher standard of living." How can such be the truth? Can the writer as a locomotive fireman and engineman with 20 years' service seek the wages of the above services upon the established lines and facilities of transportation, get the same consideration to start now in plying the ships using the seaway? Can our seamen under the La Follette bill, providing

that our merchant marine must pay our seamen wages which the bill outlines as a reasonable wage, expect to compete with the merchant marine of the British who employ upon their vessels coolie, Javanese, and West Indies labor, all of whom are paid but fractions or mere pittances compared to what our seamen earn? Please excuse the above sentence since I do not wish it understood that I approve the wages paid our seamen. I still believe they earn too little for the services they render. Such being the facts from that quarter, can the seaway improve the situation as it stands today? Will our seamen under the above circumstances get the opportunity to compete with our competitors and earn the so-called "higher standard of living"? And will they have more or less employment? Can we successfully compete with Russia on the sea? These major with several other minor foreign merchant marine factors, such as Norway, Denmark, Holland, Sweden, Germany, and Greece are a grave hindrance to our foreign economic competition.

It seems to me that if the waterway is opened, and I hope it never is, we would find our flag waving on the distant shores of the seaway to the south, and not upon the masts of the ships that will carry the commerce and trade in and out of the seaway—the seaway that we paid to build out of American tax dollars for the benefit of Canadian labor and that the foreign vessels of the world will take advantage of in trading with us. We, because of our higher standard of living, cannot hope to compete with nor gain anything from such a waterway.

In the President's message to Congress, he points out that the power facilities of the waterway would produce an added 2,200,000 hydro horsepower. This added to our present excess of 1,157,000 kilowatts would equal 3,357,600 kilowatt excess, or twice the amount required during the peak wartime production period of December 14, 1943.

Have we come to the stage of abolishing little by little our Constitution by legislative enactment, which requires but a majority vote on the one hand, while ratification of treaties between nations requires a two-thirds vote of the Senate? If such abolition is desired, let it be submitted to the States for ratification. The St. Lawrence seaway and power-project agreement as proposed to Congress does abolish that section of the Constitution that requires the two-thirds vote of the Senate for ratification.

Are we playing Santa Claus to the rest of the world while we think of retaining our present merchant-marine status to provide its portion of the really needed 60,000,000 jobs? We certainly are headed for chaos if our policy is establishing jobs and then enact legislation that will produce the opposite result.

Many of us have read the statistics about the amazing output of our industry and its labor to win this last global war. We know the value and need of the existing railroad facilities throughout the Nation, particularly in the eastern and western seaboards. From that production record, one can see the job the rails and rail labor did in delivering the goods. Therefore, to establish a new part-time facility to take the place of adequate present facilities is an economically unsound use of public money.

Another point of discussion has been raised and deserves your careful scrutiny, i. e., the problem of certain fixed costs to the existing transportation organizations. Can these groups maintain present facilities of full service in the face of the losses they would suffer during the interim between the opening of the seaway and its closing 5 months later? Such additional part-time facilities are asked to be financed by tax dollars of the American people. In view of the job done by railroads and railroad labor during the war, then an indispensable system, it is unfair that they should face the possible competition that the seaway would produce, not to our own seamen but the seamen of our competitors. The seaway would require the absolute curtailment of such facilities to reduce the fixed costs which would result in the reduction of jobs. Being a railroad man in the capacity described and seeing the effect directly, it shows that we are robbing Peter of an approximate 160,000 men to pay Paul 30,000 men, or a balance of produced unemployment in the eastern seaboard States of 130,000 men, at a time when we hope to make an attempt at a 60,000,000-job goal. Can the President of the United States believe he is seeing the problem eye to eye in the way of jobs? The Congress must say "No" to the proposed St. Lawrence waterway and power project as an economic fallacy.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN KORTES.

Demobilization of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Pacific edition of the Stars and Stripes, dated October 6, 1945, giving the views of some of the men in the Pacific on the question of demobilization.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Sgt. Buck Buchwach)

A wave of indignation among Pacific GI's greeted Saturday's announcement that the Army would release surplus enlisted men in the States.

They condemned a policy which, as Corp. Elmer Heaseley put it, "will give first opportunity at postwar jobs to noncombat, stateside men."

Corporal Heaseley pointed out that "a man who has been stationed in San Francisco, with his wife right there, for 2 years, is now eligible for discharge and first crack at available jobs.

"Combat men and overseas vets who have 2 and 3 years of service and gone through hell must stay in uniform * * * taking the vocational crumbs when they finally return," he said.

BEAR OUT MARSHALL

A 91-mile tour of nine Army air, ground, and service force installations on Oahu disclosed that General Marshall's earlier prediction that "there would be a fury of protest overseas" was being fulfilled.

Not one EM of the one-hundred-odd interviewed failed to view with varying degrees of disfavor the release of men in the States—but not overseas—with 2 years service, for whom the War Department cannot find useful service.

Mildest opinion was that of Staff Sgt. Anthony Vento: "It doesn't seem like equal treatment as far as the overseas men are concerned, but it's nice to know someone is getting out."

Technical Sgt. Andrew Jensen, who has served overseas 32 of his 38 Army months, insisted "We certainly don't think stateside commandos with 2 years' service and maybe 36 points should get out before men with 50 to 60 points, 2 to 4 years of service, combat experience, and overseas time."

SCOFF AT PROVISION

Some scoffed at the provision of the order which stipulated "the system must not interfere with discharge of high-point men."

"Separation centers already jammed in the States will now be cluttered up beyond capacity with 2-year stateside sufferers, while me and my buddies languish overseas * * * waiting," retorted Sgt. Robert Grube, who has 30 months overseas, 40 months' service, and 70 points.

The GI's couldn't understand the "surplus categories and the provision that stateside dischargees must be not 'economically retrainable to perform useful service.'"

"What kind of a racket is that?" inquired T3 Jake Fink of POA's joint intelligence center, a 3-year vet 23 months overseas. "Every man can be trained * * * uneconomical hell * * * who worried about the cost before?"

PREMIUM ON FOUL-UPS

As for the "surplus" label, Pfc Joseph Antoine charged that "it puts a premium on foul-ups, trouble-makers, and guys who contributed the least. If a CO in the States has a lazy, worthless, trouble-maker in his outfit, he can now declare him surplus and get rid of him. The efficient, hard-working, sincere soldier in the States is, of course, essential, and not the least bit surplus. It's backwards."

"Every man now in uniform in the States is physically and mentally qualified for overseas duty," said Master Sgt. Frank A. Cerruti, who has 85 points, 43 months' service, 30 months overseas, and Seventh Division combat experience. "There are no bullets to face—now."

Wacs also harpooned that system, which provides that surplus stateside Wacs with 1 year of service may be released.

OVERSEAS PENALTY

"Why should Wac's be penalized for being overseas?" asked puzzled Corp. Frances Bowman, who has been in Oahu 13 of her 17 months in service.

Pfc. Gloria MacDonald declared, "Wacs overseas with 1 year of service should be entitled to go home and have babies on an equal basis with stateside Wacs."

At the Thirteenth Replacement Depot:

T3 Arnold Carlson: "Duty must have been mighty tough in the States to let them out before us."

Two rookies, six-point Pvt. Elroy Kankel and Pvt. Robert Lansford, who arrived Saturday, insisted that "the boys in the States had lots of advantages * * * overseas men with 2 years' service should have first call."

CAN SEE FAMILY

Pvt. Clarence England: "At least in the States a guy can see his family occasionally." England has four children.

Tech. Sgt. Robert B. Dunkle, 36 months of overseas service: "Absolutely no reason for preferential treatment of men in States."

Pfc. Harry Kinzey: "He's had furloughs, passes, family visits, recreation * * * the overseas man has had hell."

Corp. Elmer Heasley: "It's chickenfeathers." (He didn't say feathers).

Wheeler Field's Corp. Harry L. Folmer: "They've pulled a lot of rotten deals * * * this is the climax."

At Scofield, a veteran of long service in the States who arrived only recently was infuriated. T3 L. A. Hagerman, who has 42 months service and 43 points, scowled: "It's a ——— ——— dirty deal * * * why should the fact I just came over prevent me from getting a discharge, when I enlisted 42 months ago and some other guy in the States gets out when he was drafted 24 months ago?"

JUST ANOTHER DELAY

Sgt. Hilbert Gramza: "* * * means just another delay to overseas and combat vets * * * sure lets a guy down."

T5 Simon Agron: "A lot of overseas vets gladly will change jobs with stateside 2-year men and promise to stay in to help discharge high-pointers."

Fort Shafter's T5 C. W. Simpson: "At least stateside GI's found enjoyment * * * they had civilization and white women."

Hickam Field Wacs:

Sgt. Dorothy Souder: "Send the gals with only 1 year of service to replace us * * * let us go home to get our homes ready for our husbands." Her husband is a GI in Germany.

Sgt. Beatrice Baird: "Why are Wacs more surplus in the States than they are here?"

(By Technical Sgt. Dick Koster)

TOKYO.—GI's stuck with the job of occupying Japan met the announcement of discharge for 2-year State-side men not qualified for overseas duty with the statement that "that's not helping us a damn bit."

Men here generally took a reasonable attitude that men of no use to the Army should be released, but countered with the argument that it will hamper discharge of high-point men.

NO LIMITED SERVICE

A field artillery veteran of New Britain and Luzon, T5 Harry R. Sanborn, Los Angeles, with 30 months' service and 61 points, added: "How can anybody be disqualified for overseas or any duty now? There's no limited service anywhere now. Out here, so many guys have sweated out so much and now seem to be forgotten. Combat men get the crap even after the war's over."

Most GI's here are more interested in what is ahead for them. All 2-year men not eligible for point discharge now ask, "After 60 points what?"

"When will they give us something tangible to count on?" asked Pfc J. William Jennings, Leominster, Mass., with 24 months' service and 52 points, many earned in the Philippines.

NOT IRRITATED

Sixty-four pointer Pfc Joe Crowninshield, with 30 months' service, was not irritated. "As long as they keep high-point men moving, I don't care," he said. "If they can't find anything for others to do, they might just as well get rid of them."

T4 Al Gerber, Philadelphia, a veteran of 34 months' service, who now has 50 points, also wants to know what will happen after the 60-pointers are released. "It's silly for those guys to be sitting around as surplus," he said, "just because we can't get home; but I ask you, When are they going to do something about us?"

National Scientific Research Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1945

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, we must immediately set up in this country a National Scientific Research Foundation. Enlightened self-interest dictates such a course. Such a recommendation was made by the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion on October 1. It was suggested that such a Federal agency should have the following functions:

First. To promote and support fundamental research and development projects in all matters pertaining to the defense and security of the Nation.

Second. To promote and support research in the basic sciences and in the social sciences.

Third. To promote and support research in medicine, public health, and allied fields.

Fourth. To provide financial assistance in the form of scholarships and grants for young men and women of proved scientific ability.

Fifth. To coordinate and control diverse scientific activities now conducted by the several departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

Sixth. To make fully, freely, and publicly available to commerce, industry, agriculture, and academic institutions the fruits of research financed by Federal funds.

Several committees of Congress have made similar proposals. Numerous bills, including one by me, have been introduced to create such an agency. The stimulus and impetus back of these bills and proposals comes largely from the remarkable record made by American scientists during the war.

A casual survey of what has been done is convincing proof of what can be done in the field of science and technology. Shortly after Hitler invaded Poland there was created in this country a National Defense Research Committee. In June 1941, through Executive order, there was established an Office of Scientific Research and Development. As an adjunct to this organization there was also established a Committee on Medical Research. In due course outstanding scientists from American universities and from American industries came at the beck and call of their Government and pooled their collective brains unselfishly in the service of their country. At one time 4 percent of all Americans with doctor's degrees in science were working in these laboratories of war. Most of them left comfortable homes and pleasant surroundings to work long hours in seclusion and secrecy. They have now gone back to their classrooms and workshops. The question arises, Shall we continue to rely simply upon philanthropic, industrial, and educational institutions to supply the inventions and discoveries so vital to the common good? Here is a field long neglected by Government. Here is a field in which Government can be of vital service.

Mr. Speaker, a brief résumé of some of the more important accomplishments of the Office of Scientific Research and Development in the course of the war is appropriate. At the height of its activity this group of civilian scientists and technologists had entered into more than 2,000 contracts with 441 institutions, employing thousands of people. They delved into all fields of physics, chemistry, medicine, and related sciences, spending altogether some four billion dollars. Of the hundreds of offensive and defensive weapons perfected the outstanding examples are, of course, radar, the proximity fuze, and the atomic bomb. But for these inventions those of us who now remain on this continent would no doubt be slaves of ruthless barbarians. It is generally admitted that our giving to the British our discoveries in radar in 1940, imperfect as they were at that time, enabled the British to save themselves from the all-out assault of the Luftwaffe and win the Battle of Britain. By its use the British were able to determine when German planes left the Continent, and the direction of their approach to the British Isles. We know what effective use we were to make of this weapon at a later date. We were amazed when one of our new battleships was able to fire upon and sink a half dozen Japanese ships in the dead of night many miles distant, and turn the tide of naval war in the Pacific.

Just as remarkable as radar was the later development of the proximity fuze. Only after the war did we learn of the phenomenal magic of this revolutionary device. Our scientists developed the proximity fuze in numerous types suitable to different shells and methods of attack. It is said that by the use of this fuze the British were able to shoot down 98 percent of the V-1 robot bombs before they could land on British soil. It is said the proximity fuze enabled us to win the Battle of the Bulge by wiping out masses of enemy soldiers sheltered in forests and fox holes where they would otherwise have been safe from the usual type of bombardment. It is said that the proximity fuse was largely responsible for our victories over suicide pilots in the Pacific and increased our firing accuracy by more than 400 percent.

Last and most startling of these inventions was, of course, the atomic bomb, whose deadliness is a matter of common knowledge and common dread.

Mr. Speaker, less spectacular but just as important have been our discoveries in the field of medical science. While penicillin was known as early as 1929, it was not finally developed until war created a pressing need for an agent to prevent infection. Due largely to penicillin, 97 percent of all wounded men who reached hospitals during the war survived their wounds. Meningitis, a terror of World War I, was no longer feared. Other toxoids and vaccines were developed which reduced to zero deaths in our Army from tetanus, yellow fever, and epidemic typhus. Again, through the use of DDT, we were able to conquer malaria and reduce tropical diseases.

Notwithstanding these remarkable discoveries, health statistics are still cause for great concern. Of 22,000,000 men of military age in this country, between eight and nine million are physically unfit and four and one-half million are so unfit as to be of no military value whatsoever. Of registrants for the draft, 40 percent of those 28 years of age were rejected; 50 percent of those 34 years of age were rejected; and 59 percent of those 38 years of age were rejected. In boasting of what we have accomplished we point out the increase in life expectancy. In 1890 one's life expectancy was 34 years. In 1911 one's life expectancy was 46 years. In 1942 one's life expectancy was 64 years.

Still, the other side of the ledger is exceedingly dark. In 1943 nearly a million and a half civilians died, mostly from disease about which little is known. More than 426,000 died of heart ailments,

more than 166,000 died of cancer and malignant tumors, more than 127,000 died of cerebral hemorrhage, more than 99,000 died of nephritis, and more than 90,000 died of pneumonia and influenza. Tuberculosis still took a large toll, as did diabetes. Many were stricken by the dread infantile paralysis. Then we have the less fatal but far more common diseases of hay fever and colds from which nearly every human being suffers untold discomfort, pain, and loss of earning power.

Notwithstanding remarkable progress in medical science, we still spend more than four billions annually on medical care, and we suffer a national loss in productiveness from illness of at least $10,000,000,000. Human suffering from these diseases, of course, cannot be measured in dollars and cents.

Statistics on scientific personnel are significant. During the war we stripped our schools of scientific students. It is estimated the war has created a deficit of 150,000 students who eventually would have received bachelors' degrees in sciences and technology, and a loss of 17,000 who would have received doctors' degrees in these subjects.

Mr. Speaker, war and disease may yet destroy civilization. Our fight against these terrible enemies of security and happiness should be waged as relentlessly during peace as during war. A Federal Scientific Research Foundation would utilize scientific genius which in the past we have allowed to waste in poverty and lost opportunity. In addition to Government support such an institution would doubtless receive untold millions contributed by those anxious to serve humanity through its facilities. In recent years we have spent billions on various conservation programs. Let us now invest a few millions in direct human conservation. Wisdom and prudence demand such action.

H. R. 4422—Payment of Certain Benefits to Enlisted Personnel in Lieu of Accumulated Leave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 19, 1945

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Thursday, October 18, 1945, I introduced a bill, H. R. 4422, the purpose of which is to grant to enlisted personnel of the armed services certain benefits in lieu of accumulated leave. In substance, it merely gives the enlisted men the same rights and benefits which are now given to officers only. While I certainly feel that officers are entitled to payment for this accumulated leave. I can see no earthly reason why enlisted men should not be. In any army in a democracy we certainly wish to establish every form of equality which military necessity will permit. We must not allow anything that savors of a caste system or special privileges. Therefore, I hope the Military Affairs Committee will quickly report either this bill or a similar one introduced by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

The bill has a retroactive clause providing that enlisted men who have been discharged before its passage should have 90 days after the enactment of this act within which to file application for payment due for accumulated leave.

The gentleman from Florida introduced a similar bill, H. R. 4051, some time ago. He has frequently called attention to the importance of this subject, and I certainly agree wholeheartedly with what he has said about this proposal.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a copy of the bill and a resolution adopted by the department executive committee of the Pennsylvania Department of the American Legion, on October 6, 1945, in support of this proposal:

H. R. 4422

A bill to grant to enlisted personnel of the armed forces certain benefits in lieu of accumulated leave

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) effective as of December 7, 1941, each enlisted member of the armed forces of the United States shall be considered for the purposes of this act, as being entitled to leave at the rate of 2½ days for each month during the war-service period. Such leave, less the leave actually received and used prior to discharge or release from active duty in such armed forces, may be accumulated, and each individual entitled thereto under this act shall be entitled upon discharge or release from active duty to receive in a lump sum, pay and allowances covering such accumulated leave.

(b) The pay and allowances referred to in subsection (a) shall be computed at the rate of the pay and allowances which the individual was receiving immediately prior to discharge or release from active duty.

(c) In the case of enlisted personnel discharged or released from active duty prior to the date of enactment of this act such lump-sum payment shall be made only if application therefor is made within 90 days after the date of enactment of this act. In the case of an individual discharged or released from active duty in the Army such application shall be made to the Secretary of War, and in the case of an individual discharged or released from active duty in any other branch of the armed forces application shall be made to the Secretary of the Navy.

(d) For purposes of the operation of this act with respect to any particular individual the term "war-service period" means the period beginning with the date of commencement of such individual's active service in the armed forces of the United States, or December 7, 1941, whichever is later, and ending 6 months after the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, or the date of such individual's discharge or release from active duty, whichever is earlier.

Whereas under Army regulations commissioned officers of the Army are allowed to accumulate unused leave up to 120 days; and

Whereas under Navy regulations commissioned officers of the Navy are permitted to accumulate unused leave to the extent of 90 days; and

Whereas upon such officers terminating their connection with the services and being honorably discharged therefrom, they are compensated for such accumulated leave at the prescribed rate for their grade, such compensation being given as terminal leave; and

Whereas the same benefits, limited to 90 days, are granted under civil-service regulations to all Federal civil-service employees, and upon their separation from their employment they are paid for such accumulated leave at the regular rate of pay to final separation from employment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion, Department of Pennsylvania, in regular meeting assembled in Harrisburg, Pa., on this 6th day of October 1945, That it recommends to the National Congress that appropriate legislation be enacted to grant unto the enlisted personnel of all branches of the various services accumulated leave on the same basis as is now permitted to commissioned officers of the respective branches of the service, and that upon their discharge from the armed forces that they be paid for such accumulated leave at the rate of their regular pay and allowance, and that it be retroactive to include leave accumulated after the passage of the Selective Service Act, September 16, 1940; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to the members of the Pennsylvania congressional delegation with the request that their best efforts be employed to enact such legislation as will put into effect the purport of this resolution.

A New Kind of Strike

REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 19, 1945

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, time was when a strike indicated some dispute between the employer and the employee concerning wages or working conditions. Today that is not the case in many instances. I rise to call the attention of the House to a new type of strike; that is, so far as I have heard.

These are the circumstances as I understand them: Ryerson & Haynes operate a manufacturing plant in Jackson, Mich. Local No. 625, UAW-CIO, is the plant union unit enjoying the collective bargaining privilege. Some of the members of the local union employed in the plant are veterans of World War No. 1.

During the period of reconversion, a number of the employees have been laid off but are being gradually returned to their jobs.

During World War II, an employee of the factory was inducted into the military service, has now been discharged, returned home, and reinstated in his old job in accordance with the law. There is much controversy, especially in union circles, over the question of seniority, and this World War II veteran was given what is designated as superseniority under the Hershey ruling. This ruling was not made by the employer. The employer, as I understand, is following directions only. I repeat that there is no dispute between the bargaining unit and the employer.

Nevertheless, veterans of World War I are picketing the factory, the principal cause of the picket line being a protest against the order made by General Hershey as administrator of the selective-service law.

Now, the local CIO union refuses to go through the veterans' picket line; therefore, the factory cannot operate. Just another case of where a factory is down and persons are out of jobs because, perchance, a so-called unauthorized picket line is operating. It may be that World War I veterans in the picket line are employees in the factory and are members of the local CIO union. Nevertheless technically it is claimed that this is not a regular UAW-CIO strike.

It does not make much difference to the people who want to work, and the employer who wants to turn out products, about technicalities. A strike is just as effective whether authorized or unauthorized. The fact is that this picket line is preventing the operation of the factory.

Mr. Speaker, I have today called this matter to the attention of the Director of Selective Service and find that the decision as to the correctness of the "superseniority" regulation lies with the courts and that some cases are now pending in the courts. Court procedure is slow at best and if this type of strike is to be a pattern for other strikes to follow then strike conditions will progressively get worse as demobilization of the armed forces proceeds. I am urging that something, if possible, be done by the Director of Selective Service to meet this situation at the moment. I am not criticizing, because I do not know. I am imploring, because I do know what the result is and what the result will be if this type of strike becomes general throughout the land. These returning veterans should have everything the Congress intended they should have and these matters should be worked out in a cooperative and a judicial way. If additional legislation is necessary then let's have it. Everybody is interested in jobs, reconversion, and the interest of the veterans in particular.

I do not imagine that strikes of this type, where the employer through no fault of his own is caught in the squeeze, are common to many industries or communities. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, an ounce of prevention at this early stage of the disease will be worth a pound of cure months from now.

Pursuant to the privilege granted me, I am enclosing herewith exerpts from a front-page story of the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen-Patriot telling about this new veterans' picket line. It is as follows:

WAR I VETS WANT JOBS; PICKET PLANT

Veterans of World War I picketed the Ryerson & Haynes plant on East Ganson Street Tuesday in Jackson's first open labor flare-up arising out of industry's compliance with reemployment provisions of the Selective Service Act and Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey's demand for superseniority for veterans of World War II.

Displaying placards asserting "We Want Work—Not General Hershey's Opinion," Ryerson & Haynes employees, who served in the Army and Navy during World War I, demanded that the company adhere to seniority provisions of their union contract.

Operation of the factory, now reconverting from war-matériel production to the manufacture of automotive parts, was suspended Monday when members of Local 665, UAW-CIO, the plant union unit, declined to pass through the picket line. Most of the factory personnel had been laid off for the change-over to civilian production before the dispute arose.

RETURNED VET HIRED

Included in the currently employed group is a returned soldier who under superseniority outranks many of the men with longer terms of service for the company who have not yet been recalled to work, says Lawrence Puffer, chairman of the plant veterans' committee. Puffer said this veteran stood two hundred and eleventh on the seniority list at the time of his induction into service.

"The union," Puffer said, "recognizes for seniority all time spent by members in the armed services, but insists that superseniority, which gives returning veterans preference over all nonveteran employees for a period of 1 year from the date of their return from service, breaks down the whole seniority system."

Union leaders of Ryerson & Haynes are alined with World War I veterans in opposing superseniority, and Beck Underwood, head of the local, Tuesday branded the plan as impractical. It breeds dissension among groups within the factory, he declared, and pits veteran against both veteran and nonveteran in a manner which his organization considers unfair and discriminatory.

CONCILIATORS CALLED IN

The dispute concerning the status of the veteran in question at the plant here arose shortly after his return from the Army a week or more ago, and Federal conciliators had met with the company and union officials last week

While no statement was yet forthcoming from the management, a company spokesman indicated that picketing by the veterans, resulting in the shut-down, came as a surprise.

Underwood asserted the suspension is not due to union action against the firm. He reiterated, however, the union's sympathy with the World War I veterans and its opposition to veteran reemployment as interpreted by the Selective Service chief.

Lined up with the protesting veterans is a Ryerson & Haynes employee, former head of the Jackson County CIO council and discharged from the Navy, which he joined voluntarily in September 1942.

CASES NOW IN COURT

The Ryerson & Haynes case localizes opposition which has broken out at numerous points over the country against selective-service reemployment provisions. * * *

Two prepared statements were submitted Tuesday in the Ryerson & Haynes case, one from Puffer, representing the veterans, and another from Underwood, on behalf of local 665.

PITS VETS AGAINST VETS

Puffer's statement says:

"We, the veterans of Ryerson & Haynes, Inc., object to superseniority, and in no way do we want to be used as tools of management to break up contractual relations between company and the union. We only want the rights that are justly ours without usurping the rights of others, thereby causing misunderstandings between the veterans and our fellow workers.

"Hershey's opinion relative to superseniority is strictly labor baiting and not helpful to the veteran. In fact it places him in the position whereby the civilian population would resent such privileges. This opinion, if carried out, would pit veterans of World War I against World War II veterans, also against other workers.

"To summarize the whole issue, if Hershey's policy is applied, the debt that this country owes the veteran would be paid at the expense of the displaced worker and not by the Nation as a whole.

"The policy of this company has been to grant superseniority which the veterans of Ryerson & Haynes, Inc., object to strenuously."

CALLS MEETING

Underwood's statement reads:

"As president of this local I can only express the opinion of my constituents, which is in full agreement with the veterans' feelings. We of the UAW-CIO have foreseen that conditions would arise if Hershey's opinion was carried out whereby the veteran would be used by the manufacturers to promote dissension among the ranks of union members.

"It seems rather odd to me that in this particular plant of Ryerson & Haynes, Inc., that they wish to go along with superseniority, but refuse to go along with the Selective Service Act when it concerns wages, because they refuse to give a veteran a like position he held prior to V-J day and put him in a lower paying classification. This definitely proves the insincerity of their attitude toward the veteran, and we are backing the veteran up with all resources at our command. The Ryerson & Haynes union members of Local 665, UAW-CIO, are requested to attend a special union meeting at the CIO hall, Wednesday, October 17, at 2 p. m."

The Voice of the Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, while our boys in uniform were in foreign lands and while the fighting was in progress, the boys did not complain much. They did their job nobly. But after hostilities ceased they wanted to come home, as they were entitled to do. They were instructed, as many of them have written me, not to communicate with their Representatives or Senators in Congress. They say these orders were issued by their commanding officers. However, several of them wrote their Congressmen and sent the letters back to the States by boys who were coming home on furloughs or as war casualties, and they were mailed from points in this country to their representatives in Washington. I received several of these myself.

Now that the fighting is over and many of these intelligent and alert young men have been returned to the United States, they are unhesitatingly writing their Congressmen and calling upon their representatives in Congress and narrating the almost unbelievable situations, which they say prevail in our military system. They seem to feel that they are now back home where freedom of speech is a guaranteed right to every citizen, and they are speaking their pieces. Those that have taken off the uniforms are absolutely unafraid to tell their stories, and many who are still in uniforms in this country and attempting to be discharged are expressing their

displeasure and resentment of the conduct and orders of those who head our military organizations.

Mr. Speaker, this indicates to me very clearly that we have just begun to hear from these, our future citizens. I believe they are determined that their sons shall not be subjected to the cunning, deceptive, and arbitrary regulations which these boys have tolerated and endured during their military service.

I want to illustrate the thinking of some of the clear-minded fellows who have been in the service, a few of whom have been discharged.

The following is a letter which I have just received from a boy who is serving in the Asiatic theater of operations:

It should be self-evident by this time that the Army intends to reduce its size as slowly as possible. This has been evident since VE-day, but is much more apparent now. As long as the War Department is permitted to handle the demobilization program unmolested we can be sure it will take many months more than necessary to reduce the Army to a practical size and attempts will, of course, be made to have it appear necessary ultimately to maintain a much larger force than is actually needed. All this is, of course, due to the fact that high-officer positions bear a direct relationship to the size of the Army and the men who now have much better positions than ever before are reluctant to give them up.

Congress should act to force the War Department to hasten demobilization through the release of all men not needed for actual occupation duties by specifying that all men with a predetermined period of service in the Army, men with overseas service, married men, men over a specified age, and/or other groups be discharged at once. The Army should be reduced to a size commensurate with actual requirements, and not a padded estimate devised for the purpose of justifying a maximum number of high grades.

The men who have given their time to the Army should not be forced against their will to continue. The draft should be continued with a definite period of service stipulated until such time as volunteers can be procured in sufficient numbers to take care of the necessary requirements. Inducements should be ample in order to attract a sufficient number of volunteers, although the biggest inducement in this respect would be a basic change in the Army caste system.

Even though Army spokesmen allege that the big bottleneck in rapid demobilization is transportation, this statement is directly contradicted by the fact that plans are being made to allow men who do not have sufficient points for discharge but who have had an extended period of overseas service to return to the States for a brief period and then return overseas.

The real bottleneck in demobilization is the evident intention of maintaining the Army in strength and the point system has proved to be a convenient device for this purpose. The point system was satisfactory for the purpose originally intended, namely, the release of some combat veterans after the defeat of Germany, but its application as a method of determining eligibility for discharge under present conditions is a farce and should be terminated. It is being used as a means for retaining men in the armed forces rather than securing their release and is a grossly unfair system.

Instead of accepting all statements made by the Army at their face value, investigations should be made into situations warranting such action. However, such investigations should be comprehensive and not merely confined to conferences with high-ranking officers, as was the case during a recent visit of several Government representatives at this headquarters, since the ideas imparted from such a source would in all likelihood not be those of the vast majority of the men concerned.

Demobilization is as much an emergency as mobilization was and should be handled as such. Instead of working backward as is the present policy, i. e., determining how many men can be let out at a time, it should be determined how many men will be required and all others released. The process of discharge from the Army is merely a clerical function and could be tremendously expedited through the utilization of more separation centers and more civilian clerical help in the processing for discharge.

It is obvious that the feeling of the men in uniform is such that any man who at this time has the fortitude to stand up for them in Government circles and fight for their rights will have their lasting gratitude and support in the coming years.

Here is a letter which was written September 17, 1945, by a boy in service in Europe. He addressed this letter to me, enclosed it in a letter to his mother, and she forwarded it to me. Think of how our boys have to get their messages to the representatives of the people in Congress, the subterfuge they have to follow to get beyond the lines of arbitrary military rules, un-American regimentation.

At present the critical score is 80 points or more. This does not include the recount up to and including VJ-day It includes those points accumulated up to VE-day. Recent directives state that men with a score lower than 35 points will be included in the army of occupation. They also state that men with points between 35 and 72 will be sent to an assembly area command. Men having over 72 points will be transferred to States bound units. These figures are effective only to May 12. A more recent directive states that the points will be recomputed to include September 2 and that they will be effective on the 20th of this month. According to this, I will have a score of 76 points. In the meantime, my unit is to leave for the assembly area point on the 21st.

Does it make sense to ship men over 500 miles inland ———, with points enough to allow them to be shipped from this present area, ———? Every man with whom I have had contact, contends that something smells. Units have been known to have boarded their ship for the States, only to be removed a few moments later. I have given you the facts as I know them, and trust that you will make a logical deduction from them.

I have been overseas 21 months, participated in the Normandy invasion, been in four major battles, have been awarded four battle stars—Bronze Arrowhead, Presidential Citation Badge, Seahorse Patch for Amphibious Operations; the latter three awards are of no point value. We were never told why. It does seem that any award by the War Department should be of value in points for discharge.

I was in the Army from 1936 to 1939 and am not allowed to count this service to my credit for points. Why? My service was honorable. Furthermore, I volunteered for duty in this war in 1942, while at time, prior to my reenlistment, I was earning close to $400 per month.

Please understand that I am asking no favors, but I do feel that you may arrive at better deductions if you know the facts. Nor do I blame anyone for the faults that are known. I am merely seeking justice for several hundred thousands of men who are known as GI Joes.

Some time ago I received a letter from a boy in service in the Southwest Pacific who said:

They have put the needle to us again. Contrary to our belief that VE-day would give us relief it is the opposite.

In the first place they withheld two authorized campaign stars until after we signed our service rating cards which reduced our points by 10.

* * * * *

The POA has now put a clause in the furlough plan whereby all men with 80 points or over have to sign a waiver of all discharge rights before they receive their furlough. They are also to be furloughed with no possibility of reassignment which means that we will have to return to the Pacific for undoubtedly the duration of the war.

* * * * *

My main bone of contention is that the POA has exceeded its authority in forcing men to sign discharge waivers before they can get the furlough that they deserve.

Dad, I have heretofore accepted the high-handed Army methods in a more or less passive manner but this is the rawest deal that I have seen. I believe it would do some good if the actual facts were brought to the attention of someone who could exert some pressure on the War Department.

This communication was referred to the President and by him re-referred to the Secretary of War, who failed to give a satisfactory explanation of the situation.

Another boy in the service wrote his father and mother describing in detail the fact that they were held in the service without any idea as to when they will be discharged and without having to do anything that will help them in any way in their future lives, unless they expect to make the Army their career. He says:

The courses are so short and so dry that those that would like to remain cannot even hold their attention to it. The instructors themselves realize the worthlessness of the whole thing and are becoming bored with teaching it.

Our flying is a farce! We fly 10 to 13 hours a month and what good we get out of it is our flying pay, and that could be done in 4 hours.

These are the words of a boy in Europe, written August 7:

I'm really not doing a hell of a lot that I feel is constructive, but, frankly, no one else over here is either, right now. I'm coordinating truck transportation out of the port here at ———. Again, sort of liaison between the port and the hauling agencies. Any buck private could do the job, but that's just the way everything is here right now. I've traveled all around this continent, and for the last 60 days I can't find anybody doing any work to speak of.

To show the disapproval by the parents of the manner in which the demobilization program is being handled, I quote the following from a father of a serviceman:

I also note that the War Department is, in effect, threatening men who try to get some justice through their Congressmen. Will Congress sit by and let the brass hats get away with this? It is quite likely that because of my letters to you that both of my sons have or will have "P. I." (political influence) on their service records, which, if done, will put them in a position to be singled out in some slick fashion for retaliation. This is one of the old Army games.

For the present I can't do much about that, but Congress can take care of the situation if it so desires.

A leading Democratic politician of my State sent each Member of our delegation from Oklahoma a copy of an open letter appearing recently in the Stars and Stripes, so he stated, and sent to this gentleman by a man overseas, concluding as follows:

If the people back home are determined to create the angriest group in our Nation's history, they can succeed by informing the men overseas the occupation job is theirs until it's finished.

In effect, they'll be telling them they're a lost generation, that they're trapped, and there's nothing they can do about it.

A man who served in the Naval Reserves in early July, in the Southwest Pacific, 36 years old, wrote me a letter which one of his buddies brought to the States and mailed while he was on furlough. He states:

I dislike having to go underground in order to write you; it would make me feel more like a free American to send this to you openly, but our commanding officer has issued an order that no member of this command is to be allowed to write to a Congressman or Senator. Such tactics may seem a bit high-handed to you, but I can assure you they are quite prevalent in this battalion. We can readily understand the fears of our commander, and most other officers of this battalion, that word of their incompetency, placed in the proper hands, might arouse sufficient action as to make their positions untenable. I have a friend leaving within a few days who has promised to see that this is mailed to you.

* * * * * *

The Army and Navy Departments may succeed in convincing a majority of the people back home that it is necessary to send an increasing number of men to the Pacific, but until they shall utilize fully the thousands already out here, they will never make us believe any of their stories. We have been around too long and in too many places to accept any of their statements without reservations. The needless waste both of manpower and matériel we have witnessed in the course of our service and travels is something we shall never be able to forget.

A mother has written me, under date of October 15, and sent me a newspaper clipping of where her son was supposed to have arrived here from England, October 4. She states:

He was sent to London ahead of his division, the Ninety-ninth, and they evidently got their orders to leave soon after, as the division is home, but this boy is still awaiting transportation home. He said that his medical doctor told him that his leg would stay swollen for the next 5 or 10 years. I'm sure that he would be granted a discharge here in the United States.

Shouldn't casualties have priority over high-point men?

An anxious father called me by long-distance telephone last Saturday and told me that his son, who served in one of our armies in the European theater for the past year and a half or 2 years, was sent to England August 5. There were about 200 boys in the group there who have been sitting anxiously awaiting an opportunity to come home since August 13. They have not received any mail since they have been in England, and this father told me that 85 letters addressed to his boy had been returned to his home at Tulsa.

These boys say they have not been paid anything since they have been in England. They say they have been alerted four different times and were pulled off the ships each time. They were pulled off the *Aquitania* when this ship sailed for the States with 300 vacant berths. The morale of the boys is unspeakably low and the parents are irate, to say the least. This situation, as well as all of the others above narrated, have been reported directly to the military authorities here, and little or no results have been accomplished.

Many other equally glaring and almost unbelievable circumstances and reports from our servicemen could be furnished if time and space would permit. It is evident that something is wrong. The servicemen know that something is wrong. Their parents and their wives know that something is wrong. They will not hesitate to tell their story as soon as they are free from reprisals and repercussions that might militate unfavorably against them. The people expect the President and Congress to afford the proper relief against these abuses. The majority party in control has the responsibility and should assume it forthwith. If they do not, the public is sure to express their displeasure at their first opportunity.

Cooperatives as a Bond Between the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, during the early part of this year three representatives of the Bolivarian Cooperative Union, which has its headquarters in Colombia, South America, as guests of the Cooperative League of the United States of America came to this country to tell of the very rapid development of cooperative organizations in South America and of the desire to further the organization of an Inter-American Cooperative Conference which will be organized very shortly. The president of the union, Mr. Francisco Luis Jimenez, wrote the cooperative league to express his thanks to the league and also to make a plea for greater interest in the support for the development of cooperatives. He emphasizes that cooperative organizations in those countries allied can do more for the development of understanding and peaceful relations between the countries than can any other organization.

Under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks the letter addressed to the Cooperative League of the United States by Mr. Francisco Luis Jimenez, president of the Bolivarian Cooperative Union:

BOLIVARIAN COOPERATIVE UNION,
MEDELLÍN, COLOMBIA, SOUTH AMERICA,
March 12, 1945.

To the Cooperative League, to the Cooperatives and the Cooperators of the United States of America.

MY DEAR FRIENDS: In postwar days, the cooperative movement will have a great task to perform and a delicate responsibility before history and humanity. The war came about because of the selfishness of men and nations which did not wish to sacrifice their desire of lucre. If we want peace to be durable and men to live in perfect concord, it will be necessary for society to stay on bases of fraternity and mutual help.

A new order will be necessary. The world must not be what it was in 1939. The forces of evil that then unloosed the conflict that today shakes humanity to its very depths ought to be chained forever, and it will be possible to do this if we resort to human concord through the necessary elements that will end forever the feeling of need and longings in the hearts of men.

For all this, cooperation is the remedy. There is no other system that can replace it. It is the only doctrine that is able to secure peace and keep the spirit of solidarity among people. Only cooperation has the necessary means to guarantee the policy of a new concept of society and of mutual relations among men.

American solidarity—according to the opinion of statesmen—is founded upon cooperation. Apparently cooperation seems to be more international than national at present. The nations of this continent march together and promise to do this until the end. They try to destroy the totalitarian forces and save democratic principles, which they wish to see more widely accepted and more firmly protected in their respective countries.

But is there any proof that the stability of these aims will be secure? Will they not be only a consequence of the need to protect themselves against the common enemy? Are we sure that when the war is ended and the danger has passed, that the feelings of solidarity will still subsist? Is it not possible that we may see the community of the American nations affected in what should be their complete unity?

A deep study of the reality of things brings us to the conviction that American cordiality depends on agreements among the States, in promises by their governments. But when these fall, are modified, or come to an end, people must wait again to see what will occur. Often we hear that it will be necessary to wait until the new men of the new government get their bearings. Why this doubt and vacillation filled with anguish? Will it not be, perhaps, that the existent bonds are not as yet deeply entrenched in the nations, in the human masses, but in definite advantages, in already known aspirations, in a word, in gain?

A careful examination of what the Latin-American people think or know about the United States of America and wish from her causes us to arrive at the following conclusions:

1. The great majority of the Latin-American people do not know, even superficially, the history, geography, customs, and the strong work being done by that great country of the North. And the same may be said of the United States of America in her relations to the Latin-American Nations.

2. The relations among the different governments are officers, based on mutual interests of trade, industry, and common defense.

3. The trade and industry of the United States of America, and the trade and industry of Latin America are connected with utilitarian conveniences, inspired by monetary gain, which is to say that the traders and industrialists of both parties only seek advantages, and for that reason when greater advantages are to be found in other parts of the world, both of them will leave their companions and their customers in order to better themselves in other situations which have been made.

4. A cautious but constant propaganda is becoming each day greater. It is asserted that the United States of America is an imperialistic country, and that the Latin-Americans are Yankee protectorates; that we must prepare ourselves to trade preferably with other peoples, and that by all means we should cast off North America's boot which tramples on us. As anyone can see, at the bottom of all this there is a desire for gain. The phenomenon is not analyzed through a sense of culture, of faith in the destiny of both peoples, and of mutual and disinterested help toward each other, but all from the point of view of trade and commercial interchange.

As I had the opportunity of saying several times in my recent visit to the United States of America, the cordial and constructive friendship between Latin America and the United States of America, in order to endure, should be a work of the people, of the human masses, and not an exclusive job of the governments. The day when the peoples of the North and of the South know and understand each other, they will love each other and work together to create the most amazing culture that history will record.

According to my idea the only force that is able to effect this union is that of cooperation. No other force could accomplish this with success. It is for this reason that I have insisted so much on the convenience of cementing the bonds of friendship and mutual help between the cooperative movement of the United States of America and that of Latin America. But you already have a strong movement, well tried out, and a great work has been done. We, on the contrary are only beginning.

The cooperative movement will construct and preserve the union of the American Continent. For that reason we who preach and praise the excellence of the system have a very great responsibility. Because of that, the Bolivarian Cooperative Union have just convened an inter-American cooperative conference that will be held in Lima on December 2 to 9 of the present year. There we shall study all of these ideas and transform them into practical conclusions for the good of all.

But it will be absolutely necessary to carry forward an intense work of publicity, diffusion, and understanding for some months before the meeting. Only in this way shall we be able to obtain the attendance of all the countries, the success of the different kinds of work, and the excellence of the conclusions to be reached. Otherwise we might fail, which would mean a great detriment for the cooperative movement and for us.

I should like to invite very cordially my cooperative friends of the United States of America, and especially of the Cooperative League, to collaborate with the Bolivarian Cooperative Union in the efficient preparation and celebration of the Lima conference.

Due to your great experience and indisputable capacity of acting in a most intense way, I think that the greater part of the work should be under the care of the organizations of the United States of America, preferably of the Cooperative League. But I should like to suggest that this be only the execution of the work, because—for obvious reasons—the direction should remain under the exclusive care of the Bolivarian Cooperative Union.

So, while inviting you very cordially to attend the next Bolivarian conference that will be held in Lima and to take a very prominent part in it, I want to make the following suggestions:

(a) That the Cooperative League of the United States of America form as soon as possible the committee that the Centennial Congress of Chicago recommended it to do, with the commission to establish relations—preferably educational—with the cooperative movement of Latin-America.

(b) That the committee, already constituted, within the plan that it might adopt, would furnish the Bolivarian Cooperative Union with means to begin a series of publications, radio speeches, and goodwill trips, to prepare, in this way, the Latin-American cooperative movement, so that it might cooperate in a proper manner with the one in the United States of America.

(c) That, as soon as it be possible, efforts to establish the International Cooperative Business Association be initiated, beginning with the American Continent's cooperatives, according to the bases set forth by Mr. Cowden in the Washington Conference and in the Centennial Congress of Chicago.

(d) That the cooperatives and the cooperators of the United States of America kindly suggest and propose the methods that they believe would be most advisable in order to accomplish without delay the aims of this message.

While making this call to you, a fervent wish to contribute to the union of the American cooperative movement inspires me. This union will enable it to have a potent influence on America's future and on the well-being of the world in general. For this reason, I am sure, my words will merit a cordial reception on the part of the cooperators of the United States of America.

I wish to make use of this occasion to send to the Cooperative League and to the cooperators of the United States of America my fervent thanks for the noble, but unmerited kindness, that they showed me during my recent visit to that great country. I shall always remember it with the deepest emotion and it will always be a reason for deep gratefulness on my part.

With highest respect and personal best wishes to my friends cooperators of the United States of America, I am,

Cordially yours,

FRANCISCO LUIS JIMÉNEZ,
President of the Bolivarian Cooperative Union.

Americans Must Cooperate To Survive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 19, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in the United States we are now face to face with a new world situation which demands that if we are to survive as a free country—or if we are to survive at all—citizens of every class and section from ditch digger to millionaire, and without regard to race, must cooperate. We have been told within the last few days by the outstanding experts of our national defense that the fate of the world hangs in the balance. We have been bluntly told that unless all men, women, and children in the United States of America do cooperate, the next war may easily result in America's being struck with such a force of atom bombs as would in a matter of minutes completely paralyze our ability to defend ourselves.

It appears to be futile for us to hope that the United States, Great Britain, and Canada can keep the atom bomb secret. In fact there is a very grave question as to whether or not it is now a secret known only to the United States, Britain, and Canada. A report in the Washington Times-Herald of Monday, October 15, indicates that Russian scientists already have the secret. I have in my files the summary of an article appearing in the Scientific Monthly of August 1945, which contains an article translated and condensed by the American-Russian Institute from Izvestia, the Russian newspaper, on November 25, 1944. This gives the names of two Russian scientists who then were far along in their investigations.

We also know that the leading German scientists who have been working on the release of atomic energy were taken into Russia after the German surrender and have not been heard of since. They presumably are working under Russian direction.

With conditions as they are it becomes a matter of life or death for every man, woman, and child in this Nation that we cooperate together to set up a new and hitherto unconceived defense.

We have all too many in this country who would like to see us enslaved to communism. Such slavery would be worse than the instantaneous disintegration that would be caused by the atomic bomb.

It seems as though the most gigantic force for all evil ever dreamed of by man has been loosed on the world. The question now is survival. Not only survival of civilization, but the survival of the human race. Death would descend from 100 miles up in the stratosphere within 3 or 4 hours after it had been launched from some distant point in the world. We are not now dealing with labor unrest and labor politics. We are dealing with life, or death, or survival of the men, women, and children of the United States. It is that awful impelling reason which urges us to get together and cooperate for our common defense and our common existence.

The Nation-wide total of people out of work because of strikes in American industries was 418,000 on October 10, 1945. This represents a somewhat reduced figure from that of the previous day because some 42,000 textile print and dye workers had returned to their jobs. If this same total were maintained for a single week, it would mean that 3,244,000 work-hours would be lost in a single day and 16,220,000 work-hours would be lost in a 5-day workweek.

It is a corollary of American production that no industry lives to itself alone. No automobiles or refrigerators can be built in large numbers while the steel industry is not producing at full blast. The steel industry cannot produce for the automobile or the refrigerator industry

unless the coal mines are functioning at top speed. We have had a recent demonstration of this. What applies to the automobile, refrigerator, steel industry, coal chain applies with equal vigor to all industrial chains existing within this country.

Nor is the effect of domestic strikes entirely confined to this country. The more than 369 vessels tied up in New York Harbor because of the longshoremen's strike just closed imperiled thousands of tons of goods piled up on the docks for foreign export. One hundred and ten thousand tons of this amount was earmarked for relief or for our boys overseas. Part of it consisted of 8,000 tons of perishable meat. If your boy in the occupation forces in Germany or Japan goes hungry, it could well be the direct result of this particular strike.

And if your boy returns from abroad and finds no job awaiting him it may also be the result of this strike. Why? The ships that left New York during the strike had to leave without cargo. We cannot take our exports to Europe at a time when it is most critical for all industries and businesses dependent upon the export trade. If our strikes continue, cheap Soviet labor plus German slave-labor under the Soviet system will glut the European market with Soviet products before the American export product will have a chance to get a fair trial by the European consumer. Even at this stage of reconversion we need all we can get of American goods carried in American ships to Europe so that we can participate in the beginning of postwar economic competition.

How can the people of the United States create badly needed jobs, relying on sales to consumers either at home or abroad, if union leaders are going to persist in the self-destructive practice of keeping wage earners out on strike?

The situation is all the more tragic when one considers that many of these strikes do not even have any relationship whatsoever to working conditions or wages. In this class falls the so-called disciplinary strike in which an important contributing company, the Kelsey Wheel Co., was forced to abandon production because thousands of men were called out in a dispute over whether or not a foreman should be allowed in a particular part of the factory.

Who is punished by a disciplinary strike? The employer? Yes. He is punished. He is under contract to the larger company which buys his product. He must sell at the ceiling or contract price. He has no opportunity to recoup his losses. The purchaser of the finished product is punished. He has been waiting all through the war to buy his new refrigerator or his new car. It is a poor reward for a faithful worker, a careful saver, to make him wait longer to replace his worn-out mechanical needs. The striking employee loses, too. He, too, is punished. It will take a long time to replace the two or three war bonds a week which he must cash in in order to support himself and his family. In addition he loses his weekly wage.

Only the union leader remains unpunished. He draws his wages while his men are striking. He always wins, whether the strike is won or lost. He risks nothing.

The same people lose and the same people win in so-called sympathy strikes, when unions which have no grievance of any kind against their employer simply walk out because another union has quit work because of a real or spurious cause. The same people lose and the same people win in so-called power strikes brought about when there is a question of which union shall control the lives of the workers.

Management is a definite and distinct business. Selling is a definite and distinct business. Labor, itself, is a definite and distinct business. Yet, none of them can survive alone. They must sink or swim together. All must be joined in order to produce. In other words, the balance, the synchronization, between all production factors must be maintained if our economic machine functions.

If any business is making beyond a reasonable profit, it should support wage increases. But it is unreasonable for labor to expect management to forego all profits and merely conduct a business to provide jobs. It is no more to the advantage of mangement to start an inflationary cycle than it is to the advantage of labor to start one. If an industry cannot safely raise prices—and at the same time is forced to raise wages—it begins to lose money and has no logical incentive for continuing in operation, throwing good money after bad. Even if the industry were allowed to raise prices—and, under such conditions, other industries would rightfully demand like concessions—pulling up wages for the worker would not ease the worker's lot. He would have to pay higher prices for his purchases; thus, losing his wage gains. A continuing price rise would make the worker try to leave the industry in which he was employed and hunt for a better job, if he could find one. Those are conditions of which crashes and panics are made.

When union leaders, with no pretense at any knowledge of an industry's financial situation, ask that industry to keep its hands up while the union leaders go through its pockets for added wages, they are asking something which is sure to fail. Management should be disposed to meet with labor on a common ground so that their differences might be ironed out if labor leaders showed a disposition to understand the problems of management.

The management-labor problem will never approach final settlement so long as labor leaders regard business as an activity from which to take as much as possible in wages while giving as little service as possible in work. Neither will management-labor relations ever come near to solution if any considerable segment of management regards labor as people to be paid as little as possible for as much work as can be squeezed from them.

Management and labor in the war performed a miracle. The Japanese war lords had prepared for war for 40 years. Mussolini had been driving the Italian people for 20 years, preparing for war. For 20 years Stalin prepared for the war he knew would come. For 12 years Hitler drove an enslaved Germany to war efforts. Yet, in 3 years, free American labor and free American management overtook the enemy in production. A year later we had surpassed the enemy and the war was won.

It will take considerably less than 3 years to reconvert our industry to a peacetime economy. In peace, the greatest market ever created for American goods awaits us. That market means prosperity for labor, for management, and for agriculture alike, as well as a chance for our returned soldiers, sailors, and marines to go back to productive careers. We cannot retreat from this prospect. It is here. We must meet it, use it, and profit by it—or we must recognize the hard truth that we are unfitted for building up our domestic economy and foreign trade. Either we are going to solve this labor-management problem or we at home are going to lose the peace after our American boys have won the war.

Back on God's Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, everybody is thankful that we are back on God's time. The wartime requirement that everybody move his clock up an hour was perhaps one of the most nonsensical of all the emergency measures enacted by Congress. It is sometimes called daylight saving; but that is an erroneous designation, for it saved neither time nor daylight. On the contrary, it caused confusion and inconvenience, disrupted business, and necessitated the expenditure of more money for light, power, and fuel, and the people could not see that there was any saving at all. Farmers, merchants, school teachers and patrons, factory workers, professional men, and citizens of nearly every walk of life, were unhappy, displeased, and disgusted with it.

Since the present Congress convened on January 3, 1945, 30 Members of the House of Representatives introduced legislation seeking the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, in response to the overwhelming demand of their constituents that we revert to standard time, sun time, or what many have been pleased to call God's time.

I introduced two measures to repeal the daylight-saving-time bill. The thirtieth bill introduced—next to the last one—was introduced by a Democratic Congressman from Oklahoma, a member of the majority party, and that bill was passed and became a law and put us back on standard time, although the bill which was passed was introduced after I introduced my bill. But its author is a Democrat, and I a Republican. The bills were identical in language. His was adopted. I am happy that it was an Oklahoman who introduced the bill

which became a law repealing the New Deal time program.

This repeal measure should have served as an example for the New Dealers to follow in repealing a lot of other laws that are at this time of no value to the people and, in fact, are encumbering, delaying, and preventing progress and reconversion. The trouble is that the New Deal Party in power here has not seen fit to repeal a lot of other laws that the people want repealed. The public should demand the abolition of most of our wartime bureaus which have served their purpose and are now no longer needed, and that we be freed from the regulation and regimentation which was forced upon us by the New Deal administration.

The President can do away with a lot of these bureaus by a mere stroke of the pen, if he sincerely wishes to do so. They were created by Executive order of the President and he can abolish them by Executive order. Those that were created by Congress should be abolished by Congress. I refer to such un-American bureaus as the OPA, the ODT, and the almost unlimited list of alphabetical bureaus which the New Deal administration brought into being and has kept alive at the expense of the taxpayers and to the almost intolerable annoyance of our citizens.

Resolution Adopted by the Council of Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 19, 1945

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted at the commemoration of the one hundred and sixty-sixth anniversary of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who was mortally wounded in the siege of Savannah, sponsored by the Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware, member of the Polish-American Congress, held on Sunday afternoon, October 14, 1945, at the Pulaski Place, Wilmington, Del.:

We Americans of Polish descent, assembled at the Pulaski Place in Wilmington, Del., on Sunday afternoon, October 14, 1945, to commemorate the one-hundred-and-sixty-sixth anniversary of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who rendered his valor, courage, and his life to the American cause for liberty and independence, who came to America from Poland to lend his aid in winning the Revolutionary War. He was a man to whom the principle of liberty was uncompromisable with any enemy of such; and later these principles were created and kept wholly up to the time of the Teheran Conference.

Further, we as Americans of Polish descent are upholding the American principles for which General Pulaski gave his life, having over 1,300 of our sons and brothers all over the world who shed their blood, of whom 26 have made the supreme sacrifice, for the principles stipulated in the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms." At home we have made sacrifices in money and work, and have given our Government full support against all intentions and aims of enemies to freedom, liberty, and independence.

Whereas we stress the grave concern by the trend of world events in the wake of the current revival of secret diplomacy in which our statesmen have participated with unhappy results in the past. We submit these blunders and sins committed by secret diplomacy in respect to Poland and elsewhere under the pressure of wartime expediencies must be rectified at the peace conference so as not to make the Government of the United States coresponsible for the crimes perpetrated by Soviet Russia in Poland as well as in the rest of eastern Europe.

Whereas we are pointing out the necessity of having alien influences removed from Poland, calling for the admission to Poland of the American Red Cross, the International Red Cross, and Polish-American relief agencies.

Whereas the United States cannot remain indifferent to the fate of Allied Poland, one-half of whose ancient lands was ruthlessly seized by the Soviets and the sovereignty of the other half taken away by the imposition of a puppet government. Much more is involved than merely the fate of Poland, the interest of America is at stake and the American way of life menaced.

Whereas we demand further that the United States Congress should commence an investigation of the deplorable treatment of the displaced persons of Polish nationality in the American occupational zone who are being coerced into returning, against their will, to Soviet occupied Poland. Until the conclusion of such an investigation all forced repatriation of Polish citizens into the Soviet zone of occupation should be postponed.

Whereas we express our opinion that the secret of the atomic bomb must not be shared with Soviet Russia and no financial aid should be granted to Soviet Russia until it fulfills the pledges of the Atlantic Charter of which it was a signatory.

Therefore, we here assembled, protest against any attempt to deprive Poland of her full freedom, independence, and integrity. In defending Poland we defend truth and equity, right and justice. We defend collective security of the world and the individual security of our country, the United States of America.

Furthermore, we here assembled, declare that the United States should not succumb to the psychosis of moral and spiritual demoralization spreading in alarming proportions over the country. The American people must be vigilant. They must be alert. Just as the appeasement of Germany brought on World War II, so the appeasement of Russia will lead inevitably to another war in defense of our liberty.

VINCENT J. KOWALEWSKI,
Chairman.
Mrs. JANINA JASINSKI,
Secretary.

Full Employment Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 19, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, S. 380, the Full Employment Act of 1945, is a bill that engenders both hope on the part of many and fear on the part of others. It is therefore desirable that we who must vote for or against the measure should have access to the different viewpoints expressed upon the bill. For that reason I propose to give one interpretation of what full employment means, and also to point out the many difficulties and handicaps that would occur if the bill becomes a law.

FULL EMPLOYMENT MEANS WHAT?

Mr. Speaker, full employment does not mean that every citizen of the United States is going to be guaranteed employment in the job he wants to do, at the factory he wants to work, in the city or village where he prefers to live. To insure full employment our workers must be willing to work at jobs where and when they become available. The author of the full-employment plan, Sir William Beveridge, in his book Full Employment in a Free Society, places special emphasis upon the need for labor mobility, the need to shift workers from one place to another when and where needed. Therefore, any full-employment plan would bog down if workers staged a sit-down strike and insisted upon the right to work at their own job, in their own plant in their own community.

Mr. Speaker, in pointing out the difficulties and handicaps that would be encountered in administering the provisions of the bill, I can think of no better way to accomplish the task than by including as a part of my remarks an editorial carried in the Chicago Tribune of Wednesday, October 17, 1945. The editorial was entitled "Some Bad Guesses," and is as follows:

SOME BAD GUESSES

The so-called full-employment bill would require the President each year to submit a "job budget." In this he would state how many jobs there were going to be in private industry, and how many jobs the Government would have to create to provide for the unemployed.

How is the President going to find out how many jobs there are going to be a year in advance? Who will his experts be? Is he going to rely on the trade-union executives like Sidney Hillman and William Green?

They are certainly men of wide experience in the ups and downs of industry. They both have excellent sources of information. However, in August, right after Japan surrendered, Hillman declared that within 6 to 8 weeks, 10,000,000 people would be unemployed. Eight weeks have passed, and the number out of work is about an eighth of the number forecast by the CIO Political Action Committee chairman. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, about the same time said unemployment was going to be serious but wouldn't give any figures.

More likely the President, in making his annual determination of how many jobs there were going to be, would rely upon an official staff. No agency in the future is going to be better prepared to estimate unemployment in the next few years than was the War Manpower Commission 2 months ago. It had immediate contacts with every employer during the war. No one could go to work without its approval. It could require reports and conduct investigations without limit. It had expert analysts, economists, and statisticians. If any outfit was ever set up to get the low-down on employment, it was the WMC.

Early last month WMC prepared a report which was used by the Government to show that 4,000,000 were going to be out of work by early spring. It now has changed its mind and says that the crest in the lay-offs has passed. If policies of expanding expenditures had been followed, based upon its 4,000,000 figure, the result would have been disastrous. The Government, with its synthetic jobs, would have been competing with industry struggling to find manpower sufficient for reconversion.

Of all the Government agencies, WMC has come closest to the mark in its guesses. Going to the other extreme, there were the statements of Chester Bowles, who placed the amount of unemployment that was going to develop at between ten and twenty million. Although unemployment never came close to the ten or twenty million mark he set for the reconversion period, he did what he could to make his estimate come true by keeping one industry after another in the dark about the prices they could charge for their products.

Government officials and trade union officials have shown that they couldn't accurately forecast the volume of unemployment 6 or 8 weeks in advance. What reason is there to think that the President, who would have to rely upon the same sources for guidance, could determine the out-of-work status 12 or 18 months in advance?

Public officials on their showing ought to be extremely humble about predetermining the course of economic forces which they have shown they do not understand. The desirability of filling in the valleys and leveling off the peaks in business has been often stated, but the instruments haven't been perfected for accomplishing this or those at the controls do not know how to use the gadgets.

Address Before Polish-American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1945

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address I made before the Polish-American Congress, assembled to observe and commemorate the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, on October 11, 1945, in the Masonic Temple at Detroit, Mich.:

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great privilege to address such a distinguished gathering and it is a special privilege to be in Detroit, the city which earned the glorious name of the "arsenal of democracies," and which so magnificently contributed to our victory. I am particularly proud that my fellow countrymen, Americans of Polish descent, are so numerous among the workers of this city and whose sweat was shed in this hard work which permitted the arming of our boys on the fighting fronts so as to assure the triumph of American weapons forged by strong American hands.

We must see now that this victory, achieved through the effort of the entire American Nation, on the battlefields, in the factories, and on the farms, shall not be wasted. Let us all together watch that the peace which shall follow our victory be worthy of our sacrifices. I am sure that as we fought and worked for victory under the enlightened leadership of our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, we shall achieve a real victory of democracy and equal rights for big and small under the statesmanlike guidance of our President, Harry S. Truman.

It is particularly fitting to remind you of the necessity of our common continued effort to secure a peace worthy of American democratic ideals, a peace for freedom, and a peace for the common man, on a day when we are celebrating the memory of our valiant American and Polish fighter for freedom, Casimir Pulaski, who, like many American and Polish boys in this war, gave his life for these ideals.

I want you all to rise and in a minute's silence pay tribute to his memory and to the memory of the fighters for freedom fallen in this war for ideals which always were and shall be forever the common ideals of the American and of the Polish people.

You want to hear my report on what I saw in Poland. Let me tell you right at the beginning that as much as I would like to report to you on the day on which we celebrate the memory of Casimir Pulaski, that I saw Poland free, independent and happy, I cannot submit to you such a report. My observations point to the fact that despite indescribable losses suffered by Poland in this war and despite the untold sacrifices the entire Polish Nation has made for the common cause, Poland was unable and still is unable to celebrate with us the day of victory as its day of liberation.

I do not want to comment upon what we saw in Poland. I will take the liberty of submitting to you cold facts and facts alone. Let them speak for themselves, and indeed, they speak eloquently.

Authorized by a resolution of the House of Representatives of July 17, 1945, to go to several countries in Europe in order to "conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs," a committee of four, comprising Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio; Representative KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota; Representative JOSEPH P. RYTER, of Connecticut; and myself, left the United States on August 12, 1945. We visited France, Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Soviet Russia.

At this time I will concentrate on observations we made in Poland only, as I know that this is of greatest interest to you.

We started out, and our destination was Warsaw.

Arriving from Berlin at the only airport that was approachable, called Okecie, on the outskirts of Warsaw, we were met by members of the American Embassy, and also by two officers, one a Russian and the other in a Polish uniform, who, as we soon found out, spoke Russian far better than Polish. They failed to show any signs of courtesy; in fact, they were definitely rude to us. Fortunately, we were in the company of our own people—Americans.

We landed safely, although at our own risk, as we were advised that this airport was not completely cleaned out of the mines and unexploded bombs. Our pilot had difficulty in making a landing, as he had to circle a few times and make observations for same. It is located 10 miles distant from Warsaw, and en route we saw the wrecked homes, which was a forerunner of what we were to see of the city itself. Arriving there, a most ghastly scene hit our eyes: There was no more Warsaw.

Every building was deliberately demolished, not so much by aerial bombing but by systematically applied demolition bombs, wrecking everything that once was a beautiful Polish city. The only building that stood out in fairly good condition was the Polonia Hotel, where we made our quarters, on Aleja Jerozolimska. This building was saved, as it was used as the Gestapo headquarters, and where the Nazis did their planning for the total destruction of Warsaw. Across the street from this hotel was once the Central Warsaw Railroad Station, and what stands there today are naked ruins and sky-piercing iron girders.

By automobile we rode through the devastated streets of Warsaw. Ruins and rubble all along. It is more than difficult; it is simply impossible to describe to what degree Warsaw is devastated. There is nothing left of the beautiful historical landmarks, as there is nothing left of the old and the modern houses in Poland's capital. The rubble has been simply shoved aside and among those ruins in cellars and in shacks crudely constructed out of lumber the people of Warsaw find shelter. People of Warsaw—you should see them as I saw them—most of them in rags, many barefooted, destitute, many of them looking starved, desperate, some looking stern, some dejected, but most of them with a very strong determined light in their eyes.

Their faces would light up whenever they saw the American flag on our car and saw us getting out of it. You would say that they expected something to happen—that some immediate action would take place now the Americans were there.

Our numerous walks through Warsaw soon convinced us that we will be unable to describe to our countrymen the destruction of this formerly beautiful city. No picture can convey this story. You simply cannot believe your own eyes. Churches, cathedrals, the old city, monuments—all are gone—and in every spot on the squares cleared of rubble and in the humble backyards you can see wooden crosses. Underneath a hero of Warsaw lies buried. Around the crosses you see fresh flowers. They are changed constantly by remembering hands. There are thousands of such crosses all over Warsaw.

It is estimated there remain in the ruins of the city about 50,000 bodies that cannot be reached for recovery as there is no machinery to excavate the ruins to get at them, and to one passing near the smell of decaying human flesh is most nauseating.

The absence of children was very noticeable, and we were informed that these youngsters were in the same category of being victimized as the older ones.

In a conversation with the President, Boleslaw Bierut, he related that "everything is being done to the best of our ability to aid the stricken people and to reconstruct Warsaw as soon as possible, and in the near future, a free and unfettered election will be held. This awaits the return of many displaced Poles and soldiers, which contributes to the actual date when the election can be held." About the same view was given to us by Edward Osobka-Morawski, the president of the council of ministers. I was left with the impression, however, that all this depends upon some outside influence.

Some of the following prices have been noted on the black market: A 2-lb. loaf of bread costs $6; steak, 130 zlotys or $26; a cup of coffee, 25 zlotys or $5; for common ordinary working shoes the price is $60. Men's suits run around $200 and women's dresses from $150 to $200 and other prices are in proportion.

The Russian occupation army is behaving very badly. We saw their arrogance and unfairness in taking advantage of the poor people of that city. We saw the nearby highways jammed with hundreds of head of cattle, horses, and farming implements, being taken out of Poland and going further east, by the Russians. Pillaging of the shops on the streets was going on most freely, and the snatching of purses from Polish women is a daily occurrence. There also exists a wholesale raping of the Polish women. When resistance would be given, the Russian soldier would use his weapons of war and kill.

There is no freedom of press in Poland, but it was said that arrangements are being made now by the Ambassador to Poland, for the establishment of quarters for the United Press, the Associated Press, and the

International News Service, and it is hoped that the freedom of press shall tell the world what actually is going on in this ghost city, before very long. The few publications there now are strictly under Russian censorship.

Radios can be used, but a heavy tax is imposed. It was said that most severe punishments are meted out to anyone possessing one without a license or permit. The government has established loud speakers on the main street, where they broadcast Russian music; restricted news of the world and Polish and Russian announcements were heard while we were there.

Traffic is controlled by uniformed Russian girls. Here and there you can see a Polish uniform, but when you ask a Pole whether those are soldiers of the Polish Army, the answer is: "Oh, no, sir—the Polish Army is still in Italy and in England—they have not come home yet." The uniformed soldiers roam the streets with tommy guns on their backs and pistols in their holsters. The officers in the army commanded by Marshal Rola-Zymierski are mostly Russian, but the worst factor in the situation seems to be the fact that numerous elements of the Soviet Russian Army are being demobilized in Poland and the individuals are automatically made Polish citizens. Large numbers of them enter Rola-Zymierski's army or the local police force. Thus a large cadre of pro-Soviet adherents is being created. There is a curfew at 9 p. m. People apprehended on the streets after this hour have been shot and you can hear shooting on the streets of Warsaw all night through. Russian soldiers are complete masters in Poland.

Order is maintained by several kinds of citizens' militia, police, and gendarmes, but the Russian secret police—the dreaded NKVD—is responsible for all the mysterious disappearances of individuals. Failure to show an identity card results in immediate arrest by the NKVD.

And so the Poles are continually under the pressure of two main worries—fear of arrest and procurement of food. How ironical must seem to them the two freedoms announced as our war aims—freedom from fear and freedom from want.

Food—I regret to state that the UNRRA failed to alleviate the terrible sufferings of the Polish Nation. The man in charge of all the UNRRA activities in Poland is a Soviet citizen, acting as one of the deputy directors of Mr. Herbert H. Lehman. The supplies UNRRA sends to Poland for the most part are stolen and find their way to the black market where they are sold at prices absolutely inaccessible to the population. A small part of UNRRA supplies is being distributed to the population but this distribution is used very obviously by Soviet Russia for political purposes to spread the Communist doctrine across Poland and the rest of Eastern Europe. American representatives have little or nothing to say about what goes on and the Russians take all the credit, although nearly all of UNRRA's funds, 72 percent of it, have been contributed by the United States. We were told of instances where American labels disappeared from cans containing condensed or evaporated milk and Russian labels appeared instead. The most important fact remains, however, that UNRRA's activities in Poland became a political weapon and that the population is not being helped by this international organization.

The production of food in Poland suffers greatly because of two factors: One, the requisition of 80 percent of the crop by the Government, which is compelled to feed the Russian army of occupation, and, two, because of the mass removals of livestock from Poland into Russia.

We have seen on the roads and even on the streets of Warsaw long herds of cows, horses, pigs, etc., driven eastward by Russian soldiers. We were told by these soldiers that this is German cattle being taken into Russia, but Polish peasants with whom we talked know differently. These peasants, who were given small land holdings, have to till their soil with bare hands. The cattle and horses and every implement of agriculture was taken from them. In a locality near Warsaw where a 120-acre estate was divided among 16 families, we were told that these 16 families own "collectively" just one pig and they have to hide that pig under straw whenever Russians are in the vicinity. The 20 percent of the crop left to the peasant after the removal of his livestock and agricultural implements and after 80 percent of his crop has been taken from him barely leaves enough food for his own family.

Incidentally, the removals do not stop on the farm. Over 85 percent of all the industrial equipment and even more in the western territories now allocated to Poland are being taken away by the Russian armies. This mainly is the reason for which Poles would not regard the newly allocated territories as compensation which was promised to them for the loss of the eastern Polish territories. They are by no means reconciled with the terrific loss. The taking away of Wilno, Lwow, and the oil fields left a deep wound in every Polish heart, and the fact that they are getting territories stripped of every modern implement makes the reconciliation still more difficult. How can they get the mineral riches which were promised to them in Silesia? How can they use the Baltic ports? Every piece of machinery has been removed and, cynically enough, the Russians tell them that they shall get these territories in the state of industrial development as they were in the eleventh century. Thus, abuse is added to injury.

The scarcity of food and clothing in Poland is accompanied by the scarcity of fuel due mostly to the break-down of all communications. Railroad cars have been destroyed or taken from the country, trucks and bridges are not reconstructed. There is only one railroad line running in Poland and this is the railway from Warsaw to Moscow. There is a deep meaning in this fact, and this leads me to tell you a few things about the political situation in Poland.

As much as every Pole wants food, fuel, and clothing, he wants freedom more. The spirit of the Polish people is not broken. The man in the street is not afraid to die. He prefers death to life under the present political set-up. If an impartial, free, and unfettered election could be held in Poland without tickets being prepared in advance, without arrests and deportations, the Polish people would wipe out the Government of Bierut and Osobka-Morawski. However, should the present situation persist, Poland will quickly be turned into a Soviet province ruled by Soviet police, despite the fact that Russia will fail to communize the Christian Polish people and to imbue the God-fearing Poles with the Soviet totalitarian doctrine. The Polish people need some rallying point around which they can build their hopes. This is why Mr. Stanislaw Mikolajczyk was everywhere received with open arms. He was to them the man coming from London, the man who had the backing of the western Allies. The reception given to Mr. Mikolajczyk was an indication of the feelings against Bierut and his Government that is completely dominated by Communists and Soviet Russia.

The hopes which the people of Poland focused on Mr. Mikolajczyk are now rapidly fading away. As much as we wanted we were not able to see him. We were told that he was absent from Warsaw. We could not see Prof. Stanislaw Grabski either, and as far as Mr. Mikolajczyk's personal position is concerned, I can tell you that his own appointed Vice Minister of Agriculture was arrested by the NKVD and no intervention on the part of Mr. Mikolajczyk could get him released. The Polish people see that Mr. Mikolajczyk is more and more helpless and that he was put aside by the present rulers of Poland. In consequence, they reason that the United States and Great Britain either cannot or do not want to help the Poles regain their freedom and independence and I regret to state that gradually Polish public opinion, shrewdly maneuvered by the Soviet-controlled press, is turning against us. As I told you, more than food they want freedom. They want us to help them to resist, and finally to release the awful Soviet grip in which they find themselves now.

The Poles do not speak openly about their worries and about their fate. They whisper in one another's ear and they do not discuss publicly their issues. Public meetings are run and controlled by the Communists and there is no free discussion in the press, despite the fact that newspapers are numerous. There is a very strict censorship and the Ministry of Information hands down communiqués and issues instructions on what may be printed. I also regret to state that instructions were issued to leave out of print all pro-English and pro-American news.

The present Polish Government is trying every means to attract men and women to work in the clearing up of the debris of that devastated city, and for it they would supplement their monthly wage with the Russian card system, good for additional food and living quarters. But it seems they do not find much response to their plans. Rebuilding of private buildings is practically at a standstill because, first, the Government may take possession of a new place that has been made livable, and simply pay the owner rent at 1939 prices, or, second, the Government may requisition the place outright. The result is that the owners resent such propositions and are slow to make any headway as to repair, since the best way to retain the ownership is to decline to make the place attractive to live in, to those in control of the Government.

There is the same kind of totalitarian grip over education in Poland. Primary schools, high schools, and universities are being reopened, apparently free in action, but the government of Bierut and Osobka-Morawski controls the organization of learning and membership of all academic societies.

There is no self-rule anywhere—even in villages and small towns. All officials are appointed by the Government and all of them must take the oath of loyalty to the Government and to Soviet Russia. Any reported anti-Soviet talk subjects one to immediate arrest and a word uttered against Stalin—is fatal.

Despite the infiltration of Communists into Polish political life and despite the fact that Soviet stooges are constantly calling political conventions of all the four Communist-infiltrated parties, there is the general belief that 90 percent of the population is against the present Government.

All the Poles want is to have the present state of things changed as quickly as possible. They want to get rid of the rapacious Soviet Army. They want to get rid of the NKVD. They want to get rid of the Government which assumed power backed by Soviet bayonets, and they want help to regain their freedom and independence—they want America and the whole world to redeem the pledges which were given to them, they want the obligations of the world toward Poland to be fulfilled, they want all of us to help them again become a free, democratic, and independent nation.

When the Polish people feel that the Soviet secret police is not around, they sing—Jeszcze Polska Nie Zginela—Poland is not yet lost!

War-Built Aluminum Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. F. NORRELL
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 19, 1945

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

TRUMAN WOULD KEEP WAR-BUILT ALUMINUM PLANTS IN PRODUCTION

President Truman disclosed today he wants to keep as many as possible of the war-built aluminum plants in production.

He told a news conference that administration policy with reference to their operation has not been established, but that private enterprise should do the job.

He said, in response to another question that he thought Government subsidies would not be necessary.

Members of the Senate Military Affairs, Small Business and Postwar Planning Committees have been hearing testimony this week on plans to dispose of the Government-owned plants. They cost approximately $700,000,000.

The Aluminum Co. of America yesterday offered to lease and operate the key unit of the Government's properties and sell alumina to any other operators the Government approves. The company offered to lease the Hurrican Creek (Ark.) plant and make the product available to small plants at a reduced price.

The lease would guarantee the Government a minimum rental of $1,000,000 a year.

Meanwhile, Congress was asked to extend for 90 days the time in which action may be taken on a plan for disposing of the Government's aluminum plants. The plan will become effective Sunday unless Congress rejects it or extends the time for considering it.

Dr. Szilard and the Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 19, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of October 19, 1945:

MAY-JOHNSON BILL

The folly of trying to legislate in the dark has probably never been more pointedly illustrated than it was yesterday at the hearings before the House Military Affairs Committee on the May-Johnson bill. Witnesses made it unmistakably plain that hasty enactment of that measure might have the effect of crippling instead of fostering future development of atomic power. The striking objections which these scientists piled up against the bill leave no doubt that it will have to be discarded for a fresh start.

Complaint No. 1 by the scientists is that the May-Johnson bill, enacted into law, would drive many of the ablest experts and technicians out of the atomic-energy project. The reason for this leaps to the eye of even casual laymen reading the bill. It would give the proposed Atomic Energy Commission plenary power to set up rules on the handling and transmission of data and equipment connected with research in the atomic field. Persons violating those rules could be fined up to $100,000 and imprisoned for up to 10 years. They could be dismissed from any agency of the Government with no recourse. An innocent mistake violating the Commission's security rules could be punished, "regardless of intent," by fines and imprisonment.

Astronomers seeking out the mystery of the stars and medical experimenters searching for new remedies for the benefit of mankind could be sent to prison under the sweeping terms of the bill, according to Dr. H. L. Anderson, of the Los Alamos Laboratories, New Mexico. Scientists cannot be expected to work under such conditions. A measure so gravely detrimental to their welfare might have been aptly called a bill to drive the ablest experts out of atomic research. The tyrannical poyers of the proposed commission could also be used to muzzle criticism of its work and thus to stifle advancement of the most important discovery of our age.

Dr. Leo Szilard, physicist of the University of Chicago, demonstrated in detail the administrative weakness of the bill. The very large measure of independence that would be given to the Atomic Energy Commission, he said, might dangerously hamper our foreign relations. The State Department could expect repeated embarrassment from the fact that control over the most powerful of all weapons would be in the hands of a separate commission which could even thumb its nose at the President. Whatever the nature or power of the proposed commission, we think it is imperative to tie it in closely with existing agencies of Government, particularly those which are directing our foreign policy.

Dr. Szilard suggested three operating agencies to deal with different aspects of the atomic-control problem. One would operate the existing $2,000,000,000 plants; another would direct research and development looking toward industrial use of atomic energy; a third would provide machinery for further work on the atomic bomb. Each of these agencies and key Cabinet members would be represented on a board for formulation of over-all policies on atomic power. This is an interesting suggestion, but we think that Congress ought to explore the issue much more thoroughly before attempting to decide what sort of mechanism is needed. Incidentally, this witness, in reply to a question from the committee, voiced enthusiastic support for our suggestion of a quickie law to meet immediate needs while permanent legislation is being worked out.

The fatal weakness of the May-Johnson bill is that it attempts to create specific machinery before a national policy has been worked out It is not much more than an abdication of congressional power into the hands of a commission. We think it is about time for Dr. J. B. Conant and others who are said to have had a hand in drafting this clumsy and dangerous measure to recall it and then help Congress to get off to a better start.

There Are Victories for Statesmen To Win

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 19, 1945

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, it is with great pleasure that I exercise this privilege and place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address of his Holiness, Pope Pius XII, to us on the occasion of the visit of our committee to the Vatican on August 27:

Even here in our retired study we are visually reminded that the clash of battle has faded away and the softer notes of peace begin to fill the air; the army, we see, is giving place to officers of state. Not that the cooperation of both was not necessary for the prosecution of the war, as a similar collaboratian may well be necessary, for a time at least, to make sure that the terrible specter has been really laid. But when cessation of hostilities has been declared, the army's appointed task has been accomplished; now statesmanship must play the chief role; because there are victories yet to be won before the world can feel secure in the possession of peace.

There is the victory to be won over hatred that springs up so easily and increases so fast between nations pitted against each other in bloody conflict. Are we right in feeling that this poisonous growth has been held in check, is mostly dying out? There is naturally so much affection and generous charity in the human heart.

Then there is the victory over distrust and that pernicious principle, sure to lead to distrust, that might makes right; which in effect means that weaker nations have only such rights as their powerful neighbor wishes to concede to them.

An obstacle to concord between peoples would be an excessively unequal opportunity enjoyed by some of access to the world's riches given by God for all; that must be overcome.

And most essential of all there is the victory over a self-sufficient materialistic philosophy, which would usher God out of His world and thus leave man without any basis on which to build an order of justice, that will be something more than a hollow sham supported by mere force, at the moment overpowering.

These are some of the victories to be won by statesmen and by the people whom they represent. In extending our cordial greetings and welcome to you, honorable Members of Congress, we want to assure you that our daily prayer accompanies you and all other civil leaders, whose responsibility is so grave at this moment. We beg that God's blessing may enable you to carry your difficult task through to success for the lasting and best interests of all men, who are so dear to our paternal heart. May this divine blessing be extended also to your loved ones at home.

Editorial Reaction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 19, 1945

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith three editorials, giving some of the press reaction to the statement made by the Special House Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning on its return from a European investigating trip. The committee expects to make its formal report on this subject—its eighth—to the Congress and the country within a few days.

I should like to add that the reaction to the press release has been almost

unanimously favorable to the position taken by the committee. These are but a few of the favorable comments which have been made in the public press of the country:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of October 12, 1945]

CONGRESS GETS ANOTHER REPORT ON EUROPE

Once again a congressional committee has returned from Europe talking patrotic good sense. This time the message comes from seven members of the Postwar Economic Policy Committee of the House. The committee visited every important country from England to Persia, including Russia, where the members were allowed to confer with Marshal Stalin.

The formal report will be forthcoming in a week or so. Meanwhile, a preliminary report has been issued in which the members ask the common-sense question: What are England, Russia, and the other countries going to give us in exchange for the loans they are demanding?

How much of the money that Russia desires to borrow is to be used for armament with which to oppress her neighbors? How does Russia intend to repay the loan, if it is made? Evidently the members were impressed, as they had every reason to be, with the brutal military machine with which the Russians are seeking to dominate Europe.

What trade barriers, harmful to us, does the British Empire mean to remove if we assist British reconstruction with credits? (Apparently the committee in asking this question was unaware of the recent insistence of the British on a multibillion dollar gift rather than a loan.)

What advantage can America obtain from a policy toward Germany which goes far beyond disarmament and contemplates the permanent impoverishment of a nation that has been one of our best customers?

These are all highly pertinent questions which every patriotic American will wish to have answered. We hope the Congressmen succeed in blasting the truth out of the State Department. The committee went on to question Russia's good faith in promising to get out of the occupied countries and to suggest that Russia should be pressed to admit foreign publications and their reporters to blacked-out eastern Europe. Most significant was the recommendation that the State Department negotiate for "at least partial payment" of lend-lease in the form of aviation rights, bases, raw materials, sites for embassies, etc.

The Congressmen returned from their travels filled with zeal to serve America and overwhelmed with evidence of the betrayal of American interests by our agents in foreign affairs. We hope this mood survives in the Washington climate.

Experience shows that nearly every congressional committee that has gone abroad has returned in a state of mingled alarm and indignation over what the members saw. Something happens to these men and women in Washington, however. After a few weeks they are found voting as they are told to vote, in plain disregard of their own convictions and the convictions of their constituents. The explanation lies in the importance of social life in Washington and the social dominance there of the foreign embassies. They call the tune. American officialdom dances to it.

[From the New Orleans Item of October 15, 1945]

A NOTE OF REALISM

Some plain and sensible talk on our European relations was heard the other day from a House committee on economic policy. It has just finished a 2-month tour of Europe under the chairmanship of Mississippi's Mr. COLMER.

It is recommending, among other things, that the United States withhold further loans from Russia and Britain until the two change some of their ways which the committee finds objectionable. Here are several of their urgent proposals:

That Russia adopt an "open-door" attitude with respect to American observers, technicians, and journalists.

That Britain remove trade barriers "inimical" to American interests.

That Germany be reconstructed, without armaments, of course, so that it can feed itself and become a factor in American trade.

That the United States expand its field forces handling the disposal of billions of dollars' worth of surplus property overseas.

Chairman COLMER says the committee visited Marshal Stalin, "frankly talked business with him, and asked how he proposed to repay the $6,000,000,000 loan that Russia is asking." Also, that they asked Premier Attlee and other English leaders what concessions they are willing to make in order to ease trade barriers. He reports that the committee got no "enthusiastic" response to either inquiry.

Recommendations and inquiries like those are eminently sound, and should be pressed. The considerations advanced by this committee on its own observations have been raised by other observers and students of affairs. It is exceedingly unfortunate that more frequent reference to them has not been heard in official quarters. For they concern most vitally the future costs that this country will be forced to assume, fairly or unfairly, in the protection of its own interests in the improvement of world conditions.

Among other sharp criticism of Russia, for instance, the committee declares that the Soviets are "moving German industry, lock, stock, and barrel," whether it is war or nonwar industry. This, it says, threatens to impose a great burden of relief for Germany on the United States and the United Nations relief agency. That it can scarcely fail to do this is obvious, if the facts are as stated.

The State Department is also urged to negotiate for at least partial payment of lend-lease advances in the form of tangible assets. Among these it suggests aviation rights, bases, raw materials, business building, and sites for embassies. The propriety of this can't be gainsaid, even though the State Department may prefer to seek triumphs of doubtful diplomacy by the easier but unbusinesslike way of sacrificing enormous material interests of the American people by less practical policies.

The committee also poses a number of searching yet very pertinent questions with respect to what is going on inside Russia in matters about which this country has every right to be informed. It says it intends to seek an audience with President Truman, and give him some helpful information along these lines. From the little we have heard of that nature in high official circles, this may be of service to the President. Yet it is possible that he has information of that character on which he has not seen fit to act, or even to talk.

It is encouraging in any case that one congressional committee is talking and acting in terms that plain citizens can understand. For this we commend the committee. It is also our belief that millions of Americans will feel the same way.

[From the New York Journal-American of October 16, 1945]

THE POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

WASHINGTON, October 16.—The so-called "congressional junkets" to foreign parts that have followed in the wake of the war have come in for a lot of undeserved criticism, chiefly of the pink, or left-wing, variety.

The truth about them is, as this writer sees it, that never before have so many of our lawmakers received so much valuable information in so short a period of time and at so little public expense.

The visit to Russia of a subcommittee of the House Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy of which Representative WILLIAM M. COLMER, of Mississippi, is chairman, may save this country hundreds of millions of dollars.

The committee has returned feeling very cold to the proposition of lending $6,000,000,000 to Stalin's Communist state.

Eight of the members of the full committee spent 8 weeks in Europe, sizing up a number of important situations at first hand. The committee, by the way, was made up of a cross-section of the strongest committees in the House, top Republicans in each instance representing that party. Chairman COLMER is himself a member of the powerful Rules Committee.

The eight subcommittee members are writing a lengthy report on what they observed and learned, to be submitted to the House. There is some fear that the remaining 11 members of the full committee, who did not go on the trip, may try to soften the report. Their views, it is feared, may be influenced by State Department policy.

In that event some members of the subcommittee want to go ahead, write an unvarnished tale of just what is going on in Europe, and especially in Russia and her puppet states, and let the rest of the committee make a minority report if they desire to do so.

That is what should be done. The report of this subcommittee should be a document in which no punches are pulled.

The subcommittee appears to be of one mind on many controversial questions, particularly the Russian situation. They reached a unanimity of mind by daily consultations as they went along from country to country. They checked and rechecked their information and their impressions.

Finally on shipboard, coming home, they sat down and drafted a preliminary report to which all heartily agreed.

Since their return the members of this subcommittee of congressional globe trotters—they traveled about 10,000 miles—have been in constant demand.

Their colleagues in the House have interrogated them closely, evidence of the increasing interest in Congress in some of the more formidable economic problems which Europe is posing, especially Great Britain and Russia.

The subcommittee members are thus exerting a tremendous influence in the House, the results of which are certain to become apparent when the question of the proposed advance of $6,000,000,000 to the Soviets and the question of the British loan come before the appropriating and legislative committees.

Our Country's Defenders Entitled to More Consideration and Earlier Discharge Than Conscientious Objectors

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, every American, I am sure, at home or abroad, in the armed services or in civilian life has had cause to be proud of the record made by our armed

forces during the recent war. Whether it be in the air, with the ground forces, or on the sea, our gallant men in uniform have given an excellent account of themselves. The determination to win the war at the earliest possible date and to get back home to their loved ones was uppermost in the minds of our fighting men everywhere.

On the floor of this House, over the radio, on the street corners, and in sewing circles, American men and women have taken just pride in the accomplishments of our soldiers, sailors, and marines who defeated the enemy much quicker than the most optimistic had dreamed it could be done.

But, Mr. Speaker, the time has come when words of praise of our gallant men for valor and courage for military and naval achievements have become to them mere empty gestures. Now that the war is over, these men, with the exception of professional soldiers and those who want to become professional soldiers, desire above everything else to get home to their loved ones. These men do not understand why they are being held when in the vast majority of the cases they are doing practically nothing.

Three splendid young soldiers called on me in my office this morning. All three are privates, all are married with dependents, and all had more than 18 months of honorable service. Previous to the war, two of the soldiers held responsible positions as teachers. Despite the serious shortage of teachers, their application for discharges were turned down because they are lacking a few points. The other had several years' experience in an administrative capacity in one of the leading business firms of Oklahoma. They freely admit that they are loafing at a nearby Army camp and have been marking time for several weeks merely because they do not have enough points for the coveted discharges. "Of course, if we were football players or even prize fighters, we would have been out long ago," one of them said.

High-ranking officials of the War Department tell us that the men themselves established this so-called point system which the Army is supposed to follow, but has not always done so. Neither of the three soldiers that called upon me today or the thousands of others who have either called or written me ever heard of the proposal until the Army's point system was suddenly announced by the War Department. So, is it any wonder that they will tell you flatly that point system is cockeyed and is actually the brain child of the brass hats at the Pentagon Building?

But, Mr. Speaker, these are not the only complaints. It has not helped the morale of our men and women in uniform to read in Washington newspapers this week that all the conscientious objectors over 38 years of age are soon to be released from detention camps. We are told that several conscientious objector camps are to be liquidated within the next 60 days. I have a very definite feeling that men, including many fathers, who have seen active combat service will feel deeply disappointed and chagrined, if not outraged, when they learn that the Government they fought to defend is actually showing preference to conscientious objectors in the matter of discharges. I desire here and now to enter my protest. I do not propose to remain silent and thereby lead some to believe I have given my approval to such an inexcusable and indefensible policy.

During the war it was the order of the day on the part of those of us in and out of Congress to be constantly praising the officials of the War Department, including the arm-chair generals, for their brilliance and strategy in helping win the war. I yield to no one in my respect for General Marshall, General Eisenhower, General MacArthur, and other able and courageous generals and officers, irrespective of rank, but the truth is that what most of the generals and admirals have done would have been of no avail had it not been for the enlisted men, including the lowly buck privates. Although they have not yet received their just recognition, we all know that except for the enlisted men in all branches of the armed services, we could not have begun to win the war. I also know they are getting fed up on mere weasel words of praise and empty promises while conscientious objectors who have never missed a meal go home before men with combat records. As one father said to me today, "I would rather see my babies and hear them say 'Hello, Daddy,' than have all the praise that a general, a Senator, or anyone else might give, or have placed on my shoulders all of the stars of any general in the United States Army."

Complaints against the Army, for its slowness in discharging men applies also to the Navy, the Marine Corps, and to Wacs and Waves as well as to the men. Recently, high officials of the Navy appeared before the Appropriations Committee, at which time I had the privilege of interrogating them about their point system on discharges and immediately they began to talk about this "wonderful point system" that the Navy has worked out. I have repeatedly stated, that all things being equal, fathers should be given preference in the matter of discharges, regardless of the branch of service. Yet, under the Navy's system, a man who managed to marry about the time he entered the service and who remained safely home and who never even saw a ship is entitled to more points and, therefore, an earlier discharge than the one who entered the service at the same time and who has spent practically all of his enlistment on a battleship, a destroyer, a submarine, or other combat ship in the submarine infested Japanese waters.

During recent hearings I presented several such cases to the Secretary of the Navy, for whom I have a high regard, when he appeared before our committee, but about the only satisfaction given the committee was that the cases about which I complained represented "two conflicting points of view." One of such cases is mentioned on page 56 of the hearings on the rescission bill now under consideration by the House and quotes a letter from a fine young former college boy who had been overseas 16 months. He says:

> For my 16 months' service overseas, I am given the huge amount of four points. I have gone through tropical hurricanes and typhoons. I have had two ships shot out from under me, and for all this I get four points, but that youngster who sat at my side at the university and who married about the time I went overseas, who now has a wife and one child, and who has never gotten 100 miles from the school, gets at least 10 points against my 4 points for combat service.

To this observation the naval officer reminded me that 10 points is all the Navy gives for dependency and the record of the same hearings show that I responded:

> Well, if you want to defend such a cockeyed point system you can of course do so, but I say that by any fair and reasonable rule the man with 16 months overseas combat service should have more points and more consideration than the youngster who remained at home.

I realize full well, Mr. Speaker, that anyone who dared to offer any criticism of or suggestions to the brass hats, either in the Army or the Navy, in time of war, was frowned upon, if not ridiculed, in certain circles, but the time has come for plain speaking; when both the Army and Navy must realize that the war is over and that they must now come down to earth and understand that these fine young men and women who offered their services during the darkest days of our Nation's history are entitled to No. 1 priority. Many of these gallant men and courageous women, languishing in Army camps, on ships, and at naval bases, are desperately needed at home. To be given the "assurance" by the brass hats that these fighting men will all be demobilized by next spring or summer is mighty little comfort or consolation either to them or their anxious families. They have done a good job and it is the height of absurdity for either the Army or the Navy to insist on keeping thousands of men in idleness for such an extended period of time.

I know how these men feel. I recall that in France after the World War I armistice was signed that immediately the cry went up "Finis le guerre"—the war is over—and that is what our soldiers, sailors, and marines are saying and thinking now. The time has come, Mr. Speaker, when Congress is going to have to take the proverbial bull by the horns and do something about it—now.

The Fifth Freedom—A Square Deal for the Members of Our Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. D. EMMERT BRUMBAUGH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 19, 1945

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, the end of World War II has brought as its aftermath a number of paramount issues and perplexing problems. Among the

chief questions of momentous interest to American citizens in every walk of life is the problem of remedying the defects in the program for demobilization of our armed forces.

Young men in the various branches of the military and naval service are writing to their parents, relatives, and friends and revealing conditions in their daily lives that demand immediate correction by military and naval authorities. In many instances officers in our armed forces who have been sent overseas in the closing days of the war with Japan and who have no combat experience to their credit are exercising their authority in a disgusting manner. It is related by parents of veterans with long months of combat duty that they are being required to perform unnecessary tasks by young officers with a desire to show their authority. In many cases they are required to perform the same duties several times on the theory that repetition of the task will keep their minds occupied and give them the appearance of being kept busy.

Methods of intimidation of the vilest sort are practiced the most flagrant one being the threat of court martial if an enlisted man writes to his Representative in Congress. Such degrading tactics on the part of officers in our armed forces is a stench in the nostril of liberty-loving Americans and the evil effects on servicemen's morale is tremendous. This is especially true when it is realized that the denial of liberty to our fighting forces is contrary to the frenzied attempts to emblazon the gospel of the so-called "four freedoms" on the frontiers of the world. It is a depressing thought that American youth in the uniform of their country undergoing heroic sacrifices, are forced to bow to the whims of superior officers whose utter disregard for fundamental American ideals is on a par with the hideous practices of the despised and infamous Gestapo army that will eternally be a stigma of disgrace to the German Nation.

It is beyond contradiction that discipline is necessary in military and naval life, but there is a wide difference between approved methods and the system that is being followed in some branches of our armed forces. Officers guilty of breach of conduct in the failure to be just and abide by the common rules of courtesy have no right to be placed in supervision of battle-scarred troops. Countless members from the rank and file of Army and Navy personnel have held responsible and important positions in civilian life in comparison to some of their superior officers, who for the first time in their careers have occupied a place of importance as leaders in our armed forces with its corresponding advantages of attractive salary and the best possible attention to provide them with living conditions superior to those under their command.

The attitude displayed by overbearing officers bent on showing their authority is a definite barrier to any hope that may be held for the success of volunteer recruiting programs designed to encourage and attract youthful Americans to consider a career in the component branches of military or naval service. Before we embark on a world mission to teach the lessons of democracy to the nations of the universe it may be a timely suggestion of great merit to have our military and naval leaders consider the immediate need of indoctrinating officer personnel with a deeper knowledge of human nature and the respect that is due every American youth irrespective of his station in life. Arrogance, cockiness, and the complete denial of the rights and privileges of American citizens in the uniform of their country as practiced by certain deluded officers has resulted in immeasurable criticism and should be no longer tolerated by those in authority and who have the obligation to correct such evil conditions.

The success of the volunteer recruiting programs is of great importance in the efforts of Congress to convince military and naval authorities of the insistent and fervent demands for the immediate discharge of all married men in service so that they may return to civilian life and assist in the preservation of one of our most cherished institutions—the American home. In addition, men in limited service with many months of duty but unable to amass any appreciable number of the points necessary for discharge, are being deprived of their right to resume their peacetime mode of living. Many of the men in this particular classification are married and the fathers of small children and it is cruel and inhuman to deprive their families of companionship and paternal counsel and guidance.

Volunteer recruiting has a definite effect on the continuation of the present draft system which during the stress and strain of the active period of the war resulted in the lowering of the draft age and the conscription of teen-age youths. Many you will recall were forced to interrupt their education, and now with the war terminated their hope of resuming school or entering college is certain to be defeated with the result that it is bound to prove detrimental to the future welfare of this Nation.

At this time I wish to add my voice in behalf of American prisoners of war. It is my firm opinion that any American youth who has spent months behind the barbed-wire enclosures of an enemy prison camp, or who has survived the perils of the sea in being rescued from a sinking ship, that such personnel should be discharged without requiring them to qualify under the present point system.

As a member of the United States army of occupation in Germany following the armistice, November 11, 1918, I believe I am qualified by experience to voice the sentiments of American soldiers in World War II who are anxious to be returned home yet they are being retained overseas for the purpose of policing areas in Europe and the rest of the world.

I am certain that many Members of Congress share my views that the United States should not be expected to furnish a large segment of the Army of Occupation but that other Allied Nations closer to the conquered areas should be expected to perform the bulk of the task. Since the countries are closer to the scene they can operate at less expense and at the same time arrange a system of furloughs to permit military personnel to visit their homes at frequent intervals.

The huge expense involved in retaining United States troops overseas should be fully realized by every thoughtful American. With the national debt now in excess of $260,000,000,000 we must trim our Federal expenditures and make certain that the United States Veterans' Administration receives sufficient appropriations to care for the needs of every man and woman who wore the uniform of their country. We owe an everlasting debt of gratitude to the heroes of all of this Nation's wars and in discharging our solemn obligation to the defenders of our country let us be certain that we are not guilty of the hideous practice of giving mere lip service in return for the great human sacrifices rendered by American service men and women.

Congress has approved legislation designed to stimulate volunteer recruiting and it is reported that enlistments are being accepted at the rate of 1,000 daily. Such response to the invitation to consider a career in the Army is very encouraging and if we are successful in placing a checkrein on the silly antics of some irresponsible officer personnel in trying to show their authority in an arrogant manner, there is certain to be many more thousands of volunteers who otherwise may have declined further military or naval service because of the memories of serving under some upstart in the garb of an officer who is sadly lacking in the attributes so necessary for commissioned personnel.

For the sake of emphasis I am repeating my request that military and naval authorities curb the abuses that are revealed in the following letters and that they take notice of the fact that the overwhelming majority of the American people desire the immediate discharge of all married men in uniform and that serious consideration be given to the plight of the teen-age youths and enlisted personnel in limited service, with months of service, yet unable to return to a useful place in civilian life because they are being retained by the armed forces in the performance of menial and useless tasks that have no value or any significance to the needs of our national defense.

The following excerpts from some of the hundreds of communications that I have received from servicemen and their loved ones are respectfully referred to your attention in the hope that the views of my constituents may be of value in convincing military and naval authorities of the necessity for further liberalization of the point system as modification is urgently needed to correct many glaring defects in the demobilization program. For obvious reasons the identity of the authors of these letters and excerpts is not disclosed:

CAMP ——, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
September 18, 1945.

DEAR DAD: It certainly is a crime to have all these thousands of young men just lying around doing nothing. Why doesn't Congress pass a bill ordering immediate demobilization to the point of the Army needs?

MacArthur says that he will only need 200,000 men for the entire Pacific area, and yet the high-ranking officers still hold the men in the service so they can keep their

high rank. Surely our Congressmen do not think that the fellows will ever forget that they (the Congressmen) are not doing a thing toward getting the men home.

The whole story is that they are afraid of unemployment if they let the boys out of the Army, and the higher Army officers use that argument to keep the boys in—a lot of the men who are generals now will be put back to majors when the Army is sent home and they don't intend to let that happen if they can help it.

It seems that even the parents of the boys in the service do not realize what is happening to their sons. If this goes on much longer many will return nothing but tramps. Nearly every cent a lot of them make goes for liquor and women. You would never believe the rate of venereal diseases that is sweeping the Army and a night never goes by that the MP's don't pick dozens of drunks up, in, and around town.

And you cannot exactly blame the fellows, for the officers have become so overbearing that times it is hard for anyone to control their temper. They have even started a form of basic training over again, every day we must go out for close order drill. All this foolishness, if so-called discipline, is completely wrecking the men's common sense. It is so depressing and morale breaking that all the fellows want to do is go to town and get drunk and of course with all the taverns and streets full of loose women you can easily see what the results would be and yet no one seems to care about how soon they demobilize the Army. This separation business is definitely no good.

If only the parents of these young fellows could see what is going on (and they will know it eventually), I'm sure there would be many demands of Congressmen to demobilize at once. And another thing that is not right is sending fathers overseas. So far I have not been put on any shipping list, but a fellow who sleeps next to me has been. He has two children and is 28 years old, but because he has not 36 points or 2 years' service he must go overseas, and yet there are thousands of single boys that have nothing to tie them down and have likewise only been in the Army 4 or 5 months. Yet they are lying around doing nothing and much worse the Army is talking of discharging them and here all the fathers sit with never a word about getting home to their families.

You cannot imagine how bitter the men are about the way they are being treated. I have seen some of the most brutal fights you ever dreamed of right in the barracks, in the streets, in alleys, or anywhere strained nerves meet and explode. And when men decide to fight it out, each knowing the most deadly and brutal blows the Army could teach, well, many shall carry the scars and injuries to their graves.

We have all earned our discharges and cannot figure out why there is not some action taken to release us who are not needed in the Army, and also the battle-weary soldiers overseas immediately.

I am not writing this because I think we should not defend our country, but because I think it is a sin and a crime to have so many young men wasting the best years of their lives doing nothing.

The war is over and I can see no reason for it to take a year or two to get the men home. It requires action right away, and please tell the Congressman for me that every man in the Army is awaiting their action and reply. Hoping you give this serious consideration.

Your loving son,

JACK.

SEPTEMBER 30, 1945.

DEAR MR. BRUMBAUGH: Is the United States Government going to be cruel enough to send fathers overseas for 18 months? Isn't there enough single men to occupy Japan and Germany without depriving our children of fathers?

Is the Government going to pay me $1,800 when they could pay a single fellow $900? Are they trying to cut expenses? It is not fair to take the fathers away from families. The children think they don't have to listen since their daddy isn't home.

Why are they going to let us worry and eat our hearts out for the men we love? Please, sir, help us to get our men home.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

APO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
September 24, 1945.

DEAR UNCLE BOB: This isn't a personal letter as much as it just a plain gripe. There's an Army regulation that prevents a member of the military forces from corresponding with a Member of Congress and in so doing criticizing any policy of the War Department or its subdivided agencies. Never in all my Army experience have I seen so much concentrated inefficiency as there is in this particular locality. In the European theater of operations such complete and inexcusable inefficiency would not be tolerated for the length of time that it takes a general officer to reduce a second lieutenant to a private which I know to have happened in the length of time necessary to remove a bar from a shoulder.

* * * * *

Another thing, the veterans of the ETO are receiving a dirty deal concerning promotions. One of the things that promoted this inefficiency is the fact that all officers in this theater were given a blanket promotion before any men from the ETO arrived. This was to prevent any of the officers from that theater receiving promotions. It also made colonels at the head of any and every concern. Ninety percent of the officers were incapable of doing the work that this promotion entailed. Therefore, the work was delegated to junior noncoms who must do the work but just don't give a d—n because the work doesn't belong to them.

* * * * *

I hope that you are able to call my letter to the proper notice. You would be doing me and the rest of the troops in this area a great service.

Sincerely,

LES.

———, PA., *October 16, 1945.*

DEAR SIR: My conscience prompts me to write you concerning faster demobilization of our boys in the Army which I too think has been sadly neglected for different reasons both political and personal, and which I think is a very grave mistake.

I as corresponding secretary of the ——— organization in ——— in your congressional district, have received many letters expressing bitterness and disgust with their Congressmen and Senators back home, looking to and depending on them to do their utmost to hasten demobilization so they can be back in their homes where they can support and rear their children as intended. And in many cases despite the Government allotment they are sorely needed. I can send you these letters and the names of the boys if you wish me to do so.

Now the large majority of the boys complaining are of highly intelligent and very fine principles, and have the highest respect and patriotism for their country; many have been in the Army 2 or 3 years and there are bitter complaints from both abroad and in the States.

They feel the war is over and the boys should be demobilized. The thousands are not needed, especially the fathers of several years' standing, much more rapidly than they have been so far and I personally feel they are fully justified in feeling as they do.

Now as Congressman and personal acquaintance I feel that you will consider this letter in the spirit in which it is written, and start a movement which the boys are waiting and praying for as well as their children, wives, and mothers.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. ——— ———.

———, PA., *October 13, 1945.*

DEAR SIR: There's one thing that I cannot understand, and that's why this little note to you. First of all, I'm wondering how you Members of Congress were able to take that sleeping tablet that General Marshall and company slipped you men right before you convened. I'm referring to that grandstand play that was pulled in regard to holding a 35-38 year old man in the Army if he does not have 2 years' service.

Eighteen months ago the draft boards quit drafting men that age—they found out it was a mistake. Now they are discharging men in that age bracket only if he has 24 months' service. That, in my opinion, and all other persons with a little common sense, is really one for the books.

* * * * *

What I would like to know is, How can a body of men like the one you are a Member of, sit and know that those military brass hats have a rope attached to old men—old in the sense of military duty? I know everything can't be done overnight, but I can't understand how Congress can accept a decision like that.

* * * * *

How do you think you would feel, Mr. Congressman, if you were just sitting in an Army camp at 36 years of age—sitting like a cow in a pasture doing nothing—and watching all other men your own age leaving?

* * * * *

When is Congress going to put the heat on those military men for pulling a grandstand play of that nature?

Very truly yours,

Mrs. ——— ———.

Assistance for Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

HELLAS CHAPTER, ORDER OF AHEPA,
Lowell, Mass., September 29, 1945.

Hon. PHILIP PHILEIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PHILBIN: All officers and members of our chapter have unanimously voted to forward to you the enclosed copy of the cable which has been dispatched in the name of the entire Order of Ahepa to the Council of Foreign Ministers in London in behalf of Greece and of her just rights and demands.

The American people are mindful of the tremendous sacrifices so readily accepted by the Greeks for the triumph of our common cause and also of the terrible years of enemy occupation that ensued. The heroic resistance of Greece to Axis aggression, a resistance undertaken against hopeless odds, shall remain an imperishable record.

The opportunity of this, our great country, to give material and everlasting aid and assistance to little Greece is now at hand. We plead with you to use your influence and to extend your help in behalf of the cause and of the territorial and reparational rights of this valiant ally, as presented to the Council of Foreign Ministers and as enumerated in the enclosed copy of the aforesaid cable.

Thank you.

Gratefully yours,

GEORGE P. THOMPSON,
President.

Whereas the heroic people of Greece held the Nazi and Fascist hordes at bay for many months in 1940 and 1941 and, by their brilliant resistance, exploded the myth of Axis invincibility and turned the tide of battle, defeating Italy and fighting resolutely the delaying action against the Germans which aided Russia to stop the Nazis at the very gate of Moscow, gave Britain much needed time and moral aid and America the opportunity to organize her industrial might and military power; and

Whereas Greece is traditionally loyal to the Western Allies and also is associated by warm, time-honored and unbreakable ties of friendship and religion with Russia and is a coastal fortress of strategic significance and a dependable ally whose position should be strengthened; and

Whereas ethnically, ethically, and historically Eastern Thrace, Epirus, the Dodecanese and Cyprus inarguably are and have been Greek territory since the dawn of history and the Greeks have been the bulwark of democracy and western civilization fighting the battles against barbarian invaders which made eventually Europe and America possible; and

Whereas the victorious Allies under the Atlantic Charter are committed to the policies of self-determination of peoples and security of nations from aggression and, in conformity with these policies, Greece is legitimately entitled to a favorable rectification of her frontiers and particularly to the territory hereinbefore mentioned and, incidentally, the Allies are morally bound to recognize her unfailing loyalty and, as well, her timely and valuable contributions to the United Nations cause and to reward her for her sacrifices in blood and material by supporting her claims to just reparations from the Axis aggressors who plundered her country and destroyed its resources; and

Whereas the Fraternal Order of Ahepa, an American organization, having more than 400 chapters in the United States, assembled in annual convention in the city of Washington, D. C., voicing the sentiments and hopes of about a million Americans of Greek descent, all of whom have abiding faith in the sense of justice of each Minister in the Council of Foreign Ministers, gave careful consideration to the foregoing matters, and thereupon it was unanimously

Resolved, That the Supreme Lodge of the Order of Ahepa respectfully petition and hereby petitions Your Excellency as a member of the Council of Foreign Ministers to consider fully, in the light of the Atlantic Charter, and determine favorably the just claims of Greece—firstly, for the awarding of due reparations; secondly, for the annexation of Epirus, the Dodecanese, and Cyprus; and thirdly, the rectification of the Bulgarian boundary to a line which will provide the maximum natural defense from this predatory aggressor who attacked her neighbors thrice in three decades.

In that connection Your Excellency may bear in mind that these awards are vital to afford—

(a) Security from recurring aggressions;

(b) The maintenance of peace in the Balkans;

(c) Living space and the chance of survival for the heroic people of Greece;

(d) The opportunity to realize their ideals and develop their economic life free from fears; and

(e) To enable them to make their pacific and democratic influence strongly felt in the United Nations' policy of ensuring durable peace and continued progress in a better world.

Your Excellency, to give Greece less, and the two Axis satellites, calculating Bulgaria and cunning Albania, more, and thus to keep Greece weak and make them strong, inevitably will bring about her economic strangulation and military subjugation—a glaring injustice to a faithful and honorable ally and a glaring historical inequity that would remain indelible in the memory of friendly small nations.

Bulgaria in the past had, and Tito's Yugoslavia now has, ambitions to expand and dominate the Balkans. A resurgent Bulgaria will revive old plans. Therefore, a common frontier between Greece and Turkey is imperative. It will remove the eruptive potential of aggression. In the event that military or political neutralization of the Dardanelles and incidental modifications of status quo take place, the historically Greek Gallipoli peninsula should be allocated to Greece for the foregoing obvious, weighty, and just reasons.

Respectfully submitted.

ORDER OF AHEPA,
HARRIS J. BOORAS,
Supreme President.

SEPTEMBER 15, 1945.

The Delaware River Is Not a Dead Nor Dying River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL K. McCONNELL, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1945

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, in the October 5 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is printed an article from the October Reader's Digest on the subject of a stream pollution control, entitled "America's Dead and Dying Rivers." This story is built around the Delaware River.

For the purpose of bringing out important facts and in the interest of fair play, I am submitting a reply by the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin, an organization which has done considerable study and work in furthering improvement activities on the Delaware River:

The title "America's Dead and Dying Rivers," of an article in the current issue of Readers Digest, which points to the Delaware as a horrible example of stream pollution, is anything but accurate. It is most misleading and grossly unfair.

While the section of the Delaware bordering on Philadelphia and Camden, over which the author made his classic trip the other day and observed the some three hundred and sixty million gallons of raw sewage churning down the stream is dirty, in fact filthy, it certainly is neither dead nor dying. What Mr. Harvey failed to realize, or at least to point out, is that the Delaware has been to war. Nothing dead or dying can qualify for such service. And, as our men and women who have recently been in combat and on the production lines well know, fighting and winning wars not only involves blood, sweat, and tears—but dirt, plenty of it, as well.

The part which the port of the Delaware River, extending from Trenton, N. J., to Wilmington, Del., and including Philadelphia, Camden, and Chester, played in winning the recent wars against Germany and Japan probably never will be fully evaluated. From the time when Hitler invaded Poland in 1939 until Hirohito, in a face-saving gesture, reported to his ancient ancestors that the atomic bomb had forced Japan to surrender unconditionally, ships were speeded by day and night from the Philadelphia Navy Yard and many privately operated shipyards located along the befouled but completely alive Delaware River to speed the day of victory. Airplanes, tanks, trucks, oil, gasoline, radio and radar equipment, guns and ammunition, iron and steel, chemicals and chemical products, tools, and machinery, medicine and food, all manufactured and processed with water from the Delaware, also were shipped from this region to all theaters of war.

It can truly be said that one of Uncle Sam's most important arsenals of democracy was centered around and supported by the virile Delaware—the largest fresh-water harbor in the country.

The two and one-half million people in the Philadelphia metropolitan region who depend upon the Delaware for sustenance and a livelihood were too busy during the war to take time off to give the river the scrubbing which it so badly needed. But, they were fully aware of its plight and adopted every measure possible in the emergency to protect and conserve its waters to the fullest possible extent. The region set an example for the entire country by being the first to initiate a campaign, under the slogan, Water Wins Wars, for this purpose. The patriotic response to this program not only put an end to unnecessary quantitative wasting of water but also provided the stimulus which led to the construction, even during the war, of plants for the treatment of particularly obnoxious industrial wastes.

It is only because we had been at war both directly and actually since 1939 that the author of the fallaciously entitled article on America's dead and dying rivers had an opportunity to condemn the Delaware. For prior to its outbreak, Philadelphia was ready to embark upon the construction of a $42,000,000 sewage collection and treatment project, and the cities of Camden and Gloucester, across the river, were under orders from the New Jersey Department of Health to meet their respective responsibilities in the planned program for pollution control formulated by the interstate commission on the Delaware River Basin, and approved by the four State governments—New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware—which support this agency. These programs had to be set aside for the duration because of the more urgent need for materials and manpower to fight and win the war.

But, they are now being renewed. Just as soon as materials and manpower again become generally available, Philadelphia and Camden will be competing with each other to see which can get its projects started first. With such an example, it is a certainty that the pollution problem in the Delaware River will be well in hand in the near future.

More than $100,000,000 has been earmarked for this type of work as a basin-wide postwar activity.

The Delaware is a live, virile, and powerful river. Parts of it have been overworked, are tired and dirty, it is true. But, the bath, so long forthcoming, is near at hand. When cleansed, it will be freshened and ready to serve—as it did in war—as one of the Nation's No. 1 assets in the building of a lasting peace throughout the world.

Gratitude to The Adjutant General and His Staff for Their Services to the Loved Ones of Those Who Died for Their Country in This War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1945

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Mr. G. A. Garstang, of Knoxville, Tenn., whose brave son-in-law, Lt. Col. Raymond Worsham, gave his life for his country in this war.

Mr. Garstang is one of our best citizens and his fine letter expresses the gratitude and appreciation felt by himself and family and that of thousands of others who are thus bereaved.

The letter follows:

HARRILL HILLS, FOUNTAIN CITY,
Knoxville, Tenn., October 17, 1945.

Hon. JOHN J. JENNINGS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JENNINGS: In these days when almost everyone has a grievance of some sort, as it were, a letter of commendation may seem somewhat singular and unusual. Nevertheless the thought comes to me that a unit of our armed forces has received little recognition for the accomplishment of an almost superhuman job, and very well done at that. I refer to the Office of the Adjutant General.

It is certainly a source of sincere gratification to us who have been bereaved by casualties to find that this department of the Army has leaned backwards to ameliorate our distress. Not only has all correspondence been answered with dispatch and efficiency, but letters have been couched in most respectful and sympathetic language, leaving no doubt that painstaking efforts have been exerted to bind up the wounds which sorrow has caused.

No doubt the personnel of this unit will, when the smoke and fire has cleared away, enjoy the happy reflection of a supreme accomplishment in the way of assistance to those of us who have suffered from the supreme sacrifice of our loved ones.

Your very truly,

G. A. GARSTANG.

Why Continue the Draft?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Army is now procuring more than 1,000 men a day by voluntary methods. The Navy cut their draft call for November to 1,000 men. The Navy had 16,000 voluntary enlistments in September, and 11,800 of these were new enlistments.

In this letter to General Hershey I point out that Gen. R. W. Berry, the Deputy Personnel Chief of the Army, testified that the Army had 6,990,000 men under arms as of October 15, 1945. General Berry further stated that there were 1,985,000 men with 60 to more than 85 points still in uniform. These men are entitled to a discharge now.

Mr. Speaker, to me it is imperative that the Army send home every man in this country for whom the Army does not find useful employment. They should be at home on an indefinite furlough and not called back until they are ready to complete their physical examination and put their papers in order. It is also apparent that the draft no longer needs to be continued. The Army and the Navy are getting sufficient volunteers to meet all their demands.

The letter follows:

OCTOBER 19, 1945.

Gen. LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Selective Service Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL HERSHEY: Gen. R. W. Berry, the Deputy Personnel Chief of the Army, testified before the Senate Military Affairs Committee yesterday that the Army had been receiving voluntary enlistments at a rate of more than 1,000 a day for the past 2 weeks. These enlistments have occurred since the Congress passed the bill to encourage voluntary enlistments in the armed forces.

The Navy announced on October 15 that they had 16,000 voluntary enlistments in September 1945 and that 11,800 of these were new voluntary enlistments. They announced that the draft call for November would be only 1,000 men.

In the light of these figures by the Army and the Navy, I am wondering why it is that your department has not announced a cut in the draft quota for November, in my humble judgment, the armed forces are getting all the men they need for replacements. General Berry, testifying on October 18, stated that the Army had 6,990,000 men in the Army. He further stated that there were 410,000 men with 85 or more points in the Army at this time.

He gave further information that on October 15 there were 1,930,000 men in the Atlantic area, 2,100,000 in all Pacific areas, and 3,500,000 in the United States. This makes a total of 6,990,000 men in the Army on October 15, 1945. Out of this large number of men, he stated there were 1,985,000 who had 60 or more points and were eligible for release. Of the 410,000 men with 85 or more points, 125,000 were in Europe and the Mediterranean area, 75,000 in the Pacific, 5,000 in the China-Burma-India area, and 200,000 in the United States.

In a careful study of the statement, one asks why is it longer necessary to continue the draft under Selective Service. It is quite evident that both the Army and the Navy are getting sufficient men to meet all their needs under the voluntary system. Is it your intention and that of the administration to continue the drafting of men under the selective-service law and keep it as an instrument to force universal compulsory military training upon the country? The selective-service law was not enacted for that purpose.

The people of my district are concerned about the continued drafting of teen-age boys who ought to be in school. The farmers and others are greatly concerned about the continued drafting and taking of experienced farm labor.

I hope your office will immediately announce a smaller quota of men for November than was issued for October. The draft should not be continued when the needed personnel can be secured by voluntary methods.

Very truly yours,

A. L. MILLER,
Member of Congress,
Fourth District of Nebraska.

Congress Hears Atomic Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, the impact of atomic energy on our society will be revolutionary. This new force is destined to change the pattern of the world as radically as it has been changed by steam and electricity. That is what we mean when we say we have entered the atomic age.

The following is an article written by Marquis Childs, entitled "Congress Hears the Facts," appearing in the Washington Post under date of October 19, 1945:

CONGRESS HEARS ATOMIC FACTS

(By Marquis Childs)

The scientist is speaking. He is speaking in the calm, dispassionate voice of one who knows.

The Senator asks if the atomic bomb can be kept a secret. The scientist replies:

"The discussion about secrecy is largely an academic discussion. You cannot keep the nature of the world a secret. You cannot keep atoms secret. They exist in every country."

If anyone can speak with authority, it is Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, who, from the beginning of the project, has had as much to do with the making of the atomic bomb as any single individual. More than any admiral or any general, what he says has weight.

Testifying before Senator KILGORE'S subcommittee. Oppenheimer said flatly that there can never be any effective countermeasures for the kind of bombs he helped to make in the Los Alamo laboratory. There is no way to detonate them in advance except by shooting down the shell containing the explosive, and a 100-percent score is all but impossible.

He replied affirmatively when Senator FULBRIGHT asked him if it was not conceivable that 40,000,000 Americans might be killed overnight in the crowded cities of the eastern seaboard. Soon, he added, the atomic explosive shell will be adapted to weapons such as the V–2 rocket, which travels faster than sound.

There is no longer any excuse for self-deception. A man who knows has spoken.

As Oppenheimer made perfectly clear, the terrible danger is a race between the nations for more deadly atomic weapons. He pointed out that one of Britain's chief scientists said recently that if America persists in an attitude of secrecy, then the only choice for Britain is to start building an atomic bomb factory.

Perhaps that race is inevitable. Perhaps the doom of this unhappy species is sealed in any event. But defeat cannot be accepted without a struggle.

It is here that opinion seems to have gone off the track. Letters that come to me say: "You don't think that if Russia had the secret of the atomic bomb they would share it with us, do you?"

The answer may be "No." But for the moment the question is irrelevant, since we must make every effort to use our bargaining power to get coöperation from Russia. We must invite an exchange of information on atomic energy and nuclear physics, and an exchange of scientists.

It may not work. The suspicion of the Russians may be too dark; it may be impenetrable. Possibly they are already committed to an atomic race.

We will have the moral satisfaction of knowing, however, that we made the attempt. We will be able to say before the world that we did everything humanly possible to break down the barriers. If our offer is rejected, then the blame will rest elsewhere.

Our position today is intolerable. Men in high positions talk about "keeping the secret." That was the net effect of President Truman's impromptu remarks in Tennessee, although he may not have intended such a result.

This has ramifications not visible on the surface. Because they share the so-called secret with us, the British have been not a little embarrassed in their relations with the Russians. The reason is a clause in the British-Soviet treaty which says that Britain will share with her ally all military and technical information.

And, as Dr. Oppenheimer said, the time is so very short. The atomic bomb gave us "a very momentary strengthening of our military position." For the long pull, it has weakened our military position and this, as Oppenheimer explained it, is why:

We are a peace-loving people. We would not be likely to launch a secret atomic bomb attack on another nation that had shown no overt signs of making war on us. But more aggressive peoples, if the atomic contest is once finally joined, may not be so constrained.

Summing up Oppenheimer's testimony, Senator FULBRIGHT said:

"We have everything to gain, then, and nothing to lose by sharing the information we have." If we can learn that in the little time that is left, then we may still hope for a future.

Freedom of Speech in the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 19, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, there are many unsigned letters coming to Congress from members of the armed forces which indicate that our soldiers are afraid to openly express themselves upon Army rules and regulations. It has come to my attention that the Army actually posts regulations which makes it an offense subject to court martial proceedings for a soldier to enter a complaint about his care in the Army or about Army regulations.

The Army still has in effect a regulation which violates the first amendment of the Constitution. It attempts to coerce and frighten not only the members of the armed forces but retired Army officers. This regulation deprives the retired Army officers of their constitutional rights. The first amendment to the Constitution reads as follows:

Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or of prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or of the right of the people peacably to assemble, and to petition the Government for redress of grievances.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I quote Army Regulations AR 600–10, paragraph 4, as follows:

Political activities of military personnel. a—General. Except as authorized by the War Department, efforts by any person in the active military services of the United States or by any retired member of the Regular Army to procure or oppose in any manner influence legislation affecting the Army or to procure personal favor through legislation are forbidden. No arm, service, or bureau chief, or subordinate in the War Department, and no person in the active military service of the United States or retired member of the Regular Army will apply to Congress, committees of Congress, or to any Member of Congress for the enactment or in opposition to or for the purpose of influencing legislation of any kind (except to procure the enactment of private relief legislation) without the prior approval of the Secretary of War. Private relief legislation is legislation proposed or initiated by or on behalf of one individual for reimbursement or relief to himself alone for damage or loss of his own person or property.

Mr. Speaker, when one reads this regulation, you can come to but one conclusion and that is an effort on the part of the Army to stifle and prevent any retired Army officer from appearing before Committees in Congress or Members of Congress in criticism of the Army. Such methods, Mr. Speaker, are the same as those which Hitler adopted when the Prussian, Von Steuben, wrote the original Articles of War at Valley Forge in the winter of 1777–1778. He took his pattern from the Prussian war lords. This regulation, including a whole mess of other Army regulations, is Prussian in design and a disgrace to our republican form of government.

Full-Employment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 19, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, it isn't very often that I find myself in agreement with David Lawrence, but I would like to begin my comments today on the full employment bill with a quotation from an editorial by Lawrence in the current issue of his United States News. This is what he has to say:

Management has a bigger stake in full employment than any other group. For full employment could mean a consumer purchasing power that would absorb a substantial part of the capacity of our machines. It could mean that we would have a surplus to spend in foreign countries and this would tend to achieve the economic equilibrium for the world which is so much to be desired as a basis for international peace.

Full employment means not only jobs for all; it means sales for the salesmen, business for the businessman; it means, actually, prosperity for all.

The great dramatic production record of the war demonstrated the versatility and ingenuity of the American system in meeting the demands of a national crisis.

The war demonstrated that our production capacity can be expanded to meet the consumer needs of the country as a whole. During the war the products of our expanded industrial capacity were consumed in the national fight for survival against fascism. The war proved that the American economic system could provide jobs for all—could support a program of full employment—without abandonment of the fundamentals of democracy.

During the war we turned out goods and services at the rate of $200,000,000,000 a year. Our total national income stood at about $156,000,000,000 a year. For the last tax year the tax yield alone on our national income was greater than the total income itself was for the year 1932.

Right now we are witnessing a spectacular drop in total national income due to the termination of war contracts. According to the Department of Commerce, the national income has dropped $20,000,000,000 in the second half of 1945.

I do not believe there is any need for hysteria about this drop and about the further probable drop, but we do have to be ready to combat a continuing, downward spiral of national income, of purchasing power, of employment.

We must work out a plan whereby all the segments of the American economy can have at least minimum protection against depression.

I believe such a plan exists in the full-employment bill.

The full-employment bill is not a guaranty that all workers will have jobs after the war. It is in no way an adequate postwar economic program in itself. We just cannot pass the bill and sit back and wait for the millennium to arrive. As you will see, the bill in itself recognizes that there is no one cure-all for the problems of the postwar period.

Briefly, what the bill does is this. It gives the Federal Government the responsibility of cooperating with all the parts of our economic structure with the view to achieving full employment. Where necessary it provides that Federal investment and expenditures would be used to this end where private business fails to do so.

The bill states that—

It is the policy of the United States to foster free enterprise and the investment of private capital in trade and commerce, and in the development of the natural resources of the United States.

The bill further provides—

To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be achieved, it is the further responsibility of the Federal Government to promote such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed to assure continuing full employment; and such investment and expenditure by the Federal Government shall be designed to contribute to the national wealth and well-being and to stimulate increased employment opportunities by private enterprise.

If you just substitute the words "national defense" or the "war effort" for the phrases "full employment" and "national well-being"—in this part of the full employment bill, you will have a legislative expression of just what has been going on in this country for the past 4 years—the war years. Where private business was unable to carry the burden of financing war production, the Federal Govern-

ment stepped in. Where more than financing was needed, the Army and Navy and other agencies built their own facilities and produced their own weapons.

In addition to stating the broad principle of governmental responsibility for the economic welfare of its citizens, the full employment bill calls for an annual production and employment schedule, including not only anticipation of Federal investment and expenditure, but also that of all groups in the country. This economic schedule whose purpose is to appraise the number of jobs needed to provide full employment in a given period will be presented by the President every year at the same time he presents his annual Budget message covering strictly Government expenditures. If the President, after his appraisal of the number of jobs needed, the total of expenditures required to provide those jobs, and the prospective volume of business, finds that there is unemployment or the threat of unemployment he is required, under the bill, to transmit to Congress his program for creating jobs through the stimulation of private enterprise and through necessary Government programs.

This program would be accompanied by recommendations for such legislation as is necessary to carry it out.

At this point in the legislative process under the bill, the responsibility for creating full employment falls upon the Congress. And this is one among many regards where this legislation is unprecedented. It specifically directs the Congress of the United States to make a study of the national economy and on the basis of that study to pass legislation designed to maintain a healthy national economy. Now during the past 12 years there have been proposed and passed many bills designed to promote a healthy national economy. But they have been piecemeal bills, dealing with this or that economic group—the industrial workers, the farmers, the small businessman, and so forth. And largely, they have grown out of desperate immediate need.

The difference between that kind of legislation, much of which I supported as necessary to bring the country back from the black depths of the thirties, and the full employment bill, is that it seeks to determine the need before it becomes desperate. I don't know whether the bill, in its present form, will actually serve as well as some other device might serve in anticipating our employment needs, but it certainly is a step in the direction of applying sound business practice to Government activities. No businessman who hoped to stay out of the red side of the ledger would neglect to very carefully survey the needs of his business before planning his budget. The full-employment bill proposes to apply this sound business axiom to the biggest business in the world—the business of keeping some 140,000,000 Americans well fed, well clad, and decently housed.

I am enthusiastic about the full employment bill not so much because I believe it is perfect, in fact, I expect in operation that many defects will show up, but because it is a departure from the old hit-or-miss type of expediency legislation and it does recognize the basic fact that without widespread purchasing power you cannot have a healthy economy, and that you cannot spread the purchasing power to enough consumers without jobs for those consumers.

Some of the critics of the bill charged that its enactment will be the deathblow to free enterprise in this country. I am always amused at the great industrial tycoons whose very lifeblood is monopoly when they evince such tender concerns for free enterprise.

I believe that unless we work out some such plan as that provided for in the full-employment bill, recognizing the interdependence of management, labor, and Government, then the free-enterprise system is doomed.

The most obvious symbol of our free American economic system is the small businessman. The small businessman is at once the symbol and victim of the free-enterprise system as it has worked out in the past. He is the first to lose customers when conditions begin to get bad, the first to have to economize by laying off workers, the first to go into bankruptcy.

He will be the first beneficiary of a full-production, full-employment economy. Before the war there were more than 3,000,000 businesses employing 3 workers or less in this country. Half a million of these little businesses have disappeared during the war because of wartime restrictions. I do not see how it would be possible for them to reestablish themselves without a greatly expanding consumer-purchasing power. I do not see how we are going to have that without a greatly expanded force of employed workers. It has been estimated that under normal peacetime conditions of full employment there will be opportunities for 1,000,000 such small business enterprises.

The Free Press Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 19, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

THE FREE PRESS AMENDMENT

Republican leaders of the House of Representatives have given their approval to a free press amendment which they propose to attach to the bill appropriating additional funds for UNRRA. This amendment would prohibit the use of United States funds for war relief in any country whose government infringes upon freedom of information or expression, or places any barriers—technical, political, legal, or economic—against the free exchange of information among the peoples of the world.

We welcome the interest of the House Republicans in a good cause, but believe that in several respects their present proposal is mistaken. In the first place, action to meet hunger and pestilence cannot wait; on humane grounds the relief problem is so acute, and the case for prompt and generous aid is so strong, that the Republicans have chosen a wrong spot to launch their crusade. They would be better advised to attach a "free press" amendment to legislation dealing with the subject of long-term loans for purposes of reconstruction and expansion. But even here their proposal seems to us to be too sweeping. For in its present form it would bar United States aid to governments which did either one of two things or both: (1) Denied freedom of speech to their own people within their own borders, or (2) prohibited American correspondents from having free access to news for publication in this country.

We cannot properly use our financial power to attempt to compel other countries to establish freedom of speech and press for their own people; for, highly desirable as this would be, judged by our own standards, we would be using our power here to interfere with the domestic affairs of other nations. But we can quite properly insist upon freedom of access to news for our own purposes—and we would, in fact, be well advised to do so. For if billions of dollars of American credit are to be used for reconstruction loans to other countries the American public which provides such credit is surely entitled to acquire all the information it wishes to have and needs to have about the conditions prevailing in those countries. This is, in fact, the only way in which loans of this kind can be made with real responsibility.

We suggest that the House Republicans take a second look at their amendment and consider whether there is not a better place and way to put it forward.

Twenty-four Top Nazis Indicted for Starting War and Atrocities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 19, 1945

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the Washington Post of October 19, 1945:

TWENTY-FOUR NAZIS INDICTED FOR STARTING WAR, ATROCITIES—CRIMES COMMISSION NAMES GOERING, HESS, AND ACCOMPLICES IN 25,000-WORD CHARGE

(By Dougald Werner)

BERLIN, Oct. 18.—Twenty-four ringleaders of Hitlerite Germany were formerly charged today with plotting and startling World War II and with barbarous atrocities, persecution and devastation unmatched in scope and savagery in the history of mankind.

A 25,000-word indictment which traced the course of a doomed "master race" from the infancy of nazism to utter defeat, was handed down against Hermann Goering, Rudolf Hess, Joachim von Ribbentrop and their accomplices who will go on trial for their lives before a four-power court in Nuernberg, probably next month.

The unprecedented document presented the horror-ridden history of nazism in terms of disappearance of 5,700,000 European Jews, murder of 4,000,000 persons in a single concentration camp, destruction of property and the treacherous and absolute disregard of honor among nations.

SPECIFIC CRIMES

Germany was charged with exhorting Japan to declare war against the United States, with violation of peace treaties as far back as 1899, with disregard of international agreements on the conduct of warfare, and with murder, enslavement, plunder of private

and public property, wanton destruction of cities and towns and devastation not justified by military necessity.

The 24 defendants were charged with individual responsibility for the crimes of nazism. They were listed individually, identified in the Nazi heirarchy and charged specifically with the three major counts of the indictment—"Crimes against peace, war crimes and crimes against humanity" and of a common conspiracy to commit those crimes.

BORMANN STILL SOUGHT

Not yet in Allied custody but possible alive, was Martin Bormann, successor to Hess as Hitler's deputy, who was indicted along with the others so that there will be no chance that he might escape allied justice.

The indictment was signed by Robert Jackson, Supreme Court Justice and United States prosecutor of the War Crimes Commission, and by the representatives of Britain, France, and Soviet Union. The defendants are expected to be given approximately a month to prepare their cases before they go on trial before the four-power tribunal whose American member is Francis Biddle, former Attorney General.

The coldly formal report was spotted with terms that were born of German terrorism—"fifth column," "master race," "ghetto," "total war," "concentration camp," "lebensraum," "blitzkrieg."

"The murders and ill treatment of civilian populations were carried on by * * * shooting, hanging, gassing, starvation, gross over-crowding, systematic undernutrition, systematic imposition of labor tasks beyond the strength of those ordered to carry them out, inadequate provision of surgical and medical services, kickings, beatings, brutality, and torture of all kinds, including the use of hot irons and pulling out of finger nails and experiments on living subjects," one section said.

The first three listed were Goering, Luftwaffe commander, and Ribbentrop, head of the German Foreign Office, and Hess, Hitler's deputy who made the ill-fated flight to England to seek a "phony" peace. Bormann was listed as Hess' successor.

ROSTER OF RASCALS

Also named were Ernst Kaltenbrunner, notorious Austrian terrorist; Alfred Rosenberg, Nazi editor and anti-Semite; Hans Frank, the land; Wilhelm Frick, Nazi Minister of Interior; Robert Ley, labor leader; Fritz Saukel, head of the slave labor organization; Albert Speer, head of the Todt organization; and Walter Funk, Hitler's Minister of Economics; Hjalmar Schacht, president of the Reichsbank; Franz von Papen, wily diplomat; Gustav Krupp von Bohlen und Halbach, head of the Krupp armament industries; Constantine von Neurath, "protector" for Bohemia and Moravia; and Baldur von Shirach, youth leader and gauleiter for Vienna; Arthur Seyss-Inquart, Nazi dictator of Holland; Julius Streicher, the notorious Jew baiter; Field Marshal Wilhelm Keitel, chief of the German high command; Col. Gen. Alfred Jodl, member of the German general staff; Grand Admiral Erich Raeder of the German Navy; Grand Admiral Karl Doenitz, submarine commander, who negotiated peace as successor to Hitler; and Hans Fritzsche, head of DNB news agency chief.

ABSENTEES

Conspicuously absent were Josef Goebbels and Heinrich Himmler, known to be dead, and Adolf Hitler himself, who is considered generally to be dead.

Each of the defendants was a member of the Nazi Party, the indictment said, and it was the "central core of the common plan for conspiracy" for world domination.

The ascendancy of Hitler to the head of the Nazi Party in 1921, after the unsuccessful Munich putsch, his rise to German Chancellor, the Reichstag fire, and the denial of civil liberties to the German people were outlined in the document. After that all parties but the Nazi Party were abolished, labor unions were banned, the first concentration camps were established in 1933 to stamp out opposition within Germany. The SS and Gestapo began their reign of terror.

CONCENTRATION CAMPS

The indictment told of the Nazi attempt to kill Christianity in Germany and their shaping of the education of youth.

The persecution of Jews was outlined in detail, and said that of 9,600,000 Jews in Nazi-dominated Europe some 5,700,000 disappeared.

The indictment referred to such concentration camps as Buchenwald, Belsen, Dachau, and Auchwitz, and referred to such methods as:

"Bad treatment, pseudoscientific experiments (sterilization of women at Auchwitz and at Ravensbruck, study of the evolution of cancer of the womb at Auchwitz, of typhus at Buchenwald, anatomical research at Natzweiller, heart injections at Buchenwald, bone grafting and muscular excisions at Ravensbruck, etc.), gas chambers, gas wagons, and crematory ovens."

The methods and crimes of the Nazis were held to be not only in violation of international conventions but also of internal penal laws and the "general principles of criminal law as derived from the criminal law of all civilized nations."

After Italy surrendered to the Allies, the Germans turned on their former Axis partners—murdering at least 7,500 men, women, and children during the period from March 1944 to April 1945.

In Poland the Germans used the "most refined methods of cruelty," the indictment charged, including "disemboweling and freezing of human beings in tubs of water and mass shootings to the accompaniment of the music of an orchestra."

Germany was blamed for the Katyn massacre of Polish officers in Russia and with treacherously engineering a break between the Soviet and the Polish government in exile. Germany swore that Russia had killed the officers and Poland's request for an investigation caused Russia to break relations with the exile government.

Citizens of the Soviet Union were perhaps the greatest victims of Germany savagery. More than 135,000 citizens were murdered near Smolensk; 172,000 civilians were shot and tortured in the Leningrad region; more than 50,000 were killed and tortured in the Stalingrad area.

STALINGRAD HORRORS

"After the Germans were expelled from Stalingrad, more than a thousand mutilated bodies of local inhabitants were found with marks of torture," it said. "One hundred and thirty-nine women had their arms painfully bent backward and held by wires. From some their breasts had been cut off and their ears, fingers, and toes had been amputated. The bodies bore the marks of burns. On the bodies of the men the five-pointed star was burned with an iron or cut with a knife. Some were disemboweled."

It was revealed that Hitler had sent a secret order decreeing that "the Fuehrer has decided to erase from the face of the earth St. Petersburg (Leningrad)." The order said the existence of this city will have no further interest after "Soviet Russia is destroyed."

The Germans looted and destroyed historical and artistic works throughout Europe. In Russia alone, 427 museums were destroyed. The grave of the Russian poet Pushkin was desecrated, the estate and museum of Tolstoy was destroyed, and the museum of the painter Repin was looted and devastated. Some 10,000 works of art were stolen from Estonia.

LIDICE CITED

The indictment listed similar Nazi atrocities in France, Holland, Norway, Greece, Czechoslovakia, and Belgium. It told of the utter destruction of entire towns—including the now historical village of Lidice.

It condemned the mass deportation of political and racial refugees, attesting that some 1,400,000 persons were deported from France and 4,000,000 from the Soviet Union. It spoke of the use and mistreatment of slave laborers and the killing of hostages. It quoted Streicher as saying, "The sun will not shine on earth until the last Jew is dead."

The Nazis justified their aggression and terrorism on the grounds that "persons of so-called German blood were a master race and were accordingly entitled to subjugate, dominate, or exterminate other races and peoples." Germany came to believe that "war was a noble and necessary activity of Germans," the indictment said.

GERMANY'S ROAD BACK

There was a careful retracing of the German road back to militarism. The indictment told of Germany leaving the League of Nations and the International Disarmament Conference in 1933; Goering's announcement in 1935 that Germany was building an air force and the enactment of a law for universal military service in the same year.

In 1936 Germany reoccupied and fortified the Rhineland. Then came the annexation of Austria and Czechoslovakia and the infamous appeasement pact at Munich on September 29, 1938.

The indictment told of Germany's launching of World War II with the invasion of Poland on September 1, 1939, and her subsequent invasions of Denmark, Norway, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxemburg, Yugoslavia, and Greece.

Then came the attack on Russia after an agreement of nonaggression had been signed.

Germany previously had sought and obtained a 10-year military alliance which created the Axis of Germany, Italy, and Japan.

"The Nazi conspirators conceived that Japanese aggression could weaken and handicap those nations with whom they were at war and those with whom they contemplated war," the indictment said.

APPEALS TO JAPAN

"Accordingly, the Nazi conspirators exhorted Japan to seek a 'new order of things,' Taking advantage of wars then being waged by Nazi conspirators, Japan commenced an attack on December 7, 1941, against the United States of America, Great Britain, France, and the Netherlands."

The indictment listed the treaties and agreements which the Nazis violated in their career of aggression. They included the Hague Treaty, signed in 1899 for peaceful settlements; the Hague Convention, regarding the opening of hostilities and the methods of warfare; the Versailles Treaty; the Treaty of Locarno; the Kellogg-Briand Pact; the Munich agreement; and individual treaties and pacts with other nations.

In addition to Jackson, the indictment was signed by the three other prosecutors, Francois de Menthon, of France; Hartley Shawcross, of Great Britain; and R. A. Rudenko, of the Soviet Union.

It was drawn after mountains of evidence had been sifted and thousands of witnesses heard. The final release of the indictment was delayed for several days while it was translated from the original English version into the other languages.

ALLIES CHARGE NAZIS BROKE 26 TREATIES—PATH OF CONQUEST TRAIL OF VIOLATION, INDICTMENT SAYS

BERLIN, October 18.—Germany violated 26 separate international treaties, agreements, and assurances in her path of conquest from 1933 onward, the war-crimes indictment charged today.

Alleged violations date back to the 1899 Hague Peace Convention and include the

United States-German Treaty signed after World War I.

Listed as violations are:

1. Hague Treaties of July 29, 1899, for the pacific settlement of peace treaties. By attacking Yugoslavia and Greece April 6, 1941, without trying to solve any dispute peaceably.

2. Hague Convention of October 18, 1907, for pacific settlement of international disputes. By attacking Poland September 1, 1939; Norway and Denmark April 9, 1940; Luxemburg, Belgium, and Holland May 10, 1940, and Russia June 22, 1941, without trying to settle its disputes by pacific means.

WITHOUT DECLARATION OF WAR

3. Hague Convention III of October 18, 1907, relative to opening of hostilities. By attacking the countries named in (2) without a declaration of war.

4. Hague Convention V of October 18, 1907, by attacking the countries named in (2) in violation of their neutrality.

5. Versailles Treaty of June 28, 1919, by rearming, annexing Austria, Memel, Danzig, and Bohemia and Moravia in Czechoslovakia and by building up the size of the army, navy, and air force.

6. United States-Germany treaty signed at Berlin, August 25, 1921, "that Germany did, at various times in March 1935, and thereafter, repudiate various parts of part V, military, naval, and air clauses of the treaty between the United States and Germany restoring friendly relations by creating an air force, by use of compulsory military service, by increasing the size of the army beyond treaty limits, and by increasing the size of the navy beyond treaty limits." The wording of this clause is the same as that of charge 5, as the American-German treaty contained similar military clauses to those in Versailles.

LOCARNO TREATY CITED

7. Locarno treaty of mutual guaranty between Germany, Belgium, France, Great Britain, and Italy, signed October 16, 1925. By occupying the Rhineland March 7, 1936, training forces, and building up fortifications there and by invading Belgium.

8. German-Czechoslovak arbitration treaty signed at Locarno October 16, 1925. By invading Czechoslovakia March 15, 1938.

9. German-Belgian arbitration convention signed at Locarno October 16, 1925. By invading Belgium without negotiation.

10. German-Polish arbitration treaty signed at Locarno October 16, 1925. By invading Poland without negotiation.

11. German-Netherlands arbitration and conciliation convention of May 20, 1926. By invading Holland without warning.

12. German-Danish arbitration treaty of June 2, 1926. By attacking Denmark.

UNITED STATES ATTACKED DECEMBER 11, 1941

13. Kellogg-Briand renunciation of war pact signed at Paris August 27, 1928. By attacking Poland, Norway, Denmark, Belgium, Luxemburg, Netherlands, Greece, Yugoslavia, Russia, and the United States. The date for the attack on the United States was given as December 11, 1941, when Germany declared war.

14. German-Luxemburg arbitration treaty of September 11, 1928. By attacking Luxemburg.

15. German-Polish nonaggression declaration of January 26, 1934. By attacking Poland.

16. Assurance given Germany May 21, 1935, that inviolability and integrity of Austria would be recognized. By invading and annexing Austria March 12, 1938.

17. Austro-German agreement of July 11, 1936. By forcing Austria to yield its sovereignty through acts of aggression between February 12, 1938, and March 13, 1938.

18. Assurances given to Netherlands by Germany January 30, 1937, April 28, 1939, and October 6, 1939, of respect for neutrality and territorial integrity. By attacking Holland.

19. Assurances given similarly to Belgium on above dates and on October 13, 1937. By attacking Belgium.

20. Assurances given to Czechoslovakia March 11, 1938, and September 26, 1938. By making further territorial claims on Czechoslovakia after cession of Sudetenland.

CZECH TERRITORY ANNEXED

21. Munich agreement of September 29, 1938. By annexing Czech territory March 15, 1939, and failing to join in a guaranty of Czechoslovak boundaries.

22. Assurances given to Norway September 3, 1939, April 28, 1939, and October 6, 1939, of respect for independence and sovereignty. By attacking Norway.

23. Assurances given to Luxembourg April 28, 1939, and August 26, 1939, of respect for neutrality and territorial integrity. By attacking Luxembourg.

24. German-Danish nonaggression treaty of May 31, 1939. By attacking Denmark.

25. German-Russian nonaggression treaty of August 23, 1939. By attacking Russia.

26. Assurances given to Yugoslavia October 6, 1939, of respect for neutrality and territorial integrity. By attacking Yugoslavia.

ALLIED CHARGE NAZIS OUTDID HUN FORBEARS AS LOOTERS

As plunderers and despoilers the Nazis made their Hun forebears look like pickpockets and Halloween pranksters.

The allied war crimes indictment released yesterday indicates that on many occasions the Nazis simply demolished what they couldn't carry off. But what they carried off was plenty. For instance:

"The museums of Nantes, Nancy, old Marseilles were looted. Private collections of great value were stolen. In this way, Raphaels, Vermeers, Van Dycks, and works of Rubens, Holbein Rembrandt, Watteau, Boucher disappeared. Germany compelled France to deliver up the Mystic Lamb, by Van Eyck, which Belgium had entrusted to her."

MILLIONS OF BOOKS CARTED AWAY

From Kiev, the Germans carted away more than 4,000,000 books, magazines, and manuscripts, many of which were very valuable, and a large number of artistic productions.

Many valuable art productions, 100,000 valuable volumes, and 70 cases of periodicals and precious monographs, were stolen from Riga.

It was not only in art that the Nazis occasionally showed good taste. For example, they removed 87,000,000 bottles of champagne from France.

All told in France, German plundering from private enterprise approximated 257,020,024,000 francs, or $5,140,400,480 in United States money at the current exchange rate, and 55,000,100,000 francs, or 1,100,002,000 from the state. In addition, from June 1940, to September 1944, the French treasury was compelled to give Germany 631,866,000,000 francs, or $12,637,320,000.

The Germans also extracted millions of tons of raw materials, great quantities of industrial equipment, agricultural produce and manufactured products from France.

DWARFED BY RUSSIAN FIGURES

But the French loot figures are dwarfed by those of Russia. In state prices of 1941 the Soviet Union estimates its material loss at 679 billion rubles. At the diplomatic exchange rate that figure would be $56,560,700,000 in American cash.

In describing the looting in Estonia alone the indictment mentions the removal of 10,000 works of art, immense quantities of agricultural stock, including horses, cows, pigs, poultry, beehives, and agricultural machines of all kinds.

Much of Russia's material loss represents destruction, and the Nazis seemed to be even better at that than at plunder.

For example, they destroyed 427 Russian museums, including those of Leningrad, Smolensk, Stalingrad, Novgorod, and Poltava. They wrecked 1,670 Greek Orthodox churches, 237 Roman Catholic churches, 67 chapels, and 532 synagogues.

The Nazis seemed to take particular delight in wrecking monuments of culture, dear to the Soviet people. Thus, they destroyed the estates and desecrated the graves of the poet, Pushkin, and the writer, Tolstoy.

They wrecked the museums of Tchaikovsky, the composer, and Repin, the painter.

These acts are recorded in the indictment because they are violations of The Hague regulations of 1907, the laws and customs of war, the general principles of criminal law, and the internal penal codes of the countries where they were committed.

The Outstanding War Record of the Eight Jansen Brothers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1945

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the membership of the House will be interested in the correspondence and information I am including herewith. John H. Jansen, who resides in my congressional district, in Junction City, Kans., has had eight sons in service in this war. Every one of them has an outstanding record of achievement. Two of them have recently been discharged—one on account of wound received in action, the other with 150 points to his credit. Six are still in the service.

Mr. Jansen has asked me to join with him in requesting The Adjutant General of the Army to grant furloughs for these sons, if at all possible, so the eight brothers may meet in the home of their parents in Junction City at Christmas time for a family reunion that is so well earned and to which they are entitled. I am glad to join with Mr. Jansen in this request, and trust it may be granted. Here is the correspondence, also the names and brief record of the service of these distinguished servicemen:

JUNCTION CITY, KANS., *October 12, 1945.*
Hon. EDWARD H. REES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Subject: Emergency furloughs and leaves.

DEAR MR. REES: I am attaching a copy of my letter to The Adjutant General, requesting that orders be issued returning my six Army sons for a Christmas celebration this year.

I know that so many parents will not have the good fortune to meet their sons this Christmas. However, I am sure you will understand the situation presented by my age, and the fact that duty may still prevent any reunion in future years.

I am sure that I can rely on your assistance in making this reunion possible.

Sincerely,

JOHN H. JANSEN.

JUNCTION CITY, KANS., *October 12, 1945.*
The ADJUTANT GENERAL,
Washington, D. C.

Subject: Emergency leaves and furloughs.

DEAR SIR: I respectfully request that your office issue instructions or orders to the commanding officers of the units of my six sons,

who are now in the United States Army, enabling them to join me in a Christmas celebration this year.

I am now approaching 70 years of age and we have had no family reunion in 15 years. During the period of war, I underwent the strain and hardship of all parents whose sons were in action. Due to my advanced years, I deeply desire to bring my family together one more time, under favorable circumstances. I feel that I have earned the right to this request by virtue of the number and services contributed by my sons.

I have had eight sons in the service during the war. One in the Navy, who has received a medical discharge due to wounds received in action; one has been discharged from the Army with 150 points. Six of my boys have seen active fighting duty; one is in training; the other is classified limited duty, and has served with distinction in his assignment in the States; three have been decorated. They are stationed in Okinawa, Japan, Europe, and the States. I know that the problem of transportation is paramount. I also know that the heart of the Army is large enough to understand my situation, and to assist me in my effort to gather my sons together in a reunion of thanksgiving for our victory and our good fortune.

Since all of my sons are members of the Regular Army, and since all intend to reenlist, it is improbable that Christmas of 1946 will prove a more favorable opportunity. Attached is a list indicating the names, serial numbers, and addresses of my six sons still in the Army. The local chapter of the VFW is assisting me in preparations for a fitting celebration.

Your promptness and your consideration of a favorable reply are deeply appreciated.

Very truly yours,

JOHN H. JANSEN.

Clarence T. Jansen, captain Field Artillery, Separation Center, Fort McPherson, Ga. Over 15 years service.

Earl F. Jansen, master mechanic first class. Medical discharge June 19, 1945. Over 9 years service.

Raymond T. Jansen, lieutenant Infantry. San Francisco, Calif. Over 10 years service.

Alfred J. Jansen, sergeant Cavalry. Discharged with more than 150 points. Over 10 years service.

Anthony H. Jansen, lieutenant Cavalry. Reconnaissance Company 634 T.D. Bn. APO 403, care of Postmaster New York. Over 6 years service.

Edward H. Jansen, captain Headquarters 315 B. W. APO No. 182, San Francisco, Calif. Over 6 years service.

John J. Jansen, sergeant 28 Photographic Reconnaisance Squadron APO No. 903. San Francisco, Calif. Over 3 years service.

Louis A. Jansen, AC P. A. A. F., Pecos, Tex. Over 2 years service.

NOTE.—Of all this service not 1 day has been lost under the 107 Article of War.

Federal Aid to Scientific Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, at the meeting this week of the board of trustees of Princeton University, the president of the university, Harold W. Dodds, will present a report in which he discusses the implications of bills pending before Congress to implement postwar scientific research programs. This report is so timely and so relevant to the present discussion of scientific research that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The experience of the war has immeasurably enhanced the significance of science for both national security and human welfare. The raw truth is that America must pioneer in science more than ever before or be destroyed. On the other hand, the rapid technological advance during the war is but a quick preview of what is possible for human welfare and happiness with peace. If we do not wreck our civilization in the process we can have a world vastly better than we now enjoy.

It is important to remember that the developments of the war revealed little or no new theoretical knowledge. The atomic bomb was rather a practical application of known theory than the discovery of new basic knowledge. Scientists say that the war developments have about exhausted the existing stock pile of unapplied theoretical science. It is wise, therefore, to assume that the next war will be won through the application of abstract scientific discoveries undreamed today but packed with great practical possibilities as they unfold.

These are not fanciful assumptions. They are so real that America will ignore them at the risk of her life.

It is well known that in engineering and technology America leads the world. It is not so well known that we have not led the world in basic scientific research. It was European scientists, for the most part, who made radar and atomic bombs possible by their pioneering work in most abstract theory, which to all practical people had no contact with real life. All practical people know better. To save herself America must lead, not follow, in research in fundamental science as well as applied science. In scientific discovery she must end her servitude to other peoples. To do so she will have to match or exceed the sums spent on science and engineering (for the two must always be associated) in Russia or any other country. Other nations will pour large amounts of public funds into this work. What will America do? The answer touches some deep issues.

There are several bills before Congress to implement postwar scientific research programs. Hearings are beginning on them at this writing. President Truman has urged on Congress the creation of a single Federal research agency to support and promote research in science and social science. Some of the clearest thinking on the subject of natural science appears in the report of July 1945 of Dr. Vannevar Bush to the President of the United States. This report is a strong case for science. On the whole, and with some qualifications, its conclusions are irresistible. It calls for Government aid reaching the sum of $122,500,000 annually within 5 years. It proposes that Government subsidize the education of thousands of young scientists. It recognizes certain dangers in the policy of governmental grants which it recommends, and suggests safeguards against them. However, many who have had experience with political processes will not be able to agree that new governmental gadgets alone will be adequate safeguards against some real dangers. No mechanisms will overcome the deeply grooved channels of political habits and outlook, unless public opinion is more alert to evils and abuses than it has been in the past.

Scientists are practically unanimous that the most fertile soil for basic research is in the universities. By the force of circumstances much of the scientific research of government and industry will continue to be an immediate problem of practical need. But our greatest national shortage has not been in this sort of research. Our hope for long-term investigation of a fundamental nature, in which we have been deficient, rests with university faculties and the students they discover and develop. It is in the university, or the nonprofit research institution, that the scientist enjoys the fullest freedom of inquiry, liberty to roam at will where science calls. Government and industry, writes Dr. Bush, are "dependent upon the colleges, universities, and research institutes to expand the basic scientific frontiers and to furnish trained scientific investigators." Modern scientific developments are making it more necessary for the theorist to be in touch with the practical man, and Government and industry will contribute to our stock of theory; but the universities should remain our chief reliance. Moreover, it is worth noting that, of our universities which made the most significant contribution to science between the last two wars, the privately supported institutions, as a group, were the most outstanding.

But the costs of research in the new age of science will be tremendous, beyond what the universities have spent in the past or can hope to attract in the future from private sources exclusively. Yet, it is highly desirable that the private university continue to secure gifts and endowment for research. It will destroy the peculiar function of private universities if they cannot continue to rely heavily on private donors, who have always been more sympathetic to basic scholarship than Congress or State legislatures. Strong private universities are as essential to the progress of science in America on the one hand, as public assistance is on the other.

To meet the new costs and to keep faith with donors, the universities must give up wasteful competition and overlap of facilities and cooperate. This calls for greater interchange of faculty, for cooperative planning in laboratory construction and for common utilization of expensive undertakings, such as the now famous pile required for research in atomic fission. In addition, it is important that industry recognize that the universities must prosper if science is to prosper, and be willing to support them by gifts and access to their laboratories and facilities. Both industry and science will profit, because the old short line between pure science and applied science is dissolving into a wider twilight zone.

The cost and scope of scientific research being what it is, even to meet defense needs alone, the private institutions must be ready to receive public funds, for it is not to be expected that hereafter they will be able to find themselves the large amounts they will need from private donors. But they must remember that in accepting public funds there are attendant dangers to their freedom and function to be faced and overcome. The first is that our law makers prefer to make appropriations to useful purposes which produce immediate practical awards. To offset this preference and to maintain the prestige and life of basic science, the private institutions will require larger gifts from private sources. It is these sources which in the past have been more sympathetic to academic scholarship than Government has been, and I predict that they will continue so. After all, contributing to nonpractical research, in both science and the arts is a cultivated taste.

A second hazard in accepting public funds, a danger familiar to all who have tried to raise money for charitable or educational purposes, is the tendency of private gifts to dry up whenever Government enters the field with tax-provided contributions. This is so natural as to have almost the force of natural law, and strong efforts will be

required to overcome it. In the last analysis the best guarantee that a university can have for its own freedom will be the amount of its own money at its disposal.

A third hazard is politics and bureaucracy in the accepted American sense. Neither politics nor bureaucracy encourages the free-roaming mind. In recent years you were called a Fascist in advanced circles if you remarked that the evils of the spoils system and log-rolling for appropriations still survived in Government. But the flat truth is that they do survive, strong and hearty, although in the normal processes of Government we have been able to absorb them without ruinous results as yet. But if these blights on democracy are permitted to taint Federal appropriations for scientific research they will retard rather than advance science.

How can the traditional forces of spoils and log-rolling be beaten and turned back? The mechanism generally proposed is some form of a national research agency to receive and disburse appropriations and to buffer between politics and science. Anyone familiar with our political habits and the inward workings of American Government will realize that this is much easier said than done. The Bush report proposes a national research foundation to manage the funds. It outlines mechanistic safeguards as complete as one could devise to assure scientific freedom. But more than mechanics are required if the safeguards are to work. Fundamental changes in public tolerance of certain political habits are essential. England succeeds through her University Grants Committee in disbursing funds without political taint, but her fiscal procedure, which in turn reflects a government organization and political practices different from ours, makes this possible.

The point for the privately supported university to remember is that its freedom to apply itself to fundamental, theoretical research in an atmosphere of free inquiry that nourished pursuit for abstract truth, will not be guaranteed solely by governmental mechanisms. In the last analysis, the ultimate guaranty must be sought in an informed public opinion and in the universities' capacity to provide a substantial proportion of their resources themselves. They must be equally alert to see that contributions from industry do not divert them from their long-time programs of basic research.

Finally, of prime importance, is the question of the effect of large appropriations of tax money for science upon other fields of scholarship and education. In particular will the effect be to siphon away from the social sciences and the humanities a disproportionate share of young talent? "Science," stated the Moe committee on the discovery and development of scientific talent, "cannot live by and unto itself alone." Indeed, the development of atomic fission calls for more rather than less attention to social science and the humanities if the destructive power of the new energy is to be stopped from running amuck in the world.

The Bush report approves the program of the Moe committee for the eventual expenditure of $30,000,000 annually to discover and develop scientific talent in American youth. Both reports point out that the war has caused a large deficit in the supply of science and technology students. It proposes to rectify this by searching out young talent and enabling it to take up science as a career. Through Government scholarships it would make it economically possible for young people to promise to become scientists who otherwise could not afford the expense.

At least one prominent scientist has declared that large public grants to science will not retard the growth of arts and letters. He points out that Russia pays great attention to science, yet that country is famed for its artists and composers. But assuming that arts and letters can thrive in a totalitarian atmosphere (which is surely debatable), Russian experience proves nothing for America. Perhaps it only proves that distinguished authors and composers develop best in an aristocratic society. Old Russia produced some famous ones, and while the order of the ruling classes was upset by the Communists, modern Russia is still organized on the aristocratic principle.

It is more realistic to assume that large public subsidies to scientific research and education will, if left to themselves, increase the relative prestige of science as an attractive career and will drain off talent from other lines unless positive steps are taken to prevent this result. While Government scholarships for science will discover and train heretofore hidden talent, they will also tend to divert young brains from other subjects which need them badly. This will be bad for science as well as for civilization.

Those who believe that we must nourish with greater resources the social sciences and the arts and letters if civilization is to endure must be prepared to work and to give to make them live. President Truman has recommended Government aid for basic research in the social sciences. Others will question this easy solution. What is proper here for the physical sciences is extremely dangerous for the social sciences and humanities. The dangers of political control are multiplied manyfold. Here the calm objectivity of science is not attainable. When it comes to human values and political ideolcgies. the private university can brook no interference by the Government as we now operate in America, even the subtle influence of appropriations divorced from raw political pressures.

Thus, we concluded that Government must aid science, if only as a means of national self-preservation; that theoretical, basic research belongs with the universities and must not become utterly dependent on Government; that public aid for science is in danger of affecting adversely other fields of learning; that the crisis thus created cannot be met by extending governmental aid to the social sciences and arts and letters in which opinions and values form so large a part; and, finally, that the crisis can be met only by enlarging from private sources the resources of these other fields, and by substantially improving the excellent of their teaching and the sweep of their influence.

OPA Controls Peril Yule Set Making

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "OPA Controls Peril Yule Set Making," by Bill Bailey, published in the October 1, 1945, issue of Broadcasting.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPA CONTROLS PERIL YULE SET MAKING—SEARCH FOR INFORMATION IS DISCOURAGED BY AGENCY

(By Bill Bailey)

Unless the Office of Price Administration acts quickly to (1) lift controls from radio parts or (2) fix price ceilings, there'll be few radio sets on the market by Christmas, unemployment will be rampant in the manufacturing field and the public must wait until some time next year for promised receivers.

That's the consensus of opinion among manufacturers after weeks of bickering with OPA. Radio Manufacturers Association has requested action. OPA has countered with demands for cost production data. Manufacturers say they can't give such data because of the peculiarities of the radio set-making industry.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, Republican of Indiana, former head of the Capehart, Indianapolis (now the Capehart division, Farnsworth Telegraph & Radio Corp.), manufacturers of combination radio-phonographs, is carrying on a one-man campaign in Congress to break down the OPA resistance to industry. Said Senator CAPEHART: "Unless the OPA does something soon, there won't be any radio set manufacturing and thousands of people will be unemployed."

Despite flat assertions of OPA officials that they'd "give no information," Broadcasting learned that the OPA through the "back door," has assured manufacturers that on October 3 price ceilings will be set on parts and receivers. Efforts to confirm that at OPA led to a merry-go-round of buck passing.

Earl Morse, head of the Parts Pricing Division of OPA who is supposed to know what's coming next, was too busy to see a representative of Broadcasting. His secretary advised the reporter to submit his problems in writing. When the reporter informed her he was seeking information, she curtly replied: "You won't get it here."

After further insistence the secretary agreed to permit James Hoyt, assistant to Mr. Morse, to talk to the reporter, but cautioned him, "Mr. Hoyt won't tell you anything." While waiting for Mr. Hoyt, the secretary wanted to know if the reporter would talk to E. O. Lang, another assistant to Mr. Morse.

"I'll talk to anybody who can give me some information and answer a couple of questions," said the reporter. "Well, Mr. Lang will see you but he won't give you any information," was the secretary's response.

Mr. Lang prefaced the interview with: "I might as well tell you I'm not going to tell you anything." Nevertheless, he was plied with these questions: "Is it true that OPA will set price ceilings on parts on October 3? Does the OPA plan to lift controls on radio sets or parts? Does OPA know that manufacturers won't turn a wheel until OPA gives them something definite?"

COULD ANSWER

"I could answer all those questions, but I'm not going to," said Mr. Lang. "Talk to Mr. Gesner in our public relations department. He'll give you all the information we want the public to have. We have orders not to talk."

So to Paul D. Gesner in public relations. Mr. Gesner explained the whole situation, said the industry parts advisory committee had asked OPA to lift controls because controls had been lifted on automobile parts. But OPA had decided otherwise.

To date only 35 manufacturers of the some 500 in the radio field had complied with OPA's request to file cost production data so no interim ceilings could be given them. None of the large manufacturers had cooperated.

To Mr. Gesner were put the same questions which Mr. Lang could answer but would not. Would Mr. Gesner confirm that on October 3 OPA would give manufacturers something definite?

That's something Mr. Gesner hadn't heard about. All the information he had was contained in three releases issued since June, the latest on September 18, advising manufacturers of all radio and radio-phonograph parts (except tubes, metal stampings, screw machine products, and cabinets) they were authorized to make delivery of original

equipment parts to set manufacturers at prices that "may be adjusted upward later when final reconversion pricing factors are determined."

He explained that no manufacturer may use adjustable pricing unless he has filed with OPA a list of the prices he actually used in March 1942, in sales of original equipment parts for radio receivers, electric phonographs, and radio-phonograph combinations. As for the questions, however, Mr. Gesner said he wished he could answer them—but the Parts Section hadn't given for publication any information other than that already released.

INTERIM FACTORS

On August 31 OPA issued a set of interim increase factors, based on meager cost production data submitted by a few manufacturers. The permanent increase factor on tubes, based on an 86-percent reply, was pegged at 10.4 percent above ceiling prices charged between October 1–15, 1941. Interim factors ranged from 5 percent for resistors and "all other radio parts, as covered by Maximum Price Regulation 136" to 11 percent for coils and transformers and chokes.

Manufacturers complained that the interim factors were too low, so OPA on September 18 issued the authorization for adjustable pricing.

Mr. Gesner suggested the writer should talk to Delmar W. Beman, the trade publication publicity man. Mr. Beman, like Mr. Gesner, was most cordial, gave all the information he had but, like his coworker, knew nothing about the October 3 date.

In a stinging speech on the Senate floor September 20, Senator CAPEHART declared that "OPA price-fixing policies are retarding reconversion and recovery. I make the prophecy," he continued, "that unless we in the Congress do something about it, not too many months from now many millions of men will be unemployed." He inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD letters from the Magnavox Co., Fort Wayne; Electric Appliances Inc., Indianapolis; General Furniture Co., Terre Haute; Edgar Morris Sales Co., Washington, and Meyers & Son Mfg. Co., Madison, Ind., complaining that the OPA is holding up reconversion because of its attitude toward industry and its price-fixing policies.

Meanwhile manufacturers have declared they will not make parts under the adjustable price regulation of September 18, contending that OPA might very well fix prices at less than cost production. Furthermore manufacturers contend they have met with the same kind of opposition Broadcasting did in attempts to gather some concrete information at OPA.

Price Administrator Chester Bowles, in a special article for retailers, said: "A flow of goods to top a growing mass market is the best answer to the threat of inflation and to the long-term prosperity of industry. Radios and big ticket appliances are extremely important among the reconversion goods coming back to the market. Speed of setting prices is important in getting radios and appliances to retail dealers."

Manufacturers agree 100 percent with Mr. Bowles, but they say his own agency apparently doesn't because "speed of setting prices" is something the Parts Section hasn't displayed.

Mr. Bowles' statement said he had compared the radio parts industry with the automotive parts industry, which has been suspended from price control as to original equipment, and "found that the reasons for such suspension do not apply to radio parts." Mr. Bowles fears the small manufacturer might be penalized by his lack of buying power if controls are lifted. On the other hand, small manufacturers argue that price fixing on radio parts certainly could work to the advantage of the large corporations and run the little manufacturers out of business.

Senator CAPEHART declared that manufacturers prospered and served the public long before OPA and he couldn't understand why they need a Government agency to run their businesses for them now.

Republican Program for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech I delivered at Columbus, Ohio, October 19, 1945, on the subject, A Republican Program for Progress, at the sixth annual fall conference of the Ohio Federation of Republican Women's organizations.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Republicans and my good friends, I can't say how much pleasure it gives me to come back again to a meeting of the Republican women of Ohio. It bodes well for the future of the State that so many can meet together and applaud the fundamental principles of Americanism which are represented in the Republican Party. It is a sign of peace that we are able to gather here again the great numbers from all over the State who are always brought together by one of these celebrations organized by Katharine Kennedy Brown.

1. THE ADMINISTRATION HAS NO PROGRAM AND NO PLAN

I come from the political arena in Washington to which as yet, no peace has come; and, so far as government is concerned, we have not even recognized the cessation of hostilities. We face new problems and new issues, but there is no program and no plan to meet them. Such measures as have been proposed by the administration have little to do with immediate reconversion problems. They are, for the most part, based on New Deal long-range philosophy, and even if they met the approval of Congress, which they usually do not, they would have little effect on the emergency problems of reconversion. We have joined the United Nations Organization, but apparently the current international conferees are unwilling to apply its principles to any of the problems immediately before us. We adopted Bretton Woods, but it now appears that the six billions authorized wholly failed to solve the fundamental problem of world trade involved in the situation of England and the Sterling bloc.

We are asked to provide for full employment and unemployment compensation at the same time, but it does not appear that the refusal of the House to handle these measures has in any way interfered with the reconversion process. Certainly, these bills would not have cured the strikes and voluntary unemployment which is the most serious threat to reconversion today.

We are being asked to provide for compulsory military training (without military service) before any plan has been presented for obtaining the regular Army, Navy, and Air Corps which all agree that we must have in order to make this country invulnerable to attack.

We are asked to reduce taxes and enact countless bills for expenditure without the slightest plan for a permanent postwar budget or any idea whether our expenditures will be eighteen billions or thirty.

In short we are asked to enact slogans into law and leave untouched the practical problems which face the Nation today.

2. A REPUBLICAN PLAN BASED ON LIBERTY

The Republican Party has an opportunity to take the lead in guiding the Nation into a postwar world of freedom and prosperity. It should present forcibly its philosophy and its plans. I have sometimes criticized the economic planners, but it has been a criticism of the particular plans of the New Deal brain-trusters associated with this administration, rather than of the principle of planning.

Any Republican plan ought to be based primarily on liberty, liberty of the individual, liberty of the State and local government, liberty of the people to express their views and wishes through Congress against the arbitrary orders of a Federal bureaucracy. This Government was established in 1776 to secure the blessings of liberty for our forefathers and for ourselves. We have fought two World Wars, not to dominate the world or save other peoples, but to be certain that this Nation remains free from any threat of foreign domination. That must be the key to any American foreign policy.

At home, liberty is the basis of the success which we have achieved in building up the greatest and most powerful nation in the world. We owe our present position in the world, and our standard of living to the initiative, the genius, the daring, and the diligence which can only exist in a system based on liberty. We also plan to afford security and prosperity to our people, but I am convinced that the kind of security and prosperity and standard of living Americans want can only be brought about by liberty of thought and liberty of action. Freedom of opportunity must be our goal rather than security.

We are faced today with all kinds of totalitarian ideas. We have apparently accepted many of the theories of the states which we have conquered. Our people are too much inclined to look to the government for the solution of every problem, and forget the great increase of centralized power which that policy creates. The State must manage everything, it is said, if we are to avoid depression and unemployment. It would be a tragic result if a war successful in assuring liberty from foreign domination resulted in the destruction of liberty by our own action. The thinking of the Democratic administration is dominated today by the policies and thinking of the CIO-PAC, derived directly from Marx via Moscow.

Remove controls

If liberty is the key to peacetime progress, it is time that we declared the end of hostilities and terminated most of the war powers. Some small part of those powers will have to be continued to meet very special emergency situations, but they should be reduced to a minimum in taxation, in price control, in selective service, in rationing, in restraints on international trade, and in a multitude of smaller controls.

Adjust taxes

Taxes must be adjusted to a peace basis in such a way that there may be no discouragement to the expansion of business and the establishment of new business. Only thus can full employment be achieved. The tax system must be one which does not reduce the full reward heretofore given by our system for individual initiative, ability, hard work, and willingness to risk time and money for future success. That involves the complete repeal of the so-called excess-profits tax.

Labor policy

A labor policy should be adopted providing for a permanent machinery for conciliation, and a board to examine the issues in labor disputes which cannot be conciliated, and

give the public an impartial decision as to the merits of the disputes. Certainly the principle of collective bargaining can only be strengthened by forbidding strikes during the life of a collective bargaining agreement, and requiring arbitration of issues which arise only on the interpretation of such agreement.

Balance the Budget

We must establish a sound fiscal policy, based on the principle that we will only spend Government money to the limit of that which we can raise by a sound policy of taxation, one which will not kill the very business activity to which we look for prosperity. Such a fiscal policy is essential to the confidence necessary for business expansion. The Administration is still dominated by the false philosophy that you can spend yourself into prosperity. Now they have added to it the equally false inflation philosophy that we are better off if we can increase wages, and increase profits, thereby increasing prices. Of course, the key to prosperity is the increase of production. Without that the general increase in wages will be reflected in an increase in prices, and when we finish we are just where we started. No one is better off and the white-collar class is a good deal worse off. The whole theory is just as false as any other panacea of cure by inflation.

An essential of Republican policy must be a reduction of Government expenditures and immediate reduction of all war expenditures. The reduction can be far greater than is now planned and shown in the Budget. We must determine what the absolutely essential postwar expenditures will be for interest on the public debt for the Army, for the Navy, and for the veterans, and refuse to authorize additional expenditures unless a sound tax system can be devised to pay for them. The President's message contained every proposal for expenditure suggested by any pressure group, and since then he has added additional spending projects, like the St. Lawrence waterway, and is now proposing compulsory military training which will cost more than $2,000,000,000 a year.

I believe in some expansion of a public-works program and a considerable expansion in social welfare, but the projects must be carefully selected and held within a reasonable total cost.

While public works have their place in meeting unemployment problems, it is only a minor place. The largest program of public works suggested will cost about five billion a year. That would only put two and a half million men to work. We have to put over 50,000,000 to work. A sound Government policy in the encouragement of private enterprise which makes possible an increase of 10 percent in its activity would put twice as many people to work as the biggest public-works program anyone has conceived of.

Full employment can only be achieved through private enterprise, unless we want a totalitarian state, where the government guarantees everyone a job and everyone has to work where the government tells him to work. Public works ought to be planned. They ought to be speeded up in hard times, held back in good times, but, above all, they ought to be undertaken only if they are worth the money which we are asked to spend upon them. The theory that government spending is a good thing in itself has come to dominate the thinking of many people. In the end it can be utterly destructive of both prosperity and freedom.

3. A SOCIAL WELFARE PROGRAM

General principles

I wish to lay special emphasis tonight on the adoption of a program for social welfare to deal particularly with those who do not obtain under our system the benefits which this country is certainly rich enough to afford. A free-enterprise system must be based on the theory that a man receives compensation in accordance with the value to others of the product of his work. That principle supplies the incentive which brings to leadership those individuals who have extraordinary ability, industry, and initiative. But it also means that, even if we achieve full employment, there may be many the value of whose work will not return to them the income necessary to provide a decent minimum standard of living. There are others handicapped so they cannot work, or can work only on a limited scale. By collective bargaining laws we can assure that men receive the value of their labor and are not subject to economic oppression. By minimum-wage laws we can raise to some extent the standard of the lowest income groups; but if we carry the minimum-wage principle too far, it will result in more unemployment and the shut-down of some types of business activity.

So we have adopted in this country as a supplement to the private enterprise system the principle that we will provide through the State, and through taxation on the more fortunate members of society, a minimum standard of subsistence, of housing, of medical care, and of education for every citizen. The expense of this system must be borne by the more fortunate four-fifths of the population who do not need it. We cannot impose so heavy a burden upon them as to discourage their initiative and activity. Nor can the minimum standards be so high as to destroy the interest of men in securing something better through their own efforts. The prosperity of the country depends upon the activity of the four-fifths. But a country as rich as the United States should not fail to provide a decent standard of living for everyone who is willing to work, or who is unable to work by reason of mental or physical handicap.

In this field of social welfare the expense is so great that State and local governments cannot successfully handle the whole problem, though it is basically a State and local responsibility. In some fields, as in education, the tax systems have been set up to provide a large revenue, and the Federal Government need only supply a small percentage of total funds expended, to be distributed for the most part in States which are so poor they cannot provide a reasonable education. On the other hand, in the field of relief and work relief, if there is any considerable unemployment, we saw in the 30's that the States and local governments were wholly unable to provide the volume of funds necessary. In housing and in health the local tax systems have been set up in such a way that it is very difficult to secure additional funds for any expansion of these activities. In these two fields the need for Federal aid is greater than in education, but not so great as in relief. Dealing with these subjects, there are certain principles to which we must adhere if we do not wish to have a concentration of power in Federal bureaus which can lead directly to a completely totalitarian state.

First. The total expense must not be unfair to the four-fifths who pay the bill.

Second. The initiative and the administration should rest upon the local and State authorities. Local self-government, I believe, is an absolute essential of real freedom. If all the powers exercised by these governments today were centered in Washington, the people would have little to say about countless matters which affect their daily lives. A Federal bureau cannot be made responsible to the people of Columbus, Ohio. People here can't get at the bureaucrats in Washington and they can't get attention when they do reach them. General policies and regulations made for the whole Nation may have little relationship to the particular needs of thousands of different kinds of communities.

It is quite true that if we only help those States and localities which assume some responsibility themselves, there may be gaps in our program. That only means that the people where those gaps exist are getting the kind of government they want and provide for themselves. But it is fair to point out that no Federal program is perfect. It may cover the whole country, but the faults that develop, its mistakes and falacies, often the ideas of a small clique, also cover the whole country.

Third. The standards on which aid is granted should be clearly stated in the Federal statute; or if that is impossible, they should be laid down by permanent regulation. States should know the exact terms on which aid is to be granted. There should be no discretion in the Federal officer to change the rules or favor one State over another. If he has that power, he can practically dictate the administration of the State plan and the policies of local officers.

Fourth. Federal aid should be confined to the lower-income groups.

We cannot hope to eliminate some Federal interference as long as the Federal Government puts up the money. The justification of Federal action is to see that certain minimum standards are provided, and no State can expect to get Federal money without giving the Federal Government some power to require that the Federal money is faithfully applied to provide that minimum. But we can make the rules definite and only give the Federal bureau power to see that the State does comply with rules laid down by Congress or by a board of experts on principles established by Congress.

At the present time we are considering a large number of public-welfare bills. Many violate the principles I have suggested; and if they were all adopted, they would add huge sums to the Federal Budget which could not be raised by taxation. Bills for social insurance like the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill go far beyond the providing of a minimum standard. They reach all or a large proportion of the population, most of whom are already in a satisfactory position under present conditions. The Pepper maternal and child health bill would provide Federal aid for from 40 to 50 percent of the population with few safeguards. In the health field, such action clearly implies the socialization of medicine. I believe a reasonable and progressive social-welfare plan should be based on the following:

Health

1. Health: We have been working on a bill to provide Federal aid in the construction of hospitals. The bill was introduced by Senator BURTON and Senator HILL and the committee has carefully rewritten it to secure many of the purposes which I have outlined. It will provide $75,000,000 a year for 5 years. The Surgeon General with the approval of a Federal advisory council of eight is authorized to make regulations fixing the necessary standards. Every State is encouraged to survey its whole hospital situation and make a comprehensive plan to fill up all gaps and provide adequate hospital service for all its people in all sections. That service may include private hospitals as well as public hospitals for we are anxious not to check or freeze at present levels development of private hospitals. All States and private applicants must match the Federal funds in different proportions according to the per capita wealth of the State. Allocations to each State are fixed for formula. The Surgeon General may not change his regulations for 2 years, and then only with the approval of the Federal Advisory Council. Federal interference with administration is forbidden,

but after 2 years States must provide their own minimum standards of hospital maintenance. If any applicant is turned down, or funds are withheld, he may appeal to the United States courts from the decision of the Surgeon General.

This method of carrying out the hospital program affords the basis for medical-care bills and other bills to extend Federal assistance in some other health fields. Assistance in the providing of medical care should be confined to the group unable to pay for doctor's services, so that there may be no socialization of medicine.

Housing

2. Housing: A subcommittee of which I was chairman reported last summer a comprehensive housing plan. Housing presents problems which are extremely complicated and more difficult to deal with than health or education. It has been suggested that parallel treatment would authorize the Federal Government to give assistance to the indigent poor through the distribution of rent certificates with which they could obtain such lodging as might be available. I have not felt that this meets the situation. It does not get rid of the slums or prevent the development of new slums. A very large proportion of the people, today, do not have decent housing of minimum standards, and unfortunately a discrepancy between the cost of housing and the cost of other commodities makes it difficult for two-fifths of the population to obtain decent housing. The ultimate solution of the housing problem must depend on the lowering of the cost of building homes. But new homes today cost 30 percent more than before the war. There was no manner which I could discover in which homes could be provided in any volume for persons with incomes of $1,200 or less and there are millions of such persons—except by the provision of public housing. It is true that we might adopt some plan of subsidizing private housers to give really low-rent housing, but it would be even more expensive than the present system of public-housing subsidies. Furthermore, I doubt if private housers would care to submit themselves to the continuous regulation required to see that quarters were provided at the necessary low rent.

Our committee recommended a goal of 1,250,000 housing units a year for the next 10 years, 90 percent of it to be private. The only question is whether that number of units can be sold at present prices. The demand exists. We are improving the ability of the Federal Home Loan Bank System and the FHA to provide funds at low rates for private construction. The Government is helping veterans to buy homes with special loans and there should be a huge demand.

For 4 years, we are proposing to authorize 125,000 public housing units a year, 10 percent of the total program, requiring that they be provided only on the initiative of city councils, and only for the income groups who have incomes 20 percent less than those who can afford to pay the rents charged for decent private housing in the city. In my opinion, if the cost of housing can be brought down by technological improvement, we can, in the future, reduce the amount of public housing which may be necessary, but I see no hope for that result in the next 4 years.

I believe the Republicans should support a national program which thus includes both stimulation of private building and a limited amount of public building.

Education

3. Education: I have had great doubt about the advisability of Federal aid to education because the State tax systems are set up to make a liberal provision for education, and it is peculiarly necessary that there be no Federal interference with the education of our children. Every community should be able to give to its children the kind of education and character training it wishes them to have. A careful study of the situation, however, shows that in a number of poorer States it is absolutely impossible for the State, even if it spends a larger proportion of its income for education than does Ohio, to give every child a basic education. This is particularly true of Negro children in the South. Our whole American system is based on equality of opportunity, and certainly we cannot attain that if we begin by failing to provide the opportunity for a basic schooling. I believe, therefore, that a system of Federal aid should be developed, designed to help those States which are making every reasonable effort, but are unable to provide a minimum standard of grade school and high school education; and thus assure such an education for every child in America.

Relief

4. Relief: While we hope that we may always have reasonably full employment, there should certainly be some plan prepared in advance for Federal aid which will avoid the necessity of another WPA. The Federal Government should not itself administer relief. Up to a certain percentage of unemployment, the States themselves are wholly able to provide relief, and all are doing so to indigents today. Beyond that point, the Federal Government should be prepared to step in in cases of serious depression if unemployment compensation allowances have run out and on definite conditions stated in the law.

Cost of program

The whole program I have suggested would not ordinarily cost more than $700,000,000 a year of Federal funds. We don't know what the Federal Budget will be, but it will probably be close to $20,000,000,000. This would not be an unreasonable addition to that Budget. I believe that a possible tax plan could be devised which will raise about twenty-one billion without a dangerous burden. The whole problem should be studied in the light of the necessary expenditures of the Federal Government and the tax assistance required to pay for them. I feel confident that under such a program, wisely administered, we can meet the requirements of the limited number of people who really need Government help, without adopting global schemes which put the Government into every home, into every profession, and into every schoolhouse.

Within sound principles of constitutional government, preserving liberty, a Republican program can stimulate employment and prosperity which will enable four-fifths of the people to assume all their own burdens and responsibilities. The other one-fifth can do the same thing to a large extent, but with varying degrees of Government aid they can reach a minimum standard of living from which they can hope to go on to a full self-sustaining basis.

The New Dealers would use these aspirations as a means of socializing the state. They would try to produce prosperity by fixing prices and wages according to the decree of statisticians and "brain trusters." They would discourage industry by eliminating its freedom. Government competition is already discouraging some industries and plans are being made to extend it into many others. Our program must be a return to freedom, a reduction of regulations, rewards for incentive and risk taking, aid on sound principles to enable the state to assist those unable to provide a decent living for themselves.

The Cheese Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I recently issued in relation to the cheese situation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today, while in the Senate restaurant, one of the restaurant officials inquired of me as to the possibility of getting some good Wisconsin cheese to satisfy the persistent demand of Members of the Senate for that vital item.

I told this individual that there would be cheese in abundance if the Government had helped the Wisconsin and other cheesemakers to get into maximum production of all types of cheese in accordance with the natural laws of supply and demand.

Instead of doing so, the Government has followed an arbitrary, unfair, and unjust policy of not only discriminating against the Wisconsin cheese industry in particular, but of striking against the entire cheese industry of the Nation. There are a number of charges which I made months ago against Government's unfair orders against cheese. Most of those charges still stand. Just what are they:

1. Wisconsin cheesemakers have been denied proper mark-up for direct sales on the service wholesaler and retail basis.

2. Because of OPA rulings, Wisconsin, which produces over 50 percent of the Nation's Cheddar, has been operating under the lowest ceiling prices on cheese in the country. This is due to the infamous Plymouth-plus formula.

3. Entire types of cheese have been priced off the market. Thus, there is no brick and Muenster available throughout the Nation. This has hit particularly the Dodge County area of my State, which for years has produced over 85 percent of the Nation's total output.

4. The Cheddar cheesemakers of Wisconsin are compelled to pay more for their milk than did the Cheddar cheese manufacturers of any other State—and still more important, as I have stated above, the manufacturers of every State received substantially more for the Cheddar cheese than did the Wisconsin manufacturers.

5. Aged and cured cheeses have been priced off the market because the Government would permit no differential in price between cheese as it came out of the factory and cheese that was aged. I think this resulted in the surplus cheese, after what the Government bought, being purchased by the processors and made into processed cheese.

6. Retail sales of Cheddar were limited to 5 pounds maximum. This prevented the sale of the customary longhorn, daisy, etc., directly to the consumer.

7. Sale on the moisture basis carried an inducement to make large-style Cheddar, but it automatically limited their sale to United States agencies or to a processor. The result is that Wisconsin production shifted from 32-percent small styles to about 6-percent small styles under this pricing system.

The justice of these and innumerable other complaints have long been admitted by OPA. Yet no corrective action has been taken. The square pegs in round holes in OPA per-

sist in doing damage to one of the most vital industries not only of my own State but of the dairy States of the Union. I, for one, am fed up with OPA's inexcusable delay in remedying this intolerable situation. We have held meetings, we have exchanged letters, we have sent petitions, all to no avail. The time now is for action, and nothing except remedial action will be accepted by us from OPA.

War Activities of American Red Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I recently prepared concerning the subject of War Activities of the American Red Cross.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I wish to pay public tribute to the workers of the American Red Cross for their humanitarian efforts during the war, particularly in the handling of personal problems and messages of our armed forces personnel stationed overseas. These cases involved considerable correspondence and work on the part of Red Cross overseas personnel and of the chapters here at home. During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945, American Red Cross chapters handled approximately 550,000 cases of various types of armed forces personnel stationed overseas. The monthly total shows a steady increase from a low of 34,056 in July 1944 to 57,047 for June 1945.

We are all familiar with the various types of cases that required this special handling, particularly the emergency type message, advising the serviceman that one of his next of kin is dying and that he is needed at home. These messages increased in volume steadily from 10,742 in July, 1944, to 14,541 in February, and 13,753 in last June. Another type of message is classified by the Red Cross as "not so urgent" involving situations where the serviceman had not heard from home for quite a while or where the folks at home have not heard from the serviceman, requiring an effort to be made to reestablish communications between the people at home and the man in the service. These have run an unsteady course and should be declining now that mail facilities are improving. They total, for example, 12,130 in June 1944; 16,207 in November; and only 10,084 in June, last. The American Red Cross and the local chapters were also of aid and comfort to men in the service in cases involving assistance in financial matters, securing medical care for close relatives, helping with orphan children or delinquents and other similar family problems. These almost doubled during the year and have increased greatly since June. In July 1944 there were only 3,492 and by June 1945 they had mounted to 6,599. In situations where the commanding officers found it necessary to determine the need for emergency furloughs and extension, valuable assistance was likewise given even though it required studying each individual case. The total in July 1944 was only 5,143 but by June of this year it had climbed steadily to 21,688.

The American Red Cross is ideally organized to handle this humanitarian work because local chapters are located in communities throughout the country. Because of the traditional solicitude and care manifested by the Red Cross workers in handling matters of this kind, the serviceman did not hesitate to place these problems in its trust. He knew that if he had a meritorious case, requiring assistance, it would be handled expeditiously and fairly. For the same reason our military and naval authorities knew that they could rely upon the findings and recommendations which were made by the local chapters in the United States after proper investigation had been made.

Subsequent to the surrender of Japan, the Red Cross announced that the overseas service of the American Red Cross will be available to the men with the armies of occupation as long as needed. As I have already stated, the Red Cross chapters recently found that there has been a sudden flood of requests for verification of the need of emergency furloughs. Each of these requires personal attention by chapter representatives, and it has been found that many are made by families under the impression that such furloughs may now be obtained, even though no real emergency exists. According to the War Department, there has been no relaxing of requirements in this respect and the request must be based on an actual emergency which can be materially alleviated by the presence of the serviceman. In some areas overseas emergency furloughs are more difficult to get than before hostilities ceased, due to transportation problems.

The release of prisoners of war and civilian internees liberated from Japanese camps, afforded another opportunity for the American Red Cross to be of assistance, particularly in the handling of messages from home, the furnishing of canteen service, food and clothing, recreational facilities, refreshments, and ministering to the needs of the sick and wounded.

American Red Cross volunteer workers have done a magnificent job throughout the war in treating all of these special problems of the men overseas. We know that they shall continue to furnish these services in the demobilization period because these same problems will continue until all of our men are returned to civilian life. We must continue to give the American Red Cross our encouragement and support.

Criticism of Mrs. Truman by Representative Adam C. Powell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Herb Graffis appearing in a recent issue of the Chicago Times, in which Mr. Graffis states:

Those who are genuinely interested in improvement of racial relations wince at the setback given their sound efforts by the New York Negro Congressman, ADAM C. POWELL.

Then he continues, with reference to Representative POWELL's remarks, as follows:

POWELL mouthed a remark which one hopes is not typical of the judgment of intelligent Negroes when he said: "From now on Mrs. Truman is the last lady."

I wish to assert that everyone acquainted with Mrs. Truman knows that she is representative of the finest type of home-loving women and of American wives and mothers. Every person who reads it and every Member of Congress who knows her resents the statement made by Representative POWELL.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL ARBITER?

(By Herb Graffis)

Those who are genuinely interested in improvement of racial relations wince at the setback given their sound efforts by the New York Negro Congressman, ADAM C. POWELL.

POWELL mouthed a remark one hopes is not typical of the judgment of intelligent Negroes when he said: "From now on Mrs. Truman is the Last Lady."

POWELL'S contribution to bettering relations between American people was made because the President's wife did not see fit to let the Congressman dictate her acceptance of social engagements. Just why Powell considers himself entitled to tell Mrs. Truman what invitations she can accept and can't accept is impossible to figure.

As an authority on ettiquette and simple social decency the record doesn't reveal POWELL to be any too hot. He pushed aside the faithful wife who sweated and denied herself many of the social benefits all women crave. She did this to enable POWELL to have enough money and enough good time to make himself a conspicuous character.

When POWELL did arrive, due in no small degree to the sacrifices his wife made, she wasn't good enough for him. He threw her away and married a talented boogie-woogie pianist to get a glamor befitting his station. Talk about discrimination; the case of the first Mrs. Powell is nothing entitling POWELL to make a loud squawk.

The DAR refused to rent its hall to Congressman POWELL'S glamor wife for a boogie-woogie concert. That action certainly is not in keeping with the principles for which the American revolution was fought. The denial of the hall was generally regarded by level-headed whites as a foolish thing, but not as anything personal.

It was POWELL who introduced the personal element by insulting the wife of the President of the United States. She had seen fit to exercise her personal liberty in accepting purely social engagements. Mrs. Truman was elected to nothing. POWELL, in insulting her, shows arrogance and ignorance that has roiled racial relations.

POWELL, the Harlem social dictator who kicked out a faithful helpmate to go strutting, has not associated himself with Negro gentlemen in his gutter crack about Mrs. Truman. * * * And if he thinks he can tell the wife of any American—white or Negro—where she can go socially, he's just plain goofy.

Homes for Returning Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a very forceful and

sensible editorial taken from the Union City (Tenn.) Daily Messenger, a newspaper published in that splendid west Tennessee town by Mr. Ed. S. Critchlow, a very able, progressive, and forward-looking man. The title of the editorial is "Union City Can't Grow Now," and it concerns the building of homes by veterans who are daily returning from the wars. We are told that nearly one and one-half million young soldiers were married on entering the Army, and when they return all will want homes. Mr. Critchlow has put his finger on an important problem.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNION CITY CAN'T GROW NOW

Union City faces a very serious housing shortage, and because of this situation there just isn't any chance for the population inside the corporate limits to grow.

This is not a new problem for Union City as there really haven't been a sufficient number of houses and apartments here in over 5 years.

But the matter is now more critical than ever before.

Discharged servicemen—many of them—have come back to Union Ctiy, and hundreds more will be returning here during the next year or so.

Many of these men have been in the service for long periods of time, and they are ready to settle down with their families in their own homes. But they can't do it in Union City—and if they can't find homes here, you can bet that a good percentage of them will be looking elsewhere.

The case of Pfc. Robert I. Cox, 36, former Brown Shoe Co., employee, who was discharged at Maxwell Field, September 28, after 3 years in the service attached to the Medical Corps, serving the Air Forces, is typical.

"My wife, Carrie Lee, and son, Stanley, have been living in my absence with her parents, Mr. and Mrs. C. C. Haley, 304 Cheatham Street," the veteran said. "The house just isn't big enough for all of us, and of course we want our own home anyway.

"I've combed Union City from one end to the other and I haven't found a single available place. I even tried to get rooms above a downtown store, but they were already occupied.

"What are we fellows who were drafted into the service, left our families at home, and did our duty to the best of our ability going to do? We come home and can't even find a place to live. We want to stay in Union City but how can we?

"I am not criticizing anyone—all I know is that we can't live here if we can't find places to live."

An application of the Union City Housing Authority for a $400,000 allotment to build some 90 dwelling units here—about half for colored and half for white—was approved in Washington before the war and has been again approved since the end of the war.

"We will build these units, which will be for people with substandard incomes, but due to the planning and red tape which must be waded through, there is little likelihood that a start on the project can be made before a year from now," Bert C. Cox, head of the local housing authority, said today.

It is further reported that Union Citians, who might normally be interested in erecting houses for rent, are not keen about the prospect at this time, because building costs—both for material and labor—are so much higher than before the war.

An Offer To Trade Places

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I bring to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Offer to Trade Places," written by Hon. Edgar Howard, a former Representative in Congress, who is now the editor of the Columbus (Nebr.) Daily Telegram.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OFFER TO TRADE PLACES

One American boy has been in the Army for 3 years, mostly in former Japanese territory.

The other American boy lives on the Atlantic coast, and is a member of the longshoremen's union, now on strike.

The name of the first American boy is GI Joe.

The name of the other American boy is Mac.

G. I. Joe is now on a little island in the South Pacific, engaged in the fight to get back home and see his wife and little boy.

Mac is now in New York, and is a longshoreman on strike against unloading the ships which transport soldiers home from foreign fields.

G. I. Joe makes an offer to trade places with Mac, the striking longshoreman, writing to him as follows:

"DEAR MAC: You are getting to be a popular boy over here, Mac. We have only three news broadcasts a day, but you are always the No. 1 character in the news. I always listen, because I am always waiting to get some news about myself, and sure enough today you and I were in the same news story. Seems like you and your bosses are having a little argument about unloading some ships, so you quit working. That's where you fit into this particular story, Mac. It also seems that the strike is delaying some thousands of servicemen from getting home. And that's where I fit in, Mac; and seeing as we are both characters in the same story perhaps we'd better talk things over.

"I got pretty mad at first, because I'm like that. I like to crab and gripe, but I soon forget about it. By the time I got out my pen and paper to write you a letter I had started to think about your own and my own predicaments, and tried to reach a solution. The more I got to thinking about it the more I thought you should be in my shoes, and I in yours. That's it, Mac. Why can't we trade places?

"You don't want to work, while I sure would like to get back home and go to work. A trade ought to suit us both pretty well, shouldn't it? There's not much to do out here now, Mac, but I think you'd like it just swell. The Nips gave up, and now most of the occupation work is being done by the 'short-termers,' so you would have plenty of time to just sit around, and you evidently like that.

"It isn't bad out here now, Mac. All of these bases have been built up, and it's getting darned comfortable. The medical units must have killed nearly all the mosquitoes ever born, and malaria is not even common any more. The food has really improved in the last 2 years and is getting so it is downright good. Usually you get a case of beer a month and you can see a different movie nearly every night for free. So you can see it isn't very bad any more. Of course, after 2 or 3 years you start getting just a little homesick, but you probably don't believe in that anyway.

"You should not have any trouble in swinging this deal for us, Mac. All you have to do is to go on strike and you can get what you want. I know your job, too, because I've been doing it off and on for quite a spell now. Of course, we don't call ourselves longshoremen. We are just 'dock detail.' We've done a lot of that work for pay all the way up from $21 a month and up, but not very far up. You know all those ships you loaded up back there. Well, we unloaded them over here, so we have had lots of experience.

"Who am I, Mac? I am a chorus of voices—thousands of voices, Mac—thousands of voices that you might be hearing in Nebraska, New Jersey, California, Iowa, and all other States if only there was shipping enough to get us back home. But they tell us that our ship is tied up by a strike. I am the guy you call G. I. Joe for some reason or other, and you have read lots about me and the thousand-and-one reasons why I have been over here helping to fight the war. It's all over now, and I want to get home and get back to work.

"How about trading places, Mac?

"G. I. JOE."

The boy who wrote the foregoing offer to trade places with the striking Mac is a Columbus boy. He has not been able to see his wife and little boy for more than 2 years. His name is Lt. Edgar Howard Rex. God bless him, and bring him home again.

EDGAR HOWARD.

Reconversion of Hudson Motor Car Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, with the eyes of our people focused on reconversion, it is refreshing to find evidence throughout the country of a wholehearted desire to speed reconversion and provide employment. Labor, industry, and Government are all vitally concerned.

A case in point is that of the Hudson Motor Car Co., one of the pioneer independent manufacturers. Its record for quick reconversion clearly refutes any contention that the industry as a whole is not ready to build automobiles.

The press has told the story of how the company planned and carried through its program for quick reconversion. Simultaneously with the end of war with Japan, Hudson entered the market for $40,000,000 worth of materials, the largest order in its 36-year history. It was a display of confidence by a pioneer in the industry.

As early as August 20, the company announced that production would be under way in 10 days. That schedule was met.

On August 30, the first 1946 Hudson rolled off the production line in the presence of Orville Wright, of Dayton, Ohio, first man to fly an airplane, and Col. H. Nelson Jackson, of Burlington, Vt., first

man to cross the country by automobile in 1903. The pioneering of these two men in 1903 had much to do with stimulating our progress in air and land transportation. The event at Hudson focused new attention on how far our country has advanced since 1903, the miracles of progress that have come about, the tremendous facilities that are ours, and the processes through which we have come to be the strongest power in the world.

Due to the significance of Hudson's early plans for production, and the confidence it should give everyone in these trying times, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement made by A. E. Barit, president of the Hudson Motor Car Co., on the occasion of production of the first postwar Hudson, a newspaper article written by him in indicating his confidence that we can and will meet the production challenge, and also a few remarks by Richard Harfst, general manager of the Automobile Club of Michigan, affiliated with the American Automobile Association.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. BARIT. This is a red letter day in the 36-year history of Hudson. For that reason, we wanted a few of our friends to observe the occasion with us. We are happy to have you here and particularly those who have traveled long distances in order that they might join with us today.

The first 1946 Hudson automobile came off the production line this morning. We look upon it as something more than a new automobile. It is a symbol of Hudson's contribution toward the accomplishment of the great task which now faces the country—the problem of getting people back to work.

My partisanship for Hudson does not blind me to the fact that this larger significance is the primary thing in the minds of all of you. Indeed otherwise I would have hesitated to ask Mr. Wright to travel from Dayton to Detroit, Colonel Jackson from Vermont to Detroit or ask Senator FERGUSON and all of you busy people to take time out from a crowded day to observe this occasion.

While our concern about the matter of unemployment at this time is dictated by a sense of humanitarianism and by the thought of the millions of returning veterans, it goes even beyond that. In view of the heavy burden of public debt and other economic and social problems facing our people and those throughout the world, uninterrupted and large volume production is imperative. Only in that way can we effect the eventual orderly discharge of the tremendous obligations facing us. This is a matter of deep concern to every man and woman in the country regardless of their calling.

I am sure that this is recognized by the responsible leaders of labor, the heads of Government who are primarily concerned with industry, as well as by industry itself and that it ranks in importance with other problems of the day. For instance, recognizing fully the importance of the anti-inflation effort, I am convinced that in the public interest it must be administered so that it will not interfere with attainment of volume production.

As we have previously announced, we have set for ourselves an ambitious task. We plan to utilize the entire productive capacity of our plants. This will eventually provide employment for approximately 20,000 people.

This morning many of you visited the end of our final production line to witness the first car rolling off. At this moment a considerable part of that line is filled with cars and bodies. You will remember that this is the famous mile-long line upon which we built airplane wings during the war. The speed that we make in accomplishing our ultimate goal depends upon the constancy of our material suppliers, who, by the way, have many problems of their own getting under way. It also depends upon the far-sightedness of labor generally and their recognition of the fact that unless we do quickly acquire momentum and maintain it, jobs may not be available when they are most needed.

We are fortunate in having with us today the pioneers in aviation and long-distance travel by automobile. They know, better than anyone else, of the production miracles that are typically American. They have seen, through the years, highways filled with automobiles and the skies filled with planes. They know the promise that lies ahead through the old-fashioned teamwork that made our country great.

BLUEPRINTS FOR AMERICA—UNITED STATES INDUSTRY NEEDS FULL COOPERATION

(EDITOR'S NOTE: A. E. Barit, president of Hudson Motor Car Co., today acts as guest columnist for Merryle Stanley Rukeyser, who is on vacation. Tomorrow Mr. Rukeyser will resume his regular column.)

(By A. A. Barit, president, Hudson Motor Car Co.)

Once again our country is faced with the sort of problem which our people look to industry to help solve.

Current predictions of protracted unemployment seem strangely out of keeping with the reputation for speed and efficiency established by American industry during the war. They also seem to discount equally the far-sightedness of labor and our Government's declared intention to abandon industrial controls.

When war threatened, industry was called upon to provide needed munitions and supplies more quickly and in greater volume than was ever done before. In responding, it created a record which was a never-failing source of amazement throughout the war period.

WAR EXPERIENCE WARRANTS OPTIMISTIC VIEW

Now the war has come to a sudden end and once again we hear, as we did in 1941, dire predictions of a long period of distress while industry makes ready to handle its job. But our wartime experience warrants a more optimistic view and, this is most important, a confident resolution to let industry have its head with the fullest possible cooperation of all concerned—the sort of cooperation it was given when it tackled the job of producing for war.

Given this, industry will again surprise those who discount its energy and resourcefulness.

COMPANY APPROACHES TASK WITH CONFIDENCE

Here at the Hudson Motor Car Co. we are approaching our task with confidence, as indicated by the fact that, just prior to the end of the war, we entered the market for approximately $40,000,000 worth of automobile materials—one of the largest single purchases in our history.

This same spirit of confidence at Hudson resulted in past years in a policy of reinvesting earnings in plant facilities. To this policy we owe the fact that we now have one of the best integrated plants in the industry, including a large and completely equipped body plant at a time when such plant facilities are more desirable than money in the bank.

REJECTS RETURN TO SOCIAL EXPERIMENTS

Hudson is ready for the economic march ahead. We see great opportunities and possibilities in our country's enormous productive capacity, wealth of raw materials, millions of waiting customers, and other millions of men and women who are ready to produce so they can also buy and consume.

To face our current task with anything but a confident attitude is equivalent to an invitation to those who espouse the cause of Government intervention in business to bring forward new places of Government planning and control. Certainly, we do not want to go back to the social experiments of the thirties.

Because we start the postwar era with a larger public debt than ever before in our history and face other unprecedented problems, both economic and social, it is more important than ever that we have confidence in ourselves. Yes; such self-assurance is mandatory if we are to continue our way of life, for which we have sacrificed so many lives.

Mr. HARFST. One of the characteristics of the automobile industry since its very beginning has been its high degree of interest in its customers.

The industry has not only consistently built better cars at lower prices, but has also furthered the movement for safer and more efficient highways and aided in the improvement of traffic conditions. In these efforts the Hudson Motor Car Co. has always been to the forefront.

Thus it is a distinct privilege to have a part in this unique event as a representative of the Nation's car owners. The American Automobile Association, founded in 1902—a year before our guests of honer pioneered in long-distance driving and flying—has been dedicated to one basic objective. It is to make ownership and operation wider and wider, more useful for business and for pleasure, more economical from the standpoint of the user, and more free from the standpoint of movement by keeping to a minimum the rules and regulations that would be imposed upon it.

In attaining this broad objective, Hudson, as a manufacturer of cars and the AAA as a service institution for owners, have always enjoyed fine relations. The oval AAA emblem and the Hudson Triangle have always been conspicuous in the progress of automobile transportation.

I was impressed recently by a statement made by A. E. Barit, who has been with Hudson since its very beginning and has carried on the high tradition he helped its founders to establish. Speaking of Hudson's future, he said—I quote:

"We are prepared for future advances in efficiency and design. This industry owes much to engineers who have dared to dream and plan for automobile efficiency, design, and styling, and ease of operation beyond the limits of known horizons. Alertness to advance has made it possible for Hudson, over a period of 36 years, to be first to introduce 80 new developments in the automobile and to hold more than 120 official AAA records for stock car performance and endurance. Incidentally, we are particularly proud of these official records because they offer substantial proof of the solid foundation upon which the Hudson name rests. We are confident that Hudson will hold a leading place among manufacturers in the competitive era that lies ahead."

Mr. Barit, in behalf of the American Automobile Association and the Automobile Club of Michigan, I want to thank you for your great appreciation of the AAA official stock-car records held by Hudson. I want to also commend the fine way in which you have paid a tribute to the engineers responsible for automotive advances. Hudson's confidence in the future has been most heartening to Detroit and a motor-minded Nation.

I am convinced that our wartime experience has strengthened the place of the automobile in our social and economic life. Prior

to the war there was perhaps too much emphasis on the pleasure side of the automobile and too little emphasis on its basic importance in our daily life. This situation has now been corrected. Reliance on vehicles that could not be replaced, the shortage of tires requiring maximum care, gasoline rationing and subsequent interruption of normal driving habits—have all focused new attention on the dominant role of the automobile on every phase of activity.

Hudson is to be congratulated on the speed with which its plant is resuming peacetime production of new cars. As new automobiles roll off the production lines, there will be an increase in the whole economic tempo of the Nation. The automobile industry can indeed be proud that it is leading the way back to normal peacetimes in the same spirit that it turned to providing the implements that achieved victory. It has every reason to be called America's first industry. It's record is one of the first on the wartime production front and first on the peacetime production front.

I am confident that we can look to a new era of automobile use in our great United States and, in turn, a new appreciation of the underlying soundness of our whole pattern of life. It is much-needed. And that fact that today we honor two pioneers is evidence that we have not forgotten the stress and strain of pioneering nor the foundation upon which we have built a structure that has stood the test of time. This occasion of looking to what we have accomplished in the past as we plan and move forward to the future reflects the spirit of Detroit and our country.

Cleavage of the Giants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD of an editorial entitled "Cleavage of the Giants," which was published in the Sun, of Baltimore, on the morning of October 21. The editorial is by John W. Owens, the well-known editor and writer, and is very timely and highly constructive.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLEAVAGE OF THE GIANTS

(By John W. Owens)

The situation is this: The Governments of the United States and of Russia have repeatedly demonstrated their realization of the necessity of cooperation and probably a majority of thoughtful people in each of the two vast nations ardently desires cooperation, but in recent weeks the evidence has pointed to separation and deepened distrust. As affairs have lately been taking shape, the policies of each nation could be construed to be the seeking of strength at the expense of the other.

The statesmen of each nation, of course, speak of principles. Quite possibly the statesmen of each nation do strive amid all the complexities and perplexities of a disorganized world to establish principles by which to guide their diplomacy. Nevertheless, this is true: The American policy in Europe calls for broad, democratic consultation in the making of treaties with the defeated Balkan nations. This policy, if successful, would probably reduce Russia's influence on her western border. The American policy in Asia calls for our dominance in conquered Japan. Manifestly, that would restrict Russia's influence on her eastern border. The Russian policy is exactly the opposite. Russia wishes a narrowed treaty-making policy in Europe. That probably would confirm her strength on her western border. And she wishes the establishment of an Allied commission of control in Japan—in addition to Mr. Byrnes' projected advisory commission. The carrying out of her will in that respect would reduce our strength and therefore increase her relative strength on her eastern border.

The situation is made more troublesome by the fact that the United States claims, in one form or another, islands in the far Pacific as sea and air bases. Our spokesmen base their claims on security and say, with sincerity, that we intend no harm to anyone. But these bases would be within striking distance of Russia's eastern border and, therefore, Russia looks at our program through the eyes of her security, not ours. Reports now circulate that Russia desires Spitzbergen and perhaps other spots in the western seas as bases. In these days of rockets and bombs, we look at this program through the eyes of our security, not Russia's.

This is the state of affairs, despite the talk in each nation of principles. Indeed, because it is the state of affairs, reasonable people in each nation must have care in talking of principles.

For a spate of eloquence on principles—much as principles are needed—might arouse nationalistic egotisms which would blind the people of these vast nations to the self-evident fact policies of each could be construed by the other as a threat in the future. Of all the evils that could befall in international relations at this time, perhaps the worse would be impassioned dogmatism in the United States and Russia on principles when, in sober truth, the principles of each call for clarification. Moreover, in all probability, neither nation will be able to clarify its principes and apply them consistently except as means are found to decrease the threats which each can find in the policies of the other. At San Francisco, the overshadowing problem was to reconcile the search of all nations for the principle of collective security with the search of all nations for individual security. The same problem arises again and again—how to establish principles to govern nations which are sacred.

No sovereign cure for the fears is possible. Cure will be found, if it is found, in the setting of faces by statesmen and people in each nation against division between them and in the fixing of wills in each nation to bridge every chasm that appears. No statesman or citizen who values the next generation will permit himself a word of cynicism. For, by all the signs of our times, war between the United States and Russia would be a global calamity beyond endurance and permanent hostility, short of war, would distort the social and economic life of mankind.

The people of each nation must think of many things. They must think of the fact that their efforts to cooperate are hampered by differences in language, in culture, in philosophy. They must think of the fact that, this being so, any misfortune in the choice of spokesmen creates graver difficulties than usually would result. No reflection upon Mr. Byrnes and Mr. Bevin should be found in remembering that in London Mr. Molotov said the trouble was that the Council of Foreign Ministers was not meeting in Moscow and that Mr. Hull and Mr. Eden were not there.

The people of both nations must think of Russian fear that Germany will be revived under conservative American and British influence as a balance to Russia's power; and of American fear that both Europe and Asia may be the scenes of Russian expansion. They must think of Russia's fear that a Western bloc will be created; and of the West's fear that a Russian bloc will be created. They must think of the atomic bomb which we used without warning—we who stand in Japan, off Russia's shores—and of Russia's ability to match our bomb in a world in which war is without mercy for women and children.

The people of each nation must think of the fact, and never forget it, that if these fears are allowed to get out of hand, they thereby confirm themselves. They become absolute perils.

Atomic Energy Most Important Subject Before Congress

REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, atomic energy is by far the most important subject this Congress, or in fact any previous Congress, has ever had to consider. We will soon have to pass on legislation which will determine the policy this Nation will follow on the future production and use of atomic energy for both military and peacetime purposes. Our final decision will have a far-reaching effect upon the future of our domestic, commercial, and industrial development, and equally far-reaching effect on our international relations with the nations of the world. We must be sure, yes, certain beyond doubt, that what we decide upon will be right.

The future of atomic energy for commercial and industrial power production staggers the imagination. If the ultimate energy of 2.2 pounds of matter such as U–235 is released, it can produce 25,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric power, which equals one-sixth of the total electric power produced in the United States in 1939. Just think what that means in revolutionizing the power industry in the Nation. This same amount of U–235 used as for military purposes in an atomic bomb, releasing its ultimate energy, could destroy New York City. Think what that means. It has been estimated that 80 percent of the ultimate energy of the atomic bomb dropped in Hiroshima was lost because of imperfections in its design, and look at the terrible destruction it wrought with only 20 percent of its strength.

The theory that matter can be converted into energy on a large scale was proved beyond doubt when we detonated the first atomic bomb. Before that it was just a laboratory experiment. Now it is a reality, and we have to deal with it. We cannot sidestep it, we cannot play politics with it, we cannot put it off. Science works faster and much more accurately than politics or Congress. Let us do a good job of this the first time. We may not have the opportunity to correct or amend our errors. It may be too late.

Housing Inflation Is Already Here—Legislation or Immediate Administrative Action Mandatory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, our time to prevent runaway housing prices is running out. Home prices already have jumped 50 percent in many cities. They are up 100 percent over normal value for lower-priced residences in some areas where the situation is very bad. If we are going to do anything to protect our home buyers, we are compelled to take action now. The upward spiral has already commenced and next month may be too late.

England has already moved to protect its home buyers by adopting legislation setting ceiling prices of $4,800 on new houses. I do not advocate anything quite as drastic as that, but the cold facts are that we have done nothing except remove the one control we had which would have prevented the skyrocketing of housing prices.

The Army has already brought 50 percent of United States servicemen home from overseas. Remaining veterans are scheduled for return by next February. One million five hundred thousand of them will be seeking shelter for themselves and their families.

VETERANS FED TO PROFIT-HUNGRY SPECULATORS

Veterans already are walking the streets looking for a place to stay. Some of them are throwing away wartime savings in paying exorbitant prices for second-rate shelter. That is what is happening while we sit here in Washington letting them be fed to the profit-hungry real-estate speculators. We have already waited overly long for proper action to be taken on this matter.

It is my view that legislation should be introduced to control these selling prices if administrative agencies do not take action immediately under the authority now vested in them.

This legislation or an administrative order—I care not what it is as long as it does the job—should include a provision for the pricing of new homes based on current construction costs plus a fair profit for the builder and a fair profit for the real-estate dealer.

On old houses one resale could be made during the period commencing in 1943. Second sales, however, should be set at the same level as the buyer's cost price.

I would make it worth while for both the builder and the real-estate dealer to build and sell houses. On old homes I would not put a limit of any sort on the legitimate owner's right to sell his home at any price he could get, but, if that home should be sold again in a speculative market, we should insist that its selling price should be limited to the second owner's cost price plus the cost of any additions or improvements he may have added in the meantime.

Such a provision would permit flexibility and provide for change of ownership, but it would prohibit speculators from cornering the market and selling and reselling the same house to drive the market upward.

I am firmly convinced that we must take this kind of action in order to prevent a recurrence of the boom-bust period of the 1920's.

I am inserting herewith three letters that are self-explanatory:

GOVERNMENT AND VETERANS TO LOSE

OCTOBER 17, 1945.

Mr. GUS W. THOMASSON,
District Director,
Office of Price Administration,
Dallas, Tex.

DEAR MR. THOMASSON: Unless effective controls are placed on the prices of real estate, including new construction, the GI bill of rights will operate as a political fraud on the returning soldier. He is permitted to borrow $2,000 with which to purchase a home for his young or new family. When he buys a home he finds that he pays $4,000 for a $2,000 home. This will finally result in the actual loss of $2,000.

It is my opinion that these controls cannot be made effective through the OPA; that the only logical way to control the price of real estate and prevent wild inflation in this important phase of activity is for Congress to levy 85 percent income tax on profits in the sale of real estate, and take by taxation all profits in new construction except an allowable 10 percent.

Yours very truly,
W. V. DUNNAM, *Chairman.*

MANY PEOPLE ALREADY VICTIMIZED

DALLAS, TEX., *October 8, 1945.*

Mr. GUS W. THOMASSON,
Dallas, Tex.

DEAR MR. THOMASSON: In regard to the controversy now waxing hot on the proposed ceiling prices on homes, I sincerely hope that you will use your influence in supporting this very necessary measure. The time is already later than we realize. Many helpless people in Dallas have already been victimized. It is the 1919–20 story all over again.

Just across the street from where I live, a home which cost the owner $5,900 18 years ago was sold for $8,500 and it needs a new roof badly. My neighbor of 12 years told me that he didn't have the conscience to ask more, even though the real estate salesman who made the sale insisted that he could get $8,950 just as easily as $8,500. This transaction occurred in July 1945.

I talked with a conscientious real estate man a few weeks ago and he told me that he did not have the heart to participate in a sale where he knows the buyer is getting gypped, and his parting remark was, "I want to stay in business after this thing is all over. I don't want a lot of people sore at me."

I vividly recall that in the year 1919 I built a $5,000 home in Strawn, Tex., at a cost of $10,000. I have never fully recovered from this loss which occurred in a period of my life when I was just getting started. A period in life when one's hopes are high and their judgment limited.

The boys that are coming home now will be just like I was: with a few dollars for the down payment they will want to own homes. Let's not allow their savings to be taken away from them and thereby disillusion them in their finest desire—the ownership of a home.

If there are no safeguards promulgated, everybody, in the final analysis, will lose.

With kindest regards and good wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,
D. H. MACKAY.

PROMISES ARE "SMOKE SCREENS"

DALLAS, TEX., *October 18, 1945.*

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to commend you upon the position taken with respect to the establishment of ceiling prices on homes, as reflected in the attached clipping taken from the Daily Times Herald of Dallas, October 9, 1945.

It is my opinion that any promise made by the real-estate interests and the home builders to keep prices down is a "smoke screen" or camouflage which will be forgotten by them as soon as all threat of price control is eliminated.

Without price control literally hundreds of thousands of helpless people will become victims of these ruthless, money-mad persons intent on serving their own selfish purposes. With a condition of this kind existing how can immediate inflation be avoided?

I do not propose to indict all real-estate people but feel it is safe to say that there are enough unscrupulous ones in the business to disrupt any organized movement toward self-restraint in the matter of prices. I have only to cite the proceedings of their recent meetings to prove this point. In these there is discord and contention now.

You may be interested in two additional articles from the Dallas Morning News of October 17 which are attached hereto.

I submit that we must have price control on the rental of homes and commercial property, new homes and continued price control on all commodities now so affected for a considerable time and trust that you will take strong steps to that end.

Respectfully yours,
W. R. ATKINS.

The Purge That Failed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 19, 1945

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper editorial from the Reporter Dispatch, White Plains, N. Y., which explodes the idea of vote-getting power of certain high-powered pressure groups:

THE PURGE THAT FAILED

Many may have forgotten that in December 1941, the House of Representatives passed the Smith labor bill, prohibiting strikes in certain types of industry, requiring public accounting of union funds, and providing other restrictions highly offensive to leaders of organized labor. The New Deal and the leaders of organized labor announced in advance of the vote in the House that those who voted for it were "enemies" and those who voted against were "friends." They added that an unrelenting campaign would be waged to defeat the "enemies."

The Dunn survey of Greenwich has now, in an effort to determine the accuracy or inaccuracy of claims of a large, solid labor vote, surveyed the results of the campaign against those who voted for this bill. The findings are of interest.

They show that of the 252 Congressmen at that time who became "enemies" of organized labor by voting for the Smith bill, only 17 have been defeated in the 1942 and the 1944 elections, for whatever cause. Those defeated represent less than 7 percent of the "enemies."

On the other hand, of the 136 "friends" of organized labor who voted against the bill, 41 were defeated in the 1942 and the 1944 elections. That represents more than 30 percent of the "friends."

The question naturally comes to mind: Has organized labor really the strength it claims for itself, or rather, to be more exact, have leaders of organized labor the power they claim for themselves? In this connection, the Dunn survey asks another pertinent question:

"The New Deal-labor leader combine has not attempted to further its policies by running labor candidates for Congress. Is it because they do not dare risk exposing the fact that they cannot deliver a labor vote?"

We submit these figures and queries to the attention of Members of Congress who may at present be reluctant to vote their convictions on labor legislation for fear of retaliation threatened this week by leaders of the CIO. Time may yet prove that it is not always the noisy minorities which really hold the balance of power.

Bill To Revoke Charter of the Daughters of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have on October 18, 1945, introduced a bill to revoke the charter of the Daughters of the American Revolution. This organization has by its flagrant disregard of the terms of its charter forfeited its right to continue as a group sanctioned by congressional incorporation.

The power to create is the power to destroy. The DAR exists by virtue of a congressional act of incorporation. The time has now come for Congress to act.

This organization has prospered under the benefits of the public charter. In Washington, it owns an entire city block worth several million dollars. One of these structures is the so-called Constitution Hall. It is a misnomer. It should be called "non-Constitution Hall." By refusing to permit Marion Anderson, distinguished artist, to appear on its platform, and now by refusing to permit Hazel Scott, acclaimed pianist, to appear, it has followed the Nazi ideology of Herrenvolk and Sklavenvolk.

In the Congressional Act of 1896, among the purposes for which the DAR was founded, appears the high-sounding phrase, "securing for mankind all the blessings of liberty." It should read "securing for 'white' mankind all the blessings of liberty."

The DAR has the right, for example, to deposit its collections in the Smithsonian and National Museums. It is privileged to make an annual report to the Smithsonian's secretary who sends it to Congress which has it printed by the Government Printing Office. All these endow the DAR with the character of a quasi public organization.

Beyond doubt, the DAR has some responsibility to the citizens of the United States under these circumstances, and it cannot exclude any particular race or creed from the hall it owns.

Unless Congress acts, Congress would be approving the outrageous practices of the DAR.

The DAR presumably stands for American patriotism. It rebuffs the decendants of Crispus Attucks, the first American to fall in the Boston Massacre, and Peter Salem, the Negro who was first to fire the shot that killed Major Pitcairn, the British officer who started the Revolutionary War.

The ancestors of the DAR fought under the creed of "all men are created equal." Their descendants would pervert that slogan to "Only white men are created equal."

Capt. Hugo E. Rogers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW L. SOMERS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include an article from the Young Democrat on Capt. Hugo E. Rogers, the Democratic candidate for borough president, Borough of Manhattan:

CAPT. HUGO E. ROGERS

It is with pleasure that we give our members the following biographical notes of our distinguished fellow member, Capt. Hugo E. Rogers, candidate for borough president of Manhattan on the Democratic and American Labor Party tickets in the forthcoming city elections.

As will be plain to anyone reading his qualification, the Affiliated Young Democrats have pledged their untiring efforts in the election of an outstanding administrator. Capt. Rogers was born in New York City on November 26, 1899. He attended public school No. 86, Manhattan, and No. 42, in the Bronx, and was graduated from Stuyvesant High School, New York City; from New York University School of Engineering, and from New York Law School. He holds the degrees of bachelor of science, mechanical engineer, and doctor of laws.

PERSONAL HISTORY

He was a member of George Washington Bicentennial Commission, 1932.

Mentioned in Who's Who in the Law in 1937; Biographical Encyclopedia of America, 1940.

Served in the Infantry, United States Army, during World War I, and was honorably discharged as combat sergeant.

Enlisted in the United States Army in World War II, and was commissioned a second lieutenant, November 26, 1942. Presently a captain assigned as acting industrial relations officer, New York Port of Embarkation, Brooklyn, N. Y.

ORGANIZATIONS AND SOCIETIES

Professional

American Bar Association (member).

Federal Bar Association of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut (chairman of committee on coordination and social security legislation).

New York County Lawyers (member committee on State legislation).

Roger Brooke Taney National Memorial Foundation, national vice president.

Formerly a member of A. S. M. E.

Reserve Officers Association of the United States.

Army Transportation Association.

Literary

Academy of Political Science.

Andiron Club of New York City.

Political

New York County Democratic Veterans' Association (member of law committee).

New Deal Democratic Club.

Affiliated Young Democrats of New York County.

General

Improved Order of Red Men (past deputy grand sachem).

Indian Confederation of America (life member and counsel).

Liberty Post, No. 22, American Legion (member).

New York University Letter Club (member).

ENGINEERING EXPERIENCE

Upon graduation from engineering school, I was employed as a draftsman for underground cables and boxes. I worked on this job for a period of 3 months as a squad boss of eight men. I left this position to become a purchasing engineer where I remained employed for a period of almost 4½ years. I resigned in order to take up the practice of law.

LEGAL HISTORY

1. Admitted to practice before the bar of the State of New York, Appellate Division, first department (1926).

2. Admitted to practice in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York.

3. Admitted to practice in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York.

4. Admitted to practice before the United States Treasury Department.

5. Admitted to practice before the United States Board of Tax Appeals.

6. Admitted to practice in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

7. Admitted to practice before the Board of Immigration Appeals and Immigration and Naturalization Service.

8. Member of National Panel of Arbitrators, American Arbitration Association.

LITERARY AND TAX EXPERIENCE

Author of the following books: Minimizing Payroll Taxes (book on Unemployment Insurance), Legal Tax Savings Methods (book on all Federal taxes, including unemployment insurance and old-age benefit), editor in chief for Whitgard Services) a service covering old-age- and unemployment-insurance taxes).

PUBLIC SERVICE IN THE LAW

1. Legal adviser to the Democratic Party in the Seventeenth Assembly District, New York County, 1929, to date of entry into the United States Army (November 26, 1942).

2. Rendering free legal services to the poor and indigent in Seventeenth Assembly District, New York County, 1927–42.

3. Member of the law committee of the Democratic Party, New York County, 1928–42.

4. Special New York State attorney general for elections, without pay, from 1932 to 1938.

5. Counsel and secretary to the majority leader of the Assembly of the State of New York, 1935–36. Entailed interpretations and opinions of all legislation introduced in the assembly during that period; also the preparation of memoranda to the governor explaining some of the legislation.

6. Acting as arbitrator in commercial and labor disputes, heard before the American

Arbitration Association, 1939–42. This was a free service. Members of the national panel became arbitrators by invitation.

7. Acting as a referee to hear and determine disputes, by appointment by the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

POLITICAL OFFICES

Secretary and counsel to majority leader of Assembly of the State of New York for session of 1935.

Special deputy assistant attorney general for elections, 6 years.

MILITARY EXPERIENCE

Stuyvesant Cadet Corps, 1915–18.

United States Army (sergeant) 7 months during World War I.

ROTC New York University (sergeant) 1919–21.

United States Army, commissioned second lieutenant, November 26, 1942; at present, captain in Transportation Corps.

The Newest Wrinkle on Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of State Byrnes' latest stand on Palestine is most disappointing. He said that before a basic decision is made, both Arabs and Jews would have to be consulted. That is what one would call pulling an "Attlee."

Assuredly, Secretary of State Byrnes must know that when the Democratic Party, which almost nominated him for Vice President, promulgated the Palestine plank of the Democratic platform providing for untrammeled Jewish immigration and for the establishment of a Jewish democratic state, the party did not consult the Arabs. And when Attlee, Bevin, and Morrison, in their platform pledges before election, said that the Arabs should get out to make way for the Jews, they did not consult the Arabs.

Consulting the Arabs at this late date is a part of the abominable policy of appeasement, the appeasement that brought us the fake "peace in our time," the Munich Pact, and the nefarious white paper which shut with a bang the doors of Palestine against the Jews.

The appeasement of the Arabs did not help. They revolted against the British in Iraq. The Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, their spiritual leader, caused the loss of thousands upon thousands of American and British lives by his espionage against the Allies. We have here in the United States 2,000 Arab prisoners of war who were part of an army assembled by the Grand Mufti.

Trying to get the consent of the Arabs is exactly what the white paper is. The white paper states that there shall be no Jewish immigration into Palestine without the consent of the Arabs. Trying to obtain the consent of the Arabs is actually dodging this issue. It is as possible as trying to balance two elephants on each ear would be.

Palestine is 10,000 square miles. The Arabian world has 2,000,000 square miles.

The artificially stimulated antagonism of the Arab against the Jew would evaporate if imperial interests would withdraw.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., at the banquet given by the Pan-American Society in honor of His Excellency, the President of the Republic of Chile, Señor Dr. Juan Antonio Rios, at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel, New York City, Monday evening, October 15, 1945:

It is a privilege to welcome to the United States the distinguished guest, who in his person and position symbolizes the firm, strong, functioning democracy of Chile—President Juan Antonio Rios.

It was once my pleasure to visit his great country and I came away impressed by the charm, the cordiality, and enterprise of the Chilean people and with the rare beauty of the landscape and scenery.

But most of all I was impressed by the discovery that in South America there is a nation devoted to the ideology of democracy. I found what to me, I must confess, was a really startling similarity between the institutional life of Chile and the United States. I found a country really ruled by law and not by the arbitrary power of men; with a constitution creating three coordinate divisions of government as here; and with a political liberty equal to our own.

I found a Congress with House and Senate composed of men of high intellectual caliber devoted to their country; and, what naturally interested me, I found political parties engaged as here in the give and take of political controversy.

I learned that while in political campaigns the politicians hammered each other as is the fashion with our own, the elections are legal and honest, and when the polls are closed and the result is known, the defeated accept the verdict of the people and do not sally forth with arms to launch a revolution.

I found complete liberty of the press where those highest in authority are not immune from legitimate constructive criticism; and absolute freedom of speech where men may speak openly their honest thought with no fear of a gestapo or a jail; where citizens may assemble peaceably to express their views of public affairs without interference from the police.

I found a brilliant, perfectly trained army that is thoroughly democratic with no thought of conquest and respected by the people by virtue of that fact.

I found that Chile, like ourselves, had come to the democratic solution in government.

We of this country are familiar with the magnificent contributions made by Chile in the waging of the war. All Chilean raw material useful in war was assigned to the United States alone, and the nitrate and copper mines increased production to meet the needs of the United States Army. When we needed ships to convey our troops across the sea, Chile turned over to us her merchant marine and some of those Chilean ships were sent to the bottom by German torpedoes. In all the war efforts and policies of the United Nations, Chile has stood four-square with us. She was represented with distinction in the Conference of San Francisco by a delegation headed by the brilliant statesman, Joaquin Fernandez; and it is my impression that she was the first nation in South America where the Charter of San Francisco was submitted for ratification. I was very happy to observe, President Rios, that when you were in the White House last Thursday you presented President Truman with the instrument of your nation's ratification of the United Nations Charter. We have absolute confidence in Chile, its people, its institutions, and its President, who is our honored guest.

There have been times, I am afraid, when Chile and South America did not have too much confidence in us. In the days of Chile's war for independence, the swaying fortunes of its armies were watched with the most sympathetic interest by the then young republic of the United States. Jefferson hailed its war for independence as a vindication of our own. Henry Clay in Congress carried on a brilliant fight for the recognition of the South American republics. When about this time the combined reactionary autocratic forces of Europe met in Vienna to shape the world in their own image, those despotic dynasties planned to dominate South America by force of arms and to deprive it of its independence. It was Monroe, one of our great Presidents, who formulated that doctrine through which we pledged that before any despotism from overseas could intervene in the affairs of any country in the Western Hemisphere, it would have to crush the Army and Navy of the United States.

Those, Mr. President, were the days when we of the United States could take pride in our South American policy.

But in later years, when money became too dominant and greed too strong, there was a time, too long prolonged, when great monopolistic enterprises looked upon the southern continent as the happy hunting ground for dividends alone. That was the period of imperialism. And out of that came the policy of dollar diplomacy. And out of that came resentments from our southern neighbors that were as inevitable as the reactions of human nature. This is the period of which we are not proud.

And then, with higher ideals, greater vision, better statesmanship came the repudiation of the policy of dollar diplomacy and the substitution of the good-neighbor policy with which the names of Roosevelt and Hull will be associated through all the years to come.

This means the fraternity of the American nations resting on the recognition of the absolute independence and equal sovereignty of every nation of the western world; it means a program of mutual help and sympathy; it means an appreciation of the legitimate aspirations of each; and that all problems distinctly of this hemisphere shall be solved by all the American nations, acting in concert and in conference.

And so we come back to where we were in the days of the struggles for South American independence, and all the unhappy events of intervening years are blotted out in this new and better day of brotherhood with the nations of the western world. To you, Mr. President, a son of the soil and a self-made man, like most of the Presidents of the United States, we extend the warm hand of comradeship. Through the desperate years from which we have just emerged you directed your country in conformity with United Nations policy and without giving up one essential principle of

democracy. Chile emerges from the most devastating and dangerous years in history without having compromised the democracy for which we fought and stand. And when you see our monuments and shrines, our great pulsating cities, and our fertile farm lands, you will know, from contact with our people, that all this power will be used if necessary for the protection of the liberty and independence of our sister republics south of the Rio Grande.

Mr. President, we are delighted to have you in the United States, and particularly in the great city of New York, and assure you that your visit means much to the people of America and the friendship of our two nations. I want you to feel that you are indeed among friends and that you can depend upon my country and its people to continue the pleasant relations that have existed down through the years, which have meant so much to both nations.

Good luck and God bless you.

Intracoastal Waterway of Louisiana and Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following address on the intracoastal waterway of Louisiana and Texas delivered by Roy Miller, Corpus Christi, Tex., president of the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, at the meeting of the American merchant marine conference and the Propeller Club of the United States, at New York, October 17, 1945:

Mr. Chairman, I have accepted my assignment on this program with some hesitancy and trepidation since I observe I have been placed in the company of experts, at least from the viewpoint of experience in the operation and use of inland waterways. I take some comfort, however, from the definition of an expert, which is that he is "just an ordinary fellow a long way from home." Since my home town of Corpus Christi is only 130 miles from the Mexican border, I am a long way from home.

My activities in respect to inland waterways have been of the promotional variety. I conform pretty accurately to the description I once heard of a promoter—"a fellow who will furnish the water if you will furnish the ships." In my long-time official connection with the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, I may have contributed something toward furnishing the water in at least one of our great inland waterways.

The organization I represent, the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, is the oldest inland waterway organization in the United States. It was founded 40 years ago on the 8th of last August by a group of public-spirited and far-seeing citizens of Louisiana and Texas. The undertaking they determined to sponsor was not entirely new since the idea of an inland waterway "from the Mississippi to the Rio Grande" was first proposed in a report of the Army engineers submitted to the Congress in 1875, 70 years ago. That report recommended construction of a canal from Donaldsonville, La., to Brownsville, Tex., to be achieved by connecting up the many inland bays that indent the coasts of Louisiana and Texas. I am quite sure those adventurous souls who participated in that meeting 40 years ago had no notion whatever that the project they were suggesting would ever assume the proportions of a great national transportation facility. I have no doubt they only had in mind the construction of a local waterway, which would permit the movement of small craft engaged in fishing and local transportation along the immediate coast. However, they builded better than they knew, for, as the years passed, the project attained importance and magnitude. The initial effort resulted in the construction of a little canal with a depth of 5 feet and a bottom width of 40 feet from the Mississippi River to the Sabine River on the Texas border and a project of like dimensions from the Houston-Galveston district to Corpus Christi. This left a missing link between the Sabine district and the Houston-Galveston area and through transportation was of course impossible. It was not long until the inadequacy of this little canal was demonstrated. It served in a limited way to provide some local transportation for the communities it traversed but that was all.

Meantime, the Canal Association continued its efforts by advocating a waterway of adequate proportions which would provide through transportation from the Mississippi River to the Rio Grande. It also insisted that the project should be considered in its relationship to the Mississippi River system since an adequate through waterway would give the coastal sections of Louisiana and Texas direct connection with commercial and industrial centers of the Mississippi Valley. In order that its case to the engineers and the Congress might be fully and forcefully presented, it employed the late Gen. George W. Goethals as its consulting engineer. General Goethals prepared an exhaustive economic report which was most persuasive and potential in convincing the Army engineers and the Congress that the project was economically sound and in the public interest. Accordingly, in the River and Harbor Acts of 1925 and 1927, a canal with a depth of 9 feet and a bottom width of 100 feet from the Mississippi River at or near New Orleans, La., to Corpus Christi, Tex., at an estimated cost of $16,000,000 was authorized. After long delays, due to rights-of-way and bridge difficulties, the canal was completed and immediately began to handle substantial tonnage, much of which moved to and from the Mississippi River and its various tributaries. When the World War, now happily over, was forced upon us, with the indiscriminate and wholesale sinking of ocean ships in the Gulf as well as the Atlantic, the canal was immediately taxed to its capacity to handle an enormous commerce. In a short time, its inadequacy to care for this tremendous tonnage became apparent. The Honorable J. J. MANSFIELD, of Texas, chairman of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, immediately introduced a bill which provided for increasing the dimensions of the canal to a depth of 12 feet and a bottom with of 125 feet and its extension from Corpus Christi to the Rio Grande Valley on the basis of the same dimensions. It also authorized the enlargement of the Intracoastal Waterway east of the Mississippi River to the west coast of Florida to similar dimensions and provided for the construction of a barge canal with a depth of 12 feet across Florida to Jacksonville where it would connect with the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway with a depth of 12 feet, extending north to Trenton, N. J., a distance of 1,026 miles. Congress promptly passed the Mansfield bill and made available necessary funds for construction work. Within less than 2 years from the approval of the bill on July 21, 1942, the entire Gulf Intracoastal Waterway from Carrabelle, Fla., to Corpus Christi, Tex., a distance of 939 miles, was given a depth of 12 feet and a bottom width of 125 feet. Construction of the barge canal across Florida, which was authorized, was not undertaken since in the opinion of the Army engineers its completion could not be insured in time to be of service in the war effort. Now that the war is over, this missing link in a great through waterway from the far Southwest to the north Atlantic seaboard will no doubt shortly be supplied.

Because of war conditions, construction on the section of the canal from Corpus Christi to the Mexican border, authorized in the Mansfield bill, was not immediately undertaken, although Congress made an appropriation of $1,600,000 to initiate it a year ago. Bids are now being asked for and a contract will be let in the near future which will insure the completion of the canal to the Rio Grande within the next 2 or 3 years.

With the enlargement of the canal as authorized in the Mansfield bill, the already large traffic, consisting chiefly of war commodities, assumed tremendous proportions. Crude oil moved in an unbroken continuous stream to the many refineries that dot the coast, especially in the vicinity of Corpus Christi, Texas City, Galveston, Port Arthur, Beaumont, Lake Charles, and Baton Rouge. Millions of gallons of gasoline daily left the refineries by barge for consuming centers in the interior served by the Mississippi River and its tributaries and to the west coast of Florida where it moved by pipe line across the peninsula to Jacksonville. There it again sought barges for transport northward through the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway. Other pipe lines on the Florida coast fed it into the interior of the Southeast. Sulfur, always an essential industrial commodity, produced exclusively in the coastal regions of Louisiana and Texas, also moved by barge to all points available on the Mississippi River system. Indeed, every known commodity susceptible to water transportation moved on to the waterway.

When General Goethals recommended the construction of the Intracoastal Canal more than 20 years ago, he estimated its normal potential tonnage at from 5 to 6 million tons and predicted a maximum of 10,000,000 tons if and when the Mississippi River system was completed. The latest available figures as contained in the report of the chief of engineers for 1944 show that the Gulf Intracoastal Canal handled in excess of 21,000,000 tons. In transporting this enormous commerce, 53,369 barges moved over the waterway.

Remarkable industrial development throughout the entire coastal area from the Mississippi to the Rio Grande has resulted from the construction of the canal. For instance, at the time the Goethals report was compiled 20 years ago, the oil industry, although already an important factor in the economy of the Gulf coast region, had not assumed the tremendous proportions it has since attained nor had the great economies now realized in the transportation of petroleum and its products by water been fully demonstrated. Texas and Louisiana together now annually produce more than half of all the crude oil produced in the United States. Last year, for example, Texas produced 747,790,000 barrels, while Louisiana's production amounted to 129,556,000 barrels. The importance of the petroleum industry in the future of Texas and Louisiana is illustrated by the fact that the total known reserves in the two States amount to nearly 13,000,000,000 barrels, or practically 60 percent of the estimated proved reserves in the United States.

Immense reserves of natural gas extending in an almost unbroken arc from the Mississippi to the Rio Grande provide another keystone in the area's industrial future. In the same territory and immediately contiguous to the canal are great sulfur deposits. Texas and Louisiana together contribute practically all of the crude sulfur produced in the United States. These and

other basic raw materials are already stimulating remarkable industrial development everywhere throughout the canal territory. Great chemical plants have already been established at important places along the canal, notably at Lake Charles, Orange, Beaumont, Port Arthur, Houston, Texas City, Freeport, and Corpus Christi. This rare and ideal combination of raw materials, abundant power, and cheap water transportation create opportunities for industry unexampled anywhere in this or any other country.

These factors of growth which are only beginning to exert their inevitable influence are already at work. For instance, 40 years ago when this association was formed, the total population of the 18 Texas counties contiguous to the route of the canal from the Sabine River to the Rio Grande was approximately 250,000 according to the census of 1920. These same counties according to census estimates for 1943 have a present population of approximately 1,500,000.

I trust I have not trespassed too greatly upon your time and patience in telling you this story of the Intracoastal Canal. Its dynamic influence upon the economy of the great Southwest is just beginning to make itself felt. The war is over and already many of the great industrial plants, in the rich territory traversed by the canal, are getting into peacetime production. Some of them are expanding and enlarging their facilities. As the rivers and streams of Louisiana and Texas, which the canal bisects, are improved for transportation services, as the years go by, vast areas of the great Southwest, rich in natural resources and raw mateirals will take their place in the national industrial picture.

While our intracoastal and inland waterways have already played an important part in our Nation's economy, I have no doubt that their further expansion and development will become a major factor in our country's future growth and progress. Few realize the broad extent of our present inland waterway systems or appreciate the very large volume of commerce they are now handling. Including improved rivers and intracoastal canals, we now have in the United States 26,500 miles of navigable inland waterways. Exclusive of the intracoastal canals, we have along the Atlantic coast 5,800 miles of navigable waterways. Along the Gulf coast we have 4,100 miles; in the Mississippi Valley, comprising the Mississippi River system, 12,000 miles; along the Pacific coast, 1,400 miles, while the intracoastal waterways along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts have a total length of 3,200 miles. These rivers and intracoastal waterways in 1943 carried a total commerce of 198,071,000 tons. Of that amount approximately 30,000,000 tons were handled by the Atlantic and Gulf intracoastal canals.

As our country is the greatest, richest, and most powerful Nation on the face of the earth, so our inland rivers must be improved to the fullest extent of their possibilities and developed into the world's greatest inland waterway system. The economy of water transportation exists in the long haul and so as we add to existing projects, as we integrate and coordinate them into one great system, we add not only to their utility but we enormously increase and augment the economy of their services. The Intracoastal Canal, as important as it is to the economy of my own section, is only a link in an intracoastal waterway system which soon will reach from Maine to Mexico, a distance of nearly 3,000 miles. All that is now required is the completion of the authorized canal across Florida and the construction of the short missing link between Trenton, N. J., and the Raritan River.

South of the Rio Grande, our sister Republic of Mexico is now exploring the possibility of extending the waterway down the coast to Veracruz and probably beyond. Surveys of probable routes are now under way.

In the Mississippi Valley and as a part of its extensive river system, two important and vital projects are now receiving the consideration of the Congress and the Army engineers. Soon a report will be submitted to the Congress on the Tombigbee waterway, which, if approved and constructed, will provide another major outlet from the interior to the Gulf of Mexico at Mobile. Another which in due course is certain to become a part of our national inland waterway system is the proposed canal from Lake Erie to Ohio in the vicinity of Pittsburgh.

Thus raising the veil to the future, we may envision the opening of new and more valuable routes for the interchange of our interior commerce and for its quicker and more economical movement to the sea. Within not so many years, it will be possible for some of the enthusiastic waterway advocates present at this meeting to board a graceful yacht or comfortable houseboat and take a jaunt through a protected inland waterway down the Atlantic coast, across Florida, along the Gulf, and down into the heart of the Republic of Mexico. On the return voyage, the fortunate navigator may journey up the Mississippi, then through the Illinois waterway into the Great Lakes, thence through the New York Barge Canal and down the Hudson to home port without having risked for one moment the dangers of the open sea. On the return trip, if an alternate route should intrigue him, he will leave the Intracoastal Waterway at Mobile, traverse the Tombigbee to the Tennessee, ride that great river to the Ohio, thence through the Ohio-Erie Canal to Lake Erie and back through the barge canal and the Hudson to New York City. On that return journey through the Intracoastal Canal and the Mississippi Basin, many side trips would allure him—a visit to the twin cities of Fort Worth and Dallas at the headwaters of a navigable Trinity, the Red River to Texhoma Lake formed by its impounded waters behind the gigantic Denison Dam, up the Arkansas and the White into the entrancing Ozarks; the Missouri into the far country of the great Northwest, and almost countless other streams that pour into the Father of Waters and make it the main trunk line of a matchless system of potential transportation. These are not the vain imaginings of a visionary. They lie within the range of practical probability, if not certainty, within the foreseeable future.

In this connection, I might observe that many informed persons believe that all of our inland waterways should be standardized on the basis of a minimum depth of 12 feet. Some experienced operators have expressed the opinion that they should be given a depth of 14 feet. In any event, there appears to be sound argument for the 12-foot proposal. The Atlantic and Gulf Intracoastal Waterways now have the 12-foot depth and in the Flood Control Act approved December 22 last, a 12-foot channel for the Mississippi River from Cairo south to the Gulf was authorized. The favorable report on the Lake Erie and Ohio River Canal submitted to the Congress January 23, 1939, recommended a 12-foot depth for that project. Undoubtedly, the 12-foot depth would assure more expeditious and economical transportation than the present 9-foot depth which is standard for most of our inland canals and improved rivers. The proposal should receive the consideration of the Army engineers and the Congress as soon as may be practicable.

In this discussion, I have limited my observations on our inland waterways to the navigation phase alone. In their development for transporation, however, their manifold potential services in other respects should not be disregarded. The program of improvement should comprehend and embrace their development for all useful purposes wherever feasible and practicable. I refer, of course, to flood control, which is an essential part of any adequate navigation program, water conservation and water use for domestic, industrial, and agricultural purposes and hydroelectric power whenever and wherever it can be produced economically as a byproduct. In other words, as we improve our inland rivers for navigation, we should take advantage of every opportunity to extend and develop their utilization for all beneficial purposes. Soil protection, prevention of soil erosion, the development of recreational facilities, protection of wildlife, and many other useful services fall within the scope of the program. It should be prosecuted wherever feasible upon a basin-wide plan and this can be fully achieved through existing Federal agencies. I refer, of course, to the Army engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior, the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture, and the Federal Power Commission. No "superduper," extra territorial or totalitarian agencies such as so-called authorities are necessary to carry out the program. Everything needed to insure the fullest possible development of our water resources for every useful purpose can be accomplished without the surrender of our time-tested democratic processes.

The jurisdiction of the Federal Government in the improvement of our waterways is based upon and limited by the right and duty to improve them for navigation under the commerce clause of the Constitution. Other services which result from their improvement are proper matters of Federal jurisdiction only because they relate to navigation or can be accomplished in connection with and as a part of navigation improvements. For instance, I doubt seriously if the Federal Government has any right whatever to construct and operate a dam exclusively for the production of hydroelectric power. If it is built in a constitutional way, it must be constructed to create or improve navigation. This has been recognized in every authorization made by the Congress for the construction of reservoirs and dams in our rivers. Although there is no navigation at all on the Colorado River in the far Southwest, if you will read the act authorizing the Boulder Dam, you will note that it is based upon navigation and the control of floods. The same, of course, applied to the dams built on the Tennessee River and on the Columbia River of the Northwest, which are used almost exclusively for the production of power. No one can or should object to hydroelectric power development on our rivers but we should not forget that if the job is to be done legally and within the plain letter of the law, the prime purpose must always be navigation and electric power, the byproduct. If this great development program is kept within the jurisdiction of existing agencies at all times under the control of the Congress, we may be sure there can and will be no perversion of the legislative intent. I think there is sound reason to doubt that these constitutional limitations will always be observed if Congress should delegate its duty and responsibility to authorities.

I plead guilty to the charge of being an enthusiast so far as our inland waterways are concerned but submit as justification, if any be needed, the indisputable fact that in the long list of things that ought to be done to insure the future of America, there is nothing more promising or alluring than the development and utilization of our waterways for every useful purpose. Second only to the human resource, our waterways constitute our most valuable national asset.

A Square Deal for the Retailer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a letter written by Inez B. Madsen, of Worthington, Minn., to Chester Bowles, Administrator of OPA, pleading for a square deal for the retailers of this Nation:

OCTOBER 19, 1945.

Mr. CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator, OPA,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: I am writing in behalf of the Benson Furniture Co., to protest the action of the OPA in granting price increases to manufacturers, which increases will have to be absorbed by the retailer.

This action discriminates directly against one group of business—the retailer—and forces him to bear more than his share of the burden. During the emergency we retailers were forced to absorb the 3- or 4- or 5-percent OPA adjustment, without any increase in our selling price, which became in many cases a distinct burden. Now there is talk of a further OPA adjustment, with only the retailer again to bear the burden.

The war years have been difficult ones for all of us and for retailers especially. Merchandise was scarce, our selling price was frozen, the OPA adjustment charge was added on, and our employees demanded higher wages. On every hand our overhead advanced, regardless of the fact that our warehouse had nothing in it to bring onto the sales floor. Yet, in spite of this, we assumed our share of the burdens of the war, working many hours overtime, cooperating in all bond drives and other war work, a duty we were proud to assume.

Now we ask only that the retailer not be singled out and made to bear the burden of a price increase without any recourse. If the manufacturer needs a price increase, then the retailer should be allowed to increase the selling price accordingly. What is necessary for the manufacturer is equally necessary for the retailer.

Private enterprise is the backbone of America. Let us cherish it.

Yours very truly,

BENSON FURNITURE CO.,
INEZ B. MADSEN.

Navy Discharges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying that the brass hats have liberalized their policy of demobilization in both the Army and the Navy during the past few weeks. Nevertheless, it may be interesting to some of my colleagues to know how they pass the buck to Congress on their ineptitude. The following was passed on to me out of a letter written by a lieutenant, senior grade, in the Navy, with over 18 months' sea duty on a carrier in the South Pacific, serving over the period of 1943–44:

Here is one thing that should be brought to the attention of someone for it appears that the Navy is pulling a fast one in an effort to get out from under the criticism that has been rifled its way. The most recent excuse circulated for not lowering the requisite points for discharge is that the Navy cannot let any large number of personnel out until Congress determines what the size of the postwar Navy will be. In other words, the Navy is putting the blame for the snail slow demobilization on Congress. We who are in the Navy are being told, via the scuttlebutt chain, that Congress by being dilatory on this matter is holding up demobilization. I cannot believe this to be the case, but rather lay the blame directly on the Navy for from my observations the delay in demobilization is entirely due to the extreme inefficiency of the separation centers. The tales told by those who have gone through the process of being separated are something to listen to. However, if Congress is at fault then certainly that should be brought to the attention of the public. Whatever the reason for the lack of action, demobilization is really ineptly handled.

The Rural Interest Rate Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the varying interest rates in effect for agricultural loans are very confusing. I list some of these loans in the following letter to the Honorable CLIFFORD R. HOPE, one of two delegates from the House to the FAO conference at Quebec:

OCTOBER 8, 1945.

Representative CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLIFF: I note in the press that Mr. Paul Appleby, Assistant Director of the Budget Bureau, is to accompany you as an advisor to the FAO conference in Quebec.

Two years ago in December Mr. Appleby called at my office and told me and a visiting constituent some of the agricultural problems of the world. During the conference the discussion entered into the field of need for a world farm credit organization. It was pointed out that in Yugoslavia and other European countries the farm interest rates were high. I remember mentioning the fact that our own agricultural set-up was most assuredly due for repairs.

If the FAO does take up the question of farm credit I wish to call your attention to the following farm credit facts in our country.

1. Farm loans based on 65 percent valuation are made at a rate of 4 percent interest.

2. Farm loans based on 75 percent valuation are provided at a rate of 4½ percent interest.

3. Loans made under the Bankhead-Jones Act for 100 percent valuation are made for 40 years at a rate of 3 percent interest. In addition an average of $300 per farm is appropriated from public funds to find a Bankhead-Jones borrower a farm and still other public funds are used to service these Bankhead-Jones loans and call on borrowers.

Some of the nonagricultural thinkers in the USDA are now talking about credit on terms of "open end note and a zero rate of interest." Just what type of loans these are to be I do not know but I presume it means nonrecourse loans made according to the opinions of some bureaucrats and not made on ability to pay and without the embarrassment of any interest rate.

It would then not be surprising to see some New Dealer introduce a bill to provide a 150 percent loan and if the borrower would promise never to pay any of it back he would be guaranteed the loan without any interest whatsoever.

From 1930 to 1940 about 100,000 foreclosures were made by the Federal land bank. The reason these borrowers could not pay the interest was, as you know, due to adverse weather conditions and to the fact that we had below-cost farm production prices. The amount of the loans was relatively small as they averaged approximately $3,000 each.

While this foreclosing was going on the New Deal was buying 30,000 farms for people who had never before owned a farm. Ten percent of them were in one State, Georgia, although the loans were supposed to be made, according to law, on the basis of farms and tenants. Nearly one-half of these loans were made in five southern States. The result is that these States have a large number of 3-percent loans and the farmers in the cut-over regions of Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and other sections have the opportunity of paying 50 percent more interest or 4½ percent even though they made a down payment of 25 percent on their farms.

4. It also should be borne in mind that $25,000,000 was appropriated by the Seventy-ninth Congress to buy farms for nonveterans at 3 percent interest while under the GI bill most farm, home, and business loans are all made at a rate of 4 percent or more interest.

5. I understand from a member of the Veterans Committee that at present it would be necessary for a veteran to pay a rate of 8 percent interest if he wishes to secure a farm, a home, or a business in Alaska, under the GI bill.

6. In 1939, after 7 years of the much heralded "more abundant life" there were more foreclosures of Federal land-bank loans in Wisconsin than ever before in the history of the Federal land bank.

So, if Mr. Appleby or any of the delegates from other countries present a world farm-credit plan of too low interest rates I hope that you will have in mind the fact that we have an obligation to correct the interest rates paid by veterans and that it would not be desirable to set up a world farm credit rate that is lower than the 4½ percent that is being extracted from the thousands of farmers in the United States who have a 25-percent equity in the farm.

Sincerely yours,

REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in addition there is a 2-percent rate for the irrigation interests and a 2-percent rate provided for REA borrowers. These varying interest rates and the whole rural loan set-up is due for a constructive legislative approach. There is also the 5 percent interest rate on rehabilitation loans in the picture as well.

Occupation Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, the following interesting article was written by Cliff Stratton, Washington correspondent for the Topeka Daily Capital, in his column entitled "I See That."

It seems almost unbelievable that the United States authorities would turn over to the Russians the plates from which occupation money in the form of marks was printed. You will note by the article that these marks were redeemable at the rate of 10 cents per mark. This article seems almost incredible and many would doubt its veracity were they not the words of John W. Hanes, former Under Secretary of the Treasury. The article has further verification from a correspondent of the New York Times.

The conversion of the occupation marks into United States money should be a very profitable venture for any nation.

CLIFF STRATTON'S "I SEE THAT"

Monetary Notes, by William E. Spahr, a publication from the Economic National Committee on Monetary Policy, issue of October 1, says:

"Upon his return from Europe, John W. Hanes, one-time Under Secretary of the Treasury, reported in the New York Journal-American of September 9, that the United States authorities had turned over to the Russians the plates from which occupation marks are printed, that 'the Russians are running hog-wild with the marks their presses are turning out on a mile-a-minute basis,' that these marks are not redeemable in the Russian ruble but are redeemable in the United States dollar at the rate of 10 cents per mark, and that the United States Treasury (really the United States taxpayer) is being milked rapidly and to a degree yet unknown.

"'But you can't blame the Russians,' Mr. Hanes said. 'They were smart. You can blame our own stupidity and nothing else. Who wouldn't spend someone else's money?'

"Mr. Hanes could not tell the exact circumstances under which the Russians cajoled the Americans out of the money engraving plates. But, he said, it went something like this. Once the Americans and Russians met in Berlin, the latter immediately levied a demand for the plates.

"Conference after conference was held on the subject. Each wound up with the Russians politely but firmly asking, 'But where are the plates? For a while the Americans were adamant—and then they yielded. The Russian printing presses began rolling. The spending orgy—and inflation—was on.

"'The net result was as obvious as can be,' Mr. Hanes said. 'The Tiergarten resembled nothing so much as a busy day at the Belmont betting windows. The Russians, naturally, will buy anything you have to sell for any amount. They have nothing to lose.'"

Various confirmatory and some qualified reports have been sent from Berlin following the Hanes exposé, comments Mr. Spahr, in Monetary Notes, "but nothing seems to deny the general accuracy of the situation as portrayed by Mr. Hanes."

And proceeds to quote from the New York Times of September 14:

"It is a fact that the Russians received plates for the printing of occupation marks identical in every respect with those used by the western allies, except that the Russian-produced notes bear a dash mark before the serial number. No restriction was placed on the amount of occupation currency any power could issue. * * * In the first month of Berlin occupation troops of the Second Division sent home something like $3,000,000 in excess of their pay. This represented the proceeds of the sale of watches, cigarettes, chocolate, and fountain pens to Red Army soldiers."

And in the New York Times of September 15 Raymond Daniell, in the concluding paragraph, discussing this situation said:

"So every soldier who succeeds in changing them (Russian printed marks) into dollars is conducting a one-man raid on Uncle Sam's Treasury because he is exchanging worthless paper for real American dollars."

The Creed of a Typical American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article which appeared in This Week magazine, issued as a supplement to many of the Nation's newspapers on Sunday, October 14, 1945:

"HARRY TRUMAN SAYS—"

HERE'S THE CREED OF A TYPICAL AMERICAN

President Truman, people say, is just an average American. Certainly he is no spellbinder, no fire eater. And yet because he is an average American, and talks the language and expresses the faith of the average American, you will hear more and more people saying: "Harry Truman says—" Here are some of the things he has said:

"I am confident that the average American can use his most precious heritage—common sense—in the solution of the pressing problems of the day.

"I wonder if it may not be such wholesome characters as Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn who will, as symbols, show the world our undying contribution to civilization. * * * They are our people and our lives.

"I like to think of our State of Missouri as situated near the heart of America, and politically—like its physical counterpart—as leaning toward neither extreme. Bitter experience has taught Missourians that it is disastrous to permit either radicals or reactionaries to obtain control of our political affairs.

"I have little patience with those who concoct fancy and plausible schemes out of thin air, ignoring the lessons of the past.

"There is no substitute for facts. When the facts are clear and are known, unbiased men do not differ as to conclusions.

"I personally am a firm believer in individual incentive, and I believe that this country reached its present development as soon as it did largely because there was free play for individual initiative. * * * But we all know that individual initiative when unregulated is abused. That is why every civilization develops law.

"The profit motive of our economic system, I think, is superior to any other system the world has known.

"There must be, and is, ample room in this country for every citizen to have the right to achieve and progress according to his capabilities and his industry and integrity.

"I believe in the brotherhood of man; not merely the brotherhood of white men, but the brotherhood of all men before law. I believe in the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. In giving to the Negroes the rights that are theirs, we are only acting in accord with our ideals of a true democracy.

"The future of America depends upon the character and quality of our youth. The primary problem is one of home training, general education, and character building.

"I believe in an adequate national defense program. I think that the old Puritan who prayed regularly for protection against the Indians was much safer when, at the same time, he prudently kept his powder dry.

"For every Government service rendered the bill must be met by taxation. Most people want all the benefits and service, but want them for nothing.

"Today America has become one of the most powerful forces for good on earth. We must keep it so.

"Thousands of our brave fighting men will never return. The least we can do in respect to those heroes is to make sure that no selfish group will ever again be permitted to plunge the entire world into war. America's heroic dead would not want empty honors in bronze nor statues of marble. The only monument worthy of their great sacrifice is a much better world—a world blessed with just and lasting peace.

"If any nation would keep security for itself, it must be ready and willing to share security with all. That is the price which each nation will have to pay for world peace.

"When the people of the world fully realize that the public welfare is the supreme law, we may at last have real peace on earth, and good will toward all mankind."

Ring-Around-the-Rosy by Navy Brass on Guam Doesn't Get Us High-Pointers Home, Says Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the following letter was received from a group of naval men on Guam Island, now classified as essential. I have brought the matter of replacement to Secretary Forrestal's attention, but I also want my colleagues to have the benefit of the information given me:

JOINT COMMUNICATIONS ACTIVITIES,
NAVY NR 926, FPO,
San Francisco, Calif., October 1, 1945.

Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
United States Congress.

MY DEAR SIR: As of this date, no man from joint communications center on Guam has been discharged under the point system, which is a month and a half old.

About 125 men were eligible as of August 15, and with the allowance for overseas time, an additional hundred or more are now entitled to discharge.

Many of us were not trained for communications but slapped in here in a hurry to win a war, and we now learn that we have become "essential" and can't be released without qualified replacements. We were not qualified when we came here, but it didn't take us long to become essential—once the war was over.

During the past 2 weeks over 500 new men have arrived and they are billeted in improvised tents as there is no room for them in the barracks. This is putting an additional drain on the chow, which has certainly been nothing to brag about and has become even worse since Nimitz' headquarters returned to Hawaii.

We would like to know why 500 men can't replace 200 and soon learn to become "essential" as we did—and just as quick, particularly in view of the fact that the traffic has decreased over 50 percent since hostilities ceased and can more than amply be handled by the men not now eligible for discharge.

Is it essential to order officers' liquor at a higher precedence than a Red Cross message notifying someone of a death in his family? Any consideration shown by our Representatives in getting us home will be greatly appreciated.

Yours very respectfully.

A Salute to a Soldier: Brig. Gen. John J. Kingman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on October 20, 1945, Brig. Gen. John Jennings Kingman retired for the second time from active service in the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, his tasks completed. Four years ago, nearing his sixtieth birthday after continuous military service of over 40 busy years, he voluntarily retired to inactive status. Up to that time his career had covered not only the peacetime execution of important public works, but outstanding service and military achievements of the highest order in the First World War and in subsequent General Staff work. In December 1941, in the emergent need for carrying out the more-than-ever vital civil functions of the War Department under the steadying hand of experienced officers, the Chief of Engineers immediately recalled him to active duty, and General Kingman, being first of all a soldier, cheerfully resumed harness and undertook the exacting tasks assigned, which he has performed throughout the war years with exceptional ability.

General Kingman, himself the son of an outstanding engineer officer, his father having been Chief of Engineers, was born in Omaha, Nebr., June 18, 1882, and was appointed to the United States Military Academy from Tennessee in June 1900. From West Point he was graduated high in his class and thus earned one of the coveted commissions as lieutenant in the Corps of Engineers before attaining his twenty-second birthday. From that time on his career has followed the active, varied and colorful pattern that has come to be identified with the experience of the typical Army Engineer. As most of us realize, a combat officer cannot always learn how to fight by fighting, but an engineer officer can and does learn how to build by building, and the solution of many a war problem has been worked out in the peacetime construction of public works. The successful engineer officer has to do not only everything any other engineer can do, but he also has to do everything any other combat officer can do. Although that covers a lot of ground, General Kingman's fine record shows the accomplishment of all these duties with distinction.

General Kingman's peacetime assignments have ranged all the way across the country and to the Philippines and European countries. But the river and harbor project in which he takes most satisfaction is, I believe, the Cape Cod Ship Canal, which materially shortens the coastwise steamer lanes between Boston, Providence, and New York. With characteristic energy and thoroughness, General Kingman took over this job, improved the design and completed the work ahead of schedule and below the estimated cost of the project.

He has always taken particular interest in projects for connecting existing waterway systems so that the public may derive maximum benefit from the transportation routes thus provided. As senior member of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, which the Congress rightly considers its own advisory body, he has consistently kept the interested committees informed as to the technical and economic aspects of proposals for improvements for navigation, flood control, and other public uses of our water resources. As chairman of the board, in hearings held to develop local aspects of river and harbor projects, he has presided with unfailing courtesy, fairness, tact, and firmness, tempered always with a relieving sense of humor. Those who are too eager for favorable reports on questionable projects, however, have found his attitude more than a little to the firm side of center.

Although General Kingman's citations and medals attest the high regard in which his abilities are held by his superior officers, the final test of a commander is the opinion of his subordinates. In that respect the General has reason for complete satisfaction. He has always been prompt and generous in acknowledging his dependence upon the diligence and loyalty of the men under him, be they enlisted men of the engineer battalions or engineers and economists forming the civilian staffs of the boards over which he has presided. And I have ample evidence that he has earned their universal approval, respect, and affection. I can pay no higher tribute to the record of a soldier.

The 90-Percent Parity Floor Prices in Relation to World Agricultural Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the 90 percent of parity floor prices to which the Congress has been committed by legislation must have consideration if these commitments are to be fulfilled. I include the following letters written to our colleague, the Honorable CLIFFORD R. HOPE, who is one of the two delegates from the House of Representatives to the F. A. O. Conference at Quebec:

OCTOBER 6, 1945.

Representative CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLIFF: I note in the press that there is to be a meeting of the World Food and Agriculture Organization in Quebec, Canada on October 16, and that you have been selected to attend. I wish to congratulate you.

As one who supported your position when this legislation was before the House I feel free to write you openly as to some of the facts that should be kept in mind and brought out at this world conference.

I wish to call your attention to the promises made by the Congress to the food and fiber producers of the United States in the first Price Control Act and in subsequent legislation.

While the basic commodities, such as cotton, wheat, rice, corn, and peanuts, have basic legislation with loan provisions of 90 percent parity, with the exception of cotton which has a 92½ percent parity, we also under this legislation provide for the 90 percent parity floor for certain crops and farm products during the war and 2 years after the first January 1, following the end of the war. These crops and products include the following: American-Egyptian cotton, butterfat, chickens (except chickens under 3½ pounds and broilers), dry beans (specified classes), dry peas (specified classes), eggs, flaxseed for oil, hogs, milk, peanuts for oil, potatoes, soybeans for oil, sweetpotatoes (cured), turkeys.

In addition to the above we have the other crops and products which have a support program although they are not classified as coming under the Steagall amendment, as follows: Barley, fruits for processing (apricots, peaches, pears, prunes, raisins), grain sorghums, hay and pasture seeds (specified kinds), naval stores, rye, sugar beets, sugarcane, vegetables for canning (snap beans, sweet corn, green peas, tomatoes), winter cover-crop seeds (specified kinds), wool, oats.

It appears that it would be very fitting that the agricultural experts of other countries be advised of these commitments already made by the Congress to the food and fiber producers of our own country.

Sincerely yours,

REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress.

IS THE UNITED STATES TREASURY TO BE USED TO PUT A FLOOR PRICE OF 90 PERCENT PARITY FOR ALL THE AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS OF THE WORLD?

OCTOBER 6, 1945.

Representative CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLIFF: Supplementing my previous letter I wish to call your attention to page A2001 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD whereon you will find a table which shows the leading farm crops and the parity prices as figured by the present parity formula.

This table also shows the parity prices which would prevail if the Pace bill, which includes farm labor, should become law.

It further shows the estimated world prices of these leading agricultural products, and the present and proposed duty under the new Reciprocal Trade Treaties.

One glance at this table will show that the guaranteed 90 percent parity floor for domestically produced agricultural products, so far as the principal farm products are concerned, exceeds the world prices plus the proposed duty.

If the Pace bill, which has again passed the House committee and which previously passed the House, should become law and we have a floor price based on the Pace concept of parity, which includes giving consideration to farm labor, we will be facing a situation all the more embarrassing. In other words, we will have to support the world prices for agricultural products, which might be based on 90 percent of present parity prices or which may be based on 90 percent of the Pace parity prices.

Sincerely yours,

REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress.

QUOTA ON IMPORTS: SUPPLEMENT THE SMOOT-HAWLEY RATES—THE NEW DEALERS MAKE POLITICAL CAPITAL OVER THE SMOOT-HAWLEY ACT BUT THEY ERECT MORE TRADE BARRIERS THAN WERE EVEN IN EXISTENCE

OCTOBER 6, 1945.

Representative CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLIFF: I am taking liberty of calling your attention to the fact that it might be well to have in mind that there has been considerable interest evidenced in the establishment of quotas on agricultural products that can be imported into the United States.

At this time it appears that only some 125,000 bales of cotton can be imported annually, which is a rather small percent of the ten to twenty million bales produced in the United States.

You are familiar with the quota on cattle, 225,000 weighing above 700 pounds and 100,000 weighing less than 200 pounds. There is no quota on the importation of dairy cows, but legislation to this effect can be expected to be introduced since there is no valid reason for differentiating between the two classes of cattle.

There is a quota on the importation of potatoes of 1,000,000 bushels a year, beginning September 1, except when the domestic production falls below 350,000,000 bushels a year, then the quota is increased.

There is a quota on the importation of whole milk which is only 3,000,000 gallons. This is a rather insignificant amount when one hundred and ten to one hundred and fifteen billion pounds are produced in the United States each year.

Legislation has already been introduced to put a quota on the importation of butter. Similar legislation has been introduced to put a quota on cheese. The other farm products which do not have quotas at the present time will have legislation introduced establishing quotas on them as well.

I realize that you are familiar with the quota on wheat imports, 800,000 bushels, which is only one-tenth of 1 percent of our annual wheat production. This import quota has been placed on wheat in addition to the 42-cent duty, as provided in the Smoot-Hawley Act. In fact, millions upon millions of bushels of wheat would have been imported during the war on which duty would have been paid if it had not been for the limitation or quota that was in effect.

What will the attitude toward quotas be at Quebec?

Sincerely yours,

REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress.

Central Valley Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in his address to the Congress on September 6 President Truman called attention to the necessity for the further development of our great natural resources. In that connection he declared that "favorable consideration should be given by the Congress to Federal reclamation projects as outstanding opportunities for returning veterans," and declared further that—

We know that by the investment of Federal funds we can, within the limits of our own Nation, provide for our citizens new frontiers—new territories for the development of industry, agriculture, and commerce.

* * * * *

We know that we have programs, carefully considered and extensively debated, for regional development of the Columbia River in the great Northwest, the Missouri River, the Central Valley of California, and the Arkansas River.

With respect to the Central Valley project in California, I wish to call your attention to the action taken at a meeting recently held in San Francisco. In attendance at this meeting were some 300 delegates, representing about 60 organizations in the State. The delegates went on record to deplore the conflict in authority which has been established in developing the project, and endorsed the program of the Bureau of Reclamation. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two newspaper articles which give an account of this meeting:

[From the Sacramento Bee of September 10, 1945]

PARLEY PREFERS CVP CONTROL BY RECLAMATION UNIT

SAN FRANCISCO, September 10.—The Central Valley Project Conference today is on record favoring the construction of the Central Valley project by the United States Bureau of Reclamation rather than the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

This stand was taken late Saturday after Col. Lester F. Rhodes, Sacramento district Army engineer, and R. S. Calland, Sacramento region director of the bureau, explained their plans for water development in the Central Valley. Both speakers agreed the CVP should be developed from a multiple purpose standpoint but offered different philosophies on how it should be undertaken.

REPRESENT 60 GROUPS

The CVPC gathering, attended by approximately 300 persons, representing more than 60 organizations, scored the "antagonism between the two agencies in their conceptions" and said in its resolution "this divergence of plans can only result in a hideous botch of the project."

In addition to advocating bureau control of the project, the conference went on record urging Congress to vote an appropriation for Shasta Dam transmission line and the stand-by plant at Antioch. The bureau considers the facilities necessary to carry out its power distribution program in the central valleys.

VOTE IS UNANIMOUS

The action of the resolutions were announced by George Sehlmeyer, of Sacramento, master of the California State Grange, who presided over the conference. He said the votes on the resolution were unanimous.

Sehlmeyer declared plans were completed for greatly expanding the organization to work to carry its program to completion.

The conference approved a report by Robert Read, conference consultant, which said the Army engineers consider each flood control and navigation project as "an isolated unit," while the bureau has an "over-all plan."

A conference statement of policy declared: "The Army engineers' report shows that they cannot develop the Central Valley of California in such a manner that all of the natural resources may be used for the benefit of the people.

"They have no coordinated plan for the interchange of water or power from one section to another.

"They do not contemplate the development of power at the higher dam sites.

"The reclamation report shows clearly that they have a coordinated plan that covers the whole Central Valley.

"Under their surveys and construction, all the water will be conserved for the use of irrigation and, inasmuch as two-thirds of the arid land is in the south end of the valley and the rest of the water is in the north end of the valley in the Sacramento Basin, it is of the utmost importance that this water and power be interchangeable.

"* * * We feel that the construction and administration must be placed under the Reclamation Bureau and that there be no dual operation of any of the individual parts of the development."

VIEWS GO TO CAPITAL

Sehlmeyer declared the organization "offered no objection" to the building of "purely flood-control" dams by the Army engineers. He said the views of the group were telegraphed to the Rivers and Harbors Board of Engineers, which was scheduled to open hearings today on the Army engineers' comprehensive plans for the Central Valley.

Sehlmeyer reported the immediate objective is to "straighten out—not confuse" CVP issues and for that reason the organization took no stand on the Grange master's proposal for a three-man authority to administer the project.

Those attending the meeting represented the American Federation of Labor, Congress of Industrial Organizations, State Grange, California Farm Bureau, Presbyterian Synod, Catholic Rural Life Council, Western Dairymen's Cooperative Union, and other organizations.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of September 9, 1945]

FARM GROUP OPPOSES ARMY CVP CONTROL

California's 15-year plan for developing water resources in the Great Central Valley should be directed by the Bureau of Reclamation and not Army engineers, members of the Farmer-Labor-Consumer Association resolved yesterday.

The association's delegates, after hearing R. S. Calland speak for the bureau, and Col. Lester F. Rhodes for the Army, voted to urge President Truman and Congress to give the Reclamation Bureau charge of the project.

George Sehlmeyer, master of the State Grange, declared that the Army's report "shows that it cannot develop the Central Valley project in such a manner that all of the natural resources may be used for the benefit of the people."

Calland told the 250 delegates attending the conference that the Reclamation Bureau's plan for development over a 15-year period would provide:

1. A million additional acres of arable land through irrigation and reclamation.

2. A million kilowatts of low-cost power for electric-power use.

Calland said that the Bureau's plan is based upon developments provided for by appropriations of $360,000,000 already made. Of this sum, $160,000,000 has already been spent. The plan also, however, contemplates an additional appropriation of $572,000,000 to complete the entire project.

Busy Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Indian summer, that delightful season of the year when, in normal times, Michigan lovers of the outdoors drive down the country roads, admiring the unexcelled beauty brought to the forests and the roadsides by nature's incomparable artist, Jack Frost; when thoughts turn to the gathering of nuts and apples to be stored to add to the enjoyment of family gatherings around the home fireplace this coming winter, or to trips to the fields with gun and dog; or listen for the thrilling calls of the Canadian geese on their southward flight. Congressmen in Washington have no room for distracting thoughts or for the planning of ways and means of recreation, which might do so much to restore our serenity and clear-thinking.

So-called full-employment legislation; unemployment compensation—$25 for 26 weeks; demands that the minimum wage be increased from 40 to 65 or 75 cents per hour be enacted; almost innumerable requests for Federal appropriations for almost every conceivable purpose; pleas from industrialists and businessmen from home, who are hindered in their efforts to bring about full reconversion by OPA regulations and strikes; wires and letters from servicemen, their relatives and dependents, give the people's Representatives no time for self-pity or frivolous, though entertaining, activities.

More than 1,000 CIO members have been in Washington asking—at times, demanding—that their Representatives vote for a flat 30-percent wage increase, which beyond question would also increase the cost of living, add to the price of everything you buy; that all employers be required to pay not less than 75 cents per hour; that we put into law their demand that all unemployed, who cannot get a job at suitable wages, hours, and working conditions, be, for 26 weeks, paid $25 a week. Labor's legislative representatives, appearing before our committee, estimated the number of unemployed would be 8,000,000. Twenty-six weeks times $25 per week times 8,000,000 unemployed equals $5,200,000,000.

Our committee heard witnesses who insisted that, unless private enterprise brought about full, regular employment at satisfactory wages, the Federal Government step in and appropriate enough money to create suitable jobs which would give all who are unemployed, useful, full-time employment at a remunerative wage, which Mr. Cowan, representing Philip Murray, of the CIO, said should be not less than $3,000 per year. He estimated the number who would be unemployed at not less than 8,000,000—$3,000 times 8,000,000 unemployed makes $24,000,000,000.

Britain is insisting upon a loan or gift of $6,000,000,000. Russia wants a like sum. UNRRA is coming along for several hundred million. The House just voted $703,000,000 to establish airports throughout the country. And none of the foregoing touches expenditures for customary, necessary Federal activities—$41,903,000,000.

Many Congressmen, like myself, have more than one committee assignment. Last week, one committee, of which I am a member, heard witnesses speaking for William Green, Phil Murray, chambers of commerce, national, industrial, and commercial organizations; while, at the same time, the Labor Committee, of which I am privileged to be a member, was hearing Henry Wallace on minimum wage legislation. The House was also considering important legislation. One day there were five roll calls, necessitating trips from committee rooms to the House Chamber. In addition, there were piling up in the office the telegrams, letters, and phone calls from those who wanted their men home from the Army and Navy.

In addition, there was a very important hearing of the Smith committee, which, among other issues, had before it the right of OPA to revoke—after the manufacturer had increased obligations to more than $200,000, employed 150 additional workers and sold more than a half million dollars' worth of his products—the written order of Chester Bowles giving a manufacturer of the District a price on his products.

Folks, these are busy days in Washington. Your Representative wonders how much money can be appropriated before disaster overtakes us; how many young Americans are to be conscripted for foreign service; how long America's sons and husbands are to remain abroad; when, if ever, other nations will cease fighting and when, if ever, we, as Americans, will decide to stay out of their battles. When will we begin to set our House in order; begin to clean out subversive elements; start restoring to our own people the "four freedoms" and return to the foundation which has made our Nation great, our people the envied of all the world?

No; I am not discouraged. I feel honored and am glad to have the opportunity to serve you in these trying days—to my mind, more pregnant with danger than were those of the war.

Sixteen Million Five Hundred Thousand Yanks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Wilmington Morning News of October 22, 1945:

SIXTEEN MILLION FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND YANKS

Not all the suffering in the Army is honored by the Purple Heart. To judge by a report just made public by Maj. Gen. Robert H. Mills a goodly portion of the total pain endured by our GI's was encountered in the prosaic setting of the dentist's chair. Since Pearl Harbor, the general says, Army dentists under his command have pulled the jaw-breaking total of 16,500,000 teeth and filled cavities in 71,700,000 more.

It makes our own molars and incisors twinge a little in sympathy just to read about dental excavations on this gargantuan scale. There may be, as the humorists are constantly assuring us, something funny about somebody else sitting down for a session in the dentist's chair. But to us, at least, there is something overwhelming in the thought of 16,500,000 teeth being yanked out and tens of millions others being drilled.

To be sure, there are major compensations for the soldiers as a result of this herculean dental task. The men who are coming out of the Army now are probably infinitely better off on the whole, as far as their teeth are concerned, than they were when they first went into uniform. At least 2,600,000 of them are coming back with new sets of false teeth; the teeth of millions of others are undoubtedly in better repair than ever before. The Army dentists have, without doubt, done a good and worth-while job, but we would just as soon not talk about it any more.

Conditions in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an appeal sent to President Truman, all members of the Government affected, and to every Member of the House and Senate, by

the Polish-American Congress, 1520 West Division Street, Chicago, Ill., dated October 20, 1945.

The Poles of America are deeply concerned over the latest flow of information received in this country through press releases emanating from Poland. They tell of the occupation of Poland, our faithful Ally, by the Russian Army and the dreaded Russian secret police, their murdering of innocent people, their raping and pillaging. It curdles one's blood to read of these atrocities that are raging in this land.

HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.

MR. PRESIDENT: A recent Associated Press dispatch reports that Red Army units, with the sanction of the Stalin-appointed Polish government, are being sent to each of the 17 provinces of Poland. This is being done under the guise of protecting the country from an "epidemic of banditry."

Catherine the Great offered exactly the same kind of "protection" before she took over Poland.

Russian headquarters in the capital of every province with Russian generals in command of all army units everywhere in Poland!

This grim news comes out of martyred Poland at the very moment when Mr. Wincenty Rzymowski, foreign minister of the Moscow-conceived government of Poland, is conferring with our State Department, which is still upholding—in words—the traditional American policy of non-recognition of governments that do not represent the free will of free peoples.

As Poland's independence is being strangled by a Soviet military noose, there is not a single word of protest from our Government.

This silence only intensifies the heart-tearing mental, physical and spiritual anguish of the people of Poland.

America's staunch ally, Poland, is a victim of ingratitude, injustice, and deception without parallel in history.

Not only was this friendly republic deprived at Yalta of one-half of its ancient lands, where barely 1 percent of the prewar population was Russian, but the sovereignty of what remains of Poland was destroyed by the imposition of an illegal government.

But Poland was not the only country sold into Soviet slavery at the Yalta market place. There were others. Ten nations, with a total population of 120,000,000 human beings—men, women and children, with the same love of freedom Americans have—met the same tragic fate.

While we are not lacking in appreciation of your expression of friendship for Poland in your speech after the Potsdam Conference, we are keenly disappointed to learn that injustices against Poland and other Soviet-held countries were not corrected at that historic gathering. It was a sad commentary on American diplomacy to learn that even Poland's reparations were placed in the exclusive custody of the Kremlin.

Victim of German and Russian aggression during war, Poland is likewise a target for plunder, murder, hunger, disease, and poverty during peace.

A member of the UNNRA Commission in Poland, Clifford H. Nillson, reports Poland is undergoing the most terrible ordeal in its history.

Representatives GORDON, Democrat, Illinois, and RYTER, Democrat, Connecticut, members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, after a tour of Poland, formally protested to you, Mr. President, that Russia is using the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration for political purposes.

We quote briefly from Representative GORDON'S observations:

"The Russian occupation army is behaving very badly (in Poland). We saw their arrogance and unfairness in taking advantage of the poor people of the city (Warsaw). We saw the nearby highways jammed with hundreds of heads of cattle, horses, and farming implements, being taken out of Poland by the Russians and going farther east. Pillaging of the shops on the street was going on most freely and the snatching of purses from Polish women is a daily occurrence. There also exists a wholesale raping of the Polish women. When resistance would be given, the Russian soldier would use his weapons of war and kill."

To conceal his intentions, Stalin juggles words cleverly. Repeatedly, he has stated he wants a strong and independent Poland. If he really wants such a Poland, he can have it. If he wanted a strong Poland, he would not have annexed one-half of it. If he wanted an independent Poland, he would not have imposed upon it a puppet government of Moscow-trained Communists.

Can anyone explain why Germany, an enemy, is under joint Allied occupation while Poland, an ally, is under exclusive Russian control?

If Russia would only withdraw its armies and stop interfering in Poland's internal affairs, Poland's troubles would come to a swift end.

The United States could and should have avoided recognizing the Communist-dominated Polish Government, until free elections were realized and not merely promised.

The attitude of our Government toward friendly Poland is in sharp contrast to our constructive intervention in hostile Bulgaria where we flatly refused to recognize the undemocratic government, installed by Moscow.

The American Nation is not bound by the secret agreements of Teheran and Yalta, made without the knowledge or approval of the Congress or the American people.

The Constitution of the United States invests in no one, no matter how exalted his position, the authority to consent to the mutilation of free nations, to the destruction of their legal governments and to the condemnation of millions of decent and law-abiding people to the yoke of a despotic foreign power.

Our responsibility to right the wrong, caused by secret agreements, violating the laws of God and man, is inescapable.

Hitler is gone, Mussolini is gone and yet there is no freedom in Europe.

The dangers against which the Polish-American Congress, representing 6,000,000 Americans of Polish descent, has consistently warned our Government are now leading to a tragic climax.

As a result of blind appeasement, all gains made after the First World War have been wiped out. Nations freed by the First World War have all been enslaved by the Second World War. Stalin, who entered the war in 1939, not as Hitler's enemy but as his ally, is out to finish the task begun by Hitler—the domination of the world.

With efforts to bring freedom to all nations being nullified by Russia, granting credit to Russia indiscriminately would be foolhardy, especially until Russia withdraws to prewar frontiers and proves by actions it has no selfish aims of aggrandizement or desire to destroy democratic civilization.

In view of the ever-growing chain of slave nations, releasing the secret of the atomic bomb to Russia would spell the doom of America. This secret should be guarded carefully, for it is the only safeguard our country has against further Russian expansionism.

America's security and the peace of the world depend upon the correction of political blunders made during the war.

Unless there is a reversal in our foreign policy, it is folly to talk about liberty, democracy, and peace.

As the shadows of despair are deepening over the world, this is not the time for silence.

For freedom's sake, Mr. President, please urge independence for Poland and for all our allies. Do not assist in the crucifixion of the people of Europe. They want to live as we Americans do, not to suffer and die.

This war was fought to protect nations from aggression.

Precious American blood was spilled to purchase freedom and not tyranny for the world.

For the Polish-American Congress:
CHARLES ROZMAREK, *President.*
HONORATA B. WOŁOWSKA, *Secretary.*
JOHN J. OLEJNICZAK, *Treasurer.*

Congress Takes Back Funds Authorized for War Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, headlines in the newspapers for Saturday, October 20, read "House votes fifty-two billion cut in spending," and then goes on to state the House of Representatives had passed the night before a bill, H. R. 4407, to reclaim $52,000,000,000 in war spending authority. Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, is reported to have told Chief of Staff Gen. George C. Marshall, that while the war was going on the committee authorized all the money needed in the war effort. Now Mr. CANNON is reported to have said that the shoe is on the other foot, and the war is over. In case of doubt, the War Department would not get the appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, it is rather unusual for Congress to consider legislation, such as H. R. 4407, reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations for the fiscal year July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1946. The action of the House last Friday, October 19, in passing this bill is a healthy sign. However, it can really be classified as a matter of bookkeeping because the money has not yet been spent, and what Congress has really done is make certain that Government agencies will not go on a spending spree and waste funds of the American taxpayer.

It is very unfortunate to have to know that the average Government bureau is supposed to ask for twice as much money as it needs, and then when it gets more than it actually needs, from Congress, the Department heads have a patriotic urge to spend needlessly—just call it waste—whatever funds they do not need. If they ever adopt the habit of turning back money into the Public Treasury, they are certainly going to shock the American people half to death.

Just to avoid misunderstanding—these remarks also apply to the War Department and to the Navy Department. Congress voted all the appropriations they requested in order to win World War II. Following victory, both the

Army and the Navy still keep men in our armed forces, some of them cripples, and none of them serve any useful or economic purpose. Apparently the high ranking Army and Navy officials, who ought to consider the American taxpayer in peacetime, just figure it is proper to overlook him. The result is going to be that when they ask the American people to support their national defense programs, even though those programs are sound and constructive, they will not get any support. Most people reason that if these folks want to waste the taxpayers' money in peacetime, they cannot be depended upon to do the right thing in connection with our national defense program. It is too bad that they do not realize this because it is my firm conviction that there will always be need for an army and a navy adequate to command the respect of other countries in this world.

In spite of a lot of wishful thinking, human nature has not changed much since VE-day or VJ-day. Teddy Roosevelt was right when he said, "Tread softly and carry a big stick."

As an illustration of how money is being wasted, the story of Sgt. Bernard B. Spindell as related in a news item in the Times-Herald for October 8, 1945, is very much in point. The situation related by him is a reflection upon the ability of those in charge of our armed forces. I do not like to tell them that but somebody must give them these unpleasant facts. This story is similar to a great many that come to us from day to day. As related in the Times-Herald, it is as follows:

RUNNING ERRANDS FOR GIRLS NOT SARGE'S IDEA OF ARMY JOB

(By Frederick C. Othman)

All afternoon Sgt. Bernard B. Spindell sat quietly while the generals told the Senate Military Affairs Committee what an elegant job they were doing in discharging soldiers from the Army.

The sun was sinking when they'd finished. The sergeant stood up on his two big brogans, pulled down his coat, and asked Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, of Colorado, the chairman, whether he could ask Brig. Gen. R. W. Berry a question.

"Why, certainly, son," the Senator replied.

Before we go any further into this it must be pointed out that General Berry was assistant headman in charge of discharges. The sergeant was a 26-year-old New Yorker with a small mustache, a pink face, and a desperate expression around his mouth.

NOW HE KNOWS MORE

"I would like the general to tell me," he said, "whether the Army intends to discharge me, find me some work to do, or keep me in the ranks doing absolutely nothing whatever."

The general said he needed to know more about the sergeant's case. By all means, the Senator said. So Sergeant Spindell told his story without gestures and with frequent halts while he thought of the right words. He tried to be polite about it; he didn't want to put the general on the spot; yet he had to get the facts across. Two dozen GI's sat in awe while he talked. So, too, I think, did as many brass hats at the witness tables.

Sergeant Spindell said that he enlisted in 1942 to fight the Nazis. The Army sent him to Fort Monmouth, N. J., where he soon became an expert repairman on sound equipment for Signal Corps talking movies.

"So they said I was on a critical job," the sergeant continued. "They wouldn't send me across. That was all right. I did my best."

The years rolled by while the sergeant mended loud speakers in New Jersey. One day a chunk of machinery fell on him and injured his back. He was disqualified physically for overseas service, but he still was good enough to fix the machinery.

"Then the war ended," he said. "There was no more equipment to repair. I was a surplus soldier with nothing to do and I inquired whether I could be discharged from the Army. I was told that I could not be; not until the high-point men from abroad got out."

The sergeant went back to reading detective stories, to twiddling his thumbs, to worrying about the civilian film job that awaited him, but wouldn't wait much longer.

"So on September 7," he said, "I was transferred to the base at Astoria, Long Island. There they were amazed. They had nothing for me to do; they said they could not understand why I had been sent there. I spent 35 days at Astoria."

ERRANDS FOR GIRLS

He ran errands for the civilian girls in the film laboratory and he bit his fingernails. Then he was transferred back to Fort Monmouth. He got there last Friday, obtained permission from his commander to come to Washington, and arrived by day coach.

The general fidgeted in his chair, but when the sergeant had finished I must report that he responded generously.

"We have not done the right thing in the sergeant's case," he said. "It looks as though the Army top-side needs straightening out. I will look into this."

The sergeant wiped the sweat from his brow. His mouth looked better; the desperate expression had disappeared. He said all he had to do now was get back to Fort Monmouth before his pass expired.

IS IT THE ARMY'S IDEA TO WASTE PUBLIC FUNDS?

In view of the foregoing newspaper item which clearly indicates that here is a member of the armed forces who apparently could be discharged without such remarkable procedure being dangerous to public health, safety, or otherwise, it is fair to comment on the subject that someone in the Army favors wasting public funds. I do not need to repeat what I have already said about this matter. When you multiply this case by one or two million cases, you run into a large amount of money. In my opinion, the bill reducing these appropriations is good, so far as it goes. It does not go far enough. A lot of these appropriations that were made for war purposes should be completely wiped out. This drastic procedure almost appears necessary, when we consider the fact that they are still drafting married men with two or three children, in peacetime, and then these fellows who are drafted have absolutely nothing to do. This is no way to reduce expenditures and by the same token, no way to reduce the tax burden. So, I hope the committee brings in another bill and cuts off a few more billion from funds already appropriated which are not needed in peacetime.

DWORSHAK AMENDMENT SHOULD HAVE BEEN ADOPTED

Our distinguished colleague from Idaho, MR. DWORSHAK, offered an amendment requiring that the Lend-Lease Administrator cancel some of the lend-lease contracts. His amendment should have been adopted. Lend-lease was intended only to help in winning the war. The war is over and there is no justification for another single dollar of lend-lease money going to foreign countries. I think it too bad that this amendment was defeated.

CONGRESSMAN RANKIN'S AMENDMENT TO SPEED UP DEMOBILIZATION SHOULD HAVE CARRIED

While this bill was under debate Congressman RANKIN offered an amendment which would compel the heads of the Army and the Navy to discharge men in the armed forces who are standing around in uniform doing nothing. They ought to be returned to civilian life where they can do something useful, be with their families and get ready to take jobs that are now available. They can then support their families and help rebuild this country, after the ravages which have been inflicted on it by World War II. This amendment should have been adopted.

One Big "No" to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of October 18, 1945:

ONE BIG "NO" TO RUSSIA

Russia still insists on a control council for Japan which would be superior to General MacArthur and in which Russia would have an important voice, according to Secretary of State Byrnes.

The United States is still opposed to any such move to admit Russia, Britain, France, China, or any other power to such a position but welcomes an advisory commission of interested allies, including Russia, Britain, China, France, Canada, Australia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, the Philippines, and even India, which has been suggested by England as an addition.

The first part of the blunt truth is that the subjugation of rampant Japan was achieved by the United States. The other allies could not have defeated Japan. The United States bore the overwhelming burden of the whole Pacific war, even saving New Zealand and Australia on the way, which fact is graciously and freely admitted by those two British dominions.

The second part of the blunt truth is that the attempt to cooperate, especially with Russia, in joint control of Germany and liberated Europe is so difficult that it would be ridiculous to replace the smoothly operating set-up in Japan with an international control council.

Of course, the difficulties encountered in Europe cannot all be attributed to any one power. The very fact of joint control raises difficult problems. But the reluctance of Russia to allow her allies anything like an equal voice in eastern Europe and Moscow's open suspicion of their motives is a warning against getting into a similar mess in the control of Japan.

Moscow, listening to some native fascists in this country, may fear that the United States has a dream of using Japan against Russia. Russian leaders ought to know that the American people would never back such a plan. These fascists are not America.

The sole American policy toward Japan is to destroy its war making power and to try to lay the groundwork for a new and democratic Japan which cannot, and will not wish to, embark on aggression against Russia or any other nation.

We are doing this job for all the world and we propose to continue the management of it.

Peacetime Air Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport (La.) Times of October 12, 1945:

PEACETIME AIR FORCES

The Army Air Forces has outlined a tentative peacetime program for itself which is reported to call for 6,500 planes and 600,000 men as its standing strength for the immediate future in the postwar period.

This is a modest request indeed for a fighting force that was a vital factor in every campaign in World War II. It is conceded, as a result of the Second World War that no nation can win a battle, a campaign, or a war without vast superiority in the air over the enemy; without, in fact, complete mastery of the air, which is something far more than mere superiority. This applies to sea battles, where carriers are both the hub and many of the spokes of the wheel of combat, as well as to land fighting.

The Army Air Forces reached a peak of 65,000 combat planes and 2,300,000 men during World War II. The proposal for 6,500 planes and 600,000 men is presented by the Army Air Forces as an absolute minimum—a program of "interim strength," which seems to mean that the plan is to go above these minimum figures eventually.

The proposal to come down to a minimum strength in the immediate postwar years, when we have a tremendous quantity of planes and undoubtedly can keep ample trained personnel in the Air Forces, and then to increase at a later date when much of the present equipment will be obsolescent or even obsolete, is sound and logical. But if it is to be successful it must not be tampered with in the way of further reduction, by Congress or by the War Department, of the minimum now proposed by the Air Forces as to both planes and men.

The United States must not again make the mistake of neglecting air power—a mistake which was a big factor in making possible the Japanese attack on this Nation and which was the main factor in much of that terrible sweep by the Japs in the early days of the war, when they took hundreds of thousands of square miles of territory with virtually no opposition.

Mr. Byrnes' Frank Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks granted to me, I am including herewith an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times of October 6, 1945:

MR. BYRNES' FRANK REPORT

Secretary of State Byrnes' report to the Nation last night on the London Conference of Foreign Ministers was a masterpiece of candor. Contrary to diplomatic tradition, Byrnes made no effort to paint a rainbow across the London fog.

The Conference ended in deadlock; momentarily irreconcilable differences developed between America and Britain on one hand and Russia on the other. With almost unprecedented frankness, Byrnes admitted this.

Major point of separation was the Russian thesis that the Three Great Powers who were parties to the surrender should make the peace, set against the Anglo-American position that the peace should be made by all the nations that will be shouldered with the responsibility of enforcing it. Also dividing the powers was the reluctance of America and Britain to negotiate treaties with undemocratic governments in Bulgaria, Rumania, and Finland.

Most Americans will overwhelmingly agree with Byrnes as far as he went. The peace arrangement cannot be safely monopolized by the Big Three. Such monopoly would found postwar settlements upon autocratic principles of to the victors belong the spoils.

The basic cause of failure at London was that the powers were all apparently obsessed by the idea that they were hedging themselves against a Third World War by the ancient devices of unilateral agreements, by setting up power blocs friendly to themselves, and by spheres of influence. The United Nations Organization was a moral embarrassment in the background.

Had the foreign ministers consistently approached their problems from the point of view of world cooperation and liberty and justice for all peoples instead of from that of making the best possible arrangement for one's own country, the result would have been happier.

While Russia's wary, pugnacious, and imperialistic performance was a chief stumbling block, it must be realized that much in our policy seems to invite criticism for the same reasons in Moscow. The Kremlin, perhaps logically, can see little difference between Russian demands for control of Tripoli and our preemption of control of Okinawa and Iwo Jima. The proposal of our leaders that we maintain the largest military establishment in the world suggests to Russia, whatever the merits of the issue, that we are building our security on traditional unilateral lines.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the London Conference bogged down on questions of national suspicion and hostility. While the American position as expressed by Byrnes seems more respectful of the United Nations Organization than that of Russia, it seems apparent that the Conference fell far short of its mark because the participants built more along lines of security through individual national arrangement than through reliance upon collective security.

At the present moment, the Allies suffer from the malady of split personality, represented by San Francisco on one hand and London on the other. This malady will have to be cured if the peace is not to be an uneasy and insecure one.

To be sure, much was accomplished at London, primarily with respect to Italy. Moreover, there still remains an opportunity for Stalin to agree to the proper thesis that the making of the peace should be approached on the broad base of universal participation by all those powers who contributed to the victory. Perhaps the next installment of our peace efforts should be on the higher level of the heads of the states rather than that of the foreign ministers.

As we have repeatedly said, the atomic bomb has so imperiled the world and so loaded war with the powers of utter devastation that we cannot permit peace conferences to fail. In effect, we must go back and back again until understanding is achieved and until decisions are made that reflect our comprehension that war is simply too overwhelmingly dangerous ever to occur again.

Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, S. 1050, provides that certain doctors and dentists in each community shall be designated by the Surgeon General of the United States as the approved Federal practitioners for that area. No doctor could qualify as a specialist in a particular field save upon the designation of the Surgeon General. And no patient would be permitted to consult a specialist until the case had been approved by a medical administrative officer appointed by the Surgeon General.

Senator WAGNER claims this is neither socialized medicine nor State medicine. I believe it is socialized medicine in its most obnoxious form.

It is well known that the doctor who receives so much per head in institutional practice tends to lose interest in the individual patient, and his practice becomes automatized. Any profession that cannot adjust its own fees to the conditions of the day, but must depend upon Government statute and Government control, will fail to attract the best minds. If this happens the practice of medicine will inevitably deteriorate.

President Truman has endorsed the objectives of S. 1050, and has given it the legislative green light.

Mr. Speaker, an editorial from the De Kalb Daily Chronicle, De Kalb, Ill., Thursday, October 18, 1945, quoting Robert Quillen, expresses the implications contained in S. 1050 so clearly that I insert it as a part of my remarks:

QUILLEN TELLS ABOUT THE MEDICAL BILL

In a recently published article the famous newspaperman, Robert Quillen, tells some things about the proposed medical bill in language we all can understand. He says:

If you prefer having a fair warning before the storm hits, go first to your doctor to have your blood pressure checked and then write to one of your Senators for a copy of the Wagner-Murray Senate bill 1161. He will send you one without charge, and you will find it a remarkable document well worth reading.

The chief author of the bill is the same German-born Senator WAGNER, of New York, who gave us the law that "protects the rights of labor," but denies the boss even the right of free speech. And if all goes well, the bill will be passed by the next Congress.

Its purpose is to provide more social security, including medical care. And, as usual, it levies a tax—this time a whopper.

It will add $12,000,000,000 a year to our annual tax burden—12 times the total cost of Government when dad was a youngster.

It will take 6 percent from your pay envelope, up to $3,000, and another 6 percent from the boss. From the self-employed—the doctor, farmer, merchant—it will take 7 percent up to $3,000, or $210 a year.

Three-fourths of the money will be raised to extend the benefits of social security, but one-fourth, or $3,000,000,000, will be turned over to the Surgeon General, and he will be the absolute czar of American medicine, empowered to provide free medical and hospital care for 110,000,000 people.

He will control all hospitals and decide which ones can operate and how much they shall charge.

He will tell doctors where to practice and how many patients they may have and how much they may charge. He will also decide which ones may call themselves specialists.

(The bill generously permits each of us to choose his own doctor, but not if the one of our choice already has his allotted number of patients).

There are many other remarkable provisions in the measure, but this is enough to give you the idea.

Three billion dollars is a lot of money. It is enough to hire every doctor in America at a salary of $5,000 a year; to hire every bed in every privately operated hospital every day in the year at the rate of $5 a day; to pay $2.50 a day every day in the year for each bed in Government-owned hospitals; to spend over $250,000,000 a year for medicine and supplies, and still leave $500,000,000 for political job holders.

If your doctor seems a little absent-minded and peevish these days, he is thinking about his future when politicians control the practice of medicine.

All GI Fathers Should Be Discharged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in a special article entitled "Mothers Fret Over Delay in Return of GI Fathers," by Ruth Millett, attention is forcibly called to the responsibility of wives whose husbands are now in the military service. This is a plea that Congress should heed. The war is over, and all fathers who have enlisted for the duration should be discharged. Ruth Millett's timely article is submitted herewith:

MOTHERS FRET OVER DELAY IN RETURN OF GI FATHERS

(By Ruth Millett)

Mrs. G. I., who was a good sport all through the war, is about fed up.

While her husband risked his life overseas and she ran the risk of being left alone to support and educate and bring up her children, you didn't hear her complain.

TIRED OF DUAL ROLE

She went about the job of being both father and mother as cheerfully as she could, all the while striving not only to keep up her own morale but the morale of her husband overseas. Without bitterness she accepted sacrifices that only part of the population was called up to make.

But the war is over now and she wants her husband back. She knows her children have suffered emotionally from having a father taken from them. She knows it is going to take plenty of time for the children and their father to become adjusted to each other, after a long separation during which the father has had no responsibility for the children and they have learned to make a mother the whole center of their existence.

She knows that the sooner her husband gets back to civilian life, the better off the family will be financially. And a man's career is important when there are children to be educated.

So she is tired of being a good sport and putting her country ahead of her family.

PATIENCE RUNNING OUT

She wants her man back home. And it burns her up to think she knows no more about when that will be than she did when the war was going on. "They don't tell us a thing," her husband writes. And "I haven't the slightest idea when I will get home."

Mrs. G. I. is fed up with that kind of treatment. She figures that at this point nobody needs a father more than his kids. And if the Government doesn't want a new pressure group on its hands it had better consider Mrs. G. I. Joe. Her patience can't be counted on indefinitely. In fact, it has just about run out.

Farmers, Veterans, Labor Favor Democratic Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 7, the American Institute of Public Opinion, better known to American newspaper readers as the Gallup poll, disclosed that the great majority of the people of this country, our farmers, our factory workers, and our small-business men, believe that the Nation is most likely to solve all of its major problems under the program of the Democratic Party than under any other leadership.

In this poll the American people were asked which party they preferred to accomplish 11 specific objectives, and it is interesting to note that on all 11 points the Democratic Party was preferred.

This poll is encouraging because it is a clear indication that the American people realize the basic issues which we are facing, and the stand which each political party is fundamentally taking. It is clear to the farmers, the workers in the city and to the small-business men that on the really important problems of the day they have much more hope from Democratic leadership than they have from Republican leadership.

War veterans, according to the Gallup poll, will be taken care of far better under Democratic leadership.

There will be higher farm income under the Democrats, one poll further indicates. Farmers favored the Democratic Party by 2 to 1, many of them probably remembering how poorly they fared under the last Republican administrations and recalling how they have prospered under Democratic leadership.

But let Dr. Gallup tell of his findings in his most recent Nation-wide survey. His report follows:

DEMOCRATS WIN PUBLIC SUPPORT OVER GOP ON 11 MAJOR ISSUES

(By George Gallup)

The Republican Party faces an uphill fight if it is to regain political control of the country at next year's election.

Just how tough the battle will be is revealed in the results of a national survey of voter opinions on Government problems.

Voters were asked which party they thought would do better at handling 11 important public problems, such as taking care of veterans, seeing that taxes don't get too heavy, keeping wages high, handling organized labor, keeping farmers happy, etc.—all problems that loom important as the 1946 congressional campaign approaches.

In every case the Democratic Party won a higher vote of preference in the survey than the Republican Party. The GOP leadership has not had much recent success in selling the Republican Party to the country on issues, as apart from candidates.

The political advantage which the Democrats hold at present can be seen from the vote on the 11 specific public questions dealt with in the survey, as shown below.

Note that in each case the Democratic percentage is higher than the Republican—the ratios in some instances being more than 2 to 1 in favor of the Democrats.

Voters were queried as follows:

"It's another year until the congressional elections, but as you feel today, which political party, the Democratic or Republican, do you think can handle each of these different problems better?"

The problems and the vote on each follow:

	Democrat	Republican	No difference	No opinion
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
Encouraging new business to start up	35	30	20	15
Reducing strikes and labor troubles	34	26	23	17
Seeing that taxes don't get too heavy	37	26	23	14
Running Government efficiently	41	23	23	13
Getting business and industry back to peacetime production	41	23	20	16
Improving the health of the people	36	15	32	17
Improving the education level of the people	36	15	33	16
Keeping farmers' income high	46	19	20	15
Taking care of veterans properly	42	12	33	13
Working out a lasting peace with other countries	45	14	28	13
Keeping wages high	49	15	23	13

One surprise in the figures is that even in the matter of administrative efficiency and of encouraging new business to start up—two major talking points of the Republicans—the Democrats come out on top in public estimation, according to the survey, though only by a narrow margin in the case of the latter.

Certain of the issues dealt with in the survey have particular appeal for some special segment of the population.

Farmers, for example, have more interest in farm income than any other group, while manual workers are especially interested in high wages.

How these groups vote on the particular issues is summarized below:

Keeping wages high: To accomplish this manual workers and white-collar workers express a 4 to 1 preference for the Democratic Party.

More farm income: By 2 to 1 the farmers say the Democratic Party would be better than the GOP at keeping farm income high.

A Few Reasons Why Men Are Not Enlisting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from a Casablanca overseas man, who is being discharged, but who writes in behalf of his comrades who are remaining, comes a letter which gives us some of the reasons why men are not reenlisting. His letter is as follows:

I think you will be glad to learn that most of us will leave this base in the next few months. There will still be many men left here, too many. I am and have been particularly interested in your comments and actions regarding the draft. You tell me that Congress has passed a bill offering new inducements to volunteers. I know that both you and I want the volunteer system to be a success but as you probably know already, it won't work as it stands. It strikes me as odd that few men have put their finger on the main reason that American men will not reenlist in the Army while most Federal services are overloaded with applicants for jobs. While there are many smaller reasons I believe the reason for this failure to reenlist, particularly in the enlisted category, is that the American man is not willing to submit voluntarily to the degradation of mind and spirit which our generals deem necessary for a successful Army.

The Army magazine, Yank, had a department named Mail Call in which servicemen aired their complaints. By reading that department you will find that what the American man has found most distasteful about his army life is the caste system of gentleman and scum that he has been forced to become a part of. An intelligent or even a decent-minded man does not wish to voluntary register himself as a tramp or slave and have to bow and scrape to a group of "gentlemen." When an American becomes an enlisted man he not only labels himself as a member of a coolie group but he also puts his wife and children in that same class as you can see in life at any Army post—"Poor dear, she seemed so nice to talk to but she is an enlisted man's wife." It is a positive crime in our Army for an officer to associate with an enlisted man unless they are blood relatives. They may not eat at the same table, drink together, sleep together, or even use the same toilet facilities. An enlisted man must address an officer as sir, when to call him by his rank would be just as effective, and in most cases, a good deal more accurate. A careful study of court-martial records and precourt-martial investigations will show that there is a double standard of "justice" in the Army. I need not give you examples for I am sure you know of many strange cases of military justice.

In short the existence of an enlisted man is such a degrading thing by American standards that it is next to impossible to get the right kind of men to reenlist. We will always be able to get the hoodlums and refugees from life who made up the Regular Army in the twenties and thirties but the next war, and there will be one, will require more brains and less brawn.

We do not need a draft because the average American won't work under compulsion. Any one civilian can do the same amount of work of four soldiers. We do need an army with justice and an army without a caste system. The Army should be made attractive and not repulsive. It should not be hated by its personnel as it is now. It should become another Federal service that men would clamor to get into, not out of.

In general, pay in the Army is adequate except in the private and corporal classes and since a man enlists as a private the pay in that class should be increased. There should also be close control of the Army by Congress to make sure it does not get out of hand.

I wish you every success in your efforts to make the Army more attractive and I hope that you might possibly get some hints from this letter as to what makes it so unattractive. I would appreciate your comments if any. I hope the writing is legible. I don't have access to a typewriter just now and it has been a couple of years since I have written any letters by hand.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. MURPHY.

P. S.—Reference rapid redelopment of troops, what do you think of the Navy's sending swarms of its largest boats to various cities in the United States so that people can visit them on Navy Day? Whose morale are they trying to build up, or is there going to be a new Naval appropriation bill soon? All of these boats should be constantly busy moving troops and should not be tied up in some harbor for people to gape at.

This young man does not come from my district and I never met him, but his letter is a clear statement of a protest often heard.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the question of price control must be continued for some length of time in this postwar period, lest we find ourselves moving into a dangerous spiral of inflation. In the control of prices it must be the duty of the Office of Price Administration to carry forth without, at the same time, producing a situation that stops production. There is ample evidence that this is occurring in many places.

The Office of Price Administration would do well to restudy their policies and remove at once all phases that have to do with lessening the production of any commodity. I have just recently returned from having spent 2 days in the city of New York, the greatest market for clothing in the United States, and I must confess that under the rules laid down by the Office of Price Administration it is more difficult today to obtain clothing for men, women, and children, now that the war is over, than it was during the period in which we were engaged in a war on two fronts.

Under unanimous consent, I include an editorial taken from the New York Times, October 15, entitled "Clothing Restrictions":

CLOTHING RESTRICTIONS

War Mobilization and Reconversion Director Snyder has decreed that the feminine silhouette for the spring season will remain frozen within the clothing limits established in May 1943. Under the wartime limitation orders, the styling of women's clothing, lingerie, and lounging wear, and the yardage used in men's clothing, are controlled. WPB Chairman Krug had recommended that these controls be abandoned, but Price Administrator Bowles insisted that their abandonment would make it more difficult to continue price control. Mr. Snyder stated specifically that they would not be lifted, since their revocation would impair the Government's price-control structure.

Here we have additional evidence that the release of Government controls in several areas is being subordinated to the insistence of OPA in retaining controls over practically all prices. Our wage policy has been bedeviled by the insistence that wage increases requiring price increases will not be permitted. Now the freedom of operation in the clothing industry is not to be restored because it may affect price control. Apparently the key question is, must we continue to control practically all prices? If the answer is yes, then there is some justification for continuing other controls to reinforce the price control. If the answer is no, however, then clearly these policies concerning related controls are not soundly conceived.

Two full months have now elapsed since Japan's surrender. The major changes in the economic situation have made it possible to eliminate most of the controls over production, to modify the manpower controls, to reduce the area of rationing, and even to consider lowering taxes. But OPA marches on undaunted with practically no liberalization in price control since VJ-day and with controls still maintained on practically all products, essential or nonessential. Instead of easing controls, OPA is tightening them in some sectors of the economy. New orders fixing prices are being issued each day when the proper policy calls for OPA to be issuing orders removing controls. In the clothing field this policy has been reflected in the virtual disappearance of low-priced items.

The Eagles' Aerie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a transcript of the proceedings on the occasion of the launching of the U. S. S. *Oriskany.*

U. S. S. "ORISKANY"

The *Oriskany,* launched at 1:57 p. m. Saturday, October 13, 1945, at the United States Navy Yard, Brooklyn, N. Y., was authorized by an act of Congress on July 9, 1942. Her keel was laid May 1, 1944. Her over-all length is 856 feet, bow to stern, but her spacious flight deck, nearly 100,000 square feet in surface area, is 870 feet long. Her complement is about 80 planes.

BATTLE OF ORISKANY

The battle for which the ship is named was fought near what is now Rome, N. Y., August 6, 1777. American forces commanded by Gen. Nicholas Herkhimer, racing to intercept the British under Lieutenant Colonel St. Ledger who was

attempting to join Burgoyne and Howe at Albany, were ambushed in a narrow defile along the Mohawk River by Tories under Col. John Butler and Indians led by Joseph Brandt. After the heaviest fighting, characterized by historians as "one of the bloodiest battles of the Revolution," the Indians fled and the Tories retreated leaving the Americans in possession of the field.

THE CEREMONIES

Rear Adm. Freeland A. Daubin, United States Navy, Commandant of the New York Navy Yard, presided.

Sponsor: Mrs. Clarence Cannon.

Maids of honor: Miss Mary Katherine Van Sant, Miss Martha DeWitt Fishback. Matrons of honor: Mrs. Robert M. White, Mrs. E. Johnston Coil, Mrs. Paul C. Stark.

ADMIRAL DAUBIN

Admiral DAUBIN. Admiral Leary, Admiral Cochrane, Admiral Cassady, Mrs. Cannon, honored guests, shipworkers of the Navy Yard, New York, you men and women of the navy yard who so loyally served the fleet during a war unprecedented in naval history have added an additional star in your field of accomplishment.

Today we launch another mighty ship, completed from keel to launching in 76 weeks. She will take her place among the great fleet units that, in the course of the war, have been built in this yard. And like other ships built in the Navy Yard, New York, the *Oriskany* is the product of the best engineering talent and superb workmanship—and she would have been another champion in battle just as her sister ships in the Pacific have been.

Carriers are named after historic battles. Our American history tells us the story of the Colonial patriots, whom we honor today, engaging our enemies in hand-to-hand fighting at Oriskany in the summer of 1777. This battle is now famous, as it marked the turning point in the war for independence. With us today we have representatives from Oneida County, New York, where the battle of Oriskany was fought. Among these representatives are school children who, by their own intensive efforts, have raised $3,000 to present a suitable gift to the ship when she is commissioned. Such interest and loyalty to the Navy among our citizens augurs well for the future.

You guests here from the Mohawk Valley are about to witness the launching of a ship whose planes and guns will be manned by men of the same spirit that characterized the stout-hearted Colonials on the now historic battlefield of the Revolution 168 years ago. And similar to the devotion of these stout-hearted patriots who fought for independence at Oriskany, this ship represents the devotion of all the people of the United States in their determination to defeat these enemies who would destroy our freedom. And when the *Oriskany* is commissioned and sails the seven seas with the other ships of the United States Navy, she will be a solemn warning that we, as a Nation, intend to and will maintain the peace.

We are honored to have with us this afternoon, Mrs. Clarence Cannon, wife of the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, Member of Congress from Missouri. Mrs. Cannon has been chosen to sponsor this great ship.

MRS. CANNON

Mrs. CANNON. Thank you, Admiral Daubin. It is a privilege to participate, even in a formal way, in a ceremony which adds another great ship to the United States Navy.

Admiral DAUBIN. We are also honored today to have as our speaker a naval officer who, throughout the critical days of the war, commanded one of our giant carriers—in fact, the oldest of them, the U. S. S. *Saratoga*, Rear Adm. J. H. Cassady, Assistant Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Air.

ADMIRAL CASSADY

Admiral CASSADY. I consider it a signal honor to have the opportunity of addressing the thousands of persons who have been employed in the building of this fine ship. Your reputation, the reputation of the navy yard, New York, for the speed of production and, most important, the quality of ships built, is indeed something of which each and every one of you may well be proud.

I appreciate that some of you may feel a touch of regret that this ship of yours was not completed in time to take part in and to share our great victory over Germany and Japan. However, let me assure you that your labor has not been wasted, your labor has not been in vain. This product of yours is destined to play an equally important part in history—namely, the preservation of the peace of the world, to which your Navy dedicates itself.

I believe that most of you are familiar with the role played in this past war by sister ships of this vessel, which is about to be launched. Our seagoing Navy was organized around the aircraft carrier. Battleships, cruisers, and destroyers were deployed for the support and the protection of our carriers. Our fast carrier task forces spearheaded every major engagement in the Pacific. Because of the pulverizing air strikes made by our carriers, we were able to destroy the Japanese Navy, able to sweep Japanese shipping from the seas, able to gain command of the sea and command of the air, and thus insure the success of every one of our invasion campaigns, from Guadalcanal to the Japanese homeland itself. The work of our carriers saved thousands of American lives. The work of our carriers made possible the establishment of land bases from which land-based Army, Navy, and Marine Corps aircraft could operate against the enemy. With full consideration and recognition of the splendid job done by our battleships, our cruisers, our destroyers, our submarines, and by the many other types of vessels of the Navy, I believe that there is no one person but who will readily admit that the aircraft carrier has demonstrated itself to be our most effective naval unit.

However, it was not always smooth sailing. It was only after the great productive capacity of this country was in full swing that we were able to dish out the punishment to our enemies which brought about their complete and unconditional surrender. Credit for that complete and unconditional surrender is due to the civilian population of this country as well as to your armed services population.

I can well remember the months when the *Saratoga*, of which I was then in command, was our only big carrier in the whole Pacific Ocean, and she had been bruised up a bit by the enemy. However, fortunately, we had a large carrier construction program underway, of which this ship is a part. Each month new and improved carriers were sliding down the ways and soon thereafter were dishing it out to the Japs. Less than 2 years ago, in November of 1943, we were plenty proud of the fact that we were able to launch an air strike from our carriers consisting of 105 planes, against the Jap stronghold of Rabaul. Yet within less than a year's time we were launching 1,000-plane attacks from our carriers. And this was followed by attacks by as many as 1,500 carrier aircraft day after day. Those strikes speeded up the collapse of Jap resistance.

All of this was not accomplished without its price. Many of you have seen the carrier *Franklin* here in this navy yard, and are familiar with the heroic yet costly fight of survival she had. The *Franklin* was but one of many. Thousands of our air men and ship's companies have paid the supreme price in achieving our great victory. This ship, about to be launched, must and will contribute its share of insurance that there shall be no repetition of the above—that there shall be no future war. However, if such should be thrust upon us, then your labor, your time, and the money invested in this ship will pay dividends.

And what is the future of the aircraft carrier? Has the atomic bomb outmoded this type of ship? Will the new and awesome weapons of which we hear and which will be developed in the future render the aircraft carrier obsolete? Perhaps so, but such a possibility is a thing of years in the future. How many years, I would not, nor do I believe anyone else, would venture to predict. To me there is not an iota of doubt but that the modern carrier will for many years continue to hold top place in fighting units. If and when new weapons are developed which can defeat the carrier, then is the time to scrap the carrier, not now.

Based upon our war experience, our peacetime Navy is to be developed around the aircraft carrier. This ship of yours will be part of the backbone of our future Navy. This ship, together with sister carriers, will be equipped with the most modern aircraft the world possesses. This must be so. Our peacetime Navy must be maintained at such strength and so modernized that no nation or combination of nations would dare to attack this country. We must possess a Navy which will constitute such a threat that any warmonger would consider it suicidal to attack us. We must constantly be prepared to strike back and to strike back fast. This vessel will be a part of that fast-striking force. We must keep ahead of every nation in the world in research, and we must develop and produce new and improved weapons in greater quantity and with greater speed than can be accomplished by any other nation. Only by so doing can we assure peace. Any dereliction on the part of this country can and will produce but one result—another war. And I shudder to think what that war would be.

So I consider the future of this ship before us to be enviable. She will play a part in the preservation of the peace of the world. Each of you who has contributed to the construction of this ship can and, I hope, will have a real feeling of pride in being a part of this ship.

The Battle of Oriskany has been called the turning point in the war for American independence. Let us hope—let us pray—that this ship, named after that famous battle, may itself prove to be a contributing factor in the turning point of the world to be, a turn from a war-torn, war-hungry world to a peace-loving, peace-maintaining world.

CHAPLAIN HARBOR

After the national anthem was played, the chaplain of the navy yard, Lt. R. L. Harbor, invoked divine blessing.

"Let us pray: God of our Fathers, whose paths are in the seas, and who makest the clouds Thy chariot, we bless Thee for Thy inspiring guidance in leading us to victory. Accept our praise for all those whose valorous deeds in the sea and sky have hastened the victory. To Thee we here dedicate the U. S. S. *Oriskany*, praying that she may become a strong arm of our Navy, to be a terror to those who do evil, and a defense to those who do well. Keep this world, O Lord, in perpetual peace, where none shall wage any more war for purposes of aggression, and none shall need it as a means of defense. For Thine, O Lord, is the kingdom of this world, and we praise Thy holy name world without end. Amen."

As the *Oriskany* started to slide down the ways, Mrs. Cannon broke the bottle of champagne over the bow of the ship, saying "I christen thee *Oriskany*, in the name of the United States. May God bless this ship and all who sail in her, and the U. S. S. *Oriskany* was launched.

A. F. of L. Wage Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Joseph (Mo.) Union-Observer:

A. F. OF L. WAGE POLICY IS SET FORTH BY THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL—OPPOSES ANY ATTEMPT TO REVIVE WAR LABOR BOARD—WANTS FREE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND NORMAL COMPETITION—PRESENT STRIFE DUE TO GOVERNMENT EFFORT TO REGULATE ECONOMIC LIFE

CINCINNATI.—The executive council of the American Federation of Labor at its meeting here adopted an opening declaration on wage policy. It follows:

"The American Federation of Labor strongly opposes any attempt to revive the National War Labor Board.

"This Board served its purpose during the war. Now that peace is here, it has outlived its usefulness. The members of the Board themselves recognized these facts and voted to dissolve the agency by December 15. That decision should be upheld.

"The executive council is convinced that continuation of the National War Labor Board will inevitably bring about in increase in strikes and particularly the threat of strikes. It will force labor and management to go to the Government for the solution of their disputes instead of finding their own solutions through the orderly and democratic processes of collective bargaining. It will prolong Government dictation of economic policies—a condition that has no place nor justification in peacetime America.

"It is extremely doubtful whether the National War Labor Board could function effectively even if it were resuscitated at this time. Its authority had been weakened almost to the vanishing point when the war ended. New legislation would be required to give its decisions force and effect now.

"Such legislation would usher in another period of government by emergency. The executive council believes the Nation has had enough of that. The time has come to move in the opposite direction. The time has come for the people of America—including labor and management—to stand on their own feet instead of depending upon the Government.

"Those who desire prolongation of the National War Labor Board have no confidence in themselves nor in the operation of the free-enterprise system. They are ready to admit that the American way of life is a failure.

"The American Federation of Labor does not share these views. We firmly believe that the way to establish and maintain industrial peace and stability is to remove Government control of wages immediately, instead of reinforcing it.

"Much of the present industrial strife has been caused by the Government's attempt to regulate the Nation's economic life as though the war emergency were to continue indefinitely. We are living in a national atmosphere of fear—fear of inflation. That fear already has resulted in deflation—sharp deflation of the income of the Nation's workers. Earnings of many workers have dropped overnight below the subsistence level. Under such conditions strikes are inevitable.

"The Government cannot enforce strict wage controls against the tide of natural economic forces. This would be vain and dangerous.

"The American Federation of Labor calls upon President Truman to adopt a new course. We urge that Government controls be dropped promptly and that the National War Labor Board be permitted to pass out of existence.

"Meanwhile wage rates should be permitted to rise to their proper level through the free exercise of collective bargaining while every encouragement should be given to business to keep prices down through the operation of normal competition."

Letters From Soldiers Came From Far and Wide—Here Is One Letter Which Shows That Demobilization Is Bogged Down—Why Isn't There Transportation for the Army's High-Point Men?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, here are a few facts from a high-point man waiting on Leyte Island for the Army to get him home. I think our servicemen deserve better treatment than this, and now:

LEYTE ISLAND, *September 30.*
Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIMMY: I received your nice letter some time ago and didn't answer because I thought I would be home before now.

I know you fellows in Congress are doing your best to get us home. I know that the Army tells you all they will get us home soon. But here are a few facts. I have 88 points as of May 12. My orders came through on September 9 and I was flown from my base in Mindoro here to the Twenty-eighth Replacement Depot to be put on a boat for home. When I arrived here 20 days ago, there were 3,600 men ahead of me. Now there are over 11,000 here with 85 points or more as of May 12. During this time 500 have gone home.

Every day we hear on news broadcasts from State side about how many men are supposed to be coming home, the fact is that we are still here. Last week a transport came in from the States with 4,000 troops from the States. We were sure we would load on that boat, but only the big shots know where that boat went.

When we ask about when will we get transportation, they tell us just as soon as the Navy gives us boats. What we want to know is if we high-point men don't get home, who is?

Jimmy, we didn't mind it as long as we had a job to do. We did that job. All we ask is to be taken home now. I am sure that all of us here feel the same—bitter and disgusted. We are getting a run around and we don't like it.

Jimmy, you can use this letter and my name to show the "brass" what is going on here instead of what they try to make the people at home believe.

I am sorry to bother you with my trouble but knowing you like I do, I know you will raise a little hell about this mess.

Thanking you for anything for us GI's, I am,

Yours truly.

Challenge to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following poem by William Ewald, of Montclair, N. J.:

TO CONGRESS

Crooks under many names are nothing new.
Subversive movements slyly use them too.

Termites working under cover dread the light;
Throw on the switch and flood their breeding sites.

Let not "witch hunting" or "red baiting" shunt your inspection;
Locate, lay bare, make known their cancerous infection.

Expore the guile of those who, loud on civil rights do call,
Are plotting to deny these sacred rights to all.

If Quislings found in places, low or high, in family tree,
Let the traitor's name be known through wide publicity.

Make deaf your ears to clamorous objection.
There's naught of greater import now or hence than cur protection.
Despots rise when free men sleep or do not see
The road to serfdom they are on unknowingly.

We want not that freemen be less free.
Your constant vigil will preserve our liberty.

Freedom, by our forebears won at bloody cost,
Must not! must not! now, by us be lost.

—*William Ewald.*

MONTCLAIR, N. J.

CIO Leaders Visit Communists in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, in the CIO News for October 22, 1945, there is an interesting item. This paper is published by the Congress of Industrial Organizations, of which Philip Murray is President and the publication and editorial office is in Washington, D. C. It is

interesting to note that Vice President Joseph Curran, who is also president of the National Maritime Union, was with the group when they called on the boys in Moscow back in October. This news item reads as follows:

SOVIET FRIENDSHIP GROUP BACKED BY CIO LEADERS

Moscow.—Formation of an American-Soviet trade-union committee was proposed here this week by Vassili Kuznetsov, chairman of the All-Union Central Council of Trade-Unions, and accepted by CIO leaders at a mass meeting in the Hall of Columns in honor of the CIO delegation now touring the U. S. S. R. Kuznetsov proposed the committee to "facilitate establishment of close contact between American and Soviet working classes" and as a step to strengthen the "friendship between the peoples, which is so necessary to support world peace."

Endorsing the proposal, CIO Vice President Joseph Curran, who is also president of the National Maritime Union, declared: "We will ardently support the idea for establishment of an American-Soviet trade-union committee. I am told to assure you that the CIO will always work hand in hand with Soviet trade-unions." CIO Secretary-Treasurer James B. Carey, declaring that he could "hardly believe I am in Moscow," told the meeting of Soviet trade-unionists:

"When I visit your plants I feel that I am in our own American establishments. When I speak here I feel as if I am speaking in my own country. All this bespeaks the fact that we and you have one mind, the same aspirations, the same community of interests. Both of our great countries can work together. We shall exert all efforts so that in the period of the peaceful development of our countries, the friendship of the Soviet and American working class will grow stronger."

CIO Vice President Allan S. Haywood declared that "the difference between the American and Soviet Government systems cannot hamper unification of the trade-unions of both countries."

Members of the House will of course be interested in this news item because on October 12 Joseph P. Ryan, president of the American Federation of Labor International Longshoremen's Association, gave out a newspaper interview in which he stated that communistic agitation behind the strike in New York City was directed by Joseph Curran, president of the Communist dominated CIO Maritime Union. You will recall that this is the strike that prevented the loading and unloading of boats, including troop ships, and that had much to do with the delay in returning the American soldiers from Europe so they could be discharged from the Army here.

Nation-Wide Bible Reading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, 1945, I introduced House Joint Resolution 117, designating the period from Thanksgiving Day to Christmas of each year for Nation-wide Bible reading. This resolution was referred to the Judiciary Committee, but so far no action has been taken upon it. We are now approaching the Thanksgiving season, and I am hopeful that it may be enacted into law before Thanksgiving Day arrives.

This program was started last year by the American Bible Society. It met with an astounding response requiring the printing of millions more of the lists of selected passages than was anticipated. This year the program will be more extensive and the response will undoubtedly be far greater. I believe that in these troublous times which confront us it would be a far-sighted move to give national recognition to this period. There is nothing compulsory or anything of that nature proposed. It merely designates the time for people voluntarily to seek inspiration from the Book of Books.

October 15 to 21 was National Bible Week. It was widely observed. At least 26 Governors endorsed National Bible Week, including Governor Martin, of Pennsylvania. Governor Martin said, in part:

Wars will cease, and man in all the world will live as brothers only when its sacred lessons are given universal acceptance as the basis of human conduct.

He said further:

I am pleased to give the observance my complete endorsement and to urge citizens throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to cooperate in the program of activities which will be conducted during the week by churches, Sunday Schools, service groups, fraternal societies, and other organizations.

This was a fine gesture of Governor Martin's and I feel that it would be a courageous and christian evidence of faith if our national legislature would endorse the Nation-wide Bible-reading program.

As part of my remarks, I include House Joint Resolution 117. Congressman VOORHIS of California has introduced a similar resolution—House Joint Resolution 120. Resolutions have also been introduced in the other body.

Also as part of my remarks, I include an editorial from the Washington Star of October 21, entitled "The Bible Now."

House Joint Resolution 117

Joint resolution designating period from Thanksgiving Day to Christmas of each year for Nation-wide Bible reading

Whereas fresh evidence comes daily of the strength, courage, and comfort found in the Scriptures by the men and women of our armed forces; and

Whereas reading the Bible will not only bring faith, hope, and courage to millions of people now disturbed by doubt, uncertainty, and fear, but such a widespread, thoughtful reading of the Scriptures will effectively repair the moral character and spiritual ideals which form the necessary foundation for an enduring democracy; and

Whereas it behooves us at home to keep faith with those on the fighting fronts by a steadily increasing devotion to the sacred truths and principles upon which this Nation was founded: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the period from Thanksgiving Day to Christmas of each year is especially designated for Nation-wide Bible reading, in order that "in God we trust" as an expression of our national life may hold new and vital meaning for all our citizens.

[From the Washington Star of October 21, 1945]

THE BIBLE NOW

One of the cultural results of the Second World War is that of an increased interest in the Bible. The explanation is obvious. Thousands of men and women in the armed services of many different countries have carried the Book of Books with them wherever they have gone in the line of their duty. During long voyages on the ocean or through the air, during tedious days and nights of watchfulness on far-flung fighting fronts and especially during weeks and months of hospital experience, the Scriptures were a source of comfort and courage to a uniformed multitude of people who perhaps otherwise might never have consulted them. Meanwhile, civilians at home likewise in the emergency turned to the traditional fountain of religious idealism.

But the American Bible Society has urged that readers should follow a systematic plan in their study of the Gospels. Mere "dipping" into the Holy Word at random may be confusing. Possibly each individual needs to build a Bible for himself. Thomas Jefferson attempted something of the sort. Other persons have compiled anthologies of quotations which appealed particularly to their own instinct of appreciation. Such a book is the volume entitled "Treasures From the Bible," recently published.

Its contents were selected by chaplains and pastors for Nation-wide perusal while the global conflict continued, but they have equal significance now that peace theoretically has been restored. The first page carries the fourteenth chapter of Saint John: "Let not your heart be troubled"—the beautiful teaching of Jesus on the evening before His crucifixion. And the last page also is from St. John—the letter beginning, "My children, these things I write unto you" and closing, "If ye know that He is righteous, ye know that every one that doeth righteousness is born of Him."

Each of the selections deserves to be called great literature. Many of them come near to being great music. Psalm 23, for example, begs to be sung. The Sermon on the Mount, from the Gospel of St. Matthew, on the other hand, almost automatically prompts an oratorical delivery. But it also is a magnificent specimen of organized and disciplined logic. The late Justice Holmes could have expounded it with a perfect distinction. So, too, any of a score of generals might pronounce with the impressiveness of their authority as commanders the Twenty-seventh Psalm: "The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear?" Or any of as many admirals might recite with a special significance the verses of the One Hundred and Seventh Psalm, commencing unforgettably: "They that go down to the sea in ships."

However, a man or a woman need not be famous or lofty of station in order to make the Bible his or her own. It is everybody's book, and the more so now, providentially, than ever in the past.

If I Were a Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from

Hon. W. H. Holcombe, sheriff of Mobile County, Ala.:

SHERIFF'S OFFICE, MOBILE COUNTY,
Mobile, Ala., October 10, 1945.

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANK: I have decided to take a little time out of the busy every days that I have lately, and while sitting on my front porch at Hall's Mill Creek, with everything here so seemingly peaceful, jot down a few thoughts that I have been indulging in lately on the subject of what I would do if I were a Congressman.

I say that everything is "seemingly peaceful." No one knows how real this peace is. We do know, however, that just a few months ago all was not so tranquil. We know that hundreds of thousands of our own Americans are at peace forever because they are dead; that thousands more are maimed for life, and that that many more have as a citation of the part they played ruined health which they will never again recover.

Even now, almost every day, the lives of some of our own Mobilians are saddened by news of the passing of one of their loved ones, the terrible news just now seeping through of deaths that occurred months ago.

My own family has been struck through the death of Leila's husband, John Boehm. J. C. Holcombe's brother-in-law died on some small island in the Pacific last September 20 with infantile paralysis, a war casualty. There are too many to enumerate.

Your sons and mine are still in the service, and even though the war is officially over, they are constantly in danger.

When one thinks it over, the inevitable, simple conclusion to be reached is that all of this is because a few evil minds in the world contrived to lead willing, misguided people into war.

We read about General Patton's removal as commander of the Third Army because he was too lenient with the Nazis.

There is dissatisfaction on the part of Russia with General MacArthur's management of his command in Japan.

Every effort is being put forth, so it is said, to so govern the defeated nations that they can "never again wage war."

"Never again" is a long time. Where and when men want to try to start wars they will do so, if their people are willing, or even easily led. Though not so willing, they can and will be regimented into war-making machines, if they are not by virtue of their character against violence and bloodshed.

It all depends on the people everywhere. The kind of government they happen to live under may or may not have a great deal to do with it. All will still be uncertain.

Much has been said recently about the juvenile crime wave that has shocked this Nation. Unless we do something constructive along this line, the shock we have received will, in some not too distant time, resemble a mild tickle from an amusement park battery set as compared to a death-dealing jolt of 5,000 volts from a rural-electrification power line.

In my humble opinion the remedy for most of the world's and our own domestic troubles lies so easily within the reach of those who are in earnest about wanting to "do something" about it that it seems silly and ignorant to overlook it.

We have but to remember the old teaching, "Teach a child the way in which he should go and when he grows older he will not forget it." Our hope for the future lies in and with the child of today, with future generations, and in the schools of the world.

Two thousand years ago there lived on this earth One who knew and taught the right way in which to live. He laid down the simple rules which we have only to follow and there will be no more wars and no more crime.

The example set and the laws laid down by the Nazarine are so easily understood, so full of common sense, so easy and pleasant to follow that all men, whether Christian or not, can subscribe to them in joining together and build a world in which it will be safe for all to live.

Some there are who will reject this thought and will say that "religion should not be taught in our schools."

We note that in Illinois recently objection has been raised to the teaching in our schools of the existence of an almighty God, and have instituted injunction proceedings in the courts to prevent children from being taught that which, if there is to be any decent foundation built for the lives of our future generation, they must believe in.

Regardless of all of this, and of course there are still others who will disagree, sound thinking and reasoning seem to order that we try to mold the hearts and minds of the future citizens of America and the world along the lines of decency. We must teach them the way in which to go. When they are taught that, I for one believe that an overwhelming majority of them will not forget it. Those who will forget and choose the wrong road will be so few in number as not to matter very much.

A world whose citizens consist for the most part of those who believe in Almighty God, who respect the rights of others and who believe in doing unto others as you would have them do unto you will be a peaceful and a good world. There can be no doubt of that.

We have gone through a terrible ordeal. All of the misery, death, and destruction of the past few years will mean nothing as a lesson to the world unless we have learned that the old ways of the past will again bring only what we have just recently experienced. There must be a change brought about in the hearts and minds of men. The future citizens of the world must be people of character.

We, the so-called victors, have a chance to serve future humanity—such a chance as no nation or groups of nations ever had before. One which we will perhaps never have again.

To make good on this opportunity we have but to teach little Americans, Englishmen, Russians, Frenchmen, the children of the victor nations, and the defeated, too, yes, little Germans, Italians, and Japanese also, the way in which to go so that when they grow older they will not forget it. If that be considered teaching religion in our schools then teach it.

They will, in truth, be against and hate war, murder, robbery, and lawlessness. They will be men and women of character.

They will all want to live in a world in which, to use your own patent and expressive slogan, "Everything is made for love." Love of our fellowmen and of peace, law, and order.

If I were a Congressman, having membership in the most powerful body in the world in international affairs, I believe I would raise my voice and insist that in remaking those countries that have been brought to the brink of destruction by false and evil leadership, a system embracing in principle which I have suggested above be adopted and carried out, and that in our own country a proper foundation for good citizenship be laid in our schools.

All here send love to you and yours.

Sincerely,

W. H. HOLCOMBE,
Sheriff.

Address by Hon. W. L. Nelson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an inspiring address by our former colleague, Hon. W. L. Nelson, of Missouri, delivered before the Democratic Women's Club of the Second Congressional District of Missouri, at Columbia, October 10, 1945.

Mr. Nelson, who served successively on the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Rules, was a Member of this body in the Sixty-sixth, Sixty-ninth, Seventieth, Seventy-first, Seventy-second, Seventy-fourth, Seventy-fifth, Seventy-sixth, and Seventy-seventh Congresses. His address follows:

Mr. NELSON. Missouri, too long heralded as the birthplace of Frank and Jesse James, the happy habitat of the long eared hound, and peopled by skeptics who demanded to be shown, is no longer so publicized. It is now "Missouri, home of Harry S. Truman, President of the United States." Since this Missouri-born son of Missouri-born parents was elevated to the Presidency, no other State has received so much favorable mention. It matters not whether the comments come from enthusiastic citizens; from writers paid by word, paragraph, or page; or whether representing the honeyed words of aspiring politicians; there is praise.

As shines forth a newly discovered star in the sky, so—if past maligners and present boosters are to be believed—a new State has been born. The rush to tell the tale may be likened to the opening of the Cherokee Strip in Oklahoma, back in the days of free land, instead of free advice, or to the mad scramble for rare nylon hose in the rayon-weary days of 1945. So marked is the transition (if we are unquestioning believers) from the old to the new era that students in the University of Missouri, oldest in the Louisiana Purchase Territory, may find the official song, "Old Missouri," long known and sung in every State, entirely out of date.

To know the man in the White House one must know Missouri and Missourians, past and present. While changes have come, old landmarks remain and early influences continue.

Many changes noted since Mr. Truman became President have been among Missourians who have taken on an added feeling of importance and dignity. This follows after too long and too often having joined with others who, facetiously or maliciously, have poked fun at Missouri, allegedly a land of "rubes" and "robbers," "slickers" and "hayseeds." The song You Got to Quit Kicking My Dog Around, is heard less, while the Missouri Waltz is featured in the White House, now occupied by the Truman family.

The name "Missouri" no longer stands for The Mysterious Stranger, a political cartoon creation. Washington knows that there is a Missouri. So do the people of every commonwealth and every country. Japan will never be unmindful of the name. It was on the U. S. S. *Missouri*, than which there is no greater battleship, that for the first time in more than 20 centuries, Japanese signed terms of unconditional surrender.

At the Potsdam Conference, it was because of the down-to-earth common sense and

humor of a Missouri man that the philosophies of Attlee and Stalin were blended with America's philosophy, thereby promoting a better understanding, and assisting in the successful termination of the global struggle. Harry Truman's love of music, nurtured in a State famous for people's music, led him to request the concert by the talented GI musician, whose skill was so enthusiastically applauded by the others of the Big Three.

Only a resourceful Missourian would have had the temerity to suggest a little music as an ice breaker at an international bull session! Yet Missouri is modest. The modesty of President Truman is in keeping with this characteristic of most Missourians. While it is true that the Sedalia (Mo.) Bazoo, when edited by J. West Goodwin, carried at its masthead the line, "He that tooteth his own horn verily the same shall be tooted," the blowing of one's own horn or bragging about one's State has never been a shortcoming of Missourians, natural haters of blowhards.

Missouri, first of all, wants to be a good neighbor. She prefers friends to fame, just as does Harry Truman, who shortly after becoming Vice President, wrote "I never want to be President." The letter was signed "Harry" and the writer meant what he said. Fate decreed differently, but it has not changed the man.

President Truman, typical Missourian, is more popular because of his manner and demeanor. As said Vice President Marshall at the end of his term, "I shall never have to go back to the common people; I never left them," so can President Truman say at the end of his public career, long though it may be.

The President has not alienated people by attempting to oversell himself or his State. Maybe he has been too modest. There is so much that might be said of Missouri. In war, for instance, many names might be mentioned: Alexander M. Doniphan, who led his men on the then record-distance march to Mexico; Crowder and Pershing and Coontz, of World War I; and Omar N. Bradley and others of World War II.

Location counts. Missouri is, in part, what it is because of where it is. Midway between the geographical and population centers of the United States, it is at the crossroads of a continent. Here preceding the Civil War period the tides of pro-slavery and no-slavery rose and fell, and here the Missouri Compromise—not the one worked out in the 1944 Democratic National Convention—was offered as a possible temporary solution for a problem touching the later border warfare and Order No. 11. Missourians, then as now, were men of conviction and courage. As stated by Justice Douglas of the United States Supreme Court, in an address before the Missouri bar, Missouri was the only State to meet its full quota for both the Northern Armies and the Southern Armies. Near Boonville, Mo., the first land battle of the Civil War was fought, and 244 of the 2,261 Civil War battles took place on Missouri's soil. Small wonder is it then that in the conflict and in the subsequent days there should have been bitterness and lawlessness, with occasional decisions by courts from which there was no appeal.

Speaking again of location, Missouri is far enough north for hustle and far enough south for hospitality. It was here that the linchpin wagon of the pioneer stopped, and here the pony express started.

Daughter of Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Kentucky to the east, Missouri became the mother of most of the States to the south and west.

Yes; early Missourians knew what hustle, daring, and hardship, too, meant. Near Independence, where is now the Summer White House of President Truman, a lone signboard, pointing to the northwest, read: "Oregon, 1,900 miles." The Santa Fe Trail, another travel way blazed by Missourians, stretched 700 miles to the southwest.

To reset a plant in its early period of growth adds to its strength as its roots go deeper into the soil selected. Missourians have always been uprooted peoples. They have come to the State from older States, from countries across the oceans, and always they have come because there were opportunities for free enterprise and industry here. Perhaps this helps account for the clear-eyed acceptance of the challenge of these uprooted days of 1945. Led by Truman, who determinedly shuns despair, the common folk of Missouri know that the vast problems of reconversion can be solved by the same fortitude and vision that helped create their State, made it a leading State in agriculture, and increasingly so in industry—yes, and that helped to win the war. The people of Missouri are still frontiersmen, facing a new west—a mental, scientific and social one that taxes all the energies and talents that men and women, forward-looking and unafraid, can command.

Missouri has about her that indefinable "something" which distinguishes her citizens from those of most other States. Missourians are different. The difference is not wholly due to heredity or environment, or altogether to background or "bringing up." No other State matches Missouri in a combination of soil and scenery and in the ability to supply man's every need, including clothing, food and fiber. But to "point with pride" to Missouri's firsts and foremosts; to mention her ability to give employment both to cotton pickers and ice harvesters; or to say much more of the State's resources in mines, fields and factories, does not disclose why Missourians are different. The soil may have something to do with it.

Half a century ago Dr. A. W. McAlester, then dean of the school of medicine, University of Missouri, and a nationally known breeder and exhibitor of Morgan horses, held that the best horses could be produced only on limestone-underlaid land suited to the growth of bluegrass, as in Missouri. Now comes Dr. William A. Albrecht, head of the soils department of the Missouri College of Agriculture and who is temporarily directing educational work in Germany, who leaves no doubt as to the importance of the source of vitamins in feed for livestock, some feeds being especially rich in those agencies making for growth and strength in animals. The suggestion is made that like contributions may be made to the development of Missourians. As to the part played by bluegrass, best grown on limestone lands, in the development of horses such as Rex McDonald, world champion five-gaited saddle horse of his day, and Easter Parade, 1945 winner over all, there is ample proof. If with feed for horses why not with food for humans?

While in no sense hero worshipers, Missourians have not failed to honor the pathfinders and home builders who cleared the forests and plowed the prairies.

Men do not set up signboards for themselves but for others who are to follow. This truth Missourians have never failed to recognize. Such sentiments find expression in old settlers' societies and reunions such as the Lone Jack picnic, held annually only a short distance from the Truman family home, and the Randolph County Old Settlers' Association.

Speaking at the fifty-seventh annual meeting of the latter, Gov. Phil M. Donnelly, Missouri's Governor, a product of the Ozarks, in addressing the Old Settlers, called attention to some of the State's out-State industries, adding, "Let us move confidently into a new future. Glorious as the past has been, our golden age is not in bygone days, but is before us. The Governor stressed citizenship, rather than commerce, merely mentioning farming and a few out-State industries, of which Missouri has many in addition to those in the larger cities. The world's foremost nursery, reminiscent of the days of Johnny Appleseed; a fire-brick plant whose immense output, ordinarily shipped to every part of the world, was all used by the Government in ship construction during World War II, the fireboxes of the battleship *Missouri* being lined with these made-in-Missouri brick; only a few miles distant from the fire-brick city a smaller town whose model factory supplies anchors and stays and other hardware, wherever telephone or telegraph wires are strung, the Government being the exclusive purchaser during the war period; largest of alfalfa dehydrators, and cob pipe factories where millions of 'Missouri Meerschaums', such as General MacArthur smokes, are made.

If one would know the secret of the strength of President Truman's home State, he will not seek it alone in bank balances or in the products of farms and factories. He will go far back and turn to many sources, to dim documents, some hidden away in old courthouses; to scrapbooks, diaries, family Bibles, ancient photograph albums, and even to tombstones yellowed with the tears of the passing years.

On my desk as I write are old account books, diaries, and other records, some of the entries made more than a century ago. Let us look first at this pocket-size and well-worn notebook carried by my grandfather.

"April 20, 1836, left Hardy County, Va. (now West Virginia) with 280 head of cattle" reads the first entry. Following on other pages, some of them dog-eared and discolored, there is recorded the slow movement of these grass-fed steers which finally, after passing through Philadelphia, were sold, on foot, in New York City. The first major river crossing was at Harper's Ferry, where rivers and States meet, and where, years later, a monument was erected to the memory of John Brown. Daily entries in the old account book show toll at ferry crossings, of which there were many; tavern charges for men, and feed and lot expense for cattle and horses are figured to the last penny in the meticulously kept diary. Saving and counting the cost was good business then as now under the leadership of President Truman.

The next entries in Thomas Tucker's book were made in Missouri, to which State he and others of his family came. A few years later, in 1839, Nathaniel Leonard, who had come to Missouri from Vermont, wrote other livestock history, as he recorded the trip down the Ohio of three pure-bred cattle, "Reds, Whites, and Roans," finally shipped by boat up the Missouri River to Cooper County. These animals were foundation stock for the present Ravenswood herd and the oldest of all known herds of shorthorn cattle under one family ownership in the world.

But there are other books and notations far more revealing as to the early and continuing strength of the State. I now read from a letter written by my paternal grandmother in 1835 to a relative remaining in Virginia:

"We have been on the road 7 weeks and all is going well with us. Near the close of each day we make camp, place the covered wagons in a circle for protection, put up our tents, and start supper. When the fires under the kettles are burning bright and there is the welcome odor of food in the air, we gather about, sing old gospel hymns, and have prayer. It all reminds me of a camp meeting, but we miss the brush arbors."

As showing the same spiritual influence, and similar deep devotion of those pioneer people, I quote the following, written in small but legible script in my grandmother's diary: "Thomas and Mary V. Tucker went to housekeeping on the 10th of February, 1848. May we both live in peace and harmony while we are traveling the path of life, and when our Maker calls us from here may we depart with joy to the place God has prepared for those who love Him."

I quote from family records, feeling that they are representative of many families which came to Missouri.

The mill-run of Missouri pioneers were a deeply religious people—good but not goody-good. They, as they made the then long and dangerous trip westward, lacking as they were in adequate transportation and communication facilities, brought with them their Bibles, axes, and rifles; all of which were used.

Coming of their own free choice from States they loved, and with faith in each other and in God, they had every confidence that together they would in "the far country beyond the Mississippi" make real homes, the abiding strength of any State.

About these makes of Missouri, whether akin to the Mayflower flock or the Jamestown group or other beginnings, perhaps followers of Duden, whose vision and vigilance caused many from Germany to locate along the rivers of eastern Missouri, they were quick to establish churches, both Protestant and Catholic.

Homes and churches were the lap-rings which joined together the chains needed to remove obstacles and to build in a new land. Along with faith grew family affection. Homes were real homes, service stations as well as filling stations. Neighborliness came naturally.

Is it then surprising to hear what the public is being told of President Truman and his family They are average Missouri folk, with background, ideas, ideals, and neighbors about like thousands of other Missourians, "fair to middlin', mostly middlin'" and not given to "meddlin'" or "muddlin'."

Independence—appropriate name for a President who has not been swayed too far to "left" or "right"—is a quiet, homey town where neighbors run in or out backdoors or cut across sideyards. This still applies to the Truman home, provided secret-service men give permission, and where the President and First Lady are still "Harry" and "Bess."

Hospitality is characteristic of Missouri homes. This was ever so. "Welcome" was the word to the man in covered wagon or on horseback. The light-and-tie greeting extended friend or stranger was never lacking in the days of the bootjack and hitchrack. The visitor entered without knocking and left the same way. Then, as always, good neighbors begat good neighbors.

The President is as hospitable to new ideas and suggestion as he is to folks. Disposing of the "chaff" and "straw" as does the cyclone stacker, invented by a Missouri farmer-mechanic, he threshes out offerings from many fields. He is hungry for whatever may prove helpful, and has no fear of foundering on facts.

Mr. Truman, once derisively dubbed "Harry the hatter" because of his hat-store venture in Kansas City, must have as his motto, Keep your head; you may need it for a hat. A talented musician, he prefers to classify folks in piano terms—square, upright, and grand—rather than violently find fault with those who do not share his views. He has shown his faith in the common man by consulting him—through his elected representatives—concerning major policies of government. His genius lies in the implicit trust in the capability of each man. This is directly traceable to his Missouri background of neighborliness, good will, and interest in the other fellow; and to the interchange of viewpoints at county fairs, church festivals, and civic clubs. Possibly President Truman might best be described as a double-barreled Democrat—big D and little d—a firm believer in the Democratic Party and in all the people.

While recognizing the importance of the national "level"—to use Washington's most overworked word—President Truman keeps constantly in mind village, city, and State levels. In fact, to him all are one. The isolated, independent community, as known to Daniel Boone and other early Missourians, has disappeared as has the prairie schooner from the grassy seas. Action taken in the Nation's Capital may affect the man on the smallest farm in Jackson County, Mo. This Harry Truman, once a farmer, knows. He knows, too, that farm prosperity is measured by the purchasing power of the product, not merely by the price, and that no producer ever got rich when he had nothing to sell.

President's Truman's first act, in assuming the high office to which he had so suddenly been called, was one of humility. He asked the American people to pray for him and in so doing revealed his inherent trust in God and his faith in his fellow men. He had not forgotten the "faith of our fathers" and of the pioneer mothers of Missouri. A Baptist, Mr. Truman is content in the thought that all paths meet at the top of the mountain.

With the love of country and friends comes the love of one's own family. Mr. Truman's first phone call, after he had taken the Presidential oath of office, was to his 92-year-old mother, Mrs. Martha Truman, in Jackson County, Mo. "Be a good man, Harry," and, with a laugh, the plain but proud mother added, "Behave yourself."

The mother did not admonish the son to be a great President. She, with perfect understanding, put first things first.

Soon came Mother's Day. when the President, eager to have his mother with him, arranged for her to travel by plane to Washington and be his guest in the White House.

Consider well these things; keep in mind that Mrs. Martha Truman is not unlike thousands of other Missouri mothers; recall the history (far too little of it in books) of early settlements and the character of the pioneer people—and you will begin to understand what makes Missouri what she is and why Harry Truman is what he is.

Address of Hon. James M. Mead, of New York, at Dedication of the Bowne House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 23 (legislative day of Monday, October 22), 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address which I delivered on October 10, 1945, at the dedication of the Bowne House, Flushing, N. Y., as a national shrine to religious tolerance. Because of the importance of the event, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Bowne House—A Shrine to Religious Freedom," together with a copy of the program which was arranged for that occasion.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOLERANCE AND WORLD PEACE

(Address of Hon. JAMES M. MEAD, of New York)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and friends, I am mindful of the significance of this occasion and of the honor conferred upon me by your committee. Judge Colden, the chairman, and all of his coworkers are to be congratulated upon their unselfish patriotism in giving so freely of their time and talents to insure the success of this celebration.

The dedication of the Bowne House as a national shrine to religious tolerance is of much more significance than the formal ceremony implies. Inspired by the noble sentiments which motivated this tercentenary celebration, you have caused people to gather here from all over our land. We are permitted to live again the sturdy faith which gave courage to John Bowne and his supporters in their successful resistance to intolerance. In the name of religious freedom, Bowne put his own life and liberty in jeopardy that he might secure for others the liberty of conscience pledged in the charter granted to the founders of the town of Flushing by the Dutch governor.

In paying tribute to John Bowne and his supporters for the signal victory which was theirs in establishing freedom of conscience in this province of the New World, we must not neglect to make special mention of the tolerance displayed by the representatives of the Amsterdam Chamber of the Dutch West India Co. in Holland. They resolved that the consciences of men, at least, ought to remain free and unchallenged. That brave country which has suffered so much to maintain its independence is represented here today by the Netherlands Minister. To you, Mr. Minister, we express our heartfelt thanks for this great contribution to the cause of religious freedom. We are aware of the sacrifices which your people made in the recent struggle against the forces of tyranny. The absence of intolerance in your country today and the elimination of class distinction might well be emulated by the other nations of the earth. The seed of religious freedom planted here in the town of Flushing was nurtured and cared for by the Dutch inhabitants and bore fruit in plentitude. This once peaceful community of homes with its wide, tree-lined streets, has given way to the busy life of a modern metropolis with its subways, shopping centers, large buildings of stone and steel, and its crowded streets. But through the fortitude of John Bowne and the generosity of his descendants, the Misses Bertha R. and Anna H. Parsons, who are present today, the future wayfarer may find here the peace and serenity of the town of Flushing of 300 years ago.

We in America have progressed far since the memorable victory of John Bowne. All of our early forebears were not entirely free of intolerance, an inheritance from the animosities of the Old World. Strangely enough, although these early settlers came here in the name of freedom to escape the persecutions of their homelands, too often they became intolerant of others in the New World. They established havens of safety in the New World, but the havens in some instances were safe only for those who were of the same religious belief. But divine providence ordained that this new land should infuse into men's souls the burning desire that hatred and bigotry be eradicated. They learned that love of neighbor was to be the keystone in welding peoples from many lands, of many religions, and of different color, into a strong and stable government. The name of John Bowne, one of the very earliest champions of freedom of religion, was soon followed by John Peter Zenger who fought for freedom of the press.

These pioneers in the cause of liberty were followed in quick succession by others among the colonists, who wrote constitutional guaranties into their colonial laws, culminating in the immortal document of freedom, our own Constitution of the United States, which guarantees freedom of speech and of religion and of the press.

But charters of liberty alone cannot insure the freedoms so essential to man's well-being and happiness. The written words of

charters of freedom must live in men's hearts, and there must be a militant John Bowne in each generation to be ever watchful that the written words of the charters be held sacred.

The recent revelations of the tortures in the concentration camps under the Nazi regime have horrified the world. The physical and spiritual sufferings of the victims of these persecutions have aroused the sympathies of all people. The danger is great that the disclosures of these cruelties will inflame men's passions and endanger the structure of a permanent foundation for peace.

The pattern set in this historic celebration commencing with the religious services in the churches of Flushing of all denominations, should inspire all of us in the ways of tolerance. We should benefit too by the lessons of tolerance which our men in the armed forces lived so nobly on the battle fronts of the world. The children of every race and of every religion—Protestant, Catholic, and Jew—made the supreme sacrifice that others might live in peace and unity. The examples of tolerance exemplified by the contributions of the chaplains of every denomination during the tragic war, attained greater heights than ever before in our history. We must hold these gains and spend every waking moment in promoting domestic tranquillity. We need unity and selflessness as a protection against the constant threat of intolerance which is always ready to raise its ugly head, especially as an aftermath of warfare between men and nations. We proved in this war that men of every race, creed, and color can work together, live together, and fight together for a common cause. We must now present this same united front in the cause of peace. The example of tolerance which we practice here in America will in a large measure determine the extent to which tolerance will exist among the nations of the world. In the world society we must be tolerant of the differences of others from us. In return, we shall have the right to expect and to ask, in the name of world peace, that they be tolerant of our differences from them. We must strive to establish a world order in which each nation is free to work out its own destiny, under its own form of government, and through its own processes, subject only to the condition that it be tolerant of its neighbor and mindful of the inherent rights of the individual.

Today, after 300 years, this historic house still stands. Its sturdy timbers are symbolic of the spirit which lives on—the heritage of religious freedom which has been passed down by each succeeding generation, to our day.

It is fitting that this celebration follows so closely the successful termination of the costly war waged in the name of freedom. As John Bowne's successful fight for freedom ushered in a new era for the people of America, we pray God that the recent successful fight of our American people for freedom, will usher in a new era for all the peoples of the earth.

Greed, intolerance and hatred are the mainsprings of war. Charity, tolerance, and love are the ways of peace. Unless the peoples of the world have learned these truths, all of our sacrifices shall have been in vain. If we in the United States treat the military victory in the war as the end of our obligation in the struggle for lasting peace, we shall break faith with our heroic dead who laid down their lives that we might live in freedom.

The flesh and blood of America, our wealth, our ingenuity, and love of liberty were the sinews that bound the peoples of the world in the united army that brought the enemy to his crushing defeat. These same sinews must be used to fashion the peace. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that peace as well as war requires total mobilization.

We are now the strongest nation on earth, a reality which is apparent to our friends, as well as our enemies. We used our strength in waging war. We must now use our strength to wage war against war. As the strongest nation on earth, it should not be our aim to dominate other nations of the world but rather to furnish the leadership to establish the unity of mankind and of the family of peoples. It is only by recognizing this unity of mankind and of the family of peoples that the world can live in harmony. Down through the ages determined efforts have been made to prevent wars. These efforts were always strongest immediately after the termination of the last preceding war. All such efforts were in vain. Our leaders in this past war did not wait until the military victory before starting the pattern for peace. The late President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill early enunciated our aims and the aims of our allies in the historic Atlantic Charter. Since that time the leaders of the great world powers have met frequently to discuss the everchanging world events. Economic and political international conferences of the representatives of the United Nations likewise have been called from time to time. All of these efforts were inspired by the hunger of men's souls for peace. That we have not thus far solved all of the problems should not be taken as an evidence of failure. Deep-rooted prejudices, nationalistic thinking, and the human frailties of man, the heritages of thousands of years of civilization are obstacles which must be overcome before we can establish an ideal world society. Our concern must not be over the difficulties which stand in the way, but rather must we be concerned lest we lose faith in our ability to succeed. We must have faith that our leadership in world affairs will ultimately lead us to that ideal family of sovereign nations which will be vested by the consent of all with supreme authority and with power to thwart any aggressor at the outset. If we can attain this objective of banishing war, we will have gone far in establishing a world which will enjoy the freedom that John Bowne secured for the people of the town of Flushing, nearly 300 years ago.

In dedicating this shrine to religious freedom in America, we might well adopt for the people of the world the promise contained in the charter issued October 10, 1645, by the Dutch governor, namely, "the right to have and enjoy liberty of conscience."

BOWNE HOUSE—A SHRINE TO RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Few towns or colonies contributed more toward establishing religious freedom in America than did Flushing.

In the charter issued October 10, 1645, by Gov. William Kieft of the Dutch Province of New Netherland, the founders of the town of Flushing were promised "the right to have and enjoy liberty of conscience." These men, of divers views on religion, courageously resisted every attempt to infringe upon that right, and accepted in their community people of every faith.

Their attitude was eloquently expressed in the Flushing Remonstrance, which is among the truly great documents in American history. Incensed by a ban ordered by Gov. Peter Stuyvesant in 1657 on the harboring of Quakers, or the holding of religious services by this sect, newly arrived in the colony, 26 freeholders of the town of Flushing proclaimed that not only would they welcome Quakers to their town and homes, but any "sons of Adam who come in love among us" and would not "condemn, punish, banish, prosecute, or lay violent hands upon anyone, in whatever name, form, or title he might appear."

Dismissal of the town officials, fining and imprisonment of some of the signers and threats of banishment failed to suppress this remarkable spirit of tolerance, which was not a common virtue of the time. Flushing continued to be a haven for Quakers, although they were forced to hold meetings secretly in the woods to escape persecution by the New Netherland authorities.

When he built his home in 1661, John Bowne, a conservative, quiet-spoken, plain, but strong-minded man, invited the Quakers to worship there. Bowne had married Hannah Feake, daughter of Sheriff Tobias Feake, who had been suspected of being an instigator of the Remonstrance. Like many other residents of the town, Bowne and his wife had been converted to the Quaker faith.

It was not long before word reached Governor Stuyvesant of this defiance of the ban on those whom he called "an abominable sect." In August 1662 a warrant was issued for John Bowne's arrest. Taken from his home in chains, he was haled before the Governor and Council and fined 25 pounds Flanders, with a stern warning to abstain himself in the future from Quaker meetings, under penalty of double the fine and banishment.

Bowne refused to pay the fine or renounce his right to religious freedom. When solitary confinement in the dungeon at the New Amsterdam fort, on a diet of bread and water, and more gentle methods of persuasion failed, Governor Stuyvesant decided to "transport Bowne from the province, as an example to others."

Sent to Holland for disposal of his case, John Bowne made such an earnest plea for tolerance and "liberty of conscience" that he was set free. In its decision the Amsterdam Chamber of the Dutch West India Co., governing body of the New Netherland Province, declared that "the consciences of men, at least, ought to remain free and unshackled."

The trial and acquittal of John Bowne on the issue of freedom of religion unquestionably ranks equally in importance with the trial of John Peter Zenger, nearly 75 years later, on the question of freedom of the press. Both helped to bring about in this new Nation the basic concepts of freedom written into the Bill of Rights.

DEDICATION OF BOWNE HOUSE

The following program was arranged for the dedication of the Bowne House held on October 10, 1945:

Presiding: Hon. Charles S. Colden, president of the Bowne House Historical Society.

Advancing of the colors: Color guard of the William A. Leonard Post, No. 422, of the American Legion.

National anthem: Mr. Everett D. McCooey, accompanied by Queens College ensemble, directed by Mr. Boris Schwarz.

Invocation: Very Rev. Msgr. John D. Wynne, St. Michael's Roman Catholic Church of Flushing.

Reading from the Old Testament: Rabbi Max Meyer, Free Synagogue of Flushing.

Reading from the New Testament: Rev. Dougald Lachlan Maclean, St. George's Episcopal Church of Flushing.

Address of welcome: Hon. James A. Burke, president of the Borough of Queens.

Reading of the charter: Rev. E. Wallace Mast, First Congregational Church of Flushing.

Reading of the remonstrance: Rev. Norman A. Hall, First Methodist Church of Flushing.

Address: Hon. Fiorello H. LaGuardia, mayor of the city of New York.

Address: Dr. Albert B. Corey, State historian.

Address: Dr. Howard H. Brinton, director of the graduate school, Pendle Hill, Wallingford, Pa.

Presentation of scroll: Dr. Charles H. Campbell, Reformed Church of Flushing.

Acceptance of the scroll and address: Baron W. van Boetzelaer van Oosterhout, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the Netherlands.

Reading of the message from Governor Dewey: Rev. B. A. Galloway, the Macedonia Methodist Episcopal Church of Flushing.

Dedication address: Hon. JAMES M. MEAD, United States Senator.

America: Mr. Everett D. McCooey, accompanied by Queens College ensemble, directed by Mr. Boris Schwarz.

Retiring of the colors.

Benediction: Rev. Archie Buchanan, Grace Episcopal Church of Whitestone.

Abandonment of Fort Brady

REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED BRADLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 19, 1945

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Fort Brady, located at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., which has stood proudly for 125 years, was declared surplus by the Army as of October 1. Secretary Patterson, in a letter to me of September 28, gave the following explanation:

Fort Brady, like some other small Army posts built along the Canadian border many years ago, has, I believe, served its useful purpose. With the existence of our firm, friendly relations with Canada, it appears to me that it will be uneconomical from both a military and a monetary point of view to maintain all of these small isolated Army posts. Experience in both world wars has shown the need for larger and more centralized military establishments where our relatively small peacetime Army can receive the intensive combined training so necessary to men who will become the nuclei of expanded wartime units.

With respect to your comments regarding the vulnerability to air attack of one of the Nation's vital areas, establishments such as Fort Brady to provide the necessary protection are not the solution according to numerous and continuing War Department studies. The guarding of such areas against sabotage probably always will be a necessity, but this function can be rapidly undertaken by Regular Army personnel from other stations or by National Guard personnel from the area in question. The situation appears to be somewhat similar to that of a city which cannot afford to disperse its police force in the continuous guarding of important property but maintains a reserve or riot squad to answer calls of an emergency nature.

In connection with your statement regarding the use of the post for CMTC training, I feel sure you will agree that if training for Regular Army personnel can be better carried out in combination with all the arms and services at large posts, so, too, can the training of the CMTC, ROTC, and National Guard be more competent and more valuable at centralized posts with large reservations suitable for maneuver and field exercises.

Of course, it is difficult indeed to find objections to the Army's decision.

However, the way in which the equipment is being removed from the buildings at Fort Brady is a disgrace and is wasteful of the taxpayers' money in the extreme. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, let me point out that Fort Brady was renovated and completely modernized in the 5 years preceding the recent war. A large, beautiful brick, steel, and concrete barracks, equipped with the most modern sanitation and cooking facilities was constructed by the WPA. The post hospital was modernized and extended through a grant of funds from the Surgeon General. During the war a large recreational building and other buildings of permanent construction were added. Through last summer, many workmen were employed making repairs to the structures to keep them up to date. Consequently, the decision to abandon Fort Brady came as quite a shock to the citizens of the Soo.

These buildings can and should be properly maintained by, and usable to, either the State of Michigan or the city of Sault Ste. Marie, especially when it is to be pointed out that this beautiful post lies right in the heart of the city proper. As a matter of fact, a delegation from the Soo is in the city right today endeavoring to find out how the city can acquire that post in its own name.

Yet the Army engineers a week before the fort actually was declared surplus—as of October 1—moved in and started destroying the permanent installations in these buildings by ripping them out bodily from the walls, floors, and ceilings. The absurd excuse has been made that all this property belongs to the Army Quartermaster Corps and I have been informed that same is being transferred to Fort Wood, Wis., or elsewhere, for storage. It is logical to concede that removable equipment such as bunks, blankets, dishes, pots, and pans, and so forth, should properly belong to the Quartermaster Corps and should thus be removed. There is no complaint with that.

On the other hand, it is entirely illogical to claim that permanent installations, such as furnaces, plumbing, plumbing fixtures, kitchen ranges, built-in chromium kitchen sinks and drainboards, are the property of the Quartermaster Corps.

They were not installed by, and they never have belonged to, the Quartermaster Corps. Surely when one sells a house out of which he is moving he does not destroy the lavatory, nor does he remove any of the other permanently attached equipment. That properly goes with the building itself, and any removal of same, especially when it is difficult, if not impossible, to replace at this time, makes those buildings unfit for occupancy for any purpose, and the terrible destructive manner in which these permanent fixtures are being removed—tearing great holes in the walls, ceilings, and floors—to say nothing of possible damage to the equipment itself, is a disgraceful waste of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. Speaker, under date of September 29, as soon as this destructive dismantling was called to my attention, I addressed a letter to Secretary Patterson protesting against this procedure and to which letter I have yet to receive any reply or even an acknowledgment.

Today we have before us on the floor a bill to retrench our expenditures and drastically reduce allocations already made for 1946 to the extent of some $55,000,000,000. With that bill, of course, I am in wholehearted accord, but I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that there are other ways in which the taxpayer can be protected, and one of those is for the Army to use more judgment in dismantling properties such as Fort Brady, and we may assume there will be many similar disgraceful such programs in the future unless a stop is put to it right now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] has expired.

Presidential Order Transferring Bulk of Surplus Disposal Activities to RFC Confirms Stand Taken by House Small Business Committee 2 Years Ago—H. R. 3873 Recommended Same Program Back in 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the fall of 1943 I introduced H. R. 3873, a bill designed to centralize disposal of Government-owned surplus property in the hands of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The bill carried with it the unanimous endorsement of the entire membership of the House Small Business Committee and was the result of the findings of that committee in its hearings held on surplus disposal way back in 1943. It also carried the endorsement of the membership of approximately 20 trade associations engaged in the distribution of consumer goods.

On October 19 the President issued an Executive order transferring the disposal of surplus consumer goods to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, thus giving to that agency the responsibility for the actual disposition of approximately 90 percent of all of our surpluses.

One of my supporters in pressing for the adoption of H. R. 3873 was Mr. Charles H. Lipsett, president of the Atlas Publishing Co., and publisher of several trade magazines and one weekly publication dealing exclusively with the subject of surplus disposal. Mr. Lipsett is considered one of the Nation's authorities on this question as a result of his studies in the field during and after World War I.

I have today received a letter from Mr. Lipsett which has provided me with considerable satisfaction. The letter reads as follows:

OCTOBER 20, 1945.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: You are undoubtedly aware of the recent order by the President, transferring the surplus disposal activity of the Commerce Department to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. This practically makes the RFC the disposal agency for at least 90 percent of our surplus war materials. I consider this order quite a compliment to your good judgment as in your bill, H. R. 3873, which you presented to the House Committee on Banking and Currency on January 17, 1944 you made the same recommendation.

In my conference with Mr. Symington, since he was appointed Administrator, I stressed the need of a centralized disposal

agency as covered by your bill, and as also outlined in my original recommendations on the disposal of surplus war materials. It has taken the Administration close to 2 years to find out that we were right.

With best wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

CHARLES H. LIPSETT.

British Loan Demands on United States Arouses Anxiety in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Sears Henning from the Washington Times-Herald:

BRITISH LOAN DEMANDS ON UNITED STATES AROUSES ANXIETY IN CONGRESS

(By Arthur Sears Henning)

Great Britain's postwar program for the United States, so far as it has been revealed, is causing increasing anxiety in Congress. How to meet the demands of the British without crippling American trade and further impoverishing the American people, already shouldering a $300,000,000,000 debt for the war, is the subject of the conference.

The principal items of the British program are:

1. A gift of $6,000,000,000 by the United States to put the British on their feet financially and restore their foreign trade potential—incidentally in competition with the United States.

SEEK LOAN OF SHIPS

2. Loan of 1,000 Liberty ships by the United States to the British to enable them to regain their ocean trade on profitable terms.

3. Repeal by the United States of the provision of American law requiring the export in American bottoms of American products purchased with the proceeds of American foreign loans.

4. Devaluation of world currencies, including the American dollar, in order to make the $6,000,000,000 gift more palatable to the American people. The six billions would be taken from the United States' $20,000,000,000 gold stock, but would be represented to the public as partly, if not wholly, offset by the United States Treasury's paper profit on devaluation of the dollar.

ADMINISTRATION FAVORS AID

The Truman administration has been won to support of financial aid for Britain in the several weeks of negotiations conducted here by Lord Keynes, who, because of his inspiration of New Deal financial policies became known as the Englishman who rules America, and by the Earl of Halifax, the British Ambassador. The only question remaining, so far as the administration is concerned, is whether the aid shall be an outright gift, an interest-free loan, or a loan at nominal interest.

In Congress, sentiment is divided, and there a battle is in prospect. Many Senators and Representatives hold with Senator TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, that it is necessary to bail out Britain to the extent of three billions or more, but insist upon gaining trade concessions in exchange. The British are relying on Lord Halifax to influence Congress, the noble lord being reputed to know more Senators and Congressmen than anyone else.

The British are satisfied on the whole with the attitude of the administration. As soon as they manifested their desire for financial aid Assistant Secretary of State Clayton was dispatched to London to learn their pleasure and inquire into their financial condition. Once the negotiations were transferred to Washington the administration was more than cooperative.

Lord Halifax, however, was firm and unyielding in his demands. He said the assistance must be an outright gift, as Britain couldn't afford to repay a loan or even to pay interest on a loan.

WANT BRITISH CONCESSIONS

The negotiations now revolve around concessions that it is conceived Britain must make if the consent of Congress to financial aid is to be obtained. Congress, administration leaders believe, while refusing an outright gift would approve a long-term $5,000,000,000 loan at nominal interest.

Britain, however, would be required to abolish or greatly scale down the imperial preference tariff system which militates against American trade, abolish the dollar pool established with the Dominions, and break up the sterling bloc of countries barred from trade with the United States.

The removal of British trade restrictions is implicit in the Bretton Woods world financial stabilization project, financed chiefly by the United States, which was engineered originally by Lord Keynes. The United States has ratified the plan but Great Britain has not.

COOPERATIVE ON SHIP DEAL

The administration has been highly cooperative also in the negotiations for the loan of 1,000 Liberty ships to Britain.

Of America's 2,500 10,000-ton Liberty ships, built at a cost of $5,000,000,000, Britain now operates 200 on extended lend-lease and wants 1,000 more for 8 or 9 years on a strictly loan basis, no cash involved.

The British plan to use these ships on the principal trade routes of the world, picking up the profitable business lost by the Germans, Italians, and Japs. American ship owners are fighting the proposal, contending that this loan would throw away America's chance to become a merchant shipping power.

BLAND BILL GAINS SUPPORT

Opponents in Congress are rallying in support of a provision in the pending Bland shipping bill prohibiting transfer of an American ship to a foreign flag until 6 months after its offer for sale to Americans.

The British won the support of the administration negotiators for their argument that much as Britain needs the money America stands in even greater need of the trade benefits that the rehabilitation of Britain commercially would assure.

Viewpoint of an American Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 23 (legislative day of Monday, October 22), 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very unusual letter which I received from a soldier abroad. At his request, I ask that his name be omitted from the letter.

There being no objection, the letter, without the signature, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 10, 1945.

Hello, SENATOR BUTLER: After nearly 3 years of censorship in the Army, both in the United States and on foreign soil, I have been privileged in reading and understanding the American soldier's viewpoint on a great many things. These things I hope to carry back with me into civilian life, and until my dying day I hope to be able to justify some of the complaints which are predominant in every Army man's heart and mind. Even back in the dark days of slavery, "there was a great many souls sold down the river," but never has such a thing been so widespread as has been the plight of the American soldier on foreign soil since the day he received his "Greetings."

The first thing that a soldier must learn is the fact that an order is an order, and that his country must come first, and that his family and his individual feelings must come second. The hour has never been too late, or the weather too bad, when a man could not be called into a duty to perform which might cost him his life. Personal feelings were never taken into consideration, and his monthly check was not changed. There is no such a thing as overtime in the Army. You belong to Uncle Sam 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, month in and month out, until such time as the emergency plus 6 months is past. You had no recourse but to do the job. If you did not do the job, you were a slacker and a traitor to the country. At all times stood such possibilities as court martial and a death sentence for your failure to perform your duty. All you need must do to check this fact is to look over any court-martial proceedings any place in the entire world where the American Army has been located and it will be verified.

Yet, while the American soldier has been away from home fighting to preserve the rights of all, others have been allowed to stay at home on fine jobs and enjoy all the freedoms which we are fighting for. Certainly to the 11,000,000 men that are returning home there is a sore spot some place in their being when they stop and realize that they fought for the same rights that the man at home enjoyed, and yet their children must look upon the children of other men that are better dressed and have more money in their pocket and ask, "Is this justice?"

Ever since that eventful day in 1942 when I was called into the services there has not been one single day that I have not been able to pick up an American newspaper and read the fact that men have been called out on strikes and lost many millions of man-hours of work that were needed in American production. Just how many lives could have been saved had they done the job as the American soldier has had to do. How many men would have worked in a mine or an automobile factory at $21 per month as a great many of us have had to do in the armed service, and yet their lives were not endangered. They were allowed to return home each day to their wives and children and enjoy them growing up, while the rest of us must have been deprived of this pleasure, and our children grew up while we were away. These precious years of their lives we lost, and we cannot be repaid dollars and cents, and yet we could not strike.

Some 60 colored men refused to do a duty here on the Island of Oahu some time back, and each one of them was court-martialed and sentenced to hard labor, and yet you allow John L. Lewis to cut the American outlay of coal production 1,000,000 tons of coal per day, while the rest of the world is looking upon us and wondering how are we going to be able to reconvert to peacetime

industry and prosperity. Certainly we cannot do it if the men whom we elect to protect our individual rights allow such a selfish group to so completely monopolize and control one-third of the men that are now out on strike. Just how many of us that are away from home would be more than happy to return and do the job that they are supposed to be doing if you would but bring us home? I ofttimes wonder how deep will be our internal strife when all of the men overseas are returned home to face the realities of a Government that cannot and will not control the unions as they have in the past. Certainly the Army was never allowed to go on uncontrolled, and I can see no justification in the allowing of any other group to be handled any other way as long as we are all to be American citizens and considered of equal rights at all times.

The boys overseas have lived on broken promises ever since they left home and now we are living on the promise of being returned home some time in the future at the conveniences of the controlling American minority. I read with some interest in the Honolulu Advertiser, Wednesday morning, October 10, 1945, the following quotation:

"Strike of longshoremen and other dock workers of New York's important harbor held up disembarkation of soldiers returning from the European conflict. Soldiers were forced to unload the giant liner, *Queen Elizabeth*, which had docked after a trans-Atlantic crossing.

"Some of the striking stevedores were working the returning troopships, but 135 dock workers refused to continue unloading the *Queen Elizabeth*, a British ship. The workers were dissatisfied with the size of the sling loads being used in getting the cargo from the ship.

"Two platoons of soldiers were ordered to take over the job, which they performed amidst boos and hisses from the stevedores lining the docks."

This is a fine way to repay the men who have fought and suffered in our European theater of operations by having them return home and do the job that others refuse to do at many times the pay the soldiers are getting. These boys know what it means to return home and are more than happy to be upon American soil and laboring for America. They are not questioning the size of the load, nor the hours that they work nor the money that they get paid. They are Americans and are more than glad to do the job so that they and others like them can be returned to the ones they love that much sooner. Yet, from the above quotation, two platoons of soldiers were ordered to take over the job and perform the task amidst boos and hisses from the stevedores lining the docks. Sometimes I just wonder if the old vigilantes parties that used to be performed in the days of the old West would not be very appropriate for the 135 dock workers, who gave these boys such a wonderful homecoming. Certainly, we should have statesmen from among our electives somewhere in Washington that will see that this practice is discontinued immediately. Personally, I would not be afraid of the votes that I lost among the 135 gripping dock workers against those I would gain among the 11,000,000 men in our armed forces that have fought and paid for the freedom of whcih all of us shall enjoy.

I am sure from the above letter you must feel that my stomach is filled with ice cream and dill pickles to merit my writing such a letter, but honestly, Senator BUTLER, there are times when a person's heart bleeds at the conditions which do exist at home today, and have continued to exist ever since this emergency began. I do hope that you do not take this letter personally in anything other than the friendly spirit in which I have sent it. For years to come I hope to be able to devote a part of my life to making the United States of America everything that you and I individually know and want it to be. To be able to tell others what a democracy is, we must be able to live it each day ourselves.

So with continued best wishes for everything for you and yours, I remain as always,

Yours very truly.

The American Shipping Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 23 (legislative day of Monday, October 22), 1945

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered last Thursday afternoon before the Propeller Club at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Trying to figure out what I could say to you people that would be helpful, or at least stimulating, I read through many of the speeches given at your annual conference here a year ago. In so doing, I was strongly impressed by two assumptions that seemed to permeate the thinking of all the speakers.

The first assumption was that a continued substantial Federal subsidy, both for ship building and ship operation, is essential if America is to have the strong merchant marine vital to our security.

The second assumption was that private enterprise should continue to build and operate ships, presumably making a reasonable profit thereon.

I wonder if those two assumptions together are not contradictory. Certainly it is true that every time private enterprise accepts a subsidy from Government, for whatever reason, it must also accept drastic limitations on its freedom of action in the form of restrictions and regulations. Isn't that a progressive disease?

I have the feeling, perhaps due to watching the geometric growth of the various subsidies which the Federal Government has paid during the war, that any kind of subsidy blunts the keen edge of competition, tends to put enterprise and initiative to sleep, leads to stagnation and the necessity for even larger subsidies. If that is true, even assuming that subsidies are essential now, they will tend to increase steadily if continued, and eventually will reach the point where the American people and Congress will decide it doesn't pay to try to make private enterprise function in this field and Government will take over completely.

I could not help remembering, as these thoughts went through my mind, what I had read about the days of sail when American clipper ships carried the cream of the world's ocean trade. Americans then built and sailed their ships without subsidy. They competed freely for their share of the business, and they got it, usually a bit more than their share. Why has the situation changed so drastically since steam came in and the handling of ships has been increasingly mechanized? I have always believed that producing and operating complicated mechanical gadgets was our special dish. I think the war has proven that belief is well-founded. One of our generals told me that when Germany put this war on wheels and wings, she played right into our hands. Why then a sick merchant marine that needs subsidy injections to maintain a precarious existence?

I haven't had all the time in the world to explore that question, but so far I haven't heard any answer that makes sense to me. I know the stock answer: That subsidies are necessary to maintain the high wages and living standards of the American workmen, both in shipyards and on ships, in contrast to lower wages of foreign competitors. I won't buy that one because it doesn't make economic sense. Maybe high wages out of line with production are one symptom of what's wrong with the industry, but they are only a symptom and not a cause.

Our living standards are high in America because our production per worker is high, partly because we have been richly endowed with natural resources, but largely because our production tools and techniques are the best in the world. Our high-dollar wages merely reflect that increased productivity. Relatively large capital investments in plant and equipment per man employed and managerial skill in planning the work have been primarily responsible for that high productivity, and the American worker has until recently measured up to the increased opportunity for him.

Of course not all industries have increased their productivity per worker to the same extent. For instance, while Congress was considering renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, with a grant of authority to reduce tariffs an additional 50 percent, it was interesting to note that wages on the whole were considerably lower in the protected, or should I say, subsidized, industries, than in the nonprotected and purely domestic industries. Yet the major argument for tariff subsidies, like that for all other peacetime subsidies, is that they are necessary to protect American wage and living standards against low-wage foreign competition. To me, the low wages reflecting low productivity in protected and subsidized industries is an indictment of management in those industries. I cannot help but think that management relied too much on the tariff subsidy rather than on its own initiative and energy to meet competition abroad.

What has all this general economic argument to do with the specific problems facing the merchant marine? After all, wages in the industry are at high levels compared to foreign competitors and there isn't any chance of reducing them, as a practical proposition. What can we do about it except a subsidy if we grant that a large and healthy merchant marine is vital, as I do?

For the immediate present I would agree that a continuance of the building and operating subsidy appears the only practicable answer. But I am not willing to accept it as a final answer. It is a palliative and not a cure. Prosperity for the shipping industry—capital, management, and labor—based on a Federal subsidy, is a strictly phoney prosperity because it has not been earned by production efficiency at the American level. I just do not believe that kind of phoney prosperity can be maintained, by subsidy or any other means. The shipping industry will be healthy and really prosperous only when its production performance by owners, management, and labor measures up to American standards, and not before.

I grant you that is an unpleasant, tough solution. Maybe you can brush it off and forget it on the basis that what I don't know about the shipping industry would fill a great many books, which I freely admit. But I do know something about American industry and the economics of a capitalistic system and I know my basic reasoning is sound. And I am encouraged to stick to my guns by the fact that several ship operators have refused the operating subsidy and managed to survive, and that one hardy owner will have no part of either building or operating subsidy and still manages to get his share of the

business. If one owner can solve his problems and compete profitably then others can.

Obviously in striving to meet this challenge, and I think it is a challenge that faces all American enterprise in varying degree, success cannot be achieved by any one segment of the industry working alone—capital cannot do it alone, neither can management nor labor. Organized labor, particularly, will have to overhaul its economic thinking drastically if the challenge is to be met.

It is my understanding that anticipated operating subsidies are relatively small; not only in actual dollar totals, but also in their relationship to gross operating revenues. The problem there of increasing production per man to justify the new wage scales should be easier to solve. Even there, however, chances of a solution are not bright without a realization by organized labor that only higher production per man can in the long run justify and sustain higher wages. In other words, raising wages without increasing production merely starts an inflationary spiral that in the long run cancels out the increase insofar as purchasing power and living standards are concerned. But in the process of proving anew that economic fact by a general arbitrary increase of 30, 40, or 50 percent in wages and then prices, we would hike our production costs and prices to the point where our competition for foreign trade would be tremendously handicapped unless we devalued the dollar again, which is inflation.

Unfortunately, much of organized labor, or its leaders, seems to be proceeding on the obviously unsound economic theory that wages can be increased substantially without relation to production. In fact, there is a widespread tendency not only to level down production per man to that of the least efficient workers and hold it there by shop rules, but there is direct opposition to the introduction of new machinery or techniques that will increase production per man and thereby make increases in real wages economically sound and possible. The recent strike of longshoremen here in New York is a perfect case in point.

As long as organized labor insists on following a policy of spreading scarcity among its members instead of helping to produce and share abundance, neither the shipping nor any other industry in America stands much chance of meeting the great challenge facing the capitalistic economy today.

I am, of course, familiar with the stock argument that increased wages unrelated to production can be paid out of profits. Perhaps in one or two isolated industries there is some semblance of economic truth to that argument. But for industry as a whole, it is completely false. If all net profits of industry after taxes were diverted to wages (and don't forget that Government must get its tax revenue from some place, and if corporation income doesn't produce it, then workers' income will have to produce it) the percentage increase that could be made in wages today would be insignificant—less than 10 percent. And, of course, the capitalistic system would not survive such a distribution and our objective would be defeated.

The shipbuilding subsidy, larger in amount and also constituting a much larger percentage of the total cost of building a ship, is a much tougher proposition than the operating subsidy. I believe it can be licked by teamwork. I have inspected a number of wartime shipyards. My conclusions are that management achieved a miracle in organizing the flow of materials and speeding up production, but that the waste of manpower in shipyards during the war has been tremendous. Undoubtedly union featherbedding rules and jurisdictional rows are partly responsible for the very poor utilization of manpower in shipyards, but I cannot help but think that if management had devoted as much topnotch brains and ingenuity to labor relations and utilization as it did to laying out the work and organizing the flow of materials, a much better record could have been made.

The late Wendell Willkie had a sort of litany which he tried to impress on the American people in the 1940 campaign. "Only the strong can be free, and only the productive can be strong." I wish that every American could keep that basic truth constantly in mind in these difficult years ahead. Our chests swell a bit when we talk of our war-production record. We're pretty proud of American production and standards of living. Let's not forget what made both possible—ability and willingness to produce.

Un-American Activities

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, those of you who listened to the attack on the Committee on Un-American Activities by Walter Winchell last night, must have been reminded of what a great newspaperman said once, when a complaint against one of his exposures came from an unexpected source. He said: "A farmer stuck a pitchfork through a bin. One prong of the fork went through a rat. The rat squealed."

You have no doubt noticed that the underworld, the housebreakers, the burglars, the thieves, and the bootleggers always want to abolish the grand jury.

The Committee on Un-American Activities is the grand jury of America. It represents the patriotic, law-abiding people of this country. Its members are doing the best they can to protect our country against those subversive elements that would destroy everything for which our young men have been fighting and dying on every battle front in the world.

Our country is in graver danger from within today than it is from without. A wave of syndicalism is sweeping over the land, stirring up strife, promoting race hatred, fostering strikes, and threatening the overthrow of this Government and the destruction of our American way of life.

They are not only carrying on their subversive plots against this Government but are using the radio, the motion-picture shows, and certain elements of the press to spread their poisonous propaganda. They want to get rid of the Committee on Un-American Activities because our investigators are checking up on them and exposing their activities to the world.

They call themselves Communists now, and say they are out to destroy the capitalistic system. What they mean by a capitalist is not merely the rich, or even the well-to-do. When they speak of the capitalistic system they mean that system of free enterprise that enables a man to own his own land, his own home, his own farm, his own business establishment, or to carry on any free enterprise in the land, from a factory to a dairy farm.

The other day we had before the Committee on Un-American Activities, one William Z. Foster, now the head of the Communist Party in America. I read to him the following statement from the record of an investigation of Communist propaganda made by a House committee in 1930. The statement reads as follows:

Mr. BACHMAN. I want to ask you about a statement it is reported you made in 1928. You made an acceptance speech on May 25, 1928, when you accepted the nomination for President.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. BACHMAN. Let me ask you whether or not, in part, you made this statement:

"No Communist, no matter how many votes he should secure in a national election, could, even if he would, become President of the present Government. When a Communist heads a government of the United States (and that day will come just as surely as the sun rises), that government will not be a capitalistic government, but a Soviet government, and behind this government will stand the Red Army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Mr. FOSTER. I made that; I think I made that. It sounds like what I said. I do not know that is word for word, but it is in substance what I said.

He admitted the other day before the Committee on Un-American Activities, that he had not changed his position on this matter. Remember that his position is that of every Communist and "fellow traveler" in America, from Johannes Steele up and down.

Note he says:

When a Communist heads a government of the United States (and that day will come just as surely as the sun rises), that government will not be a capitalistic government, but a Soviet government, and behind this government will stand the Red Army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat.

I then produced a pamphlet called Syndicalism, written by this same William Z. Foster many years ago. He admitted writing it, but said he had repudiated it. I asked him when he repudiated it. He said when he became a Communist and joined the Communist Party.

When you read the statement he made then, and examine the policies he and his party are pursuing now, you can understand that it was not much of a reformation to change from a Syndicalist to a Communist in the twinkling of an eye, merely turning a mental somersault overnight.

Now let us see what Mr. Foster said back in the days before he was converted to communism. In this pamphlet on syndicalism, which he admits he wrote, we find this statement on the subject of general strikes:

THE GENERAL STRIKE AND THE ARMED FORCES

Once the general strike is in active operation, the greatest obstacle to its success will be the armed forces of capitalism—soldiers, police, detectives, etc. This formidable force will be used energetically by the capitalists to break the general strike. The Syndicalists have given much study to the problem presented by this force and have found the solution for it. Their proposed tactics are very different from those used by rebels in former revolutions. They are not going to mass themselves and allow themselves to be slaughtered by capitalism's trained murderers in the orthodox way. Theirs is a

safer, more effective, and more modern method. They are going to defeat the armed forces by disorganizing and demoralizing them.

A fruitful source of this disorganization will be the extreme difficulty the armed forces will experience in securing supplies and transportation. Modern armies, to be effective, must have immense arsenals, powder works, and other industrial establishments behind them to furnish them their supplies of ammunition, arms, food, and clothing. They also must have the railroads constantly at their disposal for transportation. When the general strike has halted these industries the army will be striken with paralysis. Another source of disorganization will be the division of the armed forces into minute detachments to guard the many beleaguered gates of capitalism. The strikers, or revolutionists, will be everywhere, and will everywhere seize or disable whatever capitalist property they can lay their hands on. To protect this property the armed forces will have to be divided into a myriad of guards and scattered along the thousands of miles of railroads and around the many public buildings, bridges, factories, etc. The wealthy capitalists themselves will also need generous guards. The most important industries, such as transportation, mining, etc., will have to be operated in some manner. To do this will require many thousands more of soldiers and police.

The result will be that the armed forces will be minutely subdivided, and through the loss of the solidarity and discipline, from whence they derive their strength, they will cease to be a fighting organization. They will degenerate into a mass of armed individuals scattered far and wide over the country. These individuals can be easily overwhelmed and disarmed, or what is more likely, as they will be mostly workingmen and in sympathy with the general strike, induced to join the ranks of their striking fellow workers. Once the disorganization of the armed forces is complete the revolutionists will seize the unprotected industries and proceed to reorganize society.

I want you to read that statement carefully, and then compare its program with the wave of unjustifiable strikes that are sweeping over the country today, sponsored by every Communist in America, at a time when we are still at war, with millions of our young men still in the armed forces, at $50 a month.

BLOODSHED

But Mr. Foster, the head of the Communist Party in America, and the leader of their fellow travelers, has this to say on the subject of bloodshed:

But the prospect of bloodshed does not frighten the Syndicalist worker as it does the parlor Socialist.

In that connection I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the bloodshed of our servicemen on foreign battlefields has never frightened the Communists in this country who are plotting to overthrow the very Government these boys are fighting to sustain.

In order for the Syndicalist, or the IWW of that day—the Communist of today—to understand how to wreck American industries and bring about the revolution they so ardently crave, Mr. Foster gives them this discourse on sabotage:

SABOTAGE

Next to the partial strike, the most effective weapon used by Syndicalists in their daily warfare on capitalism is sabotage. Sabotage is a very general term. It is used to describe all those tactics, save the boycott and the strike proper, which are used by workers to wring concessions from their employers by inflicting losses on them through the stopping or slowing down of industry, turning out of poor product, etc. These tactics, and consequently, the forms of sabotage, are very numerous. Many of them are closely related in character. Often two or more kinds of sabotage are used simultaneously or in conjunction with the strike.

Perhaps the most widely practiced form of sabotage is the restriction by the workers of their output. Disgruntled workers all over the world instinctively and continually practice this form of sabotage, which is often referred to as soldiering. The English labor unions, by the establishment of maximum outputs for their member, are widely and successfully practicing it. It is a fruitful source of their strength.

The most widely known form of sabotage is that known as putting the machinery on strike. The Syndicalist goes on strike to tie up industry. If his striking fails to do this, if strike breakers are secured to take his place, he accomplishes his purpose by putting the machinery on strike through temporarily disabling it. If he is a railroader he cuts wires, puts cement in switches, signals, etc., runs locomotives into turntable pits, and tries in every possible way to temporarily disorganize the delicately adjusted railroad system. If he is a machinist or factory worker, and hasn't ready access to the machinery, he will hire out as a scab and surreptitiously put emery dust in the bearings of the machinery or otherwise disable it. Oftentimes he takes time by the forelock, and when going on strike puts the machinery on strike with him by hiding, stealing, or destroying some small indispensable machine part which is difficult to replace. * * *

* * * By systematically working slow and clumsy and deliberately spoiling their work and building material, they have demoralized the building industry. The building contractors are unable to cope with these insidious tactics. In 1910 they called a mass meeting of 30,000 capitalists, landlords, and architects to devise ways and means to combat them.

* * * This fear is by no means confined to France. The mere threat of the striking textile workers of Lawrence to sabote their machinery and product in case they were forced back to work was a powerful deterrent to prevent their master from breaking their strike. These scared individuals admitted that there are 1,000 ways in which rebellious workers can spoil cloth without fear of detection.

* * * Sabotage is peculiarly a weapon of the rebel minority. Its successful application, unlike the strike, does not require the cooperation of all the workers interested. A few rebels can, undetected, sabotage and demoralize an industry and force the weak or timid majority to share in its benefits. The Syndicalists are not concerned that the methods of sabotage may be underhanded or unmanly. They are very successful and that is all they ask of them. They scoff at the sentimental objection that sabotage destroys the worker's pride in his work. They prefer to be able to more successfully fight their oppressors, rather than to cater to any false sense of pride.

Read that statement and note the picket lines around places of employment where there has never been complaint of discrimination and no protest against low wages.

We are told that pickets have been ordered to surround oil refineries where the workers have never made complaint and to bludgeon those workers and prevent their going to their daily jobs. In one instance we are told that the United States Government seized and took over the plant as result of these interferences.

It reminds us of another statement in this pamphlet on syndicalism, written by this Communist, William Z. Foster, whose fellow travelers are now abusing the Committee on Un-American Activities. He goes on to say:

The Syndicalist is as "unscrupulous" in his choice of weapons to fight his everyday battles as for his final struggle with capitalism. He allows no considerations of "legality," religion, patriotism, "honor," "duty," etc., to stand in the way of his adoption of effective tactics.

Remember that the man who wrote this pamphlet on syndicalism, telling how to stir a revolution, claims to have been suddenly converted to communism, which is now plotting the overthrow of this Government, and carrying out the program of syndicalism written by its leader many years ago; not only that, but these Communists and fellow travelers are today branding as imperialists and reactionaries President Truman, Secretary Byrnes, Herbert Hoover, Foster Dulles, and every other patriotic American who does not subscribe to their destructive doctrines.

They and their fellow travelers are demanding the abolition of the Committee on Un-American Activities, whose members are laboring for the protection of this Government and for the preservation of American institutions.

Maternal and Child Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 23 (legislative day of Monday, October 22), 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in Parents' Magazine endorsing Senate bill 1318, introduced by the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and House bill 3922, introduced by Representative MARY NORTON.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIX WORDS AND A DATE

(By Clara Savage Littledale, editor, the Parents' Magazine)

"Do we as a Nation intend to provide every mother, regardless of where she lives or what the family income is, with an opportunity to get modern, scientific maternity care? Or shall we remain content with present conditions under which some mothers and babies get the best care available anywhere in the world while others get little or no skilled medical attention?"

It's Senator CLAUDE PEPPER speaking, as he introduces a bill in Congress—the same bill that Mrs. MARY NORTON introduced in the House. The bill has a name which is "Maternal and Child Welfare Act of 1945." Odd how prosaic and even dull that collection of six words and a date sounds. Actually, back of those words lie more child-bed tragedy, more heartrending need and more regard for human life than has ever before wrapped itself up in a bill before Congress—a bill that looks as though it might pass.

And that's just the point. This bill has a chance, if you and I and our neighbors know enough about it, and care enough about it to help. And if we don't—well, put it this way:

Each year some 200,000 mothers in this country go through childbirth without the care of a physician. Think back to the hours when you were bringing a child into the world. The doctor was there, nurses were there, an anesthetist stood ready. You were suffering and in pain, perhaps in terror, but you knew everything was being done that could be done to safeguard you and your baby. Then think of the 200,000 other women who knew no such care. They struggled through without a doctor—or perhaps they died.

And again thousands of babies die at birth or soon after birth in this country. Thousands of these babies would not die if their mothers had the right care before and after childbirth. It is common knowledge that a large proportion of these baby deaths, as well as mother deaths, are preventable. Then what on earth is the matter? Why isn't something done?

That's not as simple a question as it may appear. For instance, the lives of 31,000 babies could have been saved in 1 year, if every State had given its babies as good care as did the State of Connecticut. The lives of 3,000 mothers could have been saved, that same year, if every State had given its mothers as good care as did the State of Minnesota. It sounds as though one were talking in riddles, doesn't it? Just what has geography to do with the life and death of thousands of women and babies? It has a lot to do with it. The richer States—those whose per capita wealth is relatively high—can collect ample money via taxes to provide prenatal clinics and well-baby clinics and all sorts of desirable health care. Per capita wealth also makes a State a good place for doctors and nurses to locate and assures well-equipped, well-supported hospitals. It is the poorer State and rural districts that run up our horrifying maternal- and baby-death figures.

Is there any justice or democracy in a situation that safeguards the life of a baby if he happens to be lucky enough to be born in Connecticut or some one of the other well-to-do States, but stacks the cards against him and his mother if he lives in one of the poorer States? Do we, as Americans, believe in that kind of thing?

No; we don't, and we never did. It is just that we haven't been aware, haven't seen clearly enough, what was happening, and why, and interestingly enough, what brought us to a realization of the situation was the conviction that servicemen's wives and babies should have the best possible care at a cost they could afford. Patriotism, gratitude, warm-hearted humanity resulted in wartime legislation which made this possible.

Now it's peacetime. And the question before the House and the Senate and the country is whether we care enough about babies and their mothers—all babies and all mothers, no matter where they live, no matter how much money they have, no matter what their color, race, or religion—to see that not one of them shall die needlessly. Do we care enough? If we do, we will get behind this bill now up for consideration and push with all our might. This bill means that money will be appropriated for a 10-year program of necessary infant and maternal care. The United States Children's Bureau will be the administrative agency that will work with the States to see that the best in health care is provided for mothers and babies and young children, in every State, without fear or favor or duplication.

Those leaders in this country who know how shameful are our maternal and infant death rates and who know, from wartime experience, what can and should be done about them, are behind this bill 100 percent. Where do you stand? What will you do? You can discuss this legislation, you can work for it as an individual or in your woman's club, child-study group, or your Parent-Teacher Association. You can write or telegraph the Senators from your State in favor of Senate bill 1318 and your Representatives in the House in favor of H. R. 3922. (They are the same bill.) Address Senators care of the Senate Office Building and Representatives in care of the House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C. Do something and do it now.

Veterans Have Difficulty in Obtaining Automobiles From Surplus Disposal Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and include letters and telegrams from my constituents in regard to their problems, I wish to include in these remarks an excerpt from a letter which I have received from Capt. William A. Dodd, a friend of mine in my district, in regard to the difficulties which veterans are confronted with in the purchase of surplus automobiles.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has passed legislation for the disposal of surplus war material and it was intended that veterans would have preferential consideration; however, I have had complaints from the State commander of the Louisiana Department of the American Legion, and many veterans returned from the war, who state that they are unable to purchase surplus automobiles, as well as other surplus material, and the letter from Captain Dodd is typical of many which I have received.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the department charged with the obligation to dispose of this surplus war material will make every effort to give the opportunity to our veterans to secure some of this surplus war material, for it is agreed that we are all in favor of giving to the veterans every consideration and preference to which they are entitled.

Not long ago I wrote you concerning the disposition of surplus property (Government), especially automobiles, to veterans. I've got several letters but no action out of these d—— bureaucrats. It is next to impossible for a veteran to get a car without spending more for attorney fees and travel expenses than the car is worth, not to mention the time and effort.

I understand that dealers are allowed to buy cars in lots of, say, 90, at $150 to $200 each. They then sell them at the ceiling price (or over) of $800 to $1,000. A veteran can't buy just one car, unless he is a farmer or needs it for a delivery car, and so forth, and then its double tough.

I think the whole set-up is screwy and benefits only a few dealers—not the veterans. You will doubtless be unable to change the present policy, but I wanted you to know that every veteran I've seen is 100-percent disgusted with the present method of surplus property disposal.

Hearings on Reclamation Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 23, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations will begin hearings tomorrow morning on estimates totaling $93,367,000 for 28 reclamation projects. The hearings are expected to run for 2 or 3 days. I will place in the RECORD a list of these projects in order that the membership may be advised as to what projects will be up for consideration. The list of projects and amounts requested as supplemental estimates for the fiscal year 1946 as set forth in House Document No. 331, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, are as follows:

Bureau of Reclamation

RECLAMATION FUND, SPECIAL FUND

Salaries and expenses (other than project offices)	$1,000,000
General investigations	3,000,000
Projects:	
Boise project, Idaho, Payette division	2,000,000
Minidoka project, Idaho	720,000
Rio Grande project, New Mexico-Texas	750,000
Deschutes project, Oregon	1,000,000
Klamath project, Oregon	1,000,000
Owyhee project, Oregon	190,000
Vale project, Oregon	3,000
Kendrick project, Wyoming	500,000
Riverton project, Wyoming	1,000,000
Shoshone project, Wyoming, Heart Mountain division	1,000,000
Power division	1,124,000
Total, from the reclamation fund	13,287,000

GENERAL FUND CONSTRUCTION

Gila project, Arizona	2,000,000
Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada	10,000,000
Central Valley project, California	18,500,000
Kings River project, California	197,000
Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado	7,683,000
San Luis project, Colorado	1,000,000
Boise project, Idaho, Anderson Ranch	1,925,000
Palisades project, Idaho	1,000,000
Hungry Horse project, Montana	1,500,000
Tucumcari project, New Mexico	2,000,000
Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma	2,020,000
Provo River project, Utah	860,000
Columbia Basin project, Washington	11,000,000
Yakima project, Washington, Roza division	1,650,000
Total, general fund, construction	61,335,000

COLORADO RIVER DAM FUND

Boulder Canyon project (All-American Canal), $3,827,000.

COLORADO RIVER DEVELOPMENT FUND

Colorado River Development Fund (expenditure account), $1,000,000.

FORT PECK PROJECT, MONTANA

Fort Peck project, Montana, $2,000,000.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Missouri River Basin, $11,918,000.

The President's Program for Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 24 (legislative day of Monday, October 22), 1945

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, yesterday the President of the United States addressed the Congress on the subject of military training. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials dealing with this subject; one from the New York Times entitled "The President's Program," one from the New York Tribune entitled "Can We Do Less?" and one from the Washington Post entitled "Training for All," all appearing in today's issues.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of October 24, 1945]

THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM

President Truman told Congress yesterday that we must face the hard fact "that peace must be built upon power, as well as upon good will and good deeds." Then he himself faced the hard choice of how we best can retain the great international power we have won. To this end he recommended to Congress the passage of a universal military training act as a cornerstone of our military establishment. His language was plain. His position is unequivocal. It is a position and a program with which this newspaper heartily agrees:

1. A comparatively small Regular Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

2. A greatly strengthened National Guard and Organized Reserve for the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

3. A General Reserve composed of all the male citizens of the United States who have received training, to be built up by establishing a year of intensive military training for each young man reaching the age of 18 years or upon graduation from high school, whichever is later, or at the age of 17 years if his high-school course has been completed and he has his parents' consent.

The President recognizes and states clearly the many arguments that have been made against universal military training. To those who label it "conscription" and attempt to damn it with that word, he answers that the trainees would not be enrolled in any armed service; they could not be inducted into such services except by a further act of Congress; they would be no closer to membership in the Army, Navy, or Marines than if they had no training. The point is, if a crisis should come and we had again to conscript our manpower, these young men would be trained—not untrained, as has been the case in every crisis in our history.

To those who say that adoption of universal training would indicate a lack of faith in international organization, the President's answer is that it would show instead the sincerity of our intentions to support such an organization by maintaining the power with which to assist other peace-loving nations in enforcing its authority.

To those who have said, let's wait a while and see what our commitments are going to be and whether we will need a large military establishment, the President's answer is that no once can foresee the future, but that experience has taught us that we cannot wait until a crisis arrives to begin to prepare. If time proves the program unnecessary it can be modified. But if we scrap now the camp installations, the essential equipment and the training grounds we have, then these things cannot be improvised overnight if it should be proved later that a strong military force is needed.

To those who have argued that the development of the atomic bomb has made unnecessary a strong Army, Navy or Marine force, the President answers as does General Marshall—whom he quotes—that every technological advancement in war has made necessary a greater deployment of manpower, and that the more complex the machines of war become the more necessary it is to give men intensive training in how to handle them.

Finally, the President asks and answers the question of what alternative program has been offered by the opponents of universal training. It has been, he says truly, "nothing but pious hope and dangerous wishful thinking." Those are luxuries in which we cannot indulge ourselves in the hard-headed world of today.

It took great political courage for the President to speak as he did. He might have hedged on the subject by suggesting several alternatives, such as were put forward yesterday by some less courageous Congressmen after listening to his speech. Spread the program over 3 or 4 years. Integrate it with a school program. Build up a reserve only through a volunteer National Guard. These and other halfway measures might be worse than nothing, for the very reason that they would give us a sense of false security. The President has the better plan: a year of concentrated training in handling the weapons of war that will give us, if another emergency arises, the trained reserves we did not have in 1941, or in 1917, or in 1898, or ever before in our history, but which we had better have if another crisis comes, unless we wish to be destroyed.

"There will be better answers, we hope, in the days to come," said the President, voicing the wishes of us all. "The United States will always strive for those better answers—for the kind of tried and tested world cooperation which will make for peace and harmony among all nations. It will continue to strive to reach that period quickly. But that time has not yet arrived. * * * It is our solemn duty in this hour of victory to make sure that in the years to come no possible aggressor or group of aggressors can endanger the national security of the United States of America."

The President has stated the issue clearly. We have the choice: a sure and certain peace with honor, because we are strong; an insecure peace built on the unsure sands of pious hope and wishful thinking. We believe that the people of this country have the wisdom to see this, and the courage and strength to do what is necessary to insure peace with honor. Congress should act promptly to adopt a plan for universal military training.

[From the New York Tribune]

CAN WE DO LESS?

President Truman's message, advocating universal military training, may well stand in the future as one of the fundamental documents in American history. If the implications of this proposal were not so far-reaching there would be less opposition to it and doubt about it. Every thoughtful person is aware that to institute a system of compulsory 1-year military training and military discipline for every male citizen of the United States is to institute a radical innovation in American socio-economic life, the effects of which might go a long way in many directions which cannot well be foreseen. But the stark question is, Can we do less?

If the Nation is to survive it can only survive in strength as a nation. We cannot hire anyone else to fulfill the essential function of lending strength and defensive force to our society. A city can employ a specialized police to serve its requirements of force and order; a nation cannot do so. If it is to live as an effective factor in the world it must draw its power from the sources within itself, from the willingness of its citizens to serve in its interests and from their ability to do so in an emergency. In asking the Congress for a system of universal military training President Truman is, in effect, asking the country whether it will show that willingness and will expend the costs of acquiring that ability and whether it will agree to do so now, while the lessons of two great wars are vivid in its memory.

The plan proposed is that recommended by General of the Army Marshall. It is a plan which allows for all the unforeseeable technical developments of warfare by providing only a relatively small and flexible standing army, but which also allows for the colossal man-power demands which any future war would make, whatever its technical shape, by building up a vast pool of elementarily trained citizen soldiers who could be quickly drawn into any kind of army which might be demanded by another emergency. The trained citizenry would not, as in the case of the unwieldly European conscript armies of the early years of the century, be regimented into any military structure. They would, however, be given the essentials of military knowledge and discipline—the equivalent, in the modern age, of the expertness in woodmanship and with the squirrel rifle which every colonial farmer enjoyed and on which Washington relied in his recommendations for maintaining a citizen militia—and thus equipped to fill swiftly whatever military or military-industrial cadres might be required in the event of another war.

The technical details of the proposal are sufficiently well thought out to defy most of the easy criticisms which might be brought against it. The military technology, however, is not the most important consideration. The critical question is whether the people of the United States and their Congress are willing to face the real demands of the modern world, whether they are willing to invest their time and energies in the aims of peace and prosperity which they profess, or whether they are again (as before) so tired of the war just past that they will give nothing to the future peace, relapsing rather into all the old, easy, comfortable ways which will spell another war in another generation. That is the question which the President's message poses. And to that question there seems, in the view of this newspaper, only one answer.

[From the Washington Post]

TRAINING FOR ALL

A ring of conviction on the need for universal military training comes through the President's message to Congress. It is this conviction that has persuaded him to reject alternatives that would provide for the training of some instead of all our youth, or for partial training. Mr. Truman is all out for the military system that General Marshall has recommended: a small Regular Establishment, a greatly strengthened National Guard and Organized Reserve, and a general reserve of trainees drawn from the Nation's youth. The President couches his plea in the context of arguments which are now familiar to the country. The arguments, moreover, are kept in balance. Only the person who is afraid to meet this issue frontally asks for universal training on grounds that it would improve the Nation's physique, lower illiteracy, and improve moral and spiritual standards. These results, as the President says, are byproducts, and "the basic reason for universal training is a very simple one—to guarantee the safety and freedom of the United States against any potential aggressor."

No doubt, now that the debate has been loosed upon the country, the old misconcep-

tions will be revived. The bogy of conscription is perhaps the foremost. What the President proposes is not conscription, not by any strength of that ogrish word. As the President says, conscription is compulsory service in the Army or Navy in time of peace or war, and in conscription countries the conscript is immediately enrolled in the armed services. He is, in fact, a soldier or a sailor. The system proposed for this country is a training system, not particularly in drill, but mainly in the use of all the instruments and weapons of modern warfare. The young men would not be members of the armed forces and would not be used as such. There would be sufficient flexibility to allow the boys ample opportunity to develop their skills and to allow for self-improvement in general. The closest analogy to what the President has in mind, as we have said before, is Switzerland's system.

Equality for opportunity, which is the key phrase in the American tradition, underlies the Presidential approach to a system of national training. In the war, many men were deprived of the positions they merited because of the accident of late training. They were officered by men whose sole claim to rank was that they had had the wit to seek training before war broke or to apply for entry to officers' candidate schools in time. Thus the war establishment, though it performed brilliantly, was a hit-or-miss affair in the matter of status. All this would be ruled out by the new system. Everybody would start out from scratch, and, in the event of another call, which God forbid, the right men would be in the right place at the right time. This would be a gain for democracy no less than for organization and defense.

The objection that compulsory training would violate traditional American concepts of liberty and democracy is refuted out of our Nation's history. The need for just such a program as is now suggested was seen by George Washington. In his message to Congress of December 3, 1793, the first President pressed upon the Congress "the necessity of placing curselves in a position of complete defense." He declared in words that ring even truer today than they did then that "There is a rank due to the United States among nations which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness." Washington's words went unheeded because the people were anxious for peace but were unwilling to pay the price of it.

Training is one of the prices of American peace in the age we live in. If we were bent upon conquest, and not upon self-defense, the ideal scheme would be conscription. That way would lie the militarization of our country. We want no nation of soldiers, but anything less than a trained citizenry, able to defend our country, would be a deplorable weakening of the position and influence we have gained in the world and an invitation to aggression. We hope Congress will act on the basis of the arguments that the President has offered in his strong and compelling message.

Urges Caution on Universal Military Training—Adoption of the Martin Resolution (H. Res. 325) Can Prevent It

REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's message on universal military training was a forthright appraisal of our need for future protection. The only way we can prevent universal military training is to adopt and vigorously urge the United Nations to adopt the Martin resolution, House Resolution 325, which abolishes the necessity of universal military training as a means of self-protection in the countries associated with the United Nations. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the first concern of every American is the security of the Nation; and

Whereas the American people are determined that their Government shall henceforth make proper provision for the continuous maintenance of such security; and

Whereas in accordance with this firm determination it has become necessary to consider a system of compulsory military service in the United States as a permanent part of our insurance against unpreparedness in the event of sudden war; and

Whereas compulsory military service would result in greater restrictions over the lives and activities of our people, would impose heavy burdens on them, causing greater taxes and profound changes in their way of life; and

Whereas compulsory military service has long been customary in many European states and elsewhere, but has been contrary to American tradition since the founding of our Republic; and

Whereas compulsory military service has never prevented war in Europe or elsewhere but, on the contrary, causes suspicion and fears to grow between nations and inclines the rulers of men to war rather than to peace; and

Whereas 50 nations, having expressed their desire for peace, met at San Francisco and resolved to make greater efforts than ever before to abate the fear and likelihood of war in the years to come; and

Whereas the people of the United States and their leaders in all sections and parties have in good faith approved the San Francisco Charter and desire our President to take a leading part in fulfilling the great purposes for which it was formed; and

Whereas with the ultimate destruction of the military power of Germany and Japan there will never be a better time than now to secure international agreement looking to permanent peace; and

Whereas an agreement between the nations of the world to eliminate systems of compulsory military service would itself be greatly conducive to that restoration of peace which is so profoundly desired by all the plain peoples of the world, and would release their energies and resources for rebuilding their war devastated countries; and

Whereas world-wide abolition of compulsory military service in no way precludes the maintenance of national or international military forces adequate for safeguarding national or collective security: Therefore be it

Resolved, That before the United States adopts compulsory military service, the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the personal representative of the President of the United States on the United Nations Organization, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., be, and hereby are, urged to work unceasingly for an immediate international agreement whereby compulsory military service shall be wholly eliminated from the policies and practices of all nations.

If they refuse to approve and adopt this resolution, as a future policy to keep and guarantee the peace of the world, then we must proceed with a universal military training program in the United States.

Do we want universal military training if it can be avoided? We must have it, however, if it cannot be avoided. The United Nations was organized to guarantee the peace of the world, if necessary by force. Why should we proceed on the principle that we must have force to guarantee the peace when we can by mutual agreement remove the necessity of force. The only reason for universal military training is to be prepared to defend ourselves from attack by enemy nations. What enemy nations? We do not arm one State to protect it from the attack of another State in the United States. We do not have military training in one State to prepare for attack upon another State in the United States. Why? Because it is not necessary. Because by mutual agreement we have found that we can and have for 160 years lived peacefully together. Why cannot the United Nations do likewise? The nations that refuse to approve and adopt the Martin resolution will be the ones to watch. We should use this resolution as a barometer of the future good intentions of the nations associated with us in the United Nations Council.

The adoption of the Martin resolution should be our first step to show our good intentions. In the meantime we should proceed with preparation of legislation to set up this program with the hope that we may never have to adopt it.

Strikes

REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are all greatly interested in the statement of the gentleman from South Dakota on the strikes and the inability to get trucks. I want to call the attention of the Republican leadership to the fact that not only did Governor Dewey in New York settle the elevator strike when it affected the public interest, but Governor Kelly, of Michigan, repudiated the policy of Mr. Frank Murphy, one-time Governor of Michigan, who now sits in the Supreme Court Building as an Associate Justice, repudiated that policy when a strike occurred in the utility field in Michigan.

Governor Kelly has always been an outspoken friend of organized labor but when, under misguided leadership, the employees of public utility companies pulled the switches in the power-generating plants of Michigan and there was a threat to deprive some 2,000,000 citizens of light, heat, and power, and when the union leaders refused to accept a compromise offer, approved by State authorities, the Governor, according to the press, just called the union representatives into his office and in substance told them no one would interfere with their right to strike or their right to picket, but that, if they did not operate the plants, he would see to it that the people of the State were protected; that the plants were operated.

That was the only attitude which the governor of a State could take and, without hesitation, Governor Kelly took it. He should be commended for his prompt action.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The Kelsey-Hayes Controversy

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a trip to Detroit, where I was privileged to discuss with reputable citizens the Kelsey-Hayes labor controversy. This controversy is of the utmost importance to the residents of my congressional district, and from information I gained I am of the opinion that the root of the Kelsey-Hayes labor controversy goes much deeper than would appear on the surface or from just a cursory examination of conditions.

The Kelsey-Hayes Wheel Co. employed in their two plants just prior to the strike approximately 5,000 people. Their principal customer is the gigantic Ford Motor Co., which was forced to close down for approximately 6 weeks because their source of wheel supplies was cut off by reason of the strike. The employees of Kelsey-Hayes are back on the job—not in the numbers that were employed prior to the strike, as they are now employing approximately 3,500 persons, and I have been informed that this is a sufficient number to take care of the current orders for wheels manufactured by Kelsey-Hayes.

The angle of the Kelsey-Hayes strike that is of such great importance to the labor group in the Detroit area is that the officials of Kelsey-Hayes are apparently endeavoring to break the union in their plant and thus this controversy assumes the proportions of a test case; if they are successful, other corporations in the Detroit area will use the same tactics and will flout the provisions of the Wagner Labor Relations Act, and chaotic labor conditions will follow. Informed circles in the Detroit labor area are convinced that Kelsey-Hayes are not alone—they are being supported by powerful industrial groups, and if they are successful in breaking the union in Kelsey-Hayes and bringing about chaotic labor conditions, they will tie up the Ford Motor Co.

On the surface it seems strange indeed for some industrial groups to endeavor to stop work at the Ford Motor Co. However, when one probes beneath the surface it appears that certain large corporations in the Detroit area are not willing to go along with the wage increases asked for by the UAM, which from information contained in the press and financial publications are being supported by the Ford Motor Co. In fact, it is indicated by the press that the Ford Motor Co. will shortly increase their wages approximately 20 percent, although their wages are the highest in the automobile industry. The General Motors Corp., on the other hand, has just refused to grant increases to its employees and has so informed R. J. Thomas, president of the United Automobile Workers. The strategy on the part of certain industrial groups appears to be to bust the union at Kelsey-Hayes, which would result in labor controversies that would tie up the supply of wheels for the Ford Motor Co. I have heretofore indicated that Ford Motors is the chief customer of Kelsey-Hayes, and because of the recent strike Ford Motors was forced to close when their wheel supply was exhausted.

It is quite apparent, from conversations I had while in Detroit, that Kelsey-Hayes are using rather high-handed tactics. Under the provisions of the Wagner Labor Relations Act, union employees are permitted to select their own shop stewards. These shop stewards are in reality the representatives of the employees and receive no additional compensation for their services, either from the employees, the union, or the corporation. They are men looked up to and respected by their co-workers because of their qualities of leadership and knowledge of their respective crafts. Prior to the recent strike, Kelsey-Hayes employed approximately 70 shop stewards at the McGraw Street plant and 15 shop stewards at the Military Street plant. Upon the termination of the recent strike, each of these shop stewards was sent a letter by George W. Kennedy, president of the Kelsey-Hayes Wheel Co., informing him that Kelsey-Hayes Wheel Co. had extended him the privilege of returning to work on probation, but if he evidenced the slightest tendency to disobey the rules and regulations of the company or failed to perform the work assigned him, he would be discharged immediately.

Mr. Speaker, this is a rather high-handed method to do business in a democratic country and certainly it is holding the "big stick" over the heads of the employees, and flouts the very provisions of the Wagner Labor Relations Act.

The Kelsey-Hayes Wheel Co. even went further—they arbitrarily during the strike canceled by telegram all written and verbal agreements between Kelsey-Hayes and the UAW. After settlement of the strike, they informed the UAW that theer would have to be a reduction in the number of "stewards" in their two plants—now, mind you, these "stewards" are nothing more than representatives of the workers and receive no additional compensation—they are the men to whom their coworkers look for guidance and assistance in the adjustment of grievances. The UAW made a very careful survey of conditions in the Kelsey-Hayes plants, taking into consideration the nature of the work and the physical lay-out of the departments, and they presented to Kelsey-Hayes a plan by which there would be 29 stewards in the McGraw Street plant and 7 in the Military Street plant. The UAW showed just cause and outlined in detail their reasons for the necessity of each of these stewards. The Kelsey-Hayes Wheel Co. retaliated by notifying the UAW that they would agree to a total of 18 stewards and, when asked by the UAW how they arrived at this number, they refused to give any explanation—so far as they were concerned, it was a matter of take it or leave it—they did not feel it necessary to explain their decision even though employees are guaranteed adequate representation of their own choosing under the provisions of the Wagner Labor Relations Act.

Following the arbitrary position taken by the management in regard to representation, which resulted in a deadlock in negotiations, they have further complicated the matter by the discharge of four of the "shop stewards" who are the duly elected representatives of the employees. This, in my opinion, emphasizes the fact that when the management notified the UAW of its repudiation of all written and verbal agreements they also included in that repudiation the right of the workers to select representatives of their own choosing as provided by the Wagner Labor Relations Act. This is evidenced by the fact that Kelsey-Hayes has made it known to their employees that they desire to select the number of shop stewards for them and those shop stewards who have been chosen by ballot prior to the strike as the legitimate representatives of the employees but who are not agreeable to Kelsey-Hayes have been "fired" or working conditions are being made so intolerable that it clearly violates the spirit of the Wagner Labor Relations Act.

I have been informed that the UAW still considers that the duly elected shop stewards are the representatives of the workers in the Kelsey-Hayes plants and that regardless of the management's repudiation of agreements they will continue to function as such under the terms of the Wagner Labor Relations Act.

It is beyond coincidence that at the present time the entire country is watching with interest the political situation which is developing in the city of Detroit due to the candidacy of an outstanding labor leader in the mayoralty campaign which is now being so hotly contested. It would seem to me that certain reactionary supporters of the present Detroit city administration would find it very much to their political advantage to create a chaotic condition by work stoppages, which would very adversely affect the candidacy of this candidate at the November 6 election. It seems to me that certain important industrialists in the city of Detroit are more concerned in the dual object of destroying the UAW and defeating this candidate than they are in restoring a peacetime economy through the medium of a speedy reconversion program.

Another very important feature of this situation is the thousands of war veterans who are returning to a peacetime economy to which they have been unaccustomed for the past several years and to which they have been looking forward through years of bitter fighting and all kinds of personal hardship. They are returning only to find a chaotic condition which certainly does not give them the feeling that they have won in their own city the fundamental principles of

democracy for which they have been fighting. These veterans are well aware of the fact that the ranks of the UAW during wartime here on the home front were comprised of patriotic citizens who made the instruments of war which they so successfully used to win their victories on far-flung battlefields. The UAW, on the other hand, had thousands of men in the armed forces—perhaps hundreds before entering the service were employed in Kelsey-Hayes and are looking forward to returning to a peacetime condition in their home city and going back to their old jobs.

Because this is a key plant in a key industry which will largely determine the return of this country to peacetime economy, our entire reconversion program could be wrecked by a group of selfish industrialists willing to sacrifice the happiness of millions of Americans for the purpose of satisfying competitive and political ambitions.

To Prevent War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY CORDON
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 24 (legislative day of Monday, October 22), 1945

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "To Prevent War" by Tom Burns, published in the Sunday Oregonian of October 14, 1945. The statement is a prescription for the prevention of war.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO PREVENT WAR

To the EDITOR:

To halt the third world war:

1. Internationalize atomic-bomb secrets.
2. Abolish all secret treaties.
3. Execute "God-Emperor" Hirohito.
4. Let China civilize Japan.
5. Help Russia humanize Hun-land.
6. Fire State Department millionaires.
7. Retire every millionaire general.
8. Shoot all war criminals.
9. Reserve fox holes for war profiteers.
10. Chloroform every cartel cootie.
11. Muzzle race-hatred rats.
12. Combine and maintain our Air, Army, and Naval Forces in matchless condition.

TOM BURNS.

The Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 24 (legislative day of Monday, October 22), 1945

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, on the twenty-first of this month Tristram Coffin, a well-known commentator, broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System an interesting account of a meeting of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Commerce, which was at the time considering a question which is of current interest to the American people, namely, the control of atomic energy. I ask unanimous consent that the broadcast be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Down a long, quiet corridor of the Senate Office Building is a double door. A plain, ordinary wooden door with the brass numerals, 457, tacked on.

But inside that door last week a fantastic new world was taking shape, the world of atomic energy. The room is small and smoky. At the head of a long table covered with green cloth, like a pool table, sat Senator HARLEY KILGORE, of West Virginia. He is a bald, benign man with a large, round face; a pleasant, deep voice, and a light, sometimes cynical, smile.

Senator KILGORE was presiding at the hearings Tuesday and Wednesday that struck out into a murky future. To his left sat Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, of Washington, a handsome, blond man. On the other side was Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, whose tanned lean face is a background for bright, intelligent eyes.

On Tuesday, the room was dominated by admirals with that full gold stripe on their sleeves. There was a sprinkling of civilians, one of them a character with a long white beard. Over to one side sat Dr. Vannevar Bush, described as one of the keenest minds in the world. He ran our scientific research program during the war. Dr. Bush sat back quietly smoking his pipe.

Rear Adm. William R. Purnell was testifying. He was introduced as Navy's expert on atomic bombs. He is a sandy-haired man with bushy eyebrows. He puffed at his cigaret through a black holder.

Senator FULBRIGHT fished around in his pocket, brought out a clipping and drawled, "The Associated Press here says the Naval Affairs Committee knows of an effective countermeasure against atomic bombs * * * some way to detonate the bombs a distance from our shores."

The Senator paused, smiled eagerly at Admiral Purnell, and asked, "Do you feel there is a defense?"

The answer came quietly and firmly, "I do not know of any defense. The people who made the bomb have thought about any possible countermeasure and of ways to evade them. I can't believe all bombs are detonated the same way." The admiral looked thoughtful. "I doubt if more than two or three atomic bombs are even made the same way."

"Do you suppose," Senator FULBRIGHT asked, twisting around in his chair to face the admiral, "there will be any warning given of the attack starting the next war?"

"No," Admiral Purnell answered. "And we will have no time to develop countermeasures. This war might last only 30 minutes."

The low background murmur in the room had stopped. There was a hush, broken only by the reporters scribbling away on their copy paper.

Senator FULBRIGHT asked, "Is it possible we might attack first?"

The answer was, "No, that is impossible under our Constitution."

The Senator spread out his point, "Then, in event of a paralyzing attack, we are at a disadvantage. We are the most vulnerable. If we have any defense, it must be in the political field. We must have a strong world organization."

Admiral Purnell spoke softly, "That is not in my field, sir."

The Senator thought aloud. "This seems so much more powerful than ordinary weapons, our conventional ideas do not apply. We've always thought defenses could be developed for anything, so we wouldn't have to worry."

Admiral Purnell smiled dryly and said, "There must be an exception to every rule."

Could be defend ourselves by digging underground like moles, or spreading our industries. No—not even that. Atomic bombs could be made to penetrate the deepest underground shelters.

Senator FULBRIGHT asked if the bomb could be kept a secret. The admiral replied the theory was wide open. However—at this time— no other nation has the industrial resources to make atom bombs. Even Britain must modernize its industry before it can make atomic energy.

Then, Admiral Purnell suddenly opened the door to strange possibilities. He said earnestly, "There is one thing we lose sight of. We started out to develop this bomb with nothing but figures on paper. As soon as we conquered one problem, we went on to the next. We didn't stop to find out if there were a cheaper or a faster way. We do not know if the scientists left short cuts behind them, or a way of making bombs with cheaper materials. Any nation may find these short cuts."

He was asked if he felt the atomic bomb would change the role of the Navy in future wars.

The Admiral replied, "Frankly, I get lost just thinking about it. I don't think the best scientists know where we will be 15 years from now. It might wipe out the navy, or army, or air forces. An atomic bomb might be launched from submarines, or planes, or by rockets. The atomic bomb is the most powerful weapon ever found."

The air in the small room was suddenly very close. You became conscious of the haze of smoke.

All this came on Tuesday morning. There were a series of greater shocks the next morning. Wednesday was a beautiful fall day in Washington. Indian summer. The trees near the Capitol splashed with bright reds and yellows. A warm sun shone, and a smoky haze rolled across congressional hill.

Our little room—this time in the basement of the Senate Office Building—was jammed. A pretty Wave sat in the front row. A gray-haired admiral was near the back. There was an intense man in a war correspondent's uniform. Visiting scientists. A small old lady who took copious notes.

A neat, handsome man with black hair turning gray at the sides sat down next to me. I recognized him as Boris Krylov, the shy Russian news agency correspondent.

Senator KILGORE was cheerfully chewing gum and whispering with his chief investigator, Herbert Schimmel.

The crowd had come to see the principal witness, J. R. Oppenheimer. He is the research director at Los Alamos, N. Mex., where the bombs are made, and one of the world's leading authorities on atomic energy.

Dr. Oppenheimer has a fascinating aliveness about him. When he smiles, he has a merry, pixey quality. He is a slim, long-legged man with penetrating blue eyes. He has long, slender fingers that are never still; a high forehead on a long face, big ears, and close-cropped black hair.

Dr. Oppenheimer began by telling of the giant machines at Los Alamos; how they could be used for biology and medicine, as well as for death. They are the huge pyles, or chain reactors. He called them "a big sledge hammer to hit the mosquitoes of science."

These machines cannot be duplicated by private industry. They are too expensive. They belong to the people of the United

States. Congress must decide what we will do with them.

Dr. Oppenheimer spoke in a low, meticulous voice. His pronunciation was a little academic. He said, for example, "prO-ject," and "EI-ther." But there was a gathering, hypnotic quality in both his words and their sound.

The military aspects of atomic energy, the scientist said gently, are really rather terrifying.

. He damned the practice of surrounding scientists and their research with secrecy. This, he said, would stifle progress and discourage scientists. Back of the atom bomb was years of free exchange of scientific knowledge.

"All we did," Dr. Oppenheimer commented, "was to take a tree ripe with fruit and shake it hard. Secrecy is not possible. The nature of the world is not secret. Only policy is secret. You cannot keep the atom secret."

Krylov, the Russian reporter, was writing furiously in his notebook.

Can we keep the techniques of atom bombs secret? Senator FULBRIGHT asked.

"That," Dr. Oppenheimer replied, "is like why don't you stop beating your wife. The immediate problem, it seems to me, is to get confidence among the nations, not force them apart by trying to build up a great secret. Other countries will say, 'Keep your secret. We'll do it another way.' "

Dr. Oppenheimer looked around the room, catching the fixed fascinated expressions. Krylov, the Russian, had his chin in his hand.

The scientist went on, "The intolerable state is very close. It is only necessary for other nations to decide to pursue an independent course in atomic research. How little it would take to close the door. If I were a Russian scientist and had this pulled on me I'd say, 'Boys, let's get to it.' I think they will."

Congresswoman HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, of California, quietly slipped into the room and took a chair in the corner.

Dr. Oppenheimer was asked, "Are there any defenses against atomic bombs?"

The answer was clear, "There are no specific countermeasures for atomic bombs. There never will be. Our bomb cannot be exploded before it hits the target." Dr. Oppenheimer looked around the room, "I will offer to wager half my savings—small as they are—to anyone who can explode a bomb made at our place before it reaches its destination. The atomic bomb is the two-billion-dollar-straw that may break the camel's back."

Senator FULBRIGHT, his tanned face concentrated in thought, asked if there were any defense.

Dr. Oppenheimer answered, "No country is ever thoroughly alerted. Atomic bombs will be a cheap way to make war. They can do so much with so little."

"I suppose," he said reflectively, "it's a natural human reaction to wish so hard for a defense against this thing, that people begin to believe there is a defense. But this comes to a world already at the breaking point, so far as weapons are concerned."

A low, shocked murmur ran through the crowded room.

Senator FULBRIGHT thought aloud. "We in Government have a real job—to make sure the people understand the importance of this new power."

Dr. Oppenheimer spoke up again, "We scientists are willing to be circus performers, to move into the glare of publicity, if we can somehow make the people understand."

The room was quiet for a moment, lost in thought. Then Senator FULBRIGHT asked, "Could our 40,000,000 people be wiped out in one attack?"

All eyes were turned on Dr. Oppenheimer. He answered soberly and quietly, "I am afraid that is true."

There was a sound of people drawing in their breaths. The gray-haired woman bit her lip. Krylov, the Russian, had forgotten to write. Like the rest of us, he sat dazed.

The scientist went on, "The atomic bomb has weakened the military power of the United States. Ten or twenty years from now atomic bombs will be very cheap."

Senator FULBRIGHT, as if in reply, said, "That is a compelling reason why we must undertake some other means of defense. I feel the only way is through Government opposition to nationalism. Governments must agree to some world system of control."

"Yes," said Dr. Oppenheimer, "there are no technical problems. Only political ones. And even in solving the political problems, the world traditions of science will help." Dr. Oppenheimer smiled. "I am not envious of the tasks of the foreign ministers."

Senator MAGNUSON commented, "You know it might help if we put the scientists in the political field."

"Perhaps," Dr. Oppenheimer replied, "that might work. Scientists have always belonged to a world fraternity. Many times on this development of the atom bomb, we thought the war might end before we had a bomb. But some of us did not stop, because we wanted the world to see the atomic bomb. It was to us the greatest argument for world peace."

Senator FULBRIGHT said slowly, "Yes, it took the shock of Hiroshima to wake us up." Then he turned to face the scientist directly and said earnestly, "Dr. Oppenheimer, if all the people could hear you, I think it would give us the motive to really build the peace."

Through the windows, we could see a tiny scene, legs briskly walking by, a patch of sunlight, one corner of the big fountain in the park. But, somehow, it did not look the same.

The Pacific Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by me:

(By Hon. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii and member of the House Subcommittee on Pacific Bases)

WASHINGTON, October 3.—The Pacific war has brought under American control an area beyond Hawaii that is considerably greater than that of the mainland of the United States itself.

This can be graphically illustrated by placing on a map in a space beyond the Hawaiian islands an outline of the mainland of the United States drawn to the same scale. This will show that there is ample room for all the States in the area west of Hawaii, south of Midway, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa, east of the Philippines and north of Manus, Guadalcanal, and New Caledonia.

The enormous importance of the future control and government of this area cannot be overemphasized.

The islands located within these vast reaches of water constitute a bridge between the Western Hemisphere and the Orient. The future peace and development of the Pacific will depend on how these islands are held and developed.

This area constitutes a new frontier. Its military conquest has been achieved by the adaptation of weapons of modern warfare in the most ingenious innovations known to history.

Air transportation has brought them into close relationship and given them a value far beyond anything that was ever imagined in the past.

One of the results of the Pacific war is to give to Americans numbering several millions a knowledge of this area that is far beyond that which existed before, that is possessed by no other people in the world.

These are the men who have borne the brunt of the American offensive. They are keenly aware of the importance of these islands to our country.

The outstanding fact to the men in the Pacific is the determination the sacrifices in lives and treasure that have been made to bring these islands under American control shall not have been in vain.

Almost without exception, they believe these islands should be held by our country.

The point of view of the fighting men in the Pacific is quite different from that in Europe.

In the latter most of them felt that we should participate in the affairs of Europe only so far as it is necessary to prevent a recurrence of warfare that might involve our country.

They are not interested in either the possibilities of settling or developing of any areas in Europe.

They see in this world overpopulation and great suffering, and their primary wish is to get home.

In the Pacific their feeling is almost the reverse.

They want the American flag over the Pacific for good. There is no isolationism whatsoever so far as the Pacific is concerned.

These men see that the primary responsibility for peace in the Pacific will be borne by this country.

They believe that we should not undertake this responsibility without the means to meet it.

One of these means is well-developed island bases that will support a fleet and air force equal to the task of repelling any enemy or any combination of enemies.

The territorial formula which has proved so successful in the development of our country through more than 150 years can, I believe, be readily adapted to the government of the vast new areas of the Pacific.

For the present the Pacific needs a centralized administration that would be in a position to command the skills of every department of our Government.

The extraordinary diversity of the problem involved makes this imperative.

The responsibility for this administration should not be the part-time job of any one Cabinet officer.

It needs the fullest attention of men whose experience and wisdom would qualify them to sit in the Cabinet.

Unless this administration is set up in this way, it will never command the attention of the country and Congress to the extent necessary for its proper development.

There is much in the experience of Hawaii that will be of value in the government of these islands.

Interest in Hawaii in their development is extraordinary. Nevertheless, I believe any suggestions that the Territory of Hawaii be incorporated in the administration of the Pacific islands would be extremely unwise, both from the standpoint of the country as a whole and Hawaii.

The development of this Territory is so far beyond that of any other Pacific island area that none admit of comparison.

The Territory of Hawaii, moreover, should not be expected to carry any more of the financial burden of the Pacific island administration than do the States.

The Territory of Hawaii should prepare to assume the responsibility of Statehood.

The natural point from which the new Pacific islands should be administered is Guam.

This island, if for nothing other than for geographical reasons, is a better place for the headquarters of this new administration than is any other spot in the Pacific.

It is centrally situated and in an environment and among a people who live much more in the environment and spirit of the problems to be solved than do the people of any other part of our country.

The possibility that the little city of Agana, completely destroyed and soon to be reconstructed with Federal funds, may be the point from which this area will be governed, might well be taken into consideration.

This is, however, but a detail that only begins to suggest the general diversity of problems that face the administration of these islands.

In their diversity, their novelty, and their importance to our future they offer a challenge to the best ability of the American statesmanship and involve decisions of vital importance to all of the American people.

In the development of any program for the future of the Pacific area, the cooperation of the other powers of the world is essential.

England, Australia, New Zealand, France, and Holland have important interests in the Pacific islands. France holds some of the richest and most beautiful of these islands. The fabulous resources of the Dutch East Indies are well known to everyone.

The people of the Orient, and particularly of China and Malaya, will follow with great interest any agreements that are reached concerning the future of the Pacific islands. They should participate in reaching these agreements. Their support is important to any program that is adopted.

What was once determined by rivalry should now be determined by cooperation.

The retention by the United States of the islands of the Pacific formerly held by Japan under League of Nations mandate, or bases within them, in some form or other, is essential to the future security of our country and the peace of the Pacific.

In addition to these there are several other island groups whose occupation and development by American troops has demonstrated their importance to any thoroughgoing plan for Pacific peace.

I believe that we have established a sound basis for retaining these islands in the following:

1. The sacrifices our men in the armed forces have made in the Pacific offensive;

2. The enormous effort and funds already expended in constructing within these islands the bases necessary to carry on the Pacific offensive; and

3. The desire of Pacific peoples that we of this country undertake this task.

The fighting men of the Pacific are determined that the American flag shall continue to fly over those islands for which our men have given their lives.

While much of the work to establish bases on these islands has been of a temporary nature, there are roads, harbors, and airfields already constructed which, by their very nature, constitute permanent improvements.

The process of converting these bases from a temporary to a permanent status is a relatively simple one. The native people of the Pacific, and many of them now under the jurisdiction of our allies, are very partial to Americans. We enjoy their good will to an extraordinary degree.

The responsibility for the future administration of these islands is obviously that of our country.

I believe that we should assume this responsibility on the following basis:

1. Make the Marshall, Carolines, including the Palau and Marianas Islands, an integral part of the United States and thus move the American frontier to Guam.

2. Assume control of islands such as Iwo Jima and Okinawa under possibly a trusteeship so as to prevent their utilization in the future for offensive action against this country and its allies.

3. Acquire title to Manus in the southwest from Australia and New Caledonia in the southeast from France to protect our southern flank in the Pacific.

4. In those islands that are to be incorporated as an integral part of this country, inaugurate a program that seeks the assimilation of the native people as citizens of this country and has as its purpose not only to give them American citizenship but to qualify them for an increasing measure of local responsibility in the management of their own affairs.

5. Establish in the Federal Government a new and independent agency for the administration of those areas that is directly responsible to the President, one that takes account of not only the strictly military value of those islands, but their importance from every other standpoint, such as their development for commercial aviation and other civilian purposes.

Thus may be launched the territory of the Pacific.

Origin and Purposes of the American Jewish Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. THOM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. THOM. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am reproducing an address delivered over the Canton, Ohio, radio station by Mr. Reuben F. Jacobson, a prominent merchant of that city, revealing the interest of American Jews in having Palestine opened to increased immigration of their people, especially those still in concentration camps:

WHO REPRESENTS THE JEWISH PEOPLE

America is made up of people who came here from many lands to escape from intolerable conditions in Europe. In common with all others, Jewish people came here to escape the persecutions and the oppressions of the hatreds of Europe. They were grateful for the freedom and opportunity which America spelled out for them. They looked back upon their unhappy experience in Europe as upon a nightmare. They wanted to become thoroughly integrated into the life of America and they wanted to forget about Europe and its problems.

America accepted the Jew and made him feel at home here. Except for occasional outcroppings of prejudice and the minor irritants of social discrimination, there had been no anti-Semitism in this country of an organized character. American Jews always considered anti-Semitism a problem peculiar to Europe. That it might be transplanted to the free soil of America seemed to them well nigh incredible. Then the incredible happened.

With the rise of Hitlerism and its triumphant march across Europe, the seeds of hate spread to these shores. The outbreak of this war found 800 different organizations engaged in spreading anti-Semitism in this country in accordance with the Nazi pattern.

Even as the shock of Pearl Harbor jarred American public opinion out of the slumbers of isolationism, a profound change came over the thinking of American Jews. They discovered that, much as they would like to forget the unpleasant memories of Europe, they must take into account the fact that whatever happens to the Jews of Europe is bound to affect the fate and future of American Jewry. This is one world and we are all part of one another.

This Jewish concern over the plight of their unfortunate brethren led to the formation of the American Jewish Conference. Elections were held throughout the country in June of 1943 and 370 delegates were chosen to represent the Jewish people. In addition, every major Jewish organization sent delegates to the conference. Every shade of opinion was represented.

The conference held its first session in New York in September 1943. At this session and a subsequent one in Pittsburgh in December 1944 a comprehensive program was drawn up to protect the rights of Jewish people in Europe and to implement the rights of the Jewish people with respect to Palestine. This program called for an international bill of rights to protect all minority groups regardless of race, creed, or color. It called for the outlawing of anti-Semitism, for the restoration of Jewish rights and property in liberated Europe, for the punishment of war criminals, for Jewish representation on commissions that would be set up to deal with various aspects of the peace settlement, for the relief and rehabilitation of the surviving Jews of Europe, for the opening of the gates of Palestine to free and unrestricted Jewish immigration, and for the reconstitution of Palestine as a democratic Jewish commonwealth.

The conference was a source of pride to all lovers of democracy and to all who believed in the democratic processes of representation and discussion. Naturally, there were many differences of opinion; but all the resolutions included in this program were adopted by an overwhelming majority vote. In view of the democratic character of its composition and organization, the American Jewish Conference has become the recognized spokesman for the overwhelming majority of American Jews. The American Jewish Conference is not a superorganization. It is not its purpose to dominate the life of the American Jewish community. The conference is merely a channel through which we can discover what the Jews of America are thinking and what they want.

It is a channel through which the energies of the American Jewish community can be directed toward the task of helping their brethren in Europe and in Palestine. The special position of the American Jewish Conference was recognized by our own State Department when the conference was appointed as the Jewish consultant body for the San Francisco Conference.

Working in cooperation with Jewish representative bodies in other countries, the conference is gathering material in order to present the Jewish case at the forthcoming peace discussions. The Jewish people who were the first victims of Hitlerism, who suffered 6,000,000 casualties in this war, ask for no special privileges; but we do feel that the suffering and the sacrifices of this war will be meaningless and vain unless the peace settlement brings justice and security to all the peoples of the world.

The American Jewish Conference is especially interested in the problem of the so-called "displaced persons" who were discovered in the concentration camps of Germany. Among them are 100,000 Jews. They have stood by and waited while millions of other displaced persons have been returned to their homes; but they themselves have no homes to which they may return. They have no intention of remaining in Germany. Neither do they wish to return to the scenes of their suffering and humiliation, to walk

amid the ruins of their former homes, in the streets where their parents were murdered, their children butchered, their wives and their sisters violated. They cannot begin life again amid former neighbors who looted their possessions and betrayed them to the Germans.

Having been liberated by the American and Allied armies, these people hoped that they would be free to rebuild their lives amid more congenial surroundings. Imagine their bitterness when they were forced to remain in the same concentration camps in which they were held by the Germans, sometimes under guard and behind barbed wire.

Reports of their suffering reached President Truman. He sent Mr. Earl Harrison to make a survey of the condition of European Jewry. Mr. Harrison's report has now been published. The facts are all the more shocking and horrifying because these people were being mistreated not by Germans, not by Nazis, not by the Gestapo, but by Americans. General Eisenhower had issued excellent directives. Unfortunately not all of the people in charge of these camps have the experience or the qualifications to handle the problems of these displaced persons with understanding and humanity. President Truman was convinced, on the basis of Mr. Harrison's report, that the only future and salvation for these Jews of Europe is in Palestine. He has, therefore, sent a letter to Prime Minister Attlee of Britain asking him to open the doors of Palestine to Jewish immigration and to issue 100,000 immigration certificates immediately.

The American Jewish Conference is sending a team of six representatives into the concentration camps to help restore the morale of this broken remnant of Jewish survivors. But we feel that it is no solution of the problem to have these people remain in concentration camps, a constant source of unhappiness to themselves and irritation to others. The only realistic solution of the problem is to permit them to go to Palestine. Palestine was entrusted to Great Britain under a mandate from the League of Nations for the express purpose of helping the Jewish people to establish their national homeland there. Unfortunately the British colonial officials who were sent to administer Palestine proceeded to ignore the mandate of the League of Nations and to govern Palestine as if it were a Crown colony. Instead of helping the Jewish people to establish a national homeland, every conceivable obstacle was placed in their way and their rights constantly whittled down.

When Hitler began to drive the Jews from Europe, they naturally turned toward Palestine, only to discover that the British colonial administration had shut the gates in their faces in violation of Britain's international obligations and her pledges to the Jewish people.

The American Jewish Conference is grateful to President Truman for his deep and sympathetic understanding of the Jewish problem in Europe, a problem which can be solved only through unrestricted Jewish immigration into Palestine and the reconstitution of that country as a Jewish commonwealth. The Jewish question is only a small part of the vast complex of problems involved in the making of the peace, yet we believe that it is one of the great test cases of international morality, a test of the good faith of the great powers in their dealings with smaller peoples.

We hope that Prime Minister Attlee will respond favorably to the President's request and that these Jewish refugees may find healing and new hope in their own national homeland in Palestine.

Our hope, however, does not only come from prime ministers and statesmen. It comes from our belief in the ultimate triumph of justice on earth. The Jewish people, forming a minority all over the world, cannot solve the Jewish problem, for our problem is a world problem and it must be solved by mankind at large. We appeal to God's mercy and kindness, and we also appeal to the conscience of man, to his goodness, and to his sense of justice that a broken, homeless people may find a rightful place in the family of nations.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me on July 6, 1945:

Friends in the Upper Peninsula, several weeks ago I sent a letter to all the school superintendents in the Twelfth Congressional District asking for their judgment on the various legislative proposals for Federal aid to education.

In my letter to the local school officials I stated that I favored authorization of an appropriation of funds by Congress to assist the States in financing their systems of education, but asked the advice of these people, so close to the problems of local education as to the specific legislation which best met the needs of the Upper Peninsula.

The response to this inquiry of mine was extremely gratifying. I received answers from almost every one of the superintendents, and their replies showed a surprising unanimity. With very few exceptions, the local school officials in my district urged me to support the Thomas-Hill-Ramspeck legislation.

This legislation, known as H. R. 1296 in the House of Representatives where it was introduced by Representative RAMSPECK, and S. 181 in the Senate where it is sponsored by Senators ELBERT D. THOMAS and LISTER HILL, provides for the appropriation of funds to more nearly equalize educational opportunities among and within the States, and also to meet emergency situations in education in the various States.

I will go into greater detail about the specific provisions of the legislation, but first I would like to discuss the nature of the problem it seeks to meet.

One of our proud boasts as a nation has been that America is the land of opportunity for the young, that our boys and girls can rise above their background, no matter how impoverished or depressed their family circumstances might be. The premise for this boast is our national pride in the American tradition of free and equal education.

The war has done much to shake this complacency about educational opportunity for our young people. It brought to light the startling fact that more than a million young men could not pass the literacy test established by the Selective Service System for inductees. One million seven hundred and four thousand men fell short of the educational standards of a fourth-grade education set for soldiers in World War II.

These million and more young men were ineligible to take part in the defense of their country in a war emergency because their country had not given them equality of opportunity in education, had not given them the chance to exercise their citizenship rights and duties.

The time has passed when the pioneer spirit and a pickax were enough to qualify young Americans for a life of useful and productive citizenship. The horizons of opportunity today are not rimmed with unexplored forests or untapped mountains of precious minerals.

The frontiers of today where young Americans must build their futures, and the future of their country, are not the old physical frontiers of the last century. It is in the realm of technology, of business and commerce, and Government that the boys and girls of today will have to find security for themselves and their families. Their courage and enterprise must be matched with training, with education, if these new frontiers are to be conquered. Democracy will have little meaning to millions of young Americans, now boys and girls of grade-school age, unless the doors of educational opportunity are opened to them.

These children, citizens of tomorrow, are a challenge and a threat to the whole Nation. Their educational problem is not and should not be treated as a local issue.

One of the prime objectives of education in a democracy should be the furtherance of the democratic ideal. Our schools should be a major force in minimizing and eliminating undemocratic economic class distinction. The goal of education should be the molding of citizens equipped to assume the responsibilities and exercise the privileges of modern technological society.

In all too many of our States the public-school systems are totally unprepared to teach children even the minimum of what modern democratic society will demand of them. As education operates now in many States its end result is to intensify existing class distinctions, to perpetuate inequalities, to negate democracy.

The reasons for this are obvious. Those States, and sections of States, which most need improved educational facilities can least afford them. The States with the most inadequate public-school systems are now spending a larger percent of their income on education than are the States with the best school systems. The plain fact is that many States cannot afford better educational opportunities for their young people.

The wide variations in public schooling offered by the different States is directly traceable to the wide variation in State income, derived from taxes, which can be expended on education, and to the differences in the size of their school-age population. Unfortunately, small tax resources in a State are accompanied by large school-age population. A recent survey showed that Connecticut, the richest State on a per capita average, had three times as much income, with only three-fourths as many school-age children, as had Mississippi, the poorest State. Another factor which acts to perpetuate the unequal educational opportunities in poor States is the increasingly higher birth rates in these States.

I want to reiterate my very strong conviction that the problem of raising the level of education in backward States is not a State or community problem. It is a national problem that involves the welfare of all the people of the country. We cannot expect the poorer States to do more than they are now doing, in the way of State aid to education. The expense of equalizing educational opportunity must be spread over the whole population. This is done through Federal financial aid, as is contemplated in the Thomas-Hill-Ramspeck bill.

A great many statistics showing the disparity between expenditures for educational purposes between the various States have been prepared by the National Education Association, the American Association of University Women, the YWCA, various church groups, the CIO and AFL as well as many other organizations. I don't believe you are interested in just the figures involved in this question so I won't recite them to you. I know you, as mothers and fathers of children

in school, and as citizens of your community and of the Nation are very concerned with the educational facilities of your community and of the Nation.

The perpetuation of pools of near-illiteracy in our population is a threat to the well-being of the whole population. And the educational standard of the country as a whole is deteriorating, not improving under the present State-grant system. Teaching is no longer a profession which lures the best minds of the country. Since 1941 about 280,000 teachers have left the schools. Only a fourth of this exodus went into the armed services. Most of the others found greater economic opportunities in other livelihoods. The normal schools and colleges are not preparing new teachers to replace those who have left the profession. Enrollment in teaching schools and colleges has dropped more than 50 percent below what it was in 1941.

The war alone does not account for this. It has intensified a trend away from teaching that was very apparent before 1941.

It is not surprising that teaching has become an unpopular profession when you realize that in a total of more than 800,000 public-school teachers in the country, 20 in every 100 are paid less than $1,200 a year. Half of the teachers in the whole country are paid less than $1,600 a year.

This antiquated pay schedule is just one expression of the inadequate financial structure of our schools today. Of course the great majority of the underpaid teachers are in the poorer areas, the backward States, and in the rural and semi-rural districts of otherwise progressive States. Michigan is in this latter group, with children in farm and semi-farm areas receiving much poorer education than the big-city children.

One of the very strong objections to Federal aid to education has always been the fear that financial aid would be accompanied by Federal domination of educational programs, that it would mean regimentation of all the Nation's children in a federalized public-school system. I believe Federal control is undesirable in the educational field.

The Thomas-Hill-Ramspeck legislation takes cognizance of this undesirability and specifically states that the financial aid from the Federal Government does not mean interference in any way with the States' prerogative to formulate their own educational methods. It expressly forbids Federal control of the schools.

Let me outline to you just what the legislation does provide for and how it would affect the State of Michigan.

The bill provides for an appropriation of $200,000,000 each year in which Congress finds an emergency for payment of teachers' salaries, for keeping schools open not less than 160 days a year, for employment of additional teachers where needed to relieve overcrowded classes, or to raise the substandard of teachers' salaries.

It also provides for the appropriation of $100,000,000 for the purpose of more nearly equalizing educational opportunities among and within the States.

The emergency funds will be apportioned among the States on the basis of the number of pupils in average daily attendance in each State. The equalization fund will be apportioned on the basis of financial need as measured by the number of persons 5 to 17 years old and the total income payments in the various States. In this way, the poorer States would receive the larger share of the fund.

The funds will be distributed by regular State authorities to public elementary and secondary schools.

Under the terms of the legislation, Michigan would receive a total of $10,100,406 for the improvement of its educational facilities.

Very many of the letters I received from school superintendents and teachers in the Upper Peninsula stressed the need of the schools in the Peninsula for just the kind of aid provided for in the Thomas-Hill-Ramspeck legislation. They are very close to the situation, and, along with the parents of the school children, know more than any other group the educational shortcomings of our schools due to circumstances beyond the control of the local communities. I share their desire to improve and increase the opportunities for our young people, and will work toward that end here in Congress.

Thank you, and good night.

Jerusalem for the Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 24 (legislative day of Monday, October 22), 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, an able discussion of the current controversy respecting entrance of the homeless Jews into the Holy Land, with a note of appreciation by Dr. Stephen S. Wise, was written by Dr. Clinton N. Howard, superintendent of the International Reform Federation, and published in the November issue of Progress Magazine, of this city. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JERUSALEM FOR THE JEWS

The following letter has been received by the editor from Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, of the Free Synagogue of New York, president of the American Jewish Congress:

"MY DEAR MR. HOWARD: I wish you to know that I am deeply moved by what you have written. It is very fine. I am sending your article to friends in London and Jerusalem. If you could spare more copies of your advance release of the Progress magazine, I should be glad to have them.

"With deep appreciation of your very fine work.

"Faithfully yours,

"Dr. STEPHEN S. WISE."

In reply to this request we sent to Dr. Wise 500 copies of the editor's appeal in behalf of the Jews, mailed a copy to the entire membership of the English Parliament, Cabinet, and King, and the London, Liverpool, and Manchester press. We also mailed a copy to the American Jewish press, the rabbinical schools, and American rabbis, in all 3,000 copies. The article follows:

"AN ANCIENT CRY TO HEAVEN

"'And the Lord said unto Moses, I have surely seen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt, and have heard their cry, for I know their sorrows, and I am come down to deliver them, and to bring them out of that land. And thus shalt thou say unto Pharaoh, Israel is my son, even my first born: and I say unto thee, Let my son go, that he may serve me.'

"Today, God is speaking to the nations about 'My people' which are in Germany, in Poland, in the Balkans, and Russia 'by reason of their taskmasters.' To them He is saying, of the same people and of the same land, 'Let My people go.'

"For a generation the rulers of Europe have 'hardened their hearts' against God's chosen people, and worse than all the plagues of Egypt have fallen upon them. Hitler hardened his heart and sent the destroyer among them by methods of cruelty and in numbers unbelievable. Millions have been brutally treated, starved, robbed, and slain.

"THE CRIME OF THE AGES

"When God created man He gave him a home in the Garden of Eden. When He created a nation, under the guidance of Moses, He gave them a homeland in Palestine. This was in fulfillment of His covenant to Abraham, saying, 'Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee; and I will make of thee a great nation.'

"Later when Abraham and Lot divided the land and Abraham dwelt in the land of Canaan, the Lord spake unto Abraham, saying, 'Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward and westward; for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever.' * * * In the same day the Lord made a covenant with Abraham, saying 'Unto thy seed have I given this land. * * * that in blessing, I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thee * * * and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed.'

"This covenant was confirmed to Isaac, to Jacob, to Joseph, and to Moses, under whose hand God led Israel out of Egypt, 'with a strong hand and an outstretched arm.'

"From that point on, until the fall of Jericho under Joshua, as they entered into their inheritance, there is nothing in the history or literature of the world like the rise to power of the Hebrew nation under Samuel, David and Solomon, under whose reign 'Judah and Israel dwelt safely, every man under his vine and under his fig tree, from Dan to Beer-sheba, all the days of Solomon (I Kings 4:25). No other civilization before or since has produced such characters as the Hebrew prophets as God raised up from the loins of Abraham, culminating in the birth of Jesus, of the seed of David, through whom all the nations in the earth have been blessed.

"A DIVINE TITLE DEED

"From the days of God's covenant with Abraham, during the time of the dispersion, the carrying away into Babylon, the return under Nehemiah and Ezra, and, under the dominion of the Roman Empire to the birth of Jesus, Palestine has been recognized as the home land of the Jews.

"When God's favor was withdrawn and they were punished because of their idolatry and sins, there was always the promise through the prophets of their restoration in the land promised to Abraham and their fathers. The Hebrew title deed to Palestine, the ancient land of Canaan, is signed by the hand of Almighty God, and their restoration is as certain as the oath of Jehovah, 'For when God made promise to Abraham,' says St. Paul, 'because he could swear by no greater, he sware by himself,' saying 'And I will establish my covenant between thee and thy seed after thee, and to thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession.'

"A WARRANTY DEED

"This is the title deed of the Jews of Palestine, the like of which has been given to no other people or nation, not even to the Germans, the Italians, the English or the Americans, in the history of the world. Other nations have their possessions and their home lands by discovery, by purchase, by treaty, by conquest, by the might of their arms, but Palestine belongs to the Jews by the oath of Jehovah, when He sware by Himself 'for an everlasting possession.' It was a warranty deed signed by the Almighty, which when disputed by the nations, the signer must make good.

"A PEACEFUL INVASION

"Today they are in the situation of Simon Peter when he asked Jesus, 'To whom shall we go?' There is no other place for the Jews to go. Perhaps one reason why the doors of the nations are closed against them is because of the plan and purpose of Jehovah that they shall in these last days return to the land of their possession. Be that as it may, it is a peaceable and lawful invasion. They are not marching on Jerusalem with armies and the weapons of modern civilization, by land, sea, and air, with fire, gas, and sword, assassinating the inhabitants, as Italy did in Ethiopia, Japan in China, and as Germany when it kidnaped Poland, Austria, and Czechoslovakia on pain of slaughter, but peaceably, unarmed, and financed by their prosperous brethren in other lands, to purchase from the present possessors in Palestine the land promised to them by their fathers and to themselves by Jehovah their God.

"They are as much entitled to that land as are the Arabs to Arabia, the Turks to Turkey, the Italians to Italy, the Germans to Germany, the French to France, the English to England, and the Americans to the United States, for to none of these peoples hath Jehovah spoken with an oath by Himself to give to them their lands for an everlasting possession.

"Who has robbed them of their inheritance? So that the Hebrews of today, driven from the lands of their adoption by birth, stripped of their possessions, persecuted beyond human endurance, and exiled from their homes, without any destination, can say with the Jew Jesus, despised and rejected of men, 'The foxes have holes, the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay His head.'

"THE INHERITANCE OF THE JEW

"And this despite the fact that under the land laws of the Hebrew theocracy, as set up by Jehovah, the allotment of land remained with the family forever. There were no landless or forgotten men. Under our system the children acquire land by inheritance at the death of their father. Under the divinely arranged Hebrew system, a child inherited social security at birth. He became a landowner on the day he was born. It was an inheritance from God, who said, 'The land is Mine. The land shall not be sold forever.' The birth certificate of a Hebrew child was a title deed to his estate, which could not be sold. It was a perpetual possession.

"This was the land from which the Jews were exiled by conquest, to which they are now waiting to return by purchase under the promised protection of the English mandate, and whose right to return is being disputed by the Arabs, who have several lands of their own, many times larger and more fertile than Palestine, about the size of the State of New Jersey. Palestine is their only hope.

"THE EXODUS FROM EUROPE

"They go out under conditions more galling than was the exodus from Egypt, when they were allowed to take their flocks and herds and their family possessions with them. Today they go empty-handed, half-starved, and penniless.

"The Christian who is not moved by the story of suffering of a persecuted people, which gave to the world the Bible and to the race the Christ, according to the flesh, is afflicted with either hardening of the heart or softening of the brain, or both.

"Such a situation is no longer a Jewish problem, it is a world problem, and concerns every nation calling itself civilized or Christian. Let the guilty nations beware.

" 'Shall I not visit them for these things, saith the Lord. Shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?' We believe it will, not only upon such a nation, but upon those nations who, like Pilate, wash their hands and say, 'I am innocent.' Upon them all there is judgment to come. 'For the oppression of the poor, for the sighing of the needy, now will I arise, saith the Lord. * * * For in the hand of the Lord there is a cup, and the wine is red: it is full of mixture; and he poureth out of the same: but the dregs thereof, all the wicked of the earth shall wring them out and drink them.'

"Once again the Voice of Jehovah is ringing through the land: 'Let my people go that they may serve me.' "

What Are We Doing for Jews and Displaced Persons?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday last, on the Memo to America program over WMAL, I was asked to broadcast an answer to the following question: "Are we doing as much as possible for Jews and displaced persons at this time?" My reply, restricted by a time limit of 2 minutes, was as follows:

In my opinion, General Eisenhower and the armed forces have done a splendid job. As of September 10 last, or barely 4 months after VE-day, they had repatriated nearly five and a half million displaced persons. I call that magnificent. Harrison, in his report, calls it phenomenal. This leaves about 1,000,000, or less than 16 percent, almost wholly consisting of displaced persons, who refuse, or are afraid to return.

Even Harrison, in his report to the President, says: "It is undoubtedly true that the great majority of Jews now in Germany do not wish to return to those countries from which they came." Harrison frankly states that these displaced persons want to go to Palestine and the United States. Of course the Palestine situation cannot in the slightest degree be ascribed to us or to Eisenhower and the armed forces. For that the British, in the violation of their mandate, must accept responsibility.

The voluntary refusal of this million to be repatriated, created a second problem which could be developed only as the repatriation was being accomplished. Certainly, no one will contend that the Army should first have taken a census of those who refused to go home, found villas and private homes for them, and thereafter proceeded with the main job..

Now, please remember that Harrison in his report admitted marked improvement had already taken place, although he says his report was being written only 3 months after VE-day. In my opinion, that progress in 3 months shows another splendid achievement by General Eisenhower.

I visited some of those displacement camps. The Hanau camp, for instance, consisting of old barracks, providing individual apartments and wards, just out of Frankfort. The looting of a consignment of industrial alcohol by inmates (to which Eisenhower refers in his defense) had just occurred, killing or permanently paralyzing 800 to a thousand of them. The director complained of flagrant disregard of hygienic and sanitary rules, as well as immorality, which could not be punished or disciplined. When one considers that this million is the residuum or leavings of over 6,000,000 who had lived for years under the most degrading conditions, it is not difficult to realize that operating these camps is a problem.

It is true that UNRRA, with its admitted inefficiency and handicaps, had taken over much of the camp care at that time. However, their failures cannot be blamed on us, but are the fault of the United Nations. And that's why I say we are doing as much as possible at this time.

All Members of Congress Should Become Acquainted With Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, nothing is more important to our domestic and international future than to learn all we can about atomic energy and the atomic bomb. We should know what the word "fission" means.

We should know what "neutrons" are. We should know what a "chain reaction" is. We should know why "uranium 235" was used in preference to any other element.

Here are some of the answers:

"Fission" means the property to break up into fragments, to split, in this instance into other atoms.

"Neutrons" are subatomic particles which are 10,000 times smaller than atoms and are neutral, hence their name. That is they are neither positive nor negative.

"Chain reactions" are the continuations of the reaction of releasing neutrons which in turn penetrate other fissionable atoms and release other neutrons thereby establishing a continuous reaction.

Uranium 235 was used because it was found to be the one element that was most easily fissionable by neutron bombardment.

Following is part of an article written by I. I. Rabi, professor of physics and chairman of the department of physics at Columbia University, recently published in the October issue of Atlantic Monthly. It is well worth reading:

The two-billion-dollar questions which had to be answered before the atomic bomb could be realized were: (1) Did all three uranium isotopes undergo fission, and if not, which of the three was the important one? (2) Were any neutrons released during the violent fission process, and if so, how many on the average? (3) Did the remaining nonfissionable isotopes absorb neutrons to any degree?

As was stated in the official report on the development of the atomic bomb, it was known by 1940 that only U235 (Uranium 235) was important for fission by neutrons of all speeds and that neutrons of certain speeds were captured by U238 to produce U239. It also was known by this time that the average number of neutrons emitted per fission was somewhere between one and three, and that these neutrons were mostly of high speed. These facts were very encouraging and fortunate for our side in this war, because they showed that an atomic bomb was possible and also so expensive that the enemy could not produce it. The reasoning runs like this:

If more than one neutron is released during the fission process, the fission of one uranium nucleus will produce enough neutrons to set off more than one other uranium nucleus, and the whole process will multiply

rapidly with explosive effect, producing what is called a chain reaction. The chain reaction will die out, however, like a fire in wet wood, if less than one neutron is produced per fission or if the neutrons, while passing through the uranium, are absorbed to a sufficient degree by some process which does not produce fission. It is clear that the chunk of uranium has to be large enough for the neutron to do its work by colliding with a fissionable nucleus before it can escape through the surface of the uranium. Also, another important point, the neutrons must be fast to give the chain reaction time enough to consume an appreciable portion of the uranium by disintegration before the gigantic energy release blows the entire bomb apart.

Fortunately for our side, the atomic bomb was bound to be extremely expensive to produce. U235 is not only one part in 140 of the mixture of isotopes which ordinarily is bulk uranium. U238, which is 99.3 percent of bulk uranium, absorbs neutrons and thus would stop the reaction. To make a bomb, pure U235 was needed, and relatively lots of it. The separation of U235 from U238 in bulk was never attempted before and turned out to be a peculiarly difficult and costly process. To ordinary peacetime thinking, it would have been termed impossible because of the expense. Here lay our good fortune, because, unlike any other nation, we had the manpower, the money, and the time to do the task. If the abundant U238 had been the important agent in atomic bombs, our cities would have been obliterated before we entered the war, because our enemies, although short on resources, were fully aware of all the possibilities.

Another side to the development of the atomic bomb is still more eerie. The capture of a neutron by U238, which has a property, in common with some other nuclei, of spontaneously increasing its positive charge. The increase occurs in two successive steps by a process which essentially entails the creation of electrons. The electrons are ejected from the nucleus, which becomes an entirely new element, plutonium, of mass 239 and charge 94, instead of the 92 charge of uranium. This element is found nowhere on the face of the earth and represents an entirely new creation. It was suspected and later proved that plutonium also possesses the requisite fission properties to be the new material for a bomb. Plutonium had the advantage over U235, because it was an entirely different element from U238 and consequently, once made, could be separated from U238 by cheap chemical methods.

As a nation we can congratulate ourselves on having leaders in this country who were bold enough to appropriate the vast sums necessary to make this new element, atom by atom, through the bombardment of U238 with neutrons, when no certainty existed that the process would prove successful or that plutonium would be useful in an atomic bomb. Although most people feel, now that success has been achieved, that the effort was justified, one can imagine the fury of the defenders of the Treasury if the gamble had turned out otherwise.

Wagner-Murray-Dingell Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a speech made by myself at a symposium on the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill sponsored by the Jackson County (Kansas City, Mo.) Health Forum:

All of us are well aware that many people in this country do not have all the medical care they need. We were shocked to learn that 40 percent of the 22,000,000 men of military age, between eight and nine million men, were found unfit for full military duty. About 68 percent were rejected for physical defects, the other 32 percent for mental defects. Statistics show us that 600,000,000 man-days of work are lost every year through illness and accidents and that the average industrial worker loses about 12 days of work a year through these causes.

Medical facilities are far below the needs of our people. Forty percent of all our counties do not have a registered general hospital. And many existing hospitals need more space, more staff, better facilities all round. But they can't get them. They can't get them because the people who need their services most can't afford to pay for them.

America is the most advanced nation in the world in the field of medical science. Our doctors and research workers have made tremendous discoveries; our best hospitals have the most wonderful equipment. But people go on dying for lack of early and adequate medical care. Children are born in shacks without a midwife's services. Mothers die in childbirth. Babies die or incur dread diseases, curable at first but later chronic. It is estimated that at least half of the 113,000 infants and 7,000 mothers who die in childbirth every year could be saved if present knowledge were applied fully. Some 400,000 children have tuberculosis, a disease easily diagnosed and easily cured in its early stages. Half a million suffer from the dread rheumatic fever. I could go on for hours listing the health defects of our people.

While there are excellent facilities available for those who can pay well for them, many do not have access to the help they need. It is an unfortunate fact that medical need mounts in inverse ratio to ability to pay—the poorer you are the sicker you are. Likewise, the poorer you are the less medical care you get.

We might well expect that those people whose job it is to cure the sick would be the first to tackle this problem. We naturally look to the organized physicians of America for help in reorganizing our medical facilities to serve the greatest number and at the same time to insure a reasonable return to the doctor. But if we look to the American Medical Association, we look in vain.

For many years the American Medical Association and most of its constituent societies have carried on a bitter fight against attempts to bring more and better care to the American people.

Until comparatively recently, this fight took the form of a vigorous frontal attack upon anyone who dared to suggest that all was not for the best in the best of all possible medical worlds.

Let me remind you of only a few of the skirmishes in this running battle between reaction and progress:

In 1932, when the report of the conservative Committee on the Cost of Medical Care was issued, the Journal of the American Medical Association denounced it as "socialism and communism—inciting to revolution." Yet all this mild document did was advocate group practice for physicians and expansion of voluntary health-insurance plans.

As late as 1934, the American Medical Association vigorously opposed Blue Cross hospitalization insurance. The journal in that year criticized "all sorts of hospitalization insurance schemes" as "mechanization of medical practice." An attempt was made to deter the American Hospital Association from sponsoring Blue Cross plans.

The period from 1930 to 1940 saw many examples of intimidation and professional blacklisting against physicians who dared to associate themselves with voluntary group-insurance plans. I cite only a few of them: The Trinity Hospital case in Little Rock, Ark.; the expulsion of Drs. Ross and Loos from the Los Angeles County Medical Society; the persecution of the staffs of the Chicago United Medical Service, Group Health in Washington, and the Milwaukee Medical Center; the attempted throttling of Dr. Michael Shadid's cooperative hospital at Elk City, Okla.

Even the feeble stirrings within some of the State and county societies themselves were quietly but effectively suppressed. In one of its 1938 issues the Journal of the American Medical Association noted that many efforts to organize county society prepayment plans in California "have been successfully discouraged."

Such Bourbon tactics had two principal effects. First, they made the American Medical Association appear ridiculous and irresponsible in the eyes of the public, which was gradually becoming more conscious of the need for a better health program. Secondly, they threatened to precipitate a revolt in the ranks of organized medicine itself.

When the AMA was found guilty of criminal conspiracy in the case involving the Group Health Association in Washington, D. C., and when this decision was upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States, even the reactionary leadership of the AMA realized that a change in tactics was necessary.

Accordingly, they decided to abandon the frontal attack. Realizing that the ground they held was not tenable in a fair fight, they agreed upon a delaying action.

A battalion of expendable troops was left behind to fight it out as long as they could with the old weapons. This was the so-called national physicians committee for the extension of medical service. Organized with the aid and support of other reactionary elements in the country, this group continues to raise the cry of socialism and communism, and seeks to confuse the public with misleading propaganda.

The main guard then retreated to a somewhat better prepared position. Conscious of the fact that the chief criticism of the AMA was that it had no constructive program to offer, they brought forth their 14-point program.

This much-heralded program recalls the old saying, "The mountain labored and brought forth a mouse." It is a collection of pious hopes and feeble generalizations. The 14-point plan offers us a pea shooter to take the place of the atomic bomb.

It is not necessary to examine this program very closely to realize that it is part of the delaying action. Many of its provisions are merely expressions of aims that all sensible people have supported for years. It proposes nothing that would improve the organization of medical services or adapt them to present-day needs. It offers no hope of more, or better, or cheaper, medical care to any appreciable number of people.

Shorn of its noncontroversial elements, the program is nothing but a plug and a plea for voluntary health insurance. By this means the AMA hopes to delay the advent of compulsory Nation-wide health insurance.

Does this mean that the AMA is now offering us what its spokesmen once denounced as "socialism and communism, inciting to revolution"?

No; that is not the case. The AMA has had to eat a lot of its own words in recent years, but the diet, frightful as it must have been, has not changed the patient much.

You see, there are several kinds of voluntary health insurance. And the kind of health insurance that the AMA is talking about in the 14-point program is a very special, very complicated, and very limited type of plan. In discussing voluntary health insurance it is very important to distinguish

between the different types of plans, for some of them bear about as much resemblance to others as a B–29 bomber does to the Flying Jennies that were used in World War I.

I shall mention a few general types of plans and analyze them briefly.

One is the industrial group-practice plan. A good example of this is the Permanente Foundation medical service for employees of the Henry Kaiser shipyards on the west coast. In return for voluntary pay-roll deductions, the employees and their families receive comprehensive, up-to-date, scientific medical care, for all types of illness. They are entitled, without extra charge, to the services of a general practitioner in the excellent hospitals and clinics operated by the Kaiser company, as well as in their homes. They receive specialists' services and surgery when needed. The hospital bill is included in the benefits.

Perhaps most important of all, they are entitled to, and they do receive, all kinds of routine diagnostic and immunization procedures. In this way preventable illness is avoided, and incipient disease is discovered early enough so that a cure can be effected rapidly and economically.

But did the AMA approve this type of plan? No, they did not. They opposed it bitterly. They did not succeed in blocking the Kaiser plans because Mr. Kaiser was fortunately able to construct and operate his own hospitals.

But local medical politicians have succeeded in sabotaging similar projects elsewhere. An example of such sabotage took place recently in Vallejo, Calif. There, the doctors of the Stowe-Lipsett group clinic were prevented from furnishing medical services to the war workers in the Vallejo Federal housing project because the county medical society was able to exclude the Stowe-Lipsett doctors from practice in the new Vallejo community hospital.

This is a particularly flagrant and disgusting example of reactionary medical politics, because that hospital was built and is maintained by Federal funds appropriated under the Lanham Act.

Another kind of voluntary health insurance is the consumers' cooperative group practice plan, typefied by the Group Health Association of Washington, D. C. This is similar in many respects to the Kaiser plan, except that subscribers' fees are not collected through pay-roll deductions, and the consumers themselves have a vote in the management of the plan.

But does the AMA approve of such a plan? Definitely not. As I said before, the Department of Justice had to step in and save Group Health Association from the AMA's illegal conspiracy to put it out of business.

Still another type of plan is that exemplified by the Ross-Loos Clinic in Los Angeles, and by the Milwaukee Medical Center. Here, again, salaried physicians give a comprehensive type of service to the subscribers, with due emphasis on preventive medicine and early diagnosis.

The AMA will have nothing to do with that type of plan either. I do not speak of these plans from merely theoretical knowledge. I, myself, have been a member of the Milwaukee Medical Center since 1937. I have received the best medical care I ever had in my life, and have had the use of every type of medical diagnostic facility, X-ray, laboratory, eye and throat apparatus, and so on. My medical expenses have been less, yet my doctors have been better paid than the average.

The last type of plan I want to mention is the kind that the AMA 14-point program recommends, and that its constituent societies sponsor.

About 23 such plans are now in operation. In general, they provide for payment of surgical fees, and sometimes of medical fees, up to certain specified amounts, if those fees are incurred while the patient is in the hospital. This means that a person has to be very sick before he receives any benefits under the plan. In many instances, the doctor may charge a fee over and above the amount of the benefit payment. The hospital bill is not included in the benefits under any of these plans.

Usually little or no provision is made for preventive or diagnostic procedures which might save the patient from serious or prolonged illness.

Since the doctors operate as individuals rather than as a group, the quality of service cannot easily be regulated.

The many small but expensive illnesses or injuries which may confine a subscriber to bed at home are not covered. The single visits which might be required during the year by an average family are not covered. Immunization is not covered. Consultation for a complaint which proves trivial, but which might have developed into something serious, is not covered. X-ray and laboratory tests are usually not covered. Then the patient may be liable for extra fees and hospital charges. In short, an insured person may pay his fee for a year, and also pay an enormous sum for medical bills during the year for which his policy brings him absolutely no return.

Often the plans are open only to subscribers with incomes under a certain amount, and the costs are usually so high that these very people cannot afford to participate in the plan.

In short, under the medical-society plans, the subscriber simply does not get enough for his money.

Undoubtedly, the medical societies are aware of the fact that their plans offer little to attract subscribers. At any rate some of the societies are taking timid and tentative steps in the direction of broadening benefits.

A new plan has recently been widely heralded in Rockford, Ill. From the newspaper publicity on this plan you would conclude that now, at last full medical care on a prepayment basis is to be available to the people of Rockford.

If you examine this plan, however, you will find some serious hitches in it. It is true that medical care is offered in home and office as well as in the hospital. But the care is given only in disabling illness. Here, again, it is care after the illness rather than preventive medicine to keep the person from becoming really ill. Moreover, benefits begin only after the first two visits; the patient pays for those two out of his own pocket. The effect of this, of course, is to discourage early treatment. Finally, the maximum benefit paid per call or visit is $2. If the doctor's fee is more—and these days it often is—that is the patient's hard luck.

Surgery, too, is on a cash indemnity basis up to a certain specified amount only. The hospital bill is not included in the benefits.

The United Medical Service, an AMA approved plan in New York City, has also recently announced that it is going to broaden its plan to include general medical care in the home and in the doctor's office.

Under this plan the patient is to pay at the rate of $2 for an office visit and $3 for a home visit. The doctor agrees that this is all he will charge if the individual's income is $1,800 or less, or if the family income is $2,500 or less. If the income is more, the charges can be hiked.

The visits or calls are limited to one a day for 20 days in any one illness. The plan pays only 50 percent of specialist's fees, and it does not pay the hospital bill.

It is easy to understand why the limited plans approved by medical societies have not succeeded in attracting more subscribers. Although such plans have been in operation since 1933, the latest figures published by the AMA show that they cover less than 2,000,000 persons. Nearly 800,000 of these are in the State of Michigan, and about 500,000 are in the three west coast States. That leaves less than 700,000 throughout the other 44 States.

What, then, are the chances for voluntary health insurance bringing medical security to the people of the United States?

If the AMA and its constituent societies would stop persecuting doctors who affiliate themselves with bona fide voluntary group practice prepayment insurance plans which give comprehensive medical service, I believe that such plans might conceivably take care of the needs of somewhere between 30 and 50 percent of the population.

I do not believe that the plans approved by the AMA—and proposed by it in its 14-point program—will meet anybody's needs for comprehensive scientific medical care.

Those plans are nothing but patchwork medicine. They are not health insurance. They are "catastrophic illness insurance."

Even under the best of plans, voluntary health insurance cannot meet the medical needs of the people. It does give the middle-income group a chance for much better help than they ever had before and it has demonstrated the advantages of group practice, with pooling of facilities and cooperation of specialists. But it can never reach the low-income group, who would have to stint their budget for food and housing to pay for it, and who naturally choose to eat regularly and take a chance on illness.

My estimate of 30 to 50 percent of the population as the top limit that can be reached by voluntary health insurance is, I believe, a very generous one. I base my estimate on the fact that 70 percent of the families in the United States have incomes of less than $3,000 a year, and 50 percent earn less than $2,000 a year. Hardly any family with less than $2,000 a year can afford to pay the premiums charged by the voluntary plans, and many families in the $2,000 to $3,000 income group cannot do so.

Let us see what these premium rates are.

The Kaiser plans, which offer perhaps the most complete service of any, cost in the neighborhood of $120 a year for a family of four. The Group Health Association, of Washington, D. C., offers a more limited family coverage for $72 a year. The Ross-Loos Clinic in California charges the individual subscriber $30 a year, and has a reduced fee schedule for members of the individual subscriber's family.

Considering the limited benefits offered, the plans approved by the medical societies are much more expensive. The Rockford, Ill., plan which I described is going to cost subscribers $60 per year per family, if we include the extra premium for hospitalization insurance. The new United Medical Service plan in New York City offers its limited service for $72 per year per family, including the Blue Cross hospitalization charge.

Besides the high cost and the frequent limitation upon services, voluntary health insurance has other serious disadvantages.

In the first place, even those who can afford it do not necessarily join the plan. Also there is a constant turn-over of membership. The Blue Cross hospitalization plan, for example, has to sign up four members for every three that it retains.

Persons who are frequently sick, of course, tend to retain their membership in the plan if they can afford it. Those who are in good health, and who therefore have little use for the plan's services, are likely to drop out. Thus the adverse risks tend to constitute an ever-increasing proportion of the plan's membership, and this way endanger the solvency of the enterprise.

Furthermore, voluntary plans must necessarily exclude those with serious chronic illness. These are the very people who need care the most.

An added disadvantage is that a policy holder in one part of the country may not be able to obtain similar service if he moves to another place. With an increasingly

migrant and shifting population this is a serious shortcoming.

And, of course, there would be tremendous duplication and waste involved in managing hundreds or thousands of small voluntary plans. The money thus spent might better be devoted to providing medical service.

It is for these reasons that I, and many others like me, believe that legislation such as S. 1050, the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, which provides for a Nation-wide system of compulsory health insurance, offers the best hope of meeting the medical needs of all our people.

The medical provisions of this bill would do much more than establish a workable and economical health insurance system. They would provide a modern network of medical facilities—hospitals, health centers, and clinics—to serve every person regardless of where he lives or what his income is. Without such facilities and without such assurance that medical charges can be met we shall never succeed in getting doctors and other health workers into the rural and low-income areas where they are now so desperately needed.

To be sure, one of the AMA's 14 points advocates relocation of doctors to places where they are badly needed. But the AMA does not say how this is to be done. The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill gives assurance that relocation of physicians would be a reality—not just a pious hope.

The bill would also provide for a considerable expansion of public health facilities and maternal and child health services.

Opponents of the bill have charged that it would set up a system of "socialized medicine." It would do nothing of the kind. It would set up a national insurance fund into which every employed person would contribute a small and reasonable share of his earnings, in return for which he would be guaranteed complete medical care, including preventive and diagnostic services. The cost to the employee for medical benefits would be 1½ percent of his income up to $3,600, and the employer would pay a like amount. In other words, a worker earning $3,600 a year or more would pay $54 annually for protection for himself and his dependents. On the other hand, a person with an income of $1,000 a year would pay only $15.

With such contributions, a fund of about $4,000,000,000 a year would be raised. This is just about the same amount as we now spend as a nation for medical care under a wasteful system in which a relatively few people get good care, the vast majority get indifferent care, and some get no care at all.

The charge that the bill would permit the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service to become a "medical dictator" is also false. The bill specifically provides that the Surgeon General must consult with a medical advisory council on all aspects of the health program. Moreover, the council is empowered to publish all of its decisions and thus submit to the public any disagreement it may have with the Surgeon General.

Those who oppose the bill say that it would establish a bureaucracy in Washington that would completely centralize the administration of medical services. This, too, is a misrepresentation. All the Federal Government would do is collect the money and set up minimum standards followed by the doctors. Provision is made for advisory councils at the local as well as the Federal level. Through the local advisory councils the consumers of medical care in this country would for the first time have a real voice in determining how the services should be managed. The bill provides that administration through State and local authorities shall be given preference over Federal administration whenever the State and local authorities wish to assume the responsibility.

Contrary to what enemies of the bill have said, nobody would be forced to go to a designated physician or to a public clinic. Anyone could choose his own doctor, just as he does at present. The only difference would be that everyone would be able to consult some doctor when he needed him. This is not the case at present, when the money problem often stands in the way, and when there may not be a doctor available in the community.

The doctor, too, would get a square deal under the bill. Average income for doctors would actually increase. The doctors would be paid from the general insurance fund according to a fee schedule, at a per capita rate, or on a salary basis, depending upon which method the doctors in the particular community chose. In any event they would all be paid for all of the service they rendered, which is more than can be said for the system as it operates today.

Finally, despite the assertions of critics, the quality of the medical care rendered would be higher than under the present system. For one thing, the doctor could divest himself of the business care of practice and devote himself entirely to professional activities, including advancement of his skill and knowledge. Every doctor could enjoy the benefits of a group practice and would have ready access to modern, costly equipment, specialists' and consultants' services, and laboratory tests. And every patient, regardless of his economic status, would have equal access to the best that modern medical science has to offer.

The bill would also provide cash benefits to tide the worker over periods of unemployment due to sickness or disability. It would provide Federal grants to nonprofit institutions for much needed research into the causes and treatment of disease. It would enable States to undertake medical care programs for the needy, who could not qualify for participation in the health insurance plan.

I wonder how many people who listen seriously to the specious arguments so often advanced against compulsory health insurance realize that exactly the same arguments were used 75 or 100 years ago against the public school system.

In those days many people insisted that each parent must be left to choose the kind and degree of education his children should have, as well as the particular school or teacher by whom they should be taught.

There was great indignation among conservatives against the principle of what they called taking money from one person to educate the children of another.

The public schools were denounced as socialism and communism. It was claimed that they violated the sanctity of the home and corrupted every branch of government. A book published as late as 1879 said that they were responsible for "dishonesty, frauds, perjuries, defalcations, and the most gigantic, barefaced, and hitherto unheard-of robberies, perpetrated with impunity, not only upon the public moneys, but upon the dearest rights and liberties of the people."

Newspaper editors attacked the compulsion involved and said that education must remain on a voluntary basis. One writer, in 1886, declared that "the whole business of teaching school should be thrown open to private enterprise and free competition, just like practicing law or medicine or running a shoe factory."

I am sure that when the American people really understand the true significance of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, they will demand national compulsory health insurance, just as they demanded, and won, universal public education.

First, however, it will be necessary to cut through the fog of misrepresentation and invective by which the real issues have been obscured. Public discussion such as this will, I am sure, do much to clear the air and hasten a mature and reasoned judgment of the case.

Treatment of Disabled War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERKELEY L. BUNKER
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention and to place before the Members of the House of Representatives, conditions that exist in the southern part of my State in regard to the treatment of disabled war veterans. I have long contended that the veterans are not receiving a square deal. No doubt similar conditions exist over the Nation. While I have great confidence in Gen. Omar Bradley, I do feel that in fairness to him a fearless investigation should be made to erase all stigma of the Hines regime from the Veterans' Administration. I respectfully submit the following article which appeared in the Las Vegas Evening Review-Journal, October 19, 1945, as proof that veterans are not getting a square deal in my State:

RUNAROUND ON VETERANS' HOSPITALIZATION INADEQUACY REVEALED

(By Walter Taliaferro)

Concrete proof of the total inadequacy of Veterans' Administration hospital facilities for care of southern Nevada disabled war veterans and the whirligig runaround even emergency cases receive through the veterans' facility at Sawtelle, Calif., was uncovered today by the Review-Journal in an investigation of the cases of five World War II veterans seeking aid this week at the Clark County General Hospital, which has eight beds under contract to the Veterans' Administration.

Of the five cases investigated the most outstanding example was that of a United States marine master technical sergeant who had made every major landing in the South Pacific except the one made while he was in the hospital in Bougainville being treated for a tropical fungus growth on both feet.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The names, service serial numbers and service-connected disability claim numbers of these cases are on file in the offices of the Review-Journal and are in the hands of the newly formed Clark County veterans' service coordinating committee, but to save undue embarrassment to the men, will not be published.)

This marine, whom we shall call Joe, was discharged from a hospital in Salt Lake City and came back to his home in Las Vegas. He was granted 30 percent disability claim and receives $34.50 a month. The claim was reviewed last June and continued and a new claim for adjustment because of a steel-capped knee is now pending.

Last Saturday, Joe's left foot again became infected and started swelling up and filling with pain. Monday he went to the Veterans' Administration representative, Harry Robbins, in the USES office in Las Vegas, and when he produced his full records and disability claim, was sent at once to the county hospital, where he was promised quick aid and no red tape.

Robbins quickly and properly fulfilled his duty according to the law, sending the man to the Veterans' Administration contract hospital, where the superintendent, Dr. J. C. Cherry, is the Veterans' Administration approved physician for Las Vegas.

Joe went to the county hospital and Dr. Cherry gave him emergency treatment and sent him home, to return for further treatment on Tuesday. He again was treated and told to return Wednesday.

On Wednesday, Joe returned to the hospital and Dr. Cherry found the condition in his foot getting much worse and that it would be impossible for him to further use the foot even in a slight way.

Dr. Cherry, having just received his first written instructions from the Veterans' Administration after spending nearly 3 months trying to get them, remembered part of the instructions that read: "In case of emergency where delay in securing prior authority may not be permitted * * * treatment rendered a veteran without prior authority is rendered on your own responsibility," placed a long-distance phone call to Col. C. W. Colebaugh, chief of receiving and out-patient service at the veterans' facility in Sawtelle, his immediate superior.

Colonel Colebaugh refused to accept the charges on the long-distance call on Veterans' Administration business, Dr. Cherry declares, and after the charges were paid at this end, refused to allow Joe to be hospitalized here.

"I was told not to hospitalize this veteran, but to send him to Sawtelle on the train, and that the Veterans' Administration would pay his transportation when he got there," Dr. Cherry disclosed.

"When I informed them he was in no condition to travel other than by ambulance and that his condition was rapidly growing worse and he required immediate hospitalization, I was informed they would not send an ambulance and they could not authorize hospitalization without checking his case history (said by the man to be in Sawtelle now) first," Dr. Cherry further revealed.

Rather than let the man sit around while gangrene could set in, Dr. Cherry informed them he would take care of the man anyway rather than allow him to travel by train.

Finally, according to Dr. Cherry, Colonel Colebaugh authorized him over the telephone to give Joe seven out-patient, not hospitalized treatments.

The last time Joe was hospitalized by the Marine Corps for the same cause, he was under constant treatment in a hospital bed for 1 month to save amputation of his leg, he revealed.

Joe has definitely been awarded a service-connected disability claim, has been approved for vocational handicapped training, but under interpretation of rules and red tape procedure by Colonel Colebaugh, deciding his case behind a desk 300 miles away, Joe cannot be hospitalized in Las Vegas, nor will the Government send an ambulance to move him to Sawtelle.

Yes, Joe is one of those eight beds contracted for by the Veterans' Administration at the Clark County General Hospital, and, yes, he is being treated by the Veterans' Administration approved physician, Dr. J. C. Cherry—but it has not been approved by the Veterans' Administration and neither Clark County nor Dr. Cherry will be able to receive compensation for the hospitalization and treatments under Colonel Colebaugh's interpretations of the law. It is only because Dr. Cherry refuses to see any veteran go untreated, especially in an emergency, that Joe is being taken care of—not through the means supposedly set up by Congress to care for returning disabled veterans.

"After this case and the instructions received from Colonel Colebaugh, these eight beds for service-connected veterans which can only be used when the veteran is unable to be moved without endangering his very life, are of little or no value to veterans in Clark County," Dr. Cherry emphatically declared today.

Further details on the complicated red tape which hidebinds disabled veterans and doctors in Las Vegas will be disclosed in the Review-Journal tomorrow, along with the full instructions received here by Dr. Cherry from Colonel Colebaugh, and a copy of authorization form issued if, as, and when a case is approved in Sawtelle for treatment here.

Japanese Surrender Documents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on September 12, 1945, the Japanese surrender documents were placed on public display in the National Archives Building. Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright unveiled the case containing the documents. The Speaker of the House of Representatives, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, served as master of ceremonies. The Archivist of the United States accepted the documents for public display and read a message from the President of the United States. The ceremony was broadcast by several radio stations.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks made by General Wainwright, Speaker Rayburn, and Dr. Buck on that occasion:

ANNOUNCER. Ladies and gentlemen, from the exhibition hall of the National Archives in our Nation's Capital, we bring you a special ceremony during which the original Japanese surrender documents will be placed on public display.

This hall provides an impressive and appropriate setting for the display of such historic documents. Beneath a great half dome, which rises 75 feet above the floor, are murals by Barry Faulkner picturing in heroic size the signing of the Declaration of Independence and the submission of the Constitution to the President of the Continental Congress. In the cases around the hall, which is bedecked with the flags of the United Nations, are documents marking milestones on America's road from war to peace. The declaration of war against Japan, the agreement to launch the Normandy invasion, the Teheran and Yalta agreements, the German surrender documents, and copies of the United Nations Charter are among the items being shown in an exhibit on international cooperation for war and peace.

Today the Japanese surrender documents signed on the battleship *Missouri* on September 2 are to be added to this exhibit. They were flown to Washington from Tokyo soon after the signing and were presented to President Truman. They are now in the hall's center case, which is in the form of a shrine. At each side of it, a military guard of honor stands at rigid attention. Before it sit a number of honor guests—two veterans of Bataan, Pfc Felman Cappel and Corp. Russell Villiers.

The case will be unveiled by Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright, the hero of Corregidor, and Dr. Solon J. Buck, Archivist of the United States, will accept them for public exhibition. The Speaker of the House, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, will serve as master of ceremonies.

High-ranking military officers of the United Nations, resplendent in gold braid and numerous decorations, and Members of Congress, the Cabinet, and the diplomatic corps have just taken their places around the center case.

And now; the next voice you will hear is that of Mr. Thad Page, Administrative Secretary of the National Archives.

Mr. PAGE. Ladies and gentlemen, it gives me great pleasure, on behalf of the Archivist of the United States and the staff of the National Archives, to welcome you to the National Archives on this important occasion. I now have the privilege and honor of introducing to you a distinguished statesman, who will act as master of ceremonies, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN.

Speaker RAYBURN. Ladies and gentlemen, nearly 4 years ago, on December 7, 1941, that "day of infamy," Japan treacherously struck at Pearl Harbor. The Nation was shocked and angry, but it was not stunned. It was galvanized into action. We had not sought war, but when war came we mobilized our men, materials, and machines into the greatest fighting force and the greatest arsenal of democracy the world had ever seen.

Meanwhile, however, our gallant men on Bataan, first under Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and then under Lt. Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright, were fighting against hopeless odds. With no aid from outside possible, the fall of Corregidor was inevitable. The courage of its defenders and the brutality of the Jap victors, however, turned it from defeat into a flaming symbol—a promise that Corregidor would be avenged.

"I shall return," MacArthur vowed. But during those grim days when democracy was on the defensive and modern civilization seemed on the verge of collapse, the fulfillment of that promise seemed a long way off. Nevertheless, it gave a ray of hope to an almost hopeless world. All of us now know, after much bitter fighting on land and sea and in the air, how gloriously and magnificently that promise was fulfilled. We are all familiar with the successful campaigns that followed the recapture of the Philippines—Balikpapan, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa—and that led to the unconditional surrender of Japan.

It is fitting that the documents that now give, and will continue to give through unborn generations, evidence of the triumph of the United Nations over the Japanese Empire should be added to the other significant documents on display in this room. These documents now take their place along with the German surrender papers, copies of the San Francisco Charter, and papers relating to the various international conferences attended by President Roosevelt and President Truman—Casablanca, Quebec, Cairo, Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. Altogether they reflect the story of our efforts and those of our allies to win the war and bring peace once again to the world.

It is equally fitting—peculiarly appropriate—that these Japanese surrender documents should be unveiled for public display by one of history's greatest heroes, a man who even in defeat symbolized the ideals and objectives for which this Nation mobilized all its resources, a man who contributed greatly to our ultimate victory by holding out with meagre and inadequate resources far longer than was expected, a man who, despite temporary defeat and indignities heaped upon him during many months in Japanese prison camps, never lost his spirit or his faith in America, a man who by his courage and indomitable will contributed immeasurably to ultimate victory. Ladies and gentlemen, it is my privilege to present to you the hero of Bataan and Corregidor, who will unveil the Japanese surrender documents, Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright.

General WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Buck, ladies, and gentlemen, the first thing I want to say to you is that being home is fine. I was deeply moved by being invited to attend the Japanese surrender ceremonies aboard the battleship *Missouri*, and I was touched when General MacArthur presented me with the first pen he used to sign the instrument of surrender. Today you bestow upon me another great honor, that of making available to the American people the documents that bear enduring evidence of the supremacy of right over might and of the return of peace to a distraught world. On this occasion, as always, I think of the brave men who served under my command. On their behalf, as well as my own, I am pleased to unveil the documents that

brought final peace to a war-torn and war-weary world. (At this point General Wainwright unveiled the case containing the Japanese surrender documents.)

Speaker RAYBURN. Thank you, General Wainwright. I know something about the hardships endured by Japanese prisoners of war, but in view of the rigid schedule that you have experienced during the last few days and the strenuous schedule facing you tomorrow in New York, I am afraid that until you are permitted some relaxation and rest, Manchuria might still look good to you. At any rate you may be assured that we are grateful to you for being here today, and I want you to know that you will live in the hearts of Americans forever.

All of us know and are immensely proud of the important part played by the Navy and the Marine Corps in bringing the war to a successful conclusion. We are privileged to have with us a distinguished naval officer. Rear Adm. H. H. Good, who is here as the representative of the Secretary of the Navy. Admiral Good, will you be kind enough to come up here on the steps so that the audience may have the opportunity of seeing you?

And now it is my pleasure to present to you the Archivist of the United States, who will accept the Japanese surrender documents for public display and read a message from the President of the United States. Ladies and gentlemen, the Archivist of the United States, Dr. Solon J. Buck.

The ARCHIVIST. Speaker RAYBURN, General Wainwright, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a pleasure and an honor to receive from you, General Wainwright, these documents that mark the end of eight long years of war for our brave and enduring ally, China, and nearly 4 years of valiant fighting for ourselves and our other allies. When plans were being made for the exhibit on international cooperation for war and peace, to which these documents are now added, Franklin D. Roosevelt, whom President Truman has called the defender of democracy and the architect of world peace and cooperation, was still alive. He took a great interest in this exhibit because he wanted the people to know the road to peace as he was traveling it. Little did we imagine that he was to be cut down with the end of that road almost in sight. Nor did we think this spring when the German surrender documents took their place in this hall that in but four short months we would see the complete capitulation of our brutal enemy Japan.

Today, as these Japanese surrender documents join the Lend-Lease Act, the declaration of war against Japan, the Yalta and other agreements, the German surrender documents, and the United Nations Charter, the story on international cooperation for war and peace that this exhibit seeks to tell is completed.

The exhibit is completed. The war has ended. An organization to preserve the peace and security of the world has been devised. But there have been other surrenders, other agreements, and other international organizations—The Archives of the United States holds many of their stories, some of them tragic. This time we must not forget that enduring peace for the world rests on more than these structures. The possibility of its achievement lies in the hearts and wills of ourselves, of our allies, and even of our enemies.

President Truman has asked me to express his regret that he could not be here today to pay his respects to General Wainwright and to all those, living and dead, whose unflinching bravery brought the Japanese to their knees. He has sent a message, however, which he has asked me to read. This is his message:

"It is with profound satisfaction that this day we are able to lay before the people of the United States and the representatives of our faithful allies these tokens of the downfall of our enemy in the Pacific—the Japanese unconditional-surrender documents. They are only sheets of paper, some of them written in a language most of us cannot read, but they are an eternal reminder of that indomitable courage of our fighting forces and of the home front that led us through the disastrous days of Pearl Harbor, Bataan, and Corregidor to final victory.

"The world is now at peace, but we would betray those who died to make peace possible—we would make these surrender documents a mockery—if we did not continue to battle against the evil ideologies of those who forced war upon the world. Those ideas must be wiped out, and the German and Japanese people must be taught, with sternness but with justice, to live in a world where there is respect for the rights of nations and of men. This we must do to protect and perpetuate that peace we have so dearly won."

Army Band: The Star-Spangled Banner.

ANNOUNCER. Ladies and gentlemen, you have just heard a ceremony from the Exhibition Hall of the National Archives Building, during which the Japanese surrender documents were placed on public display. Participating in the ceremony were Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright; the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives; Dr. Solon J. Buck, Archivist of the United States; and Mr. Thad Page, administrative secretary of the National Archives.

Army Discharges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of the following telegram which I am calling to the attention of the membership of the House. I believe that this situation should be investigated and I feel that the conditions described should be rectified at the earliest possible moment. I am also taking this matter up with the War Department and shall urge that they look into this matter immediately.

MONTGOMERY, ALA., *October 19, 1945.*
Congressman MIKE MANSFIELD,

SIR: Wish if possible to enlist your aid in abolishing discrimination being shown insofar as discharges pertain to cadets and trainees held under AAF letter 50–113, dated April 1945. Are concerned by recent Army ruling and set forth in War Department message form as TWX from headquarters AFTRC, Fort Worth, Tex., 6E–31500, dated October 11, 1945. This separates cadets into two categories. Men here are highly perturbed and angry at apparent injustice and partiality being shown between discharging of cadets who entered directly from civilian life. They are of the low point and service class while those of us who became cadets from enlisted status have over 2 years' service and comparatively higher point scores, including overseas service. We wish also to object to the apparent indiscriminate assignment of ineligibles for discharge to duties not commensurate with their military occupational special number which is also set forth in above-mentioned TWX and their sudden induction into the essential class. This is strictly a local decision and removes us from surplus category and also makes us ineligible to derive any benefits due to discharge of surplus personnel. By means either of the two above-mentioned decisions, our status is terminated and we automatically enter into essential classification; most of us are airplane specialists and are being assigned duties ranging from ward boys to truck drivers, all of which come under apparent essential classification.

A/C RUSSELL J. PORTER, 12176611,
Representing Trainees of Maxwell and Gunter Field, Montgomery, Ala.

The Negro Disillusioned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE G. BILBO
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 24 (legislative day of Monday, October 22), 1945

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid and timely article entitled "The Negro Disillusioned," by Mr. Demps Alexander Oden, of Alabama.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEGRO DISILLUSIONED

(By Demps Alexander Oden, Childersburg, Ala.)

Purpose of this article: To open the eyes of the Negroes (and some white people) to the actual status of the Negro race in America; to acquaint them with that race's lack of intellectual background and to pour oil on the troubled water of racial discord—disturbed by claims of equality that have no factual support and exist only as the hollow mockery of politics.

Of the five races with which the earth is peopled, only one, the Negro, is ashamed of his race and tries to be something other than what God made him. Neither the red, yellow, nor brown races want to be white, as the Negro ever strives to become. Instead of having that pride of race attached to the white, red, yellow, and brown races, the black race is wholly lacking in that attribute, ashamed of his ancestry, and always trying to get as far from it as possible—deluding himself with claims of equality with the white race that are not borne out by his appearance, his present attainments, nor his background in recorded history. The Negro attempts to conceal his identity by sidestepping his racial name, Negro, and classifying himself with the colored races—red, yellow, and brown—none of whom are Negroid racially, are distinct in racial type, and bear little resemblance to one another. The Negro's claim to kinship with them lies in the absurd logic that, since they are not white and he is not white, ergo, he is the same as they.

"O wad some Power the giftie gie us
To see oursels as ithers see us!
It wad frae monie a blunder free us—"

If, as the Negro claims, his race is as good as the white race, why does he not content himself with Negro association? Does not his preference for white associates prove his own claims to be ridiculous in the eyes of the other races? If the Negro possesses all the intellectual, inventive, and administrative abilities of the white race, why not prove his contention by establishing a government of, for, and by Negroes, and demonstrate his equality with the ruling races, white and yellow? Why such scant attention to that Negro proving ground, Liberia? Would even the Negroes themselves feel secure with our coasts guarded by a fleet manned exclusively

by Negroes; by an air force staffed and operated by Negroes; by an army composed wholly of Negroes? If not, why not? Abraham Lincoln supplies the most reasonable answer to these questions. See the quote on following paragraphs:

The Negrophiles argue continually of the "wonderful progress"—(progress from what?) made by the Negro race during the past 150 years' contact with the white race (chiefly in the South); but they are silent concerning the Negro's lack of progress during the preceding 5850 years of recorded history in which he lived alongside the highest types of civilization that the world has ever known—Egyptian, Greek, etc., without "progressing" one iota beyond the savagery, the barbarism, with which the black race has ever been enshrouded. Where are the cities that the African Negro has founded; the monuments he has built; the language he has recorded; the laws he has established? Hear Abraham Lincoln's personal opinion of the Negro, as expressed in his debate with Douglas at Charleston, Ill., September 18, 1858 (Douglas had accused Lincoln of desiring to bring about social equality between the two races):

"I will say that I am not and never have been in favor of bringing about in any way the social equality of the white and black races. That I am not, nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office nor to intermarry with white people, and I will say in addition to this, that there is a physical difference [1] between the white and the black races, which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social equality; and, inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they are together there must be the position of superior and inferior; and I, as much as any other man, am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race."

(Lincoln shook his finger in Douglas' face, as he made the concluding statement).

The advances into civilization made by the Negro in America are not due to his independent efforts, but to tutelage by the superior race (see Lincoln), and he reverts to savagery, even cannibalism, when the leading hand, the protecting arm of the white race is withdrawn—vide Haiti. It is the opinion of the people who know the Negro best from longest acquaintance with his inherent traits, that if the American Negro should be deprived of the association, example, and leadership of the white race, within a generation the innate urge to savagery would crack the thin veneer of civilization acquired from contact with the white race, and the spectacle of another Haiti, a rejuvenated savage Africa come into view.

The present status of the Negro as a race in America is due chiefly to the civilizing influence of the southern whites during the years when he was nominally a slave, actually a ward of the Christian element in the slave-holding States. These white people were not the slave-dealers who brought the manacled African savages to America and sold them; first in New England where climatic conditions operated against the Negro's value as a worker, and aroused the Puritanical conscience—not to free the slaves; but to sell them in the South where they could be worked to greater economic advantage. Therefore, those humane Yankee slave-holders "passed the buck" to southern whites in a climate more congenial to the Negro's accustomed life. That humane act did not extend to the ship-owners who had abandoned whaling for the more lucrative slave-hunting, and laid the foundation for many modern New England fortunes with blood-money from the sale of such of the African cargo as stood the trip in the black-hole.

Abraham Lincoln, himself, absolves the South for the institution of slavery in these words: "It is no less true for having often been said, that the people of the South are not more responsible for the introduction of slavery than are the people of the North."

With the Puritanical example of slave-holding before them, the southern whites bought the slaves brought to market by Yankee slave-dealers, and put them to work on plantations in a climate suited to their experience and at an occupation the most natural, the most congenial to mankind—agriculture. For one Simon Legree—a wholly politico-mythical character—there were a thousand kind-hearted Christian masters whose training made human beings out of the brutal savages dumped on American shores by the heartless slave-traders. Good food in abundance; clothing suited to the climate, and reasonable hours of labor was the slave's lot. The Biblical seventh day of rest was universally observed by master and slave alike throughout the South; church attendance was an accepted institution—provision by gallery or assigned space being made for the slaves in all churches. Bible teaching, corresponding to modern Sunday school, was carried on by the mistress and her adult daughters every Sunday morning. The effects of that training for the unlettered savages is seen today in the South, particularly the rural sections, where religion is still the dominant factor in Negro social life. Elsewhere, however, those modern Negrophile crusaders include in the New Deal program that disturbing, disrupting feature, social equality, that will lead—if ever applied—to intermarriage between certain whites and Negroes; pulling white civilization from its throne, and setting up in its stead a mongrelization growing out of "Eleanor Clubs."

In the late 1850's, a noted English writer toured the United States and upon returning home, published his impressions of America. He was appreciative and complimentary toward economic conditions throughout the country, but gave as his best impression the fact that the southern whites had taken the trouble to train the African slaves into the paths of Christianity. He noted, particularly, that this was the personal task of the slave-owners, and practiced universally in the slave-holding States. Verily, Booker Washington did not go back far enough to obtain the title for his book, "Up From Slavery." It should have been: "Up From Savagery; Through Slavery, to Civilization."

Save for the stubbornness of Jefferson Davis, the Hampton Roads Conference would have ended that unfortunate, needless Civil War, and Lincoln's proposition to pay—approximately—$500 apiece toward freeing the slaves through a specified period and returning them to ancestral homes as fast as liberated, would have saved the South that bitter cup, reconstruction, whose dregs the administration would now have us drain in the form of social intermixture between white and Negro races—ignoring the impossibility of peaceably enforcing that edict. The inconsistency of that "social gain" is found in the absence of Negro or Negress among the several marriages in the White House family. What explanation does Mrs. Roosevelt tender to her Negro proteges for that? If the Negro is the equal of the white man socially; the Negresses of those admirable young women, wives of the four Roosevelt boys, why that discrimination? Evidently those young Roosevelts take Abraham Lincoln seriously in his debate with Douglas; nor do they believe that a lot of mulatto grandchildren would enhance the attractiveness of the White House. That condition respecting the White House family prevails in a similar degree all through the country, as these facts prove:

The United States Senate is composed of 96 white Senators, none of whom ever contracted marriage among the Negro race.

The House of Representatives consists of 429 white males, none of whom ever contracted marriage with a Negress and 5 white women members, none of whom ever contracted marriage with a Negro. The sole Negro Representative, to his credit, married within his own race.

The nine Supreme Court Justices confined matrimonial alliances to their own white race, as did all United States judges throughout the Union. The Governors of the 48 States are white men, none of whom ever married a Negress—all practiced race discrimination in the selection of life partners, as did the head of every State university and all members of State supreme courts.

Facts are stubborn things, and all persons referred to in the above list, to which may be added the President's Cabinet, are guilty of that same race discrimination hurled by mulatto-minded editors against the southern whites (Birmingham dailies: Please copy). To say the least of it, race discrimination in the South, as regards matrimony, has precedent in the highest official circles—not excepting the White House, whose mistress does not practice in her own family that policy which she preaches so tirelessly along her social and political orbit.

The insincerity of those Negrophiles, who inspire interracial gatherings and flood the press with assertions that the Negro race is equal to the white, is proven by a simple test—one that never fails. Ask him:

"If you have a white daughter of marriageable age, would you be willing for a Negro to marry her?"

His reply, prompt, positive, and emphatic, is "No!" In that reply, the Negro race finds full evidence that claims of equality with the white race, with which white renegades delude them, are "but as sounding brass and tinkling cymbals," with no motive above politics. If the Negroes themselves will put this question to that type of whites—pointedly and publicly—the embarrassment following will perceptibly chill the enthusiasm of interracial gatherings.

A familiar illustration of the Negro's limitations is found in the practices of the three outstanding mail-order houses of America—Sears, Roebuck and Montgomery Ward, retail, and Butler Bros., wholesale—all domiciled in the North and unaffected by southern influences. These concerns each distribute millions of expensive catalogs, carrying thousands of attractive human likenesses—beautiful women and handsome men—to demonstrate the appearance of their clothing offerings as worn. Among these thousands of illustrations, not one of Negro or Negress is found. There is a reason, a God-given physical, nonpolitical reason for this "racial discrimination," and that reason is simply the Negro race, whose dark skin, dull, expressionless eyes, flat nose, and thick lips (facts) do not lend themselves to illustrations of harmony and beauty as those characteristics are regarded by the superior race. (A. Lincoln.)

With these plain, indisputable evidences of racial discordance glaring from the illustrated page and the official records in every State in the Union, the Negro should turn his thoughts inward, take his gaze from the mirage of racial oneness, and cease pursuing that will-o'-the-wisp, social equality, and realize that, after almost a century of freedom everywhere and of political coddling in the North, he is no nearer that goal for which

[1] Evidently referring to the body odor of Negroes, irrespective of physical cleanliness, that is repugnant to the 100-percent white; but is tolerated by those whose blood is tainted with Negro strain. To guard against mixed breeds, the Creator attached to the lower grade of those types possible to intermix, an odor that is offensive to the higher type—notably the horse and the camel. The odor of the Negro is sickening to full-blooded white people; but is less offensive to those alleged whites whose blood is tainted, even in a faint degree, with Negro blood. (This may account for the enthusiasm with which some white (?) people promote the "interracial" gatherings.)

nature did not design him nor civilization equip him, than in Lincoln's day. If he will devote his energies to becoming a better, more useful Negro, rather than the dupe of designing, selfish Northern white politicians, who subtly practice "race discrimination" against him both in matrimony and catalog in this course he will reap the rewards of industry, instead of the disappointments of ambition unattainable, and he will find sympathy, protection, and prosperity among his real friends—the Southern white people. These Southern whites, occupying that superior position assigned to them by the Creator, and recognized by Abraham Lincoln, are justifiably hostile to any race that attempts to drag them down to its own level; therefore, the Negro will be wise in leaving the ballot in the hands of a dominant sympathetic race; since he is far better off as a political eunuch in the house of his friends than a voter rampant in the halls of his enemies.

That policy of the southern whites to refuse racial intermixture with the lower races is due to pride in the superiority of their own race (see Abraham Lincoln), and not to hatred toward the inferior race. The claim that color is due to climate instead of race, becomes ridiculous in the absence of a belt of black people around the earth in the Torrid Zone. The highest attainments of any race were reached in those periods when that race was free from contamination by inferior blood (again, see Lincoln). Conversely, the downfall of every ancient civilization is traceable to racial contamination that weakens intellectual, moral, and, eventually, physical power.

Universal hatred of the Negro race by southern whites has no foundation outside the envenomed minds of envious Negroes and the depraved members of the white race whose claim to be 100-percent white is open to grave suspicion (A. Lincoln). The place to determine normal racial relation in the South is in rural regions where the Negro has never been contaminated by would-be missionaries bent upon "saving" the Negro from imminent destruction at the hands of the "brutal" whites. Here the Negro is closer to year-round happiness than elsewhere in all these United States. Improvident, somewhat inclined to idleness, carefree, confident that "my white folks" (employer or landlord) stand between him and want or serious trouble, be it the law or crop-allocation documents prepared by college-bred brain trusters. Among these idyllic surroundings exists race pride in a pronounced, desirable from, with rigid lines drawn against racial intermixture, both races frowning upon violation.

Our critics recognize no neutral ground between love and hatred—the races must be either at daggers' points or in physical embrace—pity their feigned ignorance! They forget that a man may love his dog and provide him with food and shelter, without desiring the animal as a bedfellow; or like treatment for his horse, without stabling it in his parlor; yet resent with fury any mistreatment of either animal.

When the Negrophiles cease their "race hatred" toward the Negro's best friend (when his material welfare is considered) the Southern whites and open their eyes to facts regarding the Negro race from the dawn of civilization to the present day, the race problem will adjust itself in conformity with facts instead of venom, and the Negro will devote his energies to self-improvement, rather than continue to build on a foundation of sand—assuming an intellectual quality with the white race that does not exist; did not exist in Lincoln's day, nor has ever existed anywhere upon the face of the Earth. God made the Negro black; the Southern whites did not do it, and all the race-hatred spewed at them will not change His mark.

How thin is the veneer of civilization on the modern Negro, even the best-educated among them, is shown by his refusal to yield the path on the sidewalk to any woman except a Negress; nor to a little child of any race—including his own. Courtesy is nowhere second nature with the Negro; only brute force of the jungle type is the guiding factor in his scheme of life, and this factor is given emphasis by enlarged educational advantages.

The Negro has a long road—many centuries long—to travel before matching the white race's experience that has built this race to world preeminence, and he makes a grave mistake in clamoring for a college degree while yet in grade school.

SUMMARY

The foregoing is compiled by a white man of mature years; born and raised in the deep South; son of a former slaveholder; accustomed to association with Negroes and familiar with their ways, through the paternalistic dealings with the race required of the whites who have sincere regard for the material welfare of their charges; because charges they actually are. Upon these descendants of slaveholders devolves the sympathetic handling and final solution of the so-called problem that has been raised by fanatical meddlers, with only a superficial knowledge of the conditions they would rush in to remedy, plus an intention to frustrate the efforts of the Negro's real friends—the southern whites.

The writer would challenge the present propriety; the ultimate wisdom of policies designed to destroy harmony and substitute discord, confident that first-hand knowledge concerning racial conditions in the South is paramount to half-baked opinion of occasional visitors—globe-trotting or otherwise.

The thinking Negro should consider the facts set out in the foregoing article and, in calm judgment, come to acknowledge that his best and truest friends are those southern white people, descended from the former slave owners who held something more than a proprietary interest in his ancestors—a sincere regard for their spiritual, moral, and physical welfare—and realize that such sentiment, deep and sincere, exists today among the native white southerners. When this realization comes to prevail, the interracial serpents will draw back into their dens, and that peaceful understanding, natural between the southern white and Negro races, will come into its own.

Take the Lid Off the Atom!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial by Palmer Hoyt which appeared in the Oregonian on October 2, 1945.

Mr. Speaker, the haste with which the Military Affairs Committee of the House is disposing of the relatively inconsequential subject of atomic energy is causing concern amounting to consternation around the country. I wish it were possible to insert in the RECORD all the articles, editorials, and radio comments which are being made on this subject. There is not a single phase of our national life which will not be radically altered by this new force. For example, to be planning the size of the postwar Military and Naval Establishments without giving full and deliberate consideration to the effect of atomic energy upon military concepts is just as bad as if we had armed our fighting men with bow and arrow and slingshot to meet the machines, guns, and bombers and the fighters of the Nazis and the Japs. The editorial follows:

TAKE THE LID OFF THE ATOM

It is our growing conviction that the significance of the atomic bomb cannot be judged by merely staring at the ruins of Hiroshima and Nagasaki—about the only basis of judgment which the public has had so far.

We must, in addition, have the full and frank advice of the scientists who stand behind those ruins, so that we may know how plentifully the bombs can be produced, what hope there is of sequestering the secret, how quickly other elements than uranium can be utilized for atomic power, what chances there are of the development of effective defense, how costs are likely to run now that the United States, Britain, and Canada have financed the experimental work.

Such information as this, if forthrightly presented to the people at once, could well determine the direction which the United States is to take—and the rest of the world, for that matter—in the crucial months and years ahead. It could well determine whether we are to cling to the now futile machinery of the United Nations or seek a solution through a world state or world conquest.

And without that information, how stupid is our procedure!

The other day the Naval Affairs Committee reported out, unanimously, a resolution favoring a postwar fleet of 1,079 combat ships, including 116 aircraft carriers. At the same time the Army seeks to commit the country to a permanent military policy based upon universal service.

Conceive of it! It is admitted that hardly a Member of the House of Representatives or of the Senate has been let in on the secrets of the atomic bomb or nuclear research in general. Yet the House and the Senate, without knowing, are being asked to determine the permanent naval and military policies of the country. They are being asked to vote the exact number of ships needed, just as though this was still the age of the dreadnaught, and the exact number of men needed, as though it was the age of Tommy Atkins.

Actually, so far as this page can judge from both open and secret sources, mankind stands at the awesome moment of transition from the age of electronics to that of neutronics, a transition so drastic that possibly within a few years a fleet of 20,000 combat ships will be useless.

What kind of a government is it, from the White House down, which considers a permanent military and naval policy before the facts are revealed? Why are the scientists who made the discoveries being kept under censorship? Why have the British scientists gone so much further in their public statements?

Suppose, as the scientists appear to agree, that any first-class power is capable of making the uranium bomb within 5 years or a little more. Suppose that with the uranium available any one of these powers could make 50 to 200 such bombs. And suppose, as most of the scientists have asserted, at least individually, that there is no defense. Where does that leave us? Bombs could be planted a year or 2 years in advance in all our great cities and industrial centers, and set off by remote control. Or the job could be done with V-2 type rockets carrying the volatile atoms and traveling far too fast for interception.

Most disturbing of all, there is the fact that just over the scientific horizon is the possibility of the break-down of the atomic power of elements much more common than uranium. Aluminum, for example—so plentiful on earth. If an atomic bomb from aluminum were exploded, no one could answer with certainty how far the impulse would carry.

Preservation of a Just Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY,
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY,
Princeton, N. J., August 6, 1945.

Congressman RICHARD F. HARLESS,
House Office, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DICK: I very much appreciated your calling me on the phone and hope next time you are here you will let us show you around the university. Because you are in a much better position to evaluate current events and influence them, I am writing you my views.

For a long time I have been disturbed by the disparity between our leaders' statement of principles and our performance, but the accord at Potsdam seems to me to out-Hitler Hitler. It seems to me to be as vicious a discrimination against Germans, as Germans, as Hitler's policies were against Jews as Jews. In this accord we enslave seventy to eighty million Germans, men, women, and children—take away a large part of their means of survival, steal their lands in the best Hitler manner, and we do it in the name of freedom and democracy. Finland and the other Baltic states, and most of the Balkans, are turned over to the Communists who, unfortunately perfected the methods so effectively employed by the Nazis. So far as I can see there isn't much left of the Atlantic Charter.

We are then told that communism is just another form of democracy. Are the reported mass expulsions of Hungarians and Germans from their ancestral homes in Czechoslovakia and eastern Germany something we are going to commit the United States to defend with my three sons' lives? Surely not. This arbitrary Russian behavior makes any treaty to defend the peace a dead letter before it is signed. As a Christian and an American I cannot support this settlement.

In the Orient, why must we batter a beaten foe to destruction with uranium bombs? The Japanese children, burned in their homes, did not start this war. Let us ask only for a just peace which Christians can support, not a punitive one which murders the innocent with the guilty.

We lost the last peace, not because we followed the magnanimity to our enemies laid down by Wilson, but because we did not. I am terribly afraid for my sons that this peace is already lost. The next war will not be with the Germans. If the only way we can cooperate with our allies is in the destroying of our enemies, I very much fear we will run out of enemies to destroy before we have learned Christian cooperation.

Perhaps I can summarize by saying that in my opinion our only great President since Lincoln was Woodrow Wilson, whose Christian idealism as expressed in his fourteen points has apparently been largely repudiated.

I am writing much the same letter to Senator ELBERT THOMAS.

Please visit us anytime and write me a statement as to how we can reconcile current national policy with our religious teachings.

Kindest regards,
Sincerely,

HENRY EYRING.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, a great segment of the American people last week were shocked and disillusioned when there was given to the press by the State Department the first intimation that the late President Roosevelt had made secret commitments to Ibn Saud, King of Arabia, that this Government would not further press the British Government to open the gates of Palestine and continue to allow the distressed Jewish people of Europe to enter that haven set up for them as a Jewish Nation.

When Palestine was mandated to the British Government after the First World War it was under the authority of the League of Nations with the expressed conditions that this land was to become a home and a sovereign nation ultimately for the Jewish people.

Some strife later on developed between the Arabs and the Jews who came into Palestine and finally Britain reneged on her purpose and practically declared against allowing any more Jewish immigrants from entering that country.

During the Seventy-eighth Congress a resolution sponsored in the House by a Republican on the one-hand and a Democrat on the other called upon the British Government to rescind the ruling and open the gates of Palestine to carry out the original purpose of the League of Nations' mandate. This resolution passed the House and finally the administration stopped its further consideration by extending its influence to its leaders here on Capitol Hill. The war was on and the Congress was willing to hold up the matter for a time because it might have an adverse international effect.

The recent publications of a day or two ago give for the first time the real reason.

The late President Roosevelt, on his trip to the Near East promised Ibn Saud, King of Arabia, that the American Government would not further press the issue.

This is a bitter pill for the Jewish people of America and for many people who sympathize with this world situation, when they learned that the one in whom this group had the greatest confidence had quit the fight in their behalf.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I desire to include an article discussing this question which appeared in the Washington Post on October 19, 1945, and following this article, Mr. Speaker, I wish to quote an article by Gould Lincoln appearing in the edition of the Washington Star on October 20, and an article appearing in the Washington Times-Herald by John O'Donnell on Monday, October 22.

[From the Washington Post of October 19, 1945]

ROOSEVELT GAVE ARABS PLEDGE ON PALESTINE—LETTER TO IBN SAUD, DISCLOSED BY BYRNES, RECALLS HIS PROMISE

(By Edward T. Folliard)

The late Franklin D. Roosevelt, in a letter written a week before his death last April, told King Ibn Saud, of Saudi Arabia, that the United States would reach no decision on the basic situation in Palestine without full consultation with both Jewish and Arab leaders.

Addressing King Ibn Saud as "great and good friend," Mr. Roosevelt recalled that in a conversation with the monarch right after the Yalta Conference he had pledged himself not to take any action on Palestine that "might prove hostile to the Arab people."

ATLEE REJECTED REQUEST

The Roosevelt letter was made public late yesterday by Secretary of State Byrnes, along with a statement of his own to the effect that the policy of the United States with respect to Palestine remains unchanged.

Earlier in the day President Truman disclosed that British Prime Minister Atlee had rejected his request that the doors of Palestine be opened to 100,000 Jews. He said that Atlee did not want to admit that many. Asked about a Capitol Hill report that the British wanted to admit 1,800 Jews a month, Mr. Truman said it was a little more than that.

POST-YALTA MEETING

President Truman's proposal to the British Government, which the White House announced concurrently with the Harrison report on the plight of Jews in Germany, brought a sharp protest from the Government of Iraq. This said that the admission of 100,000 Jews into Palestine would be "contrary to all oral and written promises and undertakings to the effect that the United States would not move in the matter before consulting the Arabs."

It was disclosed last night that Ibn Saud warned the late President that Allied support of Zionism would bring "the fires of war" between Arabs and Jews.

The Syrian Legation in Washington, acting for the Saudi Arabian Government, which maintains no diplomatic representative in the United States, made public the text of a 2,000-word letter which Ibn Saud wrote to Mr. Roosevelt last March 10.

It was in response to that message that the late President wrote to Ibn Saud April 5.

The meeting of President Roosevelt and King Ibn Saud took place on a cruiser in the Suez Canal last February, while F. D. R. was on his way back from the Big Three meeting at Yalta.

What took place at the meeting of the two men has been the subject of considerable dispute. After a statement by President Truman on the Palestine question in August, Azzam Bey, secretary general of the Arab League, gave what purported to be an account of the meeting.

He said that King Ibn Saud told Roosevelt "If Palestine is given to the Jews I will never rest until I and all my sons have been killed in the defense of Palestine."

Azzam Bey's account continued:

"Ibn Saud then stood and placed his hand in Roosevelt's hand and told him:

"'Swear that you will never support the Zionists' fight for Palestine against the Arabs.'

"And Roosevelt shook Ibn Saud's hand and pledged he would not support the Jews against the Arabs."

King Ibn Saud wrote to President Roosevelt on March 10, a month or so after the meeting aboard the cruiser, and referred to the question of Palestine and to the Arabs' interest in current developments affecting that land.

WEEK BEFORE HIS DEATH

President Roosevelt wrote his reply to the Arab leader on April 5, exactly a week before his death in Warm Springs, Ga. To his "Great and Good Friend," he said:

"I am gratified that your Majesty took this occasion to bring your views on this question to my attention, and I have given the most careful attention to the statements which you make in your letter. I am also mindful of the memorable conversation which we had not so long ago and in the course of which I had an opportunity to obtain so vivid an impression of Your Majesty's sentiments on this question.

"Your Majesty will recall that on previous occasions I communicated to you the attitude of the American Government toward Palestine and made clear our desire that no decision be taken with respect to the basic situation in that country without full consultation with both Arabs and Jews.

"Your Majesty will also doubtless recall that during our recent conversation I assured you that I would take no action, in my capacity as chief of the executive branch of this Government, which might prove hostile to the Arab people.

"ASSURANCES" RENEWED

"It gives me great pleasure to renew to Your Majesty the assurances which you have previously received regarding the attitude of my Government and my own, as Chief Executive, with regard to the question of Palestine, and to inform you that the policy of this Government in this respect is unchanged."

Secretary of State Byrnes said yesterday that he had been "authorized" to make the Roosevelt letter available, the implication being that the authorization had come from President Truman. He said his own statement was being made in response to a number of inquiries as to whether it was true "that the United States Government had on various occasions expressed the view to Jewish and Arab leaders that they should be consulted before a decision is reached respecting the basic situation in Palestine."

[From the Washington Star of October 20, 1945]

ROOSEVELT'S PROMISE TO ARABIA STIRS SPECULATION ON ELECTIONS

(By Gould Lincoln)

Disclosure a few days ago that the late President Roosevelt, a week before his death, promised the King of Saudi Arabia to consult the Arabs as well as the Jews before the United States took any action toward opening up Palestine to free Jewish immigration has disturbed leaders of the Zionist movement here and in New York. That there will be bitter criticism was freely predicted last night.

It was recalled that in October of last year, during the Presidential campaign, Mr. Roosevelt addressed a letter to Senator WAGNER, of New York—the Jewish vote is the largest single bloc of votes in New York City—asking the Senator to convey to the forty-seventh annual convention of the Zionist Organization of America his cordial greetings. In this letter Mr. Roosevelt quoted the Democratic platform upon which he was running for reelection, which said:

"We favor the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization, and such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth."

EFFORTS WERE PROMISED

In the letter to Senator WAGNER, Mr. Roosevelt added:

"Efforts will be made to find appropriate ways and means of effectuating this policy as soon as practicable. I know how long and ardently the Jewish people have worked and prayed for the establishment of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth. I am convinced that the American people give their support to this aim; and if reelected I shall help to bring about its realization."

Mr. Roosevelt received the support of a large percentage of the Jewish voters in that election. How much his pledge to aid the Zionist movement had to do with their support is conjectural. Governor Dewey, his Republican opponent, had made similar pledges.

Many of the New York Jews were members of CIO, whose Political Action Committee was working hard for a Roosevelt election, for example, and there were other reasons for the Jewish support.

The question now is what effect, if any, the revelation of the Roosevelt letter to King Ibn Saud, who is violently opposed to the Zionist movement, will have on the mayoralty election in New York City November 6. The Republicans have given their party nomination to Judge Jonah J. Goldstein, a Democrat, against the Democratic organization nominee, William O'Dwyer. Judge Goldstein is a Jew. It has been predicted that if he receives as much as 65 percent of the Jewish vote cast on election day, he will stand a good chance of winning, and if he receives as much as 70 percent, he is a certainty.

Judge Goldstein, irrespective of any developments over the Palestine issue, undoubtedly will receive many Jewish votes. He has the nomination of the Liberal Party as well as the Fusionists and the Republicans. Mr. O'Dwyer has the Democratic and American Labor Party nominations. Newbold Morris, a Republican, is running as an independent candidate, backed by Mayor LaGuardia. The vote cast for Mr. Morris, however, is likely to be negligible, according to political observers in New York.

If the Jews in large numbers shift from the Democratic Party in this mayoralty election to support a Republican candidate, the effect may be felt in next year's gubernatorial and congressional elections. Governor Dewey is expected to be a candidate to succeed himself, and, if he is reelected, still may be very much in the 1948 Presidential picture.

The legations of Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, and Syria yesterday released a joint note submitted October 12 to Secretary of State Byrnes urging that "no change in the status of Palestine should take place without the consent of the Arabs."

Stating that any proposal to permit land sales and free immigration of Jews into Palestine would be "only at the expense of the Arabs," the note added: "There obviously can be no peace in the Near East by sacrificing Arab interests for the sake of Jews."

[From the Washington Times-Herald of October 22, 1945]

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

The secret agreements made by the late Franklin D. Roosevelt in his role of wartime President of the United States—his secret covenants secretly arrived at with foreigners—are now creeping into honest sunlight.

To the annoyance—and at times dismay—of Roosevelt's political heirs, these private pledges of F. D. R. persist in living after him and refuse to be interred with his bones.

And the most embarrassing of all at the present moment (more embarrassing Roosevelt secret pledges will be forthcoming) is the revelation which Secretary of State Byrnes made last week with respect to the attitude of the present Truman administration toward the problem of Palestine Zionism, the clashing interests of Jews and Arabs, and, underneath, the deep concern of the British Empire toward the historic traditional thrust toward greater and greater power by the peoples of Russia.

Here in Washington, Zionist leaders were outraged and angry by the October 18 formal announcement of Secretary Byrnes that all final conclusions with respect to Palestine, so far as this Republic is concerned, would not be reached without "full consultation with Jewish and Arab leaders."

This was taken by accredited spokesmen for Zionists here in Washington as a flat run-out by the administration on pledges made by President Roosevelt privately and on the formal pledge of the last Democratic Convention, endorsed by F. D. R. when he was a fourth-term candidate. They don't blame Truman. But they do damn F. D. R.

And in this respect all the evidence shows that the anger is justified. The whole story is a perfect example of one of the slickest double-crosses in the great game of American politics as expertly practiced since 1932.

But the story of how F. D. R. skillfully played for a great block of racial votes in his native State of New York when he was fighting for 1944 victory and then, with fourth-term victory won, smoothly stepped aside and left the boys holding the bag, is one for the books.

It was back in March of '44, 3 months before the national conventions, that a determined drive was started to force Britain to reverse her policy and permit free and unrestricted entrance into Palestine of Jews who had felt the horrors of the Nazi terror. This is the inside story:

In Senate and House, majorities of the committees' in charge of foreign relations at that time were prepared to back the pleas of the Palestine spokesmen. Then the hand of the White House reached out—secretly.

The British wanted no such statement of American policy from any American group. So, then Secretary of War Stimson wrote to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and Chairman SOL BLOOM (Democrat), of New York, of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, that favorable action on the pending resolution "would be prejudicial to the successful prosecution of the war."

Then came the national conventions and Roosevelt's decision to run for a fourth term. Roosevelt gave his private backing (through New York's Senator WAGNER) to the Chicago platform plank desired by American Zionist leaders, which read:

"We favor the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization and such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth."

Then the Presidential campaign got under way and F. D. R. bore down heavily on his fight for votes.

On the advice of his leaders in New York City, the original Palestine resolutions were called up again before the committees in Congress, and 3 weeks before the election Secretary of War Stimson, on F. D. R.'s orders, withdrew his objections of March in a letter to Senator TAFT (Republican) of Ohio.

Five days later, with the battle for the White House blazing hot and GOP Candidate Governor Dewey denouncing White House "double talk," questioning Roosevelt's personal veracity and painting him as a slippery customer, F. D. R. went overboard on the Palestine issue in his letter to WAGNER.

This was the campaign letter from Roosevelt which raised the hopes of American Jewry to the skies—hopes dashed this week by the revelation of the later Roosevelt secret agreement with Saudi Arabia's King Ibn

Saud after F. D. R.'s meeting with Stalin at Yalta.

The Wagner letter read:

"DEAR BOB: Please express my satisfaction that, in accord with the traditional Democratic policy and in keeping with the spirit of the "four freedoms," the Democratic Party, at its convention, included the following plank in its platform:

(Then the fourth-term plank, calling for "unrestricted Jewish immigration * * * and establishment of a democratic Jewish commonwealth" was quoted.)

"If elected, I shall help to bring about its realization."

Well, Roosevelt was elected to his fourth term. And promptly the double-cross started to work. The British raised their fears of what might happen if F. D. R. carried out his pledge.

And so, a month after the Roosevelt victory, Roosevelt told the then Secretary of State Stettinius to go up on the Hill and tell SOL BLOOM'S committee in the House and TOM CONALLY'S in the Senate that "passage of the Palestine resolution at the present time would be unwise from the standpoint of the general international situation."

Stettinius, again at Roosevelt's direct orders, told the lawmakers on Capitol Hill that they must water down the resolution by knocking the all-important word "Jewish" from the phrase "reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth."

Then Roosevelt demanded that the whole resolution be killed. WAGNER, of New York, stuck by his guns. So did Senator TAFT of Ohio, and VANDENBERG of Michigan. Stettinius was summoned before the committee; had to admit that F. D. R. and the White House wanted no part of the Palestine resolution. The White House pressure won—even against objections of House GOP Leader MARTIN and Democratic Leader MCCORMACK.

Even the veteran chairman of the powerful House Rules Committee, Illinois' ADOLPH J. SABATH, folded up after a summons from the White House. But the whole story of the slick double-cross didn't sink in until last week when Jimmy Byrnes let the cat out of the bag springing F. D. R.'s secret letter to the Arabian monarch.

Proposed Site for Headquarters of United Nations Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter to the United Nations Organization from the Honorable Chase S. Osborn, former Governor of the State of Michigan, setting forth reasons why Sugar Island—located in the St. Marys River between Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., and Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, Canada—would be a suitable site for the permanent headquarters of the United Nations Organization:

ZHESHEBE MINIS (DUCK ISLAND),
Homestead P. O., Chippewa County,
Mich., September 5, 1945.

United Nations Organization:

The sane nations of the world today have a tragically earnest desire for cooperation to ensure that another catastrophic war shall not occur, that mankind henceforth may enjoy a fair measure of peace. The United Nations Council, born of this hunger, ought not have its existence imperilled by a home in the atmosphere that killed the League of Nations. Switzerland, where that hopeful embryo was smothered by the surrounding feuds of centuries standing and the old opaque diplomacies, is not a safe place for the cradling and nurture of the United Nations organization on which the hopes of the future depend. Geneva would cloud the scene with the specter of past failure; at best it offers only the negative background of neutrality.

The world today wants no more bloody fumbles, no more clutchings at the fatuous straws of neutrality and isolation. International cooperation is the present prayer and need.

One vital necessity is to foster and maintain the belief that cooperation is not a dream but a completely practical, though difficult, objective. The seat of government of the United Nations should be set where this goal has an unmistakable foundation already cemented.

Such a firm basis for faith exists, clearly, on a colossal scale, in the international boundary that Canada and the United States jointly have erected. This 5,500-mile-long unfortified frontier that has stood the storms of frictional interests for a century and a quarter is vastly greater than all the wonders of the ancients combined. Its significance cannot easily be exaggerated. It is a will-o'-the-wisp of thousands of years at last forged into an actual fact.

Working together, Canada and the United States have wrought this boundary which has given international peace to an entire continent for over a hundred years. The nations of the world owe it to their own hunger for peace to recognize, emphasize, and build upon this inspiriting achievement. The United Nations organization should establish itself permanently on the United States-Canada boundary not only in theory but in dramatic fact.

The transcontinental stretch of this great boundary is 4,000 miles—1,500 miles link Canada and Alaska. On this impressive base line, evidencing plainly the practicability of international cooperation, there is one point which stands out conspicuously as the logical place at which the activities of the United Nations may best feed the spark of hope into the persistent fire of faith.

Instinctively, before they realized the deeper implications themselves, two communities that face each other across the international line they cherish, combined their efforts to have the United Nations Organization establish its home on the great boundary. Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, and Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., through a joint official committee, have formally offered to the Council a site in the St. Marys River, on an island which once belonged to either or both countries in the old contentious days, but which a hundred years ago was awarded to the United States.

Sugar Island (called St. George by the British; known to the Chippewa Indians as Sisibukwutminis), between the Canadian and American shores of the St. Marys River, has an area greater than the District of Columbia. Its riparian rights extend clear to the boundary. At its lower end is the point where the commissioners under the Treaty of Ghent threw up their hands, unable to fix the line farther, in 1822; where subsequent negotiations, under the Webster-Ashburton Treaty in 1842, took up explosive issues and permanently settled them.

At the upper end of Sugar Island are the Sault locks—greater than Panama, Suez, Kiel, and Manchester Canals in their commerce and its implications—a marvel in the history of world trade, set upon the boundary that has no counterpart in the history of government. The imponderable part that the Sault locks played in the winning of what we hope will be the last World War is only now being revealed to the general public. These locks are also a facet of the practical basis for faith in the possibility of world peace; and they will be more so, as it becomes known popularly that here, again, is undeniable evidence of the workability of international cooperation; for these great locks are used in common by two different nations—those pioneers in international collaboration, the United States and Canada.

Sugar Island is flanked on the east by the old channel of the St. Marys which was fought over bitterly in 1812. Along its western shore runs the modern channel where the gigantic argosies of two nations mingle in a continuous procession along a secure international trafficway.

At the head of Sugar Island are the two Saults, each under its own national emblem: two communities which are cooperating daily—not because they are groups beatifically inclined toward each other, but because—in spite of rivalries, petty jealousies, and mutually irritating incidents and characteristics—they appreciate the major bonds of common good and human brotherhood.

On every side of Sugar Island, as well as in its own history, is vivid of international cooperation that has been molded out of friction by the will-to-peace and common-sense of nations.

As if it were not sufficient that international political and commercial cooperation should uniquely mark a cross roads at the strategic locks on the incomparable boundary, here also the conflicting currents of race have resolved themselves into a cultural collaboration that is a world masterpiece.

Longfellow's Hiawatha had its beginning in legends of the Lake Superior country that were first transferred to the white race from the red race in a log house that is still standing near the upper end of Sugar Island. This epic, translated into many languages, is familiar and beloved around the earth. But more than this, it is another example of human cooperation: between races; between primitive and highly civilized groupings of mankind; between conquerors and conquered. Should the walls of the buildings that house the United Nations carry murals of part I of Hiawatha, the "poor Indian" will, in the final analysis, have wrung highest spiritual victory out of what has too often seemed abject defeat.

If the Council of the United Nations is to survive, and grow in power to divert the passions of nations from the whirlpool of self-destruction into channels of constructive cooperation, its organization must obtain a strong hold on the imagination of men and an unshakable foundation on the religious forces that refine and control. Providentially, it would seem, the world-epic Hiawatha—born at the point where international politics, international commerce, and interracial cultures have combined triumphantly—provides the specific imaginative and religious setting for just such a body as the Council of the United Nations.

Consider the appended lines, extracted from the Lake Superior country's Hiawatha.

Ponder the far-reaching influence, in the council house of the United Nations, of murals based on this popular epic, in many languages, born of two races, at the place where international boundaries and commerce have won, out of dissension, more than a century of friendly cooperation.

Weigh the important fact that all the religious upreachings of all the peoples on earth, regardless of sect or denomination, can find themselves embodied here in the Great Spirit, Gitche Manito.

We have stepped overnight into a new era. Now is the time to set out the seed of the future in a proven soil. The Lake Superior tract proffered the United Nations Council by Canada and the United States, through

their twin Saults, is at the foot of the greatest body of pure water in the world. It is close to the ancient Laurentians which gave man his first foothold above the retreating oceans; yet it has pioneer freshness. The invigoration of its latitude equals the Alpine meadows without the possible discomforts of altitude. On every hand is grandeur as inspirational as that of the Aegean Archipelago.

This communication is a call to the executive officials and the press of Ontario and Michigan to present these facts forcefully, at once.

Sincerely,

CHASE S. OSBORN.

THE SONG OF HIAWATHA, PART I

* * * * *

Gitche Manito, the mighty,
He the Master of Life, descending,
On the red crags of the quarry
Stood erect, and called the nations,
Called the tribes of men together.

* * * * *

Down the rivers, o'er the prairies,
Came the warriors of the nations,
And they stood there on the meadow,
With their weapons and their war-gear,
Painted like the leaves of Autumn,
Painted like the sky of morning,
Wildly glaring at each other;
In their faces stern defiance,
In their hearts the feuds of ages,
The hereditary hatred,
The ancestral thirst of vengeance.
Gitche Manito, the mighty,
The creator of the nations,
Looked upon them with compassion,
With paternal love and pity;
Looked upon their wrath and wrangling
But as quarrels among children,
But as feuds and fights of children!
Over them he stretched his right hand
To subdue their stubborn natures,
To allay their thirst and fever,
By the shadow of his right hand;
Spake to them with voice majestic
As the sound of far-off waters
Falling into deep abysses,
Warning, chiding, spake in this wise:—
"O my children! my poor children!
Listen to the words of wisdom,
Listen to the words of warning,
From the lips of the Great Spirit,
From the Master of Life, who made you.
"I have given you lands to hunt in,
I have given you streams to fish in,
I have given you bear and bison,
I have given you roe and reindeer,
I have given you brant and beaver,
Filled the marshes full of wild-fowl,
Filled the rivers full of fishes;
Why then are you not contented?
Why then will you hunt each other?
"I am weary of your quarrels,
Weary of your wars and bloodshed,
Weary of your prayers for vengeance,
Of your wranglings and dissensions;
All your strength is in your union,
All your danger is in discord;
Therefore be at peace henceforward,
And as brothers live together.

* * * * *

"Bathe now in the stream before you,
Wash the war-paint from your faces,
Wash the blood-stains from your fingers,
Bury your war-clubs and your weapons,
Break the red stone from this quarry,
Mould and make it into Peace-Pipes,
Take the reeds that grow beside you,
Deck them with your brightest feathers,
Smoke the calumet together,
And as brothers live henceforeward!"
Then upon the ground the warriors
Threw their cloaks and shirts of deer-skin,
Threw their weapons and their war-gear,
Leaped into the rushing river,
Washed the war-paint from their faces.
Clear above them flowed the water,
Clear and limpid from the footprints
Of the Master of Life descending;
Dark below them flowed the water,
Soiled and stained with streaks of crimson,
As if blood were mingled with it!
From the river came the warriors,
Clean and washed from all their war-paint;
On the banks theirs clubs they buried,
Buried all their warlike weapons.
Gitche Manito, the mighty,
The Great Spirit, the creator
Smiled upon his helpless children!
And in silence all the warriors
Broke the red stone of the quarry,
Smoothed and formed it into Peace-Pipes,
Broke the long reeds by the river,
Decked them with their brightest feathers,
And departed each one homeward.

* * * * *

Speech to Separatees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Col. Neal Creighton, commanding officer at Scott Field, Ill., which he delivers to personnel being separated through the separation base at Scott Field:

Members of the Army Air Forces who are about to leave the service, I should like to introduce myself. I am Col. Neal Creighton, commanding officer of Scott Field. I am going to talk to you for a short time relative to your departure from the Air Forces and, also, as one soldier to another, I want to bid you good-by.

I have been in the Army Air Forces for more than 28 years. At one time I can remember that the entire Army consisted of 98,000 men, and we went on maneuvers with such a shortage of personnel and equipment that when we wanted to simulate a machine-gun installation, we had to use broomsticks for guns and a man with a red flag to represent a regiment. I have seen that small Army grow into the terrific, deadly efficient, powerful weapon of destruction that it is today.

During the period of this war I was most fortunate in having the opportunity to be overseas for 27 months, acting as commandant of Air Force headquarters for General Eaker and General Spaatz, and I also had the privilege of serving with General Eisenhower. My conclusion is that the American Army is the best Army that we have ever had or ever will have.

I have great respect and admiration for the loyalty, self-sacrifice, efficiency, and patriotism of the Ground Forces, but naturally my heart always turns toward my branch—the Army Air Forces. I know what the Air Forces did. I know that we destroyed German production, commerce, and lines of communication, and drove the Luftwaffe out of the air. We furnished the air umbrella that enabled our troops to land on the beaches of Normandy on D-day. I know also what the Air Forces did in Asia, that they blasted the Japs from the skies from New Guinea to Tokyo, and terminated the Asiatic war by dropping the atomic bomb on Japan.

Some of you may say to yourselves, "I did not do anything to further the war effort. I did not even get overseas," but I can assure you that as a team and organization you won the war. You justified your existence and justified the right to be born. Your achievement is something that you can hold and remember as long as you live. You have enabled America to remain a free nation with freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. The greatest heritage that can be bestowed upon mankind is that of being an American. It is a heritage to be handed down to your children and your children's children.

Now that the war is won, we have another obligation—that of winning the peace. Many of our comrades in arms have lost their lives in the defense of our country. They believed that a country that is good enough to live in is good enough to fight for, and good enough to die for, and they have died that America might live. Those of you who remain are charged with a solemn obligation. Within a period of 10 years you will control entirely the destiny of America and the destiny of civilization. You must think of things bigger than yourselves—your community, your State, your country. I know that you will not fail or falter in your duty.

I hope that you will achieve your life's ambition upon your return to civilian status. When I think of my own career I cannot associate it with anything except the Army Air Forces. I came into the Army as an enlisted man and the Army is the only home I have ever had or wanted to have. I have been around the world; I have had some adventure and, at times, excitement. I shall never forget the contacts and friendships that I have made while I have been in the service. Then, there are other things that mean so much to anyone who stays in the Army for a long time, things that money can't buy—like watching the flag go down at retreat, or coming back to the post after nightfall and seeing the friendly lights of the station that are watching and waiting for your return, and standing on the hangar line watching the ships take off and feeling that you are not earth-bound.

Now that I, too, have come almost to the end of the road and will be retired, I can say with deepest sincerity that if I had to live my life over again I would travel the same road. I might add that the Air Forces will see that I live in comfort and security for the rest of my life.

It is quite possible that some of you who are leaving the service will decide to come back. If you do make that decision you may be sure that we shall be glad to have you, but don't wait too long. If any of you would like to write to me after you leave do not hesitate to do so. You may rest assured that I will try to do what you ask and that I will answer your letters. Your happiness and contentment are my greatest desire and I wish each and every one of you all the luck in the whole wide world.

To Aid the Starving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an editorial from the October 23 issue of the New York Times entitled "To Aid the Starving":

TO AID THE STARVING

One hundred and eighty million Europeans, according to Director General Herbert H. Lehman, of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, are right now "on the border line of starvation." In China many more people are probably much worse off. It is to meet such immediate and urgent needs that UNRRA was established 2 years

ago. UNRRA was not to be permanent. It was to take no more than 1 percent of the estimated income of the contributing nations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943. For the United States this sum, originally authorized by the joint resolution of March 28, 1944, was to be $1,350,000,000. Of this total Congress made $800,000,000 available. At the end of last August all but $20,000,000 had been spent or committed. Other countries had contributed or made available about $668,000,000 more. This, too, seems to be about gone. At UNRRA's recent London conference the statement was made that $1,800,000,000 would be needed from all sources to finish up the job.

Congress is now being asked to make available the $550,000,000 which was authorized last year but not at that time appropriated. We are committed to spend this much. Why there is so much hesitation when people are dying for lack of help is one of the mysteries of Capitol Hill. Twice this month, once in a letter to Speaker Rayburn and once in the message conveying UNRRA's last report, President Truman has urged the necessity for early action. Results have not been evident, though the House has found time to debate some pretty trivial subjects. But the $550,000,000 to which we are committed will not be enough. We ought to spend, and President Truman has intimated that he will ask, at least $1,350,000,000 additional. That is, our total contribution to UNRRA ought to be 1 percent of 2 years' income, or $2,270,000,000.

What has been bought and what can be bought with these funds? In order of money value UNRRA has provided clothing, textiles, and footwear; foods, fats, oil, feeds, and soap; medical supplies and equipment; agricultural supplies and equipment; transportation equipment. It has cared for displaced persons. It has fought epidemics. It has saved hundreds of thousands of lives in Greece, other thousands in Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Poland, and Italy. It is preparing to undertake a massive relief problem in liberated China. After some initial mistakes and the removal of some initial impediments, UNRRA is now organized to do this work. It just needs money.

There is not much time. Sick and hungry people cannot wait for prolonged parliamentary procedure. The cold is deepening throughout the Northern Hemisphere, all around the world. People look to the United States, one of 44 nations signing the UNRRA agreement, and, with the nations of the British Commonwealth, contributor of most of the needed money. We shall not miss 1 percent of our income or annual food supply. Even if we did miss the 1 percent we should not grudge it. UNRRA is not an instrument of policy—it is, like the Red Cross, a disaster service. In the name of humanity, Congress should act without further delay.

Attorney Favors Townsend Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter that I have received from Mr. Frank C. Smith, a prominent attorney in the city of East St. Louis, Ill.:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In the Journal, recently we were informed of the bewilderment of our Congress over the unemployment problem. President Truman, believing that the problem could be solved by allowing unemployed workers $25 a week for 26 weeks in a year made such recommendation to Congress, but Congress balked. The Senate, by a vote of 56 to 23, turned the proposition down. The President feels a mistake was made and is insisting on the 26 weeks. The governors of 30 States are protesting. These say unemployment is a question for the States, not for the National Government.

It is said that the constitutions and laws of 28 States preclude the appropriating of money for unemployment. But a very few States allow $25 a week, others less, a few $7. The argument used is that if workers can get $25 a week for not working they will not accept employment at $30 or $40. Strange indeed that our statesmen should take so much time seeking to solve the unemployment problem instead of trying to learn the cause of unemployment. If a person is ill and goes to a doctor, the first thing the doctor will do is to ascertain the cause of the illness.

President Roosevelt sought to solve the unemployment problem by putting on a vast spending program. When inaugurated there were 16,000,000 unemployed workers. The best he cculd do was to reduce the number to 7,000,000. Japan then made the attack on Pearl Harbor. The war has temporarily solved the problem.

Political economists tell us that because of the machines the day will never again come when there will not be approximately 5,000,000 unemployed workers. That being true, the only thing to do is to retire those who have reached the age of 60 on a suitable pension. The Townsend plan therefore is the remedy. By means of a tax of 2 percent on gross incomes—first $250 a month, $3,000 a year exempt—financial experts say a sufficient amount will be realized to allow every man and woman American citizen over 60 not gainfully employed, $200 a month. Unlike all other pension plans, the Townsend money has to be spent in 30 days, spent in the United States of America, and spent for articles manufactured in the United States of America. It can be spent for anything other than drunkenness or gambling. Not only will this plan take care of workers over 60, but it will affect the 800,000 old men and women in the poorhouse.

Giving these over 60 years of age money to spend, every kind of legitimate business will be benefited. And since there will be none of the unemployed, there will be no need of an unemployment pension. The Townsend plan shall have solved the problem. The Townsend bill, as originally introduced, calls for $200 a month. Another bill would make it $100 a month. These two bills, H. R. 2220 and H. R. 2230, now are pending. Congress should put one or the other into effect now.

FRANK C. SMITH.

The Post-Dispatch Appraises Fascist Franco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, one of America's great newspapers has a magnificent record of fearlessly exposing fraud, deception, and corruption in national and international affairs. Its editorial columns are an inspiration. Recently there appeared an editorial discussing the dictator of Spain. The content of such editorial is well worthy of study by my colleagues and by the country. Here it is:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch of October 13, 1945]

FRANCO, FAKE DEMOCRAT

Generalissimo Francisco Franco, Fascist dictator of Spain, is typically opportunistic in his latest promise to restore civil liberties and grant amnesty to political prisoners.

Democracy has won the war, so Franco is trying to set himself up as a loyal devotee of its principles. But in the days when Fascism was riding roughshod over Europe, he was an even more loyal Fascist.

Thus, in July 1942, he said bluntly that "the totalitarian system has amply shown its superiority over liberalism and democracy." By last November, totalitarianism was so obviously doomed that Franco gave an American interviewer the surprising information that his government was "an organic democracy."

Similarly, Franco sent Hitler flowery congratulations on his victories, and on Dec. 7, 1942, went so far as to promise: "If one day Berlin should be endangered, Spain would send a million men to defend it from the Red hordes." The Spanish dictator was reminded of this pledge last spring, but by that time he was busy claiming credit for keeping Spain out of the war, and in drafting the fake bill of rights he now promises to put into effect. (It was made public the day before the Nazi surrender.)

The exceptions in this document make it worthless. It provides freedom of speech—so long as Spaniards do not criticize the "fundamental principles" of the Falangist state. It guarantees freedom of religion—but bars all religious ceremonies except Catholic.

Would Americans consider they had political liberty if their Bill of Rights forbade them to criticize a Democratic administration, or a Republican administration? Would they consider themselves endowed with religious liberty if the law permitted only Catholic services, or Protestant services? There is no reason for thinking that freedom-loving Spaniards will be satisfied with less than ourselves.

As for political amnesty, that has also been promised at various times. Yet, according to a recent report, some 400,000 Loyalists are still held in prison camps, although the Spanish Civil War ended 6½ years ago.

Franco's latest move to establish himself as a democrat adds point to an appeal to President Truman a few days ago by an American organization, the Friends of the Spanish Republic. This is far from being a radical group. Its chairman is William L. Shirer, the noted radio commentator. Its vice chairmen are Representatives John M. Coffee and Helen G. Douglas, and Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam.

The organization urges severance of diplomatic relations with Franco Spain. It says that "Franco Spain is an enemy country," and backs up this statement by citing the action of the San Francisco Conference, reiterated at Potsdam, barring Spain from the United Nations. It refers also to Truman's own statement that our Government does not like Franco or his Government, and the recently disclosed letter by the late President Roosevelt stating a Fascist regime could have no place in the community of nations.

But, some may ask, should we tell Spain what kind of government it should have? The Friends of the Spanish Republic cite recent history:

"Our Government informed Hungary that we would recognize only a truly democratic regime. We have protested in the strongest terms against the alleged nondemocratic character of the Bulgarian Government. We have differed openly with our ally, the Soviet

Union, on the score of the alleged nondemocratic character of the present Rumanian Government."

It is a historical anachronism to find a Fascist government continuing in Spain long after its sponsors, the Hitler and Mussolini regimes, have vanished from the face of the earth. Certainly it is to the interest of the democracies to do what they can to promote Franco's exit.

Franco is opposed by at least 80 percent of all Spaniards, a Saturday Evening Post article said in August. A New York Herald Tribune writer at about the same time estimated the opposition at 90 percent. Considering such a situation, it is amazing that Franco has clung to his power so long, even with the aid of an army totaling a million men.

Withdrawal of Allied recognition may be just the shove required to topple his regime and give his opponents a chance to put Spain again into the family of democracies.

Address of George Haberman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I am pleased to offer as a part of them a short address by Mr. George Haberman, president of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor, of Milwaukee, Wis. Mr. Haberman addressed the twenty-seventh annual convention of the American Legion at Milwaukee, Wis., in September, and his remarks were greeted with approval by most of the Legionnaires in attendance.

Mr. Haberman did not pull his punches and spoke out against certain labor abuses now rampant in this country. I am sure that his address will be of interest to all Members of the House:

Fellow Legionnaires, I want to make one correction for the record, inasmuch as I note that you have a soundscriber. I happen to be the president of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor and not the American Federation of Labor—we'll leave that distinction to Bill Green.

I believe that many of the delegates, friends, and visitors of Legionnaires present this morning are somewhat concerned with the many work stoppages that are now prevalent throughout the Nation. I believe personally that it is a healthy situation, except that I do not confirm the manner in which some of these stoppages are being promulgated. I don't believe that in many instances, including some of our own affiliates, that all of the necessary machinery has been exercised in order to culminate a successful negotiation of conditions prevailing in these industries. Yet from a standpoint of reaction of pent-up feelings brought about by these 4 years of hostilities that we got into, regulation by federalization on conditions of employment and conditions of economic stability, these people naturally must relax. I do hope that the Legionnaires who are trade unionists will see that their organizations exercise every provision in their contract, and if they are unsuccessful in their negotiations, then, and only then, exercise their economic pressure. That brings about a situation that I think most of you are concerned with today.

We here back home have been postwar conscious on the part of the citizenry of our State. We felt that if we could stimulate sufficient interest, the people of Wisconsin will look out for the necessity of our economic stability in the postwar period to include reconversion of industry from war to peace time production; that we would at the same time be taking care of the interests of those who were making the sacrifices on the far-flung battle fronts of this world. In part we have done a pretty decent job. It has been my good fortune to be appointed by our commander of the American Legion to be a part of your postwar planning committee. It's been my good fortune to work with the University of Wisconsin through the committee for economic development on a national scale of postwar problems. The one thing that I foresaw, and now it is brought about to a very definite concern to you and to me and to future America, is prevalent in our country today. I don't know how many of you realize that we have consistently worked with our Congress in order to eliminate the poll tax from this country in order to grant to those in the Southern States of our Union the privilege of exercising their right of franchise at the polls. One State in the past 4 years accomplished that.

But I am wondering, too, whether certain institutions in America, on the one hand, who profess to establish the right of American citizenry in this Nation, can go to a membership in excess of 4,000,000 people and say, because of a very definite political policy, that here is a selected slate of candidates for which you are assessed anywhere from $1.50 to a day's pay for the privilege of voting for them. On the one hand, if you please, they say they will not tolerate the poll tax because they are dues-paying members of an institution, and on the other hand they justify it by extracting an assessment from that membership.

I believe that the democratic policy of our Nation is threatened and I may make some enemies here this morning because I do know that there are people within the ranks of my own organization and within the ranks of other economic institutions that are not in full accord with my program, but I've served this Nation, I've been wounded by enemy shell, and I believe in this country. I've given one son in this war, I have another one flying over in the Pacific, and one—the baby of the family—goes to sea tomorrow, all that we have. I am speaking from the heart and I say that there is no nation under God's sun can compare with what we have here, and when we look across the lake, and across the width of the State of Michigan and find there that an institution is issuing an ultimatum to one of the biggest industries in the world, with an ulterior motive in mind—that ulterior motive, my friends, is knowing rightfully now that the industry cannot bear the traffic of their demands, that the ultimate results will be that the Government even in peacetimes will take over that industry. That threatens our democracy and it threatens the right of free enterprise in this Nation of principle. That is why people left England to come to America. I don't want to lose it. I want every individual in America, regardless of what his station in life may be, to have an opportunity of going into business if he so desires. I don't want to threaten our economic policies and the right to free enterprise and of the right to exercise our right of franchise.

What we should do is to select people who we believe will do the greatest amount of good for the greatest number of people regardless of their political affiliations. So I say to you this morning, my friends, I know you have a lot of business to take care of here, so in conclusion permit me to plead that if we the people are willing to go hand in hand and consider what is best, not for you and me, but best for our neighbor, if we'll be our brother's keeper, if we'll just consider what his needs may be, and follow the scriptures, I am positive the American Legion, and the American Federation of Labor, and all other segments of our society who believe in democracy, will bring about the kind of a peace our boys fought for. Thank you.

Small Incomes and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of Friday, October 19, 1945:

SMALL INCOMES AND TAXES

The House Ways and Means Committee has now released certain basic tax data, used by it in the preparation of its tax bill. One table is of particular interest, for it shows that low incomes still bulk large in this country and that reducing the tax base materially must mean tremendous loss in revenue.

This table indicates that in 1946 there will be about 53,440,000 Americans with "net income." Of these, about 39,450,000 will have incomes, after deductions but before exemptions, of less than $2,000. Only about 14,000,000 will have incomes in excess of $2,000 and 91 percent of these will have incomes below $5,000.

Only 424,000 persons will have incomes in excess of $10,000. This means that 99.2 percent of those having incomes at all will be in the $10,000-or-under class, and these will have 85 percent of the total net income subject to taxation. In fact, those with incomes under $3,000 will have 68 percent of the whole.

From these figures it is obvious that large returns from the Federal income tax on individuals can be expected only if persons of moderate earnings are included in the tax base. If the entire income of all persons receiving more than $100,000 a year were declared forfeit, it would add only $290,000,000 to revenues beyond the $1,020,000,000 they already pay. If persons with incomes under $3,000 were freed of all tax, the Government would lose nearly $5,500,000,000, or nearly 20 times what could be gained by the confiscation mentioned.

American Slav Congress Calls for Reestablishment of Big Three Harmony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House to the forthright statement on the recent London Conference issued by the American

Slav Congress, the patriotic group of Americans of Slavic descent which was so close to the heart of the late great President, Franklin Roosevelt.

In something of the same vein as the recent splendid column, America's Divided Conscience, by Walter Lippmann, the American-Slav statement calls attention to our failures at London, and the absolute need for reestablishing the harmony and cooperation between two great nations—the United States and the U. S. S. R.—which our late President struggled so long and hard to establish.

It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that every Member of the House would do well to read and study this challenging statement. I fear that there has been too little constructive and fundamental analysis of our role at London—a role which has not given hope or comfort to those who, with President Roosevelt, looked to a world of cooperation and peace. Instead, it has added fuel, at least in this Nation's press, to the fires of those who throughout the war were violent objectors to the war and to any form of true international cooperation. It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I desire to include with these remarks the statement of the American Slav Congress.

It reads:

OUR FOREIGN POLICY MUST BE A PEOPLE'S POLICY

(Statement by the American Slav Congress on the London Conference)

WASHINGTON, October 13.—Declaring that "Our foreign policy must be a people's policy" if we are to achieve a people's peace, the American Slav Congress issued a statement on the failure of the London Conference. Signed by Zlatko Balokovic, acting president, and George Pirinsky, executive secretary of the organization, whose national headquarters are in New York, the statement reads:

The stalemate at the London Conference of the Foreign Ministers has aroused deep concern among all patriotic Americans and all liberty-loving peoples of the world.

Millions of Slavic Americans throughout the country share this concern and call upon President Truman and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to exert every effort in helping to restore the previous harmonious relations between our country and the Soviet Union—the two nations upon whose close friendship and cooperation so much depends in building the peace.

There is no doubt that if the present trend of strained relations continues, a grave rift might develop between the English-speaking and Slav countries. Only enemies of world peace and security can profit from such a catastrophe.

No one who desires the establishment of lasting peace, and who realizes that the achievement of this goal depends first of all upon Anglo-American-Soviet cooperation, can ignore the serious implications of the failure of the London Conference.

WHY THE CONFERENCE FAILED

"The matter that caused the suspension of our work is no trivial or technical question," stated Secretary of State James Byrnes. He declared that the issue on which the Conference "closed in a stalemate" is "whether the peace shall be made by three, or even five, nations to the exclusion of other nations vitally concerned in the maintenance and enforcement of the peace which is being prepared."

But the Council of Foreign Ministers was not charged with the task of making the peace. The Berlin conference of the Big Three authorized it only "to draw up, with a view to their submission to the United Nations, treaties of peace with Italy, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Finland, and to propose settlements of territorial questions outstanding on the termination of the war in Europe."

It is clear that nonparticipation of a nation in the drawing up of peace treaties does not deprive that nation of taking part in the making of the peace. The main discussion and final decision are made by all the United Nations.

The Potsdam declaration specifically states: "For the discharge of each of these tasks the Council will be composed of members representing those states which were signatory to the terms of surrender imposed upon the enemy state concerned." China and France were not signatory to the terms of surrender of Bulgaria and Rumania. They did not even declare war on these Balkan states. France, undoubtedly, is interested in the drawing up of peace treaties with Bulgaria and Rumania. But so are Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. These countries did infinitely more for our common victory over Nazi Germany. They are also much closer to Rumania and Bulgaria than is France.

Mr. John Foster Dulles, Secretary Byrnes' special adviser in London, said that the Soviet delegates "found out that the United States was not willing to sacrifice its principles or its historic friendship with China and France." But nobody in London asked the United States to do that. We were asked only to observe what was decided at Potsdam. Why should fulfillment of the obligation in the Potsdam declaration lead to sacrificing our friendship with these two countries? Mr. Dulles' talk of sacrificing friendship and principles does not square at all with our apparent readiness at San Francisco to sacrifice our friendship with the Soviet Union on the question of seating the Fascist Government of Argentina. It was there that we really sacrified democratic principles to the practical consideration of satisfying some of our Latin-American friends.

OTHERS JUDGE US BY OUR ACTIONS

Mr. Byrnes told the Nation "about the Soviet delegation's disappointment at the failure of Great Britain and the United States to recognize the Bulgarian and Rumanian Governments." According to our Secretary of State, "The thought apparently exists in their (Soviet) minds that our Government objects to these governments because they are friendly to the Soviet Union and that our unwillingness to recognize these governments is a manifestation of unfriendliness to the Soviet Union."

But this thought exists not only in the minds of the Soviet delegates to the conference in London. It exists also in the minds of millions of our own American people. There is plenty of grounds for such thoughts. For instance, our intervention in the internal affairs of Bulgaria and Rumania has had the effect of encouraging not only all anti-Soviet elements but also the habitual disrupters of national unity in those countries. Our political representatives there have tended to become the protectors of the worst former Nazi collaborationists and reactionaries.

The case of Dr. George Dimitrov, expelled from the Bulgarian Peasant Party for his efforts to break up the fatherland front, is one example. This Dr. Dimitrov was under house arrest. The British representatives in Bulgaria helped him to escape. They took him to their headquarters. Later, on instructions from London, they turned him over to our political representative, Mr. Maynard Barnes, who put him under American protection.

Reporting on this case, Constantine Poulos, of the Overseas News Agency, wrote from Sofia: "The consensus appears to be that the American political representative by granting asylum to Dimitrov has risked the possibility of a serious incident, has amateurishly intervened in the partisan politics of a small nation, and has played into the hands of those who are faithfully executing Hitler's legacy to create a rift between the United States and Russia."

"It is disquieting," wrote Poulos further, "that the people made happiest by the American action in the Dimitrov case are the same people who smugly defended Bulgaria's collaboration with Germany, who are strongly opposed to any social or economic reforms, and pray for a break in the American-British-Russian alliance."

In the same dispatch of June 5, Poulos wrote: "Coming after the British refusal, on orders from London, to grant Dimitrov sanctuary, the American action may well make the United States the 'fall guy' and trim American influence in this area for some time to come."

This is exactly what is happening. We are destroying the good will that exists among the vast majority of the Balkan peoples toward America. We are "trimming our influence." It will do us no good to blame the Russians, as many are inclined to do, for the growing resentment which is developing in the Balkans and elsewhere toward our policy of opposing progressives and supporting reactionaries.

The Balkan peoples, as well as the peoples of all Slav and other democratic countries, have always liked and trusted America. They want to maintain close and friendly relations between their countries and the United States. That is why they are bewildered, and even indignant, when they see us taking the side of the disrupters of national unity and former collaborationists. They may justly wonder whether America is trying to help them establish their life on a new democratic basis or stand in the way of achieving this objective.

WHAT ABOUT GREECE?

How can we pretend that the sole purpose of our intervention in Bulgaria is to see that democracy be established in that country while in the meantime we keep silent in face of the most outrageous monarcho-fascist terror on Greece? The people of Greece, the peoples of Yugoslavia and other Allied countries are asking these questions. Here in our own country millions are disturbed by this contradictory policy of keeping quiet where reaction is in power and intervening where the anti-Fascists rule.

Referring to Bulgaria and Rumania, Mr. Byrnes complained that "we cannot know whether conditions justify recognition unless our political representatives are fully informed and unless our news correspondents are permitted freely to enter countries and freely to send their stories uncensored." But how can the governments of Bulgaria and Rumania give full information to our political representatives when these representatives act as the protectors of those who scheme and plot to restore the old pro-Fascist regimes?

It is not true that such a policy stems from lack of information as to what is happening in the Balkan countries. In the case of Bulgaria we know and the entire world knows that the new fatherland front government did a splendid job of punishing the war criminals. The people there gave the best example of how to deal with Fascist traitors who sold their country to Hitler.

It is not true, either, that no American correspondent was allowed to enter Bulgaria. Poulos was in Sofia from January to June 1945, and sent many dispatches describing the events there. But they were not published. They, apparently, were not considered fit to print.

WE ARE NOT KEEPING OUR PLEDGE TO THE PEOPLES OF THE LIBERATED COUNTRIES

Mr. Byrnes stated that "this has been a people's war; it must be a people's peace."

We wholeheartedly concur in this belief, but a people's peace can be achieved only through a people's policy.

We agree with Mr. Byrnes that the fact that the conference in London closed in a stalemate "need not, and should not, deprive us of a second chance to get on with the peace." Of course not. But if, by any chance, a second session of the Council of Foreign Ministers should end in another stalemate, then the damage to the relations of the Big Three might be too great to be repaired. The world cannot afford a second stalemate. Our major task now and the task of all Allied Governments and their peoples is to make sure that there shall be no second failure.

We of the American Slav Congress feel that nothing will be gained and much can be lost by an attitude of complacency, by glossing over some of the things that happened at London. We are of the opinion that the already too apparent basic differences between the United States, the Soviet Union and Great Britain on the organization of the peace should spur us Americans to a very objective calm reexamination of our foreign policy.

At Yalta we joined Great Britain and the Soviet Union in a pledge to wipe out the last vestige of Nazism and Japanese imperialism. Judging by our policy and actions—our exclusiveness about bases we have captured in the Pacific, even while moralizing about Soviet exclusiveness elsewhere; our insistence on one-power rule in Japan; the tendency to use the atom bomb as a means of coercion; and acts of our military officials pointing to an attempt to rebuild a strong Germany as a buffer against the Soviet Union—the conclusion is inescapable that we are not living up to this pledge.

FRIENDSHIP BETWEEN PEOPLES

We agree with our Secretary of State when he said that "lasting peace depends not only upon friendship between governments but upon friendship between peoples." That is why we of the American Slav Congress offer this constructive criticism of our foreign policy: We offer it in order to help strengthen the friendship between our mighty Nation and the 250,000,000 Slavs in Europe, without whose help and cooperation we could not have won the war, and without whose confidence we cannot expect to win the peace.

We, Americans of Slavic descent, as all true patriots, believe that Americanism as the late President Roosevelt said, "is not and never was a matter of race or ancestry. Americanism is a matter of the mind and heart." And our minds and our hearts are dedicated to the goal of a just and lasting peace, built on the friendship and understanding of all liberty-loving peoples of the world.

Millions of Americans of Slav descent, and many more millions with other racial backgrounds, firmly believe in what Hugo L. Black, of the United States Supreme Court so eloquently expressed when he said:

"Like most of the great values of life, the ideals of democracy and peace can be won or maintained only by constant struggle. For democracy is a fighting faith. No man with a conscience can be so far removed from that struggle as not to feel the compulsion of joining in it. Each of us in our own way has a job to do. The principles of fascism, and all that fascism stands for with its barbaric denial of human values, must be obliterated and destroyed. To accomplish this there must be an emphatic reassertion of democratic values and a resurgence of democratic faith at home and throughout the world. And there will be."

ZLATKO BALOKOVIC,
Acting President,
GEORGE PIRINSKY,
Executive Secretary,
American Slav Congress, New York, N. Y.

Married Men Should Be Permitted To Return to Their Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. HOCH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from a soldier whose home is in my district. He is justified in insisting that he be permitted to return to his family.

OCTOBER 16, 1945.

Congressman HOCH:

Being that you are Reading's Congressman and that being my home town and me one of your former employees when you were with the Reading Eagle, I thought you may be interested enough to tell us what Congress is doing about getting married fellows back with their families and how soon something will be done regardless of the length of service. We fellows have been sent here to go to school 6 weeks ago and have not even seen the inside of school or have not been assigned to school yet. The 6 weeks we are here we have been doing nothing but KP and laying around in the barracks. This is not a few fellows doing this, but thousands of fellows just passing their time in the barracks, when these fellows could be home with their families where we belong, now that the war is over, and there are plenty of young fellows around to do the cleaning up who have no responsibility. Why can't the fellows with families go home and then come back to get their discharge when it is ready, instead of causing corruption in our families?

We don't think you are being fair to your public by having the Government pay these high allotments now that the war is over and causing taxes to be so high. Do you think it is being fair to our children now that the war is over, when our place should be in the home teaching our children discipline. A lot of us fellows had been classed essential up until 3 months ago when we were taken into the Army and this does not make very good sense after all we are just laying around for the last few weeks.

Our wives have been asking us fellows when we are coming out now that it is over, and we in turn are asking you this question. Hoping to have your reply soon.

Yours truly,

FROM SOME OF THE BOYS
IN CHANUTE FIELD.

A Stubborn Vestige of Old Appeasement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET O'NEAL
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles Strull, an outstanding citizen of Louisville, Ky., has sent to me an editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal of October 3, 1945, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including the mentioned editorial:

A STUBBORN VESTIGE OF OLD APPEASEMENT

The discussion now under way between official United States and Great Britain on Jewish immigration into Palestine serves to illuminate one of the most shadowy chapters of appeasement and dubious motive in the entire record which began with Hitler's rise to power. It serves also to bare the startling and shameful fact that the most evil legacy of nazism, which is hate, is still alive and active in Europe, to mock the name of liberation.

President Truman has asked the British Government in effect to abrogate the Chamberlin white paper of 1939 which stopped the admittance of Jews to Palestine and which thus left millions of harried Jews in Europe without asylum, with no way of escape from the concentration camps, the butchery, the gas chambers, and the crematoria of nazi barbarism.

Ironically, although Hitler Germany has been destroyed, and freedom of oppressed peoples is fondly supposed to have been won, the Jews of Europe find themselves on one hand unable to build new lives where they are, because of the backwash of prejudice, and on the other hand unable to move to the refuge of a promised homeland.

And this, although the British Labor Party when seeking election in May 1945 espoused the policy of reopening Palestine to the tragic refugees of the ancient faith; and although the United States Congress in more than one session has supported the plea which President Truman repeats and which his predecessor voiced with vigor in 1944 and before.

The white paper of 1939 was one of the numerous manifestations of appeasement which marked that unhappy period of Chamberlain's government. Twenty-two years earlier, the Jews of the world had been assured, by formal declaration of Foreign Secretary Balfour of Great Britain, of the opportunity to establish a national home in Palestine. This Declaration was strengthened in 1922 when our Congress approved it, and a year afterward Great Britain became the League of Nations' mandatory for Palestine and assumed responsibility for "placing the country under such political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home," in the terms of the Declaration.

With Hitler stalking the world in 1939, a year after the triumph of his bullying at Munich, the Chamberlain government apparently felt constrained to meet his competition in the Near East. A strange ferment had occurred among leaders of the feudal system of life among the Arabs—although it is easy to see today, as Mr. Chamberlain and his imperial agents saw then, that the source of this ferment lay in Nazi provocation. Diplomacy accorded the label of nationalistic spirit to the stirrings among the historically nomadic Arabs; and the white paper followed. It cut down Jewish immigration into Palestine to an aggregate of 75,000 in 5 years, and forebade it entirely thereafter except with Arab consent. Effectually doomed were the Jews of Europe, thus immobilized in the path of their destroyer.

It becomes rather plain that the British Labor Party, disregarding its assurance of last spring, chooses to cling to the line of deference to nationalistic pretensions of Arabs, in face of evidence that the rank and file of those people, left undisturbed, have lived in peace and in marked progress among their Jewish neighbors. These common people, however, are remote from the real significance of their land—its position as the stepping stone of empire, the untapped treasures of its oil, the strategy of maintaining its cultural and political status quo which depends on leaders whose quality was revealed when they blew hot and cold all through the war—and which a progressive, intellectual new influ-

ence (say, that of the Jews of modern ways and democratic yearnings) well might change.

These are the things that are being said today. One of the most vigorous statements of them, indicative of the temper and forthrightness of American leaders in this connection, comes from Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, who says in an article in the Nation:

"In Palestine international promises have been broken, loyalty and fidelity have been unrequited, hostility has been appeased, and human life has been subordinated to the mysterious demands of imperial policy. The miracle is that, despite all this, Jewish Palestine has throughout the war been a bastion of security to the United Nations and is today the most successful pioneering effort of modern history. * * * The war is over. The military considerations which have restrained official expression of America's views on the Palestine issue are no longer germane."

Far more bitter were the denunciations by Zionists themselves, which appeared in Louisville in a newspaper advertisement of nation-wide publication, An Open Letter to Prime Minister Attlee, by the American Zionist Emergency Council. It was the most forceful of rebukes, reminding the Labor Government that while it is seeking America's financial help for restoration of Britain's economy and standards, it "cannot talk of social and economic progress and at the same time bolster the reactionary, pro-Fascist, feudal Arab rulers in the Middle East, including the pro-Axis Mufti." Justice, too, it concludes, is indivisible.

Dangers of Militarism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, to what extent is slow demobilization responsible for the deplorable domestic conditions that now exist? The tyrannical attitude of the military toward our soldiers, and the brutal indifference to the sovereign will of the people, in the matter of demobilization ought to warn the people of the United States as to the dangers of militarism. President Woodrow Wilson had some definite views on militarism. I quote from his speeches and statements:

1. Militarism consists in this, gentlemen: It consists in preparing a great machine whose only use is for war. (Speech at New York, Jan. 27, 1916.)

2. It is inconsistent with the traditions of the country that their (the people's) knowledge of arms should be used by a governmental organization which would make and organize a great army subject to orders to do what a particular group of men might at the time think it best for it to do. That is the militarism of Europe, where a few persons can determine what an armed nation is to do. That is what I understand militarism to be. (Statement to committee from American Union Against Militarism, White House, May 9, 1916.)

3. Militarism does not consist in the existence of an army, nor even in the existence of a very great army. Militarism is a spirit. It is a point of view. It is a system. It is a purpose. The purpose of militarism is to use armies for aggression. (Speech at West Point, June 13, 1916.)

Militarism is now showing its purpose, its point of view, and its spirit, which is to fasten its discipline upon the civilian population, the Congress, and to take over the control of the country in peacetime. Military law, courts-martial, cruel and unusual punishments are the aim and ultimate goal of militarism. The effect of the system of militarism is the same in all countries, unless restrained by an alert, freedom-loving people.

We saw militarism in practice in the Billy Mitchell case. France saw it in the Dreyfuss affair. Our people are seeing it in operation in dealing with demobilization. Militarism is also rampant in England. Under leave to extend, I insert as part of my remarks an article appearing in the Washington Times-Herald under date of October 23, 1945, as follows:

CHURCHILL FLAYS SLOW DISCHARGES

LONDON, October 22.—Declaring that the slow rate of demobilization was the fountainhead of all Britian's domestic difficulties, former Prime Minister Churchill today demanded that the Labor government release two and a quarter million men from the army, navy, and air force.

Initiating a debate on demobilization, Churchill told the House of Commons that he understood there would be 3,842,000 in the armed forces on December 31. He urged that the forces be cut to a total of 1,550,000 men and women, comprised of 1,000,000 in the army, 400,000 in the royal air force, and 150,000 in the navy. The balance of 2,250,000 kept under arms were redundant and surplus, he asserted.

Churchill pointed out that the fear of unemployment should not deter in speeding demobilization since every industry is clamoring for labor.

Churchill emphasized in his calculations regarding the size of the British forces that he has definitely excluded the possibility of a major war in the next few years. "If the Government considers this wrong, it would not be a case of demobilization but of remobilization," he said.

He also asserted that the housing shortage was not a valid reason for keeping men in the army, and called on the Government to commandeer land for houses if necessary.

The Jap Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

TUCSON, ARIZ., *September 24, 1945.*

DEAR MR. HARLESS: While we're investigating Pearl Harbor, let's find out also who told Governor Dewey that the Jap code had been broken. That secret certainly was known to only a few of our most trusted officials at the top of the Government, and the man who passed it on to Dewey obviously did so with the expectation that the Republican candidate would spill it to the world. If Dewey had been less scrupulous, the war might have been prolonged considerably and thousands more Americans killed.

The public has a right to know who thus put party politics above the national welfare. When a man is willing to stab his country in the back during wartime for motives of personal gain or party prestige, he should be exposed and branded as a traitor.

Yours truly,

BRUCE COLE.

Old-Age Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Resolution memorializing Congress to act favorably upon either H. R. 2229 or H. R. 2230 as a broadened measure at the very earliest date possible in order to provide old-age security for all our people in an adequate amount for each retired worker and to force into circulation each and every month the full amount collected to provide such annuities, less the necessary administration expense:

"Whereas the National Social Security Act, which has now been in operation for several years, and has proved itself wholly inadequate, as a provider of old-age security; and

"Whereas only a minor portion of our people are covered by said act; and

"Whereas the operation of the act removes from circulation billions of dollars in excess of the amount required to pay the annuities it provides, thus curtailing the active flow of money in the channels of trade instead of augmenting it; and

"Whereas to broaden and extend the present old-age and survivors' insurance law in the Social Security Act as promised by both political parties last year, will only create a still greater stagnation of tax revenue in Washington, when more buying power among the lower-income groups will be so vital to postwar employment and business recovery: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the County Commissioners of the County of Morrison, in regular session assembled, That the Congress of the United States of America be requested to pass either H. R. 2229 or H. R. 2230 as a broadened measure at the very earliest date possible in order to provide old-age security for all our people in an adequate amount for each retired worker and to force into circulation each and every month the full amount collected to provide such annuities, less the necessary administration expense, thus providing a constant strong demand for goods and services; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Congressman HAROLD KNUTSON and to Senators HENRIK SHIPSTEAD and JOSEPH H. BALL."

J. E. BIEGANEK,
G. J. HODORFF,
RICHARD BORGSTROM,
STEVE OTREMBA,
M. J. KOKETT,
County Commissioners,
Morrison County, Minn.

Michigan's Tourist and Resort Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my weekly broadcast for this week which was put on the air by Stations WMAM, Marinette-Menominee, WDBC, Escanaba, and WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie, on the subject of Michigan's tourist and resort industry:

Ladies and gentlemen, we are approaching a new vista in the tourist and resort industry of our entire State of Michigan and especially so in our Upper Peninsula of Michigan.

Before the war, Michigan's tourist and resort industry was the second largest in the State and from that industry we received an annual revenue of approximately $400,000,000. That is big business; and heretofore it has been promoted by our four regional tourist and resort agencies: southeastern Michigan, western Michigan, east Michigan, and the Upper Peninsula Development Bureau. Each of these four agencies receives its own proportionate share of a State appropriation for the development and enhancement of its own tourist and resort industry. With that no one can find fault because each section has its own manifold attractions and each is charged with and should properly pursue a program promoting its own immediate interests.

But, ladies and gentlemen, it is my sincere belief that this industry, which I predict will expand with rapid strides in the postwar world, should have its activities correlated in Lansing with a State administrator for this industry, whose job it would be to correlate the activities of all those bureaus in the interest of the State of Michigan as a whole. It should be his primary purpose to "sell Michigan"—to bring the tourist into Michigan. For instance, as an example, we might point to our neighboring State of Indiana, which has just recently correlated its State-wide activities in the hands of an able State public-relations director. Others of our neighboring States, as well as our own, are considering adopting the same policy.

Now what could we gain by such a program? It has been freely predicted by those who hoped to promote their own industry that European travel will greatly cut in on our own domestic travel. For instance, we hear statements advanced by some of our major air lines that week ends in Europe will be as frequent as week ends in the Upper Peninsula. We hear statements and read advertisements to the effect that the stratoliners of the immediate postwar world will ply between Detroit and London between breakfast and dinner. That might all be true, but I submit it is not going to hurt our tourist and resort industry in Michigan one penny's worth for the following reasons. First of all, Europe is down. Europe cannot revive itself for at least 5 years. Europe has no hotels available in which to house any such influx of week-end resorters and it has no coal with which to heat the hotels, no food with which to feed its patrons and, unless an ill-advised Uncle Sap gives them an extremely greater largess than I think the Congress of the United States will authorize, that condition cannot improve itself much less than 5 years hence. Europe has no travel facilities for the tourist. The railroads have been blasted to bits and such as can be restored in the near future will be restored for far more essential purposes than tourist travel. Europe for the next 5 years will be too busy feeding itself to worry about feeding other than those of our own citizens who are over there strictly on international business; and they will pay plenty for what little they get: no heat in the hotel, lights shut off early, no soap in the hotel, black-market prices for everything they eat.

With that picture before us, it becomes apparent that our great State of Michigan has every possible opportunity for greatly extending its tourist and resort industry into one which I predict with confidence can be doubled, if not trebled, during the next 10 years. I say this predicated on the fact that the four regional bureaus will combine their efforts, augmenting an ambitious all-State program headed up by a capable and experienced public relations man in Lansing, who will seek to serve all and injure none. His first responsibility, I repeat, is to bring the tourist into Michigan.

In approaching this program we must realize that each of our beautiful sections in Michigan possesses its own natural advantages and its own natural attractions. For instance, in southeastern Michigan, nearby metropolitan Detroit, can be found the advantages of a quick week-end jaunt by car or by water. Western Michigan, opened up many years ago fundamentally along the lines of the adequate railroads serving that area, became a more settled resort territory. Thousands upon thousands of our summer visitors attracted by our marvelous climate built themselves permanent summer homes which they and their children have enjoyed and will enjoy for many years to come. Eastern Michigan has comparatively recently come into its own as a tourist and resort area—coming into its own only after the depletion of its timber and some natural mineral resources and has expanded in proportion to the extension of hard-surface highways northward. Today down in the northeastern Michigan section where I live, with its excellent deer hunting (thanks to the energetic and active cooperation of the Michigan Department of Conservation in helping to increase the deer population) we see the possibilities open to us, if we will make it even more attractive for our tourist. For instance, we do not have the small-game hunting we used to have; we do not have the trout and other game fishing in our lakes and streams that we used to enjoy, but if we will help to improve these conditions through cooperation with the conservation department, just that much more can we increase our tourist revenue. That is, providing we first of all make up for our most noticeable deficiency of all, namely, a lack of tourist cabins and hotel facilities.

Now, when we come across the straits into this beautiful Upper Peninsula, it is safe to see and conservative to state that we have hardly scratched the surface as yet despite all the admirable work that has been done by your excellent Upper Peninsula Development Bureau, which recently celebrated its thirtieth anniversary. Some may challenge that statement, but I insist that in my own humble opinion that nevertheless is true—we have hardly scratched the surface. Why? Because we have been too far removed from the centers of population which have not as yet enjoyed what we have to offer up here in the Upper Peninsula. It has been principally a matter of transportation. In the immediate prewar world our highway system was greatly enhanced—much still remains to be done. We had an improved rail transportation system that with the advent of the streamliners had been coming into its own, but even so, during the war period vacation travel was drastically restricted, which has of necessity been a deterrent to us. But in this postwar world the air travel that we hear promoted toward Europe will at the same time be of inestimable value to you up here in the Upper Peninsula. Thanks to an energetic and farseeing Michigan State Department of Aeronautics, our State led our Nation in prewar private flying facilities.

Just as soon as you can cut the grass off of some of the fields I have seen in the past few years, the hundreds of thousands of our youth who have been trained in the world's greatest air forces will find it possible to purchase low-priced planes which will make our Upper Peninsula facilities readily available to them. And I predict there will be far more week-end travel to the Upper Peninsula and far more money left by the private flyer in the future in the Upper Peninsula than will be spent by the week-end travel to Europe.

Furthermore, it is well known that we are making a determined bid for adequate airline travel to this area to augment an ever improving rail service and an ever increasing flow of automobile traffic over a continuously improving highway system. It is well known that several of the major airline companies already have their applications on file for postwar lines all through the upper part of Michigan with a major point at Pellston for service which would cover the entire Lower Peninsula from Detroit to Chicago with intersecting lines and tying that in with a service that will link the Upper Peninsula. These services in turn will go through to Chicago and across to Duluth or Minneapolis. What is needed are larger terminal airports for these planes. We have one nearing completion at Menominee right now; another huge airport is projected for Escanaba. The airport at the Soo will undoubtedly be drastically improved and as a safety factor for this particular airport we have the war-built airports at Raco and Kinross. Undoubtedly others of our Upper Peninsula cities will be in line for Federal and State aid to improve their own airports. In this latter connection Congress has just recently passed the Airport Construction bill of around $700,000,000 to be expended over the next 10 years for the construction of larger air terminals in the metropolitan cities and suitable size airports for larger cities in districts such as ours and then additional smaller fields for private flying in outlying districts.

Then I predict, too, a great future for our Upper Peninsula when, as, and if the Congress will provide funds for the Army engineers to continue its congressionally authorized program to establish an extended series of small-craft harbors to entice the amateur yachtsman. That program, while carefully pursued by the Army engineers in the prewar world with the meager funds placed at their disposal, will undoubtedly be enhanced in the near future and it opens a vista of primary importance to the entire Upper Peninsula and especially those cities bordering on Lakes Michigan and Superior. Improvements to small craft, such as ship-to-shore telephone, radar—both in vision ahead and in vision below, to find out where the fish are—are a reality as of today, and when there are sufficient anchorages provided and when the municipalities learn to cooperate with the visiting yachtsman by affording him docking space at its municipal pier and services in the form of fuel, food, and so forth, I predict that a steadily increasing influx of vacationists aboard their own private cruisers and yachts will prove extremely valuable to us.

In closing, there is one warning that I want to give all of you. It can be summed up in three words: "Don't be greedy." You may wonder why I give that warning. I say that because of my own observation in certain other tourist resort States. Whenever a merchant or a hotel man or a camp operator gets into the habit of looking out of the front window to see whether the car that just arrived has a "foreign" license plate on it and then automatically ups his price, or whenever those of us who are interested in the tourist and resort industry in our great

State assume the attitude that an out-State visitor is a "foreigner" and therefore should be gouged, just then do we stab a knife in the very heart of the tourist and resort industry of Michigan, because the gouged customer is not coming back and neither are his friends, to whom he will relate his sad experiences when he gets home. So I repeat, welcome, always welcome, our visitors but don't be greedy. We have to live for tomorrow as well as for today.

With Malice Toward None

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "With Malice Toward None," by Grenville Kleiser, which appeared in the October 22 issue of the New York Enquirer:

WITH MALICE TOWARD NONE

(By Grenville Kleiser)

The American people are proud of a self-made man. They honor him because he symbolizes the qualities of personal character possible of high development in this land of opportunity.

The self-made man realizes early in life that in order to progress he must work diligently and constructively. He must have a knowledge of his own qualifications and abilities and do all in his power to improve them.

He is alert for chances to increase his knowledge and efficiency. He safeguards the golden moments. He turns every opportunity into an occasion for self-development.

The spirit of self-help is the root of all genuine growth in the individual; and, manifested in the lives of many, it constitutes the true source of national vigor and strength. Help from without is often enfeebling in its effects, but help from within invariably invigorates.

An outstanding example of the fine type of self-made American is James A. Farley, who through his own ability, integrity, and sound common sense has achieved exceptional success.

With true self-effacement he disclaims any personal credit for his achievements. He has an extraordinary faculty for getting things done. Through the years of conscientious effort, despite difficulties and discouragements, he has stood steadfastly for loyalty, honesty, and singleness of purpose.

Of self-made "Jim Farley," as he is affectionately called, it has been said that he is a man among men, of flawless character, clean personality, high-minded, and earnestly devoted to any interest in which he may be concerned.

Here is one of the many tributes paid to him:

"Jim Farley is and always has been a big man, a fine capable leader; the best organizer either party has known in a generation, a man whose personal traits of character have endeared him to thousands of his fellowmen."

It has been said of him that he was born for friendship. He likes people and they like him. His genial personality has often transcended political and tactical differences.

Invariably he has had the courage of his convictions. Difficulty failed to get him down—he always came up smiling. He has never lost the twinkle in his eye.

He has regarded the rewards of work well done—money, influence, position—as incidents, not the ends, of his efforts. A high-minded man seeks a great place, not that he may be seen of men, but that he may speak, influence, and serve unselfishly.

Today, James A. Farley is an eminent member of that great group of self-made men who have reached places of distinction in this country. His natural modesty, high intelligence, and patriotic devotion to duty, makes him an inspiration to young men and a truly great citizen of his beloved America.

Address of Capt. John L. Beebe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the farewell address delivered by Capt. John L. Beebe, former Superintendent of the United States Maritime Service Training Station, Sheepshead Bay, Brooklyn, N. Y.

During the past 2 years I have made many visits to the United States Maritime Training Station at Sheepshead Bay, Brooklyn, N. Y., and observed the splendid administration of the superintendent, Capt. John L. Beebe. He has at all times impressed me with the efficient methods by which he has maintained command of this largest training station in the world for merchant seamen. Apart from his ability as an officer, he is a man of integrity and sympathetic understanding of the problems of the men he directed from May 1943, to October, 1945. Captain Beebe's remarks on the occasion of the last review in which he took part as commanding officer of the Sheepshead Bay training station follow:

This is the last review in which I shall take part as commanding officer of the Sheepshead Bay training station. Within a few days I shall leave and the task, symbolized here today in this ceremony, of passing the duties and responsibilities of superintendent to another, will be completed.

It is with very genuine reluctance that I approach this ending of associations. For some years I have been assigned to duties with the maritime service and had a part in its growth, and for the past 29 months I have been with the men of this station. It has been a source of never-ending admiration and pride to witness the sureness with which they have taken hold of unfamiliar tasks and duties and handled them competently and well.

Each man who took part in the wartime job of this training organization may feel personal pride in knowing how much has been achieved and how important was the task of the maritime service and of the American merchant marine in bringing to pass the final victory of our armed forces. Each one has had a place of importance in that victory and each should always remember and keep bright the knowledge that he served well in the triumph. Every man in the uniform of the maritime service should hold his head high in the company of the men of our Army and Navy, for without him and all the thousands of other merchant seamen the battle would not yet have been won.

In the years ahead, the maritime service will continue to have a place of equivalent importance in the peacetime world. America's great modern merchant fleet, created in the toil and fury of war, must continue to sail the seven seas and uphold our country's proud position as a maritime nation of the first rank. Every man now aboard a merchant ship or in training today for that service can feel confident that he has elected a career of dignity, and filled with opportunity and advancement.

I wish to leave these thoughts with you and add to them my personal expression of admiration and pride for each one of you, the officers and men of Sheepshead Bay.

I pass the command to one of those officers who has served with high efficiency and ability on my staff, first as administration officer, and then as executive officer. It is with confidence that I turn over to Captain Von Sneidern the task of directing the destinies of Sheepshead Bay for the future.

Good luck to him and to you all. I wish everyone a pleasant journey.

Let the People Decide on Military Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, President Truman urges the most far-reaching surrender to militarism ever proposed to the American people. Peacetime conscription, or as he prefers to term it, "universal training," would profoundly alter the future of every American now living. Accordingly it is imperative that the people decide this issue. To commit the American people to permanent militarism by steam rollering this measure through Congress would be a tragic misuse of the power held by the administration.

Unquestionably, President Truman wants the people of America to settle this issue. Accordingly, he should be willing that the people determine their course at the ballot box in the nearby 1946 congressional elections. Let the people choose Congress on this issue.

The people of America have entrusted Harry Truman with the highest office in this land. Now he should be glad to trust the people to determine whether or not they should march down the road of militarism, a pathway that has wrecked every major nation that has taken it. Most constitutional amendments have decided issues of lesser magnitude.

President Truman's sponsorship of military conscription automatically puts in motion the legislative power of the administration toward its enactment. Accordingly the duty and responsibility of the Republican Party is clear. It is to provide the organized political opposition to this surrender of the freedom of the people.

Here is the most critical domestic threat to liberty in our generation. All

patriots who believe that the people own the Government, and oppose the Hitler concept that the Government owns the people should rally against the European importation.

God and the Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to insert my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to present for thoughtful consideration the sermon recently given on the atomic bomb by the Reverend Russell J. Clinchy, D. D., at the Center Church, Hartford, Conn.:

On Tuesday morning, August 7, 1945, the Boston Globe carried this headline across its first page, "A new world is born."

That headline, which no one ever expected to see in a newspaper, was caused by the report that 3 weeks before an atomic bomb had been dropped on the desert in New Mexico, and 2 days before another atomic bomb had been dropped on the Japanese city of Hiroshima, and these two bombs were the greatest explosion of power which had ever been let loose in the world. The new world, however, was not brought into being by the power of the bomb but by the discovery which made the bomb possible, that of atomic energy. The dream of every modern physicist and chemist had been realized; the atom had been smashed; the principle of atomic energy had been released into reality; this discovery would transform not only our methods of power but all of man's thinking concerning the nature of the universe, and his activity in the world. When one had read the official statement he knew the headline was true—a new world had been born. He did not say this because he knew the nature of this new world but, just as he had understood that he was in a new era of the transmission of sound when he first heard a radio and yet did not understand the secret of radial waves, he now knew that, together with all mankind, he would hereafter live with a different conception of the nature of the world than his fathers had ever comprehended.

It was inevitable that one of the first reactions to this astounding news was how this revelation would affect our idea of God. The instinctive reaction of many people was, "How can we still believe in God if this is the real nature of the universe?" During that memorable week it was exciting to see that the minds of many people were concerned with two ideas of which we know the least in all the world, and of whose real nature we shall never know the whole truth—God and atomic energy. We shall never know fully who and what God is, and our minds will probably never discover the final nature of atomic energy even though we shall have increasing knowledge of how to use it. Granting all this, however, the real question that was in the mind and conscience of most people was that of the relation of God and atomic energy, and it still is the important question before us.

Because the first use of atomic energy was made in the form of the atomic bomb we are confronted with two questions, or, rather, two phases of the whole problem. The first is whether we can still believe in the Christian conception of God because of this new revelation of the nature of the universe; the other is whether there was, and is, a moral use of the atomic bomb in war.

I

It was so clear that a feeling of awe and fear swept over most people when they heard the first report of the discovery of a new energy in the texture of the universe. There was a fear that man had created a Frankenstein monster that could not be held in leash and would go on to destroy humanity itself. There was also a sense of awe of standing before such majestic power, power which seemed to be beyond the comprehension of the mind. This awe and fear were mixed together for many religious people in what was almost a sense of agony that the atomic bomb might have blasted our conception of God, as well as a city, out of existence. "How can we continue to believe in God and in life", a friend wrote in those early moments, "when the world is made of such particles of destroying power and man now knows how to use it to destroy himself if he chooses to do so?" Many who did not express it that way held something of the same sense of disaster in their minds, and the old question of the book of Job came back to plague our hearts, "O, that I knew where I might find Him." There were those who felt they would have to look for God in the ruins of Hiroshima. Christianity therefore, must reveal anew to us the real meaning of God.

Our knowledge of God is never the full and complete truth about Him, but is only our concept of Him to the fullness of our immediate awareness and knowledge. Each age has only this concept of God and it lives by the best concept it can possess. In the course of man's history there have been three great changes in the concept of God. The earliest idea of deity was that there were many gods and even the early pages of the Bible place Baal on a par with Jehovah. The first change came in the transition from many gods to one God, marked by the ancient words of the Hebrew ritual which still stand as one of the majestic utterances of the human spirit—"Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one God."

This was a conception, however, of God who had formed and shaped a static and finished world, the kind of a world which was apparent to the eyes. Our earth was the center of the universe, the sun moved around this earth, and the creation took place and was finished at one time. Then came the second change. In the space of one lifetime, Copernicus and Galileo smashed that conception to pieces and there emerged an image of God who was the creator of a living universe, beyond the comprehension of the human mind in size, and still creative in its life. If we take that for granted today, and believe that it did not strike fear to the hearts of men, we need only remember that the church prevented Copernicus from publishing his truth while he lived, and it made Galileo publicly deny that he believed what he had found to be true. But the concept was changed, and now we live with more of the light of God upon our faces because of the search of Copernicus.

The third change has now come at this moment in our lives and we have received the concept of the god of atomic energy who created a universe whose texture is that of endless energy and productive power.

All of these changes struck fear into the hearts and minds of men because they seemed to push God, at each step, out of any relationship with human life. Men believed in personal and tribal gods because then each group had its close relationship with its own god, and so the idea of one universal God must have changed the personal contact with the god who cared for his own group into the strange relationship of a God who cared for all people and could hardly be expected to care for one. So it was with the change from the God who had made this earth the center of the universe, with the sun and moon and stars bowing down before it as the sheaves in Joseph's dream bowed down before his sheath; the Church feared such a picture for how could the inhabitants of an earth, that was just like the head of a pin in a universe of light-years, be of any meaning to God, or that God be of any meaning to them? No wonder, then, that on August 7 the hearts of men and women were struck with fear as they learned that they were standing on particles of atomic power which could blow them, and their earth, into oblivion by the design of maniacs. The long road from the simple, homely God who walked in the garden in the evening with His children to the almighty power of the god of the endless atomic universe had been trod, and we wondered if the haunting fear had become true and we were orphans in a godless world.

This fear is as groundless as were the fears of those who felt that if God were the God of the Philistines He could not remember the Hebrews. It is our concept of God that changes, not God Himself. The God who watched Abraham move out of Ur in the Chaldees was the God who formed the world of atomic energy no matter how dim the spiritual eyes of Abraham might have been. How much light the old myth of the Garden of Eden now sheds upon all our search. The old myth tells us that God made man to enjoy the fruits of Eden without consciousness of the process. Yet He had also placed the power of choice in man—the choice of living in perpetual happiness in Eden without knowledge, or living in the search for knowledge which would be the pathway of travail and of struggle. Man chose the way of the search, and from the beginning he has been upon that quest.

Once man starts upon that quest there is no turning back, and there is no stopping place even though it may seem for a moment that we have reached the Promised Land. The road to truth leads ever on, and will lead on to the end of human existence. The mercy of it is that nothing on the road ever changes God; God is the same yesterday, today, and forever; all that can change is our growing and fuller conception of His kingdom, His power, and His glory. Every adventure of the human mind and spirit which unfolds greater knowledge and comprehension of the universe before our eyes can only increase the extent of His kingdom, the measure of His power, and the majesty of His glory.

II

All such discovery, however, provides the possibilities for the good or evil use of that truth. We understand this so well when we consider the discoveries of fire, of electricity, and of flight. We think of those as part of the basic foundation of life in the modern world. We use fire to cook our food and warm our houses; electricity to light our streets and run our machines; flight to open a new era of transportation. But each of these can be, and has been, used to harm and destroy man, and each was used by the Fascist powers as the tools whereby they sought to conquer the world.

We have now reached the secret of the essential texture of the universe, which is the energy to be found in the atom, and we now know how to control and use the inconceivably great power of that discovery. Whether we shall use that power for good or for ill does not have any relation to the nature of God. There are people who are saying that they cannot believe in a God who would create power which may be used to destroy humanity, but that is as idle as to say we cannot believe in the God who created fire, because some men use it to burn down their neighbor's home. Our fundamental question at this moment does not concern the nature of God, because the

atomic bomb is more powerful than a popgun; our question, as is always true regarding our use of the ways of God, is whether we have achieved a mature sense of the moral order great enough to let us use such power with responsibility.

By this we are presented with our true question. Some people are asking, "Should we ever use the atomic bomb?" And others are saying that we should never use it, because the use of so much power is immoral. The question which is really before us is quite different. It is, Should we ever use power to enforce the moral sanctions of the community?

The question, to be reasonable and constructive, must rest here, because on any other basis we lose contact with the foundation of the moral order. If we say we cannot use the atomic bomb, because it is so powerful we place the moral meaning of an act upon the materialistic consideration of the amount of power, and say it is better to shoot a rifle, even a million times, than to drop a bomb. That is sheer materialism, not alone because we would measure an act merely by the weight of the power behind it, but also, because in the moral sense the basic consideration is always the intent and the motivation, and not the weapon. Upon a moral consideration there is no difference between the slingshot by which David killed Goliath, a rifle, or a bomb—and certainly no basic difference between a thousand block busters and an atomic bomb. Whenever we allow ourselves to slip off into such observations we have become willing to leave the moral and spiritual considerations and enter the material.

Our real question is not a material one but a moral one. "Is it ever right to enforce moral sanctions by force?" and, "Is there a moral difference between the use of force for violence and its use to maintain the moral sanctions?" The social life of our civilized communities has always answered these questions in the affirmative. Civilization is the process of finding an order of life in which there can be as great a measure of freedom as is compatible with the safety and well-being of the community. Those who break the rules of this community life are criminals, and the community may use power for the social and moral ends of community life which it prevents the criminal from using for unsocial ends. That is why the common law not only provides the police with power, but also declares that a man who kills another in self-defence, or to save an innocent life, is not a murderer, but that he who kills for wanton ends is a murderer.

The social conscience of mankind, motivated by the Christian imperative for 2,000 years, has based its order of life upon this moral, rather than material, consideration. Society does not state the absurd proposition that anyone who shoots a gun is a murderer, for that is sheer materialism. It states the profound and moral proposition that the motivating forces of an act determine whether an act is criminal or not, whether it is bad or good.

It is upon such a basis of social and religious considerations that we must make our decisions regarding the use of atomic energy. We cannot disassociate the bomb from that energy any more than we can disassociate electric current from controlling the plane that dropped the bomb. The only difference between the effects of an atomic bomb and the bombs of 500 B-29's is in the time it takes to do the work. What we ask is whether America used the power responsibly and for the ends of social betterment. America gave a warning as to its use; did not use it wantonly but with responsibility; and used it to end a war and save hundreds of thousands of lives of ourselves and our adversaries. It did cost life, just as the invasion of Normandy cost life, but it is a principle written into the spiritual life of the universe that by the stripes of one many are healed. There is a strange paradox and mystery about it all. We know that those who died at Normandy saved the free nations and brought peace. We know that all those who gave their lives, and those who fought, for America in the Pacific saved their country and brought peace to the world. Strangely enough, the Japanese who died at Hiroshima probably saved their country for they brought it to surrender, and that surrender brought peace to mankind. The ways of life are passing strange.

We know now that there is a difference between those who use power to start a war and those who use power to end a war and bring order. We also know that the conscience of mankind has declared that the nature of an act must be determined by the motivating forces of its purpose. We understand that power is good or bad, not because of its weight, but because of the meaning and significance of the purposes for which it is used. Such is our faith, but now it is not a mere theory whispered in an ivory tower. It is written in letters of fire across the skies of our times. Upon the earth there are the piles of ruin and rubble of those who defied the sanctions of the moral order and the conscience of mankind and used power for violence, destruction, and self-will. Also upon the good earth are the countries of the free, inviolate, and valiant, those whose men and women maintained the covenant of the civilized world with spiritual integrity, and used the power God placed in the world for the purposes of the mind and spirit; created, nurtured, and sustained by the onward march of humanity in its search for the promised land. The deeds of our day have confirmed the faith of our fathers.

Surrounding the glory of this day—this day of the dawn of the greatest measure of truth and power ever possessed by the mind and hand of man; the day of the triumph of the spirit of man in using such truth and power to overcome evil and establish order and peace—surrounding this day stands God as the Eternal One, the Lord God Almighty, maker of heaven and of earth, and still we sing with joy "O Thou who changest not, abide with me."

Continuing the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a telegram which I sent to Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, the Director of Selective Service.

Mr. Speaker, my mail is 10 to 1 against compulsory military training. The people are more concerned about getting their men and women out of the armed forces than they are of keeping them in. Any program which takes 1 year from the life of American men, when it is done by compulsion, is peacetime conscription of men for universal military training. One cannot help but wonder if this administration expects to keep the country war-minded by suggesting that another emergency is just around the corner.

No announcement has been made by the Army as to how large a force they need. I would call the attention of the House to the fact that more than 50,000 men are now enlisting voluntarily into some branch of the armed forces. The voluntary recruitment is just beginning. How much longer is it necessary to continue the draft? I have asked this question of General Hershey in the following telegram:

Gen. LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director, National Selective Service,
Washington, D. C.

I wrote you on October 17, requesting information about number of men you would ask for in your November and December quota. You have not replied. I trust you will take into consideration that the armed forces are now getting about 50,000 men a month by voluntary methods. Voluntary recruitment is just beginning. If sufficient men can be had by voluntary methods, why continue the draft?

A. L. MILLER,
Member of Congress,
Fourth District, Nebraska.

Rights of Real Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an article written by Westbrook Pegler which every red-blooded American ought to read.

The matter referred to follows:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

New York, Oct. 21.—Senator George Spelvin, American, was sitting in his office easing the feet on the desk after a hard day of fighting for the good old sacred heritage from Valley Forge, when his secretary, Eddie Which, came in and said there was a bunch of PAC's and Communists in the outside office wanting to chase him over some jumps.

Spelvin is not quite sure how he became a Senator but, you know how it is in a dream when you are finding nickels and dimes or mowing the lawn for no reason, and then all of a sudden he was Senator Spelvin, and this bunch filed into his office raising a big holler.

Spelvin got up and brushed the ashes off his vest and there, first in front of him, was Hillman. Beside Hillman was Mike Quill of the bus drivers and subway unions, and a lot of well-known red-hot Commies and a colored fellow who kept his hat on and spat on the floor.

"Senator," Hillman began, "on behalf of the foreign-born and other down-trodden minorities we demand that you state your position in regard to a number of——"

That touched Spelvin off.

"You demand, do you?" he roared. "Who do you think you are to be making demands? It is all I can do to understand the most of you without an interpreter and Hillman can't hardly speak United States and that Quill talks like he had a mouthful of mush and you have got the gall to walk in on a Member of the United States Senate and make demands.

"You are damn well tootin' I will state my position, and first off, my downtrodden colored friend, you spit on that floor again and I will rub your nose in it, because it is scum like you that are causing trouble between white and colored, and I don't want your

vote and I would be ashamed of myself if I ever got it, and the same goes for the whole PAC, and you can tell Mrs. Roosevelt I said so.

"I happen to have quite a few colored friends and they have the same opinion, so don't try to tell me that you came here to speak for 6,000,000 colored voters, because you only represent the very lowest riff-raff of your race and one week you are yelling because you want the DAR to let some jive piano player hit cross-handed blue licks in Constitution Hall and next week you want to put on a kootch on the altar of the cathedral, because it is tax-exempt and therefore a public institution.

"You may show your dirty Communist manners in Mrs. R.'s home, but I am a little particular, myself, and if you are telling me 'The Gab' is your great, sympathetic friend, why let me ask you how many colored people did you ever see working around the White House when she was there except porters and pot-wallopers, but I mean colored secretaries, and that goes for Hyde Park, too? And the answer is you never saw any.

"You want to know how I stand on minority rights and you couldn't have picked out a better man to ask than George Spelvin, American.

"My position is that minorities have no more rights than the native American and yet every week in New York we see that poor Tom Dewey traipsing down from Albany to stand in the reviewing coop with O'Dwyer and Goldstein and Wagner and LaGuardia for a parade of Croatians or Bessarabians or Latvians because they are minorities and he is afraid if he don't show up and waste a day's time from his job you are going to spread a stink that he is anti-Bessarabian, whereas my policy is America for Americans and Bessarabia means nothing to me.

"I am hoping for the day when it will be possible for a native American to get elected mayor of New York because this year the poor oppressed foreign-born minorities they have got two candidates in O'Dwyer and Goldstein and Wagner in the Senate and everybody in the campaign frankly says LaGuardia is an ideal man of the people for New York because he speaks 14 different languages, not counting the obscene, but you don't have to speak any foreign languages to talk American.

"My slogan is going to be equal rights for downtrodden native Americans and equal rights for anti-Communists, too, and, of course, that makes me a Fascist but I happen to know that there are several million Hoosiers and Jayhawkers and Buckeyes in New York and native Americans from Texas, Minnesota, Nebraska, California, and the Dakotas and all over and yet if we should get up a parade why the PAC would holler for the mayor not to give us a permit because we are un-American and the colored people in our parade would be called Fascist stooges and Uncle Toms and Aunt Jemimas just because they believe in the United States and good manners and equal rights for white people, too. And Dewey would hide in a hat closet so nobody would suspect him of friendship with us and O'Dwyer and Goldstein and Wagner and "The Belly" would call on the foreign-born to remain calm and show their wonderful Americanism by not throwing rocks and rotten eggs at the low-down un-American natives.

"So now get the hell out of here and don't forget anything I have said because it will make me a great guy with the native-born anti-Communist majority including colored, and next election they will probably elect me President.

"Eddie," Senator Spelvin called to Mr. Which, "for goodness sake let's open the windows and give the place some clean air."

Emergency Legislation

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have a compilation of Federal laws containing emergency clauses of one degree or another. This list contains 229 statutes, some of them to expire on the termination of the limited national emergency of September 8, 1939, some to expire on the termination of the unlimited national emergency proclaimed May 27, 1941, and others to expire after the cessation of hostilities plus 6 months, and so on.

The list is as follows:

TIME LIMITS FOR TEMPORARY PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LAW

(Not including provisions which expire on specific dates) [1]

PROVISIONS LIMITED TO THE PRESENT OR EXISTING EMERGENCY OR DURING THE EMERGENCY

Act of June 26, 1940 (54 Stat. 599, c. 430; Public, No. 667). Authority for employment of one-dollar-a-year men, with the approval of the President.

Act of October 8, 1940 (54 Stat. 999–1,000, c. 757, § 302; Public, No. 801). Amortization deduction authorized during the "emergency period," under I. R. C. 124 (d, 1; e, 2).

Act of July 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 498, c. 270, § 4; Public Law 147). Authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage expansion of production of nonbasic agricultural commodities through loans, etc.

Joint resolution of September 22, 1941 (55 Stat. 728, Public Law 252). Temporary appointments as officers of the Army of the United States authorized without appointing such persons as officers in any particular component of the Army.

Act of January 21, 1942 (56 Stat. 12, c. 14, § 6; Public Law 409). Authority of the National Housing Administrator under the Lanham Act, § 4, to adjust rents to the income of the person housed (amending act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1127, § 4), as amended by act of June 28, 1941 (55 Stat. 363, § 4 (b)).

Naval Appropriation Act of February 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 82, c. 46, § 301; Public Law 441). Authority of the President to permit the Secretary of the Navy to lease ships appropriated for in whole or in part in this act or to dispose of defense articles procured from funds appropriated by this act, to countries whose defense he deems vital to defense of the United States (up to $2,500,000,000).

Act of July 12, 1943 (57 Stat. 520, c. 222; Public Law 136). Purchase of butter substitutes for St. Elizabeths Hospital authorized.

Acts of June 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 308, c. 269; Public Law 347), and May 29, 1945 (59 Stat. 208, c. 130; Public Law 62). Appointment of enlisted men from Navy, Naval Reserve, and Marine Corps to Naval Academy after 9 months' service.

Acts of June 26, 1944 (58 Stat. 337, c. 277; Public Law 354), and June 13, 1945 (59 Stat. 241, c. 189; Public Law 85). Employment of certain additional clerks for Senators authorized.

Same (58 Stat. 345 and 59 Stat. 250). Appropriations for additional police protection for the Capitol buildings and grounds, etc.

Act of February 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 9, c. 15; Public Law 12). Amendment to AAA of 1938 and § 7–17 of Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to provide that during the present emergency certain farms are to be regarded as farms on which cotton, wheat or peanuts were grown.

Act of September 21, 1944 (58 Stat. 736, c. 412 § 207; Public Law 425). Expenditures up to $1,000,000 authorized for forest fire control without matching of funds.

PROVISIONS IN FORCE UNTIL 6 MONTHS AFTER THE TERMINATION OF THE PRESENT NATIONAL EMERGENCY

Act of September 22, 1941 (55 Stat. 728, c. 414). Temporary appointments of Army officers under this act are to continue until 6 months after present emergency.

Act of February 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 63, c. 46; Public Law 441). Involuntary retirement of Navy or Marine Corps officers adjudged fitted for service prohibited until 6 months after termination.

PROVISIONS LIMITED TO THE LIMITED EMERGENCY PROCLAIMED BY THE PRESIDENT ON SEPTEMBER 8, 1939.

Act of June 20, 1940 (54 Stat. 494, c. 400, § 3). Authority of the President to appoint an Under Secretary of the Navy to serve during any national emergency, including the present limited emergency.

Act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676–681). Various provisions of "Act to expedite national defense." (But § 12 of same act provides that it shall terminate on June 30, 1942.)

Act of September 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 884, c. 717 § 301, amended by act of October 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 1006 § 201 "Sec. 301"). Suspension of requirement that heads of executive departments and independent establishments submit to the Postmaster General quarterly reports relating to free mail matter transmitted (amending § 6 of act of May 6, 1939, 53 Stat. 683, as amended by § 2 of act of June 30, 1939, 53 Stat. 989; See also act of February 21, 1942, limited to emergency proclaimed October 27, 1941).

Act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1127 § 4), amended by acts of June 28, 1941 (55 Stat. 363 § 4 (a) "§ 301"; Public Law 137), April 10, 1942 (56 Stat. 212, c. 239 § 1), and June 23, 1945 (59 Stat. 260 c. 192; Public Law 87). Authority of Federal Works Administrator and National Housing Administrator under § 1, 202, 401, and 402 of the Lanham Act (defense housing).

Act of July 8, 1941 (55 Stat. 579, c. 278), extended by act of June 22, 1943 (57 Stat. 161, c. 137; Public Law 85). Authority of the Federal Communications Commission to suspend or modify requirement that cargo ships carry at least one qualified radio operator who shall have at least six months' previous service as operator on board ship (amending § 353 (b) of Communications Act added by act of May 20, 1937, 50 Stat. 193).

Act of July 11, 1941 (55 Stat. 585, c. 290 § 3). Authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to contract for Coast Guard vessels and aircraft.

Act of December 17, 1942 (56 Stat. 1052, c. 737; Public Law 806). Accumulation of unused leave by employees of departments, independent establishments and agencies until it totals 90 days; when unused leave equals 60 days, not more than 15 days a year may be accumulated (amending § 1 of act of March 14, 1936 (49 Stat. 1161).

TWO YEARS AFTER THE TERMINATION OF THE LIMITED EMERGENCY PROCLAIMED ON SEPTEMBER 8, 1939, AS TIME LIMIT

Act of July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 388, c. 196; Public Law 119 § 4). Disposal of temporary housing by National Housing Administrator.

[1] Permanent provisions of law applicable in time of emergency or during war, etc., are not covered by this report.

PROVISIONS LIMITED TO THE UNLIMITED EMERGENCY PROCLAIMED BY THE PRESIDENT ON MAY 27, 1941

National Housing Act amendment of March 28, 1941 (55 Stat. 56 "§ 603"), extended by act of March 31, 1945 (59 Stat. 47, c. 48; Public No. 27). Authority of the Federal Housing Administration to insure defense housing mortgages (until July 1, 1946 or during the emergency declared May 27, 1941).

Act of June 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 252, c. 210). Restrictions in act of May 22, 1918 on entry or departure from the United States during war made applicable during the national emergency proclaimed on May 27, 1941 (amending § 1 of act of May 22, 1918, 40 Stat. 559).

Joint resolution of July 29, 1941 (55 Stat. 606; Public Law 190). Suspension of section 24b of the National Defense Act of June 4, 1920, 41 Stat. 773 (which provides for annual classification of Army officers and retirement, etc., of officers in class B); for this period the Secretary of War is authorized to remove any officer from the active list of the Regular Army, under certain conditions.

Joint resolution of November 17, 1941 (55 Stat. 764, c. 473, § 2; Public Law 294). Authority of the President to permit arming of merchant vessels (repealing § 6 of Neutrality Act of November 4, 1939, 54 Stat. 7).

Defense Highway Act of November 19, 1941 (55 Stat. 765–770; Public Law 295), amended by act of July 2, 1942 (56 Stat. 562, c. 474; § 1 (d)). Appropriations authorized for "strategic network of highways", etc., subject to certain conditions. (See also act of July 13, 1943, for amendments expiring 1 year after unlimited emergency.)

Third supplemental national defense appropriation of December 17, 1941 (55 Stat. 822; Public Law 353). Availability of certain appropriations for road construction in accordance with the provisions of the Defense Highway Act of November 19, 1941, etc., under preceding act, §§ 6 and 8.

Act of December 23, 1941 (55 Stat. 855–857, c. 621; Public Law 371). Availability of appropriations of $300,000,000 for national defense housing, $150,000,000 for defense public works (community facilities), and $15,000,000 for relief and civilian defense in Alaska, Virgin Islands, and Puerto, etc.

Act of January 2, 1942 (55 Stat. 881, c. 646; Public Law 394). Authority to employ nationals of the United States upon public works in Hawaii.

Act of January 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 17–18, c. 17; Public Law 412). Tax-free transfer of spirits from registered distilleries for industrial uses authorized (adding § 2883 (c) to I. R. C.).

First Deficiency Appropriation Act of February 21, 1942 (56 Stat. 101, c. 108; Public Law 463). Suspension of Selective Service System quarterly reports to the Postmaster General relating to mail matter which has been transmitted free of postage (amending § 6 of act of May 6, 1939 (53 Stat. 683), as amended by § 2 of act of June 30, 1939 (53 Stat. 989).

Act of March 13, 1942 (56 Stat. 171, c. 180; Public Law 497). Suspension of duties on scrap iron, scrap steel, etc., under Tariff Act of June 17, 1930, as amended, and § 425 of I. R. C. (46 Stat. 590; 53 Stat. 415).

Act of March 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 187–188, c. 200; Public Law 508). Time limit for Internal Revenue Code, § 2883 (d–e), relating to transfer of spirits at registered distilleries (adding § 2883 (d–e) to I. R. C.).

Act of April 28, 1942 (56 Stat. 236, c. 247). Availability of $12,500,000 appropriation for emergency safeguarding of public buildings and property; authority granted to enter into contracts in amount of $25,400,000 for construction of access roads, etc., in accordance with § 6 of Defense Highway Act of 1941 (Public Law 295; 55 Stat. 766).

Act of July 2, 1942 (56 Stat. 634, c. 478; Public Law 650). Availability of war public works appropriation of $17,500,000.

Act of October 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 1000, c. 629). Special policemen for certain public buildings, etc.; availability of appropriation for war housing.

Act of December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1080, c. 812; Public Law 832). 12½% royalty obligation of oil or gas lessee who drills well resulting in discovery of new deposit on public domain.

Act of June 26, 1943 (57 Stat. 180, c. 145; Public Law 90). Availability fo $10,000,000 appropriation for strategic network of highways, etc., under Defense Highway Act of 1941, § 9.

Act of July 12, 1943 (57 Stat. 540, 541, c. 229; Public Law 140). Availability of appropriation of $50,000,000 for war public works (community facilities) and $100,000,000 for war housing.

Act of December 23, 1943 (57 Stat. 618, c. 380). Availability of appropriation of $50,000,000 for war housing.

First Deficiency Appropriation Act of April 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 153, c. 152; Public Law 279). Availability of $115,000,000 appropriation for war public works (community facilities) and of $7,500,000 for war housing.

Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 371, c. 286; Public Law 358). Availability of certain appropriations for strategic highway network, access roads and engineering surveys and plans.

Act of June 28, 1944 (58 Stat. 604, c. 304; Public Law 375). Availability of certain appropriations for war housing.

Act of December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 817, c. 609; Public Law 504). Suspension of duty on coconuts or coconut meat under § 758 of Tariff Act of 1930 (46 Stat. 636).

Act of April 25, 1945 (59 Stat. 80, 82, c. 95; Public Law 40). Appropriations of $20,000,000 for war public works (community facilities), and of $1,000,000 for war housing to remain available during unlimited emergency.

Act of May 3, 1945 (59 Stat. 117–118, c. 106; Public Law 49). Appropriations of $10,000,000 for strategic highways, $35,000,000 for access roads, and $3,000,000 for surveys, etc., to remain available during unlimited emergency.

PROVISIONS LIMITED TO 30 DAYS AFTER EMERGENCY PROCLAIMED ON MAY 27, 1941

Act of July 3, 1945 (59 Stat. 319, c. 262; Public Law 123). Interior Department appropriation for Division of Geography.

PROVISIONS IN FORCE UNTIL 6 MONTHS AFTER THE TERMINATION OF THE UNLIMITED EMERGENCY PROCLAIMED ON MAY 27, 1941

Act of November 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 779, c. 493; Public Law 314). Provisions that Chief of Chaplains is to hold the temporary rank and to receive the pay and allowances of brigadier general.

Act of December 23, 1941 (55 Stat. 856, c. 621). Funds for emergency supplies for Territories and possessions to remain available.

Act of June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 323, § 4; Public Law 586). Authority of Secretary of the Interior to lease or sell public lands for use in connection with manufacture of arms, etc.

Act of June 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 461–462, c. 455; Public Law 635). Free importation privilege for members of armed forces of United Nations, etc.

Act of September 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 760–761; Public Law 718). Authority of the War Department to move merchandise from transportation and storage facilities to other facilities when needed for military purposes.

Act of July 9, 1943 (57 Stat. 390, c. 209; Public Law 124). Period during which suspended newspapers or periodicals may resume publication without payment of second-class application fees.

PROVISIONS IN FORCE UNTIL 1 YEAR AFTER TERMINATION OF UNLIMITED EMERGENCY PROCLAIMED ON MAY 27, 1941

Act of July 30, 1941 (55 Stat. 612, c. 333; Public Law 197). Operation or maintenance of petroleum pipe lines constructed under authority of § 4 of act of July 30, 1941.

Act of July 13, 1943 (57 Stat. 560, 562, c. 236; Public Law 146, § 2, § 7). Availability of funds apportioned to States prior to January 1, 1942, for roads, etc., for obligations by the States; funds apportioned to States for emergency relief when roads damaged by floods, etc. (amending § 5 of Defense Highway Act of November 19, 1941 (55 Stat. 566, c. 474, § 5)).

PROVISIONS TO REMAIN IN FORCE UNTIL THE CESSATION OF HOSTILITIES

Selective Training and Service Act of September 16, 1940 (54 Stat. 897, c. 720, § 16 (b)), amended by act of May 9, 1945 (59 Stat. 166, c. 112, § 1; Public Law 54). Provisions of this act, except § 3 (c), 3 (d), 8 (g), and 12 are extended.

Act of July 11, 1941 (55 Stat. 583, c. 287), extended by act of May 15, 1945 (59 Stat. 168, c. 126; Public Law 58). Prohibition against prostitution, etc., within designated distances from military or naval camps, etc.

Act of April 28, 1942 (56 Stat. 246, § 403 (h)), extended by act of June 30, 1945 (59 Stat. 294, c. 210, § 1; Public Law 104). Termination date under Renegotiation Act to be December 31, 1945, or date of termination of hostilities.

Act of March 23, 1943 (57 Stat. 42, c. 20; Public Law 14). Shipments of manufactured tobacco, cigars, cigarettes, etc., to a territory of the United States for use of our military or naval forces without payment of certain tax (amending I. R. C. 2135 (a, 1); 53 Stat. 234).

Act of June 15, 1943 (57 Stat. 153–155, c. 126; Public Law 74). Provisions for training nurses (grants to institutions for training, etc.).

Act of December 17, 1943 (57 Stat. 601, c. 345; Public Law 200). Suspension of application of R. S. 3114 and 3115 (duty on equipments, etc., for vessels) until cessation of hostilities or December 17, 1945, whichever is earlier.

Revenue Act of February 25, 1944 (58 Stat. 44–46, c. 63, § 124, 93, § 802; Public Law 235). Termination of percentage depletion for certain minerals (amending § 114 (b, 4) and § 114 (b, 2) of Internal Revenue Code, 56 Stat. 840–841); time limit for making of war contracts to which repricing provisions are to apply (tax-year beginning on or after date of termination of hostilities).

Act of February 25, 1944 (58 Stat. 93, c. 63, § 802 (b)), amended by act of June 30, 1945 (59 Stat. 295, c. 210, § 2; Public Law 104). Time limit for repricing of war contracts to be December 31, 1945, or until termination of hostilities.

Act of September 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 745–746, c. 416; Public Law 429). Authority of the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain materials on public lands.

Act of June 30, 1945 (59 Stat. 289, c. 212; Public Law 106, § 302). Requirement that President declare holiday not a workday in Federal service, as a prerequisite to receipt of time-and-one-half pay for holiday duty by Federal employees.

Same (§ 607 (f)). Exemption of certain employees of War and Navy Departments and the War Shipping Administration from certain restriction on number of employees.

PROVISION TO REMAIN IN FORCE UNTIL 30 DAYS AFTER CESSATION OF HOSTILITIES WITH JAPAN

Act of July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 459, c. 274; Public Law 134, § 20). Compensatory time, etc., for Saturday service, for certain postmasters, postal service employees, etc.

PROVISIONS IN FORCE UNTIL 60 DAYS AFTER CESSATION OF HOSTILITIES

Acts of July 12, 1943 (57 Stat. 520, c. 221, § 803; Public Law 135), June 28, 1944 (58 Stat. 572, c. 302, § 803; Public Law 373), and July 3, 1945 (59 Stat. 383, c. 263, § 803; Public Law 124). Obligation of appropriations for training of defense workers in Labor-Security Appropriation Acts.

Acts of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 362, 364, c. 286; Public Law 358), and May 3, 1945 (59 Stat. 107, 109, 110, 112, c. 106; Public Law 49). Availability of certain appropriations for national defense activities.

PROVISIONS IN FORCE UNTIL JUNE 30 OR JULY 1 AFTER CESSATION OF HOSTILITIES

Act of May 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 271, c. 294), extended by act of May 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 74, c. 91; Public Law 47). Suspension of requirement under R. S. 2324 that $100 worth of labor be performed, etc., on each mining claim.

PROVISIONS IN FORCE UNTIL 3 MONTHS AFTER TERMINATION OF HOSTILITIES

Act of March 23, 1943 (57 Stat. 41–42, c. 17; Public Law 13). Time limit for renewal of expiring 5-year-level-premium term policies for persons in active military or naval service outside continental United States, by beneficiary or agent or automatically (amendment to § 301 of World War Veterans Act as amended, 47 Stat. 334).

Act of July 3, 1945 (59 Stat. 381, c. 263; Public Law 124). Provision that Employment Service facilities are to be returned to the States within 3 months after termination of hostilities in war with Japan.

PROVISIONS IN FORCE UNTIL 6 MONTHS AFTER TERMINATION OF HOSTILITIES

Act of December 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 1041, c. 680; Public Law 790). Provision for free entry of bona fide gifts from members of armed forces of the United States on duty abroad.

Act of April 13, 1943 (57 Stat. 65, c. 62; Public Law 37). Provision that subscriptions to certain United States securities be excluded from bank deposits for certain purposes (adding proviso to Federal Reserve Act 12B (h) paragraph 1, 2d sentence and to last sentence of § 19).

Act of May 29, 1943 (57 Stat. 92, c. 107; Public Law 62). Deferment or waiver of payments under Alaska public land leases.

War Labor Disputes Act of June 25, 1943 (57 Stat. 163–168, c. 144; Public Law 89). Authority of the President to operate plants, mines, etc., taken over under this act; extension of powers of National War Labor Board, etc. (adding § 9 to Selective Service Act, etc.).

Act of July 9, 1943 (57 Stat. 391, c. 212; Public Law 127). Penalty for violation of certain regulations or orders promulgated by the Secretary of the Navy for protection of vessels, water-front facilities, etc.

Act of July 12, 1943 (57 Stat. 520, c. 223 § 1; Public Law 137). Time limit for leases of silver held or owned by the United States.

Act of July 16, 1943 (57 Stat. 567–568, c. 242; Public Law 152 § 5). Time limit for use of certain funds for water-conservation and utilization projects under certain conditions; employment of prisoners of war, etc. (adding § 4 (d) to act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418; 54 Stat. 1122).

Act of December 20, 1943 (57 Stat. 605, c. 371; Public Law 208), extended by act of June 7, 1945 (59 Stat. 233, c. 176; Public Law 77). Time limit for prosecutions in connection with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe.

Act of February 29, 1944 (58 Stat. 107, c. 72; Public Law 241). Existence of office of additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Act of June 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 324, c. 271; Public Law 349). Suspension of certain requirements relating to work on tunnel sites under R. S. 2323.

Act of August 21, 1944 (58 Stat. 728, c. 404 § 2 ("§ 25"); Public Law 418). Time limit for sections 22 and 23 (and indirectly § 24) of the Hatch Act to prevent pernicious political activities.

Act of December 15, 1944 (58 Stat. 806–807, c. 589; Public Law 486). Authorized use of District of Columbia motor vehicle operator's permit which may have expired, by members of the armed forces, etc. (adding § 7 (a) to act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1121)).

Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 913, c. 675; Public Law 542). Authority of the committee, composed of the Postmaster General and the Director of Censorship, to dispose of certain condemned mail matter.

PROVISIONS TO REMAIN IN FORCE UNTIL THE FIRST DAY OF FIRST MONTH AFTER SIX MONTHS AFTER TERMINATION OF HOSTILITIES

Revenue Act of February 25, 1944 (58 Stat. 61–63, c. 63 § 302, 64 § 304, 66 § 307 (b, 5; c), 68 § 309 (b), 69–70 § 401–403, 405, 409–410; Public Law 235). Time limit for war taxes and war tax rates; suspension of manufacturers' excise tax on luggage; tax exemption of certain War Shipping Administration transportation; power of the Secretary of the Treasury to authorize certain tax exemptions; drawback on distilled spirits used in manufacture of certain nonbeverage products; increase in postal rates, fees and charges.

Act of September 17, 1944 (58 Stat. 733, c. 411 § 5; Public Law 424). Provision for increased rates for registered mail receipts. (Amending § 407 of Revenue Act of February 25, 1944, 58 Stat. 70).

PROVISION TO REMAIN IN FORCE UNTIL JUNE 30TH NEXT FOLLOWING THE FIRST DAY OF FIRST MONTH AFTER SIX MONTHS AFTER TERMINATION OF HOSTILITIES

Revenue Act of February 25, 1944 (58 Stat. 63, c. 63 § 302 (b, 2); Public Law 235). Increase in billiard and pool tables and bowling alleys tax.

PROVISION TO REMAIN IN FORCE UNTIL 7TH MONTH AFTER TERMINATION OF HOSTILITIES

Acts of April 29, 1943 (57 Stat. 72, c. 82; Public Law 45 § 5 (f) and February 14, 1944 (58 Stat. 15, c. 16 § 5 (f); Public Law 229), amended by act of April 25, 1945 (59 Stat. 80, c. 95; Public Law 40). Exclusion of income from agricultural labor, and nursing, in considering State payments of old-age assistance.

PROVISIONS LIMITED TO ONE YEAR AFTER CESSATION OF HOSTILITIES

Act of February 26, 1944 (58 Stat. 104, c. 65, § 19; Public Law 237). Provisions of act implementing the Provisional Fur Seal Agreement of 1942.

Act of February 13, 1945 (59 Stat. 3–4, c. 1; Public Law 1). Total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps is limited to 24,000 until one year after (amending § 22 (a) of act of March 4, 1925, 43 Stat. 1276).

PROVISIONS LIMITED TO TWO YEARS AFTER CESSATION OF HOSTILITIES

Act of December 8, 1944 (58 Stat. 798, c. 547; Public Law 472). Authorization for two additional Assistant Secretaries of State.

PROVISIONS LIMITED TO TWO YEARS AFTER JANUARY 1ST AFTER TERMINATION OF HOSTILITIES

Act of February 16, 1938 (52 Stat. 67, c. 381 (c)), amended by act of April 12, 1945 (59 Stat. 50, c. 54, § 2; Public Law 30). Suspension of provisions of § 381 (c) of A. A. A. of 1938, restricting sale of cotton by C. C. C.; restrictions on sales of farm commodities below parity, by C. C. C.

Act of July 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 498, § 4 (a)), amended by act of October 2, 1942 (56 Stat. 768, c. 578, § 9). Authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to use certain funds so as to support a price for producers of certain agricultural commodities, at not less than 90% of parity.

Act of October 2, 1942 (56 Stat. 767–768, c. 578, § 8). Authority for loans on certain agricultural commodities by Commodity Credit Corporation.

PROVISIONS TO REMAIN IN FORCE UNTIL 3 YEARS AFTER THE TERMINATION OF HOSTILITIES

Act of August 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 747–748, c. 555), extended by act of October 3, 1944 (58 Stat. 781, c. 479, § 28; Public Law 457). Suspension of the running of statutes of limitation applicable to certain offenses.

Surplus Property Act of October 3, 1944 (58 Stat. 784, c. 479, § 38; Public Law 457). Time limit for provisions of Surplus War Property Disposal Act.

TIME LIMIT OF 5 YEARS AFTER TERMINATION OF HOSTILITIES

Contract Settlement Act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 667, c. 358, § 19 (a); Public Law 395). Time limit for prohibition against destruction of certain records concerning war contracts.

TIME LIMIT OF DECEMBER 31 OF FIFTH FULL YEAR AFTER CESSATION OF HOSTILITIES (OR DECEMBER 31, 1950)

Act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1198, c. 418, § 17), extended by act of April 24, 1945 (59 Stat. 76, c. 94, § 3; Public Law 39). Extension of time for payment of reclamation charges by certain water users.

PROVISIONS LIMITED TO THE PRESENT WAR

Act of June 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 275, c. 313). Active-duty pay for retired naval officers only during war or national emergency.

Act of July 1, 1940 (54 Stat. 710–711, c. 501), amended by act of August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 657, c. 391), and extended by act of June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 370, c. 415; Public Law 609). Authority of the Commissioner of Patents to order that certain inventions be kept secret, etc.

Act of December 17, 1941 (55 Stat. 808, c. 588), extended by act of June 13, 1945 (59 Stat. 259, c. 190; Public Law 86). Prohibition against employment of radio operators aboard any vessel if the Secretary of the Navy has disapproved such employment.

First War Powers Act of December 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 840, § 303). Authority of the President to have communications between United States and foreign countries censored.

Act of February 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 94, c. 77; Public Law 455). Authorization for temporary promotions of officers assigned to duty with the Air Corps and of officers commissioned in the Air Corps.

Act of March 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 182, § 1001 "§ 702"). Provision for naturalization of persons entitled to naturalization under § 701 of Nationality Code and serving in military or naval forces, without appearing in naturalization court (adding sections 701–705 to Nationality Code).

Second War Powers Act of March 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 185–186, c. 199, §§ 1301–1304). Authority of governmental officer or agency, designated by the President or the Chairman of the War Production Board, to inspect and audit books of war contractors (amending § 10 (e) of act of July 2, 1926 (44 Stat. 787).

Act of April 11, 1942 (56 Stat. 217, c. 241; Public Law 524). Decorations authorized for outstanding conduct or service by persons serving in the American merchant marine during the war.

Act of June 25, 1942 (56 Stat. 390–391, c. 447; Public Law 627). Prohibition against photographing, etc., of military or naval reservations, naval vessels, etc., without authority.

Act of June 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 461, c. 453; Public Law 633). Free importation of personal and household effects of person in service of United States, or his family and persons evacuated under Government orders, until proclamation of peace.

Act of October 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 763, c. 573; Public Law 724). Authority of the President to reduce course of instruction at United States Military Academy to 3 years.

Act of October 21, 1942 (56 Stat. 814, c. 619, § 119; Public Law 753). Involuntary liquidation and replacement of inventories

authorized for taxable years prior to termination of present war, under I. R. C. 22 (d, 6, A).

Same (p. 852, § 156). War losses limited to those "in the course of military or naval operations by the United States or any other country engaged in the present war," under I. R. C. § 127.

Act of October 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 1012, c. 632; Public Law 766). Provision for scholarships for meteorological students, under Secretary of Commerce.

Act of December 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 1024–1025, c. 651; Public Law 779). Authority of the Secretary of War, of Navy, and Chairman of Maritime Commission to provide transportation to persons employed in plants engaged in manufacture of war material, etc.

Act of December 2, 1942 (56 Stat. 1028–1036, c. 668). Provision for benefits for injury, disability, death, or detention of employees of contractors, etc., injured as a result of war-risk hazard arising prior to end of present war (p. 1033, § 201 (b)).

Act of December 17, 1942 (56 Stat. 1053–1054, c. 739; Public Law 808). Authority of the Secretary of the Navy, when it is impossible to make contracts, etc., for items for prosecution of the war, to provide facilities and provide for their operation, etc.

Act of February 19, 1943 (57 Stat. 4, c. 1, § 4; Public Law 1). Authority for lease of ships, boats, barges or floating drydocks of the Navy in accordance with Lease-Lend Act of March 11, 1941 (55 Stat. 31).

Current Tax Payment Act of June 9, 1943 (57 Stat. 149–150, c. 120, §§ 7, 8; Public Law 68). Provisions for $1,500 additional allowance for military or naval personnel under income tax and abatement of tax for members of armed forces upon death (amending I. R. C. 22 (b. 13), 56 Stat. 814, § 117, and adding I. R. C. § 421).

Act of June 19, 1943 (57 Stat. 159, c. 132; Public Law 80). Provisions for participation by United States in Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense and authorization of appropriation therefore (for the period of the war emergency or so long as the American Republics may deem the continuation of its activities to be essential to the welfare of the hemisphere).

Act of July 13, 1943 (57 Stat. 561, c. 236; Public Law 146, sec. 6). Reimbursement of States for rehabilitation of roads damaged by the military forces, etc., in connection with the war and national defense (amending § 10 of Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 768).

Act of November 22, 1943 (57 Stat. 590, c. 301; Public Law 187). Authority of the Administrator of the Veterans' Affairs to issue flag used at funeral of person who dies in military or naval service, to nearest relative, etc.

Act of June 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 310, c. 269; Public Law 347). Employment of Naval Procurement Fund.

Public Health Service Act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 712, c. 373, § 604; Public Law 410). Appropriations are authorized for certain emergency health and sanitation activities during the present war and any period of demobilization after the war.

Surplus Property Act of October 3, 1944 (58 Stat. 768, c. 479, § 6; Public Law 457). Until peace is declared the needs of the armed forces are declared to be paramount.

Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 886, c. 661; Public Law 530). Temporary rank of rear admiral for officer designated as Chief of Chaplains in Chaplain Corps of the Navy.

Until after termination of war (Time to be determined by Administrative Committee of the Federal Register.) Act of December 10, 1942 (56 Stat. 1045, c. 717). Suspension of certain requirements concerning the Code of Federal Regulations. (Amending § (a) of the Federal Register Act, as amended, 50 Stat. 304.)

PROVISIONS IN FORCE UNTIL JUNE 30 OR JULY 1 AFTER TERMINATION OF WAR

Act of June 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 463–465, c. 462, § 1–3, 5–6, 8–9; Public Law 639. Suspension of certain provisions of law relating to officer personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps; increase in number of rear admirals; modification of age limit for staff corps officers; provisions for retirement in temporary rank, etc.

Act of May 25, 1943 (57 Stat. 84–85, c. 101; Public Law 57). Provision authorizing eligibility of commissioned warrant officers and warrant officers to commissioned rank in Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard (extending provisions in act of June 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 423, § 2).

PROVISION IN FORCE UNTIL 16TH DAY OF 3D MONTH AFTER TERMINATION OF WAR

Act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 146–147, c. 166, § 13; Public Law 490). Postponement of income tax return or payment for a person in military or naval forces, or civilian officer or employee in certain cases.

PROVISION IN FORCE UNTIL 3 MONTHS AND 15 DAYS AFTER THE WAR, ETC.

Revenue Act of October 21, 1942 (56 Stat. 962 "§ 3804 (c)"). Wartime postponement of certain internal revenue tax provisions (adding § 3804 to I. R. C.).

PRIVISIONS IN FORCE UNTIL 6 MONTHS AFTER TERMINATION OF THE WAR

Act of March 5, 1940 (54 Stat. 45–46, c. 44), extended by act of June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 316, c. 340, § 9). Provisions to facilitate procurement of aircraft for national defense; multiple awards authorized.

Act of May 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 216–217, c. 201; Public Res. 74), extended by act of June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 370, c. 416). Suspension of restrictions on use of Maritime Commission's laid-up vessels, in § 510 (g) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (53 Stat. 1185); authority to sell or charter certain vessels.

Act of June 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 306, c. 327; Public Res. 82), extended by act of June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 370, c. 416). Provisions for determination of foreign construction costs under § 502 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 (52 Stat. 956, c. 600, § 10, amended by 53 Stat. 1183, c. 417, § 6).

Act of June 29, 1940 (54 Stat. 689–691, c. 447 "§ 221–228"), extended by act of April 11, 1942 (56 Stat. 214–217, c. 240; Public Law 523). Provisions for marine insurance and reinsurance under Subtitle—Insurance of Title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (added by act of 1940).

Act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 712–713, c. 508), § 1 (a) and 1 (b), extended by act of June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 317, c. 340 § 13). Authority of the Secretary of War to provide for installations for manufacture of military equipment, at military posts, plants, etc. (including privately owned plants), and for storage and shelter, to exchange surplus equipment, etc., without certain restrictions, and to operate or dispose of plants, etc.

Act of October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1092, c. 838; Public, No. 831), extended by act of June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 371, c. 416). Suspension of 8-hour day on U. S. Maritime Commission contracts; authority to modify existing contracts for construction, etc., of vessels.

Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1178–1191, c. 888; Public, No. 861). Suspension of enforcement of certain civil liabilities of persons in the Military or Naval Establishments and the Coast Guard, until six months after treaty of peace.

Act of November 29, 1940 (54 Stat. 1219, c. 923), extended by act of May 15, 1945 (59 Stat. 168, c. 127; Public Law 59). Authority of the Secretary of War to dispense with any part of examination for promotion in Regular Army of officers of Medical, Dental, and Veterinary Corps, except those relating to physical examination.

Act of December 16, 1940 (54 Stat. 1224, c. 931), extended by act of December 15, 1944 (58 Stat. 807, c. 591; Public Law 488). Authority of the President to appoint (with the consent of the Senate) an Under Secretary of War, and amendment to National Defense Act, § 5a.

Act of May 2, 1941 (55 Stat. 148–150, c. 84; Public Law 46), extended by act of June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 371, c. 416). Emergency provisions for certain activities of the U. S. Maritime Commission.

Act of June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 238, c. 162), extended by act of June 26, 1943 (57 Stat. 219, c. 149; Public Law 93). President's authority to reduce the course of instruction at the Naval Academy to three years.

Act of June 6, 1941 (55 Stat. 242–245, c. 174; Public Law 101), extended by act of June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 371, c. 416). Authority of the President to purchase, requisition, etc., foreign merchant vessels lying idle in waters under jurisdiction of the United States and of the U. S. Maritime Commission to charter foreign vessels and to recharter, insure, purchase, etc., same.

Act of July 14, 1941 (55 Stat. 591–592, c. 297; Public Law 173), extended by act of June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 371, c. 416). Authority of the President to authorize the issuance of warrants for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels.

First War Powers Act of December 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 838–841; Public Law 354). Authority of the President to coordinate executive bureaus and agencies and to authorize the making or alteration of contracts in certain cases.

Act of December 20, 1941 (55 Stat. 846, c. 602; Public Law 360 § 8). Service of inductees assigned to Navy, Marine Corps or Coast Guard (extended by E. O. 9513).

Act of January 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 19–20, c. 21; Public Law 416), extended by act of August 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 735–736, c. 544; Public Law 695). Permission for vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on Great Lakes.

Act of February 6, 1942 (56 Stat. 50, c. 40; Public Law 435), extended by act of March 6, 1949 (57 Stat. 14, c. 13; Public Law 7). Provision for detail of personnel of all component parts of the Army of the United States as students at educational institutions, industrial plants, etc.

Act of February 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 94, c. 77; Public Law 455). Appointments of Army officers assigned to Air Corps duty to higher grades, under this act, are to continue until 6 months after the war.

Act of February 21, 1942 (56 Stat. 97, c. 107; Public Law 462). Availability of appropriations for expenses of travel of civilian officers and employees of the War and Navy Departments and the Coast Guard for expenses on transfer of station also.

Act of April 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 265, c. 266; Public Law 535). Authorization for maximum flying hours of air pilots (100 hours a month) with certain exceptions (amending paragraph (1) of § 401 (l) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 990)).

Act of June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 314–317, c. 340; Public Law 580). Authority of the Secretary of War to provide entertainment and instruction to enlisted men; to employ internes in Medical Department; suspension of limits to strength of any branch of the Army, the number of aviation cadets in Army Air Corps, assistant superintendents in Army Nurse Corps, number and grade of reserve officers ordered to extended active duty and number of officers of Army required to participate in aerial flights; certain powers of the Secretary of War concerning civilian employees, removal of dependents and household effects of civilians and military personnel; lease of Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration vessels for Army transportation; construction at military posts; maximum fee of 6 percent for

fixed fee contracts for construction at military posts; operation of one railroad and lease of land; suspension of limitations on number of airplanes, etc.

Act of June 10, 1942 (56 Stat. 351, c. 403; Public Law 602). Authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to inspect meat-packing establishments engaged only in intrastate commerce.

Act of June 11, 1942 (56 Stat. 357, c. 404 § 12; Public Law 603). Suspension of prosecutions under anti-trust laws or Federal Trade Commission Act, on request of Chairman of War Production Board.

Act of June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 364, c. 413 § 10; Public Law 607). Suspension of § 2 of act of August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 629, c. 364 § 2), providing for an additional enlistment allowance for reenlistment within 24 hours after discharge from Navy, Marine Corps or Coast Guard.

Act of June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 370–371, c. 416; Public Law 610). (See above 54 Stat. 216–217, 306, 1092. 55 Stat. 148–150, 242–245, 591–592.)

Act of July 2, 1942 (56 Stat. 548, c. 473; Public Law 645), as amended by act of October 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 1003, c. 629; Public Law 763). Appointment of skilled and unskilled laborers, mechanics, etc., without regard to Classification Act, by Secretary of Interior, etc.

Military Appropriation Acts of July 2, 1942 (56 Stat. 612, c. 477; Public Low 649), June 28, 1944 (58 Stat. 575, c. 303; Public Law 374) and July 3, 1945 (59 Stat. 386, c. 265; Public Law 126). Inclusion of flight surgeons and commissioned officers or warrant officers while undergoing flying training, among flying officers.

Act of July 8, 1942 (56 Stat. 649, c. 493 § 2, 3; Public Law 658). Suspension of § 3 of Army Aviation Cadet Act (55 Stat. 239) and provision for enlistments as aviation cadets and for appointments of enlisted men as aviation cadets and temporary appointments as flight officers from certain enlisted men, by the Secretary of War.

Act of July 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 730–731, c. 538; Public Law 689). Authority for appointments and enlistments in Women's Reserve as branch of Naval Reserve (WAVES).

Act of October 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 762, c. 570; Public Law 721), amended and superseded by act of June 26, 1944 (58 Stat. 359–360, c. 279; Public Law 356). Authorization for organization of State, etc., military forces other than a National Guard, and for Secretary of War to issue arms, etc., to same. (Amendment to § 61 of National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended by 55 Stat. 628, c. 363.)

Act of October 10, 1942 (56 Stat. 780–781, c. 588; Public Law 739). Suspension of provisions of act of March 2, 1933 (47 Stat. 1423), prescribing Navy ration in kind.

Act of October 14, 1942 (56 Stat. 786, c. 603; Public Law 745). Authorization for transportation of dependents and household effects of Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Coast and Geodetic Survey personnel under secret orders, etc.

Act of October 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 987, c. 624; Public Law 758). Provision for use of certificates by officers of the armed forces in connection with pay and allowance accounts.

Act of October 31, 1942 (56 Stat. 1013–1015, c. 634; Public Law 768). Provision for adjustment of royalties for use of inventions for the benefit of the United States in aid of prosecution of the war.

Act of November 23, 1942 (56 Stat. 1020–1021, c. 639; Public Law 773). Authority for appointments and enlistments in the Women's Reserve as branch of Coast Guard Reserve.

Act of December 4, 1942 (56 Stat. 1039–1040, c. 675; Public Law 788). Provision for uniform allowance of $250 for certain officers and warrant officers serving on active duty in the Army.

Act of December 17, 1942 (56 Stat. 1056, c. 763; Public Law 811). Authority of the President to confer military decorations and medals upon units of persons serving in military forces of countries engaged with the United States in present war.

Act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1070–1071, c. 801; Public Law 824). Authorization for reemployment of persons retired under Alaska Railroad Retirement Act.

Act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1071, c. 803; Public Law 826). Authorization for payment for use of certain wharves of Territory of Hawaii by United States.

Act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1072–1074, c. 805; Public Law 828). Provisions for increase in pay of members of Army and Navy Nurse Corps and appointment of female dietetic and physical therapy personnel in Army Medical Department, rank, pay, and allowances of certain Nurse Corps members and appointment of technical and professional female personnel in Army Medical Department by the President, etc.

Act of December 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 1096, c. 836; Public Law 850). Modification of certain sections of the Communications Act of 1934 to insure protection of vessels in wartime, under regulations by the Secretary of the Navy and military and naval authorities (adding § 606 (h)).

Act of March 18, 1943 (57 Stat. 25, c. 17; Public Law 11). Provisions for lease of certain merchant vessels under the Lease-Lend Act.

Act of March 24, 1943 (57 Stat. 45–51, c. 26, § 1, 5; Public Law 17). Provisions relating to officers and crews of vessels under control of War Shipping Administration (during continuance of the First War Powers Act, Title 1).

Act of April 9, 1943 (57 Stat. 61, c. 40; Public Law 28). Provision for payment of transportation costs for naval civilian employees to place of duty outside continental United States, etc.

Act of April 16, 1943 (57 Stat. 65, c. 63; Public Law 38). Inclusion of female physicians and surgeons in Army of the United States and the Naval Reserve.

Act of June 17, 1943 (57 Stat. 158, c. 130; Public Law 78 "(h)"). Extension of time within which deposits in ship construction reserve funds shall be extended (amending § 511 (h) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, 54 Stat. 1107).

Act of July 1, 1943 (57 Stat. 371–372, c. 187; Public Law 110). Existence of Women's Army Corps, as component part of the Army of the United States.

Act of July 8, 1943 (57 Stat. 390, c. 200; Public Law 123). Permission for Washington Terminal Company to park passenger motor vehicles in Capitol grounds.

Act of July 9, 1943 (57 Stat. 391–392, c. 213; Public Law 128). Provision for detail of postal employees to camps, etc., by Postmaster General, and $2.50 a day allowance while so detailed.

Act of October 25, 1943 (57 Stat. 575, c. 276; Public Law 170). Authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to utilize Veterans' Administration automotive equipment to transport employees between field stations and public transportation.

Act of November 28, 1943 (57 Stat. 593–594, c. 330; Public Law 193). Provisions for transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

Act of February 26, 1944 (58 Stat. 105, c. 66; Public Law 238). Provision that members of Navy Nurse Corps be designated by certain ranks.

First Deficiency Appropriation Act of April 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 157, c. 152; Public Law 279). Time limit for expenditure of funds for a certain temporary weir in the Colorado River.

Servicemen's Readjustment Act of June 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 285, c. 268, § 102; Public Law 346). Time limit for detail of personnel from the armed forces to the Veterans' Administration.

Act of June 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 324–326, c. 272; Public Law 350). Provision for temporary appointment of certain members of the Army Nurse Corps, etc., as officers in the Army of the United States.

Act of June 26, 1944 (58 Stat. 359–360, c. 279; Public Law 356). *See above,* 56 Stat. 762, c. 570.

Act of June 28, 1944 (58 Stat. 393, c. 291; Public Law 362). Authority of the President to appoint Chief of Chaplains to temporary rank of major general, and chaplains as temporary general officers.

Act of June 28, 1944 (58 Stat. 395, c. 293, § 5; Public Law 364). Exemption of War and Navy Departments from certain requirements concerning use of penalty-mail envelopes, etc.

Act of June 28, 1944 (58 Stat. 463, c. 297; Public Law 368). Suspension of restrictions on establishing post-office branches and stations (under act of June 9, 1896 (29 Stat. 313)).

Acts of June 28, 1944 (58 Stat. 606, c. 304; Public Law 375) and May 21, 1945 (59 Stat. 189, c. 129; Public Law 61). Provision for crediting of certain receipts to appropriation for "Maintenance and operation of air-navigation facilities."

Act of June 28, 1944 (58 Stat. 624, c. 306; Public Law 377). Availability of appropriations for management and operation of naval plantations, etc., outside continental United States.

Act of June 30, 1944 (58 Stat. 648, c. 335; Public Law 393). Provision for additional pay for certain enlisted men assigned to the Infantry.

Public Health Service Act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 714, c. 373, § 609, 610 (c); Public Law 410). Provision for appointment of osteopaths as Reserve Corps officers in the Public Health Service; provision that seamen employed on foreign-flag vessels owned or operated by citizens of United States, etc., be entitle to certain benefits for seeamen on vessels of the United States.

Act of December 2, 1944 (58 Stat. 793, c. 505; Public Law 460). Postponement of retirement at age of 64, in case of Regular Army officers who have served as Chief of Staff in present war.

Act of December 14, 1944 (58 Stat. 802–803, c. 580; Public Law 482). Authorization for grades of fleet admiral of the Navy and general of the Army.

Act of December 23, 1944 (58 Stat. 921–922, c. 716; Public Law 554). Authority of disbursing officers to cash checks, etc.

Act of March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 12, c. 19, § 2; Public Law 14). Rivers and harbors projects for national defense only, to be appropriated for or constructed until 6 months after war.

Act of March 21, 1945 (59 Stat. 36–37, c. 29; Public Law 19). Authority for grade and rank of general on the active list of the Regular Marine Corps.

Act of March 21, 1945 (59 Stat. 37, c. 30; Public Law 20). Authority for grade and rank of admiral on the active list of the Regular Coast Guard.

Act of March 24, 1945 (59 Stat. 38, c. 36; Public Law 21). Amendment to § 1426 (i) of the Internal Revenue Code to the effect that the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration and the U. S. Maritime Commission are to make payments of tax imposed under § 1410 without regard to the $3,000 limitation in § 1426 (a, 1), etc.

Act of May 15, 1945 (59 Stat. 168, c. 124; Public Law 57). Authority of the President, without the consent of Congress, to appoint certain members of the Army of the United States to higher temporary grades.

Act of May 21, 1945 (59 Stat. 171, 175, c. 129; Public Law 61). Assignment of former

ambassadors, ministers, or employees in Foreign Service to serve in certain other capacities.

Act of May 29, 1945 (59 Stat. 226, c. 137; Public Law 69). Suspension of restriction on employment of naval officers on shore duty under act of March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 481, c. 97, § 2).

Act of July 3, 1945 (59 Stat. 375, c. 263; Public Law 124). Time limit for appropriation for temporary aid to enemy aliens and other restricted persons.

Act of July 5, 1945 (59 Stat. 412, c. 270; Public Law 131). Time limit for appointment of certain retired officers as superintendent of Gallinger Municipal Hospital and detail of commissioned officer or Public Health Service to act as superintendent of same.

Act of July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 462, c. 279; Public Law 137). Additional compensation for enlisted men of Army who are entitled to wear Medical Badge.

Act of July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 463, c. 280; Public Law 138). Authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to procure space by lease, purchase, or construction of buildings, etc.

Act of October 6, 1945 (59 Stat. —, c. 393 § 3 (a) "§ 1"; Public Law 190). Time limit for service of certain persons under 21 years old who have enlisted under act of June 1, 1945, as amended, without parent's or guardian's consent.

PROVISION TO REMAIN IN FORCE UNTIL SIX MONTHS AND 15 DAYS AFTER WAR

Revenue Act of October 21, 1942 (56 Stat. 963–964 "§ 3805"). Wartime postponement of China Trade Corporation taxes (adding § 3805 to the Internal Revenue Code).

PROVISION TO REMAIN IN FORCE UNTIL SIX MONTHS AFTER JUNE 30TH OF FISCAL YEAR FOLLOWING YEAR IN WHICH PRESENT WAR ENDS

Act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603, c. 320 § 1), as amended by act of June 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 465, c. 462 § 7), extended by an act of June 29, 1945 (59 Stat. 262, c. 194; Public Law 89). Provision for temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of Navy or Marine Corps.

PROVISIONS LIMITED TO ONE YEAR AFTER TERMINATION OF THE WAR

Act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143–148, c. 166; Public Law 490), as amended by act of December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1093, c. 828, § 1; Public No. 848). Provisions for continuance of pay of persons officially reported missing, missing in action, interned in a neutral country, or captured by the enemy, and for payment of allotments, insurance premiums, death gratuities, etc.; pay increases for sea duty and duty beyond continental United States or in Alaska.

Act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662, c. 508; Public Law 671, § 1). Authorization for officers and enlisted men of armed forces of United States to accept decorations, etc., from governments of cobelligerent nations or other American Republics.

Act of October 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 795, c. 613; Public Law 748). Suspension of restrictions on detail of Marine Corps officers to headquarters (under second proviso of act of May 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 812), as amended by § 1 of act of May 1, 1936 (49 Stat. 1249).

Act of October 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 1012, c. 632; Public Law 766). Time limit for contracts for instruction of meteorological students in weather forecasting.

Act of December 18, 1942 (56 Stat. 1057–1058, c. 765; Public Law 813). Postponement of prohibition against payment of deposits, and interest thereon of enlisted men, until final discharge under R. S. 1305 and 1306).

Act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 713, c. 373, § 605 (c); Public Law 410). Time limit for presentation of written claims under § 18 of the Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, for injury or death of Public Health Service commissioned officer occurring between November 10, 1943, and termination of present war.

Act of December 23, 1944 (58 Stat. 926, c. 726; Public Law 564). Civil Service Commission's authority to omit or defer required five-year valuation of the civil-service retirement and disability fund (adding provision to § 16 of Retirement Act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 478).

Act of July 31, 1945 (59 Stat. 411, c. 338; Public Law 170). Time limit for presentation or claims of Philippine inhabitants arising out of accidents, etc., occurring in time of war, to be 1 year after peace is established.

PROVISION TO REMAIN IN FORCE UNTIL JUNE 30 AFTER 1 YEAR AFTER THE WAR

Act of June 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 463–465, c. 462; Public Law 639). Suspension of certain provisions of law and modification of other provisions concerning Naval and Marine Corps officers.

PROVISION TO REMAIN IN FORCE UNTIL SIX MONTHS AFTER JUNE 30 AFTER FISCAL YEAR FOLLOWING THAT IN WHICH PRESENT WAR ENDS

Act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 605, § 10), as amended by act of June 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 465, § 7). Continuance of temporary status of personnel appointed or advanced under authority of act of July 24, 1941.

PROVISIONS LIMITED TO 2 YEARS AFTER THE TERMINATION OF THE WAR

Act of May 10, 1943 (57 Stat. 81, c. 96; Public Law 52). Authority for awarding of insignia, medal, or device to merchant sailors in recognition of their services.

Act of April 24, 1944 (58 Stat. 216, c. 178; Public Law 295). Authorized suspension of operation of statute of limitation under insurance agreements (adding provision to § 226 (a) of Merchant Marine Act of 1936 (54 Stat. 691), as amended by 56 Stat. 216).

Act of June 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 291, c. 268, § 500 (a); Public Law 346). Time limit for loans to veterans (2 years after war or 2 years after separation from service, but not more than 5 years after war).

PROVISIONS IN FORCE FOR THREE POSTWAR YEARS (BEGINNING WITH FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30 FOLLOWING TERMINATION OF EXISTING WAR EMERGENCY)

Act of December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 839, § 2; Public Law 521). $500,000,000 annual appropriation authorized for postwar construction of roads.

PROVISIONS LIMITED TO 5 YEARS AFTER TERMINATION OF THE WAR

Act of June 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 291, c. 268, § 500 (a); Public Law 346). Time limit for loans to veterans to be 2 years after war or after separation from service, but not later than 5 years after termination of the war.

Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 388, c. 287, § 3; Public Law 359). Federal examinations for positions of guards, elevator operators, messengers, and custodians are restricted to veterans until 5 years after the war.

PROVISION LIMITED TO 6 YEARS AFTER TERMINATION OF PRESENT WAR

Act of March 24, 1943 (57 Stat. 43, c. 22, § 2; Public Law 16). Vocational training for disabled veterans (adding pt. VII to Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a)).

PROVISION LIMITED TO 6 MONTHS AFTER TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY CONFERRED BY SECTION 2 OF THE SERVICE EXTENSION ACT OF 1941 (56 STAT. 626)

Act of August 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 858, c. 689, § 1; Public Res. No. 96), extended by act of August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 628, § 11). Authority of the President to order reserve components of the Army of the United States and retired personnel of the Regular Army to active service.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a concurrent resolution declaring the end of the limited national emergency and the unlimited national emergency, and the termination of hostilities.

Certainly there are some temporary measures that will be required during the reconversion period, but Congress ought to have the courage to deal with them as reconversion measures and authorize them as such after consideration and debate.

Let us stop using the emergency as a catch-all to carry forward the multitude of Government controls that were adopted during the war.

Point System Does Not Do Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. HOCH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very timely letter from a soldier. I feel that this complaint is justified. Unfortunately the point system does not do justice to many of our boys who have rendered extended service.

OCTOBER 16, 1945.

SIR: I am a citizen of Berks County, having resided in the city of Reading, Pa., all my life. For the past 3 years and 4 months I have been serving in the United States Army. I am married but have no children.

The subject on which I wish to bring to your attention is the discharging of Army personnel. Coming to the point right away, I would like to know why men who have served two or more years in the Army and who have never been overseas, are being discharged for the simple reason that they are 35 years or older.

There is a grave injustice being done to the men who were on the fighting fronts. My case is an example. I have spent 11 month overseas, and I have earned three campaign stars. Of the 11 months overseas, I spent 5 months of torture and starvation in a German prison camp. After liberation I lay 5 weeks in a hospital in France suffering with malnutrition, and infected sores all over myself. I then was shipped back to this country, given a convalescent furlough and then sent to this camp where I am at the present. I find that I have but 48 points toward my discharge which is a long way from the required amount.

There is my case sir, one among many. We are here in this camp doing practically nothing, watching the 35-year olds, of whom, 9 out of every 10, have never even been out of this country. Serving faithfully, yes. But nice and safe over here, where the artillery shells did not come screaming at you at rate of more than three a minute.

It is of my opinion that you, as our Congressman from Berks County, can bring forth some of the real facts about this slap in the face given us. As things stand now, we are doomed to wait till March 20, 1946, before even being eligible for discharge. General Marshall's own statement says that on March 20 all men with two or more years service will become eligible for discharge, and that they will be discharged on the first in, first out basis. Is not any thought at all given to men who were on the fighting fronts, and to those who were prevented from

earning more laurels by being captured and then suffering terribly in German prison camps? Point scores are ignored if you are 35 years old. Why? If the war were still on with Japan, I would say, discharge the 35-year olds. But, I cannot see where they rate a discharge ahead of men who saw action overseas, and, who happened to be captured, therefore preventing them from earning more points. My case is one of many, sir. I want to go home to my wife. I feel that I have done my duty to my country, and it is really a morale shaker to see men being discharged who have been nice and safe throughout the war, before us men who have suffered the tortures and hardships of war and prison camps.

My opinion is, that you, sir, could bring forth these facts to your fellow Congressmen, which could influence the United States Army into remedying this injustice being done to veterans of the fighting fronts, who are just unlucky enough to not have the necessary points for regular discharge.

Hoping that this statement of true facts will have some bearing on future demobilization.

I remain, your truly.

World-wide Bible Reading Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am inserting excerpts of my radio broadcast over Station WHP at Harrisburg, Pa., on October 14, 1945:

Tomorrow marks the start of National Bible Week, during which activities, designed to encourage the reading of the Bible, will be conducted by the churches and Sunday schools, and religious organizations of the Nation. The Bible reading program will culminate this year in a Bible reading schedule running 34 days between Thanksgiving and Christmas. For each day of the 34 days a chapter or a passage in the Bible has been named. These were born through a world-wide canvass among service men and women.

This idea of encouraging wider reading of the Bible had its inception 2 years ago in a letter from a soldier to his mother asking that she read a chapter from the New Testament every day, while he did likewise. In this way he felt that somehow they would be united.

Early in this present Congress I introduced a bill giving national sanction to this program. So did Congressman JERRY VOORHIS. There is nothing compulsory about our proposals, but it would have national sanction to something we feel would be fine and of great spiritual benefit to the Nation.

EMPLOYMENT OF PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

This also marks the end of the National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. It would have been almost impossible a few years ago for those interesting people to get Government jobs. Personnel directors wouldn't have hired them for fear they would be a burden to the offices. But during the war Dr. Verne Harvey, Medical Director of the Civil Service Commission, made a study of 3,500 Federal jobs, and he discovered that most physically disabled people can meet the minimum physical requirements. He also found that the production efficiency of disabled persons was about equal to that of able-bodied workers; and, furthermore, that there was little turn-over problem among the handicapped. The war and the manpower shortage was made for the situation, and since April 1943, when the handicapped placement unit was created, more than 58,000 disabled persons have been place in Government work.

I wish I could tell you some of the success stories of physically handicapped persons that have been brought to my attention recently. They are indeed inspiring. I feel strongly that anyone who does employ physically handicapped persons in jobs for which they are fitted is doing a service for himself as well as for the person he is seeking to help.

IMMIGRATION OF INDIANS TO THIS COUNTRY—CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT

On Wednesday the House passed a bill authorizing the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India and to make them racially eligible for naturalization. Under existing law the quota for Indians is 100 per annum. This quota is not increased by this bill, which merely permits natives of India of the Indian race to enter the United States within this quota limitation. Consequently, under the proposed legislation, not more than 100 Eastern Hemisphere Indians could enter the United States annually as quota immigrants. Under the Alien Registration Act of 1940, there were 3,896 aliens born in India who resided in the United States. They would become eligible for naturalization. This does for the Indians exactly what the repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws of December 19, 1943, did for the Chinese. If finally enacted, it will place the Indians on an equal footing with every other nation in regard to immigration into this country. But they will be subject to the existing quotas which are established long ago on a certain base period. Since there are so few Chinese and Indians in this country, the law does not open the gates to any flood of immigration from outside. So few Indians and Chinese are in this country now that there is only around 100 for each race.

I favored the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act and also strongly favor this one. This Nation has always stood for the principle of equal opportunity regardless of race, creed, or color. Therefore, it is clearly against such a principle to exclude the nationals of certain areas for the sole and specific reason of race. This is particularly true where the inflow is so small that no economic or social questions are created. Secondly, this is sound from the standpoint of economics and national welfare because both India and China are huge potential markets for the United States. Although only 100 Indians can enter each year under this law, yet India has a population of approximately 390,000,000 people. Even a minute per capita increase in the standard of living in India would vastly increase our markets there. The same is true for China. Thirdly, there is international good will. By placing in our statutes a stigma on the Asiatic peoples we can scarcely expect anything save ill will and distrust, not to say hatred, in return. By correcting this error we can secure more readily their trust and good will. The bill removes a legislative insult to a people and a race.

ATOMIC BOMB

The atomic bomb is such a mysterious and awe-inspiring invention that I hesitate to discuss it at length. Here are a few observations. They are based on the unanimous opinion of the experts. I have no scientific background qualifying me to give you my opinion but where the scientists do agree it seems reasonable to accept their findings. First, it cannot be kept secret nor can the secret be destroyed. The principles are known and it is just a question of time until other nations discover the technique. Second, our plants and our equipment for its creation are so far superior to any existing elsewhere that we have a head start of probably 3 years over any other country in the world. Third, new devices, either defenses against these bombs or new, cheaper, and easier ways of unleashing atomic force, may be developed at any time in any country.

With these three facts as a basis, and reserving the right to change my present judgment in view of future developments, I feel we should retain the secret of the atomic bomb in our possession, at least and unless and until we can receive definite and unqualified assurances from the other nations of the world that it will be controlled and utilized to maintain peace and advance human living standards. These assurances must be far more than statements, promises, and signed agreements. They must embody solid guaranties. Meanwhile, we should continue to develop our research and knowledge along this line just as rapidly as we did during wartime. Only by so doing can we maintain our position as the nation which actually has the power to use atomic energy as a means of self-protection and enforcing world peace.

The other evening, one of my friends in Congress, CHESTER MERROW, of New Hampshire, made a speech over the air to which I listened. He had compiled some facts—facts staggering the imagination—about the use of atomic energy. Here are a few of his illustrations which are almost unbelievable: 22 pounds of matter—any kind of matter whatever—would be sufficient to supply the requirements of all the electric power in the United States for a year. Let's go back to our school days. There are 16 ounces in a pound and 28 grams in an ounce. One-third of a gram of water can produce heat enough to turn 100,000 tons of water into steam. If the atomic energy of 1 gram of water were fully utilized it could raise a load of 1,000,000 tons to the top of a mountain 6 miles high. You have often bought a railway ticket. It is just a little piece of pasteboard. You and I have always thought of that as something entitling us to the privilege of a ride on a train between certain points. That is what it did and does mean. But it is something more. The information the scientists gave Mr. MERROW is this: If the atomic energy in that little bit of pasteboard in a railway ticket is released it could run a heavy passenger train around the world several times. Again, 1 pound of any substance has the power content of 3,000,000,000 pounds of coal or 1,500,000 tons. You know what the atomic bomb did to Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Yet the scientists say that the energy utilized in that atomic bomb is only one-tenth of 1 percent of the energy in the material.

We do not remain superior in the field of atomic energy because of the theoretical knowledge of the secret but because of our vast industrial power. We can only hold our superiority by the full utilization of our industrial resources and our scientific knowledge and the ability of our scientists and inventors. It would be foolhardy and ridiculous to give away this knowledge unless and until we can gain for certain our high purpose of creating an enduring peace with world-wide increased standards of living. If we should be so careless or negligent as to permit some other nation to win from us the power we wisely decided not to give, to outstrip us in the race for knowledge, then we would be in a far worse position than if we had made a full disclosure freely. Hence, I feel positive that no matter what decisions are made on other phases of this all-important question, we must continue full speed ahead at present, bending every effort to learn the secrets, and taking every precaution to see that our added knowledge is used for the benefit of mankind. There is the same urgency in progressing in atomic energy and research now as existed during the war. Whether you believe the secret should be retained as long as possible, or

whether you think it should be freely disclosed and shared, should unite in advocating its immediate development. Along this road lies our hope for security for ourselves and the attainment of peace for mankind.

Funds for UNRRA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an editorial from the October 23 issue of the Washington Post entitled "Funds for UNRRA":

FUNDS FOR UNRRA

There is occasion for concern over some of the amendments which have been proposed in connection with the $550,000,000 requested appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. This sum represents the balance pledged to the international organization when Congress authorized an American contribution of $1,350,000,000. It is needed now, urgently needed, for the purchase of foodstuffs and other supplies to be shipped into the liberated countries of Europe in which UNRRA is operating. UNRRA's activities were badly impeded in its early days by a scarcity of shipping and supplies. Now that shipping and supplies are relatively plentiful, it would be tragic if the organization were hampered by a lack of funds. The needs of Europe are immediate and brook no delay. If we are to help the helpless through the desperate winter ahead, there must be no break in the UNRRA pipeline.

Representative HERTER, of Massachusetts, after a 2-month tour of European countries served by UNRRA, brought back to the House last week a lucid and illuminating report on the operations of the agency. It was an extremely favorable report for the most part, and Mr. Herter was wholly sympathetic to UNRRA's aims. He observed, however, that "in some of the countries which I visited, bitter criticisms were voiced against the UNRRA operation, often by our own officials, because of the feeling that too little was known as to what became of UNRRA goods once they entered the country, and too little was known of the operations of the Government with respect to its own economic problems."

To correct these defects, Mr. HERTER has proposed that no part of the American contribution to UNRRA shall be used in any country unless it certifies, among other things, that press representatives "will be granted full liberty to observe and report upon the distribution and utilization of relief and rehabilitation supplies and services." There can be no doubt that UNRRA would be aided, and that American confidence in its activities would be enhanced, by unhampered reporting on the part of American correspondents. It is much less certain, however, that this freedom ought to be brought about in the manner suggested by Mr. HERTER. We should like very much, of course, to have American newspapermen unleashed in countries where their movements are now restricted; and we hope that the State Department will continue to press for this right. But we doubt the wisdom of obtaining it through the threat of withholding food from the hungry. Freedom for American press representatives is a political matter, however desirable; and the attachment of it as a condition upon an act of charity smacks of playing international politics with relief.

The conditions under which UNRRA aid is extended were agreed upon by the representatives of 44 nations, and, properly executed, they afford abundant assurance that relief will go to the genuinely needy. If the United States imposes special conditions for the use of its contribution, other nations may be strongly tempted to do likewise respecting the funds that they donate. The upshot may be to hamstring UNRRA completely. The absurd lengths to which the attachment of special conditions can go was illustrated by amendments proposed by Representative CLARENCE BROWN which would forbid the use of American funds in any country which interferes internally with freedom of the press or imposes any censorship upon information in time of peace. This would make impossible, for example, the provision of any relief for the Philippines because General MacArthur feels that press limitations are still necessary there. Perhaps we had better let UNRRA tend strictly to the administration of relief and leave it to the State Department to bring about the political conditions we desire.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of Friday, October 19, 1945:

BACKBONE OF ANY PUBLIC PROGRAM SHOULD BE ST. LAWRENCE

The St. Lawrence seaway and power project should be the backbone of whatever public-works program the United States Congress considers necessary.

As Julius H. Barnes, of Duluth, president of the National St. Lawrence Association, recently said, the proposed waterway will "cement world peace through new opportunities for foreign trade."

It will do more. It will provide much additional and cheap power for New York State and parts of Canada. It will open the way between the great manufacturing and agricultural areas of the Middle West and the markets—for both exports and imports—of practically all areas of the world that do not use direct Pacific transit.

Additionally, the Great Lakes, with an adequate outlet to the Atlantic coast, could become an added facility for defense of this Nation and of Canada, in a world that is yet disturbed and in which universal peace is not yet assured.

Mr. Barnes believes that opposition is dwindling, support is growing, and that, with President Truman's recent insistence, the seaway at last will be gotten under way by the Congress.

If so, it indeed will, or should, become the major project of the national public works program. It is a big undertaking. It will provide jobs and opportunities for common and skilled laborers, planners, engineers, administrators, and others.

It will not be a mere regional project. If the harbors of the Great Lakes become world harbors, the movement of goods to them will provide new volumes of freight for the railroads, to offset possible losses when present long hauls to Atlantic tidewater are curtailed.

Congress indeed should see that the St. Lawrence project at last is under way. Its construction has become a "must."

An Appraisal of the Washington State Congressional Delegation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of the Progressive, nationally known weekly magazine published at Madison, Wis., by the Progressive Publishing Co., of which Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE is president, there appears an article by the well-known writer, Richard L. Neuberger, entitled "My Congressional Pin-up." The article appraises the Washington State congressional delegation. Because I am very friendly with members of the Washington congressional delegation and entertain affection and admiration for all of them, and because the article contains facts and analyses of interest to my colleagues and to the country, I am asking unanimous consent to have the article reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Here it is:

MY CONGRESSIONAL PIN-UP

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

TACOMA, WASH.—Six years ago in The Progressive I nominated the delegation in the Senate and House from the State of Washington as the outstanding liberal delegation in the American Congress. This provoked considerable discussion. Partisans of other States nominated different delegations and a good time was had by all.

Now that I am back in civilian life after somewhat more than 3 years in the Army, I have been reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD again. I also have been following debates and votes and bills introduced. And I still come to the same conclusion of 6 years ago, viz, that the State of Washington has the most consistently liberal and progressive delegation on Capitol Hill.

By this I mean all-around delegation, considered from the senior Senator on through the most junior Congressman. I realize that certain States have notable individual liberals—Vermont with Senator GEORGE AIKEN, Wisconsin with Senator BOB LA FOLLETTE, Idaho with Senator GLEN TAYLOR, Montana with Senator JIM MURRAY and Representative MIKE MANSFIELD, California with Representatives JERRY VOORHIS and GEORGE OUTLAND, Oregon with Senator WAYNE MORSE, New York with Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, West Virginia with Senator HARLEY KILGORE.

But these outstanding liberals are only individuals. They do not constitute an entire congressional delegation. And on the score of long-range consistency and dependability, I am certain that the Senate and House delegations of the State of Washington are the most reliable in Congress. Not only is this true of the present delegation, but it also has such notable recent graduates as former Senator Lewis Schwellenbach, now Secretary of Labor; former Senator Homer Bone, now a Federal circuit judge, and former Senator Mon Wallgren, now Governor of Washington.

As I did 6 years ago in the Progressive, let's look over the Washington delegation and see why it ranks as the No. 1 liberal outfit on Capitol Hill. It is not the same delegation that it was 6 years ago so far as personnel is concerned. Both Senators are new and so are 4 of the 6 Representatives. Yet it is almost as progressive as it was in 1939, despite this nearly complete overturn in individual Members. The State of Washington, out in the extreme northwestern corner of the Nation,

has the liberal voting habit ingrained pretty strongly at this moment.

Let's scan the roster, beginning with the Senators:

WARREN G. MAGNUSON, senior Senator from Washington, is the second youngest Member of the upper Chamber. This youthful outlook has been shown in his stand on many important issues. He sponsored repeal of the un-democratic Chinese exclusion laws, which kept our Chinese allies at complete arm's length. He has been one of the principal enemies of the aluminum monopoly wielded by the Aluminum Co. of America. Recently he took up the fight against the Army and Navy practice of granting terminal leave to officers but not to enlisted men.

When he was a Representative, MAGNUSON was one of the few defenders of the FCC, on the committee appointed to investigate that body. MAGNUSON also distinguished himself for his opposition to the witch-hunting methods of former Representative Martin Dies. Only 40 years old, MAGNUSON, or "MAGGIE," as he is called, is one of the most popular political figures in Washington history. When Representative LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, visited Seattle, he said he had never found a politician as well liked in his district as "MAGGIE" was.

HUGH B. MITCHELL, junior Senator from Washington, is the youngest Member of the United States Senate. He is only 38 years old. MITCHELL was appointed to the vacancy left when Senator Wallgren became Governor of Washington. He formerly had served as Wallgren's secretary. The appointment of a comparative political unknown originally antagonized Washington voters, but MITCHELL has proved a pleasant surprise. He started off by sponsoring a bill for a Columbia Valley Authority, and he soon will amend the bill to pattern it identically after the TVA.

As a member of the Mead War Investigating Committee, MITCHELL has fought to retain industry on the west coast, rather than allowing the Eastern monopolies to recover their former stranglehold. On Labor Day MITCHELL said that the workers of the Nation had a right to share in the exorbitant profits earned by management during the war. MITCHELL is a former newspaperman. He comes from Montana and he is a son of Harry B. Mitchell, president of the United States Civil Service Commission.

JOHN M. COFFEE, Representative from Tacoma, is the most consistently liberal Member of the House of Representatives. No crusade for the underprivileged takes place without his support. He is rapidly ascending to a position in the lower House comparable to that occupied in the upper Chamber by George Norris. COFFEE led the long fight to withdraw recognition from Franco Spain. He campaigned against shipments of scrap-iron to Imperial Japan. He exposed the commercial interests behind these policies.

He has been the principal congressional authority on Latin America and an invaluable exposer of corrupt and undemocratic governments south of the border. COFFEE has been vigilant in demonstrating the intrigue of the big oil companies in bolstering local tyrants in South America and the Middle East.

COFFEE is an outstanding champion of public ownership, a position he fills naturally, for his own city of Tacoma, with a municipal power plant, has the lowest light bills in the United States. When other Congressmen hesitate, COFFEE will wade into a touchy issue. His reputation for fearlessness has made him leader of the liberal congressional bloc. A graduate of Yale Law School, COFFEE will probably be either Governor or Senator some day. His secretary, Paul Olson, is also an outstanding liberal who has been active in the labor movement.

HENRY M. JACKSON, Representative from Everett, represents one of America's great lumber districts in the House. He is only 33 years old. The loggers and sawmill workers have found him an effective champion, despite his youthful years. He is also a conservationist who realizes that protection of our dwindling virgin timber is in the real interests of the lumber workers. Jackson supported the bill for the Olympic National Park, although sawmill owners tried to make the workers believe that this conservation measure would reduce employment opportunities.

As chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee, JACKSON has advocated increasing benefits and privileges for the minority from which this continent was wrested by the whites. JACKSON opposed the Dies committee methods and voted consistently against funds for these witch hunts. Along with MAGNUSON, JACKSON has been the principal congressional authority on Alaska. He now is seeking a development authority which will help, financially and otherwise, in the establishment of veterans on Alaskan land. When choice war jobs, such as OPA and WPB chairmanship went to power-trust people in the Northwest, JACKSON led the protests from the liberals. He is a bachelor and considered one of the Capital's most enticing matrimonial catches.

JACK recently led a heroic fight to prevent the national vast wartime merchant marine from being frittered away to shipping companies for scandalously low prices.

HUGH DE LACY, Representative from Seattle, is one of the most controversial figures in the House of Representatives. Some liberals criticize him for voting so closely with the leftist MARCANTONIO, of New York, on many major questions. But the fact remains that since his election in 1944 he has been one of the most militant fighters for progressive legislation. In addition, his scholarly and well-documented speeches have pleasantly surprised even his most bitter critics.

DE LACY has not hesitated to go beneath the surface of important issues. When the country was indignant over the fact that returning war heroes were being transported transcontinentally in dirty day coaches DE LACY showed that railroad presidents and lumber barons were using private cars. He told the House how the president of the Great Northern had gone to Glacier National Park in a private car, while the same line was hauling war heroes in coaches. Indignant railroad workers sent DE LACY sub rosa information to add to this exposé. DE LACY's secretary, Richard Sellar, is nationally known for the fact that in 1936 he led the famous guild strike which closed the Hearst Post-Intelligencer in Seattle for nearly 100 days.

CHARLES R. SAVAGE, Representative from Shelton, has one of the most spectacular and unique labor backgrounds of any Member of either House. He has worked at nearly every job in the lumber industry, including that of high-climber. The high-climber is the man who scales the trunk of a 225-foot Douglas fir and saws off the needled top, while the tree sways like a flagpole in a storm. SAVAGE has been an officer of both A. F. of L. and CIO loggers' unions, and he has helped build many power dams.

SAVAGE, unlike some who rose from the ranks of labor, is true to this workman's background.

HAL HOLMES, Representative from Ellensburg, is one of the two Republicans in the Washington State congressional delegation. The men already mentioned are all Democrats. HOLMES, a former college professor, is also a livestock rancher. He is not as liberal as the Democrats but he has opposed Dies committee continuations, and he has stood up against local power companies in his district to favor Federal construction of transmission lines. Grand Coulee Dam, biggest power project on earth, is in HOLMES' constituency. The utilities would like to distribute this energy. HOLMES has insisted that the Government build transmission lines so that all the people can get the full benefit of the Coulee hydroelectric output.

WALT HORAN, Representative from Wenatchee, is the most conservative member of the Washington congressional delegation. He and HOLMES are the sole Republicans in the group. HORAN follows GOP policy, as set down by JOE MARTIN, on most issues. Yet he is not a reactionary and on questions of power he sometimes follows the lead of Rufus Woods, Republican editor of the Wenatchee Daily World, who is the principal newspaper advocate of a Columbia Basin Authority modeled directly on the TVA. HORAN had a distinguished record in World War I. He is a fruitgrower and packer. Wenatchee being the apple capital of the inland empire.

So there it is—Washington's delegation to Capitol Hill. In some respects the delegation is spotty. Not all the men are liberal on all questions. For that matter, who is? Perhaps there is no Senator George Norris or "Fighting Bob" La Follette in the group, although some day JOHN COFFEE may rank as one of the country's foremost progressives of the past decade. But by and large, considered as a unit, I would field this delegation against that from any other of the 48 States.

Shotgun Shells

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on October 12 the Department of Commerce made the following announcement:

Duck, pheasant, and other small-game hunters will have plenty of 12-gage shotgun shells on hand this fall for their favorite sport. Over 40,000,000 rounds of 12-gage shells, frozen for military use since the start of the war, will be sold this month to dealers throughout the 11 United States regional offices of the Office of Surplus Property.

The report further states that—

Supplies of shotgun shells for civilian use have been extremely short and the return of this ammunition to dealers' shelves in time for the hunting seasons will be welcomed by sportsmen the country over.

Mr. Speaker, the catch in this welcome news is that the majority of the shells are loaded with No. 8 birdshot and the balance with 00 buckshot. That definitely is not good news to the hunters for no hunter cares to use either of these loads for ducks, pheasants, or rabbits. Just why these shells should be loaded with that size shot could only be answered by the bureaucrats. The dealers buying this size shot will find that they will long remain upon their shelves.

Michigan Democratic Congressmen Endorse Labor's Take-Home-Pay Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon the Democratic Members of the Michigan delegation held a caucus

and agreed upon a statement relative to the take-home pay of industrial workers. We are of the opinion that the take-home pay should and must be maintained, and under permission granted I insert at this point a statement released to the press:

TAKE-HOME PAY CAN BE MAINTAINED, SHOULD BE MAINTAINED, AND MUST BE MAINTAINED

We, your Congressmen, know that the take-home pay of industrial workers can, should, and must be maintained.

1. We know industrial workers' take-home pay can be maintained, because the Congress of the United States has made ample provision through generous tax rebates for the postwar of American industry. Wartime net profits of billions of dollars have provided industry with the means to maintain take-home pay necessary for a decent American standard of living.

2. We know that industrial workers' take-home pay should be maintained, because workers cannot support their families at a decent American standard of living with a large percent reduction in take-home pay, in view of the continued high cost of food, clothing, and shelter. We in Congress never again want to be called upon to appropriate funds for relief in this land of plenty.

We know that industrial workers' take-home pay must be maintained, because the welfare of every American in every walk of life, the merchant and professional man, the nurse and the beautician, the janitor and the taxi driver; yes, the welfare of every American depends on protecting the standard of living of the industrial worker.

JOHN LESINSKI,
Sixteenth District, Chairman
Michigan Democratic Delegation.
GEORGE D. O'BRIEN,
Thirteenth District, Secretary.
GEORGE G. SADOWSKI,
First District.
JOHN D. DINGELL,
Fifteenth District.
FRANK HOOK,
Twelfth District.
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
Fourteenth District.

A Plug for H. R. 3939, To Establish Government Funds for Research To Ascertain the Cause and Cure of Dread Disease, From the Saturday Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, in accord with the purposes of H. R. 3939 the objective of which is to establish a permanent fund for use in finding the cause and cure of cancer and infantile paralysis, is the following paragraph taken from an editorial in the Saturday Review, titled "Modern Man Is Obsolete," by Norman Cousins:

What a fantastic irony that organized science knows the secret of the atom, but as yet knows not a fig about the common cold. Who can tell what advances in medical knowledge might accrue to the welfare of mankind if as much mobilized effort were put into the study of man as there has been of matter? Cancer, heart disease, nephritis, leukemia, encephalitis, poliomyelitis, arteriosclerosis, aplastic anemia—all these are anomalies in the modern world; there is no reason why mobilized research should not be directed at their causes and cure.

I am setting forth a letter received from Mr. Cousins relative to my bill H. R. 3939:

THE SATURDAY REVIEW OF LITERATURE,
New York, N. Y.

Representative WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STEVENSON: I congratulate you for your bill on cancer and polio research. I am completely in accord with what you say.

Sincerely,

NORMAN COUSINS.

Air Policy Commission Would Be Valuable in Establishing Definite Pattern by Which To Proceed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 25, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, there appears to be a considerable sentiment in Congress, and throughout the country, for a definite aviation policy for the United States. It was in the Seventy-eighth Congress that I first presented the House joint resolution to establish an Air Policy Commission. This measure was reintroduced on January 3, 1945, as House Joint Resolution 20. Its provisions are as follows:

Joint resolution on establishing an Air Policy Commission

Resolved, etc., That the establishing of sound national policies on the problems created by and associated with present and future developments in military and civil aviation is essential both to the peace and security of the United States and to the achievement of full employment and improved standards of living.

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established an Air Policy Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") to make a full study and investigation of the problems created by and associated with present and future developments in military and civil aviation and to recommend basic national policies on (1) air power as an instrument of national defense and international security and (2) the expansion of civil aviation.

(b) No later than 6 months after the commencement of its operations, the Commission shall transmit its first recommendations to the President and to the Congress, together with such suggestions for legislation as it may deem necessary or desirable; and the Commission shall from time to time submit such additional recommendations as it may deem necessary or desirable, or as may be requested by the President or the appropriate committees of the Congress.

SEC. 3. The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

(1) Two Members of the Senate, one from the majority party and one from the minority party, to be selected by the President of the Senate; and two Members from the House of Representatives, one from the majority party and one from the minority party, to be selected by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(2) Four members of the executive branch of the Government, to be selected by the President, who have special competence with respect to the problems and policies referred to in section 2 of this joint resolution, and who shall serve in a personal capacity rather than as representatives of any department or agency.

(3) Six public members from industry, science, labor, and other sections of the national economy, not directly engaged in the aircraft manufacturing or air transport industries, to be selected by the President, who shall serve in a personal capacity rather than as representatives of any particular groups or interests.

(4) A chairman, to be selected by the President.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of this resolution, the Commission is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

SEC. 5. The Commission shall have the power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary for the performance of its duties. The heads of the executive agencies, upon the request of the Chairman, shall detail or engage personnel temporarily to assist the Commission. The Commission may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as it may deem necessary. The commission may utilize the services, information, and facilities of the departments and agencies of the Government.

SEC. 6. The Commission shall, by a majority vote of its members, determine its rules of procedure, and the powers conferred upon the Commission by this joint resolution may be exercised by a majority vote of all its mebers. Members of the Commission shall be reimbursed, from funds appropriated pursuant to section 7 of this act, for the actual and necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as such members.

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $100,000 to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution. The Commission may make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the limits herein authorized.

SEC. 8. The authority conferred by this joint resolution shall expire on December 31, 1946.

Editorial comment in recent days focuses attention on this important proposal. At this point I insert the following comment from the American Aviation of October 11, 1945:

There was a strong feeling in industry and Capitol Hill circles today that the Mead committee, which yesterday listened to testimony of east coast aircraft presidents, would recommend to the Senate passage of legislation which would create an investigating board to serve the function performed by the Morrow Board following World War I.

Senator HUGH B. MITCHELL, chairman of the Mead subcommittee, asked all of the witnesses their reactions to the creation of such a board, and in all cases the response was enthusiastically in support of such a move. His committee had received a similar response when west coast aircraft manufacturers were heard by the committee at Seattle last month.

The President's Aircraft Board (Morrow Board) was created September 12, 1925, after more than 20 committees had investigated the aircraft situation without bringing forth any constructive results. The Board had been appointed 1 week after September 5, 1925, when Billy Mitchell had charged the Army and Navy with "incompetence, criminal negligence, and almost treasonable" dereliction of their duties. While Mitchell later was court-martialed, the War and Navy Departments followed his charges with a recommendation to the President that a committee be appointed "for the purpose

of making a study of the best means of developing and applying aircraft in the national defense."

The President's Aircraft Board headed by Dwight Morrow, worked rapidly and by December of 1925 had recommended to Congress legislation which in May of 1926 resulted in the passage of the Air Corps Act, the Air Commerce Act and an Army and Navy aircraft development and production program.

Numerous congressional committees today have been floundering around with studies and investigations of this country's postwar Air Force needs and there were indications today that the War and Navy Department, following the precedent of 1925, might beat the Mead committee in recommending to the President the creation of a board to do the job that was done by the Morrow Board in 1925.

RESEARCH PROGRAM PARAMOUNT

There was some feeling in industry circles that if such a board is created, Army, Navy and the aircraft industry should be represented only in a technical advisory capacity to eliminate selfish interests from having a too important role in the policy recommendations.

In addition to those mentioned in yesterday's Daily, Alfred Marchev, president of Republic Aviation Corp., H. M. Horner, president of United Aircraft Corp., and Harry T. Rowland, vice president of Glenn L. Martin Co., appeared before the committee.

All of these witnesses agreed upon the need of a basic and applied research program which would keep this country in the forefront in aviation developments and sufficient Government contracts, which plus peacetime manufacturing, would enable this country to keep alive an industry which helped give the Allied Nations complete supremacy in the air in this war and which would be ready, on the basis of quick expansion, to meet the possible threats of aggression in the future.

Charles T. Lucey, Scripps-Howard staff writer, gives the following interesting story as it appeared in the Washington Daily News of October 19, 1945:

Creation of a special commission of men of outstanding ability to study and recommend a national aviation policy will be proposed in the Senate soon. It may get the support of the Mead War Investigating Committee.

Senator MITCHELL, Democrat, of Washington, chairman of a subcommittee of the Mead committee which has been studying various phrases of peacetime air policy, announced today he would introduce a resolution for an independent civilian study.

The investigation probably would be modeled somewhat on the 1925 study made by the Board headed by the late Dwight W. Morrow. At a time when there was widespread disagreement over United States air policy, the Morrow Board produced a report which helped chart a course in both military and civilian aviation.

Senator FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan, is among the supporters of the idea who believe that a civilian board's investigation would have advantages.

ATOM CONSIDERED

The proposed study, as envisioned by some, would take into account the change in warfare brought about by the atomic bomb and guided missiles.

Such figures as Bernard M. Baruch, Herbert Hoover, Karl Compton, president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Admiral William D. Leahy, and Gov. Earl Warren, of California already are being suggested for the board.

The aviation industry as such has expressed no view, but numerous individual company presidents, questioned by the Mead committee, have favored such a study. There has been some feeling in the industry that the greatest need of the moment is to adjust research and production programs to it.

WHERE ARE WE GOING?

"No one seems to have any very conclusive approach to the whole aviation picture," said Senator MITCHELL. "The Navy requested $156,000,000 for aviation developmental work, but this was cut to $61,000,000 in the Budget Bureau. This shows there is no agreement on policy."

The Morrow Board grew out of charges by the late Gen. Billy Mitchell that the Army and Navy were neglecting aviation. It was appointed by President Coolidge, and after a 3-month study it brought forward a 5-year procurement program for military aviation, and recommendations in civilian air development which helped mold the first Air Commerce Act of 1926.

The Martinsburg, W. Va., Journal of October 19, 1945, published in the district which I represent, carried the following timely comment:

A NEW MORROW BOARD

The past few weeks have produced an unmistakable ground swell of public and official enthusiasm for a new and expanded Morrow Board which would do for our present problems of air defense what that body did for the problems of 20 years ago.

Today, of course, the situation is not the same, nor are the problems the same. The so-called "Morrow Board" was created in September 1925 by President Coolidge as a consequence of Brig. Gen. Billy Mitchell's sensational accusation that the Army and Navy, in the administration of their air services, were "incompetent, criminally negligent, and almost treasonable."

Now we have just won a war in which a superb military air organization played a leading part. There is no thought of criticizing any part of that contribution. Yet there is need of a new Morrow Board. The coming of peace has left us with no policy, or rather a confusion policies.

American military aviation got its first real impetus and direction from the Morrow Board. Its recommendations to Congress resulted, among other things, in passage of the Air Corps and Air Commerce Acts, which might be considered our constitution for aviation. Through them the Under Secretaryships for Air were set up in the War, Navy, and Commerce Departments.

The Morrow Board mapped programs for the design and production of military aircraft, and for the development of civil aeronautics. Had the former program been followed, the coming of war might have found this country with a more efficient nucleus of aircraft production than that hurriedly set up to fill French and British orders in 1940.

Congress could use suggestions for such a wise program again, a program which this time would be followed up carefully and completely. Perhaps a new Morrow Board could not provide a set of pat answers and precise blueprints. But at least it could take unto itself some of our more serious problems of national defense, hold hearings which would provide the best available opinion as to their solution, and try to integrate the sum of this opinion and the members' own thinking toward a workable policy.

Some of the questions such a Board would have to consider may be discussed later. It is enough now to suggest that the present activities of some congressional committees, the general attitude of a research-conscious Congress, statements of several Army and Navy leaders, and the tone of much of the Nation's press indicate that the formation of a new Morrow Board is not only desirable but inevitable.

The Sunday Exponent-Telegram, of Clarksburg, W. Va., October 21, 1945, discusses the proposal in the following manner:

A NEW MORROW BOARD

At least a half dozen vitally important questions will confront any new committee which the President might appoint to formulate an air policy for our national defense. Such a committee would find its problems considerably more complex than those which the Morrow Board faced in establishing our air policy of 20 years ago.

But there also would be a reasonable assurance that, in contrast to the Morrow Board's experience; the new policy recommendations would be heeded. The country is no longer complacent. Most Americans now realize that their lives and futures are intimately linked to the future of their military defense. They want to know the answers to such questions as these:

What effect will the harnessing of atomic energy have on the problem of national defense?

That is obviously the most important and least answerable question of all. But at least a new Morrow Board might recommend facilities which would give American science the fullest possible assistance in trying to find the answer.

Should all branches of the service be put under a unified command?

This is a touchy, confused, and controversial subject which Congress is in no apparent hurry to settle. The decision of a Board of distinguished private citizens and Congress' own best-informed leaders should help the legislators in making their ultimate choice.

What size peacetime air force will be required to meet our own defense needs and our obligations under the United Nations Organization, and still be economically feasible?

What Government policies should be adopted to stimulate a healthy rate of technological progress?

What peacetime nucleus of production should be maintained in the aviation industry to insure a rapid expansibility in time of emergency?

What part should civil aviation and aircraft exports play in support of the peacetime military aircraft industry?

Can we afford to neglect air power in the thought that it is an inadequate defense against the "push-button war" of the future, or shall be continue to depend on and support the evolution of military aviation, which has brought the world to the threshold of that "push-button war"?

The answers to these questions depend, to a great extent, on public sentiment as reflected in congressional appropriations. At present the military aviation program has been cut back, at the Budget Bureau's suggestion, to 2.5 percent of its wartime peak.

Certainly a big military aircraft schedule is out of the question. But it must be decided whether the present program of 2,400 military planes a year is enough to keep intact the expansible industrial core of research, development, and production which seems essential to maintain our air security.

In Aero Digest of January 15, 1945, I advocated the creation of such a group in the following language:

The time has come for the United States to create an "Air Policy Commission" for a full study and exhaustive investigation of problems created by developments in military and civil aviation. Basic national policies should be established on airpower as an instrument of national defense, international security, and the expansion of civil aviation.

Such a commission would have characteristics of the "Morrow Board" set up by Presi-

dent Coolidge in 1925, out of which came, partially at least, the Air Corps Act of 1926; and which in turn, resulted in the designation of Aviation Assistants to the Secretaries of Commerce, War and Navy Departments.

One lesson this terrible struggle has taught us—a lesson that our airmen have been trying to pound into our heads for a quarter of a century—is that our future world trade is clearly bound up with the development of flying. The nation with the best and the most planes, the best and the most highly trained pilots, the best and most ingenious designers, laboratory technicians, and productive capacity will, at that time, be in a favored position.

Many other factors will enter into the problem. There must be national ability for long-range vision in a field so vital to world stability.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the reasons for the passage of this legislation are even more compelling today than they were at the time of its initial presentation to Congress in 1944. America must retain its leadership in aviation. It is important, therefore, to have a basically sound program which will serve our peacetime needs and be available in time of necessity. I respectfully urge Members of Congress to study the proposal with a viewpoint of benefiting the United States and accomplishing a plan for international cooperation and security.

Anniversary of Czechoslovak Independence

REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 25, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, 27 years ago, on October 28, 1918, the proclamation of Czechoslovak independence was read from the steps of the Prague Museum. As Bohemia celebrated its release from 300 years of bondage, the black and yellow flags of the Hapsburgs and the Austrian double eagle were torn down from public buildings. The citizens of "golden Prague," justly prominent among European cities for over twelve centuries, jammed St. Vaclav's Square to listen to the tidings of liberation.

There was then—and there is now—a vital American interest in the welfare of the independent Czechoslovakian people. The draft of the Czechoslovak declaration of independence was prepared by that great patriot and lover of liberty, Tomas Garrigue Masaryk, in Washington, D. C. That document was signed in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, on the 26th of October 1918. Masaryk actually sat in the same chair once occupied by John Hancock, signer of the American Declaration of Independence, when he affixed his signature to that memorable message of Czechoslovak liberation.

These incidents are enduring symbols of the community of interests between Czechoslovaks and Americans. Their significance is accentuated by the consistent support of their adopted country by Americans of Czechoslovak origin. In this country today, there are approximately a million and a half Americans of Czechoslovak ancestry. Ten percent of this number were inducted into the American fighting forces during the recent war. In addition, this number was swelled in the early days of the conflict by a substantial force of volunteers. On January 19, 1942, Vladimir Hurban, Czechoslovak Minister to the United States, opened the then-current War bond campaign by purchasing the first bond. During that same bond campaign, at a conference between Jan Masaryk, son of former President Thomas Masaryk, and representatives of the fewer than 10,000 Americans of Czechoslovak ancestry in Baltimore, a bond drive goal of half a million dollars was agreed upon and later oversubscribed. In our mines, on our farms, and in our factories Americans whose grandparents called the hills of Moravia and Bohemia their home labored and produced for final victory.

And what about the influence of Americans of Czechoslovak origin on all phases of American life? Does your son or daughter go to a large college or a State university? There is not an institution of higher learning in this country which does not have one or more professors of Czechoslovak ancestry. You American travelers—your way has been made easier because of the bridges designed by Gustav Lindenthal. And American music lovers, there are men and women of Czechoslovak descent playing in every major philharmonic orchestra. You thrill to Anton Dvorak's Humoresque and his New World Symphony composed in Iowa. You hear Bedrich Smetana's Bartered Bride and Karel Weis' The Polish Jew at the Metropolitan Opera. You read Willa Cather's My Antonia, telling vividly of Czechoslovak pioneers in America. Wherever you look, wherever you listen, you will find powerful reminders of the effect of Czechoslovak culture on the American way of life.

In my own home State of Nebraska I can point to innumerable instances of the Czechoslovakian contribution to our civilization. The sturdy, reliable, intelligent, and industrious mechanics of Omaha, many of them of Czechoslovak ancestry, helped to turn out the necessities of war as they are now helping to reconvert our country to peace. From the Missouri River to Elgin, from the South Dakota border to the Platte, American farmers whose forefathers farmed Czechoslovakian valleys harvested the crops that fed our fighting men and are today helping to feed Europe's starving peoples.

What I have said of my own Nebraska could well be said of Michigan, of Montana, of the Dakotas, of Iowa, of Kansas, and of Texas.

Why were the people of Czechoslovakia so easily assimilated into the life stream of the United States? For an answer to that question we need go no further than the Czechoslovak declaration of independence of 1918. It says, in part:

> We accept and shall adhere to the ideals of modern democracy, as they have been the ideals of our nation for centuries. We accept the American principles as laid down by President Wilson—the principles of liberated mankind, of the actual equality of nations, and of governments deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. We, the nation of Comenius, cannot but accept the principles expressed in the American Declaration of Independence, the principles of Lincoln, and of the declaration of the rights of man and of the citizen.

It is not so difficult to understand the readiness with which Czechoslovaks take to American institutions when we realize that what Thomas Masaryk expressed in these imperishable words was the century-old desire of his people to exist and progress under freedom. It is even as Ruth said to Naomi: "Let my gods be your gods and my people be your people." Such kinship of national feeling is, indeed, a rarity, and it cannot be lightly forgotten.

It is symbolic of the unity of our national purposes that Thomas Masaryk married an American girl, Charlotte Garrigue. After her death in 1923 he wrote of her:

> She was absolutely uncompromising and utterly truthful. These two qualities had a great influence on my development. Our whole married life was cooperation.

This was more than a matrimonial union: it was the marriage of two peoples who believed in the common denominator of freedom.

Today Czechoslovakia is 27 years old. But that is only its chronological age. Actually, the Czechoslovak people—united in a common desire for freedom—compose a much older nation. They are as old as a nation as the Czechoslovak, William Paca, who was one of the signers of the American Declaration of Independence. They are as old as a nation as their first forebearer who gave his life fighting the forces of aggression.

We honor the Czechoslovak Nation and the Czechoslovak people on this, the day of their independence. The distinguished past of this people and this nation in their relationships with the United States points the way toward international understanding by its very existence. It is my sincere hope that the past is only the prelude to the united destinies of America and Czechoslovakia.

Descendants of "Mayflower" Passengers and Scientific "Furriners"

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 25, 1945

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, some of our superpatriots are quick to yell "furriner" when the name of any foreign-born person is discussed.

Although my ancestors landed in North Carolina before the Revolutionary War, I seldom mention it. Neither do I claim any special credit for their wise decision. In my opinion, people who make a fetish of their ancestry are in the words of Shakespeare, making "much ado about nothing." If I am not mistaken, the Japanese are afflicted with ancestor worship, and look at them now.

Now, it is a fact that the *Mayflower* was a small boat and some mighty fine people had to take a later boat. I even go so far as to say that many foreign-born people who now are American citizens are better patriots than some of the descendents of the *Mayflower* passengers. These people wrap American flags around themselves on every occasion, but deny the principles for which the flag stands. On other point, also, and sad as it may be to some of our superpatriots, it is nevertheless a fact that American-born people do not have the monopoly on brains or maybe I should say mental ability.

I have recently made quite a study on the atomic energy discovery. To those who fancy this to be an American secret discovered by the work of American scientists only, the following list may be enlightening. I might add that the list is incomplete:

FOREIGN OR FOREIGN-BORN SCIENTISTS MOST INSTRUMENTAL IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ATOMIC BOMB

Albert Einstein, German-born American: Pioneer and founder of all the theoretical work in the field. Wrote the scientific formula for the atomic bomb, which in layman's language is "matter-energy," and without which the atomic bomb would not be. Is a Nobel prize winner.

Neils Bohr, Danish: Perhaps the greatest worker in the field of describing the nature of the atomic bomb and also worked on it. Is a Nobel prize winner.

Enrico Fermi, Italian-born American: Nobel prize winner; man who described the neutron. One of the three or four leading physicists on the atomic bomb project.

Leo Szilard, Hungarian-born American: Another of the half dozen leading physicists of the atomic bomb project.

Leise Meitner: now in Sweden.

Otto Hahn: Nobel prize winner for this year. Now in Russia.

Franz Strassman: German.

The above three first actually split the atom in Berlin in 1939.

Otto Laue, German: One of the outstanding physicists of the world. Now in Russia.

Joliot, French: One of the pioneers in this work who went practically as far as the Germans in 1939 and has perhaps gone even further now. An outstanding nuclear physicist.

Madame Eve Curie and husband Pierre, Polish and French: None of the work in this field would have been possible without these two.

Kapitza, Russian: One of the greatest of the atomic physicists; is a Russian who has been working in Russia on this.

Lord Rutherford, English: The great Englishman in this field who first chipped the atom without splitting it entirely.

So in all kindness, Mr. Speaker, I would admonish the "super patriots" to abstain from the errors they are wont to commit and be kind to the next foreign-born person they meet. He might be Mr. Einstein or even one of our own congressional colleagues—even though he was once a "furriner."

Demobilization of the Armed Forces

REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 25, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, my mail is heavy with complaints from men who are seeking to get back home from the service. This morning I received the following letter from which I wish to read. It comes from a constituent, a prominent citizen in my district:

While it seems to be quite generally known that the Army is doing a rather bad job of redeployment from the European theater, I did not believe it was quite as bad as indicated in a letter from my son, stationed at Camp Calas (near Marseilles, France) dated October 12, 1945, and received today. I quote from his letter:

"We finally left Camp Pittsburg early on the morning of the 8th and what a miserable time that was. We got up at 1 a. m., fell out at 1:30 for trucks which were due at 3. They finally came at 5 after everyone was thoroughly frozen. These took us 2 miles to the station where we were jammed 70 to a small boxcar while there were plenty more empty on the siding. We were promised more at the next station, but it was 10:30 that night before we got them. With 70 men there wasn't even room to sit and we were all dead tired. When we got the other cars we were still packed tighter than I've ever ridden before, but we did get some rest. It took this French train about 56 hours to make the 500-mile trip (2½ days).

"Now that we're here we have a predicted wait of from 2 weeks to a month before we catch a boat. This staging area is worse in many ways than Pittsburg was, so we aren't having any fun with our leisure—it's dragging worse than ever."

This young man has spent 31 months overseas, all the way from Africa, Sicily, Italy, France, and Germany. One wonders, first of all, why it was necessary to send these men from Reims, France, all the way to Marseilles, while the much shorter route would have been by way of Le Havre. I understand POW's in this country are transported in first-class passenger trains, so it is hard to understand why our men should be herded like cattle in boxcars. Perhaps transportation facilities in France are demoralized, but it does seem that we could give our soldiers better treatment than here indicated.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the officials in charge of demobilization will heed the requests of our men in uniform and their families and the Members of the Congress to speed up demobilization and provide proper facilities to insure the comfort and well-being of the servicemen while being demobilized. I urge that all fathers with young children, all men with 18 months' service, all young men whose education is being interfered with be discharged at once.

Committee on Un-American Activities Defended by the Lieutenant Governor of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 25, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, the Member of Congress from New York [Mr. CELLER] who attacked the Committee on Un-American Activities turned his guns on conditions in the State of Texas, and attempted to paint a picture of horrible conditions prevailing in that proud Commonwealth.

I was at a loss to understand the reason for such attacks, for I knew that neither communism, fascism, nor nazism could thrive in the State of Texas if the blistering sunlight of publicity were turned upon them.

This morning there came to my desk a clipping from the Houston Post, published in Houston, Tex., on October 21, 1945, which contained an article on the Committee on Un-American Activities, written by Hon. John Lee Smith, Lieutenant Governor of Texas.

The article reads as follows:

The American Legion's National Legislative Committee asserts that the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities has revealed the Communist party plot to seize control of the American labor movement by infiltrating into labor groups. It further asserts that this committee has shown Joseph Curran, president of the National Maritime Union and vice president of the CIO, to be a member of the Communist Party.

Certain so-called "liberal" and "leftist" groups have lost no opportunity to smear the Congressional Committee on un-American activities. This committee is better known as the Dies committee. The fact is this committee was created in 1938 in compliance with a request of the American Legion and other veteran organizations. Due to the concerted efforts of many veteran groups it was made a permanent committee of the House of Representatives in January of this year. A number of Texans, posing as loyal Democrats, have lost no opportunity to denounce the work of this committee.

It would be well for every thoughtful citizen to remember that the bitterest opposition to this committee comes from radical and Communist sources.

A reading of only a partial list of the achievements of this committee as presented by its chief sponsor—the American Legion—will show why the radicals of every sort lost no opportunity to attack the committee. I quote only a partial list of its work as submitted by the national legislative committee of the American Legion.

"1. Exposed Communist group instigation in several labor disturbances.

"2. Disclosed that the German-American bund was foreign-backed with the result that Fritz Kuhn and James Wheeler Hill, bund officers, were convicted of subversive activities.

"3. Disclosed the Communist party plans to seize control of the American labor movement by infiltrating in labor groups.

"4. Revealed the American Youth Congress as Communist-controlled.

"5. Exposed the Transocean News Service, American Fellowship Forum, German Library of Information, and the German Railway Agencies as channels for distribution of Nazi propaganda.

"6. Investigated and exposed the Kyffhauser bund as an organization of former German soldiers and officers doing propaganda work.

"7. Exposed Joseph Curran, president of the Maritime Union and vice president of the CIO as a member of the Communist Party.

"8. Revealed Communist activities within the American Newspaper Guild, and in the California aircraft industries.

"9. Built up a complete file on fifth-column organizations containing the names and records of hundreds of thousands of individuals.

"10. Investigated and exposed Communist Party fraud in obtaining signatures to nominating petitions used in the 1940 elections with the result that party officials were indicted in several States and party candidates ruled off the ballots.

"11. Exposed the activities of Harry Bridges, Fascist leaders James E. Campbell, George Deatherage, and Charles Hudson, and Silver Shirt leader William Dudley Pelley."

During the long fight it has made to defend the American way of life it has been the target of Pacifist, Communist, and Communist-sympathizing critics. Most bitterly was it attacked recently when Representative RANKIN was urging its continuance.

It is to be seen from this brief synopsis of the committee's accomplishments why the Communists and the Communist-sympathizers have so viciously attacked the work of the committee.

It has furnished the Nation with ample evidence that Joseph Curran, prominent CIO leader, is a Communist.

It has shown that the American Newspaper Guild, nest of many radical writers, has been steeped in Communist activities.

The committee has clearly shown that communism seeks to dominate America by gaining control of the labor movement. In this connection it is the part of wisdom to remember the Political Action Committee of the CIO, which, according to one of its prominent members, W. M. Aikin, has a warchest of $60,000 to back CIO favored candidates in the next Democratic primary in Texas.

Congress is entitled to congratulation on its act in making permanent the Dies Committee. So long as it is in existence every little sleazy Communist and his well-wishers will rest uneasy.

JOHN LEE SMITH,
Lieutenant Governor, State of Texas.
AUSTIN, TEX.

Compulsory Military Training

REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 25, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, before and since my election to the Congress I have consistently taken the position that, in my opinion, our country should take the necessary steps for our protection so that we will not again be caught in the helpless position in which we found ourselves at the beginning of World War I and World War II.

Mr. Speaker, only through the grace of God have we survived through this period, and world developments since VE-day have further convinced me, and further confirmed by judgment, that, notwithstanding that our Nation is a peaceful people, and we believe that other nations should also be permitted to live in peace, unmolested, and work out their own determinations, and notwithstanding the efforts of our great leaders to bring about such a utopia, the future is not bright in that respect. All over the world there is unrest. Power politics continue in Europe. It appears that those "who get there fustest with the mostest" propose to keep the "mostest."

Mr. Speaker, we all decry this situation. However, I believe it is our duty to our country not to permit our people to again lull themselves into the condition of false security. It should not be necessary to call to the attention of our country, again and again, that an aggressor nation, girded for conquest, preparing over a period of years, invade and subjugate weak countries at will, and almost conquer all of Europe. In the East we had the same terrible experience—another nation conquered nearly all of Asia and attacked this country, which was totally and pathetically unprepared.

Mr. Speaker, we must not be caught in that position again.

Our President has appeared before us and has placed the responsibility on us. Anyone who is fair-minded will heed the warning. We have only to read between the lines of the warning of our President to realize the seriousness of the situation. We must act. We must take the necessary steps to protect ourselves and our country. We all realize that any kind of compulsory military training is, and will be, unpopular. A great President said, "There is nothing to fear but fear itself."

I do not believe the mothers of the sons of the United States want to live in fear. Would it not be better for the mothers to go to sleep at night knowing that their sons are ready and able to protect themselves, their families, and their country?

Full Employment and Minimum Wage Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 25, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the following statement recently issued by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor on the full employment bill and the minimum wage bill:

Two postwar measures of vital concern to the Nation's workers and strongly endorsed by the American Federation of Labor are experiencing rough sledding in Congress. They are the full employment bill and the amendment to the Wages and Hours Act which would lift the statutory floor under wages to 65 cents an hour.

True, the Senate passed a full employment bill. But it was so weakened by amendments, so hamstrung by reservations, that its effectiveness in present form is doubtful. Senate Majority Leader BARKLEY summed up the disappointment of the sponsors of this legislation when he said the bill as passed merely says that a worker has the right to a job—if he can find one.

Hearings on this legislation in the House are now drawing toward a conclusion and an effort will be made to restore the legislation to some semblance of its original meaning and intent when it comes up for a vote.

The executive council pledges the full support of the American Federation of Labor to this move.

It seems inconceivable that there should be any serious objections to making full employment a national policy. The legislation seeks to promote full employment by encouraging private industry to expand and make the most of its opportunities. It can in no sense be called a spending bill because it authorizes public works only when private investment falls short of the Nation's needs.

The pending amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act, setting 65 cents an hour as the new minimum wage in interstate industry, are encountering serious opposition from interests which seek to perpetuate a low-wage economy in certain sections of the country.

This narrow-minded viewpoint must not be permitted to prevail. The postwar prosperity of America depends upon a high volume of purchasing power among wage earners. By keeping wages from falling below $26 a week for 40 hours of work, we can assure a great domestic market for the products of American farms and factories. If millions of Americans cannot afford to buy food and clothing or obtain decent housing, all Americans will suffer.

Some enlightened employers are beginning to realize this unchallengeable economic truth. They learned during the war that profits can be more certainly assured by keeping production high than by keeping wages low. They are now showing increasing reluctance to support the position of unfair competitors who are unwilling to pay decent wages, regardless of the interests of the Nation.

Labor welcomes support from every source. We are determined to rally the full power of the American Federation of Labor and the backing of public opinion for prompt enactment of this vital legislation.

Army Discharge Policy in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 25, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of two letters from American servicemen in India, who are just as anxious as their buddies located in other areas to be returned to civilian life. The men in India, as well as those in Burma, China, and Korea, are entitled to every possible consideration in this matter and, in my opinion, they should be returned to the United States at the earliest opportunity. The C. B. I. was the forgotten theater during the war but that policy should not be continued into the postwar period. Now, with the proposed suspension of over-the-hump service, with our withdrawal from the Stilwell Road, and with the need for our remaining troops in the C. B. I. long since past, I think it is high time that we withdraw from that area immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to do my very best to help bring the earliest possible withdrawal of all our troops from the Far East, Japan excepted. Let us all keep faith with these men and give to them the opportunity to return to civilian life. I should like to call to the attention of the Congress the longer of the two following communications because it will give you, as it gave me, food for thought. I also intended to take up with the War Department the questions raised in these communications so that all possible action can be taken in behalf of the men in the C. B. I.

FORTY-EIGHTH DEPOT
SUPPLY SQUADRON,
APO 492, Postmaster, New York, N. Y.,
October 16, 1945.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Representative, Montana, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: I am writing to you because of your publicly expressed interest in the release of military personnel from the Orient. It is the feeling of the great majority of enlisted men and officers stationed at the Bengal Air Depot, near Calcutta, India, that boondoggling on the part of high-ranking officers is responsible for unnecessarily keeping large numbers of personnel here. These high-ranking officers are attempting to perpetuate themselves in their office. For the most part they are Regular Army officers and officers who intend to apply for commissions in the Regular Army. To them it will make no difference where they serve—and then it is to their advantage to serve overseas for many reasons. Some are afraid to face the rigors of civilian job hunting, knowing that they will never command the same salaries as they are now drawing; others realize that never again will they have the same authority and responsibility as they now possess in the military. Thus, these men in high position are doing everything within their power to retain personnel under their command. Let me cite some facts to prove this contention.

Two months after the war's end, only one out of 29 classes of Air Corps property has had any decision rendered as to its disposition. There is a systematic and thorough slowing-down process, conflicting orders, daily rescinding of previous orders—complete lack of any coordinated action toward closing down of Army installations here. A good share of this property was made obsolete long before the war's end by adoption of new type planes, advances, and modifications. Yet no one will give any order or make any decision as to its disposition.

Calcutta has been designated as one of the main supply points for Shanghai, although it is nearly half as far by water from Calcutta to Shanghai as it is from the United States to Shanghai. Depots having the same type of supplies are being dismantled in the Pacific islands, much nearer to Shanghai.

Today marks the beginning of the third month since Japan surrendered. During the time elapsed, not more than a third of the 3,500 men stationed at this depot could lay claim to the fact that they have done an honest day's work. If the men who set the war policy were as anxious to close up this theater as they were in their vigorous prosecution of the war, such useless waste of manpower would never exist. A survey of the depot now still shows men sitting around, doing nothing. This was admitted by the commanding officer of the depot, who has suggested that men without jobs be put on guard duty—the equivalent of cutting the grass with bayonets. We are dismissed from work daily at 4:30 o'clock. We are given Wednesday afternoons off as well as all day Sunday. Junior-grade officers and enlisted men alike would be delighted to work 18 hours a day, every day, if we knew it meant the prompt closing of the installation. The job can be done in 2 months, but the latest authentic information is that the field will close in the middle of March 1946, five long months from now.

If we were convinced that it would take 5 months to close up our business here, there would be no beefing. But we are far from convinced. We are sure that there is an abuse of power and authority, a desire on the part of certain general officers and their staffs to perpetuate themselves for as long a time as possible at our expense. We realize this is a serious charge but playing with our lives is far more grievous.

Can you help us?

With every best wish, I am,
Cordially yours,

——— ———.

BARRACKPORE, BENGAL,
October 14, 1945.

MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MIKE: The enclosed clipping was taken from the Sunday Statesman of Calcutta this morning.

Words cannot express our gratification at the realization that someone in the States besides our families are interested in our return.

Thanks.

(Signatures omitted.)

Maj. George Fielding Eliot's Views on Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 25, 1945

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include therein a portion of the remarks of Maj. George Fielding Eliot. These remarks are on the all-important subject of how to approach the atomic energy problem. I favor presenting as many views as possible on this subject, in order that the public may be informed.

Major Eliot's remarks follow:

There are certain things we can do now with what we have. There are certain things we should not try to do until we have facts on which we can base intelligent decisions. We have two basic problems: To establish a workable system of world security, and to survive while we are doing it.

A sensible security program might include these steps:

1. Get the various agencies and organisms of the United Nations Organization operating as soon as possible. Within that framework, begin (as the first order of business) discussion of a general agreement on limitation of armaments, with special reference to atomic weapons, rockets, guided missiles, and other things of that general type, and a provision for the Security Council to have the right to make inspections anywhere any time without anyone being able to veto such action.

2. Meanwhile come to a decision as to the domestic control of atomic energy and talk the whole subject over with our present atomic partners, Britain and Canada, in the hope of reaching a common viewpoint.

3. Postpone all legislation on the reorganization of our armed forces until we know where we stand in the international field, and use the time interval for a comprehensive, impartial survey of our military policy by a commission of top-flight civilians. This is necessary anyway in order to avoid piecemeal decisions.

A NATIONAL POLICY COUNCIL

4. Set up a national policy council at the highest level (President, Secretaries of State, War, and Navy, plus some form of congressional participation in making policy), with a permanent secretariat and with responsibilities established by law for keeping our foreign and military policies in true balance.

5. Create a first-class national intelligence service, reporting directly to the President and the policy council. We must have accurate and timely information of what goes on in this troubled world. Facts are the only basis for wise decisions.

6. While we are working out these problems, let us keep in hand sufficient margins of military and naval power, supported by industrial organization and by scientific research, so that any breach of our peace will appear suicidal to potential enemies.

These are not spectacular or dramatic suggestions. They will hardly be satisfactory to those who want the whole problem of security to be solved by tomorrow morning. But they form a connected program which seeks to make the best use of what we have while trying to find out how we may progress to better things. The lessons of history suggest that human beings will make durable progress forward and upward in the future, as in the past, only in one way: step by painful step.

We Must Act Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 25, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to submit for publication in the RECORD a copy of an editorial from the Washington Evening Star, of date October 24, 1945, as follows:

WE MUST ACT NOW

President Truman has stated the case for universal military training in a thoroughly admirable message to Congress. Every American, whatever his present views on the subject, should make it his business to read the message, for it presents the arguments in behalf of the training program with a degree of earnestness, clarity, and logic which compels respect and defies challenge.

There have been other messages to Congress on this little-understood subject. But in this one, for the first time, the issue is met squarely and courageously. Mr. Truman pointed out that the training program would be productive of a variety of benefits—educational, physical, moral, and spiritual. "But," he continued, "the basic reason for universal training is a very simple one—to guarantee the safety and freedom of the United States against any potential aggressor. The other benefits are all by-products—useful indeed, but still byproducts. The fundamental need is, and always will be, the national security of the United States, and the safety of our homes and our loved ones."

That, in a very few words, sets out the reason why this country must train its young men or run the risk—and it is a very real risk—of being defeated and destroyed in another war.

There is hope now that the world has learned its lesson and that the nations will organize to maintain the peace. Initial steps toward this end have been taken, and the United States will support this effort with every means at its command. Nevertheless, we cannot ignore the fact that aggressors filled with the urge to conquer peaceful nations have been turning up with disconcerting regularity since the dawn of civilization, and neither can we close our eyes to the international frictions and rivalries which have sprung up so quickly in the wake of this war. Plainly, as of today, this is a world in which no nation can have assurance of safety unless it is ready and strong in its own right.

The President has said, and he is manifestly correct, that never again can we count upon the luxury of time in which to get ready for war. Another conflict would burst upon us without warning and the aggressor, profiting from the lessons of this war, would strike first and in great force at the industrial heart of the United States.

There are two known ways in which we can meet this danger. One is through the maintenance of a large professional Army and Navy. But that would be too costly in terms of money, too wasteful in terms of men, and, perhaps, a real threat to our free institutions. The alternative is the one which President Truman recommends—a comparatively small Regular Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, a greatly strengthened National Guard and Organized Reserve, and a General Reserve composed of all the male citizens of the United States who have received training.

This General Reserve would not be a part of the armed forces, and, in time of emergency, it could be called to service only through act of Congress and on a selective basis. Yet, if war should come, the Reserve would be there, substantially trained and ready for quick mobilization—two big facts which would tend to discourage attack, and, more importantly, enable us to repel an assault if it should be made.

There are influential groups which oppose military training, but they have offered nothing in support of their position except what the President bluntly describes as "pious hope and dangerous wishful thinking." These groups argue for delay, but the time has come to act. The President advocates a program which, in the Star's belief, is literally essential to the security of the Nation. If the opponents have any constructive alternative, the people of this country have a right to demand to know what it is.

Information, Please

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1945

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an editorial from the Spokane Chronicle entitled "A Bad Time To Talk Spying."

This editorial is indeed timely. It comes at a time when we see information and more information regarding the conditions in both the conquered and the liberated countries of Europe and Asia.

We want all of the information we can get—as to crops, health, demobilization of the Allies and remilitarization of the liberated countries, and much other data.

We hear, already, of secret trade pacts and secret political treaties.

Light, not the darkness of stealth, will promote peace.

Obviously it is no time for our great Nation to talk spying.

The editorial referred to follows:

A BAD TIME TO TALK SPYING

If General Marshall feels that the United States is in need of a superintelligence service to carry on world-wide espionage he should not have made his wishes public.

The general is a highly respected and beloved American and his words carry the stamp of genuine Americanism, but his spy recommendation to Congress Thursday in requesting unification of the services could hardly have come at a more inopportune time. Statesmen of the world are trying manfully to come to some sort of agreement to outlaw war. They are trying to build this understanding on world-wide good will and trust. What a slap in the face to the other nations to have a top-flight American make open recommendation for a world-wide spy system!

The "over the coffee cups system" of intelligence which America has used may have been inadequate, but it could not have prevented World War II, in the face of Allied apathy. There was nothing secret about the threatening developments that led, unchecked, to the war. It required no spy system to see whither Germany and Italy were moving. Britain and America ignored them. America apparently knew of the coming storm at Pearl Harbor, but ignored that, too, right down to the last warning when the noncommissioned officer heard the Jap planes approaching and was snubbed. If we could not see a threat of war in the scrap metal and oil stock piles Japan was building, if no suspicion was aroused by the Jap moves in Indochina and China proper, what could spies have done?

No great nation could ready itself for war now without the world's knowing it, if each country opened its doors to a free press, free speech and free travel. That would do away with the need of gumshoe tactics and certainly would result in a better foundation for lasting peace.

Relief of Distressed Peoples

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it has long been a national policy of the United States to view with deep sympathy peoples in distress regardless of the country in which they live. This policy on the part of the United States has won for us ever-increasing admiration throughout the world.

Today in many sections of the Old World thousands of people are on the threshold of starvation. As a nation we promised relief. And more than that, we made available funds by the action of this Congress for that program.

I recognize that there are many political leaders in sections of Europe whose faith we might rightly challenge. It is not improbable that there are some instances where they are misappropriating food and supplies being sent to their country for their own political ends.

It may be necessary to make certain improvements in the policy of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration or certain additions of staff to see that things reach the common people. After all it is not the politicos and puppets who face death for lack of food, clothing, and medicine. It is the little people. I feel we must help them as we promised, at least to get through this first difficult winter.

Under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks an editorial taken from the Washington News of Wednesday, October 24, 1945, which clearly and intelligently reminds us of our responsibility, the title of which is "We Promised Relief":

WE PROMISED RELIEF

Almost a month has passed since Director General Lehman, of UNRRA, warned that a shortage of funds threatens to break the relief line to hungry Europe. Still Congress has not acted on President Truman's repeated appeals. According to official estimates, 180,000,000 of our allies are already near the edge of starvation, with winter closing in and worse conditions ahead. Surely it is not the desire of Congress or of the American people to ignore this desperate need.

The $550,000,000 requested was authorized by Congress last year but never appropriated. Next year, when UNRRA hopes to finish its work, an additional one and one-third billion dollars will be required to make up our original international agreement to give 1 percent of the national income for foreign relief and rehabilitation.

This does not go to former enemy countries. Most of the western European allies are able to pay. So, apart from China, the relief goes to the liberated eastern and southern European countries where the need is greatest.

Many of the supplies can come out of farm surpluses in the United States, and thus accomplish the double purpose of stabilizing the American economy while giving relief abroad. Other supplies can come from United States Army surpluses piled high in Europe, which cannot be returned to this country and which already are deteriorating.

We are aware that Russia made matters worse in eastern Europe by carrying off livestock and some supplies, and that her puppet regimes are trying to get their hands on relief supplies for political purposes. This should cause Congress to insist on stricter international supervision and all possible safeguards. But this problem is not sufficient reason for withholding relief.

After all, it is not the politicos and puppets who face death for lack of food, clothing, and medicine. It is the little people. We must help them as promised.

Militarism on the March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, President Truman is the victim and tool of the warmongering internationalists who believe in war, promote war, and who now seek to fasten militarism upon the

people. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the timely article by David Lawrence, published in the Washington Star October 24, 1945:

WAR-TRAINING PLAN LINKED TO MILITARISTS—TRUMAN SHORT-SIGHTED ON HIGHER EDUCATION NEED, SAYS WRITER

(By David Lawrence)

President Truman has swallowed hook-line-and-sinker the militaristic approach to universal military training. He has accepted the plans of the high-ranking generals and militaristically inclined civilians in the War Department who believe that it is desirable to interrupt higher education for military purposes even in time of peace.

Instead of proposing a plan that would make it optional for the boy to take one year's training any time between the ages of 18 and 24, the President accepts the War Department's proposal that between high school and college all boys must interrupt their studies and spend a year in a military camp. This proposal will never be accepted by Congress if the liberals of the country and the persons who believe in higher education become vocal about it.

The only answer that some of the War Department experts have at times made to the point is that it isn't democratic to worry about college educations. This is but another way of saying that it isn't necessary to develop doctors or dentists or scientists or any of the other professional groups so essential to American life.

CITES DOCTOR SHORTAGE

The shortage of doctors today in civilian communities is due directly to such short-sightedness by the military chieftains. As for the future, there is to be a shortage of medical men for many years to come so that even the veterans with recurrent disabilities are going to have a hard time getting medical care in the next several years.

There are some educators who have been persuaded to take the War Department's view of military training, but they are a minority. It has been contended by most of the others that when a boy graduates from high school he should go ahead with his college education because the 1-year interruption gets him out of the habit of concentration on studies and even may require refresher courses to recover ground in some of the interrupted studies.

The Army has not considered a boy of 23 or 24 unfit for training. In fact, during the war this was considered a desirable age bracket for making noncommissioned and commissioned officers. So, if the proposal were to permit boys to take the year of training any time between 18 and 24, some who were not going to college could take the year early whereas others could take it after their college courses.

The President repeats in his message to Congress the same illogical arguments that the Army chiefs have made before. He says:

"The argument has been made that compulsory training violates traditional American concepts of liberty and democracy and even that it would endanger our system of government by creating a powerful military caste. The purpose of the program, however, is just the contrary."

A SYSTEM OF TEACHING

Mr. Truman may not know it, but no militarist ever conceded a militaristic purpose. The development of a military caste cannot be prevented just by stating that there isn't any intention to develop one. Militarism is a state of mind and a system of teaching which can easily be foisted on the youth of America as it was on the youth of Germany. If boys are taken at an impressionistic age and taught the latest methods of killing, it is not likely that their professional officers will fail to tell them how to hate and how to bayonet their potential enemies—as was done during the war by a voluminous literature called indoctrination.

"The objective," says the President, "is not to train professional soldiers. It is to train citizens, so that if and when the Congress should declare it necessary for them to become soldiers, they could do so more quickly and more efficiently."

It is difficult to see the President's distinction, and it would have been better to acknowledge that the purpose is to train soldiers and make the best soldiers America can produce. But this can be done as well with boys of much more mature age and with a system of civilian supervision to avoid militaristic teachings than by entrusting the task to the military departments.

HINT OF MILITARISM

A hint of the militarism that lurks in the proposal is to be found in the following paragraph of the President's message:

"Under the plan which I propose, provisions should be made within the armed services to help trainees improve their educational status."

Presumably under such a plan the Army would be hiring teachers away from the colleges and high schools and this would mean an entire educational system overlapping the civilian educational system. The President adds:

"The period of training could well be used * * * to develop in our young men the ideals of responsible American citizenship."

This is a large order. Not a single textbook the Army got out during the war on this subject was free from criticism, because opinions differ on what constitute "ideals." The President admits, moreover, that the emphasis isn't going to be on "mere drilling" any longer or on calisthenics, but "on the use of all the instruments and weapons of modern warfare."

The business of organized killing may be over for the time being, but the training to do more killing apparently must go on.

Put an End to the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1945

MR. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 4431 to terminate the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. This was a wartime measure. I feel there is now no military necessity which justifies the continuance of this law.

I am advised that during the month of September 51,900 persons were inducted into the armed forces under this act. Of this number some 35,000 were boys and had just reached their eighteenth birthday. Another 10,000 were boys 19 and 20 years of age. In other words, about the only persons being inducted were these 18- and 19-year-old boys.

I had an 18-year-old boy in my office just this week who was compelled to leave Yale University and return to Colorado to wait for the draft. He had just finished his first term and was anxious to continue. However, so long as this law is in force no boy who is 18 or over can make any plans for his education. These boys are in constant suspense while waiting to be called.

I have a letter from a friend in Colorado advising of one case where a boy quit college when he became 18 and returned home to wait for the draft. He lost 3 years of college while waiting to be called, although anxious to serve his country in time of war. Surely no such situation should exist now that we are at peace.

It seems so unnecessary to deprive these young men of their education. Congress very reluctantly gave its consent to take these boys during the war period. We were told it was necessary to win the war. Now that the fighting has stopped we should immediately repeal this act, as it now appears that we will be able to get all of the men required through voluntary methods under the new enlistment bill just passed.

I cannot believe that the War Department wants to send these young boys to police the occupied countries. Certainly more experienced and mature men should be selected for that duty. Those who are now enlisting are trained soldiers and can be sent immediately to the occupation areas. I wish also to call attention to the statement made recently by General Marshall that it will not be possible to bring all of the men home from overseas until next June. So until that time the need for men will not be so great, and I predict that within 6 months we will obtain a sufficient number of men to fill all requirements.

I believe also, Mr. Speaker, that some consideration should be given the thousands of patriotic and loyal citizens over the country who have rendered such a valuable and unselfish service by serving on the local selective-service boards. These boards should be relieved of the responsibility of filling monthly quotas, which is becoming a most difficult assignment. I am sure they do not relish the idea of continuing to take these 18- and 19-year-old boys out of schools now that we are at peace.

I wish to include an editorial from the Colorado Springs Gazette, as follows:

PUT AN END TO THE DRAFT

Five months after the end of war in Europe, 2 months after the defeat of Japan, and with more men in uniform than the services know what to do with, youths are still being drafted for military duty at the rate of more than 50,000 a month. The Army says it is necessary in order to release the men who fought the war. The suspicion is that it grows out of the desire to perpetuate conscription.

Representative CHENOWETH denies necessity. He says that voluntary enlistments in the Army are running at the rate of 1,500 a day and may be expected soon to increase to 2,000 a day. He declares "it is quite obvious that we do not need to continue drafting 18- and 19-year-old boys," and he has introduced a bill to halt conscription.

Mr. CHENOWETH seems to be borne out in his view by Vice Adm. Louis E. Denfeld, Chief of Navy Personnel, who told the Senate Military Committee that voluntary enlistments were so satisfactory that the Navy henceforth would ask only "token" numbers of draftees.

What purpose do "token" levies serve beyond mere maintenance of the system?

The Navy aims at a permanent strength of 500,000 enlisted men. The Army has set its sights many notches higher. It remains for Congress to say what the size of the Military

Establishment is to be. The certainty is that the country cannot maintain itself as an armed camp, if for no other reason than that it has not the money. Neither will it long tolerate the drafting of men for the maintenance of armies abroad. The Army's current idea of urgent need is based on the continuance of such forces in large number.

The necessarily slow process of demobilization gives assurance of adequate armed forces for immediate purposes and soon there will be only limited requirements. There is nowhere an organized enemy force to consider. The occupation of Germany, for instance, could be effected with one or two divisions. It is now merely symbolic. Heavy replacements are not needed, and the yanking of youths out of high school and college for military service is as lacking in reason as it is arrogant.

Representative CHENOWETH is justified in demanding an end to the draft. He should find wide support in Congress and clearly has it among the people.

Signs of Trouble Are Seen Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1945

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an interesting report by Representative KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, who returned recently from a tour of 20 countries of Europe. This report appeared in the Daily Argus, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak.:

MUNDT SEES SIGNS OF TROUBLE IN COUNTRIES AROUND MEDITERRANEAN—CIVILIZATION END POSSIBLE WHERE BEGUN—WAR CLOUDS DECLARED VISIBLE IN ARAB NATIONS, BALKANS, SPAIN

(By KARL E. MUNDT, Congressman, First District)

A blue sea with a red rim. Many a song and fabled story has been written about the blue Mediterranean. And seen from a plane on a clear day, it is as blue and as beautiful as its most enthusiastic admirers have described it. But, more than any other body of water, the Mediterranean Sea is surrounded by a red rim. And unless men mend their methods, that shore line may run red with human blood once more. Unfortunately, such a floodtide of red has a fatalistic tendency to spread—within the past quarter of a century it has twice extended to distant American shores.

Civilization was born on the shores of the Mediterranean Sea at the point where the great Nile River of Egypt sprays itself out through fertile delta land to the sea. The great Christian, Jewish, and Mohammedan religions had their origin and sustain their shrines in this same area. Here, too, is the great Vatican City in Rome. In this area archeologists tell us, human and animal life had its first existence and in the south of what is now known as Iraq they take you to the site of the Garden of Eden. Yet along the shores of this great sea and the lesser seas branching off from it, more wars have been fought for more different reasons than in any other region of this earth. Like civilization, life, and religion, it seems that war, death, and pestilence have selected this comparatively small and reasonably remote area in which to originate and thrive. Judging from what one sees and hears in this locality today, the end is not yet. Trouble is still brewing its wicked broth on this red rim. And with the age of atomic warfare upon us, it may well be that civilization will create its doom where it had its dawn unless real statesmanship in many high places moves promptly and positively to avert it. The straws in the wind indicate that wise action is needed here now.

STRAWS IN THE WIND

What are these telltale straws of woe and war? In at least two areas of the blood-soaked shores of the Mediterranean (the Arab countries and the Balkans) war clouds are already visible and in a third area (Spain) some political forecasters see stormy weather ahead. Let us consider briefly the two trouble areas our committee has been permitted to study analytically.

THE ARAB COUNTRIES

On dark nights, some rifle shots have been heard during our studies here between Arab partisans and Jewish partisans each passionately believing that Palestine is their rightful heritage. The controversy is white-hot. Should the Jews be given Palestine as a homeland and an independent Jewish state or should the Arabs be permitted to retain it as part of what they call their Arab world? Great Britain, having precipitated the controversy during World War I, has been exercising a mandate over Palestine. Great Britain has been at different times first on the Jewish side and then on the Arab side of the question. She now wants to refer the problem to the United Nations. Nineteen hundred and forty-four was to be the year of decision on the question but nothing has been definitely decided. Neither side is satisfied. Accusations fly fast and furiously. There is acute danger of a widespread Arab uprising and of bloodshed. The Jews, too, have arms and their case has merit.

To add to the powder-packed situation is the fact that many Arab states, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Lebanon, Syria, as well as Egypt and Iran, want independence and complete freedom from British, French, or Russian domination? Neither do they desire American domination. Each of these four great powers has economic interests in the Arab world; each in one way or another—America included—is playing a dangerous game in dominating or directing certain aspects of the national life of one or another of these countries whose passion for independence smacks a bit of the Americanism of 1776.

At the moment, America is the most popular outsider in this area. In some respects we are the smallest offender but in one regard—I am sorry to have to report—we are the most flagrant.

Should uneasiness and restlessness and resentment break out in warfare and should each "guardian" big power help its "ward," the interests of the great nations might well clash and another small war swell into a global conflict. It is a situation for which a workable and equitable remedy must be found. This reporter and his committee will make some recommendations to President Truman and our Foreign Affairs Committee when we return. Following that, this column will report to you on our suggestions.

THE BLOODY BALKANS

Among the Balkan countries, too, we found great powers using little nations almost like pawns upon a chessboard. Here, too, uneasiness is the order of the day. America is less directly involved in the bid and barter game of the Balkans for economic and political advantage but the results of bad guesswork and guerrilla warfare might whip out to engulf us in conflict again as they did in 1914. It must be remembered, too, that in Balkan-adjacent Italy World War II had its basic beginning when men of Mussolini crossed the Mediterranean and invaded Abyssinia. This witch's brew which today intoxicates the Balkans is a potent poison.

Thus far, United Nations conferences and charters have neatly dodged the underlying factors of discontent in the Balkans. But the impacts of the difficulties, the rivalries, the jealousies, and the manipulations cannot be permanently dodged. We must face up to them. Pretty phrases on a printed page are not enough to solve problems which have incited endless wars.

If public men and potent nations permit the blue Mediterranean again to run red with blood, the pyramids may well mark the end as well as the beginning of man's conquest over the serenity of Nature. This may well be man's last opportunity to use reason boldly instead of chance in the business of ruling the affairs of nations.

DIVIDENDS

The United States today is rich in dividends of friendship around the world. We should utilize these dividends now; our leadership, our sound judgment, our sense of fair play, our insistence at times should be brought into play in trouble areas before they develop into war zones. Positive action now can prevent punitive expeditions tomorrow. Unused, these dividends mean little; but utilized, today, they can mean very much indeed.

Letter to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1945

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

SEPTEMBER 28, 1945.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am taking the liberty of sending you an article which has recently been written by Paul Mallon. It outlines in part a social disease that is spreading over this country like wildfire, and which is the culmination of the political and social philosophies of our national Government of the past 13 years.

Briefly, I am an Independent voter. I voted for Roosevelt in 1932 and against him ever since. My opinions are not those of an old-line Republican, and therefore may be read with the knowledge that this letter is not a name-calling, reactionary document.

Before the New Deal—and I use the phrase in a descriptive manner only—the old Republican line politics was to protect the few at the expense of the many. And the few were allowed to be crooked, industrialists or bankers as the case may be, all with the charming protection of being "rugged individualists." The country was backward in terms of a sound social philosophy. The big boys had things pretty much their own way. But at least the backbone of our country, the millions of little people, were honest and sound. The country as a whole reflected the innate honesty, self-respect, and responsibility of the average citizen.

After 13 years of New Deal philosophy and action, I am terribly fearful that the average citizen has been taught that all his problems are to be solved by the Government. He has a right to education, a right to work, a right to unemployment compensation, a right to organize, a right to strike, a right to social security, a right to medical care, a right to do this and to have that, but nowhere has there been the slightest emphasis on any responsibilities to match those rights. We are

about to be faced with the curse of this national disease. We are a Nation of grabbers, cheaters, liars, and lacking in self-respect to the point of being all too willing to be supported by our Government. We are willing to be supported in all these things, so long as we don't have to work out its responsibilities. We are becoming a Nation of weaklings, willing to grab all the benefits that organized minorities can force out of the Government, the methods used to obtain such benefits based upon threats of strikes, of chaos, or political revenge. This, in turn, encourages other groups to use the same methods, because at no time has there been a governmental head with sufficient honesty, integrity, and courage to face the real issues at stake and to really represent all the people of this country. It has been a spectacle of rats gnawing at the very foundations of our democracy, each being interested in filling its own belly, regardless of the rights and privileges of all.

This is what you have inherited, Mr. President. If you disagree with my thoughts, it must be because you believe the trend of our citizens appreciating their responsibilities of citizenship have increased since 1932, rather than otherwise. If you agree with me that the situation has deteriorated, then it is imperative that countermeasures be taken to correct and cure the evils that have caused the disease. To do nothing, to be "political," to depend upon the expediencies of the moment is to invite disaster. Those are the causes of our present plight.

The fortune wheel has made you President. You have been hoisted to heights of prestige and power that must make you dizzy to contemplate. You are at the summit. You can go no further. You now have the rarest opportunity that has come to any man for generations: to have the courage, the supreme integrity to be the President of the people, rather than the President of minority pressure groups. Only the President of the people can redirect the thinking and philosophy of our country back to the virtues we must attain if our freedom is to be assured. We must again realize that our responsibilities of citizenship must equal our rights of citizenship. Failing in that, we lose all rights, all freedom.

Respectfully yours,

DONALD A. FOWLER.

A Scientist's Views on the Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 25, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, Prof. H. I. Schlesinger, of the department of chemistry of the University of Chicago, in a letter which I have just received gives his views on the future of the atomic bomb and the consequences which might result from the passage of the May-Johnson bill, S. 1463. His letter is herewith presented:

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY,
Chicago, Ill., October 22, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM A. ROWAN,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROWAN: I am deeply concerned about the consequences which might result from passage of the May-Johnson bill (S. 1463) for the control of atomic energy. My concern is the result of my conviction that this bill will not safeguard us against attack by foreign enemies and that it gives this country no assurance that the nonmilitary uses of atomic energy will not disrupt our economy or destroy our free institutions.

My fears about the future of American security against foreign attacks are based on the following considerations. Present knowledge and understanding of atomic disintegration and its military uses are in an initial and highly undeveloped stage. The only way in which we can maintain our present advantage in this field is by providing the best environment for scientific and technological research and by training young men to take up the problem where the present workers in this field must leave off. The indefinite, arbitrary, and severe restrictions made possible by this bill, the provisions which make it possible to prevent free discussion and interchange of ideas, knowledge, and experience are completely incompatible with research or teaching.

Furthermore, by its very emphasis on secrecy, the bill will inevitably create the impression among our people that they are safe because we possess secret basic knowledge and can make further basic discoveries not available or possible for other nations. The Smyth report shows that both impressions are utterly false. Nevertheless, the creation of such impressions is bound to lull our people into a false sense of security which will make them unwilling to bear the cost of the future research and technological development which alone can give us any measure of security.

The bill, however, creates other equally serious doubts. The commissioners and their administrators are, in my opinion, not really responsible to the President, the Congress, or to any other authority, because they cannot be removed except for causes which are not related to the policies they may adopt. Nevertheless, they are given complete powers over a field of science which will affect and pervade every aspect of American life. They are given authority not only to control research and development, but even discussion of atomic energy; they may make regulations without knowledge or consent of the President or Congress and to punish individuals for infractions, whether intentional or inadvertent, of these regulations; they may establish a secret, independent security organization responsible to no one except themselves. Special provisions are made to allow Army or Navy officers to act as administrators—has the United States ever come so close to a military dictatorship with its attendant gestapo as this?

I realize that some secrecy and much regulation in this field will be needed. But hasty, hysterical legislation is not the solution of the problem which faces us. I urge you to use your great influence to prevent hasty action and to assure adequate open hearings and wide publicity of the view of all sides. That type of approach is the only way in which so serious a crisis can be resolved by democratic procedures.

Respectfully yours,

H. I. SCHLESINGER,
Professor of Chemistry.

A Voice From the Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 25, 1945

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Louis Bromfield, from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of October 21, 1945:

A VOICE FROM THE COUNTRY
(By Louis Bromfield)

"The sum total of the common sense of the common people is the greatest and soundest force on earth."—Thomas Jefferson.

There are times when many thoughtful, good citizens must succumb to pessimism regarding the future of this Republic, and never more so perhaps than at this moment when the country is economically, socially, and even spiritually dislocated by the confusion into which we plunged on the day of Japan's surrender.

The reasons for this pessimism seem to me to have a profundity greater than has been touched upon by any of the thinking or writing I have encountered. It is no acute cause for pessimism that we cannot at the moment get tires or new cars or build desperately needed houses. These are, at most, inconveniences which we hope will one day be alleviated.

What is alarming is the underlying cause—that the most powerful nation in the world, where wealth and opportunity still abound, is behaving as if it were a poor nation afflicted with despair like Germany or a nation like England which, after two wars and the pressure of economic, geographic, and world-political circumstances, is threatened by decline and perhaps decay.

AS IF WE WERE POOR

A considerable segment of our population appears set to impose upon this rich and powerful Republic of free citizens, a mold of government which is properly the last resort of ruined or declining nations. In the face of a huge and hungry market, in the face of a vast accumulation of free money begging to be spent, we are behaving as if we were a poor and desperate nation haunted by the necessity of providing for a population housed in half-ruined hovels and threatened by starvation.

Nearly the whole of the program proposed indifferently by President Truman to Congress is that of a ruined, despairing nation. All the proposals for increased unemployment insurance, for right to work, the abolition of taxes in lower-income brackets, and a hundred other manifestations of defeatist psychology, are both cowardly and unnecessary if the bulk of our citizens still possess the virtues which in the past have built our strength and power.

I refer to such virtues as thrift and discipline, morality, love of independence, and liberty, courage, neighborliness, human dignity, and that fundamental virtue of every strong citizen or nation, not the right to work, but a desire to work and a sense of the dignity of work.

I think President Truman knows all this in his heart. I think that is the reason he presented the program in a half-hearted fashion and has shown no great passion to see it carried through. It is essentially a cowardly program and even his mild sponsorship of it was undoubtedly brought about by political pressure from three elements of our population:

1. That of selfish minority interests seeking virtually by blackmail of the Nation to grab all they can during the Nation-wide internal crisis of reconversion.

2. The demagogic politicians who are always whining about the people, as if they were a herd of sheep or a starving rabble.

3. Those sinister elements which are endeavoring to create artificially, through strikes, confusion, and economic dislocation, conditions which do not in reality exist, and which alone can bring about the enactment of such a program.

A FOOLISH SPECTACLE

The absurdity of a theory which calls for 30 to 50 percent increases in industrial wages

without raising the cost of living speaks for itself. The tragedy is that not a few people really believe this and that many others are willing to give such a theory lip service for the sake of their immediate, shortsighted, and selfish interests. By none of these methods or panaceas was any great nation ever built or sustained.

From the White House in Washington, President Truman, a simple man of hard common sense, must find himself confronted by an extraordinarily foolish spectacle, perhaps the most foolish ever provided by any great nation in history. He sees farms and factories, hotels, and offices, restaurants, and shops, crying out for help, begging men to take jobs.

He sees huge factories shut down by strikes over fantastic demands for increased wages or jurisdictional brawls between unions or petty grievances like the discharge of an obnoxious employee. He sees thousands of people, blocks long, standing in line to draw unemployment insurance while millions of jobs go begging.

He sees hotels and trains crowded with people throwing away wildly whatever money they have because they cannot invest it soundly in cars or houses or washing machines, since organized labor will not permit them to do so.

I think that the President must ask himself, as many a solid citizen has begun to do, What would happen if all of us went to work, not to destroy this Nation, but to build it up?

Never was there such an opportunity.

Further, With Regard to Irrigated Land for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, it is well known among our membership that I have been sponsoring legislation for many months which would provide good irrigated land in family-sized farms for the Nation's defenders in the 17 Western States. I am glad to say that one of these bills, which was introduced at the request of the American Legion, passed the House on April 17, but it has not as yet been acted upon by the Senate. However, I have, during the last few days, contacted several members of the Senate Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, urging action upon this bill, H. R. 2742. I have been given assurance that action will be taken on it soon.

Another bill, H. R. 520, which in my judgment is more important as a benefit to veterans, was reported out of the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation on June 5, 1945, but due to opposition and delay it did not pass the House until September 19 last. I have made inquiry of the Senate Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation also with regard to this bill, and I believe we may expect action on it in the near future. The specific reason why I wish to see enactment of these two and other such measures at the earliest possible date is that millions of veterans have now returned from the war and are asking what Congress has done for them as well as what business and industry is doing for them. Literally hundreds have asked about the terms and conditions under which a veteran may obtain a home on irrigated land.

It is well known that the authorities took a survey of our Armed Forces before demobilization started, and it was found that out of about a dozen million men in uniform, 850,000 indicated a desire to return or go to the farm and own a piece of farm land for themselves. Of course, by the wildest stretch of imagination, with all opportunity and help furnished the Bureau of Reclamation, during the next 5 or 6 years, it would be impossible for them to provide family-sized farms for more than one-tenth of that number. However, the Government has other means to supply farms. It is earnestly to be hoped that good farm land may be made available in every State of the Union, and not merely in the so-called irrigation States. While I am interested in the Bureau of Reclamation, because of my official position, I am also interested in other agencies of the Government, particularly the Department of Agriculture, in making provision, in addition to the so-called GI bill of rights, that at least 50 percent of those desiring homes on the land may obtain family-sized farms, or at least homes in rural communities where professional men may live next to the soil while making a living in their professions or trades. I think this could occur in every State of the Union, and I think it would be good for our economy to enable several thousand of the Nation's defenders to come home and live in rural communities according to their conception of the American way of life.

As chairman of the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, I hail the President's recommendations and estimates for appropriations as contained in House Document No. 331 and submitted to the House last week. As chairman of the committee, I shall support this postwar program and urge my colleagues to do likewise. It is another evidence of the President's vision in an attempt to build the West in the most appropriate and profitable way in these postwar years. Usually the Committee on Appropriations think of my plea for reclamation as only for the Gila project, and such it has been for the last 9 years, until this year. I must continue to remind my colleagues that there are 17 Western States in which there are vast possibilities for irrigation. I have been telling returning veterans that with the timely aid of Congress, the Bureau of Reclamation could furnish them homes on good land in these 17 Western States. Therefore, my sights are lifted above the possibilities in Arizona and even beyond the possibilities of the Colorado River Basin, vast and attractive as those possibilities are.

To my constituents in Arizona, I am glad to point out that the President, in this House Document No. 331, suggests a $2,000,000 appropriation for the Gila project and $10,000,000 appropriation for the building of the Davis Dam on the Colorado River at the Bulls-Head site. To my constituents I will say that I have been committed to and have been working on the Gila project since January, 1937, and on the proposed Davis Dam for more than 4 years, having begun on the latter proposition prior to our entrance into the Second World War. Therefore, I am delighted that the President has given such prominence to these two items.

The building of the Davis Dam, halfway between Boulder Dam and Parker Dam, will confer a great benefit upon Arizona, California, and Nevada. Its influence may be felt upon all the States of the Southwest. The legal provisions for its construction are contained in the water treaty between the United States and the Republic of Mexico, ratified some time ago by our Senate and within the last few weeks by Mexico. This treaty calls for the building of the Davis Dam; and because of the requirement to fill an international obligation, a large share of the expense of construction should be an obligation of the National Government.

When Congressman James Scrugham, of Nevada, and I first discussed the building of this proposed dam, we had in mind a power producer to supplement the power needs of the Southwest; but, of course, it is capable of multiple use, and I think some irrigation benefits may come from it, if properly planned. The chief ultimate use, even surpassing that of power production, is the part it will be called upon to play in regulating the Colorado River, under the terms of the treaty with Mexico. For that reason I feel that a large share of the cost should be borne by our Government.

I have been telling service men and women of the Second World War who have written me asking their chances of getting irrigated land near Yuma, Ariz., that if and when Congress passes certain legislation—which has not yet been done—giving veterans preference on those irrigation projects soon to be completed, it would be possible for several hundred homes to be established on the Gila project within the next few months. In answer to an inquiry, I have just received a lengthy letter from the Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. Bashore—a letter dated October 23—outlining exactly what the Bureau of Reclamation would do on the Gila project if the money is appropriated as the President has suggested. Therefore, I say again, in this public way, to those inquiring veterans, "If Congress appropriates $2,000,000 to the Bureau of Reclamation for the development of the Gila project in Yuma County, Ariz., and if Congress enacts legislation giving veterans preference on such lands in the Gila project, it would be possible, within a few months, to allot homes to qualified veterans in this desirable area which the inhabitants of the city of Yuma are accustomed to refer to as 'the Garden of Eden.'" I want to call attention to the last two "ifs," and to remind my inquiring friends, now stepping out of the service, that I have constantly sought appropriations for this development and I have given more effort to get legislation enacted extending veteran preference on newly irrigated land than I have given to any other one phase of legislation. The next few months will

tell the story in this regard; and anything done on it after the year 1945 will be too late, in my judgment, to be of any benefit to veterans who would like to own a piece of irrigated land.

The remarks last made apply to one portion of the Southwest, but the President's recommendations, to which I must return, apply to almost every one of the reclamation States; and our great President, through the Director of the Budget, has suggested as to this phase of national postwar reconversion and effort that Congress appropriate $93,367,000 for the reclamation work of the Bureau of Reclamation. This is a proposal containing great prospect and hope, and it is now at the point of decision by your Congress.

The Poll-Tax Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial entitled "Here or Hereafter" which appeared in the Nashville Tennesseean on October 3, 1945:

For the third time in as many years the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate has recommended a law to allow all Americans to vote freely for President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress. In each of those years such a measure has been passed in the House by large majorities. In the Senate now, as in previous years, a majority of the membership is pledged to vote for the legislation.

For the measure to fail of enactment again this year because of the unwillingness or inability of the Senate to override a filibuster would be not only to leave millions of Americans under poll-tax disfranchisement but to stultify majority will in the Congress itself. With our Government pointedly insisting upon the right of the peoples of Bulgaria, Rumania, Poland, Greece, Japan, and Germany to express their political choice in free elections, the failure of Congress to protect this right to millions of American citizens—including the people of Tennessee—would earn for our Nation the raucous laughter of a world unimpressed by mere pretensions.

The Judiciary Committee also has recommended to the Senate Senator O'MAHONEY's proposal for a constitutional amendment to outlaw vote taxation. It is unfortunate that Senator O'MAHONEY should have introduced this proposal at this time, and that the committee should have passed it along with the anti-poll-tax statute which had so firm a priority. The effect of this action can only be to confuse the issue; and it is sufficient to observe that a poll-tax witch doctor like Senator BILBO, of Mississippi, readily promises not to filibuster against the O'Mahoney resolution to appreciate the ill-turn that has been done.

A constitutional amendment can be blocked by the simple inaction of 13 States, and by this route a free vote for all America could be achieved, if at all, for some future generation. Many of the leading constitutional authorities of the Nation have declared their belief in the rectitude of the anti-poll-tax statute—as have, of course, the Members of the House who have voted for it three times and the Senators who have pledged themselves in its favor. The poll-tax oligarchy in the Senate has opposed the statute not because they doubt its constitutionality, but precisely because they are convinced that it would be upheld in the courts.

The merit of the anti-poll-tax statute is exactly the merit of democracy—the principle of government we preach in the world and fight wars to defend. It is the duty of Congress, under the Federal Constitution, to preserve the Republic—and hence to clear the right of every citizen to his voice in government. That duty cannot be delegated to the States or to the people—certainly not to the people who are tax-barred from the vote.

At the present pass, where fundamentals of our own Government are at stake, the Senate can sidestep its duty by putting the O'Mahoney resolution ahead of the poll-tax bill or by yielding again to the disgrace of a filibuster. Or it can vindicate the Nation's love of democracy by courageously enacting the law which alone can make the America of our day a land of free elections.

Let Us Try for Peace First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, are we not going to give the peace a chance? Do we not have any faith in our efforts to achieve a permanent effective world security organization? Before the ink is hardly dry on the peace documents, and before we can fully comprehend the significance and possibilities of the San Francisco Conference, our President comes out with a statement that we must have a compulsory military-training program.

When we speak of military training, does that sound peacelike? After the last war, we advocated a disarmament program, and followed through with it. We did not join the League of Nations. That was held against us and used by the internationalists as the reason for the Second World War. Now we have come out full force for world peace organization. We were hosts to the delegates at San Francisco where hopeful prospects were forecast for a permanent peace. We have the honor of having Mr. Stettinius as its chairman. But before this organization gets set up for business, our President comes out flatly and says we have to have military training for every young man. Does this look like we are laying down our arms after just finishing the greatest war in history, and giving unselfishly our full measure of blood and treasure to down the tyranny of the Axis Powers? Does it manifest our sincere belief that peace can be achieved? Where is the courage and forthrightness of our leadership? Has it exhausted every channel of opportunity for peace? What has caused our leaders to turn to this cynical attitude? We willingly spent billions to support our war effort and to help our boys defeat the war criminals. What has our leadership offered in the way of a spending program to keep the peace? They cry out that the atomic bomb has doomed the world. Have they done anything to tame it for peacetime pursuits?

They say we have lost our moral strength and abilities in the race to our scientific progress. What has been done to build up our moral fibers since the end of the war? At our request and with $2,000,000,000, we asked the scientists to make an atomic bomb. It was something new. Something impossible. But our scientists put their full energies, resourcefulness, and intelligence to work. The result? They built it.

What is the matter with requesting our moral and spiritual leaders to go to work and discover a plan to keep the peace—or at least use the full resources of the organization we have set up? Give them the money to do the job. We discovered something to scare the pants off civilization. Now we have to do something to outlaw it. It would be far simpler to outlaw war.

All of this may seem irrelevant to compulsory military training. But to me the analogy is clear. Either we have to believe we can win the peace and stick to it, or say to the people of this Nation and the world that we are merely in a brief interlude preparing for another war.

Let us stop kidding ourselves. Which will it be? Personally, I think we should give the peace a chance. It is our one great hope for the world. But we cannot have peace by preparing for war. Compulsory military training by any name sets this Nation at work arming for a fight. And that is not peaceful.

This Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a copy of an article by Constantine Brown, Washington columnist, entitled "This Changing World," as follows:

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

The Fourth French Republic, which was born last Sunday, is colored with a "healthy" pink. The Communist Party emerged as the strongest individual political group, but the Socialists, headed by Leon Blum, and the Christian Socialists—now known as the MRP and headed by Foreign Minister George Bidault—have an overwhelming combined majority.

The Radical Socialist Party of Édouard Herriot, once the most popular political leader of France, was badly defeated.

The political situation in France can be summed up as follows:

Internally the French people have given a mandate to their representatives who are to

draft the new French Constitution to go as far as they like in the matter of socialization. This means that laws providing for the nationalization of the banks and the large industries will be put into effect. But the private initiative of the "little fellow" will not be impaired in any way. Neither will there be any collectivization of the farms. The followers of Blum and Bidault have pledged themselves to preserve the individualism of the farm owners.

In foreign affairs, and this is more important to the outside world than France's domestic affairs, the policy of the Blum-Bidault groups, which now have an overwhelming majority, will be to restore France as an important world power. Both leaders oppose any policy of subservience to another power and expect their country to play an important role on the international stage.

The victory of the Leftist Socialists who are supporting General de Gaulle is more a victory of French common sense than a personal triumph of the head of the French provisional government.

It is true that in the past 12 months General de Gaulle has made much progress in humanizing himself. He has learned to smile and, while not losing his stubbornness which had thrown him into many difficult situations, he also has learned to compromise. His dictatorial complex, which was more on the surface than underneath, has gradually disappeared under the severe knocks he has received since France was liberated.

But the fundamental reason why the Communists failed to win at the polls, despite their compact with Herriot, is to be found in the rebuffs France received in London at the hands of Soviet Foreign Commissar Molotov.

In spite of the crushing military defeat suffered by France in 1940 and in spite of the hardships which they are now undergoing, the French people have never lost their national pride. Frenchmen are convinced that France is still a great power.

The United States and Great Britain did much to bolster this feeling when both Governments insisted that France become one of the Big Five.

At the Foreign Ministers Conference in London, however, the Russians, who had been the first to recognize General de Gaulle's Free French organization as a de facto government, decided to slap down the French by refusing to let them join the United States, Great Britain, and Russia in drafting the peace treaties in the Balkans.

This was a well-calculated diplomatic operation. The French, even today, enjoy a greater prestige in the Balkans than all the other great powers together. The roots of France's political and intellectual influence can be traced back many centuries. This influence, the Russians fear, may run counter to their plans in central and southern Europe.

The brusque manner in which Commissar Molotov told the French to mind their own business had strong repercussions among the French electorate, and is said to have had a definite bearing at the polls. The Communists, who are known to take orders directly from Moscow, were better organized than all the other parties. Many official observers who have kept in close touch with French affairs predicted a great victory for them. General de Gaulle, himself, is said to have been skeptical that his platform would be accepted by the French electorate, and is reported to have made preparations to withdraw to a modest home along the Marne River to write his memoirs.

But the situation dramatically changed after the national pride of the French people was offended by the Russians in London.

Political observers are convinced that the results of the elections will make France nobody's puppet—and eventually will have deep repercussions throughout Europe.

Address by Mr. Justice Douglas Before Missouri Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK P. BRIGGS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 26 (legislative day of Monday, October 22), 1945

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. President, last month the State of Missouri was signally honored by a visit from Mr. Justice William O. Douglas on the event of the annual meeting of the Missouri Bar Association. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the honorable justice on this occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The State of Missouri has been much in the news in recent months. The name has been heard lately in Potsdam and Paris. Even the Japanese have had it impressed upon them in a way they will not soon forget.

Missouri's latest fame is well deserved. But I think that one of the most significant facts about your State is one we learned at school. That fact goes back 80 years, to the time when the North and the South of this country were having a feud. Missouri hadn't made up her mind whether she was part of the North or the South.

But Missouri never shunned an issue. And Missouri believed in backing up her convictions. There were convinced Confederates in Missouri, and there were Unionists, too. Both groups had mighty strong convictions. The result was that Missouri occupied a unique position, 80 years ago, in that war. As I recall, she was the only State in the Union that more than filled her quota of enlistments in both the Union Army and the Confederate Army.

Well, that was a long time ago, and a lot of things have happened since. But this bit of Missouri history bears on a point I wish to make.

It's about conviction—the kind of conviction your grandfathers, on both sides of that war, had.

I think we need a lot of that today.

You take this Japanese war we've just won, and the war against the Nazis that we won last spring. From some comments that are heard one wouldn't know that we had just beaten the most powerful professional military machine the world has ever seen. One wouldn't think we'd won anything but a chance to get ourselves into a lot of trouble. Rather, you would think the most important question about the beginning of this war was whether our generals were more short-sighted than our admirals, or vice versa. You would think the most pressing problem of the peace was what the Germans and the Japanese thought about America.

But we didn't go to Tokyo to psychoanalyze the Japanese. We didn't go to Tokyo so that they could have an election.

We went to Tokyo because we beat the Japanese.

We went to Tokyo because the American people are determined to prevent Japan from starting another war. We went to Tokyo to put Shinto savagery and feudal militarism out of business in the Pacific in which we live. We went to Tokyo to take the balance of power in the Far East out of Japan's hands.

If we do not take it out of her hands, if we leave Japan any vestige of political influence or prestige in the Far East, we will be making her a free gift of an infinite chance to do mischief. The first place she will try to make mischief is between Russia and America. In just this way the Nazis, both before and after defeat, have tried to disrupt our relations with our allies.

We must be on our guard against this kind of political warfare directed at smashing the friendship of the United Nations. The Japanese are clever, sly, and arrogantly ambitious. They will tell us that without them Russia will dominate the Orient; and that China will fall into disorder. They will try to sneak into every situation where they think they see a difference of opinion developing between the powers that have beaten them, and do their best to widen that difference into a rift.

Differences of opinion between our allies and ourselves are, of course, bound to develop as time passes. Nothing could be more hopeless and futile than to ignore them and let them fester between us. They must be solved in the open. But they must be solved with no helpful suggestions from Tokyo. They must be solved directly between Russia and America, or China and America. From Tokyo we can deal face to face with Russia and China, as neighbors together.

We cannot tolerate Balkan intrigue in the Pacific. The Pacific is our corridor into the new world aborning in Asia. The Pacific has become a lake connecting America and Russia. It is our link with the new China that has allied herself with America and Russia. The Pacific is America's new frontier. Now that we are in Tokyo it is our job to impose the criminal law and to operate a reform school.

The world will judge us by how well we do the job. Russia in particular will judge us by a strict test. She will look to see whether we sterilize Japanese militarism as effectively as she sterilizes German militarism. She will value us by our results, not by our rhetoric. And, because we Americans are at bottom idealists, we will value ourselves by results, too.

Our unpreparedness cost a lot of men their lives. We must examine our mistakes, and judge the guilty. We must profit by this lesson. But the worst thing we can do with the blame for Pearl Harbor is to quarrel over who the American scapegoat is to be. Let us never forget that the real guilt of Pearl Harbor lies on the shoulders of General Tojo and the other criminals who used Hirohito and the sinister religion of Shintoism as a front for the brutalization of the Japanese people. The important fact about the start of the war is that the Japanese picked a fight with us.

We beat them. Let's remember that. Instead of sighing with relief and hoping for the best (but fearing the worst), let us celebrate our victory. Let us be clear that, thanks to our victory, life for us can now be as good as we dare to make it—and better than other peoples have ever dared dream it could be.

There are many families in America to whom victory cannot mean all that it does to the rest of us. Those are the families that have changed a blue star in their service flags to a gold one. They cannot rejoice lightheartedly at a victory that was won at the cost of a son or a husband or a brother.

No, they cannot rejoice lightheartedly. But they will not understand anyone who tells them that our victory means nothing. They will not understand anyone who tells them that the last 4 years were a meaningless interlude of horror that swept their loved ones off for no reason and no gain. They will not believe it.

Victory means something which is more challenging than anything in the previous history of America. Victory means that this great Nation has acquired a position of moral leadership in the world which is not only

unique but which carries tremendous responsibilities.

Our victory was so decisive that we are apt to take it for granted. But the great victory we have won was the sum of three factors:

1. The courage and initiative and skill of American fighting men;

2. The brains of American scientific laboratories;

3. American productive power.

American production, according to Marshal Joseph Stalin, was the decisive weapon of the war. We can agree that American labor and American industry did the most amazing job during the war that the world has ever seen. But at the same time we will never forget the faith and daring and courage of the men who held and maintained our far-flung battle lines and who carried the fight to the enemy even during the dark days of 1942 and 1943 while American production was getting under way. And we will never forget the brilliant work of American scientists who won the race against German and Japanese laboratories. There can indeed be no doubt that American inventive genius has earned the eternal gratitude of free people throughout the world.

Victory has produced a new era. Those who are thinking in terms of a return to normalcy are substituting a dangerous illusion for reality. The technological changes which the war has produced make unmistakably plain that we are living in a fast-moving, dynamic society which defies any standard of normalcy. And those who think that we can now retire to the point from which we started in 1941 fail to recognize the responsibilities which go with our position of moral leadership in the world.

The 11,000,000 men and women who served in this war do not start anew from the point at which they left civilian life. They have gained in maturity and knowledge. They have lost much happiness in fighting this war. Their personal losses are a large measure of the Nation's victory. They know the difference between victory and defeat. For they have been at places where they could see what defeat really means. They have a good idea of the ruthless forces which were turned loose on Western civilization and of the great potential dangers ahead for any nation which does not maintain the lead in this competitive world.

Neither are labor and industry going back to the point from which they started.

I was brought up to be proud that the American standard of living was the highest in the world. I'm still proud of it. I'm proud of our skilled mechanics who turned out the B-29's that bombed Tokyo, the tanks that broke the German lines, and the ships that carried our supplies all over the world. I'm proud of the women who had never worked before, and who became good welders and good turret-lathe operators.

They were paid good wages and they deserved them. They won increased status and position. They deserve that too. For they did the producing that gave our soldiers and our allies the weapons that won the war. Let us not forget that the Germans, who used slave labor, were beaten.

The new industries that have grown out of the war are not going to disappear either. Radar, electronics, atomic power—they are part of our victory. They are new gifts with which to build the peace. They will be as beneficial or as terrible as we make them. It's up to us.

Scientific knowledge is discovered by men and used by men. We don't need to be afraid of it—unless we're afraid of ourselves. We don't need to distrust our future unless we distrust ourselves.

We have no reason to distrust ourselves. There is nothing in the war record of America that should make any American feel anything but proud. We are even proud of the way our early defeats were faced. We are proud of the men on Bataan, the men on Wake Island, the men of the Navy who fought the first bitter defensive battle of this war. We gave General Wainwright as big a welcome as we gave General Eisenhower.

I am proud of a country that gives as big a welcome to a defeated general as to a victorious one. I am proud of a country that remembers for 3 years that a general's defeat was its defeat; that never repudiates him; that keeps his memory bright and cheers when he is decorated for his deeply American courage during the campaign that ended in his surrender.

I am proud of that country. It is a country that is proud of itself. Japan makes a cult of suicide. America has a faith for which to live.

I am confident that our new scientific knowledge will be used as well as General Wainwright and Colonel Devereaux used what they had in hand. It will be used as scientific knowledge always has been used in America. For the good of America. For the happiness and freedom of the American people. For the expression of the essential decency of the American people. As a weapon in the continuing fight for progress and a more creative humanity.

That is America's goal. The objective is not mere security. Security alone is nothing. It is a treacherous illusion unless it is based on a constant striving for something new and better than the outgrown past. There is no security without competition—competition against the highest records that we ourselves have set; and competition that insures our ability to defeat anyone who threatens us. Such security, the only real security, is not based on self-doubt and the desire to be safe. It is based on self-confidence, on self-knowledge, and on the old American conviction that freedom and democracy can build a better world. Any other standard of security is as dangerous as the false security of a Maginot line.

No nation on earth has done more to build a better world than America. Now we have new tools with which to build that world—new material tools based on our scientific knowledge. But the new tools must still be used in the traditional American way—the way that respects the dignity of mankind, the freedom of initiative, the opportunity of youth, the strength and power of those who toil. That is part of the responsibility that goes with our position of moral leadership.

Everyone is going to have the secret of atomic power. We don't dare seek our own security through wishful thinking that others will not discover that secret. Knowledge cannot be buried in a vault. We can no more suppress the secret of atomic power or reserve it for ourselves exclusively than we could have suppressed the secret of the gasoline engine. Atomic power is going to be used in every phase of the economy—of our economy and of every other economy. We must be strong enough and alert enough and imaginative enough to see to it that this new power is used not to destroy mankind but to raise the standards of living throughout the world.

Our only security in the new atomic age will be in our ability to continue using knowledge better than anyone else can. We have not feared this challenge in the past. We must not fear it now. Let us go forward with that conviction.

President Roosevelt declared last year that we needed 6,000,000 jobs for men and women of labor. He was looking ahead then to the postwar period with the same insight and knowledge that saw the coming war in 1938 and 1939 and 1940, and that girded us for its battles. President Truman has begun the work with Congress to guarantee that program.

The drive for full employment is a noble program. But it seems to me that we limit our vision of it if we see it as merely a battle for security. We must indeed gain freedom from want in America. But we can do so only if, at the same time, we preserve our freedom to want—freedom to reach for new horizons, spiritual as well as material. Freedom to want a better education for our children, a further expression of individual happiness, as well as a higher standard of living.

A man out of work needs a job. Every man who doesn't have a decent job that he can respect himself for doing—every such man, frustrated and disappointed with the opportunities his life has given him, weakens the whole fabric of American society. We can see that that man and his family do not starve. But assurance against starvation is not the kind of security that will satisfy men. It will not solve the age-old problems of human desires and dreams.

Spiritual and intellectual security come only to those who are not afraid to live and who live adventurously. It was that kind of intellectual adventure, that willingness to strike out into the unknown, that gained us the knowledge of atomic power.

This knowledge cannot be bottled up by a high priesthood of science for use in the interest of security. There is no such security. If we had bottled up our knowledge of the gasoline engine, it might have made buggy manufacturers feel secure for a few years more. But it would not have helped our economy or our place in the world.

The only true security we can ever know is the right, and the opportunity, to gamble on the future. There are no guaranties for any of us, as individuals. There is no guaranty that America as a nation will remain what she has been during this war—powerful in the council of nations, dreaded by her enemies, generous to her allies. That is a unique position and one that was acquired not just by physical strength, but by moral leadership and idealistic determination to offer the world a chance to know the fruits of peace, as we know them here. But there are those who tell us that our generosity, and the influence and moral leadership it gives us, weaken our physical strength. They tell us that we'd better be careful in our dealings with our allies, because these countries who fought on our side, these people who have seen our supplies save their land from defeat and devastation, are going to play us for suckers. They will sit in the middle of their bombed, burned, tortured acres and do nothing about them—just sit and open their mouths from time to time to be fed by America.

I am not afraid that our allies are going to play us for suckers. No, the people who will try to play us for suckers are our beaten enemies. As I said before the greatest risk is that our beaten enemies will endeavor to break the warm alliance existing among the United Nations.

A recent episode is in point. The Japanese have been telling the Koreans for years that white men would not respect them; that discrimination against Asiatics would land with our armies. The irresponsible statement that the Koreans "were the same breed of cat as the Japs" not only did not help the American position in the Far East, it played right into the Japanese hands.

Let us be forever rid of the obsession that it is our allies whom we must fear.

Worry is based on fear and self-doubt. No normal person is going to be afraid of looking like a fool unless he has a sneaking suspicion that he is a fool. We've got enough to do in the world today without making up a bogeyman. There are real dangers in the world, and real problems to be met. If we ignore these real problems to chase off after mythical dragons, we shall be stupid and untrue to ourselves. We'll be playing America for a sucker.

Let's trust our strength. Let's trust our potentialities for the future. Let's trust our pride and our self-respect. Let us go on with the old American task of building here a so-

ciety that will come closer and closer to the democratic ideal.

The most famous saying about this great State of Missouri is, of course, that a man from Missouri has to be shown. He's cautious, and he doesn't commit himself to an idea or to a deal until he knows quite a bit about it. Nor should the rest of America. Let us be cautious in world affairs. Let us hesitate to commit ourselves to policies until we have explored them.

But let us remember that caution is not refusal to face facts. Let us hesitate to act until we know the truth. But then let us act decisively. Otherwise, the very refusal to act becomes a policy—the most self-defeating policy in the world. It becomes a paralysis of the will. Caution turns into suspicion, and suspicion into neurosis, and neurosis into hostility and violence.

We have a place in the world. There is no choice about that. It is the position of moral leadership: Our only decision is whether we shall fill it well, or badly. Our responsibility to America and our responsibility to the rest of the world are much the same—to fill that place well. If we are true to ourselves, to our generosity, as well as to our cautious self-confidence, we cannot fail.

Is the State Department Imprisoning Tyler Kent To Conceal Evidence?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the strange case of Tyler Kent, who has been imprisoned in Great Britain for more than 5 years because he disclosed the contents of code messages passing between the late President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill, who was not then Prime Minister of Great Britain, continues to be a thorn in the side of the State Department and of those who may be responsible for the war.

It will be recalled that in 1939 young Kent, who was then a clerk in the employ of the American Embassy in London, gave out to a Captain Ramsey, a Member of the British Parliament, the contents of certain messages which had come into his hands as decoding clerk and which he said had passed between Mr. Churchill and President Roosevelt.

The full text of these messages has never been given to the public. One, as disclosed by Kent, shows a message from Churchill to Roosevelt, in which the former is alleged to have said:

> I am half American and a natural person to work with you. It is evident we see eye to eye. Were I to become Prime Minister of Britain, we could control the world.

When Kent's activities became public, instead of being charged with a violation of any American law—and if he violated such a law, he was subject to prosecution here in America—he was turned over to the British and, after being imprisoned for 9 months, he was finally brought to trial under some English law, rule, or regulation, and was sentenced to 7 years' imprisonment.

He was entitled to and received a 25-percent diminution of that sentence for good behavior, and when it expired on October 5, 1945, he was booked for return to the United States on a ship sailing October 11 because of an order of deportation issued by the British on May 23, 1940. That order had been held in abeyance until the expiration of his sentence.

It is also alleged that, in the meantime, President Roosevelt had revoked his citizenship by some Executive order, although I have no accurate information as to that. I am making inquiry of the State Department.

For some reason unknown to me, Kent was not permitted to sail on October 11, but it was ordered that he should sail on a ship leaving October 19. But once again his sailing has been delayed.

His mother advises that he now is unable to learn when, if ever, he will be permitted to return or, more accurately, when he will be deported.

She called attention to the fact that he had been confined in prison for 9 months prior to his trial; that he served his sentence in prison on the Isle of Wight; and that since the expiration of his sentence, that is, after he had paid the penalty imposed by the British, he was brought to, and for the past month has been confined in, Brixton Prison.

She further said that he has been unable to persuade his attorney to make an application for a writ of habeas corpus and wonders whether the attorney is afraid that he may displease that Department if he takes aggressive action at this time.

The State Department is powerful, and from the foregoing and from the previous history of the Kent case, it is more than possible that it will attempt to delay his return to America until some bill like that before the House yesterday, enacted into law, will effectually gag him and prevent his interrogation by members of the press.

Is it possible that the order permitting him to sail on the nineteenth was held in abeyance until there could be put through the Congress the bill which has already been passed in the Senate and which came up yesterday in the House, and which, if it became a law, would make it a criminal offense for Kent to tell to the people of America through the public press what was in the messages that passed between President Roosevelt and Churchill in 1939, before we were in the war, and which might disclose that it was the purpose of those two gentlemen to see that we got into the war?

In this connection it may be well to remember that it was Churchill who, upon our entry into the war, said:

> That is what I have dreamed of, aimed at, and worked for, and now it has come to pass.

When the bill making it an offense for anyone to disclose the contents of a message which had been sent in code, whether or not that disclosure would have interfered with our national security, came before the House yesterday, the Kent case was one of the factors taken into consideration by the House Members.

Many Members were also of the opinion that the passage of this bill was desired by the State Department and perhaps by other departments of the Government to prevent a disclosure of activities which led up to Pearl Harbor and which might disclose the reason for our unpreparedness there.

Kent undoubtedly possesses valuable information. He was confined in an English prison 9 months before he was brought to trial. So far as can be learned, the State Department made no protest, made no effort to protect an American citizen from British prosecution, made no effort to prosecute him under American law.

The British were permitted without protest to seize him and to imprison him, although Great Britain's right of seizure on the high seas had been decided against her in the War of 1812.

Is the State Department more British than American? Was it, has it been, and is it interested in concealing from the American people messages which would give the American people the true facts as to what preceded our entry into the war?

Is the State Department and the administration trying to cover up the responsibility for Pearl Harbor? Was that its purpose in rushing through the Senate and attempting to jam through the House yesterday the bill making it an offense to reveal the contents of decoded messages?

In this connection, one of the strangest incidents that ever occurred on the floor of the House since I have been here arose during the roll call of the vote on the adoption of the rule to make this suppression bill in order.

On a voice vote, the rule had been defeated by 111 noes to 49 ayes. When a record vote was demanded, it was at once apparent that the vote would be close. After two Democratic Members had voted, they were seen to go to the Speaker's desk and, thereafter, from the well of the House, one of them changed his vote from "yea" to "nay," and then, when it was apparent that the rule would be adopted without their votes; that is, that the administration would win, one of them again changed his vote from the "nay" to the "yea" column, while another changed his "nay" to "yea."

A parliamentary inquiry was put to the Speaker and was answered by him, but that parliamentary inquiry does not this morning appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The American people fought and won this war. They were told that it was necessary to go into it because only by winning it could the "four freedoms" be preserved here and carried throughout the world.

Freedom of speech was emphasized by the late President, but all through the war—yes, and prior to our entry into the war—the activities of officials high in the administration, their sayings and their writings, were successfully suppressed.

Now that the war has been won, here at home there is a deliberate attempt to keep the American people from learning the truth as to the facts preceding the war, as to the part played by high Government officials in the events which preceded Pearl Harbor.

The case of Tyler Kent has become historic. Future generations, if the

present attempt at concealment succeeds, will never know the true facts, the deciding factors, which may have involved us in this war.

Open covenants openly arrived at was a sound doctrine promulgated by President Wilson, but it has not been followed by the present nor the preceding administration.

The International Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 26 (legislative day of Monday, October 22), 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, former Gov. Alf Landon, of Topeka, Kans., delivered an able address before the Kiwanis Club, Lawrence, Kans., on October 25. The subject was, The International Situation. I ask unanimous consent to have his address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Our foreign policies involve not only our future peace and prosperity but such everyday affairs as—how long your boy is going to stay in the Army or Navy—whether your boy is to be conscripted under a permanent peacetime compulsory military draft—how much of your earnings we are to give to Great Britain—and other foreign countries—as subsidies—and the atomic bomb in the hands of other countries.

All the money we may give to Great Britain and other countries, in our interest, to help the economic world get on its feet—all the collaboration that might have been but was not at the London Conference—the UNO—will not stabilize the world as long as we push the basic error of the ghastly insane Morgenthau plan in the treatment of Germany, and as long as other errors are committed equally destructive to lasting peace.

First, we have removed the surplus producing territories of Germany and crowded about 70,000,000 people into what we now call Germany.

Second, even with this surplus producing area, Germany had to import foodstuffs before the war.

Third, the Germans will only be able to produce about fifteen hundred calories per day per person. Two thousand calories are a rock-bottom diet to sustain life. Approximately 3,000 calories are necessary for a healthy living.

Fourth, we are wrecking Germany industrially so that she will not be able to purchase the additional foodstuffs she must have.

Fifth, all that, plus the mass shifting of peoples around like cattle positively means a great explosion in the future.

Once again our political leaders have lost the fruits of the glorious victories of our Army and Navy and we are headed straight for a third world war unless there is an immediate and basic reorientation of our foreign policy.

Last January—before it was certain that the impossible Morgenthau plan would be followed—I suggested in some private letters a subsidy for Great Britain. But now that appears to be throwing good money after bad.

It is unquestionably our great responsibility—and to our great interest—to help restore stable world finances—maximum production—broader markets—and thereby higher standards of living.

But we completely block all that in our German policies. To strip Germany of her industries and reduce her to eighteenth century agriculture, so violently disrupts the economic life of Europe that all the money we can scrape together to advance to other nations is of no avail in restoring stable economic conditions in the world. Therefore, stable political conditions are absent.

It's not too late to build for lasting peace if we recognize that we have been sucked farther and farther into the destructive whirlpool of balance of power politics and race hatreds, and calling that cooperative security. Despite our ideological war banners, we have participated in the ancient blood evil of shifting territories to satisfy the conflicting claims of a victorious coalition.

The political and religious philosophy of a country has never yet been uprooted by a foreign army. No country has ever been taught democracy with a bayonet.

Our national honor is tarnished by our participation in the partition of our stanch ally—Poland.

Every news report from Europe conveys a warning that we will be principally blamed for the appalling suffering ahead.

We had the friendship of all Asians—outside of Japan—because of our treatment of the Filipinos. We are losing it as fast as we use our forces to restore British, French, and, until last week, the Dutch as masters. And yet it is being proposed that we form a western bloc composed principally of those same powers. If we join them as is, and stick to the Morgenthau plan, then we will need a permanent draft act and large permanent armies of occupation with higher taxes, because we will pull the heavy car both financially and militarily. Perhaps that will be the only course in the end. But let's face what it means and other possible alternatives.

The "abysmal fiasco, as things now stand," as the New York Times called the London Conference—may open our eyes to the fact that the methods we have been pursuing will never mean lasting peace.

We have got to have a better, a different and more fundamentally sound organization than the United Nations. The San Francisco Charter was barely a step in the right direction toward collective security. The only hope in the UNO was that the Assembly would develop into a real force with time. But the UNO didn't have a chance to get started. Its fate, entangled in the wreckage of the break-down of the London Council of Ministers, seems to be similar to the European advisory commission, which was announced with much fanfare from Moscow in October 1943. After which each power continued its own way. The weakness of the unanimous consent procedure of the United Nations Council is now clearly evident.

Secretary of State Byrnes says that Generalissimo Stalin, Prime Minister Attlee, and President Truman were called upon by the London Council of Ministers but were also unable to agree. That makes the disagreement unanimous.

Out of the shock and confusion caused by the complete failure of the London Conference, everything is being considered except the possibility that the base foundation is faulty and unsound.

Why discuss the policy of the appeasement or nonappeasement of Russia? Either, on the course we have been pursuing, simply means more friction.

In addition to the piddling policy of making loans, we are to have the greatest navy—the greatest army—the newest, greatest weapon—for awhile. All history proves the futility of that policy.

We are seizing strategic bases in a "speakeasy" sort of way and then wonder why the world should look at us with cynicism and suspicion. The race between Russia and the United States to obtain strategic bases is fooling no one but the American people—who are still being doped with soothing sirup that differences between ourselves and Russia is one of language and inexperience in foreign affairs.

We are still talking about implementing the crippled United Nations Charter or about blueprints for other international organizations based on law. But law must always be based on firmly established conceptions of reason and justice. You cannot have international law and order when there is no stability or prospect of achieving stability in the world by our present policies, and when Russia and Great Britain are still carrying on the undeclared war that has been the cardinal point of the foreign policies of both countries for over a hundred years.

You can't build an international organization for collective security on the quicksilver of vindictive and ruinous and imperialistic peace settlements that lack any constructive ideas.

Therefore, we must start a new foundation on solid rock if we are to have real collective security and if civilization is to escape destruction.

What are the specifications of that solid rock? That's a large order for any man to give. I don't believe we can depend on time to find the necessary accord. Mass starvation—chaos approaching anarchy—wait on neither time nor man.

Therefore, concretely in part I believe:

1. Make the United States a sound financial mooring post for the rest of the world to tie to by reversing our present unsound fiscal policies of borrowing and spending unlimited.

2. Reverse the German policies for which we largely are responsible. In the interest of a stable world, Germany must be permitted an economic, self-sustaining life. Under the Morgenthau plan, Uncle Sam either follows in the footsteps of Genghis Khan, or must supply the German people with millions of American dollars' worth of food and clothing.

3. All nations abandon their extraterritorial practices. We should stand in the Far East as advocating in substance what we did in the Philippines, where we set the model for colonial treatment and development of self-governing communities.

4. We must insist on the honest and intelligent reasonable application of the principles of the Atlantic Charter, before we make any gifts. In other words, let's follow for the most part Woodrow Wilson's 14 principles for peace. They never yet have been tried by any nation or combination of nations, except our great and glorious Republic. As I have said elsewhere, America must stand firmly on the principle that the inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness apply to nations as well as individuals. But "according to their own racial genuis and heritage—not according to ours."

5. Four hundred scientists who helped develop the atomic bomb say that to try to keep it from the rest of the world "will lead to an unending war more savage than the last. * * * The actualities of the situation require a drastic solution. * * * Lack of the decision within even a few months will be preparing the world for unprecedented destruction—not only of other countries, but our own as well."

The solution offered by the 400 experts is to internationalize the atomic weapon.

I believe we must seriously and thoroughly consider that solution. Of course, in all matters concerning the atomic weapon, the opinion and judgment of our respected Army and Navy leaders must have great weight.

The decision regarding the disposition of the secret of the atomic weapon is not ours alone. I believe Congress should invite the legislative bodies of England and Canada, who participated with us in its development,

to form a joint committee with ours to consider this most vital problem of the age. However, the internationalizing of the atomic weapon only does a half job.

Along with the internationalizing of the atomic weapon, nations must seriously consider internationalizing the few hitherto key spots of the world.

If that is not done, they must be entirely rebuilt as their defenses are obsolete with the air teeming with accurately directed huge rockets, jet planes, gigantic bombers, and atomic bombs.

Do not forget that the next war will pick up where the last one left off—just as this war picked up from the mechanism and technology of World War I.

By internationalizing, I mean having these key spots as well as the atomic bomb administered by a real collective security international organization. That would, of course, demand that the nations of the world genuinely and sincerely abandon their imperialistic-sphere-of-influence policy of aggression.

6. If the other nations do offer everything that equity in world affairs could reasonably demand, and Russia refuses the proffered hand of the peace-seeking nations, we must not shrink from the tragic facts that a new aggressor is on the prowl. And that aggressor is old militaristic, imperialistic, totalitarian Adam Zad—the bear that walks like a man. But let us hope that Russia will be willing to accept these principles, at least as a basis for discussion, when she sees they do not apply to her alone.

The maxim, he who seeks equity must do equity, applies to nations as well as individuals. Tragically, so far since the close of the war, nations are following the power-politics pattern of the centuries which has always meant more war—not peace.

Secretary of State Byrnes' report to the American people, on the failure of the London Council of Ministers, lacked a lot of satisfying the observant citizen.

There is a general feeling that we are not getting anywhere on the course we are pursuing and that there have been too many secret covenants secretly arrived at.

Italy surrendered over 2 years ago. Yet the peace terms have not been announced and our soldiers are still tied up as an occupational army in that unfortunate country.

The program I have outlined is a step toward what at least is a definite constructive plan as a basis for discussion.

Some of these proposals are not within our control. But let me remind you that requests for financing by the United States, and our great resources, give us the opportunity—late though it may be—to use our great influence to guide international political evolutions in the interest of equity and justice on which a durable peace must ultimately be based.

Understanding other nations' side to a problem, clear thinking, patience, skill and a definite plan are essential to preventing the international situation from developing in a way that can only mean another war.

If Russia and Great Britain and France and Holland really and truly are ready to apply the principles of the Atlantic Charter, then, by the financial aid of the greatest capitalistic country in the world and the reversal of our German policies, there is a fair chance of establishing a sound base essential to any practical world organization; and our victories and sacrifices will not have been in vain.

Our course of action must depend on whether America, Great Britain, Holland, France, and Russia are genuinely willing to join in a genuinely equitable world program instead of the present grab-bag policies.

On the decisions made now—in the next few months—depend future peace or destruction for humanity.

West Side of Hell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to print, I am including a letter received in this morning's mail. The letter is just as received and is self-explanatory.

YOUTAN AIR STRIP,
OKINAWA (West side of hell),
October 14, 1945.

DEAR CLARENCE: I haven't written to you of late because I've been in doubt as to your whereabouts but presume you are back in D. C. again. So far, since the first of the month I've shuttled hundreds of miles and am now back just 3 miles from where I started in an AAF transient camp. General Larson issued orders that no one could hitch hike east on a plane. Well, under my orders that was my only chance. Anyway I couldn't go with the marines. Then there were 50 B-29's leaving for the east on three consecutive days and all 50 were empty but the order kept me off those. Finally, yesterday morning ATC put me on their list where I imagine I'll remain till my name is reached and then for some reason they will refuse me. The Army can't be beat. They don't want to get the men from here home so they pacify Congress and the public with some pretty announcements and then let the troops sit.

I'm practically 39 years old, have a family, and been eligible for discharge since August 15 and here I sit. And it's not just me but thousands. Since VJ-day I haven't been on duty of any kind except for a couple of days when I guarded a concrete mixer. I think every day they steal from our lives is a mortal sin and I pray every night and every morning that the Lord will burn the ones responsible for eternity. Every island over here is lined with ships, setting at anchor and many I know have been there for weeks. And the big new ships get all shined up and sent back to the States for a Navy Day celebration.

Since my last letter I have gone through the worst experience of my life, to date. That was the typhoon that struck on the 9th. The wind blew all that day. In the middle of the afternoon our tent blew away, along with everything in it. By 5 o'clock the entire area was gone and we were in the radio station. It was a permanent building, concrete foundation with iron sides and roof. At 6 o'clock the roof went off and the CO ordered us to evacuate the place. It was as dark as pitch and we couldn't see an inch. We were on a bluff by the seashore, about 150 feet above the water, but when I stepped outside, sea water hit my face. Twice the wind picked me up and carried me 15 to 20 yards. Was blown into a ditch finally. Steel antenna towers, 75 feet high were falling. Corrugated iron sheeting was blowing through the air like ships, cutting fellows up and steel oil drums were blowing around like baseballs. I had a flashlight so I crawled along till I found a burial vault and went in. There was a gook skeleton sitting there with his arms and legs crossed, all nice and dry, so I told him I wanted to keep dry too and that I wouldn't crowd him a bit if he'd leave me alone. The place was full of centipedes and the roof dripped constantly but I stayed there 5 hours. By that time the wind had dropped to 30 miles an hour so I went back out. I don't know how high the wind went for the gadget that measures it's velocity broke at 125 miles per hour.

This is definitely no fit country for white people. Now everyone is sweating out the next storm. There have been three here since I came but the last one was the climax.

There was no place to live so some other fellows went with me to a native village near here and we took over an abandoned house. There was just a roof on it but we moved in. Got a supply of K rations and holed up for 3 days. The rats kept us awake at night running around but otherwise things were up to the Army standard. The native neighbors appeared friendly. At least they condescended to eat our food with gusto. Some of them aren't too bad and nearly all speak a little English. They have nothing left, but all display a keen sense of humor and laugh a lot. Well, I would feel like laughing too if I could get home, and they are home. Maybe when all the ETO fellows get back they will remember the lunatics left out on these rocks and come after us.

This is Sunday morning and I'm going over to the chapel in a bit, then come back to the tent and burn away another day. Will spend my time trying to figure out a way of getting transferred to Alcatraz.

There's the truck for church now so must close. My love to each of you.

JOHN.

Operation of the Patent Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK P. BRIGGS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 26 (legislative day of Monday, October 22), 1945

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. President, Francis P. Douglas, a distinguished Missourian, has recently made a careful study of the United States Patent Office and has written a series of articles in the Washington Star about his findings. So good and so timely are the articles that I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD along with an editorial from the Washington Star on this subject.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of October 21, 1945]

PATENT OFFICE OUTPUT DECREASES AS APPLICATIONS RISE 30 PERCENT

(The American Patent Law Association meeting in Washington on October 9, adopted a resolution which pointed to the diminished efficiency of the Patent Office because the greater part of it was in Richmond, and directing attention to the hardships imposed on examiners. The association called for restoration of the entire office to its former quarters in the Commerce Building. The Star assigned a reporter to investigate conditions. The first report of three follows.)

(By Francis P. Douglas)

The Patent Office is facing the greatest task in its history, hampered by the division of its staff and facilities between Washington and Richmond, Va., and by a serious shortage in trained personnel which it is believed cannot be alleviated until the office is consolidated again in the Capital.

The output of the Office has fallen to a low for which there is no comparison since 1905.

And the number of applications for patents is running well above 30 percent more than a year ago.

The plight of the Patent Office is interfering with reconversion and reemployment, according to Patent Commissioner Casper W. Ooms. Mr. Ooms said: "I believe that anything that interferes with new business and with a man knowing he can go into a new business is bound to interfere with reconversion." He said lack of assurance that capital investment in a new invention has patent protection interferes with new business.

Mr. Ooms described the situation as a "dreadful plight."

At the end of September, he said, there were 69,794 pending applications for patents.

"A year ago," he said, "the figure was below 60,000. In 1942 there were fewer than 45,000 pending cases.

"Within 3 years we will probably have 25 percent more new business than we ever had. The year 1929 was the record year; there were 94,738 applications.

"We made a study of the work and we found the efficiency per man is off 25 percent. That is, the productive output is off. That is due to the handicaps under which the work is done. In addition to the divided facilities, the members of the staff are torn by personal problems. Because of the uncertainty as to the length of time they will remain in Richmond, many have been evicted from the homes they rented there. The rent-control measures have saved some from hardships. Others are separated from their families who remained in Washington."

TWO HUNDRED ENGINEERS NEEDED

"We can use 200 engineers if we can get them. There are trained men coming out of the Army and Navy, but the returning men don't want to go to Richmond."

The bulk of the Patent Office was moved to Richmond in January 1942, as a temporary wartime measure.

Leslie Frazer, First Assistant Commissioner, who is stationed in Richmond, gave these figures on the removal of personnel:

About 1,000 made the move from Washington to Richmond. Of that number, approximately 500 remain. The armed services took 250. Some resigned. Others retired or died. The corps of examiners, normally 700, is now 500.

BEEN "HEADACHE FOR EVERYBODY"

Of the staff in Richmond approximately 150 spend their week ends in Washington. A hundred of this number own their homes in the Capital.

Matching Mr. Ooms' description of the Patent Office situation as a "dreadful plight," Mr. Frazer said of the division of the Office: "It's been a headache for everybody." And he added resignedly, "But it's one of those things Sherman had in mind."

Mr. Frazer made it clear there is no criticism of Richmond implied. The relations with the city and its people have been excellent. Many members of the staff have taken part in the city's social and civic life to their enjoyment. Some have found Richmond more comfortable than the living conditions they formerly enjoyed in Washington. Patent Office staff members in Richmond have been generous contributors to Community Fund and Red Cross drives, and they are proud of the favorable comment they have received in the Richmond papers.

UNCERTAINTY WAS WORST ELEMENT

But since the move was temporary, many have avoided permanent ties and long-range plans. Mr. Frazer said the worst element had been the uncertainty.

As long as a year ago it was announced that the return to Washington by the end of the year was possible. Since then a few divisions have been moved back. That increased the uncertainty of those who remained.

Last week the Budget Bureau announced that offices which were moved from Washington cannot expect to be moved back before 6 months or even a year.

Mr. Ooms was asked about the prospects of the return of the Richmond staff. He made it clear it depended on space being available in the Patent Office quarters at the north end of the Commerce Department Building.

"I expect to have a substantial block of space this year," he said. "And I am hoping to get the entire crew back by the end of the current fiscal year." That would be by June 30, 1946.

In the space formerly occupied by the Patent Office are the Maritime Commission, the War Shipping Administration, the Surplus Property Board and some parts of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. The Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs formerly occupied space there. It moved out but Surplus Property moved in.

The transfer of the Office of Surplus Property from the Commerce Department to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will have no immediate effect on the space available to the Patent Office, Mr. Ooms said.

Last August the Classification and Design Divisions and two units of the Manuscript Division were moved back from Richmond. About 50 persons in all were involved.

The story is told that four of those returning were assigned to an office and established themselves at desks there. They went out for lunch and, returning, found their desks had been moved into the hall by competitors for the space from another agency. They moved the desks back, and then took turns standing guard to make sure they would hold on to the space.

A Patent Office spokesman was asked about this. He laughed and said it sounded like the general run of stories that resulted from crowded office conditions in Washington buildings. But he added, "It may be true."

[From the Washington Star of October 22, 1945]

PATENT OFFICE "JIG-SAW" SET-UP CAUSES DELAYS UP TO YEAR

(Second of a Series)

(By Francis P. Douglas)

The Patent Office has applications for patents filed more than a year ago which still are awaiting initial action.

A report on the work of the 64 examining divisions also shows that 46 of the divisions have applications that are 8 months or more old still awaiting action.

One division head told the Star: "If a person must wait at least a year before he can receive the first official report from the Patent Office on the examination of claims, he—or it may be a firm or corporation—will be exceedingly reluctant to proceed to commercialize the invention. Obviously this greatly hampers industry and retards the progress of the arts and sciences."

Patent Commissioner Casper W. Ooms, as reported in the Star yesterday, told of a loss of 25 percent in efficiency in the Patent Office.

According to officials and staff members of the Patent Office from whom the Star has obtained statements, this is due to the difficulties of working with the facilities of the Office divided between Washington and Richmond, Va., and the decreased morale of the staff. The bulk of the staff has been in Richmond since January 1942.

In Richmond the Office occupies a former tobacco warehouse of five stories, with a two-story annex. Partitions divide the floor areas. The partitions do not run to the high ceilings, but appear to be adequate.

It is agreed that a pretty good job has been done in converting the building. It is judged on the basis of what was possible during the war emergency. It is described as "not bad" and "as well as could be done."

The search room, the records and the scientific library remain in Washington. The search room, used by the public in large numbers, has been compressed to make room for the Trade-Marks Division. Lawyers who must use it say the crowded condition is intolerable. Part of the space of the scientific library has been taken to provide quarters for the Board of Appeals.

Examiners in Richmond say they are hampered because they are separated from the records, from the scientific library and from the Library of Congress and the libraries maintained by the Agriculture Department, the Bureau of Standards and other agencies here.

A truck service maintains daily deliveries between Washington and Richmond, but it far from eliminates the inconvenience. One examiner said:

"In examining an application you may recall something you saw in a scientific or trade journal which has an important bearing on the case. In Washington you could go to the library and look it up in a few minutes. Unless you recall the date you cannot order the journal sent down to Richmond. What you do is to let a few such problems accumulate and then devote a day to going to Washington and consulting the books or records needed."

The division of the Office also makes problems for patent attorneys. Patent applications are classified according to the arts and sciences, and then are assigned to the appropriate division. Applications for radio patents, for example, go to the radiant energy classification. Radio receivers are in a subclassification in which there are more than 5,000 patents.

An attorney with an application for a radio receiver patent must search through these 5,000 patents. Examiners, however, make subsidiary files which they keep for ready reference in their offices. At present if the attorney would consult these, and thereby shorten his work, he must go to Richmond.

He must also go to Richmond if he would short-cut the ironing out of problems by a personal discussion, instead of correspondence going back and forth consuming time.

[From the Washington Star of October 23, 1945]

MANY PATENT OFFICE EXAMINERS STILL BEAR DUAL HOME EXPENSE

(Third of a Series)

(By Francis P. Douglas)

Patent Office examiners whose families remained in Washington when the greater part of the Office was moved to Richmond have found they have been under extra expense amounting to from $600 to $1,200 a year, it appeared after conversations with them in Richmond.

Their initial hopes that these expenses would be deductible on their income-tax returns were blasted by rulings of the Internal Revenue office.

About 150 of these "displaced persons" in Richmond spend their week ends with their families in Washington—"commuting" is what they call it. About a hundred still own homes here.

The Patent Office, with a large proportion of its staff professional men, had a large number of home owners here, perhaps the largest of any agency of the Government. Salaries range from $2,320 up to $6,230, with added increases due to length of service. The aver-

age for the professional classification is around $4,000.

Graduates in the various branches of engineering are sought for the positions. In addition, many of the examiners take courses in law and become members of the bar in order to reach the grades of assistant chief or chief examiner.

A few of the home owners sold their homes here when they moved to Richmond in January, 1942, and some rented their homes. One man said that at that time he had children in school, one child going to a dentist for the straightening of her teeth, an uncertain draft status, and a home, which he owned. While no one of these reasons would have been enough to induce him to leave his family here, all of them together were sufficient.

THREE-HOUR TRIP

The "commuters" rent quarters in a rooming house, with a private family or in a hotel. Unless they find a good boarding house, they patronize the cafeterias and restaurants.

"We eat around and discuss our stomach ulcers," is the way one put it.

Commuting means taking the 3-hour train trip between Washington and Richmond or belonging to a car pool. One car-pool member said the return trip meant starting out from Washington at 4:30 a. m. on Monday.

Some of the personnel have bought houses in Richmond. Mindful of the crowded conditions in Washington, they are not in any haste to return.

There are also some who have found life easy and attractive in the Virginia capital, have made enjoyable social contacts, and plan to stay there even if it means leaving the Patent Office.

UNCERTAINTY LOWERS MORALE

One patent attorney said when he visits the Patent Office in Richmond he is always asked, "What's the latest news on the return to Washington?" After that subject is out of the way, he said, one gets down to business.

The uncertainty and the disturbed living conditions are listed as the chief elements in the loss of morale in the Office. This is reflected in decreased production which Patent Commissioner Casper W. Ooms has said amounts to 25 percent.

The attitude of Richmond landlords also indicates the uncertainty. It was reported some of the employees had difficulty in renewing apartment leases because the owners did not want to rent to persons who might be moving out before long.

PREVIOUS RUMORS RECALLED

Some recall rather grimly the reports of a year ago that the Office might be moved back to Washington before the end of that year. And they recall with wry humor the plans they made for the move.

Where the Patent Office goes, patent attorneys have to go. There are now 26 patent attorneys listed in the Richmond telephone book, where formerly there was only a handful. However, many do not maintain offices there, but are represented by Richmond firms. About 20 attorneys a day visit the Office. Those who go to Richmond from Washington have to take a day for work which might be disposed of in a few hours.

[From the Washington Star of October 23, 1945]

A RASH EXPERIMENT

The original announcement of the plan to move the Patent Office to New York was greeted with widespread condemnation on the ground that it was an ill-considered and rather silly experiment which would do more harm than good. Now, almost 4 years later, these predictions are fully vindicated.

The decision to move the Patent Office and 11 other agencies to make room for war workers was reached about a week after Pearl Harbor, when most of official Washington was still suffering from the shock of that experience. There was no attempt to consult the officials who would be affected by the proposal, and, apparently, there was little or no consideration of the probable consequences. The Budget Bureau, presumably acting under White House instructions, simply decided that efficiency in conducting the war called for the removal of some people from Washington so that others could be brought in, and the Patent Office, through a process of selection suggestive of the toss of a coin, was slated to go. The original proposal met with such universal criticism, however, that the New York move was abandoned. Instead, it was decided to keep part of the Office here and move the rest to Richmond, Va., with the result that in early 1942 about 1,000 Patent Office workers were sent to the Virginia capital.

Now, with the war ended, the process is being reversed, and the Patent Office is being returned to Washington. It is an Office, however, which has suffered severely from the rash experiment of 4 years ago. As pointed out in a series of articles printed in the Star, the last of which appears today, there has been a 25 percent over-all loss of efficiency in the agency. The Office is far behind in its work, so that frequently more than a year passes between the filing of a patent application and the initial action on it. Many of the employees have been put to heavy additional expenses, and the morale of virtually all of these skilled professional workers has been seriously impaired.

Since the satisfactory functioning of the Patent Office is intimately related to the development of new business enterprises, it is obvious that not only the employees of the agency but also the national welfare has suffered from the conditions brought about by the transfer. This being so, it is eminently desirable that the entire staff should be brought back to Washington as soon as possible and that the Patent Office once again should be housed in its specially designed quarters in the Commerce Building. During the war that space has been used by various preferred agencies, some of which were doing important work. But the war is over and the time has come to get these agencies out and put the Patent Office back into the physical surroundings that were designed to fit its peculiar needs, and in which the agency, whose services are vital to the country in time of peace as well as war, can be rehabilitated with all possible speed.

Wage Increases and Control of Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 26 (legislative day of Monday, October 22), 1945

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting editorial entitled "Wage Increases With Control of Prices Essential To Save Our Living Standards," published in the Bridgeport (Conn.) Herald of September 30, 1945. It discusses a subject of vital interest.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAGE INCREASES WITH CONTROL OF PRICES ESSENTIAL TO SAVE OUR LIVING STANDARD

What this country needs more than that good 5-cent cigar is a victory reconversion wage policy.

Such a policy to replace the Little Steel formula should have been readied for submission, discussion, and formulation within hours or days after the end of the war against Japan.

Like the twin arm of a pincers against either inflation or deflation in this critical change-over period, there also should have been readied a reinforced OPA price-maintenance policy and program, buttressed by congressional approval and the necessary funds.

These are the simple, basic instruments of economic peace and security, leading to 60,000,000 jobs.

Instead of breast beating because of the number of men on strike in the Detroit area, in the oil region, in New York or elsewhere, if the legions of striking men quickly would convince Congress of the immediacy for action along these lines now, instead of too little legislation too late, then I could see a point in having twice the number walk out in dramatic protests.

Congressional decision to shelve unemployment bills, because of the mounting total of strikers, is as cogent as it would be for firemen to announce that not a drop of water will be played on a blaze until the flames subside.

Good, bad, or indifferent, the Little Steel wage formula served its purpose during the fighting war. The 15-percent increase allowed workers did not compensate for increased living costs. No one claimed that, not with estimates and statistics on rising costs, ranging from 30 to 50 percent.

The war's end meant short shrift to overtime and a sharp decrease in take-home pay. To take up the slack between the fat and the leaner envelope, what was offered? Nothing. Not even a plan.

I know one manufacturer who improvised a temporary plan for his plant. He told his workers, who had been working 52 hours, that the drop to 40 hours was too sudden and sharp, and that therefore until further notice they were to be employed 48 hours.

The United Automobile Workers, CIO, and the other groups of organized workers are demanding a 30 percent wage increase. Are they to be blamed for their incisive words? I hold not. They have to forge, in the heat of collective bargaining, the beginnings of a new national wage policy, because there was none to which they could turn.

I do not know whether there will evolve a Nation-wide, general, over-all wage policy, altered by local and industry exigencies, of 10, 15, 25 or 30 percent.

But such an over-all precedent is demanded by our economy to protect wage levels and consequent living standards, and to build new and maintain old home markets.

But wage boosts, no matter what the percentage, are meaningless without price controls. A 30 percent wage increase and a 50 percent jump in prices would result in a 20 percent drop in purchasing power for millions of workers and their families. That translates itself into less food on the table, fewer clothes on the body, a decline in sales of everything.

There are two alternatives: A depressed living standard, further removed from the vaunted American standard, followed by sharper and more bitter demands for wage increases.

Should that cycle begin, there is only the black prospect of inflation, with all its tragic

implications of valueless bank accounts, insurance policies, and fixed incomes.

Is that what our boys fought for?

Or, and here is where the OPA comes in, a reinvigorated price control policy that actually will hold the lid on prices, for a sufficiently long period, until fully stocked shelves and a stabilized employment will be able to maintain a reasonable equitable balance.

It is that clear-cut, notwithstanding congressional headlining to make our immediate national industrial problem complicated, partisan and obtuse.

Wage increases, first, and equally first—not second—freezing of prices at current or lower levels, to safeguard that for which we primarily fought—a high and higher living standard, bigger and better home markets and jobs for 60,000,000 employables.—L. D.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN H. OVERTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials from the Shreveport (La.) Times on the question of universal military training.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Shreveport Times of October 25, 1945]

A SOUND, COURAGEOUS STAND

President Truman took a courageous and thoroughly sound stand in recommending to Congress that legislation be passed for military training of all physically capable American youth as an essential to preservation of peace. With pride in the manner in which the Chief Executive faced this grave issue, and with genuine and sincere conviction that the course he proposes must be followed, the Times enthusiastically endorses Mr. Truman's whole youth-training program. We have urged the need for military training of youth virtually since the end of War I. We urge it now with renewed vigor and faith.

Mr. Truman's speech was courageous both politically and morally. He knew that he was speaking in behalf of a program which faces much opposition and misunderstanding, and which never before in this Nation's history has been so moot a question as it is today. He knew also, in his heart and in his mind, that every white cross over the graves of men of the armed forces of the United States for the past century and a half is a silent symbol of a nation's tragically unending failure to realize that peace can be preserved only through possession of power.

The easy course would have been for Mr. Truman to pussyfoot along a politically expedient middle-of-the-road course with a program which offered only mild National Guard and ROTC expansion, and which did not approach the essentials of an overall and continuing youth-training program. Instead, the President strode forth boldly and without equivocation along the straight—and rocky—road that he feels the Nation must travel if the white crosses of two terrible world wars of the past are not to be multiplied over and over again by what would become an inevitable third war.

While some of Mr. Truman's political advisers felt that his course might hurt him with some citizen groups, we believe that time will prove the contrary. Right now, every mother and father, wife and sweetheart, is thinking of getting her soldier, sailor, marine, or coast guardsman home. Right now there is considerable national hysteria over any man or youth being in fighting uniform a day longer than the relatives at home think necessary. Right now, the necessity for military strength in a nation that has just won time's most terrible war may not be clear to vision largely befogged with thoughts of individual members of the family.

But, right now, the veterans of two devastating world wars—the men who fought and suffered and won—stand overwhelmingly in favor of youth military training as the one best means of preventing another war.

Right now the veterans of these conflicts—the men who know from bitter and bloody experience—know that the only way to keep American youth of the future from the horrors of world-wide combat is to have it so prepared for such combat that no nation anywhere on the globe will dare to become an aggressor.

We cannot understand how any citizen group—whether of the church or the laity, whether from the ranks of labor or from the offices of financiers—can look even casually at the history of this Nation or any other nation and fail to see that the veterans of the two world wars are right, that Mr. Truman and those who endorse his proposals are right, that no nation ever can be safe from attack unless it is armed to defend itself against attack.

The theory that national military weakness is an example to other nations in the field of peace and that it constitutes leadership toward international friendship has been tested over and over again in this Nation since the day Cornwallis surrendered to George Washington. For a century and a half it has failed—failed continuously, miserably, tragically, and horribly.

The theory that future youth training constitutes a lack of confidence in preservation of peace through world agreements and organizations is pure and simple fallacy. The world as a whole concedes today that War II followed quickly on the ending of War I because there was no force to keep peace.

The world as a whole concedes that any success coming to the United Nations security organizations rests largely on the willingness of those nations to use force to knock down aggression and to preserve peace. Is not the same thing true of such individual nations as ours? The whole history of the world has shown through all of its recorded pages that nations that are prepared are not attacked and the nations unprepared always are attacked in time—and if they continue unpreparedness after temporary victory, eventually they are destroyed.

Any agreement between nations becomes a tattered scrap of paper when a nation of aggression decides to use it as a target for machine-gun practice. Agreements—treaties, et cetera—have no strength of their own. They merely lay down a course of proposed action. That course is followed in exact ratio to the physical strength back of the words on the piece of paper.

There never has been a day when starry-eyed idealism and blind theory could get to first base in keeping peace between nations. If this Nation, and the world, are to have peace, it must be won with the same type of solid, sound, common-sense practicalism that won the war.

President Truman has proposed a course of practicalism. May the Nation have the vision to follow it.

[From the Shreveport Times of October 26, 1945]

REACTION TO MR. TRUMAN'S PLAN

Senator JOHN H. OVERTON has been one of the stalwarts in support of compulsory military training for this Nation as an essential step in prevention of war. His strong endorsement of the training program presented to Congress by President Truman deserves commendation both within and without his home State of Louisiana, indicates that the Louisiana Senator will be one of the most active leaders in seeking congressional approval of military training along the basic principles of Mr. Truman's proposal. That leadership will mean much for the proponents of youth training.

Aside from the position taken by Senator OVERTON and the statement of the Republican minority leader, Representative JOE MARTIN of the House of Representatives, in opposition to the President, most of the congressional comment on Mr. Truman's message was innocuous. This comment is disappointing both in its support and its opposition to what Mr. Truman has proposed. Most of it was purely political clap-trap—comparable to one youngster saying something is "swell" and another saying it is "terrible," but with neither offering any argument in support of his contention. The subject of universal military training, wrapped up as it is in the entire future of this Nation—and perhaps of the world—is too grave, and too important to be treated with anything but the most serious and far-reaching consideration and discussion.

Minority Leader MARTIN proposes that, instead of establishing universal military training for youth, the United States call on all nations to abolish conscription entirely, and do so itself if the others are willing to follow. We assume that Mr. MARTIN is thoroughly sincere in this proposal, although it is difficult to understand how a successful businessman and a deep student of political affairs, such as he is, could imagine that any such plan possibly could be put into effect. Russia, for one, certainly would not agree to it. The minute the war in Europe ended, Russia began conscripting 15 year olds, and still is doing so. Even if Russia and all other nations agreed to abolish conscription there would be nothing to prevent them from first establishing a huge army, or from creating domestic conditions that would force youth into military service in the guise of "volunteering."

Mr. MARTIN, in his proposal, seems to forget that the need for adequate defense and adequate citizen training has existed and has been demonstrated fully and thoroughly in this Nation from the days of Gen. George Washington to the present days of Generals Eisenhower and MacArthur. He seems to forget that throughout this period the United States always has followed the course of deliberately weakening her defenses and of virtually abolishing any power to attack an aggressor, and that the result always has been war, and then war again. On what grounds does Mr. MARTIN believe that what has failed repeatedly for more than a century and a half in this Nation, and for several times that number of years in other nations, now would succeed?

Mr. MARTIN, of course, does not represent a Republican Party viewpoint or policy in his proposals. He is speaking as an individual. The debate on youth training will find all party lines split. As a matter of fact, throughout the past dozen years it has been Republicans and anti-administration Democrats who were the strongest advocates in peacetime of defense measures that should have been taken and either were not taken or were taken too late—as World War II itself proved. For example, Representative WADSWORTH, Republican, of New York, a fel-

low easterner and close political associate of Minority Leader MARTIN, always has been an outstanding leader in advocating universal peacetime training, universal wartime service, and the maintaining always of a strong Army, Navy, and Air Force. Mr. WADSWORTH was the father of the peacetime draft legislation which originally drew no support from Mr. Roosevelt and finally was pushed through Congress by a coalition of Democrats and Republicans and some New Dealers who completely abandoned all party and factional lines.

We suggest that Mr. MARTIN, instead of proposing a nonconscription theory which he must know is unworkable—no matter how sincerely he may believe in it—should join with MR. WADSWORTH, his fellow Republican, and with Democrats and others in seeking a truly workable youth-training program patterned on the basic principles of Mr. Truman's address. We do not think that Mr. MARTIN is trying to play politics in this—for, as we have stated above, no party lines are involved—but we do think he is going to subject himself to the charge of politics unless he supports some form of universal training, or offers some substitute for it that would be workable.

President Truman on Safeguarding America

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Communists and their fellow travelers, as well as their publications, the Communist Daily Worker and its uptown edition known as PM, are attacking President Truman because of his stand on last Saturday, and his stand, previously announced, of keeping secret what he calls the know-how of manufacturing the atomic bomb.

I agree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] that the time has come for America to tell the world where she stands, and to tell it in terms that every other nation on earth can understand it.

It is time to let the world know that our country will not continue a policy of appeasement toward any nation that is following a policy of deception toward us, while plundering the weaker countries around her.

I was glad to hear President Truman come out and serve notice that America is not going to appease any country that undertakes to wreck the civilization of the world, and that "we shall refuse to recognize any government imposed upon any nation by the force of any foreign power."

Few, if any, Presidents have uttered more encouraging words to the civilized nations of the earth, and especially to the small christian countries whose rights have been, and are now being trampled underfoot, than are to be found in the following excerpts from President Truman's Navy Day address:

The foreign policy of the United States is based firmly on fundamental principles of righteousness and justice. In carrying out those principles we shall firmly adhere to what we believe to be right; and we shall not give our approval to any compromise with evil.

But we know that we cannot attain perfection in this world overnight. We shall not let our search for perfection obstruct our steady progress toward international cooperation. We must be prepared to fulfill our responsibilities as best we can, within the framework of our fundamental principles, even though we recognize that we have to operate in an imperfect world.

FUNDAMENTALS OF FOREIGN POLICY

Let me restate the fundamentals of that foreign policy of the United States:

1. We seek no territorial expansion or selfish advantage. We have no plans for aggression against any other state, large or small. We have no objective which need clash with the peaceful aims of any other nations.

2. We believe in the eventual return of sovereign rights and self-government to all peoples who have been deprived of them by force.

3. We shall approve no territorial changes in any friendly part of the world unless they accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

4. We believe that all peoples who are prepared for self-government should be permitted to choose their own form of government by their own freely expressed choice, without interference from any foreign source. That is true in Europe, in Asia, in Africa, as well as in the Western Hemisphere.

5. By the combined and cooperative action of our war allies, we shall help the defeated enemy states establish peaceful democratic governments of their own free choice. And we shall try to attain a world in which nazism, fascism, and military aggression cannot exist.

6. We shall refuse to recognize any government imposed upon any nation by the force of any foreign power. In some cases it may be impossible to prevent forceful imposition of such a government. But the United States will not recognize any such government.

7. We believe that all nations should have the freedom of the seas and equal rights to the navigation of boundary rivers and waterways and of rivers and waterways which pass through more than one country.

8. We believe that all states which are accepted in the society of nations should have access on equal terms to the trade and the raw materials of the world.

9. We believe that the sovereign states of the Western Hemisphere, without interference from outside the Western Hemisphere, must work together as good neighbors in the solution of their common problems.

10. We believe that full economic collaboration between all nations, great and small, is essential to the improvement of living conditions all over the world, and to the establishment of freedom from fear and freedom from want.

11. We shall continue to strive to promote freedom of expression and freedom of religion throughout the peace-loving areas of the world.

12. We are convinced that the preservation of peace between nations requires a united nations organization composed of all the peace-loving nations of the world who are willing jointly to use force if necessary to insure peace.

GUIDE FOR UNITED STATES NOW AND IN FUTURE

Now that is the foreign policy which guides the United States. That is the foreign policy with which it confidently faces the future.

It may not be put into effect tomorrow or the next day. But nonetheless, it is our policy, and we shall seek to achieve it. It may take a long time, and it is worth waiting for, and it is worth striving to attain.

The Ten Commandments themselves have not yet been universally achieved over these thousands of years. Yet we struggle constantly to achieve them, and in many ways we come closer to them each year. Though we may meet set-backs from time to time, we shall not relent in our efforts to bring the Golden Rule into the international affairs of the world.

We are now passing through a difficult phase of international relations. Unfortunately it has always been true after past wars that the unity among allies, forged by their common peril, has tended to wear out as the danger passed.

The world cannot afford any let down in the united determination of the Allies in this war to accomplish a lasting peace. The world cannot afford to let the cooperative spirit of the Allies in this war disintegrate. The world simply cannot allow this to happen. The people in the United States, in Russia, and Britain, in France and China, in collaboration with all the other peace-loving people, must take the course of current history into their own hand and mold it in a new direction—the direcion of continued cooperation. It was a common danger which united us before victory. Let it be a common hope which continues to draw us together in the years to come.

The atomic bombs which fell on Hiroshima and Nagasaki must be made a signal, not for the old process of falling apart but for a new era—an era of ever-closer unity and ever-closer friendship among peaceful nations.

Building a peace requires as much moral stamina as waging a war. Perhaps it requires even more, because it is so laborious and painstaking and undramatic. It requires undying patience and continuous application. But it can give us, if we stay with it, the greatest reward that there is in the whole field of human effort.

Differences of the kind that exist today among nations that fought together so long and so valiantly for victory are not hopeless or irreconcilable. There are no conflicts of interest among the victorious powers so deeply rooted that they cannot be resolved. But their solution will require a combination of forbearance and firmness. It will require a steadfast adherence to the high principles which we have enunciated. It will also require a willingness to find a common ground as to the methods of applying those principles.

Our American policy is a policy of friendly partnership with all peaceful nations, and of full support for the United Nations Organization. It is a policy that has the strong backing of the American people. It is a policy around which we can rally without fear or misgiving.

The more widely and clearly that policy is understood abroad, the better and surer will be the peace. For our own part, we must seek to understand the special problems of other nations. We must seek to understand their own legitimate urge toward security as they see it.

The immediate, the greatest threat to us is the threat of disillusionment, the danger of an insidious skepticism—a loss of faith in the effectiveness of international cooperation. Such a loss of faith would be dangerous at any time. In an atomic age it would be nothing short of disastrous.

There has been talk about the atomic bomb scrapping all navies, armies, and air forces. For the present, I think that such talk is 100 percent wrong. Today control of the seas rests in the fleets of the United States and her allies. There is no substitute for them. We have learned the bitter lesson that the weakness of this great Republic invites men of ill will to shake the very foundations of civilization all over the world, and we had two concrete lessons in that.

What the distant future of atomic research will bring to the fleet which we honor

today, no one can foretell. But the fundamental mission of the Navy has not changed. Control of our sea approaches and of the skies above them is still the key to our freedom and to our ability to help enforce the peace of the world. No enemy will ever strike us directly except across the sea. We cannot reach out to help stop and defeat an aggressor without crossing the sea. Therefore, the Navy, armed with whatever weapons science brings forth, is still dedicated to its historic task: Control of the ocean approaches to our country and of the skies above them.

POLICY NOT ALTERED BY ATOMIC BOMB

The atomic bomb does not alter the basic foreign policy of the United States. It makes the development and application of our policy more urgent than we could have dreamed 6 months ago. It means that we must be prepared to approach international problems with greater speed, with greater determination, with greater ingenuity, in order to meet a situation for which there is no precedent.

We must find the answer to the problems created by the release of atomic energy—we must find the answers to the many other problems of peace—in partnership with all the peoples of the United Nations. For their stake in world peace is as great as our own.

As I said in my message to the Congress, discussion of the atomic bomb with Great Britain and Canada and later with other nations cannot wait upon the formal organization of the United Nations. These discussions, looking toward a free exchange of fundamental scientific information will be begun in the near future. But I emphasize again, as I have before, that these discussions will not be concerned with the processes of manufacturing the atomic bomb or any other instruments of war.

In our possession of this weapon, as in our possession of other new weapons, there is no threat to any nation. The world, which has seen the United States in two great recent wars, knows that full well. The possession in our hands of this new power of destruction we regard as a sacred trust. Because of our love of peace, the thoughtful people of the world know that that trust will not be violated, that it will be faithfully executed.

Indeed, the highest hope of the American people is that world cooperation for peace will soon reach such a state of perfection that atomic methods of destruction can be definitely and effectively outlawed forever.

We have sought, and we will continue to seek, the attainment of that objective. We shall pursue that coure with all the wisdom, patience, and determination that the God of peace can bestow upon a people who are trying to follow in His path.

Atomic Energy and the Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the opening remarks I made Thursday night, October 25, 1945, in the Town Meeting of the Air, in a discussion of the subject Should We Share the Atomic-Bomb Secret With Any Other Nation?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD WE SHARE THE ATOMIC-BOMB SECRET WITH ANY OTHER NATION?

Dr. Suits and Dr. Gustavson have given us a graphic picture both of the tremendous destructive potential in atomic energy and its great beneficial possibilities for mankind. We and the world have only 2 to 5 years to devise some way to realize the benefits, and control the destructive possibilities.

Responsibility and initiative in finding the solution rests squarely on the United States. We made the bomb. We used it. We have the production secret, at least for a few years. What we decide to do with it may save or destroy civilization.

The results of an unqualified negative answer to our question—should we share the atomic bomb secret?—are disclosed in the May-Johnson bill now pending in Congress. That bill was drafted by the War Department on the assumption that production of atomic energy must remain a closely guarded national secret.

It would create a nine-member commission to control completely all phases of the production of atomic energy, from fundamental research through production and application to both military and industrial problems. There are severe penalties, up to $300,000 fines and 30-year jail sentences for the disclosure by anyone of any information prohibited by commission regulations. The commission would control not only the Government's present $2,000,000,000 investment in this project, but all future activity, public or private, and do it in absolute secrecy. It would not even be responsible to Congress, because the bill would specifically authorize it to withhold information from both Congress and the President.

In other words, we would create a gigantic, supergovernment monopoly which would operate in complete secrecy, with authority to make and enforce its own laws to protect its power. That is a horrible Frankenstein monster for a democracy to create. I am sure Senator WILEY will not like the May-Johnson bill. But some such procedure is essential if we are determined to keep this whole development a closely guarded national secret, because a secret shared with 135,000,000 people, or even with 500 Members of Congress, is no secret at all. So we are forced inevitably to this Nazi-Fascist answer of turning complete control of this tremendous discovery over to a handful of individuals. The democratic process requires that the people have knowledge in order to decide policies intelligently, and we dare not let them have knowledge in this case.

I do not think such a solution will work in America. If it did work, it would do the United States more harm than good. Scientific research does not flourish in secrecy. That's why the Middle Ages are known as the Dark Ages, because dissemination of knowledge was taboo. If we try to strait-jacket our scientists in their search for knowledge, we'll find the United States trailing instead of leading the world.

What is a possible democratic solution? I believe that fear, based on ignorance of what other nations are doing or may do in this field, is today the greatest danger in the atomic bomb. Russia is afraid of our intentions, we are fearful of what Russia might do with the bomb if she had it. The only antidote to fear growing out of ignorance is knowledge.

First, let's set up our domestic control of atomic energy so as to leave our scientists completely free to exchange their knowledge both in fundamental research and on its industrial application. Certainly, we would not withhold from the world any beneficial uses which may eventually flow from this terrifying discovery. For the time being, let the injunction of secrecy remain on the purely military application of atomic energy, and on that alone.

Second, let's initiate an international conference of both scientists and politicians to develop machinery for sharing the beneficial results of the discovery and controlling its potential destructive effects. Let's say to Russia, France, and other nations that we are perfectly willing that their scientists see and publish everything we are doing if they in turn will permit our scientists complete freedom to see and publish everything they are doing. Then Russia will know whether or not we are manufacturing a stock pile of atomic bombs, and we will know what Russia is developing in the way of secret weapons.

Armed with that knowledge, we at least stand a chance of controlling in time any madman or outlaw nation that shows signs of attempting to pervert this discovery to the destruction of civilization. To do that we must strengthen the security council of the United Nations, make it more democratic and effective by eliminating the veto power and then be vigilant to see that it functions. The only authorized stock pile of atomic bombs should be in the hands of a truly international police force controlled by the United Nations Security Council.

The only alternative to that course is to embark on a mad and secret race among the nations to develop and produce atomic bombs and other weapons nearly as terrible, which can end only in an explosion that will destroy our civilization.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, on October 28, I delivered a radio address over Station WIBW, Topeka, Kans., on the subject of universal military training, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends in the radio audience, I listened attentively Tuesday to President Truman as he read to the Congress in joint session his message recommending the adoption of universal military training for all American boys not absolutely disqualified physically to take the training.

Afterward I read and reread his message with some care.

And I must admit he left me unconvinced.

At the same time I want to pay tribute to the President for his forthrightness in coming before the Congress and advocating firmly a program which he knew the majority of the Members do not approve.

President Truman recommended for the postwar military organization—

1. A comparatively small Regular Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

2. A greatly strengthened National Guard and Organized Reserve for the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

3. A General Reserve composed of all the male citizens of the United States who have received training.

The General Reserve, he said, while available for rapid mobilization in an emergency, would have no obligation to serve, either in this country or abroad, unless and until called to the service by an act of the Congress.

Now, I am going to quote him exactly upon his next statement.

"In order to provide this general reserve, I recommend to the Congress the adoption of a plan for universal military training," President Truman said. And continued:

"Universal military service is not conscription. The opponents of training have labeled it conscription, and by so doing have confused the minds of some of our citizens.

"Conscription is compulsory service in the Army or Navy in time of peace or war.

"Trainees under this proposed legislation, however," and I still am quoting from President Truman's message to the Congress, "would not be enrolled in any of the armed services. They would be civilians in training. They would be no closer to membership in the armed forces than if they had no training. Special rules and regulations would have to be adopted for their organization, discipline, and welfare."

The foregoing is quoted directly from President Truman's message.

I do not question in the least that President Truman in his own mind has drawn a very clear distinction between conscription for military service and conscription for military training. How long that distinction would be observed I do not undertake to say. I have a feeling that in a relatively short time it would be discovered that the best military training, after all, is the experience of military service. And I remember that many of the staunchest advocates of universal military service also maintain just as staunchly that it is impossible to obtain and maintain the sized military establishment our world position requires from now on, by voluntary enlistments.

So without in the least impugning the motives or doubting the statements of the President, I take with a sizable grain of salt the contention that when we adopt universal military training we are not, really, adopting conscription for military service.

The President advocates that this military training be taken between the ages of 18 and 20, at the completion of high school if that came between 18 and 20; even before 18 if the boy finished high school before he reached that age.

In this connection I was much interested in the comment by David Lawrence, whom I have known for better than three decades, and during those 30 years he never has been accused of being either a pacifist or an isolationist.

"President Truman has swallowed hook-line-and-sinker the militaristic approach to universal military training," says Mr. Lawrence in his syndicated column. "He has accepted the plans of the high-ranking generals and militaristically inclined civilians in the War Department who believe that it is highly desirable to interrupt higher education for military purposes even in time of peace.

"Instead of proposing a plan by which it would make it optional for the boy to take 1 year's training any time between the ages of 18 and 24," writes Mr. Lawrence, "the President accepts the War Department's proposal that between high school and college all boys must interrupt their studies and spend a year in a military camp.

"This proposal," continues Mr. Lawrence, "will never be accepted by Congress if the liberals of the country and the persons who believe in higher education become vocal about it.

"The only answer that some of the War Department specialists have at times made to the point is that it isn't democratic to worry about college educations. This is but another way of saying that it is not necessary to develop doctors or dentists or scientists or any of the other professional groups so essential to American life."

That ends the quotation from David Lawrence.

The President sees no danger of creating either a military caste nor a spirit of militarism in his proposal. He maintains it will do just the opposite; increase democracy and hold down the militaristic spirit. I cannot see that.

Of course, no militarist, at home or abroad, has ever conceded a militaristic purpose. But the development of a military caste cannot be prevented by saying there is not any intention of doing that, while you take the steps that inevitably will develop just that.

Militarism is a state of mind that can be foisted upon the youth of America just as it was on the youth of Germany—I think Frederick the Great started that many years ago, by putting military conscription into effect.

And as for military conscription—or universal military training—assuring victory in wars, we have only to look at the two World Wars we have passed through to raise a doubt as to the validity of that argument.

It was not military conscription, nor universal military training, nor indoctrinated and disciplined people taught to take orders (and to depend upon orders for courses of action) that brought the United States and Great Britain through World Wars I and II as the only major nations on the winning side in both wars. Neither of them had it. Most of the losers had conscription in some form or other, and had had it for generations.

I seriously doubt if universal military training is the answer to the problem of national defense—or national security as it now is called. Unless, of course, it develops that the sized Army and Navy and Air Forces that the United States must maintain under the secure and lasting peace won by the United Nations are so large that the necessary personnel cannot be obtained by voluntary enlistments.

However, if that is the case—and I must admit that the present complexion of world affairs does make it look like a strong possibility—if that is the case, I repeat, it will not be universal military training but actual compulsory military service that we will have to adopt.

President Truman says emphatically that is not the situation that faces us. He does not propose conscription for military service. So I say let's see what we are to face before we take the initial step toward conscription for military service in peacetime.

I am still hopeful that we may have a few years of peace between wars. At least I'd like to try it.

Anglo-British Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Money for England," published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of September 17, 1945; another editorial entitled "It Is the American People's Money," published in the Chicago Herald-American of October 9, 1945; an article entitled "England Begins To Miss the Americans," by Anne O'Hare McCormick, published in the New York Times of October 17, 1945; and an article by Helen Essary published in the Washington Times-Herald of September 16, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of September 17, 1945]

MONEY FOR ENGLAND

The Socialist Government of Britain is now engaged in trying to get a vast amount of money from the American Treasury. Prime Minister Attlee and Foreign Minister Bevin didn't come to Washington themselves on this mission, nor did they send any of their Labor Party associates. They are depending upon two men who played important roles in the old Conservative Government to put over this daring business. London is using titled moochers to conceal the true nature of the undertaking.

Halifax and Keynes have made it clear that what they are after is money without any strings attached to it. The idea of a loan is ridiculed by the two Britons. Of course, a gift is much more attractive to the recipient than a loan. With a loan, you either honor it or you don't. If you do, you pay interest and part of the principal each year, and that means you can't consume all you produce. The British goal is to consume more than they produce. British production is so low that they can consume out of their own efforts only half as much as Americans can.

The British perceive that if they don't honor their debt, their credit is shut off. When that happens, some time has to elapse before the slate is wiped clean and new loans can be had.

Lend-lease had neither of these drawbacks. They got their money and didn't have to worry about paying, for there was no default and no penalty. The British were crazy about lend-lease. The Right Honorable Walter Eliot, for many years an important figure in the British Government, said when lend-lease first came into use: "Lend-lease * * * which means giving the stuff away * * * is carefully drawn so as to conceal this essential implication. * * * It is the most powerful and important economic phrase of our time, the beginning of whose importance we do not yet see, let alone the end."

Lend-lease was terminated by President Truman when the Japs were defeated. The British objective is to have it resumed, under another label. One term suggested is "retroactive lend-lease." A phrase which is intended to justify a refund to them of the $3,500,000,000 they say they spent here before the lend-lease law was passed. If we are such consummate suckers as to pay out three and one-half billions as retroactive lend-lease, this would not be the end. They would be back for more in a year or two and have another clever name for it.

What are they going to do with the money they get from us? Some say they need it to support the pound, which has been under some pressure, particularly since the Socialist government came into office with its program of taking over industries. Is money raised by taxes in this country going to be given to the Socialist government at London so that it can pay off the stockholders of the Bank of England and the British railroads?

Or are the funds now sought to be used to straighten out the tangled British financial relations with India, Canada, and Argentina? The members of the sterling bloc are calling upon London for a settlement of claims. Let us remember that this was an arrangement by which Britain was able to keep for herself, often at the expense of America, some of the choicest markets in the world.

Surely the money is not sought for the purpose of enabling British manufacturers to buy cotton and other American raw materials for processing and export. All that is required for that purpose is short-term loans. Money of that sort is available right along here, if not through the banks, then through one of the Government corporations. If what is wanted is equipment, such as for the mines and the textile plants, installment loans for

this purpose also could be arranged. The British people aren't looking now for funds for rebuilding Coventry and similarly bombed-out places. The International Bank of Reconstruction and Development was created under the Bretton Woods agreements for that specific purpose.

The British can provide for all legitimate financing through institutions already set up or provided for. It is outrageous to expect the American taxpayer to provide money to bail out the sterling bloc, which was organized among other things to impede American and other non-British exports. It is preposterous to come here for a donation to pay off the stockholders of the Bank of England. It is unthinkable that American funds are to be provided to subsidize the British standard of living, just to prove that people can live better under socialism. Halifax and Keynes need to be told that lend-lease has ended for good, and successful mooching is a thing of the past. Otherwise, touch artists from every friendly and near-friendly country will descend upon Washington.

[From the Chicago Herald-American of October 9, 1945]

IT IS THE AMERICAN PEOPLE'S MONEY

President Truman has given the public another Washington mystery to ponder over by accepting two resignations from Mr. Leo T. Crowley when, according to the White House public record, Mr. Crowley had formally tendered only one.

Washington gossip in the last several days has it that Mr. Crowley submitted two letters of resignation, including a resignation from the FEA, but that the President "did not like" what Mr. Crowley said about the parleys with Lord Keynes and Lord Halifax and hence did not make the FEA letter public, as he did the letter of resignation from the FDIC.

So once again it becomes necessary for Americans to turn to London for information as to what the American Government is doing in Washington.

The London opinion is that, in the conferences with Lord Keynes and Lord Halifax, there have been two dissenting groups of American commoners.

One group would make the Socialist-Labor government of Great Britain an outright gift of the billions of American dollars sought, with no interest or principal to be paid and no quid pro quo.

The other group wanted to make the transaction an old-fashioned business loan, of the sort which helped to build the British Empire, to be granted only if Great Britain agreed to reduce its sterling debt, to modify its arbitrary trade restrictions, and to make some other concessions toward international settlements and adjustments.

And Mr. Crowley, says London, belonged to the second, or pro-American, group.

The British Broadcasting Corp., which is owned by the British Government, has openly expressed the London opinion.

It said, unequivocally, that Mr. Crowley's resignation resulted from disagreements in the American delegation as to our policy in the Anglo-American economic conference.

It quoted the Washington correspondent of the Times of London as writing:

"It is understood that in the talks Mr. Crowley has ranged himself strongly on the side of those who believe in what may be described as 'a business settlement with Britain.'"

The Times correspondent likewise reported that Mr. Crowley was opposed to a "grant-in-aid" or "noninterest bearing loan," in other words, to another one-sided multibillion-dollar Santa Claus transaction.

Inasmuch as any money that the administration may lend or give away is the money of the American people, surely the American people have a right to know all about it.

There is certainly no justification for mystery in so costly a proceeding.

As the fragmentary public record now indicates, Mr. Crowley is out of the administration for representing the interests of the American people in refusing to give away their money without return.

If the record is inaccurate, the White House should correct it by promptly disclosing all the facts.

If the White House does not do so, it will be the duty of Congress to procure a full disclosure of the secret negotiations with Lord Keynes and Lord Halifax.

[From the New York Times of October 17, 1945]

ENGLAND BEGINS TO MISS THE AMERICANS

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

CAMBRIDGE, October 16.—There were times in the war when the American population exceeded the British in some districts in East Anglia. In training bases and nearly 200 bomber stations scattered over the flat field of the eastern counties, great stretches of which are as far below sea level as Holland, upward of 400,000 Americans were quartered between 1942 and 1944.

Some will never go home. At Madingly, 2 miles from Cambridge, 5,500 lie buried. Row on row of the white crosses are planted in green turf as soft and thick as a tufted carpet. Edges of late blooming roses frame the plots and there is nothing lovelier in England than the surrounding countryside. The young warriors who died here rest in a scene of great peace. In the soft sunlight yesterday one looked across a garden of golden woods and emerald meadows to the glint of the Cam, the spires of the old colleges and far in the distance the tower of Ely Cathedral lightly etched on the pale blue sky.

Nearby is Grandchester, immortalized by Rupert Brooke, the young poet who fell at Gallipoli and made Forever England the ground where English heroes rest. So this bit of England is forever America. The names on the crosses, seldom of British origin, trace the characteristic inscription of America, alien in its strange blend of bloods and culture and yet as natural of this landscape as if England were the mother country of them all.

It is fitting that this cemetery should be located in the shadow of Cambridge, next to Edinburgh the favorite rest center of the American soldiers stationed in the British Isles until VE-day. The Eighth Air Force was based in the country between here and the coast because this section is flatter, less densely populated and nearer to Germany than any other part of England. It is old land and mostly farming land, set in its ways and more remote from American ways than the industrial midlands or the London suburbs.

Probably there is no better place to observe the effects of the American invasion on British life and speculate on its long-range influence on the relations between two peoples far more different than they are alike and far more interdependent in the "reconversion" of the world to peace than they were in the simpler crises of the war.

Not all the American servicemen have gone home. Cambridge is beginning its first normal years since the war, but there is nothing normal in the odd conglomeration of students to be seen poring over notebooks in the famous "backs" of Kings, Trinity, Queens, and other historical colleges on the banks of the Cam.

They comprise men in uniform and men in gowns, boys of 17 and old young men of 27 resuming where they left off 6 years ago, and 144 American soldiers, some as full students, others as specials. Besides these about 1,500 Americans are taking on-the-job courses for 3 or 4 weeks in English business and professional form.

The idea behind the latter project, explained the officer directing the work from Red Cross headquarters in the Old Bull Hotel, is not primarily to give officers and men something useful to do while they are waiting to go home. It is to provide an opportunity for Englishmen and Americans in the same line of work to exchange ideas and learn one another's methods.

As an essay in promoting understanding, however, these contacts either with universities or business firms are only a small postscript to the impression made on this country by the vast American armies camped here during the hardest years in British history.

They made a terrific impact on British life. No American who follows the track of the incursion can fail to see the after-effects. No thoughtful Englishman denies them. "Nothing quite like it has happend to us since the Norman invasion," remarked a British officer who had a liaison job between British and American forces.

He went on to predict that the result of the experience would be more perceptible when the excitements and irritations of the war had died down.

"When the poignant homesickness they suffered in this strange, uncomfortable land is cured the Americans will forget what they did not like in a nostalgia to see the old country again. The British are already forgetting what they disliked in the Americans."

Certainly the latter statement is true. In Cambridge and the East Anglian towns from Norwich to Yarmouth, where our airmen and GI's were most in evidence, people will tell you with a sigh that they miss the Americans—and miss them, it seems, for the very qualities that annoyed them when they swarmed over the countryside with their full pockets, their free and easy ways, tall tales, and invidious comparisons of local amenities with things back home.

"The Americans, were a ferment in England. They helped churn up already active currents of discontent. They corrupted the language with American slang and jeered at the British equivalent. They introduced jive, pumpkin pie, Mother's Day, and chewing gum.

"They were also useful around the house and wonderful with children. They broke down British reserve and made lasting friends. And when they dug deep enough below the superficial differences they found fundamental likenesses. What I discovered in 3 years with both armies," said the liaison officer, "above all is that your chaps and ours puzzled over the same things and were sure of the same things."

[From the Washington Times-Herald of September 16, 1945]

DEAR WASHINGTON

(By Helen Essary)

Lord Keynes has come to Washington to tell the United States how much money Britain requires in order to reconvert British industries and to expand British trade. Lord Keynes is a profound economist. So I should like to ask him a few questions. I shall probably be scolded well for asking the questions. But—here they go:

How much money does it cost to support the English Royal family? How much in taxes got from the British people does it cost to keep the royal palaces and castles in purple and fine linen and satin-panted footmen?

How much does it cost to supply jewels and ermine robes to members of the royal family? To caparison their horses and decorate their royal coaches? What is the value of the estates allotted the royal family?

What is the value of the crown jewels that used to be on view in the Tower of London? Hunks of precious stones. Gobs of diamonds, rubies and emeralds watched over by guards in velvet liveries.

Since Britain is once again in financial straits, is there not some way of cutting down on such medieval extravagances as these? Some way that would be less embarrassing

than asking for another loan—call it a "grant" this time—from the United States?

Another question—Is it necessary to keep the British embassies in such luxury? The British Ambassador to Washington receives about $20,000 salary a year. The United States Ambassador to England receives $17,500.

The salaries of the British Ambassador's Washington staff, which includes several ministers and dozens of secretaries and other chiefs, are proportionately large.

The expense of maintaining the Massachusetts Avenue embassy is appalling. The British Government allows $35,000 a year for the expense of representation and another $35,000 a year for official entertainments and upkeep. Add the two last sums. They make $70,000.

The United States Ambassador to England is allowed $8,400 for representation and entertainment. The sum of $1,080 is thought enough by this Government, the Government that wants to finance most of the rest of the world, to cover the difference in the cost of living in Washington and in London.

And the ambassador of the richest country on earth, the representative of that international spendthrift, Uncle Sam, is given $4,000 a year with which to rent a house which should be equivalent in elegance and importance to the British Embassy here.

Think of the sum of $4,000 a year. To rent a United States embassy in London. If the rent-control board had cut your Aunt Minnie down to that amount for her house out in Chevy Chase, you would have felt outraged.

Summarizing the difference allowed for embassy maintenance by the Government which says it is too poor to carry on with the embassy maintenance allowed by the Government which may say "Don't you worry, we will give you some more billions," the ratio, according to our State Department, is 4 to 1 in favor of the British. Being a poor relative is profitable.

Britain pays all of her diplomats well and sees that they live in a manner to prove the importance of the British Empire.

The United States pays her diplomats penuriously. Indeed the State Department files, giving salaries paid our representatives to the ranking powers, show annotations something like this:

"It is not recommended that this post be accepted by a man without a large private income. The last Ambassador paid out of his own funds the amount of * * *. This amount was necessary to run the Embassy and to entertain properly."

It is barely possible that we in the United States are too generous with foreign suppliants and too stingy with our own people. It obviously does not occur to the British Treasury that it might save some money, quite a little in fact, by being less lavish with its pomp and circumstance at home and abroad.

The TVA—Statement of Committee for 31 National and Regional Land and Water Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the reply of the coordinating committee for 31 national and regional land and water organizations to some statements made in a recent series of articles by Peter Edson, NEA columnist.

There being no objection, the reply was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Under the caption "Washington Water Lobby," Mr. Peter Edson, NEA columnist, recently endeavored to further convince the public that TVA is all that its advocates claim for it.

In the beginning of the series reference was made to the 31 land and water users' organizations as a "water lobby," an appellation that is not warranted. The objective is the enlightment of all of the people as to the true story of the TVA. These 31 organizations have banded together to try to offset the work of the TVA lobby, which has propagandized the people of the United States for 10 years at the expense of the Federal taxpayer, and which, as pointed out in the articles in question, is now organized to promote Federal "authorities" in every river basin in the United States. With as many issues involved as there as in the "authority" proposals—placing all the land and water, mineral and industrial resources of the Nation in the hands of Federal corporations with almost unlimited powers over the political and industrial development of the Nation—the existing water organizations would be derelict in their duties to their members and to the citizens of the Nation if they did not attempt to tell the other side of the story, a story that up to the present has been viewed almost entirely through the rose-colored glasses of the TVA advocates.

There are millions of people in this country who have an interest in the land and water resources of the Nation whose views cannot be expressed by either the TVA or the private power interests. The 31 organizations mentioned represent a small segment of those millions. The farther these organizations go in their analysis of the TVA, the proposed MVA, the CVA, the SVA, and all the others, the more they find that is of interest to their members, to the common citizen, and to the taxpayers.

After setting forth the various items that enter into the cost of the project, an attempt is made in the concluding article of the series to justify the position taken by the writer. First he takes up the question of retirement of the investment and quotes TVA itself to the effect that "on the basis of operating experience up to the present, TVA estimates that its income from the sale of electric power will be sufficient to retire the entire investment in 60 years, without interest." That investment in power is set forth at $460,000,000.

Regarding this presentation it should be pointed out to the country at large that this $460,000,000 invested in power equipment alone costs Uncle Sam something like 2½ percent interest annually. In view of the fact that TVA is going to take 60 years to pay off the investment, without interest, it is quite clear that the taxpayers of the Nation are going to have to pay this interest, which amounts to $11,500,000 yearly.

It must be a very comfortable feeling to the people of the Tennessee Valley to know that a hundred and thirty million people throughout the rest of the United States are subsidizing their electric light bills and their industrial power costs while at the same time the TVA can deduct from its operating expenses one item of eleven and a half million dollars each year.

The TVA report shows a net income of $14,737,270 from operations. That, however, is the brightest side of the picture—if there is a bright side. That $14,737,270 income represents the receipts in the last and biggest business year in TVA history. It represents for the most part war business. The war will be over before very long, and then where is TVA going to get its income?

But there is still another item—and not such a small one either. It is the item of taxes. Of course, the taxpayers of the country are paying this TVA bill, too. Somebody has to furnish the money to run the Government. If TVA paid its share of the tax burden, as private interests are expected to do, there would be another obligation amounting to $7,298,077, State and local, with an added Federal tax of approximately $14,321,000, all of which adds up to a deficit of $21,619,077. Allowing a $2,000,000 credit paid in lieu of taxes, the net deficit is approximately $19,619,077, which corroborates the testimony offered by Edward L. Moreland, dean of engineering of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, before the Joint Committee on Investigation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Seventy-fifth Congress, Third Session, to the effect that "the taxpayers would have to make up an annual deficit of $20,999,000."

Emphasis is placed on the power activities of the project, which is as it should be, since power was the prime motive in setting up the TVA. But the columnist in his enthusiasm reiterates the oft-repeated but misleading statement that 20 percent of the consumers of TVA power are rural, and also that they use twice as much electricity as United States average.

Again going to the TVA annual report, it is discovered that when the 20 percent of users is translated into kilowatt-hours the story takes on a different hue. The TVA report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, which is the peak year for TVA, discloses that all of the "individual" users, rural and otherwise, used only 8,306,590 kilowatt-hours of juice out of a total of 9,110,370,790 kilowatts sold, or less than 1 percent.

Quoting from one of the said articles: "The TVA yardstick has been used in many communities to force down rates." There is much evidence in the operations of TVA to support this confession. And when this is accomplished, TVA then proceeds to dictate to the local companies which it took over with the taxpayers' money and to the cooperatives how much they shall charge for power, at rates that only a Government-subsidized corporation could hope to exist on.

Another interesting disclosure in the financial structure as cited in the opening number of the series is under the heading, "Costs." It says $65,000,000 bonds were sold. An examination of the TVA report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, discloses the fact that $6,300,000 of these bonds were deposited with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and that all of the rest, with the exception of a block of a little less than $2,000,000, which may have been retired, were deposited with the United States Treasury. So this statement may be somewhat misleading.

The question of flood control is passed over lightly, with the general statement that TVA "flatly denies charges its flood-control operations have not benefited flood conditions on the lower Ohio and Mississippi." On this phase of the subject it might be well to quote from an article in the current issue of the Public Utilities Fortnightly, entitled "The Valley and Propaganda; Another Portrait of TVA." It reads:

"During a devastating flood on the Ohio-Mississippi River system in the spring of 1937 Col. R. C. Powell, Army division engineer at Cincinnati, asked TVA to withhold release of water at its Norris and Wheeler Dams until levels in the lower Ohio and the Mississippi Rivers had dropped. But TVA couldn't comply with this request; both reservoirs were brimful of water for power-making purposes.

"Then, too, as all engineers recognize, whatever flood protection may be provided by TVA's dams is due primarily to the fact that most of the lands subject to overflow before their construction are now permanently flooded by its reservoirs. Speaking at

New Orleans in November 1944, WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON, chairman of the House Flood Control Committee, said:

"'What flood control obtains in the Tennessee Valley? Instead of protecting the valley, the construction of dams from the mouth of the Tennessee to its source has converted the entire valley into reservoirs. Before the TVA was authorized the greatest area that could be overflown was 420,000 acres. Now 360,000 acres, or six-sevenths of the entire area, are under water in the reservoir bottoms of the Tennessee Valley.'"

That irreparable damage was done to the area taken over by TVA is revealed in information divulged by the Tennessee Farm Bureau at a 3-day meeting. TVA transformed a successful agricultural community into an industrial center of doubtful permanence and without the consent of the people affected. In so doing it not only robbed large numbers of people of their homes and livelihoods, but placed another heavy financial burden on those people.

The State of Tennessee alone was deprived of an annual income of $13,415,300 from the sale of crops, products consumed, and Government farm payments. In addition it gouged the people of this one State of $16,830,360 in farm lands on the basis of a $30 valuation of the land acquired.

Another proper charge against power operations is the cost of removing towns, railroads, bridges, roads, and families. Hearings held by the House Committee on Appropriations on the independent offices bill for 1946 disclosed that 14,433 families or a total of 56,000 persons were dispossessed of both homes and livelihoods in the interest of the "experiment."

Members of the Tennessee Valley Farm Bureau charge that many of these people left the State and thus increased the financial burden of those that remained behind to operate smaller and less desirable farm lands.

They say that the land TVA took over is the most fertile and productive farm land in Tennessee. This, they say, is the land that contributes most in direct taxes for the maintenance of county governments and public schools. It is the land that creates most of the annual wealth of raw materials—corn, wheat, vegetables, livestock, wool, meats, eggs, dairy products. It creates local processing plants, flour mills, canneries, milk plants, meat packing establishments, and provides employment for large numbers of people not directly engaged in farming.

This is a part of the story that the representatives of these 31 organizations referred to as the "water lobby" believe should be told. The story thus far has been too one-sided.

Roy Miller, President, Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Chairman; William H. Webb, Executive Vice President, National Rivers and Harbors Congress; E. W. Rising, Finance Officer, Water Conservation Conference Continuing Committee; Lachlan Macleay, President, Mississippi Valley Association; F. O. Hagie, Secretary-Manager, National Reclamation Association.

A Design for Business Confidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished engineer, who is engaged in the practice of his profession in my congressional district, has prepared a very studious thesis on the subject of maintaining a high level of employment in America by means of a system of guaranteeing adequate markets for goods and services without Government planning. He originally entitled his thesis "A Design for Business Confidence." It is a very thoughtful proposal for preserving permanent high levels of purchasing power and investment capital through a national program of market insurance.

The author of this thesis, Mr. Alfred B. Sabin, is retained by some of the largest business corporations in California, and is the originator and designer of a number of modern mechanical appliances which are now in successful use by these corporations. I believe that his business and professional experience and the long and careful study which he has devoted to the problems of American markets should make his thesis a subject of interest to all Members of Congress.

The thesis follows:

WHAT IS BEHIND EMPLOYMENT?

The full-employment bill of 1945 calls for an annual survey of the Nation's over-all industrial potential markets and investment needs. The bill further provides that government shall stimulate business activity, if necessary, to insure a high level of employment.

Much of the criticism being leveled at the bill is based on the contention that planning by government has proved basically unsound and dangerous to free institutions. It is generally assumed that government stimulation must of necessity consist mostly of public-works programs. It is contended that any public-works program, to be effective, must be large, so large that by its very size it becomes politically and economically dangerous to private pursuits. The sponsors of the bill, themselves, seem conscious of this dilemma, for they have suggested that the important thing is to place the Government on record as adopting a full-employment policy, but leaving the question of the method open for further development.

The object here is to outline a method which would guarantee adequate markets for both goods and services without Government planning, without endangering the Treasury, and without bureaucracy.

REWARD MUST EQUAL RISK

The basis of these proposals is that the closer we can approach the ideal of free, unrestricted, unobstructed markets, the closer we can come to real freedom and prosperity, and that the thing we have to fear is fear itself. The corollary to this is that full peacetime employment depends on business confidence. We have many suggestions for achieving the goal—some good, most dangerous. Even the best have not yet added up to business confidence, confidence in the future, confidence that the reward is worth the risk, work, and worry. Let's set it down right here that unless the reward is worth the risk, work, and worry private enterprise is not going to be able to furnish full employment. It never has in peacetime. It never will, unless the necessary confidence is established.

The worth of any program designed to furnish full employment under private enterprise must be measured by its power to inspire such confidence in businessmen, investors, professionals, farmers, and labor. It must inspire sufficient confidence to induce some employer to hire the last marginal worker of our goal, let us say, 55,000,000 employed. There should be such confidence that this employer will hire the last marginal worker—as he did in wartime—because he needs him. It must give sufficient confidence to the investor to induce him to invest that last marginal dollar required to employ that last marginal worker. It must assure the farmer at planting season that at harvest his efforts will be rewarded. It must assure the worker a fair share of reward for his effort and a continuing demand for his services.

The first requirement for confidence is that laws, regulations, and taxes be fair, clear, and impartially administered. The second requirement is that markets for goods and services be ample to consume them at the highest levels of production, continuously. Without minimizing in the least the importance of reforms in banking, law, and taxation, the second requirement of markets and how they may be expanded to meet any production increase is the primary subject of this article.

The cost of such a program would be inversely proportional to its effectiveness. Theodore Roosevelt said he wanted a navy so big he would never have to use it. We know such a navy is expensive to maintain, but not nearly as expensive as not having it. As a parallel on costs, the Federal guaranty of bank deposits is closer. Bank reserves and Government appropriations do not, like navies, involve maintenance costs. The cost of guaranteeing bank deposits has been a negligible item because the reserves behind the guaranty are extremely large and convincing. The same type of thing is necessary for insuring business confidence at minimum cost. If a really convincing program were set up, the psychological pressures would continually tighten up the interlacing spider web of commerce. Areas not competitive before would become so. Areas of overcompetition would be relieved. We might thus approach that ideal of a free market where all goods and services are evaluated in the only truly just and democratic way, through supply and demand. Then the annual cost of the insurance would be less than the cost of one battleship—not much to pay for the winning of the peace. Let us examine the possible effects of such a program.

Obviously, the production of goods and services would be greatly stimulated. Since 1938 gross production has risen from $85,000,000,000 to $190,000,000,000. It seems likely that with the armed forces discharged and back in industry, and using the skills we have already developed, we could approach this wartime peak rather soon.

Assurance of a job has always meant that the average American spends freely. He wants a better house, a better car, more education, better roads, more travel, more sports, and more leisure. Let us not forget leisure—time to do those things we want to do, using the things we have made; leisure, which most men automatically take when their physical needs are satisfied (as witness absenteeism). Leisure is the balance wheel, which, if widespread in time of peace, due to general prosperity, will automatically hold productive levels to what the market will absorb.

Investors, large and small, would be offered the greatest field of private investment in the history of the Nation, for capital demands would be enormous. As a rule, an investor could expect greater safety for his invested funds and a more moderate taxation. Venture capital would really get the green light.

As a corollary, it is probable that due to greater safety of funds, the tendency would be toward low rates of interest, rents and dividends. This would take place due to the laws of supply, demand, and risk; not Government regulation.

The situation for businessmen and farmers would be similar. Secure markets would stimulate mass production, enlarged plants, new services, and products, all without Government red-tape, hamstrings, quotas, ceilings, or controls.

Expansion of foreign trade is held by some to be an answer to the problem of markets and employment. Others insist restriction of

foreign trade through tariffs is necessary to protect business and employment. Both can't be true and in fact neither is.

The advantages of large foreign trade are, (a) greater variety of goods; (b) better quality of goods and specialties; (c) less monopoly; (d) conservation of the nations' scarcer natural resources; (e) collection of foreign debts; (f) and most important, better international relations. The basis of foreign trade and peace is a healthy home economy.

Though we work and hope for peace, we must be prepared for war. Fortunately, the best course in preparing for war is to work for a dynamic peace. Preparing for war boils down to one thing, be strong. Be strong in national health. Be strong in unity of purpose. Be strong in industrial "know how" and productive capacity. All of these are the product of a healthy, vigorous economy of full employment and ample markets. At the beginning of every major war in the Nation's history, we have been unforgivably short of weapons, but long on industrial power, and we have so far been victorious. We should take care of our weapons hereafter, but national defense is implemented and sustained by confidence in ample markets, by full employment.

We have outlined a few of the effects to be expected if market confidence can be insured. Following are some of the elements basic to any program which aspires to create business confidence. First, we will take up a few on which many economists tend to agree. Taxation is important. The effect of taxation on business is to remove money from circulation. This causes the remainder, due to its relative scarcity, to become more valuable. A dollar buys more goods which means lower prices. We, therefore, say taxation is deflationary and injures business. Government expenditures are the opposite of taxation. Wages rise, but not so fast as prices; hence a lower standard of living. Business may boom, at least for a time, but the greater the spending the larger the debt and the impending taxes. There is always a day of reckoning, although it may be postponed; the logical attitude toward tax rates would seem to be that over a period of years the relation of taxes to expenditures should leave just enough money in circulation to maintain a stable price level.

Taxation can be kept down only by reduction in expenditures or by reducing the amount of the interest-bearing public debt. In the immediate postwar years, tax rates should be kept as high as possible without injuring business, to reduce the debt and the interest thereon, to insure eventual scaling down of debts and taxes. With markets insured, it is probable that wartime tax rates can be maintained and the war be paid for in a few years' time. Reduce tax rates then; not before. But without market insurance, adequate taxation would probably kill business and debt repayment will take many years.

Distribution of taxation can have a profound effect on the trends of business. The tendency to penalize efficient types of business structures is against the public interest. Venture capital is the mainspring of new enterprise, new products, and industrial progress. Severe taxation of resulting large incomes turns venture capital to low-interest, tax-free, safe investments, and we all are the losers. Such taxation has gone too far. Broadening the base of income and pay-roll taxes with less pressure on the peaks, and special inducements to progressive management and investments are in order.

Taxes of the nuisance variety, taxes which cost too much to collect, and taxes which tend to restrict trade should be abolished. Income taxes require further simplification. Taxation of stockholder dividends instead of excess corporate profits would tend to eliminate unfair double taxation and stimulate corporate risk taking.

Monopoly, cartels, and devices by which they are achieved tend to restrict trade, narrow opportunity, and prevent necessary adjustments of prices to supply and demand. They are the arch enemies of free enterprise and must be curbed. Patent laws which have shown themselves of great value in the stimulation of progressive invention must be redirected to that end.

Economic trends are going to be influenced powerfully by the disposition of surplus war products and war plants. Like the public debt, it is desirable to liquidate the whole thing as rapidly as possible. There are three good reasons: (1) To put these goods to the best possible use for the good of all concerned; (2) to remove the threat to future markets; and (3) to control inflation. However, again this will be possible only if in some way ample demand for newly manufactured products can be maintained, over and above the war goods which are being fed into the economic stream. And again a convincing insurance of markets becomes imperative.

Most of these ideas have been argued pro and con for years. There is nothing new about them. They have become just good old conservative propaganda. Many conservatives assert that such a program is all that is needed to put the old U. S. A. into first-class shape. But they betray their own lack of conviction by admitting that, of course, there will be more depressions, "necessary to eliminate the unfit." "Keeps labor from getting clear out of hand." No; they aren's convinced. Nor are the so-called liberals who assure us that if private enterprise can't employ everybody the Government can. But let's not deceive ourselves. Surely the Government can employ everybody. Russia does it, but not under the guise of preserving capitalism or freedom.

Public works are very necessary and many things, such as highways, schools, post offices, Army and Navy, and so forth, are done better or can be done only by government. Such projects should continue to be done by government. But when government attempts to solve unemployment through public-works programs, the public value of the project often becomes of secondary importance. Graft and bureaucracy have a chance to dig in and if or when employment is restored a great many Americans will have gone to work for the Government. A program big enough to produce adequate markets could easily overwhelm private enterprise and create a tremendous debt which would, in turn, tend to undermine the market confidence we wish to create. No; this is not an answer. We may thus solve unemployment, but at a price—a price which may well include most of the things we have been fighting for, for several hundred years. Only some new type of market insurance can bridge the gap between the old and the new—between the era of scarcity and the era of abundance.

No; the old formulas are unsatisfactory because they do not add up to business confidence in markets and profits, and unless the total equals confidence, we have accomplished nothing. Something else is needed. I suggest that this something must satisfy five demands: (1) it must be simple, simple enough to be understood by the average businessman, the average housewife, the average farmer and factory worker; (2) it must be fair, as fair as wages determined by fair competition. Good work, hard work, perseverence, imagination and creative courage must be rewarded if we want those characteristics in our civilization; (3) it must be concrete, as concrete as a 5 dollar bill in the pants pocket; (4) it must be strong, strong enough to be effective, like the Federal guarantee of bank deposits. All good design requires a factor of safety to take care of the things which no man can foresee. Better still, use a rising factor of safety, one which increases rapidly under stress so that the mind is presented with over-powering certainty; (5) it must offer a minimum of restriction to the free flow of commerce and the right of every man to follow his own road to fame, to fortune and to his own personal goals.

These specifications all can be met by a subsidy on earned incomes geared to an employment index. If employment falls below a minimum standard of, say 90 percent, a payment would be made to each person with an earned income during the previous year. Make it proportional to that earned income. Make the payments every month so long as employment is below 90 percent. Start the first payment at twice the amount estimated as required to restore markets. Then double the amount each month of substandard employment. Simplify and speed up the process by issuing certificates at the time of income tax payments. Back these up with a Federal appropriation.

As an example of how this might work, suppose that at the time of filing our income tax reports, each of us would fill in five coupons like the sample below:

"BUSINESS ASSURANCE COUPON

"In consideration for compliance with act of Congress No.____ this note for the sum of $____ shall become redeemable in legal tender of the United States of America when, and for 30 days after so proclaimed by the Secretary of the Treasury and signed by the recipient in the presence of an authorized officer.

"Issued to_____

"Signed_____

"Social Security No_____

"Date_____.

"In the presence of_____ _____ who is authorized by law to witness the above signature.

"(Seal of witnessing officer.)"

No. 1 coupon would be made out for 1 percent of the reported earned income on which the tax was paid. No. 2 coupon would be filled out for 2 percent, No. 3 for 4 percent, No. 4 for 8 percent, and No. 5 for 16 percent—a total of 31 percent of each person's previously earned income. These coupons would be checked, numbered, sealed, and mailed back to the taxpayer. Checking would consist of simply making sure that the figures correspond to the amount on which the tax was paid. By definition "earned income" might be limited to $10,000 or under if desired.

Persons having incomes too small to be taxed would get coupons by filing a sworn statement of earned income and would be encouraged, if not required, to do so. Upon completion of coupon tabulation, the total of all coupons issued would be submitted to Congress for a covering appropriation.

If, during the ensuing 12 months, the employment index remained above 90 percent, the coupons would become void. If, however, employment fell below 90 percent, the Secretary of the Treasury would be required by law to declare No. 1 coupon payable. If at the end of 1 month, employment remained below 90 percent, No. 2 would become payable; next month No. 3, etc. Payments would continue until employment exceeded 90 percent. Payments would be made whether or not the individual were employed at the time of payment. Prior to proclamation, no coupon could be discounted or bought up, this to insure full effect on markets.

The whole point of these coupons is to create confidence in markets and jobs, thereby making their payment unnecessary. An occasional payment, say every 10 or 20 years, might be desirable, if only to let people know the mechanism is operating. If more than a few were made, it would indicate political tampering or lack of public concern to maintain the basic pattern. As long as such a guarantee remained in force, however, it is difficult to see how we could have another

depression due to a lack of effective purchasing power. As long as employment remained above 90 percent, no payments would be made. The pressure to insure free markets and opportunity would be psychological.

There may be holes in this bulwark of confidence. If there are, plug them. But let's get some good insurance in effect before the dike gives way again.

The President's Navy Day Address in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD an article entitled "United States Rudder Still Needs Firm Hand," written by Bill Cunningham, and published in the Boston Herald of October 28, 1945, commenting on the Navy Day address by President Truman in New York.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES RUDDER STILL NEEDS FIRM HAND—IS TRUMAN'S BELATED EXPLANATION ENOUGH TO KEEP NATION OFF REEFS?

(By Bill Cunningham)

President Truman's Navy Day address from New York had strength in that it defined our stand, told the world what we expect and what we are prepared to recognize as the final pattern of the brave, new world. It had strength in that it served notice to Russia that puppet governments will not be recognized, and advised the British that the seas will be free and that "we believe that all peoples who are prepared for self-government should be permitted to choose their own form of government without interference from any foreign source."

WEAKENED BY VAGUE GENERALITIES

It had strength in that it clearly announced that we would keep for the present the most powerful Navy in the world and one of the strongest armies and air forces, and that, for the time being at least, we will not share the secrets of how to manufacture the atomic bomb.

It had weakness because such a statement of foreign policy is so long overdue that it looks as if this were an effort to find one. It had weakness in the fact that, like the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms," it consisted mostly of noble ideals and vague generalities. It was weak because it merely stated our beliefs and stopped short of saying what we're prepared to do about them. It was weak because instead of defining the 12 specific points as a practical program we're not only prepared to accept but to enforce, it classed them as a dream of perfection, possibly unattainable for many years, and compared them with the Ten Commandments, which, the President said, "have not yet been universally achieved over these thousands of years."

This looks like a belated rewrite of the Atlantic Charter, which has already been ignored all over the map, and except for whatever implication Europe wants to read from the big-armed-force and the atomic bomb retention, it's still a golden ideal to be hoped for some time. In the meanwhile, we have fought a hard, practical war, and have come out into a hard, practical future.

Understandings such as these should have been part of the fighting, firmly outlined by us as practical, finite provisions, and agreed to by Russia, Britain, China, and all other Allies, active and passive, as our arms and supplies were given them and our men sent to fight at their sides.

"SO WHAT?" MAY BE UNIVERSAL RESPONSE

Instead, nothing of this sort was evidently done, and a complete stagnation was allowed to develop as soon as the last shot was fired. This may have given greedy forces, at home and abroad, enough of a start to make these ideals unobtainable by any means other than another World War.

We've come in so late with our definition of what we were fighting for that unless we forcibly add that we're still willing to fight for it, the universal response may be "So what?" Many in this land hammered with all they had for such a statement as this while the fighting was on. They were assured that the "four freedoms" said it all, that they really constituted our war aims.

Our allies the while were hard-driving, realistic people. It was obvious from the first that they knew what they wanted, and that they intended to get it if possible. They didn't talk in generalities. Nobody had to wonder what their policies were. Right or wrong, they had straight practical pictures of what they were fighting for, and they still have.

The American people also had war aims, but each man was practically forced to picture his own. His were idealistic, too, but he was forced by the very nature of life in wartime to add some practicality. Each hoped, rather than was ever convinced, that as he gave his sons, his labor, his savings in patriotic contributions, that there was some master direction to what he was doing. There was not the slightest question about his idealism. He gave without stint, and the very least he expected was a better and better-ordered world when it was over.

Instead he has seen nothing of international cooperation, not to mention progress, toward even the writing of a peace treaty, and the home front, instead of being more unified, more tightly bound by the experience of sacrifice, the memory of danger, fear, and heartbreak mutually shared, seems to him to be torn into more different pieces than ever.

Remembering with chilling fear the experience of the last conflict, he has been wondering that if again and despite its awful warning, we have won the fighting and were preparing to lose or walk away from the things the fighting was about. Now comes this belated explanation of what "we believe" instead of what we insist shall be done. Is it enough?

GRAND BLOW-UP MENACINGLY CLOSE

We soldiers of the last war carried this same duty as far as it's been again carried to date. We whipped the Germans. That's all, plus the Japs, of course, that has happened up to now. We even left a Europe in better shape than this one and a world that had a much better chance of making something decent of itself. We had some war aims in our war. They were well defined and clearly enunciated. We offered the Germans a clean-cut pattern for surrender, and we had a plan for lasting peace. It was all blown apart by the bombing of politics later, but we, at least, had something to guide by. We knew what we were doing and what we expected.

We had all that—and failed.

This time there's none, or none that's shown to date. By every law of common sense that seems to say that failure will come more quickly than it did last time, unless we rouse ourselves and start moving. We have won the battle but we still can lose the war. As matters look now, we are already losing it.

If the "four freedoms" were really what we were fighting for, they still haven't been established anywhere in the world, including, incontestably, in our own country. There is want everywhere on the face of the globe, and, as soon as the false prosperity of the war years has evaporated, we'll be at grips with want in this land, too.

There is fear in the hearts of myriad peoples. You can find it all over Europe. You can sense it in Britain. If the truth were known, there's probably a lot of it here. Freedom of speech is little but a figure of speech anywhere but here and in the British Commonwealth. And all speech here is by no means free. Freedom of writing is what we really have in this land. Most of the others don't even have freedom of whispers, and freely admitted as much to a committee of American editors who toured the world about a year ago just to see. Their official report is sufficient commentary on that.

Freedom of religion is likewise far from universally established. The troubles between the Vatican and Moscow, the Arabs and the Jews, reported pograms in Poland, and anti-Semitic outbreaks in Buenos Aires are samples of that sad state of affairs.

Thus, if those noble generalities represent our war aims, we haven't, as yet, won victory on any count.

FIGHTING STOPPED BUT THAT'S ALL

What progress, then, have we made?

Well, we have stopped the fighting by stronging it down, and we have succeeded in organizing the United Nations—a body expected to function if we can ever write a peace, but a body which will blow apart as Woodrow Wilson's dream did if somebody decides first to start a fight.

The rest has been entirely stagnant and stalemated, and whether this is natural reaction, a tired world merely resting, or preface-to-breakdown remains for the coming months to decide. Up to now, we haven't done much in our handling of Germany, nor done much but agree with—some call it "appease"—Russia, on anything.

From this distance, to many people, that has seemed to be weakness, lack of decision, lack of understandings, of a plan, and it probably was. There are probably others who consider it intelligent action, and maintain that it's wise to be certain before taking a stand. It was announced this week that after much work and many conferences, the plan for governing Germany ordered into being the Potsdam Conference had been completed and evidently will be put into effect soon.

This has taken 4 months, and, in the meantime our Germans have been doing some resting of their own. This seemed silly to the Russians who considered the Germans a conquered enemy and not a public charge, who therefore took what they wanted, told the Germans what they expected and stood for no loafing nor fooling.

We have practically concluded at long and elaborate last, the machinery and the preparations for the trials of German master war criminels. It looks now as if all the formality bids fair to be a farce. Instead of cold and haughty Prussians, and impressive Nazi subfuehrers, eyewitnesses report that the former Nazi overlords and generals have disintegrated into a lot of shoddy-looking bums. Two or three have practically lost what passed for their minds and even Herman Goering, who represents the prize exhibit A, has degenerated into little but a sodden physical monstrosity.

CONVICTION WOULD RULE OUT MARTYRDOM

Herr Dr. Robert Ley, the drunkard, hanged himself with a towel. Julius Streicher, the brutal Jew-baiter, now shriveled and shabby, stands and takes imaginary salutes from imaginary columns of imaginary goose-stepping German soldiers. Rudolf Hess has so completely lost his mind, or so completely pretends that he has, that he denies ever having even heard the name Adolf Hitler.

In brief, the production is terrific, but the cast is reduced to shrunken degenerates and stir-crazy bums. Again the Russians consider us silly. They can't understand why

we didn't drumhead and shoot them while they still were worth shooting. The Russians have no war criminals. They considered them strictly excess.

Still, the other side of that is that we are trying for the record, for the ages. After such a trial, if these men are convicted and executed, no Hitler of the future ever can maintain that they were glorious martyrs, shot like dogs without a chance. An added, and important feature, too, is that here, for the first time, members of a general staff will be tried, and plotting a ruthless war will be established under international procedure as an international crime if conviction is obtained.

Understanding with Russia is still the unsolved problem and, from every means of measurement, the most serious of them all. There are those who feel that we should have stood up long since and told the Muscovites right in their teeth that they'd take orders for awhile. There are, likewise, those who feel that the slow treatment was best. These latter see the break-down of the London Conference as a constructive thing. There, at long last, after giving the Russians their way in many things—"appeasing" them, if you will—we refused to climb down any more. This was the limit. That was our way of saying it.

FURTHER DELAY MIGHT BRING COLLAPSE

The Russian, so it's said, is the type of blustering ebullient who'll push you and say "Get out of the way," but if you push him back and say, "Get out of the way yourself," he'll grin, stick out his hand and say, "Fine, we understand each other now. There isn't any reason why we can't be friends." If that's true, we've now pushed him back.

But for all this we're still nowhere on the road to winning the war—to getting the issues settled and the causes of the next war rooted out and destroyed. Rationalize it, explain it, defend it as you will, we've made no real start, and further delay invites complete collapse—more quickly than it came after a better finale and evidently better planning last time.

Meanwhile the home front gives little evidence of remembering World War II. Full pressure is on to bring the Army and Navy home. Every family wants its soldier home, as is natural, but our troubles seem to be multiplying in direct proportion to the speed of the general pull-out. The charge has now been publicly made that the fast withdrawal of our Army from Europe is weakening General Eisenhower's hand in his dealings with the foreign powers. It probably is. They take it as an index. They're realistic, not idealistic. They don't talk back to a man with a stick in his hand.

The epidemic of strikes speaks for itself—and not well in terms of the strength and steadfastness we need right now. The admirals and the generals take their eyes off what we've won overseas to parade their service politics in the argument about combination into one defense department.

ONLY THE EASIEST PART IS WON

The scientists, the military, and the President all are in conflict as to whether we should share the secrets of the atomic bomb. Congress, with reelection looming as a bugaboo for most Members, treads around the vital labor question as gingerly as if it were a new kind of atomic bomb and goes hard after that sure-fire vote getter, the lowering of taxes. The President proposes compulsory military training for all able-bodied young men of subcollege age, while the church people, the pacifists, and the educators prepare to go after him.

This is all minor staff. There's a war still on. We haven't won it. All we've won is the easiest part of it—the fighting. Whether it was wise, or weak, to hold back, we've held. Whether we had no plan, no preparation, or whether we've secretly been following a perfect plan, the time has now come to rip the wraps off and make certain of the thing our more than a million casualties bought with their blood.

The time has come to say what we are, what we were in the war for, and what we expect. It still isn't too late. The others still need what we've got. Their delegations are over here now begging for it. The call is now to step in and be the world leader we've grown up to be, to pick up the bat and stride to the plate, and not continue to play a deep shortstop, as one pundit expressed it, waiting continually for issues to be batted at us. We need to bat a few—completely over the fence. We have all the hickory and the heft necessary to do it.

If we quit the game, or let the others make the play, our fate is certain. Every student of war on the face of the globe has carefully filed away a significant fact. That is that Germany lost two wars in 25 years by making one fatal mistake. That was jumping on somebody else first, and giving us time to get ready. If there's another world war, whoever sees fit to start it will certainly slug us first, and they'll bring enough when they do—atomic bombs, or whatever—to wipe us off the face of the earth. We've got to follow through now, or prepare to perish then. It's not a pleasant thought, but this isn't a pleasant world, as yet. Nor will it be, unless we make it one.

Natural Resources of Missouri River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Kansas City Star of October 25, 1945, with respect to the natural resources of the Missouri River Basin.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is more than passing significance in the retention by the Army engineers of the Midwest Research Institute to make a scientific study of the Missouri River Basin's natural resources.

Obviously Army engineers desire to have all the facts on the area's resources at their fingertips when they submit their proposals for river development to a congressional committee. Various groups have had various interests in the flood-control program. Selection of the Midwest Research Institute is a tribute to its reputation for scientific integrity. Its findings will not be challenged as being weighted in favor of any special interest or group.

More important, however, will be the practical value of the analysis. The project associates the Army and a private research organization in a program in which both are vitally interested—the industrial and agricultural development of the Missouri River Basin. Assembling of all the facts on minerals, raw materials, agricultural products and fuels in the States drained by the river is the first step.

From this survey, the industrial potentialities of the region can be determined. Tentative plans calls for carrying the survey into the field of laboratory research on some of the natural resources.

Even before construction on the reservoir system begins, scientific research will be under way. It is an intelligent approach. The survey will be of great value in harnessing and utilizing the Missouri River for its maximum benefit to the area it drains.

Broadcasting Congressional Proceedings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, and myself have introduced identical bills authorizing the broadcasting of congressional proceedings. These bills are respectively Senate Joint Resolution 55 and House Joint Resolution 89. Much discussion thereof has appeared in the press since the first of the year. In speeches on this floor and in remarks made on public platforms I have quoted from numerous editorials and magazine articles in reference to the topic. One of the most interesting articles, which has but recently been called to my attention, appeared in the State Government magazine of August 1944. Here it is:

BROADCASTING PARLIAMENT IN NEW ZEALAND—NEWS OF LEGISLATIVE PROCEEDINGS BY RADIO

(By Leon Weaver,[1] captain, U. S. Marine Corps)

Brief notes in recent issues of popular magazines concerning New Zealand's practice of broadcasting proceedings of its Parliament raised questions of interest to students of legislative and electoral processes in democracies. Should similar proposals be made with reference to the Congress or State legislatures, the results of the New Zealand experiment will be of value in appraising the proposals.

New Zealand has evidenced a willingness to experiment, especially in social legislation. This willingness to pioneer in the changing of economic relationships doubtless helps explain the willingness to experiment in broadcasting the proceedings of Parliament.

Were such an innovation to be proposed in the United States Congress or in a State legislature, it would doubtless be the subject of considerable debate, and would probably be done only after much discussion and deliberation, with many arguments being made regarding its implications for democracy.

In New Zealand it was undertaken in a much more matter of fact sort of way, as but another of a series of political innovations.

The suggestion that parliamentary proceedings be broadcast was made as early as 1931. Speaking on the floor of the house of representatives, Mr. M. J. Savage (later Labor Prime Minister) said:

"Some day we may even have a microphone on the roof of this Chamber to enable the people to know how their Representatives are shaping in this House. Of course, it may be to the disadvantage of some of us, but we will have to put up with that. However, I would sooner put up with the publication of my remarks over the air than with the reports which I read in the newspapers."

[1] The opinions or assertions contained in this article are the private ones of the author and are not to be construed as official or reflecting the views of the Navy Department or the naval service at large.

This statement reveals that, as far as the Labor Party was concerned, one of the chief motives was the conviction that the press was not reporting political news fairly.[2] But one newspaper may be said to be a Labor paper, and it is one of the smaller ones. The newspapers published in the larger cities—Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch, Dunedin—are all Nationalist papers.

The suggestion was again brought forward by Labor in 1935, during the coalition government's consideration of legislation to permit broadcasting political speeches over the air. Labor was unfavorable to this legislation, fearing the Government would be treated more favorably in the allocation of time than the Labor opposition, but continued to press for broadcasting of proceedings of Parliament. Again the statement was made that, while newspapers gave good reports within space limits, they were not always fair; also, that many people were interested in following the debates on a given bill.

After the 1935 elections which resulted in the formation of a Labor government, the Prime Minister, Mr. Savage, gave instructions that the necessary facilities be installed. The decision was reached and carried out by the Ministry. Examination of paliamentary debates and newspaper files indicates that there was scant public debate on the matter at the time that the policy was instituted, although the Nationalist press and many of the Nationalist opposition members opposed the practice.[3] At first the broadcasts were confined to the more important debates. Mr. Savage stated that if the public demand justified it the transmission of speeches would be increased, and that the project should be viewed as an inexpensive experiment to see if the community desired to listen.

It is worth noting that the project was not conceived of as a panacea for the ills of representative government. Parliamentary debates and newspaper files reveal no high-sounding arguments that such an innovation was conceived of as a great contribution to democracy. At least, such claims were quite modest, and were implicit rather than explicit.[4] The innovation was viewed as a means of equalizing the conditions of the party struggle and as a means of disseminating news to which the public was entitled, if interested.

At first only the more important debates were broadcast. After a few months, however, the government felt that the experiment had been well enough received that it was decided to broadcast the proceedings more completely. It was also decided to meet the complaints of listeners not interested in the broadcasts by providing a special government station to carry such broadcasts. Under the present arrangement, the speakers and topics are announced in advance. The proceedings are "on the air" from the opening of the day's business until 11 p. m., when the microphone is turned off even though the house may stay in session, on the theory that only a very few people would wish to listen after that hour. This results in management of the debates so that the speeches designed for the ears of the outside public occur in the early evening. It also gives rise to the charge that it is possible for the government on occasion to time its parliamentary moves so that its speakers' remarks will be broadcast while those of the Opposition are made while the microphone is turned off. As might be expected, the allocation of the time has not been completely satisfactory to the Nationalist Opposition. The practice has been to follow a pro rata system as nearly as possible, whereby the time allocated to a party is proportional to the number of seats it possesses. For example, after the 1935 elections, the representation of the parties in the house of representatives was as follows: Government, 55; Opposition, 19; Independents, 6. As of June 9, 1936, the number of speeches broadcast was: Government, 19; Opposition, 13; Independents, 8. Whether or not this arrangement is fair will depend on the point of view. It results in the majority's side of the question being argued more fully than the minority's. The above figures show, however, that the allocation of time to the Opposition and Independents was in excess of that called for by their proportionate strength. The alternative—to allow every political grouping, regardless of its size, the same time as the majority—would hardly be justifiable.

By ruling of the speaker, members are not allowed to read speeches being broadcast. The speaker also controls the switch of the microphone. The microphone is turned off when subjects involving military security are involved. According to one political observer, there have been differences of opinion between the speaker and military censorship authorities as to what might be permitted to go out over the air, these differences being usually resolved in favor of the view of censorship authorities.

Recourse must be had to the opinions of political observers in order to assess the effects of parliamentary broadcasts on New Zealand political processes. As to the effects of the institution on legislators, its defenders argue that it makes for closer popular surveillance of measures and men and that this has a salutary effect on the attitudes and conduct of legislators. Some observers are inclined to minimize the effects of the experiment or to point out that some of them have been unfortunate. It is said that during the popular listening hours from 7 to 10 p. m. the legislators tend to "play to the grandstand," prolonging the debates, and that conduct of business is noticeably more expeditious after the microphone is turned off at 11 p. m. It is stated that broadcasting the speeches increases the tendency to speak on matters of interest only to the legislator's constituency, and thus fosters an undue preoccupation with relatively minor sectional problems. It is said that a legislator with something worth while to say but a poor radio voice is eclipsed by one whose principal asset is a good radio voice. It is argued that, with the inauguration of broadcasting debates, the people became conscious of the low order of debate—poor grammar, indulging in personalities, etc.—and therefore Parliament has lost some of its dignity and "mystery." It is also argued, however, that consciousness of the radio audience leads members to take greater care with their speeches. As to whether or not parliamentary broadcasts have tended to cause voters to return more able men to Parliament, even from the standpoint of debating ability, there is difference of opinion.[5]

As to the effect of the broadcasts on the political consciousness and civic literacy of the electorate, opinion is even more divided. Some observers, especially those not affiliated with the Labor Party, are inclined to minimize the size of the listening audience, and say that the novelty is wearing off and interest therefore is likely to drop. It is said that rural people listen more than urban people; that such broadcasts are listened to chiefly because they relieve the monotony of farm life, while the urban listener has competing interests.[6] It is said that only "cranks" listen to the broadcasts of routine proceedings with any degree of regularity, although it is conceded that on controversial measures or on measures affecting the listener's own locality listener interest may be substantial. Labor Party officials are of the opinion that the listening audience is substantial. The decision to broadcast even the routine proceedings as well as the more important debates was dictated partially by the feeling that there was a widespread popular interest in the broadcasts. Typical of this attitude is the following expression of opinion by a labor member of Parliament:

"Parliamentary broadcasts are, I think, much appreciated. When people listen to the broadcast of parliamentary debates they are hearing real talks, and I believe are more than satisfied with them. They appreciate the privilege of being able to hear the debates as they are proceeding, and I know that honorable members on all sides of the House have received letters of appreciation as a result. The electors scattered throughout the country are interested when their parliamentary representative is speaking in the House, and, although they do not naturally agree with all that is said, they like to hear their representative expressing his views and possibly putting forward the claim of his own district, as well as expressing an opinion on the many problems involved in the legislation that comes before the House of Representatives. I consider that the large increase in the number of license holders is due in a great measure to the fact that Parliament has been on the air."

---

[2] This conviction, and the resolution to deal boldly with the situation, has also been in evidence in the Labor Party's stand for close government control of radio broadcasting and its reliance on the radio as a medium for political publicity. In this connection, the Labor government's postmaster general, Mr. F. Jones, was quoted as saying that the government would be "the master of publicity * * * and is not going to wait for the newspapers or the opposition to tell the people what it is doing."

[3] Before the 1943 elections the leader of the nationalist opposition announced that if his party came to power the parliamentary broadcasts would continue.

[4] For example, about the closest approach to any such claim was Mr. Savage's statement that if the people could not be brought to parliament, parliament could be taken to the people.

[5] One observer with whom the writer talked thought possibly they had; others thought not. "Alarmists who had thought the microphone would encourage fluent hypocrisy at the expense of floundering soundness were silenced—along with the House's most agile speakers. Some of the House's lamest orators were triumphantly reelected. To champions of parliamentary broadcasting this seemed proof that the New Zealand voter was capable of being educated without being entranced" (Time, November 1, 1943).

[6] Greater interest on the part of rural people is probably partially caused by two facts: (1) In recent years, parliamentary debates have frequently dealt with matters of great concern to rural people as producers; (2) this type of news reporting would doubtless be of greater interest to the rural population whose newspapers do not carry as promptly available and complete reports of the parliamentary proceedings as do the metropolitan newspapers.

Where Food Was Produced in 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, to answer many inquiries I receive I include the following letter and table from the Department of Agriculture:

OCTOBER 26, 1945.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: In the absence of Mr. Bennett I am replying to your letter of Octo-

ber 19 requesting income from all farm products and from food products for the year 1944. The enclosed table shows cash receipts from sales of all products and the closest approximation we can make at the present time to receipts from the sale of food products.

Cash receipts from farm marketings of cotton lint, tobacco, and wool were subtracted from the total cash receipts from farm marketings to obtain the indicated income from food products. Actually there are a number of other deductions that also should be made to obtain a more realistic indication of income from food products alone but, to date, the department has not assembled its income data to fit a precise food-nonfood classification.

The attached information is preliminary and subject to revision.

Yours very truly,

PAUL L. KOENIG,
Head, Division of Agricultural Statistics.

Cash receipts from marketing of farm products used for food and all farm products, by States, 1944 calendar year [1]

[In thousands of dollars]

States	Cash receipts from marketings of all products	Cash receipts from marketings of food products [2]
Alabama	262,336	156,870
Arizona	123,541	103,556
Arkansas	340,318	191,165
California	1,711,964	1,657,307
Colorado	301,400	295,964
Connecticut	102,646	97,140
Delaware	81,341	81,335
Florida	337,757	330,110
Georgia	380,475	250,165
Idaho	236,687	231,131
Illinois	1,124,289	1,121,794
Indiana	656,542	650,520
Iowa	1,458,998	1,454,805
Kansas	683,026	681,015
Kentucky	356,655	316,867
Louisiana	235,358	166,667
Maine	121,188	121,080
Maryland	158,009	148,435
Massachusetts	144,375	142,494
Michigan	493,350	490,826
Minnesota	798,528	794,618
Mississippi	360,255	144,213
Missouri	693,558	644,340
Montana	236,753	224,492
Nebraska	620,294	619,097
Nevada	24,985	22,986
New Hampshire	43,668	43,642
New Jersey	191,437	191,415
New Mexico	107,595	87,689
New York	613,423	612,479
North Carolina	615,046	208,681
North Dakota	409,865	406,606
Ohio	697,914	687,101
Oklahoma	438,700	382,119
Oregon	281,995	278,091
Pennsylvania	521,320	512,989
Rhode Island	16,969	16,963
South Carolina	245,222	100,410
South Dakota	337,212	331,046
Tennessee	316,555	217,820
Texas	1,222,596	921,140
Utah	115,735	108,271
Vermont	75,848	75,791
Virginia	319,848	250,642
Washington	453,056	451,448
West Virginia	85,363	83,408
Wisconsin	729,690	721,912
Wyoming	91,562	80,526
United States	19,975,447	17,909,181

[1] Preliminary. Excludes Government payments.
[2] Cash receipts from all farm products minus receipts for cotton lint, tobacco, and wool.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

There are several factors to be considered in analyzing these tables:

First. The receipts in dollars is not a true reflection as to the amounts in pounds, bushels or tons of the various products that have been produced. Some States receive 50 percent or more for the same products than do other States.

Second. These returns must be considered as cash receipts and not as net cash returns. From these cash receipts must be deducted labor, fertilizer, feeds, irrigation costs and general farm expense so that while the $19,000,000 as cash receipts may appear large, yet when the expenses are deducted and the resulting total is divided by 7,000,000 the number of farms in the United States, the net cash receipt per farm is, even during wartime, relatively small.

You will note that the States of California, Iowa, Texas and Illinois are the four leading States in dollar receipts, and one must realize the size of Texas with an area of 263,644 square miles and the size of California 156,803 square miles in comparison to the 55,986 square miles comprising the great State of Iowa. Minnesota with 80,009 square miles ranks fifth and Wisconsin sixth with 54,715 square miles although both of these States are only partially developed agriculturally.

Twelve Million Men Seen Available as Reserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the American people have never been subjected to the liberty crushing effect of militarism. The system now sought to be fastened upon our free people through universal military training is the first step in setting up a military regime which is as foreign to our principles of American liberty as it would be to establish a king in place of an elected President. Once militarism is suffered and permitted to take over the control, education, and training of our youth, even for a year, this will be the beginning of the end of civilian control and direction of the young people of the Nation. If the military caste system is permitted to inoculate the coming generation with its philosophy of military government and its complete domination of the civilian population, the influence of the home will be destroyed as a "soft and dangerous influence" upon our youth both morally and physically.

Millions of fine people have come here to become citizens of the United States to escape from the war-breeding scourge of militarism, and our founding fathers sought to keep this Nation free from its pernicious influence upon our liberties and institutions.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article on universal military training by David Lawrence, which article appeared in the Washington Star October 25, 1945:

TWELVE MILLION MEN SEEN AVAILABLE AS RESERVES—YOUNG ENOUGH FOR WAR DUTY FOR 5 YEARS, SAYS WRITER

(By David Lawrence)

Approximately 12,000,000 men will be available as Reserves out of the armed services. They will be young enough for duty for another 5 years at least. Then why all the hurry to get a universal military training bill passed now?

This question is being asked on Capitol Hill and doubtless throughout the country. President Truman was aware of it and tried to answer the point in his message to Congress by saying:

"At the present time we have the necessary organization, the required camp installations and the essential equipment and training grounds immediately available for use in a training program. Once we disband and scatter this set-up, it will be much harder and more expensive to reestablish the necessary facilities."

This comment—which has, of course, the War Department flavor, because it has been issued heretofore repeatedly in a long series of statements by Army officials and others—merely means that the military men want to be assured of their status in the armed services. They would like to remain generals and colonels and not step back in rank, at lower pay, as is usually the case when the military services are diminished in size after a war.

MORE JOBS FOR OFFICERS

If the universal military training program goes through, it will require that more commissioned officers be retained on active duty than would otherwise be the case. So it is understandable that the military groups should insist that it is better to maintain the present organization and not disband it.

Mr. Truman takes note of another phase of the same argument against delay when he says:

"It has been suggested in some quarters that there should be no universal military training until the shape of the peace is better known, and until the military needs of this country can be estimated and our commitments under the United Nations Organization can be determined. But it is impossible today to foresee the future. It is difficult at any time to know exactly what our responsibilities will require in the way of force. We do know that if we are to have available a force when needed, the time to begin preparing is now. The need exists today—and must be met today."

It seems, of course, incredible that the President of the United States immediately after the close of the most horrible war in history—a war fought to destroy militarism and set up an international organization to preserve peace—should be saying that it is impossible to forsee the future and that he doesn't really know "what our responsibilities will require in the way of force."

Clearly there would appear to be little faith in the United Nations Organization and little faith in the capacity of the moral forces of the world to keep peaceful nations from developing enmities against one another. But there is also another phase of the uncertainty which Mr. Truman omits to mention.

WHO WON THE WAR?

Ever since the atomic bomb was dropped, high officers of the Army and Navy have been telling us that this didn't really win the war and that Japan was actually beaten before the bomb was dropped. The Russian press insists the atomic bomb was superfluous and that Russia's entry really turned the scales.

Spokesmen for the Army Air Forces are broadcasting claims that the Air Forces won the war by bombing, even before the atomic bomb was dropped. Navy men point out that seapower won the war against Japan because the bases from which the bombs were dropped were taken by the Navy and Marine Corps, assisted in some instances by ground troops of the Army.

Certainly nobody has come forth to make a case for a large group army. In fact, a considerable sum of the taxpayers' money is being used by different services inside the War Department to put over the idea that

the Air Forces won the war. It is most unfortunate that the ground troops which fought their way so brilliantly across France and into Germany and the artillery and tank forces haven't as effective press agents today clamoring for recognition for them. The public is left with the impression that ground armies are really of secondary importance, if not altogether obsolete.

Yet in the fact of such impressions created by high-placed military men themselves, the urgency is for immediate passage of a peacetime conscription.

For, however much that name may be denounced, the universal military training plan certainly isn't the volunteer system. And few Members of Congress are willing to maintain draft boards to keep on drafting 18-year-olds to fight an imaginary war.

Maybe a year or two from now when the military needs of the United States can be better estimated, some plan for universal service on a quasi-volunteer basis may be justified in connection with instruction in the high schools and colleges—that is, under civilian jurisdiction. But in the meantime, nothing is lost because there are 12,000,000 reserves available for any emergency for at least 5 years.

The Witnesses, Please!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on peacetime military training is receiving the serious consideration of all of us, and I include in my remarks an editorial appearing in the Oregonian published in my district, under date of October 24, entitled "The Witnesses, Please!" in which this entire problem is discussed. The editorial which follows is worthy of careful consideration:

THE WITNESSES PLEASE!

A couple of weeks ago when Gen. George C. Marshall recommended universal training, it was said here that it was difficult to deny his argument that there must be adequate manpower to back up the weapons of the atomic age, so long as Russia hid behind a curtain of secrecy and practiced conscription along with science.

How could the United States, seriously exposed to atomic weapons both on the east coast and the west coast—thus standing in the open—increase its danger by making less of a levy than did Russia—standing in the dark—upon its manpower?

The extremity of the situation compelled us to give the utmost weight to the recommendations of the Chief of Staff—contrary as these are to the national traditions.

Now President Truman has embodied General Marshall's program in a definite proposal to Congress. The President would keep the professional services "comparatively" small. He would strengthen the National Guard and the Organized Reserve. He would form the basis for an army of citizens, to be subject to quick mobilization, by giving a year of training to young men in their late teens and then holding them in various reserve categories during their physically effective years.

In short, here is peacetime conscription for America, which always has hated the thought, camouflaged under the name of "civilian training."

Now let us say, bluntly, that the plan for our national protection, as set forth in the President's message, leaves us unconvinced.

Six of the eight reasons for universal service advanced by the President are absolutely unacceptable. He talks about the young men improving "their educational status"; about their working for "self-improvement" generally; about their developing "skills which would be useful in civilian life"; about reduction of the illiteracy rate; about the development of "ideals of responsible American citizenship"; about improving "the moral and spiritual welfare of the Nation's youth."

Bah! All this might have come out of the mouth of any military leader from Alexander to Keitel.

It is the very claptrap which Anglo-American civilization discarded when it started to build modern society—when it gave the world democracy.

No; if we are going back to the Prussian system of having the military organizations of the country train the youth of the country it must be for the purpose of preserving the Nation—not for any of this hokum that military life is the good life. If we come to that, we must say that our enemies were right all the time, and on that score we do not agree.

Thus there are only two arguments advanced by the President which bear validity. His point No. 1 was that the youth of the country should "perfect themselves in some military specialty." His point No. 5 was that the program would "raise the physical standards of the Nation's manpower." If the fate of America depends upon these two points, we can go along with Mr. Truman; if it does not, we cannot.

And at the moment, we are wondering; we are skeptical. Several things cause distrust.

Foremost is the fact that the Government seems to be determined to force universal training through before the Congress and the people really know about the atomic bomb. It is reported to us on the best of authority that the scientists of the University of Chicago group have all signed a remarkable document as to the seriousness of the bomb, and that this document is deliberately withheld by the Government and the War Department, in spite of the fact that it gives away no technical secrets. What other purpose could there be than to impose universal training prior to a renewed discussion of whether universal training has become worthless?

Then there is the fact that the recommendation, and the program, are submitted before we have had a chance to hear from those battle-front commanders best qualified to testify as to the nature of the wars of tomorrow. The Oregonian, for one, wants to have the testimony of General MacArthur and his remarkable air commander, Gen. George Kenney. These men were in large part responsible, from the strategic standpoint, for forcing the surrender of a practically intact enemy army of 7,000,000. Shouldn't they be heard on what the wars of the future will be like—whether they will be wars of universal service or of specialists? And there are others from the European theater, and from the naval theaters on both sides, who cannot be ignored. Why not get their views? In particular, Generals MacArthur and Kenney.

Then, what about this strange lack of an explanation, as to why, with highly scientific weapons, we should have a comparatively small Regular service and this great poorly trained universal force? One would think that air power and the use of the atomic bomb would require specialists giving the work a lifetime.

And lastly, why doesn't the President use the temporary advantage of the United States to bring Russia into line? There is only one reasonable solution of this atomic-bomb situation. That is a world in which every foot of land would be subject to scrutiny by an international body charged with the duty. And the only chance of that is to bring Russia around to our way of thinking while we still have the advantage. Otherwise Russia, living in secrecy and in vast distances, will feel that the dice of fate are on her side. But not a breath of that comes into Mr. Truman's message.

We have said before, and we repeat it, that it does not seem reasonable to go against the recommendations of our military commanders in regard to universal service, so long as the other major power of the world, Russia, practices universal service. They brought us through the war.

But the present procedure is terrible, and we will support the matter no further until we know what the scientists think as to the atomic bomb and what the battle-front commanders, especially those in the Pacific war, think of the needs. We believe the people want the answers to these questions. We believe they also want to know why, with science so specialized, a year's training is held so important as compared to a permanent force. And we believe the people would like to have the President of the United States use the present position of the United States to bring about a reasoned world.

He doesn't seem to be doing much about it, and we are drifting toward disaster in the dawning age of neuclonics.

Bargaining With Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Daily Times of Larchmont, N. Y., titled, "Bargaining With Britain":

BARGAINING WITH BRITAIN

Tremendously vital fiscal negotiations are under way in Washington between representatives of the United States of America and the British Empire. England feels she must have billions of American dollars if she is to be restored to economic parity with other great nations. She feels she cannot pay even the interest on such loans, though the United States must pay its bond buyers in order to raise the billions to loan to the Attlee government.

But America looks beyond these representations. We see that while Britain is complacently accepting cancellation of $29,000,000,000 in lend-lease which we sent across, she does not intend to cancel, in interest of peacetime trade, the loans she obtained from units of her empire. Why, we suggest, should we be asked to give more than members of the British family itself give to the mother country? We want these others to forgive Britain her debts as we forgive her as our debtor.

We want freer trade within the Empire and less of trade restrictions, designed to shut out from fair competition those not within the British Commonwealth. Above all, we want elimination of factors within the British policy which have, through selfishness in the past, created trade wars leading to actual military clashes.

And incidentally, while Britain is bargaining on these vital points, we suggest it would be polite for spokesmen of the British Socialist Government to refrain from invidious comment upon the capitalistic system which has made us strong enough to invite the British appeal.

Battle-Weary Veteran Asks Why Army Drive Is Not in Use for Redeployment System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, a battle-weary sergeant in Germany sent me the following plea for a square deal. He is right that it is up to this Congress to see that he receives it.

Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON:

Having just read an account given by you, in regards to an officer's letter of protest on the redeployment schedule and discharge rate, I would like to add to the subject, from an enlisted man's standpoint of view. As a result of your interest and fight, I can think of no better individual, in your position, to criticize and protest to on the Army's much debated demobilization program. It seems apparent that congressional action has the only forceful hand in making changes and bettering the particular program, so it is to our national political figures that we look forward to—with hope.

I won't attempt to elaborate or cite any personal cases or instances, but rather to try to portray the opinions and feelings of the average GI in the European theater. There has been a woeful situation created in the Army, due to the inadequacy and inefficiency created by officials in high positions who seemingly possess the status of being mentally incapacitated. There appears to be no drive or push whatsoever on the Army's part to speed up discharges and redeployment to the States.

In regards to the point system, the majority believe the whole thing is grossly unfair and should be done away with as soon as possible. Length of service and combat credit should be given more consideration in the release of military personnel.

Probably the worse mistake the War Department has yet committed was the authorization to discharge any man in the States regardless of points if a job could not be found for him. A man with 44 points over here will remain in the army of occupation for an indeterminate period, according to a recent USFET statement. Thirty-six points is sufficient a score to keep from being sent overseas for those who are fortunate enough to be in the United States. The troops who fall in this category are also enjoying furloughs up to 45 days at a time. I have enclosed a small clipping from today's edition of the Stars and Stripes that gives an interesting light on this matter.

We believe that shipments to the United States can be increased and speeded up. We have read that 300 ships have been laid up since "there is no further use for them." Do these people responsible think that all men in the European theater are home? We see, in the Munich area, hundreds of large planes being "pickled" for storage. Cannot these planes, which are capable of Atlantic flights, be made available for the transportation of troops?

Morale is so low among troops in this sector that it is actually pitiful. The men, who deserve to be home, and should by all rights of sensible argumentation, are in most cases bitter toward the administration in fault. If any individual or collective group in Washington has the idea that all's well and rosey in this theater, pertaining to the disposition and morale of troops, I sincerely wish that an investigation could be arranged. I'm sure that the analysis of the outcome of the investigation would ve very startling.

There are so many troops over here with nothing to do, that it almost creates a problem on many unit commanding officers as to what to do with the vast surplus. The fact that there are 10 times the actual required and necessary number of men needed to carry out occupational duties in assigned sectors is an outstanding one. You can interview 10 GI's and 9 will tell you that all they're doing is passing away time and "sweating out" a boat ride home. It's a common sight to see outfits jammed in small towns, with no more military installations to guard and administer than you would find in some desolate desert.

Then, too, we would like to know about the facts and figures concerning the replacements that are supposed to replace some of the lower point men in the European theater. It seems that with the drafting of 50,000 men monthly, the reenlistments, and the men eligible for overseas service who have yet to leave the States, the War Department could certainly muster sufficient a force to comply with the required occupational force figures. Incidentally, the psychological and physiological requirements for overseas duty shouldn't be at a very high fixed standard now that the war has reached its climax. Any 4–F could do what we are doing.

We also read that a recruiting program is being launched by the War Department. There's one thing definite—nobody who is aware of what the Department has done and is doing regarding demobilization would want anything to do with this Army, no matter how great the inducements may be. Unless something is done by congressional legislation to readjust or radically change the present demobilization program, I fear the outcome of the men who stand as victims.

I hope and am sure that you employ and devote your energy, efficiency, and prestige on the subject involved. I'll close with my only compliment—orchids to the few Members of both the House and the Senate who are at least trying and realize our plight.

Sincerely.

Irrigated Lands for Veterans May Yet Be Furnished by Congress Another Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, a few hours earlier this afternoon I was called out of the Chamber to go down to one of the Departments on official business. Therefore I was absent at the time the conference report on the land-grant railroad bill was brought before the House. I understand that the House rejected the conference report, probably because of the opposition to an amendment placed in the measure by 10 western Senators, including the 2 Senators from Arizona. This Senate amendment sought to authorize an appropriation to be used in the irrigation States to provide family-sized farms for veterans in those Western States. I know it was contended that this Senate amendment was a rider placed on a bill to which it seemed to have little logical relationship. However, I favored accepting it in the conference report.

There is a definite relationship between this amendment offered by 10 western Senators and this land-grant railroad rate bill to which it was attached prior to the action of the House in rejecting it. This measure when it becomes law will turn back to the Government certain lands in those Western States to the public domain and as such it will not be taxed. While this railroad land was in private ownership, it was subject to taxation by local government and thus yielded some local tax revenue. Now, it is in these Western States where the Federal Government owns so much of the area nontaxable that the local governments are hard pressed to find revenue for local need. If the amendment could have been accepted it would have provided thousands of farms for veterans in private ownership and thus would have counteracted the local tax losses incurred by the bill itself by furnishing new taxable wealth in homes for new settlers.

Aside from the logic of furnishing, by this amendment, local revenue to compensate States and counties for the lost revenue which this bill will cause by returning the railroad grants to the public domain, this Senate amendment deserved our support even more because it conferred benefits upon returning veterans. While I am working for other legislation which seeks to furnish good irrigated land in family-sized farms for veterans, I was neverthless strongly in favor of this Senate amendment. Members may say, "It is a splendid idea to provide farm homes for veterans on good irrigated land, but there is another way to do it rather than through the adoption of this amendment. Congress ought to do it the other way." Now, I will not only agree, but insist, that it ought to be done some way as part payment of the obligation we owe to veterans and we ought to do it as a part of the postwar reconversion plan. If the House will not accept the Senate amendment to provide homes for veterans in these irrigation States, it is all the more reason why Congress should do it the other way. And what is that other way?

I submit that one other legislative way which Congress could and should choose to furnish veterans homes on irrigated lands is to enact into law two bills which the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation has already reported out, and on which the House has taken first action. I refer to H. R. 2742 and H. R. 520. These bills may need slight changes, but in the interest of veterans both of these bills should be enacted into law quickly as a legislative foundation, and followed up with due appropriation. At this moment the Appropriation Subcommittees are hearing requests for various amounts for irrigation projects. To give

force and effect to our plan to furnish veterans farm homes, Congress should immediately appropriate $93,367,000 to the Bureau of Reclamation as requested by the President about 2 weeks ago. This request is found in Document No. 331, which contains supplemental estimates to enable the Reclamation Service to carry on its postwar program for the benefit of veterans. Any Member who sincerely wants to enable veterans to get irrigated farm lands, but who could not support the Senate amendment in the conference report today, can still accomplish this most commendable objective by wholeheartedly supporting the legislation and appropriation I have just referred to.

I hope I do not tire the membership by dwelling on this one topic so much and so often, but I must say solemnly that now is the time of decision. Either we pass some laws, such as H. R. 520 and H. R. 2742, giving preferential rights to veterans, and appropriate sufficient money to do something in this line for veterans, or we will do nothing for them in the way of such benefits. And Congress must act now if it is going to act, for next year will be too late. Let no sincere Member say or think for one minute this type of legislation for veterans can be taken care of next session. Now is the time to make our words mean something through our action for, without action immediately, our promises are mere words.

A Tribute to the Home-Front Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today America launches a campaign to gather $11,000,000,000 in the Victory Loan drive, money needed to finish the job of winding up the war, to pay for bringing home our troops, to care for the wounded and disabled, and to pay the final installment on the planes and tanks and guns and bombs we used to defeat the Axis Nations. This drive is under the able leadership of the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Fred M. Vinson.

THE AVERAGE AMERICAN

No time could be more fitting for us to pay a word of tribute to the average American; to thank him for the splendid way he has dug so deeply into his pocket to finance our struggle for freedom. Later I expect to have something especially to say about the Honorable Theodore R. Gamble, who has so effectively and so efficiently conducted these campaigns.

Much has been said about the tremendous production job our industries did, the speed with which they produced ships, the hundreds of thousands of planes and weapons that rolled off our assembly lines. It was a magnificent record. But none of that would have been possible, not a wheel could have rolled, had it not been for the millions of Americans who took out of their pocketbooks and laid down the money to provide the payment for our part in the struggle for freedom.

THIS, THE EIGHTH DRIVE FOR FUNDS

Seven times the Treasury has called on the American citizen to supply the financial sinews for our struggle against the aggressor nations. The first time it was for $9,000,000,000. Our people responded by buying $12,000,000,000 worth of bonds in 30 days. As the tempo of conflict increased, the Treasury called again and again. For thirteen billion, then fifteen, then sixteen, and $14,000,000,000. Each time our people responded so generously every goal was exceeded.

During the war the Treasury has asked the people for a total of $95,000,000,000. They gave $135,000,000,000. Today more than 85,000,000 individual Americans have bought partnership in their Government through war-bond purchases. That shining contribution stands uniquely beside the bravery of our soldiers abroad, as a tribute to the unity of a true Republic fighting for its freedom.

How was this accomplished? Did our Government spend millions of dollars for a vast force of workers to persuade people to buy bonds? No. The total number of paid Treasury employees actively engaged in these war-bond campaigns has only been approximately 650 men and women.

It was accomplished by an army of civilian volunteers, 6,000,000 of them—one-half the size of our uniformed Army in the field—and by the leadership and organization of America's entire radio and publishing and moving-picture industry, working with the Treasury force on a purely voluntary basis.

Too high a tribute cannot be paid to our Nation's publishers, editors, advertising agencies, and advertisers, and the hundred other media which brought the war-bond story to every crossroads hamlet in the Nation. They were handicapped by lack of paper and by lack of manpower, yet they gave space without stint to bring the war-bond message to the people.

They donated a total of $153,174,966 worth of advertising space to the war-bond drives. The radio industry alone contributed $77,658,742 in otherwise salable time. Daily newspapers contributed $36,000,000 worth of space.

Weekly newspapers contributed more than $1,000,000 in space; magazines gave twelve million; the outdoor advertising field gave $11,000,000 worth of space to the various campaigns. No dollars-and-cents value can be put on the millions of dollars' worth of free publicity supplied these campaigns by the moving-picture industry and the theatrical interests of the Nation. Neither can we properly appraise the dollars-and-cents value of the thousands of retail store windows given over to war-bond displays or the efforts of our manufacturers who put war-bond slogans on everything from pats of butter to cross-country freight trucks.

It was the greatest sales form ever assembled in history, sparked by a tremendous wholehearted desire to cooperate with the war effort.

In 1 drive this year, more than 3,000 magazines gave their front covers to war-bond pleas. Literally millions of columns of editorial space in newspapers and magazines, thousands of hours of radio time, and the work of thousands of trained writers and publicists have been thrown voluntarily in this effort. These contributions have helped to write one of the proudest stories of the entire home front in this war.

The team mates of those who brought the war-bond story to the people deserve a special tribute. Those were the soldiers in the civilian army of 6,000,000, the individual salesmen who gave so much of their time and effort, the ones who literally tramped from door to door, who completed the cycle of bringing the bond directly to the hands of the citizens who wanted them.

Those infantrymen of the civilian army will get no medals, but all their lives they can keep the satisfaction of knowing that they played a vital role in bringing us along the successful road to victory. They will have the gratitude of the many whom they persuaded to invest in war bonds. It was a job well done.

There is still another group on this team, the administrative officials of the Treasury Department who supplied the program and the leadership for financing this war under the able direction of Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau. No Secretary of the Treasury in our Nation's history ever faced a more difficult task than he did in developing the vast ramifications of finance necessary to provide funds with the least possible pledging of the Nation's future income. His success is fully attested to by the fact that, to finance World War I, the Government paid an interest rate which averaged 4¼ percent, while, today, the average interest rate on the Nation's total debt is only 1.9 percent.

Today, we are embarking on the last of the war-loan drives. We need $11,000,000,000 to nail down the lid on final victory. Some of this money will go for ammunition already fired; some to pay the cost of guarding Germany and Japan. It will cost one and a half billion dollars to bring all our soldiers and sailors and airmen back home. Money will be needed to provide medical care for our 500,000 disabled and wounded veterans. Returning servicemen must have a stake to start again in civilian life and we have provided up to $300 per man for that. That will require some $2,000,000,000. Those are the major items of the final bill.

We have waged a long struggle—the most destructive one in history. With our skill and power of men and materials, we have stunned our enemies, pulled their fangs, and made them harmless. The cost has been incredibly heavy, but the victory is ours—complete, inspiring.

This total victory, however, the victory of our armed forces, is but a prelude to another battle before us—the winning of the peacetime battle against inflation. We are at the beachhead. To win that battle, we must mobilize the same energies, the same skills, the same team spirit

that won the war, to win a prosperous and enduring peace.

The immediate financial task in this battle is to hold back our excess purchasing power, to finish the job of paying for the war, and to establish a sound foundation for the way of life before us.

We cannot falter at this stage any more than our armed forces could stop fighting before victory. As a free, generous daring people, there is but one answer—to redirect our resources—manpower, material, skills and capital from war's destruction to rebuilding peace and prosperity. This is the greatest challenge and opportunity we have ever had. Let us provide the money and finish the job.

Dictatorship by Commission?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the bill soon to be reported to the House by the Military Affairs Committee, the purpose of which is to control the development and utilization of atomic energy, the following editorial from the Cincinnati Times-Star of October 25, 1945, is appropriate:

DICTATORSHIP BY COMMISSION?

The problem of controlling atomic energy has had somewhat the same effect upon official thinking in Washington as the atomic bomb had physically upon Hiroshima.

Everyone agrees that control of this terrible new form of energy is essential to the future of the United States and of the entire planet. But this does not excuse the setting up of a commission dictatorship over the United States, with no public voice in the matter and indeed no public understanding of what is going on.

Such a dictatorial power would be created by the May-Johnson bill, now pending in Congress. That measure would set up a 9-man control commission, appointed by the President with the approval of the Senate for staggered terms and removable only by the President for extreme cause. Most of the commission's powers would be exercised by an "administrator," who could be removed only by the commission.

This extraordinary official and the commission under him would wield powers never before dreamed of in the United States. They would control "all sources of atomic energy and all matters concerned with research." They could direct the services of the heads of all governmental agencies. They would have condemnation powers over all uranium sources and over all minerals, real property, mines, factories, technical information and patents which might be related to atomic research now or in the future. They could muzzle all scientists, who would work under commission orders. Their extreme powers of censorship would be backed by heavy penalties.

This bill was prepared by the War Department, introduced by the President and rushed through two hearings, at which no real discussion was permitted by the congressional sponsors. There has been no public weighing of its merits or defects by scientists or by representatives of the people. It might fairly be called a product of atomic hysteria.

This bill to set up a commission which might easily become more powerful than the Government itself must not be railroaded through Congress without thought or discussion. In our concern to restrain and harness the appalling force of atomic energy we must not invite the tragic consequence of a dictatorship by commission in the United States.

OPA County Carnival Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

ILLINOIS FEDERATION OF
RETAIL ASSOCIATIONS,
Chicago, Ill., October 26, 1945.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We would appreciate it very much if you would investigate the county carnival program now being staged by the OPA in some counties and being prepared for 2,400 buying centers over the United States. We understand the carnivals are to popularize the continued need for price control under the guise of checking inflation.

A week or so ago the OPA enlisted the aid of merchants and other businessmen in greater Jackson and Madison County (Tenn.) in its first Fight Inflation Week. We can envision this as an effort on the part of OPA to sell people on the need for a continuation of controls far in advance of the present termination date of the Price Control Act on June 30, 1946.

HOW IS IT AUTHORIZED?

We would also like to know how much of the taxpayers' money these elaborate programs are costing and in what manner they are authorized by the Bureau of the Budget and under what appropriation? We also would like to know why these programs are being held without also setting forth the tragic results of current OPA restrictive absorption and proticketing policies not only on the manufacturers and their merchants but on their customers?

WHY NOT BOTH SIDES OF THE STORY?

We wonder why there are not displays of so-called new goods coming on the market—such as were mentioned before the Smith committee—new goods coming on the market from new producers and goods far inferior in quality and far higher in price than the merchandise which is now not being made by established manufacturers because of the price squeeze. We wonder why the bare shelves of retail stores are not photographed and displayed. We wonder why a Government agency can utilize taxpayer money for the purpose of presenting only one side of a story. We wonder why the program is necessary if OPA is sincere in its hope to abandon controls soon. We wonder if the shortages of today which might necessitate the controls of tomorrow are not being manufactured to a large extent by the restrictions of the present. We wonder, in truth, whether or not the citizens of this country are simply being readied to bombard their Congressmen with requests to continue price control—and the emergency—come June 30.

"Supported by the Greater Jackson and Madison County (Tenn.) Association," the federation reported, "the OPA enlisted merchants and other businessmen almost 100 percent behind its 'fight inflation week.' Plans now are being made to carry this carnival type promotion into about 2,400 population centers. We presume they will be held in Illinois and we expect that businessmen here will also 'cooperate' because noncooperation could easily be construed by the well-propagandized citizenry as meaning that merchants were for inflation. They are less for it than anyone else could possibly be. But they are beginning to wonder whether these carnivals are less to fight inflation and more to perpetuate controls."

"The Tennessee carnivals," the federation reported, "were quoted as well-organized, effectively displayed and convincing."

WHAT THE CARNIVAL FEATURES

"The local newspaper carried a series of stories on the coming event. On September 30, the entire Sunday edition of 58 pages was devoted to the stunt. News section, society, business, local events, and religion were tied tightly into the plan. Every advertisement was keyed to it.

"Over 40 merchants in Jackson (a city of 40,000) designed special window displays. Prizes were offered for the best windows, for slogans and essays. The local radio stations carried spot news of the program every day during the week and merchants sponsored three special programs for the week.

"Local women's and men's clubs scheduled speakers on the subject and staged a civic rally. The theaters ran special shorts prepared for the occasion and established elaborate lobby displays. Schools gave special lectures for parents and children on the evils of inflation and explained the OPA program.

"One of the features of the week which brought about most public enthusiasm was an auction on the public square where a new Ford car, 100 pounds of sugar, automobile tires, and 50 pounds of lard were auctioned off to the highest bidder. The auction was cleared through the State attorney general so that the adjustments made later would be legal and no controversy would arise.

"The car sold for $2,500, sugar for $36, tires for $29 and $30 and lard for $15. After the auction it was explained that this was an object lesson to show what people would pay for scarce items. The purchasers were then sold the items at OPA ceiling prices. The car, which has not as yet been priced by OPA because it was an unreleased model, was returned to the factory but the man who bought it was given a certificate allowing him to buy the first Ford issued to that area at the regular ceiling price.

"Congressman ALBERT GORE and Lt. Gene Kelley were brought into Jackson as special guests for the occasion and spoke on the need for public education against inflation. Some ex-servicemen who had been stationed in countries where inflation abounded reported on what prices civilians were paying for clothing, food, and rents. They testified publicly that the veterans were grateful for what OPA did for their families by keeping prices in line.

"Merchants pointed up the testimony of servicemen in their window displays. They priced $75 men's suits as they are priced in France at $400. Shoe stores, haberdasheries, food stores, laundries, and specialty shops cooperated in this form of display. Merchants also displayed goods priced as they were after World War I and gave comparative postwar II prices."

WHAT IS INFLATION?

"It was," concluded the federation, "a skillful presentation but it did not tell the whole story. There are many kinds of inflation. Inflation can come from inferior quality of goods resulting from OPA restrictions. It can come from OPA policies which discourage adequate production, lower the supply and invite inflation. It can come from regulations that distort normal practices. And it

can come through steady elimination of sound small merchants who, by going out of the competitive scene, make prices less controllable by normal, vigorous competition."

We wonder what Illinois city will be the first to have the opportunity to stage one of these dramatic events.

Sincerely,

J. T. MEEK.

Our Service Men and Women Should Be Brought Home More Rapidly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Army and Navy authorities must exert greater efforts toward bringing the servicemen home.

We are now at peace with the world. There are three basic principles and facts that we must not forget:

First. The American people are definitely opposed to military government.

Second. In times of national danger the American people have never failed to rally instantly to their country's defense.

Third. When the danger is over the servicemen instinctively want to return to their homes and their families, who are equally anxious to receive them.

Servicemen and all of us alike in wartime loyally defer to the plans, decisions and strategy of our military and naval commanders. But when the war is over the problems of peace become paramount. Since the family is the basis of American life the rapid restoration of the American family becomes our first great peacetime responsibility. Millions of our families have become disrupted and saddened. The military and naval authorities therefore owe the servicemen and their families and the country a duty to subordinate all other activities to the task of returning the fighting men to their homes immediately. I recognize that this is a difficult task and that is more the reason for immediate action and the most efficient effort possible. The failure of any demobilizing officer however slight, cannot be condoned.

While generally speaking, most of the demobilizing officers may have performed their duties in accordance with instructions, yet there has been a terrific lack of system and coordination running through the whole program. There has been too much adherence to rigid regulations which smack of Army discipline. This is not a matter of Army discipline. It is a matter of natural human emotions making themselves manifest in the desire of the boys to go home. The matter must be handled accordingly.

Sharp criticism by many Members of Congress, including myself, have brought many desirable changes in plans and in the methods of carrying them out. Point requirements have been reduced drastically. Transportation has been speeded up and a marked change of attitudes has been noticed in the actions of demobilizing officers and agencies. But there is yet much room for improvement. I receive many justified complaints from servicemen from all parts of the world. These complaints indicate that there is more blame to be attached to the system of demobilization and the methods employed than with the personal conduct of the demobilization officers.

For instance a number of Ohio men with long overseas service and with point credits varying from 90 to 125 have been since August trying to secure their discharge. After serving 3½ years in the Army most of which was in the African and European campaigns they were brought back and landed in an eastern port in August. After a furlough home to Ohio they were brought back to the eastern port and then sent to a California camp to be demobilized. After waiting there for weeks they were finally processed but have waited additional weeks for transportation, and are still there. During their stay and by way of adding to their mental anguish they report that they have seen contingents where men had only 60 and 70 points come in to that same camp and receive their discharge papers and their transportation back to New England and to Florida with no great delay while they, the battle-scarred veterans, are still waiting.

My mail also discloses that the demobilization in the European theaters and in the Pacific is being subject to some criticism. The men complain that demobilizing officers are inefficient and uncooperative. Charges are openly made that priorities are given to some to the prejudice and disadvantage of others who are much more deserving. Men with long service and men with children should not be discriminated against. Charges are also made that men are afraid to demand their rights under threats that they may be sent overseas or to undesirable assignments.

Mr. Speaker, the military and naval officers charged with the responsibility for the demobilization of our service men and women should put first things first as they did when they were waging the war so successfully. They should insist that this task be done immediately and that it be done fairly. This is no time for excuses. Parades and pageantry should be subordinated to the best interests of the American family life and to giving our fighting men a chance to come home and in many cases to see a son or daughter that they have neyer seen.

Building up an Army and Navy with a big war on are entirely different from demobilizing an Army in peacetimes. Nothing should be omitted in our efforts to bring our boys and girls back home as fast as humanly possible. I shall continue to do my part. I invite my constituents to continue to write me.

The present temper of the House of Representatives is to pass the Reed bill which provides for the discharge of all servicemen who have served honorably for 18 months or more.

The Public Has a Stake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial titled "The Public Has a Stake" which appeared in the Standard-Star, published at New Rochelle, N. Y.:

THE PUBLIC HAS A STAKE

In the epidemic of strikes which has spread so rapidly and so alarmingly over the Nation, there is need for calm, sober efforts toward conciliation. Name calling will not help; rather it will aggravate an extremely serious situation. For while these strikes continue, the national income drops, thereby reducing the purchasing power of the country; at the same time, consumers are denied many household conveniences they had been led to expect early in the reconversion period. Further, idleness is always reflected in a heavier drain upon public funds, whether unemployment insurance benefit payments or relief funds.

It was, perhaps, to be expected that in the let-down after the war there would be a renewed outburst of controversies between labor and management, largely postponed during the war because both were then allied in common warfare against a mutual enemy. But this postwar period of controversy can be shortened and its gravity minimized if all concerned exercise restraint and tolerance and patience. Certainly no intelligent person wants a knock-down-and-drag-out battle wherein eventually all would suffer loss.

What seems to be lost sight of in this unfortunate postwar development is that the public has a great stake in the outcome. Those who are neither of management nor of labor unions involved can suffer severely in the struggle. For the public is not and cannot be a mere bystander; its own interests are closely intertwined. Consider, as mentioned, the housewife who is eagerly awaiting a new carpet sweeper or refrigerator or washing machine, or the newly married couple studying plans for a new home, or nearly all of us awaiting a new car. Strikes postpone the day when our proper desires can be met.

There is an even more serious element to this business of strikes. If the 30-percent increase in wages is gained, or any substantial part thereof, the advance must of necessity be reflected in increased prices of commodities, both necessities and luxuries. And where one group secures these wage increases, another group is by that same token encouraged to make demands, in order to meet increased living costs caused by the rise in price of the commodities produced by the first group. Thus, eventually, the entire scale of living costs advances, whereupon we have another series of strikes to offset this new increased cost, and so on around the dizzily revolving squirrel-cage of inflation.

Who suffers most in this sort of thing? Why, it is the white-collar class, comprising by far the majority of Westchester and of the rest of the country. Widows and orphans dependent upon investments of their dead are also among those hardest hit, as the purchasing price of the dollar declines in the inflation spiral. The defenseless, the previously sheltered, the middle-class office, and professional workers—these are without recourse when strikes push up living costs

and a national administration talks instead of acting.

Make no mistake about it, this epidemic can become a grim, life-and-death matter to thousands not directly involved in the negotiations. It is not solely an issue between the employer and the employee. Instead, it will, if permitted to continue, affect the comfort and the budget of every American citizen, big or little, high or lowly placed, even the members of the unions themselves.

Will There Ever Be Any Coordination of Food Efforts?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there appears to be little coordination in the efforts of the various bureaus. They all seem to operate on a basis of spending money instead of cooperating to furnish food for the hungry of the world.

KRAUT FOR THE HUNGRY

It took the OPA at least 2 months to decide what they were going to do about sauerkraut prices. The WFA had been compelled to wait also to find out what if anything the OPA intended to do about the kraut price. The OPA and WFA confusion could have been avoided if the Fulmer bill that passed the Agriculture Committee in June of 1943 had had consideration or if the Andresen amendment, which was the same thing, had been adopted in June 1945.

In June 1945 the Secretary of Agriculture, Clinton P. Anderson, evidently opposed the Andresen amendment so if he has to fry in the OPA fat it is the result of the emasculating of the Andresen amendment.

The following telegram shows the kraut picture:

APPLETON, WIS., *October 3, 1945.*

REID MURRAY,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Wisconsin cabbage situation rapidly growing more critical. OPA apparently sitting on price ceiling removal and made no other price announcement for past several weeks. Wisconsin has nearly 6,000 cars cabbage, most of which could be used by Ohio-Indiana kraut packers if assured could reflect cost plus freight in sales. Season now too late for full pack but if OPA ceiling removal made official next 2 days might save 3,000 car loads of nearly 6,000 that will otherwise rot in field with public demand for quantities of kraut in excess of entire crop. Bungling somewhere in OPA already cost us thousands of cars loss and if matter isn't rectified immediately three-fourths of entire Wisconsin crop will be lost. Eleven hundred members this association frantic something be done. Have spent 4 weeks and hundreds of dollars but can find no one in OPA interested in doing anything. Government buying program helpful but inadequate to handle 95 percent of surplus. In view of OPA failure to act feel we should have same protection as crops under Steagall amendment and guaranteed price of cabbage to farmers $15 this year as Government agency entirely responsible for tremendous losses involved through inability to set price. Normal filling of kraut tanks are three year year; because of lateness of season many be filled only once. Salvage some returns for our members.

R. H. EBERDT,
General Manager,
C. S. H. Crops Cooperative.

POTATOES FOR THE NEEDY

The potato situation is cited in the following letter to our colleague, CLIFFORD HOPE, as one of of the delegates to the FAO Conference at Quebec:

OCTOBER 9, 1945.

Representative CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLIFF: It appears that it would be desirable to discuss the possibility of disposing of our surplus foods at the FAO Conference in Quebec. Possibly some of these countries could make use of potatoes, for example, as the surplus seems to be embarrassing at this time.

If $60,000,000 is to be spent on the domestic potato program why could not that $60,000,000 be more profitably spent to buy dehydrated potatoes to be sent to the hungry of the world?

I think most people would rather see this money spent for a food to bfie sent to the starving, at the same time it is being used to fulfill the commitments.

I believe the potato growers of America would appreciate your discussing this situation at the conference.

Sincerely yours,

REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress.

Here then is the situation:

First the OPA's attitude did not result in the maximum kraut pack.

Second. UNRRA made rather large purchases of sweetpotatoes but pleaded lack of funds for purchases in appreciable amounts of Irish potatoes.

The United States has made certain food commitments:

(a) The ones President Truman made at Potsdam, which most every American wants to see fulfilled.

(b) The UNRRA commitments for food for the hungry.

Third. I ask if it would not be better to spend the money in purchasing food for the needy rather than spending the money on a program that does not provide conservation of food already produced.

Fourth. When one considers the millions of pounds of tin plate wasted in canning a product like filled milk, it is to be regretted that sufficient tin plate is not now available to can foods really needed for the hungry of the world. The last time I checked it, over 50,000,000 pounds of tin plate had been allocated to filled milk alone.

Fifth. If the powers that be had told the kraut makers of America that they would take a certain amount of kraut at a given price, and if the same powers would have told the potato growers that they would take a certain amount of canned potatoes and dehydrated potatoes for feeding the hungry people, these hungry people would be getting much more food and the confusion and waste of money would not be continuously taking place.

The hungry people of the world will never forgive us if we allow food products to be wasted that could just as well have been sent to them.

Control of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three thoughtful articles from the Washington Post on the problem of atomic energy, one entitled "Handling the Atom," by Marquis Childs, one entitled "Controlling the Atom," by Ernest Lindley, and the third entitled "Secrecy on Weapons Should Be Abolished," by Merlo Pusey.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of October 6, 1945]

WASHINGTON CALLING
(By Marquis Childs)
HANDLING THE ATOM

While he has postponed a final decision on the international use of atomic power, President Truman has made it clear that he favors some form of control through an international organization.

Long delay on this decision would be unfortunate. While the uncertainty hangs over the world the distrust and suspicion grow.

The choices that lie before us have been badly stated, it seems to me. Those who talk about the "secret" of the atomic bomb, and how we must keep it, are bracing themselves to resist a move that no one contemplates.

Those who urge international control of atomic power do not propose to rush out day after tomorrow and hand over the formula to every nation in the world. That is an unfair distortion of what they propose.

The most intelligent proposal has come in the form of a bill introduced by Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, of Connecticut, who would eventually entrust control of atomic power to the Security Council of the United Nations Organization. But before this was done careful steps would be taken to make sure the Security Council had the right to inspect all plants and laboratories in every country of the world to see whether the agreement was being kept.

If the Council could not obtain such assurances from each nation, then, presumably, the basic information on the method of atom splitting, which still is the secret of the group that did the job in this country, would be withheld. As President Truman said in his message, the principle is no secret. And the method of blowing the world to pieces will not long be our exclusive possession—perhaps 3 to 5 years at the most.

If we were to move toward sharing this power with the rest of the world, I believe it would do more than anything else to wipe out the cloud of suspicion and hostility rapidly forming on the international horizon.

We should have no illusions about that cloud. Above all, it is separating East and West, separating Russia and the United States into opposing camps.

We are beginning to deal in hints and threats. On their side, the Russians are beginning to do some hinting about atomic fission, and, as we have learned, the Russians never do anything without a purpose.

One broad hint was recently overlooked. The information bulletin published by the Soviet Embassy in Washington was devoted in considerable part, one day last week, to Russia's scientific achievements. In the course of a revealing article titled "Can

Science Be Planned?" A. Joffe, director of the Physico-Technical Institute, had this to say:

"By way of illustration, I can cite an experience of my own in May 1930, at a time when our country was still comparatively poor and everything was being directed toward the fulfillment of the first 5-year plan.

"My colleagues at the Physico-Technical Institute and I thought it essential to begin work on the atomic nucleus. We were worried, however, because it was the middle of the year, when appropriations for our work had already been made, and the new research work we had outlined required an additional expenditure of several hundred thousand rubles.

"I went to Sergei Orjonikidze, who was chairman of the Supreme Council of National Economy, put the matter before him and in literally 10 minutes left his office with an order signed by him authorizing the sum. Once started, we continued work on the atomic nucleus for 15 years, an essential part of our plan."

That is pretty plain. That says, almost in so many words, that Russia is a rich and powerful country geared to go to work immediately on any technical or scientific problem.

We may not believe it. But the important thing is that Russia wants us to understand just that. Suspicion feeds on itself, and will until we try to find a cure.

[From the Washington Post of September 24, 1945]

CONTROLLING THE ATOM

(By Ernest Lindley)

THE M'MAHON PROPOSAL

Two of the proposals concerning control of atomic energy now before Congress are purely preliminary. They would do no more than set up bodies to study the problem and formulate recommendations.

Senator VANDENBERG's resolution would create a joint committee of six Members of each House to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker.

Senator ELBERT THOMAS' would create a special commission of seven, composed of the Chief Justice of the United States, the chairmen of the Military and Naval Affairs Committees of the two Houses, a representative of the President, and a representative of industry who had a part in the development of the atomic bomb.

A third proposal, by Senator MCMAHON, goes further. It would set up a national board of control composed of a chairman appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, six Cabinet officers—the Secretaries of State, War, the Navy, Commerce, and Labor, and the Attorney General—and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. It would define the general duties of this board, which would include further research and experiment in the field of atomic energy. It would prescribe penalties for unauthorized production, transport, or use of atomic energy and materials or articles produced with the aid of atomic energy, and for the unauthorized disclosure of secret or confidential information.

The McMahon proposal also looks forward to the next step: the international control of the production and application of atomic energy. It would empower the national board of control to enter into agreements with the Security Council of the United Nations for the licensing of research and experiment with atomic energy and of the production and use of atomic energy.

Senator MCMAHON stipulates, however, that any such agreements with the Security Council should: (1) be approved by Congress, (2) provide that all other nations should turn over to the Security Council all information which they have concerning research and development in the field of armaments and munitions, and (3) provide that the Security Council shall have access to and inspect "all plants, laboratories, and operations of whatsoever kind relating to research, development, manufacture and production of armament and munitions of war."

Senator MCMAHON may be somewhat ahead of the congressional procession. Most of the Members will want to give the whole question thorough study before taking a first step. But the present Congress can hardly escape setting up some kind of national board of control, with authority to direct further research and development, but also with safeguards for secrecy. And, in the firm view of some of our wisest public men, the United States—and Britain and Canada—should not long delay the formulation of policies for the international control of atomic energy.

The scientists seem to be agreed that the bomb could be duplicated by another nation, starting from scratch, in a few years—probably not more than 5 years, probably less. The choice now is between national—or United States-British-Canadian—control and no control. Within a few years it will be between effective international control or no control. If an effort to establish effective international control is delayed, it may come too late. We might not even know that our feat had been duplicated until atomic bombs dropped on us. Moreover, indications that the United States or the United States-British-Canadian combination was intent upon keeping the atomic bomb a secret as long as possible would, as Senator MCMAHON has pointed out, breed distrust.

The conclusion becomes inescapable that the United States, Britain, and Canada should soon declare their intentions. A proffer of the bomb and its attendant secrets to the Security Council of the United Nations would have to be conditional. Senator MCMAHON's bill has indicated at least some of the essential conditions.

[From the Washington Post of October 2, 1945]

SECRECY ON WEAPONS

(By Merlo Pusey)

SHOULD BE ABOLISHED

What shall we do with the atomic bomb? Discussion of that subject is spinning so fast and furiously and gathering so much confusion as it goes that it seems almost a crime to give it further momentum. Since it is the biggest issue that the world is likely to face in the next decade, however, any effort to strip it down to fundamentals should be welcomed.

Much of the discussion has gone askew, in my opinion, because it is directed to the question of giving away the atomic-bomb secret. That question arouses emotions and obscures the more basic issues. It could assume great significance only if we were trying to halt research and further development of atomic power and to induce all other peoples to do likewise. But no one I know of is thinking seriously of any such proposal.

The general assumption is that science will now move heaven and earth to harness atomic power, as it previously harnessed electric power, for industrial and commercial uses. This necessarily means that atom splitting will be brought into the light of day. Senator MCMAHON hit the nail on the head last week when he asked, "How in the name of common sense could we make any peacetime use of it and keep it secret anyway?"

We must start, then, with the fact that if this knowledge is to be utilized for the benefit of mankind, it cannot be hidden under a bushel. Secrecy would imply that atomic power should be reserved for destructive purposes only. I think Senator MCMAHON is 100 percent right in assuming that the American people would never tolerate such a policy. Even if it were possible to prevent other nations not now sharing the secret from obtaining it, which it is not, the idea of bottling up the formula for release of atomic energy over any extensive period of time must be discarded.

But the argument on the other side—that we should hasten to give away the atomic-bomb secret—is equally untenable. Suppose we should open our files and equipment to inspection by Russian, French, and Chinese experts tomorrow and impart to them everything we know obout atomic power. Would such blind generosity automatically prevent other countries from using atomic power against us? Of course not. The result would probably be to give the Russians, for example, more knowledge than we have, for they would add all the information developed here to the data assembled through their own independent research.

Instead of talking loosely about giving our secret away, therefore, we ought to be using it in this period of its novelty to minimize the dangers of future atomic warfare. Senator MCMAHON has the best formula I have seen. What his bill proposes is the abolition of military secrecy among the United Nations. The governments in possession of the atomic-bomb secret would turn it over to the Security Council in return for all the information that other nations possess on weapons of war.

Of course, the agreement would have to be applicable to future discoveries as well as present knowledge. It would create a common pool of military information among the great powers. The next logical step would be an agreement forbidding the use of atomic weapons in any possible future war, as use of poison gas is now forbidden by international convention, or, if that should prove impossible, rigidly limiting the manufacture of atomic weapons.

The key to future world security must necessarily be, however, the lifting of all secrecy as to weapons among the armed powers. It is to be assumed that Germany and Japan will be kept disarmed. But in the absence of internationalization of atomic information and controls, all of the other big powers will probably be in a position a decade hence to wipe out their neighbors, even distant neighbors, without warning. Without a common pool of military information and a rational understanding among them, the only feasible course for any one of them would be intensive research and large-scale production of weapons infinitely more deadly than the bombs which laid Hiroshima and Nagasaki low.

Secrecy would goad each nation to the utmost efforts to avoid possible annihilation. Russia is said be already whipping up her scientific research in feverish haste. Unless we can succeed in bringing about an open defense system among the United Nations, we shall not know whether the atomic bombs Russia is certain to develop will be more powerful than our own. We shall live in fear and distrust, as every other people must. The logical outcome of such a state of tension would be an earth-shaking attack by the nation suffering from the greatest fear complex.

The least we can work for in these circumstances is an open defense system, with the Security Council regularly inspecting all military establishments and all sources of information on new weapons. It would be futile and self-defeating to ask more. And to trade our secret for less would leave the world without a foundation on which future security could be built.

Federal Grants to State and Local Governments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, there is not a Member of Congress who does not receive appeals for a balanced Budget. At the same time we also receive letters from home urging us to support new authorizations for appropriations. The most recent example was the $650,000,000 grant for airports. That bill provided the States and municipalities should match the Federal grant. The question is, Can we continue to pass such legislation and ever reach the goal, a balanced Budget, unless we raise by taxation the money? It should also be remembered when the State matches a Federal grant it too can only secure the money either by selling bonds or taxation. Therefore, the people who must pay the bill are called upon to pay by both the Federal and State Governments. We have pending a number of bills that provide Federal aid and for new projects that will cost billions of dollars if enacted into law.

Legislation providing for Federal aid and Federal grants is always very popular. It is hard to remember when we have started a Federal-aid project that we have ever repealed the law. You have bills pending providing for Federal aid to stop river pollution, Federal aid for education, as well as additional Federal aid for vocational education. The Commodity Credit Corporation wants a half billion dollars. We have increased our appropriation for Federal aid for roads. There are provisions for public housing, aid for aeronautical experiments. They want hundreds of millions of dollars for health programs of all kinds, also Federal aid for the construction of additional hospitals in the States and the cities, and many others that I could mention.

Very recently there came to my desk a very strong appeal from a chamber of commerce urging me to support a bill that would have set up three laboratories as well as plants to provide research and manufacture by the Government that would result in the production of a better fertilizer. We all know that one of the outstanding organizations in the United States that is always demanding a reduction in expenditures as well as a reduction in taxes is the National Chamber of Commerce and its affiliates. Likewise, they demand that the Government stop competing with private industry. I answered the letter and in my reply told them of the demands made upon us by the United States Chamber of Commerce and its affiliates for reduction in expenditures and taxes. I pointed out that we could not do both and if we could I would like to have them advise me how it could be done, but up to this time I have not received a reply.

The outstanding feature of that letter, however, was that they not only favored the bill but the letter stated the only objection of the chamber was that it did not provide for 10 manufacturing plants and laboratories rather than 3.

From time to time I call upon the Bureau of the Budget for a statement in reference to expenditures for Federal grants to States and local governments. I have just received a letter from the Bureau of the Budget, together with a statement of expenditures, and, under the permission granted me, I include it as part of my remarks. It follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., October 25, 1945.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COCHRAN: In accordance with your request of October 15, 1945, we are sending you herewith two copies of a statement of expenditures for Federal grants to State and local governments for the fiscal years 1944 and 1945.

The compilation is similar to that sent you July 19, 1944, except that the data are limited to the last two fiscal years, for which only estimated expenditures were available at that time.

The payments are classified, first, as to type of grant: Regular, shared revenues, war, and emergency works and relief; and second, under each of these headings, according to major functions. It is believed that this form of presentation of the data will promote their usefulness.

Not classified as grants for the purpose of this tabulation are the contribution ($6,000,000 annually) to the District of Columbia and several minor items, such as education and health of Indians.

I hope this information meets your needs. If there is anything further we can do, please let me know.

Very truly yours,

F. J. LAWTON,
Administrative Assistant.

Statement of expenditures for Federal grants to State and local governments: fiscal years 1945 and 1944, general and special accounts

	1945	1944
I. REGULAR GRANTS		
SOCIAL WELFARE		
Social Security Board:		
Old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind	$399,809,904	$429,457,226
Unemployment Compensation Administration	37,517,152	36,200,545
Department of Labor:		
Services for crippled children	3,873,822	3,786,793
Child-welfare services	1,365,688	1,423,314
Veterans' Administration: Federal aid to State homes [1]	1,446,300	1,181,250
Federal Security Agency—Office of Administrator: Vocational rehabilitation	7,079,906	4,628,922
HIGHWAYS		
Public Roads Administration:		
Federal-aid highway system	30,806,059	36,128,241
Federal-aid secondary or feeder roads	3,550,516	4,420,754
Elimination of grade crossings	4,531,374	6,457,062
Public-lands highways	61,594	167,864
NATURAL RESOURCES		
Department of Agriculture:		
Agricultural Research Administration: Experiment stations—Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico	6,972,336	6,946,392
Department of Agriculture—Continued		
Forest Service:		
Forest-fire cooperation [1]	$5,945,884	$5,911,208
Fighting forest fires [1]	115,988	78,662
Farm and other private forestry cooperation [1]	112,431	143,275
War Food Administration:		
Extension Service—Payment to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico	18,715,606	18,754,024
Food Distribution Administration:		
Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities: (*a*) Purchase of agricultural commodities for distribution through State welfare agencies.	8,316,967	6,219,481
(*b*) School lunch and milk programs	47,844,050	34,399,569
Department of the Interior:		
Fish and Wildlife Service: Federal aid in wildlife restoration	1,433,259	1,305,289
HEALTH		
Public Health Service:		
Control of venereal diseases [1]	9,482,196	9,702,583
Assistance to States, general [1]	10,913,490	10,839,953
Control of tuberculosis [1]	1,370,114	
Department of Labor:		
Children's Bureau: Maternal and child health services	5,543,755	5,947,969
EDUCATION		
Federal Security Agency:		
Office of Education:		
Promotion of vocational education	6,779,977	6,893,919
Further development of vocational education	12,814,238	13,310,083
Further development of vocational education, Hawaii	27,984	29,926
Further development of vocational education, Puerto Rico	99,682	100,461
Colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts	2,550,000	2,550,000
Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts	2,480,000	2,480,000
American Printing House for the Blind: Promotion of education of the blind	115,000	115,000
War Shipping Administration: State marine schools	182,575	186,594
HOUSING		
National Housing Agency—Federal Public Housing Authority: Annual contributions to public housing agencies	8,722,300	10,129,997
Total, regular grants	640,580,147	659,896,356
II. SHARED REVENUES		
NATURAL RESOURCES		
Federal Power Commission: Payments to States	26,209	50,062
Department of Agriculture:		
Forest Service:		
Payments to States, from national forests fund	4,138,653	2,475,655
Payments to school funds, Arizona and New Mexico, from national forests fund	28,476	26,888

[1] Obligations.

Statement of expenditures for Federal grants to State and local governments: fiscal years 1945 and 1944, general and special accounts—Continued

	1945	1944
II. SHARED REVENUES—continued.		
NATURAL RESOURCES—con.		
Department of Agriculture—Continued.		
War Food Administration:		
Food Production Administration—Soil Conservation Service: Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land—payment to counties from submarginal land program	$115,829	$75,281
Department of the Interior:		
Grazing Service: Payments to States from receipts	419,128	489,124
General Land Office:		
Payments to States of 5 percent of proceeds from sales of public lands	2,175	2,444
Payments to Oklahoma from royalties, oil and gas, south half of Red River	3,000	8,587
Payments to counties, Oregon and California land-grant fund	881,580	950,423
Payments to Coos and Douglas Counties, Oreg., in lieu of taxes on Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands	----------	17,380
Payments to States from receipts under Mineral Leasing Act	4,086,179	2,689,448
Payments to States from potash deposits, royalties, and rentals	220,455	338,575
Fish and Wildlife Service: Payments to counties under Migratory Bird Conservation Act	61,281	43,444
PUBLIC WORKS		
Tennessee Valley Authority: Payments in lieu of taxes [1]	2,137,513	2,168,798
Department of Interior: Colorado River Dam fund—Boulder Canyon project (Boulder Dam), payments to Arizona and Nevada	600,000	600,000
War Department—Corps of Engineers: Payments to States, Flood Control Act	129,316	59,457
Total, shared revenues	12,859,794	9,995,566
III. WAR GRANTS		
(National defense)		
HIGHWAYS		
Federal Works Agency—Public Roads Administration:		
Strategic highway network	9,792,415	13,527,626
Access roads	44,951,304	88,111,447
Surveys and plans	604,865	172,541
Flight strips	658,720	3,363,032
NATURAL RESOURCES		
Department of Agriculture:		
War Food Administration: Supplies and expenses (Extension Service) [1]	4,070,000	1,815,648
HEALTH		
Department of Labor:		
Children's Bureau:		
Emergency maternity and infant care	45,000,000	29,945,889
Emergency health and sanitation activities	----------	38,519
EDUCATION		
Federal Security Agency:		
Office of Education: Education and training, defense workers	46,261,806	72,730,629

[1] Obligations.

Statement of expenditures for Federal grants to State and local governments: fiscal years 1945 and 1944, general and special accounts—Continued

	1945	1944
PUBLIC WORKS		
Federal Works Agency:		
Office of the Administrator: Defense public works (community facilities)	$114,803,068	$135,256,831
Total, war grants	266,142,178	344,962,162
IV. EMERGENCY WORKS AND RELIEF GRANTS		
NATURAL RESOURCES		
Department of Agriculture:		
Forest Service: Forest fire control	----------	811,159
PUBLIC WORKS		
Federal Works Agency:		
Public Roads Administration: Highway funds, highways and grade crossing elimination, NIR and emergency relief acts	410,863	1,711,341
Office of Administrator—Public Works Administration: Grant funds, 1936 and 1938 (net)	----------	3,495,874
Total, emergency works and relief grants	410,863	6,018,374
Grand total, Federal grants	919,992,982	1,020,872,458

Must Inflation Go Into Building of Nation's Homes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, back in the summer of 1940, many American editorial writers had the foresight to cry out against the dangers of the coming war, and to try to warn the Nation to arm. For far too long, their clear-sighted warnings fell on deaf ears in Washington.

Today they are once more lifting their voices against a danger that can wreck our Nation as thoroughly as occupation by a robbing, burning enemy army; the specter of uncontrolled inflation. In the hope that some of their wise warnings will this time reach more receptive ears, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include two editorials from my home State of Texas on this subject. One is written by the able editor of the Austin, Tex., Statesman, and appeared on October 16, 1945. The other is the equally clear-sighted warning of the Marshall News Messenger, of October 25, 1945:

[From the Austin (Tex.) Statesman of October 16, 1945]

MUST INFLATION GO INTO BUILDING OF NATION'S HOMES, TOO?

Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN has lashed out vigorously in the housing controversy, demanding that more careful study and less impulsiveness be given the situation before precipitate action is taken which may weaken the national economy.

The controversy, in the view of the Texarkana Congressman, has become so heated that it obscures most of the fundamental facts. It is high time, he says, that all sides consider how much material we have with which to build homes, and how much they will sell for. The present inflated market for homes is a danger signal that must be heeded.

Most persons can be fully in accord with the fundamental objective of building homes as rapidly as they can be built. But the by-products of a program which also entails the lifting of all price controls completely disregards the danger of uncontrolled inflation.

Responsible leaders in the materials and construction industries agree that a serious danger to the country exists in the present housing situation. The most bitter opponents of housing price control admit that the building industry has a critical shortage of materials—lumber, pipe, brick, and scores of other items. Both lumber and steel are on the verge of going back on the WPB critical list.

The pressure for housing, the pressure of wartime savings comprising a purchasing power never before present in the Nation's history is tremendous and dangerous without control on prices. And until these materials get more closely in line with demand, we are going to see $6,000 homes costing $10,000, and a period sometime ahead when deflationary influences which always follow a boom will leave their owners holding the sack. The record of the last depression demonstrates this in terms of billions of dollars.

What the Nation needs and must have is less impulsiveness, less agitation by some elements who want to make a financial killing, and better planning and willingness to see the danger for what it is.

[From the Marshall (Tex.) Morning News Messenger of October 25, 1945]

INFLATION AHEAD

This country faces the threat of an inflationary spiral that could be more disastrous than the depression of the 1930's, for while the depression merely froze real values and paralyzed the Nation's economy, a first-class, all-out, uncontrolled inflation would wipe out all values beyond recall, and force us to scratch.

We were going to control this inflation in the brave days of yore. We were going to have lots of jobs, heavy production, steady consumer demand. Where there is production to ease off consumer demand, free and open competition keeps values in line and there is no inflation. Where you have 100 people bidding against each other for one small item, you have skyrocketing prices. Money loses its value, which is inflation.

People are uneasy about the rapid rise in real-estate prices. They are soaring upward at a fast clip, with no sign of abatement. How could there be, with the demand for housing what it is, and no flow of materials to construct new units?

Several million wartime marriages, plus a slowed-down wartime building program that couldn't even keep pace with needed replacements, spells a demand for housing that surpasses the imagination.

Only one thing could cure that situation—unlimited materials, an abundance of labor, easy credits.

The materials aren't to be had, and it probably will be 3 to 5 years before we even reach normal supplies. Meantime the demand for homes piles up, and this demand sends prices through the ceiling.

Artificial control of prices is impossible. If loopholes could be found by the dozens in wartime, they could be found by the hundreds in peacetime, and the inflationary spiral would go right on up.

That is just one angle to the forces that are driving this country into an orgy of

inflation. Meantime, Congress only contribution toward a solution is to ease the tax burden, which is like pouring oil on the flame.

Relief Operations in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the current widespread interest in the volume and type of relief operations being conducted in Europe, I felt that it would be significant to examine the extent of our relief activities after World War I. Accordingly, I wrote to former President Herbert Hoover, asking for some factual data on the subject, and, under unanimous consent, I include in these remarks his letter to me of October 23, 1945, together with certain tables appended to that letter:

THE WALDORF-ASTORIA TOWERS,
New York, N. Y., October 23, 1945.

Hon. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I have your letter of October 20.

I take it that what we are interested in is the period after the armistice. I have obtained the figures from the War Library records, and they are shown on the attached tables. They do not include our very large operations prior to the armistice.

You will see that the total relief supplies after the armistice from the United States to the European continental countries was 13,615,357 tons, valued at $2,109,518,971, of which the United States received in cash $275,581,553, in obligations to pay $1,689,783,645, and gave in charity $144,153,773. In addition, we provided 4,305,330 tons of food alone to Britain on credit to the amount of $687,775,300. The charity was almost wholly given in special feeding for children on the Continent conducted separately from the general relief. As the obligations to pay were largely defaulted, therefore it was nearly all charity.

There are several gaps in this picture.

1. Britain, France, and Italy include only food and feed that was financed by the United States Treasury. They purchased other food from overseas. It is probable that under our exchange arrangements of the time some of these purchased supplies were at the cost of our Treasury. What their clothing, medical, and miscellaneous supplies (aside from arms) from the United States were has never been worked out.

It could possibly be done by a study of our exports to these countries during the period, plus our Army liquidation sales.

2. During the period November 1918 to November 1919, I coordinated the food supply of the European neutrals with the whole program, but as these nations paid cash and transported their food imports, we did not make a statistical record. The information on their purchases from the United States and elsewhere could be secured by the Department of Commerce from the statistical reports of these countries as to their imports. Inadequate statistics of the League of Nations show these neutrals imported during the period from all quarters about 4,000,000 tons.

You might get the Department to investigate this. The countries are Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Portugal, and Spain.

It is possible to get the exact amounts each government paid on their obligations to the United States—which included other supplies—and by prorating it to thus determine how much was paid on food loans. These figures could be secured from the Treasury summaries of the amounts paid on debts up to 1932 when all these countries repudiated, except Finland. Whatever the amounts were, they could be regarded as cash.

3. The operation was much more complicated than appears on the surface and will never be fully presented in statistics. For instance, we shipped food from America into the Mediterranean area of Yugoslavia on condition that the Yugoslavs furnished food to Hungary and Rumania from their eastern surplus. Our men arranged trades in manufactured goods, coal and oil, but we did not attempt to engage a staff to preserve full records of such barters. We were satisfied when the people got the food. Some of these trades were recorded and appear here as exchange of goods. I suppose if someone wanted to, he could work out this European interfood movement—if the national statistics of the countries have not been destroyed.

A broad estimate shows that about 27,000,000 tons of food and supplies were imported from overseas after the armistice, either under my direction or coordinated with our movement, of which we furnished nearly 18,000,000 tons.

4. This does not include the coal movement. The central European coal movement was coordinated under my direction, but overseas coal shipments were carried on otherwise. We attempted no statistical record of either movement.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

Sources of food supplied (including seed) post-armistice period (beginning November 1918)

[Metric tons]

	United States	British Empire	France	Italy	Argentina	Others	Total
Armenia	119,149						119,149
Austria	612,952	11,500		64,061		97,632	786,145
Belgium	839,842	31,090				11,641	882,573
Bulgaria	22,862						22,862
Czechoslovakia	388,890	6,012	16,571	75,861		50,560	537,894
Danzig	571						571
Denmark	19,919						19,919
Estonia	53,554	8,224				462	62,240
Finland	170,275	3,467				14,442	188,184
France	4,439,076						4,439,076
Germany	810,708	270,648	14,404		135,000	67,229	1,297,989
Hungary	21,152						21,152
Italy	4,478,900						4,478,900
Yugoslavia	77,038	19,561					96,599
Latvia	25,390						25,390
Lithuania	9,244						9,244
Poland	652,364	12,778					665,142
Rumania	124,687	88,688					213,375
Russia (old)	19,693						
Russia (Soviet)	729,091						748,784
Total (continental)	13,615,357	451,968	30,975	139,922	135,000	241,966	14,615,188
Great Britain	4,305,300						4,305,300
Total	17,920,657	451,968	30,975	139,922	135,000	241,966	18,920,488

Clothing, medical, and miscellaneous supplies, post-armistice period (beginning November 1918)

[Metric tons]

	United States	British Empire	France	Italy	Argentina	Others	Total
Armenia	16,614.0						16,614.0
Austria	2,609.0	6,500				26,946	36,055.0
Belgium	25,944.0	24,941					50,885.0
Bulgaria	22,862.0						22,862.0
Czechoslovakia	7,120.0	1,120					8,240.0
Danzig	1.6						1.6
Denmark	19,919.0						19,919.0
Estonia	4,179.0	400					4,579.0
Finland	366.0						366.0
France							

Clothing, medical, and miscellaneous supplies, post-armistice period (beginning November 1918)—Continued

[Metric tons]

	United States	British Empire	France	Italy	Argentina	Others	Total
Germany	124.0	28,496	55,000		20,000	6,303	109,923.0
Hungary	241.0						241.0
Italy							
Yugoslavia	16,665.0	14,089					30,754.0
Latvia	976.0						976.0
Lithuania	3,633.0						3,633.0
Poland	77,309.0	8,684					85,993.0
Rumania	4,817.0	11,100					15,917.0
Russia (old)	7,895.0						
Russia (Soviet)	11,480.0						19,375.0
Total	222,754.6	95,330	55,000		20,000	33,249	426,333.6

Finance of post-armistice relief

	United States			United Kingdom		France, loans	Italy		Argentina		Others, loans	Total
	Cash or exchange	Charity	Loans	Cash	Loans		Exchange	Loans	Cash	Cash and exchange		
Armenia		$12,671,722	$15,492,304		$631,400							$28,795,426
Austria	$4,642,723	10,787,537	26,903,600		30,709,631	$20,500,000	$20,878,122	$16,000,000		[1]$15,059,596		145,481,290
Belgium	23,033,683	11,500,500	136,632,260		20,241,565	18,500,000					$2,300,000	212,208,008
Bulgaria	4,856,647											4,856,647
Czechoslovakia	922,607	5,353,171	80,540,827		2,552,198	7,540,918	16,653,920			[1]1,874,710		115,438,351
Danzig	8,574	119,126										127,700
Denmark	2,147,059											2,147,059
Estonia	414,815	1,460,796	16,764,071		2,342,360					[1]35,207		21,017,249
Finland	16,237,715	932,780	9,872,171		920,250					[1]2,318,830		30,281,746
France			680,428,000									680,428,000
Germany	205,214,850	9,208,101		$75,653,861		16,262,889			$16,774,000	15,610,801		338,724,502
Hungary	511,327	1,845,416	1,685,835		564,561							4,607,139
Italy			478,210,000									478,210,000
Jugoslavia	533,677	2,074,343	33,655,437		9,635,192							45,898,649
Latvia		1,588,170	5,880,931		80,920							7,550,021
Lithuania		463,817	5,459,884		57,120							5,980,821
Poland	8,523,936	29,087,926	147,454,053		15,798,098							200,864,013
Rumania	1,024,322	733,272	36,451,028		15,428,688							53,637,310
Old Russia	444,718	332,508	14,353,244									15,130,470
Soviet Russia	7,064,900	55,994,588								[2]115,360		63,174,848
Total (continental)	275,581,553	144,153,773	1,689,783,645	75,653,861	98,961,983	62,803,807	37,532,042	16,000,000	16,774,000	35,014,504	2,300,000	2,454,559,168
Great Britain			687,775,300									687,775,300
Total	275,581,553	144,153,773	2,377,558,945	75,653,861	98,961,983	62,803,807	37,532,042	16,000,000	16,774,000	35,014,504	2,300,000	3,142,334,468

[1] Exchange.

[2] Charity.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport (La.) Times of October 26, 1945:

A SOUND, COURAGEOUS STAND

President Truman took a courageous and thoroughly sound stand in recommending to Congress that legislation be passed for military training of all physically capable American youth as an essential to preservation of peace. With pride in the manner in which the Chief Executive faced this grave issue, and with genuine and sincere conviction that the course he proposes must be followed, the Times enthusiastically endorses Mr. Truman's whole youth-training program. We have urged the need for military training of youth virtually since the end of War I. We urge it now with renewed vigor and faith.

Mr. Truman's speech was courageous both politically and morally. He knew that he was speaking in behalf of a program which faces much opposition and misunderstanding and which never before in this Nation's history has been so moot a question as it is today. He knew also, in his heart and in his mind, that every white cross over the graves of men of the armed forces of the United States for the past century and a half is a silent symbol of a nation's tragically unending failure to realize that peace can be preserved only through possession of power.

The easy course would have been for Mr. Truman to pussyfoot along a politically expedient middle-of-the-road course with a program which offered only mild National Guard and ROTC expansion, and which did not approach the essentials of an over-all and continuing youth-training program. Instead the President strode forth boldly and without equivocation along the straight—and rocky—road that he feels the Nation must travel if the white crosses of two terrible World Wars of the past are not to be multiplied over and over again by what would become an inevitable third war.

While some of Mr. Truman's political advisers felt that his course might hurt him with some citizen groups, we believe that time will prove the contrary. Right now, every mother and father, wife and sweetheart, is thinking of getting her soldier, sailor, marine, or coast guardsman home. Right now there is considerable national hysteria over any man or youth being in fighting uniform a day longer than the relatives at home think necessary. Right now, the necessity for military strength in a nation that has just won time's most terrible war may not be clear to vision largely befogged with thoughts of individual members of the family.

But, right now, the veterans of two devastating World War—the men who fought and suffered and won—stand overwhelmingly in favor of youth military training as the one best means of preventing another war.

Right now, the veterans of these conflicts—the men who know from bitter and bloody experience—know that the only way to keep American youth of the future from the horrors of world-wide combat is to have it so prepared for such combat that no nation anywhere on the globe will dare to become an aggressor.

We cannot understand how any citizen group—whether of the church or the laity, whether from the ranks of labor or from the offices of financiers—can look even casually at the history of this Nation or any other nation and fail to see that the veterans of the two World War are right, that Mr. Truman and those who endorse his proposals are right, that no nation ever can be safe from attack unless it is armed to defend itself against attack.

The theory that national military weakness is an example to other nations in the field of peace and that it constitutes leadership toward international friendship has been tested over and over again in this Nation since the day Cornwallis surrendered to George Washington. For a century and a half it has failed—failed continuously, miserably, tragically, and horribly.

The theory that future youth training constitutes a lack of confidence in preservation of peace through world agreements and organizations is pure and simple fallacy. The world as a whole concedes today that World War II followed quickly on the ending of World War I because there was no force to keep peace.

The world as a whole concedes that any success coming to the United Nations security organizations rests largely on the willingness of those nations to use force to knock down aggression and to preserve peace. Is not the same thing true of such individual nations as ours? The whole history of the world has shown through all of its recorded pages that nations that are prepared are not attacked and that nations unprepared always are attacked in time—and if they continue unpreparedness after temporary victory, eventually they are destroyed.

Any agreement between nations becomes a tattered scrap of paper when a nation of aggression decides to use it as a target for machine-gun practice. Agreements—treaties, et cetera—have no strength of their own. They merely lay down a course of proposed action. That course is followed in exact ratio to the physical strength back of the words on the piece of paper.

There never has been a day when starry-eyed idealism and blind theory could get to first base in keeping peace between nations. If this Nation, and the world, are to have peace, it must be won with the same type of solid, sound, common-sense practicalism that won the war.

President Truman has proposed a course of practicalism. May the Nation have the vision to follow it.

War Department Snafus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, selfishness is being practiced by too many Army men in positions of power with the following result. If Congress does not correct this situation, the predicted consequences are at our door.

GERMANY.

DEAR SIR: I happen to be one of those very bitter and disgusted ex-civilians that know I should have been home to wife and children some months ago. Now this new news of lost ships to us plus the striking harbor workers is the last straw. I am not a foolish kid, but a mature man of 37. I know that the War Department itself is putting snafus in the way to slow down discharges for own selfish reasons. I have reached the place where I'm ready to go to hell and take some of those responsible for all this with me. I would like to point out to you what you know to be true. Last fall the papers were full of how many soldiers certain ships brought across in one load. I was one of them, so I know it to be true. Now these same ships are docking with half or slightly over half the number of troops less all that equipment we brought over with us. Does that look like to anyone but an idiot that they are doing their very best to get us home? Now last winter, no excuses were accepted from us. It was give and do. Now in return we get lies; promises that they know are lies when given, and excuses.

Have lost confidence in you Congressmen to see we get justice. You have swallowed all these promises, lies, and false figures given out by those who delay discharge for own selfish interest. I have a deep hatred of Army and from now on my vote and all influence will be lined up in opposition to any measure for the armed forces. The point deal for the combat men was a kick in the teeth for their reward. Now I happen to be one of the old men who was drafted in early 1944 when the need was great. That 2-year clause of 35 and past helps the bulk of us fellows a lot, doesn't it? Yet, I remember the big talks given us at Fort Meade and Camp Shanks before coming over. The theme was like this: "You old men are needed very badly but as soon as Germany is beaten, you will be among the first 2,000,000 released." What happened? The point deal. No age. Nothing for the combat man who took the snow, cold, rain, no food, no clean clothes for months. But combat men will come home first.

The combat man is still the poor relation. Most points go first. They are in the Air Corps and service units. Combat units are full of us replacements. Oldest are dead or wounded. Now take Charlie Trippie getting out on 41 points, no combat, no overseas. While I am for every man being discharged, I still resent an old man as myself being held in. I resent being turned down four times for O. C. S. after having made the grade in everything except ACC (too old—rejected). Yet I made a good private along with all those younger fellows and no favors shown because of age. The other way around a dangerous job fell to me because of good common sense. In fact I volunteered for plenty because I felt younger fellows would bungle it. I resent the fact also that most of the fellows got a furlough home before shipping over while I, an old man, married, was denied one. I am sorry, Mr. MORRISON, that I have taken up your time letting some of this bitter festering sore out on you. But you know the true facts of the southern draft boards, as like this. Young men going to defense works and transfering to the board there and our board had to draw from us old men who had to stay with our farms and business. In that way we are in while a lot of those same fellows are out due to being essential or from a high number and lots to draw from at their board. I want you to know that we over here are boiling and ready to spill over. Should even a minor revolt start, it will get out of hand very soon. There are too many like myself, that just don't care any longer. If we could get to those who laid up those 300 ships or those strikers would be some hanging take place. Would show these men even less mercy than did some of those SS Germans. After those of our boys were shot to death last winter, we asked no quarter and gave none. Seems like I could go on for a long time letting this bitterness out but will stop. You won't read any of it anyhow, or pay any attention either.

Yours truly.

West Coast Steel Industry

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the problem of reconversion serves to emphasize the difficult situation facing the people on the west coast. In the years before the war our population was growing rapidly, much more rapidly than the heavy industries essential to maintain sizable urban populations. During this period of growth we fought to maintain a standard of living consistent with the American dream. In the period just before and during the war the need for heavy industry was met by the mushroom development of aircraft factories and shipbuilding yards and aluminum plants, and so forth.

With the sudden cessation of the war in the Pacific every citizen, from chamber of commerce presidents to union organizers, is asking what the next step will be.

We are by no means faced merely with the problem of conversion to our prewar pursuits. The west coast, and Washington State particularly, had no industrial activities capable of supporting the vastly expanded populations. Two millions of additional population came to the Pacific slope to help in the tremendous job of production necessary to carry on the war. These 2,000,000 people do not want to go back. In polls conducted by the larger defense plants at least 70 percent are staying in their new-found homes.

Let us look at the situation in regard to industrialization in the West. The basic foundation of industrial development of any size is a steel industry. Major industrial status is impossible without it, and it has been the lack of such an industry that has hamstrung the West.

The west coast has all the physical qualifications necessary for low-cost steel production. At this point, I should like to call the attention of the Members to an information circular published in March of this year by the Bureau of Mines, entitled "A Pattern for Western Steel Production." The Bureau of Mines asserts, after a comprehensive survey of the known iron and coal resources in the West, that the raw materials needed are available in sufficient quantity for a comprehensive steel industry. The report also reaches the conclusion, based on reliable statistics, that there are sufficient markets available at the present time, and as far in the future as can be reasonably predicted, to support production in plants of economic size.

In short, according to the experts, the west coast has the resources, and it has the market. We have a labor force, not only numerically larger, but skilled and experienced far beyond our prewar standards. Furthermore, in the Puget Sound area, as well as in lower California, we have the physical location necessary for bringing together iron and coal at water level and at the same time close to our western population centers. All we can point to as steel plants are Fontana and Geneva, and they are not necessarily examples of the best we can do, because of their inland locations.

I repeat, the west coast has all the physical qualifications necessary for low-cost steel production.

Why have we not developed a sizable steel and iron industry?

Let us look into the cause for the West's industrial backwardness. Our local industrialists have been unable successfully to enter into competition with the entrenched monopolies concentrated in the East. This inability is not calculated to maintain legitimate competitive factors. Eastern capital has maintained a strangle hold through financial control on any industrial development, which threatens the profit-making capacity of its huge eastern investments. We all know how complicated and powerful is the web of financial control that stretches from Wall Street. Another of the illegitimate factors brought into the picture, by the self-perpetuating economy with headquarters in the East, is

seen in the long-lamented but still extant freight-rate structure. We all know the evils of this system. It is a prime example of monopolistic control redounding to the detriment of free enterprise and western and southern regional development.

The Eastern monopolists are afraid that they will lose their markets if the West builds up industrially. They have consistently and effectively prevented the West from rising for just this reason. They are sadly mistaken in this view. Under the limited economy of previous years, figures show that the East has only been able to sell 10 percent of its output to the West and South. This will never improve until the purchasing power of these areas is increased.

Developing a competitive steel industry on the western seaboard will be of tremendous value to the western consumer. Current prices for all heavy steel manufactures now must include the freight charges of a cross-continent haul. The farmers on the wheat farms and fruit ranches of Washington will be able to buy farm machinery at reasonable prices based on really competitive manufacturing costs for the first time in the history of the Northwest. Consumers of the entire Pacific coast will no longer have to pay the penalty of higher prices for the privilege of living in the West Coast States.

I am not asking for special favors for the people of the Northwest. I am only asking for an equal opportunity for them to utilize the natural resources, location advantages, and labor supply that are already available in our territory. I am asking that the artificial barriers set up by those who desire to perpetuate themselves, and their century-old advantages, be torn down, as unbefitting a modern, progressive Nation looking to the future for new and better solutions for the economic ills that have plagued our past.

The fact that we must face today is, that this country and its industrial economy cannot remain half colonial, any more than it could remain half slave and half free. One-half of the country cannot be prosperous if the other half is existing on a marginal economy. Today the West is well-nigh as much of a frontier territory, industrially, as it was 50 years ago. Only now it is not only agricultural development but industrial development that is needed. The sons and grandsons of our western pioneers stand ready to take up again the battle to insure that the Pacific coast will be given every opportunity to assume its rightful place in the economy of the United States and the world.

Minnesota Leads the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. GIBSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein an open letter addressed by A. J. Olson, chairman, Minnesota Peoples Action Committee to the Minnesota congressional delegation.

After reading this letter I was so inspired over the purpose of this organization that I made some further investigation.

I find that the organization has had to say in a pamphlet gotten out by it, the following, which to me is very sound:

In the progress of a government that is of, by, and for the people, it is necessary for citizens to examine tendencies which, if neglected, might destroy the blessings and the opportunities of the American way of life.

Active and growing pressure groups led by selfish men, most of whom are alien to this state, now seek to control the Government.

These men and groups must be opposed if democracy, under the Constitution, is to survive.

There are other tendencies in this country that also menace the American way of life. We see them in—

1. The increasing demand that business of the Nation be turned over to politicians to administer and manage.

2. The accompanying growth of bureaucracy with its withering effect upon individual initiative, ambition, and character.

3. The continued belief in high places that public spending is a panacea for domestic problems.

4. The centralization of Government in Washington with its usurpation of the rights of States and communities.

5. The idea that the Government ought to support all citizens, regardless of their unwillingness to support themselves.

6. The growing power of group organizations to interfere with the individual freedom of citizens.

We call upon all citizens who view these tendencies with distrust and alarm to unite in a State-wide, nonpartisan movement to check them and to turn back the leaders responsible for them. In order that citizens may unite in this common purpose, we submit for their consideration and support the following declaration of principles—

(a) We believe in the American way of life.

(b) We believe that America's greatness rests upon a foundation that has as its cornerstone religious freedom, freedom of the press, personal liberty, full economic opportunity, and the right of private enterprise.

(c) We believe the first duty of government is to protect the citizen under the law.

(d) We believe that any combination of power, be it government, business or labor, that seeks to stifle freedom of the individual is a menace to democratic institutions.

(e) We strongly oppose political action groups which threaten to coerce the government against the rights of other citizens.

(f) We believe profoundly in the rights of organized labor to have such bargaining power as will secure for it an equitable return for labor given.

(g) We believe that agriculture must be given the administrative machinery, under farmer management and control, to insure parity of income and opportunity with other groups.

(h) We believe with Thomas Jefferson that that government is best that governs least.

(i) We believe that "big labor" as well as "big business" when uncontrolled by the people is a menace and a danger to the guaranties that assure the American way of life.

(j) We believe in the free-enterprise system.

(k) We believe, now that the war is ended, it is of first importance, if we are to have any certainty of prosperity, happiness and opportunity for the service groups when they come home, that there be formulated a national labor relations policy. Such a policy must recognize the rights of the public in labor disputes, the rights and duties of both management and labor, seek to maintain uninterrupted production as the basis for national prosperity, provide just and fair opportunity for settlement of labor disputes and provide for firm insistence upon acceptance of such settlements.

(l) We believe that the people's savings, whether life-insurance policies, war bonds, or other forms of savings, should be protected from the inflation that will follow continued reckless public spending.

(m) We believe that no member of an organization, labor, agriculture or business, should place the demands of his group above his rights and duties as an American citizen.

I quote the letter as follows:

To Members of the Minnesota Congressional Delegation, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The purpose of this memorandum is to give factual data in support of the telegram we sent you October 5, reading as follows:

"Manpower situation in Minnesota most critical in history. Increase in unemployment payments will aggravate matters. Farmers hardest hit. Embargo threatened on livestock shipments because packing plants so undermined they are unable to keep pace with receipts. Processing of $20,000,000 Thanksgiving turkey crop handicapped. Creameries short-handed. Potato harvest short pickers. Earnestly hope you will resist CIO–PAC delegation pressure."

Through personal interviews, correspondence, and telephone, we have contacted farmers and others in all parts of the state. This survey confirms our statement concerning the acute manpower shortage and the manner in which it is lowering the incomes of Minnesota citizens, particularly farmers.

The views of the great majority of citizens are well expressed in a letter from a farmer, reading:

"To ask for increased unemployment compensation is today so fantastic, un-American, and illogical that some reason other than need must exist. There are today thousands upon thousands of well-paying jobs crying to be filled. Wealth must be had if postwar problems are to be met. While other nations buckle down to work, in the realization that only through the rendering of service and in the production of goods is wealth produced, we in the United States are forced to witness the most outrageous attempts to foster leeches on the public, determined to be supported in idleness by the taxpayer.

"The belief that the Government—in other words, the taxpayer—owes everyone a living, with no effort on his part to collect it, seems to be the philosophy of too many today in responsible positions. It is the responsibility of the individual to support the Government, not the Government the individual. Further, it would be the height of folly to dissipate the funds now in reserve for unemployment at a time when jobs are going begging. These funds should and must be kept in reserve against the time of actual need. That time will come quickly if the demands of labor leaders are granted. Not one penny should be paid for unemployment compensation as long as a job is available to a person, physically able to fill it, and within reasonable distance from his home.

"These demands are fantastic, absurd, and—if America is to come through—impossible to grant."

There is no way of accurately determining the total number of jobs open in Minnesota. Efforts to secure help are made through the urban and rural press, by placards placed in shop and hotel windows, and by filing requests with United States employment agencies. Some indication of the total may be had from the fact that the United States employment offices in Minnesota alone have unfilled orders for more than 27,000 jobs.

In spite of that situation, there are 5,186 persons drawing payments from the Minnesota unemployment fund. This fund, in our opinion, is unusually well and conservatively managed.

The following are random excerpts from reports of those who have participated in this survey:

LIVESTOCK

The packing houses all over the State are in need of help. More than 2,000 additional persons are needed in South St. Paul plants alone. Unless this additional labor force is promptly obtained, there will be restrictions on the amount of livestock the packing houses can accept, possibly an embargo against shipments, which will inevitably reduce prices paid to the stock raisers.

POULTRY

None of the larger plants processing dairy and poultry products have a full quota of help. This is true also to some extent in the smaller plants. Poultry is backing up in the country because processing plants are unable to accept it. This deprives producers of present good prices caused by unusual consumer demand. There are more than 1,000,000 Minnesota turkeys ready for market, but shortage of help at dressing plants forces them to remain on farms. Experts say that if the present situation prevails for another 30 days, the average price will drop $1.50 per bird. Turkeys kept on farms are putting on weight. The market will be glutted with heavy birds suitable only for hotels, clubs, and dining cars, and for which there is limited demand.

There is a very heavy crop of other poultry in Minnesota—hens and springs, etc. Due to labor shortage, processing plants are running only 60 percent capacity. Therefore the farmer has been able to market only a limited number of birds.

The farmers are protesting bitterly that after producing the stock they are unable to market it. They say that this heavy production was at specific Government request.

SUMMARY OF REPORT FROM DULUTH

On October 1, there were approximately 1,400 jobs available in this business area (southern part of St. Louis County, Duluth, and immediate area, extending as far as Cloquet). These jobs were chiefly with iron and steel manufacturers, railroads, wholesale and retail firms, and construction work.

Approximately 725 persons in this area received unemployment payments for the period September 24 to 29; in addition, there were 118 World War II veterans who received SAR checks during the same period.

This report covers about 80 percent of employable people in this area, the other 20 percent being domestics, etc.

Insofar as employment is concerned, there seems to be an even balance on Iron Range proper. However, there is a shortage of common labor in the Hibbing district. Survey shows that those who are drawing unemployment payments in this area are mostly women and older men, who do not expect to return to work.

TWIN CITIES INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT

Even though production has been lessened in some plants because of Government cancellation of contracts, many of these same plants are still running only 80 percent capacity, because of the manpower shortage.

A survey of 26 industrial plants in the Twin Cities shows only 2 plants fully manned. In the remaining 26 plants anywhere from a dozen to 1,500 additional employees are needed. Plants are short of all classes of help, skilled and unskilled, men and women, including all classes of office help—accountants, stenographers, and clerks.

SMALL EMPLOYERS

This manpower shortage is by no means confined to large industrial plants or farms. A proprietor of a medium-sized garage reports that for more than 3 weeks he has been in dire need of a cashier, floorman, mechanic, and car washer, but is positively unable to secure the required help.

Small restaurants, soft-drink establishments, and similar institutions are unable to secure needed help. Hotels are unable to get chambermaids, telephone operators, waitresses, and elevator operators. The situation in laundries is particularly bad. It takes a minimum of 2 weeks to have laundry finished, and frequently 3 weeks.

Many small employers report the situation as bad as during the height of war production.

GENERAL SITUATION IN MINNESOTA

At a regional meeting of Minnesota Peoples Political Action Committee, held at Mankato October 6, similar conditions were reported throughout the entire Second Congressional District. Reports from officers of the organization living in other parts of the State show conclusively that there is an acute manpower shortage in all parts of the State, except Duluth and the Iron Range district.

That the manpower shortage is affecting agricultural districts in adjoining States is indicated by the following news release from the North Dakota Agricultural College, under date of October 4:

"An urgent appeal for more help in the commercial potato-producing areas of the State has been issued by the farm labor office of NDAC Extension Service. Unfavorable weather has delayed harvesting, and many workers who were available earlier have left the State.

"Growers must have more manpower in order to get an exceptionally large crop safely in storage before cold weather sets in. Excellent wages are being paid and workers have an opportunity for several weeks of employment.

"Going wages are 8 cents per 'pickers' bushel' with board and lodging, and 10 cents per pickers' bushel when the worker pays his own expenses.

"County agent offices or offices of the United States Employment Service will direct potato pickers to areas where the help is needed."

UNEMPLOYMENT PAYMENTS VERSUS WAGES

The Minnesota unemployment fund is being administered with unusual care and skill, with the result that only slightly more than 5,000 persons are drawing unemployment payments. However, there are many more applications for unemployment payments than are granted. The reason for the large number of applications may be found in the fact that in many cases it is nearly as profitable to remain idle and draw unemployment payments as it is to work and draw pay. For example:

The so-called stabilized rate for labor in this area for metal manufacturing plants, as established by the War Labor Board, sixth region, is 70 cents per hour, or $28 per week for a 40-hour week. A single man working for this $28-a-week wage, would have deductions from his pay, for old-age benefit, victory and withholding taxes, amounting to $4.19, or a net pay check of $23.81.

Under existing law, a single man is entitled to draw unemployment payments of $20 per week. Thus, he would sacrifice only $3.81 per week by staying idle and drawing this unemployment pension, as against working 40 hours per week for the $28 wage. If the unemployment compensation rate is increased to $25 per week, the same man would get $1.19 per week more, by remaining idle and collecting unemployment payments, than he would get for working a full 40-hour week.

At the regional meeting of our organization, in Mankato, the seriousness of the unemployment situation was discussed at length. It was the unanimous belief of those present that any increase in the unemployment compensation rate would only aggravate a serious situation, and I was instructed to inform you that your action in resisting pressure for such increase would be appreciated, and that you could rely upon the united support of all citizens who have the best interests of our State at heart. The unanimous sentiment was expressed by one of the farmers present, who said:

"Tell our boys in Congress that if they have the courage to look after our interest in Washington, they can count on our looking after their interests at home."

We believe the situation speaks for itself, and have no comment to make except that we believe profoundly in the basic principles of unemployment relief. We believe that in times of stress, it becomes the duty of Government to come to the aid of persons willing to work and support themselves, but who are unable to secure employment. However, in defense of that principle, and in defense of the great body of honest and industrious citizens of our State, we must guard against abuses which will so enrage our citizens that they may repeal the law and thus deprive the deserving from the protection to which they are justly entitled. Any further increase in unemployment benefits by Federal law will place a larger premium on idleness, it will aggravate a situation which is reducing the agricultural, industrial, and commercial income of our State, and cause a tide of resentment which threatens our whole system of unemployment protection. We believe in millions for honest unemployment relief but not one nickel for loafing.

MINNESOTA PEOPLES POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE.
By direction of the executive committee.
A. J. OLSON, *Chairman.*

Mr. Speaker, if the sound thinking people of this Nation who are interested in preserving free enterprise and our American way of life do not unite and counteract the activities of the CIO Political Action Committee, God pity our posterity. They are running rampant over everything held dear to the heart of the true American and are not stopping at anything to force their philosophy of government over the American people by every known means of intimidation on the Members of Congress.

I have on so many occasions seen groups of around 300 menacingly promenade around the Capitol grounds in an effort to intimidate Members of Congress to vote for legislation which they were sponsoring and which was fundamentally un-American, until it gives me new hope to see the citizens of this great State rise up with courage to combat their sordid efforts. We Members of Congress who have had courage enough to fight them in the face of their threats of defeat and other means of intimidation, welcome this patriotic effort manifested by the good citizens of Minnesota, and let it be hoped that all people throughout the United States who are interested in defeating this CIO gang and their purposes will follow the lead of these stalwart Americans.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of October 24, 1945:

WOLL'S SEAWAY CRITICISM LACKS CONVINCING SUBSTANCE

Matthew Woll, vice president of the AFL, has expressed his organization's opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway in a pamphlet that now is being circulated in Wisconsin.

Mr. Woll says one objection to the proposed seaway plan is that any American funds to be supplied for work in Canadian territory must be used for the employment of Canadian labor.

What would American labor say if Canadian funds, used on the American side, must be paid to Canadian labor, imported into the United States in competition with American workers?

Further objections, says Mr. Woll, are that American maritime workers would be hurt as foreign ships sailed the Great Lakes in competition with American ships; that the production of electrical power would reduce the use of American coal and thus hamper American coal miners; that the seaway would divert some rail shipments and thereby harm railway workers.

Any major increase in maritime activity on the Great Lakes ought to help rather than injure American maritime workers. If actual seamen suffered from competition—which we doubt—what about American shipyard workers, dock workers, harbor workers, and many others? Clearly, they would find new and more jobs, wholly under American standards and labor agreements.

As for electrical power: If coal operators, and thereby miners, should lose some outlets for their products or energies, electrical workers would find new opportunities.

The coal argument won't impress many Americans who have, for some years, been unable to get enough coal for their own needs, due to exports, strikes, or other causes.

Rail shipments evidently would not be curtailed as great cargoes were brought into and out of Great Lakes ports. These cargoes merely would be routed from and to other markets rather than into and out of a few Atlantic seaboard ports.

Lumber Situation in Regard to Small Homes

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, for the past 42 years I have been engaged in the real estate and building business. At the present time I own and operate two businesses engaged in selling lumber and building supplies at retail. I am also quite familiar with the building trades from the construction standpoint as I was only 26 years of age when I constructed approximately four thousand houses, which were the nucleus for the present city of Hamtramck, which metropolis at the present time is completely surrounded by the city of Detroit. I make these statements to show that I know something about the real estate and building businesses from first-hand experience over a long period of years.

Because of my experience in the construction and building trades in the Detroit area, as well as the fact that I own and operate two businesses, many of the retail dealers are constantly contacting me in regard to the unsatisfactory condition that prevails in securing materials. The majority of retail dealers in the Detroit area some months ago endorsed a program of unrestricted building operations and insisted that directive L–41 issued by the WPB be revoked. In fact, at the time this matter was first brought to my attention I was in favor of revoking L–41, but after its revocation I came to the conclusion that on account of the shortage of materials, especially building materials and principally lumber, the revocation of L–41 was advantageous to the large contractors and real-estate operators because their financial resources are in excess of those available to smaller businessmen and the markets have gotten out of control and beyond the reach of small businesses. It also became apparent to me that these large contractors and real-estate operators would be able to purchase in such quantities that very little lumber would be available for the use of an individual who desired to build his own home or, for that matter, a small contractor.

The Congress has provided the first priority to veterans for building materials but on account of the rescission of L–41 the veterans and the small retail yards, as well as other individuals, are able to purchase only those building materials that may dribble through and are not contracted for by the large contractors. The large real-estate operators, even though not engaged in retail building materials operations, find ways to contract for building materials to the detriment of the veteran, the individual builder, and the small businessman.

In view of the fact that the veteran, the individual who desires to build his own home, and the small businessman have been confronted with so many obstacles since the rescission of L–41, I am convinced—in the light of experience gained—that L–41 should be restored and that a set quota should be fixed on the same basis as when a grave national emergency confronted the country during actual wartime. I am further convinced that this quota should be based on the amount of material available for construction for each month, in the several areas of the United States, and that the retail distributors, especially the small businessman, should have first priority on the materials available for that particular month and that the distributors be directed to give priority to: First, veterans; second, the individual who desires to construct his own home; third, the small businessman; and fourth, the small contractor. If after this program has been carried out in the manner I have heretofore enumerated and it is found that the supply of materials for a particular month has not been exhausted, then the remaining supply for that particular month should be equally distributed among the large real-estate operators and contractors in the several specified areas.

This program should especially be followed in the Northern States, or colder climates, where there are only 8 months suitable for construction and that the quota for the 8 months' period in these colder areas should be figured the 12 months' quota basis because of the fact that for a period of only 8 months—and not 12 months—is the weather suitable for construction operations. In other words, in these colder areas the year's quota for 12 months should be equally divided over an 8 months' period in order that in the colder areas the same amount of materials would be available as would be allotted to areas where construction operations can be carried on throughout the whole 12 months' period.

Mr. Speaker, I regret very much to announce to the House that this administration is being deceived by the real estate and mass building interests of our country. In fact, it is being led into a trap and unless a change of policy takes place immediately the record will show that our Government is being used as the unwitting tool of speculators and profiteers. I realize full well that these are strong words, but the facts will bear out the allegation.

Mr. Speaker, a cursory examination of the facts will also disclose that the responsibility for the administration's present incorrect and untenable position rests on the shoulders of one man—Mr. John W. Snyder, Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. That examination would also disclose that Mr. Snyder was confronted with the opportunity of making a decision between protecting our veterans and small business and preventing inflation on the one hand, and acquiescing to the pressure of big business which will result in profiteering to the benefit of greedy real estate interests on the other hand. He chose to side with the profiteers.

Mr. Speaker, as one who has made his own way since early youth in the competitive field of business, it is needless for me to state that my efforts have always been directed to the end of making a profit and I have evidenced the same satisfaction as any other businessman when at the close of a business year he finds that his books are not in the red. All businessmen have a feeling of personal exhilaration when their businesses have shown a profit through honest efforts and I, like other businessmen, have felt that exhilaration when such profits have been evidenced, but never in my entire career have I stooped to make a dishonest dollar. As a patriotic American citizen I certainly would not choose to make money at the expense of my country's economic future and thereby jeopardize our economic welfare for years to come by deliberately using whatever power I might have, politically or in the business world, in a way that would result in inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I do not question War Mobilizer Snyder's sincerity or his integrity but I do question his judgment in this matter because of his lack of experience and knowledge of the complex problems with which he is dealing.

Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks one of the most courageous Members of this body, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, has made several speeches to this House in which he has pointed out the dangers of uncontrolled inflation which faces this Government because of Mr. Snyder's decision to stand by the re-

scission of L–41 and the other agency orders and directives which have kept the lid on housing prices. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has courage because he takes the side which has no strong lobby here in Washington to defend its interests. He has chosen a hard and difficult, not an easy, road.

Mr. Speaker, I want the Members of this House to know that I am wholeheartedly in accord with the fight being made in defense of small business by the distinguished gentleman from Texas, who is chairman of the Select Committee To Investigate and Study Problems of Small Business. I also want my constituents to know I realize full well that this endorsement by me will not be popular with many of the customers of my lumber businesses back in Michigan, especially the large real-estate operators and contractors. In fact, it is the leaders of the large builders and realty interests who have been successfully leading Mr. Snyder into this unsavory trap at the expense of the economic welfare of our Nation.

In fact, Members of both the House and Senate have been told, as Mr. Snyder was told, that unless L–41 was recinded no houses could be built to take care of the great demand for homes which we all know now exists. That is pure fabrication. Houses were built under L–41 and houses can still be built under a similar order. The only limitation of the people of this country to build houses is their inability to obtain the materials which we now have on hand to build them. It is true that some of these materials are scarce today and that they are needed for the construction of low-cost housing for returning servicemen and their dependents. It is proper that our returning veterans should have first priority, regardless of how much other individuals, including ourselves, need new homes—surely we can wait until our boys have found roofs for themselves and their families. In my considered opinion, it is too much to ask or require a returning veteran to take his wife and children in on a double-up deal with his parents or his wife's family—that is the worst way in the world to restore his morale and show faith to him for what he has done for us and the welfare of the world as a whole.

Under the program which Mr. Snyder favors, mass-construction builders stand the best chance of getting these scarce materials. These men build before they sign up a customer for the house they are building. There is no limit on their profits. They can and will charge whatever the market will stand. The little man, both the customer and the small builder, does not stand a chance under Mr. Snyder's program.

War Mobilizer Snyder has the power to correct this injustice. He can arrange through the President to have an Executive order issued which will restore L–41 or some similar order which channels the flow of lumber to the proper customer. He can by means of such an order limit the profit that can be made on such homes. Why does he refuse to do it?

It is unnecessary to talk about old houses—they have already been built. Perhaps we will have some speculation in them but certainly not if new houses are placed on the market at fair prices, under legislation enacted to prevent excessive profits. If new homes are obtainable at fair prices, certainly old houses will not be sold at excessive prices. It is my considered opinion that War Mobilizer Snyder has it within his power to issue the necessary administrative orders to prevent this inflationary building program. On his shoulders—and his shoulders alone—rests the responsibility for doing this job and doing it right.

Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago War Mobilizer Snyder testified before the Senate Small Business Committee on this very subject. He toyed with the problem. He did not pick it up in his hands and tackle it in the way a competent executive would have handled the problem. He handled it like a hot political potato. If this administration is to evidence good faith and show to the people of this country that it understands the problems of the average citizen and the small businessman, it must present a program which will eliminate the present inequalities in the distribution of building materials. Certainly no such program has yet been presented by the officials of our Government and if the handling of the present problem is to be taken as a criterion it is a poor omen for the future.

War Mobilizer Snyder, his assistants, and the lobbyists for the real-estate interests have endeavored to tell us that the Army has vast stock piles of surplus lumber. This is not borne out by the facts. When the Army stopped ordering lumber, it only stopped putting in orders for boards still on the trees—not for already processed lumber.

Mr. Speaker, there has been much propaganda relative to this housing problem—maybe I will lose some valuable customers by the position I have here taken, but I would rather lose them and contribute my share toward stopping the wild race toward inflation than have the few dollars I might make out of their business. I am a real-estate man, a builder, and a lumberman, and I know whereof I speak. Think it over, gentlemen, before it is too late.

Despite Promises, Men in Armed Forces Still Not Being Discharged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, we have not yet had an answer from the War Department as to why unscrupulous officers are permitted to continue to interpret the point system to the disadvantage of the men who fought for those points. That being so, we here in Congress must immediately help these boys. The following appeal is only one reason:

I'd like for you to write a letter to our Congressmen and ask if they won't do something about this matter. Here are the circumstances. After the war ended with Japan our unit was supposed to return to the States for redeployment to the Pacific but the War Department lowered the point system to 80 points for discharge and 70 for return to the States. Under this revised point system my unit would have automatically fallen in category IV which means eligible for return to the States and demobilization. A circular came down from the War Department asking for the unit's point average and our commanding officer sent in a score computed as of VE-day robbing us of the eight points granted all Army personnel between VE- and VJ-day. Had our score been computed to take in VJ-day approximately 900 men would have been eligible for return to the States out of 1,300. After checking, the score of the regiment would have lost all its key personnel; so in order to keep the organization together so as to hold positions, the correct information as to the unit's score was withheld from the War Department, making us eligible for occupational duties in Germany, and unless somebody comes to our aid we will be detained in Europe indefinitely. I'm asking that you do anything you possibly can but whatever you do withhold my name, because I'd catch plenty hell if anything happens and it is found out I started it. Will you please write that letter immediately and request an investigation be made?

Sincerely yours.

Prices, Wages, Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of October 25, 1945:

PRICES, WAGES, PROFITS

Labor, demanding higher wages, argues the business situation is now such that industry can have adequate profits, can grant all wage demands, and can still sell its product at lower prices than during the war. If this is true, there is, of course, no reason why wage adjustments should not be made, though perhaps not at the rate labor suggests.

The fact is that, whenever there is technological or other advance in production, there is a benefit. That benefit may go wholly to stockholders in the form of higher dividends, or to the workers in the form of increased wages, or to consumers in the form of lower prices. Ordinarily, the benefit does not go to any one class but, in varying degress, to all three. Prices are lowered to a certain extent and, at the same time, profits and wages are increased. The individual manufacturer determines the proportion under the various pressures that are exerted on him.

The point which should be remembered by all is that the greatest good to the greatest number, at least under normal conditions, comes from price reduction, with wage increases coming second and profit rises coming third.

Everybody is a consumer. When prices go down, the benefits reach everybody—wage earners, capitalists, the retired, and the "widows and orphans"—everybody. The dollar goes further, so the weekly stipend,

whether it be in a pay envelope or in a remittance check, can stay where it is and still buy more.

When wages rise, even though prices remain static, only those who work for wages benefit. If the rise is general throughout labor, the distribution is, of course, very wide. Since, however, the stronger elements in labor always get the lion's share of advance, the real benefit is largely confined to them.

When profits rise, the benefits are still spread to a considerable number, for those who own small blocks of stock, as well as those who have millions invested, and those who share in the prosperity of insurance companies and the like, find their incomes or their estates increasing. In these days when millions have investments or live off the proceeds of investments, even profits are widely spread.

Labor at this time must realize that high wages are per se of no value. The dollar with high purchasing power may be worth several inflated dollars, and 52 weeks of sure pay are better than fewer weeks at a higher figure.

Our economic problem today is how to achieve consistently high purchasing power for the greatest possible number. We cannot meet that problem just by raising wages—just by meeting labor's demand for more and more dollars. If those raises mean higher prices and lower profits, consumption will dwindle and capital will get discouraged. Then jobs will disappear.

It is only when the division of benefits is nicely balanced, with the consumer, the worker, and the stockholder each getting a fair share, that enduring prosperity can be expected.

The Army Service Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post:

THE ARMY SERVICE FORCES

The biggest business in the world made its report yesterday to its stockholders, the people of the United States. Its managing director, Gen. Brehon Somervell, reported that in the fiscal year July 1, 1944–June 30, 1945, it trained, clothed, fed, armed, treated, entertained, instructed, paid, deployed, and redeployed an army of 8,300,000 men. Its expenditures totaled $54,000,000,000.

As General Somervell says in his report, the Army Service Forces were taken largely for granted by the American public. When a million men and a hundred thousand vehicles were landed on the Normandy beaches in 109 days, that fact stirred hardly a ripple of comment. When a barren island was occupied and made into a major base in a few weeks' time with airfields, repair shops, motion-picture theaters, housing for 50,000 men or more, that was only what they were organized to do, wasn't it? The Army Service Forces, as the report makes clear, were the men behind the men behind the guns that made victory possible.

The over-all extent of the forces under General Somervell's command probably is little appreciated. The Army Service Forces included practically every activity except that of the actual fighting. There were seven technical services: Quartermaster, Ordnance, Engineers, Medical, Signal Corps, Chemical Warfare, and Transportation. There were the following administrative services: Adjutant General, Judge Advocate General, Provost Marshal General, Finance, Special Services, and Information and Education Divisions and Chaplains. It will be seen that the Army Service Forces therefore were responsible not only for all the physical needs of the combat soldier but for his mental and spiritual needs as well.

Probably more than to any other part of the Army, the personnel of the Army Service Forces—1,250,000 officers and men—went directly from civil life into the ASF. At the end hardly any of the men and less than 3 percent of the officers were professional soldiers. General Somervell gives full credit for the task accomplished to the skill of these men trained, before they ever saw the Army, in organization, production, and transportation.

General Somervell gave to the Service Forces, when he returned to the Army from years of distinguished service in this city as a public works administrator, the somewhat flamboyant slogan: "The impossible we do at once; the miraculous takes a little longer." Looking back from victory at what was accomplished, it does not seem now too broad a statement.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable James A. Farley at a Democratic rally held under the auspices of the Queens County Democratic Committee, in the Flushing, N. Y., High School, Thursday evening, October 25, 1945:

Not so long ago all our thinking and all our actions were concentrated in the effort to win the war and it is not many weeks since we began to translate our victory into a peace that will help to eliminate the causes which precipitated the war.

New York City, in common with every other community in the land, must do its share in this titantic task.

New York is the greatest city on God's footstool. This may sound extreme, but I think that with only a little study anyone would reach the same conclusion. I may be accused of being a little prejudiced or partial in my views and, if so, I plead in mitigation that I love this city and its people. I have been part of its throbbing, pulsing life for many, many years and I think that I sense the pulse of the metropolis.

Those who have been here as long as I have, or even a lesser period, cannot but help absorb the rhythm and color of this greatest cosmopolitan community on the face of the earth. New York City belongs to no one man or to any one group. It is made up of divers religions, of men and women from every clime who manage to live together in a spirit of give and take and broad tolerance.

I speak, of course, of the general picture, for I do not think we need stress the transient quarrels and disputes that occasionally arise in an area where nearly 8,000,000 human beings go about their affairs from day to day. That these differences should ever arise is to be regretted. But they are not of vital concern. What must amaze one is the fact that there is so little of it. Yet that little is too much and it is the duty of all of us to strive to put an end to it. And, it can be done.

We are now in the midst of a political campaign involving not only the major offices from mayor down, but also our judiciary and the members of the council.

But tonight, I will speak chiefly about my candidate and your candidate for mayor, Brig. Gen. William O'Dwyer, the nominee of the Democratic and American Labor Parties.

Four years ago I supported General O'Dwyer for mayor because I knew him to be an upright man of high personal integrity and courage. It was my considered judgment then that his extensive administrative experience and his unimpeachable record qualified him for the exalted office he was seeking. This year General O'Dwyer is again a candidate and I am supporting him for the second time for the same reasons that were mine in the last campaign. My enthusiasm for General O'Dwyer is even greater now, because during the past 4 years he has grown in stature. As a soldier and statesman he has lately carried heavy responsibilities which he assumed in the interest, not only of his fellow citizens in this city, but of the Nation and of lands beyond the seas.

In the past 4 years General O'Dwyer has changed. He has changed in the sense that his experience as an administrator has broadened out, and that his knowledge of the changed conditions is such that the people may feel confident that he is well qualified to handle the postwar problems of the city as thoroughly and efficiently as he handled the important war assignments given to him by President Roosevelt and his immediate superiors in the War Department.

Time will not permit me to go into a detailed discussion of the many and complex problems that face the city in the immediate future. Most of you have a fairly good idea of these problems, and I have no doubt that a great many New Yorkers have their own solutions.

But I think there will be general agreement among us that such problems as employment, traffic congestion, housing, transit, juvenile delinquency, improved school facilities, elimination of slum areas, and greater recreational facilities for children press for immediate consideration.

Such a program stirs the imagination. There is no easy road to the attainment of the objectives called for in the plans that must be carried out in the next administration. This program will require the meeting of many minds around the council table, the highest engineering skills, and last, but not least, a keen sense of social consciousness and responsibility.

It will call for the integration of all the forces of good government. It will bring into play the full physical and financial resources of this city. It will determine in no small measure the future of our children.

We must recognize that not only must talent and ability of the highest order be enlisted into the service of the people, but that good over-all administration is vital too.

I am fully satisfied, as I know you are, that General O'Dwyer can ably cope with the city's postwar and rehabilitation plans, equipped as he is with splendid personal qualifications and a wide and successful experience as an administrator.

Let us consider the personal equation. General O'Dwyer comes from the people. He has lived among them. He understands them.

He began his public career as a policeman on the beat and as such learned the individual trials and tribulations of the average man, the housewife, and the children.

He saw them every day, he talked with them, he gained a clear conception of their hopes and aspirations.

Later on as a magistrate, as a county judge and as district attorney, he encountered an-

other phase of human life and of human problems.

All this time he was learning from people, as well as from books. It gave him a more humane outlook, a broader and more sympathetic understanding, and because of his background it engendered in him a greater desire to be helpful to members of the community, regardless of their party affiliation or their religious beliefs.

His splendid work as a soldier and as special minister to Italy, together with his designation by President Roosevelt to handle the war refugee problem, are too recent to need any discussion by me at this time.

You all know what a series of grand jobs he did. You all appreciate the kind of administrative ability that was needed in the performance of the duties assigned to him.

I merely mention these things to point out that General O'Dwyer as mayor of New York City will go into this most important post not only equipped from a technical standpoint, but conversant with the needs of the people as simple human beings.

And now I should like to dwell briefly on an aspect of this campaign that borders on the fantastic.

Some of General O'Dwyer's political opponents have charged that he was associated with Communists and would be subject to their influence. The more extreme among them said that he was a Communist. And there were other smearing charges made. And we all know how untrue these charges were. Charges which were brought up in the last days of the campaign.

Like General O'Dwyer, I, too, am opposed to communism, fascism, nazism, and all other "isms" that run counter to Americanism. My record in public life has been such that no one can truthfully deny that I have ever made a statement that failed to carry my strongest convictions, and that do not square with my conscience. And now let me say that those who have made these false charges will receive a well-merited rebuke from the electorate on November 6.

Like General O'Dwyer, I am and always have been against intolerance. I stand, and always have stood, for our democratic process of government, which is alien to intolerance.

Under this democratic process no man can be prevented from expressing his thoughts on public questions nor can he be told how he must vote.

A candidate for office may say to an individual or to a group that he doesn't want their support, as General O'Dwyer said to the Communists and to the Communist Party. But he cannot, under our democratic process, keep these individuals or groups from going to the polls and voting for him.

It follows that a candidate is under no obligation to any individual or any organization advocating a course at variance with our American way of life. You and I know General O'Dwyer well enought to realize how he feels on the subject of un-Americanism.

He could not have made such substantial progress in public life if he had catered to any elements in the community who flouted our democracy and its institutions.

When he is in city hall, he will do a first-rate administrative job because he will cater to no one group and will not yield to pressure from those who would seek to destroy our American institutions and our American traditions.

A vote for General O'Dwyer represents a vote for our American way of life and is an investment in the future well-being of our great city.

I would also urge you to vote for Lazarus Joseph for the office of comptroller and for Vincent R. Impellitteri for president of the city council, and all their associates on the Democratic ticket. It is highly important to make certain that General O'Dwyer will have complete cooperation in putting his program into effect.

Hospital Care Is Not Charity—Stars and Stripes Editorial Attacks Pauper Oath for Veterans

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I desire to extend in the RECORD a piercing and illuminating editorial that appeared in the Stars and Stripes, National Tribune, on October 11, 1945, concerning the much-discussed pauper-oath requirement for veterans.

This editorial is based on two articles carried in the September issue of Veterans Outlook magazine, one by Joseph Leib, vice commander of Costello Post, American Legion, Washington, D. C., and the other by the Legal Division of the Veterans' Administration.

War veterans were greatly favored on September 18 when Representative JERRY VOORHIS, of California, placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the arguments of a prominent World War II Legionnaire against employment by the Veterans' Administration of the so-called pauper's oath and, immediately following, the reasons given for its use. The latter were not necessarily in reply to the protests of the veteran first quoted, but they were an enlightening treatise by the solicitor for the veterans' agency in defense of the use by it of forms used in dispensing hospitalization to war veterans.

It is our desire to be fair. Solicitor Edward E. Odom doubtless intended to set out dispassionately the reasons why the Administration feels called upon to pauperize certain of our comrades and not necessarily to defend the practice. However, the two cannot be successfully divorced, and we so deplore the movement to term as charity any right extended by the Congress to men who wore the country's uniform in time of war that we desire to discuss the subject once more.

Odom correctly states that the Congress granted certain hospital and medical care to service-connected veterans as a "right." He then gives the history of hospital care under the World War Veterans' Act of 1924, which extended "authority" for hospitalization of others not directly service-connected, who are "financially unable to pay for hospitalization and necessary traveling expenses," and he says that, even though the Congress enacted the law, there is a distinction between a "right" and an "authority" within the limitations outlined.

Going then to the repeal of all veterans' laws in 1933, when the Veterans' Administration grabbed more authority than was good for it, and to the later and final justification for the pauper's oath, Odom cites Public Law 312, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 23, 1935, in which the Congress amended the Economy Act in order to grant hospital care to any war veteran "unable to defray the necessary expenses therefor." He again correctly quotes the law which says that "the statement under oath of the applicant on such form as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall be accepted as sufficient evidence of inability to defray necessary expenses," but here we note that the Solicitor carefully refrains from acknowledging that the Congress had declared a "right" to hospitalization to certain non-service-connected veterans. Instead, he calls this quotation the pauper's oath "about which so much misinformation has been circulated."

We record that much of the material written for the record by the head of the Legal Division because we are pledged to fairness. That is in truth an application of the pauper's oath, but only a sample of a hateful practice. Some months ago this newspaper, on behalf of veterans, protested strongly against the use of that particular clause on the application blank then used by all veterans, including the so-called service connected, when applying for hospital care. Our friend, Odom, admits that the Administration was in error, uses the flimsy excuse that it was not intended for them anyway, and says that no attention was paid to those answers when service-connected veterans sought hospital admittance. But the fact remains that the form was altered to advise service-connected veterans that they need not answer certain questions; it was altered in other respects; and a bold-faced penalty clause threatening applicants with fines and imprisonment, if they failed to tell the truth, was put on a back page where it did not have to be subscribed to. That much was accomplished, anyway.

The power to remove the oath, says Odom, lies with the Congress. Again, that is fact. It "is prescribed by law," he says, "not by the Veterans' Administration." That is only half-truth. The Veterans' Administration wrote the law and persuaded the Congress to pass it. It recommended the language employed for reasons which the Solicitor in a long statement evidently thinks proper and sufficient. To read it one would believe it is a picnic for a veteran to be hospitalized just to have a pretty nurse take his pulse and feed him pills. He carelessly quotes figures to suggest that, unless somebody prevents it, 20,000,000 veterans will be hospitalized "for free" even though there never will be that many veterans unless we have another war. He says there were more than 3,000,000 admissions in the last 25 years, which would lead the unwary to believe that three out of four of all World I veterans have been in hospitals. Of course, that would be a foolish conclusion because there are a few veterans of other wars still alive, and some patients have been admitted many times, but it all helps to add up to big figures for purposes of argument. And, finally, the Solicitor poses the suggestion that the veterans themselves and their families, making up as much as a third to one-half of the population, had better take a good look at the problem—all nicely balanced and quite alluring argument and every bit of it actually, if not legally, a pleading for continued use of the pauper clause.

There is not a veteran in the country who will be moved by efforts of this sort. All were sent off to war with a promise in their ears that nothing ever more would be too good for them. There is not a single one of them who would purposely ask for something for nothing. They well know that they sacrificed months of their lives and years of their earning power when they donned the uniform.

There has never been any question about priorities to the so-called service-connected. But if or when they require the aid of the Nation they served and of the people they saved, veterans want no strings attached to rights voted to them by the people's representatives, and they want no modification by interpretation or otherwise from the Veterans' Administration, which is the agent of Congress. Least of all do they consent to affixing their signatures to any paper saying, "I cannot afford to pay." That is the abominable pauper's oath. It is as degrading as it is unnecessary. And before war veterans lie in free graves in a national cemetery, they do not wish to feel that that is to constitute charity or that their final resting places are to be paupers' graves.

The new Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, General Bradley, wrote an article for the Philadelphia Inquirer of September 23. In outlining the benefits and opportunities afforded by a grateful Nation to those who

have earned them by sweat and blood, he recorded himself thus: "In no sense of the word can a benefit of any nature to a war veteran be considered as charity." That is a clear statement from a distinguished soldier who has lived with his troops in the field. It is becoming to a fighting general. He has not yet taken a stand on the "pauper's oath" which organized veterans are trying to eliminate by legislation. We hope he will make it indelibly clear that hospitalization or any other right, now or hereafter, which may accrue to a war veteran is not charity, that a beneficiary need not humble himself to receive it, and that a person who is good enough to serve his country in war is too good to be a liability under any circumstances on the community which produced him.

Resolution of Southern Commissions on Interstate Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

RESOLUTION OF REGIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONS OF INTERSTATE COOPERATION OF THE SOUTHERN STATES (ALABAMA, ARKANSAS, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, OKLAHOMA, TEXAS, AND TENNESSEE), HOTEL ST. CHARLES, NEW ORLEANS, LA., OCTOBER 20, 1945

Be it enacted by the representatives of the Southern Commissions on Interstate Cooperation:

1. That pending congressional legislation providing for the return of the employment services to the States be adopted immediately and that necessary Federal appropriations be made to match available State funds for the operation of the services in the future.

2. That our system of unemployment compensation be left exclusively to the States, particularly as to matters of administration.

3. That the Federal House of Representatives should insist on the inclusion of provisions of the Senate bill providing for the channeling of Federal aid for airports in the revised Federal aid airport bill which is now being rewritten by a conference committee. The House on two occasions expressed itself favorably on this principle.

4. That the United States Senate be urged to give immediate consideration to S. 1398, by Senator MCMAHON, of Connecticut, providing for the disposition of surplus airports, facilities buildings, equipment, etc., to States and cities wtihout charge through the Surplus Property Administrator.

5. That the Surplus Property Administrator be commended for establishing a dvision to handle State surplus disposal problems, and for immediately making large supplies of tires and other surplus material available directly to States on a priority basis.

6. That the proposed Federal public works program contemplated in legislation pending before Congress be handled on a Federal-State cooperative basis as in the case of the public-roads program and not operated like the WPA program in the past; and be it further

Resolved, That in order to implement these conclusions the following steps should be taken:

1. Copies of this resolution should be sent to every member of every commission on interstate cooperation in the southern region, and members of other regions of the council of State governments should be kept advised of action taken by the southern cooperation commissions.

2. Each commission on interstate cooperation in this region should be promptly called into meeting to review primarily pending Federal legislation of serious concern to the States.

3. Copies of this resolution should be sent to Members of Congress and Federal departments particularly interested in the above subjects.

(Adopted unanimously.)

Sea-Air Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the Propeller Club of the United States held its annual convention in New York from October 17 to 19.

The membership of this organization comes from all branches of the maritime industry. It is a voluntarily supported nonprofit organization, having for its sole purpose the advancement of the American merchant marine. Its 10,000 members are scattered over the United States, Europe, the West Indies, and South America in some 100 or more clubs or branches, known as ports. They are all people engaged in maritime activities and who have a deep interest in the development of the American merchant marine.

The Propeller Club also has some 30 student ports located in American universities and colleges, composed of young people studying courses in naval architecture, marine engineering, foreign and domestic commerce, trade and transportation, business administration, and economics.

There is probably no group of people in this country better acquainted with the problems of the American merchant marine and its development as an agency of national defense. They recognize the absolute need of coordinating our transoceanic surface and air transportation so that our merchant marine can meet the competition of foreign maritime nations.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution adopted by the Propeller Club at its recent convention:

The war has brought great improvement in airplane service facilities and equipment throughout the world and demonstrated the necessity of commercial air power to national defense and the establishment of a comprehensive overseas transport service in the postwar period.

It is in the public interest that American steamship lines participate in the development of transoceanic air service to the end that an efficient and adequate American transport service be established and maintained under competitive conditions.

Steamship lines have longe engaged in transportation of passengers, mails, and cargo by water and have contributed to the development of international trade and established the organizations and relationships essential to efficient overseas air service.

A complete coordinated sea-air service under a single management affords the shipper and the traveler the most efficient, adequate, and up-to-date facilities in transportation, and is demanded by the public and affects the public interest.

Foreign countries, particularly England, France, and Holland have long been active in the field of air transportation through the facilities of the steamship companies of their respective countries, and these and other foreign countries propose to press the development of overseas transportation service in this manner in the postwar period. It is essential to protect the American merchant marine from the threat of foreign competition that it likewise be permitted and encouraged to engage in transoceanic air-transport service to the end that it will be enabled to meet the inevitable competition of foreign steamship lines.

The Propeller Club of the United States urges:

1. That steamship companies are entitled to certificates of convenience and necessity, without discrimination, upon a proper showing before the Civil Aeronautics Board that the proposed air service is required by public convenience and necessity and the applicant steamship company is fit, willing, and able to perform the service properly.

2. That it is vitally essential to the operation of a sound and adequate American merchant marine that the right of American steamship companies to engage in air transport, as an auxiliary and supplemental service to their service operations, should be fully recognized and established at the earliest possible date.

The secretary is directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, all Cabinet officers, to the United States Maritime Commission, to the Civil Aeronautics Board, to the Senate Committee on Commerce, to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to all Members of Congress, chambers of Commerce, and boards of trade in the United States.

Production the Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 25, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, many of us are thoroughly convinced that production is the answer to many of our problems. Just how to get it with fairness to all, is the question.

What one editor thinks is shown by the following editorial from the Allegan Gazette of October 25, 1945, which reads:

If the average American wants to maintain his standard of living, and there isn't any question about that, then at some time that American must come to the realization that he can't drive automobiles, own a home with all the new, modern appliances in that home and in return produce for 30 hours each week. Indeed, it is doubtful if that standard of living can be maintained on a 40-hour week and this is especially true if there are more than two in the family.

Labor has been talking a lot of nonsence when it thinks it can produce enough value per individual in 30 hours or 40 hours to have all the good things in the average American's life. It can't be done for the

simple reason that as yet, and there isn't any prospect in sight, labor's value just isn't sufficient to permit it to earn enough in 30, 36 hours or even 40 hours. There are of course some specialists who can earn enough in 40 hours to give them a home, a car, modern appliances and sufficient money to raise and educate a family, but insofar as the average man is concerned it just isn't in the cards.

The reason is simple. Labor cannot enjoy high wages without being forced to pay high prices. The price of every commodity on the market is made up, for the greater part, of labor. Each wage increase means and must mean a raise in the price of the commodity being sold and while it is true that, generally speaking, a certain wage rate can be allowed without a resulting increase in price, most business doesn't work on a large enough margin to warrant wage increases without price increases.

High-priced labor means high-priced commodities, and, with labor constantly struggling to get ahead on its end of the schedule, it simply means labor-wage chases price schedules in an endless chain until soon nobody can buy and money is worthless.

Without capital labor is sunk and without labor capital is lost, but the two, working in close unity, can bring the highest standards of living and at the same time a profit for capital. Without a profit, capital cannot be obtained and is not interested. If that happens, and it can and has in earlier New Deal days, the result is no jobs.

Labor is entitled to fair play and a just return for its effort, but a lot of labor has gone wild. Every man is entitled to a job if he can hold one, not if he can get one. Every man is entitled to a home, a family, and a decent standard of living if he wants to earn it, and is capable of earning it, and it shouldn't be necessary for any individual to work 50 or more hours a week to have a decent standard of living, but the idea that average labor is worth anywhere from $2,500 to $5,000 annually is hooey. Yet there has been a lot of ordinary labor which has, during the past few years, earned three thousand and more annually. That pace cannot be continued, not without boosting all labor to a similar income, and if that is done it won't make much difference how large the pay check reads. It will be worthless.

Atomic-Age Lessons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Hanson W. Baldwin, military analyst for the New York Times.

Mr. Baldwin is a graduate of the Naval Academy of the class of 1924. During the war he has written many interesting and highly constructive articles on our national-defense problems, particularly the problems and functions of the Navy. The following article is well worth reading:

ATOMIC-AGE LESSONS—GOOD INTELLIGENCE SERVICE, AIR POWER AND INDUSTRIAL LEADERSHIP OUR BEST DEFENSES

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The details of the atom bomb and its manufacture are still—and will long remain—to the great majority of people, either a closely guarded secret or a scientific puzzle.

But the effects of the plane and the bomb, the rocket and radar and the other military miracles of this scientific age are plain enough. The United States can no longer count on distance for immunity from physical assault, our geographical position is still a strategic asset of major importance against actual invasion by men, but distance and surface forces cannot prevent damaging assaults of terrible consequence through the air.

There are certain conclusions that can be drawn from this. An atomic Pearl Harbor—a stupendous and massive attack by surprise in the atomic age now dawning—could mean virtually a crippling blow particularly against an unprepared nation. Therefore, we must never be surprised again.

INTELLIGENCE SERVICE FIRST LINE

An adequate intelligence service—the world's finest—is today the first line of defense. The present organization in Washington is not the proper one for the best collection, analysis, and presentation of information. The intelligence service of tomorrow cannot be tied down to any one, or two, or three Government departments, though each department must maintain its own specialized intelligence service. But the coordinating agency, the master agency, must be independent of the State, War, and Navy Departments and answerable preferably to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This is Lesson No. 1. If we ignore it, if we do not develop an adequate intelligence service, it will be the Nation's peril.

Lesson No. 2 was already clear before the atomic bomb was introduced. The accomplishments of air power are too well proved to be argued. Our second line of defense is in the air—not necessarily air power as we now conceive it, more probably pilotless planes and rockets—and it must be offensive air power, not defensive. Air power, particularly strategic offensive air power, must not in the future be subordinated to ground and sea power, even if the implementation of this lesson means a third and separate Department of Air.

Lesson No. 3 is also a byproduct of the preatomic age and of combat lessons, but it has been validated by the lessons so far learned from the atom bomb. The lesson is simple; the future of the Nation probably depends on preeminence in scientific research and development and in industrial "know-how" and production. We proved ourselves in the war masters of mass production, but we often lagged in the race for quality. We have too few scientists and not enough scientific engineers, and the service policy toward scientific education during the war has set us back by some years. Yet the future of our military strength depends fundamentally on the laboratory and the factory—and the hearts of men.

QUIBBLING ON DETAILS HIT

These three lessons are of fundamental importance to our military institutions and to the national future. Yet there is not much evidence that they are well understood. Instead of concentrating on them, we are quibbling about details. We are talking about organization instead of education; we are talking about universal military training instead of scientific training; we are planning hopefully for industrial mobilization but doing little to induce the men who can keep those plans up-to-date to stay in Government service. We speak of a single department of defense as a panacea, instead of devising ways and means of insuring the fullest possible scope for the development of air power, and, as needed, of postatomic land and sea power. We speak of military training when we may need disaster training—the training of the whole civilian population in defense against atomic bombings. We speak of unification in blueprint terms instead of in terms of the mind and the heart.

All these questions are interrelated; none can be solved unless the others are solved. They are not being solved today in Washington. They are being discussed piecemeal and with prejudice. They will never be solved, with safety to the country, by Congress acting through separate and biased committees and by the fighting services acting as partisans. The time is short; the time is now. A commission of distinguished civilians, impartial, objective, chosen for their judicial and mental attainments, should be appointed by the President with the consent of Congress to review our entire postwar military program and its relationship with foreign policy in this atomic age. Atomic legislation itself should form part of this study. But in the meantime such legislation, national legislation of vital importance, is pending before Congress. This legislation provides for the creation of an atomic control commission (this commission would have nothing to do with studying our postwar military problems). This atomic control commission would be endowed, under the proposed legislation, with powers so far reaching and broad that even a cursory study leaves the reader apalled. It is true that legislative grants of such far-reaching powers may be in step with the frightful development of physical power in the atomic age, but there is considerable doubt that the legislation as originally drawn is either desirable or necessary.

SCIENTISTS OPPOSE SECRECY

Scientists say that the emphasis on secrecy in atomic bomb experimentation and development would stifle the development of nuclear physics in this country rather than aid it. Scientists believe in a free exchange of the facts of life—and perhaps an embargo, if that be the national policy, and no international solution is possible, on purely military information. Amendments to insure the freedom of fundamental scientific research and to limit the unparalleled grant of power made to the projected atomic energy commission must be accepted by Congress. Moreover, the rights of property—essential to freemen everywhere—must be preserved, something that the proposed act does not specifically do. Under the terms of the present legislation, the atomic commission could apparently sequester and appropriate almost anything in the United States.

If this be necessary to live in the atomic age, perhaps Americans will make even these sacrifices. But let us see first whether it is necessary; let us put first things first. Let us create not only an atomic energy commission, with requisite powers, but also a fact-finding body of even broader scope, a commission to study the whole military problem of postwar America, to consider how atomic energy magnifies that problem and to fit into proper perspective the fast changing roles of all the instruments of war. Until that is done, until an over-all answer is given to the over-all problem, we shall build the postwar military system of the United States on quicksand.

Their Own Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Times-Herald there is a piece by Eleanor Patterson passing out to Mr.

Winchell and Mr. Pearson a very small dose of the medicine which they so often prescribe for others. Let me, but not in their order, quote excerpts from that article. First is described a visit to the St. Elizabeths Hospital—but let the author speak:

Dr. William White, beloved humanitarian and for 34 years superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital for the insane, explained to this writer some time ago that the mentally deranged follow an orderly pattern within the consciousness of their own minds. Whatever point of reasoning they take off from, they stick to.

On a visit through one of the women's wards at St. Elizabeths, we observed a comely young woman standing still as a statue before a sizzling radiator. She was clad only in a cook's apron. Her blonde hair fell down her bare back. Her hands, thickly bandaged against the heat, rested on the boiling pipes.

"She's got one obsession," explained the doctor. "She's crazy about fire. This way we keep her quiet and contented for hours at a time."

The writer then refers to certain liberals as follows:

And youth—"liberal" youth—girls and boys who are just naturally crazy about playing with fire, like the comely girl we saw standing contentedly, with her hands bandaged against the heat of the sizzling radiator. But the hands of "liberal" youth aren't bandaged. And they're not contented. For, as the sage of the sagebrush, Mr. Cal Carrington, of Wyoming, remarked: "The excitement of life is a wonderful thing, but when the beauty of youth has went, there's no more excitement to it." And we old folks shouldn't begrudge the young ones that which we have lost and once enjoyed ourselves—not unless they raise a little too much hell, that is, in passing.

Another patient is then described, and I quote:

Farther along inside the big room a little gray ghost of a woman stood, her eyes riveted to one of the top windows, her hands clasped in a frenzy of prayer. Her white lips moved incessantly. Nobody ever could find out to whom she prayed, or for what.

Application of this type was made in the following words:

Henry Wallace, for instance, crystal-gazing crack-pot: He belongs as a type along with that little gray ghost of a praying woman. He, too, prays incessantly, to whom or for what nobody knows. A harmless kind of a nut, Wallace. Tilter of windmills. Out to save the world—all alone by himself, of course.

Another patient appeared on the scene. Here are the words of the writer:

Then up swept a well-dressed, nicely turned-out woman with mottled cheeks and flaming eyes. "Get me out of this," she shrieked. "Me, jailed with thieves, murderers. * * * Why, I speak five languages. Railroaded. * * * Jealousy. Spies. International spies. And plots * * * plots * * * plots. I'm worth millions. Perfectly disgusting. Now they've got me and I'm the only lady in the joint. Get me out of here quick, I tell you, it's a filthy plot. * * * Doctor, doctor, please," she sidled up to him with a smile. But with the casual touch of long experience the doctor removed her clutching fingers and brushed her aside.

"Oh, she just gets pretty excited," he explained. "Pretty wild. Persecution mania. Never quits talking."

The application:

Walter Winchell: Hard to tell just what's biting this middle-aged ex-chorus boy. False shame of his race and his family name may be at the root of it all. Anyhow, like the old gal we described above, he suffers from a chronic state of wild excitement, venom, and perpetual motion of the jaw.

You can chuck the whole of PM staff into this same category. Although of evil intention, they are harmless on the whole, but kind of tiresome.

Then came the description of still another inmate:

A little old woman, shaped like a top, stalked by. She wore nothing at all but a big white sheet, draped over one shoulder and under one bare arm. She was almost bald. Her few white hairs gathered into a knot about the size of a peanut on top of her head. Haughty, silent, she passed, waving her free arm grandly, dragging her sheet behind her.

"She's harmless, too," said the doctor. "Believes she's a queen. Has a fine time of it."

Applied in the following words:

Poor puppet-king Marshall Field rightly belongs in the "harmless" ward, too, with a paper crown on his head, trailing his dirty sheet behind him. You remember the little top-shaped old lady? He, too, believes he's "royalty," makes grand gestures, and has a very fine time of it.

Another patient is described:

Visitors are not allowed in the wards of the criminal insane, but from the outside looking up, the strangest object appeared, peering through a barred window.

A white, waxen wedge of a face. Eyes so close together they appeared to overlap. It was sniffing at a red rose held in one hand, while with the other it beckoned with a vaguely obscene gesture.

"Oh, we have quite a few of those," explained the good doctor. "This one loves flowers and little children. We give him a rag doll to play with, and he'll nurse it for hours. But he's a pretty vicious type just the same. Sadist. Torturer. Killer.

"Like Robespierre? He looks like Robespierre's pictures."

"Yes, doesn't he? * * * Robespierre loved flowers, you remember, and canary birds and little children. And he loved blood, too. A very common type."

And a comparison is drawn:

Drew Pearson: Ah, Drew, rose-sniffing, child-loving, child-cheater, sentimental Drew. Vicious and perverted Drew—as like as two peas in a pod to that poor creature who beckoned to us from the ward of the criminal insane.

Incidentally, you GI Joes, when you happen to listen to the phony Quaker Pearson of a Sunday night—Bleeding Heart Drew—never forget that although he was 20 and in perfect health in 1917, he managed to "thee and thou" himself out of service in World War I. Then, as now, Drew was a yellow-bellied slacker. (For further information, please write in.)

All of this happened quite some years ago (the visit to the asylum). But a recent discussion about the wonders of the new "liberal" party, and what could be really going on inside the screwy heads of the poor jerks who belong to it, popped these fantastic scenes back to mind.

For a while we had fun cataloging the better-known "liberals," according to the various types described above.

Then, for good measure, the following:

Now you may ask yourself to what degree is this so-called liberal gang insane, according to ordinary standards. As the great Dr. White has often pointed out, the thin and wavering border line between sanity and insanity is difficult, even for an expert, to follow. Too many of these zanies are crazy all right, but they're crazy like foxes. Winchell and Pearson, for instance, and other quislings (we use the name advisedly) manage to get paid big money for their treachery.

But, to go back again, how can any normal-minded human being choose this filthy work of plotting, planning, sneaking, lying, spying, cheating, stealing, smearing, in the mere hope of one day overthrowing our American form of government, for that's all it amounts to.

Who, with anything approaching a sane mind, would trade freedom, prosperity, and the right to live in peace for the degradation of body and soul and slavery under the bloody fist of Asiatic Soviet Russia?

The answer is that these so-called liberals are not sane, although some of them, like many of the inmates at St. Elizabeths are crafty and scheming beyond the reaches of the normal mind.

Don't forget that when Winchell and Pearson snidely try to smear our great generals of this war—MacArthur, Eisenhower, and Patton; our great admirals of the Navy; the "brass hats"; the "gold braid"; when they aim their spittle at Congress; sideswipe the judiciary; the Cabinet; our President, and even Mrs. Truman and her young daughter, Margaret; it's true, they're crazy, but there's a fine method in their madness.

It's as simple as this: Once respect is destroyed, once gratitude and decency of feeling for the great traditions of our country are successfully ridiculed and vilified, why then these "punks" figure they will have done their job to clear the way and smooth the road for on-rushing bloody revolution.

Yes; they're nutty all right, these "liberals"—for they can't see further ahead than the first frenzied days of plunder, murder, fire, rape, and prancing about with pale, fresh-cut human heads on bloody pikes.

But if this wild-eyed crew ever studied history—and some of them were once fairly well educated—they have become so besotted in their lust for blood and carnage and dollars that they have forgotten one great and simple lesson. They have forgotten that revolution feeds upon and destroys itself.

As inevitably as the change in the tides of the sea, come revolution. Come counter-revolution. Each one bloodier than the first.

They have forgotten that the big historical names of the first French revolution, and thousands of others, were the first to go to the slaughter of the second terror. Desmoulins, Danton, and Marat were themselves bounced over the same cobblestones of Paris, exposed to the same jeers of the same rabble, wobbled about in the same bloody tumbrils, to the same guillotine to which they had condemned thousands to die.

And Robespierre—the bloodiest of them all. Rose-sniffer, child-lover, sentimentalist, fiend.

Robespierre—what happened to him? Attention: Messrs. Winchell and Pearson.

Well, when Robespierre was finally dragged shrieking to the scaffold, and his lunatic head rolled down into the basket, the rabble went even wilder than on that previous day—only 18 months before—when it howled with joy to see Louis XVI humbly kneel to die.

We haven't space here to tell about the revolutions and counterrevolutions within bloody Russia itself since 1917. Remember that royalty—aristocracy—teachers, doctors, lawyers, clerks, down through the whole white-collar classes—even to the humblest peasant with one cow—all in all, more than 15,000,000 Russians have died to keep one man in power, and we do not count the losses involved in this war.

"The earth is the lunatic asylum of the universe," wrote old cynic Voltaire. He knew.

Wonder how Pearson and Winchell like it.

May-Johnson Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, the May-Johnson bill is one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before the United States Congress. This is what one newspaper thinks about it. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on October 19, 1945:

MAY-JOHNSON BILL

The folly of trying to legislate in the dark has probably never been more pointedly illustrated than it was yesterday at the hearings before the House Military Affairs Committee on the May-Johnson bill. Witnesses made it unmistakably plain that hasty enactment of that measure might have the effect of crippling instead of fostering future development of atomic power. The striking objections which these scientists piled up against the bill leave no doubt that it will have to be discarded for a fresh start.

Complaint No. 1 by the scientists is that the May-Johnson bill, enacted into law, would drive many of the ablest experts and technicians out of the atomic energy project. The reason for this leaps to the eye of even casual laymen reading the bill. It would give the proposed Atomic Energy Commission plenary power to set up rules on the handling and transmission of data and equipment connected with research in the atomic field. Persons violating those rules could be fined up to $100,000 and imprisoned for up to 10 years. They could be dismissed from any agency of the Government with no recourse. An innocent mistake violating the Commission's security rules could be punished regardless of intent by fines and imprisonment.

Astronomers seeking out the mystery of the stars and medical experimenters searching for new remedies for the benefit of mankind could be sent to prison under the sweeping terms of the bill, according to Dr. H. L. Anderson, of the Los Alamos Laboratories, New Mexico. Scientists cannot be expected to work under such conditions. A measure so gravely detrimental to their welfare might have been aptly called a bill to drive the ablest experts out of atomic research. The tyrannical powers of the proposed commission could also be used to muzzle criticism of its work and thus to stifle advancement of the most important discovery of our age.

Dr. Leo Szilard, physicist of the University of Chicago, demonstrated in detail the administrative weakness of the bill. The very large measure of independence that would be given to the Atomic Energy Commission, he said, might dangerously hamper our foreign relations. The State Department could expect repeated embarrassment from the fact that control over the most powerful of all weapons would be in the hands of a separate commission which could even thumb its nose at the President. Whatever the nature or power of the proposed commission, we think it is imperative to tie it in closely with existing agencies of Government, particularly those which are directing our foreign policy.

Dr. Szilard suggested three operating agencies to deal with different aspects of the atomic-control problem. One would operate the existing $2,000,000,000 plants; another would direct research and development looking toward industrial use of atomic energy; a third would provide machinery for further work on the atomic bomb. Each of these agencies and key Cabinet members would be represented on a board for formulation of over-all policies on atomic power. This is an interesting suggestion, but we think that Congress ought to explore the issue much more thoroughly before attempting to decide what sort of mechanism is needed. Incidentally, this witness in reply to a question from the committee, voiced enthusiastic support for our suggestion of a quickie law to meet immediate needs while permanent legislation is being worked out.

The fatal weakness of the May-Johnson bill is that it attempts to create specific machinery before a national policy has been worked out. It is not much more than an abdication of congressional power into the hands of a commission. We think it is about time for Dr. J. B. Conant and others who are said to have had a hand in drafting this clumsy and dangerous measure to recall it and then help Congress to get off to a better start.

Exit Japan's Drug Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of October 20, 1945:

EXIT JAPAN'S DRUG INDUSTRY

General MacArthur's current decree liquidating Japan's narcotic industry ends one of the most shameful phases of that country's ruthless program of aggression by any and all means. The master minds who guided the course of Japanese imperialism long discovered that habit-forming drugs could be useful instruments in the debauching of Oriental peoples especially addicted to such vices, thereby weakening their moral fiber and rendering them less resistant to Japanese domination, while at the same time rich profits could be garnered in the process. Accordingly, Japan and its dependencies went in for the growing and processing of the world's three most harmful narcotics—cocaine, opium, and hashish, which were deliberately forced upon subject peoples and sold in other markets by methods which contravened the League of Nations control agency to which Japan had formally subscribed.

These nefarious policies have been authenticated by factual proof. The league agency has for years found grave abuses and evasions in Japan's narcotic export trade, while MacArthur's headquarters has announced that it is in possession of well-documented evidence that the Japanese authorities had deliberately fostered the use of opiates in Asiatic areas "for attaining their quest for empire and as a means of subjugating conquered peoples." Simultaneously, Dr. Wellington Koo, Chinese delegate to the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations, points out that Japan had reintroduced the drug menace throughout the vast areas of China under its control, supplementing the traditional opium by other narcotics such as heroin and cocaine. "In parts of China where opium had been practically eliminated," says Dr. Koo, "millions of people have again become addicted to it." The league control agency estimates that Japan has been the source of 90 percent of the world's illegal drugs, while MacArthur's headquarters states that stocks on hand in Japan provide more than 30 years' supply on a basis of normal medical requirements.

The measures taken to end Japan's narcotic industry are as drastic as they appear to be effective. All plantings of opium poppies, coca shrubs, and hashish hemp are to be destroyed forthwith and further cultivation prohibited. Stocks of narcotic drugs are frozen under control of the occupational authorities, and exports forbidden except under special license. Thus, Japan's narcotic "fifth column" is being liquidated.

Congress Should Act To Speed Up Demobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1945

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, while there has been a step-up in the demobilization of men and women from the armed forces, it is apparent to me that there is a decided need for congressional action to secure maximum results. I am convinced that a large part of the Army and Navy personnel, not needed for occupation purposes, can be demobilized before Christmas.

To bring the question of demobilization to the attention of Congress, I have introduced H. R. 4467, which reads as follows:

A bill to provide for the discharge or release from active duty of certain members of the armed forces and for terminal leave for enlisted personnel.

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) there shall be discharged from, or released from active duty in, the military or naval forces of the United States without delay, any person who requests such discharge or release and who—

(1) has served on active duty 18 months or more since September 16, 1940; or

(2) has, at the time of making such request, a wife or a child or children with whom he maintains (or would but for his service maintain) a bona fide family relationship in his home; or

(3) has, at the time of making such request, a mother or father dependent upon him for chief support; or

(4) desires to resume his education or training by enrolling in an educational or training institution, if his education or training was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with by reason of his entrance into the service. Any such person who was not over 25 years of age at the time he entered the service shall be deemed to have had his education or training impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with; or

(5) has, at the time of making such request, a status of being essential to the operation of a farm, as certified by the county agricultural agent of the county in which such farm is located; or

(6) has the desire and requests to be returned to his business or profession, which he was forced to discontinue or place in other hands at the time of his induction or enlistment into the military service.

SEC. 2. All enlisted personnel and noncommissioned officers shall be granted the same terminal leave which is now allowed to commissioned officers.

Mr. Speaker, the subject matter of my bill speaks for itself. However, I desire to point out that, in addition to providing for the discharge of members of the armed forces, I am proposing that all enlisted personnel and noncommissioned officers shall be granted the same terminal leave now received by commissioned officers. While there may be some objection from staff officers to giving terminal leave to the enlisted personnel, I insist that the rank and file in the armed forces are just as much entitled to receive from 30 to 60 days leave with pay at the time of discharge as those who have been fortunate enough to secure commissions.

There has been some talk about a recess of Congress in November. I will oppose such recess, as I strongly feel and urge that we should act on the demobilization of persons in the military and naval forces who desire to be discharged before we adjourn. I urge the passage of H. R. 4467, which I have introduced. I am satisfied that if the leadership of the House would permit a vote on the bill today it would be approved by a large majority. I urge the Committee on Military Affairs, to which the bill has been referred, to take prompt action in reporting it for consideration by the House.

Justice for Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of October 28, 1945:

JUSTICE FOR GREECE

It was 5 years ago today that Italian troops invaded Greece after that country had refused Mussolini's 3-hour ultimatum. The succeeding months marked one of the most gallant and surprising chapters of the war. At a time when Axis successes were creating in many countries a spirit of gloom and defeatism, the promptness and skill with which the small Greek Army thrust the Italians back on a 120-mile Albanian front astounded and encouraged the free world. After months of continued Italian defeats and withdrawals, some of the best of Hitler's divisions had to get Mussolini out of his ill-advised adventure. In April 1941 the Nazis took Athens and the swastika flew above the Acropolis. But the glorious winter of Greek resistance was left undimmed in history by this final surrender to overwhelming German power.

Since the liberation of a brave and greatly devastated Greece, little has been done for the rehabilitation of a people whose heroism in defense left so many homes in ruins. With an area about the size of New York State, with a population of little more than 7,000,000, Greece is a country of many small, tough-acred farms. According to recent reports, more than 800,000 of her farmers are homeless, existing in huts near their land, with agricultural equipment, down to the smallest tools, looted or destroyed during the enemy occupation. Establishment of political and financial stability in the distressed country is, of course, the more difficult while these conditions of living continue.

Greece complains—and her spokesmen, we believe, are justified—that she was not invited to state her claims at the lately ended Foreign Ministers Council in London. She points out that Italy and Bulgaria, because of armistice clauses, have been able to delay reparations in kind. She is disappointed to find her aspirations toward the future of the Dodecanese Islands and northern Epirus postponed.

Increase of Minimum Wage Rate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, one of the important industrial plants in the Second District of Massachusetts is that of Johnson & Johnson located in the city of Chicopee. This corporation has won not only a national but an international reputation for fine products, many of which are household commodities with which I presume every Member of Congress is familiar.

I have, therefore, been particularly interested in the testimony given by Robert Wood Johnson, brigadier general, Army of the United States, retired, chairman of the board of Johnson & Johnson, at the hearings before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor relative to a proposed increase in the minimum wages payable under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. The amendment under discussion calls for a minimum of 65 cents an hour.

I have stated on many occasions publicly that I believe that the present minimum rate should be increased. I am particularly pleased, therefore, to place before you the opinion of a successful manufacturer who has carried on business on a large scale for many years. I believe his statement is well worth consideration by all of us.

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT WOOD JOHNSON, BRIGADIER GENERAL, AUS, RETIRED

As I understand the purpose of this hearing, it is to discuss the plight of the underpaid. We are not here to consider questions of collective bargaining or those who are earning a fair and adequate wage.

The proposals embodied in the amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act are not aimed to raise the general wage level of the United States, but rather they are aimed to correct certain social and economic distress growing out of substandard wages.

There have always been more underpaid employed than unemployed. I suppose it would be fair to estimate that given six to eight million unemployed, we would in the past expect fifteen to twenty million underpaid.

I suggest that this committee should take the position that the average American workman cannot keep body and soul together on less than $30 per week anywhere in the United States. On the basis of a 40-hour week, I, therefore, am compelled to recommend a 75 cents per hour minimum wage throughout the Nation. On the score of exceptions, and there will be many who dwell exclusively on that feature of the problem, we might assume the exemptions of apprentices, perhaps those under 21 years of age.

It can be said that a large portion of our underpaid are unmarried and that single individuals can exist on less than $30 a week. It is well to add, however, that the great majority of single men and women have responsibilities to parents, brothers, sisters, and relatives that are frequently comparable to those of the head of a family.

I suppose it is impossible to discuss any question of wages, even the establishment of fair minimums, without some consideration of the broader economic aspects of the relation of wages to costs. It is a great surprise to me to learn that this outstanding feature of American economy is so little understood.

Some will say that industry moves to low-wage areas. This is a fallacy. Factories move to markets, not to low-wage areas.

We are surrounded every day from morning to night with thousands of examples that go to prove beyond discussion that the most outstanding characteristic of our country, in terms of economics, has been its accomplishment in the field of production and distribution. On every side we see the proof of the ability of this country to pay higher wages and sell at lower costs. This equation needs no proof beyond the record of the past 50 years.

At times we hear of the loss of export markets through our efforts to correct the substandard wage. Apparently those who oppose reasonable minimums for such reasons, have failed to realize that the products able to pay transoceanic freight, overcome tariff walls, pay the high price of export selling, and compete with cheap native labor are almost exclusively the products of our high-wage industries.

Of course there are exceptions, and we must acknowledge the fact that the components of industry and commerce differ one from the other. In some industries the wage factor is very low, and in others, it is quite high. But here again I should like to remind the committee that we are dealing with minimum wages and the plight of the underpaid, the substandard wage earner not reached through union organization, and that his problem cannot be adequately corrected through State legislation. Only a courageous and realistic Federal law can do the job.

It will be better if we come to realize that in discussing this question of a minimum wage, we are covering the field of commerce, industry, services, and agriculture. For many years the question of wages has been attached in the public mind to factories and factories alone. I am told that factories have never employed as many as 25,000,000 wage earners, and that in the future the percentage of factory employed in relation to the total employed will probably decline.

While I appreciate that this committee is giving its attention almost exclusively to the question of minimum wages, it would seem only proper to bring before you that at same later date we must consider the question of hours. I doubt that a 40-hour week will solve our problem, and, therefore, recommend to you that a part of your staff be assigned the task of preparing legislation for a 36-hour week and a 30-hour week. Commerce, industry, the trades, and services as well as agriculture would be classified into three major divisions—those operating on a 40-hour week; those on a 36-hour week; and those on a 30-hour week.

One method of establishing the workweek for a given business would be the percentage of labor content in the gross cost. In other words, to pick a figure out of the air, if the labor content was in excess of 50 percent, that business would be given a 40-hour basic week. If under 50 percent but above 35, the business would be given a 36-hour week. And if under 35 percent, the business

would be given a 30-hour week. In each instance the same minimum weekly wage of $30 per week would apply in all three divisions.

For those seasonal industries that cannot rapidly be adjusted to these hours, it is suggested that in any and all divisions business be allowed to operate for any 8-week period during the year at a maximum of 10 hours overtime per week to be paid for at double time. And for those extreme cases which require a further extension for a short period, I offer the suggestion business be allowed an additional 10-hour period for 4 weeks a year to be paid for at the rate of triple time.

Even today we occasionally meet a man who believes that working less than 48 hours a week is somewhat sacrilegious—that it is wrong in principle. Let us look at the record in this respect.

Throughout most of Christian history, the western world was influenced by the laws of the church, and it has been found that in those days the church allowed about 100 holidays a year. It was only when the industrial era began in England that the sweated days of 14, 16, and 18 hours came into vogue. And when children were forced to work those hours for starvation wages. We have come a long way since then, but why should we stop now?

What we are really doing is to create a new code of business ethics with the aid and guidance of our Federal Government. It would be hard to imagine a more important task nor one that would make a greater contribution to the world. All observers have long ago concluded that it was underpaid, the unemployed, and the destitute of Europe that caused the political upheavals which led to this great war. We have come to a time when we can honestly say, at least in our country, that man does not have the right to employ his fellow men unless he can pay a subsistence wage.

Recently I found that the Reverend Donald A. MacLean said that "the well-being and perfection of each person is intimately bound up with the welfare of all. Nature has so decreed and there is no other road to the real liberty, the higher welfare, perfection, and happiness of men."

Someone else has said, "None but the brave would be able to fashion that future, and none but the brave deserve it."

More Support From Home for H. R. 3939 To Banish Polio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

LA CROSSE, WIS., *October 18, 1945.*

Hon. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Noted in late copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a bill sponsored by you to help fight polio. Its a noble thing to do, and when there are billions spent to kill why not money to save life? My daughter's son, near 18, is right now in a hospital at Madison for treatments. He was stricken with the disease a month ago. Thanks a million for your effort in behalf of this humanitarian legislation.

Most sincerely yours,

(Mrs.) MARIE A. SANFORD.

A Governmental Research Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent statement on the desirability, character of organization, and conduct of a Government research foundation. The statement was prepared by the following distinguished scientists at the University of Minnesota:

Ancel Keys, director of the laboratory of physiological hygiene, and professor of physiology, University of Minnesota Medical School; with concurrence by the senior staff of the laboratory of physiological hygiene, Josef Brozek, assistant professor of psychology; Austin Henschel, assistant professor of physiology; Olaf Mickelson, assistant professor of physiological chemistry; Ernst Simonson, associate professor of physiology; Henry Longstreet Taylor, assistant professor of physiology; and Samuel M. Wells, physician.

At a time when one invention or scientific development has the destructive power of thousands of soldiers, not to mention its vast possibilities for constructive purposes in such fields as industry and health—surely there is no more important subject for our earnest attention than maximum stimulation of research under the most favorable circumstances possible:

NATIONAL SECURITY AND THE GENERAL PLACE OF SCIENCE

The desirability, character of organization, and proper conduct of a postwar governmental research foundation have been given careful thought in this laboratory. For several years we have been concerned with the general problem of the necessities for the proper use of scientific research and methods for the national good, including national security. Our views have particular reference to the special field of knowledge cultivated here, namely, human physiology and the effects of age, occupation, diet, climate, and the hazards of ordinary life. From early 1941 until now our efforts have been devoted to military subsistence, human dietary needs, personnel in hot climates, convalescence, starvation, and nutritional rehabilitation.

There can be little debate about the previous accomplishments and present potentialities of scientific research, though far too much attention is generally paid to technological applications without inquiry into their true foundations. Everyone agrees that increased volume, quality, coordination, and application of scientific research is needed for national security. In addition, we all want scientific and technical progress generally, better health and hygiene, and a fuller understanding of the world in which we live. We insist that these latter objectives are inseparable from national security and that to consider security simply a problem of military establishment is totally fallacious.

General Marshall reflects an outmoded and narrow viewpoint when he states that December 7, 1941, found us to be a third rate military power. The inference is that the Army and Navy worked actual miracles to transform us, in scarcely 3 years, to the greatest military power the world has ever known. This is pure nonsense. The readily available manpower, material, scientific, technical, and organizational resources of a nation are the measure of military might far more than the number of men in uniform or the battleships and planes in operation on the first day of crisis. To deny this is to recapitulate the errors of the professional military in Germany, Italy, Japan, and Poland.

The greatest single resource, ordinary or military, of any nation is in the health, morale, and skills of its people. To improve and increase this resource must be a prime objective of any broad and long-time measure to guarantee national security. Our professional military men have agreed that armed conflict is a matter of men and machines and that technical equipment is of extreme importance. But the technical equipment of modern warfare directly reflects and is limited by the scientific and technical development of the Nation as a whole. Innumerable illustrations can be advanced to prove this point beyond question. And with the increasing complexity of the equipment comes the necessity for a large reservoir of special skills and knowledge to produce, improve, operate, and direct such equipment. Clearly there is undeniable need for scientific research to improve the general, and secondarily the military, technical equipment of the Nation. Just as clearly there is the need for increased training of personnel to produce, improve, operate, and direct such equipment.

Scientific accomplishment is not something you can buy on the market by specifying an application of principles not yet known. The basis from which an application can come cannot be predicted and the fabric of useful knowledge is too tightly woven of surprise ingredients to predict the detailed means needed to achieve a desired practical end. Throughout all time the wellspring of scientific accomplishment and creative research has been the free pursuit of a fuller understanding of the world in which we live. It is first necessary to supply the basic ingredients of general scientific knowledge before specific applications can be made. The latter step is frequently not too difficult though it may be spectacular. It is possible to buy such application and the delivery date is dependent on the offering price and the number and skills of the scientists and engineers who are available.

Scientific advances by Army and Navy during the recent war have been improperly portrayed. Generally speaking, these advances has been chiefly simple applications and these have been made by civilians, in or out of uniform, from bases not remotely connected with the military. When the true record is written the waste, inefficiency, ignorance and obtuseness in utilizing scientific knowledge in the recent war will be apparent to all. While the military may admit some of this now, there is no reason to believe that great improvement will result from continuing the authority of nonscientific men in scientific matters by merely ensuring that good advice is available to them. The inevitable tendency of nonscientific men is to confuse scientific research with final adaptation and to recognize basic needs too late.

THE DESIRABILITY OF A FEDERAL RESEARCH ORGANIZATION

In this country scientific research progress is made in the universities, in private industries and in Governmental laboratories. These have serious limitations at present. Besides absence of coordination, each of the major sources of scientific knowledge has its particular handicaps.

The restrictions of industrial research to the immediate or relatively short-time commercial profit motive means that basic work is restricted and whole areas of knowledge are excluded. There is no way in which private investment can be economically justified for research in most of the problems of human biology and medicince. Individual companies or even whole industries cannot

be expected to undertake the burden of research which is really the responsibility of the whole Nation.

Governmental laboratories do much useful work but as at present constituted this is chiefly in applications and not in fundamentals. Unless we are willing to reorganize these establishments drastically and to give them far greater latitude they cannot do much more. In any case, scientific research by a centralized bureacracy must always be relatively inefficient and uninspired. Few good men will accept the low salaries, irksome red tape, rigidity of organization, and political vagaries of direction involved in Government jobs. Once in such a job, the scientists are subject to the deadening effects of overspecialization, absence of wide-ranging intellectual stimuli and the need to "produce" to satisfy nonscientific superiors and political pressure groups.

The universities have been, and are, by far the most important source of scientific research. Research, however, is a side line of university work and is hampered by the following facts:

1. Good research men often have inadequate time for research; the teaching job comes first.

2. Universities are organized in teaching departments and proper research organization frequently demands a breakdown of such departmental lines or the creation of special research departments.

3. Modern effective research needs facilities and assistants beyond the means of university budgets. Scientific foundations and private philanthropy are very helpful but they are likewise limited.

4. The time and energy required of the researcher to enlist and maintain suitable funds is inordinate and tends to become a full-time job in an ambitious enterprise.

Private research foundations have both stimulated and made financially possible much progress in scientific research. The present and future limitations of funds in these foundations have been adequately demonstrated in all recent discussion of the subject. While it may be hoped that these foundations will continue to give crucial assistance on occasion and to sponsor activities which may be otherwise neglected, it is not possible to rely on this source for the greater general progress of scientific endeavor.

At present there is little or no coordination in research between different institutions and even intercommunication is poor. Scientific meetings are too brief, infrequent, and personally expensive for the researchers. The committee meetings of the National Research Council have been very helpful in the war emergency but they have been too hurried and restricted in both scope and personnel for peacetime purposes. Scientific publications are in need of subsidy if they are to provide a prompt and detailed means of interchange of knowledge between scientists.

The present faults in coordination of research do not result in an unnecessary duplication so much as an omission of work on many important problems. Particular efforts are needed to ensure proper development, evaluation, and standardization of methods. Large and complex problems require simultaneous attack from several different directions.

All of the foregoing points indicate that over-all extent and organization of scientific research in the United States is far from adequate at present. Some kind of large-scale organization and financial support is badly needed. We believe that the proper center for research should be primarily in the universities where scientific researchers are trained and where maximal stimuli operate in relative freedom from political and commercial interests. However, it is clear that the universities need encouragement and funds to allow adequate research effort and facilities. The barriers created by the teaching-department structure and by traditional orientation toward undergraduate and purely vocational training must be removed. These barriers persist because of budgetary limits and the traditions established by nonscientific administrators.

Attention should be given to the training and recruitment of qualified young people to enter scientific research as a life work. Finally, the utility of governmental and industrial laboratories can and should be increased by liberalization of working conditions and, in the latter, by more favorable tax and patent laws.

We believe that nothing short of an overall scientific foundation on a Federal scale can possibly meet the requirements. The purposes indicated in the report by Vannevar Bush, and in Senate bills 1285 and 1297, include expansion of facilities and financial support for scientific research, preservation of conditions necessary to the scientist for creative work, improvement in intercommunication between researchers, coordination of related projects, consideration in planning of the general directions for study, and the training of researchers. We are in full agreement with these purposes and believe they can only be achieved by a new organization established by act of Congress.

THE PROPER CHARACTER OF A GOVERNMENTAL RESEARCH ORGANIZATION

A postwar governmental organization for scientific research is urgently needed, in our opinion. The basic requirements of organization would seem to be indicated from the following points:

1. The experience and facilities of present research laboratories and organizations should be utilized to the full. Besides universities and other research operating institutions, consideration should be given to the various scientific and learned societies.

2. Judgment of scientific merit and accomplishment can only be made by competent scientists.

3. Specialized research institutes within universities have a splendid record of accomplishment and the encouragement of such establishments should be a major item in the responsibility of a new foundation.

4. National security demands that the military organizations have close contact and consultation with the advance of scientific knowledge. This should not mean military domination.

5. The health, welfare, and skills of the people is a matter of vital concern for national security and demands extensive research efforts for maintenance and improvement.

6. The impediments of bureaucracy and rigidity of organization must be avoided so far as possible at both policy-making and operating levels. Centralized direction and master planning research in detail would be fatal to real progress.

7. Improvement in intercommunication between researchers and between researchers and the general public is essential and would go far toward improving coordination at an operating level. Only such items as are agreed to be competent scientists should be guarded in secrecy.

8. Research projects must be established on a relatively long-time basis as only in this way can complex problems be attacked and researchers encouraged to invest their time in the essential planning and development work. While short-time projects are suitable in some instances, in many others periods of at least 5 years must be provided for in advance.

9. The training and recruitment of scholars and researchers cannot be left to chance. Scholarships, fellowships, and other aids must be provided.

10. Absolute freedom from all ordinary political and commercial control and dictation must be guaranteed to the researchers and to the administrators.

11. The organization must be devised to prevent the possibility of domination of the Foundation by pressure groups, scientific cliques, or persons from particular institutions or localities.

Several bills, offered to achieve one or more of the purposes listed here, are now before the Congress. Of these the May bill (H. R. 3440) and the Byrd bill (S. 825) may be dismissed as taking too restricted a view of the problem of national security and allowing undue authority to the Army and Navy. Either of these bills would represent an advance but would be, in our opinion, far from adequate. The Fulbright bill (S. 1248) is limited to certain aspects of technical progress, and even these are considered chiefly from the standpoint of small and medium-sized business. The Kilgore bill (S. 1297) and the Magnuson bill (S. 1285) most closely approximate the requirements as set forth above.

Both the Kilgore and the Magnuson bills have many valuable and desirable features, the chief differences, in the versions printed in August 1945, being in the character of the administrative authority and in the extent to which conditions necessary to freedom from political interference are safeguarded. On both these grounds we believe the present Magnuson bill is far more acceptable than is the present Kilgore bill. To vest the powers in a board serving without compensation is far preferable to providing the chance of a directorship which might become a Presidential "plum," as in the present Kilgore bill. The inclusion of a considerable proportion of Government officials on the controlling board would be dangerous and potentially disastrous. A similar potential political domination of the major committees is also provided in the Kilgore bill. The specific provision in the Magnuson bill for allowing unobligated appropriations to remain available for 4 years (sec. 8b) is an important point in favor of it and in earnest of a better appreciation of the requirements for effective research.

Any legislation effecting the establishment of a science foundation or similar organization will require that the director or board submit an annual report to the President and to the Congress. This is essential, of course, but it is believed that such a report would be greatly strengthened by somewhat independent scientific testimony as to the general conduct and operations of the foundation. We suggest that the legislation provide for printing and distributing with the foundation report such resolutions or recommendations referring to the foundation as may be made each year by the National Academy of Sciences and by the National Research Council.

THE CONDUCT OF A NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The conduct of a national science foundation will be largely determined by the legislation which creates it and by the character of the top administrative personnel selected. We believe that the cardinal principles to guarantee proper conduct are:

1. Administrators of recognized scientific standing who are free from political pressure or obligations must be appointed.

2. Reduction of red tape and bureaucratic machinery to the absolute minimum should be a major policy.

3. Appointment of committees on a truly national basis should use the advice of the professional scientific societies.

4. A policy of encouraging long-term projects, grants, and contracts on relatively broadly defined problems should be initiated and maintained with vigor.

5. There should be full recognition of the great importance of carefully prepared reports on research as well as of the time and effort needed to prepare such reports.

6. Specialized conferences and committee meetings should not be limited to a few hours

and there should be insistence on careful preparation of agenda and material for presentation. Many meetings should be publicly announced and provision made for attendance on petition of noninvited researchers.

7. Close cooperation and consultation with the scientific and learned societies and with private scientific and medical foundations should be asked in organizing and reviewing the work of the National Foundation.

8. Excerpt files of requests for contracts, as well as of contracts approved, should be available to the public except where national security seems definitely involved.

9. There should be specific recognition of the great importance of the interchange of knowledge and ideas in stimulating and improving scientific research. Besides a review of the whole problem of scientific publication, there should be provision for visits and exchange of personnel between institutions.

10. The dangers of secrecy should be recognized and every effort made to ensure that only such items and projects are hidden as are really vital and potentially disruptive to peace and inimical to military security.

11. The interpretation of 'sciences and natural sciences should be broad enough to provide aid to such aspects of the social sciences as may be amenable to proper scientific study.

12. Efforts should be made to inculcate the public generally, and the schools in particular, with an understanding of the meaning of science and scientific methods.

Enlisted Men Should Be Granted Terminal Leave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, there is no question that deserves immediate attention more than the one concerning terminal leave for enlisted men. On December 18, 1943, I introduced a bill, H. R. 3875, on this subject. Last January 8 I introduced another bill, H. R. 1160. I am glad to say the bill has the support and endorsement of the American Legion. I trust we shall be able to receive action on this meritorious legislation immediately.

I include in my remarks a letter from Mr. John Thomas Taylor, director, national legislative committee of the American Legion, concerning my bill:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., October 24, 1945.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are, as you know, vitally interested in your bill, H. R. 1160, which provides terminal leave to enlisted men in the same manner as is now given to officers, except that it also provides that the compensation to which the soldier is entitled shall be paid in a lump sum, which, of course, is a very good idea.

Demobilization is taking place at such a rapid rate at the present time that unless this is enacted into law quickly it is not going to benefit very many GI's.

It does not seem to me as though it is a very controversial issue and that the House Military Affairs Committee could make up its mind very readily as to how they feel about it. We shall appreciate very much if action can be had on this matter.

Sincerely yours.

JOHN THOMAS TAYLOR,
Director, National Legislative Committee.

Charter Becomes Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Manchester Leader, Manchester, N. H., of October 26, 1945:

CHARTER BECOMES LAW

One cannot fail to note the apparent lack of enthusiasm over the ratification of the United Nations Charter by the required 29 nations, whereby it becomes a part of the law of nations. Why this seeming coolness? Ordinarily one would have expected that this event would be, as Secretary Byrnes labeled it, "a memorable day for all peace-loving nations."

When the United Nations gathered at San Francisco to draft the outline of a world peace organization, the occasion was hailed with great enthusiasm. When those nations completed their work and announced agreement on a world peace charter, enthusiasm was still deeper. All peace-loving peoples hailed this achievement as the beginning of a new era, as it truly was, and looked forward hopefully to the necessary ratification of the Charter and the beginning of its operation.

And then two things happened, and those two things are responsible for any lessening of enthusiasm that may have occurred. One was the discovery of the atomic bomb, which incorrectly created the impression that perhaps the work at San Francisco had been outdated and that the world peace organization was no longer able to fulfill anticipations. The other was the unfortunate deadlock in the Foreign Ministers' Council at London that aroused the fear that the Allied Powers, upon which the success of a world peace organization must rest, would not have sense enough to work together.

But this cooling of enthusiasm and the entertaining of doubts toward the World Charter are a grave mistake, for the world peace organization created at San Francisco is still the hope of future world peace. The Charter has shortcomings and imperfections, but it constitutes a solemn pledge on the part of the nations that have signed it to refrain from the use of military power, or any dread weapons that may be discovered, for any other purpose than the maintenance of peace. This pledge must be the first plank in any foundation for world peace that can be laid.

Moreover, these nations pledge themselves to exercise police power to see that some recalcitrant national leader does not upset the peace. That, too, is essential. Now it is said that the atomic bomb has outdated this machinery. Not so. The basic principle of control of the atomic bomb is a determination of peace-loving nations not to make war and to restrain those who try to make it.

True, the Charter drafted at San Francisco may not be strong enough to curb an aggressor with an atomic bomb in his hands. But that does not disqualify the Charter for what it does accomplish, but only means that it must be developed to meet atomic conditions. One of the members of the Canadian Parliament speaking in the debate in that body on the World Charter put the matter correctly when he said:

"The challenge of atomic energy will not only strengthen the conviction that the United Nations Charter must be made to succeed, but that through it must be developed some special measure of international control, however this is to be done, of the latest and most deadly menace to world security."

The first premise of peace is a world organization based on justice and fair dealing. The Charter provides such an organization. It is up to the nations supporting that organization to make it work and to broaden it to meet any new challenge to peace that may arise.

Area WMC Director Glen Filley Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if in every section of the country the operations of the War Manpower Commission were carried on as smoothly as they were in the area administered through the agency's office at East St. Louis, Ill., then that wartime organization should be entitled to special commendation from Congress.

I want to pay tribute here to the splendid work done by the War Manpower Commission in the East St. Louis area under the direction of Mr. Glen Filley. Under his guidance the agency won the respect of both labor and management. He performed a notable work in the war effort. He was the type of administrator we need in more of our Government agencies. Mr. Filley possessed the remarkable ability to make the general public understand the program, and he exercised innate good judgment which permitted the agency to avoid mistakes which might have hampered the war effort in the many important industries in St. Clair and Madison Counties which were contributing so much toward final victory.

Mr. Filley's good work was recognized not only by the men of industry and labor who worked with him, but the press of the area also took notice of his remarkable record. Under leave to extend my remarks I herewith submit an editorial which appeared in the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal of Sunday, October 21, 1945:

THE WMC CLOSES SHOP

Another wartime agency, the War Manpower Commission, is passing from the East St. Louis scene.

The people accepted the WMC here, as did the rest of the Nation, in April of 1943 in the same spirit they had greeted other necessary wartime controls. It had become obvious, particularly in industrialized areas such as East St. Louis, that something had to be done about regulating employment in the war plants. That was the task delegated to the WMC.

Under the guidance of Glen Filley, area WMC administrator, the Government branch

here set up a labor-management committee and went to work. Some of its directives were distasteful; keeping an American workingman literally chained to one job was unprecedented. But it had to be done.

It is to the credit of Mr. Filley and his associates of the labor-management committee that they completed their work without losing the respect of the community.

We all hope that such restrictions of our liberty never again will be required. But if they should, let us hope that they are administered as capably, as unobtrusively as did the War Manpower Commission representatives here.

Disposition of Surplus Army Kitchen Equipment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I have been granted unanimous consent to include therein a timely article prepared by Margaret Truesdale Gibbs, entitled "For Junior or for Junk?" I commend it to my colleagues in the Congress.

On Tuesday, October 23, 1945, the President delivered a message of prime importance to the Nation on the subject of universal military training as an integral part of our over-all plan for national defense.

In that message he referred to men who were physically unfit for active military service. Why in this country we should have such a large proportion of men in this category is food for sober thought. The statistics and experience of the Selective Service are appalling. Something must be done to raise the health standard in America. The dollars and cents cost of those people whose poor physical condition can be traced to malnutrition or eating habits formed in early youth is a drag on our economy.

Mrs. Gibbs comes forward with a pertinent, constructive suggestion that we turn over to the schools field kitchens and other cooking and eating utensils.

In the long run her scheme will pay many times more dividends than the paltry sum we shall receive for this equipment from the junk dealers.

Here is Margaret Truesdale Gibbs' article:

FOR JUNIOR OR FOR JUNK?

(By Margaret Truesdale Gibbs)

When that great day comes when the mess sergeants have no customers, when our great army camps are dismantled, and the boys go back to "mom's cooking," what are we going to do with our fine and efficient army kitchen equipment? Sell it for junk at 5 cents on the dollar; or use it to build a stronger and healthier generation than GI Joes', in which over half the 4-F's are chalked up to defects from childhood malnutrition? Shall we melt the fine stoves, the great aluminum kettles, the big thermos containers down for scrap metal; or shall Uncle Sam use them "to promote the general welfare" by putting them to service in expanding the hot-lunch program in American schools?

For over 2,000 years all sensible people have agreed that the old Greek ideal of a sound mind in a sound body is a social goal. But so far we have concentrated in our public schools on the first half of the ideal only. It is time we realize that the two are interdependent, and that every American child is just as entitled to good teeth and strong bones as he is to a good understanding of arithmetic. Health and vigor in every citizen is a public asset as valuable in peace as it is in war, and its achievement must be recognized as a public responsibility. The lamentable percentage of our youth found unfit for army service proves lectures and charity cannot answer the national malnutrition problem. No, we must look upon good and adequate feeding of America's growing children as a gilt edge public investment. For one thing, it is the best possible insurance against juvenile delinquency; well-fed youngsters do not get on the road to crime by petty larceny in food stores and fruit stands. For another, they have energy enough to get the most out of their school work and to develop initiative. The futility of trying to teach children too apathetic from bad nourishment to grasp or retain their lessons is bemoaned by teachers the land over. Who knows how much tax money is wasted on this large and limp class of unfortunate children?

As a teacher myself, I know that not nearly all of them come from poverty-stricken homes. Pampered children who get to eat just what they like are often as vitamin starved as the little kids who get nothing but sowbelly and beans. In one Nebraska town we found the banker's 8-year-old son to be the most badly nourished child in school. In other cases the mothers don't know how to cook, or are too lazy to bother, or put too much of the food budget into showy clothes. Shall we let their children grow up with the rickets and hand a little charity out to the very poor?

If the Army feeding program can take under-par boys at 18 and bring them out of it, think what one good Army meal a day could do for them from the time they are 8.

The conversion of Army kitchen equipment to use in the hot lunch program has already proven practical. Before the war a committee in Washington, D. C., who were working to further child health by a hot noon meal established a large central kitchen for preparation of the menu. They obtained out-moded Army field kitchen equipment for their cooking. A dietitian planned the menus, the Surplus Commodity Corporation supplied part of the food, and well-balanced, piping hot meals were packed in huge thermos kettles and rushed to surrounding grade schools by truck.

Why, when the war is over cannot the same thing be done in every city in the land? America has the equipment, America has the food to provide every child in our schools with one good, hot, well-balanced meal a day. It can be done and it will be done if parent-teachers associations and other child-welfare groups speak up and demand it and help organize such a set-up.

Veterans Return Home To Find Housing Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, day by day the problem of finding housing facilities for returning war veterans becomes more acute. It is a serious situation which should call for immediate attention.

The shortage is so alarming that many articles are appearing in daily newspapers in all sections of the country carrying pleas from returning veterans for a solution of the problem.

In my opinion, the postwar housing program of the Federal Government, if we are to have one, should be placed in operation without delay. I recognize the fact that there were many war housing projects completed in the last 3 years, but the number of homes built during that period fall far short of meeting present and future needs.

Not only the larger cities in my congressional district—Alton, Woodriver, East Alton, Granite City, Venice, Madison, Belleville, East St. Louis, Collinsville, Greenville, Nashville, Waterloo, Edwardsville—feel this housing shortage, but it is just as keenly felt in the smaller communities.

The war-weary young man who spent from 2 to 4 years fighting the battle of freedom in the remote parts of the world returns to his home community in the hope of reestablishing his home—or, perhaps, as in the majority of cases, with the thought of having his own home for the first time in his life.

The following news article from the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal of Sunday, October 21, 1945, tells the story of what the home-seeking returning GI is finding:

VETERANS FIND HOUSING ONE BIG HEADACHE—RED CROSS AT A LOSS TO SOLVE THE SHORTAGE PROBLEM

The problem of finding housing space for returning war veterans and their families has become almost insurmountable in the East St. Louis area, Mrs. Genevieve Schiffer, executive secretary of the East St. Louis Chapter of the Red Cross, said Saturday.

"Frankly," Mrs. Schiffer said, "we are at a loss for a solution to the problem. We certainly would welcome any suggestions as to our future course."

SHORTAGE MORE SERIOUS

East St. Louis wartime housing shortage has become increasingly acute since VJ-day. Men now in foreign service and men who recently have been discharged frantically are seeking suitable homes for their families. They appeal to the Red Cross for aid and the home-service unit of that organization has been working steadily in an effort to accommodate them.

"But we have reached the point where nothing else can be done, it seems," Mrs. Schiffer explains.

The Red Cross is not the only organization to whom the veterans are appealing. Real estate dealers are bombarded with requests for homes. Veterans are finding themselves in a position of having to buy property, if it is available, whether or not they can afford it.

"Our troubles come from both sides of the fence," Mrs. Schiffer said. "We get requests for aid both from veterans' families who are being evicted due to sale of property and from those who have been forced to buy property, only to find it difficult to evict the tenants. And in many cases the tenants also are veterans' families."

VET COMPLAINS

The Journal received a letter Saturday from a veteran who has seen combat service both in the Pacific and European theaters of operation. As he puts it:

"I returned to the United States (after 4½ years in the Army) on September 21, and expected to find a comfortable home. Far from it. All there was available were two furnished rooms; up to date we have had several cold days. We have had no heat nor a heating stove which had been promised us."

This obviously disgruntled veteran is seeking a four-room house.

Red Objective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Daily Mirror, of New York, of October 16, 1945. It throws some light on Communistic coordination to destroy America.

RED OBJECTIVE

The strategy of communism has been so clearly demonstrated here in recent days that there should remain no doubt in any American's mind of its final purpose.

That purpose is revolution.

The subjugation of private property, the abolition of individual rights and freedom, and the substitution for these of a dictatorship as absolute as that of Stalin's in Russia—those are the brazen objectives.

Red-tainted Harry Bridges and the Red-splashed maritime unions, following the familiar tactics of the Communists to confuse, divide, and take over, moved in on the New York dock strike, which itself was instigated by the left-wing elements within the International Longshoremen's Association.

Bridges came 3,000 miles from California with his offer of "moral, political, and financial support" for the rebel strikers, who had already paralized the world's greatest port and blasted the home-by-Christmas hopes of thousands of United States servicemen in Europe.

Bridges is both of West Coast International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union. With him in his fight for east coast power are five other powerful CIO organizations, including the National Maritime Union, headed by Joseph Curran.

Curran and his NMU have never wavered a hair from the Communist party line. When Russia was Nazi Germany's partner in aggression, the NMU denounced the cause of the Western Allies as an "imperialist war." But when Hitler attacked Russia then, and only then, did the Allied war become a holy crusade.

It is significant that Curran is now in Moscow where Sunday night he hailed "the great and wise leadership of Comrade Stalin," endorsed a Russian idea for an American-Soviet Trade Committee, and pledged that "the CIO will always work hand-in-hand with Soviet trade-unions."

It is significant, too, that Communist-led longshoremen are on strike in England at exactly the same time that a similar stubborn strike progresses here with Communist provocation.

One of the first aims of world revolutionary communism, as expounded by Marx and Lenin, is to gain control of vital transportation.

No one willing to face the facts can doubt that this struggle for control is at the bottom of the present strike in New York or that communism versus American democracy is the basic issue.

At the precise moment that the wildcat strike is petering out, with thousands of men returning to work under the leadership of Joseph P. Ryan, militant anti-Communist and president of the International Longshoremen's Association—at that moment Bridges and the Red-dominated unions leap into the picture.

Mr. Ryan, we are told, has his faults. One criticism of him is that he got himself elected for life to the $20,000-a-year job of ILA president.

In his long career, however, he has fought like an American to protect his men and his country against the encroachments of communism.

But communism, for many years the recipient of political favor—and favors—from those whose sworn duty it should be to fight it with all their strength, is resurgent, openly out again to destroy our form of government.

And there is nowhere in our national political life any public man with guts enough and patriotism enough, apparently, to cut the issue clear and stand up in the defense of America against this imported, invading philosophy of defeat, frustration, degradation and slavery.

What Is Mr. Truman Trying To Hide?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of October 27, 1945:

WHAT IS MR. TRUMAN TRYING TO HIDE?

President Truman has given the New Deal majority of the Pearl Harbor investigating committee the power to suppress incriminating evidence against his party and its wartime leader, Mr. Roosevelt. Mr. Truman has signed an Executive order providing that witnesses and records may be subpenaed only by majority vote of the committee members. Since there are six Democrats and only four Republicans, another whitewash is inevitable.

In taking this indefensible action Mr. Truman resorted to his wartime powers as custodian of secret Government records and as Commander in Chief whose permission is needed to question Army and Navy personnel still on duty. Although the war has been over for 2½ months, Mr. Truman has refused to issue a proclamation terminating the national emergency. His order yesterday indicates one reason why he insists on clinging to his wartime powers. Under them he can frustrate any effective action to develop the truth about his predecessor's culpability in sacrificing the fleet and 3,000 lives to his desire for war. To allow the evidence to become public knowledge might well arouse such public outrage as to wreck Mr. Truman's party and his personal prospects.

Mr. Truman's order is the more outrageous in that it was issued directly after the administration had been defeated in the House when it attempted, by legislation, to impose the same sort of gag which he has now achieved by Executive decree. His party was compelled to withdraw a bill which would have punished anyone transmitting information obtained from coded messages—either our own or those of any other government—with 10 years' imprisonment and a fine of $10,000. The Republicans could block that, but they could not prevent Mr. Truman from reviving his predecessor's favorite role as "commander in chief."

In fastening the muzzle on witnesses and locking up the secret records, Mr. Truman has abandoned the last pretense that he is a disinterested leader of all the people and has frankly acknowledged that he is a party politician. When he was campaigning for Vice President he made the statement: "I'm an organization Democrat. A statesman is only a dead politician. I never want to be a statesman." We are now obliged to take the description at face value.

There already have been two whitewashes of administration responsibility for the events of December 7, 1941. The Roberts Commission, appointed by the White House, was told to look somewhere else than toward Washington in determining the guilt for the disaster. The Army and Navy boards authorized to conduct new inquiries by Congress last year were allowed a somewhat greater latitude and displayed more courage. It was too much to expect that they would inquire into the actions of Mr. Roosevelt and his Secretaries of War and Navy, who received the reports and decided on the disposition of them, but the investigators did possess sufficient independence to criticize former Secretary of State Hull, General Marshall, the Army Chief of Staff, and Admiral Stark, former Chief of Naval Operations.

Mr. Roosevelt, with the support of Secretary of War Stimson and Secretary of the Navy Forrestal, pigeonholed the reports for a full year and, when they finally were made public, Mr. Stimson gratuitously stated that the findings relative to Mr. Hull were "uncalled for and not within the scope of their [the Army Board's] proper inquiry." It was clear that Mr. Stimson wanted that scope restricted so that no fingers would be pointed at his associates in Mr. Roosevelt's official family. If such lese majesty were permitted who knows but that somebody would have the effrontery to start pointing at him?

In his defense of General Marshall from the Army Board's criticism, Mr. Stimson had the support of President Truman, who expressed "confidence in the skill, energy, and efficiency of all our war leaders." Mr. Truman, however, himself was not wholly disinterested. During the 1944 campaign he had written a magazine article slandering the reputation of the Hawaiian commanders, General Short and Admiral Kimmel, who were nominated as scapegoats within a week of the disaster by the late Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox, and who were subsequently pilloried (but, until this day, denied a hearing) by the Roberts Commission and the Army and Navy Boards. After the release of the reports of these two boards, Mr. Truman was asked if he wanted to recant some of his harsher charges against Kimmel and Short, but he refused to make an apology or correction beyond saying that he was mistaken in his statement that the two commanders had not been on speaking terms.

Now, with 52 pages of the Army and Navy reports still suppressed on the pretext that they concern the national security of a country no longer at war, the public is to be presented with a new and more complete whitewash of responsibility than any of those which had preceded it. The investigation this time frankly is entrusted to a majority of New Deal party politicians, under the leadership of the majority leader, Senator BARKLEY. It will be able to squelch any attempt to bring out embarrassing evidence.

Mr. Truman and his henchmen can continue to withhold from the people the 52 pages of suppressed evidence. They can hide the Japanese code messages which were intercepted and decoded before Pearl Harbor and which gave unmistakable evidence of approaching attack.

Did Mr. Roosevelt and his Cabinet know the attack was to be made at Pearl Harbor and keep this information from Kimmel and Short? Mr. Truman's action indicates they did.

Understanding the Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

UNDERSTANDING THE ATOMIC BOMB

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Present public discussion of the atomic bomb is confusing the American people. Such confusion is dangerous. Yet the average citizen cannot hope to discover the true situation by himself. Where public men differ so widely whom is the citizen to trust?

There are two quite irreconcilable theses about what the bomb means.

The first, as expressed by Dr. Vannevar Bush, Director of the Office of Research and Development, holds that "the atomic bomb differs in magnitude but not in kind" from existing weapons. It is just vastly more powerful, requiring new and correspondingly powerful defense controls."

This is the view of Secretary of the Navy Forrestal and of General Marshall. It has been expressed by General Groves, military head of the group that built the bomb. It inspires the reassuring statement that "adequate defense" can or will be found. The sort of legislation President Truman recommended to Congress seems to show that he has been converted to this view.

Partisans are extremely active. Recently a major general informed an influential Senator that the atomic bomb did not "save a million American lives" (as the Administration has stated) because the Japs were already beaten by orthodox methods. Another "reassuring" statement is Americans could defy atomic bombs in enemy hands if they would, at the cost of $15,000,000,000 annually for the next 20 years, disperse their key industries and bury their arsenals. Our present cities it appears, should be replaced by new and smaller one-dimensional towns 30 miles long and less than a mile wide.

Radical change in the national defense is unnecessary. Surely the future of the bomb can be trusted to the men who so brilliantly won the last war. The average citizen does not need to be anxious. There are no radical political conclusions to be drawn.

Unhappily, there are other voices. They come from the scientists who accomplished the miracle of building the bomb. What do these scientists say?

First, they deny to any but nuclear physicists like themselves the right to judge the potentialities of atomics. General Groves, they say quietly, is a civil engineer, Vannevar Bush an electrical engineer, George Marshall a general, Secretary Forrestal a banker. If the people want the facts, let them listen to the few score Americans who know most.

These scientists speak like this:

The atomic bomb is not another weapon like the others. It is not just another bomb. It is totally different. The explosive possibilities of TNT are chemically limited and essentially like the fire in your grate or the metabolism within your body. The energy of the atomic bomb is not chemical but cosmic. It is something that heretofore has been wielded by God alone. It is the creative force that shaped the stars, that makes and unmakes suns. It could destroy creation.

They say, further, that bombs will soon be made 20 to a thousand times more powerful than those which atomized Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Against such force there can be no adequate defense. Counter missiles are impractical. Dispersion can lessen but cannot prevent frightful destruction and slaughter. A sudden attack might bring even a powerful country to its knees in 2 hours. Reprisal, if possible, is the only possibility.

They say all competent industrial peoples will soon be making atomic bombs, unless prevented. The only remedy is to prevent the use of the bomb by anyone. The only solution is world government to enforce peace under law.

So speak the men who built the bomb.

Who are right, the military men or the scientists? We citizens do not know. The American Congress does not know. But it is up to Congress to find out. The answer is far too momentous to be left to any individual, be he the President of the United States.

Here is one way Congress could properly go about it. Let the House of Representatives immediately establish with the Senate a joint committee. Let this committee invite to Washington spokesmen of the scientific groups that built the bomb and other nuclear physicists along with such industrialists, engineers, and military people as may care to testify. Let the committee lay before those men in writing all the questions which any Member of either House may care to have answered, not the secret of the bomb but its implications. Let the witnesses answer in writing, collectively or individually. Let the committee study these answers and then summon contradictory witnesses to appear at secret hearings to amplify and explain their reason for disagreement. Let the committee then commit its findings and conclusions to a secret report. And, finally, let the committee transmit its recommendations concerning the care and disposal of the bomb to the two Houses of Congress for appropriate legislation.

Finally, let the committee be sure to tell the people such of its conclusions as can be made public without danger to the United States.

Where Are the Ships?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Stars and Stripes of October 20, 1945:

THE B BAG—BLOW IT OUT HERE

WHERE ARE THE SHIPS?

Can the current, critical shipping "shortage" be blamed on the transfer to the British of the *Queen Elizabeth* and the *Aquitania*, on dock strikes in the United States, and on storms in the Atlantic?

Or, is redeployment delayed because the War Department has failed to utilize all of America's mammoth merchant marine in the priority I job of getting soldiers home; because it has miscalculated shipping needs; because it has failed to act aggressively in meeting those needs; because it has failed to order freighters converted to troopships; because it has not pressed into service idle ships; because it has not enlisted the aid of the world's greatest navy in redeployment; because in general it has been neglectful of its most important job since VJ-day?

Are the ship transfers reasons for the month delay—at least—now promised us in redeployment from the ETO? Or are they just excuses?

The best case we have seen stated thus far tending to prove the latter, was in a letter submitted to the European edition of the New York Herald Tribune by T/3 William C. Craig, Jr., and T/4 T. S. Hyland. It said:

"All right, whose fault is the latest redeployment crisis?

"1. At the war's end the United States had 5,000 merchant ships (source: Time Magazine, October 15). Using only 3,000 of these converted to carry troops, these 3,000 could have taken every soldier in the ETO home in one trip. Naturally, this would be too much to expect, but it shows the possibilities.

"2. When the United States canceled lend-lease on August 21, the British stated that they would have to withdraw their Queens, as they were badly needed to repatriate their own and Canadian troops.

"3. On October 13, the British withdrew only one Queen and the *Aquitania*. The United States was allowed to keep one Queen for the rest of the year. And the German *Europa* is now ready to replace the *Aquitania*.

"4. If the United States had used only 600 of its own ships, roughly 10 percent of the available total, making only one trip per month, they could have returned every GI in Europe since VE-day. This would leave more than enough ships for (a) the Pacific redeployment and (b) vital commerce and relief.

"5. Operable United States ships are today rusting idly in United States harbors (source of fact: Time magazine, Oct. 15, p. 27. A photograph shows five good new ships laid up in a single small port, Mobile). There is no shortage of shipping. There is a surplus.

"6. More than enough time has passed since either (a) VE-day or (b) cancellation of lend-lease to convert countless freighters into transports. Nobody can plead (a) lack of time or (b) lack of materials or manpower as excuses. Shipyards have undergone terrific cutbacks.

"7. Army spokesmen now blame the latest redeployment crisis on (a) loss of the British ships, (b) storms in the Atlantic and the English Channel, (c) strikes in the United States. These explanations seem flimsy afterthoughts providentially provided to cover up negligence and poor planning.

"It is outrageous to suggest that redeployment has been slowed up by turning over ships to the British in exchange for use of the *Queen Mary*. We have plenty of ships to turn over without taking any out of service.

"High Army and War Department officials have just talked their way out of one crisis over congressional, civilian, and GI indignation concerning redeployment and discharges. And now now another crisis—with no excuse whatever. It is a tragedy to the whole Nation that top Army planners are not wise enough to realize that the peace-time future of the Army depends on its performance during the post-VJ interval.

"When our armies were triumphant on both sides of the globe, any of us thought that perhaps, after all, the professional 'big-brass hats' (General Eisenhower's phrase) were shrewd and competent men. But since VE and VJ, millions of GIs and more millions of civilians have returned to their former deep mistrust of the military mind. They had won our trust, then threw it away in an outbreak of poor planning, chicken, bad faith, confusion and ineptness. The result of civilian mistrust of military authorities may well be a smaller peacetime Army, reduced Army budgets, no postwar training, etc., thus affecting, perhaps tragically, the future history of the American Nation."

Eloquent as are Sergeants Craig and Hyland, however, it would not be fair to the War Department to accept their argument as fact without hearing what the official Army answer is to their seven points.

Thus far, there has been no explanation satisfactory to soldiers in this theater of the

shipping shortage. But maybe there is such an explanation.

It is impossible for us in the ETO directly to ask General Marshall or the War Department's redeployment branch or G-3 or the War Shipping Administration what the explanation is.

All that we can do is ask that some one put the questions to the War Department for us and that, in any case, newspapermen in Washington seek to find the full answers to them.

We ask, too, that in any investigation the answers be examined thoroughly and checked carefully, that the profusion and confusion of figures under which the War Department has thus far snowed the soldiers and the public be avoided, and that especial effort be devoted to an attempt to find, even at this late date, some means to correct any mistakes that may have been made, and to get the eligible soldiers home and out of the Army.

(Thirty-eight signatures, the Stars and Stripes editorial staff.)

The Country Is Becoming Class Conscious

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call attention to a recent article by William Stuart Howe, of Somerville, Mass. Mr. Howe is a constituent of mine, a well-known publicist, trained both in local government and in international diplomacy. He is a keen student of affairs, a prolific and brilliant writer, and his weekly articles in various newspapers in New England are read and enjoyed by a wide circle of readers. The article is as follows:

FULL-EMPLOYMENT BILL A MONSTROSITY

The advocates of the so-called full employment bill are asserting that the Government should guarantee a job to everyone willing and able to work and that this so-called right to work should be considered just as fundamental as the right of free speech, free exercise of religion, etc. Nobody has contradicted this, the same as no one as yet has offered more than perfunctory opposition to the bill, for fear, apparently, that any criticism will be construed as against the desirability of full employment. Yet the so-called right to work is a fallacy and the full-employment bill, as now drawn, a monstrosity.

GOVERNMENT'S DUTY IS TO ALL GROUPS

The right of free speech gives a man the right to say what he wishes, but it does not mean that someone will write his speeches for him. Freedom of religion enables us to worship God as we please but does not build up churches for that purpose if our particular parish cannot afford same. Everyone now has the right to work, but that is very different from saying that the Government is obligated to find and provide work. If it is the duty of the Government to assure jobs at a living wage, it is equally the duty of the Government to guarantee the employer a profit sufficient on which to live, the farmer a regular and liberal income, the investor who depends on interests and dividends a regular and satisfactory return, the lawyer and doctor regular professional fees, the landlord a regular rent sufficient to maintain his property and give him a fair return. We are all members of the country, doing our best in our several ways to earn a living, and we should all have equal treatment.

The answer is, of course, that we are rapidly becoming a class-conscious country. The reason the Government insists on maintaining rent control but cares nothing about the landlords' return is because there are 20 renters to 1 landlord. The reason it is proposed to guarantee jobs and wages but not prices and profits is because there are 15 times as many workers as there are employers. The reason nobody thinks about the owners of stocks and bonds is because it is assumed that these are the wealthy classes, although there really are large numbers of elderly people absolutely dependent on this class of income for their subsistence. The all-important consideration in this country now is votes and the criterion of proposed legislation is not its soundness for the country as a whole but the size of the groups it will attract. The only hope for minority elements to secure justice is where they are very large and well organized. Labor unions, for example, constitute a minority group but one so numerous and aggressive that it seems to hold the balance of power and be more potent than the even larger unorganized group of workers. The farmers are very articulate and consequently they have a farm bloc in Congress which is an effective spokesman, but they also are a minority.

SUBSERVIENCE TO POPULAR BELIEFS EXTENDS TO COMMENTATORS

This subservience to what is popular extends into many fields. Commentators and columnists, for example, are very much affected. The commentator usually depends on a sponsor. The sponsor will only employ him if public reaction to his comments is favorable. The commentator knows this favorable reaction will not be received if he takes a strong stand against something which seems popular because of its title or propaganda enveloping it—such as the full-employment bill. Consequently, the commentator is all for it and his tendency is usually to go along with the group in power. Just think over the number of commentators who take a strongly divergent line and you will find they are almost nonexistent. Yet many of them are intelligent men and must know the stuff they are handing out is neither just nor sound.

CLASS LINES EMBITTERED AS RESULT OF NEW DEAL

As for the politicians, they know only too well on which side their bread is buttered. The New Deal, of course, played to the masses. This tendency is as old as history, but it was the New Deal which not only bowed to it but actually favored it, accelerated it, and made it prime political technique. The New Deal candidates built up the myth that they were the champions of the poor, the oppressed, the virtuous, and the many, as opposed to the privileged, the rich, the greedy, the reactionary, and the few. Before the New Deal, the easy transition between classes existing in this country afforded a strong resistance to demagogic tendencies. As a result of the New Deal, class lines have become hardened, more distinct, and embittered.

NEW-DEAL POLICIES DETRIMENTAL TO ALL CLASSES

Yet all this is killing the goose which lays the golden eggs even though the process is complicated and difficult for people to see. If rents are controlled in such a way that owners cannot build and receive a decent return, if wage policies are enforced and burdens put upon employers so that it becomes much easier and just as profitable to work for someone else, then owners will not build, employers will not employ, and the Government itself must eventually do the building, the employing, and the investing. This, of course, leads straight to more and more collectivism, and the ever-growing spending program pushes us along in the same direction. Eventually (and this is something, perhaps, which labor-union leaders particularly do not realize) not only the professional, investing, and employing classes but the unhappy, overburdened, and disorganized middle class will throw in the sponge and say that if we must be ruled and regimented, it is better to have this by an authoritarian administration than by and for the benefit of a special class. An all-powerful Government at least would put some of the favored groups in their places very rapidly, and the elements at present unorganized might well receive fairer treatment.

I suppose these thoughts may cause me to be labeled as Fascist, Tory, reactionary, and defender of entrenched greed. These terms are certainly not correct, but, even if they were, the words I have written are true.

Can There Be Freedom From Fear and Freedom From Want?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Orange Daily News of October 23, 1945:

CAN THERE BE FREEDOM FROM FEAR AND FREEDOM FROM WANT

A nation, like an individual, is prone to be long on promises and short on the performance thereof. We like to paint the picture in roseate colors. Like a candidate for office we love to tell of the wonderful things we are going to accomplish for a long-suffering public, only to discover belatedly that the human element must be reckoned with, and that the impossible is difficult of accomplishment.

In the early days of the war we were boldly promised freedom from fear and freedom from want. It sounded great. And anyway, why not?

Came the surrender of Germany and a few months later the downfall of Japan. The picture brightened up, and quite naturally so. The world was at last free of those two hobgoblins who upset our waking haurs and disturbed our slumbers. With fear and want banished from a turbulent world we could truly lead the life of the fabled Riley.

And what happened? In the closing days of the war with Japan in steps a new gadget that fills us with terror while pondering its implications—the atomic bomb. Its discovery, and the havoc it wrought on Japanese cities, has brought more fear into the world than any other single incident of history. Even America now fears what might happen should Russia come into possession of the secret of this new death-dealing power. So freedom from fear seems to be just another dream gone with the winds of atomic energy.

And what about freedom from want? Reports from England tell us that the shipping industry strikes have put an end, for the time being at least, to the importation of food supplies so necessary to keep England from starvation this winter. Press dispatches predict dire consequences for the people of Continental Europe because of food shortages. General MacArthur reports that thousands of Japanese will perish this winter from starvation. Conditions in China and India are worse than usual, and that is saying a good deal.

So, the question naturally arises: Can we promise a stricken world freedom from fear

and freedom from want until we have mastered the laws of nature, and until we can control the minds, the emotions, and the follies of mankind?

Stop Drafting Essential Farm Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, in spite of our continued efforts, the military authorities are still muddling along with their demobilization policies. Several outstanding injustices have occurred which I believe should be speedily corrected either by the military authorities themselves or by immediate legislative action. A letter I received from one of the servicemen in my district who has served in Europe and was then sent to the Pacific before the end of the war with Japan clearly reports one of the unfair instances. The other concerns the continued evasion of the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act.

Our President has asked for funds and food to aid the starving peoples of the war-torn countries. To produce this food we need farmers. If the Tydings amendment was followed to the letter of the law, there would not be the indiscriminate drafting of the young men needed so badly to raise our crops.

I am dropping into the hopper today a bill to stop this drafting for military service our essential farm youth.

In regard to the unfairness of the military's demobilization plans where pre-Pearl Harbor fathers are concerned, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the following excerpts I have taken from one of the many letters I have received from a serviceman. It points out a condition that should be corrected immediately in all fairness to a group of veterans who served in one of the theaters of war and was then transferred to another and is now doing occupation duty.

The letter follows:

You have been very kind in answering the letters which I have written to you. In each of them, the subject of which was the unfairness of retaining pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, who are middle aged, in service, you stated that the voluntary enlistment bill will return men to their families quickly. I shall try to give you a serviceman's opinion made after a calm analysis.

The men in this theater who are reenlisting consist of 95 percent of the following type: Men who have 6 or 7 months or less than a year's service, with perhaps a month in the Pacific theater. Under this plan they receive priority over all other returnees to the States for their furlough. They fully expected to be here for a year, but now they are being sent home after only 2 or 3 weeks overseas. There are probably 200,000 of these men who will reenlist and be given priority on return, thereby holding up for 1 month more men who have been overseas for a year to 3 years. We came here direct from ETO after the war was over. Is that fair?

In the above respect this system is as unfair as the point system which gives no credit for age nor enough for pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. I would be very interested in hearing why Congress has ceased all investigations of demobilization and why all efforts to release fathers, whose wives and children are suffering needlessly, were terminated abruptly. Was it because of the War Department's pretty speeches as to their efficiency? If that is the reason, all servicemen, or 95 percent of them, will tell you that they are in favor of investigations, and also even those who have no children or are not married will agree that pre-Pearl Harbor fathers with long-established homes should be returned to those homes where they are needed badly. Don't get the impression that your civilian soldiers like the point system or that they had anything to do with its preparation.

My principal gripe is no age consideration nor father consideration. But all servicemen gripe about the simulated transportation bottleneck. What do you think on this question? If war had made it necessary to move a half million men a month from or to here would it not have been done? Every available means of water and air travel would have been used. And it's just as necessary to move men home. Why not do it?

Here It Is!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently condemned bureaucracy. I shall continue to condemn it as un-American. It is an encroachment upon our American liberties, and an undermining of American principles of government.

Before the war, we witnessed the New Deal President advocating planned economy. It was an economy planned by his bureaus to meet what he termed emergencies. The New Dealers reach up into the clouds and grab a new emergency excuse for everything that comes along. Emergency bureaus were created on the slightest provocations.

Then, after planned economy had utterly failed and we openly got into World War II, emergency bureaus were set up on every hand to control our almost every activity in life. Although hostilities have ceased, the President has not yet declared by proclamation that the war is over, and most of the ante-bellum emergency bureaus of the planned economy program continue to function and practically all of these so-called war emergency bureaus are still operating, at the expense of the taxpayers.

Many of these bureaus were created by Executive order of the President and can and should be abolished by Executive order of the President. They can be put out of existence by the mere stroke of his pen, as it were. The President has declared that he is in favor of abolishing many of these useless bureaus, but recent actions of the executive branch of Government indicate that his intentions are to shift the functions of these temporary bureaus into the permanent Department of Government headed by his Cabinet members.

Worse than all and as evidence that the present administration does not intend to get rid of these obnoxious bureaus but intends to continue their functions in newly created bureaus and new set-ups in the permanent Departments of Government, we find a shifting of the personnel from one place to another, instead of dismissing them from service. This is mere camouflage and subterfuge. It is but a device to deceive the people.

Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of the following letter dated October 26, 1945, on the stationery of the Civilian Production Administration, Washington, D. C.:

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCHWABE: In a WPB release dated October 12, 1945, an announcement was made that the War Production Board as such would cease to exist on November 3. A new temporary agency has been created to carry on the remaining essential activities of the War Production Board. This new agency will be known as Civilian Production Administration.

The press release outlined the proposed functions of the new CPA and a break-down of the various bureaus to be established and the personnel that will administer the new agency.

The House Liaison Office will be continued in the new organization to assist Members of Congress as they have in the past. This office is available to serve you and your staff. Please feel free to call upon Mr. W. K. Chapman regarding your problems. (Phone Capitol switchboard, extension 335 or 1096.)

Sincerely yours,

J. D. SMALL,
Administrator.

Here it is. The old War Production Board will be no more, but the Civilian Production Administration will take its place. This is a mere change in name. It is the old bureau operating under a new name. The War Production Board operated during the war, and although the President has not declared the war at an end, he has set up a new bureau to perform the same functions in peacetime.

I call your attention to the statement in the above letter that this is a "new temporary agency to carry on the remaining essential activities of the War Production Board." This is the same old gag. It is called a new temporary agency, but you will note that it is to carry on the activities of the War Production Board, and is to establish various bureaus, and so forth.

Do not be fooled for one moment. This is not a mere temporary agency. Too many people have recently been transferred from other bureaus to the War Production Board, with the advice and tacit understanding that its functions are to be permanent or to continue for a long period of time. Likewise, contracts for office space in cities scattered all over the United States recently have been sought for periods of 5 years, without including the customary 30-day cancellation clause. We have been told that it would be necessary to continue the functions and personnel of the WPB for many years to come.

The American people will not appreciate this kind of deception. They can

begin now to understand the fact that they are being led down the same path that Stalin, Hitler, and Mussolini led their respective peoples under their planned economy schemes, with promises to give the people happiness and plenty. Our Nation has endured, and our people have prospered and been happy without planned economy and without bureaus. Red-blooded Americans cannot be happy and free under a system of planned economy and bureaucracy. The inevitable result of a planned economy is totalitarianism in one form or another.

King Ibn-Saud's Letter to President Roosevelt and the President's Reply to the King

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, because of the widespread comment which the exchange of letters between President Roosevelt and King ibn-Saud, of Saudi Arabia, has created and because of the numerous efforts of different people to read into the correspondence either more or less than it actually says, I am inserting in the RECORD at this time the complete text of both letters just as they were released to the public by Secretary of State Byrnes. The letters speak for themselves.

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the text of these letters was not made available to the public at the time they were exchanged between the Executive of the United States and Saudi Arabia. Much less misunderstanding would have eventuated from such a course of candor. When our Chief Executive exchanges correspondence with the executives of other sovereign states on matters of public business which are not concerned with our national security such letters should not be made the property of private files.

The release of such correspondence, posthumously, creates understandable concern over discrepancies between the spoken statements and the written commitments of one of the correspondents and the result is likely to make more rather than less difficult the settlement of an already highly perplexing and prodigious problem.

If nothing else constructive accrues from this exchange of correspondence and its belated release to the public, Mr. Speaker, I hope it results in the use of a policy in the future wherein we shall have less secrecy in foreign affairs and fewer covenants and secret commitments by correspondence which are not made a part of the public record.

KING IBN-SAUD'S LETTER TO PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

MARCH 10, 1945.

To His Excellency Mr. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States of America:

YOUR EXCELLENCY: This is indeed a happy occasion for us to join with you in rejoicing at the triumph of those principles in defense of which war was declared and to remind those great personalities in whose hands, after God, the fate of the world order rests, of a right which has existed unquestioned since the dawn of history.

This right men now seek to destroy by injustice unparalleled and unequaled in history. Such is the right of the Arabs in Palestine, which the spokesmen of Jewish Zionism wish to scorn and abolish by the use of various forms of lying propaganda, invented, concealed, and employed by them throughout the world.

They have acted unjustly and are making hostile preparations against the Arabs, some of which are known, although much remains undetected. They are preparing to create a form of nazi-fascism within sight and hearing of the democracies and in the midst of the Arab countries, as well as in their very heart and in the heart of the East, which has proved itself loyal to the Allied cause in these critical times.

RIGHT TO HOMELAND

All people have the natural right to live in their homeland, a right guaranteed to them by natural law established by the principles of humanity which the Allies have proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter and on numerous other occasions.

The Arabs have a natural right in Palestine which needs no explanation. We have on a separate occasion mentioned to Your Excellency, as we have many times to the British Government, that the Arabs have inhabited Palestine since the beginning of history and that they have throughout the ages been its masters and enjoyed an overwhelming numerical superiority.

We would now make a brief reference to Palestine's history, ancient and modern, up to the present day, to make it clear that Zionist claims in Palestine are not based on historical facts.

The earliest recorded history of Palestine begins in the year 3500 B. C., its first inhabitants being the Canaanites, an Arab tribe which emigrated from the Arab peninsula and had its first abode in the lowlands, hence the name Canaanites. In 2000 B. C. a section of the Jews under the leadership of the Prophet Abraham emigrated from Iraq (Ur of the Chaldees), settled in Palestine and then immigrated because of famine into Egypt where they were delivered into bondage by the Pharaohs.

The Jews remained scattered there until their delivery from exile by the Prophet Moses, who brought them back to the land of Canaan by the southeastern route, either in the time of Rameses II, i. e. 1250 B. C., or his son, Munfitah, 1225 B. C.

If we accept the text of the Bible, we find that the conqueror of Palestine was Joshua, the son of Nun, who crossed with his army and captured the city of Jericho from the Canaanites, with great cruelty and barbarity: witness his words to his army:

"Burn ye all that is in the city and slay with the edge of the sword both man and woman, young and old, and ox and sheep, and burn the city with fire and all that is therein." Joshua, chapter 7, verses 21 to 24.

Thereafter the Jews split up into two kingdoms. One, the Kingdom of the Israelites with its capital Samaria (Nablus), lasted 250 years and then fell into the hands of Shalmaneser, King of the Assyrians, in the year 722 B. C., and was led into captivity. The other, the Kingdom of Judah, with its capital Jerusalem, lasted 130 years after the Kingdom of Israel had perished.

It was later destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, who burned down the city and the temple with fire, and led the people into captivity to Babylon in the year 580 B. C.

The captivity in Babylon lasted 70 years, and then the Jews returned to Palestine by order of Cyrus, King of the Persians.

The Greek conquest followed in 332 B. C., under the command of Alexander the Macedonian, their rule continuing in Palestine for a period of 272 years.

The Roman conquest took place next in the year 63 B. C., under the command of Pompey, their rule lasting in Palestine for 700 years.

In the year A. D. 637 the Arabs occupied Palestine, and their rule lasted continuously for 880 years.

The orders of the Caliph to the conqueror were: "You shall not act treacherously, dishonestly, commit any excess or mutilation, kill any child or old man; cut or burn down palms or fruit trees, kill any sheep, cow or camel, and shall leave alone those whom you find devoting themselves to worship in their cells." This was related by Ibn-al-Atheer, the famous historian.

Palestine then passed under the rule of the Turks in A. D. 1517, during the reign of Sultan Saleem the First, and their rule lasted for 400 years. The Arabs were the inhabitants and participated with the Turks in the government and administration of the country. It was then occupied by the British who are still there.

This history of Palestine, an Arab country, shows that the Arabs were its first inhabitants and that they dwelt there for a period of 3,500 years before Christ and have remained there since Christ until the present day.

They ruled it alone or with the Turks for a period of about 1,300 years, whereas the disjointed reign of the Jews did not exceed 380 confused and sporadic years.

No Jewish rule has existed in Palestine since 332 B. C. nor until the British forces entered Palestine in 1918, i. e., for 2,200 years there have been few Jews there and they have had no influence. They numbered not more than 80,000 when the British entered Palestine, and lived comfortably, happily, and prosperously in that country with the original inhabitants, the Arabs.

The Jews were merely aliens who had come to Palestine at intervals and had then been turned out over 2,000 years ago.

The permanent rights of the Arabs in Palestine rest on the following:

(1) The right to dwell there. This they have done since the year 3500 B. C. without ever leaving the country.

(2) The natural right of life.

(3) The existence therein of the Holy Land.

(4) The Arabs are not aliens in Palestine and there is no intention to bring any of them from other parts of the world to settle there.

The historical claims of the Jews is, however, a fallacy. As already mentioned, their brief and sporadic rule gives them no right to claim that they own the country, for to occupy a country and then leave it entitles no nation to claim and demand ownership thereof. The history of the world is full of such examples.

The solution of the problem of the persecuted Jews in the world differs from the fictitious problem of Zionism. For to provide homes for the scattered Jews is something in which the whole world can cooperate, and here Palestine has borne more than its full share. But to bring these scattered people, put them in countries already occupied, and do away with the original inhabitants is an act unparalleled in human history.

We state frankly and plainly that to help Zionism in Palestine not only means to endanger Palestine but all neighboring countries.

The Zionists have given clear evidence of their intentions in Palestine and in all neighboring countries. They have organized dangerous secret military formations. It would thus be a mistake to say that this was the action of a group of their extremists and that it had met with the disapproval of their assemblies and committees.

We declare that the actions of the Zionists inside and outside Palestine are based on a program agreed upon and approved of by world Jewry.

These people began their vile work by wronging the government that had treated them kindly and sheltered them, namely, the British Government. Their assemblies declared war on Britain and organized dangerous military formations, which at present hold in Palestine all the arms and military equipment they require.

Their members have carried out various attacks of which the most shocking was the attack on the outstanding figure, so kind and charitable toward all men and with the greatest sympathy for persecuted Jewry, Lord Moyne.

LAYS TERROR TO ALL JEWS

The proof that all Jews aided and abetted their vile deed is to be seen in the demonstrations and efforts made by Jews everywhere, demanding a light sentence for the criminals in order to encourage others to do the same.

This, then, is the way they behave with the government which has treated them so kindly. What would be the position if they were able to realize their objects and make Palestine entirely their own country, in which and near which they could do as they pleased.

If the matter were left to the Arabs and these aggressors it might perhaps be easy, but they are protected by the British Government, the friends of the Arabs. The Zionists did not respect the sanctity of this protection, but plotted mischief, beginning first with Britain and threatening the Arabs after Britain with similar and more dangerous plots.

Thus, if the Allied Governments, whose friendship the Arabs are aware of, wish to see the fires of war break out and bloodshed between Arabs and Jews, their support of the Zionists will surely lead to this result. What we and the Arab countries fear from the Zionists are:

(1) That they will carry out a series of massacres as between themselves and the Arabs.

(2) That the Zionists will be one of the main causes of dissension between the Arabs and the Allies. The latest proof of this is the case of the two Jews who killed Lord Moyne in Egypt. Had the Jews been able to hide the criminals, a dispute would have occurred between the British Government and Egypt.

(3) That the ambitions of the Jews are not confined to Palestine alone. The preparations they have made show that they intend to take hostile action against neighboring Arab countries.

(4) Supposing that the Jews obtain their independence somewhere in Palestine, what is to prevent them from coming to an agreement with any power that may be hostile to the Allies and to the Arabs? As it is, they have begun taking hostile action against Britain while under her protection and mercy.

NO BASIS IN HISTORY

Such factors should no doubt be taken into consideration in regard to the establishment of peace in the world when the problem of Palestine is discussed. Not only is the gathering of Jews in Palestine based on no historical argument nor on any natural right, and is in fact absolutely unjust, but it constitutes at the same time a danger to peace, to the Arabs and to the Middle East.

The crux of the matter is that the formation of a Jewish state in Palestine will be a deadly blow to the Arabs and a constant threat to peace, for disturbed conditions are bound to prevail between the Jews and the Arabs, and if the patience of the latter is one day exhausted and they despair of their future then they will be obliged to defend themselves and future generations against this aggression. No doubt the Allies, who are working to uphold peace and respect for men's rights, are aware of this. We have no doubt that they are dissatisfied with this uneasy situation which threatens peace in the Middle East.

We did not wish to bother Your Excellency or your ministers with this matter during the present titanic struggle in which you are engaged. Confident that the Allies will treat the Arabs fairly, however, we would have preferred the Arabs to forbear until the end of the war had it not been for the provocative and offensive acts committed by the Zionists who, regardless of war conditions and the preoccupation of the Allies, seek to bring every form of pressure to bear on them to adopt a policy which is inconsistent with the principles of right and justice which the Allies have proclaimed.

That is why we wished to explain the true rights of the Arabs in Palestine so as to refute the flimsy arguments of the Zionist party, counter their aggressive tactics, and set out the facts in order that the Allies may fully understand the rights of the Arabs in their country, the country of their fathers and forefathers.

The Jews should not be permitted to exploit the forebearance of the Arabs or their desire to avoid any embarrassment to the Allies, to obtain concessions to which they are not entitled.

All we ask is that the Allies should fully realize the rights of the Arabs and for the present prevent the Jews going ahead in any new matter which may be considered a threat to the Arabs and to the future of every Arab Nation, in order that they, the Arabs, may be assured of justice and equity in their lands.

With highest respects,

Your friend,

ABDUL AZIZ AL SAUD.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S ANSWER TO KING IBN SAUD'S LETTER

APRIL 5, 1945.

His Majesty ABDUL AZIZ BIN ABDUR RAHMAN AL FAISAL AL SAUD,

King of Saudi Arabia, Ryadh:

GREAT AND GOOD FRIEND: I have received the communication which Your Majesty sent me, under date of March 10, 1945, in which you refer to the question of Palestine and to the continuing interest of the Arabs in current developments affecting that country.

I am gratified that Your Majesty took this occasion to bring your views on this question to my attention and I have given the most careful attention to the statements which you make in your letter. I am also mindful of the memorable conversation which we had not so long ago and in the course of which I had an opportunity to obtain so vivid an impression of Your Majesty's sentiments on this question.

Your Majesty will recall that on previous occasions I communicated to you the attitude of the American Government toward Palestine and made clear our desire that no decision be taken with respect to the basic situation in that country without full consultation with both Arabs and Jews.

Your Majesty will also doubtless recall that during our recent conversation I assured you that I would take no action, in my capacity as Chief of the executive branch of this Government, which might prove hostile to the Arab people.

It gives me pleasure to renew to Your Majesty the assurances which you have previously received regarding the attitude of my Government and my own, as Chief Executive, with regard to the question of Palestine and to inform you that the policy of this Government in this respect is unchanged.

I desire also at this time to send you my best wishes for Your Majesty's continued good health and for the welfare of your people.

Your good friend,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

UNRRA Appropriations and Future United States Participation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Republican Congressional Food Study Committee report to the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Republican leader, House of Representatives, October 29, 1945:

In view of the fact that Congress will soon be asked to appropriate additional funds for UNRRA, officially known as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and that a large proportion of these funds if appropriated will be used to purchase food, the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee has examined the program and performance of UNRRA and herewith presents for your information its findings and recommendations on that subject.

It has not been easy to arrive at a factual analysis of UNRRA's effectiveness. Press reports from abroad have been contradictory and too often colored by the author's personal prejudices. Statements issued by those in this country with some knowledge of UNRRA's activities likewise have too frequently reflected only the individual's desire to justify a position either for or against UNRRA. Press representatives have not been given free access to all the countries in which UNRRA operates and the details of relief operations within those countries, including the ultimate disposition of relief supplies, have been clothed in many instances with secrecy. These factors, together with the physical reality of the great distance from Washington at which UNRRA activities are carried out and the large number of nations involved have made accurate reporting difficult.

In spite of the difficulties involved, however, the committee believes that it has obtained as accurate and factual a report on UNRRA's operations as can be had without actually visiting, as a committee, the countries where relief is being dispensed. The committee has secured its information from official UNRRA reports; from UNRRA officials, including Roy Hendrickson, Deputy Director; from first-hand statements of members of the press and others who have witnessed UNRRA operations abroad; and from members of this committee who have been in Europe during recent months, including Representatives CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, of Massachusetts, CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas, WALT HORAN, of Washington, and BARTEL J. JONKMAN, of Michigan.

UNRRA operating funds are contributed by those of the 47 member nations which have not been invaded by the enemy. The contribution requested for 1945 was an amount equal to 1 percent of each nation's income for the year ending June 30, 1943. The total for all nations was $1,866,116,241, and of this amount $1,268,750,254 had been made available by September 15, 1945. The United States share was $1,343,000,000, of which $550,000,000 has not yet been made available to UNRRA.

Additional funds: The United States is being asked now to appropriate the $550,000,000 to complete its contribution for 1945 and, according to statements of UNRRA officials, will soon be asked to make a 1946 contribution of an additional $1,350,000,000 as its proportionate share of next year's operating expenses. Although these requests will be presented separately, they are, in fact, por-

tions of a continuing operation and are inseparable as to subject matter. They are therefore treated jointly by your committee in submitting this report and recommendations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. UNRRA should be permitted to finish the job in Europe.

There is nothing in UNRRA's record to inspire confidence in that organization. On the contrary, the record is one of inefficiency, political intrigue, mismanagement, and downright poor administration. In response to widespread criticism, there has been some improvement in the past few months—but not enough to prevent some Congressmen recently returned from Europe from expressing the belief that the organization should, even now, be abandoned and the job of European relief turned over to a more effective organization.

Other things being equal, your committee would agree with those who believe we should do away with UNRRA and make a fresh start. Unfortunately, however, we do not have a free choice. Winter is almost upon us—winter that will bring misery, starvation, and pestilence to millions of human beings in Europe. In spite of its shortcomings, UNRRA's pipe lines are now filled—its organization is in existence. Food, clothing, medical supplies, the tools of rehabilitation, are being delivered to the beneficiary governments. If safeguards such as are proposed later in this report are adopted, a reasonable proportion of such supplies will reach those for whom they are intended.

Neither the Red Cross, the military, nor any other existing organization of which this committee is aware is prepared to step in and take over this job. There is no time to create a new organization. Relief of human misery, not administrative efficiency, is the goal before us.

We believe, therefore, that UNRRA should be continued to do the relief job in Europe this winter—and that it should receive the wholehearted support of this Government and the people of the United States in improving its administrative and operating effectiveness and accomplishing its humane purposes.

2. The $550,000,000 remaining to complete the current contribution of the United States toward UNRRA's operating expenses should be made available immediately.

This is a national obligation. It is unthinkable that the United States should now default on the commitments it has made to UNRRA and which UNRRA in turn has made, in reliance upon us, to the people of the liberated countries of Europe, and the hundreds of thousands of displaced persons now homeless and penniless and without any means of helping themselves.

UNRRA's funds are almost exhausted. The $550,000,000 to which the United States is committed should be made available without delay.

3. The United States should contribute its proportionate share of any additional amount found reasonably necessary to fulfill amply UNRRA's obligations in Europe this winter.

The $550,000,000 remaining of our original contribution will not be adequate to carry on relief activities in Europe throughout the coming winter. The original allocations were regarded as the 1945 contributions to UNRRA's operations and that organization has announced its intention of requesting another $1,350,000,000 from the United States for 1946 operations, and proportionate contributions from other participating nations.

We believe that whatever amount is needed should be made available without stint. Continuation of relief through this critical winter and next spring is more than a matter of good faith. It is a question of basic humanity and of completing the objectives for which we have fought.

Furthermore, our own security and self-interest will be best served by pitching in now to relieve the desperate plight of those people who were lately our allies. The unleashing of the atomic bomb has placed an obligation upon this nation—the awful seriousness of which we are just now beginning fully to realize—to prevent that dreadful power ever being used in warfare again. The atomic bomb cannot be successfully outlawed, suppressed, or monopolized.

We can prevent its use in warfare again only by building a world in which there will be no war. The seeds of peace do not thrive in an environment of hunger, disillusionment, and disease. Everything we can do, therefore, to alleviate suffering in Europe this winter will be a sound investment in peace for the world, security for ourselves, and control of the atomic bomb in the only way it can be controlled—by removing the desire to make war.

4. UNRRA should present a budget for 1946 operations in Europe.

The United States should contribute promptly and generously whatever amount may be needed as its share of completing the relief job in Europe, and UNRRA should be instructed now to prepare a budget on such a basis. The amount required should not be anywhere near the $1,350,000,000 presently contemplated as the 1046 contribution of the United States, for two reasons: (1) the 1946 UNRRA program now includes operations in the Orient, which we believe should be dealt with separately; (2) UNRRA operations are not carried out on a strict calendar year basis and part of the $550,000,000 still due on our 1946 contribution will remain available for 1946 operations in Europe.

UNRRA is prohibited by its own directives from obligating any funds not actually available on hand or on request. Its purchases of supplies in this hemisphere for European delivery are made 1 to 6 months prior to the date of shipment, and average about 2 months. Thus, supplies being purchased now will generally be shipped in December and UNRRA's shipment program for the balance of the calendar year is virtually completed without the $550,000,000 still to be made available by the United States. It is reasonable to assume, therefore, that a major portion of the supplies purchased with that money will be scheduled for shipment during the first months of 1946, and that the additional contributions required to complete this season's operations in Europe might be considerably less than a calendar-year calculation would indicate.

While the United States should contribute generously every cent that is required of it for this purpose, it should insist on UNRRA operations being conducted on a sound, businesslike basis and should safeguard both its own investment and the welfare of those for whom relief is intended by attaching several specific stipulations to expenditure after December 31, 1945, of any funds contributed by the United States, including the amount still to be paid on the 1945 contribution.

5. European relief operations should end with next year's harvest.

This coming winter is the crucial period in Europe. Need for outside assistance will probably carry over into next spring and summer. But by the time of the next harvest—assuming normal growing conditions—the need for relief shipments should have ended.

The expressed purpose of UNRRA is not merely to provide emergency relief, soup-kitchen style, but to assist the recipient nations to become self-supporting. Observers in Europe have frequently encountered the idea in the liberated countries that the flow of UNRRA supplies might continue indefinitely.

We believe that all concerned will benefit thereby if recipient countries in Europe are put on notice now that there will be no UNRRA shipments of foodstuffs after August 31, 1946, nor of rehabilitation materials after October 30, 1946, and that the UNRRA operation in Europe will be dissolved at that time. Our appropriations should make this stipulation.

6. The press should have free access to UNRRA recipient nations.

There has been far too much secrecy surrounding relief operations. UNRRA is extending its operations into the Byelorussian Republic and the Ukranian S. S. R. Little is known about conditions in these countries and it is unlikely that restrictions on coverage by the press which now handicap correspondents in many recipient countries will be any less severe in these areas.

Billion-dollar relief and rehabilitation is a subject in which those who contribute are legitimately interested. Such activities should be conducted in the full light of day and the American public has no reason to be satisfied with the censored reports of Government propagandists or the diplomatically worded accounts of unknown UNRRA observers.

We want to know where relief supplies are going and what is being done with them and we believe we have the right to learn this from the uncensored dispatches of our own press representatives in whom we have confidence. We believe, therefore, that accredited press and radio representatives of the member nations of UNRRA must be granted access to all countries where UNRRA supplies or materials are deliverd, and complete freedom to observe and report on distribution and utilization of such supplies, and that our contribution should be made with this stipulation.

7. Markings showing the nation of origin should not be removed from UNRRA supplies.

There are well-authenticated reports of markings on UNRRA supplies indicating that they originated in the United States being removed or obliterated before such goods were sold or distributed.

8. All trade agreements, full information on exports and imports, and periodic financial statements should be made available to UNRRA, particularly showing funds accruing from sale of UNRRA goods.

Lack of adequate foreign exchange is one of the basic qualifications for assistance from UNRRA. It is inconceivable that UNRRA should be able to plan a program of food or industrial imports if it does not have full information as to what foodstuffs or other materials are being imported or exported under secret agreements by the country it is trying to assist. There can be little doubt that such secret agreements are now in effect.

As to accounting for UNRRA supplies, it must be remembered that UNRRA has no control or supervision whatever over disposal of its relief materials. UNRRA supplies are turned over to the government of the beneficiary country and become the property of such government at the time they cross the border or are landed at a port of that nation. Thereafter UNRRA has authority only to observe the manner in which such supplies are disposed of and to protest if it finds that there is discrimination in the use to which the materials are put.

Some UNRRA supplies are distributed free of charge to persons needing relief, but others—probably the greater part of all provided—are sold by the recipient government either through normal trade channels or in any other way it may see fit. It is this feature, most of all, which has given rise to the frequently repeated charge that UNRRA is not primarily a relief operation but a political instrument for bolstering the authority and improving the position of the governments now in control in the various nations receiving supplies.

Be this as it may, it is an established fact that no accounting as such is required

by UNRRA on the sale or other distribution of its supplies. The recipient government must agree to utilize all such income to pay for other relief supplies or services, including the cost of operating the UNRRA mission in the country, but UNRRA has apparently been satisfied if returns from sale of goods have in fact been sufficient to support its mission, and has not asked—or at least has not obtained—any other accounting of such funds.

Equally serious as this slip-shod method of bookkeeping is the charge that UNRRA supplies have actually been diverted from their civilian-relief purpose after becoming the property of the respective recipient governments. There are well-substantiated reports of UNRRA supplies being taken and used by foreign military units stationed in beneficiary countries and some indication that such supplies have actually been shipped out of beneficiary countries for sale elsewhere.

9. Procurement of trucks should be speeded up and all motor-transport equipment should remain the property of UNRRA until its operations are completed.

Trucks are probably the most important single item of relief in most of the European countries in which UNRRA operates. Transportation equipment and facilities were so completely destroyed by the war that they simply no longer exist and transportation in many parts of Europe is still almost entirely paralyzed.

Members of this committee were told repeatedly in Europe of adequate crops of foodstuffs within 200 miles of starving cities which could not be used because there was no means of bringing them in. Growing weather has been favorable in most of Europe this year with the exception of Greece and Italy. In spite of abundant local production, however, we are faced with the anomaly of food actually going unused in some places while people a relatively short distance away are hungry because the food cannot be transported to them. The same situation, of course, inhibits adequate distribution of UNRRA supplies sent into the country.

The committee believes that UNRRA officials are aware of the importance of truck transportation to achievement of the relief program but it believes that the system under which trucks are employed could be drastically improved. UNRRA officials were unable to give the committee, for example, any clear idea of the arrangements which have been made for adequate maintenance and repair of trucks used in their operations. These trucks are surplus military vehicles and while they are presumably in good condition when turned over to UNRRA, any American knows that they must have constant expert maintenance and repair or they will soon be immobilized, and that maintenance of fleets of hundreds or thousands of such trucks cannot be carried on successfully except on an organized technically controlled basis.

Trucks, like all other UNRRA supplies, become the property of the recipient government at the moment they enter the country. They are driven up to the border, title is transferred to the recipient government, native drivers take them away, and UNRRA thereafter has neither supervision over the manner in which they are used nor any responsibility for their continued operation.

We believe UNRRA should have both such supervision and responsibility. Motor transport delivered to recipient nations under the UNRRA program should remain the property of UNRRA until its program in that country has been completed; UNRRA should have direct authority and control over its disposition and utilization, full responsibility for its maintenance and repair, and authority to allocate all fuel and lubricants supplied by the Administration. Any appropriations made hereafter to UNRRA should contain this stipulation.

Such an arrangement will place control and responsibility where it belongs and should contribute materially to the cause of actual relief of suffering by greatly increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of operations. Rigid supervision by UNRRA should set at rest the unsavory stories of misuse and disappearance of UNRRA trucks and give UNRRA the authority to correct such conditions if they are proved to exist.

The committee believes, too, that if relief is to be provided adequately in Europe this winter the rate at which trucks are being transferred to UNRRA from military surpluses in Europe must be considerably accelerated. UNRRA plans to acquire 62,034 trucks for European use. These are now being delivered at a rate reported to be about 600 per day, but 200 of these are from Canadian and British sources. All but 10,460 of the trucks will come from American sources—chiefly Army surplus—and at a delivery rate of 400 per day it will take several months to accomplish the transfer. The job of speeding up these deliveries would seem to be one to be tackled jointly by UNRRA and the Army.

Incidentally, the committee respectfully suggests that UNRRA officials and the War Department give some thought immediately to the possibility of using war veterans to service UNRRA transport equipment in beneficiary countries. It might be that soldiers no longer needed in Army transport units in Europe and still waiting for their return to this country would be willing to volunteer for employment as UNRRA mechanics or maintenance men if given an Army furlough for that purpose or an overseas discharge.

10. UNRRA must not be made the dumping ground for unwanted American surpluses.

A considerable portion of the supplies used by UNRRA can be procured from war and agricultural surpluses of the United States and UNRRA officials have shown a willingness to do this. But there is a limit to which this policy should be carried.

UNRRA directives require that 90 percent of the amount contributed by any nation shall be spent for supplies purchased from that nation. The United States provides 72 percent of UNRRA's total operating budget. It is easy to see, therefore that—in view of the great proportion of UNRRA goods which must be purchased from the United States—undue insistence by our Government officials on UNRRA taking surpluses off their hands, whether they fit into the UNRRA plan of operation or not, would seriously embarrass UNRRA's plans and impede its relief program.

If such surpluses as we have happen to fit into UNRRA's dietary and relief schedule, they should be used for that purpose; if they don't, pressure should not be exerted on UNRRA officials to take over these surpluses just for the sake of helping one of our Government agencies out of a tight situation.

The committee feels that attention should be called to this situation because of the unfortunate tendency manifested in several Government agencies in the past few weeks to regard UNRRA as a convenient dumping ground into which any embarrassing surplus with which an agency finds itself stuck can be quietly unloaded. This may make the agency's record look good on paper, but it will not contribute to the effectiveness of European relief.

Any surpluses on the hands of our governmental agencies have already been paid for once by the American taxpayer. If they are to be given away, there are places other than UNRRA where they may be more appropriately disposed of. UNRRA does not operate in France, Belgium, Holland, the United Kingdom, nor Russia proper. Rather than foisting off unwanted surpluses on UNRRA, they might rather be made available to some of these other countries.

11. Operations under the existing UNRRA set-up should be limited to Europe and a new organization established to conduct relief in the Orient.

China will be the scene of the largest single program of relief and rehabilitation to be undertaken. Relief operations in the Orient will be carried out almost entirely in China and the Philippines, with the Philippines as a natural center of distribution. These programs have as yet hardly been started. There is still time to establish them on a sounder basis than that on which relief in Europe is being conducted, and there seems to be little sense in turning these operations over to an organization which has indicated such doubtful effectiveness elsewhere.

It would seem to be the course of sound administration to make a fresh start in the Far East with an agency geared to the specific requirements of the China operation and unhampered by a background of political intrigue, poor administration, and questionable effectiveness, which is UNRRA's inheritance from its European operations.

It is respectfully suggested, therefore, that the United States enter into conversations with China and the Philippines leading to establishment of a mutually acceptable reorganization to take over at the earliest possible date whatever outside relief activity is required in the Far East.

Respectfully submitted.

THOMAS A. JENKINS,
Member of Congress,
Chairman.

HARRIS ELLSWORTH,
Member of Congress,
Secretary.

BARTEL J. JONKMAN,
Member of Congress,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Government Food Purchases.

Letter of Washington Representative of the National WCTU

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union and for the purpose of rectifying the grave injustice that has apparently been done them by the publication of a garbled version of a letter to the Washington Daily News, I am inserting the text of the letter as it went to the newspaper, showing the date:

AUGUST 20, 1945.

MR. CHARLES STEVENSON,
City Editor, the Washington Daily News,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As I am sure it cannot be the policy of your paper to publish irresponsible statements from persons having no connection with an organization as the statements of the organization, may I ask the courtesy of a correction of the statement which appeared in your publication of August 14 and was attributed to the WCTU? I am the only person in the city representing the National WCTU, and I was absent from the city on vacation at the time and have only had the statement called to my attention this morning. I have talked with Mrs. Coates, the president of the District of Columbia WCTU and its official spokesman, and have learned that she knows nothing about the statement and did not make it—which, of course, I knew, as the WCTU is not in the habit of making statements of that character.

We certainly should never be guilty of such an unkind and unjust aspersion on the men and women who represent the people of the United States in Congress. There are too many fine men and women here giving their all even until death in the effort to meet the harassing problems of our day both within and without the Nation.

There is too much alcohol circulating in Washington, but let us not forget it was Members of Congress who tried to stop appropriations for "entertainment" which they had reason to believe was largely made up of liquor.

Very truly,

ELIZABETH A. SMART,
Washington Representative,
National WCTU.

Doing Business With Nazis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, in the October issue of the magazine known as Prevent World War III, there appeared an editorial entitled "Black Lists," which contains provocative and challenging statements well worthy of study by my colleagues and the country.

Here it is:

BLACK LISTS

We are informed that the black list of German and pro-German firms in the Americas and in European neutral countries may be withdrawn in the near future.

This would be a dangerous development. The German war machine has been smashed, but now it appears that Nazi-indoctrinated and pro-German tradesmen in all corners of the world will be given an opportunity to keep the ideology of Pan-Germanism alive.

That is what happened after World War I. Britain made the original mistake of extending a helping hand to German industry. Then we followed suit. Germany took advantage of our errors and built the enormous war machine which launched World War II. The plan was carefully worked out by deceit, selfishness, and fraud, with characteristic German thoroughness, disregarding all morals and ethics. While constructing this war machine, the Germans were pleading good will, friendship, and poverty.

After 1919 the Germans carefully thought out their commercial attack. They openly advocated the breaking down of all business ethics; they relied upon trickery and circumvention to gain their end. They stopped at nothing, from the dumping of goods to crush competition, to false labels and the breaking of contracts. These are plain historical facts.

The dropping of the black-list would open the door wide for Germany to repeat. It would practically demonstrate to the entire world that the Chamberlain appeasement policies are still alive.

We must take a firm stand against such developments. They might possibly be in the interest of individual businessmen, but they are emphatically not in the interest of the American people and the other peoples of the United Nations. In order that the peaceful reconstruction of the world shall not be jeopardized, it is necessary for us to observe closely the economic and commercial steps taken by our allies.

If the German "trade ambassadors" are permitted to operate and to reaffirm their influence in the various countries, they will simply suck foreign exchange into Germany for the war chest of World War III.

We should not allow the healthy competition of American and British economic enterprises to founder in the storm of German deceit and treachery.

The Detroit Labor Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of a speech by Walter P. Reuther, UAW-CIO, vice president and director of the union's General Motors department, over the Mutual Broadcasting System Friday evening, October 26. Mr. Reuther's speech sets forth in detail the present labor situation in the Detroit area and contains much valuable information in regard to that subject.

The speech is as follows:

This discussion tonight is more than an argument between General Motors Corp. and the UAW-CIO. It is an argument as to which way America is going. Did the American people fight this war to go back to unemployment and insecurity, or did they fight to win their way forward to a better and more abundant life?

The war has proven that production is not our problem; our problem is consumption. How do we get the means of moving the good things of life from farm and factory to the store shelves, to the homes of America?

The American people know the answer. It is very simple. First, there must be jobs for every American able and willing to work. And, second, such jobs must provide the purchasing power to match our ability to produce.

Secretary of the Treasury Vinson has stated: "The American people are in the pleasant predicament of having to learn to live 50 percent better than they have ever lived before. Only the defeatist can scoff at the inescapable fact that we must build our economy on that basis."

We can learn to live 50 percent better, providing that we put the necessary purchasing power into the pockets of farmers, workers, white-collar and professional groups.

Private industry has the ability and the responsibility to make its contribution toward achieving this goal; and—if it is to survive—it must make the contribution now.

Only yesterday Government economists, after a careful study of the financial position of American industry, advised the President that industry can and must raise wages at least 24 percent without increasing prices as the key to winning the peace.

The facts in the current GM wage negotiations prove that General Motors Corp. can pay 30 percent higher wage rates without raising the price of cars one cent and still make record profits. General Motors can do more; it can make a three-way split among workers, consumers, and stockholders. Chevrolet car prices, we can prove, can be reduced at least $100 at the same time that wage rates are increased 30 percent; while net profits can be higher than any year in GM history.

The outcome of this case will affect the welfare of every American. It will decide whether we are really going to have prosperity, and if so, for whom and for how long. Will there be jobs enough to go around? Will wages and salaries be high enough to buy what our farms and factories can produce in such abundance—at a rate unsurpassed in the history of the world?

Now that we have won the war on the battle fronts, and our men are coming back, are we going to finish the job, or are we going to make a mess of it again—this time with 19,000,000 unemployed?

For example, are we going to take the advice of C. E. Wilson, president of General Motors, that the normal workweek be lengthened to 45 or 48 hours, thereby robbing additional millions of workers of jobs—including millions of veterans, now returning, eager for jobs and a fresh start?

Reconversion Director John Snyder has estimated 8,000,000 unemployed by spring. How long a line of unemployed does Mr. Wilson want?

Are we going to let ourselves be hypnotized by the gigantic lie—the lie that higher wages necessarily and inevitably mean higher costs and higher prices, when the whole secret of our great machine civilization is that more and more goods can be produced at lower and lower prices, with higher and higher wages being paid to insure a steadily rising market for the goods produced?

No domestic issue more directly affects every one of us at this moment than this basic question of wages, prices, and profits. Because the outcome of the GM wage negotiations affects all Americans, the public is entitled to know what goes on in these negotiations. The union has proposed public negotiations. The corporation has refused, preferring to meet behind closed doors. General Motors has stated that if and after a strike occurred, they would then be willing to agree to public negotiations. The union wants public negotiations now, so that the issues can be settled on the basis of facts and a strike averted.

The union has nothing to hide. We want all the cards on the table face up, so the public can see the true facts. We have stated repeatedly that the issue must be settled on the basis of economic facts, and not by the arbitrary use of economic power, either by management or by labor.

Now let me give you a few highlights from our negotiations thus far:

General Motors representatives have told us that prices and profits are—and I quote from the record—"none of your (our) damned business." We have been told that if we would forget about prices and profits, then we could get somewhere.

In other words, if we were to enter into a conspiracy against you, the American people, who are the consumers of General Motors products, we might get a wage increase that would then be made the excuse for charging you higher prices.

This proposal we flatly rejected. American labor will not be a party to jacking up prices. We say that the price line can and must be held. We do not propose to be paid off in the wooden nickels of inflation. We do not propose to eat the bitter bread of a new depression.

In rejecting the corporation's proposal, we made a counteroffer—a firm, fair offer that I want to repeat again tonight. We said that if General Motors could disprove our facts, hard economic facts taken from the corporation's own reports and from Government documents, and could show that it could not pay the 30-percent increase in wages without increasing prices, then we would cut our demand to whatever top figure could be paid without increasing prices. But, we added, unless and until our facts are disproved, we shall not concede one red cent.

The more than 325,000 GM workers represented by their union in these negotiations have built their wage demand for a 30-percent increase—without raising prices—on solid facts.

I can only give you a few of these facts tonight, but if you want more facts—and I hope you do—please write me in care of the UAW-CIO, Detroit, and I'll send you a copy of the economic brief we have presented to the General Motors Corporation.

Can General Motors pay a 30 percent wage increase, maintain 1942 prices, and still make a high return on its investment? Let's see what General Motors did in 1941, its last year of auto production.

In 1941 General Motors actually received more in profits before taxes for each man-hour worked than it paid out in wages. For every dollar a General Motor worker earned in wages for his family, he produced more than a dollar in profits for the corporation.

In the last 9 years, General Motors earnings have paid back the stockholders' investment in full and 45 percent in addition, a total of 145 percent after taxes.

Market surveys show a demand right now for 18,000,000 cars, a demand which cannot be met before 1952. Given this unlimited market, General Motors is left free to achieve capacity production and thus reap the enormous profits which come with maximum output.

Now for the answer to the big lie that higher wages mean higher costs and higher costs mean higher prices: From 1936 to 1941 General Motors wages increased more than twice as much as General Motors prices. Yet profits outstripped both wages and prices, jumping 61 percent. Why? Because volume of output increased 21 percent.

General Motors has predicted a 50-percent increase in postwar sales. GM profits at this greatly increased level of production will so greatly exceed prewar profits as to make possible a three-way split of these excess profits. GM can meet our 30-percent wage demand, can cut the price of its Chevrolet $100 f. o. b. Detroit, and still keep $105,000,000 more in profit after taxes than its average profit for the last 10 years of car production.

Last week the corporation announced that car production would hit a level of 72 percent above prewar—which means that profits will soar to unheard-of heights.

Mr. C. E. Wilson has told GM workers, whose average weekly take-home pay during the war was $56, now cut to $44 per week, that their wage demand is unreasonable. Look who's talking. Mr. Wilson made an average of $8,846 per week—and his take-home pay has not been cut. Is it not more important to the future welfare and prosperity of the Nation to put more dollars into the pockets of 325,000 GM workers who get $44 per week when they work, rather than into the hands of a few GM officials who already have more than they can spend?

More dollars in the pay envelopes of GM workers will keep moving across the store counters of this Nation, into the pockets of farmers, other manufacturers and workers. We want to buy more of the things all the rest of you grow and make, and we want you to buy the cars we make.

The GM profit figures we have cited make no allowance for the enormous advance in labor productivity due to improved methods and machines developed during war production. The Bureau of Labor Statistics tells us we may expect a sharp rise in output per man-hour during the next few years. Improved machines and technology mean greater output at lower cost per man-hour.

General Motors is one of the most efficient corporations in the world and GM workers earn every dollar they get and more. In negotiations this week I proposed to Mr. Anderson, whom you have just heard, that he and I go into a GM plant and work side by side so that he could learn for himself that GM workers do an honest day's work. Mr. Anderson declined my offer.

The production record of the GM workers is second to none in the Nation. They stayed at their jobs throughout war production, despite grievances and provocations. Despite the corporation attack on the union in full-page ads, Mr. C. E. Wilson admitted to the press last week that the work record of GM workers was 14 times better than the average for industry as a whole.

Three hundred and twenty-five thousand GM workers feel that their wage demands are just in terms of their own need and the welfare of the Nation.

The facts prove that General Motors can increase wage rates 30 percent without raising prices and still make substantial profits.

This is our story. We have laid the facts before the American public, with the aid of press and radio. It is up to General Motors to disprove our facts or pay the 30 percent.

Gen. Frank T. Hines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following speech which I delivered at a dinner given in honor of Gen. Frank T. Hines, at the Mayflower Hotel, on October 18, 1945:

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Toastmaster, I plead guilty to most of the charges preferred, and especially to the one that I seldom attend a dinner. However, the provocation has been rather great tonight for me to break over and change my future course in that respect.

I am reminded of an old fellow down at home who used to go park himself in the amen corner at church, listen to the preacher's sermon rather carefully, and pick it to pieces during the week while he and the minister were fishing or playing golf. One day the preacher decided to quote his text without reading it. He told where to find it and said, "It reads thus:

"The Lord fed 5 people on 5,000 loaves and 2,000 fishes."

His friend laughed, punched the man next to him and said, "I could have done that." The preacher heard him and became rather disturbed.

After the sermon, he buttonholed this fellow and said, "What was it that fool said to you when I gave out my text?" He said, "Fool nothing; do you know what you said? You said the Lord fed 5 people on 5,000 loaves and 2,000 fishes." The preacher almost went through the floor. He said, "That was a terrible mistake; but I'll correct it next Sunday. Just watch me get even with him."

So the next Sunday the old fellow was there waiting for him. The preacher wisely adjusted his glasses, reached over for his Bible, opened it, and read his text. It said, "The Lord fed 5,000 people on 5 loaves and 2 fishes." He closed his book, laid it down, looked at his friend, and said, "Could you have done that?" The fellow said, "Yes, I believe I could." "Well," the preacher said, "how would you have done it?" "Why," he said, "on what you had left over last Sunday." [Laughter.]

So what I see here tonight rather encourages me to say that this won't be the last time.

I just want to add one word to what the toastmaster said a while ago. He left you all out on a limb. He talked you to the end of the ceremonies here and then started you home. But I will give you a tip. One of my predecessors in Congress was probably one of the most witty individuals who ever served in the House of Representatives. He used to tell this one on himself. He said away back in the old prewar, pre-Ford, pre-Volstead days, when he was practicing law at home, they had a court one day and a couple of visiting lawyers met with him down at the only hotel in town and played poker until about 4 o'clock the next morning. He said there were no automobiles in those days and when he started home there was nobody on the street except him, and he said it was a good thing there wasn't anybody else, because it took about all the street for him to get home on.

He said that he eased off his shoes at the door and thought he would slip into bed without waking his wife up. He was just settling down and congratulating himself when his wife awoke, got about half awake. She had a little dog that was always running around over the house and jumping up on the bed, the sofas, and the chairs, and she thought he was that little dog. She reached over and put her hand on his head, shook him, and said, "Get out of here, Fido." He said, "You know, I just did have presence of mind enough to lick her hand." [Laughter].

You may need that tip before daylight.

I want to assure you that it is a sad pleasure for me to come here tonight under these circumstances to bid General Hines bood-by, after more than 20 years of service together in the most difficult work connected with this Government. In this connection, I want to say that I agree with Thomas Jefferson when he said that there are three questions to be asked of an applicant for public office: "Is he honest? Is he qualified? Is he faithful?" General Hines measures up to that standard. [Applause.]

I have no reason at all for any flattery. I am not a patronage politican. There is not a man on the pay roll of the Veterans' Administration who was placed there by my appointment. I have not tried to use it for my own interest, but have looked to the best interest of the veterans themselves. I was placed on the Veterans' Committee the day it was created, and for the last 15 years I have been its chairman. I know what it means. I know the hundreds of thousands of disabled men that General Hines has had to deal with, and I know that he is not only qualified, but I will say that no man in America is better qualified for the job than he is. [Applause.]

He has been faithful. In spite of all the abuse and criticism that has been heaped upon him, I can truthfully say that he stands out as one of the most conscientious public servants this Government has ever had. [Applause.]

His integrity has never been questioned by any honest, informed man. I repeat that: His integrity has never been questioned by any honest, informed man.

A few weeks ago there appeared a magazine article written by a man whom I consider a draft dodger. He said he was classified as a IV-A. I said, "What is that?" "Oh," he said, "that meant I was engaged in some essential work." I came to find out that he was out writing just such slanderous stuff as he published on the Veterans' Administration for home consumption, while your sons were fighting the battle of the Republic. When we brought his statements and his testimony in and investigated them, we found them to be not only conglomerations of falsehood and misrepresentations but often quotations from crazy men who didn't know what they were talking about.

Another one of these critics was a Communist, with a Communist record a yard long, with the Dies committee, and a longer one than that with the FBI. Yet that filthy stuff was published all over this country to disturb the fathers and mothers of the sons who were being taken care of by the Veterans' Administration.

The Veterans' Administration is the largest organization of its kind on earth. We have 94 hospitals. There is not another hospital organization in the world that compares with it. When these charges were first published I went myself time and time again to look into the conditions. I remember I slipped into one hospital when nobody was looking for me. They did not know who I was. I started in the storage room where they kept their food, and I went through the entire hospital. I had picked up the dietitian and the head nurse. They said, "We would like to know your name." I said, "My name is RANKIN." "Oh, my goodness," one of them said, "you are chairman of the Veterans' Committee, aren't you? Have you seen the manager here?" I said, "No; I'm looking at the hospital. I'll see the manager when I get through." [Laughter.]

I went on through the kitchen. I have been in enough kitchens to know when one is clean. I went on through the dining room and sat down and ate with them. I just picked up the plate next to me. I didn't let them bring me an extra one. I went through the wards, I went through the clinic; I examined the medical supplies. I made the best investigation I could, and I failed to find any of the horrible conditions these two propagandists described. I have gone through hospital after hospital, and I have yet to find any of the conditions that were publicized to the world in order to discredit the Veterans' Administration and to disturb the fathers and mothers of this country. I sent the members of my committee out on a similar expedition. They came back with the same report.

Occasionally, of course, they would find a man who was a misfit. We had some doctors shoved over onto the Veterans' Administration that we hoped to get rid of. And we would have got rid of them if General Hines had remained as head of the Veterans' Administration. Some of them the Army didn't want, and I don't blame them, and some of them didn't want to get into the Army, because they didn't want to get close to the firing line. So we have had them to contend with.

Yet with all that there is not a State insane hospital in a single State of this Union that begins to compare with any veterans' neuropsychiatric or mental hospital anywhere in the whole country. [Applause.]

Now, they told you that these veterans were abused. I know one fellow who said, "Here is one who will give us a story. He will tell us all about it." They called him in, and he said, "Yes, I will tell you. There are things going on here in this hospital that are terrible." He said, "I will tell you what they do. They don't let it out, but I know it, and since you have come to me I will tell you confidentially." He said, "They take patients in and give them hot baths. They strip them and put them down in the tub and turn the hot water on them and burn them to death. They keep them there until the are thoroughly cooked, and then they slice them up and serve them that night for supper."

They realized then that the poor fellow was hopelessly insane. Yet, stories from just such sources were published in those magazine articles and spread throughout the country.

I want to call your attention to the difference between a veterans' hospital and a State insane asylum. When a veteran becomes mentally deranged, he is sent to a veterans' hospital, where he is given the very best treatment, and when he comes out if he has recovered, he goes back into his usual avocation. I know numbers and numbers of them who are back today in their usual avocations, working and making an honest living, an honorable living, and are respected in the community. If they had gone to a State insane asylum, the chances are they would have been regarded for life as ex-inmates of an insane asylum, and there would have been an atmosphere of suspicion about them. So these men are being taken and rehabilitated and enabled to resume their usual avocations without any such stigma. Two and a half million ex-servicemen have passed through our veterans' hospitals since General Hines has been at the head of the Veterans' Administration, and just think how few cases of just criticism there have been. I doubt if there is another record of its kind in the world that will compare with it. So far as I know not a single person has ever said or inimated that a single dollar of Government money ever stuck to General Hinds' hands. [Applause.]

Yet when he took over he succeeded a man, as you know, who went to the penitentiary for stealing the medicine and the blankets provided for the disabled servicemen.

Criticisms have been made—and I don't say there are not some just criticisms, because these have been trying times to get doctors, nurses, and other employees—but you will find that those young men General Hines has helped to rehabilitate in every nook and corner of the United States will sing his praises long after he has gone out of his present position.

I am saying this because I have been more intimately associated with him, perhaps, than any other man in Congress, because I am chairman of the only committee in either House that deals exclusively with the Veterans of World War I and World War II, and that is the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. I have never seen the time when he was not more than willing to go on foot and out of his way to assist and serve the servicemen of this Nation.

I am probably taking up too much time, but I am simply telling you what is in my heart. General Hines' successor, General Bradley, came before our committee the other day and his difficulties began to appear, as Shakespeare says, "Not as single spies, but in battalions"; and when the going got a little tough, I said, "Now, remember, General, you have only been through a war up to now. You have a good deal to contend with from here on." [Laughter.]

General Bradley is a splendid general, a great general, a great man, and a great American, and he is assuming one of the most difficult jobs connected with this Government when he undertakes to fill the place now occupied by General Hines.

I am going to give him the same loyal support I have given General Hines, and do my best to help him succeed.

Let me say to our friend, the representative of Panama, who is with us tonight, that I envy you people in Panama. I admire your wonderful country and your wonderful climate, but I envy you because you are taking as our Ambassador to your country one of the ablest men in America, one of the finest men we have, and one of the most conscientious public servants I have ever known—General Frank T. Hines. [Applause.]

"An old man traveling on a lonely highway
Came at evening cold and gray
To a chasm deep and dark and wide
Through which there flowed a sullen tide.

"The old man crossed in the twilight dim
For the sullen stream had no fear for him,
But he turned when he had crossed to the other side,
And built a bridge to span the tide.

"'Old man,' said a fellow pilgrim near,
'You waste your strength in building here.
'You've crossed the chasm deep and wide
'Why build a bridge at eventide?'

"The builder lifted his old gray head,
'Good friend in the path I've trod,' he said,
'There follows after me today
'A youth whose feet must pass this way.

"'This chasm, which was naught to me
'To that fairhaired lad may a pitfall be.
'He too must cross in the twilight dim.
'Good friend, I'm building this bridge for him.'"

General Hines has built a bridge for these suffering veterans who came home from the last war and are coming home from this one.

They will never forget you, General Hines. [Applause.]

A Thought-Provoking Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from an Army lieutenant now serving in Bavaria. The letter contains a lot of food for thought, and I hope it will be widely read:

OCTOBER 10, 1945.

Hon. O. C. FISHER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: First, let me make clear who I am and my interest in writing to you. I am a long-time citizen of Uvalde, Uvalde County, Tex., and am currently commanding a line company of an engineer combat battalion located in southern Bavaria. Due to the facts that my point score is low, that my business opportunity in Uvalde is being lost to me because of my absence, that I have a wife I have not seen in over a year, and that I am a civilian at heart, I, like a few million others, am extremely anxious to get home and out of the Army. Because of these facts I feel the necessity of calling attention to one civilian soldier's attitude on certain current questions. I am sure the Congressman has studied all of these matters carefully, but as a member of the constituency it is my duty, as well as my privilege, to express my viewpoints to the duly elected Representative.

I am not at liberty to criticize the Army for many of the things that it has done that has indicated inefficiency and waste, but I am at liberty to say that now that the fighting is just over is no time to castigate and render impotent our Army. I believe we should leave no stone unturned to maintain peace in the world and I am heartily in favor of all men's efforts for peace, but I am certain in my own mind that in time there will again be war on the earth. The attitude of all Europeans that I have met is such that they do not regard war with the great distaste with which it is favored in Texas. We must never be misled to believe that all hatchets are buried and we are all good friends from now on. Treaties are made to be broken and whenever an advantage, real or fancied, can be gained all of our fine agreements will be forgotten. I believe that is the average European's way of thinking and we can prolong the period of peace only so long as we make it a decided disadvantage to disturb the peace. Therefore, occupation of conquered countries is vitally necessary and all other peoples must be made to understand we will tolerate no action threatening the peace. Force is the only language understood so we must maintain the force.

Emotionally, and I am no exception, most Americans are anxious to get away from everything that is reminiscent of war and to get all of our men back home; but we must not lose sight of the hard facts involved. I realize it is not the proper thing

to do these days, but our lawmakers must see the true situation and lead us away from the fatal mistake of losing all we have fought for. If the draft is necessary to maintain our Army, though if all the people knew the need for a large Army I doubt that it would be necessary, then the draft must be continued at all costs. The cost of war never can be equally distributed to all individuals but all eligible individuals should be given the opportunity to contribute at least a portion of their share, and the draft is one way of encouraging some of the more reluctant. All of us who have fought the enemy on the field of battle feel that it is now time for others who were not called upon for so great a contribution to step forward and carry some of the not so great burden.

Another matter that has given me considerable food for thought is the attitudes of Americans themselves toward the principles of democracy. In my numerous talks with soldiers from all parts of the country I have been amazed to find a very predominant leaning toward what by some definitions is socialism. A startling indifference to the privileges and obligations of democracy is found on every side. If such is a true picture, then the way of life that I hold dear and I am sure the Congressman holds dear is ebbing away. I do not know what can be done about such a condition, but some method should be used to arouse enough interest in our way of government to see that it is preserved. The disgraceful labor strikes now sweeping the country convince me that both capital and labor need a thorough indoctrination in the democratic principles of living laid down in the greatest of all books and the Constitution of the United States.

Personally, I have appreciated the manner in which the Congressman has represented the constituency, and for a continuation of such representation my support is always available.

All of my comments are my own and are in no way intended to have any connection to my position in the Army.

Sincerely yours,

_____,
First Lieutenant, CE.

American Policy on Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of memorandum submitted by the American Zionist Emergency Council to the State Department on the occasion of the meeting of Dr. Abba Hillel Silver and Dr. Stephen S. Wise with Secretary James F. Byrnes, October 23, 1945:

1. The exchange of correspondence between President Roosevelt and King ibn-Saud which has now been made public and the statement by the Secretary of State of October 18 raise issues of fundamental importance in regard to the implementation of American policy on Palestine. Viewed in the light of the unequivocal and firmly established policy of the American Government and people as expressed in a long series of public and authoritative acts and pronouncements, that statement and correspondence, it is submitted, call for immediate clarification.

2. In March 1919 President Wilson, who was directly associated with the issuance of the Balfour Declaration, stated that:

"The Allied Nations, with the fullest concurrence of our Government and people, are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish Commonwealth."

Every President since that date has given his support to the Jewish National Home objective. Most recently, in statements issued by President Roosevelt on October 15, 1944, and March 16, 1945, that is to say, almost contemporaneously with his correspondence with King ibn-Saud, the late President expressed his support for the establishment of Palestine as a Jewish Commonwealth. In addition to these pronouncements by the heads of the executive branch of the Government, the desires of the American people as to the policy to be pursued in Palestine have been repeatedly expressed in the clearest possible fashion.

On two occasions, in 1941 and 1945, a majority of the Members of both Houses of Congress joined in a declaration favoring the establishment of Palestine as a Jewish commonwealth. A similar declaration was made on July 4, 1945, by the governors of 40 out of the 48 States of the Union. Further, the legislatures of 33 States, representing 85 percent of the population of the United States, have recently gone on record in favor of the Zionist objective. In the summer of 1944 the national conventions of both major political parties adopted declarations favoring the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization and, in the words of the Democratic platform, "such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth." The late President Roosevelt, as well as President Truman, were elected on that platform. It must be recalled finally that our Government's support of the Jewish national home is recorded legislatively in two acts forming part of the supreme law of the land, namely, the joint resolution (No. 73) unanimously adopted in 1922 by the Sixty-seventh Congress of the United States; and the United States-British Convention on Palestine, ratified by the Senate on February 20, 1925, and proclaimed in December of that year.

3. The policy therefore to which our Government and people stand deeply committed is clear and unmistakable. Of this fact, however, neither the letter of President Roosevelt nor the statement of Secretary Byrnes take any cognizance whatever. It is true that in neither instance is the traditional American position in fact repudiated. Nevertheless, it is deeply disturbing that it should not have been found necessary to make affirmatively clear that American policy on Palestine has already been established by the public pronouncements of the Presidents of the United States and otherwise—a policy which is predicated upon the right of the Jewish people to rebuild their national home through free immigration and the close settlement of Jews on the land. That omission can only lead, and has already led, to serious doubts and misunderstandings.

It is not conceivable that the law of the land, the will of the American people, and the repeated pledges of the heads of our administration publicly made, should thus be disregarded in official correspondence. The issued raised by the publication of this correspondence cannot be ignored and places upon our Government the responsibility of indicating in clear and precise terms whether or not it abides by, and proposes to act in accordance with, the policy so long and firmly established.

4. President Roosevelt's letter refers to assurances previously given to King ibn-Saud regarding the attitude of the United States with respect to the question of Palestine. The exact nature of these assurances is not disclosed, but it is respectfully submitted that whatever their tenor, they would not be valid if inconsistent with the publicly stated objectives of American policy or with the terms of the Palestine Mandate.

5. At the same time, it is deeply to be regretted that President Roosevelt's letter, while assuring King ibn-Saud that no action would be taken by our Government that might prove hostile to the Arab people, failed to point out that the policy of the Jewish National Home, envisaging as it does free Jewish immigration into Palestine and the ultimate establishment there of a democratic commonwealth under the auspices of a Jewish majority, could not be conceived as hostile to the Arab people. The desire of the Jews to live in friendship and good neigborliness with the Arab countries and with the Arab inhabitants of Palestine is well known, and neither Jewish aspirations in Palestine nor the declared policy of this country in support thereof, nor yet the conduct of the Jewish people in Palestine resulting in great good to the Arabs can be construed as hostile to them.

6. The occasion will be taken separately to deal in detail with the contents of King ibn-Saud's letter and with the Arab claim to Palestine, a matter which had been considered fully by the Allied Nations in connection with the territorial settlements made at the end of World War I and the issuance of the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate for Palestine. It is doubly regrettable that the reply sent by President Roosevelt to that communication failed to repudiate its baseless attacks and its vilifications of the Jewish people. It is painful to observe that such calumnies as that the Arabs have reason to fear "a series of massacres" at the hands of the Zionists, that the latter "are preparing to create a form of Nazi-Fascism" and that it is the intention to "do away with" the inhabitants of Arab countries, should have been allowed to stand unchallenged by one who knew how false those statements are.

7. It is sufficient to say here with regard to King ibn-Saud's letter that the Arabs have neither legal nor moral title to the sovereignty over Palestine. While they conquered the country over 1,300 years ago, Arab rule ceased as early as 1071. Throughout the centuries the role of the Arabs in Palestine has not been creative but destructive. In the eroded, poverty-stricken and disease-ridden country which within the last few decades the Jewish people set out to reclaim, it was difficult to recognize the land of milk and honey described in the Bible. In the 20 years between the two World Wars the Jews have done much to repair the ravages of the previous 1300. They have conquered deserts and swamps, revived agriculture and industry and established in Palestine a sturdy, self-reliant community. The Pan-Arab claim to Palestine is an attempt to add yet another to the immense, but for the most part thinly populated and undeveloped territories of the independent Arab states. This expansionist appetite has recently manifected itself also in the demands put forward by the Arabs for Eritrea, the Sudan, and Cyrenaica.

The great mass of the people in the various Arab states are kept down in ignorance and fanaticism, in dirt and wretchedness by a ruling class which shows little or no interest in the improvement of their miserable lot. As regards the ethnic claims, about 75 percent of the Arabic-speaking people in Palestine today are themselves recent immigrants or the descendants of persons who emigrated to Palestine in comparatively recent times. If Palestine exists as a separate concept, it is because of its immemorial association with the Jews and Jewish history. At no time was there a Palestine Arab state. It was the Jewish people which produced in Palestine the civilization and religious culture which, along with that of Greece, molded the civilization and the spiritual life of the whole western world.

8. In general, it is desired to protest against a procedure which seems to accord a right to the various Arab states to be consulted in the affairs of Palestine. The right of our own Government as one of the principal Allied and Associated Powers in the First World War as well as by virtue of the United States-British convention above-mentioned, to participate in the future disposition of Palestine is obvious and unquestioned. The right of the Jewish people to be consulted is likewise clear and undeniable and is legally confirmed by the League of Nations mandate which, in recognizing the right of the Jewish people to reconstitute their national home in Palestine, authorized also the recognition of the Jewish Agency for Palestine as representing the interest of all Jews in the establishment of the national home. The Arab states are in this matter without legal standing of any kind and we submit that their attitude in recent years is certainly far from giving them a moral voice in this issue.

9. We feel constrained, at the same time, to make a frank statement of our views with regard to the course of action pursued by the executive branch of the Government and the State Department in particular, over a period of years. Despite the unbroken chain of pro-Zionist acts, promises, and pronouncements to which we have referred, the policy they express has not been translated into action. On the contrary, numerous acts and omissions have emboldened the Arab leaders to allege that the American Government was, in fact, withholding its support from the Zionist cause, and that the pronouncements made here from time to time were meant for home consumption. We have consistently disregarded these allegations as unwarranted aspersions upon the good faith and political integrity of our Government.

10. We are now compelled to review the situation in the light of the recent correspondence. We must recall that so far as we are aware, the Government took no effective action to protect the interests of the Jewish national home, at the time of the issuance of the British white paper in 1939, or to rectify that wrong in the years which followed. The Government did not energetically intervene even when opening the doors of Palestine became an urgent humanitarian necessity because of the wholesale slaughter of the Jews of Europe. It appears further that our Government failed to advise its representatives abroad, particularly in the Near East, that it was definitely committed to the policy of the Jewish national home and to instruct them to be guided accordingly. The State Department has on various occasions appointed to positions of importance in the Near East persons known as avowed opponents of this policy and has had to rely in turn upon reports and advices emanating from them. On two occasions the executive branch exerted its influence to prevent the adoption by Congress of a resolution reaffirming the traditional American policy on this subject. Above all, our Government has failed to utilize the fluid political conditions created by the war and the process of political reorientation and reorganization under way in the Near East, for the purpose of insuring the status of the Jewish national home in the context of its Near East policies.

11. On the other hand, our country has given generous support to Arab aspirations. It was among the first to recognize the independence of Syria and Lebanon. It has encouraged Arab States to make last-minute declarations of war against Germany on the eve of the San Francisco Conference, assuring them places of honor among the United Nations, irrespective of their war records. Nor has it withheld its support from the Arab League despite the fact that the League has declared its opposition to Jewish aspirations and has proclaimed the liquidation of the Jewish National Home as one of its major objectives.

12. The one gratifying positive act in relation to Palestine has been President Truman's recent request to Prime Minister Attlee, the outcome of which, however, is still uncertain. We take grateful note that the statement of Secretary Byrnes indicates that measures to facilitate immigration into Palestine of substantial numbers of the survivors of European Jewry should, and can be undertaken forthwith, and that such immigration does not affect the basic situation in Palestine. The basic situation is in fact that established by the Mandate, which calls for the facilitating of the immigration of Jews into Palestine and their close settlement on the land. We therefore earnestly hope that our Government will continue to press for the immediate admission of 100,000 Jews from Europe in line with President Truman's request. But the statement of the Secretary is silent regarding the attitude of the Government in relation to the basic situation. The only light which it sheds on that issue—which is the crux of the whole matter—is the statement that "it would be the policy of this Government not to reach final conclusions without a full consultation with Jewish and Arab leaders." This is a point of procedure rather than a definition of policy. Moreover, the statement indicates an intention to wait until any proposals emerge, rather than to act on its own initiative in conformity with established American policy.

13. The point has now been reached, at which ambiguity and delay are no longer feasible. Millions of American citizens, who have a strong moral and humanitarian interest in this problem, look to the Administration for immediate and forthright action, which will once and for all dispel any possible uncertainty regarding its present position and future intentions. We cannot believe that the menacing words of the spokesmen of countries which did not lift a finger in their own defense during the war and which were, indeed, either actively or passively hostile to the democracies, should be allowed to deflect our country from a just course of action. The request is made on behalf of masses of suffering humanity who cannot wait. It would be cruel to deny their last hope for individual and national rehabilitation; but it would be the very refinement of cruelty to keep them further in suspense, or to feed them with promises which turn to ashes in their mouth.

Compulsory Peacetime Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED BRADLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a recent broadcast on the subject of compulsory peacetime military training over radio stations WMAM, Marinette-Menominee; WDBC, Escanaba, and WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.:

SHALL WE HAVE COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING?

President Truman stirred up a mild hornets' nest down here in Washington with his speech to Congress last Tuesday advocating compulsory training of our youth between the ages of 17 and 20. Naturally, it is a very controversial subject and there is a great diversity of opinion down here as to the merits of his proposal as to the mechanics by which it will be worked out, if adopted by the Congress, and as to the results to be obtained therefrom. Naturally, Mr. Truman presented the most plausible arguments for his proposal but most Members are anxious to learn the reaction from the folks back home after the subject has jelled in their minds for some time and a more considered and thoughtful opinion reflected in correspondence with their Congressman. Hasty opinions are usually of doubtful value, but after the matter has been commented upon in the press and over the radio and possibly over various public forums of the air, it is likely that Members of Congress will receive considerable and varied opinions on the subject.

Certain it is that, to say the least, many Members of Congress—myself included—are not overenthusiastic on the President's program nor were we too much impressed by his speech. That was best illustrated by the fact that about the only applause the President received during the speech was when he referred to the splendid accomplishments of our armed forces in winning the past war.

It seemed to many of us that the President drew a very narrow line of distinction when he said that his proposed compulsory-training program was not conscription. If you will recall, he claimed that the difference was found in the fact that conscription means enrollment in the armed forces, whereas under his compulsory-training program the young men would not actually be in the armed forces but rather would be a citizen group in training. The fact remains, however, that those who are physically fit would be trained in Army camps; they would be in uniform; they would be away from home; they would be under Army discipline and instruction, and all of this would be done by compulsion. There would be no escaping the training program by anyone except those completely physically disabled. It seems to me that a rose by any other name would be just as sweet; likewise a dandelion by any other name would be just as bitter.

Now, I want to look backward into history a little bit. I remember when the Selective Service Act first came before the Congress—and, incidentally, I voted against it. At that time we were told exactly the same thing that Truman said last Tuesday namely, that these boys were going into training only—not getting ready to fight anyone, and that it was to be a 1-year proposition, at the end of which they would be free to return to their homes, farms, and work benches, and all after being presumed to be benefited by such training in exactly the same measure as the President proposed last Tuesday, namely, that they would understand how to use modern arms; that they would be benefited physically, morally, and intellectually as well, and that they would have an opportunity, perhaps, to learn a trade at Uncle Sam's expense. Well, we know what happened then.

At the end of the year President Roosevelt came back to Congress again and demanded that we forget our previous promises and that we not only keep these boys in the Army for further training, but then went on to say that if we break up the team, where would we be in the eventuality of war? Well, I voted against that extension, too, because I felt it was breaking faith with the boys and making liars out of Members of Congress. We now know in retrospect that what we needed then, just as we need right now, is more candor from the White House in letting the American people know what our foreign policy is; wherein the danger, if any, lies and into what dangers our foreign policy may be leading us. Let us look at the first point I have just made. A year after this

compulsory-training program goes into effect—if it does—we may well assume, because it is specifically stated in the Truman proposal that these boys will be trained in large units, that we will again see combat teams formed, and will we then be told that we dare not break up the various teams?

Furthermore, if I understand the matter correctly, these boys will not go into this training program in any large groups, but rather, as the President said himself, they will go into the training service on their eighteenth birthday, or whenever they have completed their high-school course, whichever comes the later; so that we can expect these boys to be moving into the training groups at spasmodic intervals, and it seems to me that it is going to take a cleverly devised mechanism to work out the system so that they will be activated to fit into the team at proper intervals. Now this brings up another point with reference to his delineation between compulsory training and conscription. His proposal provides that after these lads have received a year's training they will then be placed in a first-line reserve for a period of 6 years, subject to recall at any time for refresher training; and then in a secondary reserve to be called up to the colors later if it should become necessary through a selective-service system. Now to go back again.

If a class, let us say, should start next January and a large group formed, they will receive, according to the program, 8 weeks of what the Navy calls "boot training," and then they will have some special training and will end up with about 2 months of maneuvers. Presumably thus we will have completed a combat team of citizen soldiers. If this group should later be called upon to fight as a unit, how else is that going to be done unless the entire group is called up at once regardless of any selective-service program? If they are not called up as a group, then that puts the lie right on those who told us when they called for the extension of the Selective Service Act that it was absolutely imperative not to break up the teams. In short, the administration ought to keep their story straight down here in Washington.

Now let me go back to our foreign policy again for a few minutes. President Truman told us, as has been the custom of the White House for the past 13 years, that this was an emergency measure and the time to act was now. This prompts me to ask: Just what is the emergency? Who are we getting ready to fight? Surely it is not Germany or Japan—both not merely beaten to their knees but rather flat on their back. Surely it is not Britain nor France, both of which countries tell us they are flat broke and are over here with hands out-stretched for alms. Surely it is not China. Surely it is not Latin America. Can it be the only one major country left that Mr. Truman is afraid of? Can it be that we are preparing to fight Russia after all she has been through and is now herself over here seeking a cash loan of some $3,000,000,000 to say nothing of ships and other equipment? If that be our danger, why then are we debating whether or not to give her our atomic-bomb secret? Why did we some time ago send her a complete analysis of our naval-training program and of our naval tactics and strategy? I just want to know and I think it is up to President Truman to tell us just what enemies we are getting ready to fight, if any. And if we are not getting ready to fight again; why all the rush about the enactment of this legislation and why institute compulsory military training along the lines suggested by him at this time?

Are there not better alternatives open to us? To start with we are going to have in our Regular Army over 900,000 troops as armies of occupation or as garrisons for outlying possessions. I believe that we are safe in saying these garrisons will be more alert in the future than they were at Pearl Harbor; will be far better equipped with ordnance, munitions, and matériel, and I believe that our armies of occupation will be able to take care of themselves for a long time to come.

The Navy will have a nucleus of 500,000 men and this time our ships are not going to be cut up for scrap nor sunk as a result of some idealistic treaty.

We will have a huge merchant marine in reserve and in service.

Mr. Truman called for a greatly expanded National Guard and a trained Officer Reserve. With these two points I am strongly in accord. And we will, of course, be maintaining a relatively small but nevertheless highly mobile and effective regular Army in the continental United States. Those will be your first-line combat teams, organized to work together.

There is no intention of decreasing our scientific research into new discoveries both of weapons and munitions of war and, inasmuch as every war has demonstrated that when war actually starts there is a rapid improvement in both weapons and munitions and a discard of the older weapons, of what value is it then to train an 18-year-old boy on a 1945-model gun and have to retrain him again 5 or 10 or 15 years later on the newer models?

Would it not be better to greatly expand our Reserve Officers' Training Corps, both in the high schools and the colleges wherein those boys will not only get their basic training but as they are permitted to continue uninterrupted their school course they will continue to get more advanced military training. Then couple those training courses with two or three summer encampments for maneuvers at our larger military establishments or for advanced training and study in the latest weapons of the day; thus letting the youth improve his military knowledge more gradually and in line with the latest scientific and ordnance developments.

The President stressed the fact that once we have these young men trained we will have created in their minds—and in the minds of their parents—a very definite opposition to war and that it will thus serve to maintain our Nation at peace. My answer to that is, when has this Nation ever sought to be an aggressor nation or sought to provoke a war? As a matter of fact, it is doubtful if the peoples of any nation ever sought war, but as very definitely happened in this last war, it is their leaders who commit them into the struggle. Well do we recall the frequently uttered promises of the late President Roosevelt that our boys would not be sent to fight on foreign soil unless we were attacked. Following the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor there remained no possible course for the Congress but to declare war. Whether or not the attack on Pearl Harbor was deliberately provoked along the line of since repeated statements attributed to Mr. Winston Churchill will remain for historians to decide.

It is not improbable that the congressional investigating committee may uncover some damaging testimony to that effect. We can only wait and see. One thing is certain—that a definite slyly conceived attempt to muzzle that committee through the denial of any information that had ever been coded or decoded was smacked in the face by both parties in the House last Thursday, and the bill was withdrawn.

In conclusion, I want to make one more reference to our foreign policy. Some time before Pearl Harbor a statement was made on the floor of the House by Representative DAN REED, of New York, that it was primarily British and French capital that had created the Frankenstein monster, Adolf Hitler, and had paid for the rearmament of Germany making it a threat to world peace. Representative REED further charged that an agreement had been reached between the British, French, and Germans that a mock war would be staged in Europe to partition up the smaller countries of Europe and to preclude the spread of communism in those smaller European nations. Some time later, upon inquiry of a leading British statesman in this country, he told me that both charges were absolutely true and undeniable but, further, that we should not condemn Britain nor France for contributing to the cost of rearming Germany when we, ourselves, contributed more heavily than both countries combined. Therefore, I say to you, my friends, that in our foreign policy for the future we should be very careful and our State Department should certainly be ever in possession of the facts and make sure that American dollars do not again contribute toward the creation of another Frankenstein monster who would disturb the peace of the world. This can, this must be prevented by our own Government.

Well, the fact of the matter is that the House Military Affairs Committee will consider President Truman's proposal in hearings starting on November 8. Senator JOHNSON of Colorado, acting chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, has said that their committee would not consider the matter before January 15 next at which time it is hoped that the chairman of the committee, Senator THOMAS of Utah, will have recovered his health sufficiently to resume his congressional duties. The evidence introduced in those hearings will be intently watched by every Member of Congress. This is one of the most momentous proposals ever to have come before the Congress of the United States and it is one on which, in my opinion, we in Washington should have the most considered advice, recommendations, and council on the part of each and everyone of our constituents back home. I repeat—hasty, impetuous decisions are of little value. Considered opinions are extremely important at this time. Won't you please write me and give me your views.

In the best interest of our country, which I try to maintain uppermost in mind at all times—I am keeping an open mind on this subject because I want to cast my vote based upon the evidence submitted to the committee, based upon your opinions from back home—because it is your boys who will be called upon for training if the proposal is adopted—and lastly—based upon the final form in which the bill may be presented to us for a vote. One thing is certain—it appears very likely at this time that the Committee on Military Affairs will report some sort of a bill embodying most of—if not all—the President's suggestions. Nevertheless, I predict it will find awful tough sledding on the House floor. The reactions of the public will be watched with a great deal of interest by all of us down here in Washington. We all want to do and vote for what we conscientiously believe to be for the best interest of this Nation.

Capt. Joseph J. McCarthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. KELLY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following citation made in connection with the awarding of the Congressional Medal of Honor to Capt. Joseph J. McCarthy. Although Michigan may have claimed this man,

because of his wife's residence and because his allocations and insurance were sent to the city of Ironwood, Mich., he has lived in Chicago, in my congressional district, all his life. Captain McCarthy is a member of the Chicago Fire Department and in that position has brought honor upon the department and to the people of the Third Congressional District of Illinois.

CAPT. JOSEPH J. M'CARTHY, USMCR, TO RECEIVE MEDAL OF HONOR FROM PRESIDENT TRUMAN

For his conspicuous gallantry at the risk of his own life above and beyond the call of duty at Iwo Jima, Capt. Joseph J. McCarthy, USMCR, will receive the Medal of Honor from President Harry S. Truman at the White House on "Nimitz Day," October 5.

Captain McCarthy's award is for action described in the following citation:

"For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty as commanding officer of Company G, Second Battalion, Twenty-fourth Marines, Fourth Marine Division, in action against enemy Japanese forces during the seizure of Iwo Jima, Volcano Islands, on February 21, 1945. Determined to break through the enemy's cross-island defenses, Captain McCarthy acted on his own initiative when his company advance was held up by uninterrupted Japanese rifle, machine-gun, and high-velocity 47-millimeter fire during the approach to Motoyama Airfield No. 2. Quickly organizing a demolitions and flamethrower team to accompany his picked rifle squad, he fearlessly led the way across 75 yards of fire-swept ground, charged a heavily fortified pillbox on the ridge to the front and personally hurling hand grenades into the emplacement as he directed the combined operations of his small assault group, completely destroyed the hostile installation. Spotting two Japanese soldiers attempting an escape from the shattered pillbox, he boldly stood upright in full view of the enemy and despatched both troops before advancing to a second emplacement under greatly intensified fire and blasted the strong fortifications with a well-planned demolitions attack. Subsequently entering the ruins, he found a Japanese taking aim at one of his men and with alert presence of mind jumped the enemy, disarmed and shot him with his own weapon. Then, intent on smashing through the narrow breach, he rallied the remainder of his company and pressed a full attack with furious aggressiveness until he had neutralized all resistance and captured the ridge. An inspiring leader and indomitable fighter, Captain McCarthy consistently disregarded all personal danger during the fierce conflict and, by his brilliant professional skill, daring tactics, and tenacious perseverance in the face of overwhelming odds, contributed materially to the success of his division's operations against this savagely defended outpost of the Japanese Empire. His cool decision and outstanding valor reflect the highest credit upon Captain McCarthy and enhance the finest traditions of the United States naval service."

Captain McCarthy was born in Chicago, Ill., on August 10, 1911. His mother, Mrs. Catherine Hart, now resides at 5715 South May Street, Chicago, and his wife, Mrs. Mildred G. McCarthy, lives at 205 Wilson Street, Ironwood, Mich.

He first enlisted in the Marines in 1937 and served 4 years. After 1 year of civilian life, he reenlisted in February 1942 and was discharged in June of that year to accept a commission in the Marine Corps Reserve.

Joining the Fourth Maine Division shortly thereafter, he went overseas in January 1944 and is a veteran of the Roi-Namur, Saipan-Tinian, and Iwo Jima campaigns. For gallantry as a rifle company commander at Saipan, he was decorated with the Silver Star Medal, and for wounds suffered at Saipan and Iwo Jima he received the Purple Heart and Gold Star in lieu of a second Purple Heart.

Who Pays for Federal Aid?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a letter written by the Honorable Samuel B. Pettengill, a former Member of this House, to the editor of the Wall Street Journal and published in that paper under date of October 30, 1945, with reference to the source of Federal aid. I wish that every taxpayer in this country might study the contents of this letter and reflect upon it as it might affect him and the heritage which, as a good American, he hopes to transmit to succeeding generations.

The letter follows:

ON FEDERAL AID

The EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

The other day you commented effectively on the demand of Controller Oakman, of Detroit, running to Washington for "Federal aid" on the ground that if "Federal aid" ever stops, the city, town, and county government would go broke.

A man who rates a job of controller of a city like Detroit ought to know there is no such thing as "Federal money." That except for the printing press, there is no money whatever that the Federal Government can send to the people, except what it takes from the people.

There is, however, another aspect of this matter of relying on the Federal Government to support local and State governments which the fiscal problems of the next few years may bring acutely to our attention.

States and cities are forbidden to print or coin money to pay their debts. They cannot make the money markets their creatures nor depreciate interest rates at their caprice. When States, counties, cities, and towns undertake to borrow money, they have to pay interest rates established in a free market, and have to satisfy the lender that the loan is sound and secure. To pay interest and principal of debt, States and municipalities have to get the cash the hard way—by taxing the people. This puts some brake on their borrowings, some resistance to socializing the business of their taxpayers. You see this force at work in every municipal ownership election.

The Federal Government, however, is under none of these restrictions. It can force interest rates down, borrow huge funds cheaply, pay its obligations of interest and principal by converting more of its promises into Federal Reserve notes, or by devaluing its gold and silver hoardings—clipping the coins to pay the bills—or by outright greenbacks.

The Federal Government has a printing press; the States do not. This easy-money route promotes the extension of Federal power, subtracts from State and local self-government, and greases the road to bankruptcy.

If the American people and their public officials have so little character as to continue to charge their public expenditures to their unborn grandchildren, it would be far better for Detroit and every other city to go into bankruptcy, as some 2,000 municipalities did in the 1920's, than for the Federal Government to do so. This, for the reason that the Federal Government alone controls the money in which all obligations, public and private, are paid. Federal insolvency would ruin not only Federal bond holders, but every insurance policy holder, savings bank depositor, social security card holder, and so forth, in the land.

Nothing would do more to assure confidence in the future of our country than a reassumption by State and local government of their responsibility to pay their own bills.

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

NEW YORK CITY.

Getting Our Boys Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, several days ago, I offered an amendment on the floor that provided for the immediate discharge, on his own application, of anyone in the armed forces of this country who has served continuously for 18 months, or more, or who has dependents at home to look after, or who desires to return to school.

That provision was knocked out on a point of order; and I am now urging my friends in the Senate to put this amendment back in the bill. If that is done, I feel confident that the House will sustain the amendment by a vote of at least 5 to 1, and probably more.

I have just received a letter from a member of the armed forces now stationed in Hawaii, in which he enclosed the following clipping from a Honolulu paper:

SAILOR DIES IN DOWNTOWN SUICIDE LEAP

Irvin Lincoln Pike, 23, Navy torpedoman second class, plunged to his death in a suicide leap from the third story roof of the central branch YMCA building, Hotel and Alakea Streets, Friday at 5:10 p. m.

The sailor, who was not further identified, was said by police to have left his personal effects on the ledge of the roof before jumping to the concrete border of the swimming pool enclosed in the building.

Detective Herbert Cockett, who investigated, said the victim told a waitress in the YMCA restaurant, Mrs. Marie Santiago, 2017 Kaumualii Street, a few minutes before his death that he was depressed because he "didn't have enough points to go home."

A witness to the fatal plunge was Police Sergeant Harry Shupak of the vice squad, who saw the sailor's body hit a canopy in the pool enclosure and then crash to the pavement below.

Sergeant Shupak was off duty at the time, and preparing for a swim.

The shore patrol is investigating to learn fuller identity of the sailor.

Coroner Moses Branco termed the case a suicide.

The letter enclosing the clipping reads, in part, as follows:

Representative JOHN E. RANKIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed you will find a newspaper clipping from a Honolulu newspaper.

Your colleagues in the House override your efforts to help servicemen with long service, interrupted education, and children, out immediately, but what can they know of our frustrated feelings out here, with 2 and 3 years' service behind us and still not enough points to go home.

I sincerely hope you will read this attached article to them. Can you imagine my feelings upon becoming eligible for discharge with 38 points this 1st day of January 1946, after 4 years service, to have my rate in the Navy classed as essential, and making me ineligible for discharge.

No, Mr. RANKIN, it wasn't very hard for me to understand why that sailor committed suicide.

I repeat what I have said before and that is that the point system is a miserable failure.

Congress is going to have to enact a law for the discharge of these men; and for that reason I am urging the Senate to adopt my amendment.

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to insert in the RECORD, I include an article on Poland that appeared in the New York Times on October 23, 1945, and also an editorial that appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune on October 6, 1945:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of October 6, 1945]

TURNCOAT

Oscar Lange came to the United States 11 years ago as a beneficiary of the Rockefeller Foundation. In the succeeding decade he was admitted as a graduate student and employed as a teacher by a number of American universities. Two years ago he was granted the privilege of American citizenship. This was upon the condition, of course, that he forswear his allegiance to his native Poland and pledge his fealty to the United States.

About the same time he was made a professor at the University of Chicago. Shortly thereafter he made a pilgrimage to Russia and was granted an interview with Stalin. He returned to the United States and began to make assertions that the puppet government that the Russians had set up at Lublin was not really a puppet government but was "democratic," and similar statements useful to Russian propaganda in this country.

That same puppet government, now installed in power in Warsaw, has tendered Lange the post as its ambassador to the United States. He has accepted the job and in so doing has renounced his American citizenship and the fidelity to this country and its principles of liberty which he pledged only 2 years ago with, no doubt, all the sincerity of which he is capable.

He asserts that his motive is to further Polish-American relations. He has little training in diplomacy and the appointment obviously has been made because of his supposed usefulness as a propagandist for the Communist-dominated government of Poland.

Lange, we think, is bound to fail. The detestation of the American people for turncoats is such that none of his assertions on behalf of his new masters will find credence in this country. As a Nation we are well rid of him.

If Lange thinks he can use his new position to address his propaganda over the head or behind the back of the State Department to the people of the Nation, he should be disabused the moment he arrives in Washington and warned that if he undertakes a propaganda campaign in this country his withdrawal will be demanded of the Polish Government.

[From the New York Times of October 24, 1945]

POLISH REDS RULE BY ERSATZ PARTIES—TWO POLITICAL GROUPS CREATED TO MISLEAD VOTERS INTO SUPPORTING UNITED FRONT—FALL SEEN IN ELECTIONS—MIKOLAZCZYK'S PEASANT PARTY IS EXPECTED TO GET 60 PERCENT, LEFTISTS VERY LITTLE

(By Gladwin Hill)

WARSAW, POLAND, October 14.—Poland is in the throes of an intense political struggle. It is a struggle led by Moscow-trained Communists to get permanent political control of a country that is historically conservative.

These Communists are a small minority, but at present have a strong advantage in that they dominate the Moscow-created Polish provisional government. This government, while nominally representative, is actually ruling by decree. This gives the Communists a wide scope, although not unlimited.

They cannot flout Polish opinion too badly or there might be a popular outburst. They know, furthermore, that their time is limited, that the Potsdam agreement calls for free elections in which their present governmental inside track may be obliterated.

Their strategy is to use the intervening time to spread voluntary acceptance of their ideas and to build up from virtually nothing an effective political machine. This they are attempting by some of the cleverest devices in the politicians' handbook.

PREWAR VOTERS CONSERVATIVE

Before the war, although temporarily suppressed by the semidictatorship, something approaching a majority of the Polish electorate were actual members or political followers of the conservative Peasants Party. The Socialists had a potential command of possibly one-quarter of the electorate. The rest of the vote was distributed in small blocs among a number of groups, ranging from the center to the right.

The Communists were conspicuous by their absence. Some of them, like Poland's present President, Boleslaw Bierut, operated from exile in places like Czechoslovakia and Russia.

Most Poles still are adherents of the Peasants Party and there has been no great upsurge of leftist sentiment, particularly communistic. How then, did communism get established in Poland?

The first thing the Communists did was to establish a disguised Communist Party, the Polish Workers Party. The next thing was to launch an offensive on the established parties. The strategy was to split them. This was done by the incredibly bald device of simply setting up in the postoccupation confusion duplicate parties, superficially indistinguishable from the original ones, even in name. Thus the Peasants Party, led by Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, one of the two London government-in-exile Poles allowed in the provisional government, found itself confronted by an opposition Peasant Party, which in the confusion drew a lot of Mikolajczyk followers.

In the case of the Socialist Party the trick was easier because the Socialists had split in 1938, one faction going with the war to London the others staying in Poland. One fragment of this split was revived by the new left-wing operators, who installed as its head the present Premier, Edward Osubka-Morawski, who in 1943 went to Moscow to coordinate the left-wing Polish underground with the Russians.

Like some other parties, the Socialist faction has not yet set forth a clearly defined program but to many Polish observers it seems about as far from the old Socialist Party of Marshal Joseph Pilsudski, of which it claims to be a direct descendant, as it is from the Communist Party.

The next move of the Communists was to organize a government of the four principal parties, their Polish Workers Party, Socialist Party, the Peasants Party, and Democratic Party. No other parties are represented in the government, although they are allowed to exist rather vicariously. Although the Peasant leader, Mr. Mikolajczyk, is included in the government, it is the ersatz Peasants Party rather than his Polish Peasants Party which the government recognizes. Thus the Communists have increased their original strength of virtually nothing into domination of the regime while maintaining a front of multi-party government.

The 20-man cabinet that is running Poland is composed as follows: Workers Party and Socialist Party, 6 each; Peasants Party, 5; Democrats, 1; non-party, 2. But this doesn't tell the whole story. At least 1 of the Peasants Party men is a member of the Communist-inspired ersatz Peasants Party. The one "Democrat" is Foreign Minister Wincenty Rzymowski, one of the Polish Moscow alumni who is a sort of front man for the Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs, Zygmunt Modzelewski, former leader of Russia's Union of Polish Patriots.

POWERFUL MAN IN BACKGROUND

Invisible in this picture are Mr. Bierut and his Communist aide, Jacob Berman, who holds the obscure post of cabinet Under Secretary, but is recognized as one of the most powerful men in Poland.

To assure complete weighting of the government scales to the left the Communists arbitrarily impose the principle of "united action."

"Between these four parties," Premier Osubka-Morawski said a few days ago, "no fight can be allowed." In arguments within the government the leftists prevail.

The same pattern is applied down through the other ostensibly democratic processes in Poland, which up to now consisted chiefly of workers' election for union factory and industry representatives. These elections were rigged on the grounds of the need for "national unity" by the device of a "unified list of candidates." A single slate containing representatives of all parties and also possibly non-party candidate was drawn up by party leaders.

The "unified list" comes cut with a curious preponderance of Leftist candidates. If rebellious workers concentrate their votes on candidates unfriendly to the regime there is a solution, which has happened several times in recent weeks in various places in Poland. That is to declare the election illegal and postpone it until things can be rearranged.

All these machinations haven't altered the fact that most Poles are small farmers and that a large number of them are followers of Mr. Mikolajczyk's Polish Peasant party. The Leftist provisional regime has wooed their support by rushing through agrarian reforms, in which several hundred thousand peasants received small holdings. But any good will thus acquired has been more than offset by Government moves favoring the industrial workers—a more likely Communist target—in which the farmers charged they are being victimized.

So, while the Leftists have been trying desperately to keep afloat their ersatz Peasantry Party, preposterously denouncing the Mikolajczyk group as "separatists," the latter is gaining strength to the point where some

observers believe they will garner 60 percent of the voters in the election and return the Leftists to obscurity.

While it looked at first as though the Leftists would try to delay the general elections a long time while by their various devices they built up strength some observers now think they may suddenly call elections within the next few months before the opposition gets any more powerful.

REMOVAL OF RED ARMY URGED

LONDON, October 23.—Thirty former members of the prewar Polish Parliament, in a memorandum circulated today, demanded that the Red Army, all Soviet poliitcal police and militia and all Soviet officeholders be removed from Poland before the elections ordered by the Yalta agreement are held.

The signers included 12 senators and 18 deputies of the preoccupation parliament. Among them was Jan Kwapinski, one of the leaders of the exiled government in London.

The parliamentarians, who oppose the Warsaw regime of President Boleslaw Beirut, charged that "in Poland a Communist infiltration with all its attendant consequences has taken place in the same way as in Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Rumania."

The memorandum said "the country continues under the occupation by the Red Army and the Soviet political police—the NKVD—continue to be active, and the Public Security Department is entirely in the hands of the Communists."

It charged "that about 1,000,000 people have been deported into distant Soviet provinces and further groups running into the millions are at present scattered all over the world. Under present conditions they cannot return to Poland, yet it would be difficult to refuse them the right to take part in the elections."

The Evils of Pork-Barrel Legislation With a Depleted Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, on October 22, 1945, there appeared in the Bryan Democrat the following article by Cass Cullis, publisher, and chairman of the Williams County Democratic Committee:

CLEVENGER OPPOSES BILL FOR AIRPORTS—SAYS NEW FIELDS ARE NOT NEEDED—DISTRICT PLANS SEVERAL PROJECTS

Congressman CLIFF CLEVENGER, of Bryan, voted "no" on a bill authorizing the expenditure of $650,000,000 over a period of 10 years on airport construction. He was 1 of 82 Members voting against the bill, which carried with 279 votes.

To a Blade correspondent he explained that he is not against air transportation, but that the places which have enough air travel to pay for airports already have airports. He also said there is only one county in his district, Paulding, which does not have passenger-train service.

In Congress, Mr. CLEVENGER represents a seven-county district where there is considerable interest in aviation, and where several cities already have made progress in the development of airport projects and are hopeful of receiving Government funds to aid these fields.

Bryan, the Congressman's home city, has been recommended for a $305,000 airfield, which would serve this area, providing excellent passenger, mail, and freight service. Montpelier, Napoleon, and Paulding also are working for the establishment of ports so apparently people of the Fifth District are more air-minded than the man they elected to Congress.

Now, the gentleman conveniently changed the Blade article that said "one county-seat town, Paulding, has no rail passenger service" to read as above although he well knew other towns in the county had passenger service on the Wabash and Nickel Plate lines, and that the New York Central had discontinued passenger service on its lines from Cincinnati to Jackson, Mich., nearly a decade ago, thus leaving Paulding without passenger service, or that Paulding has bus service to Fort Wayne Field 25 miles away.

The fact that a field is under development by my own county does not change at all the "pork barrel" evils of this measure. This field was advanced by local capital and by our county boards of adjoining counties. This new field is within 15 miles of Paulding, a dozen miles from Hicksville and 22 miles from Montpelier over level country, and with excellent highways to all of them.

On October 18 a bill authorizing $700,000,000 be spent for building 7,000 air fields was before Congress. I voted against this monstrous pork barrel. Not for 14 years has our country taken in taxes enough to cover its spending. Our debt has multiplied fifteenfold as of the end of 1946 fiscal year—twice the amount of assessed property in the 48 States. But let a leading Democrat tell the story, the man who prepares the great spending bills of this Government, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, chairman of the Appropriations Committee:

ECONOMY BLOC

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I hope no one will overlook the list of 82 men on page 9808 of this morning's RECORD. It is a notable list of notable men. They not only preach economy but, extraordinary as it may seem, they actually vote for economy.

Mr. Speaker, that list of names ought to be printed in every newspaper in the country. I do not know just how interested in economy the newspapers are, but there have been so few votes for economy lately that it ought to be in the same class with the story of "Man bite dog."

We have all kinds of blocs here—the farm bloc, the labor bloc, the railroad bloc; now, at last, we have an economy bloc.

May I suggest that formal meetings of the bloc be convened here on the floor of the House every time a bill is up to spend money we do not have for something we do not need.

You will recognize a brother of the bloc when he gives the password. The password is the word "No," spoken clearly and distinctly when the Member's name is called on a vote to appropriate borrowed money for something we can get along without. The uninitiated are earnestly invited to affiliate at any regular meeting of the bloc.

Twenty-four other Democrats joined with Mr. CANNON of Missouri in his long-overdue march to the mourners' bench. It was a welcome reenforcement to those of us who have so long held the economy line, many times with less than 30 votes and sometimes less than a dozen. Who knows, we may yet save the Republic.

China and the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Fred H. Lysons, of the Seattle bar, on the subject China and the Peace, before the King County Democratic Club, at Seattle, September 1, 1945:

The problem of permanent peace, confronting the world today as never before, can be solved or at least greatly simplified if we will but turn the pages of China's history through the past half century.

Put on the chopping block just prior to the turn of the century by certain European powers, China was saved from dismemberment by the application of Secretary of State John Hay's open-door policy. Her integrity was again preserved in 1914 by President Woodrow Wilson's courageous ultimatum to Japan, staying her hand in which she held the threat of taking over China under her notorious Twenty-one Demands.

It being apparent that Japan still nurtured her designs of conquest, China launched a trade boycott against her, of such intensity that it was felt by the United States, a fact established by a congressional investigation of the subject. Negotiations and consultation between the parties resulted in our calling the Washington conference of 1921, and the conclusion there of the Nine Power Treaty which obligated the signatories, the United States and Japan included, to respect the sovereignty, the independence, and the territorial and administrative integrity of China.

Recognized as assuring to China the full adjuncts of independence in government which its 14 pungent words expressed, the treaty was uniformly acclaimed as a finality in that accomplishment. It was appraised by (present) Secretary Stimson as "One of the most admirable and farsighted treaties in the history of modern civilization." Charles Evans Hughes, then Secretary of State and chairman of the cenference, expressed the opinion that by the treaty the open door in China has at last been made a fact. Baron Shidahara, Japanese Ambassador to the United States and head of the Japanese delegation to the conference, said that "the treaty has disposed of the Chinese problem which, it was often asserted, would one day lead to world-wide conflagration."

But Japan started that conflagration, nevertheless. In 1931 she seized Manchuria and in 1937 opened full-scale war on China.

The vice of the situation which has been made our corrective concern was that we were supplying Japan the matériel for her war. Our people protested and Congress was flooded with bills, all of them, with one exception, ignoring the Nine Power Treaty. The one exception was a bill by Senator Lewis B. Schwellenbach, of the State of Washington, which directly invoked our Nine Power Treaty obligation.

The Schwellenbach bill received wide acclaim, there being general concurrence of statesmen in Secretary Stimson's public endorsement of it in a statement urging its enactment because, as he said, "Drafted in treaty language, its passage would have the great advantage of demonstrating more clearly than any other method the reason for our action and the emphasis which we place on right conduct in international relations and particularly upon the treaty for which we are mainly responsible, undertaking to respect the integrity and independence of China."

The same high purpose and regard for righteousness which prompted Senator Schwellenbach's drafting of the measure characterized also the motive of its introduction. "I did not present this matter from the point of view of our interests in China," said the Senator from the Senate floor. "I presented it from the point of view of our responsibility and our obligation as a Nation under a treaty into which we entered. * * * In our action in reference to Japan and by our violation of the Nine Power Pact we become just as flagrant a violator of international agreements as any other nation in the world."

There can be but little doubt but that, denied our critical war essentials, Japan would have been incapacitated militarily.

As assurance of world peace no international machinery devised could be superior to the Nine Power Treaty. To assure to a nation its sovereignty, its independence and territorial and administrative integrity is to assure to that nation every governmental function and adjunct essential to its security and existence on an equality with every other government in the family of nations.

Dependent upon the United States for their future prosperity, it should not be difficult for us to bargain the "have" nations into paths of peace and world amity. In such manner was Japan brought into the Nine Power Treaty.

Senator Schwellenbach in his Senate address on the subject August 2, 1939, quoted this testimony of Dr. WALTER H. (now Representative) JUDD (whom the Senator vouched for as the highest authority) given before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on China's protective boycott against Japan's aggression: "It was slowly but surely bringing Japan to terms. * * * China promised to call off the boycott if the Japanese would get out * * * and stay out. * * * If all the nations would stay out of China. We all promised. That is what the Nine Power Treaty meant from China's standpoint. She trusted America."

Let there be negotiated and concluded between the nations of the world the Nine Power Treaty in replica, with its obligations of the strong nations to the weaker, from the "have" to the "have not" nations; and with good-faith observance of those obligations, permanent world peace and tranquillity will be an established fact.

Reduction of Government Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it seems to be a part of the national policy to fight every war on a high level of cost. It has always been a matter of regret to me that the Baruch plan of price control was not adopted at the beginning of World War II. The freezing of prices of finished products and of all elements entering into the cost of such products would have reduced the cost of the war by many billions of dollars. Furthermore, where would have been the inequity to any group since it was proposed to maintain the relationship then existing?

Every country, having enjoyed a synthetic prosperity during the time it was engaged in the business of killing, now is determined to keep up existing levels by artificial means. England proposes to do this by going socialistic—that is if we will lend her the money. In America, we are undertaking it by a continuation of our spending program. Both nations will eventually learn that wars can be paid for by only one method and that is by hard work and sacrifice.

Every spending program in Congress has its enthusiastic supporters but the taxpayers get little attention.

As part of these remarks, I attach a letter written to me by a well-known and successful banker in Lime Springs, Iowa. It occurs to me that this Congress, and particularly the minority party, had better listen to Mr. Cray. I am sure there are millions in the country who agree with him. Some day they will find a way of making their influence felt, and it will be greater than all the pressure groups combined.

The letter follows:

DEAR MR. GWYNNE: Another bond drive is on and it does not look as though the people were going to buy as freely as before and their principal objection is that so much money is being wasted by the administration that it is unfair to ask people to subscribe since the war is over and there is no attempt by the administration to economize and reduce the number of persons on the pay roll.

Money is being appropriated for every thing that comes up without any regard to balancing accounts.

Another thing the people do not like is the scandalous graft by the Army engineers. That is a few of the engineers. There is going to be a big flare-back if our Congress does not take a hand in reducing the operating expense of the Government.

You are at liberty to use this letter as you see fit.

Yours very truly,

A. J. CRAY.

The Weapon of Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, on October 16, when I spoke to this House on the Palestine question, I said that there will be no end to imperialism while powerful groups within the United States and Britain are permitted to play Arab against Jew and Jew against Arab for the sake of oil concessions.

It was not 8 days until this statement was confirmed by the daring threats of King ibn-Saud of the British-created Arab League to terminate American oil concessions in Saudi Arabia if this Nation persists in seeking justice and democracy for Arab and Jew alike in Palestine.

As reported in the New York Times of October 25, the Arab Leaguers offer oil to Standard Oil and the Texas Co. if we compromise with our conscience and with our own deep devotion to democracy and to the rights of man.

Actually, of course, Mr. Speaker, unless ibn-Saud is counting on British help, carrying out his threat would be to kill the goose which lays his golden eggs. The Arabian American Oil Co., Texas, and Standard Oil in Arabia, has accounted for large and increasing contributions to ibn-Saud's treasury through rents, royalties, and—during the war—through loans. These companies have also appealed to our State Department, often most tender in its consideration of oil interests abroad, for aid in stabilizing ibn-Saud's currency and for agricultural and irrigation missions and equipment. Saudi Arabia was declared eligible for lend-lease aid on February 18, 1943. Through June of 1945 they had received direct lend-lease equipment worth $1,500,000 on their own account and much larger amounts on the British account.

Yes, King ibn-Saud, unless he confidently expects British help, would be tossing away the financial aid he needs to keep himself in power should he carry out this latest threat.

Ibn-Saud is playing a game with the future of democracy and with the question of a homeland for the Jews of the world. It is a vicious game. But he, and the entire Arab league, which by no means represents the plain Arab people, can be beaten at this game of theirs. They are counting on Standard Oil's persuasive power with the United States Government.

If we can and do keep our foreign policy on the level of humanity and democracy and the greater good of the people of the world—the level established by our late great President, Franklin Roosevelt — then the Arab League will have outdealt itself.

When King ibn-Saud and the rest of the Arab League learns that the United States believes more firmly in democracy than it does in oil concessions, his game will change.

As in earlier times, this Nation has billions for defense, and not one cent for tribute. America's will to see justice done will be strengthened by the threat of the Arab League. We will not be intimidated. Let King Saud wipe the oil off his hands and its black blot from his royal conscience if he wants a hearing before the court of America's opinion.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I desire to include with these remarks the article from the New York Times to which I made reference. The article reads:

ARABS PLAN OIL BAN IF UNITED STATES AIDS ZIONISM—AMERICAN FIRMS FACE LOSS OF CONCESSIONS IN REPRISAL FOR INTERVENTION

(By Clifton Daniel)

CAIRO, EGYPT, October 24.—The recurrent threat of economic sanctions against American commercial interests, especially oil companies with Middle East concessions, is being used by Arab politicians in their campaign against Zionism.

American support of Zionism, it was reported from Beirut today, was cited in the discussions of a Lebanese Parliamentary sub-

committee as one reason for disapproving a proposed concession for two companies to establish refineries in Lebanon at the terminus of the pipe line from Iraq. A satirical statement by a Turkish newspaper that "His Excellency, Mr. Gasoline, is in process of vanquishing Zionism" appeared prominently in one Cairo newspaper today.

King ibn-Saud, who has assumed new stature as the champion of Arab nationalism as a result of the publication of his exchange of letters with the late President Roosevelt, has been described by Egyptians who know him as prepared to terminate American oil concessions in Saudi Arabia if America persists in a pro-Zionist policy. "He can do it, too," one American said.

American business representatives here have been made to feel acutely conscious of Arab chilliness toward business dealings as a result of American declarations on behalf of Jewish immigration into Palestine. This matter has a broader aspect in that in some Arab countries, especially Egypt, there is growing sentiment for ending the economic privileges enjoyed by foreigners.

The opposition to a concession to Standard Oil of New Jersey and Socony-Vacuum to erect refining facilities in Lebanon is so great, it was reported, that the parliamentary subcommittee postponed its discussions and will refer the proposed agreement back to the government for revision. The two companies jointly own a 24-percent interest in the Iraq Petroleum Co., in which British interests predominate.

News reached Cairo today from Haifa that the concession for the Transfarabian Pipeline Co. to build a line across Palestine to Haifa from the American-operated oil fields in Saudi Arabia would soon be signed by Field Marshal Viscount Gort, British Commissioner in Palestine. This was confirmed by informed quarters here and a representative of Transfarabian is expected to go to Palestine from New York soon to complete the deal. This does not mean, however, that the pipe line will definitely be built; that decision will be made later on the basis of whether such a line would be worth its cost.

The trans-Arabian line, which would be about the same size and length as the famous "Big Inch" in the United States and would cost more than $75,000,000, was originally projected by the United States Government during the war. Its construction is now in the hands of Trans-Arabian, a subsidiary of the Arabian-American Oil Co., owned jointly by Standard Oil of California and the Texas Co.

The construction of another pipe line to Haifai from Kikuk by the Iraq Oil Co. was reported this week by the Palestine Post to be already under way with 3,000 tons of materials on hand. The line would be 620 miles long—about half the length of the suggested Arabian line.

The Secret of the Atom Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over radio station WDRC, Hartford, Conn., October 28, 1945:

I welcome this opportunity to talk with the people of my own State about the most important question that has ever faced our Nation: The atom bomb. The answer that our legislators and statesmen give to that question will determine the survival of America.

As you know, there is a bill before the House Military Affairs Committee which seeks to keep secret and develop all processes, formulae, patents, and methods; and to control, take, and work all raw materials and properties; plants, and lands related to the production of atomic energy.

But before we discuss that bill, let us enumerate briefly seven facts about the bomb, which are now widely accepted by all experts, scientists, statesmen, or journalists who know, as the expression goes, the "atomic score."

First. About the so-called secret of the bomb: The fact is that no fundamental secret of the bomb exists. German, Japanese, Russian scientists, and scientists of other lands, know methods and procedures of nuclear fission, or splitting the atom, fully as well as our own. The secrets which we still have to protect are the blueprint, formula, and mechanical secrets by which the actual bomb can be made and detonated. However, every scientist who has appeared before the Congress has testified that it is only a matter of time—from 2 to 5 years—before Russia, for example, will be able to manufacture bombs quite as deadly, if not more deadly, than those we are making now.

Second. About the raw materials of which the bomb is made: We cannot hope, as a nation, to monopolize the bomb by monopolizing its raw materials. Great deposits of uranium ores are to be found in Czechoslovakia and Russia now, and many new sources are sure to be found in other nations in other parts of the world in the next decade.

Third. About winning a secret atom bomb race: A race with other nations to manufacture secretly the biggest pile of atom bombs will not, even if we win it—which we probably can—give us a military advantage. The nature of this weapon is altogether different from the nature of other military weapons. Airplanes, guns, battleships combat one another. In the past, the general who "gits thar fustest with the mostest" has had tremendous military advantage, although we have seen that the one who "stays in thar lastest with the mostest" generally wins. But an atom bomb is not designed to strike against another atom bomb. It is designed to obliterate ports, home-front war installations, industrial centers, whole populations. If we had buried away, ready for use, say 10,000 atom bombs, such as we dropped on Hiroshima, and our enemy had only a thousand, he could, nevertheless, destroy us utterly with his one-tenth as much, if he struck first. In one surprise attack he could destroy every one of our great cities and kill 40,000,000 of our people. The war could be lost exactly 1 minute after it began, and before we could release our own bombs.

Fourth. About the fear of retaliation as a control over the use of the bomb: The fear of retaliation will not prevent, and is not preventing, its manufacture in any nation today, and the very fact that nations are manufacturing it may hasten its use. The dread of just such an overwhelming 1-minute atomic war that will grip nations and peoples will tend to precipitate such a war. Every worsening of international relations will cause an attack of atomic jitters throughout the civilized world, and a real crisis anywhere—say, in the Arabian oil fields, the Dardanelles, India, Manchuria, or Spain—might encourage a nation which thought its vital interests threatened in any of these or other areas to seek a military decision in its own favor by launching a 1-minute or 1-hour or 1-day atomic war.

Fifth. About the defense against the bomb: There is no defense against the atom bomb that any scientist can envisage today, except for a nation to disperse its industries and to go underground. This would be a vast and incredibly costly enterprise, particularly in a democratic country. It would involve a building program costing billions and the resettlement of millions of people away from their present jobs and homes. Indeed, to accomplish such a program this country might have to abandon democracy itself and submit to extreme dictatorship.

Sixth. About outlawing the bomb: The bomb cannot be outlawed. In order to outlaw anything, you must have an international law which can be guaranteed by an international government, backed by an international police force. We witnessed, in 1922, the signing of the Kellogg Pact to outlaw not only weapons but war itself. Every civilized nation in the world signed that pact, and yet war came. If tomorrow every nation in the world signed an agreement never to use the atom bomb, what power or force exists that could prevent one nation from breaking that agreement if it felt it was to its own selfish interest to do so? Absolutely none exists.

Seventh. About the ability of the United Nations Organization to control the bomb: The United Nations Organization, as created at San Francisco, has no power today which enables it to control the development of the atom bomb in our country or to prevent our use of it should we decide to do so tomorrow, and this means, of course, that it has no power to do so in any other nation.

And we have seen the proof of this last statement in the fact that we have today before the Congress legislation to control and keep secret atomic-bomb manufacture in the United States of America.

Early in October the War Department sent this bill to the Military Affairs Committee, of which I am a member. There is not time now to discuss the details or import of that legislation beyond saying that it is the greatest grant of dictatorial powers in the history of our country.

Now, in view of the facts that we have reviewed today, do you think that this bill in its present form will (a) permanently secure the defense of America against the atom bomb attacks of other nations; and (b) tend to prevent another world war? I most emphatically do not. In my opinion, this bill will simply serve notice on all the other countries of the world that the atom-bomb race is on, and that we have begun it. The passage of this bill, in its present form, will certainly heighten the terrible tension that already exists in our foreign affairs by multiplying fears and suspicions between us and Russia and other nations, thus causing future conferences of the UNO to be held in an atmosphere of increasing fear and hatred.

And yet, you ask, shall we give away now in one great generous gesture, all the temporary secrets we do possess to every other nation, in the hope that this gesture will soften their hearts toward us and incline them permanently to peace? We know that it will not, for we have seen that in the past America's military weakness, in a world of sovereign nations, has been an eternal invitation to war among them, and in the end upon us. As Professor Einstein said yesterday, for Uncle Sam to give Russia the bomb now would be like a man giving away one-half of his capital to a prospective partner for fear he might become a rival. Then what is the answer? I think the answer is to pass this bill, but with an amendment which will make it perfectly clear to all the nations of the world that it is merely an interim piece of legislation, a necessary safeguard to ourselves—a sacred trust, as the President called it—until we can create some mechanism of truly international control over armaments, backed by a far greater measure of international government than we have now.

We should pass this legislation including an express statement that it shall be repealed the very day that we and the other United Nations can agree to form and operate an international commission for atomic inspection—a commission which can inspect at

all times, in all nations, what is being done, or rather not done, about atomic war weapons.

In short, I think that this legislation should be passed only with the inclusion of the Congress' clear intent to instruct the President and the State Department forthwith to call a world conference on atomic energy, with the view to preventing its use for destruction, and developing its use for peaceful purposes.

For here is another fact: the use of atomic energy for constructive, rather than destructive purposes, could change the face of the world for incredible good.

As Norman Cousins said in a searching editorial in the Saturday Review of Literature: "Man now has it within his grasp to emancipate himself economically. * * * He has at last unlocked enough of the earth's secret to provide for his needs on a world scale. The same atomic energy that can destroy a city can also usher in an age of economic sufficiency. * * * There is power enough and resources enough for all * * *." But if man cannot, or will not use for peace the power he has unleashed during this war, then "modern man is obsolete."

Will atomic energy be used for good or ill? For life or death? The answer is the only secret of the atomic bomb. And the only secret of the atomic bomb still lies locked in the heart of man.

Molasses for Dairy Feed As Well As for Liquor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

EASTERN FEDERATION OF
FEED MERCHANTS, INC.,
Sherburne, N. Y., October 23, 1945.

Congressman EDWIN A. HALL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: Speaking for 750 feed manufacturers and retailers of the 12 northeastern States who comprise the membership of our federation, this is an appeal to you to help us convince the national policymakers that it is vitally important that a substantial supply of molasses be made available for use in the manufacture of livestock rations and for direct feeding to dairy cows.

As you well know, our Northeast is a deficit feed area and because corn isn't moving to the Northeast, and protein supplies for livestock feed use are in tight supply, livestock feeders in our section of the country are right up against it in securing an adequate feed supply to maintain their dairy herds and poultry flocks. The situation is as acute now as at any time during the war period.

Our Government, during the war period, has purchased and imported large quantities of molasses, which for the most part was supplied to alcohol manufacturers, and on good information, we are informed that the Government will very soon purchase and import a large tonnage of molasses which, under present Government plans, will be supplied to alcohol manufacturers.

With the feed supply as critical as it is in the Northeast, livestock feeders should have first call on this molasses supply. On any appraisal that is fairly made of the situation, this molasses is more greatly needed for livestock feeding than for the manufacture of alcohol.

Added to the problems of livestock feeders in the Northeast in solving the problem of maintaining their dairy herds and poultry flocks on an inadequate feed supply is the problem of poor quality roughage.

Due to the unusual amount of rain in the Northeast this summer, and labor shortages on the farms, the hay harvested is way below par in feeding value. However, if an adequate supply of molasses is made available for use on roughage, the hay supply will be stepped up in feeding value.

An urgent appeal to the Feed Management Branch of the Department of Agriculture is being made by our federation for the establishment of a policy that will make available a large portion of the molasses imported by your Government for livestock feeding. Your support of our effort to secure Government recognition of the needs for molasses for livestock feeding in the Northeast will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,
EASTERN FEDERATION OF
FEED MERCHANTS,
A. W. CARPENTER,
Executive Director.

Rehabilitation of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, at the request of H. J. Lieb, service officer of the American Legion Post, Washington, D. C., I herewith present a letter to him dated October 6, 1945, from W. B. Jones, service officer at Atlanta, Ga., for the East Atlanta Post, No. 159, together with a resolution dated September 18, 1945, by said East Atlanta Post, No. 159, together with a list thereto attached dated September 18, 1945, sworn to by Roy H. Bryant, M. D., chief medical officer. Certainly the fullest possible information about and in connection with the hospitalization, treatment, and rehabilitation of the veterans of the American forces is what we all seek. And certainly the highest ability and professional accomplishment there is existent, is not too good for these lads as they are compelled by physical or mental conditions to enter our hospitals, clinics, and other places which should be havens.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
EAST ATLANTA POST, No. 159,
Atlanta, Ga., October 6, 1945.

Mr. J. H. LEIB,
Service Officer,
Post 15, American Legion,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BUDDY: As requested in your letter of October 1, attached hereto is complete file properly signed and dated, also report on Hospital 48, Atlanta, Ga., by committee appointed by our Fifth District Commander, William G. McRae, together with statement by Dr. Bryant concurred in by Dr. Daniel, and resolution passed by my Post 159, which was handed to General Bradley while on his visit here by Commander McRae.

Hoping this additional information will assist you in bringing some relief to a very bad condition in our veterans' hospitals.

I remain,
Your friend,
W. B. JONES, *Service Officer.*

Whereas the committee appointed to investigate conditions at United States Hospital No. 48 has made a report outlining conditions at that hospital and making certain recommendations in connection therewith; and

Whereas it is the opinion of the members of this post that said recommendations should be adopted: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the recommendations of said committee be adopted and approved and that the same be transmitted to the Veterans' Administrator with a request that he take action to place the recommendations therein contained into effect as soon as possible; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution together with said report which is hereto attached, be immediately transmitted to the Veterans' Administrator.

Unanimously adopted by the East Atlanta Post, No. 159, the American Legion, this 18th day of September 1945.

ERIC M. BURK,
Commander,
R. A. SEWELL,
Adjutant.

To All Posts in the Fifth District:

Pursuant to motion adopted at conference of posts of the fifth district at meeting held September 17, 1945, your district commander, together with Buddy W. B. Jones, of Post 159, and Buddy C. Price Williams, of Post No. 1, were designated as a committee to conduct an immediate investigation into the conditions presently existing at United States Hospital No. 48, with respect to determining the needs of said hospital necessary to improve the standard of care and treatment of patients at said hospital, and to make recommendations to the Veterans' Administrator which would, in the opinion of the committee, if placed into effect, result in improving the said standards of medical and hospital care.

The committee, with the exception of Buddy Williams, met at the hospital at 8:30 a. m., September 18, 1945, and immediately obtained interviews with Roy H. Bryant, M. W., chief medical officer; Robert L. Daniels, M. D., chief of medical service, and John M. Slaton, Jr., manager of the Veterans' Administration facility.

We secured from the chief medical officer a written statement outlining the immediate needs of the hospital from a medical standpoint. The needs for equipment will be met when deliveries are made on an electrocardiograph machine and new X-ray equipment now on approved order.

The needs for additional personnel of physicians, surgeons, and technicians is very acute.

The chief surgeon of the hospital has been ill for practically 1 month, and there is no first assistant to the chief surgeon. A first assistant to the chief surgeon is indispensable and should be obtained immediately. A neurosurgeon is badly needed, together with two neuropsychiatrists, all of them for full-time employment at the hospital.

One neuropsychiatrist is now conducting examinations for all out-patients, as well as hospital patients, averaging about 15 a day. The load is too heavy and cannot result other than in a more or less superficial examination, because not more than five examinations a day may be made efficiently. A Roentgenologist must be added to the hospital staff if proper use is to be made of the X-ray equipment on hand and on order. All of the above

should have a rating as Senior Medical Officer and be specialists in their respective fields.

In conference with Robert L. Daniel, M. D., Chief of Medical Service, the committee ascertained that there is a critical need for one full-time physician, P & S-4 for ward relief. Due to illness of present physicians, we found that one doctor has had to care for as many as 160 patients, which is predictive of overwork to the doctor, lack of proper care to the patients of the hospital and forebodes danger of the worst sort. The Chief Medical Officer and the Chief of Medical Service have had to act as utility men in every branch of the hospital in order to meet the emergency which has arisen. We find that of nine Army doctors assigned to the hospital, five of them will be due their release between now and December 15, and this presents an acute problem of replacement.

There is an urgent need for an Assistant Laboratorian in Bacteriology and Assistant Laboratorian in Roentgenology and additional Pharmacists.

Attached hereto is the written statement of the Chief Medical Officer as to medical needs of the hospital. The committee discussed these needs with Mr. Slaton, Manager of the Veterans' Administration, and he stated that the entire trouble now was due to a shortage of doctors and that if he could secure the doctors, he would be able to improve the standard of care and treatment. The committee noted that there had been considerable improvement in the caliber of nurses and attendants within the past year and there appears to be no deficiency in nursing and attendants' care.

The manager informed the committee that due to his inability to secure full-time doctors for work at the hospital, he had been authorized by the Veterans' Administration to make arrangements with certain private physicians and to employ private physicians as consultants for part-time work at the hospital and examinations downtown. The manager stated that he had been handicapped in securing appropriate office space to establish a downtown clinic where patients not needing hospital confinement might be examined and treated, but that there was some delay encountered in obtaining the necessary space. He expressed the hope that this matter would soon be worked out and the downtown clinic established.

It was the consensus of opinion of each of these three officials that the major difficulty in attracting skilled medical personnel to the Veterans' Administration is the lack of adequate compensation for full-time employment. The preponderance of members of the medical staffs of veterans' hospitals in the early years following the World War I were composed largely of young doctors who took employment with the Administration in preference to battling the economic hazards which so often beset men of small means in establishing themselves in the medical profession. In later years, it appears that the Administration has attracted as full-time employees many physicians who have not been too successful in their private practice.

The case load of this hospital is bound to undergo rapid expansion in the years immediately ahead. Monetary considerations should not be a barrier to providing the very best of medical skill in these hospitals. More attractive financial inducements must be offered for skilled members of the profession to accept full-time employment with the Veterans' Administration. Obstacles which block the attainment of this objective, whether due to low salaries established by law or to the system of classification under the Civil Service Act, should be suspended or set aside in view of the emergency which now confronts this hospital.

The committee recommends that every effort be made by the Veterans' Administrator to enhance the financial inducements to members of the medical profession to accept full-time employment with the Veterans' Administration and to exert every effort to channel into the services of veterans' hospitals skilled physicians and surgeons from the ranks of the Army and the Navy.

Respectfully submitted.

WILLIAM G. MCRAE,
District Commander, Member Post No. 1.
W. B. JONES,
Member Post No. 159.

NEEDS—HOSPITAL (MEDICAL)

PHYSICIANS AND GRADES

First assistant to chief surgeon, senior medical officer.

Neurosurgeon, senior medical officer.

Two neuropsychiatrists, senior medical officer.

Roentgenologist, senior medical officer.

One full-time physician, P & S 4, for ward relief.

TECHNICIAN

Assistant laboratorian in bacteriology.

Assistant laboratorian in roentgenology.

Pharmacist.

EQUIPMENT

Electrocardiographic machine. (This machine has been approved and should have been delivered before now. Letter has been sent to the Procurement Division to find out to what the delay in receiving same is due.)

New X-ray equipment. (This has been approved and bids let on September 15, 1945, making our present X-ray equipment into two diagnostic machines instead of one diagnostic and one fluoroscopic as this is a bottleneck if we increase out-patient examinations beyond the present call in.)

ROY H. BRYANT, M. D.,
Chief Medical Officer.

Attest:

A. S. TILLER,
Notary Public, Fulton County, Ga.
My commission expires January 2, 1948.
SEPTEMBER 18, 1945.

The Navy's Peacetime Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered at Portland, Maine, October 27, 1945, by Lyman A. Thackrey, captain, United States Navy, U. S. S. *Portland:*

I know I speak for the Navy present here this evening—and most particularly for those from the U. S. S. *Portland*—when I say that we are happy indeed to be spending this first peacetime Navy Day in the city of Portland. The State of Maine and this city, in particular, have been closely associated with things maritime and naval since colonial days. You not only build ships, you sail them. You speak the language of the sea, and when we return to this port it is with the feeling that we are among people who understand us. Regarding the quality of the merchant ships you built, I cannot speak except that I know you built them rapidly and that they run. But your destroyers I have lived in and know their sturdy qualities. Among the first questions a young officer ordered to a destroyer asks is, "Where was she built?" And if he finds that she was built in Maine, he is happy, for he knows she'll keep her station when others are breaking down.

The U. S. S. *Portland*, on August 9 of this year, when the first hints of a Japanese surrender spread across the world, was anchored with the other ships of Task Force 95 off Okinawa. The force expected to sail on the following day (10th) for a strike into the East China Sea and conclude with a bombardment of Japanese strong points in Korea. But our sailing orders never came. Peace came instead. And soon we were on the long voyage home.

On this voyage with the ships no longer darkened and the gun watches secured we had much time for thought. "What of these splendid ships, with their war-seasoned crews?" we pondered as we looked out across the task force. "Would we tie them up and disperse their crews? Now that the enemies of law and order had finally unconditionally surrendered, was there any need for a United States Navy—for any navy in fact? If they were all scrapped what would become of the peace—would it remain? If so, for how long and on whose terms?"

One answer is to consider the Pax Britannica—that splendid 100 years of peace which the might and prestige of the British Navy gave to the world. This great era started with the Battle of Trafalgar about 1812, when Napoleon's hopes of world conquest were finally blasted, and extended to the summer of 1914. During this period the fleets of Great Britain were the glory of her empire. They literally policed the world. While there were many local conflicts in the land areas, no great intercontinental holocaust enveloped the world because the vast water highways were controlled by the British fleet. It was only when Germany had built her own high seas fleet and felt it strong enough to challenge Britain's power that she was able to plunge Europe and the world into war in the summer of 1914.

The fact that Britain had been able to achieve world domination for 100 years was no coincidence. With conscious design for world power she had for centuries carefully and arduously trained the youth of her ruling classes in world strategy and politics. Her statesmen, generals, and admirals had assurance and background, and could more than hold their own with those of other powers.

The United States stands today where England stood after the downfall of Napoleon—to use Churchill's words, "At the summit of the world." Our enemies lie defeated around us and we have at our disposal a victorious Navy of almost unbelievable power and range. But we lack what England seems always to have had: a long-range, world-encompassing policy and the men trained to carry it out. But the policy and the men, I believe, are on the way. Even now they are emerging and our present big problem is not to allow the magnificent Navy which should be their reservoir of strength around the council tables of the world, to be frittered away as it was after World War I.

The crippling effects of the lack of sea power are reiterating themselves in the lessons already coming out of this war. For instance, the Japanese have stated since their surrender that the reason they did not follow up their sneak attack on Pearl Harbor with an invasion was because they knew they did not have the supply shipping to support it.

Von Rundstedt, the German, when asked why Hitler did not invade England instead of attacking Russia, said that although the Germans felt certain a toehold could be obtained in England they knew they did not have the sea power to reinforce and maintain it in the face of Britain's home fleet.

Stalin, at the time of the Normandy invasion, said what a fool Hitler had been to

embark on a career of world conquest without a powerful navy.

The most poignant example, however, as far as we are concerned was our own naval weakness during the campaign for Guadalcanal. Due to the lack of carriers and cruisers, withdrawal from Guadalcanal with all the loss and delay it would have entailed was seriously considered about midpoint in the campaign. During this campaign the ship that I was in stayed at sea for 72 consecutive days—there were many whose time at sea was 100 days and over—keeping the thin supply line open.

Those were our darkest days, for soon after, the effects of your efforts at home were felt by way of additional planes, and ships, and we moved on with new confidence. In a few words I will review this expansion and our subsequent advance across the Pacific in order to remind you again what the Navy has done and what it should be kept to do in the future if need be.

The Japanese struck at Pearl Harbor with the assumption, of course, that we would never be able to recover. They realized our tremendous potential but thought we lacked the courage, the fighting heart, and skill to recuperate from the staggering loss of most of our capital ships, let alone be able to concentrate for an offensive capable of penetrating their powerful island bulwarks. Similar thoughts were in the minds of many naval officers in those early days. We knew the Japs were wrong but would we be able to prove it? By scraping and straining we put sufficient ships and planes together to meet them successfully in the Coral Sea and again at Midway. These were defensive battles both. But they showed that our technique was sound, that the spirit and courage was there and that when the planes and ships came from the mainland we would be ready to roll.

But in good American fashion we started to roll before we were ready—into Guadalcanal on August 7, 1942. From this date for the next 6 months the bloody battles for this island continued with sometimes ourselves on top and sometimes the Japanese. One night they sank four of our cruisers with no loss in return. Another time they sank one and torpedoed three others. Then we sank two Jap cruisers and three destroyers with no loss to ourselves. And so it went until the culminating night battles of November 13 to 15, 1942, when, with heavy ships newly arrived from the Atlantic, we smashed them, in what since has become known as iron bottom bay, so they never returned. Thus successfully concluding our first offensive started on a shoe string 6 long, dark, months before.

From that time on there was no doubt about the ultimate end. We had found ourselves and had begun to move in earnest. The pattern of the advance was always the same—island after island captured solely for their air strips and fleet anchorages to be used to spring to the next island—with the carrier task forces always out in front spearheading the advance.

To illustrate, we had consolidated the Gilberts and Marshalls and were ready to spring 1,000 miles to the westward to Guam and Saipan. But there were hundreds of Japanese planes on Guam and Saipan, which our land-based fighters could not reach and which could successfully thwart our attempts to land there. So carrier task forces, in foray after foray carried naval fighter planes to meet the land-based enemy planes on Guam and Saipan until the enemy air strength there had been so depleted that our landing attempt was a reasonable risk, and when undertaken in June 1944 was successful. And so it went—on to Palau, the Philippines and finally Iwo Jima and Okinawa—with the carriers and their planes protected by battleships, cruisers, and destroyers always in the lead.

The final outcome you all know. There has been nothing like it in the entire previous history of warfare—a great nation surrendering unconditionally while the bulk of its army was still undefeated, but with its navy and air force annihilated. One single Japanese capital ship floated upright on VJ-day—the battleship *Nagato*—and this was not manned!

Had there been no carrier task forces to [illegible] the way we should still be battling our [illegible] Hawaii, casting balefully eyes across the western Pacific, waiting for long-range land planes capable of carrying atomic bombs to Japan, with sufficient gas for their return and guns to protect themselves en route.

Spectacular as were the contributions of the carrier task forces, we must not overlook the brilliant achievements of our submarines. When I tell you that the majority of Japanese aircraft carriers sunk during this war were by torpedoes from our submarines, that they sank 42 enemy destroyers and 10 enemy cruisers, you will realize in a measure their magnificent work. Their average monthly sinkings when Guadalcanal was staged, was about 70,000 tons; when the Japanese surrendered, it was over 350,000 tons a month—about the same as the U-boat monthly average in the Atlantic at its peak.

Isn't it reasonable then to retain these carrier task forces and underseas craft which served us so admirably in war for policing and safety insurance in peace? Not at their full wartime strength but in sufficient numbers to insure our safety and make clear to the world we are ready for any emergency?

There is much talk about the atomic bomb having made the surface Navy obsolete. And that land planes will soon be developed of such range and armament that carriers will no longer be needed. To both of these, I say perhaps, many years from now. The effect of atomic bombs on task forces at sea is incomparably less than on cities and fortifications ashore.

Also many years from now is that idylic day when the great nations of the world will have revised their sovereign rights until all the armed force in the world is vested in a single international authority. Before that day arrives, literally years will have been spent around the council tables in London, Washington, and Moscow. And at these meetings it isn't the size of one's bank roll that counts. We learned to our sorrow that our bank roll and our vaunted potential had little effect on Hitler and the Japanese. The only thing that counts when the chips are actually down in these round-table sessions is the number of warships and planes you have, first, and, secondly, the size of your Army.

As people we have cast off our isolationism and have stepped out boldly in the role of international leaders. It is now essential that we give our statesmen the means, in the form of an existing Navy and Air Force, of accomplishing in this international structure what we as a people want.

In closing, I will try to make another point, by asking a question. What are the predominant changes you have noticed in the young men returning from the service? Are they returning strengthened in body and spirit, broader, more self-reliant, and with less thought for themselves and more for their neighbors? I believe they are.

At the start of the war, in the spring of 1942, I was attached to the battleship *North Carolina*. We were in the Brooklyn Navy Yard, fitting out with all haste for the Pacific. We held drills, instruction periods, and lectures, and did our best to prepare for what we knew was in store for us. But we got little response from the majority of the crew who were recruits of about 6 months' service. At morning muster after morning muster, we would have 100, 150, sometimes 200 absentees. They weren't interested in winning the war, in wiping out the ignomy of Pearl Harbor. Their whole concern was in having a good time—movies, cabarets, girls.

"Could a war be fought and won with such material?" we asked each other over and over again. Finally we put to sea, and after a brief shake-down in and around Casco Bay, headed for the Pacific. By the time we reached the forward areas, 3 months later, the whole tone of the ship's morale had changed away from the indulgences of the land and into the rigors of the sea in wartime, they had responded as only the American youth can respond. Their bodies hardened, their spirits came alive, and after 4 months out of New York, when our first action came, we could not have asked for a finer team. They not only were willing to fight, they wanted to fight—they were on the stalk with the pioneer blood of their ancestors coming to the fore.

And so I say that we should keep the homecoming youth and the youth that is growing up from returning to these old indulgences. Unfortunately this depleting self-indulgence is an American trait sprung from the bountiful conditions under which we live. If we are to survive as a great race it must be submerged and restrained by emphasis on those pioneer virtues which have won this war for us.

Universal military training is a thing deplored by many as un-American. But it seems to most of us in the Navy that 1 year away from his chosen calling, during the malleable period of his life, is a small price for a young man to pay for the inculcation of those pioneer virtues of faith in himself, restraint and integrity which this training is designed to give, and will give.

I must say I view with some alarm the feverish haste with which we are demobilizing on one hand, and on the other hand rushing on with our reconversion so that we may get the jump, economically, on our late allies. We have the jump on them already and they do not like it. An undercurrent of ill will is developing even with England. But whether they like it or not we can keep our advantage if we wish—and build a vast economical empire of great prosperity. But, if in this building we neglect the military foundation on which it must rest, the next great world crisis will bring it down in pieces about our ears.

I do not mean to strike an unnecessarily pessimistic note; however, I feel that this is a time for serious thought as well as great rejoicing. We are truly at the "summit of the world," and a magnificent future stretches ahead if we build soundly and with care, playing the game of give and take in our international relations as it is meant to be played—with a reasonable amount of "give" and not all "take."

A Comment on the Atomic Bomb Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the Press Alliance, Inc., recently issued a statement on the subject of the atomic bomb i.. which the so-called May-Johnson Act is discussed. There is much thoughtful material in the article. Can we sit on a scientific discovery and keep it a secret

from the world? Furthermore, if we can or could what effect would that have on world peace?

Here is the article:

ATOMICS—A QUESTION OF GENERATIONS

These are the times that try men's wits—old men's wits.

Under the influence of the President and the War Department, two scientists, Vannevar Bush and James Bryant Conant, with appropriate legal counsel (allegedly), drew a bill for the control of atomic energy. This bill has been introduced simultaneously into the House of Representatives and the Senate as the May-Johnson Act.

Mr. Bush and Mr. Conant are very distinguished scientists. They are no longer young men.

Mr. Bush is 55 years old. Mr. Conant is 52. The average age of the nuclear physicists who built the atomic bomb is 24½ years. Mr. Bush and Mr. Conant have one notion about the bomb which is at the bottom of their thinking about how it should be controlled. Almost without exception, the young nuclear physicists have another idea. They are in vocal revolt against the ideas of Messrs. Bush and Conant. Some of them even go so far as to state that if the May-Johnson Act is passed as written, they intend to violate it publicly as a patriotic act of civic disobedience and go to jail.

The point—in this writer's judgment—is that Messrs. Bush and Conant grew up in a different world. In their world—the world they first learned about—the universe was composed of 92 different sorts of bricks called elements, eternal, immutable, dependable. Together these constituted matter. Matter was limited and indestructible. Time could be regarded as the unfolding of an unyielding determinism, according to which everything that happened had to happen. It was an inhuman world but it was relatively small. In it a trained mind could find its way without more difficulty than when navigating the crowded front hall at home in the dark.

During the lifetime of these living older men, that universe decayed. Today it is completely dead. Not a single one of its cardinal assumptions has stood the test. But the memory of it still haunts and confuses the minds of people born into it.

The new universe is utterly different. It can best be considered as, well, a field of cosmic forces, probably in the end, of one force. The immutable 92 elements composing indestructible matter can each and every one be changed into something else. One of them has just been transformed into two brand-new elements. All of them may vanish, to merge as pure energy. Energy, mass, and velocity are inextricably linked.

The key to this universe is the atom—and most of the atom is empty space. Within that space fascinating entities called electrons, positrons, protons, neutrons, what nots, move and have their being. They are the only "bricks" of the new universe and they are as hard to put your finger on as fleas. Streaming into these atoms from an undetermined source come life, rain from heaven, invisible ultrapotent cosmic rays.

Yet, strangely enough, over these limitless forces mankind, with the atomic bomb, has begun to establish control. Cooperative development of this control is a prerequisite of human survival.

Iron-clad causation has broken down into major probability. In last analysis, most anything can happen.

In this new, freer world the young generation of scientists are at home. They take it for granted. Compared with the survival problem it offers, the problems that haunt the rest of us—political, economic, social—seem temporary. These young people calmly announce that the only safe antidote to the new bomb they have built is world government. When told that this is impossible they smile scornfully. Why should anything be impossible when it is also necessary?

To them, science is the key to future human living, the common inheritance of all nations.

Above all, science must be free. Scientists, not government, must direct research if it is to be successful. Scientists must consult among themselves freely, without interference.

The young nuclear scientists who discovered and built the atomic bomb believe the May-Johnson Act would, if it became law, limit atomic research. It would permit a governmental commission, possibly headed by an outsider, to decide what young scientists should experiment with. It would limit international cooperation in research.

Thereby it would defeat its own ends. Gagged and directed American minds would be no match for free minds in other countries. In seeking to secure American leadership in atomic research, the May-Johnson Act would kill that leadership.

Therefore they oppose the May-Johnson Act and hope the President will have it modified or withdrawn.

Ode to Ie Shima

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem from the Grand Rapids Herald, of October 24, 1945:

ODE TO IE SHIMA

There's an island Ie Shima;
Just a stone's throw from Japan.
Now it's marked with wooden crosses,
Where once was no man's land.
These are the graves of peaceful chaps
Whose love for freedom's bliss;
Caused them to give their lives, their all,
For just a hole like this.

If one of you could see it,
I'm sure you'd wonder why;
All these lives were given,
Why all these boys must die.
It's really not worth fighting for
As far as land's concerned;
It's only just a coral reef
From ocean's depths upturned.

But these lads did not fight for land,
For conquest or for fame;
They fought, you know, for freedom's love,
For loved ones, home, and name.
For the stripes that make Old Glory,
For the land across the sea;
So we could go on living
In a country of the free.

Though they didn't live to see it,
Their job is now complete
By others who followed in their steps
The lowly Jap to beat.
Now Old Glory flies so proudly,
O'er the palace in Japan.
We came, we saw, we conquered,
Did the job for Uncle Sam.

It's little that we ask tonight,
As we toss in restless sleep;
We only want to shake the hands
Of lads upon our street.
We only want to wander,
O'er the meadow's beauty green,
Or sit at night 'neath starlit skies,
Our arm around a queen.

This may be our gray-haired mother,
Or the wife we loved so well;
Who has prayed each day for safety
For her boy out in this hell.
Now that it is over,
Our troubled hearts doth yearn;
To see the smiles upon their faces
As all their men return.

So take us back that we may feel,
Good earth beneath our feet;
Or shake the hand of little lads,
That play upon our streets.
Or take that gray-haired mother
In our arms once more;
Or kiss the lips of faithful wives
Who wait upon the shore.

So that the island Ie Shima,
With its rocks, its cliffs, its caves;
May be just another name some night,
Nightmare of hell's own days.
But never shall we e'er forget,
This coral-rock domain.
Let us bow our hearts in silent prayer
At the mention of its name.

For here are others whose dreams like ours,
Can never be fulfilled.
They rest tonight 'neath coral's sand,
A cross on Ie's hill.
Let us not forget them;
May we make this world secure;
So our sons shall never see
The rocks of Ie's shore.

—*Staff Sgt. Robert Cox.*

UNRRA Supported by Michigan Council of Churches and Christian Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter received from the Michigan Council of Churches and Christian Education:

MICHIGAN COUNCIL OF CHURCHES
AND CHRISTIAN EDUCATION,
Lansing, Mich., October 12, 1945.

Hon. GEORGE F. SADOWSKI,
First Congressional District,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned members of the staff of the Michigan Council of Churches and Christian Education, realizing the desperate need of Europe for food and fuel, and believing that America as a Christian nation should render all help possible, urge you to support all measures for necessary rehabilitation, particularly release of UNRRA funds. We believe that the future peace of the world is in jeopardy as long as Europe is allowed to go hungry.

Respectfully yours,

J. Burt Bouwman, Kearney Kirkby, Edwin C. Earl, C. Walker Hayes, (Mrs. A. C.) Grace B. Evans, Birdice Lawrence, Lucy C. Smith, Pauline M. Ryder.

Training for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, President Truman commented on what he thinks is in the country's best interests. Unanimous consent having been granted me, so today I ask you to read an editorial which appeared in the Press-Telegram in my home city of Long Beach on October 24, 1945. It is a splendidly written editorial, self-explanatory, and expresses some of the thinking of one of the ablest newspaper staffs that I know of:

TRAINING FOR DEFENSE

If there is going to be a World War III—and nobody today can say confidently there won't be—the United States ought to have military training of its youth. The nation that is not ready to defend itself when the next attack comes may not survive the shock.

As President Truman told Congress, the development of technological warfare does not lessen the need of training men for military service, but increases it. When musket or rifle was the principal weapon, America might rely for its defense upon the million men who would spring to arms before sunset of the day when war started.

It is different with the machinery and chemistry of modern warfare. Scientific technicians are the product of thorough training. A year's advance training of them, says the President, might make the difference between life and death for the Nation.

During the recent war universal military training was opposed as being untimely. Opponents of it said the Nation should concentrate on winning the conflict it was in, and postpone until after the war the argument over training for a future war. Some of them now probably will say consideration of military training should be postponed until it is learned whether the United Nations Organization can end war.

A wiser plan is for the United States to find out by experience that it and nations associated with it can prevent war before America puts all of its trust in the new league of nations. Military training is not war. If war can be prevented, the boys who are trained never will be inducted into the armed forces.

President Truman deserves commendation for the courageous and patriotic stand he has taken for what he thinks is in the country's best interests. The question is highly controversial and is sure to arouse serious, even violent, opposition from a number of sources.

It is better to admit frankly that what the President proposes is military conscription, regardless of the technical distinction he draws between training and induction. It is compulsory service in peacetime, which is contrary to American traditions, and advocates of it, as something shown by two world conflicts to be necessary to the national safety, cannot deny that it will mean a year's delay in boys' entering college, or the loss of a year in beginning their life work; but two wars have proved to this generation of Americans that nothing is as disruptive of the lives of a people as war for which a nation is unprepared.

Though everybody is entitled to his opinion on so vital a question, those opposing universal training should concede that Americans, whose only desire after participation in two world wars has been to return to civilian life as quickly as possible, are not going to be made militaristic in spirit by a year's training. Furthermore, the existence of a body of trained civilians will avoid the need of a large standing army, which is even more repugnant to the powerful antimilitary sentiment in the United States.

Einstein's Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post, October 29, 1945.

Mr. Speaker, now that we have found the secret of secrets, now that we have gotten hold of the string that can unravel the universe, man is gripped by fear. A fear that he has never known before. We can use this fear to weld the peoples of the earth together into a harmonious, unified whole, or we can allow this fear to drive us farther apart and finally ring down the curtain on our civilization.

Already, as the Washington Post says, the shadow of the atom bomb has fallen across the conference table.

We cannot allow this shadow to remain for long.

The following editorial discusses what Albert Einstein, the original discoverer of the secret of atomic energy, has to say on the course we must follow at this time if we are to survive:

EINSTEIN'S IDEA

Anything that Albert Einstein, the original discoverer of the secret of atomic energy, has to say is bound to be significant, though it must be borne in mind that he is a physicist and not a political scientist. He and men like him have been at work for the past 2,000 years in improving and strengthening our physical organization. So shrunken has the world become as a result of their discoveries and inventions that mankind now finds itself living in a common room. Professor Einstein, in an interview with Mr. Raymond Swing in the Atlantic Monthly, recommends that we acknowledge the sameness of our living quarters in our political organization. Authority, in other words, would henceforth be universal. Instead of subjecting ourselves to the nation-state, we should subject ourselves to a world government.

The trouble is that there has been so little preparation for the world state. The riddle of the universe has been unraveled to a generation which is still wedded to life under separate sovereignties—to the authority of a unit instead of a cosmos. There is no form in our planetary life in the shape of a common religion let alone a common polity. Accordingly most people, we fancy, will approach the issue of political accommodation to the atomic age in terms of preparation for a world state. At any rate, this has been this newspaper's approach. However, the administration thinks differently. The President on Saturday talked of keeping the secret of the knowhow of the atomic bomb as a "sacred trust." The fact is attested by all nuclear scientists that the trust would be temporary. Within 18 months, according to Professor Oppenheimer, any nation armed with the Smyth handbook issued by the War Department and a hunk of U-235, or the kind of uranium which is at present fissionable, will be able to make an atomic bomb. Maybe by that time other materials will be fissionable. In another 5 years or so, according to Sir James Chadwick, the energy in the atom can be canalized for peacetime uses as well as exploded for war purposes. This is an age that has dawned suddenly, not slowly, as did the age of steam or of electricity.

This fact alone makes imperative an adjustment in the thinking of our statesmanship. We are thinking mainly of American statesmanship. For the responsibility is singularly ours, since this Nation is, in Mr. Churchill's words, on the summit of the world, and, moreover, took the lead in the first use of the atomic bomb for lethal purposes.

Action, in our opinion, should be taken at once to sound out the other governments of the world on a project to institute world government over all applied research on atomic energy. This would involve a proffer on our part of the secret of atomic knowhow. In return we should require that these properties in every country be brought under control of a world body to be set up by UNO; all factories engaged in atomic work and all uranium and thorium deposits. In addition, the world body should be given the right of inspection for its technical police in the countries of participating governments. If one or more countries refuse to help set up this world body, the proffer should be withdrawn, steps should be taken at once to form an alliance with those who had offered a partnership, and the objecting countries should be declared world outlaws. This is a suggestion which we advanced when the atomic bomb was first announced; we have seen no suggestion as yet which would improve upon it.

Certainly Professor Einstein's idea belongs to the future. It is the present we are concerned with. It is obvious from the setting up of atomic commissions in one country after another that a new and highly dangerous arms race is on. Already the shadow of the atom bomb falls across the conference table, and will continue to do so as long as the United States holds it as a "sacred trust." It is a shadow that by the same token is falling over the entire human race, making people prey to fears and nations anxious only to protect themselves by making bigger death-dealing missiles. No civilized life can be redeemed out of the holocaust of the last war unless this country makes a move along the suggested lines.

Blueprint for Postwar Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, a former Member of the House:

BLUEPRINT FOR POSTWAR PROSPERITY—THE MOST SUCCESSFUL POSTWAR PLAN EVER DEVISED—IT PULLED EARLY AMERICA OUT OF INFLATION AND CHAOS—IT WILL WORK AGAIN IF WE RETURN TO IT

(By Samuel B. Pettengill)

One hundred and fifty-seven years ago the Constitution of the United States was signed.

Following the Revolutionary War it was the plan upon which the postwar America was built. We are now concerned with the postwar America of 1945 and thereafter. We are looking forward with hope to the ending of the war, and then with much doubt and uncertainty to the peace years that will follow.

I wish to speak of the Constitution today, not with reference to freedom of worship, a free press, the right of self-government, etc., valuable as they are. Instead, I wish to speak of the Constitution in terms of jobs, prosperity and happy homes.

Many plans are being discussed with reference to jobs in postwar America. It is important that we plan. But it is doubtful if any of these modern plans will long succeed unless we fit them into the American Constitution. The Constitution has proven itself to be the greatest bread and butter document in the history of the world. Under it more people have enjoyed more of the goods and comforts of life than any other people under any other form of government.

Why is this so? It is to this question that I invite your attention. I believe its understanding by all Americans will go far to provide jobs for our soldier sons when they come home with banners flying, for demobilized war workers and our 2,000,000 young people who become of age each year.

Despite the cost and loss of war, our marvelous scientific advance has made it possible, for the first time in human history, to produce enough to provide a decent living for every American family. We have the physical, financial and the scientific resources, as well as the human skills, to produce the greatest era of prosperity the world has ever known. Nothing can cheat us out of this, except our failure to understand the reasons why America has prospered so greatly in the past and why it can do so again.

Why is it that by 1930 New York City had more telephones than all Russia? Why did Texas and 6 other American states each have more automobiles than England or France or Italy or Germany? Why did 7 percent of the world's people, living in America, have 45 percent of the world's wealth, and among themselves do almost half the business of the globe? Why did we have more life insurance than all the rest of the world? Why were we able to spend more on the education of our children than was spent by all other people in the world for their children?

There were many reasons for all this; but in planning for postwar America, we must not overlook the greatest reason of all. That was a stable and completely solvent Government under the Constitution of the United States, operating in the interest of all the people, with an enterprise system free from what President Wilson called the "palsied hand" of a vast governmental bureaucracy.

Compare our progress with that of any other country in Europe or Asia. For example, France during the past century had three republics and three empires, at least six different forms of government in 100 years. In such an atmosphere of uncertainty no one could make long-range plans for the future. As a result, France had a per capita income about one-third that of ours. Under such circumstances, she could not enjoy the tremendous advance that we have had. Other European countries had a similar experience and a similar fate.

The European country which had the most stable and predicable government was England, and it enjoyed the highest standard of living of any country overseas. But our 130,000,000 Americans by 1930 had greater income and a smaller debt than England, France, Italy, Germany, and 10 other European countries put together, with 435,000,000 people. That is the one reason why we are going to win this war.

What was it that we had that these other nations did not have? Our great asset was a written Constitution and a people devoted to it, who believed that they should support the Government rather than the Government support them. Both of our great political parties swore to defend the Constitution. As a result, despite many hard-fought political campaigns, when the votes were counted, the losers accepted the results in good spirits. They wheeled the winners around the courthouse in wheelbarrows, shook hands and went back to work.

The chief reason for all of this is the fact that the great basic rights and freedoms of Americans were never at stake in a political campaign. As the pendulum has swung from one party to the other no temporary majority of either party ever thought of challenging these basic rights.

But are they safe today? That is not my question. That is what millions of people are now asking.

The Constitution's safeguards have been a priceless asset to us in the past and can be still more valuable to us in this unsettled world. I pray to God that the men and women of both great parties will continue to remain loyal to the American Constitution in the days to come. Our happiness, our prosperity, our domestic concord, and jobs for our soldier sons, the workers in our great factories and those who till the soil depend on it.

Despite the immense importance of freedom of religion, freedom of speech, of the press, and of assembly, etc., the Constitution was the bread-and-butter side of life, and that was the chief reason why our fathers adopted it. They wanted to make life, liberty, and property secure; to make contracts enforceable, to make government stable and predictable and thus encourage business to plan and expand. In short, our fathers wanted government to provide ground rules by which the game of life could be played. They wanted to prevent the umpire from changing the goal posts every time the ball was put in play.

The Constitution was written in 1787 when there was almost total collapse of confidence in the future of America. All real wealth had gone into hiding; no credit was available anywhere.

Fear of inflation and repudiation hung over the land. In such an atmosphere of chaos the Constitution provided that no State could impair the obligation of contracts, including its own. No man could be deprived by his Government of life, liberty, or property, except by due process of law.

No man's property could be taken for public use except for just compensation and under lawful procedure.

All taxes had to be uniform. This assured all men of equal treatment by government. The United States guaranteed each State a republican or representative form of government. This was designed to end the threat of any budding dictatorship. Every citizen was to have the same legal privileges and immunities as all others.

The Federal Government was given only limited power over the lives and business affairs of our people. This was intended to prevent national socialism, which requires a government of unlimited power. It enshrines free enterprise as opposed to political ownership or management of business. It gave men the assurance that they could plan their own futures. Elections were made nonpostponable and frequent in time. This assured men that they could get rid of a government which abused its powers over them.

The Constitution made the liberty of the citizen the keystone of progress. Under it every American had the right to choose any lawful occupation without leave from anyone, to change jobs or employers, to move to better one's chances in life, to keep what one makes, to own property, and enjoy its fruits; to have and to hold. The Constitution thus released the most powerful incentives to work and climb the ladder of success, the world has ever known.

Patents were protected by the Constitution, and we became the greatest inventors in human history, constantly creating slaves of iron and steel to lift the burden of soul-killing drudgery from the backs of men.

The Constitution protected property, stocks, and bonds, and because it did so, our thrifty investors promoted these patents into enormous production which reduced unit costs and so brought them within the reach of millions.

The Constitution gave our courts the right and duty to hold unconstitutional any law of Congress or the acts of any President which infringed on our basic freedoms. It assured them against oppression by government; against government by bayonets. It placed the citizen for the first time in history on equal terms with the state itself.

This was done and then what happened? Within 3 years Alexander Hamilton, as Secretary of the Treasury, was able to borrow money from Holland for the United States on better credit terms than any nation in the world save one. And then to this new land of few people and little capital hundreds of millions of dollars poured across the Atlantic to build our canals, our turnpikes, our railroads, and our great industries. Foreign investors found in America, behind the mighty dikes of the Constitution, the safest refuge in the world. As we accumulated capital of our own, we began to invest it in the 10-, 30-, or 50-year promises of American industry, realizing that while we took the business hazards of success, we were free from the political hazard of confiscation, or repudiation.

The Constitution thus released the springs of energy, the ideas, inventions, dreams, and ambitions of millions of freemen to march forward in the greatest pilgrimage of progress the world has ever known. It turned work, thrift, sweat, and hope loose in this free and fortunate land. The American standard of living became the most revolutionary fact in the modern world.

This is what our farsighted forefathers did for us. If I were planning a postwar business now, I would try to locate the home road once more. I would try to understand and get my fellow citizens to understand why for a century we had the greatest prosperity, national unity, and good feeling ever known to history. If we preserve the Constitution now from being undermined, we can rebuild the wreck of war as our forefathers did.

If we let our charter of freedom slip from our hands, we may wade through debt, repudiation, and domestic discord for long years to come.

Let us return to the Constitution.

Give our billions of American capital, now choking our banks, the same confidence in the stability of American institutions that European capital had 100 years ago and we can march forward again.

Maintain the Constitution and its guarantees of liberty and property, elect men to public office, Democrat or Republican, who will fight to preserve liberty under law, and the rights of the States against concentrated power; restore free markets for goods and money, prevent monopoly wherever it exists, and we can have a hundred and twenty-five billion dollar national income—we can pay our huge debt with honest dollars, secured by reasonable taxes levied against a huge base of national income; we can give the green light to the new Edisons, Burbanks, Whitneys, and Fords.

We can climb new Pike's Peaks; we can go on to new Klondikes; we can harness these billions of dollars to the Aladdin's lamp of

modern science, technology, and power to rebuild this war-torn land; we can tear down our slums; we can provide employment for all who want to work and succeed.

And we can again become a great, a free, and happy people.

High Cost of Being President, U. S. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article which appeared in the American Weekly magazine on October 28, 1945:

HIGH COST OF BEING PRESIDENT, U. S. A.

If your little man who is going to be President some day is not rich when he steps into the White House he is going to have a hard time to make ends meet.

Any mother's son, of course, can aspire to the top job in this free country, and may get it as threadbare Abe Lincoln did—but today it's no place for a poor man.

Harry S. Truman, up from the grass roots, knows this as well as anyone, and many Congressmen are saying it's time to save him from financial worries.

With no private income to fall back on, as the late millionaire President Roosevelt did through 12 years he can sharpen his pencil point as often as he wants to, and still have to figure that financially he isn't sitting as easy as a $2,600 a year Government clerk.

"Well, his take-home money comes to $75,000 a year," someone may say right away. "He ought to be able to scrape along on that."

Let's see.

He is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and as President he holds the Nation's highest honor, but like any John Doe, he pays an income tax. It's a whopper.

Congress fixes his pay by law, and unlike the head of a big industrial corporation, he can't reduce his salary figure and thus net more in a lower income bracket. He can't incorporate himself as some movie stars do. He must take the rap on the whole $75,000.

First, Uncle Sam reaches out and whacks $46,000 off the $75,000. (Until President Roosevelt took office, the Presidential salary was immune to taxes.)

Next, his home State of Missouri swings. It knocks off about $3,000.

Before the President has even bought a pack of chewing gum, his salary is down to little more than $25,000.

He isn't through with taxes yet. He's a home owner. In Independence, Mo., just outside Kansas City, is the Truman house. On that he pays a varying tax rate, as any small-town property owner does.

"But he gets free rent in the White House, doesn't he?" the question sometimes bobs up.

Of course, he does. Also he meets so many expenses there, not paid by the Government that he would be better off living in the modest Washington apartment he had when he was a Senator and then Vice President.

The White House is a big domestic establishment. It has to have a host of servants. They have to be fed.

Guests come and go, and keep on coming. Until you are President, you don't know how many people can drop in, nor how many you have to ask as a matter of course.

When Gen. Charles de Gaulle, provisional President of France, is a state guest at the White House, as he was recently, expenses are paid out of a special fund. But a group of Senatorial friends, or run-of-the-mill diners and house guests from hither and yon are people of another stripe. The President foots the bills.

So there goes $7,500 a year more for food.

Now, with Federal income tax paid, State income tax paid, local property taxes paid, and food bills met, the $75,000 is down to $15,000.

Still the President hasn't tackled the normal expenses of the head of the family. He hasn't stopped to say to himself, "I had a hundred bucks Wednesday morning. Now all I've got is a fin. This is funny."

One considerable expense he's probably glad to meet. He can feel warm inside about it. What's a man want money for, anyway, more than for something like this? He's sending his daughter through college—George Washington University.

Then there is the clothing bill for the family. There's life insurance and home insurance. Lodge dues, gratuities, and contributions. Incidentals and always the procession of unexpected drains on the wallet that any family man knows come as inevitably as a change in the weather.

President Truman, by careful housekeeping and frugal living, under the circumstances, is lucky at the end of the year to have anything left of his 75 grand.

Heads of some other great nations must smile about this. A President has to skimp and pinch. Americans are funny people. The people elsewhere must think so.

King George of England, for example, rereceives enormous royal grants. That's the King's lot. President Truman, when he stepped up to the top job, actually took a loss. He was getting along better financially during the short time he was Vice President.

President Taft was the only President ever to receive his full $75,000 a year. The President's pay was increased from $50,000 to $75,000 in 1909. In addition he received a $25,000 yearly fund for traveling expenses.

President Truman receives $30,000 yearly for travel expenses and for entertainment on state occasions. This defrays the cost of such Presidential trips as Big Three conferences and United Nations parleys, and it takes care of visiting foreign dignitaries and White House receptions.

Its use is strictly limited to state purposes and it is not an additional item of Presidential income.

The actual income has been going down in purchasing value much of the time since the first Presidential salary was put on the books on September 24, 1789. The Continental Congress on that day fixed it at $25,000. A lot of money then.

President Washington, as it turned out, didn't care much whether it was a lot or not. He was wealthy in his own right, had large land holdings, and his beautiful plantation at Mount Vernon on the Potomac below Washington. Food wasn't something bought all the time; it grew. There was no servant problem.

The Presidential salary remained at $25,000 until 1873, when it was raised to $50,000 during the administration of Ulysses S. Grant. Then in 1906, when Theodore Roosevelt was President, Congress voted the travel fund, at first, $25,000.

The White House itself always has been a kind of Government stepchild. It has had to get along a good deal on its own, and no one ever has seemed to want to claim it.

It is, of course, the executive branch of government, as the Congress is the legislative branch, but it never has received appropriations on the basis of other Government departments.

It is far more than merely an Executive Mansion where the President lives. In a way it is a business organization of fair proportions.

For the Mansion and Grounds there is a force of employees, usually about 70. They include ushers and servants in the White House, and gardeners, electricians, painters, engineers, and a variety of smaller fry.

In the Executive Offices of the White House, a section in the west wing where the President works, there is a clerical force of about 260. Almost none are on the White House pay roll. Most are under civil service and are really employed by another Government agency such as the State Department, Agriculture Department, or other agency.

The size of the force varies with the needs of the White House, with war years and the present postwar work keeping it large. The employees are regarded as being lent to the White House, although some may work there for years.

When duties let up, the personnel is sifted; some may stay, some may go back to the department which had employed them.

Since President Truman has been in office, he has instituted some economies, and here and there the staff has been reduced.

Like the other White House employees, the police force there came over from another branch of the Government. The police, charged with the protection of the White House establishment in general and the surrounding grounds, are under the Treasury Department and their salaries are paid by it.

The Secret Service operatives at the White House also are from the Treasury Department.

In the White House's east wing are the offices of John W. Snyder, Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion. It is an important office and its work is complex.

War and postwar work adds to the scope of the duties performed there. This has meant, and still does mean, crowding here and there. Some of the functions of the White House had to be transferred to the adjacent State Department Building.

In that building, for example, were the offices of the six Presidential assistants whom the late President Roosevelt described as "men with a passion for anonymity." President Roosevelt, while in the White House, paid the salaries of two private secretaries, and Mrs. Roosevelt paid one secretary. When necessary, they hired extras.

Their affairs were multifarious, and they were satisfied only with expert assistants. This ran into money, but not to any sum which could have caused them much concern, considering the mode of life to which they had been accustomed.

President Roosevelt paid the salary of Reynolds, his butler, and the wages of servants who were brought from Hyde Park and New York on special occasions. Besides the butler, regularly, there was a second man, a chauffeur, a private cook, first, second, and third maids, and a laundress. Mr. Truman never had such a retinue of servants; in fact he had just a hired girl.

Mr. Roosevelt did not mind the expenses. The huge income-tax slice out of his salary did not trouble him, either. He always had the solid Roosevelt fortune to depend on.

Both he and Mrs. Roosevelt favored holding salaries down long before an actual limit was fixed. Mrs. Roosevelt in 1942 suggested a limitation in her newspaper column, and Mr. Roosevelt in messages to Congress on April 27, 1942, asked that a net of $25,000 be established. Both the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee discussed the plan but did not take action.

Then Mr. Roosevelt in a Presidential directive on October 3, 1942, ordered that net salaries, after taxes, should not be more than $25,000. Congress, in April 1943, nullified the order by amending the public debt limit bill.

The short-lived limitation, even if it had been extended indefinitely, of course, would

have given no financial twinge to Mr. Roosevelt. His private income was $140,000 a year.

Harry Truman's position is one in sharp contrast. Soda clerk, newsboy, railway paymaster among tough section hands, artillery officer, unsuccessful merchant, notably successful politician, he has worked diligently, paid his debts, learned his various jobs, and come through the hard way to a position of great trust.

Coming to it that way, he hasn't piled up a stack of bonds with coupons ready for the shears. He isn't a President who can depend on a big, steady family income to pay part of his current expenses.

He still must keep an eye on pay day.

He remembers having heard that when President Roosevelt was 5 years old his parents took him to the White House. President Cleveland, then in office, patted him on the head, and said:

"Young man, may you never have to be President of the United States."

Cleveland, of course, was thinking of the cares and responsibilities that bow down the heads of Presidents. Times were easier then, and a man with a few dollars in his pocket could make them do more than he can today.

Realizing this, and realizing that many a successor may be in Mr. Truman's financial position, too, many Congressmen believe there should be no more delay in raising the President's salary.

They feel the country will be behind them in the idea that the President ought not have to pinch nickels. They even go a little further.

They think the country will stand back of the principle that a worker is worthy of his hire—and ought to be able to lay by a little something for the days ahead.

Leon Henderson on Wages and Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, if, when the Government was awarding defense contracts of 1941, the public had been as much concerned over the prices the Government would have to pay for war materials as it now is over the prices it will have to pay for peacetime goods, the advice given to the Ways and Means Committee by Mr. Leon Henderson in 1941 might have carried more weight.

It will be recalled that Mr. Leon Henderson came to national prominence as an economist advocating the cause of labor. In that capacity he played a major part in the drafting of labor legislation of that period and especially in the drafting of the Fair Labor Standards Act, which in addition to fixing minimum wage standards also employed devices of penalizing employment beyond 40 hours a week for the purpose of spreading employment.

In 1941, when our democratic allies were on the verge of utter defeat and our major problem was how to get aid to them that would be neither too little nor too late, Mr. Henderson, serving as Administrator, Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply, suggested the relaxation of the 40-hour workweek as an appropriate method of speeding up production as well as for the control of prices. His advice was not followed, and we had a resulting price increase of approximately 30 percent. No one has attempted to figure what that price increase cost the Government on its war contracts or what it has cost and is still costing the consuming public, but the total runs into the billions.

No one has been more opposed than I to a general sales tax as a peacetime method of financing the Government, yet every economist will tell you that price inflation is more drastic than the same percentage of sales taxes. We are already trading in 70-cent dollars, which means that nearly one-third of the income of the Nation before any other expenses are paid has been consumed by price inflation. Experience has demonstrated that while some may temporarily gain from price inflation, it is impossible for all to have their incomes increased as the cost of living goes up, and it is likewise impossible to prevent a period of inflation from ultimately turning into a period of deflation when all will suffer.

Since this is the most serious issue that now confronts us, the following testimony of Mr. Leon Henderson, given before the Ways and Means Committee on May 7, 1941, should be reexamined since he was a friend of labor and voiced his honest convictions as to what would be best for labor as well as the general public:

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Henderson, if Mr. Baruch's statements that uncontrolled prices in World War I added an unnecessary $15,000,000,000 to the cost of our armament, what did those prices add to all the purchases of consumers in the country?

Mr. HENDERSON. I would say at least twice as much a year.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That would be, in cost to the taxpayers and to the people generally, many times the emergency taxes that are now proposed partly to finance our defense program; and partly, as you say, to be used in connection with other things in preventing runaway prices.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is right. The effect on the civilian is not as marked as it is with the Government. The Government was using a very high percentage of borrowing, and that debt was projected into a later period when the price level had been reduced. Now, a lot of prices that are paid currently in connection with the price rise represent income payments to some individuals as well as cost to others. And there is what you might call an adjustment constantly taking place. But somebody gets stuck at the end when the play is over, just as happens in stock-market inflation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The gentleman from New York, Dr. Crowther, and I have been trying to develop the theory that the small-income man is paying considerable taxes under the existing laws, more than he realizes, and more than the public realizes.

Your chart indicates that under existing laws, the man with an income of under $500 per year pays a higher rate of taxes than any income group until you get up to $10,000 per year.

Mr. HENDERSON. At the present time; yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And that under the surtaxes proposed in the Treasury plan, you would get up to an income of $3,000 a year before that man would pay as high a rate of taxes as the $500 a year man.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And that is the reason you oppose even the excise taxes proposed in the Treasury plan except on certain luxury goods and durable goods that compete in the defense program for essential raw materials.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is correct. I would put it this way, Mr. Robertson. As I said, we are going to have 4,000,000 automobiles next year. We made 5,300,000 in the last year. The demand for them would probably run 6,000,000 if there had not been a curtailment by Mr. Knudsen. That curtailment was for the purpose of getting essential materials and skills. Now, one of the things which would help keep that in line and help keep a diversion going, and add pressure also on the automobile industry, would be a tax of 20 percent.

Mr. ROBERTSON. There should be no doubt in the mind of anyone that the lack of price control in World War No. 1 was a very costly error for our Government, and the necessity for it now should be quite apparent. But did we not attempt price conerol during World War No. 1?

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes; but a lot of damage had been done. The war broke out, as you know, in August 1914, and it was 3 years later before we got into it. And it was in that period, as I recall it, that the wholesale price level went up about 75 percent.

Then in the period of control, they only controlled certain items. There was another 10- to 12-percent advance, and then when these controls were taken off, at the conclusion of the war, we had another 20 percent. So that the highest part of the price rise in the last war was really before and after we used the controls.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I recall quite distinctly that the Government indicted a lot of coal operators for selling coal at $15 to $20 a ton, which was about three times the Government price, and then abandoned the prosecution because they reached the conclusion that they had no adequate law to sustain the program.

Have you got enough law now to sustain this necessary program that has been loaded on you?

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes. At the present time we have got everything that the War Industries Board had, and even more, as far as the ways in which you secure compliance are concerned, leaving out the principal thing, which is the general support of the community for price ceilings.

Let me point out that where the Lever Act fell down was on a constitutional matter of the application, and it was not due to the general powers that had been exercised. The Lever Act tried to control exactly the margins which retailers would be permitted to charge, and I think it failed on a technical point there.

Mr. ROBERTSON. You have all the law that you want to handle this?

Mr. HENDERSON. We have got all the law that we need at this present time. We have had only a four-point rise in the index since this defense program started. I do not know how long that will continue.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, let us see what this present time is and what may lie immediately before us. You probably heard the radio address last night by the Secretary of War?

Mr. HENDERSON. No, Mr. Robertson. I was working on my statement.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think he said in effect that we have got to do whatever is necessary at the present time to get our supplies to Great Britain.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, I agree with that.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is a big order, is it not?

Mr. HENDERSON. That is a big order.

Mr. ROBERTSON. You probably noticed in the press this morning that after sending up a budget in January, estimating defense appropriations at $28,500,000,000, it was then

raised to approximately $40,000,000,000, and now it is proposed to increase that greatly.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not think it is big enough yet. I think it should have been bigger, and it should have come earlier.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I believe you told us that if we spent the money that is necessary to be spent to get the production that is necessary to be had, we will have to add four or five million workers in industry alone.

Mr. HENDERSON. What I said was, if we can get that much, we can put that many people to work.

Mr. ROBERTSON. You mean get that much money?

Mr. HENDERSON. No; it is not marks to the credit of the Treasury, such as flow out of an appropriation. What I mean is, get the actual pig iron capacity built, the blast furnaces, things like that. You can appropriate money, but that will not get 10,000,000 more tons of iron ore down from the Mesabi range. You can appropriate money, but that will not get 5,000,000 more tons of scrap. The demand is already there, Mr. Robertson, and I am saying if we can find, by working with the steel industry how we can get additional capacity, we will get $4,000,000,000 more of income, and we will get more people back to work. I said if we had no bottlenecks at all, if we could get next year's production the way we got last year's production, by merely taking up idle capacity, we would put four or five million people back to work.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I was struck with your statement to us, because it defines our experience in agriculture; that it is very difficult to set aside the laws of supply and demand. When we have too much cotton and too much wheat and too much tobacco, a Government stabilization program does not get us very far because everybody sees the visible supply, and if the demand is not there, the price will not be there.

I believe you applied that to consumer goods.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That one means of keeping down too rapid advance in consumer goods would be to produce more goods to equalize this income which you say may go to $108,000,000,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. I said I thought it would go around $95,000,000,000.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In which year?

Mr. HENDERSON. In the coming year; that it might go to $108,000,000,000 if we had no bottlenecks.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is an unparalleled income.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I was wondering if other forces are not going to be at work that may make your task more difficult. For instance, you said that the machine-tool workers have found a way to step up production, to meet the stepped-up demand. And is not the way they have found to do that a two-shift program, working one shift 50 hours a week and another shift 55 hours a week?

Mr. HENDERSON. Let me go back. I did not say the machine-tool people had found enough. I meant to imply that they had always found some way, even when they felt they had reached their limit of going further. They have done it in many ways. They have done it sometimes by financing their own plant expansion. They have done it by financial expansion with Government funds. They have done it by reorganization of their own efficiency methods. They have done it by more shifts. Even at that, there is still quite a bit of lag. Some of the machine-tool industry is a 2½-shift basis, but on the average they are only working about 65 or 70 percent even of that basis.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not know whether I have been correctly informed or not, that the machine-tool industry is working 50 to 55 hours a week.

Mr. HENDERSON. I cannot answer that specific question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I got it from high Government source.

Mr. HENDERSON. I presume it is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then I went to a machine-tool manufacturer and I said, "What are you paying in overtime per week?" And he said, "An average of 12 hours a week." And I said, "Who pays for that?"

Now, what is your guess as to who pays for that?

Mr. HENDERSON. I think since the Government directly or indirectly is taking most of the machine tools, the Government is.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That was his answer, and he said, "Not only does the Government pay for that overtime but we have an escalator clause in our contract, if wages go up still further, the Government pays still more."

Mr. HENDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is true, is it not?

Mr. HENDERSON. That is true.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I saw in the paper this morning—I do not know whether you had the time to read the paper, getting all these figures ready for us, or not -that the workers in the shoe industry had notified you that they wanted a 20-percent increase in wages, but that you must not let the price of shoes go up.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is correct. I might say that is the first time I ever knew a union to make a move toward helping control prices; usually it is the other way. The union and the employers get together, and they say, "We will give you a wage increase" and "we wil' let the price go up." So this was refreshing. And you have got to keep in mind that I was at the NRA.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have not forgotten that.

Mr. HENDERSON. And I have not.

Mr. DINGELL. Can you do that?

Mr. HENDERSON. Do what?

Mr. DINGELL. Give them a raise in wages and still hold the price where it is.

Mr. HENDERSON. In many industries, yes. In many industries sometimes wage increases can come, as they always have come, out of increased productivity of the industry working at a high level of activity.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It was estimated by the operators that an increase to a dollar an hour, 7 hours a day, for 5 days a week in coal would probably add $200,000,000 to the cost of coal. And I believe you finally eased off a little bit on the question of the price of coal.

Mr. HENDERSON. I did not ease off. It went back under the aegis of the Bituminous Coal Commission.

Mr. ROBERTSON. A few days ago, the chairman of the board of the Steel Corporation observed that the recent increase in wages paid by the Steel Corporation would add $60,000,000 a year to the cost of the United States Steel Corporation. They do not know yet what the added cost to the coke will be in the production of steel, but they estimate that it would probably be $1.25 a ton.

Mr. HENDERSON. Did you take a pencil and their statement, and do a little arithmetic and see how much they would still have left, after they paid that increase?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. I saw that in 1940 they had a net income of approximately $100,000,000. But I also saw that on substantially the same amount of business in 1929 they had a net income of $190,000,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. That year, 1929, is a sport as far as the earnings of the Steel Corporation is concerned. Between 1922 and 1928, the period of their greatest activity, the average was around $90,000,000, and I do not know of a statistician yet who works with figures that does not throw out 1929 in the Steel Corporation's earnings.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, I am neither an economist, nor an expert, but I saw a chart prepared by Mr. David Lawrence's experts; they are supposed to be economists, and you will see in that chart that between 1929 earnings and 1941 estimated earnings, the earnings of all these big companies, would be about $600,000,000 more, while the wage shows an increase of some two billion. Do you think that chart is correct?

Mr. HENDERSON. If it is in the United States News I would assume that it was.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. But, Mr. Robertson, I do not want to leave the impression that I agree or approve of the distribution of income as between profits and wages in 1929.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, I am not referring to that, but the point I am coming to is this: When you fix prices, you have got to take into consideration the cost of production.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And wages are a part of the cost of production.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. At the present time, in industry in 1941, what percentage of the value of the manufactured product is represented by the wages?

Mr. HENDERSON. On a national-income basis I think it would be somewhere around 63 percent for wages and salaries.

Mr. ROBERTSON. 63 percent of the value of the product is represented by wages and salaries?

Mr. HENDERSON. No; I said that as a percentage of the national income, salaries and wages——

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am trying to get a breakdown, if I can, as to the cost of production, showing what percentage of the cost of the manufactured product is represented by wages and salaries.

Mr. HENDERSON. It varies from a very low percentage in the chemical industry and the cigarette industry to a very high percentage in the coal industry.

Mr. ROBERTSON. What would the average be? I am sure that you have some averages.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, I know the disadvantage of an average like that, using the average between the cigarette manufacturer and the coal industry. I can give you an average if you want it, but I do not think it is useful. I would rather go to the cost of production in a particular industry that we had put a price ceiling on.

Mr. ROBERTSON. When you appeared before the Joint Committee on Labor of the House and Senate on behalf of the 40-hour week did you not give an average in making your point as to what would be the result if you put a limitation on the hours of work to 40?

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, I presented five pages of industries.

Mr. ROBERTSON. What is the general average cost of labor given by you in your statement that if you put a high enough penalty for working more than 40 hours industry could not afford to do it?

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not recall my testimony before the committee, but I will say I will stand back of it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Here is your testimony before the joint committee of the House and Senate at that time, in which you state that, based on 1936 production, the wages and labor represented 38 percent of the manufacturers' cost.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would say that I had made a calculation by taking a weighted average of all the industries that had reported to the Department of Commerce, and made a very careful estimate upon it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. There have been many increases in wages since 1936, have there not?

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Therefore the percentage now would be greater?

Mr. HENDERSON. Not necessarily, because we have got higher productivity from workers.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, some, but not as much higher as the increase in many industries in wages; is that not true? You may have some increase in individual production since 1936, but the increase in most plants has not kept pace with the increase in wages.

Mr. HENDERSON. No; no; it has not in the durable-goods industries. It has in the nondurable; and even in the durable-goods industries it has since 1937.

Mr. ROBERTSON. All right. If we go ahead with our defense program, as you have indicated, and I favor it, and most Members of Congress favor it, and also increase the production of consumer goods that do not compete with it, do you think we will reach maximum employment of labor, that is, of those who are ready, able, and willing to have a job?

Mr. HENDERSON. That depends on how well we plan our expansion. If we let things run for a while there can be a few months of inflation when we would have, I suspect, nearly full employment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I believe in 1937 you estimated unemployment at 7,900,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is about correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And in order to put people to work I believe you recommended a high penalty for working anybody engaged in any interstate-commerce activity—of course, since that date all distinction has been wiped out, as you well know—a heavy penalty of 50 percent for working a man more than 40 hours, and if you work on holidays or some other such occasions, 100 percent. Is that not correct?

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not recall that I made that specific recommendation, but at times of low employment that is not a bad idea. At a time of low employment, when naturally we require a great number of people to be employed, I would be in favor of any kind of a reasonable strategem that would put more people on the pay roll.

Mr. ROBERTSON. At the time of that hearing you quoted with approval the study by Mr. Witt Bowden, of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, that you said was published in January 1937, studying the employment of 2,200,000 workers, and you said the wage reduction following the NRA of so much gave a cost average which was reflected in lower prices.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, if wage reduction would result in a lower cost average, high wages would operate just in the reverse, would it not?

Mr. HENDERSON. Not in the same ratio; depending on how large your operation was.

I have got some figures, the best I could possibly get, of the unit labor costs. You can get those by calling on the Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Now, let me see, that was 1936 or 1937, was it not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes; 1937.

Mr. HENDERSON. In 1936 hourly earnings on durable goods were about 91 in the index, based on the 1935-39 average. They are now 112, but output per man-hour was only 98 and now it is 113.

The unit labor cost was 93; it went up to 104 in 1937; 108 in 1938; but then it went down to 99 in 1939; and 99 in 1940.

That is, while hourly earnings were going up, the output per man was going up, too. Labor costs are lower than in 1937.

The index of production in that time on the same goods went up from 108 to 135.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I want to read you a sentence from your testimony in June 1937, which is found on page 158 of the printed hearings, in which you stated:

"Many lessons are to be learned from the NRA experience, many of which relate to administration. Certainly it was learned that penalizing overtime needs to be stiff to force reemployment."

Mr. HENDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The 50-percent overtime was presented by you at that time, not as a fair wage, but as a penalty to spread employment.

And are you still of that same opinion?

Mr. HENDERSON. If we are in a low level of employment, yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is the very point I am trying to come to. And, it has been bothering me all through these hearings about stepping up production of consumer goods and keeping the price down for the manufacturers who must increase production, but if they work their men more than 40 hours a week we will penalize them up to 50 percent for holidays, Sundays, and Saturday; but we are asking them for 100 percent production, and yet we penalize them for meeting the requirements.

Now would not the reasons that you advanced in 1937 for the penalty apply with reverse English for taking off or relaxing the restrictions which in 1937, on the basis of employment in 1936 you said would apply to 12,000,000 men?

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Robertson, I stand on that testimony, and I think it was good. I think at the present time that those in charge of the Wage and Hour Division—and I notice in the press this morning the statement that there were cases where wages and hours interfered—would consider relaxation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It seems to me that the production problem is already sufficiently acute for some action, and do you think they have got the power, in interstate commerce, to relax the 40-hour week?

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, I think there have been many modifications, and there have been a number in the defense industry.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I don't think they could do it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think he could do it—that is my impression—and I think he said he would.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Do you not really think, with this program confronting us, it is vitally necessary to keep down these prices not only for defense articles but in order that we should give people work, and that it is advisable not to penalize an employer who works a man more than 40 hours a week, since when you are putting that on, you are penalizing the expansion of employment?

Mr. HENDERSON. I think that ought to be given serious consideration if he can't increase the number of shifts.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Thank you very much. That is a better answer than I got from an economist last week when I ask if the economists had endorsed his supplemental statement, and he said they did not endorse his statement but they endorsed the general atmosphere.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think you will find the Defense Commission has been giving a lot of serious consideration to this, and I would guess, although I am not in the Labor Division, that what was stated in this morning's paper represents the kind of consideration they want to give at this time as between the responsibility for producing and the responsibility for wages-and-hours standards.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think that will be fair.

* * * * *

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have just one matter, and it won't take me but half a minute. When the labor shortage occurs that the gentleman from Michigan referred to, shall we relax the restraint upon production of a 40-hour week if we want to carry out your program with the fullest production possible?

Mr. HENDERSON. In the arsenals, Mr. Robertson, when they have run smack up against that, there has been relaxation. I think that Hillman has found time and time again that there is a lot of complaint where there is no real difficulty, and where they won't take on skilled workers. However, I think on every legitimate case we ought to; I think that that is what the purpose of the flexibility act is for.

Mr. ROBERTSON. You and I will have to get together on an amendment to the law, because since you have testified this morning General Fleming advised me that no matter how acute the shortage might become he has no power to relax the 40-hour requirement in interstate commerce.

A Proposal for Advancing the Science of Human Relationships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the following proposal has been prepared in pamphlet form by two young servicemen of the recent war. It is encouraging to find America's veterans turning their thoughts to peace and devoting their thinking to the evolvement of constructive proposals for marshaling the brain power of this country for the solving of current problems. I am happy to pass the suggestion of these two young men along to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD both in and out of Washington.

One of these young men is remotely related to me as he is the son of a cousin of mine; the other is Ensign Clawson, who is presently on his way to Tokyo. Either of these servicemen, however, can be contacted at the permanent addresses given at the conclusion of their proposal, so if there are those who read these remarks who desire to correspond with the authors of this suggestion for creating a national research committee to devote its time to the finding of solutions for specific domestic problems, you will know where to write to them.

The proposal follows:

WHAT ABOUT THE HUMAN PROBLEMS OF DEMOCRACY?

In a single issue of the New York Times readers wrote their opinions of the atomic bomb. "It is a stain upon our national life * * *." "It is simply mass murder, sheer terrorism * * *." "Let us * * * dump the whole thing into the Atlantic or Pacific * * * man is too frail to be entrusted with such power."

The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. G. F. Fisher, was not afraid of "endless destruction" but he did warn: "Men must become better men. That is the moral of it all."

Radar is another of the fantastic, Buck-Rogerish inventions of World War II. So is jet propulsion.

These dramatic advances, achieved under the fearful impulse of war, have stretched almost to the breaking point one of the most dangerous maladjustments in modern civilization—the lag of human science behind physical science.

Yet plans are already under way to continue research in physical sciences through a peacetime version of the Office of Scientific Research and Development—to the entire and flagrant neglect of social science.

It is, therefore, urged that a committee on human research and development be organized to coordinate human research and experimentation on a Nation-wide scale. It was with national coordination that the Office of Scientific Research and Development produced the atomic bomb and other decisive weapons.

Whatever the final organization of the committee, it should somehow perform these vital functions:

1. RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION

It would farm out projects and funds to social research centers all over the country calling for the solution of specific problems. To do this, it would encourage the study of

problems such as strikes, depressions, unemployment, Government reorganization, the revitalization of religion, race riots, family stability, juvenile delinquency, etc. Thus it would initiate and support scientifically controlled, real-life experiments on possible solutions to these problems and eventually secure reliable answers to them.

The applied part of the research and experimentation would go hand in hand with pure or basic research and experimentation, since basic social and psychological laws underlie specific solutions.

Graduate students and teachers in psychology, sociology, anthropology, economics, public administration, and other pertinent fields would work on pure and applied projects, sometimes initiated and proposed by themselves, sometimes as directed by the committee.

It is urgent that human research be now put under forced draft and that the advances of the next quarter century in this field be telescoped into a much shorter interval. The physical sciences have already proved that this can be done. Though miracles cannot be expected overnight, the first step must be taken now. The social sciences admittedly lag far behind the physical sciences, but they are nevertheless advanced enough to be useful from the very start. The impressive list of wartime contributions by the social sciences include their achievements in the fields of morale, public-opinion measurement, food habits, consumer habits, spending and saving, radio, and communications, national psychologies, personnel selection, rumor control, race tensions, etc.

2. DEVELOPMENT

The committee would fill its fundamental purpose when it makes its findings known to the public, to the Nation's leaders, and to its future leaders. This it must do as rapidly and steadily as possible, carefully avoiding the propagation of half-digested or undependable social knowledge.

In carrying out this educational function the committee would not only benefit the people by enabling them to make wise decisions on national problems, but it would place highly valuable information in the hands of their leaders, who must take confident action.

How would the committee be financed? Funds might most logically be obtained from a congressional appropriation, through contributions by philanthropic and research foundations should be accepted as well.

How would the research problems be selected? Government officials, unions, factories, churches, farm bureaus, consumer organizations, veterans' groups, and educators could submit problems to the committee through their group representatives. The committee would then consider the proposed projects, select those of widest concern, and assign them to the proper research and experimentation agencies.

Would the administration in power be able to use the committee for propaganda purposes, perhaps tending toward regimentation of national opinion? No. The political members of the committee could easily be selected in a bipartisan manner. Moreover, they could be outvoted by the other members of the committee.

Would the committee have any powers to force its findings into use? No. The committee as such would have no power (other than the assignment of projects and funds to its researchers and the publication of their findings). However, it seems desirable to steer away from having a committee of public-spirited but powerless individuals offering unwanted advice to uninterested administrators. That is why it is suggested that the committee members be actual organization heads who so far as possible have the executive power to put new solutions into effect in their own organizations if they so desire. That is also why it is urged that projects be problems actually facing their respective organizations—a guaranty of self-interest.

To summarize:

1. The committee will enable human science to overtake and ultimately control the soulless instruments of physical destruction to which the twentieth century has given birth.

2. The committee will prove to the world that a democracy can solve its problems without resorting to regimentation. It will show that free men can courageously and efficiently obtain security and happiness without taking refuge in arbitrary, State-imposed solutions.

3. America's leadership for peace in world affairs depends primarily on national unity, which can be strengthened immeasurably by a committee facilitating the realization of common national goals and ways of achieving them.

4. Not only would the committee's program aid our powerful military and political leadership toward peace, but it would provide a free and invigorating atmosphere for human progress in the cultural and spiritual fields.

5. The committee's work would recapture the spirit of the American town meeting. Communities which participated in the experiments and projects would be taking a personal part in the progress of knowledge and in the control of their own destinies.

6. The need for an undertaking such as the Committee on Human Research and Development has penetrated down to the humblest citizen. Now is the time to encourage his interest and request his cooperation.

Lt. JOHN MUNDT, U. S. Army,
1710 South Fourth Avenue,
Sioux Falls, S. Dak.
Ensign JOSEPH CLAWSON, USNR,
508 North D Street,
Madera, Calif.

Labor Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter.

Mr. Van Nest, of Toledo, should be Secretary of Labor for 10 days then we could release about a thousand who are having "just conferences."

His letter follows:

NATIONAL LABORATORIES,
Toledo, Ohio, October 25, 1945.
The Honorable HOMER A. RAMEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HOMER: The present widespread labor unrest and increasingly serious outbreak of strikes are a cause for deep concern of every citizen.

Neither the Government nor any group or individual seems to have a plan to straighten out the present mess; and it seems to me that if this is not done, then not only the reconversion to peacetime production will be very seriously delayed, but possibly the economic structure of the country will be weakened and perhaps disrupted if some solution is not found soon.

With this thought in mind, I would like to suggest a plan which in our own small company employing about 50 people has worked out very satisfactorily for the past 15 years. This plan, in simple words, is to pay every employee a percentage of the net profit of the company each year. While we set the amount aside each month and then pay it only once each year, it could be altered so that the payments were made monthly, quarterly or semiannually. Thus when the profits of the company are up, the bonus increases; and when profits go down, it decreases. Employees therefore receive more bonus when business is good and, of course, less when it is bad.

It seems at present that industry is afraid to guarantee any fixed increase in wages to labor generally, due to the uncertainty of what their volume of business will be in postwar and also because of uncertainty over the amount of income taxes. On the other hand, labor is afraid that any amount of increase they accept may be too small and that a huge business boom will take place during the next 5 to 7 years so that they will "miss the boat" or not receive what they feel is a fair share of the increased profits which will result from this boom. I believe if industry knew that they would only have to pay increased wages if their earnings were proportionately higher and that this increase would be reduced if their business profits were lower, then they would not object to such a sliding scale of pay increase. On the other hand, it seems that labor should be satisfied if they knew that they would "cash in" or receive a larger amount of bonus or income when the company for whom they were working was making larger profits. I believe they would realize that the company for whom they were working could not afford to pay these increases if their profits declined.

It therefore appears to me that this bonus plan would be mutually acceptable to both labor and industry. In our own company the bonus plan has resulted in a much better spirit of cooperation in our employees, because they feel they are sharing in the profits of the business and it is, therefore, to their interest to make the business as efficient and profitable as possible. The percentage rate could be varied and does not necessarily have to be standard, but the principle remains the same.

Do you not believe that this offers a fair and sensible solution to the present problem? If so, I hope you will find this suggestion of some merit. Personally, I believe that it will work.

Sincerely yours,
NATIONAL LABORATORIES,
V. L. VAN NEST, *Treasurer.*

Golden Jubilee of St. Elizabeth's Church, Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Catholic Review:

ST. ELIZABETH'S OFFERS THANKS, GOLDEN JUBILEE—MANY OF PIONEER PARISHIONERS AMONG THOSE PRESENT AT CELEBRATION

Maybe the fresh air sweeping across Patterson Park on which St. Elizabeth's Church, Baltimore, fronts might have had something to do with the vigor and the enthusiasm of the members of that parish in the 50 years of its existence. Or, and more probable, the sturdy faith and the generous hearts of its members have maintained the devotion and loyalty of the parishioners and former parishioners to the parish and helped it to accomplish so much for God and church and country.

It was nothing less than vision which led the Reverend Thomas Stapleton, first pastor of the parish, to build the first church on the site which it occupied and on which the second and present church was built. Fortunate, that Mrs. Elizabeth Peppler, a parishioner of 50 years ago, owned property opposite Patterson Park and gave part of the property for the erection of the first church.

All who are familiar with the story of the development of the parish know that the combination church and school, the first building in the parish, gave way in the course of the years to the present beautiful church, the commodious school, the pleasant convent, and the rectory of the parish.

While the environs of many churches built 50 years ago have changed, not so with St. Elizabeth's frontispiece, Patterson Park. It still remains a preservative of the neighborhood. To the north and west and east of St. Elizabeth's what once were fields have become a great residential section of happy home owners, homes by the hundreds with the white marble steps which are uniquely the boast of Baltimore.

It may be said by way of parenthesis, that it has been Patterson Park, with its various athletic facilities, which has enabled the baseball teams and other teams from St. Elizabeth's to win so many championships in sports in recent years. In this respect the youngsters of St. Elizabeth's are probably the luckiest to be found in any of the city parishes in the archdioceses of Baltimore and Washington.

By virtue of their environs, most of the parishioners of St. Elizabeth's, including the Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis who teach in the parish school, have been kept in the best of health. We never have heard that any classes at St. Elizabeth's have been suspended even briefly through illness of the Sisters.

Undoubtedly such healthy conditions accounted for the presence of so many of the pioneer members of the parish at the golden jubilee celebration held last Sunday. From the looks of some of them they are the nearest thing to immortals this country has known.

In his congratulatory remarks following the Solemn Pontifical Mass, of which he was the Pontificant last Sunday, the Most Reverend John M. McNamara, Auxiliary Bishop of Baltimore and Washington, referred among other things to the choice location of the parish buildings.

Indeed, it was in Patterson Park that many of the 1,100 young parishioners who wore the uniform of their country in the recent war were helped to become strong and stalwart young men, of whom 39 made the supreme sacrifice.

Reference to the 1,100 members of St. Elizabeth's Parish who served their country in the war was made by the Right Reverend Monsignor John J. Russell, pastor of St. Ursula's Parish and the son of St. Elizabeth's Parish. Monsignor Russell is the nephew of the late Bishop William T. Russell, who died as Bishop of Charleston.

BISHOP IMPRESSED BY RECORD

His Excellency, Bishop McNamara, at the beginning of his talk of congratulation to the members of the parish after the mass, said that His Excellency the archbishop had looked forward to being present on the occasion of the golden jubilee day, but the veil of darkness which had descended upon his eyes had prevented him. The archbishop had asked him [Bishop McNamara], to extend his congratulations, thanks, and blessings to priests and people of the parish.

CALLS RECORD REMARKABLE

Bishop McNamara in alluding to the 1,100 young men of St. Elizabeth's who had responded to their country's call and to the 39 who had made the supreme sacrifice said that the record was indeed a remarkable one.

These young men of the parish, he declared, had been summoned by their country to war. They had gone in response to that call. Their country had summoned them from their homes, and they had answered the summons. Their country had told them to go to training camps, and they went. Their country told them to go overseas, and they went. They were told to go into battle and they went. Thirty-nine of them were called to give their lives for their country, and they gave them so.

His Excellency said that in no parish in the section of Washington in which he lived had so many been called upon to make such sacrifices. He spoke of the young men from his parish who had called upon him to say goodby and to ask for his blessing before they went forth to answer their country's call. It was evident that such visits had saddened him.

CAN TAKE LESSON FROM COMMUNISTS

Bishop McNamara alluded to the difference between such young men and the Communists who work not for their country but work against it. And yet the Communists in their campaign to extend their subversive doctrines have shown a determination which is not matched in some respects by those of us who have the faith. The Communists teach us a lesson. If many of us Catholics were as zealous in promoting love for God we would do far more for God.

"If you and I loved God and worked as hard for God as the Communists work for their cause we would do more for Him and show Him how truly we love Him."

In his sermon at the mass Monsignor Russell had paid tribute to the long pastorate of the Right Reverend Monsignor John J. Murray, for more than 40 years at St. Elizabeth's. Monsignor Murray, who is now at Jenkins Memorial Hospital, was in the sanctuary at the mass. He received a hearty welcome from his parishioners after the mass.

PRAISE FOR FATHER SEBASTIAN

In referring to Monsignor's Russell's sermon, Bishop McNamara said that Monsignor Russell had done well to show what the venerable prelate, Monsignor Murray, had done for St. Elizabeth's in the many years he had worked in the parish. But, added His Excellency, he himself wanted to pay a tribute likewise to the Reverend Jerome D. Sebastian, now administrator of the parish and who has been stationed in the parish since his ordination 23 years ago.

"I am especially happy to pay my tribute to Father Sebastian," said His Excellency, "since I have known him many years. When I was an assistant at St. Patrick's parish in Washington I used to give catcheism instructions to him and the other pupils. He has done a marvelous work in his years here. He has been indefatiguable. He has given himself unstintingly to you and he has kept the spirit of this parish the vibrant one it is."

His Excellency paid tribute to the children's choir which sang the mass. He declared he never had heard a mass sung better. He congratulated the young singers. He said that the sister who was in charge of the choir had trained them well and stated she was indeed entitled to both thanks and congratulations.

The church was crowded to the doors with present and past parishioners. Among the special guests who assisted at the mass were Gov. Herbert R. O'Conor, Congressman Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., and Thomas W. Pangborn, of Hagerstown.

The assistant priest at the mass was the Reverend John Volk, C. SS. R., chaplain in the United States Army. Chaplain Volk's mother lives across the street from St. Elizabeth's. His father was a daily communicant for years at St. Elizabeth's. The latter was stricken ill while Chaplain Volk was in the European war zone. The chaplain flew to this country in the hope he could see his father before he died, but learned on landing in Delaware that his father was dead.

The deacon of the Mass was the Reverend Mr. Joseph Coyne and the subdeacon the Reverend Mr. Martin A. Schalwenberg, both members of the parish and both of whom will be ordained to the priesthood before Christmas. Other members of the priesthood and sons of St. Elizabeth's parish were present in the sanctuary. Present also were members of the religious sisterhoods and the religious brotherhoods, sons of the parish.

Father Sebastian was host at dinner to the visiting clergy and other guests.

On Monday morning there was a Solemn Mass for the children of the parish. The Reverend Charles W. Dausch, of St. Mary's Church, Hagerstown, and son of the parish, was the celebrant. The Reverend Francis J. Childress, the deacon, and the Reverend Edward V. Echle, of St. Elizabeth's, subdeacon.

On Tuesday morning there was a Solemn Mass of the Blessed Mother for all the parishioners and former parishioners and friends of the parish, with Father Childress as celebrant; the Reverend Leo V. McGrain, of St. Elizabeth's as deacon, and Father Echle as subdeacon.

On Wednesday morning there was a Solemn Mass of Requiem for the 39 boys of the parish who gave their lives in the World War. Chaplain Thomas A. Farrell, USA, was celebrant; Father Childress, deacon, and Father McGrain, subdeacon.

Last night 400 parishioners attended the jubilee banquet in the ballroom of the Emerson Hotel.

Characteristics of the World in Which We Live and Attitudes of Life Which Must Guide Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the very scholarly address delivered before the thirtieth session of the FBI National Academy in the Department of Justice auditorium at 10:30 a. m., Friday, October 26, 1945, by Dr. Joseph R. Sizoo, of New York:

Mr. Hoover, distinguished guests, members of the graduating class, ladies and gentlemen, I am not unmindful of the very great honor of having a part in this closing impressive ceremony and for that honor I wish first to express my sincere gratitude. A man's value to society is determined not by what he begins but by what he ends. Anybody can begin a thing, but to bring it to a successful conclusion gives you the earmarks of a great spirit before God and man. What you began you have ended and with your friends I pause to express gratitude.

Emerson once said that any movement is always the lengthened shadow of someone's life, and I cannot help but feel again this morning that we have here a dramatic and spectacular demonstration of something that has come to pass through the genius and through the inspiration and through the imagination of one who is the director of this enterprise, Mr. Hoover. And with you I pause to express also my gratitude. Now,

no one can take his place in the work of the world unless he understands that world. To serve your generation you must know your generation. A physician cannot heal or cure unless he has made an accurate diagnosis. No man can help build a better tomorrow until he knows what is wrong with yesterday. Because your work and mine have so much in common, I want to think a little while of some of the characteristics of the world in which we work and then to point to some attitudes of life which must guide us.

Obviously there is this to be said about the world into which you are going. We are living in a world which is taking a moral tail spin. You don't have to live long or read much or travel far to discover that the tides are running out upon ethical values. There are well meaning but misguided people who live in our country with a pleasing illusion and because this illusion is pleasing it is so deadly and fatal. It is this, that the enthusiasm for unselfishness and high idealism generated by the war will be permanent.

Many have made themselves believe that the lofty standards of devotion to country, disciplined living, and restraint of common life in time of war will run over into the time of peace. Well, history holds no such warrant. After the Napoleonic era with the signing of the peace treaty of Vienna in 1815 there followed a period of exploitation, of class consciousness, of undisciplined nationalism that ended in chaos. At the close of the Civil War, which in the North was fought that union might be obtained, there followed a period of dark political corruption striking an all-time low in the Tweed Ring. After the First World War, fought to make democracy safe for the world, there came this period of freedom. Let yourself go. Obey that impulse without asking yourself if you are worthy of expressing, bringing social irresponsibility, untutored nationalism, and undisciplined restraint in conduct. High moral effort is always followed by moral lassitude. That is the kind of a world in which we live. And you have to take it into consideration in all the enterprises to which you are committed. I don't have to stand here and tell you about that for it is perfectly obvious. Vulgar indecencies, the inordinate display of wealth, flagrant violations of decency, juvenile delinquency, sordidness of thought, dreadful deterioration on the stage and on the screen—how real it is, this thing we call modern moral lassitude. But I am not thinking of that, for this kind of moral tail spin of which I am thinking goes deeper than that because it becomes something that goes to the root of our national life in its moral instability.

Going up and down the country—and I do it a great deal—going up and down the country, I find that thoughtful people are not asking, "Is the Nation turning to the right of center, or to the left of center?", but they are asking if there is a center. People are wondering if there is some standard of ethical idealism. Is there some North Star of morality by which we shall sail the ship of state? Is there, in the last analysis, some great form of moral conviction by which we live? For we now know that we have got to stop fooling wth the Ten Commandments and the arithmetic table; moral instability; letting "I will" wait upon "I would"; following the line of least resistance; constant vacillating; sending up a trial balloon to find cut which way the wind is going before a conviction is expressed; gyrating from one side of the street to the other; living with expediency; obeying the impulse of pressure groups; accommodating curselves to this point or to that point without first asking, "Is it right or is it truth?" That is the peril which you will have to deal with in all the problems in the world of tomorrow. And it is on that basis that contemporary communism becomes such a tragic force. For at least my indictment of communism is not its social attitude or its political construction or its economic structure, but rather this, that it is so utterly unprincipled in advancing its call. It gains its converts so unscrupulously. There is no sense of moral conviction behind its progress. It advances by creating confusion and by creating fires of chaos and misunderstanding. It is so utterly unethical and immoral in its advance. And ycu have to deal with it, so I say we are living in a world which is taking a moral tail spin and you can never play your part unless somehow you begin with that fact.

Now there is a second characteristic in the world of today which you and I, in our separate spheres of activity, must deal with. It is this. We are living in a world with a new kind of frontier. There was a time when the frontiers of nations were determined by geography. The boundaries between peoples and races were largely natural barriers. People separated themselves from one another by these ordinary frontiers, a ridge of hills, a tall range of mountains, a wide river, swamp areas, thick forests, and as long as these stood nobody from without could come in. Nobody from within could go out and they thought themselves secure. But modern science has shrunken this earth and these frontiers are no longer tenable.

There are not two points in the world which are more than 50, or at the most 60, flying hours apart. Why, you can go around the whole thing in 150 hours. Barriers are meaningless. Frontiers are imaginary lines. Walls have become windows. The old frontier is gone, but in the place of it races and nations are building a new kind of frontier, and this frontier is invisible. It isn't something you can put your hands upon. It is much more impenetrable. It is much more difficult to hurdle. It sinks so deep long before you dream it exists, for the new frontiers are in the frontiers of the mind and of the heart. They are the frontiers of suspicion and fear and hate and greed and power, and we can never have a better world until these new frontiers are penetrated, and you can never take your place in modern society until you deal with these new frontiers which are coming in the world of today. Well, at any rate, there you have something of a diagnosis, a world in a moral tail spin and a world with new frontiers. Now the question arises: "How can we play our part in that kind of a world?" I would like to suggest at the very beginning that to live in a world like that we shall have to walk with caution. By the mercy of God and the gallantry of men, our enemies have been utterly conquered and subdued. But their evil dies hard in the world. It may coo like a dove. It is still a serpent at heart. It may wear sheep's clothing, but it is still a wolf inside. We have invaded their land. We have not yet invaded their conscience. We have destroyed their power to make war, but we have not yet destroyed their will to make war. And in this other conflict we shall have to use other weapons than the weapons we used to invade their land or destroy their power, and I have been asking myself the question whether we have these weapons of the mind and of the heart. We shall have to walk with caution. What is true in the world outside is true in the world within.

One of the most magnificent and inspiring sights of modern American history was the sense of unity which held us together. We buried our differences. We put aside the areas of disagreement and we held together to a common task. But the peril of it is, and I have seen it up and down this country, that the honeymoon is over. And it may be that we are beginning to tumble apart into broken and brittle groups, each seeking some advantage at the expense of the other. Why, there are men who are beginning to think that if we only hate enough we will build a better country and bring in prosperity. I say to you men, if you are going to minister to a world in a moral slump and with new frontiers, we shall have to walk with caution.

Now there is a second one. If it is true that we shall have to walk with caution, it is also true that we shall have to live with courage. Believe me, yesterday will never come back. Yesterday is dead. Yesterday ought to die. It was not good enough. Mankind deserved something better. Man was entitled to something different. I haven't lost my faith because so much of yesterday has been shattered. If the things that are wrong did not tumble apart every now and again then I would lose my faith and life would be insanity. Live with courage, because there are coming into being new attitudes, new attitudes to life; a new sense of value to living; new concepts of wealth and of race and of government and of stewardship. Live with courage. There is coming something in the world to which you men may appeal. We have got our chance. It may be our last chance to build a world without hate; without disease; without panic; a world in which childhood shall not be forgotten, womanhood not neglected and old age not abandoned; a world in which man shall come before the machine and personality before profits; in which man's inhumanity to man shall be supplanted by the higher law that we are our brother's keeper. Live with courage. The age into which you are going needs men and women with imagination, with courage, with adventure, who can live creatively. Never forget, it is better to light a candle than to curse the darkness. The kind of a world into which we are going to live was the kind of a world of which Wordsworth wrote of the French Revolution. "Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive and to be young was very heaven." Walk with caution. Live with courage, but that isn't enough. You may be cautious. You may have imagination and you may still make a wreck of the universe. Our enemies were cautious. They were resourceful. They were adventurous. They had imagination, but look what they did to the world, and look what has happened to them. There must come another attitude in the minds of those who would serve this kind of a generation.

During the war I went up and down the Army camps and naval bases for a long time in many places. One day I found myself in a camp. Early one morning at dawn three regiments were to march out into an open field a few miles away and there sit down in the morning dew on the long grass to listen to a lecture from an officer overseas on how to advance one's position. I marched out with them. There we sat at dawn on the wet grass and the colonel was describing how men should advance.

He would first describe the wrong way and then demonstrate it. Then he would describe the right way and he would demonstrate it with seasoned troops. So in the course of his lecture he was talking about how to take a certain objective out yonder on the edge of another hill. And then he described how it should be done correctly and we saw a group of seasoned soldiers creeping through the grass hugging the soil, keeping close to the earth. You could hardly see them move on their hands and knees, and as they advanced the colonel said, "When you advance on your knees your are always safe." Men and women, that sentence should be written on the door post of every school and on the lintels of every home. "When you advance on your knees you will be safe."

Five months before Pearl Harbor the first of my two boys who are in the service, was spending the last evening with me. We were talking together and at the end of a long conversation he said to me, "Where did your generation break down that all this had to happen?" Oh, I think we know the answer. I could give him the argument of political chicanery. I knew something about the economic maladjustment of the world and I was familiar with the social injustices up and

down this universe. I knew something about political chicanery and diplomatic double talk. I knew something about crackpot ideologies and it was all a part of it, but it wasn't the truth because the world became what it was, not because it did not have enough or did not know enough, but because it was not good enough. We have seemingly forgotten that the basis of a nation's greatness is not in its political technique or in its social structure, but in the character of its men and women and a new day for the Nation can never come in the last analysis except through the reconversion of the human spirit. The same God who gave us eyes to see and ears to hear and lips to speak gave us knees to bend. It is still true that the nation alone is great whose God is the Lord. So you and I are each of us now going back to the task committed to us; in a world with a moral slump; in a world with dangerous frontiers, and we shall walk with caution. We shall live with courage and we shall advance on our knees.

Once a week I go to Halloran Hospital to see some of the men there who have been pretty badly shot up. A few weeks ago I was there and I was visiting with a room full of men and we were talking about things that we are talking about now; about a braver tomorrow and a better country and a finer concept of national oneness and integrity. And after we had talked about it a little while a chap over yonder in the corner with one arm shot off, the other arm in a sling, paralyzed from the hips down, craned his neck and lifted it from the pillow and said to me, "Padre, do you think anything will come of it?" Well, will it?

Speech of Rear Adm. Thomas L. Gatch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Rear Adm. Thomas L. Gatch, United States Navy, Judge Advocate General of the Navy, to the Military Order of the World Wars at the John Paul Jones Monument, Washington, D. C., on October 27, 1945:

Hasdrubel said to Hannibal, "You know how to win a victory, but not how to use it."

Just as peace is more difficult to maintain than war, so victory is more difficult to use than to win. After the object lesson of the First World War, that truth should be patent to the densest American. Every one of us should realize that the hardest part of the wars we have just finished fighting lies before us. We cannot throw away this victory.

It is a pleasure to talk to veterans because you completely understand what I am driving at. Every veteran in this land must talk in season and out, must iterate and reiterate, that the only hope for our country in a world that can breed Nazis and Jap warmongers, lies in our own strength.

You, who fought in this war and prior wars, know full well what we fought for. Volumes have been written on that subject; eloquent speeches without number have been addressed to that subject; but as individuals, and concerned primarily with our own affairs, I feel that I can truthfully speak for every veteran when I say that what we really fought for, way down in our hearts, was that our sons and grandsons would never have to fight. And I say that we veterans do not propose to have our sacrifices thrown away again. We feel deeply in this matter and we are very realistic about it, for we deal with realists.

Down the ages men have prayed for peace. Peace is probably the greatest boon that men may be granted. How can we expect to win such a boon by wishful thinking? The world does not run that way; what we get we earn. We earn victory in war by sacrifices of life and treasure, by devoting our whole national effort solely to that end, by oceans of blood, sweat, and tears. And then when we have won the victory we expect to win the peace by sacrificing—nothing. Many of our countrymen throw up their hands in horror at the thought of our young men devoting a year of their lives to military training so that peace may endure; a din now fills our land that our brave soldiers and sailors be returned home immediately—without waiting a moment to clinch our victory—blithely throwing away all that we have won in four terrible years—because, apparently, peace is not worth turning a hand for. Unless we pay for peace we shall not have peace.

I cannot believe that solemn conclaves of statesmen, that charters and covenants, no matter how laboriously produced, are going to be considered by fate as an adequate price for peace. I believe that we shall be granted peace when we have sacrificed sufficiently to show that we are worthy of peace, and not before.

I get over my depth. You and I, veterans, are merely fit to fight for our country; we are not qualified to have any say about the victory that we win. Now is the time when cloistered men, who helped to victory by valiant words and doughty papers, will take the helm from our incapable hands. Thus it was after the last war, and thus it will be again if we do nothing about it. Already our our cloistered experts have the atomic bomb making all navies obsolete. Such a song was first sung when David toppled Goliath with a lucky sling shot, and it was resung with the advent of firearms, the explosive shell, the ship's ram, the torpedo, the submarine, the airplane.

One of the most remarkable facts of these last wars is that poison gas was not used against us. Why? Because our inhuman enemies knew that we were fully prepared to make its use recoil on them with telling effect. They would have heeded nothing less. So it will probably be with the atomic bomb—a far more horrible thing than gas. As long as we stand fully ready, the atomic bomb will probably never again be used in war.

Any day now we may expect our cloistered pundits to bring forth the idea that we are being too hard on the Nazis and the Japs. With the evidence spread before our eyes at every turn that the one thing nature will not tolerate is softness, still they preach softness. Consider the Japs. In the sixteenth century a Portuguese ship came across a Jap junk foundering in the South China Sea. The Portuguese went alongside and rescued the Japs. A few days later the Japs seized their chance, murdered every white person, and sailed the ship to Japan. That was the first contact of civilization with the Japs. About the last contact with Japs who thought themselves still free agents, was on Palawan Island last December. The Japs drove 150 white prisoners into an air-raid shelter, poured gasoline into it, and threw in a torch. That shows the progress of 400 years. There might be hope that they could become semicivilized in 4,000 years.

This world is too small to hold 70,000,000 Japs and twice that many Americans unless the 70,000,000 change radically, and that would take scores of centuries. The only answer is an unremitting, vigilant, strict watch over them; the absolute prevention of their ever copying their betters in matters of war so that they can egotistically think they can defeat them. If we fail there, our children will pay for our softness.

One cannot use moral precepts with beasts.

If there is to be any hope for peace in a world that Japs live in, it lies solely in our displaying constantly to those Japs such patently overwhelming power that they even in their ignorant provincialism cannot decry.

Our pacifists who, remarkably enough always fancy themselves great amateur strategists, are strong for overthrowing the most successful war-waging machine the world has ever seen; a set-up that simultaneously won two great wars half the world apart; that finally took an overwhelming expedition 7,000 miles across the world's largest ocean, and beat an embattled nation to its knees in its very homeland. Some of us dare to think that such an eminently successful institution should be tampered with very gently if at all, but the appeasers, who always welcome confusion, and revel in inefficient and wasteful war, are strong for change. Never under any circumstances does wasteful war waste their lives. Our doves are still rather quiet for them but the signs are abundant that they lurk in their nests, ready to spring forth instantly in full song. We veterans failed after the last war in that we did nothing to keep peace talk out of the realm of dreams. This time, I, for one, do not propose to sit back supinely while the millenniolists prattle us into a situation where my grandson would be forced to fight to save their languid pacifistic souls.

It is timely that we here and now echo the words of the man at whose monument we stand, and highly resolve that in the achievement of that peace for which over a million of our brave men were killed or wounded in the past four years—in that achievement, we have not yet begun to fight.

Army Demobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, for some weeks I have been advocating and urging the establishment of more separation centers and separation points, and also the use of civilian personnel to hasten the demobilization program at these centers and points.

Just recently I received a letter from Secretary of War Patterson, indicating that these policies were being followed by the War Department insofar as possible. There has been a tremendous improvement in the whole demobilization program during the past 6 weeks, and we should give the War Department credit for its great accomplishments during this period. I hope and trust further improvements will follow. Also, I feel strongly that a similar concentration upon the transportation bottlenecks in the Atlantic and the Pacific areas will cause similar good results, and I continue to demand this be done at once.

Secretary of War Patterson's letter is included as part of my remarks, as follows:

OCTOBER 24, 1945.

Hon. JOHN C. KUNKEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KUNKEL: Your letter of October 8 has been received, and I have studied with

considerable interest your suggestion for activating additional separation centers.

You will be interested to know that discharge procedures are no longer confined to separation centers and hospitals. During the past 60 days additional separation facilities have been established at more than 136 Service Forces camps, posts, and stations, and at 43 Air Forces bases. In accomplishing this, we are utilizing every installation having the necessary facilities for discharging military personnel.

The rate of discharge has increased from 5,000 per day on August 1 to 40,000 per day at present. Over 1,000,000 men will be discharged in the month of October alone, and with the existing organization the rate will probably increase in the future.

We will soon be able to process personnel in the United States as rapidly as they become eligible for release, and facilities will be more than adequate to handle the flow of returnees from overseas. We will continue to lower the critical score progressively at a rate which will keep the separation facilities working at peak capacity. Very soon the sole factor controlling the discharge rate will be availability of shipping space.

We have granted authority to the commanding officers of separation facilities to employ civilians, but this has not always been possible due to a shortage of skilled manpower in certain areas.

Your interest in cur problems is greatly appreciated, and I wish to assure you that we are exerting every effort toward a speedy demobilization of the Army.

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

Demobilize Faster—Use Liberty Ships and More Naval Vessels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD O. McCOWEN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Speaker, the question has been raised again and again in this House as to when the demobilization of American men and women still in military service will be completed. The American people in their homes are still writing many letters to the Members of Congress asking for speedier demobilization.

The mothers and fathers and wives cannot understand why fathers and husbands, who have served so long and who have fought so well, should be kept in the service longer, now that the war is really over although it has not been declared so officially. They want them out now and why not?

Many men, in the Army and Navy in particular, are writing very serious complaints to their people back home and some of them are even writing to their Members of Congress in spite of the fact that they have the feeling in many cases, and the knowledge in other cases, that they are not supposed to do so.

In order to present a clear picture of this situation to the Congress, I shall quote from a few letters from servicemen and others. I do not care to disclose the names of these soldiers whose names are not already disclosed, while they are in the service because I want to make sure that no displeasure will fall on them because they have dared to write; but I have the letters and I shall be very willing to show them to individual Members of Congress.

The following quotation is from a Sergeant:

I am a thirty-two-year-old father of two children who need me. I have been in the Army more than two years. Speed up the brass hats.

The following is from a soldier in Manila. I quote:

MANILA, PHILIPPINES.

I am 38 years, 8 months in age. I have served in our armed forces for 2 years. We served 9 months in Europe, then without leave or furlough, we were shipped over 15,000 miles to take part in the Pacific campaign. Treated somewhat worse than cattle on the 47 day voyage, we did not complain. I find, however, that there are thousands of troops here that are not needed. We are doing street repair jobs, mending curb and gutter, cleaning up debris on property that the Army has not the slightest interest in nor shall be interested in. Conditions in Manila would be a national scandal if the truth was to reach the public. Then the order for the release of thousands all over thirty-eight was announced. Many men have already been started on their way. Two of eleven men in our company had been approved for discharge when the rest of us were informed that we would have to serve on—on the order of the commanding officer of this depot. In other words, there has been discrimination between enlisted men and the rest of us must sweat out 3 more months in this hell on earth merely upon the whim of some "brass hat." I thought that you should know the above-named facts.

The following excerpts are from a letter written by a soldier to his sister:

You probably read how well they are taking care of the boys overseas. The man that did the fighting is really getting treated poorly. We don't get one d—— point for fighting. A fighting man didn't live long enough to get many points to start with. We had about 45 men left out of 106 the first day of combat. I saw 500 men go up one hill and not come out alive. I'm one of the few guys that came out alive. Why in the h—— they are going to keep me over here, I don't know. There isn't a d—— thing we guys can do. We can't go after the government or say anything about it. We are sure counting on the people back home to help us out. If people back home would write their Congressmen, we would get home sooner. The way I feel right now, I don't give a d—— if I never get home.

I give the following quotation from a soldier stationed in Nebraska, to show how some things are even in continental United States:

While the officers are free to enroll in the University of Nebraska here at Lincoln for the regular courses because of the 24 hours a day free time they have, the enlisted men sweep the officers' barracks, clean the officers' latrines, serve as KP's in the officers' mess halls, and are detailed to the officers' clubs, gratis, of course. We enlisted men have been living by this caste system long enough and desire at this late date a real chance at proving our worths as compared to that of the officers.

The following excerpts are from a letter written by a wife regarding her husband:

He has been in active service in the Pacific for 32 months and is now at Saipan supposed to be on his way home. He left Iwo the latter part of August and has been stranded at Saipan now for over a month. The conditions these boys are living under must be terrible and that is why I am writing you.

Then she quotes from his letters as follows:

You and the people at home don't realize what a mess this is. Men and more men, living the same as cattle in the yards; tents that leak as if they had no canvas over the top; and large warehouses jammed so thick with cots, we can't walk around; in camps built for prisoners of war. Well, you would not think it was possible to get so many men in such a small place, and the odor at night, well, I would much rather be on the battle front. There one expected to live like a rat for a time, but the war is over and living like this does not make sense. Honestly, if the people at home could know and see all this it would not last long. All these men here just sweating it out and empty ships in the harbor. The food is rotten; the drinking water—if it rains and you are lucky you might get a drink; other than that you stand in line for at least a quarter of a mile and take a chance that it will not run out. The showers are blackish water and you wallow around to get clean worse than in a hog pen. We are all so jittery, nerves shot, and getting so bitter, we are hating ourselves. The officers must be in hiding, there is not anyone to complain to. All we hear is the big celebration in the States for Navy Day. We are out here 32 months—for what—Navy Day!

The following quotation is from a letter, dated October 8, from the wife of a soldier:

I am a soldier's wife and my husband has been in the service over 3 years. I have a little boy 3 years old. I have to live by myself. My rent has been raised and I want to know if there is any way of my husband getting a discharge. If you can help me, I would appreciate it a lot.

I have a letter, dated October 9, from a prominent resident of my district, from whose letter I quote:

All of these young men and young women who want to come home, should be released now or at the very earliest time possible. They suffer with discontent to a degree that is nothing less than torture. The war is over. Most of them are idle or performing meaningless tasks. They want to get back home and adjust themselves to living at once. Service that is now meaningless, and delay in their discharge, is to them frustration. That is unjust and selfish on the part of the leaders of the armed forces. They want to come home. We want them home as fast as their release can be effected. It is not enough to say we are doing a job the best we can. If it is an emergency, they will find some way to get it done post haste. That is the traditional American way. The trouble seems to be that there is hesitancy. If that is so, away with it. We want action now, not for one but for all. We write to you to ask your help to get this done.

Quotations from many other letters could be given, but these seem to be enough to show, in particular, the great dissatisfaction among soldiers themselves, as well as back home, not only with conditions, but with this slowness of demobilization.

I also have letters from soldiers whose education has been interrupted and who want to be released to continue it. There are many letters also from fathers and mothers who want their sons released to further their education.

I have one letter in particular from a sailor, seaman first class, who was a school teacher when inducted, and who is now being required to attend school, which will likely be continued for 9 months. He complains about having to be away from his wife and children, now that the war is over. He claims that his attendance in school is only costing the Government money, and that the training will do no good either to him or the Government. He states further that there are hundreds of men in the same position. Why waste their time and taxpayers' money? Why can these men not be released now?

The following is quoted from the issue of the Daily Pacifican of October 12:

NAVY DAY

EDITOR: The demobilization farce is, I dare say, the cause of all the bitterness and animosity toward the Army, Navy, Government, and those who can exert pressure in the right places, if they but would.

Take Navy Day, for instance; Navy tradition, big ceremonies on the east coast with ships that should be bringing men to the west coast.

What we GI's over here want is cards dealt from the top of the deck, not a "raw deal." Get us home.

Technical Sgt. WALTER U. WARDEN, Jr.

The following is from the issue of the Daily Pacifican dated October 17:

WAITING FOR SHIPS

EDITOR: I've been sweating out a boat at the Twenty-second Replacement Depot for 16 days, but just think of Jack, Spencer, Wendel, Frank, Fortin, Murray, Deerfield, they're all 80 pointers and they've been waiting there for 4 weeks. That's the truth; I know these boys who have been in the Twenty-second for a whole month and they're still waiting, without a boat in sight.

If they don't take off soon, how long will I have to wait? How long will the 70 pointers and the 60 pointers have to wait?

To round out this paradoxical picture, I read an article in Reader's Digest, and I quote: "Our Navy today has 25 battleships, 70 cruisers, 105 carriers, 125,000 vessels in all. That is more vessels than the Navy had men when the war clouds first gathered."

Everything was sacrificed for the sake of freedom, whether we fully understand the meaning of that word or not.

The sacrifices have been made; we mourn the dead, but the living want to be returned to life. That should be the solemn obligation of our leaders. Where is the vast armada now that will bring us home? Have the issues at hand been befogged? Does the gala Navy Day celebration take precedence over the interest of thousands of men?

Corp. PHILIP B. AIN.

A few other letters from the Daily Pacifican follow. Scores like them could be given:

EDITOR: What has become of the world's greatest two-ocean navy and merchant fleet that could accomplish anything short of miracles during wartime? The answer appears to be that they are preparing to return to the States to celebrate and demonstrate the power of this mighty armada on Navy Day, while we sweat it out here waiting for the luxurious transport ships that are to return us to our loved ones someday.

It was all right to bring us over packed like cattle in every available and conceivable vessel from the lowliest scow to the most luxurious liners. It was all right to ship us from island to island on our road to victory in old Liberty ships and FS boats.

But now, when we would be more than willing to go through the same hardships for our last and final boat ride, we are told "there are not enough ships available."

Sgt. R. SCHULTZ.

EDITOR: Colonel Amy's reluctance to use cargo ships to send GI's home is far outweighed by the men's desire to go home in anything available.

Fresh in the men's memories is the means of transportation used to carry them from one combat zone to another.

Most GI's believe that every day they spend away from their loved ones is a day of their lives wasted.

Put it on a voluntary basis. Ask the men if they want to go home on unconverted freighters or if they want to wait their turn to go home at the convenience of the War Department.

Pvt. ROBERT A. GLASGOW.

DELAY FEARED

EDITOR: The news of the Army's recruiting campaign has caused us great concern. The provision that reenlistees will get an immediate furlough has given rise to an utterly demoralizing fear. Will the "red apple" delay the 60, 70, or 2-year men from getting home?

We refuse to believe that the Army will not make every effort to fulfill its widely publicized promises. We refuse to believe that there is any significance in the fact that 60- and 70-point men were announced eligible on October and November 1 while reenlistees shall receive immediate furloughs. We refuse to believe that there is any significance to the fact that authority to send home the 35-years-olds, 80- and 70-point men is delayed while a colonel speaks in detail about the "red apple" 15 minutes after it is announced.

We are certain that the Army realizes that we are not mentally deficient children but men with memories, voting privileges, responsibilities, tired of military life, and a hungry yearning to return to civilian life not after the reenlistees but now.

Sgt. MARTIN FLEER.

ENDORSEMENT

EDITOR: I—and 600 officers and men of the One Thousand Two Hundred and Eighty-ninth Engineer (C) Battalion, European theater of operations and Southwest Pacific area veterans—heartily endorse Lt. Col. C. H. Davidson's cry in the wilderness of outfitting Liberty ships as troop transports.

Apparently the Army doesn't think Liberty ships are good enough to be used as troop transports for they are not as comfortable as the *Queen Mary* or the *Lurline*. Who cares about comfort if a little discomfort means we will get home weeks or months sooner? The Liberty ships were comfortable enough to be used as transports during wartime when the chips were down, so they should be good enough in peacetime. The men in this theater don't care how much discomfort a few weeks aboard a Liberty ship demands just so they get home a few weeks or months sooner.

If Colonel Davidson needs any volunteers to convert Liberty ships, there are thousands of men sitting around Manila more than willing to work hard to get the high pointers home so that the rest of us can leave this hellhole.

Lt. J. E. WILBURN.

This exposition of conditions could go on ad infinitum.

May I urge that all men not now needed in the armed forces be released immediately by those having the authority to do it? Or if that will not be done by the high command, let Congress pass a law at once to declare the war ended and to demobilize as promptly as possible.

Memorial to Correspondents Who Lost Their Lives in the Late War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill providing for the erection in the city of Washington of a memorial to newspaper correspondents who lost their lives in the late war.

The text of the bill is as follows:

Whereas in the late war many American newspaper correspondents lost their lives; and

Whereas the services of these correspondents were of the highest value toward creating an enlightened public opinion and making possible the final victory of right and democracy over wrong and repression; and

Whereas these men were as essential a part of our national forces as members of the armed services and died like soldiers on the fighting front; and

Whereas they performed their hazardous duties in a manner that conformed to the highest ideals and traditions of the public service, entitling them to the recognition of a grateful country: Therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby appropriated the sum of $50,000 to erect a memorial to the American newspaper, newsreel, and magazine correspondents and associated radiomen and photographers who lost their lives in World War II.

SEC. 2. The task of carrying into execution the purpose of this act is delegated to the president of the National Press Club and the chairman of the standing committee of congressional correspondents and a committee to be chosen by them.

SEC. 3. Square 226 in the city of Washington is hereby designated as the site for this memorial.

I believe the merit and propriety of this bill will appeal to everybody. Correspondents like Raymond Clapper and Ernie Pyle were more valuable to the United States in the recent war than many major generals, and that is no reflection on the splendid services of the major generals. Between 600 and 800 American correspondents were engaged in covering the war on all fronts. According to Editor and Publisher 38 correspondents and photographers lost their lives. I do not believe that any citizen of America will disapprove the idea that it would be very fitting and proper to erect a modest memorial to these men in the capital of the Nation they served so well. As president of the National Press Club when Raymond Clapper was on its board of governors, I learned to know him intimately and I never knew a more thoroughly honest, genuine, manly man or a more devoted American than Raymond Clapper. Ernie Pyle had just renewed his membership in the National Press Club before he began his last journeys with his beloved GI Joes.

I have purposely provided a relatively small appropriation for the memorial for the reason that, knowing my old comrades of the press as I did, I feel sure they would not want a costly memorial. The amount provided in the bill, I believe, would be sufficient to erect a suitable modest memorial and to place with it a bronze plaque setting forth the names of all of the deceased correspondents.

The location which this bill proposes for the memorial is, I think, highly appropriate. Square 226 is on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue between Fourteenth and Fifteenth Streets where the Office of Information is now in a temporary building. It is Government-owned land and the site would cost nothing. This is the nearest available site to historic old "newspaper row," which was on the east side of Fourteenth Street extending from Pennsylvania Avenue to F Street and including the present site of the National Press Club. The establishment of the memorial there would bring it into close association with the ancient traditions of newspaperdom at the Nation's Capital. We can pay our country's tribute of its love to our fallen comrades of the press by passing this bill, and I hope that early and favorable action will be taken on it.

A Serviceman's Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to receive a number of communications from men in the service in the South and Southwest Pacific similar to the following. I am impressed with the fact that where there is so much smoke there must be some fire, and I trust that both the Army and the Navy will make it their policy to return to the United States the high-point men who are eligible for discharge before transporting men with low-point scores. A bitter resentment is being built up in the minds of young men who have had sufficient points for discharge for some time but who are left to "sweat it out" while less eligible men are returned to the United States and released.

One of the communications follows:

MANILA, P. I., *October 18, 1945.*

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: Wish to call your attention to a damned unforgivable situation—the delay in transporting high-point men home from the Philippines.

For weeks now, Washington and local "brass" have promised us immediate shipment home. I have 90 points and now—because there are "no ships" we are stranded with thousands of others in replacement depots. It has been possible to get the Aussies, PW's, and others out—but not us.

The divisions are shipping 60-point men home while high pointers sweat it out. Why? No ships, and yet the Navy plans for a Navy Day demonstration in the United States to tell how the Navy won the war—while we stay here and rot! Why?

This is my thirty-fourth month in the Tropics. No; I haven't been stationed in New Zealand or Australia. I have met the Pacific face to face. Now it is time to go home.

Generals Styler, Trudean, and Plank—the masterminds of AFWESTPAC and other commands have things badly screwed up—or we would be coming home.

When MacArthur wanted ships for a beachhead he got them—but what about us now? I've seen whisky, officers' club dance floors, etc., travel by air and enlisted men kicked around. We could stand it then—but the war is over now.

I supported you when I worked for the old Santa Cruz News and when I had my own little weekly newspapers at Saratoga. I had to leave that little paper for the Army and lost everything. In the Army I felt I did my share—now I want to get out and get going for myself, I am not a military parasite. And I am only one of thousands in the same frame of mind.

Let's go home. You can help us, Mr. ANDERSON, by finding out. You can give the "hot foot" to the right parties. Please help.

Sincerely.

Navy Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air John L. Sullivan at the Navy Day dinner, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on October 27, 1945:

I am honored and made happy by the opportunity to meet tonight with the members of the District of Columbia Council of the Navy League on this joyful occasion. The United States has just concluded the greatest naval struggle in the history of mankind. It was a sea power struggle waged over jungle islands, through typhoons, and across vast water spaces which make the land areas of the world seem small by contrast. Victory, in the end, rested with what is today the world's greatest Navy—greatest in number of ships; greatest in the fighting qualities of its officers and men; greatest in the strength and resources of the people who support it; and greatest in its ability to defend its country and preserve the peace—the biggest and the best concentration of air-sea power the world has ever known—the United States Navy.

Today, in cities all over the country, people are participating in ceremonies honoring your Navy. There are ceremonies far from the sea, in those inland communities from which so large a proportion of our naval personnel is drawn. At inland ports, the smaller vessels of the Navy—those small vessels which bore so heavy a share of the Pacific naval struggle—are being inspected by the people who own them—by the people whose sons manned them in the battle which has just ended. At the coastal ports lie great ships of the Fleet—the battleships, the cruisers, the destroyers, and the carriers, from whose flight decks the war was carried to Japan itself. Some of those ships are whole histories in themselves. Tonight, for example, many of us think sentimentally of the *Enterprise*. The gallant "E," now on display at New York, is no longer regarded as a first-line fighting carrier. But there was a time when she stood almost alone between the Jap battle fleet and our survival.

The tribute paid our victorious Navy today is a tribute to the 4,000,000 men and women who fought and won the titanic naval struggle. Leaving their farms and factories, their schools and their offices, America's amateur sailors proved themselves apt pupils with indomitable spirit. The superb way in which they learned their tasks and performed their duties was the real secret weapon of the war and is today the source of America's great strength. Indeed, even as we meet here tonight thousands of those men are at work maintaining the ceaseless vigil which is the Navy's never-ending job. Even as the *Enterprise* rides at anchor at New York, other carriers are patrolling the western Pacific. Still more carriers and other combat ships are engaged in the task of bringing our fighting men home from overseas.

In speaking of the Pacific victory, I do not intend to give the impression that anybody in the Navy believes that the war against Japan was the Navy's exclusive business. Victory was the product of partnership—partnership with the Army: its ground forces and its Air Forces. Each service was organized and trained separately, as each had to be, in order to accomplish its special tasks in the joint effort. Each service was led by men who knew its special problems and its special duties. And then, for operational purposes the services were joined under operational commands so that the special abilities of each service could be used to mutual benefit and for the common purpose.

The Navy's part of the job, of course, was separate and distinct from that of the Army, because the Navy's job was seapower. But within the Navy, teamwork was also the explanation of success. To win the seapower struggle, the Navy employed an extremely high degree of integration—the same high degree of integration which will govern the composition and the operation of the Navy in the future. Naval aviation, the surface forces, the submarine service, the marines, and Coast Guard were members of the same organization and served under the same command to do the same job—to win that seapower struggle. Hence, the credit for victory rests equally with all of them.

So out of the experiences of the Pacific war, and the Battle of the Atlantic, came reaffirmation of the fact that integration of air, surface, and subsurface forces is essential to successful naval operations. But out of the experience of the Pacific war there also emerged a newer fact: That the influence of naval airpower on seapower is decisive. The demonstration of that fact began on that day of infamy when Japanese naval airpower struck us at Pearl Harbor. It gained strength when our carrier supremacy frustrated the enemy's supreme effort to move against Australia—at the Battle of the Coral Sea. It was conclusive when our carrier supremacy scattered an enormous Jap invasion armada at the Battle of Midway. Naval airpower flanked and supported the strides along New Guinea which were pointed at the Philippines. Naval airpower wrote finis, in the early days of the war, to the enemy's use of Rabaul, once a powerhouse, as an important naval base. The Gilberts, the Marshalls, the Marianas, the Philippines, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa were all made vulnerable to our surface and land forces by our carrier-based air supremacy. Naval air power is the punch of a modern navy—and of any future navy. That is why when we speak of the Navy, we speak of a combination of air and sea power. For naval purposes, air power is indistinguishable from sea power. The plane, as much as the surface vessel and the submarine, is the symbol of our modern Navy, our air sea power.

Thus, America faces the future with the most modern, efficient Navy in the world. Today it prepares to defend the Nation from

attack, to defend this hemisphere from attack, and to make our power available for use against any would-be aggressor or international criminal. How well your Navy will be able to discharge these responsibilities depends largely upon the people of the United States who own this Navy. I doubt if there exists in this country tonight widespread public appreciation of the task that lies ahead. No people ever supported its fighting forces as well as the American people backed up their fighting men in this war. No other people ever supported their fighting fronts with such a prodigious increase of uninterrupted production. No other people were ever in such complete partnership with their government in financing a war. The unrelenting effort, the stamina, and the determination of the American home front is one of the most thrilling chapters of this war. Unfortunately, no other people, when wars end, let their armed forces become impotent as quickly as we do.

Now that the war is suddenly over, and there has been superimposed upon the war-weariness of our people confusion growing from the use of atomic energy, the American people appear to have lost for a time their unity of thought and tenacity of purpose. The American people must appreciate what is involved in preserving the peace so hardly won and must wage the peace with the same vigor with which they waged the war.

I would like to speak of some issues upon which I think a degree of confusion exists. I think you will agree with me that most of this confusion is the unmistakable child of wishful thinking.

At the moment we are all eager to end the burdens of war and we are all preoccupied with the problems of reconversion and demobilization. Demobilization is today, and properly so, one of the primary objectives of our armed services. It is the desire of the Navy to return to their homes as speedily as possible all of those men who will not be needed for occupation roles or for our post-war military forces. This, the Navy is doing everything in its power to expedite, but we are genuinely concerned with the extension of the trend of demobilization-thinking which has swept this country. I doubt if any war ever died as fast in the hearts and minds of a people as this war has died in America. I speak of this tonight in anticipation of possible future public demands to accelerate and expand demobilization of men and matériel faster and further than our present plans contemplate. I remind you that late in 1918 and early in 1919 we were all anxious for the boys to come home. We were all anxious to return to normalcy. The boys came home, most of them, very quickly and the Nation spent the 23 years regretting that they had not gone through to Berlin.

The military forces of this country spent over three and one-half years fighting their way back from Pearl Harbor to Japan. If a public demand arises for the early release of our occupation forces in and around Japan, it might be well for us to recall our regret that World War I died so soon after Armistice Day. The will to implement our war and peace offensives may be dissipated in direct proportion to a premature and extended demobilization of military personnel and military power.

There are a great number of fine young American boys whom no point score can demobilize. They are the valiant heroes who gave their lives to win this war. Their lives won for us a temporary military advantage. The true value of their sacrifice is for history yet to record and its evaluation will depend largely upon the way the American people pursue victory to secure peace.

Another topic upon which I believe confusion exists today flows from the discovery of atomic energy. The view seems to be growing in America that, thanks to this great invention, the next war can be fought and won by pushing buttons in an office and that, because of the high degree of scientific development and mechanism, it will be possible for us to keep our men at home and send our machines to war.

The substitution of machines for men has ever been the quest of the military scientist. The emptiness of that hope seems to be established by the records of this last, the most mechanized, war in history which employed the largest number of soldiers and seamen in any war the world has ever known.

An atomic-bomb-laden plane or guided missile must be launched from some platform. Obviously, the nearer that platform is to its target the more efficient the operation. To state that this bomb has outmoded navies is to disregard one of the fundamental facts learned in this war: namely, that the only way to stop a determined air attack is at the source. Ask any of those gallant men who sailed with the fleet that came to stay—and did stay—off Okinawa, and they will tell you that no matter how good your fighter patrol or how accurate your antiaircraft gunnery, if there are enough fanatical kamikazes coming from enough different directions some of them will get through. Ask those veterans who lived in London through the war and they will tell you that the valiant RAF could not stop all of the bombers when they came over on a determined mission. They will tell you that the only defense against enough buzz bombs fired from enough different directions is to do what was done—transport men across the ocean to fight through to capture the launching platforms from which those bombs started on their fearful mission. Obviously, in the atomic age, it will be truer than ever before that the best, and perhaps the only, defense is an effective and successful offense—one that captures the site from which the atomic weapons are launched.

Curiously co-existent with the belief that the atomic bomb eliminates the necessity of an army and a navy, we find two incompatible public views. The first indicates that this discovery has conferred upon us permanent military superiority; the second demands our immediate sharing of this secret with the rest of the world. History reveals that supremacy in any military arm shifts rapidly from one nation to another, and that the leader who ceases for a moment in his endeavors to increase his lead finds himself following a new leader. That is why the Navy 5 years ago was first to investigate the possibilities of atomic propulsion. That is why the Navy must do its utmost to discover the potentialities and the limitations of atomic explosives and to develop all possible defenses against this new weapon. We can leave no stone unturned in the development of this new energy. Neither can we afford to neglect the maintenance and improvement of the weapons which won this war. The Navy, therefore, paraphrases Alexander Pope's warning: Be not the first upon the new to have relied, nor yet the last to lay the old aside.

We hear in this country an insistent demand that the secrets of this great discovery immediately be made known to all the nations of the world. It is argued that our retention of this information creates ill will. I share the Nation's great respect for many of those who make this argument. However, I can neither follow their reasoning nor arrive at their conclusion, that we should share these secrets before the world's organization and machinery for peace has been established and has demonstrated its effectiveness. In two great wars in the last 27 years, this country has done a great deal not only for humanity but for many individual nations. If our actions have not by now convinced others of our good will, nothing ever will. We cannot buy with military secrets or superior technical knowledge respect which our conduct has not already earned.

The last general topic upon which I wish to speak this evening is the proposal that the defense of this Nation could be secured with many fewer men and at substantially less cost if the Army and the Navy were merged into a single Departmen of Defense. We always seek to improve upon the best. It is typically American that within less than 2 months of our achieving the greatest military victories the world has ever known we immediately embark upon a program to improve our military system. With that objective I am in complete accord. With the idea that there is room for improvement within our military departments I completely agree. But I cannot support the theory of a merger of the Army and the Navy within a single department and under the control of a single Secretary, who, however brilliant, could ever hope to be adequately informed about all branches of the services. Should such a merger occur, it is inevitable that from time to time the influence of one branch of the service will be dominant to the great, and perhaps irreparable, damage to the other.

Coordination between the Army and the Navy can be perfected while maintaining the advantages of the present system. America will suffer far more from the termination of competition and free expression from separate War and Navy Departments than it ever did from imperfect coordination. Early in its history, America recognized the value of competition. We early learned that lack of competition was a serious sociological, as well as an economic, threat. Hence there was developed in this country that great body of antitrust laws and decisions which assured for America in the business and industrial world one of our greatest assets. Yet there are those who today seek to persuade us that in the military field, unlike every other phase of human endeavor in this country today, monopoly is desirable.

The pattern of action followed by America after every war has been identical. The Navy has been somewhat reduced and the Army has been more than decimated. In the years between wars America has looked to its Navy as its first line of defense. This tradition, traceable to the distrust of professional soldiers which was born in the early days when foreign troops were billeted in the homes of our ancestors, has survived because the American people know that the Navy is not only the indispensable line of defense but is the most economical method of purchasing national security. Thus, after each of America's wars, the Army is shrunk almost into an organizational chart, and the Navy—though reduced—has remained the major military force in being. Within the next 12 months that process probably will be repeated.

I submit to you that it is unthinkable that the military forces of this country should be entrusted to any single individual with Army background, influences, and conviction at a time when by far the greatest part of its military force is Navy. With equal vigor, I suggest to you the absurdity of the control of a single department of defense by any single man with naval experience and naval traditions who could not possibly appreciate in full the significance or the urgency of the development of equipment and procedure and doctrine peculiar to land fighting.

But in addition to the departmental organization for defense, the people's mental outlook, their awareness of the task ahead must be our major concern. Peace must be more than a pious wish in our minds. We like to believe that America is the most peaceful nation in the world. Certainly, we have always been one of those least prepared for war. Yet in the 156 years since this Republic was established, we have fought the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the War Between the States, the Spanish-American War, and two world wars. Few nations have fought more wars in that same period. Such a record is conclusive evidence that peace does not come automatically to the nation

that wants peace or has deliberately courted military weakness.

"Peace at any price" for generations has been anathema to Americans. Perhaps that is one reason why we have come to believe that peace has no price. The record disproves that belief. The record shows that peace demands its own price, though an infinitely small fraction of the price war demands. The record shows that a nation can achieve peace only by waging it, by relentlessly working for that objective with the same unity and the same determination with which war is waged. Passive defenselessness has never won peace and probably never will.

The world stands tonight on the threshold of its greatest opportunity. I believe we will seize that opportunity. I feel that this may be humanity's last opportunity. I pray God the day may come when there is no longer a need for any navy or any army. The arrival of that day can be speeded by the reasonable maintenance of America's might until the hopes and dreams of today are translated into the living, effective world organizations of tomorrow. I fear that happy event will be postponed and perhaps may never materialize unless America retains and develops a navy which will be capable of snuffing out any threat against the just and enduring peace for which the entire world yearns.

Ceiling Prices on Undershirts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include therein an article which appeared in the New York Times for October 10, concerning the sale of imported undershirts. I especially refer to the statement made by the president of the Underwear Institute that if the Office of Price Administration would grant a ceiling which would permit a small profit, American mills could sell the same or a better shirt at retail for 55 cents.

I am informed that on December 6, 1944, the armed forces ordered 65,000,000 lightweight undershirts. Mills had to produce these shirts at a loss and did so as a patriotic service when the armed forces made a direct appeal for them. The mills took the loss rather than have servicemen wait until they had had a chance to induce OPA to change the ceiling prices.

It is the duty of the Office of Price Administration to encourage production and prevent inflation. It is doing neither when it keeps ceiling prices on American production so low that mills cannot produce; and yet the market is open to foreign manufacturers at almost double the price.

The article follows:

UNDERSHIRT SALE STIRS WRATH AT OPA—IMPORT IS SNAPPED UP AT 98 CENTS, TWICE DOMESTIC CEILING, AND UNITED STATES MILLS COMPLAIN

Eighteen thousand men's cotton undershirts, imported from South America and put on sale at 98 cents a few days ago in a local department store, became one of the fastest sellers of the day. New Yorkers who were able to get a few of the garments considered themselves lucky in view of the current shortage of low and medium-priced underwear.

The Nation's underwear manufacturers said yesterday that they could have made shirts of equal or better quality to retail at 55 cents, but were blocked by the Office of Price Administration.

The Underwear Institute, charging the OPA with discriminating against home industries, said that unless there was an early revision of price ceilings on domestic goods the men of America would have to pay higher prices for imported products or go without underwear by next spring. Women and children will be in the same fix, according to Roy A. Cheney, president of the industry organization.

FORTY-NINE-CENT RETAIL CEILING

The retail ceiling on domestic undershirts comparable to the 98-cent importations is 49 cents in most cases, said Mr. Cheney. Rather than lose money making shirts to retail at that price, most of the mills are not making any, he reported. Mr. Cheney said a 55-cent retail price would permit a profit to manufacturer and retailer.

"But the OPA holds us to our prices based on costs in the fall of 1941," asserted Mr. Cheney. "Since then our material costs have gone up 38 percent and our labor costs 45 percent."

Mr. Cheney pointed out that the higher retail price for imported garments was sanctioned by the OPA. Officials of the regional OPA headquarters in the Empire State Building were reluctant to discuss import ceilings, saying legal prices on goods from abroad were fixed in Washington. They admitted, though, that imported commodities might have higher ceilings than domestic goods of the same quality.

The discrepancy, according to the OPA, is due to the fact that it can control manufacturers' prices in this country but has no authority over foreign factories. As a result when it comes to fixing sales prices on imported items, the national OPA takes the cost to the importer of bringing the goods here and permits a mark-up over the "landed cost."

An OPA spokesman said that a domestic manufacturer could file with the national office an application for a ceiling-price adjustment if he found himself in a squeeze of rising production costs.

NOT AN EXCEPTIONAL CASE

The 18,000 cotton undershirts were not an exceptional case of discrimination against United States mills, Mr. Cheney declared. He said that as shipping becomes easier, imports of men's, women's, and children's garments from South America are increasing, and that prices are generally higher than if the garments were made here. He said other New York stores are receiving shipments from time to time.

Warning of the underwear crisis expected by spring, Mr. Cheney said September and October were the months in which jobbers usually bought from the mills for the spring trade, but that most jobbers were getting nothing at present.

A survey among 36 principal jobbers in all parts of the country disclosed to the Underwear Institute that 23 were finding it impossible to obtain any stock at present and 10 were getting from 2 percent to 20 percent of their normal amount.

A separate poll of underwear manufacturers, said Mr. Cheney, disclosed many instances of lightweight goods being produced at a loss. He said a sampling of 17 of the largest mills brought reports of the discontinuance of unprofitable items, reductions of as much as 70 percent in lines of spring goods, and predictions of employment reductions within the next week or two by several plants and the shut-down of one mill.

Earle E. West, secretary of the institute, said that while cotton yarns were still scarce the yarn supply was improving since the war ended. He said that the legitimate manufacturers could use all the yarn available if they could produce goods at a reasonable profit.

Don't Go the Way of the Mob

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. BUELL SNYDER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, in the unanimous-consent request to extend my remarks, I here include the fine thought-provoking address delivered by Postmaster General Robert E. Hannegan before the FBI National Academy at the graduating exercises of the thirtieth session, held October 26 in the Department of Justice auditorium:

When Mr. Hoover invited me to speak to you on this occasion, I asked him what subject, in his opinion, would interest you most. He answered that as a rule the speakers at these graduation exercises of the FBI National Academy take up some phase of law enforcement, local or national.

Well, right at the start I am going to break that rule. I am going to talk for a little bit about J. Edgar Hoover.

Not that he needs any introduction to you, or to Americans anywhere. I once heard Francis Biddle, the former Attorney General, tell a story on himself which proves that Mr. Hoover is not exactly unknown here.

In 1941, many war-emergency measures were in force. To get into an office in the Department of Justice after 6 o'clock, a person had to show a pass to the guard at the door. One evening shortly after his appointment as Attorney General, Biddle wanted to get in to finish up some work. The guard asked to see his pass. Biddle couldn't find it. The guard therefore refused to let him in. "I suppose you don't know who I am," Biddle said. The guard admitted his ignorance. "I'm Francis Biddle." Whereupon the guard replied: "That's O. K. with me. But you can't get in here without a pass, I don't give a damn if you were J. Edgar Hoover."

In my opinion the FBI, in the 5 years past, has made the greatest achievement in preserving internal security in time of war that has ever been made in the history of the United States. And the man who led America to that achievement is J. Edgar Hoover.

You are going back to your respective communities, prepared to do all you can to improve the quality of law enforcement. And here, in the record that is before us from December 7, 1941, to August 14 of 1945, we have a brilliant performance in law enforcement, a textbook of action upon which we may well draw for guidance whether in time of war or peace.

During the period when danger was abroad in the world, America was held safe from danger at home. The spy, the saboteur, the enemy propaganda stooge, all the members of that sinister institution known as the fifth column, were here in force, and still others were on their way over. They were confident that they could pursue the same methods here that had been so effective in other countries.

But in America those methods did not work. It would not be quite accurate to say that enemy dynamiters and arsonists found it hard going—they never even got started! In all of World War II there was not a single instance of a successful operation by enemy-directed saboteurs!

It seems that the climate in America disagreed with them. For their purposes there was too much light over here, and also too much heat. In fact it disagreed with them so violently that some half a dozen of them were shocked to death.

It was the FBI, an alert FBI, an FBI trained and developed and guided by J. Edgar Hoover, which created and maintained that unhealthy climate for the internal enemies of our country.

But that was only part of the job. To me, the brightest spot in this record of internal security lies in a still greater achievement—the fact that America, in combating all the elaborate machinery which the Axis powers had set up for espionage and sabotage, in disabling that machine and rendering it harmless, America remained true to herself. Through it all, this country played her destined role of a democracy faithful to democratic ideals. Fighting for her very life, she clung to the democratic method of enforcing her law.

In the matter of democratic law enforcement we have been moving forward through the years. For the measure of that improvement, we need only look back into the history of our own times. Some of you remember what happened in World War I.

We had no FBI then as we know it now. We had a Bureau of Investigation—with no J. Edgar Hoover in it—and we had 21 other Government agencies authorized to handle matters of internal security.

But spy hunting was not the exclusive business of those Government agencies. The public took it over. The grocery store, the barber shop, the street corner—these became the legal game reserves of the amateur spy hunter in World War I. Neighbor gossiped about neighbor. Privately sponsored "national security" organizations, so-called, ran full-page advertisements in the newspapers, inviting the public to track down German secret agents by becoming members of the organization—at $1 a head.

The result of all this was that thousands of innocent persons suffered. Families made up of loyal, patriotic American citizens were held suspect because they happened to have German-sounding names, and on that ground alone. Many were persecuted for that reason alone. We were interested in saving the world for democracy, but we were neglecting to try it out at home.

Now, how about World War II? As you all know, the American people did not repeat that performance. Throughout the conflict we have been remarkably free of persecutions.

As we look back over the record of these two wars, we see a remarkable contrast, one that should gratify every American and make him feel proud of his country, proud of his Goverment, and proud of its firm and gallant adherence to that same democratic principle which it holds out to a groping world today.

I know you share this pride with me. And I think you will agree with me, too, that a major part of the credit belongs to J. Edgar Hoover. I know this, because I happen to know that there were powerful pressures to make him abandon the clear-cut policy which he adopted at the beginning of the war emergency.

That policy, you know, was to discourage amateur spy-hunting. It was to take a strong stand, right at the beginning, against vigilantism and mob action. Again and again Director Hoover told the public, "If you suspect anything or anybody in this war, tell the FBI. Don't tell your neighbors. Don't take the job of saving America into your own hands. Don't join witch-hunts. Don't go the way of the mob."

In Europe the mob had served as the most useful tool of fascism. We didn't want that to happen here. But while fascism was still on the march and going strong, there were some people with those leanings, some who were susceptible to that disease, in every country. And we had them in America. We had some who wanted to set aside due process of law and who wrapped up their sinister purpose in the drapery of patriotism.

Against these efforts at sabotage—and let me remind you that it was a kind of sabotage more deadly than blast and flame—America was held safe. And I therefore take this occasion to express the gratitude that I, as an American citizen, feel toward the one man who had so very much to do with preserving us from that danger at home—J. Edgar Hoover.

That kind of sabotage, however, does not end with the surrender of our enemies in war. There were attempts, many years before December 7, 1941, to scuttle democracy in America, and there will be attempts to do so many years after August 14, 1945.

Because the majority of these attempts involve no criminality under the law, and because it is natural that our people should now relax from their wartime alertness, they are even more difficult to deal with in time of peace. And for that very reason they are more dangerous.

You are officers of the law, whose job is enforcement, or the supervision and direction of others engaged in enforcement. When a crime is committed you or your men go after the fellow who committed it.

But the whole framework in which you operate rests on the principle of justice as the means of protecting a law-abiding society.

Society punishes criminals—and engages you to go out and catch them—not because men want revenge, or because by putting the criminal in jail we believe we can educate him, or because prison labor can makes shoes cheaply.

No; the reason society sends you out to arrest a thief or a murderer is to protect itself. You catch your man, he is tried, and if he is found guilty he is punished. The justice done to the man is his punishment. But the justice done to society is the force of example which will prevent a dozen or a hundred or a thousand other men from repeating the crime for which one man has been punished.

What interests society, then, is not primarily the apprehension and punishment of the criminal. That is only the means to an end. The end is the safety and well-being of humanity.

Now, the machinery of law enforcement is not like the machinery in a factory that turns out automobiles or refrigerators or prefabricated houses. It is a human machine, working with the materials of humanity. There are no prefabricated crooks. Murderers do not emerge full-grown, gun in hand, from a factory assembly line. And a person who works at this human machine of law enforcement does not stand at one corner of it and perform a single operation over and over, through an 8-hour day, as the fellow who works with a wrench in a mass-production plant.

No; the man who works at law enforcement has got to understand not only the process, not only the mechanics, but the principles that underlie that machine, its reason for being, its place in the community and in the world. He has to know his raw material, what it consists of, where it comes from, what creates it.

As public servants in this field, therefore, your interest extends far beyond the apprehension of the criminal. It reaches into crime prevention to the building of good citizenship, to the elimination of influences in your community and your country that breed crimes and bad citizenship.

To do that kind of work well, you have to know why criminals act as they do, what brings on crime. Sometimes those influences are wholly personal or pathological. Sometimes they exist in the broader fields of sociology or economics. Whatever they may be, you want to discover them, and wherever you can you want to correct them.

Therefore, you are as deeply interested in events which may involve no criminality themselves, but which lead up to crime, as you are in the end result.

There have been recently, for example, some very disquieting outbreaks among our youth, those who will follow us into the voting citizenry of America. Doubtless you have read in the newspapers over recent weeks about school strikes and threats of strikes over race issues. They have followed other flare-ups of mob action from time to time in recent years, directed against religious minorities. Only last week the newspapers carried the story that the Ku Klux Klan was once more burning its fiery crosses—after lying low through our war with fascism.

Now, it is true that we have not had very many occurrences of that kind. They have been scattered, sporadic. But they are symptoms. They are danger signs. I do not think the specialist in crime prevention can afford to overlook them, or the underlying conditions that bring them on, any more than the specialist in medicine can afford to overlook the symptoms of disease in his patients, or the public health expert can afford to ignore the danger signals of epidemic in his community.

These outbreaks of race and religious hatred in the schools and among those of school age have taken place in times when juvenile delinquency has been in an uptrend. The Nation was shocked to learn, from your own FBI reports, that last year 40 percent of the crimes against property in this country were committed by persons under 21. That means that out of 110,000 known crimes, our youngsters committed 44,000. It means that one out of five thieves and arsonists and vandals is under voting age.

The FBI found that 17-year-old boys and 18-year-old girls committed more crimes during the war years than any other age groups. Crime among young girls more than doubled, and in the overcrowded centers of war industry and military camps the numbers of these young victims of our times were increased three- and four-fold.

Now, I am not going to burden you with any more statistics. But I think we should take these figures seriously. They are more than cold percentages and totals that statisticians can juggle around and arrange in neat tables. They are stark tragedy, the blighting of personal lives and the damaging of our whole body politic. They are liabilities on the future of America. And they cry aloud to us to do something about it.

Juvenile delinquency has always been an accompaniment of war, and of the stress and displacements of wartimes. We cannot, however, pass off the significance of these trends and these figures merely by pointing out that the war is over now.

War does disrupt the lives of our young people and it does divert many of them into dangerous paths. But this does not mean that the end of war automatically straightens them out again and takes care of their troubles. Far from it. I believe this period of transition is in certain ways more dangerous to the emotional balance and the level-headed thinking of our boys and girls than war itself. Many things are happening now that will try the stamina of these youngsters, and that will also try our own ability and our willingness to help them.

But we must prove ourselves able and willing to help them or take the consequences. Sometimes, you know, we don't see those consequences right away. Sometimes there is no visible sign—not until a new wave

of crime hits us and we find ourselves wondering what could have caused the youth of our country to do such things. Sometimes we hear nothing about it until the Fascist philosophy of race and religious hatred breaks out where we least expect it—in our schools—and we are shocked and bewildered and we wonder what these misguided youngsters could have been thinking about while their older brothers were overseas, fighting and dying to keep that same philosophy from being brought over here and forced upon us.

Make no mistake—that can still happen here. We were once troubled, you may recall, by the prospect of winning the war and losing the peace. Our Government and the governments of other nations have been making herculean efforts to find the way to peace, and I believe they will succeed.

But we Americans want to be at peace not only with the outside world, but also with our own consciences and our own souls. Unless we are vigilant here at home, unless we are awake to the trials that beset our own people, and especially that generation which is to follow us in accepting the leadership of the world, I say that we can win the war and win the peace and still lose that which we fought for; we can still emerge with an empty victory; we can still bear on our consciences the unfulfilled obligation to our heroic dead.

What are we to do, then, to safeguard our youth? What policies can you officers of law enforcement support, what projects can you undertake?

In this academy, you have been instructed in the methods of the FBI. The FBI is a fixture of democracy. It has been built to function as a democratic agency, adhering faithfully to democratic procedure in the enforcement of law. I need not go over that ground, but of course this principle is requirement No. 1 in your own community just as it is here in Washington.

But there are other policies, other projects, beyond the curriculum here, which in these times are directly related to your job.

First, within your respective communities, you will have to face the reality that peace in the world does not mean peace in the police department, and you will have to convince the citizens of your community, the parents and householders and businessmen, of the importance of maintaining the police force both in quality and quantity.

The end of war has brought broad general pressure for retrenchment of government expenditures. You will have to show your communities why this retrenchment, necessary though it may be in many branches of public service, is not justified in your branch of government.

Both in numbers of police officers employed and in salaries paid, we are now down to inadequate levels throughout the country. Through the war years there has been a steady drop in police personnel, and I was disappointed to see that this trend has carried over into 1945. As of April 30 of this year, the total stood 8.2 percent below 1942.

Salaries have not been kept in line with the increased cost of living, and as a result, even when the manpower shortage is ended it will not be easy for you to attract as high a caliber of personnel as you would like. You should consider it a part of your duty to fight and fight hard for a budget that means grade A people to do a grade A job.

In tackling the problem of juvenile delinquency, your interests will have to go far beyond the traditional limits of law enforcement. You will have to keep yourselves informed on the broad social and economic picture in the world of today.

If the police personnel of these times are to do the whole job that society assigns to them, they must know these world events and these changes in world trends, because such events and trends are translated directly into happenings in their home communities, no matter how small they may be or how distant from the main stream of our national and international life. The world is a smaller place now. And just as it takes less time for a person to travel from one country to another, it also takes less time for a habit of thinking to cross the ocean, or an influence on character, or a way of life.

Finally, there are the new recreation and child-care projects that have sprung up in your communities, projects that Government agencies and public-spirited citizens undertook when they saw the sad toll that war was taking in the character development of our children, and when they resolved to counteract it in every way they could. There are the high-school canteens, the various recreation units, the child-care centers, which were created to fight the spread of juvenile delinquency.

These, too, are facing the pressure of postwar retrenchment. You will hear it said that, now the war is over, there is no reason to keep them up, to spend the money necessary to maintain them.

But I urge you to keep those institutions going. Point out to the people of your town or your city that to close them now is no saving—not even in dollars and cents, and certainly not in the far more precious currency of our human resources. For if those places where boys and girls could get wholesome entertainment were needed during the past 4 years, they are needed more than ever now.

We have entered, here in America, a new and wonderful age. But it is also a dangerous age. If the criminal mind ever again should rise to a ruling status as it did in Nazi Germany, the tools that science has now placed in the hands of men will enable the aggressors to destroy all civilized life on earth. And you men who have studied the subject know that big crimes grow out of little ones.

Mr. Hoover has warned us of the danger that lies ahead of us here at home if the tide of crime is not checked. To that timely warning, I want to add that unless America sets the example that is needed in the world today, the danger will not be confined here at home.

Let us not forget that it was crime that we had to suppress in winning World War II—the greatest and most hideous crime in the history of mankind. The governments that we had to defeat were not made up of statesmen who were simply fighting for an ideal that differed from our own. No; they were thugs, a gang of thieves and murderers; and by their every action, before their surrender and after, they themselves have proved it. They have shown none of the attributes of statesmen who have been bested in the field of honor. The leaders of the aggression that set off World War II were acting the part of criminals from the outset, and they stand properly indicted as criminals today.

We want no more of their breed. With atomic power now a reality, we do not have living space anywhere on this earth for those who would attempt the crime of using it in an aggression on their fellow-man.

Let us remember, too, that these criminals of World War II began their career of crime at home. They started it with the persecution of racial and religious minorities. They developed it in book burnings, in confiscations, in the suppression of their own people, and from there they carried their crime abroad.

We are determined that no such careers will find their starting point here. And we look to you, the officers of the law in America, to see to it that they do not.

To the boys and girls of your home town, wherever it may be, the uniformed man serving under you is something more than just the policeman on the block.

In their world that man is law, he is justice, he is order, he is the integrity of democratic society. He is most of the things that the civic authority of a self-governing people means in the lives of those boys and girls.

Now, that is a pretty large order. It puts a heavy responsibility on his shoulders. Nevertheless, in practice that is the way it works out. If the officer of the law carries himself properly, the boys and girls of the neighborhood respond with respect for the law. If he is fair with them they react not only to him as an individual, but to the whole concept of justice in a democracy. If he is dependable, they trust not only him but the society that gives him his authority. If he fails in any of these, his failure will likewise be reflected.

The respect and trust that children place in the police—most children in most neighborhoods—is pretty good evidence, I think, of a job well done. You don't get that respect and that trust from youth unless you deserve it—whether you wear brass buttons or not.

But no matter how well the task of law enforcement is done, there is always room for further achievement, and there are always danger spots that need attention. You have been given here in Washington the finest training that any chief of any police force could get anywhere in the world. I know that no matter how high your standards have been in your respective communities, as the result of this training you will find ways of raising them higher still.

In your work that is always possible and always important. For yours is a stewardship on which the future of our children—and this means the future of America—depends. That is the measure of your job. May the hand of God guide you, may He be with you always in your resolve to do it well.

The Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter that I have received from a senior high school student, Miss Georgia M. Goepfert, who resides in my congressional district, regarding the atomic bomb:

DEAR SIR: I am a senior in high school. Through my civics class I have become deeply interested in governmental affairs and hope I might take a big part in them some day. But for the time being you are my Representative and now I realize you depend upon the people, whom you represent, to know what actions to make.

I want to express the thoughts of my civics class on the atomic bomb. The majority of us agree that Russia should be let know of the secrets of the bomb. One student suggested that scientists of the Big Five form a commission and make laws concerning the atomic bomb. They could forbid its use in war as was the use of poison gas. I think Mr. Truman suggested this.

There are two outstanding reasons why we should let Russia know. First, her scientists will work continuously until they discover the details, which is predicted to happen soon. Besides our scientists can work harder to find a way in which to counteract the effects of the bomb.

The second point is—Russia would have more faith in us. If Russia would have discovered the bomb first and given the United States the formulas the people of our country would trust Russia, have faith in her, and not act so stubbornly to her. So don't you think if this story would be vice versa, it would be a great advantage to the world?

I sincerely hope that our opinions might help you in deciding the answer that is so hard to solve.

Respectfully,

GEORGIA M. GOEPFERT.

BELLEVILLE, ILL.

Speech of Rear Adm. George F. Hussey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Rear Adm. George F. Hussey, United States Navy, Chief, Bureau of Ordnance, Navy Department, in Baltimore, Md., October 27, 1945:

It is a privilege to be here in Baltimore on this first Navy Day after victory. It is first a personal privilege because my own connection with the Navy League goes back to my high-school days in Massachusetts. I think perhaps one of the earliest influences toward my Navy career was an address under the auspices of the Navy League made by Rear Adm. "Fighting Bob" Evans shortly after he retired during the cruise of the fleet around the world. Next, it is a privilege to be in Maryland again because, as was brought home so forcefully during the celebration of the Naval Academy centennial a few days ago, Maryland has for 100 years been the cradle of naval officers. It is not the slightest disparagement of the brave and loyal Reserve officers who made up 95 percent of our commissioned personnel during the war to say that without the Regular officers trained at the Naval Academy in Annapolis the Reserves could not have done their job, nor could the 5 percent have carried on without the 95, neither could do without the other, but together they made an unbeatable Navy, on the surface, under the surface, in the air, and in support of the fleet.

The work of the Navy League has continued steadfastly over many years, keeping before the people of the United States in sound presentations the country's needs for naval strength, and the reasons behind those needs. To my mind the Navy League has been one of the primary sources of a well-informed public opinion in support of a strong first line of defense. To those sources you of the Navy League in Baltimore have added the very real demonstration of Maryland hospitality in your Navy League Club. And your public-spirited women both in and out of their smart uniforms have made Baltimore a welcome port of call for the Navy, the marines, and the Coast Guard.

My own experience during this war has been very largely behind various desks in Washington. For the first 4 months of the war I had the privilege of commanding a task group made up of two squadrons of converted four-stack destroyers equipped especially for mine-sweeping and mine-laying at high speeds. We had also special anti-submarine gear and constituted the offshore patrol for the Hawaiian Islands area. Figuratively speaking we sat on the doorstep off Pearl on an antisubmarine mission. We reinforced ocean escorts for convoys coming and going, escorted transports and merchant shipping within the island area, and did various and sundry jobs among the islands, all the while maintaining a constant picket line against submarines. From that position we saw come and go the task forces that carried the ball for us in the early months of the war. You are accustomed to seeing in the newsreels or reading in newspapers and magazines of mighty Task Forces 38 and 58, the great armadas that have carved for themselves lasting niches in the Navy's hall of fame. The task forces of the days I am recalling were pitifully small—one carrier, two cruisers, five destroyers. Of course we took special precautions to insure that the way was cleared whenever such a task force left Pearl or returned. In spite of the confidence that I had in the commanding officers of my ships and their ability to perform their jobs I must admit that I always hove a big sigh of relief when the task force was clear of our area and making high speed toward the horizon, or when the last returning ship was safely inside the nets. The Navy came a long way from those days until the *Missouri* and her cohorts dropped anchor in Tokyo Bay.

I should like to tell you first-hand details of the Navy's exploits during those stirring days when the Navy came from behind to win overwhelmingly, but far more able and better informed representatives of the Navy than I have told you in written and spoken words of the amazing deeds performed by young Americans in times of stress. Not only that, there has been brought home to you the many times young Americans stood up under long-continued periods of inactivity during which there must be maintained constant alertness against a competent and ruthless foe. Hardly a week goes past without the newsreels, illustrated magazines, and the daily papers being filled with scenes where real heroes are decorated. In the face of such concrete evidence of real exploits I can hardly talk to you of them. There is, however, one phase of the Navy's service which I should like to mention, perhaps partly because I had no direct connection nor personal responsibilities for any part of it—that branch is the Hospital Corps. When the Surgeon General returned from one of his trips to Pacific bases he told me that in a number of hospitals he had talked with the wounded, an amazingly cheerful lot, and in each case he would ask the men, "How long was it after you were wounded before you got first aid?" To that question he got a puzzled look and a reply, "I don't understand what you mean, sir." He rephrased his question, "Well, after you were hit how much time elapsed before a hospital corpsman got to you?" The answer to that question was, "No time at all, sir; the hospital corpsman was right there." Only occasionally do we hear of the outstanding valor of these men who—unarmed—went through the hell of the landings, the terrors of the beachheads to save lives. Theirs was an outstanding contribution and a major reason why the mortality rate among the wounded has been so amazingly low.

I said that I had spent most of the war behind desks in Washington. First, as Director of Production, then as Assistant Chief, and now as Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, I have had a first-hand contact and a close-up view of what American industry has done to make winning the war speedily an actual accomplishment. You have heard speakers from to time, particularly those concerned with the presentation of the Army-Navy E, that visible symbol of appreciation from the armed services, tell of outstanding accomplishments on the production front of both management and labor. Teamed with the military they performed miracles of production to place in the hands of the bravest and most competent Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard the world has ever known, the finest possible weapons.

Happily all of that is in the past and it is not of the past that I want to talk to you this evening, but of the future—the future of the country and what the Navy's share must be in that future. Without the enlightened support of a well-informed public opinion the Navy may well be denied means to carry out its essential share in preserving for ourselves, our children, and our children's children, the peace which this generation has fought so valiantly to acquire.

If the advertising pages of magazines are any criterion this Nation is insurance minded—life insurance, fire insurance, accident insurance, health insurance, liability insurance—insurance against all manner of mishaps and misfortunes—the American people at large are insurance minded. It must be brought home to the country that the Navy is national insurance. So long as people of this country run their own lives on the basis that insurance is the last expense to be dropped, and that luxuries must be laid aside first, there is little reason to believe that the country as a whole will not support insurance in the form of an adequate Navy. Insurance to be worth buying must be adequate—by the same token the Navy to be worth paying for must be adequate for the purposes for which it is intended. The Navy of the United States is intended to maintain the national interest, to protect the continental United States from invasion, to maintain securely our island possessions and advanced bases, to carry our share of the United Nations effort—all with the end of insuring that no enemy may disturb our peace.

The composition of the Navy necessary to carry out those ends has been set before Congress after prolonged studies by trained officers well versed in weighing the problems and the necessities. The Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives, of which your Representative SASSCER is an able member, gave careful consideration to the Navy Department recommendations and reported to the House of Representatives a recommendation to pass a resolution setting forth the sense of Congress as to the size and composition of the Navy.

It should be noted that the resolution embodying the details of that size and composition deals only with combatant ships. It is particularly significant that other sections of the resolution provide that there shall be maintained an adequate number of auxiliaries and a sufficient Shore Establishment to support the fleet. If that resolution is passed by the Congress there will devolve upon the Navy Department the duty of maintaining in the best possible condition the active fleet, the reserve fleet, and the inactive fleet. Maintaining the active fleet in prime condition, in a condition of complete readiness is a comparatively easy task. It calls for constant training and material upkeep and a judicious disposition of the active units to the end that they may be in the areas where they are most likely to be needed, and at the same time that the morale of the personnel may be of the highest. The comings and goings of the active fleets will once again become routine sights in our larger coastal naval bases. Casco Bay, Narragansett Bay, New York, Norfolk, San Diego, San Francisco, Puget Sound, and Pearl Harbor, all will be accustomed once more to see the fleet come and go upon its normal business. Maintenance of the inactive ships is another matter since the shore stations must support them. A ship out of commission, in spite of advances in dehumidification and other means of preservation, must necessarily turn in for storage a considerable portion of her equipment, particularly her ammunition. The vast merchant fleet and the tremendous number of auxiliaries which supported the activities of the fighting fleets and moved assault troops, garrison forces and their supplies to

the various beachheads, which later became advanced bases, all were armed with modern, effective antiaircraft and antisubmarine weapons. Those weapons, too, must be preserved against the day when they will again be required to rearm like ships in another conflict, which we hope will never come. To preserve this ammunition and equipment it has been necessary to keep as permanent parts of the naval ordnance Shore Establishment, a very considerable array of ammunition depots, magazines, and ordnance plants—many of them constructed during the war when their production was vitally needed to keep the fleets supplied. The ordnance plants in particular were set up in 1940, 1941, and 1942, located in areas of good labor supply within the interior of the country and specially equipped for the particular purpose for which each was intended. Without painting a picture of lavish extravagance these plants must be described as splendidly equipped with the finest tools that America's exceedingly able machine-tool industry could produce. Naturally enough those plants have been eyed by many alert chambers of commerce, corporations, and able individual businessmen with a view toward converting them to peacetime production.

In each case the Navy has had to say "No," because of the lessons of the war. At the close of World War I we had one gun factory, one large ordnance plant, and one very small one, and three torpedo stations. Those plants, preserved through the peace interval and operated to the extent necessary to maintain the peacetime Navy, were by no means adequate to build, equip, and maintain the wartime Navy. By the availability of the naval ordnance plant, South Charleston, W. Va., which had been preserved as a war plant from 1922 to 1940, the Bureau of Ordnance was able to get an early start on the production of armor and gun barrels for the new fleet. Against the day when with far less warning than we were vouchsafed for this war, a national emergency may again arise, it is only the part of wisdom that these plants be preserved by and for the Navy. After due consideration, as Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, I submitted to the Secretary of the Navy recommendations for the conversion of those plants which were contractor operated during the war to Navy operation as part of the permanent shore establishment. The Secretary approved those recommendations and steps are now in process, some already completed, to transfer from operation with high employment figures to a stand-by status under complete Navy control with officers, a few enlisted personnel, and a nucleus of civil-service employees. Such an action has been, naturally, disappointing to many, but mindful as I am of the urgent necessity for creating the maximum possible employment in the country I should still be derelict in my duty if I failed to recommend to the Secretary that these plants be preserved for the Navy's use in time of need.

Ships, reserve equipment, and stand-by plants will be of but little use to us if we allow our research and development to fall by the wayside. In this well-informed country hardly a person can fail to be aware of at least some of the contributions which science has made to the winning of this war. The atomic bomb has captured everyone's imagination. The VT fuze, of which the Navy is particularly proud, and which our antiaircraft guns used with such deadly efficiency, is another striking example of what the best brains of science and the skill of American industry can do when faced with a particularly tough problem. If you have ever dropped your bedside radio set you probably recall the disastrous results; imagine then the problem of developing and manufacturing a radio set no bigger than my fingers and capable of being fired from a gun at 2,500 feet per second. That in a nutshell was the problem handed to the scientists of Section T, of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, those same scientists who now man the applied physics laboratory of your own Johns Hopkins University. Thanks to the broadmindedness of Dr. Bowman as president of the university and of the very able board of trustees who support him, Johns Hopkins has taken on further projects of very great importance in devising weapons for the Navy. One problem laid before them was recognized as requiring at least 2 years for solution. Already they have made such strides that while the final solution is still far distant there is every reason to believe that they will come up with an answer not merely to the precise problem presented, but an answer on which solutions to numerous other problems all in the same general field may be shaped. I am particularly happy that I can tell you, who are so close to Johns Hopkins and to whom Johns Hopkins is so close, how keenly the Navy appreciates the very real contribution of that university to the winning of the war and the preparations for maintaining the peace.

I had the privilege of sitting during the summer of 1944 as a member of the Wilson Committee on Postwar Military Research. Presided over by Mr. Charles E. Wilson, of the War Production Board and the General Electric Co., the board included four eminent scientists, four general officers of the Army, and four flag officers of the Navy, each with a personal responsibility for some phase of the material readiness of the armed services. Having in mind the outstanding accomplishments of the Office of Scientific Research and Development and the National Defense Research Committee with their widespread sections, groups, and committees, the efforts of the Wilson committee were bent toward establishing for the peace era a sound basis for continuing the interest of the best minds of science in the problems of national defense. There was neither confusion nor conflict in the committee as to the ends sought. Naturally, there were considerable differences of opinion as to the best means to those ends. After very illuminating discussions the committee finally submitted its report to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy at whose behest the committee had been established. The first concrete result of that report was the establishment under the National Academy of Sciences of the Research Board for National Security with Dr. Carl Compton, the distinguished president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, as its chairman. The board comprises 20 outstanding scientists selected from various fields, 10 Army officers, and 10 Navy officers, including the chiefs of the technical branches of the Army and of the technical bureaus of the Navy. Currently there are before Congress various bills looking to the establishment on a permanent basis of some sort of national research organization. The bills differ in details, some are wider in scope than others, but all of them emphasize the vital necessity of bringing to bear on problems of national welfare and national defense the active support of the best scientific minds of the country.

Men of science, and I am construing science broadly to include the engineering branches, have given of their best during the war. It is vital that along with their peacetime contribution to the country's prosperity and the constant improvement of the American standard of living the country recognize that contributions to national defense problems on the part of scientists are also essential. We must bring ourselves to the frame of mind where the scientists who solve a crucial national defense problem receive the same public acclaim as the men who develop new means of combating disease. With the backing of the American public, American scientists can and will contribute of their best to insure that the United States Navy, now in a preeminent position in the world, maintains that position throughout the years to come. On the sustaining of the American Navy and its readiness rests no small share of the peace of the world.

There, ladies and gentlemen of the Navy League and of the Propeller Club, are the Navy's most pressing problems for your attention. The Navy looks, as always, to the Navy League for help in establishing and maintaining a well-informed public opinion to the end that a Navy of adequate size, backed by sound research in the constantly expanding fields of science, may be at all times ready to preserve the peace of these United States.

Victory Day Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a speech I delivered at the welcoming home celebration of the veterans of Chelsea, Mass., on Sunday, October 28, 1945:

VETERANS OF CHELSEA, WELCOME HOME

Just 5½ months after VE-day, nearly one-half of the millions of troops we sent overseas to fight and win this war for us have been returned home. Those still in Europe will be back by February; those in the Pacific, by June. At the present moment the Navy is transferring seven aircraft carriers and six cruisers to help the transports in the job of bringing our men home as quickly as possible.

Already, on the streets, we see increasing numbers of men and women wearing the discharge buttons which identify those who have been returned to civilian life after the months and years they gave in honorable service to our Nation. They are young men and women who have traveled far, who have seen and done so much, and now they are coming back to live as we have lived during these past 4 years, as free and responsible Americans. The families and friends who have missed them so are gathered here to honor them and, what is more important, to rejoice in seeing them and being with them again.

The long days and nights of anxiety and loneliness are over. Families are being reunited, and a great Nation reaches out with her arms to gather these, her finest sons and daughters, into the embrace of her heart. America is proud of her young men and women. They cheerfully sacrificed some of the best years of their lives to save her. Wherever they have gone they have brought credit to America. All over this world, oppressed peoples have seen the flower of American youth; they have been stirred by their fairness, their generosity, their faith and hope, that a better world can and shall be created out of the chaos of war. Our service men and women have been our best ambassadors By their actions, they have cleared away the hate and fear that darkened the lives of so many millions. Their example has served to revive our feelings of human brotherhood. They have won the war, but they have also planted in every country of this earth the seeds of mutual trust and friendship. They have already won the beginnings of the peace.

The returning service man or woman has a deep love and respect for home, even greater

than ours because he knows what it is to be without one. From barracks to battlefields, in airplanes and submarines, for the few minutes each day that he could take from the grim business of war, he talked with his comrades of the home that was, and of the home that could be. These men had no time or wish to fool themselves. They had seen death and suffering and ruin and misery such as we at home can never know. From this realistic experience they had come to understand the essentials of living. Quietly and earnestly they talked, heart to heart, about their girls back home, of the new jobs they wanted, of the Nation which would have to change some of its ways to be worthy of their sacrifices.

The first few days, to those who have already rejoined us, seemed like heaven. The old home town, unscarred by war, looked so good. His hard-working and unassuming dad, whom he had never quite appreciated before, he greeted as a buddy, somewhat older, but a buddy nonetheless. In the privacy of the home, his mother's cooking and her concern for his every want, was a foxhole dream come true. Then he took his best girl to a dance or the movies. Afterward, as they talked over a coke, he thought he had never seen, in all his travels, such a sweet, attractive girl as his. He thought of the home and the life they would share together. The old home town, and all the people in it never looked so good. This was worth fighting for.

After a month, however, the homecoming honeymoon was over. The veteran started to look around for a job so that he could get started in life again. Here, he experienced his first disillusionment. People were courteous to him, but somehow he couldn't seem to get going again. There were so many papers to fill out and so much confusion in civilian life, and there was no one to help him. The veteran drifted, and became bitter. Was this what he had fought for?

Did people really know what he and others went through out there? Did it have any meaning to them? As he watched them passing him on the street, he wondered and began to doubt.

From somewhere he remembered a chaplain speaking just before his outfit went into action. It was a serious moment, and all knew it to be so. The chaplain was telling them that a man going into the mortal danger of combat needed more to sustain him than just concern for his own safety. Teamwork was needed to win, and every man was a part of the team. No one could stand aside. The chaplain spoke of selflessness and generosity—so great that a man gives his life, all that he is, to save a buddy.

Where was that? Anzio, Normandy, Iwo Jima? It was these and many more. And then they went into action and men fought and suffered and died for each other.

But the picture passed from the veteran's mind as he was jostled by someone hurrying by in his home town. The veteran stepped into a doorway. It was not a dream, what he had been through, but it must be just a dream or a story that is told, in the minds of these civilians hurrying by. He looked at his own clothes. He was no longer in uniform. He was dressed after the manner of these people hurrying by, but he felt a difference between himself and them. They had a job and he had none. And he thought again of the chaplain who spoke to the men out there before they went into battle. The veteran frowned. Does the Golden Rule belong only on the battlefield? Must a generous life be led only for those few bloody moments of battle? Isn't it possible for men living together in peace to offer each other the same selflessness? How else is the world to find a way of survival? Where, how, can I find an opening for myself in my home town? For teamwork is needed at home as well as abroad. Yet, somehow, they don't seem to want me on this team.

Though the people seem indifferent to the returning veteran, in reality they are not. No city in this Nation wants to see a veteran problem come into being and disrupt the life of the community. The city of Chelsea, like all other cities, has many agencies to help the veteran in his adjustment to civilian life. It is not alone a question of agencies, however. Each citizen has the responsibility of knowing these organizations, where they are located, and what they can do for the returning serviceman so that the veteran can be given helpful advice. For our responsibility to those who fought for us is a continuing one. They did so much for us. Now it is our turn to do something for them.

This was not a "glory war." We had no bands and no parades as our men and women went away. They were going off to do a grim and life-breaking job. Now that it is over, the time has come for us to welcome them back and to do all in our power to fit them into the ways of civilian life. We are happy but at the same time we want to be helpful. The veterans don't want charity. They want a job, and a better one than they had before. Let us keep this uppermost in our minds this day even as we extend our hands and say: "Well done. It's good to see you home."

The veteran's first and rightful concern is for a job. But he had other interests as well. Having fought for his country, it has a greater meaning for him. He has had a chance to compare it with other countries and with other people. He is coming back home with a wider horizon and with a world experience that will be needed as our Nation faces up to the problems of the peace. We shall need his advice on questions of national policy.

A Congressman, as you well know, receives much mail. Some of it is quite frank. During the course of the war I received many letters from men and women in the service. They were in far-away places as they wrote of home and of our country. They had been thinking earnestly of both and they had come to have mature and definite opinions. Men from Massachusetts had rubbed elbows with men from Georgia and Ohio and California. Catholic and Protestant and Jew, brown, yellow, white, and black men had fought and died helping each other, as Americans. Our service men and women have learned through dangers shared what many at home have not yet learned, that tolerance is the first step on the road to wisdom and the goal of justice between man and man.

One soldier believed that we would have a better nation if every section of the country had the same standard of living. Writing from Italy, he said: "No one State in the Nation can be rich while others are poor. New York should help Arkansas, California should help Mississippi, so that the children of poor States shall have a chance for a common education. We must learn to live together regardless of race, color, creed, or what sections of the country we come from. If I had my way, I would make racial discrimination a Federal offense."

A sailor wrote from somewhere in the Pacific: "Out here we have learned, the hard way, how foolish are those distinctions we made back home. Here you are taken at your face value. You are judged by your manhood, not by your name or your church or your skin. Democracy works in the armed forces because each man must think of and depend upon the next. Having seen it work out here, we expect to see it work back home."

Many veterans are dissatisfied with our educational system. They believe that America was unprepared for danger because the public, during its school years, was not taught enough about the world, about international relations and the effect these have upon our security. A soldier wrote to me from England saying, "Why is it that our colleges do not require a course in world history? We stand on the threshold of world leadership, yet our people are not being trained for it. It is necessary to train a man for a job in life, but why not also prepare him to measure up to his thinking responsibilities to his city, his State, and his Nation? We will spend hundreds of thousands of lives and nearly $300,000,000,000 before we defeat the enemy. All this might have been saved if our people had been trained to an awareness of world affairs and if our Nation had been prepared * * * for then the aggressors, seeing us strong, would not have dared to attack. It was the mental and material unpreparedness of the democracies that encouraged the aggressors. I know it is too late to think of what we might have saved, but let us look to the future and make certain that the next generation will know what is developing and will be able to check aggression before it can get rolling."

The veterans are coming home with their eyes open. They will not be satisfied with some of the things they see. For a stronger America, they will want compulsory high-school education, a more modern system of vocational education that will have the benefit of industry's advice, and the opportunity for every man to have a job. They want to see our slums torn down and decent housing accommodations put up in their place. They want low-cost hospital and medical service which will be available to everybody. They want to see prices for all commodities kept within reasonable limits and they want our Nation to be prepared for any emergency.

They want a job, a good home, good schools, and good churches. They want these not for themselves alone, but for all. By getting these the veteran knows that he will be happy and so will his fellowmen. The veteran will be a home man as his father was before him, but he will be alert and informed in a changing world. And he will expect us to go forward with him. Nothing less will do.

The Congress, anticipating the new viewpoint of our homecoming veterans, has passed the GI bill of rights, which is the most liberal and comprehensive legislation affecting veterans in the history of this or any other nation. It is not a law providing for cash awards or land grants. It does provide for disability benefits and hospitalization, but its primary purpose goes much further than this because it knows that the veteran wants to get going in civilian life again. The GI bill of rights helps the veteran to get a loan which will enable him to buy a home or get a start in business. It also helps those without money to get an education at the Government's expense, realizing that education is our greatest asset in the complex world of tomorrow. The United States is blessed with great material wealth. Now it needs the brain and the character to use it properly.

These are the sobering thoughts that fill our minds as we try to put ourselves into the veterans' shoes on this homecoming day. But there is a lighter side to it. Reunion with loved ones long parted is a rich and overwhelming human emotion. All the pent-up human needs of years speak out for fulfillment. Like all supreme delights, the joy is sometimes too much to stand. A neighbor of mine had such an experience, a few weeks ago. Her boy had been overseas for 2½ years. The good woman spent all her spare time in praying for him, in writing to him, and in worrying about him. Then she got the glad news that he would be home on Thursday. So she set about preparing the house for him and as she worked the tension mounted. There had been a change of orders, however, and the boy, without notifying his mother, walked into the kitchen on Wednesday, a day before he was expected. When the mother saw him she fainted. The boy, who was

healthy enough, having survived the African, Sicilian, Italian, French, and German campaigns without batting an eye, was completely unnerved by this reception. He fainted, too. The presence of someone else in the house saved the day. Mother and son were revived and the reunion proceeded on a joyous, though less intensive scale of emotion.

Perhaps it is safer to welcome you home, as we do this day * * * all together. There are so many of your friends and relatives here, bringing their personal greetings. The city of Chelsea, which is a home, second only to that of your flat or tenement, welcomes you through Mayor Bernard L. Sullivan. As your Representative in Congress, I am happy in your happiness and I want you to call on me in any matter in which I can be of assistance to you. Many others are here to meet you: Representatives of labor, of industry, of the churches, of the schools, of the veterans' organizations, all glad for your safe return and anxious to help you in your adjustment to civilian life.

We ask you to be patient with us. For a little while, some of our attitudes and opinions may seem strange to you because we did not share your experience. But give us time. As all of us, veterans and stay-at-home's alike work to bind up the Nation's wounds, we shall stand, men, women, and children together, all Americans, facing the future which we share in common.

To the boys and girls who left Chelsea to fight our battles and who now come back as men and women, no words of ours can express the gratitude we feel in our hearts. Only by our actions can we tell you what this means to us.

That is why all of us are here today. Your loved ones at home, who never complained as they endured eternities of anxiety, working, waiting, praying for your return, they have the first claim on your affections. Remember, however, that all the people in Chelsea are proud of you. As friends, we share in your joy and wish you the happy future which you have so gallantly earned.

President Truman Clearly and Emphatically States Sound Policy re Wages and Prices; Corporation Net Profits Would Permit Wages Increase Without Commodity Increase; Unemployed Men Who Want Work and Cannot Find It Are Not Normal-Acting Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, last night the President of the United States, as the Chief Executive of this Nation, stated so clearly and emphatically the policy and objectives of this Government with reference to wages and prices, which declaration went over the radio and throughout the press of the Nation, that it is not necessary to here restate what he so much better said.

In his speech he referred to the excess-profits tax, and its possible repeal by Congress, as one of the items to be taken into consideration as to ways and means by which industry could well afford to pay increased wages, without increasing prices. Yesterday afternoon, late, this Congress did repeal the corporate excess-profits tax, and as a result thereof, it can now be fairly well estimated that this repeal of this corporate excess-profits tax will result in making available for net profits or for dividends, or for operating capital, or for promotion and expansion, a sum estimated as not less than $2,500,000,000. From another viewpoint, this sum, distributed as wages, would approximate a 10-percent increase in wages for the workers in industry and the manufacturing in our Nation.

Corporation profits more than doubled after taxes between 1939 and 1944; from $4,200,000,000 in 1939 to $1,900,000,000 in 1944. According to the United States Department of Commerce, another $26,000,000,000 has been retained as undistributed profits. The total corporate profits after taxes 1940–45 come to $52,000,000,000. In addition, Congress passed a law assuring corporations carryback credits amounting to another $30,000,000,000 for tax refunds, should postwar profits happen to fall below the levels of 1936 to 1939. Industry can raise wages and salaries an inadequate 10 percent now without adding to unit labor costs, through elimination of overtime alone, without even calling on its earned net profits.

Today, due to increases in productivity, four workers do the work of five. This represents another 25 percent saving which can be restored to workers without affecting the unit cost of items. Corporate profits will reasonably continue to rise. In 1946, now that the excess-profits tax is repealed, profits will be $10,500,000,000.

Two other factors which our President mentioned as factors to be taken into consideration in anticipating increase in wage rates without an increase in prices were reduction of overtime and elimination of wartime up-grading. It is estimated that the reduction of overtime would reasonably result in a 4 percent less wage output, and by the elimination of an estimated wartime upgrading there would be a reasonable saving of at least 9 percent in wage output. Adding these three figures, to wit: Corporate excess-profits tax at 10 percent, and the reduction of overtime at 4 percent, and the elimination of one-half of wartime upgrading at 9 percent, there is a total of 23 percent reduction in wage output; which would reasonably be available in increase in wages to the American worker—and without an increase in prices of goods, wares, and merchandise.

Granting that industry's ability to pay higher wages does depend upon many factors, some of which are measurable and others nonmeasurable at this time, it is estimated by scholars in that field that the cost of increases in average manufacturing wage rates would be reasonably compensated for by these three factors which I have given. For instance, if no changes whatsoever are made in basic wage rates, a reduction in the length of workweek will however reduce the gross average hourly earnings. Therefore premium pay for overtime work will practically disappear. And allowing for the same amount of premium pay at overtime rates as of January 1941, gross hourly earnings will reasonably approximate 99.3 cents per hour. Therefore, the average American worker in American industry and manufacturing would earn $38.95 for a 39-hour week. This is a reduction of 17 percent in weekly earnings from the level of April 1945. And a drop of from 48 hours to 40 hours per week determines a 23-percent drop in weekly earnings of these same people.

It is reported that much of the difference between the general wage-rate changes and changes in average straight-time hourly earnings adjusted represents wartime increases which are "reversible" and that the "up-grading" which resulted from the necessity of war hours "reversible," that this "reversible" will tend to increase as unemployment increases, and as wage-rate schedules are naturally administered with greater peacetime "frugality." Also, "shift premiums" will practically disappear and jobs will be reclassified downward instead of upward. Normally, also, workers who have received rapid "up-grade" promotions will be replaced by returning veterans, by new entrance into industry, and by workers displaced from other jobs. It is estimated that if all the wartime "up-grading," "merit increases," "shift premiums," "incentive-pay plans," and so forth, are eliminated on account of the removal of the war conditions surrounding industry, that then the average weekly earnings in the manufacturing and industrial enterprises would likely fall to $30.96, which figure is 34 percent below the April 1945 level and is only 16 percent higher than the level in January 1941.

The effect of the successive elimination of various components of weekly wages in April 1945 is shown in the following table:

Assumptions to average gross weekly earnings	Gross weekly earnings	Percent change from January 1941 ($26.64)	Percent change from April 1945 ($47.12)
1. Workweek reduced to 39 hours; no reduction in hourly pay except elimination of most premium overtime	$38.95	+46	−17
2. Workweek reduced to 39 hours; return to 1941 distribution of employment	36.95	+39	−22
3. All factors listed above, plus elimination of half wartime upgrading, merit increases, incentive pay, shift premiums	33.96	+27	−28
4. All factors listed above, plus elimination of all upgrading, etc	30.96	+16	−34

It should be noted that the gross weekly pay of the average American worker in industry and manufacturing has increased from $26.64 in January 1941 to $47.12 in April 1945, or 77 percent. But making allowance for the increase in the cost of living and in personal income taxes during that period, the value of the worker's take-home pay in terms of 1941 dollars only increased from $26.64 to $31.47—assuming an income tax exemption for only one dependent—or an increase of only 18 percent. Furthermore, of this 18-percent increase which

did occur in gross pay of the average American worker during the war period, 36 percent of that 18-percent increase resulted from increasing hours of work and these hours of work will normally be reversed in 1946.

It is reasonably estimated that a money wage of $33.96 in 1946 represents 3 percent less purchasing power than a wage of $26.64 in 1941. When allowance is made for payment of 1946 income taxes, the purchasing power of take-home pay for an average worker with exemptions for one dependent will be $23.95 in 1941 dollars, or a reduction of 10 percent from January 1941.

Between April 1945 and the spring of 1946 total salaries and wages paid will reasonably decline by between thirty and thirty-five billion dollars. Accompanying this reduction will likely be a fall of total national output of more than $40,000,000,000 and a sharp decline in profits before taxes and in farm income.

It is estimated that 1946 profits after taxes of manufacturing corporations will be over $6,000,000,000, a figure higher than the wartime peak. This estimate assumes an increase in wage rates sufficient to maintain average hourly earnings in each manufacturing industry at the April 1945 level.

In my judgment there is a determining factor with reference to this whole subject of wages and profits and taxes on corporate profits which I have not heard mentioned as yet on the floor of this House. Nor have I observed it in reports or by commentators; I therefore venture the statement that inasmuch as American industry in wartime was necessarily furnished the great bulk of its wartime operating capital by the Government from taxes and other federally raised money, therefore American industry in a larger sense should consider a substantial portion of its wartime profits in a substantially different light than it would had industry itself furnished its own total operating dollars. In other words, the American taxpayer furnished the great bulk and amount of operating capital for American industry during the war, from the use of which American industry made its great accumulated net wartime profits. What, therefore, should be the duty and privilege of American industry with reference to the American workingman and the American taxpayer who furnished them the great bulk of their operating capital, as a result of which they made their great wartime net profits—the greatest net profit in their history? Granting that there was no other way provided whereby we could win the war; granting that it was absolutely necessary and sound for American industry to be thus furnished and supplied with the necessary armament of such operating capital, both in terms of money, plants, and machinery—this does not eliminate the fact that in a truer sense American industry morally owes an obligation of considering some reasonable portion of these war-gained net profits as a fund in reserve for the protection and security and the stability of the American public against the hazards and tragedies of unemployment in this period of reconversion from wartime to peacetime.

If the world economy were such that no money profits could be made out of war, then there would reasonably be no war. I wish it were so now. And assuming it is true that one of the factors entering into the frequency of wars is the making of huge money profits by war lords, then the time must sensibly and soon come that the patriotic call to the voluntary sacrifice of human life will also be a patriotic call to the sacrifice and elimination of huge money profit in a war period.

When ambitious, sober, patriotic men—fathers of children and husbands of mothers of American children—are unable to obtain reasonable employment at a decent wage, which permits them to raise and educate their children in reasonable decency and security, these American citizens can hardly be expected to be normal in their attitude toward their Government and toward their duties of citizenship. Hungry men can hardly be expected to be reasonable men. Nor can honest, industrious men, who are not reasonably sure of steady employment, be expected to form the basis of a strong, sound national resource in terms of human endeavor and relationships. Steady, dignified, compensating employment is an absolute necessity and is a requisite to soundness in national domestic stability and security. Nothing less than this sort of opportunity for such employment can be tolerated with candor and fairness. Material things are only valuable as they make the people happy and healthy. And material wealth is only a national asset when it is used to the end that the people who create it are increasingly made more happy, and secure and sound in their daily life.

Suppression of GI Free Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a soldier to Hon. Harry N. Hansen, of Toledo, veteran of World War I. The soldier reports discrimination which he was not allowed to write his Congressman:

SUPPRESSION OF RIGHT OF FREE SPEECH IN ARMY

OCTOBER 17, 1945.

MY DEAR MR. HANSEN: The next election must be a Republican victory.

I have never been more sure of that fact than I am now, after being in the Army 3 years and 9 months and having spent some of that time down here in South Carolina, the State capital of a deep South State. I have seen so much rotten politics.

This letter would have gone to RAMEY long ago but since the War Department has taken over so that we can't write direct to our own Congressmen, I shall have to direct it to you and perhaps you can sneak it through to RAMEY or some other person you feel might like to read it.

These times are to my sense, and a lot of other GI's here feel the same way, the formulative months for the coming elections. The fellows in the Army who feel they should have been discharged a long time ago are hot under the collar and are doing more political discussing than I have ever heard before in the Army. You see most of the time the boys know it is wise to shut up and not be heard by the wrong man, but now I have heard statements that if turned in would cause much trouble for the men themselves, but no one seems to care these days. They want to have one thing happen: to get discharged and home, then watch the political battle start.

But we can't wait till they get home to formulate in their minds how they should vote. Democrats in the Army are even fed up with the way their gang have messed up on handling this entire discharge program and lots of other programs, so now is the time to get busy.

Naturally most of the GI's are watching the comments by various Senators and politicians and seeing how they stack up. The War Department and Congress are not fooling anyone in the Army these days with the "what's going on." The fellows in the Army have been in cheap politics ever since the day they got into the Army and the big stuff doesn't fool them any.

Let me give you some examples of what the GI's wonder about.

Enclosed is an article by Drew Pearson telling about how our mail and that of our family members writing to Congress concerning discharges is being taken care of. That article raised a stink from high heaven down here about the fort ——— and why. This thought is expressed. If this is a democracy and one function of its leaders in Washington is to know what the people think about a matter, then how can such a vital question be bucked over to the War Department, where stock answers are sent back to the folks at home and in some cases GI's suffer from the letters they write complaining about the conditions. It just doesn't add up.

Lots of men down here are saying now, "Well, our Congressmen just passed the buck to the War Department and are happy to let them whitewash the figures and report back to them that all is well on the discharge front, when the truth of the matter is that it stinks for most men today."

You remember I spent a year overseas, so this is not personal. But what about the fellow that was drafted back in early 1941 for a year's service, only to find that he is still in the Army.

One of my friends, a staff sergeant and a fine boy, has now been in 4½ years. He has about as much chance of getting out right now as a peanut, for he is physically unfit for overseas and thus has been in this country all that time and has now only 55 points and 4½ years' service. Boy, is he burned up? Just because the Army won't send him overseas back when he got in, now he has to sit by and watch fellows with three and four kids getting discharged, and they have been in only sometimes 1 to 2 years, but their points because of children are in the high brackets.

Then please notice the article on surplus Army enlisted men. What a laugh that is here at Fort Jackson, and I daresay all over the States.

There is no surplus of men in the Fourth Service Command today, and certainly if they find one or two there, they never will in this organization. Why? Because every outfit on this depot are adding more men today than they have had in their Table of Organization before. But let's say a man should be declared surplus by the officer he works for. The next thing he goes to a surplus detachment. There he is up for auction to any

other outfit that might want him, and should he not be asked for in this depot by any outfit (and that's almost impossible for everybody is crying for more men) then he is sent on paper to Fourth Service Command after post headquarters says they don't want him. Then for sure the Fourth will find some place for him to work should he ever get that far from Fort Jackson. So all the Army gang knows that the surplus article is War Department whitewash, and printed only for those back home so that the storm can be quieted.

But the GI does not forget. He is already so filled with the stench of Army r litics that he wants that fixed, and fast.

Here is one story I picked last week. A chap went home on furlough and found that the camps around New York are putting out discharges much faster than we are here. So he comes back with this idea. He is asking everyone he knows to write this statement on a plain page of paper: "Don't forget the soldier vote beat Churchill," and then to send it to every Congressman that man can think of. Well be that for what it may. I personally think writing to Congressmen a so-called pressure letter not much use unless you know they are interested in knowing what the score is with what the GI is thinking today in the camps.

The War Department has not recognized length of service at all now. The 3- and 4-year boys that were kept in the States have no more chance than a peanut of getting out right now. December might be a different story, but if it is coming for them let's try and tie it up to Republican work, for it will count.

Length of service is one way to please many.

Recognition of 50 points is another way—but I think the 3 years' service more important.

So I have run on now with some talk that I hope may get to our good friend RAMEY and he can noise it around in the places it will help as I know he can and then for the sake of good living once more let's have that Republican victory.

A Republican President is not enough—get that Congress vote first.

When I get home we will talk again. I worked a bit with the young Republicans once before and served as a poll official but never have I been more sure that this time there can be nothing but a Republican victory and that now is the time to form the groundwork among servicemen for that victory.

Your friend.

P. S.—This letter is confidential to you but I hope you will sneak it through to RAMEY. He can use it I feel sure.

Veterans' Discharges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to show my colleagues the letters which I have received from literally hundreds of young men who are sweating it out in forgotten corners of the world. Most of these men overseas and in camps right here at home are doing absolutely nothing. There is not a reason in the world why they should not be furloughed home while they are waiting for discharges. I have said this once and I shall say it a thousand times until the War Department wakes up.

The absolute pointlessness of keeping men in Army camps playing indoor baseball, cutting shrubs with bayonets, and in at least one camp going through basic training again—although many of the men are veterans of the European war—has not been lost on the American people.

It is certainly time for the Government to propose a program for volunteer enlistments to attract whatever standing army we need for occupation or defense. Increased pay, educational opportunities, and advancement in service rank would stimulate these enlistments.

The men who enlisted to fight are entitled to better treatment than they are getting. Immediate furloughs home while they are waiting for their discharge are certainly better on every score than idleness and frustration waiting in a camp far from home and loved ones.

Did Hitler Win the War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 22, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence, one of the most respected news analysts in America, points out in this week's issue of the United States News that, while victory has been achieved over enemy nations, the philosophies of the leaders of those nations remain dominant in the world today. Promises of rule of reason and justice remain unfulfilled as the theory of might makes right prevails. Under permission to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Lawrence's editorial:

DID HITLER WIN THE WAR?

(By David Lawrence)

Less than 3 months have passed since VJ-day. Less than 6 months have elapsed since VE-day.

And yet as we look around we see no signs of the new world that was promised us in the wartime slogans and the eloquent speeches of our statesmen.

We were promised a world in which reason would prevail, in which justice would be administered to all peoples, in which greed for territory and economic resources would give way to a rule of law and equity. For this many millions of young men gave their lives.

Democracy was extolled above fascism or communism; above totalitarianism and one-man rule. Enslaved peoples were promised emancipation. America, the great unselfish power, was to help reconstruct war-torn lands and resuscitate international morality.

But what do we see?

A world dominated by a single idea—that might makes right. The talk is not of freedoms but of exploitation; not of emancipation of peoples but of more and more enslavement. Nations with colonies hang on desperately to their possessions. Movements for independence and autonomy are squelched.

Hitler cried out again and again that the democracies had refused Germany a chance to live. He argued that Germany had tried reason in the years after the Versailles Treaty but was scorned. Germany had wanted her colonies back. They were to be trusteed for her by the Versailles Treaty—not annexed by her enemies. For in World War I the pledge was "no annexations," just as in the Atlantic Charter. Hitler said Germany had tried reason with the democracies but that they never gave up anything. So he concluded that force and only force could talk.

THE LANGUAGE OF FORCE

The whole Nazi philosophy was built on the principle that there is not only a master race but a master class within the race and that force—military power—is the language of government internally and externally. Japan in the Far East adopted the same philosophy. She, too, wanted to expand. The democracies refused to let her, she said, and she felt that her whole Empire was frustrated. Inside Japan arose the master class to dominate the liberals, to tell the Japanese people that force and only force would win for Japan her place in the sun.

Hitler had a plan. He would divide the world into three major systems. America was to dominate this hemisphere. Japan was to dominate the Asiatic world. Germany was to dominate Europe.

But the basis of the Hitler concept was power—economic, military, political.

Today we see the same pattern, only Russia takes the place of Germany and means to dominate central and eastern Europe, while Britain can dominate western Europe, and this hemisphere can be ruled by the United States. Also Russia would like to have a controlling voice in the Far East.

POWER POLITICS AGAIN

The theory of "power politics" and "spheres of influence" is back again in all its majesty. Even in the United States apologists have risen to defend it. What else do we expect in this world, they ask, except systems based on power? And, they inquire, what's wrong with "power politics"?

To those who differ with them the cynical answer is given that "idealists" must be brushed aside as "perfectionists." So today we see in full vision the result of that concession of spirit during the war. It began at Yalta, where the late President Roosevelt compromised with idealism so as to buy Stalin's continued support in the European war. It was pursued at Potsdam, where President Truman followed the same policy in order to assure Russia's participation in the war against Japan.

Today Russia, believing earnestly in the Hitler philosophy of force, wants her spoils. She feels entitled to the fruits of victory because, as she sees it, that was what was promised her. She insisted on carving up Poland. British and American public opinion went along. The despoliation of an ally was rationalized as in the interest of Russia's security.

But what kind of a world has this given us? Less than 6 months have passed since the United Nations Charter was drafted. The world was to be committed to peaceful methods of resolving disputes.

Is that the kind of world we are living in or really expect to live in? We ourselves—our leaders—are distrustful of it. We are saying with tongues in our cheeks that, of course, we expect the United Nations Charter to be useful but that until it is useful we must have force and more of it. This was foreseen after the Yalta Conference. On this page, the writer predicted then that if the rule of force were to prevail, the United States would have to maintain the biggest army, navy, and air force in the world.

The rule of force is today dominant. President Truman speaks it. General Marshall speaks it. Secretary Patterson speaks it. Our whole Government is beginning to adopt the philosophy that the United States must have a big army, navy, and air force.

What for?

To fight Germany or Japan? Presumably both these nations have been buried deep in defeat and their war-making potential destroyed.

To fight Britain? A nation so badly off financially that we are considering a loan to her? Of course we are not arming against Britain.

To fight Russia? Some people in this country say so openly, others say so privately.

The idea is illogical. The Russian people are peace-loving. The Russians admire Americans—they don't have hate in their hearts for us. Yet because our diplomatic relations have been bungled—and there is a good deal of blame on both sides—we are beginning to think again in terms of force to secure compliance with our wishes. Only last week the President of the United States made this remarkable statement to Congress in connection with his plan for universal military training:

"It has been suggested in some quarters that there should be no universal training until the shape of the peace is better known, and until the military needs of this country can be estimated and our commitments under the United Nations Organization can be determined. But it is impossible today to foresee the future. It is difficult at any time to know exactly what our responsibilites will require in the way of force. We do know that if we are to have available a force when needed, the time to begin preparing is now. The need exists today—and must be met today."

TWELVE MILLION RESERVES ALREADY

What need? We have had 12,000,000 men under arms. Their training will not evaporate over night. They will be useful as potential reserves for another 5 years anyway. Why do we have to tear 18-year-old boys from their homes and plunge them into military camps where record of the Army in the recent war has been none too good in maintaining conditions of morality or sobriety?

If we need a big military force, why not a standing army of volunteers or, if need be, why not allow the training to be given in connection with educational institutions where military instructors would be confined to the teaching of military matters? This would be better than a system in which the military group controls everything, including the indoctrination of military "ideals"—the ways to hate and kill.

MILITARY COERCION IN DIPLOMACY

Why the urgency for military training? Maybe the answer is given in the following statement made by General Marshall recently in his widely publicized report:

"The timing of our decision on the question of universal military training is urgent. The officials of the State Department have been strongly of the opinion that a decision in this matter prior to the final peace negotiations would greatly strengthen the hand of the United States in securing acceptance of a genuine organization to handle international differences."

Strengthen our hand against whom? Against vanquished Germany and Japan? Against Britain? It must be that we mean against Russia. It must be that we have turned to the philosophy of force instead of reason and that military demonstration instead of the language of reason and justice or self-denial is to be foremost.

This is the only solution that Hitler found for Germany's troubles. He distrusted the other nations. Now we are beginning to distrust other nations, too, and build a military force to speak for us in the world. Militarism has begun to infiltrate rapidly into our democratic system. We talk of one-man control of our armed forces. We render lip service to the United Nations Charter as we begin to suspect one of its principal members.

This writer believes in national defense and does not accept pacifism. But he does not believe that we should abandon moral force and emphasize physical force at this time. Rather American policy can afford to try moral force whole-heartedly in the next 5 years, at least, while we retain the ingredients of a huge army, navy, and air force.

Let us not begin to lose faith in moral force and extol physical might. If we do, we shall be admitting that Hitler was right in his concept that there are no noncombatants in war and that jungle law must prevail. Is idealism losing ground in America and especially in high places in our Government? Did Hitler really win the war?

Wage Increases

REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, charm does not pay. President Truman tried charm and a reactionary coalition simply sat down and went on strike. Thank goodness the people and the Government of the United States again have a leader who is not afraid to lead—to state issues plainly and to propose a plain solution that appeals to the average man and woman as sensible, fair, and workable.

President Truman has made it very clear that he is going to face facts and not sugar-coat the truth. He will need and must have support on this issue of wages and prices, which affects all of us—not only the wage earner but the welfare of every businessman, farmer, white-collar worker, and teacher.

If our circulation of income can be healthy and made even more healthy up to the 50 percent improvement that Judge Vinson said we must achieve, then we will be on the road to winning the people's peace.

I wish to include some material to show that wages are lagging behind profits, productivity, and the cost of living, and to show that wages can be increased without raising prices, at the same time allowing profits which will be more than ample.

This material is based upon a report prepared in the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion for the use of the OWMR Advisory Board as reported in the New York Journal of Commerce under date of October 29, 1945. The OWMR Advisory Board includes the following members, representing industry, labor, agriculture, and the general public:

Industry: Eric Johnston, president, United States Chamber of Commerce; George H. Mead, president, the Mead Corporation, Nathaniel Dyke, Jr., consultant, Smaller War Plants Corporation, wholesale building materials trade.

Labor: Philip Murray, president, CIO; William Green, president, A. F. of L.; T. C. Cashen, president, National Railway Switchmen's Union of North America.

Agriculture: Edward A. O'Neal, president, American Farm Bureau Federation; James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Cooperative Union; A. S. Goss, master, the National Grange.

General public: O. Max Gardner, chairman, counselor at law, former Governor of North Carolina; Mrs. Anna Rosenberg.

The material referred to follows:

1. The gross weekly pay of the average worker in manufacturing has increased from $26.64 in January 1941 to $47.12 in April 1945, or 77 percent.

2. When allowance is made for the increase in the cost of living and in personal income taxes during the war period, the value of the average worker's take-home pay in 1941 dollars increased from $26.64 to $31.47 (assuming income-tax exemption for one dependent), or 18 percent.

3. Of the increase which occurred in gross weekly pay during the war period:

Thirty-six percent resulted from increased hours of work, and will be reversed by 1946.

Ten percent resulted from interindustry shifts, which will also be reversed by 1946.

Twenty-one percent resulted from general changes in wage-rates, which are not likely to be reversed.

Thirty-three percent resulted from wartime upgrading, the liberal administration of wage schedules in a tight labor market, and other factors which will be reversed in part.

4. On the assumption that half the increases resulting from liberal administration of wage schedules will be reversed, the gross weekly pay of the average worker in manufacturing will fall to $33.96 in 1946, or 28 percent below the April 1945 level.

5. A money wage of $33.96 in 1946 represents 3 percent less purchasing power than a wage of $26.64 in 1941. When allowance is made for payment of 1946 income taxes, the purchasing power of take-home pay for an average worker with exemptions for one dependent will be $23.95 in 1941 dollars, a reduction of 10 percent from January 1941.

6. Between April 1945 and the spring of 1946 total salaries and wages paid will decline by between thirty and thirty-five billion dollars. Accompanying this reduction will be a fall of total national output of more than $40,000,000,000, and sharp declines in profits before taxes and in farm income.

7. It is estimated that 1946 profits after taxes of manufacturing corporations will be over $6,000,000,000, a figure higher than the wartime peak. This estimate assumes an increase in wage rates sufficient to maintain average hourly earnings in each manufacturing industry at the April 1945 level.

8. Industry's ability to pay higher wages depends upon many factors, favorable and unfavorable, some of which are measurable and others nonmeasurable.

9. In the case of the measurable factors, it is estimated that the cost of increases in average manufacturing wage rates indicated below would be compensated for by the factors indicated:

Increase in wage rates

Factor reducing 1946 costs:	*Percent*
Reduction of overtime	4.5
Elimination of one-half of wartime upgrading	9.5
Repeal of corporation excess-profits tax	10
Total	24

Return Our Veterans to Their Homes

REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Army and the Navy continue to bungle the problem of returning our soldiers and sailors home from the fighting fronts, although so many of them have more than the required points for discharge.

I have just received a letter from nine boys, who have been overseas approximately 30 months, and who have engaged in many of the battles on islands in the South Pacific, who are stranded on the island of Tinian. They write as follows:

We send a plea for help from this Godforsaken island. There are nine of us. We received orders to fly back to the United States. All of us have 90 or more points, with an average of 30 months' service overseas. Since we arrived here we have evidently been forgotten. That is, men here with only 70 points are flying home, and just because we are not in their organization we are not permitted to go with them. Just who won this war anyway? We figured we all had a hand in it, but according to officers in this neck of the woods they won it themselves.

Mr. Speaker, those boys are completely disgusted. They have a right to have the feeling that they are the forgotten men of this war. With many of our ships tied up in harbors in this country, and with many of the huge carriers, tank carriers, and other ships available for transporting men back home, taken out of duty in order to hold a big Navy Day celebration in the ports in this country, those boys, together with the untold thousands of others who join with them, are denied the right to be returned to their homes—even though they have the points which entitles them to their discharge. I do not know whether that situation impresses the War Department or the Navy Department, but I am fully and reliably advised that the people of this country are deeply impressed by reason of this bungling on the part of those Departments, and of the high-ranking officers in the field. The people are demanding that these boys be returned to their homes at the very earliest possible date, and they are not in accord with any dilatory methods which are now being practiced by the officers and departments in both the Army and Navy. They are demanding action—and that action which will demobilize the Army as quickly as possible, and which will force the reduction in the strength of the Navy at the earliest possible date. All of these boys, veterans of this war, have their lives before them. They have serious problems confronting them. They must rehabilitate themselves in the arts and trades of civil life; and if their discharges from the service are deferred, as we now observe in so many instances, these boys will be delayed much longer in that highly important state of rehabilitation. Many of them have wives and families, and many of them have businesses, while others desire, and justly so, to resume their education both in the high schools and colleges. All of these boys have their big problem of life to solve when they come home. They cannot delay longer, and it is time the officers in both the Army and Navy recognize the fact that they are dealing with the problems of life, instead of dealing with pawns and the inanimate.

Mr. Speaker, our boys still in the service are disheartened and completely disgusted with the delay in returning them home. While I realize the Army and the Navy continue to contend that they are doing their best to accomplish a great task, yet, I am advised, they can do much better. Take every ship available for transport duty, and every plane available for returning our veterans, and use them incessantly and constantly until this job is done. And, it is certainly deplorable to know that so many of our fleet, all available for that particular duty of returning our boys back home, were taken out of duty and placed in docks, for show purposes, on Navy Day. Many thousands of our boys could have been returned home during the period those ships were standing idle—and the boys were still enduring the days and weeks of service, with nothing to do, upon the foresaken and dismal islands of the South Pacific, and in torn and destroyed Europe. They were worried, disturbed, and disheartened as they witnessed the departure of many ships of our glorious fleet steam out of the harbors, for mere purposes of show and pageant at our home ports, while the sick, the injured, the discouraged GI's, with sufficient points, had to wait until some other day. The greatest pageant of all would have been demonstrated, I am certain, to have witnessed a constant parade of ships, of every class, crossing every ocean, with our boys aboard returning to their homes and to the arts and trades of civil life again.

Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the War Department and the Navy Department this situation which now exists, and I urge—with every parent, every wife, every child, and every relative of the boys—that it is now up to them to do their job. The boys have completed their task, and they did it well. They have won the war. Now let them return our boys home at the earliest moment.

The Federal Government Does Not Owe You a Job

REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, having in mind the address President Truman delivered to the Nation last evening, I wish to submit for the RECORD some excerpts taken from the Economic Outlook, issue of October 1945, published by the Congress of Industrial Organizations; and, in addition, to present the contents of a letter dated October 27, 1945, written by C. E. Wilson, president, General Motors Corp., to International Union, UAW-CIO, Detroit, Mich.

Mr. Speaker, Economic Outlook, in discussing the subject The Fight for Full Employment, makes the observation that:

America must provide jobs for all those willing and able to work. Unemployment is our greatest peacetime enemy. It drains our wealth and corrodes our faith and belief in the democratic system.

The economic losses from unemployment are staggering. Every unemployed worker means an average annual loss of $4,000 in wealth produced. Conservative Government experts estimate that unemployment will hit 8,000,000 in 1946. Continued throughout a year, this would mean a loss of some $32,000,000,000 worth of production, or about one-third of the wealth produced in the United States in a relatively prosperous prewar year.

Currently, strikes are crowding all other news off the front pages. The public is being warned of the great social cost of this and that strike. You don't see the same treatment accorded to unemployment. Yet any sober analysis of the facts reveals that the loss in worktime from unemployment dwarfs that caused by strikes. By the end of August, for example, unemployment was already costing the Nation at the rate of 40,000,000 man-days of work a month. On the other hand, 1,450,000 man-days were lost because of strikes and lockouts in August—about one-thirtieth of the loss due to unemployment. Remember, too, strikes to boost purchasing power have long-run value for the Nation's well-being. But unemployment is a total loss.

Bare unemployment figures don't even tell the whole story. The rising tide of insecurity affects all workers. Among the employed, fear of being laid off finds its outlet in reduced efficiency, increased accidents, and, in some instances, unauthorized strikes.

The frustration and personal loss for the unemployed worker, these, too, cannot be measured by mere figures. The deterioration of skills, breakdown in morale, all represent an irredeemable loss to the community, as well as to the worker.

When men are idle, machines are idle. And idle machines accumulate rust and soon depreciate in value. The tremendous capital investment in Government-built defense plants, for example, will depreciate at a rapid rate if the machinery continues to lie idle.

It is with great interest I note the Economic Outlook did not say "The Federal Government must provide jobs for all those willing and able to work." Mr. Speaker, America, as I would interpret that word, means the citizens of the United States primarily located on the mainland. I agree with the Outlook that we, the American people, must provide jobs for ourselves if we are to have those jobs. I would further observe that if we are not now willing to work, that it is high time we brought ourselves to the conclusion that we must not only be willing to work but that we proceed without further hesitation in the producing of the goods and services which are required to meet not only the necessities but many additional demands of our people. That is, if we have any sense of responsibility whatsoever for the commitments which we have already made, not only to our people as such, but to the other peoples of the earth, we must realize there is no time for us to lose in proceeding to carry

out the obligations which we have already assumed.

The successful handling of the funded debt already incurred, evidences of which are held by literally tens of millions of our people who have invested their savings in Treasury issues, and who rely upon that investment for financial strength to sustain them through rainy days in the future, will require the most consecrated effort of all of our people. If a large portion of our people—I am now speaking in numbers—submit their claims against the Treasury and collect dollars back in exchange for Treasury issues previously purchased by them, and thus bring about a high concentration of holdings of Government issues, it is reasonable for us to assume that two forces will be set in motion incident to such a course: (a) Millions of people will cease to become owners of Government securities; and (b) There will, in due course, arise a great public clamor for the burden represented by taxes of servicing the debt as to interest payments and amortization of the principal to be removed from the economic necks of the masses, letting the economic consequences of such a step fall as disastrously as it will on the highly concentrated small number of holders of such Government issues as may be outstanding.

In other words, it is reasonable to assume that the interest burden incident to the debt will approximate $6,000,000,000 per annum, and if only 1 percent of the principal is amortized on the basis of a debt of $300,000,000,000, this will amount to $3,000,000,000 per annum, which added to the $6,000,000,000 of interest charge would give in the neighborhood of $9,000,000,000 which the taxpayers must raise annually for the purposes of servicing the debt. It is reasonable to now assume that in peacetime this one single item of $9,000,000,000 will probably be the largest individual element in the Federal Budget. Therefore, I repeat that the masses will grow tired of carrying such a burden and demand of Congress such action as will relieve them of such a tremendous tax load. If our people bring themselves to where they are willing to work, and if we by the millions will go back into the harness and contribute value for value in the production of goods and in the receiving of payment for the services rendered, we can carry the national income measured in dollars at today's price level far beyond anything yet witnessed. Through such a course, America will provide jobs for its people.

On the other hand, if we get the idea fixed in our mind that the Federal Government is obligated to provide or to guarantee jobs for the people of this country, that simply means that in due course we shall destroy all confidence our people have in the faith and credit, and in the currency issued by this Government; and it also means that we kiss good-by our idea of a balanced budget and proceed with the forces of highly destructive inflation, letting the economic consequences be whatever economic law dictates. The Federal Government owes no citizen a job. It has other functions to perform far more fundamental. We, the people, must make our own jobs.

The letter written by Mr. Wilson, of the General Motors Corp., is, in my opinion, so highly constructive that I submit it for the record and for the use of students of our politico-economic problems:

GENERAL MOTORS CORP.,
Detroit, Mich., October 27, 1945.

INTERNATIONAL UNION, UAW-CIO,
Detroit, Mich.

GENTLEMEN: General Motors proposes that the UAW-CIO join with it in petitioning the Congress to change the Wages and Hours Act to make the standard workweek 45 hours in place of 40 hours during the postwar reconstruction period. This proposal is made recognizing that the country has a big load to carry in cleaning up the aftermath of the war and that under these conditions we can all have more only if we produce more.

The reason for this proposal to change the law is that the present law putting the penalty of overtime pay of 50 percent on the extra hours over 40 discourages employers and business generally from planning such extra hours of production, thereby tending to reduce the country to a 40-hour week, when the country and the world are demanding more production at lower prices.

With this change in the workweek, we propose that all wage rates be increased approximately 6 percent so that men working 45 hours at the new straight time rates will make as much money as they do now for 45 hours of work. This proposal would increase the earnings of those working less than 45 hours and would also increase the extra compensation for any hours worked over 45, since such hours would be paid for at time-and-a-half based on the new rates.

Your first impression of this proposal probably will be that it is a reactionary idea, and not in the interest of labor. It is not reactionary any more than working longer hours in the war emergency was. We are sure that it is in the best interests of all the people of our country, and particularly in the best interests of all workmen.

If the 40-hour week was sound pre-war and the 48-hour week during the war, the 45-hour week is sound for the immediate period following such a world catastrophe as we have been through. All Americans are expecting an even higher standard of living postwar then we had pre-war. This can be accomplished at this time only by producing more, as we now must carry the huge additional tax burden and other expenses growing out of the war. The simple fact is that we have a big job ahead of us. We cannot get it done on the pre-war basis of work. We must produce far more than we did in the past.

The workmen of other nations will work for more than 45 hours. In many cases they will have only a bare subsistence living while they are doing it, because of the lack of good tools and machinery, like those supplied by employers in our country.

This proposal has much to recommend.

1. It avoids a substantial reduction in weekly earnings.

2. It prevents inflation and preserves the purchasing power of War Bonds, insurance, social security and other savings.

3. It does not upset the balance between agricultural workers, salaried workers and industrial workers.

4. It will produce more goods and services, and the people of our country will have more.

5. It will create more good jobs and the employment of more people. Just as many men and women will be employed in our plants on a 45-hour week as on a 40-hour week. And it will allow the use of our plants for the extra five hours when they would otherwise be idle.

6. It will stimulate business activity and create more jobs, and result in the employment of many more people in all related businesses.

7. If our plants could be scheduled to work on this basis, we would produce nine cars where we would otherwise have produced only eight. It will mean that one man out of nine will have a car who would otherwise go without.

We believe that a 45-hour week is necessary and desirable during the period of postwar reconstruction, for the following reasons:

1. During this period our country will be shipping food, materials, and machinery to other countries all over the world to help them rehabilitate themselves and avoid starvation.

2. We still have the extra expense of bringing our fighting men back home and fitting them into civilian work.

3. We still have high taxes, which necessarily are a charge against industry and all producers.

4. To develop and apply technological improvements and to reorganize industry takes time—years, not months.

It is hoped that at the end of this postwar reconstruction period:

1. Our relations with other countries will be on the basis of a two-way street, where we shall get back goods and services for those we supply.

2. The fighting men will be back at peacetime work, and the aftermath of the war will be over.

3. Government expense and the number of Government employees will be reduced and not be such an excessive burden on all producers.

4. Technological improvements—the better ways of doing all the things that are necessary to deliver products to customers—will have become effective.

We can then have a 40-hour week with more leisure time and more goods and services, and can continue to improve the standard of living of all Americans.

Yours very truly,

C. E. WILSON,
President.

Coal-Mining Industry

REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, with respect to the future disposition of the Big Inch and Little Big Inch pipe lines, I would point out that the United Mine Workers of America and its members, and the citizens, and the communities of the anthracite-coal region of Pennsylvania are not, of course, directly affected by the disposal of much of the surplus property, or the manner of their use in the hands of Government or private industry. However, the disposal of such properties as the Big Inch and the Little Big Inch oil pipe lines do hold a very decided interest for these people. I feel that the future of our people, as reflected in the wage scales prevailing in the coal industry—both bituminous and anthracite—is bound up to a great degree with the industry itself

and with any possible governmental operation of, or subsidy to, private enterprise in the marketing of competing fuels, such as oil or natural gas.

Generally, we feel that these pipe lines were wartime projects and, therefore, are expendable, just as any other temporary war investment. They should not be leased or sold to private industry, or be governmentally operated or subsidized. They should be held intact in reserve for any future emergency. To allow oil or natural gas to be unfairly delivered through this medium into the coal markets of this country, and thus improperly compete with the abundant coals now being produced by private industry, would certainly tend to seriously interrupt and impede postwar reconversion and recovery. Such natural resources as oil and gas should, as far as economically feasible, be conserved in place and certainly used wherever possible at point of origin rather than be transported a thousand miles into the heart of the coal fields, whose life exceeds by hundreds of years the life of the known reserves of oil and gas.

The lives of approximately 600,000 coal miners and their families will be affected by the final disposition of these lines. Therefore, I feel that no lease or sale of them should be authorized by Congress or any other governmental agency without adequate notice to all interested parties and full public hearings held thereon.

The Office of Price Administration

REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to abolish OPA. I know that other bills of a similar nature have been introduced heretofore. However, 10 days ago I read a statement by Leo F. Gentner, Acting Regional Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, in which he said that the Office of Price Administration is anxious to get out of business. I wish we could make this unanimous.

The House of Representatives has been very busy picking out the monkey wrenches that OPA throws into our economy to destroy small business. I believe the benefits would far outweigh the burdens if we would abolish this war agency now that the war is over.

I am including in my remarks an editorial which I believe expresses the prevailing sentiment in my district and all over the country, which reads as follows:

THUMBS DOWN ON OPA

When Michigan Tradesman in its August 29 issue said, "Let's have an end to OPA and all its works," we stated the case against this Government agency only mildly, compared with what a committee of the House of Representatives declared October 22 in its bitter indictment of OPA.

The committee is headed by a Democrat, Representative HOWARD SMITH, of Virginia, hence its report cannot be laughed off as a political-party statement. The committee was created to look into abuses by executive agencies, and its report on OPA activities was unanimous.

It charged the agency was stifling production of household goods, boosting prices to consumers, creating unemployment, hampering the production of consumer goods by insisting upon continuing rigid war controls in times of peace, and with having bound itself to "unrealistic" methods, with a resulting loss of output of needed goods.

Let's go into more details. The House committee's report declared that OPA's refusal to grant a "reasonable profit" to establish manufacturers on a long line of household goods has prevented maximum output. What's even worse, the report asserted that new producers are being granted the right by OPA to turn out and sell similar goods of inferior quality at higher prices. The report cited numerous examples of OPA rulings which forced consumers to pay higher prices while established companies were prevented from returning to peacetime output.

Here's a typical instance: An established producer of electric irons applied for a price ceiling to permit retail sale of his irons at less than $3. OPA refused to approve this price. But it permitted a newcomer in the field to "price an inferior and inherently dangerous electric iron to retail at $5.50."

And OPA is one of those Government agencies which likes to boast that it favors free enterprise and that the ultimate consumer's interest lies next to its heart always.

The House committee tells us that OPA still adheres to the same "unrealistic" and "outdated" decrees which kept business under Federal control throughout the war, and that this stiff-necked adherence has retarded reconversion, restricted opportunity for full employment, and at least in some instances "actually caused prices of cost-of-living commodities to rise."

There's more to come. The House Committee declared that OPA's denial of reasonable profits to business on low-priced products is largely responsible for the return to shelves of only high-priced goods in numerous lines. It charged that shortage of such vital consumer items as shirts, underwear, and sheets—and even stoves—is due partly to OPA's refusal to set ceiling prices to cover costs plus a reasonable return. It charged further that OPA's attempt to hold prices at 1942 levels, despite greatly increased material and labor costs, throttled production and worked hardship on the whole Nation.

What to do? The House report proposed that OPA's present complex methods of fixing prices should be replaced by a simple rule that producers may charge a price reflecting current production costs plus a reasonable profit; that wholesale and retail merchants should be permitted to pass on price increases to their customers, when the new prices reflect only reasonable profit margins.

The report suggested that producers should file their price schedules on simple forms, with regional or district OPA offices, and that these prices should be effective unless objected to by such offices. Price control, said the report, should be abandoned on any products where supply now is sufficient to meet production demands.

On top of all this, the House committee paid its compliments to Price Administrator Chester Bowles. It asserted he had exceeded the authority granted to him by Congress, by attempting to dictate to manufacturers not only prices but the quantities of various lines of consumer goods they may produce. This, added the report, is tantamount to trying "to revamp the economic structure of the Nation" through Executive decree. Which is what we have been saying right along in this magazine of business.

We believe the majority of Congressmen are in accord with the ideas of the men who formulated the report on OPA which we have just been giving you in condensed form. Why can't the majority be frank and courageous, and put an end to this Government agency which has no justifiable reason for continued existence and which can exert only a retarding effect upon business, employment, and our economic progress?

The Future of Philippine-American Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLOS P. ROMULO

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two important documents: First, the speech delivered by President Sergio Osmeña, of the Philippines, at the opening session of the New York Herald Tribune Forum in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York, October 29, 1945; and second, an address delivered on the same occasion by Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright, hero of Bataan and Corregidor. At this juncture of Filipino-American relationship, I wish to commend to the attention of the Members of this Congress these two thoughtful adddresses which point to the road that should be followed by our two peoples for our mutual best interests.

President Osmeña says:

This is a period when your people must decide whether or not the Filipino-American brotherhood that existed before the war and was sealed in blood during the war will continue now that the war is ended, and even after independence.

As if in reply to that statement, General Wainwright says:

The ties which bind us to the Philippines, based on long years of friendly cooperation, have been reforged in the fires of a bloody war. We stood shoulder to shoulder. We believed, and we still believe, in the same principles of right and decency. They have been our comrades, and we will not let them down.

We must make good all our pledges to them, and continue to help them when they need us.

May I commend these two addresses to the consideration of the distinguished Members of this Congress who will soon be called upon to make vital decisions about the future course of the relation between our two countries.

The following is President Osmeña's address:

I am delighted to be able to participate in the Herald Tribune forum, which has done so much to help inform and crystallize American public opinion on the vital problems confronting your country. With your indulgence, I propose to discuss briefly the future of Philippine-American cooperation—a subject which has a direct bearing on the whole problem of responsibility of victory.

Thirty-eight years ago this month, in the year 1907, there convened in Manila the first popularly elected legislative assembly of the Philippines.

That assembly faced many problems. Our country was emerging out of centuries of Spanish rule, and everywhere we had to cope with the tasks of education, economic development, political growth. One of the

most pressing questions at that time—strange though it may seem to us now—was to what extent were we Filipinos willing to cooperate with the United States.

Remember, if you will, the background of our history. For three and a half centuries we had been under the rule of Spain. Spain had brought us many good things—our Christian religion, our western orientation, our familiarity with European governmental systems—but it had not brought us liberty. We had to get that for ourselves. We had to rebel against Spain. By the time Dewey's squadron sailed into Manila Bay for the battle that was to end Spanish rule in the Philippines, the Filipino revolutionists had overthrown Spanish control of the whole country, with the exception of Manila itself.

Our leaders had assumed that after the American victory Philippine independence would be recognized at once by the United States. But your country preferred to establish its sovereignty over the Philippines, and gave us only a promise of future freedom. Since there had never been in all history a case of a powerful sovereign voluntarily assisting a weak colonial people toward self-government and liberty, many Filipinos did not believe your promise—and there followed the bloody years of war between Americans and Filipinos.

After the conflict, the American policy of increasing self-government for the Filipino people began to unfold. It was a new and revolutionary policy. It was an experiment, a common adventure, indeed, a promise to all the submerged millions of this world.

When the Philippine Assembly first met in 1907, there were still some Filipinos who did not fully trust the American intentions in our country. I had the honor to be elected Speaker of that Assembly and the burden of decision on the question of whether or not to cooperate with the American Government in the Philippines fell largely upon me. I helped make the decision, and the decision was to cooperate.

The first resolution of the Philippine Assembly was addressed to President Theodore Roosevelt, thanking the American people for permitting us to establish the assembly and thereby to participate directly in making the laws by which we were governed. And the first law that we passed was to appropriate a million pesos for the construction of—not armaments—but schools, where the people could learn the English language and American democracy.

All of us in the Philippines know now that this decision to work with you, and grow with you, and fight by your side, was a wise decision. The record is there, for the whole world to see—and it is a record of which both your people and mine may well be proud.

There is another—and equally important—fact to remember about this record. It is the fact that, although the Philippines was under American sovereignty when Japan invaded the Philippines, we Filipinos fought in defense of the American flag. In other areas, under similar circumstances, the people chose not to defend the sovereign power whose flag flew over their country. As you know, in some places they actually welcomed the Japanese. We did not do that. We chose not to do that. Our struggle by your side was a deliberate decision made by the people of the Philippines. We decided to defend your sovereignty—not as slaves fighting for their masters, but as a free people making a free decision to join in defense of the free way of life which your country represents.

Now, we in the Philippines, on the eve of our independence, face the same issue that we faced in 1907, when our first Philippine Assembly convened—the same issue that we faced in December 1941, when the enemy attacked your sovereignty in the Philippines. We must decide whether, after independence, Philippine-American cooperation should continue—and how close it should be.

My own position on this matter is well known. I see no reason why the cutting of our political ties, when independence comes, need make any change in the close relationship between our two nations. My predecessor, President Quezon, and I have assured our people that Philippine-American friendship is a two-way passage. We have offered our most sincere cooperation to your Government. We have gladly consented to the building of bases on our soil for the protection of the Philippines and the United States, even after our country is independent. Now, as in the past, we are willing to assume our full responsibilities to the United States. I hold to that policy, taking it for granted that the United States, for its part, will discharge its full responsibilities to the Philippines.

For you have assumed these responsibilities and made definite commitments to the Philippines. You did so—not only because you are the kind of liberty-loving people that you are—but also because you will receive something in return.

You made a commitment to the Philippines when your late and very great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, told the Filipino people in the earliest days of the war that "your freedom will be redeemed and your independence established and protected," and that we would be "assisted in the full repair of the ravages caused by the war." President Roosevelt's worthy successor, Harry S. Truman, reaffirmed the promise when he said: "The Philippine people, whose heroic and loyal stand in this war has won the affection and admiration of the American people, will be fully assisted by the United States in the great problems of rehabilitation and reconstruction which lie ahead."

You made a commitment to the Philippines when, in 1909, the Congress of the United States decided to establish a free-trade relationship between our two countries. Our Philippine Assembly adopted a resolution petitioning you not to do so, expressing the fear that free trade "would in the future become highly prejudicial to the economic interests of the Filipino people" because it would orient our entire economy in your direction. But you decided to establish free trade, in spite of our protest. We have made the best of this, and the best has been very good indeed. We had achieved, before the war, the highest standard of living of any nation in the Orient. Our economy, before the war, was growing, and our country was prospering. The truth today is that unless some such relationship is restored and maintained for a reasonable time, we shall not be able to rehabilitate our country.

You made a commitment to the Philippines when you undertook to protect our independence and when we agreed on the establishment of American air and naval bases for mutual security in the Philippines. That commitment involves—for your own safety as well as for ours—something more than the mere building and maintenance of bases. It involves a network of roads and communications to make those bases worth while, and it involves the assurance of a peaceful, prospering hinterland to make those bases firm.

President Truman has always borne these commitments in mind. Only a few days ago he made public a series of directives to various United States agencies and officials covering many problems of the Philippines. Most of the specific points he made arose out of the conversations which I have had with the President and other high officials of your Government.

I want to make it clear, however, that neither President Truman nor I consider the concrete steps taken last week to be anything like a complete program for the solution of our problems. They do not cover many of the over-all questions of full rehabilitation and reconstruction in the Philippines. I believe that American responsibility to the Philippines will not have been fulfilled until these problems are settled.

When I speak of the pressing need for America to carry out her responsibility to the Philippines, I am thinking of very specific matters.

We are asking for 20 years of quota-limited free trade with the United States on the basis of the 1940 level and not a strangulating graduated tax on such trade. We are asking for fair treatment on war damages, providing just compensation to those who suffered when the war came to Philippine soil, protected by American sovereignty. We are asking the United States to help us pick up again from where we were when the Japanese attacked American sovereignty in the Philippines.

The past half century of gigantic progress in the Philippines, brutally interrupted though it was by the war, is one of the brightest pages of human history. Your inspiration, your guidance, your help, has been tremendous, and the United States of America will always be respected for its role in the Philippines. But do not forget that Filipinos, too, had something to do with all of this. Our progress was achieved by us largely through our efforts and entirely with our money. Check back over the appropriations voted by your Congress through all these years, and you will find no item for the operation of our government, the building and maintenance of our school system, the construction of our roads and public works, the development of our public health program. The costs were not borne by you. They were borne by us.

We do not ask for your charity, any more than we have asked for it in the past. What we do ask for, as we have in the past, is your help, your understanding, your willingness to fulfill the obligations which you yourselves have assumed.

I know how warm and friendly is the American sentiment toward the Filipino people. Every person I have talked to in this country—whether public official or private citizen—has revealed his heartfelt sympathy for our present distress and his sincere desire to help us get back on our feet. There is a very special American feeling for us, just as there is a very special Filipino feeling for you. Nowhere in the world is there a relationship between two peoples that resembles the relationship between the American people and the Filipino people.

But today we must make up our minds—on the basis of this relationship—about the future strength of the ties that bind us together. President Truman, in his recent directives, has shown to the world that he gives a very special priority to the problems of relief, reconstruction, and rehabilitation in the Philippines. He has, for himself, made the decision, and it is a good decision.

But our trade relations, our war damage claims, our over-all rehabilitation needs, are not for him alone to decide. These questions come before the Congress of the United States, and they come before the intelligence and the conscience of the American people. This is a period when your people must decide whether or not the Filipino-American brotherhood that existed before the war and was sealed in blood during the war will continue now that the war is ended, and even after independence. We of the Philippines cannot make that decision for you. We can only tell you that, for our part, we want to continue our close cooperation with you. Beyond that, the decision is yours to make.

General Wainwright's address follows:

By some process which I do not clearly understand, a military man who achieves notice—perhaps I should say notoriety—in war time is sometimes looked upon as a sort of oracle or soothsayer, capable of uttering

words of wisdom on almost any subject and gifted with powers of prophecy.

If he is not careful, he finds himself making ponderous observations on religion, sociology, art, economics.. I almost said politics. Sometimes he talks too much.

I am going to guard against any impulse to prophesy in this brief address, and I am going to try not to talk like an oracle. But I do want to raise my voice, with what earnestness and eloquence I can command, on behalf of a very fine and loyal and brave people—the Filipinos—and to say something about our common destiny in the Orient.

It is not necessary to remind you how Philippine troops—Scouts, Constabulary, and Philippine Army—teamed with our own forces to check the Japanese invader on Luzon. Filipino fighting men helped us delay the enemy's southward sweep across the Philippine Archipelago for 5 months, from December 8 to May 6. The bulk of them were hurriedly trained; their equipment was inadequate. But they stood shoulder to shoulder with us and the delaying action which they made possible threw the enemy's time table for Pacific conquest painfully off schedule.

I do not minimize the part played by our own United States regulars in that campaign. I am fully aware that the Filipinos were fighting on their own soil, for their homeland. But in helping themselves they were helping us, and without their courage and loyalty our efforts to withstand the invader must have collapsed weeks earlier.

When I first went to the Philippines in 1908 the natives spoke little or no English and it was necessary for us to learn Spanish in order to deal with them. There were but few schools and most of the native population was illiterate.

There were almost no roads, only mud tracks and oxcart trails; and only one railway line, running north from Manila.

When I returned in 1940 the scene had changed greatly. English was spoken in practically every town, and every community had its schools. There was an excellent highway system with many roads as good as those here in New York State. Railway lines connected many of the principal cities and towns.

Where once you had to swim your horse or splash across a stream, soundly built bridges made safe and easy passage. There was a potable water supply all through the islands, where once we had to boil all our drinking water to avoid amoebic dysentery. There were telegraph and telephone lines connecting all parts of the Philippine Islands. Agriculture had developed tremendously; there was extensive production of rice, coconuts, copra, hemp, sugar, and tobacco.

This remarkable development, which impressed me so strongly when I returned there, took place under American occupation. American engineering did part of the job; American capital and cooperation did some more. But the Filipinos showed a capacity for improvement, a willingness to learn and grow, without which our cooperation would have accomplished little. They are 100 percent loyal to the United States. They appreciate what we have done for them. But they are not servile, not dependent upon us.

In granting complete independence to the Philippine nation, we cannot say merely, "Good luck and good-by." We have confidence in their ability to stand on their own feet, and we are hopeful for their continued friendship. But we cannot cut them loose on a sink-or-swim basis.

Our interest in the Philippines is not to be measured by geography nor weighed by the air and naval bases the Philippine government is willing to grant us, or even by the continuing consultations of our military and naval leaders.

The ties which bind us to the Philippines, based on long years of friendly cooperation, have been reforged in the fires of a bloody war. We stood shoulder to shoulder. We believed, and we still believe, in the same principles of right and decency. They have been our comrades, and we will not let them down.

Our future relationship depends not only upon the policies which our Government may formulate but on the warm and friedly understanding between the American and Philippine peoples.

We must make good all our pledges to them, and continue to help them when they need us.

The Trouble With UNRRA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the current issue of Life magazine:

THE TROUBLE WITH UNRRA

As we Americans have been told so often, millions of people face what may become the worst winter in the history of human suffering. The instrument we think will save them is UNRRA, but it won't. In fact, it is so far from adequate that we had best junk it and start anew.

The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was, in its origin, the most ambitious humanitarian undertaking ever conceived. Its course has been paved with good intentions; also with dollars. No thoughtful American will begrudge the dollars. Congress, now debating whether to extend UNRRA's life in 1946 at a cost of $1,350,000,000, has at least the simple duty of appropriating $550,000,000 to fulfill U. S. commitments for 1945. UNRRA's bookkeeping, about which the Russians have grumbled, is not what is wrong with it. UNRRA's administrative bungling, bad as it is, is not what is wrong with it. Herbert Lehman, however irretrievably destroyed may be his reputation for efficiency, is not what is wrong with it. Even if UNRRA were the best-managed outfit in the world, which it isn't, it should still be dissolved. It should be dissolved not to limit relief but to speed it up, make it effective and introduce a little realism into the present muddle.

NOT BY SOUP ALONE

We usually speak rather glibly of Europe and the Orient as needing relief. But as a matter of geographical fact there are several Europes and not just one Orient. There is northwest Europe—France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark, Norway. When Americans hear of cold and starving Europe, this is the part of the globe that comes to mind.

Yet UNRRA is specifically barred from these countries. It has been barred except for a few spot activities, since its very first meeting in Atlantic City, November 1943. These countries took the position that they had money, could pay for their own relief and wanted no outside agencies dispensing charity, and possibly political ideas, within their borders. The blunt fact is that no agency—American, Anglo-American, international, private or public—is meeting the urgent needs of northwest Europe today.

Generally, these needs fall into two classes: (a) soup-kitchen relief, food, clothing, medicines, emergency shelter; (b) reconstruction, getting the economy rolling once more so these intelligent, enterprising people can again take care of themselves.

As to soup-kitchen relief, the only possible answer at this late date is for the British and American armies to resume it, insofar as the governments of these lands will permit and assist. The United States Army was prepared for this wake of war activity and continued it up until recently. Only the Army has the transportation, the personnel, and experience needed to do this job in the desperately short time remaining.

The second job, reconstruction, requires an entirely new and different approach. It was not foreseen, though it should have been, that the worst scourge of the postwar era would not be hunger but unemployment. The hands and wheels of northwest Europe are mostly idle. The complex machine of an industrial civilization is stuck on dead center.

To some it may seem that this is not America's fault and not America's business. Yet only America, at this time, has the technological know-how, the machines, the repair parts, the financing, even the drive and push necessary to restart the European economic machine. For example, the present bottleneck for much French production is coal. To send American coal (however necessary for this winter's emergency) is no economic answer. But perhaps American machines of the right sort in French mines are the answer. To find out, we need a quick-acting, economic agency competent to assess and meet such needs.

The agencies we have had, such as Foreign Economic Administration, are dissolved or dissolving beyond recall. But why could their functions not be continued in a new Board for European Reconstruction, under the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs? Let Mr. Clayton assemble a board of the caliber and velocity of the WPB. Its members should understand, as does Mr. Clayton, that the United States cannot long be prosperous and happy in a depressed and unhappy world. In their fumbling with various kinds of socialism, Europeans hope that internal social change will restart the industrial wheels. But the truth is that much of western Europe's trouble is external; its century-long economic integration with the Western World was shattered by the war and occupation. The United States, as the leading western power, must show some initiative in repairing this integration.

UNRRA cannot do this job. Even if northwest Europe would let it in, it is specifically enjoined from long-range reconstruction by a resolution adopted at its first meeting and underlined afterward by the United States Congress. The second "R" in UNRRA—Renabilitation—has been a fraud from that day on. Yet UNRRA is a barrier to somebody else's doing the job simply because so many people misapprehend its scope.

As for the Orient, UNRRA has made large plans. China can absorb a limitless amount of soup-kitchen relief; and some sort of international organization is required to coordinate and supplement what the various nations and the many private organizations do for China on this level. Perhaps UNRRA's Chinese set-up for this purpose should be retained. If so, its limitations should be made vividly plain. For soup-kitchen relief will not answer China's bigger need, which (as in Europe) is for the tools and technology of reconstruction. Such needs involve higher policy decisions than UNRRA can make.

WHERE UNRRA IS ACTIVE

Of $530,500,000 worth of relief goods actually delivered by UNRRA through Sept. 30, $503,900,000 went to the Balkans and eastern Europe. This is a part of the world which, except for Greece (where the British policy has governed UNRRA's distributions), is falling under the Russan sphere of influence. Since the United States puts up 72 percent of UNRRA's cash, and Britain 17 percent, a

cynic might assert that UNRRA has become an Anglo-American Administration for the Relief of Russian Europe. The bulk of our money is going into a region from which, because of Russian restraints, we cannot even receive free and fair reports on how the work is progressing.

Certainly this relief work should be continued this winter. The hunger of a Pole or an Albanian is just as real as a Belgian's or Norwegian's. Italy, too, must be helped, even though it is confusing to hear Mr. Molotov demanding reparations from Italy at a moment when we are asked to pour in the essentials of living. Some of UNRRA's machinery in this central and eastern European area should undoubtedly be retained. But its name should be changed to something more accurate and its central administrative organization should be simplified—less harness and more horse.

WHAT TO DO INSTEAD

UNRRA is ineffective in northwest Europe. It lacks constitutional authority to deal with the big problems of reconstruction. It cannot make high policy decisions that cry to be made. And meanwhile the unfortunate delusions which have accumulated around UNRRA are lulling Americans into the comfortable but wrong belief that a mere $1,350,000,000 appropriation from Congress can answer the world's pleas for help.

Let Congress vote the funds which will enable UNRRA to finish its current programs and then let UNRRA wind up its affairs. It should be supplemented immediately by effective soup-kitchen relief and replaced before next spring by a clear program and machinery in Washington for overseas reconstruction.

Some of the high policy decisions which UNRRA cannot make are, nevertheless, international decisions, not for the United States to make alone. But these decisions could well be centered in the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations Organization. To abandon UNRRA is not necessarily to abandon internationalism. Through UNO the nations can start to collaborate more effectively against unemployment, undernourishment, trade dislocations, and similar problems. Their solution is our best hope of drawing the world's peoples closer together.

The Rural Industrialization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Smith Southwest American commenting upon the bills introduced by Senator BAILEY and myself:

The South must develop new industry at the farmers' doorstep to meet its employment problems, BROOKS HAYS, Arkansas Congressman, said in a speech to the House.

Representative HAYS and Senator BAILEY, of North Carolina, are coauthors of a bill to stimulate rural industry through a Federal appropriation with the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce and Interior as its directors.

The Arkansas Congressman pointed out that the South must step up its industrial employment if it is to take care of the people who are coming back from the military service and war plants, and provide work for people who soon will not be needed in the cottonfields.

His effort is in line with the industry-building program now being carried on in Arkansas and, less intensively, in some other Southern States.

Southern States contributed their full share to the military forces. They contributed more than their share, on a population basis, to the migrant war-labor force, since there was less war enterprise at home to provide jobs. Industry is the chief hope for providing them jobs in peace, and it must be chiefly industry based on the agricultural resources of the area.

An important change in employment in cotton production is virtually certain. Mechanical cotton pickers have been developed and proved in tests which will sharply reduce the demand for hand cotton pickers. Planting already is done largely by tractors and mechanical planters. Chopping is being done more and more by tractor-drawn rotary hoes. Cultivation is now being done on an experimental basis with flame throwers which consume the grass and weeds but not the cotton.

Sprays are being used to drop the leaves from the plants before the mechanical pickers move in to gather up the cotton fiber. The impact of mechanical genius on the cotton industry will make it possible for American farmers to compete with the rest of the world. But it will also create an employment problem we must face.

The Hays-Bailey bill looks like an intelligent approach.

It is obvious that the raw materials of the South have been too much shipped out of the South for manufacture elsewhere. The producer of raw material, whether it is farm product, lumber, or minerals, gets a small return. The manufacturer who converts raw material into finished product adds the greatest value and therefore has the greatest amount to distribute to labor for its production and to owners for dividends. We have been too long content to be the "hewers of wood and drawers of water," and let other areas take the profits.

The purpose of the bill sponsored by Representative HAYS and Senator BAILEY is to create a program of small business development which would back up the efforts of such local and State agencies as the Arkansas Resources and Development Commission and the Arkansas Economic Council-State Chamber of Commerce.

Columbus Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Charles G. Notari, Esq., national president of the Sons of Columbus of America, at Columbus Day banquet in the ballroom of the William Penn Hotel on Sunday evening, October 14, 1945:

This is Columbus Day. We meet here today to commemorate a great figure of the fifteenth century who, 453 years ago, set foot upon a new land—a land destined to become a haven of refuge for all the oppressed people of the Old World, a land of freedom and opportunity, a land of tremendous influence and leadership.

On October 12, 1492, Christopher Columbus at last realized his dream—after many years of toil and obstacles requiring the highest courage and unswerving faith. His reading of Marco Polo's travels, and information he obtained from Paolo Toscanelli convinced him that he could find the east by sailing west, but he erroneously underestimated the size of the earth. His error, however, proved a fortunate one, and had he known the actual distance he probably would not have ventured on his undertaking. His purpose was twofold. One was to find Asia, for he carried with him letter to the Great Khan, the Emperor of Asia. He also hoped to find new lands as he was made admiral and governor of the new territories to be discovered. It was most fortunate that he discovered new land.

But for all the credit that is due Columbus, it was not destined that the land he discovered be named after his name. That great honor went to Amerigo Vespucci, a Florentine who traveled in the new land and described it in his writings. These writings came to the attention of Martin Waldseemuller, a German geographer who first called the new land America—the land of Amerigo.

America has tried to make amends for this error. The Central Government is the District of Columbia. There are cities, streets, and squares named in honor of Columbus. The musical world has brought out the songs, Columbia the Gem of the Ocean; Hail, Columbia; and others. The Federal Government finally declared Columbus Day a national holiday.

The city of Pittsburgh, the historic gateway to the West, the workshop of the world, the home of the greatest number of nationalities who have come from the Old World, and who have sought and found security and freedom, has done little to honor the memory of Columbus. The city of Pittsburgh with all its traditions and history should do something more than merely naming two streets, Columbus Avenue and Columbo Street.

The Sons of Columbus of America, organized in the city of Pittsburgh, early dedicated themselves to perpetuating the memory of Columbus. For years they have carried on a campaign to raise funds for the erection of a monument to Christoper Columbus. During the convention we have just concluded, we have adopted a resolution to sponsor a Columbus Plaza in the city of Pitttsburgh within the next 3 years. We realize that we alone cannot undertake this work. We need the help of the community. We call upon the city of Pittsburgh, the State of Pennsylvania, and the Federal Government to aid us in this noble undertaking.

Norwegian Journalists Tour the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, five distinguished journalists from Norway recently made a tour of America to learn first-hand what part we played in the liberation of their country from the Nazis.

I refer to five newspapermen who have worked for the past few years underground in a courageous effort to defeat the foe and bring hope to the people of Norway. To have been caught would have meant death

On many occasions during the war I spoke to the underground people in Norway by short-wave radio, and it was the job of these brave Norwegian journalists to pass the news and messages of hope along to the people. I also talked to many Norwegian newspapermen on my recent trip to Norway.

Because I feel that many Americans will want to know more about the visit of these Norwegians, I am inserting an announcement issued by the overseas branch of the Office of War Information and a copy of the tour schedule:

NEW YORK, September 5.—Five Norwegian journalists, who worked underground in their homeland during the enemy occupation, have arrived here for a 7-week tour of the United States as guests of the United States Government. The trip was originally arranged some months ago by Overseas Branch of OWI. The purpose of their visit is to catch up on a story they missed while working for liberation—what happened in the United States during the war years.

The visitors, whose itinerary will take them to places within the United States where they will find the story they seek, are Olav Brunvand, of the leading Norwegian labor newspaper Bergens Arveiderblad; M. C. Kirkeboe, an editor of the Norwegian Christian Press Agency serving 80 newspapers; Miss Joruun Johnsen, of Norway's largest newspaper Aftenposten; Oskar Hasselknippe, of the new Norwegian newspaper Verdensgang; and Per Thomsen, of the newspaper Stavanger Aftenbland.

The journalists will stay in New York City for 6 days visiting such places as Columbia Presbyterian Medical Center, Radio City, the Metropolitan Museum, and new Idlewild Airport. From there they will go to Detroit, center of the Nation's automobile industry, touring factories and viewing at first-hand reconversion from war production to manufacture of civilian goods. After 3 days in and near Detroit they will proceed to Chicago, to see the city's printing plants and the famous stockyards.

After a 3-day stay in Chicago the visitors will spend 2 days in Minneapolis, and will meet many Americans of Norwegian descent. They will stay 2 days in Fargo, N. Dak., in the region settled by many Scandinavians. This will be followed by a 2-day visit to Yellowstone National Park in Wyoming.

From Yellowstone the visitors will go to Seattle for a 5-day stay. Then they will jonrney down the West coast to San Francisco where they will visit the Kaiser shipyards and talk with Henry Kaiser. After 2 days in San Francisco they will spend a day in Los Angeles and Hollywood.

The rest of the trip will take the journalists on a 2-day visit to Wichita, Kans., large war-production city which is reconverting to peacetime production, especially the manufacture of small private planes. They will fly over the Grand Canyon in Colorado and then on to New Orleans. They are scheduled for a visit to Knoxville, Tenn., and an extensive tour of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Later they will stop in Washington, meet President Truman, Members of Congress, and other national figures, and view the workings of Government at first hand.

The journalists will spend the final week of their trip visiting Wilmington, Del., Baltimore, Philadelphia, Boston, and Hartford. Before returning to Norway they will probably spend several days in New York City.

The biographies of the visiting journalists follow:

Olav Brunvand, 33, is employed by the leading labor newspaper Bergens Arbeiderblad in Bergen—Norway's second largest city. During the occupation the number of daily undergound newspapers in Oslo exceeded the number of daily newspapers in peacetime—and the same was to a smaller degree the case in Bergen. Olav Brunvand is a recognized journalist for many years in the labor press. He was one of the first to start the underground press service in Bergen as well as in other cities. The underground press in Norway was always well informed and up to date. After 1 year's activity he was arrested and spent 4 years in the forced-labor groups in Germany. His stories will be syndicated to all labor papers in Norway. (NB. Norway had a labor government at the time of the occupation, and the government carried on in London during the occupation, and in Norway after the liberation, until it finally "placed its seats at the King's disposal" and an interim government, consisting of members from all parties, but mainly laborites, took over. The interim government will now function until after the elections in October this year.)

Mr. M. C. Kirkeboe, 48, is editor in the nonpolitical Norwegian Christian Press Agency, serving 80 newspapers. Mr. Kirkeboe was a coworker of Bishop Berggrav, who was the leader of the unshakable Norwegian church front. Mr. Kirkeboe has been a very active member of the church front throughout the war.

Miss Jorunn Johnsen, 40, is employed by the conservative newspaper in Oslo, Aftenposten, which is Norway's largest. Even before the war she was a recognized journalist, having as her specialty social-welfare activities and woman's affairs. Today she is considered as Norway's foremost woman journalist.

Woman's activities played a very important role in the Norwegian home-front's resistance, and Miss Johnsen was highly active on this front. As a reward she got a stay of 14 months in the notorious concentration camp Grini, near Oslo. She is especially interested in women's organizations and social-welfare work in the United States.

Oskar Hasselknippe, 34, is employed by the new nonpolitical newspaper Verdens Gang in Oslo. Throughout the war he was very active in the Norwegian home front. The home front military set-up was extremely well organized. A spokesman for General Eisenhower said after liberation that it was the best he had seen. Mr. Hasselknippe made an outstanding record in this organization, and at the time of liberation he was an officer in command of a unit of 2,000 men. The connection between the Norwegian Government in London and home-front leadership was very close during the whole occupation—a fact that has speeded the reconversion. During the occupation Hasselknippe made journeys for conferences both to Sweden and England.

Per Thomsen, 40, is employed by the newspaper Stavanger Aftenblad. Equally well known as a journalist and as a novelist, he is recognized as one of the leading writers of Norway. He was a member of the Norwegian home-front leadership. From the spring of 1944, Per Thomsen worked in the leadership for southwestern Norway. He was imprisoned as a hostage in October the same year, and remained in prison until the liberation.

Itinerary for Norwegian journalists

Date	City	Hotel
Sept. 11-13	Detroit, Mich	Book-Cadillac.
Sept. 14-17	Chicago, Ill	Drake.
Sept. 18-20	Minneapolis, Minn	Radesson.
Sept. 21-22	Fargo, N. Dak	Gardner.
Sept. 24-25	Yellowstone National Park, Wyo.	Yellowstone.
Sept. 27-30	Seattle, Wash	Olympic.
Oct. 1-4	San Francisco, Calif	St. Francis.
Oct. 6-8	Los Angeles, Calif	Biltmore.
Oct. 10-12	Wichita, Kans	Tassen.
Oct. 13-14	New Orleans, La	Roosevelt.
Oct. 15-18	Knoxville, Tenn	Andrew Johnson.
Oct. 19-24	Washington, D. C	Statler.
Oct. 25-26	Wilmington, Del., Baltimore, Md., Philadelphia, Pa.	

President Truman Made an Honorary Member of the Alumni Association of the University of Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of being one of a group of members of the Alumni Association of the University of Missouri who presented President Harry S. Truman with a certificate of honorary membership in the University of Missouri Alumni Association this morning, October 31, 1945, in recognition of his outstanding service to the University of Missouri, in his devotion to the progress of education generally during his public service as a Senator, Vice President, and President of the United States.

I include, as follows, the presentation speech by Mr. Clark Nichols, president of the Alumni Association of the University of Missouri, in Washington, D. C., the certificate, and the citation accompanying it:

PRESENTATION SPEECH BY MR. CLARK NICHOLS

Mr. President, sometime in January 1945 the Washington, D. C. group of the University of Missouri alumni conceived the idea of presenting Vice President Harry S. Truman with a certificate of honorary membership in the University of Missouri Alumni Association. This took some doing on the part of the university and alumni authorities at Columbia. By the time the necessary formalities were enthusiastically accomplished we looked around for Vice President Harry S. Truman, and he wasn't there, any more. Believing in the motto of the Northland Mounted Patrol, "We always get our man," we started to find our man. We finally located him in the White House in Washington, D. C. We don't want to deprecate the deeds of the mounties, but we wonder if they ever tried to get their man in the White House in the manner and time they would like or had planned. We did not despair. And now after 9 months' battle against the demands of the problems of the struggling and sometimes bewildered America and the near chaos of the entire world we have our little moment. Our reasons for conferring, what we please to call an honor, are expressed in the following citation:

"THE ALUMNI ASSOCIATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

"To Whom It May Concern, Greeting:

"HARRY S. TRUMAN

"In recognition of his outstanding service to the University of Missouri—a service which represents a singular devotion to the progress of an educational ideal and which has been rendered freely and unselfishly—is hereby awarded honorary membership in the Alumni Association of the University. This certificate carries with it the gratitude of all men and women who take pride in the university of the past and present and who hold great faith in its future.

It is with a deep sense of appreciation that this membership is conferred the 31st day of October in the year 1945 A. D.

"By order of the board of directors:

"OAK HUNTER,
"President, Alumni Association.
"ALLEN L. OLIVER,
"Chairman, Awards Committee.
"ROBERT E. LEE HILL,
"Chairman, Public Relations Committee."

To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, HARRY S. TRUMAN:

The alumni of the University of Missouri take pride in the achievements of the native sons of Missouri, both alumni and nonalumni, and watch with interest and approval the men of vision and ability who bring honor and distinction to themselves and to the State. One of these men is Harry S. Truman, farmer, soldier, judge, Senator, and an individual devoted to the welfare of Missouri and the progress of the university as an integral part of the State's well-being.

We could well expect continued remembrance and loyal service from an alumnus who carries the memory of college days and who associates with The Columns a past of many friends and happy experiences. When a nonalumnus continuously supports the State's leading educational institution and urges others to support it, aiding always the progress and advancement of the school, the alumni are deeply grateful. It is, therefore, our privilege to bestow honorary membership in the Alumni Association of the University of Missouri upon Harry S. Truman, the first Missourian to become President of the United States.

President Truman was born in 1884 in Lamar, Mo., the son of John A. and Martha Ellen Truman. After serving his country in field artillery in the First World War, he attended the Kansas City School of Law, served as judge and then as presiding judge of the Jackson County court. President Truman served two terms as Senator from the State of Missouri, building a fine record of public service and winning friendship and respect from the people of the Nation as well as his native State.

Upon assuming the Presidency of the United States, Harry Truman assumed a responsibility of unprecedented proportions and seriousness. As he confronts this task the eyes of the world are turned upon him. Many pray for his success.

The alumni of the university hereby express their confidence in their fellow-Missourian and extend their wholehearted support to that man who in past years has with diligence and vision supported the University of Missouri We express our belief in his ability to guide the Nation through the difficult days ahead.

We welcome as an honorary member of the Alumni Association of the University of Missouri, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America.

Labor Policy Based on Collective Bargaining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, President Truman last evening delivered a speech on labor policy that should be read and reread by all interested parties. It is entitled to serious consideration because it recommended the application of the American principle of collective bargaining as a means of settling wage controversies. It recognized difficulties, but gave expression to the optimism that is characteristic of our people, namely, that no difficulty is unsurmountable if approached in a proper spirit. If labor and management sit down together and discuss questions at issue between them in the spirit of give and take, as advised by the President, it will mean much in making our future prosperity certain and sure.

The postwar reconversion period with its attendant problems present a situation that can easily result in either deflation or inflation. Either one, as the President pointed out, can result disastrously to our national welfare. To escape these dangers will require both management and labor to act jointly for the common good. The responsibility of each is great. By their ability to see the right and act accordingly, they can add not only to our welfare but also to our prestige as a Nation.

The President has pointed a way to settle, in a truly American way, the vexing problems of wages and living conditions that now exist. In clear and unmistakable language he has made it plain that it is a joint responsibility of capital and labor.

If we are to have a prosperous country and our American standard of living maintained there must be full employment at good wages. And, furthermore, in no other way can our national income be maintained at the high level necessary to carry our enormous debt. To effectuate these objectives each must recognize their responsibility, and, this includes Congress. Congress must be ready and willing at all times to do its part. Our welfare as a people, and, our influence as a Nation, in these difficult times, requires that none shall fail.

My support was given to all measures that were necessary to a successful prosecution of the war. My continued support will be given to all measures that are necessary to make the reconversion period equally successful.

No Precipitate Action on Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, Prof. H. I. Schlesinger, of the department of chemistry of the University of Chicago, delivered an address before the American Chemical Society, on October 19, 1945, in which he gave some unusually interesting views on the atomic bomb. Professor Schlesinger has made a very comprehensive study of the future of the atomic bomb and his address aroused unusual interest.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD, Professor Schlesinger's address:

This evening should rightfully have been reserved for its major purpose of doing honor to our retiring chairman and to the winner of the American Chemical Society award. You may be assured that I would not have offered to appear before you tonight if I were not convinced that what I have to say deals with a crisis in our national life as great as, if not greater than, any other our people have ever had to face. I appear before you not as a scientist speaking to other scientists but as an American citizen fearful that our Nation is entering upon an exceedingly hazardous path—a path which imperils not only our safety against attack by foreign enemies but which imperils to an equal extent the freedoms for which we have repeatedly fought and bled since the days of the American Revolution. Only in one respect do I speak as a member of our chemical society to his colleagues. I know that as scientists we are better prepared than laymen to appreciate these perils; I am convinced that it is our duty as scientists to use our influence, our energy, and our patriotism to make sure that our country does not enter perilous waters before having a clear chart of the hidden reefs they may conceal.

As we all know, the successful development of an atomic bomb has completely altered all previous concepts of what is needed for national defense; we all realize that the discovery of means for releasing atomic energy raises social and economic questions, the full implications of which no one can at present forecast. It is self-evident that the direction of this powerful tool and dangerous weapon cannot be left to mere chance, and that our country must embark upon a policy of greater governmental controls than any to which even the war years have accustomed us. But before we embark on any course we must make sure by full and open discussion that the restrictions we shall voluntarily accept actually do contribute to our safety and do not infringe unnecessarily upon the rights of freemen.

To achieve national safety and to exercise control over the economic and social consequences of the new scientific discoveries, the May-Johnson bill (S. 1463) has been introduced in Congress. This bill, in my opinion and that of others more qualified than I to judge, completely defeats its major purpose. Not only does it fail to assure our national safety, it actually increases our hazard; not only does it fail to usher us into the new social and economic era with as little impairment of American ideals as possible, actually it undermines the very foundations upon which our national life is built.

Unfortunately I cannot, without encroaching on the original purpose of the meeting, enter upon a detailed discussion of the features of the bill which have led to the opinions I have just expressed; all I can do is to call to your attention some of its dangerous features.

The bill seeks to achieve national safety by throwing around the whole field of atomic energy and all related subjects an impenetrable fog of secrecy. To achieve this secrecy and to maintain our leadership in the field it establishes a commission and administrators in whom is vested complete control over research in this and related fields, as well as control, not only of publication but of discussion of these topics. It imposes severe penalties for disclosure whether intentional or inadvertent of any matters related to atomic energy without the administrators' consent. Finally it authorizes the commission or its administrators to establish its own security division which, since it is responsible only to the administrator, is an excellent imitation of a small gestapo.

Let us first inquire into the effects of those provisions on the national safety. We, as scientists and technologists, are fully aware that no new scientific discovery springs perfected and complete from the brains of men. It is obvious to us that any advantages our country may have gained by being the first to make practical use of atomic energy will inevitably be lost if we do not continue research, invention and technological improvement. As scientists we also know that the greatest enemy of scientific and technological advance is arbitrary secrecy and centralized control—these advances require the cross fertilization resulting from discussion, and the genius of the individual working under the guidance of his own intuiton and talent. Nor

is this all. Progress will cease unless young minds can be trained to participate in the work so that their fresh ideas will continue to keep the field fertile.

This bill not only imposes arbitrary, unchecked, irresponsible control on science and industry but threatens scientists and technologists with severe penalties for infractions of regulations the administrator may set up without a check by any other governmental authority. So far as I can see these regulations need not even be published. For such an infraction the administrator may order an employer, holding a contract with the commission, to discharge any man in his employ without recourse or redress, and may prevent any other contractor from employing the man. For an unintentional violation it may impose a fine of $500 or 30 days imprisonment or both; for intentional violation or merely for gross negligence a fine of $100,000 and 10 years imprisonment. Nor does the bill specify who is to determine whether infraction was intentional or inadvertent, or whether the negligence is great or minor.

Will scientists, technologists, and industry be willing to assume the risks involved by infractions of regulations made by an authority over which no one has control? Will teachers be able to train a new generation to carry on the work started by our generation? Will students enter into a terrain so widely sown with hidden mines of disgrace and punishment? The answer is clear.

But there is another even greater danger. By surrounding the whole field with a smoke screen of secrecy, the bill's method of approach implies that we, the American people, possess knowledge which will prevent other nations from achieving what we have achieved. By so doing the bill implies that all we have to do to be safe is to keep from others the knowledge we have, or the new knowledge which we may acquire in the future. It assumes that others cannot do what we have done or discover the things we may still discover. The Smyth report makes absolutely clear that this is not true. The bill achieves only two ends—both bad. It will force other nations to accelerate their own research in what may be new directions and to keep their discoveries secret; it will give our people a false sense of security that will discourage sustained effort. The ultimate result will be that, as in 1914 and in 1940, we shall be once more unprepared, and that by this very unpreparedness we shall bring on the cataclysm which will engulf us all.

Equally dangerous are other implications of the bill. To achieve its purposes the bill establishes a commission of nine members, normally to be appointed for 9-year terms by the President with the consent of the Senate. But its members are not responsible to the President or to the Senate or to any other authority because they can be removed by the President only for failure to carry out their duties, and not for the nature of the policies they adopt. The commission is required to meet only four times a year—in the intervals between meetings its powers are exercised by an administrator and a deputy administrator, appointed by the commission for a term entirely in the hands of the commission.

The powers which the commission thus delegates to a single individual and his deputy are greater than have ever been put into the hands of any American; they transcend the control of the President, of the Congress, of the courts, of the American people. The administrators will have absolute control over the sources of atomic energy, over production of materials which are related to utilization of atomic energy, over research bearing on atomic energy, even over discussion of atomic energy. The commission, through its administrators, may condemn any property, tangible or intangible, related to atomic energy. And so far as I can understand the bill, it lies in the sole discretion of those 11 men, who are responsible to no higher authority, to determine what is related to atomic energy and what is unrelated. No one knows today what existing patents the administrator may later force the present owner to sell to the commission under the guise that it is important to atomic energy. No one can predict today that the few elements now known to be usefull in releasing atomic energy are the only ones through which that purpose can be achieved. No one knows today what research will be related to atomic energy or for what kinds of investigations the materials and knowledge controlled by these 11 men may be used.

Under the cry of emergency this bill seeks to control discussion, research, and technological advance in a field of science; under the cry of emergency this bill permits the condemnation of property and the penalizing of individuals without the normal safeguards or means of redress; under the cry of emergency this bill was prepared hastily and an obvious effort is being made to force it through the House without adequate hearings. The bill makes very special provisions to allow an Army or a Navy officer to act as administrator and as deputy. It creates a dictatorship in an area of science and industry which will some day pervade all science and all industry, and it provides that this dictatorship may be a military one. Again the excuse is the cry of emergency. But this cry is nothing new; it is always invoked when the freedom of peoples is to be overridden, it is raised whenever individuals or groups seek to increase their power over their fellow men.

We all realize that some secrecy and much regulation will be needed, we know that some bill is necessary. But is it necessary to act hysterically, is it necessary to give up so much of what America has stood for in the past? I am sure that wiser measures can be devised if thought and free discussion are allowed to precede action. I do not ask you to accept my judgment of the bill; I do not ask that you enroll in the ranks of the opposition. But I am convinced that it is your duty to wire and to write at once to your Congressmen and especially to our Senators demanding that precipitate action be avoided and that there be open hearings and wide publicity of the views of all sides.

Aluminum Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Washington Post of October 29, 1945:

ALUMINUM DILEMMA

Within the past 3 weeks a congressional committee, the Department of Justice and the recently dissolved Surplus Property Board have reported on the problems connected with disposal of surplus aluminum plants. All of these reports show that the industry is under the unchallenged domination of the aluminum trust (Alcoa) and that it will continue to be monopolized unless the Government takes drastic steps to subsidize competitors of the trust or itself goes into the business of producing aluminum on a big scale.

Under the law governing disposal of surplus property, Administrator Symington is ordered to develop disposal policies calculated to discourage monopoly, foster free competitive enterprise and assure effective use of surplus property for national defense. That mandate limits his choice of disposal methods, but it does not preclude consideration of alternatives that might necessitate revision of existing legislation.

The aluminum industry expanded sevenfold during the war. More than half the alumina and aluminum producing capacity of the country is now owned by the Government, but as all these producing facilities, with a minor exception, have been leased and operated by Alcoa, the latter's control of producing capacity remains virtually unimpaired. What's more, Alcoa's own expanded plant facilities are more than sufficient to satisfy all the requirements of a greatly increased postwar demand for aluminum. Any independent entering the field would be gravely handicapped by Alcoa's control of practically all the high-grade domestic bauxite.

Alcoa also has access to the cheapest sources of power. Its own plants are so placed as to make for an integrated system of production and fabrication, and well located in respect to markets. On the other hand, Government plants are in many cases too large to fit into an integrated system that independents might desire to develop, and they are scattered over a wide area. To try to promote competition under such conditions would be a quixotic as well as a costly venture, with the outcome admittedly in doubt.

The Surplus Property Administrator is prepared to offer certain plants for sale on terms equivalent to heavy subsidization. He also suggests leasing, with a sharing of profits between the Government and the lessee, the Government possibly to stand losses for an initial period and to review and approve the prices at which the metal would be sold, the salaries paid and extraordinary expenses. In addition, he recommends that the Government supply bauxite to operators from its own stock piles and investigate the possibilities of obtaining foreign ores. The Government would also have to finance the expense of relocating plants to put them in position to compete.

We agree with the Department of Justice that public funds and assistance of this kind provide no adequate solution for the problem of monopoly insofar as aluminum is concerned. "Competition will never become healthy enough to stand on its own legs if it is dependent on so much nursing and propping by the Government." The Department accordingly favors breaking Alcoa into a few independent companies with integrated systems. Under such conditions, it argues, an independent producer, such as Reynolds, would have a better chance of prospering and the way would be open for the entry of newcomers. That still leaves the problem of badly located and oversize plants to be dealt with, but the Department thinks their integration would present fewer difficulties.

There is, however, an alternative to subsidized competition or forced dissolution of Alcoa that deserves consideration. That alternative would be to preserve the efficient organization set up by Alcoa but to subject the trust to regulation as a public utility. Because of the importance of aluminum to the national defense and the civilian economy the industry is "affected with a public interest." The Government might retain certain plants not adapted to profitable commercial utilization, scrap others and establish a measure of protective control over the privately operated Alcoa plants. Such a way out of the dilemma would establish a precedent that might have far-reaching consequences; but in dealing with an entrenched monopoly of the impregnability of Alcoa, strong measures of some sort are unavoidable.

Poles Found Cowed by Fear Into Submission to Regime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article that appeared in New York Times of October 22, 1945, by Gladwin Hill, entitled "Poles Found Cowed by Fear Into Submission to Regime":

POLES FOUND COWED BY FEAR INTO SUBMISSION TO REGIME—60,000 TO 80,000 PRISONERS REPORTED HELD—OSWIECIM CAMP REOPENED—SECRET POLICE WATCH HOMES—NEWSMEN NOTE HOSTILITY

(By Gladwin Hill)

WARSAW, POLAND, October 12.—This is written in Warsaw, but it will not be committed to print until this correspondent is safely out of Poland.

Foreign correspondents at present are being allowed to circulate in Poland under the Potsdam Agreement, and none so far has been harmed, but a definite hostility toward foreign reporting of unquestionable facts already has been displayed.

There also exists throughout the war-torn country today a condition approaching a subtle reign of terror in which there is no assurance of what may happen to critics of the present regime.

There are, however, too many indications of what may happen. The official line advanced by some Government officers is that there are no more than 1,000 political prisoners in Poland today. However, other Government officials have acknowledged to me that there were between 60,000 and 80,000, with the stipulation that the bulk of them is "volksdeutsch"—Polish Germans or Germanized Poles.

The belief is widespread in Warsaw that there are 10,000 at Cracow alone and some responsible observers think the total may be nearer 100,000.

The former German concentration camp at Oswiecim, whose name to any Pole is synonymous with horror, is operating again under Polish auspices and its wire fences have been charged with electricity.

The round-up of persons whose only evident offense was suspected opposition to the current Communist-dominated regime was in any case extensive enough to have netted in recent days a number of individuals with claims on American citizenship, most of whom are still locked up under no specific charges and without trial.

One institution in Warsaw and other cities these days is the Well, a Gestapo-like operation in which the police keep guard for days on end if necessary of a block, a building or part of a building, seizing indiscriminately anyone who visits the place. This might be excused as an ordinary manhunt except that it happens curiously often, involves the detention of innocent people and has spread such fear that I know of innocent people who have stayed away from home nights on end because they had been told that the Well was working in their neighborhood.

I will give other examples of incidents that have contributed to what I have been forced to describe—only after considerable thought and with considerable regret—describe as a near reign of terror in a country whose regime takes pride in being "democratic" and that under the Yalta and Potsdam agreements supposedly is heading for "free democratic elections."

On September 16 the Polish Peasants party, principal opposition threat to the present regime, held a rally at Cracow. One of its prominent regional leaders was a man named Rjeszow Kojder. The day after the rally I was informed authoritatively that four uniformed men had appeared at M. Kojder's home and had taken him away.

Three days later he was found shot to death.

I have just returned from a 10-day automobile trip across Poland under Government auspices. The interpreter on the trip was a young Pole named Alexander Mierzejewski, director of the Government-controlled Polish radio's foreign broadcasting service. M. Mierzejewski, former Oxford student, fought in the Warsaw underground and was tortured in a concentration camp and, as attested by his radio position and his own statement, is a Leftist.

Nevertheless, in the course of the trip it became uncomfortably evident that his friendliness and candor with myself and two other correspondents irritated extremely other high government officials on the trip. On his return to Warsaw M. Mierzejewski received a 24-day leave in Poland. It seemed that a sudden need had been found for his services as an interpreter with the Polish mission in Washington.

This may have been true but, with Polish-English interpreters plentiful, it seems like a curious assignment for an important executive of the Government radio service, on a 24-hour notice, curious enough to have excited comment throughout the Polish Foreign Office.

PROTESTING OFFICIAL DROPPED

On a recent anniversary of the Warsaw uprising the Polish radio had broadcast a prepared script from on-high full of digs at the former Warsaw resistance movement so unpopular in Moscow. The announcer protested and a woman program director, a former underground campaigner, said that she could not, in all conscience, ask him to read it. A program of phonograph records was substituted.

A few days later the woman was called to account for the substitution and then discharged—on the accusation that there had been a discrepancy of $10 in her accounts.

A responsible official told me that an employee of the Polish Foreign Office had been discharged simply because he had lunched too often with foreigners.

One of the generals in the Warsaw uprising who died a few days ago was buried as a plain civilian without due military honors because his relatives feared reprisals.

Any of these incidents may be verbally justified by the Government and some may actually be justified. Nevertheless the fact is that they and thousands of incidents like them that do not occur under an American-idea democracy have engendered a reign of fear—a situation in which the people dare sing the songs of the old Warsaw underground only behind closed doors; in which the "Deutsche Blick"—glance over a shoulder before one says anything—is becoming a universal habit; in which the press uniformly abstains from criticism of the Government and opposition is found only in the illegal underground press, and in which in city after city across Poland I encountered ordinary people afraid to say to what political party they belonged.

There are two principal organizations of a police character in Poland. There is the army nucleus, composed of the Polish forces that fought with the Russians and admittedly largely directed by Russian officers. Then there is the militia, the national police, nominally a civilian organization, but uniformed almost indistinguishably from the army. Ths admittedly also has been subject to strong Russian influence.

The prewar Polish police force was largely discredited by its collaboration with the occupying Germans and with the liberation of Poland a new force had to be built. At first the Government acknowledged the training by Russian police experts, now the Government claims that there is no Russian participation.

Behind the facades of these two organizations are numerous subsections, some of them secret. And it is the general impression among the Poles that the secret police are ubiquitous—the NKVD tag for the Russian secret police is a term you do not have to explain to any one in Poland today—and are responsible for many arrests.

What is the purpose of this reign of fear? There are two obvious possible answers. One is that the police measures were taken to preserve order. If this be the aim the measures are failing notably.

In Polish cities, with shooting a nightly occurrence, even government officials are timid about traveling across the country by night.

The conditions are openly admitted in the newly announced installation of units headed by Russian generals in each of the country's dozen regional divisions for the stated purpose of stopping marauding.

GOVERNMENT EXCUSES METHODS

The other obvious answer is that the present provisional regime is going to these extremes to suppress opposition and perpetuate itself. The official attitude is that sweeping measures were necessary against the reactionary and Fascist elements at large in Poland who jeopardize national unity—an argument curiously exactly as old as authoritarianism itself.

Many foreign observers in Poland feel that this is regrettable because, aside from the current regime's strong Red tinge and aside from its obvious political maneuverings to perpetuate itself, which is perhaps expectable on the part of any regime, it is making a manful effort to pull Poland out of her almost unprecedented economic desolation.

The Father of Two Servicemen Speaks Out on Demobilization Delays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, most Members of Congress have their desks piled high with letters from mothers, wives, sweethearts, and sisters of servicemen; rarely, however, do fathers write. Therefore I read with a great deal of interest a letter which came to my desk very recently from Mr. Morgan L. Fitch, 7915 Exchange Avenue, Chicago, in which Mr. Fitch does not mince matters in a portrayal of a father's sentiments toward the continued service of his two boys in the armed forces of the United States. Mr. Fitch, among other things, characterizes the continued service of boys in the fighting forces as "an outright larceny of the very lives, spirits, and souls of the men of our country and the young men who have already given more than their share to the horrible business of war."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I respectfully include the letter of Mr. Fitch in the RECORD:

CHARLES RINGER CO.,
Chicago, October 23, 1945.

Congressman WILLIAM A. ROWAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: I have restrained myself from writing this letter as long as I possibly can. I know something of the tedious delay involved in all military operation. I can appreciate, too, the reluctance of men of military rank to lose their commands. I understand the hesitancy of Congress to interfere in military operation even in peacetime.

But this business of holding American boys against their will in military service for protracted periods after war is over has gone beyond all reason. It is fast becoming a major social crime—an outright larceny of the very lives, spirits, and souls of the young men of our country, of young men who have already given far more than their share to the horrible business of war. And it is making anarchists of their fathers and mothers who are writhing in the futility of their own inability to do anything about the situation.

We must look to Congress for relief. We are entitled to look to Congress. That body has no job so important, so vital to human decency, to the national welfare as the immediate demobilization of the Army and Navy.

I know that the labor situation is critical. I know that the atom bomb presents a great problem. I know that international relations are important. But all of them collectively pale into insignificance compared to the magnitude of the crisis being created by the mass thievery of the vital years of young men's lives in the interest of vanity, confusion, and neglect.

My own two sons have been in service, one in the Navy, one in the Army, for almost 3 years. They enlisted voluntarily, although they would, of course, have been picked up soon after in the draft. They were throbbing with idealism, an earnest, eager desire to do their part. One of them fought all over the South Pacific on an escort carrier, finally missing death only by a miracle when a suicide bomber went through his ship. The other fought through the mud and blood, the sorrow and suffering of infantry war in the vanguard of the Third Army across France, Belgium, and Germany.

They are still in uniform, doing—as far as I can determine—nothing except destroying their own lives.

There is no answer to be found in the statement that we haven't got ships, that we must police foreign countries, that we must "win the peace." The answer is to get the ships. We got them to ship them over. The answer is to let the foreign nations police themselves. They must do so eventually. The answer is that by our present program we are "losing the peace" anyway.

I ask you, please, not so much as a Congressman, but as one father to another, as one citizen to another, to lend your hand to the relief of the distress of millions of parents and get these boys home—not just my boys, but the boys of America.

Sincerely yours,

MORGAN.

The Zionist Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an excerpt from Barnet Nover's column in the Washington Post of October 27 with relation to the Zionist problem and the underlying reason for Arab opposition to the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine:

Recently there was made public the text of an exchange of letters between the late President Roosevelt and his "great and good friend," ibn-Saud.

In this exchange ibn-Saud spoke bitterly of the Zionist experiment in Palestine. His letter was a curious melange of crooked history and dour threats. The one thing he was careful to avoid discussing, however, was whether the mandate in Palestine has been of advantage or disadvantage to the Arabs.

Ibn-Saud happens to be one of the few absolutist rulers left in the world. Within his realm there isn't the shadow of a suspicion of the "four freedoms." Indeed, in Saudi Arabia, no Christian, Jew, or dissident Mohammedan is allowed to take residence. But that system of exclusion has not led to any great improvement in the lot of the nomadic tribes who inhabit the vast region. They still live lives that, for the most part, are the same as that lived by their ancestors a millennium ago.

It is clear that what ibn-Saud is afraid of is that the example of what is happening in Palestine, where western science and technology have transformed a desert into an oasis, will undermine the foundations of his rule.

In this respect ibn-Saud reflects the views of the rest of the top crust of Arab spokesmen. The banner they raise is the banner of self-determination. But what they seek is the perpetuation of their feudal control.

How About Government by the People in Settling the Conscription Issue?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, is it the intention of the administration to force a decision on military conscription without allowing the people a fair chance to participate in this momentous verdict? Military conscription would result in the most far-reaching surrender of individual liberty in the history of America.

Is is too much to ask that the humble people of America have a part in this decision? It was their sons who died, and it was their work that turned out the weapons of victory.

Mr. Speaker, it is very easy on the argument over compulsory training to substitute "authority" for "truth." The following excerpt from Barron's seems to explode one or two of the favorite arguments for conscription and uses the Army's own figures in so doing:

CONSCRIPTION

Questionable assumptions lie behind President Truman's recommendation for conscription, or universal training as he prefers to call it. The recommendation, and the arguments for it, follow closely the line laid down by Army Chief of Staff General Marshall in his recent biennial report.

There the general says that "even with our overwhelming concentration of air power and fire power, this war has been the most costly of any in which the Nation has been engaged." He then proceeds to make a tabular comparison of battle deaths in all our wars, showing also the average per month, during each war, but making no mention of the differences in population. He compares on the same basis the battle deaths in the Revolutionary War, when our population was less than 4,000,000, with those in the war just ended. If his figures are taken in relation to population, on the other hand, the Civil War was by far the most costly, with 194,000 battle deaths out of a population of 31,500,000, as against 265,000 in this last war out of a population of more than 131,000,000.

Let us examine also the general's argument tying together "the enormous cost of this conflict" and the fact that "we were so completely unprepared." The deaths and defeats which may be ascribed directly to our lack of preparation are solely those incurred in the Japanese war, since we carefully avoided fighting the Germans until we were ready to do so. General Marshall's own figures show that Army battle deaths in the Japanese war were almost exactly one-quarter of those in the European conflict, about 40,000 against 160,000. We lost more men in the war for which we had time to prepare than in the one which was forced on us.

PREPAREDNESS

Of course, it is still true that we would have lost fewer men and much less territory if we had been completely ready for the Japs. But no one, not General Marshall, nor President Truman, talks of always being completely ready. What the President recommends is a general Reserve composed of all male citizens, who are to receive military training. It would still be necessary at the start of a war to induct them into the armed forces and to supply them with clothes and weapons. They would not have helped us one bit when the Japanese attacked us in December 1941.

The President says that "in any future war the heart of the United States would be the enemy's first target." Undoubtedly true, but how would the existence of a trained civilian Reserve help defend us against such an attack? It wouldn't. The Reserve might speed up the process of assembling an army for defense against the invasion which would follow the robot-atom attack. But whether that army would be a very effective one is a question about which there is grave doubt. The lesson of this last war is that the professional military powers lost to the amateurs. This was partly because the amateurs did not suffer the psychological handicap of owning a lot of obsolescent equipment, since they had little or no equipment. They were forced to start with everything that was newest and most powerful.

It is also questionable how long-lasting would be the value of civilian reservist training. In the majority of cases the military skills so learned would soon be out of date even if remembered. How many men of 25 can still use the algebra they learned at school?

Hutchins' Great Gamble—Chancelor Hutchins Says "Yes"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, the story of the important part played by the University of Chicago in the atomic bomb development, and particularly the momentous decision of Chancelor Robert

M. Hutchins, is told in an article written by Lloyd Lewis and published in the Chicago Sun on October 28. I herewith insert in the RECORD a copy of Mr. Lloyd Lewis' very informative article:

HUTCHINS' GREAT GAMBLE

(By Lloyd Lewis)

Ever since the atom bomb went off I have been vainly watching the national magazines and such out-of-town newspapers as I could see and listening on the radio for some adequate recognition of the University of Chicago's leadership in the production of that awesome event.

In local newspapers the Midway's work in producing the bomb has been hailed, but a strange silence has reigned elsewhere. The magazines and syndicates have curiously slighted if not eliminated the university. They have dug into the tomb to bring out all the obscure or famous scientists of the past whose experiments laid the groundwork for atom breaking. They have gone into detail about what other universities did, about what the United States Army did, what the humble workers in plants did—and the radio orators, the statesmen have all taken the same line. But nobody outside Chicago has faced the simple fact that if Chancelor Robert M. Hutchins hadn't said "Yes" to Washington on a certain day in 1943, there would as yet have been no bomb.

There came a day in 1943 when nobody else was able or willing to take the gamble of running a large pilot plant to make atomic bombs. Prior to that Professor Einstein had sent a committee to President Roosevelt urging him to see if the atom couldn't be broken in time to be of use in the war. Roosevelt had put scientists on the job. At Columbia, California, and the University of Chicago secret experiments were made. At the Midway the scientists, working at Stagg Field and at Palos Park, reported that the thing was near enough to warrant a large-scale, all-out effort. Columbia and California reported the same.

INDUSTRY DID A SIDE-STEP

The problem then confronting the War Department, to whom President Roosevelt had given the decision, was to find somebody who could manage a pilot plant to see whether the bomb could be manufactured on a large scale. It would be a colossal industrial scale. It would be dangerous very likely, to life and limb, and dangerous to the prestige of the manufacturer should, as was very possible, the whole thing fail.

Whoever undertook the job would be responsible for the expenditure of millions of dollars.

For one reason or another the big industrialists side-stepped. No other university came forward. It was perfectly plain that if a university assumed the task, spent the money, called in the top scientists of the world, hid them in their secret laboratories for years, and then came up with nothing, it would be laughed at for a generation, probably for always.

A GOVERNMENT INVITATION

This, then, was the situation on that certain day in 1943 when the War Department came to Hutchins and asked him if he would take the great gamble.

And it would be, Hutchins, of course, knew, a greater gamble for him than for any other university president, since he was already regarded by the conservative scholars of the land as a reckless innovator. They had blasted at him for years because of his experiments in education, his booting of football off the Midway, his award of the A. B. degree to 18-year-olds, his scorn of manual training, his enmity to science, his withering comments upon the waste of students' time in the conventional colleges. Also, a large sector of his own faculty had been at odds with him on policy and could be depended upon to press for his removal if his adventure with the bomb turned into a fiasco. It would be merely proof on a grand scale of their claim that he was impractical.

The young university president must have turned all this over and over as he listened to the War Department invitation. Should he commit the university to a stupendous industrial effort when it was not an engineering institution at all and was, instead, devoted to the humanities?

He couldn't ask his trustees for advice. The thing was too secret. He couldn't ask anybody. We were at war. He had opposed the war before Pearl Harbor, been pilloried, in fact, as an isolationist, an "American Firster," although he had never belonged to that organization nor shared many of its credos.

"HUTCHINS' BIGGEST FLOP"

There was drama in the air that day when he made up his mind whether to say "Yes" or "No" to a question that might end the war, might, indeed, end the world altogether, or produce limitless benefits to man. Time and events had brought him to a crisis. He stood, in effect, between two worlds, the one that had been and the one that could be. The warriors and the industrialists had put it up to the educator, and the educator gulped and then said "Yes."

From that moment the atom bomb was in production. The pilot plant went up. The scientists, under assumed names, vanished, as did the workers, into great areas of silence. Industry threw itself into the work. Columbia, California, other universities. Scientists from many institutions labored at it. Countless hands were in it, but the University of Chicago's responsibility was so well recognized on several other campuses across the Nation that professors were laughing there, only a few weeks before the bomb actually blew, at "Hutchins' biggest flop."

NAGASAKI SUPERMEN?

The War Department eventually let Hutchins tell a select few of his trustees what he had committed the university to. But it was not till the bomb went off that even they knew how the gamble was going.

So that is the story which hasn't to date been told the world outside the range of Chicago's press. Why, I do not know. If Hutchins hadn't said "Yes," we might still be at war and nobody might be planning as men now are to melt the polar ice cap and turn it into a habitable region. And we might never have heard, as I am assured we will by next April, that it is entirely feasible to heat and light the world with atomic energy and that one ton of uranium will heat and light the United States for 2 years.

And we might not be hearing, as I have, that the scientists think it entirely possible that the atomic energy loosed in the bomb burst may affect the genetic powers of persons in the vicinity, producing perhaps supermen in the region of Nagasaki—maybe, indeed, producing a whole lot of men with the courage of Bob Hutchins.

Renunciation of Anti-Semitism by Robert Ley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Robert Ley's amazing renunciation of anti-Semitism and the Washington Post editorial commenting on it. The astounding mea culpa confession of this architect of nazism in its vilest form, his call to his people to cleanse their mental and spiritual house, gave hope to the world that there is decency in the basest of human beings which is bound to find expression. It is unfortunate that the man did not have the courage to present himself at the bar of world justice and back up his dying message by repeated exhortation to the Germans that murderous intolerance bent on wiping out minority groups has always proven the downfall of a people and always will, because it violates man's better instincts nourished by the teachings of true religion and devotion to God's word. It would be well for Americans who harbor in their hearts intolerance for minorities in this country to pay solemn heed to Ley's dying message.

The article and editorial follow:

ANTI-SEMITISM NAZI'S MISTAKE, LEY ADMITS IN LAST TESTAMENT

Do I have a right to appeal to the German people after its singular catastrophe? I have been one of the responsible men, I was with Hitler in the good old days, during the fulfillment of our plans and hopes, and I want to be with him now in the black days.

I have learned to see in everything the hand of Providence. God led me in whatever I did. He led me up and now lets me fall. I am torturing myself to find the reason for the downfall, and this is the result of my contemplations:

We have forsaken God, and therefore we were forsaken by God.

We put our human volition in the place of His godly grace. In anti-Semitism we violated a basic commandment of His creation.

DISTORTED BY ANTI-SEMITISM

Anti-Semitism distorted our outlook, and we made grave errors. It is hard to admit mistakes, but the whole existence of our people is in question; we Nazis must have the courage to rid ourselves of anti-Semitism. We have to declare to the youth that it was a mistake.

The youth will not believe our opponents. Men may fall, parties and systems disappear, but the people must remain and live.

In order to succeed, we have to go all the way to tolerate the new. This is not enough. We have to eradicate distrust. We have to meet the Jews with open hearts and on a clear basis. We have to clean up our mutual relationship. A complete reconciliation has to be found, and a new modus vivendi. This doctrinal (Weltans-Chaulich) clarification has the priority over any economic or cultural reconstruction. We have to have the courage to do this.

For the lack of any other ideal, youth will stick to national socialism. The deported Jews will not be able to return carefree, they will find themselves opposed by a phalanx of defense and hate, the occupation troops will leave some day, new political constellations might give Germany new chances. Nothing is more unstable than peace agreements. Then anti-Semitism would flame up anew and rage much worse than ever before.

TRIALS WON'T SOLVE PROBLEM

It is unwise to believe it possible to exterminate anti-Semitism with histronic trials no difference how skillfully they are conducted. On the contrary, one will achieve the opposite, one will steer world opinion to a problem which can only maintain itself in dark, unless one has courage to solve Jewish problem by public discussions and enlightenment. One cannot stop the excited sea at once, but has to let her calm down gradually. Otherwise terrible repercussions will result.

German anti-Semites have taken the first step. They have to take the second step, too. Jewry has to reconcile herself with Germany and vice versa, for the sake of world peace and of world welfare, not an armistice, but a peace built on logic, knowledge, clear rights and obligations is necessary. The Jew should make a friend out of Germany and Germany a friend out of the Jew. If humanity is not able to control again the stirred-up emotions, she will perish through them.

The emotions have to be subdued at the starting point, from Germany. They have to be calmed down. Here the outspoken anti-Semites have become the first fighters for the new and yet old idea. They have to find the courage to conquer themselves, they have to show their people the way. God has taught me that in my cell in Nuernberg, and now my plan:

A. First, the creation of a board of Jews and anti-Semites, honestly prepared to travel this road and to find the conditions under which Jews and Germans can live together.

B. Executive committee, again Jews and Germans together, to execute the agreed-upon arrangements.

C. An organization for reeducation and propaganda to disseminate these ideas down to the smallest village.

For the moment I have no more to say. Otherwise my plan will become obscure. Doubtless there is still plenty to be talked over.

German people: Many of you might think me mad or a traitor. They do not realize that I am not admitting a mistake, but that I am merely coming to a logical conclusion. They cannot perceive that one must have been an anti-Semitic (sic) to come to this further step of knowledge. This is why only you, my German people, may dare to invite the Jews to make their future home with you. Is it not strange that nearly all Jews all over the world understand German? Hate and love lie close together.

JEWS COULD HELP REBUILD

Who will help you rebuild, my German people? It is a question of confidence. The prerequisite is and remains the solution to the Jewish problem in Germany. German people: Be a good family father, make an honest balance. You have been totally defeated, yet you possess a marvelous logic, idea, and are a great people. God shows you the way. Learn from your downfall. Reconcile yourself with the Jew. Invite him to make his home with you.

Is the Jew prepared to go along? If he is intelligent—yes. If not, then I cannot change that. At least I have done my duty by showing humanity the road. God showed me. If the Jews refuse my plan, then the depleted world catastrophe will take its inevitable course.

Should Germany solve the Jewish problem, and grow healthy through it, the whole world would benefit from it. This most burning problem of the whole world would be solved once and for all. Zionism in its present form is not a permanent solution. Germany is ripe to solve the Jewish problem.

LEY SAYS PLAN IS BOLD

I know my plan is bold, almost audacious. If one should ask me what the Fuehrer would have said, my answer would be: "This singular genius, a commander in chief like Hannibal, would not want Germany to perish as Carthage perished."

All I can say is that I dared it, I put it now into the hands of God, from whom I believe I have received the inspiration and revelation.

Only a few weeks ago, I did not dare to touch the subject of anti-Semitism. Today it is entirely clear to me. I am possessed with this idea, now God has to help me to bring my thoughts to the appropriate place. I have confidence in Him. He will find the right way.

[From the Washington Post]

THE REAL SURRENDER

Doenitz surrendered Germany's arms. Robert Ley has surrendered something more vital and more significant—the ideology which led the German people to aggression and to disaster. Arms can be wrested from a beaten people; ideas are less easy to take away. Yet the ideas which dominated the Germans, which diverted them from the cultural growth of their fellow men and turned them back to the discarded savageries of a primitive past—these, and not the German people, are our mortal enemies. And it is these that must be uprooted, extinguished, taken away from the life of Germany, before that nation can once more resume its proper partnership in the society of mankind.

Robert Ley has left as a legacy to his people the renunciation of Nazi ideology. His conversion is not to be dismissed because it came within the shadow of death; it was motivated by no hope of earthly salvation. There is a ring of conviction, of the fanaticism characteristic of the Nazi mind, in the remorse expressed by this unhappy culprit just before he put an end to his own misguided life. It does not follow, of course, that he spoke for his people, simply because he spoke to them. The signs of genuine remorse are pitifully scarce among the Germans. And it remains to be seen whether his legacy will be accepted by them. But it is nonetheless significant in spite of this uncertainty. Ley was a leader—and moreover an intellectual leader of considerable stature. His recantation may be at once portentous and of great influence. It carries the impact of a revelation. And it points the inescapable and only way toward the spiritual regeneration of his countrymen.

Robert Ley has rediscovered the Christianity which is not a theological dogma but a way of life. He has rediscovered the meaning of conscience. "We have forsaken God," he wrote, "and therefore we were forsaken by God. We put our human volition in the place of His godly grace. In anti-Semitism we violated a basic commandment of His creation."

Here is a negation of the whole arrogant doctrine of supremacy which was the nexus of the Nazi cult. Anti-Semitism was merely one of the earliest and ugliest manifestations of the disease which warped and subverted the German mind. Its terrible consequences there afford a tragic lesson for all peoples among whom the virus may exist.

It was this same Robert Ley who wrote but a few years ago: "Only what Adolf Hitler, our Fuehrer, commands, allows, or does not allow is our conscience. We have no understanding for him who hides behind an anonymous conscience, behind God, whom everybody conceives according to his own wishes." And now Robert Ley has learned that the individual human spirit is, after all, supreme; that there can be no denial of individual responsibility. It was the surrender of self to the dictates of an earthly leader that was the undoing of the German people. It is the reassertion of the sovereign dignity and worth of the individual human conscience which alone will restore Germans to fellowship among men.

Ley said a shrewd thing in his testament: "It is unwise to believe it possible to exterminate anti-Semitism with histrionic trials, no matter how skillfully they are conducted. On the contrary, one will achieve the opposite * * * unless one has courage to solve the Jewish problem by public discussions and enlightenment." There is a lesson and a legacy in this for the conquerors. The Germans can be helped; but in the end they must work out their own regeneration. Ley's testament should be blazoned on all the lintels of their doorposts. Its words are words which have welled up from one of their own, from among themselves. They must not merely learn it, but must come to understand it, and to accept it, and to live by it. This will be their real surrender. And only when they are thus disarmed and re-created will our own victory be real.

Labor Difficulties of the Motor Express Industry in Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose herewith a letter from Mr. M. W. West, Laurel, Miss., a returned veteran of my congressional district. This man is both a veteran and a small businessman, both of whom are the subjects of much lip service here on the floor. I think his letter will prove most interesting to those who really want to help the small businessman and the returned serviceman.

His letter follows:

WEST BROS. MOTOR EXPRESS,
Laurel, Miss., October 5, 1945.

Hon. BILL COLMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: When I was drafted for the Army I was told that I was being drafted to save the world from dictatorship. However, on being discharged last week after 18 months under fire in Europe, I go to New Orleans to rest for 2 weeks and the first sight that reached my eyes when I stepped out of my car in front of my New Orleans office was a picket with a sign stating that West Bros. Motor Express was unfair to the teamster union.

I immediately went to work talking to my men and was informed by them that they were not interested in paying anyone for the privilege of working, and that the War Labor Board had held a strike vote for the entire system and that the vote had been 97 percent against striking. As 90 percent of our employees live in Mississippi, I asked all of them what they thought of West Bros. Motor Express signing a contract with a union and was informed by 100 percent of them that if I signed a contract with any union that they would not work for us as they did not want to pay for the privilege of working.

I next contacted the business agent of the local union in New Orleans and was informed by him that unless I signed a contract with him that I could forget about operating in New Orleans. This contract called for all of my employees to belong to his union or else discharge them. The contract he wanted me to sign has broke every truck line that has signed it owing to the fact that our rates are lower than they were in 1942 and as we cannot carry more than 20,000 pounds in Mississippi and are at present 6 percent higher than the railroad.

Before each battle I went into, I was given a pep talk to the effect that we were fighting to save the world from dictatorship, and after doing this for 18 months and during this time seeing a large number of my best friends killed, a great number of them wounded and crippled for life, I am brought back home disarmed and then told by the War Labor Board and several lawyers that unless I sign a contract forcing all of my employees against their will to pay a party who cannot even speak good English for the privilege of working, who hire men to follow my trucks and tell the shippers that if

they ship by my trucks that he will see that they are caused plenty of trouble, it seems that I have been fighting in vain.

I cannot believe that while I was dodging bullets and living in mud, seeing my buddies killed, that the lawmakers surrendered this country to a bunch of racketeers with a penitentiary record and gave them a Federal license to levy a tribute on all who wanted to work.

I would appreciate your advising me how it is possible to operate my business without having to sign a contract against my employees' will forcing them to pay tribute for the privelege as it was my intention to provide jobs for over 50 of my buddies who went through hell with me and I believe that you will agree with me that they have paid a high enough price at present without me signing a contract forcing them to pay tribute.

I am not asking for sympathy or any help, only for the chance to make a living and provide a job for anyone who might want it without paying tribute.

If you wish to check my service record it is Sgt. Macon W. West, ASN 34279399, Seventy-ninth Division, Three Hundred and Fifteenth Infantry, Company H.

I would appreciate an early reply as to how to conduct this business. Do not think that I am against my employees belonging to any union they wish but I want them to be able to work if they want to without belonging to any union.

Respectively yours,

M. W. WEST.

The Chickens Come Home to Roost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of October 26, 1945:

THE CHICKENS COME HOME TO ROOST

General Motors Corp. concedes fatalistically that its 325,000 employees are almost certain to be led out on strike by the CIO United Automobile Workers. The company's statement is that "in such strike votes the vote is usually overwhelmingly in favor of the strike," although most workers don't want to strike and hope that the mere threat of a walkout will bring the employer to terms.

General Motors prophesies that the strike may be of long duration, and its only request is that its employees refrain from violence and cause no damage to plants and equipment with which the workers must earn their living when the strike is finally brought to an end.

The labor dispute which is coming to a head in the Nation's largest automotive enterprise is not an isolated instance of friction between capital and labor. The Nation is torn by labor strife. It would be hard to find a major industry which is not facing trouble.

While all of this is happening the Truman administration is sunk in hopeless apathy. President Truman's abilities are being subjected to stresses which would tax the capacities of a far more resourceful and competent man. So far he has manifested little ability to cope with them. If his administration proves a failure he cannot be held altogether, or even primarily, to blame. He is the inheritor of a veritable Pandora's box of troubles, both on the domestic front and in the field of international affairs. The late President Roosevelt, who was the author of the difficulties, would be no better equipped to avoid the inevitable smash which was being stored up by the policies he created.

It was Mr. Roosevelt who, by establishing lopsided favoritism in the regulation of labor disputes, built up a hierarchy of union leaders who have grown too big for the country. It was Mr. Roosevelt who, by encouraging such leadership to press their demands ever more relentlessly, misled millions of workingmen into the belief that they were entitled to "rights" which are now approaching such dimensions that the national economy cannot sustain them. It was Mr. Roosevelt whose bland promises, made in the expectation of votes, encouraged the notion that the employer is always wrong. It was the Roosevelt price regulations which now leave producers with the option of operating at a loss if they assent to wage increases which Mr. Roosevelt was willing to require employers to shell out.

If these problems are too big for Mr. Truman, what can one say of his heritage from Mr. Roosevelt in foreign relations? Mr. Roosevelt was not only willing to put the affairs of the United States in an unholy mess, but he insured that the world would enter a period of anarchy and trouble without precedent in history. His decisions at Yalta, which Mr. Truman felt bound to follow at Potsdam, have reduced Europe to misery. Unworkable economic dispositions, starvation, enslavement, and political tyranny are his legacy to hundreds of millions of Europeans.

Mr. Roosevelt made one concession after another to Russia, and not one of the resulting injustices can be recalled. He stored up more trouble for his successor by encouraging every nation in the world to believe that America's wealth and resources were inexhaustible, and that they were to be had for the asking. He is responsible for the belief prevalent in Britain that it is somehow our obligation to carry the empire indefinitely on a remittance basis. The presence of the Keynes mission in Washington today to press its request for $6,000,000,000 is attributable to Mr. Roosevelt.

In all these actions it is easier to perceive expediency, vanity, and the personal ambition of attaining a place in history than it is to discover wisdom or a regard for morality. Europeans are the victims of some of these decisions, colonial peoples of others. But Americans are the victims of all of them. The strife and class conflict at home are but part of the legacy. The hate and resentment of millions of foreigners who have suffered as a consequence of Mr. Roosevelt's intervention await their fulfillment on some future day of reprisal. The chickens hatched during 12 years are coming home to roost.

Should Price Control Be Retained?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the well-being of the people of America depends upon the intelligence and integrity of the administration in not hamstringing economic recovery.

On scientific problems in engineering, physics, and chemistry, Government heeds the studies of competent students and research experts. The atomic bomb was the work of such scientists, carefully discovering and implementing the natural laws involved.

Our economic welfare is governed by similar natural laws, but will the administration listen to those whose economic studies have qualified them to speak with authority? Most enlightening is the recent study by Harold G. Moulton and Karl T. Schlotterbeck entitled "Should Price Control Be Retained?" published by the Brookings Institution last month:

Will the administration have the courage to be guided by the findings of these eminent scientists?

Or will the President, instead, be persuaded by his White House advisers to follow the primrose path so eloquently described by Dr. R. S. Tucker:

"When a private businessman makes a mistake he either finds it out pretty quickly and corrects it, or else the sheriff and the receiver in bankruptcy corrects it for him. But when a governmental planner makes a mistake all he has to do is to persuade the voters that his critics are scoundrels, and then he can go on repeating his mistakes for another term of years, and paying for them with other people's money; and if he uses that money to lengthen his term or to increase his power, can he be blamed for it? That is what dictators and tyrants have done regularly since the dawn of history."

The following paragraphs constitute the summary of the Brookings report on prices:

The inflation outlook as a whole appears to involve some restraining factors and some danger tendencies.

The favorable elements in the situation are as follows:

1. Agricultural production and supply are, or shortly will be, so large in all except a few lines that extensive price declines will occur, unless prices are artificially supported at present levels. A fall to the present legal support level at 90 percent of parity would mean a drop of approximately 20 percent.

2. Mineral raw materials, with few exceptions, will be abundant. Supplies on hand plus potential production are adequate to meet any prospective demands.

With large supplies of raw materials available, the danger of inventory speculation is slight. All that is required is to make public at frequent intervals full information as to the supply situation. The Government is also in a position to check any speculative tendency by releasing some of its own accumulated supplies.

With abundant food supplies in prospect, there would seem to be little reason for food profiteering. Again, the Government is in a position to check speculative buying by releasing Government supplies. The supply and price situation in foodstuffs is, of course, of primary importance from the standpoint of the cost of living.

3. Industrial capacity in general is large enough to permit production schedules very much above the levels of 1940–41. Supplies of a wide range of semifinished and finished products can thus be increased very rapidly. In most lines there would appear to be no occasion for consumer scrambling for short supplies.

The principal danger spots are as follows:

1. There are acute shortages in the durable goods field which might encourage profiteering. This situation, however, is safeguarded by the fact that as much as 80 percent of the production is in the hands of some 20 companies, which are subject to strong competition and which have long had low-price policies.

2. There is a powerful movement for higher wage rates. If wage rates generally are increased with a view to maintaining wartime purchasing power after work schedules have been reduced, costs would be increased pretty

much all along the line in the field of industrial production. Or if they are increased in special lines, a whole series of readjustments in the interrelated cost and price structure will become necessary. The major inflationary danger at the present time lies in the possibility of rapid wage advances.

In summary, this analysis has established the following points:

1. The rapid advance in prices in 1919–20 was rooted in the fear of shortages of raw materials and foodstuffs, which led to speculative buying and inventory accumulation on a vast scale. In the acute stage, we had the familiar spiral of rising prices, rising costs, and again rising prices. Consumer goods prices rose less than the prices of producer goods, and we eventually had a consumers' strike against the high cost of living.

2. Today we are faced with surpluses rather than shortages of most raw materials and food prodcts. With the information as to supplies now available, businessmen have little reason to engage in speculative buying of raw material inventories. Moreover, the Government is in a position to check inventory speculation, whether in foodstuffs or raw materials, by releasing supplies now controlled by the services and the Surplus Property Board.

3. The acute shortages are confined chiefly to the field of durable consumer goods, where 80 percent of the production is accounted for by 20 companies which have consistently exemplified the principle of mass production, low unit costs, and low prices to consumers.

4. War experience in this and other countries has demonstrated that the control of wage rates, the most important element in costs, is indispensable to price stabilization. In the light of the newly announced policy of relaxing wage controls and increasing wage rates in order to sustain purchasing power, firm control over costs, and hence over prices, has been surrendered.

5. The transition from war to peace affects the cost-price situation quite differently in the various divisions of industry. Accordingly, the whole price structure has to be revised. Moreover, since rising costs in any particular industry will affect costs in related industries, continuous review and readjustment of prices is necessary to meet the needs of a rapidly changing situation. The time required for any administrative agency to make wise and equitable price readjustments is so great that the expansion of production and employment would be seriously impeded.

6. Without effective control over wage costs, all that the OPA can hope to accomplish is to retard price advances by delays in granting price relief or by applying "the squeeze" somewhere along the line.

7. The announced policy of requiring distributors to absorb increased costs at the manufacturing level greatly magnifies the problem of price control at the retail end. War experience indicates that rationing is essential to the control of retail prices in lines where there are acute shortages. But it is apparently recognized that a rationing system for durable-consumer goods in peacetime would not be tolerated.

8. The principal argument advanced for the continuation of price control is that it is necessary to prevent the excess purchasing power from pulling up prices where shortages exist. We have shown that if the price stabilization program were successful, the excess purchasing power would not have disappeared; hence it would be necessary to continue the price control indefinitely. Similarly, we have shown that if prices are adjusted upward because of wage or other cost increases, there is no foreseeable stopping place; price control would have to be retained as long as inflationary pressures from the cost side existed.

In the light of this analysis we reach the conclusion that, beyond the setting of initial prices for products whose manufacture was suspended during the war, the continuation of price control is impracticable. Without wage stabilization and without rationing, the OPA is not in any case in a position to hold the price line. And the process of continuously reviewing and readjusting a multitude of prices to meet the needs of a rapidly changing situation would be so time-consuming that the expansion of production and employment would inevitably be retarded.

If the President and the administration are truly trying to stop inflation, and not merely "conceal inflation" a courageous stand against spiraling costs must come about immediately.

Protect Labor's Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Memphis Press-Scimitar:

PROTECT LABOR'S POWER

In days when labor was organized weakly and ineffectively, if at all, the Scripps-Howard newspapers championed the principle that labor should be organized strongly and effectively.

We believed then that workers, for the country's good as well as for their own, should have power to deal on equal terms with powerful employers. We believe that just as firmly now.

Another principle in which we have always believed, and which we have consistently championed, is that organized power in any hands needs checks and balances against its abuse.

A sound and deep instinct in the American people has impelled them, time after time, to demand that concentrated power be controlled and required to live up to its public responsibilities. This has been the case with the railroads, with the banks, with the stock exchanges, with the utilities, with other great forces in our national life.

It will be so, we think, with organized labor.

No one should be surprised—and we are not—to see organized labor abuse the power which, with Government's help, it has now attained.

The recent demonstrations that headstrong union officers or undisciplined union members can deprive the Nation of coal or oil, shut off telephones from coast to coast, paralyze essential services in great cities, obstruct the industrial reconversion on which so many hopes depend—these are alarming. They are not surprising. For the tendency to abuse unrestrained power is one of the commonest of human failings.

Nor are we surprised to find labor leaders desperately resisting proposals for legal restraints on organized labor's power. They are pursuing a normal, human course. It is presumably too much to expect of them clearer vision than was displayed in previous times by railroad presidents, bankers, stock-exchange officials, and utility magnates. All of these desperately resisted legal restraints on their power, though few of them would now go back, if they could, to conditions under which liberty was perverted into license.

But it is reasonable to expect Congress to legislate in the public interest where labor is concerned, as it has legislated where other powerful forces were concerned.

No organized group should be free, any more than an individual is free, from obligation to fulfill a contract entered into in good faith, or from penalty for violating such a contract.

No organized group should be free, any more than an individual is free, to make reckless use of a dangerous weapon—and in our complex economy the right to strike is a deadly, dangerous weapon—without regard for the safety of innocent bystanders.

No organized group should be free to employ antitrust law immunities, granted for protection of its legitimate activities, as a cloak for predatory and antisocial practices.

No organized group whose activities deeply affect the public interest should be free to conduct its own affairs by undemocratic methods.

Seeing no evidence that organized labor will restrain its own tendency to abuse of power, we believe that restraints will be imposed by legislation. We hope the legislation will be wise, so that labor's power may be preserved for proper use.

No Starvation Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 19, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is now pending before the Committee on Labor, of which it is my privilege to be a member, proposed legislation to require everyone hiring another to pay a minimum wage of at least 65 cents an hour, to be increased later to 75 cents an hour.

It is only natural that those who hire others want to do so as cheaply as possible, just as those who work for others wish to get as much as they can for their services. There are a few employers who would pay even less than what might be called a decent wage, just as there are employees who would force an employer to comply with their demands, even though they knew it would break him financially.

Every sensible employer knows that an employee should be paid enough so that he has sufficient to eat, to clothe himself, have adequate shelter and fuel, something for a rainy day and for the education of his children. Every employee knows an employer must have a profit or he cannot provide jobs. There are few, if any, employers who either attempt or desire to operate a "sweat shop," though if we listen to the professional breeders of discontent we might think otherwise.

Practically all the people in this country, whether they be workers or hirers of workers, employees or employers, have a laudable desire to acquire more than they have. That is as it should be. Without ambition, we would have stagnation; then, deterioration, until we would all descend to a hand-to-mouth existence.

Under our system of government, the barefoot boy, with little more than his cheek of tan, has had and now has opportunity to reach the White House. Lincoln was the greatest, Truman is the latest, to prove conclusively that this—yes, this land in which you and live

now—today—is the land of opportunity; all the preachments of the calamity howlers; all the detractors of our Constitution, of our system of government; all the creators of abuse against businessmen, industrialists, those who have property, to the contrary notwithstanding. Henry Ford and others have demonstrated that here it is possible to acquire millions, do it honestly, pay a fair wage, give the public more for its dollar.

Not only practical thinking, but kindliness and consideration for the welfare of others, inspires our desire to see that the less fortunate, the less energetic, those less qualified to protect themselves, do not suffer; impels us to strive for a minimum wage adequate to their need. Unfortunately for the attainment of an equal degree of so-called prosperity, while our Constitution endeavors to endow each with equality of opportunity, we do not all come into this world equal in either ability, willingness to strive, to sacrifice, or with the same objectives.

Few find any fault with the theory of a minimum wage. It is only when the attempt to put it into practice is made that difficulty arises. A minimum wage law compels everyone, with a very few exceptions, who hires another to pay the fixed minimum wage, regardless of the ability of the one hired to perform an amount of work equal in value to the wage. Many people, because of physical or mental defects, cannot earn a minimum wage, and, if less cannot be paid, they will be denied employment and so will add to the public burden.

Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach, appearing before the committee this week in support of a minimum wage of 65 cents per hour, answering my questions, stated quite frankly that the purposes of the legislation was to enable every American worker to enjoy an American standard of living. My definition of the American standard of living, he said, was broader than his. Under my definition, it means not only sufficient food, clothing, and shelter to enable a man to live in comfort, but to marry, obtain a home, rear a family, educate his children and provide for old-age security.

The Secretary admitted that all workers were not capable of doing work of equal value; that some could earn far more than the minimum wage, while others could not earn that amount. Employers can, in the long run, pay only for what is produced. The Secretary agreed to the proposition that, if the hirer of workers was required by law to pay not less than a certain sum per hour, the worker hired should be required to render a service which was productively worth that amount. If the employer must pay 65 cents per hour, every individual who receives that 65 cents per hour should be required to contribute 65 cents worth of productivity—work, just as, when we go to the market and pay 50 cents for meat, flour, or any other commodity, we should get 50 cents worth of meat, flour, or any other commodity. But the Secretary saw no way of putting such a requirement into effect. He thought employers should be required to pay a minimum wage, but that employees could not be required to make adequate return; that is, render a service productively worth the minimum wage.

It is axiomatic that the over-all wage any employer can pay—from the man who hires but one to the corporation which employs thousands—is limited by the price of what is sold. Because of that fact and because of the varying degrees of skill and desire to produce which exist among workers, the question of whether a minimum wage, applying to all, and the amount thereof, should be set by the Government, without any attempt to fix the volume of work given in return, is one difficult of solution.

David Lawrence, Long-Time Observer of the Washington Scene, Gives Thought-Provoking Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, among Capital newsmen, David Lawrence writes with a fine background of experience. We may not agree with his findings on all occasions, but, being human, I feel the Congress Members will appreciate his following column from today's Washington Evening Star:

WRITER HAILS CONGRESS AFTER 35-YEAR STUDY—SAYS NATION HAS ABIDING FAITH IN REPRESENTATIVE SYSTEM

(By David Lawrence)

Thirty-five years ago today this correspondent came to the National Capital to write about public affairs. Being 21 years of age and just out of college, it was natural, perhaps, that a bit of cynicism about government should at first have crept into his mind.

Today, in recollection over the years, the one thing that stands out more clearly than any other is an abiding faith in the representative system of government. The American people like to criticize their institutions and even go so far at times as to satirize their public men, but a close observation of the trends of opinion and of the ups and downs of legislative controversies over the 35 years leads to the conclusion that the Government is responsive to public desires. Congress is in reality far more representative of the public wish than is generally believed even by the people themselves.

On many an occasion it has seemed to the writer that the collective thinking of Congress has been wrong, that its delays or postponements have disregarded the public need or demand. Allowing for some instances in which all the facts have not been available to Congress at the time or public thought has failed to crystallize clearly, it is this correspondent's belief that the votes in Congress have turned out only on rare occasions to be at variance with the currents of public opinion outside of Washington.

FEEL BACK-HOME ATTITUDE

There always will be a question as to whether Congress should guide or be guided by public opinion. But however commendable it may be to encourage legislators to take the leadership in public thought—in educating their constituents—it has been my impression that Senators and Representatives do earnestly endeavor to interpet the desires of the people. To the extent that these interpretations constitute sometimes an anticipation of the citizen's wishes it is often true that Senators and Representatives feel an instinctive reaction. They frequently feel the back-home attitude on particular measures before the people express themselves.

Representative government is, of course, a cumbersome thing. Many improvements in forms and procedures remain to be made as population grows and the responsibility of government increases. But despite the criticisms of government frequently heard, despite the denunciation of governmental bureaucrats and their occasional abuses of power, it is a fact that the citizens demand of government far more than government is able to give them in the way of service.

Public officials, it has seemed to me, are in the main honest. The unsung public servants are in the administrative categories. Their fidelity to the public interest as well as their incorruptibility is unrivaled anywhere in the world.

Like all institutions, government has its weak spots. Ambitious and unscrupulous men sometimes acquire authority and exercise it for purposes of personal prestige or to the detriment of the governmental process. But these are the exception rather than the rule. The periods of abuse of power are relatively short. The cycle of good administration inevitably emerges out of ineptitude or mistaken zeal.

HEALTHY AIR OF INQUIRY

The most important factor in the operation of our representative system is the power of Congress to enter any hidden place and expose to the healthy air of inquiry such facts as are pertinent to the public interest. The investigating committees have at times overreached themselves, but a corrective public opinion has usually put a stop to such abuse. On the whole—irritating though it may be—the constitutional immunity of Members of Congress to lawsuit for what they say on the floor of the Senate or House or in committee has been an advantage rather than a disadvantage to representative government.

Looking back over the years, this writer's respect for men in public office has increased rather than diminished, and above all there has grown up in my mind an unequivocal conviction that the freedom of the press is the real safeguard to representative government. Minority views sometimes become majority views in the court of public opinion. Irresponsibility of utterance is to be deplored, but even irresponsibility often becomes the forerunner of responsibility. The evolution of press criticism has been toward greater and greater responsibility, and, in the last analysis, an informed opinion is the best assurance of the continuance of representative government.

This is an anniversary on which the writer may appear to some as optimistic about the quality of representative government in America, but the optimism is born of a repeated experience which has proved that legislative proposals and laws have rarely been as bad as their critics said they were and often better than their sponsors ever ventured to claim.

Navy Day Address of Hon. Robert Hale, of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address

of Hon. ROBERT HALE, Member of Congress, at the Navy Day banquet held at Portland, Maine, October 27, 1945:

It is a satisfaction to be able to be here with you on Navy Day. I want to take this occasion to express my gratitude for the kindness of Secretary Forrestal who is a very good friend to the members of the Maine delegation. He took pains to get us the cruiser *Portland* and the other ships now anchored in our harbor for Navy Day, and he also sent us down here in his personal plane—no small favor when time is valuable and space in commercial transport, air or rail, is at a premium.

Washington's mind is today very much on questions of national security and national defense. It was only 2 weeks ago yesterday that Admiral Nimitz came before the Congress reminding us that the Japanese army and the Japanese air force were more powerful on August 14 last than on December 7, 1941. Japan surrendered because our Navy had carried the war to their four islands, had sunk practically all the Japanese Navy and most of the Japanese merchant marine, had blockaded their home islands, and brought planes, which with or without the fantastic new bomb, assured the destruction of all their cities.

Then only last Tuesday, President Truman was before a joint session of our two bodies, advocating compulsory military training. I expect to discuss this subject at some length in the near future, but I want to say here and now that I am very much in sympathy with the President's recommendations.

No informed person can overlook the fact that we were within a hair's breadth of defeat in this war, and within only about two hairs' breadths of defeat in the last. I am not willing to take any avoidable chance of defeat in another war, and I believe that compulsory military training would help to safeguard our position. We shall not have much time to prepare the next time. I have some very good personal friends in the Office of Scientific Research and Development. What they predict in the way of new weapons is almost too lurid to discuss. The only defense to these weapons is to land in the hostile country and take possession of it.

I appeal to you. Let us not in the hour of victory be soft with ourselves. We all want the boys home, but let us remember that our opinions are respected in Europe and in Asia very much in the proportion of our armed forces on those continents. Our job now is not so much to rush back to a fancied "normalcy," as to perpetuate peace for our posterity and to keep America free. We shall do this only by being very realistic and very resolute.

Statement of Secretary Vinson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Secretary Vinson before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on the full employment bill, Wednesday, October 31, 1945:

The war has taught us many things about our economy.

It showed that when the people of the United States set their minds on doing a big job that job will be done, and the whole resources of this great country will be mobilized for its accomplishment. Winning the war was, obviously, all important. So we did our best to call into service every human and material resource which the country had at its command and put it to use either directly for the war effort or for the maintenance of the civilian economy.

The war also revealed the tremendous productivity inherent in our economy. Our gross national product increased from $89,000,000,000 in 1939 to $199,000,000,000 in 1944. Some of this, of course, represented an increase in prices; but the product of the country, expressed in real terms, increased by about 75 percent.

We learned other important facts about our economy too, in winning the war. We discovered that as a consequence of our all-out effort, unemployment disappeared. There were more employment opportunities than people seeking work. The job sought the man, rather than the man the job.

We discovered that as a result of the effective use of our resources during the wartime period, the real standard of living of the civilian population was higher in 1944 than it had been before the war, despite the fact that nearly one-half of our production was for war purposes.

The No. 1 problem which confronts the people of the United States here at home right now is how to apply the economic lessons of the war to the peace. Now at first glance, it might appear that there would be hopeless disagreement in this country on how this can be done. But a more careful study will convince thoughtful men that there are important fundamentals upon which all can agree.

In fact, there are two fundamentals upon which the American people already are agreed. The first is that our economic problems must be solved within our system of free enterprise. The second is that the most important of these problems is to maintain full employment.

Mass unemployment is the source of most of our social and economic evils; it is the greatest menace to economic security in this country. We cannot periodically condemn 10,000,000 unemployed to bear this burden. We cannot declare these men and women industrial surplus and dispose of them in that way. That is not the American way of doing things.

I do not subscribe to the pessimistic view that unemployment is inevitable and that any effort to prevent it is a threat to free enterprise. Our people want to keep the economic system under which this country achieved leadership. They know it offers the best hope of continued economic progress and higher standards of living. They will never abandon this system so long as they can cherish this hope. The only threat to free enterprise in this country can come from mass unemployment. Our task is to remove this threat by meeting the problem.

And, let me make this clear: Unemployment is not the fault of business. Businessmen do not want to stop production or to lay off men. They know that profits come from production. So long as they can find markets they are prepared to employ labor and to produce goods. It is only when the demand falls off, when goods cannot be sold, that they close down or reduce their force. Give American business the markets, the demand for the output, and we will witness a new miracle of production that will surpass everything we have seen before. Unemployment is not the fault of business. On the contrary, business like labor is the victim of depression.

It is equally clear that unemployment is not the responsibility of business. When demand falls off, businessmen have no alternative; they must cut production. If they persist in producing goods for which there are no markets, they will incur losses that may force bankruptcy. In general, when businessmen produce efficiently, when they sell at fair prices, and when they pay good wages, they have done all they can do and they are entitled to profits from production. Business cannot assume the responsibility on unemployment.

Now the fact is that somewhere there must be a responsibility on unemployment. There can be no vacuum, no void of responsibility on the most important domestic problem confronting the American people. When we face the issue we must admit that all of us have a responsibility to see that our economic system works, to see that there are opportunities for jobs for men and women willing and able to work. This is a responsibility of all the people, and we must look to the Government, acting for all the people, to meet this responsibility.

There is nothing revolutionary in recognizing this responsibility. In every deep depression the Government has found it necessary to deal with unemployment. In 1921, during the crisis of that year, President Harding called the Conference on Unemployment, which met under the chairmanship of Herbert Hoover. In 1931, in the midst of an even greater crisis, Congress passed the Employment Stabilization Act, establishing a board composed of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Labor. The whole experience of the 1930's is concrete evidence that the Government must deal with the problem and that it cannot abdicate this responsibility.

During depression we are conscious of the need for Government action, but as soon as we have prosperity we seem to forget it. In 1928, in the midst of the great boom, Senator Wesley Jones, of Washington, introduced a bill for a reserve of public works to be constructed during depression. The bill was killed, according to the Senate committee report on S. 381, because it was deemed unwise to mention depression before a Presidential campaign. That same year Senator WAGNER introduced the employment stabilization bill. It was a bill to provide for the advanced planning and regulated construction of public works, for the stabilization of industry, and for aiding in the prevention of unemployment. This bill, which could have been so helpful when the crash came in 1929, lay dormant for three vital years. It was only in the midst of the deepest depression of our history, when it was too late to take measures that might have prevented the catastrophe, that we realized what should have been done. When the bill was finally passed in 1931, it was in emasculated form.

The Employment Stabilization Act did not provide for a comprehensive program on unemployment. It was not concerned with many types of measures that can be taken to prevent a great depression. It dealt exclusively with the planning and timing of public works as a means of providing employment during depression. It was enacted during a great crisis when public works could do no more than alleviate the mass unemployment that already existed. This could be done under the act, and this was done as far as possible.

As a matter of fact, John Garner put a bill through in 1932 authorizing expenditure of $2,200,000,000 for public works. This bill followed the principles established in the Employment Stabilization Act. The money was to be used only for the construction of public works previously approved by Congress or the Executive, except for $70,000,000 for post offices in the smaller communities. The bill was vetoed by President Hoover. In 1933 Congress passed another bill authorizing $3,300,000,000 for public works. The construction so authorized was undertaken through the PWA.

The Employment Stabilization Act never contemplated the submission of a National Budget with recommendations to deal with

prospective depressions. It only provided for plans to arrange the construction of public works in a manner which would assist in the stabilization of employment. The timing of public works is a useful part of a program for dealing with prospective unemployment. But by itself, it is entirely inadequate. Under any circumstances, it would not be possible to do anything now under this act, for these functions, which had been consolidated with those of the National Resources Planning Board, were abolished by Congress in 1943.

The full employment bill is a logical development of the act of 1931. It recognizes the continuing responsibility of Government to see that there are enough job opportunities. It provides for a National Budget that will show the amount of production necessary to maintain full employment, and it requires estimates to be made of the prospective demand for this production. Such a National Budget will be transmitted by the President to Congress each year and will be considered by a joint congressional committee which will report to the Senate and the House of Representatives its findings and recommendations with respect to the National Budget.

This procedure seems to me the commonsense and dollar-wise way to deal with the problem of unemployment—through prevention rather than through relief. The first step is to get the facts and place them before those who have the responsibility for dealing with the problem.

The argument has been made that if the National Budget calls attention to a prospective deficiency or excess of demand, depression or prosperity will start at once. The evidence does not bear out this view. We don't get prosperity or depression merely by predicting it. If we could, we would never have had the crisis of 1929 to 1933. Businessmen were assured time and time again that prosperity was just around the corner. Businessmen act on the prospects for demand for their products from their customers. When demand falls off they stop production. A National Budget that recognizes a prospective deficiency in opportunities for employment and carries recommendations for dealing with the problem can give increased confidence to businessmen to continue with their investment, their production, and their employment.

In spite of the oft-repeated statement that the Government cannot make accurate estimates of the type required by this bill, I want to go on record as stating that the Government is in a position to make reasonably good estimates. In dealing with the tax and savings program during the war we had to make estimates of prospective income and expenditure. From these estimates we developed a program to reduce and limit over-all expediture to the available supply of consumer goods. Nobody claims that the statistical data we now have are perfect. They can and will be improved under this bill. Estimates on the National Budget will be made after consultation with business on the basis of data provided by business.

I have seen some doubt cast as to the competence of the Government to prepare a national budget on the grounds that the Government has not done very well in estimating its expenditures and receipts. I should like to comment briefly on the receipts side of this criticism, since the estimate of receipts is a statutory responsibility of the Treasury Department. In the 6 years before the war, from 1935 to 1940, the average error between estimated and actual tax receipts averaged about 6 percent. In 4 of these 6 years, the error was 5 percent or less. Now this is not a bad record, because it is more difficult to estimate tax receipts than it is to forecast business conditions. We estimate tax receipts by starting with an estimate of business conditions. An error of 6 percent in tax receipts is probably comparable to an error of 3 percent on national income.

It is the estimate of national income and its components that is significant for purposes of the proposed National Budget. An error of 3 percent would represent a difference of not more than 1,500,000 jobs from the number actually employed. In dealing with the problem of preventing mass unemployment, an error of 3 percent could not impair the usefulness of the National Budget. In practice, the problem will not be the elimination of minor errors of estimate; the real problem will be to see whether a deficiency in demand is developing in the construction, equipment, and durable goods industries which generally precedes a great depression. The National Budget will be submitted annually, but quarterly reports will be made to Congress taking account of changing conditions.

The National Budget will compel the attention of Congress and the executive departments to the problem of employment. But it would be a serious mistake to assume that the submission of a budget can of itself prevent mass unemployment. The responsibility of the Government does not end there. The important thing is to take the positive steps that will facilitate and encourage an expansion of consumption and private investment whenever this becomes necessary to prevent a great depression.

There is no reason for assuming that the remedy that will be recommended, when a deficiency in employment opportunities appears, will be Government spending. There will be times when changes in our tax policy will be needed to help maintain employment and production. There will be times when changes in credit policy will be needed. There may be times, of course, when because of a decline in private construction, the proper remedy will be an expansion of public construction. We should be ready to proceed promptly with the construction of necessary and useful public works whenever there is a falling off in private construction.

This bill is not a spending bill. It does not authorize any expenditure. Whatever legislation may be recommended in the National Budget in connection with the maintenance of employment will go to Congress and will be subject to the same procedures as now. In fact there will be the additional opportunity of having the joint congressional committee on the National Budget give to the Congress its report on the policies that should guide Congress in dealing with legislation relating to the National Budget.

In addition to the specific criticisms of the bill which I have discussed, there are certain broad objections offered by some—and apparently believed by many more. I call these objections the Union League Club objections because they find their most enthusiastic supporters in the stuffy environs of the most exclusive clubs. But they deserve to be held up to critical and public analysis where their merits can be evaluated.

The most pervading of these Union League Club arguments is the defeatist attitude with respect to our economic system. Mr. William L. Kleitz, vice president of the Guaranty Trust Co. of New York City, for example, told the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that depressions are inevitable under the free-enterprise system. Such depressions, of course, will be only minor inconveniences to Mr. Kleitz. I should like to put myself on record as dissenting from the view that the free-enterprise system makes such periods of unemployment necessary for those less able to bear them. I have greater faith in the vigor of the free-enterprise system than that, and I know that you gentlemen have also.

It is a false dilemma which gives us the choice between full employment and a free society; and those who tell us that depressions are the price we pay for freedom, are doing no favor to the cause of freedom. The system of private enterprise has enabled the United States to outproduce every other country in the world, and to win this most destructive of all wars with a minimum loss of American lives and a maximum reliance on the products of industry. I am sure that the system of free enterprise will also enable us to win the peace, if its friends will stop insisting that it must produce depressions to realize its natural destiny.

The second of these Union League Club arguments is that a full-employment policy is expensive and that relief is cheaper. For example, Mr. Rufus Tucker, the chief economist of the General Motors Corp., told the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that the taxpayers "may (he said only 'may') have a moral obligation to keep any citizen from starvation," but that this obligation can often be fulfilled more cheaply in other ways than by providing jobs. I am sure that you will agree with me that this is an excessively narrow view of the problem. Ignoring altogether its callous disregard of the feelings of the unemployed, it errs even on the side of expense, for it treats only the symptoms of unemployment and makes no attempt to effect a cure. It is like the view taken by a doctor who prescribed that a poor patient should wear a truss all through his life because the doctor feels that an operation would be unduly expensive or bothersome.

Lastly, some of the club intellectuals believe that a pool of unemployed helps to keep labor in its place, and is conducive to the profitable operation of the enterprises with which they are connected. Naturally, these persons seldom express their opinions for the records.

In addition to the three broad currents of opposition to the full-employment bill which I have just mentioned, there are other persons whose opposition is based on the honest belief that the adoption of some policy or policies which they particularly advocate will result in the attainment of the objective of continuing full employment. To the extent that these people are right, there is room for the consideration and adoption of their policies within the broad framework of the full-employment bill.

Finally, I want to emphasize again that this bill is in complete accord with our system of free enterprise. It does not authorize the Government to operate any plants or factories or productive facilities. It does not authorize the use of any compulsory measures in determining where people are to be employed. Every businessman remains free to run his business as he always has. The Government's sole function is to exercise the necessary foresight in dealing with prospective developments that affect employment and to take such measures as are authorized by law to prevent a deficiency or excess in demand. The whole spirit of this legislation is not to coerce industry but to provide an environment in which industry can realize its enormous potentialities for production and employment.

The full employment bill makes no assumption with respect to the general character of our economic problems at any particular time. The bill specifically provides that the National Budget shall make recommendations for the control of inflation whenever this shall be necessary as well as recommendations for achieving and maintaining full employment. There is nothing inflationary in this bill.

Some opponents of this bill have leveled most of their attack on an alleged promise to provide every man and woman with a job. The bill does not do this. It merely recognizes the Government's responsibility to see that there are enough opportunities for productive work to employ all men and women willing and able to work. The chance to earn a living is so fundamental a human right that it cannot be denied by quibbling or by the equivocal use of words. In a

modern industrial society the opportunity to work is the very basis of the inalienable and God-given rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

There is no class of sectional interest in this bill. It is truly a national bill to promote the general welfare by protecting the national economy. Of course, it is in the interest of labor to have an adequate demand for our production so that there will be sufficient jobs for all men and women willing and able to work. But it is no less in the interest of agriculture and industry. The farmers of this country know that unemployment in American industry means low prices and the accumulation of surplus crops. They know that a sound postwar farm program must start with plenty of jobs and good wages in industry so that our workers can consume the foods and materials which our farmers can produce in abundance and businessmen know what depression means to them—reduced output, losses and even failures. The maintenance of production and the profits of business depends upon an adequate demand for output. Such a demand requires the prevention of mass unemployment.

Some people seem to think we cannot afford full employment. There is a confusion of thought here. It is unemployment that we cannot afford. The unemployment of the 1930's cost us in lost income far more than the war; and this cost was not distributed among all the people on an equitable basis. It was concentrated in large part on the unemployed worker and the depressed farmers. We cannot afford another depression like that.

If we put our full resources to work, we can increase our production of consumer goods by 50 percent above the 1940 level and our production of capital goods, including construction, by more than 100 percent above the 1940 level. This chart, based on a Commerce Department study when Jesse Jones was Secretary, shows in more detail what full employment means to business. My own review of the facts, when I was Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, has convinced me that we can and must increase consumption by 50 percent and expand construction and investment by 100 percent above prewar levels. We cannot let one-fourth of our resources go to waste. As Secretary of the Treasury, I say that it will be much harder to balance our budget and to service our national debt if we drift into another great depression.

There is no doubt in my mind that we can prevent mass unemployment if we decide to deal intelligently with this problem. I have said it before and I shall say it again: "Depressions, like wars, are not acts of God. Man makes them. If we make them, we can unmake them. We must create, in peace, a new prosperity and a greater opportunity for jobs than has existed before."

We shall not solve the problem of unemployment by ignoring it. We must not repeat the error of 1921 and 1931 of trying to deal with this problem when it is too late. This is a bill that should be enacted promptly. In my opinion, it is an urgent bill, not because we need it to deal with mass unemployment now, but because we need it now to deal with the threat of depression when it does come.

I want to read one paragraph on this point:

"When business again declines men will be laid off and the problem of unemployment may again become serious. It will then be too late for any measures except relief for the unemployed unless we now address ourselves to the task of preventing, or at least reducing, these extreme fluctuations of business activity. Prevention as contrasted with relief is possible only through foresight."

This is a statement as timely now as when it was made by the committee headed by Owen D. Young and appointed by Herbert Hoover as chairman of the President's Conference on Unemployment in 1921.

In my opinion the full employment bill enables us—yes, requires us—to deal with the problem of unemployment while there is still time, before it is too late.

I speak for the President of the United States when I tell you that he regards full-employment legislation as the basic framework upon which a large share of our efforts to solve the central problem of full production and full employment must rest. He is most anxious that the legislation be enacted at the earliest possible moment.

Demobilization of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the War Department records show that during the period of May 12, 1945 through October 19, 1945, 1,919,000 men were released from the Army and returned to civilian life. During this 5-month period, some 250,000 men were taken into the Amy by selective service. The records further show that from September 2, 1945 through October 19, 1945, there were released 1,326,000 individuals. This very definitely shows that between a period of May 12 and September 2, pressure by the citizens of this country and Members of Congress did cause the Army to speed up their demobilization plans.

The armed forces are now receiving something like 50,000 men a month under voluntary methods. Even though demobilization has been speeded up, we may well have more than 5,000,000 men under arms, most of them in this country, at Christmas time. Many of these men are fathers with several children at home. They are in this country not usefully employed.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that every man in the Army who is not usefully employed should be given an indefinite furlough at home and left there until the armed forces are ready to complete his discharge. It would solve many of the difficult problems now facing demobilization.

On October 15 there were 1,985,000 men with sufficient points which entitle them to a discharge from the Army. Four hundred thousand of these man had more than 85 points. There were 200,000 of these 85-point men in the United States. It does not speak well for some parts of the demobilization machinery.

Mr. Speaker, shortly 30 legislative days will have elapsed since I introduced a measure which would speed up demobilization. This bill is before the Military Affairs Committee. I propose to place a petition upon the Clerk's desk at the proper time, in an effort to get this bill before the House for amendments and consideration.

GIBBON, NEBR., *October 29, 1945.*

Congressman A. L. MILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I feel pressed to express my deep concern in the matter of demobilization.

My son-in-law is in the Navy. He is stationed on Ward Island, Corpus Christi, Tex. Since VJ-day this school has been so unorganized and without purpose. Class instruction for these radio technicians has become nil.

These young men are losing faith in our democracy and in the officers over them. The waste is so alarming—first, the waste of the purpose of life; second, the economic waste.

A man who has a wife and wishes to be on his way with a life plan and purpose should be honorably discharged now.

Very sincerely.

A Soldier's Letter To His Son

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter that Capt. T. C. McKibben, a brilliant young soldier friend of mine and who lived in the district I represent, wrote his little son just before meeting his death in France in 1944.

The letter deserves a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SOMEWHERE IN ENGLAND,
A. P. O. No. 15,186,
June 8, 1944.

DEAR CURLY HEADED LITTLE BOY: Today I received four letters from your mother. One of the letters she wrote for you, saying you would like a letter all your own from your daddy. So, though you are not yet 2, and there are many things you don't understand, daddy is writing this letter all to you.

Maybe this is a rather serious tone for a letter to a gay young fellow like you, but you will not always be so young or so carefree. As the years roll by they will continuously heap more cares and responsibilities upon your shoulders. You will learn that the serious and trying times come more frequently than the glad and carefree times. So let us think now a little seriously about the years that lie ahead for you, young man—There is a terrible war going on now. We are fighting it so our sons will not have to fight another one at some later date, but that is what the men who fought the First World War were told. At any rate, son, I hope war is one of the trying things you will be fortunate enough to miss. Though your daddy is in no serious danger at the moment, no one knows now what the near future holds. Regardless of what happens you may be sure your daddy will be doing everything humanly possible to get safely back to you and mother.

However, there is, of course, the possibility you will have to face the world in the years to come without a daddy. So let's face that possibility bravely and try to imagine what those first few years will be like. First let's see what is still left on the bright side. Perhaps the greatest asset you will start life with

is a wonderful, brave, and true mother. She will stand by you, care for you, and work for you to the last ounce of her strength and if need be, fight for you to the last drop of her blood, while you are yet too young to care for yourself. She will have the fortitude and strength of character to be both a mother and a father to you. She will be able to face all the sorrow and all trials of future years as she has in the past and still be able to smile at the world. She will do everything possible to see that you are properly cared for, well trained and educated. You see—before you were even on your way to this world we both saw this possibility and considered it seriously—and she said, "If worse comes to worse, I can still carry on." So I know she can.

And what else do you have. Why—you will still have you. Though now you are not more than a little curly headed fellow with a very bright smile you have a near perfect little body that is growing stronger every day, until one day you will be a healthy young man. Continue to develop that bright smile and sunny personality and it will in later years do more for you than anything else can.

Learn to curb your desires, develop a sense of honor and a character which no man can purchase. Be a well-rounded man by developing all your talents. Learn at least something of music, dancing, athletics, and learn to enjoy all wholesome fun. Develop a sense of humor—be able to laugh at the world when it would "irk" you unnecessarily. Develop a strong clean mind and body.

Learn to read a lot but don't be a book worm. Learn to speak fluently and write well. Someone has said "Reading makes a ready man and writing an exact man."

Don't believe all men evil, but don't be dismayed when those you have believed in prove false. Remember that mankind can at once be God's noblest creature and the world's vilest animal.

At last and most important of all the thoughts I would like you to retain is a consideration of the necessity of Godliness to a fine life. Early in life I hope you will learn to look to God for guidance in all things. Christian life is the happiest, fullest life you can have. A Christian has a soul that is not imprisoned in the confines of this small world. The trials of this world become less important, since to him they become only incidents along a route he is passing to the attainment of a greater life than this world can offer and death becomes the beginning and not the end.

If you should have to make it without a daddy it may be a little harder for you and mother. You may have a little less and your opportunities be a little fewer, but with courage, you will triumph and in your lives there will be a lot of sunshine and happiness, too.

Perhaps you think I expect a lot from you, little fellow. Well, I do. And if you can do all this and "A lot more you'll be a man, my son."

But things are never as bright as we might hope, nor as dark as we may fear so we shall be looking forward to the bright day when your daddy will be returning home to his little curly headed boy and his mother and the joyous time we will have in watching you grow into a man and watching the bright little smile of yours light the darkest days like the morning sun.

And whatever may come to pass, remember always, that somewhere you've got a daddy to whom you will be the most wonderful curly headed little boy ever to come into this world.

It is about your bedtime now, little fellow. Goodnight and sweet dreams and awaken again tomorrow to turn on again that bright little smile. And on all of your tomorrows remember to be sweet to mother and take care of her until your daddy comes home.

From your loving daddy,

TOM.

Congress Rolls Out "Pork Barrel"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. JONES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walker S. Buel, from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of October 27, 1945:

CONGRESS ROLLS OUT "PORK BARREL"—AND THEN ENDORSES GREATEST RETRENCHMENT BILL IN ALL HISTORY

(By Walker S. Buel)

WASHINGTON, October 26.—Under the ordinary circumstances of human existence, it is accepted as an impossibility to eat your cake and have it, too. But the ordinary circumstances of human existence do not apply to Congress, which this week gave a masterly demonstration that the trick can be done without mirrors.

The commodity was political "pork," not cake. On one day the House of Representatives voted enthusiastically for one of the first omnibus postwar spending measures, denounced by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee at a "fat pork" bill. It provided $700,000,000 for a 10-year program for airport construction in thousands of communities all over the Nation.

ASTRONOMICAL FIGURES

The very next day the House indulged in oratorical ecstasy over economy as it passed the greatest retrenchment bill in history, recapturing for the Federal Treasury $52,453,535,278 in appropriations and contract authorizations originally voted for war purposes.

The amount was described by appropriations chairman, CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, as "a sum so stupendous as to be incomprehensible to the finite mind of man." CANNON declared of the bill that "a hundred years from now it will be looked back upon as one of the landmarks in fiscal legislation," and that its magnitude "is unprecedented in any bill in any legislative body in any country in any period of the world's history."

Representative LOUIS LUDLOW, of Indiana, a high-ranking Democratic appropriations member, calling the rescinding measure historic, undertook to reduce its total to understandable terms in this fashion:

"One way of looking at it is that it is the equivalent of $26,868,348 for every year since the birth of Christ and $73,886 for every day since Christ was born."

EXCEEDS WAR COST

It was further pointed out that the amount recaptured for the Government was nearly $5,000,000,000 more than the entire cost of World War I, and more than twice the total amount appropriated to run the Government during 43 years of national existence, from 1873 to 1916.

Appropriations Chairman CANNON as a prelude to presentation of the retrenchment bill, paid tribute to the Members, who, on the preceding day, voted against the airport construction "pork" bill. The vote on that bill was 279 to 82. Only three Ohioans, all Republicans, were among those voting against it—Representatives CLIFF CLEVENGER, of Bryan; ROBERT F. JONES, of Lima, and FREDERICK C. SMITH, of Marion.

Chairman CANNON, expressing a hope no one would overlook the list of 82 who opposed the airport bill, said:

"It is a notable list of notable men. They not only preach economy, but, extraordinary as it may seem, they actually vote for economy. Mr. Speaker, that list of names ought to be printed in every newspaper in the country. I do not know just how interested in economy the newspapers are, but there have been so few votes for economy lately that it ought to be in the same class with the story of 'man bites dog.' We have had all kinds of blocs here—the farm bloc, the labor bloc, the railroad bloc; now at last we have an economy bloc. You will recognize a brother of the bloc when he gives the password. The password is the word 'no,' spoken clearly and distinctly when the Member's name is called on a vote to appropriate borrowed money for something we can get along without."

TO SAVE THE COUNTRY

Representative JOHN TABER, of New York, ranking Republican on the Appropriations Committee, interposed to remark:

"Mr. Speaker, a hasty count of those 82 immortals who voted 'no' yesterday upon a bill to spend $650,000,000 to $700,000,000 that we do not have, have not got, and create inflation, reveals 12 members of the Democratic Party and 70 members of the Republican Party voting to save the country."

The retrenchment bill was passed without a record vote. But Representative TABER said even so huge a cut left a balance of similar funds of $94,000,000,000. The Budget Bureau estimates the expenditures for this fiscal year from these sources will be $50,000,000,000, he said, adding:

"This means there is still $44,000,000,000 of velvet kicking around that we need to dig up and recover for the Treasury."

Air Lines Public Relations Faces the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

OF NEW JERSEY

HON. FRANK L. SUNDSTROM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 1, 1945

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Air Lines Public Relations Faces the Future," by Thomas J. Deegan:

AIR LINES PUBLIC RELATIONS FACES THE FUTURE

(By Thomas J. Deegan, director of public information, American Air Lines, Inc.)

Someone once said, "Man's darkest continent is the human mind," and while it is not certain that it was spoken by an air-lines public relations executive, it should have been. For we are uniquely equipped to discourse on the subject, being in the challenging position of using all the proved techniques of our profession plus a whole set of new ones. We are asking man to leave the ground and move through air, the only singular quantity of the universe.

And man doesn't leave the ground too readily. He thinks air transportation is a "great thing," but "you fly." It is his resistance to change, to do something his father and grandfather before him did not do, that perplexes man. That's where we enter the dark continent of the human mind. That's why our job in public relations has no precedent. It is new and vast.

The nearest parallel to presenting air transportation to the public is the experience of the automotive industry a quarter century ago when it was selling a motor-driven vehicle to replace the horse and buggy. The

trials and tribulations of that step in civilization's progress is history; eventually it won universal acceptance. But while the increased speed of movement of the automobile was revolutionary at the time, the motorist still stayed on the surface of the earth—the same surface over which man had sailed boats, led oxcarts, driven covered wagons, and ridden trains since the beginning of time.

Air transportation is asking man for the first time in natural history to leave that surface, to move into the only singular medium of the universe—air. Air connects all things. It envelopes the globe. Yet, man does not leap at the opportunity of leaving the surface of the earth and taking to the air. That is the job set up for us by the brave pioneers who have made possible this latest and greatest step in the progress of civilization.

Take a cross section of the best definitions of public relations, then add in one part information (to dispel public ignorance of a new vehicle and a new medium); one part psychology (to penetrate the dark continent); one part geography (to help fix places and their relation to each other in the public mind; and one part wordliness, in its most literal sense (to make man realize that with air there are no boundaries on eath; that Crooked Limb, Mont., is on a direct line—by air—with Jhaagnoor, India, and only hours apart). Mix them all together, they spell air-lines public relations.

Like all craftsmen in our business, we break down the phases of public relations into its component parts—publicity, promotion, press relations—and we add a few indigenous to our subject—community relations, air-age education, and passenger relations. And because air transportation in the United States is conducted under what is called regulated competition in accordance with the Civil Aeronautics Act we have a grave responsibility to the public through Government. Hence, our over-all guiding factor must at all times be public service. With the job thus categorized we break it down in the following manner:

1. TECHNOLOGICAL

The growth of our industry has evoked a great deal of interest on the part of the public regarding the technical phases of our operations. A sample of this occurred recently when one of our pilots developed a slide-rule technique for bringing in planes by instrument when they were stacked in heavy weather over an airport. Although this story might have been considered too technical for public interest 5 years ago, it made the first page across the country just recently.

2. OPERATIONAL

Due to censorship, we are still unable to tell the whole story of our overseas operations, though at the proper time this will make the most absorbing material in the history of the industry. In publicity, we are not particularly interested in new speed records on the theory that passengers will wonder if we do not attain the maximum speed on every flight between two given points. However, load factors, new cargo records, and material of similar nature make good copy.

3. FINANCIAL

This part of our publicity is pretty obvious. The transactions of a large corporation are always newsworthy.

4. FOOD

Stories and features regarding our meal service prove interesting to the food editors of the major newspapers. This type of story helps to sell air travel because food is always identified with the home and when we talk about the eating habits of air travelers, we are automatically identifying ourselves in the minds of the readers as something which is a part of everyday life; not something which builds up resistance to change.

5. HOME FURNISHINGS

Sounds obscure on the face of it but don't sell it short. The interior of our flagships is akin to the interior of an attractive living room. New designs and color combinations are interesting to the public and again, by the psychological strategem we are removing resistance to change.

6. WOMEN'S PAGE

Stories geared to attracting the attention of women exist in abundance among the air lines. In American Airlines, for example, half of the engineering department which is planning the future of aviation, is composed of skilled women—some engineers, some scientists, and some other technically trained members of the distaff side. It is a story within a story and is only one facet of women's page possibilities. Add to it, stewardesses and dietitians, female administrative executives, plus the use of air transportation in fashion, and you have a well of publicity material.

7. EDUCATION

The story of air-age education contains countless possibilities featuring the air globe and its new concept of geography. In American Airlines the air-age department operates as a separate and distinct unit and is headed by a renowned educator.

8. SCIENCE

Newspaper survey statistics prove that science news has gained steadily in readership during the past 10 years. The story of our meteorology department alone makes a fascinating tale if adroitly presented in its myriad phrases. This type of story not only has excellent publicity possibilities but implicitly speaks for American Airlines attention to the safety factor.

9. SPORTS

Here we are stymied again by wartime regulations against air trave' that is not essential. However, in our postwar operations, it is well to keep in mind that the traveling habits of well-known sports figures and big league teams are followed avidly by millions of hero worshipers. "If Joe DiMaggio flies, it must be O. K.," becomes their theme.

10. REAL ESTATE

Although the real estate section's audience is limited, the interest of that audience is intense. Let's, therefore, cash in on it. Stories of airport development, expansions of property, pending improvements, and even homes purchased by our personnel, are typical of the kind of realty news through which we can benefit.

11. HUMAN INTEREST

Human interest stories abound and might well be considered the most valuable of all. The story of Nubbins Hoffman, invalid boy who was given an early Christmas last November, constituted probably the biggest publicity story of the year and the Union Pacific Railroad, who employed his father and guided the exploitation of the story, was the direct beneficiary. We occasionally run into stories which can be similarly developed to our direct benefit. An example of this occurred most recently when Eric Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, was flying to Smith College for a dinner. In leaving Washington, Mr. Johnston forgot his prepared speech. Through the efforts of American's personnel, the speech was procured from Mr. Johnston's apartment and flown to him. The story made the front page. A child being rushed to some distant city for an emergency operation or a serviceman being flown home to be married are on tap every day. In such stories alertness by our own personnel, who actually witness a given incident, determines success or failure.

An air line, as one can well imagine, has its share of postwar planning problems. American Airlines, moreover, has always made a particular point of improving its pasenger service, finding out what was needed, what would be helpful—and then aiming to do it better than it had ever been done before. We'd heard talk, too, of week-end trips to Afghanistan right after victory—plus tales of 18-motor planes and flying wings and what not. Tall talk, of course, but it makes an air line wonder about public expectations in air travel. What could be more natural, then, than that an air line should look directly to the public to find out what the public really wants in postwar air transportation? And so we did—with the aid of a questionnaire booklet, You and Postwar Air Transportation, prepared by our advertising department which is separate and distinct from the department of public information. By mail, at luncheon and dinner meetings, on board flagships and in response to requests resulting from national advertising, American Airlines distributed thousands of these booklets seeking thoughtful answers to many questions about postwar air transportation. A grand total of 1,378,434 question answers came in—ample to let us know what air travelers want after the war.

Thus, sketchily, we view the problem of guiding and planning air-lines publicity, promotion, and press relations. A new book has just begun to be written. It will be long, exciting, and productive, and it will be called Airlines Public Relations Faces the Future.

Future of the GI Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 1 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the Congress now has under consideration the rewriting of the GI bill of rights. There was published in the November issue of the magazine Washington News Digest, a very interesting article by the national commander of the American Legion, Edward N. Scheiberling, entitled "Future of the GI Bill of Rights." I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUTURE OF THE GI BILL OF RIGHTS

(By Edward N. Scheiberling, national commander, the American Legion)

If I were to make a prediction of things to come, it would be that the GI bill of rights will be so effectively amended by Congress in the near future that it will unlock the floodgates to billions of dollars in home, farm, and business loan credits for World War II veterans.

Under the revised law it will be very much easier for any veteran with a good reputation and steady income to buy a home or a farm or a business without having to dig into his own pocket for a down payment. In fact if he bears a good name and has a job he won't need a nickel in his jeans to swing the deal.

Insurance companies have $57,000,000,000 and banks have more than $100,000,000,000 in deposits, much of which they are willing to place in veterans' GI loans. During the past year loans already made under the GI bill—some 19,000 of them—demonstrated

that World War II veterans were the best credit risks in the country.

Since these financial institutions have all this money and are willing to lend it to veterans, the American Legion, as the father of the GI bill, enlisted their best brains to aid in amending the loan provisions of the bill.

EXPERTS MOBILIZED BY LEGION

The Legion assembled 32 of the greatest financial experts in Washington, D. C. It told them, in effect: "You are the fellows who will have to put up the money for the GI loans. How do you think the bill should be amended to make it more effective?"

The experts formed a special committee which sat down with the Legion and wrote a proposed new amendment to title III of of the GI bill which deals with the loan provisions.

That new amendment provides for placing the authority and responsibility for making loans almost entirely in the hands of the lenders and not in the Veterans' Administration. At the same time it protects the veteran against exorbitant interest rates and inflated values. That is the loan amendment for which the Legion is now fighting in Congress.

SIMPLIFIED PROCEDURE PROPOSED

If Congress enacts the loan amendment as written by the financial experts under Legion auspices, the entire procedure of securing GI loans will be simplified.

1. The Veterans' Administration will be required to issue a certificate of eligibility for a loan to the veteran when he leaves the service, or as soon thereafter as is practicable.

2. A veteran wishing to borrow money will apply to any lending agency he may select, but not until 30 days after his discharge.

3. The lending agency will make the loan or refuse it on the basis of its own judgment and without processing it through Washington.

4. After making the loan the lending agency will notify the Veterans' Administration of its action and certify the loan for Government endorsement. The Veterans' Administration then will be required to guarantee half of any loan, but in no case will the total to be guaranteed be more than $2,000.

The new amendment also will provide for granting of working capital and inventory loans for business, an entirely new feature.

END TO ALL HOCUS-POCUS

To understand just how the proposed new amendment will simplify loan procedure, it is only necessary to take a squint at previous operations.

Formerly the veteran's first step toward securing a loan was to apply to the Veterans' Administratioin for a certificate of eligibility for a loan. This sometimes required weeks.

When the certificate arrived, the veteran had to make out his application for a loan. Because the soundness of every loan was judged in Washington, D. C., hundreds or perhaps thousands of miles away, the veteran had to execute a tremendously long form, answering hundreds of questions. The lender likewise had to fill in an agonizingly long form. These forms were then sent to Washington.

When the Veterans' Administration received these involved applications, it sent home-loan requests to the Federal Housing Administration (FHA), farm loan requests to the Farm Security Administration (FSA), and business loan requests to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (RFC), for opinions as to soundness. It might take weeks to secure such an opinion.

When the opinion was available, then the Veterans' Administration made its own ruling for or against the requested loan. That took more time.

All of this hocus-pocus is done away with in the proposed new amendment. After all, local lending agencies know their business and are not interested in making unsound loans.

LOAN DISCOUNTS NOW POSSIBLE

Another feature of the proposed new loan amendment will permit banks and all lending agencies to go to the limit with their funds in making GI loans. They may then discount their paper with the Federal Reserve System, obtain more money and make more GI loans. This, of course, applies to banks which belong to the Federal Reserve System, but any bank may buy the paper of any lending agency if it wishes to do so.

The time limit within which veterans may take advantage of the lending provisions and other features of the GI bill also is extended by the amendment to 6 years after discharge, or 5 years after the end of the war, whichever is later, but in no case more than 8 years after the end of the war. Formerly the limits were 2 and 7 years.

HOW TO BUY WITHOUT CASH

Under the revised GI bill the veteran will find it much easier to buy a home, or a farm, or a business without having to dig into his own pocket for the down payment. He must, of course, satisfy the credit and income requirements as to his ability to make regular payments on the loan.

His procedure in buying a home, for instance, will be:

1. He will borrow 80 percent of the purchase price from the FHA.

2. He will secure a second loan for the other 20 percent under the GI bill.

The second loan will provide the down payment on the home.

This same plan will apply to farm loans under FSA and to business loans under the RFC.

WORKING CAPITAL LOANS

In the case of loans to be used for working capital, or the purchase of merchandise with which to do business, the Veterans' Administration under the proposed revision would guarantee up to 15 percent of the total of all such loans made by a lending agency, provided no single loans exceeded $4,000. If only a few loans proved bad, there would be a 100-percent recovery for the lending agency. But if more than 15 percent defaulted, any loss over that would have to be assumed by the lender.

The financial experts who served on the lender's committee at the invitation of the American Legion, and drafted the amendment to title III of the GI bill, includes J. A. Brott, of Washington, D. C., associate counsel for the American Bankers Association; Horace Russel, of Chicago, general counsel for the United States Savings and Loan League; George E. Walton, of New York, associate counsel for the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.; Oliver Walker, president of Walker-Dunlop, Inc., Washington, D. C., an insurance firm; and R. W. Hudgens, associate administrator for the Farm Security Administration.

The American Legion thinks they did a fine job. It will back their recommendation.

BIGGER CHECKS FOR GI STUDENTS

The American Legion also surveyed the operation of title II of the GI bill, dealing with the educational provisions.

As of August 31, 1945, the Veterans' Administration had approved a current total of 106,379 applications for campus schooling.

The Legion survey showed that most dissatisfaction over the educational features of the bill arose on two points; one was that the monthly subsistence allowance for both single and married GI students was not sufficient; the other complaint was against the requirement that any income which a veteran attending school under the bill might earn at a part-time job, must be deducted from the monthly subsistence check.

Chief changes in title II of the bill, therefore, sought by the Legion, raise the monthly subsistence rate of single students from $50 to $60, and those with dependents from $75 to $85, and eliminate the requirement that part-time campus job earnings must be deducted from the subsistence allowance.

FUTURE IMPORTANCE OF THE BILL

The GI bill of rights will increase in importance to the welfare of America as the years roll by.

Not only will this law become an essential factor in the economic rehabilitation of the millions of our World War II veterans, but it will at the same time, serve as an effective deterrent to the spread of any social unrest in the ranks of our veterans.

The veteran who is a home owner, or a farm owner, or in business for himself, is not going to become a Communist, or a radical of any kind. He will already have sampled too many of the sweet fruits of Americanism to listen to any foreign "isms."

The GI bill is really an Americanism bill.

Therein lies its greatest future value to our Nation.

Protective Custody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 1, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by former Congressman Samuel B. Pettengill:

PROTECTIVE CUSTODY

It is an astonishing situation when the United States takes over an industrial plant in which there is no labor dispute, no work stoppage, no lock-out, no strike.

But we live in strange times. The Sun Oil Co. has a gasoline refinery in Toledo, Ohio. The workers have no connection with the CIO. The men were reporting daily for work in full force.

However, CIO members, none of whom were Sun Oil employees, picketed the refinery. They told the nonstriking workers that if they made any motor gasoline they would be prevented by force from entering the plant.

So the Sun Oil workers in the plant did other work. Because of this intimidation, no gasoline was produced. This went on for over 2 weeks. No one wanted his head broken.

Then the United States seized the plant.

It did not seize the lawless goons on the outside who were threatening the plant.

It took the plant and its loyal workers into the protective custody of the United States.

"Protective custody" is an European term. It has the smell of skunk cabbage.

The United States of America, the greatest power on earth, was apparently intimidated by men threatening violence to prevent the production of gasoline. So it seized the plant.

Not only the United States, but the State of Ohio, city and county officials were asked to preserve law and order. None responded.

At Reelfoot Lake, Tenn., President Truman, taking a well-earned rest from a strenuous 6 months, said that strikes were a let-down from the war effort and that "he was not worried about them at all."

It is a let-down. But who is let down?

The *Queen Elizabeth* landed at New York with 15,000 returning soldiers. Stevedores on strike refused to unload the ship. So the soldiers had to. The United Press reports that "17 troop ships of the War Shipping Administration were ordered to sail

without cargo as a strangulation strike of stevedores was drawn tighter around the country's largest port." Over 300 ships were immobilized at that harbor. American soldiers wait in European ports for ships to bring them home, and their fathers and mothers and sweethearts wait on American shores for them; and empty ships go to hungry Europe.

In Detroit four men throw a foreman bodily out of a factory making automobile parts. For this act of violence the men were discharged. And their discharge was upheld by the War Labor Board. Then 4,500 men strike to force the rehiring of the four men. The 4,500 refuse to go back to work despite the pleas of their union officials. Because no parts were made, Ford was forced to close, throwing 50,000 more men out of work. This lasted for 6 weeks. Four men use violence on one foreman, and 54,500 men stop producing needed goods.

In a smaller midwest city strikers refuse to permit plant officials to enter a factory. Nothing is done about it. The city's police department is unionized.

This is not in France just before the German invasion in 1939. This is in the United States of America, "My Country, 'tis of Thee," but sadly enough as I write these lines I do not feel like singing.

Let it be said to the credit of some union officials that they have urged their men not to go out on outlaw strikes. But the vital question of the responsibility of labor to abide by contracts and union discipline (where that exists), the rights of John Public, who pays the freight and perhaps will go cold this winter for lack of coal and fuel oil, and the need of writing equality under law into the Wagner Act remain unsettled.

Meantime high officials busy themselves with restoring law and order in Bulgaria, Rumania, Yugoslavia, and Kamchatka.

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

Tuberculosis Is Preventable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 1 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, last Sunday the Rhode Island State Sanatorium celebrated its fortieth anniversary, and I had the privilege of making an address on the elimination of tuberculosis. Since the subject matter is of national as well as State interest, I ask for unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, my fellow citizens, it is always good to be back home in Rhode Island, especially for an occasion like this, and you may be sure that I am happy indeed to be here today at Wallum Lake to celebrate with you the fortieth anniversary of the founding of this State sanatorium and to pay tribute to Dr. Harry Lee Barnes, who was its first superintendent and served it well for almost 30 years.

I have long been interested in the welfare of our State institutions and especially in this sanatorium. That interest dates back almost 40 years to a time in 1907 when, as a member of the general assembly from Providence, I first had an opportunity to observe, in an official way, the condition of things at these institutions. Wallum Lake was in its infancy then, and ever since I have followed its development. Then, too, over the years, particularly in these later years, it has been my privilege to have had some part in shaping its growth and development. That is the reason why I left my duties in Washington and came to be with you here today.

The record of the State's interest in this institution prior to 1933 is a dark chapter in our history. In fact, it might well be said that for a long time prior to 1933 the inmates of all our State hospitals were truly the forgotten men and women of the State. Many of you present have first-hand knowledge of the conditions that existed at our State institutions during those dark years, and I shall not recount them now.

In 1933, however, a new spirit of humanity arose in government, due in large measure, I think, to the enlightened leadership of our late President Roosevelt. With it Rhode Island entered upon a new era in the field of social welfare, especially in recognition of its responsibility to the inmates of our State hospitals. It was my privilege to be Governor of Rhode Island during the 4 years which marked the beginning of that era. They were critical years—years of depression—but notwithstanding this fact we almost immediately embarked upon a program of social and physical reconstruction of our State institutions. The program was predicated upon the social philosophy that primarily it is the duty of the State to do all in its power to provide not only for the custody but also for the care, and, if possible, the cure, of those committed to its charge. This had also been Dr. Barnes' philosophy, but he, like his patients, was the forgotten man. It was hard for him to struggle along without proper equipment and without appreciation of his efforts, but he persisted and deserves all the praise we can give him today.

I am glad to say that this sanitorium at Wallum Lake was one of the first to benefit by that program. The needs were indeed urgent. I found both patients and employees here living in ancient, unhealthy, and overcrowded buildings. In some cases people were living in quarters originally provided to take care of less than half their number. Tubercular patients requiring sunshine and fresh air were confined in dark, overcrowded wards and corridors and mingling with other patients without any attempt at segregation. In short, there was an utter lack of proper facilities.

With the help of the Federal Government some 12 building projects were undertaken. Architects were engaged, bids awarded to contractors, and the work was started and completed in a remarkably short period of time. Two of the new projects here at Wallum Lake that we were most proud of were the children's building and the main hospital building designed to provide facilities for nearly 400 patients. This latter structure also included a chapel, an auditorium, an extensive kitchen, as well as quarters for the administrative officers, a nurses' home and several apartment houses for physicians were also built. Then there was the matter of a power plant to provide electricity and such things as a water supply system and a sewage disposal plant. Those took shape and were completed in the due course of time. Other necessary facilities had to be rebuilt or installed such as a laundry and carpenter shop, an ice plant, an incinerator, a warehouse and garage. All this was done in spite of critical opposition to the program as a whole. Due to the generosity of the Federal Government, we were able to construct these projects at a cost to the State of little more than one-half of what they would have cost at any other time.

In addition to the physical improvements brought about as a result of this program, all of which are visible to the eyes of interested citizens, there was an improvement even more important. It consisted of a complete reorganization of the work based upon modern scientific principles, and made possible only by the material facilities provided by the program of which I have been speaking.

During my administration as Governor it was my pleasure to visit Wallum Lake frequently, especially during the period when the building program was in progress. I regret that during these busy wartime years in the Senate in Washington I have not been able to visit here as often as I would like.

There is still much that should be done here and I foresee that these coming postwar years will bring with them added problems of treatment, space, and facilities. It is my hope that sympathetic Federal and State administrations will give a helping hand. You may be sure that, as in the past, you will have my continued interest and support.

Let me tell you why I speak of greater work to be done and new problems to be solved:

Tuberculosis, properly designated "the white plague," is preventable; yet last year, 1944, 279 Rhode Island citizens died of tuberculosis. Death, by some deep instinct, is most repellent to the human race. So is it not strange that the community looks with complacency upon the death of nearly 300 of its citizens when we know that these deaths are unnecessary?

Leading public-health officials are agreed that tuberculosis can be wholly eradicated within the borders of the continental United States within the next 25 years, and that there are four necessary steps to this end.

The first is early detection and isolation.

Periodically every individual in the community should be given a TB diagnosis by a free chest film. At the present time, the United States Public Health Service is planning a comprehensive program for early detection of tuberculosis. This program is under Dr. Hilleboe of the United States Public Health Service. This case-finding will be achieved by the use of modern portable X-ray equipment in charge of a staff of technicians. I understand that Rhode Island will participate in this program through funds made available to the department of public health by the Federal Government.

The second step is a thorough-going program of public education.

In 1936 Rhode Island had the highest incident of death from this disease of any New England State. It has now been reduced to a point where we are below the national average. Constructive public-health work and education are responsible for this progress. I call your attention to what was done by the public health department of New York City. A specially designed body was built on an automobile truck. People entered one end of the truck body. Inside there was a series of sliding pictures whereby the enormity of this menace was brought home to every observer. The need for greater education at public expense is indicated by the fact that nearly 53,000 men and women die of tuberculosis every year in the United States. The economic loss alone, not to count the human misery, is sufficient to call for a national crusade.

The third step is the removal of sources of infection.

The city slums and in many of our large cities, highly unsanitary factory lofts and antiquated buildings account for a terrific toll. In a Federal pamphlet put out by the Federal Works Administration on postwar urban redevelopment, it is shown that blighted districts in our cities comprise about 20 percent of the metropolitan residential areas. This, however, is but part of the story. These blighted residential areas housing one-third of the population, account for 45 percent of the major crimes; 55 percent of the juvenile delinquency; 50 percent of all arrests; 35 percent of fires; 45 percent of cities' service costs;

and what is especially interesting to us here today 60 percent of tuberculosis victims in the United States and 50 percent of all types of disease.

We can no longer tolerate slums and other blighted areas. The Congress of the United States has done much to develop a public-housing program. I regret to say that even at the present moment, a powerful lobby representing real-estate interests and those engaged in private construction, seek to sabotage a progressive housing program.

The fourth step is: Basic scientific research.

It is surely an indictment of our society when we find that before the war less than one-third of 1 percent of the national income was devoted to scientific research.

We need only to consider the $2,000,000,000 expenditure on the atomic bomb to realize the untold potentialities, if we organize an integrated, thoroughgoing program of scientific research, supported by public funds.

Just as the atomic bomb has opened up vast vistas on the horizon of the future for unlimited power devoted to peace as well as war, there are even greater vistas on the horizon in the social sciences. I include the great science of medicine, and especially the growing science of biochemistry. The discovery of penicillin by the biochemists has already saved many more lives than the atomic bomb has destroyed. As you know, the sulfa group of drugs has, to a large extent, reduced the menace of pneumonia and other pulmonary diseases. These discoveries in the field of biochemistry are all new. There is every reason to believe that with a proper amount of money devoted to scientific research, in a few years' time, we shall find something like penicillin which will at an early stage attack and destroy the tubercular bacilli and with that the terrible menace of the white plague. I am extremely interested in some bills now pending in Congress which propose the establishment of a national research foundation for these purposes.

All of you here today will, I am sure, agree entirely with this fourfold constructive public health program, but always there will be the Jeremiahs to raise outcries of lamentation and criticism. They will ignore the great good to be accomplished and talk or write only about an increase in public expenditure and thereby an increase in taxes. This was their cry when I proposed to erect all these buildings here at Wallum Lake. This will probably be their cry as I now propose to take full adavntage of the work to be carried on here. I want to point out that the great bulk of all money raised by taxation today is expended for constructive objectives.

We are just beginning to realize that public expenditures for health, welfare, and social security belong in the same category as public expenditures for highways. They are creative expenditures. The rejection of some 30 percent of our young men for the armed services, because they were physically unfit, should be an object lesson to our businessmen and to our large taxpayers. It should be clear that if 30 percent of our young men in the very prime of their youth, between the ages of 18 and 35, were unfit for military service, they are unfit to carry on creative production in our rapidly expanding economic system. When we invest public funds for adequate medical care, hospitals, and creative public health work, we invest money in creating a people strong in mind and strong in body. Such people in the modern economic world are even more necessary than new factories and new types of productive machinery.

We are living in an epoch of change in our intellectual, social, and spiritual life. We see evidence in every part of the world that the people do not intend to be pushed around any longer. In countries ruled by outsiders they are seeking political independence. In other countries they are seeking economic independence. They do not intend to suffer patiently the low standard of living, lack of proper food, housing, and constructive health measures necessary for health and well-being. In this world, now on the verge of plenty and abundance through the revelations of modern science, people demand a new place in the sun. Equality is no longer a vague dream. It is a definite hope which people are striving to realize all over the world.

The crusade to eradicate the menace of the white plague under whose banners we meet today, is but one of many crusades looking to the alleviation of suffering, misery, ill health, and substandard living. These are indeed holy crusades. Those of us who are enlisted as was Dr. Barnes, for the duration of our lives in these crusades, must not and cannot falter. I, for one, am confident that tuberculosis will be eradicated in this State and this Nation, and I am happy to be with you today and to join with you as a crusader in this great cause.

Stop, Look, and Listen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 1, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Samuel Crowther:

STOP, LOOK, AND LISTEN

(By Samuel Crowther)

The American people, groggy after two wars and yearning for a true peace, are by well-planned propaganda being brought into a kind of coma in which nothing greatly matters. They may awake into a grisly land quite different from the brave new world they have been promised.

The Roosevelt strategy, which President Truman was supposed to have scrapped, is again being used to create a fake emergency to force the Congress to pass, without question, legislation that will utterly change the nature of both our domestic economy and our foreign relations and snuff out the flickering light of liberty.

And also, under cover of a whipped-up frenzy, certain investigations are being shoved aside. These are investigations that ought to be made before any important legislation is passed. We ought at least to know before we go further everything about Pearl Harbor, about the Tyler Kent affair, about the influence foreign powers are exerting in domestic politics, and about what Russia has been doing in Europe.

The evidence is not clear as to whether the present drama is being managed by the new triumvirate—President Truman, Secretary of State Byrnes, and Secretary of the Treasury Vinson—or whether they are being managed and are only actors in the show. The weight of evidence is that they are being managed and have no clear comprehension of the chain of events which they have set in motion or their consequences.

It would seem that the same cabal that ran the Roosevelt administration is now beginning to run the Truman administration and that the President is out of his depth and does not know it. If such be the case, it is a major tragedy. For certainly the President has the desire to serve the best interests of the people.

Here is the record. The pieces fit together as in a jig-saw puzzle.

1. The collapse of Germany brought to light for a moment the fact that in Europe the United States and Britain were vassals to Russia. They could go only where Russia said they might. Then the curtain went down again. It stayed down while President Truman made his unfortunate pilgrimage to Potsdam. The curtain was lifted a moment to show a naked agreement signed by Messrs. Truman, Stalin, and Attlee. The exact authority or status of this agreement is not clear, but its words not only confirmed the Russian suzerainty of Europe, but also committed the United States to a program which repudiates every principle for which the war was supposed to have been fought and violates every important American ideal and tradition—including the tradition that the United States is a Christian Nation. The agreement is as unmoral and godless as Russia.

It has been explained that the President was willing to let Stalin step into Hitler's shoes and rule Europe because he believed that Soviet brutality held its own cure and that the small nations would recover as they had many times before.

That is sound American doctrine. It was laid down by George Washington. If we had kept to that doctrine, we would not have gone to war.

But we threw away that doctrine and went to war for liberty and democracy. We can now abandon these subject peoples to their fate. Then they might recover.

But we are not just abandoning them. We are offering to agree through the San Francisco Charter to use Amercan lives to keep them subject to Russia and through the Bretton Woods schemes to finance their conqueror.

It seems scarcely possible that the President realizes what he has agreed to.

2. Perhaps in order to divert public opinion from the terrible program laid down at Potsdam, the President, after a perfunctory radio address which explained nothing, gave himself over to pulling our troops out of Europe. That thereby dropped the curtain on Europe. We all want the boys back, but there is as yet no information as to whether our troops are being withdrawn at such a rapid rate to satisfy the American people or to satisfy Stalin. None of the Russian troops, insofar as can be learned, have been withdrawn.

3. Before leaving for Potsdam, it will be recalled, President Truman demanded and received as aids to his bargaining power the passage of the new, sweeping Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, an act putting the United States into the Bretton Woods money schemes and a confirming vote by the Senate on the United Nations Charter as drafted at San Francisco. We have no information on how the President used his virtually autocratic powers. It is significant that since then Russia has confirmed the Charter and has not protested the President's sudden ending of lend-lease. We have no information whether lend-lease with its shadowy promise of a return payment will be continued in another form without even the shadow of a return.

4. The President, before the collapse of Japan and at a faster pace since, has given himself over to our quick reconversion from a war to a peace economy. This is in line with what the President wants and with what the people want, for everyone is fed up with regimentation and ration books. It was good psychology at once to take gasoline and canned goods off rationing and to promise more meat. Many controls have been taken off and people generally believe that private business is now completely free to do what it likes and to show its worth.

5. That is not true. All the important price controls remain. The free market is the lifeblood of voluntary enterprise and it is callous mockery to talk about business being able to go ahead under controlled

prices. The insiders who seem to be pulling the strings know that. The only freedom as yet granted to business is the freedom to fail without recourse—which is a freedom it already had.

6. The price controls are being retained on the plea that, if they are lifted before production is well under way, we shall have a serious inflation. Once more we are being told that we must be protected from inflation by a benevolent and far-seeing government. Everyone above the grade of idiot ought to know that the people cannot cause inflation. Only government by its misuse of the money power can cause inflation. The bureaucrats, with complete hypocrisy, are trying through controls to protect themselves from being swept out of office by a tidal wave of inflation. They are pretending that, if inflation comes, the people will be to blame.

7. Nearly every Washington release, no matter what it is about, contains a dire prophecy of unemployment. These prophecies pretend to be founded on statistics. The statistics are bunk. No one anywhere can do more than guess at the size of future unemployment. The amount of employment in the future—as in the past—depends upon the number of legitimate customers that we have for our goods. Customers created by the distribution of tax or printed money—no matter how the operation be disguised—are not legitimate. Artificial purchasing power can wreck but cannot build our economy.

8. The apparent but not actual freeing of business, the fervor about preventing inflation and the prophecies of unemployment are all parts of a propaganda show to build up public sentiment behind the Murray full employment bill so that it may be made to appear that anyone who is against that bill is against employment and in favor of unemployment. The Communists, the fellow travelers, and the whole anti-American crew are already taking that line in their slime sheets.

9. The full employment bill has very little to do with unemployment and a great deal to do with driving out the last vestiges of voluntary enterprise in this country and the substituting for it of a state slavery of the Hitler-Stalin type.

The eventuality of this bill is the work ticket. The work ticket is the badge of slavery.

Such is the record. The pieces fit together just a bit too nicely.

And also they fit together into a program which is identical with the program of Sidney Hillman's Political Action Committee—which was supposed no longer to have its headquarters in the White House.

That committee—no matter what some of its leaders and most of its members may think—is controlled at every important policy point by men and women who follow the Soviet party line as dictated from Moscow for use in foreign countries.

That party line has two main rules for American Communists. The first is that no obstacle must be put in the way of Russian imperial aggrandizement. The second is that every legislative measure must be supported which serves to break down money, to regiment the economy, and to prepare the way for chaos while pretending to do something else.

The Potsdam agreement, especially if implemented by the United Nations Charter and the Bretton Woods money dance, clears the way for Russia in Europe.

The "full employment" bill would complete the wreck of the American economy.

The PAC is carrying out the party line to the very letter.

The question which must now be answered is whether our titular officers are running this Nation or whether they are, voluntarily or involuntarily—it makes no difference—marionettes pulled about the stage by a foreign power.

The question can be answered in part if honest American reporters are allowed to roam Europe and honestly report the news.

The question may be answered in another part by Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

He is a thorough American and a great statesman, as well as a great general. He can be depended upon to administer the affairs of Japan and of the Orient as a resolute, God-fearing American. He is our greatest national figure.

If he be hampered, it will be a certain sign that American principles are not ruling America.

In the meanwhile, this would seem to be a good time for all citizens to stop, look, and listen.

For things are not what they seem to be.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURTON K. WHEELER
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, November 1 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article dealing with the President's message to Congress on the subject of universal military training in peacetime, written by Dorothy Thompson, and published in the Washington Evening Star of October 30, 1945. I call attention to the fact that before the war Miss Thompson was one of the leading interventionists in the United States.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

On Tuesday, President Truman addressed Congress on the necessity of universal military training in peacetime. Wednesday, Secretary of State Byrnes signed the text of the protocol of deposit of the United Nations Charter, which formally brought the World Security Organization into being, calling it a "memorable day for the peace-loving people of all nations."

There is something strangely ironic in this combination of events. On one day it is proposed that the United States train all its male youth for war; on the next, the United Nations of the world solemnly covenant to live together in peace.

The President says: "The sincerity of our intention to support the World Organization will be judged partly by our willingness to maintain the power with which to assist other peace-loving nations to enforce its authority."

To enforce its authority over whom?

The only nations not counted among the "peace lovers" are utterly vanquished and unconditionally surrendered. The victors are about to put on trial as criminals those who resorted to a war of aggression.

At such a moment the "peace lovers" enter an armament race.

The President says: "The United States now has a fighting strength greater than any other time in our history. It is greater than any other nation in the world."

But the President asks for more power. Power for what purpose?

"Until we are sure that our peace machinery is functioning adequately we must relentlessly preserve our superiority on land and sea and in the air." * * * "Research, new materials, and new weapons will never, by themselves, be sufficient to withstand a powerful enemy."

What powerful enemy? What member of the United Nations? Superiority over whom?

The President makes another plea for "realism." So, by all means, let us look at the reality.

The reality is that at Teheran, Yalta, San Francisco, and Potsdam our political leaders gave away the power that America had built up for the cause of justice, liberty, and peace. So today they must ask for more power.

The political leaders of the three great powers rejected the Atlantic Charter, first as its provisions applied to the vanquished, then as its provisions applied to any nation weak enough to be bullied.

The political leaders of the three great powers rejected, at San Francisco, the thesis that great powers must be subject to any law governing their soveregn actions and, in the name of law, established lawlessness for the powerful and servitude for the weak.

The political leaders of the three great powers threw into the wastepaper basket at Potsdam every shred of historical and ethnographical principle and human rights. By extending the frontiers of Poland under a thoroughly unrepresentative government to the Oder and the Neisse, and agreeing to the expropriation and deportation of indigenous populations, they compounded the crimes of Hitler himself—the very crimes of which the Nazi leaders stand accused before the world—and condemned millions of absolutely helpless men, women, and children to terror, migration, and starvation.

By agreeing to divide vast parts of Europe into zones within each of which four armies would have, in effect, unrestricted license to do as they pleased, they made inevitable the division of Europe into two blocs, and the breakdown of the London Conference.

By agreeing, in the name of "reparations" and "industrial disarmament," to a four-way loot in countries already devastated beyond imagination, they initiated in the name of peace a new scorched-earth policy; set adrift the last remnants of order; betrayed the hopes and prayers of all Christendom, and sowed the seeds of anarchy, nihilism, and despair.

All this was done while the United States had the mightiest army, navy, and air force the world had ever seen—and the atomic bomb on the verge of perfection.

Let us, then, face the reality. Universal military training is not for the enforcement of peace. It is asked because there is no peace—in our consciences, our minds, our hearts, our policies, our societies. It is asked in the frantic hope that the great nations, estimating each other's terrifying power and maneuvering against each other over the moans of the real peace lovers—the suffering, sacrificing, believing, hoping, and broken-hearted people of the world—will fear to attack each other, lest the result be mutual annihilation.

This is our peace, for which the youngest and noblest died.

Business Management and Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, November 1 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me

at a dinner given by the Financial World in New York on October 2, 1945, on the subject of business management and economics.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure to me to participate in this project of the Financial World designed to improve business methods and the active interest of stockholders in the business corporations which contribute so largely to progress and prosperity in our economic life. The subject of business management and economics has become infinitely more complicated, but at the same time this more difficult economics has come to dominate politics. And so if we are going to have an intelligent public opinion regarding political policy, certainly it is the duty of every business executive to give his stockholders the broadest education in the methods by which the machinery of free private production operates in the United States.

I have come from Washington today impressed with the confusion and inconsistency of principles, of issues, and of policies in which the thinking of those concerned with Government is now involved. During the war we had one great purpose. Since the accomplishment of that purpose there is no clarification of issues, and no clearly defined policy has emerged. We are all dominated by a vast optimism regarding a prosperous future for the United States. I feel it strongly myself in spite of the difficulties which face us. But there is no agreement on the methods required to reach that result, or even on the most fundamental principles of economic policy. We talk of a planned economy, under the full employment bill, and otherwise, but as far as I can see, while there is plenty of miscellaneous and inconsistent planning, there is no plan. To make a plan we don't need the elaborate statistical set-up of the full employment bill. We just need a putting together of the figures which the Government has, a little common sense, and an ability to count. In the absence of a plan, the tendency that I fear more than any other is the continued strength of the theory that the Government can bring about prosperity merely by spending money. Congress is so flooded by great spending projects, that probably most of its time from now until next June will be spent in giving them consideration.

The basic element of any Government policy to produce or maintain prosperity is a sound fiscal policy, one which decides on the necessary expenditures of the Government and the kind of tax system which is required to raise the money to pay for them. We need a postwar budget now. True, there are many uncertainties, particularly with relation to the immediate postwar period and the aftermath-of-war expenditures from which we cannot at once escape.

We should, however, have first a distinct goal for the Federal expenditure budget to be in effect when normal peacetime conditions are restored. Many private estimates have been made running all the way from sixteen billion a year to twenty-five billion a year or more. But there is no official estimate, not even an official guess. President Truman's message to Congress listed countless spending projects, but never suggested that there might be a problem in raising the money to pay for them. His only reference to taxation was to a reduction of taxation designed to stimulate business without "losing sight of the budgetary situation." It is hard to lose sight of something which we have never yet seen. Temporary tax revisions are being proposed by Mr. Vinson and the committees today, but they seem to be wholly unrelated to the expenses of the Government in 1946. Many private organizations have proposed permanent tax plans, with wholly insufficient knowledge of probable expense; but there has been no indication from the Government what its policy might be. In short, plans for spending proceed along one line, plans for tax reduction proceed along another, and no official attempt to reconcile the two has ever been presented.

We should determine now how heavy a tax can be levied without killing incentive, discouraging business growth, and reducing employment. If that figure can be determined we can and must then limit our expenditures to approximately that amount. A wise fiscal policy can put more men to work than all the public works in sight My own guess is that we can raise about twenty billion a year without crushing initiative and that we can hold our expenses to that figure. But we can only do it if we recognize the necessity of having to do it. The thinking of most people is still carelessly dominated by the thought that there isn't any necessity of trying. They seem to feel that since we had a deficit of fifty billion a year in wartime we can do the same kind of thing in time of peace.

I do not believe we can escape an annual budget of about $20,000,000,000—six billion for interest on the public debt, six billion for the armed forces, $3,000,000,000 for veterans, and five billion for the other departments of government, including agricultural aid, social welfare, and public works. Taxes to raise this amount will be heavy and probably will involve the 40-percent tax on business earnings and a personal income-tax schedule beginning at 20 percent, but with somewhat higher exemptions and somewhat lower rates than at present, and I hope a reduction of the double taxation on business and stockholders.

But today there is no plan. This year Congress has already passed bills providing for $500,000,000 a year of Federal aid to highways, and $200,000,000 a year investment in rural electric cooperatives. The Senate has passed a bill giving seventy-five million a year as aid to the construction of airports. We shall soon consider bills to provide a hundred million a year for aid in the construction of hospitals, and several hundred million a year for aid to common-school and high-school education. Many other spending bills are before Congress, including a hundred million a year for aid to vocational education, five hundred million a year for a national food-allotment plan, the old stamp plan, fifty million a year for a rural telephone administration, fifty million a year to provide free school lunches, fifty million a year for aid to States in eliminating river pollution, fifty million a year for aeronautical experiments, a hundred million a year for additional subsidies for public housing, and many flood-control projects, irrigation proposals, and river projects like the Missouri Valley Authority. Yesterday the Army engineers announced they were ready to start a program costing ultimately $1,500,000,000. There are many additional proposals for aid to public health, in addition to the construction of hospitals amounting, perhaps, to as much as $600,000,000 a year.

President Truman has even recommended in his message that the Federal Government adopt a general policy of grants to State and local governments for all public works. I am willing to give some Federal aid when there is a direct Federal interest as I see it, but I can see no justification for Federal aid to public works of purely local concern, except the same old fallacy that the spending of public money is itself a sufficient justification, on the ground that it in some way creates prosperity.

Then we have the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill increasing the pay-roll tax to 8 percent and providing universal compulsory health insurance and many other benefits along the lines of the Beveridge plan in England. Last year the advocates of this measure wanted 12 percent of all pay rolls. The reduction of pay-roll tax in the present bill suggests to me that a considerable part of the expense is now to be borne by general government and become a burden on the general taxpayer. I do not agree with the theories of Sir William Beveridge, but at least he is frank in giving a fair estimate of the cost and consequences of his numerous plans. From his English figures, I estimate that the Beveridge plan, if fully applied in this country, would cost about $18,000,000,000 a year. The Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill moves a long way in that direction.

Of course we have almost unlimited proposals for further aid to the veterans. Certainly, some substantial changes will have to be made in the GI bill of rights..

Then we have the huge sums proposed for foreign lending. We have already authorized about $6,000,000,000 for Bretton Woods, $3,500,000,000 for the Export-Import Bank, and $1,350,000,000 for UNRRA. It is suggested now that we loan or grant Great Britain approximately five billion more. Russia would like six billion. Many European and Asiatic countries will follow in their wake, although I think most of them can be taken care of by the Export-Import Bank. UNRRA wants another billion, three hundred and fifty million dollars.

I have always felt that we should make reasonable loans abroad to enable war devastated countries to get their own machinery in working order, but I have never felt that American dollars could cure the troubles of the world or make more than a small contribution to the success of a foreign nation in solving its own problems. But foreign lending on any such scale as is now proposed becomes another general charge against the American taxpayer. Our experience with the World War debts, our experience with lend-lease, teaches us that if the sums loaned are so large as to become truly burdensome they will never be paid. Present plans contemplate the outpouring of American money abroad at the rate of perhaps five billion a year for the next 4 years. That would add $20,000,000,000 to our public debt and I doubt if it can ever be recovered.

We are drifting rapidly, therefore, to a chronic condition of deficit spending. With the huge reserves of purchasing power in this country, with $40,000,000,000 in E bonds outstanding and convertible into cash, with a huge increase in currency and commercial deposits, with a great backlog of pent-up demand, we are headed for the biggest spending spree and inflation this country has ever seen. We must resume immediately some sense of responsibility and planning in our spending and taxing. We must provide for a definite and steady reduction in the Federal Budget to reach a balance in the fiscal year 1948.

Many of the spending projects are entirely worthy. Taken altogether they are impossible. I have felt that perhaps $1,000,000,000 a year might be added to the Budget for improvements in social welfare, and public works other than roads, provided that every other expense is reduced to the minimum. If the Budget is allowed to run as high as $25,000,000,000 a year, I believe it would require such a burdensome system of taxation as to stifle the very prosperity which pays the taxes. It would mean a total tax burden, Federal, State, and local, of about $35,000,000,000, probably more than 25 percent of the Nation's income. But this is merely a guess. I believe that no further expenditure should be authorized until we have an overall plan for taxation and peacetime expenditure.

There is more danger of inflation in the present Government policy outside of direct Government spending. A strong group in the Government is favoring further increase in wage rates, brought forcibly to our attention by the wave of current strikes demanding a 30-percent increase in such rates. The last figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics

show that since January 1941, adjusted straight time average hourly earnings of factory workers have increased about 40 percent, while the cost of living has increased 30 percent. It is doubtful if, during this period, labor has become substantially more efficient in peacetime industry except a very few. No doubt wage increases are due in some industries. But if wages go up generally, it will undoubtedly bring about a corresponding increase in prices, and start a spiral of inflation.

The President has also recommended a substantial increase in the minimum wage, at least 62½ percent from 40 to 65 cents. Any such large increase in the minimum wage will undoubtedly force a general increase for all those above that level. The same tendency is shown in the demand for an increased unemployment compensation wage to $25 a week after many States last winter fixed a lower rate.

Many of these wage increases may be wholly justified, but the effect of a general increase in wages can only be an increase in prices and a strong boost for inflation. The general tendency of the administration is shown by the recommendation that every Congressman and Senator be raised to $20,000 a year, a hundred percent increase, the normal effect of which would be to encourage increases in every line of salary and wages throughout the United States. Even the Congressmen themselves don't take this particular recommendation seriously.

The administration's only proposal for the prevention of inflation is the strenuous maintenance of price control. Chester Bowles stands like King Canute bidding the tide of inflation to recede. Inflation to him apparently means an increase in the published OPA price for retail stores, regardless of the fact that the whole country is becoming involved in a floodtide of inflation. The stronger this tide becomes, the greater incentive to a spreading black market. The only effect of Mr. Bowles' lonely activity will be to interfere with the operation of legitimate industry and discourage the expansion of production and employment. If costs and wages are allowed to increase and prices are held down, there will be no incentive to increase production at this time, there will be no incentive to new men to venture their money in losing enterprises. The large companies, of course, can stand a loss, but the policy is destructive of existing little business and discouraging to all those new enterprises we need to provide more jobs. The result of decreased production then is more inflation because the supply is less able to meet the demand. The best solution for high prices is a rapid increase in production, and a balancing of the Government's Budget. The administration makes the mistake of regarding increased prices and cost of living as inflation when it is merely the evidence of inflation. In 1929 we were told that we were living in a new era, that we had solved the problem of depression and prosperity and the argument was supported by the fact that there had been no increase in commodity prices. But there was inflation just the same, brought about by an undue expansion of private credit. The collapse of that balloon, which also included incidentally a good many unsound foreign loans, brought the greatest depression that we have ever seen in this country. Now we face the same result through an unwise expansion of public credit.

The proponents of the so-called full employment bill endorsed by the President are frankly inflationists. Mr. Wallace, whose book on the subject was published last week, proposes that we maintain in peacetime the same production of goods and services as at the peak of the war activity, approximately $200,000,000,000 annually. Under the terms of that bill as introduced, if the President estimates that production will be less than some conjectural figure required for 60,000,000 jobs, and cannot think of any way to stimulate private activity, he must propose a program of Federal investment and expenditure sufficient to reach the goal. I cannot imagine any more inflationary proposal. Fortunately, the Senate amendments have destroyed the compensatory Government spending theory contained in the original bill.

I do not believe the administration has thought through the cumulative consequences of the combination of the various policies proposed. Fortunately, when these proposals are translated into concrete measures they offend the common sense of the average American if he is not too much dazzled by those particular spending projects which appeal to his personal interest. A majority of Congress is instinctively opposed to inflationary measures of any kind. This week I was interested to see the most eager spenders repudiating the idea they were for deficit spending.

We must change the whole spendthrift policy which is probably necessary in time of war. We must weigh every expenditure in the light of the necessity of raising from our people, millions of plain working men and women, the money to pay for such expenses. We must stop appropriating money and see where we stand. We must exorcise from our thinking the theory that the Government can spend itself into prosperity, or that the creation of purchasing power is a sufficient excuse for spending.

The only way this can become and remain a prosperous country is to speed up the machine of private enterprise. The largest public-works program anyone has imagined is about $5,000,000,000 a year, which will put two and a half million men to work. We wish to employ more than 50,000,000 men. If, by sound fiscal policies, we can keep the private-enterprise machine on a stable basis and increase its operation by 10 percent, we can put more additional men to work than the largest possible public-works program. Public works are necessary and should be expanded when unemployment occurs, but they can never be a panacea for depression. They must be undertaken only if they are justified by their intrinsic worth.

It is important to adopt such a fiscal policy and policies that there will be a proper incentive of private industry to expand; a proper relationship between wages, prices, and the cost of living; a proper relationship between farm prices and industrial prices; and a proper relationship between savings and consumer expenditures. There are many other elements which can be indirectly affected by Government policies dealing with taxation and agriculture, credit, and controls or relaxation of controls. Public spending is only one of many policies, not by any means the most important and not by any means a catch-all solution. The machine won't run any better if you pour in more gasoline while you throw monkey wrenches in the machinery.

There is another objection to unlimited Federal spending. Every time a new method is found to spend Federal money, it requires a great extension of Federal power which is never easily relinquished. If public works cannot supply enough jobs, the next step is for the Government to go into business to compete with private enterprise. This in itself would discourage any further expansion of private enterprise in that field because no one can compete with a billionaire government. If we adopt or weakly acquiesce in the spending theory, the mere fact that a measure provides for pouring out Federal funds thereby becomes a sufficient recommendation for its adoption, and all critical judgment of the mertis of the particular plan is discouraged. In other words, the adoption of the spending theory means the indefinite expansion of Federal regimentation over States, local governments, and private business.

And so I urge that we get down to realties, that above everything we insist upon a program and a plan, and oppose every type of additional spending until we can judge just what the proper limit of Federal expenditure will have to be. If we have any such inflation as the drift of present policy indicates, it will be followed by a greater depression than the last, by suffering, hardship, and unemployment, and I fear by the deterioration of our free economy and of free government which has made this country the greatest and most powerful nation in the world, and with the highest standard of living.

OPA

REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 1, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, during the early part of the month of September the manufacturers of pine lumber from the Southern States sent representatives here to contact their Senators and Representatives to have them appeal to the OPA for relief because the ceiling price on pine lumber was below the cost of production, and as a result many of the mills were closing down, and those operating were operating at a loss and, consequently, the production of lumber was being drastically curtailed.

At a meeting of the Senators and Representatives from the Southern States Senator BANKHEAD, of Alabama, was elected chairman of a committee of 10 Senators and Members of the House, and officials of the OPA were called before the committee, and the situation was explained to them.

The OPA officials promised the committee to advise them in the premises at once, and on October 3 a letter was received by Senator BANKHEAD, chairman, and Mr. Frank S. Ketcham, assistant general counsel for the OPA, copy of which was furnished to me by Senator BANKHEAD, and I wish to quote my reply to Senator BANKHEAD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., October 4, 1945.

Hon. JOHN H. BANKHEAD,
United States Senator,
Chairman, Southern Pine Lumber Congressional Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have received your letter of the 3rd instant, enclosing copy of letter received from Mr. Frank S. Ketcham, assistant general counsel for the OPA, and for which I thank you very much.

Judging from my past experiences with the OPA, due to the interminable delays and intransigence in the administration of that agency, I doubt that we will be able to obtain any relief for our constituents before the agency is abolished, or unless we appeal "higher up."

Assuring you of my full cooperation in this instance, and with kind regards and best wishes, I am

Very respectfully yours,
HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the OPA continues to give the Members of Congress the same old

"run around" that they have been giving us since their beginning, and we have been unable to obtain any satisfaction from the OPA to help our constituents and to give relief to an important industry. We all know that there has been a most acute shortage of lumber all over the United States due to the exigencies of war, and that building of all kinds was completely suspended during the war, and now that the war is over, we feel that the OPA and other governmental agencies should now give some consideration to the civilian population and to the industries who supply the civilians with the things necessary to life and to their welfare.

Shortage of Lumber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 1 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dated October 25, 1945, from the Northwestern Lumbermen's Association, dealing with the shortage of lumber.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTHWESTERN LUMBERMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Minneapolis, Minn., October 25, 1945.

Mr. A. O. SLETVOLD,
Senator, Chairman, Minnesota Small Business Commission, State Capitol Building, St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR SENATOR AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION: We have read in the newspaper and in a bulletin issued by the Independent Retail Lumber Dealers' Association directed to your commission of the controversy between the Independent Retail Lumber Dealers' Association and the Office of Price Administration with reference to paying wholesale and commission lumbermen an 8 percent commission for their services.

May we impose upon your time long enough to state some facts which may be of help to you and the commission in solving some of our industry's problems, and lay before you the complete story and not only one phase of it?

Of the 2,700 retail lumber yards in Minnesota, Iowa, North and South Dakota, the Northwestern Lumbermen's Association has a membership of 2,350 retail lumber yards. This membership comprises independent yards, farmer and farmer cooperative yards, small and large line yards. Of the 2,700 retail yards, 1,037 yards are individually owned, 1,663 yards are small and large line yards. Seventy-six percent of the 2,700 yards are independent yards and small line yards operating 1 to 10 yards.

The big problem confronting the retail lumber industry of the Northwest, the prospective home owner who wants to build a home, and the farmer who needs lumber and other building material for farm buildings is the lack of lumber and building materials. This everybody knows. Building material manufacturers are from 7 to 9 months behind in production; and the lack of lumber is caused by the present strikes, manufacturing equipment, trucks, tires to get the logs to the mills for production, and, we add, in no uncertain terms, the meddling of the Office of Price Administration.

This association has always stood for controls for the prevention of inflation. The present price controls on our industry were sufficient to prevent inflation during the war and will do so in this postwar period, but Mr. Bowles of the OPA hopes to establish an over-all, new OPA program, and is now fighting for this new program in Congress.

The general over-all policy of the OPA as announced is threefold:

1. The establishment of ceiling prices on new dwellings, resulting in control of what materials, items, etc., can go into a home.

2. Control of labor costs and services performed by builders lower than present labor costs, reverting in some cases to 1943 labor rates.

3. Establishment of dollar-and cent ceiling prices on distribution (distribution is now operating under price control) forcing retailers out of business, as retailers will have to absorb all increases in costs permitted producers in hopes of encouraging production.

What does this story tell? It means that the people who want to build homes will be told how much they can pay for their home, what kind of materials must go into their home, when and where they can build a home. With the National Housing Authority working hand-in-hand with the OPA, all home construction will be programmed by the OPA and the NHA, with the owner of the home having little to say about his own home.

What is labor going to say when the OPA "rolls them back" on wage scales, such as OPA has done in their directive imposed upon the prefabricated home manufacturer? Do you think labor is going to stand for "roll back in wages"? No. They will strike and homes will not be built when materials are available.

Do you think the retail lumber industry is going to sell people material for home and farm buildings at a loss, because OPA would force us to absorb all increases in producing costs?

Before the meddling of OPA and NHA the lumber industry as a whole worked hand-in-hand—the manufacturer, the wholesaler, commission man, and retail dealer—and built the homes and farm buildings people needed, any they can do the job again and employ millions of people if the OPA and NHA keep their fingers out of the mess they have and are creating.

What has the retail lumber dealer of the Northwest, regardless of who or where he is, had to do in order to get lumber for the consumer? He has had to buy green timbers and have them remilled in transit at a cost of $15 to $20 per thousand feet in order to get a little lumber, and he has had to absorb this additional cost. He also has had to absorb the extra freight on green lumber, absorb extras allowed mills on special grading paragraphs in OPA orders, plus added costs on less than carload shipments where retail price is based on carload shipments. All this the retailer did in order to get a little lumber, and now the OPA wants the retailer to absorb more and more costs which will definitely discourage the retailer and eventually put him out of business.

Another factor of importance is present retail lumber stocks. A recent survey, made by this association, of lumber inventories showed that all yards, regardless of kind or type, scattered throughout the Northwest are 15 percent of normal stocks of the kind and type of lumber needed to build homes and farm buildings—boards, dimension lumber, siding, flooring, and millwork. If the Commission would make a survey of lumber inventories themselves, with a questionnaire to all Minnesota lumber dealers, we know your eyes would be opened when the figures are laid before you.

The writer was in Washington 3 weeks ago, met with many Senators and Representatives, both Republican and Democrats (not New Dealers), and they are all familiar with what OPA is doing and how OPA is stagnating reconversion, and they told me in no uncertain terms that they are dead against OPA's new 5-year program, as it is called, and will do everything in their power to prevent the program from being established. But all of them, like this association, are for control of some kind to prevent inflation.

I was also advised that the OPA is already lobbying for their perpetuation after July 1, 1946, and our Congressmen don't like it.

So you see, Senator and members of the commission, you have heard only one phase of the problem preventing the building of homes and farm buildings in the presentation made to the Commission by the Independent Retail Lumber Dealers' Association.

We quote from the Independent Lumber Dealers' Association bulletin directed to the Commission, dated October 3, 1945: "It is possible for him to band together with other independent dealers and form a buying organization, hiring representatives to compete with present purchasers for chain systems and large industrials." What are the facts on this subject?

As stated previously in this letter, there are 2,700 retail lumber yards in Minnesota, Iowa, North and South Dakota. Of these 2,700 lumber yards only 276 yards retain a buyer on the West coast. All the rest have had to depend for their lumber supply on manufacturers salesmen, wholesalers, commission men, and wholesale distribution yards. If the big chain yards, as mentioned in this bulletin, were getting the larger share of the lumber, then homes and farm buildings would be built. But they are not because the lumber inventories of 98 percent of the lumber yards of the Northwest are 15 percent of normal.

We are not interested in controversy between certain factions in the lumber industry. What we are interested in is the getting of lumber and building materials for the prospective home builders and the farmers, and if OPA and NHA leave their meddling fingers out of the picture, homes and farm buildings will be built, thousands of people will be employed in the Northwest, and present price controls on distribution will prevent inflation. As John Snyder, Chief of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, says, "The idea was that industry, once freed of regulation, would produce in sufficient quantity to keep prices down by competition."

Enclosed are several copies of a bulletin sent all independent, farmer, and farmer-cooperative yards, line yards, small and large. Please read it. It gives a complete picture of the problem now confronting the lumber and building-material industry, the prospective home owner, and the farmer. When major problems of this nature confront our industry, we place the problem before the entire industry, and this association's policy is based upon their counsel and advice as shown by their vote.

We also go on record with the Commission that the wholesalers and commission men of the lumber industry have been for many years, and will be in the future, a factor in the procurement of lumber for retail dealers. In fact, this association is on record in Washington and with the Wholesale and Commission Lumbermen's Association as not only favoring the wholesale commission, but have been, weeks before your Commission was presented to the problem. If the lumber dealers of the Northwest are desirous of absorbing the 8-percent commission as proposed by the Independent Lumber Dealers' Association, they will say so in answering the questions outlined in the enclosed bulletin. This is a matter for the lumber dealers to decide, not this association.

If your Commission is desirous of discussing the critical lumber and building-material situation with this association, we will be more than happy to do so. We have not brought our problems to your Commission since, as an association, our problems cover the States of Iowa, North and South Dakota, as well as Minnesota, while you function for Minnesota only, but be assured we will cooperate with your Commission whenever we can be of service.

Sincerely yours,

W. H. BADEAUX,
Secretary.

Maintenance of Individualism and Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH McKELLAR
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 1 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Preston Delano, Comptroller of the Currency, before the Robert Morris Associates at the regional meeting of the Buffalo-Rochester-Syracuse Chapters, at Buffalo, N. Y., on October 26, 1945. The address deals with the maintenance of a society of individualism and free enterprise.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is our fortune, or perhaps our misfortune, to live in a turbulent and dangerous time. It has the smell of fire about it. There is a pleasant touch of nostalgia in turning back the clock to the teens of our now maturing twentieth century and comparing the problems which we knew as young men and those which confront us today. We had our economic and social difficulties then, even our wars, but somehow from this distance they seem much more simple, candid, and direct than those which plague us now. They did not strike at foundations. We still had a stable footing. There were distant rumblings but the great majority of thinking people dismissed quite casually the idea that there could be a real threat to our competitive individualistic economy or to our social structure. Socialistic and communistic theories were regarded as the indoor sport of slightly pink individuals who carried no weight. Science was beginning to have doubts about some of its treasured principles, but here again the new doctrines typified by Einstein's relativity were regarded with rather amused tolerance and as significant only in the classroom. The gay and roaring twenties, now dangerously prophetic in retrospect, confirmed our basic idea that after all it was a pretty good world, particularly if you were on the right side of the market.

Now suddenly and ominously we are aware that the rumblings of distant drums are catching up with us. With recent events abroad staring us in the face, we no longer lightly brush aside the talk about a collective or socialistic economy. We begin to realize that the maintenance of a society of individualism and free enterprise is a rather serious business, our serious business if you please. And science, after brooding in her laboratories for a decade, has suddenly emerged with a handful of real and tangible results, capped by the release of atomic energy in the form of the most destructive instrument the world has ever known. What she has to offer both amazes and appalls us. It is a fascinating, bewildering, and hazardous time.

Now all of this has to do with us as citizens but in a narrower sense it is also our concern as bankers. It is the background for any discussion of the banking situation of today. If we look at the balance sheets, statements of condition and of earnings and dividends, yes, the examination reports in my own office, we have some reason for satisfaction which can easily lull us into complacency. The figures look pretty good. But underlying this technical situation are the grave difficulties of the times.

Two questions pose themselves: What can we as bankers do to assist in the restoration of a free economy in a world which has been regimented for war; and second, what can we as bankers do to maintain our traditional financial leadership in that economy?

Paraphrasing the first question, What can bankers do to maintain the individual as the important factor of society, and his initiative as the driving force which turns the wheels? For the last few years the important thing which we could do has been to devote all our energies to the winning of the war. This we have done. If the dictators had prevailed, the struggle for the rights of the individual would have been lost for a long time to come. Now the war has been won and the dictators crushed, but there remains the difficult task of gradually releasing the controls and once again permitting the economic machine to run under its own power. This so-called total war in which practically all the nations of the world have been involved has produced an absolutely unprecedented dislocation in individual liberty of action. The delicate balance which is so essential to a free economy has been completely disrupted, and the world will not automatically settle back into the general prewar pattern. If we really want back a world of free enterprise and initiative, instead of a regimented one, we are going to have to struggle for it. Possibly one answer is that in the daily conduct of our affairs we can keep ever before us the importance of bolstering up personal initiative wherever it may be found and strengthening that desire to be on his own which is a part of every American's heritage. We can direct credit into those channels where it will best serve the purposes of a vigorous free economy. We can become a part of the great drama to preserve the rights of the individual against the encroachments of the socialized or authoritarian state.

I realize that many of the factors, and probably the determining ones, which will ultimately make for the success or failure of the reconversion effort, lie outside the banking field. Yet bankers must be giving thought and exercising leadership in those broader fields which lie outside the confines of their own immediate affairs. To fail to do so in this crisis is to lack vision indeed.

As to the second question, it is possible to be somewhat more explicit. At the present time, it seems likely that the classic pattern of equity financing with risk capital is about to face a severe test, perhaps because the rewards (even before the impact of taxes) do not seem to justify the hazards, or perhaps for other reasons.

It is not the job of banking to furnish means for launching every scheme that occurs to the minds of the would-be entrepreneurs. But it is the job of banking to supply needed credit to ably managed enterprises—new as well as established—which have reasonable prospects of success and show promise of making a contribution to our national well-being.

One valuable device for the discharge of this function is the so-called term loan, which has been used increasingly for over a decade. Another technique—still largely in the potential rather than the kinetic state—is the organization of credit groups. Whether it is entirely fortuitous, or whether there is some casual nexus, these two developments serve to supplement each other to permit fuller utilization of each than otherwise would be possible.

It is unnecessary to describe the basic differences between term loans and the traditional short-term commercial loans. The 60- or 90-day seasonal loan to an old customer is almost foolproof, provided certain well-known checks are made and precautions taken. A 5- or 10-year-term loan presents very different problems, and requires the banker to possess and exercise judgment—almost prophecy—regarding the business cycle, as well as the future of the industry and the particular organization, over that substantial period of time.

Obviously, an application for a term loan calls for much more thorough study of management, performance, and earnings than a seasonal loan to bridge the period between shipment by a manufacturer and receipt of payment. Special methods of analysis are required involving factors quite different from those which are important to the short-term lender, bondholder, or equity investor; for example, a bank considering a term loan sometimes can safely disregard the borrower's net profits from the correct accounting standpoint, with its necessary provision for depreciation and depletion, and can base its conclusions on the "cash throw-off" to be expected over the life of the loan.

To a degree, of course, some of what are today designated as term loans are old wine in new bottles—merely a recognition of short-term loans for what they actually are—a term loan in disguise. As we all know, many short-term loans have been made with full realization that they could not be discharged at the ostensible maturity, but would have to be renewed again and again, with payment several years off. To this extent, the development of the term loan is simply a frank recognition of the facts and is all to the good.

But most term lending is relatively new in substance as well as in name. The term loan is a flexible intrument which can be adapted to numerous situations, where neither short-term loans nor bond, preferred stock, or common stock financing could fit the need precisely. To some extent it constitutes the answer of banking to the challenge of Government lending and Government guaranties.

Of necessity, such term lending is a step in a direction which could lead American banking toward permanent financing of industry, a conceivable development which in my opinion, should be approached thoughtfully and with the utmost caution, despite its successful use in European banking for many decades. Up to the present, no noticeable trend in this direction has been observed. But by their very nature some potential term loans involve unavoidable hazards, and are of a size which makes them unsuitable for handling by a single institution.

For these two reasons, may I invite your attention to a possible advantage in coordinating term lending with the formal or informal credit-group procedure in order to utilize the full potentialities of both. The correspondent banking groups or credit pools or credit groups, launched during the past 2 years, can perform important functions in many ways, but particularly in combination with certain types of term loans. The possibilities of these groups are not limited to serving as a semipermanent, large-scale aggregation of participating banks organized for the stimulation of activity by their members.

It seems to me that the credit group can be of special value in connection with loans, generally term loans, which cannot be handled in the traditional manner by reason of

their nature, rather than their magnitude. To speak plainly, there are numerous situations in which the element of risk is such that no one bank would care to hazard a substantial percentage of its capital, but which nevertheless are within the scope of a reasonable definition of "bankable loans." Loans of this type in fact often are the very ones which provide the means for a small business to start on the way to becoming a major enterprise; in other words, these borrowers are the expanding element in our economy. For this very reason, any one of such loans may result in considerable loss, but a hundred of them, prudently made and supervised, represent en masse very profitable business, even after writing off the two, three, or five loans which do not pan out. Not only that, but some of the concerns thus helped along the way probably will be among the bank's biggest and more profitable customers in 10 or 20 years. Finally, and most important, through such advances banks can supply the means which are needed to make possible the continued expansion of our economy—full employment and constantly higher standard of living—which constitutes one of our primary national aims.

Let there be no misunderstanding here. I am not advocating that banks should furnish ventur capital in order to preserve our society of free enterprise or to maintain their own position in it. The supplying of venture capital is the proper function of the entrepreneur and of the investment banker. Commercial bank deposits should never be used for that purpose. What is presently under discussion must be understood as restricted to the field of properly bankable loans, which, of course, in the term category will always present, even within bankable limits, varying degrees of risk.

I need hardly describe in any more detail the relationship which I envision between term loans and credit groups. It is often quite justifiable for a bank (as one of a group of 20 or 30) to advance, let us say, $20,000 in connection with each of some 50 loans, whereas it might not be safe and sound banking, in the eyes of either the directors or the supervisory authorities, for each bank to make a single one of such loans in an amount of $500,000, or to retain $200,000 and grant $100,000 participations to each of three correspondent banks. In a word, broad diversification can make this field both safe and profitable, and in this way credit groups can make possible much-needed and sound advances to small but growing organizations.

By performing this function, through group handling of properly planned and devised term loans, American banking can prove once more its adaptability and capacity for growth, create for itself a new and promising field for credit extension, and diminish the necessity either for Government lending or use of the crutch of Government guaranties, with its constant threat of atrophy to banking judgment. Above all, by rendering such service in this and other areas within their competence, bankers can assist in meeting one of the important obligations of our generation. This obligation is the task of holding fast to certain fundamentals, the tried and proven in our present social and economic organization. It is important to hold fast to the sure things against those alluring but dangerous vistas which come to us from the heated imaginings of war and which are always present in the years of ferment which follow the cassation of hostilities.

This young and very imperfect civilization of ours is rich—rich because it has time in its purse. May we spend this time wisely. In all eras of great unrest and change there are certain outposts of the past which must be held lest hard-won truths be lost. Holding these outposts is oftentimes a lonely and unrewarded task but it is an assignment of great honor.

Over the Top

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 1, 1945

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks I include two news items from the Atlantic News-Telegraph of Atlantic, Iowa, and it goes without saying that I am justly proud of the people of Audubon County, my home county, which was one of the first if not the very first county in the Nation to oversubscribe their quota in the E-bond drive. You can always count on the people of Iowa to do their duty.

The news items follow:

AUDUBON CHAIRMAN FLIES TO CHICAGO WITH "OVER THE TOP" REPORT

CHICAGO, October 29.—Holger Lindholm, of Audubon, Iowa, dumped $330,000 in checks and E-bond stubs on a Federal Reserve bank desk at 12:30 p. m., central standard time, today after an airplane trip from Des Moines.

Clarence T. Laibly, assistant cashier of the Federal Reserve bank, said the county was the first to report "over the top" in the five-State midwestern Federal Reserve district.

DES MOINES, October 29.—His suitcase crammed with $330,000 cash and E-bond stubs, Holger Lindholm, Victory loan chairman, Audubon County, boarded a plane today for Chicago where he hoped to be the first in the country to report a county over the top in the drive which started today.

Lindholm, a lumber dealer, said 300 solicitors started work last Tuesday to raise Audubon's $280,000 quota of E-bonds and "had to stop with 112 percent of quota because the banks ran short of bonds."

Accompanying Lindholm on his journey to the Federal Reserve bank in Chicago was Elmer Carlson, 1935 world champion corn picker, now in business in Audubon County.

AUDUBON HAILED AS ONE OF 12 COUNTY WINNERS IN BOND SALE

DES MOINES, October 30.—Audubon County, Iowa, was hailed today as one of 12 counties in the Nation to reach its E-bond quota on the first day of the Victory loan campaign.

At Chicago, Clarence T. Laibly, assistant cashier of the Chicago Federal Reserve Bank, said Audubon was the first county in the 5-State midwestern Federal Reserve district to go "over the top."

Holger Lindholm, Audubon County campaign chairman, flew to Chicago yesterday with $330,000 or 112 percent of the county's E-bond quota. The goal was reached prior to the official opening of the drive.

The achievement of Audubon and the other 11 counties across the Nation gained these comments from Washington:

"In behalf of the hundreds of thousands of wounded and disabled veterans of this war who will benefit directly from the Victory loan I want to congratulate and commend you for the fine and patriotic record in meeting your bond quota on the opening day of the drive," Gen. Norman T. Kirk, surgeon general of the Army, wired each of the county chairmen.

"This," said Secretary of the Treasury Vinson, "shows that people in widely scattered parts of the country are aware of the importance of the loan and are out early to make and surpass their quotas."

The little west-central county with Audubon, with a population of less than 3,000, as its largest town was first or one of the first counties in Iowa to reach its quota in all seven previous war-bond drives.

Laboratory for the Study of Tropical and Subtropical Fruits and Vegetables

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HENDRICKS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 1, 1945

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago the Citrus Products Research Council met in Daytona Beach, Fla., and at that time they recommended that there be established in the State of Florida a laboratory for the study of tropical and subtropical fruits, vegetables, and plants. At that time they stated that such a laboratory would contribute to the improvement of the national diet and health, uncover new sources of national wealth and the potential resources of this area and remove a disadvantage under which this section now suffers in competing with other agricultural areas. It was reported that the council sought the aid of the Congressmen and Senators from Florida and the Secretary of Agriculture for such a project. While they have not taken the matter up with me, I immediately took it up with certain officials of the Department of Agriculture and had a conference with all the bureaus concerned in regard to the form in which such a bill should be drawn.

Those agencies conferring on the bill were the Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry, the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils and Agricultural Engineering, the Bureau of Animal Industry, the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, also the Agricultural Research Administration, and Mr. Elmer Mostow from the Solicitor's Office. While none of these men in the conference committed themselves to the approval of such a bill, and I did not ask them to do so, they did suggest the substance of the bill, and Mr. Mostow assisted me in drafting the bill. That bill I am introducing today, and it covers a far greater range than was suggested by the Citrus Research Council.

I fully believe that now that the war has ended we should turn to the peaceful pursuits. Research in the tropical and subtropical fruits, vegetables, and plants, byproducts thereof, feeds for animals, and the marketing outlets for these various crops has long suffered for lack of funds and lack of scope of authority to do the proper research. I introduced this bill not alone because I thought these people wanted it, but because I have felt for a long time that such research should be done. My record will show that I have always tried to secure more funds for research purposes. I propose to ask the Committee on Agriculture of the House to send this bill to the Department of Agriculture for a report, to ask the

approval of the Secretary of Agriculture and to ask for hearings on the bill.

Such an establishment in the State of Florida with the authority to do the work carried in this bill would mean millions of dollars not only to the people of the State of Florida, but to the entire Nation.

Address of Hon. Tom C. Clark at Unveiling of Bust of Franklin D. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 1, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Hon. Tom C. Clark, Attorney General of the United States, in behalf of the President of the United States and the American people at the unveiling ceremonies of Franklin D. Roosevelt's bust, the war President, at Hyde Park, N. Y., Sunday, October 28, 1945:

Mr. Booras, Mrs. Roosevelt and family, members of the Order of the Ahepa, and friends, I regard it as a high favor and rare privilege to accept, on behalf of the President and people of the United States, this likeness of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt who, in life, personified the hope of liberty to oppressed peoples everywhere.

I need not remind you, who were privileged to know our late beloved President as an active member of the Order of the Ahepa, that the lamp of liberty that he handed down to posterity will shine brightly as long as men of good will stand ready to guard its sacred flame.

It is truly fitting that we assemble here in this quiet place where he sleeps, surrounded by the countryside and river he knew and loved so well, to pay homage to this man of the ages whose name will forever remain synonymous with liberty to freemen everywhere.

You, who have descended from the warriors who fought at Marathon and Salamis and the brave men who held the pass at Thermopylae—the land of Plato, Aristotle, and Bozarris—know what I mean by freemen.

For Greece, whose cultural heritage has so richly endowed our own civilization, has never in the long centuries of her glories bent her knee in servility to a tyrant. Indeed, 5 years ago this very day, those of your blood in the old country gladly chose death and suffering rather than yield their God-given right to live as freemen. There were no quislings in Greece.

It is reassuring to know that you Americans of Greek ancestry have never forgotten your heritage. Thousands of your sons, and daughters, too, donned the uniform of America's armed forces when the evil forces of darkness threatened to engulf her.

To the name of Dilboy has been added those of Americans of Greek ancestry who unselfishly made the supreme sacrifice on the altar of liberty, while you who fought on the home front, manifested your unswerving loyalty and patriotism by your wholehearted support of the war bond drives. Your splendid record in previous war bond drives has caused the Secretary of the Treasury to honor you by permitting your organization to open the final victory drive.

In closing, I am most honored on behalf of the President and our fellow Americans to accept your gracious tribute to the greatest American of our times, and to one of the immortals of the ages.

In the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 1, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Krock, from the New York Times of November 1, 1945:

ARBITRATING THE GOOSE AND THE GOLDEN EGG

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, October 31.—The President's broadcast on labor disputes, accompanied by his revised wage adjustment formula, was devoted in great measure to a plea for the spirit of cooperation and mutual understanding between industry and its workers on which he said the success of any plan must depend. But this spirit has been notably absent in recent management-labor exchanges, and today few would venture to predict that the President's invocation, or the general agreement to the unexceptionable axioms he stated, will restore it.

The reception of the speech and the Executive order by persons close to both sides of the growing national controversy suggests the answer Hotspur made to Owen Glendower when the Welsh chieftain proclaimed he could call spirits from the vasty deep. "Why, so can I, and so can any man," replied the young Percy, "but will they come when you do call for them?"

FIRST TEST SOON

The response of labor and management to the President's appeal for a more constructive attitude toward each other, a more common-sense appreciation of each other's problems and rightful expectations, will first be tested in the conference that has been summoned for the early part of November. Already, however, labor is resisting the suggestion that it renew its no-strike pledge of wartime, even though that was broken on numerous occasions, as a material advance toward the halfway mark. And already management is drawing back from a commitment to collective bargaining which would be left to the interpretation of the political power, fearing the construction would be that such bargaining is not real unless demands are always met in substance.

Unless a broader formula than the President's, on which reasonable wage-and-hour negotiations can be reasonably conducted, is the outcome of the conference, and with the formula an enforced determination to abide by it, little hope was expressed here today by experts in industrial relations that Mr. Truman's speech and Executive order can be relied on to bring the issue nearer to peaceful solution. By these his plan was held to be inconsistent, in part, with his axioms and stated objectives, and they turned their eyes on the conference and Congress and the corrective legislation it is considering.

AN UNCOVERED SITUATION

One of the many advisers on whom the President relied for the patchwork of ideas that took form in his speech made two points about it to this correspondent today, one hopeful, the other not. Mr. Truman, he said, was planning as late as last Thursday to confine himself to a statement and an amended Executive order, but he was prevailed on to go to the country with a full-length speech in which he would stress the need of mutual understanding and recite the problems of each industrial group. But Mr. Truman failed to touch the situation of workers in industries that are continuing on the wartime basis of 48 hours a week, who, when they note that 40-hour workers are getting almost as much, will quit or strike and thus cut down the high productivity the President set as a national standard.

This disparity was implicit in certain passages of the broadcast, and Government boards could readily effect it in their findings. The President did say that wartime take-home pay could not as a general practice be expected by labor, now that the war is over. But he did not indicate in any way that those workers on 40-hour base pay should expect or accept reductions to the amount of 8 hours less earnings than those whose industries are proceeding on the 48-hour basis. Mr. Truman sanctioned the 40-hour week as a standard, but he did not explain how this could achieve the production he concedes to be a necessity.

A MIXED PATTERN

"It is pretty hard," said one informed critic, "to give birth to triplets—to preserve the authorities and positions of Chester Bowles, John Snyder, and the CIO at the same time."

Others noted that the President dealt with the excess-profits tax as a reservoir for wages, not as the temporary war measure it is, but as a producer of funds to which the Government was entitled in wartime and therefore labor should be given in peace. Mr. Truman did not include the reserves which wise and successful management has laid by in industry as another reservoir from which to draw wage increases. But labor spokesmen have cited it as such, denying that this project amounts to socialism.

So many minds and pens joined and clashed in the preparation of the broadcast that its inconsistencies and omissions are not surprising. The analysts of such compositions are sure they recognize the plain track of Judge Rosenman, Robert Nathan, and other New Deal economists and literary amanuenses. But they are equally certain that in other passages they came on the footprints of Mr. Snyder, of Chester Bowles, and of Philip Murray. The latter were definitely missing in the place where the President might have fixed a percentage for wage increases and did not. But the tracks of Mr. Snyder and Mr. Bowles, though at times these suggested a scuffle ending in a draw, were heavy throughout the area of composition.

St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 1 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Fargo (N. Dak.) Forum of September 30, 1945, favorable to the St. Lawrence waterway.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Thomas W. Wahl, a Duluth man who is a member of the Minnesota-Great Lakes-Tidewater Association, in a recent letter to the Fargo Forum urged citizens of this area lend support to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, which, if constructed would have the effect of making Duluth an ocean port.

This project has been in the discussion stage for a long time.

Powerful opposition has developed to it, heading up in the port of New York, which does not want to see this development, obviously because it would take away a lot of traffic that now flows through that port.

Most eastern and some midwest railways are opposed and it is easy to understand why. They stand to lose traffic and revenue.

But isn't that one very definite reason why the shippers of the Midwest should be for it?

If the construction of this waterway should result in the diversion of a great amount of traffic from the rails and away from the port of New York it will be for one reason only, and that is it will move that way cheaper. In other words, that will be the most economical way for this traffic to flow.

And who would benefit by that? Obviously it would be the producers and the consumers and the shippers of this vast midcontinental section, far from the ocean and cheap ocean transportation.

If ocean freighters can be brought within 250 miles or less of the boundaries of North Dakota, that would be almost the same as moving North Dakota within 250 miles of an ocean port—and what a sweeping change that would make in the economy of this section of the world.

Farmers of North Dakota always have been under a severe handicap because they have such a long haul to get their products to the consumers in the dense population centers of the rest of the Nation and the world. What a change it would make to the wheat growers of North Dakota if they were but 250 miles from an ocean port.

We believe Mr. Wahl will find strong support behind the deep-sea waterway in North Dakota.

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. LaFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a radio address which I made on the subject of the pending legislation for a permanent FEPC over the American Broadcasting System on July 27, 1945:

I am honored and privileged to speak on this program with Mrs. Anna Arnold Hedgeman, the executive secretary of the National Council for a Permanent FEPC. I know of no one who has worked harder or more intelligently for the cause of the permanent legislation. If it were necessary or proper to personalize the principles to which those of us who support this legislation adhere, I know of no person who, by their own intelligence, character, and conduct, more completely personifies both the justification for and the need for this legislation, or more fully exemplifies the truth of the ethical and biological premises upon which those of us who support this legislation base our case.

I am willing to debate both the principles upon which the permanent legislation is founded and the mechanics of the specific legislation now pending in the House, any time, anywhere, with any person, subject only to limitations upon my time arising out of the presently existing personal reasons, or out of the duties imposed upon me as a Member of the National House of Representatives.

Tonight, because of the very limited time available, I can only touch upon fundamentals and treat those only briefly.

The proposed permanent legislation declares it to be a matter of national policy, operating in industries which affect interstate commerce, that the right of an individual to work in any job which he has the ability to attain and the character qualifications to keep shall not be denied to him because of the color of his skin, his creed, his race, or the nation of his origin.

There is nothing basically new in this proposal. Beginning with the Mayflower compact and extending down through the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, the Emancipation Proclamation, and the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution, our Government has been founded and operated upon the theory that men were born free and that they are entitled to live in a society in which they enjoy an equal opportunity in that society with all other members.

This is the democratic principle in which we profess to believe. Therefore, it is by this yardstick that we must measure our accomplishments, if we are to understand the extent to which we have produced democracy in fact, in our country.

At Gettysburg Lincoln stated that we were testing whether a nation, so conceived and so dedicated, could long endure. Although this issue of freedom and equality of man was present in the struggle of which he spoke, nevertheless, Lincoln was largely speaking of the capacity of our Nation to maintain democracy in the governmental or political realm. Gradually, since Lincoln's day, our people have begun to realize that the democratic ethic or principle upon which this Government is founded must also be made to operate and be brought to its complete fulfillment in the economic field, as well as in the political field. Consequently, we have learned that all men, being free, not only possess the right to speak and the right to vote, but they also possess the right to eat. And—just as the right to speak and to vote includes the right to secure and hold political office—so also the right to eat includes the right of all men to attain any position in our economic society which their intellects, their ability, and their skill entitle them to fill and their character habits entitle them to hold.

If, therefore, the ethic and principle upon which our Government is founded requires that these things be made available to all men as part of their natural rights, it follows that it is the obligation of that Government to create a situation in our economic life where each citizen can enjoy this natural right, as a factual and existing social and economic right and not as a theoretical one. From this it follows that any discrimination operating against a man's right to employment which, in its operation, prevents him from obtaining employment, purely because he is a Negro or a Jew or of Mexican or of Latin-American origin, is an antidemocratic and un-American discrimination operating in our economy. As such it must be eliminated by any government such as ours by operation of law, where it is clearly demonstrated, by the existence of such discrimination over a long period of time, that those who control and operate our economic system are incapable of eliminating the discrimination without obtaining the assistance of the Government for that purpose.

Those of us who support the legislation for the establishment of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission therefore propose nothing new; we merely propose that our Government shall assist those who operate our economy to eliminate an antidemocratic and un-American condition in our economic life which is inconsistent with the democratic ethic upon which this Government was founded, and to advance which it finds is its greatest justification for its maintenance.

Since this legislation, therefore, is based upon the most fundamental Americanism possible—the ethic and principle upon which this Government was founded; and since it is known to everyone, who understands the democratic ethic and principle, that it, in turn, finds its source in Judaeo-Christian thinking, it is not surprising that we find many leaders, both secular and clerical, who have publicly supported the ethic and principle upon which this proposed legislation is grounded.

Speaking before the War Writers Board on January 11, 1945, Mr. Eric Johnston, president of the National Chamber of Commerce, said this: "The withholding of jobs and business opportunities from some people does not make more jobs and business opportunities for others. Such a policy merely tends to drag down the whole economic level. Perpetual poverty for some merely guarantees stagnation for all."

Mr. James B. Carey, executive secretary of the National CIO—who, for the benefit of those who do not know, is not a Communist—says this: "It is a matter of practical common sense. The unions that are affiliated to the CIO have found that discrimination against any minority of our citizens results in danger to the interest of all."

Rt. Rev. Msgr. John A. Ryan, nationally known Catholic leader, says this: "Discrimination, whether practiced by employers or employees, is definitely immoral * * * as if they committed theft or murder."

G. Bromley Oxnam, bishop of the Methodist Church and president of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ, says this: "The religious forces and, I believe, the democratic forces of the United States, face a fundamental problem here, and that is finding a concrete means to translate our ethical ideas into the realities of economic justices and racial brotherhood."

I have taken these quotations deliberately from leaders of American life who are not members of the minority groups against whom discriminations which presently exist have been practiced. I have done so in order to give the lie to the canard which has been given much too much prominence in recent days—that this legislation is being supported only by Communists, Negroes, and Jews. Of course, such a statement is a lie and a falsehood. This legislation is as American as Plymouth Rock. It is as Christian as the second great commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

When the people of America fully understand that the passage of this legislation is demanded of them, if they are to meet the responsibilities imposed upon them by the principles inherent in the ethics and the Constitution under which they live—and they will understand it—then, its passage is as inevitable as the rising of the tides and the sun, for it is part and parcel of the ineffable laws of the universal God and the powers of evil cannot and will not prevail against it.

Control of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 1, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing before this Congress that

remotely approaches the question of what we should do about the control of atomic energy for either military or peacetime purposes nationally or internationally. What are we waiting for?

The future peace and prosperity or the doom of civilization hangs on every moment we wait. I heard a scientist who worked on the atomic bomb say last night that 1 hour after the next bomb was dropped that civilization could be wiped out. Those are not my words, they come from a recognized expert on atomic energy. Science will not wait for log-rolling legislation. This is no question to play politics with. We cannot afford to postpone this question for one moment until we have settled it one way or the other; not days, not hours, but seconds count. A joint committee of the House and Senate should be organized at once. Not two separate committees.

Who is going to assume the responsibility for further delay? I do not believe any Member of Congress wants to answer that one.

What more do we have to know than the fact that atomic energy must be controlled both nationally and internationally, and that without control it is left to the devices of man to destroy civilization or make the world a happier place to live in. Which do you you think will happen?

The abomination of desolation may be closer than we realize.

Cotton Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 1 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "More Research on Cotton," from the Southern Agriculturist for November 1945. This is one of the oldest farm papers in the Nation, being over 75 years old. It is ably edited by Hon. B. Kirk Rankin, the managing editor.

I direct special attention to this editorial because it deals with the great fight King Cotton is now carrying on to save himself from the competition of a thousand synthetics. Of course, this great agricultural product is one upon which many millions of our people depend. I invite the special attention of my colleagues to this editorial because to my mind it outlines what has to be done in order to save the cotton farmers of the Nation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE RESEARCH ON COTTON

The South's tremendous stake in cotton makes it imperative that research programs be greatly expanded in the next year. We keep hearing that cotton is doomed. It is—unless far more work is done toward developing new uses for this southern crop.

Growing attention is given to synthetic textile fibers like rayon, nylon, and vinyon. Others are made from natural protein materials such as skimmed milk, soybeans, peanuts, corn, and fish. We even have glass fibers competing with cotton, silk, and wool. Scientific research made them possible. Similarly, scientific research can do much for cotton—provided it is done on a comparable scale.

Cotton will continue to meet increasing competition from synthetic fibers. Cheaper cotton-growing countries like India and Brazil also pose a problem. The war stimulated the production of rayon, especially in the Axis-controlled areas. In this country, total rayon production and consumption increased mightily during the past few years. Rayon is being steadily improved in quality following new processing developments.

Congress pledged itself to support the price of cotton at 92½ percent of parity for 2 years after the war was over. That was intended to help farmers. It does—for the time being. But from a long-range standpoint it may result in lasting injury. Why? Because nobody pledged a similar floor for rayon or nylon. As a result, rayon's cost has steadily dropped until it is now in line with that of corresponding grades of cotton. It will drop even lower in the next few years. Faced with a choice between low-priced, good quality rayon and high-priced cotton, manufacturers of clothing and tires naturally will choose in favor of the synthetic fiber.

We are aware of research undertaken in recent years, and especially during the war, to further the use of cotton. We refer particularly to the fine work of the Institute of Technical Research at Charlottesville, Va., the Textile Research Institute at Princeton, N. J., and the Southern Regional Research Laboratory at New Orleans, La., and the research of some of our large cotton mills like Bibb, Callaway, Cannon, Westpoint, and Riverside, and Dan River.

But the solution of these cotton problems is so vital to thousands of southern farm families, largely dependent upon this cash crop, that we must greatly expand all existing research activities. More than anything else we must attract to this job the best scientific brains of our country. This will cost money—and plenty of it. It presents a challenge to cotton growers, shippers, and manufacturers alike. If cotton is to retain its leadership in apparel and industrial uses, we must equal the time and money that have gone into research on synthetics.

The Atomic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 1, 1945

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, no one doubts that this is the atomic age in which we are living. It came with force and rapidity. It challenges the aspirations, the hopes, and the imagination of all of us.

America was fortunate in having the industrial might, skilled labor, capital, and brains to produce the atomic bomb which brought quick victory to our cause. One of those who was, to a great degree, instrumental in the success of this deadly modern weapon of war was Maj. Gen. L. R. Groves, officer in charge of the atomic-bomb project. General Groves and his aides worked tirelessly on this project and are deserving of the plaudits and praise of a grateful people.

On October 26, 1945, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., bestowed upon General Groves the honorary degree of doctor of science. On that occasion General Groves delivered a speech on the subject of the atomic age, the full text of which follows:

Today is October 26. Today hundreds of thousands of Americans were scheduled to be on the water on their way to the beaches of Japan. The sons of many of you would have been there. Awaiting them were well-prepared fortifications manned by the most fanatical enemy we have ever faced—an enemy with guns and ammunition and the will to resist—an enemy who would have had to be destroyed cave by cave. This would have been the last voyage for thousands of our fellow countrymen. Many of them are on the water today but they are homeward bound. World War II is over. We did not have to storm the Japanese homeland and pay the price in American blood and tears to overcome the expected last-ditch resistance. Two bombs, produced through the efforts of a veritable army with a maximum strength of some 120,000 men and women and indirectly by tens of thousands more, ended the war. The course of history was changed.

The story of the atomic bomb is that of the greatest joint effort and achievement of organized science, engineering, and industry in history. Our scientists had the ability to piece together and to develop the theories, the discoveries, and the knowledge of many men in many different fields of science into workable practical processes. Our engineers had the ability to design and our industry the capacity to build and operate the unprecedentedly and incredibly complex plants and processes required.

Our achievement is a tribute to the American way of life. It could not have been done elsewhere in any comparable time. It required the intelligence, willingness to work, and ingenuity of the people of the United States—the same factors which give us our unparalleled high scale of living.

When the theories and preliminary experiments of the scientists revealed the possibility that an atomic bomb might be feasible, we were faced with an all-important decision. Was it wise—was it even sensible to proceed on a vigorous determined effort aimed at successful use in this war—what chance did we have of success? There were almost as many shades of opinion as there were advisers. The chances could not be calculated—they could only be guessed at and no one man or group of men was qualified even to do this. Could we develop a process to prepare or separate the basic material? If so, would it be so complicated that not even a Hercules could build it and if built not even the residents of Mount Olympus could operate it. Would the material even explode and if so with sufficient force to be effective? If we did manage to separate the material, and if it would explode could we design and build a bomb that would work?

We were sure that it would entail a major effort over a long period and that it would cost a tremendous amount of money and, further, that if it were to be done in time we would have to have absolute top priority in men, materials, and equipment. I was convinced that whoever first obtained such a weapon would gain a quick and complete victory. This conviction was shared by the Military Policy Committee—Dr. Bush, Dr. Conant, General Styer, and Admiral Purnell. This conviction overbalanced the possibilities of failure and brought the approval of the highest authorities in the land. We all knew that the chances of failure were far from insignificant.

Once the decision was made, the first move was to turn to industry. Our industrial leaders met the challenge—they did not hesitate. The task was immediate transition from the pretest-tube stage to practical production, with time the vital factor. American industry shouldered the vast production problems. These included the designing, building, and installing of complicated machinery, completely revolutionary in design, the construction of vast plants to the most exacting specifications and the operation of the most complex processes. As it turned out, it was a $2,000,000,000 job and required hundreds of thousands of employees. Industry had to carry this burden on top of its already tremendous armament program which, as you all know, was not limited simply to meeting the needs of our own military forces. Without American industrial capacity and performance, this war would not have been brought to a successful conclusion so soon, and in fact history might well have recorded the defeat of democracy and the triumph of Hitler and his ideologies.

The release of atomic energy ushers in a new era in the understanding of nature's forces. The use by man of this force in the atomic bomb has been characterized as the dawn of the atomic age—what that age has in store for us, no one knows.

The dawn of this new epoch has caused all thinking Americans to ponder the effect of this great development on the lives of our own people and on other nations. The effect on the policies of the United States and other nations will not be answered today or tomorrow. As President Conant, of Harvard University, has said, "Nothing like this has happened in the course of science or invention unless it be the invention of fire itself in prehistoric times."

The lessons of history must not be ignored. For that reason, I should like to review briefly the impact of scientific and technical developments on previous ages and the effects on the welfare of all peoples.

The origin of political relations between peoples of the western world started with the palisaded village which grew into a walled city and led to the establishment of the agricultural city-state. Since scientific methods and techniques were literally unknown, endurance rather than skill determined superiority. Had the intelligence of the citizen-soldier of that age been supplemented by a rational development of weapons, organization, and techniques, an energetic and courageous people, like the Spartans, might have changed the course of history. Instead, semibarbarian people led by Philip II of Macedonia and his son, Alexander the Great, established control over the then known European world. They adopted the principle of quality rather than quantity and established for the first time methods and procedures which were the foundation of modern civilization.

In the century following the death of Alexander in 323 B. C., progress in mechanics was unrivaled for many centuries. The Romans, who further developed the techniques of the Greeks, became the leaders of the then known European world. Their power reached its ascendency under Julius Caesar, who improved the military art and fostered engineering development. The Roman legions owed much of their success to their entrenched camps and excellent roads.

The barbarian invasions of the Roman world influenced the course of history profoundly and established the Middle Ages. The rigid standards of society made possible by feudalism retarded the development of new scientific discoveries. However, the military art developed, and a new weapon, the English long bow, prepared the way for a new social order as it psychologically, as well as tactically, heralded the fall of feudalism and the rise of the common or underprivileged human being by placing in the hands of the common soldier for the first time a truly powerful weapon. The power of the then privileged classes was diminished still more by the first use on a western world battlefield of gunpowder in A. D. 1327. Again the value of human strength and skill and personal courage was lessened.

The sixteenth century brought standing armies, the development of competitive armaments, and the introduction of the balance of power as a policy. Gunpowder was a decisive factor in the development of England as a naval power, even as her rise in the nineteenth century to world economic dominion was due to coal.

In 1698, the first steam engine was introduced in England and with its further development by Watt, the world entered the age of steam. The industrial revolution which now set in, synchronized with the preaching of a new way of life, equality, and liberty, by a host of philosophers such as Montesquieu, Voltaire, and Rosseau. Our own American Revolutionary War for Independence and later the French Revolution followed.

Napoleon Bonaparte turned France into a military nation and aimed at the domination of Europe at the same time the steam engine was beginning to turn the western world into a group of powerful industrial nations. Factories became even more important to armies. In 1813, Robert Fulton built the first steamer to cross the Atlantic Ocean and 6 years later the first true railway was constructed by George Stephenson. On the 9th of March, 1862, the battle between the *Merrimac* and the *Monitor* ended the wooden navies and forced more modern ideas on even the most conservative.

In the nineteenth century, the internal-combustion engine began to take practical form. Its development caused a rapid increase in the production of petroleum. As a commercial proposition, the gas engine was first introduced by Dr. Otto in 1876. Nine years later it was improved upon by Gottlieb Daimler, who fitted a small petroleum internal-combustion motor to a bicycle and produced the first petrol-propelled vehicle. It was then adapted to four-wheel carriages and in 1895 the first automobile race was held from Paris to Bordeaux and back, the winner covering the 744 miles at an average speed of 15 miles per hour.

Then, on the 17th of December 1903, at Kitty Hawk, N. C., Orville Wright remained in the air for 12 minutes in a power-driven airplane. Six years later a monoplane spanned the English Channel between Calais and Dover in 31 minutes.

Within a half century, the internal-combustion engine changed the face of the world, bringing us to year 1945. The changes brought about by oil, as well as changes resulting from scores of less spectacular inventions, when coupled with the studies made in the metallurgical, chemical, biological, and other sciences, set in motion forces quite different from those released by coal and steam. The relationships between nations were revolutionized. The possibilities of this vast industrial instrument were unfolded in World War I and reached a tremendous level of development by the end of World War II. Our conceptions of the potentialities and the interrelationships of air, sea, and land power have undergone a great change. A vast staff of engineers, technicians, mechanics, and craftsmen has become necessary to the conduct of war. The conflict among nations in the war we have just terminated demanded the participation of every citizen and absorbed nearly all the resources of the state.

We were still in the oil age when the first atomic bomb made history just over 2 months ago. Before we have had sufficient perspective to judge the effects of the oil age upon our civilization, we are face to face with the dawn of a new age. This age was precipitously opened with the successful large-scale release of energy by atomic fission in an isolated section of New Mexico on July 16, 1945. And 20 days later the strike on Hiroshima alerted a surprised world to its new historic era.

Behind this military use stretched the war's strangest army. Linked together for a common purpose were representatives of all branches of the military services, ranging from the men who stood untiring guard over our plants to the handful who dropped the two bombs on Japan. It was a high-speed army working without identity. It included on its roster engineers to design and construct vast plants, physicists, chemists, and other scientists and technicians, industrialists, and specialized Army and Navy personnel, all with the difficult, but vitally important mission of shortening the war by developing the atomic bomb. The front along which this army toiled and fought its battle against time and under the closest security extended completely across the Nation. The majority of its members contributed their specific skills without knowledge or foresight of the high urgency or aim of their accumulative efforts.

Our Nation's leaders watched with ever-increasing interest as the goal gradually was approached. Almost 3 years had gone by, almost $2,000,000,000 had been spent, we had built and were operating our separation plants; but we still did not know that the material would explode or that our bomb would work. On July 16, 1945, we found out that we were right—the bomb did explode.

A long slim tentacle of our organization had been extended to the Marianas; within 2 weeks we were ready for the final goal of the entire project. Here in the Pacific, young scientists and the military were indistinguishable as they toiled side by side. From here was launched the revolutionary weapon, end product of our venture. Precision, on a high plane, keynoted final assembly of the custom-made, intricate bomb—the missile which opened the military age of atomic energy. Only weather, and that only for 5 days, delayed ringing up the curtain on this decisive step into the future. Teamwork and the will to win carried us successfully into combat. The war ended—less than a month after we first proved that we were not on a wild-goose chase.

Steam had revolutionized society in 100 years, and oil in its turn in 50 years. I repeat, we do not know what the effect of atomic energy will be or when it will come into full bloom.

We hold in trust a power capable of destroying the structure of our civilization. The atomic bombs dropped on Japan have proven the destructive uses to which this power can be applied. I believe that it can and I hope it will—it must—be developed as a mighty force for human welfare. During the past 2,000 years, many different methods for preserving peace have been attempted. There was the Pax Romana based on the overwhelming military strength of Rome. A common culture was established throughout the Latin world with common language, citizenship, laws, and customs. In the nineteenth century, there was the balance of land power, plus English naval supremacy, which prevented wars from assuming world-wide dimensions. Today we are hoping that the United Nations will be the opening wedge toward complete world peace.

Only a few months ago, the military might of a nation was estimated in terms of the number of men, ships, and planes that it could put into action. These numbers were determined by the resources and industrial power that the nation could muster. But the atomic bomb wiped out such simple mathematical solutions just as it wiped out

Hiroshima and Nagasaki. We are now confronted with the possibility that even a small third-rate power could reduce a mighty industrial nation to helplessness with a relatively small number of atomic bombs. Necessity requires that any system for preserving peace be a solid one that will insure justice to all the peoples of all nations. We are for the moment entrusted with the future welfare of mankind. May historians of the future write that the United States of America fulfilled that trust.

Land-Grant Railroad Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 1, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the action of the House last Monday in rejecting the conference report on the bill to repeal the land-grant railroad rates was a step in the right direction. If we can keep that bill from becoming law it will mean a saving of hundreds of millions of dollars to the Government not only for the present but also for the future.

As I stated in my speech Monday, the concessions granted by the railroads to the Government in rates was the result of an agreement made at the time that the Government gave 130,000,000 acres of land for the purpose of stimulating the construction of railroads in various parts of the country. This was an outright grant of a tremendous acreage of the public domain. In return for that grant the railroads agreed to carry our troops and property free of transportation costs.

Some 60 years ago the railroads took the position that the agreement meant that the roads would be available to the Government to transport its troops and property and the courts sustained their position.

Following that the Government not desiring to go into the railroad business made an agreement with the land-grant roads to carry troops and Government property at 50 percent of the commercial rate. It is that agreement that the railroads desired to set aside by the passage of this legislation.

There is also another feature in connection with this matter that should receive the attention of Members of Congress and that is that when non-land-grant railroads desired Government business they secured permission from the Interstate Commerce Commission to make an agreement with the railroads to carry the troops and property at 50 percent of the commercial rates. As a result of that agreement our troops and property have been carried by the non-land-grant roads under what is called the equalization rate.

Therefore should the Congress repeal the land-grant-railroad rate clause in the act to regulate commerce the non-land-grant roads will immediately cancel their agreement with the Government to carry its troops and property at 50 percent of the commercial rate.

In order that the Members might be fully informed in reference to this matter I have secured a statement from the Comptroller General, and, under the permission granted me, I include as part of my remarks the Comptroller General's letters. They follow:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, November 1, 1945.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. COCHRAN: Reference is made to your personal inquiry as to the amounts paid by the Government to land-grant and land-grant-equalization railroads during the fiscal year 1945, and as to the cost to the Government of rail transportation services if it had not been for land-grant and land-grant-equalization deductions.

In my letter of May 15, 1944, to you, a copy of which is enclosed, it was estimated that about $2,000,000,000 would be paid to rail carriers by the Government during the fiscal year 1944, and that on the basis of past experience approximately $200,000,000 would constitute the "contribution" to the United States by reason of land-grant and equalization deductions. During that year land-grant deductions, which have been estimated at from 10 to 17 percent of the commercial charges applicable to military and naval traffic in the absence of such deductions, were relatively low in proportion because the predominant movement of traffic was eastward, much of it between points involving little or no land-grant mileage. On the other hand, during the fiscal year 1945 more traffic was moving westward to the Pacific ports, en route to the Southwest Pacific area, through territory involving a substantial amount of land-grant mileage, and the proportion of land-grant deductions to the total transportation bill was relatively higher. In addition, the total bill, as shown by the estimate below, was also higher than the amount stated in my letter of May 15, 1944, for the fiscal year 1944. These factors substantially increased the amount of land-grant and equalization deductions estimated for the fiscal year 1945.

It is now estimated that approximately $2,500,000,000 was paid to the railroads directly by the Government during the fiscal year 1945 for movement of freight and passengers on Government bills of lading and transportation requests. Of that amount, approximately $2,375,000,000 represents disbursements for military and naval transportation. It has been estimated that about 63 percent or $1,500,000,000 of the amount disbursed for military and naval transportation involved land-grant and equalization deductions. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that land-grant and equalization deductions, where applicable, averaged approximately 17 percent of the commercial charges subject to deductions, or 20 percent of the net amount paid after making deductions. Accordingly, it appears that $300,000,000 is a fair estimate of the amounts deducted for land-grant during the fiscal year 1945.

It has been further estimated that 40 percent of the above amount of $300,000,000, or $120,000,000, was deducted from payments to land-grant carriers and 60 percent, or $180,000,000, was deducted from payments to land-grant-equalizing carriers. Application of the same percentages to the total rail-transportation bill of $2,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1945 would result in amounts of $1,000,000,000 and $1,500,000,000 as the payments to land-grant and to land-grant-equalizing carriers respectively. Addition of the deductions of $300,000,000 to the total rail bill of $2,500,000,000 results in an approximate amount of $2,800,000,000 as the constructive cost of rail transportation to the Government during the fiscal year 1945 had it not been for land-grant and equalization deductions.

I trust the foregoing will serve the purpose of your inquiry.

Respectfully,

LINDSAY WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington D. C., May 15, 1944.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. COCHRAN: In compliance with your telephone request of today there is furnished herewith such information as is available with reference to land-grant contributions by carriers to the United States, being deductions for land-grant from freight charges on certain shipments of Government property.

Of course, as you know, original land-grant statutes provided the Government with the free use of trackage developed over land which had been granted to carriers; that by judicial interpretation it was established that such right was predicated on the use of Government-owned equipment; and that since the Government did not own or use its equipment there was required a fair fixation or reduction of service charges and that subsequent legislation recognized a basis of 50 percent. In addition, you are familiar with the fact that many carriers whose revenues were not subject to land-grant deductions and who, accordingly, were not preferred for Government shipments inasmuch as the use of their trackage involved larger service costs to the United States, tendered to the United States and entered into equalization agreements which provided that their revenues from Government business would be limited to sums not in excess of the charges otherwise available to the Government had the business been restricted to land-grant carriers.

In the early years, in fact until just prior to World War I, the amounts realized by the Government in reduction of the commercial charges to land-grant charges or sums equal to land-grant charges were so small as to be hardly worthy of consideration when compared with the value of the granted lands, even though the national benefit as a result of development of unsettled areas is considered. Of course during the period of World War I and with the subsequent expansion of Government business the amounts contributed to the Government by reason of land-grant computations increased and may be roughly computed on a percentage of from 10 percent to 17 percent of the amounts directly expended by the United States for transportation. For instance, during the fiscal year 1941 it is estimated that the Government expended a total of $70,000,000 for transportation of matériel and personnel by all means of transportation facilities, i. e., rail, water, highway, air, and express. No records have ever been maintained of the exact figures representing the deductions allowed the Government by land-grant or equalizing carriers although it is believed to be fair to consider that of such amount $50,000,000 was expended solely for freight and passenger movements of matériel and personnel by rail and that only about from $5,000,000 to $8,500,000 accrued to the United States as land-grant and equalization deductions.

During the defense period just prior to the war and during the present war period the United States has greatly increased its obligations to carriers, so much so that for the fiscal year 1944 it is believed that there will have been expended a total of about $2,500,000,000; that of this sum about $2,000,000,000 will be paid to rail carriers; and that on the basis of past experience approximately $200,000,000 will constitute the contribution to

the United States by reason of land-grant and equalization deductions.

In connection with the figures cited above it is particularly significant and attention is particularly invited to the fact that land-grant carriers furnish only about 40 percent of the amounts contributed by the carriers as reduced charges and that 60 percent of such reductions are realized with reference to revenues due equalizing carriers. In other words, carriers which are under no legal obligation to offer the United States any reduction in charges constitute, on a revenue basis, the major carriers of Government business in connection with which reductions are offered and realized. It is also significant and important to point out that equalizing carriers are constantly liberalizing the services subject to land-grant equalization and that this trend is definite, despite the fact that under equalization agreements carriers may limit the services subject to equalization or may terminate such agreements at will.

It appears to be conceded that the carriers are enjoying a period of profit realization in which previously unheard-of sums are being made available for carriers' use and it has been estimated that carriers' revenues will approximate $10,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1944, of which sum it is believed that $7,500,000,000 may be stated as Government business, direct or indirect, although only $2,500,000,000 is direct Government business. Therefore, it would appear that with reference to $5,000,000,000 of income due to governmental activities the carriers will realize full commercial charges with reference to the revenues involved.

At the present time when carriers are enjoying a period of unprecedented prosperity and are urging the repeal of land-grant statutes, attention is invited to the fact that this whole matter was considered some 4 years ago in much more detail and with much greater attention to the rights of the parties involved than appears to have been the case in connection with the pending legislation. The whole matter was carefully considered prior to the enactment of the Transportation Act of 1940, 54 Stat. 898, at which time land-grant benefits were removed from all Government traffic except "military or naval properties of the United States moving for military or naval and not for civil use" and "members of the military or naval forces of the United States." Consideration was again accorded the matter in April 1942 at which time the Congress took no action.

Too much attention cannot be invited to the fact that the term "land-grant rates" is loosely used and loosely understood, to mean that the United States is granted a reduction equal to one-half of the charges applicable to business generally in connection with its transportation matters, whereas, actually, carriers' revenues may be subjected to land-grant only with reference to line-haul charges, i. e., pure transportation charges, excluding from consideration all charges for special or accessorial services furnished by carriers. Also, in determining amounts due by the United States to carriers whose revenues are subject to land-grant computation, the computation is determined on the basis of a deduction for land-grant percentage as applied to road-haul revenue, i. e., each shipment is considered individually and the land-grant deduction with respect thereto ascertained on the basis of the ratio of land-grant-aided mileage to total mileage in the line of the land-aided carrier over which the charges are computed, divided by two. Thus, if a charge of $1 accrues to a line of railroad for its haul over 100 miles of its line embracing only 20 land-grant-aided miles, the deduction for land-grant from the charge of $1 is 10 percent, being one-half of the ratio of the land-aided milcage to the total mileage involved. In many instances, the land-grant "contribution" accorded to the United States may represent only 5 percent or less of the total charges involved. Deductions for land grant in connection with passenger transportation subject to land grant is determined on a similar basis.

It is hoped this will afford the information you desire.

Sincerely,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

The Full Employment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 1, 1945

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the language of the full employment bill is beguiling, but not enough so to deceive stanch defenders of Americanism. I wish to include here an editorial taken from the September 30 Arkansas Democrat and signed by leading citizens of my State, in which the illusions and dangers of this proposal are cited.

The editorial is as follows:

PLENTY OF JOBS IN SIGHT

Fear invites the evil it flinches away from. That's a truth which wise men, real leaders, have long understood.

Job declared, centuries upon centuries ago, "The thing which I greatly feared is come upon me."

President Roosevelt spoke from this ancient knowledge when he first took office, in that stormy time when the country seemed to be crumbling into ruin. He challenged the fear which had gripped the Nation, roused its energies, with the ringing words: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

Now the Senate passes a measure, the full employment bill, which is written in fear, and whimpers with fear—that and the vicious purpose of creating a "spending heaven" for the pressure groups and politicians.

The bill has been modified, it is true. Certain checks are placed on government outlays to provide jobs. Such outlays would have to be accompanied by a tax plan to raise the money. The spending would have to be consistent with the Government's "needs, obligations, and other essential considerations of national policy"—whatever that means.

But there are loopholes in these restrictions that you could drive a cow through. For example, billions might be shoveled out in 1 year, with the tax to collect them spread over a "reasonable number of years." Congress could say that 10 years, or 40 years, was "reasonable"—and meanwhile add 10 billions, or 20 billions, to the already staggering national debt.

The vital thing is that if this bill passes the House, even as it is—even further modified—the spending camel will have its nose in the Treasury tent. And you remember what happened in that old fable. The camel kept inching farther into the tent till its owner found himself out in the cold.

This bill will work the same way if it becomes a law. Can you picture Congress refusing to make an appropriation for Government jobs in an election year, if the President should forecast that millions would want work?

Do you want to pay taxes to provide soft Government jobs whenever the pressure groups and politicians thought them useful to their personal plans?

Do you want to threaten the expansion of private enterprise—a vital matter to Arkansas—with the possibility that its taxes may be shoved up any year to furnish political or pressure-group employment?

If not, let your Congressman know. There is work in sight for all who really want to work if industry and business are given a fair chance.

"The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." Let's be men, true to our proud American heritage, not cringing socialistic mice.

Transportation Facilities for Soldiers Eligible for Discharge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 1, 1945

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, providing boats to bring service men and women eligible for discharge back to this country so that they can be mustered out and returned to their homes and families is the most important problem facing this country today. To me it has the same relative importance now as did the supplying of our troops with necessary food, ammunition, and equipment during the war. The existing bottlenecks in the Atlantic and the Pacific must be broken. If the War, Navy, and merchant marine could solve the transportation problems involved in winning the war, as they did so magnificently, certainly they can and must solve this one at once. We have the greatest number of boats and planes in the history of the world. They must be used for this purpose until these men and women are returned.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include a letter printed in the October 21 edition of the Stars and Stripes, which, in turn, is a reprint from the European edition of the New York Herald Tribune. The boys who signed this letter were located in the ETO and, consequently, their remarks are directed at that particular phase of the problem. However, it is well known that the situation is even more aggravated in the Pacific and that there are even more men eligible for release stranded in that vast area.

The letter follows:

All right, whose fault is the latest redeployment crisis?

1. At the war's end the United States had 5,000 merchant ships (source: Time magazine, October 15). Using only 3,000 of these converted to carry troops, these 3,000 could have taken every soldier in the European theater of operations home in one trip. Naturally, this would be too much to expect, but it shows the possibilities.

2. When the United States canceled lend-lease August 21, the British stated that they would have to withdraw their Queens as they were badly needed to repatriate their own and Canadian troops.

3. On October 13, the British withdrew only one Queen and the *Aquitania*. The United States was allowed to keep one Queen for the rest of the year. And the German *Europa* is now ready to replace the *Aquitania*.

ALL COULD GO HOME

4. If the United States had only used 600 of its own ships, roughly 10 percent of the available total, making only one trip per month, they could have returned every GI in Europe since VE-day. This would leave more than enough ships for: (A) The Pacific redeployment, (B) vital commerce and relief.

5. Operable United States ships are today rusting idly in United States harbors. Source of fact: Time magazine, October 15, page 27. A photograph shows five good new ships laid up in a single small port, Mobile. There is no shortage of shipping. There is a surplus.

6. More than enough time has passed since either: (a) VE-day, or (b) cancellation of lend-lease, to convert countless freighters into transports: Nobody can plead (a) lack of time, or (b) lack of materials or manpower as excuses. Shipyards have undergone terrific cut-backs.

7. Army spokesmen now blame the latest redeployment crisis on (a) loss of the British ships, (b) storms in the Atlantic and the English Channel, (c) strikes in the United States. These explanations seem flimsy afterthoughts providentially provided to cover up negligence and poor planning.

PLENTY OF SHIPS

It is outrageous to suggest that redeployment has been slowed up by turning over ships to the British in exchange for use of the *Queen Mary*. We have plenty of ships to turn over without taking any out of service.

High Army and War Department officials have just talked their way out of one crisis over congressional, civilian, and GI indignation concerning redeployment and discharges. And now another crisis—with no excuse whatever. It is a tragedy to the whole Nation that top Army planners are not wise enough to realize that the peacetime future of the Army depends on its performance during the post-VJ interval.

When our armies were triumphant on both sides of the globe, many of us thought that perhaps, after all, the professional "big brass hats" (General Eisenhower's phrase) were shrewd and competent men.

But since VE and VJ millions of GI's and more millions of civilians have returned to their former deep mistrust of the military mind. They had won our trust—then threw it away in an outbreak of poor planning, "chicken," bad faith, confusion, and ineptness. The result of civilian mistrust of military authorities may well be a smaller peacetime Army, reduced Army budgets, no postwar training, etc., thus affecting, perhaps tragically, the future history of the American Nation.

T-3 WILLIAM C. CRAIG, Jr.
T-4 T. S. HYLAN.

The Situation in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 1 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dealing with the Palestine situation written to the editor of the New York Herald Tribune by Mr. William S. Bennet.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 19, 1945.

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

The press dispatches the other day carried in a matter-of-fact way the alleged statement that the Army officer assigned by the British court sitting at Lueneberg for the trial of Kramer, the "beast of Belsen," and some forty-odd defendants, made the remark that the victims that were killed in the concentration camps were "the dregs of the Ghetto." That the Army officer was what we call in this country "assigned counsel," that is, a counsel selected by the court for defendants who have no counsel, should have caused the court to rebuke the counsel for his remark even more quickly than if he had been counsel serving under a retainer from the defendants. In either case he would have been an officer of the court, but in the situation as it was, he was an officer chosen by the court itself. The impelling reason for the rebuke that should have been made was that the remark is completely without justification.

Just why this insulting remark of the defendant's counsel did not cause a wave of resentment everywhere that Jews are known I can understand only on the basis that we have had such a succession of shocking revelations of Nazi brutality that a more or less casual remark of an unknown defense counsel did not attract the attention which it otherwise would.

Prior to 1933 there were practically no ghettos in any country in Europe, that form of discrimination against the Jews having long since ceased. Ghettos were completely attributable to the Nazis. They could, and did, establish them in Germany and as rapidly as they conquered or overran countries they established ghettos, although I think that most Jews in Norway and Denmark escaped this humiliation. The fact is that there was not a country in Europe in 1933 in which the Jews were the "dregs" of the population. In Germany they constituted only about 1 percent of the population. Their standing socially and financially was high.

The same is true in Austria where they constituted about 3 percent of the population. In Russia Jews are now as highly regarded as are other Russian citizens. Many high officers were Jews. In Holland, Belgium, and Italy there was no anti-Semitism until Mussolini manufactured it in Italy under Hitler's orders. The only time I ever was in Rome the mayor (sindaco) of that imperial city was a Jew. "E. Nathan" was the way he signed himself on the proclamations which I saw. In 1933 the one country in Europe in which there was active and continued persecution of the Jews, which had commenced years before Hitler, was Rumania. As to Hungary, I had the honor to preside at an organization meeting here in New York of Christian clergymen of Hungarian birth or descent—Roman Catholic, Greek Orthodox, and Protestant—at which these Christian clergymen drafted and cabled the then dictator of Hungary a strong protest against the massacre of the Jews at the time when Hitler ordered Hungary to send its citizens who were Jewish to concentration camps.

As the Jewish population of Europe in formerly German-controlled territory is now stated to have been 9,600,000, of whom at least 5,700,000 were exterminated, it certainly could not be true that nearly two-thirds of the Jewish people were "dregs." The wanton recklessness of any such statement appears at once when it is recalled that this includes the Jews of Germany, Holland, western Russia, Belgium, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Bulgaria. I saw a letter the other day written by a businessman of standing still living in Budapest which detailed the deaths of members of his family in labor camps and concentration camps, and of his own wife from exhaustion consequent upon the hardships of her work while a sick woman to rescue her husband and son. The writer of the letter is a man of such standing that after he was released from German custody he returned to Budapest to his own residence and to his business in his own office, where he waits with pathetic hope for the return of some of the members of his family of whose fate he is not yet certain. I also know personally an outstanding scientist now in this country, a Czechoslovakian with numerous family connections, of whom, including cousins and second cousins, about 100 were killed in concentration camps, mostly in Auschwitz (Oswieczim). This gentleman assures me that he knew all of these people personally and that they were all worth-while and substantial persons, and not in any sense to be referred to as "dregs."

It should not be forgotten that we Christians have the same cause for resentment as have the Jews. Four million three hundred thousand Christian and other non-Jews perished in these camps, among them some of the best people in Germany, and in each of the countries that was invaded. In fact, it seemed to have become a Nazi practice if a person, Jew or Christian, showed any signs of independence or opposition to the Nazi actions to send such a person to one of these camps. Because of that practice all of Europe has suffered an irreparable loss in intellectual power and leadership. The remark of the defense counsel in a trial which on the whole is a credit to Anglo-Saxon methods of procedure with a desire to do full justice even to the most abhorrent of men and women, ought to be widely repudiated and the repudiation ought not to be confined to Jewish organizations, nor to the United States, but should be as widespread and wholehearted in the countries of our allies in Europe, in which countries the substance of the remark is known to be false.

WILLIAM S. BENNET.

Russian Policy in Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 1, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, just so we do not forget the facts Members of the House will recall the attitude of Russia toward the small countries of the Old World. It would be interesting to comment about different countries which have come under Russian influence. However, one of the striking examples is the Republic of Finland. Not much has been said about it but something over a year ago Finland and Russia made sort of a treaty of peace which required Finland to pay indemnity of something like $50,000,000 to Russia.

Just recently according to newspaper dispatches, Russia demanded another $15,000,000 from the Republic of Finland by way of additional indemnity. When Finland told the Russians that she could not pay the money, their suggestion was to come to the United States and borrow $15,000,000. The idea seemed to be that the United States was a big sucker anyhow and would greatly help out the little republic which is at the mercy of Russia. In addition to being a rather peculiar

evidence of the friendship of Russia for the United States, this $15,000,000 episode speaks for itself when you talk about humanitarianism and ideals which our pink-parlor people in this country stress so much, when they speak about Russia. I may have more to say about this later but these are just facts and our Communists and their fellow travelers in the United States are entirely too silent about the treatment of the small countries of Europe including Finland.

One of our American newspaper correspondents who is writing a series of articles dealing with problems in foreign countries discusses the problem of the Finnish people in a very interesting way in an article in the Duluth News-Tribune, for October 23, 1945. This article reads as follows:

FINNS ECONOMIC VASSALS OF RUSSIA BY INDEMNITIES

(By Walter Ridder)

HELSINKI.—Finland is right back where she started from in 1914. Before the First World War this country was a grand duchy of the Czars' Russia; now, after the Second World War and after 27 years of independence, Finland is once again a vassal of its eastern neighbor. No political ties bind the two nations, but through loss of her wars against the Soviet Republics, Finland has sunk into economic bondage to the Soviet Republic. Finland is today working for Russia.

The war indemnities claimed by Russia have turned Finland's entire home industry to the task of protecting Finland's reputation as a debt payer. The home consumer is going without essential articles so that the indemnity payments may be met, fully and on time. On September 19 of this year Finland celebrated the first anniversary of the armistice; it could also celebrate virtual fulfillment of the first installment on the armistice indemnities.

According to the terms of the agreement, Finland pays Russia goods worth $50,000,000 based on 1938 prices. She will pay that sum for each of 6 years. Nor can Finland choose the reparations in kind which she will send to Russia. The items have been very specifically designated, and only five-twelfths of the annual sum can be turned over in Finland's greatest export commodity—lumber. By straining herself to the limit, Finland met this year's installment, lagging slightly in metal goods, but overpaying in wood products. The lag in metal deliveries was due in large measure, the Finns assert, to the great metallurgical strike which hogtied Sweden's metal industry for 5 months this year. Finland was unable to procure vital metal supplies.

Finnish vessels are working for Russia. Under the armistice terms Russia took outright about 100 Finnish ships; at good fees, she has chartered almost all the rest of the once large Finnish merchant marine. Finland needs her vessels, but all she gets is the charter rent. Left to Finland are only small ships which are practically useless for resumption of Finland's normal marine commerce.

The full extent of Finland's trade contributions to Russia are well illustrated by Prime Minister J. K. Paasikivi. He said in an Armistice Day speech to the people of Finland: "Our whole export during the first 7 months of the current year was 2,894,000,000 marks, but of this 2,314,000,000 represented war indemnity payments for which nothing is received in return." In other words, 87 percent of Finland's export trade is headed toward the Soviet Union. Nor does the year 1946 show much greater promise. The Prime Minister estimated that Finland must import about $110,000,000 worth of goods.

Those indispensable imports cannot possibly be paid for. Because of the shortage of raw materials, the Prime Minister predicted Finland's foreign exports, exclusive of indemnities, will not rise to more than forty-four or forty-five million dollars (at 1938 prices). Of those free exports, $14,000,000 worth must go to Russia as compensation for goods which Finland removed from east Karelia and other now Russian territories. Thus, the extra fourteen million plus the regular $50,000,000 indemnity payments would show Finland having at least a 64 percent unremunerative trade in 1946, and all 64 percent going to Russia.

Finland is working out other kinds of economic relations with Moscow. Three trade agreements have already been consummated. Russia has already commenced to ship badly needed grain to Finland, although the amount received will not meet the demands of near-starving Finland. In the acute coal shortage which has struck every European country, the Finns have not been unscathed, but they are importing some of the vital commodity from Russia and Poland, although the quality of both the coal and the coke is said to be very poor.

This close relationship with Soviet Russia is something new to republican Finland. In the years before the First World War, Russia's grand duchy sent most of her imports to the mother country. After the bitter struggles of the White and Red guards in 1919, and the subsequent independence of Finland, the new republic sought other outlets for her exports and commercially turned her back to her eastern neighbor. Finnish trade figures for the period between the wars show almost no dealings with the Soviet Republic. Today, Finland has reversed her policy and so large are her relations with Russia that she is economically at the mercy of Moscow.

The extent to which Finland is living independently only through sufferance of the Soviets is well exemplified in other passages of the Prime Minister's Armistice Day speech. He found solace in this thought: "It must be borne in mind that in the autumn of 1944, as well as in the winter of 1940, the Soviet Union, by continuing the war which would have caused Finland additional heavy losses, could, if it had wished, have completely crushed Finland and destroyed its independence." He found it necessary to tell the Finnish people that Finland could exist as an independent state. "The government is convinced," he said, "that Finland, in sincere and firm friendship with the Soviet Union, can live its own life—in accordance with its own spirit and its own needs—as a sovereign state."

But this Paasikivi did admit, that the armistice agreements restrict the sovereignty of the Finnish state "and the exercise of the rights which belong to it."

However much the Finn may exclaim, "We are a free country," and however much he may desire to act independently, the facts of the matter are that Finland is today an economic vassal of Soviet Russia and shall remain so until September 1949, when the last war indemnity payment falls due. Until that date, the Finn will not be a free man.

Mr. Speaker, I do not need to elaborate on what Mr. Ridder has to say. His story is factual. It demonstrates very forcibly the truth of the suggestion that Russia is looking after Russia and has very little regard for the small countries in the world or for their people, or for anything else or anybody else except Russia.

I would respectfully suggest that some of the enthusiastic supporters of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration look into this matter and then justify their enthusiasm for some of UNRRA's funds to Russia.

I am told that Russia asked for $700,000,000 of UNRRA funds but has finally agreed to compromise for $250,000,000. If Russia's treatment of Finland can justify this procedure, then I shall listen with interest to the excuses which those people who always want to do good to others, at the expense of America, have to offer.

Los Angeles County Is Famous for Many Things, Especially Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 1, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, food production continues in peace as in war as one of the most important industries of southern California in general and Los Angeles County in particular. With entire countries ravaged by the evils of war, and millions of people in war-torn areas suffering acutely from years of malnutrition and starvation, the farmers of the United States are being looked to as the principal providers of the world's food supply. That the farmers in this area are making a real contribution to this challenge is indicated by the succession of records which they have and are continuing to set.

In 1939 the total f. o. b. value of farm products raised in southern California amounted to slightly over $277,000,000. This figure has increased steadily each year, reaching an all-time high in 1944 of approximately $733,000,000. An equally impressive record was made by Los Angeles County, the value of products sold in this county in 1939 being only $76,000,000, and rising each year to an all-time high in 1944 of slightly over $192,000,000. Although part of this tremendous increase can be attributed to high wartime prices, the records verify that no small portion was due to greatly increased acreage and production. It must be remembered that the high wartime prices were in many instances counteracted by comparably higher costs.

Holding first place among the 3,072 counties of the Nation in value of farm products ever since the census of 1910, agriculture in Los Angeles County continues in prominence, despite the expansion of war industries. Other southern California counties also demonstrate this prominence, the 1940 census revealing that 9 out of the 10 southern California counties were within the 100 leading counties in the United States in total value of farm products. Most of these counties were high on the list. Locally grown, nourishing, vitamin-yielding fruits and vegetables will play a big part in bringing health and energy to the half-starved nations of the world.

Further indications of the important role played by the rich agricultural area surrounding Los Angeles is afforded by statistics on local unloads of fruits and vegetables. Although only fifth in population, the arrivals here annually exceed those of all other United States

cities, with the exception of New York and Chicago. No other big city receives such a large proportion of its fruits and vegetables from the area surrounding it. Almost half of the produce used in Los Angeles is grown within 50 miles of the city, and approximately 84 percent originates within the State. By contrast, in New York City only 22 percent of the fruits and vegetables come from New York State, and Illinois furnishes about 6 percent of the Chicago unloads. It is estimated that Los Angeles County farmers produce about 18 percent of California's produce; the State provides 43 percent of the Nation's commercial fruits, and 13 percent of the commercial vegetables.

Labor and Management and Government Must Cooperate Fairly To Accomplish Industrial Peace and Productivity for a Peacetime America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 1, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, we should lay down a broad policy under which labor and management, with the cooperation of Government, can eliminate much of the industrial strife that affects our peacetime economy. It is understandable that the reconversion period brings unrest and certain unwarranted work stoppages.

We have enacted, especially during the last 12 years, legislation under which labor received benefits long overdue and which were right and proper. There is a greater responsibility, therefore, on labor leadership than was expected in the days when management overstepped itself in withholding gains rightly due the great working population of our country.

The Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette editorialized October 28, 1945, as follows:

NEW PLAN FOR LABOR

The strike as a weapon is like impeachment as a weapon—a necessary factor in preserving civil liberties. If a man could be made to work against his will, this would no longer be a free Nation. But the strike is like the surgeon's knife or a drastic medicine—to be used only in case of actual need, and then with expert care.

When the strike weapon is used carelessly, without sufficient cause, it hurts everyone—strikers, employers, and the whole people. It is like the knife or a dangerous drug. The weapon is not to blame, but it needs to be taken from irresponsible wielders and held safe for its right and proper uses. It should not be used until all other peaceful means are exhausted.

Federal Judge John C. Knox, of New York, has proposed a plan for labor courts which, if wisely worked out, might provide a sensible answer to the constant threat of irresponsible strikers under which the public now lives and moves, almost as under an enemy air force. He suggests Federal courts organized for the special purpose of adjudicating labor disputes. To these courts would be taken all labor contests—wages, hours, conditions, seniority, and the rest—which now distress the public by stoppage of service or production. Work would go on while suits were tried; the strike would be a last resort.

Of course such courts would have to function expeditiously, and the characteristic delays of the law would have to be overcome. It would have to be impossible for either side to a controversy to delay proceedings. Any objection that the courts might be bought up by powerful interests is unrealistic; American courts are not venal.

Something has got to be done to handle these ever-recurring labor controversies in orderly manner. They must come out of the realm of war into civilian responsibility.

Unless something of this sort is done—and quickly—Congress is going to be forced to pass much more stringent laws that may prove of great disadvantage to both labor and management.

Mr. Speaker, the suggestion which I now make will perhaps be in error in certain particulars, but I believe many of our labor and management ills could be found in a unified, coherent labor board, one with broad powers, operating without fear of censor and without desire to please any person or group. It should have full authority. Membership should be by appointment of the President, and he should retain the power to remove the members. But he should not have the power under any circumstances to set aside this board's decisions nor assume its role as arbiter.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who believe that a board of arbitration would fail to be helpful. It is my feeling, however, that such a board would not act as a jury, but rather in a judicial capacity, with power to make final decisions. I further trust that Congress consider now, not later, some proper approach to a problem which threatens to weaken our general well-being.

Short Memories and Nice People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 1 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Short Memories and Nice People," from the October 26 issue of Yank magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHORT MEMORIES AND NICE PEOPLE

In 1935, in the period of comparative quiet between World War I and World War II, an advertisement appeared. Its illustration was a wounded, disabled veteran. Its caption was "Hello, sucker."

The text of the advertisement went on to explain the shocking waste of World War I and how little all the struggle had accomplished in spite of the high ideals of the cheering section. "Hello, sucker," seemed a brutal thing to say, but when you got through reading the ad, and thinking about it, the tag seemed quite appropriate.

There is a danger that the double of that advertisement might appear in 1962 to be just as true of World War II. It is a danger that is being spotlighted increasingly every day in newspaper reports and word-of-mouth stories from Germany and Japan. It is a danger we can avert only if all of us—the soldiers of this war and no less the officers—wise up and wise up quickly.

The reports from Germany, in a paper as unsensational and correct as the New York Times, tell of incidents like this:

"An American general (later kicked backstairs) stated that 95 percent of the members of the Nazi Party were forced in the party against their will.

"An American major in Munich said that he didn't believe all those stories about atrocities in the nearby concentration camp at Dachau.

"United States enlisted men have decided that the cleanliness and friendliness and efficient plumbing of the Germans are irrefutable evidence that the Germans are nicer people, 'more like us' than the Frogs or even the Limeys."

An enlisted man just back from Japan, a GI who had pretty strong feelings about the importance of the war, reports the following disillusionment:

"Many GI's, even GI's who had fought from Guadal on, are quick to forget their dead, and why their dead died, in the face of Japanese correctness and cooperation in surrender, and the pretty faces of Jap girls.

"A feeling is growing up that the Japs are a fairly decent, efficient, and 'westernized' people for the Orient, probably much nicer and more like us than the 'slopeheads.'"

It begins to look as if "Hello, sucker" is a label quite a few of us could wear already.

There are things we are forgetting, things we will have to remember if that label is not to be stamped indelibly on all of us. General Eisenhower, for one, has recognized the danger in his repeated directives to his subordinates in military government, reminding them of the terms under which Germany surrendered and of our obligations as victors to the ideals for which we fought.

We must remember that the general who analyzed Nazi percentages, although a good general in war, evidently never studies his history lessons beyond the military sections and that, whatever he may think, it did take millions of willing Nazis to arm Germany for war—millions of willing Nazis to inflict, in that war, 700,000 casualties on American troops. And it is frivolous and dangerous for anyone of any rank to compare the political tactics of these Nazis to a Democrat-Republican squabble back in the United States.

We must remember that the major in Munich was lazy physically as well as mentally; it would have taken him only a short ride to visit Dachau and to see, by evidence still available, that the atrocities there were no pipe dream. Or he could have asked the GI's who first liberated Dachau. After they had puked a few times, their only impulse was to slug any German who had anything to do with the Nazi Party.

The GI's who think cockeyed and rosy thoughts about the Germans are not a majority and may not even be entirely to blame for their own thinking. If their leaders are sometimes confused and contradictory, it is difficult to blame the men. Rules laid down to insure a hard and just peace are often broken by the very officers supposed to enforce them.

If soldiers have forgotten the reasons for this war, they must be reminded of them. If they fought only in the sudden hate of battle, they must remember that the ending of that hate does not mean a complete turnabout, an excusing and apologizing to their late enemies. Fraternization is natural, but it is possible for an American soldier to fraternize without being played for a sucker, to mingle with Germans without swallowing all their opinions, to treat Germans as human

beings without treating them as unfairly beaten supermen.

A concentration camp cancels a clean bathroom, and attempted mass extermination of a race overbalances a sunny disposition. The Nazis had been living on the loot of a continent for years, while the Frogs and Limeys were nursing their wounds and living on not much more than the hope of making that continent free again.

The GI's in Japan who are misguided about the Japs present the same problem as the misguided GI's in Germany. They, too, must wise up. They must learn that we need more insurance than an explosion in New Mexico to save our children for peace. Perhaps they may remember friends who died and how they died and friends who were captured and how they were treated.

We must remember, for those who cannot or will not remember, that the pleasant westernization of the Japs was a meaningless veneer on an old and cruel and internationally unmoral state. The cute tricks the Jap learned from the west, brewed in his undeveloped, not-yet-ready mind, exploded before Pearl Harbor in Manchuria and China and will explode again unless some drastic changes are made in Japan's attitude toward the rest of the world. The Jap is going to be even harder to reeducate than ourselves.

We must remember all these things, not just on Memorial Day or on Sundays, but all the time. Unless we remember them, unless we are prepared to work for peace as hard as we worked for war, the sucker sign is going to be back.

We don't have to be brutal conquerors, but we do have to avoid a sentimental good fellowship with the people who started World War II. There will be time for that when they have proved their worthiness and, for most of them, the proving will take some time. We do not need to, we must not, "compromise with the devil."

Because if ever people can point at us again and say with justice, "Hello, sucker," it will be our own fault—our own bloody fault.

Mr. Davis Is Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article from the Kenosha Labor of Thursday, October 11, 1945, by Alfred Baker Lewis, entitled "Mr. Davis Is Right":

MR. DAVIS IS RIGHT

(By Alfred Baker Lewis, member, American Federation of Teachers Local 189, New York)

William H. Davis, former Director of Economic Stabilization, has made a suggestion that we should aim at a 40-percent to 50-percent increase in average pay without any increase in average prices within the next 5 years. Naturally enough, the head of the National Association of Manufacturers has been startled almost out of his wits, and the economic ignoramuses among the newspaper columnists, editors, and financial-page writers who accept as gospel truth whatever the reactionaries say, have joined the chorus of pained critics.

The trouble is that such people do not know the facts of life—economic life at any rate. The truth is that Mr. Davis' proposals should be adopted as a goal if we are to avoid another depression. For the facts which led up to the Hoover depression in 1929–32 are plain and the lessons from these facts are even plainer.

The Department of Commerce publishes an index number showing the actual physical output of manufacturing industries on an average. That index number shows that between 1919 and 1929 the average output of "our" manufacturing establishments increased by 42 percent. This 42 percent more goods was turned out by 6 percent fewer people.

MORE GOODS, FEWER MEN

The population of the United States in that decade went up by 15 percent, but manufacturing only gave employment to 6 percent less workers at the end of the decade than it did at the beginning. Certain economic factors, among them the power of the unions, compelled some increases in pay. Total payrolls in manufacturing went up by 11 percent including salaried officials. Now it is obvious that you cannot sell 42 percent more goods to people with only 11 percent more pay. That is why we had a depression.

In each basic industry the constant stream of labor-displacing devices resulted in more goods being produced by fewer workers. While wage increases in some instances kept the decrease in payroll less than the decrease in employment, in no case was the increase in payroll equal to the increase in output. The result was that the production could not be sold. That is why we had "overproduction," unemployment, and depression.

If manufacturing had hired the same proportion of people in 1929 that it gave jobs to in 1919, it would have hired 15 percent more people instead of 6 percent fewer. In that case the increase in manufacturing output would have been 70 percent not 42 percent. The surest way to sell such an increased output would have been to increase payrolls by 70 percent. A 70-percent increase in 10 years is a 35-percent increase in 5 years, close to the minimum of 40-percent increase suggested by Mr. Davis.

The manpower shortage during the war gave a very great impetus to the invention and utilization of labor-displacing machinery and processes in the production of war materials. Most of these improved processes, because of the necessity for priority for war production, could not be applied to peace production while the war was on. There is therefore a 4-years' accumulation of new inventions and processes which have not yet been used to any great extent for the manufacture of civilian goods.

It is entirely reasonable to suppose that, when these new machines and processes are put to use for peace production, the average increase in productivity will be greater in the 5 years succeeding the war than in the period from 1919 to 1929, so that there will be substantially more than a 35-percent increase in manufacturing production in the next 5 years. Hence Mr. Davis' call for an increase of 40 percent to 50 percent in payrolls without any increase in prices is not only a reasonable one, it is necessary to avoid depression.

The figures already cited show plainly that the root of the trouble which brought on the depression in 1929 was that employers generally used labor-displacing machinery which made possible the increased output during that period in order to cut down their labor costs and try to increase their profits. Therefore, they did not raise wages equally with increased output, the increased output therefore could not be sold, and unemployment and depression resulted. Mr. Davis is the economic statesman trying to avoid a repetition of this result, and the National Association of Manufacturers and its followers are completely wrong.

SUPERFICIAL JUSTICE

Some persons who are well meaning and who do understand the danger of depression resulting from the effort to use labor-displacing machinery solely for private profit of the owners of industry, nonetheless feel that the way to prevent the increased productivity of labor from bringing about another period of overproduction is to reduce prices equally with increased output instead of raising wages proportionately. There is a superficial justice in their position, because such a reduction of prices, say about 25 percent, would reduce the cost of living for everyone, including salaried people working for the Government or for nonprofit organizations, and would let the members of organized labor benefit as consumers.

But this price reduction would involve an enormous unearned gift to security owners, especially bondholders. We have a larger national debt than ever before in our history, probably amounting to about $250,000,000,000. While more people own Government bonds than ever before, the smaller bond owners have been cashing them in fairly rapidly. The rate of sale and redemption of the bonds by wage earners is certain to increase in the next few months as transitional unemployment due to the problems of reconversion increases. More and more, therefore, the Government bonds will be held by the wealthier groups in the community and by banks.

Ownership by the banks, of course, means ownership by the banks' stockholders and bank stocks are traditionally a rich man's investment. The present bondholders bought bonds during the war, and the bonds are scheduled to mature at various times from 7 to 20 years from now. If there is a decrease in average prices of 25 percent or more in that time, that is equivalent to a 25-percent gift to the bondholders. They lent money to the Government when a particular commodity would cost $10, let us say, and would get it back when the same commodity would cost only $7.50.

OTHERS WOULD GAIN

In terms of actual commodities the burden of the national debt and of the interest on that debt would be increased by 25 percent. That would constitute a 25 percent gift in the form of increased wealth and increased income both, not distributed evenly through the population but bunched and concentrated for the special advantage of those already rich.

What applies to the interest and principal of Government bonds would apply equally to the interest and principal on other bonds and mortgages. The bondholders and mortgage owners, who we must remember are on an average the richer section of the population and those who least need an increase in their income, would gain. If the decrease in prices were 25 percent, the wealthiest group would gain 25 percent in wealth and income measured by the actual purchasing power of their money. Every farmer or home owner with a mortgage, on the other hand, would find the burden of servicing that mortgage, that is paying the interest and principal, increased proportionately.

Stabilization of prices and an increase in wages, just as Mr. Davis advocates, therefore, is what we should prefer as the means to avoid the unemployment and depression which would otherwise surely result from increased productivity of labor just as it did in 1929, as the figures so clearly show.

The members of organized labor will benefit most certainly and surely through an increase in pay (without an increase in prices) to meet the increased productivity of labor that will come from continued invention and use of new machines and processes.

It is both wise and right for organized labor to help other useful or needy sections of the population to get a similar improvement in their standard of living. Organized labor has usually supported increases in pay for Government employees such as teachers, firemen, policemen, postal employees, etc.

It should continue and increase its efforts in that direction.

It should steadily demand, as it is doing, increases in old age and unemployment compensation payments in so far as such increases do not follow automatically from increases in pay. It must work for improvement in the standard of living of the sharecroppers and unskilled workers who are particularly low paid now and who have little economic power to improve their own condition.

It must see that farmers get a chance to sell an increased output without a reduction in the price that they receive, as agriculture joins in the common tendency to increase the output per hour of labor of the farmer through improvements in seeds, fertilizers, and farm machinery. Where that does not occur, organized labor should realize that farmers are entitled in justice to some increase in price in order to share in the increased prosperity.

The main thing to remember is that we are certain to get a vastly increased flood of goods from manufacturing industry in the United States in the near future. We must increase purchasing power proportionately, or else we will have another depression, just as the failure of the owners of industry to increase pay proportionately with increased output plunged us into the depression of 1929–32.

Prosthetic Appliances for Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 1, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much loose talk and unjust criticism of the Veterans' Administration, relative to the furnishing of prosthetic appliances to disabled veterans, that I think it is not inappropriate to call attention to a letter which I have just received from the Veterans' Administration on that subject.

The letter reads as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., October 31, 1945.

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
Chairman, Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RANKIN: This is in reply to your informal request for a statement relative to the furnishing of prosthetic appliances by the Veterans' Administration.

Under existing laws the Veterans' Administration furnishes prosthetic appliances required for service-connected disability or disabilities aggravating service-connected disability. Furthermore, the Veterans' Administration is authorized by section 104 of Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, to furnish any person entitled to a prosthetic appliance the necessary fitting and training, including institutional training in the use of such appliance either in a service or a Veterans' Administration hospital or by outpatient treatment, including such service under contract.

There is no distinction made in appliances furnished officers and enlisted men and there is no fixed predetermined cost limitations for such appliances but the whole purpose of the Veterans' Administration is to furnish to disabled veterans the best available appliances.

Veterans' Administration practices permit flexibility in fitting and equipping veterans with necessary appliances. Of necessity, appliances must be approved by the attending doctor as suitable and orthopedically appropriate, but within that limitation, the veteran may choose the prosthetic appliance best suited to his needs.

The responsibility of the Veterans' Administration is an important and continuing one in the field of prosthetic appliances. Research and development of modern prosthetics have until recently had little organized support. With the aid of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, the National Research Council on Prosthetic Devices has been conducting a long-range research project in this field. Since the Office of Scientific Research and Development is a war agency which would not continue indefinitely, the Veterans' Administration has entered negotiations to take over the Council on Prosthetic Devices.

It is understood, of course, that the furnishing of prosthetic appliances and necessary training in the use thereof is in addition to the monetary benefits payable to veterans of World War II for service-connected disabilities. An additional allowance of $35 monthly is provided for certain anatomical losses or loss of use and payable where there is a ratable disability of 10 percent to total in degree in addition to the rates provided therefor which range from $11.50 to $115 per month; other specific rates for more severe disabilities range from $200 to $300 per month.

Very truly yours,
EDWARD E. ODOM, *Solicitor.*

Boston Can Be a World Flying Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 1, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Lester Allen, from the Boston Sunday Post of October 28, 1945:

BOSTON CAN BE FLYING CENTER—ENTERPRISE NEEDED TO EXPLOIT CITY'S ADVANTAGES AS PLACE WHERE LAND AND SEA ROUTES MERGE

(By Lester Allen)

The first token flight over the North Atlantic with commercial, revenue-paying passengers, by American Airlines Overseas, has again brought to the forefront the subject of Boston as an international airport.

It is no matter for impatience or immediacy, but one which must remain in constant view and subject to constant planning if Boston is to avoid becoming a "whistle stop" on a world network of airways. Boston rightfully should and must be a terminal of international air routes.

Three powerful air lines have permits to fly the Atlantic route from Boston.

American Airlines Overseas, which has flown the first passengers from Boston, taking off and landing at Bedford, acquired its overseas permit by purchase of American Export Line.

Transcontinental & Western Air was granted its permit by virtue of its ability to draw upon a transcontinental air system for passengers.

Pan American, with the longest experience in overseas flying, naturally was entitled from the outset to a route across the North Atlantic.

To see the operations of these three holders of permits to fly to Europe from Boston as three titans struggling for power and position is a complete mistake. Overseas passenger service by air requires an immense investment, a combination of skills and experience and equipment, which, without a vast network of feeder lines, such as American and Transcontinental & Western operate, or immense prestige, which Pan American has acquired through successful overseas operations over a period of many years, would be doomed to early failure.

The immediate problem from Boston's standpoint is how to avoid becoming a whistle stop on the world's airways. An indication of the global scale of these air services may be gained from TWA's change of name from "Transcontinental and Western Air" to "Trans-World Air."

IMPATIENT OVER PROGRESS

In many quarters there is impatience with the slow progress of the development of Logan International Airport in East Boston to accommodate the bigger transport planes to be used in postwar operations with longer runways. It is safe to assume that the full use of the long runways will not be possible until next June. This is no reason for an outcry for more haste, however.

Be assured that other cities competing for designation as terminals for overseas routes would give their eyeteeth for a location like East Boston. No city in the country has a big airport so close to the heart of the business district or to railroad terminals. La Guardia Field, in New York, is far from ideal, and Idlewild, where New York is spending several times as much as Boston to develop a huge airport, is even more inaccessible.

The long limousine ride from LaGuardia Field to New York is the source of more griping among people using air service into New York than any other factor, and there is very little that New York can do about it short of operating a rapid-transit service at a loss.

If it is kept in mind that the construction in progress at East Boston airport, if continued through the next few years, will secure for Boston a commanding position among the cities of the world, Bostonians should feel highly enthusiastic.

If any index of the acceleration of air travel with the end of the war is needed the operations of Northeast Airlines on the Boston-New York run for the first 20 days of October may be cited. In the first 20 days of this month with only six planes available, Northeast carried 12,000 passengers between Boston and New York. American Airlines, with more equipment, carried correspondingly more passengers, and TWA, with fewer flights into Boston, showed proportional gains. In short, the traveling public is rushing to the air lines.

The distinction between Boston as a whistle stop on international air routes and Boston as a terminal is rather difficult for the layman to see, who knows only that the fastest and safest route from here to there is of primary importance.

If the routes of the two big domestic airlines coming into Boston are examined it will be readily understood that it is most important for Boston's future to have the Atlantic terminal here.

TWA has for example, the shortest route from coast to coast, and comes into Boston now via Pittsburgh and Albany, not touching New York from the West. It taps San Francisco, Los Angeles, Albuquerque, Amarillo, Wichita, Kansas City, St. Louis, Chicago, Detroit, Cincinnati, Pittsburgh—virtually all the big commercial centers of the country north of Mason and Dixon's line.

AMERICAN'S PROGRAM

It pioneered most of the new equipment and ideas in commercial aviation, and has to its credit the first Stratoliners, and en-

gineered with Lockheed the super-fast Constellation transport.

It was first with de-icers, Sperry automatic pilots, homing direction finders and speed-retarding wing flaps. TWA believes that sub-end feeder lines are uneconomical and that traffic should flow continuously from city to city with way stops. It is hooked up with Latin-American lines through part ownership of Taca and Aerovias of Brazil, and has service to about 130 American urban centers.

American Airlines, which carries the largest volume of passengers and express of any airline in the country, launched its token flight from New York with a stop at Boston's Bedford airport. American is shooting at connections with 10 cities of 1,000,000 or more population in a network of 82 cities in 32 States touching at least 40,000,000 potential air-travel customers.

American Airlines, originally out in the cold on overseas flying, moved in solidly by the purchase of American Export. The latter company had overseas permits from the Civil Aeronautics Board before the war, but couldn't seem to get going because as rapidly as a European terminal was selected it was overrun or made impractical by the war. During the war, however, American Export covered thousands of miles flying the routes for the Navy. This backlog of experience has now been assimilated by American Airlines.

Under the present set-up no good purpose would be served in changing the terminal from New York to Boston for the Atlantic because of the Newfoundland stop, where the planes can gas up and prepare for the overseas hop. But in the very near future the Newfoundland stop will be eliminated, and then will come the question of a point of departure or terminal to be used for the greatest economy of fuel.

Few people suspect that there is an overseas route to Europe on which the longest over-water hop is from Iceland to Scotland There are stops on Baffin Island, Greenland, Labrador, and Iceland, all of which were used throughout the war by Air Transport Command.

Pan American, with no domestic service, has the greatest experience in over-ocean flying through flying 98,000 miles of over-water routes, 64,000,000 miles a year. It maintains 297 airports and 224 weather and radio stations throughout its vast system.

Always operated with a tough realism, Pan American will use for a terminal that place which offers the best connecting service and the fastest connecting service to the rest of the country. It would seem that for the Middle and Far West, Boston is the best port of entry and exit—but all this depends upon how the terminal facilities at Boston are developed.

WHAT GOOD TERMINAL NEEDS

The kind of development the air-line operators want includes long runways, development of all-weather flying facilities, accessibility of the airport, skills required for servicing planes, adequate supplies of fuel at the lowest possible cost, and hotel facilities for passengers who stop over waiting for planes.

Boston can provide all these things within the next year, and it is possible that radar blind-landing devices will make it possible to land in Boston in any kind of weather. It has been done at Bedford airport in an experimental way, and radar experts say that further development depends upon training of pilots to absolute obedience to landing commands from the radar operators on the ground.

All that is needed to make Boston a terminal instead of a whistle stop can be accomplished, but it won't be done in 2 or 3 months. The Massachusetts Recess Commission studying the problem is learning many things about the almost fatal delays which have marred the program to date. One of the chief obstacles has been the tendency to regard air transport as a fad which will amount to nothing. The thousands of passengers who storm air-line ticket offices every day are ample proof that it is no fad—but a dynamic fact of the present.

That three big air lines feel enough confidence in the future to risk large sums of money to develop overseas services out of Boston is no accident. Establishment of Boston as a terminal rests with the people of Boston and New England. They have taken to the air. How far and how fast they want to go depends entirely upon them. But they will go greater distances at greater speed and in greater comfort and safety if Boston is a terminal airport instead of a whistle stop.

Procedure for Discharge and Disability Cases Before Army and Navy Review Boards Suggested

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have recently read an article appearing in the Disabled American Veterans Semi-Monthly by Hon. Millard Rice entitled "Retirement Review Tips Have Compiled." This article is well written and gives much helpful information. I am therefore asking that it be published in the RECORD that it may reach veterans and their families throughout this country.

Although the Army-Navy Discharge Review Board has been in existence since the Seventy-eighth Congress, very little is known to the public of its activities or its existence. More and more I am receiving requests from dischargees for the correction and the change of the discharge certificate. It is obvious that those who make the requests are not familiar with the procedure required of this discharge board and need help in asserting their rights to these changes and corrections, which rights are given them by an act of this Congress. It is with this idea of giving vital information the widest possible circulation, I am including the entire article below:

PROCEDURE FOR DISCHARGE AND DISABILITY CASES BEFORE ARMY AND NAVY REVIEW BOARDS SUGGESTED

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Numerous letters have been received from service officers and claimants as to the proper procedure for the handling of discharge and disability retirement cases before Army and Navy Review Boards, and it is hoped that the following information will prove helpful toward their proper presentation.

Under section 301, Public 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, all persons who have been discharged or released from further active service in the armed forces, except those discharged by reason of the sentence of a general court martial, are eligible to have their discharge reviewed by an Army or Navy Discharge Review Board.

ARMY DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD

The first step in applying for a review of discharge is to obtain WD AGO Form 94. Execute this form completely and submit it to the Adjutant General's office, War Department, Washington, D. C., with the original discharge, whereupon the Adjutant General's office will make a photostatic copy and return the original discharge. The veteran, with no further effort upon his part, will be informed as to the date and time of the scheduled review of his case.

At the time the application form is submitted to the Adjutant General's office it would be advisable for the veteran or his service officer to prepare: (1) a notarized brief of all the pertinent facts involved in his case; (2) notarized affidavits from physicians where there is any medical question involved; (3) notarized affidavits from friends (former Army "buddies," teachers, ministers and employers as to the veteran's personal character prior to service, in the service and after his discharge). It is well to bear in mind that it is of paramount importance that the veteran should submit all of the pertinent facts relative to the conditions surrounding the discharge.

These notarized affidavits and other documentary evidence should be forwarded to the National Service Department, Washington, D. C., if the veteran desires to have a member of the staff of the Washington office represent him so that the counsel will have complete evidence to present to the Discharge Review Board.

The local service officer should thoroughly examine the veteran as to the purpose for which the veteran desires to have his discharge reviewed. It has come to our attention that many veterans are of the opinion that because they have a blue discharge that they are not entitled to compensation. Some veterans have even expressed the belief that because they do not have a CDD they are not eligible for compensation. If such is the case, the service officer can correct this erroneous impression, and the necessity for reviewing the discharge will be solved.

In certain cases, especially where a veteran has been released from the service because of a fear of flying, or lack of moral fiber, it may be advisable for the veteran to postpone having his case reviewed until the war is over. At that time the Army will not have to consider questions of policy, discipline, and precedent that must be considered at the present time. In these types of cases it is our opinion that after the termination of hostilities the veteran will have a much better chance to obtain corrective action than while the war is still on. Where the testimony of buddies in the Army may be of vital importance, it is best to postpone the case until such evidence from buddies now in the service can be feasibly obtained.

The proper procedure for obtaining a review of discharge from the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard is the same as for the Army, except the Navy Department uses a different application form. The National Service Department of the DAV, or the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington, D. C., will furnish his application form upon request. This form should be executed completely and sent to the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington, D. C. The Navy Department has recently amended their regulations concerning the requirements for the issuance of a full honorable discharge, Bureau of Naval Personnel Form 660. Previously, to obtain an honorable discharge from the Navy, the veteran must have obtained a final average of 3.5 in proficiency and conduct. The regulations now require that veterans who have obtained a final mark of 3.0 in proficiency and 3.25 in conduct can be issued the full honorable discharge instead of the discharge, under honorable conditions, Bureau of Personnel Form 661. Therefore, service officers who come in contact with these types of cases can simply forward the discharge Form 661 to the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington, D. C., and request

that the veteran be issued an honorable discharge, which can be done by administrative action without action by a review board.

A great deal of information relative to discharges, including the various types of discharges, reasons for, and AGO or Bureau of Personnel form numbers, may be obtained from Senate Document No. 152, 78C, pages 49–54, inclusive.

DISABILITY RETIREMENT

Under the provisior of section 302, Public 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, all officers who have been retired or placed upon inactive status by virtue of the decision of a retirement board are eligible to make application to have their retirement proceedings reviewed by either the Secretary of War's Retirement Review Board or by the Secretary of Navy's Retirement Review Board in Washington, D. C. It should be clearly understood that an officer who has been put upon inactive status and has not appeared before a retirement board is not eligible to have his retirement case reviewed under the provisions of Section 302, Public 346 of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

ARMY RETIREMENT

Application form WD AGO 0258 must be executed completely and sent to the Adjutant General's office, War Department, Washington, D. C. The officer who desires the Disabled American Veterans to represent him as counsel should designate that fact upon the application form. It is not necessary to submit a P–22 Form in these cases.

Since retirement cases are solely questions of medicine and medical judgment, the primary problem in preparing evidence to submit before the Retirement Boards is to prove that the disability was incurred in the service or was aggravated by such service. Therefore, the officer should prepare a brief of all the pertinent facts in each case and submit it to the National Service Department of the DAV in Washington, D. C.

This brief should be accompanied by notarized affidavits: (1) From physicians, if possible, as to his physical condition, both prior to and subsequent to his release from active duty; (2) including clinical and laboratory reports; (3) affidavits from friends and employers as to their knowledge of his physical condition, both prior to and after his release from the service; (4) reports of insurance examinations whenever possible; (5) proof that the officer's physical disability prevents him from obtaining employment or is a handicap to him in retaining employment; (6) proof that the veteran is under the doctor's care and is following a very rigid diet or routine of living; (7) another type of material evidence which has proved effective in the past cases is to have the veteran furnish the diagnosis of the Veterans' Administration, plus the degree of stability that it has been awarded him. In summary, the officer should take as complete and as factual a brief as possible, showing that his disability is a very definite handicap to him in civilian life, and, if it can be shown by affidavits, evidence that this condition was definitely incurred in or aggravated by the service, then he has greatly increased his chances of being awarded retirement benefits.

Since in these cases, when an officer is granted retirement benefits, there are no further physical examinations, he should be impressed with the fact that it is very necessary to make sure that every factor which would have a bearing on the decision of the Retirement Board should be presented.

NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND COAST GUARD RETIREMENT

In the retirement cases of the officers in the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, the procedure to be followed is the same as Army retirement cases except there is a special form necessary. This form may be obtained from either the National Service Department of the DAV or the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington, D. C. This form should be executed completely and sent to the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington, D. C., and the applicant will be informed as to the date and time of the scheduled hearing of his case.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Where an officer has been discharged with a condition of psychoneurosis, it is our considered opinion, in view of the experience before the retirement boards, that such case be postponed at the present time. In view of the fact that the great majority of officers suffering from psychoneurosis will make a full and complete recovery in a period of a few short months, retirement boards have been very loath to grant a man retirement benefits for this condition. The basic premise upon which an officer is granted retirement is that his physical disability will be a permanent condition. Since psychoneurosis is not a permanent condition, and medical judgment has shown that such men, in the vast majority of cases, make complete recovery, the basic tenet is not fulfilled. Therefore, this office is suggesting that when a service officer contacts such a case he urge that the officer postpone his appeal of his retirement-board proceedings until such time as: (1) He can prove by factual evidence that his disability is a definite handicap in obtaining employment; (2) that his disability prevents him from living a natural, normal life; and (3) that it has existed over a period of years and medical judgment has determined that this condition is permanent.

Whenever it is possible for an officer to do so, it is advisable that he appear and testify in person. In a great number of cases the applicant's personal testimony as to the facts and conditions relative to his physical disability may well be the deciding factor in the case.

OPA Prices Threaten Honey Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT K. HENRY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 1, 1945

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

OCONOMOWOC, WIS., *October 25, 1945.*
Hon. Congressman ROBERT K. HENRY,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HENRY: The two cars of honey that we had bought and contracted for in the Republic of Mexico at OPA ceiling of 9.7 cents per pound were actually resold and now we are out on a limb and what are we going to tell our customers, and what will we do to deliver honey to those people?

The whole picture is heart-rending. If we can't bring any honey in from the outside and import honey for baking and manufacturing purposes we are just going to be out of luck and we'll have to close our doors.

Why can't price restrictions be entirely removed from honey and let us have a free market and in that way we would probably be able to compete with the European market. The fact that they're taking all the honey of the West Indies as well as Central and South America leaves the dealer in honey in the good old U. S. A. completely out of the picture.

Don't you folks in Washington realize and understand that when we furnish the money to the Europeans to buy the products that we should buy, that we're cutting our throats and doing it double handed? How can the Europeans afford to pay 15 cents per pound for honey or almost 50 percent more than the American ceiling? We are licked and licked to a finish, and we don't know what to do about it.

May I have your reaction to this matter and what can be done to put an end to this thing, otherwise we'll be out of business insofar as the sale of bulk honey for baking and manufacturing is concerned?

The regrettable part of the whole thing is that the industrial users that saved the day for the honey industry in the so-called good old days, if they do not receive any honey at this time may leave it forever. When all is said and done, it is the old-time industrial user of honey that saved the day for the honey industry in America when honey was a drug on the market and that time will come again. When sugar comes back there will be a lot of honey and no one to buy it. If we can't save these customers we're just up against it.

Yours very truly,

C. W. AEPPLER CO.
C. W. AEPPLER.

Palestine Pledges and Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 1, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "Palestine Pledges and Policy" delivered by me over the CBS network program Congress Speaks, Tuesday, October 30. The program originated at WTOP, Washington:

On October 18, Secretary of State James F. Byrnes made the statement that the administration is exploring every possible means to aid in the relief of the displaced Jew in Europe. But—and it's a large but—he added no final decision would be made concerning Palestine without full consultation with the Arabs as well as the Jews.

Thus, at one fell swoop, the Secretary of State again dashed to the ground the hopes of the Jews for relief in Palestine. Secretary Byrnes' statement amounted to an announcement of American policy directly in opposition to the openly declared statements of American officialdom for 28 years.

Assuredly, Secretary Byrnes must know when the Democratic Party, which almost nominated him for Vice President, promulgated the Palestine plank of the Democratic platform, called for untrammeled Jewish immigration and for the establishment of a Jewish democratic state, the party did not consult the Arabs. And when Attlee, Bevin, and Morrison in their platform pledges before election said that the Arabs should get out to make way for the Jews, they did not consult the Arabs.

Consulting the Arabs at this late date is part of the abominable policy of appeasement, the appeasement that brought us the fake "peace in our time"—the Munich Pact, and the nefarious white paper which shut with a bang the doors of Palestine against the Jews.

The demarche of the Secretary of State is apparently based upon the texts of letters passing between King ibn-Saud, of Saudi Arabia, and the late lamented President Roosevelt, wherein Mr. Roosevelt talked in terms of consultation with the Arabs. How can one letter, the depths of its meaning something we cannot now plumb because the writer is dead, establish to that degree administration policy?

Remember, Palestine is not a cause that has been relegated to inch notices in newspapers, nor confined to Tuesday night club

discussions. It has been the subject of covenants and international treaties. Its pros and cons have echoed through the halls of the two most powerful democratic legislatures in the world—the Congress of the United States and the Parliament of Great Britain. Every political party in England and the United States seeking favor with the public has been pro-Zionist—until, of course, it came into power. The Labor Party in Great Britain, the Republican and Democratic Parties in the United States made room for a Palestine plank in their election platforms. Even Churchill when on the Opposition bench whipped out against Parliament when the white paper was being debated before passage. Leaders of historic stature, Thomas Masaryk, Lord Balfour, Lloyd George, Woodrow Wilson, Field Marshal Smuts, Lord Wedgewood, and yes, Franklin Delano Roosevelt openly and verbally, at least championed Zionism.

Further, there was the Balfour Declaration. There were 52 nations signing consent to Britain's mandate over Palestine which called for the establishment of a Jewish National Homeland. There was the Anglo-American Treaty of 1924, reiterating the terms of the mandate. Strange, isn't it, that all these documents of state and all the party platforms and all the oratory should sink beneath the weight of one letter whose meaning, at best, is dubious.

American public opinion is solidly against the attitude of the administration as revealed by the Secretary's statement. Four hundred Members of the House and Senate have gone on record endorsing untrammeled immigration of the Jewish people into Palestine and for an eventual democratic Jewish commonwealth therein. Thirty States through their Governors recently petitioned President Truman to adhere to those principles. In addition, only recently a debate was staged in the Senate wherein Members of both parties inveighed against the perfidity of England in its failure to redeem its oft-repeated pledges. On October 16 in the House of Representatives over a score of Members on both sides of the aisle severely condemned the British Government for its callous repudiation of its pledge.

Thus, we have a coalesced public opinion vehemently expressed in and out of Congress, and against that opinion dare the administration set its face? There are some who are misadvising the Secretary of State, if not the President. Both should not be purblind and fail to recognize the avalanche of public opinion that is daily gaining in momentum.

It would appear that a marked effort is being made to stem the tide of that public opinion. Else, why should the Roosevelt letter at this time have been released to the press? Or the vindictive, inaccurate letter of King Ibn-Saud, too, for that matter? The timing of the release was not accidental; it was deliberate, and, I add, with a studied purpose.

Much, entirely too much, has been made of Arab claims to first consideration. Have the Arabs a case? Emphatically no. As Eliahu Ben Horin in a recent issue of the Nation pointed out, there seems to be an endless stream of Arab protests and proclamations. King Ibn-Saud thunders his demand for the maintenance of the abominable white papers which bars Jewish immigration into Palestine and even dares to threaten the peace of the world should the issue be resolved in favor of the Jews. British statesmen, though knowing better, carefully let it be known they have fallen for this tripe. The build-up has been so great that even some of the advisers of President Truman have been smitten. Any idea of a Pan-Arabian military force in the Levant capable of military victory is too ludicrous for words. Two battalions of British troops suppressed the pro-Axis revolt of the Rashid Ali Bag Gailani Government in Iraq in 1941. In fact, the Iraq revolt is the clearest example of the ineffectuality of appeasement. It's an old truism, "Appease a rascal as you will, he was and is a rascal still." A few airplanes would scatter and render ineffective the horsemen and camel riders of Saudi-Arabia. And let me emphasize this: No American and no British troops should be necessary to defend the integrity of Palestine against Arab marauders. A Jewish brigade could be readily recruited as they were in the war against the Axis to defend to the death their homeland.

The white paper is no law to the Jews nor to the world. Just as the Americans disregarded the stamp tax and tea tax in the American Revolution, just as Ghandi and his followers disregarded the salt tax, the Jews in Palestine do not recognize the white paper. They are prepared to make every sacrifice. The Jewish D-day has arrived in Palestine. The landing of homeless refugees in Palestine will take place. Let the British troops dare to fire upon them. If nobody will teach the British the meaning of honor, the Jews will. They will return blow for blow and bullet for bullet.

Let us not forget that Ibn-Saud, the self-styled ruler of the Arabs didn't even lend a camel or a donkey to the Allies in their most distressful moments in the Levant. Right now, there are remnants of the Arab Legion, who as prisoners of war are now at Camp Opelika, Ala. Under the leadership of the traitorous Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, they fought against American and British troops. They fought as members of the Waffen SS against the Yugoslav partisans. When Rommel was at the gates of Alexandria, not only did King Farouk and his Egyptians fail to lift a finger in their own defense, but members of the King's cabinet were arrested carrying the plans of the British High Command, and carrying them to the Nazi generals.

It is interesting to note that the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem who fled to Berlin is not on the war criminal list due to the failure of the British Government to place him there, although he is under residential surveillance in France. The so-called Pan Arabian League is demanding his release and reinstatement, although collaborators like Laval and Quisling have already met the firing squad. They would make of the Grand Mufti, erstwhile friend of Hitler, a national hero.

In the face of all this, I received a letter from the Foreign Economic Administration which revealed that as of June 30, 1945, we had transferred to Saudi Arabia under lend-lease goods value at $9,492,000, consisting of industrial and agricultural commodities and as of the same date we had furnished lend-lease aid to Iraq in the sum of $4,144. Further, substantial quantities of lend-lease goods has been sent to Transjordan to the British forces stationed in those countries. To my mind, this was a flat violation of the intent of Congress. Under the lend-lease statute, this aid was to be given only to those countries who had been on the Allied side.

In stark contrast was the display of devotion to the Allied cause by the Jews of Palestine. The Jewish agency was able to raise a volunteer army of a higher ratio than did the United States through selective service. The Jewish brigade performed brilliantly in Italy and elsewhere as the citations show. Two hundred new industries were started by the Jews of Palestine to service the Levant theater of military operations. Medicines, drugs, chemicals, and potash, to name but a few.

The equities weigh heavily against the claims of the Arab big chiefs. The Jews have no home. They relied upon the promise, internationally confirmed, that the tiny strip of land, no larger than the size of Vermont, approximately 10,000 square miles, would be theirs. The Arabs have 2,000,000 square miles self-admittedly underpopulated. It is absurd for them to claim the patch of land that was promised to the Jews at the same time when the Allies in the First World War released all of Arabia from Turkish domination.

What I say here is well known to the British authorities. Then why this frantic appeasement of the Arab big chiefs? Is this all being done for the benefit of the Arab peasant and worker? Decidedly no. Far from being displaced in Palestine, the Arab has doubled in population in the past 10 years. Here is the highest standard of living for the workers in all of the East. The Arabs recognizing this have flocked in increasing numbers to Palestine. The birth rate among Arabs had increased as the death rate from disease decreased. The Jewish pioneer had brought a social awakening to the East, an awakening that is feared by reactionary Englishmen and Arab rulers alike. The modern techniques of the intensive cultivation of the soil and the quickening brought in the wake of the industrialization swept new values into the East. The disease-ridden, exploited, illiterate Arab has found a new source of strength. What he knows of schools, medical treatment, the developments of the arts and sciences, the protection of labor, he has learned from Jewish settlement in Palestine. Without the redemption of Palestine by the Jews, that part of the Arab world would have slumbered on, the mass of its people held firm in the grip of feudalism and imperialism.

Again, then, why this appeasement of the handful of Arab potentates? Can the answer lie in oil? The Arab potentates know that international rivalry for control of these oil lands in Saudi Arabia has increased. They are playing it up for every bit of its worth. And so the powers of the world bid feverishly for Arab favor. Are the powers ready to trade human dignity and honor for oil? The New York Post has put it well, "We can have a Near East that will be more than an oyster for a few pincelings. It can be a decent place for all—for the Arab common man as well as for the pitiful remnant of Europe's Jewry.

In the financial negotiation talks now going on between England and the United States, Lord Halifax raised the question of honor. England, he pointed out, has obligations to its dominions and the maintenance of the imperial preference trade duties is important to her honorable discharge of those obligations. That's a strange word, "honor," to be used by Lord Halifax. It is unbecomingly absent in the British Government's observations on Palestine. Where was British honor when she slammed shut the doors of Palestine when a haven of refuge would have saved thousands of lives?

Let's face it.

We are at the crossroads today. We either face the beginning of a new era in which decency and honor are more than words a politician glibly uses or we face the destruction of our civilization. That's the story the atom bomb tells. If we remain indifferent, if we remain apathetic, we ourselves sanction a world of moral degradation.

What happens to and in Palestine will be the clearest indication of the road the powers of the world have elected to follow.

H. R. 2536

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 1, 1945

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement on the Bulwinkle bill by Col. J. Munroe Johnson,

Director of Defense Transportation and a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, before a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am J. M. Johnson, Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, a war agency created by Executive Order 8989, dated December 18, 1941. I am and was also a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I am pleased to accept the invitation of the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to appear before it to discuss the measure under consideration at this hearing, H. R. 2536.

Mr. REECE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr BULWINKLE. Mr. Reece.

Mr. REECE. If I may ask, you are still a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. JOHNSON. I am and was before I became Director of the Office of Defense Transportation.

Mr. BULWINKLE. And also, may I just say here, you are from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, sir; I am very glad to say that.

Mr. BULWINKLE. And you and I had the same teacher, I believe?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. REECE. He and I served in the same division in France, so I will not let you get ahead of me there.

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes; and I might give the name of that division. The famous Rainbow Division.

You have already been advised by the chairman of the legislative committee of the Interstate Commerce Commission and by Commissioner Aitchison of the views and recommendations of the Commission concerning this bill. With those views and recommendations I am in full accord.

The members of this committee are fully aware, I am sure, of the unparalleled accomplishments of the railroads, the motor carriers, and other forms of domestic transportation during World War II. And, I may interpose, I presume you are to some extent familiar with what transportation did in World War I, and I will refer to that again after I shall have read this prepared statement. Confronted by an unprecedented volume of traffic, both freight and passenger, which seemed to more than tax their capacity; faced with the necessity of expediting the movement of troops and materials of war and at the same time providing transportation necessary to the maintenance of the essential civilian economy; beset by shortages in manpower, facilities, materials, and supplies—and I will revert to that again—and other difficulties which attend an all-out war effort, the carriers of the Nation rose to the occasion and wrote into the history of transportation a page which shall forever remain indelible.

It is not necessary or appropriate at this hearing to attempt to evaluate the various factors that contributed to the magnificent record of domestic wartime transportation, but I do feel justified in saying to the members of this committee that in my sincere opinion the task could never have been performed adequately in the absence of machinery and procedures for joint and collective action among the various types of carriers and among the carriers themselves. It is true, of course, that the executive order creating the Office of Defense Transportation invested it with the necessary authority to coordinate and direct domestic traffic movements with the objective of preventing possible points of traffic congestion and assuring the orderly and expeditious movement of men, materials, and supplies to points of need, but the discharge of our responsibility in this behalf was very greatly facilitated in the field of regulated transportation by the existence of associations, committees, bureaus, and conferences—agencies which had been set up in peacetime by the carriers to deal collectively with each other and with the public. The situation not only made for ease in administration but because it was in existence it contributed immeasurably to the time factor in putting policies into effect, which, in time of war, is of paramount consideration. It was found unnecessary except in a very few instances to set up additional committees to assist in effectuating policies and recommendations of this office, relative to joint or collective action by regulated carriers.

During the fore part of the war—in 1942—the bureau or conference method employed by the railroads and motor carriers in dealing with rates and practices affecting the charges made for transportation was sharply challenged. Because of the obvious adverse effect which the challenge would have upon the ability of the Office of Defense Transportation and other agencies of the Government to utilize carrier committees and bureaus in promoting joint and collective action among carriers, and without attempting to appraise the merits of the challenge, the then Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, the late Joseph B. Eastman, requested the Chairman of the War Production Board to issue a certificate under section 12 of Public Law 603, Seventy-seventh Congress, granting immunity, under proper safeguards, from the provisions of the antitrust laws of the United States to common carriers and their representatives participating in rate bureaus, rate conferences, and other similar organizations. In this request the Director was joined by the War and Navy Departments. As a result, on March 20, 1943, the Chairman of the War Production Board issued his certificate No. 44, applicable to the situation. One of the conditions of his certificate is that joint action taken by common carriers or freight forwarders shall be in compliance with certain regulations for rate conferences formulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission. These regulations were made a part of the certificate. Unless there already is in the record a copy of the certificate and regulations, I should like to submit a copy.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Without objection, that may be done.

(The document, certificate No. 44, above referred to, is as follows:)

"CERTIFICATE NO. 44

"To the ATTORNEY GENERAL:

"Pursuant to the provisions of section 12 of Public Law No. 603, Seventy-seventh Congress (56 Stat. 357), I hereby approve joint action by common carriers or freight forwarders, or their respective representatives, through rate bureaus, rate conferences, or other similar carrier or forwarder organizations, in the initiation and establishment of common carrier and freight forwarder rates, fares, and charges, and carrier and forwarder regulations and practices pertaining thereto: *Provided*, That such action is taken subject to and in compliance with certain regulations for rate conferences formulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission, a copy of which is hereunto annexed and made a part hereof; and after consultation with you, I hereby find and so certify to you that the doing of any act or thing, or the omission to do any act or thing, by any person in compliance with my approval herein expressed, is requisite to the prosecution of the war.

"DONALD M. NELSON,
"Chairman, War Production Board.
"MARCH 20, 1943."

Mr. JOHNSON. This certificate No. 44 is still in effect. However, a communication dated October 4, 1945, from the general counsel of the War Production Board requests that the Office of Defense Transportation suggest a date prior to November 1, 1945, on which the Chairman may withdraw the certificate, or in the event there is some reason why it is thought the certificate should not be withdrawn before November 1, 1945, to suggest the first date thereafter, prior to January 1, 1946, upon which it may be withdrawn. I have consulted with the War and Navy Departments and the Interstate Commerce Commission and it is our common view that the certificate should not be withdrawn prior to February 1, 1946, and I have no great doubt that we won't recommend a further extension--and representations to that effect have been made to the War Production Board.

So far as I am advised, operations of rate bureaus, rate conferences and other similar organizations under certificate No. 44 and the Regulations for Rate Conferences of the Interstate Commerce Commission have been eminently satisfactory.

The purpose of the measure pending before this committee, as I view it, is, in effect, to replace the wartime protection afforded the regulated carriers by certificate No. 44, with permanent statutory immunity under conditions which will assure a full measure of protection to the public. In my judgment, no one who is familiar with the history of regulated transportation can offer any valid dissent to this objective. Rate bureaus and similar carrier organizations have existed and functioned for years. They have, in general, the full support of shippers, regulatory commissions and regulated carriers alike. They are, in my opinion, a creature of necessity. I cannot conceive of the regulated carriers of the country conforming to the duties and obligations imposed upon them by the Interstate Commerce Act unless they are in position to consult, confer and deal collectively with many phases of the matter.

I have not attempted in this statement to analyze the specific provisions of the pending measure. This I have felt to be unnecessary in view of the testimony which has preceded and particularly in the light of the very adequate statements made upon behalf of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

So far as the Office of Defense Transportation itself is concerned, you no doubt know that it is in the process of liquidation. It seems unlikely that permanent legislation of the type under consideration will affect the functions of this Office during the remainder of its existence. However, it would be unfortunate in my opinion if there should be any hiatus between the expiration of certificate No. 44 and the enactment of permanent legislation on the subject, particularly in view of the problems of reconversion which confront the country.

My connection as Director of the Office of Defense Transportation with the railroads has been largely one of operations, and while this bill has more to do with the rate features, which is a connection of the citizens with the carriers, still operations make and control rates.

You have heard both Admiral Mitchell and General Gross on this subject. They spoke to you from the standpoint of the military man; spoke to you about their tonnage. They, perhaps, know but they did not mention what these railroads and our truckers have done in this war. It has been spoken of as a miracle, long before it had reached its peak.

Mr. REECE. May I interpose there?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. REECE. And I think it also ought to be said for the record or otherwise that the Office of Defense Transportation under your predecessor and under yourself as Director has contributed a great deal to the accomplishment of this miracle. I feel, and I say without any intention of exaggeration, that the Office of Defense Transportation has functioned as efficiently, or more efficiently, than any emergency office that was set up in connection with the prosecution of the war.

I have not talked with officials of the transportation industry, but I think they would feel the same way about it.

It is a credit both to your predecessor and yourself and staffs which have supported you in this effort. You deserve the gratitude of the Nation.

Mr. BULWINKLE. With which I agree.

Mr. CHAPMAN. And I, very strongly endorse that statement.

Mr. JOHNSON. You are very kind, gentlemen. I appreciate it. We certainly have done our utmost; but I want to tell you it is not the Office of Defense Transportation. It is the over-all unification—conferences of carriers, and to include the shippers, too. If there ever was a time when the entire transportation service of the United States served the world in the greatest avalanche of transportation the world has ever seen in one nation, it was during this time, and it was because these organizations brought them all in and it has been one industry, and the Government was with them.

Mr. BULWINKLE. And you regulated them.

Mr. JOHNSON. We forgot who owned the railroad cars; we forgot who owned the trucks. It was one unit, and that is the only way the United States will ever have the transportation it deserves and can have.

Mr. REECE. That is why you did a good job.

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, I do not know why I did a good job. I did it because I was working with good patriotic people ready to make any sacrifices in the world regardless of cost, and they did it, and if they had not done it our war effort would have been wrecked and our allies defeated before we ever reached their side on the battlefield. Just as sure as we won a victory, that would have happened.

Transportation cannot win a war, but you cannot win one without transportation. And this transportation and service was furnished under the most appalling difficulties transportation ever faced. We went into this war with 600,000 less freight cars than we had when we went into the First World War, and we still have 600,000 less freight cars; we went into it with 18,000 less passenger cars, and we still have 18,000 less passenger cars; we emerged from this war with half a million less employees than we had at the end of World War I, and we have carried two or three times the burden that was imposed on the then transportation system, and we have done it without any annoyance to the civilian in his every day life. How it was done, was only because it was done as a unit. We did not, nor did they exercise any of those individual activities urged by profit pursuits. And, God is good. With all of the sacrifices, without regard to expenditures, it has been profitable to them, not only as compared with what they might have had, if they had not done so well, but as compared with World War I, when the railroads, the shippers, and the Government suffered enormous losses.

The United States Goverment in the First World War, to cordinate, took over, and if you take out these bureaus, the Association of American Railroads, Association of Short Lines, Southeastern Association, Northern Association, and the Western Association, and Association of Truckers, the Government has got to organize and establish something of that sort itself running into millions of dollars; millions of dollars every year in peace and in war. Then think of the revenue that we spent on our transportation when we took it over, and this time they paid taxes, and we emerged with a lower freight rate than we had when we entered this war.

You cannot conceive of such things being done when every piece of steel was used for shells, tanks, trucks—we could not get enough rails; could not get enough material to build cars, nor enough people we thought to run the railroads and the trucks and the air lines, and our inland waterways. In all of those agencies transportation, our coastwise shipping, our foreign shipping, all went out. We had to furnish fuel to New England by rail that formerly went by ship. We had to take that freight that moved by truck, because the truck had to drop out because of lack of rubber and parts, and put it on the rails. Our entire shipments from South America that formerly went up the east coast and the west coast, taken to the first port and we transported that traffic by rail. We fed this enormous northeastern corner by rail for its petroleum and when this first was mentioned as an additional burden doubt was expressed that they could transport 200,000 barrels a day into the northeast. We transported at times more than a million barrels per day into the northeast. All of the tank cars in America, private and publicly owned, were pooled and taken away from everybody and put into solid blocks of trains and given passenger schedules—as fast as the cars would take it.

Why, think of some man down in Tennessee, my brother in arms, wanting to ship something up into Canada and each railroad being its own agent; and it travels over 5 or 6 different railroads, 20 or 30 different routes by which it would reach its destination, and each one of these, sometimes short 50-mile railroads, at each station could never figure out the freight rates. And, it might move by rail, by barge, by truck, then on the rails again, and then on a barge again. You would have confusion worse confounded at the time transportation is going to be needed in this Nation as never before, and there is something about transportation that you cannot understand. It is one industry that will commit harikari if left alone. They will haul the tonnage rather than see some competitor haul it, at a loss—assuming that a train moves, or a truck is going to run anyway—and it does not cost anything to move something that somebody else would move, and they get the business.

You cannot permit railroads to be unbridled among each other and certainly not with the water carriers, or a water carrier with the railroads; or a trucker with another trucker; and certainly not a trucker with a railroad. You would have confusion worse confounded.

Now, somebody, of course, has to govern this conference method of serving this Nation. They cannot be turned loose as an industry, because they can throttle this country in a week. This country does not tick long without transportation beyond the dreams of any other nation. Someone must govern it and we must assume whoever governs it, whether the courts of the land or the Interstate Commerce Commission, that they possess integrity and in addition to that you want skill.

There is no danger, no matter how many conferences may be had among these various transportation agencies and between the various forms of transportation—a problem you gentlemen have to solve now pretty soon—if that is done under regulation, published and known to the world. You may have transportation and will have transportation.

I have never met a more patriotic group of people nor a more skillful group of people than it has been my pleasure to meet and work with in all of the transportation agencies of the United States, and I want to tell this committee they have done their very best, patriotically, and nothing less than their best would have served this Nation in a desperation that never existed before. They are going to need intelligent, safe regulation, and I can think of none that gives and guarantees a nation securing that national transportation needed that is greater than the Bulwinkle bill.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Any questions?

Mr. REECE. I would like to ask one.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Reece.

Mr. REECE. Does this bill have any important relationship to this southern freight question that the southern governors have heretofore presented?

Mr. JOHNSON. I see no connection whatsoever between this and the unification of rates between territories and zones. Whatever eventuates from that will eventuate more intelligently under the Bulwinkle bill than without it.

Another thing I want to let you understand, too. Perhaps I did not advert to it. You heard the two transportation directors of the greatest shippers in the world, the Army and the Navy. They could not have started if they had had to deal with the individual railroads. It could not have been done. And, the Office of Defense Transportation, had there not been the Short Line Association, the Association of American Railroads, the Trucking Association—which, by the way, has not covered its field to the same extent as the others have—it is younger—if they had not been there you would have had appropriations for the Office of Defense Transportation rivaling some of these other war agencies and spent hundreds of millions of dollars, for I would have established not a short line or Association of American Railroads, but a railroad agency, a truckers' agency, and I would have had to spend millions of dollars to create organizations not as skillful or as effective as those in existence.

These railroads could not run without such overall supervisory coordinating agencies as the Association of American Railroads, or the American Short Line Association, and the truckers will do well if they get theirs inclusive, so that the Government can talk to one place.

I can get out a service order. That is an interstate-commerce order. And, I still use that bureau of service of the Interstate Commerce Commission almost as a part of the ODT. You cannot see where the line is. I can call the AAR and say we are issuing such and such an order. The order will be mimeographed and out this afternoon, and before we will have mimeographed that order; before it reaches the AAR, every railroad in America knows what that order is and begins observing it.

Suppose we had to deal with individuals, with a thousand railroads, and millions of truckers. You would be sunk and such a war could not be successfully waged.

Regulated conferences as unifications of action is essential to transportation. Without it you are crippled beyond repair.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Any further questions?

Colonel, we certainly appreciate your coming here today.

Mr. JOHNSON. If I can do anything to better the transportation of the United States, I will have had a satisfactory tour of duty with the United States Government. There is no activity in America any more important to the United States as a nation than its transportation.

Mr. BULWINKLE. We thank you, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON. Thank you.

Address of Harris J. Booras at Unveiling Ceremonies of Bust of Franklin D. Roosevelt

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 1, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following dedicatory address by Harris J. Booras,

supreme president of Ahepa, at the unveiling ceremonies of statue of Franklin D. Roosevelt, known as the war President, at Roosevelt Library, Hyde Park, N. Y., October 28, 1945:

Your Grace, Mrs. Roosevelt, distinguished guests, and my fellow Americans, it is now autumn of 1945 in this historic Dutchess County of New York. Most befittingly, Mother Nature donned her multicolored beautiful fall attire in order to behold this memorable day The ancestral fields of the Roosevelts at Hyde Park are bathed with cheering and refreshing smiles of a brilliant sun and the invigorating odor of the pure country air. All is peace and serene, but not like ever before.

An incense of sanctity has now baptized this historic site. A national or rather an international shrine has been here installed, a sanctuary of glory and altar of liberty. For here lies at rest here we behold the sepulchre of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the greatest war President of the United States of America.

We assemble here as pilgrims with sad and heavy hearts that our late Commander in Chief is no longer in our midst to inspire us and to lead us on to a lasting world peace. But we come with the profoundest gratitude and pride as participators and inheritors of most glorious pages of our country's, nay, even of the entire world's history, which he made possible by his genius, his leadership, and his sacrifices.

For, never before in the annals of freemen was it ever recorded that so many millions the world over, during this past darkest period of history, locked upon one man for inspiration, hope, and deliverance. Before the person of this giant of intellect, of freedom, and of the rights of man, there was a momentary pause in the whole record of mankind; here the past, the present, and the future met, and in him and under his great leadership, terror, peril, evil, and suffering at the worst, gave way to new found strength, hope, confidence, and freedom; here the world tyranny and despotism were destroyed and again liberty and justice triiumphed and won.

Most befittingly indeed, therefore, our illustrious President Harry S. Truman, proclaimed Franklin D. Roosevelt as the greatest war President of the Nation. I say that he was the greatest war leader of the entire world and that justly he is acclaimed by all freedom-loving people as a world deliverer.

His illustrious name belongs to America; his immortal fame to all mankind. The loftiness of his spirit, the majesty of his soul, the magnitude of his character, the sublimeness of his intellect, and the greatest of his ideals, shall guide the pathways of all generations to come as a brilliant beacon of freedom and democracy. With unbounded reverence and respect, therefore, we come before our Hero's grave to dedicate a memorial to him, to whom all humanity has already dedicated its heart.

The fraternal Order of Ahepa, an organization composed largely of Americans of Hellenic descent, was accorded the high privilege by our late President, who was also a distinguished member of our brotherhood, of presenting to the people of the United States, the statue of the war President. This outstanding work of art was carved and molded by the ingenious hands of a new Phidias, our world-famed American sculptor, Walter Russell, of New York City. In accordance with the wish of our beloved late President that the same be unveiled soon after the war, we are here today to make this formal dedication.

We have chosen October 28, my fellow citizens, on account of two reasons. Firstly, because the Order of Ahepa, as an official issuing agency of our Treasury Department, having sold in the past various war bond drives more millions in bonds than any other similar organization in America, it was accorded the distinctive privilege by the Secretary of the Treasury to commence its Victory loan campaign a day earlier than the rest of the Nation. We, therefore, officially commence, at these historic ceremonies, Ahepa's Victory bond drive, and our chapters throughout the land, having been instructed to stand ready, now shall begin their patriotic activities with zeal, enthusiasm, and unremitting devotion. We pledge to the memory of our war President that Ahepa will again lead this triumphant march of our Nation, so that we may all prove worthy of the victory that he made possible. The Ahepa calls upon every American to buy a bond so that we may be bonded together as freemen forever.

Secondly, this day was selected as it marks an annual of glory in present world history. For, on October 28, 1940, Fascist Italy of 45,000,000, supported by Nazi Germany of 75,000,000, treacherously attacked with all its might and fury the freedom-loving people of heroic and noble Greece, who numbered only 8,000,000 souls. A miracle was witnessed. The results we all know. The legions of Mussolini were smashed to pieces by the bayonets of the Greek evzones. It was the first victory against the Axis; it marked the turning point of the war. The more ferocious and resolute resistance of the brave Hellenes against the Nazi hordes and the Bulgarian sattelites that poured into Greece in order to extricate the doomed Fascists, destroyed the myth of Axis invincibility and shattered to pieces the timetable of Hitler. Thus it made it possible for Russia to stop the Nazis at the gates of Moscow, gave Britain much needed time and moral aid and gave America opportunity to organize her industrial and military might. A new and more glorious Marathon was born on this day of 1940.

This day shall also be marked in the records of time because of our present historic ceremonies. This memorial of bronze, stamped as it is with immortality, shall stand here as a pillar of glory of this great democracy that brought forth to the world a worthy and true son of all America's traditions. Ordained as it is with the breath of life of an ageless spirit, it shall serve as a trophy of triumph, for victory and freedom. The brilliancy of its rays vibrating from this living image of our great war President shall forever light the pathways of all generations to come.

In the name of the Order of Ahepa, it is my proud privilege and high honor to now officially present to the people of the United States and their posterity, this glorious memorial of the war President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Inland Plants to Aid Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 2 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS] I present the following request by him for the printing of a statement in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Mr. President, our safety of the future is going to be dependent on the proper location of our strength and on the disintegration of our defense plants. In the Middle West, a group of interested loyal, patriotic citizens has studied this problem and has made specific recommendations to Congress, to industry, and to all others concerned. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement on national safety and economy require inland plants to aid defense program, issued by the West Central Industrial Association, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL SAFETY AND ECONOMY REQUIRE INLAND PLANTS TO AID DEFENSE PROGRAM

A MATTER OF VITAL IMPORTANCE TO EVERY CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES

Now that World War II has ended in victory, it is the responsibility of the Congress, aided by military and naval officials, to formulate and effectuate an adequate program for our national defense in this atomic age.

This must be done without undue delay.

It must be done so as to assure, to the fullest extent possible, our national safety.

It must be done so as to enable us to cope with any foreseable method of enemy attack.

It must be done with due regard for the economical expenditure of the taxpayers' money, so as to secure maximum results for the funds expended.

Air power in all of its phases will be a chief factor in our defense program, and our air power production facilities must be in the least vulnerable locations. Also, we must make adequate provision for constant research and experimentation.

Even before the development of the atomic bomb, the strategic military advantages of the West Central region of the United States for air-power production had become widely recognized during World War II. Now that we have the atomic bomb, we are absolutely compelled, as a matter of national safety, to both recognize these advantages of this region and to plan our future defense program accordingly.

Air power production facilities can be operated in the west central region with maximum certainty of successful defense in case of enemy attack. This fact is implicit with inland locations, whereas coastal locations afford the least opportunities for defense. This vast advantage of inland locations for plants can be ignored only at the expense of national safety.

The Nation's newspapers on September 20, 1945, published an item quoting Lt. Gen. Barney Giles, who had just led a one-stop flight of Superfortresses from Japan to Washington, D. C., as declaring that the Pacific Northwest would have been bombed by Japanese suicide planes before the end of 1945 if the war had not ended suddenly. He said those same Superforts took off from a super air field on Hokkaido, from which Japan was planning to send four-motored suicide bombers against Seattle and other Pacific coast cities. In his opinion the bombing would have come within 6 months if the war had not ended.

The extravagant claim was made recently in a nationally circulated magazine that, by flying the Great Circle route, certain nations could attack this inland west central region as easily as the coastal areas. This cannot be successfully argued for the simple reason that inland locations afford time and space within which to apply effective defense measures. All coastal areas are vulnerable to carrier-based aircraft. This was demonstrated by the Japanese in the attack upon Pearl Harbor and by other actions in World War II. In planning a continuation of our air power production program, these facts must be recognized.

It is worth noting that many millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money were expended during World War II for coastal plant protection. For example, Associated Press

news and pictures were published throughout the Nation, July 24, 1945, of Boeing plant camouflage at Seattle, and the Wall Street Journal of August 10, 1945, published a story of similar camouflage, costing $18,000,000, at aircraft plants in southern California, stating that additional millions will be required for its removal. Douglas, Lockheed, Consolidated Vultee, Northrop, and North American plants were included.

Additional millions were spent for air-raid shelters, black-outs, antiaircraft defense, barrage balloons, revetments on airports, bombproof walls separating important plant areas, and duplicate sets of original drawings of whole plants for safekeeping in the interior.

All of these measures were necessary in World War II because, being on the coast, these plants were wide open to enemy attack. Such expenditures were not made at plants in the West Central region, because such protection was believed unnecessary. The inland plants were considered safe, or at least much less vulnerable than those on the coasts.

By concentrating much of our air-power production in dispersed, inland locations, the Government very probably can avoid the necessity for and the tremendous expense of such protective measures in case of another war emergency, as the presently existing production facilities of this region can be preserved and, if war comes again in a few years, they could serve as the nucleus for quick expansion to meet requirements. Even if, as some argue, the atomic bomb and other scientific developments in warfare should require some types of protective measures for inland plants in the event of future conflicts, the inland plants would still afford the tremendous advantage of time and space within which to stop anything directed toward them by the enemy. This might very easily spell the difference between defeat and victory, between safety and disaster.

Prior to World War II, airplane manufacturing was heavily concentrated on the west and east coasts. During the war, these facilities were augmented by Government-built plants, and the Government also established large plant facilities in several dispersed locations in the West Central region. These factories still are owned by the Government. The West Central region's aircraft plants, it should be noted here, have made the most outstanding production records in World War II, proving this region's labor is superior—no serious strikes, less absenteeism, more production per worker. Furthermore, the West Central region has better transportation to the east coast than exists between east and west coasts, with only seven transcontinental rail lines, as against numerous railroads between the West Central region and the east coast. Bombing could far more easily knock out the seven east-west lines, where they cross the Rockies, than the numerous West Central-east coast lines. This is a vital advantage which we cannot afford to sacrifice.

Due to the fact that the prewar west and east coast locations usually include the home plants of the parent companies, there is a natural tendency on the part of the companies involved to draw back into these prewar coastal plants, now that war orders have been canceled and their services are no longer required for operation of the inland Government-owned plants.

If this is allowed to happen, leaving all of the inland plants idle or permitting their sale and diversion to other types of manufacturing, our defense program would necessarily depend on the coastal plants for essential production, and they would have to serve as the nucleus for quick expansion of production in the event of a sudden war emergency. Such concentration of production in the coastal areas not only increases vulnerability to attack but reduces the potential expansibility because of the limited reservoir of manpower.

To permit the development of such a condition would be, manifestly, the height of folly and in utter disregard of our national safety, for the reasons already cited.

For these same reasons, it is obvious that our wisest and safest course, and the one least costly to the Nations' already heavily burdened taxpayers ,is to prepare for the concentration of a large portion of our production in these inland plants, which already are in dispersed locations. From the cost angle, our expenditure of $309,000,000,000 in World War II, representing unavoidable and tragic waste and destruction, and leaving us with a national debt of astronomical proportions, compels judicious fiscal policies if we are to provide the defense measures required for national safety and simultaneously retire or even carry our existing debt, thereby avoiding national economic ruin.

Some of the companies, therefore, should be induced to move inland. Surplus Government plants at inland locations might be traded for privately owned coastal plants, or they might be leased to the coastal companies on such attractive terms that they could afford to move their operations inland. Expense of such removal to the interior should be borne by the Government, to assure such removal and because this would be less costly in money and far less hazardous to our national safety than to have our production concentrated in the vulnerable coastal areas, with expansibility reduced by inadequate resources of manpower.

It may not be found necessary or desirable to keep all of these inland Government-owned plants to produce for our defense program. Congress, with advice from military and naval officials, should decide how many and which of them are to be retained. Some of the communities where these plants are located may prefer to have them made available to private enterprise for other types of manufacturing. Where this would not conflict with the needs of the Government in developing an adequate defense production program in dispersed inland locations, such uses should be permitted.

It cannot be truthfully said that these arguments are motivated by selfish sectionalism. It just happens that the facts of life force this Nation, as a means of self-preservation, to be realistic in planning its future defense program so as to most effectively meet the new conditions of this atomic age. Such realism will, of necessity, accept the conclusions herein expressed. There is no disposition to injure or take advantage of other sections of the country by developing the proposed program. All sections are equally and vitally concerned. Indeed, the west and east coast sections should, and probably will, recognize the validity of the arguments advanced and therefore, in the interest of the Nation's safety, not to mention economy in the use of public funds, may very well be expected to favor such a program. Opposition would be an untenable attitude on the part of any section, because, when national safety is at stake, all other arguments fall.

Of course, if this Nation knows positively that no other nation will suddenly attack us at some future time, these conclusions can be ignored. Manifestly, we possess no such knowledge, but, on the contrary, it is reasonable to assume that a danger exists and that our safety requires adequate defense plans for possible future emergencies, more especially so since we cannot hope to permanently monopolize the ability to employ atomic energy in warfare.

There is no time to be lost in developing this defense program. Congress should move swiftly, assisted by military and naval officials. The program should be defined and the necessary funds appropriated by Congress, followed by prompt effectuation of the program. Our national safety demands it.

FACTS ABOUT THE WEST CENTRAL INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL

The West Central Industrial Council was organized on April 6, 1945, at Oklahoma City, Okla. It is composed of chambers of commerce, public officials, and other interested organizations and individuals of the 15 States and parts of States comprising the area embraced.

The west central region is bounded by the Mississippi River on the east, the Rocky Mountains on the west, the Canadian border on the north and the Gulf and Mexican border on the south. The States affiliated with the council through representatives as indicated, are: Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Iowa, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and those parts of New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, and Montana lying east of the Rockies.

The purposes of the council, agreed upon when the council was organized, are:

1. To ascertain the policy of the United States Government and its interested subdivisions with reference to postwar disposition of industrial institutions and facilities established in promotion of the war effort, and to cooperate with those Government agencies in the most efficient utilization of these facilities and institutions for the benefit of the Government and of the communities where located.

2. To promote the general recognition and acceptance by the Government and by the Nation of the factual information and practical conclusions of the McCarran report to the Senate of the United States.

3. To secure the cooperation of the congressional and governmental representatives of the States composing this area in recognition of the problems above stated, and their cooperation in finding solutions of these problems which will be advantageous to the national interest and to the interests of this area.

4. To cooperate in the solution of such other problems of common interest to this area and States composing it as may from time to time arise.

West Central Industrial Council Executive Committee: Governor R. S. Kerr, Oklahoma, Chairman; Geo. W. Catts, Kansas City, Mo., First Vice Chairman; William Holden, Fort Worth, Tex., Second Vice Chairman; Lloyd A. Wilson, Wichita, Kans., Secretary-Treasurer; Russell S. Rhodes, Tulsa, Okla.; John D. Adams, Des Moines, Iowa; George Collisson, Denver, Colo.; Oliver W. Roberts, Omaha, Nebr.; Scott D. Hamilton, Little Rock, Ark.

Some Bottlenecks of Reconversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 2 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address on the subject Some Bottlenecks of Reconversion, which I delivered before the seventeenth annual meeting of the Gray

Iron Founders' Society, at the La Salle Hotel, Chicago, October 24, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and friends, it is certainly a pleasure and privilege to be with you here at this luncheon. In a certain sense I feel as if I had almost come home. There are friendly folks here, and, of course, Chicago was once a part of Wisconsin Territory.

I needn't tell you gentlemen the problems of your own industry, which are not only grave and crucial to you men, but to the Nation as a whole.

I, personally, in Washington, have watched with concern the failure of some of our Government officials to understand the importance of the foundry industry in meeting the reconversion needs of this Nation and in providing jobs for the Nation. The Government is proving a bottleneck on this score.

And that is just what I want to talk to you about—not only the bottleneck of the Government; not only the bottleneck in your own industry, because of insufficient manpower, but the bottleneck of strikes; and lastly, the greatest bottleneck of all in the human mind—the bottleneck of synthetic and loose-minded thinking.

THE FIRST BOTTLENECK: LACK OF MANPOWER IN THE FOUNDRY INDUSTRY

Now, to take these four bottlenecks in order, let's consider the bottleneck in the Gray Iron Founders' industry first. I believe I have covered that in a letter which I recently wrote to Mr. John Snyder, Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. I am going to read that letter to you. It is as follows:

OCTOBER 10, 1945.

Hon. JOHN R. SNYDER,
Director, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SNYDER: There has recently been called to my attention a very serious situation in the gray iron founders industry.

As you know, we have a number of gray iron founders in Wisconsin.

I am informed that if this situation is cleared up—if 68,000 to 70,000 men can be secured for this industry—it will mean that as a result of what they produce, jobs for three or more million men in industries which use the gray iron castings will be created.

I will be specific in this matter. The automobile industry, as you know, is in dire need of gray-iron castings for motor blocks and heads. The refrigeration and air-conditioning industries require castings for motor compressors and heads, motor endframes, cylinders, and rings; the washing-machine industry for frames, arms, motor endframes; the textile industry for repair parts for looms, weaving machines; and all types of textile machinery; the rubber industry for tire molds and repair parts for the rubber-making machinery; the mining industry for coal-mining machinery; the railroads for brake shoes and car wheels. Other industries need these vital items for farm machinery; for food-processing machinery; for office equipment, etc.

I have recently listened to talks over the radio and seen press releases in relation to shortages, but all of these seem to have missed the vital point that none of these shortages can be met without the prior production of gray-iron castings.

As you know, much of the machinery that we are relying upon for reconversion has been worn out, and the need for new parts (castings) in all the lines suggested above, is so critical that I feel that I am doing the proper thing in calling your attention to this fact, which you undoubtedly know, but because of pressure of business and other matters may have overlooked.

Now, anyone who makes a suggestion should have a remedy.

If the Government is really interested—as I think it is—in getting reconversion under full steam, then the Government must look after first things first. That means getting 70,000 workers into the gray iron founders' industry—70,000 jobs there are looking for men. What is the Government doing about filling those jobs? I am sure it is not disputed that these jobs will produce 3,000,000 other jobs. Is there anything more important in America than the matter of creation of jobs—the very thing about which I am writing you? If there is, I don't know it. On other occasions the Government has taken steps to get men to fill critical situations. I think that is what must be done now.

Will you kindly let me hear from you in the immediate future in relation to what is intended to be done and what is done on this matter?

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

I might say that I also sent a copy of this letter to each of the following:

Hon. James M. Mead, chairman, Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program; Hon. John D. Small, Chairman, Civilian Production Administration; Hon. J. A. Krug, Chairman, War Production Board; Hon. James E. Murray, chairman, Special Committee To Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises.

I have already spoken in the Senate and introduced this letter into the RECORD. On that occasion I said:

"It was not so long ago that we heard talk about bottlenecks in the production of materials for war. The situation has now changed. We are no longer producing for war, but we face bottlenecks in reconversion which will interfere with our economic prosperity unless we 'bust' them wide open.

"I especially stress the importance of this matter (the Gray Iron Founders' problem) to the chairmen of the two committees I have mentioned. Without any reflection upon any individual or committee, I wish to say that failure to take action in this matter will not only clog the channels of employment, but will demonstrate an utter lack of perspective.

"There is another phase to this matter. There are some ugly rumors going around. They are to the effect that there are those in Government, and those in labor, who don't want reconversion to run along smoothly and get under way at a maximum pace. I pass no judgment on such rumors, but I do say that there is a lot of dumbness in high places.

"I said the other day that the public interest was paramount to any individual interest; that is, the right of the Nation should not be interfered with by individuals or groups. At that time I spoke on the subject of strikes. Strikes, of course, constitute a bottleneck, especially when they occur in industries, the closing of which results in shutdowns in other industries, in dissipation of jobs.

"But the bottleneck I am speaking of today is outlined in the letter I have just read. It is one that Government can iron out, if it will get under way, if Government will assist in siphoning men into this (Gray Iron Founders) industry instead of interfering with the industry, as was done a few years ago. The general average of pay in this industry throughout the Nation is $1.02 an hour. But the big thing about it is that it is calling for help, not so much for itself as for the general welfare of the Nation. It will produce wealth and 3,000,000 additional jobs."

I know that you gentlemen want action on this matter. You are fed up (and I don't blame you) with empty promises from Government, with the futile exchange of correspondence, with the issuance of meaningless Government reports that tell of insignificant gains in your manpower and the like. You gentlemen want results from Government in helping you to serve this Nation. And I, for one, am going to do everything within my humble power to see to it that you do get results.

Now, I am not going to talk any further "shop" with you. That would be just as foolish as my attempting to talk mathematics with Einstein. So let what I have said cover "shop."

THE SECOND BOTTLENECK, GOVERNMENT

The second bottleneck to which I have already referred is the bottleneck of Government. As you so well know, men in Government have often been a hindrance to the Nation's business during peacetime years for the past decade, during the war years, and now during the reconversion period. Just why is this?

1. Government has too many pegs in round holes, too many misfits in high places who haven't been weeded out by efficient administrators. It has too many petty dictators, too many extravagent wastrels who squander the resources of our people.

2. Government simply has too many people and they are stepping over each others' feet. Right now, the Federal Government has more than 3,000,000 civilian employees! The financial costs of their employment are staggering, particularly when you consider the $300,000,000,000 of national indebtedness which faces this Nation.

3. Government administrators have adopted policies which are inimical and harmful to free American enterprise. They have failed to provide incentive to produce. They have penalized our businessmen instead of encouraging them to maximum production. The OPA, in particular, has adopted a reconversion pricing policy which in many instances will not even allow business to turn a profit at all.

4. There are too many snoopers in Government. A business friend of mine said he had 10 in 1 day. The Government's habit of requiring a multitude of reports and questionnaires, its habit of sending out incomprehensible instructions and a thousand other nuisance pieces of correspondence and orders, not only plagues private enterprise but sets it far back in its work.

5. The Government is handling functions now which should properly be handled by the State and local governments. Our States and municipalities are in a far better position today financially than the Federal Government. We should turn back to them the functions which were taken over by Washington, D. C., first during the depression emergency, and then during the war emergency.

THE THIRD BOTTLENECK: STRIKES

The third bottleneck is the matter of strikes. I have already proposed on the floor of the Senate a 10-point plan which would meet head-on this strike situation. It is obvious that the strike conditions in this country are going to get worse before they get better. But we want to make absolutely sure that they get better mighty quickly. If strikes imperil the Nation's food supply, its fuel, its transportation, its communication, then there is no telling what grave consequences there will be, not only to labor and management but to the public as a whole.

I have proposed the following steps:

1. Reevaluate the entire Wagner Act. That act obviously filled a certain need in bygone years, but it is hopelessly obsolete and even harmful today to the best interests of the American people. It is a segmental act, designed for only one segment of our population. It must be revised in the interest of the public welfare.

2. Immediately enact legislation to have compulsory arbitration protect the public interest. Compulsory arbitration is now with us in some labor-management contracts and between business concerns, and has been very effective. It results in protecting the public interest. There may be some differences of opinion as to imposing compulsory arbitration upon all disputes—big and small. There can be none, because the public interest is so overwhelming, in disputes covering such matters as the food and fuel supplies for whole communities, transportation, communications, public utilities, and the like. The public interest and safety require it.

3. Establish the policy of having representatives of the public participate in every labor-management conference.

4. Enact any necessary clarifications of the draft law in order to insure full protection of the reemployment rights of veterans.

5. Insure full protection by law enforcement officers to all veterans and others who want to take up jobs vacated by strikers.

6. Establish the legal responsibility of unions for all violations of contract in the form of wildcat strikes, and so forth.

7. Require the full and accurate reporting of union finances and officers in the same manner as we require such reports from corporations.

8. Establish the labor-management-public conferences in Washington on a continuing basis rather than on a one-time basis.

9. Request of labor leaders that they themselves come forth with legislation that will end the menace of strikes and provide ways and means of collaboration between management and labor.

10. Amend the Sherman Antitrust Act to make labor organizations whose members are engaged in interstate commerce subject to that act. Prohibit them from engaging in unreasonable restraints of trade, for example, those restraints designed to compel the hiring of useless labor to prevent the use of cheaper material, improved equipment or more efficient methods, etc.

That concludes the 10-point labor program which I have proposed. But I might say here that last Thursday I introduced a bill which would naturally supplement this program. This bill would prevent the plundering of union treasuries for political purposes. It would ban election expenditures by unions and would thus, I believe, constitute an important addition to our present statutes on the election process.

THE FOURTH BOTTLENECK: MAN'S THINKING

Now, the last bottleneck, one which affects every last one of us, is the bottleneck of our own thinking. The human mind, one fellow Senator once told me, is a "helluva contraption." The occasion for that phrase was this: We had heard two Senators speaking on the floor of the Senate, interpreting the same subject, but interpreting the same absolutely different. My answer to the statement that the human mind was a "helluva contraption" was this: There are 96 men in the Senate with different backgrounds—economic, social, religious, political, racial, educational, and geographical—and because of that, these men rightly see things differently.

In other words, we know now that the human eye, looking at the same object with different powered electroscopes, sees things differently. In the days of Galileo, the wise man thought he was crazy when he spoke of the world as a globe and said that it moved. Their limited vision determined their approach.

But we need not be discouraged. In fact, it is a good thing that we have this difference of opinion, because it provides the check and balance that is fundamental in our American way of life.

We were told by St. Paul that we should "have that mind in us which was in Christ Jesus." Not this human confused thinking of the average mortal. In other words, we must not let the demands of the passing human events obscure our vision, befuddle our thinking, and take from us the "kick" that comes from living—living expectantly, constructively, joyously, adventurously, getting a joy out of meeting problems head-on and solving them.

Socrates once said there was only one evil—ignorance. Now what did he mean? Ignorance of what? Certainly he was not talking about man's wisdom which St. Paul characterized as "foolishness with God." No, he was talking about ignorance which stunts man's growth mentally and spiritually; that ignorance which creates fear and indecision and makes man stumble along; that ignorance that makes man oblivious of the fact that he serves God best who serves best his fellow man.

You know it was Browning who said: "Life has meaning and to find its meaning is my meat and drink."

Undoubtedly both Browning and Socrates were looking for light, that inner light, not the light of the sun or the moon or the stars, but spiritual understanding; a knowledge not of the transitory but of permanent values; a comprehension of life as an eternal thing, not a passing show; a glimpse of the truth about man, a sensing of power within, giving him dominion.

I want to tell you a story which has in it the atomic bomb of truth which will cast out the fear which grips too many of us Americans in this age. You know, I think that because of the high degree of integration and interdependence which now characterize our American national life, and because we now seem to have awakened to the realization that we are so dependent upon each other (for example on our long distance telephones, our railroads and all transportation, our coal and oil supply), and because we realize what the tying up of one or more of these industries would mean to the safety and health of this country—a fear has come upon us that we will not be adequate.

Now, that is part of this bottleneck of our thinking that I want to "bust" wide open. I have suggested a way to handle this strike situation in my previous remarks. But there is a strike situation within each one of us that must be handled, and this incident which I am about to relate has in it the way out.

The story is as follows: There were two Irishmen, the proverbial Pat and Mike, who worked and roomed together on a war job. One morning Pat woke up and said: "Mike, I had a strange dream. I dreamed that you died and you were on your way to heaven, and then I dreamed that I died and that I was following after, and as I got up near the pearly gates, I saw you knocking at the portal and St. Peter came. I hid behind a bush and was I surprised! St. Peter never asked you anything about the Ten Commandments. He didn't apply any of them. He didn't ask you a question about any of them.

"His first question was: 'When you were on earth, Mike, were you guilty of arrested development?' And I heard you say to St. Peter: 'Sure I don't know what you mean.' And then St. Peter explained: 'Were you one of those who quit growing; did you graduate from college and get a degree and think you had arrived; or were you one of those who were satisfied with doing a little good and neglecting the bigger jobs? In other words, did you remain mentally stunted, spiritually dwarfed, or did you realize that this link in the chain that you called life was but a kindergarten; was it your business to know more and more about life's meaning?'

"Then I heard you say, "Mike: 'St. Peter, you will have to pass that one, so I can think about it.

"Then St. Peter said: 'Michael, were you a sewage carrier down on earth?' And I heard you say: 'Oh, no; I just worked for the Government, had a good job with Uncle Sam.' And then I heard St. Peter say: 'Now you could still have been a sewage carrier.'

"Then you said: 'Just what do you mean, St. Peter?' 'Well, were you one of those who carried around idle gossip, idle tales; were you one of those who dispensed fear and doubt and criticism; were you one of those who always talked defeatist, spread gloom, peddled filth, caused frustration?'

"And then I saw you bow your head, Mike, and say: 'St. Peter, you will have to pass that one.' Then St. Peter said: 'Well, here's one I trust you can answer. It is this: When you were on earth, did you pay your obligations?' And I saw your face light up, Mike, and you said: 'I always paid by bills—the butcher, the grocer, the doctor, and the dentist. All my bills are paid,' you said.

"And then I saw you look expectantly up at St. Peter and St. Peter said: 'Is that the only obligation you had? How about looking after the interest of your city, your State, and your government? Did you see to it that good men ran for office—not racketeers; did you support principles; did you pay that obligation? How about the poor in body and spirit? Did you think about them and do what you could to brace them up? In other words, Mike, were you a Good Smaritan? How about paying your obligations to your Government? Did you stand for the right principles outlined in the charter of your Government? Did you think about the neighbor boy who needed a little encouragement? How about that obligation? Did you try to bring cheer and confidence to those who needed it? Did you praise the little woman after you married her?" etc.

"You know, Mike," Pat continued, "just then I fell out of bed and woke up."

The next day was the Sabbath and Mike and Pat went to church. After mass they had an opportunity to talk with the good father, and Pat told him the story. Pat then asked, "Isn't it queer, Father, that St. Peter never asked me about the Ten Commandments?" And the good father, being an understanding man, said: "Pat, in every one of those tests, there was not only one, but all of the Commandments."

Ah, yes, my friends, this is no time for arrested development. Growth is the law of the soul as well as of every other of God's creatures. America needs, as never before, men with faith and glory in their inner parts—growing souls.

Not so long ago I attended the funeral of a friend, and I remember the clergyman saying of him: "John is all right. When he lived here on earth, he was aware of the glory of the presence of his Maker. He has simply gone on ahead in the journey we all must take. I have only one fear, and that is that when I come to go, he will have gone so far ahead that I will not be able to overtake him."

We need voices cheering the timid; enthusing our youth; encouraging the down and out; standing by the Republic as valiantly in peace as our fighting sons have done in two world wars; casting out all foreign "isms." We must not forget that we are privileged to be in the center of an heroic epoch, wherein America has been precipitated to leadership among the nations of earth.

We have mastered the earth; split the atom; circumnavigated the globe in 6 days; multiplied our knowledge of the heavens. Read General Marshall's report, and you will glimpse the mastery, character, and ability of this Nation of which you and I are a part.

We must not forget that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," and we must maintain eternal vigilance with all that implies, in this new world. There must be no more Pearl Harbors for America.

In conclusion, I give you this thought: God is in His heaven; available for guidance and direction if we seek Him; the future of America is in our hands; we will not fail her but will transmit to those who come after us our liberties, unimpaired.

Letters From Men in the Armed Services Respecting Demobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, November 2 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, in order to give a wider circulation to the sentiments of our men in the armed forces regarding the demobilization program, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three letters from officers and men in the armed services. One letter comes from a group of Navy officers and men at Okinawa, another letter comes from a group of Army officers and men in France, and the third letter comes from a group of 300 Army officers and men in the United States who are alerted for overseas shipment today. I have thousands of letters of a similar nature, but I should like to have the three letters in question printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER FROM GROUP OF NAVY OFFICERS AND MEN AT OKINAWA

OCTOBER 18, 1945.

Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator from Texas,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We received word over the radio that Congress is planning to make an investigation of the Navy discharge system and we wholeheartedly agree that nothing better could happen because it certainly needs investigating from top to bottom. The Navy is lagging behind and is not trying to release the men quickly enough, especially from overseas. I am aboard the U. S. S. *Zaniah*, Ag-70, anchored at Buckner Bay, Okinawa. We repaired battle-damaged ships all through the Okinawa-Gemto campaign while under constant attack by the Jap suicide corps. All during the compaign our ship and three other repair ships repaired all battle damage. Since the war is over and there is no more work of this nature to do, 11 other big repair ships have joined us. We do nothing but sit around and wait for another typhoon to wreck or sink us. Especially the typhoon of October 9 and 10 needs investigating. We realize that some must die during war, but in peacetime this should not happen. The Navy has been warned as we have had three typhoons here in the past 30 days, yet we stayed on and had 74 ships sunk or damaged, 1,500 casualties—900 dead which will never return to the country they saved. The Navy is keeping quiet about all this; we know what happened. We are here. It is nothing but murder; even in the typhoon of September 16 we had several ships sunk and dozens of men killed and yet the Navy just waited and let more ships sink and more men die. They are still waiting. The Army is evacuating this typhoon-infested place, except for a small garrison; the Navy is yet doing nothing and there is no reason to keep all these ships tied up here doing nothing, but costing the Government millions of dollars. We men out here paid for the war in blood and sweat and when we come home we're going to have to pay it in taxes.

In reference to the point system, whenever changes are made we are not notified for several days and they are trying to hold men on the ships as long as possible even after they have the required number of points. On October 1 men with 3 children were eligible for immediate discharge, but not one of these men have yet left the ship, and they say they're being held for lack of transportation; that is absurd when there are hundreds of ships and thousands of aircraft we have that are doing nothing. The Navy discharge system is a flop and unfair, if they are going to give any points at all for dependency, the only fair way would be to give so many points for each child. The Navy places no value on men's lives, and not the slightest consideration is given them. We realize that there are some who would like to see a military regime in our country; so many of these men are afraid of losing their jobs, so they want to keep as many men in as possible to retain their commands. The Army is getting the job done, but there is a "nigger" in the woodpile somewhere in the Navy set-up; the Navy men out here are very, very bitter and to the highest and fullest extent. Men at home with 44 points can get immediate discharge, but out here in the Pacific they hold the men on the ships for a month, then it takes another month to get home. We were made to come out here and fight, to leave our wives, children, and families, and now we want back as fast as possible. We don't care how it's done, but we want it done because it can be done.

We fully agree that Congress should thoroughly investigate these typhoons and also completely investigate and revise the Navy discharge system to speed it up. The Navy is letting the men out in their own way and according to their own fancies without regard to what Congress, the people at home, and the men overseas want. We are still out here fighting for our very existence against these typhoons.

We who have been overseas in combat away from our families, we who have kept those at home safe from the horrors and tenor of war, plead with you to investigate this deplorable Navy situation to the fullest extent. Anything you can do in this regard will be greatly appreciated.

LETTER FROM GROUP OF ARMY OFFICERS AND MEN IN FRANCE

We, the undersigned, members of the Eighty-eighth Cavalry of the Eighth Armored Division, wish to express our views on the redeployment of troops to the United States.

Our division (the Eighth Armored) was scheduled to sail on the 2d of October 1945 for America. On the 3d of October, the AFN radio announced that the Eighth Armored Division was on the high seas for America. But we would like for the Members of Congres to know that the Eighth Armored Division is still sitting at Camp Oklahoma City, France. An assembly area command. Each day we are fed new rumor about the date we will leave here to go to one of the cigarette camps, but as it stands, we will stay here indefinitely.

Not only is the Army holding us here but they are trying to make the last few months of army life as miserable as possible. We have to take road marches each day and listen to boring lectures on "going home," etc. We do not complain of living in tents, that we do not mind; but when we ask for a stove, as it is very cold here, we are told by higher headquarters that it is not winter and stoves will not be issued until headquarters decides it is winter.

We know we do not have the highest points in the Army, but every man in this division meets the requirements for discharge. What we do not understand is why the Army does not speed up the redeployment of men with high points, so we, in turn, can return to our homes as civilians. Men with high points eligible for discharge have been in the ETO for months now, and yet the Army claims to be breaking records.

Whether it is a lack of ships or what, we would like to know and so would the public as a whole. If that is so, then we would be willing to sit here and wait a few weeks.

Rumors lay the lag in redeployment to strikers. If this is so, why not take congressional action? If the soldiers went on strike, you know very well what would happen to them.

As men of every State, we send this as a request and a plea for Congress to step in and take immediate action to see that our return home is expedited.

We believe that Congress has performed an excellent job throughout the war, and believe that they will continue to do so. Thanking you in advance, we remain—

LETTER FROM GROUP OF 300 ARMY OFFICERS AND MEN IN UNITED STATES

We, the undersigned, have served our country in various capacities for from 2 to 3 years and are now on the alert for overseas shipment. We feel this a great injustice, as it was no fault of our own that the Army did not send us over previous to this time. This group of men is composed of approximately one-half men with above-mentioned service and feel that due consideration should be given us for our time spent in the service. In view of the fact that Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, informed Congress that men with our qualification would be released by late winter, we feel the War Department is ignoring our length of service as a soldier. We, the undersigned, are listing our names and total time of service so that attention can be brought to proper authorities and consideration be shown.

If Gen. George C. Marshall's statement last month is the truth, and men with 2 years' service are to be discharged by late winter, then we would like to have it explained to us how we shall be included in such a discharge system, or must we spend additional time overseas to qualify. Thanking you for your consideration shown and anything that can be done to justify the situation.

The Effect of the Atomic Bomb on American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, November 2 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Effect of the Atomic Bomb on American Foreign Policy," delivered by me at a meeting of the Foreign Policy Association held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City on Saturday evening, October 20, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To say that there is confusion in this country regarding our foreign policy, particularly in governmental circles, is a rank

understatement. Science has so changed the world that the ancient international political order is intolerable. The conflict in a world united by science and separated by outworn political barriers will continue, either until science destroys man, or man destroys that archaic political system. In July, after months of preparation and weeks of debate, we adopted the United Nations Charter. We thought we had taken quite a large step toward the creation of an effective political system for the maintenance of a stable and peaceful world. Although some of us thought the Charter, as adopted, inadequate to maintain a lasting peace, we believed there would be sufficient time to improve it later on. At least the United States had joined it, and there seemed to be that universal support which was lacking in the creation of the League of Nations. But our satisfaction was short lived. Within a few days of the adoption of the Charter, the atomic bomb, not only blasted the Japanese into submission, but also blasted our confidence in the Charter. Since then a profound uneasiness has spread over the world, the uneasiness of fear of the unknown. Like primitive man in the darkness of the caves and jungles, we too are faced with elemental and infinite forces which we do not understand; forces which threaten to snuff out our lives like one does a candle between the fingers. We are doubtful of our ability to control this terrifying new force. We have lost our bearings and are unsure of our future.

Ten years ago, it was unthinkable that human beings could possibly be as savage and as completely immoral, according to Christian ethics, as the Germans have proved to be. We have had an ugly but powerful demonstration at Belsen, Buckenwald, Dachau, and many other extermination camps, of what lies beneath that thin crust of civilization so laboriously acquired by man through countless centuries of struggle up from the jungle. Although we talk bravely about our prowess, we in the United States are worried in our hearts. Like children who have lost their parents, we have lost, since the airplane and rocket bomb, the protection of two great oceans. We are now exposed at close quarters to the violent forces of a turbulent world. Our confidence in our own invincibility and our faith in the solicitude of a beneficent providence have been shaken by the atomic bomb.

The incredible scientific progress of the last few decades induced in many people, besides the Germans, a certain arrogance and a feeling of superiority which seemed to make them unconscious of moral obligations to other men. Few people were bothered about the fate of the peoples of other lands. Let them stew in their own juice was the common slogan. They were great, they were powerful, they could take care of themselves and, therefore, they reasoned they must be good. But the cleverness of man has now brought into the world a power of destruction against which there is no defense. We are troubled by a feeling of helplessness. We are beginning to take a greater interest in our fellow human beings. Now we wonder if those people who concerned us so little are good people. We hope that they are and that they will not use the bomb against us first. On every hand this fear, amounting almost to hysteria, causes otherwise rational men to act in strange ways and to utter the grossest absurdities. Men react in strange and unpredictable ways when afraid.

Even before the affair of Hiroshima, we were unpredictable in our own policy. We declared great principles on occasions, but we faltered in carrying them out. In September 1943, by an overwhelming vote, the House of Representatives declared that it favored the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace,—but we have wavered in our path toward this objective. Our principles surely include the support, wherever possible, of liberal democratic governments and the creation of a multilateral organization to preserve peace. What have we done? We went down the line, with all our strength, for Argentina under Peron, at San Francisco. We insisted upon exclusive jurisdiction over conquered bases in the Pacific, thereby setting the precedent for similar demands from Russia. In the drafting of the Charter, we supported the concept of national sovereignty as the first principle and we defended the veto power in the Council, both inconsistent with the ultimate purpose of the United Nations Organization.

In spite of our professed intention to build an organization with adequate power, we have done little to achieve that end. Instead we have already fallen to quarreling with Russia like two big dogs chewing on a bone. While I am sure the alleged stubbornness and bad manners of the Russia diplomats are irritating, it should not be decisive of policy. To be tough, or to be soft, toward a nation is not a policy. Our objectives must be clear and our principles must be adhered to if we are ever to have a policy. Our policy should not be merely to love or to hate Russia or any other people; it should be to obtain their assistance in the creation of a bona fide organization based upon law, and with force and vitality in its system. The control of the atomic bomb, coupled with important strengthening of the organization's powers, could be that vitality.

Inconsistencies between our declared policies and our actions indicate the confusion in our minds. We undertook to play a large role in the occupation and pacification of the conquered nations, but we precipitately withdraw our armed forces and demobilize even before the peace treaties are signed. One may wonder, Are we, or are we not, going to use our influence and play a leading role in world affairs?

On the subject of the disposition of the atomic bomb, there is similar inconsistency and confusion as to the proper course. A few have chosen, apparently, to ignore its significance. They still talk of armies and navies, ships and planes just as if nothing important had happened. They seek refuge in the old saw that after every discovery of offensive weapons, a defense has been developed. They discount the advice of the physicists who tell us that they are unable even to imagine a defense to the ruthless use of such power.

Our common sense should tell us that an enemy who chooses to attack us in peacetime, as Japan did, without declaring war, can plant bombs in all our large cities and wipe out one-third of our population in one night. Or if one chooses to speculate, a single fleet of 500 planes could, in peacetime, without any warning, drop sufficient bombs to destroy our cities and our industrial powers. I cannot imagine how a nation can maintain constantly, and indefinitely, an effective defense against a sudden attack without warning. I do not believe there is a defense against total destruction inflicted instantaneously.

There are others who say that the bomb is a secret and that we must keep it for our own protection and for the peace of the world. We paid for it, we found it, why shouldn't we keep it, and besides we are good people, we should be trusted for the good of mankind. These ideas which you may think superficial and worthy of little notice, are nevertheless held by many people, some with considerable influence, and cannot be dismissed as being of little consequence. Such views are the natural reactions of unsophisticated people, they are easily understood, they are simple, they are popular, and they are in accord with our traditional isolationism. They require no mental effort and no break with the past. They give one a feeling of security. It is the same basic philosophy that led us to believe that we were so self-sufficient that we could live apart from the world, that we, all by ourselves, had created a rich, comfortable life and should not be disturbed in our enjoyment of it by concern over the troubles of other peoples in China, Spain, Ethiopia, or Poland. In opposition to this popular conception, we have the word of the scientists themselves, practically all of them, that there is nothing secret about the bomb except the industrial process of manufacture and that any one of several industrial nations probably can produce bombs in from 3 to 5 years. Further, it is common knowledge that the scientists of many nations, men and women from Italy, Germany, Hungary, Denmark, and England, to mention only a few, contributed to the production of the atomic bomb. This discovery is ours only in a limited sense. Our money would have been fruitless without the brains of others. But even if we had found it by our efforts alone, is it possible that we regard this cosmic discovery as a mere chattel for our personal use? To those good citizens who think the peoples of the world should trust us to use the bomb to protect them, I can only say that I am sure those other peoples disagree. It is already clear that the Russians have some doubts about the stability and security of such a world. More than words will be necessary to convince them. We should ask ourselves, would we be content to entrust our lives and fortunes to the Russians if they alone had the atomic bomb? I agree that we have, on the whole, been relatively peaceful and nonaggressive people, but there is no guaranty that we shall remain so. In fact, I have heard of some people who advocate our immediate attack upon potential enemies, and one prominent general recently asserted publicly, in no uncertain terms, that a third war is inevitable. With whom is it inevitable, we may well ask. I do agree that such foolish talk is calculated better than anything I know to induce another war. But regardless of these considerations, a peaceful and decent society has never been and is not likely in the near future to be founded solely upon the assurances of individuals or the good will of peoples. Throughout the long and troubled history of mankind, the only organizations which have been successful in providing security for human beings, have been based upon law. It seems clear to me, therefore, that the only possibility for a decent and peaceful world lies in the adoption of laws of universal application and sanctioned by the moral and physical force of the civilized world.

The discovery and use of atomic energy has dramatized in a highly effective manner a fact that many observers had already sensed. That fact is the fundamental disequilibrium that has gradually grown up between the natural sciences and the art of government. Regrettable as the use of the atomic bomb may have been in the opinion of some people, it may well be that without the awful warning of Hiroshima the world might have stumbled along into the atomic age without any realization of its arrival, and therefore without the shock necessary to arouse it to a realization of the danger, and compel action before it is too late. Hiroshima provided that shock, and I do not think it is too late. There is the question of whether or not we have the intelligence and courage to adopt the proper means of control within the short time at our disposal. In other words, can we bring back into balance the art of government and natural science? Can we readjust the disequilibrium which has been growing for approximately 170 years?

The last significant advance in the art of government occurred in the era of the American and French Revolutions. Democratic representative government and the Federal principle for the association of States were great and momentous political events, bringing to a close in vast areas of the world the oppression and slavery of feudalism. With the release of human beings from bondage,

a great surge of energy and inventiveness brought on the industrial revolution and the rise of modern science. Throughout these 170 years, with ever-increasing rapidity, we have advanced from one scientific miracle to another. From the wagon to the railway, the automobile, the airplane, and the rocket ship; from sailing vessels to submarines; from smoke signals to radio and radar; from buckeyes to penicillin; from foot power to electricity and atomic energy. The advance has been at a dizzy pace in science, but can any of us recall during that entire period a truly significant advance in the art of government.

It is true that during this period the petty German principalities and the autonomous Italian states were welded into large nations. Russia exchanged the absolutism of the Tzars for the dictatorship of Stalin, but it is scarcely a novel principle of government. Throughout this period no important step for the control of independent sovereign states was adopted nor any machinery seriously considered, except the League of Nations. On the contrary, nationalism and the principle of absolute national sovereignty were enormously enhanced in every land. During this period when science was rapidly reducing the world to a small community and making it interdependent economically and socially, nothing whatever occurred politically to compensate for this change. In a very real sense, I think it may be said that both world wars were the logical consequence of this disequilibrium.

It should not require an extended argument to persuade anyone that something is seriously wrong with our world order. Two World Wars within a quarter century should be sufficient proof. Likewise, it should be clear that the trouble is the lack of any law or rules of conduct, agreed upon and binding, as among all nations. This void in the international field must be filled either by reason and agreement, or by force, as attempted by the Germans. The alternative to a system of law for the settlement of differences is constantly recurring warfare of rapidly increasing destructiveness. Peace and order have rarely, if ever, been achieved by good will alone. In all ages rules of conduct accepted by all, and superior to all, have been the indispensable basis for a decent and peaceful society.

To me, it seems clear that the medieval political status under which the world operates is obsolete and that it must be discarded just as we discarded the horse and buggy, not over night, but by stages as we develop the appropriate machinery. We have in a very limited sense, already begun the process in the creation of the United Nations Organization. But this organization provides us only with a skeleton machinery without life and vitality. Before it can become an effective instrumentality, it must be given more definite and certain powers. The greatest defect of the Charter, which was quite clear at the time of its adoption, is the requirement of unanimity of the five big powers on all matters of importance. This rule of unanimity is but another way of saying that we shall go along and abide by the rules if it suits us in each particular instance. As a practical matter it is a hopeless principle for any governmental organization. The League of Nations demonstrated its weakness and more recently the London Conference of Foreign Ministers has shown us what to expect from its operation. I know of no instance in history in which it has been effective. At the time of San Francisco this requirement was apparently indispensable to obtaining agreement. However, since the atomic bomb, it may well be that all the nations will agree that, at least in the field of armaments and especially the production of atomic weapons, a complete and definite power to inspect and control throughout the world should be given the organization. This power should be carefully limited, but within its proper limits it must be positive and complete or there can be no confidence in its efficacy. The scientists who are familiar with the theory and techniques of nuclear physics should act as the agents of the organization to maintain a continuous system of inspection and reporting. By an extensive system of exchange of students and of industrial scientists, together with unrestricted access to industrial records of various kinds, it should be possible to know of any serious effort to evade the rules pertaining to atomic weapons.

I feel very strongly that the path of wisdom is not secretiveness and suspicion, but is the widest possible dissemination of scientific knowledge, coupled with an efficient system of control. If many people in all advanced nations know something about nuclear physics, it will be difficult to prepare secretly for an aggressive attack upon an unsuspecting neighbor. The knowledge will spread through many channels. On the other hand in an atmosphere of suspicion and secrecy, each nation naturally and inevitably will suspect every other nation of preparing an attack and sooner or later someone will no longer endure the suspense of impending annihilation.

I do not pretend to be qualified to describe to you the exact nature of regulations which would be adequate to insure the world against the possibility of a sudden devastating atomic bomb attack by some future Hitler. The details of such rules are for the scientists themselves. One problem is to reconcile legitimate research and use of atomic energy with the prevention of illegitimate production for aggressive purposes. The greatest difficulty is, I believe, not in the technical problem, but in the problem of obtaining from the various governments the authority for the agents of the United Nations to enter and inspect as a matter of right. The great obstacle to this step is the ancient and antiquated concept of sovereignty. The absolute sovereignty of nations is utterly inconsistent with the establishment among nations of any laws with sufficient force to give confidence in their effectiveness to the peoples of the earth. For centuries treaties and compacts have been made among nations, but whenever a nation believes its vital interests are threatened, it always ignores the treaty. We have pretended that treaties are binding, but at the same time we have refused to recognize any power superior to the independent sovereign state. There is an inconsistency in the position which has never been solved. The only solution that I can conceive of is the recognition, by all nations, that at last the time has arrived for all of us to delegate certain and definite powers over armaments to the United Nations Organization. Safeguards and limitations should be carefully worked out and agreed upon. Disputes of any kind relating to the subject should be under the compulsory jurisdiction of the international court, and every nation, and every individual in every nation, must be subject to the verdict of the court. If a nation, or individuals within a nation, should prove to be recalcitrant, then the full power of the organization collectively and severally should be pledged to the enforcement of the judgment.

To those who object that this is setting up a world government, I can only reply that call it what you will, there is no other principle with the slightest chance of success in the control of the atomic bomb. All other methods of controlling armaments and preventing wars have been tried. It is entirely vain to say that we shall renounce the use of the bomb or that we shall outlaw it by treaty. The very words "to outlaw" as between sovereign nations are a fraud. There is no law in the real sense between sovereign nations and it is fallacious to speak of outlawing any practice they may believe to be to their advantage to use. It is just barely possible that atomic power is so deadly that all people will be afraid to use it, but this is a very faint hope upon which to erect a decent and peaceful world. If it is so deadly, why should we object to a strict regulation of it by the United Nations Organization?

To those Americans who find so much satisfaction in the thought that we alone have the bomb and at least for 3 to 5 years no other will have it, I repeat that the scientists are unanimous in the opinion that the principles are not secret and that the industrial know-how cannot be kept a secret for long. In addition, they should ponder the physical organization of our industry and the location of our population. Our great cities which contain a third of our population and a much greatest percentage of our industry are perfect targets for atomic bombs. The 20 largest metropolitan areas contain 40,000,000 people. In one night of carefully planned attack without warning we would be paralyzed. Compared to the dispersion of Russian industry and population, we are infinitely more vulnerable. It is not so much the ability to make great quantities of the bombs above an essential minimum that would count in an atomic war, rather is it the ruthlessness and the will to attack first, without provocation, that would be decisive. Does anyone believe that America, with its history of reluctance to make war, with its aversion to militarism, will be the first to attack? The very qualities which inspire our devotion to this country are the ones which make it the most vulnerable in a war of atomic bombs.

One of the most desirable and attractive qualities of these United States, before this war, was the freedom and open-handedness, the easy hospitality of the people, both socially and commercially. Having been permitted to grow to maturity without outside interference, and with no hereditary enemies, we were not a suspicious people. I for one would dislike to see this quality destroyed. Not only does it make life agreeable, but if it can be preserved without danger to our security, I believe it will induce, in time, a reciprocal trust and friendliness in others. If we are suspicious and distrustful of others we must expect the same in return, and that road leads to trouble. I recognize that it is difficult for us to forsake any ancient political custom or practice, because we associate those practices with happier days. Two characteristics of our people have been the alacrity with which we adopt and apply, for the comfort and happiness of our citizens, the new discoveries of science and at the same time the stubborn reluctance with which we entertain new ideas in politics.

I, for one, would rather adopt a new idea in politics than risk vaporization by an atom bomb or, as some have suggested, spend the remainder of my days in the subterranean recesses of the earth. What a curious picture it is to find man, homo sapiens, of divine origin, we are told, seriously considering going underground to escape the consequences of his own folly. With a little wisdom and foresight, surely it is not yet necessary to forsake life in the fresh air and in the warmth of the sunlight. What a paradox if our own cleverness in science should force us to live underground with the moles.

The hope for America, and for the world, does not lie along the road of secret methods of destruction or more and bigger armaments. I do not suggest disarmament in the world as it is now constituted. The only hope lies in the application to all men of the principles of law, which are the only principles that have ever brought peace to mankind. Within large areas of this world peace has prevailed for centuries among the inhabitants. These people are not substantially different from those to whom we attribute the wars. We have the compelling motive of complete extinction if we are too timid and fail. We have at hand the rough skeletal machinery to begin our task. It is

the kind of opportunity which is not likely to come to a people more than once. As so often happens, a great poet, many years ago, described our present opportunity in these fitting words:

"There is a tide in the affairs of men—which
taken at the flood leads on to fortune.
On such a full sea are we now afloat.
And we must take the current when it
serves
Or lose our ventures."

On the Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 31, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the atomic bomb is not just another weapon. It is cosmic energy, the primordial power of this universe. When science found a way to release atomic energy it broke down the last barrier between mankind and the ultimate sources of power of creation itself.

Except for the birth of Christ, this is the most portentous event to occur on this earth in thousands of years. It has plunged mankind into a completely new world and placed in his hand the power to either create a world of peace and plenty heretofore undreamed of, or to wipe from the earth the civilization that has been built since the beginning of history—yes; even to destroy himself.

All the great advance which natural science has made and which has culminated in the release of the very basic energy of the universe will prove not a benefit but a terrible curse to mankind unless we quickly make a corresponding moral advance and an advance in the ability of men and nations to control their own actions. When man presumed to tap this reservoir of God's power it became incumbent upon him to bring the power of conscience among men and nations to a stage of development comparable to that of his intellect.

Two imperative duties now confront us. The first is to make certain that the peacetime benefits from the release of this atomic power will be spread equally among all the people and never permitted to be monopolized by a few.

The second duty upon which everything else on this earth depends at present is to prevent an atomic war from taking place. It will take a higher degree of statesmanship, in my opinion, than has yet been shown anywhere in our country if we are to avoid committing ourselves and the world to the kind of armament race in atomic weapons which, according to all the expert testimony, can only end in a devastating sneak attack by some nation willing to become the worst aggressor in history, and which probably would result in the destruction of civilization as we know it.

To these ends any legislation passed by Congress must provide for national control in the United States over atomic power and the establishment of national ownership of the basic energy. For in no other way can we assure that its benefits will be generally and equitably distributed among all the people or made available on equal terms to all producers. And any such bill should at least carry a section setting forth a general national policy to the effect that America does not propose to develop atomic energy for the purpose of precipitating an atomic war and that she stands ready at any time that proper basis can be laid for such action, to join fully and freely with other nations in an international control of this completely new and fearful force. Every competent person who has testified has declared that there is, and probably can be, no defense against atomic weapons. Our policy must be a lot more helpful policy than one which simply states, "We are going to keep this thing secret." Especially when there is no evidence to indicate that any real "secret" can possibly exist for more than a few brief years.

It is the duty of Congress to make it absolutely certain that all right and title to the basic power developed from atomic energy—as distinguished from development or exploitation—must be vested in the whole people of the United States. It should contain a provision that all patents covering the release of atomic energy should become the property of the United States, due compensation being given therefor.

No commission established to exercise control over this great new force should consist of part-time people who might in that case be on private pay rolls while still being called upon to do by far the most important piece of work that any officials of the United States have been called upon to do in all its history. Such a commission must consist of full-time people, paid as much if necessary as $50,000 per year, who would be forbidden to be on any other pay rolls excepting that of the United States. It should not be made too difficult for members of the commission to be removed for the whole future will depend on faithful performance of their duties. It would be altogether right, also to provide that a certain number of members of this commission should be scientists, certainly that some of them should be representatives of our armed forces, and that the balance of them be so appointed as to represent every group and phase of American life. For this problem is a problem of the whole American Nation and not of any single group in it.

And there must be the strongest possible provisions against any possible monopolistic control over the application of atomic energy to peacetime uses. The legislation must require that, if and when its use can be safely licensed or leased for industrial purposes, it must be done on absolutely equal terms to all qualified persons. Nor can we now turn back to an earlier age. And therefore there must be provision to guard the right of science to continue free research in this field.

But the main question lies in the field of establishing effective international control to prevent an atomic war in the only way it can be prevented, namely by stopping before it starts any armament race in atomic weapons. America should push research and development in this field. We cannot do anything else for the time being and we should try to stay ahead of other nations in this development. But this must be done for one reason and only one and that is because America's possession of this tremendous new power is her main hope and opportunity for forcing the establishment of a peace mechanism in the world that can save mankind. If I believed that there were any possibility of the United States retaining any effective secrets with regard to the development of atomic weapons so that America and America alone would possess this power, then I would say that for a time at least we should keep it in trust, giving a solemn pledge to all the world that America would never use this power under any circumstances whatsoever excepting to enforce the peace and prevent aggression. But unfortunately, by every single bit of competent testimony that has been given, no such simple solution is even remotely possible. We know that no effective secrecy can possibly be kept and here let me quote a recent editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on this very point:

> On the subject of the atomic bomb, Mr. Truman repeated his Reelfoot Lake statement that we are not going to share our know-how as to its manufacture. The scientists tell us that this policy is madness and will surely lead to a race in which other nations, sooner or later, will find out what we already know. It satisfies no other nations for Mr. Truman to proclaim our possession of atomic secrets "a sacred trust." A trustee usually serves by agreement of others. Who nominated us?
>
> This newspaper does not think we ought to hand the bomb on a silver platter to one and all, but it does think we should place it on the world conference table and make it a factor in the process by which a "brave new world" can be constructed—a world in which the atomic bomb can never be used to destroy mankind, while the atom divisible is used for the security and happiness of mankind.
>
> Is that idealism? If so, then so be it. We are either going to have to be idealistic and cooperative with the other nations in this world, or there isn't going to be any world. And it could be a very fine world indeed if we only have the sense to make it so—if we only have, in our social and political thinking, a shred of the sense we have in manufacturing instruments of destruction.

And so unless we use within the next few years, or maybe it is within the next few months, our present powerful position to bring about international control and to create an atmosphere of knowledge and confidence among the nations and to end the present psychology of terrible fear and suspicion, we shall be responsible for committing the world to the kind of armament race and ultimate destruction of which I have already spoken. I cannot forget the Scriptural injunction, "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul." I believe this can be applied to nations as well.

I am not for having America give away her knowledge, but we must, if we are to have a moment's thought for our children, use it with all the vigor and statesmanship at our command as the one instrument that might forge a genuine peace-keeping mechanism in the little time that remains to us.

The Los Alamos scientists, the men who with the Oak Ridge group created the atomic bomb, have told us just where we stand today. I want to quote their statement in part:

One proposal is for this country to try to maintain its present position by producing more and bigger bombs than other countries. Merely having more bombs than other countries is not decisive if another country has enough bombs to demolish our cities and stores of weapons. The overwhelming advantage will lie with the aggressor and our superiority might be lost in the first minutes of a surprise attack. A world in which nuclear weapons are owned by many nations and their use held back only by fear of retaliation will be a world of fear, suspicion, and inevitable final explosion.

It has been suggested that the United States, together with Great Britain and Canada, assume unilateral control over atomic power development throughout the world and by force, or threat of force, prevent all other nations from producing atomic bombs. Other nations will not willingly lose their sovereignty to those who maintain their own in this way. Such a policy will lead to an unending war more savage than the last. We cannot conceive of it leading to a stable, peaceful world.

We are convinced that we are left but one course of action. We must cooperate with the rest of the world in the future development of atomic power, and the use of atomic energy as a weapon must be controlled by a world authority. We are heartened by the statement of our President in which he says that there will be "* * * an effort to effect agreement on the conditions under which cooperation might replace rivalry in the field of atomic power." Such conditions will demand some modification of our conception of national sovereignty. This makes it imperative that we have the good will of all nations, for it must be realized that we are dealing with a deadly challenge to civilization itself.

We believe that international control is technically feasible. However, we must emphasize that the problems of such control are not essentially technical. For example, the abolition of secrecy in national and international relations may be necessary. A world authority, if it is to be effective, must eventually realize free access to all laboratories, industries, and military installations. We realize the serious problems that control presents. The actualities of the situation require a drastic solution and the atomic bomb is a sufficiently revolutionary force to impel us to such a solution.

It certainly is the move of the United States, not of anyone else. And we might save humanity, which can only be done if an atomic war is prevented, by a frank proposal that on condition that other nations will make a simple agreement with us, we will entrust to an international authority our knowledge of atomic power. The agreement would require all nations signing it to pool together whatever knowledge of military weapons they may possess.

The agreement would provide further that the nations entering into it would open every nook and cranny of their nation, every laboratory, munitions plant and factory to the inspection and control of an international body of scientists and others commissioned by all the nations to perform the task of preventing mankind from plunging into self-destruction. This group of men would be privileged to enter every country and to know all about what that country was doing, not only in the field of the development of atomic weapons but in all other fields of military preparation. Since the only thing the United States possesses now which the other nations do not have as yet is the know-how of production, such an agreement would not hurt our position a single bit; but even if it did that is not the primary consideration in these days. For with the establishment of the kind of system here proposed, and by such means only, could fear and suspicion and the danger of sneak attack be allayed. With military secrecy ended and with all nations knowing just what other nations were doing, it would then be possible for the first time to make and enforce joint covenants for the keeping of the peace and the outlawing of atomic weapons by forbidding any nation to possess them at all.

Such a covenant should call for two primary things. First, the setting up of a world-wide technical police with power to forbid and prevent the manufacture of any atomic weapons by any nation in the world. Only the world authority would be allowed to possess them, and it could only use them to prevent any nation from acquiring or using them.

The scientists have all testified that it would be entirely feasible for such inspection to be made and for it to be effective.

In the second place there should be created an international body of scientists to direct and make safe the development of atomic energy for peacetime purposes in order to guide it along lines that would be of benefit to mankind. The scientists understand the enormity of the power they have released and in their hands it would be safe and could be made a boon to all mankind.

If any nation or nations refused to cooperate in the establishment of such world authority for the control of this great and terrible power, then it would be clearly known who they were and all the other nations could join even more strongly together and be guided in their actions accordingly. Ultimately any nation refusing to join would in my judgment be compelled by its own people to do so. For I cannot believe that any of the common people of the world will actually want to be the victims of an atomic war.

And here I quote an editorial from the Washington Post which will I am certain reinforce the position I have taken in this speech:

EINSTEIN'S IDEA

Anything that Albert Einstein, the original discoverer of the secret of atomic energy, has to say is bound to be significant though it must be borne in mind that he is a physicist and not a political scientist. He and men like him have been at work for the past 2,000 years in improving and strengthening our physical organization. So shrunken has the world become as a result of their discoveries and inventions that mankind now finds itself in a common room. Professor Einstein, in an interview with Mr. Raymond Swing in the Atlantic Monthly, recommends that we acknowledge the sameness of our living quarters in our political organization. Authority, in other words, would henceforth be universal. Instead of subjecting ourselves to the Nation-State, we should subject ourselves to a world government.

The trouble is that there has been so little preparation for the world state. The riddle of the universe has been unraveled to a generation which is still wedded to life under separate sovereignties—to the authority of a unit instead of a cosmos. These is no form in our planetary life in the shape of a common religion let alone a common polity. Accordingly most people, we fancy, will approach the issue of political accommodation to the atomic age in terms of preparation for a world state. At any rate, this has been the newspaper's approach. However, the administration thinks differently. The President on Saturday talked of keeping the secret of the know-how of the atomic bomb as a sacred trust. The fact is attested by all nuclear scientists that the trust would be temporary. Within 18 months, according to Professor Oppenheimer, any nation armed with the Smyth handbook issued by the War Department and a hunk of U-235, or the kind of uranium which is at present fissionable, will be able to make an atomic bomb. Maybe by that time other materials will be fissionable.

In another 5 years or so, according to Sir James Chadwick, the energy in the atom can be canalized for peacetime uses as well as exploded for war purposes. This is an age that has dawned suddenly, not slowly, as did the age of steam or of electricity. This fact alone makes imperative an adjustment in the thinking of our statesmanship. We are thinking mainly of American statesmanship. For the responsibility is singularly ours, since this Nation is, in Mr. Churchill's words, on the summit of the world, and, moreover, took the lead in the first use of the atomic bomb for lethal purposes.

Action, in our opinion, should be taken at once to sound out the other governments of the world on a project to institute world government over all applied research on atomic energy. This would involve a proffer on our part of the secret of atomic know-how. In return we should require that these properties in every country be brought under control of a world body to be set up by UNO: all factories engaged in atomic work and all uranium and thorium deposits. In addition, the world body should be given the right of inspection for its technical police in the countries of participating governments. If one or more countries refuse to help set up this world body, the proffer should be withdrawn, steps should be taken at once to form an alliance with those who had offered a partnership, and the objecting countries should be declared world outlaws. This is a suggestion which we advanced when the atomic bomb was first announced; we have seen no suggestion as yet which would improve upon it.

Certainly Professor Einstein's idea belongs to the future. It is the present we are concerned with. It is obvious from the setting up of atomic commissions in one country after another that a new and highly dangerous arms race is on. Already the shadow of the atom bomb falls across the conference table, and will continue to do so as long as the United States holds it as "a sacred trust." It is a shadow that by the same token is falling over the entire human race, making people prey to fears and nations anxious only to protect themselves by making bigger death-dealing missiles. No civilized life can be redeemed out of the holocaust of the last war unless this country makes a move along the suggested lines.

This is an hour when statesmanship is called for as never before in this world. We have our choice between some such plan as I have outlined, or a world so fearful that none but the ignorant or the brutish will be able to live happily for a single day.

Brig. Gen. Harry H. Vaughan—Statements of Rev. Cliff R. Johnson and Chaplain Luther D. Miller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, November 2 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, recently Gen. Harry H. Vaughan, military aide to the President of the United States, made an address at the Westminster Presbyterian Church, Alexandria, Va. General Vaughan's address was either grossly misunderstood or grossly misrepresented. The address was given most unfavorable publicity, and he was subjected to criticism for what he was alleged to have said during the course of his address.

I have before me a letter from the Reverend Cliff R. Johnson, pastor of the Westminster Presbyterian Church, Alexandria, Va., to Luther D. Miller, Chief of Chaplains, of the United States Army. In that letter Reverend Johnson said, among other things, as follows:

With reference to General Vaughan's recent address to the Women's Auxiliary of the Westminster Presbyterian Church, let me state that those who heard the address, including several ministers, left the meeting without the apparent feeling that General Vaughan had made any remarks derogatory to the chaplaincy. There could hardly be this feeling when he had given us unstinting and sincere praise to a chaplaincy record studded with heroic action and outstanding work.

Among other things, Reverend Johnson also said:

In my day-by-day contacts with my congregation following the meeting, I can recall not a single remark of any more consequence than that General Vaughan had given a good talk, and that it had been a good meeting.

* * * * *

I should be proud to know, as a Christian minister, other men in positions comparable with General Vaughan's who, Sunday after Sunday, prepare a Sunday-school lesson, and teach faithfully a little class of six or seven boys. I should like to know others in comparable position who would be thoughtful enough, while abroad, to seek out a little souvenir for each member of the Cub Scout pack in his church and see that it was personally presented.

General Vaughan is a Christian gentleman who is rendering valuable service to the cause of religion in the position he holds by the manner of his life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter of the Reverend Cliff R. Johnson to the Chief of Chaplains, Luther D. Miller, as well as the letter from Chaplain Miller, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESTMINISTER PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
Alexandria, Va., October 18, 1945.

The CHIEF OF CHAPLAINS, LUTHER D. MILLER,
Washington, D. C.

Re Brig. Gen. Harry H. Vaughan.

MY DEAR GENERAL: This letter claims merit for your attention on the basis of the fact that it is from the minister of the church in which Brig. Gen. Harry H. Vaughan is a ruling elder.

With reference to General Vaughan's recent address to the Woman's Auxiliary of the Westminister Presbyterian Church, let me state that those who heard the address, including several ministers, left the meeting without any apparent feeling that General Vaughan had made any remarks derogatory to the chaplaincy. There could hardly have been this feeling when he had given unstinting and sincere praise to a chaplaincy record studded with heroic action and outstanding work.

Because of its location, the auxiliary in this church has had the opportunity to be addressed by United States Representatives and other men of some note. General Vaughan's address elicited neither more nor less comment than others which the group had heard.

In my day-by-day contacts with my congregation following the meeting, I can recall not a single remark or any more consequence than that General Vaughan had given a good talk, and that it had been a good meeting.

It came, therefore, to those who heard the address as rather a surprise that any one of the newspaper representatives had heard anything considered worthy of particular comment, much less controversial, and all the more less deserving attack. Especially was it surprising that when there had been only the briefest factual reports in the papers, there should come an editorial after a lapse of several days. Of those who noticed or had their attention called to the publicity in the Post, and Time magazine, the reaction has been a measure of surprise, as I have said, mingled with half amused tolerant disgust at the attempt of these publications to make something out of nothing.

So much for General Vaughan's address and the reaction, or what was in Westminister, the lack of reaction to it. But, having presumed to address you, I beg permission to make further a personal comment.

My particular concern over this matter has not been with the merits of the matter under discussion, in that there seemed to me to be no merits. It seems that a forest of significance for Christian leaders is being missed by surprising preoccupation with a distorted twig.

By far the most significant fact was that the military aide to the President was addressing, at all, a small group of Christian people in a little inconspicuous church. You as an Episcopal minister, as well as chief of our chaplains, are doubtless aware, as am I, that one of the greatest obstacles we encounter in trying to do our job is the widespread indifference we must meet. In contrast, we have here a man who, having risen to national prominence, continues to serve his church with regularity, sincerity, and unselfish devotion. The fact that in the highest political circle of our Nation, we have a man who proudly and faithfully and effectively seryes in his little church—that is significant.

I should be proud to know, as a Christian minister, other men in positions comparable with General Vaughan's who, Sunday after Sunday, prepares a Sunday school lesson, and teach faithfully a little class of six or seven boys. I should like to know others in comparable position who would be thoughtful enough, while abroad, to seek out a little souvenir for each member of the Cub Scout pack in his church and see that it was personally presented.

General Vaughan is a Christian gentleman who is rendering valuable service to the cause of religion in the position he holds by the manner of his life.

Sincerely,

CLIFF R. JOHNSON.

HEADQUARTERS ARMY SERVICE FORCES,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF CHAPLAINS,
October 26, 1945.

The Reverend CLIFF R. JOHNSON,
Westminster Presbyterian Church,
Alexandria, Va.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: The delay in acknowledging your letter of October 18, relative to the address delivered by General Vaughan to your women's auxiliary, is due to my being out of the city on a trip to military installations in the Southwest.

I appreciate your thoughtfulness in writing me so fully of what General Vaughan really said at the meeting. It was indeed unfortunate that he was misquoted, for our Protestant chaplains are deeply hurt by his reported statements.

Everything possible will be done by this office to give the chaplains the true picture.

Thanks again for writing to me.

Wishing you every blessing in your work, I remain,

Sincerely,

LUTHER D. MILLER,
Chaplain (Brigadier General),
United States Army,
Chief of Chaplains.

Individual Security in the Postwar World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, November 2 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, recently the Secretary of Labor, Hon. L. B. Schwellenbach, issued a statement for the Trans-Radio Press entitled "Individual Security in the Postwar World." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIVIDUAL SECURITY IN THE POSTWAR WORLD

(By L. B. Schwellenbach, Secretary of Labor)

Economic security for the individual is as necessary as collective security for nations. Tyranny and aggression thrive on uncertainty and poverty. When faced with the brutal realities of economic privation people will surrender their liberty to gain a promise of security. We must not let this occur in our country.

Security was the companion of opportunity in the early history of America. Escape from the poverty and insecurity of the old world was a vital factor in attracting settlers to the new. Here a man might progress on his own merits; here he had opportunity. Here, also, he had access to the fruits of agriculture and the animals of the forest; here he had security from the stark privation of the crowded cities and restricted estates of the Old World. There is no true opportunity without a degree of security; no true security without opportunity.

The Federal Government, as a source of security, is not a new factor in our life. One hundred years ago the early American labor movement was pressing for a program of free homesteads for settlers. The purpose was relief to the wage earners from the insecurity of economic existence in the urban East. The 1830's like the 1930's were a time of depression, and security was an important factor in the minds of the wage earners.

While land remained the Nation's greatest expandable resource, it was the basis of Federal aid to the poor and restless worker,

as to the railroads and the newly developing educational system. With the passing of the physical frontier, this source of Federal largess disappeared and Americans, including the rapidly growing millions of wage earners, were forced to work out their own destinies where they dwelt, without recourse to the Government. The struggle for economic existence became more severe and resulted in social unrest. If measures had not been taken to restore in some degree the security which had passed with the physical frontier, these factors might have threatened severely our democratic way of life.

Over the past 30 years, and particularly during the last 15, we in this country have been building a system of security which frees the the individual once again from the brutal and devitalizing effects of hopeless insecurity and economic privation. This movement is not alien to our way of life; it is essentially American and democratic. Its aim is not social revolution, but the restoration of that security which guided the early settlers to these shores and played so important a part in developing a hardy democracy and progressive industrialism.

We have behind us in the recent past a depression which showed us the dangers of insecurity, and a war-production program which indicated the limitless scope of our industrial frontier. A constantly developing system of security for the individual will help guard against a return of the former and be of material assistance in recapturing in peace the power and abundance of our wartime economy.

Implications of the Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

IMPLICATIONS OF THE ATOMIC BOMB

(By one of the scientists who developed it)

According to the official release a General Account of the Development of Methods of Using Atomic Energy for Military Purposes Under the Auspices of the United States Government, 1940–45, by H. D. Smyth "the answers given to the political and social questions may affect all mankind for generations. * * * Such questions should be debated by the people. * * * It is hoped men of science in this country can * * * help their fellow citizens in reaching wise decisions. The people of the country must be informed if they are to discharge their responsibilities wisely."

The following questions and possible answers suggest some of the problems which are now facing the thinking people of the world:

"Why is the atomic bomb so much more powerful than previously known explosives?"

One bomb is equivalent to 20,000 tons of TNT. In all previous explosives the atoms have remained unchanged, but in the atomic bomb there is a breaking down of the atoms with an actual disappearance of matter which reappears as enormous energy. These atomic disintegrations evolve a million times as much energy as chemical reactions.

"Did the use of the atomic bomb shorten the war and save countless American lives?"

Yes. Winston Churchill released the estimates of casualties expected in an invasion of Japan—1,000,000 American and 250,000 British Empire troops.

"Has a new era of international relations been ushered in?"

Yes. It will be either an era of warless prosperity—or the end of civilized men.

"Were the high military and civil authorities aware of the implications of the atomic bomb and did they realize that its use involved much more than military expediency?"

Yes.

"Can Washington and Chicago be destroyed as well as Hiroshima or Nagaski?"

Certainly.

"How long would it take another nation to make atomic bombs and use them against us?"

Possibly 3 years or more, depending upon the nation's resources in scientists and industrial productive capacity, and its willingness to sacrifice national living standards to speed up the program. The general principles involved were known to scientists throughout the world before Pearl Harbor.

"What military defense can be developed against the atomic bomb?"

As seen at present—practically none, except retaliation. Theoretically each nation will be able to destroy the cities and manufacturing centers of any other nation instantly and without warning.

"Should we decentralize manufacturing facilities and populations?"

Yes. This decentralization is desirable also for other reasons. We should not allow our large cities to grow larger. Some of the factories and the people should move to smaller towns. Modern transportation makes such a change possible.

"What about living underground?"

The construction of underground factories and homes should be encouraged. Modern ventilation and lighting render such a development possible. Atomic bombs can penetrate the ground but if they do, the area destroyed is smaller.

"Is there a chance of developing still more powerful atomic bombs?"

Yes.

"Could atomic bombs be smuggled into a country and exploded by remote control years later?"

Very likely.

"Is the danger of atomic bombs confined only to international warfare?"

No. A group in control of an atomic bomb could threaten to destroy a city if its demands were not met.

"Why publish these ideas? Someone might make use of them."

Evildoers will have these ideas, anyway, and peaceful citizens of the world must face the facts if they are to act wisely and in time.

"Is there danger of an atomic bomb setting off a chain reaction which will suddenly destroy the whole earth?"

Such a catastrophe, although conceivable, is extremely unlikely. A general atomic conflagration cannot be started by any means now known.

"Atomic bombs are made from uranium. How much uranium is there in the world?"

Enough to destroy all the major cities of the world. High-grade ores of uranium are known to exist in Canada, the United States, Africa, and eastern Europe. New deposits will be found and the low-grade ores, which are widespread, can be utilized if there is sufficient incentive.

"Why not control the supply of uranium and other materials needed for the manufacture of atomic bombs?"

Certainly; but such control will not be easy. Uranium mines should be internationalized and their output controlled and licensed. All material entering the country should be inspected and checked for radioactivity. An international commission should be given authority to inspect and police all parts of the earth to see that no plants are allowed to manufacture materials for atomic bombs. Severe penalties should be imposed on any unlicensed person having such materials in his possession.

"Now that we have the atomic bomb, what shall we do with it? Bury the secret, burn the records, and kill the scientists who have the knowledge?"

No. A phenomenon of nature is not like a legal document which can be hidden or destroyed. It is free to the scientists of any nation who have sufficient training, ingenuity and perseverance. The secret would soon be rediscovered.

"Is not the international control of atomic bombs a matter for the new United Nations to take over?"

Certainly. The United Nations was organized just in time. Furthermore, the assignment of a problem like this would serve to strengthen and develop the United Nations organization. A strong world government offers the most promising solution.

"Why cannot the United States of America alone control the atomic bomb program?"

Because a temporarily held secret offers less security than international good will and cooperation. We can be trusted more than any other nation to keep the peace of the world, but we will certainly incur the ill will of other nations if we alone have in our possession the means of instantly destroying any other nation. Free and open international discussion has always been the way of science. It should continue even now. We are in a strong bargaining position for peace now if we cooperate with others, but this unique position will soon disappear.

"What are the chances of utilizing nuclear energy for useful purposes?"

Man has for the first time tapped the source of energy which feeds the sun and the stars. One cannot predict all the future applications which may follow. It will be easy to use the nuclear energy for the controlled production of useful heat and power. The energy can be released instantly or over a period of days or years at will. The material in a single atomic bomb could be adapted in a few months to supply all the electricity needed by a city for a long time. Engines and dynamos of standard design can be utilized in converting the heat into work. However, nuclear fuel will be expensive and limited in quantity. At the present time, sunlight and the burning of coal are much cheaper. Moreover, the nuclear fuel carries with it a health hazard due to radioactivity which must be kept under careful control. No immediate large-scale displacement of coal, oil, or water power is in sight now, but there will probably be applications in isolated regions or under special conditions where the transportation of ordinary fuel is difficult. One pound of uranium 235 is equivalent in heat value to a trainload of coal.

"Will it not be much more difficult to control the production of atomic bombs if nuclear energy is permitted for operating engines and for other peaceful purposes?"

Yes. This may well be one of the difficult questions for the people to decide. Denial of the practical use of nuclear power would involve no great economic hardship now—yet it would be unfortunate to deny man the use of any of nature's resources merely because he cannot be trusted.

"What about our national security based on the largest navy in the world and the greatest industrial productive capacity?"

Gone with the atomic bomb. These things are no longer a protection against war waged by a nation which can drop the new bombs on major cities and factories without warning.

"Weren't we foolish to develop the atomic bomb and thus render obsolete our old lines of defense which would have given us national security?"

No. We must explore all possibilities. Other nations would have developed atomic bombs within a few years even if we had done nothing. Not until our development of the

atomic bomb was practically complete did we learn that we had far outstripped Germany in the race.

"What about universal military training?"

This is now a minor issue. Scientific research is far more important to the security of the Nation than a large army and navy. Even as it has been our policy to train reserve officers we should assure that sufficient numbers of young men have an opportunity to become scientists and skilled technicians.

"Does the atomic bomb affect the plan of controlling Germany's and Japan's war potential through repression of the manufacture or aluminum, nitrogen, and heavy industries?"

These materials are less important now for making war, and insofar as they contribute to a higher standard of living and economic contentment, they should be permitted, as least on a limited scale.

"Would it not have been a good plan to have dropped a few more bombs on Japanese cities?"

The atomic bombs were used in the hope that they would shorten the war and thereby save human life. The use of two bombs accomplished this purpose. We would have gained only a troubled conscience and loss of respect if we had used more.

"Was it not a mistake to use these atomic bombs? We would have won the war anyway. Perhaps we have saved our sons only to lose our grandsons."

We know that we have saved many of our sons. Arguments for prolonging the war usually come from those who are far from the front. Men have stopped killing each other, and our casualty lists have ended suddenly. Atomic bombs will be available in other countries in the near future, whether we had used them in this war or not.

"But haven't we lost our moral prestige with other nations and with ourselves? We have long preached against the bombing of civilians."

"Yes, but we had lost it before we dropped the atomic bomb. What difference whether we destroy 60 percent of a city with one atomic momb or with thousands of explosive and incendiary bombs. The dead are no more dead and the injured no more injured. For a long time we have been killing women and children by bombing cities from the air. Few protested. War forced upon us tasks of destruction and slaughter we did not want. Our cities have gone unscathed and our people have become prosperous making weapons of destruction which have brought death and misery to the rest of the world. We had to do it because we were fighting for a better world and for a chance to live in freedom and peace. Perhaps the atomic bomb has shocked us into realizing that we, the high-minded, peace-loving citizens of the United States, have been guilty of mass murder for years. Fortunately we and our military leaders have never glorified war. We will now hate war more than ever.

"Is not the atomic bomb worse than poison gas which was outlawed? We respected our pledge not to use poison gas even though it could have been used to our advantage on some of the Pacific Islands."

There is no real difference between these and other methods of warfare. We did not pledge ourselves against the use of atomic bombs; they were previously unknown. The tragedy is not that men fight with knives, arrows or bullets, or flamethrowers, or poison, or exploding molecules or disintegrating atoms—the tragedy is that men make war. Debate on the relative wrongness of different weapons is of questionable value. The common enemy is war itself.

"Wouldn't it have been better if we had demonstrated the atomic bomb—on a desert islands or on Mount Fujiyama, and then told the Japanese of its power and given them a chance to surrender?"

Possibly so. Only a few would have been impressed. Now the whole world knows that there can be no compromise with the institution of war.

"Let us abolish wars by frightening the nations into keeping the peace. Friendly union against a common enemy has often been effective in keeping the peace. The atomic bomb may be the last common enemy which will force all nations to unite."

Fear of war has rarely prevented war, but now the existence of such an awesome weapon may shock us into accepting the national sacrifices necessary to eliminate war. When it is realized that every nation can have a "pistol" loaded and aimed at the heart of every other nation, it should be easier to form a world government or an international union for settling disputes by peaceful means. Even before the atomic bombs we were approaching the "pointed pistol" stage in international relations with the possibility of many super rockets focused on the cities of a neighboring nation ready to be released at or just before a declaration of war.

"How shall we prevent war?"

We must remove the causes of war—such as population pressure, ideas of race superiority, economic restrictions, thoughts of isolation, and attempts to sell indefinitely without buying. Intelligent, enlightened self-interest will go far, but the only real solution lies in raising the moral standards of the men and nations of the world. The principles of unselfish brotherhood have always been desirable—now they are necessary for survival.

UNRRA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a recent broadcast which was prepared for the three radio stations in my district, WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie; WMAH, Marinette-Menominee; WDBC, Escanaba:

One of the greatest international problems confronting ourselves and the other United Nations today, and about which we hear a great deal of conflicting comment, is the very important question of what we are doing to feed, clothe, and otherwise help to rehabilitate Europe in general and more especially the displaced peoples of Europe. We have heard a great many reports about the probability of widespread starvation in Europe during the coming winter months and it is, of course, a very important matter in which all of us are greatly interested here in Washington. You will recall that many months ago the United Nations set up what is commonly known as UNRRA and officially known as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Theoretically, this international organization is contributed to by all the United Nations who were signatories to that agreement but in reality of course—as usual—the lion's share of this money is being put up by Uncle Sam.

Recently a subcommittee of seven members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee left for Europe for a 7-week tour of western Europe to learn at first hand just what the situation actually was; and as I promised you in my last week's broadcast, I am fortunate today to have with me in the studio a member of that subcommittee from our own State of Michigan, the Honorable BARTEL J. JONKMAN, representing the Fifth District. Mr. JONKMAN is effectionately known to all his colleagues as Barney, and I shall call him that from now on in this broadcast. So now I want to present to you my dear friend, BARNEY JONKMAN, and ask Barney if he will briefly tell us in general just what the committee found out in that part of Europe the committee covered.

Mr. JONKMAN. As you stated, Fred, I was a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs which was delegated by a resolution of the Congress to investigate UNRRA and lend-lease. On this mission we left New York on the 5th day of August on the *Queen Mary*. An interesting sidelight on this ocean trip was the tremendous change that had been made in the *Queen Mary* to transport our servicemen from Europe back to the States. As you know she is capable of accommodating 15,000 servicemen in her revamped condition. I was amazed how large lounges had been converted into bunkrooms, some of them accommodating as high as 400 to 700 men. To provide additional transportation they used what they called the d-b ticket (double-berth ticket). About every other man as he came aboard was handed one of these tickets and that meant that he would alternately sleep on the bare deck or in a bunk. In this way they accommodate 3,500 additional servicemen on each trip.

Mr. BRADLEY. I imagine the boys did not kick much on that as long as they were getting home.

Mr. JONKMAN. The first night out at about 11:30 we were notified by the captain that he had just had a wireless from the FBI stating that incendiary bombs had been placed aboard ship to explode at twelve. He immediately assured us that there was nothing to worry about and it turned out that it was a false alarm; although coincidentally our ship did receive an S O S signal from another ship that was afire at just exactly 12 o'clock.

We arrived in London on a Saturday morning and the next week attended the UNRRA Conference which was being held there at that time. However, as you will recall the unofficial VJ-day came just about that time canceling most of those sessions.

Mr. BRADLEY. What is the general appearance of London today. Is it pretty badly bomb shattered?

Mr. JONKMAN. In driving through London we could not help but feel that the damage had been grossly overstated. In one district around St. Paul's Church a great many blocks had been demolished and the damage was severe although it had been cleared up. When walking through one will find in certain districts that flats and apartment houses have been bombed. However, in most cases the structure still stood subject to internal repairs. When we are told that four out of every five homes in London have been damaged, much of it is only flak damage or damage by flak to roofs which have since been repaired.

One of the first things we interested ourselves in was the, at that time, proposed $75,000,000 lend-lease provision for prefabricated houses for England. We immediately sought these prefabricated houses and after considerable seeking finally located them. One was of American make at $1,500 and the other English make at $2,500, which incidentally was built with lend-lease materials from the United States. We were told these houses were wanted to replace slum districts. We asked the British Ministers of Health and Construction to show us some of their worst slums, and upon examination we found their conditions were far less serious than our own slum conditions in Washington and other cities over here.

Mr. BRADLEY. I understand that you toured through France, Belgium, and Holland, and then into Germany. Can you tell us what the food situation looked like in those areas?

Mr. JONKMAN. Yes, Fred, Paris was our next headquarters. It, of course, had not

been bombed. Business was in very listless condition and food shops were inactive, furnishing only staple and coarser foods. From there we made it our business to drive by automobile through northern France and later through Belgium and well up into Holland. In all this territory we found crops in excellent condition—wheat, potatoes, sugar beets, rye—although we saw little corn. Not only that but we were all surprised to find all through these countries more herds of cattle than I have seen driving through Michigan, even when I was driving through your dairy counties of Menominee, Delta, and Chippewa. These cattle were in most instances tethered in straight lines, 12, 20, or 30, alongside a field of rich red clover, enabling them to eat of a fringe each day. We found the same condition in Germany after passing through about 10 miles of borderline territory between Belgium and Germany, which we were told was neglected because the land mines had not yet been removed therefrom.

Mr. BRADLEY. Well, Barney, as they have all this food growing over in these countries what then is the bottleneck and why can't this food get to market?

Mr. JONKMAN. By making that statement I do not mean to infer by any means that Europe is self-supporting as far as food is concerned. It never was even in peacetime; but the real problem in Europe is transportation. We all know that Europe depended for transportation largely on rail and river and canal traffic. It was pathetic as we drove through the country to see how railroads and river boats had been destroyed. In Holland, for instance, we could see this and we were told that a little railroad 33 miles long had 90 bridges destroyed. In the other countries it was pathetic and often times you could see with one sweep of the eye, four, five, or six large bridges crumbled like a roller-coaster, part in the water and part still above its foundations.

Mr. BRADLEY. Did that condition maintain down in southern Europe?

Mr. JONKMAN. Well this is true practically all over Europe except in Italy—even in Greece. In Italy, as we know, our armies pushed the Germans up from the south and as the latter destroyed the bridges our boys at least replaced some so far as was necessary for military operations so that Italy is in the best shape as far as transportation is concerned. A healthier state of agriculture was also found in better than half of northern Italy. In the southern part of Europe, especially Greece, the food situation has been impaired not only by the ravages of war but even more so by a drought which they have experienced now for 6 years and of which 1945 is by far the worst, so that Greece will have only a 40-percent wheat crop this year. Dozens of times I have asked leaders in communities, "Isn't it true that there is enough food produced within 200 miles of this place to relieve your needs if you had transportation facilities to get it in here?" In every instance they answered "Yes." In other words, if adequate transportation could be provided for food produced in Europe, there would be a marked reduction in requirement from this country.

Mr. BRADLEY. Well, Barney, to get back to this UNRRA situation. What is your impression of the work UNRRA is doing as a whole?

Mr. JONKMAN. I understand that the criticism to which UNRRA has been subjected and which was admittedly justified by many of their own members has improved the situation and UNRRA is now desperately seeking to secure trucks from the various Army forces and I understand they have already made arrangements for 80,000 trucks which, however, are being delivered to them in such small quantities that the winter will be well advanced before they solve this problem. Of course, it must be borne in mind that UNRRA could not accomplish much toward securing trucks until after VJ-day because even after VE-day the Army was reluctant to part with this equipment until the war had been won.

Mr. BRADLEY. Well, Barney, isn't it true that as the Army proceeded in its campaigns and liberated these countries like France and Belgium and Holland that the Army itself undertook a great burden in feeding and clothing these natives and displaced persons?

Mr. JONKMAN. Yes; the Army did an excellent job—an outstanding job—but it must always be remembered the Army was doing it only to facilitate their military operations and not as a relief agency in itself.

Mr. BRADLEY. But, of course, the fact remains that UNRRA could not move in to any area until the Army turned it over to them. Isn't that correct?

Mr. JONKMAN. That's correct.

Mr. BRADLEY. Well, now, Barney, tell me something. What are we doing to help these Jews and displaced persons at this time?

Mr. JONKMAN. In my opinion, General Eisenhower and the armed forces have done a splendid job. As of September 10 last, or barely 4 months after VE-day, they had repatriated nearly five and a half million displaced persons. I call that magnificent. Harrison, in his report, calls it phenomenal. This leaves about one million, or less than 16 percent, almost wholly consisting of displaced persons, who refuse or are afraid to return.

Even Harrison, in his report to the President, says: "It is undoubtedly true that the great majority of Jews now in Germany do not wish to return to those countries from which they came." Harrison frankly states that these displaced persons want to go to Palestine and the United States. Of course, the Palestine situation cannot in the slightest degree be ascribed to us or to Eisenhower and the armed forces. For that, the British, in the violation of their mandate, must accept responsibility.

The voluntary refusal of this million to be repatriated, created a second problem which could be developed only as the repatriation was being accomplished. Certainly, no one will contend that the Army should first have taken a census of those who refused to go home, found villas and private homes for them, and thereafter proceed with the main job.

Now, please remember that Harrison in his report admitted marked improvement had already taken place, although he says his report was being written only 3 months after VE-day. In my opinion, that progress in 3 months shows another splendid achievement by General Eisenhower.

I visited some of those displacement camps. The Hanau camp, for instance, consisting of old barracks, providing individual apartments and wards, just out of Frankfort. The looting of a consignment of industrial alcohol by inmates (to which Eisenhower refers in his defense) had just occurred, killing or permanently paralyzing eight hundred to a thousand of them. The director complained of flagrant disregard of hygienic and sanitary rules, as well as immorality, which could not be punished or disciplined. When one considers that this million is the residium or leavings of over six million who had lived for years under the most degrading conditions, it is not difficult to realize that operating these camps is a problem.

It is true that UNRRA, with its admitted inefficiency and handicaps, had taken over much of the camp care at that time. However, their failures cannot be blamed on us, but are the fault of the United Nations. And that's why I say we are doing as much as possible at this time.

Mr. BRADLEY. Barney, is UNRRA getting any cooperation from Russia or are they being handicapped in the distribution of supplies to those east European smaller nations such as Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, which are under Russian influence at this time?

Mr. JONKMAN. This involves the question of cooperative effort all the way through and immediately upon my return, I made a statement that the whole situation in Europe is one of chaos, red tape, and inefficiency. To this all the agencies, the Control Council, which is composed of the military staffs of the four governments, our American military government, and UNRRA are all contributing but it is my opinion that Russia's failure to cooperate—just as she failed to cooperate in the Foreign Ministers' Council—is the principal obstacle to progress.

Cash and Carry: European Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, American foreign policy during the late war was based largely upon America's ability to produce and to give away. In some instances no acknowledgement whatsoever was made of the fact that war supplies and material were acquired through lend-lease. In other instances, lend-lease has been utilized by foreign powers in such a way as to bring reflections upon the good intentions and the good name of the United States.

Members of Congress who traveled in Europe, the Middle East, and the Far East have observed these cases of neglect or actual misuse of materials supposedly loaned but actually given to our allies to win the war. Representative BARTEL JONKMAN, of Michigan, on his return from Europe, was quoted as saying that Soviet troops in Berlin were much surprised to see the Americans riding in jeeps since the Russians were under the impression that jeeps were manufactured only in their country. They could not understand how Representative KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, told the Associated Press on his return from a tour, which included the Middle East, that Syrian men and women, fighting for their promised liberty with primitive weapons, had been mowed down by one of our allies with American modern battle equipment furnished that ally through lend-lease.

Similar reports have been brought to the attention of the American people concerning American lend-lease weapons being employed by the British to kill Greeks, and by the Dutch to kill Indonesians.

Lend-lease has been terminated. Foreign nations have been deprived of this particular means of getting something for nothing.

Yet, hardly had the ink dried on the Presidential order ending lend-lease than alien pressure groups invaded the United

States demanding economic concessions and outright gifts. The British monetary mission, headed by Lord Keynes, to whom I have referred heretofore, encountered unexpected opposition. The British asked a direct gift approximating a sum between five and six billion dollars. They met with Americans who took the stand that the United States could do business only with a Great Britain who had abolished the sterling bloc and the empire preference in trade.

A spokesman for the British delegation summed up the British attitude when he said:

> We are unwilling to put our names to a loan we cannot repay, and to giving up our system of empire preference.

Robert Boothby, influential member of Parliament, went even further. He said in the House of Commons:

> If the price demanded by the Americans is * * * abolition of the sterling area, then I think the price is definitely too high and we ought not to pay it.

Within the week, according to the press, a tentative agreement has supposedly been reached to "loan" the British four billions at one-half of 1 percent, payment of such interest not to begin for 10 years. It also provides that payment of principal and interest shall be suspended at the pleasure of the British. This means, of course, that they will pay only at their convenience. Let us not forget that it has not been convenient for them to pay anything on the six and one-half billion dollars debt growing out of the First World War in the last 13 years. It is understood that Lord Keynes and his cohorts are still hopeful of securing the advantageous gift they originally set out to get.

Nor is Britain alone in her expectations that the United States will pay her way through postwar recovery and set her up as a commercial competitor with American businessmen in every market in the world.

Chinese officials have named sums varying between five and ten billions of dollars as the basis of their needs to develop China's resources, to improve Chinese inland communications, and to open Chinese ports for foreign commerce. France, too, is seeking an enormous loan from the American Government.

The Soviet Union wants at least six billions—and should this money be given to Stalin—we will never learn whether it was used to improve the lot of the Russian people, or to augment the use of the power of atomic energy for world conquest. Russia has never permitted general observers of the press to penetrate beyond their policed areas in Moscow and elsewhere. It is beyond the realm of possibility that Stalin should allow the trained observers of science to investigate the true objectives of Russian spending.

The people of the United States—for it is the American taxpayer who pays all bills—are financing the American occupation forces in Europe. We are the sole source of funds for the present policing of Japan. We are to be the heaviest contributor to the currency stabilization fund and to the World Bank. We are supporting the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration beyond the combined support of other member nations and we are being called upon to advance additional sums.

A recent United Press report, quoting Department of Agriculture officials, has this to say:

> October (through) December food plans call for the export of more than 3,000,000 tons to continental Europe, excluding Russia * * * almost equal to shipments in the first 6 months of 1945.
>
> Nearly 90 percent of all food in the relief pipe line is wheat and flour.. In addition, the 1945 exports will include 171,000 tons of meat, 54,600 tons of cheese, 304,000 tons of other dairy products and 137,000 tons of lard and other fats and oils.
>
> Relief authorities estimate that Europe will need 18,000,000 tons of imported food during the next 12 months.

How is that to be carried to Europe? According to the European view, that food will be carried in American ships operating at the expense of the American taxpayer or in 1,000 British ships, built by Americans in American shipyards and transferred as an outright gift to the British.

Douglas Larsen, American economics authority, writing in the Washington Daily News of October 12, says of the British shipping situation:

> At the outbreak of the war it was agreed that Britain would concentrate on making warships and the United States, with its capacity for mass production, would build cargo vessels. This program would have given the United States 68,000,000 tons of shipping—more than all other nations combined. Losses and the abrupt end of the war caused America to fall short of that goal by about 8,000,000 tons—still more than all nations put together.
>
> Now it is the growing belief that England hedged her bargain to concentrate on warships. There is evidence that in spite of losses of more than 5,000,000 tons in ships sunk and damaged her merchant marine is close to its prewar size.

Before the war, the United States ranked second to England in the size of our merchant marine. During the war, the next four ranking merchant marine competitor nations have been practically eliminated from world competition—Japan, Germany, Italy, and Norway. By giving Britain a thousand merchant vessels we would add those thousand ships to the British Empire shipping pool, and give Britain almost complete control of foreign markets. It might necessitate making our foreign trade policy everywhere subservient to that of our British competitor.

The term "cash and carry: European plan" means that we should give Europe our cash and our products and furnish the ships in which Europe can carry away these spoils.

Just exactly what are American statesmen expected to do for the rest of the world? They are being called upon to give away American money, American processed goods, and American raw materials. They are being asked to reduce the American standard of living, to still further burden the American taxpayer with an ever-increasing unbearable load. They are being urged to increase the national debt of the United States to such a point that we can no longer be a solvent nation. They are under tremendous pressure to coddle a world that wants to ride piggy-back through the reconstruction period at our expense. It must appear incredible to our statesmen—as it will certainly appear to the American taxpayer—how Europe ever passed through over 2,000 years of recorded history without the help of the United States.

Let us be realistic and face facts.

The United States is getting no cooperation from the Soviet bloc or from the sterling bloc in the establishment of world peace and security. Yet, it is the doctrine of both of these blocs, together with their satellite nations, that America must finance them, feed them, clothe them, underwrite their farms and factories, give them ships and renounce our foreign markets. This is not a doctrine advocating charity. It is, rather, a doctrine which attempts to rationalize international piracy.

If we must have a doctrine of charity, that doctrine, like charity itself, begins at home. Millions of Americans face temporary unemployment due to the dislocations of the reconversion period. The needs of these men and women who served either in the armed forces or in war work must first be met. No one will help them but their fellow Americans. We have yet to hear any expression of a desire to help Americans from the heads of States who demand everything from America.

It is only after we have helped our fellow Americans that we can turn to the task of helping others, if we then so decide. In this, the foreign diplomats themselves have given us the cue: The English think first of Englishmen; the Russians think first of their Soviet comrades; the French think first of Frenchmen. It is time that we think first of Americans.

In reconstruction we must first build a sound American economy. American businessmen must be assured of the safety of their investments in order to assure the American workingman security in his job. We must acquire our fair share of foreign markets. When we have made America strong and secure and safe, then we can, if conditions should then warrant, pass along that strength and security and safety to the world. But we cannot give these inimitable gifts to an uncooperative world, a world that refuses to work for its daily bread, a world that insists on a philosophy of something for nothing.

"Cash and carry: European plan" is an impractical nightmare. It cannot work in a civilized world community. A community of nations, like a community of individuals, must adhere to a code of laws. If we do not want to revert to jungle savagery in international finance, then we must play the game by the rules. Nations who wish to borrow must do so honestly, with the determination to pay their debts. We can make a valuable

contribution to world self-respect by insisting on looking after the future of the American taxpayer and standing for the practice of making reputable loans to only those countries whose national honor will force them to treat financial agreements as well as treaty agreements as more than scraps of paper.

Naval Academy on West Coast

REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, as further evidence that the congested situation at Annapolis prevents our expanding the institution to provide for the training of naval officers, I call the attention of the Members of the House to a resolution recently adopted by the Virginia Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, which resolution is as follows:

VIRGINIA CHAPTER, THE
AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS,
Radford, Va., October 22, 1945.

Whereas the Navy Department has announced plans for the acquisition and demolition of the land and ancient improvements known as St. John's College at Annapolis, Md.: and

Whereas it is the opinion of the chapter that such acquisition and destruction would deprive the Nation of one of its most notable cultural and architectural monuments; and

Whereas it appears that the aforementioned proposal is not founded on real necessity or the results of competent establishment of design requirements: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Virginia Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, being sensible of the obligation inherent in such a professional group, do hereby protest to the Congress of the United States to the end that such proposed abuse of the Government's power of eminent domain may be prevented; and

That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to other appropriate officers of Federal and State governmental administration, to all representatives in both Houses of Congress, to the president and board of directors of the American Institute of Architects, and to all chapters of same American Institute of Architects.

By direction of the chapter.

CHARLES A. PEARSON, Jr.,
Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I have been advocating that the facilities for training naval officer personnel be increased by building a new naval academy on the west coast. We just passed a bill here setting up the composition of the postwar Navy. We plan on training 50,000 officers for that purpose, but we cannot do it with the present facilities at Annapolis. We have a disjointed program for training these men in various universities throughout the United States far separated from each other. How much better would be the esprit de corps if they were trained together at the same institution. How much better would it be if a new institution, a new naval academy, were built on the west coast where broad expansive facilities are available, where a wide choice of shore line and ideal climatic conditions which permit all year-round training on land, sea, and in the air, which is not possible at Annapolis. These facts are recognized by the resolution recently adopted by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, which I had the honor and privilege of being a member for 11 years:

OFFICE OF THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF
LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
October 30, 1945.

The board met in regular session. Present: Supervisors William A. Smith, chairman, presiding; Leonard J. Roach, John Anson, Ford, Raymond V. Darby, and Roger W. Jessup; and J. F. Moroney, clerk, by Alice Burks, deputy clerk.

IN RE PROPOSAL FOR NAVAL ACADEMY ON PACIFIC COAST: RESOLUTION URGING FULL SUPPORT BY CALIFORNIA SENATORS AND CONGRESSMEN

On motion of Supervisor Jessup, unanimously carried, it is ordered that the following esolution be, and the same is hereby adopted:

"Whereas for some years serious consideration has been given to proposals that the Federal Government establish a naval academy on the Pacific coast; and

"Whereas southern California would be an ideal location for an institution of this kind because of the splendid all-year climatic conditions which prevail here; and

"Whereas the development of a two-ocean Navy by the United States assures the permanent importance of the west coast as a major defense area; and,

"Whereas the great and growing importance of southern California as an aviation center provides an additional advantage that southern California has to offer for the location of such a training center; and

"Whereas the need for additional training facilities for Navy officers is necessitated by the increased size of the Navy and by the overcrowded conditions at the training center at Annapolis; and

"Whereas the increasing importance of the Pacific area from the standpoint of commerce and population requires that great emphasis be placed on the defense of this area: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That California Senators and Congressmen be urged to give full support to this naval academy proposal and that the clerk of the board be instructed to send copies of this resolution to all of the aforesaid; be it further

"*Resolved*, That city councils, chambers of commerce, other civic-minded groups, and individual citizens be urged to support this plan by sending letters of endorsement to their representatives in Washington."

Communist Says "We Must Do Everything We Can To Abolish the United States"

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 1, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Communists and their fellow travelers, who are attacking the Committee on Un-American Activities, are busy in one place attacking us and in another place attacking the Government of the United States.

A distinguished lawyer from Cleveland, Ohio, yesterday sent me a clipping from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of October 29, containing excerpts from a speech delivered in that city by one Prof. M. J. Adler, of the University of Chicago, in which he said: "We must do everything we can to abolish the United States."

This lawyer asked: "If this is not treason, what is it?"

This Professor Adler, who, according to Who's Who in American Jewry, was born in New York, December 28, 1902, went on to say in his speech in Cleveland:

The only answer to the threat of atomic war is world government—complete relinquishment of the United States and all other national sovereignties.

In other words, these communists are not asking us to help keep the peace of the world through cooperation with other civilized nations, but they are demanding that "we must do everything we can to abolish the United States."

That is a doctrine that has not been preached openly in this country before since the days of Benedict Arnold.

No wonder that crowd want to get rid of the Committee on Un-American Activities!

No wonder they want to humiliate the Daughters of the American Revolution!

No wonder they do not want our American boys to come home!

They want to "abolish the United States," and they know they can never accomplish that treasonable undertaking with patriotic Americans on guard.

The News Behind the News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Paul Mallon from the New York Journal-American of November 1, 1945:

THE NEWS BEHIND THE NEWS
(By Paul Mallon)

WASHINGTON, November 1.—The British are more than our best friends in this none too friendly world.

They are in a way our grandparents—grandparents who have fallen upon hard times. But they have put over some amazing stunts on us, always doing it in a half-hurt, half-superior sort of way, as if they had a right to our gold eye teeth or the world's oyster.

Anyone who says, "Wait a minute; let's see what is going on here," they look upon with their injured air as if he were just too backward to understand, or worse, possibly anti-British. You never know whether to laugh at their obviousness, or get angry at their imposition upon your intelligence.

Not the least of their offenses for their own business interests against the world is what they have done in Assam, Malay theater, where native insurrections are top news. You may not believe these inside facts, but I have them by direct, objective, provable written pipe line, and would not present them if they were not true beyond successful contradiction, to wit:

Although the natives are naked, hungry, and ill the British have succeeded in imposing upon our armed forces an officially ordered restriction against leaving anything behind of benefit to the natives.

Our hospitals will have to be razed to the ground, unless the British take them over for themselves. The medical supplies and equipment which the natives need so much already are being subjected to the same foolish disposition.

Believe it or not, the sun glasses of our Air Corps men were collected as they departed for the States, and taken out to the air strip where a steam roller was run over them. They were expensive Government property of the $7.50 type.

Again, 6,000 ordnance wrist watches were destroyed within a 2 weeks' period by M. P.'s. Our men were not permitted to purchase them, but if they lost one, they had to pay the purchase price.

Our soldiers were told the Government had overbought airmen's Swiss watches during the war to keep the Swiss watchmakers from making precision instruments for the Nazis, and all this surplus must be destroyed as Government property—and cannot be given to the natives or brought home for use by our men.

Three auto vehicles were stalled at a missionary rest camp due to the monsoon. The missionaries asked to buy them for the mission. Instead an officer was sent out with three sticks of TNT and destroyed them to prevent anyone from using them.

Chemicals and drugs are buried in the ground for destruction when no longer of use to us and surgical instruments are systematically ruined in a Government dump prepared for that purpose. Appeals for use of the drugs in mission hospitals were unavailing.

Want some more? In India all electric current is AC, but all our equipment is DC. Our generators, fans, refrigerators, radios, and X-ray equipment are being destroyed by us—DC generators decimated by 14-pound sledgehammers.

The British will not furnish DC current, and will not allow us to leave our generators to the needy natives. They will have to buy British, or else—and it must be else because they have no money.

Our American pay standard to the natives had to be lowered at the request of the British. Even so, we paid a top of about 33 cents a day for the best Indians around hospitals. This will be lowered to 8 cents a day when we leave, and the natives are pleading with our men to bring them to the States. We introduced them to combs, mirrors, shaving creams, soaps, towels, and decent clothing, which they will have no more.

Burma conditions are customarily described among GI's as CBI—confusion beyond imagination. The medics are screaming to get home because they have nothing to do, as the 1,000-bed hospital in one locality has only 285 patients. But the Army still carries it as a 1,000-bed hospital and therefore must needlessly keep a staff there equal to its full assumption.

Five troop ships came into Calcutta to take troops back to the States, 6 weeks or so back, but no troops were permitted to go on them. So much of a fuss was raised, one officer lost his job. We are getting the men out now, 24,000 being scheduled to leave during October, but 6,000 had to wait another month until they acquired more points. Morale is not what you would call high.

The basic British impositions certainly laugh at the "four freedoms." Shades of a quart of milk a day! We cannot even leave our hospitals, give medical supplies or left-over lighting or radios to the needy. We cannot give them our sunglasses or watches, indeed we cannot carry these home ourselves.

I hear one American officer did permit disposition slyly of some of our worn-out Army clothing to a few naked natives, but I hesitate to report this sensible kindness for fear he might be punished.

I was sitting in a restaurant eating dinner the night I heard the radio flash about the war declaration by revolutionaries in the Burma-India area, the first of new wars before the breath of the old one died. My companions suggested the Communists might be financing opposition to the British there. I decided to investigate what was behind the matter. I found the British themselves apparently responsible rather than the Commies—or crochety, self-interested grandparents who are dead set in their colonial and commercial ways.

Gould Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gould Lincoln, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Thursday, November 1, 1945:

THE POLITICAL MILL

(By Gould Lincoln)

Millions of men and women in war-torn Europe and the Far East face starvation and death from disease unless they get help. It's a situation which this country, all other members of the United Nations which escaped invasion in the war now ended, and even those which suffered the actual physical ravages of war, must face. There is no way of dodging the issue except the unthinkable way of allowing these people to die.

The organization set up to meet the situation—the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, headed by former Governor Lehman, of New York, has just made its appeal to Congress for $550,000,000 to keep open the pipe line of food and relief to these desperate people. This will complete this country's promised contribution of 1 percent of its estimated income for the year 1943—a contribution totaling $1,350,000,000 and of which $800,000,000 already has been appropriated by Congress.

Forty-five nations, as of September 15, had promised contributions amounting to $1,882,760,000, including those which had been overrun by war. The lion's share is the contribution of the United States. Next is the United Kingdom—Great Britain—with $332,400,000. Canada is third with $69,369,000, Australia fourth with $38,400,000, and Brazil fifth with $30,000,000.

The same yardstick—1 percent of national income—was followed for contributions—except that the contributions from the invaded countries, which included Russia, France, China, the Philippines among others, are contributions for administration.

These sums are not going to be sufficient to turn the trick of relief and rehabilitation. The UNRRA's first job was in Greece—beginning in 1944—where it literally saved the people from destruction, not from war but from lack of food, clothing, and transportation.

Since then UNRRA has been active in many parts of Europe and is now turning its hand to the liberated areas of the Far East. The additional $550,000,000 from this country makes it possible to go ahead without a hiatus in the work. Without it deliveries from the United States of the most needed supplies would cease almost entirely in December and January. It has been estimated that the relief and rehabilitation work of UNRRA can be completed in Europe by the end of 1946 and in the Far East 3 months later.

This country and the other nations are to be called on to make additional contributions of 1 percent of their estimated incomes for the same year, 1943. It means that American taxpayers must dig down in their jeans for another $1,350,000,000, bringing the total for UNRRA contributions from this country to $2,700,000,000.

The job UNRRA has been set up to do has two aspects. First, it gives relief, the essentials to keep needy people alive. If the organization were limited to that work it would be in danger of becoming merely the source of a dole. It would leave these people no better off at the end of its operations than they were at the commencement—or little better.

The second main job of UNRRA, therefore, is rehabilitation. These people must be enabled to help themselves. To help themselves, UNRRA is providing these destitute people with seeds, fertilizers, farm machinery, trucks, limited amounts of raw materials, power plants, textile and other machinery. So completely devastated have huge areas been, by war and by the stripping the Germans gave them, that unless such supplies are provided the people haven't a chance to stage a comeback.

Thus far UNRRA has gone into Greece, Yugoslavia, Albania, Italy and, with limited programs, Poland and Czechoslovakia. It is opening up in China. It is prepared to undertake an enlarged program in Italy, assuming that responsibility from the military and Allied Control Commission. It is ready to take over in Austria, when requested by the military, and to assume responsibility for a program in Korea, and to carry on a limited program in the two Soviet republics which were hit with terrific force by the Nazis—the Ukraine and Byelorussia.

The organization has met many difficulties—but it is rolling now.

When Are They Coming Home?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

The following facts are now prevalent on Okinawa:

The high-ranking officers here on Okinawa (particularly the Signal section) are trying to keep as many troops here on this island to create as large a base as possible. They are trying to do this to make it necessary for them to hold their present grade of colonel

or whatever it may be so that they won't have to be reduced to their permanent Army grades, which, in the case of the island Signal officer, Colonel Baer, is the grade of captain.

General MacArthur's headquarters has authorized a very small signal group as permanent garrison of this island, but Colonel Baer has submitted a list of some 1,400 signal troops that he says that he needs to handle communications on this island. He originally tried to keep 2,200 troops for signal personnel, but the local island G–3 cut him down, and he ended up with a request of 1,400. The allotment of men from General MacArthur's headquarters wouldn't take more than 50 to 100 men.

You can see how we would feel about something like this when we realize that he, Colonel Baer, is trying to pull the wool over the eyes of the boys upstairs. I believe that you have seen the statements of General Stilwell and General Lawson, who said that this place was unfit as a base.

Well, here are a few figures to bear that out: During the month of September there were 13 days unfit for unloading ships, and the month before, 8 days were unsuitable for unloading. This is because barge unloading has to be used. It takes some ships as long as a month or more to discharge their cargoes. There are no dock facilities available, as the port of Naha was ruined when we shelled the place during the campaign. Goodness only knows how many days during the month of October have been lost for unloading, what with the last big typhoon of last week. There is a report out tonight that there is another one on the way. Right now it is raining outside. We have had one major and two minor typhoons in the last month. All of this makes Okinawa sound like a hellhole, and it amounts to about that. Winter is coming on, and there has been no provision made for quarters, and it really gets cold around here. Now we are sleeping under three blankets and could use still more.

All of us here got a big laugh when the news reports said that there were Quonsets and tentage being rushed in for replacement quarters. There are no Quonset living quarters on the island except for the visiting dignitaries who are carefully shown around and see only the things that are intended for their eyes. All of us have always lived in pyramidal tents and the "Ascom Hotel" is the only place where living quarters are actually Quonsets or buildings. This "hotel" is the place where visiting generals and Congressmen stay on their way through.

The food situation has always been a serious situation here because they cannot unload ships fast enough to keep a good backlog of food in the dumps. The news reports said that the typhoon created a food shortage that had to be remedied by the flying in of food in B–29's. This existed long before the typhoon ever hit us here. For 3 weeks before the typhoon, we had been eating various kinds of emergency rations, "C's" or "K's." We have had very little fresh food ever since we have been here. The only times that it has been available is when someone makes a deal with one of the naval vessels in the anchorage to take some of their refrigerated stock off so that they can haul cargo out. The food situation has always been the gripe on this island. We thought that is would improve when the war was over, but it got much worse instead of better.

Vitamin deficiency is a common trouble, and dehydrated potatoes and corned beef won't cure it. I don't know how long it has been since we have had any fresh vegetables. We have had occasional oranges and apples, but they are very few and far between.

This is the situation on Okinawa today.

One Negro's Viewpoint on Communism

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if anyone wants a real picture of the damages communism is doing to the Negroes of this country, I invite him to read a letter which I am inserting in the RECORD, written by Charles Lee White, a Negro now living in Jersey City, N. J.

In addition to organizing a certain element of the Negroes and encouraging them to adopt an attitude of antagonism to the white people, these Communists, in the early days of the war between England and Germany, and especially at the time of the nonaggression pact between Russia and Germany, encouraged their stooges among the Negroes all over this country to buy up all the firearms, pistol cartridges, shotgun shells, and other ammunition they could get their hands on. Here in Washington they even bought up all the ice picks at one time preparatory, evidently, to carrying out the Communist mandate for a revolution at the proper moment.

These Communists might as well understand it now: This Government is not going to be overthrown, and communism is not going to control America.

It is about time that men in public office stop coddling these Communists for political effect, and help us rid the country of this menace.

Here is a Negro who has struggled to make himself a place in the world among his own race, turning the sunlight onto just what the Communists have done, and are now doing, to the Negroes of this country.

It reads as follows:

To the EDITOR:

SIR: This continual arguing back and forth about the DAR is so childish it seems to me that the real cause of all the trouble should be put before the people. The Communists in this part of the country have caused so much trouble and disagreement between the races it is about time we got after them and chased them out of the country so that we can plan a peaceful future.

In the first place, the Communists have been working for years to cause not only trouble between the North and South, but to cause trouble between the races. The whole organization is based on deceit. They have spurred the Negro to demand things he sincerely does not want such as moving into white neighborhoods, demanding entrance into white institutions, even intermarriage.

This is not the Negro's idea of equal rights—that is, the intelligent Negro. I am a Negro with a college degree, and I most certainly want my race to have certain privileges, but being an intelligent person, I certainly don't approve of the Communist propaganda which has fired the Negro's demands for such privileges to the point where he may marry with the white man.

I came north from Tennessee 14 years ago. My mother worked for a white family and helped raise their children. They paid her a reasonable salary and gave her an ideal home. I worked on this country estate for several years before entering a Negro university. To this day, I correspond with the family, and only deep devotion remains even though my mother died several years ago and the entire family—the white family for which she worked—attended her funeral and wept for her.

Is there any such devotion in the East between the white man and his Negro help? There is not. Communism has destroyed all that is fine in these relationships. However, I would never even consider dining at the table with this fine white family, or even entering their church, for I would much rather be with my own people in a place exclusively for them. The Communist has done his best to try to make the less intelligent Negro think differently. He has encouraged him to demand entrance to white hotels, organizations, and I was told of a case where Negro girls entered a white beauty parlor demanding service. This makes me ashamed of my race, and no Negro with any intelligence would consider such things or be so impressed with Communist propaganda that he would be led to such actions.

If we, as a race, are given good living conditions, a chance to make a decent living, and an opportunity to have our own clean hotels, hospitals with our own Negro staffs and nurses, our own churches and schools where our own teachers might teach, then and then only will we lick communism. Some of my dearest friends in the South are among white people, and I do not expect any Communist-contaminated Negro or white in the North to understand this relationship.

I have no enemies among the white men, and I have no desire to enter his institutions—hospitals, schools, and so forth—but when that is the only decent place for me to go, what am I to do? There should be money to finance a Negro hospital with a Negro staff, especially where the number of Negroes in that city warrants an institution of their own. My children would be much happier in a school where only Negro children attended, and where only Negro teachers taught. That is all we ask.

CHARLIE LEE WHITE.

JERSEY CITY.

A Scolding President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, whether the President was irritated because his fishing trips and pleasure jaunts were interrupted by the necessity of recognizing the danger to reconversion and full employment caused by the strikes pulled by his political ally, the CIO, we do not know. But we do know the Presidential-congressional honeymoon was rudely blasted when he heaved, not one, but several, wrenches at congressional committees.

Sidney Hillman and his Political Action Committee, responsible for his Vice Presidential nomination at Chicago, are demanding payment for their support. They insist the President jam through Congress legislation which would guarantee the payment of $25 per week for 26 weeks to all those who are unemployed

and who do not find suitable jobs. But a majority of the Ways and Means Committee refused to take orders from Sidney, though relayed through the President. So the President heaves a brickbat their way.

Sidney and the PAC also demand the enactment of the so-called full employment bill. The House Expenditures Committee has been holding hearings on the bill, but, while now charging delay, the administration did not send up its big shots in support of the bill until this week when Reconversion Director Snyder, Secretary of Commerce Wallace, and Secretary of the Treasury Vinson appeared on the scene.

Nevertheless, the President, perhaps prodded by Sidney, exploded and accused both committees of holding up reconversion. There is no more foundation for that statement than for the one that the Yanks were mistreating the Jews in Germany or the one that the American people were to blame for the disaster at Pearl Harbor.

Although the bill states that its purpose is to give all Americans an opportunity for full, regular, useful, remunerative employment, either by aiding private enterprise or by providing Federal jobs through the expenditure of Federal money, behind it all is deficit spending and stateism or a socialistic state—government regimentation.

The automobile industry, the steel industry, corporations making radios, refrigerators, washing machines, and a hundred or more other items, are ready now to go into full production, if strikes end and agencies of the administration lay off. Big business may be able to survive the attacks of the administration's agencies, the demands of some unions, but little businesses are finding it extremely difficult, if not impossible. The result, if the President does not change his policy, will be that ultimately we shall have more and bigger monopolistic corporations; little business will fade out of the picture, and a titanic battle between industry and labor, with unemployment, will follow.

That the bill will not afford equality of opportunity to all unemployed Americans is evident when we remember that, under Federal law and the Administration agencies, no man can work on a Federal job unless he joins a union and continues to pay the dues and special assessments levied upon him. This week a veteran with a record of 5 years' service reenlisted because he would not pay the $50 demanded by the union as an initiation fee before he could work.

There is neither legal nor moral justification for the practice of labor politicians and Mr. Truman's administration which, by law, takes from the taxpayer his dollar, uses it to create a Federal job for the unemployed, and then denies to him, because he does not join a union, the opportunity to work at that job. I called upon Mr. Snyder, Mr. Wallace, and Mr. Vinson, when they appeared before our committee, to justify that practice, and each and all dodged the issue, refused to give a direct answer.

Under the administration practices which now prevail, the bill, if enacted into law in its present form, would deny to more than 50 percent of our workers who might be unemployed the opportunity to work on a job created by their money. To that doctrine I will not subscribe and the President can blow his top off as often as he wishes.

Accomplishments of FSA in Richland County, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just had a report from the acting FSA supervisor of Richland County, Wis., outlining some of their accomplishments during 1945. The work of the FSA office in Richland County since July 1944 has been carried on by two women, Edna H. Puttkammer, acting supervisor, and her assistant, Eleanor Nelson, while their supervisor has been serving his country in the Navy.

According to this report Richland County was high in its district in making new loans; high in supplemental loans, and near the top in collections. Their case load changes every year; old borrowers pay up their loans in full, and new borrowers are added.

A fact that speaks very high for the work done by FSA is that many borrowers now feel free to go to the FSA office for financial guidance and other agricultural guidance, even though they have paid their loans in full.

The report expresses gratitude to Members of Congress who made the FSA possible, and to Administrator Frank Hancock for the fine progress made by Farm Security since he took over its administration.

One of the finest tributes to the work accomplished by FSA for the people is found in the report of the acting supervisor, Mrs. Puttkammer, when she says:

I am now beginning to get applications from boys and girls who have been reared in homes under the influence of Farm Security. As they come in, I am more convinced than ever that this program, properly administered, can be one of the most outstanding factors in keeping America free, as her children are reared in homes free from hunger, cold, and disease, and are free from any other form of direct relief. I am sure I bring to you the deepest gratitude of the 150 families which now comprise the Richland County farm security family. We are grateful for your continued support of our program and for all of the things you have done or can do to aid Farm Security in helping more families.

Mr. Speaker, I am including in these remarks a few paragraphs from the report of the acting supervisor of Richland County, which pictures very clearly the good work done by the Farm Security Administration in my district:

XII. HEALTH

The largest amount of time spent on any one phase of home supervisory work has been spent on health. As each plan is developed, we have discussed the need for medical care (both new and supplemental loans). If there seemed to be a need for something and money was not available, this was included in the loan. When an emergency comes up, we have released income to take care of the problem. In two cases we have asked for county help.

One case was a little girl who seemed to be having increased "growing pains." Mother was not satisfied with doctor's diagnosis and child was finally taken to the State hospital where she was thoroughly checked. Rheumatic fever with gall-bladder complications was the diagnosis at the hospital. She is still in a convalescent home for rheumatic-fever patients, and her heart condition is improving.

XIII. FARM-OWNERSHIP PROGRAM

Our goal was three farms purchased, but we were able to buy only two before the funds were exhausted. Those two families are proud owners today. One is a young family with two small children. The energy and enthusiasm they have shown in their farm development this summer is great. They are remodeling an old barn, and the problems have been many, but they have not been discouraged. The crops are good, well tended, and harvested, yet every spare minute has been planned for in the remodeling of their farmstead. Logs have been cut, fences built or changed, new land brushed for additional pasture, the well has been cleaned out, and a cow tank made of concrete has been built, besides other jobs which come in routine farm operation.

The other family, an older one, had rented on one farm for 11 years. They had always had a desire to own land but had never seemed to get far enough ahead to make the down payment. After hearing about the TP program, they made application. It was with caution that they considered this method of ownership because it sounded so impossible. They are making progress in their building program and at the present time are extremely conscious of the run-down appearance of their farm compared to the farmsteads which are owned by older families and well improved.

We have made 24 tenant-purchase loans and so far every one seems satisfied with the farm they have purchased. Eighteen of these borrowers are paid ahead of schedule, 2 are paid to date, and 4 have paid in full through income. There are no delinquencies.

Total amount loaned to date for FO farms, $158,970; amount due as of April 10, 1945, $19,928.62; amount paid as of April 10, 1945, $49,663.25.

At the present time we have 13 applications on hand but no funds to make loans. The price limit is making this program move rather slowly in our county as the better farms are worth more money in normal times than our allotment is at the present time.

The program is well recommended by those folks operating under the set-up. Applicants frequently mention the name of present borrowers as recommending this method for purchase. There is no better advertisement for any product or program than a satisfied user.

One of the most outstanding cases in the county is a family where the father is 60 years of age and the mother is 55. Years ago they purchased a farm. Later it needed some repairs and they mortgaged what they thought to be only the livestock to buy the lumber for the barn. When the note came due they discovered it covered the farm and livestock. The man and his wife were Norwegian immigrants and unused to legal documents. The lady who held the mortgage

(through a bank) felt sorry for them and allowed them to remain on the farm and receive one-half of the income for a number of years. In 1944 she died and the estate had to be settled. The family could not raise the funds so their cheese-maker asked them if they had contacted the Federal land bank. They tried that source and failed. Then the Lutheran minister asked them to see the farm-security supervisor and they came to us. We were able to make the chattel loan and found local credit to carry the farm loan.

Another case is the R family. Five years ago they made application for an RR loan. The family were a thoroughly good family. After visiting the home and giving them the routine investigation, the loan was made.

This farm of 243 acres kept them busy every minute. The older boy was fond of the farm and the father was most interested. This farm offered a diversified crop venture, a few beef cattle, sheep, 24 dairy cows, and 4 brood sows. The buildings were better than average and the land belonged to the State annuity board and they had kept the land well fertilized and farmed by soil-conservation methods. Their landlord rented the farm cash rent, then put one-half the cattle on, and subleased the farm, so it was a share-rent unit for them. After renting for 3 years in this manner, Mr. K., the landlord, decided he would like to invest his money in something different. The family were faced with a new problem—moving or buying out Mr. K.

Finally, after serious thought and much discussion, the family decided they could carry on by themselves. By careful planning they were able to salvage enough cows to continue on, letting Mr. K. take the young stock, most of the beef cattle (keeping only a few heifers for foundation stock), and the sheep. Then Mr. R. borrowed additional money from FSA for the pieces of machinery which were necessary.

Mrs. R. says, "It was a sacrifice on all our parts, the children, too, since, because of a lack of funds, they could do only a limited few of the things high-school students do." After 2 years at the county normal, the daughter went on to Platteville State Teachers College, taught 2 years, and is now in the University of Wisconsin studying to be a home-economics teacher. Two of the boys are in service—one serving overseas as a marine and one in the Navy.

This year they purchased the farm from the annuity board. I wish I might be able to picture the joy of ownership which comes to this entire family.

To me, America's greatest crop is still her children. If in our county, typical of the many counties in the Nation, we can keep the younger generation of low-income families from knowing what it means to be reared in homes where members are forced to seek aid from any relief agency, then anything we may have done or can do will not be wasted.

EDNA H. PUTTKAMMER,
Acting FSA Supervisor.

It Is Time for President Truman To Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the commentators friendly to the present administration are becoming more and more critical of the manner in which demobilization is being conducted. The proadministration columnists are also becoming more and more insistent that the demobilization be speeded up. Evidently President Truman is as much Commander in Chief as he ever was, and since none of his wartime powers have been given up, there surely is not any reason why he cannot issue a directive to speed the demobilization by utilizing ships now in the harbors of the United States to bring the veterans home by Christmas. I find the following in the National Whirligig Column in one of the Wisconsin papers:

Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY and Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democratic leaders on Capitol Hill, do not worry over the shafts of criticism shot by the GOP. Secretly they declare that their partisan foes are using up their ammunition before the campaign really starts. By the time election rolls around they expect verbal blasts against strikes and OPA to sound stale. The more pressure Republican Congressmen exert on the military to speed up demobilization, the sooner that troublesome subject will be settled.

It had not occurred to me that demobilization was a partisan question, but if it is, no doubt the Republicans have at least made a worth-while effort to get the boys back home.

If this or any other administration thinks the American people care to see the military take over; have hundreds of idle ships that are not being used; have space provided for shipment of horses instead of veterans, they are deceiving themselves and not the people.

The following article is from the Sunday, November 4, 1945, Washington Times-Herald:

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

(By Lt. Comdr. Tyrrell Krum, USNR, retired)

It is now almost 6 months since the guns of war were silenced in Europe. And yet, we still have more than 2,000,000 good American lads who won that war sweating it out over there awaiting their return to home and civilian life.

The War Department has just released a glowing report showing that 2,225,000 soldiers were released from the Army between May 12 and October 26. These figures, of course, include men from all theaters of war as well as many whose service was entirely in this country.

Which means that some 4,000,000 soldiers are still to doff their uniforms between now and next July, the target date when demobilization will be completed.

Just what is the reason for the snail's pace at which men are being returned home? The public would like to know. Congress would like to know. And above all else, so would the Army families and the soldiers, themselves, like to know the answer.

Ask the War Department and they'll tell you blandly that everything possible is being done to bring the boys home. But, they add quickly, if there is delay it is due entirely to the lack of shipping space. A matter of transportation, entirely.

All of which brings up the big question: "What's happened to our huge merchant fleet?" The Liberty and Victory ships that cost such an astonishing amount of money and about which such great boasts were being made by high officials in the Maritime Commission before the war ended.

At war's end the United States had some 5,000 merchant ships. Of course, they were built primarily to haul cargo to all parts of the world, a task which we all admit is still important if we are to feed and supply our men overseas. But there is certainly no reason remaining why they should haul anything else. They don't need tanks, guns, and airplanes at the fronts any more.

Supposing we had converted right after VE-day only 600 of the merchant ships we built during the war into troop carriers, or roughly 10 percent of the available total, and each ship made only one trip per month carrying troops, we could have hauled every soldier in Europe back here by this time.

The biggest ships afloat—Britain's *Queen Mary* and *Queen Elizabeth* and *Aquitania*—used to arrive regularly every 2 weeks with as many as 15,000 soldiers comfortably berthed below. In fact, the two Queens and the *Aquitania* did the lion's share of the job so far.

Admittedly, one Queen and the *Aquitania* have been withdrawn. But there has been added the *Europa*, which we grabbed from the Germans. Which still leaves us two big liners to add to the *West Point* and *Monticello*, which we always have been using.

It just don't make sense for the Army to blame the whole thing on a lack of shipping space and still not do anything to try and remedy the situation by converting cargo ships into troop carriers.

The high command would probably say that a cargo ship is no place for a returning hero to come home from the wars. But ask the hero himself and see what he says. I've talked to a lot of them returning home. They would gladly have shipped in a rowboat, if it would have gotten them home sooner.

To repeat: "What's happened to our merchant fleet?"

Some faint glimming of an answer was seen the other day in a picture that appeared in a national magazine of five good new ships lying idle in a southern port. Are they and hundreds like them to be left rusting at their moorings while millions of good American citizens are literally going to pieces in foreign lands?

Lack of shipping space is not the only reason the Army will give you for the breakdown in the return of our victorious Army. They blame it on longshoremen's strikes, on storms at sea, and on bottlenecks that have been built up in American separation centers.

The last reason is actually laughable. There was a time when men were delayed at separation centers.

But these activities have been geared so that men are passing through on a virtual conveyor-belt system. Right over at Fort Meade, more than 1,600 men are being turned out as civilians every working day.

And if more evidence is needed that the hold-up is not on this side, you have only to read the announcement by the Army Air Forces lowering its critical score to 50 points a month ahead of schedule. The AAF admits it had run out of men on this side to be released and is begging Army Transportation Corps to bring back more men to process.

And finally, why does the Navy have to step in the try to solve the problem? One of the great heroes of this war was the carrier *Enterprise*. Instead of gaining the rest to which it is so deserving, the *Big E* is being converted, along with several other carriers, into troop ships to bring soldiers home from Europe.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for President Truman to issue a directive the same as he did for the boys being allowed to finish high school. This is the only language the brass hats seem to under-

stand. If he does not, his administration can receive all the criticism on this subject it deserves.

Postwar Organization of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregonian of October 30, 1945:

MR. EBERSTADT'S REPORT

Ferdinand Eberstadt, appointed by Secretary of the Navy Forrestal to report on the best postwar organization of the armed services, has recommended against unification of the Army and Navy. And whether or not the decision is with him or against him, he has done a brilliant job of analysis and in two particulars especially he has brought out points which have been sluffed over and which badly need emphasis.

First, he reminds us that unification where it has been tried has "accomplished the subordination of civilian to military life." (In our blunt way of thinking, that means it is a preparation for fascism.)

Second, he asserts, and proves at great length and conclusively, that the grave lack of coordination which developed during the war was no more a phenomenon of the relationship between the services than a phenomenon of the relationship between the services and the civilian organization.

Consequently he does not see the answer in unification of the Army and Navy. He would keep the War and Navy Departments in Cabinet status. He also would add a Secretary for the Air Forces out of the logic of the atomic bomb and the separate striking power of that branch. He wants the Joint Chiefs of Staff retained, along with a National Security Council, a Resources Board, a Munitions Board, and a Sciene Board. Mr. Eberstadt lets us know that in logistics even more than in actual military operations, the services and the civilian population were out of step. Vast surpluses were piled up in some places, and serious shortages developed in others. His concern is with a smooth flow over all, if we have to go through it again. And he doesn't think this can be achieved by merger of the Army and Navy.

When the matter comes down to its final test in Congress, these two points certainly will have far more weight than they have had up to the present. There is something about the proposal for a single department which makes the average democratic American distrustful. Unquestionably it would make seizure easier, if we ever should come to that. And meanwhile, as Mr. Eberstadt has brought out, there can be no argument over his conclusion that coordination of the services with civilian production and civilian life is quite as essential as coordination between the services themselves.

It is the turn now of the advocates of unification to reassure us as to the dangers of unification and also to reassure us as to the superiority of their program so fas as logistics are total mobilization is concerned. One thing is clear: That in the future there must be a better working arrangement between the services and the public. We are afraid the stock piles are going to prove appalling when the curtain is raised.

Return of Pacific Veterans

REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter which I have received from some 40 stranded and homesick boys on Luzon Island, all of whom have many more than a sufficient number of points making them eligible for discharge. I want to select for emphasis one or two remarks from the letter:

The duty of returning the Pacific veterans to the homeland has obviously been bungled * * * there should be an immediate and thorough congressional investigation of the current situation.

Mr. Speaker, with these statements I wholeheartedly concur. It is nothing short of alarming to read of strikes by our longshoremen, of Navy Day shows consisting of the display of hundreds of ships, of the return of seized ships to their original owners, of the sale of merchant ships and of the hundreds of idle ships, all of which could be used to return hundreds of thousands of high-point boys to their homeland. Mr. Speaker, if this administration and some Members of Congress were half as anxious to get these boys back to their homeland as they were to get them sent across, many more boys would be home now than there are, instead of sitting in some of these godless, outlying spots all over the world.

It is the responsibility of this administration to get these boys home; and I join the signers of the letter which I am including in my remarks in their accusations, for they are 100-percent right:

TWENTY-FIRST EVACUATION HOSPITAL,
Manila, Luzon, P. I., October 24, 1945.
Hon. EARL WILSON,
Representative from Indiana,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is a letter from a group of GI's hailing from Indiana who are now, and have been for over 2 years, in the Pacific. We are plain fellows calling upon the Congressmen of Indiana to help us get something we have all fully earned.

Every man who has signed his name below has more than 67 points, 27 months overseas, 17 months' service in combat zones, and 3 years in the Army. Each man has turned in an unblemished service record, and all of them have accomplished their duties in a commendable manner.

The object of this letter is to lay our case before you in a hope that by doing so you will be moved to aid us, and by doing it for us you will be doing it for all the veterans in the Pacific theater.

In order to best present the problem, we have enclosed letters written by other soldiers in this sector and addressed to the Daily Pacifican, the principal Army newspaper in Manila. The thoughts that they express are held by 99 percent of the troops here.

The duty of returning the Pacific veterans to the homeland has obviously been bungled. Whether this was because of incompetency in method, policy, machinery, or individuals, we, in our lowly positions, are unable to ascertain. But since thousands of us hold the same opinion, it is without logic that we are wrong.

These letters are typical, and were not chosen for their excellence, nor close proximity to our own convictions. They reflect admirably the basic opinions of the soldiers in the Pacific.

Deep in their minds is another thought: "There should be an immediate and thorough congressional investigation of the current situation."

The greatest issue in our lives at the present moment is our getting back to the States and rejoining our families. This is such an all-important factor, measured in the human element, that we can not begin to impress you with its magnitude.

Yes; we are dreaming of a white Christmas, but we are doing it with a grimness that can be done only by men who have suffered violations of a great trust. We have accomplished our mission. America's war is won. Now it is principally your mission to get the American fighters home.

We will be indebted to you gentlemen in Congress for all of our lives, if you will only take up the banner where we must leave it. Get us home, please.

(A copy of this letter has been sent to all Indiana Congressmen.)

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 16, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, of the many issues under the consideration of our Government and the Congress, the proposal to establish universal peacetime military training is a serious threat to the freedom of the American people and our form of government.

Starting from a small beginning, surrounded on every side by potential enemies with a foothold in this country, in Canada on the north, in the Louisiana Territory on the west, and in Florida on the south, the plan that provided an army and navy for our defense and protection in those perilous times and which was given us by the founders of this country, has made this Nation preeminent among world powers. Now, after winning the war which extended to every quarter of the globe, with all but our allied nations defeated and helpless for generations to come, we are told we must sacrifice the best years of the education of our youth to adopt the same plan of compulsory military training which was followed by the heretofore strongest military powers in Europe—Germany and France—a plan that saved neither country in the holocaust of war which has just swept over the world.

In this conflict we fought for peace and justice. Now that we have peace let us direct our efforts to achieving amity and fair dealings among all the people of the earth and establishment of a just and enduring peace. The principles of the issue of peacetime military training we are called upon to deal with are ably presented in the following article by Joy E. Morgan, editor, Journal of the National Education Association, to which I fully subscribe:

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

Lowell Mellett's comparison in the Star of peacetime conscription with required attendance at school, calls for further consideration. He has performed a service in his admirable column by bringing this issue into the open. Let us make a comparison.

First, take required attendance at school. It applies to young children, not to men at 18 or over who are face to face with getting established in life. School attendance does not take the child out of his home, away from his parents, and away from his community and local church. The school requirement does not insist that the child attend any particular school—he may go to a Catholic school or a Lutheran school or any kind of private school which meets reasonable standards. Whatever school he attends is in charge of persons responsible to the community. Education is guided growth. It does not seek to force the child, but in cooperation with the home and local church and neighborhood to build his natural endowment into the finest possible well-rounded character. The common free school, more than any other institution is close to the people, responsible and responsive to their wishes, and devoted to the ideals of the golden rule and the brotherhood of man.

HIS VIEW OF CONSCRIPTION

Second, take conscription. It proposes to go into every home, community, church and school and by force to take from those homes and communities their mature young men, to put them under military law, in charge of officers not selected by the community and not responsible to it. It proposes to put these young men in charge of an Army hierarchy whose whole outlook, training, experience, and faith are associated with the use of force and the conviction that force and only force can maintain peace. It is proposed to give these young men a training in the art of killing, which in many cases will destroy the very finest elements of their manhood. It proposes to give them training in "citizenship" Army style, which by its very nature is totalitarian and medieval. Every young man is to be exposed to a life which as any one familiar with such life knows multiplies drinking, gambling, and prostitution.

In a nutshell the fundamental difference between educational philosophy and military philosophy is this: Education asks, What is right? What is best? and allows wide freedom. The military asks, Who's boss? and Who's strongest? One builds democracy, the other destroys it and always will. The day the United States adopts conscription, if it should do so, which I do not believe it will, would mark the beginning of the end of American democracy and would be a black day in the life of humanity everywhere. Conscription would be a constant threat to our personal rights, political liberties, and representative institutions.

SEES NO NEED TO HURRY

This is not a matter that needs to be decided hurriedly. We can afford to wait until the shape of things to come is clearer; until the United Nations Organization is in operation and we can know our obligations under it; until a sincere effort can be made under Representative MARTIN'S bill for a world conference on the limitation of armaments; until plans can be evolved for whatever peacetime program is needed in a form that will not destroy our democracy and produce riots and rebellion, and until the issues can be thoroughly discussed and considered in at least one congressional election.

Nothing could be more foolish than to try to rush this issue through Congress before Christmas to avoid the next election. The issue should go over into the next congressional election and it will go over unless its proponents drop it. Even the passage of conscription by Congress would not prevent that, but would merely make certain that the question would be an issue in every congressional election until it was repealed. Members of Congress know this. They know that the people will hold them accountable and will not forget. The people will not forget because they will be reminded year after year as families are broken up, men taken from farm, office, store, and community when most needed. They will be reminded when their sons who wish to go to college and to prepare for the professions are delayed in their careers. The people will not stand for conscription in the form in which the Army hierarchy is trying to ram it down their throats by methods which reveal all too well how much respect many Army men have for the democratic processes. We are all proud of the part our Army leaders have played in winning the war; we shall have to look to civilians to win the peace.

JOY E. MORGAN,
Editor, Journal of the National Education Association.

Bobtailed Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregonian of October 29, 1945:

BOBTAILED PROGRAM

President Truman gave the finest talk we ever have heard from a man deeply and righteously determined and yet much confused.

His program, reduced to the bare bones, is for the United States to maintain its land, sea and air forces at whatever the cost, demanding that the world accept this armament on our part because of our superior moral position—our denial of any desire for additional territorial possessions except those required for defense. He asserts, without enlightening us further, that those persons are 100-percent wrong who think the atomic bomb may have made the traditional services out of date.

And yet he goes on to state that the problems of the atomic bomb are so urgent that they cannot wait upon the machinery of the United Nations. There must be action promptly. But in the process of that action the United States will give away none of its secrets of manufacture.

If this isn't a bewildering outline, we never have encountered one. Not one single solitary concession is proposed by the United States. We are to have universal military training; we are to maintain the naval ascendancy achieved during the war; we are to do the same with regard to our air forces; we are to hug and nurse, and exclude from the rest of the world, the manufacturing details in regard to the atomic bomb. We are to sit around the green-topped conference table with the nations of the world, preserving and hiding every advantage which we have gained and refusing to divulge anything. All we put into the pot is our moral position—our assertion, embodied in Mr. Truman's several points, to the effect that the United States want nothing except a few naval bases guarding the approaches to the western continents.

The Oregonian feels that the President's address has high value, in that it is notification that the administration has backbone and will not be pushed around by Russia or anyone else; that it has uncompromising moral ideals. But we see little in it pointing toward a permanent solution of the problems in which we find ourselves involved, and there is no answer, except the President's unsupported testimony, to the question of whether the atomic bomb will alter the time-worn practices of force.

After all, our President has a touch of both the questionable and the admirable qualities of the Missouri mule. And one cannot ignore the dramatic setting in which he gave his widely advertised Navy Day address—with a million people gathered in Central Park and its environs, and with many of the proudest of the Navy's ships at the adjacent Hudson River docks. Since this came at the close of the world's worst war—a war in which our armed forces played so magnificent a part—one would anticipate that his address would tend toward national pride and toward support of those implements of war which, in reality, had won the war before the introduction of the strange new power—the atomic bomb.

And that is exactly what came to pass. Mr. Truman made a magnificent address in a magnificent setting in support of the Army, Navy, and Air Forces, and in support of the American view that America's possession of these must be accepted by the world because America is right at heart. Meanwhile, he gave our minds little to feed upon in connection with the atomic age which broke upon us at the close of the war. In fact, his tone was disrespectful of that age, and so in conflict with the scientists and with the dreadful record of Hiroshim and Nagaski. Thus, as a nation, we emerge from his talk swelling our chest as to what has been done during the war, and assertive as to our position in the future, but still not knowing the true meaning of atomic power and without any real glimmering as to a peaceful world.

It was a stirring address under stirring circumstances, with the best dramatics of the world's greatest city as a background, and a triumphant Navy at the docks. But we are troubled. The President said it would be the duty of the Navy to guard the approaches to America. Many of the scientists believe a specially constructed submarine, with a special bomb, could rise at night off this same city, and discharge a bomb which would destroy it. The President was a Missourian in this particular. He resorted to pride in our present victory, and ignored the true problem.

Wages, Prices, and Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

"Wages, prices, and profits are today the Nation's No. 1 problem," Walter P. Reuther, vice president of UAW-CIO and General Motors department director, said today, declaring that "325,000 General Motors workers who are members of the UAW-CIO will fight against increases in car prices just as hard as we are determined to fight for the 30-percent increase in wage rates which unanswerable economic facts prove General Motors is well able to pay without increasing car prices one cent.

"In doing so, we are supporting President Truman's policy that wages can and must be increased without increasing prices if we are to avert a disastrous shrinkage of purchasing power that would throw all of us, wage-earners, farmers and business, into an economic tailspin. Everything the President said on this point is conspicuously true of the highly profitable automobile industry and particularly of General Motors Corp., always a record profit maker in that industry.

"The Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce study released yesterday by Secretary Wallace supports and documents, for the automobile industry, the OWMR report which found that industry can increase wages by an average of 24 percent without increasing prices.

"When, as I will show later, the Commerce Department study is adjusted to bring it up to date, in terms of actual 1945–46 production figures, wage rates actually being paid, etc., it shows that the automobile industry generally, and conspicuously General Motors can now pay even more than the 30-percent increase in wage rates needed to make up for the loss in take-home pay caused by reduction of the wartime workweek to the normal workweek of 40 hours.

"The automobile industry is maneuvering and pressuring OPA in an effort to secure unwarranted and unnecessary price increases by feeding its own self-serving costs figures, including materials, parts, and wages into a so-called reconversion price formula which ignores the accelerating economies of the volume of production that in 1946 will rise 50 percent and more above 1941. This formula adds to the 1942 car price the following:

"1. Increase in material and parts costs since 1941.

"2. The increase in labor cost as measured simply by increase in wage rates (ignoring decreases in real labor costs resulting from improved technology and productivity).

"3. Except that the margin of profit permitted is not higher than that earned in the base period years 1936-39.

"If the economic fifth columnists succeed in translating industry's pressures into regulations boosting car-price ceilings in violation of the President hold-the-price-line policy and in defiance of the economic facts of the industry, such increases will be a betrayal of the interests of American consumers and the Nation's efforts to achieve a peacetime economy of full production and full employment.

"We refuse to believe that President Truman and Administrator Bowles will permit the industry's high-pressure boys, inside and outside OPA, to get away with this bold raid on a car-hungry consuming public. If they do, they will have put short-run profits ahead of long-run welfare of the industry and the public interest.

"We prefer to hope that the President and Mr. Bowles will break up this game in the back room, this cozy practice whereby automobile producers furnish their own figures on their own costs to prove their own contentions that prices must be raised and the public servants thereupon apply a cockeyed formula to stack a deck of marked cards.

"Because the Nation's whole economic future is at stake in our price policy during reconversion, we believe that Mr. Bowles, the President, or Congress must reconsider and change the policy of secrecy restated in Mr. Bowles' letter addressed to me, which I received today:

" 'As I understand it, your position is that facts and allegation of facts be opened to public examination exactly as are the facts which you are setting forth in support of your demand for a 30-percent increase. However, this office, as an agency of the Government, cannot make public confidential data filed with it, and I am, in fact, prohibited by law from doing so.'

"The relationship of wages, prices, and profits determines the health of our economy. They cannot be rigged in secret by selfish groups at the expense of the public interest. We renew our demand that all the facts be brought out in public, that the cards—all the cards—be put out on the table in public hearings when they can be examined and tested not only by the agency officials but also by other parties in interest, labor and consumers.

"If the policy of public prices secretly arrived at is allowed to continue and if price increases, wholly unjustified by the incontrovertible economic facts, are put into effect, the 325,000 General Motors workers, represented by the UAW-CIO, will fight those price increases just as hard as we are now determined to fight for a 30-percent increase in wage rates.

"The public welfare requires that these basic economic facts be gotten out of the locked vaults of the corporation so that the public can know the truth.

"Collective bargaining will not succeed until and unless these facts are public property. It is the Government's responsibility to get these facts and put them in the hands of the people.

"In the event that OPA orders increased ceiling prices on cars above the 1942 level, as reported in today's press, we will then take the first step toward an injunction against OPA setting aside and enjoining the OPA order by filing immediately on behalf of the General Motors workers and all consumers and protesting with the Administrator as provided in the Emergency Control Act, and we will demand a showing of the economic facts upon which the CPA order is based—a showing to which the protestant is entitled under the law, in the event the Administrator denies this protest."

Reuther quoted section I (a) of the act which states as its purpose "To protect persons with relatively fixed and limited incomes, consumers, wage earners, investors, and persons depending on life insurance, annuities and bonuses."

Tuesday night the President, Reuther added, told the Nation why the price line must be held—"White-collar workers would find that their fixed salaries buy less food and clothing than before. Farmers' incomes would shrink because they would have to pay so much more for what they buy. Therefore wherever price increases would have inflationary tendencies, we must above all else hold the line on prices."

Reuther included in his statement an analysis of the Wallace report on the auto industry in which he said:

"The Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce report released by Secretary of Commerce Henry A. Wallace fully supports the UAW-CIO contention that General Motors can maintain 1942 prices, increase wages 30 percent and do it now. The Commerce Department report was written last spring, before the end of the war, and its assumptions on volume of auto production were based on the expectation that the war would continue into 1946.

"The Commerce Department report assumes that 1946 car production will be 15 percent below 1941 production and that we shall not reach high volume production until 1947. The early end of the war makes these assumptions of the Commerce Department report out-of-date, since figures already announced by spokesmen of the auto industry indicate that volume of car production will reach a level early in 1946 higher than the Commerce Department assumed would be reached in 1948.

"This increased volume of production, which will be reached early in 1946, is the key to the wage-price-profit problem. C. E. Wilson, president of General Motors Corp., stated at his recent Detroit press conference that General Motors would be producing at the level of 1,150,000 cars per year by December 1945 and that by March 1946 they will have achieved a level of 50 percent or more above the 1941 level of production.

"According to Wilson's figures, General Motors will in March 1946 be producing at a higher rate of production than the Department of Commerce reports assumed would be achieved by 1948. This high level of production, according to the Department of Commerce report, will permit the maintaining of 1942 prices, the earning of record profits, while paying the 25-percent wage increase on a base rate of $1.20 per hour. Since the current average wage rate is $1.12 per hour, the Commerce Department reports prove that General Motors could pay a 34-percent increase on this base rate and pay it now. The break-even point in General Motors after applying a 30-percent wage increase and 15-percent increase in material cost while maintaining 1942 prices will be at the production level of 1,100,000 cars per year. General Motors will exceed this production in December of this year.

"The Commerce Department report, brought up-to-date in accordance with actual and anticipated production scheduling, arrives at the same basic conclusion reached by our independent economic study and upon which we have based our 30-percent wage demand—with no price increase. Each day the economic facts from Government reports further prove the union demands reasonable and sound."

Repeal the Pauper Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, in support of my bill H. R. 2417, I desire to present for your consideration, an article by Joseph Leib, service officer of Vincent B. Costello Post, No. 15, Inc., the American Legion, Washington, D. C., together with copy of P–10 Form, Legion resolution and copy of petition adopted by the national executive committee, which I will read:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AMERICAN LEGION URGES ABOLITION OF VETERANS' PAUPER OATH

(By Joseph Leib)

In September 1944, Costello Post, the largest American Legion unit in Washington,

D. C., started a Nation-wide movement to bring about a much needed revision of the infamous pauper oath that presently appears on Form P–10—Application for hospital treatment or domiciliary care.

It is now gratifying to report that veterans groups throughout the Nation have since added their voices to the steady mounting chorus demanding the removal of this un-American and obnoxious oath.

This month the District of Columbia, Department of the American Legion, representing over 50 posts finally joined our ranks and it is with great pride that we welcome them among our supporters.

The Washington Legion adjutant has forwarded copy of the following petition to national headquarters for further action by the national convention to be held at Chicago, Ill., November 18–21, 1945. In this connection it may be well to point out that the national executive committee of the American Legion adopted a resolution submitted by the Illinois Department covering this matter which in turn was an exact reproduction of the original Costello Post resolution. This action came on July 28, 1945, while the committee met at Indianapolis, Ind.

To date there are seven bills in Congress to repeal this pauper oath. The Legion resolution, together with copy of P–10 Form and copy of petition adopted by the national executive committee, follow:

"OCTOBER 30, 1945.

"Whereas it is deemed that certain information requested on VA Form P–10 is unnecessary and whereas in replying to certain questions the applicant may subject himself to unwarranted criticisms and possible prosecution: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the American Legion recommend a change on Form VA P–10, revised in May 1945, under question 4, as follows: 'Where application is for condition for which applicant was discharged for disability in line of duty, or held service-connected by Veterans' Administration questions 5 and 7 need not be answered; be it further

"Resolved, in this connection, That question 6, which reads 'Are you financially able to pay the necessary expenses of hospital or domiciliary care?' be entirely eliminated; be it further

"Resolved, That question 7 be changed to read 'Are you able to pay transportation to and from a Veterans' Administration facility without causing undue hardship.'

"HERBERT J. JACOBI,
"Department Commander, the American Legion, District of Columbia."

Veterans' Administration
Form P–10 Rev. May 1945

APPLICATION FOR HOSPITAL TREATMENT OR DOMICILIARY CARE

The applicant should forward this form, when fully executed, with the original or a certified copy of his discharge or release from last period of service, to the Veterans' Administration facility nearest his home, which is located at _____
(Location of facility)

1. I, _____ C–No. _____ Social Security No. _____ hereby apply for
(Print) (Last name) (First name) (Middle name)
admission to a Veterans' Administration facility for *(hospital treatment) (domiciliary care) _____
(Date of birth) (Color) (Sex)
_____
(Place of birth) (Present place of residence)

2. My entire service in the active military or naval service of the United States has been as follows:

Enlisted		Serial No.	Discharged		Rank and organization	Character of discharge
Date	Place		Date	Place		

NOTE.—If you served under a name other than the one used in this application, indicate the name under which you served and the period of service _____

3. Have you filed claim for pension, compensation, or retirement pay? _____
(Yes or no)
What office has your case file? _____
(Location)

4. Give the name and address of your wife, or nearest relative, or guardian, or other person to notify in event of emergency.
_____
(Name) (Relationship) (Address)

NOTE.—Where application is for condition for which applicant was discharged for disability in line of duty, or held service-connected by Veterans' Administration, questions 5, 6, and 7 need not be answered.

5. Are you entitled to hospital care by membership in a lodge, society, community group treatment plan, etc., or as a beneficiary of an insurance company, workmen's compensation commission, industrial accident board, etc.? _____ If "yes," give name of agency or organization _____
(Yes or no)

6. Are you financially able to pay the necessary expenses of hospital or domiciliary care? _____
(Yes or no)

7. Are you able to pay transportation to and from a Veterans' Administration facility? _____
(Yes or no)

8. Have you received hospital care from the Veterans' Administration? _____
(Yes or no)
If "Yes," state when _____ and where _____
(Give most recent dates) (Name of facility)

9. Have you received domiciliary care from the Veterans' Administration? _____
(Yes or no)
If "Yes," state when _____ and where _____
(Give most recent dates) (Name of home or hospital)

10. If discharged against medical advice, absence without official leave, for disciplinary reasons, or given an enforced furlough, underline applicable term.

I *{have read / have had read to me} and understand all questions and answers on this form, and the printed provisions on the reverse hereof.

The answers to all questions are true and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief. The foregoing questions and answers are made a part hereof with full knowledge of the penalty provided for making a false statement as to material fact in this application.

Witness to signature by mark (X)

1. _____ _____
(Signature) (Signature of applicant or representative)
_____ Post office address _____
(Address) (Number) (Street)
2. _____ _____
(Signature) (City) (Zone) (State)
_____
(Address)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____, 19___, by _____, claimant, to whom the statements herein were fully made known and explained. I certify that the questions and answers thereto have, in my presence, been *{read to / read by} the claimant.

[SEAL] _____
Notary Public.

*Strike out inapplicable words or phrases.

[Reverse side]

PENAL PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO TITLE I, PUBLIC, NO. 2, 73D CONG.

SECTION 15. Any person who shall knowingly make or cause to be made, or conspire, combine, aid or assist in, agree to, arrange for, or in anywise procure the making or presentation of a false or fraudulent affidavit, declaration certificate, statement, voucher, or paper, or writing purporting to be such, concerning any claim for benefits under this title shall forfeit all rights, claims, and benefits under this title, and, in addition to any and all other penalties imposed by law, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

REDUCTION OF PENSION, COMPENSATION, OR EMERGENCY OFFICERS' RETIREMENT PAY WHILE RECEIVING HOSPITAL OR DOMICILIARY CARE

Where any disabled veteran having neither wife, child, nor dependent parent is being furnished hospital treatment, institutional or domiciliary care by the United States or any political subdivision thereof, the pension, compensation, or emergency officers' retirement pay shall not exceed $20 per month, provided that the amount payable for such disabled veteran entitled to pension under Part III, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, for non-service-connected disability shall not exceed $8 per month: *And provided further*, That where any disabled veteran who is being furnished hospital treatment, institutional or domiciliary care by the United States or any political subdivision thereof, has a wife, child or dependent parent the pension, compensation, or emergency officers' retirement pay may, in the discretion of the Administrator, be apportioned on behalf of such wife, child, or dependent parent, in accordance with instructions issued by the Administrator.

NOTE

This application is made with notice of Public Law No. 382 approved December 26, 1941 (38 U. S. Code 17-17i) which in effect provides that upon the death of any veteran receiving care or treatment by the Veterans' Administration in any institution leaving no widow (widower), next of kin or heir entitled to inherit, all personal property, including money or balances in bank, and all claims and choses in action, owned by such veteran, and not disposed of by will or otherwise, will become the property of the United States as trustee for the Post Fund.

MEDICAL CERTIFICATE

A careful physical (including mental) examination of the applicant discloses these findings and diagnosis:

(1) Brief history:

(2) Symptoms:

(3) Physical findings:

(4) Diagnosis:

(5) Strike out the clauses not applicable: The applicant (is) (is not) ambulant. He (is) (is not) mentally competent. He (will) (will not) need an attendant during his travel. The proposed attendant's name is _____ address _____ The attendant (is) (is not) a relative of the patient. It is proposed that travel to the hospital will be made by (train), (bus), (automobile).

(Date) (Signature of examining physician) (Street) (City) (Zone) (State)

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, JULY 26-28, 1945

Be it resolved, That the existing and written method of interrogation for admission to veteran hospitalization, as non-service-connected patients or as service-connected patients seeking treatment for ailment other than cause of discharge—either emergency or extensive cases—is un-American, degrading and in addition clothed with the dubious but legal power of subjecting a veteran of the World Wars to the possibility of prosecution by arrogant and antagonistic Government bureaucrats.

Whereas the membership of the Department of Illinois, the American Legion, respectfully suggests that Veterans' Administration officials be requested to authorize and institute a more democratic and more appropriate procedure of ascertaining and determining the financial status of an applicant or his or her eligibility for hospital treatment; and

Whereas these pleadings are not submitted for the intention of removing proper or necessary restrictions and safeguards for hospital admittance but to eliminate the apprehension of being stigmatized in official records by a so-called act of pauperism, and to remove the contingency of being coerced or threatened by overzealous public officials: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Department of Illinois, The American Legion, is authorized and directed to recommend for consideration the deletion of questions Nos. 5 and 9, respectively, from Veterans' Administration Form P-10, "Application for hospital treatment or domiciliary care," otherwise known as the pauper's oath.

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the Nebraska Conference of the Evangelical Church relative to compulsory military training.

Mr. Speaker, the President's program favoring compulsory military training during peacetime is meeting with a great deal of resistance in my district. The people are more concerned about getting their sons and daughters, husbands and wives home from the military than they are about inducting them for military training. The armed forces are now getting nearly 3,000 men a day by voluntary enlistment methods. The recruitment program is just starting. It would seem that sufficient men are now enlisting under this program to meet all the needs of the armed forces. If this is true, why the haste about compulsory military training? Should not this program wait until the boys and girls are home from the service?

The letter follows:

NATIONAL SERVICE COMMITTEE,
NEBRASKA CONFERENCE,
EVANGELICAL CHURCH,
Culbertson, Nebr., October 31, 1945.

The Honorable A. L. MILLER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MILLER: Following is a resolution passed by the ministers of our Nebraska conference of the Evangelical Church in which we express our opposition to peacetime compulsory military training:

"Whereas the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, has expressed himself as favoring compulsory military training during peacetime; be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the ministers of the Nebraska conference of the Evangelical Church, now in session at Hastings, Nebr., hereby register our opposition to such peacetime compulsory military training, in that it is a hindrance in the promotion of world peace and security, and is undemocratic in that it is an infringement upon the personal educational, social, and economic rights of the citizens of our Nation, and that we ask our Representatives in Congress to oppose any legislation to put into effect any compulsory peacetime military training." (Enacted October 24, 1945, at Hastings, Nebr.)

Your most careful consideration in this matter will be much appreciated.

Most sincerely,

FRANK E. SCHROEDER,
Secretary, National Service Committee.

Adjustment of Labor Disputes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein a very splendid editorial from the New York Times under date of November 1, 1945:

ARBITRATING THE GOOSE AND THE GOLDEN EGG

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, October 31.—The President's broadcast on labor disputes, accompanied by his revised wage adjustment formula, was devoted in great measure to a plea for the spirit of cooperation and mutual understanding between industry and its workers on which he said the success of any plan must depend. But this spirit has been notably absent in recent management-labor exchanges, and today few would venture to predict that the President's invocation, or the general agreement to the unexceptionable axioms he stated, will restore it.

The reception of the speech and the Executive order by persons close to both sides of the growing national controversy suggests the answer Hotspur made to Owen Glendower when the Welsh chieftain proclaimed he "could call spirits from the vasty deep." "Why, so can I, and so can any man," replied the young Percy, "but will they come when you do call for them?"

FIRST TEST SOON

The response of labor and management to the President's appeal for a more constructive attitude toward each other, a more common-sense appreciation of each other's problems and rightful expectations, will first be

tested in the conference that has been summoned for the early part of November. Already, however, labor is resisting the suggestion that it renew its no-strike pledge of wartime, even though that was broken on numerous occasions, as a material advance toward the halfway mark. And already management is drawing back from a commitment to collective bargaining which would be left to the interpretation of the political power, fearing the construction would be that such bargaining is not real unless demands are always met in substance.

Unless a broader formula than the President's, on which reasonable wage-and-hour negotiations can be reasonably conducted, is the outcome of the conference, and with the formula an enforced determination to abide by it, little hope was expressed here today by experts in industrial relations that Mr. Truman's speech and Executive order can be relied on to bring the issue nearer to peaceful solution. By these his plan was held to be inconsistent in part with his axioms and stated objectives, and they turned their eyes on the conference and Congress and the corrective legislation it is considering.

AN UNCOVERED SITUATION

One of the many advisers on whom the President relied for the patchwork of ideas that took form in his speech made two points about it to this correspondent today, one hopeful, the other not. Mr. Truman, he said, was planning as late as last Thursday to confine himself to a statement and an amended Executive order, but he was prevailed on to go to the country with a full-length speech in which he would stress the need of mutual understanding and recite the problems of each industrial group. But Mr. Truman failed to touch the situation of workers in industries that are continuing on the wartime basis of 48 hours a week, who, when they note that 40-hour workers are getting almost as much, will quit or strike and thus cut down the high productivity the President set as a national standard.

This disparity was implicit in certain passages of the broadcast, and Government boards could readily effect it in their findings. The President did say that wartime take-home pay could not as a general practice be expected by labor, now that the war is over. But he did not indicate in any way that those workers on 40-hour base pay should expect or accept reductions to the amount of 8 hours less earnings than those whose industries are proceeding on the 48-hour basis. Mr. Truman sanctioned the 40-hour week as a standard, but he did not explain how this could achieve the production he concedes to be a necessity.

A MIXED PATTERN

"It is pretty hard," said one informed critic, "to give birth to triplets—to preserve the authorities and positions of Chester Bowles, John Snyder, and the CIO at the same time."

Others noted that the President dealt with the excess-profits tax as a reservoir for wages, not as the temporary war measure it is but as a producer of funds to which the Government was entitled in wartime and therefore labor should be given in peace. Mr. Truman did not include the reserves which wise and successful management has laid by in industry as another reservoir from which to draw wage increases. But labor spokesmen have cited it as such, denying that this project amounts to socialism.

So many minds and pens joined and clashed in the preparation of the broadcast that its inconsistencies and omissions are not surprising. The analysts of such compositions are sure they recognized the plain tracks of Judge Rosenman, Robert Nathan, and other New Deal economists and literary amanuenses. But they are equally certain that in other passages they came on the footprints of Mr. Snyder, of Chester Bowles, and of Philip Murray. The latter were definitely missing in the place where the President might have fixed a percentage for wage increases and did not. But the tracks of Mr. Snyder and Mr. Bowles, though at times these suggested a scuffle ending in a draw, were heavy throughout the area of composition.

The Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress the following letter and statement of principles which I have received from a distinguished group of Philadelphia scientists concerning the future policy of the Government of the United States with respect to the control of the atomic bomb and atomic energy. I am advised that in addition to the names which appear on the enclosed letter, 600 Philadelphia scientists have signed this statement of principles in the past few days.

The letter and statement of principles follow:

OCTOBER 23, 1945.

DEAR FELLOW SCIENTIST OF PHILADELPHIA: In view of the extreme importance of the atomic bomb and atomic energy to our own lives and probably to the existence of civilization, we are initiating this method of allowing Philadelphia scientists to endorse two statements. One was made by fellow scientists who worked on the bomb at Los Alamos Laboratory calling for a world authority to control the atomic bomb as a weapon. After this statement was issued the May-Johnson bill was introduced in Congress for domestic control of all aspects of atomic energy. This bill in our considered opinion stifles scientific research and individual scientists. Consequently we endorse also the statement of 500 Boston and New York scientists who protested the restrictive character of the bill.

As a scientist you should rally to the support of nuclear physicists because you also realize that science cannot flourish in such a contemplated environment of restriction, secrecy, and control. We again emphasize that this protest applies to the fundamental research aspects of atomic energy only and that we do not wish to encroach upon the technical details of atomic bombs over which there must be control.

We speak here as scientists in appreciating the significance of the destructive and constructive uses of atomic energy and in realizing the effects of rigid control on fundamental research. We speak as citizens in examining the courses of action open to us as Americans and in advocating control by a world-wide authority.

We therefore ask you, as we are asking many Philadelphia scientists, to sign this letter to President Truman and Congress and return it speedily to Dr. W. E. Stephens, physics department, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

In addition we strongly urge you to write personally to your own Congressman, Senators, and to President Truman. Your speedy action on these two requests is solicited.

Dr. W. E. Stephens, Assistant Professor of Physics, University of Pennsylvania; Dr. Park Hays Miller, Jr., Acting Head, Physics Department, University of Pennsylvania; Dr. Robert Hodes, Johnson Foundation University of Pennsylvania, President, Philadelphia Chapter of the American Association of Scientific Workers; Marion Bernheimer, Secretary, Regional Council, Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians, CIO; Dr. Loren Hurd, Jenkintown, Pa.; Dr. D. W. Wilson, Head, Department of Physiological Chemistry, University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine; Dr. Stuart Mudd, Head, Department of Bacteriolcgy, University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine; Dr. Melvin C. Molstad, Professor of Chemical Engineering, University of Pennsylvania, Vice Chairman, Philadelphia Section, American Chemical Society; Dr. Richard M. Sutton, Head, Physics Department, Haverford College; Dr. George Morris Piersol, Professor of Physical Medicine, University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine; Dr. A. L. Patterson, Head, Department of Physics, Bryn Mawr College; Dr. L. V. Heilbrunn, Professor of Physiology, University of Pennsylvania; Dr. John A. Goff, Dean, Towne School of Engineering, University of Pennsylvania; Dr. Abraham Cantarow, Professor of Biochemistry, Jefferson Medical School; Dr. Otto F. Meyerhof, Research Professor of Physiological Chemistry, University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine; Mr. Morris L. Cooke, Consulting Engineer.

A STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES BY SCIENTISTS OF PHILADELPHIA

To President Harry S. Truman, the White House; to House and Senate Military Affairs Committee; to the Members of Congress, the Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:

In view of the extreme importance of the atomic bomb and atomic energy to our own lives and to the existence of civilization, we, the undersigned Philadelphia scientists, endorse the statement of our fellow scientists at the Los Alamos Laboratory when they said:

"President Truman, in his message to Congress on atomic power said, 'Never in history has society been confronted with a power so full of potential danger and at the same time so full of promise for the future of man and for the peace of the world.'

"The scientific background necessary to develop an atomic bomb is generally known throughout the world. The technical design and industrial methods of production are at present the secrets of this country, Great Britain, and Canada. However, it is certain that other countries can achieve these ends by independent research, before many years they also may be manufacturing bombs, bombs which may be tens, hundreds, or thousands of times more powerful than those which caused such devastation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

"This country, with its highly concentrated industrial centers is particularly vulnerable to such weapons. The fact that the atomic bomb represents such a concentrated form of destructive energy makes counter-measures against each of the large number of possible methods of delivery extremely difficult and uncertain. It is particularly difficult to develop counter measures that would provide a sufficiently large proportion of interceptions of high-speed missiles of the V-2 type such as recently described by General Marshall.

"The success of the best possible defense system would, in any event, require a continuous hour-by-hour alert. A single heavy attack, lasting a matter of minutes, might destroy the ability of a nation to defend itself further.

"One proposal is for this country to try to maintain its present position by producing more and bigger bombs than other countries. Merely having more bombs than others is not decisive if another country has enough bombs to demolish our cities and stores of weapons. The overwhelming advantage would lie with the aggressor and our superiority might be lost in the first minutes of a surprise attack.

"A world in which nuclear weapons are owned by many nations and their use held back only by fear of retaliation will be a world of fear, suspicion, and inevitable final explosion.

"It has been suggested that the United States together with Great Britain and Canada assume unilateral control over atomic power development throughout the world and by force, or by threat of force, prevent all other nations from producing atomic bombs. Other nations will not willingly lose their sovereignty to those who maintain their own in this way. Such a policy may lead to an unending war more savage than the last. We cannot conceive of it leading to a stable, peaceful world.

"We are convinced that we are left but one course of action, however difficult it may be to achieve. We must cooperate with the rest of the world in the future development of atomic power, and the use of atomic energy as a weapon must be controlled by a world authority.

"We are heartened by the statement of our President in which he said that there will be 'an effort to effect agreement on the conditions under which cooperation might replace rivalry in the field of atomic power.' Such conditions will demand some modification of our conception of national sovereignty.

"This makes it imperative that we have the good will of all nations, for it must be realized that we are dealing with a deadly challenge to civilization itself. We believe that international control is technically possible and feasible. However, we must emphasize that the problems of such control are not essentially technical.

"For example, the abolition of secrecy in national and international relations may be necessary. A world authority, if it is to be effective, must eventually realize free access to all laboratories, industries, and military installations.

"We realize the serious problems that control presents, and the atomic bomb is a sufficiently revolutionary force to impel us to such a solution.

"We have seen the beginnings of cooperation among nations during the war. The extension of this cooperation is made imperative by the terrible nature of a future conflict.

"World-wide control of nuclear energy in which the scientific tradition of international collaboration may play an important part, provides a unique opportunity for preventing the current suspicions among nations from growing into tensions which lead to war.

"It is our hope that the bomb will be a great force for world cooperation and peace. To this end we urge this country to assume its responsibility in the initiation of action leading to a world authority for the control of nuclear energy. We suggest that the United Nations Organization be adapted to such control.

"The need is urgent. Effective action is impossible not only when other nations have atomic bombs but even when programs for their manufacture are well under way. Lack of decision within even a few months will be preparing the world for unprecedented destruction, not only of other countries, but of our own as well."

In addition, we disapprove of the May-Johnson bills, H. R. 4280 and S. 1463, because we realize that science cannot flourish in such a contemplated environment of restriction, secrecy, and control. We emphasize that this applies to fundamental research aspects of atomic energy only, and we agree that the technical aspects of the atomic bomb be controlled. We insist that the results of all fundamental research should be published freely and the peacetime applications be made available to all. Consequently we support the statements of many other nuclear physicists on this subject and particularly endorse the sentiment of over 500 Boston and New York scientists when they say:

"We, the undersigned scientists have read President Truman's message to Congress on the control of future work in nuclear physics with interest and with care. It suitably reflects the gravity of the problems that face us. We agree that the fundamental problem is an international one needing the exercise of statesmanship of the highest order. We also agree that reasonable national measures of control must be taken immediately while international negotiations proceed.

"These need not extend beyond supervision of all sources of war material, licensing of all production on an industrial scale of fissionable material such as plutonium, and regulation of the use of products in dangerous quantities. However, the purpose of national measures of control now before Congress in the May-Johnson bill go far beyond these necessary measures. They include restrictions of the dissemination of purely scientific knowledge.

"We believe that such additional restrictions are contrary to the national interest. They will make very difficult, if not impossible, the attainment of the objective outlined in the President's message. They will curtail the spirit of national and free enterprise and will hardly permit the widespread distribution of peacetime products on equitable terms which will profit the people as a whole.

"We address you primarily as citizens who are concerned with the security of our country. We have special knowledge about this matter that entitles us and encourages us to speak. Because of our professional training we are familiar with the kind of scientific questions involved.

"The restriction of peacetime work in nuclear physics to a few licensed groups would inevitably slow it down. The rush of new ideas is unpredictable, but there is no doubt quantity would decrease severely if the number of people allowed to have basic information were appreciably reduced. If security measures are to be enforced, even widespread licensing would not produce effective work in the universities and other laboratories. There is an inevitable degenerating influence at work under such conditions. The consequences of violation of security regulations are immediately and highly personal where as playing safe by withholding information is all too easy. It produces a slow insidious smothering that is cumulative and certain and for which individuals cannot be blamed.

"Our military potential stands in large part from our ability to make technological application of scientific principles and to organize for such efforts on a large scale. If we are to maintain this strength, there must be a steady flow of new ideas. As they first appear they are seldom ready for immediate use. To develop these ideas for application, a considerable policy of rejections by many interested scientists is required. The possibility of this will be lost if limiting restrictions are applied.

"We maintain that the national interest will be best served by a policy of complete freedom of fundamental research and its publication. This is based on our conviction that the country would lose more by hampering and restricting research and the training of scientific men than it would by forcing potential enemies to find the facts of nature for themselves. This they can, and will, do anyway. Our security can be the security of achievement; it may not be the security of concealment."

James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley at the John Adams High School, Ozone Park, Queens County, under the auspices of the Queens County Democratic organization, Tuesday, October 30, 1945:

Every 4 years in New York City we engage in a most extraordinary commotion. It has to do, of course, with the selection of a mayor to preside over the great business corporation that manages the affairs of five boroughs and affects the well-being of more than 7,000,000 people. Incidentally, the man we select, of necessity, takes on national size and becomes an important figure in the life of our Nation, for this is considered by many the second most important job in the Nation. To a very considerable extent he speaks for the municipalities of the country, especially when he goes to Washington.

The mayor of New York centers in his hands, under the present charter, the most sweeping powers. He has great influence on municipal finances, frames the city's policies, and speaks its mind and attitudes on all important questions. He can and has determined whether we shall have meatless days, lightless nights, radical or conservative policies, clean or immoral plays, bookmakers, loan sharks, and what not.

Recently the mayor has had a house to live in, a radio to talk over, and divers cars to speed him around the city. One of these cars is decorated with five vari-colored glass stars, all lit up like a Fourth-of-July fireworks display, when the mayor is dashing to a fire or somewhere else. He has distinguished guests and visitors to entertain, commissioners, judges and what not to appoint, patronage, a big salary, banquets to preside over, and go to, critics to answer.

Our mayor has abuses to right, houses to build, tunnels to construct, subways and busses to operate, street names to change, a theater to run, zoos to manage, reservoirs to build, publishers, editors and reporters to assail, playgrounds to supervise, a governor to deal with, a citizens union to please, ferryboats to run. He has taxes to collect, political leaders to placate, and, I might add, many other tasks and duties too numerous to mention. One of these is after-dinner speaking. Once the mayor led a simple life, like the rest of us, but now he is a fairly busy man—whether he wears a fire hat, a derby, a Dobbs, a Knox, an Adam—or a 10-gallon Stetson.

And yet, all down through the years, despite the intimate and important respects in which his acts affect the daily lives and activities of us all, so many of our citizens by neglecting to qualify to vote in the approaching election, display an amazing and regrettable indifference over the type of individual to occupy the city hall during the next four and very vital years of our existence.

At this moment another period of commotion and agitation is upon us. While the clash over the mayoralty this year has provoked some bitterness on the part of our opponents, this has been compensated for by the universal belief that our candidate, General O'Dwyer, is destined to win by a most substantial majority.

Some experts insist the only question in doubt is whether the Republican candidate, or the No Deal nominee will run second or third. And I am equally certain, as you are, that General O'Dwyer's running mates, State Senator Lazarus Joseph for comptroller, and Vincent R. Impelliterri for president of the council, and in fact, the entire ticket, will triumph on election day.

A few false issues have been raised against General O'Dwyer, but what the voters are concerned about may be summed up in these three questions:

What manner of man is General O'Dwyer?

How does he measure up?

Does General O'Dwyer's past give assurance for the future?

The answers to these queries are found in the picturesque life story of the man. We begin with him as a small child in Ireland. One of a number of children, a large family, not poverty-stricken, but certainly far from rich, as in common with the Irish. His parents, like others in his family, were school teachers. Do you know what school teachers got in the old days in Erin? Great gratitude, great personal satisfaction, but little money.

We see young O'Dwyer bound for America—for the land of opportunity. He went from job to job, always ambitious, seeking his future.

Ultimately we find him on the New York police force. It meant good pay and enough time to continue his education at night.

At last he is a full-fledged lawyer, after years of striving, study, effort and, I might add, patience and fortitude. In succession we follow his career, ever upward, as magistrate, county judge, and finally district attorney of Brooklyn. He didn't gain eminence by luck or pull. Nor did burning the midnight oil alone make it possible. It took sturdy character, hard work, a tolerant helpful attitude, a progressive viewpoint, and a notably independent spirit.

Who can truthfully say that a man who has thus prepared himself is the creature of any one man or group of men, good or bad? By the very nature of things he is a free agent and a foe of evil.

Who can truthfully say General O'Dwyer is not steadfast in his allegiance to a nation and a government that made such an enviable career possible? Having attained the success he has in the country of his adoption, can it conceivably be possible that he will raise barriers against other young men who follow in his footsteps by lending encouragement to those forces which would make a mockery of the "four freedoms"? I'll answer that with a vigorous "No," as I am sure you will.

It should be apparent to anyone, too, that General O'Dwyer has ideally prepared himself for the mayoralty. Let us go down the line a minute and see how well he is endowed to become a tenant at the City Hall.

Let us take one pressing problem that faces us—housing. Everyone knows there isn't a living place to be found within the confines of our city, and practically that same condition prevails in our suburbs.

Will General O'Dwyer be alert to a solution of this vexing condition? I answer that by asking you a question. Isn't it safe to assume that a man who has been a policeman, a magistrate, a county judge, and a district attorney is aware of the fact that from decent homes law-abiding children emerge, while the tenements and hovels too often breed crime, corruption, sickness, and death? In all the public positions General O'Dwyer has filled he has seen juvenile delinquency linked with the slums, the back alleys, and the street corners where gather the children whose homes are an affront to civic decency.

Crime is another problem greatly aggravated by the war. How are we to cope with it? What remedial measures should be applied? What must the viewpoint of your fine police department be? Doesn't General O'Dwyer know the answers? Hasn't experience prepared him and taught him? Didn't he patrol a beat? Didn't he meet the sorrowful parents of delinquents face to face in court? Doesn't he know a gangster, a racketeer, a chiseler—any enemy of society—when he sees one? Hasn't he tried and sentenced them as a judge and prosecuted them as a district attorney? Who sent the members of Murder, Inc., to the chair but General O'Dwyer? When the New York County Democrats failed to endorse District Attorney Frank S. Hogan for reelection for another 4 years, who forced the party to accept Hogan? General O'Dwyer, of course. And when one talks of racketeers, one remembers that Hogan has been their hated enemy, and has closed the iron bars around many, while sending others to the electric chair—as General O'Dwyer himself has done.

I talk as a New Yorker. I am exceedingly proud to be a New Yorker. True, I wasn't born here but I did first see the light of day within a short distance of Manhattan—just a few miles up the Hudson River. I have been in and out of New York for 40 years. I went to school here and I hope you will pardon me if I say I cut out a career here. My intense love for this great city would not permit me to support for mayor a man not eminently fitted for the place.

I hope you won't consider me vain if I say I know a little about politics. I have been conversant with it in city, State, and Nation. And I have learned most, if not all the tricks indulged in by irresponsible candidates, especially when they become desperate as certain defeat faces them. And Americans, quite generally know these tricks.

For instance, you can't charge a fine decent, honest man like General O'Dwyer with unholy alliances with underworld characters in the last weeks of a campaign and make such an unwarranted allegation stick. His unblemished life and his manifold good deeds in behalf of a better world in which to live are a sufficient answer to this foul charge.

Discard if you will everything he did before the war and judge our candidate for mayor by the splendid record he made in the Army from which he emerged as a brigadier general. He tracked down the crooks, racketeers, and profiteers for Uncle Sam and brought them face to face with stern justice. Then he went to Italy to help the displaced and starving people of that most unfortunate land, crushed by fascism. That job done, he took over the gigantic task of feeding and rescuing the war refugees.

In passing, it might be well to recall that the Republican Party in this campaign is not any different from the Republican Party we have known down through the years. It is still the same old stand-pat organization it was back in the twenties and thirties. Its leadership is constitutionally opposed to progress and reform. They are still walking backward, and this despite the many in the party's rank and file who violently differ with its reactionary leadership.

Witness the spectacle of the Republican Party, publicly confessing that it was so bereft of talent and ability that it had to step over into the ranks of the Democratic Party to get a man to make the mayoralty race for it.

Witness also a newspaper advertisement paid for by the Republican ticket's supporters wherein it was shamelessly proclaimed that if the Democratic Party won this mayoralty campaign the red light district will be resurrected. In the 40 years I have worked and lived in New York, there never has been a red light district.

Such base falsehoods as these are unworthy of a party with even the slightest pretensions to decency, and it is just this sort of thing that will swell the vote of General O'Dwyer and his running mates. This sort of thing is always resented by the electorate. A smear campaign never elected anyone.

Now, fellow-citizens, as we approach the impending election it seems to me we should honestly consider what is best for our city in the next 4 years. That should be a paramount consideration with every voter.

As I conceive it, the highest service which General O'Dwyer, as the next mayor, and his running mates in their offices, can perform is to maintain the supremacy of New York City. We must increase its prestige, its earning power, its industries, its commerce. We have the great port of New York, the finest in the world. We are inclined to forget its importance. It is what gives our city its vitality. Not only our own prosperity, but, to some extent, that of the Nation depends upon the trade passing through here. Our margin of foreign trade will be the critical balance upon which our well-being will depend.

Remember it is this trade, foreign and coastwise, entering into New York Harbor with its myriad ships and all its manifold industries and services, which makes for a prosperous and happy metropolis. Yearly it represents several billions.

We must improve our port. We must modernize it at any cost so that here we can compete on a parity with every other port in the world. And to this project I know General O'Dwyer is committed.

Let us never forget that through our port have come the peoples from all the world seeking sanctuary and a better way of life for their children. Let us even remember how these folk from other lands have contributed to our material and cultural development. And above all, let us never forget that twice when the freedom of our Nation was threatened, the descendants of these emigrants and many of these emigrants themselves, millions in all, embarked from this magnificent ocean terminal we call New York, for every battle. Let us pray that henceforth and forever this port shall never again have to send forth soldiers to fight on foreign soil, but shall be used for the profitable trades of peace.

The Democratic candidates are certain to be elected on November 6. Let each and every one of us continue to put forth our best efforts on their behalf so that they will go into office backed by the greatest majorities ever given Democratic candidates in the city of New York.

The Mexican Cross of Military Merit Awarded to Col. Modesto E. Rodriguez, United States Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESÚS T. PIÑERO

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. PIÑERO. Mr. Speaker, Col. Modesto E. Rodríguez, United States Army, of Puerto Rico, received on August 8, 1944 the Cross of Military Merit from the Government of Mexico.

Col. Rodriguez served as liaison officer for the United States Army with the Mexican Army and was decorated in the name of the President of the Republic of Mexico by General Felipe Rico, commander of the Second Military Zone and Governor of the Territory of Lower California. The decoration was bestowed for invaluable contributions to cooperation and understanding between the two countries.

General Rico began the ceremony by addressing the following remarks to his soldiers:

Young soldiers derive inspiration from these men whom we honor here today. They symbolize the spirit that should guide every soldier, that spirit for which the highest values are not found in material things.

When he presented the decoration to Col. Modesto E. Rodríguez in name of the President of the Republic of Mexico, General Rico said:

Colonel Rodríguez, when the world-wide conflagration threatened the safety of the United States and Mexico and both Nations decided to unify their plans of naval and military defense along the Pacific coast, you came to our country to be the spokesman of the Army of the United States before the military authorities of Mexico. Yours was a grave and difficult mission. Two nations were involved, each with its own personality; two strong races, two different civilizations. But you brought your intelligence and your tact to bear, your understanding and affection for both nationalities, in developing the plans for the western defense of both peoples in the historic conferences at Agua Caliente and you, Colonel Rodríguez, built a bridge of friendship and understanding between the Armies of the United States and Mexico, inaugurating the perfect harmony in which during your service in this zone the military questions entrusted to your wisdom were decided. Your dynamic energy, at the service of both armies, was devoted solely to the hard work of the true soldier who knows how to comply with his duty. Even when you were taken to a hospital for treatment and observation after a serious aviation accident, you chose to take another airplane within a very few hours in order to complete an important mission of your Army without hesitating for personal considerations of health or family. Your mission in our Army was carried out with wisdom and love, and therefore, in name of the President of our Republic, I have the honor and the pleasure of conferring you the Cross of Military Merit.

Atomic Energy Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 5, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, at a conference on atomic-energy control held at Rye, N. Y., October 27 and 28, the attached resolution was adopted by a group of prominent American scientists, whose names are attached to the resolution.

I believe that the recommendations made by this distinguished group of American students deserve the careful consideration of the Members of Congress.

The following is the text of the resolution:

I

The Johnson-May bill for the regulation of atomic energy, now before Congress, does not protect the vital interests of the United States. This bill should be withdrawn.

Amendments have not corrected the essential defects of the bill. They retain the objectionable features of the original bill. The bill, if enacted, would:

1. Weaken the national defense.
2. Jeopardize the democratic institutions of the American people.
3. Frustrate fundamental research necessary to the maintenance of American leadership in the development of atomic energy.
4. Set up an authority within the United States responsible to no one—not even to the President or the Congress.
5. Take atomic energy away from the American people, where the President says it belongs, with the danger that it may become the exclusive property of the military.
6. Make it more difficult, perhaps impossible, to stop the present drift toward an atomic armaments race.
7. Block the normal negotiation of international agreemens in the field of atomic energy, and interfere with attempts to set up vitally necessary international controls.

The bill, as now amended, creates a Commission with autonomous powers not only in the area of atomic military research, but in scientific, medical, and industrial fields. The new amendments do not require the Commission to license independent research or to make materials available to independent laboratories under proper safeguards. Nor are standards set up under the bill for atomic research privileges. The Commission would have power to grant exclusive rights in atomic energy development to certain private companies, or to withhold these rights from other companies at its own discretion.

II

In our judgment, any legislation in this field should, as a minimum, provide the following:

First, the Commission and its Administrator should be responsible to the President and to Congress. They should be removable by the President in the same manner as Cabinet Officers.

Second, any secrecy regulations should be applicable only to the disclosure of the design features and laboratory tests pertaining to the plant and to details of the atomic bomb itself; that is, only to such matters as are normally kept secret when the manufacture of munitions or weapons of war is involved. We note that the President of the United States had distinguished between the scientific knowledge and the design features, tests, plants, and details of the bomb itself. Other regulations should be limited to removing hazards to safety.

Third, prior to promulgation, all secrecy regulations should be reviewed by a special Cabinet committee to make sure that the public interest in full disclosure is protected whenever possible.

Fourth, to protect individual research, the Commission should be required to provide sufficient materials, under proper safeguards, to make independent research possible. It should be made perfectly clear that the Commission has no power to control research.

Fifth, the Commission should be required, after an appropriate interval, to recommend to the Congress a program setting forth the standards which should apply to the Government regulation of the industrial use of atomic energy. Until such a program has been recommended and enacted by the Congress, the Commission should not have any power to permit the use of atomic power for industrial purposes. Such a program should deal specifically with such problems as patents, exclusive rights, and those steps to be taken to encourage private enterprise to assist in this development. Research and experiments looking toward the industrial use of atomic power should be permitted prior to the submission of the industrial program.

Sixth, we believe that the free exchange of scientific information with the United Nations as proposed by the President is of the utmost importance, and is not entirely separate from the development of a domestic program. Atomic power has been made possible only by the work of scientists all over the world. Many of the most eminent of these scientists are not in the United States and are citizens of foreign countries. Legislation must be framed by the Congress so as to take advantage of such international agreements as may be achieved, and to permit the free exchange of scientific information, not only within our own country, but with foreign scientists.

III

President Truman has said: "Never in history has society been confronted with a power so full of potential danger and at the same time so full of promise." Surely, any legislation on a subject so momentous deserves the gravest consideration by Congress. We welcome the creation of the special committee of the United States Senate to deal exhaustively with these matters. Equal consideration must be given by the House of Representatives. To forestall the dangers and realize the promises of atomic energy, Congress owes the American people the best legislation which its combined wisdom can draft.

Frank Altachul, Stamford, Conn.; Ben M. Cherrington, Chancelor, University of Denver; Norman Cousins, Editor, the Saturday Review of Literature; R. G. Gustavson, Vice President and Dean of Faculties, University of Chicago; R. M. Hutchins, Chancelor, University of Chicago; C. D. Jackson, New York City; John K. Jessup, New York City; Warren C. Johnson, Chairman, Department of Chemistry, University of Chicago, Oak Ridge, Tenn.; Irving Langmuir, Associate Director, Research Laboratory, General Electric Co., Schenectady, N. Y.; Edward H. Levi, Profesor of Law, University of Chicago; Jacob Marschak, Professor of Economics, University of Chicago; Edgar Ansel Mowrer, Washington, D. C.; Robert Redfield, Dean, Division of Social Sciences, University of Chicago; Theodore W. Schultz, Professor of Agricultural Economics, University of Chicago; John A. Simpson, Jr., Chairman, Executive Committee, Atomic Scientists of Chicago; John T. Tate, Professor of Physics, University of Minnesota; Glen H. Taylor, United States Senator from Idaho, Washington, D. C.; Harold C. Urey, Professor of Chemistry, University of Chicago; Eugene P. Wigner, Professor of Mathematical Physics, Princeton University.

Adopted at Rye, N. Y., October 28, 1945.

Arguments For and Against Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the American people will face in the very near future a most important and far-reaching decision. The question, Shall we establish compulsory military training? should be answered intelligently rather than sentimentally.

In order that my constituents might have the knowledge contained in the following compilation of arguments on both sides of this important question, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the appended subject matter. I also intend to mail with this subject matter several thousand post-card questionnaires on this subject, which I hope will be returned to my office marked in such a manner as to indicate their thoughtful and careful advice on this very important legislative problem.

The compilation follows:

NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

FOR

In the 168 years of its existence the United States has had seven major wars, all undertaken with various degrees of unpreparedness. Realism demands that in the future we prepare continuously for whatever emergencies may come.

In spite of any peace terms that may be made and any system of international cooperation that may be established at the end of World War II, compulsory military training is essential to the future security of the United States.

Universal military training is the only dependable way in which the United States can match the military strength of other world powers.

For defense against sudden attack in undeclared wars the United States should have at all times a large reserve force of trained civilians—perhaps a constant reserve of about 10,000,000 men. This would be more economical and more effective than to maintain a large professional military establishment.

Because of technological advances the geographic location of the United States no longer affords sufficient protection to permit adequate preparation for war after it has been declared.

Military preparedness not only affords safety in case of attack but is the best way to prevent attack. Thus, in a nonaggressor nation such as this, it promotes peace.

Universal military training would give the United States greater stature in international affairs; create greater respect for our international policies and proposals.

In the United States universal military training would always be regarded as a defense measure. Committed as we are to the principles of democracy and the right of self-government, our military force—no matter how powerful—would never be used in a war of aggression.

POSTWAR MILITARY NEEDS

FOR

For several years after this war ends, the responsibility which the United States will have in policing various regions will require a large military force.

Because of the unrest and uncertainty which are sure to follow World War II, the United States should have a trained reserve ready for any emergency.

MILITARY EFFECTIVENESS

FOR

Unpreparedness at the outbreak of a war always results in hasty, partial training, which in turn results in a large number of needless casualties.

In order to train a large reserve army the United States would necessarily have at all times a considerable stock of military equipment and supplies. In the absence of such a program, the tendency is to allow these stocks to dwindle.

Universal military training would give our reservists an esprit de corps which is never developed in a hastily assembled civilian army. If called to combat duty, the reservist would be a professional, not an amateur.

Compulsory military training would develop physical fitness, generally, and build the toughness and stamina which are essential to effective military service.

After we are engaged in war there is not sufficient time to give a conscript army the training the men should have in basic military facts and skills.

NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

AGAINST

There is no convincing proof that universal military training from the beginning of our national life would have prevented any of the major wars in which we have engaged and the outcome, in each case, has been satisfactory.

Universal military training will be entirely superfluous if suitable peace terms and a workable international organization can be developed. The introduction of universal military training now would be a retreat toward isolationism, would deny our faith in world cooperation, and would jeopardize any plan of international collaboration that may be developed.

Military training alone would be no guaranty of security, or victory, if the United States were to come in conflict with a highly industrialized China or Russia with manpower and production in excess of our own.

For defense against sudden attack the United States should have, not an enormous reserve of common soldiers with training only more or less up to date, but a powerful Navy, a large and effective Air Force, and a well-equipped mechanized Army that is highly mobile and has plenty of striking power.

Assuming that the Navy, Air Force, and Regular Army are strong enough to withstand the first shock of a surprise attack, a well-educated citizenry, together with a highly developed industrial and agricultural life, afford the only basic protection that is needed in the United States. Specific military training en masse can be given after the threat of war appears.

Active military preparation stimulates armament rivalries and tends to provoke wars rather than prevent them. That compulsory training does not prevent aggression, witness the German attack on France and Russia, particularly.

Peacetime conscription would cause other nations to regard us with suspicion, particularly our Latin-American neighbors who would resent this obvious threat of interference in their affairs.

A powerful military machine, to military and political leaders, is ever a source of temptation. It could lead, even in the United States, to overaggressiveness in international affairs and perhaps even to imperialistic ambitions.

POSTWAR MILITARY NEEDS

AGAINST

Although the size of the military force needed after war ends cannot be accurately determined now, every probable need can be met with those trained under the present Selective Service System.

The seven to ten million veterans and trainees who will return to civilian life at the close of this war will constitute a reserve adequate for any emergency for a period of at least 10 years.

MILITARY EFFECTIVENESS

AGAINST

Training given when needed is up to date, not out of date. Without extensive retraining, a reserve army, too, would be subject to the "casualties of ignorance."

Existence of standard equipment and supplies may be a handicap rather than a help, leading to the use of obsolete materials. Without a large stock pile our armies must be equipped with new materials produced to latest specifications.

Much of the success of our armies in all wars is attributed by some military authorities to the fact that they have been com-

MILITARY EFFECTIVENESS

FOR

ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS

FOR

Preparation after war begins must necessarily result in extravagant outlays for the necessary military equipment and supplies. The step is too great in changing over from peacetime to wartime production.

Manufacture of the equipment and supplies used in the training program would provide employment for thousands of people and thus add a substantial amount to our annual national income.

The boys in training would be off the labor market, out of competition with older men, and the total number of gainfully employed persons would be permanently reduced by narrowing the age range of employment 1 year.

PERSONAL VALUES

FOR

Through induction procedures health defects would be discovered and, in many cases, would be corrected. Thus the whole level of health would be materially lifted in the United States.

Military training establishes good health habits and teaches personal health care. These are valuable assets in civilian life.

Military training develops acquaintance with outdoor living and independence in taking care of one's self under whatever circumstances arise.

The proposed year of military training would include not only basic military instruction and drill but also, in a large percent of cases, a valuable program of vocational education.

Military training is a valuable experience in citizenship. If universally required, it would increase patriotism and give each trainee a feeling of personal investment in the country's welfare. It would teach the responsibilities as well as the rights of citizenship.

Military training affords valuable lessons in cooperation, efficient teamwork, assumption of personal responsibility, and so on.

In their military training, many boys would find vocational interests and aptitudes, and lay the foundation for their peacetime careers.

In military camps, many would be removed from a too-sheltered home life, would overcome homesickness, and gain that degree of personal self-reliance necessary to their own success.

Military training would often bring out qualities of leadership and administrative ability which had not been discovered and developed in civilian life.

The discipline imposed during military service would be a valuable asset to the individual all through life. Everyone needs a wholesome respect for duly constituted authority and the habit of prompt obedience to it.

Military training would afford opportunities for boys to travel about over the United States, becoming acquainted with the dif-

MILITARY EFFECTIVENESS
AGAINST

posed of civilian rather than professional soldiers—men who were fighting to defend their homes or their ideals rather than disinterested, well-discipline regulars.

Most of the reservists, if away from training a year or more, would require essentially the same toughening up schedule as if they had never been in service. Military training would do nothing for those rejected because of defects.

Physical fitness, not specific military instruction and drill, has been the outstanding training problem both in the present war and in World War I.

ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS
AGAINST

A continuous program of military training at an estimated annual cost of two to four billion dollars would, in the long run, be less economical than periodic preparation which admittedly involves a certain amount of waste. In addition to the actual cash outlay, peacetime conscription would keep about a million men out of productive pursuits at all times.

Production for military purposes is economically unsound, since the output is focused on destruction. Economically, from every point of view, extensive military training represents the choice of guns rather than butter.

Because of the pool of unemployed persons which regularly exists, a system of compulsory military training would have little influence on the labor market except for the first year. About the same number of new workers would be seeking jobs each year, whether at age 18 or age 19.

PERSONAL VALUES
AGAINST

Induction age is too late to check up on health defects. This should be done through an adequate school-health program beginning with the first grade and extending through the entire period of school attendance.

The health improvement claimed for military training could be achieved at lower cost and with better results through adequate school- and public-health programs.

The same degree of self-reliance in outdoor living which military training gives can be acquired in nonmilitary activities, notably in well-planned camps for older children and youth.

Vocational training, the same as education of other types, should be the function of the schools rather than the Army.

Citizenship in a democracy can be taught more effectively in schools and in civilian pursuits than in an army camp. Even a period of national service, if that were deemed advisable, might be required without resort to military training.

Effective teamwork and group loyalty can be developed—are being developed—by schools, camps, and many other nonmilitary agencies.

Compulsory military service would necessarily interrupt either the educational or occupational plans of young men and tend to postpone the time when they could marry and establish homes.

The moral atmosphere of military camps usually is not the most wholesome. Probably the dangers from this quarter are fully as great as that of an excessive amount of "apron-string" control.

Those who would "find themselves" through military training must be balanced against those who, because of the delay, would not go on to college and whose vocational plans would be revised downward.

Enforced obedience, as exacted in military discipline, is not the conduct pattern needed in a democracy. Military life makes a small contribution to self-discipline and to harmony in personal relationships.

PERSONAL VALUES
FOR

ferent regions, and to experience something of the frontier adventure once available but now virtually gone.

RELATION TO DEMOCRACY
FOR

Since volunteer military service is never, never adequate when the United States is at war, universal peacetime conscription is a logical national policy. Compulsory military training in peacetime is just as democratic as universal conscription in wartime.

A year of military service would help young men to understand, and to revere, the principles of democratic government. It would help them to understand and appreciate the basic freedoms on which democracy rests.

Lack of peparedness at the onset of war makes it necessary to yield dictatorial powers to the executive branch of government in times of crisis. Because of the difficulty in recalling these powers, every war emergency is a threat to democracy.

Compulsory military training is democracy in action. In the training camp, rich and poor would live together and engage in common tasks. Boys from city and country, the sons of professional men and unskilled laborers, youth of all nationalities and creeds, would live and work together.

A year of compulsory military service would increase the percent of voting citizens. Through preparing to defend democracy with their lives if necessary, the trainees would learn the importance of the ballot.

Through military training many competent leaders would develop their powers and afterward use them in the service of their country.

A reservist army would be useful in preserving the peace in case of any internal disturbance or emergency situation arising within the United States.

Those whose formal education ends with high-school graduation or before, need, especially, another year of educative experience and training. Even those who continue in college would profit by a year of military instruction.

THE TIME TO DECIDE
FOR

Universal military training should be introduced now while there are officers and camp facilities to handle such a program.

Unless the issue is settled now, while there is a keen awareness of defense needs, the public is likely to take no action. In peacetime it is hard to dispel the sense of false security which is blind sometimes even to the most essential requirements.

PERSONAL VALUES
AGAINST

Due to improvements in travel facilities we are well on the way toward the elimination of provincialism. Travel is neither an adventure nor a novel experience for a substantial number of American youth.

RELATION TO DEMOCRACY
AGAINST

The fact that conscription in wartime is the fairest, most democratic way of meeting an emergency, nowise means that peacetime conscription is also democratic. On the contrary, it is an encroachment on personal rights and freedom which millions of immigrants came here to escape.

Conscript armies have been the foundation of the totalitarian states. Schooled in the use of force and trained to unquestioning obedience, they have been ready to follow a strong leader. Democracy is not enhanced by training which makes "the voice of the drill sergeant louder than the voice of conviction."

Dictatorial powers must be given to the executive branch of government in wartime, irrespective of degree of preparation. The threat to democracy in peacetime conscription is fully as great as the threat arising from the wartime delegation of any additional discretionary powers to the President of the United States.

Military training, no matter if universal, is undemocratic. The officer caste system accentuates inequalities. Aside from accidental acquaintance little is done to bridge the gap between the rich and the poor. Military camp management is autocratic, not democratic.

Trainees would acquire a dangerous respect for, reliance upon, and skill in the use of force. This would soon be reflected in public opinion on international issues. Perhaps, also it would result in greater violence in the case of strikes, more frequent attempts at mob rule, and other resorts to force instead of to the ballot.

Just as some of the most intelligent and aggressive young men from other countries have come to the United States to escape military service, so would military training here tend to drive out some of our best potential leaders.

Reservists, including union members, could be called into service and sent back to their jobs, in uniform, to break strikes. This was done in France.

In a system of universal military training all boys would come under complete Federal jurisdiction just before they reach the present voting age. Yet Federal control of education—which surely could never be so complete—is generally recognized as a hazard to democracy.

THE TIME TO DECIDE
AGAINST

Facilities and training officers will be readily available for a considerable time after the present war ends. This is a secondary rather than a primary consideration.

If military training is a wise national policy, the American people can be trusted to make that decision on the basis of cold facts, without the strong emotions and hysteria of war. Also, those now under arms should participate in any decision of such importance, both to the Nation they are defending and to their own sons.

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter from a constitutent in my district on the subject of compulsory military training.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the observation of this fine citizen in Nebraska represents the thinking of many thousands of anxious mothers and fathers.

This Congress may soon be called upon to decide a very vital issue—that of compulsory military training. The President, in his message to this body, did not call it compulsory military training. He called it citizens training but, Mr. Speaker, it is compulsory regardless of the dress you put upon the subject. Wh. is it necessary to exhibit so much haste acting upon this most vital problem? Does this administration feel it is necessary now under a guise of mob hysteria and thinking to force a compulsory military training on the country before the soldiers who have just fought and won this war get home? Are they afraid of the reaction that may come from these soldiers? The country will have some 12,000,000 men who have had immediate training. At least 5,000,000 of these men who have had training would be ready should another emergency develop in the next several years.

This administration apparently is embarking upon the game of power politics. If that is to be our policy, it will be necessary to have a rather large trained Army. It will be necessary for them to create emergency after emergency. They are following the pattern of the last 12 years. This Congress should go slow and think, look and listen before they adopt a program of compulsory military training. The letter of my constituent is as follows:

OGALLALA, NEBR., *October 30, 1945.*

Dr. A. L. MILLER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. MILLER: As a resident of the State and district of Nebraska which you represent, I would like to voice my opinion on compulsory military training.

For 25 years I have been in favor of military training, as my husband served in both World Wars I and II; and as you know, the Legion and its Auxiliary have favored this youth training.

Now, however, I'm dubious of such a program for the following reason, and I'm not taking into consideration the atomic bomb. Since VE-day, my son, who had been in the service for some months prior to that date, has had no constructive program mapped out for him and he, with several I personally know, have been shifted from camp to camp without doing a thing but putting in time.

Now I'm aware of the fact that events happened fast after VE-day and it, no doubt, would take some time to readjust the needs of peace, but should it take so long? Now, I question the advisability of placing our youth in the hands of the military who are not giving the boys any instruction now, when everything was operating supposedly as a going concern. How will we know they will do any better later?

My son, as soon as he was 17, went into the Army specialized-training program, as I convinced him he would be more valuable to the service with a little knowledge. While still in the AST he joined the Air Corps, to be called as soon as his age would allow. Then came VE-day and after that the military seemingly cannot get a program functioning which includes them.

If the administrative officials cannot handle this situation better than the proof seems to bear out, what assurance do the parents of boys have that the program they wish to put into operation will be any better?

The welfare and influence of such a training program would depend primarily on the caliber of the men selected to administer it. Do we have enough high-minded men to do the job, and what check would the average parent have on such a program? It could be a program giving immeasurable benefit to the youth, or it could be the ruination of a boy.

Yours sincerely.

The Development of the Coast Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to include therein an article written by Elizur Yale Smith on the development of the Coast Guard. The article appears to have been written for information on the one hundred and fifty-fifth birthday of the United States Coast Guard by Major Smith, who is said to be an authority on early American history and, while its insertion now may be somewhat belated, I think that its insertion will serve a useful purpose:

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE COAST GUARD—ITS CHRONICLE INCLUDES FINE RECORD OF DUTY FOR THE TREASURY AND THE NAVY SINCE 1790

The one hundred and fifty-fifth birthday of the United States Coast Guard was celebrated throughout the Nation and on shipboard throughout the world. This branch of our armed services was established by the First Congress of the United States, under the Constitution, in Federal Hall, corner of Wall and Nassau Streets, here in New York City, by the signature of President George Washington to "An act to provide more effectually for the collection of the duties imposed by law on goods, wares, and merchandise imported into the United States and on the tonnage of ships or vessels." Alexander Hamilton, as the first Secretary of the Treasury, was the instigator of the organization. Included in this act were four sections which provided for a revenue cutter service, which became a sort of naval police for the suppression of piracy and smuggling.

At the time of the creation of the service, whose name has since been changed to the United States Coast Guard, we had no navy. The Continental Congress, during the Revolution, created a small navy and authorized the commissioning of privateers, but after this war the navy fell into a state of desuetude. At the end of the war the navy was almost annihilated, and the only American ship of the line remaining in 1782, the *Alliance*, was presented to the King of France to supply the place of a similar vessel lost in Boston Harbor by accident.

THE TREASURY'S 10 CUTTERS

After Washington had resigned his commission as Commander in Chief of the Continental Army in 1783, a small standing Army was maintained, but, as before stated, the idea of a navy was relegated to the deep, and this same situation continued in force after the formation of the Government under the Constitution, so that all naval affairs came under the authority of the War Department until 1798, when the Navy Department was created. Even the frigate *Constitution* was launched in 1797, and her sister ships were slid from the stocks, before a Navy Department came into being. All the naval protection we had was the Revenue Cutter Service

When Hamilton's subsequent recommendations for a new protective tariff were adopted by the First Congress in 1790, he stated that the collection of impost duties could not be enforced without ships. Consequently, the Congress authorized him to build and equip not more than 10 cutters, at a cost not to exceed $10,000, and to man each of them with one master, or captain, at $30 a month, and with first, second, and third mates, four mariners, and two boys. The wages ranged down to $4 a month for the boys, and all hands received subsistence allowances. The officers and men were deemed officers of the customs and were under the control of the Treasury Department.

They had authority to search ships bound for the United States within 12 miles of the mainland coast. The act also provided for collectors of the various customs districts, located from the northern part of Massachusetts to the southern borders of Georgia. The act likewise gave the collectors power to provide and employ small open row and sail boats, and men to serve in them, for going on board vessels, and for the better detection of frauds. Even then, as in late years, much contraband rum was being smuggled into the United States from the West Indies and Europe. It was the collection of imposts on rum, spirits, and merchandise that gave us our first principal revenue for financing the costs of running the Government. Although the Continental Congress had raised money by means of a national lottery and foreign loans, the first tariff act was adopted in 1789, and it was for the collection of this tariff that a naval police force became necessary. Our first issue of Government bonds was not authorized until 1790.

No other nation in the world has a comparable organization to our Coast Guard. It is purely a product of the formation of our Union. During its span of life of over a century and a half it has constituted a part of the military forces of the United States; has operated under the Treasury Department in time of peace, and under the Navy Department in time of war. The President may direct its departmental affiliations. This famous branch of the services has fought side by side with the Navy in every war in which the United States has fought since the undeclared war with France in 1798–1799, when vessels of this service fought against French privateers in the Caribbean Sea. At that time one of the original cutters, the *Pickering*, made two cruises and captured 10 prizes. In the War of 1812, 16 cutters defended the coast and commerce of the country as far as the caliber of their guns and the size of their vessels would admit.

MULTIFARIOUS DUTIES

Down through the years—in the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and World War I, high standards of duty and a seaman's job well done have crowned the efforts of the Coast Guard. Over a month before the attack by the Japanese at Pearl Harbor the Coast Guard was taken over by the Navy by Presidential proclamation on November 3, 1941, but operates as a separate unit of our naval forces. It is proudly living up to the traditions of its motto, Semper Paratus (always ready).

Since its birth in 1790, as time went on, many duties were added to the original Revenue Cutter Service besides its first purpose as a naval police force and protection against foreign aggression. It assists vessels in distress, prevents oil pollution, assists in the immigration, quarantine, and neutrality laws, protects the fur seal, game birds and fisheries, cares for lighthouses, maintains the North Atlantic Ice Patrol, and performs a dozen or more other duties for the enforcement of Federal statutes.

The Coast Guard maintains an academy for the instruction of cadets at New London. The mission of this academy is "to graduate young men with sound bodies, stout hearts,

and alert minds, with a liking for the sea and its lore, and with that high sense of honor, loyalty, and obedience which goes with trained initiative and leadership; well-grounded in seamanship and sciences, and the amenities, and strong in the resolve to be worthy of the traditions of commissioned officers in the United States Coast Guard in the service of their country and humanity."

NOW THE SPARS

Remembering Hamilton's "10 little sailing cutters" with keels of about 40 feet, it is interesting to note a recent statement made to me by Rear Adm. Stanley V. Parker, the captain of the port of New York and commanding officer of the Coast Guard in this naval district, in which he said:

"The size of our vessels has increased greatly, so that today one of our most effective types is the 328 footer, which has been so successful in operations against submarines. Among the names distinguished in this connection are the *Campbell*, the *Spencer*, the *Duane*, and the *Icarus*. Our types of seagoing craft vary all the way from the motor lifeboat and picket boat of about 36 feet in length through 125 footers; tenders for servicing aids to navigation, ice-breaking cutters of the *Mohawk* type of 165 feet in length, the 250-foot cutters which were transferred to the British, and many other varieties of craft that I have not mentioned. Their armaments range from the service small arms to the 5-inch guns and the variety of special weapons which this war has developed. The compliments of personnel of these vessels extend today from two or three men to several hundred."

George Washington and Alexander Hamilton did not foresee that women would some day form a part of the revenue-cutter service. Today they are a valuable addition to the service. That they should be ought easily to have been foreseen, but the proof of the pudding is in the eating, and high officials in the Coast Guard have stated that they are very well pleased with the demonstration of usefulness which the SPARS have given.

U. S. S. "Oakland"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the city of Oakland, Calif., recently had the distinction of welcoming home the U. S. S. cruiser *Oakland*.

It was a glorious Navy Day celebration which saw a spontaneous greeting given this veteran ship by the people of the city for whom she was named.

The *Oakland* is a product of the West that has lived up to the proud traditions of the West.

At a testimonial dinner honoring the commander and gallant crew of this historic ship, Capt. A. P. Calvert delivered the following:

Mr. Chairman, Mayor Beach, other distinguished guests, ladies and gentleman, very few ships in the United States Navy other than the *Oakland* have been fortunate enough to be returned to the city which they were named for Navy Day. For that reason I feel that we have been deeply honored in having this opportunity to show the people of Oakland the wonderful ship that has been named after their home city.

Sponsored by Dr. Reinhardt, president of Mills College, our ship was commissioned in July 17, 1943, at the Bethlehem Steel Co., in San Francisco and departed for the combat area in October with Capt. W. K. Phillips as her first commanding officer. At the end of the war she had taken part in 10 "star" combat operations which I would like to list: Gilbert Islands; Marshall Islands; Asiatic-Pacific raids, 1944; Bismarck Archipelago; Western New Guinea; Marianas; Western Caroline Islands; Leyte; Okinawa.

Third Fleet operations against Japan—July and August of this year.

Additional awards authorized were the Philippine liberation ribbon with two stars.

The *Oakland* assisted in sinking a Japanese destroyer and a 7,500-ton freighter and took part in two shore bombardments. Fourteen Jap aircraft were shot down during the war operations.

The *Oakland* is not an inexpensive national investment. To launch her cost $20,000,000. To build and maintain her would have cost every man, woman, and child in the city of Oakland each $75.26. She has steamed over 200,000 miles doing her part in this war or the equivalent of about 10 years of peacetime steaming.

In November of 1943, the *Oakland* together with some heavy cruisers and destroyers rendezvoused near Funa Futi in the Ellice Islands group with three carriers and additional cruisers.

On the afternoon of November 20 this task group was attacked by a formation of Jap two-engine torpedo planes, better known as Bettys, and the *Oakland* received its baptism of fire by shooting down two of them and assisting in splashing two more. The remainder of November and early December were taken up by strikes supporting the Gilbert Islands operations and action against the Marshall Islands, prior to the invasion of the latter group.

The ship was relatively inactive until February when it became a unit of the famous Task Force 58 and took part in the action against the central Caroline Islands and the first attack on Truk. During this operation the *Oakland* splashed two more Jap planes.

In March of 1944 the ship made a trip to the South Pacific furnishing support for the landings in the Bismarck Archipelago and the first air strikes against the Palau, Yap, and Woleai before returning to Majuro in the Marshall Islands group.

Until June our time was largely taken up with maintenance work, drills, and training for the prospective invasion of Saipan and Guam. The *Oakland* took part in the attacks on Guam on June 11, 12, and 13 and proceeded with Task Force 38 to meet the menace of the Japanese combined fleet which was advancing toward the Marianas group, and participated in the first battle of the Philippines Sea on June 19 and 20. Iwo Jima and Pagan were taken under fire on June 24.

On July 9 we had our first taste of shore bombardment when Guam objectives in the vicinity of Agat were taken under fire.

In early August the *Oakland*, together with several other cruisers and destroyers, made an antishipping sweep northwest of Chichi Jima and assisted in the sinking of a Japanese destroyer and medium-sized freighter during a night engagement, which was followed by a shore bombardment of Chichi Jima early in the next morning. During the bombardment the *Oakland* was fired on by large-caliber shore batteries, but no hits were scored.

In early September Task Force 38 was organized and the *Oakland* resumed the job of furnishing antiaircraft support in actions against the central Philippines, after which the ship proceeded to Ulithi for replenishing of ammunition, fuel, and provisions.

The later part of October was taken up with Task Force 38 strikes against Formosa and Okinawa during which the *Oakland* covered the withdrawal of two damaged United States cruisers. Before Ulithi could be reached with the cruisers the second battle of the Philippines was brewing, and the *Oakland* proceeded at high speed toward Leyte Gulf and took part in the engagement against the Japanese battleships and cruisers that were attacking our escort carriers.

During November and December 1944 we operated with various task groups of Task Force 38 supporting the Southwest Pacific forces amphibious operations in the Philippines. Targets on Luzon and Visayas were hit repeatedly by Task Force 38 aircraft in support of Leyte and Mindoro operations.

The *Oakland* weathered the first of a long series of typhoons on December 18, the typhoon during which three destroyers capsized, although the *Oakland* received no serious damage. On Christmas Eve 1944 the Flying "O" received orders to return to the United States for a much-needed overhaul and returned to Pearl Harbor therefrom in early March 1945, prior to proceeding to join Task Force 58 at Ulithi. At this time this force was conducting daily strikes in support of the landings then in progress on Okinawa. Six planes were shot down by the *Oakland* during this series of operations.

In mid-April the *Oakland*, together with Task Force 58, swept to the northward to launch strikes against airfields in the Japanese home islands. Twice during these operations the *Oakland* opened fire and assisted in shooting down a Jap twin-engine bomber and driving off another before it could attack the task force. On April 17, we met up with Kamikazes for the first time and assisted in splashing two of them before they could reach their targets.

The first 10 days of May were spent off Okinawa furnishing support for the operations thereon. Task Force 38 sortied from Leyte Gulf on July 1 to take part in air strikes and shore bombardment on the Jap island of Honshu, which occupied our time until the Japs decided to call it quits on August 13, at which time all offensive operations were halted.

On August 31, we dropped anchor in Tokyo Bay off Yokosuka Naval Base and witnessed the surrender ceremonies on the *Missouri* on September 2.

Prior to entering Tokyo Bay, we picked up a Jap naval officer who was supposed to pilot us through the mine fields at the entrance to the bay. However, he possessed no chart and only a few words of English, and, besides that, he wasn't tall enough to be able to look over the bridge railing, so, all in all, he was practically of no assistance. He only succeeded in getting his coat burned on somebody's cigarette.

During our stay in Tokyo Bay the crew was able to go ashore in Yokosuka, Yokohama, and Tokyo for sightseeing. However, the Army B–29's had arranged it so there was very little sights to be seen. The devastation there was even more than we had anticipated. The people themselves did not appear to us to be hostile but were helpful, the ones who could speak English. The children invariably held up their fingers in a V-for-victory to us as we went by.

There were very few souvenirs to be bought. Food appeared very scarce. Victory gardens—victory for us—were growing up in the business district even between the sidewalks and the pavements. It looks to me like they are going to have a very hungry winter.

We remained in Tokyo Bay for about 1 month taking typhoons at regular intervals, weathered them all very nicely until one night on a midwatch when two large tankers moored together, dragged their anchors and came down and smacked us. Didn't do a great deal of damage but it's just like getting a scratch on the fender of a new car. I hated to see it happen. Did have to leave our calling card in the form of our starboard

anchor and chain in Tokyo Bay in order to get away from the tankers.

We left Tokyo Bay on the 1st of October and proceeded in company with other ships to Buckner Bay in Okinawa to load passengers for return to the States and had a typhoon blow us in and we left on the 6th with one right behind us, except it deviated enough in order to get out of its way. That was the typhoon that did so much damage in Okinawa on the 9th of October.

Our passengers consisted largely of Seabees who were extremely grateful for anything we were able to do for them. They had been living in the mud and dust of Okinawa for several months and proceeded to have a fine time on the way home.

Finally in closing I wish to thank Mayor Beach, for the ship, for all the wonderful hospitality that has been extended to us, and the Oakland Chamber of Commerce for this marvelous souvenir booklet which we have and which all of us will treasure forever.

Montana Tops Nation's E-Bond Sales

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, once again Montana is out in front in the Victory bond drive. Our record in all previous drives is unsurpassed. Before the bond campaign even got under way six of Montana's counties were over the top. This is only an indication of what we intend to do. I want the Congress to know that Montana will occupy once again its usual position of leadership in this drive.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am including with my remarks an article from the Christian Science Monitor of November 3, 1945, concerning Montana's place in the Victory loan drive:

MONTANA TOPS NATION'S E-BOND SALES

WASHINGTON, November 3.—The total sales to individuals in the Victory Loan yesterday stood at $314,000,000, of which $167,000,000 was in series E bonds, the War Finance Division of the Treasury reported.

Montana was leading the Nation in percentage of E bond sales against the quota, with 20.7 percent of its State quota sold in the first 5 days of the drive. Eight Montana counties already had exceeded their E bond quotas, six of them on the first day of the drive, and Powder River and Treasure Counties since then.

The over-all goal of all securities to all investors is $11,000,000,000. Of this amount, $4,000,000,000 is the goal for sales to individuals and half of that is the goal for E bonds.

"E bond sales in the Nation are holding the gains over the anticipated sales of the first few days," said Ted R. Gamble, National Director of the Victory Loan drive. "This is most heartening, for it indicates that our volunteer sales force is working hard, determined to finish the job, and that the public is responding."

Robert W. Coyne, assistant national director, returning from a trip through New York, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Illinois, Ohio, Iowa, and New Jersey, reported that he found war workers even more optimistic in rural counties than in the industrial urban centers.

A Man's Value to Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and pleasure to attend the graduating exercises of the FBI Academy here in Washington, October 26, 1945, and to hear the address to the graduating class by Rev. Joseph R. Sizoo, D. D., of New York City, and under unanimous consent granted, I am glad to include same in my remarks, which follows:

Mr. Hoover, distinguished guests, members of the graduating class, ladies and gentlemen, I am not unmindful of the very great honor of having a part in this closing impressive ceremony and for that honor I wish first to express my sincere gratitude. A man's value to society is determined not by what he begins, but by what he ends. Anybody can begin a thing, but to bring it to a successful conclusion gives you the earmarks of a great spirit before God and man. What you began you have ended and with your friends I pause to express gratitude.

Emerson once said that any movement is always the lengthened shadow of someone's life, and I cannot help but feel again this morning that we have here a dramatic and spectacular demonstration of something that has come to pass through the genius and through the inspiration and through the imagination of one who is the director of this enterprise, Mr. Hoover. And with you I pause to express also my gratitude. Now no one can take his place in the work of the world unless he understands that world. To serve your generation you must know your generation. A physician cannot heal or cure unless he has made an accurate diagnosis. No man can help build a better tomorrow until he knows what is wrong with yesterday. Because your work and mine have so much in common I want to think a little while of some of the characteristics of the world in which we work and then to point some attitudes of life which must guide us.

Obviously there is this to be said about the world into which you are going: We are living in a world which is talking a moral tail spin. You don't have to live long or read much or travel far to discover that the tides are running out upon ethical values. There are well-meaning but misguided people who live in our country with a pleasing illusion, and because this illusion is pleasing it is so deadly and fatal. It is this, that the enthusiasm for unselfishness and high idealism generated by the war will be permanent.

Many have made themselves believe that the lofty standards of devotion to country, disciplined living, and restraint of common life in time of war will run over into the time of peace. Well, history holds no such warrant. After the Napoleonic era, with the signing of the Peace Treaty of Vienna in 1815, there followed a period of exploitation, of class consciousness, of undisciplined nationalism that ended in chaos. At the close of the Civil War, which in the North was fought that union might be obtained, there followed a period of dark political corruption striking an all-time low in the Tweed Ring. After the First World War, fought to make democracy safe for the world, there came this period of freedom. Let yourself go. Obey that impulse without asking yourself if you are worthy of expressing, bringing social irresponsibility, untutored nationalism and undisciplined restraint in conduct. High moral effort is always followed by moral lassitude. That is the kind of a world in which we live. And you have to take it into consideration in all the enterprises to which you are committed. I don't have to stand here and tell you about that, for it is perfectly obvious. Vulgar indecencies, the inordinate display of wealth, flagrant violations of decency, juvenile delinquency, sordidness of thought, dreadful deterioration on the stage and on the screen—how real it is, this thing we call modern moral lassitude. But I am not thinking of that, for this kind of moral tail spin of which I am thinking goes deeper than that, because it becomes something that goes to the root of our national life in its moral instability.

Going up and down the country, and I do it a great deal, going up and down the country, I find that thoughtful people are not asking "is the Nation turning to the right of center or to the left of center?" but they are asking if there is a center. People are wondering if there is some standard of ethical idealism. Is there some north star of morality by which we shall sail the ship of state? Is there, in the last analysis, some great form of moral conviction by which we live? For we now know that we have got to stop fooling with the Ten Commandments and the arithmetic table; moral instability; letting "I will" wait upon "I would"; following the line of least resistance; constant vacillating; sending up a trial balloon to find out which way the wind is going before a conviction is expressed; gyrating from one side of the street to the other; living with expediency; obeying the impulse of pressure groups; accommodating ourselves to this point or to that point without first asking, "Is it right or is it truth?" That is the peril which you will have to deal with in all the problems in the world of tomorrow. And it is on that basis that contemporary communism becomes such a tragic force. For at least my indictment of communism is not its social attitude or its political construction or its economic structure, but rather this, that it is so utterly unprincipled in advancing its call. It gains its converts so unscrupulously. There is no sense of moral conviction behind its progress. It advances by creating confusion and by creating fires of chaos and misunderstanding. It is so utterly unethical and immoral in its advance. And you have to deal with it, so I say we are living in a world which is taking a moral tail spin and you can never play your part unless somehow you begin with that fact.

Now there is a second characteristic in the world of today which you and I, in our separate spheres of activity, must deal with. It is this. We are living in a world with a new kind of frontier. There was a time when the frontiers of nations were determined by geography. The boundaries between peoples and races were largely natural barriers. People separated themselves from one another by these ordinary frontiers, a ridge of hills, a tall range of mountains, a wide river, swamp areas, thick forests, and as long as these stood nobody from without could come in. Nobody from within could go out and they thought themselves secure. But modern science has shrunken this earth and these frontiers are no longer tenable. There are not two points in the world which are more than 50 or at the most 60 flying hours apart. Why you can go around the whole thing in 150 hours. Barriers are meaningless. Frontiers are imaginary lines. Walls have become windows. The old frontier is gone, but in the place of it races and nations are building a new kind of frontier, and this frontier is invisible. It isn't something you can put your hands upon. It is much more impenetrable. It is much more difficult to hurdle. It sinks so deep long before you dream it exists, for

the new frontiers are in the frontiers of the mind and of the heart. They are the frontiers of suspicion and fear and hate and greed and power, and we can never have a better world until these new frontiers are penetrated, and you can never take your place in modern society until you deal with these new frontiers which are coming in the world of today. Well, at any rate, there you have something of a diagnosis, a world in a moral tail spin and a world with new frontiers. Now the question arises, How can we play our part in that kind of a world? I would like to suggest at the very beginning that to live in a world like that we shall have to walk with caution. By the mercy of God and the gallantry of men, our enemies have been utterly conquered and subdued. But their evil dies hard in the world. It may coo like a dove. It is still a serpent at heart. It may wear sheep's clothing, but it is still a wolf inside. We have invaded their land. We have not yet invaded their conscience. We have destroyed their power to make war but we have not yet destroyed their will to make war. And in this other conflict we shall have to use other weapons than the weapons we used to invade their land or destroy their power, and I have been asking myself the question whether we have these weapons of the mind and of the heart, we shall have to walk with caution. What is true in the world outside is true in the world within.

One of the most magnificent and inspiring sights of modern American history was the sense of unity which held us together. We buried our differences. We put aside the areas of disagreement and we held together to a common task. But the peril of it is, and I have seen it up and down this country, that the honeymoon is over. And it may be that we are beginning to tumble apart into broken and brittle groups, each seeking some advantage at the expense of the other. Why there are men who are beginning to think that if we only hate enough we will build a better country and bring in prosperity. I say to you men, if you are going to minister to a world in a moral slump and with new frontiers, we shall have to walk with caution.

Now there is a second one. If it is true that we shall have to walk with caution, it is also true that we shall have to live with courage. Believe me, yesterday will never come back. Yesterday is dead. Yesterday ought to die. It was not good enough. Mankind deserved something better. Man was entitled to something different. I haven't lost my faith because so much of yesterday has been shattered. If the things that are wrong did not tumble apart every now and again then I would lose my faith and life would be insanity. Live with courage, because there are coming into being new attitudes, new attitudes to life; a new sense of value to living; new concepts of wealth and of race and of government and of stewardship. Live with courage. There is coming something in the world to which you men may appeal. We have got our chance. It may be our last chance to build a world without hate, without disease, without panic; a world in which childhood shall not be forgotten, womanhood not neglected, and old age not abandoned; a world in which man shall come before the machine and personality before profits; in which man's inhumanity to man shall be supplanted by the higher law that we are our brother's keeper. Live with courage. The age into which you are going needs men and women with imagination, with courage, with adventure, who can live creatively. Never forget, it is better to light a candle than to curse the darkness. The kind of a world into which we are going to live was the kind of a world of which Wordsworth wrote of the French Revolution. "Bliss was it in that hour to be alive and to be young was very heavy." Walk with caution. Live with courage, but that isn't enough. You may be cautious. You may have imagination and you may still make a wreck of the universe. Our enemies were cautious. They were resourceful. They were adventurous. They had imagination, but look what they did to the world, and look what has happened to them. There must come another attitude in the minds of those who would serve this kind of a generation.

During the war I went up and down the Army camps and naval bases for a long time in many places. One day I found myself in a camp. Early one morning at dawn three regiments were to march out into an open field a few miles away and there sit down in the morning dew on the long grass to listen to a lecture from an officer overseas on how to advance one's position. I marched out with them. There we sat at dawn on the wet grass and the colonel was describing how men should advance. He would first describe the wrong way and then demonstrate it. Then he would describe the right way and he would demonstrate it with seasoned troops. So in the course of his lecture he was talking about how to take a certain objective out yonder on the edge of another hill. And then he described how it should be done correctly and we saw a group of seasoned soldiers creeping through the grass hugging the soil, keeping close to the earth. You could hardly see them move on their hands and knees, and as they advanced the colonel said, "when you advance on your knees you are always safe." Men and women, that sentence should be written on the door post of every school and on the lintels of every home. When you advance on your knees you will be safe.

Five months before Pearl Harbor the first of my two boys who are in the service was spending the last evening with me. We were talking together, and at the end of a long conversation he said to me, "Where did your generation break down that all this had to happen?" Oh, I think we know the answer. I could give him the argument of political chicanery. I knew something about the economic maladjustment of the world, and I was familiar with the social injustices up and down this universe. I knew something about political chicanery and diplomatic double talk. I knew something about crackpot ideologies, and it was all a part of it, but it wasn't the truth, because the world became what it was not because it did not have enough or did not know enough, but because it was not good enough. We have seemingly forgotten that the basis of a nation's greatness is not in its political technique or in its social structure, but in the character of its men and women and a new day for the Nation can never come in the last analysis except through the reconversion of the human spirit. The same God who gave us eyes to see and ears to hear and lips to speak gave us knees to bend. It is still true that the Nation alone is great whose God is the Lord. So you and I are each of us now going back to the task committed to us, in a world with a moral slump, in a world with dangerous frontiers, and we shall walk with caution. We shall live with courage, and we shall advance on our knees.

Once a week I go to Halloran Hospital to see some of the men there who have been pretty badly shot up. A few weeks ago I was there, and I was visiting with a roomful of men, and we were talking about things that we are talking about now; about a braver tomorrow, and a better country, and a finer concept of national oneness and integrity. And after we had talked about it a little while a chap over yonder in the corner with one arm shot off, the other arm in a sling, paralyzed from the hips down, craned his neck, and lifted it from the pillow and said to me, "Padre, do you think anything will come of it?" Well, will it?

Inflationary Pressures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a talk delivered on September 22, 1945, to the New England Newspaper Advertising Executive Association by the Honorable Zenas L. Potter, special assistant to the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration:

For the past week I have been trying to determine what I might say to you today that would have the most significance. The conclusion was inevitable—the message is that inflationary pressures do not end when war ends.

We know that this is true if we let our minds go back to 1919 and 1920. To me that does not take great effort, for as Assistant Director of the Central Bureau of Planning and Statistics of World War I, in charge of preparing weekly reports on the progress of all war activities for Woodrow Wilson and Bernard Baruch, I was in the midst of the economics of the First World War.

I remember how we failed then to control prices. Living costs rose 62 percent before the armistice. I remember also how all the businessmen who came to Washington to make the world safe for democracy hurried home when the fighting ended. What few controls were set up during the war were quickly rescinded. The Nation returned to normalcy. Or did it?

For a few months while reconversion was going on prices turned downward. Then they started up again and in 16 months they rose another 56 percent above start-of-the-war prices. Forty-three percent of the total inflation in living costs came after the armistice.

When prices get out of hand as a result of war's inflationary pressures they never stay up. In June 1920 came the collapse. In 13 brief months prices fell 109 percent of start-of-the-war prices and the Nation paid heavily for its failure to control prices. The normalcy it returned to did not turn out to be happy normalcy. It brought tragedy for millions of our people.

Corporation profits of $6,400,000,000 in 1919 turned to losses of $55,000,000 in 1921, and in the next 5 years 106,000 businesses failed. (By way of contrast I would like to call attention to the fact that in 1944 only 1,222 businesses failed.)

Labor, too, took punishment. Factory employment fell 31 percent. Factory pay rolls shrank 44 percent. Just when sustained business activity was needed to give employment to demobilized soldiers, millions of workers lost their jobs.

Farmers, however, were hit hardest of all. Farm prices went all to pieces. Average farm income dropped from $1,360 to $460. I want to repeat those figures: From $1,360 to $460; and in the next 5 years 453,000 farmers lost their farms through mortgage foreclosures; not only their homes but their jobs gone out of the window.

Stop if you will and imagine the sleepless nights of worry spent by owners of those 106,000 businesses that failed; by millions of workers who lost their jobs, and by the 453,000 farmers who lost their farms through mortgage foreclosure. They were defenseless against forces over which they had not

the slightest control. These were not, however, forces over which the Government had no control. The millions of Americans who lost their homes or jobs might have been guarded from their troubles had the men who then filled the Nation's legislative halls had the foresight of our present Congress.

If there is any lesson to be learned from that experience, it is this: We do not necessarily get back to normalcy when we decide to do so. In fact, we are pretty sure not to get back to normalcy if we turn the laws of supply and demand loose in the face of powerful inflationary pressures built up during a war.

Living costs in World War I inflation rose 108 percent in 71 months, which was exactly the length of the recent war. In World War II in a like period we held living costs to a gain of only 31 percent, against far more powerful inflationary pressures.

How much more powerful will be clear from these simple facts:

The last war cost a total of $32,000,000,000. The recent war cost three hundred and one billions—almost 10 times as much.

In the last war only 25 percent of all goods produced went off to war. In 1944, 44 percent of our national output was used for war.

In the last war currency in circulation increased less than $2,000,000,000. During the recent war it increased by $19,000,000,000—over nine times as much.

In the last war checking accounts in banks increased less than $5,000,000,000. During the recent war they increased by $45,000,000,000—over nine times as much.

During the last war savings of the public increased by $27,000,000,000. Those savings hanging over the market played a considerable part in the postwar inflation that brought distress to millions of Americans. Well, let me tell you something. During the recent war savings of the public totaled $145,000,000,000. Compare those figures: twenty-seven billions—one hundred and forty-five billions.

One hundred and forty-five billion dollars is equal to 1 year and 8 months of our total national income in our most prosperous prewar year. In other words, if we could consume without producing (which, of course, is impossible) we could live on our wartime savings for a year and 8 months at the highest standard of living ever attained before the war.

Increase in checking accounts in banks during the war totaled $45,000,000,000. No assets save cash is more easily spendable than checking balances in banks. Forty-five billion dollars, by the way, is three billions more than our total national income in our bottom depression year, 1933.

Other facts also have an important bearing upon the situation. Every billion dollars' worth of goods we send abroad for relief is as inflationary as war expenditures. So, too, are the billions we are going to lend liberated countries to provide them with materials and machinery to rebuild their cities and factories. In both these cases we pay industries and workers to produce without any goods becoming available for purchase in our domestic market. Even the millions being spent to reconvert our industries for peacegoods production are as inflationary as war expenditures, for people are paid for work that brings no consumer goods directly into the market.

I got to wondering the other day how our military expenditures for the first year after VJ-day would compare with the total expenditures for World War I. Here are the figures: World War I cost $32,000,000,000. Our military expenditures for the first year after VJ-day will cost $41,000,000,000. Thirty-two billions versus forty-one billions. And some people tell us the thing to do is to throw off all these wartime controls and give supply and demand an opportunity to function.

If you will permit me to say so, this is not a time to get back to normalcy; for the normalcy we will get back to by abolishing controls too soon will be an even more disastrous postwar inflation and collapse than that from which we suffered a generation ago.

The one highly encouraging fact in the present situation is our great productive capacity. We did the impossible during the war and doubled a production that already was the wonder of the world. Of course, a great deal of our increased capacity is in the form of shipyards and munitions plants not usable for the production of civilian goods. Other plants will require a great deal of reconstruction for civilian use. But much of our increased productivity is ready to go to work serving the public.

We have made also extraordinary technological advances during the war that are certain to have marked results on production in the future. In the 3 years following World War I output per factory worker increased a total of 32 percent. We are not unlikely to experience similar advances in the years that follow World War II.

This vast productivity, once it gets well under way, will wipe out one shortage after another. Capacity to produce machine tools and most capital goods expanded greatly during the war. Ceilings on such goods will go, one by one. So will ceilings on luxury goods, when they can be removed without hampering production of essential goods.

Food production increased more than 25 percent during the war. With Army setasides cancelled there are reasons to believe that ceilings on many foods can be suspended and later removed before many months go by. Sometime next spring, too, clothing production should begin to wipe out shortages and permit removal of many soft-goods ceilings.

Most persistent shortages will be those of building materials and of consumer durable goods, such as automobiles and electric washing machines, refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, and radios.

The best estimate is that due to low wartime and depression-year construction and to increases in population during the war, we are short close to 10,000,000 homes. Our cities already are crowded and 1,400,000 GI's, who married just before or during the war, and coming back wishing above all else to settle in homes of their own. We are going to hear a great deal from those GI's before their problem is solved.

OPA's controls over building materials prices and charges on contractors' services are going to be under terrific pressures, now that War Production Board allocation of materials is ended, for it is not possible under present laws to put ceiling prices on homes. The Government guaranteed loans of $2,000, authorized by Congress to help GI's buy homes, will not be very useful to them if the only homes available carry highly inflated prices. In fact, those loans instead of being a blessing are likely to get our GI's into financial difficulties.

We are definitely on our way out of wartime controls. Most rationing will stop by the end of the year. Month by month we shall be out from under additional ceiling prices. Inflationary pressures, however, still are terrific and if controls are removed before production can ease pressure below the hand of control, we may find ourselves in an inflationary spiral that will make that of the last war seem mild in comparison.

Alarming inflationary tendencies are evident on all sides. Uncontrolled city residential property prices have increased 50 percent or more. Uncontrolled farm land prices have risen 55 percent. Uncontrolled commercial rents have soared dangerously in many areas. And the stock market is showing signs of the kind of inflation that sent the Nation into a tailspin in the late 1920's. When taxi men begin to talk about the stocks in which they are taking flyers it is time for stockmarket leaders and Government officials to see what can be done to check inflationary advances.

Some people predicted that the laying off of many workers during the reconversion period and the ending of overtime bonuses would cause a sharp drop in retail sales that would bring supply and demand into balance and render needless continuation of price controls. There was a sharp decline on VE-day. It lasted 1 month. The second month retail sales returned to the 1944 levels. Then for four successive months they rose 12, 10, 6, and 7 percent above last year's levels, this although last year's sales were 182 percent above prewar levels. Evidently the vast public savings are going to prevent for some time at least the sharp decline in sales volume which some people predicted.

As director of OPA's congressional relations, I am glad to be able to tell you that in my belief Congress is pleased with the results of its policy of controlling prices in the face of war's inflationary pressures. I am very certain, too, that when Congress faces the issue next spring it will continue price control on products still under inflationary pressures. However, those in Congress who never have believed in price control are becoming increasingly vociferous, spurred on by the demands of small-minded businessmen from every section of the country who think they want a return to normalcy.

We are very likely, when the President's War Powers Act expires in December, to face an attempt to tack riders onto the renewal bill, which will seek to weaken OPA's authority to control prices. The move will be fought strongly by farm interests. It will be opposed by labor, a little weakly, for labor is absorbed these days in its fight to hold to its wartime earnings, with overtime wor ended. It will be opposed, too, by consumer groups. And it will be opposed—too silently, I fear—by businessmen who remember the lessons of 1919 and 1920. I am quite certain the attempt will be defeated; but Congress and the country will know that we have been in a fight.

Efforts to kill OPA are taking the form of charges that we are retarding reconversion and hampering full production and employment. The fight centers around reconversion industries.

The fact is that lack of recent production costs for reconversion goods, which made it impossible to gage need for price increases by the standards applied to other goods, has forced OPA to set up formulas which base prices of reconversion goods on their 1941 prices. To these are added increases in material costs, increases in basic wage rates and average 1936–39 profits.

Reconversion industries have told the War Production Board they expect to exceed average monthly 1939 production by 53 percent in December this year, and by 138 percent by June next year. With such pricing standards and anticipated volume it is difficult to see how reconversion industries can escape having a very profitable year in 1946.

Most persistent complaints are those of wholesale and retail distributors of reconversion goods who object to OPA's requirement that they absorb increases in manufacturers' prices. What they fail to mention is that OPA does not require cost absorption if doing so will reduce a trade's over-all profits below its average 1936-39 earnings or will reduce its realized margin below those it realized in the prewar period. We do not seek to protect theoretical margins distributors were supposed to get under manufacturer's list prices, but which they actually never realized.

The fact is that there is a vast accumulation of demand for automobiles, electrical household appliances, and other consumer durable goods which have been out of pro-

duction during the war. Had 1941 output been continued through the war period, we should have produced:

To Oct. 1, 1945:	
Passenger automobiles	13,725,000
Refrigerators	13,125,000
Sewing machines	1,500,000
Washing machines	7,552,000
Vacuum cleaners	7,939,000
Electric irons	20,944,000
Electric toasters	9,904,000
Radios	51,375,000
Clocks and watches	102,975,000
Pianos	416,000
Furnaces and heaters	13,000,000
Stoves and ranges	17,512,000

These figures, of course, exaggerate the backlog of demand accumulated during the war, but they suggest how great is that backlog.

Along with this enormous accumulated need we have greatly increased productive capacity and we have the greatest consumer purchasing power in the history of the Nation.

If wholesalers and retailers of reconversion goods get the margins they actually realized in the prewar period and enjoy a greatly increased volume of sales, it is difficult to picture them in hardship in 1946 under OPA policies. There is every reason to believe they will enjoy one of their most profitable years.

From having been business manager of a metropolitan newspaper, I know that newspapermen are interested in advertising volume. It may reassure you to know that our formula for reconverting manufuacturers and for wholesale and retail distributors of reconversion goods will permit them to spend as much per unit for advertising as they spent in the prewar period. If the prediction of manufacturers that the output of such goods by next June will exceed by 138 percent average monthly production for 1939, it seems likely that advertising of such goods will be on a very satisfactory basis in 1946.

I trust that the newspapers, the public, and Congress will not be impressed by the present campaign of misrepresentation of OPA's policies, but will back an orderly lifting of price controls, as production takes the pressures off ceilings. I can assure you that if removal is left to Chester Bowles, controls will end as soon as it can be done safely. If, however, controls are removed too soon, or if other parts of the stabilization program are not skillfully managed, we may find ourselves in a disastrous experience. Never in the history of the Nation were such terrific inflationary pressures loose in the land. This time let's have a normalcy that leadsd to long-time prosperity, not to boom and bust. The choice is ours to make * * * in the next 8 months.

Contract Renegotiations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, No. 1 of the list of guiding principles advocated by Secretary of the Treasury Vinson in his able presentation to the Ways and Means Committee October 1 of the national tax structure declared:

Taxes should be levied in such a way that they have the least harmful effect on the expansion of business investment and the creation of jobs, because productive employment is the source of our standard of living, of all income, and of the revenue which the Government collects from taxes.

That is sound advice and this Congress has in the main accepted and approved it. The Secretary made bold to declare that the war had demonstrated that an annual gross national product of $200,000,000,000 at present prices is within our reach and that the only real solution of our tax problems and our debt problems is a high level of production, employment, and national income.

Speaking of deflationary factors, the Secretary said:

Such deflationary dangers as we face are the byproducts * * * of a titanic physical change-over from war production to peace production.

In other words, we should have adequate demand if we were able to mobilize our physical resources quickly enough to satisfy it. Therefore, one of the primary objectives of our fiscal policy must be to encourage the boldest, the quickest and most venturesome expansion of peacetime enterprise by business investors.

Discussing the excess-profits tax in its relation to the then pending tax amendments, Secretary Vinson said:

A serious defect of the excess-profits tax for the postwar period lies in the weakness of the average earnings credit, which uses prewar profits as a measure of normal profits. A corporation may continue to earn free of excess-profits tax 95 percent as much as it averaged during the years 1936–1939, and this amount is often enlarged by various relief provisions. A corporation with a high prewar earnings experience may thus earn 20 percent, 30 percent or more on its invested capital without paying any excess-profits tax. New and rising corporations do not have the benefit of such a credit and are thus at a competitive disadvantage in relation to established long-prosperous corporations.

Mr. Speaker, what I have quoted Secretary Vinson as saying with respect to taxes could with but slight change be appropriately applied to inequitable treatment by certain Federal Government agencies of "new and rising" and let me add, relatively small corporations, which are at a competitive disadvantage in relation to their colossally financed and rapaciously inclined rivals.

Into just how many fields of contract settlements our Government gun bearers and game beaters have ventured I am not at this moment prepared to state; but one field, that of contract renegotiation, is being pretty well shot over, to judge from reports which have been reaching our committee for some time, and, if these reports are correct, the game laws are being applied in such manner that the little fellow is shot before he is flushed.

The attention of our committee has recently been called to what is said to be a typical instance, one of many, of the favoritism of the big over the little companies. In this case the panel of the Renegotiation Board allowed big company X a profit on its fixed-price renegotiable volume far higher than on its nonrenegotiable volume; while little company Y has been offered on its renegotiable volume a ruinous percentage reduction below its nonrenegotiable business. The profit on fixed-price Government contracts of company Y at the same percentage rate as its nonrenegotiable business, whereas company X's profit on renegotiable business was materially in excess of its profit on nonrenegotiable business. Because of its small capital resources and the inequitable treatment accorded it by the Renegotiation Board, company Y will have considerable difficulty reconverting and thereby providing jobs, profits, and taxes resulting from the manufacture of its highly popular products. Company X, on the other hand, because of its size, command of unlimited resources, and comparatively liberal treatment at the hands of the Renegotiation Board, reconverts with ease and dispatch.

Company Y made enormous contribution to the victory of our armed forces. Its products in peace and war have enjoyed the highest reputation. The contributions of company X to the war effort were enormous and its products are of high type, but perhaps its ethics need examination.

It is with that thought in mind that I have taken the floor to speak for the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman, and to say that it seems to me to be only fair that notice be taken of these complaints and that a special committee of the Committee on Military Affairs make a study of, and a report to, this body thereon.

Such an investigation need not be confined to the complaining contractors themselves; all those who honestly feel that they have by Federal agencies been subjected to injustices and inequities growing out of their contractual relations with the United States Government under renegotiation procedure would be invited to notify the committee of their desire to appear before it and be heard.

Let me repeat, Mr. Speaker, small companies can be subjected to as much frustration and injury by governmental imposition of pound-of-flesh and inequitable settlements as they can by onerous and unavoidable taxes—perhaps more so, for in the latter they know what is required and can plan accordingly, while in the former their pathway is cluttered with obstacles which may become insuperable.

One wonders, as these complaints troop in, if it may not be the purpose of some clique combining wealth and influence with authority to take advantage of these contracts presently being renegotiated to help bring about a slaughter of the innocent little plants and the further strengthening of their muscle-bound adversaries.

If this be true, I do not believe this Congress will be a complaisant witness. The brains, bone, and sinew of this Republic are made up in chief part of the little businessmen and the small industries, and this Congress is going to see to it that they get a fair deal.

War Ban Is Urgent, 515 Scientists Say

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include the following article by William M. Blair, from the New York Times of October 31, 1945:

WAR BAN IS URGENT, 515 SCIENTISTS SAY—UNPRECEDENTED WORLD PATTERN FOR AMITY ONLY DEFENSE FOR ATOM BOMB, RADAR MEN HOLD

(By William M. Blair)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., October 30.—Five hundred and fifteen scientists, asserting that no effective defense was possible in atomic warfare, called today for international cooperation of an unprecedented kind to assure survival of the human race.

In a statement urging that the development and production of atomic energy be brought under effective international control, the physicists, chemists, and engineers who have been engaged in war research at Harvard and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology declared:

"If the people of the world are to survive, it is necessary for the United States Government, as first producer of the atomic bomb, to initiate immediately steps to achieve effective world cooperation for the prevention of war."

They asserted that traditional methods of international policy had been unable to prevent war and contended that to perfect new methods of international cooperation "national sovereignty in its traditional form will have to be sacrificed."

The scientists made no attempt to outline a plan for the international control of atomic energy or for a world organization, although spokesmen admitted that the crisis that they believed the world faced had forced them into the field of political action.

VIEWS OF RADAR EXPERTS

The statement was modeled on previous declarations of other groups of scientists, notably those at Los Alamos, N. Mex., and others who perfected the atomic bomb. The chief difference, however, was that the statement was prepared by experts in radar, the present major defense mechanism against attack.

These experts declared flatly that the physical principles involved in the atomic bomb made it clear that "a complete defense is absolutely impossible."

Spokesmen explained that the experts' purpose was to "alert the American people and the Government to the terrible consequences of an armament race with atomic weapons."

The statement was adopted in final form by a vote of 175 to 1 at a meeting here October 23. The lone dissenter was not identified. During the last week several hundred endorsements were received from scientists who could not attend the meeting.

Attached to the statement were two memoranda on defense against atomic explosives and how an atomic bomb might be delivered.

DEFENSE QUESTION ANSWERED

Dr. I. A. Getting, a division head of the M. I. T. radiation laboratory, who worked on nuclear physics at Harvard before the war and is regarded as an outstanding radar fire-control expert, answered the question whether there was a possible defense against missiles carrying atomic explosives. He declared:

"The answer is 'the possibility of making an adequate defense against atomic missiles is so vanishingly small as to be zero from any practical viewpoint.'"

Dr. Louis N. Ridenour, professor of physics at the University of Pennsylvania, an expert on guided missiles, said in discussing the methods of atomic bomb attack:

"Of two principal classes of means for using the atomic bomb, the first, and overwhelmingly the most important, is the infernal machine, or mine, which has been located in operating position during peacetime."

"The tremendous importance given the infernal machine by the development of atomic explosives has scarcely been appreciated in public statements so far made on atomic warfare and the Military and Navy Establishments needed to take part in it," he added.

Other conclusions in the scientists' formal statement were that other nations would be able to produce atomic bombs; that safety would not be obtained by superiority in atomic armament; and that henceforth war would mean the destruction of a large part of civilization.

Among the signers of the statement were:

Dr. Lee A. Du Bridge, dean of the graduate school and head of the physics department of the University of Rochester, and director of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology radiation laboratory.

Prof. P. W. Bridgman, Harvard physics department.

Prof. W. H. Furry, Harvard.

Dr. S. A. Goudsmit, professor of physics, University of Michigan.

Prof. H. L. Chazen, head of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology electrical engineering department.

Pro. E. C. Kemble, former head of the Harvard physics department.

Prof. M. Stanley Livingston, Massachusetts Institute of Technology physics department.

Prof. F. W. Loomis, University of Illinois physics department and associate professor of the radiation laboratory.

Dr. J. C. Street, Harvard physics department

F. E. Termain, director of the radio research laboratory, Harvard, and head of the electric engineering department, Stanford.

Prof. L. A. Turner, physics department, Princeton University.

Prof. G. E. Ulenbeck, physics department, University of Michigan.

Prof. J. H. Van Vleck, Harvard physics department.

Prof. A. T. Waterman, Yale physics department.

Relief and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial in the Washington Post for November 3, 1945, is especially appropriate in view of the action of the House in amending the bill for the UNRRA appropriation. I am wondering if the time will ever come when the opposition party will be able to stop playing politics with hunger and human misery.

RELIEF AND POLITICS

The Brown amendment which the House on Thursday tacked onto the UNRRA appropriation is at once a mischievous irrelevancy and an administrative absurdity. It pretends to assure freedom to American newspapermen in countries where UNRRA operates. Press freedom is, of course, a laudable goal. And espousal of it, like espousal of the sanctity of American motherhood, seems an easy avenue to political glorification. It has nothing to do, however, with the filling of bellies which crave not news but food. We do not believe that the House Republicans were prudent, or even politic, in making a party issue of this specious amendment. They have laid themselves open to the ugly charge of playing politics with relief.

The Brown amendment has to be read to be believed. It provides that none of the funds appropriated "shall be furnished to or used in any country of which the controlling government * * * maintains any barrier—technical, political, legal, or economic—to obtaining, dispatching, and disseminating the news." Such barriers, wherever they exist, are lamentable. But the fact is that they do exist and are certain to be continued to some extent in a number of the countries which have undergone recent political upheavals. The people who live in those countries may be no less hungry, however, than the people in countries adhering more closely to our own concepts of press freedom.

In point of fact, every country maintains some barriers to obtaining news. Newspapermen were excluded, for example, from the executive session of the House Appropriations Committee which acted on the UNRRA request for funds. A liberal interpretation of the Brown amendment would mean, therefore, that not even the United States would be eligible for UNRRA aid. General Eisenhower necessarily maintains certain barriers to dispatching news from Germany; the Brown amendment would make it impossible, therefore, for UNRRA to give assistance to the displaced persons now inside the Reich. The Russians—at whom the Brown amendment is patently aimed—are not going to be forced into an abandonment of their deplorable censorship by this sort of blackmail; all that we can get out of such tactics is a further deterioration of our relations with them.

The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee reported just a few days ago that "the $550,000,000 remaining to complete the current contribution of the United States toward UNRRA's operating expenses should be made available immediately. This is a national obligation. It is unthinkable that the United States should now default on the commitments it has made to UNRRA and which UNRRA in turn has made, in reliance upon us, to the people of the liberated countries of Europe." We cannot now impose a special condition upon our contribution to UNRRA without just such and unthinkable default on our commitments. The Brown amendment imposes a condition which is, in any case, impossible of fulfillment and which, if enforced, will condemn millions to hunger. UNRRA was established not for the purpose of opening foreign doors to American newspapermen but for the simple, humanitarian purpose of getting food to starving human beings. We hope the Senate will have a better sense of values.

Harbors of Refuge—Knife River, Lutsen, Beaver Bay, and Other Great Lakes Harbors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, early this session, Congress passed Public Law No. 14, Seventy-ninth Congress, which was approved on March 2, 1945. This law authorizes the War Department engineers to carry on an extensive program for the improvement of various rivers and harbors throughout the United States. Included in the list of projects are numerous harbors on the Great Lakes, including Lake Superior. In my district we find the harbors at Knife River, Lutsen, and Beaver Bay, Minn.

These harbors are what is known as harbors of refuge, and are being established by the War Department engineers on the Great Lakes as a part of the recreational and summer resort development of the lake areas. At the present time small pleasure craft and yachts have very few, if any, available harbors along the north shore of Lake Superior—and this is true in other localities in other States—and the people who want to find a vacation spot during July and August either go elsewhere or are deprived of the advantages which come from the use of pleasure craft at vacation and summer resort centers.

Public Law No. 14 contains a section which provides that money for these projects shall not be appropriated for their construction until 6 months after the termination of World War II. No official termination of World War II has been made either by the President or by Congress. Such termination of the war ought to be made, in my opinion, but unless and until it is made there is no authority for the Appropriations Committee to appropriate money needed by the War Department engineers in the construction of these projects.

Accordingly, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 267 to amend Public Law No. 14 by striking out that section which postpones appropriations for these projects until 6 months after the termination of World War II. This has been referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and we are hopeful of early action. Numerous Members of Congress are interested in this bill to eliminate the 6 months' delay.

POSTWAR EMPLOYMENT

We ought to proceed as quickly as possible to change the law so that appropriations can be made for all of these rivers and harbors projects. Our returning soldiers and sailors, and also war workers who are out of employment, will be looking for jobs made possible by this legislation. In connection with the public roads program, it should be noted that legislation similar to House Joint Resolution 267 has already been passed. This will enable the State highway departments in the different States to proceed with highway construction work and thereby furnish jobs for the unemployed.

HARBORS PROPOSED ON NORTH SHORE OF LAKE SUPERIOR

The plans of the War Department engineers call for development of harbors of refuge at Knife River, Beaver Bay, and Lutsen, Minn. These harbors are provided for in Public Law No. 14. It should be noted that in addition to these proposed harbors, surveys are being made at other points on Lake Superior, namely, Tofte, and Grand Portage, and when those surveys are completed reports will be made to Congress by the War Department engineers. We are also requesting further improvement of the harbor at Grand Marais, Minn., and in due time report by the Army engineers will be made on that project.

The policy of the War Department engineers is to require the States that are interested in improvements of this character above described to make contributions for that purpose. In other words the customary procedure is to have the proper State authorities contribute State funds to match Federal funds appropriated by Congress.

MINNESOTA TOURISTS AND VACATIONIST ARE ALL INTERESTED

This proposed improvement of the north shore of Lake Superior is of vital concern to every citizen of Minnesota who wants first-class advantages when he gets ready to take his vacation. When these harbors are constructed, in addition to other advantages possessed by northern Minnesota, and not found elsewhere, the best boating, yachting, fishing, and water sport facilities will be available. Not only Minnesota people but people from adjoining States will want to take advantage of these new opportunities. At the present time I am advised that one of our postwar developments will be the development of small craft, yachts, and so forth for recreational purposes, wherever harbors of refuge are located. The Army engineers are to be congratulated upon recommending these various projects. They will add to the great natural advantages of the State of Minnesota, which already attracts tourists and vacationists from far and near during the summer season. Those with asthma find our northern climate a sure relief. Those who want to escape the discomforts of summer heat and who want to get away from home for a rest in a climate where the nights are always cool, where you sleep under a blanket—these people invariably come to northern Minnesota and find every hope fulfilled and, they return year after year to this garden spot where every diversity of nature can be found. This section of the country is known as the wilderness area. It is dotted with many small lakes and most of it is untouched by the hand of civilization. Bears roam without fear of being molested, and the deer and the moose are plentiful. Not only on Lake Superior, but in our other northern Minnesota lakes as well, you will find the best crop of fish available in this sportsmen's paradise of northern Minnesota.

I could go at some length into a recital of the wonderful possibilities of northern Minnesota, but it seems to me that the sentiment I want to express is put in very beautiful and effective language by Mr. Howard Everett, who paid tribute to Minnesota in language which has never been excelled. Mr. Everett says:

MINNESOTA

God made Minnesota the Garden of Eden of America and placed it in the wonderland of the North. He gave it fertile soil that man might subsist with ease; then blessed it with 10,000 lakes and surrounded these with trees. He called it the home of laughing waters and proclaimed the Mississippi the father of sparkling streams. He sweetened its balmy air with the music of song birds and honey bees, and pronounced it the playground of wildwood and graced it with the innocence of wild life. He taught the sunshine to romp with the shadow through the forests and the fragrances of its flowers and fields of clover to mingle with the perfume of its pines. He filled its lakes with fish, its forests with game, its plains with fowl, and unto these He gave the romance of the red man. He made it grow fruits, vegetation, corn, and field of waving grain. Over it He placed a carpet of luxurious grasses and underneath He planted a store of untold mineral wealth. He took the scenic beauties of Switzerland and a Colorado and combined them with the fertile soil of an Iowa, and the fascinating climate of a California. To these He added all things else which contribute to the health, happiness, and comfort of life, and when He had finished, He called it Minnesota.

Montana Future Farmers of America Plans Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, last week end I spent a very pleasant hour with Mr. A. W. Johnson, of Bozeman, Mont., State adviser to the Montana State Association of Future Farmers of America. The young folks who comprise the membership of this organization are to be highly complimented on the fine work they have been doing on rural problems and their leadership and initiative is to be commended. These are serious young people doing serious work in serious times. We of Montana are proud of them and we know that the very necessary work they are undertaking will help to give our State and our country a sound farm foundation. Mr. Johnson represents the fine type of adviser that this organization has, and the membership represents not only the future farmers of America but the future citizens of our country as well.

Mr. Speaker, Montana was honored by having the picture of the officers of the Montana State Association and their adviser, featured on the cover of the magazine, The American Farm Youth, in its September 1945 issue. The names of the officers and their residences are as follows:

President: Oscar Donisthorpe, Lewistown.

First vice president: Bill Byrne, Kalispell.

Second vice president: John Malinak, Hot Springs.

Secretary: Joe Lee, Belgrade.

Treasurer: Malcolm Swan, Fromberg.

Reporter: Burris Blackwood, Bozeman.

Executive board: John Stewart, Miles City; Gene Combs, Laurel; Herb Fisser, Sidney.

State adviser: A. W. Johnson, Bozeman.

Under unanimous consent granted to me by the House, I am inserting with my remarks the Montana State Association of Future Farmers of America program for 1945–46. These 1,500 Montana farm boys have laid out a program that fits in with our high ideals of American citizenship, and I know that they will achieve their goals:

MONTANA FFA PLANS PROGRAM

At a recent meeting of the State officers of the Montana State Association of Future Farmers of America it was unanimously approved that the following program items be

stressed and put into operation for the year 1945–46 by Montana Future Farmers, a total of some 1,500 farm boys, so that standards of farming methods and rural leadership and citizenship development will progress to higher levels, states Oscar Donisthorpe, State FFA president, of Lewistown, Mont.

Support the Seventh War Loan drive, the Red Cross, the national clothing drive, and drives for needed scrap iron and steel.

Conduct a farming program, including a victory garden which will help meet war food needs and also aid farm boys to get established in farming.

Each Future Farmer conduct a farmstead improvement and beautification program on the home farm.

That all Future Farmers cooperate and work together for farming improvement and a satisfying way of life.

That all Future Farmers plan a program that will aid all farm boys in becoming straight thinkers and effective speakers.

To conduct a program that will teach farm boys how to earn and save so that thrift and credit will have a continuing value throughout life.

Provide leadership training in human relationships and business conduct.

Devote time and study to scholarship attainments to the end that Future Farmers will be on the alert.

Organize and conduct suitable and adequate recreational programs that will improve individuals mentally and physically.

Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce Endorses Combined Steamship and Air-Line Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of providing adequate air-line services to the American people, it appears wise and in the interest of public necessity and convenience, to permit steamship lines to operate air lines as part of their service and any administrative ruling opposing such joint operation as a first policy, would undoubtedly prove undesirable and opposed to the best interests of public necessity and convenience.

The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, conscious of the beneficial service such joint operation would provide, have adopted a resolution pressing their views which I request be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks:

OPERATION OF AIRPLANES BY STEAMSHIP LINES—RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE LOS ANGELES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

At its meeting held on October 4, 1945, the board of directors of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce took the following action:

"*Resolved*, That since ownership and operation of airplanes in overseas commerce by steamship lines may be found desirable, and since competing foreign steamship lines will probably render such air services, steamship companies should not be precluded by law or general administrative ruling from doing the same; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the management be instructed to present copies of this resolution, together with such supporting material as might be proper, before the President of the United States, the Civil Aeronautics Board, United States Maritime Commission, members of the United States Senate Committee on Commerce and Interstate Commerce, United States House of Representatives Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and all California Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, and that the management be authorized and directed to support such legislation or other action as might be necessary to effect the chamber's position."

COMMENT

The economic future of Los Angeles and other coast cities depends in large part upon the continued growth and development of all forms of overseas transportation, to the end that passengers and goods may be transported economically and in the manner best suited to meet each situation. It is of utmost importance, therefore, that steamship lines which heretofore have constituted the principal means of overseas transportation shall not be precluded either by law or by the ruling of administrative boards from modernizing or otherwise improving through the addition of airplanes the character of services offered by them. Otherwise such carriers would continue to engage in the business of transportation and enlarge and expand their facilities at the possible risk of being forced out of business or into inferior and unsatisfactory competitive positions simply by reasons of technological advances in transportation.

They Also Served

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, on November 2 the Indianapolis News, one of the great newspapers of the country, printed an interesting editorial on a bill I have introduced to provide a memorial for newspaper correspondents who died in World War II.

The editorial referred to reflects, I think, in appropriate and beautiful language, the opinion of newspaper people generally in respect to this proposal for a memorial to the honored dead of our profession who served America so faithfully and so creditably in covering the news of the greatest war in history.

The editorial was as follows:

THEY ALSO SERVED

The proposal of Representative LOUIS LUDLOW that Congress appropriate $50,000 for a memorial to the 38 press correspondents and photographers who lost their lives in the war is entirely fitting and should be approved.

As Representative LUDLOW points out in his resolution, which is now before the House, these men "died like soldiers on the fighting front." They died for the same ideals for which the men of the armed forces fought. By their lives and by their deaths they served those ideals well.

They were not alone in this. Between 600 and 800 correspondents were accredited to the fighting fronts during the war. Most took the same or greater risks as the fighting men; most shared the same hardships; most were gallant above and beyond the call of duty. They left the comforts of their homes to serve the people of the United States. They had a high duty in this Nation founded on free enlightenment, and they were true to their trust. They brought the war back to the firesides of America; they were the link between home and fighting front. They lived in mud and blood, in numbing cold, or suffocating heat; they dared the perils of the deep, the terror from the skies, disease and death by night that the people at home might know how this war was being fought that we might understand why it was being fought.

Alone and unarmed, they walked daily with danger. And those who did not return were among the bravest and brightest of all, for death loves a shining mark. They died remembered by millions for whom they gave their lives; they died deserving the Nation's gratitude. They should have their memorial as enduring as the cause for which they died.

Just More Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press:

JUST MORE GOVERNMENT

Mr. Truman in his wage-and-price address indicates that he would solve the present troubles of labor and industry by these means:

First, higher wages with a minimum of price increases.

Second, since this might be a difficult stab in the dark for many industries, a grant of price increases where cost-of-living's rise since 1941 has not been met, where there is inequity among plants in the same industry or locality or where present wage rates cannot bring out needed manpower in necessary reconversion lines.

Third, in cases where wage increases have not been granted previously by Government, industries will be given a 6-month test period to try out higher wages without price increases, then given price boosts if they can prove they couldn't make a fair profit during the 6 months.

From this summary of the President's address it is difficult not to draw the following conclusions:

"The OPA will be drawn increasingly into decisions affecting private business, rather than less.

"The way is opened for new cost-of-living determinations by the OPA to justify price increases.

"A new flood of price increase applications based on alleged inequities within an industry will descend on the OPA, on the basis of the President's second method of relief above.

"The War Manpower Commission and OPA will be called into action to determine what wage rates will bring out needed manpower—and perhaps a revival or substitute for the WPB, under some such name as the reconversion production board, will be needed to determine just which industries are 'necessary to reconversion' under the President's formula and which are not.

"And since the OPA is to give 'prompt' consideration to all wage increases on the more complex basis of the President's new rules, especially the requirement for going into companies' books to discover what's a fair profit and whether they made it, the

OPA will need a rather large increase of its force.

"Finally, there will be an increasing area of union demand for higher pay on the basis that almost any company could boost prices under one or another of the President's list of justifications, which are seemingly very liberal."

Thus the effect of Mr. Truman's address from the standpoint either of calming labor strife and averting strikes, or of holding the inflation line, is rather dubious. If his loopholes for price increase are widely used and freely granted by Government, the inflationary effect will be about as great as if the OPA had ceased business and we had returned to free markets. If the OPA is extremely strict on prices, the labor strife will not be mended. Politics being what they are, the loopholes are not apt to be plugged very tight by Government. And the OPA is on the way to a rush of applications by management, pushed in its turn by labor.

It is hard to see that the President's solution solves anything. Despite his vigorous assertion that we must "get back to the free operation of our competitive system," all his proposals definitely tend to increase the interferences of Government rather than reduce them. Despite Mr. Truman's concern for companies needing reconversion but unable to find manpower—in many cases because the manpower would rather continue living on present unemployment doles than go back to work—he takes occasion to chide Congress for failing to increase the size and extent of those doles. Despite his concern for little business, the fact is that any major wage increases for big business under one of his formulas must inevitably be reflected all the way down the line in wage demands, and little business has the hardest time both in obtaining price increases and in living competitively under them. Despite the President's warning against a repeat performance of "the dizzy upward spiral of wages and the cost of living ending in the crash of 1929," there will be great perplexity as to how he has contributed to its prevention by the offers made in his speech of Tuesday night.

Its general tone, the fatherly warnings given both labor and management, its good will and cheerfulness in the fact of a very serious national crisis, may be commended. But just now the American public needs a strong and statesmanlike leadership emphasizing the need of abandoning ridiculous demands at the muzzle of a strike shotgun, bargaining sensibly, reviving vigorous production at once as the best possible offset to inflation and also the best guaranty of wages and wealth. The speech instead was temporizing in its tone and palliative rather than sound or curative in its suggested methods. It proposes injecting Government and politics still further into the equation instead of pulling them out. To the extent that this policy hampers the restoring of full production, it is inflationary.

A Grand Rapids small businessman lost no time in wiring the Press after listening to the President. We quote his telegram:

"His speech will hinder not only the small businessman but a superman, and also the large industries. Wages have gone up at least one-third since March 1942, and raw materials have gone up accordingly, yet the very industries, large and small, which produce the necessities so scarce today are not only asked to hold the prices at 1942 levels but also to increase wages further. Small business does not need help from the Government. All it needs is the lifting of Government restrictions so it can adjust its prices according to actual cost of materials and labor. Then you will see real production and competition."

Will there be any great difference between this small business reaction and that of larger industries? We doubt it.

Address of Hon. L. B. Pearson at the Closing Session of the Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from the Food and Agriculture Conference which closed its sessions at Quebec last Thursday. I hope at a later date to make a report to the House on the activities and achievements of this conference.

The chairman of the conference was Mr. L. B. Pearson, Ambassador from Canada to the United States. It was the universal opinion that much of the success of the meeting was due to the wisdom, tact, and leadership shown by Mr. Pearson, not only as a presiding officer but in bringing about harmony and understanding between the conflict of ideas and personalities inevitable in a meeting of this kind.

One of the outstanding features of the conference was the closing statement of Mr. Pearson. It contained so much soundness, good advice, and practical idealism applicable alike to FAO and all other contemplated United Nations organizations that it should be given the widest possible circulation. In order that it may be available to every Member of Congress and others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am extending Mr. Pearson's address in the RECORD at this point:

It is customary on an occasion like this—the last meeting of a conference—for the chairman to wind up the proceedings with a few remarks. Those remarks usually fall into two parts. The first includes his thanks for all the help he has received during his term of office. The second sums up the accomplishments of the conference.

The first part presents no difficulty apart from my inability to express adequately the gratitude I feel to all the members of the conference and the secretariat for their cooperation and assistance to me while I have been chairman. They have made my work easy, and I am very grateful.

The second part, however, is not so easy if one wishes to be entirely honest. I have attended many international meetings and listened to the closing speeches of many chairmen extolling the magnificent and imperishable results that have been achieved. I have seen these results embodied in impressive resolutions, and I have seen too many of these resolutions remain impressive as words only. I am too confirmed an idealist to become cynical over all this, but I am enough of a realist to be careful when I express my own opinion of the value of what we have done in Quebec.

We have made a good beginning in United Nations cooperation in a vital field—food and agriculture. We have also blazed the way for others in the launching of the first permanent United Nations specialized, functional organization. We have laid down principles of administration and operation which will, I think, be helpful guides for United Nations organization in other fields. In this respect, we have established precedents, and I think they have been good ones.

We have worked hard. The fact that in 2 weeks there have been more than 210 meetings of the conference and its committees, to say nothing of the informal groups that have assembled here and there and worked far into the night, is a tribute to our interest in the task given us and our industry in trying to do something about it.

Out of all this industry and interest has come FAO and Sir John Boyd Orr, two very good results. To help them both we have drawn up a blueprint for the work ahead. But blueprints must be converted into buildings, recommendations into realities. That is FAO's job, but FAO is in the last analysis, people and governments. So it remains for us to make this organization a success. I have no doubt of the competence and zeal of the organization itself under its great director general. I have some fear, however, that the governments, because of apathy or ignorance, may not give FAO the support it must have; may not implement its recommendations or accepts its advice. I can only hope that my fears in this respect will be entirely groundless and that, say, 5 years from now, when I take up the long list of recommendations which we have now accepted as a guide for sound action, I will be able to see written after each one, "Action already taken by FAO and its member governments." That, however, will never happen unless FAO gets its message across to the people by every possible method—press, radio, and film. Only if it is made clear to the people what this organization can do will governments give it the backing it must have if it is to succeed.

Our organization is now a going concern. In its first months of life it should, I think, avoid two things: underrashness and undue timidity. If FAO too ambitiously tries to run before it can walk, it will crash. On the other hand if it is too fearful of falling it will never learn to walk at all. In its work, thereore, it must be at the same time careful and enterprising, imaginative, and practical. It must not become a body with both its feet firmly suspended in midair or one with both its feet firmly stuck in the mud.

Important international progress in the field of food and agriculture has, I think, been made in Quebec. There are, however, implications in the work that we have done here that are more far reaching than those arising merely out of the technical subjects on our agenda. We of the United Nations have taken another cooperative step along the road that leads to peace and prosperity. We have marked another advance in the organizing of the United Nations for concrete, specialized purposes. This approach to international progress and understanding—calling together specialists and technicians who know their jobs and giving them specific jobs to do—is, of course, essentially a nonpolitical and nondiplomatic approach to the solution of international problems. But it is the best approach, because it is concerned with the welfare of the individual, not the pride or prejudice of the Nation. It may be that once or twice in our deliberations considerations of international politics and national prestige have raised their embarrassing heads. But this happened on refreshingly few occasions and when it happened we put these complicating and irrelevant issues in their place as quickly as possible.

Specialist, functional conferences are, of course, less exciting than other and more glamorous meetings. We are no Congress of Vienna. True, we have danced once or twice in this hospitable hotel, but we have also marched. There is more construction, thank God, than controversy; more drudgery than drama, about our work. No Hollywood producer of historical romances will ever be able to make much out of the meetings of the committee on statistics or agricultural production. But millions of workers may some

day live better lives because of those meetings. That is an objective more desirable to achieve, I suggest, than the altering of a boundary or the policing of an election. Scientific warfare with its shattering finality has made disputes and intrigues over boundaries and regimes as unreal as the chattering of children over the right to possess sand castles. Nevertheless, in a world where science has blown to unrecognizable dust particles all the old concepts of national rights and national security—although some of the admirals and generals may stubbornly refuse to admit this—human welfare remains, or should remain, as always, the first objective of governmental action. We can be proud, therefore, that welfare, not warfare, has been our concern at this conference and we have, I hope, made our contribution to its promotion.

It will, however, be a negligible contribution unless others are made in more difficult fields. FAO cannot stand alone.

That, among other things, means that the future of FAO is bound up with the present of UNRRA. Our organization is not, and was never meant to be, directly concerned with relief. Our task is long-range reorientation and reconstruction. Nevertheless, I speak with restraint but with a deep conviction made deeper by a visit to Europe this summer—if we do not help Europe and Asia to save themselves from ruin this year, there will be nothing to reconstruct next year.

There is an interdependence to all sound international effort. That is why I, personally, am happy that in every possible way we have emphasized at this conference that the Food and Agriculture Organization is only one of a number of technical organizations that should in some way be linked together and all coordinated for the achievement of peace and progress under the one great United Nations organization. That is why there has run through all our work the conviction that there can be no prosperity without security, freedom from want would indeed hardly be worth achieving, even if it were possible, in a world which did not have freedom from war and fear of wars.

That is the central, vital problem that has been in the mind of every one of us in our work here, no matter how technical or how remote from political considerations that work may seem to have been. There is no escape from that problem; now less than ever, when science has made war total and destruction total.

We at this conference know, and we have shown, what science could do if harnessed to the chariot of construction. Man's fears have, however, harnessed it also to another chariot—that of atomic obliteration. On that chariot race, with science driven by both contestants, all our hopes and fears and agonies and ecstacies are concentrated. If we lose in that contest anything that we have done here or may do elsewhere in London, or Washington, or San Francisco, or Moscow, will have as much consequence as a pebble thrown into the Gulf of St. Lawrence. But if we should acquire some trace of sanity and bring social progress in line with scientific development by subjecting the annihilating forces of science to some sort of social control, which in the last analysis means some sort of international control, then the work we have done at Quebec will have made a worthy and permanent contribution to man's long effort to move upward from the jungle of hatred, suspicion, and death, where so many powerful, selfish, and frightening influences even today are working to keep him mired.

Our conference is now coming to an end, but the work of FAO goes on. It is a hopeful augury for the future that this work was begun in this historic and progressive city, Quebec, where not long ago plans for victory in war were made, and where now plans for victory in peace have been laid. That those plans may be carried forward by FAO with vigor, courage, and imagination is, I know, the heart-felt wish of every member of this first conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, which I hereby declare adjourned.

Oklahoma Veterans' Homestead Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide homesteads in the State of Oklahoma for certain veterans of World War II, and for other purposes.

The Oklahoma Ordnance Works, located on the Grand River between Pryor and Chouteau, in Mayes County, Okla., originally comprised a tract of approximately 18,000 acres, some small portion of which has been disposed of by the Government. My information is that approximately 16,000 acres remain in the tract. On this tract are some 63 or 65 large two-story frame dormitories, most of which were never occupied. There are perhaps 15 or more residences in a group which were occupied by the administration staff of the ordnance works. There are many other buildings on the land, such as the ordnance plant scattered over several hundred acres of the land in separate plant units, administration buildings, and so forth. In addition to these, there is a large pumping plant on the river bank that was used to pump water over the entire plant for plant operations and other purposes. There are many miles of pipe of varying dimensions through which the water was conducted.

This tract of land originally was made up of many hundreds of farms operated by individual owners and tenants. It is in a good argricultural section and the land is adapted to the growing of practically all agricultural crops and fruits grown in that section of the country, and to stock raising of all sorts.

Besides the large area of land with improvements thereon, constituting the Oklahoma ordnance works, plant, and operations, some 3 or 4 miles distant and in the edge of the city of Pryor, there are approximately 350 prefabricated housing units which were constructed for the employees of the Oklahoma ordnance works.

All of this property is owned by the Government and all of it has been or soon will be declared surplus. An intensive study has been made by the United States Army engineers and other agencies of the Federal Government, by chambers of commerce in nearby cities and towns, and by almost innumerable individuals and groups of people, to determine the best use that can be made of this tract of land, the equipment and buildings thereon and the prefabricated houses at Pryor. I have discussed this problem with hundreds of peoples. Apparently industry cannot be attracted and interested. It is essentially a chemical plant and because of the lack of raw materials available, transportation, and ready marketing within close proximity to the plant, all hopes for the commercial operation of these facilities have vanished.

Mr. Speaker, there are many worthy boys in the service, the men of tomorrow, who have been reared or lived considerable portions of their lives within close range of this plant and who have expressed a desire to follow some agricultural, horticultural, or stock-raising pursuit when they are discharged from the armed services. Many of these veterans will not have sufficient funds with which to purchase a desirable tract of land and establish a home for themselves and their families. Naturally they will have only a small amount of cash, and if they are financed under the GI bill of rights for the remainder of the amount necessary to purchase a farm, they will have no funds with which to improve the land, buy livestock, and incur other necessary expenses to begin operations.

It has occurred to me that this land should be subdivided by the Bureau of Reclamation into family-size parcels, varying in acreage according to the adaptability of the soil and conditions of any particular tract, with the idea of having each tract sufficient in quantity to support the average size veteran's family. The Bureau of Reclamation should be authorized to make a study of the soil and its adaptability for the growing of various varieties of crops, fruits, and vegetables and with the use of water from Grand River and through the pumping unit on the land for irrigation purposes. This terrain for the most part lends itself readily to irrigation. It can be made a veterans' paradise.

Hence, I propose that individual tracts of this land should be given to Oklahoma veterans in the order of the filing of their applications therefor, with residences to be moved onto the respective tracts from among the prefabricated houses at Pryor and those that were used by the administrative staff, as far as they will go. Additional housing may be afforded out of lumber salvaged from the dormitory buildings and other buildings on the grounds.

Each veteran will be obligated to pay the Government the sum of $300 per tract in one lump sum or in installments over a period of 5 years, and each applicant, in order to obtain title to the tract selected by him, must actually occupy and live upon such tract for a period of at least 5 years. During this period, the Government will continue to hold title to the property and it will be tax exempt.

This is similar to the old homestead laws and will afford some 700 to 1,000 future Oklahoma farmers, horticulturists, and stock raisers the opportunities that were afforded many of their ancestors in filing upon and homesteading lands in the Middle West. It will tend to encourage these serious young fellows to become established, self-supporting, and to produce the choicest products from the soil for the benefit of mankind. It will encourage a long-felt need of putting back to the farms the best element of our population. Thus, that which made America great will be rekindled in

the lives of these young veterans. Self-reliant and self-sustaining home-owning citizens are never among the malcontents. They are happy because they are independent, and that is always an inspiration to youth. Furthermore, their Government will thus be manifesting in a material, social, and spiritual manner some degree of appreciation for the sacrifices they have already made for their country.

This is a practical plan for doing something worth while for our veterans. It will give them a new vision and a new hope. They will have as their closest neighbors those of their approximate ages who have been reared in that general area and who love their State, their country, and its ideals. They will have much in common. There will be a community of interest and the sphere of their influence will be immeasurable upon those of surrounding sections and neighborhoods, and upon generations yet unborn. It is a means by which the spirit of America may be rekindled and have a new birth. Our economic ideals expressed in the familiar phrase of free enterprise and independence will be revived in the lives and souls of these boys and their families. Social and ethical values of the American type and standard will predominate. Community interest and citizen responsibility will be assumed and made a vital factor. Ideal results can easily be envisioned.

Whatever we do for these veterans will be too little. Let us offer them this wholesome opportunity and we may be assured that they will assume their responsibilities individually and collectively. This may be much cheaper than the bill the taxpayers will have to pay for neglecting to provide such encouragement and inspiration for these boys and their families. From a dollar-and-cents standpoint, no one can complain. It will be appreciated by these young folk and their posterity. It is better to build such units of civilization on proven ground and according to tested methods, than to offer this land, these homes, and this material for sale and sell it for a mere pittance to those who will profit, or profiteer, in the resale of the same to our citizens.

I sincerely trust that the Congress will properly appraise the values inherent within and bound to flow from such a venture, and that we will not overlook this opportunity to give our sons the chance to make the type of useful citizens we want them to become when the war clouds shall all have cleared away.

Shall We Establish Compulsory Military Training?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, a most important decision will face Congress within the next few months: Shall we pass legislation which will establish compulsory military training during peacetime in the United States?

In order to ascertain the views of my constituents, I plan to mail several thousand questionnaires during the next few months. The questions to be answered are as follows:

Public-opinion poll on military training

	Yes	No
1. Do you favor the principle of military training for boys between the ages of 18 and 21 years?		
2. Are you opposed to all forms of compulsory military training in peacetime?		
If you favor military training, please answer the next 4 questions.		
3. Should military training be established on—		
(a) A compulsory basis?		
(b) A voluntary basis?		
4. How many months of military training should be required?		
(a) 6 months?		
(b) 12 months?		
5. When should Congress decide America's postwar national policy on compulsory military training?		
(a) Within the next few months?		
(b) 1 year after the President's declaration ending the war?		
6. If you favor a military training program would you prefer to have it in our school systems similar to ROTC....?		

Remarks:

Signature (optional).....

Dr. Frederick Taylor Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the Congress, as well as countless other friends, had an affectionate interest in a simple and impressive ceremony which took place recently at a rural point in Tennessee. The occasion was the erection of a bronze marker designating the birthplace of Dr. Frederick Taylor Wilson, noted author, lecturer and friend of man.

Dr. Harry L. Upperman, president of Baxter Seminary, Baxter, Tenn., who spoke on Dr. Wilson's work today said, in part, as follows:

We are here on this Sunday afternoon, October 14, 1945, for a very pleasing purpose. Here between the towns of Rome and Carthage, Tenn., we have erected this beautiful bronze marker in honor of the nearby birthplace of our lifelong friend, Frederick Taylor Wilson, whom we have seen flower and blossom out of the farm lad of other years into the successful teacher, lawyer, author, and lecturer of today.

Other speakers have told you incidents of Fred's early life. Messrs. Walter and Virgil Sampson and Mr. Josh Denton have each pictured his early revealed talents as a writer and speaker, which have in recent years won for him fame as a writer on historical and philosophical themes and as a lecturer, who has spoken in at least three-fourths of all our States. Mr. Ed Ferrell told you of Fred's work as a store clerk and Mr. Julius Williams, who as a State legislator helped him become clerk of the Tennessee House of Representatives, has told of Fred's fight for an education at Vanderbilt University, where he won highest oratorical honors.

We all appreciate the gracious words of Mr. Gordon Moore, our master of ceremonies. There has been no secret in Fred's remarkable success. He has in recent years reaped the results of his labors of long ago. He is now perhaps the most widely read man any of us ever knew. More than 5,000 different books have been read and devoured by our friend and former neighbor. He now holds many college degrees and his name appears in numerous volumes of successful men.

An ability to make and hold the friendship of worthy men and women has served Fred well and the messages that have come to us have attest to the high regard in which he is held by great present-day leaders in education, politics, and religion.

If there has been one key to the life of our good friend, that key has been the keen desire to serve the other fellow as his good friend, Mr. Ewing Herlein, of Houston, Tex., so aptly wrote.

From the time Fred, as a mere lad, taught the Negro family in the cabin near his birthplace for 10 cents a night, until now when his work is Nation-wide, he has found his chief delight in unselfish service to humanity. Few men have so realized their boyhood dreams. As the Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW, Member of Congress from Indiana wrote, "Dr. Wilson is a scholar whose brilliant mind has explored many entrancing fields of thought and a writer who has made notable contributions to the literature of our time."

So we honor ourselves when we pay honor to our dear friend. How fitting it is that this marker be placed upon this great Tennessee highway. Here, in the years to come, unnumbered travelers will pause and contemplate Fred's eventful career and finding inspiration therein, travel onward, renewed in vision and strengthened in courage and faith.

General MacArthur Becomes Convinced of Need for Unified Command—Praises Air Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, it is most encouraging to know of the vigorous support for a unified command by General MacArthur as contained in the following article from today's Washington, D. C., Times-Herald:

SAYS MACARTHUR ADMITS ERROR IN FIGHTING MERGER

NEW YORK, November 5.—General Kenney, commander of the United States Far Eastern Air Forces, said here that General MacArthur considers his opposition in 1931 of a unified armed forces "the biggest mistake of my military career."

General Kenney, who advocates unification of the Army, Navy, and Air Forces under a single Cabinet head, said that General MacArthur expressed himself on his earlier views when General Kenney arrived in Port Moresby, Australia, in 1943.

"I realized then," said General Kenney, "that I was working for a man whose mind was not set in concrete. He still had an open mind and thoroughly understood the unlimited possibilities of warfare 20 years from today.

"An understanding of those terrible possibilities had undoubtedly altered his opinion."

The Navy League, opposing the merger, recently quoted General MacArthur's opposition when he was Army Chief of Staff.

FOCH WRONG IN 1910

In New York for a short visit before returning to Japan, General Kenney told newsmen that General MacArthur's reversal of opinion was similar to a change of mind once made by the great French military leader, Marshal Foch.

General Kenney said that in 1910 Foch had said the airplane could never be anything more than a sportsman's plaything, but in 1921 declared the airplane's possibilities in warfare were incalculable.

To statements that separate Army and Navy departments would mean "healthy competition," General Kenney said:

"That hardly seems advisable. Businesses don't run competition with themselves. I question also the advisability of using taxpayers' money to run two organizations that do almost the same thing * * * separate funds for what amounts to exactly the same thing in many cases."

General Kenney said morale and tradition would be preserved in individual units, but added:

"I don't believe we should stress tradition at the expense of efficiency."

Pathfinder, a National News Weekly, Discusses Proposed St. Lawrence Seaway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, in the Pathfinder for the weekly issue of November 7, 1945, there is an article dealing with the proposed navigation developments on the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River. This article comments briefly on the purpose of this seaway development, gives a short account of its history and summarizes the arguments for and against the project.

Incidentally Members of the House know that our colleague Congressman WILLIAM A. PITTENGER, of Duluth, Minn. has been an ardent supporter of the St. Lawrence seaway ever since he first entered Congress in the year 1929. His work in favor of this measure has been consistent and aggressive.

While World War II was in progress, the St. Lawrence seaway project and many other worthwhile matters were overlooked and almost forgotten. Not so—with Congressman PITTENGER. He continued to point out on frequent occasions to the House the great value of this development. It is interesting to note that the Pathfinder recognizes his outstanding service, in this article which reads as follows:

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—A FOURTH SEACOAST FOR THE UNITED STATES, 2,687 MILES LONG FROM DULUTH TO THE ATLANTIC, IS ONE WAY TO DESCRIBE THE GREAT LAKES PROJECT

It was virtually talked to death once. Stalling tactics have delayed it. The strategy seems unchanged.

Last month, Harry Truman joined the unbroken Presidential line extending back to Wilson and urged speedy congressional approval of the St. Lawrence seaway and hydroelectric power project. Administration stalwarts introduced bills; there was a brief flurry in the press.

This week, the seaway bills rested undisturbed in committees.

Senate Foreign Relations admitted its docket listed only one other major issue, still said it has no plans for the seaway measure.

In the House the Rivers and Harbors Committee said it was waiting for the Senate. A committee member, Representative WILLIAM A. PITTENGER, a Minnesota Republican and chief seaway advocate, who sees in the project a source of thousands of jobs, has no hope of hearings before spring, flatly predicted efforts by the opposition to delay action until midterm elections.

WHAT IT IS

Simply, the seaway is a joint effort by Canada and the United States to open the Great Lakes area to large-scale ocean shipping and to establish the world's second largest (except Grand Coulee) hydroelectric power project on the St. Lawrence River.

Normally, specially shallow-draft ocean-going ships carry some 115,000 tons direct from the Great Lakes to foreign ports. By deepening the channels linking Lakes Huron, Erie, and Ontario, and by constructing locks and canals in the rapids section of the St. Lawrence extending from Ogdensburg, N. Y., to Montreal, Duluth could become an accessible port for more than two-thirds of the world's freighters.

Power would come from a dam at Barnhart Island, between Massena, N. Y., and Cornwall, Ontario, supplemented by a small dam upstream. Half of the 2,200,000 horsepower would go to Canada, the balance (under New York State auspices) to an area within a radius of 300 miles of Massena.

Cost to the United States is estimated at $275,000,000, to Canada $145,000,000 (not counting $132,000,000 spent for the Welland Canal).

HISTORY

Canadian-American interest in opening mid-North America to ocean commerce traces back to 1895. A treaty covering the seaway was finally negotiated by President Hoover and presented to the Senate for ratification in late 1932. Extensive hearings were held that winter, extensive debate (including a Huey Long filibuster) continued until March 1934. Finally a majority—but not the necessary two-thirds—voted for the measure.

In 1941 President Roosevelt negotiated an agreement with Canada to replace the treaty. This would require only a majority vote of both Houses, but the test has never come.

PROS

Seaway supporters maintain it will provide more markets for the Midwest (which accounts for 50 percent of the Nation's production), save $4 a ton on shipping costs, provide cheap power for New York and New England.

CONS

Opponents argue that the seaway would be uneconomical, hurt the railroads, existing harbors, and waterways. Representatives of these groups, including railroad and maritime unions, fight the seaway, don't care about the power project. The latter, however, makes public-utility groups see red because the New York Power Authority Act specifies that municipalities, farm and other cooperatives get preference in the sale of power.

But whether the seaway and its accompanying power project would do more good than harm is still undecided.

Once seaway bills are pried out of committee, Senate proponents will have first to beat down resistance that a treaty is necessary, will then be able to get a favorable majority. The fight will come in the House. But if the administration puts its full weight behind the measure, there'll be enough Republican support from interested States to pass it.

The Betrayal of Poland in Favor of Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I discussed the problems of the little Republic of Finland in relation to Russia. I called attention then to the fact that other small countries in the Old World were similarly situated. In yesterday's mail I received a letter confirming that statement, insofar as it relates to Poland. What we say about Poland is also true of other small countries. Attached to this letter was a copy of an appeal to President Harry S. Truman. This letter reads as follows:

POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., October 27, 1945.

To Members of the United States Government, United States Congress, the American Press and Radio Commentators:

Attached herewith is a copy of an appeal by the Polish-American Congress, addressed to the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, asking for a reversal of America's foreign policy in order to rectify wartime political blunders which have made Poland and other Allied Nations the victims of Russia's expansionism.

I sincerely urge your kind consideration of the contents of this letter and your support of the cause in behalf of which it was written. This is an ardent plea of six millions of Americans of Polish origin who desire to safeguard the security of the United States and the peace of the world, and who want true independence and democracy for Poland and all our allies.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES ROZMAREK,
President.

The copy of the letter which Mr. Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish-American Congress wrote to President Truman is as follows:

POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., October 20, 1945.

HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.

MR. PRESIDENT: A recent Associated Press dispatch reports that Red army units, with the sanction of the Stalin-appointed Polish Government, are being sent to each of the 17 provinces of Poland. This is being done under the guise of protecting the country from an epidemic of banditry.

Catherine the Great offered exactly the same kind of protection before she took over Poland.

Russian headquarters in the capital of every province with Russian generals in command in all army units everywhere in Poland.

This grim news comes out of martyred Poland at the very moment when Mr. Wincenty Rzymowski, foreign minister of the Moscow-conceived government of Poland, is conferring with our State Department, which is still upholding—in words—the traditional

American policy of nonrecognition of governments that do not represent the free will of free people.

As Poland's independence is being strangled by a Soviet military noose, there is not a single word of protest from our Government.

This silence only intensifies the heart-tearing mental, physical, and spiritual anguish of the people of Poland.

America's staunch ally, Poland, is a victim of ingratitude, injustice and deception without parallel in history.

Not only was this friendly republic deprived at Yalta of one-half of its ancient lands, where barely 1 percent of the prewar population was Russian, but the sovereignty of what remains of Poland was destroyed by the imposition of an illegal government.

But Poland was not the only country sold into Soviet slavery at the Yalta market place. There were others. Ten nations, with a total population of 120,000,000 human beings—men, women, and children, with the same love of freedom Americans have—met the same tragic fate.

While we are not lacking in appreciation of your expression of friendship for Poland in your speech after the Potsdam Conference, we are keenly disappointed to learn that injustices against Poland and other Soviet-held countries were not corrected at that historic gathering. It was a sad commentary on American diplomacy to learn that even Poland's reparations were placed in the exclusive custody of the Kremlin.

Victim of German and Russian aggression during war, Poland is likewise a target for plunder, murder, hunger, disease, and poverty during peace.

A member of the UNRRA Commission in Poland, Clifford H. Nillson, reports Poland is undergoing the most terrible ordeal in its history.

Representatives GORDON, Democrat, of Illinois, and RYTER, Democrat, of Connecticut, members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, after a tour of Poland formally protested to you, Mr. President, that Russia is using the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration for political purposes.

We quote briefly from Representative GORDON'S observations:

"The Russian occupation army is behaving very badly (in Poland). We saw their arrogance and unfairness in taking advantage of the poor people of the city (Warsaw). We saw the nearby highways jammed with hundreds of head of cattle, horses, and farming implements being taken out of Poland by the Russians and going farther east. Pillaging of the shops on the street was going on most freely and the snatching of purses from Polish women is a daily occurrence. There also exists a wholesale raping of the Polish women. When resistance would be given, the Russian soldier would use his weapons of war and kill."

To conceal his intentions, Stalin juggles words cleverly. Repeatedly he has stated he wants a strong and independent Poland. If he really wants such a Poland he can have it. If he wanted a strong Poland he would not have annexed one-half of it. If he wanted an independent Poland he would not have imposed upon it a puppet government of Moscow-trained Communists.

Can anyone explain why Germany, an enemy, is under joint Allied occupation while Poland, an ally, is under exclusive Russian control?

If Russia would only withdraw its armies and stop interfering in Poland's internal affairs, Poland's troubles would come to a swift end.

The United States could and should have avoided recognizing the Communist-dominated Polish Government, until free elections were realized and not merely promised.

The attitude of our Government toward friendly Poland is in sharp contrast to our constructive intervention in hostile Bulgaria where we flatly refused to recognize the undemocratic government, installed by Moscow.

The American Nation is not bound by the secret agreements of Tehran and Yalta, made without the knowledge or approval of the Congress or the American people.

The Constitution of the United States invests in no one, no matter how exalted his position, the authority to consent to the mutilation of free nations, to the destruction of their legal governments, and to the condemnation of millions of decent and law-abiding people to the yoke of a despotic foreign power.

Our responsibility to right the wrong, caused by secret agreements, violating the laws of God and man, is inescapable.

Hitler is gone, Mussolini is gone and yet there is no freedom in Europe.

The dangers against which the Polish American Congress, representing 6,000,000 Americans of Polish descent, has consistently warned our Government, are now leading to a tragic climax.

As a result of blind appeasement, all gains made after the First World War have been wiped out. Nations freed by the First World War have all been enslaved by the Second World War. Stalin, who entered the war in 1939, not as Hitler's enemy but as his ally, is out to finish the task begun by Hitler—the domination of the world.

With efforts to bring freedom to all nations being nullified by Russia, granting credit to Russia indiscriminately would be foolhardy, especially until Russia withdraws to prewar frontiers and proves by actions it has no selfish aims of aggrandizement or desire to destroy democratic civilization.

In view of the ever-growing chain of slave nations, releasing the secret of the atomic bomb to Russia would spell the doom of America. This secret should be guarded carefully, for it is the only safeguard our country has against further Russian expansionism.

America's security and the peace of the world depend upon the correction of political blunders made during the war.

Unless there is a reversal in our foreign policy, it is folly to talk about liberty, democracy, and peace.

As the shadows of despair are deepening over the world, this is not the time for silence.

For freedom's sake, Mr. President, please urge independence for Poland and for all our allies. Do not assist in the crucifixion of the people of Europe. They want to live as we Americans do, not to suffer and die.

This war was fought to protect nations from aggression.

Precious American blood was spilled to purchase freedom and not tyranny for the world.

For the Polish-American Congress:

CHARLES ROZMAREK,
President.
HONORATA B. WOLOWSKA,
Secretary.
JOHN J. OLEJNICZAK,
Treasurer.

These documents speak for themselves. I would be remiss in my duties to American citizens of Polish ancestry in the Eighth Congressional District of Minnesota, if I did not endorse the position that the Polish-American Congress has taken in connection with the problems of the Polish people.

It just strikes me as rather odd, Mr. Speaker, that some of our orators will tell how we have fought a war for the "four freedoms," and then find that not only the "four freedoms," but every principle of decency and fairness has been violated in connection with the small countries like Poland. I join with the Polish-American Congress in urging the President to take the steps suggested by this group of American citizens.

Altered Liberty Troop Ships Feasible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a newspaper article which appeared in the October 19, 1945, issue of the Army newspaper, Daily Pacifican. The article, written by editor Phil Gordon of the Pacifican staff, is entitled "Altered Liberty Troop Ships Feasible." The Army and Navy should give immediate attention to the conversion of any available Liberty ships in order to expedite the return of troops from overseas who are high in points but who are being held back because of shortage of shipping space. The article follows:

MANILA.—Liberty ships capable of carrying 750 men to the States in comparatively good living conditions can be readied within 48 hours, according to Lt. Col. C. H. Davidson, superintendent of the Water Division, Port of Manila.

Colonel Davidson, in reply to a query as to the practicability of using Liberty ships for transporting troops, said yesterday that it had been done before successfully and could be done again.

"If the ships can be allocated," he said, "I can have each one ready to carry 750 troops back to the States in comparatively good living conditions within 48 hours—if I have 50 men to work on each of them."

He stated that all equipment, with the possible exception of M-37 ranges for cooking, is available to convert the Libertys so that they will be capable of carrying troops. "These ranges may be available," he stated, "but I haven't checked on them."

"These are facts," said the colonel, who was responsible for moving the First Cavalry and the Twenty-fourth, Thirty-second, and First Infantry divisions out of Brisbane under similar conditions. "And they are indisputable."

Colonel Davidson said that the objection that Liberty ships could not be used because of cold weather encountered during the voyage was not based upon fact.

Most Libertys travel the Great Circle route, which passes near the Aleutians, between Manila and West coast ports, and cold weather is encountered during the greater part of the trip. The alternate route is by way of Honolulu, and at no time would a ship traveling this alternate route between Manila and San Francisco be more than 38 degrees north of the equator.

Although Liberty ships are without heating facilities below deck, the weather would create no problem as long as the Honolulu route were followed. Should an unseasonable cold spell be encountered, troops on board would not be uncomfortable because of the complete winter clothing issued at replacement depots before troops embark.

The Honolulu route is longer than the Great Circle route, but the added day or two would not extend the voyage to more than a total of 24 to 26 days.

Water Division, second major port, is allocated ships by AFWESPAC. So far, Colonel Davidson indicated, no ships have been allocated for conversion into troopships. The colonel has, however, converted one Liberty ship for transporting 1,500 prisoners of war back to Japan.

"This same ship," he said, "could have carried 750 GI's to the States."

The only feature of actual discomfort for troops traveling on such converted Liberty ships would be the lack of bunks of any kind, for, Colonel Davidson said, "cots would present a safety hazard." Since the cots are made of wood, they present a fire problem, and, in addition, there is no way of securing them.

The colonel said that he felt sure that any Liberty ship which he converted would pass the necessary inspection by officers from Troop Movement, Water Division, Port Surgeon and Inspector General departments.

Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for the average layman to understand the apparent lack of understanding and cooperation between our ally, Russia, and this Government.

Many of us could not understand that, notwithstanding this country was supplying Russia with lend-lease matériel and we were fighting side by side during the war, our military and other personnel was not allowed to make any observations in the conduct of the war either in Russia or in any territory under Russian control, and while I am convinced that by agreement between President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Premier Stalin Russia was designated to enter Berlin, there was much criticism of the fact that Americans were precluded from entering that city at the pleasure of the Russians.

There have been stories spread here that in that portion of Germany occupied by the Russians that not only have the Russians dismantled German industrial plants and other facilities and transported them to Russia, it has been charged that American-owned industrial plants located in Germany have likewise been confiscated and transported to Russia.

It is difficult for an American to understand why it is necessary for the United States through UNRRA to furnish 2,400 milk cows for relief, in one shipment, when pictures are published showing fine Holstein herds being driven from Germany by the Russians for transport to Russia.

Of course, I understand that our Government cannot disclose all of the facts which actuate certain actions in many respects in dealings with other nations; however, our people have seen so many apparent inconsistencies in our actions toward other countries that they are alarmed, and in many cases keenly disappointed.

Mr. Speaker, while we have been amazed and puzzled in reported concession after concession being made by this country to Russia, it is my opinion that at the time many of the so-called concessions were made, President Roosevelt and his advisers were forced to make most of them as a matter of expediency and due to the exigencies of the situations existing at the time. It is not necessary to now reiterate the course of the war, nor our meetings with the leaders of Russia and our other allies, as these developments were followed most closely by nearly all of us, and I will say that, in my opinion, many of the decisions made and many of the concessions granted were made against the better judgment of those in authority. I believe that ground was yielded and many concessions were made in the interest of and in the hope of terminating the terrible conflict in which the world was engaged, primarily with a view of saving thousands of the lives of our own Americans and those of our allies. Anyone who was intimately acquainted with our great President Roosevelt, and had observed his career, have only to examine the photograph of the meeting at Yalta picturing President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Premier Stalin at the conference table. A study of that photograph will reveal that we do not see the Roosevelt as we knew him; his head was not held in that old familiar posture of defiance, but, on the contrary, he reflected a tired man, trying to bargain and arbitrate with at that time a much-needed, made strong by us, ally.

Mr. Speaker, no matter what commitments were made by those in authority in behalf of this country, oral or written, the fact remains that President Truman had fallen heir to the same. I believe that President Truman is at a great disadvantage in falling heir to these commitments made under stress of circumstances; however, I think he is fully able to cope with the situation and, given time, will work out these problems with honor and to the best interests of the country. Mr. Speaker, apropos of my remarks, I wish to include two articles of interest on the subject under discussion, one by Constantine Brown, the other by Ernest Lindley, Washington columnists, which follow:

(By Constantine Brown)

The political chickens from Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam are coming home to roost.

The end of the war has brought forth such a wide divergence of views between the western democracies and Russia that even the most inveterate optimists, who have specialized in hiding their heads in the sand, admit that the international situation today is precarious.

The difficulties we are encountering at the gatherings of the representatives of the United Nations and in our direct dealings with Moscow are not surprising. They are a logical sequel of a policy of expediency started in the fall of 1943 and continued until VJ-day.

A policy of utmost secrecy, adopted in the name of military security, prevented the people of this country from learning everything we surrendered to Russia's desire for expansion.

When the war ended, situations which in the past could be concealed came out in the open, and the American and British Governments were unable to hide the truth from their own people. These new conditions resulted in an inevitable stiffening on the part of Washington and London to the increasing Russian appetite for more territories and further infiltrations in the lands of her neighbors, far and near.

EXPEDIENCY POLICY BREEDS TROUBLE

The Russians had been spoiled children and had become accustomed to thinking that their wishes had to be followed without discussions by the nations which the Red armies claim to have saved.

The propaganda that the Russian armies contributed 90 percent to the defeat not only of Germany, but also of Japan, has been so strong that the Russian policy framers themselves have begun to believe it.

The trouble we are now meeting is the sequel to a policy which began at Teheran and ended at Potsdam. It is the result of a policy of expediency, which was best illustrated by the statement of Secretary Hull before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee when he said that America's main foreign policy (at the time of his statement at the end of 1943) was to defeat the enemy.

It is the result of an honest belief which, however, shows how little our leaders understand foreign mentality, that all nations which had gone through the war would be only too eager to cooperate with one another after the war. It is the result of the Yalta Conference, at which President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill gave up the last shreds of a practical ideology as contained in the Atlantic Charter, in order to purchase Russia's adherence to the United Nations Organization.

The trouble is also the result of the Potsdam Conference, where President Truman, reportedly against his better judgment, allowed Russia an entering wedge in our Pacific defense by yielding the Kurile Islands, and did not insist on a cut-and-dried agreement regarding America's preponderance in the Pacific.

PERSONAL COMMUNICATION PHASE

It is true that Premier Stalin agreed that the supreme command in Japan would be entrusted to an American general, Douglas MacArthur. But the civilian representatives of the American Government did not bother to have everything in black and white in clear language, so that a repetition of the infringements of the Yalta agreements regarding Poland and the Balkan States should not recur.

We are once more in the personal communication phase which preceded the other wartime conferences among the Big Three. Mr. Truman is writing letters to Premier Stalin and few intimates know what they contain. The Russian Premier is answering in the same secretive manner. And the chances of an improvement in the general situation appear slim unless the administration is willing to continue on the road to further concessions. Such a policy is not likely to be successful because the wartime secrecy can no longer be maintained and the American public—keenly aware that something is wrong in the international machinery—will become alerted as soon as new concessions are translated into fact.

Moreover, President Truman in his Navy Day speech has shown a definite trend toward reverting America's foreign policy to the practical idealism contained in the Atlantic Charter.

How these principles can dovetail with Russia's insistent demands for a greatly increased zone of influence from the Mediterranean to the Pacific is difficult to perceive.

EXPEDIENCY ERA OVER

By enouncing his 12 points—which contained nothing new but reasserted a traditional American policy—President Truman served notice on the rest of the world that

the era of expediency was over and that the spirit and the letter of the principles contained not only in his speech but also in the United Nations Organization must be followed.

Clouds darker than those between the spring and fall of 1939 are covering the international horizon. Today we know that we will be affected by whatever happens in the res of the world.

In agreement with all our wartime allies we have created a new machinery for peace, the United Nations Organization. When its creation was being discussed and its friendly critics remarked that there was no implementation to compel any of the "big five" to submit to its golden rule, our policy framers admitted quite frankly that the UNO would be on the rocks if any of the major powers decided to put it on the rocks. The insertion of the veto power for the "big five" was intended to prevent such an occurrence.

In recent weeks the Russians have shown interest in the maintenance of world peace only on condition that their demands be accepted.

Unless America complies with these requests, it is feared that Russia's attitude toward international cooperation will remain lukewarm. Ostensibly this already has been demonstrated, since the failure of the London Conference, by the fact that the Soviet representatives at the International Food Conference left Quebec without signing any agreement and by the hesitancy of Russia to send a delegate to the meeting here of the consultative committee for the Far East. The meeting was scheduled for October 23. It was postponed at the request of Secretary of State Byrnes, until October 30, in the hope that the cooling-off period might create a change of heart in Moscow.

Our choice today lies between either accepting the Russian thesis or opposing it and taking whatever consequences might follow. Most of the intimate advisers of the overworked and somewhat disheartened Secretary Byrnes in the State Department still believe that a policy of concessions should be followed by this country.

They argue that if we appease Russia further by complying with all her present demands the UNO will become a reality. And while it may appear to the uninitiated that a Soviet wedge in Japan, for instance, might endanger our future security, the fact that the UNO will become a living reality should offset such fear. The security of the United States, such men as Ben Cohen, counselor of the State Department, and Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson believe, can be much safer if the UNO becomes a workable organization than if we have to rely exclusively on America's forces.

But if we adopt a "strong policy," as Mr. Truman's speech seems to indicate, the UNO will be doomed and a rearmament race will take place, with unpredictable consequences. Hence, Mr. Byrnes is being advised, some of his well-informed friends say, to leave nothing to chance and do his utmost to reconcile Russia.

ATTEMPTS "STRAIGHT TALKING"

Others outside the State Department and close to the White House believe that this policy of continually humoring the U. S. S. R. without our ever being humored in matters which affect our own security must come to an end. These men admit it is difficult to make a diplomatic reconversion from appeasement to "straight talking," but it can be done. Mr. Truman attempted it at Potsdam and almost got away with it. It was only when his political advisers, convinced that the people of the United States would be disappointed if he came home empty-handed, that he changed his mind and accepted some of the Russian demands which will come to light in the near future.

Mr. Truman's advisers are as firm believers in the UNO as the advisers of Mr. Byrnes in the State Department.

Those men who prevailed on the President to make his "strong" Navy Day speech say the UNO can work even if Russia sulks. Her place will always be open to her when she thinks the time has come to enter into the work of the Organization, but we must not continue to yield to all her demands.

For diplomatic reasons little is being said in this country, from official quarters, about the present state of the Red armies. Numerically, they are larger than the combined forces of the other allies. Redeployment has been much slower than in this country or in Britain, and the men who have been sent home have been quickly replaced by the new classes of youngsters between the ages of 18 and 21 who were due for compulsory military service. But the end of the war has produced new and unexpected conditions in the Red armies. The stern discipline so essential in a force which still contains a large proportion of illiterates has slackened. Mass desertions have resulted. The Soviet high command is reliably reported to have given drastic orders, including the execution of officers, in order to erase these conditions.

RUSSIAN STRENGTH LIMITED

The Red army still has a sizable quantity of American weapons, jeeps, and trucks. But because of the lack of experienced care, the motorized equipment is less effective than formerly, and no replacements are forthcoming. Russian aviation never has been really efficient. The Red army is not mechanically minded, and this has been felt in the Red air forces.

The Russians have enough strength and lease-lend material for another military effort of short duration. But their able leader, Premier Stalin, is fully aware that an attempt to force the pace by violence would jeopardize all the gains he has obtained for his country since he joined the Allied camp.

This brief sketch of Russia's war potential does not mean in the least that there are those in this country who favor using coercive methods against Russia to make her understand the path of conquest heads to disaster. But it serves as an illustration for some of our policy framers to show that while some further minor concessions might be made to the U. S. S. R., provided they do not conflict with the policies set forth by President Truman, a policy of appeasement as we have followed in the last 2 years would constitute a much greater menace to the United Nations Organization and to the United States.

This, at least, is the considered opinion of many of President Truman's realistic advisers outside the State Department. The clouds in the Near East, in the Balkans, and in the Far East all indicate another storm is brewing. This can be voiced only by an objective and at the same time determined attitude on the part of the American Government, which represents the greatest power in the world.

(By Ernest Lindley)

Secretary Byrnes neither set a new policy nor modified an old when he said that the United States recognizes the Soviet Union's "special security interests" in central and eastern Europe and promised that "America will never join any groups in those countries in hostile intrigue against the Soviet Union."

The same assurances have been given many times during the last 4 years. The late President Roosevelt and former Secretary Hull tried to make that clear to the Kremlin. President Truman and Secretary Byrnes have followed the same line.

At the same time American officials have sought to convince the Kremlin that: (1) Russia, like other nations, must find her ultimate security in a strong United Nations Organization and (2) Russia's special security interests in eastern and central Europe do not require that she control the internal affairs of those nations.

MINORITY IN CONTROL

The United States has consistently recognized that Russia is entitled to have friendly and cooperative neighbors, that any attempt by the western Allies to build a tier of anti-Soviet buffer States in eastern Europe would surely destroy the United Nations and the hope of a long peace. But it is a long jump from this to complete Russian control of central and eastern Europe.

It was perhaps only natural for the Russians to rely, in the first instance, on the Communist Parties in that part of the world.

But, with Russian backing, Communist minorities in some countries seem to have been trying to liquidate or intimidate leaders of parties and groups unquestionably democratic but unwilling to accept Communist domination.

It is easy to call anyone who will not accept Communist dictation or cooperate with a Communist-controlled puppet government either pro-Nazi or anti-Soviet. Many peoples of eastern and central Europe had no love for the Russians, even prior to the Bolshevik Revolution. Wise leaders in some of these countries realized, however, that they would have to learn to live and work as friendly neighbors of the Soviet Union. Unfortunately, methods adopted by the Russians have added new fears and hates to old. It has become increasingly difficult for the western Allies to support democracy in eastern Europe without appearing to be anti-Soviet.

DANGER FORESEEN

Roosevelt and many others foresaw this danger. At Yalta, Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill reached agreements concerning Poland, specifically, and the rest of liberated Europe, more generally. It was agreed that these countries were to have provisional governments representative of all democratic elements and that these governments were to hold free elections. It was agreed in substance, also, that the Soviet Union, Britain, and the United States should deal jointly with the problems of liberated European nations.

It was difficult to reconcile subsequent Russian performance with the pledges. Roosevelt, before his death, was disturbed by the failure, or tardiness, of the Russians. Harry Hopkins, as President Truman's personal envoy, managed to obtain from Stalin partial performance of the Yalta pledge concerning reorganization of the Polish provisional government.

Secretary Byrnes has been trying to give life to the Yalta agreements concerning liberated Europe generally—because the agreements were sound. They are no more anti-Russian now than they were when Stalin subscribed to them.

They do not challenge Russia's special security interests. On the contrary, they outline the only way in which these interests can be safeguarded within a framework of international security and close and friendly collaboration among the great powers—and probably the only way in which Russia can hope to have friendly peoples, as distinct from compliant governments maintained by force and terror, as her neighbors.

Russians have clung so long to the wrong path that it may not be easy for them to change. But the longer they delay, the worse their difficulties seem like to become. Their best hope is to invite the help of major Allies in extricating them from a predicament. They can rely on Secretary Byrnes' pledge. Any attempt to violate that would obviously be ruinous to major objectives of American policy, which center around a secure peace.

Shall We Take Inventory of Our Possessions, Our Needs, and Our Responsibilities as of Today?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. FOLGER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I did not vote for the resolution calling for the strongest peacetime Navy in our history. I did not, and I do not now, think that we have taken a sufficient inventory of our possessions, our needs, and our responsibilities as of today that would justify the launching upon what to me is probably a needless approach to the demands of our time.

From June 1941, when I came here, to VJ-day, I voted for every bill and every resolution designed or expected to aid us in the prosecution of the war known as World War II. I did not miss one vote. But the times have changed. Science has produced or discovered, should I say, implements of war so powerful and so swift as to make it, in my opinion, demanding upon us that we do take an inventory of our needs and responsibilities as of the present date, and not before or during this war, when these things were not known. The atomic bomb is not an imagination, nor is it a fantastic dream. It is a demonstrated fact, and that fact changes drastically the whole international picture.

I am inserting in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a broadcast made by Mr. Raymond Swing on October 31, last, a partial survey of our situation which, to me, calls for the greatest concern and consideration. I regard the author as one of our greatest patriots and soundest thinkers, and I believe this broadcast, as others of his have done, deserves very special attention:

Without a dissenting vote, the House of Representatives has passed a concurrent resolution calling for the strongest peacetime Navy in our history. The resolution goes into great detail about how the Navy is to be constituted. Thus it is to have 3 superaircraft carriers, 24 standard-sized carriers, 10 light carriers, 79 escort carriers, 18 battleships, 3 large cruisers, 31 heavy cruisers, 49 light cruisers, and so on.

This Navy is to be manned by 500,000 enlisted men serving under 58,000 officers. They will be assigned to a total of 6,084 vessels, 12,000 planes and a specified list of bases in all parts of the world. It is an imposing picture, this plan for a peacetime Navy. If we had had it in 1939, we might have offered our counsel in Europe with certainty that it would be heeded. If we had had it in 1941, there would not have been the attack on Pearl Harbor.

PLAN SHAPED BY HINDSIGHT

And it is not unfair to characterize this plan for the Navy as one created from hindsight, and shaped very little by the information of foresight. It is a Navy designed and built for the world as it was toward the close of the war. And it will serve the purpose assigned to it, if the world of today remains basically unchanged. To say that is not in any way a disparagement of the record of the Navy or the judgment of the men who conduct it. The creation of the Navy during the war and its stupendous fight to victory are among the finest achievements in our history. It is only human that plans for the peacetime Navy should be based on experience first, without much heed to omens of change.

All the same, there is an air of unreality about yesterday's action in the House. Why 116 aircraft carriers? The airplane became the characteristic weapon of World War II. The aircraft carrier defeated Japan. But will the airplane be the characteristic weapon of defense in the future? Possibly, though, if so, it will be a long-range plane of tremendous speed, not a carrier plane. But quite possibly it will be replaced by the rocket, or by electronically guided missiles. In either event, we won't want 116 aircraft carriers.

We still do not know what the atomic bomb will do to naval vessels, if exploded as a depth charge. It may make the battleship obsolete. In that event, we hardly shall want 18 obsolete battleships.

FOR USE AGAINST WHOM?

A further question must suggest itself to many persons here and abroad. Against whom is such a huge Navy to be used? The textbook answer to that question is that it will be used against any aggressor, with no further specifications. But to look around, one can see that, aside from our own, there is only one other navy in the world of any power, the British Navy. And we need no assurance that we are not building the greatest peacetime Navy in history against the British. Furthermore, naval power, like all other kinds of power, is relative, not absolute. Security is not to be had from a big navy but from a bigger one, in the sense that strength is the means for security. But is not this Navy ever so much bigger than any navy against which it might be pitted? The Japanese Navy exists no more. Secretary Byrnes announced today that, save for 38 of its destroyers, all that is left of it will be scuttled. The German Navy is gone. The Russians are planning to increase their naval strength, but it cannot be anything like ours in size, not if the Russians are going to improve their standard of living, as they intend doing.

Suppose all the international machinery for maintaining peace should break down and everybody—the British included—should gang up on us navally, would we need a Navy as much bigger as this one will be to feel secure? If we should, nobody has stated a case for it in any convincing way. Apparently what has happened is that we have decided to have an overwhelmingly strong Navy, and so it is to be. Yet there is the difference between what this will cost and what one would cost that was not so overwhelming and still quite adequate. No one has analyzed that for public information.

There is, moreover, the possibility, and one hopes the probability, that international cooperation will reduce the danger of war down to a minimum, so that a Navy so overwhelmingly strong would be a shocking financial extravagance. In 1939, when we could have done with a Navy of this size, the machinery for maintaining world peace was worth little, because most of the potentially strong countries, we, and the Russians, the Germans and the Japanese, were not working together for the purpose of keeping the peace. Now the only strong nations are dedicated to that purpose. If this means nothing in terms of the size of our defense equipment, it means nothing—period. One wonders if in the minds of the 347 Members of the House who voted for the naval resolution yesterday that is the true appraisal of the prospects for maintaining peace. If so, matters are perilous indeed.

TREMENDOUS COST

Another comment is in order about this naval resolution. The upkeep of such a Navy is going to cost a solid amount of the taxpayer's money, and absorb a share of all the money to be devoted to our own defense, and to our contribution toward the maintenance of world peace. Who can say that a Navy of this size will take the proper share of the total defense budget? What would be a proper share? What, indeed, is the total budget? What is it, not only with the experience of 1939 and 1941 in mind, but in the world as it promises to be in 1950 and 1955? The naval resolution was duly discussed by the House Naval Affairs Committee and will not go before the Senate Naval Affairs Committee. But the two Naval Affairs Committees do not sit with the Military Affairs Committees of the two Houses. And there is no discussion anywhere in Congress of defense as a subject to which all the parts are related and must be weighed for their bearing on the subject as a whole.

Any child knows that there is not a naval defense, or an army defense or an air defense, all of them separate which can be planned separately, paid for separately, or function separately. It never was less true in history. In a world of slow time and long distances and only moderate explosive charges, the Army and Navy had tasks so different that they could safely be dealt with as distinct from each other. That ceased to be during World War II. It will be even less possible in the world of new weapons. Distance has been obliterated. Weapons will be swifter than the speed of sound.

Every Bit of Shipping Space Should Be Made Available for the Return of Our Troops Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including herewith a very interesting and important statement that appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of November 4 by its veterans' editor, Lt. Comdr. Tyrrell Krum, United States Naval Reserve, retired. This statement calls attention to the fact that our shipping facilities are not nearly completely being used for the redeployment of our troops. Incidentally, it is in line with a statement I made on the floor of the House last Tuesday.

Our Government did a wonderful job getting the boys over there. The least it can do now is to use every facility at its command to see that our service men and women are returned at the earliest possible date.

The statement follows:

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

(By Lt. Comdr. Tyrrell Krum, United States Naval Reserve (retired))

It is now almost 6 months since the guns of war were silenced in Europe. And yet, we still have more than 2,000,000 good American lads who won that war sweating it out over there awaiting their return to home and civilian life.

The War Department has just released a glowing report showing that 2,225,000 soldiers were released from the Army between May 12 and October 26. These figures, of course, include men from all theaters of war as well as many whose service was entirely in this country.

Which means that some 4,000,000 soldiers are still to doff their uniforms between now and next July, the target date when demobilization will be completed.

Just what is the reason for the snail's pace at which men are being returned home. The public would like to know. Congress would like to know. And above all else, so would the Army families and the soldiers themselves like to know the answer.

Ask the War Department, and they'll tell you blandly that everything possible is being done to bring the boys home. But, they add quickly, if there is delay it is due entirely to the lack of shipping space. A matter of transportation entirely.

All of which brings up the big question: "What's happened to our huge merchant fleet?" The Liberty and Victory ships that cost us such an astonishing amount of money and about which such great boasts were being made by high officials in the Maritime Commission before the war ended.

At war's end the United States had some 5,000 merchant ships. Of course, they were built primarily to haul cargo to all parts of the world, a task which we all admit is still important if we are to feed and supply our men overseas. But there is certainly no reason remaining why they should haul anything else. They don't need tanks, and guns, and airplanes at the fronts any more.

Supposing we had converted right after VE-day only 600 of the merchant ships we built during the war into troop carriers, or roughly 10 percent of the available total, and each ship made only one trip per month carrying troops, we could have hauled every soldier in Europe back here by this time.

The biggest ships afloat—Britain's *Queen Mary* and *Queen Elizabeth* and *Aquitania* used to arrive regularly every 2 weeks with as many as 15,000 soldiers comfortably berthed below. In fact the two Queens and the *Aquitania* did the lion's share of the job so far.

Admittedly one Queen and the *Aquitania* have been withdrawn. But there has been added the *Europa*, which we grabbed from the Germans. Which still leaves us two big liners to add to the *West Point* and *Monticello*, which we always have been using.

It just don't make sense for the Army to blame the whole thing on a lack of shipping space and still not do anything to try and remedy the situation by converting cargo ships into troop carriers.

The high command would probably say that a cargo ship is no place for a returning hero to come home from the wars. But ask the hero himself and see what he says. I've talked to a lot of them returning home. They would gladly have shipped in a rowboat if it would have gotten them home sooner.

To repeat: "What's happened to our merchant fleet?"

Some faint glimmer of an answer was seen the other day in a picture that appeared in a national magazine of five good new ships lying idle in a southern port. Are they and hundreds like them to be left rusting at their moorings while millions of good American citizens are literally going to pieces in foreign lands?

Lack of shipping space is not the only reason the Army will give you for the breakdown in the return of our victorious Army. They blame it on longshoremen's strikes, on storms at sea, and on bottlenecks that have been built up in American separation centers.

The last reason is actually laughable. There was a time when men were delayed at separation centers.

But these activities have been geared so that men are passing through on a virtual conveyor-belt system. Right over at Fort Meade more than 1,600 men are being turned out as civilians every working day.

And if more evidence is needed that the hold-up is not on this side, you have only to read the announcement by the Army Air Forces lowering its critical score to 50 points a month ahead of schedule. The AAF admits it had run out of men on this side to be released and is begging Army Transportation Corps to bring back more men to process.

And, finally, why does the Navy have to step in and try to solve the problem? One of the great heroes of this war was the carrier *Enterprise*. Instead of gaining the rest to which it is so deserving, the "Big E" is being converted, along with several other carriers, into troopships to bring soldiers home from Europe.

The Future of Our Synthetic Rubber Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, somewhat unbeknown to the Congress, the future of our synthetic-rubber program is being determined. I will include in my remarks an article that appeared in the Wall Street Journal for November 3, 1945.

That article will show that a group of appointed individuals in the administration is undertaking to find the answer in respect to America's future rubber supply. The answer to that question involves, first, the defense of America; second, foreign commerce; and third, the stability of agriculture. Congress has a very definite responsibility in respect to all phases of the problem.

Congress should serve notice now upon the administration that our synthetic rubber industry must be preserved and maintained. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 26, 1945, on page 5158, there can be found a letter from Mr. W. M. Jeffers, the former Rubber Administrator. I wish to again quote two paragraphs from that letter. They are as follows:

As soon as practicable, all phases of the synthetic rubber industry, now in Government hands, should be returned to private enterprise. This return to private initiative must be safeguarded, however, to assure that research and development is carried forward to the point where synthetics will meet all requirements at a fair cost. Proper dissemination of information must be assured so that, regardless of the views of the larger companies, the smaller have an equal opportunity. This industry has been built with the money of all of the people, and all should have an equal chance at the future.

Certainly we ought never permit ourselves to be placed in the position again of being dependent upon a supply of rubber from the Far East, neither should we permit ourselves to be placed in the position again of allowing the Dutch and British or any other foreign power to fix prices on crude rubbers.

Mr. Speaker, this inter-departmental committee that is studying our rubber program could well heed Mr. Jeffers' advice. If this administration, in any measurable degree, destroys our synthetic rubber industry the American people will hold them responsible.

The article from the Wall Street Journal is as follows:

OUR RUBBER POLICY—BIG PROBLEM IS DECIDING FUTURE ROLES OF NATURAL, SYNTHETIC IN INDUSTRY—EIGHT-MAN FEDERAL TEAM CONSIDERS PLAN, STUDIES DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT PLANTS—WORLD PACT AWAITS DECISION

(By A. K. Estill)

WASHINGTON.—Rubber is bouncing up as one of the administration's major peacetime problems.

This commodity hasn't yet swung round the full cycle of scarcity-to-surplus. But while the Nation's $750,000,000 synthetic rubber industry continues to operate at capacity, a trickle of natural rubber is beginning to flow from the Far East. Before foreign plantations start shipping in quantity, the United States must have a long-range rubber policy.

A compact group of officials, representing eight Federal agencies, is working quietly to develop such a program. It hopes to prepare a comprehensive report by the end of the year. This study will go to Reconversion Director Snyder, and presumably will form the basis for White House recommendations to Congress.

William L. Batt, the War Production Board's vice chairman for international supply, is chairman of the eight-man task force representing Mr. Snyder's office. Other delegates are Assistant Secretary of State Clayton; Assistant Attorney General Berge; Surplus Property Administrator Symington; Reconstruction Finance Corporation Chairman Henderson; Maj. Gen. Sidney Spalding, of the War Department; Arthur M. Hill, Navy; and Alan Grant, of the RFC's Office of Rubber Development.

COORDINATED NATIONAL POLICY DEMANDED

This Inter-Agency Policy Committee on Rubber is charged with "recommending a coordinated national policy on rubber." It must find the answer to such questions as these: Should all the Government's wartime synthetic plants be kept operating permanently? Should the United States have a peacetime rubber stock pile? How much crude rubber will this country want to import, from where, and at what price? What are our minimum military needs for rubber over the next few years?

Official estimates, hitherto unpublicized, suggest that some natural rubber may be shipped from Pacific areas far sooner than had been anticipated. Rubber stock piles in liberated regions of the Far East are believed to total at least 250,000 tons, split up this way:

Indochina, about 140,000 tons; upper Malaya, 32,000 to 34,000 tons; Netherland Indies, about 32,000 tons; Sumatra, about 30,000 tons; Singapore, about 7,000 tons of first quality rubber and 8,000 tons of inferior grades. Burma, 500 tons, although the original estimate of discovery was 2,000 tons. There is little rubber available in the Philippines and practically none in Japan.

The Netherland Indies Government has set up an emergency agency known as Rubberfonds to speed the shipment of rubber supplies during the reconstruction period.

SYNTHETIC TIRES NEED NATURAL RUBBER

Because some natural rubber must be mixed with present types of synthetic for many industrial uses, and for heavy-duty tires, the United States is actively seeking rubber imports. The country's stock pile of natural rubber will have dwindled to less than 66,000 tons by the end of this year.

The Office of Rubber Development has five scouts looking for crude rubber in the Pacific. Three of these men are attached to the British rubber buying unit in Singapore and two others are in the Dutch East Indies. The Office is continuing its wartime function of buying all natural rubber coming into the United States.

The expiring WPB foresees an over-all shortage of rubber for domestic purposes for some time to come. It is on record that there

must be "some Federal control of rubber for at least a year." This control will be exercised by its successor agency, the Civilian Production Administration.

Rehabilitation of plantations in Malaya, Sumatra, Java, and Burma may take as long as 2 to 3 years. Once this is accomplished the world will have available well over 1,600,000 tons of natural rubber from these sources annually. United States synthetic plants will be capable of producing a million tons or more. This total anticipated supply of 2,600,000 tons stacks up against prewar world production of 1,500,000 tons in 1941, 1,300,000 tons in 1940, and 959,000 tons in 1939.

While fighting was going on in Europe and the Pacific, the State Department was carrying on informal talks with the British and Dutch on current and future rubber problems. A study group representing the three nations will meet again the first of next year. It is expected to lay plans for a full-dress international conference which may result in a definite rubber agreement. Up to now discussions have been informal and no long-range commitments have been made.

PROPOSALS FOR SURPLUS PLANTS DELAYED

No world rubber pact will be possible until the United States has reached a decision about the future of Government-owned synthetic factories. The Surplus Property Administration has not yet come forward with specific proposals to Congress on the disposition of these plants. Officials of the SPA call the question a "hot potato," even though it hasn't yet become as urgent as some other plant-disposal dilemmas.

Unofficial suggestions for disposing of the war-built synthetic rubber installations range all the way from outright scrapping of excess capacity to the maintenance of some plants as stand-by facilities in case of emergency and the sale of the rest to private operators. One question still to be answered is whether a peacetime stock pile of natural rubber is to be built up.

The Army is understood to have set its minimum security requirements for rubber at the amount that it used in 1944. Those figures are secret. Total United States peacetime needs for synthetic rubber for all purposes have been estimated at anywhere from 300,000 to 700,000 tons, depending on how much natural rubber is imported to supplement domestic production.

The WPB's Rubber Division estimated recently that consumption of synthetic and natural rubber in 1945 would total 870,000 tons, compared with 1944 usage of 711,000 tons, and a peacetime peak of 650,000 tons in 1940, considered the last prewar year. Consumption in 1941 was 781,000 tons.

BALANCE USE OF TWO TYPES SEEN

Present thinking in administration circles is that a balance will be struck in the peacetime use of general-purpose synthetic rubber and natural rubber.

The Rubber Development Corporation estimates it will probably take 2 years to get the rubber industry back on a normal footing and about 6 months before any substantial quantity of natural rubber will come out of the Far East. An answer to how much natural rubber the United States will want when imports can be resumed on a prewar scale will depend largely on relative quality and price, officials believe.

The experts say synthetic can be produced at 14 or 15 cents a pound in the near future as output is concentrated in low-cost plants.

Prewar natural rubber cost about 18 cents a pound. The pegged price during the war was 22.5 cents, and the Dutch and British want 25 or 26 cents for their first shipments now.

For the 10 years up to 1944 the International Rubber Regulation Committee, set up by the British and Dutch to fix prices and assign production quotas, kept natural-rubber prices between 10 and 20 cents—as close to the top figure as possible, of course.

Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Founding of Frederick, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 6 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, on September 3, 1945, the city of Frederick, Md., celebrated the two hundredth anniversary of its founding. The exercises were admirably planned and carried out in a highly successful manner. On that occasion I made an address and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The celebration today of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of Frederick city suggests this interesting query: If in 1861, the so-called rebel legislature had been called by Governor Hicks, of Maryland, to meet in Annapolis, as customary, rather than in Frederick, would Maryland have seceded from the Union, and would the course of history have been radically changed? The question is an interesting one.

Had Maryland seceded, Baltimore would have been the largest city in the Confederacy. The State of Maryland possessed large and valuable resources which might have been a big factor in turning the scales of war. The city of Washington would have been completely surrounded by the Confederate States. The high strategic importance of such a position is obvious. These are among the reasons why the position of Maryland at the beginning of the Civil War has been regarded by historians as one of paramount importance.

The facts in the case are interesting and quite unique. One Southern State after another was passing ordinance of secession. The Federal Union was apparently going to pieces. Delegation after delegation came from different seceding States to Maryland, urging that our State join them, individually or collectively. Persistent efforts were being made in Maryland to persuade Governor Hicks to call the legislature to vote for secession. However, Governor Hicks, a Union sympathizer, had been refusing to do so.

After President Lincoln, upon the fall of Fort Sumter, called for volunteers for the Army, Massachusetts troops passed April 19, 1861, through Baltimore on their way to Washington. Baltimore was in an uproar. These Massachusetts troops were attacked and a few were killed. Tremendous mass meetings were held that day in Baltimore city, expressing violent opposition to any plans by which Maryland would be used as a means for coercing the Southern States.

A historic meeting was held that night in Governor Hicks' bedroom. Then and there Governor Hicks reversed his position and called a special session of the legislature to meet on April 26. But in doing so he took the very extraordinary step of shifting the meeting place of the legislature from Annapolis to Frederick. Later Governor Hicks stated his reason for doing so was that he thought that the meeting of the legislature in Frederick, where Union sentiment was known to be very strong, might prevent a secession bill from being passed and put into operation.

The so-called Rebel legislature passed no secession measure although there was tremendous continuing pressure upon it to do so. At least one secession bill was drafted. After adjourning from time to time for short recesses, many members of the legislature were arrested by the Federal Government on the charge of treason, and thrown into prison, where they remained for quite a long while.

Years ago I wrote a book on that period which was accepted by the Johns Hopkins University as a thesis for the degree of doctor of philosophy which I received from that university. In that book I attempted to speculate as to what might have happened if Governor Hicks had not made his momentous decision to shift the meeting place of the legislature. His decision may have changed the course of history. It illustrates again the continuity of history, and also the fact that the current of history is sometimes changed fundamentally by the doing of the unusual.

Today we meet in this historic city of Frederick. Two hundred eventful and consecutive years have transpired since Daniel Dulaney secured his estate of 7,000 acres and his brother, Patrick, laid out the town of Frederick in 1745, and since John Thomas Schley built the first house in this city. We are here to pay tribute to the vision, wisdom, and energy of those who founded Frederick and to call attention to some of the many very important happenings here since that day. According to an old-fashioned concept of history a mere listing of important events would constitute the history of Frederick. We know better. We know that such milestones have a special significance, but that they are not isolated events. We know that history is not a series of records merely but it is a constantly flowing stream whose course is shaped largely by forces it meets and also by those which it has left behind. History is an evolutionary process. Reading a page in a book gives information usually inadequate only, unless we read what is on the preceding page and on those that follow. And so an understanding of the course of history requires intimate consideration of the past, the present, and the future.

When we look over the long record of progress and achievement which has characterized Frederick the story is a fascinating and an instructive one. We find here a very prosperous city located in a county said to be the richest agricultural county in the United States. Here is success obtained in truth by merit, not by chance.

We find Frederick has been characterized by a spirit of thrifty, progressive conservatism throughout the years. In no place has the average man or woman filled a more helpful role than here. But that is only a part of the story. No county in Maryland has been more closely associated with men who played a predominating part in the history of the States, especially in the earlier days. Daniel Dulaney, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, Roger Brooke Taney, Francis Scott Key, Gov. Tom Johnson, the first Governor of Maryland, Admiral Schley, John Hanson—these are among the very prominent people who have been born in Frederick or once had a home here.

A few years ago I had the pleasure and honor of speaking at the unveiling of a tablet to John Hanson in your Frederick Courthouse. John Hanson may for many reasons be regarded as the first President of the United States. When he signed his name as President of the United States in Congress Assembled the term was certainly no idle one. As first President of the United States under the Articles of Confederation, he carried us a long way toward a federal government.

Today the American flag is the most significant and most effective material object in the world. The hopes of mankind center largely in it. Frederick will always have enduring fame as the birthplace of the author of our national anthem. There has been considerable controversy as to whether John Marshall or his successor Roger Brooke Taney was the most effective Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. A northern poet found the

theme of one of his most delightful poems in the story of Barbara Fritchie.

In our own generation men and women of Frederick ancestry have held prominent positions in the State. Judge Albert Ritchie and his distinguished son, Gov. Albert C. Ritchie, were members of a Frederick family. Each one of you will agree that the course of history of Frederick County has been happily influenced by the distinguished services of the late Joseph T. Baker and by the example which he gave of fine citizenship.

These men and women did big things for their county and for their State, but no history of Frederick is in any sense adequate which fails to bear witness to the fact that men and women generally who, during 200 years lived in Frederick city, have reached and maintained a very high standard of usefulness and accomplishment. Attempt to pay justly earned tribute to them is pleasant. Their example is stimulating and a call to new service.

Someone has said:

"Politics without history has no root;
History without politics has no fruit."

The term "politics," of course, here is used in a very broad sense, implying the drafting and operations of general policies. If we in Frederick, or out of it, attempt to decide the grave questions pressing upon us for action without due consideration of the lessons history teaches us, we will be making decisions without deriving the benefit which experience can give. It would be like a lawyer, physician, businessman farmer, or housewife deciding what to do today without paying any attention to what the experience can teach.

Let me give another illustration. Now, we know that much of the reason for the ever-increasing efforts of our Government to press forward our war operations at home and abroad at a tremendous speed was needed to win against the Nazis in the race for the development of the atomic bomb and certain other instrumentalities of warfare. For a long time that race was a close one. Again and again we were on the verge of defeat and disaster. Had we failed, we would not be meeting here today on this anniversary to pay tribute to Frederick's patriotic and distinguished sons and daughters. On the contrary, we would be completely at the mercy of the cruel and capricious whim of ruthless conquerors. All the years of free enterprise and liberty which our ancestors had utilized so successfully would have come to naught.

The story goes that once upon a time efforts to capture Babylon by siege and assault long remained unsuccessful until the course of the river which ran through Babylon was changed by the stupendous work of digging a new river channel and diverting the course of the river. Thereupon the enemy marched into Babylon on the former river bed. Thereby the channel of history was turned. Most assuredly the course of history would have been changed suddenly, violently, and most disastrously if the Nazi had won out in the race for new, terrible powers of destruction.

Never let us lose sight of the fact that for the first time in history the power of the atomic energy has been brought under the control of man. We face indescribable disasters unless this power, for the first time unleashed, is utilized for peace and welfare and not for carnage and destruction. We have opened a new Pandora's box. What will come out of it? That fateful decision is in our hands.

If the world acts in accordance with the wise, sound spirit which has made Frederick an outstanding type of an industrious patriotic and well-balanced community, it will see to it that the course of history as shaped by the atomic bomb will be turned into happy channels and not into turbulent and destructive waters.

Those decisions we must reach just as Governor Hicks, after opposing secession and after being placed in the position where he had to unleash certain powers, made a momentous decision. What he did quite likely prevented here in Frederick the secession of Maryland and thereby may have altered materially the course of history.

In countless ways, history illustrates and emphasizes that the poet told a part of the truth only when he said:

"Of all the sad words of tongue and pen,
The saddest are these, it might have been."

These words at times are among the happiest of expressions whenever they call attention of dangers avoided and harrowing threats of misfortunes which did not materialize. Fortunately what we often escape is stark and hideous tragedy. The history of the atomic bomb bears witness to that fact.

Never have I accepted an invitation to participate in the dedication of a building when there were more reasons why I wanted to accept. I will mention a few only of them.

First of all anyone in Maryland or out of Maryland would naturally consider it a privilege to participate in these exercises. Here I have many friends whose confidence and kindness I appreciate greatly. Another reason is that I have a special feeling of attachment for the Steiner family, former owners of this property. Dr. Louis Steiner was in charge for years of the Enoch Pratt Library and rendered invaluable service in providing Baltimore with a first-class public library.

His son and successor, Dr. Bernard C. Steiner, continued the good work of the Enoch Pratt Library. Bernard C. Steiner was one of my teachers in history at Johns Hopkins University. It was upon his suggestion that I wrote the book just mentioned on the Civil War period, stressing the vast significance of Frederick as the meeting place of the so-called Rebel legislature. Long ago Dr. Bernard S. Steiner and I became very closely associated with each other, and until his untimely death our friendship continued constantly to grow stronger.

Another reason why I am happy to be here is that I have been keenly interested in the subject of history as a student, a teacher, and to a very limited extent, as a writer. For 30 years I have been an officer of the Maryland Historical Society and am now its president. As a citizen and as president of that society I rejoice in the fact that Frederick County is today acquiring such an attractive and useful home for the study and presentation of the history of Frederick County.

Relations between the Maryland Historical Society and the Frederick County Historical Society have always been close and I am confident that each year will find many new opportunities for closer cooperation to our mutual advantage.

The Maryland Historical Society rejoices in your opportunity, prosperity, and success.

The Maryland Historical Society has accumulated during its 100 years of existence a vast collection of books, paintings, manuscripts, relics, and other objects of historic importance. Some of these are concerned with Frederick County. I am hoping that within the near future we can have a Frederick County night at the Maryland Historical Society having its program in the charge of Frederick County Historical Society.

The astonishing thing about a historical society is how quickly historical material begins to flow in. Books, manuscripts, paintings, and relics are finding depository in the Maryland Historical Society. Almost every day the Maryland Historical Society receives a gift or an offer of worthwhile material. Many of these come from outside of Maryland, just as Mrs. William Bradley Tyler Belt, the generous donor of this splendid home to you, is not living in Maryland. In your new home you will find your historical collection growing rapidly.

I rejoice also in the fact that in providing this historic and attractive home for the Frederick County Historical Society the far-sighted donor is doing something which in no end of ways will aid greatly the cause of good citizenship.

History pleases, but it also instructs and constructs. In the trying days which are ahead of us we will need the benefit of every useful agency which can be made available to assist us in adopting wise policies and doing essential things. This building enshrining the tradition and history of Frederick County will ever be a stimulating reminder of what has been done so well by your forefathers in this county. It will bring to your service the vast field of experience. As you go forward step by step, it will aid and succor you. The information which it will bring to you, and the helpful advice which it can prompt are elements of tremendous value. Although I do not mean in any way to ignore the significance and value of the cultural and pleasure-giving province of history, I am glad to bear witness to the fact that history is one of the useful factors in human progress. The history of Frederick County will contribute much as we attempt to solve, in this day of vast economic readjustment, problems of business, labor, agriculture, return of veterans to civilian life, elimination of governmental restrictions and so many other matters pressing upon us for consideration and action.

Everyone knows that the present rate of Federal taxation does not give opportunity for venture or risk capital so essential to development of business. We must begin to reduce these taxes and yet be ready to meet the heavy cost of interest charges on debt, reconversion from a war to peace basis, reasonable needs of our veterans, of unemployment, and other necessary expenditures.

There is not time to attempt to dwell upon the many wise lessons that history can teach us. Let me emphasize one. Some people cavil at our frequent references to what we call the American way of life. They are wrong. We cannot overstress its importance. The American way of life typifies consistency, but it is elastic enough to permit change whenever clearly advisable.

The American way of life began in Colonial days. It grew greatly during the Revolutionary period. It went forward by leaps and bounds at the time our Constitution was framed and our Nation was created.

Throughout the years some of the apparent changes in our way of life are recognized almost universally as being in the nature of improvement. But our American way of life has certain principles which are fundamental. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, the "four freedoms" are among the basic elements of our concept. That way of life does now and must always continue to contemplate and require that our Government of men and women should be freed as far as feasible from governmental restrictions. It holds that thrift, free enterprise, and wide opportunity for private initiative and discretion are among the factors which have made this Nation great. These principles are going to be preserved in our systems of government and society. We are not going to be swept from our moorings by socialistic or communistic theories of government. We are not going to embrace a regimentation or paternalism which would enfeeble. What we need is more and more invigorating self-reliance and less debilitating paternalism.

In the furtherance of this great objective the people of Frederick will continue to serve valiantly, blessed by guidance from the light which ever shines so brightly in the history of Frederick. In this new home ideally situated and adapted for the purposes desired, the Frederick County Historical Society can and will continue to play a very useful role.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, November 6 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a talk which I delivered this morning at the Federal court here in Washington to a class of new citizens approximating about 175.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGES OF CITIZENSHIP

It is a great pleasure and privilege to me as a United States Senator and as an American citizen to contribute in a small way to this inspiring naturalization ceremony.

In a very brief period, you will be privileged to become citizens of this great country. You will join 140,000,000 compatriots in the privileges, rights, and obligations of American citizenship, so newly rewon for us on the battlefields of the world.

Unlike myself, you will become a citizen because of your own free choice. I had nothing to do with my own citizenship. I was born here in this blessed land, but I am the son of immigrants. My father and mother both were born in Europe.

I feel that the experience that you are undergoing in becoming a citizen is somewhat analagous to that in the Book of Books, wherein it is said that "man must be born again to inherit the kingdom."

THE OLD WORLD AND THE NEW

To fully appreciate the privilege that is to be yours, you must be born again. I know that is the way my father looked upon it. In the old country at that time, he wasn't good enough to own land. He worked for some 40 cents a day in the mines (I emphasize a day) and he left the old land to come over here. He raised a brood of seven children. He had little or no education. Those seven (because our parents wanted it so) went through the public high schools and each of them had the benefit of higher education.

In the old country there was a state church. In America, church and State are separate. Here, you go to the church of your own free choice.

In the old country (and this is so now in many places) there was no such thing as freedom of speech or press, and men dared not to express their own thoughts aloud. In this country, these freedoms are part of what you attain today. I know, however, that you will not confuse freedom with license.

You may be assured that the eyes of all the peoples of the world are upon this glorious land today, as never before. Recently it has been decided that the headquarters of the new United Nations Organization will be established on the free and friendly soil of America. This is in itself a tribute to America, which has been precipitated to leadership among the nations of the earth.

Here in this land, there is abundant opportunity for the innate and dormant qualities of man to be reborn. In the Senate of the United States, we have several men who were born abroad. Here the poor boy of today becomes the factory owner of tomorrow. Here the son of the European peasant becomes a famous judge, lawyer, doctor, educator.

To every foreigner who comes to these shores and becomes a citizen, we say "Welcome." Our arms are extended, our hearts are warmed by the thought that another brother has come into our midst. You know the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor has engraved on it:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses, yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore:
Send these, the homeless, tempest tossed, to me:
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

And the salutation from each American to you is:

"As you breathe the free air of our shores,
Homeless wanderer, reaching home,
Become one with us in freedom's cause:
Take the riches of our liberties,
And repay the gift by becoming one of us,
An American."

But, we ask every individual upon whom we confer citizenship that he leave behind those hates, those prejudices, which are unfortunately still so prevalent in Europe. Here, there is only one ism, and that is Americanism, for him to become inoculated with. We ask him to bring and throw into the blood of the Nation the high concepts of his people, the fine music, art, drama, religious concepts—those things which make for better living. All these constructive qualities we accept with gratitude. But, we ask that, in his rebirth, the new citizen leave behind those negative qualities, those destructive forces, which have made the Old World a vale of tears and terror for so long.

LOYALTY TO YOUR LAND

How, specifically, may you demonstrate the love of the land which you are now to call your own? How may you be adequate to the challenges of citizenship?

May I suggest a few ways:

1. Know and love the American Charter.

What is the American Charter? It consists in part of the United States Constitution, including, of course, the great Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments to the Constitution.

The American Charter consists in part of the Declaration of Independence, sealed by the blood of the martyrs of the American Revolution. It consists in part of the Gettysburg Address, delivered by that epic figure, Abraham Lincoln. The American Charter consists of these and more. It consists of American history, the deeds and words and thoughts of every generation of America since 1776, in times of war and peace. All these you must learn and relearn and love sincerely from the very depth of your being.

2. Know and love the American cultural heritage.

America, the Beautiful is more than a song. Ours is more than a great and beautiful geographic expanse. We have American poetry, literature, music, art, which can hold their heads high amidst the other great cultures of the world. We have thrilling customs, traditions, flowering in every one of our regions, in every one of our local communities, all constituting a part of our cultural heritage—yours and mine and the possession of those who are yet to come.

3. Know and respect the symbols of America.

Every good citizen knows and respects the great symbols of our land. He has a deep and abiding respect for the Stars and Stripes. He knows our great songs. He observes our national holidays—Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Independence Day, Memorial Day, Thanksgiving, Christmas. He loves these symbols of our country, not blindly, but with his eyes clear and filled with the beauty of them. He respects all these symbols in the very depths of his heart and soul and relives each holiday in the very fiber of his being.

4. Know and contribute to American leadership.

You should become acquainted with the workings of your government—local, State, and national. You should make certain that the men whom you elect and support in public office respect public office as a public trust. They must be men devoted to the American way of life. You must exercise your ballot choice wisely and carefully. Do not allow yourself to be mentally stampeded by false slogans and synthetic thinking.

5. Know and contribute to your community.

You have obligations not only to the land in which you live, but to the local community in which you reside and work. Do your part in helping to make it a clean, happy, thriving community. Fulfill your neighborly obligations to those who dwell in your vicinity. The strength of the Nation is founded on the strength of its smallest unit—in the family and in those who are close to the family.

6. Contribute to the economic well-being of our country.

You must become an ever more important sustainer to the economic life of our country. Contribute to the economic bloodstream of our land. Do your part, however humble, in helping to make jobs, wages, and goods. America needs job makers and job builders.

7. Develop the personal qualities of an American.

We have great traditions for the ideal American. He is a man of thrift and diligence, industry and energy, humor and love. His mind is unclouded by distrust or fear. He has perspective. He has faith in himself, in his loved ones, in his Government, in his fellow man. He has no time for the pessimist, the defeatist, the divisionist. He owes allegiance to his God, to his country, and to his fellow man. He holds his head high because his conscience is clear. He is a growing man. He is not guilty of arrested development. He knows that life is an unfolding process in which more and more of his potentialities can be developed with each passing day.

These are great times in which to be an American—times full of challenges. America and the world have just entered a new revolutionary atomic age. Greater possibilities for an abundant life in our land and in all other lands have now become possible.

The aged cry is true now more than ever before:

"God, give us men!
The time demands strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and willing hands."

The field of citizenship is ever expanding. The opportunities for you to become a proud contributor to our way of life are increasing all about you. I have faith that you will fulfill the faith that your country is placing in you, in giving you the great honor of citizenship. I have faith that you will help your fellow Americans to pass on, unimpaired, the great values of which we of this generation are but trustees.

I extend to you my hand and my heart in welcoming you to our brotherly fold.

The Veteran Looks to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, November 6 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the

RECORD a radio address entitled "The Veteran Looks to Congress," which I delivered before the Disabled American Veterans' convention in Chicago, on October 20, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The veteran very properly looks to Congress to facilitate his readjustment into civilian living. Exactly what measures should be enacted into law by the Congress to accomplish this worthy purpose is not so easy to determine. However, the Nation owes its first obligation to provide for its disabled and handicapped warriors and for their dependents and for the dependents of those who have made the supreme sacrifice.

I agree with the viewpoint expressed by the National Service Director of the DAV, the Honorable Millard Rice, who, during his recent appearance before a Senate committee, stated that Americans, who have sacrificed their bodies or their health to preserve the American way of living, deserve richly an opportunity for themselves to live a normal American life. They above all men certainly are entitled to have a home and a wife and children if that be their desire.

Most of us are inclined to take too many things for granted. Americans have been assuming that our Government already has made adequate provisions for all of its war disabled veterans and their dependents, and the dependents of our war dead. I have found, however, that that is not true and therefore, as one Member of Congress, I shall do what I can to enable this grateful Nation to make adequate provisions for the human aftermath of its wars.

It is common knowledge that the Veterans' Administration is authorized to provide compensation or pensions for service-connected disabilities of war veterans, in amounts ranging from $11.50 per month for a 10-percent disability, to $300 per month for a so-called double total permanent disability. Very few of us, however, realize that the sum of only $115 per month is the highest amount payable to veterans who are totally disabled and unemployable, and that higher awards are payable only to those who have lost one or more limbs or both eyes. We provide family allotments for the men in the armed forces but very few of us realize that no dependency allowance is provided for discharged veterans who are totally disabled.

The Disabled American Veterans and its authorized representative, Millard Rice, have vigorously advocated that the United States should provide the same dependency allowances to its totally disabled veterans as Canada provides, namely $25 for a wife, $15 for the first child, $12 for the second child, and $10 for each additional child. Such allowances would be about half those provided for the dependents of men now serving in the armed forces. Such payments are necessary if disabled veterans are to live a normal family life and rear their families according to American standards. My bill, S. 1031, now receiving the attention of our committee, provides for such payments.

The Veterans' Administration has been authorized to provide hospitalization for treatment of service-connected disabilities, but very few citizens realize that single veterans who are hospitalized for the treatment of service-incurred disabilities are not permitted under existing law to receive more than $20 per month compensation, regardless of the payments due them. Thus, veterans in effect are required to pay at least in part for their hospitalization. To correct this situation, I have another bill, S. 1203, now before our committee, which provides that there should be no reduction of compensation during at least the first 3 or 4 months of hospitalization. This would enable the veteran to take care of his many financial commitments while undergoing hospitalization.

Certainly our hospital bed capacity must be increased just as rapidly as possible so that veterans requiring medical treatment may not wait for weeks or months before they can be hospitalized. I am pleased to state that the new Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Gen. Omar N. Bradley, has taken a firm hold of the many perplexing problems with which he is confronted. Very definitely he is on the way to their solution.

It is not generally realized that only about 10 percent of our war disabled veterans are rated by the Veterans' Administration as totally disabled and unemployable. The other 90 percent must be regarded as employable, since their compensation provides only a small portion of their support. These partially disabled and handicapped veterans must have gainful, useful, and suitable employment, since they cannot rely upon compensation or pension payments for their full support.

Surveys definitely have indicated that handicapped employees are more sensitive to injury and therefore are naturally more careful and cautious and less likely to lose time from the job by reason of injury or illness. Furthermore, handicapped employees are generally more productive, more cooperative, more resourceful, and more loyal to their employers than are able-bodied persons.

Every employer in the country owes it to our returning disabled dischargees to do his utmost to employ in suitable jobs just as many disabled veterans as possible.

Out of a selection of several hundred courses the Veterans' Administration is authorized to provide for handicapped Veterans of World War II vocational training to prepare them for suitable employment in some profession, business, or occupation. Every war-disabled veteran should look carefully into the advantages of taking a specialized course of vocational training.

The monthly allowance now provided is admittedly not adequate; $92 per month for a single veteran plus $11.50 for a wife and $5.75 additional for each minor child. The Senate Sub-Committee on Veterans Affairs is now considering legislation to increase the basic monthly allowance for vocational trainees, disabled and able-bodied veterans alike. Proposals to facilitate the economic adjustments of our returning veterans, who are not handicapped by any service-incurred disabilities, present many perplexing problems. We must consider not only the immediate effects but the after effects as well. As a matter of fact, our committee has many bills before it, proposing amendments to the GI bill of rights including the proposal to guarantee loans by the Veterans' Administration to GI Joe for purchase, repair, improvement, and operation of a home or a farm or a business. We hope to report out a bill in a very few days.

All of us are anxious to help returning veterans become adjusted to civilian life, but in our enthusiasm we should not enact into law provisions which may prove to be unfair or inequitable as between various groups of returned veterans, nor should we enact into law provisions which do not afford the very solutions which we seek.

In the final analysis, the desire of our returning able-bodied veterans is essentially the same as the desire of returning disabled veterans; that is, to resume normal civilian living status, to have a home and a wife and children, and the means to rear those children in the accepted American way. The Nation should compensate to the best of its ability the sacrifice of their time, and the loss of opportunities which they might have enjoyed had they not served so many years in the armed forces during a time of war. Most of our returning young men and women have lost their youth in the crucible of war. Time cannot be turned back. So the loss in that respect is permanent. But they should be assured that in fighting to preserve the American way of living they will not be compelled by their fellow Americans to forfeit it for themselves and their dependents.

Veterans will represent between 20 and 25 percent of the total number of employables. They will represent a very substantial portion of the total number of taxpayers. In every conceivable undertaking in our economy they will occupy a place as professional men, businessmen, agriculturalists, white-collar employees, skilled workmen, and as laborers. They will be looking to Congress for adjustments on a Federal level of the interrelated problems that will affect their welfare as American citizens, just as do other citizens and other groups.

Yes, the veteran looks to Congress and I hope not in vain. Many Congressmen are veterans of one or more of the wars in which our country has been engaged. Several of the Member of every congressional committee are ex-servicemen. All of them are deeply interested in the disabled warrior.

Veterans represent a cross section of our society, culturally, occupationally, socially, politically, and religiously. They and their relatives will constitute a majority of the population of this Nation. They will not all have one viewpoint on legislative or economic or social-justice questions.

But in looking to Congress they must bear in mind that Congress is an institution of the people. Its voice is their voice. Its will is their will and its power is their power. It determines what should be done in our relations with other nations and what should be done in our relations with each other, only to the degree desired by the people themselves. Through Congress the American people determine what they shall undertake collectively on behalf of able-bodied veterans, disabled veterans, their dependents, the dependents of our war dead, our handicapped citizens, the aged, the infirm, and every other group. Congress can and must, however, work out the proper adjustment between all of its citizens.

Yes; "the veterans look to Congress" and for advice and guidance Congress in turn must look to the veteran. Congress has no funds that do not belong to the people and Congress possesses no wisdom that is not inherent in the people.

Address by Hon. William O. Douglas, at Portland, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 6 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on June 30, 1945, Mr. Justice Douglas, of the United States Supreme Court, delivered a very interesting and statesmanlike address in Portland, Oreg. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We here in the Pacific Northwest think that the West is a particularly vital part of the Nation. I admit feeling that way myself. But it seems to me that the vitality of the West is simply the newest expression of the vitality of our social system.

The vitality of our social system is something we all feel, but do not often stop to analyze. First of all, our vitality consists in our common pride in our country, our pride

in being Americans. Life in this country is full and satisfying—not as much as we want it to be, but more so than it has ever been anywhere else at any other time. We do not have to feed the minds of our children on myths of past greatness. We are greater now than we have ever been before. We have met the challenges facing our generation, and we have conquered or are conquering them.

Nor do we have to dream of future imperial splendor in order to offset a narrow present. We here in America enjoy mature and responsible life. Opportunities that are dead or that never existed in other countries are within the grasp of our people. Certainly, we dream of a better and happier life for all. But we dream of it in the practical, inventive way that is typically American. We know we can make our dream come true. We do not tie our dream to conquest, or to the subjugation of other nations, or to inflexible, unrealistic ideologies.

Jefferson, as we westerners know, was one of the world's great prophets. He sent Lewis and Clark out to find the Columbia River. With the Columbia, America found more than the inland empire of Jefferson's heritage. It found a way to create the society of Jefferson's dreams and of our dreams. Nothing is more intangible than the current of our imperial river, and yet nothing is more powerful. Nothing except the democracy it symbolizes and enriches.

The promise of a nobler power than the world has ever seen flows through the current of our river. It is the promise of happiness for people. It is the promise to which Jefferson dedicated America in his great concept of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

That is a simple aim which the Declaration of Independence expresses so nobly. Here in our rich and beautiful land, we count upon the blessings of liberty as we count upon the air we breathe. Our real problem is that last great objective—the pursuit of happiness. But who can be so sure of life, so certain of liberty, that they can dare to concentrate on this last aim? Only freemen. Only members of a society which is strong, which is vital, whose traditions of liberty grow out of a great past.

There are people who say that this idea—the pursuit of happiness—is idealistic nonsense. But a long time before Jefferson, Jesus Christ said, "Man does not live by bread alone." And our great achievements in this war against brutality and indecency bear witness to it. The Americans who died—and who will die—for their country in this war went down fighting for the highest aims of our society.

There have always been sunshine patriots who have wanted America to cater to very puffed-up tyrant from George III to Hirohito. They don't change from one generation to another. They call themselves "realists." Actually, they are the most unrealistic minority among us.

They are unrealistic because they are irresponsible. They are afraid of new ideas because they are afraid of responsibility. They don't trust the people of America.

True social realism never belittles people and their ideals. Idealism and hope for the future are the driving forces of true social realism. Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt—they were idealists. And yet each won a great war. Each of them saw further into the future than the small-minded men of little faith who bedeviled them. They knew that idealism is not impractical, that it is part and parcel of true realism, along with hope and responsibility and trust in people.

These men are examples to us of the good that true social realism can do. Their idealism, their statecraft stand out in bold contrast to the so-called realism of Hitler, who corrupted men's souls.

Germany collapsed as our victorious Army rolled toward Berlin to join hands with the Russians. The shame of Dachau and Buchenwald was made clear before the world—and the sullen people stood in the streets like cattle and watched our troops march past. But not one voice rose to say "This ruin is what we made. It is enough. Let us try to become human beings again, responsible for our fate." The proud cities of Germany are rubble. That was the Allies' work in this grim war. But the souls of the people are rubble, too. And that was Hitler's work.

Hitler and his gang are dead men, Hirohito and his are marked men. "Those who take the sword shall perish by the sword." But those who corrupt the human mind shall have their minds corrupted. So out of the rubble of empire there is no one left to build anything new, simple, humble, anything with vitality. These people have lost their moral sense and because of that, they have lost their social responsibility.

Here in America the time has come to talk of peace. Half of the war has been won. In the West we know better than any that the toughest part is still ahead of our fighting men. But to define our attitude toward the peace will not slacken our effort against the Japanese. It will strengthen it. Let us take thought for the future. In so doing we shall reinforce the power and determination of our present actions.

The part we play in world affairs is inevitably influenced by our domestic situation. We cannot be strong abroad if our economy is weakened by depression and unemployment. Equally, we cannot be strong abroad if our ideals of justice and understanding are absent from our national life.

One of our fundamental concepts is the value of competition. That holds good in sports, in business, in politics. Neither race, nor creed, nor color disqualifies anyone for that competition.

We believe in competition because we trust people. Here is our basic difference from Hitler. He believed that human beings, if left to themselves, act according to their basest desires and in the most short-sighted way. But we believe that human beings know their true interest and that these interests do not differ in the long run from the interest of the community.

We believe that if men sometimes act basely, they also act nobly. We believe that if a man or an idea is sound, progressive and productive, that man or idea will be recognized and put to work.

At one time, when our economic system was in transition, we passed a statute declaring economic competition to be the law of the land. That statute—the Sherman law—still stands. It was sustained not only by the courts but by the hardy belief of the people as well. But we have never needed to pass a law sustaining political competition. It is our fundamental assumption, because we do trust each other, because we do believe in the good will of common humanity.

So deeply rooted is our belief in political competition that we know when political partisanship must leave off. Americans are mature enough, they are responsible enough, to know that patriotism must always come before partisanship.

This war has been fought by a united country—a country not beaten and dragooned into unity; rather, a country that has consciously subordinated its differences of opinion to the great common necessity of defense.

To win the war, we first won harmony among ourselves. We trusted ourselves to be Americans. We made the distinction between patriotism and partisanship. We showed the world how, as Wendell Willkie said, the free are strong and the truly strong are free.

Liberty in America has always been strengthened by crisis. Liberty in America has always risen to responsibility. The world was surprised because we dared to hold a wartime election. We welcomed the test.

Now the making of the peace lies before us. No peace can be won in a year or even in a decade. We may be thankful that no peace can be lost in a year either. The crisis of war is self-evident. But the crisis of peace is invisible. The obligation imposed upon a free people to be responsible is, therefore, even greater when a peace can be lost than when a war must be won.

We did not realize this when we were losing the last peace. When the shooting stopped, we assumed that the danger had ended. Patriotism was blacked out by partisanship. Our national interest was subordinated to lesser issues. We lost the peace when we lost sight of the responsibility of partisanship. This must not happen again. Hitler dead must not divide the Nation that Hitler alive united.

The men who won the war in 1918 and lost the peace in 1920 had more excuse for their lack of vision than we do now. A new situation faced the world then. The world has just become one.

The last war broke up the old system of alliances. It swept the personal diplomacy of kings and princes out on a tide of democratic hopes. But not only was cooperation between nations necessary to maintain peace after 1918. Political maturity and responsibility on the part of the common people had become a basic necessity too.

The last peace conference was a holiday for old men who liked to play games with maps. State-making replaced king-making as the fashion of the day. What the so-called practical men of 1920 forgot, what it took the world 25 years of cynicism and tragedy to learn, was that a strong state must be a united nation. In peace as in war, a modern state is as strong as its citizens are united.

Some far-sighted men in every country saw this necessity. One of them in this country was Governor Cox, of Ohio. Another was Franklin Roosevelt. When Wilson became a casualty of World War I, and young Roosevelt followed Cox into the campaign of 1920, he knew that the fight he was making was not for the lost peace. It was for this one. It was for the peace we must now win in his name.

Anyone who has lived through these past 25 years—anyone who merely reads their history—knows the facts. Political immaturity and irresponsibility, social and moral default, mean war. They always have and they always will.

Our oceans are no longer barriers against a possible enemy. A Maginot line is not a secure wall against hostile neighbors. It is only a wall against ideas and progress. America's only protection in the days ahead lies in the wisdom and the imagination with which we meet the inevitable problems that will plague us. We are strong. We are free. We are generous-minded. Our national dreams disdain imperialism and conquest. Instead, we truly believe that it is to our national interest to see freedom, and mature self-government, spread over the entire rest of the world as quickly as possible.

Those ideals and beliefs—the imaginative mind and the quick practicality of the American—they are our strength and our defense. If we live up to our ideas, if we bring to the problems of peace all our ingenuity, all our faith in God and our trust in fellow men, then we have nothing to fear. We shall pioneer into the future with the courage and the dignity and the rich success of the men who conquered the Rockies and won the Columbia River for a new nation "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

Mr. Wallace's Horoscope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of November 3, 1945:

MR. WALLACE'S HOROSCOPE

Secretary of Commerce Wallace has issued a report dealing with wages and profits in the automobile industry that will simply add to the flames of current wage controversy. Except for purposes of political propaganda, there is no excuse for publishing a document of this description bristling with hypotheses and unverifiable assumptions. It is designed to prove that the automobile industry could increase basic wage rates 25 percent by 1947 without raising prices and yet continue to make high profits. To reach these conclusions Mr. Wallace's statisticians have had to do a lot of guessing about future conditions—what they are likely to be in the next 2 or 3 years as regards increases in productivity and in material costs, volume of sales and other factors affecting future profits. "Even with a 25-percent wage increase and some increase in material costs," according to the report, "profits three times larger than in the 1936–39 period can be expected on sales two and one-half times as large" in 1947 and 1948 on the basis of 1942 prices.

As was to have been expected, spokesmen for the automobile industry dispute the validity of the Department's estimates and protest its conclusions. President Wilson, of General Motors, says that his company would have to increase its volume of production by 60 percent over 1936–39 in order to make as much money as it did during that period, under OPA price formulas, without any wage increases whatever. And the general manager of the Automobile Manufacturers Association declares that labor efficiency in the industry is currently 20 to 40 percent below prewar levels. This clash of opinion again emphasizes the need for labor and management to get together and settle their differences by means of an impartial fact-finding analysis of the position of the individual automobile companies involved in wage disputes. It is certainly not the business of the Department of Commerce to prejudge the issues at stake in pending wage controversies by resort to sweeping conclusions based on assumptions open to challenge.

Furthermore, the Department of Commerce study seems to take it for granted that if an industry is able to meet wage increases out of profits, the case for higher wages has been proved. In the present instance, however, the question should be raised as to whether all these prospective profits of the automobile industry belong of right to the automobile workers. Why should they be the sole beneficiaries of technological progress and reduced production costs? Under a progressive free economic system, the gains from industrial progress should be shared by all workers as consumers. Sharing is accomplished by lowering prices. This is the way to stimulate expansion and create jobs. Moreover, the man who has invested his savings in an industry is also entitled to a share in the rewards of progress. If all future profit increases are skimmed off by wage increases, the incentive to effect economies and expand markets by lowering prices will be greatly weakened, if not killed. These larger issues involved in current demands for wage increases have been almost lost to sight owing to the statistical bombardments to which we have been subjected. Yet, they are of fundamental importance to the preservation of a sound, progressive, private business economy.

VJ-Day Address by Mayor Patton, of Knoxville, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, November 6 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered on VJ-day, August 14, 1945, by Mayor E. E. Patton, of Knoxville, Tenn. The speech was broadcast over Station WNOX.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is the most glorious day in the history of America since the day the Pilgrim Fathers landed at Plymouth Rock. It means that the treacherous Japs have been whipped to their knees; it means that no more brave and gallant American boys will have to shed their precious blood and sacrifice their lives on the altar of the god of war; that our boys in the far-flung Pacific and all the other battlefields of the earth will come home at an early date to their loved ones.

Every loyal American will give thanks to Almighty God for victory over a barbarous and uncivilized foe; every loyal American will pray God that never again will the earth be cursed by war.

We know that hundreds of our brave boys from this city and section have laid down their lives in order that we might remain free. To the fathers and mothers and other relatives of these gallant sons of freedom our hearts go out in sympathy and love; and may the God of love, and charity and forgiveness be with them in their hour of deepest grief. The bodies of these brave men consecrate and hallow the soil of every country in the Eastern world; their warm blood has reddened the blue waters of the seven seas. God bless and comfort their relatives that they may have faith that they will meet their loved ones in that temple not made with hands.

We should begin to put into operation our plans for seeing that our boys come home to a welcome as high as the heavens, as deep as the ocean, as warm as the rays of the friendly sun; a welcome that should come from the heart; that we highly resolve that everything possible shall be done for their happiness and success.

This is not a time for wild orgies of drink and dissipation; but rather it is a time for fasting and prayer. To this end, the people are urged to assemble in their respective churches and synagogues and there give thanks to God for the peace that now covers the earth, with a solemn petition that never again shall the earth run red with the blood of heroes.

And, now, by virtue of the authority vested in me as mayor of the city of Knoxville, I hereby proclaim tomorrow, August 15, as a solemn and sacred holiday, and I hereby declare that all offices of the city of Knoxville will be closed during the entire day of August 15; that city employees, with the exception of the fire and police departments, will not report for duty tomorrow.

In the language of a great American, let me propose a toast in the following words, "Cheers for the living; tears for the dead."

A Free Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, November 6 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which was printed in the Jersey Journal, of Jersey City, N. J., on Tuesday, October 23, 1945, under the subject Only Congress Can Free Associated Press From Marshall Field Fetters.

Without in any way questioning the judgment of the Supreme Court in this case, it is my opinion that the people of the United States and their Representatives have much to think about in connection with the effect of this Supreme Court decision on a free press. To my way of thinking, we can never hope to get rid of dictatorship or lead the way to peace unless we keep our press and news-gathering agencies from from governmental control or suppression of any kind that interferes with giving the true facts and correct news to the people in the home.

If it is necessary for the Congress to take special recognition of this case in order to preserve freedom of the press and proper freedom of enterprise for news-gathering agencies, then in my opinion such action should be taken by the Congress without delay.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONLY CONGRESS CAN FREE ASSOCIATED PRESS FROM MARSHALL FIELD FETTERS

Marshall Field, one of America's richest men, publisher of the Chicago Sun, has the distinction of having succeeded temporarily in shackling the free press of the United States.

He may be expected once again to knock on the door seeking membership in the Associated Press. He should be unanimously voted down, if he does apply at this time. Here's why:

1. When he first applied for membership in the Associated Press he failed of election. A Chicago newspaper member in good standing objected to the election of Field's Sun on the grounds (as he was entitled to object under the bylaws then in force) that for many years the present members have expended millions of dollars to develop a news service which it would be unfair to make available to competitors of the present members in Chicago. Newcomers could buy news service from the United Press, or from Hearst's International News Service, or build up from scratch their own world-news coverage (as the radio people have done to some extent). By Field's willingness to see his application and its denial used as a lever or crutch for

an antitrust case against the Associated Press, Field has demonstrated his failure to see the value to our Republic of a press free from governmental control.

2. A renewed attempt by Field's Sun to gain membership while the Associated Press is being run under the supervision of the courts would be proof that Field is willing to submit the management and news judgment of his Chicago Sun to the superior control of the Government. At the present time, as a result of the antitrust case arising out of the refusal to admit Field to membership, the Associated Press is a ward of the courts. It must submit to the courts some sort of bylaw satisfactory to the courts and then adopt such bylaw; or else, it must accept a bylaw written by the courts for the Associated Press. This bylaw must prohibit a vote against any newspapers on the ground that admission would destroy the competitive advantage of members. How can even the wisest judges in the United States write a bylaw to do that and still leave the Associated Press free? Field, being plainly out of sympathy with the fundamentals of a real free press in the United States, is just as plainly not a suitable person to admit to the membership of the Associated Press.

Field should know that any request by him for admission to the Associated Press will be out of order until the Associated Press has been freed by an act of Congress from restraint by the courts. If and when Congress relieves cooperative news-gathering organizations from application of the Sherman Antitrust Act, then will be time enough to consider a fresh application from Field, if he then wants to make such application.

The board of directors of the Associated Press is trying to comply with the order of the Court by the second week of February. In the meantime, the free press of the United States, which is the precious right of the people of the United States, must look to Congress for correction of the situation.

The courts have done their duty. They have interpreted the law and applied it to the Associated Press. It must be clear to Congress now that a law intended to protect the people against monopoly has a result never intended when it is applied to mutual news-gathering cooperatives, such as the Associated Press. It was further never intended to destroy the right of cooperatives to choose their members or to use for their own benefit the commodity—news—which they had bought with their own money and reported by their own efforts.

Cooperative news-gathering organizations should be exempted from the application of the antitrust laws. Proper legislation enacted before the end of the year would relieve the Court of a duty which must be distasteful, namely, trying to run the free press from the bench, and would restore to the people confidence that the report of the world's and the Nation's news is free from control by the Government.

Atomic Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 6 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Atomic Controls," written by Ernest K. Lindley and published in Newsweek of the issue of October 29, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATOMIC CONTROLS

(By Ernest K. Lindley)

Public discussion of the control of atomic energy has become unnecessarily confused by failure to distinguish between its national and international phases.

President Truman drew a line between the two. It was not arbitrary. It was as natural and workable as the distinction between prohibiting private citizens from maintaining armed forces equipped with 155-millimeter howitzers, poisonous gases, and B-29's complete with bombs, on the one hand, and the international regulation of armaments on the other.

Whatever may be done about international control of atomic energy, internal regulation is obviously imperative. In addition, prompt action is necessary to protect and enhance an asset which is so valuable that it makes the initial investment of more than $2,000,000,000 look like chicken feed.

Should the vast wartime research and engineering combination which produced the atomic bomb be allowed to evaporate? Should the vital plants and installations in Washington and Tennessee be turned over to the highest private bidders? Should uranium-235 and plutonium be sold on the public market or passed out to the first callers? Should the scientists and engineers who worked on this project be encouraged, or permitted, to peddle or give away their knowledge wherever they choose? Should American owners of the raw materials from which atomic energy now can be produced be allowed to sell these materials wherever they like? Should we relinquish to unregulated private enterprise or other nations the atomic raw-materials sources outside the United States on which we now have contractual claims?

Fifty similar questions could be posed. The answers are self-evident. But most of them can be made effective only by congressional action.

President Truman has asked that Congress create a national commission to manage and regulate the release of atomic energy within the United States. He asked that this commission be clothed with broad powers to conserve and improve a priceless asset and to safeguard the public against the hazards of irresponsible experiments.

This relatively clear proposition is being blurred by argument over international policy. It is not too soon to explore the international side. Mr. Truman is already examining it with our copartners in the atomic bomb, Britain and Canada. In due course—the sooner the better—the United States should set forth a program for the international regulation of atomic energy. But this will require much more study. For an ill-considered step might be fatal to the United States and to all of civilization.

It was exactly for that reason that Truman asked that Congress act now only on a system of internal controls. Such a system is absolutely necessary, regardless of the decisions made later concerning international policy. There are many reasons why it is needed promptly. Not the least is to hold together the wartime organization which produced a miracle and to assure that large-scale experiment continues.

The Truman plan for internal control supposes nothing concerning our international policy except that it is to be framed by the Government of the United States. This means, of course, that individuals privy to secret information cannot be at liberty to give it to others on their own initiative. It means that when now-secret knowledge is shared with other nations it should be as a considered national act.

Many of the scientists who worked on the atomic bomb think that the secrecy provisions of the May-Johnson bill are so severe that they will hamper legitimate research. Some apparently feel that there should be no restrictions whatsoever. The objections of the first group can be met by slight modifications in the bill, and probably will vanish with the appointment of outstanding scientists to the Atomic Energy Commission. The second group is thinking of science alone rather than of all the realities of the world which must be weighed in framing our international policy.

The orderly procedure for Congress is to set up the internal-control system now, and take up the international problem later. The former is both easier to be sure about and more urgent if our national investment in atomic energy is to be conserved.

A 20-Percent Hike in Federal Pay?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of November 3, 1945:

A 20-PERCENT HIKE IN FEDERAL PAY?

President Truman is asking Congress to raise the pay of persons in the Federal classified service a flat 20 percent and to make even more substantial increases in the pay of the higher officials of Government. The increases, it is said, would apply to 860,000 persons and would cost $414,570,000 a year. For the higher jobs, the raise would be $10,000 a year and would bring Supreme Court justices to $30,000, Cabinet members to $25,000 and Congressmen to $20,000.

It is not necessary to go into the merits of the various increases to deplore their being suggested at this time. The country is beset by labor difficulties and it is trying to float a Victory loan. Surely any plans for greatly increasing the pay of Federal employees should await the settlement of wage disputes in industry and the completion of the loan drive.

The President, coming forth at this time with extravagant demands for higher pay for 860,000 people, is revealing more of the same kind of ineptitude he showed in his recent address on wages.

A fair case could have been made out for an increase of 10 percent in the wages of the Federal classified service, as it can be made out for many groups of industrial workers. But the suggestion of a 20-percent increase can only encourage labor to persist in uneconomic demands. That and the 50- to 100-percent increases proposed for high-ranking officials cannot help but have a bad effect on the present loan drive, for citizens will wonder about the why and the wherefore of appeals that are made to them, even though these appeals do have a good basis in fact.

British Empire Trade Preferences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY CORDON
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, November 6 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, in view of the action which the Congress has taken during the current year in extending and broadening the powers of the Export-Import Bank, in adopting the Bretton Woods agreements, in liberalizing reciprocal-trade agreements, and in taking other steps on the part of the Federal Government looking toward a broadening of international trade, I am greatly concerned at reading in the New York Times of today an item under the heading "New Zealand bars 1946 United States imports," and a following article in which a former Prime Minister of Canada appeals to the United States to permit the so-called British family of nations to maintain their present trade preferences. I ask unanimous consent that both these articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ZEALAND BARS 1946 UNITED STATES IMPORTS—WEIGHT OF PURCHASING THROWN TO BRITAIN BY LICENSE LIST—CANADIAN BACKS PREFERENCE

WELLINGTON, NEW ZEALAND, November 4.—The Government's import licensing schedule for 1946, issued today, virtually eliminates United States goods and gives heavy allocations to Britain.

It was explained that "some uncertainty exists regarding imports from nonsterling areas, and as a result it has not been in general possible to provide allocations for imports from those sources in the meantime." It is hoped, however, that a solution of this problem will be found before long.

The import schedule, issued for the eighth year to meet the flight from New Zealand of pounds after 3 years of a labor administration, shows that the country maintains its novel stand that this policy is not discriminatory against the United States since other countries also are barred. The State Department, however, has argued that the policy is a departure from the Atlantic Charter, and possibly from article VII of the lend-lease agreement.

It also shows that Finance Minister Walter Nash has lost no time to justify the Government's procedure in utilizing the cut in New Zealand's holdings of sterling funds that he recently made by repaying one-fifth of this country's bonded indebtedness to Britain.

After this operation, Mr. Nash says that while the state of New Zealand's London funds gives grounds for satisfaction, it must be remembered that it will be necessary to draw heavily on them for essential imports. Foreign purchases of machinery necessary to replace that worn out or made obsolete during the war and also to equip new industries and develop existing ones will be substantial.

RAW MATERIAL FIGURE LARGE

Mr. Nash said that a large expenditure was envisaged to provide raw materials for industry, meet transport needs and carry out the development of the Government's hydroelectrical works.

Some relaxation has been made in controls on consumer goods, but the country cannot afford the money for nonessentials or goods that can be satisfactorily supplied by domestic plants, Mr. Nash said.

The import schedule showed that the allocation of foreign funds for carpets in 1946 will be 150 percent of this year's figure, linoleum 15 percent, chinaware 133⅓ percent, sporting goods 200 percent, printed books 125 percent, and organs and pianos, for which there has been no allocation for years, 100 percent of the 1938 total—all covering only British goods. For British bicycles imports of 260 percent of the 1941 shipments will be permitted, and for motorcycles 50 percent of 1938 purchases. For vacuum cleaners the British have permits equaling 50 percent of the imports from all sources in 1938.

CANADA CITES BRITISH AID

LONDON, November 5.—Defending empire trade preferences as legitimate concessions granted in the British family of nations, Viscount Bennett, former Prime Minister of Canada, appealed to the United States today not to ask slashes in preferences in exchange for a loan to Britain. He was guest speaker at a luncheon meeting of the American Chamber of Commerce in London.

"I would like you to bear in mind that we are a people who have made great contributions to the world," Lord Bennett said. "We have preserved civilization. We stood alone for a year and we are very tired indeed."

Lord Bennett added that it did not seem proper to him "that this family should be compelled by circumstances over which it has no control to abandon its family relations in order that we may borrow a few dollars."

Recalling that he presided at the Ottawa Conference in 1932 when imperial preferences were worked out for members of the Empire, Lord Bennett said that since then the United States had succeeded in getting "enormous concessions in the way of reductions in the preference rates."

"The cuts made have deprived Canadian wheat growers of a favored position in the British market and took other advantages away from other members of the Empire," he said.

In view of the concessions already given to the United States, he added that it was difficult to understand why Washington officials were asking for even more.

The reason the United States is considering a loan to Britain is that it is recognized as necessary that Britain be prosperous, he argued. The only sure way of guaranteeing prosperity for the Empire is to permit it to retain preference, he concluded.

San Francisco Proposed as Capital of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, November 6 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the San Francisco Chronicle of October 30, 1945, urging the selection of San Francisco as the capital of the United Nations. The article is by Dr. Herbert V. Evatt, Minister of External Affairs of Australia.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVATT PLEADS THE CASE OF SAN FRANCISCO AS CAPITAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

(By Dr. Herbert V. Evatt)

(The case for San Francisco as seat of the United Nations Organization is presented here by Dr. Herbert Vere Evatt, Australian Minister for External Affairs, and strong man of the United Nations' Conference on International Organization. Just arrived in Washington from London to attend the first meeting of the Far Eastern Advisory Commission, Dr. Evatt yesterday telegraphed the accompanying article to San Francisco for exclusive use in the San Francisco Chronicle. It reiterates his hitherto unpublished plea before the Preparatory Commission for selection of San Francisco as the new world capital.)

I think that what we are called upon to do is recommend a seat for the permanent headquarters of the Organization. And in my opinion, nothing could be worse than to start off by deciding that it is to be in Europe or not in Europe, and then to choose by way of compensation or compromise a Secretary General from the continent or zone which is not selected for the seat of the Organization.

In my view, the Secretary General question must be kept absolutely distinct from the question of the seat. Clearly the Secretary General should be elected upon personal qualifications.

What we are required to do is ask what place is most suitable for the seat of the United Nations. Australia's view is in favor of San Francisco—not because it is part of the United States, or because it is not in Europe—but because, after considering all the available evidence, San Francisco is the most suitable site.

I think it is obvious that the peoples of the world expect a fresh start to be made in world organization; we consider that that can best be done by choosing a new site. That view tells strongly against Geneva, but the case for San Francisco is not a negative case but a positive case.

San Francisco has all the facilities. So far as the argument of distance is concerned, modern transport has greatly reduced its importance and the facilities for transport to and from San Francisco are excellent.

It has been claimed that it is essential that the Organization should operate in complete freedom from local or governmental pressure. I agree with that. But it does not follow that the seat should not be situated in the territory of a great power.

There is nothing in the Charter that suggests that the site should not be in the territory of any power. Why should the fact that the United States is a permanent member of the Organization debar a site otherwise suitable from being selected as the permanent seat of the Organization? If that fact was thought to be disqualifying, it would have been expressed in the Charter. There is no such disqualification.

San Francisco is a city which breathes the very spirit of freedom. Freedom of expression is guaranteed in the country of which San Francisco belongs; freedom of expression is enforced by the courts; nowhere in the world is freedom more secure.

It is a city of progress, it looks with courage and confidence to the future. That is the atmosphere which is required for the success of the new Organization.

In drawing up the Charter at the Conference in San Francisco, we all recognized with

gratitude and admiration the debt we owed to the city of San Francisco and its people. In fact, the Charter was worked out in the spirit of San Francisco—the spirit of progress and freedom and tolerance.

I realize that the question cannot be dealt with finally today but I am convinced that the claims of San Francisco are pre-eminent and are already proved by the great success of the San Francisco Conference, which produced the Charter under which the new Organization will have its being.

The situation is quite clear. We make a recommendation to the Preparatory Commission. In turn, it makes a recommendation to the Assembly. Our recommendation might not be adopted by the Assembly. It is difficult at this stage of the investigation to secure unanimity. Therefore, I think the attempt to get it should not be pressed.

At the same time, a stage will be reached in which a very distinct majority will express its view, and that is the stage at which the minority might reasonably be expected to yield. Today, at any rate, there is a substantial majority of this committee against the headquarters being situated in Europe.

PACIFIC PROBLEMS

I regret that the reaction of one or two of the delegates suggests asking them to go to San Francisco for meetings is almost like asking them to go into exile. In my opinion that approach is quite wrong. Indeed, it contributed to the first breakdown of the League, which occurred in the Far East. If going to San Francisco leads to a greater interest in Pacific problems, that will be all to the good.

I also urge strongly that we should not recommend a temporary or provisional headquarters of the Organization. The Charter and the constitution of the Preparatory Commission require us to make recommendations concerning a permanent headquarters of the United Nations. It is quite contrary to that requirement to select a temporary headquarters.

In Australia, we had a temporary capital until Canberra was finally selected. But the temporary capital remained temporary for a quarter of a century.

If we established a temporary headquarters, vested interests would grow up tending to prevent any subsequent change, while year by year the proceedings of the Assembly would be convulsed by this contentious issue. Therefore, let us abandon the idea of a provisional headquarters and proceed in an orderly way forward to the selection of a permanent site. That is what we are required to do by our Charter.

Slave Labor

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I have always believed in the doctrine of freedom. However, many advocates of the free American system, or in the name thereof, insist that that system can only exist by having slave labor. We have freed labor by the Clayton Act under the Wilson administration, and by the Wagner Act under the Roosevelt administration. The captains of industry now, however, want to go back to the old times where unions can be disrupted by injunction and blackmail; they want to establish that as the rule of the land.

Such legislation as the Ball-Hatch bill and that proposed by the House Military Affairs Committee, make not for industrial peace and prosperity, but the reverse. Can it be that our industrial and political tories want to force a capital-labor war, by way of the general strike method. In such a strife only industrial pirates gain and then only by national misfortune.

Oliver K. Bovard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the death of a journalist does not always warrant reference to his passing in the House of Representatives, but when Oliver Kirby Bovard, managing editor of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch from 1908 to 1938, passed away it was the end of a career of one of the most outstanding journalists in the United States. He was 73 years of age. He had been ill only 2 weeks, his sickness developing from a hunting trip.

It was Mr. Oliver K. Bovard and his staff who did more than any other individuals to bring out the facts of the naval reserve oil scandal, Teapot Dome, of the 1920's. Likewise it was Mr. Bovard and his staff who uncovered the evidence that resulted in the resignation of Federal Judge George W. English of the East St. Louis-Danville district, who resigned on the eve of his trial before the Senate as a result of impeachment proceedings instituted in the House.

It has been my pleasure to be able to call Mr. Bovard my friend for over 40 years. Under the permission granted me, I am including in my remarks excerpts from an article published in the Post-Dispatch a few days ago. They follow:

Post-Dispatch readers, and more than a generation of newspaper workers in the Middle West, to whom he was known as "OKB," remember the 6 years' news campaign directed by Mr. Bovard to bring out the facts of the naval reserve oil scandal of the 1920s; the expose which brought the resignation of Federal Judge George W. English, of the East St. Louis-Danville district, on the eve of his trial by the Senate on charges developed solely by this newspaper; the exposure of the baby hoax of Mrs. Nellie Muench and accomplices, resulting in Federal prison terms for four persons; the padded registration expose of 1936; and the fights on franchise and utility issues in St. Louis and at Jefferson City which were sparked by a relentless quest for facts vital to the public interest.

* * * * *

HIS FIRST BIG STORY

Mr. Bovard's first important news story, printed a few days after he joined the Post-Dispatch staff early in 1898, was a factual account of the paying of money to members of the municipal assembly for their votes on a street-railway franchise. The story aroused the public, and a circuit judge charged the grand jury either to indict the persons guilty of bribery or to indict the editor of the Post-Dispatch and the writer of the article for criminal libel. The grand jury indicted no one, the prosecutor took no action, and the boodlers had come under the protection of the statute of limitations when, more than 3 years later, Circuit Attorney Joseph W. Folk's vigorous inquiry established the truth of the Post-Dispatch news account. Some of the participants were convicted by Folk of later acts of bribery, and were sent to the penitentiary.

From the beginning of his work as an executive, in 1900, Mr. Bovard strove to make the Post-Dispatch first in presentation and treatment of news of public importance and to make its daily coverage of all sorts of news more thorough and accurate.

Early in his tenure as managing editor, he brought about establishment of the Post-Dispatch's Washington bureau; this paper had previously depended on the Washington bureau of the affiliated New York World. The bureau, under his direction, obtained material for a news campaign in behalf of the nonviolent persons among the political prisoners who remained in confinement after the World War. President Harding freed 28 of these prisoners, and others were pardoned later by President Coolidge.

NAVAL OIL SCANDAL

In 1922, when the first revelations of the naval reserve oil scandal were made, the Post-Dispatch, under Mr. Bovard's direction, began its persistent inquiry into the facts. Senator THOMAS J. WALSH, prosecutor of the cases, testified later to the value of the series of news stories in apprising the country of the surrender of the oil reserves to exploitation. When the Fall bribery, with $233,000 Liberty bonds, was made known, the Post-Dispatch's demand was "Who Got the Bonds" and this query was answered, to a considerable extent, after it printed the bonds' serial numbers.

In the same period came the Judge English investigation, following orders by Mr. Bovard from a hospital bed while he was recovering from an appendectomy. For their work in the oil and English cases, respectively, the late Paul Y. Anderson and the late John T. Rogers received Pulitzer prizes for a reporter's work.

Matters of national importance in which, under Mr. Bovard's direction, the Post-Dispatch went far beyond routine news concepts, were the fight on President Roosevelt's court-packing bill in 1937, and the news presentation, late in 1931, of the depression which then had paralyzed business and industry for 2 years.

FALSE ARMISTICE REPORT

On November 7, 1918, when a St. Louis afternoon paper issued extras carrying the false armistice report, Mr. Bovard, knowing of the report, discredited it, and the Post-Dispatch printed no reference to it, except to tell of the wild downtown celebration caused by the unverified announcement, which was shown in a few hours to be unfounded. As to this, Mr. Bovard wrote, in connection with the biographical memorandum previously quoted:

"The extra—issued by another paper—said the signing took place at 11 a. m. French time. Analysis of the official news from France showed that the German armistice commissioners had not entered the French lines up to that hour, and that General Pershing's army was heavily engaged in front of Sedan as late as 1:45 p. m. It was further obvious that the signing could not take place for several hours after the meeting of the parties. Finally, the message bore no inherent mark of truth; no authority was given. It was mere assertion. While this was not a

factor in reaching the decision, it was interesting to note."

Personally, one of the least known of men in important executive positions in St. Louis, Mr. Bovard made few public appearances, and his photograph was first generally published with the announcement of his retirement. His keen wit was sometimes turned upon news workers whose work fell short of his standards. To one man, a former theatrical advance agent, who magnified the convivial side of his calling, he once handed a pay order with the remark: "I have stood between you and a stage career long enough." Paul Anderson wrote that "despite legends which dramatize Bovard's sardonic humor and cruel wit, the fact remains that he was the best friend of every competent man who ever worked for him."

The Fight for Agricultural Equality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address delivered by Senator JOHN H. BANKHEAD, of Alabama, before the annual meeting of the Alabama Farm Bureau Federation at Biloxi, Miss., on October 31, 1945:

It is a pleasure to be here today with homefolks even though we are some distance from home. With conditions as they are, I make as few long trips as I possibly can. But this trip to meet with Alabama farmers, and other farmers too, is one that I made gladly.

During the years I have been in the Senate I have devoted most of my time to agriculture and to southern agriculture in particular. More than any other group, perhaps, the farmers needed help and still do, for that matter. It is true there has been some improvement during the past few years, a good deal of improvement, in fact, but farmers had a long way to go, and still have a long way to go. While farm income during the war has been at the highest recorded levels, it is still well below the income of industrial workers. For example, the per capita net income of all persons living on farms averaged $534 in 1944, but persons living off the farm received $1,317. The average realized net income per farm in the United States in 1944 was $2,269, whereas in the 10 principal cotton growing States the average per farm was $1,702, or 75 percent of the United States average.

The farmer may be well off by comparison with years past, but he is not well off by comparison with other groups. The farmer will not have received justice until he gets the same pay as the other fellow, other things being equal, for the same work. That is my objective and the objective of all true friends of agriculture.

This fight for agricultural equality has been a long hard fight and still is continuing. I do not need to tell you how hard it was to persuade the Government to help raise farm prices. As many of you will remember, the McNary-Haugen bill was twice vetoed by President Coolidge. The farmers had to contend with the opposition of many men high in Government and industry. The idea of these men—an idea which still is very much alive, by the way—was that it was all right to extend Government aid to business, but socialistic to extend such aid to agriculture. For years, industry has had its tariffs, its patents, and a mass of protective legislation. As you well know, labor has protection and very efficient protection growing out of Federal legislation. Finally, the Government reluctantly decided that it had some responsibility toward agriculture and extended to it a measure of the protection given other groups. Farmers will not give up that protection. They fought to get it and they will fight to keep it.

One of the big reasons why the farmers got protection and why they have kept it is the American Farm Bureau Federation. Men like Ed O'Neal, Walter Randolph, and many others have given the farmers of Alabama and of the country the kind of service that cannot be bought with money. They have organized the farmers and massed their strength against the strength of other organized groups. Only through organization can farmers make their wants known, and, what is more important, get what they want. Without organization, they are helpless.

I have worked with the Farm Bureau Federation for many years. As a result of that experience I say to you that it is in the interest of the farmers of America to strengthen and build organizations like the Farm Bureau. If only the farmers had seen what I have seen, there would be a powerful and vigorous farm bureau in every State in this Nation.

I stated a few moments ago that farmers would fight to keep the protection they had gained. However, they will give up that protection willingly, in my opinion, on one condition. That condition is that other groups also give up their protective legislation and special advantages. Later on I propose to discuss phases of this situation in more detail. But first, I would like to review for a moment the situation in 1932 and some of the things which have happened since that depression year.

Let me illustrate the change by some figures about Alabama. In 1932 Alabama farmers received $37,621,000 for their cotton. In 1944 they received $118,851,000 for their lint and seed, or about three times as much as they got in 1932. In 1932 the Alabama peanut crop sold for $2,136,000 and in 1944 for $23,397,000, or about 10 times as much as in 1932. The value of Alabama livestock products was $13,341,000 in 1932; 12 years later it amounted to $80,663,000. The value of all Alabama crops and livestock in 1932 amounted to $62,547,000; in 1944 it amounted to $275,960,000. Cash income per farm in 1932 averaged $237 in Alabama but in 1944 it averaged $1,129, or almost five times as much. The figures tell the story of the difference between 1932 and 1944. I don't have to explain them.

I don't want to dwell on the bad years. Nevertheless, it is a good thing to think about them now and then. We don't like to recall 5-cent cotton, 8-cent tobacco, 2-cent peanuts, $3 hogs, and 30-cent corn. We don't like to think about the time when community after community lay paralyzed under the blight of depression and the thought of almost everyone was, "What will we do?" No, we don't like to think about those times, but to the wise their memory can serve a most useful purpose. If we aren't careful, 5-cent cotton and the other low prices will come back.

Inevitably, ruinously low prices will come back if we remove protection from agriculture and leave labor and industry protected. There is an insistent demand for the withdrawal of Federal aid from agriculture. We hear frequent demands for a reduction in the loan rate on agricultural commodities. The groups and people which urge this know full well that loans on agricultural commodities are the most effective method for protecting agricultural prices and income. As farmers have learned, appropriations from the Treasury are a most uncertain and precarious means of augmenting and stabilizing farm income. One year farmers have these appropriations; the next year they do not. On the other hand, the loans are not only simple and reliable but, on the basis of experience thus far, are far less costly than appropriations. Since 1933 the Commodity Credit Corporation has made loans aggregating billions of dollars, and, exclusive of wartime subsidies made to hold down the cost of living, has made a profit of approximately $34,000,000 on its operations. All of this and more than $60,000,000 more was made on cotton.

As you know, I was in the Senate at the time of the passage of the original Agricultural Adjustment Act. I helped lead the fight in the Senate for this measure. It embodied some fundamentals which I regarded as fair and just and which I regard as fair and just today. Let us see what those fundamentals were.

The right of the farmer to have Government aid in his effort to get a decent price and income for his labor was clearly recognized in this act. One of the means employed to give him this decent price and income was assistance in adjusting the supply of agricultural commodities to the demand.

Before the first Agricultural Adjustment Act, the farmer had no legal machinery to help reduce production. One year later, I helped put through the Bankhead Act which provided for compulsory production control. Through it, noncooperators were forced into line and prevented from taking advantage of their neighbors. The idea embodied in the Bankhead Act now is embodied in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 which provides for marketing quotas. It also is embodied in related legislation, including a control measure for peanuts. But prior to the measures to which I have referred, the price the farmer received for his product in the market place depended in large part upon the supply of that commodity. A big cotton crop meant, generally speaking, a low price. So did a big potato crop, a big peach crop, a big peanut crop, and so on through the list.

One hears nowadays that farm income depends primarily upon the income of the country as a whole. To a certain extent this is true. But I would like to remind you of agriculture's experience in the 1920's. Prior to World War II, the high for national income was nearly $90,000,000,000 in 1929. Yet, agriculture's share of this national income amounted to only 7.8 percent as compared to 16.6 percent in 1918 and 12.4 percent in 1910-14. The rest of the country was relatively prosperous in the 1920's. Agriculture went steadily downhill. The stock-market boom could not drown out the plaintive cry of farmers, pleading for fair prices. All this time, the law of uncontrolled supply and demand was operating—operating at the expense of the farmers.

But industry never has allowed itself to be governed by the law of uncontrolled supply and demand which operated with regard to agriculture prior to 1933. Industry consistently practiced rigid production control; in fact, a primary reason for the formation of monopolies and trusts was the elimination of competition thereby enabling production control to work more effectively. Of course, if production control operated effectively, prices were kept at satisfactory levels without too much difficulty.

If anyone doubts what I am saying, let him find out what happened during the last severe depression. During the 1929-33 period, production of five major industrial commodities declined from 70 to 83 percent; prices only 6 to 33 percent. In agriculture the story is just the reverse. Prices declined 63 percent; production only 6 percent.

Uninformed people take it for granted that production control in agriculture, that is, planned production control, has failed. So far as cotton is concerned, they do not know what they are talking about. Before 1932, the acreage in cotton averaged over 40,000,000 acres annually. The 10-year average yield was around 170 pounds per acre. Since 1932, the acreage in cotton has averaged 23,715,000 but the yield has gone up until it averaged over 290 pounds per acre in 1944 and has been well above 200 pounds for every year since 1932. Most informed persons will agree that the release of thirteen or fourteen million acres from cotton has been primarily responsible for the diversification and soil conservation that has taken place in the South during the past 15 years.

Furthermore, production control in tobacco has been an outstanding success. So successful has the program been, in fact, that flue-cured and burley producers insisted that it be continued throughout the war.

It is true that agricultural production, taken as a whole, declined very little in the 1932–39 period. This does not mean, however, that production control failed or that the fundamental reasons which brought it about have changed. The agricultural adjustment programs produced similar results where corn and wheat are concerned as they did for cotton and tobacco. This enabled corn, wheat and other farmers to conserve their soil and to build up their lands so they could—and did—produce more per acre. While corn and wheat production have not declined, one of the reasons for this was the increase in production per acre which followed the triple A programs.

All over the country the farm programs since 1932 helped farmers. They put farmers and farming back on their feet. Both were in condition to meet the test imposed by the war. On the average, farmers produced 26.6 percent more during the wartime period than during the 1935–39 period, notwithstanding the loss of millions of farm workers. They had other disabling difficulties. Had it not been for Federal programs for agriculture inaugurated since 1932, this increased production would not have been possible.

Now, some persons predict that our agricultural structure will collapse unless existing programs are changed, and changed quickly at the expense of the farmer. Undoubtedly some changes will be needed in existing farm programs. But let those people who want the price of cotton and other farm commodities reduced remember that their record for prophecy is not too good. Nor is their record as sincere friends of agriculture too good, either.

Let me emphasize again that the record production of food and fiber which made an invaluable contribution toward winning the war would not have been possible if we had left it to the free market to set the price for farm products. This market, let me reemphasize, is not a free market where industrial prices are concerned. It is not a free market where labor is concerned.

With this fact in view, I am proud of the part I have played in enacting Federal legislation for farmers. The handlers and processors are always complaining about this legislation, but the farmers are not complaining. The farmers do not feel that Congress betrayed them. The tears that are shed are being shed by other interests. In the light of your experience as farmers, I will let you draw your own conclusions as to the reason for these tears.

Not long ago, I made a brief compilation of some of the agricultural legislation which I have helped put through Congress. I have decided, however, to mention some of recent action.

I am a coauthor with the late Henry Steagall of the provision in the Stabilization Act of 1942 increasing the rate on mandatory loans on basic commodities from 85 to 90 percent of parity. This act extends the support prices on almost every major agricultural commodity until 2 years after the end of the war, thus assuring there will be no price collapse of agricultural commodities such as followed the last war. Incidentally, the loan rate on cotton due to legislation sponsored by me is now 92½ percent of parity, and will continue at that rate for the 2-year period referred to. For the crop year 1944 the rate was 95 percent of parity, the rate being increased as the result of an amendment introduced by me.

I am a coauthor of the Bankhead-Jones Act, authorizing increased appropriations, amounting to $17,500,000 annually, for extension experiment-station work and land-grant college support, and also coauthor with Representative FLANNAGAN, of Virginia, of legislation enacted in 1945 which authorized another increase in Extension Service appropriations of $15,000,000.

I am a coauthor of the Bankhead-Fulmer bill, providing Federal crop insurance for cotton.

I am coauthor of the Bankhead-Brown amendment to the Price Control Act. This amendment provides that the price ceilings on a major individual cotton textile item shall be such that it will reflect parity for raw cotton, thus placing a sufficient margin in the textile ceilings for the cotton mills to pay parity. This amendment also directs the President to use all lawful means and all agencies of the Government to assure farmers parity. Under this amendment the Government purchased cotton of the 1944 crop at prices averaging 99.9 percent of parity. The Bankhead-Brown amendment is still in effect and is a prime factor in securing parity prices for the 1945 cotton crop.

In 1945 I was coauthor with Representative FLANNAGAN of a bill, S. 298, which became a law, to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and to increase CCC funds available for agricultural loans to $4,750,000,000. This measure is of tremendous importance to all farmers, carrying as it does the funds for support programs on all major commodities.

This is only a partial list of the agricultural legislation with which I have been connected in one way or another. I am giving you this résumé not to boast or for the purpose of reflecting glory upon myself. There were many Members of Congress who helped frame these measures and who did all in their power to put them through the House and Senate. On much of this legislation I had the help of most of the farm organizations, including, of course, the Farm Bureau. That organization has been my strong right arm.

When there is legislation of importance to agriculture pending in the Congress, it isn't hard to find Ed O'Neal. He'll probably be somewhere around the Senate or the House, depending upon which branch has the legislation at that particular time. And with him, in all probability, will be Randolph, Ransom Aldrich, Romeo Short, Harold Young, Earl Smith, Wingate of Georgia, and some of the other Bureau leaders that most of you know.

In the months to come, we will need Ed O'Neal and his lieutenants at the Capitol. Agriculture faces many difficulties, and cotton is near the head of the list in that regard.

Let me say here and now that the way out of these difficulties is not a return to the ruinous prices which prevailed during depression years. We cannot have prosperity in this country by deflating agriculture and inflating industry.

There is now pending in Congress a proposal to raise the minimum wage in industry to 65 cents per hour, later increasing the rate to 75 cents an hour. Labor in many industries is asking pay raises. Industry is balking at the reconversion prices fixed by OPA. The trend in these fields is toward higher wages and higher prices. It is toward a high wage and price structure supported by Government action. With the abandonment of the Little Steel formula and the removal of restrictions upon wage increases, and increase in both wages and prices is likely. It is clear also that the living costs of farmers will be correspondingly increased.

It is strange to me that some southern businessmen and some editors agitate constantly for a cotton price which is competitive with cheap cotton labor of foreign countries, but are not worried about the tariffs which keep out of our county foreign cheap-priced goods. They should be consistent. What is sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander. We should have either a high-price level for farmers and industry, or a low-price level for both. So far as I am concerned, I favor a price level that will enable workers on the farms and in the factories to buy on a parity-price basis the products of the labor of each group. It is not in the interest of farmers to have low wages for industrial workers. City families must have purchasing power to pay fair prices for the things farmers raise. By the same token, it is not in the interest of city workers to have low prices for farm products. Farmers must have purchasing power if they are to buy the things which workers make. It should be kept in mind that farmers and their families comprise 19 percent of our population. A high national income cannot be maintained if agricultural purchasing power is not maintained.

I am opposed to tampering with cotton prices on the flimsy pretext that as industry is reconverted there should be a reconversion of farms and cotton production and prices. The industrial reconversion will result in higher prices, not lower ones. If any change in the price of cotton is made at this time there are many reasons for increasing the price.

The public debt of this country is $262,020,413,381.79, as of September 30. How can we pay this staggering public debt unless we maintain a high price and high wage standard? We cannot do so. Yet, we are confronted with repeated demands that farmers reduce their prices. If labor and industry are to remain on a high wage and price plateau, the only result of decreasing agricultural prices will be to condemn the farmers perpetually to a low living standard.

There is no need for price reductions merely because we have moved from war to peace. Certainly, I will oppose with all the power at my command any attempt to reduce the loan rate during the 2-year support period. And unless there are radical changes in conditions, I will continue thereafter to oppose proposals to reduce loan rates, believing as I do that such reductions will reduce the price of the major agricultural commodities.

On the one hand we are told that agricultural prices should be reduced. On the other we hear that the world, or a large portion of it, is starving and that we must help feed millions. I believe that we should use our surpluses during the next few years to prevent starvation in war-ravaged territories. I know of no better way to spend some of the millions that we must contribute toward world recovery. And in appropriating the funds which will be used to buy food and fiber to contribute to world rehabilitation, the Congress should see that the money spent in this country is spent in a way that will stabilize and support the price of American farm products. One way to do this would be to make the Commodity Credit Corporation the purchasing agent for the food and fiber referred to and to direct that its purchase be made in the open market.

After a reasonable time for adjustment of manpower and production machinery, we will, in my opinion, enter into a period of prosperity. It is short-sighted for southerners to consider seriously any program which will result in a smaller volume of purchasing and debt-paying power in the Cotton Belt.

We are told that rayon will take cotton's market unless we drastically reduce the price

of cotton. In my opinion, the use of synthetic fibers will increase no matter what we do about the price of cotton. The synthetics are preferred in certain fields. For years rayon sold far above the prices of cotton and yet its use expanded steadily all those years. Part of this was due to improvement in the quality of rayon and part to better promotion and advertising. Instead of calling for lower prices, the true friends of the cotton industry should insist that cotton devote as much time and money to research and promotion as the rayon industry devotes to those fields. There are magnificent possibilities in an expanded and coordinated research program—a program which should have the support of the Federal Government. I shall do all in my power to see to it that the cotton industry develops such a program. If so, the use of cotton might be expanded steadily and the farmer might get a fair price for his product.

The salvation of the cotton industry will not come through price decreases to meet foreign-price competition. Rayon expanded into the tire-cord field during this war because rayon, according to the Army, who was partial to rayon, gave a more satisfactory performance where tires were subjected to unusually heavy pressure and high speeds. This was not a matter of price; it was a matter of performance. The way for cotton to get this market back is for the cotton industry to develop a better tire made from cotton cord. Already, cotton cord for tires has been greatly improved. It can be improved a good deal more. Cotton must keep its markets on performance.

Let me remind those who fear rayon that this fiber is made primarily from linter pulp and wood pulp. Why do those who advocate lowering the price of cotton not worry about the price of linters, which as you know is a byproduct of cotton? Why don't they worry about the price of the wood which is used in making the pulp which in turn is used to manufacture rayon? Maybe, instead of cotton being too high, linter prices and wood prices are too low.

From time to time, I have seen references to the fact that our forest resources steadily and systematically are being wasted. Most of the wood that is sold to make pulp for the manufacture of rayon is owned by farmers and cut by farmers. I believe that the farmers who sell this pulp are selling it all too cheaply. They are following the familiar farmer practice of giving away their labor and their resources at the same time.

I also would like to see attention given to improvement in the marketing and handling of cotton. There is room, perhaps, for improvement and far-reaching ones in the manufacture and marketing of cotton products.

In this connection, I recently got hold of a very interesting little pamphlet. It is Marketing and Manufacturing Margins for Textiles, and is the result of a study by L. D. Howell, of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. This study shows that in 1939 the farmer for his cotton got only 7½ cents of every dollar spent by consumers for cotton clothing and household goods made from cotton. Here is how the remainder of the doliar was divided. Seven-tenths of a cent went for ginning and baling, 2.1 cents for merchandising, 10.5 cents for spinning the yarn and weaving the cloth, 8½ cents for dyeing and finishing cloth, 29.9 cents for manufacturing apparel and household goods, 8.2 cents for wholesaling, and 32.6 cents for retailing. This is what Mr. Howell stated in the introduction to his study:

"The cost of marketing agricultural products has an important bearing on returns to farmers, on the one hand, and on marketing outlets and levels of living, on the other. The relative importance of marketing costs for textiles is indicated by the fact that on the average more than seven-eighths of the consumer's dollar paid for textile goods is usually absorbed in marketing and manufacturing margins. A reduction of 5 percent, for example, in these margins would make available for distribution to farm producers or to consumers, or to both, more savings than a reduction of one-third in the cost of producing the raw fibers on the farm."

This language, mind you, is not my language or that of any farmer. It is the language of an economist for the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

I would again advise some of those who harp continually on the necessity of reducing raw cotton prices to look to their own fields, to see whether some reductions cannot be made there. And I would suggest to farmers that they look into some other fields and put some other low price advocates on the defensive for a while.

What I have said about cotton applies equally well to some other farm products. In some instances, perhaps, there should be a decline. I know of none at this time. The situation surrounding each product merits careful examination before conclusions are drawn. But to propose that Government aid to agriculture be withdrawn and the farmer sell in an open market and buy in a closed one is outrageous. This talk of reducing loans and paying farmers parity with appropriations out of the Treasury, is, in my opinion, misleading. As I have indicated, appropriations cannot be depended upon. We cannot get appropriatinos for cotton without getting appropriations for other agricultural commodities. The resultant total would be, in all probability, many billion dollars annually. The public, as I see it, would not go along with such a policy for any lengthy period. The result of lowering the loans on cotton and other commodities would, in my opinion, be a lowering of the prices for the commodities. So long as industry and labor insist upon high wages and high prices, agriculture must resist efforts to reduce substantially prices for farm products. In their own interests and in the interests of the country as a whole, farmers should resist these efforts.

Of course, a part of the low-price plan for farm products is unlimited production of farm products, even at a loss. Nobody expects a manufacturer to continue to make goods at a loss. Yet that is what agriculture is asked to do. When hard times come, farmers are to go right ahead, flooding the markets and piling up surpluses and beating down farm prices.

I do not favor production control for the sake of production control. I wish that farmers could produce to the fullest and get a fair price for all they raise. As things stand now, this happy state of affairs cannot be. Therefore, I urge farmers to use the powers of the Federal Government to protect themselves—just as other groups use there powers. Where production control is effective it should be applied. I urge farmers to use the aid of the Government wisely and moderately, but effectively. So long as I am in public life I will do all in my power to see that Federal powers are available to farmers if they continue to be available to the rest of the country. I feel that such a course is not only in the interest of the farmers, I feel that it is in the interest of the Nation as a whole.

The President Slaps Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of November 2, 1945:

THE PRESIDENT SLAPS CONGRESS

President Truman, in his wage policy talk to the Nation, practically accused Congress of indifference to public interest in refusing to adopt three extremely doubtful measures conceived and consistently pushed by the administration.

The first of these would set a national standard for unemployment compensation. The second would keep employment offices, taken over by the Federal Government from the States during the war, under Federal control for a further period. The third is the misnamed "full employment" bill.

Congress has seemed to hold States can approach the matter of jobless pay maximums, each for itself on the basis of its knowledge of its own conditions and its own needs, better than can the Federal Government.

Congress has seemed to hold, if there was ever any need for Federal operation of employment offices, the need disappeared with the decline in the labor demands of war plants. The States have had long experience in this field and can resume control almost overnight.

Congress, along with a large section of the population, apparently has felt that the full employment bill at least belies its name. It would furnish nobody a job. Its terms and its background are so vague that it is objected to by some as a menace and by others as wholly ineffective.

We believe that it is much more desirable to prepare a program of great public works—the St. Lawrence seaway, the Missouri Valley development, transcontinental roads—and have that ready to give jobs to those who need them, rather than pass a hollow resolution that there shall be jobs for everybody.

If economists marveled at the shallowness of the President's thinking, politicians must marvel at the sharpness of his criticism of Congress for its refusal to be whipped into passing three extremely doubtful measures.

Why No Effective Price Control?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we have a dairy program in operation that is difficult to understand. None but those who had too many sips from the New Deal fountain of philosophy would ration butter when the cream from which butter is made is not rationed.

Butter, with 81 percent butterfat, has an OPA ceiling of some 50 cents per pound. On March 20, I told the House about other dairy products, such as a dairy concoction made in Ohio with a 20 percent fat and a 45 percent moisture selling as cheese for 55 cents a pound right in sight of the Capitol. This means $2.75 per pound of butterfat as purchased by the consumer.

I recently sent two samples to the Agriculture Department to be analyzed. These products were sold as American cheese, not as cheese foods. The product was supposed to have been manufactured in New York.

The following letters furnish the facts on these two samples:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE, PRODUCTION
AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., October 18, 1945.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: In line with your recent conversation with Mr. Henry G. F. Hamann of the Inspection and Grading Division of the Dairy Branch, you will find attached hereto copy of a report submitted by our Chicago laboratory relating to the samples of cheese you asked us to analyze.

We trust this information will be of some help to you.

Very truly yours,

T. G. STITTS,
Director, Dairy Branch.

[Enclosure.]

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Chicago, Ill., October 10, 1945.

Mr. B. J. OMMODT,
Production and Marketing Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. OMMODT: Below you will find the results of the two cheese samples which were to be analyzed for your information. These samples were brought to the laboratory by Mr. Meister.

	Moisture	*Total fat*	*Fat dry basis*
Large sample	44.4	24.20	43.53
Small sample	44.7	21.96	39.71

Very truly yours,

O. J. KAHLENBERG,
Senior Chemist.

Mr. Speaker, this alleged cheese from New York were purchased at 59 cents per pound. The OPA ceiling on American cheese is 39 cents per pound and it contains 32 percent fat and 37 to 39 percent moisture. Compare this with the 44 percent moisture and 21 to 24 percent fat concoctions that are being sold a few blocks from the Capitol for 59 cents per pound.

The consumers are being cheated out of millions of dollars and yet certain groups who claim to speak for the consumers say that the OPA is protecting them.

The OPA claims they cannot do anything about these falsely advertised products and evidently no other bureau of the present administration wishes to do anything about what is taking place.

The Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

FORTUNE,
New York, November 2, 1945.

DEAR MR. WICKERSHAM: Elmo Roper has just completed a Nation-wide poll of public opinion on the atomic bomb. The survey is scheduled for publication in the December issue of Fortune, but due to the immediate importance of this information, we are releasing it to the press in advance of its appearance in our own magazine.

Because of your concern as a Member of Congress, I am enclosing a copy of the release for your information.

Cordially yours,

WILLIAM D. GEER,
Publisher.

TWO-THIRDS OF UNITED STATES PEOPLE BELIEVE ATOM BOMB SECRET WILL BE OUT WITHIN 5 YEARS, FORTUNE SURVEY REVEALS—40 PERCENT THINK RUSSIA WILL BE FIRST WITH ATOMIC BOMB OF ITS OWN—MAJORITY SAY WEAPON SHORTENED WAR BY 6 MONTHS TO A YEAR

NEW YORK, November 1.—Two out of three Americans believe the United States cannot keep the atomic bomb a secret for more than 5 years, the Fortune survey reports today.

Russia is regarded by 40 percent of the people as most likely to win the race to develop another atomic bomb, according to this survey, which was conducted by Elmo Roper. Other Fortune survey findings:

1. Only 15.7 percent of the people think the atomic bomb has increased the chances of a future world war.

2. 53.2 percent think the use of the bomb shortened the war against Japan by something between 6 months and more than a year.

3. Almost the same percentage (53.5) are convinced that we should have used the two bombs against Hiroshima and Nagasaki exactly as we did.

"It took the United States about 5 years to develop the first atomic bomb," Fortune pointed out, asking, "About how long do you think it will be before some other country will develop one if we don't give them any help at all on it?" The replies:

	Percent
Less than 5 years	52.7
About 5 years	12.9
Total	65.6
More than 5 years	11.7
Never	4.5
Don't know	18.2

Among the college-educated an even larger percentage (83.2) think an atomic bomb will be developed elsewhere within 5 years, Fortune discloses.

"Which nation or nations," Fortune then asked, "do you think will be the first to develop the atomic bomb?" The answers follow:

	Percent
Russia	40.4
Germany	28.5
Great Britain	8.9
Japan	7.4
Other	1.7
None	4.5
Don't know	19.0

"Those who picked Great Britain either forgot that Britain is a party to the bomb or believed that Britain would develop separate facilities for producing the bomb," Fortune comments.

In Fortune's opinion, stories of how near the Germans came to developing the bomb probably influenced some of the 28.5 percent who named Germany. "Apparently some of the public was sufficiently impressed to believe that Germans can complete the bomb even with a shattered and closely supervised industry. The selection of Germany probably does not reflect ignorance of the present German situation, for 35 percent of the college-educated picked Germany to be next with the bomb. And the well educated are usually well informed."

On the subject of another big war, people are less optimistic than they were 6 months ago. Answers are compared below to the Survey's question: "Do you think that there will probably be another big war during the next 25 to 30 years, or do you think there is a fairly good chance to avoid it?"

	October 1945	April 1945
	Percent	*Percent*
Big war	38.0	27.1
Good chance to avoid it	51.1	63.7
Don't know	10.9	9.2

Yet nearly half the people think the atomic bomb actually decreased the chances of a future war—and these people include a third of those who are pessimistic about chances of avoiding another world conflict.

Fortune asked: "Do you feel that the atomic bomb has increased or decreased the chances of a future world war, or made no difference one way or the other?" A breakdown of replies follows:

	All the people	Those who think a big war will come	Those who think there is a chance to avoid a war
Chances of war—	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Have been increased	15.7	23.3	11.2
Decreased	46.9	33.7	58.5
Remain unchanged	24.1	30.4	21.0
Don't know	13.3	12.6	9.3

As for the effect of the bomb on the length of this war, only 8.4 percent think it made no difference at all. Here is how opinion divided on the question: "How much longer do you think the Japanese would have held out if it had not been for the atomic bomb?"

	Percent
No longer	8.4
A month or less	9.9
2 to 5 months	17.0
Total	35.3
6 months	17.2
7 to 11 months	3.3
1 year	15.1
Over a year	17.6
Total	53.2
Don't know	11.5

What effect, Fortune wondered, did the atomic bombs have on the United States mind? The attitude scale below shows that while the majority is satisfied with the use of the bombs, there is more disappointed ferocity than compunction among the rest of Americans. The question: "Which of these comes closest to describing how you feel about our use of the atomic bomb?"

	Percent
We should not have used any atomic bombs at all	4.5
We should have dropped one first on some unpopulated region, to show the Japanese its power, and only dropped the second one on a city if they hadn't surrendered after the first one	13.8
Total	18.3
We should have used the two bombs on cities, just as we did	53.5
We should have quickly used many more of them before Japan had a chance to surrender	22.7
Don't know	5.5

Heaviest vote for the last and most destructive course came from the poor and from people of the Southwestern States, Fortune reports. The prosperous and the well-educated turned in larger than average minori-

ties for the two milder courses of action. Negroes differed radically from the poor; their choices followed a pattern similar to that of the well-to-do.

Sales of Surplus Automotive Equipment to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARTER MANASCO
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

SURPLUS PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., October 20, 1945.
Hon. CARTER MANASCO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MANASCO: This is in answer to the questions you raised in our recent telephone conversations about sales of surplus automotive equipment to veterans at Fort Meade, Md., and Fort Devens, Mass.

Our Compliance Division has made a thorough investigation of both of these sales which, as you know, resulted in unfavorable news stories and complaints from veterans. The following is a brief summary of what our investigators found.

The veterans had legitimate complaints. The sales were inadequately organized and arrangements between the Smaller War Plants Corporation and the Commerce Department were not properly coordinated. There was a break-down in the sales procedure, but our investigation does not disclose any deliberate noncompliance nor discrimination against the veterans.

The situation was made worse at Fort Devens by such unfortunate situations as the parking of jeeps which were not surplus on the same lot with the trucks which were for sale, and in the fact that vehicles sold to dealers several days previously at Fort Meade were being driven away at the time when the veterans were having their difficulties. In the Massachusetts case the situation was further complicated by the head of the Commerce Department office there, who held an unfortunate press interview in which he attacked veterans.

Another bad factor was the lack of proper information on the part of veterans as to the procedure to follow in obtaining vehicles, and also lack of information as to the type of vehicles available and their condition. This resulted in the majority of veterans arriving at the site of the sale without having previously qualified with SWPC, as is required. At Fort Meade, for example, only 29 of 129 veterans at the first day of the sale had qualified with SWPC.

Still another contributing cause to the trouble was the fact that at Fort Meade the majority of the vehicles were not particularly suitable for civilian use and no batteries were available, so that vehicles had to be purchased without the purchaser testing the motor. This has been corrected in recent sales.

Newspaper accounts of the Fort Meade sale pictured conditions as worse than our investigation disclosed them to have been. For example, they did not mention that the veterans were sold their vehicles at prices uniformly less than dealers had been paying.

Newspaper stories also failed to mention that many of the trucks were unsuited to civilian use, not because of their condition, but because they were constructed for a particular military purpose.

Intensive efforts are being made to get the information across to the veterans on the correct method of obtaining surplus vehicles and the administration is also taking steps to correct the inadequate planning and lack of coordination which characterized these two sales.

As you know, a new veterans' regulation has been put into effect since the time when these sales were held. This regulation was worked out in cooperation with the major veterans' organizations and we believe that it will enable the veterans to exercise the buying priority which Congress intended them to have. The SPA will be glad to get for you any further information you may wish concerning these sales.

Sincerely yours,
W. STUART SYMINGTON,
Administrator.

Navy Day Address of Admiral Alva D. Bernhard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. LYLE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Navy Day address at Corpus Christi, Tex., October 27, 1945, by Rear Adm. Alva D. Bernhard, United States Navy:

It was with a feeling of humble pride and pleasure that I accepted the invitation of your Navy League to address you today on Navy Day, 1945. I feel honored to have received this invitation. I remember well the first time I saw Corpus Christi in the summer of 1940 from 10,000 feet in the air. The great naval air stations that exist here today were then nothing but empty spaces. Plans and organization were not yet worked out. I had received orders to come to Corpus Christi to build the greatest air station in the world. It's a matter of history that this task was accomplished in record time. Its accomplishment was greatly expedited by the cooperation and the loyal assistance of the people of Corpus Christi and of Texas. The main base was commissioned in March 1941 and we immediately started training aviators. By November of '41 we were graduating naval aviators daily and in the month of February '42 we graduated more than 300 naval aviators—a mark which had been our goal at the beginning—but after Pearl Harbor Day the lid was off and we had no limit.

Today the Navy is 170 years old. Today also is the birthday of former President Theodore Roosevelt, who may well be called the father of the modern Navy. I've always remembered a statement he made in one of his addresses, "Whatever arms have cost us, they have made and kept us a great Nation."

The mission of the United States Navy is control of the sea and of the air above it. In the past two World Wars our enemies failed to control the seas and they were defeated. In the future—as in the past—the key to victory and to the freedom of this country will be in the control of the seas and of the skies above them. Due to our geographical position no foreign enemy can reach us without coming across the sea. Conversely—we cannot reach or defeat an aggressor without crossing the sea. If we control the sea and the air above it, we will remain secure.

In the latter part of March 1942, I was detached as commandant of Naval Air Center, Corpus Christi, and ordered to the Naval Air Force, Atlantic Fleet. This time was probably the darkest period in the war for the United States. Our merchant ships, tankers, and supply ships were being sunk daily at a prohibitive rate and unless we could build more ships and stop these attacks we would soon be isolated from our allies in Europe. German submarines were coming to the very gates of our harbors and sinking our ships with almost complete impunity. They would lie on the sandy bottom until they heard a ship coming—then come to the surface, torpedo it, and go back down below for another listening period. They could do this because we had neither the ships nor planes nor bombs nor guns to stop them.

This condition did not last long—soon we were getting planes and antisubmarine vessels in rapidly increasing numbers. We had the crews trained by the time we received the ships. It became too hazardous for enemy submarines to remain in shallow waters and they were driven out to sea where their targets were fewer and life not so easy for them. Finally they began to hunt our convoys with wolf-pack tactics—where as many as a dozen submarines would shadow one convoy and attack it for days. At that time we did not have enough escort vessels or planes—but we had to keep the supplies moving. We finally began to get deliveries of our most effective weapon which greatly expedited the defeat of submarines in the Atlantic—this was the escort carrier with its air group. The first few were converted from merchant ships. These vessels operated along convoy routes in midocean—in the area which was too far from shore for land-based planes to be effective. When these little carriers, with their aircraft and submarine escorts, through secret instruments and weapons, began wiping out whole wolf-packs, the Jerrys finally admitted defeat for their greatest weapon at sea, on which they had counted heavily to win the war.

By securing control of the seas we were able to transport safely vast numbers of men and vast quantities of equipment, stores, and material for bases. We were able to invade enemy lines and come to grips with him, and defeat him, and end the war in the Atlantic.

It was sea power that made this outcome possible. I do not mean that sea power alone won the war—but it could not have been won without sea power.

By sea power I mean not only ships and planes with their highly trained crews but farms, factories, schools, training stations, air and ship bases, transportation, everything needed to support the force at sea. The great air training organization at Corpus Christi with its many bases was an indispensable part of our sea power.

The war in the Pacific was in principle similar to the Atlantic war but far more difficult. The vast distances multiplied the number of ships required, made many more bases necessary, and you remember the enemy, prior to his sneak attack at Pearl Harbor, had prepared hundreds of unsinkable air bases all over the Pacific, between us and our objectives. We had to secure control of the seas before we could advance across the Pacific. We had to capture the enemy's unsinkable aircraft bases that we needed, and put them to our own use.

To make possible the capture of these strongly fortified islands a new weapon was devised—it was the fast carrier task force. When we built enough carriers, with their air groups, battleships, cruisers, and destroyers to protect them, we went anywhere in the Pacific with impunity and attacked any island or group of islands, destroyed their

planes, the facilities of their bases. This was followed up by a surface bombardment, the landing of amphibious forces, and the island bases were ours and were rapidly developed with everything we needed for air and naval bases. The enemy islands we did not need we simply bombed and bombarded until they were of no further use to the enemy, whose fleet could not supply them and left the garrisons to wither on the vine. Hundreds of thousands of enemy troops were still on these isolated bases on VJ-day, and have surrendered. Our fast carrier task forces spearheaded every attack in our advance across the Pacific.

As our sea power increased, and the enemy's sea power decreased, our jumps across the Pacific to new bases became longer and longer, and we finally had bases built up at the very threshold of the home islands of Japan, air bases for long-range bombardment planes, for medium bombers, and for fighters. Army and Navy air power made daily bombardments over the cities of Japan and played havoc with their factories, arsenals, fuel and gasoline storage, and in fact with everything necessary for the enemy to wage war.

Our fast carrier task forces made continuous raids on enemy shipping: his navy yards, his men-of-war, his air fields in the enemy homeland. When the enemy's last battleship, the *Yamato*, the flagship of the Imperial Fleet, several other warships, and 662 enemy planes were destroyed by our fast carrier task-force planes on April 6 and 7, 1945, the Imperial Japanese Fleet no longer existed.

During the war in the Pacific we had a powerful force of submarines operating in enemy waters. Just how effective they were was never disclosed until the war was over. As our submarines increased in number they were sent out to make it highly hazardous for any Japanese ship to sail the seas even in the far western Pacific. Our submarines at the end had sunk 1,256 enemy ships, with a total of over 10,000,000 tons of shipping.

On VJ-day Japan had a larger army and a far more powerful air force than she possessed on December 7, 1941. In the home islands, at the time of the surrender, there were more than 2,000,000 trained professional soldiers; in China, Manchuria, Formosa, and the by-passed islands there were more than 3,000,000 soldiers. On the day war ended Japan had approximately 6,000 combat planes.

Why did Japan surrender before being invaded? It was because the Japanese live on islands—they are a maritime nation dependent on food and materials from overseas—and they had lost their seapower and could no longer live. Their sea communications were destroyed, their people were at the point of starvation, their industry was destroyed, they lacked fuel for their ships and gasoline for their aircraft.

We had sea power which made it possible to protect our lines of communications and move vast numbers of men and quantities of materials to our forward bases and prepare for a successful invasion of the enemy home islands.

There is much confused thinking today about the atomic bomb. Much misinformation is being circulated—largely due to lack of accurate knowledge. Many people believe that armies and navies will become obsolete and that future wars will be frightful orgies of long-range mass extermination of whole countries. This belief is not true. To the Navy the atomic bomb is just another bomb more powerful than any we have had before. It will still require ships and planes and men to use it against our enemies—or for our enemies to use it against us. In the past, many weapons have been invented for which claims were made that they were so frightful that they would end war. None have done so nor have we ever failed to invent a defense against such weapons. We will do so in the future and our sea power will use the atomic bomb—or any other better weapon that science can devise—if necessary to do so—against our enemy armed forces. The invention of the atomic bomb has made our sea power, including air power, more important and necessary than ever before. Our defense frontiers are no longer the waters adjacent to our shores; they extend over all the oceans of the earth.

We developed many secret weapons during this war, all of which greatly assisted in winning it, but we have one secret weapon which really won the war all by itself, and that is the people of the United States of America. First, I give credit to the young men and women of the armed forces; their loyalty, courage, endurance, and bravery were magnificent. They are all heroes. Next, I give credit to the people of the home front. They bought bonds, which means they supplied their Government with necessary money in astronomical sums. They supported industry with millions of men and women who left their homes to work in factories. A production miracle occurred that supplied our fleets and armies with everything they needed when they needed it. This miracle also supplied our allies with forty-odd billions of dollars worth of lend-lease supplies, without which they could not have continued to fight. When the home fronts of Italy and Germany could no longer supply their armed forces, we invaded those countries and beat them. They surrendered. When the home front in Japan was shattered by our attacks, although they had an army of 5,000,000 men and a powerful air force, they quit. They surrendered. They allowed our armed forces to occupy their home land without a fight; they now submit to our will. Victory was won by our greatest secret weapon—the people of the United States of America.

There is one final requirement of sea power which I have not mentioned—that is the organization which creates sea power and directs its use both in peacetime and in wartime. Our present organization—the Navy Department—has done this so effectively that our sea power has made possible the winning of two world wars. World War II has truly been a global war. There is no ocean on earth in which the influence of our sea power has not been felt. The use of sea power is a fit duty for naval officers who have spent their lives in preparing for this great task. In spite of the unsurpassed record of our use of sea power in two world wars—there is a strong movement being advocated today to change the organization of the Navy Department and combine it with other departments of the Government. The Navy believes this would be a step backward and that at some future time officials not familiar with naval operations might hamper its intelligent use of sea power and thereby endanger the security of our country.

Today you people of the United States of America own the greatest sea power ever created in the history of the world. We have accomplished a great task of winning victory and now we are confronted with one as great of implementing victory into peace for the entire world. I wish I could tell you there would never be another war—I hope and pray there will not—but human nature has not changed and there are still lots of potential aggressors in the world.

We have joined a community of nations and we have pledged ourselves to create a world governed by laws and not by dictators. To keep this pledge we must remain strong. History has demonstrated that the greatest instrument for preservation of peace is sea power. We have it now—let us keep it and redeem our pledge to peace-loving nations for our own security and for the security of the world. Let us speak softly and carry a big stick.

Home Seekers Watch Death Notices, Besieging the Bereaved for Places to Live; Real Estate Lobby Propaganda Misconstrues Facts of Housing Situation

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week the Chicago correspondent of the New York Times reported that homes and apartments are becoming so scarce that would-be renters are watching the death notices in the daily newspapers, then besieging the bereaved to rent the quarters vacated by the newly dead.

That this could happen in our country today is shocking. But this is doubly shocking—while this shameful, ghoulish scrambling for the quarters of the dead takes place, Washington real-estate lobbyists continue to complacently assure us that the housing demand is overrated. They contend that a little such shortage is good for the real-estate business, and that the demand is not so great as we think.

Homecoming veterans are beginning to seek shelter for themselves and their families for this winter with a grim desperation, willing to pay any price. Yet these lobbyists tell us not to worry about it, that by next year the building industry can start building homes to meet the demand. In plenty of time, they say, to prevent runaway inflation in home prices, and to meet the need for homes.

Gentlemen, I submit that these people have but one interest in this housing problem—to make the highest possible profit at the expense of the Nation and the rest of the building industry. They represent the small group of big speculative builders who sell houses a hundred at a time. They are fighting to avoid controls on both building materials and home prices. They wish to be able to outbid the little builder for scarce material in an open market. If they wreck him as a future competitor, all the better. They wish no control on home prices—it might cut their profits on the juiciest market they have had in a quarter of a century. The effect this policy may have on the man who buys does not move them one whit.

Under pressure, they have paid lip service to the need for some control. They agreed to have a "meeting" to work out some system of self-policing of the building industry. Officials already have pointed out that trade associations acted promptly in warning speculative operators who a few weeks ago raised the prices of $8,000 homes built under WPB's old control orders.

The effect of these warnings can be seen in last Sunday's newspapers. The same speculative builder to whom I called attention on the floor of the House 2 weeks ago, the same man who was given a price of $7,250 on his homes and

raised the price to $9,000 after controls were lifted, advertised those houses for sale after being warned by his association. The price was still $8,990. Almost every home advertised for sale ran above $13,000.

This blindness to the serious problem in housing facing us, to the danger of inflation threatening us, and the lack of forthright action, has been the chief characteristic of housing discussions in Washington lately.

I have no quarrel with either the building industry or the rank and file of the real estate profession. I have fought hard for them, time and time again, when they ran into difficulties with the Office of Price Administration or other governmental agencies. I am sincerely interested in seeing to it that the realtor has houses to sell and that he make a fair profit. Because of that interest, I am equally concerned about the possibility of his going bankrupt in the bursting of a real-estate boom.

However, I am critical of this small group of speculative builders who have been so vociferously active in Washington. This is the group that has assured the administration that if building controls were lifted, sufficient houses could be built to meet the demand.

That statement alone is typical of the failure to recognize the genuine causes of the housing jam, the misconstruction that has been put on the facts underlying our housing problem. This lobbying group has declined to acknowledge that scarcity of materials, not any governmental controls, has been the real factor limiting our ability to build homes. They likewise have declined to acknowledge the obvious fact that thousands of houses have been built under control to the extent that present material stocks are at an all-time low.

This group of speculative builders, interested only in profit, does not agree that returning veterans should be given priority on homes, or given protection against inflated prices. They have publicly expressed the opinion that a little more inflation would be good for the country. They have seemed oblivious to the dangers of an uncontrolled building boom, and have failed to recognize that their course will return a profit to a few at the expense of the country's economic future.

After hearing many of their statements, both public and private, I can only reach the conclusion this group has three selfish objectives:

First. To secure the removal of all controls so their single group will be able to use its extensive financial reserves to outbid the small builder for what little supply of building material is available. Most of them are confident that they can pass on the excessive construction cost to the ultimate home buyer in the present market.

Second. Many of the speculators (a few of them leaders in the various real-estate organizations) are confident that they can make a killing in the present rising market and get out before the crash comes, leaving the mortgage lenders and the buyers to suffer in the subsequent crash.

Third. Many of the speculators apparently feel that they have no moral obligation to other members of the real-estate profession to avoid an inflationary situation, to the veterans needing homes, or to their country. It is a coldly selfish attitude of "We want the profit. It is every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost." Some of these men, who realize the inflationary danger of the present market, feel the more builders who go out of business as a result of the lack of materials, the less competition they will have from from the little builder when the supply situation improves next year.

In view of the very real inflationary threat to the Nation created by rising housing prices, and the growing scarcity of building materials, I cannot subscribe to such a selfish attitude, regardless of its sincerity.

I firmly believe that the bulk of realtors and builders in the country are better men than that, are farsighted enough to realize the danger of a "boom and bust," and are willing to submit to control of prices for a few months longer until we can produce the material to build more homes.

Simply stated, the facts of our housing problem are as follows:

There is a greater shortage of building material now than at any time since 1941. It will be next June or July before manufacturing facilities can reconvert and step up production to a point where a sizable amount of building material will be available.

Between now and next July the scarcity of houses will continue to be critical—whether or not we have any controls. It is conservatively estimated that more than a million and a half homes must be built to begin to meet the demand. Against this, the building industry says it can only construct 450,000 homes, and can build those only if sufficient materials can be produced.

This unprecedented need for homes, plus the many millions of dollars' worth of wartime savings in the hands of the people, has developed a purchasing power that could lead to run-away, uncontrollable inflation in our economy.

My sole aim in considering these facts is to seek some means of holding down prices so the ordinary citizen and the veteran can have a fair chance to buy homes at a decent price during these next critical 9 or 10 months.

I am in full agreement with the statement of sincere spokesmen for the builders that scarcity of homes is due to the return of the veterans, the unscrambling of families who have been living in doubled-up fashion, and the movement of war workers, plus the deterioration of old houses.

But I do not agree with the contention that cessation of building activity has been due to Government regulations. Instead, I hold that it is due primarily to the scarcity of materials. Regulations necessarily were imposed to channel what supplies of material were available so that most legitimate demands could be met first. That need for channeling of materials still exists. Low-cost homes should be built before mansions. The veteran should be given a priority.

In view of the present scarcity of building materials, Government control is still essential to prevent competitive bidding among builders that would send materials prices ballooning.

Some of these Washington representatives apparently are out of touch with the rank and file of the building industry. Many builders have expressed the opinion to me that they dislike price control, but dislike the prospect of runaway prices on construction material even more. They have no desire to see controls lifted for some months. If such controls were lifted, there can be little question that the big mass builders could easily absorb all of our present stocks through their mill and factory contacts, putting the little builder out of business.

Despite the complaints of building spokesmen against regulation, it is the opinion of experts both within and without the industry that if all governmental control were removed tomorrow, housing construction could not be stepped up before next June or July.

However, if these controls were removed, prices of all materials from brick to nails would immediately rise under the pressure of competitive bidding. That is what I would like to avoid, not only because of the home buyer, who must eventually foot the bill, but because it would put thousands of small buiding contractors out of business.

Again, the speculative spokesmen cry for lifting of rent ceilings on the ground that it would increase building of needed rental property. Their reasoning on this is equally fallacious. In the face of the present material shortage, I do not see how construction of rental property can be stepped up any more than construction of dwelling units—regardless of how much incentive was given the builder by unlimited rents.

Removal of rent control in those congested areas where it now applies would, in my opinion, result in the eviction of thousands of families unable to pay the higher rents. They would be seeking other places to live—and the housing shortage would be further aggravated.

It is true, as real-estate spokesmen reiterate, that a ceiling price on homes will not produce more homes nor create sales. But once more they are attempting to mislead us as to the purpose of imposing ceiling prices. Such a control would be imposed—during the next nine critical months—solely to prevent soaring prices from wrecking the real-estate industry in a boom and bust period, to prevent ruinous inflation from striking our country. We should learn from our sad experience in an exactly similar situation after the last war.

Once more paid propagandists of the real-estate lobby are attempting to misconstrue the facts with the contention that if the market price of a home is too high it will not sell, and the realtor will do no business. They tell us that this would constitute automatic price control. They know and the public knows that in the present market a home will sell at almost any price.

If a ceiling price accomplished the one task of holding the line against inflation, it would serve a worthy purpose.

I fully believe the Government is doing everything humanly possible to stimulate increased production in the building field. Mr. John Snyder, Reconversion Director, has taken a long step in the right direction with his six points to step up manufacture of building materials. Incentive prices have been given segments of the industry.

However, the results of these efforts cannot be felt for months in the actual production of homes. Until then, we must provide protection for the small builder and the home buyer, and prevent an inflationary upsurge in home prices.

Our duty is clear on this point. If we are to sincerely conduct our fight against inflation we cannot view the rising waters of this housing boom as a mirage. The danger is imminent. The penalty will be imposed on all of us if we fail to stop this inflationary tide before it engulfs the Nation.

Navy Day Address of Admiral P. N. L. Bellinger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, we were indeed fortunate on October 27, it being Navy Day, to have as our guest speaker on the occasion of the celebration of that event at Charleston, S. C., a native son of South Carolina, Admiral P. N. L. Bellinger, commander, air force, Atlantic Fleet. So interesting were his remarks and so timely at this time when America contemplates an adequate fleet to keep the peace which the Navy helped so gloriously to win, under unanimous consent, I insert his address in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that in future years his words may bear testimony to the vision which men in similar positions demonstrate to insure future peace and protection to the peoples of the world:

It is a real pleasure for me to be here tonight, because in addition to the many attractions Charleston offers a visitor, it offers me an opportunity to visit my home State. Of course, Cheraw is quite a distance from here but every South Carolinian knows that when he has been away for a long time, anywhere within the State's borders is home.

I am especially glad to talk to you tonight about the Navy, not just because I have spent all my adult life in that service but because I believe that what we are doing and what we are thinking about our Navy, on this Navy Day, give a clear indication of what we will be doing as a Nation during the critical years ahead of us.

The American people today possess the greatest Navy the world has ever seen. With the largest fleet, the mightiest naval air force, and the broadest expanse of naval bases, it guarantees for America effective access to any part of the globe.

But what are we going to do with this great Navy? Are we going to demobilize the men, decommission the ships and dismantle the bases, leaving our security to strange new weapons operated with push buttons? Are we going to abolish this great weapon we have forged, and rely for our safety on the innate goodness of human beings? Or, on the other hand, are we going to maintain this overwhelming power at peak strength and attempt to force upon all the world our own ideas of politics, economics, and ethics?

Of course, we shall adopt neither extreme. We shall acknowledge the innate goodness of most human beings, and keep our Navy strong. We shall grant the right of other people to their own systems of freedom and be ready to repulse any attack upon our freedom.

But saying this doesn't make it so, and it is because some foresighted people knew this that we have Navy Day. The first Navy Day was celebrated in 1922. October 27 was selected because it was on that date in 1775 that the Continental Congress received the bill providing for the original United States Fleet. Incidentally, the 27th of October is also the birthday of Theodore Roosevelt, who, like his great kinsman, loved the Navy and did so much to build it to greatness. Navy Day was sponsored then, as it is now, by the Navy League, an organization of patriotic civilians whose prime purpose is the security and defense of our country and who believe that the best way to achieve this security and this defense is to maintain a strong Navy.

However, despite the efforts of members of the Navy League and countless other citizens, the years that followed 1922 saw anything but the building of a trong Navy. In 1921, the year before the Navy League was established, this country had led in the calling of a naval disarmament conference; a few years later many of those who were advocating a strong Navy were being stigmatized as "merchants of death"—and not long before our enemies struck, many of our citizens sincerely—and effectively—opposed the building of new planes and ships and the fortifying of vital bases. Pearl Harbor was the almost inevitable result.

I believe that the Japanese sneak attack succeeded primarily because of a national attitude, an attitude which only a few months earlier, in the face of a fast-spreading war, had caused the House of Representatives to come within one vote of disbanding our brand-new Army.

That Sunday morning, December 7, 1941, there were 8 battleships, 7 cruisers, 28 destroyers, and 5 submarines at Pearl Harbor. The Japanese planes sank five of the battleships and damaged the other three. They also destroyed a goodly portion of our naval combat planes.

In the western Pacific during the days that followed, our small Asiatic Fleet, no larger than a modern task force, was driven south and cut to pieces; our few aviation units were forced to flee to Australia, and our garrisons on Guam and Wake were captured. We lost our only drydocks in the western Pacific when Japanese carrier planes nearly obliterated Cavite during a 10-minute attack in their invasion of the Philippines.

By early May, the Japanese had pushed the Allies out of 10,000,000 square miles of ocean areas and were heading for the east coast of Australia. Our forces challenged them in the Battle of the Coral Sea. What followed was the first major engagement in naval history in which surface ships involved did not fire a single shot at each other. It was purely a naval air battle, with the opposing warships remaining hundreds of miles apart.

The surviving Japanese ships fled north and little was heard of the enemy fleet until they decided to take Midway. What they took was anything but the island of Midway. It was the most decisive defeat suffered by the Jap Navy in 350 years.

These two naval air battles—Coral Sea and Midway—turned out to be decisive, but during the following weeks they seemed little more than silver linings for some very dark clouds, for it was at that time that the Germans broke through to El Alamein and Stalingrad seemed about to fall.

Although the Japs' southward march had been stopped in the Battle of the Coral Sea, they had seized strategic positions in the Solomons and were building an airfield on Guadalcanal. We decided to capture it.

You all know the story of that epic struggle, of how our Marines hung on against overwhelming odds and set the pattern for their heroic advance straight into Japan's front yard, of the fact that after 6 months of bitter warfare on land and sea and in the air, the Japanese pulled out what they could and began the withdrawal that was to end in Tokyo Bay.

Few Americans realize, however, by what a close margin victory was won. Few know, for example, that on Navy Day, 1942—3 years ago tonight—the only American aircraft carrier left for action in the Pacific was the *Enterprise*, and she had 27 feet of water in her bow as a result of battle damage. The *Hornet*, our newest carrier, had been sunk the day before, during the Battle of Santa Cruz. The few others that we had were either undergoing battle damage repair or had been sunk.

But from then on, our forces grew steadily in size and in power. The Japanese were thrown out of the Aleutians, beaten in the Gilberts, in the Marshalls, in the Marianas, and in the Philippines, until finally at Iwo Jima and at Okinawa American courage captured the gun mounts needed for the assault on Japan itself.

Meanwhile the Navy had been fighting another full-scale war in the Atlantic. I am sure I need not tell the people of Charleston much about that. You were a part of it. It was from bases like those in this area that our planes and ships went out to destroy the U-boats.

The Germans knew they had to win the Battle of the Atlantic or lose the war. They threw into that battle everything they could and for a time they succeeded all too well. Had their early successes continued, there could have been no landings in Africa, no invasion of Europe. In fact, Russia and Britain might have been overwhelmed.

In our efforts to beat the U-boats we concentrated along our coastal areas all the ships that could be spared from other equally pressing tasks and almost any planes that could fly. Finally, the submarines were driven away from our shores and began concentrating in midocean. There, they believed, they were safe from our aircraft, which had turned out to be highly effective against them. We then introduced escort carriers into the Atlantic and in spite of the fact that terrible weather was added to all the other dangers of flying from baby flattops, they hunted down and destroyed the Nazi wolf packs.

By the end of 1943 the U-boat menace in the Atlantic was under control, but it remained so only because of the heroic work of many thousands of men. Their heroism was not always manifested in actual combat with the submarine but in the continual night and day grind, battling the elements in their effort to apprehend the submarine. Even during the final weeks before the German surrender, the U-boats came out with new devices and new tactics which threatened our victory. For example, they installed "schnorchels" which permitted the subs to be run submerged almost indefinitely and which added greatly to the difficulty of finding and destroying them.

When the Germans surrendered we prepared to turn all our power against the Japanese. Before this could be done, however, the power already being exerted against them took effect and they, too, gave up.

The surrender of Japan, it should be remembered, came before a single American soldier had set foot on the Japanese mainland. It was the first time in history that a major power had been forced to acknowl-

edge defeat before invasion. It demonstrated clearly what the power of an air-sea Navy could do to a nation even while her Army was at peak strength.

Japan was almost helpless, strangling to death under the Navy's air and sea blockade, before the first atomic bomb fell and before the Russians declared war against her. The record now reveals that her rulers had been trying to get out of the war for weeks. They knew that regardless of how many million men they had under arms, without planes and ships their army was useless.

I do not intend to argue that this service or that arm won the war. It was the systematic application of all kinds of power that won. But I want to stress the fact that it was integrated air-sea Navy, planes and ships working together in perfect unity, which played a major part in our victory. Naval aviators were largely instrumental in breaking the back of enemy resistance in both the Pacific and the Atlantic. Significally, after the attack on Pearl Harbor the number of Navy planes increased from 5,000 to more than 37,000 and the number of pilots from 6,000 to more than 55,000.

During that time the number of our carriers increased from seven to approximately a hundred, and it was these carriers which stood off Japan during the closing days of the war and hurled thousand-plane raids at the enemy. They not only raided the Japanese mainland; they stayed there, beating down the Japanese land-based air force despite all that the Japs and the weather could do.

One advantage of these flexible mobile airfields, which, in effect, is what carriers are, is their ability to move in close, hit hard and often, and withdraw quickly. The enemy, being constantly thrown off balance, is at a loss to know where to concentrate his available defense. Usually he tries to spread it over his whole area and the result is that he is weakened everywhere. Our carriers demonstrated that they could go anywhere, fight off the best the enemy could throw at them, and stay there to give close support to landing forces. They were ready to furnish the air support for the invasion of Japan when the enemy surrendered.

It is because of these qualities that a large number of carriers was included among the vessels suggested for the postwar Navy by Secretary of the Navy Forrestal. He told the House Naval Affairs Committee on September 19 that the postwar Navy should comprise approximately a thousand major combatant ships, of which 300 should be in active service, about 100 in a "ready reserve," and the remainder in a "laid-up reserve" with only care-taker crews aboard but ready on short notice to join the fleet upon the approach of an emergency.

This would call for a postwar Navy of some 50,000 officers and half a million men as compared with 300,000 officers and more than 3,000,000 men in the Navy at the time of Japan's surrender.

Our postwar Navy must be organized and maintained on an offensive rather than a defensive basis. It must be prepared to take quick offensive action thousands of miles from our country's shores. The costly experience of two wars has taught us that there is no security in our relative geographic isolation. The very fact of our isolation requires a Navy of far-reaching power, power to display at all times in distant waters a naval might sufficient to discourage would-be aggressors and convince the world that we mean to keep the peace.

Although teamwork throughout our fleets and between all combatant forces was the foundation of success, I believe that naval aviation more than any other single agency was responsible for winning World War II. Carrier aviation in particular spearheaded every campaign in the Pacific and made it possible not only to bring other forces into action but also to continue them in action for extended periods by furnishing air protection. Our enemies know this and our postwar Navy should reflect it.

Much has been said about the atomic bomb. There are those who believe that this invention makes it unnecessary for us to maintain a large Army or a powerful Navy—that the atomic bomb should end all wars. But as the Secretary of the Navy told the House committee, no one knows the ultimate effect of atomic power. The possibilities are almost beyond our comprehension and every effort should be made to develop this weapon not only to wage war but to preserve peace and foster the general welfare.

In the same manner that air power has been developed, atomic power will doubtless be developed, but until more of its ramifications are known we should rely, for the most part, upon the weapons which smashed Germany and Japan. Until technical developments radically change the concept of modern warfare, it would be folly to discard the weapons which have proved their worth.

On the other hand, the postwar Navy must foster research and development—be quick to probe, and accept new weapons—and to change its theories so as to be abreast of science and invention at all times. I am sure that the Navy's record in the development of radar, the proximity fuse and many other special devices, as well as its participation in the development of the atomic bomb, gives assurance to the American people that the Navy's historic mission will be carried out with whatever weapons are most effective. You may be sure that if we are so unfortunate as to have another war, the Navy will continue to keep that war away from our own shores and carry it to the enemy.

Who's Selling Your City?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "Who's Selling Your City?" by Mr. Hubert M. Harrison, Longview, Tex.

WHO'S SELLING YOUR CITY?

In the keen competition between cities, regions, and States for postwar patronage of tourists and investors, word-of-mouth publicity will play a large part in fixing the standing of your community. All the beautiful pictures and alluring advertising matter that your city can issue may be offset by what little people up and down main street say about the town and how they treat visitors.

Most of us form our opinions about towns largely by the treatment we receive from taxi drivers, waitresses, hotel clerks, retail sales people, traffic cops, and gasoline service station attendants. This may be illogical but it is human nature.

My visit to one great southern city was almost spoiled by an insulting head waitress. A certain city in East Texas, which is the home of some of our finest citizens, is notorious for its bad food and poor restaurants. The name of another nice little town always suggests dirty show windows to me. In a southern resort city recently an unusually capable and courteous automobile mechanic and a hotel manager who went out out of his way to favor me had more to do with "selling" me on that town than their delightful climate and their excellent chamber of commerce. Another southern city which is proud of its traditions and gardens will always be remembered because of the most exorbitant taxi fares in my experience and the largest and most voracious mosquitoes.

A pleasant, alert filling station attendant will meet and greet many more visitors to your city than the president of your chamber of commerce. That gum-chewing blonde waitress at the Bum Bum Cafe dispenses more local history than the DAR even if it is mostly incorrect. A few live local chambers have realized the important public relations value of little people. Some cities have regular meetings of waiters, taxi drivers, retail clerks, and gas service employees to inspire them to know the city and sell it right.

Only a few visitors to a city ever call at the chamber of commerce. Only a fraction of 1 percent of the people who are sizing up your town ever meet the president of the first national bank.

The reputation of your town with visitors is largely in the hands of little people. Let's try to see that they sell your city by actions that speak louder than words.

HUBERT M. HARRISON.

EAST TEXAS, *November 1945.*

Full Employment a National Necessity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including an excellent article from the November 1945 issue of the Journal of the National Education Association by the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY entitled "Full Employment a National Necessity":

FULL EMPLOYMENT A NATIONAL NECESSITY

(By Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY, Senator from Montana)

"You take my life when you do take the means whereby I live."—*Shakespeare.*

No longer in the United States is a man allowed to starve because he lacks the means whereby he lives. But if all men are entitled, in addition to life, to liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, then it follows that all men are entitled to the means by which they can attain these inalienable rights. Charity makes a man dependent upon the giver; a dole, upon the state. Man can be truly free only if he through his own powers can produce what he needs for his own happiness. Freedom in our times means, first of all, the right to a job.

A year ago the then Senator Truman, as a member of a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee, joined me in submitting a report to the full committee, in which we pointed out that "no thoughtful American—no matter what his creed or station in life—would deny that every man or woman in the country who is willing to work and capable of working has the right to a job." The President in his message of September 6 reiterated his views on this subject when he called for "a national reassertion of the right to work for every American citizen able and willing to work."

Largely through the power of education we have become the most productive people on earth. We continue in ever-increasing volume to educate more people to become increasingly more productive. (It is true that segments of our population are not sufficiently educated to produce enough for their

own well-being, but the percentage is small and we are, I hope, about ready to break the vicious circle in two places—in the school and in the opportunity for a job at a decent wage.)

Yet we are confronted with the problem of producing more than our present economic system permits men to consume. If we are to supply the jobs for which people are being educated, it is imperative that education emphasize man as the consumer, and as the end for which our economic machinery is intended to function. We must also educate people to make good and full use of their leisure. In contrast to the doctrine propounded by Adam Smith, this generation must be taught that only if we follow our unselfish social inteersts will it be to the best interest of each one of us.

It is the basic philosophy of the full employment bill, S. 380,[1] that the human being is the center about which economic life revolves and that our economic machinery should function constantly in the best possible way for his benefit. The bill recognizes that human freedom and happiness are unavailable without the opportunity of all workers for productive employment. The bill is designed to overcome the weaknesses of our present system, to encourage and stimulate private enterprise to produce to the maximum extent possible, and to insure a standard of living and purchasing power sufficient to absorb all that can be produced.

The means used are not new or revolutionary, and certainly they are not socialistic. The bill's only claim to distinction is that it does emphasize and take very seriously that which has been ignored or to which only lip service has been paid. The bill assumes that the private-enterprise system is a good one and that Government is run by and in the interest of the governed. It continues, expands, and formalizes the successful wartime cooperation of industry, agriculture, labor, local and State governments together with the Federal Government in the common interest of all. It legally recognizes and spells out the duties of the President and the Congress and their responsibility for maintaining sound economic conditions.

At the same time it establishes a better channel of communication between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government and between the two Houses of Congress and their several committees. It puts the responsibility where it belongs.

WHAT THE BILL DOES

The familiar tactic of labeling has been resorted to by the critics of the full employment bill. Aside from being called communistic and socialistic, which hardly anyone takes seriously, the bill has most frequently been called a public works or deficit-financing bill. A casual reading or careful study of the bill will show that it is neither. The bill sets up a scientific framework and machinery which enable the President and the Congress to look at the economy as a whole and to utilize in the best possible way the knowledge of all groups, public and private, in bringing about full employment and full production.

The President, according to the bill, after estimating what the labor force will be, would analyze the current economic conditions and trends. Depending on whether he estimates (a) that more people will be seeking work than current conditions would seem to provide jobs for, or (b) whether there are more jobs available than there are people seeking them, he would then recommend either a program designed to encourage private enterprise (a) to fill the job gap or (b) to reduce the inflationary gap. Such a program would include, for example, policy suggestions and legislative recommendations on taxation, money and banking, foreign trade, agriculture, wages, social security, etc.

Such a program would be a consensus of the best ideas for bringing about the optimum economic environment for private enterprise in the light of the best and most comprehensive data on economic conditions and outlook by industry, by area, and for the Nation as a whole. If this program did not result in enough jobs for all desiring them, then and only then, would the bill make it incumbent on the President and Congress to enact a program of public expenditures and investments. Such a program would not be limited to public works. It would include public services, loans and assistance to business, agriculture, home owners, veterans, or consumers, or for other purposes. It is a much broader approach and permits more flexibility than would a program of merely public works. It would enable the Government to keep the economy operating constantly at full employment levels of production. No longer would the Government have to wait until after the wheels of industry had slowed down or stopped and unemployment had piled up before action could be taken. The program is designed to prevent emergencies from arising.

Consumers with the assurance of continuous high levels of income would maintain a high level of expenditures. Private enterprise being similarly assured of sustained demand would confidently produce at high levels, thus reducing the need for Federal investments and expenditures.

WHY THE GOVERNMENT MUST STEP IN

The Government has been increasingly forced to take a more active part in the economic affairs of its citizens. Contrary to the general belief, every step has been taken reluctantly and only after very careful consideration. The men in Congress and in the White House are probably less inclined to let the Government run things than are the men and women they represent. The reasons the Government has had to step in so often have been many and varied, but one of the chief reasons has been that we have allowed our free competitive system, in large part, to degenerate into private collectivism.

Huge corporations have been allowed to develop and devour the economic energies of men. These economic octopuses have spread their tentacles over the economy to such an extent that all businesses and enterprises are affected by their decisions. Small business either buys from, sells to, or competes with big business. The farmer buys his wares from big business and sells his produce to it and to the mass of workers employed by it.

These corporations determine the price and the amount which will bring them the maximum profit. High prices and restrictions of production have resulted in lower purchasing power and less employment. Government influence and decisions favorable to their practices have been one of their chief unethical technics.

The full employment bill intends to stop this. It does it by specifically requiring the President to recommend and the Congress to decide upon policies and programs which prevent monopolistic practices from interfering with continuing full employment. More than that, the bill seeks to encourage good economic conduct on the part of these large corporations by insuring business as a whole a large and more predictable market and a favorable economic climate for continuously profitable operation.

To the extent that the monopolist fails to end monopolist practices and persists in carrying out restrictive production and employment policies, in spite of the above, he would, in effect, force the Government to resort to the investment and expenditure device. The monopolist is definitely put on the spot. It is upon him, more than anyone else, that the decision must rest whether the Federal Government will be required to spend or invest much. It is he who has forced the Government to interfere on the side of free enterprise.

CONGRESS MADE RESPONSIBLE

The bill places the final responsibility for the decision on the full employment program on the shoulders of Congress. The bill sets up a Joint Congressional Committee to receive and consider the National Budget Message of the President. This committee would hold hearings on the Budget message and then send a report and concurrent resolution to both Houses of Congress recommending a specific program of action, which would in all likelihood vary in some or many respects from that recommended by the President.

The concurrent resolution and the report, of course, would offer the opportunity for comprehensive debate and full publicity on total economic policy and a consideration of an integrated and coordinated program in relation to it. The passage of the bill would mean that Congress would no longer be able to get by with hit-or-miss or piecemeal legislation.

Sectionalism on the part of Members of Congress and those whom they represent would tend to be discouraged and a national point of view would be encouraged. The debate would bring out clearly the dependence of the welfare of the community upon that of the Nation, and the Nation's upon that of its communities.

It would provide the opportunity for Representatives and Senators to become real national figures and, very important politically, they would be given credit for their work back home.

A FIRST NECESSARY STEP TOWARD FULL EMPLOYMENT

The bill offers the first necessary step toward full employment. It is no substitute for any bill or for a program such as has been boldly and intelligently outlined by President Truman.

But Congress, if it passes the full employment bill, will have declared that it has the responsibility for maintaining full employment and it would be required to view legislation in terms of that responsibility. Congress would begin to see, as it viewed the economic problem as a whole, that only insofar as it provides for all without discrimination would it lessen the need for providing at all.

[1] As this article is written, the bill has passed the Senate and is now before the House.

The Tax Bill Is Ready

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of November 2, 1945:

THE TAX BILL IS READY

Congress, which has a habit of delaying tax bills, is to be congratulated for getting the 1946 measure passed and into effect so promptly. There were several controversial issues involved and it cannot be said that all were settled ideally, but, by and large, a good job was done and done in time so that the Treasury can prepare new withholding tables and other forms safely in advance of January 1.

Probably too much "relief" has been given the individual taxpayer, but few who ben-

efit will criticize Congress for that. The continued freezing of the old-age and survivor pay-roll tax at 1 percent was definitely uncalled for, but this, too, was a "safe" mistake for Congress to make.

These and other provisions may be criticized by experts, but there may be excuse in the fact that speed was essential and that this is only a temporary, stopgap revision. The big task now awaits congressional attention—a complete revision of the country's tax program.

It may be hoped that a quick start will be made on this more fundamental revision, which will require the development of a new over-all tax policy. The time has come to consider anew the part that business taxes, import tariffs, excises, individual income taxes, and death duties should have in the financing of government. Theories as to taxation have changed considerably in the last few years. In arranging a postwar tax program these new theories should be given due weight and the whole tax structure should be simplified and streamlined so far as this is possible.

The move should, of course, be in the direction of discontinuing indirect taxes in favor of direct levies and in bringing into the tax picture every person with a regular, even if modest, income.

One World or None

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the privilege given me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered recently by Rev. William E. Dudley, LL. D., minister of the First Congressional Church in my home city of Toledo, Ohio. The address is as follows:

ONE WORLD OR NONE

The newspaper headlines are startling enough to wake the dead but not sufficiently dramatic to hold the attention of the living. We are informed that 750,000 people were killed and injured by the two atomic bombs which this country released upon two Japanese cities.

There are many reactions to this assault against humanity. There is one small group that is deeply troubled, to whom this act is a disturber of conscience, a stimulant to shame and contrition. Another group holds that the Japanese soldiers and civilians alike deserved every punishment produced by human ingenuity. Still another faction justifies the bombing as an advance agent of peace. Their argument is that half a million lives lost now is safer economy than ten times the number later. Then there are those who say that one cannot stop the march of science because men choose to use science for evil ends.

MAN NEEDS TO ASK GOD'S FORGIVENESS

Whatever the reaction and attitude to this latest invention of destruction, we know that a tremendous amount of rationalization is involved, which means that much that is done cannot be justified. Indeed, we have heard very little about any moral and spiritual disturbance in the heart of man. No group of people or single nation has come to feel the need of kneeling down and asking God's forgiveness for their crimes against humanity. In this country, for example, few have talked about the terror, suffering, and torturing pains that gripped helpless civilians in the early hour of a great city when more people were exposed to danger than at any other hour of the day.

Had these atomic acts been perpetrated by some enemy nation our indigation and anger would know no bounds. We were shocked when the Germans gutted Coventry and blasted London. Those were dastardly deeds and we said so. Why is it that we are not morally disturbed regarding our own acts upon Japan? Why is there not more sensitivity concerning the wholesale slaughter we have wrought? The answer is that if Germany or Japan had first secured the weapon they would have gone the limit. That is doubtless true. The fact remains that we went the limit. This is disturbing, because though the act may have been one of military necessity, there were no qualms of conscience.

It would seem that every concept of decency has been dulled among the nations. Every vestige of human sympathy has been scattered to the winds. Thus all the nations, including our own, front toward barbarism and not toward the Christian ethic.

NO KIND OF FUTURE SECURITY IN PRESENT TREND

Again we should remember that there is no kind of future security in the present trend. An American general said recently, "We must not fail to strike down any future aggressor nation before it gets dangerous." At what point does an aggressor nation become dangerous? Furthermore, how are we to know that the United States will always possess the last secret in military destructiveness?

As a prominent journalist recently put it, "Are we asked to believe that the Anglo-Saxon peoples have alone been granted the Godlike power to crack atoms?" Scientific knowledge is universal. The idea of atomic destruction has been studied in all parts of the world. German physicists, including a German Jewess, aided in the evolution of the atomic bomb. Danish scientists made their contributions to it. Great Britain added her quota to the laboratory tests. An Italian used the proceeds of the Nobel prize to reach America to help the atomic race along. This country furnished its resources and genius and gave the thing a name. Scientific knowledge knows no bounds.

This situation means that no one nation, or three nations, or any San Francisco treaty can control world peace indefinitely. The idea that America must strike down any nation before it gets dangerous is naive and impracticable. It reveals how blindly we are led toward an understanding of atomic energy and its basic implications. As nations we are dependent upon each other for survival. We are at the mercy of each other. We can totally destroy each other because this is one world or none.

We shall do well to discount the idea that America is self-sufficient. The nations that now control the atomic bomb may lose that control at any moment. Sooner or later some nation, great or small, will evolve some new horror until the whole earth becomes bedlam. To believe that any small group of nations can be trustees for the safety of humanity may have been true yesterday, but it is not true today.

NATIONS MUST GET ON AMICABLY TOGETHER

What we need is not so much the ability to strike down an aggressor nation, but the sense and eagerness to create a revolution in human thinking. A nineteenth century nationalism is totally obsolete for twentieth century needs. We have cracked the atom, but what of it if in so doing we have cracked humanity? We shall not heal the damage by more cracking in the name of brute force. The condition demands a new kind of conduct that takes in the whole human race as the basic part of God's creation. The problem is not how is the world to be run by the Big Three or controlled by the power that holds the latest atomic device, but rather the willingness of groups of people in every nation, large and small, friendly and unfriendly, to get on amicably together as children of God.

This assumption brings us at once to the need for some kind of philosophy, religion, or gospel—especially a philosophy, religion, or gospel that demands recognition of the moral and spiritual implications of life. I am convinced that the economic materialists have little to offer. Speedier airplanes, more destructive weapons, intricate radar instruments have their place, but if through wrong uses there is a shrinkage of the human spirit, a lessening of the moral urge, an utter disregard for the right human relationships, of what avail?

So, too, our isolationists are confused in their reasoning in the light of modern conditions. Isolationists are people who live in small fractions of the brain that long ago stopped thinking. The problem today is not how can we through human cleverness practice insularity and survive, but how can we share our enlightenment about human decency, sympathy, and understanding so that the whole world may benefit. The further we go without spiritual insight, the more brutal life becomes; and the more fragile is the future security of the nations.

PRESENT-DAY THINKING OBSOLETE

The present attitude toward the understanding and settlement of world problems is utterly inadequate. This means that present-day thinking is obsolete, whether it be the thinking of our political leaders or of the man on the street. Modern man is in the throes of a fatal disease. He has become an opportunist and in many respects a devil. He has lost all sensitiveness to the sufferings of the world. To say that 1,000,000 people are absolutely homeless does not cause the loss of one single hour's sleep. The result is that the democratic way of life—which is the brotherhood way of life—is failing, and our so-called Christian conduct is being revealed as the shabby article it is.

At this point of human history, the drift is toward one kind of totalitarianism or another. Thus the nations are in constant fear, and the citizens of every nation, including our own, are bartering away their God-given liberties. We are in the hands of far too few people. We place our problems at the doors of small groups and let it go at that. We leave our thinking to politically elected representatives of the third-rate kind. Thus democracy has so little to say and the Christian way of life is jeopardized. When half a dozen individuals resolve that a new terror shall be loosed upon the world, the act is perpetrated without our knowledge or sanction. This condition indicates the lack of a sufficient amount of moral or spiritual restraint. The fact is that grave tragedies soon will overwhelm mankind if the energies of the nations are to be employed exclusively to outwit, out-fight, out-think, and out-devil each other.

How long can what is left of civilization endure if each nation considers itself a law unto itself in an age when man's knowledge of atomic energy gives the lie to such specious reasoning? Is anyone fool enough to believe that nationalism is enough in an age that demands international control? Is there a single isolationist abroad stupid enough to imagine that the United States, with its 132,000,000 population, can remain aloof from world events, events that crash the boundaries of all nations as so many papier-mâché fences? Unless the nations get a world vision and plan well some kind of supersovereignty, there can be no peace for the future. What we need is universalism. It is one world or none.

Such was the one world that God created when He first flung this planet from His hand; it was one humanity God fashioned when He created man in His own image to live prosperously and joyously. In the Garden of Eden He breathed His breath into the

dormant clay, and the clay became flesh. Man became a living soul with the power of free will to rise to heights sublime or fall. Man fell. He was driven from Paradise. Angels with flaming swords guarded the gates and announced that there could be no security or peace in a divided allegiance. The tragedy deepens. Man in his insularity, greed, discontent, and sinister cleverness defies his Creator. Thus the hand of man is against his brother, and the hand of one nation is against another until darkness and confusion blot out the divinity man's iniquity derides. In some such way are we lost. Humanity is broken into a thousand parts. Its comeliness has fled. Its moral grandeur is wrapped in fog. Its sense of divine direction is obliterated. Nationalism divides humanity. It creates suspicion. It perpetrates greed.

Again the question becomes paramount, What kind of philosophy, religion, or gospel can be substituted for this present blind confusion? What kind of conduct should replace the stark-naked materialism that is at once man's shame and undoing? None is big or good enough unless its scope takes in all the world and its plans enfold all mankind. This is the heart of the teaching of Christ.

Said Christ, "That they all may be one," meaning all races and classes, white, black, yellow, red, and brown; Christian and Jew, bondman and free, prince and pauper, merchant and common clerk, my lady of leisure, charwoman, and seamstress. It means wherever these are in Europe, Asia, or the Americas, all are the children of God. This is one world and one humanity. To believe less is to refute the God who made us and the Christ who bled on Calvary's cross.

Of course, we are the citizens of a great republic and are proud of it; but of greater significance is the fact that we are the children of a great world order. Beyond that, we are the citizens of a vast and exhaustless universe, in which time and space are no more than child-made blocks with which we daily play. Let us not permit human knowledge and its techniques to submerge our beliefs in the universality of human nature and its spiritual origin. Much has been said about progress in the economic and social realms to the extent that industrialism has become a way of salvation and the scientist a new kind of world savior.

RAW MATERIALS OF EARTH FOR USE

The fact is overlooked that industrialism and science are merely man-made techniques applied to the raw materials of the earth for man's use and profit. It might be more correct to change the order to man's profit and use. Whatever the sequence, these are bread and butter, clothes in shops, mortgages on property, bread in bakeries, steel in foundries, cotton in mills, carpets on stairways. All are important; yet man faces ruin if he persists in placing implicit trust in the techniques of industrialism and science.

"THESE TIMES"

(By Gertrude Ryder Bennett)

"Our motors pierce the clouds. They penetrate
The depth of oceans. Microscopes reveal
New worlds to conquer, while we dedicate
Our intellects to strength of stone and steel.
We are as proud as those who built a tower
To reach to heaven. Recklessly we rear
Our lofty Babels, arrogant with power.
How dare we boast of cities while we hear
The nations groping through the dark along
The road of life? What right have we for pride
Till truth is steel and faith is iron strong,
Till God and man are working side by side?
Then let our prayers and labors never cease;
We act the prologue of a masterpiece."

There must be a return to the basic virtues. Love, justice, mercy, and faith in God are necessary in any permanent world order. The principles of the Gospel must be applied to world problems if humanity is to endure. Through centuries man has mastered physical phenomena, but he has not mastered the mysteries of the human spirit. There have been high points in man's evolutionary struggle through applied knowledge and inventive genius; there have been moments when man has glimpsed the glory of the Holy Grail. But the main product of man's endeavor is a hodgepodge beyond power to classify or describe.

HUMANITY BROKEN INTO A THOUSAND PIECES

Man is confused by his knowledge and hardened by the independence and impudence of the brain children he has created. Cleverness, mechanical ingenuity, scientific knowledge, mass-productiveness await man's demonic or spiritual control. Unfortunately, thus far man's greed and cunning have outrun his hope and aspiration. Consequently, our so-called Western civilization is a thin veneer that covers the cowardice, hyprocisy, and greed which is everywhere dominant and triumphant.

The human order is broken into a thousand pieces. Disillusionment is complete. Confusion ruins the structure that humanitarians, prophets, and saints thus far have wrought. Through the unholy urge of an economic materialism man is exploited; he is subjected to humiliation; he is the victim of campaigns of intolerance and hate. Thus he becomes the "pale martyr in his shirt of fire." His dignity is destroyed through the welts inflicted upon his body and the bruises imposed upon his spirit by a mad and unfeeling world that does not care. Certainly, the individual is not regarded as a member of one humanity or a citizen of one world. This condition leads to increased disorder and a more complete destruction of the present world pattern.

Atomic energy is man's last adventure. The atomic bomb is an index of the mind's anarchy and the soul's despair. The first use of atomic energy in man's scheme of things is to blow up cities so that humanity is totally buried in a soulless rubble. Two billion dollars was not too much to spend for such destruction, which reveals the low level at which the nations think and live. There is no unified attempt to give human beings a chance and a goal. Anyone with insight and sense knows that in the future there will be one world or none.

Can we dodge the dynamite man's hands create? Have we the will to blaze new trails over the bruised and tortured earth? Is it within the power of modern man to retrace through jungles of muddled thinking a way that leads to goodness, security, and God?

Shall It Be "UNRRRA"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald of November 3, 1945:

SHALL IT BE "UNRRRA"?

The 45 countries which joined to aid the war-broken peoples of the world called the new organization the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. The House, in appropriating the rest of America's $1,350,000,000 contribution for 1945, has sufficiently altered the purposes of the agency so that it might now be called the United Nations Relief, Rehabilitation, and Reformation Administration.

The story is this: The Republican Congressional Food Committee, in recommending that UNRRA be permitted to finish the job in Europe, declared that there had been too much secrecy surrounding its operations. It urged that, as a condition of further assistance, accredited press and radio representatives be admitted to recipient countries and given full freedom to observe and report on the distribution of supplies. The House, by a majority of 20, accepted this restriction, over the earnest protests of Secretary Byrnes and UNRRA Director Lehman.

Unlike the old Hoover organization, the recipient countries are doing the actual distribution of relief supplies. Perhaps this was a mistake in policy. In Yugoslavia, for instance, Premier Marshal Tito may be helping to secure his ascendancy by directing the hand-outs, a political stratagem not unknown in this country.

The question now is: Do we want to fortify our official observers to combat such relief perversion or should we turn the job over to the press?

The House amendment looks innocuous, for it seems to apply only to UNRRA activities. But no one can believe that our correspondents in relating what is done with relief supplies will fail to reveal political and social conditions. No competent job of reporting could be performed otherwise. So the amendment really constitutes an attempt to remove censorship. In effect we would be saying to these countries: Either you adopt our views on freedom of communications or starve.

In the first place this is extremely autocratic behavior. If Russia should attempt anything like that in this hemisphere we would say: "Go to!" In the second place, we are only 1 of 45 nations contributing to UNRRA. Though ours is by far the largest contribution, that doesn't give us the right to change the rules by unilateral decision.

We all want world-wide press freedom. We want our UNRRA aid to be distributed fairly. But the House amendment is a bad way to attempt either.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable James A. Farley, Friday, November 2, 1945, over radio station WJZ, at 6:45 p. m., under the auspices of the Citywide Independent Citizens Committee for the election of O'Dwyer-Joseph-Impellitteri:

Ladies and gentlemen, I welcome this opportunity afforded me by the Citywide Independent Citizens Committee for the election of O'Dwyer, Joseph, and Impellitteri, to make known my views in this campaign. I shall speak plainly. In all my years in politics I have made it a habit to speak plainly. My experience has taught me that the people welcome plain speaking by those who exercise political leadership.

This ticket, sponsored by the Citywide Independent Citizens Committee, is an excellent ticket. General O'Dwyer is as fine a candidate as has run for mayor in our time. My friend, Senator Lazarus Joseph, our can-

didate for comptroller, is an able and attractive man who has made a record at Albany which is all the guaranty I need that he will conduct properly the high office to which he aspires—and to which he will be elected. Vincent R. Impellitteri, another friend of mine, was an effective assistant district attorney of New York County and his record there induces confidence in his stewardship as president of the council in the years to come.

I have always favored, and I think my record shows it, the selection of men for high office who have qualified by previous broad experience. It is too grave a risk in these troubled times to elect officials without ripe administrative skill and judgment. Of General O'Dwyer's Republican opponent, it may be said that although he is mature in years, he has had no experience whatever in the actual handling of large governmental affairs.

I was for General O'Dwyer when he was a candidate for the office of mayor in 1941, because I thought he was the best qualified man then in the field. I am for him again in 1945, because what has happened in the past 4 years has strengthened the view I held in 1941. His notable services to our country during the war have brought out in high relief the strength of character and the capacity that I saw in him in 1941; and these services have given him immense administrative experience and breadth of vision.

With all his splendid achievements, General O'Dwyer has remained a modest man. He has not himself stressed his own brilliant record. But I can talk about the O'Dwyer record since he is to modest to do so. The public posts and places that he has held make up a truly impressive record. He was magistrate, judge of the Brooklyn Adolescents' Court, county court judge, district attorney of Kings County. Then followed his notable service to our Government.

The general's record in his first public office, that of magistrate, and particularly his judicial conduct in the labor troubles of the early thirties showed where his heart was.

It was natural that our great Gov. Herbert H. Lehman—I wish he were still in Albany—should, in December 1937, appoint this able judge to the county court bench in Kings County. When he was county judge the wails of the crooks who found him unapproachable echoed through the city. In that well-compensated and honorable post many a man would have remained. Not O'Dwyer. At a sacrifice of long tenure in office and at a reduction in salary, he accepted the office of district attorney of Kings County. In his first few months as district attorney he cleaned up that murderous mob of hoodlums know as Murder, Inc.

That was a blow at gangsterism unequaled in the annals of crime.

The day after Pearl Harbor, General O'Dwyer offered his services to President Roosevelt, and shortly thereafter was commissioned a major in the United States Army. His great investigating talents were instantly put to use by the War Department. His rise was rapid, and in 1944, when he was a brigadier general, President Roosevelt selected General O'Dwyer to investigate the Italian situation, so threatening to the welfare of millions of people and to the economic future of Italy. With the rank of minister, and as personal representative of the President of the United States, he headed the economic section of the Allied commission in Italy.

The example that he gave the Italians of democratic methods, and the understanding he showed for the problems of an unhappy people, have not been forgotten. A grateful Italian Government conferred upon him the prized decoration of Grand Officer of the Crown of Italy. While on active duty he was unanimously reelected district attorney of Kings County, having been nominated by all parties.

In June 1944, General O'Dwyer was appointed executive director of the War Refugee Board, established by President Roosevelt to help those unfortunate European minorities who, because of race, religion, or political faith, had been persecuted by the Nazis. Thousands of people owe their safety and the improvement of their conditions to the work of this gallant humanitarian. General O'Dwyer was practical about it. When it was a question of trucks to carry food, he got trucks. If the trucks needed tires and gasoline, he got the tires and gasoline.

There is General O'Dwyer's record. And no political opponent, no matter how base he may be, can mar that glorious list of high achievements.

On the merits, General O'Dwyer is entitled to your votes and worthy of all your efforts to swell his plurality, which, I predict, will be unprecedented for a candidate for mayor in this great city.

But there is more to this campaign.

As mayor, General O'Dwyer will be concerned with our schools, our police, our housing, our sanitation, our parks, our city finances, and many other important problems. One matter of great importance to this city is the adequacy of its port facilities. Our foreign trade—passing through New York—supplies a great deal of our city's income, affecting the livelihood of all of us. To this problem I know that General O'Dwyer will devote his mature judgment.

The next few years will prove that this city can be made a better place for all of us, and in his speeches General O'Dwyer has shown that he is fully aware of the city's shortcomings. He has not promised the moon, but he has evidenced an awareness of the city's needs. His record shows that this awareness, and the pledges he has made, will be translated into action. It is easy indeed for a candidate to go from place to place promising one group this and another group that. But General O'Dwyer has not dealt with the people as groups but as New Yorkers all. And we know that the promises he has made will be kept.

I have known the two opponents of General O'Dwyer for years. I have met the Republican candidate at Democratic meetings and conferences of all sorts, including those of Tammany Hall, throughout the years. We Democrats regard him as a loyal member of our party. Some of us were astonished when he jumped the political fence and took the Republican nomination for mayor. We knew that he, as a Democrat, had been anxious to run for mayor, because he had made long and strenuous efforts to get the Democratic nomination.

Having failed in that effort he apparently concluded that any nomination was better than none. And now his supporters are wondering whether he will run a poor second or a bad third.

Then, there is the "no deal" candidate, a splendid young man whom I know well. He is a bred-in-the-bone Republican. Many of us in politics fully understand his dismay and anger when his party turned from him to a Democrat. He had a commendable record in the Republican Party and in public service, and could have expected better of his party.

The untruthful charge that General O'Dwyer is bossed by anybody is ridiculous to those who know what is going on in politics in this city. I do not think that silly charge is fooling anybody.

The charge that Communists influence him is likewise poppycock. If I thought that he was influenced by any group opposed to our American institutions and traditions, I would not be speaking to you tonight, because I particularly despise all fifth-column organizations.

Why is a lifelong Democrat the candidate of the Republicans? I said I would speak plainly. I say, without fear of honest contradiction, that in high Republican circles at Albany—and in certain Republican circles here in this city—it was decided that such an extraordinary move would help Governor Dewey's campaign for reelection next year. These Republican leaders thought they would try to move certain groups of Democrats and liberals into the Republican column.

They thought that by nominating a Democrat this maneuver could possibly be accomplished. There it is, as plain as that. And that is the real reason for the nomination of Judge Goldstein, and the only reason. He is well known in this city, and the Albany group and their New York City followers, decided that they could do some recruiting among his Democratic friends and followers in behalf of Governor Dewey.

Now I happen to think that the office of mayor of this city is so important that it should not be made a part of a plan of another man to be Governor of the State. Many think that the office of mayor of New York City is a bigger job than that of Governor of the State of New York. Whether it is or not, no New York municipal campaign should be manipulated by Republican politicians at Albany or elsewhere up-State for their political benefit next year. Do not believe it when you hear the Republican bosses tell you that it just happened that Judge Goldstein was selected for their nomination. It was a dictated nomination and it was dictated from Albany. In a way I am glad that next year's State campaign has been introduced into this municipal campaign, because it gives me a chance to tell you that we Democrats intend next year to resume our rightful place in Albany. We were there for a long time. Nothing that has happened in the last 3 or 4 years induces me to think that the Republicans can continue to control the State administration. And in common with other interested Democrats, I intend to have a say as to what happens next year.

I am going to talk for a moment directly to Governor Dewey, who is scheduled to talk on the radio tonight.

You present yourself as an exemplar of good government, Governor Dewey. You like to picture yourself as the foe of gangsterism. You like to have yourself called the greatest opponent of corruption in office. Very well, then, Governor Dewey.

Why do you not look into Nassau County? Why do you not appoint an independent investigator, one not of your own political faith. By so doing you can make public the truth as to the shameful conditions in Nassau. All of your predecessors were quick to do this because they realized it was a primary obligation of the Governor to stop corruption and malfeasance in office.

Let us look at the record, as another Governor used to say:

Nassau County is riddled from top to bottom with graft, according to the public reports, with which you must be familiar. The boss of Nassau, and one of the prominent bosses in this State, is Russell Sprague.

Governor, Mr. Sprague is your own political mentor; he is your political adviser, as stated by your own headquarters in the last Presidential campaign. With your influence he was elected Republican national committeeman from New York. No man is stronger with you, Governor, than is Russ Sprague, according to public reports.

We have seen shake-ups in the police departments of the various townships; in the central staff of the county itself. We have seen shifts in the district attorney's office. We have heard of graft earned out of gambling concessions.

Why not have a completely nonpolitical investigation, Governor Dewey? Are you afraid of the outcome? Are you afraid that one of the two biggest Republican counties will not be as strong for you after an investigation as it has been in the past? Why not give us

some action instead of a lot of words, Governor? In so doing, you will be following the example General O'Dwyer has set.

It is General O'Dwyer's courageous actions which prompt me to support him.

The election of General O'Dwyer will give this city a fine mayor, a man of character, unbossed, and filled with ideas for our welfare. His election will give a setback to the complicated Republican plans laid by the Albany high command. I was for many years at the head of Democratic affairs in this State, and I cannot say that I regard such a setback with anything but relish.

I warn those of you who have been with me in the Democratic Party and you independents who are interested in the views which I hold of General O'Dwyer that a vote for either of the other two candidates merely takes you into a futile civil war within the Republican Party. Therefore, vote for General O'Dwyer, one of the best qualified men who has ever offered himself for mayor in all the city's history.

Full Employment and Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the enlightening testimony of Rt. Rev. Msgr. John O'Grady, secretary, National Conference of Catholic Charities, before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on the full employment bill, S. 380, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, August 31, 1945:

FULL EMPLOYMENT AND HUMAN RIGHTS

After our very remarkable success in mobilizing our resources for war it is inconceivable that we should fail to mobilize them for peace. But we shall never succeed in this effort until we realize that we are living in a changed world. We can no longer be satisfied with the economic philosophy of 25 years ago. While we must continue to make the fullest use of the remarkable genius of the American people we must also have a considerable amount of planning.

UNCULTIVATED POWER RESOURCES

In the pioneer days the people of the United States were able to emerge from depression because there were vast and uncultivated resources to be explored. We still have vast unharnessed resources in our river valleys all over the country. We should be able to repeat in these river valleys what has already been done in the Tennessee Valley and along the Columbia River. I am very much interested in the proposed Missouri Valley Authority. I am interested in it not only because of the vast power resources that it will make available in many States, and because of what it will mean in flood control, but also because of what it will mean in the reclamation of land. I see vast numbers of farmers given an opportunity of owning a home on the land. I can see in this proposed Missouri Valley development a very important step in the revival of the family farm in the United States. I see it as one of the basic hopes of our democratic institutions. I see the Missouri Valley Authority not as a great engineering development, but as a great social institution. In the Missouri Valley and in other river valleys there are vast opportunities for new economic developments. We have in these proposed authorities new economic frontiers, new opportunities for investment, new wealth-producing resources, and new social resources.

HOUSING AND CITY PLANNING

Another very large field for after-the-war investment, for improving the standard of life of the people and providing new development opportunities will be found in the field of housing and city planning. In writing about the situation in Great Britain, Sir William H. Beveridge says, "Adequate and healthy housing presents the largest single objective for desirable outlay after the war and affords the largest scope for raising the standard of life, health, and happiness." (Full Employment in a Free Society, p. 163.)

In a recent bulletin of the National Housing Agency, Mr. John Blandford states, "It is estimated that during the first 10 years after the war, construction of 12,600,000 nonfarm dwelling units will be needed in the United States. The great majority of these units should be provided through new construction, the remainder through conversion of existing structures." (P. 4, Housing Needs.) If the housing program envisaged by Mr. Blandford is carried out it will represent an investment of seven to eight billion dollars a year.

The development of the housing program which will include units built through private enterprise and public low-cost housing, if properly handled, should have a great amount of influence in stabilizing the construction industry. It will perform a very essential service in rebuilding large sections of American cities.

I need not call the attention of the committee to something that has already been emphasized several times before Senator TAFT's committee on housing, and also before the Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning of the House of Representatives, namely, the process of deterioration that is under way in American cities. The so-called slum areas have a high degree of infant mortality, high delinquency rates, tax rates are rapidly falling off, and maintenance costs are mounting. As a result, many cities are being reduced to economic and social bankruptcy. It is inevitable that the blighted areas of American cities should be made over. This calls for a large investment of funds, both public and private. It must be a planned investment. We have learned a great deal about these areas in recent years. We have made statistical studies of administrative costs of housing, of health, of delinquency in these areas. We are pretty much in agreement as to what should be done. But we are not going to make over these blighted areas by a few housing projects here and there. It calls for large-scale planning, not only on the part of local governments but also on the part of the Federal Government. We cannot isolate private from public housing in the rebuilding of our cities. They are a part of the same program. We cannot isolate housing—public or private—from city planning, from transportation, from public utilities.

If we could only stabilize our residential construction through long-term planning we would have taken the most important step toward stabilizing our whole economy. At a recent hearing before the House Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, Mr. Blandford emphasized the extremely fluctuating and unstable character of the house-building industry. During the 10-year period from 1920 to 1929, the average annual number of units started was 703,000, at an annual cost of $3,000,000,000; while during the 10-year period 1930–39, the average annual number of units started was only 273,000, at an annual cost of slightly over a billion dollars. To sharpen the contrast all the more, he points out that there were 937,000 units, costing almost $4,500,000,000 started in 1925 and only 93,000 units, costing only about $285,000,000 started in 1933. It is clear, therefore, that if we can only level off the residential-construction industry on a fairly high plane in the postwar period we shall have taken the most important step toward a full-time employment program. And, it should be remembered, that this will not call for any vast expediture of public funds—it will be a stabilized private investment. According to Mr. Blandford's estimate we can build one and one-quarter million nonfarm residential units, and not more than 1 in 10 shall be public low-cost housing units. Housing and city planning will therefore constitute a most important element in our postwar economy and in the development of a program of full employment.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

One of the most encouraging signs pointing to a program of full employment is the very intelligent plan for highway construction under the Bureau of Public Roads of the Federal Works Agency. Under this plan $500,000,000 a year has been authorized for the first three postwar years. These funds are to be matched by the States and local communities. The program will include work on city streets, feeder roads, primary roads, rural free delivery roads in and out of cities of 5,000 or less. With the releasing of the frozen Federal funds for highway construction, and the additional funds to be expended by the States, cities, and counties, highway construction of one kind or another during the next year will involve an expenditure of approximately $3,000,000,000. This is most encouraging to those who are interested in public works as a method of dealing with unemployment because in the past in many respects it has been the most effective form of public work. Geographically it has reached various sections of the country to a greater degree than any other form of public work. In the providing of direct and indirect employment it has used a great variety of skills. One of the greatest difficulties about highway construction during the last depression was that States and local communities reduced their expenditures in the same degree to which the Federal Government increased its expenditures. We hear on all sides at the present time that States, counties, and cities are sitting back and waiting to see what the Federal Government will do. They remember what happened in the early thirties. They went ahead and expended their money and later they found that the Federal Government was willing to take up the whole load.

DISTRIBUTION OF LABOR SUPPLY

The new highway program requires cities and localities to put up 50 percent of the cost. This may look like a rigid system in dealing with some States but once the Federal Government deviates from it there appears to be no stopping point.

Everybody who has done any thinking about full employment knows that there are difficulties in the way. Sir William H. Beveridge figures that we shall always have a certain percentage—he sets it at 3 percent—of unemployment so long as we have a free economy. This amount is needed to provide an opportunity for workers to move around in order to improve their condition. But even in reducing unemployment to this low level we shall undoubtedly have difficulties. Everybody who has observed the efforts of the country to secure an adequate distribution of its labor supply during the war knows something of the problems involved. Certainly, we shall never have any adequate method of distributing the labor supply if we turn the Employment Service back to the States. It will mean that we shall have the same condition that we have had during the war—every town will be competing with every other town and employment offices in areas with low-wage standards will refuse to permit workers to move to other localities in which there is a demand for their labor. This is what happened during the war. When the

country was confronted with certain critical situations the Army and the Navy moved in very quickly and secured the labor they needed. Those who talk about States' rights in dealing with the labor supply are not talking in terms of realities. It must not be assumed for a moment that by any mechanism that Government sets up labor can be made completely mobile and it will therefore be in a position to respond to demands in any section of the country. After all, labor becomes rooted in certain communities. While extreme mobility may be desirable from the standpoint of industry it involves many other problems. It involves the stability of family life; it involves housing; it involves community facilities of all kinds including churches, schools, community centers, cultural traditions, etc.

By reason of the relative immobility of labor it is necessary to give adequate thought to the location of investments and new enterprises so that employment opportunities may be provided where they are most needed. This is essential not only in private but also in public enterprise.

COOPERATION BETWEEN GOVERNMENT, LABOR, AND INDUSTRY ESSENTIAL

In order to secure a high level of production and of consumption there must be the closest working relationships between government, labor, and private industry. All the elements must work as part of a team. It should be kept in mind that the fullest utilization of our resources calls for teamwork. It calls for acceptance of a new and wider responsibility of the state but it also calls for constructive private enterprise. The state must assume the leadership but it must be a state which at all times is subject to the influence of free democratic thinking. As the state comes to assume a larger part in the life of the country there is need for closer collaboration between the state and private effort. There is need for a thorough revitalization of all the democratic forces of the Nation. These forces must be banded together on the local community basis. The various elements in community life must learn to work together more closely. We must everywhere have a revival of the spirit of the old-time neighborhood. There must be a new emphasis on adult education. Every citizen must recognize more seriously his responsibility for participating in common affairs. There must be spread abroad everywhere a new concept of the sacredness and integrity of the individual, of the sacredness of family ties. There is a new call for a moral leadership that will guide men's minds from the cruelties of war back again to the brotherhood of man and the sacred ideals of charity and justice.

"SOCIAL BUDGET" CALLED FOR

In the testimony before this committee, I am sure that there has been a very complete description of the type of budget for which the full employment bill calls. It really calls for the "social budget," for as accurate a statement as possible in regard to expenditure and investment—public and private—during the forthcoming year, and also in regard to the total labor supply. If investment and production is not sufficient to maintain the labor supply, then the deficit will have to be made up by stimulated private effort or presumably by governmental effort.

WORKERS' RIGHT TO A LIVING WAGE

The basic principle of the bill is the right of the citizen to employment. "All Americans able to work and seeking work have the right to useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment, and it is the policy of the United States to assure the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities to enable all Americans who have finished their schooling and who do not have full-time housekeeping responsibilities freely to exercise this right." (Sec. 2 (b) of the bill).

Before the 1890's there was quite a wide chasm between economics and ethics in the field of labor. Up to that time it was assumed that the wage earner received what he had added to the product. There was a recognition, of course, of some economic friction, but there was general oppcsition to what was regarded as the natural law of supply and demand. Now during the nineties, under the influence of a new group of economists, there was a new emphasis on what is known as the "standard of life." People had a right to a certain standard of life. Contrasts were soon established between theory and practice. It was found that under existing conditions large numbers of people were not receiving sufficient to maintain a minimum standard of life. The leaders of American labor claimed that the securing of this standard was one of the basic purposes of the labor movement. It was the basic philosophy of labor that the worker, by positive economic action, could improve his status, could secure high wages and better working conditions. Beginning about 1910 there was a recognition of the fact that organized labor alone could not do the whole job of lifting the standard of life of the people. It had to be implemented by legislation. We therefore had a minimum-wage movement. Designedly at first it was limited to women and child wage earners. Its purpose was to secure a minimum income for all women wage earners. It was not applied to men at first because of the fear of adverse court action. This legislative program did not work out in an ideal fashion. It represented a gradual uphill struggle toward an ideal.

BEGINNINGS OF SOCIAL INSURANCE LEGISLATION

The same development that was applied to minimum rates of pay has also applied in the field of industrial accidents. In this field it was necessary to apply a social remedy. The costs of industrial accidents came to be recognized as part of the responsibility of industry. This meant that the workers had a right to compensation for industrial accidents. The ideal was not reached immediately, but very important steps were taken. It was said many times in the beginning that wages could not be regulated by law; that the social principle of compensation for industrial accidents could not be embodied in law. More recently we have had a recognition, through the Social Security Act, of the fact that workers hav a right to compensation against the hazards of temporary unemployment and old age. We have not yet reached this ideal for all workers but by legislative action we have taken important steps in this direction.

When various forms of social insurance were first developed they were an extension of a pattern that had already grown up in a number of industries. The workers in those industries had recognized that they could not through their wages alone or through the sale of their products protect themselves against all the hazards of life; that they needed some sort of mutual insurance for this purpose. Therefore it is that we find that some of the early unions were basically friendly societies. There were also many other types of friendly societies. It was quite natural that the first efforts of government in this field should be to stimulate the existing developments so that they might secure wider coverage. The basic idea, however, was that of a basic and balanced insurance program, of a program that was fully self-liquidating.

WORKER'S RIGHT TO A JOB

Side by side with this insurance program there has grown up another concept, namely, that of the responsibility of the state to provide certain basic services for individuals and families. We find the recognition of this responsibility in the field of health, in the field of education, in the field of recreation. It has also found its way into social insurance so that while we still have the thought of a system that is supported in part by industry and in part by the worker, we also have a recognition of the basic responsibility of the state to secure certain minimum standards for the citizen. We have had a great deal of experience in the application of state action to the securing of certain minimum-wage standards and the securing of a definite amount of protection for workers against the hazards that cut off their wages and their source of livelihood.

While we have had considerable success in implementing the individual's right to a living wage, to protection against the hazards that cut off his wages, we have not given very much thought to his basic right to a job. Now this right is just as fundamental as his right to a living wage or to protection against industrial hazards, or to assistance if he is no longer able to work and does not come within a social-insurance program. We have devoted comparatively little thought to implementing this right. The growing hazard of unemployment, however, is forcing us to give more serious thought to ways and means of implementing the citizen's right to work. The alternative is mass unemployment. We know very well that during the thirties unemployment was our most serious social problem. The depression of the thirties was the severest that America had ever experienced. The time has therefore come to devise ways and means of implementing the individual's right to a job.

There is no use in implementing his other rights if we overlook this basic right. The citizen has a right to the things that are necessary for life. For the ordinary wage earner this means a full-time job. In the last analysis, he must look to Government to protect this right for him. Many people claim that this will undermine individual initiative. The same has been said about other reforms. In the minimum-wage movement one used to hear about the inefficient workers. The problem was attacked and it has been worked out. We heard the same about old-age pensions and about unemployment compensation. There are individuals who will abuse it—some malingerers—but they are few.

RESPONSIBILITY OF GOVERNMENT

There is no social program that does not have some undesirable consequences but we have to think about the things that are necessary for the welfare of all the people. Government is not going to assure full-time employment without taking many important steps and it will probably make many missteps. That does not excuse Government from trying and using every effort possible to develop new investments, to reach out for new sources of wealth and for income, so that so far as is humanly practical every citizen will have an opportunity of engaging in remunerative and productive employment.

Byrnes' Word on Russia Nothing New

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Byrnes' Word on Russia Nothing New," which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, November 4, 1945, written by Ernest Lindley:

BYRNES' WORD ON RUSSIA NOTHING NEW

(By Ernest Lindley)

Secretary Byrnes neither set a new policy or modified an old when he said that the

United States recognizes the Soviet Union's special security interests in central and eastern Europe and promised that "America will never join any groups in those countries in hostile intrigue against the Soviet Union."

The same assurances have been given many times during the last 4 years. The late President Roosevelt and former Secretary Hull tried to make that clear to the Kremlin. President Truman and Secretary Byrnes have followed the same line.

At the same time, American officials have sought to convince the Kremlin that: (1) Russia, like other nations, must find her ultimate security in a strong United Nations Organization and (2) Russia's special security interests in eastern and central Europe do not require that she control the internal affairs of those nations.

MINORITY IN CONTROL

The United States has consistently recognized that Russia is entitled to have friendly and cooperative neighbors, that any attempt by the western allies to build a tier of anti-Soviet buffer states in eastern Europe would surely destroy the United Nations and the hope of a long peace. But it is a long jump from this to complete Russian control of central and eastern Europe.

It was perhaps only natural for the Russians to rely, in the first instance, on the Communist Parties in that part of the world.

But, with Russian backing, Communist minorities in some countries seem to have been trying to liquidate or intimidate leaders of parties and groups unquestionably democratic but unwilling to accept Communist domination.

It is easy to call anyone who will not accept Communist dictation or cooperate with a Communist-controlled puppet government either pro-Nazi or anti-Soviet. Many peoples of eastern and central Europe had no love for the Russians, even prior to the Bolshevik revolution. Wise leaders in some of these countries realized, however, that they would have to learn to live and work as friendly neighbors of the Soviet Union. Unfortunately, methods adopted by the Russians have added new fears and hates to old. It has become increasingly difficult for the western allies to support democracy in eastern Europe without appearing to be anti-Soviet.

DANGER FORESEEN

Roosevelt and many others foresaw this danger. At Yalta, Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill reached agreements concerning Poland, specifically, and the rest of liberated Europe, more generally. It was agreed that these countries were to have provisional governments representative of all democratic elements and that these governments were to hold free elections. It was agreed in substance, also, that the Soviet Union, Britain, and the United States should deal jointly with the problems of liberated European nations.

It was difficult to reconcile subsequent Russian performance with the pledges. Roosevelt, before his death, was disturbed by the failure, or tardiness, of the Russians. Harry Hopkins, as President Truman's personal envoy, managed to obtain from Stalin partial performance of the Yalta pledge concerning reorganization of the Polish provisional government.

Secretary Byrnes has been trying to give life to the Yalta agreements concerning liberated Europe generally—because the agreements were sound. They are no more anti-Russian now than they were when Stalin subscribed to them.

They do not challenge Russia's special security interests. On the contrary, they outline the only way in which these interests can be safeguarded within a framework of international security and close and friendly collaboration among the great powers—and probably the only way in which Russia can hope to have friendly peoples, as distinct from compliant governments maintained by force and terror, as her neighbors.

Russians have clung so long to the wrong path that it may not be easy for them to change. But the longer they delay, the worse their difficulties seem likely to become. Their best hope is to invite the help of major allies in extricating them from a predicament They can rely on Secretary Byrnes' pledge. Any attempt to violate that would obviously be ruinous to major objectives of American policy, which center around a secure peace.

Italian Military Armistice and Other Agreements and Related Papers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following papers and documents pertaining to the armistice with Italy, including the following:

1. Italian military armistice, September 3, 1943.
2. Additional conditions of the armistice with Italy, November 9, 1943.
3. Letter of September 29, 1943, from Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower to Marshal Pietro Badoglio.
4. Memorandum of agreement on employment and disposition of the Italian Fleet and Mercantile Marine (Cunningham-de-Courten agreement), September 23, 1943.
5. Amendment to the agreement on the employment and disposition of the Italian Fleet, November 17, 1943.
6. Statement of Admiral de Courten November 17, 1943.
7. Aide memoire of February 24, 1945, to Italian Government by acting president of Allied Commission.
8. Commentary of the British and American Governments on the armistice terms and the Cunningham-de-Courten agreement.

1. ITALIAN MILITARY ARMISTICE

SICILY, *September 3, 1943.*

The following conditions of an armistice are presented by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, commander in chief of the Allied Forces, acting by authority of the Governments of the United States and Great Britain and in the interest of the United Nations, and are accepted by Marshal Pietro Badoglio, head of the Italian Government:

1. Immediate cessation of all hostile activity by the Italian armed forces.
2. Italy will use its best endeavors to deny, to the Germans, facilities that might be used against the United Nations.
3. All prisoners or internees of the United Nations to be immediately turned over to the Allied commander in chief, and none of these may now or at any time be evacuated to Germany.
4. Immediate transfer of the Italian Fleet and Italian aircraft to such points as may be designated by the Allied commander in chief, with details of disarmament to be prescribed by him.
5. Italian merchant shipping may be requisitioned by the Allied commander in chief, to meet the needs of his military-naval program.
6. Immediate surrender of Corsica and of all Italian territory, both islands and mainland, to the Allies for such use as operational bases and other purposes as the Allies may see fit.
7. Immediate guaranty of the free use by the Allies of all airfields and naval ports in Italian territory, regardless of the rate of evacuation of the Italian territory by the German forces. These ports and fields to be protected by Italian armed forces until this function is taken over by the Allies.
8. Immediate withdrawal to Italy of Italian armed forces from all participation in the current war from whatever areas in which they may now be engaged.
9. Guaranty by the Italian Government that if necessary it will employ all its available armed forces to insure prompt and exact compliance with all the provisions of this armistice.
10. The commander in chief of the Allied Forces reserves to himself the right to take any measure which, in his opinion, may be necessary for the protection of the interests of the Allied forces for the prosecution of the war, and the Italian Government binds itself to take such administrative or other action as the commander in chief may require, and in particular the commander in chief will establish Allied military government over such parts of Italian territory as be may deem necessary in the military interests of the Allied Nations.
11. The commander in chief of the Allied Forces will have a full right to impose measures of disarmament, demobilization, and demilitarization.
12. Other conditions of a political, economic, and financial nature with which Italy will be bound to comply will be transmitted at later date.

The conditions of the present armistice will not be made public without prior approval of the allied commander in chief. The English will be considered the official text.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
General, United States Army, Commander in Chief of Allied Forces.
By WALTER B. SMITH,
Major General, United States Army, Chief of Staff.
Marshal PIETRO BADOGLIO,
Head of the Italian Government.
By GUISEPPE CASTELLANO,
Brigadier General, attached to the Italian High Command.

Present: Rt. Hon. Harold MacMillan, British resident minister, AFHQ; Robert Murphy, personal representative of the President of the United States; Royer Dick, commodore, R. N., chief of staff to the commander in chief in the Mediterranean; Lowell W. Rooks, major general, United States Army, assistant chief of staff, G-3, AFHQ; Franco Montanari, official Italian interpreter; Brigadier Kenneth Strong, assistant chief of staff, G-2, AFHQ.

2. ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS OF THE ARMISTICE WITH ITALY (AS MODIFIED BY THE PROTOCOL SIGNED NOVEMBER 9, 1943)

Whereas in consequence of an armistice dated September 3, 1943, between the United States and the United Kingdom Governments acting in the interests of all the United Nations on the one hand and the Italian Government on the other hand, hostilities were suspended between Italy and the United Nations on certain terms of a military nature;

And whereas in addition to those terms it was also provided in the said armistice that the Italian Government bound themselves to comply with other conditions of a political, economic, and financial nature to be transmitted later;

And whereas it is convenient that the terms of a military nature and the said other conditions of a political, economic, and financial nature should without prejudice to the continued validity of the terms of the said armistice of September 3, 1943, be comprised in a further instrument;

The following together with the terms of the armistice of September 3, 1943, are the terms on which the United States, United Kingdom, and Soviet Governments acting

on behalf of the United Nations are prepared to suspend hostilities against Italy so long as their military operations against Germany and her allies are not obstructed and Italy does not assist these powers in any way and complies with the requirements of these Governments.

These terms have been presented by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, commander in chief, Allied Forces, duly authorized to that effect;

And have been accepted unconditionally by Marshal Pietro Badoglio, head of the Italian Government, representing the supreme command of Italian land, sea, and air forces, and duly authorized to that effect by the Italian Government.

1. (A) The Italian land, sea, and air forces wherever located hereby surrender. Italian participation in the war in all theaters will cease immediately. There will be no opposition to landings, movements, or other operations of the land, sea, and air forces of the United Nations. Accordingly, the Italian Supreme Command will order the immediate cessation of hostilities of any kind against the forces of the United Nations and will direct the Italian navy, military, and air forces authorities in all theaters to issue forthwith the appropriate instructions to those under their command.

(B) The Italian Supreme Command will further order all Italian naval, military, and air forces or authorities and personnel to refrain immediately from destruction of or damage to any real or personal property, whether public or private.

2. The Italian Supreme Command will give full information concerning the disposition and condition of all Italian land, sea, and air forces, wherever they are situated and of all such forces of Italy's allies as are situated in Italian or Italian-occupied territory.

3. The Italian Supreme Command will take the necessary measures to secure airfields, port facilities, and all other installations against seizure or attack by any of Italy's Allies. The Supreme Italian Command will take the necessary measures to insure law and order, and to use its available armed forces to insure prompt and exact compliance with all the provisions of the present instrument. Subject to such use of Italian troops for the above purposes, as may be sanctioned by the allied commander in chief, all other Italian land, sea, and air forces will proceed to and remain in their barracks, camps, or ships pending directions from the United Nations as to their future status and disposal. Exceptionally such naval personnel shall proceed to shore establishments as the United Nations may direct.

4. Italian land, sea, and air forces will within the periods to be laid down by the United Nations withdraw from all areas outside Italian territory notified to the Italian Government by the United Nations and proceed to areas to be specified by the United Nations. Such movement of Italian land, sea, and air forces will be carried out in conditions to be laid down by the United Nations and in accordance with the orders to be issued by them. All Italian officials will similarly leave the areas notified except any who may be permitted to remain by the United Nations. Those permitted to remain will comply with the instructions of the Allied commander in chief.

5. No requisitioning, seizures or other coercive measures shall be effected by Italian land, sea, and air forces or officials in regard to persons or property in the areas notified under article 4.

6. The demobilization of Italian land, sea, and air forces in excess of such establishments as shall be notified will take place as prescribed by the Allied commander in chief.

7. Italian warships of all descriptions, auxiliaries, and transports will be assembled as directed in ports to be specified by the Allied commander in chief and will be dealt with as prescribed by the Allied commander in chief. (NOTE.—If at the date of the Armistice the whole of the Italian Fleet has been assembled in Allied ports, this article would run—"Italian warships of all descriptions, auxiliaries, and transports will remain until further notice in the ports where they are at present assembled, and will be dealt with as prescribed by the Allied commander in chief.")

8. Italian aircraft of all kinds will not leave the ground or water or ships, except as directed by the Allied commander in chief.

9. Without prejudice to the provisions of articles 14, 15, 28 A and D below, all merchant ships, fishing or other craft of whatever flag, all aircraft and inland transport of whatever nationality in Italian or Italian-occupied territory or waters will, pending verification of their identity and status, be prevented from leaving.

10. The Italian Supreme Command will make available all information about naval, military, and air devices, installations, and defenses, about all transport and intercommunication systems established by Italy or her allies on Italian territory or in the approaches thereto, about mine fields or other obstacles to movement by land, sea, or air, and such other particulars as the United Nations may require in connection with the use of Italian bases, or with the operations, security, or welfare of the United Nations land, sea, or air forces. Italian forces and equipment will be made available as required by the United Nations for the removal of the above-mentioned obstacles.

11. The Italian Government will furnish forthwith lists of quantities of all war material, showing the location of the same. Subject to such use as the Allied commander in chief may make of it, the war material will be placed in store under such control as he may direct. The ultimate disposal of war material will be prescribed by the United Nations.

12. There will be no destruction of nor damage to nor, except as authorized or directed by the United Nations, any removal of war material, wireless, radiolocation, or meteorological stations, railroad, port, or other installations or in general, public, or private utilities or property of any kind, wherever situated, and the necessary maintenance and repair will be the responsibility of the Italian authorities.

13. The manufacture, production, and construction of war material and its import, export, and transit is prohibited, except as directed by the United Nations. The Italian Government will comply with any directions given by the United Nations for the manufacture, production, or construction and the import, export, or transit of war material.

14. (A) All Italian merchant shipping and fishing and other craft, wherever they may be, and any constructed or completed during the period of the present instrument will be made available in good repair and in seaworthy condition by the competent Italian authorities at such places and for such purposes and periods as the United Nations may prescribe. Transfer to enemy or neutral flags is prohibited. Crews will remain on board pending further instructions regarding their continued employment or dispersal. Any existing options to repurchase or reacquire or to resume control of Italian or former Italian vessels sold or otherwise transferred or chartered during the war will forthwith be exercised and the above provisions will apply to all such vessels and their crews.

(B) All Italian inland transport and all port equipment will be held at the disposal of the United Nations for such purposes as they may direct.

15. United Nations merchant ships, fishing and other craft in Italian hands wherever they may be (including for this purpose those of any country which has broken off diplomatic relations with Italy) whether or not the title has been transferred as the result of prize court proceedings or otherwise, will be surrendered to the United Nations and will be assembled in ports to be specified by the United Nations for disposal as directed by them. The Italian Government will take all such steps as may be required to secure any necessary transfers of title. Any neutral merchant ship, fishing, or other craft under Italian operations or control will be assembled in the same manner pending arrangements for their ultimate disposal. Any necessary repairs to any of the above-mentioned vessels will be effected by the Italian Government, if required, at their expense. The Italian Government will take the necessary measures to insure that the vessels and their cargo are not damaged.

16. No radio or telecommunication installations or other forms of intercommunication, ashore or afloat, under Italian control whether belonging to Italy or any nation other than the United Nations, will transmit until directions for the control of these installations have been prescribed by the Allied commander in chief. The Italian authorities will conform to such measures for control and censorship of press and of other publications, of theatrical and cinematograph performances, of broadcasting, and also of all forms of intercommunication as commander in chief may direct. The Allied commander in chief may, at his discretion, take over radio, cable, and other communication stations.

17. The warships, auxiliaries, transports, and merchant, and other vessels and aircraft in the service of the United Nations will have the right freely to use the territorial waters around and the air over Italian territory.

18. The forces of the United Nations will require to occupy certain parts of Italian territory. The territories or areas concerned will from time to time be notified by the United Nations and all Italian land, sea, and air forces will thereupon withdraw from such territories or areas in accordance with the instructions issued by the Allied commander in chief. The provisions of this article are without prejudice to those of article 4 above. The Italian supreme command will guarantee immediate use and access to the Allies of all airfields and naval ports in Italy under their control.

19. In the territories or areas referred to in article 18, all naval, military, and air installations, power stations, oil refineries, public utility services, all ports and harbors, all transport, and all intercommunication installations, facilities and equipment and such other installations or facilities and all such stocks as may be required by the United Nations will be made available in good condition by the competent Italian authorities with the personnel required for working them. The Italian Government will make available such other local resources or services as the United Nations may require.

20. Without prejudice to the provisions of the present instrument the United Nations will exercise all the rights of an occupying power throughout the territories or areas referred to in article 18, the administration of which will be provided for by the issue of proclamations, orders, or regulations. Personnel of the Italian administrative, judicial, and public services will carry out their functions under the control of the Allied commander in chief unless otherwise directed.

21. In addition to the rights in respect of occupied Italian territories described in articles 18 to 20—

(A) Members of the land, sea, or air forces and officials of the United Nations will have the right of passage in or over nonoccupied Italian territory and will be afforded all the necessary facilities and assistance in performing their functions.

(B) The Italian authorities will make available in nonoccupied Italian territory all transport facilities required by the United Nations including free transit for their war material and supplies, and will comply with instructions issued by the Allied commander

in chief regarding the use and control of airfields, ports, shipping, inland transport systems and vehicles, intercommunication systems, power stations and public utility services, oil refineries, stocks and such other fuel and power supplies and means of producing same, as United Nations may specify, together with connected repair and construction facilities.

22. The Italian Government and people will abstain from all action detrimental to the interests of the United Nations and will carry out promptly and efficiently all orders given by the United Nations.

23. The Italian Government will make available such Italian currency as the United Nations may require. The Italian Government will withdraw and redeem in Italian currency within such time limits and on such terms as the United Nations may specify all holdings in Italian territory of currencies issued by the United Nations during military operations or occupation and will hand over the currencies so withdrawn free of cost to the United Nations. The Italian Government will take such measures as may be required by the United Nations for the control of banks and businesses in Italian territory, for the control of foreign exchange and foreign commercial and financial transactions, and for the regulation of trade and production, and will comply with any instructions issued by the United Nations regarding these and similar matters.

24. There shall be no financial, commercial, or other intercourse with or dealings with or for the enefit of countries at war with any of the United Nations or territories occupied by such countries or any other foreign country except under authorization of the Allied commander in chief or designated officials.

25. (A) Relations with countries at war with any of the United Nations, or occupied by any such country, will be broken off. Italian diplomatic, consular, and other officials and members of the Italian land, sea, and air forces accredited to, or serving on missions with, any such country or in any other territory specified by the United Nations will be recalled. Diplomatic and consular officials of such countries will be dealt with as the United Nations may prescribe.

(B) The United Nations reserve the right to require the withdrawal of neutral diplomatic and consular officers from occupied Italian territory and to prescribe and lay down regulations governing the procedure for and methods of communication between the Italian Government and its representatives in neutral countries and regarding communications emanating from or destined for the representatives of neutral countries in Italian territory.

26. Italian subjects will pending further instructions be prevented from leaving Italian territory except as authorized by the Allied commander in chief and will not in any event take service with any of the countries or in any of the territories referred to in article 25 A, nor will they proceed to any place for the purpose of undertaking work for any such country. Those at present so serving or working will be recalled as directed by the Allied commander in chief.

27. The military, naval, and air personnel and material and the merchant shipping, fishing, and other craft and the aircraft, vehicles, and other transport equipment of any country against which any of the United Nations is carrying on hostilities or which is occupied by any such country, remain liable to attack or seizure wherever found in or over Italian territory or waters.

28. (A) The warships, auxiliaries, and transports of any such country or occupied country referred to in article 27 in Italian or Italian-occupied ports and waters and the aircraft, vehicles, and other transport equipment of such countries in or over Italian or Italian-occupied territory will, pending further instructions, be prevented from leaving.

(B) The military, naval, and air personnel, and the civilian nationals of any such country or occupied country in Italian or Italian-occupied territory will be prevented from leaving and will be interned pending further instructions.

(C) All property in Italian territory belonging to any such country or occupied country or its nationals will be impounded and kept in custody pending further instructions.

(D) The Italian Government will comply with any instructions given by the Allied commander in chief concerning the internment, custody, or subsequent disposal, utilization, or employment of any of the abovementioned persons, vessels, aircraft, material, or property.

29. Benito Mussolini, his chief Fascist associates, and all persons suspected of having committed war crimes or analogous offences whose names appear on the lists to be communicated by the United Nations and who now or in the future are on territory controlled by the Allied Military Command or by the Italian Government, will forthwith be apprehended and surrendered into the hands of the United Nations. Any instructions given by the United Nations for this purpose will be complied with.

30. All Fascist organizations, including all branches of the Fascist Militia (MVSN), the Secret Police (OVRA), all Fascist youth organizations will insofar as this is not already accomplished be disbanded in accordance with the directions of the Allied Commander in Chief. The Italian Government will comply with all such further directions as the United Nations may give for abolition of Fascist institutions, the dismissal and internment of Fascist personnel, the control of Fascist funds, the suppression of Fascist ideology and teaching.

31. All Italian laws involving discrimination on grounds of race, color, creed, or political opinions will insofar as this is not already accomplished be rescinded, and persons detained on such grounds will, as directed by the United Nations, be released and relieved from all legal disabilities to which they have been subjected. The Italian Government will comply with all such further directions as the Allied commander in chief may give for repeal of Fascist legislation and removal of any disabilities or prohibitions resulting therefrom.

32. (A) Prisoners of war belonging to the forces of or specified by the United Nations and any nationals of the United Nations, including Abyssinian subjects, confined, interned, or otherwise under restraint in Italian or Italian-occupied territory will not be removed and will forthwith be handed over to representatives of the United Nations or otherwise dealt with as the United Nations may direct. Any removal during the period between the presentation and the signature of the present instrument will be regarded as a breach of its terms.

(B) Persons of whatever nationality who have been placed under restriction, detention, or sentence (including sentences in absentia) on account of their dealings or sympathies with the United Nations will be released under the direction of the United Nations and relieved from all legal disabilities to which they have been subjected.

(C) The Italian Government will take such steps as the United Nations may direct to safeguard the persons of foreign nationals and property of foreign states and nationals.

33. (A) The Italian Government will comply with such directions as the United Nations may prescribe regarding restitution, deliveries, services, or payments by way of reparation and payment of the costs of occupation during the period of the present instrument.

(B) The Italian Government will give to the Allied commander in chief such information as may be prescribed regarding the assets whether inside or outside Italian territory of the Italian state, the Bank of Italy, any Italian state or semi-state institutions, or Fascist organizations or residents in Italian territory and will not dispose or allow the disposal, outside Italian territory of any such assets except with the permission of the United Nations.

34. The Italian Government will carry out during the period of the present instrument such measures of disarmament, demobilization, and demilitarization as may be prescribed by the Allied commander in chief.

35. The Italian Government will supply all information and provide all documents required by the United Nations. There shall be no destruction or concealment of archives, records, plans, or any other documents or information.

36. The Italian Government will take and enforce such legislative and other measures as may be necessary for the execution of the present instrument. Italian military and civil authorities will comply with any instruction issued by the Allied commander in chief for the same purpose.

37. There will be appointed a Control Commission representative of the United Nations charged with regulating and executing this instrument under the orders and general directions of the Allied commander in chief.

38. (A) The term "United Nations" in the present instrument includes the Allied commander in chief, the Control Commission, and any other authority which the United Nations may designate.

(B) The term "Allied commander in chief" in the present instrument includes the Control Commission and such other officers and representatives as the commander in chief may designate.

39. Reference to Italian land, sea, and air forces in the present instrument shall be demed to include Fascist Militia and all such other military or para-military units, formations or bodies as the Allied commander in chief may prescribe.

40. The term "war material" in the present instrument denotes all material specified in such lists or definitions as may from time to time be issued by the Control Commission.

41. The term "Italian Territory" includes all Italian colonies and dependencies and shall for the purposes of the present instrument (but without prejudice to the question of sovereignty) be deemed to include Albania. Provided however, that except in such cases and to such extent as the United Nations may direct the provisions of the present instrument shall not apply in or affect the adminstration of any Italian colony or dependency already occupied by the United Nations or the rights or powers therein possessed or exercised by them.

42. The Italian Government will send a delegation to the headquarters of the control commission to represent Italian interests and to transmit the orders of the control commission to the competent Italian authorities.

43. The present instrument shall enter into force at once. It will remain in operation until superseded by any other arrangements or until the voting into force of the peace treaty with Italy.

44. The present instrument may be denounced by the United Nations with immediate effect if Italian obligations thereunder are not fulfilled or, as an alternative, the United Nations may penalize contravention of it by measures appropriate to the circumstances such as the extension of the areas of military occupation or air or other punitive action.

The present instrument is drawn up in English and Italian, the English text being authentic, and in case of any dispute regarding its interpretation, the decision of the control commission will prevail.

Signed at Malta on the 29th day of September 1943.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
General, United States Army, Commander in Chief, Allied Forces.
Marshal PIETRO BADOGLIO,
Head of the Italian Government.

3. LETTER OF SEPTEMBER 29, 1943, FROM GEN. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER TO MARSHAL PIETRO BADOGLIO

SEPTEMBER 29, 1943.

His Excellency Marshal PIETRO BADOGLIO,
Head of the Italian Government.

MY DEAR MARSHAL BADOGLIO: The terms of the armistice to which we have just appended our signatures are supplementary to the short military armistice signed by your representative and mine on September 3, 1943. They are based upon the situation obtaining prior to the cessation of hostilities. Developments since that time have altered considerably the status of Italy, which has become in effect a cooperator with the United Nations.

It is fully recognized by the governments on whose behalf I am acting that these terms are in some respects superseded by subsequent events and that several of the clauses have become obsolescent or have already been put into execution. We also recognize that it is not at this time in the power of the Italian Government to carry out certain of the terms. Failure to do so because of existing conditions will not be regarded as a breach of good faith on the part of Italy. However, this document represents the requirements with which the Italian Government can be expected to comply when in a position to do so.

It is to be understood that the terms both of this document and of the short military armistice of September 3 may be modified from time to time if military necessity or the extent of cooperation by the Italian Government indicates this as desirable.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
General, United States Army, Commander in Chief, Allied Forces.

OFFICE OF COMMANDER IN CHIEF,
MEDITERRANEAN STATION,
September 23, 1943.

4. MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT ON THE EMPLOYMENT AND DISPOSITION OF THE ITALIAN FLEET AND MERCANTILE MARINE BETWEEN THE ALLIED NAVAL COMMANDER IN CHIEF, MEDITERRANEAN, ACTING ON BEHALF OF THE ALLIED COMMANDER IN CHIEF AND THE ITALIAN MINISTER OF MARINE

The armistice having been signed between the head of the Italian Government and the Allied commander in chief under which all Italian warships and the Italian Mercantile Marine were placed unconditionally at the disposal of the United Nations, and H. M. the King of Italy and the Italian Government having since expressed the wish that the Fleet and the Italian Mercantile Marine should be employed in the Allied effort to assist in the prosecution of the war against the Axis Powers, the following principles are established on which the Italian Navy and Mercantile Marine will be disposed.

(A) Such ships as can be employed to assist activity in the Allied effort will be kept in commission and will be used under the orders of the commander in chief, Mediterranean, as may be arranged between the Allied commander in chief and the Italian Government.

(B) Ships which cannot be so employed will be reduced to a care and maintenance basis and be placed in designated ports, measures of disarmament being undertaken as may be necessary.

(C) The Government of Italy will declare the names and whereabouts of (i) warships, (ii) merchant ships, now in their possession which previously belonged to any of the United Nations. These vessels are to be returned forthwith as may be directed by the Allied commander in chief. This will be without prejudice to negotiations between the governments which may subsequently be made in connection with replacing losses of ships of the United Nations caused by Italian action.

(D) The Allied naval commander in chief will act as the agent of the Allied commander in chief in all matters concerning the employment of the Italian Fleet or merchant navy, their disposition and related matters.

(E) It should be clearly understood that the extent to which the terms of the armistice are modified to allow of the arrangements outlined above and which follow are dependent upon the extent and effectiveness of Italian cooperation.

2. Method of operation: The commander in chief, Mediterranean, will place at the disposal of the Italian Ministry of Marine a high-ranking naval officer with the appropriate staff who will be responsible to the commander in chief, Mediterranean, for all matters in connection with the operation of the Italian Fleet, and be the medium through which dealings will be carried out in connection with the Italian mercantile marine. The flag officer acting for these duties (flag officer, liaison) will keep the Italian Ministry of Marine informed of the requirements of the commander in chief, Mediterranean, and will act in close cooperation as regards issue of all orders to the Italian Fleet.

3. Proposed disposition of the Italian Fleet:

(A) All battleships will be placed on a care and maintenance basis in ports to be designated and will have such measures of disarmament applied as may be directed. These measures of disarmament will be such that the ships can be brought into operation again if it so seems desirable. Each ship will have on board a proportion of Italian naval personnel to keep the ships in proper condition and the commander in chief, Mediterranean, will have the right of inspection at any time.

(B) Cruisers: Such cruisers as can be of immediate assistance will be kept in commission. At present it is visualized that one squadron of four cruisers will suffice and the remainder will be kept in care and maintenance as for the battleships but at a rather greater degree of readiness to be brought into service if required.

(C) Destroyers and torpedo boats: It is proposed to keep these in commission and to use them on escort and similar duties as may be requisite. It is proposed that they should be divided into escort groups working as units and that they should be based on Italian ports.

(D) Small craft: MAS, minesweepers, auxiliaries and similar small craft will be employed to the full, detailed arrangements being made with the flag officer (liaison) by the Italian Ministry of Marine for their best employment.

(E) Submarines: In the first instance submarines will be immobilized in ports to be designated and at a later date these may be brought into service as may be required to assist the Allied effort.

4. Status of Italian navy: Under this modification of the armistice terms, all the Italian ships will continue to fly their flag. A large proportion of the Italian Navy will thus remain in active commission operating their own ships and fighting alongside the forces of the United Nations against the Axis Powers.

The requisite liaison officers will be supplied to facilitate the working of the Italian ships in cooperation with Allied forces. A small Italian liaison mission will be attached to the headquarters of the commander in chief, Mediterranean, to deal with matters affecting the Italian Fleet.

5. Mercantile marine: It is the intention that the Italian mercantile marine should operate under the same conditions as the merchant ships of the Allied Nations. That is to say, all mercantile shipping of the United Nations is formed into a pool which is employed as may be considered necessary for the benefit of all the United Nations. In this will naturally be included the requirements for the supply and maintenance of Italy. The system will be analogous to that used in north Africa, where the North Africa Shipping Board controls all United States, British, and French shipping under certain agreements which will have to be arranged in detail insofar as Italian ships are concerned. While it may be expected that a proportion of Italian ships will be working within the Mediterranean and to and from Italian ports, it must be appreciated that this will not always necessarily be the case and ships flying the Italian flag may be expected to be used elsewhere as is done with the merchant ships of all the United Nations. Italian ships employed as outlined in this paragraph will fly the Italian flag and will be manned by crews provided by the Italian Ministry of Marine.

5. AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE NAVAL COMMANDER IN CHIEF, MEDITERRANEAN, ALLIED FORCES, AND THE ROYAL ITALIAN MINISTER OF MARINE WITH RESPECT TO THE EMPLOYMENT OF THE ITALIAN NAVY

The aforementioned agreement is amended as follows:

The following phrase to be added to the preamble:

"It is understood and agreed that the provisions of this agreement as to immediate employment and disposition of Italian warships and merchant ships do not affect the right of United Nations to make such other dispositions of any or all Italian ships as they may think fit. Their decisions in this respect will be notified to the Italian Government from time to time."

Final sentence of last paragraph to be amended to read: "will be manned so far as possible by crews provided by Italian Ministry of Marine and will fly the Italian flag."

The present instrument is drawn up in English and Italian, the English text being authentic, and in case of any dispute regarding its interpretation the decision of the control commission will prevail.

Signed on the 17th of November 1943 at Brindisi.

For the naval commander in chief, Mediterranean, Allied forces:

R. MCGREGOR, *Rear Admiral.*
AMM. R. DE COURTEN,
Ministro della Marina,
Flag Officer Liaison, Italy.

6. STATEMENT OF ADMIRAL DE COURTEN

By order of His Excellency, Marshal Badoglio, Chief of the Government, I have signed the clauses added to the preamble and to the last paragraph of the Cunningham-De Courten Agreement, which were requested by the Allied Governments as conditions of the signature of the amendments to the armistice.

In signing, I request that note be taken of the following statement: "I believe it my duty to make clear that the request for insertion of these clauses, put forth less than 2 months after the meeting with Sir Andrew Cunningham, then commander in chief of the Allied Mediterranean Fleet, alters the spirit of the agreement concluded between Admiral Cunningham and me. The clauses of this Agreement had been put forward in accordance with the armistice, by Admiral Cunningham himself, who invited me to examine them and make known to them my observations and comments. Inasmuch as there was complete agreement in regard to the text presented by the Allies, and as the Agreement has up to now been carried out in the widest and most complete manner without opposition either in letter or spirit, I did not and do not have any reason to believe it should be modified and completed by a subsequent safeguarding clause. This clause seems to be at odds with the active collaboration given up to now by the Italian Navy and with the visible demonstration of the loyalty with which the Italian Fleet is contributing to the utmost to the conduct of the war against the common enemy in the spirit of existing cobelligerency."

Brindisi, November 17, 1943.

(Signed) Admiral DE COURTEN,
Minister of the Navy.

7. AIDE-MÉMOIRE TO THE ITALIAN GOVERNMENT BY THE ACTING PRESIDENT OF THE CONTENTS OF THE NEW DIRECTIVE ON THE FUNCTIONS OF THE ALLIED COMMISSION

In accordance with the declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain, the Allied Governments propose to relax the control of the Italian Government under the armistice in the matter of day-to-day administration and only to exercise such control when Allied military interests require.

2. The political section of the Allied Commission is being abolished as of March 1, 1945. The Italian Ministry for Foreign Affairs will deal with the Chief Commissioner on matters of major policy, and on matters of minor policy and routine business it will address itself to whatever section (economic or civil affairs) of the commission may be appropriate to the subject involved. Matters involving the travel of diplomatic and other public officials will hereafter be dealt with on behalf of the commission by the office of the Executive Commissioner.

3. The Italian Government will continue, as at present, to have direct relations with foreign diplomatic representatives accredited to the Quirinal. The Allied Commission should be kept generally informed by the Italian Government of any negotiations in which they engage with other governments. Facilities for the use of secret bags will be granted to the Italian Government for use in correspondence with their diplomatic representatives abroad. Undeposited cipher facilities cannot be allowed for the present.

Insofar as these negotiations have to do with economic and financial matters, the Economic Section and its Finance Subcommission should be kept informed of their progress.

It would be convenient if the Italian Government would furnish a periodic summary of all negotiations completed or pending with other governments.

4. The Allied Commission will limit its dealings with respect to territory under the jurisdiction of the Italian Government to consultation with and advice to the ministers of the Italian Government.

5. The advisory functions of the Subcommissions of Education, Monuments and Fine Arts, Local Government, Legal and Labor in territory under the jurisdiction of the Italian Government will be performed only when requested by the Italian Government.

6. It will no longer be necessary for the Italian Government to obtain the approval of the Allied Commission for decrees and other legislation enacted by the Italian Government in the territory under the jurisdiction of the Italian Government.

Nevertheless the Allied Commission should be informed of proposed decrees sometime before their enactment, in order to enable the chief commissioner to consult with the Italian Government as to their application to territory under the jurisdiction of Allied Military Government (A. M. G.), and to lay plans for their effective implementation in such territory when appropriate.

7. It will no longer be necessary for the Italian Government to obtain approval of the Allied Commission for Italian appointments, whether to national or local offices, in territory under the jurisdiction of the Italian Government except with regard to the attached list of positions having military significance. The Italian Government will have the right to alter appointments made previously by A. M. G. authorities.

8. The Allied Commission officers stationed in the field in the territory under the jurisdiction of the Italian Government will be withdrawn. As a first step it is intended to abolish by the 1st of April 1945, the regional offices of the Allied Commission for Sicilia, Sardegna, Southern and Lazio-Umbria regions. Representatives of the Allied Commission will, however, be sent into territory under the jurisdiction of the Italian Government when necessary, and certain specialist officers with economic functions will remain in such territory for a limited period.

9. It is the desire of the Allies to encourage free trade in knowledge and learning with the Italian people. Arrangements will be facilitated for the flow between Italy and the United Nations of books and other publications of a scientific, political, philosophical, and artistic nature, and for the movement of scholars, artists, and professional men between Italy and the United Nations.

10. The Allies welcome the decision to hold local elections in territory under the jurisdiction of the Italian Government as soon as may be.

11. The Allied Nations desire to make concessions with regard to Italian prisoners of war now or hereafter held in Italy, other than those captured since the armistice was signed. Provided that arrangements can be made for the services of such persons to continue to be made available on terms satisfactory to the Supreme Allied Commander, their status as prisoners of war will be terminated.

12. It is essential that the Italian Government formulate and implement appropriate economic controls and take all other steps possible both in order to ensure that maximum production and effective and equitable distribution and control of consumption of local resources possible under existing conditions be secured and as a prerequisite to increased economic assistance.

13. In the joint programme of essential Italian imports, now being prepared by the Inter-Ministerial Committee for Reconstruction and the economic section of this commission, there will be some supplies for which the combined United States-United Kingdom military authorities will assume responsibility for procurement (category "A") and other supplies for which they will not assume responsibility (category "B"). A definition of the supplies which fall into category "A" follows:

(a) Those quantities of agreed essential supplies necessary to prevent disease and unrest prejudicial to military operations, such as food, fuel, clothing, medical, and sanitary supplies.

(b) Those supplies, the importation of which will reduce military requirements for the import of essential civilian supplies for the purposes referred to in this paragraph, such as fertilizer, raw materials, machinery, and equipment.

(c) Those materials essential for the rehabilitation of such of the Italian communication facilities, power systems and transportation facilities as will directly further the Allied military effort.

14. The program for which the military authorities assume responsibility will be maintained for the duration of combined (United States-United Kingdom) operations in Italy. For this period, and within the limits defined in paragraph 13, Italy will be treated as a whole. The date of the termination of military responsibility will be fixed by the Allied Nations.

15. In addition to the program of supplies for which the military assume responsibility for procurement (category "A") the Allied Commission will assist the Italian Government in the preparation of programs of supplies designed to rehabilitate Italian industry. Such programs, referred to as category "B," will be handled under procedures already notified. The purchasing of supplies in category "B" programs will be undertaken immediately without reference to the present difficult shipping position in order that the supplies so purchased may be called forward as and when shipping space becomes available.

16. The Allies desire that industrial rehabilitation in Italy be carried out by the Italian Government to the fullest extent permitted by Italian resources and such supplies as it may be possible to import under the terms of paragraphs 13, 14, and 15 above, and subject to the limitation in paragraph 19 below. The sole exception to this principle is to be made in the case of industries involving the production or repair of munitions or other implements of war, which will be rehabilitated only to the extent required by the Supreme Allied Commander in the discharge of his military mission, and to the extent necessary to further the Allied military effort in other theaters. The priority order in which Italian industry will be rehabilitated (after the rehabilitation of industries essential for Allied military purposes) will be determined by the Italian Government, with the assistance and advice of the Allied Commission.

17. The prime responsibility for the control of inflation in Italy, including the imposition and administration of the appropriate financial controls and economic controls, and appropriate utilization of supplies, rests with the Italian Government. In this connection, as in others, the Allied Commission stands ready to advise and assist.

18. The extent to which exports are to be stimulated and the development of machinery to handle export trade are for determination by the Italian Government. For the time being, the Italian-export programme will necessarily be limited by certain shipping, military, financial, and supply factors. The applicability of these factors to individual programmes will be worked out between the Italian Government and the economic section of the Allied Commission along the lines already discussed by the economic section with the Interministerial Committee for Reconstruction.

19. Nothing contained in the above should be taken as constituting a commitment by the Allied Nations with respect to shipping. Any supplies to be imported into Italy must be transported within such shipping as may be allocated from time to time by the Allied Nations.

HAROLD MACMILLAN.

FEBRUARY 24, 1945.

List of Italian Government appointments requiring prior approval by the Allied Commission:

Minister of War.
Minister of Marine.
Minister of Air.
Any other Minister of Armed Forces who may be created.
Under-Secretary for Telecommunications.
Director of Railroads.
Director-General of Pubblica Sicurezza.
Commanding General, CC. RR.
Chief of Staff, CC. RR.
Commanding General, GG. FF.
Appointments in the Army, Navy, and Air Force in accordance with current practice.

8. COMMENTARY ON THE ARMISTICE TERMS AND THE CUNNINGHAM-DE COURTEN AGREEMENT

The extent to which certain articles of the agreement have been implemented or modified is indicated in the following comment. The remaining articles, on which no comment is given, have either been superseded by events and are therefore dormant, or are still in force.

Articles 1 to 5 were complied with.

Articles 6 to 12: With the cooperation of the Italian Government, the Italian armed forces have been used to the maximum useful extent in the service of the United Nations and have contributed materially toward the liberation of Italy and final victory. The Italian Navy has operated with Allied warships in the Mediterranean and elsewhere, and since the cessation of hostilities has largely been employed in the Italian interest in minesweeping and the transport of displaced persons.

The Army fought alongside Allied formations during the campaign in Italy and the

air force took its place with the Allied Air Forces.

Article 14: While Italian merchant ships have been employed in the general interests of the United Nations they have been primarily employed in the Italian interest. Italian inland transport and ports have now been largely returned to Italian administration except insofar as redeployment and maintenance of Allied Forces has had to be effected.

Article 15: The provisions of this article, as regards small vessels and craft, have not been fully satisfied owing to the difficulty of locating and identifying the vessels and craft concerned.

Article 16: Control of radio has been returned to the Italian Government. All military and rehabilitated civilian telecommunications are being handed over to the Italians as military requirements decrease. Internal censorship has been abolished in the areas under Italian Government control.

Article 18: The second sentence of this article has never been invoked, except in two frontier areas, i. e., on the Franco-Italian frontier and in Venezia Giulia.

Article 19: Care has been taken to conserve wherever possible Italian resources for the use of the civil economy and to utilize local goods and services only when military necessity demanded. The Allied Forces Local Resources Board, on the committee of which Italian representatives have sat, was established as the allocation agency.

While the legal rights of the Allied Forces under this article have not been modified, in practice it has been administered with as much regard as possible for Italian needs.

With the redeployment of Allied troops from Italy, the utilization of local resources and facilities is diminishing rapidly. In addition, large quantities of food, coal, clothing, and other commodities have been imported into Italy by the United Nations largely in United Nations ships to supplement local resources and to alleviate distress.

Article 20: Allied Military Government was rigorously enforced in combat zones for obvious operational reasons. This was progressively relaxed as the battle moved forward until territories were handed over wholly to Italian administration.

Article 21: As Allied Forces are redeployed facilities are progressively being handed back to Italian control.

Article 22: With the declaration of war upon the Germans by the Italian Government in October 1943, and the cooperation and loyalty of the Italian people to the Allied cause, there has never been any necessity to invoke this article.

Article 23: The Italian Government has been informed that the Allied Commission will no longer intervene in Italian internal financial affairs (except in cases of Allied military necessity) and that, with certain exceptions in Italy's own interest, the Italian Government need no longer obtain the approval of the Allied Commission prior to the execution of external financial transactions. The Italian Government is now free to fix or negotiate exchange rates for the lira without prior consultation with the Allied Commission.

Article 24: Private export trade may now be resumed and all types of commercial and financial correspondence may now go forward from Italy to the nonenemy world, subject to the Italian Government putting into force certain trade-control measures similar to those employed by the United Nations against enemy interests.

Article 26: This article is no longer enforced, and provided an individual has the necessary civil documents, such as passport, visas, et cetera, there is nothing to prevent his leaving Italian territory, subject of course to the immigration laws and regulations of the countries of intended destination.

Articles 30 and 31: The Italian Government has of its own volition done all that would have been required.

Article 32: This article has been complied with and is, in the case of clauses A and B, no longer applicable. As regards clause C the Italian Government has cooperated loyally in carrying out such instructions as have been given concerning the preservation and administration of United Nations property in Italy, previously sequestered by the Italian Government.

Article 33: The part of clause B that deals with the disposal of foreign assets has been modified in favor of the Italian Government (see under article 23).

Articles 36 and 37: The execution of these articles has been modified by the MacMillan Aide Mémoire of February 24, 1945.

Article 41: In practice the armistice conditions have not been applied to Albania or to any former Italian territories overseas.

With respect to the Cunningham-De Courten Agreement, the following general comments show the extent to which certain articles have been implemented or modified.

1. As explained in the document this agreement was produced in modification of the armistice terms so that the Italian fleet and merchant marine could assist in the prosecution of the war against the Axis Powers.

2. The additions to the agreement were inserted at the Allied request after the original agreement had been concluded and were accepted on the Italian side in view of an amelioration of certain articles in the original terms of the armistice. Signature was accompanied by the formal statement by Admiral de Courten printed above.

3. The provisions of this agreement have been carried out and those provisions that remain operative with the cessation of hostilities and change of circumstances are still being carried out. Furthermore, many Italian warships are undertaking work of direct benefit to the Italians themselves, for example, transport of displaced persons.

4. While the employment of Italian ships has been of use to the United Nations, it is pointed out that considerable United Nations resources have been expended in Italy and elsewhere to help the Italian Government in keeping the Italian ships running and their crews fed and clothed.

5. In addition to the use of Italian mercantile shipping under this agreement a number of the smaller Italian merchant ships has been returned to the control of the Italian authorities.

Poland Lies at Russia's Feet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the cause of Poland should have the attention of responsible officers in our Government. President Truman has, in my opinion, a direct responsibility to the end that equity and justice prevail in the relationship between Poland and Russia. When the history of this situation is written, it will be to our eternal shame unless we now take action to correct the gross inequities that now exist between those two countries. As champions of the rights of smaller nations, we should immediately see that a free, untrammeled election and a representative government is chosen by the Poles themselves, and not by the Russian Government. I am submitting herewith a letter addressed to President Truman by the Polish-American Congress to be incorporated in these remarks:

POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., October 20, 1945.

HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.

MR. PRESIDENT: A recent Associated Press dispatch reports that Red army units, with the sanction of the Stalin-appointed Polish Government, are being sent to each of the 17 provinces of Poland. This is being done under the guise of protecting the country from an "epidemic of banditry."

Catherine the Great offered exactly the same kind of protection before she took over Poland.

Russian headquarters in the capital of every province with Russian generals in command of all army units everywhere in Poland.

This grim news comes out of martyred Poland at the very moment when Mr. Wincenty Rzymowski, foreign minister of the Moscow-conceived Government of Poland, is conferring with our State Department, which is still upholding, in words, the traditional American policy of nonrecognition of governments that do not represent the free will of free people.

As Poland's independence is being strangled by a Soviet military noose, there is not a single word of protest from our Government.

This silence only intensifies the heart-tearing mental, physical, and spiritual anguish of the people of Poland.

America's staunch ally, Poland, is a victim of ingratitude, injustice, and deception without parallel in history.

Not only was this friendly republic deprived at Yalta of one-half of its ancient lands, where barely 1 percent of the prewar population was Russian, but the sovereignty of what remains of Poland was destroyed by the imposition of an illegal government.

But Poland was not the only country sold into Soviet slavery at the Yalta market place. There were others. Ten nations with a total population of 120,000,000 human beings—men, women, and children with the same love of freedom Americans have—met the same tragic fate.

While we are not lacking in appreciation of your expression of friendship for Poland in your speech after the Potsdam Conference, we are keenly disappointed to learn that injustices against Poland and other Soviet-held countries were not corrected at that historic gathering. It was a sad commentary on American diplomacy to learn that even Poland's reparations were placed in the exclusive custody of the Kremlin.

Victim of German and Russian aggression during war, Poland is likewise a target for plunder, murder, hunger, disease, and poverty during peace.

A member of the UNRRA Commission in Poland, Clifford H. Nillson, reports Poland is undergoing the most terrible ordeal in its history.

Representatives GORDON (Democrat, Illinois) and RYTER (Democrat, Connecticut), members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, after a tour of Poland, formally protested to you, Mr. President, that Russia is using the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration for political purposes.

We quote briefly from Representative GORDON's observations:

"The Russian occupation army is behaving very badly (in Poland). We saw their arrogance and unfairness in taking advantage of the poor people of the city (Warsaw). We saw the nearby highways jammed with hundreds of heads of cattle, horses, and farming implements, being taken out of Poland by the Russians and going farther east.

Pillaging of the shops on the street was going on most freely and the snatching of purses from Polish women is a daily occurrence. There also exists a wholesale raping of the Polish women. When resistance would be given, the Russian soldier would use his weapons of war and kill."

To conceal his intentions, Stalin juggles words cleverly. Repeatedly, he has stated he wants a strong and independent Poland. If he really wants such a Poland, he can have it. If he wanted a strong Poland, he would not have annexed one-half of it. If he wanted an independent Poland, he would not have imposed upon it a puppet government of Moscow-trained Communists.

Can anyone explain why Germany, an enemy, is under joint Allied occupation while Poland, an ally, is under exclusive Russian control?

If Russia would only withdraw its armies and stop interfering in Poland's internal affairs Poland's troubles would come to a swift end.

The United States could and should have avoided recognizing the Communist-dominated Polish Government until free elections were realized and not merely promised.

The attitude of our Government toward friendly Poland is in sharp contrast to our constructive intervention in hostile Bulgaria, where we flatly refused to recognize the undemocratic government installed by Moscow.

The American Nation is not bound by the secret agreements of Teheran and Yalta, made without the knowledge or approval of the Congress or the American people.

The Constitution of the United States invests in no one, no matter how exalted his position, the authority to consent to the mutilation of free nations, to the destruction of their legal governments, and to the condemnation of millions of decent and law-abiding people to the yoke of a despotic foreign power.

Our responsibility to right the wrong caused by secret agreements, violating the laws of God and man, is inescapable.

Hitler is gone, Mussolini is gone, and yet there is no freedom in Europe.

The dangers against which the Polish-American Congress, representing 6,000,000 Americans of Polish descent, has consistently warned our Government are now leading to a tragic climax.

As a result of blind appeasement, all gains made after the First World War have been wiped out. Nations freed by the First World War have all been enslaved by the Second World War. Stalin, who entered the war in 1939, not as Hitler's enemy but as his ally, is out to finish the task begun by Hitler—the domination of the world.

With efforts to bring freedom to all nations being nullified by Russia, granting credit to Russia indiscriminately would be foolhardy, especially until Russia withdraws to prewar frontiers and proves by actions it has no selfish aims of aggrandizement or desire to destroy democratic civilization.

In view of the ever-growing chain of slave nations, releasing the secret of the atomic bomb to Russia would spell the doom of America. This secret should be guarded carefully, for it is the only safeguard our country has against further Russian expansionism.

America's security and the peace of the world depend upon the correction of political blunders made during the war.

Unless there is a reversal in our foreign policy, it is folly to talk about liberty, democracy, and peace.

As the shadows of despair are deepening over the world, this is not the time for silence.

For freedom's sake, Mr. President, please urge independence for Poland and for all our allies. Do not assist in the crucifixion of the people of Europe. They want to live as we Americans do, not to suffer and die.

This war was fought to protect nations from aggression.

Precious American blood was spilled to purchase freedom and not tyranny for the world.

For the Polish-American Congress:

CHARLES ROZMAREK, *President.*
HONORATA B. WOLOWSKA, *Secretary.*
JOHN J. OLEJNICZAK, *Treasurer.*

Amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEPHEN PACE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of the Members to the following statement by Hon. Tom Linder, commissioner of agriculture of Georgia, which I have found most interesting:

STATEMENT BY TOM LINDER, COMMISSIONER OF AGRICULTURE, STATE OF GEORGIA, ON S. 1349, A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE AMENDMENT OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938 AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

The National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture is a nonprofit membership organization comprising the commissioners, secretaries, and directors of agriculture of the 48 States.

The constitutional and statutory duties of the members of the National Association, in addition to a general supervision of agricultural crop yields and the processing and marketing of agricultural productions, have largely to do with financial, social, and other economic benefits which can be effected in behalf of farmers, planters, processors, and agricultural industries within their respective States.

I am a member of the National Association and am in close contact with the activities of that organization. I am appearing before you as commissioner of agriculture of the State of Georgia, but, by reason of my contact with the national association, will say that I am confident that the views which I am expressing here are in accordance with those of the other 47 members.

The rights of labor are the same whether that labor is an organized group or an unorganized group.

The rights of labor are the same whether that labor consists of physical effort, mental effort, or a combination of both.

There is no difference under or Constitutution between the rights of different labor groups. What appears to be a difference in their rights is simply a difference in their ability to enforce their rights.

Indeed, it is very easy to confuse the rights under the Constitution of a group with their power to enforce their demands.

Every American is supposed to subscribe to the oath of allegiance to the flag of the United States:

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

This does not say justice for any particular group. It does not say justice for those who are organized strongly enough to enforce their rights. It does not limit justice to those who labor in any particular field of industry. It does not limit justice to those who contribute to the Nation's economic welfare in any particular manner, but it provides justice for all.

I also want to make it perfectly clear that we are not opposed to that portion of labor that is organized; on the other hand, we are their friends. We stand ready at all times to go to bat to see that they are not denied full justice in every way under our national economic set-up.

I also wish to make it clear that I am not appearing in any sense in opposition to labor and its demands at this time.

I believe without going into any discussion of the merits or demerits of what has already been done, that our Nation is faced today with an economic condition that makes it vitally necessary for all labor to receive high wages in terms of money.

I believe it is equally necessary, from the standpoint of the Nation's welfare, for all white-collar workers, professional people, school teachers, etc., to receive high salaries in terms of money.

Likewise, I believe it is most essential for all farm crops to bring high prices in terms of money.

This necessity is brought about by reason of tremendous national debts and other public debts which will prove a crushing load on the taxpayers unless very high incomes are to be had, together with a very large national income which will make it possible to refinance and carry this tremendous load of debt until it can be reduced and a sufficient part of it retired to leave only a manageable balance.

I have, I hope, made it perfectly clear that we are not antagonistic to any other groups. I would like to proceed to demonstrate to the members of this committee just where the American farmers now stand in the overall picture of our American economy.

From governmental sources I have prepared certain tables of figures, which will demonstrate in a very concsise way the picture of the farmers' present condition. I believe that unless this picture is materially changed, that a tremendous economic upheaval in this country, and perhaps worldwide, is inevitable.

Since this hearing is concerned with industrial wages, I shall make comparison between the farmers' condition and industrial labor.

Let us go back to the years that the Democratic administrations have chosen as the base years. Let us assume that during these years the farmer was on an equality with business and industry. Let us compare his prices during that period with factory workers' pay during that same period; then, let's compare the price that the farmer gets for his crops today with factory wages today and see just how the farmer has fared for the last 35 years.

If farm prices today bore the same relation to factory workers' wages that they did during the base period, then the farmer today would be getting the following prices for basic farm products and crops:

For cotton, he would receive 52.20 cents per pound.

For corn, he would be receiving $3.30 per bushel.

His wheat would be bringing $4.45 per bushel.

Hogs in Chicago would be 38 cents per pound.

The average price of beef cattle in Chicago would be 39½ cents per pound.

HOW MUCH OF A FARMERS'S CROP SHOULD PAY FOR AN HOUR OF FACTORY LABOR?

All figures used here are from United States Government statistics, authority for which I will cite at the close of this statement.

During the 5-year period of 1911-15, the average wage of factory workers was 21.73 cents per hour. During the year 1944 the average factory wage was 1.01½ per hour. This is an increase of about 500 percent.

From 1911-15 to 1944 the net change in the price of the farmers' five basic commodities was as follows:

1911-15:	Cents
Cotton, per pound	10.44
Corn, per bushel	66.10
Wheat, per bushel	89.00
Hogs, per pound	7.60
Beef cattle, per pound	7.89
1944:	
Cotton, per pound	20.51
Corn, per bushel	112.00
Wheat, per bushel	141.00
Hogs, per pound	13.20
Beef cattle, per pound	10.74

The following table shows the increase from 1911-15 to 1944 of the number of pounds of these five basic commodities required to pay for 1 hour of factory labor:

1911-15:	Pounds
Cotton	2.08
Corn	18.40
Wheat	14.70
Hogs	2.80
Beef cattle	2.70
1944:	
Cotton	4.95
Corn	50.75
Wheat	43.20
Hogs	7.70
Beef cattle	9.40

Further on in this statement I will submit tabulations which show how this change came about during the years.

For the benefit of any who might wish to make a party issue out of these facts, I would like to call attention of this committee to the fact that for either political party to try to make a party issue out of these facts would simply be a case of the pot calling the kettle black.

According to these governmental statistics the national administration in 1926-30 made the following increases in the number of pounds of each of these five basic commodities that were required to pay for 1 hour of factory labor as compared to the period 1911-15:

1911-15:	Pounds
Cotton	2.08
Corn	18.40
Wheat	14.70
Hogs	2.80
Beef cattle	2.70
1926-30:	
Cotton	3.61
Corn	40.30
Wheat	32.90
Hogs	5.40
Beef cattle	4.70

The next table shows the increase in the number of pounds of these five basic commodities that were required to pay for 1 hour of factory labor during the period of 1936-40 as compared with the period of 1926-30:

1926-30:	Pounds
Cotton	3.61
Corn	40.30
Wheat	32.90
Hogs	5.40
Beef cattle	4.70
1936-40:	
Cotton	6.48
Corn	57.90
Wheat	49.00
Hogs	7.60
Beef cattle	6.30

In passing, I would like to call the committee's attention to the period of 1931-35, which was partly Republican and partly Democratic.

Let us compare this period of 1931-35 to the base period of 1911-15.

The following table will show the number of pounds of each of these five basic commodities required to pay for 1 hour of factory labor during these two periods:

1911-15:	Pounds
Cotton	2.08
Corn	18.40
Wheat	14.70
Hogs	2.80
Beef cattle	2.70
1931-35:	
Cotton	5.46
Corn	57.50
Wheat	51.08
Hogs	8.90
Beef cattle	6.70

LABOR LAWS MUST BE BUILT UPON THE SAME BASIS AS ALL OTHER LAWS IN A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY—EQUALITY OF ALL BEFORE THE LAW

There is no difference in the principle of enacting laws to guarantee labor a minimum wage and a law to guarantee the farmer a minimum price for his crop in line and on an equality with such labor wage.

In fact, the price which the farmer receives is the farmer's wage for his labor.

There is no difference in the principle involved. There is, of course, a marked difference in the position of the two groups. One group is in position to demand. The other group can only ask for justice at your hands.

One of the remarkable signs of the times is the fact that some of the labor leaders today are demanding higher wages for their own organized groups and are at the same time demanding lower wages for the farmer—the unorganized group.

There is a persistent and insistent demand, largely Government inspired, to force the American farmer to accept wages on the same basis as is now paid in other countries of the world.

They propose to force the farmer to accept low world-standard wages by forcing him to sell his crops in competition with and at world prices.

The very basis and foundation of our national economic policy is symbolized by the Smoot-Hawley Tariff of Act of 1930.

The reason that I say the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act symbolizes the basic thinking of America is because it was passed by the Republican administration and has been kept in force by the Democratic administration since March 1933, more than 12 years.

The very foundation rock is protection of American producers and American labor against cheap wages and cheap commodities in the world market.

Suppose that the farmers of America were strongly organized as a group.

Suppose that such a farm organization should demand very high prices for farm products in the United States. Suppose that such farm organizations at the same time demanded a cut in industrial wages to the world level.

If this were the case, I presume that almost everyone would say that the farmers making such demands were unfair and unreasonable to the other working people of the country.

Is it not obvious to every person that it is equally unfair and unreasonable to expect the farmer in the United States to labor for a wage that is in line with the world level?

The American farmers cannot produce at world prices or even at the present United States prices of farm products and maintain decent American living standards.

THE AMERICAN MARKET FOR THE AMERICAN PRODUCER

We have never had a substantial surplus of farm products in the United States in the last 25 years.

What we called surpluses were imported.

Over a period of the last 15 years we have consumed the equivalent of 35,000,000 bales of cotton more than we have produced.

Had it not been for imports of rayon, jute, wool, cotton, and cotton and wool manufactures and semimanufactures, America would have consumed every bale of cotton produced even if there had never been any crop control.

From 1931 to 1941, according to Government figures, we imported the equivalent of 33,000,000 bales of cotton and cotton substitutes.

They tell us that farm mechanization will reduce the cost to the farmer of his crops.

Modern improvements and mechanization in cotton mills have not reduced the cost of a yard of cloth.

Modern improvements and mechanization in garment factories have not reduced the price of garments.

Modern improvements and mechanization have not reduced the cost of transportation or of communication.

Is it reasonable to suppose that modern improvements and mechanization will reduce the per unit cost of farm products? I say it is not to be expected.

While I represent a State in the old Cotton Belt the figures that I have presented make out a case equally well for other farm sections.

COTTON

Cotton is not the problem alone of the South. It is equally the problem of the balance of the country.

In the South lies the natural market for tremendous amounts of industrial goods.

In the South lies the potential for the production of vast quantities of meat, dairy products, poultry, eggs, fruits, and vegetables.

Every time that a cotton farmer is forced to abandon cotton it means additional production of corn, wheat, meat, etc., to compete with the farming States of the West and the Middle West.

Every time a cotton farmer is forced to abandon cotton it means a decreased supply of food, feed, and fiber for the national economy.

Whatever you do, be fair.

Whatever you do be fair with regard to industrial wages. Be fair to the farmer. Be fair to the unorganized groups. Be fair to yourselves and be fair to America. Feed us all out of the same spoon.

Respectfully submitted.

TOM LINDER,
Commissioner of Agriculture,
State of Georgia.

OCTOBER 15, 1945.

NOTE.—All figures used herein are taken from or based on Statistical Abstract of the United States of 1943, Crops and Markets, of the USDA, July 1945, and Information Relating to Cotton Problems issued by USDA, November 1944.

Murray Full Employment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, S. 380, the Full Employment Act of 1945, is both an illusion and a snare. It is an economic mirage painted to create false hopes. When carefully analyzed the bill promises an economic utopia, but it does not even attempt to set up the machinery to create this much to be desired utopia. The preamble of the bill expresses a pious purpose to which everyone, employers and employees alike, gladly subscribes. But how is full employment, this desired utopia, to be established and maintained? That is the rub.

From the dawn of civilization to the present time mankind has been misled time and again by false prophets who promised the millennium. Karl Marx, away back when, offered a plan to bring about full employment. He has had his followers. Stalin, Mussolini, Hitler, all followed in the footsteps of Marx. Stalin says—in the Communist constitution for Russia—"Citizens of the U. S. S. R. have the right to work, the right to receive guaranteed work with payment for their work in accordance with its quantity and quality." Hitler told his followers, "We shall banish want; we shall banish fear. National socialism is the revolution of the common man." Mussolini said, "It is only when private enterprise is inadequate that the state intervenes." Do we want to follow in the footsteps of Italy, Germany, or Russia? Do we want to exchange our conditions, imperfect as they may be, for the conditions that are prevalent today in either Italy, Germany, or Russia—conditions brought about as a result of following false leaders?

Mr. Speaker, Sir William Beveridge is the direct father of the Murray full-employment bill. He is the man that sold our late President on the idea of 60,000,000 jobs, full employment for all. Henry Wallace, Mordecai Ezekiel, and F. D. R. swallowed the full-employment bait held out by Beveridge, but ignored or overlooked the hook embedded in the bait. Now our labor leaders, both William Green and Philip Murray, have swallowed the bait, but they also have overlooked the hook. What did Beveridge mean when he said, "The state cannot undertake the responsibility for full employment without full powers. If trade unions under full employment press wage claims unreasonably, maintenance of a stable price level will become impossible; and wage determination will become a function of the state"?

In plain English, Beveridge's statement means that workers will be told where they must work, what hours they must work, and what wages they must work for. That is exactly where the followers of Mussolini, of Hitler, and of Stalin finally landed. It happened in Italy, in Germany, in Russia; and it can happen here—if Congress obeys the order contained in the Communist Party statement filed with the Senate Labor Committee, "Congress must adopt this legislation."

Considering the statement from the Communist Constitution for Soviet Russia guaranteeing full employment for all, and the brazen order of the Communist Party of America given to our Congress, "Congress must adopt this legislation," can there be any question as to what is the Communist Party line on Murray's full employment bill? Should Congress follow the Communist Party line in this matter?

"FULL EMPLOYMENT" MEANS WHAT?

"Full employment" does not mean that every citizen of the United States is going to be guaranteed employment in the job he wants to do, at the factory he wants to work, in the city or village where he prefers to live. To insure full employment our workers must be willing to work at jobs where and when they become available. The author of the full employment plan, Sir William Beveridge, in his book, Full Employment in a Free Society, places special emphasis upon the need for labor mobility, the need to shift workers from one place to another when and where needed. Therefore any full employment plan would bog down if workers staged a sit-down strike and insisted upon the right to work at their own job, in their own plant, in their own community.

Peace Advocates Should Watch the Present London Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, without fanfare or flourish of trumpets, there convened in London, England, on November 1 an international conference which in the long pull may well achieve more in the direction of maintaining permanent peace than all the conferences which have preceded it. I refer, sir, to the United Nations Educational Conference, which has as its objective the establishment of an International Organization of Educational and Cultural Affairs.

Members of this session of Congress will follow with special interest the deliberations and decisions of the present London Conference in view of the fact that it was their action in passing the so-called Mundt resolution (H. Res. 215) which started the processes by which the present Conference has eventuated. When I introduced House Resolution 215 early last spring I was gratified no end by the great response which welled up throughout the country in support of the proposals which it contained for the international cooperation of educational and cultural leaders, working through an appropriate organization, in the development of codes of conduct and patterns of thought which would tend to preserve the peace.

The favorable action of the San Francisco Conference of the United Nations in including provisions for educational and cultural groups in the San Francisco Charter provides further testimony that the peace advocates of the world have come to recognize that in the final analysis it is imperative that the hearts and minds of mankind be dedicated to the ways of peace if the scourge of future war is to be averted.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I call attention herewith to a recent editorial appearing in the New York Times which sheds additional light on the program now getting under way at the London Conference:

UNO'S CULTURAL WING

An undramatic but important UNO agency will make its bow in London tomorrow, when the United Nations Educational Conference opens. Even so, some elements of controversy will be present. Russia has held aloof so far, on the ground that the conference should have been called by UNO's Social and Economic Council, under whose roof it will ultimately reside. The French go little further than the general objectives of developing better cultural relationships among the nations and raising the standards of education. They think the new organization should "endeavor to enter into contact, in all countries, with the press, the broadcasting authorities, and all the other elements which contribute to the formation of public opinion." In countries with a censorship and an official propaganda line this function would be a delicate one. But the fact that the conference may get into a wrangle or two is not disquieting. What would be disquieting would be the spectacle of a group of polite gentlemen not taking education and culture seriously enough to argue about them.

Of course, these are really the most exciting subjects in the world. The evil sort of education produced Nazis, Fascists, and State Shintoists; it produced bullies, sadists, and murderers. The destructive varieties of culture glorified tyranny and war. The antidote is not a neutral and negative education and culture but one which will, in the words of Sir Alfred Zimmern, enable "the countries of good will to enter into closer relations." There can be an exchange of ideas through print, film, and radio; an exchange of teachers and students between countries; a sharing of the fruits of research; a growth of interest in those very differences in tradition which enrich our civilization. On such a basis it can be hoped that the Russians will overcome their original reluctance and come along in.

Poles Wait Soviet Exit Impatiently

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following article, Poles Wait Soviet Exit Impatiently, by Mr. J. Emlyn Williams, staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, under date of November 2, 1945:

POLES WAIT SOVIET EXIT IMPATIENTLY

(By J. Emlyn Williams)

WARSAW, November 2.—No conversation between a foreigner and a Pole continues long before the inevitable question arises: "When are the Russians going to leave our country—when are we going to be free to live our own national life again?"

It is understandable that any people want to be masters of their own state, especially individualistic people such as the Poles, who have endured untold hardships and humiliations as a nation during the past 6 years. Anybody, for example, who has spent some time in France, Belgium, and Holland since VE-day could say the peoples of those countries also are longing for the time when the Americans and British depart from their soil, though these peoples are not quite so vociferous in their desires as the Poles.

Naturally, it is harder for the Poles to tolerate their situation, since the Russians played a significant role in the fourth partition of Poland in September 1939, and also since the Russian Army, unlike the American and British Armies, lives off the land and therefore is an expensive luxury, especially if the part Russia played in the later liberation of this country is forgotten.

HOW MANY RUSSIANS?

It cannot be ignored also that the behavior of many of these Russian troops, especially those demobilized in Germany and moving homeward across this country, has greatly exasperated the Polish countryside.

Despite many inquiries, it is impossible reliably to estimate the number of Soviet troops not only throughout Poland, but also in any given command or city. The Russians themselves are extremely vague when questioned, while the Poles do not know or give exaggerated figures, valuable more as an indication of their fears or dislikes than from the standpoint of accuracy.

At the same time, traveling through the greater part of Poland during the past month, I encountered Russians in almost every town, large and small, often not in large numbers, but sufficient to make their presence felt if desired.

There must be thousands of Soviet troops throughout the length and breadth of this country. A large number form garrisons essential to maintenance of supply routes across Poland to the Russian zone in Germany. How many are here for other purposes, such as to influence internal affairs in Poland, is another question impossible to answer. In towns like Warsaw, Krakow, and Stettin many members of the Russian security police, with blue bands around their military caps, are seen about the streets.

Much looting and other similar crimes have been attributed to the Russian troops by Poles, but the extent to which these are due to troops actually doing duty inside this country, to demobilized Russian soldiers, or to displaced persons returning to Russia often is most difficult to determine. Often acts are ascribed to Russians for which unruly Polish elements are responsible.

SPECIAL POLICE

But that these demobilized Russians have been a pest and terror for the Polish countryside, none can deny. In fact, early in October this was tacitly admitted by a Russian higher officer (with the rank of general) attached to special provincial forces whose duties are defined as fighting marauders—interpreted as all those who "willfully steal cattle, corn, etc., and those participating in bandit raids."

In some quarters, there is a tendency to interpret this new development as a move to intensify the Soviet grip on Poland, but there is evidence that Russian military commanders themselves are much concerned about the damage to their armies' prestige from such wild actions. An interesting result of what has happened has been that the Polish peasant often has developed a sense of superiority against the Russians which is not without its political significance, since the Pole considers the present provisional government largely a Moscow creation.

The largest proportion of hundreds of horses and cattle which I have seen driven eastward along the roads of west Poland probably are Russian booty from Russian-occupied Germany or such booty as the Russians claim is theirs from parts of the new Poland which formerly were included in the Reich.

SELL BOOTY IN CITIES

It is difficult, however, for the impoverished Polish peasant to believe this when what little he has left is stolen by these marauding bands as they pass his small holding or village. Many of these Russian ex-soldiers get rid of their booty by selling it when they reach the large cities, especially as the Polish zloty is exchangeable for the Russian ruble at an equal rate and there are a number of reports that they are not permitted to take such booty across the Polish-Russian frontier.

Complaints also are heard against Russian soldiers stationed here that they are guilty of some looting, though generally most of their activities are much circumscribed in the many towns where they are confined to the barracks most of their free time. One of the main difficulties appears to be that here, as elsewhere, the Russian soldiers act as if the only orders they must obey are those issued by their own unit commanders.

So long as Russian troops remain in Germany, some part of Poland must continue to be a transmit area for their movements in and out of Russia. At present, the Russians have a specially reserved broad-gage railroad across the southern region, roughly via Katowice, Krakow, Tarnow, and Lwow.

How long this will continue remains to be seen, especially as this also is the route for transporting upper Silesian coal to Russia, much of which is going now as reparations.

OFFICERS SPEAK POLISH

A more important question is the extent to which the Soviet is influencing Poland's internal affairs. Of course, this is more difficult to answer, since information on such an issue is always hard come by. At the same time, some facts are outstanding. Many high officers in the present Polish Army speak only Russian, being Poles resident in the Soviet Union before the present war and who early joined the forces organized by the Lublin Provisional Government.

The extent to which their sympathies would be Russian rather than Polish in case of any issue is impossible to say. The fact that they are Russian speaking, however, does increase prejudice among the more patriotic Poles and gives plenty of opportunity for talking about Russian influence in Poland's affairs.

Another significant fact noticeable is that when a person calls a Polish Government department on the telephone, he often is answered by a person who is unable to speak any Polish—only Russian. Whether such persons actually are Soviet citizens or belong in the same class as the army officers just referred to would take much investigation to establish.

Clarification of this issue of Russia's influence on Poland's affairs probably will only come after elections indicate the trend in Polish politics. It also would be easier to determine the extent to which unruly Russian or Polish elements are responsible for much rowdiness presently in Poland were it not mixed up so much by vodka drinking and the befuddled actions resulting therefrom.

A Returned Veteran Offers Timely Suggestions on Universal Military Training Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 1, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, within the past several days I have received many letters, especially from Oklahoma, for and against universal military training. A considerable number of such letters take an extreme view, either for or against such proposed training.

On the other hand, I am pleased to find, judging from sentiments expressed by those who have written me on the subject, that the public well understands the issues involved, and can be depended upon to take a sane, fair and practical view of this important problem as concerning all public questions.

I am also firmly convinced that not only the enlisted men but the fathers, mothers, wives, children, and other loved ones of our gallant young men and courageous young women who have served in the armed forces are equally as interested in the welfare of our country as are the high-ranking Army and naval officers of the Nation.

Judging from the rather voluminous mail I have received on the subject of universal military training, most citizens have not so soon forgotten how hopelessly unprepared we were during the past couple of decades and are determined that never again shall the Nation be caught off guard and asleep at the switch.

It is also significant, however, that many of our citizens who are strong believers in preparedness are very definitely opposed to conscription. Others say they have no objection to any reasonable form of military training, but are unwilling to turn over the education of our 18-year-old boys to the United States Army. It has been surprising to note how many such letters have come from young men and boys who have served in some branch of the armed forces during the recent war. Typical of those letters is one from Ray L. Smith, a well-known young war veteran who has returned to finish his education at Oklahoma's Agricultural and Mechanical College, at Stillwater, Okla. The letter in question presents food for thought. It follows:

STILLWATER, OKLA., *October 24, 1945.*

Congressman JED JOHNSON,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I am writing to you, after having read the President's address on military training. I agree that some training should be given every young man that is physically fit. But it seems unwise to me to place the boy in some training camp just as soon as he has completed his high school work.

I am a returnee, now attending Oklahoma A. and M. College, and having been away from school now for several years I am finding it rather hard to settle down to the routine of the classroom. Others with whom I have talked are finding it the same way.

If the young students are not allowed to continue their education after completion of high school, they will not go on after being released, as many of the returnees are now doing (it is a small percentage of the veterans that are going back to school). Most of our colleges have ROTC units on the campus and require four semesters of the various types of military training. There are some boys, however, that would choose to go into training rather than go to college.

I feel that criticizing a plan is not worth very much unless something better is offered so here is my suggestion:

1. Register every boy as he becomes 18.

2. Upon completion of his high school allow him a choice of (1) going to a training camp for 1 year or (2) attending a college (where ROTC is required) for 4 semesters.

3. The boy would be sworn into the ROTC as a private, or apprentice seaman, and would be furnished at Government expense: (1) his books and tuition; (2) his uniforms; (3) a suitable subsistence allowance (for room and board). There would be no monthly salary for the boys taking advantage of this plan.

4. The one requirement would be that the boy must pass at least 12 credit-hours each semester or serve the remainder of service

in a training camp (giving each semester the equivalent of 3 months in the regular training).

I feel that this type of training, if handled properly would prove more satisfactory than requiring every boy to go to a training camp for a period of 1 year. I hope that, after reading this, you will feel the same as I, that our boys thus trained would be more ready for the task that lies ahead of them.

Sincerely,

RAY E. SMITH.

Twenty-Year Sugar Quota for the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, we have before this Congress H. R. 4185, a bill to provide the Philippines with a flat 20-year quota of 850,000 long tons of sugar, duty free. This quota is similar to the quota given to the Philippines before the war. Senator TYDINGS has also proposed a quota for a 20-year period, qualified by a provision that duty is to be applied on an increasing basis until full duty is paid at the expiration of 20 years.

Proposals are being made to take care of Cuba on a less than full duty basis and a guaranty that Cuba would be assured 40 percent of the American postwar sugar market. Cuba's share of the American market was set at 28.6 percent in the 1937 Sugar Quota Act. The continuing acts carried the same figure. This new 40-percent Cuban quota proposal not only gives that foreign country an 11.4-percent additional cut in our domestic market but the supporters ignore the fact that Cuba's share of our market has been steadily increasing even under the 28.6-percent basis.

Enactment of the above proposals would result in American sugar-beet producers being in an even more uncomfortable position than before the war. Such legislation would not only necessitate curtailment of domestic production, but it would actually block any possibility for expansion of sugar production in this country.

Sugar is one crop in the category of farm commodities of which we have never produced more than a small fraction of our requirements. However, if the market of sugar is to be handed to foreign countries, what chance has the present grower of the crop in future years.

On this question I vigorously protest the present proposal to guarantee the future economy of Cuba at the expense of the American farmer. How long must the policy be pursued of sacrificing American lives, money, and resources to assure peace in the world, only to be followed by a policy of sacrificing the domestic markets of American farmers? What has Cuba done that she should be rewarded by a flat guaranty of any certain percentage of the American sugar market?

Let us take the case of the Philippines. Is it not reasonable that instead of encouraging the islands to go back to an economy based on sugar, that the time is at hand to serve notice on them that as an independent nation they must build a diversified economy?

Our sugar policy has been largely dominated by the free traders and interests with heavy financial investments in Cuban and Philippine sugar production, as well as by those owning the coastal refineries in this country. Are these groups going to be allowed to thwart the ambitions of the unorganized farmers of this Nation? Such will be the case unless we, the United States Congress, belligerently expose these selfish interests and mistaken ideas today expounded as to what is best for our own agricultural welfare.

"Stalining" State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a good deal recently about streamlining the State Department. But I would say that what is actually taking place is the "Stalining" of the State Department. For those who may be mystified by this unusual term, let me define it as the process of making changes in personnel and policy with a view to their acceptability in the eyes of Joseph Stalin.

It would seem that we are no longer masters in our own house. Like the Soviet-dominated puppet governments of eastern Europe, we have chosen to grovel and curry favor with a dictator who owes much of his present power to our help and support and so important a policy-making agency of this great Republic as the State Department is no longer an independent instrument of the American people. The American people did not sacrifice their blood, sweat, and tears during the past war in order to surrender their sacred birthright as a free Nation. They have not been told of the significance of the changes which have taken place, nor have they ever approved of this line of action. They have a right to know the true facts.

In presenting these facts I have no desire to disparage the work of Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, who conducted himself with such marked statesmanship and courage at the recent Council of Ministers Conference in London. I have the feeling that full responsibility for the changes I will describe rests elsewhere with those who are more concerned with petty, partisan advantage in this or that election campaign, than with the security of our Nation. I am certain that recent appointments and policy changes will tend to disintegrate, nullify, and vitiate all efforts to set America on the road toward a far-sighted and sound foreign policy of intelligent self-interest.

To fully understand the picture, one must appreciate the nature of the Soviet squeeze-play tactics. On the one hand we have the hard-boiled Soviet diplomacy operation within the United Nations Organization supplemented by the undemobilized might and unilateral tactics of the Red army. On the other we have Stalin's foreign legion, the Communist Party of the United States threatening increasing internal disorder—witness the recent dock strike in New York, Kelsey-Hayes wheel strike in Detroit, the film strike in Hollywood, mass demonstrations of unemployed, and so forth—and controlling enough votes to hold a balance of power in such important areas as New York, Detroit, California, and a number of larger industrial cities. Those who would scoff at the few hundred thousand Communist voters throughout the country, should bear in mind Lenin's instruction to his followers to take hold of that particular link in the chain by which the rest of the chain may be controlled. Thus 200,000 Communist-controlled American Labor Party votes may be enough to decide an election in New York City, which controls the balance of electoral power in New York State, which is in turn a pivotal State in national elections. That is how the tail wags the dog. Now let us get down to cases.

On June 5, 1945, the Democratic Party of New York City picked William F. O'Dwyer as its candidate for mayor in that city. After considerable haggling, the Communist-controlled American Labor Party endorsed Mr. O'Dwyer on June 12, 1945. Communist endorsement had, however, long been assured. On June 1, 1945, the Daily Worker hailed O'Dwyer as the popular Kings County district attorney. On August 21, the Communist New Masses urged its readers "to throw every ounce of effort in the campaign behind the Democratic-ALP slate." At its twenty-sixth anniversary on September 18, in Madison Square Garden, the Communist Party, through its president, William Z. Foster, urged its followers to support O'Dwyer. Since nobody would hazard the ridiculous charge that O'Dwyer is a Communist, and since Communist support was not therefore based upon any ideological sympathy or kinship, the natural question is, What was the price of this strange political deal in which Bob Hannegan and the national committee of the Democratic Party could not disclaim their interest.

The key to the mystery of the Red endorsement of Tammany Hall, long anathema to the Communist Party and its principles, and to the strange deal behind this endorsement, lies perhaps in the very nature of this party. It lies in the fact that the Communist Party is primarily concerned at all times and in all its maneuvers with the advancement of the interest of the Soviet Government. It will be remembered that American Communists opposed American entry into the war until the Soviet Union was attacked, when they became foremost in their demand for a second front. Communist interest in the State

Department, its policies and personnel, should therefore be understandable to all. Permit me to illustrate this with a few quotations and the developments that followed.

On June 2, 1945, the national board of the Communist Political Association, now the Communist Party, adopted a resolution containing the following peremptory demand: "Remove from the State Department all pro-Fascist and reactionary officials." In plainer language this means, of course, the removal of all officials whom the Soviet Union considers unacceptable for the advancement of its purposes.

The Communists were not satisfied with this general demand, however, and proceeded to name specific individuals whom they held in disfavor. Chief among them were Assistant Secretary of State Joseph C. Grew and his associate, Julius Holmes, who pressed the indictment of six individuals charged with the "illegal and disloyal conveyance of confidential and secret information to unauthorized persons." Phillip J. Jaffe, alias J. W. Phillips, editor of the Communist magazine, Amerasia, and a heavy financial contributor to the Communist Party, was the recipient of these documents. The Daily Worker, on June 9, saw in this case a policy shift in the State Department, "revealing its own changeover to a reactionary diplomacy in the Far East."

The subsequent exoneration of three of the defendants, the public apology to John Stewart Service, one of the defendants, by Assistant Secretary of State Grew, followed by his resignation, have been described in detail by my good friend, the Honorable GEORGE A. DONDERO, of Michigan, in his speech of October 10. Assistant Secretary of State Julius Holmes also resigned. Throughout this case the disapproval of Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, was evident. Small wonder that on June 7, Adam Lapin, Washington correspondent of the Daily Worker, hailed him as "one of the more forward-looking men in the State Department." On August 13, 1945, Mr. Acheson offered his resignation. On August 16, 1945, Mr. Acheson accepted the post vacated by Mr. Grew. We do not know the basis of this adjustment. We do know that practically all but two of the "espionage" cases have since been liquidated, in one case involving a fine for journalistic irregularity, nothing more.

The satisfaction of the Communist press was undisguised, as was to be expected. In the Washington Notes column of the Worker of October 7, 1945, we find the following gratified comment:

> With the assistant to Assistant Secretary of State James C. Dunn, Eugene Dooman, who was chairman of SWINK, the powerful interdepartmental committee representing State, War, and Navy, and former Acting Secretary Joseph Grew out, the forces in the State Department which were relatively anti-imperialist were strengthened.

For "anti-imperialist" one must, of course, read pro-Soviet appeasement. The knowledge of the internal workings of the State Department displayed by the two Washington correspondents of the Worker in this article is truly remarkable. Eugene Dooman, by the way, has been with the Department for over 30 years and is looked upon as one of the leading international experts on the Far East. His loss is irreplaceable.

But the Communists were not satisfied with these initial successes in their attempt to make the State Department into an adjunct of the Soviet Foreign Office. They continued their fire against every individual who showed a spark of courage in resisting their machinations. On June 7, 1945, Adam Lapin reported in the Daily Worker that—

> Truman is thinking seriously of a drastic shake-up in the State Department, involving the removal of Stettinius, Rockefeller, and Assistant Secretary James Clement Dunn * * * Dunn has long been one of the most ardent anti-Sovieteers in the Department.

Lapin explained further that Assistant Secretary Rockefeller had committed the horrible crime of reporting to a House appropriations subcommittee that his agency should be maintained for Latin America because he believed it was "essential to combat communism."

"To our mind," declared the New Masses of June 26, 1945, "one of the best indexes as to how well the administration intends to work with the U. S. S. R. in the interest of world peace would be found in the retirement of these men," referring to Averell Harriman, James Clement Dunn, and Nelson Rockefeller. The Daily Worker on June 2 had previously called attention to an alleged statement by Mr. Harriman, quoted by none other than the pro-Soviet radio apologist named Johannes Steel, that the "interests of the United States and the Soviet Union are irreconcilable." What was the result of this barrage?

The subsequent resignation of Mr. Rockefeller brought forth the following laudatory comment from the New Masses of September 11, 1945:

> The removal of Nelson Rockefeller from his post as Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Latin-American affairs is a public repudiation by the State Department of the policy it pursued from the Chapultepec meeting thrcugh UNCIO.

The fruits of this change were far reaching. We proceeded immediately to become embroiled with Argentina and to alienate the Latin-American countries which had stood by us so loyally throughout the recent war and throughout the United Nations Conference. We practically torpedoed the good-neighbor policy by calling off the Rio de Janeiro conference without consulting our Latin-American neighbors. In the meantime, the Soviet Foreign Office was reaping a harvest by establishing new ties throughout Latin America. It is not without significance to point out in this connection that the Communist Party of Ecuador has blocked the granting of aviation bases to American interests, that the Communist Parties of Argentina and Brazil have been legalized, and that our attack on Peron has been repudiated by the Argentinian people.

On July 9, 1945; James Clement Dunn and Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., were assigned to take charge of the apparently still-born United Nations Organization in London. Mr. Dunn has for many years been the sheet anchor of the State Department. He has provided that element of experience and continuity so necessary to the formulation of a sound foreign policy. He has been taken out of his important policy-making post to fight windmills in London. That makes two more down for the Communists.

Others are slated for the ax if the Communists continue to have their way. The New Masses of August 14, 1945, demands "the removal of Admiral Leahy from his post as President Truman's personal chief of staff." The reports are that the admiral is slated to resign as of January 1, 1946.

One must really read what the left-wing press has to say to know what is actually going on. Here, for example, is the statement of Blair Bolles, who was one of the foremost defenders of Communist Marshal Tito and who was a leader in the campaign to defame Mikhailovitch. In an article in PM of October 7, 1945, he says:

> STATE DEPARTMENT TO FOSTER BETTER U. S. S. R. TIES—BYRNES SEEKS LIBERAL AIDES TO DEVELOP MORE INTELLIGENT POLICY
>
> What the Government seeks now is to develop a diplomacy based on better appreciation of what the Soviet wants. That explains in part the search for liberals. The various assistant secretaries are soliciting their acquaintances for names of possible appointees of progressive tinge. The pay rolls of OSS, OWI, and OIA include names of many liberal thinkers, who previously have disturbed the most conservative elements in the State Department and their transfer to the Department is turning the balance of opinion in their direction. The decision of General Eisenhower to dismiss General Patton as chief of occupation in the eastern area of the American zone in Germany came after prodding from the State Department.

Let no one be deceived by such terms as "liberal" and "progressive," which are merely Mr. Bolles' way of designating his pro-Soviet confreres. The foregoing comment on General Patton should be judged in the light of a New Masses statement of October 2, 1945, which says:

> Gen. George S. Patton should be removed at once as head of the military government in Bavaria.

It should be judged also in the light of the widespread campaign of disparagement and slander carried on by Soviet agencies and the American Communists against outstanding representatives of the American armed forces. Of which, more anon.

Some of the recent State Department appointments bear out Mr. Bolles' predictions, although there have been a number of sops to keep the conversatives quiet. Among them we find Alfred McCormick placed in charge of State Department Intelligence and of coordinating the OSS and the OWI forces into the Department. He has been associated for a number of years with Assistant Secretary of War John J. McCloy in the law firm of Cravath, DeGersdorf, Swain & Wood. Mr. McCloy stoutly defended granting commissions to Communists in his testimony before the House Committee on Military Affairs on February 27,

1945. Mr. McCormick was in full agreement with Mr. McCloy on this policy and acted accordingly while he was with Military Intelligence prior to his present appointment.

Mark Etheridge, general manager of the Louisville, Ky., Courier Journal, has just been appointed as special representative of the State Department to investigate conditions in the Balkans. On April 15, 1940, he was chairman of a meeting of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, described as a well-known Communist front organization in the South. A speaker at this meeting was John P. Davis, executive secretary of the Communist-controlled National Negro Congress, a man with a long Communist record. Mr. Etheridge has been designated in the Daily Worker of July 27, 1944, as one of the initiating sponsors of the Independent Voters Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, which is closely interlocked with the National Citizens' Committee of the PAC. Both of these committees have had the open support of the Communists. It is rather curious that Mr. Etheridge's appointment was immediately hailed by the Rumanian pro-Soviet puppet, Premier Groza. I have no means of knowing how he became acquainted with the talents of Mr. Etheridge. But I can guess. According to a New York Times dispatch of October 19 by Sam Pope Brewer, "Communists are spreading the word that this visit is intended to pave the way for recognition of the Groza government."

On October 15, the State Department announced the appointment of Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, as a special adviser and consultant. Mr. McGill has been a sponsor of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, which followed the line of the Communist Party completely on foreign policy. He was comptroller of the National Citizens Political Action Committee during the 1944 campaign.

Among those appointed to attend the London Conference of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization of the United Nations, are Archibald MacLeish, former Assistant Secretary of State, poet and supporter of numerous Communist front organizations; Prof. Harolow Shapley, chairman of the conference of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions held in New York City on June 22-23, 1945, a Communist front publicized in the Worker of June 3, 1945, page 7. Shapley organized a recent delegation of scientists to the Soviet Union. He has stoutly advocated giving Russia the secrets of the atom bomb. He has been a member of the Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder. The technical secretary of this conference will be Bryn J. Hovde, of the State Department, who was a character reference for James Hulse Dolson, internationally known Communist agent, in 1937.

I have already pointed out that these appointments have paid the Soviet Union fruitful dividends. I have already mentioned the applause with which the Communist press greeted them. As Virginia Gardner and Art Shields admitted in the Worker of October 7, 1945, these appointees "were able to push through certain directives which had been held up in committee theretofore." Let me enumerate.

First:

The recent rebuke to Gen. Douglas MacArthur's policies given by Assistant Secretary of State Dean Acheson was the culmination not only of a split in the State Department but in the War Department itself. (Worker, October 7, 1945, p. 2.)

Second:

The set of directives for treatment of Japan which the White House recently released were even better than the original directives which had been flown over to MacArthur and apparently lay ignored somewhere on his desk or thereabouts. Among those most alarmed and exercised by the MacArthur policies and the complete lack of carrying out of directives from the State Department was Assistant Secretary of War John J. McCloy. In fact, McCloy is said to be determined that the new directive shall be carried out even if he has to go over to Japan and take a look-see himself. (Worker, October 7, 1945, p. 2.)

Please note that the attack on MacArthur by Acheson preceded a later attack by Soviet Minister Molotov.

Third. When former Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau's plan for dealing with Germany was made public, it was received with wide-spread condemnation by the press and by Congress. It has never received congressional approval. Nevertheless, the State Department issued a directive to General Eisenhower on October 17, 1945, incorporating the main features of Mr. Morgenthau's plan. This plan had the hearty approval of the American Communists and the Soviet Union. It may, in fact, have been originally drawn up by Harry D. White and Gregory N. Silvermaster, of the Treasury Department, both of whom have Communist records.

It is high time to call a halt to this alarming disintegration and infiltration of our most important Government department. It is high time to call a halt to a policy of appeasing dictators, which has never borne any but ar evil fruit. It is high time for the appointment of men of principle, who cannot be corrupted, who will fight for American democracy regardless of the consequences to themselves. It is high time that some of us here at home emulate the spirit of courage, idealism, and self-sacrifice displayed by our boys on the field of battle. It is high time that we set ourselves to the noble task of defending, come what what may, the Nation they did so much to safeguard and preserve. It is time for high-minded, intelligent Americanism.

What Willkie Said on Colonialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch under date of November 1, 1945, printed excerpts from the radio address of October 26, 1942, delivered by Wendell Willkie, after he returned from his world tour. It appears to me that the statements made by him at that time are even more pertinent and important today. Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

WHAT WILLKIE SAID OF COLONIALISM—LATE REPUBLICAN LEADER WARNED 3 YEARS AGO THAT AMERICA WOULD LOSE ITS "RESERVOIR OF GOOD WILL" ABROAD IF IT DID NOT INDORSE SUBJECT PEOPLES' ASPIRATIONS FOR LIBERTY; FOUND MILLIONS IN EAST DETERMINED TO END IMPERIALISM; URGED THAT WE JOIN IN CONDEMNING INJUSTICE

[From radio address by Wendell Willkie, October 26, 1942, after his world tour]

This world we live in has become small, not only on the map but also in the minds of men. All around the world, there are some ideas which millions and millions of men hold in common, almost as much as if they lived in the same town. One of these ideas has tremendous significance for us in America; it is the mixture of respect and hope with which the world looks to this country.

I bring back to you this clear and significant fact: that there exists in the world today a gigantic reservoir of good will toward you, the American people.

I was amazed to discover how keenly the world is aware of the fact that we do not seek—anywhere, in any region—to impose our rule upon others or to exact special privileges.

All the people of the earth know that we have no sinister designs upon them. They know that in this war we are not fighting for profit, or loot, or territory, or mandatory power over the lives or the governments of other people. That, I think, is the single most important reason for the existence of our reservoir of good will around the world.

Now, as I see it, the existence of this reservoir is the biggest political fact of our time. No other western nation has such a reservoir. Ours must be used to unify the peoples of the earth in the human quest for freedom and justice.

A LEAKING RESERVOIR

The preservation of this reservoir of good will is a sacred responsibility not alone toward the aspiring peoples of the earth but toward our own sons who are fighting this battle on every continent. For the water in this reservoir is the clean, the invigorating water of freedom.

I bring you the assurance that this reservoir exists. I also bring you the warning that it is leaking. It is leaking dangerously. It is leaking at a thousand points. It is leaking through steadily spreading cracks and holes.

These holes have not been punched in the reservoir by Hitler. They have been punched by us. All the leaks in this priceless reservoir are of our own making. For the very existence of this reservoir is built on confidence in us, in our integrity of purpose, our honesty in dealing, our ability in performance.

Doubts were expressed to me in simple, unmistakable questions. "Is there to be a charter only for the millions of the Western Hemisphere?" they asked. "Is there to be no charter of freedom for the billion people of the East? Is freedom supposed to be priceless for the white man, or for the western world, but of no account to us in the East?"

People of the East who would like to count on us are doubtful. They cannot ascertain from our Government's wishy-washy attitude toward the problem of India what we are likely to feel at the end of the war about all the other hundreds of millions of eastern peoples. They cannot tell from our vague and vacillating talk whether or not we really do stand for freedom, or what we mean by freedom.

In Africa, in the Middle East, throughout the Arab world, as well as in China and the whole Far East, freedom means the orderly but scheduled abolition of the colonial system. The rule of people by other peoples is not freedom, and not what we must fight to preserve.

THEY INTEND TO BE FREE

I am talking about the colonial system wherever it exists, under whatever nation.

Not all the peoples of the world are ready for freedom, or can defend it, the day after tomorrow. But today they all want some date to work toward, some guaranty that the date will be kept. For the future, they do not ask that we solve their problems for them. They are neither so foolish nor so faint-hearted.

They ask only for the chance to solve their own problems with economic as well as political cooperation. For the peoples of the world intend to be free, not only for their political satisfaction, but also for their economic advancement.

Men and women all over the world are on march—physically, intellectually, and spiritually.

After centuries of ignorant and dull compliance, hundreds of millions of people in eastern Europe and Asia have opened the books. Old fears no longer frighten them. They are no longer willing to be eastern slaves for western profits. They are beginning to know that men's welfare throughout the world is interdependent.

WESTERN WORLD ON TRIAL

They are resolved, as we must be, that there is no more place for imperialism within their own society than in the society of nations. The big house on the hill surrounded by mud huts has lost its awesome charm.

Our western world and our presumed supremacy are now on trial. Our boasting and our big talk leave Asia cold. Men and women in Russia and China and in the Middle East are conscious now of their own potential strength. They are coming to know that many of the decisions about the future of the world lie in their hands. And they intend that these decisions shall leave the peoples of each nation free from foreign domination, free for economic, social, and spiritual growth.

These peoples of the East want us to join them in creating a new society, global in scope, free alike of the economic injustices of the West and the political malpractices of the East. They want us neither hesitant, incompetent nor afraid. They want a partner who will not hesitate to speak out for the correction of injustice anywhere in the world.

Palestine and the Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. STARKEY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. STARKEY. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that no fair-thinking man or woman should be in doubt in regards to the Palestine question. Without attempting to trace the lengthy history of the Jewish "rights" to Palestine, the home of their shrines, the fount of their religion, the Promised Land which they sought in their long journey through the wilderness, I need only call attention to the Balfour Declaration of 1917 which gave the Jews the opportunity to establish a homeland in Palestine if they so desired at the conclusion of World War I.

The Jews desired to establish a homeland, and they have turned this ex-desert, formerly used for grazing, into an agricultural productive country that today supports almost twice as many persons as it supported 25 years ago. And it is worthwhile noting that as the Jews demonstrated that this land could be made productive the Moslems began returning to it so that in the years 1922 to 1942 almost as many Moslems settled or rather resettled in Palestine as Jews.

I do not know all of the intricacies of international diplomacy in the Near East, but on the surface this seems to me very much as though somebody sold me a chicken and then sent his poor relations over to help me eat it. The British captured the land from Turkey, a German ally in World War I. A mandate of the League of Nations gave the governing of this land to Great Britain. Great Britain, in the Balfour Declaration and its implementation in the 1920's, gave the Jews an opportunity to establish a homeland. The Jews came in and bought the land—I repeat, bought—from the Moslem owners who knew they were getting a very high price for it. After all, grazing land is only worth a couple of dollars an acre. The Jews paid an average price of more than $200 an acre, and many Moslems sold their land and retired rich.

But the Jews brought in modern equipment and methods, new farm machinery, electricity, roads, modern dams, irrigation pumps, and all the comforts and labor-saving devices of modern life. Soon Palestine had the highest standard of living in Arabia.

The result was that the Arabs became envious. Many returned to live in Palestine and enjoy some of these modern comforts. Other held on to their land, upping the prices outrageously, and brought in relatives and friends to live with them. After all it was better than the desert where the poor are little better than slaves.

Here, I believe, we have the crux of the matter. Arabia is land poor. Years of grazing and wind have blown almost all the good top soil away—save for some few valleys. The climate is dry and good for only limited habitation without irrigation and reclamation. The Jews come in, buy the land, and, using modern methods and modern knowledge, make it productive. The Arabs become jealous and wish they had land as fruitful as the land the Jews are farming. When they had it they used it for sheep raising, but now suddenly they see the fields of grain, the citrus orchards, the grape arbors, the pleasant homes of the Jewish farmers, and they want that land back, forgetting the millions of idle acres they own.

The higher standard of living in Palestine arouses envy on the part of the poor Moslems, but it also arouses fear in the hearts of some of the local Arabian princes. They see the worker in Palestine paid wages far beyond any they intend to pay to their followers. They see their retainers dissatisfied with the conditions under which they must live and envious of the Jews. What is easier than to turn this dissatisfaction into anti-Jewish activity. And soon some alarmist writes that the entire Arabian world is seething with unrest and likely to rise in arms and drive the British into the sea.

What foolishness. No Arab horseman is going to charge a British tank. No sheik and his followers are going to sneak up on a squadron of Spitfires. The Moslems are too intelligent to pick a fight which can have but one outcome, particularly as there is no occasion to fight. The Jews want to return to their homeland. They want to buy land from the Arabs at a price which is not only fair but munificent. In spite of all the smoke screens thrown over the situation, I suspect that many Arabs want to sell. I also know that the vast numbers of ordinary Arabian people want to raise their standard of living however well satisfied some wealthy prince may be with his.

I have then this suggestion to make: That Palestine be immediately opened to unrestricted Jewish immigration; that the Jews be allowed to purchase and improve land; that the Arabs be recompensed for this land at a price equal to the average Palestine acreage cost between 1922 and 1942 plus what would be a fair present-day mark-up; that the United States and Great Britain jointly offer to the Arabian nations financial and technical aid enabling them to improve their land, their agriculture, and their standard of living.

We have the knowledge and the tools to loan to the Moslems, enabling them to build dams, roads, and reclamation projects of their own, and once they become content and prosperous on their own land they will not spend so much time envying their neighbors.

If this project does not come under one of the new international loaning agencies which we are establishing, I believe that the United States Government itself should make a special long-term interest-bearing loan to Great Britain to be reloaned in turn to Moslems for agricultural rehabilitation. We would, of course, supervise the expenditures under this loan, and we would hold Great Britain responsible for it, taking, if necessary, a lien on certain British oil rights in the Near East.

In closing I want to urge upon every Member of Congress to join me in asking President Truman and Secretary of State Byrnes to request Great Britain to remove the restrictions on Jewish immigration to Palestine immediately and to join with the United States in any program that will enable the unhappy persecuted refugees of Europe and other Jews who wish to join them find a haven in the land they have so long sought.

At present there are press reports of outbreaks of violence against Jews in the Near East, of looting of shops, of assaults against peaceful men and women. These disorders must be checked at once. If we are going to maintain world-wide peace let us start by maintaining order in the lands of the peace-loving nations of the world. There is need for urgency on this matter. We must act at once. Prime Minister Attlee is visiting this country as the guest of President Truman. I strongly recommend that the American position be made clear to him, and that he be made to realize that we

want no compromises or appeasements. Palestine must be opened to unrestricted Jewish immigration and the promises of the civilized world redeemed.

When Are Our Troops in China Coming Home?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, while in China in the early part of September as a member of the War Department Subcommittee of the Appropriation Committee, we held a number of conferences with Army officials. Naturally the question came up as to just when we could get our troops out of China and send them home now that the war is over. We were told at one of these conferences that the job could and would be finished by December 15; that they expected to fly the troops from Kunming, China, across the Hump to Karachi, India, where they would embark for the States. We were further told that all China wanted was a military mission and were given to understand that the Chinese divisions would take care of the Japanese prisoners of war.

That night in passing through the Red Cross at Kunming, where we stayed, I was approached by a number of the soldiers with the usual question, "When do we get home?" The morale in China was very low. China was shut off from all supplies except what came over the Hump by air. Fresh vegetables could not be used without cooking, the water had to be boiled even for cleaning teeth, and there was very little, if any, entertainment. Naturally, when these boys asked me I told them what I had been told and that we expected to get them out by December 15 for the States. The story was published in the China Lantern. To my amazement and surprise I was sent a copy of another issue of the China Lantern, which I am attaching hereto, in which General Wedemeyer stated that they expected to keep the troops in China to assist in repatriating and deporting approximately 2,000,000 Japanese soldiers to Japan.

On October 17, I wrote a letter to the Honorable Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War, and on October 29, I received his reply, copies of which I am including in my remarks. I was pleased to learn that the War Department stated that our assistance to the Chinese will principally consist "in movement to reoccupational areas of Chinese Armies, and contacts on a staff level concerning the repatriation and deportation of 4,000,000 Japanese." The Secretary of War further states that "relatively few Americans are involved in this operation and they will be withdrawn continuously and returned to the United States."

I want to add however that I am very much alarmed at the activity of the American Army in China. You cannot help to move troops in a country that is at war, and China does have civil war, without becoming involved on one side or the other. Selling China war materials is one thing, helping to maneuver her troops into a position where she can defeat those with whom she is at war is another, and is actually taking part on one side of the civil war in China. The American people will not tolerate any action on the part of our Government which will involve them in another war in the Orient. Every American and I think every Member of Congress wants these men brought out of the China-Burma-India theater as soon as possible now that the war is over.

The matter referred to follows:

[From the China Lantern]

WEDEMEYER SCOTCHES DECEMBER DEPARTURE DATE

CHUNGKING.—GI's in China will be returned to the United States as quickly as possible, Lt. Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer promised, but the theater commanding general declared emphatically that the rumored setting of December 15 as "target date" for redeployment "conveys a commitment that I am unable to meet." The general's statement was made in answer to a request from the China Lantern that he shed further light on the question—topmost in GI's minds—"When are we going home?"

General Wedemeyer previously had stated that the bulk of American forces would be out of China by the spring, if their jobs were completed on schedule and if sufficient transportation facilities were available.

Since then, a touring Congressman, quoting unidentified Chungking sources, said GI's would be out of China by December 15 at the latest and November 15 if the transportation system could absorb them.

The China Lantern printed the Congressman's statement without comment and appealed to General Wedemeyer to clarify the situation.

His answer scotched the December 15 date, pointed out the tasks still to be completed before the Yanks can sail States-ward, and promised that "contingent upon our ability to accomplish our assigned tasks and restricted further by the availability of transportation, personnel in the China theater will be returned as rapidly as possible to the homeland."

STATEMENT

General Wedemeyer's statement:

"To officers and enlisted men of the China theater:

"I regret exceedingly that due to a misunderstanding a statement was attributed to military authorities in Chungking to the effect that all GI's in China would be out of the China theater by December 15.

"It has been my policy since assuming command of the China theater last October to observe carefully the interests and well being of the officers and men. I have called upon them to make unstinted sacrifices, endure hardships, and work long, arduous hours at their respective tasks. They have responded magnificently throughout, and I am justifiably proud of the commendable record attained.

"I appreciate the strong desire to return to loved ones and friends in the United States. In previous issues of the China Lantern it was clearly indicated that every effort will be made to facilitate the early return of the officers and enlisted men.

BIG JOB

"However, it was further pointed out that the China theater still has a definite task, prescribed by the War Department, to assist in the repatriation and deportation of approximately 2,000,000 Japanese to Japan. Our comrades in the occupational forces in the Pacific have similar objectives which may require several months to fulfill.

"Contingent upon our ability to accomplish our assigned tasks and restricted further by the availability of transportation, personnel in the China theater will be returned as rapidly as possible to the homeland.

"I have never misrepresented conditions in China, no matter how depressing or distasteful, and feel that the above-mentioned report that appeared in the China Lantern—indication that 'all GI's will be out of China by December 15'—conveys a commitment that I, as theater commander, am unable to meet.

"I repeat, American personnel in China will be evacuated to the United States as rapidly as possible in consonance with instructions issued by the War Department."

OCTOBER 17, 1945.

Hon. ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
The Secretary of War,
War Department, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: While in China with our subcommitte we had a conference with various War Department officials and I think it was at Kunming, China, where we were told that the job could and would be finished by December 15 and that they expected to fly troops from Kunming across the hump to Karachi, India. They stated they were trying to close up the China theater by December 15. We were told that all China wanted was an American military mission and that the Chinese would take care of Jap prisoners of war.

The same day I talked to a group of servicemen. I never saw the morale lower than it was there. They wanted to get home and I didn't blame them. In trying to boost their morale I said we had been informed they would probably be out by December 15. The China Lantern, a paper published there, a copy of which I am enclosing, had a story about it and I was amazed to read General Wedemeyer's statement. Particularly was I amazed to read that part of the statement on page 2 which reads in part as follows:

"However, it was further pointed out that the China theater still has a definite task, prescribed by the War Department, to assist in the repatriation and deportation of approximately 2,000,000 Japanese to Japan."

I would like to have you either verify or deny the statement made by General Wedemeyer. I would like a full statement as to the War Department's policy and mission in China with particular reference to our mission and responsibility in assisting in the repatration and deportation of approximately 2,000,000 Japanese to Japan.

I certainly shall not support an appropriation to keep our boys there to repatriate the Japanese Army in China. I think we ought to get out of China, India, and every other allied country at the earliest possible moment. Our occupational troops should be confined to Germany and Japan and the taxpayers' money should not be spent in keeping troops in China, India, or any of the Allied countries.

Your personal attention is requested.

Most sincerely,

ALBERT J. ENGEL.

Hon. ALBERT J. ENGEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ENGEL: I have received your letter of October 17, concerning the evacuation of the China theater, and have just completed a very thorough study of the situation.

The information given to you in Kunming, apparently was intended to apply only to West China, and was correct, as we hope to have most of the personnel out of that area by December 15. General Wedemeyer's statement in the China Lantern is also correct as

his remarks applied to the complete evacuation of the entire China theater.

You will be glad to hear, I am sure, that the evacuation of American troops from West China, which includes the Kunming area, is proceeding exceedingly well. Our men are being returned to the United States as rapidly as units are released and transportation over the hump is available. By December 15, United States personnel in West China will be reduced to less than one-tenth of its top strength, which is the minimum necessary to protect United States property and material which it is not feasible nor economical to remove. Just as soon as suitable arrangements, now under way, can be completed by our Government for the disposition of the above property, our remaining troops will be brought out.

The accomplishment of our present plans will furnish the over-all strength of United States troops in the China theater to 6,000 by January 1, 1946. This reduction is dependent upon the early conclusion of arrangements for the disposal of surplus property, authority for an American Advisory Mission to China, as well as availability of shipping. Assistance to the Chinese is principally in movement to reoccupational areas of Chinese armies, and contacts on a staff level concerning the repatriation and deportation of 4,000,000 Japanese. Relatively few Americans are involved in this operation and they will be withdrawn continuously and returned to the United States.

Our directives to General Wedemeyer have required the evacuation of United States military personnel from his theater at the earliest practical date, consistent with the protection of our country's interests there.

It is my hope that the above information will satisfactorily clarify the situation for you. I shall be very glad to answer any further questions you may have in the matter.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

The Full Employment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing a great deal every day about the so-called full employment bill. The following editorial from the Clear Lake Reporter, of Clear Lake, Iowa, is such a good exposition of the fallacies and dangers of the proposal, that I am making it a part of the RECORD.

The editorial is as follows:

SHALL GOVERNMENT ASSUME ALL RISKS?

We know of no one who is not in favor of full employment. There is nobody opposed to the general idea of everyone who wants to work having the opportunity to do so and to receive for such labor an adequate and even a generous compensation.

But—and if space permitted we would put that word in luminous letters at least a foot high. But—just what is involved when government, meaning all of us as represented by our Federal administration, undertakes to guarantee everyone a job? Just what does it mean for us to declare it as our fixed policy to provide those jobs, not as a favor but as a definite right of every citizen?

Shall we also guarantee a good job or a satisfactory job, or shall we just declare that if anyone wants to work we will see that he or she works? Certainly, if we are going to accept full responsibility for seeing to it that everyone works, will it not naturally follow that we will also through our national administration assume the direct responsibility for deciding what he shall do and what he shall receive for his labor?

Has this ever been done before? Oh, yes. It has been done for many years in Russia. It was done for several years in Germany under Hitler. It can be done here—but, only if we—the Government—have full power and authority to say just exactly what each person shall do and what, how, and when he shall be paid.

Do you think Government can guarantee every bricklayer or carpenter or plasterer or cabinetmaker or any other craftsman a continuous job at his particular kind of work? Will these skilled workers be entitled to liberal unemployment pay if they decide not to work unless the job is suitable?

Well, what do you think? If you and the rests of us guaranty the right of everyone to work, are we also going to guaranty his right to choose the kind of work he is to do and to decide whether he wants to do it or do nothing?

Just where would labor unions come in on this kind of a program? Well, we have definite and convincing answers in those countries where the right of everyone to work has been recognized during the last decade or two. It might even be suspected by those who read history that the right to work might easily be construed to mean the obligation to work at whatever task is assigned to you if you want to eat.

Without going into such matters as the obviously great cost or any of the features of the proposed bill other than its opening declaration of policy, and without questioning the good intentions of those who propose such a declaration, we have no hesitation in saying that such a guaranty will inevitably result in the end of individual choice as to jobs and wages, for only if we collectively control these conditions of employment can we possibly make good on our guaranty.

With these controls in our hands just what type of country will we be creating? You ought to be able to answer that question without any suggestion or help.

The President's Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the New York Times of November 4, 1945, entitled "Wages, Prices, and Controls":

WAGES, PRICES, AND CONTROLS

The President's talk on wages and prices last week was a well-meant effort to please everybody that ended by pleasing few. There were sentences in it that could be cited by unions to prove that large increases should be granted; sentences that could be cited by employers to show that substantial wage increases could not be granted, at least without substantial price increases; sentences that could be used to prove the need of an indefinite prolongation of Government controls, and sentences that could be used to show that the Government ought to get out of the business of trying to control wages and prices as quickly as possible. The speech, in short, contained ammunition for everybody because it contained so many assertions that contradicted each other and because it contained both truths and fallacies.

What the President seemed to say on net balance, however, was that prices should be held where they are but that hourly wage rates should be raised substantially. This is a self-contradictory policy that cannot be made to work. The arguments used by the President in support of it are not convincing. What the speech failed sufficiently to take into account was that the wages to war workers to make wartime products paid for by the Government cannot fairly be compared with wages to make peacetime products to be paid for by the people as private consumers. Industry was making peacetime products at peacetime prices and wages when it went into the war. It has emerged from the war with hourly wage rates much higher. These wage rates can be paid only if there is a corresponding increase in the prices of these peacetime products, or if, alternatively, there has been an increase in labor efficiency to compensate for the higher hourly wage.

It has yet to be demonstrated that this increase in efficiency has taken place. A recent study of 25 civilian industries by the Bureau of Labor Statistics showed that there had been very little increase in labor productivity between 1939 and 1944. In nine of these industries output per man hour had actually declined. As wage increases had taken place in all of the industries, there were only two in which unit labor costs had fallen. In the rest they had increased anywhere from 17 to 69 percent.

The President's new policy, unless it is modified, seems likely to give rise to even more industrial strife than that of recent months. This is precisely because of the ambiguities in the President's talk. Certain groups of workers—those who feel themselves to be in the wage categories included in the President's amended order—have been told in effect that they are entitled almost as a matter of right to an increase in wages. But all labor groups have been encouraged to make new demands, provided only that these demands are "reasonable"—though that word is not defined in percentage terms. Employers are urged to grant these "reasonable" demands, even if, apparently, they do not know whether they will continue to be able to make ends meet. If they cannot make ends meet, they are in effect urged to go on producing anyway, and to wait at least 6 months before they are granted any price relief.

The President rightly declared at one point in his talk that "we must get away as quickly as possible from Government controls, and that we must get back to the free operation of our competitive system." But the policies he is now pursuing move away from that goal, not toward it. The rigid control that OPA is still assuming over tens of thousands of prices forces the administration to adopt a "wage policy" in order to maintain this "price policy." But the effort to do this means that it must revive agencies like the War Labor Board to pass on wage demands. In order to continue price control the Government is forced to resume wage control. The kind of formula with which it is seeking to solve this relationship forces the Government, again, to de facto profit control, and profit control is the ability to say whether a given industry or firm will be permitted to live and grow or be forced out of existence.

Thus by trying to hold on to price control too long the Government is forced to impose a regimented economy and to try to solve problems of the interrelationship of thousands of wage rates to each other, of thousands of prices to each other, and of thousands of wage rates to thousands of prices—a problem that is utterly insoluble by anything but a free competitive market economy.

The reason the Government gives for not beginning rapidly to take the controls off prices is that it would lead us to "inflation."

But the chief cause of inflation is the continuation of the Budget deficit. This is the real problem that the administration should strive manfully to solve. But when with its right hand it keeps injecting new purchasing power, new bank credit, new money into the economic system through a Budget deficit, and adds to this by encouraging wage advances, and then with its left hand tries to offset the inevitable effects of its own policies by holding down prices, it merely wipes out profit margins, causes unemployment and industrial strife, and demoralizes production.

The right road for the administration is clear. It should not try to frame any "wage-price policy"; it should put the Government finances in order, and move toward the restoration of a free competitive economy.

Warning to Government Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, millions of young Americans have won a military victory over the Axis Powers. Throughout the war, billions of dollars and the resources of our country were lavishly expended. Hostilities have ceased, but there are many public officials who still believe that the way to win the peace is to destroy our economic security.

Billions of dollars are being expended under the lend-lease program, although the President on August 17 issued an Executive order terminating this program. Russia, Britain, and other Allies are intent upon securing additional billions of dollars under various programs in order to maintain the solvency of their respective governments. Millions of Americans, including war veterans, are beginning to wonder how long such policies can be continued before the United States itself becomes bankrupt.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I am inserting a warning to Government officials made by the Reverend Dallas F. Billington, of Akron, Ohio, in the Washington Star. Will this warning be heeded?

II Kings 20: 12–18: "At that time Berodachbaladan, the son of Baladan, King of Babylon, sent letters and a present unto Hezekiah: for he had heard that Hezekiah had been sick.

"And Hezekiah hearkened unto them, and shewed them all the house of his precious things, the silver and the gold and the spices and the precious ointment and all the house of his armour, and all that was found in his treasures: there was nothing in his house nor in all his dominion that Hezekiah shewed them not.

"Then came Isaiah the prophet unto King Hezekiah, and said unto him, 'What said these men? and from whence came they unto thee?' And Hezekiah said, 'They are come from a far country, even from Babylon.'

"And he said, 'What have they seen in thine house?' And Hezekiah answered, 'All the things that are in mine house have they seen: there is nothing among my treasures that I have not shewed them.'

"And Isaiah said unto Hezekiah, 'Hear the word of the Lord.

" 'Behold, the days come, that all that is in thine house, and that which thy fathers have laid up in store unto this day, shall be carried into Babylon: nothing shall be left, saith the Lord.

" 'And of thy sons that shall issue from thee, which thou shalt beget, shall they take away; and they shall be eunuchs in the palace of the King of Babylon.' "

Mr. President, Senate, and the House of Representatives, how many of you in some lodge or church have said your faith was in God?

This being true and your faith being well founded, how can you as leaders of America deny all the teachings of God?

Are you now willing to do as the foolish king did, show the atomic bomb and its secrets, the bomb sight, our poison gas, and all that God has permitted the wise men of our country to find out? These have been given to us for our protection.

Now shall we be as foolish as some ancient king and call in all the foreign countries and show them our secret weapons, our treasures, the way we operate our factories, and the way we do things?

Are you aware of the fact that God said in the Bible all these things were written for our learning?

I repeat, Mr. President, Senate, the House of Representatives, take warning for God's sake, don't sell our country, permit our boys to be carried off to a foreign country, by revealing to them all the treasures and secrets of the United States and the Stars and Stripes.

If God used prophets in days of old, why not let our own Nation come back and listen a little more to some of the ministers of the gospel rather than listen all the time to the college professors and many others who deny the teachings of Almighty God?

I beg you in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, please take warning and save our Nation from having the foreign countries come in to take away our treasures and our sons and daughters.

American Veterans of World War II (AMVETS) Principles, Constitution, and Bylaws Adopted At Its First National Convention, Chicago, Ill., October 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to insert the constitution and bylaws and a list of the officers elected by the AMVETS:

CONSTITUTION OF THE AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II—AMVETS

PREAMBLE

We the American Veterans of World War II, AMVETS, fully realizing our responsibility to our community, State, and Nation—associate ourselves for the following purposes: To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; to safeguard the principles of freedom, liberty, and justice for all; to promote the cause of perpetual peace and good will among nations; to maintain inviolate the freedom of our country; to preserve the fundamentals of democracy and Americanism; to perpetuate the friendship and associations of the Great War of Liberation, and to dedicate ourselves to the cause of mutual assistance, this by the Grace of God.

ARTICLE I

The name of this organization shall be "American Veterans of World War II, AMVETS."

ARTICLE II

The aims and purposes of this organization are as follows:

1. To serve our country in peace as in war; to build and maintain the welfare of the United States of America toward lasting prosperity and peace for all of its inhabitants.

2. To encourage, in keeping with the policies of our Government, the establishment of a concrete plan to secure permanent international peace, and to assist in the maintenance of international peace.

3. To inspire in our membership a sense of responsibility, and to develop leadership, for the preservation of our American democratic way of life.

4. To help unify divergent groups in the over-all interest of American democracy.

5. To train our youth to become purposeful citizens in a democracy with full knowledge of the responsibilities as well as the privileges of citizenship.

6. To cooperate with all duly recognized existing veteran organizations in the furtherance of the aims of World War II veterans.

7. To insure the orderly return of the veteran to civilian life by protecting his rights as an individual while he is still in uniform.

8. To expedite and assist in the rehabilitation of the veteran by maintenance of employment services, sponsoring educational opportunities, and providing counsel on insurance, housing, recreation, personal problems, hospitalization, and veterans' benefits.

9. To act as a liaison agent between the veteran and the Government.

10. To provide an organization to encourage fellowship among all veterans of World War II.

11. To keep the public forever reminded that the veterans of World War II fought or served to preserve peace, liberty, and democracy for their Nation.

ARTICLE III

Organization

SECTION 1. The American Veterans of World War II, AMVETS, shall be organized with a national headquarters, State and territorial departments, and under these departments, local posts. Intermediate administrative groups may be created by the national executive committee where such action is deemed advisable.

SEC. 2. The national headquarters shall be composed of officers hereinafter described; one department representative from each department, and such other members as the national convention shall specify. It shall be the duty of the national officers to advance the cause of the American Veterans of World War II, AMVETS, carry out their aims and purposes, provide the machinery of organization and carry out the national policies and plans of the entire organization, as established by the national convention.

SEC. 3. The State departments shall be organized in a manner similar to the national organization, and shall be composed of officers and representatives selected by post delegates to a department convention. It shall be the duty of the department to aid in organization and maintenance of local posts and to carry out the policies and plans delegated to it by the national headquarters, and to adhere to the provisions of this constitution.

SEC. 4. Local posts shall be chartered by the national headquarters and administered by the department headquarters, but shall be governed locally by their own officers chosen according to its constitution and bylaws. The policies, activities, and actions of the local posts must never be at variance with

those prescribed by the national headquarters.

ARTICLE IV

Membership

SECTION 1. Any American citizen, male or female, shall be eligible for membership in the American Veterans of World War II, AMVETS, who was regularly enlisted, inducted, or commissioned, and who was accepted for, or was on, active duty in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, of the United States; or our allies, on or after September 16, 1940, and who served between this date and the date of cessation of hostilities, as established by the Government of the United States. Service with the armed forces must have been terminated by honorable discharge or honorable separation from the service, provided, however, that persons otherwise eligible for membership who are on active duty, or who must serve after the cessation of hostilities are eligible.

SEC. 2. There shall be but one form of membership and that shall be an active, regular membership, except, however, honorary members shall be admitted on the following basis:

(a) Not more than one honorary member per post per year.

(1) Only persons performing outstanding service to the Nation or veterans shall be eligible. Nothing herein shall abrogate existing membership.

SEC. 3. No person shall be a member of more than one post at any one time. No person expelled by one post shall be eligible for membership any other post without the consent of the expelling post or the consent of the department executive committee after hearing on appeal.

SEC. 4. Dues shall be payable annually or for life.

ARTICLE V

National convention

SECTION 1. A national convention shall be held annually at a time and place fixed by the previous convention and shall constitute the legislative body of the American Veterans of World War II, AMVETS.

SEC. 2. The members of the convention shall consist of department and post delegates. The department shall choose its delegate and alternate at its convention held at least 3 weeks prior to the national convention. Each local post shall have a delegate and alternate elected to attend the national convention.

SEC. 3. Each delegate shall be entitled to one vote. The vote of an absent delegate may be cast by an alternate. Alternates shall have all the rights and privileges of the delegates, except that of voting.

SEC. 4. The department representative to the executive committee shall be chosen at the department convention and by such election shall become one of the delegates to the national convention, without vote, for that department.

SEC. 5. Sixty percent of the voting delegates shall constitute a quorum.

ARTICLE VI

Officers

SECTION 1. The national convention shall elect a national commander, first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth national vice commanders, one of whom shall be a woman, a finance officer, adjutant, judge advocate, and provost marshal. No two vice commanders shall be chosen from the same department. The commander and vice commanders shall not succeed themselves in office.

SEC. 2. All the elective officers shall be members of the national executive committee, but the commander shall vote only in the event of a tie.

SEC. 3. Elective officers and the departmental representatives of the national executive committee shall convene immediately following the close of the national convention and transact all necessary business that may come before the committee.

SEC. 4. The national commander, with the consent and approval of the national executive committee, shall appoint a chaplain, historian, two national service officers, one of whom shall be a woman, a national executive secretary, a public-relations officer, surgeon general, and a legislative director.

ARTICLE VII

National executive committee

SECTION 1. The administrative power between national conventions shall be vested in the national executive committee, which shall be composed of the national commander, vice commanders, and other national elective officers, and one national executive committeeman from each State, to be elected by the respective State departments. An alternate shall be selected by each department to act in the absence of the committeeman.

SEC. 2. The term of office of each national executive committeeman and alternate shall be 1 year. The term of office of each national executive committeeman and alternate shall commence immediately upon adjournment of the department convention after his election.

SEC. 3. Members of the national executive committee shall be delegates to the national convention without vote.

ARTICLE VIII

Department organization

SECTION 1. Each State or Territorial area of the United States shall constitute a department, which shall be organized in a manner similar to the national organization. The department shall have an executive committee and shall conduct its own convention, to be held not less than 3 weeks before the annual national convention, at which time it shall choose delegates to the convention and the national executive committee.

SEC. 2. The departments shall be chartered when application has been made to the national headquarters and approved by the national executive committee.

SEC. 3. The departments shall have the authority to create intermediate administrative groups for the handling of the local posts should they deem such action advisable.

ARTICLE IX

Local posts

SECTION 1. Local posts may be formed by any 10 eligible individuals by making application to its local department, and if there be no department, directly to the national headquarters. If the department approves, the application shall be forwarded to the national headquarters and a charter shall be issued. Each charter shall be signed by the national commander and national adjutant, and countersigned by the department commander and department adjutant.

SEC. 2. Local posts shall be subject to the jurisdiction of the national headquarters and the department headquarters and any provision of a department constitution or a local post constitution conflicting with or contrary to the provisions of the national constitution, the provisions of the national constitution shall prevail.

ARTICLE X

Finances

SECTION 1. All finances of the American Veterans of World War II, AMVETS, shall be under the control of the finance officer, who shall make an annual report at the national convention. Revenue shall be derived from annual dues and other sources approved by the executive committee. Regulations of annual dues shall be by a majority vote of the delegates in annual convention.

SEC. 2. An annual budget shall be submitted for approval at the first annual meeting of the executive committee. It shall be prepared by the retiring finance officer, who shall have received national departmental budgets from the other retiring officers and shall have consolidated the same. In the event that the budget is not approved, a finance committee consisting of five members of the executive committee shall be appointed by the new national commander to prepare the budget.

SEC. 3. Each local post shall remit annually to the national headquarters the sum of $2 for each member of the post, and remit annually to the department headquarters the sum of $1 for each member of the post. The post shall retain the balance of the annual membership fee. The annual membership fee for each member shall not be less than the sum of $4.

ARTICLE XI

Discipline

SECTION 1. Disciplinary rules relating to local posts shall be prescribed by the Departments.

SEC. 2. The National Executive Committee, after notice and hearing before a subcommittee, may cancel, suspend, or revoke the charter of any department for good and sufficient cause to it appearing. Procedure for such action shall be prescribed by the judge advocate.

SEC. 3. In the event of such action the National Executive Committee is empowered to take over the operation of the department, but is bound by the constitution and bylaws thereof. At the next department convention new department officers must be selected to carry on the work of the department.

ARTICLE XII

Post transfers

Any member in good standing may change his post or department, and may join a new post without paying the current annual dues.

ARTICLE XIII

Auxiliaries

SECTION 1. The American Veterans of World War II, AMVETS, recognize the organization known as the "Auxiliary of AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II."

SEC. 2. Membership in the auxiliary is limited to the mothers, wives, daughters, and sisters of regular members of American Veterans of World War II, AMVETS, and mothers, wives, daughters, and sisters of deceased veterans and mothers, wives, daughters, and sisters of all men and women who served in the armed forces of the United States between September 16, 1940, and the date of cessation of hostilities as fixed by the United States Government.

SEC. 3. The auxiliary shall be governed in each State department by such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the National Executive Committee and approved by such department.

ARTICLE XIV

Sad Sacks

SECTION 1. The American Veterans of World War II recognizes a subsidiary organization known as "Amvet Sad Sacks" of American Veterans of World War II.

SEC. 2. Membership in Sad Sacks shall be limited to members in good standing of American Veterans of World War II, AMVETS.

ARTICLE XV

Amendments to constitution

SECTION 1. This constitution may be amended at any national convention by a majority vote of the total authorized delegates present. Proposed amendments must be submitted through the national adjutant to the several departments and members of the national executive committee by mail at least thirty (30) days prior to the convening of the next national convention. This constitution may, however, be amended at any convention without notice, by unanimous vote.

SEC. 2. No proposed amendment shall be submitted through the national adjutant unless it shall be submitted by a department

convention, department executive committee, or the national executive committee.

BYLAWS OF AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II—AMVETS

ARTICLE I

National executive committee

SECTION 1. In case of death, resignation, or removal by his respective department of any national executive committeeman or alternate to the national executive committee, the successor shall be selected as such department shall determine and shall serve for the remainder of such unexpired term.

SEC. 2. The national executive committee shall meet within 24 hours after the adjournment of the national convention and shall also meet immediately preceding the holding of the succeeding national convention. Special meetings may be held upon reasonable notice at the call of the national commander. The national commander shall call a meeting of the national executive committee upon the written request of the national executive committeemen from 15 or more departments.

SEC. 3. A majority of the members shall constitute a quorum of the national executive committee.

SEC. 4. The national commander shall name such committees as he shall deem advisable, subject to ratification by the national executive committee, at its next meeting succeeding the appointment.

SEC. 5 The national commander shall appoint, subject to approval by the national executive committee, the following standing national committees: Finance committee, membership committee, rehabilitation committee, hospitalization committee, program committee, legislative committee, liaison committee, family welfare committee, and convention committee.

The number of members to serve on any national committee, except the finance committee shall be determined as outlined in section 6 (B).

SEC. 6. (A) The national finance committee shall consist of three members, appointed following the first national convention, and shall serve for 1 year.

The national commander, national finance officer, and the national executive secretary shall be members ex officio of the national finance committee.

The national finance committee shall be charged with the preparation of the yearly budget and the handling of funds under that budget and such other duties as shall be prescribed by the national commander, subject to the approval of the national executive committee.

(B) The national membership committee, program committee, legislative committee, liaison committee, family welfare committee, rehabilitation, hospitalization and convention committees shall consist of such a number of members as shall be designated by the national commander with the approval of the national executive committee, and their duties shall consist of the usual prescribed duties for such committees, as well as any further directives given by the national commander and/or the national executive committee.

The term of office of the members of such committees shall be 1 year.

SEC. 7. The national executive committee shall provide for the appointment and employment of such subordinate officers and employees as may be needed for the administration of the affairs of the American Veterans of World War II (AMVETS), and prescribe their duties and compensation.

SEC. 8. Any national officer may receive compensation for his activities on behalf of the organization. The amount of such compensation shall be fixed by vote of the national executive committee.

SEC. 9. All questions affecting the eligibility for office and conduct of national officers shall be referred to and determined by the national executive committee. All questions affecting the eligibility for office and conduct of the national executive committeemen, department officers, or members of department executive committees, shall be referred to and determined by the executive committee of the department involved, which shall be the final authority. However, no candidate for nomination or election to any remunerative elective public office shall be eligible to serve as national executive committeeman, or as alternate national executive committeeman, except upon the approval of the department executive committee by unanimous vote.

ARTICLE II

Duties of officers

SECTION 1. National commander: The national commander shall be the executive head of the American Veterans of World War II, AMVETS, with full power to enforce the provisions of the national constitution, national bylaws, and the will of the national convention. He shall be the chairman of the national convention and the national executive committee. He shall appoint all necessary committees, where not otherwise provided, subject to the ratification of the national executive committee, and shall perform such other duties as are usually incident to the office.

SEC. 2. National vice commanders: The national vice commanders shall act as representatives of the national commander in all matters referred to them by him, and shall upon his request preside over the meetings of the national convention or national executive committee, and perform such other duties as are usually incident to the office.

SEC. 3. National executive secretary: The national executive secretary shall be charged with the administration of the policies and mandates of the national convention, the national executive committee, and the national commander. He shall perform such other duties as are usually incident to the office. His tenure of office shall at all times be subject to the will of the national executive committee.

SEC. 4. The national finance officer: The national finance officer shall be the custodian of the funds of the national organization. He shall sign all checks disbursing the funds of the national organization, and shall make reports upon the condition of the national treasury when called for by the national commander or national executive committee. The national treasurer shall furnish a surety bond as hereinafter prescribed. He shall perform such other duties as are usually incident to the office.

SEC. 5. National judge advocate: The national judge advocate shall advise the national officers and the national executive committee on all legal matters, including the construction and interpretation of the national constitution and bylaws, and shall perform such other duties as are usually incident to the office.

SEC. 6. National service officer: The national service officer shall be the welfare officer of the national organization. He shall be directly concerned with all matters pertaining to the social and material welfare of members, and shall particularly be concerned in the assistance of all members in securing all rights and privileges accorded them by law. He shall act as liaison officer between the national executive committee and Federal agencies charged with veterans' affairs, and shall also act in direct assistance to department and post service officers. His tenure of office shall at all times be subject to the will of the national executive committee.

SEC. 7. Public-relations officer: The national public-relations officer shall keep the public informed relative to the activities of the national organization, in order to build and maintain good will toward the organization. He shall be directly responsible for national convention plans and activities. His tenure of office shall at all times be subject to the will of the national executive committee.

SEC. 8. National chaplain: The national chaplain shall perform such divine and nonsectarian services as may be necessary, adhering to the appropriate ceremonial rituals.

SEC. 9. National historian: The national historian shall compile from year to year all records of historical value and interest for the national headquarters of the American Veterans of World War II. He shall also assist department and post historians so as to coordinate and unify the work of these officials, and shall perform such other duties as the national executive committee shall prescribe.

SEC. 10. National provost marshal: The national provost marshal shall maintain order at all meetings and conventions. He shall distribute, collect, and count ballots and shall announce the result of voting. He shall perform such other duties as may be requested by the national commander.

ARTICLE III

Charters

SECTION 1. A department executive committee may suspend, cancel, or revoke a post charter. The action taken by a department executive committee shall be final and conclusive, unless an appeal is taken to the national executive committee within 30 days from the date of said suspension, cancellation, or revocation. The action taken by the national executive committee, upon appeal, shall be final.

SEC. 2. Any post failing to meet the obligations imposed upon it by the constitution and bylaws, or ceasing to function for 6 months as a post of the American Veterans of World War II (AMVETS), or voluntarily ceasing to function as a post, or merging with one or more other posts, or refusing, or failing to pay the department and national per capita dues, or under such other conditions as might make such action necessary, shall upon order of the department executive committee, surrender its charter. Upon failure to surrender such charter, immediate steps may be taken for its revocation, suspension, or cancellation.

SEC. 3. Upon revocation, cancellation, or suspension of the charter of a post in any department of the American Veterans of World War II, AMVETS, said post shall immediately cease operations, and upon revocation or cancellation, shall turn over its charter to its department commander or department executive committee. The department executive committee is authorized, empowered, and directed by and through its duly authorized agent to take possession, custody, and control of all the records, property, and assets of said post: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein shall be construed as requiring any department to take over or assume any financial responsibility as to such property. Said department executive committee may provide for the transfer of the members in said post to other posts of their choice, subject to the approval of such other posts.

SEC. 4. The national executive committee shall provide a uniform code defining the procedure to be followed in the revocation, cancellation, or suspension of post charters, a method of appeal and further, a code of procedure for the revocation, cancellation, or suspension of post charters with continuing power to revise said code: *Provided, however*, That the procedure now in effect shall continue until such code is so adopted.

ARTICLE IV

Discipline of posts and post members

SECTION 1. Each post of the American Veterans of World War II, AMVETS, shall be the judge of its own membership, subject to the

restrictions of the constitution and bylaws of the national organization.

SEC. 2. Members may be suspended or expelled from the American Veterans of World War II, AMVETS, upon a proper showing of cause. Charges shall be based upon disloyalty, neglect of duty, dishonesty, and conduct unbecoming a member of the American Veterans of World War II, AMVETS.

SEC. 3. Any member who has been suspended or expelled has the right of appeal to his department executive committee, or to the department convention, according to the provisions in the bylaws of such department. The decision of the department shall be final.

SEC. 4. A member whose dues for the fiscal year have not been paid by January 1 shall be classed as delinquent. If his dues are paid on or before April 1 he shall be automatically reinstated. If he is still delinquent after April 1 his membership in the American Veterans of World War II, AMVETS, shall be forfeited. A member so suspended or whose membership has been so forfeited may be reinstated to active membership in good standing by a vote of the post and payment of dues for the year in which reinstatement occurs.

ARTICLE V

Membership

SECTION 1. Membership in the American Veterans of World War II, AMVETS, is membership in the national organization of the American Veterans of World War II, AMVETS, by affiliation with posts.

ARTICLE VI

Moneys and collections

SECTION 1. All national, department and post officials handling moneys of the American Veterans of World War II, AMVETS, shall be properly bonded with a good and solvent bonding and surety company as acceptable to the United States Treasury, as surety to cover double the average amount of money handled in a single year. In case of delinquencies in the payment of amounts due department or national headquarters, action shall be taken at once by the proper officials to bring about an immediate and complete settlement. The bonds provided by national officials shall be approved by the national judge advocate and the national executive committee, and those provided by department and post officials shall be approved by the department judge advocate and the department executive committee.

ARTICLE VII

Transfer of posts

SECTION 1. Posts of the American Veterans of World War II, AMVETS, which may transfer from one place to another, and which are organized under the department in which they are then located, may transfer to another department in a manner similar to the transfer of individuals from one post to another.

SEC. 2. Any existing post in the territorial or insular possessions of the United States or in foreign countries, and not under the jurisdiction of a present existing department, shall, within 1 year following the adoption hereof, unless extended by the national executive committee, request the national executive committee to place it under the jurisdiction of a department to be selected by such post. Said request shall have attached thereto the formal consent of such department. Should a post fail or refuse to make such request or be unable to obtain the consent of a department, then the national executive committee shall designate the department.

ARTICLE VIII

Definitions

SECTION 1. The word "he" wherever it shall appear in either the constitution or bylaws of the American Veterans of World War II, AMVETS, shall be construed as referring to both sexes.

ARTICLE IX

Restricted use of organization

SECTION 1. The American Veterans of World War II, AMVETS, or any component part thereof, shall not be used to promote the interest of any individual who is a candidate for public office, or to promote otherwise, any individual, organization, political party, faction, or product. Any violation of this provision shall be sufficient cause for the suspension or revocation of any post or department charter.

ARTICLE X

Meetings

SECTION 1. All meetings of the American Veterans of World War II, AMVETS, shall be conducted under Robert's Rules of Order.

ARTICLE XI

National flower

SECTION 1. The national flower shall be the fourleaf white clover, meaning "think of me."

ARTICLE XII

International affairs and peace division

SECTION 1. There is hereby created the international affairs and peace division of AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II. The division shall be composed of three directors, one of whom shall be the executive director and the other two shall be associate directors. The directors shall be appointed by the national commander with the consent of the national executive committee.

SEC. 2. The directors shall serve subject to the will of the national executive committee.

SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of the directors to be informed on matters of international affairs, perform research and investigation in such affairs, inform the national executive committee and the membership of the organization of all matters found to affect the peace, and make recommendations thereon, and provide representation at any peace conference, subject to the approval of the national executive committee.

Funds shall be provided upon approval of the executive committee for the operation of this division.

ARTICLE XIII

Accounting for moneys

SECTION 1. All moneys received by this organization shall be strictly and accurately accounted for, and a public report shall be made annually, showing the source of all such income and the expenditure thereof. Such accounts shall be audited monthly by a nationally known firm of public accountants.

ARTICLE XIV

Amendments

SECTION 1. These bylaws may be amended at any national convention by a majority vote of the total authorized representation thereat, provided that the proposed amendment shall have been submitted through the national executive committee by mailing or delivering the same to it at least 30 days prior to the convening of the next national convention; and provided further, it may be amended by unanimous vote at any convention without notice prior to the national convention.

SEC. 2. No proposed amendment shall be submitted through the national executive committee or considered by the national convention, as provided in section 1 of this article, unless said proposed amendment shall have been first submitted by a department convention through the department executive committee.

Following is the list of officers of AMVETS elected Sunday, October 14, 1945:

National commander: Jack W. Hardy, Title Guaranty Building, Los Angeles, Calif.

First vice commander: Dr. Gerald I. Cetrulo, 234 Mt. Prospect Avenue, Newark, N. J.

Second vice commander: Dr. Clyde Longstreth, Atlantic, Iowa.

Third vice commander: Mrs. Beatrice Wade, care of 125 Fourth Street, Reading, Pa.

Fourth vice commander: Henry Simpson, 506 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

Fifth vice commander: Edward A. Trudell, 88 Tremont Street, Boston, Mass.

Sixth vice commander: Frank T. Ross, Milwaukee, Wis.

Judge advocate: Anthony R. McGrath, 530 William Penn Place, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Adjutant: Jess Curtis, 807 North Third Street, Phoenix, Ariz.

Finance officer: Carl Freudenberg, 1298 Michigan Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Provost marshal: Fred F. Nimz, Glendale, Ariz.

The AMVETS are dedicated to the development of a sound American program to promote the cause of perpetual peace and good will among nations.

The declared principles and objectives of this organization of distinguished veterans of the recent World War II, cannot help but inspire and encourage and strengthen the hearts, minds, and souls of every reader thereof. I specifically call to your attention the preamble and then to article 2, in which article sets forth the 11 highly patriotic and strengthening aims and purposes of this significant organization.

I say to these AMVETS—good luck and God bless you!

I know each Member of this House joins me in sincere good wishes. It is a pleasure and an honor for me to be asked to present this constitution and bylaws to your attention and to have it officially placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

If my own son, who was first lieutenant in the Army Air Corps had survived this war, he no doubt would have been identified with these other distinguished AMVETS and their high purposes. So, for him who made the supreme sacrifice—and with hundreds of thousands of others who did likewise—I bespeak your cooperation to the end that this timely and appropriate group of distinguished Americans may realize the most prompt and possible fulfillment of their high ideals.

Certainly these distinguished men have selected their leaders for the first year from the length and breadth of our great Nation.

Their officials were elected at their first national convention in Chicago, and their national headquarters are at 1507 M Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (National 6651), and their executive offices at 725 South La Salle Street, Chicago 5, Ill.

Demobilization of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, one of the sad blights of the war's aftermath is the manner in which the Army and Navy are treating the GI's in the matter of demobilization. This

really amounts to a national scandal. The inequalities and injustices of the Army and Navy demobilization plans and actions have been repeatedly called to attention. True, liberalization and some action has been had, as a result of continual protests by the public and by Members of Congress, but it has been very little.

Many bills have been introduced to speed up demobilization and to get the boys home with their families. Of course, we realize that introducing a bill accomplishes nothing unless the administration's majority in Congress will permit the bill to come before Congress for consideration. The people know that the administration has a majority in both branches of Congress and a majority on every committee, and, through this majority, it is keeping these bills bottled up in committee, thereby preventing action by Congress.

I ask the majority leadership, "How long are you going to continue holding these bills in committee? When are you going to give these boys just treatment? These boys who left homes and families, who left their schools and careers and fought and bled, and many died, in order to win the war—I ask again, When are you going to give them justice now that the war is over?"

Again I beg the administration majority to permit legislation to come before Congress that will get these heroes returned to their families and loved ones without further delay.

The following letter, written to the editor of the Terre Haute Star, vividly expresses the feeling of the GI's and this matter should have immediate action:

EDITOR TERRE HAUTE STAR,
Terre Haute, Ind.

DEAR SIR: Inclosed you will find a copy of a letter sent to the Star and Stripes by 120 enlisted men and officers. I would like very much if you could find space to print it in your paper.

I am from Terre Haute and have been in the Army over 3 years. Have been wounded in Germany. I would like most of all to get back to my wife and daughter the same as all these other GI's in the same fix I am in. I thank you.

Yours truly,

CLYDE JOHNSON.

"HEADQUARTERS TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SECOND E. A. GROUP,
"Camp Boston, France, October 15, 1945.

"EDITOR B-BAG, STARS AND STRIPES:

"It is a sad and shameful reflection on the sorry state of world affairs when thousands of American soldiers go home—if they ever get there—nurturing a feeling of bitterness and disgust against everything military and political—thoroughly fed up with the shabby way in which they have been kicked from pillar to post in the recent maelstrom of broken promises, blunders, paper snafu and just general inefficiency.

Here in our AAC camp, and in every other camp in the Reims area, are thousands of GI's whose morale has reached a new all-time low, and whose memories will forever be tainted with reflections of this final chapter of their checkered Army careers.

Our particular outfit has been stagnating here for three long weeks and this is only the beginning. We are now calmly told that we probably will be marooned here for six more interminable weeks. We left Germany under the moronic impression that we were headed for home. We so advised our loved ones, raising their hopes and seemingly bringing to an end months of weary waiting; we tabbed all incoming mail to be returned to sender—and as a consequence we are now unaware if our folks at home are alive or dead, nor will we for weeks to come. We could easily have remained at our comfortable stations in Germany where all processing could have been completed with a minimum of effort, and the outfit headed directly for the port. Instead we are jammed in a camp together with teeming thousands of equally dissatisfied, disappointed men whose nerves are constantly at a tension and who are rapidly becoming more hopeless and bewildered.

As every GI knows, the most abject failure in all military history was the so-called point system. Men with from 80 to 100 points are still dreaming of home, while in the States 60 pointers, including, of course, all movie stars and big-name athletes, are being discharged—men who never left the United States; while men who went through combat and have sweated out at least 18 months without seeing their families are still wondering what happened to the scales of justice.

"And then one fine day we read the following: 'Giant ships transferred to British'—'Reconversion of ships far below schedule'—'Longshoremen's strike ties up ships'—(Why not an orientation course at Dachau or Belsen for them?) The greatest country, with the most powerful Navy in the world—the Nation which invented the atomic bomb—depends on England for transportation to get their men home. All the average GI knows is that 'They got us over here fast enough!'

"Yes; the war is over now. Well we know it. Once more 'the world is safe for democracy'. Big fortunes were made while our buddies died. And now things aren't looking so good in the States due to homecoming servicemen strangely desiring jobs; there aren't enough jobs—so why not let them dawdle around in Europe a while longer to keep them out of the way? Sure, we did our job. The greatest job in the history of the world. And already, within a few short months, we are forgotten, just as our fathers were after World War I—a faithful horse gone blind in the service of its master. During the war, a hero. After the war, a bum. The only people who give a damn about our future are our immediate families, a few honest politicians, and some square officers in high places who are giving this thing an honest try—to them we doff the battered hat and say, 'Thanks.' Meanwhile, in a situation ridiculously and tragically enmeshed in a hopeless quagmire of inefficient and careless administration, the loud-speaker comfortingly croons at least once a day—'I'll be home for Christmas!' Amen.

"FED-UP FA JOES."

Fail in This and Another War Is Certain and Fairly Soon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include an editorial by W. D. Archie, editor of the Evening Sentinel, Shenandoah, Iowa. Mr. Archie is a veteran of World War I and World War II. This editorial proves he has given much earnest thought and study to the future as well as meeting the problems of the present with forthright thinking and expression:

ALONG THE BANKS OF THE NISHNA
(By W. D. Archie)

In a New York address General Marshall not only asked, he pleaded, for a quick decision as to the future size of our Army, Navy, and Air Corps. He feels the security of the world depends on a strong armed force in our Nation. That the time to have it is now.

I thoroughly agree with him. We have emerged from this war as the strongest nation in the world. Russia is in second place. Britain a poor third. We cannot avoid the situation. It is there, whether we wanted to attain it or not. Now having arrived at the top we will find the position difficult to maintain. Everyone who gets to the top finds it hard to stay there.

In order to maintain face with the other nations of the world. In order to retain respect with our neighbors on the north and south and in South America we must have a strong army and navy. Our planes must be the best, our ships of the latest design, the Army modern in every respect, this will be the best selling argument we can present for peace in this world. Backed by the atomic bomb, we should be able to preserve peace for a century at least, if we carry out such a plan.

General Marshall himself has weakened his own position in the past by proposing compulsory military training, and doing away with the National Guard. Compulsory training for youth is no answer to the problem. We need professional soldiers, millions of them. We need trained pilots ready for instant use. We need a Navy already at sea ready for instant use. The citizen Army is not the answer today.

Give us the necessary men and equipment and we can have a powerful Army and Navy and we can maintain peace. Give us a strong National Guard and we can keep the citizens trained and ready to assist when needed.

It is a costly program that I favor, but it must be done. The men who enter the service must be better paid than they are now. Officers salaries are sufficient, but the pay of privates is a pitiful sum. Fifty dollars per month, with all the nice things of life going only to officers, is no inducement for building a strong Army or Navy. We must prepare to pay salaries comparable to that obtained in industry, and get good men. We must be prepared to pay for equipment and ready to discard obsolete guns and ships every year.

But the cost is cheap. Peace is what we can purchase. Outlaws can be stopped before they get a chance to start. At least every nation will understand that when they start a war the strongest country of them all stands ready to fight. With such a force General Marshall thinks this war could have been avoided and no doubt he is right.

When the atomic bomb dropped on Japan we entered a new age in warfare. It is the most terrible weapon ever used by man. It does not twist the steel in buildings like other bombs; it disintegrates them and returns the steel to dust. A bomb dropped on Shenandoah would leave nothing but dirt. There would be no ruined buildings. Nothing would remain. It is a difficult thing to imagine.

We must now be prepared to act instantly. Hours may mean the complete destruction of our Nation in the next war. No longer can we stop to raise a citizen army. No longer can we hold off the enemies while factories are completed. The war will have ended, in all probability, before any of these things could be done. Our planes must take to the air in hours or minutes. Our ships must be on the move. Hesitation might mean a ruined Detroit. Only a blot would tell us where Chicago had been. Thinking must change to keep pace with this terrible invention.

Pacifist thinking of today is treachery. It may be inspired by Communists, who are

still trying to make our country weak and Russia strong. It may be inspired by other enemies of our democratic form of government. It cannot be allowed to continue. We must not return to the old ideas. Preparedness is now the only answer. There is no other.

Congress should act as General Marshall requests. They should act now. They should be the leaders in the movement for preparing our Nation. Army men have been whipped by the pacifist thinkers for years, and are now afraid to make constructive proposals for preparedness, for fear they will get nothing, like they had in the late twenties. It is up to the Nation and to Congress to push them boldly along the only road to peace left.

Fail in this and another war is certain—and fairly soon.

Bring the Boys Back Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 1, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under previous leave granted to me, I am inserting herewith a copy of a letter received from a constituent regarding high-point men who are overseas. This letter was written from Leyte, in the Philippine Islands, and indicates the seriousness of conditions among our men who should be home.

Also, as part of these remarks, I am inserting several news clippings from the Daily Pacifican:

LEYTE, P. I.

Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: As a qualified voter of the First Wisconsin District (Whitewater, Walworth County), I am taking the liberty of sending you the enclosed clippings from recent issues of the Daily Pacifican regarding the mythical shortage of shipping and the delays in shipping men from the Pacific theater to the States. The views expressed are mainly of conditions on Luzon. Here they are as bad, if not worse.

I have been overseas more than a year, in active service for almost 3 years, but have only 46 points. I don't expect to get home just yet, but I fully realize that until something is done about getting overage and high-point men home my chances of getting home are pretty slim. A month and a half after the 38-year-olds were "immediately eligible" to go home we got orders to send our men down to the replacement center. The 80-point men and 35-year-olds went down 2 days sooner, but still a month after they were eligible. Two days difference in arriving at the center may make a difference of 2 or 3 weeks in getting on a boat. These men left us better than 2 weeks ago and are still sitting down there with 10,000 other men, waiting for a ride home. There are men there who've been sitting there for more than a month.

Some time ago the War Department announced that 70,000 men had left the Philippines for home during the month of September. About 3 days ago they decided that it was only 51,000. What happened to the other 19,000 men? Our men waiting at the center were told that not a man left Leyte during the month of September to go home for discharge. Yet there have been dozens of ships sitting in the harbor town of Tacloban that haven't lifted their anchors in about 2 months. Our men have been told that they won't leave this island before November 4.

There's not a man out here who will believe that the War Department wants to get us home or is making any special efforts to get us home. We read of Army big shots testifying before congressional committees but never do we hear of them offering any proof of their statements (they never give the same figures twice) nor of any of the committeemen asking for any proof. Those of us who have been in the Army know that when the Army says one thing it means another of opposite extreme. The Army has the country in the palm of its hand. What is Congress going to do about it? Or are you going to let them continue till we end up like Argentina?

[From the Daily Pacifican]

STATEMENT WANTED

EDITOR: It would seem to me that a statement explaining the reasons for not using Liberty and cargo ships for moving troops back to the States, would help clear up some of the recent gripes appearing in Mail Bag I, too, spent a good number of days on the decks of a Liberty on the Leyte invasion where 400 men had to climb through deck-loaded earth-moving equipment to get from one end of the ship to another.

Malicious rumors have been spreading regarding the reason for not utilizing these ships for troop transports. These malicious rumors are doing nothing but spreading lack of confidence, and a statement explaining the reasons for not using these ships will do a great deal to help the morale of men at this base.

T/4 WILLIAM M. SMITH, APO, 75.

EDITOR: It cost the United States a million dollars to keep these PW's for 30 days or approximately 26 cents per day per man. If the Government is so desirous of saving money, wouldn't it be less expensive to use the 12 Liberty ships required for the Japs to transport several thousand men back to the States for discharge and keep the Japs here for reconstruction work on the ruins of Manila?

T/Sgt. DALE H. ADAMS, APO 714
(And eight others).

LEFT BEHIND

EDITOR: My deepest and most heartfelt sympathy to Corporal Blatt and her fellow Wac's who are going to return to the States with a bitter taste in their pretty mouths because they haven't had a chance to see Tokyo as yet.

There are about 1,000 of us sitting here on Luzon doing nothing. We want to go to Tokyo also, and perhaps we have a slightly better reason. We are the boys who were fortunate enough to remain on Luzon while our division was the first to enter Tokyo. We were supposed to follow with supplies and equipment only a few days after the rest of the outfit left but we have been sitting here for 2 months now, waiting for those ships to take us to Tokyo, and there are no prospects of our leaving in the near future either.

We don't want to go to Tokyo just to see the scenery but our records happen to be up there and we can't go home without them. There are hundreds of us here who have more than enough points to go home. It isn't unusual here to see some GI walking around mumbling to himself and tearing his hair out because he has over 100 points or is 39 years old and still hasn't any prospects of leaving for the States.

Pfc JOHN BRESCH, APO 201.

ENDORSEMENT

EDITOR: I, and 600 officers and men of the One Thousand Two Hundred and Eighty-ninth Engineer (C), Bn., ETO and SWPA veterans heartily endorse Lt. Col. C. H. Davidson's cry in the wilderness of outfitting Liberty ships as troop transports.

Apparently the Army doesn't think Liberty ships are good enough to be used as troop transports for they are not as comfortable as the *Queen Mary* or the *Lurline*. Who cares about comfort if a little discomfort means we will get home weeks or months sooner? The Liberty ships were comfortable enough to be used as transports during wartime when the chips were down, so why should be good enough in peacetime. The men in this theater don't care how much discomfort a few weeks aboard a Liberty ship demands just so they get home a few weeks or months sooner.

If Colonel Davidson needs any volunteers to convert Liberty ships, there are thousands of men sitting around Manila more than willing to work hard to get the high pointers home so that the rest of us can leave this hellhole.

Lt. J. E. WILBURN, APO 75.

EDITOR: Congratulations on today's story, Altered Liberty Troop Ships Feasible. Now I believe that the Army paper's opinions are unbiased. Many thanks for this story from myself and all the men in the unit.

It certainly is gratifying to note that there are still officers that are not afraid of expressing their opinion.

T/4 WILLIAM M. SMITH, APO 75.

EDITOR: We, the undersigned, heartily concur with the articles in today's Pacifican and wish to volunteer our services to help build troop accommodations on cargo vessels.

T/5 ALFRED FELLER, APO 75
(And 47 others).

MORALE FACTOR

EDITOR: Some several thousand of us 80-odd pointers have been fighting the battle of the Twenty-second Repple Depple for over a month now in a vain effort to reach the home front. The majority of us, veteran SWPA men, established a "bridgehead" at the Twenty-second about the middle of last month, ostensibly for a week of processing and staging for the final hop back home. Thus far, all we have met with are delaying tactics, excuses and rumors.

And our morale lowered considerably when we hear of our old outfits and others getting 70 and 60-point men ready to go home as a unit. Moreover, the inquiries we made about this at higher headquarters confirmed the additional fact that these lower point men will have priority.

After VE-day, every GI who saw the WD movie on demobilization figured that seniority would rule, that the WD would stick to its guns in this point system as to shipping priority of higher point men on down.

My particular group or priority have had two dry runs since the first of the month; i. e., we were on shipping orders twice, but the orders were cancelled or "postponed" for some indefinite reason. And there has been no clarification either on the bulletin board or otherwise.

It may shock you to know that there are still some 90-pointers around as well as 80-pointers. I, myself, have 89 points and 5 years in the Army, including 2 years overseas.

I think this matter should be brought to the immmediate attention of all Army authorities responsible without delay. My cosigners and I will gladly cooperate to furnish any additional information desired as to the facts set forth in this letter.

Corp. JOE BERONSKY, APO 925
(And 20 others).

EDITOR: Perhaps you could shed some light on why 60 pointers should be shipping homeward while 80-, 85-, and 90-pointers are still

sitting here waiting for transportation home. In the practical working of the point system, someone seems to have butchered it beyond all semblance of fairness in getting the highest-point men home first.

Why is it that we're periodically belabored yith estimates and statements about how many they're going to ship this month and next month, and next year? It seems that when things bog down, there is always a new statement and a new set of figures. Why?

I've been in this Army for over 4 years, 2 of them overseas, and I'm sick of the waiting and excuses. To put it bluntly, I'd like out—and not behind a bunch of 60-pointers. Is asking for a square deal being presumptuous?

Sgt. HENRY DOERMER, APO 320.

EDITOR: Usually Mail Bag carries a small notice insisting that writers stick to one subject. To me and a few others, there just happens to be one.

How lovely to see in today's issue of the Pacifican that four ships have sailed with 60-pointers of a famous division. We men with 92 points get a bang from it. We'll try and make it an even 5 years before we take off.

Sgt. DOANE MICHAEL, APO 320.

REVERSE PRIORITY

EDITOR: The Thirty-eighth Division has sailed for the United States of America as a unit, including all their men with 60 points or more.

The point system has been severely criticized since its inception. The War Department has constantly maintained that its system is the best one possible. Even though we have greatly disagreed with the equitability of the system, we realized there was nothing we could do about it and hoped that at least it would be fairly administered.

The critical ARS was reduced to 70 points October 1. All of us have over 70 points and many of us have over 80 points. If the War Department arbitrarily deems that the point system is correct, why do they not have the firmness of their convictions in its administration, and why are 60 pointers going home before us?

We are not discrediting the valiant work of the Eighth-eighth Division, but we, too, are in the same Army and many of us are seasoned combat veterans who were redeployed without benefit of furlough.

We have stated the plain facts as we understand them. If there is a legitimate explanation we respectfully ask that it be promptly presented through these columns; otherwise we shall be obliged to draw our own conclusions.

Staff Sgt. GUY H. MARTIN
(And 15 others).

EDITOR: I recall in one of your September issues of the Pacifican the headlines "Seventy points eligible for discharge October 1," "Sixty pointers eligible for discharge November 1," and several other promises which were never kept and were almost impossible to keep. The reason I say they were impossible to keep is because there has been no attempt to get us down to replacement depot to even get ready to be sent home, and there are many boys down here with 90 and 100 points still sweating it out.

What we would like to know is why our hopes are continued to be built up for a big let down.

If the promise cannot be carried out, why make them? I'm sure that the Joes would think better of our country if the War Department would carry out their promises or else discontinue to make them.

Pvt. KENNETH LANPHER, APO 928.

EDITOR: We note with interest in the Pacifican of October 17 an article about the Thirty-first Division returning to the States with 60-point men. This is the second time this month that a division has returned 60-point men to the United States. We would like to know how come.

Not long ago we sat through a film called "Two Down and One to Go," which explained how high point men would be substituted for low-point men in outfits returning to the United States. Can anyone say why 60-point men are returning, while 85-point men are still waiting to go to disposition centers?

If we are to believe what the Government tells us, men with 60 points are eligible for discharge the first of November. If the Army has forgotten, this is still October.

Cpl. ROBERT D. REGIER, APO 75
(And 25 others).

EDITOR: It is time the Army sent all of its 80-point men home before the papers print optimistic stories about the 70- and 60-point men. Many of us with over 80 points were optimistic too when we came to the Twenty-second Replacement Depot to wait for a ship to carry us home.

It doesn't help our morale when the 70-point men in our old outfits start processing to go home as a unit and chide us "casuals" that they'll probably beat us home to the States. It doesn't sound fair or logical that lower point men will get a ship before 80 pointers if the point system is carried out to the letter and spirit.

Cpl. JOE RANDALL, APO 925
(And six others).

EDITOR: What point system do they use that 60 pointers are now being sent home? Are the high pointers going to sweat it out until all the 60 pointers are gone?

Here we are in the Twenty-ninth Replacement Depot, waiting our turn for shipment, when we read about this in your daily paper. That saying, Golden Gate in '48," looks true for us.

Corp. FRANK M. SUCHANEK, APO 75.

EDITOR: After sweating out 22 days at this replacement depot, together with other men with 80 to 95 points, you can imagine our shocked surprise to learn through your paper that men of the Thirty-eighth Division with 60 points have departed stateside.

Are we to understand that no shipping is available because it is being used to get 60-point men home? I think you'll agree that an explanation is in order.

Another thing that has me puzzled is the seemingly unending stream of "combat fatigue" men who process here and ship out ahead of men with high points. Is someone pulling a fast one?

M/Sgt. M. B. ABRAMS, APO 714.

DEMOCRATIC PROOF

EDITOR: While stationed at the Twenty-ninth Replacement Depot from August to October it was my duty to oversee a group of Filipino girls at the depot tailor shop. The girls could all speak good English, and I found them to be good-natured, cooperative, and of a very kindly nature.

When the shop closed the girls conferred among themselves and planned a farewell party as a parting gesture for their former employers and their new friends. As at any good farewell party, there were tears and there were speeches. And then there was dancing and singing until the evening had worn away.

If I have profited from this experience, I have certainly learned not to sympathize with prejudice. Rather, I am more certain that the racial issue is founded on ignorance, that a man who denounces another color denounces himself, and that where there is wisdom there is peace and love.

Corp. ADELMO FABRIZIO, APO 238.

TRIPP TRAPPINGS

EDITOR: I predict the University of Georgia Bulldogs will win the mythical national football championship in a walk. With wholehearted support from the outfit that whipped Germany and Japan, how can they lose?

Perhaps Mr. Patterson, with a little pressure from South Carolina Senators MAYBANK and JOHNSTON, could round up some football talent (preferably rugged young 40-point men) for my little alma mater, Wofford College, in Spartansburg.

Sgt. JAMES W. CROCKER, APO 707.

SHIPPING SPACE

EDITOR: It seems that the buck-passing from the higher-ups on down is the two words, "shipping space."

I realize that PW's are first and hospital cases next, but having seen the Pacific anchorages recently, I refuse to listen to that escape route, "no shipping space."

On the way over from Europe to Manila, we passed through three huge anchorages, Ulithe, Eniwetok, and Batangas. At Eniwetok we sailed for 3 hours before we lost sight of ships anchored there, at Ulithe the same, and at Batangas there were over 100 ships.

Give orders to those thousands of empty cargo ships, let the boys sleep on decks, let them figure out their latrine systems, they'll get home O. K.

Nobody worried much in the jungles; why worry about them on a 2-week voyage? We're able to take care of ourselves. How about the Army and Navy port commanders getting together?

Pfc H. SCHIER, APO 75.

EDITOR: According to a tiny article in the October 10 Pacifican, the transport *Monticello* sailed for Italy with 6,000 PW's.

We, the undersigned, waiting for shipment home, have been continually lectured on the point that the heads of the Army and Navy are doing their best to get us home. Only an idiot would believe that PW's are more important to Italy than we combat veterans of the ETO and SWPA are to our homes. This is a disgrace and should be remedied so that no other ship will sail again under those premises until all veterans have been returned home.

It is getting very tiresome seeing so few of us going home every day. This piece of news made us blow our tops.

T/4 LEONARD EPSTEIN, APO 320
(And 92 others).

(The return trip from the States to Italy would undoubtedly have been made empty by the *Monticello* had these Italian PW's not been taken. No United States veteran had his return home delayed, and the Government is saving money on the upkeep of these PW's by returning them.—EDITOR.)

EDITOR: It is time that a few pertinent questions were addressed to the powers that be; most of them have been more or less touched upon in Mail Bag, but I would like to summarize them.

Why, with enough air and sea transportation available in the Pacific to move at least 500,000 troops per month, is the homebound stream a mere trickle yet, 6 weeks after the war ended? We have (or had) at least 1,000 B–29's over here. At a conservative estimate of 80 men apiece, three round trips per month, they can carry 90,000 men home each month. In addition, we have thousands of other planes, bombers, and transports; we have literally thousands of ships, transports, aircraft carriers, etc. Not one of us, officer or enlisted man, will object to discomfort or inconvenience if it means a speed-up in our return.

Our job is done; now get us home as fast as possible. Give us no more talk of shipping shortages.

Lt. R. H. FOLKMAN, APO 75.

EDITOR: How can there be a shortage of ships to get us home when our Navy is the largest in the world and they have just an-

nounced that we have a surplus of 2,700 Liberty ships, which is twice the amount needed to get all the high-point men home? I, for one, would appreciate it if they would stop kidding us with promises and give us action instead.

Sgt. AL. SHREIBMAN, APO 925.

The Artificial Limb Scandal and the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Joseph Leib, service officer, past vice commander, Costello Post, No. 15, the American Legion:

Recently numerous charges have appeared in the press to the effect that soldiers with amputations are not getting the best artificial limbs that science can devise. These accusations have been met with immediate denials by certain Veterans' Administration officials, as well as by agents representing manufacturers producing these appliances. Although the tune of some of these dissents is now undergoing a slight modulation—these basic charges are still being challenged in some official quarters. Because these conflicting statements and sweeping contradictions are confusing the public, is it not time that the truth be told so that Congress and the American people can be fully apprised of the ugly facts surrounding this nauseating and disgraceful situation?

I believe that I can speak with some authority on this matter. Soon after I had appeared before the Senate Military Affairs Committee early in 1942, pleading for an investigation of the alarming service air crashes (which resulted in the scandulous Curtiss-Wright and Consolidated-Vultee reports), I received letters from amputees urging that I forget aircraft accidents and devote my time in an endeavor to clean up the artificial limb scandal. One person went so far as to send me parts of an artificial leg pointing out the defective material and poor construction of the appliance. At the time I was more concerned in seeing that the armed forces were getting the best possible aircraft, I nevertheless called these complaints to Members of Congress, Government officials, and veteran leaders. Many individuals were acquainted with this situation long before it came to my attention, but it seemed that only a few appeared willing to do something about it.

Then in September 1942 the American Legion national convention adopted a Michigan department resolution demanding extensive research and indicated that improvement in manufacturing artificial limbs were not keeping pace with mechanical progress shown in many other phases of engineering.

This petition was passed on to General Hines, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, who in turn referred the resolution to Chester C. Hadden, president of the Association of Limb Manufacturers of America. Under date of November 14, 1942, Hines propounded these questions to Hadden:

"1. As to the sort of research which is mentioned in the said resolution, may I trouble you to let me know whether each of the manufacturing firms who are members of your association do conduct research of this kind, and finance their own research?

"2. Or does your association conduct research from its funds, and with the thought of turning over to all of the members of the association such new ideas in materials and in the fabrication of the finished products as are so developed?"

Sixteen days later Hadden's reply consisted of three pages pointing out that the American Legion resolution was not based on facts. Said he:

"I believe it is pretty generally accepted that the improvement in the manufacturing of artificial limbs has not only kept pace with mechanical progress shown in many other phases of engineering, but actually has exceeded mechanical progress shown in a great many other fields."

Then Hadder added:

"In conclusion it appears to me that the resolution referred to is completely contrary to the known facts. It would appear that there is absolutely no necessity for the allocation of any Federal funds for research in this field at the present time but rather it would appear to us that this association and its members are well qualified to meet this problem."

And here an amazing thing happened. Based solely on this ridiculous inquiry and reply, General Hines sat down and advised T. O. Kraabel, national director of rehabilitation of the American Legion, on December 14, 1942, merely 2 weeks later, that "after careful consideration to this matter and giving due regard to the position of the organization whose members consist of those individuals and firms engaged in the manufacturing of artificial limbs in America, it is not believed to be proper for the Veterans' Administration to initiate the establishment of research facilities of this character."

That ended that. Kraable and the American Legion for some reason muffed the ball, for they refused to press the matter.

However, the Limb Association suddenly reversed itself and organized a subsidiary known as the Research Institute Foundation, advising its membership that it needed funds badly for research work, disregarding the fact that it had notified General Hines that it had able finances.

The prospectus of the newly formed subsidiary read:

"The most important factor to carry on the research work successfully is the need of sufficient funds. The Research Institute Foundation to start with one plastic engineer, but would also like to have a draftsman and a machinist."

Two years later on May 21, 1945, Mr. F. O. Peterson, treasurer of this group, advised this writer:

"The research work is progressing slowly due to insufficient funds. However, several details have been accomplished with only the help of one plastic engineer."

This startling fact was repeatedly brought to the attention of the Veterans' Administration yet General Hines refused to take proper action.

Ironically enough, Lt. Col. Albert N. Baggs, national medical consultant for the American Legion, told a House Labor subcommittee on October 26, 1945 that the maimed veterans of our wars "had to accept artificial arms and legs in which there had been no basic improvements for 50 years or more."

Again, I repeat—few persons seemed willing to help clean up this startling scandal. It was an uphill battle. On a number of occasions I sought copies of the previous quoted Hines-Hadden-Kraabel correspondence, but my requests were in vain. Then I called upon Representative MORRISON, one of the best friends the veterans ever had, for assistance, but General Hines excitedly rushed his special assistant, William C. Murray to the Congressman's office to advise that the letters "were too hot" to give out. I then solicited the aid of a Member of the Senate, and after I had advised him what had transpired, he went all out and demanded the entire correspondence. After further procrastination the file was released. The Senator was ready to make a speech about the scandal but General Hines got to him and persuaded the gentleman to accept a brand new veterans hospital instead.

This did not stop the complaints. Day after day veterans poured out their resentment to deaf ears. The Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice finally became aroused because of price-fixing and cartel charges and they undertook to prove the scandal.

Rumors began to leak out in official Washington and they reached the interested ears of Douglas Smith, Staff writer for the Scripps-Howard newspapers. He called upon the Justice Department for information but officials there referred him to the Senator mentioned above who in turn referred him to me. Out of this incident came a number of articles and editorials that helped the cause along.

During this same period the Surgeon General of the Army—not the Veterans' Administration—called a conference in Chicago, Ill., to standardize artificial limbs, and as a result of this meeting a committee on prosthetic devices was organized within the Division of Medical Sciences and the Division of Engineering and Industrial research of the National Research Council.

A climax of this scandal came during the last weeks of October 1945, when kindly Representative PATTERSON of California charged:

"I do not want to see profiteering in artificial limbs. I do not want to see anyone, serviceman or civilian, subjected to exorbitant prices due to excessive profits. However, in the case of veterans, I am more concerned with seeing that they get the best possible artificial legs and arms, whatever they cost."

Yes, ladies and gentleman, that was more than 3 years after a few of us were pleading that something be done to correct this great injustice.

But the whopper of all these sudden excuses and alibis came on October 14, 1945, when Lobbyist Hadden, of the Association of Limb Manufacturers, who had so misled General Hines, appeared before a Disabled American Veterans committee and had the audacity to openly charge that the Army was responsible for this deplorable situation.

There is no time for further denials or alibis. It is time for immediate action. We must no longer allow special interest or greed to dominate this scene. Our Government has a moral obligation to see to it that those who lost part of their body fighting in defense of this great Republic should not undergo further hardship or pain because of a few warped individuals whose only concern is high profits.

In the Washington Times-Herald, on November 5, 1945, there appeared a dispatch quoting Dr. Paul E. Klopsteg, director of research at the Technological Institute, Northwestern University, and chairman of the committee on prosthetic devices of the National Research Council, to the effect that there are seven major faults in artificial limbs now being supplied to our war heroes.

This eminent authority pointed out that limbs today are of excessive weight, have a susceptibility to breakage, especially at the knee and ankle joints, and to moisture and water, which causes parts of the limbs to corrode and glued surfaces to come apart. Other major faults he pointed out is in joint weaknesses, and that limb surfaces, made of wood, metal, or plastics, are hard and not natural to the touch.

Dr. Klopsteg ended his statement by predicting that it would be 2 or 3 years before the new improved prosthetic appliances would be available to our veterans.

Imagine—2 or 3 years to wait.

Thanks to General Hines and his blind cohorts.

Mexican Interpretations of the Water Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, when the water treaty with Mexico was before the Senate for ratification, the State Department negotiators told the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations that, with respect to the Colorado River, the treaty obligated Mexico to accept water regardless of quality, even though it might be so salty as to be unusable; and that the so-called extraordinary drought clause of the treaty would relieve the United States from furnishing the guaranteed quantity of 1,500,000 acre-feet per year if the drought occurred in any portion of the basin in the United States and resulted in the curtailment of usage, and that it would not have to occur simultaneously in all portions of the basin to entitle us to relief.

There has recently been brought to my attention the interpretation given to the Mexican Senate by the Mexican negotiators of the treaty on these same two points, among others. Their interpretation is exactly opposite to that given the Senate by our State Department. As to quality of water, the Mexican negotiators reported that the water must be of good quality for irrigation, of the same quality as that delivered to American projects. As to extraordinary drought, the Mexicans reported:

> The amount guaranteed to Mexico can only be reduced in cases of extreme drought and only if that extraordinary drought should bring about the reduction of all consumptions in the United States.

These, among others, were exactly the ambiguities which opponents of the treaty pointed out during debate. Now that these ambiguities have been so definitely established, certainly in the interests of proper relations with our neighbor, Mexico, and to obviate future misunderstandings or bitterness which might come from forced arbitration, and also so that the people of our Colorado River Basin States may know definitely the burdens which they must assume, under the treaty, the State Department is under the deepest obligation to remove them by exchange of notes before the treaty is made effective by exchange of ratifications, and certainly before this House appropriates money to implement the treaty. A deficiency bill containing money for this purpose is before the House Appropriations Committee at this moment.

For the information of the Members, as more will be heard of this grave matter in the near future, I am placing in the RECORD a full translation of the text of the report to the Mexican Senate by Engineer Adolfo Orive Alba, executive chairman of the National Irrigation Commission of Mexico.

The statements of Engineer Adolfo Orive Alba are taken from a prepared report which he submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee of the Mexican Senate on July 31, 1945. This committee was, at the time, holding hearings on the water treaty with the United States concerning the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and the Rio Grande, which had been ratified by the United States Senate.

Engineer Adolfo Orive Alba is executive chairman of the National Irrigation Commission of Mexico. This Commission is under the Department of Agriculture and Development and is in charge of all irrigation and reclamation work in Mexico. It corresponds in Mexico to the Bureau of Reclamation in the United States and Engineer Orive Alba holds a position corresponding to that of Mr. Harry Bashore, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Engineer Orive Alba has been in charge of irrigation works on both the Rio Grande and Colorado Rivers. He speaks from intimate knowledge of both rivers and his statement is made officially in his capacity of executive chairman. Moreover, he was one of the negotiators of the Treaty which gives his interpretations and statements even greater weight. He closes his report with this statement:

> The above considerations reach the conclusion that the treaty technically is beneficial for the country, and I express this in the name of the National Irrigation Commission and as a participant, in my character of executive chairman, in the technical aspects of its negotiation.

This brings to light the different attitude of the Mexican Government from that of our Government in the treaty negotiations. It is evident that Mexico recognized the value of including the executive chairman of its National Irrigation Commission as a participant in treaty negotiations in order to secure the detail knowledge which the Commission had acquired relative to the rivers in question. On the other hand, our State Department did not even consult Commissioner Bashore during the negotiations much less have him participate in those negotiations. Commissioner Bashore testified that he knew nothing of the treaty prior to its being signed in February 1944 and that he had never been consulted by our State Department in regard to it.

The full text of Engineer Orive Alba's statement is as follows:

[From El Universal, Mexico City, of August 1, 1945]

THE WATER TREATY OF THE COLORADO RIVER AND RIO GRANDE FAVORS MEXICO

Engineer Adolfo Orive Alba, executive chairman of irrigation, made a well-founded defense of that document before the Senate.

In the exposition which Engineer Adolfo Orive Alba, executive chairman of the National Irrigation Commission, made yesterday before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, on the International Water Treaty recently signed by Mexico and the United States, that official, with obvious knowledge of his subject, maintained that the arrangements made between the two Governments not only merit the ratification of the Mexican Senate, but represent valuable advantages for the Nation.

He destroyed one by one the charges and objections which have been formulated against said agreement, making a documented study before the Senators of the channels of the Colorado River and Rio Grande, of their courses through American and Mexican territory, and of the conditions under which the waters of the two rivers were and still are used, without the benficial provisions which the international treaty establishes subject to ratification.

Concretely, the executive chairman of the National Irrigation Commission affirmed that the maximum possibilities of areas irrigated without the treaty would reach at the highest to 360,000 hectares, that is, that the concrete advantage which Mexico obtains with that international instrument is that of counting on a volume of water sufficient to irrigate 445,000 hectares (1,000,000 acres) more than it could irrigate without the approval or existence of the treaty.

The exposition of the executive chairman of the National Commission of Irrigation constitutes, without doubt, a historical document which dissipates any doubt or suspicion which might have arisen regarding the international arrangements on the waters of the Colorado and Rio Grande Rivers, and punctually, as it has great importance, we transcribe it below just as Engineer Orive Alba read it, interrupting his reading only in order to make it more explicit with clarifications made on maps and diagrams fastened to the walls, which the senators, deputies, and the public in general could consult freely.

STATEMENT OF ENGINEER ADOLFO ORIVE ALBA, EXECUTIVE CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL IRRIGATION COMMISSION [1]

HONORABLE SENATORS: I am highly grateful for the kind invitation which you have given me for appearing at this round table, both in my character as executive chairman of the National Irrigation Commission and in that of participant, with that category, in the negotiation of the treaty.

The heated commentaries which this treaty has aroused, the importance that the Senate has given it in its study and this democratic form of discussing it before you, are undoubtedly not exaggerated, because the treaty is one of the most important that our country has signed since its independence and is the most important of its kind in the entire world.

The National Irrigation Commission is preparing a voluminous report on the treaty which it will present to the Senate officially, at the opening of the next period of sessions. This report will contain all the data, calculations, etc., which served as a basis for the treaty. It will contain, moreover, a detailed study, from the technical point of view, of each of clauses, of each of the phrases, and even of the words of the treaty, with the interpretation which the National Irrigation Commission officially gives to them.

But with the hope that you may receive in due time this report now in preparation and in attention to your kind invitation, I have come to make a brief exposition of the treaty with the object of clarifying many of its concepts and of commenting on the observations which have been made about it to date by the press, from the point of view of the National Irrigation Commission.

---

[1] The words and figures enclosed in parentheses, e. g., "445,000 hectares (1,100,000 acres)" and also the supplement table following table 1 are interpolations of United States equivalents of quantities expressed in Mexican units.

This exposition should be begun by a brief description of the Rio Grande, Colorado, and Tijuana Rivers.

1. THE RIO GRANDE (RIO BRAVO)

It rises in the United States and runs through said country to the south until reaching Ciudad Juarez, where it is converted into a boundary between the two countries for some 2,000 kilometers (1,200 miles) to its outlet into the Gulf of Mexico.

The International Water Treaty of 1906, signed by the United States and by our country, distributed the waters of the Rio Grande up to the place called Fort Quitman, where the Juarez Valley terminates. The present treaty, therefore, is only occupied with the Rio Grande, from Fort Quitman to the Gulf.

From Fort Quitman to the Gulf of Mexico the impounding basin of the Rio Grande in the United States is 150,528 square kilometers (58,119 square miles) and in Mexico 211,177 square kilometers (81,536 square miles).

If there were no use of the waters either in Mexican territory or American territory, there would reach the Rio Grande as an annual average, from Fort Quitman to the Gulf:

	Millions of cubic meters	Percent	Thousands of acre-feet
1. Proceeding from the United States	3,047	35	(2,470)
2. Proceeding from Mexico	5,812	65	(4,712)
Total	8,859	100	(7,182)

The regimen of the Rio Grande, in spite of the dams that are constructed on its subsidiaries, both American and Mexico, is to this date very irregular. On numerous occasions each year the flow of the river is so reduced that it is not enough to satisfy the needs of irrigation on both banks. On the other hand, on other occasions great floods pass through the river, of short duration, which cause serious inundations of the bordering lands, and principally of Mexican lands.

II. THE COLORADO RIVER

It rises in the United States and its basin includes part of seven American States. It is 2,730 kilometers (1,696 miles) long, of which about 30 (19 miles) serve as the international boundary between Mexico and the United States, and the last 160 kilometers (100 miles) are totally within Mexican territory. It has no subsidiaries of any kind in Mexican territory. Its total runoff proceeds from the United States.

Before storage dams were constructed to regulate its current, its flow was highly irregular. Its current fluctuated from a few liters per second, which allowed it to be crossed on foot, practically without wetting the shoes, to imposing floods of 6,800 cubic meters per second (240,000 second feet). The average annual run-off of the Colorado River is estimated at 22,000,000,000 cubic meters (17,835,000 acre-feet), but this annual run-off, without dams, has fluctuated from 7,000,000,000 (5,675,000 acre-feet) to 28,000,000,000 cubic meters (22,700,000 acre-feet).

This very irregular flow of the river demonstrates the necessity of storing its waters so that they may be used for irrigation. In the United States there are numerous adequate sites for carrying out this storage. In our country, as the river is already in its deltaic zone, there is none.

III. THE TIJUANA RIVER

The Tijuana River is formed by two principal tributaries; the Las Palmas River which rises in Mexico and the Alamar River, which, rising in the United States, crosses the international line to enter Mexico and join with the Las Palmas River some 6 kilometers (4 miles) to the south of Tijuana. Both rivers together form the Tijuana River, which runs toward the northeast, again crossing the international line at Tijuana to enter American territory and empty into the Pacific three kilometers north of the frontier.

On the Las Palmas River our country has constructed the Rodriguez Dam and uses all of its waters. There are dams on the various American tributaries of the Alamar River.

The impounding basin of the Tijuana River is:

	Square kilometers	(Square miles)
In the United States	1,230	(475)
In Mexico	3,200	(1,235)
Total	4,430	(1,710)

Its run-off is even more irregular than that of the other international rivers, since the case has occurred in which the Tijuana River became completely dry for a continuous period of 7 years, and on the other hand, on other occasions it has carried floods of up to 2,000 cubic meters per second (70,000 second-feet). Its annual average run-off has been estimated at some 20,000,000 cubic meters (16,200 acre-feet).

IV. HISTORIC ANTECEDENTS

The treaties of 1848 and of 1853 between the United States and Mexico, with respect to the use of their currents, only considered the navigation of the Rio Grande and Colorado Rivers.

The active use of the waters of these rivers for irrigation only began at the commencement of the present century.

As these uses were increased and as both countries constructed irrigation works, the water commenced to become insufficient and the need of reaching an agreement between the two countries for the better use of the waters of these rivers became apparent.

In 1927 the United States and Mexico agreed to hold conversations for studying the problem of the international rivers. In 1928 the first of these conversations was held, it having been decided to gather the necessary technical data on the three rivers. In 1929, with this data collected by mixed commissions, conferences were held regarding the distribution of the waters of the Colorado and Rio Grande, but as there was not sufficient data about the Tijuana River and as this current has relatively small importance, it was decided to postpone its study until later.

The conferences of 1929 failed because the two delegations were not able to reach an agreement. It is interesting to note that the American delegation made a proposition which in summary was equivalent to the following:

1. That of the waters which reached the Rio Grande, there should be assigned in the first place to the United States the volume which had been in use in Texas of 1,188 million cubic meters (963,000 acre-feet), and to Mexico what it had been taking from the principal current, or 70,000,000 cubic meters (56,700 acre-feet), and the rest would be divided equally between the two countries. This was equivalent to assigning from the Mexican tributaries 985,000,000 cubic meters (798,500 acre-feet) to the United States.

2. In the case of the Colorado River, to assign to Mexico the maximum volume that it had used until then; that is, before the construction of Boulder Dam, a volume which was estimated at 925,000,000 cubic meters (750,000 acre-feet).

The Mexican delegation proposed that the waters of the Rio Grande should be divided in half between the two countries, which was equivalent to assigning to the United States 426,000,000 cubic meters (345,350 acre-feet) of water from the Mexican tributaries, since the latter carried more water to the Rio Grande than the American tributaries. In the case of the Colorado River the Mexican delegation asked that there be furnished sufficient water to irrigate the 600,000 hectares (1,482,600 acres), which were considered as irrigable on the Mexican side.

After the failure of the above conferences, it was not until 1943 when it was possible to again commence negotiations by engineers and lawyers of the two countries, which culminated with the signature of the present international water treaty, in the first part of 1944.

V. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TREATY IN THE CASE OF THE RIO GRANDE

I am going to read the fundamental article of the treaty in the case of the Rio Grande:

"ART. 4. The waters of the Rio Grande (Bravo) between Fort Quitman, Tex., and the Gulf of Mexico are assigned to the two countries in the following manner:

"A. To Mexico:

"(a) The total of the waters that reach the principal current of the Rio Grande from the San Juan and Alamo Rivers, including the return water proceeding from the lands that these two rivers irrigate.

"(b) Half of the run-off from the principal basin of the Rio Grande below the lower main international storage dam, whenever said run-off is not assigned expressly in this treaty to one of the two countries.

"(c) A third part of the water which reaches the principal current of the Rio Grande proceeding from the Conchos, San Diego, San Rodrigo, Escondido, Salado, and Arroyo de Las Vacas Rivers, which third part shall not be less in total, on an average and in cycles of five consecutive years, than 431,721,000 cubic meters (350,000 acre-feet) annually. The United States will not acquire any right by the use of the waters of the tributaries mentioned in this clause in excess of the 431,721,000 cubic meters (350,000 acre-feet) mentioned, except the right of using the third part of the run-off which reaches the Rio Grande from said tributaries, although it exceeds the volume named.

"(d) Half of any other run-off in the principal basin of the Rio Grande, not assigned especially in this article, and half of the contributions of all the tributaries not measured—which are those not named in this article between Fort Quitman and the lower main international dam.

"In cases of extraordinary drought or serious accident to the hydraulic systems of the measured Mexican tributaries which may make it difficult for Mexico to allow to pass the 431,721,000 cubic meters (350,000 acre-feet) annually which are assigned to the United States as the minimum contribution from the Mexican tributaries mentioned, in clause 'c' of paragraph 'B' of this article, the amount lacking which may exist at the end of the following cycle (will be replaced) with water proceeding from the same tributaries.

"If the useful capacity assigned to the United States of at least two of the main international dams, including that located upstream, is filled with water belonging to the United States, a cycle of 5 years will be considered terminated, and all the charges totally paid, a new cycle beginning from that amount."

In the first place I desire to call your attention especially to this fundamental phrase which, if it had not been carefully determined, would have given rise to much confusion: "There is assigned to the United States (c) a third part of the water which reaches the main current of the Rio Grande * * *." Thus it is not a matter of assigning the third part of the virgin run-off of the Mexican tributaries which this clause mentions, but only the third part of the water which freely reaches the Rio Grande, that is, the surplus, after having made all the use possible of the waters of these tributaries within national territory.

Thus, having cultivated an average from 1900 to 1943 on our tributaries of a total area estimated at 127,000 hectares (313,800 acres) under the plans of the Commission there will be cultivated some 315,000 hectares (778,400 acres) in the future.

In effect, our country, through the National Irrigation Commission, before negotiation of the treaty, studied the form of making use within the basin of each Mexican tributary of the Rio Grande the maximum possible volume of the water of said tributary. For example, in the case of the Conchos River the following utilizations in detail actually exist:

	Hectares	(Acres)
By direct intakes on the Conchos River, there are irrigated	17,239	(42,600)
On the San Pedro River, tributary of the Conchos	5,000	(12,400)
On the Florido River, with permanent irrigation	10,000	(24,700)
On the Chuviscar River	3,150	(7,800)
In the Delicias irrigation district	33,371	(82,500)
Total	69,500	(170,000)

The Commission has made a study in order to make use of the waters of the Conchos River and its tributaries to the greatest degree possible, by the construction of numerous new dams which would permit regulation to the point where it is physically practicable of the torrential waters of the Conchos River and its tributaries, having found that the maximum utilizations which can be made are the following:

	Hectares	(Acres)
Increase in the Delicias irrigation district with the Las Virgenes and Villalba Dams	30,000	(74,100)
Increase of 8,200 hectares by means of the dams projected on the Florido River and permanent irrigation of 2,450 hectares not considered in the area benefited at present but evidently to be irrigated	10,650	(26,300)
Increase by utilization of the waters of the Chuviscar River through the construction of the Los Aldamas Dam	2,100	(5,200)
Irrigation in the Ojinaga Valley through the construction of the dam at "El Piguis"	4,500	(11,100)
Total possible increase	47,250	(116,700)

But in spite of the above increase it will not be physically possible to make use, every year, of the total of the run-off of the Conchos River, because there will always be cases of extraordinary floods which are spilled over the dams and go to the Rio Grande, because there will always be return water from the irrigated lands which inevitably arrive at the river bed, etc., that is, in the case of the Conchos River as in the case of any other Mexican river in the center of the country, and to generalize even more, in the case of any river in any part of the world, there will always be surpluses, since it is never possible to use 100 percent of the current of the river. These future surpluses appear in estimates in the attached table, but it is necessary to state that the amounts given will be the average of numerous years, that is, there will be years in which the surplus from the Conchos River, which reaches the Rio Grande, will be almost nothing and on the other hand there will be abundant years in which, by spillings from the dams, large surpluses will reach the Rio Grande. The amount of 770,000,000 cubic meters (624,000 acre-feet) per year which is given, is the average of the future surpluses of many years.

In like form the National Irrigation Commission proceeded with the other tributaries of the Rio Grande, that is, without taking into account that they flow into the Rio Grande, it tried to make use of the total of its current in the irrigation of lands of the basin of these tributaries and thus determined the unavoidable surpluses to which we refer in the case of the Conchos River.

The attached table shows numerically the form in which the treaty will operate with respect to the Rio Grande. This table shows what the virgin current of the Rio Grande would be if no uses existed, the actual consumptions which diminish said virgin current, the total future consumptions which will diminish said virgin current even more, and the future surpluses which will result from deducting from the original amount of the current the future consumptions.

In its studies the National Irrigation Commission has not proceeded by methods, but analyzed the case month by month of each year and year by year, for a period of 45 years.

So then, having made all the imaginable utilizations of the waters of the tributaries of the Rio Grande, in the manner before explained, there still will reach the Rio Grande surpluses from these tributaries whose average volume for many years is that given by this table.

From these surplus volumes which reach the Rio Grande, proceeding from the six tributaries: Conchos, San Diego, San Rodrigo, Escondido, Salado, and Arroyo de Las Vacas Rivers, with an average total contribution of 1,423,000,000 cubic meters (1,153,600 acre-feet) per year, Mexico by the treaty assigns the third part to the United States. Mexico guarantees that the volume assigned to the United States from these tributaries will never be less than 431,000,000 cubic meters (350,000 acre-feet) which is an amount slightly inferior to the third part of the average volume of the surpluses before mentioned.

Why did Mexico assign this volume to the United States?

Because our country has always sustained the logical thesis that the waters which flow in the Rio Grande in its bounding section should be distributed by halves between the two countries, and the simple arithmetical operation made in this statement shows us that by means of the stipulations of the treaty the surplus water which runs in the Rio Grande is divided practically in half between the two countries. Please note that in 1929 our delegation made an equivalent proposition in the case of the Rio Grande and that the American delegation in that year asked for a volume three times greater than that which the present treaty grants it.

Moreover, it should be noted that the United States has been taking in all the latter years a large volume of water from the Rio Grande. Said volume is made up of water proceeding from the United States and of water proceeding from our country. It is calculated that the water proceeding from our tributaries and diverted by the United States is 922,000,000 cubic meters (747,400 acre-feet). The treaty, consequently, reduces the volume of Mexican waters used by the United States by half.

VI. SITUATION ON THE RIO GRANDE WITHOUT THE TREATY

Without the existence of this treaty, the situation of Mexico with respect to the Rio Grande would be the following:

(a) With respect to its tributaries, Mexico could develop the same projects which it can execute with the treaty, but not a single one more.

(b) With respect to the principal current of th Rio Grande during the first years, Mexico could continue to take the small volume which it uses by El Retamal for the irrigation of some 30,000 hectares (74,100 acres). The United States would continue taking in the first years a volume of 1,419,000,000 cubic meters (1,150,400 acre-feet) for the irrigation of 236,000 hectares (583,200 acres). But, and this is a decisive "but," the United States had already begun some gigantic works with the name of Federal Project No. 5, or Rincon, a project approved by the American Congress which would permit of carrying practically the total of the waters of the Rio Grande to American territory, with the very reasonable cost of $60,000,000. On the Rio Grande there has existed a "race" of utilizations on the part of the two countries. The United States commenced installing a large number of pumps for taking water from the Rio Grande. Mexico, in 1937, began the use of these waters by opening the small gravity intake of Retamal. The United States answered with the gigantic works of Federal Project No. 5, or Rincon. Mexico would not have recourses nor physical possibilities for making an answer to these works, which, as we say, would be equivalent to taking the Rio Grande to American territory. These works were suspended at the beginning of the present war, but could be renewed on its termination.

VII. SITUATION ON THE RIO GRANDE WITH THE TREATY

If the treaty is approved by the Senate and goes into effect, the situation of Mexico with respect to the waters of the Rio Grande will be the following:

I. With regard to the use of the current of all the Mexican tributaries of the Rio Grande, our country could carry out exactly the same projects which it would have done if there had been no treaty. That is, there is no injury to any of the States in which the basins of these tributaries are found.

II. With the treaty in effect it will be possible to construct international dams in the bed of the Rio Grande itself, which will regulate through their storage the surpluses which, with a very irregular regimen, flow and will flow in the future in the bed of the Rio Grande. Through the use of its waters, Mexico will be able to irrigate in the Mexican part of the delta of the Rio Grande, blessed with extraordinary fertile lands, an area estimated at 245,000 hectares (605,400 acres).

By means of the treaty, the danger for Mexico will disappear which was implied in the Federal Project No. 5, or Rincon project, which if constructed by the United States at the end of the war, will only be for carrying the part which corresponds to it of the waters of the Rio Grande, and not the total of said current.

The treaty will bring the following additional advantages for the two countries:

1. Thanks to the international dams, it will control the floods which now cause great destruction, principally on the Mexican side.

2. Energy will be generated which will be distributed equally between the two countries and which will permit on the one hand the amortization of part of the cost of the

international dams and, on the other, the industrialization of our frontier region.

VIII. PRINCIPAL OBJECTIONS MADE TO THE TREATY WITH REGARD TO THE RIO GRANDE

The great majority of the objections which I have read or heard about the treaty have been made through the lack of knowledge about it or of the technical data which served as a basis for it. For example, various opponents of the treaty have objected by stating that it assigns 60 percent of the water of our tributaries to the United States, which, as we have seen, shows a complete lack of knowledge of the treaty, or of the amounts of water which are really involved. I do not refer, therefore, to these objections since I am sure that those who made them will modify their opinion on better knowledge of the treaty and will revise it dispassionately with the correct data of the National Irrigation Commission. But if they still have some doubts, I will make the offer of hearing them in the Commission's office and giving them all the numerical explanations that may be necessary to convince them.

The National Irrigation Commission cannot refer to the objections which are derived from legal theories, and I will confine myself to considering the objections of a technical character. On the other hand, as engineers, the realities weigh more in our minds than the abstract theories.

With the above clarifications made, I am going to refer to the principal objections which it is our duty to remove for you.

1. Various opponents say that the treaty assigns the third part of the waters of our tributaries, the Conchos, San Diego, San Rodrigo, Escondido, Salado, and Arroyo de Las Vacas Rivers. We have already explained that the third part of the waters of said tributaries is not assigned, but simply the third part of the surpluses which reach the Rio Grande after having made all the possible developments in the basins of each one of said streams. The guaranteed amount of 431,000,000 cubic meters (350,000 acre-feet) is slightly less than the third part of the average surpluses which the National Irrigation Commission has calculated as the quantities which will reach the Rio Grande after having made all possible developments of the current of the six Mexican tributaries mentioned.

2. It is said that projects which now appear impossible to us could perhaps be carried out in the future, when some new powerful pump is invented, etc. The National Irrigation Commission has calculated that the average surpluses which will reach the Rio Grande from the six Mexican tributaries affected by the guaranty of the treaty will be 1,423,000,000 cubic meters (1,153,600 acre-feet) per year. As the treaty only guarantees to the United States 431,000,000 cubic meters (350,000 acre-feet) per year, there still remains to Mexico 992,000,000 cubic meters (747,400 acre-feet) per year to cover amply any project which might have been omitted as being impossible of construction at present. I believe it pertinent to call your attention to the fact that, in the case of the Colorado River, the American opponents to the celebration of the treaty with Mexico adduced exactly the same reasoning, that is, they say that the United States ought not to promise to Mexico a single drop of water of the Colorado River because all the water of that stream could be used in the future by the execution of projects which now are deemed impossible. I only desire to add that if for this reasoning, in one or the other of the countries, the treaty were to be rejected, it would surely be the United States, which by its economic potentialities would sooner be able to carry out those fantastic projects in the case of the Colorado River, in order not to leave a drop to Mexico.

3. It is objected that "a preferential right is given to the United States to the use of 431,000,000 cubic meters (350,000 acre-feet) from our tributaries which would bring it about that, in years of shortages, the permanent Mexican cultivations would be deprived of water and would die." The treaty clearly specified that Mexico guarantees that volume of 431,000,000 cubic meters (350,000 acre-feet) from any of its six tributaries and as an average in cycles of 5 years, therefore in 1, 2, or more years of scarcity, it would not need to give a single drop of water from one, various or all the six tributaries which the guaranty affects. Moreover, the treaty permits Mexico to pay the deficiencies of a 5-year cycle of scarcity in the following 5 years.

4. It is objected that "Mexico will bring quiet waters to the Rio Grande while the United States will bring floodwaters." This is not true and we have already demonstrated that the larger part of the surpluses of the Mexican tributaries in the future will be floodwaters. In any event, both the quiet waters of either country which reach the Rid Grande, and the floodwaters, will need dams to regulate them by their storage. The construction of these dams is something vital for the two countries, but principally for Mexico, which only can be realized by means of the treaty.

5. It is objected that "there appears to exist a lack of equity in the treaty, because it specifies that in the case of periods of extraordinary drought, Mexico must pay into the Rio Grande the shortages with respect to the volume guaranteed for a cycle of 5 years in the following cycle, while, in the case of the Colorado River, the United States, when such droughts occur, will not compensate Mexico for the volume lacking with respect to that guaranteed in the following year."

The difference is the following: In the case of the Rio Grande, Mexico does not agree to deliver the guaranteed volume in all and each one of the years—as, on the other hand, happens in the case of the Colorado River—but Mexico has the choice, according to the treaty, of giving the volume guaranteed in lesser or greater annual volumes, if the annual guaranteed volume is completed in cycles of 5 years. This, which is beneficial for Mexico, because it gives Mexico great elasticity in covering its obligations and which does not exist for the United States, in the case of the Colorado River, is compensated by the fact of having to pay the deficiencies in the following cycle of 5 years. On the other hand, in the case of the Colorado River, in which the United States, as we will see, is obligated to furnish us with exactly the volume guaranteed and even with the monthly distribution which our irirgation demand requires, there would be no object in having the deficiencies caused by extraordinary droughts compensated by paying us the water in the following years, since we would not have any place to store the excess volume of water from the abundant years to compensate for the dry ones, while, on the other hand, in the case of the Rio Grande the international storage dams are there.

6. It is objected that the cost of the international dams on the Rio Grande, which will be constructed in accordance with the treaty, will be so great (several hundred million dollars according to some, and a thousand million dollars according to others) that Mexico will not be able to defray its corresponding part, for which reason our country would have to be content with having a very small part of the capacity of these works.

It is estimated, by engineers of both countries, that the cost of the three international storage dams and of the necessary diversion works will be 430,000,000 pesos. The hydroelectric plants at the two upper dams will generate 330,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year of firm energy, with additional secondary energy. The firm energy, sold at a minimum price, will permit the amortization, besides the cost of the hydroelectric plants, of 80,000,000 pesos of the cost of the dams. Therefore, between the two countries there would have to be paid 350,000,000 pesos for all the works. Our country surely will be able to pay the part corresponding to it of the above total sum. I wish to remind you that the National Irrigation Commission has at present an annual budget of 155,000,000 pesos and that this annual budget has been increasing in geometric progression in the last few years. I also wish to remind you that the Commission is constructing various dams of similar magnitude to that of the dams that are planned for the Rio Grande.

We should note, in this respect, that the international works of the Rio Grande will have a very economical cost, per hectare benefited. In reality the unit cost for the item of irrigation works per each hectare benefited in conformity with this international project will be slightly lower than the average obtained by the works which the National Irrigation Commission is developing.

IX. TIJUANA RIVER

In the case of the Tijuana River, the treaty in article 16 reads as follows:

"With the object of bettering the existing uses and of assuring any practicable future development, the Commission will study, investigate, and submit to the two Governments for their approval:

"1. Recommendations for the equitable distribution between the two countries of the waters of the Tijuana River system.

"2. Projects of storage and control of floods in order to promote and develop the domestic, irrigation, and other practicable uses of the waters of this system.

"3. Estimates of the costs of the works proposed and of the form in which the construction of said works or their costs should be divided between the two Governments.

"4. Recommendations with respect to the parts of the works which should be operated and maintained by the Commission and the parts of the same that should be operated and maintained by each section.

"The two Governments, each acting through its respective sections of the Commission, will construct the works that both Governments propose and approve, will divide the amount of the work or its cost and will distribute the waters of the Tijuana River system in the proportions on which they decide. The two Governments agree to pay by equal parts the cost of operation and maintenance of the works assigned to it for said object."

This article leaves, then, for the future decision of the two Governments, the manner of developing the waters of the Tijuana River for the two countries, which river, as we said, originates in the two countries. Naturally, neither of the two Governments would agree to having that part of its waters that could be used in its respective country assigned to the other. In reality, there is only one development on the Tijuana River of an international character that can be realized, which the International Boundary and Water Commission should study in accordance with the stipulations of the treaty. This is the Marron Dam which will remain in the United States and partly in Mexico. This dam will be fed by Mexican and American tributaries and its extractions could be 15,000,000 cubic meters (12,160 acre-feet). This amount would be distributed equitably between the two countries.

Summarizing, the problem remains to be discussed in the future by the two Governments and therefore, as regards the

treaty, there cannot exist anything which would harm the interests of one or the other country, and even less when we take in account what was said above. On the contrary, the construction of this dam will permit a better development on the part of our country of the waters of the Tijuana River, which is naturally very important for Lower California.

X. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TREATY IN THE CASE OF THE COLORADO RIVER

In order to understand better the enormous importance that the treaty has for Mexico with respect to the Colorado River, it is necessary to give a brief historical description.

At the beginning of this century a concession was given to an American company, organized for the purpose as a Mexican company, in order that it might construct a canal, the Alamo, which passing through Mexico would carry the waters of the Colorado River for the irrigation of the rich Imperial Valley in the United States. By this concession, Mexico has the right to use up to 50 percent of the water that flows through said canal.

The existence of this canal permitted the rapid development of the American lands of the Imperial Valley and the slower development of the Mexican lands of the Mexicali Valley, with our country using not 50 percent of the water of the Alamo Canal, a percentage which it never reached, but an amount in the majority of cases close to the third part of the volume that passed through the canal. While the Alamo Canal functioned for carrying water to the American Imperial Valley, the Mexican lands did not have any problem other than that which arose from years of low current in the Colorado River, in which case the American and Mexican lands suffered equally.

In order to be able to use to better advantage the waters of the Colorado River the United States projected and constructed: (1) a great storage dam, the highest in the world, Boulder Dam, a work that was terminated in 1935 and that permits the storage of the flow of 2 average years of the Colorado River; and (2) the All-American Canal, which runs exclusively in American territory.

We Mexican engineers, when we saw that these gigantic works were being executed, understood that there approached a critical moment for Mexico in which the lands of Mexicali Valley ran the danger of returning to their condition of one of the most inhospitable deserts of the world through lack of water, since our country would have to depend on taking water, in the manner that it might best be able to do it, from the Colorado River by using the occasional surpluses that might flow through said river.

In 1942 the All-American Canal entered into operation, that is, it was now no longer necessary to carry the water of the Colorado River through Mexican territory in order to irrigate American lands and therefore it was not possible for Mexico to take part of the 50 percent of the water in the Alamo Canal to which it had the right, and this canal remained abandoned for the exclusive service of Mexico, which already had in cultivation that year more than 120,000 hectares (296,500 acres) in Mexicali Valley.

The situation in 1942 showed us how well founded were our fears because that year, during several of the hottest weeks, there came from the great American dams constructed on the Colorado River only a small volume which did not permit of filling the requirements of irrigation in Mexico. And with this came the clamor of the public land holders, the small owners and colonists of our Colorado River irrigation district, who saw their crops lost for lack of water. But there is even more, for at the end of the summer, there came from Boulder Dam a great flow of water which overflowed in Mexico, inundating cultivated lands and ruining the crops of other thousands of hectares.

That is, even when it is true that the total volume of the surpluses which flow through the Colorado River will still be very great in many years, its current is from now on so irregular that it can be stated that, while during some weeks the Mexican lands of the Mexicali Valley can be dying of thirst, in the following weeks they may be choked and submerged by the inundations provoked by discharges from the American dams.

Under these conditions the agriculture of Mexicali Valley is in desperate condition. In order to better it, without the treaty, it has been necessary for the Mexican Government, in the years of 1943, 1944, and the present year, to be constantly requesting of the American Government that the discharges be now increased, that tomorrow they be diminished, that part of the water be furnished through the All-American Canal, etc.

This critical situation makes clear how unfounded is the opinion of some of our citizens who believe that Mexico should not be preoccupied in the case of the Colorado River and that the treaty was not needed, as it could always take the abundant water which inevitably flows in the Colorado River. We insist that, effectively, in the case of the Colorado River as in the case of the Mexican tributaries of the Rio Grande, there will always be surpluses which will flow in the beds of said rivers but these surpluses cannot be used in irrigation due to their eminently irregular regimen in present years and much less in future years. The only solution for using them would be to regulate them by a storage dam and we must remember that at the beginning of this exposition we said that in Mexico there is not the slighest possibility of storing the surplus water of the Colorado River, a possibility which exists for the surplus waters that flow in the Rio Grande.

For this and many other reasons we who know the problem of Mexicali Valley in its painful reality have always been convinced that there was no other solution than that which a treaty gives which guarantees water from the Colorado River for the irrigation of its lands.

The treaty which is under your consideration resolves this problem. Its article 10 reads:

"From the waters of the Colorado River, whatever their source, there are assigned to Mexico:

"(a) A guaranteed volume of 1,850,234,000 cubic meters (1,500,000 acre-feet) each year, which will be delivered in accordance with the dispositions of article 15 of this treaty.

"(b) Any other volumes which reach the Mexican points of diversion; with the understanding that, when in the judgment of the United States Section, in any year there is water in the Colorado River in excess of that necessary to supply the consumptions in the United States and the volume guaranteed annually to Mexico of 1,850,234,000 cubic meters (1,500,000 acre-feet), the United States is obliged to deliver to Mexico, in accordance with the terms of article 15 of this treaty, additional amounts of water from the Colorado River system up to a total volume not in excess of 2,096,931,000 cubic meters (1,700,000 acre-feet) annually. Mexico will not acquire any right, other than that which this clause confers, to the use of the waters of the Colorado River system for any purpose, in excess of 1,850,234,000 cubic meters (1,500,000 acre-feet) annually.

"In cases of extraordinary drought or of serious accident to the irrigation system of the United States, which might make it difficult for the latter to deliver the guaranteed amount of 1,850,234,000 cubic meters (1,500,000 acre-feet) per year, the water assigned to Mexico, per clause "a" of this article, will be reduced in the same proportion as the consumptions are reduced in the United States."

As is seen by the above article, Mexico is guaranteed by the treaty a volume of 1,850,000,000 cubic meters (1,500,000 acre-feet) as a minimum, a volume which in many years will be 2,097,000,000 cubic meters (1,700,000 acre-feet).

Now, then, before negotiating the treaty a precise estimate was made of the net area in Mexican territory irrigable with water from the Colorado River under economically practicable conditions. Accordingly this estimate found that there was an area of 200,000 net irrigable hectares (494,200 acres), equivalent to a gross area of 300,000 hectares. This gross area of 300,000 hectares (741,300 acres) is less than that estimated as irrigable by our engineers during the international conferences of 1929, to which we referred at the beginning of this report. The difference between these two estimates is that in the latter, great areas, considered in the estimate of 1929, are eliminated as being useless for agricultural operations due to the large amount of salts that the lands contain. For example, the basin of the Laguna Salada and the lands adjacent to the Gulf were eliminated. There were also eliminated some other areas of lands of poor quality where heavy pumping would be required.

Now then, for the irrigation of the net 200,000 hectares (494,200 acres) in accordance with the coefficient of irrigation observed as an average since the commencement of agricultural work in the Mexicali Valley (1.25 meters, or 4.1 feet), a volume of 2,500,000,000 cubic meters (2,026,700 acre-feet) would be needed.

This volume can be obtained with the amount guaranteed by the treaty of 1,850,000,000 cubic meters (1,500,000 acre-feet) in the minimum year or 2,097 cubic meters (1,700,000 acre-feet) in the majority of the years plus the water that is pumped from wells—similar to those existing on the Laguna—which will more than supply the deficiency between the quantity required and the quantity guaranteed by the treaty.

If the coefficient of irrigation in Mexicali Valley should be increased notably, it will be necessary to make a greater use of the abundant (freaticas) water which exists in the subsoil of Mexicali Valley. If on the contrary, as we hope, by a greater preparation of our farmers, the coefficient of irrigation diminishes, it will be practically possible to irrigate the whole of the 200,000 net hectares (494,200 acres) existing with the volume guaranteed by the treaty.

It is necessary to note that as Mexico did not have any place to regulate the waters of the Colorado River in order to distribute them day by day, during each year, according to the needs of irrigation, it was necessary to arrange by means of the treaty for the United States to deliver that water to us regulated to our wishes within certain limitations which do not impose on us any sacrifice for any plan of cultivation that is followed in Mexicali Valley. For this service of regulation of that water, our country does not have to pay a single cent. Besides this, on account of the topographical conditions of the lands to be irrigated on both banks of the Colorado River, it was necessary to arrange that the water of the Colorado River be delivered to us when desired by Mexico, compatible with the needs of the lands to be irrigated at three different points.

1. At Pilot Knob, in order to irrigate the high lands which are found adjacent to the Colorado River on its right bank;

2. At San Luis, Sonora, in order to irrigate the high lands which are found on the left bank of the Colorado River;

3. At the Colorado River in order that by means of the construction of an international dam at the site where Mexico may desire it the rest of the lands on both banks of the river can be irrigated.

Mexico even has the possibility, if it so desires, of obtaining construction by Arizona of a canal which would carry waters of the Colorado River from a diversion dam constructed on the section of the river bounding the lands of Sonora.

These are the advantages obtained by the treaty which cannot be relegated to a second place, but which for our country have a fundamental importance because if it were not for them we would not be able even to use the annual volume that the treaty assigns to Mexico.

XI. ADVANTAGES OF THE TREATY WITH RESPECT TO THE COLORADO RIVER

By means of the treaty the critical fortuitous condition of the crops of 120,000 hectares (296,500 acres) farmed at present is eliminated (area times 4.1 feet=1,215,650 acre-feet present annual use).

The treaty permits of increasing the cultivated area to the total of the area that can be cultivated economically, that is, to 200,000 net hectares (494,200 acres).

The treaty provides for the construction of works by the two countries for defense against inundations, with which this great danger to Mexican lands will be removed.

Finally, the cost of these works is extraordinarily reasonable, since the storage dams which always constitute the heaviest part of the costs of all large irrigation works are not included in any of the costs for Mexico and of the cost of the diversion works Imperial Dam and All-American Canal we will only have to pay a part proportional to the use that we may make of them.

In closing this chapter I believe it convenient to note that Mexicali Valley is agriculturally the most important zone in all of Lower California, because in the rest of the territory there cannot be irrigated, in total, even the fourth part of the area of 200,000 hectares (494,200 acres) which the great Colorado River irrigation district will have.

XII. OBJECTIONS TO THE TREATY WITH RESPECT TO THE COLORADO RIVER

As in the case of the Rio Grande, we will only refer to the objections of a technical character.

1. It is objected that the water which is given us from the Colorado River can be of poor quality, either because it may contain an excess of silt or an excess of salts.

With regard to the silt, the reality is exactly the contrary. The American dams constructed on the Colorado River have served so that the silt which the current brings with it is deposited in them, for which reason the Colorado River actually passes through Mexico with a small percentage of silt, and is scouring the bed of the river instead of filling it with silt.

With respect to the possibility that the waters of the Colorado River which are delivered to us may be of poor quality, because they contain dissolved salts, we are able to affirm, based on reasons of legal and technical nature, that fortunately such a danger does not exist. In the official report to the Senate that the National Irrigation Commission is terminating this theme will be considered more fully, in order to do away with any doubt that may be had in this respect. It is not within the purpose and the time set for this report to do it as fully as is necessary, but we may point out at least the following reasons:

(a) The negotiations of the treaty on the part of the American delegation and later its approval by the American Senate, were made by taking as a fundamental basis the official document called the Santa Fe Agreement, which with the approval of the American Federal Government distributed, since 1922, the main stream of the Colorado River among the American States of the upper and lower basins, and specified that the waters assigned to Mexico should be taken from the excess which the average virgin volume of the river (22,000,000,000 cubic meters) (17,835,000 acre-feet) had over the volume distributed among the American States of the upper and lower basins (20,000,000,000 cubic meters) (16,213,600 acre-feet). Our assignment of 1,850,000,000 cubic meters (1,500,000 acre-feet) is included, then, within the 2,000,000,000 cubic meters (1,621,000 acre-feet) of the difference. The virgin waters of the Colorado River are of good quality. Besides this, even a superficial study of the treaty shows, from the introduction to the transitory articles with which it terminates, that it is inspired with the fact that "it is to the interests of both countries to take advantage of these waters in other uses and consumptions * * * in order to obtain its most complete and satisfactory utilization." This is a paragraph transcribed from the preface. In article 27 of the transitory articles it is clearly stated that the use to which these waters are to be put is that of irrigation. Therefore, in this treaty, as in any other of its kind, it is understood that the water must be of good quality. Mexico has the right to have the water that is assigned to it from the Colorado River proceed entirely from the virgin volume of the current, but knowing that this is physically impossible to obtain for any use of water downstream on any river fully utilized, as is the Colorado River, our country had no objection to receiving these waters the same as the other American users of the lower portion of the Colorado River, as long as they were of good quality for irrigation.

(b) The salinity of the return waters which may come in the Colorado River depends on the use that Arizona makes of the waters of the Colorado River that belong to it. If it constructs an irrigation project with a value of about $1,000,000,000 to carry the water to the center of Arizona, then a certain volume of return water with a high percentage of salinity might reach the bed of the Gila River, but even this volume could not reach the Colorado River as it would be absorbed, as happens at present, by the great dry bed of the Gila River which for some years has not brought a drop of water to the Colorado River. If Arizona employs these waters to irrigate its southwest corner, which would cost it at least the tenth part ($70,000,000), then the return waters would be of good quality. Whatever the project that it selected, it would not be totally developed for many years, probably at the end of the present century. The most pessimistic technical calculations show that even considering that Arizona would employ its water in its central region and that the return water with a high percentage of salinity would reach the Colorado River without being lost in the bed of the Gila River, these returns mixed with the rest of the assignment to our country of waters with very small percentage of salinity would give a mixture that our country would probably accept in accordance with what was said above relative to its undeniable right to receive waters of good quality.

3. It is objected that it is of no use to obtain water for Mexicali Valley because the lands of that valley are in the hands of foreigners.

Also in this case the reality is entirely opposite to that asseverated by the opponent.

4. That in a year of drought the treaty permits the volume guaranteed to Mexico to be reduced and that the treaty only promises to reduce the American volumes in an equal proportion, which would be very difficult to carry out in practice. A reading of the final paragraph of transitory article 10 shows that the objection is completely unjust since the case is entirely the contrary. The amount guaranteed to Mexico can only be reduced in cases of extreme drought and only if that extraordinary drought should bring about the reduction of all consumptions in the United States.

XIII. CONCLUSIONS

The international water treaty which has been brought up for consideration of the Mexican Senate is beneficial for our country for the following reasons:

1. Because in the case of the Colorado River it terminates the critical situation in which the 120,000 cultivated hectares (296,500 acres) in Mexicali Valley was found, a critical situation which existed since 1942 when operation of the All-American Canal was commenced. Under the treaty the net 200,000 economically cultivable hectares (494,200 acres) which exist on the Mexican side along both banks of the Colorado River may be cultivated.

2. It also ends the existing danger that through the construction of the Federal project No. 5, or Rincon project, all the usable surpluses which flow in the Rio Grande, proceeding from Mexico and the United States will be diverted for the exclusive use of irrigation of the American lands of the region of Brownsville, Tex., thus leaving in a precarious situation the Mexican lands which with great effort are being opened to cultivation in the zone of Matamoros, Tamaulipas. On the other hand, with the treaty, not only can the water of all the Mexican tributaries of the Rio Grande be used to their maximum, up to the cultivation with them of an area of 315,000 hectares (778,400 acres), but with our surpluses which flow in the Rio Grande, duly regulated by the international dams, it will be possible to irrigate 245,000 hectares (605,400 acres) of the fertile lands of the Mexican part of the delta of the Rio Grande, that is, the region of Matamoros, Tamaulipas.

The attached table shows synthetically the situation of our country with the treaty and without the treaty. This table, a summary of what has been said, shows that thanks to the treaty, Mexico will be able to irrigate 445,000 hectares (1,100,000 acres) more, and that this will be achieved without any harm to our country, that is, as we have demonstrated in this statement, without injuring the maximum possibilities of development of all and each one of our frontier States with water from the tributaries of the Rio Grande which pass through them.

The above considerations reach the conclusion that the treaty technically is beneficial for the country, and I express this in the name of the National Irrigation Commission and as a participant, in my character of executive chairman, in the technical aspects of its negotiation.

TABLE 1.—*Virgin regimen, actual and future consumptions, and future surpluses of the Rio Grande*

[Millions of cubic meters (see supplement to table 1)]

Source	Virgin flow	Consumption		Future surpluses	Percent
		Present	Future		
FROM MEXICO					
1. Conchos River	2,045	843	1,275	770	
2. Arroyo de las Vacas, San Diego, San Rodrigo, Escondito Rivers	418	106	128	290	
3. Salado River	925	562	562	363	
I. Total, 6 tributaries	3,388	1,511	1,965	1,423	
II. Alamo and San Juan Rivers	1,557	372	953	604	
III. 50 percent direct basin	867			867	
Total for Mexico	5,812	1,883	2,918	2,894	58

TABLE 1.—*Virgin regimen, actual and future consumption, and future surpluses of the Rio Grande*—Continued

[Millions of cubic meters (see supplement to table 1)]

Source	Virgin flow	Consumption		Future surpluses	Percent
		Present	Future		
FROM THE UNITED STATES					
I. Pecos, Devils, Goodenough Springs Rivers, Terlingua, Alamito, San Felipe, and Pinto Creeks	2,180	988	988	1,192	----------
II. 50 percent direct basin (including Fort Quitman)	867	(1)	----------	867	----------
Total for United States	3,047	(2)	988	2,059	42
Total for Rio Grande	8,859	----------	----------	4,953	100

Supplement to table 1

[Thousands of acre-feet]

	Virgin flow	Consumption		Future surpluses	Percent
		Present	Future		
1	1,657.8	683.4	1,033.6	624.2	----------
2	338.9	85.9	103.8	235.1	----------
3	749.9	445.6	455.6	294.3	----------
I	2,746.6	1,224.9	1,593.0	1,153.6	----------
II	1,262.2	301.6	772.6	489.6	----------
III	702.9	----------	----------	702.9	----------
Total for Mexico	4,711.7	1,526.5	2,365.6	2,346.1	58
I	1,767.3	801.0	801.0	966.3	----------
II	702.9	(1)	----------	702.9	----------
Total for United States	2,470.2	----------	801.0	1,699.2	42
Total for Rio Grande	7,181.9	----------	----------	4,015.3	100

[1] Without considering the present use of 1,419,000,000 cubic meters (1,150,000 acre-feet) in the American agricultural zone of Brownsville, Tex.

[2] The 265,000,000 cubic meters (215,000 acre-feet) which as an annual average pass by Fort Quitman and which are distributed equally between the 2 countries are not included in this table.

TABLE 2.—*Distribution of future surpluses in the Rio Grande in accordance with the treaty*

TO MEXICO

	Millions of cubic meters	(1,000 acre-feet)
(1) Two-thirds of the surpluses of the Conchos River, Arroyo de Las Vacas, San Diego, San Rodrigo, Escondido, and Salado Rivers	649	(769)
(2) One-half of the surpluses of the direct Mexican Basin	434	(352)
(3) One-half of the surpluses of the direct American Basin	433	(351)
(4) Total of the surpluses in the San Juan and Alamo Rivers	604	(490)
Total	2,420	(1,962)

TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

(1) One-third of the surpluses of the Conchos River, Arroyo de Las Vacas, San Diego, San Rodrigo, Escondido, and Salado Rivers	474	(384)
(2) Total of the surpluses from the Pecos, Devils, Goodenough Springs, Alamito Terlingua, San Felipe, and Pinto Rivers	1,192	(966)
(3) One-half of the surpluses from the direct Mexican Basin	433	(351)
(4) One-half of the surpluses from the direct American Basin	434	(352)
Total	2,533	(2,053)

SUMMARY

	Millions of cubic meters	Percent	1,000 acre-feet
To Mexico	2,420	49	(1,962)
To the United States	2,533	51	(2,053)
Total	4,953	100	(4,015)

TABLE 3.—*Maximum possibilities of irrigated areas with treaty and without it*

	With [without] [1] the treaty	Without [with] [1] the treaty	(Acres)
	Hectares	*Hectares*	
A. With the Colorado River	0	200,000	(494,200)
B. With the Rio Grande:			
(1) In the basin of the Mexican tributaries	315,000	315,000	(778,400)
(2) In the Mexican part of the delta of the Rio Grande (Reynose to Matamoros)	0	245,000	(605,400)
Total	315,000	760,000	(1,878,000)
Difference	----------	445,000	(1,100,000)

[1] The words "with" and "without" in the 2 headings are obvious transpositions.

The Voice of America Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1945

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State in Charge of Public Affairs, before the Herald Tribune forum, grand ballroom, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, Tuesday, October 30, 1945:

The Voice of America is a voice with 10,000 tongues. It is all that the people of other lands hear about us and all that they read about us. It is the American movies they see and the American GI's and tourists they meet.

I am glad we Americans speak with 10,000 voices. Some critics would call it a confusion of voices. But it is the democratic way of peoples speaking to peoples. The alternative way—the single voice—is the way of censorship and of ministries of propaganda.

My theme tonight is that the people of the United States, through their Government and their State Department, have a vital national interest in the Voice of America. Their national security may be at stake if this voice is inadequate or distorted—if it fails to represent us with reasonable fullness and fairness as we really are, our history and our culture, our faults and our fears, our hopes and our ambitions for our democratic processes and our free society.

Today, 38 short-wave radio transmitters, operating all over the world under the direction of our Government, are known to millions in Asia, Africa, and Europe by the name, the Voice of America. Here is an example of the new role of Government. The Voice of America radio programs supplement and help to clarify the message of America's 10,000 tongues. Further, they reach vast areas of the world which otherwise would be completely shut off from America.

There are people in Iceland, in China, Iran, the Argentine and the Balkans—millions of ordinary people all over the world who listen eagerly for America's voice. During the war these Voice of America broadcasts went out over the air every day in the year in 40 languages. Today, in the backwash of the war they go out in 18 languages. They give people in foreign lands straight, impartial news from America, news in their own languages, news untainted by special pleading or by propaganda.

The radio Voice of America was developed in war by the Government. Now before the American people and the Congress is the broad and inclusive question: "What role shall the Government play in America's voice abroad in peacetime?"

Is it enough, in the rapidly contracting world of today, for our people and our Government to be presented to the peoples of the world as a giant, completely equipped with battleships, superfortresses, and atomic bombs, but voiceless except for diplomatic exchanges and the erratic interplay of private communication?

There is one basis for judging the future information policy of the Government abroad upon which we can all agree.

Does an expanded peacetime role for Government help us to achieve national security? Is it worth while deliberately to explain ourselves to the rest of the world? Does this help give us willing and friendly allies, in times of crises as well as in peace? Is understanding also a force? Isn't it the kind of force we prefer? Suppose we had to choose between two investments in security—between a year's cost of the radio Voice of America and its rough equivalent, a year's cost of operating one battleship in a fleet of battleships?

These are new questions for America. They will be debated in the next few weeks and over the years to come. Battleships are the traditional symbols of our security. But to speak to the other peoples of the world about America—to speak through such new and miraculous channels as short-wave radio—to seek security through understanding rather than through force—that is a new role for our Government.

In the field of short-wave radio beamed abroad, we have not yet decided how best to operate or manage or control; we only

know that the Government must put up most of the money to underwrite the cost if a job is to be done.

The American people have deliberately chosen a policy of active participation in world affairs. As a people we are becoming aware of the danger inherent in that policy. We do not propose to forsake the policy, but we must realize that the danger is greater if America is misunderstood abroad. The next few years—perhaps the next few months—are crucial. The new United Nations Organization will be meeting its first tests. America will be trying to revive world trade on a sound basis. The time to build the kind of peace we want is now and in the years just ahead.

Yet the plain fact is that as we enter this crucial period America is neither fairly nor fully understood by the peoples of other nations.

America is a legendary country to most of the world. It has been a land of legend through most of its history. The legend has changed from time to time. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, America was the land of freedom; in the nineteenth century, during the great waves of immigration, it was also the land of opportunity.

The American legend today is a curious and contradictory mixture. A legend can hardly be otherwise.

We are known to be immensely strong. Yet Axis propagandists found ready belief for the story that good living had made us so weak and spineless we would not and could not fight.

We are acclaimed as generous and open-handed with billions to spend on lend-lease and rehabilitation—a veritable Uncle Santa Claus. At the same time we are called Uncle Shylock.

We believe in freedom of speech for all, yet sinister capitalists are said to control the means of communication.

We stand for free enterprise, but our critics abroad stress our great combines and monopolies.

The Metropolitan Opera House is the goal of all foreign opera stars, but we are said to have no music except swing.

We believe in due process of law, yet the world pictures the gangsters shooting it out on the streets of Chicago.

Now, I am not going to suggest that any role that the Government can play abroad will clarify this picture readily or quickly. Like education, of which it is a part, information is a slow, laborious business that works no miracles and produces no millenium of understanding. It can, however, help to correct mistaken ideas. It can make available the facts about our actions and our policies, as they develop out of our customs, our laws, our institutions, and our politics.

A government information service abroad to strengthen America's voice should, in major cities include a room or three or four rooms or a building · here the ordinary people of Amsterdam or Cairo or Chungking, for example, can go to find out about the United States. During the war we developed small United States libraries in many foreign cities. They were used by newspaper writers, school teachers, doctors, farmers, engineers, students, and people off the street. There is intense curiosity abroad about the United States. I am thinking of the long lines of anxious people who came to our American library of information in Melbourne on the day of President Roosevelt's death. They wanted to know what would happen to our Government. Would we have an immediate election? Who would succeed the President and how and why? Their concern was real and immediate. I am thinking of the foreign youngsters who stopped in at an American picture exhibit to ask why the boundaries of our States are so straight. I have in mind a doctor who stops in at the American library in Montevideo to search American medical journals for news of the latest treatment of infantile paralysis. It is a remarkable fact that the British Government's stationery office has printed and sold more copies of many American war documents than has our own Government Printing Office. An example is Target—Germany, the official report of the operations of our Eighth Air Force. British book shops sold several hundred thousand copies of this report.

A few weeks ago the veteran scholar and world traveler, Henry Seidel Canby, returned from Australia and New Zealand. He reported that our libraries there, I quote: "Have enabled the right people at the right time to learn for themselves, from books and not from propaganda, what America was, is, had, could offer, what we were thinking, and how we felt. They and all such institutions should be part of our permanent foreign policy," he said.

Far more important than the rooms, of course, are the books, periodicals and documents they house. Few of you can have any conception of what these mean, for example, to the liberated people whose only link with us for the past 5 years has been the radio Voice of America. Let me read a few lines from a letter that came to me from Athens just the other day. My correspondent is a stranger to me, Mr. Nicholas Chantiles. This is what he said: "I knew there was a whole treasure behind those library doors. Books and magazines full of that unrivaled American democratic spirit; books where the authors are free to express their ideas and beliefs whatever they may be." I confess I was moved by that letter.

In wartime we have discovered, too, the immense value of official American political documents to the newspapers, the scholars and opinion makers of other countries—documents which the commercial news services do not cable in full and which, therefore will be sent abroad only by the Government. Foreign editors ask for the complete texts of Presidential speeches, acts of Congress, reports such as General Marshall's on which to base their editorial comments and special articles.

Our Government documentary films have won appreciative audiences abroad. Just the other night I saw a small documentary that has gone overseas, about the jeep. It showed how American ingenuity produced for war a vehicle that has captured the fancy of the whole world. It was a simple but entertaining · film. Millions of people in other lands have been instructed by it. It was a piece of information about Americans.

Finally, I should like to tell you briefly what a United States information program should be in terms of people. The bone and marrow of any good program are, of course, the people who run it. There is no substitute for face-to-face relationships. We need only a few hundreds of Government information people abroad, directed on policy by our ambassadors and available to foreign editors and broadcasters and others. They should be real Americans in the sense that they know America. Having homesteaded in Montana as a boy, I submit to this New York audience that I am personally partial to those who have deep roots and varied experience in rural and western and southern America. With such knowledge of America, they can represent America more faithfully in foreign lands.

Perhaps even more important people over the long pull are those we systematically exchange with other countries—the students, professors, technicians, scientists, and others. Here in the United States, such visitors see us as we are and take that story home. They become our friends and remain our friends. Those American students and experts we send abroad to foreign universities and governments go as representatives of our traditions and culture.

These are some of the materials available to the State Department in its efforts to represent the American people in the development of America's voice overseas. Such efforts need not compete with our private businesses operating abroad. They should only supplement and facilitate normal commercial and private communications. They should operate chiefly in those areas where private agencies will not or cannot function profitably. Nor should we conduct vague, well-meaning good-will campaigns. Our information program should be modest, realistic, and candid. America's voice should be neither the big stick nor the supersalesman. The Government's role will represent only a fraction of the great volume of communication between ourselves and our friends abroad—a fraction but a highly important and indispensable fraction.

Ultimately, there are only two roads to national security. One is sheer physical power. The other is mutual understanding with the other countries of the world. We now need to follow both roads. But we must hope that we shall need to invest less of our resources in military power as we invest more of our thought and attention in the task of mutual understanding.

In an atomic age—understanding, not bombs, is the last, best hope of earth.

Preserve the American Form of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1945

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me before the Franklin County Republican Club, Chambersburg, Pa., November 2, 1945:

President Deihl, Congressman GROSS, and members of the Franklin County Republican Club, this evening I want to point out some very dangerous trends those in charge of our Government have been following and where they may lead to unless there is a change in the leadership of our Government.

I shall attempt, briefly, by comparison, to refute the arguments of those who are determined to remake America, those who, whether they know it or not, are advocating state socialism.

The foundation stone of the American Republic, generally referred to now as a democracy, was based on the freedom and dignity of man.

This great and successful superstructure of government arose from this foundation preserving for him the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness guaranteed to him under the Constitution of the United States, further protecting his rights and opportunities by the Bill of Rights and providing him the opportunity to establish representative government and courts of justice under the Constitution. It placed the conduct of his Government in the hands of him and the other citizens of our country and to protect his rights further, it prohibited the people from the enactment and enforcement of any laws contrary to the basic law of the Nation, the United States Constitution.

This Nation where the people have controlled their Government and where the greatest liberty has obtained and where the greatest progress in agriculture, industry,

science, and invention have developed has again returned to peacetime status after having saved the nations of the world for a second time from being conquered and oppressed by autocratic military governments.

The thing that worries many thinking people in America and the majority of the Members of Congress, is that today in view of our illustrious past as a Nation, there are those in this land who are raising a great hue and cry to remake America. Those who want to pattern it after governments in Europe which have stamped out freedom and liberty and the dignity of the common man. I do not want to alter or change our basic form of government. I am willing to improve this heritage of government if that be possible, but I do not want to trade it for a socialistic, communistic, fascist, or a totalitarian form of government.

For nearly 200 years governments in Europe have been trying to make socialism work. In every attempt there has followed in its wake poverty, the loss of liberty, jails crowded, the guillotine overworked, and ultimately nazism, communism, fascism, and world-wide wars. Our form of government during all this time, has given us happiness, peace, and contentment, liberty, an opportunity for growth and advancement, the elevation of our standards of living, and the protection of the dignity of the common man. Ours is the only government in the world that has approached in dealing with other nations and dealing among our own people, the Christian doctrine of the Golden Rule. So long as we maintain our form of government, "do unto others as ye would that they should do unto you," it will continue to be America's inspiration to the liberty-loving people of all the world.

THE POWER OF PROPAGANDA IS A THREAT TO THE NATION

The attacks against our present form of Government by those who hold alien ideas starts with the well-known use of propaganda. Irresponsible commentators through the columns of the daily newspapers and irresponsible radio commentators who can be hired for a price, for the past few years have lent themselves to the political ideology of the New Deal which has grown up in centralized government here in an attempt to control the thinking of the American people. In a subtle way, not content with regimenting and controlling the actions of the people, more important than that, they want to regiment the minds and the thinking of the people of America. This constant barrage by commentators in the press and over the air which has tried to destroy the confidence of the people in the Congress of the United States fits into the over-all general plan. They constantly try to mold your thinking on national and international questions.

Then comes the planners and the do-gooders. They hope to go here in America from planning to regimentation, to state socialism. State socialism is the twilight zone leading to fascism or communism. In fact, it is the threshold of communism, nazi-ism, or fascism. Germany and France tried it in real earnest after the French Revolution. Germany followed it under Karl Marx and up to Kaiser Wilhelm. It brought about World War I. The sad thing about it is that many well-intentioned people in the past have joined with the leaders of socialism in the hope of bettering their conditions, later to find out that as you begin to take power from the people to make socialism work you must take more power and more power and finally you must take all of the power from the people and place it in the hands of a dictator because as Lincoln said, "No government can live half free and half slave."

Many people in France, Germany, Russia, and Italy tried to turn back when they found they were on the wrong road, the road to destruction. When they finally saw that the power must be left in the hands of the people or given to a dictator.

It was too late. They were purged by the millions under the dictatorship of communism in Russia. Those who tried to turn back in Germany were murdered, driven into concentration camps where many of them starved to death during this war. The same rough and cruel treatment was the fate of those in Italy. Planning and socialism gave Europe communism in Russia, nazism in Germany, fascism in Italy. Liberty was completely wiped out in those three European governments. Hitler and Mussolini gave World War II to the people of the earth.

The United States Government, the one Golden Rule nation of the world, the Nation that has always defended the freedom, liberty, and dignity of the common man, this Nation that many glib-talking crackpots want to remake, threw its tremendous force and power back of its ideals into this war, defeating and leveling Germany, Japan, and Italy to lands of rubble and devastation; yet, there are those in America who cry out against our form of government and there are those in America who aid this alien-minded group in wanting to remake it. They are willing to start planning to regiment the people, to further establish centralized government, and bureaucracy, to travel down the road to serfdom, to socialism, and probably to communism or fascism in America.

We have had, during the war, and are having now, some socialistic controls. The Congress gave the authority for these controls in order to channel the effort of the people of America first into war production and into an all-out effort to win the war. The war has been won. Many controls have been lifted and more of them should be but the "planners" don't want to let loose.

Reconversion to peacetime production and peacetime jobs is the most important problem in America today. I want to charge that the maladministration, the regimentation, and control being exercised by the OPA is holding back reconversion in preventing the people from buying billions of dollars' worth of goods which they want and need by preventing the manufacturers and the retailers from making and distributing to the people these billions of dollars' worth of merchandise.

The policies of the OPA will keep millions of men from being employed—it is widening the gap between the goods the people want and the money available with which to buy them.

Money is piling up into the hands of the people faster than the goods are being manufactured thus widening the inflationary gap. There are a little less than 3,000,000 small business firms in America employing less than 100 persons each. These small business firms employ 45 percent of all the wage earners in the Nation in peacetime. It is they who must go ahead now to produce and retail goods and create jobs for former war workers and returning veterans.

OPA regulations are slowing down nearly all business recovery and also employment. They allow the manufacturer, in some instances, to raise the price of the manufactured article because it costs him more in wages and other overhead to do business. Then they say to the jobber, the wholesaler, and the retailer, even though these goods are costing you more from the manufacturer you cannot sell them at a higher price than you were selling the same type of goods in 1942. This is forcing little business concerns out of business all over the Nation and this policy prevents the retailer from hiring more help, hence contributes to unemployment.

Chester Bowles has predicted we will probably have 8,000,000 people unemployed during 1946 If this happens no one will have contributed so much to this unnecessary status as will have Mr. Bowles.

To show you how difficult it is for a centralized or socialized government to operate business, and how it holds back production and employment let me give you a few illustrations as to how the OPA operates.

I can only give you two or three because of the lack of time. These are not exceptions to the rule but are a fair sample of how the whole OPA set-up is being operated.

A crippled man over in Ohio, in an effort to make a living for himself, made a weeding tool which he could make at his home and sell for $2.50. He asked the OPA to allow him to increase the price to $2.85. The OPA compelled him to make out many papers and after many months waiting they told him if he did not sell over $55 worth of these weeding forks per month he could sell them for $2.85. In the meantime, under their rule, any new concern could come in and make the same tool and the retail price would not be based on the price of the old operator. In other words, the new concern would have no historical background which the OPA talks so much about.

In this case, a new man began to make the same type of tool that was being made by the old cripple in Ohio who was refused the right to sell at $2.85. The new dealer was promptly given the right to sell the tool at $3.50. What do you think of that? Is that holding prices down to the consumer?

A big concern in New York, whose name is synonymous with underwear, a concern turning out millions of dollars worth of goods and employing thousands of men, was selling a pair of shorts at the OPA ceiling of 60 cents. They wanted to get a slight raise in the wholesale price. They were denied. A new concern came into the market with a pair of men's shorts, not quite as good in quality as the 60-cent pair, and they were promptly given a ceiling price of $1.35. Now, the New York manufacturer who was not allowed a raise told a buyer who happens to be one of the Congressmen from California who is in the retail business in that State; that while they had many thousand pairs of these shorts they cannot ship them to merchants throughout America because they cannot comply with the map plan. You know, the OPA has maps telling people where they can sell and where they can't. Furthermore, that the OPA had ruled that they could not sell the 60-cent shorts at all unless they sold some shorts at 39 cents to balance against the 60-cent shorts. The firm could not buy the material to make the 39-cent shorts which would give them the right under Chester Bowles to sell some 60-cent shorts. In other words, here is a big concern with a hundred thousand dollars worth of men's shorts who can't sell them and, of course, if they can't be sold the people will have to go without them even though winter is approaching and, of course, laboring men will not be employed to make more new ones. In this case the OPA seems to be hitting below the belt.

Here is an illustration which will prove to the housewife that the actions of the OPA are raising the price of merchandise in many instances rather than holding it down.

A manufacturer of an old-established electrical iron selling at $2.75 retail, asked that he be allowed to raise the price 20 cents. The request was promptly denied. In the meantime a new manufacturer produced an iron, not nearly as good as the old reliable $2.75 iron, and the new manufacturer was promptly allowed a ceiling price of $5.50 per iron. In other words, the housewife cannot buy the better iron at $2.95 but has to take an inferior iron at $5.50.

Again, this is not an exception, it is more nearly the regular rule of OPA.

This illustration should be of interest to wool growers, textile manufacturers who employ more people than any one business in the United States and to the people who want underwear up here in cold Pennsylvania where winter is well on its way.

Mr. Chaney, of the Underwear Institute, recently pointed out that today the only woolen underwear you can buy in the United States is coming in from a country in South America. If the underwear manufacturers of the United States were permitted by the OPA to operate, he says, a better article could be sold to our people for one-half the price. This means less American wool, less textile men employed, less clothing for the people, widening the inflationary gap and encouraging inflation rather than helping to "hold the line."

The OPA has contributed more than any one other organization in America to undermining the health of the merchants. While I have no statistics they have probably driven more of them insane than all of the other troubles they have. The OPA has contributed to the paper shortage by using hundreds of thousands of tons of paper because of their long regulations and directives.

One manufacturer testified before the Smith committee in Congress that they had to rent a complete new building in order to have a place to store their OPA files.

Here is one that bounced the operator out of the frying pan into the fire. An energetic businessman had developed an improved and up-to-date frying pan. He had a cover on it to which was attached a little thermometer and extra vent for escape of steam. He rented a building, arranged for his raw material, hired his employees to start the business. So sure was he of success that he went to the Government and through one of its agencies was loaned $150,000. He was ready to start in a big way. It was a fine illustration of the old American spirit willing to risk what he had and borrow more, bringing venture capital in for the expansion of business and the employment of American workmen. The OPA approved his sale price of $1.59. He was sure of a profit and braced himself for a rapid take-off. He started going great guns. The customers liked his product, the factory was humming, his men were employed but a month or two later the control arm, the regimentation arm of OPA came down on him with such force that it staggered him in amazement. A former soda-counter jerker who had never made a success in anything had attached himself to the office of the OPA and catapulted himself up the ladder in a meteoric rise to the position of an economic analyst at $6,500 a year. This economic analyst, whose name I withhold, operating under the power of the OPA colossus, decided that he could not longer make the frying pan. He decided in his wisdom that the thermometer gadget was not necessary, that the steam escape gadget was superfluous because the operator of said pan could tilt the lid a little to let the steam off. He cut the price accordingly and put the man out of business.

The factory shut down, the men were laid off, the ambitious owner and his friends who joined with him in the experiment lost their money and, presumably, the Government will lose its money. Yes, the OPA "held the line" against production.

I could go on for an hour with such illustrations but time will not permit. The facts are that the OPA should be wiped off the statute books at once and immediately.

The strange thing about it is that our new President, in whom the people a few months ago had so much faith, is backing the OPA and Chester Bowles with greater enthusiasm than did the late President Roosevelt.

The Congress would stop this foolishness and in fact the Republican Members of Congress have tried to stop it but they have been voted down in almost every attempt through the power of the Administration coming down on its Members in both the Senate and the House demanding every time that OPA be extended without any amendments which would cure some of its many abuses. I am happy to report that your Congressman Goss voted to discontinue the OPA.

Now let me swing into a wider field of operation on price control and governmental control from the top.

The United States is the second largest wool-producing Nation in the world. Normally, our production is 400,000,000 pounds per year and our consumption has run about 600,000,000 pounds per year. During the war period we have consumed over 1,000,000,000 pounds per year. Notwithstanding this fact we have used mostly foreign wool and not disposed of our domestic production. Through the Commodity Credit Corporation purchasing all of the wool in our country we find that we now have overhanging the wool market 530,000,000 pounds of domestic wool in storage and with the June clip of next year which the Government will buy, we will have on hand nearly a billion pounds of wool.

The United States Tariff Commission, in a report of last January, stated, due to the increased costs of the production of wool, that at the Commodity Credit price of 40 cents per pound paid the wool growers by the Government, the producers of wool were losing 10 cents per pound. These figures may surprise some of you who are raising sheep for profit. I must confess it surprised me because on my farm I have been trying to make a profit on sheep.

You will remember we had a meat shortage last summer and that too was caused by the unwise policy of the OPA. Here is how they contributed to a shortage of mutton. The prices they set on wool and mutton were so low that the sheep growers have been liquidating since 1943, as the following figures will show. On January 1, 1943, we had on hand 45,000,000 sheep. On January 1, 1944, it dropped to 41,000,000 and it is estimated by Government statistics that today we have only 38,000,000 head of sheep in this country, which is the lowest number of sheep in America in 50 years notwithstanding our population has increased during that time by over 40,000,000 people.

The United Kingdom produces in New Zealand 350,000,000 pounds of wool a year. South Africa produces 250,000,000 pounds. Australia produces over a billion pounds of wool a year. Now, Great Britain has entered into an agreement with these dominion countries of hers to buy all of their output for a period of 13 years. Great Britain will control its market and ship the most of it into the United States under our lowered reciprocal tariff agreements to the dismay and destruction of the sheep and wool producers of America. The American producers will not be competing against a world price but against a control price set by Great Britain and, of course, she will set the price on wool low enough to flood the American market.

Let me give you a potent illustration of the cooperation the OPA is giving Britain today on the importation of wool fabrics.

You may not know it but under the rules of the OPA it is a fact that the big textile mills employing more men and women than any other one business in America are permitted to make only a small amount of what is known as the better woolen fabrics. For instance, the Botany Woolen Mills of New Jersey, making woolen fabrics that would provide fine suits for men for $50 per suit, are compelled to make the cheaper grades and only a small percentage of the better woolens. Now, on these imported woolens from England which are beginning to come into American markets in large volume, the OPA does not set any ceiling price, with the result that men's English-made woolen overcoats are being advertised in New York at $75 a garment whereas if the Botany Woolen Mills were allowed to use our best American wool and manufactured these same overcoats they could sell them to the American public for $55 a garment. What do you think of that?

These are not idle statements, they are facts beyond contradiction. The regulations of the OPA are forcing the people of America to pay $20 to $25 more for a suit or overcoat for English garments whereas if the American manufacturers were allowed to make these garments the American purchaser could save $20 to $25 on the price of the garment. Yet, the OPA shouts, "Hold the line."

Under the present administration which believes in free trade, which believes in throwing the American markets open to the markets of the world and which is silly enough to hope that we can maintain our standard of living, is in fact preventing reconversion, preventing millions of American workmen from having a job, is increasing the dangers of inflation and is dragging down the American standards of living.

The Congress and the administration will have to get rid of OPA and in my judgment under the present world condition will have to set a quota on how much wool can come into the American markets regardless of tariffs, and that quota should be set low enough that we can again place the sheep and wool grower in a position where he can make a profit on his production of mutton and wool. Unless this is done there will be less sheep and less wool grown in this country. Price control, regimentation, lower tariffs, all supported by this administration, unless corrected will bring us ultimately into a depression in this country which may wreck us financially and will probably result in a loss of our representative form of government.

A few months ago the people had hopes that President Truman would turn his party back and away from the road toward State socialism and centralized government. Their hopes were proven unfounded when he sent his message to Congress, which was an endorsement of, and an identification of, the New Deal policies of his late predecessor. He advocated and endorsed the enactment of the most radical and socialistic legislation ever offered to United States Congress, rather than a return to free enterprise, less centralization, and control in government and to a policy of real economy. He is a stranger to economy.

The recommendations carried in his message, if enacted into law, would launch out on a program of the greatest peacetime deficit spending in the history of our country.

With a debt approaching $275,000,000,000, the people are becoming alarmed. They are beginning to realize that adding to this debt rather than paying it off is endangering the bonds they hold, the property they own, and the life insurance they have carried for later protection in life. They are beginning to understand that the leaders of the New Deal have been promoters and spenders. They have been the wasters of the people's money to perpetuate themselves in power politically.

The people will decide to return to the Republican Party to save them economically and financially. They remember that the Republican Party took over at the end of the First World War when the country was $36,000,000,000 in debt. It reduced taxes right and left, encouraged free enterprises in the expansion of business, prevented a depression following the war and by the encouragement of business took in so much money in taxes they were able to balance the Budget each year and retire the national debt by $1,000,000,000 a year for 10 successive years.

That is the type of government the American people want and must have to save this country. They know now that President Truman and those in charge of the Government cannot be reelected if they stop the waste of the people's money, because the Communist and radical labor groups which they must have to continue in power will

not support them if they cut off special legislation and special privileges to Sidney Hillman and the PAC and to the radical groups in labor along with the two communistic leaders, as William Z. Foster and Earl Browder.

The people are beginning to realize that we must have a government in the future that will make certain the interest of the American people is taken care of first.

They want such rigid economy practiced in Government and such a tax program as will not only balance the Budget in the future but that will set aside a reserve each year for the retirement of the national debt. This can be done if 2,000,000 bureaucrats, who are leeches on the taxpayers, are taken off of the pay rolls and if every possible economy is practiced in government.

They want an honest, courageous Executive leadership that will quit playing one pressure group against another for political purposes, which has been done and is being perpetuated under the present administration.

They want a leadership that will establish mediation machinery which will help to decide disputes between capital and labor with economic intelligence in the interest not only of the disputants but also in the interest of the general public welfare of the Nation. This can be done by a courageous Executive and Congress which will forget politics in the framing of such legislation.

The present administration has given us 14 years of the New Deal in power; 14 years of centralization and socialization of our Government; 14 years of waste, extravagance, expense; 14 years of government by boards, bureaus, and the playing of one group of citizens against the other for political purposes; 14 years of political partnership with the Communist Party.

There is only one instrumentality to which the people of America can turn to reverse such dangerous trends in government, and that is the Republican Party. This party enacted the Budget Act and cleaned up the mess after the First World War, as I have previously shown. It can and will do it again if we can hold out until 1948. The people will put the welfare and the destiny of this country into the hands of the Republican Party when they have that opportunity at the next national election.

Col. Howard A. Rusk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 7, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, Col. Howard A. Rusk, assigned to duty with the air surgeon, Medical Corps of the Army, has just been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal.

Colonel Rusk, a young man, was one of the leading physicians and diagnosticians in St. Louis at the time he voluntarily entered the Army. He was immediately assigned to Jefferson Barracks, which adjoins St. Louis, where the air surgeon had a hospital and convalescent center.

In order to get acquainted with his duties as well as his patients, Colonel Rusk made a tour of the hospital. In the second room where he visited, the patient, in reply to his question as to how he was getting along, said:

No place in the world could I get better treatment. There is no complaint whatsoever from my standpoint, but I wish I could find a way to occupy my mind while I am required to remain in bed. I can tell you how many cracks there are in the ceiling and how many nails in the ceiling. How much better it would be if I had something to do.

Then and there was born Colonel Rusk's program of rehabilitation. He inaugurated a plan that regardless of the disability the patient would have something to do. When the chief air surgeon on an inspection tour visited Jefferson Barracks, Colonel Rusk told him of the program he had inaugurated. The air surgeon was so impressed that he immediately ordered Colonel Rusk to Washington and made him the Chief of the Convalescent and Rehabilitation Branch of his office. Colonel Rusk visited every Air Corps hospital and convalescent center in the country and his program was installed at each. For this he received the Distinguished Service Medal.

Mr. Speaker, I am quoting the citation for the Distinguished Service Medal issued by the War Department. It follows:

Col. Howard A. Rusk, Medical Corps, O166916, from March 1943 to October 1945, bore the heavy responsibilities of Chief of the Convalescent and Rehabilitation Branch, Professional Services Division, and Chief of the Convalescent Service Division, Office of the Air Surgeon.

Given the difficult assignment of pioneering the organization of a convalescent services program in each Army Air Forces hospital, he instituted procedures for physical reconditioning and educational training which utilized previously wasted convalescent time.

The results of this far-reaching program were extraordinarily successful. Hospital readmissions dwindled, the period of convalescence was shortened, sick leaves were reduced, the military and general knowledge and skills of the patients were increased, and tremendous improvement of morale in the hospitalized men was noted.

The outgrowth of Colonel Rusk's program was the Air Forces plan for the rehabilitation and convalescent care for returning overseas casualties. Through great vision, superior organizational ability, and wide experience gained in the practical application of his theories, Colonel Rusk accomplished a task which benefited thousands of soldiers and contributed in important measure to the success of the Army Air Forces' vast medical program.

Colonel Rusk has just been discharged from the Army. Rather than take his wife and children back to St. Louis and resume his private practice, he is so interested in the program now that he has accepted an assignment with a private organization with headquarters in New York that will assist private institutions to install a rehabilitation branch in all hospitals and convalescent homes.

I happen to have a personal knowledge of the work of Colonel Rusk and I can say without fear of contradiction that the rehabilitation program he arranged for Air Corps patients is the most outstanding of any in the Army or Navy. He has served his country well and deserves the recognition that has been accorded him.

High-Point GI's Still Sweat It Out in Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 7, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two letters that I have received from men in the armed forces now serving in the Pacific theater of operations regarding demobilization:

MACHINATO, OKINAWA, *November 1, 1945.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PRICE: Have your letter of October; thank you. Here it is November. Yes; I'm still in the clutches of the Army and on Okinawa Island. Looks as if it will take 2 months or more before they get us 60-69 pointers processed and on transports headed State-side.

Suppose you have heard or read of Brig. Gen. Robert Berry, Assistant Personnel Chief, assertion that the points could be lowered to 50 by December 1. Wonder if it would interest him or you to know that on this island hundreds of 35-year-olds and thousands of 70 to 85 pointers are over here not even processed, and in their outfits sweating it out.

My information is first hand, for our company's project is the rebuilding of the Okinawa personnel center (leveled by the typhoon) and we have access to true lists and records.

The War Department and its demobilization program is certainly getting its share of unkind words spoken about it. Of course, General Berry's talk goes over big with the folks back home who aren't in the know.

It's entirely two different set-ups to have the "brains" in Washington, D. C., issue orders, then expect the officers to put the order in fast and efficient, for the majority of the big brass are rolling in more money, and having a better time, and life of ease than as civilians, and are in no great hurry to see the men go out from under their command. Any time you want verifications of my statements, or endorsements by many others in this organization as evidence, I would be more than glad to present same.

Very truly yours,

A GI CORPORAL.

MANILA, P. I., *October 24, 1945.*

DEAR SIR: Just a few lines from a disgusted soldier in the Pacific.

We certainly have been looking forward to seeing some action on returning the men from the Pacific. All we hear is a lot of figures which in a few weeks are changed to a somewhat lower figure.

At the present no man with less than 90 points will be accepted at the disposition center. That's a far cry from the 70 points which is supposed to be the critical score for October. If the higher point men are still kept here how can fellows like myself with 66 points expect to get home before Christmas of 1946.

Yes, we volunteered once back in 1940, but never again will the veterans with 4 and 5 years' service sign again. It will take a lot more than a $50-per-year bonus for enlisting. No son of mine will ever enlist in the service if I have anything to do about it, and I've talked to thousands of men who feel the same.

Yes, the men from the Pacific are coming back with a very bad taste that won't be easily forgotten. Unless something is done to clean this mess up I can certainly tell you men who are now the heads of the Gov-

ernment that you will have quite a fight on your hands the next time you run for office. This is the thought in many a man's mind down here.

It won't be necessary to send me one of the mimeographed specials that Government officials are using. We want action and an ex-servicemen like yourself should be out in the lead fighting. All we want is action and no fancy excuses.

Thousands of troops were redeployed here from the ETO and there certainly wasn't any bottleneck in the shipping. The boat we traveled on carried 4,300 men and officers of the Army besides the ship's crew. This same ship returned to the States a couple of weeks later with only 3,500 men and officers and civilians. Maybe the reason for the smaller amount going to the States was due to the fact that they carried a general back. There is a lot of difference between the distance from Manila to Marseilles and the distance from Frisco to Manila.

All we ask for is a little action, and I would like to see you leading the fight for that.

A VERY DISGUSTED SERGEANT.

Plantation Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 7, 1945

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I feel sure that you will concur with me when I rise with particular pride to call your attention, and that of my colleagues, to a book which has just been issued.

The volume is Plantation Parade, by a native of Louisiana and a former fellow worker of mine, Harnett T. Kane, of New Orleans. Mr. Kane, in a few brief years, has risen to a widely acclaimed place as one of the most important of the new American writers. His field is the South, which I represent in this House, and few men of this or any other day have received such general praise for his magnificent presentation of this region of America.

Mr. Kane is the author of three other national best sellers. Four years ago he wrote his first book, Louisiana Hayride, dealing in pungent and exciting fashion with Louisiana politics. This book broke all Louisiana book records, and won a place on the national best-seller lists. Shortly afterward came his superb book The Bayous of Louisiana, in an entirely different vein, a rich and warmly lovable volume about the unique Acadian people of the water-covered lower Louisiana. The Bayous of Louisiana exceeded Louisiana Hayride in public and critical acclaim. Last year Mr. Kane gave us yet another great book Deep Delta Country, dealing with the strange and beautiful land at the mouth of the Mississippi River. Like the one before it, it exceeded its predecessor in wide popularity.

This week brought the national publication of Mr. Kane's Plantation Parade; and this book has outstripped all of Mr. Kane's others. It has gone into several printings, made the national best-seller lists, and has broken every Louisiana book total, topping each of Mr. Kane's preceding volumes. Here is a striking instance of the fact that an American book cannot only be a richly, beautifully written one, but also win the general public applause. This, as I need hardly remind you, does not always happen.

Plantation Parade is a book that I call to your attention for a particular reason. It represents a new, novel approach to its subject. It is a superbly handled picturization of the days of the great cotton and sugar plantations of Louisiana. But it is not a gushy, moonlight and magnolia presentation of the type which has long afflicted the South. Mr. Kane, a man with a sharp sense of social values and of economic interests, does not moon and moan over the so-called wonders of the forgotten past. You have all heard the story of the colored mammy who told a northern visitor who admired the Louisiana moon, "Honey, the moon is sure fine tonight; but you should have seen it befo' de wah!"

Mr. Kane does not fall prey to such sirupy oversentimentality. Plantation Parade is, instead, a brilliant reenactment of the human life of the plantations. Mr. Kane offers the people and the place as they were—the truth that is often so much more strange and fascinating than the false and made up. Mr. Kane has steeped himself in his subject, investigating old records, checking court documents, interviewing survivors of the day, finding family diaries. He takes up in turn each of the white-pillared establishments of the State and tells their histories straight, from their beginnings to their present day, their triumphs and joys and tragedies. Its scenes are the Mississipi River, False River, the Opelousas region; Bayous Plaquemine, Teche, and Lafouche; Cane River, Baton Rouge, Donaldsonville, the Feliciana country; and other parts of Louisiana—a panorama of the State.

The result is a fabulously entertaining study. All of us, southerners and northerners alike, realize that the economy of that earlier day was based on a false and shifting base—the social injustice of human bondage, the enslavement of one group of men by another. Such enslavement is contrary to the teachings of all of our religions; and today we are all the better off because it has ended. A sounder economy, as Mr. Kane points out, is taking its place. In lieu of one man with an unchecked command over thousands of acres and thousands of men, the land has been broken up into truck gardens or other units. Crop diversification—so badly needed in the South—has been introduced; cattle and hogs, sweetpotatoes, and other crops have taken the place of the single staple crops. An interesting social contrast is offered, too, in the rise of the oil industry on the scene of the once great plantations.

But the life of those days had a certain gusto, a genuine merriment, a sense of identification with the place. The plantation day had its charms; and these, too, Mr. Kane realizes, while keeping them in their proper place. Few writers have ever given so entertaining, so finely readable account of this day. And wisely he stresses the fact that the plantation era in Louisiana, this plantation parade, gave America some of its finest architecture. In this parade of the castles was an indigenous building, fitted perfectly to the demand of its scene, West Indian-type residences and Greek, revival homes with wide galleries, great windows and doors to admit every breath of wind, elevation to catch the passing breezes. We have begun to lose the fine principles of architecture which this early day fostered.

As Mr. Kane wittily puts it, these buildings were put up to "provide a maximum of comfort with a minimum of perspiration." For any Members who wish to see some of the most magnificent examples of home construction in America, I recommend a visit to Mr. Kane's plantation country, to see the lines of these buildings.

Plantation Parade is a book that could have been written only by a Louisianian with a deep sympathy and understanding of his place and people. I am proud to have worked on the New Orleans newspapers at the time that Harnett T. Kane did. Mr. Kane for 17 years was a star journalist, a correspondent and staff writer on the New Orleans Item, who won a reputation throughout the South for his fine writings. For a time, to, he taught at Loyola University. In recent years he has given his full time to his book and magazine writings. He is known to the readers of Collier's Magazine, Reader's Digest, Saturday Review of Literature, and American Mercury.

It is not often that we have opportunity to learn so much, while being so well entertained, as in the case of this book.

Mr. Kane tells in various chapters of the Louis XIV of Louisiana, who set up his American gardens of Versailles on the Mississippi; the Creole father who made sure his daughters married properly by picking out the young men himself and asking each, in turn, "Will you be my son-in law?"; and the 13-year-old Louisiana bride who received a doll for a wedding present, and found it stuffed with jewels.

Other rich characters in Mr. Kane's plantation tapestry are the Prince from Naples who established a plantation here, and astounded the neighbors with his odd liking for baked owls and stuffed snakes; and the Spanish beauty who strode her acres like a man, playing cards for plantations, and, once, shooting off the head of a man who threatened to rob her mansion. Still another is the gay Parisian who asked his 15-year-old wife to run the plantation while he had his slaves row him over the bayous in a brightly painted boat, strumming love songs all day long. They lived happily together all of their lives. In Plantation Parade, Mr. Kane weaves a story of the old South, with personages ranging from Spanish dons to Jefferson Davis, from pirates to revered patriarchs.

With his new work, Harnett T. Kane further cements his place as a leading American writer. The Times Picayune called Plantation Parade "not only Harnett Kane's best, but also one of the most brilliantly readable books to come out of the South in many years, with superb flavor, zest, chuckling humor, and beauty

bordering the poetic. It realizes magnificently the possibilities of a magnificent subject." The New Orleans States called it "absorbing reason" and used the words "shrewd, skillful, and fascinating." The New Orleans Item declared that Mr. Kane reveled pleasurably in Plantation Parade, writing with a gusto well nigh irresistible.

Office of Price Administration Hinders Reconversion to Peacetime Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 7, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of things which hinder a return from wartime economy to a peacetime economy. I say "things" because in my opinion that is just about the right designation of the Office of Price Administration. It falls far short of being even an excuse for a going Government agency. We need price controls, but misfortune has come to the American people every time the Office of Price Administration has mixed into things. During the war, it followed the doctrine of scarcity and refused to permit food producers to make a profit on livestock or other food products. As a result, people quit producing food and everybody knows that you could not get meat and other foods on account of this wrong policy.

Now that the war is over the Office of Price Administration persists in making one mistake after another. One of our colleagues chanced to remark the other day that the greatest factor and obstacle in getting a return to peacetime production of almost everything was the OPA. He pointed out that OPA refused to permit a price ceiling, so that goods could be manufactured at a profit. As a result industry has no incentive to go ahead. Neither has small business. So they just simply are not producing. This means unemployment and the people who are going to be looking for jobs next year may just as well make up their minds now that OPA is doing and will continue to do everything it can to prevent any new industry, which means lack of jobs and unemployment, and to cripple existing business and industry. That also means lack of jobs and unemployment. Of course, this OPA outfit will claim that it is a friend of the workingmen, but the facts are that it is his worst enemy, and when we have breadlines, we can charge a good long part of the procession up to OPA and its false economy ideas.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE HEARING

I call to the attention of the House of Representatives a very important hearing that will start tomorrow morning and which will be conducted by the Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives. I expect to be present at that hearing and present the views of automobile and truck dealers in northern Minnesota. Many of them have either wired or written me requesting this procedure.

This situation is brought about by a notice that OPA officials served on the Automobile Dealers' Industry Advisory Committee on October 31. We all know that the manufacturers of automobiles want to increase the selling price. I do not question that right. But I do question the wisdom of OPA officials' statement to the Advisory Committee to the effect that small business dealers throughout the country would have to absorb that increase in price which the automobile manufacturers were going to charge the small dealers throughout the country who handle the retail end of the selling of automobiles and trucks. As I understand OPA officials' plan, the amount of discount to which the dealers were entitled, when they paid the manufacturer for the automobiles would be reduced to the extent of the increased price of the automobiles. This is just a simple way of saying that the dealers' profits on the retail sale of automobiles would be diminished to that extent. That is a fine bit of demagoguery to hand out to the purchasers of automobiles, because OPA will tell the purchaser that the price of automobiles and trucks to the public has not increased.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE RESTS ON PROFIT

This proposed policy of OPA officials runs directly contrary to the fundamental principle that private enterprise is based on, the making of a profit. It is no crime in this country to engage in business with the hope of being paid for your services and your time. In the language of the street, this is what is known as making a little money. That is why people engage in a business enterprise and hire people to work for them and create pay rolls and create jobs.

It doesn't make sense to say that dealing in automobiles has to depend on love or hot air or some other intangible product of OPA imagination in order to make a living. If the dealer in automobiles and trucks cannot sell that merchandise at a profit, he will not have any money to pay rental for the store building he occupies, or to pay automobile salesmen, or to pay his taxes, or to pay the grocery bills at the end of the month in order that his family can live and eat. I am sure that the OPA never heard of this kind of a thing which is popularly designated as the American system of private enterprise.

NATIONAL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSOCIATION PROTEST ACTION OF OPA

Naturally the National Automobile Dealers Association is opposed to the OPA program. So are the various people in my district who are engaged in the retail business of selling automobiles and trucks. I have a telegram from Art. L. Mattson, president, Automobile and Truck Dealers Association of Virginia, Minn., in which he says in part:

Any tampering with traditional discount would seriously jeopardize our future existence as dealers. By reason the public and our factories for many years past have set standards of service expected, making it impossible to do business on a smaller discount. If OPA imposes impossible cut in discount, it will result in complete break-down in automobile and truck transportation.

I have numerous other telegrams to the same effect and it would make the record entirely too long to set forth those different telegrams at this point. However, they are available in my office for examination by the Small Business Committee if it so desires.

Demobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 7, 1945

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Helena, Mont.:

Congressman WESLEY D'EWART.

GENTLEMEN: Will you please explain to me why the Montana Representatives in Congress are making no effort in any way whatsoever to bring the Montana boys still overseas back home now?

I have two sons who have been overseas since last March, one in Okinawa and one in Burma; they were both forced to leave college to go into the service, both are extremely anxious to get back home, as I am, and back into school, as they have every right to do. It certainly is much more important for a young man to get back to school and finish his education than it is for him to be discharged from the service in order to come back and play football for his school. I refer to the football player from Georgia, whom the Senator from Georgia was able to have discharged so he could come back and play.

Not only are these boys being kept overseas unnecessarily but the conditions under which they are living, the food which they are getting, particularly in Okinawa, are worse now than they ever were during the war. My son in Okinawa writes me as follows:

"We get very little mail, we hear how easy it is for the fellows in the States to get discharges on low-point scores when we can't even get to the States, we hear about the strikes, the 81,000 unemployed veterans, we don't get decent food. * * * We feel that the people at home don't give a damn about us, that we are forgotten while you people no longer have wartime restrictions placed on your pleasures or rights. It was fine for the good old United States of America to ship us out here when we were needed—now that you have no more use for us leave us out here."

How would you men enjoy going through one typhoon after another, especially one like the last horrible typhoon which hit Okinawa in early October, in which many of our boys were seriously injured, some losing their lives, and all of them losing everything they had? It is nothing short of criminal for the Government, and Congress in particular, to keep our sons over there now that the war is over. Why aren't any of you doing your part and fighting to have Congress declare the war over, and demanding that our boys be brought back? I want my sons home and back in school, they want the same thing, and are entitled to it.

How dare you men sit back in Washington figuring out ways and means to increase your salaries 100 percent, saying the work you are doing for your constituents justifies the increase, when you are not doing one thing to get our boys back home, which is more

important to your constituents than anything else could possibly be? And no doubt in the face of your absolute indifference toward this one real important matter, you will all have nerve enough to come back and ask the people of Montana to return you to office. Employers have discharged employees for far less indifference to the job they were hired to do than you gentlemen are displaying toward your job, and I am very sure that the people, your employers, will do as much when you ask to be reemployed as their Representatives in Congress unless you do something, and at once, to correct the situation and bring our sons back home immediately

I might add that I do not care for the explanation, "there aren't enough ships to bring them back any quicker." There were plenty of ships to get them over there; let's not forget that. Also, if there is a shortage, which I doubt, why should 47 ships be tied up in the harbors of this country for a Navy Day celebration, which meant nothing whatever to the boys overseas, and the same to the parents of those boys. If such celebrations are going to delay the return of our sons, those celebrations should be dispensed with until these men are all home. The tying up of these ships not only delayed the bringing back of our sons, but has resulted in their not even getting mail from home or decent food to eat.

Do any of you have any explanation for your attitude in regard to these matters; if so, what is it?

Very truly yours,

(Mrs.) VIRGINIA TAYLOR.

What the St. Lawrence Seaway Project Means to Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a radio address by Harry C. Brockel, municipal port director, city of Milwaukee, from radio station WHA, Madison, Wis., and affiliated stations, Tuesday, October 23, 1945:

The St. Lawrence seaway is again in the news. President Truman has recommended the project to Congress for immediate action. Ten distinguished Senators of three political parties, including Senator LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, have presented a joint resolution to carry out the provisions of our long-standing agreement with Canada for development of this great waterway. Congressman SABATH, the dean of the House of Representatives, has presented a similar resolution in the House. President Truman's unqualified support of the project, and its distinguished congressional sponsors, representing all major political parties, indicate that conditions are now more favorable to adoption of the project than in the past.

The State Department has given the St. Lawrence project first place in its international program, to demonstrate to the world that nations living side by side can peacefully develop projects whose benefits transcend international boundary lines. The State Department is convinced that the St. Lawrence project will prove to the world that America is determined to cement international relationships, and to build peace on a sound foundation by expanding trade and commerce between nations.

The St. Lawrence seaway has two great economic justifications—the justifications of low-cost water transportation, and of low-cost hydroelectric power development. I will touch briefly upon the power development features of the project. The power to be generated will be distributed to sections of Canada, New York, and New England, which are badly in need of it. The St. Lawrence River is the gretest undeveloped source of hydroelectric power in North America. Two million two hundred thousand horsepower of electrical energy are constantly running unused into the Atlantic because of our past failure to harness this tremendous energy.

Our national consumption of electrical energy has increased from 14,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours in 1914 to 240,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours in 1944. President Truman, in his message to Congress, cited the important role which hydroelectric power in the Pacific Northwest and in the Tennessee Valley played in the development of the atomic bomb. He emphasized that the whole economic and military future of the United States will require further development of our power resources, and urged that the vast potential energy of the St. Lawrence River be harnessed without delay.

The St. Lawrence seaway project is of interest to Wisconsin because of its transportation aspects. By extending ocean shipping to Wisconsin, our farms and industries will be able to take advantage of water transportation on a scale hitherto impossible. Our industries can then import raw materials in large quantities, at a minimum of cost, by substituting a water haul for costly rail transportation and by eliminating transshipment costs. Wisconsin agriculture and industry will be able to tap new markets abroad by utilizing direct shipping service.

There is nothing new or experimental in the St. Lawrence waterway development. For more than a hundred years Wisconsin has been shipping into world markets via the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River. As early as 1700, shallow canals were built around the Lachine Rapids of the St. Lawrence River. It is more than a century since the Erie Canal and the first really practical locks of the St. Lawrence canals were dug.

The Great Lakes area was discovered, explored, and colonized by water transportation. The growth of our civilization in this region has followed the watercourses, and the growth of our waterways has paralleled the expansion of the Middle West until it is one of the wealthiest and most productive sections of the Nation.

The seaway is not an inland waterway or an artificial waterway. It is a sea road into the heart of the North American Continent. Fundamentally, it belongs in a class with the river approaches to a dozen or more of the great ocean ports. It differs from these only in the greater distance it projects ocean carriage inland, and in the great extent of territory and the large number of people it will serve.

The seaway is essentially not a canal project. From the head of Lake Superior to the Atlantic Ocean, a distance of more than 2,000 miles, there will be but 16 locks and 40 miles of canal section. More than 90 percent of the route will be through open water or through channels no more restricted than the entrance channels to most ocean ports. The time lost by ships in traversing these locks and canals will be negligible.

The seaway project does not contemplate the creation of a new transportation route, but will increase the usefulness of an important existing route, which has served the United States and Canada for over a hundred years. The waterway is already substantially complete. The agreement between the United States and Canada affects only 115 miles out of a total of 2,339 miles in the great waterway stretching from Duluth to the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

Although the Middle West contributed its full share to the cost of the Panama Canal, it is without a doubt the only section of the entire world which did not benefit by its construction and which has, on the contrary, actually been handicapped by it. The Panama Canal brought our eastern and western seacoasts much closer to one another in terms of transportation. Long water hauls are far cheaper than other forms of transportation. A short rail haul to a seaport plus a long water haul means relatively cheap transportation. A rail haul of half or two-thirds the distance across the continent means high transportation costs.

The two coastal areas, using the long water haul via the Panama Canal, have found interchange of business easy and economical. The Midwest manufacturer and farmer is confronted with a long rail haul in order to reach his markets, and is unable to take advantage of the cheap water transportation made possible by the Panama Canal. The Middle West can be restored to equality in competition by bringing tidewater to this area.

With the seaway the Great Lakes would become an estuary of the Atlantic. Our Great Lakes shore line would become a seacoast. The seaways will remake the transportation map of the world. It will reveal and develop new markets and new commerce, will add value to the product of our agriculture and industry, and will increase the purchasing power of 40,000,000 people around the Great Lakes.

The seacoasts of the United States and the Great Lakes region will be brought into closer business contact. The waterway will bring ocean shipping to their Great Lakes terminal ports and will confer upon our western railroads the same privilege of direct access to the Atlantic which the eastern railroads now enjoy.

While the seaway is amply justified by the twin advantages of cheap power and cheap transportation, World War II has forcefully brought home to us its military and naval potentialities. It is a national misfortune that the seaway was not developed before the war. Had it been available, Midwest industry and agriculture could have made a more forceful and effective contribution to the war effort, and much treasure and perhaps many lives could have been saved. I would like to discuss briefly some of these national-defense considerations.

In a shipbuilding effort unprecedented in history, this country has, within 4 years, turned out 60,000,000 tons of new merchant vessels to meet the shipping needs of a global war. Vast additional tonnages have been constructed in the form of thousands of naval and military craft of all types. The combined shipbuilding production of the past years—merchant and military—probably exceeds 75,000,000 tons.

Only about 2 percent of this tonnage has been constructed on the Great Lakes although we have sheltered harbors, vast industries, the great bulk of steel production, and a great reservoir of skilled workmen. A few score of small-type ships have been constructed in lake ports and sent into ocean service through the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers, only at great labor and expense. The shipbuilding potentialities of the Great Lakes area have hardly been scratched. The bottleneck has been the difficulty of getting ships to tidewater once they are built.

Had the St. Lawrence seaway been developed with a 30-foot channel to the Atlantic Ocean, we could have constructed in sheltered lake harbors escort carriers, cruisers, destroyers, and merchant ships of 10,000 ton size. These ships could have been loaded in lake ports with foodstuffs, munitions and all the material of war—and if this seems like mere speculation, let us remember that Detroit was ranked as America's No. 1 arsenal and was closely followed in volume of war production by Great Lakes industrial

centers such as Buffalo, Cleveland, Chicago, and Milwaukee.

Convoys could have been assembled in the sheltered waters of the St. Lawrence River and sent to European ports with an ocean crossing 1,000 miles shorter via the St. Lawrence than from our North Atlantic ports. The submarine hazard would have been reduced by one-third, in terms of distance; and the great burden of shipping losses, naval escort requirements and similar military considerations could have been reduced in proportion to the reduction in ocean mileage by use of the St. Lawrence.

Our tremendous war effort has depleted our natural resources to a very considerable extent. We have used lavishly our forests and our minerals. We find ourselves with rapidly dwindling supplies of iron ore, petroleum, manganese, copper, lead, and many other strategic materials absolutely necessary to us in war and in peace. A strategic stock-piling program is now being developed based upon future industrial requirements and national-defense considerations. These critical materials should be transported and stored as effectively and economically as possible. They should be brought to sheltered interior locations, and to the area which will use them in great volume, which means, of course, the industrial area surrounding the Great Lakes.

Considering the exposed position of our coasts in terms of naval and air attack, it would be sound national policy to encourage the location of strategic industry in the sheltered interior of this country. We have the opportunity to locate strategic industry in the sheltered heart of the Nation and at the same time to provide these industries with all the advantages of ocean transportation by extending deep-draft shipping into the Great Lakes.

The seaway development is essential to check the drift of population from the Middle West to the seaboard. In recent years there has been a mushroom growth of new industry along the seaboard, particularly along the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific coast. The employment opportunities offered by these new industries have encouraged great numbers of people to migrate from the Middle West to the seaboard areas. The result has been a rapid growth of population around the seacoasts of the United States and a gradual decline of population in the interior. During the 10 years from 1930 to 1940, many Midwestern States actually lost population. This trend has been accelerated during the war period.

Twenty of the 23 States showing population decreases during the war are within the transportation and trading area of the Great Lakes. Every State tributary to the Great Lakes with the exception of Michigan has suffered a marked loss of population during the war period. The seaboard States have uniformly shown a strong population growth, reflecting the growth of industry and the trend of population toward these areas. The St. Lawrence seaway is absolutely essential to permit industry and agriculture in the Great Lakes area to meet the competition of industry and commerce on the seaboard.

The economic effects of a continued loss of population are obvious. A declining population means reduced levels of manufacturing, reduced wholesale and retail trade, decline of building construction, reduced transportation, reduced food consumption, and a general lowering of economic vitality.

Obvious economic conclusions are presented when we find the majority of the Midwestern States declining in population while States like Florida, in a single decade, gain 29 percent in population; Nevada, 21 percent; Washington, 19 percent; Oregon, 11 percent; and California, 22 percent. The St. Lawrence seaway can do much to check this trend by giving to us in the Midwest the same economic advantages which are attracting industry and population to our sister States on the seaboard.

Wisconsin has a great stake in foreign trade. Wisconsin products which move into world markets in great volume include wheat, rye, canned goods, tractors, automobiles and parts, meats, silk hosiery, leather, machinery, iron and steel, dairy products, motorcycles, wood, paper, and electrical equipment. Many phases of Wisconsin industry and agriculture are interested in world trade, and every citizen of our State is, or should be, concerned with its potentialities.

In normal times the city of Milwaukee alone shipped into export markets goods with an average value of about $50,000,000 a year, to practically every country on the globe. A large part of this business would seek the most economical route available, meaning the St. Lawrence. In normal years States tributary to the Great Lakes account for about 35 percent of our total national exports.

On any impartial or logical basis the merit of the St. Lawrence project cannot be challenged. Nevertheless, there is strong opposition. The principal objectors to the improvement are seaboard ports, which fear the loss of transfer business between ship and rail, and the eastern trunk-line railroads.

There is also opposition from utility interests who object not to the St. Lawrence power development, but to the fact that the distribution of the new power will be through public agencies rather than through private utilities.

This opposition can only be described as short-sighted and selfish. As the Middle West prospers and expands, all sections of the Nation will share in that expansion and prosperity. Increased production and purchasing power in the Middle West means that the people of this area will do more business with the seaboard and with the world.

The cost of the St. Lawrence seaway will be shared equally by Canada and the United States. The entire cost of the project to the United States would be less than 1 day's war expenditures. At the peak of our war effort, expenditures were running at about $275,000,000 a day. Our share of the seaway project would be about the same. If the United States every day, year in and year out, could find $275,000,000 for purposes of destruction, certainly it should be able to find an equivalent amount for development of one of our great natural resources.

American postwar planning is geared to a philosophy of expansion—greater production, full employment, expanded foreign trade, and an enlarged merchant marine. The St. Lawrence development will help us to obtain every one of these objectives. An expanded foreign trade will cement friendly relations with other nations. We need new trade routes and new traffic to support our merchant marine, which will be the largest in the world. The objectives of full employment and full production obviously must be geared to a greater volume of commerce and transportation. No project before the American people today will do more to accomplish these objectives than will the St. Lawrence seaway.

Wisconsin's inland communities, like our port cities, will share in the benefits of improved distribution and cheaper transportation made possble by the seaway. Our great ports of Superior, Ashland, Marinette, Green Bay, Manitowoc, Sheboygan, Milwaukee, Racine, and Kenosha will enjoy new shipping and commerce, with resulting increases in employment and revenue. It has been estimated that the seaway project will create in Wisconsin from 15,000 to 25,000 new jobs.

A score of Midwestern States will share the benefits of the seaway project, and Wisconsin should be foremost among them. The opening of the St. Lawrence ship channel will mark the beginning of a new era for the Great Lakes region and for our own State of Wisconsin.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day I introduced a House joint resolution authorizing the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and water-power project. I shall not take up the time of the House to enumerate the broad benefits of this project, they have been concisely stated in the message of President Truman, which is printed as House Document No. 302, and is available to every Member.

Mr. Speaker, every President since Woodrow Wilson has favored this project, and in the past 20 years active efforts have been made to realize the construction of this, the world's greatest engineering undertaking. It is now high time that we begin work on this important development. The delay in the fulfillment of the program is a reflection on the ability of our democratic system to overcome the obstruction of a few misguided and selfish minority interests. We cannot let it be said that we allowed the national interests to be sacrificed for unworthy sectionalism. What difference does it make where a project is located if its benefits are Nation-wide? It is our country and we cannot handicap any one section without dragging down other sections, and it must be realized that an improvement in one section benefits all others.

Within the past several weeks resolutions on this subject matter have been introduced in both branches of Congress. Mr. Speaker, I was disturbed to find a report in the Pathfinder magazine of November 7 that the committee to which the subject matter was referred in the other body is said to have "no plans for the seaway measure." I must reluctantly point out that this is not exactly responsive to the President's request for speedy enactment, or to the wishes of the people. It must be equally plain that we can ill afford to sit down on this proposal if we are to ask for the continued confidence of the people. The people of my State are plain-spoken and sincere. They ask, and have the right to know, why a project which has been proclaimed as the greatest project in the world by a succession of six Presidents is being delayed to death by an administration that claims to be the people's party, and I am proud to belong to it. The St. Lawrence seaway and water-power project will directly have broader and more far-reaching benefits than any project this country has undertaken since the completion of the Panama Canal. It is one of the few remaining undeveloped frontiers that will contribute vastly to the further growth and prosperity of our Nation. I therefore plead with you, my colleagues, from every part of the country to get on with the business of this Nation and to build the St. Lawrence seaway as a shining example of democracy at work.

Grand Jury Investigation of International Hod Carriers Union at Yonkers, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 7, 1945

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

APRIL 1944 GRAND JURY,
White Plains, Westchester County, N. Y., November 5, 1945.

The Honorable ROBERT F. RICH,
The House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RICH: In April 1944 the grand jury of Westchester County undertook an investigation into the activities of the officers of Local 60 of the International Hod Carriers Building and Common Laborers Union of America, located at Yonkers, N. Y. This investigation continued for a period of upward of 6 months and resulted in a series of indictments against James Bove, international vice president of the aforesaid union and secretary-treasurer of the local. Mr. Bove has since that time been convicted on 74 counts of grand larceny and forgery. Other officials of the local union have either pleaded guilty or are awaiting trial.

It was the sentiment of the grand jury at the conclusion of its long investigation that steps should be taken to prevent the recurrence of the conditions which were shown to exist in this case, and to protect labor and the general public. As a result, the grand jury appointed a committee to draft recommendations to be forwarded to the President of the United States, Members of Congress, the Governor of New York, and members of the New York State Legislature. We enclose a copy of these recommendations, and we urge your cooperation in enacting these recommendations into the Federal and State laws.

Sincerely yours,
DAYTON EDWARDS HERRICK
(For the Grand Jury).

The April 1944 grand jury, of Westchester County, N. Y., having conducted a lengthy in estigation in the affairs of Local 60, of the International Hod Carriers' Building and Common Laborers' Union, of Yonkers, N. Y., returned an indictment in October 1944 against five officers and members of the executive committee of the local union charging grand larceny and forgery. The results of that indictment to date have been as follows.

James Bove, formerly vice president of the international union and secretary-treasurer of the local, has been convicted by a jury in the Westchester County court on 74 counts of grand larceny and forgery. Two other defendants have pleaded guilty. The remaining two are awaiting trial.

We, the members of the aforesaid grand jury, feel that our work would not be complete without some attempt on our part to protect labor union members and the general public against the conditions which were discovered in this case and which have been known to exist in other instances. We believe that members of labor unions are entitled to protection against faithless union officials bent solely upon self-enrichment. We believe that the public is entitled to the same kind of accounting from officers of labor unions that the law demands from business and other groups in which the public has a legitimate interest. We are convinced that protective legislation is the only feasible solution, and we, therefore, earnestly recommend that our legislators, both State and national, introduce and support legislation embodying the following principles:

1. All national and local unions should be required to file copies of their constitutions and bylaws and amendments thereto.

2. All national and local unions should be required to file an annual financial report, containing detailed information as to income and expenditures and particularly the salaries and expense accounts of officers. Copies of such reports should be furnished to all members in good standing of the unions involved.

3. Officers charged with the custody and disbursement of union funds should be required to furnish indemnity bonds for the faithful discharge of their financial duties.

4. An annual audit of the books of account of all national and local unions should be required under the supervision of appropriate Federal or State departments.

We believe that such a legislative program would not only promote the welfare of labor itself, but would also lead to better understanding and increased cooperation between labor, industry, and the public in general.

Sincerely yours,
THE APRIL 1944 GRAND JURY
OF WESTCHESTER COUNTY, N. Y.,
By H. KNAUSS,
DAVID DAUK,
DAYTON EDWARDS HERRICK,
Committee.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 7, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee on October 29, 1945:

Whereas President Harry S. Truman, following in the great tradition of his predecessors, Presidents Taft, Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover and Roosevelt, has recommended to Congress the early enactment of legislation to complete the St. Lawrence power and navigation project; and

Whereas the development of the St. Lawrence seaway will extend the benefits of ocean shipping to the industrial heart of America, with resulting benefits to the Port of Milwaukee, the State of Wisconsin, and the entire Great Lakes area; will permit Milwaukee industries to import raw materials at low cost and to reach new foreign markets through direct ocean shipping service; will permit the generation of vast quantities of low cost hydroelectric power; and will enhance the economic prosperity and well-being of the Middle West and of the Nation; and

Whereas the recent world conflict has demonstrated the necessity for construction of the St. Lawrence seaway for the national defense and the military security of this Nation, by providing a safe and landlocked basin for strategic industries, for storage of vital materials, and for construction of naval and merchant vessels; and

Whereas this great unexploited power and transportation resource of North America should be authorized by Congress as the Nation's No. 1 postwar public-works project for the benefit of industry, agriculture, transportation, and foreign trade: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That we hereby commend President Harry S. Truman for his statesmanlike presentation of the St. Lawrence power and navigation project to the Congress of the United States; that we commend Senator LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, and other Senators who have demonstrated their vision, enterprise, and statesmanship by joining President Truman in the determination to make this great project a reality; and that we urge all congressional Representatives from Wisconsin to support the President's recommendation to schedule the construction of the seaway as the Nation's No. 1 postwar project, thereby to assure adequate employment, expanded foreign trade, and the national defense; and be it

Further resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to his honor, the mayor; to the board of harbor commissioners; to the Governor of the State of Wisconsin; to Senators and Representatives from the State of Wisconsin; and to the mayors of all principal port communities on the shores of the Great Lakes, with the request that neighboring States and cities join in the common effort to assure early completion of the St. Lawrence project, with its vast potentialities for the future welfare of the cities and States of the Great Lakes region, and the Nation at large.

Put the Scientists in Charge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILBUR D. MILLS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 7, 1945

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

PUT THE SCIENTISTS IN CHARGE

The point at issue in the controversy over the organization of a foundation for scientific research in Washington is fundamentally whether the direction of its activities shall be dominated by the Government or whether, while integrated with the Government, it shall have the freedom to go ahead on its own which its purpose demands. More specifically, the battle before the Senate committee having the subject in charge lies between the proponents of the Kilgore bill and those to whom the Magnuson bill seems far preferable. The one measure would repose control of the agency in the hands of an administrator, appointed by the President, with the duty merely of consulting an advisory board. The other would center control in the board by giving it authority to name the director.

In the Magnuson camp are most of our distinguished scientists, including Drs. Conant, of Harvard; Compton, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; and Vannevar Bush, Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, the war agency which made such enormous contributions to victory. These gentlemen now have a champion and spokesman in the person of Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, who has just insisted to the committee that the science cabinet, as he calls it, should consist of a body of men selected solely for the contributions they can make to the advancement of science, that "full power and responsibility should rest with this board" under an executive director to be appointed by the President on the board's nomination.

This, it seems to us, is not only a sensible but an imperative program to follow if the foundation is to attract the services of our first-string scientists. It differs perceptibly from the Kilgore proposal and also from one put forth recently by Prof. L. C. Dunn, of Columbia. Dr. Dunn, properly impressed with the vital importance of the prospective foundation, urged that it be made a regular department of the Government with a director of Cabinet rank. But, obviously, this again would divorce its control from its scientific staff and open the door to its political manipulation. What the country needs is not a department of science to overlap the functions of all the other departments into whose operations science so largely enters but an independent agency of research, a clearinghouse of scientific discovery.

Veteran at Battle Front Writes Home That GI Bill Is Not Adequate in Education Benefits for Man With Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from my young man friend, Bob, dated September 22, 1945, was forwarded me the other day by his mother. Bob is known to be one of the most able, ambitious young men in the community. As this letter to his mother makes some pretty definite and specific statements of such a citizen—still serving us in uniform on foreign shores—I commend it to your attention.

I have said it before—I repeat that the results of war are hellish and destructive enough—without us being slothful on the job of seeing to it that these GI boys are receiving their due respect, whatever is reasonably necessary to permit them, as promptly as possible, to reenter their educational program and to press forward and to get through it at the earliest practical date. I am in favor of increasing the amount of the GI bill for educational advantages to a reasonable point at which they feel they are being encouraged to complete their education; in an amount which will enable them to go straight through with diligence and application chiefly on their books. They should not, during this time of completing their schooling, have to worry about having enough bread and butter for themselves and their wives and children, and in many cases other dependents, too.

The paragraph in this letter in which my name is mentioned has reference to a very happy case when I had the high privilege of addressing a few remarks to several hundred men as they reclined to listen on the beautiful hillside where Fort MacArthur is situated, close by the Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor.

SEPTEMBER 22, 1945.

DEAR MOM: After all the talk about how they are going to help the returning serviceman, we find out that one by one the benefits of the GI bill of rights are tied up with hidden clauses so that in many cases one is better off not to do business with the Government. Their help is more of a hindrance.

Take the educational benefits, for instance. Under the present laws I can have my tuition paid to school plus $75 a month living allowance. No one with normal intelligence could presume for one second that Beattie, Bobby, Jr., and myself could live on that. However, as I thought, it would be a good start, and that with a part-time job earning say $50 per month, we could get by.

Now I learn that any outside earnings would be subtracted from the $75. In other words, I'd have to have a job paying at least $125 per month in order to pay living expenses while at school. That is impossible. It is also impossible to live on $75 per month.

The very weak excuse is that a man in school hasn't time to work and still get the most out of his schooling. They already have one check on that. If a man doesn't keep up his grades he gets no more schooling at the Government's expense.

Of course, one could lie about his outside work and probably get by. That is not what I want to do, but may be forced to do.

The GI plan fits only those who have an outside income, and those are the ones who don't need it. I wasn't in school when I enlisted because Dad died and there was nothing to go to school on. So I am still on the same boat.

I am sure that men like CLYDE DOYLE wouldn't want the law to stand as it is. I can remember his talk to our CMTC outfit at Fort MacArthur in 1939, when he told us that too many people at that time thought too much of their own and other foreign ancestry, and lost sight of the fact that we are all Americans. I bet he is very satisfied now with the showing made by a mixture of bloods. Our unity of purpose has won the fight, but there are a lot of wrongs to be straightened out before we are the kind of a nation we should be.

Those who have lost loved ones must feel it even more of a personal duty to see that we build a nation as it should be built.

One of the biggest benefits would be to make it possible for every intelligent veteran to get proper schooling for a peacetime position to which he could do real justice.

I've taught for almost 3 years since I put on the uniform, and even in radio and radar work we found that a few months' good schooling made a more intelligent and flexible repair man than years of practical (or butt-your-head-against-the-wall) experience. If I can learn what has been found to work and what has been found not to work, those are lessons you don't need for yourself, and you are miles ahead.

With this kind of interpretation of the GI bill of rights, it looks as if the Government is either going to make a bunch of liars out of us, or going to discourage a lot of us from trying to better ourselves.

Even if they were to loan an additional $50 a month, that would be a help, although I'd rather earn it.

I am going to college—I have my choice of starving my family or getting a part-time job and not saying so. My family won't starve.

Perhaps they will liberalize the laws. I hope so.

Love from all of us,

BOB.

Lithuania Suffers Under Red Fascism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 7, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is quite generally known what conditions are in Yugoslavia, Poland, Austria, Hungary, and Bulgaria under the so-called new order in Europe. Appalling as these conditions are, they are nothing compared to the inhumanity which prevails in Lithuania.

To give the people of America a clear idea of what is taking place in Lithuania under the so-called new order in Europe, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a letter of the Lithuanian bishops in exile to the bishops of the Catholic world:

LETTER OF THE LITHUANIAN BISHOPS IN EXILE TO THE BISHOPS OF THE CATHOLIC WORLD, IMPLORING THEIR INTERVENTION FOR HELPING THEM TO RECOVER THE LIBERTY OF THE LITHUANIAN NATION

Most Reverend Fathers in God, in the name of Catholic Lithuania, which during this war has had to endure unspeakable ordeals and vexations, we, the spiritual shepherds of Lithuanians dare draw the mercifulness of your excellencies and, through you, the comprehension of the leading authorities of your blessed countries to the great hardships and unmeasurable needs of our people.

The Lithuanian nation, well known by its history, was since nearly a thousand years a free state in that part of the European northeast it now occupies. During the fourteenth to seventeenth centuries, Lithuania was great and powerful, and extended from the Baltic Sea down to the Black Sea. The Lithuanian people speak a distinct language, fully different from Slavic and German idioms, and enjoy their own history and peculiar genius.

After the dismemberment of Lithuania and Poland, toward the end of the eighteenth century, Lithuanians underwent the despotic Russian yoke during more than a century. But after that period of great sorrows and struggles, they succeeded in 1918, with the help of divine providence, in recovering their independence and political liberties, which are the only factors able to give birth to a favorable moral climate, and to the indispensable material conditions for an intense and flourishing religious activity.

In spite of its firm resolve and endeavors to keep a strict national and political neutrality, Lithuania was doomed during this Second World War to carry the full weight of three successive and ruthless occupations.

At the very outbreak of hostilities, Soviet Union, desirous to exploit the situation then created, became an accomplice of Nazi Germany in the division of Poland and enforced upon Lithuania, in October of 1939, a treaty of mutual assistance whereby our country was compelled to billet Soviet garrisons.

Eight months later, on June 15, 1940, under the pretext of fallacious accusations and in violation of the treaty of mutual assistance and all the others still in force, the Soviet Government, irrespective of all its solemn promises, addressed an ultimatum to an irreproachable Lithuania, ordered the occupation of the country by a strong contingent of troops, enforced the dissolution of the legal government, and abrogated the sovereignty of the nation and within a few weeks, perfidiously annexed Lithuania to the U. S. S. R. together with the other two Baltic republics. Even before the incorporation of Lithuania into the U. S. S. R., Moscow unilaterally allowed the revocation of the concordat between Lithuania and the Holy See, so that the Apostolic Nuncio was obliged to leave Lithuania.

Soon thereafter the prisons threw their doors wide open and new jails were erected to keep pace with the steady flow of thousands of Lithuanian prisoners. First came the turn of prominent people, laymen and clergy, members of former governments, and all those in charge of some important commitment in public life and even in the cultural and religious organizations. All were

committed to prison. The declarations emanating from the propaganda services of Moscow, tending to prove that Lithuania had entered the Soviet Union of its own free will, are unfounded. We ourselves lived in Lithuania at that time and, together with our people, endured the terror of persecutions, vexations, and humiliations. Nobody cared in the least about the real desire of the Lithuanian people and all was being disposed of with the help of the Red Army, the Soviet emissaries, and the secret police: GPU–NKVD.

One must confess that there were Communist collaborators in Lithuania, but their number was really insignificant. The great mass of Lithuanians never cared about dealings with the Communists. The real expression of the will of the whole nation was evidenced during the general insurrection of June 22–26, 1941, against the Soviet invaders, when a new Lithuanian Government was constituted by representatives of all patriotic parties. The Government proclaimed the restoration of state sovereignty and disavowed the Soviet regime. Unfortunately, the first occupation was soon followed by that of Nazi Germany, which immediately suppressed the newly formed Lithuanian Government and introduced its own administration under the title of "Generalbezirk Litauen" (General District of Lithuania).

Although the Soviet occupation did not last long (June 15, 1940–June 22, 1941), it proved to have been quite sufficient to disrupt the life of our people and to ruin the religious, cultural, social, economic, and political life. This evil year of terror will forever remain despicable by its toll of human losses: thousands of Lithuanians were literally slaughtered, imprisoned, or banished to distant regions of the Soviet Union. Within the space of 3 days, i. e., between June 14 and 17, 1941, nearly 40,000 persons were deported, irrespective of their age, profession, or health. Children and old people, women and men, all were crammed and shut into freight cars without food or water. A large number of these poor wretches died while still in Lithuanian railroad stations, where the cars stayed for several days. The fate of the survivors is still unknown. Some rare letters which reached Lithuania informed us that men were confined to concentration camps, women were sent into factories or to collective farms, and the children, separated from their parents, were entrusted to Soviet orphanages.

Thus, the methodical extermination of the Baltic peoples premeditated by the U. S. S. R. was in full swing. According to secret documents found intact after the abolition of the Soviet regime, it appears that Moscow had planned and ordered the deportation, in the shortest possible time, of about 700,000 Lithuanians to the farthest regions of the Soviet Union.

Although the 3 years of German occupation (1941–44) did not seemingly prove to be ruthless, they were notwithstanding a real way of the cross for our people. Stubborn opposition to Nazi ideology and the new order, unflinching resistance to the repeated summons to declare war and to collaborate on political grounds with Germany were savagely retaliated. Catholic Lithuanians made new acquaintance with prisons and concentration camps; more than 100,000 of them were deported to Germany and enslaved. However, all these hardships did not in the least diminish our passive resistance. The promises of liberty uttered in favor of all the small nations and states and boldly shouldered by the great western democracies upheld the Lithuanian people in its determination to set forth in an unequal battle for liberty and political independence.

In July of 1944 our nation was once more visited by a new scourge, as Soviet-German forces were fighting on our soil and the Red Army for the second time overflowed and occupied our fatherland. Countless cities and villages were completely destroyed. During their retreat German troops set fires as far as they had time to do so to all that was met on their passage. Twice the front was stabilized in Lithuania and, each time, the Germans, like the Soviets, evacuated the population of the occupied regions. Thus, thousands of Lithuanians were constrained to leave for Germany, where a great number had to live under extremely difficult conditions and to toil together with war prisoners in sectors of military operations. The Soviet authorities did the same with the Lithuanians caught by them.

A certain number of Lithuanians, fleeing from the Soviet terror, extermination, prisons, and deportation, willingly left for Germany. Among them may be reckoned some thousands of Lithuanians who had already languished in Soviet jails in 1940–41, for a mere inculpation of not being Communists and their unwillingness to adhere to the Communist Party. Their flight to Germany explains itself by the nearness of that country and the hope of finding temporary rest and shelter there. The number of Lithuanians deported, evacuated, or fleeing to Germany may be estimated at about 200,000—the majority of which are intellectuals. Among them may be found three bishops and approximately 250 priests. All the Lithuanian refugees are Catholics of all ages, professions, and occupations.

Lithuanians, Latvians, or Estonians who succeeded in escaping from the Soviet grasp are concentrated in the territories occupied by the American, English, and French armies. They fear to return to their countries as long as these are ruled by Soviet Communists.

From our own experiences we know what bolshevism means and we cannot help it if our opinions strongly diverge from those formed in certain spirits under the influence of Soviet propaganda.

As far as we can judge, it does not appear that the western United Nations have foreseen the presence in Germany of foreigners unable to return to their Soviet-occupied countries, a fact liable to aggravate considerably the fate of our distressed brethren bereft of their fatherland. We, their pastors, and constant witnesses of their great misery, deep sorrow, and afflictions, can only express our most serious apprehension to Your Most Reverend Excellencies and to the whole Catholic world.

If we are unaware of what is actually going on in our occupied fatherland, now resembling a huge prison closely guarded by the Russian state police (NKVD), we know perfectly well that atheistic communism has in no way improved and still remains on the stage of 1941. Now, as heretofore, all books and newspapers, unless they are communistic, are prohibited and the whole country is hermetically shut to every communication from abroad.

During the first Soviet occupation the so-called religious liberty that we were permitted to enjoy in Lithuania consisted in the closing of all the cultural associations and putting down of all fellowships and brotherhoods. The new authorities were moreover urging priests to sign an engagement whereby they would pledge themselves to discontinue teaching catechism either privately or in churches. Furthermore, they were strictly forbidden to enter schools, where up to that time, religious instruction was obligatory. An embargo of printing was put on prayer books, catechism, or Catholic publications. The best and rarest religious editions found in stores or in the nationalized libraries were confiscated and, without exception, destroyed. Imprisonments, tortures, and other means of terror aimed at intimidating the priests and compelling them to join the NKVD services as informers was the common practice. Seminaries were closed and all the bishops, together with a conspicuous number of priests, were evicted from their residences and dwelling places without any chance to settle down elsewhere in decent abode.

This was, roughly described, "the religious liberty" we personally experienced under the Soviet regime of 1940–41.

In spite of all our rights and in opposition to the sacred laws of justice and humanity, our fatherland, Catholic Lithuania, lays under the threat of becoming legally and politically recognized as an integral part of the Soviet Union. At any rate, we solemnly declare before God the Almighty and our Saviour, His Son, that Lithuanians are firmly decided to recover their national and political liberty and to re-create a real free state. Lithuanians will never consent to become a colony of Russia, against which they struggled in the past centuries in order to maintain their existence, culture, and Catholic faith. This is why every Lithuanian rebels against any and all suggestions that he undergo the atrocious yoke of atheistic Soviet communism.

We dare now point out to Your Most Reverend Excellencies that the World War seems to be over. Victorious and vanquished nations are looking forward to peace in conferences and congresses. Leaders of nations are meeting with a view of setting down the terms of peace. Many a political discussion and deliberation refers to nations which have suffered aggression during this war and may expect repatriation, but whose liberty is in such a manner jeopardized that they require a new liberation. Among the nations never referred to, figure in the first place the three Baltic Republics, thereunder our most cherished Lithuania. This silence, in our view, looms as a burial of our political liberty. We dare not admit that the plenipotentiaries of the powers present at the San Francisco Conference did not keep in mind the above-mentioned nations as they were solemnly assuring the world that once the war is ended, liberty would be returned to all nations without any exception.

Today Lithuania is in such a state that it cannot even think of expressing publicly and openly its wishes. Therefore we dare to call on you, Most Reverend Excellencies, and entreat you to come to the rescue of our Catholic brethren. In tendering this short description of the afflictions which have visited and are still visiting our people, we beg to appeal to your mercifulness to enlighten through your pastoral word your faithful people on our dolorous fate and to intercede in the measure of your possibilities with your governments in favor of our distressed people, so that at the peace conference the delegates of the governments may intervene in favor of the rights of our people to reconstitute a free and independent life and not recognize nor ratify the attempted imposed incorporation of Lithuania into the U. S. S. R. as a reward for the Russian participation in the war against Germany.

If ever Lithuania, like the other nations partaking the same fate, were to be recognized at the peace conference as subject to the totalitarian and despotic Soviet regime, this would be an injustice crying for celestial vengeance, this would be the triumph of falsehood and brutality, the negation of the most natural human rights. This would be equal to a verdict of death for our whole nation, for deportations, and other well-known methods of extermination would in a short time achieve the annihilation of our people.

We kindly beg you, Most Reverend Excellencies, to take the necessary steps in order to put as soon as possible an end to this slaughter, which still continues under Soviet occupation.

For 5 years Lithuania is suffering under the ycke of occupation and witnesses the destruction of its national life. Hundreds of thousands of innocent people endure the hardships of exile in the far regions of the Soviet Union and in Germany. They all long

for a speedy return to their beloved fatherland, where they wish to live by their own means and labor for the welfare of their country and for humanity.

Therefore we once more appeal to all the bishops of the Catholic world, imploring them to help us in the achievement of this sacred, just, and lovable petition of our people. Moreover, the extreme misery with which the Lithuanians, scattered all over Germany, have to grapple compels us to ask for the benevolent intervention of Your Most Reverend Excellencies in order to promote an action in favor of all those victims devoid of clothes, food, and medical relief.

Fully confident in the divine providence and in men of good will guided by a spirit of justice and truth, we hope the moment is not far ahead when Catholic Lithuanians will be able to thank God and all those who by the grace of our Lord will have brought about the liberation of their country. We also foresee the time when the Lithuanians, once returned to their homeland, will become noble and zealous advocates of human justice, working for the realm of our Lord in that outpost of Catholicism in Europe, as defined by His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, in an answer to the Lithuanian Minister to the Holy See.

Hereby, we wish to express to all the bishops of the Catholic world our deepest gratitude for the moral and material aid they will deem advisable to bestow upon our Nation and we avail ourselves of this opportunity to express to your Most Reverend Excellencies our sentiments of profound respect and affection.

Your most faithful servants in Our Lord Jesus Christ:

JOSEPH SKVIRECKAS,
Metropolitan Archbishop of Kaunas
Assistant to the Holy See.
VINCENTIUS BRIZGYS,
Auxiliary Bishop of Kaunas.
VINCENTIJS PADOLSKIS,
Auxiliary Bishop of Vilkaviskis.

Written in exile, this 8th day of September, Festivity of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, 1945.

Use of Liberty Ships for Transporting Troops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 7, 1945

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a newspaper article which appeared in the Daily Pacifican, the Army newspaper in the Western Pacific. If it is true, as indicated by Colonel Davidson, that Liberty ships can be easily altered and used for transporting troops home to the United States, it seems to me that no time should be lost in taking advantage of this proposal. We all know, of course, that literally hundreds of Liberty ships are lying idle at ports throughout the United States, rusting at their anchors while high-point men in every branch of the armed services are clamoring for transportation home. The time for talk has long since passed. Let us get busy.

The article follows:

MANILA.—Liberty ships capable of carrying 750 men to the States "in comparatively good living conditions" can be readied within 48 hours, according to Lt. Col. C. H. Davidson, superintendent of the water division, port of Manila.

Colonel Davidson, in reply to a query as to the practicability of using Liberty ships for transporting troops, said yesterday that it had been done before successfully and could be done again.

"If the ships can be allocated," he said, "I can have each one ready to carry 750 troops back to the States in comparatively good living conditions within 48 hours—if I have 50 men to work on each of them."

He stated that all equipment, with the possible exception of M37 ranges for cooking, is available to convert the Liberties so that they will be capable of carrying troops. "These ranges may be available," he stated, "but I haven't checked on them."

"These are facts," said the colonel, who was responsible for moving the First Cavalry and the Twenty-fourth, Thirty-second, and First Infantry Divisions out of Brisbane under similar conditions, "and they are indisputable."

Colonel Davidson said that the objection that Liberty ships could not be used because of cold weather encountered during the voyage was not based upon fact.

Most Libertys travel the Great Circle route, which passes near the Aleutians, between Manila and west coast ports, and cold weather is encountered during the greater part of the trip. The alternate route is by way of Honolulu, and at no time would a ship traveling this alternate route between Manila and San Francisco be more than 38 degre s north of the Equator.

Although Liberty ships are without heating facilities below deck, the weather would create no problem as long as the Honolulu route were followed. Should an unseasonable cold spell be encountered, troops on board would not be uncomfortable because of the complete winter clothing issued at replacement depots before troops embark.

The Honolulu route is longer than the great circle route, but the added day or two would not extend the voyage to more than a total of 24 to 26 days.

Water Division, Second Major Port, is allocated ships by AFWESPAC. So far, Colonel Davidson indicated, no ships have been allocated for conversion into troopships. The colonel has, however, converted one Liberty ship for transporting 1,500 prisoners of war back to Japan.

"This same ship," he said, "could have carried 750 GI's to the States."

The only feature of actual discomfort for troops traveling on such converted Liberty ships would be the lack of bunks of any kind, for, Colonel Davidson said, "Cots would present a safety hazard." Since the cots are made of wood, they present a fire problem, and, in addition, there is no way of securing them.

The colonel said that he felt sure that any Liberty ship which he converted would pass the necessary inspection by officers from Troop Movement, Water Division, Port Surgeon, and Inspector General Departments.

Caught With Points Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 7, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing a great deal recently about the APA—Annapolis Protective Association—and under permission to extend my remarks, I am inserting herewith a poem apropos that subject:

CAUGHT WITH OUR POINTS DOWN, OR NOTHING COULD BE FINER THAN TO BE A FORTY-NINER IN THE MORNING

O, this is the law of the Navy;
O, this is the cross that we bear;
We find "the duration"
Is perpetuation.
We're sunk in the depths of despair.

What use is an overseas ribbon?
What good are the stars that we wear?
Our sons and our daughters
Are point-giving naughters—
The trade schoolers tell us it's fair.

We'll just have to grin and act happy;
We'll just have to sweat out the years;
Come hell and high ocean,
We'll prove our devotion
By bravely withholding our tears.

So let's lift a toast to the Navy—
To all the Annapolis clan—
We're caught in your clutches
Until we're on crutches—
From now on MacArthur's our man!

Group Sanctions Against Racism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 1, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Group Sanctions Against Racism" by A. H. Pekelis and published in the New Republic of October 29, 1945:

GROUP SANCTIONS AGAINST RACISM
(By A. H. Pekelis)

A syndicated column by John O'Donnell, of the New York Daily News, charged on October 2, 1945, that "behind the successful drive to disgrace and remove Gen. George S. Patton from his army command in occupied Germany is the secret and astoundingly effective might of this Republic's foreign-born political leaders—such as Justice of the Supreme Court Felix Frankfurter, of Vienna; White House Administrative Assistant Dave (Devious Dave) Niles, alias Neyhaus; and the Latvian ex-rabbinical student now known as Sidney Hillman. * * * These boys and their pals decided to go out and get General Patton's hide and rank because—the columnist revealed—the soldier who got slapped by Patton in an Army hospital was of Jewish descent. "Then Patton proved himself a great leader and hero in France. But his foes here in Washington never forgot the Sicilian episode."

The story was made out of whole cloth; the soldier slapped by Patton was not a Jew, and no Jewish political leader had anything to do with Patton's transfer.[1] But the canard received wide publicity. The New York Daily News alone has a daily circulation of more than 2,000,000 copies. The Jews were shocked, then worried. The Jewish press charged that the Jewish organizations, instead of assuming a militant leadership, confined themselves to a letter to the editor.

Can't the Jewish organizations do better than that? It is easy to say "militant leadership," "war against neo-fascism," etc., but

[1] O'Donnell made a complete retraction in his column of October 19.—The Editors.

when war is declared, what form shall warfare take?

Among the weapons available in a society built upon the profit motive, there is that of economic action: refusal to patronize, picketing, boycott. Could not a defamed minority refuse to buy or advertise in a publication guilty of attacks which follow the classical pattern of Mein Kampf? Could not Jewish organizations ask all decent Americans to support them in their action? Or should they bring a suit for libel and try to get satisfaction through the courts?

The answer is—according to what may be described as legal tactics—that they cannot safely do any of these things. Legal dynamics, new trends, or straws in the wind, may point in the other direction. But the orthodox "law on the books" seems to be weighted against them. To begin with, in the eyes of the law the Jews do not exist as a group. They may be murdered as a group, but they may not complain about it as a group. They can be defamed as a sinister gathering of the Elders of Zion, or of ritual murderers, but there is no effective remedy against their defamation as a group. The harm done to each of them may be far greater than what he could suffer from personal defamation. But neither as a group nor as individuals are Jews entitled to ask that their defamer prove his assertions or be branded a libeler.

This is no accident. It is in keeping with the basic character of modern law which—after having been permeated by Rennaissance individualism—has become a law of relations among individuals and lost its feeling for collective rights or group responsibilities.

This attitude, which is based on the recognition of the value of human personality, has made for much progress in human relations. But in its blindness to group relations it fails to conform with reality. The course of our individual lives often depends more on the fate of the group to which we belong—family, union, class, or race—than on our own individual merits. Even if the trials of war criminals did not abandon the theory of individual guilt, expiation by the Germans, that is, loss of political or economic independence, had, by its nature, to be collective. When responsibilities are clearly collective, such as in the case of a lynching, attempts to allocate individual guilt lead inevitably to a break-down of justice.

Of course, an individual may stop reading, or advertising in, the News. But if a group decided not to patronize that paper, and tried to induce others to do likewise, the ghosts of criminal conspiracy, combinations in restraint or secondary boycott would be raised against them. This is what paralyzes collective action and reduces a number of organizations to the device—welcome to some and odious to others—of writing letters to the editor or to the sitting-down-at-lunch-with-the-colonel technique.

To lay those ghosts vision and courage are needed. At the cost of life and limb, American labor has laid the ghosts of conspiracy and boycott, and invigorating currents have penetrated the American political atmosphere. Those who are responsible for the honor and livelihood of the threatened minorities must persuade the popular, political, and legal opinion of the country that people singled out for attack as a group have the right to defend themselves as a group.

This principle has led, in industrial relations, to collective bargaining, and has provided a defense against conspiracy charges. The same principle can lead to equally important results in the field of ethnic relations. For instance, the enforcement of antidiscrimination laws should not be left to individual initiative only, but minority organizations should be given the power, analogous to that enjoyed by the unions under the National Labor Relations Act, to file charges of unfair practices.

Our present problem, however, does not require legislative intervention. Collective bargaining was granted to labor by statute. But its second basic right—to picket and boycott—was won by effecting a change of judicial attitude. This change has removed labor picketing from the inferno of criminal conspiracy, or the purgatory of disorderly conduct, to the constitutionally protected sphere of freedom of speech, and has put labor's right to picket and boycott beyond the reach of unreasonably restrictive municipal ordinances, State statutes, or congressional enactments.

This change in judicial attitude was not the result of the discovery of a new legal argument. As in all basic constitutional issues, the operative forces were ethical or political rather than strictly legal. It was the recognition of the moral and political importance of the economic issues that labor was presenting to the country. To say that the pickets or boycotters "just spoke" was not enough to afford them constitutional protection. Freedom of speech does not mean freedom to say whatever one pleases. A number of torts, misdemeanors, felonies, and even capital offenses can be committed through speech alone.

Suppliers of a commodity, for instance, could not picket a customer's store or otherwise discourage the public from patronizing him because he refused to pay the suppliers a fair price. But suppliers of labor have the right to picket the store of an employer who refuses to pay fair wages. In 1943, Texas declared that solicitation of union membership, like the solicitation of insurance, would be subject to prior licensing by the State. Some members of the Supreme Court argued that unions were business organizations and that the State could subject them to restraints similar to those usually imposed upon economic activities. But a majority held that the statute was unconstitutional. The reason for this decision lies in the recognition of the general value of the ideals for which labor fights, of the general public interest in the problem that it raises, in the need for the citizenship to be informed about the controversy and the opposing arguments. The political and the social value of the aim pursued make the use of the boycott weapon legal.

Do racial and religious tensions have a public importance similar to that recognized in industrial tensions? Does the public need to be enlightened about the various aspects of racial or religious unfairness, such as incitement to hatred or exclusion from employment and educational opportunities? Is not a fair settlement of ethnic relations as important for the general welfare of the country as the fair settlement of industrial relations? If so, then the right to appeal to public solidarity must be upheld even if the appeal results in an individual refusal to patronize or in a mass boycott. *Thornhill* v. *Alabama* was concerned with labor picketing only. But the language of the Court's opinion asserted "the liberty to discuss publicly and truthfully all matters of public concern without previous restraint or fear of subsequent punishment."

However, the recognition of the right of minorities to confront the American people with the problem of racial justice cannot come from a royal grant or a gracious judicial decree. Assertion must precede recognition. Like every other boundary, the line between lawful and unlawful acts is shaped by the forces active on both sides of the line. The boundary between incitement to boycott and the advocacy of social sanctions against violators of decency is variously drawn by society and its judges in various circumstances. And the result depends, to an overwhelming extent, on the way in which the action is conceived and felt by the actors themselves.

In theory, if a man has a right, he possesses it whether or not he is aware of it. In political reality, however, awareness and assertion of rights can become the condition of their existence. Secrecy and deviousness are incompatible with assertion. An act which is a manifestation of inalienable freedom if performed in a manner consistent with the dignity of a freeman, may become unlawful if performed surreptitiously. Concealed inducements to advertisers or subscribers to cancel their contracts is secondary boycott. An open appeal to the conscience of advertisers, subscribers, and the public at large, is exercise of freedom of speech. And this is as it should be. A public appeal states the issue, recites the accusation, affords an opportunity to refute factual falsehoods and logical fallacies or opposes an appeal to reason against an appeal to emotion. It transforms a base conspiracy condemned by the law into a trial by public opinion protected by the charter of freedom.

The answer to hatred and oppression is not mere debate, or legislation alone, or half-hearted pressure. Once again the history of labor affords a lesson—debate plus pressure, legislation plus picketing, individual protection plus group action offer the only chance of success. Nor is the ideal value of the struggle impaired by the injection of an economic motif. On the contrary, a community has the moral duty to see to it that, like any other crime, racial aggression does not pay.

Not that the task is easy. Racial exploitation, discrimination, and defamation have long been good business and their economic bastion is beyond the reach of minority snipers. Only public support can help them. But the recognition of their right to appeal for such support cannot come without an uphill fight. Assertion, we said, must precede recognition. But recognition does not always follow assertion, and almost never does so at once. If the minorities want to conquer the right to collective action they must be ready for financial and physical sacrifices, and for set-backs and defeats. No change can be accomplished with a previous license, and no revolution, however peaceful, with a declaratory judgment obtained in advance.

On the other hand, short-range defeats are often long-range victories. The defeat of a righteous cause in a court often becomes an impelling argument for legislative or social change and results in a political victory. Nor can it be expected that the courts will decide this issue without the usual distinctions. The advocacy of a boycott of an employer guilty of racial or religious discrimination may fall not only within the definition of a labor dispute for the purposes of the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act, for also within the scope of freedom of speech. On the other hand, it is conceivable that picketing and boycott may be outlawed as an answer to defamation. It could be that the only constitutional restraint on the defamers' constitutional freedom to advocate religious hatred—and the News in an editorial has claimed that right for O'Donnell—is not the freedom of the defamed to advocate a boycott of the defamers, but an action for libel. This, however, should focus attention on the failure of our law to provide the victims of group defamation with an adequate defense against libel and lead to a judicial or legislative reversal of the prevailing policy against group libel actions.

All this is within the realm of political and judicial probabilities. However, one thing is certain, the chances of success cannot really be determined in advance of action. To win or to lose may be a question of luck. But the game must be played according to rules. And the rules of the game now call for neither apologetic propaganda nor economic guerrilla warfare, which the loosely knit American minorities could not afford, anyway. The rules of the game and decent respect for American opinion call today for an open declaration of economic war against racial aggression and for a full statement of reasons to be submitted, in each individual case, to public opinion.

American minorities have no other force, no other weapon, and no other hope than America herself. To pit the economic power of the minorities against a powerful newspaper would be no more hopeful than to assume that a Fifth Avenue beauty parlor would go bankrupt if the members of the hairdressers' union stopped patronizing it. The essence of boycott is an appeal to the solidarity of all decent citizens. The American minorities have the right to launch such an appeal. The Jews—and the Negroes—have a right to picket the News and the newsstands and call for their boycott by all truth-loving men and women. The Negroes—and the Jews—have the right to picket the DAR's Constitution Hall and to ask all lovers of art and beauty not to cross their line. They have the right to picket and call for the boycott of those New York department stores which, in the teeth of the Ives-Quinn law, are today as lily-white as ever.

This kind of struggle is not without risks. But it is well to remember that those who voyage and take no risks are destined to perish

Principles Adopted by AMVETS at National Meeting in Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, by unanimous consent, I was privileged to have incorporated in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the constitution and bylaws adopted by AMVETS—American Veterans of World War II. I am now privileged to insert therein the principles adopted by the AMVETS at their first national convention on October 12, 13, and 14, 1945:

THE AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II
DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

We, the American Veterans of World War II, believing that we bespeak the mind of the American men and women who bore arms, fought, and died for a free America and a free world, do hereby resolve that our national leadership must assert itself through cooperation with leaders of all nations who advocate and practice international peace as a national policy, to the end that not again shall any nation be permitted to breach the international peace.

And we do resolve that since Americans on the fighting front, supported by civilians on the home front, have made available to the world one last chance for the survival of humanity; and that since the cataclysm of another world war will result in the extinction of civilization; and since that we are determined that this final opportunity shall not be lost by individual or collective greed, ignorance, or indifference, we therefore pledge ourselves to develop mutual confidence and understanding within our Nation and between America and the other nations of the world to the end that all men may live in peace and be responsible members of an enlightened family of nations. We shall not fail this trust.

And we do further resolve that we accept our paramount obligations and duties as American citizens, and adopt the basic principle that the best interests of all the American people are superior to any group or organization within the national political, economic, or social structure. To this end, we rededicate ourselves to service to our Nation in peace as in war to insure that American ideals for which we and our countrymen have fought and died, may be preserved for us and posterity. We believe that the basis of world peace is founded upon the following truths and beliefs, which we do hereby declare:

1. INTEGRITY

National integrity is based upon the intergrity of the individual citizen and those who lead and represent him. To maintain our spiritual and political leadership in the world, individual and national integrity must exist as a fact and be practiced as a living philosophy. To this end, we further resolve that our national leaders cooperate with the leaders of all nations who accept world peace as a national policy, and to establish forthwith common principles for the settlement of all international problems and disputes, and to abandon the progressive tendency toward national self-interest and power politics on the world level. The objectives of the four freedoms must be made a living precept for all peoples and nations.

2. EQUALITY

We are representative of the membership of various political parties, races, faiths, and creeds, and our common denominator is that we are all Americans who have honorably served the Nation during time of war. We shall not discriminate between veterans because of rank, service, sex, race, creed, or political party affiliation. Our first demand is loyalty to the United States of America, and that the welfare of the Nation be placed above the interests of any individual, group, or organization. We shall endeavor to represent honestly and effectively the 13,000,000 men and women veterans of World War II, and we shall not front or permit our organization to be used as a front for any individual, group, party, movement, or "ism."

3. INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

We believe that America's unparalleled industrial achievements during the war resulted from the combined efforts and cooperation of industry and labor. To attain our full potentialities as a nation, this effort and cooperation must be continued without interruption, and we believe that industry and labor are interdependent and that what harms one injures both, as well as the national welfare. We demand that both industry and labor clean house and establish responsible leadership and labor-management policies and procedures based on merited mutual confidence and integrity. We believe that both industry and labor have a paramount duty to the American people to reestablish their faith by denouncing and removing from their ranks and leadership professional racketeers labor haters, labor baiters, and agitators, regardless of what names they go by or what positions they occupy.

4. FREE PRESS

We believe not only in a "free" world press, but in an honest press. We believe that the honest, impartial, and unslanted dissemination of news can heal the internal wounds and strife between our racial and economic groups, and give all Americans a chance to know and understand more fully the problems and aspirations of others within our own country as well as those of other nations and their peoples.

5. RECONVERSION

American veterans of World War II do not want "charity" in any form. We believe that the American people feel a deep obligation to the men and women casualties of a war in which they fought for all Americans, and will do all things necessary and proper to care for and assist them so long as that care and help is necessary. Those who have served in the armed forces and have returned to civilian life or who will later return ask only that they be not prejudiced by their absence in the service. They demand a decent opportunity for employment so that they may establish themselves as thrifty, industrious, self-respecting, and worthy citizens of the American community.

6. LIVING MEMORIALS

We believe that the memory of those who gave their lives that a free America and a free world might survive, should be honored and preserved by living memorials in the form of additional educational and recreational facilities so that no American shall lack opportunity for adequate education, a healthy mind and a healthy body.

7. TECHNICAL RESEARCH

We deplore the wasteful extravagance of war in both human and material resources. We dedicate ourselves to the principle that these resources can be preserved by devoting part of our national income to the development of means by which future wars may be made impossible, to the extension of education and research in the sciences to the end that disease and ignorance may be abolished.

8. MILITARY PREPAREDNESS

We believe in the necessity of maintaining such military training programs, and adequately equipped active and reserve components of the armed forces as may reasonably be necessary to insure that this Nation shall never again be vulnerable to attack or invasion; that under Government supervision, such scientific research and personnel shall be maintained as may be necessary to insure that this country shall lead all peace-loving nations in such military and scientific techniques as may be required to preserve and maintain the peace against any future aggressor nation or nations.

9. ETERNAL VIGILANCE

We shall resist by whatever means are reasonably necessary any attempts by enemies from within or without to undermine or destroy the democratic principles upon which this Nation is founded. These must be maintained inviolate. Only by eternal vigilance on the part of all Americans can this, our heritage, be preserved for ourselves and posterity.

10. DUTY TO VOTE

We believe that public office is a public stewardship and trust, and must be administered as such; that it is our responsibility as citizens to exercise our voting franchise, and to elect, and maintain in office men and women of personal and public integrity; persons who will serve all the people instead of any bloc, organized minority, special or pressure group. AMVETS will stand with any man who is right, but part with him when he is wrong.

DEDICATION

The American Veterans of World War II believe in the America which we fought to preserve. We believe in the future of America and in the men and women who have made it great and who will make it greater. In this faith, we dedicate ourselves to the fullest development of the spiritual, mental, physical, economic, and human resources of the Nation.

To these ends, we resolve, and do dedicate ourselves to these ideals and pledge ourselves to their fulfillment.

Full Employment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee on October 15, 1945:

Whereas Congress is now considering the Murray-Patman full employment bill recommended by President Truman to avoid unemployment and to afford opportunity to those willing to work; and

Whereas it is necessary that the Federal Government assume this responsibility in order to avoid another depression: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That it urges the passage of the Murray-Patman full employment bill recommended by President Truman now pending before Congress;

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all Wisconsin Members of Congress.

United Nations Headquarters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 7, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks, I include the following communication from the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce:

ST. LOUIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
St. Louis, Mo., November 5, 1945.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have today written Hon. E. R. Stettinius, United States representative, Preparatory Commission, United Nations, inviting the United Nations to locate headquarters in the State of Missouri. Hon. Phil M. Donnelly, Governor of Missouri, has authorized me to say that the selection of a location within the State of Missouri would have his full endorsement and that he would cooperate in every way to secure from the State legislature, which is now in session, any legislation necessary to bring the headquarters to Missouri. At a recent meeting of the Missouri Resources and Development Commission a resolution was unanimously adopted, inviting the United Nations to locate in the State.

At a meeting of the executive committee of the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce Friday, November 2, I was instructed to write Mr. Stettinius, calling his attention to a specific location which has many attractive features and advantages, making it an ideal location for the headquarters. I refer specifically to a tract of land owned by the Government, formerly occupied by the War Department and now declared to be surplus property, and known as the Weldon Spring Ordnance Plant.

This property, comprising approximately 27.7 square miles, lies along the north bank of the Missouri River, on high bluff land overlook the valley of the river, approximately 16 miles northwest of metropolitan St. Louis and 26 miles by high-speed superhighway from our union station.

Briefly stated, the salient features of this suggested location are:

1. Ample area: 17,699 acres, more or less, or 27.7 square miles.

2. Strategic location: Near the center of the United States, about midway between the center of population and the geographical center, and near a metropolitan city of approximately 1,400,000 population, with all of its attendant advantages—economical and cultural.

3. Single ownership: The land is wholly owned by the United States Government and is no longer required by it. Its acquisition by the United Nations would create no problems of expatriation, either by the State of Missouri or by the United States. No condemnation of property would be required and no existing population would be displaced, as the property was entirely cleared of population when acquired by our Government in 1940–41.

4. Immediate occupancy can be authorized.

5. Completely enclosed by fence and easily guarded.

6. About 15,000 acres completely vacant, the balance can be quickly cleared of Government-owned facilities.

7. Some buildings and 30 modern residences are immediately available for use as construction headquarters and for temporary offices and living quarters.

8. Water: A complete, duplicate, water system is installed with a daily capacity of 40,000,000 gallons of treated, potable water, sufficient to serve a community of about 200,000 persons and to provide a cooling system for complete air conditioning.

9. Power: There are two steam-power plants equipped with six boilers, each with a capacity of 100,000 pounds of steam per hour. Power-generating plant of 1,250 kilowatts is installed in one of the plants but was never used, as power was continuously supplied by the Union Electric Co. from high-tension lines, through two transformer stations located on the property.

10. An abundance of building stone can be quarried on the site. The Government opened and operated large quarries along the river front.

11. St. Louis is one of the world's most important telegraph and long-distance telephone communications relay centers. The site is connected by telegraph lines along the right-of-way of the Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad and by telephone cable direct to the exchanges of the Southwestern Bell Telephone Co.

12. Transportation: The site is served by 104 miles of motor roads and 22 miles of new standard-gage railroad, connecting with the main-line tracks of the Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad. It is bounded on the east by United States Highway No. 61, which gives direct access to the city of St. Louis, and lies about 7 miles south of United States Highway No. 40 and the main line of the Wabash Railroad. It is 18 miles west of Lambert St. Louis Municipal Airport. The Rock Island Railroad runs along the south bluffs of the Missouri River with station facilities about 4 miles from the site.

13. Topography The site is on the bluff lands about 150 feet above the valley of the Missouri River. The terrain is rolling, with numerous long level stretches formerly used as farm land. There are beautiful sites within the tract for residences, offices, parks, parade grounds, and for recreational areas. The bluff lands nearest the river are rugged. Locations are available either within the area or adjacent on which airport facilities can be erected, should a private field be desired. The river provides opportunity for use of hydroplanes.

The southern portion of the site drains into the Missouri River, although a larger part of it drains northeast into the Mississippi River.

14. The site is removed from all industrial activity of St. Louis.

We are now preparing a booklet setting forth in more detail the location and description of the Weldon Spring property. Because of delay in securing release of data from the War Department and the time required to prepare exhibits and reproduce them, it will not be ready to forward to Mr. Stettinius for some days. In the meantime, I have sent him some literature describing St. Louis.

Frankly, we know of no better, no more readily available and suitable site anywhere than Weldon Spring. Its location near the center of the country offers a strategic advantage of importance should this Nation ever be involved in another armed conflict. We devoutly hope that it will not be and are anxious to bring the United Nations quickly into being.

We thought it desirable that you know of our effort to secure the location at St. Louis and invite your sympathetic cooperation if there is any way you can help in the matter.

Very truly yours,

GEO. C. SMITH,
President.

Commonwealth of Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 1, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post by the Honorable Sumner Welles, entitled "Commonwealth of Palestine":

PROBLEM FOR UNO
(By Sumner Welles)
COMMONWEALTH OF PALESTINE

The Government of the United States is officially committed to the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine. Both major parties have, in their most recent platforms, endorsed this policy.

An independent Jewish commonwealth of Palestine represents to many millions of people throughout the world the symbol of their passionate conviction. The failure to provide assurance that this ideal is going to be realized will result in dangerously increased tension in an already gravely troubled world.

Unfortunately, this Government is as yet giving no sign that it is pursuing any clear and consistent policy which will facilitate the achievement of the objective to which it is pledged.

The President is urging the British Government to permit the immediate immigration into Palestine of 100,000 of the homeless and destitute Jews in Europe who are unwilling or unable to return to their former homes.

The rescue and resettlement of these pitiful survivors is a moral obligation which rests upon all free peoples. The President's humanitarian desire is altogether praiseworthy.

But so long as this Government continues to refuse to assume any responsibility for the security of the people of Palestine can his suggestion be regarded as constructive? For the British Government strongly maintains that an Arab uprising will take place if any large-scale immigration into Palestine is now permitted. British military and material resources have reached a low ebb. Vital British interests are involved.

Is Great Britain to be expected alone to keep the peace in the Near East if hostilities break out as the result of a step against which she has repeatedly warned?

Are the true interests of the Jewish people going to be advanced by an insistence upon measures which threaten discord between the Anglo-Saxon powers?

President Roosevelt never believed that the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine was in any sense "hostile" to the Arab peoples. On the contrary, he believed that such a solution would prove beneficial to both Jews and Arabs. Moreover, he was

confident that the surest way of finding a just and permanent solution of the problem of Palestine was through negotiations in which both Jews and Arabs would be fully heard. Some of the ablest leaders of Zionism have also held that the best hope of success lay in negotiations in which Jewish and Arab leaders would take part.

If the present floundering continues, the hope of a peaceful solution will become increasingly remote. The antagonism of the Arab leaders is daily becoming more envenomed. As the Arab states become increasingly aroused, the position of some Jewish groups is becoming correspondingly extreme.

Certain facts seem by now to be plain.

The commonwealth of Palestine is not going to be established through any unilateral armed imposition on the part of the British Government.

It will not be created as a result of mere protestations of sympathy on the part of the United States.

The commonwealth will only come into being when the United Nations Organization decides, as it must, that the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine is essential to world peace and to world stability. Unless the International Trusteeship Council to be set up by the United Nations Organization is charged with the obligation of carrying out such a decision, the commonwealth of Palestine will continue to be an ideal and not a reality. Only the United Nations Organization itself, representing the concerned determination of the free peoples of the world, will possess the necesary authority to achieve a final solution of the Palestine problem.

The British Government should, under article 77 of the United Nations Charter, transfer its mandate over Palestine to the International Trusteeship Council as soon as the Council is established. Until then, if large-scale immigration into Palestine is to be permitted, the United States should share in the task of keeping the peace in that area.

From the moment the Council assumes jurisdiction the United Nations Organization should make available whatever armed force may be required to give assurance of security to all inhabitants of Palestine.

The Council should thereupon summon representative Jewish and Arab leaders for consultation as to the most desirable solution.

Should it prove impossible for the International Trusteeship Council, after full consultation with both Jewish and Arab leaders, to obtain their agreement to whatever solution it considers most equitable and desirable, the United Nations Organization should nevertheless decree that its decision be carried out.

Once this step has been taken, the International Trusteeship Council should set up a broadly representative provisional government in Palestine and intrust it with all necessary authority until such time as free elections can be held and an independent and democratic government can commence to function.

As soon as the Council is intrusted with a trusteeship over Palestine, unrestricted immigration should be permitted. Immigration should thereafter be interrupted only if the International Trusteeship Council, or the future government of Palestine, decides that such restriction is temporarily required for economic reasons. Such authoritative surveys as Dr. Lowdermilk's admirable report prove that immigration can be greatly increased over the year if an intensive program of irrigation and of power developments is undertaken.

Unless the United Nations Organization immediately assumes the responsibility for finding a solution, the danger of an outbreak in the Near East is very real. Unless all the major powers share in the responsibility for the settlement to be reached, the whole of the Near East will become a fertile field for power politics.

No people in the history of mankind have suffered more grievously than the Jewish people. If a free and peaceful world is within our grasp they must receive something better than illusory promises—something more tangible than hollow assurances of sympathy.

The declaration issued by the World Zionist Conference at London in August of this year is poignantly true: "Any delay in the solution of the problem, any attempt at half measures, any decision which, however favorable, remains on paper and is not faithfully and speedily implemented, will not meet the tragedy of the hour and will only increase suffering among Jews and tension in Palestine."

Veterans' Job Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to establish a veterans' job and integrated national program to provide maximum work opportunities and careers for veterans. We will reach this objective under our free competitive enterprise system by integrating the present diversified efforts to aid the veterans on the part of industry, agriculture, labor, foreign trade, private agencies, State and local governments and the Federal Government. It is not intended to accomplish these aims by displacing other workers, but rather to create and take advantage of new opportunities for veterans by utilizing our unused capacities and undeveloped natural resources.

Ample Federal machinery is already set up for this purpose in the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, which was established under title III of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944. We, in the Congress, had the foresight to set up such an agency, but we did not have the foresight to charge that agency with specific responsibility and objectives. This veterans' integrated national program completes that unfinished business on our part.

To state it in its simplest terms, this program will provide fuller employment of veterans and others toward an ever-expanding economy, and it will go far in counteracting the effects of recessions or depressions on employment. This program will knit together more closely in each community, the activities of the Federal, State, municipal and private agencies into a streamlined veterans' guidance and information service center. As this veterans' center in the community is developed to serve the veterans adequately, it can serve also as a permanent center for the benefit of all of the people in the community to enrich their lives.

The organization of this veterans job and integrated national program is not only a challenge to the Congress, to the States, and to the communities, but it is also a direct challenge to industry, to organized labor, and to the veterans' organizations. It is a challenge too, to the women of America, and finally, it is a challenge to all of us because we are at the fork of the road. We must make a choice. We must make that choice immediately. Eleven million men and women are presently returning from war to civilian life. For the good of the Nation they must be assimilated efficiently, promptly, and without causing unnecessary dislocation to other workers, professional people, and established businesses. I do not mean to say that the veterans should not compete vigorously with any and all people. It is through competition in private enterprise that our American people have raised their standard of living for the common man higher than any other people in the history of civilization. Furthermore, in this program we can open the way for more abundant opportunities for veterans without damage to those who have property rights and job rights, by utilizing the unused capacities of the Nation, and by utilizing more of the undeveloped natural resources of the Nation. Let us come down to earth.

We are still at war. This is the war after the war, or I should say the other half of the global war. We are now fighting the other half of the global war, which is the economic war. If we win the economic war now, we shall have gone far in preventing World War III. Can it be said that we will rise to our legislative responsibilities only through fear? Are we afraid of a technological unemployment of 10,000,000 people such as we had before the war? Have we the courage not to stand still, but to stimulate an ever-expanding national economy?

While it is the direct responsibility of the Federal Government to integrate the functions of the various Federal agencies concerned with veterans affairs, it is also the direct duty of the Federal Government to streamline these functions with the activities of the States and the communities. This program will promptly create better teamwork between the Federal Government, the 48 States, and the communities and the private agencies. We have passed 360 Federal laws concerning various veterans' affairs. The 48 States have enacted collectively over 3,600 laws pertaining to veterans. In most of the communities in the United States an increasing number of agencies, organizations, and individuals are attempting to serve the veterans. As a result of all of these diversified activities we in the Congress are receiving increasing complaints that the veteran is getting the inevitable "run around." You can believe it or not, but the Federal Government has not as yet issued a simple index and guide for the use of the hundreds of thousands of people in the Federal, State, community, and private agencies who are trying to serve the veterans.

Comparatively speaking, we have stood still since World War I in integrating and streamlining the functions of the Federal agencies, in order that they may assist the State, community, and private agencies in serving the veterans. Will it take another Pearl Habor—a depression—or a technological unemployment of

10,000,000 people to force us in the Congress and in the Government to rise to our legislative and organizational responsibility? We rose to the occasion in war. We must rise again to the occasion in making the winning of the peace worth it.

We have a potential new power in the 20,000,000 living veterans of our wars. We can double this power by counting on the power of the women who are interested in the 20,000,000 veterans. For each veteran there is usually a mother, a wife, a husband, a daughter, a prospective bride, or a sweetheart with hope in her breast. Most of the women in America will be directly affected and concerned with the success of this veterans' job and integrated national program. The women of America have the greatest opportunity since the emancipation of their sex. Following World War I, American women won the fight to vote. They became full citizens with full vocal and ballot rights. The women of America can help win World War III, in its incipiency by using ballots instead of bullets. If the women of America will put their full strength behind this veterans' job and integrated national program, they will exert far greater power on the distaff side than all of the male warmongers combined. The best insurance against World War III is the stimulation promptly of a vigorous, ever-expanding national economy which will provide maximum work opportunities and fuller employment. The best insurance for fuller employment for all of our people is to provide work opportunities and careers for the armies of returning veterans as early as possible. The fastest way and the surest way to accomplish that objective is to match the unused capacities of the veterans with our unused national capacities and our undeveloped natural resources.

There are at least 6,000,000 of our boys and girls presently becoming veterans, who have never worked before, who have no particular job to go to, or who have no security. The number of Americans who were disabled in World War II is larger than the total number of Americans who were disabled in all the previous wars in which the United States has been engaged. This program will give highest priority to our disabled veterans in aiding them to adapt themselves in occupations where they can become more self-reliant, more self-sufficient, and more important in our new postwar world. The women of America can strike a new note in applying their abilities in the community centers, and by using the ballot to make this program successful. This program is the stepping stone to a more abundant life for all of our people. Women have the courage to create life. Their courage and high-mindedness is now needed to help give birth to this veterans' job and integrated national program.

We men and women think in terms of economy in buying battleships, school houses, motorcars, shoes, bread, and butter. Our American economic development will depend upon how wisely we make our national investments in America now. As we sit in these Halls of Congress we are spending at the rate of $2,000,000 each week on veterans' adjusted compensation allowance. To put it plainly, that is a veterans' unemployment compensation. It is a natural tendency that one who is unemployed is less likely to be employed profitably than those who are employed, or those who are part of a well-organized program, such as this program which I am proposing. Idleness brings evil consequences. The veterans' adjusted compensation has so far amounted to $51,000,000, and we estimate through the fiscal year of 1947, it will total more than $1,000,000,000. These expenditures will be reflected in increased taxes. On the other hand, this veterans' job and integrated national program, immediately upon its enactment will transfer those mounting expenditures from a national liability into productive channels. This program will effect a reduction in taxes and contribute to general prosperity for all of our people.

We have already extended to the veterans of World War II a potential borrowing power of twenty to sixty billions of dollars. If these vast funds are wisely invested by the veterans, it will be an economic asset to the Nation. If the veterans, on the other hand, are not given well-organized information, and have no organized facilities to serve them, the veterans and the Nation will suffer.

According to business statistics 90 percent of all new businesses either fail or go out of business within 10 years. If the veterans go about their new life in a haphazard and unskilled manner, and if they are given the "run-around" in being battered from pillar to post, it can easily contribute toward inflation, subsequent deflation, and depressions. It will affect the purchasing power of real wages, the pensions of all widows and orphans, and the value of the dollar in stabilizing our economy.

It is our solemn duty to integrate all the activities of our Federal, State, community, and private agencies, to assist the armies of returning veterans to recapture those lost months and years, in which they served our Nation so gloriously. It is also our solemn duty to other workers who also helped to win the war, that these millions of veterans are not allowed to become a segment in any unemployed labor force.

To win the war we were obliged to integrate our scientific facilities and the capacities of the Nation, to select, to train, and to equip the individual men and women in our armed services. Now that these same men and women are veterans, we must turn these same national facilities and capacities toward providing them with the necessary facilities, guidance, and information to enable them to adjust themselves speedily into civilian life. We can thus demonstrate to our own people, and to the other peoples of the world that what we performed in building the arsenal of democracy for war, we can now perform in building the arsenal of democracy for peace. This veterans' job and integrated national program will be the first step in a fearless, ever-expanding national economy to give all our people increasing prosperity and security.

The Responsibility of Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 8, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald-Tribune of Sunday, November 4, 1945, entitled "The Responsibility of Victory":

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF VICTORY

There was a presence at the Fourteenth Annual Herald Tribune Forum on Current Problems last week which dominated every session. It was unseen, and only a very few of those who attended the forum, who heard the addresses broadcast, who read or will read the texts this morning, could clearly visualize its form. But the atomic bomb, because of its own dread performance, as a symbol of the scientific terrors of the war just ended and the far more terrible peril poised over the heads of mankind, stood as the primary responsibility of victory. That great disintegrating force integrated the complex problems of a world newly and dazedly returned to peace.

"Now we are in it all together," was Norman Corwin's dramatic interpretation of the forum's theme, which Paul Robeson brought to the audience at the opening session, and which Jay N. Darling expressed graphically for the readers of section IX in this newspaper today. That was the message of Dr. Vannevar Bush, himself a leader in the development of the atomic bomb. Each in his own way set forth the alternatives of suicide or a richer life, posed by atomic energy; each drove home the point that, confronting these alternatives, distinctions of race, nationality, economic status, become trivial. "Now we are in it all together."

On that basic concept, the structure of the forum was logically and inescapably reared. The messages of General Marshall, of General Eisenhower, of Mr. Robert P. Patterson, the Secretary of War, all emphasized the need for America to be strong within herself, to do her job in the world. Fear of war is not enough; it may be a positive incitement to war, "and," as General Eisenhower put it, "the words of the strong are weighty in the councils of peace."

A strong America, in this atomic world, must be a wise, a sympathetic America, conscious of the crowding problems that girdle the earth. It must view with new understanding the vast Pacific area, where, in Manchuria, World War II began and where it ended, that old region with its new potentialities for good and ill. It must learn to know Europe and the peoples who suffered under tyranny, until as in the song which Mme. Claude Alphand sang, they could breathe again in freedom. Above all, it must learn to know Russia, which, like the United States, lies like a link between Europe and Asia, a new land presenting a new challenge.

As Dr. Ernest J. Simmons phrased it, one of history's most reiterated commonplaces today is that the future peace and prosperity of the world depend largely upon relations between the United States and Russia. These two great agglomerations of power, if they move blindly behind a wall of mutual misunderstanding, could bring down the structure of world peace in one of the mightiest cataclysms of history—or, conversely, they could, working together, raise the earth's peoples to new levels of prosperity and security. Those speakers, American, Russian and British, who discussed this problem at the Forum were obviously moved by an earnest

recognition of its importance and by a determination to break down the wall, to assist in a fruitful interchange of knowledge and emotion between the United States and, to quote Dr. Geroid T. Robinson, "our Russian next-door neighbor across the strait in Alaska and across the street in Berlin."

Under the shadow of the atomic bomb, it was inevitable that the forum should soberly lay most of its emphasis upon responsibility rather than upon victory. The victory will be only transient and illusory, unless the responsibility is recognized and shouldered manfully. Yet no one who attended the sessions or who read the addresses can fail to sense that the atomic world offers exciting promise as well as dark threats. It was expressed most clearly in the remarks of the younger speakers, those who burned with a clean anger against intolerance and injustice, and with a great hope that these might be abolished in a new and united world. The simple and moving recital by Sgt. Ben Kuroki of the values for which, and the evils against which, he fought; Sgt. Bill Mauldin's wrath at the preachers of hate, who, in this country or in any other, stir men up to persecution and war; Mrs. Masha Scott's human and personal appraisal of the Russia of her birth and the America she has known—these are the very stuff of which men and women the world around build their hopes of a decent life.

And from the younger speakers, too, came the most provocative replies to the challenge of atomic energy. Gontran de Poncins spoke boldly of a new citizenship of the world; Lt. Cord Meyer, Jr., tested the old formulas of absolute sovereignty and found them wanting in an atomic age. The world can still hope, looking back at the pillar of smoke over Japan on August 6, that it may yet prove that cloud by day and pillar of fire by night which is to lead mankind out of the wilderness of fear, hatred, and oppression and into the promised land of universal good will.

Full Employment for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1945

VETERANS' JOB AND INTEGRATED NATIONAL PROGRAM

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to establish a veterans' job and integrated national program. This program will enable us to provide full employment and careers for veterans under our system of private enterprise and without having to displace other workers. The program would be carried out through the combined efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, foreign trade, the service trades, private agencies, State and local governments, and the Federal Government. The Veterans' Administration would be charged with the administration of the law.

No interests are represented in introducing this bill other than the interests of the veteran and other workers as well. If any interests are represented in proposing this legislation, it is the interests of all the people of the United States for the very reason that 90 percent of the people selected 10 percent of the people and placed their faith in them to fight and to win their war. The 10 percent kept that faith magnificently and gloriously. It is our duty now to see that the 10 percent who are now veterans do not lose faith in the 90 percent. In addition to our memory of the dead who gave their lives, to our aid for the disabled who gave their flesh and blood, and to our help to the other veterans who made sacrifices, we can make this program a new asset to strengthen the Nation.

In wartime we charged the various agencies of Government and industry and labor with definite responsibilities. We charged them with the responsibility of backing up our military leaders. We charged our leaders in the war theaters with specific responsibilities. We gave our military commanders specific missions and we gave them the authority that they needed to accomplish their missions. That war program was accomplished successfully by our leaders at home and overseas with skill and efficacy. We not only gave them the power to do the job but we also told them specifically what we wanted them to accomplish.

During the war the Congress was farsighted enough to see that 20,000,000 veterans and war workers would be affected by the reconversion from total war to total peace. The Retraining and Reemployment Administration was created by the Congress to accommodate that load of 20,000,000 who would seek readjustment. We gave that agency ample authority but we did not spell out specifically what we expected that agency to accomplish. The early defeat of Japan caught us unprepared to meet this present emergency. It is the purpose of this veteran's job and integrated national program to charge the Retraining and Reemployment Administration with specific responsibilities as we charged other agencies of Government and our military commanders with specific responsibilities during the war. If we express to the Administrator of Retraining and Reemployment the will of Congress and back him up as we backed up General Marshall, Admiral King, Eisenhower, Nimitz, MacArthur, Halsey, Bradley, and our other illustrious leaders who accomplished their missions with traditional American vigor, skill, and efficacy, we shall have gone far in winning the economic war. After all, the military phase and the economic phase are both part of the one total war which we have been waging. That total war will not end shortly. This veteran's job and integrated national program will contribute vastly to prevent World War III. If the 90 percent of our people will now show faith to the 10 percent who fought for them, we can retain our leadership as a great Nation. We can thereby increase the standard of living for increasingly more of our people.

Let us assume for the moment that we in Congress are directors of a corporation who are elected by the stockholders. The stockholders of any corporation own the business. The stockholders in this case are the citizens of the United States who likewise own the United States. Like any corporation, a board of directors and a president are elected to devise methods and to administrate the affairs of the business toward a profitable return on the initial investment. Original investments in any enterprise come from the genius, the skill, the sweat and toil of those who accumulated savings to invest in it. Therefore, we in Congress are custodians of the job property right and the investment of the stockholders of this United States enterprise. We are charged by law with returning to our stockholders, who in this case are our constituents, the best possible return on their investment.

If we in Congress were to seek to find an immediate means to create an overexpanding national economy, what means would we employ? What new power could we possibly utilize that would cut across all geographical, political, and denominational boundaries? Would such a new power not be a veterans' job and integrated national program? The answer is "Yes." This program directly concerns most of the families of the United States. Most of the families in this country have as one of their members at least 1 of the 20,000,000 living veterans of our wars. Most every family has a father, son, brother, relative, or a sweetheart in whom they are personally interested, and, in most cases, upon whom they are dependent. If we as Members of Congress are as alert as the directors of our successful private corporations who represent their stockholders we will assert our legislative power and prerogatives. We can make use of this vast new power of our veterans and match it with the new opportunities now at hand to further develop the prosperity of the Nation.

Now that I have discussed our duty to the veterans and to our constituents, let us touch upon some of the high lights relating to the means of accomplishing the objectives of this program. We know why we should do it, now let us develop our thinking on how we are going to reach those objectives.

Those in industry, science, labor, the armed forces, and in the Congress were all surprised by accomplishing the seemingly impossible during the war. Our military leaders eliminated the word impossible from their vocabulary and raised us rapidly from a third-rate military power at the time of the attack at Pearl Harbor to the greatest military power the world has ever known. We also accomplished that miracle in wartime through our American organizing geniuses on the home front, by the skill of our American hands and through the leadership of Congress. We created out of myriad complexities an astounding national war machine. What we all demonstrated in war we can demonstrate in winning the peace. We can do it if we set our sights high now. As good businessmen, as legislators and as program planners we in the Congress can repeat that performance with one hand tied behind us, if we create promptly the proper moral climate to see this program through to its end. The veterans job and integrated national program has short range problems and it has long range problems to solve. If we do not plan for the long range problems promptly the short range problems will be our increasing problems in the future.

Specifically, the first step is to utilize the unused capacities of the Nation which we created during the war and much of which will be idle. We have untold natural resources which are crying for development and utilization. Our scientific genius and the skill of our workers have developed amazing new uses for old products and have developed vast new uses for new products. We have millions of untilled acres of land in the United States which are some of the finest in all the world. Paradoxically, we have millions of acres which need only water. On the other hand we have other millions of acres which need only to be drained. For example, there are millions of acres in the Northwest which are rich in natural fertilizers, are already clear and have available water to give those acres life. We have also lands in my own State of Louisiana and in other States of the South which have been enriched by the finest top soil and loam from the heart of the United States for many hundreds of thousands of years. These acres need only to have the water drained from them to make them some of the most productive in all the world.

We have new opportunities in the fishing industries in the South and on both coasts of the United States and in our possessions. These fishing opportunities will produce additional sources of food, vitamins, and minerals for our undernourished people and fertilizer for our undernourished soil areas. We have coastal and overseas trade and shipping opportunities for our veterans who know the sea and love it. The veterans can use some of our surplus marine and naval property, particularly in supplying feeder lines and in developing small business enterprises and trade routes without displacing present maritime personnel or other established enterprises. Furthermore, these feeder lines will contribute to an expansion of the coastal and overseas trade development of that industry.

We in the Congress who are charged with raising funds and making appropriations will immediately question the cost of this seemingly ambitious program. As intelligent businessmen, let us sharpen our pencils. Instead of costing our taxpayers additional amounts this program will reduce their anticipated taxes. Let us examine our national financial position at present and take into account how this veterans' job and integrated national program will reduce our cost of Government and increase our prosperity. We have already made an effort to reward the veteran by enabling him to borrow $4,000 to enter business, a profession, buy a farm, a home, or to handle old or new obligations. This borrowing power will be exercised by the veterans to an amount ranging somewhere between twenty and sixty million dollars under those specific loan provisions. This integrated program will give the veterans the best available information to prevent business or professional failures and to afford him expert guidance, information, and counsel. We have given him the benefit of a readjustment allowance or, plainly speaking, unemployment compensation which so far amounts to $51,000,000 and which through the fiscal year of 1947 is estimated at $1,000,000,000. Which will it be? Are we going to buy $1,000,000,000 worth of idleness or $1,000,000,000 worth of careers? After World War I the veterans had no other recourse than to ask for bonuses. Now following World War II there is a veterans' bonus sentiment growing rapidly, which according to estimates of veterans' organizations will probably amount to $30,000,000,000. A hurried adding-machine calculation of these sums will give us an amount approaching $50,000,000,000, which we are likely to expend in the near future. Adding this to the approximate national debt of three hundred billion we shall have a total national debt beyond all human comprehension and beyond the limits of management.

It is no extravagance to say that this is a situation of appalling gravity. In that direction lies inevitable disaster. Let us take note of what Alexander Hamilton said about government: "It must contain an active principle." This veterans integrated national program is that active principle which will be the first practical step with teeth in it toward fuller employment for increasingly more of our people. Let us follow the lessons in clear thinking and a logical pattern of government given us by Hamilton, Jefferson, Adams, Washington, and our other founding fathers. They gave us a system of government and of free enterprise which has proven out in the 150 years of the great American experiment.

If we provide the veterans with properly coordinated facilities in the communities, State and Federal agencies to afford them guidance and expert counsel, the veterans will benefit immediately. In the long run the veterans' fitness, moral power, borrowing power, and his new initiative will pour a new force into channels of prosperity for all the people as well as for the veteran.

Let us make a note of warning at this point. If we do not create promptly a veterans' job and integrated national program we are likely to have an abnormal inflationary movement. Following that we shall have the inevitable deflationary movement which could bankrupt the Nation and harm the veterans and other workers for years to come. The Commerce Department as early as 1943 estimated that in 1946 we could produce the same amount of goods that we produced in 1940 and still have 19,000,000 people unemployed in 1946.

The solution of the veterans' complex problem is simple. The solution is simple and clear for the simple reason that it is momentous and urgent. The eyes of the Nation are upon us. If we do not initiate this integrated program for the veterans we will be faced shortly with a crisis. We must meet this crisis head on by rising to our legislative and organizational responsibility.

This program will integrate our people. It will be a down payment for the veterans on prosperity and careers. This veterans' job and integrated national program will be the first installment on national unity, solvency, prosperity, and security for all the people.

Pearl Harbor Whitewash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 8, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, one whitewash after another has characterized the New Deal administration. The Elliott Roosevelt's financial swindle, and now the ghastly holocaust at Pearl Harbor. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of November 8, 1945:

PEARL HARBOR SECRECY

When Democrats in Congress ceased to oppose a Pearl Harbor investigation and took charge of it, putting the investigating committee under the chairmanship of the Senate Democratic leader, there was ground for suspicion that a whitewash was in the making.

When the committee engaged as counsel the able William D. Mitchell, Attorney General in the Hoover administration, there was some ground for hope that there would be an honest investigation and an honest report. Through no fault of Mr. Mitchell that prospect grows dim.

From Republican members of the committee there is coming a sordid story. Individual members are denied access to documents that would throw light on the subject under investigation. Some documents the committee has not been able to obtain. Some documents which were known to exist now cannot be found. There is a charge that witnesses have been tampered with and efforts made to have them change their testimony.

Now Republicans realize the political advantage that might come from a full account of Pearl Harbor and it is part of politics that they should exploit that advantage. One cannot take without question every statement made. But it is unlikely that they would say what they do without some basis and if a small part of what they say can be substantiated, the situation is pretty bad.

Of course anyone who has read the full Army and Navy reports on Pearl Harbor does not need to be told a great deal more than is contained in them.

Information of a Japanese attack was in the hands of the White House at 1 p. m. Washington time December 7, and high military personnel the night of December 6. 1 p. m. was dawn in Hawaii. Th Navy has in its files a memorandum which exactly outlined the possibility of a dawn attack on Hawaii. And in those circumstances nothing was done, at least nothing was done in time to avert the attack. The idea that the attack could not have been met by adequate preparation and considerable damage averted is blasted by Admiral King.

Washington had information but did not act. It failed adequately to inform the Pearl Harbor commanders. Even so they took no action which was commensurate with the seriousness of the partial information that they did have. Surely there is a chain of curious coincidences involving a number of people suddenly turning dull-witted in a serious situation. And on Sunday morning tne usual practice was to have antiaircraft maneuvers at Pearl Harbor. On Sunday, December 7, they were not held.

On the evidence made public, it is simply impossible to believe that there was any intention except to let an "incident" occur. The surprise, and the only surprise, was the gravity of the incident.

Burning the Books Again!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURTON K. WHEELER
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 8 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Burning the Books Again!" written by the Reverend John Haynes Holmes, one of the outstanding preachers of the United States.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Progressive of November 5, 1945]

BURNING THE BOOKS AGAIN!

(By John Haynes Holmes)

Would you believe it—that Germany, now in the hands of the guardians of civilization and the custodians of culture, is in the business of banning books again? Not burning them—not yet—though the blazing pyres of the printed page will probably follow in due course. But getting rid of books not liked, and thus doing what can be done to rebarbarize mankind.

What Hitler did in 1933 is perfectly well remembered. He made a long list of books that were considered hostile to the ideas of the Third Reich and dangerous to its interests. Many of the condemned books, perhaps most of them, were ancient and modern classics. They included some of the really great works of German literature—Goethe, Schiller, Lessing, Heine. But they were not selected because they were good or bad. The question was, did they fit into the philosophy of nazism? Would they help or hinder the acceptance of Hitler's notions of the "new order"?

The Fuehrer wanted to bind and fetter the German mind. He didn't dare to have this mind do any thinking or investigating for itself. This mind must be conditioned to one set of ideas, one fixed system of thought. To this end, it must be cut off from all contact with anything apart from Nazi dogma. So books by the thousand were listed and banned. And the logic of the whole process of blindness and stupidity was the heaping of these books in the public squares—the hoarded treasures of the universities, and the fresh wares of the busy book shops—and the burning of them in huge holocausts of flame.

Now the process is begun again, as Ernest Meyer told you in the Progressive last week. The destroyers and successors of the Nazis, the civilized rulers now in occupation of Germany, are going to do what the Nazis did. They, too, do not trust the human mind. They also are afraid of freedom. They would condition German thought in their own particular interest, as the Nazis did formerly in theirs, by binding it fast in the strait-jacket of preconceived opinion and idea. This is their conception, I suppose, of teaching the German people to know the blessings of democracy. We are going to show them how wrong the Nazis were, and how right we are in all the ways of life. And we begin by doing what the Nazis did—banning books.

Here is a special dispatch from Berlin to the New York Herald-Tribune, which tells the story. An index, or black list, of dead and living authors is being prepared, and will be issued in due course. The authors included in the list are those deemed not fit for German reading.

All Nazi writers, of course, are included, and some 2,200 other authors who, although not themselves National Socialists—most of them probably lived before national socialism was ever heard of—are yet considered dangerous to the new Allied regime. The writings of all these authors will be banned.

This action means that the books in question may not be published, sold in book stores, or given out into general circulation by libraries. The forbidden works will not be removed from the library shelves—there will be no searching or stripping of public institutions or private homes. But so far as is humanly possible, the books will be outlawed from all public use, and thus effectually banished from German life.

I have been interested in noting some of the particular titles involved in this sweeping act of condemnation, especially in relation to my own modest library. First on the list, of course, is Adolf Hitler's Mein Kampf. When I was in Germany in 1935 I took particular pains to get an authorized edition of this influential and historically important work. If I went to Germany today under United Nations auspices, I couldn't get a copy. Here on my shelves are two other editions of Hitler's book, both published in this country. Our American publishers apparently did a grossly reprehensible thing when they issued these books, and thus exposed the minds of our people to their foul contagion. I tremble as I look at my copies of Mein Kampf, and think of the damage they may have done to my mind.

Another banned author is Houston Stewart Chamberlain, the expatriated Englishman who wrote The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century, which popularized the superrace theory in Germany. I remember reading the two large volumes of this work in the early days of my ministry—they were published in London by the John Lane Co., highly respectable publishers, in 1910. I have kept them on my shelves here all these years. And right side of them stand the prodigious volumes of Chamberlain's masterpiece on Immanuel Kant. Here undoubtedly is the explanation or a part of the explanation, of the dangerously perverted condition of my mind.

Another name on the list of banished books in Berlin is Oswald Spengler, and the book responsible for his disgrace is The Decline of the West. Here it is in my library—two huge volumes. I can't honestly say that I have read these volumes through—much of their learning and elaborate argumentation were too much for me. But I read a good part of them, and the rest I got from Prof. Charles Beard's laudatory reviews. Spengler, one of the greatest scholars of his time, is described as "the philosophical precursor of nazism," and so he has to go.

Other authors? Well, Von Treitschke, the great nineteenth century nationalist historian of Germany. I can't seem to lay hands on my old Treitschke volume, but I remember reading it in 1914, and getting a lot of insight into the whys and wherefores of German militarism. So this man's writings are dangerous. Yes, perhaps so, for they came perilously near making me a Germanophobe of the worst order.

And here is Knut Hamsun, the great Norwegian novelist, and Nobel prize winner. What a writer he was! Here on my shelves is his masterwork, Growth of the Soil, and the other fine book of his, Hunger. There isn't any nazism in these noble writings. They are filled with profound compassion for the common people and a deep sense of human brotherhood. But Hamsun was foolish, or misled, in the early days of the war. He compromised himself by publicly expressing admiration for certain of the principles of nazism. So he must go. His books cannot stand on their own worth, but must be damned with their erring author. But I shall keep them here on my shelves all the same.

So my library wouldn't fare very well in Berlin these days. It would be almost as badly off as in the old bad days of the Nazis. Most of my library would then have been burned. Perhaps burning may again come in Germany. There is no sign of it yet. It is difficult to imagine Americans, Englishmen, or Russians dumping armfuls of books on raging bonfires and dancing about the flames like naked savages. But one never knows, once a thing like this is started. A month ago I would have said that the mere banning of books by the occupation forces was impossible. But here it is—with Avernus yawning not far away down the "swift descent."

It all goes to show that all men everywhere are much the same. Placed in the same conditions, exposed to the same temptations, they will be guilty of the same follies and the same crimes. Americans, English, Germans, Italians, Russians, Japanese, Indians, Negroes, Jews, Gentiles, Roman Catholics, Protestants—they are all built of the same fundamental substance of human nature. All are subject to the same physical, mental, and psychological ills. Why then divide men into angels and demons? Be careful, be careful. Condemn your enemy—and before you know it, you are yourself doing the very things that stirred your ire against him.

Yet we should know better. Conditions in this country and Europe are not the same. Temptations are not equal, or even similar. There is no imaginable excuse for us to repeat Nazi tricks, or follow Nazi precedents. Thrice shame to us if, on any excuse, we do these loathsome things.

Statement by W. L. Mallon Before House Small Business Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 8 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, there are approximately 35,000 automobile dealers in the country, a large number of whom are in California, who are greatly concerned over the OPA's proposal to change the established trade discount. This morning the House Small Business Committee held a hearing, at which Mr. W. L. Mallon, of Newark, N. J., president of the National Automobile Dealers Association, appeared and testified. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of his statement may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF W. L. MALLON, NEWARK, N. J., PRESIDENT THE NATIONAL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSOCIATION, BEFORE THE HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE, NOVEMBER 8, 1945

I am William L. Mallon, of Newark, N. J., where I have been an active automobile dealer for the past 32 years. I am appearing as president of the National Automobile Dealers Association, in which capacity I draw no salary.

There are at present somewhere between 30,000 and 35,000 retail automobile dealers in the United States. Before the war, there were

more than 40,000. All factories are planning to greatly increase their prewar volume. The distribution of this increased number of units will not only require the return of the 10,000 dealers who have dropped out during the war period, but will necessitate an additional number of dealers. It must be borne in mind that a satisfactory and competent dealer establishment cannot be created overnight. It is reasonable to assume that factories, in their long-range planning, will be appointing additional dealers in the near future. Unless production promptly reaches the proposed increased volume, it is apparent that the number of units to be handled by the present dealer establishments will be reduced. Consequently, there is no guaranty as to the number of units that each dealer will handle during the coming 2 years.

These 35,000 dealers today are located in every county in the United States and in both large and small communities. Generally, they are small merchants. The average dealer sells less than a hundred cars a year. Many of them sell less than 25 cars in a year. In peacetime, when there were about 40,000 active dealers, less than 10,000 of them were large enough to be incorporated and pay income taxes. That put three-fourths of them, or about 30,000, definitely in the small-businessman class. That is the chief reason why we are here today to appeal to your Small Business Committee for help in a crisis which has arisen in our trade. We regard the House and Senate Small Business Committees as the outstanding protectors and defenders of small business in Government.

Retail automobile dealers have good reason to appreciate and rely on this House committee. When the war threatened to close our doors in 1942, it was your committee which promptly came to our rescue. Largely as a result of your inaugurating a fair-treatment program for automobile dealers through enactment of the Murray-Patman Act, 75 percent of the then active dealers have been enabled to remain in business. One fourth, or about 10,000 of them, were forced to close their doors. Almost to a man, however, these 10,000 are simply marking time in other lines of business and hoping that they may soon return to the sale and servicing of automobiles.

Contrary to a picture frequently presented nowadays, the retail automobile dealers are not about to step into a golden harvest of sales. Many and serious problems lie before them. They include refinancing, obtaining new and old cars to sell, manpower, and finally operating at a normal profit under OPA pricing and profit-control regulations.

It is a feature of this OPA profit-control program which brings us to you today. The dealers of the Nation are gravely concerned over a threatened slash in their established trade discount by OPA. Dealers believe such a cut as OPA proposes would prove ruinous to them. They have asked me to lay the facts which confront us before you in the hope that as friends of small business you will find a way to assist them to get a square deal.

First, let us understand just what the trade discount is and what OPA proposes to do to it. The discount is the long-established mark-up which the dealer is allowed by the manufacturer to put on his new cars. The prices of new cars are set at the various factories. Then dealers are given certain discounts, averaging about 24 percent on each car, and this is their gross profit before any expenses.

May I emphasize this point—that it required 25 years, in a highly competitive market, to increase the dealer discount from 18 percent to 25 percent. The manufacturers realized that 24 percent to 25 percent was the minimum discount required for the average dealer to continue business and that it would not permit of the dealer receiving excessive profits. From that average of 24 percent dealers paid a large part of their operating costs and other expenses.

This 24-percent gross profit may sound generous at first sight, but the net profit that results after expenses are paid is small. Accurate figures on just what dealers make are difficult to obtain, but the average for 3 years before the war, 1939–40–41, was somewhere between 1 percent and 2 percent. Should an industry-wide survey, which never has been made, show even a net return of from 1 percent to 2 percent, it could not be called a large or unreasonable profit. Certainly such a return would not justify a top slash of 50 percent in discount such as OPA now says is possible.

According to the Statistical Division of the Bureau of Internal Revenue during the 3 years immediately preceding the war, 1939–40–41, the net before income taxes averaged only 1.07 percent. The highest net profit after income taxes for any one year was 1.16 percent in 1941. The lowest was 0.29 for 1939. This low earning for 1939 is an important figure to remember because it appears quite prominently in the present pricing plan of OPA.

The whole situation in a nutshell, then, is that OPA officials have announced their intention of slashing the dealer discount to as low as 11 to 13 percent, or approximately half of what it has been, if necessary, in order to help absorb the increased cost of new car production. This would mean cutting the dealer gross earnings in half. Cutting the 1939–40–41 average of 1.07 percent in half would mean an average earning of about one-half of 1 percent. This is the extreme OPA cut, but it would be possible.

This trade discount cutting plan has been decided upon by OPA officials largely in star-chamber sessions. Contrary to repeated OPA promises to House and Senate leaders and representatives of the retail automobile dealers, OPA has not consulted fully with any or all of these groups before coming to a decision to reduce the dealer discount rate. The first definite announcement that OPA had decided to cut the discount was made at a meeting of the OPA Industry Advisory Committee October 31. The only information given at that time was that OPA experts had reached their decision after examining the earnings reports of only 300 dealers. Three hundred dealers constitute just about 1 percent of the active dealers in the country and probably would not constitute more than two-thirds of 1 percent of the full peacetime dealership whose prices and profits OPA now is planning to set.

I think it important at this point that you know in a little more detail of the many futile efforts of the retail automobile dealers of the country to induce OPA officials for practically 2 years to conduct their study of the trade discount situation in full cooperation and consultation with the dealers. Other NADA officials and I have been active in these efforts, and the details that I give you are amply supported by documentary evidence.

Reports that OPA officials were planning to lower the dealer trade discount became current as early as the fall of 1943. When the National Automobile Dealers Association convention was held in Detroit in January 1944, these reports had become quite persistent. Efforts to confirm them at OPA headquarters in Washington during the next year were futile. Inquiriers usually were told that OPA had not given consideration to this part of the pricing formula.

Suddenly, however, in March 1945, Administrator Bowles and James F. Brownlee, Deputy Administrator, appeared before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and made clear their general pricing plan which included absorption by certain retailers of any increases in production costs. At that time, they indicated that special retailer cases would be given special consideration when increased cost absorptions were being allocated.

The manufacture of new cars ceased in January 1942. The vast majority of dealers had a limited number of new cars frozen in their stocks, and with few exceptions they have been without new cars for nearly 2 years. During the war period, dealers' costs of operation greatly increased and their personnel was drastically cut. In spite of this, the 30,000 dealers continued to render vital service to essential transportation. For these reasons, and many others, NADA felt that the retail automobile dealers constituted a special case. Hence, they made haste to contact OPA officials and register their desire to be given every opportunity to present their situation to OPA before any changes in the dealer discount rate were even contemplated by OPA.

In connection with this movement, I personally called upon Administrator Bowles on March 8, 1945, and in the course of discussing the general pricing policy for reconversion, he stated that some industries would be entitled to special consideration. As a result of this discussion I concluded that our industry was properly one of these. Therefore, on March 16, 1945, I promptly requested by mail that our industry be given ample opportunity to confer with representatives of OPA prior to issuance of any regulations to apply in the reconversion period. Under date of March 24 Mr. Bowles replied that it seemed appropriate that OPA should comply with my request and arrange for prompt consultation with representatives of the retail automobile industry.

Simultaneously, dealers and their representatives contacted congressional leaders and expressed their fears that OPA might suddenly subject them to a discount cut without proper consultation. It was thought that if this fear had any strong foundation legislation to protect special cases such as those of automobile dealers might be sought. Leaders on both sides of Congress upon contacting OPA officials were assured that before a discount cut dealers would be consulted fully as previously promised, and upon these assurances plans for legislation were abandoned.

No progress was made at the first meeting held on April 4 with the OPA Industry Advisory Committee and as it appeared that further conferences were indefinite the House Small Business Committee again made inquiry as to just what OPA proposed to do in the situation. OPA repeated its promise that it would consult not once but several times with the Industry Advisory Committee before acting.

Our efforts to come to an agreement with OPA on making its survey of dealer operations, continued to be marked by long delays in OPA. Finally, however, in May 1945, both OPA and NADA sent out questionnaires to dealers in this connection. We made a preliminary report on our replies during July and advised OPA that we could continue our studies and make available current reports when called for. We fully expected, of course, that when the time approached for OPA to make a decision on any possible changes in the dealer discounts, we would assemble all the figures they and we had gathered and go over them, as their promises to congressional leaders and NADA officials indicated would be done. All of our statistical work was pointed toward this end. Such a meeting we fully expected would take place shortly prior to the resumption of new-car production, possibly early this fall.

At the end of July, I made a progress report on NADA cost studies and some comments on the dealer-discount situation to a meeting held in Chicago of OPA representatives and the industry advisory committee for the motor vehicle retail trade. Nothing was said at that meeting to indicate any change in the discount rate. Simultaneously, the chairman of your House Small

Business Committee was reassured in a letter from James G. Rogers, Jr., Acting Administrator of OPA, that no policy would be applied to affect the dealers' profit margin without full consultation with the dealers' advisory committee or without notice to the chairman of your committee personally.

Again, on August 28, Administrator Bowles issued a press release promising that no action on dealer margins would be taken until the facts were in and the dealer groups had been consulted. Mr. Bowles also declared in that statement that he expected manufacturers generally to maintain 1942 price levels and that if this were followed, there would be no change in dealer discounts.

In the light of these many assurances and reassurances of OPA's intention to reach a decision on dealer discounts only after full congressional notice and dealer consultation, announcement on October 31, last, that a decision had been reached by OPA came with atomic speed and surprise. A meeting of the OPA industry advisory committee was called on October 26 for October 31 in Washington. Rumors that a decision had been reached on the dealer discount situation could not be confirmed, OPA officials evading both congressional and dealer inquiries. Confirmation first came when the advisory group assembled on October 31.

Members of the advisory committee were told at that meeting that a study of 300 dealer reports had convinced OPA that dealers could operate profitably under a discount range of from 11 percent to 13 percent. Therefore, it followed that any increased cost in new-car production, which manufacturers could not absorb would have to be absorbed by the dealers down to the 11 percent to 13 percent discount level. When asked for detailed figures upon which the decision was based, OPA officials refused to reveal them, saying that they were confidential.

Lee Moran, executive vice president of NADA, who was present at the meeting as an observer, went on record, representing the dealers, that we did not consider this satisfactory and not full consultation as promised by OPA.

Further, NADA officials knew their complete compilations on dealers' operating costs had not been considered. NADA still was compiling data daily in order to be able to submit the most current figures when OPA arranged its frequently promised consultation.

Likewise NADA has reliable information that OPA has not made a thorough study of manufacturer costs. In fact, in the face of the pending labor situation, it would have been impossible for OPA to have made an accurate manufacturer cost study at the time of the discount cut announcement.

What appears to have happened was that OPA statisticians had taken a mere handful of figures on dealer operating costs and a few scattered manufacturing costs and used them as a basis for a proposed discount rate change which might easily wreck the entire retail automobile trade structure.

Your committee was not, of course, in possession of all of these facts, but it was known to you that OPA had not kept its oft-repeated promises to consult the dealers fully and keep you advised. Very properly, therefore, you immediately called this hearing to determine the facts.

I must apologize for the somewhat lengthy review of our futile negotiations with OPA on this matter. It was necessary, however, in order to lay the groundwork for presenting to you important information about dealer operations which follows.

NADA has contended in all of its negotiation with OPA and now reiterates that insofar as possible official Government reports, such as those of the Internal Revenue Bureau, should be used in figuring dealer, manufacturer, and public earnings and cost absorption possibilities. Such statistics are not open to suspicion or question. They are a part of the official record on which the taxpayers have paid off.

Hence, in arriving at the prewar position of the dealer, it is fair to take his income-tax reports for the years immediately preceding the war, 1939–41, as a base.

A study of the income tax reports of approximately 9,400 dealers for this period demonstrates forcibly that the retail automobile busniess under the average 24 percent trade discount has not been a generally prosperous one. During 1939–40–41, combined net dealer earnings were only 1.07 percent before income taxes and only .71 percent or less than three-quarters of 1 percent after income taxes.

In 1939, more than 50 percent of the dealers reporting to the income tax bureau lost money. In 1940, more than 40 percent lost money, and in 1941, more than 25 percent lost money. Over the 1939–40–41 period slightly more than 38 percent made no money at all.

The low 1939 dealer earnings are of particular interest because of a current situation.

When Administrator Bowles, at a recent press conference, sought to justify his proposed discount-cutting plan, he was quoted as saying that dealers were demanding twice as much profit as they made in 1939.

Dealers have not and do not now demand any particular dollar profit. They only ask that their regular discount be continued that they may gamble on a fair profit as they have done heretofore.

That point, however, is an aside. The interesting feature is that Administrator Bowles, for some reason, chose 1939 as a typical dealer profit year. It really was the worst of any 3 years immediately preceding the war and the only one in which more dealers lost money than made it, according to the figures of the Internal Revenue Bureau. During that year, out of 9,359 incorporated dealers reporting to the income tax bureau, only 4,668, or less than half, made any money whatsoever. Their net gross after income taxes was .29, or less than a third of a cent on each dollar's business.

I shall not read, but will file the dealer income tax figures for these 3 years and urgently request that they be used as a basis for determining if dealers should be forced to pay any part of increased new car costs.

Income of 9,400 incorporated dealers handling estimated sales of 80 percent of all new cars

(Statistical Division, Bureau of Internal Revenue)

Year		Net income before income tax	Gross receipts
1939	4,668	$22,033,770	$2,006,677,093
	4,691	[1] 10,770,396	880,514,658
	9,359	11,263,374	2,887,191,751
1940	5,715	35,565,740	2,882,002,094
	3,862	[1] 9,880,860	763,650,815
	9,577	25,684,880	3,645,652,909
1941	7,012	78,985,940	3,853,442,258
	2,398	[1] 4,467,988	398,237,056
	9,410	74,517,952	4,251,679,314

[1] Net loss.

1939: Net income on gross sales before income taxes	$0.41
Net income on gross sales after income taxes	.29
1940: Net income on gross sales before income taxes	.72
Net income on gross sales after income taxes	.52
1941: Net income on gross sales before income taxes	1.82
Net income on gross sales after income taxes	1.16

RECAPITULATION

9,400 dealers total gross sales, 1939–41	$10,784,523,974
Net income before income tax	$111,466,206
Average before income tax (percent)	1.07
Average after income tax (percent)	.71

These income tax figures tell the national dealer picture for the 3 years immediately preceding the war more clearly than anything else can. The average dealer went into the war in not more than fair shape. One-fourth of them failed to survive the war. The remaining three-fourths made out by selling used cars so long as their supply held out and by doing service work.

All too often an attempt is made to make it appear that taking new cars away from dealers and making them dependent upon used cars and repairs was a universal golden blessing. The fact is, of course, that while here and there a few large dealers made money during the war, the average dealer had a desperate struggle to keep his doors open. He comes out of the war with his inventories exhausted, his shop equipment worn out, his new car supply uncertain, and grave dangers of future competition being much keener.

OPERATING COSTS

In considering dealer operations the question of increased costs of doing business in either large or small volume is an important one. Under the present ever-changing conditions it is difficult to accurately forecast costs. NADA has submitted questionnaires on these items to the dealers, and up to the present time have been able to summarize the first thousand returns.

We submitted 14 items which mainly comprise the cost of doing business and the percentage estimated increase is as follows:

	Percent
1. Make ready for delivery (excluding freight)	28.43
2. Guarantee policy adjustments	26.04
3. Average salary paid (including clerical and sales commission)	29.21
4. Average wage paid	30.04
5. Reconditioning per used car	73.56
6. Miscellaneous supplies (including stationery)	19.07
7. Miscellaneous express and hauling	15.02
8. Rents and leaseholds	34.67
9. Maintenance—buildings	40.30
10. Maintenance—equipment	39.55
11. Taxes other than income	19.17
12. Insurance (including building)	16.75
13. Light, heat, water, power	14.24
14. Telephone and telegraph	15.98

The weighted average of these 14 items is 25.91 percent.

I would like to amplify on a few of these items.

AVERAGE SALARIES PAID INCLUDING CLERICAL AND SALES COMMISSIONS, 29.21 PERCENT

The Wage Stabilization Act has made it most difficult for automobile dealers to obtain permission to increase clerical salaries, over the amounts paid in 1942. These inequities must be promptly corrected. Many increases have already been made.

Compensation to salesmen is an important item. For instance, the west coast salesmen are employed under a union contract which agreement stipulates the amount of their compensation and prohibits all others in the establishment, including the dealer himself, from selling a car. These agreements, arrived at through collective bargaining, would make it extremely difficult for a dealer in that section of the country to curtail his sales force. In the remainder of the country the general average compensation to salesmen prior to the war would not support the standard of living advocated recently in the President's address.

It is generally recognized that the adoption of a more satisfactory scale of compensation to salesmen is one of the first moves to be made by dealers.

There are some who contend that in the initial stage of limited distribution salesmen will not be required. It must be realized that salesmen are not made by pinning a tag on them. It will require 8 months to a year to organize and properly train the sales forces that will be required to handle the increased

distribution. This will necessitate a considerable outlay by the dealer for some period before he receives any return.

AVERAGE WAGE PAY, 30.04 PERCENT

Prior to the war automobile dealers employed in the neighborhood of 600,000. This number was materially curtailed during the war. Dealers gave to Army Ordnance alone more than 30,000 men who were organized by the dealers themselves. Reassembling and making satisfactory working arrangements with this staff will be a large and expensive job, and earnings cannot start until dealers' forces are properly staffed.

Many of the items, of course, in a dealer's operation involve labor. It is indisputable that the increase of wage in dealer establishments will be comparable with that in the manufacturing end of our industry or in other lines of business. Incidentally, since the removal of restrictions upon increases in salaries, many dealers have increased the wages to their mechanics although the same ceiling on retail prices remain as existed in 1942.

RECONDITIONING USED CARS, 73.56 PERCENT

It is difficult to estimate the number of used cars a dealer will trade in against new car sales. There certainly will be a reasonable number and it can definitely be accepted that the condition of the used cars traded in will be such as to necessitate much larger reconditioning costs in order to make them safe for further use.

RENTS AND LEASEHOLDS, 34.67 PERCENT

Many leases have expired during the past year and are expiring currently. In the majority of cases, renewals have carried an increase from 25 to 50 percent, and in some cases as much as 100 to 150 percent higher.

MAINTENANCE OF BUILDINGS, 40.30 PERCENT

The majority of dealer establishments are badly in need of repair and renovation due to the inability of caring for such items during the war period. This work will require considerable outlay in the immediate future. The average figure from 1,000 replies received is approximately $9,000.

MAINTENANCE OF EQUIPMENT, 39.55 PERCENT

During the past 3 years it has been practically impossible for a dealer to replace any shop equipment. On an average this will require an immediate outlay of approximately $4,000.

I have taken time to explain but a few of the cost items, but all of the others are subject to a comparable explanation.

As previously mentioned, it is difficult to obtain a comprehensive survey of dealer operations. The shortage of clerical help prevented many dealers from completing and returning the questionnaire. We have, however, approximately 2,000 complete replies upon which to base our calculations. We have about completed the analysis of 1,000 returns. Indications are that for the 3-year period 1939–40–41, the net profit figure may exceed the average individual report figure shown in the 9,400 income tax reports.

The remaining 1,000 reports are in the hands of the International Business Machine Co. for indexing and summarizing. We expect to receive the completed figures within the next few days and will then be in a position to render data covering the operations of 2,000 dealers.

To the experienced dealer who has traveled the rough roads in the hills and valleys of past years of the trade, there are two outstanding problems for which he cannot provide an answer. They are:

1. How soon he will be able to obtain a normal supply of new cars on which he can make a reasonable profit.

2. How he will be able to get rid of the used cars he is forced to accept as trade-ins without sustaining a tremendous loss.

Only a crystal ball reader would dare hazard a guess on the date of the return of factories to normal production. The same statement goes for estimating final manufacturing costs. How anyone can predict accurately on either of these two points in the face of a threatened strike for a 30-percent increase in wages and the refusal of suppliers to set costs is beyond the ability of the average dealer to comprehend. Many of our most experienced automobile men do not believe that factories will be in full production for at least a year and possibly longer. Nevertheless, the figures upon which OPA is seeking to justify its proposed cut of dealer discounts are predicated on the assumption that full production and normal peacetime sales operation and assured profit are just around the corner. The mildest thing that can be said about these rosy predictions is that they just cannot be supported by facts.

The used-car problem is not as grave, of course, as that of new-car production, but it cannot be slighted. The assumption that there will be no old cars traded in is wholly unsound. Not only will there be trade-ins, but they will be of a type of car which will require vast reconditioning expenditures. Many trade-ins will have to be junked outright. Nevertheless their owners, having bought them in the black market which immediately followed an imposition of OPA ceilings on used cars, will be demanding high prices for them.

Dealers everywhere are asking these pointed questions about the future used-car market:

1. How will OPA adjust used-car ceiling prices periodically to meet going market values on a basis that will be fair to both car owner and dealer alike?

2. Can the dealer make money on used cars in a falling price market?

3. How many used cars will be traded in on new cars?

4. Can the dealer take in used cars at prices which will permit him to properly recondition them for a profitable sale?

5. What proportion of cars traded in will have to be junked?

Until these new- and used-car problems are solved, dealers everywhere will be forced to restrict the number of their employees. As an element in the reconversion picture, this fact is worthy of consideration. Before the war, dealers gave employment to approximately 600,000 persons. Today only a small percentage of that number is employed, but dealers everywhere are anxious to create as many jobs as possible. They will be forced to make jobs strictly in accordance with their ability to do so, and this ability will be greatly affected by whether dealers are permitted by OPA to operate under a living discount.

The place of the car buyer in the situation is of the utmost importance. Dealers who are in direct contact with automobile users find far more interest in a return of new automobiles and good service for used cars than they do in any possible slight increase in costs made necessary by increased production expenditures. The motorist, who represents a very large part of the adult population of the country, realizes that he has shared in the enormously increased national income during the last 3 years and has saved money on the restricted operation of his car while the retail automobile dealer has had virtually nothing to sell. What the average citizen needs and wants badly is adequate transportation. He cannot see that the return of it is going to be expedited or his general transportation needs aided by slicing the dealer's discount to a point where he will have difficulty in operating.

The motorist also is aware of the fact that many dealers have operated at an actual loss during the war in order to hold their old customers for the coming of a better day. There is an appreciation of this effort to give service and in return for it car owners generally want to see their friends, the dealers, treated fairly now that the time again is at hand when they will have a chance to recoup some of their wartime losses.

Dealers often are asked just what it is they want done in the present trade discount situation. That is a fair question and one which is easily answered. They are most desirous that no change be made in their historic trade discount until it can be proven publicly and absolutely that any suggested changes are justified. Dealers believe that no attempt should be made in the present muddled automobile production situation to make any change in the dealer discount until the following points are definitely settled through a complete inquiry into all facts:

1. What will be the actual production costs of all cars after the present wage discussion is settled and all factories are in full production?

2. What part, if any, of these increased production costs should the dealer have to bear in the light of his 3 years of adverse business?

There is a simple way for our Government to meet this situation and be completely fair to all concerned. That way is to permit the dealer discount rate to remain on the time-proven present level. This would give every one of the 35,000 or more dealers an opportunity to start rehabilitating his business on the same basis as where he left off when the war curtailed his operations. In doing this he would be carrying his share of the postwar burden.

Every dealer is more than willing and anxious to bear a fair share of the postwar burden as he has borne the burdens placed upon him during the war period.

To you gentlemen of the Congress who, as members of the Small Business Committee, are charged with the responsibility of protecting the interest of the 3,000,000 or more small businessmen and their many millions of employees in this country, it certainly must be obvious to you that if the OPA is permitted to arbitrarily disturb the traditional dealer discount that it is conceivable and probable the great majority of dealers will be forced to discontinue business with the resultant disastrous effect upon the general economy and welfare of the country.

Aftermath of the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 8 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "You Pays Your Money," by Milton Mayer, published in the Progressive of November 5, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOU PAYS YOUR MONEY

(By Milton Mayer)

At times I fancy myself as a crazy utopian, because I insist that the world can be made a fit place to live in; at others, as a hopeless pessimist, because I insist it cannot be made a fit place to live in by next Thursday. But today, as I glim a couple of front-page stories in the St. Paul Pioneer Press, I fancy myself as the only sane man left alive.

One of the stories from Tokyo asserts that mass starvation—already a fact in bombed-out Europe—will occur in Japan this winter in spite of General MacArthur's statesmanlike struggle to get the country on its feet. Relief, in the form of food, has got to come from the United States. The other story, from Washington, reports that the current turkey crop in the United States will be twice as big as it was before the war, and that the Government is going to have to support the falling prices on turkeys and chickens; and, horribile dictu, the egg situation is so good, and the price going down so fast, that the Department of Agriculture will have to curtail egg production.

Here it is, then, a few weeks after our biggest and best war to support the American way, and the American way is beginning to collapse again. The American way is capitalism, sometimes known as the free market, but there is nothing free about a market supported by Government parity, and Government curtailment of production, in the interest of maintaining prices, is nothing short of socialism, though the Socialists would point out in a hurry that it is socialism in reverse.

And, while the American way, so recently vindicated by the atom bomb, moves rapidly toward a header, with the specter again of poverty in the midst of plenty and the very means of life being plowed under in order to support an inedible dollar, the people of two continents approach starvation and freezing. Since their starvation is socialized, and they have nothing to exchange for eggs, their relief must be socialized. Either we feed them through UNRRA or they die. Some vermiform vestige of morality whispers to us, "Thy brother is hungry," but an equally vermiform vestige of the American way whispers, "Plow it under, cork up the hens, support the prices."

Thus the American way, and our morality is, I hope, American, too, is caught between two socialisms, socialized greed and socialized charity. And all this a few weeks after a war that was fought, at a cost of $2,000,000,000 a week, to bring freedom from want to the world.

We pay our money, and the blood of our young men, but apparently we don't take our choice. Having sunk a hundred billion a year to the bottom of the seven seas, we find ourselves approaching, slowly but surely, the condition of the two nations first involved in this war, Germany and Poland. In Poland mass hunger has been the rule for seven centuries, in order to support the American way. In Germany, for two centuries, the American way has been supported by the imprisonment of a freezing man who took so much as a fallen twig out of another man's forest.

We grow poorer in goods, we, the only rich people left on earth, and we grow more arrogant in spirit. The cost of war must be measured not merely in the expenditure of goods, but also, and much more so, in the increased determination to hold on to the decreased goods that are left. Worse yet, the cost of war to the victor must be measured in the determination to take from somebody else sufficient goods to compensate for those expended. And so the "hard peace" boys, who are only crazy with the heat, play into the hands of the national lust for somebody else's goods. The utopian ideal is to fight $2,000,000,000-a-week wars without paying a cent for them.

This ideal could once be realized in the Congo, in India, and in Mexico, but it cannot now be realized in Asia and in Europe for the main and simple reason (as Penrod would put it) that you cannot get blood out of a turnip. If Europe and Asia freeze and starve—such people grow so desperate that they will fight anybody anywhere, including each other—while we return to Mr. Wallace's reverse socialism of plowing under, or to Mr. Hoover's free, but empty, market, there will be war everywhere, and it won't be the atom bomb that started it.

The more I think about all this—this total failure of the total war, even in terms of our own greed—the more my private suspicion is confirmed that I am the only sane man alive. The more I think about Mr. Truman's peacetime conscription—the "Prussianism" we went to war against 25 years ago—the readier I am to offer myself as candidate for the office of prophet without portfolio. The more I think about our red-handed policy toward Puerto Rico, which we don't even need in order to be rich; the more I think about Russia's acquisition of Manchuria and half of Korea as its share in the divvy for its 8-day participation in the east; the more I think—

I am the only sane man alive. Plow me under, daddy, eight to the bar.

Closing of the Higgins Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. OVERTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 8 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement appearing in one of the local newspapers, written by Andrew J. Higgins, president, Higgins Industries, Inc., and entitled "Give Me Liberty." The statement explains why Higgins Industries closed shop in New Orleans.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GIVE ME LIBERTY

(The statement below, addressed to the loyal workers of Higgins Industries, Inc., New Orleans, La., is published here because we believe it holds special interest to every American citizen. Higgins Industries, Inc., has voluntarily shut down shop because of the harassment of organized labor unions and government agencies.)

This present and last strike called by the self-styled "elected" bargaining agents of the multitudinous crafts accepted for affiliation with the American Federation of Labor, has degenerated into violence, intimidation, and sabotage. No matter what name has been applied to it—"lockout," "shutdown," "stoppage," or "fishing expedition"—this is the last strike at Higgins Industries, Inc.

The dream I had of educating these people to cooperate and produce an example, a yardstick that would prove that management and labor could get along together, degenerated into a nightmare.

On every occasion when speaking to labor groups I counseled moderation, clear thinking and wise leadership to make the peace obtained at such high costs worthwhile. I preached the same theories on many occasions before employer groups.

I have fought the good battle for labor. I will continue to stand for the rights of labor. I believe in organized labor and collective bargaining, but I do not believe in and will not support any isolated pressure group that is abusing organized labor and its membership.

I consider the Wagner Labor Act oppressive in its operation, and in the long run it will do labor and American industry a disservice. Under that law, or its interpretation, an employer is powerless to effectively plead his own case. He is denied his constitutional right of free speech. He can be accused of any outrageous thing, or deed, or intent, by any labor representative, and if he dares to defend himself to the public, or to his own employees, he is in danger of being found guilty of unfair labor practice!

The men who have been with this company have on many occasions been ordered to cease work, arbitrarily, by some steward or by some business agent, completely ignoring the bargaining contracts and agreements, or the orderly processes of settling disputes provided therein.

We had resigned ourselves to work out difficulties and possibly overcome them by conciliation and the processes of law, however inadequate and unjust; but within the last several days, the stream of reports and visible evidences of assault on those men coming to work, threats and intimidations to their families, threats against their lives, plus acts of sabotage, has caused this management to come to an extreme decision that we hope will be so sacrificial and so soundly taken, that it will shock the lawmakers and those who have been abusing power; we have decided for these reasons and for the protection of the lives of our employees to call this terrible condition to the attention of the country by shutting down our manufacturing operations despite golden opportunities.

We have approximately $40,000,000 of orders on hand. If we were free of this threat, if we could be clear in our planning, we could take on more work to provide more jobs. It is a certainty that we could have provided more jobs, at equal or higher pay, than we did in our spectacular accomplishments during the war. Such an operation required cooperation of labor and management alike, but labor was found unable to meet this responsibility.

These alleged labor leaders have shown a callous disregard of the interests of their members and of the industries they were serving. They never recognized the fact that by helping improve the position of the company, or any other company they had dealings with, they would be assisting in creating work, better work, in providing better jobs at better pay.

Men that collect, handle, and are custodians of immense amounts of money derived from dues and fees should be worthy of a bond. Does the rank and file know what disposition is being made of the immense amounts so collected?

These self-styled or self-elected bargaining agents have been misleading their membership. This strike was unquestionably called for their own self-perpetuation, and the workers are their scapegoats.

These business agents of the local crafts who have gained the support of the presidents of their international unions have influenced these responsible and serious men against this company. In face of the fact that I, the president of this company, overlooking all of the difficulties I was suffering from a local condition, gave support to organized labor, subscribing as I have always done to the rights and dignity of labor, and hoping that I could add sound, workable ideas to the principles of democracy.

Contrary to these pygmy men damaging organized labor, I am still the friend of labor and of organized labor, but from now on I will suport organized labor only provided labor itself does the sensible thing—to demand and elect that they be made responsible under the law, as is any other organization, and as I wrote President Truman in my letter of October 15 past: "All officers or agents of the unions should be accountable for all

initiation fees, dues, fines, and collections, and such officers or agents should be commercially bonded."

Organized labor unions must be made responsible under the law for their agreements and their contractual obligations, the same as any other commercial organization.

We have just finished an awful war. If the poor devils that got by without being killed cannot take a job without paying a tribute for it, then it is a futile victory.

Now, this company is a prosperous and a going concern with vast operations possible for it at the time of this decision. Its operation would have called for the employment of a great number of men vital for the prosperity of the community, this State, and this section of the country. But, under the conditions imposed on us the ambition to take chances to take on work to create jobs has been lost to us.

To the stockholders and management of this company, the chief incentive was to create good work, to provide jobs, and make a contribution to the welfare of this country. To do so we must meet pay rolls, we have to be in a competitive position; we realize we cannot do so when dealing with pygmy-minded vicious men.

So, spectacularly, we are going to act as the guinea pig, and call it quits rather than work under these impossible conditions. These grave decisions were arrived at when we had evidence that the power, unconstitutional or not, of various Government agencies were combining and being directed in association with these local groups, fallaciously supported by their international presidents, to coerce us into impossible working contracts.

Last year the War Labor Board said we had a justifiable, full, and proper right to cancel the contract with the AFL crafts; ridiculously at the same time, another branch of that board said that we must continue an association with those same people under the same conditions of the contract they said we had the right to cancel.

We submitted to indiginities and arbitrary contradictions because we were manufacturing vital things needed for the winning of the war. When the war ended, we believe we very properly questioned the constitutional right of this wartime board to continue its domination over us.

Here recently, we have been put in an absolutely untenable position where another group of organized labor has contended they represent a majority of our workers and have been granted hearings by an organization set up under the Wagner Labor Act, but in the face of this the War Labor Board notified me yesterday that I was in contempt or in default, and would be shortly required to go to Washington again to debate clauses of a contract that that same War Labor Board said were properly canceled—this edict coming at a time when loyal workers are being assaulted or threatened with assault or worse; the placards carried by hired goons in front of my plant, brazenly denouncing and vilifying, damning the company, threatening that they were going to ruin the company, and vocally broadcasting a boycott of the company.

After due deliberation, we came to the decision that we would free ourselves of this oppression. We cut the tentacles of the octopus, and like the Massachusetts colonials that threw the tea overboard from the ships, by this act we will evidence our protest against bondage. The men at our plants, like the Colonies, had no representation. They were denied the right of voting who would be their collective bargaining agents.

Five years ago a few people forced a union contract on me. The local power hounds, aided and abetted by Government departments, have held our workers in bondage and forced them to pay, not taxes, but tribute—and to whom?

Now, I don't intend to emulate Patrick Henry, or go as far as he did. He said, "Give me liberty or give me death." We say for ourselves and our workers, "Give us liberty and life," and the right of any man to take any job that is offered and he is qualified to take without tribute to anyone.

HIGGINS INDUSTRIES, INC.,
ANDREW J. HIGGINS, *President.*

Retail Lumber Dealers Oppose OPA Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 8, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, the retail lumber dealers in the Northwest are opposed to the new proposals of the Office of Price Administration. Briefly, the OPA proposes to hold the consumer's price at the present level; to grant the manufacturers of lumber and building materials the right to increase their selling price to the retail lumber yards and building material dealers, and let the retailers absorb the increase in price. There are also other features in connection with the construction of new buildings. In all plans, it is important to note that the retailers will absorb the increased costs.

Yesterday, I pointed out that such was the principle of action proposed in connection with the retail dealers in the sale of automobiles and trucks. They are to absorb the increased costs, and the effect will be to put them out of business, because they will not be able to operate at a profit.

The same thing applies in the case of the retailers of lumber and building materials, if the OPA program is to go into effect. This policy will ruin the retailers. They must operate at a profit if they are going to stay in business. The proposed OPA plans will stagnate reconversion to a peacetime economy of the building industry, and will prevent the construction of homes and farm buildings so badly needed by the people of the country.

The program is supposed to prevent inflation, whatever that may be. Inflation means one thing to one person and another thing to someone else. It is a loose term. It has many contributing factors and causes. A rise in price does not necessarily mean inflation.

Following World War No. 1, the currency of France, Germany, and other countries became practically valueless. It lost its purchasing power. Some people point out that this happened on account of the countries being bankrupt. The rise in prices was the result of the use of currency that had ceased to have value. The evils of printing-press money was called inflation.

Regardless of what constitutes or does not constitute inflation, the policy of OPA will work injury to the retail merchants who deal in lumber and building materials. Our system of private enterprise is built on small business and it ought to be encouraged instead of being handicapped. Here, again, when OPA attempts to eliminate the element of profit, it destroys one of the cornerstones of our American system. The only alternative is the communistic conception of government ownership and operation.

School of International Affairs in Memory of Woodrow Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, November 8 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Honorable Jesse H. Jones has made a donation of $300,000 for the purpose of creating at the University of Virginia the Woodrow Wilson School of International Affairs.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by Mr. Jones to Dr. Newcomb, president of the University of Virginia.

I do not know of anything more appropriate that could be done than to establish at the University of Virginia a School of International Affairs in memory of Woodrow Wilson, who stands today as he always stood as one of the greatest American statesmen.

As a Virginian, I want to express my great appreciation to Mr. Jones for this very valuable contribution he has made to a better understanding of international affairs.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 23, 1945.*
Dr. JOHN LLOYD NEWCOMB,
President, University of Virginia,
Charlottesville, Va.

DEAR PRESIDENT NEWCOMB: I have under consideration the founding of the Woodrow Wilson School of International Affairs in some outstanding university, and my thoughts turn first to the University of Virginia, of which he was so distinguished an alumnus.

Such a school would be devoted to the teaching of international relations with emphasis on those aspects of the subject with which his name will ever be associated.

I cannot pretend to outline the field for such a school, and nothing would be further from my thought than to limit the academic freedom of the school or of the university authorities. To illustrate what I have in mind, the teaching might embrace such things as past and present history of American foreign relations, American policies in the foreign field, past and present efforts at international organization, international commerce and its effect on Government policy, international law and international justice, negotiation and interpretation of treaties, the practice of diplomacy, etc.

If the idea appeals to you and your board, and you would create the Woodrow Wilson

School of International Affairs at the University of Virginia, I would contribute, or cause to be contributed by a foundation that Mrs. Jones and I have heretofore created, $20,000 a year for the ensuing 15 years for the payment of faculty salaries and lecture fees. This amount should be sufficient to attract persons of high reputation and recognized competency. The period of 15 years is suggested with the thought that it is a sufficient length of time to prove the usefulness of the project. If it fails to justify itself, it should then be abandoned. If it succeeds, means will no doubt be found to carry it on.

I am prompted in this move not merely to honor the memory of a great American statesman, whom, because of his service to the world, his recognized high principles, his great political and intellectual integrity, I hold in reverence, but to help in giving to coming generations of young Americans a livelier appreciation of the vital interests and heavy responsibility of the United States in the outside world.

I should like to feel that I was by this means helping to make ready some of your students to serve their country in foreign affairs.

As I see Woodrow Wilson, he sacrificed his life for world peace.

If, following World War I, his ideals for world cooperation could have been consummated, we might have been spared World War II, with its devastating effect on mankind. It will be recalled that during his speaking tour in 1919 when he was appealing to the American people for support of world cooperation, and on which tour he was stricken, President Wilson said at Omaha, Nebr.:

"I tell you, my fellow citizens, I can predict with absolute certainty that within another generation there will be another world war if the nations of the world do not concert the method by which to prevent it."

Now, a generation later, we recognize the wisdom of his appeal for world cooperation and will profit by adopting that philosophy.

Will you give the subject consideration and let me hear from you?

Sincerely yours,

JESSE H. JONES.

Hospital Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 8 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hospital Aid" published in the Washington Post of November 6, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

HOSPITAL AID

Our national health rests on four main pillars, according to the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. These are medical research, preventive medicine, medical care and hospitalization. Each of those pillars is weakened by the present inadequacy of health centers and hospitals. The committee found, for example, that a community which has no hospital is often deprived also of doctors' services, for many young men in the profession refuse to practice where hospital facilities are not available.

Surgeon General Parran told the committee that 40 percent of the counties in the United States, with some 15,000,000 people, have no recognized hospital. Most of our hospitals have been built with private contributions. Their location has thus been erratic. The result is that we have no systematic pattern of hospital service. Medical centers and hospitals are particularly scarce in the rural areas. But many city dwellers also are deprived of these aids to health. Dr. Reginald Atwater, secretary of the American Public Health Association, told the committee that less than 10 percent of the country's health agencies "are provided with physical facilities even approaching reasonable standards of adequacy."

The outcome of the committee's investigation is a bill authorizing Federal grants-in-aid to help the States overcome these deficiencies. It would authorize the appropriation of $5,000,000 for State health-facility surveys and planning and $75,000,000 a year for 5 years for actual construction of hospitals and health centers. The modesty of the program is indicated by the fact that in 5 years it could provide only about one-fifth of the facilities estimated to be currently needed.

We heartily endorse the committee's recommendation of this bill for early enactment. At the same time, however, we share Senator MURRAY's dislike for one important administrative feature. The bill would set up a Federal Hospital Council and give it a sort of administrative veto upon the actions of the Surgeon General if he should disapprove State plans for hospital construction under the terms of the bill. An advisory group to aid the Surgeon General in making decisions, with full power to publicize its findings, would be most useful. But we do not think that administrative powers should be split in this haphazard manner. To pass such a measure while Congress is voting power to the President to eliminate confusing administrative tangles would be a grave reflection on congressional judgment. With this obvious defect corrected, the bill will hold great promise of better care for the sick in the postwar years.

Common Sense About the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I extend my remarks by including the following timely and interesting article by William Henry Chamberlin, on common sense about the peace, which appeared in the Progressive magazine of October 15, 1945.

Mr. Chamberlin spent several years in Russia, is a world-wide traveler, highly educated, but has never lost the common touch, and it is my hope that many people will read his splendid article.

COMMON SENSE ABOUT THE PEACE

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

Marvelous is the power of semantics. A poll of American public opinion on the proposition, "Do you believe that the peace should be based on the principles of the Atlantic Charter?" would probably reveal a substantial affirmative majority. But if the question were worded differently, "Do you believe in a tough peace for Germany, as laid down in the Potsdam Declaration, and an equally tough peace for Japan?" a majority in the affirmative would again be registered.

But the kind of peace that was foreshadowed in the secret conclaves of Teheran and Yalta and announced at Potsdam bears no more relation to the Atlantic Charter, or to any principles of decency, humanity, and civilization than the Declaration of Independence bears to a totalitarian concentration camp. After the last war, the Nation, then edited by Oswald Garrison Villard, and not to be confused with the magazine of the same name which recently gave its blessing to "Bull" Halsey's desire to kick the defeated Japanese in the face, published one of those very few magazine editorials which are brilliant enough to remain in the recollection after a lapse of 25 years. It was entitled "The Madness of Versailles," and it was a magnificent indictment of the injustices and mistakes of the Versailles Treaty and of the betrayal of Wilson's Fourteen Points.

But Versailles was a model of equity and humanity compared with Potsdam. It took away comparatively little territory that was authentically German. Its reparations arrangements were its worst feature and broke down with a disastrous crash that was equally harmful to victors and vanquished. But it did not authorize the wholesale uprooting of populations or deliberately deprive the German people of some of its most important means of national livelihood.

There is no stronger condemnation of the peace settlement, which is now largely an accomplished fact, even though the major victorious powers tied themselves in hopeless knots trying to settle some of its minor points at London, than the phraseology of the Atlantic Charter:

"No territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned. . . . The right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live. . . ."

What a mockery these phrases are, when one contemplates the spectacle of fifteen or twenty million homeless, beggared refugees who have been, are being, or will be driven from their homes and set adrift in the postwar Europe of hunger, cold, and pestilence. These would include several million Poles who formerly lived east of the so-called Curzon Line. There are also some nine million Germans who have been uprooted in the regions east of the Oder and the Neisse Rivers which have been assigned to Poland and the Soviet Union. Finally one must reckon three million Sudeten Germans and an uncertain but large number of stranded refugees, Poles, Ukrainians, Serbs, people from the Baltic States, who have strong reasons for not wanting to return to their native lands under existing regimes.

Even after the savage Thirty Years War, Protestants who left Catholic states and Catholics who, by choice or compulsion, left the rule of Protestant princes were assured compensation for their property. There has been noteworthy progress in inhumanity in the twentieth century, by comparison with the seventeenth. The millions of uprooted people in eastern Europe are permitted to take nothing of their property and life savings, except what they can carry in their hands or in any primitive conveyances they may have kept through the ravages of war and plundering armies.

If the political realities of Potsdam are a travesty on the professed war aims of the United Nations, the economic provisions of the Potsdam agreement are a complete repudiation of the fourth point of the Atlantic Charter:

"They will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity."

Such vital branches of German peactime industry as metals, chemicals, shipbuilding, machine building are sentenced either to complete destruction or to a system of foreign control so rigid as to make normal efficient production impossible. At a time when all Europe needs all the machinery, equipment, and manufactured goods it can get from any source, the most productive industrial system in Europe, insofar as it has survived obliteration bombing, is to be very largely wiped out of existence.

The contradictions of the Potsdam economic program are so numerous and flagrant that one might well suspect a purpose not to disarm but to destroy the most productive industrial mechanism in Europe, and thereby increase and prolong the distress in that stricken continent indefinitely. American responsibility to help feed and clothe the cold and hungry peoples of Europe is often stressed. But the territorial and economic decisions of Potsdam have wrought more harm than the most general contributions to UNRRA can repair.

One of the most glaring of these contradictions is the simultaneous declaration that "primary emphasis shall be given to the development of agriculture" in the German economy and the decision to give one-fourth of Germany's arable land to Poland. Another contradiction is the thrusting of millions of destitute refugees into the shrunken remainder of Germany and the decision to eliminate or greatly reduce the industries which might conceivably give these people employment.

Perhaps the most hopeless contradiction lies in the announcement of a desire to assist the growth of democracy in Germany while at the same time the peacemakers do everything in their power to make living conditions there utterly insupportable. There may be differences of opinion about the precise meaning of the word "democracy." But all experience shows that no system worthy of the name has maintained itself very long when economic conditions have become not only dark but hopeless.

Some of the glib talk about transforming Germany into an agrarian country would convey the impression that there are vast open spaces waiting for new hands to till. Germany is one of the most densely populated countries in Europe and the population per square mile will be even larger because the eastern regions which have been taken away are more agricultural than the highly industrial Ruhr and Rhineland.

Some of the criminal blunders of Potsdam could have been avoided if American public opinion had been better instructed in European history, geography, and economics and if men who know the realities of the situation had not often been intimidated because of the hue and cry set up against anyone suspected of favoring a soft peace. When one considers what the world has suffered from hardness and toughness during the last generation, a reflective mind might suspect that a little softness, which might be better translated as justice, mercy, and humanity, would not be out of place.

Arguments about a hard or a soft peace possess little relevance when countries have been so thoroughly decimated by modern bombing as have Germany and Japan. The road to reconstruction and recovery in any case would have been long and difficult. With the terrific lightning reprisal weapon of air bombing in the hands of the Big Three any attempt at rearmament could be quickly and easily smashed.

It is a curious example of the age of confused thought in which we live that some of the very individuals who are clamorous in their advocacy of One World are equally vociferous in demanding a permanent pariah or helot status for the German and Japanese peoples. As if one could take the most advanced industrial countries in Europe and Asia, respectively, and turn them into cesspools of unemployment and hopeless festering misery without the most disastrous consequences for the economic well-being both of Europe and east Asia.

It is high time to bring a little common sense to bear on the problem of the peace. The American people should understand that they must choose between revenge and reconstruction. They cannot have both. It is easy to predict which road will lead most surely toward the rehabilitation of the civilization which has been almost extinguished in some parts of the world which have suffered most in the war.

It is noteworthy that American administrators on the spot, often military leaders who certainly cannot be suspected of softness in the undesirable sense of the term, are often more humane and reasonable than certain back-seat drivers at home who are animated by nothing more constructive than an insatiable and indiscriminate desire for revenge not only on all living Germans and Japanese, but on still unborn generations.

It is a common fallacy in pseudo-liberal circles to suggest tha a tough peace in the sense of the destruction of German and Japanese industry, shipping, and foreign trade will only injure the well-to-do classes and may be reconciled with the interests of the German and Japanese masses. This is utter and conspicuous poppycock.

Quite regardless of whether their internal economic systems are capitalist or socialist, individualist or collectivist, Germany and Japan, as thickly populated countries which cannot be self-sufficient in food and raw materials, must possess a reasonable amount of peacetime industry, shipping, and foreign trade in order to maintain economic equilibrium. The alternative would be permanent mass unemployment, hunger that could easily pass over the borderline into starvation, chronic unrest and a complete eclipse of the hope that the previously submerged liberal and democratic forces in the two former Axis states could establish stable governments and reintegrate Germany and Japan into a world community of peaceful nations.

There is often a disastrous time-lag, especially dangerous in this atomic age, between a changed situation and popular realization that it has changed. There is no danger that the next war, should such a catastrophe occur, will be launched by a shattered and decimated Germany or Japan. Yet the whole "Dumbarton Hoax" was framed on the absurd assumption that this was the danger, that the only powers which could conceivably wage war within any predictable future were all somehow peace-loving and should enjoy an above-the-law status.

Strikingly barren as it was in positive results, the recent London fiasco may serve a useful purpose if it dispels certain illusions about the close unity and common purposes of the United Nations and points the way for a strong, independent American foreign policy. One of the first signs of such a policy would be to set about the task of genuine peacemaking in those parts of the world which are open to our influence. We should put aside counsels which are inspired sometimes by blind hate and sometimes by desire to serve the interests of a foreign power which seems interested in spreading as much chaos and misery as possible in neighboring countries. We should look to the future, not to the past, place reconstruction ahead of revenge, and think in terms of building up a united Europe, not of tearing down the economic livelihood of any country. If there is ever to be a semblance of democracy in Germany and Japan, the people must eat.

Dorothy Thompson Makes Same Proposal Regarding Atomic Bomb as Is Contained in H. R. 4014 and H. R. 4015

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in a recent column Dorothy Thompson discussed the problem of the atomic bomb in her customary forthright way. I am encouraged that once again there is concluded in her column substantially the same proposal which is contained in the two bills which I introduced in the House on September 12, 1945, namely, H. R. 4014 and H. R. 4015. Under unanimous consent, I include herewith the column by Miss Thompson:

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Recently I set forth propositions about the atomic bomb: It is no secret; it can be used only as an instrument of aggression; as an instrument of war it rings the death knell of small nations and promises mutual annihilation to the largest; it is an instrument for unlimited political blackmail; as the property of a commission, such as that proposed in the original May bill, it is an instrument threatening domestic liberties.

Already the atomic bomb is blowing up what little there was of international confidence. No nation can "trust" another which has the capacity to destroy its centers of population from long distances. Its unique possession by us, together with flaunts of power—"We are the most powerful Nation militarily on earth, with the largest Navy and air force," and the call for universal service to "enforce" peace, is scaring the world to death, and leading to an atomic science race. Our moral position is weakened. At Nuremberg we shall accuse Germans for having broken the rules of warfare by first resorting to weapons banned by international conventions. The onus for the introduction of atomic warfare rests, however, on the United States.

We have committed ourselves to stopping potential aggressors. Already there is apprehension abroad that the United States may be the next potential aggressor. The only way, in the atomic age, to strike down a potential aggressor, is to strike without warning. Any nation, with the atomic bomb, can act before a security council agrees on who is potentially dangerous.

To hand the atomic bomb about indiscriminately in a world of sovereign states and great powers who have hitherto refused any restrictions upon their actions is suicidal. If every one has the atomic bomb, one will use it first.

Soon all great nations will have it. Estimates that it will be years before it can be developed elsewhere are based on false assumptions. One is that no other country has a formula now.

How do we know? The greatest contribution came from Germany. One of the leading atomic physicists, Professor Lange, went to Russia as early as 1934. When the Russians took Berlin, they captured the physical laboratories in Dahlem, and there and in Vienna are bidding for scientists and getting them. The length of time needed depends on advances already made, and the urgency put behind development. That will be immense.

Atomic power for war should be outlawed. How? By verbal or paper agreements?

The solution is as simple as the judgment of Solomon.

The secrets of atomic science should be given to every country which agrees to submit to a control of its mines and laboratories by an international authority, responsible exclusively to the world security organization—to humanity. It should be composed of scientists, technicians and engineers, selected chiefly from small nations who would, of course, also be under observation. Small nations are more trustworthy, since for them atomic warfare means obliteration.

The composition of the authority and watchmen is of preeminent importance. If any power represented in the board knows about its dispositions, relative to that power's own territory, the purpose of control will be largely stymied. If the watched participate in watching, they are certain to try to control the directives. The body must be neutral vis-a-vis any single power.

It may be argued as a measure of difficulty that atomic bombs can be manufactured in small factories. But there is unanimity that the deriving of atomic energy from elements more stable than uranium and plutonium is long distant. The commission, therefore, must have a geological branch to investigate and guard sources of raw materials.

Its purpose is not to control the bombs but prevent their manufacture.

Blue Discharges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 8 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD some editorials from the Pittsburgh Courier with respect to blue discharges. I make this request because I feel that the granting of blue discharges is all wrong. I am informed that in recent months the Army has curtailed the practice of the promiscuous issuance of blue discharges. I earnestly hope this is true. There ought not be a twilight zone between innocence and guilt.

Soldiers guilty of the most heinous crimes because of influential friends and pull have been granted blue discharges, while other men, honest and honorable, but not by nature and training adapted to military life are given blue discharges.

Blue discharges are certain to be a headache for Congress from now on.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Courier of October 20, 1945]

COURIER LAUNCHES PROBE OF ARMY'S BLUE DISCHARGE

(By John H. Young III)

Charges are flying thick and fast on the Army's issuance of the blue ticket which deprives holders of practically all benefits in compensation for military service. The Army is reportedly (1) handing out the blue ticket with reckless abandon, (2) allowing the discharge to be issued without holding proper board hearings, (3) allowing commanding officers to use it as a weapon to settle personal differences with their men, (4) allowing prejudiced officers to use it as a means of punishing Negro soldiers who do not like specifically unbearable conditions, and (5) issuing the blue discharge in proportionately higher numbers than other discharges.

One story coming from a Congressman's office in Chicago is that some 50 soldiers near Chicago were blandly asked if they wanted a discharge. When they answered in the affirmative, they were invited in to sign. Not until they were actually in the act of signing did they discover that they were signing for blue discharges. The charge here is that soldiers are being tempted with the blue discharge as being the quickest way of getting out of the Army.

As open to question as the Army's issuance of the blue discharge is the Veterans' Administration use of a power which it is believed Congress intended to be granted that agency in carrying out the provisions of the GI bill of rights. * * *

Section 300 of the GI bill makes it clear that Congress intended to bar from benefits only those who had been dishonorably discharged as a result of general court martial. As exceptions, Congress was careful to list being a conscientious objector and an officer resigning for the good of the service.

[From the Pittsburgh Courier of October 27, 1945]

COURIER ASKS SECRETARY OF WAR TO LIMIT ARMY BLUE DISCHARGES

(By John H. Young III)

Branding the blue discharge as "a vicious instrument which should not be perpetrated against the American soldier," the Courier this week called upon Secretary of War Robert Patterson for outright abolishment of the questionable discharge or issuance of orders for strict limitations on its use. This action was taken when last week's article brought an avalanche of letters from holders of the blue discharge and interested citizens who considered the situation an outrage.

No one seems to be able to explain how the blue discharge came to be issued in such great numbers in this war. In World War I the blue discharge was rarely, if ever, given. In the last war it was the general practice to either give the dischargee a clean bill of health or give him the benefit of formal trial by court martial before imposing such severe terms on his rights as is the case in the blue discharge. This, the Courier holds, should prevail at this time.

Regardless of the Army's belief and the Veterans Administration's interpretation, the Courier believes that there is no twilight between honor and dishonor. A discharge is either honorable or dishonorable.

[From the Pittsburgh Courier of November 3, 1945]

ATTORNEY GENERAL AGREES TO STUDY BRIEF

(By John H. Young III)

The Courier's fight in behalf of veterans who are holders of the blue discharge gained momentum last week as Attorney General Tom Clark and Assistant Solicitor General Harold Judson, after lengthy discussion, agreed to study a brief prepared by the Courier which pointed to the question of the Veterans' Administration's own interpretation of its powers to sit as a court on each blue discharge. Coupled with this agreement was the Congress of Industrial Organizations' decision to place its full strength behind the fight to place the blue discharge holder's case before the Nation.

Veterans' Administration Instruction No. 1, issued October 30, 1944, over the signature of Gen. Frank T. Hines, then Administrator, listed those barred by Congress and went on to make a provision of its own:

"Provided, however, That where service was otherwise honest, faithful, and meritorious a discharge or separation other than dishonorable because of a minor offense will not be deemed to constitute discharge or separation under dishonorable conditions."

The Courier contends that by this provision the Veterans' Administration went on its own to set forward a condition of qualification that was neither written nor implied by Congress; that by this provision the Veterans' Administration sets itself up as a court of judgment.

In an interview in his office, Veterans' Administration Solicitor Edward E. Odom admitted that the handling of the blue discharge, in relation to GI benefits under the GI bill, was a cumbersome affair. He said that Congress had shifted the responsibility of interpreting the law to the Veterans' Administration and added that he had asked Congress to clear the matter up prior to the passage of the GI bill.

When asked if any outside legal authority had given an opinion on the Veterans' Administration's interpretation of the GI bill, Mr. Odom said that such had not been the case. He said that the interpretation was made in the Veterans' Administration and that his office stood behind the legality of the interpretation.

The case of the blue discharge was discussed with Meyer Bernstein, veterans' representative of the CIO. Mr. Bernstein declared:

"There ought not to be any limitations on the rights of any soldier or veteran unless he has been given a dishonorable discharge for sufficient reasons. I am for the outright abolition of the blue discharge."

[From the Pittsburgh Courier of November 10, 1945]

LEGION TO SCAN BLUE DISCHARGES

(By John H. Young III)

A high spokesman of the American Legion told the Courier that he believed that limitations should be drawn in the GI bill, specifically naming types of blue discharges believed to be under "dishonorable conditions," the terminology used by the Veterans' Administration to give itself power to sit as a court on blue discharges.

The Legion spokesman said that his organization would take up the matter of the blue discharge at its executive meeting in Chicago on November 15 of this month. Later, he said, the blue discharge will be the subject of discussion at a session of the national Legion meeting in Chicago, beginning November 18:

Record of blue discharges

Number of blue discharges issued between December 1, 1941, and June 30, 1945 (official War Department figures for the Army alone):

Negro	10,806
Others	37,797

The Courier challenges the Nation to solidify its opinion on what should happen to the holder of the blue discharge. These are our forgotten men. The spirit of the GI law demands that Congress should make its position clear.

Viewpoints of Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 8 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials published in Yank News, one entitled "Tap Roots" from the issue of October 11, and the second entitled "The $64

Question" from the issue of October 18. These editorials set forth very clearly and with great force the point of view of a great many servicemen in regard to matters pending before the Congress of the United States.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Yank News of October 11, 1945]

THEY CAME BACK

"TAP ROOTS"

They were having a banquet in Mapleville. Everybody who was anybody was there. At the head table sat all the mighty of Mapleville—the town dignitaries, the bank president, the secretary of the chamber of commerce, heads of labor organizations, and church groups. As I said, everybody who was anybody was at the head table. Seated at the end of the head table, as sort of an afterthought and local color, sat a lone buck private.

The banquet was in celebration of, and in anticipation of, postwar planning. The speeches were as stimulating as a tomato-juice cocktail. When the orators were all through—they called on the buck private.

I saw him get up from his end of the table and walk over to the microphone. He limped, just a trifle, and he said into the microphone quietly and most ungrammatically:

"My name is Boone—Ezra Boone—and this ain't no speech. I had seven brothers and sisters. I was the oldest and I had to work since I was 13. I worked all my life, and I got drafted out of Mapleville. And I've come back to my old job, if I can hold it. You'll excuse me if I don't make a good speech.

"There was one guy in my outfit who dreamed of this kind of a banquet. He used to say to me, 'When the war's all over, Ezra, when we've won freedom for everybody, don't forget, we got to win it for ourselves.' When we used to get the papers from back home about folks rowin' and strikin', he used to say to me, 'Don't pay any attention to that, Ezra. That's just disputin'. That's democracy in action, liberty in the makin'. Only in America can they do those things.' From the papers, I kinda think we've been havin' a lot of 'democracy in action.'

"I've listened to everybody tonight. Nobody seems to have the idea of this fellow. He used to say to me, 'Ezra, liberty's a great tree. Its branches shade all men. Don't forget you belong to the greatest Union in the world—the United States of America! That's States in Union. And don't forget another thing—that liberty has got its tap roots in the soil!'

"I've listened to all your speeches. Maybe I don't understand them. You're plannin' for my future. You're plannin' for thousands of jobs for fellows like me who will come back. You're goin' to lend us so much money to buy a home or to go into a little business. That's nice of you to lend it to us. We appreciate that. But what about liberty—the freedom he used to talk about—the liberty that covers all men, the freedom he lived for and he died for?

"You want to know one thing? Nobody said where the tap roots of liberty are. I'll tell you, Mister. The tap roots of liberty are everywhere the Army's been, the marines have been, where the sailors have been, and where the fliers dropped like falling autumn leaves—where those men fell, Mister—that's a tap root of the tree of liberty! They mark the spot with a little white wooden cross.

"And I know where one of those tap roots is, Mister. It's where he lies—in a grave on Kwajalein!

"I'm sorry he ain't here tonight to talk for himself. I ain't got no education. Maybe you know what you're doing because you're smarter than I am. But I'm goin' to tell you somethin'! A lot of us are back and more are coming back. All we expect is a world like he dreamed—dreamed about and died for. A world where there's a job for every man that wants to work. A world where every man can sit under his 'own vine and fig tree and no man can make him afraid.' He made me learn that. He said, 'Washington wrote that'."

Then he looked around the hall very carefully, very quietly, and very deliberately, and he said:

"You know, this friend of mine, my buddy—he used to say to me, 'Ezra, the folks back home have got to realize one thing. They planned their world their way. We're going to save it—their world—but from there on out, Ezra, we're going to plan the world—our way!'

"You've done a lot of planning tonight—for a world that we fought for. Don't you kinda figure you should kinda ask us about the world we want? I don't think that's any more than fair. Do you?"

Then he turned and walked away from the microphone; I noticed that he limped perceptibly.

After he sat down there weren't any more speeches on postwar planning.

There just couldn't be.

[From the Yank News of October 18, 1945]

THEY CAME BACK

THE $64 QUESTION

(By C. W. R.)

I noticed him sitting on the park bench watching the falling leaves. They're beautifully colored this time of year. They seemed to match the service ribbons he wore. On one of these service ribbons was the insignia of five major engagements. One little ribbon to the side, I noticed, was the unit citation. I watched him out of the corner of my eyes—watched him light a cigarette with hands that trembled—the aftermath of the jungle. You'll notice a lot of that in the days that are to come.

Then I said to him, "From the looks of those service ribbons, son, you've been around."

"Yeah," he said, "* * * you can say that again. Caribbean—European—Mediterranean—Asiatic—that makes it all the way around, Mister."

"And that unit citation—how come?"

"Oh, that one? I got that in the second battle of the Kula Gulf. I was on board the St. Louie."

There was a young fellow on the bench, a little older than this boy, but not so very much older, and he folded up the newspaper and turning to the both of us, said:

"It looks like the guys are going to get that raise this time. Oh, maybe not the full 30 per cent, but we'll ring the bell around 15 or 20 percent. That makes up for the overtime we lose. More dough 'to take away' from the job. Yeah—'the war's over', and the boss might as well learn it now as any time—'business is business.' That'll mean more money for you, sailor, when you get a job."

The young sailor lit another cigarette and his hand trembled perceptibly. "Yeah," he said, more to himself than to us, "—if—and when—I get a job that I can hold." He took a couple of drags from his cigarette and sat watching the falling leaves and sort of nodding to himself.

This fellow with the paper said, "What do you think about it, Mac? I'd like to hear what you got to say. This makes it soft, don't it?"

"Yeah," he said. "Maybe we owe you a debt of gratitude. Maybe some day I'll pay it off—who knows? Now let me answer your question; the fact is it's two questions in one, but I'll answer them together.

"The boss made so much lousy money that he never had so much in his lifetime. You've got better wages than you ever had before, and that's no kidding. You've both made it—a lot of it. How about me? That's the $64 question; that's the jack-pot question. I'm going to give you the answer so you can have it all yourself.

"I've been thinking of guys like you and the boss all the way from boot camp to Tinian. I've been wondering why guys like me have to go while guys like you stayed behind; you and the boss. But I know the answer to that one. You don't have to tell me. You and the boss were 'indispensable.' Me and thousands like me were 'expendable.' You want to know what I think about this raise? Now get a load of this.

"You want more dough to take home. I know guys that'll never take nothin' home. The Government will send their mothers or their dads or their wives a little better than 50 bucks a month until they eat up the face of the policy, then there won't be nothing to take away. Then the jungle can just grow over them and the world will forget them.

"Did you ever think about giving the dead a raise? Did you ever think that you and the boss wouldn't have anything if it wasn't for those guys? How about giving the dead kids a raise; the dead kids I know on Tinian, Saipan, and Tarawa? How about raising the pay of the dead? How about the wounded? Does that 30 percent apply to us, the wounded? Or do we struggle along on these lousy pensions? Or do you and the boss ever think about that?

"How about some back pay for me while I'm living? How about House Resolution 127 that would give me 3 bucks a day for every day I was in the States while you were making your twelve to fifteen a day and the boss was making his thousands a month? How about that House Resolution 127 that would give me 4 bucks a day every day I was overseas in the jungle while you were making 12 and 15 bucks a day and dodging hot spots at night, and while the boss was figuring out how he could beat the income tax?

"How about me? I was on that 24-hour shift. Did you ever think about that? Or do you think that three and four dollars is too much of a raise for me? How about this Purple Heart, the one I'm wearing? The House Resolution 127 would give me 500 bucks for that. I'd give 500 bucks to see some of those Congressmen where I've been.

"You got to understand me, mister. You're all hopped up over the 30 percent more pay to take home, but do you want to know what I really think about the whole thing way down underneath? Way down underneath, you and the boys stink!

"Sure, I know, I know, the war's over, business is business, but when you get time, tell this to the boss what I told you. And don't ever tell it again to a guy with a service ribbon like mine."

Then he got up and walked away.

The young fellow on the bench took one look at him and walked the other way.

But me, I sat there watching the falling leaves, the drifting leaves, and I thought about the unpaid debt to the dead, and the niggardly payment to the living. And I thought about this boy's answer.

Yeah, his answer to the "$64 question."

Promotion of Industrial Peace—Will of a Marine Lieutenant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 8 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, from the holocaust of the war just ended has

come a story which is today so timely and may always be so inspiring that I feel the Senate should pause to hear it. It is the story of a will scribbled by one of the immortal heroes of Iwo Jima just before he made the supreme sacrifice on that bloody Pacific island.

The will is that of the late First Lt. Benjamin Rush Toland, United States Marine Corps Reserve. His home was in Concord, N. H. By his will the young officer left a part of his possessions to the A. F. of L., the CIO, and the National Association of Manufacturers "for the purpose of improving general relations between labor and capital."

In recent days, Mr. President, many in high places and many in the rank and file of our citizenry have pleaded for industrial peace. In the midst of the Nation's internal strife, Lieutenant Toland's will has come to light and to me it is the most eloquent appeal to get along with each other that the American people could receive.

The will of Lieutenant Toland is of manifold significance. It emphasizes the truth that the American youth is sound and even in the face of death thinks of a fuller life for the people of the land he loves and serves. It emphasizes the truth that failing to establish and maintain domestic tranquillity would be failing those who fought and those who died to keep America secure.

The will of Lieutenant Toland emphasizes the loss our country has suffered in this war, for this hero's generation many are gone who would have lived and worked diligently for the complete unity of our people.

Mr. President, in loyalty to the purpose for which so many have given their lives we must not fail to make the peace of the world permanent and we must not fail to establish industrial peace in our own land. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Manchester Union of November 5, telling this story.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARINE HERO'S BEQUEST TO BETTER LABOR-CAPITAL RELATIONS REVEALED — TOLAND LEAVES FUNDS TO CIO, A. F. OF L., AND MANUFACTURERS—WROTE WILL BEFORE GOING TO DEATH AT IWO JIMA

Under the provisions of a will he scribbled shortly before he went into the thick of the bloody Iwo Jima campaign, Lt. Benjamin Rush Toland, 24, USMC, of Concord, left a portion of his modest estate "for the purpose of improving general relations between labor and capital."

First public disclosure that the valiant Marine Corps officer who was killed in action on Iwo Jima last February 21 had provided gifts for both labor and management organizations was made yesterday at the annual meeting of the State CIO council in Manchester.

WRITES OUT DOCUMENT

At that time Harold Daoust, State president of the CIO council, revealed that the lieutenant had, in a hand-written document executed before he entered the Iwo Jima campaign, stipulated that in event of his death the CIO, A. F. of L., and the National Association of Manufacturers each be given one-tenth of his estate for the purpose of promoting better relations between labor and capital.

Attorney Frank J. Sulloway, of Concord, executor of the Marine lieutenant's estate, confirmed the CIO State head's announcement later in the day, adding that the will was being interpreted to mean the State divisions of the organizations mentioned. He added that after various taxes had been deducted the gifts in each instance would probably be "about $500 or $600."

Other bequests included gifts to St. Paul's School of Concord, the St. Paul Episcopal Church of Concord, Yale University, and the New York Times' Christmas Fund for its 100 neediest cases.

Following Mr. Daoust's announcement Sunday the State CIO council at its annual convention voted to set up a Benjamin Rush Toland trust fund and to award each year a medal to the member of a CIO affiliated union in the State who is judged to have done the most during the preceding year to promote harmony between labor and capital.

Lieutenant Toland, a brilliant student at St. Paul's School and at Yale University, where he was Phi Beta Kappa, and was graduated summa cum laude, was a member of the Yale varsity hockey team. Recently a gift of books on social and philosophical subjects was presented by Yale University in his memory to the Concord Public Library.

Lieutenant Toland's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Edward D. Toland, have resided for some years at Ash Brook farm on the Hopkinton road. Mr. Toland, an artillery captain in World War I, recently retired from the St. Paul's School faculty. Mrs. Toland, active in civic and social affairs, is Republican national committeewoman from New Hampshire, a post which she has held for more than a decade.

Following his graduation from Yale in June 1942, Lieutenant Toland, who had enlisted with the Marine Corps 3 months previously, went to Washington, where he worked for a short while for a Government agency pending call to active duty.

Mr. Toland said today that his son was keenly interested in the subject of labor-management problems and had intended entering that field.

Views of the Automobile Dealers of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Small Business Committee:

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to you and your committee for the privilege of appearing before you to present what I believe to be the views of the automobile dealers of the State of North Dakota, which State I have the privilege of representing at large.

I should like to say at the outset of my remarks that I appear before you representing automobile dealers who would be classified in the national category as more or less of the small-business type. Within my State are some large dealers, but the rank and file of them are small dealers. The annual number of cars sold by many of these dealers would not run into great proportions. It is my opinion that Mr. Bowles with his ideas would centralize the automobile business in the big cities.

I think you have here before you a truly fundamental question: Are we to stand sponsor for the American plan, which is the open door for small business to move forward under its own steam or are we to stand sponsor for the principle of monopoly or for the amalgamation of capital as would be the case in the large business centers. It is my firm belief that the automobile dealers of the Nation, particularly the smaller ones, hold the record, perhaps, in the production of the small margin of net profits, and as a result it is but natural that their mortality rate would be very high.

The people of North Dakota are more concerned with the service available on their cars and trucks than they are over the matter of a few dollars' difference in the purchase price. They have learned through bitter experience, particularly western North Dakota, which as you all know went through a series of crop failures caused by extreme drought, that their automobiles and trucks might be called upon to give service over a period of time far in excess of average expectancy. This area is usually referred to as the "dry area."

Many of our western North Dakota citizens drove automobiles produced during the 20's for well over 10 years. They were forced to do this by circumstances beyond their control. It was fortunate indeed that these automobiles were sold by dealers who recognized the following obligation: That is, the obligation to provide service after the profit was realized on the new car sale. Were is not for the fact that the vast majority of dealers stocked parts and maintained service establishments, these cars could not have gone through the long period of service which they were called upon to render.

At the present time the number of dealers handling new cars in North Dakota is slightly in excess of 300. We are experiencing a steady expansion because of good crops in North Dakota. However, in the late 30's the number of dealers in business was close to 600, and even in 1941 495 dealers were still in business in spite of the shrinkage of new-car production caused by the defense program.

I have every confidence that my constituents will take a fair attitude toward the dealer in the matter of protecting his established trade discount so long as the tendency of the retail automobile business is to tie in service availability with each sales outlet.

It must be readily apparent that the average sales per dealer is well under 30 cars per year when you check the fact that North Dakota delivered at retail new passenger cars in the following volume:

1936	11,095
1937	12,060
1938	8,620
1939	9,805
1940	12,358
1941	13,621

While a matter of forty or fifty dollars per car taken from the large city dealer who deals in thousands of cars may not be a factor in his being able to stay in business, in the State of North Dakota, where the average dealer handles only an average of 30 units, this forty or fifty dollars per car means the difference between a living and a loss for the dealer.

As I understand it, these dealers are not asking for a fraction of 1 percent increase in their trade discount. Their business is based on volume, as everyone knows. To talk in terms of dollars per unit distorts the entire business picture.

I suppose many dealers in North Dakota gave away as much of their profit as the average dealer in the country. I fail to see anything inflationary in the tendency of an automobile dealer to give away part of his profit. On the other hand, I can see no way in which Mr. Bowles or any Government agency can

revolutionize the standard of automobile dealers to a point where they will all cease to lose money, give discounts, or in other ways dissipate part of their profits. This is a variable factor and is not subject to control.

Dealers in my State, when guaranteed the retail price under the Murray-Patman Act, delivered automobiles to divisions of the Federal Government and to the State government at a discount from list. It may have been poor business; it may have been their expression of appreciation of the help they received from a federally created crisis in their business. However, the record of the Internal Revenue Department and the records of the State highway department at Bismarck, N. D., will reveal that as late as 1943, discounts were given to both the Federal Government and the State government on both cars and trucks in spite of the fact that the Murray-Patman Act guaranteed these dealers full retail price on their automobiles and trucks covered by that act.

Finally, I emphasize this fact, so far as North Dakota is concerned:

Since Pearl Harbor a good many States have had a reduction in the registration of used cars, but in North Dakota we have more cars registered today than we did at the time the war began.

This means that we are going to have a considerable number of trade-ins, and these automobiles will have to be completely repaired and reconditioned in order that they can be resold and give service to the next owner.

So, naturally there is going to be a loss under these circumstances and the dealer cannot afford to take a cut in his discount because the used car will absorb a great deal of this profit.

Should the OPA put into effect their proposed ruling, it is my personal belief that it would be most devastating to the industry, hinder reconversion, and damage future employment.

The Soldier's Gripe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 8, 1945

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the endless delays and difficulties experienced by enlisted men in obtaining release from the service and the honorable discharge each one has earned, I wish to extend my remarks and include a carefully prepared statement by George E. Sokolsky, well-known columnist, which recently appeared in the Daily Courier, Ottumwa, Iowa. Mr. Sokolsky included in his column a number of specific complaints and urges an investigation of them. These complaints are typical of many that I receive in almost every mail.

THESE DAYS
(By George E. Sokolsky)
THE SOLDIER'S GRIPE

Whenever I talk to a soldier anywhere, on the street, in trains, among strangers or personal friends, I hear the same gripe—officers did not treat the men as Americans are accustomed to being treated. "The caste system may be necessary for discipline but it was carried too far." "Officers selected fine establishments for themselves but put the soldiers in filthy huts." "The West Point officer had some respect for the rights of the GI, but the barbers and ribbon salesmen treated him as though he were a German."

Here are a few paragraphs from Japan:

"In our company we have men with over 100 points who are still here while other men with less have already left. One man's wife died, leaving four children, and he has enough points. It took them a month to notify him of the death and he has been standing by awaiting transportation for 2 weeks now. Yesterday a colonel was flown out simply because he had enough points. We were told we were stationed too far from the docks, yet we are only 2 miles away.

"These are the men we must not forget, for if this type ever gets the power—watch out. They don't want to demobilize, for then they would lose their rank and authority and have to go to work."

Here is another letter (place not identified by request):

"If we were in a prison camp, you'd all be howling 'get them out'—let me assure you that we're in prison—every last one of us. What can we do—we can't bitch to our Army CO's. If we did we'd end with some swell assignment—you can imagine. We can't write to our Congressmen—those letters are forwarded to the War Department and 'proper action' is taken.

"* * * Find out why doctors who spent the war in England have gone home with 46 points while doctors over here with 80 plus points are still here Find out why we're used as storekeepers, garagemen, restaurant supervisors, odd-job men, supply officers."

Here is another:

"I belong to that small minority who were prisoners of war in Germany and who, because of their small numbers, are receiving no credit or consideration in being discharged from the Army.

"The point system—where does it leave us? In the same status as a soldier who was safely berthed in England—even worse—he may receive campaign stars for being attached to a combat outfit. We were unattached. * * *

"I think we have a gripe."

A doctor wrote me that where he is stationed doctors have enough work to keep them busy 2 hours a day. He says many are becoming alcoholics from ennui.

Obviously, it is impossible for me or any other reporter to investigate these gripes, to determine whether they are individual or general, whether they are justified or the inevitable dissatisfactions of strong and vigorous youth with the restrictions of a regimented life. Yet this fact does stand out: The letters I have received and the conversations I have had cover all theaters of war, Europe, Africa, Asia, and even American theater. The gripes are all the same.

This, true or not, is very bad for the Army. In time it will be reflected in the attitude of Congress toward the Army. The gripes are too widespread to be laughed away. The bitterness displayed by the men in their letters and conversations will not down.

The Army ought to invite a nonmilitary commission, appointed by the Secretary of War, to make a thorough investigation of these gripes and to determine what is true and what is false. For instance:

1. Is it true that officers raided soldiers' food supplies?

2. Is it true that USO shows and bands, designated for GI's, were used to the advantage of officers?

3. Were GI's punished, even by transfer, for complaints?

These are a few questions. There are many more, particularly with regard to leaves, separation, and transportation. These problems need to be studied to strengthen, not to abuse, the Army, to determine if the Reserve Officer system is beneficial or harmful to the service.

Governor Lehman Denies Clothing Gathered for Europe Is Rotting in Philadelphia Warehouse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM R. THOM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 8, 1945

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, letters have come to me from Ohio charging neglect and inefficiency in the handling of the clothing gathered in drives throughout the country to be sent to Europe. Specific charge has been made that garments are rotting in warehouses in Philadelphia.

These complaints have been submitted to Gov. Herbert H. Lehman, Director General of UNRRA, who has written me that at present there are none of the garments in Philadelphia warehouses, and that of the 111,000,000 pounds collected less than 10,000,000 pounds will remain in this country by the middle of November.

His full letter follows:

Hon. WILLIAM R. THOM,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I have investigated the complaint that used clothing contributed by people of this country was rotting in the warehouses of Philadelphia, and I am informed that there is not a pound of loose clothing warehoused in Philadelphia at this time. In fact, the baling plant in Philadelphia (D. Pomerantz Co.) completed baling operations on September 30, and by October 1 had shipped out all baled clothing. Not one pound of clothing collected in Philadelphia has rotted or suffered damage, and to the best of our knowledge not a pound of it was lost.

I assume you know that the United National Clothing Collection, which took place in April and May, involved the gathering together of small parcels of clothing from millions of homes. They were then concentrated in specified places, or collection points, and shipped to Treasury warehouses, and to baling plants for sorting, baling, and packing; and finally, all of this clothing had to be transported and loaded onto ships. Despite this very complex task, all of the clothing has been baled and packed for overseas shipment and less than 10,000,000 pounds of the total 111,000,000 pounds collected will remain in this country by the middle of November.

I outline below the present status of clothing collected in this drive:

	Pounds
Received at Treasury warehouses	111,105,246
Baled and packed for overseas	111,105,246
Exported or booked for shipment on specific vessels	103,132,979

The unshipped balance includes 1,000,000 pounds allocated to the American-Jewish Joint Distribution Committee for distribution to persecuted persons in Hungary, Rumania and Bulgaria. Shipments of this clothing have been delayed because of congested conditions in Black Sea ports. Shipments of 700,000 pounds for stateless persons in Holland, Belgium, France, Spain, Portugal and north Africa—to be distributed by the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees—have been delayed awaiting cables from representatives of the Intergovernmental Committee on the distribution and

type of persons for whom the clothing is intended.

At the recent request of the military, we have also set aside 4,000,000 pounds for displaced persons of other nationalities in camps within Germany and negotiations are proceeding on this matter.

An additional million pounds for displaced persons of other nationalities in camps in Austria has been allocated and we are awaiting instructions from the military authorities as to reshipment.

A small reserve of approximately 1,272,000 pounds is being held to meet emergency needs.

Although UNRRA is proud to have participated in this undertaking, and to have assisted both with money and with personnel, the United National Clothing Collection was accomplished more by the American people than by UNRRA. The chairman, Henry Kaiser, who was appointed by the President of the United States, was assisted by private relief organizations and many individuals who have given their time and energies. Thousands of our countrymen here in the United States devoted their best efforts to this undertaking, activated only by the desire to help those who had suffered more than themselves and who needed their friendship and material assistance.

I am grateful as always for your interest and hope that you will continue to call upon us if you need additional information. I can assure you that any further particulars you may desire will be readily supplied.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Director General.

Address at Dedication of Fifth Marine Division Cemetery on Iwo Jima

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAL HOLMES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1945

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address, copy of which was received by C. A. Hawley, Grant County auditor, Ephrata, Wash., from a soldier on Iwo Jima. Mr. Hawley says:

I have read nothing more beautiful or appropriate regarding the boys who gave their all in this terrible conflict.

I commend it to your reading this coming Armistice Day.

In March 1945 a Jewish chaplain by the name of Roland B. Gittelsohn, whose home address is 301 Earle Avenue, Lynbrook, Long Island, N. Y., delivered the following address at Iwo Jima on the occasion of the dedication of the Fifth Marine Division Cemetery:

"This is perhaps the grimmest, and surely the holiest, task we have faced since D-day. Here before us lie the bodies of comrades and friends. Men who until yesterday or last week laughed with us, joked with us, trained with us. Men who were on the same ships with us, and went over the sides with us, as we prepared to hit the beaches of this island. Men who fought with us and feared with us. Somewhere in this plot of ground there may lie the man who could have discovered the cure for cancer. Under one of these Christian crosses, or beneath a Jewish Star of David, there may rest now a man who was destined to be a great prophet; to find the way, perhaps, for all to live in plenty, with poverty and hardship for none. Now they lie here silently in this sacred soil, and we gather to consecrate this earth in their memory.

"It is not easy to do so. Some of us have buried our closest friends here. We saw these men killed before our very eyes. Any one of us might have died in their places. Indeed, some of us are alive and breathing at this very moment only because men who lie here beneath us had the courage and strength to give their lives for ours. To speak in memory of such men as these is not easy. Of them, too, can it be said with utter truth, 'The world will little note nor long remember what we say here. It can never forget what they did here.'

"No; our poor power of speech can add nothing to what these men and the other dead of our division who are not here have already done. All that we even hope to do is follow their example. To show the same selfless courage in peace that they did in war. To swear that by the grace of God and the stubborn strength and power of human will, their sons and ours shall never suffer these pains again. These men have done their job well. They have paid the ghastly price of freedom. If that freedom be once again lost, as it was after the last war, the unforgivable blame will be ours, not theirs. So it is we the living who are here to be dedicated and consecrated.

"We dedicate ourselves first to live together in peace the way they fought and are buried in this war. Here lie man who loved America because their ancestors generations ago helped in her founding, and other men who loved her with equal passion because they themselves or their own fathers escaped from oppression to her blessed shores. Here lie officers and men, Negroes and whites, rich men and poor—together. Here are Protestants, Catholics, and Jews—together. Here no man prefers another because of his faith or despises him because of his color. Here there are no quotas of how many from each group are admitted or allowed. Among these men there is no discrimination; no prejudices; no hatreds. Theirs is the highest and purest democracy.

"Any man among us, the living, who fails to understand that will thereby betray those who lie here dead. Whoever of us lifts his hand in hate against a brother or thinks himself superior to those who happen to be in the minority makes of this ceremony and of the bloody sacrifice it commemorates an empty, hollow mockery. To this, then, as our solemn, sacred duty, do we, the living, now dedicate ourselves: To the right of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, of white men and Negroes alike, to enjoy the democracy for which all of them have here paid the price.

"To one thing more do we consecrate ourselves in memory of those who sleep beneath these crosses and stars. We shall not foolishly suppose, as did the last generation of America's fighting men, that victory on the battlefield will automatically guarantee the triumph of democracy at home. This war, with all its frightful heartache and suffering, is but the beginning of our generation's struggle for democracy. When the last battle has been won there will be those at home, as there were the last time, who will want us to turn our backs in selfish isolation on the rest of organized humanity, and thus to sabotage the very peace for which we fight. We promise you who lie here: We will not do that. We will join hands with Britain, China, Russia in peace, even as we have in war, to build the kind of world for which you died.

"When the last shot has been fired, there will still be those whose eyes are turned backward, not forward, who will be satisfied with those wide extremes of poverty and wealth in which the seeds of another war can breed. We promise you, our departed comrades: This, too, we will not permit. This war has been fought by the common man; its fruits of peace must be enjoyed by the common man. We promise you, by all that is sacred and holy, that your sons, the sons of miners and millers, the sons of farmers and workers, will inherit from your death the right to a living that is decent and secure.

"When the final cross has been placed in the last cemetery, once again there will be those to whom profit is more important than peace, who will insist with the voice of sweet reasonableness and appeasement that it is better to trade with the enemies of mankind than, by crushing them, to lose their profit. To you who sleep here silently, we give our promise: We will not listen. We will not forget that some of you were burnt with oil that came from American wells, that many of you were killed by shells fashioned from American steel.

"We promise that when once again men seek profit at your expense, we shall remember how you looked when we placed you reverently, lovingly in the ground.

"Thus do we memorialize, those who, having ceased living with us, now live within us. Thus do we consecrate the living to carry on the struggle they began. Too much blood has gone into this soil for us to let it lie barren. Too much pain and heartache have fertilized the earth on which we stand. We here solemnly swear: This shall not be in vain. Out of this, and from the suffering and sorrow of those who mourn this, will come—we promise—the birth of a new freedom for the sons of men everywhere. Amen."

The Role Played by Turkey in World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House and for the information of the Congress and the country, I am including with these remarks the complete text of the annual speech to the Turkish National Assembly which was delivered in Ankara on November 1, 1945, by President Ismet Inonu of Turkey. I commend its careful reading to all those desirous of making an accurate appraisal of the role played by Turkey in World War II.

Last month when Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, and I spent several days in Turkey as members of Subcommittee No. 2 of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, we spent over an hour one morning in conference with President Inonu, of Turkey. In that conference, speaking through an interpreter, the President of Turkey reviewed for us the contributions which his country had made to the cause of the United Nations during the war. His recital that morning was much the same as the portions of the attached speech dealing with that phase of Turkish activity, except that in his conference with us he went into greater detail and added some interesting side lights and background concerning his conference with Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill in Cairo.

When President Inonu had completed his statement to us he asked, "Have I persuaded you that Turkey really made a contribution to the United Nations' cause during the war? Do you feel we should be criticized or commended for our course of action?" Mrs. BOLTON and I, making no claim to being military experts or war strategists, could not, of course, qualify as judges of the value of the contributions made by Turkey to our side of the fighting but we did recommend to President Inonu that he make a public statement of the part played by Turkey during the war because we assured him that he had given us an understanding and an interpretation of Turkey's position which we believed was not generally appreciated by the American public.

With gracious charm, President Inonu stated:

If you really feel the American public and the people of the United Nations would be interested in knowing how our wartime policy was evolved and what we desired it to achieve I shall make this a part of my public pronouncement when I address the next national assembly.

Yesterday, the press attaché of the Turkish Embassy in Washington delivered the following speech to my office and I take pleasure in calling its contents to the attention of readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is my belief that President Inonu and the people of Turkey have a real friendship for the United States and a genuine desire to participate with all other members of the United Nations in the maintenance of world peace and the development of the democratic ways of life. I am hopeful that a reading by Americans of the record of Turkey's part in the war as reviewed by President Inonu will help develop a more widespread recognition of the difficult problems faced by Turkey during the war and a greater appreciation for the fact that she resisted the threats and lures of the Nazis and cast her lot and her future with the free fighting forces of the United Nations.

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT ISMET INONU, OF TURKEY, MADE BEFORE THE TURKISH NATIONAL ASSEMBLY ON NOVEMBER 1, 1945

It is with emotion that Turkey, too, follows the effort for the establishment of world peace, after the catastrophies and sufferings caused by World War II. The sole desire of peoples everywhere is directed toward the attainment of the goal for humanity to live in peace on the foundation of the principles proclaimed by the United Nations.

In these days of the final settlement of world issues, Turkey finds herself in the position of one, who can face everyone and the world society of nations with a clear conscience and hold her head high, with a deep sense of justice. The United Nations have, during the last 6 years appraised the role of Turkey in the Second World War from different angles and viewpoints. In many ways Turkey has won their esteem. I beg the national assembly's permission to review the position of Turkey—without allusion to secrets which cannot yet be revealed—during the Second World War. At the time the horizons darkened in the spring of 1939, Turkey was the only nation, among her equals, who openly took her stand by the side of Great Britain and France, for the cause of the ideal of justice. When in 1940 France collapsed and the battle of Britain was in full progress, we were still the only nation who would laud British heroism and declare ourselves Britain's ally. Later, when diplomatic relations between France and Great Britain were broken and the battles of Merselkebir and Dakar were fought the triple alliance concluded between Great Britain, France, and Turkey imposed upon us, juridically and by reason of events which came to pass between our allies, a strict neutrality. Yet it was Turkey again, which declared, without hesitation that our alliance with Britain continued. In the Tripartite Treaty the reservation was made, in a special protocol, that Turkey's obligations, arising from the alliance, could not lead us to an armed conflict with the Soviet Union.

In the early parts of 1941, Turkey stood, her forces mobilized, ready to face German and Italian aggression from Thrace or Rhodes. Let us remember that these were the days when a pro-Axis Government had been installed in Irak and that the Vichy Government had openly declared its anti-British attitude in Syria. When one remembers that though fully encircled from all sides by Axis forces the Turkish nation alone, solely dependent upon her own manpower and almost to the exhaustion of her financial resources, barred the road to those proud aggressors who held Europe in their grip, it is, in all justice, right that the services rendered and the perils envisaged by the Turkish people in the Allied cause should be accorded due appreciation at once.

Upon the outbreak of hostilities between the Soviets and the Germans, Turkey informed the belligerent parties of her decision to remain neutral in the conflict. The years 1941 and 1942 were the most difficult for Soviet Russia and Great Britain, when they had to face great pressure from the Axis powers. The recognition of the services rendered by us could not be better illustrated than repeating to the honorable members of the National Assembly the very words of authoritative Allied spokesman. On January 19, 1942, the Soviet Ambassador, acting as an intermediary of the Soviet Government officially communicated, in detail, to the Turkish Foreign Ministry the appreciation of the Soviets, stating that Turkey's position had really benefited the Allies.

On December 4, 1941, the President of the United States declared that the defense of Turkey was of vital importance to the defense of America and that lend-lease material would be delivered to Turkey without signature of a formal agreement. This agreement was not officially signed until February 23, 1945. As to the British Government, their appreciation of the Turkish attitude has been made public on several occasions. In the early part of 1943, during his visit to Adana, Britain's Prime Minister made declarations the memory of which we shall always cherish.

I would now like to answer before the Grand National Assembly to criticisms directed against Turkey since the end of 1943. You know that in the domain of international relations secrets between powers are not the property of one state. However, I want only to emphasize as the expression of a simple factual truth the injustice of which has been imputed in our case. We have been criticized for having concluded a treaty of friendship with Germany. Before the outbreak of hostilities between the Germans and the Soviets and the arrival of the former at the gates of Istanbul, the Germans were tied to Soviet Russia by a pact of nonaggression previously concluded. At a time when our country stood all alone to face the combined Axis forces, at a time when the United States had not yet entered the conflict, at a time when Great Britain mobilized everything against a possible invasion of the British Isles and at a time when the Soviets were tied to the Germans by a nonaggression pact, could it have been rightly expected of us to refuse a written German commitment not to attack Turkey? All the more so, when it was explicitly stipulated in this pact that Turkey would remain attached to her alliances and obligations.

In all preceding and following discussions, German aid to Syria and Iraq, by giving passage through Turkey, had been categorically refused them. We were able to make the Germans accept all these conditions. It has been brought to light since and present disclosures show that this pact with Germany signified nothing but a postponement for the Germans to a later date of their military operations against Turkey. Insofar as we were concerned this pact afforded us the opportunity of taking the necessary military measures, providing us with the means to surmount these critical times. Besides, the point must be borne in mind that that Soviet, British, and American praise on the Turkish attitude antedates the conclusion of friendship pact with Germany. This, too, indicates that the friendship pact with Germany had been considered, while it served its purpose, equally indispensable in the conscience of the Allied Nations and that criticisms have been artificially provoked. Once the dark days were over, it has been voiced, from a number of sources that at the time of the German advance to the Volga, we embarrassed the Soviets by concentrating our forces on our eastern frontiers. The truth, even though it may be unknown to peoples, is entirely known in detail to Allied authorities and officials. The facts are entirely contrary to these allegations used for purposes of reproach. When the Germans advanced up to the Volga, our defenses extended from Rhodes, in the Mediterranean to Hopa, on the Black Sea. The probabilty of a sudden German surprise attack against our Black Sea defenses led to the dispersal of our forces all along the Black Sea front. We even had to concenerate forces in the capital for the defense of Ankara. German plans, recently discovered, clearly disclose that these precautionary measures had not been taken in vain. Moreover, at the end of the summer of 1942, we officially informed the Soviet Government that we were concentrating forces at Trobzon and Hopa against the eventuality of a German landing at the back door of the Caucasus and that dispersal of our military forces was due to this reason.

In reply the Soviets expressed their satisfaction. I do not know of a more convincing proof than the disposition of the Turkish forces during this war, that our military movements were directed against no one else but the Axis powers.

With reference to criticism of our belated entry into the war against Germany and Japan, it is alleged that Turkey's declaration of war made no effect and that it came after Allied victory had assumed a decisive character.

We have no pretention as to the effect of our declaration of war. We contend, however, that Turkish conduct during the period of years of nightmare has helped in the victory of our Allies. Our entry into war against the Germans and the Japanese was decided upon demand of our Allies. To this declaration of war our Allies must have attached certain importance, for it was they who asked for it and it can never be alleged that we declared war on Germany after Allied victory had become definite. We were with them during the dark days. As to the days of glorious victory, we had no desire to share the spoils and we, therefore, would not think of taking advantage of the occasion. Our action was prompted solely with the desire of acting in concert with our Allies.

Criticism has also been levelled against us for not entering into the war immediately after the breaking off of diplomatic relations in the August of 1944. The Turkish attitude decided upon after exchange of communications between Great Britain and ourselves was as follows: Turkey's decision would constitute the first step towards effective belligerency. The British Government had informed

us that they would go into detailed discussions with us later regarding Turkey's entry into the war. But our Allies made no demand of us for the execution of the decision which they held in their hands.

As regards the reproach that we did not let Allied ships pass through the straits to aid Russia, the allegation is absolutely unfounded. No reproach or default can be leveled at Turkey on this account. If the Allies were not able to extend help to each other by using the straits, this is through no fault of Turkey. Nor is it due to Turkish action. The situation was the result of Axis Powers being able to keep closed on sea and in the air the Mediterranean routes. While on the subject, I judge it useful to mention that Great Britain drew our attention to the passage into the Black Sea of certain German ships in June 1944. In her capacity as one of the signatories to the Montreaux Convention, she objected to this. During the discussions which ensued, it did not take more than a week for Turkey to make categorical and radical decisions to stop the passage of German ships. This was again in accordance with the spirit of our alliance with Britain and our attachment to the United Nations cause. It is, therefore, impossible to argue that the Montreaux Convention, in practice, worked against the Allied cause. Moreover, it was proven during the Second World War that the straits were in good hands and that there was no obstacle to bar free passage of ships of all nations.

Honorable members of the Assembly—German policy contended that the Second World War was a continuation of the First. The fact is also clear that Turkey was the only country which constituted an exception. The rest of central European powers found themselvess in the same camp.

As to Turkey, she had to bear burdens as heavy as those she bore in the First World War. After the First World War Turkey suffered four more additional years of war until she could conclude the Peace Treaty of 1923. She lost a great empire and to be able to safeguard her existence and national frontiers endured countless misfortunes. This was the Turkey, which 16 years later, toook her firm stand by the side of Great Britain and for the survival of the cause of the United Nations, often at the risk of great dangers. In return for all this, Turkey had no demand or claim on her losses in the past. Instead, Turkey endeavored, within her means and to the best of her ability, to render services to the Allied cause. Under the circumstances, it would be fully inconsistent with any sense of justice to exact from Turkey, under any pretext whatever, something of her territories or her sovereign rights. We do not doubt that, if we could explain these facts and put forward our rights to the peoples of Soviet Russia, to the peoples of the British Empire, and to the peoples of the United States, they would find that we are within our rights.

I have no illusions as regards the fact that it is without the bounds of our material means and possibilities to make our cause heard and bridge the vast oceans to enter among the peoples of Soviet Russia, Great Britain, and America, for such explanation of facts.

Consequently, it depends essentially on the sentiments of justice and equity of the leaders of great powers that their peoples may have an exact knowledge of the problems concerning Turkey If such sentiments are allowed to depart from the truth, it becomes difficult to formulate an idea of the nature of understandings with the great nations of the world. In spite of all, however, we want to believe that the principles of the United Nations Charter have been permanently established and that sincere intentions shall guide the world. If humanitarian feelings are to be taken as the foundation upon which the future world edifice is to be built, we have confidence that Turkey shall be recognized as one of the useful members of the new world peace organization. Meanwhile, we proclaim openly that we have no debt to pay anyone whatsoever in territory or in the relinquishment of Turkey's sovereign rights. We shall live as men of honor and so we shall die as men of honor.

Honorable members of the assembly, the actual state of our foreign relations is as follows: Following the denunciation by the Soviets of the treaty of friendship we have exerted great effort to conclude a new treaty seriously ameliorating the old one and based on new foundations. The result of these efforts are well known to you. We have not lost hope that the truth will be better understood and that good neighborly feelings shall prevail. It is probable that good relations will be established between the two countries. We always welcome, wholeheartedly, that future possibilities with Britain—to whom we are tied by an alliance—shall increase and that after the many events which took place during the course of the Second World War, the British people consider our excellent relations and our alliance with them a useful factor.

Our relations with the United States of America are developing in an atmosphere of increasing friendship. We have faith that the United States will apply sincerely the principles of the United Nations Charter toward all the nations of the world. We wish that all our neighbors beginning from Bulgaria to Irak shall live as independent nations. Our aim is to maintain good relations with them all. We follow closely and with sympathy the efforts of our neighbor, Greece, deployed by her on the road of rehabilitation and the healing of her wounds which she received during her catastrophic struggle. We welcome with satisfaction possibilities of the development and deepening of our friendly relations with Irak. We have no other political objective other than to become one of the most civilized nations of the world so that Turkey ascends to the ranks of a useful and hardworking member of the family of world nations.

Certificate of Incorporation of World Bill of Rights Association, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following certificate of incorporation of the World Bill of Rights Association, Inc.:

We, the undersigned, being desirous of associating ourselves for purposes hereinafter more particularly described, pursuant to and in conformity with the membership corporations law of the State of New York relating to membership corporations, do hereby certify and declare that we are all of full age, citizens of the United States, residents of the State of New York, and that all of the directors hereinafter named are citizens and residents of the United States and the State of New York.

First. The name of the proposed corporation shall be known and designated as World Bill of Rights Association, Inc.

Second. The particular objects for which said corporation is formed are as follows:

To preserve and defend the Constitution of the United States of America and the constitutions of the constituent States of the United States of America.

To acquaint by means of publications and public meetings all peoples of the United States with the democratic rights and blessings which they possess under the Constitution of the United States of America and the constitutions of the particular constituent States to which they belong.

To preserve for all Americans every democratic freedom contained in the Federal Bill of Rights.

To oppose by means of publications and public meetings and all legitimate peaceful methods every form of totalitarianism in the United States of America.

To advocate the adoption of a world bill of rights, whose principles and provisions shall be based on our own Federal Bill of Rights, the Atlantic Charter, and the "four freedoms."

To support the Constitutional Government of the United States and all Americans in extending such a world bill of rights to all the peoples of every nation upon the face of the earth.

To oppose all efforts of any totalitarianism to deny the peoples of any nation democratic freedoms contained in this world bill of rights.

Third. The territory in which the operations are principally to be conducted shall be New York, N. Y.

Fourth. The principal office of the World Bill of Rights Association, Inc., shall be located in the city, county, and State of New York.

Fifth. The number of directors of the World Bill of Rights Association, Inc., shall be not less than 5 nor more than 30.

Sixth. The names and residences of the directors until the first annual meeting are: John Torpats, 510 West One Hundred and Twenty-third Street, New York; John Lembergh, 28 West Seventieth Street, New York; Richard Hermanson, 105 Grand Avenue, East Rockaway, N. Y.; John Balkunas, 64–14 Fifty-sixth Road, Maspeth, N. Y.; Alina Rabcewicz, 121 St. Marks Place, New York.

Seventh. That all of the subscribers to the certificate are of full age; that at least two-thirds of them are citizens of the United States; that at least one of them is a resident of the State of New York, and that of the persons named as directors at least one is a citizen of the United States and a resident of the State of New York.

In witness whereof, we have made, subscribed, and acknowledged this certificate, this 14th day of August 1945.

JOHN TORPATS.
JOHN LEMBERGH.
RICHARD HERMANSON.
JOHN BALKUNAS.
ALINA RABCEWICZ.

OFFICERS

The temporary executive board of the World Bill of Rights Association, Inc., is as follows: President, Hon. Alvin E. O'Konski, Congressman from Wisconsin; vice president, Rev. John Balkunas, trustee of the Lithuanian R. C. Federation of America; vice president, Richard Hermanson, writer and high-school teacher, representing the Latvian Americans; vice president, Dr. Tibor Kerekes, professor at Georgetown University, executive secretary of the American Hungarian Federation; vice president, Gustav Kosik, editor of the Slovak V Amerike; vice president, Milan Obradovich, vice president Serbian National Defense Council; vice president, Dr. John Torpats, economist, author, and writer, representing the Central Committee of Estonian-American Organization; executive secretary, Rev. A. A. Skoniecki, executive secretary of the Coordinating Committee of American Polish Associations in the East, author and writer; treasurer, William H. Smyth; recording secretary, Alina Rabcewicz.

The headquarters of the association are located at 103 Park Avenue, Room 511, New York 17, N. Y., telephone Murray Hill 5–6486.

Any freedom-loving group or person can join by contacting World Bill of Rights Association, Inc., 103 Park Avenue, Room 511, New York 17, New York, telephone Murray Hill 5-6486. For freedom's sake join now.

H. R. 4393

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1945

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include two letters relating to H. R. 4393, a bill introduced by me some weeks ago for the purpose of reimbursing the owners of gold mines for the damages done to their mines during the time they were arbitrarily closed down by the Government. The order closing the gold mines was a type of order not duplicated in any other instance and inflicted a financial loss upon the gold miners without parallel in any other industry in this country. These two letters from practical mining operators in my district are so much to the point and state the case so well, that I feel they are of general interest:

PIONEER-LILYAMA MINES,
Placerville, Calif., October 31, 1945.

Hon. CLAIR ENGLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLAIR: I acknowledge receipt of copy of your H. R. 4393 which I have read with much interest. This bill seems to be well drawn and such that it covers the subject. If it can be enacted into law, it will mean a tremendous benefit to the State of California. Probably no industry ever suffered such an unjust blow as western gold mining received under L208. Its results have been disastrous for dozens of profitable mining operations—operations which by their very nature were unable to convert to any wartime activity.

Here in California we are endeavoring with a promise of success to induce our corporate securities department to relax some of their stringent regulations governing the sale of mining stocks. I met with the commissioner yesterday and believe we have worked out a program that will be of great help—but it all still involves the sale of stock to get our mining industry again going. This means a reduced interest for the operators, of course—a penalty directly chargeable to L208.

All of this, too, is involved with present high wages and low gold prices of $35. No other industry ever was so nearly bankrupt by arbitrary Government action—twice the target. At a time when all attention is centered on postwar employment problems our Uncle Sam hamstrings gold mining—with a price lower than anywhere else in the world and a legalized banditry that compels a producer to sell instantly all of his product at the buyer's price and exclusively to that buyer—the buyer being immune from all responsibility for his actions. Maybe some college economist who never operated any business anywhere can figure out that it is cheaper to pay a dole to unemployed miners than it is to pay a decent price for their product—but I am too simple minded to be able to reach any such conclusion.

Your fine letter was read to the mining council's last (annual) meeting at Auburn a couple of weeks ago—all mining people appreciate your efforts on their behalf.

With best wishes to you,

Sincerely,

HAL GRIGGS.

ORO FINO CONSOLIDATED MINES,
Auburn, Calif., October 31, 1945.

Mr. CLAIR ENGLE,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLAIR: Thanks for the copy of your bill for the relief of the gold miners. That is a practical move on behalf of this ignored industry and naturally, originates from the one man in Washington realizing our plight and with determination enough to attempt to do something about it.

I note that gold mining is booming in Canada. Also, that neither Russia nor South Africa are letting any of their gold out of their hands. In fact, only our Nation seems indifferent to the metal and, as a consequence, it is only a misfortune to be a gold miner if his mine happens to be in the U. S. A.

The President's generous attitude toward labor, and his consideration for those industries whose margin of profit is so slight that advances in price are required in order that they exist, and so are permitted to apply for permission to advance prices, was noted in yesterday's speech. But, as there cannot be any advance in the price of our product except by international agreement, how is the operator of a gold mine to compensate for this increase in the cost of production incurred by increased wages? Perhaps this would be an auspicious time to advance a bonus on newly-mined gold? A few high-grade properties may be able to shoulder this additional burden, but the majority of California's gold mines are marginal and for them this is out of the question. So what?

We are having the first storm of the season. It started yesterday and looks as though it might clear up tomorrow. Please keep us informed of progress, and know we greatly appreciate your thoughtfulness and efforts.

Cordially,

JACK.

Discharges From the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am daily in receipt of letters from men in the armed services expressing a desire to be allowed to return to their homes. Some of these come to me from the theaters of war in Europe and Japan, and others from camps in our own country, as well as many from their families. I feel particular concern on this question for those who have served long periods of time overseas, and equal concern for those who have families at home dependent upon them.

I am further concerned with the vast numbers of young men who have been taken into the service and deprived of opportunity to finish their education. This situation was imperative so long as the Nation was at war. It seems to me now that the country is at peace again every effort should be made by the War Department to return these students in order that they may complete their education. We have a responsibility to them, and there will come a time when their education will be of immense value not alone to them, but in the public service they may render to the country in private life. We will need educated men in the future.

I express equal concern for young men who have been taken from the farms of the country. I know of many instances in the State of North Dakota where young men have been taken into the service of their country, leaving their aged parents to carry on as best they can. These cases should be looked into intelligently and carefully by the War Department. There are hundreds of instances where men are being held in the service today where they can render no further service to their country. They should be returned to their farms and to the farms of their parents. Their contribution to the country would be of vastly greater importance at home than to be retained in the armed forces.

Under unanimous consent, I include herewith excerpts from a few letters which have come to me within the last few days:

1. "I would like to write you a few lines concerning my son who is in the Army. He has been in the Army now for 25 months, nearly a year overseas. He has been on the island of Okinawa since the island was taken, and is still there. He is very anxious to get back in the States so that he can continue his studies which he started before he was drafted into the Army. Great promises were made him that he would go back to school as soon as the war was over and it is up to the ones in higher authority to see that these promises are fulfilled."

2. "We have been hearing so much about the discharging of servicemen for continuing their education and this especially among the medical men who are so badly needed in the States. Very little is being done, although a lot is being said. My husband has been in the service over 2 years. At the time he joined the ERC in college, many promises were given to the students about finishing their period of training and education. He was a medical student and the Army called him in spite of the special set-up which he was in. He was given a short period of training and was then sent overseas. Now the war is over, he wishes to continue his work in the field of medicine, and in spite of the fact that every newspaper and magazine keep telling those fellows of the need of medical students here in the States, they are not being given the opportunity to do so. Like so many others, why can't he be released and allowed to continue his schooling? These boys have done their share of fighting and it is the least they deserve after all that they have done for their country."

3. "I am writing to urge you to do everything possible to speed up the release of men in the Army and Navy whose services are not needed. My only son got the first 2 years of his medical education at the University of North Dakota before the Navy took over the education of young doctors. Then the Navy ordered him to Duke University Medical School, July 1, 1943, where he finished his work on March 24, 1945, and got his degree in medicine. He was then ordered to Farragut, Idaho, to serve as an intern in the United States Naval Hospital, where he started his duties April 1, 1945. As long as there was work to do there he was happy—he was very willing to do his part. But for the past 3 months there has been less and less work to do at Farragut Naval Hospital. Now there are three times as many doctors there as are needed."

4. "Now that the war has been won it appears to me that the size of the armed forces can be cut. I was one of the last

ones drafted from our county, being as I am, 32 years old, having been married 10 years and the father of two children, ages 8 and 5. I was considered essential but due to the shortage of available men I was inducted on May 15, 1945. The allowance my wife gets, in addition to being a great burden to the taxpayer is not sufficient to care for my family with living costs as they are. It appears that with volunteer and Army career men, and men 18 to 26 without families, they will have a more efficient Army than they would have keeping us family men in and take a chance on our homes being broken up in addition to the added expense."

5. "Now that the war has come to a successful end the next thing that comes to our minds is what is going to happen to the men in the service that have been recently drafted and are past 26 years old with families. I am 28 years old. I was married in 1940 and have two children, one 4 and one 2 years old. I was kept out of the Army so long due to the fact that I was a family man, and now with the point system it looks like the men drafted within the last year will be the last ones out. We were the last ones in due to our families and I really believe we should be in line as being the first ones to be discharged."

6. "I think something should be done about discharging limited servicemen who are classified as unfit for overseas duty and have never been able to serve overseas. They have no way of getting enough points to be discharged the way the point system is now and it is not their fault they haven't been able to go overseas to get their points that way. My husband is 30 years of age and has been in the Army since August 3, 1942. He went in with the first group of limited service fellows and was always classified as unfit for duty overseas, consequently he has been shoved here and there from one Army camp to another for the simple reason that the Army has not known just what else to do with some of these men. I suggest something be done for their benefit also as they have surely done their duty."

7. "My son who is now 21 years old entered the Army 2 years ago. He had been a premedic student at the Jamestown College for one full term of 9 months and 3 months' summer school and had started another year at the college when he left for the Army. He trained as a tail gunner on a B-17. Spent over 5 months in England during the war with Germany. Made 14 bombing missions over Germany, Czechoslovakia, France, and Belgium, and in addition to this, made several food missions over Belgium and Holland while the fighting was still on. He did not receive credit on his combat missions for the food missions nor was he given credit on his combat hours for the food missions. His outfit received a Presidential citation for their bombing of some port in France that was still being held by the Germans. He is now at Drew Field, Tampa, Fla., and has been there since August of 1945. He has been assigned to MP training. Imagine a man wanting to get back into college to complete his medic course and gets thrown into an outfit like the MP's."

8. "I am writing you in regard to my husband who is now in Japan. He entered service May 22, 1942, and went overseas in December 1942. He has served in Fiji Islands, New Caledonia, Philippine Islands, and now is in the mainland of Japan. He has 77 points to September 1 and has had only a 7-day furlough since he entered the service and that was just before he went overseas. Isn't there some way you could send him home, as he has been there almost 3 years?"

9. "My husband is in the service and is in Camp Berle, Calif. He writes me that he is just idling his time away. I need him at home and I have four children to take care of. I am requesting you to use your influence to get his discharge."

10. "I am writing to you about my son. He will be 30 years old next January and has worked with me in my farm-machinery business since he was out of high school. He was sent to Italy in 1944 and fought in France, Germany, and Austria to the end of the European war. He has applied for a discharge to his commanding officer. I forwarded a number of affidavits to him, one from my doctor who is treating me for arthritis and heart trouble, but that was rejected and "not essential" written over it. Now I am past 70, raised a family of 10, all of whom are either married or on their own and have but four boys left single. One spent 3 years in the Army and is discharged and is all crippled up with arthritis and drawing a small pension. He is unfit to work. Another boy served in the Army nearly 5 years and is still in Japan. My youngest boy is 19 and is in France and expects to be sent to Germany for some time to come. I tell you I am desperate, and there is this son doing nothing in camp but chewing his fingernails, as he writes, and becoming a bum if he has to stay in longer. Surely there can be no just reason for not discharging him as he is surely not worth a thing to the Army while here the job is waiting for him, and not only that, but three or four more jobs for others if he takes over, which I want him to do as I cannot in present state of health carry on any more."

11. "I received yours of October 1 and usual paper phooey on discharges. Many others are getting out. We lost over $5,000 in crops and wages by the taking of all our help. We want our boys discharged and home by Christmas. Now the war is over—we will choose our help according to their ability to serve all alike."

Do Retailers Get a Square Deal From Government?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1945

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, today I attended, together with many other Congressmen, a meeting of the House Small Business Committee, which is considering the OPA policy of cost absorption, as applied now to automobile dealers. The dangers in this unfair policy have long been apparent to me and it has been evident to all of those of us who have studied the matter that the policy would gradually be extended to more and more lines of business, if the OPA planners get their way.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following brief article prepared by me and published in the November issue of the Missouri Grocer, the monthly magazine of the Missouri Retail Grocers' Association. The article follows:

DO RETAILERS GET A SQUARE DEAL FROM GOVERNMENT?

(By Hon. MARION T. BENNETT, Member of Congress, Sixth District)

I have been invited to express my views as to what the Federal Government appears to have in mind for private enterprise, especially the retail merchant. It is with mixed feelings that I undertake this assignment because I fear that many of the things that the present governmental leaders tell the merchants of the country they wish to do for them will never become a reality.

On the other hand, I am fearful that many things will be done to our retailers by the present administration which were not bargained for when we last went to the polls. To be blunt, the outlook is far from promising.

The American retailer today faces the greatest challenge in his history. For scores of years, prior to this war, the distributors of this Nation have operated under a competitive system that could truly be called free enterprise. Today, however, just at a time when the frustrations caused by operating in a wartime economy should be coming to an end, the retailer finds himself threatened by a form of unfair competition which he cannot beat down by supermerchandising methods or by sheer ingenuity and energy.

Today his competition is not that of the store across the street, but the coercive force of misused policing powers vested in the hands of the Government itself. Today, the retailer's competition sneaks up behind him and grabs him by the throat in a manner that he cannot combat.

This crippling force of governmental interference takes several forms. I shall only discuss a few of its manifestations in these limited remarks.

First of all, it manifests itself in that travesty upon justice—the OPA pricing policy known as cost absorption. This new device to confuse and upset the retailer in his normal business calculations has not yet been foisted upon the retail grocer, but, in my opinion, it is only a matter of time until he, too, feels the weight of this regulatory squeeze.

Cost absorption, as you know, instead of encouraging a man to stay in business, sets up squeezing price powers which, if carried through, can only result in his being put out of business in a relatively short space of time.

As I stated, not all of our retailers have yet felt this squeeze. Certain product lines have been temporarily exempted from the formula. In the hard-goods line, however, the squeeze has already commenced. In my opinion other lines will shortly be placed under the same order unless the Congress or the President takes prompt action to prevent the OPA from carrying further this destructive and almost criminal policy.

OPA's price-control program for the reconversion and transition periods rests upon a series of wholly unwarranted economic assumptions. We all agree that a flexible control over prices on essential living items is important and might act as a brake upon runaway price rises. OPA's policy of rigidly controlling almost every known price, however, impairs the incentive to produce and thus adversely affects the number of jobs we may expect to have available. The natural carollary to this is that we then find a further restriction on the volume of civilian goods for which there is an admitted pent-up demand.

A policy of rigid price control while wage increases are permitted or encouraged is doomed to failure, in my opinion. It is economic fallacy to think that it could ever succeed.

Statistics show that wartime earnings before taxes for retailers have increased far less rapidly than in other industries. The record shows that earnings of manufacturing corporations increased approximately four times as much as did earnings of unincorporated retailers during wartime. Most retailers, of course, still operate in the unincorporated form. I shall discuss these tax problems also a little further on.

Today, retailers are being asked to absorb the price increases that are being given to the manufacturer in practically every case. For example, of the 54 general price increases granted by OPA to manufacturers in the first 7½ months of 1945, distributors were required to absorb the full increase in 51 in-

stances. In 1944, 54 increases were also given to manufacturers. In those cases also the retailers assumed the absorption of the full increase in 35 cases, with no absorption being asked of the wholesaler.

That is just the beginning. The flood of manufacturing increases is just before us and the retailer has only begun to absorb these increases if OPA is permitted to have its way.

It is a recognized economic fact that volume of retail sales are closely related to changes in individual incomes. We all recognize that many individual incomes are going to fall below wartime inflated levels as the war production demands cut off, as the servicemen return, and as discharged war workers are forced to seek other employment. This decline is already under way and is reflected in Nationwide statistics for retail sales.

Statistics also show that the actual cost of retailing per transaction rose during wartime. It is not likely that this trend will be reversed in any great hurry. Why OPA does not recognize these fundamental economic facts is more than I can understand unless it be that the course that agency is plotting is deliberate and of a sinister nature.

Incorporated retailers turned over as taxes to the Federal Government 9 cents of their sales dollar during wartime as compared with about 1 cent before the war. With the heavy national debt still hanging over our heads, we are not safe in assuming that this tax liability will become very much less for many years to come.

All evidence points to the fact that the small retailer will be less able to absorb these manufacturing price increases than will the large retailer and the chain store. The margins which OPA proposes to allow retailers in most lines will be so inadequate that failures may be expected on a large scale unless prompt action is taken to stop this un-American and, in my opinion, illegal policy.

To top this we now have a leading Democratic Senator, the chairman of the powerful Senate Finance Committee, insisting that tax reductions shall not be granted to the small man for psychological reasons. He says that he must be made conscious of his duty to the Government. Whose Government is this, I ask, unless it is that of the little man?

I fear inflation. Everyone with a grain of common sense fears inflation. But, when we weigh these punitive, rigid, stupid, unimaginative, and undemocratic policies which OPA is now pursuing against the problems of providing full production and full employment, I say that the present administration is playing a dangerous game in promising us prosperity on the one hand and building us a one-way highway to permanent depression and breadlines on the other.

Let me point one or two other examples of this short-sighted Federal policy with respect to retailers and small businessmen.

The Department of Commerce, headed by Henry A. Wallace, has charge of selling surplus consumer goods which the Government no longer needs for its own purposes. Under a policy which presumably carries Mr. Wallace's personal approval, that Department gives to chain stores and mail-order houses an extra discount which is often as much as 20 percent when a chain store or a mail-order house makes a purchase of surplus consumer goods from the Government. And it does this even where the purchase covers small lots of a size that independent, small retailers would willingly acquire for their own stocks.

Thus, we find another powerful agency of Government deliberately putting road blocks in front of small retailers and, in effect, subsidizing their large competitors, the chains and mail-order houses. How much longer these policies will prevail depends upon the President, the Congress, and the President's right-hand officials.

Again, let us look at the manner in which another Government agency favored large firms over small ones in the allocation of scarce materials. A survey of the textile low-cost-garment program made last summer showed that the War Production Board had so arranged its allocation orders that one single chain outlet had secured title to 95 percent of one class of men's underwear, 81 percent of another class, and 75 percent of still another group. Those things just can't happen under a Government-materials-control program unless the officials in charge of the program are aware of what is going on.

Taxwise, the small retailer faces a very uncertain future. Excise taxes, continued high income taxes, and little sympathy for the needs of small firms to build up adequate reserves of capital with which to meet their competition and periods of lean times seems to be the order of the day. It avails a merchant nothing today to merely act as a middleman of funds which pass across his counter to rest ultimately in the Federal Treasury. No credits or exemptions are offered to him for the amount of midnight oil he burns or the paper he uses in filing out the multitudinous forms required of him as the Government's tax collector and for other purposes.

I could go on and mention other examples than these, some so ridiculous as to be almost unbelievable. I shall not bore you with the details, however, because many of you readers have a greater detailed knowledge of some of these problems and obstacles from first-hand experience than I have.

Considering the picture from the broad viewpoint, however, I feel that the combination of all of these Federal actions I have mentioned constitute the gravest threat to our postwar happiness and prosperity that can be imagined.

Our retail merchants are the backbone of this country. Their futures are at stake in this wierd program which has been given to us by the theorists of the OPA by remote, but firm, control. The other programs referred to are just as potentially dangerous because they reflect a sinister and incomprehensible program which, if followed to its final implications, will throttle and put out of business the majority of the small merchants of the Nation.

There has been too much propaganda during the past few years from the viewpoint of the consumer and not enough from the viewpoint of the man who sells the consumer the great bulk of his purchases.

Price control, low selling prices, keeping the cost of living down, and all of the other aims we seek are laudable in the extreme, but when these aims conflict with the fundamental aim of our Republic, which is freedom of enterprise for the individual, then a crossroads has been reached and a decision must be made.

Unless our present governmental leaders change their minds and reverse themselves on some of the programs that they are trying to foist upon us, I fear for the future of the independent merchant. When he fails, the bulwark of democracy in this Nation goes down with him.

Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee of the House of Representatives to Investigate Executive Agencies has submitted its report, No. 1142, as of October 22, 1945, on the subject of the reconversion policy of OPA. Here is its opening statement in that report:

The policy of adherence to rigid formulas has retarded reconversion, prevented production, especially in low-priced commodities, has restricted opportunity for full employment and has, at least in some instances, actually caused prices of cost-of-living commodities to rise. It has compelled manufacturers to discontinue and abandon production of prewar low-priced commodities they were skilled in making in great volume and has permitted newcomers to manufacture such commodities at higher prices than were necessary to enable those already in the field to stay in business.

The report then continues with a few specific but typical examples:

The largest-volume low-priced awning manufacturer in the country produced prewar a window awning which retailed in tremendous quantity at $1.59. Manufacturing costs have risen, he required an increase which would have resulted in a retail price of $1.79. Unable to get it, he abandoned that product. A vastly inferior awning of the same size, made by a newcomer to the field sells at retail for $3.26 with OPA approval.

A large-volume manufacturer of low-priced electric irons was given authority by War Production Board in May 1944 to manufacture 58,000 irons. Application was made to OPA for a price which would permit these irons to be manufactured and retailed at less than $3. Seven months elapsed before any price was granted. The price then granted was not sufficient to cover manufacturing costs. In consequence, these irons were not produced. In contrast, a newcomer to the field was granted permission by OPA to price an inferior and inherently dangerous electric iron to retail at $5.50.

A large-volume manufacturer of home medicine cabinets, whose products wholesaled prewar at 70 cents and $1.50, needed an adjustment to cover increased costs of manufacture. He could not get the adjustment and was forced to discontinue these items. In contrast, a newcomer to the field, whose own business had been the manufacture of lamp shades, obtained OPA approval of wholesale prices of $1.30 and $2.30, respectively for identical medicine cabinets.

Your committees' investigation also revealed that current OPA policy includes a practice known as open billing. Under this practice a merchant has no way of knowing how much his merchandise will eventually cost him as the manufacturer's price depends on subsequent OPA action.

In one such instance a merchant, having long since sold goods so purchased, was billed an additional $45,000 because his supplier later received authority to increase his price. In another, a merchant having received 200 washing machines sold them to his customers and is now nervously awaiting OPA action to ascertain how much money he may have lost.

On the other hand, some merchants are more cautious and refuse to sell commodities until they know the price at which their suppliers will eventually bill them. Despite theis customers' need, and their own reluctance, such merchants are obliged to warehouse their goods and scarcity is prolonged with all its consequent hardships and dangers.

The Nation's productive potential, long geared to the necessities of all-out war, must be assisted and directed as rapidly as may be to the resumption of the important function of providing for the citizenry the high standard of living in which it is their birthright to participate and flourish. To bring this about, and to make its fullest realization attainable in the nearest foreseeable future should be the actuating policy and underlying motivation of all official thought, concept, and action.

The primary need of our Nation's economy in the reconversion period is ever-increasing production. The actions and policy of OPA should reflect this fact. No action which curtails or shuts off production should be taken by that agency. On the contrary, where there is conflict between rigid holding of the price line on one hand and increasing production on the other, the latter must now be the controlling consideration.

That is the language of the committee report, and, of course, it is right as far as it goes. I would go a little further and say that we should declare this war at

an end and as quickly as possible abandon these attempts at a managed economy into the mire of which we sink a little deeper with each new OPA directive.

General Motors' Answer to UAW-CIO Demands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 8, 1945

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 6, 1945, carried the statement of Walter P. Reuther, vice president and director of the General Motors department of the UAW-CIO's demand for a 30-percent wage increase.

In order that the public may have full and complete information regarding the wage controversy between the UAW-CIO, General Motors and other automotive industries, I offer for the RECORD a statement of Mr. C. E. Wilson, president of General Motors.

General Motors, like the rest of the automobile industry, believes in high wages. It has paid high wages in the past and expects to continue to pay high wages in the future. General Motors wants all jobs in its plants and offices to be good jobs, not only in terms of working conditions and opportunity, but good jobs as judged by compensation for equivalent work generally throughout the country.

Immediately at the end of the war, the UAW-CIO made a demand for a wage increase amounting to 52 hours' pay for 40 hours' work and backed this up by a strike threat. Other CIO unions representing others of our employes made similar demands. These demands were made even though the union officers knew that as a result of our war effort there would be a considerable period during which profitable volume operations were impossible on account of the reconversion problems. The demands were made even though they also knew we were making every effort to speed the reconversion of our plants, restore peacetime production, and expand employment.

They expressed these demands on two principal counts:

1. Maintenance of the wartime take-home pay of employes on the argument that employes should be paid the same amount of money for 40 hours' work as they had been paid for 48 hours' work including overtime on the extra hours over 40.

2. The assumed ability of the corporation to pay this large wage increase either from working capital, tax refunds from the Government or estimated future profits.

On October 3 General Motors refused this unreasonable demand for a 30-percent increase because we were convinced that there was no justification or merit in the reasons advanced supporting the demand. Moreover, we believed that such an increase was not consistent with the country's effort to stabilize wages and prices and avoid inflation.

We would like to have been better prepared for peacetime production, but the necessities of the war effort, as interpreted by those responsible, did not make this possible. Therefore, a number of employees had to be temporarily laid off. However, in order to speed up reconversion all those who could be employed on such work have been employed more than 40 hours. Likewise contractors who are building new plants and modifying our old ones have had their employees work more than 40 hours and paid them the extra premium for overtime work. Speeding up this work has meant extra cost which the contractors have charged to us. We have done everything we could to employ quickly more men than ever before worked for General Motors in peacetime. We have worked more than 40 hours per week where this would expand production and employment.

If it had not been for strikes in plants of our suppliers and one or two in our own plants—most of which the UAW-CIO was responsible for—we would have already employed many thousand more workers on productive work, and they would be working more than 40 hours per week to meet the demand for our products which so many people need so badly. Plants like our electromotive plant at LaGrange, Ill., where we build Diesel locomotives and where there was no reconversion problem, have been regularly scheduled at 48 hours per week. Since we were doing everything we could to speed up production and were willing to pay the extra overtime premium for the work, we did not think there was any merit whatsoever in the take-home pay argument. Paying more money to those who are working will not help those who are temporarily laid off.

Few people realize that working more than 40 hours a week in manufacturing plants does not result in unemployment. Obviously, when all the work places or jobs are filled and a plant is operating only 5 days or 40 hours per week, no more people can be employed on this basis but the plant will remain idle on the sixth day. Therefore, working extra time on the sixth day or more than 8 hours per day for 5 days per week does not prevent a single additional person from getting a job. Additional employees cannot be employed for a few hours per week. More people are actually employed in distributing the extra products produced and in other occupations supported by this higher level of production.

Demands were pressed for the unreasonable increase in wages, without any corresponding increase in productivity over prewar levels, on the assumption that the additional costs could be absorbed from profits previously earned, from tax refunds in case of operating losses, or from assumed future profits. General Motors is not willing to pay out in excess wages for work not performed money saved up for many years to modernize and expand its plants and provide more good jobs. The money cannot be spent twice. Neither is General Motors willing to sell its products at such excessively low prices in relation to costs as to incur an operating loss and get a tax refund with which to pay excessively high wages. The union is really proposing that the taxpayers of the country be called upon to subsidize either unjustifiably high wages or uneconomically low prices on General Motors products. We will not be a party to a proposal to subsidize the prices of our products at the expense of the taxpayers.

Extravagant estimates have been made by the union regarding the possible future production volume and profits of the corporation. In its reply to the union's brief made today, General Motors pointed out some typical examples of the inaccuracies and distortions in the union's figures.

General Motors rejects the theory of ability to pay as a valid argument for demanding high wages for the employees of a particular concern as compared to wages of other workmen doing similar work in related industry. To demand that we should pay our employees higher wages than others pay is just as unreasonable as it would be to demand that we pay higher freight rates than others or higher prices for our materials. It would be like requiring certain individuals riding on trains to pay higher fares for the same distance and class of service than others or asking some citizens to pay a higher price for a loaf of bread in the same store than others pay.

Under the National Labor Relations Act, collective bargaining specifically calls for bargaining over wages, hours, and working conditions and other conditions of employment and does not provide for bargaining with unions over prices of products or assumed future profits.

We expect in the postwar period, and as soon as our plants are completely reconverted, to make a reasonable profit, continue to pay high wages, and deliver good products to our customers at fair prices.

It is almost 4 years since we produced automobiles and there never has been a time in the history of the business when it was more difficult to determine costs. This is especially true in view of the fact that practically all of our suppliers are being confronted with excessive wage demands and do not know at what prices they can afford to sell us their materials. Nevertheless, this question of car prices must shortly be settled with OPA since all of our divisions are now in some production, cars are being delivered to dealers and they should as soon as possible be made available to the public who have been waiting so long for their new automobiles.

There was no provision in the OPA formula announced September 6, for recognizing any general wage increases that would affect costs and prices. This matter is fully presented in our answer to the union's brief.

On Tuesday, October 30, the President of the United States made a talk to the Nation on the question of wages and prices and announced a new Executive Order, No. 9651. This order modifies previous Executive orders and particularly gives authority for recognizing, as affecting costs and prices, any current wage increases necessary to make the percentage increase in average straight time hourly earnings since January 1941, equal to the percentage increase in the cost of living between January 1941, and September 1945.

Since this new Executive order is now part of our country's wage and price stabilization policy, we are offering under these new circumstances to increase those wage rates by classifications which since 1941 have not been increased in proportion to the increase in the cost of living as determined by the Government agency responsible for administering these Executive orders.

When these adjustments have been made, our factory employees will have had their wages, on the basis of a 40-hour week, increased in proportion to the increase in the cost of living since January 1941. This means that the standard of living of our factory employees will have been maintained in spite of the war and the difficulties of postwar reconstruction. Whether or not the cost of living and basic wage rates can be kept in line in the future will depend on whether or not the people of our country are willing to work for the things they would like to have.

What Is the World Bill of Rights Association, Inc.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 8, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the World Bill of Rights Association, Inc., was founded in the belief that if the rights of men are not respected in all

countries of the world, they cannot remain secure on our continent. Freedom is not static; it either expands or it shrinks. It seems that with the present powerful offensive of communist totalitarianism, only a militant movement, dedicated to the expansion and protection of human rights everywhere, can save Christian civilization and the democratic way of life. An all-out offensive based on the principles contained in the Bill of Rights appears to be the urgent necessity of the day.

The association believes that it is not alone in this conviction. Many outstanding men of the church and in public life in America, on various occasions, have expressed similar views in this matter.

President Harry S. Truman declared at the final plenary session of the United Nations Conference at San Francisco, June 26, 1945:

> Under this document we have good reason to expect the framing of an international bill of rights, acceptable to all nations involved. That bill of rights will be as much a part of international life as our own Bill of Rights is a part of our Constitution. The charter is dedicated to the achievement and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Unless we can obtain those objectives for all men and women everywhere without regard to race, language, or religion, we cannot have permanent peace and security.

Church leaders everywhere are saying:

> In all history, and particularly in modern history, dangers to world peace have come from the unjust treatment of minorities, the denial of civil and religious liberties, and other infringements on the inborn rights of men. To remove these dangers, the nations should adopt an international bill of rights, in which men and groups everywhere would be guaranteed the full enjoyment of their human rights.

And in their latest utterances after the termination of the London Conference, both the Secretary of State, Mr. James Byrnes and his Republican adviser, Mr. Foster Dulles, placed themselves on record in favor of an international bill of rights as the necessary solution for all mankind.

The principles and objectives of the World Bill of Rights Association, Inc., are as follows:

First. While establishing the association, its founders were aware of the fact that although the war is victoriously ended, freedom in large areas of the world is gravely menaced. Human rights, as defined in the Bill of Rights, are under repeated attack and constantly violated. Thus the very foundations of the democratic concept of life are undermined. Many regimes, although assuming a false cloak of democracy, practice terror, and suppress the elementary liberties of people.

Bearing this in mind, the association has dedicated itself to the restoration of freedom and respect for the individual, as the principal condition for democracy. No system, whatever its name may be, which disregards these fundamental rights, can be considered democratic. The bill of rights is the only genuine and undistorted criterion for democracy.

The association will, therefore, denounce and combat any such attempt to falsify or abuse the concept of democracy, as the gravest danger to the minds and consciences of humanity.

Second. The first objective of the World Bill of Rights Association, Inc., is to bring about a better understanding of the true meaning of the Bill of Rights and of its implications among the people of the United States. This will be done through publications, mass meetings, lectures, and so forth. In each important center in the United States branches of the association, closely linked with the headquarters, will be established.

Every group definitely opposed to totalitarianism and believing in the principles of the Bill of Rights is welcome to collaborate on this program.

Third. The association will struggle for the establishment of the Bill of Rights in all countries in the world, and will give all possible support to groups and organization everywhere that accept the principles of the Bill of Rights as their program.

The association trusts that most countries will in due time establish their own national world bill of rights associations, working in close contact with the American headquarters.

Fourth. Simultaneously with the organizational work, all effort will be made to protect the rights of all people who suffer today because of political and ideological tendencies and systems suppressing human rights and liberties.

The association will:

(a) Endeavor to bring to the American people the true picture of and facts concerning the fate of peoples and nations now living under totalitarian domination.

(b) Denounce and combat any false propaganda trying to camouflage the real aspect of policies leading to gradual extermination of religion.

(c) Denounce all governments and regimes which under whatever name or slogan suppress the rights of men.

(d) Concern itself with the fate of those people who, because of conditions of terror in their native countries, became homeless.

Fifth. The association will strive for the application of the following basic rules as essential conditions for a civilized, Christian, and democratic regime anywhere:

(a) Full freedom of religion, both in the field of religious services, rites, and teaching.

(b) Full freedom to organize political parties, two or more, according to the desires of the population, and not just one party or political front on the totalitarian pattern.

(c) Constitutional government based on free elections, secret ballot, freedom of open campaigning for all parties.

(d) Full freedom of speech, writing, expression, assembly, and the right of citizens to criticize their own government.

(e) The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches, and seizures. Security of all citizens against unlawful arrest, detention, or persecution because of religious, political or other convictions. No secret police, concentration camps or any other methods shall coerce and terrorize human minds.

(f) No trial without legal defense and jury.

(g) Impartial courts, free from political influence or pressure.

(h) Freedom of labor to establish and join unions, to strike, to collective bargaining and decent wages.

(i) Adequate protection for the sick, aged, and disabled. Necessary insurance in case of unemployment, sickness, old age, or death for wage earners.

Sixth. The association will seek and demand, under the United Nations Charter and under the Atlantic Charter, for all nations:

(a) Freedom to work out their own destiny with justice and equality before the law.

(b) True independence and right of self-determination.

(c) Territorial settlements in conformity to the wishes of the people concerned.

(d) Rightful voice in treaties of peace so that justice and equal treatment be assured to all.

Seventh. The association will strongly advocate the restoration of principles and morality as a guide to conduct, and the subjection of physical power to the restraints of moral law.

By starting a militant movement, dedicated to these ideals, the association believes itself to be fulfilling the obligation of every true American toward the dead in this war, and to all those people who, placing their hopes in democracy, conducted a sanguinary fight for freedom for over 5 years. Now that the military campaign has been victoriously ended, an equally powerful campaign for the rights of men must be launched. Only full success of this campaign can assure a just and permanent peace for the whole world.

The charter members of the World Bill of Rights Association, Inc., are representatives of Americans of Estonian, Finnish, Hungarian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, Serb, and Slovak descent. Other groups or persons can join by contacting World Bill of Rights Association, Inc., 103 Park Avenue, Room 511, New York 17, N. Y., telephone Murray Hill 5-6486. For freedom's sake, join now.

HOW YOU CAN JOIN IN THE FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

Any freedom-loving group, club, society, or individual can join by writing: World Bill of Rights Associations, Inc., 103 Park Avenue, room 511, New York, N. Y., telephone Murray Hill 5-6486.

The fees and dues for membership are as follows:

Clubs, groups, societies, etc., national or central organization

Charter and life membership	$1,000
Honorary life membership	500
Honorary year membership	100

Clubs, groups, societies, etc., local chapters

	Per year
Sustaining membership	$50
Active membership	25
Participating membership	10

Individual membership

HONOR MEMBERS

Charter and life membership	$1,000
Honorary life membership	500
Honorary year membership	100

SUPPORTING MEMBERS

	Per year
Sustaining membership	$50
Active membership	25
Participating membership	10
Contributing membership	5
Regular membership	1

Opposition to OPA Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, by telephone and telegraph, I have received protests from my people against the OPA plan which is now proposed to increase the factory profits at the expense of the automobile dealers throughout the country. I have studied the proposed plan carefully, and I feel that if instituted, it will perpetuate a rank injustice on the little automobile dealers throughout the United States. It will mean that many dealers will have a struggle to carry on, and that some dealers, now near the margin, will be thrown completely out of business.

But more than this, Mr. Speaker, the OPA plan, as proposed, will mean that the entire country will make a direct contribution to the financial good health of the giant automobile factories of the Nation, located largely in the Detroit area of this country. The little dealers will be scaled down—not to help the public bear the heavy costs of rising prices—but for the purpose of increasing profits to a few big factories.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the OPA will "Stop, look, and listen" before making this serious mistake and before perpetrating a most serious injustice upon these people throughout America. To show the general interest being manifested in opposition to the OPA plan I am setting forth telegrams which I have received from dealers in Louisiana:

HOMER, LA., *November 7, 1945.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Please attend OPA hearing Thursday, November 8, 10 a. m., and protest reductions in dealers discount.

WEST MAIN MOTOR CO.,
F. P. MCFARLAND.

HAYNESVILLE, LA., *November 7, 1945.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Our delegation will be in Washington Thursday to attend OPA meeting and protest reduction in dealers discount at OPA hearing. Will appreciate you attending meeting and cooperating with delegation. Thanks.

HAYNESVILLE MOTOR CO.,
GEORGE BREED.

MINDEN, LA., *November 7, 1945.*
Congressman OVERTON BROOKS,
Washington, D. C.:

OPA has not announced retail price on automobiles. It is rumored that OPA is considering a 50-percent reduction in the dealers discount. We have handled automobile dealers accounts for many years and know such a reduction in the dealers margin would be ruinous. Such price fixing would force dealers who want to comply with the law out of business and turn the sale of new cars over to the unscrupulous who would handle them in the same manner that a great many used cars are being handled today. In the interest of honesty in merchandising, respectfully request you to use your influence with OPA to allow the usual dealer discount in the fixation of retail prices of automobiles.

MINDEN BANK & TRUST CO.,
J. E. HARPER, *President.*

URANIA, LA., *November 8, 1945.*
T. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress:

Would be glad if you would request Mr. Bowles to withhold all price orders on automobiles pending hearing before House Small Business Committee. Prices should not be fixed until this committee is heard.

Q. T. HARDTNER.

MANSFIELD, LA., *November 7, 1945.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Our Louisiana dealers' delegation will attend an OPA hearing Thursday, November 8, 10 a. m., to protest their plan of reducing the dealers discount. This would be a most unfair reduction at this time when we must incur heavy expenses in rebuilding our organizations. Our committee will call you early Thursday, and I would appreciate it if you could attend the hearing with them and give us your enthusiastic support. Would appreciate it if you will wire me collect advising if you can give us this help.

AMOS N. LATHAM.

MINDEN, LA., *November 7, 1945.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Small Business Committee hearing November 8 for discussion of OPA proposal to reduce dealers discounts is against all small dealers that have tried to operate legitimate business through the war period. The OPA ceiling on used cars has proven very unsatisfactory and has not been enforced, and it has worked a hardship on the new-car dealers, as they have not been able to buy the used cars but are being sold to people that are dealing in black market, and a reduction in new-car dealers' discounts will cause a widespread black market with new cars as some dealers will force a trade for the consumer to get a new car. I urge you to attend this meeting personally and give your full cooperation to the Louisiana delegation that will contact you early Thursday in defeating OPA proposal to cut dealer discounts.

T. C. BLOXOM MOTOR CO.,
Dodge and Plymouth Distributors.

SHREVEPORT, LA., *November 6, 1945.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Our Louisiana dealers delegation will attend an OPA hearing Thursday, November 8, 10 a. m., to protest their plan of reducing the dealers discount. This would be a most unfair reduction at this time when we must incur heavy expenses in rebuilding our organizations. Our committee will call you early Thursday and I would appreciate it if you could attend the hearing with them and give us your enthusiastic support. Would appreciate it if you will wire me collect advising if you can give us this help.

PLEASANT HILL MOTORS CO.,
YEARWOOD.

SHREVEPORT, LA., *November 6, 1945.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Louisiana Automobile Dealers Association delegates will attend an OPA hearing Thursday, November 8, at 10 a. m., to discuss proposed plan for reducing dealer discount. This reduction would be most unfair at this time when we are incurring heavy expense in rebuilding our dealerships. Will greatly appreciate if you can arrange to attend this hearing with our delegates and give us your support. Will also appreciate if you will wire me collect advising if you can give us this help.

HOLMES PONTIAC CO., INC.
C. W. HOLMES.

SHREVEPORT, LA., *November 6, 1945.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Washington, D. C.:

Please welcome our dealer delegation from Louisiana that will attend OPA hearing Thursday this week in Washington. This reduction would be unfair in the face of higher overhead and salaries. I would appreciate if you would attend this meeting and go to bat for us. Please advise collect by Western Union if you will assist us.

HUTCHINS MOTORS,
T. W. HUTCHINS.

SHREVEPORT, LA., *November 6, 1945.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We earnestly request your support in opposing proposed OPA reduction in dealers discount before Small Business Committee hearing Thursday, November 8, 10 a. m. This matter is of vital importance to all automobile dealers in view of the ever increasing operating costs. Please wire answer collect.

PACKARD SHREVEPORT CO.,
D. E. PROCTOR,
J. BRYAN THIGPEN.

VIVIAN, LA., *November 6, 1945.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

A most unfair reduction in discounts for automobile dealers is to be discussed at a OPA hearing Thursday, November 8, 10 a. m. A Louisiana delegation is leaving immediately for Washington to protest a reduction at this time when our reconversion expenses are mounting so rapidly. Our delegation will contact you early Thursday, and I would appreciate your wholehearted cooperation as well personally attending the hearing. Could you please wire me collect if you can give us this much-needed assistance.

CALDWELL & GIBSON, INC.,
C. T. GIBSON.

LOGANSPORT, LA., *November 6, 1945.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Representatives from dealers meeting held in Shreveport today will attend OPA hearing Thursday, November 8, 10 a. m., in protest of plan to reduce dealers discount. If possible attend this meeting with our delegates. Any help you give them will be appreciated by us. If labor increases in auto plants our labor increases also. We think plan very unfair and ask your aid. Please wire us collect if you can and will go to this meeting with our crowd.

STUBBLEFIELD CHEVROLET CO.,
J. D. STUBBLEFIELD.

COUSHATTA, LA., *November 6, 1945.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand Small Business Committee hearing Thursday, November 8, 10 a. m., for purpose of discussing OPA reduction in deal-

ers discount. Louisiana delegation will contact you early Thursday and we must earnestly request that you extend to them your wholehearted cooperation as well as personally attending the meeting in order to defeat this most unfair reduction in our discounts. Particularly in face of increasing cost of labor, rent and other reconversion expenses in our business. Wire us collect at once and let us know if you can give us this assistance.

WILLIAMS and STRANGE.

SHREVEPORT, LA., *November 6, 1945.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The automobile dealers of Louisiana are sending a delegation to Washington, November 8, 1945, 10 a. m., to protest their plans of reducing dealers discount. At this time we are having to increase our expenses considerably to rebuild our organization and we feel that reduction is unfair. Please expect a call from our committee early Thursday and I would appreciate it if you could attend the meeting and support our protest. I will appreciate it if you will wire me collect, advising if you can give us this help.

HOWARD CRUMLEY,

SHREVEPORT, LA., *November 6, 1945.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Our Louisiana dealers delegation will attend on OPA hearing, Thursday, November 8, 10 a. m., to protest their plan of reducing the dealers discount. This would be a most unfair reduction at this time when we must incur heavy expenses in rebuilding our organizations. Our committee will call you early Thursday and I would appreciate it if you could attend the hearings with them and give us your enthusiastic support. Would appreciate it if you will wire me collect, advising if you can give us this help.

GLENN HUFF, INC.

SHREVEPORT, LA., *November 6, 1945.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Thursday November 8, 10 a. m., OPA will discuss reduction in discounts for automobile dealers, which, to me is most unfair. A Louisiana delegation is leaving immediately for Washington to protest a reduction at this time when reconversion expenses are increasing daily, and will contact you early Thursday morning. I will greatly appreciate your cooperation as well as your attending the hearing in person. Please wire me collect if you can give us this assistance.

W. B. SAFFORD, Jr.,
President, Central Motors, Inc.

SPRINGHILL, LA., *November 6, 1945.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Our Louisiana dealers delegation will attend an OPA hearing Thursday, November 8, 10 a. m., to protest their plan of reducing the dealers discount. This would be a most unfair reduction at this time when we must incur heavy expenses in rebuilding our organizations. Our committee will call you early Thursday and I would appreciate it if you could attend the hearing with them and give us your enthusiastic support. Would appreciate it if you will wire me collect, advising if you can give us this help.

BRANCH BROS. MOTOR CO.

MINDEN, LA., *November 6, 1945.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Have been informed Small Business Committee hearing is set for Thursday, November 8. To discuss reduction in dealers discount. Louisiana delegation to contact you Thursday and I earnestly request your wholehearted cooperation and your personal attention with you personally attending the meeting in order to defeat this unfair reduction in automotive dealers discount. Since we are faced with increased labor, rent, and reconversion cost and have gone through 4 years without any new cars whatsoever I feel that this is a gross injustice to all the dealers in the United States. Wire collect if you can and will give our committee assistance.

STANDARD CHEVROLET CO.,
K. L. ALBRITTON.

MINDEN, LA., *November 6, 1945.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand Small Business Committee hearing Thursday, November 6, for purpose of discussing OPA reduction in dealers' discount. Louisiana delegation will contact you Thursday. We most earnestly request that you give them your hearty cooperation in their efforts. It is further requested that you personally attend this meeting in order to defeat this disastrous reduction in discounts. It is apparent to all of us that gave our services to the armed forces that governmental forces are operating to our disadvantage, to say nothing of the dealers that stayed in business and kept the transportation system of the Nation intact. The automobile dealers were the first American civilian casualties of this war; they will be the first to bring to the public the fruits of a true reconversion policy. Why should they be penalized in order to help OPA appease a labor group that has made more money than they ever dreamed possible? Cost of living, cost of labor, rents, and all equipment pertaining to this business has increased at least 30 percent. Let's halt this thing somewhere if we all have to quit. Your help will be appreciated.

T. & M. MOTOR CO.

SHREVEPORT, LA., *November 6, 1945.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The OPA is to have a hearing on the reducing of automobile dealers' discounts at 10 a. m., Thursday, November 8. This proposed discount is an unfair reduction during this time of reconversion. A group of Louisiana automobile dealers will call on you early Thursday morning and I would appreciate you attending this meeting with them and giving them all the support you can; please wire me collect advising if you can give us this help.

RED RIVER MOTOR CO.,
PATTON HAWKINS.

HOMER, LA., *November 6, 1945.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Our Louisiana dealers' delegation will attend an OPA hearing Thursday, November 8, 10 a. m., to protest their plan of reducing the dealers' discount. This would be a most unfair reduction at this time when we must incur heavy expenses in rebuilding our organizations, our committee will call you early Thursday and I would appreciate it if you could attend the hearing with them, and give us your enthusiastic support. Would appreciate it if you will wire me collect, advising if you can give us this help.

CLAIBORNE MOTORS, INC.,
FRANK HARKNESS.

MINDEN, LA., *November 6, 1945.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Our understanding Small Business Committee hearing next Thursday morning, 10 o'clock, to discuss with OPA reduction of dealers' discount. Such a reduction is most unfair and will likely result in putting this dealer and three ex-service sons out of business. We request your wholehearted cooperation and attendance at meeting to defeat such unfair action by OPA. Advise, collect, if you can give this much-needed assistance.

PARKER BUICK CO.,
C. J. PARKER.

SHREVEPORT, LA., *November 6, 1945.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

There will be a Small Business Committee hearing Thursday, November 8, 10 a. m., for the purpose of discussing OPA reduction in dealers' discounts. Shreveport and Louisiana delegates will contact you early Thursday, and I most earnestly hope that you will extend to them your wholehearted cooperation, as well as personally attending this meeting, and, after hearing discussed what they think is unfair reduction in our discounts, help us to defeat this move, particularly in face of increased cost of labor, rent, and other reconversion expenses in our business. Wire me, collect, at once if you will be able to give us this assistance.

R. F. KAYSER TRAILER CO.,
J. M. BOGARD.

MINDEN, LA., *November 6, 1945.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Please attend personally the Small Business Committee hearing Thursday, November 8, for the purpose of discussing OPA reduction in dealer discounts, and urge you to use your influence in not allowing discounts to be cut. Our costs of doing business have increased considerable since 1941, and we cannot service our customers as they should be serviced if our discount is cut. A Louisiana delegation will contact you early Thursday, and would appreciate your extending to them your wholehearted cooperation to defeat OPA proposal to reduce our discounts.

ANDRESS MOTORS CO.,
HARRY C. ANDRESS.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *November 7, 1945.*
Congressman OVERTON BROOKS,
Washington, D. C.:

Would appreciate your asking Chester Bowles to withhold all price orders on autos pending the hearing before the House Small Business Committee.

Clay Dutton Co., Tom Dutton, Louis H. Clay, Miss Alice Field, Harry Halbedel, Rene Dausin, Eddie Barber, H. C. Griffin, Elton Bealer, Mrs. James N. Sudduth, Milton Harder, Alford Singer, Arthur Polo, Horace Jefferies, Clarence Noonan, John Basile, L. E. Walker, D. C. Guidry, W. M. Todd, Roby Toney, M. J. Broussard, Joseph Broussard, Palmer Abott, Altis Rozier, Roosevelt Jone, Cicero Bulloch.

PLAIN DEALING, LA., *November 6, 1945.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives:

Small Business Committee meets Thursday morning to discuss reduction in auto dealers discount. Our delegation will contact you before meeting. Thad Andress is in Shreveport. Member, please help us fight this reduction. It will wreck the dealers.

CALDWELL MOTOR CO.,
J. D. FENET.

OIL CITY, LA., *November 6, 1945.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

An unreasonable reduction in discounts for automobile dealers is to be discussed at an

OPA hearing Thursday, November 8, 10 a. m. This reduction, when our reconversion and labor expenses are mounting so rapidly, is very unfair. Our delegation will contact you early Thursday, and I would appreciate your whole-hearted cooperation, also personally attending the hearing. Will you please wire me collect if you can give us this needed assistance?

A. G. LEE.

HOMER, LA., *November 7, 1945.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Thursday, November 8, at 10 a. m., there will be an OPA hearing to discuss reduction in discounts for automobile dealers. A delegation from Louisiana is leaving immediately for Washington to protest this reduction, especially at this time, when our reconversion expenses are mounting so rapidly. Our delegation will contact you early Thursday, and I would appreciate your whole-hearted cooperation as well as your personally attending this hearing. Please wire me collect if you can give us this much needed assistance.

EMERSON MOTOR CO.,
H. H. EMERSON.

HAYNESVILLE, LA., *November 7, 1945.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

A Louisiana delegation is leaving for Washington to protest a reduction in discounts for automobile dealers to be discussed at OPA hearing Thursday. Our delegation will contact you on that date and we would appreciate your cooperation as well as personally attend the hearing. Could you please wire collect if you can give this much needed assistance?

WATTERS HARDAWAY MOTORS.

PLAIN DEALING, LA., *November 6, 1945.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We are making large investment in Ford dealership and hear that unfair reduction in discounts for automobile dealers are to be discussed at OPA hearing Thursday, November 8. This reduction, if passed, might cause our business failure. We are asking you to meet and cooperate with our Louisiana delegation, as well as personally attending this hearing for us. If possible, will you please wire us your decision collect?

GLEASON & SPEARS,
W. A. SPEARS.

The World Bill of Rights Association Is a Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the last 8 months I have talked to nearly a million people throughout this Nation championing the cause of freedom. In spite of the threat to freedom throughout the world, I was amazed at the love for freedom that still burns in the hearts of Americans everywhere. In the course of my travels literally thousands have stopped me and asked what is there that they can do to help preserve freedom and keep it secure here in America. These thousands even went further. They inquired at to just what is there that they can do to extend freedom elsewhere. These people know that freedom never remains static. It either grows or it shrinks. These people know that if the friends of freedom remain dormant, the enemies of freedom will march and conquer.

For that reason I accepted the presidency of the World Bill of Rights, Inc. It was, indeed, an honor to be part of the American Legion celebration of the one hundred and fifty-sixth anniversary of the American Bill of Rights enactment at New York on September 25, 1945. It was here that I, as president, launched the World Bill of Rights Association to the freedom-loving people of this Nation, so that all freedom-loving people could organize as a unit in their fight to keep freedom here in our shores by working to extend freedom elsewhere. Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks the speech I made on that occasion:

Fellow Americans, I deem it an honor and privilege to speak at this historical spot and on this truly American occasion of the one hundred and fifty-sixth anniversary of the enactment of the Bill of Rights, that priceless heritage which, thank God, permits me to speak without fear about the newly organized World Bill of Rights Association which it is my honor as its president to introduce to the world here today.

In 1941, when the war clouds were hovering over the world, a Sesquicentennial Bill of Rights pamphlet was published by the Library of Congress. It contains a significant and strong appeal to the people of America. It stated as follows:

"Now it will be a time for the renewal of faith, faith in the doctrine of human liberty, faith in the principles by which we govern and are governed. It will be time, too, for remembering—for remembering that in other parts of the world these privileges and these protections are denied, and for remembering that when they are denied neither human liberty, nor human decency, nor human self-respect survives their loss."

This battle cry for freedom in 1941 was reiterated in the Atlantic Charter and again in the pledge of the "four freedoms." This battle cry for freedom was our only objective in World War II.

Since these words were written, World War II was fought for the precise attainment of these objectives so that personal freedom be preserved and insured for posterity. For this reason we participated in this war, in which we sustained more than a million casualties. Our boys and girls in all areas of this global war suffered privations, starved in prisons, plowed through jungles, bled, were murdered, and died, to defend and spread freedom where it was threatened.

There are those who are tempting us to forsake the purposes for which more than 13,000,000 of our youth offered their lives. Picture if you will the denial of freedom to the people in Estonia, Finland, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Serbia, Poland, Slovakia, and many other countries.

World War II was started by the totalitarian dictators, not so much against the American Government, but against any system of "human rights and liberties." Thus the Bill of Rights is the arch enemy of any totalitarian system of enslavement. Dictators hate and despise any bill of rights for the people, no matter where it may be. World War II, therefore, was a defensive war because, we, as free people, saw a threat to our Bill of Rights, not only in the United States of America, but all over the World.

In a military sense we have won World War II! Now, as the victorious military power, it is our duty toward ourselves and to all others to whom we promised freedom, that we turn to the offensive. Nothing is static in the world. Freedom either expands or shrinks. The Bill of Rights either extends or diminishes. Freedom through the Bill of Rights will not remain secure anywhere if it does not spread. If we do not turn to militant action in the offense for the extension of the Bill of Rights to other people in other countries, then the enemies of freedom will march and conquer instead.

It is now obvious to the American people as a result of this war that the Bill of Rights is indivisible. This means that if, anywhere in the world, the Bill of Rights is attacked our own security in America and our way of life is menaced. Do not forget that it can be menaced from within as well as from without. In order to make our future secure, we can no longer remain indifferent to the fate of freedom elsewhere. For the security of America we must promote and protect the Bill of Rights throughout the world.

America is at the peak of her power. We must carry the torch of the bill of rights aloft everywhere and not retire in fear to a selfish shell. After World War I we scrapped our Navy and disarmed. Let us not today, with a world more turbulent than ever, dare disarm and scrap our moral arsenal and invite enemies of freedom to steal from us that for which our boys struggled and died when it is our history-given opportunity to use our power for the blessings of all humanity.

The Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" were announced to the world as the objectives of World War II. They were an extension of our own Bill of Rights in applying them to the whole world. This was a solemn promise by America to all the oppressed and all those peoples fighting for freedom and justice. We cannot fail them now. We must not fail them now. We dare not fail them now.

With that idea in mind, the World Bill of Rights Association today has been founded. As its first president, I have the honor here today to announce its establishment, initiated through the efforts of American citizens of Esthonian, Finnish, Hungarian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, Serbian, and Slovakian ancestry. This is just a nucleus. We invite all true Americans of any race and creed who believe in the missicn of the Bill of Rights and in the blessings of democracy to join with us. We must build a militant movement of free men who will carry forward the torch of liberty handed to us by our forefathers. We must act, recognizing that as Abraham Lincoln said, "The world cannot remain half slave and half free." People of America, champions of freedom, for freedom's sake join us now.

When Are They Coming Back?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, here are just a few of the letters received from the boys who want to know when they are going to get home. They read as follows:

I want to let you know this, mom, else I wouldn't bother you about it. Please don't make any decisions till you have read the entire account and then if you feel that

——— and myself have not been done an injustice, then may God grant you the power of knowing what justice is.

As you know, ——— and myself have our orders to go to the States and are awaiting transportation. Our C. O. relieved us of all duties—when we checked three new boys out on the range. Incidentally, one old fellow in the unit remained—by old, I mean been in the unit longer.

Well, this morning ——— and myself were called to the captain's office. We could not imagine what it was unless it was something pertaining to our transportation. Well, when we entered his office, B. T. Talbolt, the captain of the base, flew in a rage—flung his arms around, his eyes popped out, and his face as red as a beet. He stormed around, wanting to know why we weren't at the range on duty. We could not get a word in edgewise over his storming to tell him our orders were in and our C. O. relieved us of all duties, and that we had checked out of the station. He had us stand at attention for an hour, and what did he do but go to the range and look around and he didn't like the start the new fellows had there and he claimed they were corking off, and he brought the entire four of them up, gave them a fast mast and put them in the brig for 5 days on bread and water. Then he tells ——— and myself we were on duty and that he would send us out on our orders when he "damn please." And he said "I want you people to realize you are only "damned enlisted men." So ——— and myself are on duty again and probably will be until the other boys are released from the brig. So if your boy isn't home as planned, you can blame a B. T. Talbolt, commander, USN.

Our C. O. is really burned up and there is not a thing he can do. I am telling you, mom, no one can cope with that maniac. He is as stubborn as a mule and swears a blue streak at enlisted men and officers alike (including our C. O.) and no one can get a word in edgeways. I definitely know he had a fit this morning and was off his noodle, and no one can tell me different, as no man in his right mind would act that way. My C. O. and many others here would verify that and the following. He was a hot pilot and got in a bad crack-up. Now, this is definitely the truth. He was in a naval asylum at one time and the doctors claim he got all right. He has 28 years naval service. My C. O., myself, and many others contend that that man does not belong in the command of a bunch of men, but should be in an asylum. He is an Annapolis man and has lots of big shot buddies who stick up for him, and that man knows he can do anything he wants to because he can pull strings with his big-shot buddies and crawl out of it.

When he took the relief that came in for me and assigned him at NAB—I thought that was mighty small, but, boy, I think this takes the cake. How ——— and myself ever escaped the brig we don't know yet. He sure was mightily angry. If he had put us in the brig, I would feel that it was a sentence for no misdemeanor, just as I feel that the four boys he did put in the brig were put there unjustly.

I really didn't want to bother you about this, but I thought you had ought to know about a character like that, and that if he does hang something on ——— and myself I want you to know I have tried to do the right things all along, and I feel I have given good service, and I don't want a man of his calibre making you think I did a great crime if he does brig us or fails to let us go on our orders. However, I hope he does let us go soon after the other boys are released from the brig. If not, I'd like to have you write HOFFMAN and tell him I received orders from Pearl Harbor to return to the United States for rehabilitation and that a maniac captain here has taken custody of the orders and claims he will let us go when he damn pleases. We will wait a week or so, and if in a future letter I ask you to write HOFFMAN, you do so, and maybe something can be done to prevent other men from having to be under a madman. Many officers and men on this station would verify every word of this letter.

I've troubled you enough, so will close with loads of love. May God bless you.

OCTOBER 30, 1945.

DEAR SIR: I am writing this to you understanding that I have this right as a constituent from the district that elected you to your present position, but also knowing that you possess a keen interest in the welfare of the soldier who has fought for his country. This letter may sound like a purely selfish way of trying to improve my own position, but such is not the case, for I feel that I am speaking for every soldier on this island, namely, Okinawa. Naturally, since the end of the war we have all experienced a terrific let-down, and a terrible desire to get home. This is only the human instinct in every man away from home. The real thing we have to complain about is that we believe that the country and the administration is selling us down the river. I am going to include the local publication of the island newspaper, which will explain the situation that exists here better than I would ever be able to do. I happen to be one of the few unfortunates who were redeployed from the ETO without benefit of a furlough to the States. At that time we were not bitter, for we realized that there was another war to be fought and that many men who had been overseas so very long were much more entitled to get out of the service, or at least see their loved ones, before continuing the fight.

Now, the war is over with and naturally we expected the Army and the Government to use the same initiative and brilliance in getting us home that they used to bring us over to this theater in such record-breaking time. Such has not been the case, as especially on this island it has been and is continuing to be a long drawn-out process. The shipping has just not been assigned here and plainly we would like to know the reason why. Does it sound plausible that every other location in both theaters can have ships assigned to take them home, while the Ryukus, Korea, and Japan will have only 10 ships with a capacity of 25,000 men, when there is at least easily a million men in these three places.

Men still remain on the rock with 100 points and they have been told that there is not much hope of them to get home for Christmas and there is no real relief of shipping in sight until after the first of the year.

Personally, I do not have too much to complain about as my points are not too high but I, too, am beginning to wonder just how long I have to spend here against my will until I get home when the men that are eligible cannot get there. We all gladly put up with the hardships that all soldiers must face and have even done so to a greater degree, at least here as you probably have read, without complaint. All we want is the promises kept that our Chief of Staff and the President of the country has made us. Where have all the optimistic statements of 6,000,000 men out of the Army by July and the swiftness of getting men home gone? Are they just cases of political demagoguery meant to fool our parents and loved ones, and make them believe they are really trying? This undoubtedly sounds very cynical but how else can a man get after being fooled so much?

Ever since I have been in the service and ever since I have been overseas I have found that you expressed your views, no matter how much ridicule you take and whatever the cost. I hope you can find the time to consider this letter and let me know the picture from the position you hold. If this is possible, I would appreciate it very much.

SEOUL, KOREA, *October 25, 1945.*

Representative C. E. HOFFMAN,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Perhaps this little poem will explain itself. It echoes the sentiments of thousands of men.

I will never forget when I left a POE for overseas duty. At that time the United States had the largest and greatest transportation system of any nation. Those words are not mine, but yours and the other men who run our country. In fact transportation was so damned good that I could only get 7 days at home with my wife and four children. If 50,000 men had been needed on the top of Mt. Everest, I have no doubt but what they would have been transported there immediately. Whoever heard of a transportation break-down until it became time to return home? But it was just that system that won the war. Perhaps the break-down of the system will lose something too.

Most of us are civilians in a uniform. The job is done and there are no gripes there, but now it's time for the professionals to take over.

My youngest daughter expected her daddy to come home as soon as the Japs were licked. I'm tired of trying to explain things to her. Perhaps I'll suggest that she write to you instead and you can give her the latest dope, all wrapped up in a new red ribbon.

Sincerely and your former supporter.

We sit on our rear
And view with fear
  The trend of the discharge plan
We can't but regret
The fact that we "set"
  Far away from our native land.

The war is done
No need for a gun
  And we wait for the journey home
You can't go yet
'Till the problem's met
  By the brains in the Capitol Dome.

We've got the points
And a pain in the joints
  From sweating out transportation
But the boys with the brass
Are viewing the "glass"
  To picture the whole situation.

We served and we fought
Like they told us we ought
  And now that the victory is here,
We sweat out each day
We hope and we pray
  To return to the girls and the beer.

We eat Ten-In-Ones
Without bread or buns
  As we watch for the promised day
But there are no trips
'Cause there are no ships
  To take us the other way.

The points go down
No need to frown
  Now the Army can all qualify
Still we wait and wait
For that mythical date
  And pray that we don't petrify.

We scream "It ain't fair"
And we tear out our hair
  It's like making your very first million
Oh, little Sad Sack
Your poor aching back
  Is crying to be a civilian.

ADDED BY CARL D. MILLER

Oh yes there are ships,
I'll bet all my chips,
  But no one sends them this way
Unless they get smart
And give us a start
  We'll be here for a year and a day.

Constitution of World Bill of Rights Association, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following constitution of the World Bill of Rights Association, Inc.:

We, citizens of the United States of America, to unite our strength against any and all aggression that may endanger the security of the United States, to bind ourselves together for joint action to defend, preserve, and uphold the principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" and every democratic right and freedom set forth in the Federal Bill of Rights, and to dedicate ourselves to a world bill of rights, to guarantee to every man, woman, and child of every race and creed and in every nation the fundamental rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and the right to worship God as their conscience dictates, do make, publish, and declare this constitution for our association.

ARTICLE I

Name

The name of this association shall be: World Bill of Rights Association, Inc.

ARTICLE II

Aims and objects

To preserve and defend the Constitution of the United States of America and the constitutions of the constituent States of the United States of America.

To acquaint by means of publications and public meetings all peoples of the United States with the democratic rights and blessings which they possess under the Constitution of the United States of America and the constitution of the particular constituent States to which they belong.

To preserve for all Americans every democratic freedom contained in the Federal Bill of Rights.

To advocate the adoption of a world bill of rights, whose principles and provisions shall be based on our own Federal Bill of Rights, the Atlantic Charter, and the "four freedoms."

To seek by all lawful and peaceful means the establishment of the principles of the Bill of Rights, of the Atlantic Charter, and of the "four freedoms" in all countries of the world.

To engage in any and all lawful educational activities anywhere in the world which contribute to the progressive achievement of these aims and objects.

To lend aid and assistance to any organizations, groups, and movements whose objects and practices conform with the purposes of this association.

To support the constitutional Government of the United States and all Americans extending such a world bill of rights to all the peoples of every nation upon the face of the earth.

To bring about the fulfillment of the aims and purposes of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" in the name of which our country entered World War II.

To expose, resist, and combat all efforts to defeat or deny to peoples anywhere the fundamental human democratic rights which this association has undertaken to uphold and to propagate.

To fight relentlessly and to oppose all efforts of Fascist, Nazi, and communistic totalitarianism which deny the peoples of any nation the sovereignty and the democratic freedoms contained in the World Bill of Rights.

In general, to further by constructive educational means and methods the cause of liberty, freedom, and justice, to the end that there may be established the reign of democratic ideals and principles, which, under God, the Constitution and the world bill of rights can alone bring fullness of life to men and banish strife and hatred and war from the earth.

ARTICLE III

Membership

Regular

Membership shall be open to all citizens of the United States who subscribe to the principles set forth in this constitution and desire to lend active support to the work of the association.

Organizational

Membership in the association shall be open to all lawfully established organizations, associations, clubs, societies, parishes, newspapers, and corporations which subscribe to its aims and purposes.

Honorary

The board of directors may from time to time confer honorary membership in the association upon such persons as, in their judgment, render or have rendered, conspicuous service or support to the causes for which the association stands.

Sustaining

Sustaining members shall be those persons who, believing in the aims of objects of the association, are desirous of contributing to the support and maintenance of the association and its activities.

The rights, privileges, and duties of membership shall be defined in the bylaws of the association.

ARTICLE IV

Meetings

The membership of the association shall meet annually in convention on Bill of Rights Day, September 25, except Saturday or Sunday, or on the next succeeding day.

The place of the meeting, the order of business, the voting rights of members, and the powers of members in convention assembled, shall be as stated in the bylaws of the association.

ARTICLE V

Governance

The property, affairs, and activities of the association shall be under the guidance, control, and direction of a board of directors, consisting of not less than 5 nor more than 30 directors elected by the membership in convention assembled in accordance with the applicable provisions of the bylaws of the association.

The board of directors may form, from among the membership of the association, or outside thereof, an advisory council to be comprised of persons who, in the judgment of the board of directors, are in accord with the aims and purposes of the association and qualified to lend it special aid and/or services.

ARTICLE VI

Amendments

This constitution may be amended from time to time by the membership of the association at any annual convention by the vote of delegates and members representing two-thirds of the entire membership of the association.

Any freedom-loving group or person can join by contacting World Bill of Rights Association, Inc., 103 Park Avenue, Room 511, New York 17, N. Y., telephone Murray Hill 5-6486. For freedom's sake join now.

The Poor Germans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial that appeared in the Brussels Socialist newspaper Le Peuple, written by Camille Huysmans, the mayor of Antwerp and Minister of State:

BEWARE!

(By Camille Huysmans)

(During the war he presided over the small group of Belgian members of Parliament who succeeded in reaching London. He is a prominent figure in Belgian political life and a spirited writer. Although he is rightly credited with a considerable amount of Shavian wit, it is not apparent in this article, which is a stern warning to those who think that business should be as usual in the Reich.)

I have been visited by a number of officers who have come back from Germany—Belgians, English, Americans. I dare not say that their impressions agree. They sometimes come from different sectors.

I have also received letters from London, signed by well-known people, specialists who have studied the case of Germany. They tell us to beware. They are uneasy. They are asking themselves what the policy of the Allies with regard to Germany really is.

The policy of the Russians, of which we do not know much, except that they are emptying the houses and factories and at the same time are promoting democratic fraternization.

The policy of the Americans, who do not always understand the rather harsh sentiments of the occidental people (the United States was never occupied).

The policy of the British, who as a rule are reserved and all too often limit themselves to religious sermonizing.

In brief, my correspondents have the impression that the policy of the Allies is oscillating and diverse. Worse, my friends are forced to state that words and actions do not always correspond, and they give examples, among others, a very impressive one—the case of Holland.

Everybody knows that our neighbors to the north have not been treated better than we. The Germans took everything—their industry and their agriculture, their machines and their cattle.

What is now the reward of this people, which, according to the generals, fought well?

The Dutchman looks around him and sees nothing but a void. But when he looks across the frontier, he notes with some bitterness that his cattle and his machines are in Germany and he claims restitution.

What does the military administration answer? "Many regrets. The German people must get through the winter under favorable conditions. That is required for our security."

What should one answer to this? That the Dutch farmer is more worthy than the German farmer, it seems to me. The Dutch farmer has lived through the occupation. He has enjoyed the benefits of expropriation. The German farmer, on the contrary, has been very well off economically.

What is still worse, it is announced that industrial Germany should be reconstructed to allow the German people to live, in order to show them that we are Christian and fraternal peoples.

Is it in this way that Germany should be reeducated? It was a different story in 1942. We agreed at that time that German industry is a war industry, conducted for war, an industry which should be curbed and controlled, if we wished to avoid the return of the beast.

How come then that we do not think any more today of this necessary limitation and of this indispensable control? Furthermore, is it correct that the bombings destroyed the German potential? I do not think so. I base my contention on the Kilgore report.

Germany still possesses 4,000,000 tons of all kinds of machinery and an enormous capacity for producing in a short time new machines. The metallurgical industry still has a productive capacity of 25,000,000 tons a year, with 10,000 tons of synthetic rubber, and the chemical industry, including explosives, has not even been touched. The entire oil refining industry can start up again inside of 6 months in its prewar state. In short, the bombs have damaged 20 percent of the total; there is still 80 percent as a basis for further development.

Mr. Hugenberg, the banker who financed Hitler from the beginning and who belonged to the first government he set up, made no mistake. He plays for high stakes—the stakes of 1920. He has just sent a memorandum to the Allies, and he would like to exploit the West against the East. He threatens us with communism if we do not behave. He will turn Bolshevik if necessary. For sure, the old bogy is still with us, or at least there are those who would try to use it.

But let us ask an indiscreet question. How is it that this gentleman, who should be among the first on the list of war criminals, is still at liberty in September 1945?

What does the renewal of this strange policy of appeasement mean? How come that the president of the American branch of the Farbenindustrie in the United States has suddenly been promoted to the high function of president of the German mother concern, the role of which in Fascist and Nazi politics throughout the world is notorious? This promotion from agent to chief—should it be understood as an official blessing or as the ratification of a business combination? We can indeed ask these questions. Are we already having "business as usual"? Are we losing the peace?

The Germans, especially the women, are already beginning to treat the occupants with irony. I do not underestimate the usefulness of fraternization. But not today. Nothing will be gained by running after them. Let us at least avoid looking ridiculous. The events of the occupation have proved overabundantly that the Germans as a whole stood behind Hitler. The Allies have been unable to find a real underground pro-Allied movement, either during or after the war. The majority of those Germans who were put in prison became overseers of the other prisoners, simply because they were Germans. They kept their positions by turning into the worst torturers and to exculpate themselves they repeated the familiar formula: "I had orders. I was not responsible."

The German high command, still alive, must be well satisfied. Has it not succeeded in demonstrating that it is equally able to exploit the situation after defeat by playing on the weaknesses of the victors?

The movie houses are open; the theaters are crowded; newspapers are published, and one reads in them very suggestive articles. I have one in hand. It develops the thesis that the Versailles Treaty is responsible for the coming to power of the Nazis, that economic conditions alone explain the policy of aggression and everything that has followed. Therefore Germany is not to blame. Economic conditions are. Still better, tomorrow we shall read that the Germans are the victims of the Allies.

The international clergy is setting the stage for this comedy. Cardinal Griffin of the United States has just made a tour of Europe to congratulate the German bishops on their attitude. All of them without exception in their pastoral letters protested against the persecution of the church, but were careful to bless the artisans of every Hitler victory. "Gott mit uns."

If I was asked to give a piece of advice to the Allies, I would like to say: Beware. It is not through kindness that you will destroy nazism. You will destroy it only if you act as masters up to the moment when nazism disappears. In the meantime, avoid the two extremes: the Russian and the other one.

Why the Delay of Demobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1945

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, every day in the newspapers we find releases by the War and Navy Departments about their wonderful performance in demobilization. However, from the letters and first-hand information from servicemen, we are satisfied that the public statements and releases are not correct. They need checking.

The truth is that in many Army camps and Navy camps, abroad and at home, there is deliberate stalling. Some of the higher-ups are responsible for this stalling. We are going to find out who is responsible. Congress is getting impatient. This is the business and problem of Congress.

The fathers and mothers, the wives and relatives of the servicemen have a right to know who is keeping their sons or husbands unnecessarily in the armed forces. Finally, the taxpayers have a right to know why there is so much delay in this discharge business.

It is not for the best interest of the servicemen to lay in foreign ports with nothing to do. Such a course is demoralizing. The morals of these boys are worth more than keeping a commander in his rank by holding the boys unnecessarily. The Nation's welfare must be put above the War and Navy Departments.

Here are excerpts from a few of the many letters that I and every Member of Congress receives.

Here is one from a sister of a serviceman at Jamestown, N. Dak:

I have a brother who has been in the service 42 months, has two battle stars, 60 points, and is 31 years old. At present he is in Germany with no signs of coming home, let alone being discharged.

* * * The army of occupation certainly can't have the same men during the entire occupation period. They have their own future, too, that has to be considered.

Here is one from a serviceman at Harlingen, Tex.:

We have been held at HAAF in complete ignorance of any pending order concerning our disposition and, even though we have been wholly inactive since the termination of the gunnery training program, not one of us has been declared surplus.

On the other hand we have seen commissioned officers and flight officers, rated bombardiers, declared surplus here at HAAF, the extremely low critical score of 13 points all that was necessary for them to become eligible for discharge. That is the War Department's business, but it does smack of discrimination.

Here is one from a serviceman at Great Bend, Kans.:

Here's a great challenge: Get the 2-year men out of the Army.

Too many thousands of soldiers who have already devoted 2 and more years to the Army, and who face an additional 12 to 18 months of service once impending shipments take them overseas, are relying on just such men as you to help us—now.

For some time we men with two or more years of service have been writing our Senators and Representatives in Washington asking them to legislate a bill which would, after becoming an act of Congress, force the Army to release us from the service.

Here is one from a serviceman at Great Falls, Mont.:

With the end of the war, millions of us in the armed services have been looking forward anxiously to our discharge. The result to date has been anything but encouraging. In spite of repeated promises of the War Department to release men faster, it has been our experience that men are being released slowly. It is the unanimous opinion of the men I am in contact with that there is deliberate procrastinating.

There is a conviction on our part that the military hierarchy is deliberately taking its time, with the realization that their own commissions will be slashed upon a return to peacetime Army strength. It is pitiful that this small group of willful men should have their nice salaries cut, but we who have thrown away from 2 to 5 years of our lives in the Army, do not feel we owe any further Army service that these men may continue to prosper.

I urge you to take every means possible to expedite the slashing of War Department red tape and to force them to start releasing men now, instead of talking of how many they will release by thi. New Year's, or a year from this New Year's.

Here is one from a wife of a serviceman at Napoleon, N. Dak.:

My husband is in the service and is in Camp Beale, Calif., and writes me that he is just idling most of his time away.

I need him at home as I have four children to take care of.

Here is one from a serviceman at Camp Crowder, Mo.:

We married men with dependents are waiting patiently to see some action from you to see that we are returned to our homes and families right away. Most of us are needed at home for one reason or the other. If we were accomplishing something useful in the service we wouldn't mind so much. But most of us are just wasting our time reading magazines and newspapers.

My own observation at Williamsburg, Va., convinced me that the demobilization is not as rapid as it could be or as it should be. That the delay in the demobilization is not only conducive to the best interest of the servicemen, or the future of the Nation, but very expensive. It not only costs money, but it is a waste of money to keep men in the armed service when they are no longer needed. This especially when there is nothing for them to do but lay around and waste their time.

Let Congress pass most of the bills pending on this subject. Let us save the morals and the patriotism of the servicemen by discharging them and sending them home, feeling that they have rendered a real service in time of need. Let us declare that the hostilities were at an end on September 2. Let us not be hypocritical enough to fool the boys and keep them in the service because the executive and legislative branches of our Government are too dumb to know that the war is over.

Automobile Dealers Have Hearing Before Committee on Small Business of the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 8, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Small Business of the House is composed of the following Members: J. W. ROBINSON, Utah; EUGENE J. KEOGH, New York; HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington; ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee; LEONARD W. HALL, New York; WALTER C. PLOESER, Missouri; WILLIAM H. STEVENSON, Wisconsin; EVAN HOWELL, Illinois; and myself, as chairman.

I am inserting herewith an opening statement made by me as chairman of the committee this morning on the proposal of the Office of Price Administration to reduce automobile-dealer discounts below the prewar percentage level:

This public hearing has been called by the House Small Business Committee for the specific purpose of getting facts on the automobile-pricing situation. Our primary purpose is to determine if the proposal of the Office of Price Administration to reduce automobile-dealer discounts below their prewar percentage allowance is fair and equitable to the dealers of this Nation.

Retail automobile dealers, of whom there are approximately 30,000, constitute small business in the eyes of this committee. They are located in every State and county of this Nation. The problems that confront them are typical of the problems which face the majority of retailers and small merchants of the country. The only difference between their situation and that of many other types of retailers is that they have suffered from a lack of business during wartime while many other types of retailers have enjoyed substantial business and continued prosperity.

This committee, when it was created, was charged by the House with the specific duty of investigating the acts or regulations of any agency or department which might be construed as being harmful to the best interests of small business. We have been informally advised by literally thousands of automobile dealers and by several score Members of Congress that the proposed action by OPA will work an extreme hardship on these 30,000 small business firms and their employees, and will force many of them to close their doors just at a time when the Nation is supposed to be entering its period of prosperity in peacetime.

Small business is more than just a form of business activity. It is a way of life. Like farming, like teaching, like a professional career, it symbolizes the spirit of independence which built this country. The very foundations of this democracy are rooted in small business. Without it this Nation as we have known it would cease to exist.

For the past several weeks, national attention has been focussed on the problems of big business and of big labor as represented by our great industrial corporations and our great labor unions. Today, we intend to look into the problems of small business and hear the story of the man who is in the middle—the man who may possibly be caught between the demands of big business and big labor and asked to carry the burden of financing such price and wage increases as are given to either side in this current wage and price dispute which has made headlines for the past few weeks.

The Office of Price Administration is under a mandate from Congress and the President to "hold the line" on prices.

The Congress and the President are under a self-imposed mandate to do everything within their power to speed industrial reconversion, to maintain purchasing power, and to provide maximum employment for all.

For every manufacturing firm in this country which provides jobs for labor there are 15 firms which distribute the products of these factories in some form or other. For every man or woman employed in a factory there are 5 persons employed in distributing or servicing these products.

Approximately 1,250,000 persons are employed in the manufacture, distribution, and servicing of automobiles in this country.

Only about one-third of these, 398,000, are employed in the direct production of cars.

The remainder are engaged as follows:

Wholesaling	72,000
Retailing and repair work	389,000
Service stations and affiliated retailing	335,000

Like the Army, the automobile business requires its production units and its services of supply. As in the case of the armed services, more persons are required to distribute and service the goods than are required to produce them. I mention this to show that only a relatively small percentage of those employed in this business are in the car factories. Many more persons are affected by the problem of car prices than just the manufacturers and their employees.

For every man employed in an automobile factory there is another man employed in selling, servicing, or repairing automobiles. More than 350,000 working people depend in normal times on the automobile dealers of this country for employment. Computed in terms of affected workers, the health and well-being of the automobile dealers of the country is just as important to their employees as is the continuance of car manufacturing to the workers employed in direct car production.

The only reason we do not stop to consider these facts is that there are only a few large car manufacturers and one or two large labor unions concerned in their problems and disputes as against 30,000 individual car dealers and their thousands of unorganized employees. Their problems are no less critical for that reason, however.

The House Small Business Committee has had extended contacts with the retail automobile dealers of this country dating back as far as January 1942. This committee professes to have some knowledge of this group's problems.

In 1942, the Government froze more than 600,000 passenger cars in dealers' hands and the entire trade was threatened with bankruptcy. Realizing the plight of the dealers, this committee explored their situation in a series of hearings and, upon the facts developed, prepared and helped to secure passage of the Murray-Patman Act in cooperation with the Senate Small Business Committee under the able leadership of Senator MURRAY.

No bill passed in the history of Congress ever did more for a single industry in such a short space of time. Automobile dealers have told us—the members of the committee—that the passage of that measure meant the difference between absolute ruin and the saving of 75 percent of the dealers of this Nation. More than 30,000 dealers were, as a result of this act, able to survive the hard days of this war which rationing and cessation of passenger-car production imposed upon them. About one-fourth, or 10,000 of them, however, were forced to close their doors.

I shall not attempt to review that act in detail. Most of those present are fully aware of its provisions. Briefly, it provided that full retail value to the dealers for the cars they were holding in stock at the time of the freeze would be assured to them by the Government. When cars were carried for more than 1 month, a monthly increment was added. Likewise, under the act, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was authorized to assist materially with loans.

The widespread nature of the retail automobile business makes it particularly important that the Government give the utmost consideration to firms in this line. Their prosperity or failure can have a marked effect upon the health of almost every community in the Nation. It has been said that before the war there was a dealer at every crossroads in the United States. That is almost literally true. Every Member of Congress recognizes what a force for good business these dealers are in every community. In normal times, these dealers are at the forefront of every progressive move in their home communities. They constitute the active, forward-looking citizens to whom we look for much of the home-town leadership in this difficult reconversion period.

As I understand the present situation which we are about to investigate, these dealers are not looking for a hand-out from the Government. They are merely asking for the privilege of being permitted to start doing business again under the same trade-discount provisions that prevailed before the war.

They tell us that the Office of Price Administration's proposal to reduce their traditional discounts will prevent their reopening their establishments, will jeopardize their existing investments, and will force many of them to go out of business permanently after having held on by a slender thread of hope during wartime.

It is the purpose of this hearing to find out to this committee's satisfaction the validity of these complaints. In order to do his, we propose to hear, first, from the dealers and their accredited representatives. After that, we propose to give an equal opportunity to representatives of the Office of Price Administration to explain the position of that agency on this matter. After that, if necessary, we are prepared to seek testimony from the manufacturers or from any other persons having a legitimate interest in this situation.

This committee is in full accord with the need for curbing inflation and the avoidance of any undue rise in the cost of civilian products to the ultimate consumer. On the other hand, it feels that the time has come for a greater realization and a keener appreciation on the part of Government, industry, and labor of the importance of the role of the small distributor in the American scheme of things. This hearing is held in that specific frame of mind.

I should like to caution all those who expect to appear before us as witnesses today and thereafter that we are not going to be very patient with those witnesses who deal solely in generalities. We are here to learn facts and not to deal in theories. That is the reason I have taken so much time in outlining our reasons for holding these hearings.

We expect both the dealers and the representatives of OPA to provide us with solid factual information as a basis for any state-

ments made. If a witness cannot support his testimony with that kind of evidence, we shall feel obliged to ask him to step down and make way for the next witness.

The charge has been made that the proposed OPA order to reduce dealers' discounts will work an undue harship upon the dealers. That is the subject of these particular hearings and it is upon that point alone that we expect concrete evidence from both the dealers and from OPA.

Before calling the first witness for the dealers, I should like to point out that a great many Members of both the House and the Senate have asked permission to appear at these hearings and express their personal views and the views of their constituents upon this question.

Due to the fact that so many dealers have come such a long way to attend these hearings and are incurring considerable expense in remaining here in Washington for that purpose, I am going to take the liberty of reading the names of those Members who have asked that they be heard and their interest in this matter recorded for the record. Later, when a more convenient time can be arranged, we are willing to set aside a special day to hear from all interested Members. I have been assured that this will be satisfactory to those Members who have expressed such a keen interest in this particular hearing.

Doctors in the Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, enclosed is another of the many letters I received from highly trained physicians who are continuing to rot professionally because of nothing to do in the service, while their colleagues in civilian practice here are overwhelmed with work and patients are unable to get adequate medical care.

I repeat his question, "Can our country afford such waste? If not, when do we get action?"

OCTOBER 18, 1945.

Hon. WALTER JUDD,
Representative from Minnesota,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR DR. JUDD: After finishing a letter to Senator DOWNEY I am impelled to write a short note to you as a doctor Member of the House. The first time I remember seeing you was when you spoke at the Students Volunteer Convention in Buffalo in 1932 and the second was when you spoke in the Congregational Church in Rochester, Minn., in 1939, I believe, while I was a fellow at the Mayo Foundation. I have followed your career from afar, and especially after you entered the House, being pleased to see at least one doctor enter the political arena where so many are needed.

You have guessed, no doubt, about what I want to speak to you—the shameful manner in which redeployment of doctors to the States where they are needed so desperately is going forward. At least so it appears to us ensconced here high in the Alps twiddling our thumbs and taking one special tour after another to Bad This and Bad That and Switzerland, the Riviera, Italy, and where else?

Confusion is to be expected in such a huge undertaking, so much is granted. But there appears to be more than confusion, and some of us wonder if there is not something sinister about the whole mess as far as doctors are concerned. With 62,000 of us in uniform out of 160,000 or so total in the United States, why is not some energetic program undertaken to actually get more of us back where we could alleviate the acute shortage instead of getting "the run around" here as we have lately. The matter has been just this evening clinched in our minds in this General Hosptal that has been overseas as a unit for about 14 months or more. Our delegate from the officers with high points here returned from Frankfurt this evening with the very heartening news that the doctors with less than 80 points will probably go home next March. Those with more may go sooner.

Now let me cite some line and verse for you to explain why such a report is so alarming to us who have had nothing but misleading information from the start about this program. When I returned from Bremen recently—about a month ago—several of us were assured definitely that we would be on orders home not later than October 3, and that it was merely a matter of the mechanics of the Army until such was done. October 3 arrived and a call was placed to Paris to the officer responsible for our redeployment and we were sweetly reminded that that particular officer had gone "home last week." So his successor was contacted and he assured us that he knew absolutely nothing about our case but would look into it. The office was in process of moving to Frankfurt but he would look into it and for us please to call back in a couple of weeks. This blow was taken standing up by our men, and they called back at the appointed time, only to be informed that they still knew nothing about it all and suggested we call back in a couple of weeks and maybe somebody would know something or other. This week our delegate went to Frankfurt and this evening returned here with the above report that we would perhaps return next March.

Now the strange part of it all is that our enlisted men are being redeployed fairly rapidly, leaving the high-point officers high in the Alps here. Most of our officers are veterans with many more points than the average enlisted score. Why are doctors being held here where they are doing absolutely nothing, while less essential enlisted men are being sent home by transport which is allegedly so scarce?

Is there such a need at home for drivers, helpers, carpenters, electricians, clerks, chemists, etc., that they are being sent home with lower point scores than doctors? We certainly, as officers, would be the last to begrudge the enlisted men their chance when it comes in turn, and we are all for them, even if they are out of turn, if the system is confused enough to permit that. But here comes the suspicion of a sinister purpose back of all this delay, delay, delay, in the redeployment of doctors home. Is somebody among the planners and experts on what is good for the American people trying thus to hamstring the program of private medical care there by holding us as hostages until the situation becomes unbearable there and the people demand Government intervention in their medical care? Judging by the number of bills before the legislatures and Congress now, one could believe such possible, and 62,000 of us in uniform are powerless to ameliorate the situation while held as hostages. Now that is conjecture and has been expressed before by others, but it begins to take better shape when considered in the light of the planned confusion in the redeployment of doctors from this theater. There are a thousand excuses why doctors cannot be gotten home. But is it a matter of safety of the Nation's health, or not? If so, then who is committing the seditious crime against the people by not getting the trained men home to avert the disaster. Transportation can always be found for perfectly awful USO shows and for Hollywood glamour boys on their way home to discharge, as in the case of four of them whose names just appeared in the press during the past month; but not for the doctors—they are not needed badly enough, apparently, and so must commit professional hara-kiri by continued enforced idleness and professional decay. What about our future patients? Will the Army take the responsibility for our decay? Not on your life, for that is our problem and the people's problem. That is why I feel justified in taking the problem to you in Congress, our only court of appeal against a system which is against the public good.

When Wally Ritchie of Saint Paul, whom you perhaps know and whom I knew as fraternity brother, was discharged several weeks ago a great to-do was made about it, since he was the first medical officer of this war to be discharged on points, a fact which I should think would bring shame to the War Department, to admit that they had postponed to so late such a program of returning essential professional men to where they could be used for the national interest.

In a large general hospital such as this one, our professional disaster has been less by far than that of the poor fellow out in the field units. I have talked with many of them who spend half an hour a day caring for the medical needs of a couple of hundred men, and the rest of their time they are forced to invest in traveling to far and near places such as Denmark or Paris. There is a shocking amount of professional decay going on which bodes no good in the light of the alleged continuing doctor shortage in the postwar years until the training schedule has caught up with the need of young recruits to the profession.

One more point and then I shall quit: Have you gentlemen in Congress been aware of the impending ruin to the Medical Reserve Corps of the Army? All I know is what I hear and that is not promising. I have yet to talk to a single medical officer who plans to have anything whatsoever to do with the corps after the war, and can you blame them? They entered this service for the good of their country, realizing full well that they were probably laying the profession wide open to the invasion by planners and social experts who would use every opportunity to discredit private enterprise in our profession when the situation due to our enforced absence became bad enough. It appears they may achieve their purpose if we are held as hostages much longer, considering the long obituary notices in the Journal of the American Medical Association, and the fine trickle of doctors actually returning to their practices.

My wife writes that I am due home just any day now, and so she feels hardly justified in writing. Meantime she has been lulled into a false sense of well-being by the clever propaganda put out by certain types of public relations men who have caused the public to ease its clamor for the return of the doctors because of the alleged imminent return of them home. Large in this scheme loomed the Green project by which some of us were to fly home. It would be interesting to know just how many actually returned via that scheme, and how many, as some of our own high-point doctors, are still taking tours all over Europe to keep from going crazy. Of course, many have fallen into such a state of coma that they don't even tour, but vegetate in their quarters day after day with absolutely nothing to do. I was astonished the other day to hear the chief of a service in a general hospital state that he would just have to go to school again after getting home, and so he had given up the idea of trying to keep abreast of medicine meantime. That was a mature specialist in internal medicine speaking, who is on the staff of Bellevue in New York. What about the battalion surgeon then?

Well, what is the sense to it all, anyway? Is there something sinister or is it just Army "snafu"; the answer lies with the people—whether they will or not tolerate continuation of such shameful waste of professional talent which will take years to replace after the war is over. Can our country afford such waste? If not, when do we get action?

Sincerely yours,

_____,
Captain, Medical Corps.

The Full Employment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 30, 1945

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. F. C. Fay, president of the Southwestern Sash & Door Co., at Joplin, Mo., is a successful businessman. He is a good American with sound sense, who has employed men and paid them without Government funds.

Recently he has written me two letters so chock full of keen insight and unanswerable argument that I want to insert them in the RECORD, that they might receive the widest distribution.

If the wild-eyed radicals, crackpots, and screwballs who yell and shout would take time to read these two letters, we would have less confusion in Washington.

Under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks, I include these communications from Mr. Fay, which are enlightening, constructive, and if followed, will be most helpful to our State and country:

SOUTHWESTERN SASH & DOOR CO.,
Joplin, Mo., August 18, 1945.
The Honorable DEWEY SHORT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: If the amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act is enacted, making 75 cents per hour the minin un. pay for all workers, it will mean that in order to do this there must be far less spread between skilled and unskilled workers' pay. In competitive business any company must pay all overhead out of gross profit, and there is a definite limit to how high that expense can go if companies are to operate at a profit and if they do not operate at a profit, they cease doing business. Competitive conditions not only control prices, but they control pay; and no fixed minimum pay can be right under changing conditions unless that minimum pay is low enough to be workable during poor years. A company can only pay so much of their total overhead in pay roll; therefore the more unskilled pay goes up, the more skilled pay goes down or the company goes broke. We resent putting more premium on the shiftless, indigent, and lazy people, when to do so it means taking it away from the thrifty, studious, hardworking people who deserve it most.

Furthermore it would mean that older people would cease to be employees, as companies would only take the cream of workers. It would mean you couldn't afford to employ young people and train them, but instead would tend to employ, where possible, people who are already trained. A person with defects physically would be on the out as far as employment is concerned.

It seems to us that Congress must recognize that there is a limit to the burden that any operation can carry whether it be a small company, a large corporation, a city, a county, State, or Federal Government, if we are to keep America and American people and institutions on a sound economic basis.

During wartimes many companies are broke and done for, many of them unnecessarily, many unavoidable. Many that are operating are making plenty and prices are so high now, in spite of controls, that ridiculously high wages can be paid; but laws made to apply now can be disastrous later under normal conditions. What are we to do in the next depression with all this debt and Congress now figuring out ways to add billions and billions to that already top-heavy debt? Most businessmen feel that the next depression will make the last one look like a boom, due to the wasteful spending policies of the Federal Government in the past 13 years.

It is hoped that you will give the above every consideration when reaching conclusions on legislation that is to be enacted.

Respectfully yours,
SOUTHWESTERN SASH & DOOR CO.,
F. C. FAY, *President.*

SOUTHWESTERN SASH & DOOR CO.,
Joplin, Mo., September 5, 1945.
The Honorable DEWEY SHORT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Subject: The Murray-Wagner full-employment bill.

DEAR SIR: Let's try to look at this bill from a common-sense, practical viewpoint. During the period of this World War, it is unquestioned by anyone that the people have ahead of them the largest pent-up demand for goods in history due to the fact that so many things were not produced for civilian consumption during the war period. Again we have the largest savings in history with which to buy this avalanche of goods and services which undoubtedly can be produced. The above are accepted as facts by every thinking person.

The above being undisputed facts, then if private enterprise cannot employ the employables of this country during the postwar period, it is only common sense to assume that never again in history will private enterprise be able to employ employables.

Therefore if it is necessary to do additional governmental deficit financing during the immediate postwar period, it is practical to assume that the Government must forever do deficit financing and if they do that, it is only a question of how many years the United States of America can remain solvent.

Yours very truly,
SOUTHWESTERN SASH & DOOR CO.,
F. C. FAY, *President.*

Rural Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1945

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a speech delivered at a meeting of the Alabama Farm Bureau Federation by Dr. B. F. Austin, health officer, State of Alabama, at Biloxi, Miss., on October 31, 1945:

Alabama is so predominantly rural that any discussion of public health in this State will necessarily deal largely with the rural aspects of this important subject.

We are a people who believe in slogans, catch phrases, and mottoes. Everyone is familiar with the frequently advertised slogans such as "The pause that refreshes," "Good to the last drop," "Drink a bite to eat," "L. S. M. F. T.," and the products thus advertised. In our effort to capture the fancy of a slogan-minded people your health department has one motto which we hope every Alabama citizen will consider as personal and will exercise his utmost effort to support. It is: "The health of your State depends upon the state of your health." The more you analyze the words in this statement the more significant they become. If we can repeat this motto often enough that every Alabamian will recognize his part and assume that responsibility we can confidently look forward to great improvement in the health of our people.

It is evident that while the health problems of city dwellers are by no means neglected, the main task of Alabama's far-flung public-health agencies is the safeguarding of the health of the State's rural population. Thomas Jefferson on more than one occasion expressed the opinion that democracy would survive in the United States as long as the country remained predominently agricultural. If agriculture should ever have to play second fiddle to industry, however, he was not so sure. "The mobs of great cities add just as much to the support of pure government," he wrote, "as sores do to the strength of the human body. I think we shall be virtuous as long as agriculture is our principal object. When we get piled upon one another in large cities, as in Europe, we shall become as corrupt as in Europe."

However much we may say in praise of a predominantly rural population as a factor in keeping democracy alive and in praise of its other advantages there is no doubt that certain problems assume greater seriousness among rural people than among city dwellers. One of them certainly is in the protection of the people against certain diseases.

The presence of the Negro as a considerable segment of the Alabama population has profoundly affected our health status. With nearly 70 percent of her population classified as rural and containing more than one Negro for every two white people, Alabama is, to an unusual degree, enjoying the benefits and suffering from the disadvantages brought by ruralization and the Negro.

This State's peculiar status with regard to both rural population and the Negro adds greatly to its health problem. There are numerous diseases, some of them taking high rank as killers and others adding greatly to the burdens of poverty, ignorance, and personal inefficiency, to which the members of one or both of these groups are particularly susceptible. The Negro whooping cough death rate, for example, is about two and one-half times as high as the white rate. The tuberculosis death rate is about three times as high among Negroes as among white people. Malaria kills more than twice as many Negroes in proportion to population as white people. The Negro death rate for syphilis is about seven times the white rate. More than two and one-half times as many Negroes succumb to pellagra in proportion to population as white persons. Higher Negro death rates are also found for pneumonia, diarrhea, and enteritis (under 2 years) and the conditions associated with childbirth. The Negro stillbirth rate is considerably higher than the white rate, and the death rate among Negro babies is markedly higher than among white babies.

Furthermore the rural death rates for typhoid fever, scarlet fever, whooping cough, diphtheria, malaria, influenza, measles, typhus, pellagra, diarrhea, and enteritis (under 2 years) are persistently higher than the urban rates for these same conditions.

The increased mortality and presumably the greater prevalence of these forms of ill-

ness among our rural population have a public-health significance and also a social significance not apparent on the surface. Some of these diseases, like scarlet fever, whooping cough, and diphtheria, play little part in society's advancement except insofar as they affect the health and personal fortunes of their victims. Others, however, like malaria, typhus, and pellagra, tend to act as a brake upon the social, economic, and educational advancement of our people as a whole while making complete or partial invalids of their immediate victims.

If we leave the vital statistics for a moment and turn our attention to a disease that plays an almost insignificant role in the mortality tables but a vastly important role in the progress, prosperity, and happiness of our people, we find one of the most potent reasons why rural health is so important in Alabama.

The disease to which I refer is hookworm which kills very few Alabamians but is constantly robbing thousands of them of the physical energy and mental alertness without which individual or social progress is impossible. I need hardly emphasize that this vampire disease, which is really an invasion of the human body by blood sucking parasites, is almost entirely confined to our rural areas, where there are few modern methods for the sanitary disposal of body wastes and where shoeless feet frequently come into direct contact with hookworm infested soil.

Your attention is called to the fact that rural conditions per se are not entirely and directly responsible for the greater prevalence of certain diseases in rural areas. It is unfortunately true that certain social conditions, which have an important bearing upon health, are more unfavorable in the country than in the urban areas. For one thing there is a more serious lack of medical care than in the city. You can hardly expect the best of health conditions in any community where there are enough physicians, nurses, dentists, pharmacists, and hospitals to adequately meet the medical care needs of the people. Unfortunately, in a State like Alabama, a large proportion of the population is not served by public water supplies and commercial graded dairies and therefore does not benefit from the careful supervision of them.

Fully aware of the peculiar health problems due to Alabama's being essentially a rural State and containing an unusually large percentage of Negroes, your State department of health is devoting particular attention to the solution of those problems. Much has been accomplished. But much still remains to be done.

The people of Alabama take justified pride in her health record. While we are handicapped because of the existence of several preventable diseases and other factors common to our southland we are not sitting complacently by and lamenting that climate, poverty, nature, and other phenomena have been unkind to us. On the other hand much has been done to rid our great State of many preventable diseases and other handicaps peculiar to the Southern States. I am delighted to direct your attention to some of the activities and wonderful accomplishments in the health field.

We who are engaged in public-health work fully realize that credit for Alabama's health fame does not all go to paid public-health workers by any means. First of all, we commend the medical profession as a whole for its excellent contributions to health promotion in our State.

Alabama's unique system of health work and enviable record in accomplishments in this field were made possible because of the dream of a great Alabama physician, a statesman, humanitarian, and scholar—Dr. Jerome Cochran, of Mobile. It was through his persevering, unselfish efforts that the medical association of the State of Alabama first undertook to lay the foundation for our successful health system. Later the Alabama Legislature by official action designated the medical association of the State of Alabama as the State board of health. It has functioned efficiently and satisfactorily for 70 years.

We who constitute your paid public-health workers are also mindful of the outstanding contributions made to health work by our governing bodies. We are quite cognizant of the fact that little could have been accomplished by the relatively few paid public-health workers if it had not been for the legislation passed by State, county, and municipal governing bodies. The governors, legislators, county, and municipal officials have not only enacted laws but have wisely appropriated public moneys for the employment of efficient specialists in the public-health profession and payment of other expenses incident to the services rendered. Furthermore, the law enforcement and judicial officer of cities, counties, State, and Federal Government have cooperated in a magnificent way to assure success in our health program. We therefore pay tribute to the official of the United States, State, counties, and cities because of the splendid way in which they have promoted Alabama's health.

We also realize that the intelligent cooperation of an informed public has done much to place our great State on the forefront in the battle against preventable diseases. Furthermore, we acknowledge the definite contribution made to the health of our State by such voluntary organizations as the American Red Cross, Alabama Tuberculosis Association, Field Army of the American Cancer Society, Alabama Crippled Children's Society, National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, all civic clubs, parent-teacher associations, extension services, women's clubs, and others.

I shall not burden you with statistics but will use some comparative figures of deaths caused by a few diseases in 1917 and 1944. I chose 1917 because that is the year Alabama embarked upon an ambitious program to organize county health departments in the State on a full-time basis. Our first full-time county health department was organized in 1914 in Walker County, with Dr. Carl A. Grote serving as health officer, and sponsored by the United States Public Health Service in cooperation with the State and county officials. This was one of the very first county health departments organized in the United States of America. It was in 1917 when the late Dr. S. W. Welch became State health officer and began to interest the Federal Government and the Rockefeller Foundation to make financial contributions to Alabama's health program.

Let us consider some of our accomplishments in reducing the number of deaths caused by a few preventable diseases. Perhaps the most outstanding of these is typhoid fever. In 1917 there were 989 Alabamians who died of this disease. Last year there were only 16. At the same time deaths caused by diarrhea and enteritis under 2 years fell from 1,560 in 1917 to 295 in 1944. Malaria caused 530 deaths in 1917 and only 41 in 1944. Tuberculosis, although still one of our great killers has lost much of its prominence as such. In 1917 there were 2,914 Alabamians who succumbed to this disease while in 1944 there were 1,239. Pellagra killed 1,073 Alabama residents in 1917 and 98 in 1944. Diphtheria caused 191 deaths in 1917 and 59 in 1944. Smallpox once a great scourge has not caused a death in Alabama since 1932 although a man died last year of pneumonia contracted while he had smallpox.

I give you these facts to illustrate what has been accomplished but that is not all. These reductions in deaths did not just happen. It was planned and the people of Alabama responded. There were several factors entering into the picture. Laws were passed requiring public water supplies to be safeguarded, milk and food regulations were enforced, persons were vaccinated to prevent smallpox, diphtheria and typhoid fever, sanitary disposal of human excreta was provided and enlightened public cooperation was experienced.

The only deadly disease that has increased steadily since 1917 is cancer. There were 781 deaths in the State that year from this ailment and 2,083 in 1944. This increase is due partly to the fact that more of us are reaching the cancer age. We are living longer to die of malignancies. Better diagnosis is now available and more persons are consulting their physicians for cancer. A motto of the field army of the American Cancer Society is, "Fight cancer with knowledge." Efforts are made to make a cancer-conscious population and prevent cancer fear. You need to remember that quacks using salves and ointments cannot cure cancer and will only prolong the time when proper treatment is instituted.

Recent State legislation and that now pending in the Congress are going to add much to Alabama's health. Provision is made by State legislation to receive Federal funds and use State and local funds to match for the purpose of building hospitals in areas not now furnished with these institutions. These hospitals are not to be built as charity institutions by the Federal and State governments but these agencies are to contribute funds to aid local nonprofit hospital associations in constructing and equipping hospitals and health centers. Hospitals will include general and tuberculosis hospitals as well as nursing homes for the chronically ill.

It is firmly believed that the construction of these hospitals and health centers will induce well-prepared young physicians to locate in communities where they are now urgently needed. This will make hospital facilities and medical care more readily available to all our population. The reestablishment of the 4-year medical school will inevitably provide a greater number of physicians for Alabama within the next few years, and with modern facilities to aid in their practices there is little doubt that many of them will locate where the hospitals are.

Remember, "The health of your State depends upon the state of your health."

Columbus Day Address by Francis P. Matthews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 9 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Columbus Day address which was delivered over the Mutual Broadcasting System by a very distinguished citizen of my home town, Omaha, Nebr., Supreme Knight Francis P. Matthews, on October 12, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, four centuries and a half have passed into history since Christopher Columbus discovered the Western Hemisphere and inaugurated a new epoch in human affairs. By piercing the veil of mystery which had fenced

the world of the fifteenth century within a small section of its global expanse, the Genoese explorer lifted the curtain of the unknown which, until that time, had retarded the progress of civilization.

Columbus was born into a world limited in its proportions and prospects by stubborn ignorance and paralyzing superstitions. He lived to see that ignorance transformed into a revolutionary knowledge of physical science which directed its enlightening force on the weird superstitions which pictured the terrifying dangers lurking beyond the horizon of the known surface of the earth, and dispelled them like the melting of the twilight mists of morning before the irresistible rays of the rising sun. The force of his discovery has been felt by every human soul that has since responded to the quickening impulse of life. Columbus released the sleeping atomic energy of exploration and discovery, and the limitless blessings of man's creation proceeded to unfold with ever-increasing richness. For 453 years, the fruitful consequences of his undeniable genius have enriched the possibilities and the realizations of man's adventurous progress from the cradle to the grave, as no other single event of human origin has done in the course of time.

By common consent, Christopher Columbus, the discoverer, is secure in his position as the greatest human benefactor of mankind. No other member of the race has, of himself, so definitely enhanced the significance of human existence.

It was a circumscribed world that made up the theater in which the drama of the failures and successes in the life of Columbus transpired. That world is beyond the comprehension of the modern mind, which only casually reflects upon the miracle of the recent encirclement of the earth by an Army airplane in 149 hours. The complacency with which that marvelous achievement is accepted as a routine job indicates how much at a loss the present-day beneficiaries of the voyage of the Santa Maria are, to visualize or evaluate either the cost in human heartache or the price in all but superhuman faith which were expended to vindicate the startling conception of the earth's shape which, for so many painful years, isolated Columbus from normal human contacts and associations in every land where he lived.

It was the unfaltering faith of Columbus which split open the closed gateway that, for centuries, had blocked mankind's unquenchable desire for new lands to explore and exploit. Helpless in his own poverty to promote the daring expedition which he knew would vindicate his seemingly radical theory of the earth's structure and form, through the sheer force of his own will power he compelled a reluctant and conceited society to accept his contentions and provide the means with which to demonstrate their soundness. The story of mankind supplies no more sublime exemplification of the efficacy of fervent faith than is represented in the triumph of Columbus over the ridicule, the disbelief, and the scorn of the self-anointed scoffers of his day.

His was the same indomitable faith, emanating from a humble acknowledgment of man's total dependence upon Almighty God, that inspired the zeal of the crusaders, that fired the determined self-sacrifice of the Pilgrim Fathers, that fortified the anxious heart of the kneeling Washington at Valley Forge, that animated the deliberations of the framers of our Constitution, that comforted the martyred Lincoln, and that the world, in its hunger for the God-given blessings of peace, is seeking in the souls of men today. On that faith alone can the war-torn, torture-ridden, horror-shocked generation in which we live eradicate the malignancies which corrupt domestic, national, and international relationships in this perilous hour in history, and reestablish Christian civilization in harmony with the true essence of Christianity.

Columbus, by his undeniable faith in divine guidance and the supernatural benevolence of the Supreme Father of mankind, single-handed conquered the skepticism and overt opposition of an unsympathetic world, and we, and those who have preceded us since his time, have reveled in the fruits of his faith and sacrifices.

The epoch to which Columbus gave birth marked the beginning of a long era of material profit and spiritual enrichment for mankind in general. New continents, with their seemingly inexhaustible natural resources, poured their fabulous riches into the treasure basket of almost every nation. Capitalized by this material rehabilitation of their impoverished economy, the nations of the earth succumbed to the political pushing and crowding, the internal and international conflicts from which there have evolved the two principal philosophies of government—democracy and totalitarianism—which inevitably fashion the lives of all people today.

Through 453 years of wars and famines and plagues, which at times have neutralized or completely dissipated the beneficent fruits made available through the genius of Columbus, we have progressed from the bleak and grim deficiencies of human life in days before America, to the fascinating realities of the twentieth century. It is difficult to evaluate the breadth of culture stretching between the sailing ship, the hand printing press, the oxcart, and the personally carried letter of the fifteenth century, and the airplane, the lightning-fast printing presses, the streamlined automobiles, and the worldwide postal system of this day.

In transportation, in communication, and in the dissemination of knowledge through the printed word, progress has proceeded through the accomplishment of one miracle after another. With amazing repetition in the material world, the impossible has become commonplace through the inventive and engineering genius of our scientific minds. The potential substances deposited in the bowels of the earth, and which were first opened up for man's exploitation through the dreams of Columbus, have been appropriated and processed in the laboratories and workshops of industry and research, to create the marvels of modern production which serve man so completely in every phase of his needs.

As has happened so often in man's complacent satisfaction with himself, it had almost come to be believed that the ultimate in the evolution of human progress had been attained. At last, human society had exposed and explored the total surface of the earth; it had appropriated the skys to accommodate the airplane and the radio; it had banished distance; it had perfected the instantaneous exchange of ideas through visual and oral intercommunication by means of the radio, the telephone and the talking movies; it had devised numerous appliances to serve the individual's comfort and convenience; and, in spite of the annihilating destruction emanating from the most terribly devastating war of all time, society was ready to strike a pose, and, with folded arms, challenge the future to outdo the accumulated fruits of the receding past.

And then the cataclysm came! Unsuspected and without warning, the fact of the atomic bomb crashed into the unprepared consciences of men, and a new epoch was born—the epoch of atomic energy! One does not have to be very sensitive to discern that the world was frightened by the menacing potentialities of what it had done, or that it is still stunned by the shock of that fright.

The epoch opened by Columbus was one of hope. It foreordained a constructive era. It foretold progress. It could not avoid bringing happiness to mankind.

What may we expect of this new epoch? What does the splitting of the atom mean? How will the harnessing of atomic energy affect the weal or the woe of ourselves and the children of the future families of the world? Has there been produced at last, in the providence of God, a cause which will compel the population of the earth to come together and live in brotherhood, with mutual forbearance and understanding, or perish? It is not so silly to accept that interpretation of the ghost-like ruins of Nagasaki and Hiroshima, when you dwell upon the international misbehavior of society during the last 6 years. The epoch of atomic energy, by its potentiality for annihilation, could well be the final epoch in history. It could well exterminate human life on our planet. It could, on the other hand, produce the elusive millennium of universal peace under an acknowledged and welcomed fatherhood of God.

Which will it be? The answer is to be found in your heart and mine, and in the hearts of our 135,000,000 fellow Americans, as well as in the hearts of some 200,000,000 Russians, and the 540,000,000 of the British Empire. If the 875,000,000 of victorious Allies and their leaders fail to heed the awful significance of war in the future, then, in punishment for our folly, it may well be that the vengeance of an outraged God shall be visited unmercifully upon our children, and our children's children.

It is a sobering thought to contemplate what the coming years may hold for mankind. As has seldom happened in history, events have transpired to center responsibility for the fate of the future within a limited circle. It is not too much to say that upon the United States and Russia depends the hope for peace. They are the two most powerful nations. They have much in common; but, in the most fundamental concept of man, there never were two nations wider apart or more violently in conflict. With us, the individual is supreme; the state, his servant. In Russia, the state is everything; and the individual, subordinate.

Our philosophy is the product of that thinking whose fountain source is deep religious conviction, an appreciation of man's total dependence upon the divine will. Tangible evidence of that fact permeates the records which preserve the story of the Nation's birth and growth to its present preeminence.

Washington, kneeling in the snow at Valley Forge; Lincoln, with bowed head, beside the casket of his little son; Benjamin Franklin, on his knees with the other delegates, rescuing the first Constitutional Convention from failure; the Chaplain's invocation which opens each session of Congress; Thanksgiving Day; President Truman reverently acknowledging God's merciful handiwork in the termination of the war; these, and many other manifestations of religious faith exemplified in our national life, suggest that the poet's conviction that more things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of, has consistently been America's guiding influence. And in that we emulate the edifying example of Christopher Columbus, as he crowned his conquest of the Atlantic by erecting the cross of Christ on the gleaming sands of the newly found shores of San Salvador, in grateful acknowledgment of God's guidance and help.

Can our Nation, with such a glorious religious tradition, work with Russian atheistic communism to establish in the world the program of the Prince of Peace? Only Russia can answer that question, because only Russia can say how far she will relax the totalitarian dictates now gripping her own people, as well as the tens of millions outside her own borders but still embraced within her smothering sphere of influence. If we are to be realistic with ourselves, we cannot minimize the grave conflict between the principles of American democracy and the dictatorship of the Soviet Republics.

There is no room for compromise in that situation from our point of view. The silent lips of the 250,000 American youth who died

to win our latest war cannot be heard, to voice their demand for the faithful preservation of our cherished liberties and freedoms; but President Truman and Congress recognize and will heed the challenge which their supreme sacrifice represents. We have the power, we have the will, we have the leadership to keep our American idea of democracy safe and sound. In that position of advantage, we dare not betray "the last full measure of devotion" so generously expended by our heroic dead to win victory in every war we have fought.

The ghastly menace of the atomic bomb dictates that there must be peace in the world. With the patience, the perseverance, and the unfaltering faith of Columbus, in spite of every disappointment that comes, and every obstacle that is faced, America will never yield until that goal is assured. The road may be long and hard, but somehow, in God's providence, simply because it must, the righteousness of our cause shall prevail.

Subsidy Program for Aluminum Manufacture and Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 9 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the president of the Fairmont Aluminum Co., of Fairmont, W. Va., addressed under date of October 22, 1945, to Mr. W. Stuart Symington, Surplus Property Administrator, Washington, D. C., in which he sets forth very clearly opposition to the subsidy plan. I think the letter is worthy of being placed in the RECORD and read by Senators.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIRMONT ALUMINUM CO.,
Fairmont, W. Va., October 22, 1945.

Mr. W. STUART SYMINGTON,
Surplus Property Administrator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have read very carefully the report of the Surplus Property Board to the Congress, dated September 21, 1945, on aluminum plants and facilities. We are deeply concerned with that part of the report which proposes, in effect, a subsidy program which applies to practically every phase of the aluminum manufacture and distribution. It is the purpose of this letter to protest against the putting into effect of any such subsidy program which we believe would be dangerous to the economy of the United States, and especially dangerous to the entire aluminum industry including all independents now operating in the aluminum industry, except those who are the beneficiaries of these subsidies. It would open the way to demands for subsidies in other industries and once started, would have the most serious effect upon the free enterprise system in America and upon its free economy.

You call attention on page 26 of your report to section 2 of the Surplus Property Act which provides among other objectives, "to give maximum aid in the reestablishment of a peacetime economy of free independent private enterprise, the development of the maximum of independent operators in trade, industry, and agriculture." Granting of any such subsidies as proposed in your report would destroy peacetime economy of free independent private enterprise rather than encourage it, and would retard the development of the maximum of independent operators in trade and industry, instead of promoting it. We wish to go on record with you as being unequivocally opposed to the granting of Government subsidies in industry on any theory. The principles of democracy are based upon equal opportunities and equal justice to all. For the Government, by any process, to pick out a single individual operator in industry and to grant him a subsidy over his competitors, and to provide that if there is any loss the Government will absorb or share in it, strikes at the very fundamentals of the principle of equal opportunity of justice and of democracy.

We hold no brief for the Aluminum Co. of America, or for any other concern in the aluminum industry. Neither are we motivated by selfish interest in the position that we take. It is true that we believe that the establishment of subsidies such as proposed by you would eventually destroy our company along with other independent aluminum companies, and even the Aluminum Co. of America. But it is not for that reason that we feel impelled to protest and object to the program proposed by you. To destroy us is a relatively small and insignificant thing compared to destroying the principle of democracy, the principle of equal treatment to all, and of equal opportunity in America. Naturally we will fight to protect our own business which was built up against severe competition and without Government subsidy or help of any kind, as all business should be. But we will fight even more to retain in America the free enterprise system and the right of industry in America to be free of unfair competition on the part of the Government, or of the Government providing subsidies to create unfair competition.

We do not go into the question at all as to whether there ought to be more competition in the production of aluminum pig and other aluminum fabrications. If this competition can be developed legitimately with private capital, that is one thing; but for it to be developed under paternalistic subsidies and protection of the United States Government is quite another thing. We maintain that the aluminum industry would be far better off without more competition than it would be with more competition developed by any such pernicious plan as you propose in your report.

We now make specific reference to some of the points urged in your report as a program of the Surplus Property Board in support of Government subsidies. We refer first, to the Government guarantee against losses to which reference has been made earlier in this letter. The proposal is, as we understand it, to give an operator of a Government subsidized plant 15 percent of the net profits, but will require the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (in other words the Government and the taxpayers of the United States) to stand all losses. We agree with the testimony that has been made before the joint Senate committee investigating the matter of disposal of surplus property aluminum plants that such a proposal is an invitation to reckless, extravagant, and calculated mismanagement. Under such a program, an operator could spend money recklessly for sales expense, advertizing, capturing of markets, and other practices which his competitors could not possibly meet, knowing well that if he suffered any losses, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation bore them. The taxpayers paid for his recklessness. And this is true, even though the Reconstruction Finance Corporation did reserve the right to review and approve the prices at which the metal is sold, top salaries, and extraordinary expenses. This would virtually place the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, an agent of the Government, in a position to dictate the price at which aluminum was sold and could result in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation putting all competitors of the favored son or beneficiaries of the subsidy out of business. We furthermore call your attention to the fact that such a subsidy would enable the favored operator to raid other operators in the industry, of their keymen without regard to the cost of it, because the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would pay. Some competition has already been built up during the war period, by raiding the organization of other operators, and the granting of a subsidy such as is proposed, would make this practice feasible and possible to a continuing extent.

You propose, further, to give the lessee of Government plants an option to purchase based upon the earnings record of the plant during the subsidized lease. This would permit a lessee of these plants to deliberately incur losses so that he might eventually buy the plants as cheaply as possible.

As to the subsidy proposed in the Government procurement of bauxite, we will not go into special arguments against it except to stand on the premise that the principle of subsidy is all wrong in a democracy and the subsidy applied to the procurement of bauxite is as indefensible as the subsidies applied to the purchase of plants, or guaranty against losses. The same thing applies to the proposal to subsidize the manufacture of alumina at prices equal to, or lower than the Aluminum Co. of America's cost.

It is our studied opinion that, contrary to what you say in the report, the advent of new producers in the industry through Government plant disposal under the subsidy plan proposed by you, would decrease national security instead of increasing it, and would decrease employment in the aluminum industry rather than increase it, and would create a confusion in the industry. It would play havoc with independent operators, as well as the principal producers. It would be handing over on a silver platter the aluminum industry that has been built up through long effort and through years of energy and devotion to it, to some newcomer protected from the rains of adversity by a Government umbrella.

Respectfully submitted,

FAIRMONT ALUMINUM CO.,
L. M. BRILE, *President.*

Demobilization of Army and Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL
OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 9 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD two very interesting letters, one from a Navy man stationed on Guam, and one from an Army man stationed in France, expressing their criticism and dissatisfaction at the methods employed in demobilizing the Army and the Navy.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUAM, MARIANAS ISLANDS,
Thursday, October 18.

Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have not wanted to waste the time of any man in Washington over the Navy point system, because I knew that the Navy

had not had time to get started on demobilization, and I felt that when that time came they would do the best that they could possibly do. However, now with their plan for demobilization announced I feel that the time has come for us to write our views—just in case the Navy Department is putting up a pretty good argument before Congress.

First of all I want to point out a couple of obvious lies in the Navy's announcements of the last 2 days. Yesterday, with the announcement of the reduction in points, the Navy Department announced that with a reduction only to 39 in December, one-third of the Navy would be out by the first of next year. When the average point score right now is 26 or 28, I ask you just what kind of fools they take the people back home to be when they announce such a thing. A reduction of 10 more points would be necessary to get it to one-half its wartime force—so, how can a reduction of only 6 points possibly get out one-third?

Today, they made the further announcement that none of the ships in the States for Navy Day could be used for transporting troops. The falsity of this statement lies in the fact that they don't explain why they are not now preparing them to transport troops home instead of leaving them in the ports back home for 10 days to 2 weeks—just to show them off. Nor does it explain why the U. S. S. *Portland* could not have been making another trip to carry troops back when it was in Pearl Harbor for 3 weeks while the 44-point men of the Navy who were homeward-bound were made to paint it for the celebration in the States.

Those are only two of the many flagrant abuses of the truth by the Navy Department that we in the Navy would like for the Members of Congress to inquire into. I feel sure that in our democratic form of Government such utter lack of regard for the rights of civilian sailors will not be allowed to continue.

I appreciate your consideration in reading this letter, and hope that I do not feel called to write any other—because I know that you, as well as all the Members of Congress, are very busy with all the problems of a Nation changing back to peace.

Your humble constituent.

FRANCE, *October 22, 1945.*

DEAR SENATOR O'DANIEL: This is the first letter that I have ever written to a Congressman.

They say that the storms in the channel are holding up the shipping, but the port commander says that there have been no storms lasting more than 24 hours. Fellows in the States are getting out of the Army with only a few points, yet men over here are being shipped to Germany for the army of occupation when they have over 3 years of service, and some with over 50 points.

All we seem to be doing over here now is shipping men to other outfits, and other outfits shipping men to this outfit. All they seem to accomplish is mixing things up and moving men around when we don't like to travel especially under the conditions that we have to travel under. There doesn't seem to be any system to it whatsoever. They are just shipping men around for the sake of shipping them around. That's all they accomplish. Things are worse now than they were when the war was going on.

I've only been in the Army 33 months and have only 39 points, and I didn't expect to get out of the Army right away because there are other men over here who have 4 years of service, but when I read about men in the States getting out when they have only a few points, and I am being shipped to Germany, I get mad because I can't see any justice in it.

I volunteered for the Army and wanted to do my part to help win the war. At that time, they made a lot of promises none of which have come true. The Army is just a vicious Army and when they get you trapped and up against the wall, they don't care what happens to pfc's or anybody else for that matter except generals.

My folks read the papers at home saying how every effort is being made to get me and my fellow soldiers home, and they expect me home by Christmas or at the latest New Year's. As far as I can see it will be way past June before I get home and by that time they will have forgotten that I was ever home and will look upon me as a complete stranger. I'm not the only guy in this fix. There are others.

They say they are discharging some men in the States because they are surplus. They can't claim that we're essential over here because all we do is sit around and doodle. Enclosed is a sample of this doodling to prove that we have done about every kind of doodling there is and are running out of ideas to kill time with.

We read all of the magazines that we can get and all of the home-town papers that we and our friends get including papers from towns of 5,000 population that are 2 months' old, and of towns that we never heard of and aren't the least bit interested in and still we run out of reading material before noon every day.

This joke has gone far enough.

Yours sincerely.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I hold in my hand another illuminating letter, written to me by the father of a boy who is in the Navy. This father is an official in a large industrial plant, and is fully informed on the subject about which he writes. His son is also qualified, by experience, to speak on the subject. For obvious reasons I shall protect this father and son by not divulging their names. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

No doubt you receive many letters like this but I would appreciate your reading this.

I would like to call to your attention that no points are allowed for combat engagements for our boys in the Navy. I and about 3,000,000 other fathers do not consider this a fair deal. I have a boy 23 years old, who was pulled out of the Texas University when he only lacked one semester of getting his degreee in aeronautical engineering. He has been on active duty for 28 months and I would like to quote from some of his letters as follows:

"It seems that the Navy has lowered its point system and I don't have but two more years to do; isn't that thrilling. This Navy can't make me believe that they are trying very hard to get their men discharged, when they let the fleet set at anchor a month in the States in order to give the public a Navy Day show. I listen to the news every day, and it seems to me that Congress is really on the ball. A lot of Congressmen propose good legislation whether they get it passed or not. Ships going back to the States could carry an average of at least three to four thousand men per ship; that is, carriers and transports, etc. In other words, it would take 240 ships to bring home a million men. The public may believe that they don't have the shipping available, but they can't make me believe it, because I have seen as many as a thousand ships setting in one anchorage out here. Not all could be used as troop-carrying ships, but at least half of them could, and when you stop and think that there must be other ships at other anchorages, the idea that there is a lack of shipping sort of leaves your mind, and you wonder how hard the Navy is trying to get their men home, and thank God for the pressure Congress is applying. The whole matter is very disheartening. It is unheard of for the Navy to send a person home when they don't have a place for him—he must have the points. I have been excess ever since I have been in this organization. What a stupid, miserable existence this Navy is.

"If this proposed bill for drafting 18- to 20-year-old fellows goes through, the country may as well kiss its supply of doctors and professional men good-by. I have seen these older fellows in school; they usually drop out the first semester, because it is not what they had expected. Most of them have knocked around so much that the things they throw at you in the first part of college seem silly and useless, so they just quit. The ones that do stay are no match for the younger, more eager fellows, who are much sharper and who apply themselves to their work with a burning desire that the older ones cannot start to equal. The Government won't have to put out as much money as they think sending fellows to school. Lots of them intend to go, but I am very skeptical about their attitude toward school once they are on the inside looking out. They won't be able to see the reasons for some of the things they have to put up with in the first 3 years of college, and, consequently, will do them only half way or not at all, and will finally become disgusted, decide that they know more than the professor, and leave. If they don't get disgusted and leave of their own accord, they will probably be thrown out due to poor grades. The years a young fellow spends in school before he has booted his way around in the world are decidedly the most fruitful as far as education is concerned, and are something that, once taken away, the Government cannot give back. It is only the stupid, uneducated, selfish military men who insist on a draft of 18- to 20-year-olds when there is no necessity for it, and I consider them worse than criminals, since they are stealing something that is irreplaceable. If the country wants to keep a large standing Army and reserve Army, I think it is fine, but men like those would put everyone in the Army if they could. I know there must be some solution besides forcing people into 2 years of unfruitful training, wrecking their lives, killing their spirit, and breaking their health, and destroying a potential source of production men and scientists. I can truthfully say that my health was never worse than now, and I don't feel like I will ever have my energy again. The thing that has made me maddest of all is that in my heart I know I haven't done a damn thing toward winning the war, since I have never been needed anywhere I have been placed, and therefore all the time spent has been wasted. The ROTC was just a big joke as far as I am concerned; everything they taught was worthless and out of date; the most foolish thing I ever did was to join that outfit, since it kept me from getting my degree. The people who are handed commissions straight out of civilian life and go through the 3-month indoctrination course the Navy has are of just as much use to the Navy and are just as well equipped as any ROTC man. In fact, ROTC and Regular Navy men are laughed at by the numerous men commissioned right out of civilian life, who have done such a good job in this war. I suppose all this sounds like old stuff to you, mother and dad, but I can't help writing it once more. It isn't bad out here at all; it is just this marking time that gets under a person's skin."

This boy was in four major engagements and has four stars, which would bring his points up if they were allowed to in the Navy. If the Navy needs men, why don't they draft these young communistic CIO boys who are doing so much striking and picketing of plants, and who have been hiding behind lathes and machines in these plants for the last 4 years—and let the boys who

have served their time out there come home? I'm not asking anything special for my boy—only that he and the rest of them be given a fair deal, and it certainly seems unfair that so many who have never seen overseas service have already gotten their discharge.

United States Employment Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, November 9 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Atlanta Constitution which briefly but accurately points out the need for continuing the United States Employment Service as a federally operated agency.

Experience has shown that the present State-by-State system of employment service and unemployment compensation cannot operate satisfactorily in a national economy such as ours.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNEMPLOYMENT KNOWS NO STATE BOUNDARIES

It is to be hoped that Congress will follow President Truman's suggestion and resist efforts to turn the United States Employment Service back over to the individual States. Some Government services are more efficiently and economically rendered by States, some by municipalities, still others by Uncle Sam. Because Nation-wide cooperation is needed to prevent unemployment in some sections while labor shortages exist in others, job-finding naturally falls under the Federal category.

From War to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, November 9 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very stimulating and penetrating address entitled "From War to Peace," which was delivered last night by a great American statesman, Hon. Harold E. Stassen, of Minnesota.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HAROLD E. STASSEN, OF MINNESOTA, DELIVERED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, NEW YORK CITY, NOVEMBER 8, 1945

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and fellow citizens; there can be little doubt that we meet at the opening of one of the crucial decades of history. A world-wide war, tenfold more destructive than any previous war has ended. It ended, and left in its wake a billion of the men and women and little children of the world hungry and short of food. It ended, and left a quarter billion of the people of the world without shelter. It ended, and left a half billion of the earth's inhabitants, including many on every hemisphere, seething in the ferment of political and social unrest. It ended, and let 50,000,000 of mankind wounded or ill or long, dreary distances from home, at strange locations to which they had been swept by the flood tides of the conflict. It ended, and left little white crosses, row on row, around the globe, as signposts of the youth, virility, and manhood that was no more and as symbols of the sorrows in the hearts of their loved ones. It ended, as the United Nations were preparing to put into effect their Charter for peace. It ended, and left the production and distribution systems in great areas of the world disrupted and destroyed. It ended, in a rapid succession of guns that shot farther, of airplanes that flew greater distances in shorter time with heavier bomb loads, of rockets that outsped sound itself. It ended, with the awesome flash at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, signaling to the world that science had unlocked the devastating and disintegrating force of the atomic bomb. It ended, and we face the future. And what of that future? What shall our course be?

I believe the best way to discuss that future course is to take up specifically one of the world's problems. I believe we can best come to grips with the issues of the days ahead by discussing frankly and in detail our policy on the world's major challenge of the future—atomic energy. Needless to say, I speak as an individual and not in any sense for the Navy or the Government.

Seeking to find the wise policy as to atomic energy it is important that we first endeavor to clarify basic factual information.

First of all, the successful development of the sustained neutron chain reaction resulting from nuclear fission, and the manufacture of the atomic bomb, was a result of many years of effort by scientists of many countries, including Denmark, France, and Germany, culminating in the specific intense work by large groups from England, Canada, and the United States in the Manhattan Project in Hanford, Wash., and Clinton, Oak Ridge, Tenn., and in groups at Berkeley, Chicago, Columbia, Los Alamos, and elsewhere.

Second. Scientists do not anticipate that there can be any successful scientific counter measure to an atomic bomb. There appears no scientific theory that would provide for its neutralization or its advance detonation.

Third. The production of atomic bombs at present requires an installation of such size that a rigid, thorough inspection, and auditing of materials by competent scientists could ascertain with reasonable certainty the presence or absence of such production.

Fourth. It appears likely that the tremendous energy developed by the process of nuclear fission and the products derived therefrom with its alpha and beta particles and gamma rays can at some future time be harnessed and controlled for peaceful and constructive purposes for the benefit of mankind.

Fifth. There is nothing about the scientific features or fabrication methods of the production of the bomb that cannot be ascertained in a relatively short space of years by any group of able physicists and engineers anywhere in the world with adequate plant facilities.

Sixth. The destructive power in one small bomb is greater than a thousand of the greatest bombs made previously, and it is physically possible to manufacture these by the hundreds and also to still further increase the destructive power of every bomb.

If these are the correct basic facts, then what should the policy of America be? Obviously, there are a number of alternatives. The first is the policy of secrecy and suppression. Under this policy we would provide for heavy penalties against anyone who would reveal any part of the information that was not already public. We would keep our own scientists under surveillance. We would investigate all reports of any of our scientists meeting with scientists or representatives from other countries. We would follow a policy that is inherent in the preface of the Smythe report. I quote, "All pertinent scientific information which can be released to the public at this time without violating the needs of national security is contained in this volume. No requests for additional information should be made to private persons or organizations associated directly or indirectly with the project. Persons disclosing or securing additional information by any means whatsoever, without authorization, are subject to severe penalties under the Espionage Act."

Under this secrecy and suppression policy, we would give to our Government extreme powers which it has never approached before in time of peace. And, what would be the result? Throughout the world other scientists and other engineers would pursue the same discoveries, would experiment and develop, until they too had atomic bombs. Throughout the world the pressure of all governments would be on their scientists to develop the explosive and the destructive powers of atomic energy. Throughout the world the research and experimentation and the utilization of atomic energy for peaceful and constructive purposes would be retarded. Here in America, for the first time in peace, we would be restricting the freedom of science. For the first time in peace, we would be departing from that basic liberty and openness of science which has led in the past to our superb scientific achievements. America would become less attractive as the home of scientists and we would begin to establish conditions of a nature similar to those which caused many scientists to flee from Germany and seek refuge elsewhere.

Or, as a second alternative, we can say we have no secrets from our allies, and open up our entire records and details of production to every one of the United Nations, and rely on their good faith in their use of this information.

What then would be the result? Many other nations would manufacture some of the bombs. There would be an uneasy apprehension between nations as to what their future course might be. Changing policies of government and changing leadership would be viewed with uncertainty around the world. Relations between nations would be carried on with the dread of possible surprise attacks. All of history says that good faith alone is not sufficient for the peaceful relationship between men. Good faith must be coupled with a framework of order, of law, and of justice. Under the give-away alternative, there would be no guaranty of reciprocal openness of information. We would, in effect, be increasing the armament of every other individual United Nation. There is no logical reason why each nation of the world should have the power to destroy other nations. Balancing of power has not proved in the past to be a road to peace but rather a road to war.

It is the third alternative that I advocate tonight. This is the alternative of placing the control of the atomic bomb definitely on the world level. To my mind, it is the only basis that has real hope for future peace, stability, and progress. To my mind, the splitting of the tiny atom, and the destructive release of its tremendous energy, urgently requires the uniting on this great earth of the constructive energy of all mankind.

This new development is one additional powerful reason for developing a new and higher level of government to serve mankind.

The progress of science, of communication, of travel, and of mass production, have already brought the people of the world close together. All of history tells us that whenever men are living close together, they require a government of some form to prevent anarchy and chaos, to establish order and justice, and to facilitate progress and well-being. The world needed government on a world level before the atomic bomb. Now it has become an imperative.

I present tonight specific detailed recommendations not because I am insistent that these are the precise answers but rather because it is my observation that to discuss a subject in broad terms that mean all things to all men, does not contribute to clarification or decision. I present exact detail in order that men might differ with me and from the discussion of those differences we might find the way to the best answers.

The development of atomic energy administration on a world level and the utilization of its force for peace rather than destruction should be through the growth of the United Nations Organization.

I suggest that the United States propose an amendment and implementation of article 43 of the United Nations Charter so as to grant to the Security Council the right and the duty to establish and maintain a small United Nations Air Force of 5 bomber squadrons and 10 fighter squadrons, manned by volunteers from the United Nations, not more than one-fifth of the personnel of any squadron to be of any one nationality background, to be based at 5 different suitable bases around the world, to be financed by a small tax on all international travel, and that the United States furnish 5 atomic bombs to each of these 5 bomber squadrons at the 5 bases around the world to serve as the stabilization force for world order.

I suggest the United States propose to implement article 26 of the United Nations Charter so as to provide that no nation shall manufacture an atomic bomb, and that the manufacture or possession of such a bomb would be a crime against mankind. The present plants would manufacture the number required for the world stabilization force, and then stop.

I suggest that the United States propose to the United Nations that the Security Council be given the right and the duty to establish a United Nations Atomic Commission of distinguished scientists, with the power and the duty to thoroughly inspect all nations, including our own, and to keep accurate accounts of fissionable material to ascertain the fulfillment of the foregoing charter provisions.

I propose that no one shall engage in any nuclear or atomic research without registering with this United Nations Atomic Commission, but that once having registered, any scientist would be entirely free to carry on scientific research and to publish his results to the world. I wish to emphasize that scientific freedom is just as important as academic freedom and freedom of the press to our way of life. The registration should be merely for the protection of mankind as to the location of the research and to facilitate the inspection of the activities.

I know full well that proposals of this kind will be attacked. There will be those who call them visionary, but I might ask whether or not to fail to seek some such method would not be blindness. Are not each of these proposals in fact practical, sound, and attainable?

Some of the clamor of opposition will come from those who will say that such a proposal will violate the absolute national sovereignty of the member nations. Yes; it will. But the narrow concept of absolute nationalistic sovereignty belongs in the same historical discard as the theory of the divine right of kings. The proposal that I make would not cause the people to lose sovereignty. They would be simply delegating a portion of their inherent sovereignty to a new and higher level of governmental machinery where it can be more effectively administered for the people's welfare. Principles of government must stand the test of service to the people if they are to be respected. The concept of absolute nationalistic sovereignty no longer serves the people of this world. It is a barrier that prevents that successful cooperation which every other fact of modern life demands. It is a fertile source of those clashes and frictions that lead to war. And might I add, that the diplomats' squeamishness about abstract sovereignty, as they refuse to take steps to prevent war, does not impress the millions of men who have seen the intimate innards of their pals spread over the landscape by war. Measures of world cooperation, steps of effective working together, machinery that serves mankind, should be judged on their own merits, not by seeking to apply to it the outworn shibboleth of absolute nationalistic sovereignty.

Another argument in opposition that will probably be made is that this proposal does not serve the self-interest of America. It will be argued that we now occupy a position of great power with our armed might, and the possession of the atomic bomb; that we should use this power for our own enlightened self-interest rather than diffuse it on a world-wide basis.

Permit me to meet that argument head-on. In my judgment, if the selfish interest of America becomes the official guiding light of our world policy, it will be one of the most tragic phases of American history. The doctrine of "America first" is purely and simply the extension of the doctrine of "me first." There is, and there will be, a considerable measure of this doctrine in life. But if it ever becomes the officially accepted standard to be followed by everyone, the tragedy, chaos, and suffering, the demoralization and disintegration, will be indescribable. Selfishness is not a virtue for individual life. Neither should it be considered a virtue for national life.

It is my view that the first pennant nailed to the mast of our foreign policy should state the objective to promote the slow, steady march of social, economic, and cultural progress of all mankind and the general welfare of one world at peace.

Nothing less than that is worthy of America. This does not mean a policy of waste and extravagance. It does not mean the encouragement of idleness in other lands. It does not mean a careless charity that undermines the recipient and dissipates the resources of the giver. It does not mean placing the welfare of any other individual nation above that of America. It does not mean that we should be weak in armed forces. It does not mean that we love America less. But it does require a broadness of concept of our policies. It does require that in our domestic activities we constantly be concerned as to their effect on peoples of other parts of the world. We are today the most powerful nation in the world. We do have the greatest productive capacity. We do have a homeland—thank God—that has not been ravished by war. We do have an economy that is healthy and strong. If we seek to be selfish and narrow in this position, that same selfishness and narrowness will pass on down to groups within our country. America will be divided. It will be bigoted and intolerant. And our economy will wither. Unemployment will multiply. We will lose that precise powerful position which we seek selfishly to maintain.

The broad policy I advocate means specifically that we must do more than give lip service to the United Nations Organization. We must do more than cooperate in a manner of detached aloof interest. We must seek constantly to give it vigor and vitality and contribute to its growth. I know there are those who speak of its inadequacy. It is true as I said long since, that it is only a beachhead in the battle for peace, that it is only a very small step in the right direction.

But it is nevertheless a tremendously important step. It is a vital beachhead. It has brought together all of the essential elements for effective world administration. It directly and indirectly represents three-fourths of all the peoples of the world. Its purposes are right. I read them to you:

"1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace;

"2. To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;

"3. To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and

"4. To be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends."

Its machinery and powers are limited. Its veto is restrictive. But it is flexible. It can grow. It can be amended. It can be changed. Do not sell the United Nations Organization short. Do not undermine what you have in an academic discussion of what you wish you had. The United Nations Organization can be developed in any manner the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, China, and France, and a majority of the other nations wish it to be developed, and realistically, there cannot be effective world government without the agreement of those powers. Let us not lose sight of the fact that the constructive economic and social developments under the United Nations Organization will in the final analysis do more to insure a lasting and durable peace than will the enforcement provisions. The United States must continue to give leadership in this growth and development.

I am tremendously encouraged by the ratification of the necessary 5 and 24, by the successful completion of the work of the preparatory commission in London, and by the fact that in less than 2 months the first Assembly of the United Nations as a definite, functioning organization will take place. This has been a bright spot amidst the dark clouds of the deterioration of our world relationships which occurred at the London Conference of Foreign Ministers, a conference, it should be remembered, that had no connection with this United Nations Organization and was not planned and prepared for in the same thorough manner.

The broad policy we are discussing means that we must promptly reconvert, develop full production, and proceed with plans for the exchange of some of the results of our great productive capacity, with those who need it now, in return for future raw materials and investments and trade and tourist opportunities.

We should not overlook that the basic long-range facts of the world economy are encouraging, even in this tragic winter. The threat of Nazi and Japanese domination has been removed. This good earth has the capacity to produce enough food for all the people in it. The materials are here to construct shelter for all who wish it. There is room on the globe for all the people on it. But the science of government has not advanced as rapidly as have the other sciences, nor as rapidly as has the growth

of population itself. We need intense study of this art of living together. This study should involve not only the development of mechanisms of government on a new and higher level for the conduct of those affairs that cannot be carried on successfully on the old basis of the nationalistic state, but it also means the development of more effective government at local and national levels. The value of a periodic choice by the people between alternatives in administration needs earnest discussion and analysis.

The avoidance of a complete political fragmentation of the population in a democracy to a point where no effective government of continuity is possible, needs emphasis. The Federal principle, its strength and its flexibility; the relations of the economic, social, and political structures; the specific question of federated economies, coexistent with political alliances; and the comparison of men's existing governments with what they had previously rather than with an abstract ideal, all need searching consideration. These must challenge the best of intelligence the world can apply to them. Surely we have learned through two tragic wars and a world-wide depression in a single generation, that the failure of men to learn how to live together can destroy and devastate much of what all their other intelligence, invention, study, and toil can create.

This same broad foreign policy also means that throughout the world we must constantly emphasize basic human rights more than American rights. I am convinced that if we follow such a broad policy as we have discussed tonight, it will not result in our own impoverishment—it will not result in our own weakness. In fact, we will thrive and grow and be happier under the challenge of this course. We will find that after the decade goes by we have a healthier economy. We will find that we have access to more raw materials and greater markets than we otherwise would. We will find that we have a greater measure of good will throughout the world; that we have more jobs at home; that we are at peace.

In any discussion of the seriousness and scope of our discussion this evening, there always arises the question of how it shall be concluded. Permit me to merely say—Let us face the future with confidence.

The Men We Elect to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 29, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I quote from a booklet entitled "A Plea for Honest Education":

A trained doctor, regardless of the measure of love he bears a patient, can and does save the life of that patient, where an untrained person would lose the life of that patient even though he were his dearest friend.

But a trained doctor untrained on social forces would make a poor master to be entrusted with control of social forces and the entire public suffers as a consequence.

Men and women in public office can all be highly trained doctors, lawyers, and scientists, and all of them 100-percent honest, and yet if they lack proper training on social forces, they will make the same botch of their task that public officials in this and all other capitalist economies have made for generations past, and all people suffer as all people are now suffering.

In 1787 John Adams expressed this truth in the following words: "All the perplexities, confusion, and distress in America arise not from defects in the Constitution or confederation, not from want of honor or virtue so much as from downright ignorance of the nature of coin, credit, and circulation."

The since failure of public education to heed this criticism of public education by John Adams in 1787, and the consequent election to public office of people who understood as little about coin, bank credit, and circulation as they did of money, price, and purchasing power, has cost the people of our Nation alone, and in but the last 13 years, an average annual loss of more than $50,000,000,000 of wealth either not produced, solely because of the lack of a sane spread of purchasing power, or produced to be destroyed and to destroy the lives and wealth of like miseducated millions in other nations.

What better proof for the statement that people in public office who do not understand social forces are civilization's deadliest enemies.

A nation's medium of exchange is its economic bloodstream. If our doctors understood as little about the human bloodstream as the public officials of this and other private profit economies understand about their Nation's economic bloodstream the resulting premature deaths and human misery would be no more than the present and past casualties from untrained and untested unfits in public office.

All that each of us need do to fulfill our obligation to true democracy and end the present ravages of social ignorance of social forces is:

(A) Stop voting until we first gain an understanding of social forces;

(B) Spend a few hours of study necessary to gain a clear understanding of social forces; and

(C) Vote only for those candidates for public office who first prove to us that they possess a clear understanding of social forces, the fundamentals of government.

The Silent Delegate to the Disarmament Conference: The Unknown Soldier

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, officially, this is Armistice Day.

On November 11, 1918, the First World War closed; and for every man in uniform at that time it was the greatest day he had ever seen. It meant the greatest homecoming the American people had ever known.

On November 11, 1921, we buried the Unknown Soldier in Arlington Cemetery. To me that was one of the most solemn events I have ever attended.

On the next day, November 12, 1921, just 24 years ago today, the Disarmament Conference met here in Washington. I attended that conference, and wrote the following report of the opening session:

WASHINGTON, D. C., November 12, 1921.—These are eventful days for Washington. Things are happening so "thick and fast," that we can hardly keep pace with the procession.

The most powerful and important delegate to the disarmament conference arrived a few days ago—the dead body of an unknown soldier—one of those countless thousands whose names disappeared with their bodies as they went down in the recent contest for the military and naval supremacy of the world.

President Harding had to have an amplifier, radio service, telegraph and telephone wires to make his voice heard throughout the country; but this delegate of delegates needed no assistance to carry the voiceless eloquence of his silent protest against war and militarism throughout the length and breadth of the land, and to find a responsive chord at the fireside of every American home.

He was accompanied by the world's greatest interpreter, the sorrowing figure of a widowed war mother who had lost a husband and three stalwart sons in the recent conflict and who had come 3,000 miles to place a wreath upon his bier. If there were those who could not appreciate his appeal, or who did not realize the sacrifice he made, they could not have failed to understand it when they looked upon her withered form and saw his message translated into the terms of a mother's sacrifice, a mother's love.

He was given a great reception, such as no king, prince, or potentate has ever received. The procession down Pennsylvania Avenue surpassed all description, and the floral tributes, coming from every quarter of the globe, have possibly never been equaled in the history of the world. More than 50,000 people bowed in reverence as he was consigned to his resting place of vantage in Arlington Cemetery, overlooking the city of Washington, which, for the time being, is the Capital of the world.

I witnessed the opening of the disarmament conference, and I must say that it was one of the most impressive spectacles of all times. In the words of Irvin Cobb, I had a reserved seat at the greatest show on earth.

Before me, seated around the conference table, were the chosen representatives of the leading nations of the earth, while back of them sat the foreign diplomats, heads of the various armies and navies, other high-ranking officials and visiting dignitaries without number. The delegates proper were all dressed alike, or nearly alike, except the one from British India. He wore a white turban on his head, which together with his long cloak, gave him the appearance of some Biblical character. The galleries were packed with Senators, Congressmen, and other American officials. The stage was set for action, and action of the most far-reaching character was not long delayed.

It was announced that French and English would both be the official languages of the conference. In the hollow square surrounded by the conference table, a French stenographer took down everything that was said. If a man spoke in English, he rapidly translated it into French and repeated it to the French delegates in their own language; if one spoke in French, he recorded it in French, translated, and repeated it to the rest of the delegates in English. He is a wonder. All the delegates spoke in English, or tried to, except the French, and this marvelous man took down their rapidly spoken and badly broken English and translated it into French with the greatest ease and rapidity.

After the opening prayer and the President's welcome address, Secretary Hughes was nominated for chairman by Mr. Balfour and elected without opposition. He arose and proceeded to thrill the world with a program for a reduction of armaments, which, if carried out, will lift hundreds of millions of dollars in yearly taxes from the shoulders of the American people, as well as from those of every other country involved. If there

had ever been any doubt as to how the American Congress stood on this proposition, it was certainly dispelled when Mr. Hughes laid down his proposition. With one spontaneous accord every Senator and every Congressman present leaped to his feet—as did diplomats, generals, admirals, visitors, and reporters—and made that great auditorium ring and resound with unbounded enthusiasm.

Secretary Hughes did not take time to argue the case but confined himself largely to the statement of a concrete proposition, which promises to mark the turning point in the history of the world.

He did not need to argue. That had already been done by the silent delegates at Arlington, whose mute but thrilling message had touched the hearts and awakened the conscience of a war-torn civilization. His appeal had been heard at last, and by it he had possibly ushered in a new day, when war between civilized nations shall cease, at least for years to come, when the great burden of taxation which war and armaments entail shall be lifted from the masses of the world, when Christianity shall take on new life and civilization be given a new birth.

The Executioner Again at Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Thursday, November 8, there appeared in the Old House caucus room, several hundred retail automobile dealers from all over the country, protesting the threatened issuance of an order which would compel them to pay more for every car purchased of a manufacturer, but to sell at the same old price to every purchaser.

The proposed order, in its purpose and effect, is similar to many previous OPA orders which have aided in the liquidation—execution—of so many small businessmen during the past few years. The number of small businessmen, as estimated by Henry Wallace, who have been put out of business exceeds a half million.

These automobile dealers, many from the smaller towns and cities, see in this order the end—the bankruptcy—of the businesses which they have spent a lifetime in establishing. They see the end of the business which for many years gave them a livelihood, the only business they have. During the war, they willingly suspended business. They cooperated wholeheartedly with the Government. They obeyed every rule and regulation which they were told by the administration would aid in the war effort.

The fighting on the battlefield is over. They cannot understand why their Government should continue to fight them; make it impossible for them to give employment to others; put into the hands of their customers, who are waiting to buy, automobiles, trucks and farm machinery—all so greatly needed.

And so they came to Washington, representing hundreds of thousands of mechanics, clerks, bookkeepers and businessmen, who depend for a livelihood upon the retail automobile dealers. Some of them are amazed; some are confused; some are bewildered, that such an order, so destructive in its effect, can be even contemplated—much less issued—by an administration to which they are forced to look for protection; which they support.

At the invitation of the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, they made their protests to the committee of which he is chairman, little realizing that the gentleman has been the staunch friend, supporter, and advocate of the OPA. They might just as well have appealed to Harry Hopkins or to Chester Bowles.

Undressed, OPA's proposed regulation is just another order which, in effect, will deprive businessmen and industrialists of an opportunity to make a profit, to continue in business. This time the order catches the retail automobile dealers, as others heretofore have caught many another small businessman. It is a shifty scheme to get the 30-percent increase in wages now demanded of automobile manufacturers paid, not by the manufacturers, but by the retail dealers out of profits which it is thought they may make.

Automobile workers demand that their wages, while making cars, be increased 30 percent, but Reuther, their representative, insists that the added cost shall not be included in the price of the car. The manufacturers say they cannot pay it. So this is an attempt to pass it along to the dealer.

Some day there must be a test of the proposition that taxes, wages, materials and insurance can be increased, but that, when the sum total is added, it will be no more than a previous price based upon lower costs. Secretary of Commerce Wallace and his associates, including some labor politicians, insist that two plus two plus one do not make five; still make four.

What will happen if General Motors, Ford and other manufacturers quit making cars; if dealers, because of this order, refuse to handle cars, because they cannot sell for less than they buy; just go out of business? Will we have more or fewer jobs in this country?

The OPA, the New Dealers, the CIO and the Communists, although there may be no connection between them, all advocate a course which in the end will destroy private business, lead to Government control, not only of business, but the American worker, who apparently does not see what is at the end of the road down which he is being led.

Will Congress make its bad boy, OPA, behave?

Full-Employment Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, November 8, I addressed this House on H. R. 2202, the so-called full-employment bill. On last Friday, November 9, there appeared in the New York Times an editorial titled "For a Full-Employment Study." This editorial should be read by each Member of this House, and I therefore insert it herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FOR A FULL EMPLOYMENT STUDY

After 7 weeks of testimony, the House Expenditures Committee has closed its hearings on full-employment legislation by appointing a subcommittee of five, which the chairman hopes will draft some sort of compromise measure.

No sound full-employment legislation is likely to be drafted unless we know precisely what causes unemployment and how the private-enterprise system works. The policies that are necessary to assure full employment in a genuinely free society are the same policies that would assure a stable and expanding economy and the maximum possible production. It is highly unlikely that all these policies could be embodied in a single new bill. The achievement of many of them, in fact, would require the repeal of a great deal of legislation that is already on the books.

Even if we assume that the House subcommittee could draft a satisfactory bill and have it passed in the same form by the House, that bill would have to go into conference with the measure already passed by the Senate. The Senate measure is a highly unsound proposal. Notwithsanding its amendments and supposed safeguards, it rests at bottom on the assumption that full employment is to be chiefly attained by increased Government spending, deficit financing, and added doses of inflation. While the measure pays lip service to the private enterprise system, it rests on a basic distrust of that system and embodies policies that would seriously undermine that system. The Senate conferees would probably insist that at least part of these Murray bill policies should be embodied in the compromise bill. If that occurred, the final bill could not be a sound one.

Nothing would be achieved, on the other hand, by any empty declaration. President Truman remarked in his letter to JOHN H. MCCORMACK, the House majority leader, a few days ago: "It is time that the people be reassured by the Congress that the Government stands for full employment, full production and prosperity, not unemployment and relief." If a resolution were drafted simply making this declaration, it could perhaps be passed unanimously. But such a resolution would hardly carr us very far. It would be the equivalent of saying that Congress was for virtue and against sin. The American people are probably willing to assume that Congress is for full employment, full production and prosperity, without any formal declaration to that effect.

The real problem concerns the most appropriate means by which these important aims are to be achieved. About these most appropriate means and methods there has been the greatest variety of opinion. President Truman took a real step forward when he wrote to Representative MCCORMACK that he was not insisting on "any specific bill" but merely on "the general purposes and principles of full employment legislation." This leaves it to Congress itself to decide the proper means.

But this puts upon Congress the task of determining precisely what the most appropriate means are to obtain full employment. Congress must admit in all candor that it does not know the answer at the present time. The most promising way to obtain that answer would be to appoint a temporary commission of outstanding and impartial economists, not selected in such a way that their answer was practically known in advance, to study this great problem.

It would probably be wiser to call this a commission on full employment and full production than a commission on full employment alone. In any case, Congress should make clear in its instructions to such a commission that it wanted it to study the question in its most comprehensive aspect, and to propose the policies that would be most likely to insure the maximum of production and full employment, under a system of private enterprise and economic liberty, and without resort to inflation. Such a committee should be free to state not only what new laws might be necessary to put the recommended policies into effect, but also what old laws might have to be amended or repealed to make these economic policies effective.

If a procedure like this were followed, the subject of full employment would be taken out of the more heated areas of politics and given over to the more important and scientific study of facts and principles that is now so urgently necessary.

Communism Spreads in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the following item from the Redford Record ought to arouse every citizen in our fair land to be on guard against the enemies of his country. It is time to be afraid. Will we be destroyed from within? Communism is slavery.

DETROIT RED GROUPS NOW OUTNUMBER SERVICE CLUBS

It will probably come as a surprise to most members of service and luncheon clubs to know that there are more Communist organizations in the Detroit area than there are Rotarian clubs or Exchange clubs or Kiwanis clubs or Lions clubs in each case.

Not counting the insurance-front organization known as the International Workers' Order, of which there are many clubs scattered throughout the city, particularly in areas housing residents from middle Europe, there are dues-paying and money-raising organizations in behalf of Joe Stalin active on the entire Detroit political, labor-union, and social-penetration front.

This was again evidenced Tuesday evening, October 23, when the twenty-sixth anniversary of Communists in America was celebrated at the Book Cadillac, where a packed meeting heard the Red "fuehrer" of America, William Z. Foster, deliver the new party line. This new party line involves continued worming into labor unions, into educational and social organizations, as well as doing a frontal attack politically through the Communist Party.

The best way to give an index of the more active Communist organizations, not counting those such as the Lawyers Guild, the American Polish Democratic Committee, the Slav Congress, the NAACP, Friends of Soviet Russia, and a dozen more, and not counting the International Workers Order chapters, the following paid in money at the Tuesday night meeting, to Phil Raymond, Michigan, treasurer of the Communist Party, who announced:

Michigan Communist Club	$100.00
Russians	100.00
Oakland Club	100.00
Croatian Group	205.00
Hungarians	105.00
Twelfth Street Club	$150.00
South Dexter Club	100.00
Dearborn Communist Club	150.00
Polish Communists	100.00
Rumanians	100.00
Fenkell Communist Club	50.00
North Dexter Club	100.00
McGraw Club	46.00
Midtown Communist Club	75.00
14th Congressional Club	55.00
Hellenic-American Fraternal Society—IWO	75.00
Armenians	100.00
Hamtramck Communist Club	75.00
Ben Davis Club	50.00
Russian Organizations	280.00
Downtown Communist Club	47.00
Grand Rapids Communist Club	25.00
Bulgarians, etc	25.00
Southfield Club	25.00
Serbian Club	37.50
Uptown Communist Club	25.00
Bohn Aluminum Club	15.00
A Friend	10.00
Ukranians	35.00
Finnish Group	11.00
Ford Club (wait until next year)	13.00
Nat Turner Club	12.50
Professional Club of the Communist Party (plus $400 pledge)	50.00

What Fate for Lithuanian Refugees and Deportees?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania is now living under the third foreign occupation to be forced upon her since the beginning of the Second World War. Each of these occupations has resulted in the uprooting of thousands of Lithuanians from their homeland.

On January 10, 1941, Soviet Russia signed an agreement with Germany concerning the repatriation of Germans from Soviet-occupied Lithuania. Under that agreement, 52,600 persons of allegedly German origin were transferred from Lithuania into Germany. Official German sources had never claimed the existence of more than 30,000 persons of German origin in Lithuania. Actually more than half of the repatriates were persons of pure Lithuanian stock who sought by this means to escape the Bolshevik terror. Concerning this repatriation, see Current News on the Lithuanian Situation, No. 10 (22) of 1942.

Tens of thousands of Lithuanians were deported to Asiatic Russia by the Russians in 1940–41. Up to the present, the Soviets have not allowed any organized assistance to be extended to these deportees by Lithuanian charity or religious groups in the United States, or by any international organization. It is presumed that most of the deportees have already perished in the Siberian wastelands.

The 3-year German occupation—1941–44—resulted to a particularly great extent in the displacement and annihilation of Lithuania's population. The Germans forcibly mobilized Lithuanian youth into their armed forces, and recruited them for slave labor in Germany. The number of persons rounded up for slave labor alone exceeded 100,000. Due to the Germans' barbarous extermination policies, only about 30 percent of Lithuania's Jews survived.

When in the summer of 1944 Soviet troops again approached Lithuania's borders, the Germans intensified their policy of forced evacuation. At the same time, large numbers of Lithuanians, fearing the much-dreaded Soviet political police—NKVD—sought to leave Lithuania and to escape abroad. The only path open to the majority was escape to Germany, where slave labor and starvation awaited them. Others attempted the perilous journey to Sweden. However, since both the Germans and the Russians did all they could to prevent the escape of refugees to Sweden, even shooting at the boats and sinking them, many perished on the way, and only about 300 persons were successful in reaching Swedish shores. These refugees are termed "enemies of the people" or "Fascists" by the Soviets simply because they stand for an independent and truly democratic Lithuania, and cannot endure a totalitarian order. The refugees from Lithuania in Sweden represent nearly all walks of life as may be seen from the following table:

	Percent
Fishermen	11.7
Unskilled laborers	6.5
Shoemakers, bakers, locksmiths, etc	8.9
Housewives	14.5
Office workers	13.9
Students	17.6
Small shopkeepers and retailers	5.6
Professionals (doctors, dentists, engineers, lawyers)	4.9
Children under 7 years of age	8.6
Unclassified	7.7

Swedish press dispatches indicate that Soviet officials are trying to induce Lithuanian refugees in Sweden to return to Lithuania. So far not a single one has shown any desire to do so, so long as the Soviets remain in occupation. There are also several hundred such refugees in France. Ominous news from that country indicates that some Lithuanian refugees there were turned over to the Soviet authorities against their will and are being deported to Siberia or "repatriated" to Lithuania where reprisals, if not liquidation, await them.

The plight of the hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians in Germany is desperate. No exact figures are available, but it is estimated that about 300,000 Lithuanian refugees and evacuees were in Germany at the time of her collapse. What will happen to these people, especially those in areas under the Soviet occupation? It is said that Soviet officials are rounding up all such Lithuanians as "Soviet citizens" and sending them eastward. It is reported that about 50,000 were rounded up in East Prussia. There are grounds for fears that many innocent people will be labeled "pro-Nazis" and doomed to liquidation. It is to be hoped that the Lithuanian citizenship of Lithuanians in areas under American-British occupation will be honored and that "repatriation" against their will to Soviet-occupied Lithuania will not take

place. A Lithuanian Citizens' Association has been formed in Wurzburg, Germany, to assist allied commanders in caring properly for all Lithuanians who are the unfortunate victims of Nazi war and aggression.

It is reported that 83,000 Lithuanians were recently deported from the eastern regions of Lithuania to the Soviet Union for slave labor. The tragic situation of Lithuanian deportees and refugees is causing the greatest uneasiness, not only to those directly concerned, but also among Lithuanian-Americans in the United States who fear for relatives and friends.

Peacetime Conscription: The Promise Is Security—the Record Is Disaster—Ambitious Leaders Involve Nations in War to Perpetuate Their Power and Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, compulsory peacetime military training would constitute the most far-reaching permanent surrender of individual freedom in the history of America. This sober fact measures the significance of the proposal. In the absence of a clear expression by the people, it should also serve as a solemn warning to Members of Congress.

Because, if Congress passes a conscription law, regardless of the form it takes, Congress will be delivering America into a system of militarism that has brought to ruin every major nation using it. That is the record of the history books.

The need for adequate preparedness, military security, and national safety generally are not debatable. These aims are the common goal. The issue here is: Will conscription give us the safety its sponsors claim for it? Will conscription save us from being attacked or assure us of victory in case of attack? These are the practical questions involved. In short, will it work?

Fortunately, this proposal can be appraised and evaluated by facts instead of theory and argument. Complete factual data is available to guide us to sound conclusions.

FRANCE WAS FIRST VICTIM

The first modern major country in which conscription became a national policy, was France, where it was initiated in 1792. After a few exciting years of conquest under Napoleon, France suffered overwhelming defeat at Waterloo. Conscription was dropped, but was revived in 1848 by Napoleon III. It prevailed in France before World War I and World War II. Never has it prevented France from being attacked. Never did it provide France with the defense necessary for safety. France, saddled with conscription, has become one of the weak, second-rate powers of the world.

In Germany conscription was started in 1814 as a defensive measure. What happened? Germany's tragic cycle of militarism began. Here again conscription sprouted the same fruits as in France. First came militarism, then imperialistic conquests, and then defeat and disaster.

What was the record in Japan? Japan adopted peacetime conscription in 1873. Again came the telltale sequence of militarism, imperialistic conquest, and then defeat and disaster.

The fourth victim of conscription was Italy. The people of Italy have always been unusually peace-loving, but when Italy adopted conscription it had taken the irreversible step toward destruction. First came costly militarism, then imperialistic conquests, and then defeat and disaster.

The foregoing summarizes the record in every major nation using peacetime conscription as a national policy. Perhaps some mention should be made of Russia, although the revolution in Russia prevents a completely valid comparison from being attempted. However, the record there also is clear. Conscription under the czar never kept them from being attacked, nor saved them from defeat. Similar comment applies to communistic Russia. Conscription did not prevent them from being attacked by Hitler in 1941. Moreover, they were at the point of unlimited disaster when supplies from the two nonpeacetime conscription lands, England and the United States, saved them.

PEOPLE ARE PEACE-LOVING

Was the disaster in these conscript nations brought about because the people were militaristic? Or was it because peacetime conscription carried in it the seeds of destruction? The history of these nations offers sobering testimony that conscription brings about this sequence automatically: First, militarism; second, imperialistic conquest; third, defeat and disaster.

A closer study of developments in conscript nations reveals the factors inherent in compulsory peacetime training that make it a certain road to defeat and desolation.

What is the pattern of these factors? Obviously, each nation adopts compulsory training for purposes of national defense. In doing so, they authorize a military organization to train the masses of conscripts. It is at this stage in conscription that the fatal weaknesses automatically develop.

The first action of the compulsory military set-up is to respond to nature's first law—self-preservation. This brings about expansion, or in military terminology—empire building. In this respect the military are not unlike other governmental bureaus or a private business. They know that more activity means more pay, more generals, and more position-security for those at the top.

So, those in charge of conscription, like any businessman or bureaucrat, vigorously plan both to entrench and expand their organization. The next steps follow automatically. The first move toward expansion is to excite the fears of the people. Accordingly, carefully prepared tales about the dangers of sudden attack from a possible enemy nation are circulated in every conceivable way.

In Japan, the military authorities indoctrinated conscripts with the imaginary danger of attack by the United States, and justified it by this argument:

> To make a good soldier, there must always be an immediate enemy. He must be led to believe that this enemy may strike today. He must be convinced that the enemy is prepared to annihilate our country at the first opportunity.

Then activities of the military expand, either by extending time service for conscription or in other ways. With this increase, the military costs mount. In prosperous years this load is endured by the people with some grumbling. Then come years of depression. Soon the people demand relief from the impoverishing burden of armaments and conscription. What happens?

OPPOSITION SUPPRESSED BY WAR

The leaders are confronted by an economy-minded people demanding drastic cut-backs in military expenditures and the carefully built-up empires of personal power. Unlike ordinary governmental bureaucracy, however, at this point the military chiefs have an ace up their sleeve. A method is available for refusing retrenchment and evading the loss of face and demotions involved in reduced establishments. That method is to arrange the incidents that bring about a full-fledged war.

This pattern of events has happened again and again. For the military chiefs the declaration of war not only suppresses criticism and protects their power but also has other seductive charms, including rapid promotion, prestige, glamour, and publicity—all dazzling prizes of war for military officers. With or without the collaboration of civilian officials, this has been the record in Germany, Italy, France, and Japan.

Mr. Speaker, if the Congress of the United States gives up the freedom of the people and delivers them into military conscription, it will surely happen here.

A specific example is Japan. In 1931, the civilian government in Japan was being urged by the people to reduce the heavy burden of military expenditures. In the world depression the military costs were becoming unbearable. How did the military respond? They started a war in Manchuria. That stopped all public criticism and effectively suppressed civilian opposition from the Japanese Diet.

Has every war provoked by a nation using conscription since Napoleon's ambitious conquests been generated in similar fashion? Without vouching for the exact pattern in every instance, careful study reveals it with sobering regularity. Despite the cunning efforts made by war-creators to hide their tracks, the pattern is usually discernible. The record is so parallel, in these nations of diverse national characteristics, that this conclusion seems inescapable:

Wherever the rulers of a major nation have established conscription, the people have been marched into militarism, imperialistic conquest, defeat, and disaster.

PROMOTERS FLATTER US

Against this record in other lands, the advocates of conscription in America declare with patriotic fervor that we are different. The promoters of conscription claim that America will not be subject to the cycle of militarism, conquest, disaster, that has resulted elsewhere. They claim that the United States is not militarily ambitious; that we have no imperialistic schemes; and that the rest of the world does not need to fear us.

They know such statements appeal to the people, because the people are honestly peace-loving. But the people of other lands are also peace-loving. Certainly that is true of the Italian people, who are perhaps more peace-loving than almost any other. The fallacy in this argument is that the people do not start the wars—nor are they able in a conscript nation to prevent the leaders from involving them in war.

No, Mr. Speaker, conscription is not the way to national security for America. The genuine road to national safety is a thoroughly modern army and navy, equipped with the latest technical and scientific weapons, plus an efficient air force, personnel for all of which can be secured by adequate military pay schedules. Beyond the foregoing, an invigorated ROTC, CMTC, and National Guard in the several States can furnish specialized training for reserve forces.

END WAR BY NOT SUPPLYING AGGRESSORS

Beyond our own defensive preparations, however, the effective way for the United States to discourage war lies in another direction. It is for the United States to stop supplying the armaments for war to the rest of the world.

Without financial and material aid from the United States and England neither Germany nor Japan would have started World War II. Ambitious politicians in our Government and England, combined with selfish commercial interests, provided Hitler and Tojo with their arsenals of war.

Mr. Speaker, many contend that conscription fails because it undermines the home, church, and school. However, I have simply outlined the cold practical facts against it—that it produces not security but disaster. The people sense this truth. But the people have neither radio networks, nor newspaper chains to express their beliefs.

THE PEOPLE PAY—LET THE PEOPLE DECIDE

The promoters of conscription, both public and secret, have tremendous facilities for propagandizing purposes. The military clique is well organized. It is getting cunning support from imperialistic quarters. More powerful than either of these in the New Deal political machine. It must keep America in fear and hysteria to conceal the continuing regimentation, inflation, and governmental corruption. Against this spiritual wickedness in high places, the humble American, who bears the heartache and broken home of Army service, has little chance—unless this Congress will protect him.

Accordingly, I make this plea to the sincere advocates of this proposal who, I know, want to be fair with the people. This decision should be made by the people. It is their future and their children's destiny that are at stake.

If mistakes are made in our national policy, it is the people who pay for these failures—in blood, tears, and treasure. So the people should have the deciding voice on this proposal—either through its consideration by means of a constitutional amendment, or by making it an issue in the next general election. Certainly with 12,000,000 men now trained, sufficient time is available to make this decision in an orderly way.

Unless the administration is willing for the people to determine this issue, then it seems clear that it does not trust the people. That would be a tragic sequel to the sacrifices by the American people in the conflict just ended.

Mr. Speaker, the advocates of conscription claim to be practical and cool-minded realists. Yet by the practical test and the vaunted realistic approach, peacetime conscription is a sickening failure.

America's national security can only be preserved by a free, strong, and productive people. Let Congress, by defeating this scheme, reaffirm its faith in America's destiny as "the land of the free and the home of the brave."

Our Right to Know About UNRRA Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call attention herewith to an editorial appearing in a recent issue of the Daily Argus-Leader, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak. It is especially pertinent in view of current congressional interest in UNRRA appropriations, UNRRA activities, and UNRRA ambitions:

OUR RIGHT TO KNOW ABOUT UNRRA MONEY

If a man gives another some money as a matter of charity, he is usually interested in knowing how it is expended.

This explains why charitable organizations customarily provide full and complete reports of their activities. The donors have a right to be assured that their money is being spent for the proper purpose and that waste is kept at a minimum.

So it is that we as a nation are concerned about the expenditures of UNRRA. It is our money—the money of the American taxpayers—that is financing the UNRRA operations and we'd like to know how it is being spent.

This is the reason why the House of Representatives inserted in the $550,000,000 appropriation for UNRRA a clause requiring that American newsmen be permitted to visit the countries receiving the assistance and to describe the expenditures without censorship.

Stimulating action by the House was the realization that some UNRRA resources already had been employed in ways sharply contrary to the spirit and the purpose of the fund.

No one can question our right to obtain this information through our own sources. Surely no one expects us to hand over $10,000,000, $15,000,000, or $20,000,000 to some foreign group and receive in return only the group's assurance that the money was wisely spent.

We would be naive, indeed, to assume that all such intermediaries would absorb and be directed by our restrictions on the fund unless some system of checking were maintained.

The Argus-Leader sympathizes with the viewpoint that starving people should not be denied assistance because their overlords are too secretive. But if we do not make some requirement, how will we know that the starving people are the beneficiaries instead of the overlords? We are asking no country to change its form of government for this purpose. We are merely seeking the normal right to ascertain for ourselves how our money is being spent.

Lithuanian Refugees and Deportees in Western Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, among the prisoners liberated from the dread Dachau concentration camp after the Allied victory were about 30 Lithuanians who were found in the most deplorable condition. The Lithuanian-American press carried an account of an interview with the Reverend Jurgis Parancevicius, of Vistytis—Vilkaviskis diocese—a Lithunian priest who survived 46 months of imprisonment in Dachau, where he was sent because he opposed Nazi efforts to mobilize the Lithuanian youth into SS units. According to Rev. Parancevicius, the brutalities and horrors suffered by the prisoners are beyond description. Other Lithuanian priests and pastors imprisoned in that same camp were Vytautas Pikturna, of Kaunas; Stanislovas Puida, formerly of Seta and Nasielsk; Antanas Giedgaudas, formerly of Vevirzenai and Ratnycia; and Siegfried Loppe, of the city of Vilnius.

Erdmonas Simonaitis, a well-known Lithuanian of the Klaipeda region, was also imprisoned in Dachau. Simonaitis, the first president of the directorate of the autonomous Klaipeda territory, fled to Greater Lithuania after Hitler's annexation of Klaipeda in 1939. Simonaitis was arrested by the Gestapo in 1941, and before his transfer to Dachau, spent many months in the concentration camp of Hauthausen.

The Rev. M. Krupavicius, an outstanding leader of the Christian Democrat Party in Lithuania whose name is associated with the Lithuanian agrarian reforms, reported in a recent letter to his sister in this country that he had been released by the western Allies from the

Regensburg concentration camp. He was deported by the Nazis in 1942 because, together with Dr. K. Grinius, former President of Lithuania, and Professor Aleksa, he had protested against the Nazi disregard of Lithuania's sovereign rights. After about a year's imprisonment in Eastern Prussia, the Rev. Krupavicius was moved to Regensburg.

About 250 of the 1,600 Roman Catholic priests of Lithuania are now living in exile in western Germany. Under the Soviet occupation 18 priests were imprisoned, 15 were executed, and 10 were deported to Siberia. One such deportee, a priest who was formerly a visitor to this country, is now in western Europe. He managed to survive the death march to Cherven, near Minsk, in June 1941, and describes his experiences in a letter recently published in the Lithuanian-American press. During his imprisonment this priest was cruelly tortured and underwent cross-examinations, averaging 8 hours each, 42 times. After his escape from the NKVD executioners he hid for a week in the swamps, and finally managed to make his way to Kaunas through the Nazi-Soviet battle lines. The sufferings of the prisoners on the march to Cherven have been vividly described in the memoirs of Col. J. Petruitis, whose story was recently published in English translation under the title "Lithuania Under the Sickle and Hammer."

The following Lithuanian victims of the Nazis are known to have been buried in the cemetery at Rottenburg, Germany: Jonas Sitkovicius, Motiejus Simerlaitis, Vincas Milkovicious, and one Malinauskas.

Soviet agents are at large in many localities where there are groups of Lithuanians, urging them to return home, and the Soviet Union continues to press for the forced repatriation of Baltic refugees. However, the citizens of Lithuania as well as the other Baltic countries overwhelmingly oppose return to the Soviet-occupied homelands. For example, only 3 of the 460 Lithuanian refugees at Celle, Hanover, chose to return, despite propaganda repeatedly disseminated by Soviet agents.

The New York Herald Tribune of September 9, 1945, commented on the situation:

> It was learned that the Russian Government is pressing for help from the western Allies not only in forcing the repatriation of Russians who do not wish to return, but also the return of 65,300 Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians who are in the American zone of occupation.
>
> The Russians say that these Baltic peoples are Soviet citizens, by virtue of the 1940 annexation, and as such they come under the Yalta agreement.
>
> Although responsible officials at Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower's headquarters here refused to comment on this delicate situation, it was learned from other sources that the United States is unwilling to concede Russian nationality of citizens of the Baltic States and will tell the Russians so in response to their newest demand.

According to the same source, the British and the American occupation forces in Germany are extremely unwilling to participate in forced repatriation to Soviet-occupied territory. The paper says that the situation is coming to a point where blood may be shed in skirmishes with unwilling repatriates.

The tenth meeting of the UNRRA Council in London, held in August 1945, passed a resolution approving UNRRA assistance to displaced persons forced to leave their homelands due to racial, religious, or political persecution, until some time as they shall have returned to their homes. This policy will stand for at least the next 6 months, until the following UNRRA meeting.

Up to the middle of September 1945, about one-third of the Lithuanian refugees in Germany were living outside the camps installed for displaced persons by UNRRA. Lithuanians housed elsewhere were receiving, up to the end of August, cards entitling each person to food averaging 2,000 calories a day. In some cases, however, they had to subsist on rations of from 1,000 to 1,200 calories, which is the amount allowed for the Germans. In regard to the rations allotted to displaced persons, the New York Times of October 11, 1945, carried a dispatch from which we quote:

> SHOWS DISPLACED ARE NOW WELL FED
>
> The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration issued a statement on their diet today.
>
> The minimum ration for displaced persons is 2,300 calories, as compared with 1,300 for the normal German ration, this report said. The displaced persons will eat white bread baked from flour obtained from the military government, whereas the German civilian population will have dark breads made from mixed domestic flours.
>
> Displaced persons also have priority over German civilians on German-grown potatoes and "on fresh fruits and vegetables when available," but very little will be available. The DP ration also includes butter and other fats, sugar, tea, and coffee which may disappear from civilian German stocks this winter.
>
> Children of former slave laborers will this winter have milk rations whether or not milk may be available to the previously favored children of Germany.

It is estimated that almost one-third of the Lithuanians have been separated from their families. Consequently, many of them are constantly moving from one locality to another, seeking their parents, wives, husbands, or children.

Lithuanian refugees in Lubeck handed over to the appropriate Allied authorities a notorious Nazi war criminal named Richard Schneizer. A high official of the German security organization in Lithuania, Schneizer was known for the many atrocities he had committed against Lithuanian patriots. He was found in possession of several falsified Lithuanian passports.

British occupation authorities have arrested two Nazi officials who are well known in Lithuania: Heinrich Lohse, former Reichskommisar for Eastern Territories (Ostland); and Otto Drechsler, former SA Brigadenfuehrer and Kommissar for Latvia.

In the Scottish-Lithuanian weekly Iseiviu Draugas (Emigrants' Friend), a Lithuanian serving in the British Army gave an account of his meeting with Lithuanian refugees in Blomberg, near Herford, Germany. He describes the installation ceremonies of the new Lithuanian camp established there on August 5, 1945, which began with the raising of the Lithuanian tricolor. Lithuanian Boy Scouts and girls in national dress participated. The program included religious services during which the officiating priest led the congregation in an impressive prayer, "Lord, give us back our country."

Lithuanian-American papers described the religious services organized by Lithuanian refugees in the Austrian Tyrol in commemoration of those Lithuanians who were deported by the thousands to Siberia by the Soviets in 1940–41. Mass was held in Innsbruck on June 17, 1945. The Reverend Gureckas, president of the local Lithuanian association, delivered the sermon in which he exhorted his listeners to pray for those who had perished and to implore the Almighty to protect those who still survive.

Lithuanian refugees in Yverdon, Switzerland, numbering about 300 persons, participated in the commemoration ceremonies held on the Swiss national holiday, August 1, 1945. Dressed in Lithuanian costume and carrying the Lithuanian flag, they marched in the traditional parade. The Lithuanian program, consisting of music and folk songs, was attended by local Swiss officials and by representatives of Lithuanians residing in Switzerland.

Among the refugees in Switzerland are several university students (Lithuania), 17 of whom are continuing their studies in Zurich at the Ecole Polytechnique Federale and in various schools of the university.

The Lithuanian colony in Rome expressed happiness in the Allied victory against the Axis in a letter to Gen. Mark W. Clark, commander of the American Fifth Army. We quote in part:

> In our quality of faithful sons of the Lithuanian Nation, which has repeatedly suffered cruel violations of her right and her will to be independent and who still continues a dangerous clandestine struggle against the invaders, we realize that the triumphant entry into Rome is a gage of the approaching liberation of all oppressed nations suffering alien domination.
>
> Unanimous with the people of Lithuania and with many hundreds of thousands of the United States citizens of Lithuanian extraction, we firmly believe that victory of arms as well as of ideals will restore the independence of the Republic of Lithuania which was one of the first states of Europe daring to take a position against the oppressive goals of the Nazi Reich.

Archbishop J. Skvireckas, of Kaunas, according to the latest reports, has completed his journey from American-occupied Germany to Rome. He carries with him a petition signed by thousands of Lithuanian refugees in Allied-occupied western Germany addressed to His Holiness Pope Pius XII.

According to reliable sources, the British Red Cross is sending assistance to Baltic refugees. Shipments have already gone forward to Copenhagen, Lubeck, and Paris. The committee for the assistance of Baltic refugees, headed by

the Duchess of Atholl, is located in London.

Of the group of Lithuanian war refugees in France, more than 50 men are known to have voluntarily enlisted in the French Foreign Legion.

The People Not To Blame for Pearl Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, certainly the President was in error in assessing the responsibility for the debacle at Pearl Harbor. Where were the Secretaries of War and Navy, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, foregathered that fatal night and morning of December 6–7, 1941? With whom were they conferring while war clouds gathered and watchdogs slumbered? I would like to know; the country would like to know.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of November 9, 1945:

THE TRUTH AT LAST

The horrible truth of the Pearl Harbor catastrophe is now known. President Roosevelt and his administration invited the Japanese attack. They had been told when it was coming and where it would come. They deliberately withheld adequate warning from the Hawaiian commanders, Admiral Kimmel and General Short. They permitted our battleships in Pearl Harbor to be sunk and our war planes on the airfields of Hawaii to be destroyed. They sacrificed the lives of 3,000 Americans. All this they did to have war.

The cost they exacted at Pearl Harbor to achieve their ambition was only the beginning. By the end of the war 262,000 Americans were dead. More than three-quarters of a million others were maimed or left broken in mind. More than a third of a trillion dollars was spent on destruction. The future of America is mortgaged.

The facts disclosed in Congress by Representatives KEEFE and GEARHART and Senator BREWSTER have finally shattered a secrecy which was maintained for 3 years and 11 months by Mr. Roosevelt and his successor, using every unfair means at their disposal. The facts are as unanswerable as they are shocking. The defendants are no longer Kimmel and Short. They are Mr. Roosevelt; his Secretary of State, Cordell Hull; his Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson; and his Secretary of the Navy, Frank Knox.

The present Secretaries of War and Navy, Robert P. Patterson and James Forrestal, are faced with the necessity of proving that they did not share the guilty knowledge. The Army Chief of Staff, General Marshall, and the former Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Stark, are in highly suspicious positions. They should come very clean if they are to save themselves from the general condemnation.

It is now disclosed that we had cracked the Japanese code by November 5, 1941, a month and 2 days before the Pearl Harbor attack. From then until the day of slaughter Mr. Roosevelt's government knew everything the Japs were saying among themselves, every intention they had, every action they planned. All of this vital intelligence was, as Representative GEARHART says, "purposefully withheld" from Kimmel and Short.

The texts of the intercepted and decoded Jap messages remove the last doubt that Mr. Roosevelt and his inner circle knew positively that the "surprise" blow—no surprise to them—would fall on Pearl Harbor. On November 5 Tokyo notified its diplomatic corps abroad that war with the United States would be announced by the phrase "East Wind Rain" in a false radio weather report. On December 5, 2 days before the attack at Oahu, Washington heard these fatal words. No word went to Hawaii.

A whole series of intercepted messages, hitherto classified "top secret" to keep them from the knowledge of Congress and the people, all pointed unmistakably to war. By December 5 the Roosevelt government knew war was an actuality, despite the absence of a declaration. The only question left was where the attack would come. Three pieces of code information left no doubt even as to that.

The first was a message radioed November 18 to Tokyo by Nagao Kita, Japanese consul general and director of Jap espionage in Honolulu. It brought Tokyo up to date on the identity of American warships in Pearl Harbor and gave the course of eight destroyers leaving the harbor. On November 29 came the clincher. Tokyo radioed Honolulu: "We have been receiving reports from you on ship movements, but in the future will you also report even when there are no movements."

Tokyo was not concerned about warships in harbor at Hong Kong, Singapore, Soerabaja, or San Diego. It wanted to know what was at Pearl Harbor. It said, in so many words, that its principal interest was in the ships remaining tied up in harbor. What could that mean except that it wanted the knowledge that they were staying in Pearl Harbor because it intended to attack them in Pearl Harbor?

Washington says this message was not decoded for a week after receipt, that is, on December 5, the same day as the "East Wind Rain" war warning, and 2 days before the attack. There was ample time to have warned Kimmel and Short, but they were not warned.

The final, conclusive evidence that the attack was intended to take place at Pearl Harbor, and no place else, came in the early hours of December 7. It was the "give-away" message from Japan setting the hour for the attack through instructions radioed the Japanese envoys in Washington to present their reply to Secretary Hull's ultimatum of November 26 at 1 p. m. Washington time the same day—sunrise in Hawaii—the time for surprise air attack.

Lieutenant Commander Kramer, on duty in the Navy Department, handed Secretary Knox a memorandum pointing out this fact of transcendent importance at least 3 hours before the bombs fell. Everybody stalled. Finally, an hour and seven minutes before the attack in Hawaii, General Marshall sent a warning to Short. He used ordinary commercial radio, instead of the powerful Navy or FBI transmitters at his disposal, or the scrambler phone on his desk with a direct wire to Hawaiian headquarters. The message to Short was in code. It was not decoded until 2:58 p. m. Hawaiian time, hours after the great base was in ruins. Admiral Stark, who had received the same information as Marshall on the morning of December 7, cried, "My God! This means war. I must get word to Kimmel at once." Why he did not do so is a mystery he must explain.

No such offense as has been brought home to Mr. Roosevelt and his inner circle was ever committed in this country before. It is obvious that gnawing anxiety lest the truth become known contributed to the premature deaths of Roosevelt and Knox. Some of the surviving conspirators have made matters worse by seeking to conceal the truth. They have even attempted to get laws passed to imprison anyone who might bring out the truth.

Stimson has added to his infamy by sending Col. Henry C. Clausen around the world in the hope that various Army witnesses who testified before the Pearl Harbor Board of Inquiry would change the stories they had given under oath. This attempt succeeded in at least one instance. Col. R. S. Bratton, chief of the G-2 far eastern section, was induced to alter his testimony that he personally had delivered to General Marshall on the night of December 6 an intercepted Jap message pointing to immediate hostilities. Congress has been told that Commander (now Captain) Kramer, who had told Knox that Pearl Harbor was certain to be the target of attack, has been hounded into a psychiatric ward by Navy officers seeking to make him change his testimony. Beyond that all records of the four Navy radio monitoring stations relating to the "East Wind Rain" interception of December 5 declaring the existence of a state of war have disappeared.

The story of Pearl Harbor is the blackest page in American history. Nothing is left now but for Congress to impeach all still living who may have played a guilty part and bring them to bar.

Peace Demands Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Washington Post, November 7, by Sumner Welles, former Undersecretary of State, urging the importance of granting the American representative on the Security Council authority to use our armed forces to quell aggression.

It is gratifying that the administration is supporting legislation to this end and that a comprehensive measure implementing the provisions of articles 41, 42, and 43 of the United Nations Charter is now before the Senate.

We have only to go back into recent years of world history to determine the urgency of this legislation. The leadership we have demonstrated in garnering world support for an international organization to keep the peace makes it mandatory that we assume like leadership in advocating steps that will make our plans for peace effective.

Because of the instability of conditions today, due to the irritations and doubts that are somewhat natural to the easing of the tense cooperation which so largely contributed to Allied victory, it is urgent that we lay the groundwork now for action that may be necessary sometime in the future against a hopeful aggressor, whether he embarks on a campaign for world or territorial domination. Every intention we have pronounced respecting the independent development of nations and peoples will be nullified unless we show that we intend

to back up our spoken intentions by practical means.

Article 41 of the Charter provided for measures short of the use of armed force to put down any disturbing situation. Article 42 provided that when such measures fail the nations on the Security Council, acting by mutual agreement, should use their armed forces, whether by sea, air, or land to keep the peace by force. We have fought for victory. Let us be ready to fight for peace, in the full realization that such concerted immediate action on a small scale may well prevent concerted action on a world-destructive scale.

That principle is contained in the resolution I presented to the House on October 11, and in the measure now before the Senate. Time may decree amendments to these measures, depending on changing conditions, such as developments as we progress into the atomic age. But regardless of what physical changes may determine changes in methods and thinking, the principle remains the same—immediate concerted action to stop any nation which is bent on aggression, or the disruption of peaceful relations between any individual countries or groups of nations.

Mr. Welles' article follows:

PEACE DEMANDS ACTION

(By Sumner Welles)

SETTING THE UNO TO WORK

With the deposit by the Soviet Union at our State Department of its ratification of the Charter, the United Nations Organization came officially into being. In this new international organization are represented all of our present hopes for a peaceful and a better world.

It is profoundly discouraging that so little significance has been attached to this great step forward. Yet the reason is easy to understand.

Public opinion is disheartened and perplexed by the mounting cloud of suspicion and of antagonism between the United States and the Soviet Union. Increasing civil strife throughout the world, the ominous signs that millions of people in Europe may starve or freeze this winter, and the utter failure of the major powers as yet to show that they can agree upon even one of the foundations needed before world reconstruction can be commenced, are rapidly undermining popular faith in the United Nations Organization as a means of obtaining physical and economic security.

I cannot reiterate too strongly my own conviction that the United Nations Organization cannot function successfully unless its establishment is accompanied by a practical understanding between Moscow and Washington. Such an understanding alone can enable the two greatest powers to cooperate to make the United Nations Organization work.

But at the same time most of us seem to underestimate the inherent capacity of the United Nations Organization to become under such conditions a guaranty of world progress and of world peace.

No realistic supporter of the United Nations Charter will maintain that the Charter is a perfect instrument or that, as the years pass, it must not be radically revised and improved. We are, however, seeing two highly dangerous trends in public thinking.

An increasingly noisy number of propagandists insist, because of existing international difficulties, that these constitute conclusive evidence that the United Nations Organization cannot succeed. They urge that we must consequently maintain vast armaments, and occupy bases, even those of our allies, all over the world. This is nothing more than an imperialistic development of that same policy of isolation which was so directly responsible for the Second World War.

Another group, also rapidly growing in number, maintains that there can be no hope of our survival in this atomic age unless national sovereignties are scrapped and a world republic is immediately instituted. According to them, the United Nations Charter must be discarded before it even begins to function.

The only way in which such hysterical and defeatist doctrines as these can be checked, and public confidence in the Charter can be stimulated, is for the United States to take the leadership in putting the United Nations Organization to work, and in seeing to it that it succeeds.

No step at this time could be more helpful than for the Congress before the end of the present year to fix the duties and responsibilities of the United States representative upon the Security Council and to intrust him with the necessary authority to carry out our national obligation to cooperate in preventing war.

This would be positive action. It would tend to dispel the persistent belief on the part of other peoples that the American Government is long on professions of self-righteousness but lamentably short on action when its help is needed to maintain world peace.

President Truman's recent speech on foreign policy tended again to reinforce that fatal inclination on the part of the American people to believe that the mere pronouncement of pious principles is all that is needed to make those principles come into operation. The President's address also offered no hope that any real understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States was as yet in the making.

Fortunately, however, the administration is already discussing with the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations legislation which will delegate authority to the American representative on the Security Council.

On October 11 Congressman KOPPLEMANN, of Connecticut, introduced a joint resolution, which is well worthy of consideration as a basis for such legislation.

Congressman KOPPLEMANN'S resolution provides in section 1 and in section 5 (a) that the American representative on the Security Council shall have authority, provided he is so instructed by the President, to pledge, subject to the special agreements made under article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations, such part of the armed force of the United States as may be required to enforce the decisions of the Security Council when the Council decides that the use of force is necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security.

Section 2 provides that any pledge of the use of the armed forces of the United States which may be given by the American delegate on the Security Council shall not only be binding on this Government but shall also be immediately implemented by the appropriate American authorities.

Section 3 makes it clear that any such use of the armed forces of the United States "shall be regarded as being in the nature of international police activities for the prevention of warfare through the exercise of joint international responsibility," and that the joint resolution conferring these powers upon the American representative "shall not be regarded as in any way abrogating or altering the constitutional right of the Congress of the United States to declare war."

Finally section 5 (b) of the resolution obliges the President to provide the Congress with complete information concerning any decision which the Security Council may take under article 42 of the Charter, and which involves the use of armed force.

If the Congress will promptly enact legislation of this kind, the United States will be able to give the United Nations Organization that kind of concrete support which it greatly needs at this moment. Such a step will also help to convince public opinion in the other United Nations that the people of the United States are determined to act as well as to talk in order to maintain world peace, and in order to make international organization succeed.

What's Wrong With Demobilization?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hastings (Nebr.) Daily Tribune:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH DEMOBILIZATION?

There is growing evidence that there is a need for more efficiency and coordination in the demobilization program. Military teaching and training is such that higher authority is not to be contested but apparently conditions are such that men in uniform have come to the point of calling their plight to the attention of the public and their elected representatives, taking the chances of going over the heads of their superiors with their complaints.

Recently, several such letters have been made public here. From the men overseas come allegations that ships are lying idle in ports; that the public is led to believe by announcements relative to the discharge program that men are coming home rapidly, when, according to the letters, they are not being discharged on the point basis as announced, causing their wives to ask why they have not applied for discharges. And a protest has come from enlisted men at Harvard that they are being sent overseas even though the majority have been in service 2 years and more when it has been announced that except for essential men, 2-year veterans were to be discharged beginning at the end of the year.

There is no doubt that there is another side to the story; that there is sound and good reason for some of the delay and for some of the actions being taken. But when enlisted men, trained in military discipline to fight battles, are so strongly moved that they will go beyond the authority of their superior officers in voicing their complaints and disappointments there must be something wrong.

News From Soviet-Occupied Lithunia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, news from reliable sources confirms the reports of Soviet terror, executions, and deportations. On July 30, 1944, the first blood bath is said to have been organized at Zarasai. The officials and clerks

of the local institutions and the families of the rebels of 1941 were tortured and executed. Women and children were compelled to watch this crime. Further executions were organized at Utena, Vilnius, Daugaliai, Deguciai, Salakas, Dusetai, Antaliepte, Kamajai, Svedasai, Daugai, Verena, Siauliai, Rumsiskes, Jonava, Ukmerge, Kupiskis, and Rokiskis. All the population found in the Leliunai, Moletai, and Daugai parishes were shot. Only a small number who were in hiding managed to escape the massacre. Lithuanian sources state that at several places near Panevezys and Kedainiai the local population was ordered to dig up the bodies of the Communists who had been executed by the Germans. After the exhumation, executed Lithuanians were buried in the same graves. There are repeated reports of mass deportations to Siberia. The figure 83,000 is often mentioned as an estimate of persons deported during the second Soviet occupation.

Mobilization for the Red Army was proclaimed by the Soviets as soon as they entered Lithuania. This involved all men born in the years 1908 to 1926. It is estimated that only about 30 percent of the men who were called up appeared for registration.

Reports indicate that communication facilities in Lithuania, disrupted by the Nazi-Soviet warfare, are still in a bad state of repair. Horses and carts owned by farmers living near the more important localities are being confiscated for military purposes. Every community, isolated from the larger centers, lives its own life. The inhabitants of the country are fed on all sorts of rumors. Though two Lithuanian newspapers, Tarybu Lietuva (Soviet Lithuania) and Tiesa (Truth), are published in Vilnius, they rarely reach the provincial towns and villages since transportation is poor. All the good radio sets were confiscated some time ago, and the people are allowed to possess the most primitive radio receivers only.

Soviet authorities are still examining the identification documents of the entire population. It is reported that on Laisves Aleja (Freedom Avenue), main street of Kaunas, passersby are being stopped and asked for their documents the whole day long.

After its experience under three consecutive occupations, the nation's determination to fight foreign enslavement has strengthened. Their achievements during the uprising of 1941 and their stubborn resistance against the Germans have given the Lithuanians increased self-confidence. It is stated that the patriotic partisan movement in Lithuania has become so strong that in December 1944 they set free the town of Ukmerge and kept it under their control for 3 days. When Russian forces approached Ukmerge, these Lithuanian patriot fighters took to the woods. The morale of the Lithuanian people is unbroken. In many places in Lithuania Soviet authorities are unable to organize local Communist committees, for the persons appointed by them are usually found dead the following night. The Soviets, unable to find the necessary number of collaborators, have been forced to appoint several non-Communists to relatively important municipal positions.

SOVIET BROADCASTS IN LITHUANIAN FROM VILNIUS IN FEBRUARY 1945

Reports about events on the Eastern front are broadcast every day—except on those days when the Vilnius radio station does not function, which has happened quite often of late; indeed, several times weekly. During its "working days" the Vilnius station transmits war news, Communist propaganda, and Russian music. Often Russian songs and vulgar couplets are sung. In their broadcasts the Soviets try to give the impression that they are interested in Lithuanian problems. However, their listeners are well aware that this is merely propaganda, since the broadcasts completely neglect Lithuanian political or cultural interests. The broadcasts deal with local matters only so far as to instill into the minds of the listeners that their country is incorporated into the Soviet Union forever, and that they should cease to think of Lithuanian independence. Such propaganda, however, has an effect quite opposite from that intended, as is proved by direct information from Lithuania.

During February one of the most popular subjects in the radio broadcasts was the alleged zeal of the Lithuanian workmen in the factories and their supposed loyalty to the Communist regime. Names of workers who have thus distinguished themselves are constantly being read. These are nearly always Russians, such as Comrade Vetrov, a railway worker from Kaunas. On February 1 and a few days later, the broadcasts described several public meetings wherein the Lithuanians were said to have shown "the greatest satisfaction at the reincorporation of Klaipeda (Memel) into Soviet Lithuania." On February 2 the announcer stated that Klaipeda, said to be burning and totally abandoned by its population, was a "dead town." He added that, nevertheless, "life will blossom there again—the harbor has good prospects." The reason given for this optimism was the alleged fact that "a few hundred people from the east had arrived there and had already organized a Communist Party and its committee."

On February 5 the announcer read a communiqué about some slight amendments which aim at the centralization of control to be made to the so-called "Soviet Lithuanian Constitution."

The frequent mention of Russians appointed to office proves the Soviet determination to Russify Lithuania. Among new appointments broadcast on February 5, the announcer mentioned, for example, Ponomarev, a Russian, as the commissar for Lithuianian forests. The announcer also stated that Paleckis, head of the Soviet puppet government, had decorated some distinguished Lithuanians with Soviet orders and medals. However, their names, such as Morozov, Kapralov, and so forth, sounded completely Russian.

Instructors of Communist youth circles, Russians such as Loza, Mironcov, and Mrs. Sroll, have become famous throughout Lithuania as zealous organizers, and in a broadcast on February 7 were mentioned as having devoted themselves to the task of the "liquidation of the former agricultural system in Lithuania."

Another popular theme is the alleged fact that all previous regimes of independent Lithuania "put obstacles in the way of the education of the people." On February 8 the announcer claimed that the universities of Kaunas and Vilnius as well as the agricultural academy of Dotnuva were functioning again. However, nothing was said of the national origin of the students or of the professors of these institutions. In this same broadcast the announcer mentioned the names of several pupils at the Vilnius radio school, such as Alexey Baukov, Mitrovanov, and so forth, which sounded pure Russian.

The broadcast of February 17 was devoted to propaganda for Soviet sports activities. The Lithuanian young people were urged to take more interest in skiing, which was said to train better soldiers for the Red Army. Among the instructors of this sport a certain "Comrade Timofeev," secretary of the Communist youth circle at Rokiskis, received high mention. Lithuanian young people were urged to form sports clubs all over the country.

The Palestine Question—King Ibn Saud's Letter to President Roosevelt and His Reply

---

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I was taken to task on the floor when I suggested that a certain element in this House was marching into Palestine waving a red flag in the face of the British Empire.

I call attention to the fact that Secretary Byrnes has given to the world a statement showing that President Roosevelt guaranteed King Ibn Saud that no interference in Palestine would be taken without consulting the Arabs, many of whom are of the Christian faith.

Now, do not cry "anti-Semitism" at me, because both of these factions are Semites.

Besides, this is an affair in which we have no right to interfere.

KING IBN SAUD'S LETTER TO PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT AND PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S REPLY

The following correspondence between King Ibn Saud and President Roosevelt should be very enlightening to the American people, and especially to the American Congress, on that much-publicized issue.

You remember President Roosevelt in effect said that he learned more on this subject in talking with Ibn Saud 5 minutes than he had learned about it all his life up to that time.

The correspondence between them on this subject reads as follows:

KING IBN SAUD'S LETTER TO PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

MARCH 10, 1945.

To His Excellency Mr. ROOSEVELT,

President of the United States of America.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: This is indeed a happy occasion for us to join with you in rejoicing at the triumph of those principles in defense of which war was declared and to remind those great personalities in whose hands, after God, the fate of the world order rests, of a right which has existed unquestioned since the dawn of history.

This right men now seek to destroy by injustice unparalleled and unequaled in history. Such is the right of the Arabs in Palestine, which the spokesmen of Jewish Zionism wish to scorn and abolish by the use of various forms of lying propaganda, invented, concealed, and employed by them throughout the world.

They have acted unjustly and are making hostile preparations against the Arabs, some of which are known, although much remains undetected. They are preparing to create a form of nazi-fascism within sight and hearing of the democracies and in the midst of the Arab countries, as well as in their very heart and in the heart of the East, which has proved itself loyal to the Allied cause in these critical times.

RIGHT TO HOMELAND

All people have the natural right to live in their homeland, a right guaranteed to them by natural law established by the principles of humanity which the Allies have proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter and on numerous other occasions.

The Arabs have a natural right in Palestine which needs no explanation. We have on a separate occasion mentioned to Your Excellency, as we have many times to the British Government, that the Arabs have inhabited Palestine since the beginning of history and that they have throughout the ages been its masters and enjoyed an overwhelming numerical superiority.

We would now make a brief reference to Palestine's history, ancient and modern, up to the present day, to make it clear that Zionist claims in Palestine are not based on historical facts.

The earliest recorded history of Palestine begins in the year 3500 B. C., its first inhabitants being the Canaanites, an Arab tribe which emigrated from the Arab peninsula and had its first abode in the lowlands, hence the name Canaanites. In 2000 B. C. a section of the Jews under the leadership of the Prophet Abraham emigrated from Iraq (Ur of the Chaldees), settled in Palestine and then immigrated because of famine into Egypt where they were delivered into bondage by the Pharaohs.

The Jews remained scattered there until their delivery from exile by the Prophet Moses, who brought them back to the land of Canaan by the southeastern route, either in the time of Rameses II, i. e., 1250 B. C., or his son, Munfitah, 1225 B. C.

If we accept the text of the Bible, we find that the conqueror of Palestine was Joshua, the son of Nun, who crossed with his army and captured the city of Jericho from the Canaanites, with great cruelty and barbarity; witness his words to his army:

"Burn ye all that is in the city and slay with the edge of the sword both man and woman, young and old, and ox and sheep, and burn the city with fire and all that is therein." Joshua, chapter 7, verses 21 to 24.

Thereafter the Jews split up into two kingdoms. One the Kingdom of the Israelites, with its capital Samaria (Nablus), lasted 250 years and then fell into the hands of Shalmaneser, King of the Assyrians, in the year 722 B. C., and was led into captivity. The other, the Kingdom of Judah, with its capital Jerusalem, lasted 130 years after the Kingdom of Israel had perished.

It was later destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, who burned down the city and the temple with fire and led the people into captivity to Babylon in the year 580 B. C.

The captivity in Babylon lasted 70 years, and then the Jews returned to Palestine by order of Cyrus, King of the Persians.

The Greek conquest followed in 332 B. C., under the command of Alexander the Macedonian, their rule continuing in Palestine for a period of 272 years.

The Roman conquest took place next in the year 63 B. C., under the command of Pompey, their rule lasting in Palestine for 700 years.

In the year A. D. 637 the Arabs occupied Palestine, and their rule lasted continuously for 880 years.

The orders of the Caliph to the conqueror were: "You shall not act treacherously, dishonestly, commit any excess or mutilation, kill any child or old man; cut or burn down palms or fruit trees, kill any sheep, cow, or camel, and shall leave alone those whom you find devoting themselves to worship in their cells." This was related by Ibn-al-Atheer, the famous historian.

Palestine then passed under the rule of the Turks in A. D. 1517, during the reign of Sultan Saleem the First, and their rule lasted for 400 years. The Arabs were the inhabitants and participated with the Turks in the government and administration of the country. It was then occupied by the British, who are still there.

This history of Palestine, an Arab country, shows that the Arabs were its first inhabitants and that they dwelt there for a period of 3,500 years before Christ and have remained there since Christ until the present day.

They ruled it alone or with the Turks for a period of about 1,300 years, whereas the disjointed reign of the Jews did not exceed 380 confused and sporadic years.

No Jewish rule has existed in Palestine since 332 B. C. nor until the British forces entered Palestine in 1918, i. e., for 2,200 years there have been few Jews there and they have had no influence. They numbered not more than 80,000 when the British entered Palestine, and lived comfortably, happily, and prosperously in that country with the original inhabitants, the Arabs.

The Jews were merely aliens who had come to Palestine at intervals and had then been turned out over 2,000 years ago.

The permanent rights of the Arabs in Palestine rest on the following:

(1) The right to dwell there. This they have done since the year 3500 B. C. without ever leaving the country.

(2) The natural right of life.

(3) The existence therein of the Holy Land.

(4) The Arabs are not aliens in Palestine and there is no intention to bring any of them from other parts of the world to settle there.

The historical claims of the Jews is, however, a fallacy. As already mentioned, their brief and sporadic rule gives them no right to claim that they own the country, for to occupy a country and then leave it entitles no nation to claim and demand ownership thereof. The history of the world is full of such examples.

The solution of the problem of the persecuted Jews in the world differs from the fictitious problem of Zionism. For to provide homes for the scattered Jews is something in which the whole world can cooperate, and here Palestine has borne more than its full share. But to bring these scattered people, put them in countries already occupied, and do away with the original inhabitants is an act unparalleled in human history.

We state frankly and plainly that to help Zionism in Palestine not only means to endanger Palestine but all neighboring countries.

The Zionists have given clear evidence of their intentions in Palestine and in all neighboring countries. They have organized dangerous secret military formations. It would thus be a mistake to say that this was the action of a group of their extremists and that it had met with the disapproval of their assemblies and committees.

We declare that the actions of the Zionists inside and outside Palestine are based on a program agreed upon and approved of by world Jewry.

These people began their vile work by wronging the government that had treated them kindly and sheltered them, namely, the British Government. Their assemblies declared war on Britain and organized dangerous military formations, which at present hold in Palestine all the arms and military equipment they require.

Their members have carried out various attacks of which the most shocking was the attack on the outstanding figure, so kind and charitable toward all men and with the greatest sympathy for persecuted Jewry, Lord Moyne.

LAYS TERROR TO ALL JEWS

The proof that all Jews aided and abetted their vile deed is to be seen in the demonstrations and efforts made by Jews everywhere, demanding a light sentence for the criminals in order to encourage others to do the same.

This, then, is the way they behave with the government which has treated them so kindly. What would be the position if they were able to realize their objects and make Palestine entirely their own country, in which and near which they could do as they pleased?

If the matter were left to the Arabs and these aggressors it might perhaps be easy, but they are protected by the British Government, the friends of the Arabs. The Zionists did not respect the sanctity of this protection, but plotted mischief, beginning first with Britain and threatening the Arabs after Britain with similar and more dangerous plots.

Thus, if the Allied Governments, whose friendship the Arabs are aware, of, wish to see the fires of war break out and bloodshed between Arabs and Jews, their support of the Zionists will surely lead to this result. What we and the Arab countries fear from the Zionists are:

(1) That they will carry out a series of massacres as between themselves and the Arabs.

(2) That the Zionists will be one of the main causes of dissension between the Arabs and the Allies. The latest proof of this is the case of the two Jews who killed Lord Moyne in Egypt. Had the Jews been able to hide the criminals, a dispute would have occurred between the British Government and Egypt.

(3) That the ambitions of the Jews are not confined to Palestine alone. The preparations they have made show that they intend to take hostile action against neighboring Arab countries.

(4) Supposing that the Jews obtain their independence somewhere in Palestine, what is to prevent them from coming to an agreement with any power that may be hostile to the Allies and to the Arabs? As it is, they have begun taking hostile action against Britain while under her protection and mercy.

NO BASES IN HISTORY

Such factors should no doubt be taken into consideration in regard to the establishment of peace in the world when the problem of Palestine is discussed. Not only is the gathering of Jews in Palestine based on no historical argument nor on any natural right, and is in fact absolutely unjust, but it constitutes at the same time a danger to peace, to the Arabs and to the Middle East.

The crux of the matter is that the formation of a Jewish state in Palestine will be a deadly blow to the Arabs and a constant threat to peace, for disturbed conditions are bound to prevail between the Jews and the Arabs, and if the patience of the latter is one day exhausted and they despair of their future then they will be obliged to defend themselves and future generations against this aggression. No doubt the Allies, who are working to uphold peace and respect for men's rights, are aware of this. We have no doubt that they are dissatisfied with this uneasy situation which threatens peace in the Middle East.

We did not wish to bother Your Excellency or your ministers with this matter during the present titanic struggle in which you are engaged. Confident that the Allies will treat the Arabs fairly, however, we would have preferred the Arabs to forbear until the end of the war had it not been for the provocative and offensive acts committed by the Zionists who, regardless of war conditions and the preoccupation of the Allies, seek to bring every form of pressure to bear on them to adopt a policy which is inconsistent with the principles of right and justice which the Allies have proclaimed.

That is why we wished to explain the true rights of the Arabs in Palestine so as to refute the flimsy arguments of the Zionist party, counter their aggressive tactics, and set out the facts in order that the Allies may fully understand the rights of the Arabs in their country, the country of their fathers and forefathers.

The Jews should not be permitted to exploit the forebearance of the Arabs or their desire to avoid any embarrassment to the Allies, to obtain concessions to which they are not entitled.

All we ask is that the Allies should fully realize the rights of the Arabs and for the present prevent the Jews going ahead in any new matter which may be considered a threat to the Arabs and to the future of every Arab Nation, in order that they, the Arabs, may be assured of justice and equity in their lands.

With highest respects,
Your friend,

ABDUL AZIZ AL SAUD.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S ANSWER TO KING IBN SAUD'S LETTER

APRIL 5, 1945.

His Majesty ABDUL AZIZ IBN ABDUR RAHMAN AL FAISAL AL SAUD,
King of Saudi Arabia, Ryadh:

GREAT AND GOOD FRIEND: I have received the communication which Your Majesty sent me, under date of March 10, 1945, in which you refer to the question of Palestine and to the continuing interest of the Arabs in current developments affecting that country.

I am gratified that Your Majesty took this occasion to bring your views on this question to my attention and I have given the most careful attention to the statements which you make in your letter. I am also mindful of the memorable conversation which we had not so long ago and in the course of which I had an opportunity to obtain so vivid an impression of Your Majesty's sentiments on this question.

Your Majesty will recall that on previous occasions I communicated to you the attitude of the American Government toward Palestine and made clear our desire that no decision be taken with respect to the basic situation in that country without full consultation with both Arabs and Jews.

Your Majesty will also doubtless recall that during our recent conversation I assured you that I would take no action, in my capacity as Chief of the executive branch of this Government, which might prove hostile to the Arab people.

It gives me pleasure to renew to Your Majesty the assurances which you have previously received regarding the attitude of my Government and my own, as Chief Executive, with regard to the question of Palestine and to inform you that the policy of this Government in this respect is unchanged.

I desire also at this time to send you my best wishes for Your Majesty's continued good health and for the welfare of your people.

Your good friend,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Set the American Indians Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by O. K. Armstrong from the Reader's Digest:

SET THE AMERICAN INDIANS FREE
(By O. K. Armstrong)

A young fullblood Indian, sergeant in the Army Air Corps, stood before his tribesmen on the Winnebago reservation and told of his experiences on many fronts. Then he said: "I'm leaving again, to finish this war. When we Indian servicemen get back, we're going to see that our people are set free to live and act like American citizens."

There was silence. One by one the older men came forward and threw their arms about his shoulders, their faces tense with emotion. Then the younger men, among them two boys in Navy uniform, gathered about the sergeant in earnest talk. He had given voice to an unmistakable determination on the part of American Indians to demand full rights of citizenship.

Speaking with grim accents, this Winnebago told me: "We're tired of being treated like museum pieces. I'm a mechanic. I want a real job. They're not going to send me back to live in a shack and loaf around in a blanket."

Few know the shameful story of the present status of the Indians. By fire and sword the settlers drove them from their lands. Then, in 1824, the Government established a Bureau of Indian Affairs to civilize and emancipate the Indians. Reserved areas were set aside for the tribes, where they could live while they learned the white man's ways.

Today about 220,000 Indians still live upon 210 reservations. Legally they are free to come and go as they please, and to take up any work they choose. Actually most of them are tied to their reservations and to old tribal ways.

In three important respects they have never been emancipated. They are restricted in property rights. Without consent of their superintendent they cannot own land on the reservation, or sell it, or mortgage it, or lease it. They live under conditions of racial segregation. And they are subject to special limitations and exemptions because they are Indians.

In recent months I have visited many reservations. I talked with tribal chiefs, farmers, teachers, with Indians prominent in business and politics. I talked with agency superintendents and employees—able, conscientious men who are working tirelessly to better the lot of the Indian. All agreed that the Indian problem is a national reproach.

The great majority of the Members of Congress heartily applaud the stand of Representative WILLIAM G. STIGLER, of Oklahoma, himself a Choctow-Chickasaw Indian. Speaking to the House last April, he said: "There should be an early and complete rehabilitation of the Indian so he may go forth in the world and take his place by his white brother, asking only an opportunity to prove his worth."

More than 22,000 Indians are serving with our fighting forces. Many have given their lives; many more have won decorations. There can be no doubt that all who return from the service will seek a greater share in America's freedom. About 45,000 other Indians from reservations have been working in war industries. Most of these have tasted economic opportunity for the first time, mastering skilled trades. They're not going to forget that they made a good living on their own.

Why aren't the Indians free? The policy of segregation and special treatment is deeply rooted in the past. Early reservations were concentration camps, where troops kept the inmates subdued. By the middle 1870's, reservations had become centers of paternalistic control, where able-bodied Indians waited from week to week for the agents to distribute beef and clothing.

It became apparent that the reservation system was pauperizing these wards of the Government, so in 1887 an Allotment Act was passed presenting individual Indians with tracts of land, usually 160 acres. The act provided that for 25 years title to the land would be held in trust by the Government, after which ownership would pass to the Indian and he would be a full citizen. The motive was good: to keep the Indian from being cheated out of his land by unscrupulous tribesmen or white men. But there was no sound program for educating the Indian to be self-supporting on his land or to be assimilated into industry.

When, in 1891, the act was amended to extend the 25-year trust period, other amendments closed the door to full citizenship. If the ambitious and industrious Indian left the reservation he risked losing his rights in tribal land and money. If he stayed he could not own a farm or add to it by purchase. The policy of perpetual guardianship took firm root.

Although all native Indians were declared citizens of the United States by act of Congress in 1924, the act made no provision for the details of their emancipation. Today only Congress or the Great White Father, the Secretary of the Interior, can remove restrictions upon ownership of property. With their land held in trust by the Indian Office, Indians are in the anomalous position of being both citizens and wards of the Government. They cannot use funds owned by the tribe without consent of the Office, even for cooperative enterprises. Their money is not their own until the superintendent doles it out for a specific purpose.

Young people in Indian schools, at ages when white children are taught self-reliance, are trained in dependency. They are required to ask superintendents for spending money and must get permission to purchase books, clothing, and personal effects. If an adult Indian secures a Government loan for purchase of livestock, machinery, or household goods, the agency assumes control of all such personal property. If the Indian farmer's cow produces a calf, he must not sell the calf without permission.

Lands held by reservatian Indians—56,000,000 acres—are not subject to State, county, or local taxes. Hence they cannot vote in Idaho, New Mexico, and Washington, because of constitutional provisions forbidding suffrage to Indians not taxed. They cannot vote in Arizona because of a law denying the ballot to "persons under guardianship." North Carolina requires that voters be able to read and write to the satisfaction of the election registrar—and a Cherokee holding an M. A. degree from the University of North Carolina was told by an election judge: "You couldn't

read or write to my satisfaction if you stayed here all day."

Surplus reservation lands not allotted to individual Indians have been opened by tribal councils for settlement by whites. Individual Indians can also lease part of their allotments. The Indians have found it more convenient to lease to whites than to farm for themselves under Government restrictions. Not more than 1 acre out of 4 on reservations is now used by the Indian.

Many Indians to whom land was alloted have died, but their lands could not be sold nor their estates settled without the Government's permission. Heirs were given "bookkeeping equities" in the original allotments. Continued dividing of the tracts has gone on until now the problem of "fractional heirships" has reached fantastic proportions. Some bits of land have as many as 200 heirs. The Indian Office must find them and get their consent before the land is leased. Thousands of acres of Indian lands lie idle because heirs cannot be found. I talked with a returned veteran who had tried to rent a 40-acre tract. "There are more than 100 heirs for that piece. Some are lost. We can't rent it," the supervisor finally informed him.

The latest Government efforts to meet the Indian problem have been in the wrong direction. In 1934 Congress passed the Indian Reorganization Act, by which the Department of the Interior was authorized to purchase land and hold it "in perpetuity" for tribal use. Further allotments to individual Indians and sale of Indian lands were were banned. The act provided for organization of tribes into "corporations" and for "communal" use of land and machinery.

One effect of the Reorganization Act has been to force a collectivist system upon the Indians, with bigger doses of paternalism and regimentation. Under the plan, the tribal council is the ruling power, but since the council is completely dominated by agency officials it actually functions only with the advice and consent of the Indian Office. The tribe assigns each member Indian the plot of ground he is to work—in true collectivist pattern.

Since the plan went into effect, the Office has spent about $2,000,000 per year buying land—often for tribes that have more acres by far than they ever use. The Shoshones and Arapahoes, at Wind River, Wyo., have 1,500,000 acres of land, 300,000 of which are not needed by the Indians and are rented to whites, yet the Indian Office has spent nearly half a million dollars to add ranch land and equipment to the tribal estates. For the Blackfeet tribe in Montana $95,252 was spent for land, although the tribe has leased out 747,068 acres of its vast holdings.

In a recent report Senators THOMAS of Oklahoma, WHEELER of Montana, CHAVEZ of New Mexico, and SHIPSTEAD of Minnesota, members of the Indian Affairs Committee, offered this stinging indictment:

"While the original aim of the Indian Service was to make the Indian a citizen, the present aim appears to be to keep the Indian an Indian, and to make him satisfied with the limitations of primitive life. The Bureau has been concerned with segregating the Indian, condemning him to perpetual wardship, and making him the guinea pig for experimentation."

The most advanced tribes are those that have had the smallest connection with the Indian Office. The Choctaws, Chickasaws, Cherokees, Seminoles, and Creeks in Oklahoma show how our Indians, through freedom rather than restriction, may become an integral part of our national life. During the settlement of the Indian Territory, Indians mixed freely with the whites and adopted white ways. Lands were granted in fee to Indians individually.

In 1908 Congress gave full citizenship to 60,000 (about 80 percent) of these Oklahoma tribes. Their members helped found the State and have occupied high positions in business, education, and public affairs. Every Oklahoma legislature has found Indians in positions of leadership. Former Senator Robert L. Owen is a Cherokee. Chief Justice Samuel E. Welch of the State supreme court, is a Chickasaw. The late Will Rogers was a Cherokee. In the courthouse at Claremore (Rogers' home town) I asked J. C. Gipe, deputy sheriff, how many county officials are Indians. Sixteen of the 20 proved to be of one-quarter blood or more.

Yet every major policy of the Bureau in recent years has tended toward revival of tribal autonomy and ancient customs. Separate CCC camps were maintained for Indian youths. There were separate sewing rooms for Indian women and separate projects for Indian men under the WPA. Segregated hospitals are maintained on the reservations. A restricted Indian is not permitted a loan from the Farm Security Administration; he must deal with the special loan service of the Indian Office. Proposals have been made by Bureau officials that problems of Indian war veterans be handled by a special division of their office.

Tribal control and governmental regulations constantly remind the Indian of his inferior status. Indians loll about agency offices, waiting to ask permission on matters that a free farmer would decide in an instant. Congressmen from reservation States are familiar with letters such as this one from Charlie Red Shirt to Congressman FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota: "My oldest daughter receive Sioux benefits. She want to buy milk cows because we like dairying. But they want her to buy beef cattles and they make her feel bad. If they let her go and buy what she want in the first place she would have about 30 or 40 head of cattles by this time."

One Sioux farmer, disliking an old horse, sold him for $75 without permission and reported he had disappeared. The horse had to be found. The superintendent's report fills a small volume. Two field men after long search and the expenditure of about $2,500 of taxpayers' money, settled the matter. The Indian was given a strong reprimand—and the horse.

Every agency official I talked with cried out against the bureaucratic red tape of the Service. Nothing, it seems, can be done simply or promptly. Suppose Jack Muskrat wants to borrow money to plant a crop. He takes up the subject at the agency office. The matter must come before the tribal council. A "farm plan" must be worked out especially for Jack. The superintendent must approve. The credit unit must study and approve the plan. A loan agent showed me a stack of complicated forms, reports, letters and printed instructions. "That's what it takes to get one Indian farmer a loan," he said. "No wonder they'd rather rent the land and loaf."

The cost of keeping Indian wards has risen year by year. In 1928 the appropriation for the Indian Office totaled $10,000,000, supporting 4,000 employes. Critics in Congress declared it was time to emancipate the Indians and let the Office "work itself out of a job." Yet by last year the number of employes had increased to 7,383. And in the appropriation bill for 1946 the Indian Office requests $32,000,000 and 306 new positions.

For all the vast expenditure, how many Indians are there? Nobody knows.[1] In 1934 the number was put at 234,792, including 30,000 in Alaska. Now the Indian Office "estimates" a total of 419,970. Congressmen say that the figures are padded to obtain ever-increasing appropriations. Persons with no more than 1/256th Indian blood help to swell the total.

Despite Government outlays, most reservation Indians live in poverty. Until war work came to their aid, not more than two percent of reservation families averaged more than $500 income a year. Living conditions are often extremely bad. Disease is prevalent and infant mortality is high.

Two pressing tasks confront Congress and the Indian service:

The first is to provide legislation that will remove restrictions from—and thus emancipate—every Indian who is able to manage his affairs.

The second is to chart a new course for the Office of Indian Affairs, whereby its efforts, during the time it remains in existence, are directed toward assisting all Indians to be self-supporting.

What Indians, now restricted, should be declared competent? Opinions vary, but agreement is possible on immediate emancipation of:

1. Honorably discharged veterans of the present war. This would be an act of simple justice for those who have fought for freedom.

2. All Indians born from this time forward.

3. All persons of less than one-quarter Indian blood.

4. Graduates from a standard high school or its equivalent.

5. All others who are competent to manage their affairs. Definite provisions should be made for determining competence. Any Indian should be permitted to apply. Veterans of past wars might automatically obtain removal of restrictions.

Ownership of real and personal property will bring responsibility for support of schools and other public services. It will furnish the same incentive for thrift and good management that are enjoyed by the Indians' white neighbors. I asked a young Indian farmer, plowing with a shaggy team, what he needed most. He replied, "Tractor. Not agency tractor. Mine!"

The assumption that most Indians are agricultural has been a tragic mistake. Many are skilled craftsmen. They are potential engineers, mechanics, and technical workers. Iroquois and Onondagas in industrial centers are recognized as among the best structural steel workers in the world. Navajos who have been trained off the reservation have become competent draftsmen, laboratory assistants, and nurses. Indian girls from Haskell Institute in Kansas are noted as accurate stenographers and efficient secretaries. Graded on careful tests for mechanical aptitude, Indian youths from 15 to 22 years old at the Flandreau, S. Dak., school scored a higher average than white students of corresponding age in Detroit.

Frank Beaver, veteran leader of the Winnebago Tribe, told me: "Give our boys and girls training as Americans, and not as Indians, and they'll set themselves free."

The words of Lincoln's Secretary of War now sound with new significance. To a Congressman seeking an interview for a bishop who protested conditions among the Indians, Mr. Stanton exclaimed: "The Government never reforms an evil until the people demand it. Tell the good bishop that when he reaches the heart of the American people the Indians will be saved."

It is time for the people to demand that this evil be reformed.

---

[1] There is no official definition of what constitutes an Indian. Census Bureau enumerators in 1940 were directed to list as Indians "any person of mixed blood if one quarter or more, or if the person is regarded as an Indian in the community in which he lives."

Henry Wallace's 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Lawrence Sullivan, from Nation's Business for November 1945:

HENRY WALLACE'S 1950

(By Lawrence Sullivan)

Most businessmen will have difficulty following the economic theories set forth in the latest of Henry Wallace's trilogy—Sixty Million Jobs. The predecessor volumes, America Must Choose, published in 1933, and New Frontiers, in 1943, were but the rough scaffolding for the present comprehensive outline of managed economy within the framework of political democracy.

The volume is perhaps more significant than important. It offers a guide and index to the philosophy and social attitudes of the Secretary of Commerce—a matter of deep significance in this critical era of reconversion. The want of historical importance which marks the work on every page arises, probably, from the fact that not many workaday citizens will regard the book with more than passing curiosity.

During his entire public career since 1933, Mr. Wallace always has had a new book in preparation. As Secretary of Agriculture, he surrounded himself with a group of fervid thinkers and plausible reformers. They began by writing, not books, but legislative bills to be sent to Capitol Hill for prompt enactment.

Their first bill created the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, which aimed at a permanent balanced abundance, to be achieved by the simple mechanics of mass destruction of surplus farm crops and the future control of production through acreage allotments on each major crop. In the panic of the banking crisis, this measure was whipped through Congress almosts without reading or debate. But when a moment of reflective contemplation revealed to Members of the House and Senate what they actually had writtten into the Federal Code, the word passed informally among congressional leaders that all future bills touching farm policy should be written—or at least rewritten—on Capitol Hill.

A GROUP OF PLANNERS

From about that point, in the late summer of 1933, the Wallace group have been interested primarily in books. In 1935 they were leaders in the Washington political tempest which led to establishment of the Temporary National Economic Committee. In 1940, when the pamphlet alarms of TNEC had been forgotten by a Nation which now found itself drifting into World War II, the planners set themselves up anew in the National Resources Planning Board.

This agency, Congress summarily abolished in 1943 by striking out the appropriation for the next fiscal year. For the unemployed planners, a new lease on official life was obtained soon afterward by the creation of the Board of Economic Warfare, which the then Vice President Wallace headed. This agency at length was liquidated by creation of the Foreign Economic Administration, which Mr. Wallace did not head.

Over some 13 years, Mr. Wallace has thus held within his orbit some of the most far-seeing thinkers and most searing phrase makers in America. As one who watched the planners' GHQ as it moved from one aphabetical designation to another, I feel little hesitancy in describing "sixty million jobs" as the flower of their decade's work.

COLLECTION OF REPORTS

In the entire book there is hardly a thought or a statistic which had not been presented earlier in either the pamphlet reports of TNEC or the hefty tomes of NRPB. Throughout the text there recur constantly the favorite themes and shibboleths of David Cushman Coyle, Mordecai Ezekiel, Rexford Guy Tugwell, Richard Hipplehouser, Oscar Altman, Luther Gulick, Eveline Burns, Adolph Berle, and Alvin H. Hansen. Without naming them, Mr. Wallace acknowledges his debt to the various Government research staffs, in his introduction.

"It has been my good fortune during the past 13 years of official life in Washington," he says, "to contact the minds and share the aspirations of many thoughtful men and women in the various Government agencies and in business, labor, and agricultural groups who are thoroughly devoted to the common good."

Mr. Wallace uses 60,000,000 jobs "as the symbol, if not the arithmetically exact symbol, of the full employment we can have. * * *"

Because of technological advances and higher productivity per man-hour, he explains, it may develop that we can attain a national income of $200,000,000,000 a year with only 55,000,000 people at work.

"If so, then we are so much healthier a Nation."

Having opened this escape hatch of 5,000,000 jobs, Mr. Wallace then goes on to chart the legislative and administrative steps required to set up his Civic Index of the People's Peace of Full Employment. This index is made up of 10 points. They call for higher minimum wages and a federally enformed minimum standard of living; maintenance of farm prices, a considerably broadened public-works program in rural electrification, river valley development, and soil conservation; a housing program to "assure adequate homes for all groups"; health insurance, socialized medicine, and Federal grants-in-aid to provide better educational facilities everywhere.

And all of this is to be accomplished during the next 5 years, under Mr. Wallace's plan, concurrently with gradual reduction in taxes "in a balanced manner, so as to stimulate private initiative, to increase consumption, and to protect the public interests against special tax privileges."

Yet all of this, Mr. Wallace believes, may be attained "without a planned economy, without disastrous inflation, and without an unbalanced budget that will endanger our national credit." But at this point Mr. Wallace veers off into semantics—the science of giving new meanings to old words. Without an understanding of the new definitions Mr. Wallace has in mind, his paragraphs often do not make sense.

He is, for example, perfectly sincere when he speaks of doing all these things without an unbalanced budget that will endanger our national credit. But when he uses the term "unbalanced budget" he is not talking about the same thing most people have in mind. To the lay reader, the budget is the business-like itemization of governmental receipts and expenditures, with the annual deficit to be financed by public borrowing.

THE NEW STYLE BUDGET

But the Wallace civic index is constructed on the conception of a national budget in which all personal and corporate incomes and expenditures also are included, along with all governmental transactions. The whole then is balanced off at the bottom with the term "gross national product." All incomes combined always add up to all expenditures combined, with the Government deficits balanced off against private and corporate savings. The gross national income is the sum of all subsidiary incomes, and the gross national product every year is the result—obviously too clear and simple to be misunderstood. Hence, we shall always have a balanced budget, no matter how much the Government spends, or how little it takes in. By thus broadening and reconverting words as he writes, Mr. Wallace achieves a degree of logic and plausibility almost beyond belief.

To arrive at his calculation of 60,000,000 jobs, Mr. Wallace takes the Census Bureau's graph of population growth since 1900. This gives a total labor force of 40,000,000 as of 1920, 54,000,000 as of 1940, and 62,000,000 as of 1950. Allowing for normal frictional unemployment of 1,400,000 (temporarily sick or incapacitated, changing from job to job, and seasonal unemployment), he finds 60,000,000 jobs the goal for 1950. He then constructs the following break-down of working assignments, the table showing comparative figures for 1940, as reported by the Labor Department, and the theoretical figures set down by Mr. Wallace for 1950:

	1940 (actual)	1950 (Wallace estimate)
Armed forces	600,000	2,500,000
Civil service	3,900,000	4,500,000
Agriculture	9,100,000	8,000,000
Domestics	2,000,000	2,000,000
Self-employed	6,400,000	6,000,000
Manufacturing and mining	10,900,000	15,000,000
Transport and utilities	1,600,000	3,500,000
Construction	2,700,000	3,500,000
Trade	6,100,000	9,000,000
Finance and miscellaneous	3,600,000	6,000,000
Unemployed	7,400,000	1,400,000
Total	54,300,000	61,400,000

In its essences, then, Mr. Wallace's program is to reduce the 1940 unemployment of 7,400,000 to 1,400,000 by 1950. To absorb these 6,000,000 workers, he places 2,000,000 in the armed forces. That leaves him with 4,000,000 new jobs to be created under his 5-year plan. That's nothing to be alarmed about, is it? It could happen very easily.

The only thing we may be certain of at this point, if history is a guide, is that if it does happen, it won't be after Mr. Wallace's plan. This book will have nothing to do with whatever happens in America in the next 5 years, because not enough people understand Mr. Wallace's semantics. If some brash political demagogue should jump to the rostrum and shriek, "Let's make 4,000,000 more jobs in this great country of ours," he probably would command a landslide following overnight. Few would even ask, How?

But Mr. Wallace says we must first construct an elaborate civic index of the people's peace of full employment, and then implement it with a new national budget which would forever take the lid off of Government spending. The old American conception of a balanced Federal budget would be cast into the limbo, and Government would gear itself to spend from year to year whatever might be needed to give everybody a steady job at good wages.

True, it is no simple matter to create 4,000,000 additional jobs in the postwar years. But many still hold sufficient faith in the energy and vitalities of the American people to believe it is much easier than Mr. Wallace's circumlocutions make out.

Reactions to Anti-Baltic Moves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, in a letter to the editor, published in the New York Herald Tribune of September 9, 1945, the Honorable Robert P. Skinner, former American Minister to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, said:

THREE BALTIC STATES

There seems to be no ground for doubt that the American position with regard to the status of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania is in need of clarification. It is a fact that representatives of these states are accredited to this Government and the United States still recognizes them. Nevertheless, while certain measures are announced respecting Italy, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Finland, to mention a few, no statement is available which in any manner affects a tacit recognition that the three Baltic States are under the jurisdiction of Soviet Russia.

If our recognition of the three Baltic states means anything beyond empty words, if the Atlantic Charter possesses real validity, if the right of small nations to exist continues to be a part of our credo, there must be some way of bringing the issue to an acceptable settlement. Although the Potsdam communique contains no direct reference to the Baltic question, the Council of Ministers now set up certainly possesses the authority to consider the subject. The immediate important task of the Council is to draw up treaties of peace with five enemy countries "and to propose settlements of territorial questions outstanding on the termination of the war in Europe."

No fair-minded person will deny that Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania are entitled to a hearing, nor that we should give something more than lip service to our recognition.

A letter written by Constantine R. Jurgela, president of the Lithuanian-American Council of Societies of Greater New York, was printed in the New York Times on September 21, 1945, as follows:

TROUBLE IN BALTIC STATES—ACTION BY RUSSIA VIEWED AS VIOLATION OF ATLANTIC CHARTER

Your editorials seem to take it for granted that the Russian territorial acquisitions of 1939-45 are to be permanent annexations along the eastern fringe of Czechoslovakia, the Curzon line, and across east Prussia.

However, a delegation of the Lithuanian-American Council, uniting the preponderant majority of Lithuanian-American organizations, called at the State Department on August 22 and was told that the American policy of nonrecognition of the Soviet conquest of the Baltic states, namely, the statement of July 23, 1940, remains unchanged, and that the principles of the Atlantic Charter continue to guide the American policy.

Unfortunately, as recently as at Potsdam, the Anglo-American policy toward Russia seems to have been that of give and hope, not give and take. With the hostilities ended in Europe and Asia, the democracies must now face the vital issues affecting the destinies of some 100,000,000 people of eastern and central Europe, and compel Russia to live up to its commitments and its adherence to the Atlantic Charter in the declaration of the United Nations.

Meanwhile, the Baltic peoples, who had built an excellent record of political maturity and self-government, lie submerged under the vilest conditions of terror, oppression, deportations, forced labor, and colonization at the hands of the Russian NKVD.

Your reporters have been able to depict the conditions of life under the Soviet occupation in Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, and, to some small degree, in Poland. However, the conditions in these countries do not approximate the conditions in the conquered Baltic states. There is a total blackout of news from the Baltic states except the odds and bits that emerge through the lucky few refugees.

There are 200,000 to 400,000 Baltic refugees in western Germany, Austria, and Denmark, plus some 35,000 in Sweden. About 50 refugees in Sweden agreed to go back—including 4 Lithuanians, of whom 1 managed to escape back to Sweden. All the rest refuse to go into Russian slavery, despite the terrorizing effect of the visits of armed Soviet officers who circulate freely in the Anglo-American zones of occupation. Besides the hosts of farmers and laborers, the Baltic refugees account for practically all of the intellectual elite—professors, scientists, teachers, physicians, nurses, engineers, opera singers, artists. The priests generally remained at their posts, except the few hundred who had been forcibly deported by the retreating Germans.

American Catholic bishops have already spoken in behalf of their fellow Christians of the Baltic states. The Latvians and Estonians are predominantly Protestant, and British Protesant organizations have spoken in their behalf. These are encouraging signs of sympathy for the progressive and democratic neutral Baltic peoples who had suffered manpower losses greater than any of the belligerent states, 40 percent in the case of Lithuania The friends of the Baltic peoples in this country will certainly continue to act and strive for the implementation of the war aims of the democracies with active deeds, such as demand for evacuation of the Soviet troops and NKVD terrorists from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

NEWS FROM OCCUPIED LITHUANIA—"LITHUANIAN PARTISANS" ARE NOT LITHUANIANS

This bulletin has repeatedly stated that the "Lithuanian Partisans," much propagandized by the Soviets and active in German-occupied Lithuania, were mainly non-Lithuanians; most of them were Russians who had parachuted into Lithuania. That this is true may readily be seen from the fact that the list of "Lithuanian Partisans decorated by the Soviet Government," provided by Soviet sources, is composed almost entirely of Russian names. Any person familiar with the Lithuanian language will admit that none of the following names, taken from the list published on July 5, 1945, in Pravda, official publication of the Soviet Communist Party, can be considered Lithuanian: Konstantin Yugosovich Rodion, Rava Ivanovich Bukin, Ivan Ivanovich Vasilyev, Karp Pinovich Ivanov, Konstantin Mihailovich Izvekov, Gavril Karpovich Klychev, Fedot Antipovich Krugliakov, Mihail Danilovich Markovski, Andrei Markovich Murnikov, Sergey Grigoryevich Nevedomski, Yosif Dmitrevevich Nikitin, Sergey Stepanovich Sergeyov, Yakov Vasilyevich Streltsov, Fedor Kornetevich Antonov, Feoktist Aristorchovich Lebedev, Dmitry Andreyevich Perfenov, Ekaterina Zaharovna Radionova, Klementy Ivanovich Sokolov, Ivan Kuzmich Avdeyenko, Grigory Yuryevich Ankudinov, Yefim Grigoryevich Belenki, Yakov Osipovich Bielov, Dmitry Konstantinovich Borisov, Vyacheslav Romanovich Braziuka, Nikifor Kondratyevich Bursov, Sergey Nikitovich Vakulenka, Vassily Nikolai Yosifovich Ginko, Timofey Grigoryevich Golubov, Kuzma Andreyevich Gorkin, Aleksamdra Aleksandrovna Gratska, Aleksander Nikitovich Gromenkov, Vasily Mitrofanovich Gusev, Vasily Stefanovich Dorofeyev, Fedor Kapitonovich Dyakov, Konstantin Yevgenevich Yevseychik, Arten Ivanovich Yelkin, Kuzma Yagorovinovich Yefishov, Ivan Lariyonovich Yefremov, Aleksander Mihailovich Zolotov, Leonid Andreyevich Kair, Ivan Afanasyevich Klaus, Danil Semyonovich Kostoshka, Vasily Yefremovich Koshkin.

The above list constitutes about one-third of the decorated partisans bearing similar names, as published by the Soviets. Not only are the Lithuanian names very few, but, they include members of the Soviet puppet government in Lithuania and a few pro-Soviet journalists; during the German occupation of Lithuania all these persons resided, not in Lithuania, but in Soviet Russia.

The partisan movement sponsored by the Soviets, which was designed to abolish Nazi rule in Lithuania and replace it with the Soviet occupation, is not to be confused with the Lithuanian patriotic underground movement which is still in existence. These underground fighters, who actively resisted the Germans, seek to protect Lithuania from foreign enslavement, Russian as well as German.

The Soviet official organ Pravda, in its issue No. 166, instructed the Lithuanian Communist Party to see that Lithuanian farmers harvest the sugar-beet crop between October 20 and November 1. This is the first time that Lithuanian farmers have been ordered by the central government in Moscow to accomplish their work by a specified date.

Paleckis, the Soviet puppet premier of Lithuania, in a speech given at the Twelfth Supreme Soviet Council, reminded his audience of Lenin's statement to the effect that, "no nation which holds other nations in bondage can be truly free." These words apply perfectly to the Soviet Union in its present policies toward Lithuania.

Soviet efforts to bolshevize Lithuania may be seen from the following list, published in Pravda, of Communist educational institutions opened in Lithuania by the Soviets: two Marxist-Leninist evening universities, 10 evening Communist Party schools, and one seminar to prepare Communist leaders for Lithuania. All this in a country where communism was never popular among the people; in 1941, as admitted by the Soviet orgen arybu Lietuva (Soviet Lithuania) in its issue No. 35 of 1941, the Lithuanian Communist Party had barely 1,500 members.

Museums and libraries in Vilnius have been robbed of 8,000 museum pieces and 36,000 volume. According to the Soviet paper Izvestia, in its issue No. 169, all this property was taken to Minsk. Need-

less to say, the wishes of the Lithuanian people were not consulted.

According to broadcasts over the Vilius radio, two monuments associated with Lithuania's wars of independence—the tomb of the Unknown Soldier and the Statue of Liberty, both on the grounds of the War Museum in Kaunas, have been destroyed.

Father Matulaitis was a Lithuanian patriot whose work for his country's independence during World War I and in the period immediately following will long be remembered.

Relief and a Free Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the November 5, 1945, edition of the Sterling Advocate, Sterling, Colo., on the need for a free press in the world if there is to be mutual sympathy and understanding among nations:

RELIEF AND A FREE PRESS

Action of the House of Representatives in tying a free press provision to the $550,000,000 appropriation for relief in liberated countries, was an untimely, though well-intentioned move.

Secretary of State James Byrnes, in a letter to House Appropriations Committee Chairman CLARENCE CANNON, stated the objection to this action very plainly when he said:

"We cannot put curselves in the position of denying promised relief to millions of human beings because we have failed to secure our other objectives in advance."

The willingness to grant relief money should not be tied to irrelevant "ifs." Either we are willing to aid the suffering peoples of the world, or we are not, and there should be no political questions involved.

The motive behind the House action is apparent. It aims directly at Russia, where tight censorship continues despite the fact that wartime need for such secrecy no longer exists. Naturally, if we are going to send huge sums abroad for relief, we will want to know how that money is being administered, whether the goods which that money buys are being used for political purposes.

More than that, we want to know what is going on inside the other nations of the world. We can trust the officers of UNRRA to keep a sharp eye on the administration of its funds and to report to UNRRA members honestly, but there is more to it than that.

There has been much talk of one world, and international cooperation as the guaranties of lasting peace.

But can there be one world in the true sense if any country prohibits free reporting to the rest of the world of conditions within that country? Is that international cooperation? Is that the sort of attitude that will promote the trust and confidence that is necessary to peace?

There must be a free press in every corner of the world if there is to be mutual sympathy and understanding among nations. We are wholeheartedly in favor of the United States pressing for free reporting in all nations, but it should not be a restriction on any move to alleviate suffering.

Religion and Morality Are Indispensable Supports of Political Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith submit a transcript of the record of an audience granted myself and other members of a congressional committee by His Holiness Pope Pius XII in Vatican City on June 27, 1945. It follows:

The following remarks were made by His Holiness Pope Pius XII to the Honorable ROBERT SIKES, of Florida; the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD, of California; the Honorable MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois; the Honorable J. LEROY JOHNSON, of California; the Honorable CHARLES R. CLASON, of Massachusetts; the Honorable THOMAS E. MARTIN, of Iowa; the Honorable JESÚS PIÑERO, of Puerto Rico, members of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, when they were received in private audience by His Holiness at the Vatican on June 18, 1945:

"You are most welcome, gentlemen, welcome to Rome, welcome to the Vatican City State.

"Recently we have had the pleasure of receiving on different occasions several groups from both Houses of your American Congress, who were visiting war-torn Europe in search, it would seem, of first-hand knowledge of what has been happening and is happening over here. We take this as a very good sign. It shows that you and your colleagues are very much alive to the responsibilities weighing heavily today on the legislatures of the world, on the legislatures of the free peoples of the world. Men expect, and with reason, that law will be for them the bulwark of justice and truth, that in law they may find safe protection for those God-given human rights, whose free exercise is basic in any world order wherein peace may hope to take root and flourish; among others the right of every nation, small or weak as well as great or powerful, to its own life and independence; the right of every individual to worship God publicly as well as privately, and to serve Him according to the dictates of conscience. When in any part of the world these fundamental rights are not safeguarded, or, what is worse, are infringed upon or grossly violated, however adroit or specious the pretext, that man would be very credulous who would promise himself any long respite from war; and millions of precious human lives would have been sacrificed in vain. The world of your day is too small not to be affected by the moral ideas and conduct of any one of its component nations; and the words of your first President have lost none of their meaning and force, that religion and morality are the indispensable supports of political prosperity. Without them how can you hope for obedience to law? Without them there remain only despotism, brute force, and slavery.

"May God protect Europe and the world against such a calamity. That is the burden of our prayer as we beg God to guide you in your deliberations and to bless you and your dear ones at home abundantly."

OPA Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the OPA seems determined to change the business methods of the car dealers in America. I have had a great many wires and letters from the dealers in my district protesting the new directive which changes the regular order of business of automobile dealers. The OPA Act, subsection H of section 2 specifically states as follows:

The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices, or methods or means or aids to distribution established in any industry.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that this section is crystal clear. It is put in as a restriction upon OPA. We now find this organization trying to evade this section of the law and attempting to change the business practices of the automobile industry.

The OPA seems intent upon controlling profits. Their actions have been one which is not that of controlling inflation but antibusiness. It seems that the OPA wants to get a stranglehold on industry. They want to prevent competition which is the best governor to business. They fail to understand that efficiencies in business and competition will decide the price of many articles.

Our pattern of living and of producing is so complicated that it cannot be blueprinted and regimented by the OPA making every individual travel the same path.

Many regulations imposed upon business by the OPA have been done with a ruthlessness and a pettiness far beyond the law or any conception of Congress. This Congress ought to do everything possible to get Government off the neck of business. Industry working with its own special problems in its own special market will make adjustment under competitive prices without regulations being prescribed by the OPA.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that many of the policies of the OPA have encouraged inflation. They do this because they discourage production. There are thousands of businessmen with factories, materials, and labor ready to go to work, but they are waiting upon the OPA to give them a price upon the article they wish to sell. Many of these small businesses being denied a price which will reflect a reasonable profit are turning the keys in their places of business and going fishing. This will cause not only a shortage of consumer goods but unemployment.

The automobile dealers of this country should be left alone. This Congress should speak in no uncertain terms. They should insist that OPA follow the law and not make interpretations which permit them to change long-established business practices.

The Principles of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave given me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose comments from a letter of a former employer of mine who is a member of the Marine Corps and has been overseas in the Pacific area for the past 3 years. I think it is well for us who have been following the war in the States to give heed to these thoughts of a fighting marine who believes in the principles of democracy being applied to all people and Americans in particular:

At this point, I am a somewhat confused person. Judging from what I can gather through various sources, racial conflicts are bursting forth in rather odd places. I am told that school children are even involved. Believe me, if all this is true I am a disappointed man. My despair has found an entirely new low, surpassing all others considerably. To think that parents (for this could come only through them) would stoop so low as to undermine the roots of youth and poison their own children so that their minds shall forever be warped!

We are a people of a Nation based on the principles of democracy. The eyes of the world look to us for guidance. Gladly we dictate the policies of the other countries, yet we pitifully fail to practice them at home. We even fail to educate our own citizens on how to appreciate our democracy to the fullest extent. At this point, every school should be teaching a subject called democracy. Instead, Americans in various portions of the country are slowly falling in line with those radical agitators that seek to gain through others' failures.

Perhaps some people don't realize the seriousness of the existing circumstances. If those agitators succeed at all, then they are stronger than our Government itself. For every democratic principle they break and remain unpunished, then there lies another weak spot in our own executive legislative and judicial body.

Surely some one can start a movement somehow, to rid the country of these heretics. Am I to return and be pushed about by a German who just decided to become a citizen of the United States merely because his country failed to conquer us all? Under the existing set-up this can happen. Frankly I have no intention of being trod upon by anyone. I am quite firm in my own convictions. I'll die for what I believe in my own way to be my rights. By the same token, I'll go out of my way to avoid trouble. Just think, 10 Nazis distributed cleverly in 1 city could turn it into a complete and destructive storm. People are gullible, some to a pitiful extent, some merely follow the crowd, while still others choose to avert trouble. When is our Government going to take drastic action and quell the storm? Can we truthfully say Germany lost her war of exploitation and subjugation? No! Every bit of successful racial agitation is a victory far greater than any she could have possibly won in the field. Those victories will live in the hearts of men. They breed discontent. They flow in the bloodstream and stab the heart.

The American Legion, Seventh District, Department of Wisconsin, Pledges Support of H. R. 3939 To Wipe Out Cancer and Infantile Paralysis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am setting forth a letter and resolution of the seventh district of the Department of Wisconsin of the American Legion endorsing my efforts toward an appropriation of $500,000,000 for research with respect to the causes and cure of cancer and poliomyelitis:

ROY L. VINGERS POST, No. 52,
La Crosse, Wis., October 15, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
United States Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEVENSON: The Seventh District of the Department of Wisconsin of the American Legion, in session at Tomah, Wis., on October 15, 1945, went on record as heartily endorsing your efforts toward an appropriation of $500,000,000 for research with respect to the causes and cure of cancer and poliomyelitis.

The scourge of cancer and infantile paralysis causes untold suffering and anguish to the human race throughout the world. We commend your stand and pledge our support to you in helping to wipe out disease by the passage of your bill, H. R. 3939.

Very sincerely yours,

C. F. EVANS,
Post Adjutant, Post 52.

Approved:

Dr. MYRON H. MOEN,
Commander, Seventh District.

Relief and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of November 12, 1945:

RELIEF AND POLITICS

The Brown amendment which the House on Thursday tacked onto the UNRRA appropriation is at once a mischievous irrelevancy and an administrative absurdity. It pretends to assure freedom to American newspapermen in countries where UNRRA operates. Press freedom is, of course, a laudable goal. And espousal of it, like espousal of the sanctity of American motherhood, seems an easy avenue to political glorification. It has nothing to do, however, with the filling of bellies which crave not news but food. We do not believe that the House Republicans were prudent, or even politic, in making a party issue of this specious amendment. They have laid themselves open to the ugly charge of playing politics with relief.

The Brown amendment has to be read to be believed. It provides that none of the funds appropriated "shall be furnished to or used in any country of which the controlling government * * * maintains any barrier—technical, political, legal, or economic—to obtaining, dispatching, and disseminating the news." Such barriers, wherever they exist, are lamentable. But the fact is that they do exist and are certain to be continued to some extent in a number of the countries which have undergone recent political upheavals. The people who live in those countries may be no less hungry, however, than the people in countries adhering more closely to our own concepts of press freedom.

In point of fact, every country maintains some barriers to obtaining news. Newspapermen were excluded, for example, from the executive session of the House Appropriations Committee, which acted on the UNRRA request for funds. A literal interpretation of the Brown amendment would mean, therefore, that not even the United States would be eligible for UNRRA aid. General Eisenhower necessarily maintains certain barriers to dispatching news from Germany. The Brown amendment would make it impossible, therefore, for UNRRA to give assistance to the displaced persons now inside the Reich. The Russians—at whom the Brown amendment is patently aimed—are not going to be forced into an abandonment of their deplorable censorship by this sort of blackmail. All that we can get out of such tactics is a further deterioration of our relations with them.

The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee reported just a few days ago that "the $550,000,000 remaining to complete the current contribution of the United States toward UNRRA's operating expenses should be made available immediately. This is a national obligation. It is unthinkable that the United States should now default on the commitments it has made to UNRRA and which UNRRA in turn has made, in reliance upon us, to the people of the liberated countries of Europe." We cannot now impose a special condition upon our contribution to UNRRA without just such an unthinkable default on our commitments. The Brown amendment imposes a condition which is, in any case, impossible of fulfillment and which, if enforced, will condemn millions to hunger. UNRRA was established not for the purpose of opening foreign doors to American newspapermen but for the simple, humanitarian purpose of getting food to starving human beings. We hope the Senate will have a better sense of values.

UNRRA—Our Tragic Let-down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial on UNRRA entitled "UNRRA—Our Tragic Let-down" which appeared in the Washington Post of Sunday, November 11, 1945:

UNRRA—OUR TRAGIC LET-DOWN

American prestige in the world had never before reached such a peak as was attained

at the close of the war. Millions of people in all parts of the earth looked upon the United States as their chief liberator. By our tremendous contribution to victory we had earned and won the moral leadership of mankind in the fight for a better world. Now—less than four months after VJ-day—it must be acknowledged that our influence in the shaping of tomorrow is critically sagging.

In our opinion, every citizen ought to be asking himself with the utmost gravity what is the reason for this tragic let-down. Why have we suddenly relinquished our vigor in pursuit of aims which only a few months ago were deemed worthy of the sacrifice of our sons? Can it be that peace and democracy and decent regard for human life are any less desirable than they were at the height of our military effort? That is unthinkable. Yet we are confronted by a shocking failure to carry through some of our simple obligations growing out of the war.

The most glaring example of this dereliction is the failure of Congress to appropriate the funds that it had previously pledged for the relief of the starving people of Europe and Asia. The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, which celebrated its second anniversary on Friday, is nearly at the end of its rope. Its food shipments to war-devastated Europe are being curbed for want of funds. For the great democratic power which poured out billions to supply the world with weapons is quibbling over a relatively small sum for starving women and children.

Our shameful position is exposed by a roll call of the nations in default in their obligations to UNRRA. A total of $598,594,000 is due that life-saving agency, and of that total the United States owes $550,000,000. In other words, the richest and most powerful Nation in the world is alone in default in any substantial amount. We were expected to lead the world in binding up the wounds from battle and in salvaging the wrecked lives of people in the formerly occupied countries. Instead, we are trailing so far behind that the whole idea of world-wide relief for the victims of war is hanging in the balance.

Foremost among the causes for this critical situation at the moment is the confusion of rescue operations with freedom of the press. No one is more interested in promoting world-wide freedom of expression than ourselves. But when people are suffering cruelly from hunger we can no more ask them to embrace freedom of the press in return for food than we can buy a change in politics or religion by domestic relief grants. It is an outrageous misconception of democratic principles to suppose that they can be fostered by this means. Throw up freedom of the press as a barrier between starving people and the food they crave and we shall create everlasting hatred of that principle and those who so stupidly espouse it.

It is time for the American people to wake up to the fact that we are losing the precious advantages purchased with the blood of our sons because of petty and short-sighted deviation from our main course. To suffer a million casualties for the sake of peace with freedom and then leave a sick, devastated, hungry, and disorganized world to its own misery would be nothing short of insane. The American people would never deliberately consent to such a profligate deflation of our victory. Yet we are drifting into a situation of disillusionment, despair, and lack of unity for want of an aggressive policy of pulling the world together in reconstruction and peace. That drifting cannot continue without disaster. And we do not believe that it will continue if the leaders who see the dangers ahead let the people know what is happening and use all their power to swing the Nation back onto its true course.

Supreme Court Justice Answers the Question, "Why Vote Republican?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, because of its unusual interest and because of the high regard in which Mr. Justice Burton, of the United States Supreme Court, is universally held, I am placing in the RECORD at this point an article which appeared in the October issue of the Republican magazine and which was written by Mr. Burton shortly before his appointment to the Supreme Court.

In this article the former United States Senator of Ohio and the former mayor of Cleveland, places strong emphasis on some persuasive arguments demonstrating why the citizens of this Republic should vote Republican in 1946 and 1948. In justice to Mr. Burton, the editors of the Republican included the following notice in an announcement at the beginning of the article as it appeared in that magazine:

It is with pride that the editors of the Republican offer you this last partisan article of former Senator Harold H. Burton, who now takes an impartial position in the United States Supreme Court. In all fairness to Harold Burton, we want to emphasize the fact that this article of Justice Burton's was written before his late appointment to the Supreme Court, and at a time when he was in the full vigor of his partisanship and public service combined in his United States Senate work.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that the present administration places such high confidence in the judgment and ability of Mr. Burton as to appoint him to a position on the Supreme Court of the United States tends to underscore and emphasize the importance of Mr. Burton's answers to the question, "Why vote Republican?"

The Republican magazine is edited and published in Chicago by Mr. Richard Nowinson, its editor and manager. Since 1935 the Republican has been the national party magazine and it has been designated many times as an official party publication. Consequently, Mr. Burton's compelling arguments calling upon his fellow citizens to vote Republican because "the Republican Party is the natural meeting place today for the conservatives, the progressives, and the liberals who believe in Jeffersonian freedoms, in Lincolnian sympathies, and in the principle of individual liberty as opposed to ever-increasing regimentation" merit most careful consideration. They accurately reflect the thinking of the Republican leadership in America today.

The Republican magazine adds another service stripe to its long record of constructive party service in the publication of this important article, and citizens generally will benefit by the thoughtful reading and analysis of Mr. Justice Burton's compelling arguments:

WHY VOTE REPUBLICAN?

(By Harold H. Burton)

Why vote Republican? Because the Republican Party best fits the time.

It is time for a new birth of freedom from regimentation in our America.

It is time for freedom from all forms of intolerance.

It is time for America to live within her income.

It is time to demonstrate that constitutionally organized freedom and truly representative government are far better for America than communism or national socialism.

It is time to emphasize the value of a reasonable separation of local from Federal functions and of the executive from the legislative branch of our Federal Government.

It is time to develop dependable prosperity through increased production and widened distribution of newly created wealth.

It is time to liberate the natural strength of large and small private enterprises and to encourage the production, distribution, and sale of the products of American shops and farms, both at home and abroad. This means seeing to it that our economy and our Government are agencies of freedom and progress suited to our needs and equal to the hopes of our young people who have fought this war and who are looking for results worthy of their sacrifices and their efforts.

The Republican Party is destined to become the majority party in American just as soon as it demonstrates that it best meets these timely needs of the country.

PARTY NEEDS CANDIDATES

In addition, the party must have candidates who reflect the invincible spirit and the deep-seated loyalty of our service men and women. They must reflect the tolerant, sympathetic spirit of Jefferson and Lincoln toward all men, regardless of their wealth, position, race, or religion. They must believe deeply in our Declaration of Independence and in our Constitution. They must show the combined vigor of pioneers, vision of scientists, and faith in God and man that typifies America and is the hope of all humanity.

I say it is time for "a new birth of freedom" from regimentation in America—and the Republican Party is the best agency to insure it, because for 12 years the economic, social, and political regimentation of America has increased steadily, first to meet the scarcity of depression days, and then to meet the scarcity of wartime. As both the depression and the war have now ended, we face the critical necessity and the priceless opportunity of developing greater industrial and agricultural activities in America and abroad than ever before have been attained. Regimentation is a natural mechanism in time of scarcity. It is the enemy of dynamic prosperity. Without even arguing whether the regimentation of America has been necessary or wise, it is clear that the political party now best fitted to end it quickly is the party that is and has been seeking to reduce it, and not the party that established it, developed it, and manned it with hundreds of thousands of appointees who are dependent for their own employment upon the everlasting extension of it.

I say it is time for freedom from intolerance—and the Republican Party is the party best able to lead the way to such freedom, because never before has the whole world been as nearly united as it is now in support of the common interests of humanity. Never before has America as clearly supported an international agreement dedicated to the practice of the principles of the universal brotherhood of man. Never before has it been so vital to the survival of humanity that there be cooperation rather than controversy among all peoples. In this light,

America stands before the world as a natural champion of tolerance. To make good its traditional pledge and current teachings, the Government of the United States must put into practice the principles of tolerance proclaimed in its Declaration of Independence.

The primary principle of our political faith was written into our Declaration of Independence by Thomas Jefferson, who then identified himself as a "Republican" while basing such identification largely upon his deep faith that all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, including life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Lincoln testified later to that same faith. While laying the foundation of the new Republican Party, he quoted Jefferson's famous phrase, to which I have just referred, and then illuminated it with this statement:

"This was their majestic interpretation of the economy of the universe. This was their lofty, and wise, and noble understanding of the justice of the Creator to His creatures—yes, gentlemen, to all His creatures, to the whole great family of man. In their enlightened belief, nothing stamped with the divine image and likeness was sent into the world to be trodden on and degraded and imbruted by its fellows: They grasped not only the whole race of men then living, but they reached forward and seized upon the farthest posterity. They erected a beacon to guide their children and their children's children, and the countless myriads who should inhabit the earth in other ages. Wise statesmen as they were, they knew the tendency of prosperity to breed tyrants, and so they established these great self-evident truths, that when in the distant future some man, some faction, some interest, should set up the doctrine that none but rich men, none but white men, or none but Anglo-Saxon white men were entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, their posterity might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their fathers began, so that truth and justice and mercy and all the humane and Christian virtues might not be extinguished from the land; so that no man would hereafter dare to limit and circumscribe the great principles on which the temple of liberty was being built."

GOP IS TOLERANCE PARTY

Tolerance and mutual understanding among all men and women is of the very essence of the American Bill of Rights and of the Republican Party. The Republican Party, by tradition, precept, and practice, is the party of racial and of religious tolerance.

I say it is time for America to live within her income—and the Republican Party is the best party to help her do so, because for 12 years, under the pressure, first, of a depression and then of the war, America has each year deepened her deficit, usually by a larger amount than in the preceding year, until now the debt is over 10 times greater than it was after World War I. Our Federal Government has been borrowing against the credit of our grandchildren and our great-grandchildren to pay its current operating expenses. This profligate policy points the way to inflation, national bankruptcy, and the final breach of America's pledge to her citizens, and to the world, that every bond of this free Republic is worthy of infinite faith and confidence. The financial standing not only of the United States, but of all self-governing republics, depends upon the reputable standing of America's bonds.

There is no more insidious habit than that of living on borrowed capital. It is an easy habit to start and a hard one to stop. We, of this generation, are the trustees of America for our children and our children's children. We owe a sacred obligation to them to keep our Nation solvent and to stop at once spending today the resources that should be theirs a generation from now. Officials, who for 12 years have been paying current expenses out of borrowed capital, are not the best ones to be entrusted with the responsibility of breaking that habit. The Republican Party—traditionally, the party of sound money and balanced budgets—is the party best fitted to put an end to the profligate policies it has condemned and sought to restrain.

I say it is time to demonstrate that constitutionally organized freedom and truly representative government are far better for America than communism or national socialism, and this is the essence of the creed of the Republican Party. Today the United Nations are trustees of the future of the world. Among the leading United Nations, as separate nations, there exist three marked trends. One is toward communism as exemplified by Russia, standing for the dictatorship of one party of workers over all other people. One is toward national socialism as exemplified by Great Britain, presenting the solution of a tired nation faced with scarcity. The third is that of organized freedom exemplified by the representative self-government of the United States. Under this, our elected officials serve as trustees for all the people in accordance with a written Constitution. Under this, also, there has developed that extraordinary freedom of individual enterprise, which has fostered the irresistible economic strength that produced the astounding quality and quantity of materials and supplies that enabled the world to beat back the greatest and most ruthless attack ever made upon civilization.

America was founded, in part, to get away from the handicaps and mistakes of Europe. It was founded, in part, to establish here a freedom of opportunity, under which people from all over the world have demonstrated the feasibility of such organized freedom.

The Republican Party is dedicated to this principle of organized freedom and to the mechanism of truly representative government. The Republican Party is vigorously opposed to communism, and Communists in America have demonstrated this by their opposition to Republican candidates. The Republican Party is opposed to national socialism, and the advocates of national socialism have demonstrated this by their general opposition to Republican candidates.

It is the purpose of the Republican Party to support, for America, the policy of organized freedom, with as little regimentation as is consistent with the protection of all from unfair interference by others. It is the belief of the Republican Party that such a policy best serves America, regardless of the drift of certain other great and friendly nations in other directions. While recognizing the right of other nations to choose their own domestic policies, the Republican Party believes strongly that America's best interests lead neither to communism nor to national socialism. America is still the dynamic vehicle of a vigorous new Nation seeking ever-rising standards of living. America's demonstration of the success of such policies will be the greatest possible source of encouragement to people everywhere to follow us on this road to freedom. If America believes in organized freedom and in a representative government for America serving as a trustee for all, and if America wishes to outdistance the advocates of communism or national socialism in this country, the party to serve in office for such a purpose is the Republican Party.

I say it is time to emphasize the value of a reasonable separation of local from Federal functions and of the executive from the legislative branch of our Federal Government, and the Republican Party is now the leading exponent of this doctrine. Jefferson, as founder of his Republican-Democratic Party, emphasized the value of local and decentralized government at every possible point, in contrast to any over-centralization of Federal functions. No doubt, today, he would resist vigorously the trend toward over-federalization of functions which has characterized the New Deal program in a substantial reversal of Jefferson's principles. Today, the Democratic Party is, at best, deeply divided within itself on this issue. The Republican Party, however, has resisted the veritable extinction of many State and local functions by the Federal Government under the New Deal program, until today the Republican Party, rather than the Democratic Party, stands as the champion of the preservation for local and State governments of as many of their functions as can be administered by them in the public interest.

The time has come when the cumbersomeness, arbitrariness, and wastefulness of overfederalization of functions has demonstrated itself under the New Deal. Today, the Democratic Party—if it wished to do so—could not separate itself from this New Deal tendency, nor could it separate the hundreds of thousands of Federal employees from the Federal pay roll, whom it has placed there in its drift toward overfederalization. The happy medium between local governments administering local functions and the Federal Government administering Federal functions can now best be attained by the Republican Party which has not encumbered itself with almost countless appointments of its members to overfederalized bureaus that should be abolished.

Similarly, the past 21 years have marked as astounding advance of executive authority into the legislative field of our Federal Government. While the line between legislation and administration cannot be sharply defined and while the separation of executive from legislative functions will always rest in some uncertainty, the recent advances of the executive into the frontiers of the domain of Congress have been so marked as to call for a prompt reversal of policy.

In order to permit our Chief Executive to be effective, our Constitution has given him wide discretion in interpreting the extent of his own executive authority. If the President decides to extend his authority as far as possible, he can push far into normally legislative fields before he will be held to have actually violated the Constitution. To some extent, his Executive orders can be checked and overridden by express legislative action; yet, the only really practical control over such executive intrusion upon the legislative functions of Congress rests in the self-restraint which the Chief Executive imposes on himself by limiting himself primarily to the execution of policies determined by the Congress, rather than attempting to initiate the policies himself without legislative approval.

During the past 12 years—since the inauguration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1933—there have been issued over 3,750 executive orders, far exceeding the number of executive orders previously issued in any corresponding period of our American history.

The Republican Party, therefore, stands today as the natural champion of reasonable limitations both on the intrusion of the Federal government into the field of local government and on the intrusion of the Federal executive into the field of Congress.

I say it is time to develop dependable prosperity through increased production and widened distribution of newly created wealth. It is time to liberate the natural strength of large and small private enterprise and to encourage the production, distribution, and sale of the products of American shops and farms, both at home and abroad. This is a Republican doctrine contrasted with New Deal doctrines of synthetic purchasing power based upon subsidies to some paid from taxes on others, but not representing new products.

There can be no progress without the human effort needed to produce the standards or facilities sought. Every advance in our standards of living comes from the efforts of someone who produces those benefits.

One man alone on an island knows that his condition can be no better than he makes it by his personal efforts. He, therefore, gets to work on new facilities to improve his condition. There is nothing in the presence of 2 men on the island, or of 2,000,000,000 men on the earth, that changes that simple fact. It is through the combined efforts and exchange of efforts, that men do more together than they can alone. In any case, however, the gain depends upon someone's real effort.

Today, great progress is being made through countless scientific advances, labor-saving devices, and inventions. These benefits now contribute so widely to the advance of mankind that each generation is better off than its predecessors, although each individual expends less physical labor than did his ancestors. The advance of mankind will be substantially in proportion to the efforts of mankind, and civilization will suffer substantially in proportion as men fail to make the best productive use of their abilities.

The Republican Party is destined to become the majority party in America just as soon as it demonstrates that it best meets the above timely tests.

The Republican Party best fits our time because it is best fitted to develop the assets of America in accordance with American tradition and experience. The Republican Party will not sell America's unique heritage of individual freedom for any "mess of pottage" brewed in the old world cauldron of international or class conflict.

WANT AMERICA TO STAY AMERICAN

A majority of Americans, and especially our returning veterans, want America to stay American and to meet the needs of our time in accordance with the principles on which America was founded and for the preservation of which this war has been fought. Americans appreciate the increasing need of international stability as a basis for domestic stability, and they also appreciate the leading part that America, hereafter, must play in order to secure international peace, justice, and stability. Most Americans, however, ask that America lead the way in accordance with the American principle of constitutional freedom for all.

The Republican Party is now the natural vehicle for those who believe in the traditional American programs of freedom for the individual and of a Nation's dependence upon the consent of the governed as the source of its political power. The Republican Party is the rallying point of those whose conservatism means faith in the basic principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. In addition, the Republican Party is now the natural vehicle for those who seek to advance into new fields of modern economic, social, and international progress without abandoning the purpose for which America was founded: the greatest possible freedom for the individual.

If America is to overcome the greatest financial handicap of her history, her $300,000,000,000 national debt, without bankruptcy, she must develop a dynamic system of peacetime production of real wealth that will far exceed her prewar production but need not equal the peak of her wartime production. With international stability, domestic stability, and the preservation of individual opportunity, such production needs can be met. We have ample plants, machinery, raw materials, skilled workmen, skilled supervision, transportation, and demand for new goods to do this. It cannot be done, however, by reliance on the dole, or a subsidy, or governmental operation, because those procedures do not unlock American genius and enterprise. The keys we need are those of freedom of opportunity to seek individual success and such freedom of competition as will call forth the best efforts of each competitor.

The Republican Party is the natural meeting place today for the conservatives, the progressives, and the liberals who believe in Jeffersonian freedoms, in Lincolnian sympathies, and in the principle of individual liberty as opposed to ever-increasing regimentation.

Freedom is our goal—and the Republican Party is the American party of universal freedom.

Armistice Day, 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, this is Armistice Day and we are celebrating again the winning of the First World War.

In viewing all the misery and destruction, with the backset to the advancement of civilization, I thought the time had come to gather all remnants of armaments and munitions of war and hand them over to an international commission for the enforcement of universal peace and the prevention of all future wars.

We remember when this country was being importuned on every side to come to the rescue of the Allies in that war and America sent her boys forth to save democracy and fight a war to end all wars. Our great President had the foresight to announce the humanitarian principles comprising Fourteen Points for which we entered the fight; principles which were universally subscribed to by our co-belligerents.

Then came the armistice and the Versailles Treaty, based on the selfish manipulation of our former allies, soon to be followed by the disheartening disregard of international security and fair dealing: The attack by Turkey on Greece when Smyrna was sacked and its innocent people were driven to the sea. Italy was permitted to overrun and destroy the government of Ethiopia. Japan descended on helpless China, proceeded to wreck Shanghai and destroy its people and then overrun all of China's richest provinces, while America provided most of the munitions used in this conquest.

Mr. Speaker, after our disillusioning and disheartening experience following the last war and all the sacrifice and contribution we have made to bring peace to the world again after this war, for which so many American lives have been lost, we must see to it that all the promises of freedom, security, and the blessing of good government so devoutly made to all the people of the world were not made in vain.

That we may know something of the difficulty to be overcome in keeping these sacred promises, I commend for consideration the condensation that has been made of an article by William Hard, printed in the Reader's Digest and inserted herewith:

We are urged to have good will toward the Soviet Union. But peace does not come just by good will.

In almost all of central eastern Europe, "liberated by the Red Army," the Soviet Union proceeds to practice deportations and liquidations, and proceeds to exclude—or narrowly restrict—all observers from other countries, and proceeds to set up governments controlled by Communists responsive to Moscow only. It proceeds to make half a dozen countries—running from Poland on the Baltic to Yugoslavia on the Adriatic—into Soviet annexes.

But now why did Britain and the United States allow this process even to start? Why did they bow to that false phrase "liberated by the Red Army"? All countries liberated from Germany were liberated by the joint efforts of all the Allies.

Did Britain erase from its memory the British fleet which had stranglingly blockaded Germany? Did Britain and the United States forget their air forces which had crippled Germany's war industries and transportation system? Did they retain no recollection of the British and American armies which, in Africa, in Sicily, in Italy, in France, in Belgium, in the Netherlands, in Germany, drew hosts of German soldiers away from the Soviet front? Did the United States count as nothing its lend-lease offerings to the Soviet Union?

In lend-lease—to March 31, 1945—the Soviet Union got from the United States, among many other things, the following: 158,000 guns of all calibers, 13,300 airplanes, 312,000 tons of explosives, 1,500 locomotives, 540,000 tons of rails, 406,000 motor vehicles. "These vehicles," say President Truman in his last lend-lease report to the Congress, "carried—on some Soviet fronts—more than half the supplies moving up to the Soviet troops." And the President also remarks:

"During the year ending March 31, 1945, lend-lease fats and oils sent to the Soviet Union comprised more than half of the supplies of these commodities consumed by the Soviet armies and by the Soviet urban population."

Why then did the United States and Great Britain fail to object, from the very beginning, frankly and firmly, to obvious Soviet intention or using an Allied joint victory to add some 60,000,000 non-Soviet central eastern European people to the area of sole Soviet domination?

The answer is abundantly historically clear. The historic "sphere" idea was not the Soviet Union's only. It was, at base, everybody's.

Greece, for instance, passed to the British sphere, just as manifestly as Rumania and Bulgaria passed to the Soviet sphere. In Greece, from liberation till now, the British have exercised sole supremacy.

Italy passed to the sphere of the Americans and the British, especially the British, who (for intance), for a purely British reason and by a purely British edict, forbade the Italians to include their distinguished statesman Count Sforza in their cabinet.

Syria and Lebanon, before the war, belonged to the French sphere. During the war the Free French Government conceded them their independence. Soon, though, the French perceived that the great power theory was getting revived. They thereupon revived their claims to certain special "sphere" advantages in Syria and Lebanon. How could a power be "great" without a great "sphere"?

Now Syria is only about 250 miles from the Soviet Union. Yet Britain and the United States, thousands of miles away, proposed to settle the affairs of Syria and Lebanon in a conference to which the Soviet Union was not invited. Here, to Soviet eyes, was an attempted Anglo-American "front" or "sphere" in the Soviet Union's back yards.

Iran adjoins the Soviet Union. It is part of the oil area of the Near East. The near eastern oil reserves are among the richest in the world. They are virtually monopolized by British and American oil companies. They vastly exceed the oil reserves of the

Soviet Union. Yet, without prior arrangement with the Soviet Union, the United States Government permitted American oil companies to approach the Iranian Government for new oil concessions. Again the Soviet Union could see an attempted Anglo-American front or sphere—this time right across its border.

Tangier is in Morocco, in Africa; but for centuries it has been part of the European political scene. The greatest modern international effort to settle the affairs of Morocco was the Algeciras Conference of 1906. It was attended, automatically, by Russia. Yet France and Britain and the United States have now proposed to settle the future international status of Tangier at a conference without the Soviet Union.

What is all this but a race by the great powers into what George Washington called their "combinations and collisions"?

This is nothing but a relapse into the world we always have known, a world of new divisions of spoils and thereupon, as we already see, of plans for new great conscript armies and navies in preparation for new impending wars.

Let us have friendly relations with the Soviet Union but let us not lose our own self-respect. We cannot and should not ask the Soviet Government to stop controlling the press in its own country. We can and should demand that it stop suppressing the freedom of the press of its allies in regions which it has liberated only with Allied assistance. We can and should do this in the very name of close friendship with the Soviet Union. Let our Government candidly tell the Soviet Union Government the truth: namely, that every day of such Soviet press suppression is a day of decline of Soviet prestige in the United States.

Never forget: Stalin's heart is in Asia. And we Americans and British and Dutch and French, we "western democrats," can never hope to rival him there unless we have a similar nonracial broadmindedness and similar passion for raising Asiatics to modern levels of living.

Approach the Soviet Union immediately on the problem of disarmament. A race with the Soviet Union in the accumulation of arms and armies would be ruinous. At current birth rates, the Soviet Union will presently have more inhabitants than all the English-speaking countries combined. With its European and Asiatic spheres, if world politics is permitted to produce spheres, it will in a few decades, have 400,000,000 people within its military domain. And the Soviet Union is headed toward complete militarization.

The Soviet authorities have abolished coeducation in all Soviet schools, for the openly announced reason that the girls are in the way of the boys while the boys are getting prepared, from their youngest years, for the Red Army. The new Suvorov Military Academies take boys at 8 to be trained for the officers' corps. One of the pupils of the Kalinin Sovorov Military Academy, Vitali Morozov, saw battle action at the age of 12 and wears the "for valor" medal. Does the United States want, does Britain want, to enter this kind of competition?

It is idle to say that the prospective conscript military preparations of the Soviet Union and Britain and the United States and France are directed against Germany and Japan. Germany and Japan are to be totally disarmed. It is idle to say that these preparations are directed against small powers. The small powers, all added up together, are militarily insignificant. These preparations for war by the great powers can be directed only against one another. They make a hypocritical mockery of the whole San Francisco Charter, the central theme of which is the unity of the great powers.

For friendship with the Soviet Union, and in order to try to wrench the great power theory into being a vehicle of peace and not just of greatness, let us approach the Soviet Union on disarmament now.

If we can solve the question of spheres, and if we can solve the question of the armaments race, let us give the Soviet Union what it most sorely needs: American help in repairing the frightful devastations visited upon the Soviet Union by the Germans. I say "if." Because: Would it not be silly to send machine tools and production machines and electric-power generators and railroad equipment and chemical-industry apparatus to the Soviet Union in order to give the Soviet Union strength for more spheres and more arms and armies? Would it not be silly for the Allies to help one another to be more formidable and dangerous to one another?

Let us get on the road of peace, and then let us help one another, unstintingly.

And to get on the road to peace with the surest feet, let us make the very most we can of the General Assembly, of all nations, in the new United Nations founded at San Francisco. Let that General Assembly be in session at all times.

UNRRA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave given me to insert my remarks in the RECORD, the following radio talk which I gave yesterday on the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration will, I am sure, give additional weight to the continued need for UNRRA and for the passing of an appropriation to carry on this necessary work through the fiscal year of 1946:

Today for the first time in 3 years we are celebrating Armistice Day in a world of peace. This should be a time for hope and rejoicing. It should be a period of international good will and brotherly love. Instead, millions of men, women, and children will continue to die this winter, not from bombs, but from hunger, disease, malnutrition, and cold. Moreover, the stunted bodies and minds which come out of these conditions are the greatest source of infection for future wars. If we are to carry the torch of peace and freedom left in our care by those millions of American men who did not return from the last World War—whose peace we're celebrating today—and this war, we must win the battle for the life and faith of these people.

We, who have suffered so little in this war, have an obligation to share our abundance with the miserable and suffering hordes left in the wake of occupation and battle. We have an international agency which has undertaken this collosal job. The agency is the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, which I shall refer to as UNRRA during this discussion.

Our country has committed itself to a policy of international cooperation. At Bretton Woods, at Dumbarton Oaks, at San Francisco, and at the recent Food and Agricultural Organization Conference in Canada, we have said that we believe in a world community of effort to meet common problems. UNRRA is the first demonstration of our belief, the first actual, concrete operation in this field of international cooperation.

This is as it should be. Why not? If your neighbor's house catches fire, you won't hesitate a second to call the fire department and take the stricken family into your home. What we as a Nation are doing through UNRRA is exactly the same thing. The only difference is that we are doing it on a large scale, to meet the greatest need that ever existed. And we have joined with other nations to help our stricken neighbors rather than try to do it as individuals.

Perhaps, before I go further, I should tell you exactly what UNRRA is. There are 47 nations in UNRRA. Every one of these nations contributes to the administrative costs of the agency. And the 31 nations which did not suffer invasion contribute 1 percent of their national income to the operating fund. Our Congress agreed to such a contribution. We authorized $1,350,000,000 and appropriated $800,000,000 of this amount. But it has not yet furnished the rest of the funds for which, in effect, it signed a note. That amount is $550,000,000. A bill to provide this money has passed the House of Representatives and is now before the Senate. The House put some strings on the contribution, a condition which no other country has imposed as a regulation on genercsity. Whether or not the Senate will join in these restrictions remains to be seen. But the Senate must act fast. UNRRA supply schedules show a steady rise from June through October. If they are to continue to ship the immediate necessities for life, UNRRA must have the balance of our obligation this month.

Most of the $550,000,000 is already committed. But the job of relief for Italy and China is just getting under way and the basic agricultural and industrial rehabilitation necessary to get devastated countries on their feet is a long way from finished. To meet these needs the UNRRA council has asked the cooperating nations to make another contribution equal to the first. The House will start hearings on the second request this coming week.

I want to say to you today, above all other things, that this money is necessary. This obligation must be met. The United States must pay its share. If it does not, then we shall be giving only lip service and sham adherence to the principle of international cooperation and the policy of saving suffering humanity.

Let me tell you something about the needs. You have seen the war pictures showing the destruction wrought in the battles in Europe. You know how towns were reduced to rubble and dust. You know that the armies left nothing untouched. For example: When UNRRA went into Crete it first took in powered milk to keep the children from dying of starvation. But there was not a single metal pot or kitchen dish to mix the milk. Luckily the UNRRA workers were able to round up a few clay jugs and jars with which to mix the milk with water. Of course, UNRRA took in other foods afterward. But this is merely an instance of the monumental need, the terrific job that UNRRA is doing and must continue to do.

Now let me cite to you the statement which a Greek girl made to an UNRRA worker.

"The struggle for life was continuous, incessant, implacable during those dreadful years of occupation. You had to go on living. You had to survive. It was a duty you owed to your country. Death was sleep, an eternal sleep, without nightmare. It was easy to die, it was hard to live. Everybody worked, the women, the children, the old men, the sick.

"Boys of 10 and 12 years carried heavy loads of wood or coal from distant villages. Little girls of 8 and 10 years worked as servants in the big Germans' kitchens. All this struggle, this misery, was just for a dry piece of bread. To survive and see the great day of liberation was the inmost dream of all

Greeks. The Greeks had to live. It was their duty. Their children could and should live happily in a peaceful world."

UNRRA workers in Poland, last spring, found farmers in one community tending crops of winter rye. Only a few months before these farms had been a battleground. The UNRRA worker was surprised that a crop had been planted in the autumn. The farmers explained. The Germans had confiscated every bit of grain, leaving nothing for seed. But the Polish farmers, in the night, crept into the military storehouses and stole some of the rye back. Then they went out at night to plow and seed the land so that the Germans would not detect them. Part of the time they were putting in crops in no man's land between the German and Russian forces. These are just tiny, quick pictures, snapshots as it were, of the need and the conditions. The whole view is an appalling one, beyond the imagination of those who have not seen it.

The Allied armies won the military battle against aggression. But we have another war to win. That is the war we now are fighting through UNRRA against misery and filth, against starvation and disease and death. Make no mistake. This war is still on in full force. We have mapped out our program and we have made an important start in the battle. But we are far from sight of victory.

There are some additional things which need to be emphasized. There are those, both in Congress and outside of it, who have belittled the efforts of the UNRRA organization. Nobody questions the need for a relief and rehabilitation program in devastated areas. A recent national poll showed that 90 percent of the American people were willing to share their food with the victims of war. Six percent were opposed and 4 percent were undecided. But there are many good intentioned people who have no conception of the gigantic problems UNRRA has had to face.

Up until VE-day the military was in control. Few supplies and almost no shipping were available to UNRRA. The best personnel was in the armed services. It was not until VE-day that UNRRA could begin to set in motion its vast machinery of supply and relief. It could not, until the war victory was ours, launch the campaign against hunger and sickness and death which it had carefully planned in the long months beforehand. But when the time came, and the physical barriers were down UNRRA went into action fast. One month after the war ceased, UNRRA workers were operating in Czechoslovakia. Jan Masaryk, their foreign minister, said, "We in Czechoslovakia are very grateful to UNRRA. UNRRA came in time, even a little sooner than we expected, with meats, fats, prunes, and also even coffee. We were at the threshold of a typhus and typhoid epidemic. We got the penicillin and other drugs in time and a disastrous situation was averted."

The campaign is now in full swing. It must continue. We went all-out during the war to see that our armies had everything they needed to carry on the battle against the aggressors. Even so, there were times when we criticized ourselves by saying that our supplies were "too little and too late." As fast as we could, we remedied such conditions. This criticism must not now apply in our drive against sickness and starvation.

Now, we must show the world the full measure of our ideals. We must show it by our actions and our contributions. We must show it by a wholehearted generosity. We dare not fail.

We have announced to the world that we favor international cooperation and we took the lead in making UNRRA the first operating arm of such cooperation. We cannot go backward now. We must give UNRRA what it needs to do the job. Never again shall we face a justified criticism of "too little and too late."

Deferment of Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. MAY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report:

The President has sent the following letter to the Honorable Edgar F. Puryear, Chairman of the Review Committee on Deferment of Government Employees, following receipt of Mr. Puryear's report on the work of his committee, which is attached hereto:

OCTOBER 31, 1945.

DEAR MR. PURYEAR: Thank you for sending me the report of the Review Committee on Deferment of Government Employees under your chairmanship.

I think that a splendid job has been done in keeping down the number of deferments of employees of the Federal Government. I know that a great deal of this accomplishment is due to your own patience, energy, and patriotic determination to see that the Selective Service System operated fairly and efficiently among Government employees without disrupting the Federal service too much.

I take this opportunity of thanking you and congratulating you on the results achieved.

Very sincerely,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

REPORT OF REVIEW COMMITTEE ON DEFERMENT OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The duties and authority of the Review Committee on Deferment of Government Employees were incorporated in Executive Order No. 9309, dated March 6, 1943 and in the provisions of Public Law 23 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, approved April 8, 1943.

The present chairman and committee members assumed their duties in February 1944, and this report covers the deferment status of Federal employees at that time, the action taken by the present committee and the resulting totals of occupationally deferred Government employees at the close of hostilities on August 15, 1945.

In presenting this report this committee wishes to state its activities have resulted in a far smaller proportion of deferments approved for Government employees than has been secured elsewhere for non-Federal employees during this period. Due to committee policies occupational deferments for Federal employees have been constantly reduced over the past 18 months. As of August 15, 1945, 80 percent of all agencies of the executive branch of the Government had no approved occupational deferments whatsoever.

EMPLOYEES AGED 18-29 YEARS

When the present committee assumed its duties in February 1944, there were 264,378 male Federal employees under 30 years of age. Requests for deferment, or for the renewal of previously approved deferment for employees in this age group were considered by the committee as presented by department officials.

By reference to the statistical summary attached hereto it will be noted that 11,997 occupational deferments were in force for all Federal employees on August 15, 1945. Of this number only 201 men were under 26, and none were under 24 years of age. Approved deferments represent but a fraction of 1 percent of male employees of the Government. The remainder of the 264,378 males under 30 years of age as noted above were made available to the armed forces.

Deferments approved for employees under 30 years of age covered scientific or highly skilled specialists who were irreplaceable at the time because of the lack of trained replacements. The immediate induction of such persons directly connected with the war effort would, it is believed, have delayed the prosecution of the war. The War and Navy Departments were granted 8,881 such deferments consisting chiefly of men engaged on direct war production in arsenals and navy yards in the same category as those engaged in the manufacture of war weapons in industry. Only 3,116 persons who were shown to be directly engaged in war activities were approved for deferment in the other 70 Government agencies. In most cases these employees were engaged in the development, testing, or production of secret war weapons, such as the atom bomb, radar-controlled fuses, etc.

In conferences and hearings held by this committee with officials of the departments and agencies it was the unvarying policy of the committee to place the burden of proof for the necessity of retaining any individual, by means of occupational deferment, squarely upon them. Over the period of its operation the committee received an increasingly favorable reaction to the stated policy of nondeferment of Government employees. Most departments and agencies acceded to the continuing request of the committee that replacements be secured by the appointment of women, of men disqualified for military service or, in every possible instance, by the employment of honorably discharged veterans of this war.

It is pertinent to note that subsequent to the action reflected in this report but shortly after the cessation of hostilities, the induction of all males who had reached their twenty-sixth birthday was halted by action of the Selective Service System.

EMPLOYEES AGED 30-37 YEARS

Induction of men in this age group was general in the early period of the war. Immediately upon assuming its duties this committee was presented with 34,098 cases of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers for possible deferment under Public Law 197 of the Seventy-eighth Congress. The committee authorized short-term deferments for replacement purposes of only 5,050 persons. The balance were made available for the armed forces.

After actual combat was experienced by our troops the War Department requested that only men below 30 years of age be called for induction. Pursuant to this request the Selective Service System, on May 18, 1944, issued their memorandum No. 115-F. This directive stated that draft registrants who had reached their thirtieth birthday could be given a deferred classification by their local draft boards on presentation by employers of a simplified form (No. 42) unaccompanied by detailed supporting data.

Under the provisions of Public Law 23, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, no employee of the Federal Government could be considered for occupational deferment by Selective Service except by full compliance with the terms of Executive Order No. 9309. This order makes mandatory the official processing of every request for reclassification for any Federal employee through the review committee. It was therefore necessary for Federal agencies to submit request forms for employees within this age group. Requests for employees in private industry were filed directly with the local draft boards by employers.

As of February 21, 1945, Selective Service believed it might prove necessary to induct an increasing number of men, including those who had reached their 30th birthday. This age group was divided into those

30 to 33 and those 34 to 37 years of age. The short form of deferment request was continued but an additional statement was required that a man in the 30 to 33 age group was "necessary to" as well as "regularly engaged in" an activity in support of the national health, safety, or interest. The statement that an employee in the 34 to 37 age group was "regularly engaged" in such an activity was sufficient to secure reclassification by Selective Service. Only a small number of men over 30 years of age were actually inducted during this period.

Under date of May 23, 1945, Selective Service regulations were again amended and all men 30 through 37 years of age were considered in one group. Under these amended regulations local draft boards were informed that a registrant aged 30 through 37 years should be placed in class II-A, class II-B, or class II-C if he was "regularly engaged in" an activity in support of the national health, safety, or interest, or an activity in war production, or in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort.

The production of arms, armament, warships, etc., in War Department arsenals and Navy Department yards was facilitated and maintained, to a great degree by reclassification of their employees in this age group under Selective Service policies.

War and Navy Departments secured 80 percent of the total of such reclassifications granted to employees of the Federal Governments.

RELEASE TO ENTER ARMED FORCES

During the past 18 months the Review Committee has reviewed numerous appeals by Federal employees whose request for release to enter the armed forces had been denied by their department or agency.

Hearings on such appeals were held and in every case where the employee submitted evidence to the committee that he was to enter combat duty the release was approved.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The cooperation given this committee by the officials of the various departments and agencies of the Government is appreciated.

It is also very gratifying to be able to report that during the 18 months of operation by this committee cordial relations were maintained with Selective Service System, the Congress, and the press of the Nation.

Respectfully submitted.

EDGAR F. PURYEAR,
Chairman, Review Committee on Deferment of Government Employees.

SUMMARY REPORT OF ACTION REVIEW COMMITTEE ON DEFERMENT OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES OPERATING UNDER PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC LAW 23 AND EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 9309 FOR THE PERIOD FEBRUARY 15, 1944, TO AUGUST 15, 1945

Total male employees ages 18–29 years as at Feb. 15, 1944

For age groups:	
18–25 years	195,915
26–29 years	68,463
	264,378

ACTION OF PRIOR COMMITTEE

Occupational deferments in force Feb. 15, 1944

For age groups:	
18–21 years	13,110
22–25 years	20,553
26–29 years	62,015
Subtotal, 18–29 years	95,678
Subtotal, 30–37 years	113,228
Total	208,906

ACTION OF PRESENT COMMITTEE

Requests for deferment received Feb. 15, 1944–Aug. 15, 1945

(a) For occupational reasons (18–37 years) including resubmissions for renewal of prior deferments or as appeals from previous denials	277,986
(b) As pre-Pearl Harbor fathers (filed under provisions of Public Law 197 and part VI of Executive Order No. 9309)	34,098
Total requests submitted for the period	312,084
Total requests considered and adjudicated	520,990
Requests denied or deferments expired, rescinded, or voided after consideration and review in conformity with administrative and selective-service policies	508,993

Occupational deferments in force August 15, 1945

(Classification: Physicists, chemists, aeronautical or electrical engineers, arsenal-navy yard skilled craftsmen; men on secret, confidential, foreign assignments, etc.)

Distribution:	
War Department	1,799
Navy Department	7,082
All other (70) agencies (80 percent—no deferments)	3,116
	11,997
Age group:	
18–23 years	0
24–25 years	201
26–29 years	11,796
	11,997

Analysis of President Truman's Speech On Wage Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Willford I. King, nationally known and highly regarded economist, has made a very interesting analysis of President Truman's recent speech on wage policy. Because it offers a clear-cut appraisal calculated to clarify the significance of the President's important message, I believe it should be made available to all who are interested. Therefore, under permission to extend my remarks, I include Dr. King's analysis:

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S SPEECH OF WAGE POLICY

(By Willford I. King)

In his October 30 radio speech on wage policy, President Truman took a position which in many respects is thoroughly defensible. He points out that "There are important limits upon the capacity of industry to raise wages without getting price increases."

He warned labor that "It has a strong responsibility to see that demands for wage increases are reasonable. Excessive demands would deny to industry reasonable profits to which it is entitled, and which are necessary to stimulate an expansion of production. We must not kill the goose which lays the golden egg.

"Labor itself has the responsibility to aid industry in reaching this goal of higher production and more jobs. It must strive constantly for greater efficiency and greater productivity—good work done, for good wages earned. Only in that way can we reach the mass production that has brought this country to the front of the industrial countries of the world.

"Labor must constantly find ways within its own ranks of cutting down on absenteeism, producing turnover, avoiding jurisdictional disputes and wildcat strikes."

If labor heeds this advice, production will advance to such an extent that industry can pay wage rates materially higher than those now prevailing. If such is the case, it is almost certainly true that competition will force an advance in wage rates, and labor will find itself enjoying a higher scale of living than it has ever known in the past.

Among the policies which the President has laid down, those of starting forward maximum production of civilian goods, removing Government controls, and avoiding both inflation and deflation are all thoroughly sound from an economic standpoint. All reflect that hardheadedness and common sense which have given the people confidence in the President's judgment.

One of the peculiarities of the President's message to the American public is that there is a wide gulf between the logical, well-balanced conclusions stated above and the premises upon which these conclusions are presumably based. These premises contain such a goodly collection of current economic fallacies that one can scarcely escape the conclusion that they have been foisted upon the President by certain unorthodox expositors of views which he accepted as sound economic principles. In the first part of his address appear at least five such fallacies.

The first is the assumption that higher wage rates give to the laboring class higher total earnings and, therefore, greater ability to buy the products of industry. As a matter of fact, this assumption is almost the exact reverse of the truth. At any time when unemployment appears, an increase in wage rates invariably accentuates the difficulty, throws additional people out of work, lessens the aggregate take-home pay of all the employees in industry, and lowers the national income. This means, of course, that the ability of the working class to buy the products of industry is diminished rather than increased.

The second fallacy is the assumption that the total volume of spending power of the Nation is increased by the payment of unemployment compensation to those not at work. Clearly, if the money to pay doles to the unemployed is taken from the taxpayers, the total buying power of the community will be no larger than it was before the transfer took place. Furthermore, experience everywhere shows that the payment of unemployment insurance always insures unemployment. When men can obtain pay for not working, the common tendency is for them to hold out for higher pay than their services are worth. Hence national production and national income are diminished, the total spending power shrinks and more unemployment results.

The only way that unemployment compensation can be paid without increasing unemployment is to print, directly or indirectly, the money needed to pay the doles. This inflationary process brings about evils even worse than the unemployment which it is intended to remedy.

The third fallacy in the President's address is the inference that workers can be expected to get as much pay for working 40

as for working 48 hours. Unless the work is very strenuous, the probabilities are that a man who works 40 hours will produce only about five-sixths as much as the man who works 48 hours. The employer's ability to pay depends upon production. If any group of employees prefers to work fewer hours and draw proportionately less pay, that certainly is their privilege. It is unreasonable and illogical for any group to sharply reduce the working time of its members and their output without having a corresponding reduction in the contents of their pay envelopes. If the American workingman wishes to retain his high wartime pay, he ought to insist upon working high wartime hours.

The fourth fallacy is related to the third. The President assumes that workers transferring from wartime to peacetime industries should suffer no loss of pay when they make the change. It is, however, a matter of common knowledge that during the war emergency it was necessary, in order to obtain sufficient help in the war plants, to pay the workers exorbitant wages. Without such unusual compensation, it was impossible to induce the necessary number of persons to move to out-of-the-way places and suffer many inconveniences. Most of the war workers were frankly told that employment and pay were both temporary and that they should save up for the days when their jobs would disappear. Such being the case, it is unreasonable for them to expect that they can now return to the more stable conditions of peacetime production and still enjoy the inflated pay made possible solely by the fact that in conducting a war, government must pay whatever is necessary to get the earliest possible delivery of material.

The fifth fallacy in the President's message to the public is implied rather than stated. He implies that prices can be kept from advancing if Government agencies like the OPA are given sufficient authority and funds. This assumption is contrary to the experience of all nations over hundreds of years. As long as governments indulge in deficit financing and use newly created currency to pay their bills, prices will advance regardless of all efforts of government officials to prevent such an outcome. If the President really wishes to stop inflation—and there is every reason to suppose that he does—he should forget about strengthening Government controls and devote all of his energies to balancing the Budget, and especially to eliminate at once the dangerous and destructive procedure of borrowing from the banks to meet Government expenditures.

On the whole, the President's address on wage policy is far more reasonable in tone and content than most of his critics expected it would be. If the President is wise, he will hasten to rid his staff of the group of unorthodox theorists whose pseudoeconomic reasoning runs so counter to the President's inherent, basic common sense.

We Are Told Officially That Arizona Has Another Great Reclamation Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, there has lately come to my desk a voluminous official report from the Department of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, which is a preliminary draft of the partial report comparing the various proposed diversion routes to bring water from the Colorado River into Central Arizona. To me this is an absorbingly interesting report, although filled with engineering data of a highly technical nature. It is interesting because it deals with a problem so very vital to the future development and continued prosperity of the State of Arizona.

For much more than the quarter of a century just passed, during which time I have lived in Arizona, the question of diverting some of the waters of the Colorado River into our State has intrigued me and every thoughtful citizen, and has been the subject of extensive study by the leaders of the State and often the cause of great controversy between groups with conflicting opinions. This report I have just received is a more thoroughgoing scientific study than any we have thus far had. It is more authoritative and official in this respect; that it is a combined effort on the part of the United States Bureau of Reclamation, working with the proper officials of the State of Arizona, to determine which is the best and most feasible method of obtaining Colorado River water for maximum use in Arizona. Somewhat over a year ago the Legislature of Arizona appropriated $200,000 to be matched by an equal sum from the Bureau of Reclamation to finance this thoroughgoing study of the vital problem. The report I refer to is a partial fulfillment of the task set before our reclamation engineers by this combined effort financed by joint contributions of the Federal Government and the State of Arizona.

It is trite to say it, but it needs to be said—that there is far more good land in the State of Arizona capable of being irrigated and tilled than there is water from all sources which might be furnished to those millions of thirsty acres. Therefore a correct answer to our water problem will mean a hard choice between different degrees of scarcity. In view of the fact that the rainfall in Arizona is inadequate for agriculture, irrigation is necessary for the State's agricultural development. We have a great area of rich soil and a splendid climate in many sections of the State permitting the growing of crops 12 months in the year, and with that situation a limited supply of water to bring only a fraction of these possibilities to reality. That explains in part why this study is so important to the future of Arizona.

During the last quarter century at least half-dozen different plans have been proposed to bring water from the main stem of the Colorado River into the agricultural portions of Arizona. In view of the fact that throughout most of its length in northern Arizona, the Colorado River is in an awe-inspiring canyon—the greatest gorge on earth, more than a mile in depth—the engineering problem of getting its waters onto the tillable areas of the State has been most challenging to the hydraulic engineers. Some of the proposals previously made have been wild and fantastic. Perhaps some of the later proposals may be regarded as visionary, but at last the Bureau of Reclamation and the State officials of Arizona have, during the past 12 months, been giving close study to three of the half dozen proposals to bring water into the central part of the State.

At meetings of a Senate subcommittee in Arizona in August last year, the Bureau of Reclamation sketched, in a preliminary fashion, the three regarded as most feasible proposals to bring water into central Arizona from the Colorado River. This earlier, tentative study may be found in the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, United States Senate, Seventy-eighth Congress, pursuant to Senate Resolution 304. The report I first referred to is but a continuation and a confirmation of the preliminary report contained in the hearings before the Senate committee.

In the words of Solomon, "there is a time for everything." There are opportunities and moments of decision in the life of an individual or of a community which, if not properly grasped, may be lost forever. We have now arrived at such a moment for the State of Arizona. It so happens that this moment of choice and decision is in a sense the second for Arizona. In the decade of the twenties there was much discussion as to how the Colorado River should be developed so as to serve best the Pacific Southwest, including seven States in the Colorado River Basin and with special reference to Arizona and California. Naturally, the people of Arizona were tremendously interested and anxious that Arizona should receive her share, her rightful share, in the total development. Receiving her rightful share did not occur. With the building of Boulder Dam the way it was built and under the circumstances of its building and all the other accompanying circumstances, the share of Arizona in the total development of the Colorado River Basin was greatly limited. However, the thing has happened, and there is no need of "crying over spilt milk." Arizona and the Nation must take the situation as it is and make the best of it.

And now once again we have come to a time when Arizona and the Nation must decide how we shall get Colorado River water on a maximum number of thirsty acres in order to approximate the greatest possible good. If no solution is worked out soon, Arizona stands to lose untold wealth in the waters that flow through her mile-deep canyons and along her borders to go elsewhere to enrich others who have very little shadow of claim to their use.

As chairman of the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation and as senior Congressman from the State of Arizona, I am so personally and officially interested in this problem that I can give little time to anything else. However, I do not feel that I should try to determine the choice of projects, since all have the objective of bringing a given quantity of

water into that part of the State where it can be used most effectively. Not being an engineer, I hesitate to speak out about the physical problems, and I also hesitate to take a hand in the political phases of the question, because that is a matter properly resting with the State and the reclamation officials. Yet I do want to help get the thing done.

I note from the report which I received that interested persons or officials concerned who have criticism to offer of this report or any of its findings are invited to offer those criticisms on or before the middle of November. I intend, Mr. Speaker, to avail myself of that invitation and shall have some suggestions to make at a later date both to the Bureau of Reclamation and to the State officials of Arizona before a final complete report is submitted for official action.

We Must Make This Armistice One From War to Enduring Peace, Not an Armistice Between Wars—Let Us Dedicate Our Hopes, Our Prayers, Our Deeds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, November 11, 1921, seems ages ago as I think of just a few of the world transitions occurring since. Yes; the world has walked into every home in America, every shop, every school, every church—the world has shrunk into one neighborhood since 1921. Space has shrunken into insignificance by reason of transportation advancement; communication improvement has resulted in almost instant questions and answers—to every place and from every race on the face of the globe. So our great Nation today, on the peacetime Armistice Day, has been catapulted into a world neighborhood of daily world responsibilities, privileges, misunderstandings. We must now learn to get along in this world neighborhood, else it will fall apart. If it does fall apart as a world neighborhood, then another world conflagration naturally results. We have but one choice: It is to do our dead level best to build a world neighborhood, and live in it—in sincerity and truth—as a world neighbor.

Suspicion, ill will, greed, corruption, unjust condemnation, envy—these evil things which tear apart friendliness and neighborliness in a small town community will also destroy the workings of a world neighborhood.

Let us here highly resolve that America will steadfastly do her utmost to have it come to pass that the world peace which came with the capitulation of Germany and Japan shall be an enduring world peace. Let us here search our own national heart and soul and cast out any speck of selfish greed or material ambition which might grow into full size and stature if nurtured. Let us help create a world whose heart is full of faith and good will as between world neighbors. Only thus will there be enduring peace.

And only with enduring world peace will there be material plenty and prosperity which will endure. A material prosperity built upon less than mutual good will and respect for the other neighbor's rights and merits, too, is but temporary gain and rests upon the sands of an ego and greed which already condemns to destruction and utter collapse the man or the nation who builds upon such shifting sands instead of upon the rock.

This day, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, let us so view and look at ourselves that on tomorrow this world neighborhood in which our beloved Nation now has its being will be firmer in clear thinking; fairer in its judgments of one another; less hasty to condemn; radiant with a determination to do our utmost for an enduring world peace.

Let us recognize that enduring world peace is not only the most desired thing in the world; let us dedicate our hopes, our prayers, our daily deeds to its coming to pass, because we have done our part to make it so.

Japanese Brutality Toward War Prisoners—By Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 8, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, every Communist in this country who belongs to what they call a minority racial group continues to attack the white majority of our people and charge them with race prejudice.

They wreak their own race prejudice by their accusations.

If anybody wants to know what would happen to the white people of America if the un-American element of some of these racial minorities got control, let him read the following excerpts from an article written by Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright, describing the beastly brutality of the Japanese toward our American fighting men who were unfortunate enough to be captured by them during this war.

It is one of the most horrible stories in history.

Note the manifestation of their inferiority complex by Japanese in their attacks on those helpless American heroes.

I wish every newspaper in the country would carry General Wainwright's articles, so that everyone could read them and realize the vicious, sadistic, savage brutality of these atheistic apes, even toward the helpless white women and children who fell into their hands.

General Wainwright's article follows:

WAINWRIGHT BEATEN TO GROUND BY JAP; SLASHED WITH BAYONET—STARVATION BECOMES ACUTE AND GENERAL MOORE IS CHOSEN BY PRISONERS TO DIVIDE RATIONS

(Today's installment of General Wainwright's story paints a graphic picture of the starvation and beatings suffered by the author and other prisoners at Karenko. The article also tells of the ruse General Wainwright used to evade Jap censorship, and in a letter to his wife inform her of his severe loss of weight.)

(By Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright)

Our starvation was so acute at Karenko Prison camp by the fall of 1942 that we took to counting the two or three beans which sometimes appeared in the bottom of our watery soup pail, and if a man received a bean in his soup and another did not, it made for hard feeling. This must be hard to imagine, but it is true.

In fact, the division of our pathetic ration became so important to us—for we were on the very border line of serious and perhaps fatal malnutrition—that we asked an officer to divide our food for us as impartially as possible.

Our craving for sustenance was such that we stood over this man while he attended to each split-up of the food that came to us from the kitchen. Finally he said he could not do this job any longer, and quit. We then voted for Maj. Gen. George F. Moore to divide the food. He accepted, but with the reservation that he could attend to the splitting of the rice and the soup behind a closed door, so that there could be no supervision. We would wait outside, bereft of anything in our minds except our never-ending, excruciating hunger.

Major General Beckwith-Smith died on the morning of Armistice Day, 1942, of diphtheria and heart failure—and starvation. The American officers had become very fond of this plucky Englishman, but while we were grieved to see him go, some of us felt in our hearts that he was better off than the rest of us.

Though Beckwith-Smith was gone, we nevertheless went through with our plan to observe Armistice Day. He would have been a party to that plan. At 11 a. m. that day every one of the prisoners in camp stopped whatever they were doing, or saying, and for the next 2 minutes none of us spoke. We made it as inconspicuous as possible, and felt a little better for having done it.

Beckwith-Smith's body was cremated and the senior British, American, and Dutch officers attended the burial of the urn.

By December 12, 1942, my weight was down to 125⅓ pounds. It was on this day that I was permitted for the first time to write to my wife, with the usual restrictions. There were so many rules, however, that there was little to write, unless a man wanted to lie to keep up his own or his family's courage.

On this day—just 36½ years since the day I graduated from West Point—I did not give my wife the figure of my weight. I just told her, in the most innocent-appearing phrasing possible, that I now weighed exactly what I did when I graduated from the Point. That was all she needed.

ILL WITH STARVATION

I was taken sick the night of December 12 and for the next few days lay on my bunk with a fever and chills. It was a combination of ailments, mostly starvation. Among the ailments was beri beri, which I had contracted several months earlier. In my last days at Tarlac I had been walking across a wooden floor when Brig. Gen. Lewis Beebe stopped me.

"Say, you've got the foot slap," he said.

Only then did I notice the tell-tale way in which the soles of my shoes were slapping the floor. The dry type of beri beri causes the muscles in the shins and ankles to lose their sensitivity with the result that when the heel is placed on the ground while walking, the rest of the foot quickly collapses.

Beri beri or not, and most of us at Karenko had it, we eventually were forced to work. We decided that it was either work, or death by starvation, which left us little choice. The Jap guards had insinuated that if we did go to work we would be supplied with "work rice," that is, an extra portion allotted to workers.

But the Jap mind is a baffling nest, and going to work was not as easy as expressing the willingness. We had to appeal to them to permit us to work, to make it appear that we were breaking down their lofty resolve to uphold the Geneva Convention.

ABSURD NEGOTIATIONS END

But at last the absurd negotiations were done with, and we were told that we would work on an area just outside the prison barriers, an area which would be cleared for a truck farm. Whatever we raised, they told us, we could eat. Each officer was given a tool which the Japs called a kuha and we called a chunkle, and marched off.

A chunkle is a dull-edged, wide and very heavy adze mounted on a shaft about 2½ feet long. It is used for breaking soil, cutting out brush or grass, and grubbing for roots and rocks.

By this time we were in such atrocious physical condition, however, that for many of the senior officers this work was a dangerous gamble with our lives. It was difficult even to walk on our clogs to the area we had to clear. In my case I came to depend more and more on the light walking stick which General McArthur had left for me on Corregidor when he departed.

But slowly and painfully we did clear our first patch of ground and prepared it for the planting of various seeds. But we were not intrusted with the seeds. The Japs knew very well we would have eaten them.

SOME LOSE 100 POUNDS

As for our "work rice" we soon saw that the Japs were using this promise as another means of mocking us. At least half of the time they refused to give it to us. The "work rice" we did get, therefore, was not enough to compensate for the strength we were expending on our tasks of walking to and from the land and clearing it. The land became much harder to clear, in addition, and our conditions sank accordingly. Some of the heavier Dutch officers lost nearly 100 pounds.

One day in December I was ordered by "Boots"—Lieutenant Nakashima—to get Generals Percival and terPorreten and Governor General Tjarda van Starkenbourg and bring them before him. We lined up and "Boots" waited until we bowed. Then he launched into a long and furious charge that Jap internees in the United States, India, and Australia were being grossly mistreated.

In my case he demanded that I write to the War Department and protest this treatment of Japs in the United States. If I refused, he said, our own treatment at Karenko would become worse. With the help of Generals King, Moore, Beebe, and Funk, I did put a letter together the next day, written in such a way as to underline the fact that it was coerced.

But the Japs never waited for that letter to reach its destination. In fact, after "Boots" dismissed us that day, 24 hours before the letter was written, we saw him march across the parade grounds on his queer, tight riding boots and run up the steps toward the administration buildings.

I went back to my room, and while sitting there I saw "Boots" return, line up the Jap guard, and saw him speak at length to his men.

BEATINGS START

I do not know what he said to them. But I do know that immediately thereafter all of us began to undergo indiscriminate slappings, beatings, and clubbings.

It was on this night that I was first struck. After the 8 p. m. roll call, knowing I had a half hour before I had to be in bed, I picked up my towel and went to the back of the barracks to the vile latrine.

Just as I came out of the latrine and started for the washing spigots on the rear porch of the barracks, I noticed a Jap sentry standing nearby. He was a short, stocky, muscular man.

I turned a bit and bowed to him, with the usual sick feeling in my stomach, and started to go on. But he shouted something at me and then motioned to me to step closer to him. I walked over.

"Yes?" I asked. A group of American officers nearby stopped to watch.

The Jap swung very quickly and slapped me across the face. It was a stinging blow and in my throat I felt a rising gorge of hate and despair.

I stood there. Encouraged by what he had done, he slapped me again, then again, and then a fourth time. Each time he hit me he shouted, "Japanese in America."

The blows made by legs weaker, but I was determined not to fall at the feet of a rat like that.

He saw that I was not going down, so he took a lunge at me and hit me on the left jaw with his fist. And then I fell. I was only half conscious from the blow, but part of my consciousness that was alive told me that here was the very pit of my life.

I shook my head clear, got up and walked slowly over to the water spigot, and after a time I had strength enough to turn on the water and wash my self.

General King was in bed and the light was out when I got back to my room. I told him about it and lay there awake the rest of the night.

The next day was inspection day, and it was my duty to help General King clean and dust our little room. We were at work in there and I was still shaking from the night before, when our door was suddenly flung open and a Jap sentry jumped in and roared something at us.

My back was turned to the door at the moment and I was dusting off the shelf that held our mess bowls, and in my nervousness I accidentally knocked one of the bowls off the shelf.

I tried to catch it before it hit the table below but I missed—and it broke in many pieces.

The Jap sentry let out a bellow of rage, shifted his bayoneted rifle to his left hand, and rushed at me with his right fist drawn back.

BAYONETED IN WRIST

His bayonet went into my left wrist, and he beat me about the face with his right hand for what seemed like a terribly long time. Then, exhausted he stopped and screamed at me to pick up the broken pieces of the dish.

I picked them up. He got behind me and prodded me out of the room, in front of my silent men, and marched me over to the guardhouse, where he lined me up in front of the sergeant of the guard and made his report.

All I could do was stand there, holding the bits of the dish. My wrist bled badly, the blood running down my fingers and dropping to the ground.

I felt myself growing quite faint, for I was in such awful physical condition. The sergeant of the guard listened to the long report of the sentry, looked at my wrist, and then ordered me to go to the hospital.

Col. Harold Glattley of our Medical Corps bandaged my wrist, cursing quietly while he worked.

Our beatings never stopped at Karenko. Some of the enlisted men were slugged as many as three times every day, and it became a rare sight to find one whose eyes were not blacked, nose mashed, or head and body full of lumps.

Our men were beaten, sometimes with rifle butts, for many undetermined infractions of rules—rules we often did not know about until we found ourselves breaking them. The Jap rules often were made up on the spur of the moment.

BONE MISSING IN ARM

One of the cruelest beatings was the one taken by Lt. Gen. Sir L. M. Heath, a grand and decent man. He had been quite badly wounded in the World War. About 3 inches of bone had been removed from his left arm between the elbow and shoulder. His left arm simply hung by its flesh and muscle. To relieve the drag on this tissue, General Heath had small loops sewn on the left lower pocket of his blouse. He would fit his fingers into the loops to support his arm.

A Jap private watched him approach one day. General Heath saluted as correctly as any man could salute, but the private pretended to believe that Heath had saluted while his left hand was in his pocket.

The Jap raised his gun and beat General Heath unmercifully over the head and face with the barrel of the weapon. Then he beat the butt of the gun into the boneless portion of the British general's bad arm and left him lying there in the dirt hardly conscious and badly battered.

For weeks after that Heath's eyes were like twin pools of blood, and his left arm had to be put in a sling.

The weather turned cold about the time the beatings began, and we had so little meat around our bones that we shivered perpetually. If they would only have given us our shoes it would have been helpful, but they never would.

The cold and our condition had a bad effect on our kidneys. Most of us, young and old, were forced to get up about every hour of the night, find our clogs outside, and paddle through the cold night air to the latrine.

UNBEARABLE NIGHTMARE

The Japs would be waiting for us at the latrine. They knew we had to come and it saved them the trouble of searching for us. Almost every one who went in was slapped, kicked or abused. Sometimes the sentries would line up 20 or 30 of us outside the latrine and then go down the line, hitting us in the faces.

I tell you it was an unbearable nightmare. But there was nothing to do but bear it.

I was badly beaten one night at the latrine for using the wrong door to emerge from the terrible place. There was no use explaining that I had not heard that the rule had been changed. Nothing was an excuse at Karenko. It was deep-dyed hell.

No American can take a punch without a suffusing desire to fight back. Yet we had to swallow our rage and take it. One of our officers could bear no more one day and he instinctively drew back his fist to hit a Jap private who was slapping him pitilessly. But he never threw the punch.

NEARLY KILLED AMERICAN

The Jap private let loose an insane roar, seized his gun in both hands and would have killed the American on the spot if we had not found an interpreter just then and begged him to explain to the soldier that our man had simply raised his arm in self-defense.

The officer's life was spared, but he was placed in one of the solitary confinement cells for days, with next to no food. There were no beds in any of these cells. Men placed in solitary were forced to remain standing in the frigid little rooms from 6 a. m. until 9 p. m. every day, day after day. Most of them had to be dragged out when their sentences were finished.

And thus it went at Karenko until Christmas, 1942.

Foreign-Trade Zone Seeks Expanded Role in Postwar Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 1, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of October 26, 1945:

FREE PORT HOPES—FOREIGN-TRADE ZONE SEEKS EXPANDED ROLE IN POSTWAR COMMERCE—RIGHT TO MANUFACTURE FOREIGN WARES FOR REEXPORT SOUGHT; CRITICS CONVERTED TO PLAN—1,000-YEAR-OLD IDEA NEW HERE

(By Paul Goetz)

New York's foreign-trade zone, first free port in the Nation, is about to blossom into new usefulness in postwar foreign trade, the National Council of American Importers hopes.

The importers base their cautious optimism on the prospect of early return of the foreign-trade zone to comparatively commodious quarters on Staten Island, and on the efforts of Representative EMANUEL CELLER to jar loose from the House Ways and Means Committee his bill to expand free port privileges in the foreign-trade zone.

Representative CELLER'S current amendments to the Celler Act of 1934 would allow goods to be brought into the foreign-trade zone, sampled, blended, exhibited, and manufactured, then reshipped abroad without paying United States duty. Now, merchandise may only be "stored, broken up, repacked, assembled, distributed, sorted, graded, cleaned, mixed, or otherwise manipulated," but not exhibited or manufactured.

In a free port or foreign-trade zone (the terms are synonymous) no import or export duties are levied. The port's income arises from charges for services rendered, such as wharf dues and warehouse rentals. Import duty is payable only when goods pass from the free port area into the hinterland.

STORAGE PRIVILEGES EXTENDED

Moreover, storage is permitted for an indefinite period, compared to a 3-year limit for storage in a bonded warehouse. While in theory there is a draw-back or rebate of 99 percent of any duty paid if an importer reexports dutiable goods from a bonded warehouse, the remaining 1 percent is definitely lost, and red tape in getting the rebate reduces the net value of the 99 percent. Too, reexport from a bonded warehouse requires goods to remain under the original mark of importation, while goods in the free port can be repacked and relabeled. Zone receipts are as negotiable as any other warehouse receipts.

The free port idea is a thousand years old. It found its most romantic expression in the Hanseatic League, which reached the zenith of its power in the fourteenth century, when its membership extended from towns in Italy through central Europe to Scandinavia and beyond to the ancient Russian principality of Novgorod.

The idea, changed to foreign trade zones rather than entire ports, was revived in Germany toward the end of the last century, and its outstanding success won it followers in other countries. Free ports go naturally with high tariffs like those of the United States; low-duty nations like Holland and pre-1918 England don't need them.

The rise of pre-war Germany, poorly endowed with natural resources, to be a first rate economic power, was greatly aided by her free ports and their skillful administration. An outstanding role was played by Hamburg. This, together with the foreign trade zones in Copenhagen, Denmark, was the only free port where manufacturing of all types was freely permitted.

The Hamburg free port had 5 miles of water frontage and a land area of some 1,300 acres, dotted with warehouses and manufacturing plants, including foundries and shipyards. Cheap foreign spirits from the Baltic and Russia, on which there was a high German import duty, came to the Hamburg free port and were mixed and manufactured into fancy liqueurs, colognes, or tonics, then exported all over the world at great profit.

British-made razors from Sheffield passed through Hamburg's free port for expert honing and transshipment to America.

UNITED STATES SLOW TO ESTABLISH ZONES

Our own steps toward free ports have been irresolute. It took 20 years of investigation and wrangling before the Foreign Trade Zone Act, fathered by Representative CELLER, was finally passed in 1934.

As this act was a compromise between eastern sponsors and western and midwestern opponents, with bonded warehousemen in opposition everywhere, it fell short of giving the free port full usefulness.

The practical demonstration by the New York Foreign Trade Zone has resulted in a change of heart in most or all the former opponents. Even the bonded warehousemen, once fierce foes of the zones, are reported to be trying to obtain zone privileges, or to have their warehouses incorporated in the zone. A recent statement by the American Warehousemen's Association says it is now "in wholehearted accord with the underlying purpose of this (Celler) act, which seeks to foster American foreign trade by freeing it, to a marked extent, of inhibitory customs regulations."

The right to exhibit, competent opinion holds, would permit free port zones to become something like permanent international fairs, bound to stimulate business.

"MANUFACTURING" AN EVASIVE TERM

The much more important right to manufacture would do away with the annoyance and confusion which arise from the difficulty of drawing a line between manufacturing and manipulation. One may add coloring matter to beeswax. That's manipulation, as the substance remains beeswax whatever the color. If gelatin sheets are colored, however, that's manufacturing, because the sheets might be used as color slides.

If one mixes essential oils to produce an agreeable fragrance, that's manufacturing, too. The result is perfume, a new article.

A manufacturer of American radios may place them in Canadian-made cabinets provided the cabinets are a perfect fit. If there's any filing, sawing, or other adjustment, that again is manufacturing. The same is true of Swiss watch movements and American-made cases. All these operations are under the eagle-eyed supervision of customs inspectors.

IMPORTER OF PEAS IS FIRST PATRON

In the face of all handicaps Foreign Trade Zone No. 1, established in the port of New York in 1937, has been impressively successful. It started out with a shipment of split peas from abroad. The importer brought them into the zone, cleaned them of the shells, imperfected peas, and foreign matters, sacked them up again, and saved enough by paying the duty on salable peas alone to pay the free port's charges and come out ahead.

In 1937 the free port's incoming cargo was worth only $1,170,000. This rose to $5,700,000 in 1938, $39,000,000 in 1939, $83,000,000 in 1940, and $89,000,000 in 1941, when 232 kinds of goods from 70 countries entered the foreign trade zone.

Even this was only a tiny fraction of free port trade all around the world, estimated at $7,500,000,000 a year.

Business dropped off sharply after the free port was moved at the outbreak of the war from its first quarter on Staten Island to four obsolete piers in the North River, considered unfit for the Army's needs. Value of merchandise received was $36,000,000 in 1942, $25,200,000 in 1943, and $22,600,000 in 1944.

At that, the zone's facilities are taxed to capacity. The whole space, inside the covered piers and outside in the wire-fenced yards patrolled by armed customs guards, is jammed full of goods. Endless rows of barrels with whisky, rum, and other spirits from South Africa, Great Britain, and the Latin Americas are stacked high in the open as there is no room under cover.

Inside there are piles of small boxes containing Swiss watch movements, each box valued in excess of $30,000, bolts after bolts of Argentine woolens looking like fine English tweeds, and perhaps some 150 other kinds of goods, ranging from precious stones to tungsten from China and Bolivia.

Tungsten, incidentally, was refined in large quantities in the zone during the war—another example of a broad interpretation of the law. Tungsten remained tungsten, whether refined or not, and so its refining was regarded as manipulation, not manufacturing.

MANY ADVANTAGES ON STATEN ISLAND

The zone's deep-water Staten Island piers, built by the city in 1921–23 and rarely used before, had a water frontage, easily capable of expansion of 3,000 feet, 2 miles of dock space, and 26 acres of adjoining land. They were served by eight trunk-line railroads, had sprinkler systems making for low-insurance premiums, and were equipped with heavy-duty, electrically operated cranes, traveling hoists, elevators, conveyors, and escalators.

Retransfer of the zone to Staten Island is taken for granted as soon as the piers there are released by the Government. According to authoritative information, at least part of them will be available by January 1, 1946.

Perhaps the zone's most important accomplishment was the establishment within its confines of the "American Frascati," the world's new trading center in Java and Sumatra tobaccos, formerly conducted in Amsterdam. Dutch merchants had succeeded in salvaging their colonial tobacco crop from the Japs and Germans, and the crop found refuge in the New York foreign trade zone.

Later, two buildings were erected by the Dutch at a cost of close to $400,000 for storage and auctions. There is every reason to believe that the "Frascati" is here to stay.

The New York foreign trade zone is the forty-fourth port to be established in the world. Hamburg, Bremen, Danzig, Copenhagen, Malmo, Genoa, Trieste are some of the best known on the list, and then there are colonial free ports like Hong Kong and Macao.

Operating the New York port is the New York Foreign Trade Zone Operators, Inc., a private corporation headed by Harry C. Shanks. The company is under the supervision of the Department of Marine and Aviation of the City of New York, with Col. Robert S. Allyn the deputy commissioner directly concerned.

An Eyewitness Report on the Situation of Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, American soldiers stationed in Germany frequently encounter Lithuanian refugees and describe their experiences in letters to this country. One such American soldier from Chicago wrote to his father:

Yesterday I met 10 Lithuanians and had a long talk with them. According to them all the Lithuanians in the American zone are afraid to return to their country, for the Russians take all their possessions and send them to Siberia to work in the mines.

I asked these people if they needed anything such as clothes, money, or food. They said * * * they only wanted their country back so they can rule as they see fit * * * and they do want a democratic country.

They have a visual idea that our country will help them get their country back. * * * I hope these people are not let down. For they seem so ambitious to get their country back and return home so they can build it up to a new and better Lithuania. I was talking to a man named X from Panevezys. He's been traveling this part of Germany on foot for the last month trying to locate his wife and children. * * *

This morning I went to see the military government in regards to these 10 Lithuanians here in this small town. The Russians want them back as slave laborers. The Germans here are jealous for they (the Lithuanians) work in our mess halls, they also claim that these people are eating their food. A month ago there were about 300 Lithuanians here—so one night the German mayor, a Russian captain, and some American military police came to the Lithuanian camp at 3 in the morning and loaded 50 of them on trucks and drove off to Russia. Next morning the rest of them fled to all four winds. Since then our military government released an order stating that these people are not compelled to return to their country. * * * They have been getting papers (from Soviet agents) to sign every week, stating that they want to go to Russia of their own accord and free will—they haven't been signing them—so now the mayor is threatening them verbally.

They are very much afraid that they will be shanghaied some night. There is a Russian captain here in town checking on the Russian citizens. From the information I gathered in town the mayor was aiding him in shanghaiing all the people he needed for the dirty work that's going on in Russia * * * behind fences. The Russian border zone is 30 miles from here. * * *

Those poor Lithuanians, without a home, no clothes, no place to go, are being mistreated. Not intentionally * * * but the American officers don't take an interest in their cases. For example, when I spoke to a major who is in the military government in town here, he didn't know about the special order that was issued from our Government in regards to these people's movements back to their original country—that they are not forced to return. * * *

Gee, Dad, I wish I could do more for these people—to help them find themselves. They are happy now since they are free. * * * But I can see that they never knew what real happiness was, or forgot what it was like to have their own homes and their loved ones near them. The mere thought of them being free is a great joy.

What I can't understand is that they want only one thing and that's to be left alone until their country is freed from Russian rule. I asked them how they'll manage to eat in case the Army camp moves. They said they'll manage. Some of them are working in our camp and receive 100 marks ($10) a month which is not much. The UNRRA gives them a little food such as 200 grams of meat per week.

Official Termination of the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS RIZLEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a joint resolution declaring December 7, 1945, as the date of the duration of the present war. It is hard for the average citizen throughout the country to understand that we are still at war even though hostilities ceased in Europe several months ago and in Japan almost 3 months ago.

Necessarily, when our country is at war, almost complete dictatorial powers are given to the executive branch of the Government, and the Chief Executive—through agencies set up for the prosecution of the war—has almost full and complete control of the domestic economy of our country and complete regimentation and regulation of the lives and fortunes of our citizens. This is necessary in the best interest of an all-out war effort.

It is quite natural that many people are apprehensive concerning the relinquishment of these vast war powers by the Chief Executive when the war is over and peace comes. Thus far in the history of our country they have been handled wisely and well. In view of a lot of things that have been happening in this country during the past 12 years, one of the questions I have heard most often propounded by the average citizen was this: Will the executive branch of the Government voluntarily relinquish the war power which has been given to it?

There are some signs on the horizon now which indicate that the executive branch of the Government may intend to hold on just as long as possible to many of the vast war powers which were given to it for emergency purposes. I know of no good reason that anyone has advanced as to why the war should not be declared officially at an end, so that the "6 months after the duration" which was written into many contracts, will start running.

The President has the authority and power, by proclamation, to declare the war at an end. His failure, or refusal, so to do authorizes the Congress by joint resolution to declare the war at an end. In my opinion, sufficient time has elapsed; the President has failed to act and, so far, I am advised he has not indicated when, if at all, he expects to issue such a proclamation.

This Congress should not recess for the holidays without giving the people of the country some assurance or reassurance that it intends to recapture and retake these vast powers which it has turned over to the executive branch of the Government and which belong to the people. Accordingly, I have introduced the resolution referred to and I hope that it may have the immediate action of the appropriate committee, to which it will be assigned, so that we may consider this resolution and adopt it before we recess for the holidays.

Latest Appeal of Lithuanian Patriots to the Western Democracies and to the Conscience of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation:

The eyes of the world are again turned toward the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of Great Britain on the eve of their meeting with the President of the Council of the People's Commissars of the Soviet Union. Perhaps at no time have so many hopes and expectations been placed in the leaders of the two great democracies as on the occasion of this impending conference in Berlin. When the military might of the Reich had been shattered and the power of national socialism and fascism destroyed, an intense feeling of relief manifested itself throughout the world. The Lithuanian Nation, which had tenaciously resisted the Nazi occupation of that country for more than 3 years, and which had never doubted the ultimate triumph of the principles proclaimed by the western democracies, rejoices with all peace-loving peoples in the victory of the United Nations. Unfortunately, however, Lithuania is not yet free; she is still under foreign military occupation—that of the Soviets. Therefore, the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation, which represents all the Lithuanian democratic political parties and which led the struggle of the Lithuanian Nation against the Nazi occupation, as the exponent of the unshakable will of the Lithuanian people to be free and to have an independent democratic state, has the honor to request you, Mr. President, to permit it to make the following appeal to you, and through you to the conscience of the whole civilized world:

The Soviet Government, continuing the imperialtistic policy of czarist Russia, and taking advantage of the European crisis provoked by the Third Reich, had already decided in 1939 to incorporate the Baltic States into the Soviet Union (a statement to that effect was made by M. Molotov, the Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs, to the Foreign Minister of the puppet Lithuanian Government, Professor Kreve-Mickevicius, on June 30, 1940). After coming to an understanding with Hitler in August 1939, the Soviet Government began to carry out its

decision by fraud and by force, in violation of the treaty obligations it had contracted and the international pledges it had given (peace treaty with Lithuania in 1920, Nonaggression Pact of 1926, and Mutual Assistance Pact of 1939). Disregarding the traditionally friendly relations between the two countries, the Soviet Government chose the moment of the French debacle, which b ought the European crisis to a head, to present to Lithuania the notorious ultimatum of June 14, 1940, and on the next day Soviet forces, concentrated beforehand on the Lithuanian frontier, overran the country. Only after the military occupation was complete and the all-powerful Soviet secret police (NKVD) had spread its net over the country and the first wave of red terror had swept over the land did the Soviet Government take measures to legalize the act of force and violence of the 15th of June. For this purpose elections to the so-called People's Diet, which was convened by July 21, were held on July 14–15, 1940. At the dictate of Miscow this diet passed a resolution humbly requesting that Lithuania be admitted into the Soviet Union. That the so-called diet has no authority to speak in the name of the Lithuanian Nation or to make decisions determining the fate of the Lithuanian people and binding the Lithuanian state is evident, not only from what is stated above but also from the following facts:

1. The composition of the People's Diet was made up in advance by the local Communist Party, controlled by the emissaries of Moscow—the Deputy Commissar for Foreign Affairs, G. Dekanozov, and the Soviet Envoy to Lithuania, N. G. Pozdniakov. This party alone was entitled to nominate candidates for election.

2. Only one list of candidates was submitted to the voters in each electoral district, and it contained the exact number of candidates to be elected.

3. No name could be deleted or added: the elector had no free choice whatever; he had to vote for the list as a whole.

4. The elections took place under the close supervision of NKVD agents who were posted even in the polling booths.

5. On July 11, 1940, 3 days before the elections, the NKVD arrested all the Lithuanian Democratic Party leaders, newspaper editors, and other influential persons who could sway public opinion, about three hundred in all.

6. The Communist Party alone was allowed to conduct an electoral compaign. All newspapers were suppressed and were replaced by a regimented Communist press. No expression of free public opinion was allowed.

7. In spite of the terroristic methods employed by the NKVD and the pressure exerted on individual voters by Soviet soldiers, according to authenticated electoral returns, not more than 18 percent of the electorate actually voted; the rest, driven to the polls by force and intimidation, filled the ballot boxes with empty envelopes or with envelopes containing clippings from newspaper comic strips.

Since the local Communist Party alone was entitled to nominate candidates, obviously no member of the parties which had made up the democratic Lithuanian Diet (Christian Democrats, Social Democrats, Populists, etc.) was elected to the so-called People's Diet. It is noteworthy that the local Communist Party, which did not have a single representative in the democratic Lithuanian Diet, even when it was busy nominating its candidates and having them elected to the People's Diet, had a membership of only 800. Under the Soviet domination of Lithuania, the party's membership rose to 2,500, according to official Soviet figures, but the majority of the members even then were of non-Lithuanian extraction. It is a curious and telling fact that the former Soviet Envoy to Lithuania, Mr. Pozdniakov, and General Kuznetsov, a high-ranking officer of the army of occupation, were also elected representatives of Sovietized Lithuania to the People's Supreme Council of the Soviet Union, in Moscow, although both these Soviet dignitaries were completely alien to the Lithuanian people. The role of the Soviet Union and its armed forces in the rape of Lithuania is reflected even in the resolution of the so-called People's Diet, one paragraph of which reads:

"Now the people, aided by the mighty Red army, have * * * established in their own country the Soviet regime."

The Lithuanian Nation unanimously considers the efforts of Moscow to base its claims to Lithuania on the resolution of the so-called People's Diet to be an unprecedented falsification of the will of the Lithuanian people, and categorically and uncompromisingly rejects all the pretensions founded on this falsification. The incorporation of the Lithuanian state into the Soviet Union based on the said resolution, which was passed while the diplomatic representatives of the Great Powers were still present in Lithuania, was not recognized by the greater western democracies: the United States of America, Great Britain, and France. After the Red Army had occupied Lithuania and the farce of incorporation had been played, the late President Roosevelt made the following statement on October 15, 1940, to a delegation of Lithuanian Americans who had been received in audience at the White House and had expressed their anxiety regarding the fate of the Lithuanian state:

"It is stated that Lithuania has lost her independence. It is a mistake to say so. Lithuania has not lost her independence. Lithuania's independence has only been temporarily suspended. The time will come and Lithuania will be free again. This will happen much sooner than you may expect."

The Soviet Government furthermore endeavored to justify its aggression against Lithuania in the eyes of the world by alleging its need to secure its western frontiers. However, an independent Lithuanian state, traditionally friendly to the Soviet Union, did not and could not imperil the security of the Soviet Union; on the contrary, separating as it does the German and Slavic worlds and holding up German expansion toward the east, it could only strengthen this security. Moreover, at the present time, with the destruction of German militarism and the adoption at San Francisco of the United Nations Security Charter, arguments of this character are obviously inadmissible.

From the very beginning of the present political crisis, Lithuania has sided with the great western democracies and her fate was bound up with their victory. In 1939 Lithuania rejected the Third Reich's suggestion that she attack Poland and thus join the Axis bloc. Instead, she hospitably gave asylum to retreating Polish soldiers and refugees and helped many Poles to reach the countries of their allies. From 1941 to 1944 the Lithuanian people carried on active resistance against the Nazi occupation, refused to be harnessed to the German war machine, and sabotaged and disorganized it whenever and wherever they could. For the most part, the Lithuanian people were unable to inform the outside world about this type of activity. A not inconsiderable number of soldiers of Lithuanian descent have fought and died in the ranks of the American and British Armies. Even in its greatest hour of trial, the Lithuanian Nation proved by deeds that it cherishes liberty and is determined to fight for it.

Three consecutive occupations and the military operations in her territory have inflicted terrible wounds on Lithuania. Many of her towns and villages have been left in ruins; her economy, once so flourishing, has been very nearly wrecked. During the first Soviet occupation, more than forty thousand Lithuanians from various walks of life were deported to the Arctic wastes of Siberia, and to this day their fate causes grave concern to the Lithuanian people. Tens of thousands were done to death solely because they were Lithuanians. The Nazis, who succeeded the Soviets, destroyed hundreds of thousands of Lithuanian citizens; about one hundred and fifty thousand Lithuanian nationals were forcibly deported as slave laborers to Germany. Hundreds of Lithuanian intellectuals were tortured and put to death in Gestapo prisons and concentration camps. Panic fear of a second Soviet occupation caused nearly three hundred thousand Lithuanians to leave their homeland. Today, when Lithuania is for the second time occupied by the Soviets, mass deportations are again being carried out by the NKVD. The Lithuanian people, outlawed, tortured, and deported, appeal to the conscience of the world, praying in despair for help and deliverance. Only a nation which is in possession of its freedom and enjoys independence can heal the wounds caused by war and foreign occupation, can rebuild its devastated towns and villages, reorganize its economic life, and reintegrate its country into the great process of world reconstruction.

The imposition on Lithuania of any arbitrary ties with the Soviet Union, which is so essentially alien to the Lithuanian nation in speech and religion and culture, would plunge the Lithuanian people, who have fought so long and so hard for their liberty, into absolute despair, would paralyze their creative energy, would condemn to permanent emigration about half a million Lithuanians who are today enduring the hard lot of the exile, sustained only by the hope of a speedy return to a free and independent homeland.

Now that hostilities in Europe have ceased and the Allied Nations are well on the way to a durable peace founded on law and justice, the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation takes the liberty of calling your attention, Mr. President, to the situation of the Lithuanian people and the Lithuanian state, and submits the following requests for your favorable consideration:

1. That the Soviet claims to Lithuania, whether based on considerations of security or on the alleged will of the Lithuanian nation as expressed through the so-called "People's Diet," be not recognized as hitherto.

2. That action be taken to induce the Soviet Union to withdraw without delay its army, administration, and police from Lithuanian territory, in order that the sovereign institutions of the Lithuanian state may be reestablished and may resume their functioning. These institutions will maintain order and tranquillity in the country and will guarantee to the nation the right of freely expressing its will through unfettered democratic elections.

3. That the United States of America, Great Britain, and France take under their protection that portion of the Lithuanian people which has been deported or exiled in consequence of the war. The majority of these people are living at present in Germany, pending the creation of the condition sine qua non for their return to their native country, namely, the restoration of the exercise of the sovereign rights of the Lithuanian state.

4. That the Soviet Government be prevailed upon to return to Lithuania the Lithuanians who were forcibly deported to the interior of Russia. Until this is done, it is requested that the Lithuanian Red Cross and Lithuanian-American relief associations, directly or through the International Red Cross, be permitted to enter into communication with these deportees in order to ascertain their

fate, to enable them to communicate with their relatives and friends, and in order that aid may be organized for them.

The Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation appeals to you, Mr. President, in the name of a small nation of some 3,000,000 people. This nation, which the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation represents, loves and values liberty as much as do the larger nations. Even as they, it is equally ready to fight and to die for freedom. The high principles of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" proclaimed by the late President of the United States of America, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, constitute a beacon which lights the way for the Lithuanian people in this, the darkest hour of their history. The victory won at the cost of so much sacrifice and such great suffering would be troubled, and the sacrifices of the Lithuanian people completely in vain, if, at the time when the triumph of the great western democracies has brought the blessings of liberty to other nations, the Lithuanian Nation should be condemned to hopeless slavery and extermination only because, in the words of the Soviet Foreign Commissar, M. Molotov, this state of affairs is demanded by the imperialist Russian policy which has been pursued since the days of Ivan the Terrible.

We avail ourselves, Mr. President, of this opportunity to convey to you the expression of our highest consideration and that of the whole Lithuanian Nation.

THE SUPREME LITHUANIAN
COMMITTEE OF LIBERATION.

JULY 10, 1945.

Permanent Headquarters for UNO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Globe of November 9, 1945:

MAKE IT THE HUB OF THE WORLD

Will the United Nations Organization establish its permanent headquarters in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts? The only surprising feature of that question is that there has been so long a delay in posing it and in preparing to argue the case before the Preparatory Commission of the UNO, which is open to hearings on selection of the site a fortnight hence, at London.

While the selection of a site for the UNO is still pending, with the western European nations led by Britain making a fight to retain Geneva, the headquarters of the old League of Nations, for the purpose, opposition to any attempt to set up the new world organization in intrigue-wracked Europe has already been sufficiently powerful to induce the subcommittee charged with this matter to go on record as favoring a site in the United States. The headquarters, as the subcommittee puts it, "should be" in the United States.

Support from Latin America and other member states in the UNO for an American headquarters promises to be further strengthened once it becomes clear that Russia's opposition to Geneva remains unalterable. Moscow's veto on Geneva derives partly from the fact that one of her officials was assassinated several years ago at the Swiss city. It stems mainly, however, from Russia's bitter experiences of League partiality and big power snubs administered during the twenties and thirties at this League center.

With Europe probably eliminated, and Asia out of the question, as a site for the new UNO, and with a subcommittee recommendation already supporting selection of a headquarters in the United States, prospects for choice of a site somewhere along the eastern seaboard of this country are very strong. Frowns on San Francisco, as being too far away from Europe and Washington, apparently have eliminated the west coastal area.

Massachusetts will need to work fast and hard, if its case is to prevail at the hearings which open November 23 at London. Other seaboard cities, notably Philadelphia, have been toiling in their own interests on this matter since late last spring. Yet the case for the Bay State as a site for the UNO is formidable, and would doubtless command support from all our sister States in New England. For the benefits which would accrue to them all, were the UNO established within suitable distance from the port of Boston, would be spread throughout the loveliest of all vacation areas in eastern America.

Massachusetts meets the requirements laid down by the United Nations for choice of a site. It proffers adequate rail and highway facilities and a rapidly developing air center. Its availability is further increased by virtue of the nearness of Boston to Europe—an advantage which gives it the edge over New York.

There is ample room in our Commonwealth to permit the setting aside of the requisite territory—which would be approximately a square mile—for internationalization. There are hotel facilities in Boston comparable to any which will be found presently along the eastern seaboard; and provision for the temporary accommodation of UNO staffs, until the great world center is built, is at hand.

Inasmuch as the UNO plans to construct not only its necessary public buildings, but also suitable housing facilities for its personnel at the site selected, no difficulty should be found in managing this part of the plan. But there are other reasons which fortify the plea for choice of a site in the old Bay State.

Here, American freedom was born. Here the first experiment in democracy in the West had its beginnings. Here sprouted the seed which later matured into the American Constitution. The finest libraries, the largest collection of colleges and universities assembled in a single State, the most famous technical schools and laboratories in the country, find shelter here, in a State whose cultural traditions are deep and productive.

If the UNO is coming to America, the Bay State is the logical place for it.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Ever Hear of the Praying Mantis?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article reprinted from the Hartford Courant, October 21, 1945, and the Hartford Times, October 22, 1945:

EVER HEAR OF THE PRAYING MANTIS?

The praying mantis is a useful insect—a friend of man—because he destroys other insects recognized as pests.

But when the female mantis gets angry with her spouse, she pulls off his head. He doesn't die immediately. For a while he staggers around aimlessly, willy-nilly, without knowing where he is going or why. But after a while he dies.

Nothing can exist long without a head, whether insect or industry. In every business someone must chart the course, line up the objectives, keep the ship sailing steadily—else that business, like the headless mantis, goes round and round, getting nowhere fast.

The head, of course, is management.

But being management is not all beer and skittles. Management has four responsibilities which it must fulfill if it hopes to survive.

First of all, management has a responsibility to the customer, to give him full value for what he buys. The customer—the public—is the real boss who always has the last word. When he says "No" too often, it's too bad for both management and the men and women on the production lines. In order to get the customer to say "Yes," management and employees have to produce efficiently and sell at prices to meet competition.

Next, management has a responsibility toward those who produce, sell, and service its products. This responsibility is linked to the first. For management's responsibility to provide continuous work, decent working conditions, and fair wages is dependent on how the customer likes the company, its products, and its services.

Management has the responsibility, too, of operating the business so that it is a community asset rather than a community liability. Fair employers who pay fair wages are an asset to any city or town.

Finally, management has the responsibility toward those who have put their money into the company. The stockholders took a risk to buy the plant and the equipment and furnish the capital so that jobs could be created and goods made, and those stockholders are entitled to a fair return in one way or another.

But what's that got to do with the praying mantis without a head? Merely this: just as rights imply responsibilities on the part of both management and labor, so do these responsibilities imply that certain functions properly belong to management and labor so that their respective responsibilities may be fulfilled.

Management has the function of maintaining orderly procedures in production, of hiring the best men and women for the jobs at hand, of devising new products and seeing that they are profitably marketed. These are functions of management, just as it is the function of the shipping clerk to send out the product, and the function of the machine operator to run his machine.

If management didn't perform its functions, the business—like the headless mantis—after a period of staggering around, would collapse. There would be no products to sell to the customers. The community and the Government would lose a good, growing, taxable asset. The stockholders would lose their investment. And the employees wouldn't have any jobs.

If management failed or refused to fulfill its functions, everybody would lose. Nobody would gain.

It is the responsibility of management to make decisions. When management fails to exercise the functions of hiring the best men, devising the most efficient methods of manufacture, promoting to responsible positions the best talent available, rewarding the diligent and disciplining the sluggard, then, to that extent, management is not fulfilling its duties.

Certainly, in a highly competitive field, the management with the most efficient organization which can make good products, service them efficiently, and sell them in competition with others, is bound to get its share of the business, and its employees will have jobs.

Management and employees, working with a knowledge and appreciation of each other's duties, responsibilities and obligations, work for the good of all concerned.

When management and labor each do a real job with pride and enthusiasm, and fulfill their respective functions, the business has the best chance of succeeding—of making money for its stockholders, its community, its government, and for its employees.

Principles of the Disabled American Veterans With Regard to Membership in Chapters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am glad, indeed to take this opportunity to insert with my remarks a copy of the column entitled, "Commander's Message" published in the Disabled American Veterans' News for the Department of California, issued in October 1945:

COMMANDER'S MESSAGE
(By Joseph W. Spedding)

One of our chapters have requested an opinion from our department judge advocate. I consider this question most important and fundamental. It is one that admits of no equivocation or compromise. It strikes at the foundation of our democracy. It is a challenge to us to state our conception of the American ideal, the one thing we have fought to preserve since 1776.

Since the opinion is of interest to all chapters, I am having it printed in my column. Let us read it and do some thinking as true Americans worthy of our heritage and which we must preserve for generations to come.

Yours in comradeship,
JOSEPH W. SPEDDING,
State Commander.

OPINION NO. 47, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA, OFFICE OF THE JUDGE ADVOCATE

One of our chapters requests opinion on the following points:

1. Do we have to accept into membership in our chapters disabled veterans who are of (designations deleted) color or racial group?

2. Shall we require that they organize and function through their own separate chapters?

The Disabled American Veterans, Inc., is not a private club. It is not a social or fraternal organization of some disabled veterans serving their own purposes. Prior to 1932 we may have been in such a classification. However, in that year we applied for and received from the Congress of the United States a charter of incorporation (Public, No. 186, 72d Cong., H. R. 4738, approved June 17, 1932. Amended, Public, No. 668, 77th Cong., 2d sess., H. R. 7282, approved July 15, 1942). By the terms of this charter, Congress has prescribed, and we accepted, standards of eligibility for membership and the purposes we must serve. We have not the right or power to vary the terms and conditions of our charter. Only Congress can amend its enactment.

It is helpful to remember that Congress chartered our organization to serve a public purpose. We are given powers and privileges not enjoyed by private or other fraternal organizations. But these powers and privileges were conferred on us not as a gift or outright grant. These were conferred on us for the purpose of enabling us to discharge the obligations which are also prescribed by that charter. The Disabled American Veterans, Inc., is in the nature of a semipublic organization. In some respects it is an instrumentality of the Government, intended to serve the public in a specified field. So we hold and exercise these powers and privileges as trustees of a public trust. And we must account to the public as to what use we make of them.

Section 5 of our charter prescribes the standards of eligibility for membership in the Disabled American Veterans:

"Any man or woman who was wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled in line of duty during time of war while in the service of either the military or naval forces of the United States of America, and who has been honorably discharged or separated from such service or who may still be in active service in the armed forces of the United States is eligible for membership in the Disabled American Veterans. Others who were disabled while serving with any of the armed forces of any nation associated with the United States as allies during any of its war periods, who are American citizens and who were honorably discharged, are also eligible."

We find nothing in this language, express or implied, which could be construed to grant to us the right to discriminate on the grounds of race, color, or creed.

Not only Congress has not left us any such choice, but by express language, has prohibited it. Section 3 of our congressional charter defines the purposes of our organization. We quote in part:

"To uphold and maintain the Constitution and the laws of the United States, to realize the true American ideals and aims for which those eligible to membership fought."

It would require extraordinary moral obtuseness and monumental cynicism to say that we may discriminate on the grounds of race, color, or creed and at the same time fulfill our purpose "to realize the true American ideals and aims for which those eligible to membership fought." Such discrimination is the very negation and the death knell of the American ideal.

Evidently our organization is conscious of the grave responsibilities placed on us by our charter. We have not been content to let these provisions of our chapter speak for themselves. We require every member to take an obligation. We quote, in part:

"I ———, do, in the presence of Almighty God and my comrades here assembled, promise and declare that I will always uphold and maintain the Constitution and laws of the United States of America; * * * that I will always uphold the integrity and character of a brother veteran; that I will do my best to exemplify the principles of comradeship, loyalty, and devotion."

The promise to uphold and maintain the Constitution is a pledge to uphold and maintain the American ideals. Bigotry, race prejudice, intolerance, the stupidity of self-arrogated superiority, discrimination on the grounds of race, color, or creed, cannot be tolerated by an organization of veterans functioning under a charter granted by the Congress of the United States and where it professes to uphold and maintain the Constitution.

We take it that those who were chosen, without discrimination as to race, color, or creed to fight by our side for the preservation of the American ideals, have the right to expect that those of us who have sworn to uphold and maintain the Constitution and to "realize the American ideals" will "uphold their integrity and character and will exemplify toward them the principles of comradeship, loyalty, and devotion."

Speaking of the American ideals, Washington wrote to Lafayette that "these institutions will survive so long as there remains any virtue in the people."

By reason of service to our country in time of war and the injury and suffering sustained by us in defense of the American ideals, Congress has charged us with and we have accepted the obligation "to realize the true American ideals and aims" for which we fought and suffered. Comrades, this calls for sober thinking and responsible conduct.

Therefore, any veteran who is eligible for membership as prescribed by Congress is entitled to membership in a chapter of the Disabled American Veterans nearest his place of residence.

Any denial of such right on the grounds of race, color, or creed is a violation of our oath of membership, and is conduct contrary to the provisions of our charter. It would amount to the use of our congressional charter to unconstitutional, un-American ends, and would be sufficient to justify the revocation of our charter.

The question of the desirability of forming separate chapters involves other considerations. Since these comrades have the right to join us in our several chapters, the question of separate chapters must be approached entirely from a consideration of which plan will enable these comrades to better enjoy the privileges of membership, and also make them most effective in the discharge of their responsibilities.

Our experience in California and elsewhere has proved that in chapters where there are common bonds, in addition to the bond common to all disabled veterans, they have been able to function with greater harmony, and, therefore, they have been more effective. Thus, we have chapters composed entirely of naval personnel. We have chapters composed entirely of disabled veterans who are now in Government service. So we have chapters composed entirely of veterans of a certain campaign or who served in a particular arm of service. In many of our chapters we have Negro comrades who enjoy the respect and affection of their respective chapters and some hold office. On the other hand, some of our Negro comrades in California desired to form their own separate chapters, and the results have amply justified their wisdom.

Therefore, the answer to the second question is that we cannot require the formation of separate chapters on the grounds of race, color, or creed. But we can and should make available to them the experience of such separate chapters and wherever greater advantages will accrue to them and to the organization we should assist them in organizing their own chapters.

ALFRED ARAM,
Department Judge Advocate.
SAN JOSE, CALIF., *September 17, 1945.*

I approve and adopt the foregoing opinion.
JOSEPH SPEDDING,
Department Commander.
SEPTEMBER 18, 1945.

Gus Edwards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include the following editorial on the life of the late Gus Edwards which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of November 11, 1945:

GUS EDWARDS

If the history of show business in America ever is written in terms of biographies of the great impressarios who created it, the name of Gus Edwards may lead all the rest. He made dozens of stars. The roster of prodigies whom he sponsored, taught, and trained is literally a scroll of fame. His method was to capitalize on the natural instinct of children to dramatize themselves. Understanding that what the youngsters needed was competent instruction, he educated them in all the tricks of the entertainment trade and then proved the efficacy of his technique by touring the country with his "school" of kids.

Eddie Cantor, George Jessel, Eleanor Powell, the Duncan sisters, Mae Murray, Mitzi Mayfair, Hildegarde, and many other vaudeville, screen, and radio headliners received their inspiration as well as their earliest professional guidance from Gus. The legends of their careers trace back in numerous cases to his genius for obtaining what he called "breaks" for them. Meanwhile, he achieved an independent success as a composer of popular songs for grown-up performers. For Anna Held he wrote, I Can't Make My Eyes Behave. Several of the Ziegfeld Follies featured his productions. The tunes were not classic, neither were the words authentic poetry, but millions of people whistled In My Merry Oldsmobile and By the Light of the Silvery Moon.

Obviously, Edwards will be remembered. He had a rich, colorful, and useful life. Let it be added that part of the credit was due to his wife's unfaltering help. She traveled with him when he took his troupes on tour and was a foster mother to all the Lilliputian crew, and she still was with him when at last, long sick, he died.

St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project Meets Delays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to preface my remarks with just a suggestion as to what constitutes the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. I do this because most people, in fact, nearly everybody, admits that they are not informed about this matter. The project contemplates the deepening of channels in the rapids section of the St. Lawrence River from a depth of 14 feet to a depth of 27 feet so that ocean-going vessels can travel from the Atlantic seaboard to the various ports on the Great Lakes, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, Milwaukee, Duluth, Minn., and other ports. In effect it establishes a fourth seacoast 2,687 miles long from Duluth to the Atlantic Ocean. In connection with this project there is involved the building of a dam and below that the construction of a power project at Massena, N. Y., which will furnish 2,500,000 horsepower in terms of electricity.

In the Pathfinder, Washington, D. C., for November 7, 1945, there is a short article dealing with this project and of special value is a colored map which tells its own story and one glance at it will convince anyone of the vast possibilities to the Midwestern section of the United States as well as to the Atlantic seaboard, when the St. Lawrence seaway improvements are made.

DELAYS ARE DANGEROUS

Friends of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project do not like to admit the fact that it will soon be a year since there was tangible progress made in connection with this matter. In December 1944, the St. Lawrence seaway and power project was offered as an amendment and while there were no hearings in the Senate there was a roll call on the amendment in the Senate, and for reasons not here discussed real progress was made. This roll call vote was truly victory in defeat.

However, there appears to be no justification for the fact that this project has been delayed in the year 1945 for over 10 months and on this date it is just as far away from making progress as it has ever been during the last 50 years. I repeat, delays are dangerous and if the friends of this project are having a hand in the delays, then they had better take inventory. One of the ancient legislative tricks of the opposition is to practice the art of delay and postponement. If you are opposed to a measure, the longer you delay it the better. Anyone familiar with legislative procedure knows just exactly that this is true. Seaway advocates must admit that the advantages are with the opponents of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. I will call the roll on them some of these days.

In this connection the Duluth Herald, of Duluth, Minn., under date of October 29, 1945, has an interesting editorial by its able editorial writer in which some optimism is expressed. His high hopes may or may not be the result of wishful thinking but anyhow the editorial is interesting and is as follows:

THEY'RE TALKING MORE ABOUT IT

The pessimistic express themselves as disgusted with the whole seaway situation, and predict that current efforts to secure its construction will fail as others have failed in the past.

But, for the resuscitation of optimism in such folk, let us point out that more people who count are talking more about the project.

That usually is taken as indicating not only renewed but growing interest.

Senator CONNALLY, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has been authorized to appoint a special committee to study the proposal, chiefly as to what is the best form for dealing with it in Congress. That certainly is something that should bolster spirits. That action followed President Truman's advocacy of the St. Lawrence project, and after a lot of discussion on the side. The President characterized the St. Lawrence idea as "one of the great projects of the world," in his message of October 3.

Raymond Moley, in an article in a weekly magazine of recent date, asserted that the influence of the East, especially in opposition to the St. Lawrence project, will be less decisive from now on than ever before. We certainly hope he is right and realize that incidents and discussions of the recent past give him a good basis for his conclusion.

An article on the Minnesota Resources Commission, by its director, James W. Clark, which appeared in press dispatches recently, lists as one of "two most encouraging prospects" the progress toward completion of the St. Lawrence seaway. The commission, which in its recent report, virtually ignored the seaway, must be waking up, or somebody has told Mr. Clark the facts of Minnesota life.

All in all, the project has taken on a very vigorous rejuvenation. It is not yet to be regarded as certain of fruition, nor even as a probability, but it certainly can be put at or near the top of the list of possibilities, and that's better than we have ever been able to classify it before.

You will note that the editorial writer in the Duluth Herald waxes eloquent in one paragraph in the editorial because the Minnesota Resources Commission has arisen from its Rip Van Winkle sleeping potion and has issued another report. I do not mean to say that it is remarkable that a report has been issued, but as the editorial writer indicates the fact that the Minnesota Resources Commission actually found out about the St. Lawrence River indicates that the Commission is getting slightly damp and nobody needs to feel that it is just a case of mildew.

THERE IS CAUSE FOR PESSIMISM

One of the ablest newspaper correspondents in Washington is Gustaf A. Nordin, a northern Minnesota boy who has a grasp on executive and legislative situations in the Nation's Capital and who knows how to correctly analyze them. Mr. Nordin does this job very diplomatically in his column in the November 6, 1945, issue of the Duluth News-Tribune, published at Duluth, Minn., and his article reads as follows:

WASHINGTON WITH NORDIN

(By Gustaf A. Nordin)

WASHINGTON.—Delays in getting hearings started on the St. Lawrence waterway joint resolution introduced in Congress 2 months ago may prove to be the next hurdle for proponents of the deep seaway.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee October 24 authorized Chairman TOM CONNALLY, Democrat, Texas, to name a subcommittee to consider the legislation. Two weeks have gone by and no sign has developed that the Texas Senator is anxious to hurry the thing along.

It is known that strong advocates of the plan in the Senate had hoped to see hearings already under way. With the bipartisan support of the seaway—10 influential Senators sponsoring it in the Senate while Speaker SAM RAYBURN authored the House version—it was believed no further delays were in store for this important midwestern waterway.

If hearings do not get started this fall, advocates of the legislation may find Congress take a Thanksgiving-Christmas holiday. That would put the whole matter over to the next session of Congress in January.

A lot of delays could develop as a new session gets under way—especially if there is more than meets the eye of the stalling now going on.

Should hearings be held up until spring under such circumstances, it is hard to know how the seaway proposal will fare. Next year is an election year. Congressmen and Senators will not be looking for a controversial issue to hurt their reelection chances. Rather than face the waterway issue, which has been pushed from pillar to post for three decades, the congressional committees might decide to withhold activity until after November 1946 elections.

Keep in mind, that could happen unless something is done immediately to force hearings.

CONNALLY was honest when he said he would take his time in selecting the subcommittee. He contended his anxiety to bide his time was to be sure all sections of the country are represented instead of just one section. That should not be difficult to do. He has only 22 members on the Foreign Relations Committee to choose from, 6 of them being sponsors of the joint seaway resolution.

Of the six sponsors on the parent committee, three are from the Midwest, one from the East, and two from the South.

Perhaps the answer lies in a different explanation Chairman CONNALLY gave the press after the subcommittee authorization was voted.

He pointed out that there are still two schools of thought on the Great Lakes-to-the-Atlantic waterway. One favors the agreement form of legislation, which requires but a simple majority of both houses to be approved. The other favors a treaty form with Canada, which would require two-thirds vote of the Senate—and likely would result in seaway defeat again.

But President Truman, Majority Leader BARKLEY, Republican Leader VANDENBERG and others supporting the legislation have offered the plan along a third line—a joint resolution. This, too, would take but a simple majority of both Houses. The controversial features are pretty much eliminated, yet development of power and navigation resources are preserved.

Chairman CONNALLY has asked members of the Foreign Relations Committee to submit names of those whom each believes should be on the subcommittee. That might be another way of holding up final selection of a committee to get to work.

A spokesman for the group made this comment:

"The Senator [Mr. CONNALLY] is in no hurry about it. He is busy with other matters right now—the atomic bomb, Pearl Harbor, and delegation of powers to the United States representative on the United Nations Council."

And all of the problems are not in the Senate. Republican Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, may find himself in an embarrassing position if he can't get the New York congressional delegation to see the light.

Reports are trickling through that most of the upstate New York Republican Representatives are balking. Only three—FULLER, KILBURN, and BENNETT—are said to be ready to go along when the resolution reaches the House. If true, that poses a problem for Mr. Dewey, who has been a firm advocate of the waterway, although he has, as Governor of New York, insisted upon protection of his State's power rights in the project.

As yet there is no cause for pessimism, proponents of the seaway insist, but the sudden slow-down in senatorial activity since the joint resolution was introduced is forcing waterway backers to get busy or the excellent groundwork laid among Democrats and Republicans may crumble before their very eyes.

There are some things that Mr. Nordin does not discuss, probably because it would make his article too long. He does mention the fact that Christmas is coming and does not appear disturbed in contemplating the result that the year 1946 will soon be with us and not a thing done to make progress in the way of getting hearings or getting legislative action on the part of Congress. This is indeed laudible optimism. My frank opinion is that the story as told by Mr. Nordin in the Duluth News-Tribune for November 6 does give cause for pessimism.

Next year is an election year and to experienced observers on Capitol Hill that fact tells its own story when a legislative program is undertaken.

The American people are interested in this project. Those who have not informed themselves should do so and then they should tell their duly elected representatives how they feel about the matter. Right now the lobbyists who are opposed to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project are flooding the country with a lot of vicious propaganda which is intended to frighten Members of Congress and mislead them in respect to pending legislation on this subject.

Storm of Public Protest Brewing Over Nation's Housing Scarcity; Newspapers Taking Up the Cry For Immediate Action To Meet Inflation Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 8, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, frequently within the past several weeks, I have humbly tried to warn the Members of the House against the approaching national crisis due to the scarcity of homes for the people. I have sincerely endeavored to point out the serious dangers of the economic inflation speeding toward us in the soaring prices of homes.

Today we are hearing the distant thunder of a Nation-wide storm of public protest that is brewing from Maine to Florida over the housing situation. Some of the Nation's most responsible newspapers, big and little, already are resounding with editorial protest over the fact that neither the Congress, nor the building industry, nor the executive branch of Government have taken any forthright action to deal with unscrupulous speculators who are making a profit out of the desperate housing need of the people.

The Florida Times-Union, often called the New York Times of the deep South, demands reasonably priced homes for veterans. The Christian Science Monitor, looked up to by professionals as representing the finest in American journalism, in an unusual editorial, urges swift action against these speculative profiteers. The New York Sun points up the situation in an editorial entitled "While Tenants Wait for New Houses." The Nashville Tennessean, the Johnstown (Pa.) Tribune, the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press, the Eryan (Tex.) Eagle—newspapers from every section of the country—are echoing the same cry for action.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include a few of these editorials to show the trend of the thinking among the people:

[From the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press of October 26, 1945]

ANOTHER "BOOM BUST"?

Legislation to control the sales prices of both old and new houses has been asked by Price Administrator Bowles, but Congress seems in no mood to amplify legislative price controls. Congressman PATMAN, of Texas, who declares that "discharged war veterans are throwing away their wartime savings in paying sky-high prices for second-rate shelter," said this week that "drastic action is needed to prevent a repetition of the boom-bust cycle" in housing that followed the First World War.

An unprecedented volume of home building is in the cards for the next 10 years to make up for the dearth of new construction during the war and also to meet the housing demands of returning veterans and shifting populations. The National Housing Authority estimates the need at 12,600,000 new nonfarm dwelling units, of which 10 percent should be built each year during the next decade. The Bureau of Labor Statistics predicts, however, that about 900,000 new dwelling units a year will actually be built during the next 5 years. The record construction in any previous year was 935,000 in 1925. Over the last 40 years, new housing units averaged about 475,000 a year.

At present there is no legislative restriction on the prices that may be charged for newly built or used homes, although there are still price ceilings on the materials that go into construction. The ban has now been lifted on the construction of homes selling for less than $8,000, which before October 15 existed under the famous order L–41.

There is ground for PATMAN'S fear of another boom-bust. After the other war, conditions in the housing field were about what they are now. Demand was high and supply low. By April 1920 the price level of materials was 214 percent higher than before the war and new housing was in the luxury class. Inevitably this was reflected in rentals, which by 1925 were 60 percent higher than when the war ended. About that time the price of new housing became too high even for the well-to-do and construction fell off. Employment in the building trades declined almost one-third in the next 4 years. With the falling off of all prices which began in 1929 and continued during the depression, many home owners could not meet mortgage payments based on the inflated prices of 1919–25 and tens of thousands of foreclosures resulted.

Similarly today, it is feared that too much new construction will go into luxury homes. Not only do these offer the highest profits for builders, but families in the upper income brackets, with large accumulations of savings and inadequate channels for investment, seem willing to buy at any price. An Urban Land Institute survey shows that three-fourths of the new homes scheduled for construction in the next 2 years will be priced at more than $5,000, while two-thirds of the need is for homes costing less than that. If the threatened black market in building materials should develop, the prices of new homes will skyrocket.

To see what can be done about all this, the United States Chamber of Commerce is calling a conference of the construction industry to meet in Washington November 1.. The real purpose is to get the industry to hold prices and profits down and to divert much of its activity into the low and medium cost fields. The industry will be told that if it does not regulate itself, the Government may have to step in and do it.

[From the Bryan (Tex.) Eagle of October 3, 1945]

BUILDING COST CONTROLS

Officials of the Office of Price Administration, backed by some Members of Congress and other citizens more or less familiar with the situation, believe some price controls should be maintained on building materials, especially of the type required in home-building. Unless this policy is followed, they maintain, there will be a disastrous inflation in this field and many returned veterans and

others who are in the market for new homes will be required to pay exorbitant prices. If they are compelled to do this, or further delay home-building, and the real-estate market is inflated as much as it is in Bryan, for example, they have much more invested than they ever would be likely to recover.

Sunday, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN stressed the need for price controls in this field. He called attention to the fact that under the full employment program building is rated as a $15,000,000,000 industry, making it one of the major ones of the Nation. Discussing the situation he said:

"All the inflationary ingredients needed for a gigantic black market are present in the housing situation. We have a major industry with a critical scarcity of materials, a tremendous demand for new homes, and plenty of money for purchases, with no prospect for any price control on the finished home.

"A widespread black market in an industry of that size will have an impact on our postwar economy that is little short of catastrophic.

"The demand for new homes already is exerting tremendous pressure on the industry. It is estimated there is a need for 12,500,000 new homes in the next 10 years. The War Production Board says more than $6,000,000,000 should be spent in the next year on construction, not including repairs and renovations which would add another $2,000,000,000 to the cost of work needed. More than 1,500,000 returning servicemen need homes, in addition to the pent-up civilian demand for more than 1,000,000 houses a year.

"Coupled with this pressure is the critical shortage in construction materials—seasoned lumber, tile, brick, castiron soil pipe, low-priced plumbing fittings, gypsum lath, and a multitude of other items."

During the war controls were tight on most or all these materials. Some were obtainable only on a priority basis and on others price controls were put in operation. Now, with supplies opening up slightly, but still a great shortage in many material lines, it is believed prices will sky-rocket unless controls are inaugurated or maintained.

The consensus is that the price-control program maintained thus far on everyday necessities, many of which have been comparatively scarce, has prevented a highly inflated condition. It is reasonable to believe that if this policy is dropped, or if it is not employed in fields where shortages still exist and where demand is greatly stepped up because restrictions on securing these materials have been lifted, we shall have inflation in this field. Sight should not be lost, either, of the fact that approximately 60 percent of the inflation after the First World War came after the last shot had been fired and that this inflation finally resulted in costly economic and social disaster.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennesseean of October 2, 1945]

CEILINGS ON ROOFS

Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN'S plea for continued Government controls on the costs of home building, including the completed houses, is buttressed with the soundest economic arguments. Certainly something should be done to head off the impending skyrocketing prices and competitive rush for scarce materials which will follow the removal of most of the current restrictions 2 weeks hence.

Mr. Bowles has opposed the removal of restrictions until a safe stockpile, both as to quality and quantity, of building materials has been built up. He has also urged that an additional step be taken by imposing ceilings on finished homes, old and new. Mr. PATMAN ably supports the conclusions of the OPA head at every point.

The WPB has estimated that an inventory of at least 13,000,000,000 board feet of lumber is the minimum safe margin over the pent-up demand for housing. The national inventory is at the lowest level in history—an estimated two to four billion board feet—and the quality is poor. The shortage also extends to castiron pipe, lath, plumbing, brick, tile, and other building items.

An additional invitation to spiraling prices in the building field is the fact that Congress has taken no action toward renewing the Second War Powers Act, which expires January 1, or the other legislation which gives the President control over priorities, prices, and rationing.

Congress cannot afford to permit the raw economic forces of long-denied demand and limited supply to wreck the $15,000,000,000 industry before reconversion is half completed. Ceilings on finished homes would be one very strong check on a dangerously wild market.

[From the Johnstown (Pa.) Tribune of October 25, 1945]

HOUSING AND PRICE CONTROLS

Although Congress does not seem to be disposed to increase price controls, there may be good reason for legislation to control the sales prices of houses, new and old. Prices have skyrocketed in response to the active demand for homes. Representative PATMAN, of Texas, charging that discharged war veterans are "throwing away wartime savings in paying sky-high prices for second-rate shelter," said this week that "drastic action is needed to prevent the boom-bust cycle" in housing that followed World War I.

An unprecedented amount of home construction is in the cards for the next 10 years to make up for the dearth of new construction in the last 6 years and also to meet the new housing demands of that part of the population that is shifting to new localities. The National Housing Authority puts the need at 12,600,000 new nonfarm dwelling units, with 1,260,000 to be built each year during 1945–55. The United States Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated that about 900,000 new dwelling units a year will actually be built in the next 5 years.

To realize what these estimates mean, one need realize only that new housing units over the last 40 years averaged about 475,000 a year. The record construction in any one year was about 935,000 in 1925.

The most difficult problem of the housing situation is that of providing low-cost dwellings, the field in which the demand is heaviest. It was this problem that forced the Federal Government to adopt its wartime housing program. The return of millions of servicemen to civilian life, most of them eager to marry and establish homes and families, is expected to force the Government to continue with its housing activities, and probably to expand them. The construction of luxury homes will be sufficient, in all probability, to keep the construction industry busy, but the greater demand will be in the low-cost field, and that may bring with it price-control legislation.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Morning Tribune of October 27, 1945]

THE COST OF NEW HOUSES

Price Administrator Chester Bowles wants legislation to control the sales price of houses, but Congress doesn't seem inclined to accede to his request. Representative PATMAN, of Texas, warns that "drastic action is needed to prevent the boom-bust cycle" that followed World War I.

An unprecedented amount of home construction is on the program for the next 10 years, to make up for the lack of new construction in the last 6 years, also to meet the demands of shifting population. The National Housing Authority estimates that 12,600,000 new non-farm dwelling units a year will actually be built in the next 5 years. Compare this with the figure of 475,000 units a year over the last 40 years.

One fear is that too much of the new construction will go into luxury homes. These offer the highest profits to the builders and also to prospective owners. If the threatened black market in building materials should develop, the prices of new homes will go up all the more.

Something definite may come out of a conference of the construction industry, called for November 1 by the United States Chamber of Commerce. The real purpose is to get the industry to hold prices and profits down and to divert much of its activity into new low-cost and medium-cost housing. The industry will be told that if it does not police itself, the Government will.

[From the New York Sun of November 6, 1945]

WHILE TENANTS WAIT FOR NEW HOUSES

Much dissatisfaction seems to have been aroused in the real estate trade by the OPA's decision to impose rent ceilings on new housing. The agency delayed long in making its announcement, and uncertainty in the building trades served only to retard plans for an incalculable mass of new construction. The viewpoint of many builders apparently is that the announced policy of restricting the rents of dwellings not yet erected will further discourage construction. The secretary of the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, T. J. Miley, has already proposed that the Emergency Price Control Act be amended to deprive the OPA of authority over construction of housing designed for renting rather than sale.

The OPA itself believes that it can allow enough for increases in building costs since 1939 to compensate investors in new housing. Ostensibly the OPA has at heart the interests of tenants, yet clearly tenants will suffer most if the new policy further delays construction of housing in all rent classifications. Certainly if the shortage of dwelling space continues to become more serious, some modification of the OPA policy on new housing for rental will be demanded.

An essential source of relief for the shortage is the financing of repairs and improvements by the Federal Housing Administration. Now that restrictions on loans and on the use of building materials have been removed, many property owners will be able to remodel houses and thus provide living quarters which until now could not be made available. Representative WRIGHT PATMAN has made strenuous efforts to bring to wider attention the problems created by scarcity of building materials. He has charged that in the controversy over the lifting of governmental controls on construction of homes, the difficulties caused by lack of lumber and plumbing and other materials have been overlooked. Families with limited cash and little credit meanwhile are patiently awaiting a more auspicious time to take the first steps toward ownership of that suburban home which so many hope will free them from the prevailing fear of being roofless in a world of skyrocketing costs of shelter.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., of October 25, 1945]

PROTECT THE HOME BUYERS

Cheers should greet the announced intention of Senator WAGNER and Representative PATMAN to introduce legislation to curb speculative builders' profits. Veterans, war workers with money in their pockets, and others who may have been waiting for peacetime to buy that little home have been dismayed in recent instances by the prices asked. And this feeling may grow worse. Unless Congress gives someone the authority to control the price of finished homes, these

potential home buyers will be unprotected from inflation and the rapacity of speculative builders.

The OPA has theoretical control of the price of building materials, but since allocation of scarce materials has been abandoned, its only chance of holding inflationary pressures in check is to post prices in every place where building materials are sold. Even if these should hold against the threatening inflationary flood, there's a weakness in the flood wall. It is the omission of the top layer of sandbags: the fact that the Government does not have authority to control the price of finished houses offered for sale.

New homes will be out of reach of most people, says Chester Bowles, Price Administrator, if this control is not established. Already, due to wartime scarcities and increased wages, building costs have risen one-half or more. Even if black-market operations in materials are brought reasonably under control, speculative builders may still demand any price they please—and get away with it.

Largely because the cost of new homes is already in the stratosphere, the price of older dwellings is inordinately high. Another obvious disadvantage of lack of a ceiling on new-home prices is that maintenance of rent control will be made increasingly difficult.

The whole situation is one capable of working injustices on many, but Congress can remedy it. OPA has not asked for the job of controlling the price of finished houses, but it is the logical agency for the task.

[From the Florida Times-Union, Jacksonville, Fla., of October 25, 1945]

VETERANS ARE ENTITLED TO REASONABLY PRICED HOMES

The request of Price Administrator Chester Bowles for legislation to control the sales prices of houses, new and old, places in the spotlight a problem of the greatest concern to all Americans. At the same time it places Members of Congress in the unenviable position of yielding to the demand that restrictions of every nature be removed from the building of homes, or giving veterans an opportunity to reestablish their homes, which were broken up while they were away fighting for their country, on a reasonable basis.

Representative PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, charges that the war veterans are "throwing away wartime savings in paying sky-high prices for second-rate shelter," and urges that "drastic action is needed to prevent the boom-bust cycle" in housing that followed World War I.

All that is necessary to confirm the Texan's charge is to get the story of almost any veteran who has returned to civilian life, and is trying to find a place in which to set up his furniture, long in storage, in order that he may reclaim the companionship of his family.

Inasmuch as Congress apparently is not in the mood to give this matter the attention it needs, in fairness to the war veterans, it would not be amiss for those veterans to get in touch with their Representatives in Washington and make their stories available for the records. Such stories would fill many voluminous volumes of best-seller caliber that ought to bring shame to men and women on the home front until every veteran has been restored to a home free of the monetary excesses and indifferences that are so glaringly evident wherever the returned serviceman turns today.

A conference of the construction industry has been called by the United States Chamber of Commerce to convene in Washington November 1, the primary purpose of which is to get the industry to hold prices and profits down, and to divert much of its activity into new low-cost and medium-cost housing. The industry will be told that if it does not police itself, the Government will.

That is one conference that would do well to mix liberal portions of patriotism with its economics, for there are 12,000,000 servicemen to be returned to civilian activities, and they are flocking to the veterans' organizations by the thousands. Thus they will be in a position to wield an influence upon lawmakers that will decide the future course of Government. Already they have in mind the sacrifices they made along the battle fronts while others, many through deferments, were left at home to enjoy the highest incomes in history, and too often striking for more. Obviously they will not be in any mood to put up with more of that sort of thing, regardless of its source.

Every veteran is entitled to a job, to a home on a reasonable basis, and to a kind of treatment from the various civilian service industries that does not place him in the position of an intruder in the sacred precincts of highly privileged classes.

How To Create Jobs in a Free Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an address on how to create jobs in a free economy, delivered by Mr. Joseph L. Trecker, president of the National Machine Tool Builders Association, before the forty-fourth annual meeting of the association, in Chicago, October 22, 1945. This address, in my opinion, is one to preserve.

Gentlemen, I am going to talk to you today in terms of ideologies.

You can poke fun at ideologies if you want to. Yet in the last two decades we have seen one ideology sweep Russia; we have seen another sweep Germany and lead to the World War; and a third threatens to overturn the basic philosophy of the British Empire.

Meanwhile, our own country has been a battleground for various ideologies; and all that most of us have done about it is to tell each other that the world is going to the dogs.

Industry has tried in a vague sort of way to develop an ideology, but we have been too narrow in our point of view. Most of the arguments which we have put forth have been on behalf of our own self-preservation; and that isn't enough. The people don't care about us. The people are interested in themselves. They have exactly the same degree of self-interest as we have. Therefore we cannot gain any real following for our philosophy until we learn to interpret that philosophy in terms of the public interest.

So I propose today to develop an ideology for industry, based upon the question: "How to create jobs in a free economy."

Now, first of all, note that I say "in a free economy." It is a simple matter to create jobs under a dictatorship.

Germany created jobs and Russia created jobs, by simply ordering people to go to work as directed by the Government. And in the old days jobs were created by the institution of slavery.

I am talking about a system of government under which a man is free to choose the type of work he thinks he wants, and to compete with other people for the job he is after.

It is significant, therefore, that as a matter of history there has been more job opportunity in the United States under our free economy than has ever been the case in any other country in the world.

That cannot be explained away on the ground that we were a frontier country with vast natural resources. The chief foundation for job opportunity in the United States lay in our tremendous industrial development.

Now, what was the basic principle behind our industrial development under a free economy?

The basic principle was competition.

So if past history is any guide, I think you can lay down the premise that the operation of the competitive system leads to the creation of jobs. And I think that this has been instinctively recognized by most of our population and has been reflected in our laws and against monopoly.

Now, if we accept the evidence of past years that competition creates jobs, we have to go further and ask how and why does competition create jobs.

All of you here today know the answer. Competition creates jobs, because competition is always a matter of offering more people better things at lower cost.

All right—how do competing companies contrive to offer better things to more people at lower cost? They do so by the use of productive equipment which increases the output of the individual worker. In other words, they do it by utilizing the principle of maximum productivity, whereby machines and men become partners in multiplying output.

A NEW PRINCIPLE

What is not generally understood is that this is a new principle in civilization. Before the advent of productive equipment as we now know it, this principle did not apply.

For instance, suppose a company made mouse traps purely by hand. Once this company's overhead was taken care of, production costs remained constant no matter how many mouse traps it sold.

But then along came Eli Whitney, who introduced the principle of interchangeability of parts. Out of that there arose our present production system under which costs of production go down in proportion to volume.

In my opinion, it is the failure of industry to educate the public to an understanding of the basic economics behind the volume production principle that has led to much of our present social unrest.

VOLUME PRODUCTION AND JOBS

Suppose we define, in an elementary way, the basic economics of volume production in terms of jobs.

Insofar as a company, by the aid of good machine tools and other productive equipmen, can cut the cost of its product, it can offer that product at a lower price. As the price goes down, its potential market increases. As its market increases, its volume goes up. As its volume goes up, it can hire more men. That is how more jobs are created.

Machine tools and other productive equipment come into this picture by way of reducing costs. Well—how do they reduce costs? They reduce costs by increasing the productivity of the individual worker. So we arrive at the fundamental principle that jobs are created by increasing the productivity of the worker.

That, gentlemen, is the ideology which I think industry has thus far failed to present, and must somehow contrive to present and to sell today.

The New Deal and the labor unions have put forward an absolutely contrary ideology.

Their premise has been that since this is no longer a pioneer country and we have reached our frontiers, there is a limit to the number of jobs that can be created. Therefore, they say, our problem becomes one of sharing the available number of jobs among the largest possible number of people.

The fallacy of this point of view lies in the simple fact that there is no limit to human desires. Therefore we have no frontiers, we have no limits as to possible number of jobs that can be created, and employment possibilities are limited only by the extent of our ability to reduce the purchase price of the things that people want to buy. Proof of this fact is evident in the industrial history of our country.

DESIRES VERSUS NECESSITIES

Sociologists are always fond of talking about minimum requirements of a decent existence. But as a matter of fact, most of the employment in our country has been founded not upon the things that people had to have, but upon things that people wanted over and above the necessities of existence.

People lived perfectly well before they had automobiles, radios, refrigerators, and vacuum cleaners. Those things do not represent necessities of existence. In fact, people lived perfectly well before they had telephones and before they had electricity. All that people really have to have is adequate food, shelter, and clothing.

The great industries of our country, and the employment that resulted therefrom, have been founded upon things that people wanted, but didn't really have to have.

Now, gentlemen, all those jobs were created jobs. I want to emphasize that fact. They were created by inventors, engineers, and practical production men, who contrived to satisfy human desires at prices that people could afford to pay.

Now suppose we look forward. What about television? What about the helicopter? What about the hundreds of new devices that are in the offing? Devices that represent not human needs, but the fulfillment of human desires?

Every one of these new ideas will result in jobs. They will result in more jobs provided the cost of the product can be brought within reach of the average pocketbook. And this can be done by men and machines working together on a basis of maximum productivity.

You cannot create jobs by presupposing a static economy which has reached its frontiers. All you can do in that kind of economy is share the work—with less money for all concerned.

The myth of frontiers and job limitations will be utterly exploded when the principle of competition with maximum productivity as its chief motive power is accepted as a foundation to employment progress. This, I say again is the ideology which industry must now put forth.

But in order to do that, we must contrive to explode the fallacy of hourly wage rates.

HOURLY WAGE RATES AND JOBS

The idea of hourly wage rates arose back in the days when time was in fact at least a fair measure of productivity. But today this assumption has completely gone by the boards. The idea now is that a man should turn out only as much work per hour as is permitted by his shop steward. This is a reflection of the over-all union ideology that there is only so much work to be done, and that unless it is spread out to the greatest possible extent, there will not be enough jobs to go around.

It is exactly on this point that we arrive at a head-on conflict between industry's concept of creating jobs, and labor's concept of creating jobs. Labor's idea is that by limiting productivity, more jobs can be maintained. Industry's idea is that by increasing productivity, not only can more jobs be maintained but additional jobs can be created.

In this connection, it is rather interesting to look for a moment at what has been happening in Russia.

The left wing of organized labor in the United States has often expressed a strong leaning toward the Russian system of regimentation, as contrasted to the American system of competition.

But in Russia today workers in most cases are paid on the basis of productivity per hour. The incentive system, which is so generally objected to by organized labor in this country, is for the most part in full effect today throughout Russian factories.

Furthermore, the rewards for increasing output are on an accelerated basis. The more a worker exceeds his standard, the larger is the premium he gets.

It is certainly a paradox when Russia, under a system of regimentation, accepts and utilizes the principle of maximum productivity, while in America where the whole preservation of our social economy depends, in my opinion, upon the acceptance of that principle, organized labor is proceeding in exactly the opposite direction.

In any event, hourly rates are not a fair measure for compensation under our volume-production system. I don't think we ought to go back to the straight piecework system which was abused in past years by many manufacturers. But I say that we should work out some method where, by mutual agreement, men's pay should be determined more by their output and less by their time-clock records.

PRODUCTIVITY IS THE KEY

Until the workers of this country get through their heads that jobs depend upon productivity, we are not going to make proper headway in creating the number of jobs we must have to maintain the employment levels which we want in this country.

And that leads directly into the question of job security. This is another of the fallacies which is being encouraged by the labor unions and the left wing sociologists.

If competition is the foundation of job creation and productivity is the key to competition, it follows that the man who does not produce on his job is no more entitled to job security than is the company that fails to produce a better product at a lower price entitled to economic survival.

If every employee, whether he is an efficient worker or not, is entitled to a job, every company, whether it is an efficient producer or not, should likewise be entitled to a profit.

The end of the road of the philosophy of job security is the abolition of competition, a controlled economy, governmental regimentation, and a regime comparable to that which was adopted by Germany and Italy.

As a matter of fact, it is simple to get job security. All you have to do is to go back to the days of slavery. The slave had job security. He never had to worry about being out of work.

At the same time I think industry would do well to study ways and means whereby employees who do produce can gain a greater degree of job security than they have had in the past. Employers used to ask themselves, "How can we cut our working force and thereby make profit?" Today the question should be, "How can we keep men employed at a profit?" Don't forget that our employees are our customers, and we can't have profits without pay rolls.

Industry can't guarantee job security to anybody, but industry can teach the principle that productivity is the key to steady employment.

The philosophy of productivity will not be easy to sell—for not only the labor unions, but the Government, have long backed an opposing ideology.

Ever since the advent of the New Deal, practically every move that could be taken by industry leading toward larger employment as the result of greater productivity was opposed by Government.

By the application of its depreciation policy, Government imposed a penalty upon the installation of productive equiment.

Government made it more difficult for companies to secure investment capital for new enterprise.

By its tax policy, Government made it more difficult for companies to retain out of their earnings the money needed for plant modernization.

Government encouraged the unions in their philosophy of restraining productivity, and pay for hours worked instead of for work performed.

And, finally, Government has upheld the practice by labor unions of breaking contracts and thereby interrupting production.

The only way in which I can interpret this situation is that the unions have sold the public the idea that the future welfare of most of the citizens of our country will be better served by adopting the ideology of limited production and Government regimentation than by adopting the ideology of competition and maximum productivity.

That is why inevitably we come back to ideologies. We can't laugh them off any more. Industry must present an ideology and sell it to the public and to the Government. That ideology cannot be one of profit for the manufacturers. It has got to be one embracing the self-interest of the largest possible number of people.

And here is something else. If we are going to put forward an ideology, we must be mighty sure that we adopt in our platform the good things that have been part and parcel of the New Deal platform, and you and I know that there are many of them that have been good.

There were many abuses in industry which were corrected by the New Deal methods. We must accept these corrections as representing progressive measures. Particularly in this respect I think we must accept the SEC; we must accept the basic principle of collective bargaining; we must accept the principle of taxation higher than in past years; and we must accept the general principle that workers are entitled to the highest degree of job security commensurate with the operation of the competitive system, and to a fair share in the rewards of increased productivity.

So we arrive finally at an ideology based in the main upon the following premises:

1. We can increase employment in this country only in proportion to productivity.

2. Productivity can be increased only by the increasing utilization of machines which enable the worker to multiply his own output.

3. The pay which the worker gets should be related to his output, rather than to the time clock.

4. Taxation policies should be revised so that there will be an incentive, instead of a penalty, for the installation of equipment which will lead to greater productivity.

There, gentlemen, is a bill of goods. But we will get nowhere with it if all we do is to indulge in the vicarious satisfaction of telling it to each other.

TELL ALL THE PEOPLE

How can we sell this ideology to the American public, to labor leaders, and to our legislators in the Congress and in the Senate?

I present this broad problem to our industry because our industry is the very key to the entire picture. We probably know more about the underlying principles involved than any other industry in the United States.

As I see it, it is our responsibility to broadcast this ideology. Nobody else is going to do it for us. How many times have you said to yourself, "Somebody ought to get up and tell these people a thing or two." Well—you were absolutely right. But that somebody is you.

Some of you may say, "How can this little industry of ours ever hope to make any dent on our national philosophy?" Gentlemen, that is purely a defeatist attitude.

Not so long ago, as history goes, there was a man who sat up in an attic and wrote a

book that has come close to turning the world upside down. His name was Karl Marx.

In the middle of the American Revolution, when things were desperate and it looked as though the whole cause might be lost, an obscure journalist wrote one essay that stiffened men's backbones and was a major factor in tiding over the crisis. That essay was called "Common Sense." It was written by Tom Paine.

In the face of facts like these—and there are plenty of examples like them—how can anyone say that a whole industry, with all of the facilities at its command, cannot make any substantial dent upon public opinion?

And unless the philosophy of limited productivity can be defeated, we stand to face in this country a steady decline in the invention and development of new devices and new equipment, a slowing down in scientific advancement, and a retrogression in our standard of living.

Our industry will share that fate, because our future is, whether you like it or not, inevitably tied up with the thinking of large masses of people. The thinking of people is reflected in laws and governments. We, in turn, operate under law and government. The thinking of people is reflected in the practice and behavior of industrial employees. Decreased costs of manufacture—which is, after all, what our industry has to sell—can be gained only by the cooperation of industrial employees.

In my opinion, the future of our industry will depend upon the extent to which people and Government may come to understand and support the principle of productivity as the basic foundation of maximum employment.

Document Reveals Dashnag Collaboration With Nazis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 1, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, in justice to the Armenians, I herewith submit a statement from the Armenian Mirror-Spectator as of September 1, 1945, entitled "Document Reveals Dashnag Collaboration With Nazis," and excerpts from Propaganda Battlefront, as of September 30, 1945, entitled "Document Shows Dashnags as Nazi Collaborators":

[From the Armenian Mirror-Spectator of September 1, 1945]

DOCUMENT REVEALS DASHNAG COLLABORATION WITH NAZIS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following document, translated into Armenian from the original German text and published in a pamphlet in France, recently arrived in this country. As the document reveals, the so-called Armenian National Council (not be confused with the Armenian National Council organized and now functioning in America) appealed to Alfred Rosenberg, Nazi minister of the eastern occupied areas (Russian) to turn Soviet Armenia into a Germany colony. The council was comprised of the following Dashnag leaders: President, Prof. Ardashes Abeghian; vice president, Abraham Gulkhandanian; secretary, Haroutune Baghdasarian; members, David Davidkhanian, Garegin Nuzhdeh (father of Tzeghagrons), Vahan Papazin (Count), Dro Ganayan, and Der-Tovmasian.)

1. The Armenian National Council was organized in Berlin, December 15, 1942, under the patronage of the ministry of the eastern occupied areas. The former will endeavor to carry out its program by maintaining permanent ties with the eastern bureau as well as with other jurisdictional departments (authorities). Thus the Armenian National Council undertakes to be an agent between Germany and the Armenians, and to that end is ready to serve the people and, of course, within the coexisting circle of the European peoples.

2. On the one hand, the Armenian National Council strives for the liberation of Armenia from the Bolshevik yoke and the Russian domination, but, on the other hand, it encourages the efforts of the Armenian nation for freedom and the political self-government of Armenia.

3. In order to carry out these purposes and programs freely, to achieve and to establish them firmly, the Armenian National Council considers the political protection of the German Reich over Armenia the most secure guaranty. On this occasion the Armenian Nation Council is actuated by the idea that in this way the policy followed by the Armenian leaders of the Middle Ages may be revived and established; according to the policy, the powerful German Reich was considered the liberator of Armenia and of the Armenian people.

4. For the successful execution of its program the Armenian National Council finds it imperative to gather together all the Armenian national living forces. It will strive to achieve this purpose by oral or written methods.

5. The Armenian National Council finds it imperative—the gradual return to the fatherland of its nationals who under definite historic or political conditions, against their will, were compelled to emigrate and now live in various countries. In this category are, first, artisans, skilled workers, farmers, also physicians, nurses, writers, and intelligentsia, etc. Only in this way will it be possible to utilize the inner creative power of the Armenian people in its entirety for the growth and progress of the country—and it is this power which has been accepted and appreciated by the noted travelers and scientists of Europe.

6. The Armenian National Council, to second its program, will call the attention of its patron government upon the territorial needs of the present-day Armenia. The Armenian National Council, as far as it is capable, will try to solve this problem justly in Transcaucasia, and, if necessary, will call upon the adjudication of the Reich.

7. The Armenian National Council is convinced that the efforts of its people should be crowned with success because Armenia, through the powerful help of the German Reich, will become a self-governing country and, as such, will be built up. Only in this way will the Armenian people be able to develop freely their native culture and national life in all its phases. Language, literature, industry, economy, administration, justice, etc., and, of course, in new ways and new direction.

8. The Armenian National Council will do everything to facilitate the work of its patron government, including the national wealth of the land, taking into consideration the economic reconstruction of Armenia and the interest of the two peoples.

9. Under the protection of the German Reich, Armenia, so far as she is able, will strive to strengthen the German influence in the Near East. In this connection the Armenian National Council finds it imperative to evaluate the bitter disappointments and terrible misery which Russia, as well as England, have caused on the Armenians in the course of history. This is a strong reason for the Armenian people to turn their face from (relinquish) the above-mentioned governments forever. In this connection the Armenian National Council would like to mention the fight of many years which the Armenian people waged against the Russian tyranny, whether czarist or Bolshevik. On this occasion the general revolt of the people on February 18, 1921, should be remembered, as a result of which the Bolshevik despotism was overthrown and a national government was established, even though for only a short time.

10. Besides this, the Armenian National Council will strive to cultivate relations with all neighboring peoples, and especially with the people of the Caucasus and their national organs, and, of course, upon the basis of mutual understanding and common interests.

11. Realizing the historic, political, economic, and cultural intimate ties between great Germany and her protectorate, Armenia, the Armenian National Council will consider it its high duty to strengthen these mentioned ties and to render them unbreakable. For this purpose are already called, and hereafter will be called, those auxiliary Armenian forces which are now active and fighting with the Germans for final victory and liberation.

12. The Armenian National Council is an agent in the present period of transition. Its jurisdiction and activity cease the moment when, under the leadership of Germany and the help of the Armenian National Council, a new government is created in Armenia.

(Translated from the German, Berlin, February 15, 1943.)

[From the Propaganda Battlefront of September 30, 1945]

DOCUMENT SHOWS DASHNAGS AS NAZI COLLABORATORS

Conclusive proof of the Fascist character of the American Revolutionary Federation (Dashnag) was provided recently with the discovery of a German document showing that eight top-ranking ARF officials entered into an agreement with Alfred Rosenberg to serve as Quisling rulers upon Germany's conquest of the Caucasus.

The document and supplementary photographs show that on December 12, 1942, ARF leaders in Berlin, headed by the notorious Gen. Dro Ganayan, formed an Armenian National Committee to serve as agent between Germany and the Armenians. The Dashnag traitors regarded "the political protection of the German Reich over Armenia the most secure guarantee," and looked upon the Nazis as "liberators of Armenia."

ARF leaders in Boston, Douben Dasbinian and Simon Vratzian, at firs frantically denied the authenticity of the document, but finally admitted in the party organ, Hairenik, that it was genuine. They offered the lame excuse that the ARF leaders were all noble and patriotic men who could do no wrong. Photographs show Dro Ganayan posing with high-ranking Nazi officials and other Dashnag chieftains charged with training ARF spies to penetrate into Soviet ranks. Another Dashnag Quisling, active with Dro in Berlin, Rumania, and Bulgaria was General Nejdeh, organizer of Tzeghagrons (race worshippers), the ARF Youth Corps in the United States.

Sympathy for the Nazis was expressed in Asbarez, Dashnag organ published in Fresno. On February 23, Asbarez protested against a harsh peace, saying: "A harsher treatment (of Germany) is not possible to formulate. * * * Whether such dragonic treatment of the vanquished people by the conquerors will serve its purpose, will thwart their recovery forever and will prevent future wars, is moot question."

And on August 10 it attacked the Potsdam conference on three points, apologizing for Germany, and attacking the harshness of the terms. It regarded as reprehensible to let the living standards of the German people excel that of the small and poorer people of Europe. It decried the peace terms whereby the highly talented, industrial and com-

mercial German people were deprived forever from engaging in heavy industry and commerce.

ARF leaders have falsely represented themselves to Americans as representatives of the Armenian people, and, under that guise, terrorist Dro and his Quisling gang made their agreement with the Nazis.

Lack of Housing In Long Beach, Calif., Area Means Lack of Job Opportunities for Veterans—50,000 Unfilled Jobs for Veterans But No Place To Live in Southern California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial in the Press-Telegram and Sun, at Long Beach, Calif., on November 8, 1945, speaks clearly of the very condition I have been calling to attention of this House and of the NHA.

It is not so in some districts represented by distinguished Members of this House; but it is nevertheless a fact in the Eighteenth District of California that, increasingly, job fulfillment and opportunity is more and more lacking because housing and homes are lacking for the workers and their familes.

And this applies to GI's too. That is a disgrace, in my judgment.

Nor, do these veterans and GI boys have a big bankroll to buy a new house with; their pay for fighting for us has been relatively insignificant. Their families come to southern California to greet them; they find no place to lie their heads in rest nor to live together as a reunited family. It is tragic and unsound.

Nor has the period of reconversion fairly commenced for the human reconversions necessary. The spirits of men, the ambitions of men, the family relationship of men, the education, cultural, religious aspirations of men, the ultimate morale of these veterans is dependent upon homes—happy housing surroundings; time does not permit delay.

Here is the editorial so powerfully and sanely written:

HOUSING FOR VETERANS

Shocking lack of provision for returning servicemen is shown by testimony at the hearing in Los Angeles before the State senate interim committee on veterans' affairs.

Witness after witness testified yesterday that veterans are forced to go without needed hospitalization because of crowded conditions at the Sawtelle veterans' facility, that many of them have been victimized by usury sharpers and swindlers, and that thousands of them cannot take jobs in southern California because of the lack of housing.

The men out of service want to settle down here and go to work in civilian life, and jobs for them are available, but they cannot take the jobs because there is no place for them to live.

Returning servicemen are made the mark of swindlers and extortioners of various kinds because they mostly are young and inexperienced and have several hundred dollars of ready money each on their discharge from service. Their protection from these wolves, so far as it is possible, is the imperative duty of agencies created to aid returning servicemen, police, and veterans' organizations.

Hospitalization, of course, is a Federal function. Every Congressman representing southern California should be given a complete report of the Los Angeles hearings and make it his first duty to get relief for the veterans. The facts already revealed show that the situation here is acute.

One witness yesterday stated that as of October 30 there were 50,756 unfilled jobs for veterans in the 11 southern California counties, and there are 35,194 applications by veterans for jobs in this area, but the veterans cannot take the jobs they want and which are waiting for them because of the lack of housing.

Unquestionably there is a national shortage of building materials, but a nation that performed prodigies in supplying the means of war surely can provide decent shelter now for the men who won the war.

Southern California, particularly Los Angeles County and most especially the Long Beach-Los Angeles Harbor district, are abnormally congested areas. Often there are as many men in Navy and Army uniforms as civilians in a local street scene. Many of these servicemen have families here.

The result is an aggravated housing problem in this region. The housing need here is not unique—the need admittedly is Nationwide—but neither is it average or typical. The housing need here is so unusually great as to constitute an emergency, deserving immediate attention.

Proposal for World Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I present for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a letter I sent today to the President of the United States, as follows:

NOVEMBER 11, 1945.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On this Armistice Day, the first since the end of World War II, I venture for your consideration the suggestion that the time has come to transform and enlarge the annual ceremonial known as Armistice Day and make it a commemoration of the heroes who died to make men free in both world wars.

This enlargement of the meaning of the day would be a recognition of the successful end of the Second World War and would be in keeping with the atomic age and the newly organized world society.

Armistice Day has had inspiring significance in our national life and it seems appropriate that its beautiful customs by which the people have poured out their gratitude to their soldier and sailor dead should be extended to a world-wide scale.

This might be done by the creation of a new day in our calendar of special days which could be called, for lack of a better name, "World Memorial Day," when the people of the world might pay their homage at the same time to the heroes of all nations who gave their all for the cause of freedom and humanity in both world wars.

I think all of us will agree that May 30 should continue to be our national Memorial Day, but there may well be established a new world memorial day which would carry with it a connotation of affection for the head of the two world wars, together with humanity's hopes and prayers for perpetual world peace.

The designation of a Sunday for this purpose probably would be wise, as that would not increase the number of days that involve interruption of work and would also surround the occasion with a fitting air of reverence and solemnity.

While more nations were engaged in conflict in the Second World War than in the first, the inspiring motive of both wars was the same—the removal of the shackles from the human spirit so that all men might walk upright and free.

In a broad sense the Second World War was but a second chapter of the first, involving in the main the same conflicting forces and the same cosmic issues.

The selection of a new day that would unite in one commemorative occasion what otherwise would continue throughout the years as two separate observances on separate days is a matter, I think, which could well be regarded as coming under the scope of the jurisdiction of the United Nations organization. I hope you may deem it a proper matter to be brought to the attention of the United States members of the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations which will meet soon in London, with a request that they invite the cooperation of the representatives of the other nations in fixing a new day when tributes may be paid simultaneously all over the world to the precious dead of both World Wars.

Very sincerely yours,

LOUIS LUDLOW.

Another Letter From a Serviceman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 7, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, here is one more letter from a serviceman:

PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

To the EDITOR:

Remembering the Public Opinion column in your paper, I thought I'd drop you a line and let you know some of the inside facts on the present demobilization plan. According to all the reports over the radio and in the newspapers, the folks back home think everything is going along fine. When it comes to propaganda, the United States Army makes Goebbels look like a piker.

"Seventy" in October, "sixty" in November, 2-year men the first of the year. Yes; it makes good headlines for the folks back home to read. We are getting tired of that song and dance.

Every day I talk to men with 80, 90, and even 100 points who are trying to get in depots to be shipped home. These depots are filled with men waiting for transportation, while all the time Liberty ships leave Manila Bay empty.

The Army's excuse for this is that these ships aren't equipped to carry troops, yet there are men here now who came over on these same ships despite the poor chow, lousy washing facilities, and crowded sleeping conditions. They would gladly do it again if it meant getting back home.

The Army has the "demob" plan so messed up we sometimes wonder if it wouldn't be better to marry a Filipino and settle down here. I can't kick yet as I only have 62 points, but the high-pointers are beginning to feel

bitter about the whole thing. Sooner or later there may be trouble, such as the Canadians displayed in England.

The Congressmen back home should be notified of these things so that they can get the Army "on the ball."

BOB BORGMAN,
Corps of Engineers.

P. S.—At the present rate of demobilization we should all be home in 3 years.

GI Loan Fails to Meet Need, Takes About 45 Days to Consummate Loan—GI Loan Should Be Primarily for GI's, Not for Banks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, again I call attention of the Members of this House to the fact that the GI bill is in many ways inadequate; nor should those who authored it feel that they are being criticized either when I say this. They could not have planned everything to be perfect at the start.

But now, there is no longer time for delay. There has been too much of time elapse as it is. I respectfully urge that everyone concerned with action on this GI bill front, get results desired at the earliest possible date.

The Eighteenth District of California which I represent, is one of the strategic and important areas of our great Nation. It is said that at present date there are likely 50,000 naval personnel in Long Beach alone; the great Roosevelt Base and naval dry docks are there located; the fleet rides at anchor behind the protective breakwater in its home harbor; a great separation center is there and the naval hospital, too So, with these few items of what is there located called to your attention, you will realize that from my home city of Long Beach, with its over 300,000 people, the letter I hereafter set forth, is speaking loudly of conditions which must be corrected—and now.

This letter from the executive director of the veterans' service center comes in reply to one from me in which I asked him to tell me what the actual experience was with the GI bill in three fields of human needs for the GI boys. In loans; in education; in housing. The letter is self-explanatory. Let us move in and without delay and do something about it.

The letter follows:

CITY OF LONG BEACH,
Long Beach, Calif., November 8, 1945.

CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND CONGRESSMAN DOYLE: I received your letter yesterday, and I read it to my staff here at the service center last evening and asked them for any explanations that they would care to have me include in a letter to you. Briefly, they were as follows:

1. The percentage of GI loans being processed is low because the value of the property in the Long Beach area today, is too high for the banks to allow a loan to go through on it.

Another reason that the GI loan is failing, is the extreme amount of paper work connected with it. A recent magazine article estimated the paper work at 12 hours. Most of the banks do not care to use a member of their staff, for that length of time, on a loan whose chances are slim. It takes approximately 45 days, at best, to consummate one of these loans at the present time. Mr. Crow of the Bank of America, tells me that the loan is sent to New York or Washington, D. C., for approval, and that the establishment of an office in Los Angeles would reduce this time considerably. Of course, the main trouble with the GI loan, is the fact that it is a bank loan, and the boys who haven't been earning any money in civilian life, due to military service, are unable to produce the collateral that is necessary.

2. On the question of the educational phases of the GI bill, our education man, Mr. Loyal Thomas, of the local public schools, believes from his contacts here daily (20 to 35 per day) that a revision of the age clause and an approximate increase in the monthly stipend of 40 to 50 percent would be most effective. While statistics prove that men over 23 do not readily readjust themselves in school, a huge readjustment of all of our boys today would offset an arrangement to remove the 25-year limit.

I believe that many of the colleges and universities are working with the housing problem through the medium of huts and trailers, and if the rental of these trailers was kept nominal the stipend per month would not have to be increased too much.

3. As for our housing problem, it is still No. 1 in the Long Beach area. I believe that a Nation-wide advertising campaign to keep the servicemen's wives and families at home would be an aid, and if the serviceman, himself, was given top priority in the matter of transportation, it might keep some of these women from coming out here on a wild-goose chase. It should be impressed that the serviceman does not know for sure the day and date of his discharge and arrival, and for the women to stay home and wait a little longer.

You asked me what we need in the way of housing. The answer is, anything and everything. Rooms are available for single men and women but that is all. There are no family accommodations to rent in Long Beach. I believe that is the total extent of our case at the present time, and I shall keep you advised in any other matters that may come up.

Sincerely yours,

D. P. AHERN,
Executive Director of Veterans' Service Center.

Control of the Use of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, November 14 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, on Sunday, November 11, at Princeton University, I had the privilege of participating in a broadcast on the subject of the control of the use of atomic energy. The other participants in the broadcast were Prof. Henry D. Smyth, chairman of the department of physics at Princeton University and author of the official report on atomic energy for military purposes; Prof. William S. Carpenter, chairman of the department of politics and president of the New Jersey State Civil Service Commission; and Prof. John F. Sly, professor of politics and director of the Princeton surveys of Princeton University. The program was directed by Prof. Roy Dickinson Welch, chairman of the university's faculty committee on radio.

Inasmuch as the broadcast was carefully prepared by the participants and discusses some of the principal issues which have been raised on the subject of the control of atomic energy, I feel that it makes a valuable contribution to our present consideration of this important matter, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCER. Ladies and gentlemen, WOR takes pleasure at this time in bringing to you the Princeton University Preceptorial of the Air, another in a weekly series of forum discussions by Princeton professors and their guests on topics of national interest. This comes to you from Wodrow Wilson study in '79 Hall on the Princeton University campus. Your moderator, Prof. Roy Dickinson Welch, chairman of the university's faculty committee on radio.

Professor WELCH. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Ever since the first atomic bomb destroyed Hiroshima, this question of control of atomic energy has taken on greater and greater significance. The visit to this country of Prime Minister Attlee and Prime Minister King to discuss this question with President Truman; and recent public statements by Mr. Molotov, Mr. Churchill, and also by President Truman, indicate that until this question is settled, we shall live in an increasingly uneasy world. To discuss this control of the use of atomic energy, there are gathered here today, in the Woodrow Wilson study on the Princeton University campus, four men of eminent authority. Here is the Honorable H. ALEXANDER SMITH, United States Senator from New Jersey, who represents the stateman's responsibility in passing upon any proposal that may be adopted for controlling this energy. Also here is Prof. Henry D. Smyth, chairman of the department of physics at Princeton University and author of the official report on atomic energy for military purposes. Professor Smyth, a foremost student of nuclear physics, and one of the important participants in the research that developed the atomic bomb, speaks with an authority shared by few on the scientific prospects of this new energy. Here, also, is Prof. William S. Carpenter, chairman of the Princeton University department of politics, and president of the New Jersey State Civil Service Commission; and Prof. John F. Sly, professor of politics and director of the Princeton surveys of Princeton University. These latter two men bring to the discussion a wide and responsible experience in regulator processes of government.

In order that we may be on common ground in discussing this vital problem, I should like to ask the panel one or two clarifying questions. Professor Smyth, since the bombing of Hiroshima, the national press has been full of the most amazing reports pertaining to the destructive effects of atomic bombs. Some of these reports seem so fantastic as to be almost beyond belief, and there has been an effort in some quarters "to cut them down to size," so to speak. In your judgment, has there been some exaggeration of the effects—both actual and potential—of the destructive qualities of atomic energy?

Professor SMYTH. Yes, there have been exaggerations, such as early reports from

the Jap press pertaining to the long-time poisoning of the ground and to the damaging effects of bomb radiations extending far beyond the area of the blast itself. These were not confirmed by later investigators. But let there be no doubt about this: Atomic energy is powerful beyond anything man has ever known, and the splitting of the atom is a process totally different from any other process familiar to this planet.

Professor WELCH. Could you give us, Professor Smyth, just a layman's explanation of what makes this atomic process so different?

Professor SMYTH. Perhaps it can be understood this way: All other sources of energy depend on changes only in the outer structure of the atom. This is true of the digestion of food, of the burning of coal, the explosion of dynamite, or of any other familiar chemical change. The atomic bomb, however, depends on changes in the nucleus—the very heart of the atom. Such nuclear changes release millions of times more energy than any chemical change. Just as splitting the sun would make much more difference to us than disturbing one of the outermost planets.

Professor WELCH. Can you give us some idea of what a Pearl Harbor sneak attack with atomic bombs might mean if directed against the continental United States?

Professor SMYTH. It is not possible to be specific, but a few thousand bombs of the type used at Hiroshima could cripple this country's industry and destroy a large part of the population.

Professor WELCH. Is there, Professor Smyth, any hope of an effective defense against atomic bombs—that is, a defense that might be developed within the foreseeable future?

Professor SMYTH. If you mean protective devices or counterweapons of a military nature, I would say no—and there is not likely to be any. In the future, bombs of enormous destructive range could be sent as rockets from any spot on earth to any other spot. These will doubtless be jet-propelled, and find their targets by radar. The attack would, of course, be a surprise one, and the rockets would come in such numbers that many of them would probably get through any antiaircraft defense. We might not even know from what country the attack had come.

Professor WELCH. You present a most ominous picture.

Professor SMYTH. I am speaking only as a scientist. Our sole hope of survival as a nation in an atomic war would be to have our cities and industries dispersed throughout the country, preferably underground. Then at least a part of our population and industry would survive the initial attack and could retaliate with equally destructive bombs.

Professor SLY. Mr. Welch, could I ask Professor Smyth a question?

Professor WELCH. Certainly, Professor Sly.

Professor SLY. There has been much talk about the so-called secret we hold in regard to the atomic bomb. Without divulging vital information, Professor Smyth, could you tell us the nature or character of the information that is secret?

Professor SMYTH. Well, the situation is very much like this: The fundamental scientific principles on which the atomic bomb is based were well known by 1940 to scientists in every country. The only secret of the atomic bomb that the United States has for the moment—and it is for the moment only—is our knowledge of technical details in the process of manufacture and final assembly of the bomb. In a few years, other countries can certainly develop these same manufacturing processes—or even better ones.

Professor SLY. Now may I ask one more question: If this secret involving the details of manufacture and assembly were to be shared with other nations, just how would we go about sharing it?

Professor SMYTH. If we were to share it completely, we would have to permit the scientists and engineers of other nations to inspect our atomic bomb installations, and actually to watch the manufacture and assembly of a bomb from start to finish. Short of this, we could possibly provide each country with complete blueprints of the bomb assembly, without inspectional privileges.

Professor SLY. May I inquire of Senator SMITH as to what the attitude of Congress might be toward sharing our secret in either of these two ways?

Senator SMITH. While I cannot speak for Congress, I do not think my colleagues in the Senate would at the moment agree to either of these proposals. Before any such steps were taken, I, for one, would certainly insist upon agreements providing for a two-way exchange of information extending to the future developments of atomic energy—both military and industrial—in all countries party to the agreements; and in addition, some kind of permanent, international authority to administer such agreements—an authority in which we could all have confidence. Under such conditions, Congress might take some such steps—but not at the present moment.

Professor WELCH. I take it, Senator SMITH, that your suggestion would involve some kind of international committee or group that would have complete access to all laboratories and manufacturing plants involved in the harnessing of atomic energy in all countries?

Senator SMITH. Yes; but as I said, Professor Welch, I believe that we are very far from a move of that sort.

Professor WELCH. Professor Carpenter, do you have any questions to ask Professor Smyth before we pass on to the problem of controls?

Professor CARPENTER. Well, two things seem to me to stand out from Professor Smyth's statements: First, no nation can ever again afford to risk even a successful war; and, second, there is no longer any safety in the supremacy of armaments.

Professor WELCH. Are those fair conclusions, Professor Smyth?

Professor SMYTH. I think so. I am not sure just what a "successful" war means, for in the larger sense, no modern war is ever "successful." But one thing is now abundantly clear to those of us who are aware of the meaning of atomic energy: A war between two industrial nations, each well dispersed and each well equipped with atomic bombs, would probably destroy a large part of each nation.

Professor WELCH. And is there, from now on, any safety to be found in the supremacy of armaments?

Professor SMYTH. Certainly not in the sense in which we have been accustomed to think of it. We have heard it said recently that even if an armament race should develop the United States would have a great advantage and could keep ahead of other countries on the production of a stock pile of bombs. But atomic bombs last a long time after they are made. If 5,000 atomic bombs could wipe out all the great cities and industries of this or any other country—provided they had not been dispersed—there would really not be much advantage in having more than 5,000 bombs. In other words, even a small country possessed of this number of bombs and determined on a lightning attack, could wipe out a much larger and richer country overnight. It is, moreover, fair to assume that the bombs of 10 years from now will dwarf the ones used over Hiroshima—and, incidentally, will be produced at a lower cost than the equivalent in ordinary bombs.

Professor WELCH. Well, I think the problem and its implications are plain to all of us. In some way we must set up an international control of the use of atomic energy. Control, then, is what we must seek. Professor Carpenter, have there been any precedents—international or domestic—as to how this new force could be both adequately and appropriately controlled?

Professor CARPENTER. Precedents in this field are singularly scanty—indeed, almost nonexistent. The practice has been for the government which possessed the greater scientific knowledge in the methods of warfare to guard that knowledge with the utmost care.

Professor WELCH. But is there nothing at all to which we can turn for guidance?

Professor CARPENTER. There have been occasions when nations have renounced the use of some method of warfare. England and France in 1854 abandoned privateering. Two years later, the Declaration of Paris contained an article extending the principle to other nations. The use of poison gas was forbidden in The Hague Convention of 1899 and reaffirmed at the Washington Conference of 1922. Poison gas was, as a matter of fact, not used in the recent war, but there is a strong suspicion that its nonuse was due not so much to international agreement as to the fear of retaliation and to the fact that strategic bombing was found to be more profitable.

Professor WELCH. Did the League of Nations develop anything of a regulatory character that might be helpful?

Professor CARPENTER. Almost nothing. The problem of inspecting armaments was once investigated by the League, but nothing came of it. Under the League's administration of reconstruction loans in Austria, Hungary, and Bulgaria, the Council of the League appointed commissioners to reside in each country to supervise the use of money available under the loans. Their work, however, was largely advisory plus certain approval powers in regard to procedures. The refugee settlement question in Greece was placed under an autonomous settlement commission, two of the four members being appointed by the Council of the League. These, however, are very pale examples to support the regulation of the use of atomic energy.

Professor WELCH. It seems, therefore, that historical precedents offer us almost no guidance. Senator SMITH, can you tell us about curent proposals that have been suggested to Congress for the control of atomic energy?

Senator SMITH. Specifically, we have been considering the question of the domestic control of atomic energy which the so-called May-Johnson bill aims to cover. For the purposes of our discussion today, this is not of first importance compared with international control; but I might note in passing that there is grave danger of hampering the free scope of scientific research and discovery if anything approaching rigid governmental controls—either domestic or international—are imposed on this or any other field of scientific effort. The danger of excessive controls of exploratory research was the chief defect of the May-Johnson bill. Senator BALL has, within the past few days, introduced a substitute bill intended to correct these defects, but I have not yet had an opportunity to examine it thoroughly.

Professor WELCH. What have the hearings developed concerning the international control of atomic energy?

Senator SMITH. The important issue, of course, is whether we can have adequate international controls—and if so, whether we can trust those in control—in other words, whether we dare to pool what knowledge we have and what further knowledge we may develop, and if so, with whom? It has been suggested that this new instrument of such unprecedented destruction—so little understood and so different from anything in the whole history of human experience—should be placed under a special authority composed of representative world scientists.

Other groups have suggested that we immediately organize a "world government" to rule us all through some sort of world parliament and world police force. Still others point to the San Francisco Charter and urge that the control of atomic energy be placed in the Security Council of the United Nations Organization

Professor WELCH. I gather, Senator SMITH, that you think that even if we had the confidence and the courage, we should have to choose among three methods. Either a special authority, as you have said, or a world government, or some development out of the United Nations Organization. Would you care to express your own opinion, Senator, on which of these courses should be followed?

Senator SMITH. I do not think the international problem has been sufficiently developed to permit a complete answer at this time. Before we proceed, however, to a general discussion of these and other possibilities, I want to enter a strong protest against considering any proposal looking toward a world government or a world republic at this time. Any such proposal now will only tend to dilute our confidence in the accomplishments at San Francisco in the setting up of the United Nations Organization. Whatever else may be our policies, we must, in my judgment, build from that. The San Francisco Charter is not perfect. It is certainly not the long-range final destination in world organizations. But what we need to be working for today is progress rather than perfection—milestones on the road to world understanding and peace—even though the final expression of our hopes and efforts is still a long way off.

Professor WELCH. You feel strongly, Senator, that no new international authority should be established to handle this matter?

Senator SMITH. I do. We cannot have two or more world organizations. The one we have is more—far more—than many of us dared to hope for, and nothing must be done to weaken it. But, above all else, we must immediately put into practice the spirit of human understanding and confidence that dominated at San Francisco and brought such amazing success to that Conference.

Professor WELCH. Thank you, Senator, for so frank an expression. Well, gentlemen, in view of the facts you have had presented and the situation you have discussed, what immediate action would you suggest toward the control of atomic energy? Professor Sly, do you care to start?

Professor SLY. Only to propose a rather grim premise but one which seems to me fundamental. It is this: Nations today do not make peace the first objective of their foreign policies. Their first objective is security; their second objective is domestic prosperity; and their third objective is peace. The only way to place peace first is to place security and prosperity in a position where they are no longer issues. A very tall order, indeed, but let us talk only of modest beginnings.

Professor WELCH. Professor Smyth?

Professor SMYTH. If, as Professor Sly has indicated, security is the first aim of modern diplomacy, I can only fall back upon the implications of my previous statements. There remain two choices open to us: Either we shall have to move a large part of our industrial and domestic economy underground and concentrate on developing the maximum destructive power of atomic energy—this may bring us a precarious survival, but it will not bring us peace; or, we shall simply have to stop fighting each other and concentrate on the maximum productive powers of atomic energy. This would promise us both security and peace, and also, I believe, prosperity. There seems to me no middle course.

Professor WELCH. Professor Carpenter, does that make sense to you?

Professor CARPENTER. It does. I suppose the first choice is possible—and I fear only too likely. But I cannot conceive that any people anywhere would voluntarily choose a life of perpetual burrowing to keep a few feet under the latest jet-propelled, high-penetration bomb. As fantastic as it may seem to a disillusioned, suspicious, and war-torn world, I propose to talk about how to stop fighting—and I agree with Professor Smyth, there is no middle course.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Welch—

Professor WELCH. Senator SMITH?

Senator SMITH. Professor Carpenter proposes that we talk about how to stop fighting, but I want to ask if we can get at our problem that way? What is it, really, that prevents us from having peace? I believe that what we know as "national sovereignty" is the chief stumbling block to world peace. If this idea of "national sovereignty" could be relaxed—all over the world, and even just a little—then an important beginning could be made in creating a world without the incitements to make war. As you well know, Professor Carpenter, almost no impression has been made on this idea of "national sovereignty" since it took hold of nations nearly 400 years ago. A new political force must be released for the world by statesmen and political scientists exactly as new physical force has been released by the physicists and other scientists—and it may take quite as long to do so.

Professor WELCH. I am sure we all hope that you are right, Senator—what do you suggest?

Senator SMITH. Simply that the United States take the initiative and invite representatives of the British Empire and Russia to enter into informal discussions looking toward the formation of an international partnership for the development of atomic energy. I say informal discussions because no binding agreements could be expected until the possibilities are thoroughly explored; I say partnership because I am seeking a common enterprise as opposed to ruthless competitive bidding among sovereign nations, which is, to me, the root of so many of our international troubles. If this course were followed, the three nations concerned could plan for their joint approach to the other members of the United Nations Organization, looking toward the establishment of international cooperation in the use of atomic energy, within the framework of the United Nations Charter. The purpose would be to prevent competitive armaments, to safeguard world peace, and to make the peacetime benefits of atomic energy available to all peoples.

Professor WELCH. You suggest an international partnership for development—I note you say nothing of control.

Senator SMITH. That is right. Talk of controls seems to me, at the moment, to be premature. The immediate question is not control. It is the attitude of mind with which we approach the problem. Everyone is talking about the need of a new line of thinking to meet the promise of a new world of atomic power. Well, let's try it—let's forget (so far as this question is concerned) world police forces, economic sanctions, inspectional and reporting services, and all the rest of the panoply of potential force upon which we have depended so long and so vainly, and try something a little different; namely, a partnership arrangement in the development of this great new power. Controls will follow—not, however, as police measures—but rather as a set of commercial bylaws growing naturally and easily from the needs of a common venture.

Professor SLY. I like what you say, Senator, and it makes sense to me; but we will never get anywhere with it until we name names, and the names at the moment are England, Russia, and the United States. Anything more than temporary and superficial differences between England and the United States are to me unthinkable. But as between Russia on the one hand and England and the United States on the other—there is suspicion, distrust, and even fear. To put it bluntly, Russia's attitude toward international cooperation today is very much like the attitude of the United States toward international cooperation in 1920—although Russia has behaved somewhat better; she did, at least, join the United Nations Organization. I would like to add this thought to your proposal: If the United States invites Russia to such a conference as you propose, and either Russia does not come or fails to cooperate, that the same offer of partnership be made to England alone, with the hope that Russia may join at a later date.

Professor WELCH. Does that suggestion meet with your approval, Senator?

Senator SMITH. Well—yes, I think so. As Professor Sly points out, however, it is common knowledge that our relations with Russia are not as smooth as we would like, and I would not wish to see an element of threat enter the negotiations. In other words, I would not say to Russia, "Join with us, or else—."

Professor SLY. I did not mean to present it as a threat—rather let me say as a "stimulus." It looks very much as if the day of the giant power in world politics is here, and just in case things should go wrong again, perhaps in the beginning, we should take our partners where we can find them. England well may be, at present, our only opportunity—certainly our most hopeful one.

Professor WELCH. Do you think, Professor Carpenter, that the adoption of this proposal would tend to weaken the prestige of the United Nations Organization?

Professor CARPENTER. I think not. After all, the United Nations Organization is not yet a going concern, and the Security Council is not even formed. Would it not be likely that as Senator SMITH'S international partnership developed and other countries were admitted (as I assume they would be), that the Security Council might become, in a sense, the trustee of the partnership, and serve as an administrator of its affairs.

Professor WELCH. Would you agree to that, Senator?

Senator SMITH. I would hope that some such development would take place. I would hope, further, that with the leading nations working together in this common effort—an effort that I realize would, in the beginning, be extremely limited—that sufficient confidence would be created to extend this type of cooperation into other fields—possibly medicine, agriculture, and the engineering sciences.

Professor WELCH. Professor Sly, does this proposal seem to you to hold any hope?

Professor SLY. Well, at first thought, Professor Welch, it sounds to all of us, I think, a little frail and a little vague, but we shall have to start with something like it. Perhaps the conversations between Mr. Attlee, Mr. King, and Mr. Truman taking place today are steps in this direction. Certainly no major country will submit, at the present moment, to the type of controls that have been so freely discussed. The recent proposals to arm heavily, on the one hand, and to outlaw the atomic bomb as a military weapon, on the other, just do not alone make the slightest sense to me. Nor in my judgment should we scatter such secrets as we have throughout the world without substantial assurance of good faith—and not too much risk. This will take time, and a diplomacy almost as new as the bomb itself. But this is very clear to me: We will either find a common bond in this new atomic force, or in place of security we will find ourselves striving only for survival.

Professor WELCH. Professor Carpenter, you have something to add?

Professor CARPENTER. I would just like to emphasize two things: The first is the urgent need to make the tremendous implications of atomic energy clear to every citizen in America. This, I think, is a new responsi-

bility that our scientific men must assume, for they alone speak with authority and full understanding in the field. The second thing I would like to emphasize is that I would urge the prompt passage of domestic legislation to prevent the internal abuse of this new force and to encourage the freest possible study of it.

Professor WELCH. Gentlemen, I feel that you experts have done our listeners a great service. You have made three proposals:

1. That an informal conference be set up between Great Britain, Russia, and the United States to establish an international partnership among the United Nations designed to develop the peacetime use of atomic energy, and ultimately to prevent its use as an instrument of destruction;

2. You urge the widest possible publicity in the United States and Foreign countries pertaining to the tremendous implications of both the use and the abuse of this energy; and

3. You urge the prompt passage of domestic legislation to assure us internal protection and to encourage the freest possible scientific development.

If the world is not to set out to destroy itself—and any such idea is inconceivable—the world must gradually agree, in good faith, to control for mutual benefit, this incalculable force.

A Chance for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 14 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "A Chance for Peace" which I delivered Friday night, November 9, before the Cincinnati Foreign Policy Institute at Cincinnati, Ohio, and which was broadcast over Station WLW.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is just 3 months since the Second World War ended in complete victory over the Axis. Are we already losing the peace? Have we and our allies already begun to drift toward another and many time more destructive war?

Many millions of thoughtful Americans are asking those questions today. They are asking them in thousands of letters pouring into our offices in Washington, and over dinner tables and in meetings from Maine to California.

I have been asking myself those questions and I do not like the answers I reach.

The United Nations Organization we are about to establish, with its veto power and many concessions to national sovereignty, was always weak for the task of preserving world peace. Since the atomic bomb exploded, the Charter appears pitifully inadequate. Leadership in strengthening the United Nations Organization must come one of the three great powers: Russia, Britain, and the United States. Yet there has been no indication of even the desire to move in that direction from the responsible leaders of any one of those three.

Instead, it is becoming more and more apparent that the governments now in power in Britain, Russia, and the United States, are planning to rely for security far more on national strength and regional arrangements than on a world-wide security organization. Far from strengthening our collective security organization, we are already embarking on a secret, nationalistic armaments race in the invention and production of even more destructive weapons with ever greater ranges. This we are doing in the face of historical precedents which indicate that the climax of every such race in the past has been an explosion into war.

Even before the United Nations Organization is established, the real power of the world is being frozen into the old power politics, spheres of influence pattern which, if not broken up in time, will make a mockery of that peace Charter on which the peoples of the world have pinned their hopes. Yes, we protest bitterly against the frank and sometimes brutal way in which Russia chooses to manage affairs in her particular sphere in Eastern Europe, and we condemn the imperialism which occasionally shows through the smoother operations of Britain in her sphere in the Near and Far East. But we have a congenital blind spot when it comes to recognizing the similarity between what Russia and Britain are doing in their spheres and what we are doing or propose to do in our own sphere, the American hemisphere and the Pacific ocean, which takes in a fairly large slice of the whole world.

It is futile and unrealistic, even if more comfortable, to try to blame Russia and Britain for this tragic situation. Our own Government is playing much the same game, albeit somewhat less aggressively. Certainly we are not exerting any vigorous leadership in the opposite direction. At best, as occurred in the London Conference, we oppose unilateral decisions by Russia in Eastern Europe, but so far we haven't proposed any constructive alternative solution to Russia's security problem.

If this drift is to be stopped, and some realistic move made toward preserving world peace, the United States will have to make it. Leadership is thrust upon us, whether we like it or not, not only because much of the world is looking to us for rehabilitation help, but because of our tremendous economic and military power, and above all, because we made the atomic bomb and we used it. If we refuse to accept the responsibility of leadership, then the world will continue to drift toward a third great war.

It is equally futile to blame lack of courageous leadership in Washington for our present depressing outlook. We'd better look nearer home, at what you and I and Neighbor John are doing and thinking. By and large, in this democracy, we get just about the kind of leadership from our public officials that we want and deserve. If we are so confused that we don't know what we want, or too lazy to think things through and decide what we want, then we get no leadership at all and the nation drifts, as it is drifting today, toward chaos.

And as long as a substantial number of the 135,000,000 of us in American prefer to listen to demagogic appeals to hates, fears, and prejudices rather than appeals to our reason, which may involve some unpleasant decisions, we and the world will continue to drift.

The democratic, peace-loving peoples of the world are facing a critical test in the next few years. It isn't easy to make up the collective mind of 135,000,000 people and develop a strong, vigorous and concrete foreign policy. It can be done only if every one of us is willing to do some tough thinking, and rid ourselves of some of the ridiculous paradoxes and prejudices in which we are bogged down today.

Here are a few of the paradoxes I'm talking about.

We want our Government to take an even stronger position against Russian unilateral decisions in eastern Europe, yet every poll taken shows an overwhelming majority of us determined that the United States hang on to most of the military bases we have used in the Pacific war. What is the difference between Russia wanting absolute control in nations adjoining her, from which an attack was launched on her in 1941, and our wanting absolute control of the bases from which the attack on Pearl Harbor was launched? Apparently we want Russia to place all her faith in the United Nations Organization but we're not willing to place any faith in it.

Often the very same people who demand that we talk tough, in fact dictate, to Russia and Britain, are the very ones who insist that demobilization of our armed forces, which General Marshall says already is going so fast it amounts to disintegration, be still further speeded up. They are usually the ones who bitterly oppose even consideration of peacetime conscription, as a precautionary measure to make sure that our voice raised against aggression will not again be disregarded because we are impotent. Just what are we to do if our allies don't like our dictation?

We are supposed to keep the atomic bomb a closely guarded national secret, on the basis that all nations can trust our intentions but we dare not trust any other nation, or even the United Nations with the secret. We should demand a settlement in Palestine to our liking, but we should not assume any responsibility for the enforcement of that settlement. Similar confused and paradoxical reactions could be multiplied indefinitely.

I've been pretty rough with we, the people. I have done it deliberately because I think we need some harsh talk to wake us out of our lethargy and get the American "let's do something about it" spirit in action. American boys didn't win the war by sticking to relatively safe fox holes. They won by climbing out of the fox holes and slugging it out. We won't win the peace by staying in mental fox holes hoping that something will turn up. It's time to slug it out with the facts and realities, decide where we want to go, and then get going.

It is futile to blame lack of leadership in Washington for our present drifting. Destructive criticism has never accomplished anything constructive. But that does not mean that we, the people, are helpless. We can do something. We can think this international situation through, decide where we think America ought to go, and then demand that our political leadership start moving in that direction. If a strong enough demand of that sort is made, the kind of vigorous leadership we need will develop.

Let me state the realities of the international situation as I see them, and chart the direction in which I believe we should demand that our Government in Washington move.

The facts are not pleasant. Perhaps it is very late to reverse the drift toward a "power politics-spheres of influence" pattern for the world. All history indicates to us that such a pattern inevitably leads to war. But while it may be late, we owe it to future generations to at least try to save the peace.

We and the peoples of the British Commonwealth talk the same language and have much the same political background. When we talk of freedom for the individual, free elections and democracy in international conferences and agreements, we can be reasonably confident that when it comes to the specific application of such principles, we will not be too far apart.

There is no such common understanding between ourselves and the Russians. The London conference made it tragically plain, that despite Moscow, Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam, we and the Russians do not mean the same thing when we talk about or agree upon "free election" or "interim governments broadly representative of all democratic groups in a country." When Russia speaks of democracy, she doesn't mean the same thing we do. This is a grave problem and

one which must be solved if we are to work effectively with Russia in an international organization to preserve peace. To ignore it, or try to fool ourselves that it does not exist, will hinder rather than help a solution.

We are confident, despite a minority indulging in vociferous anti-Russian jingoism, that the overwhelming majority of our people want desperately to work with Russia and not against her. But it is equally clear that the Russian Government does not share that confidence in our intentions. In view of our resistance to Russian regional security aims, while admitting of no discussion of our own regional security moves, our obvious reluctance to trust Russia with the atomic bomb secret on any basis whatsoever, and the jingoistic anti-Russian talk that is all too prevalent here, Russia's suspicions are easy to understand. Just becoming irritated will not remove those suspicions, but some constructive leadership on our part might do it.

It is becoming increasingly clear that the division of Germany into four different occupation zones has not worked out well, just as the division of Europe into spheres of influence has slowed down economic recovery and undoubtedly will increase suffering and starvation among the people of that unfortunate continent during this winter. The whole mess in Europe cries aloud for a truly international control with the power back of it to make it function.

The solution is not, as Russia proposes, to duplicate Europe's chaos by setting up the same system in Asia. Nor is the answer for the United States to insist on retaining solely in its own hands the decisive power in Japan and Asia. That way we are likely to wind up as thoroughly hated in Asia as Russia will be in eastern Europe if the present situation continues.

We have talked about how modern communication and transportation have made us one world. Most of us would say that we accepted that reality. But the fact is that our Government and Russia's and Britain's Governments are acting as though we still lived in the world of the nineteenth century. We talk about one world, but we do not act as if it is one world.

The civil wars now raging in Indochina and Java show that the urge for freedom of those peoples is not satisfied by the weak and watery promises of the San Francisco Charter. If it is wrong for Russia to impose puppet governments on Bulgaria and Rumania, isn't it equally wrong for us and the British and Dutch and French to impose governments on Java and Indochina which they don't want? Where is there any real difference? What moral justification is there for applying one standard in Europe and another in Asia?

International decisions in Europe cannot be considered separately from those in Asia, Russian isolation and secrecy cannot be discussed apart from the atomic bomb secret, a settlement in Palestine must fit into the whole European and Near East picture, and we cannot insist on a voice in the affairs of Europe and Asia and also demand a strict observance of the Monroe Doctrine in this hemisphere.

We can't have our cake and eat it too. We cannot insist on a free hand in the Americas and the Pacific and expect Europe and Asia to place their trust in the United Nations Organization. It won't work. We cannot play it both ways at once. It would be far better to openly throw overboard collective security and arm to the teeth, than to continue our present double talk which is only fooling ourselves and confusing the rest of the world.

It is possible, that by dominating the world and spending vast sums on military preparations, we could in effect achieve a Pax Americana for a few decades. I am against that, for reasons I will elaborate in a moment. But such a policy would make more sense than our present, do nothing, policy of drift.

Or we could really throw our leadership and strength into making collective security work. We could act vigorously on our belief that this is one world. I think that is the only course that holds any hope for us or the world.

Before examining the steps necessary, if we choose that course, let's take a look at what the atomic bomb, the proximity fuse, the B-29, and the V-1 and V-2 projectiles mean in terms of national defense, possible war, and the prevention of another world war.

It is difficult to believe the destruction of this war unless one actually sees it. Despite news stories and newsreels, I had no real conception of the devastation wrought by our bombing of Germany with old-fashioned TNT until I walked the streets of Cologne and Aachen, and flew in a cub plane over the shattered industrial cities of the Ruhr Valley. Having seen that destruction and desolation myself, I am convinced.

I believe it utterly when General Marshall says that any future aggressor will strike first at the United States, whose great power, mobilized during two precious years, turned the tide and defeated the Axis. Next time we'll be the first, not the last, victim of aggression.

I believe it completely when Dr. Oppenheimer says that in one swift night raid 20 key industrial cities of the United States could be destroyed and 40,000,000 of our people killed with atomic bombs. I believe him when he tells us the scientists so far cannot envisage any effective defense against such an atomic bomb raid.

I believe the many scientists who have told us that the so-called atomic-bomb secret is no secret at all, and that the applied research and engineering discoveries which enabled us to produce it can be duplicated by any industrial nation in from 3 to 10 years, making it certain that another war if it comes will be an atomic war. To talk of outlawing use of the atomic bomb by international agreement strikes me as ridiculous. No aggressor would be deterred by any agreement from using a weapon so powerful.

I know that we have bombing planes with a range of 3,000 miles today, and it is only a question of time until all major nations have them, or their successors with even longer ranges. I believe the scientists who tell us there is no theoretical reason why rocket and other self-propelled projectiles cannot be fired at targets three and five thousand miles distant, and directed to a specific target by remote radio control.

I believe completely the scientists and military strategists who have told me that once the planes in an atomic-bomb raid have left their home bases, nothing could avert terrible destruction, perhaps the complete extinction of our civilization; that the only possible defense against such an attack would be to attack first, striking potential bases for such a raid before they were even completed, let alone the planes launched.

I believe the scientists who tell us that when the problem of industrial use of atomic energy has been solved, and they are confident it can and will be solved, that peaceful and beneficial application will utilize the same finished materials which are put together to make an atomic bomb. I am confident we would not withhold any such beneficial discovery from mankind. But I also believe the scientists who say that once plants to make the finished materials necessary for peaceful utilization are established, converting those plants to the manufacture of atomic bombs would require only 3 to 6 months.

Those are the grim and soul-shaking facts upon which we must build the structure of world peace. Difficult and unpleasant as they are, they are the realities we must face squarely. To close our eyes to them, to continue to drift, is to condemn future generations to death, destruction, and chaos.

There is a further intangible which I believe we must consider. It is my conviction that fear based on ignorance and lack of understanding is the greatest danger of all in the world today. Russia is fearful that we are building a stock pile of atomic bombs which may sometime be used against her. Britain is fearful that the United States will once again make international commitments which when the show-down comes we will not fulfill. And we are afraid of what Russia, behind her Chinese wall of isolation, might do with the atomic bomb if she had the secret. The only antidote to that kind of fear is knowledge and faith. We must know what Russia is doing, she must know what we are doing, and Britain must be sure that we will not repeat the mistakes of the past. And we must have more faith in the peoples of the world, in the collective judgment of mankind, once they know the facts. That faith in our own people is the very foundation stone of our democracy. No lasting structure for peace can be built on a foundation of fear.

In the light of these realities, what will be the consequences if we choose to seek security solely in our own national strength, the alternative toward which we are surely drifting today? Remember, the only practical defense against the atomic bomb is to attack first and wipe out the bases from which we might be attacked before they can operate.

That means that not only must we seize and fortify bases all over the world, but we must be prepared to attack immediately from those bases any nation that shows signs of preparing for aggression. We dare not wait until the aggression is actually launched. To do so is to invite destruction. That is one of our realities. In other words, if we are going to rely solely on our own strength, we must always be the aggressor in the future, because only the aggressor will stand any chance of avoiding destruction of his homeland. That is the only logical solution of the realities we face.

Do you want the United States to deliberately choose that course? Do you want the United States to drift into a position where our only chance of survival demands such a policy? I do not believe there can be any moral justification for such a policy under the ethics of God or man. If there is, then we had no moral right to oppose Hitler and Hirohito. I do not believe the American people will ever, under any conceivable circumstances, support such a policy. I reject it as unmoral and unworkable. Yet I am convinced that we are drifting toward just such an impossible dilemma today.

The other alternative is for the United States to place its faith in and throw its strength into fashioning a collective security organization strong enough and democratic enough to at least stand a chance of preserving peace. I would not junk the United Nations Charter, but build upon it. After all, it does represent a large area of agreement among 51 nations, and a starting point.

I believe the United States should take the lead, along with Britain and Canada, in calling together at the earliest possible date an international conference at which all delegations would be half politicians and half scientists. One of the most hopeful developments in the atomic bomb is that at long last the scientists, who have turned our world topsy-turvy, are becoming interested in politics, which has been following the same rut for a hundred and fifty years. But heaven forbid that we should have just another international conference where delegates wrangle for months over vague generalities. That would accomplish nothing. Such a conference should meet to consider specific changes in the United Nations Charter proposed and published in advance.

It is my conviction that six major changes in that charter are essential if the United Nations Organization is to be strong and democratic enough to give us and our children even a hope of peace. Here are the six:

First. The veto power of any one of the five permanent members of the Security Council must be eliminated, and decisions to take action against a threatened aggression made by a majority vote of six or seven members, with any member nation directly involved in the issue not permitted to vote. Obviously, any aggression with atomic bombs in the future is most likely to start with one of the great powers, which are the only ones likely to have the industrial capacity to produce it. If such an aggressor through the veto power is in a position to stop any quick action, then obviously the organization is useless insofar as preventing an atomic bomb aggression is concerned. That is tough medicine for the United States. Contrary to any impression you may have that the veto power was a concession to Russia, the fact is that we wanted it every bit as much as did Russia.

Second. We must create a true international police force, composed of quotas of various nationals thoroughly mixed and under an international command, in place of the present pledge by individual nations that parts of their national forces will be made available to the Security Council on call. This force should occupy key bases and strong points throughout the world and no individual nation should be permitted to have military bases outside its own territory. I am familiar with the major argument against an international police force, namely, that an armed force without an assured home base of supply is impossible. I think there are two possible solutions. One would be to maintain always on the bases occupied by such force supplies and matériel sufficient to last for 6 months or 1 year of fighting, which would make them independent of supplies for the critical period in a war. A second would be to limit national forces to those necessary for internal policing and repelling of an invasion by ordinary arms, making the international force strong enough so that it could assure its own supply sources. My next proposed change in the charter would also go far toward meeting that objection.

Third. The international force should have the only legal and authorized stock pile of atomic bombs permitted in the world. Whether manufactured in the United States or elsewhere, every atomic bomb in existence should be taken immediately to one of the two or three strongest international bases and there kept. All manufacture of such bombs should be under the strictest supervision of the Security Council.

Fourth. The Charter should provide for the complete interchange of all scientific knowledge, including military applications as well as all others, among all member nations, and for the free inspection by scientists and others acting as agents of the United Nations, of any and all activities in every nation. The details of making sure that such an interchange and inspection is complete and impossible of evasion will have to be worked out by the scientists. The realities of the atomic bomb make such a free interchange and inspection the only feasible way of making sure no individual nation is manufacturing atomic bombs in secret.

Fifth. The Security Council should be authorized and directed, the instant any nation violates the agreement on free interchange of knowledge by closing its borders or refusing complete freedom of inspection, to order the international police force to move in on such nation and discover and destroy any secret preparations for war being made. Of course, the authority would also apply to preparations made openly. The important thing is that the world dare not in the future drift and delay while a would-be aggressor prepares to attack. The only way an effective policing job can be done in the atomic age is to do it before the aggressor can prepare. That is probably the toughest issue of them all to meet. But it seems to me the only logical solution which squares with the facts we have outlined. If the United States alone assumed that responsibility, I do not believe it could be justified on moral grounds. But I believe that for the organized world community to take such action, which is essential to the survival of civilization, is morally justified by the realities of the world.

Sixth, and last. We should rewrite the trusteeship provisions of the Charter and place directly under its administration such trouble spots of the world as Java, Indochina, Korea, Trieste, Palestine, and perhaps even Austria and Bulgaria. At the same time, it might be a good idea to turn over to the United Nations the administration and occupation of Germany and Japan. This change is not perhaps so vital to the control and prevention of atomic war, but I doubt seriously whether the organized world can continue to treat the same basic problems of individual rights and freedom one way in Europe and another way in Asia and make it work.

Those are the conclusions I have reached after a great deal of thought about the hard facts we are up against in the world today. I am not too happy about my conclusions, because I can see many grave difficulties in the way of obtaining world-wide agreement on such proposals or even a substantial part of them. The greatest difficulty, perhaps, might be getting the people of the United States to agree on proposing them. I know, of course, the $64 question that is in all your minds. What about Russia? Would she come out of her isolation and agree to such a program? What could we do if she refused to go along?

There can be only one answer at this time. We cannot know what Russia will accept unless and until we propose something. Even the most jingoistic of our Russian critics seem to give Stalin and his advisers credit for being tough-minded realists. I am inclined to agree. And I believe that with realists, we stand a chance. Perhaps an invitation to Russia's leaders and scientists to observe a demonstration of the atomic bomb dropped in Siberia might help. And as a last resort, there is always the possibility of organizing the rest of the world and leaving Russia in self-imposed isolation.

The United Nations organized as I have proposed would be a superstate. We would have government on the world level, and the United States National Government, like those of all other nations, would in the field of war and preparations for war be inferior to and subject to the United Nations. So what? Are we going to be frightened by mere words into disregarding the realities of the world in which we live?

Which is more precious for us and our children and our grandchildren—complete national sovereignty, or a chance to live in peace? Let us pray God that America has the courage and vision to make the choice in time.

Peacetime Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 14 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me at the Central State Teachers College, Stevens Point, Wis., on November 8, 1945, setting forth some of my reasons for opposition to peacetime military conscription.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Once again we have the issue of peacetime compulsory military training squarely before the Congress. After considerable vacillation, the President recently recommended the enactment of such legislation.

This endorsement was the signal the militarists were waiting for. We shall shortly witness a gigantic propaganda drive in the public press and over the radio designed to push the legislation through Congress early next year at the latest. Proponents frankly admit that this is their last big chance to fasten peacetime conscription on America. They know all too well that the opinions of returning veterans and the considered judgments of more normal times will do their cause no good. So they choose to strike for their objective before the reaction against the plan becomes too great.

There are some well-meaning people in their ranks who firmly believe that we should have a large training program. There are well-meaning people who confuse mere numbers with true military security. There are others who have suffered irreparable losses in this war and who seize upon this in desperation as insurance against repetition.

The militarists know full well that calm, full, and frank discussion of the facts involved will cause large deflections in the ranks of these people, and so they want to push the program while the aftermath of war still beclouds the issues and facts.

In my brief discussion of this subject today, I want to address myself to some of these issues and to try to shed some light on various arguments advanced.

INTERNATIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Let me say at the outset that I advocate that we fulfill our international responsibilities. I favor adequate military security for our Nation and the winning of the peace. And no responsible official in the Government or Congress who is either for or against military training is advocating any other course.

I make that statement to clear the atmosphere of debate upon one of the most far-reaching decisions in our history, because some of the supporters of this adjunct of totalitarianism attempt to brand those who oppose it as having no concern for winning the peace or maintaining our national military strength. I shall endeavor to explain later in this discussion why it is my firm conviction that compulsory military training will actually weaken us in a military way, as well as in economic and social respects, while at the same time lulling us into a false sense of security.

WAR: CONTEST OF TECHNOLOGY

It was apparent even before this war that the science of war was rapidly becoming a contest of technology. The war proved this and clearly showed that manpower without the latest weapons of war is virtually helpless. High-performance airplanes, radar, and other electronic equipment, guided missiles and rockets, the proximity fuse, and the atomic bomb are the spectacular weapons that immediately come to mind. Other thousands of technical inventions and improvements serve to emphasize further the point as we look back on the war.

It is true that we still required many millions of men to win the war, despite our mighty technical weapons. One reason is that our activities were expanded over the entire world, over much more territory than a previous war had ever been fought. Another reason is that all too often we were not

efficiently organized. But perhaps the primary reason, other than the necessity of occupying territory, is the fact that modern technological warfare requires tremendous numbers of men behind the lines repairing and maintaining equipment. In general, the men behind the lines, the ground crews and maintenance personnel, are more closely associated with the normal activities of industry and the laboratory than they are with the military.

INDUSTRY AND SCHOOLS CAN SUPPLY TECHNICIANS

It is undoubtedly true that our future military strength will require us to make sure that we have available for any emergency a sufficient number of technically trained men who can perform technical war jobs without too much conversion. Apparently some who desire a military-training program for all youth think the Army should do this. This is a rash conclusion. A strong industrial economy is rich with technical personnel who can do the job. Any additional training along this line that needs to be done can best be done within our present technical schools and industrial organization. What we need most is a good corps around which to build; an efficient professional army, well organized, surrounded by proper technical personnel and up-to-date weapons, and loaded with practical plans for rapid expansion if the occasion demands.

The modern criterion for war strength is not manpower, but rather it is technical and industrial power and the requisite raw materials to feed the industrial activity. We are proceeding in the wrong direction when we indiscriminately draft prospective scientists and put them in uniform.

DANGERS OF RASH ACTION

We came dangerously close in the recent war to the point of destroying the source of our own strength. We blindly drafted young scientists and then put them in routine jobs in the Army and Navy, where no use was made of their exceptional talents. So firmly entrenched was the idea of mass service and mass training and mass conscription that a few leaders who did recognize the indispensability of the services of these men had to go to the absurd lengths of blanketing these men into uniform by Presidential order, in order to keep intact the personnel of certain Government laboratories. This is an excellent example of the kind of Frankenstein we can create for ourselves when we make a fetish of universal training, or place our complete confidence in brute numbers.

I cite the previous situation as a case where blind action tended to retard technical progress. It could be worse. And peacetime military training would be precisely the factor that would produce the worse condition, namely, not merely retarding but choking off the ideas for technical progress even before the ideas are born.

It is a well-known fact that most of the startling technical progress of the past war came from outside the armed forces. And many a scientist and engineer will bitterly tell you that his developments and contributions were made in spite of, not with the help of, the services. The military atmosphere simply is not conducive to progress in science. And I am frankly concerned over the numerous reports in the press and elsewhere telling how the services have largely alienated those who did the work behind the scenes and received very little credit therefor when the cloak of secrecy was lifted.

SCIENCE AND MILITARY DO NOT MIX

The plain fact is that science and the military do not mix. If we seek to inculcate the youth of America with what the military proudly calls discipline—then simultaneously we destroy the creative, the inquisitive, and other special aptitudes of our youth which make for technical progress. There would be exceptions, I know, but the general result would be a leveling process, regimenting all to a general pattern.

News correspondents filing stories from Germany nowadays are continually writing about the amazing servility of the German people in accepting and obeying any orders issued, no matter how harsh. They are unanimous in reporting that it is no particular deference that is being shown to the victors, but simply an acceptance of the fact that the Allies are the successor government to a previous government that demanded and instilled this militaristic servility in its people.

If that is what we want in our youth, we will get it with mass compulsory military training. Even if we don't want it, we will get it with peacetime military training.

PEACETIME TRAINING DISTORTS GROWTH

Advocates of military training are always enthusiastic about training young men. They explain that young men don't have set ideas and prejudices against military training and take to it. What better proof can be had that militarism takes advantage of immaturity and distorts normal thought processes? It is no credit to those who teach military discipline that they can break the spirit and imagination of a boy more easily than a man.

Mass peacetime military training is not only a drug to youth, it is also a drug to the members of the professional army who must do the training. Several of the military historians who have studied the mass training programs in Europe in the past two centuries have commented on the problems of assigning top-notch military men to teach civilian armies. They point out that insofar as military training is concerned, mass teaching is not akin to generalship on the field of battle; that a long tour of duty as an instructor, especially if kept in the same surroundings, tends to weaken him as a battle commander; that he becomes imbued with the fixed dogmas that he teaches, if not totally discouraged with the impossible task of making a military man out of every boy. This, of course, is the directly opposite situation to that which prevails when a select few who desire military training are chosen for such training in institutions comparable to our present military and naval academies.

PROFESSIONAL ARMY MAY BE IMPAIRED

I repeat, there is a very real danger that mass training on a grandiose scale can seriously dilute and impair the effectiveness of a professional army that we need for adequate military security.

That brings me directly to several questions I want to pose. What can we expect to teach the trainees? What length of training is necessary? How long will what they learn be of value to our national defense? What are the alternatives? What are the human costs?

First, what can we expect to teach the trainee? It is generally admitted that in peacetime the prospective trainee will be apathetic if not actually unwilling to undergo training. That is definitely strike one on the teacher in any training program. As to a course of training, proponents of the training have widely separate views in what they advocate for the curriculum. We have those who want to use training to promote the health of the Nation. We have those who want the program to be strictly military. We have those who want a broad training. We have those who want a specialized training to suit the individual. We have those who want to train all youth, men and women. We have those who want to select only the best specimens of young manhood.

SOCIAL BENEFITS AND COSTS

My own personal opinion is that some health benefits might be derived from the training. We have many undernourished and underprivileged youth who might benefit physically. But if health be our objective, why not go to the root of the health problem directly? And why must we tie military training to it? If it is necessary and desirable to insure better health for our youth—and few will argue against it—the corrective proposition should stand or fall on its own merits, and not be a subordinate side-issue to military training.

It is frequently argued that universal training will have democratic benefits socially. This is not true. Instead of promoting wholesale social conditions, the segregation of large masses of men for prolonged periods undermines accepted social attitudes and standards of values. The reason is simple: It is an unnatural life and conducive to many warped attitudes and behaviors. This is an important part of the heavy social price we would pay for compulsory military training of all our youth.

ARMY VERSUS TECHNICAL SCHOOLS

Some of the advocates of training try to make it more palatable by suggesting that the curriculum be partially elective and include a variety of subjects among which they cite aerodynamics, electronics, jet propulsion, rocket missiles, and allied subjects. They may be excellent sugar coating and may entice some to swallow the bitter pill that goes with it, but it is sheer folly to imagine that any effective results along these lines could be obtained in any short training course or with any trainee who had a limited background. Subjects like this can be taught much more effectively within the framework of our present educational system, including the technical schools operated in conjunction with certain industrial organizations. During the recent war it was the technical experts brought in from the various schools and industrial organizations who carried the brunt of the training programs for the Services. Why should we try to make a technical college out of the Army when we are better equipped to do general training in our present educational system?

It is a different matter when we come to specialized military applications of highly confidential nature. Many of these devices will be developed and studied behind the closed doors of Government laboratories. But it would be a nonsensical policy to allow every Tom, Dick, and Harry in any civilian training program to have access to equipment of highly classified nature.

TIME RAPIDLY NULLIFIES TRAINING

Let us suppose for a moment that we have trained one class of trainees. How much time was necessary or how much money it cost is for the moment irrelevant. The real question is How long will this training be valuable to the Nation? The answer is found in our experience in the recent war. In many branches of the Army and Navy it was the established policy to train and retrain, or train and refresh at periodic intervals for the reason that technical progress was so rapid it was necessary to do so. This will be equally true in peacetime. Hence, with the diversions of civil life, the ravages of time, and the changes in military tactics, it is not unreasonable to expect that the potential value of the training will be almost zero less than 5 years thereafter. A single weapon can change military tactics overnight, as we have learned in connection with the atomic bomb.

COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL COSTS

What are the costs of a system of military training? In a study on postwar fiscal requirements, the Brookings Institution has estimated the direct costs of training would be a minimum of $1,360 per man per year, based on a trainee wage of $30 per month, and excluding instructional and supervisional costs which would be considered a part of regular Army and Navy costs. Multiply this by 800,000 trainees and you get a bill

for military training that is in excess of $1,000,000,000. Now, contrast this with the total public expenditures for education: Federal, State, local; boys and girls, men and women; full-time day schools, vocational schools, night schools, part-time schools; colleges, universities, libraries. Toward the support of all of these institutions, with about 26,000,000 persons attending school, total support, including various grants and aids, is only about $2,500,000,000. If we are to spend money on training, we might do better to spend more of it on our established educational institutions.

Financial costs to the Government are only one of the costs involved. I have already mentioned other social and human costs. But over and above these there are still other intangible costs that will be very serious. One is the loss that will result from the interruption of education. Educators confirm the statement that too often an interrupted education—for whatever the reason—means the end of education for that person. Too often the student does not return to finish. This is just another social cost we would have to pay.

MILITARISM WOULD STUNT NATION

I feel strongly that the mere existence of the universal philosophy of militarism would stunt our national growth. Ask anyone who has served for any length of time in the military establishments. If he is candid he will confirm the fact that the accepted attitude all along the line is, in vernacular language, "Don't worry about it; don't stick out your neck; keep your own skirts clean; let the next fellow do it!" I don't have to convince you that such an attitude is not conducive to progress.

What are the ingredients of national strength? Everyone will agree it is a combination of manpower, economic resources, and national morale. However, a mere reservoir of any or all of these factors is not enough. The speed and mobility of modern war requires that we be able to translate these factors into offensive striking power and that we maintain a proper balance between peactime uses and probable wartime needs.

On the one extreme, we could devote all our manpower and resources for military purposes. Obviously, unless we intended it for aggression and plunder, this would be a national folly of protecting an empty cupboard; because economic wealth and strength can arise only from creative economic activity. Such a policy could lead only to national financial suicide.

On the other extreme, we could devote no manpower or resources for peacetime military purposes. This would be the cheapest, but a disastrous policy.

MILITARY REQUIREMENTS DEPEND ON WORLD OUTLOOK

As long as international relations remain uncertain we have no alternative but to maintain sufficient military power to cope with eventualities. How much manpower will be necessary to maintain sufficient military power is a decision that must be squarely met on the basis of three factors: The world outlook with respect to international relations; the extent of our foreign policy commitments; and the security of the United States and its interests.

Our forefathers recognized the danger of militarism to the democratic way of life. Ever since the founding of the Republic we have resisted every effort to fasten compulsory military service upon the people except in time of war. This traditional resistance of the citizens of the United States is not based on mere theory nor prejudice. It has been clear through all history down to this very hour that universal compulsory service in peacetime has been the characteristic of governments which have been to a greater or lesser degree totalitarian and despotic. We should not reverse our policy without complete understanding of its far-reaching, devastating effect on fundamental human rights and the political, economic, and social consequences which it will bring about in the years to come.

STRENGTH FROM HOME, SCHOOL, CHURCH

We have always depended upon the family, our educational system, and the church to build the moral and intellectual strength of American youth. A year of universal, compulsory peacetime conscription will snatch every youth away from these three great institutions of American society at the most critical period in their lives. It is no reflection on the military to deny that they cannot provide adequate substitutes for the family, the school, and the church.

In fact, every thinking person knows, if he is honest with himself, that the military, despite any efforts they may make, is an organization radically different from any of those we have relied upon in the past to build for better citizenship and higher moral values.

In the world in which we now live, it was never more important for ourselves and for humanity as a whole that we strengthen and foster the family, the schools, and the churches, as the institutions for the development and attainment of the highest ideals of human conduct. Can anyone seriously argue that a year away from these institutions which have been the source of development of American civilization will weaken their influence upon American youth? And here let me warn you not to be taken in by the window dressing which the advocates of peacetime conscription will set up to make the proposal more attractive. They will talk about giving educational courses; they will shout about the religious opportunities which they will provide. If they could get by with it, they would cook up some military substitute for the influence of the family.

No! A thousand times no! Despite all their efforts the military cannot provide an adequate substitute for the family, the school, and the church, when it comes to developing and improving the moral and intellectual values of our society.

REVERSAL OF NATIONAL POLICY INVOLVED

I think any thoughtful citizen will admit that the burden of proof is upon those who advocate that we reverse our national policy and adopt the abhorrent system of universal compulsory military service. And they have not proved their case. It does not make it so just because men in high places say it is so.

The experience in two world wars should make us pause before we take the first step toward totalitarianism. Twice in my lifetime we have furnished the decisive military force to defeat nations which have relied upon universal military service for vast numbers of trained reserves for their military power.

EXPERIENCE OF FRANCE

In this war one of the first nations to fall was France. She relied upon universal service for her national security. I can recall early in this war that some of those—both military and civilians—who are now loudest in their support of universal service were saying that the French Army was the greatest in the world. They pointed to the huge reserves trained as a result of the French policy of universal compulsory training. We all know now that mere numbers of trained reserves proved to be a false base of security for France.

If someone says that the atom and the V bombs have changed the situation, I ask in turn what evidence is there that these discoveries and others yet to come point to building our military security on masses of men trained for a year? On the contrary, the logic of scientific developments for war point in the opposite direction. They indicate the need for vast, well-organized research, and the maintenance of highly trained and constantly retrained military forces of sufficient size to provide adequate security for America and to fulfill our international responsibilities and obligations.

VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENTS SATISFACTORY

There is no evidence to prove that we cannot have such military forces as we require on a voluntary basis. On the contrary, the results now being obtained in the recently launched voluntary recruiting program indicate that it will be a success. Just before I left Washington, enlistments were being made at the rate of 2,500 per day and the drive is just beginning to gain momentum. This rate will produce 75,000 per month which now exceeds the quotas being inducted under the Selective Service Act. This record is being made at a time when we still have to maintain large occupational forces in both Europe and Asia.

To make the voluntary system work over a period of years we will have to reassess the compensation offered and the conditions of service. We will have to provide more opportunities for promotion, in-service training for skills and professions, as well as additional retirement benefits, but I am convinced the job can be done. Others may disagree but before we break our national life-long tradition and take the consequences in social, educational, and moral retrogression, let us make the effort.

Let no man say we do not have time to try the voluntary plan. We are getting all the men the military now require by voluntary enlistments and the wartime conscription act. For the immediate future, we have millions of men who have had the best training the military can now provide. In case of an emergency in the immediate future, they will be available.

NO NEED FOR HASTY DECISION

There is no need for a hasty decision to fasten peacetime conscription on American youth forever. It is the proponents of this alien system who are in a hurry. They have everything to gain and nothing to lose if they can stampede the people and the Congress into making this initial move toward totalitarianism.

No, the evidence is clear that we do not have to take this decision on the basis of any immediate situation.

If it is argued that peacetime conscription is required for the more distant future, I ask who is it we are preparing to fight? Certainly no informed person can contend it is one or all of the enemies we have just defeated. They have been crushed, their ability to wage war destroyed or in the process of destruction. They will not be able to wage war in the foreseeable future, as General MacArthur has said, and every competent military authority I know agrees with him.

Then, is it one or more of our allies we are preparing against? If the proponents of conscription in peacetime answer "yes", then I say let us propose to our allies the universal abolition of peacetime conscription before we launch on another destructive, mad rush among our allies for rearmament and peacetime conscription.

The mothers and fathers, the educators, the clergy, the citizens, and the youth of America are entitled to frank answers to these momentous questions before we sentence our youth to involuntary servitude even for 1 year.

Let us not import this alien philosophy and stunt our growth as a Nation with militarism. Let us maintain adequate military security by voluntary methods and free the people of this great Nation to devote their energies toward building a better America, a better world, and winning the peace.

Science and the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, when I introduced H. R. 2827 in March providing for the deferment of scientifically trained men from the armed services, in the same way that Russia, France, England, and Canada have done, little or no notice was taken of it. Since we have revealed the atomic bomb everybody has become scientific minded. We hear from all quarters that we must protect our scientists, except from the Military Affairs Committee who have had the bill under consideration since it was introduced.

Here is an editorial from the New York Times calling attention to the need of protecting our scientists:

SCIENCE AND THE DRAFT

For about 3 years scientists, engineers, and educators have been protesting against the dragnet policy of Selective Service, a policy which, though it did consider workers essential in war industry, made no distinction between research and truck driving. Particularly strong was the joint protest which was uttered a few months ago by the American Council on Education and the National Research Council and which predicted that because of Selective Service industrial progress would be retarded 20 years. Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson has now made a proposal which recognizes "the desirability of granting deferments to young men who had their scientific education interrupted in order to engage in war research activities and who now wish to complete or further their education in scientific fields."

Good as this is, it is not good enough. The young men who will now be permitted to continue their studies must have had at least 2 years of service in some scientific or engineering war activity. What of the many young engineers, chemists and physicists who are still wearing a private's uniform? And what of others who were deferred for occupational reasons and who wish to return to teaching, research, and production? And what of the thousands who will be inducted for police duty for at least 2 years in occupied countries? All these technically trained men ought to be returned to college or to industry if the tempo of technological progress is to be maintained.

Great Britain and Soviet Russia drained the last necessary man to fight, yet both countries wisely recognized that the training of scientists and engineers must not be interrupted because of war. The statistics speak for themselves of the pass to which we have been reduced. In 1940 about 110,000 students were enrolled in engineering courses alone; now the number is under 40,000. And this at a time when, in the reconversion of industry, we need all the technically trained men that we can muster. The policy of the Selective Service never had sufficient justification. It is time to revise it thoroughly.

We will probably realize the error of not adopting this kind of legislation too late when we wake to find that other nations, more alert than we have been, have surpassed us in scientific developments, even while we hold the secret to the greatest scientific discovery of the age, atomic energy.

INDUSTRY FEARS DRAFT WILL RETARD PROGRESS

The aircraft industry has warned Congress that the continued drafting by Selective Service of young, qualified aeronautical engineers was seriously interfering with the Nation's research and development program and hampering reconversion.

The statement was made by R. E. Gillmor, president of the Sperry Gyroscope Co., and a member of the board of governors of the Aircraft Industries Association, in presenting a comprehensive program for maintaining national leadership in research and development, to the War Mobilization Subcommittee of the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

POSITION IN DANGER

"The Nation's position of aeronautical leadership cannot be maintained for long," Gillmor said, "if the aircraft industry continues to lose its engineering personnel at the present rate."

He cited one aircraft company which lost five engineering specialists during October alone, and has 25 others subject to induction at a time when it is working on more secret projects for the Army and Navy than at any time during the war emergency. One other company has 49 engineers now subject to induction, another has 23, and still another, 7.

REPLACEMENTS UNAVAILABLE

"We must remember that no college-trained replacements for these specialists are available," Gillmor pointed out.

The industry statement cited reports that Britain and Russia were embarking on greatly expanded aeronautical-research programs and contrasted these trends with recent drastic reductions in appropriations for Army and Navy aeronautical research and experimental research work. Requests by the Army and Air Forces have been reduced from $245,000,000 to $115,000,000, while the Navy's requests were cut from $148,000,000 to $61,000,000, the statement said.

Management Opposes Ball-Burton-Hatch Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, because I believe it is highly important to the entire question of antilabor legislation now pending before this House, I desire to call attention to a poll conducted by Modern Industry, one of the largest and most authoritative business magazines in this Nation, on the question, Should industry support the Ball-Burton-Hatch Federal Labor Relations Act?

The overwhelming majority of the readers of this magazine—from a total of 50,000 readers among management men in 31,500 plants in America voted a resounding "No."

While the Ball-Burton-Hatch Act is not now before us for consideration, this vote has a significance beyond the terms of that bill. I firmly believe that through such measures as the Smith bill (H. R. 3937), as amended by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] in the Military Affairs Committee, and as reported to the House, and the Hobbs bill (H. R. 32) we are proposing to enact piecemeal the most repressive provisions of the Ball-Burton-Hatch bill.

Therefore, I desire to include with these remarks a letter which I received from the publisher of Modern Industry, setting forth the results of their poll. It is particularly important since it shows that management in every section of the Nation disagrees with the principles of repressive labor legislation.

The letter follows:

MODERN INDUSTRY,
New York, N. Y., November 9, 1945.
The Honorable HUGH DE LACY,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Should industry support the new (Ball-Burton-Hatch) Federal Labor Relations Act?

Modern Industry's, Debate in Print, a regular feature of this industrial magazine with more than 50,000 readers among management men in 31,500 plants, covered the pros and cons of this timely question in the September 15 issue.

The readers of Modern Industry, given an opportunity to have their say on this question by means of a post-card ballot, voted as follows:

	Percent
No	57.9
Yes	42.1

Senator JOSEPH H. BALL, of Minnesota, one of the sponsors of this bill, wrote in favor of it. His opponent was Arthur T. Jacobs, labor economist for the National Foremen's Institute, Inc.

Breaking down the total vote by regions, opinion across the Nation lines up in this way:

	Yes (*Percent*)	No (*Percent*)
New England	38.8	61.2
Mid-Atlantic	37.9	62.1
North Central	45.8	54.2
South	41.6	58.4
West	44.8	55.2
Pacific Coast	41.5	58.5

If you'd like to receive tear sheets of this debate, please let us know. And we shall also welcome your comments on this issue.

Cordially yours,
ELDRIDGE HAYNES,
Publisher.

Leadership and American Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, leadership today is the outstanding problem in our domestic and foreign endeavors. Congress, business, and labor cannot avoid these responsibilities. We are today searching for practical ideas to meet the present crisis. Our great President, Harry S. Truman, has asked for the cooperation of all.

We, the lawmakers, must analyze every issue and reach for a constructive conclusion and solution.

Our great industries must register their beliefs and policies as labor registers theirs. In my State of Louisiana successful employment is similar to that of

every other State—mutual understanding and cooperation of both business and labor.

It is almost universally agreed that free enterprise made our Nation great—we should continue to make it great and strive to make it even greater.

The following address should be read by every American. It is a direct, forceful, and masterful approach of these problems by one of America's greatest industrialists—the Honorable R. W. Gallagher, chairman of the board of directors of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.

The following is Mr. Gallagher's address:

Our Nation has just ended a major war victoriously. A great challenge has been met. A task has been completed—the task of beating down a serious threat to our way of living. But all of us are aware, I am sure, that the job was not a final one. Conclusion of the war does not mean the end of problems. On the contrary, there are signs aplenty that the problems of peace are no less vast and no less urgent than those of war. Scores of questions, affecting the whole future of our country, must be answered. Many of them must be answered by American businessmen.

Challenges and problems are not strange to us. American business has successfully and constructively met them in the past. But in that past, problems were mainly those of production—of organizing the great resources of this country to meet people's material needs. Businessmen did a remarkable job in that field.

Today, of course, there are still problems of physical production. But by and large we can see ways to supply the goods that people need to live full and healthful lives. American business understands and practices the technique of large-scale production.

Now, however, we face problems that are more difficult than those of material output. They are more difficult because they are less tangible. These are the problems of distribution, of government, of security, of human relationships.

When the chief need of the American people was for material goods, certain individuals discovered means for meeting those needs, and they became the great businessmen of the country. Because they found ways to solve the problems of their day, they exercised leadership in their society. That leadership carried America far toward the goal of individual freedom and happiness.

If American businessmen are to continue to lead they must bring to the problems of today no less imagination, no less energy, no less ability than they have applied to the problems of production.

Essentials of leadership are awareness of the deep aspirations of people and ability to provide constructive suggestions as to how those aspirations may be realized. Leadership will not be granted to those who are content simply to point out the difficulties and flaws in the proposals of others. If today's managers of private enterprise are to justify their positions, they must conceive their duties in broader terms than simply the production of goods. They must have a sense of public responsibility; must see their function in society from a modern viewpoint, and must assume active roles.

It is not enough merely to adapt ourselves to changed conditions. We ourselves must help change conditions; we ourselves must find and show the way.

I do not want to convey any impression that I believe the responsibility is ours alone. What I am saying is that unless we bear our share of the load, the initiative will pass to others by default. Neither am I suggesting that today's complex economic problems do not at times require the help of government in their solution. But I am warning that when management, or labor, or local government, or any other group turn to Federal aid to solve problems they ought to be capable of solving themselves, they should realize that they generally will have to give something in return. If one asks, for example, that the police powers of the State be used for his benefit, he does not get the advantages of that power for nothing. He has to pay, and often pay double. He may, in fact, be endangering the very freedom which is one of the basic aspirations of all our people.

This is not because men in Government are hostile to the liberties of the people. The question is simply how far in such cases the power of government will be used to regulate, and to what degree such regulation may become permanent. It seems certain to me that the regulatory powers of government will be exercised to the extent that the private leaders of our country fail to accept and meet the responsibilities that society has entrusted to them. So-called government interference often is not really interference at all, but is induced by the inadequacy of those who normally are depended on to meet the need. If America has proper leadership, few situations will arise which will call for intervention by government in the private affairs of its citizens.

In the Declaration of Independence there is a phrase which states that governments derive "their just powers from the consent of the governed." Let me paraphrase that and say that, in a free society, leadership derives from the willingness of people to follow.

People will follow someone who tries to find answers to their deeply felt needs. They will desert leadership which ignores their needs or which is limited to criticizing proposed solutions without putting forward any alternatives.

As evidence of this we have only to consider the support that can be obtained for what are often called "crackpot ideas" when those ideas seem to offer solutions to problems which face large numbers of people. The Townsend plan is a good example. It won thousands of followers because it offered a scheme, however impossible of practical operation, for meeting the desire of people for economic security. It lost its force following the adoption of more practical measures which attained the same objective.

In this connection I might observe that "crackpot ideas" are symptoms which may deserve more respectful consideration than we usually give them. Their very existence may call attention to a problem. The more such schemes there are the more important the problem is likely to be. In the field of scientific invention, for example, the greatest number of novel ideas usually springs forth where there is most pressing demand for a new way to do things. Before Cyrus McCormick demonstrated his reaper in 1831 there were records of 1 German, 2 French, 22 American, and 33 English attempts to make a reaping machine. Many of those devices were no doubt completely impractical—"crackpot ideas"—and when McCormick found the right answer to the problem of easing the toil of gathering grain the earlier machines were discarded. But at least the inventors were trying—and they were making progress for all of us by that most basic device of the researcher—trial and error.

In general the great mass of a people have a pretty accurate sense of the important needs of their time. What are some of the needs which most concern the American public today?

Obviously, they want a plentiful supply of low-cost products and services. But they want more than that.

They want protection against threats to their living standards through sickness, accident, unemployment, and old age. They want the standards of their families protected against the death of the chief earner.

They want industry and labor to work together. They want small business and new business given every chance and encouragement.

They want leisure and the means to enjoy it healthfully. They want to raise their own living standards and to give their children opportunity for still higher ones. They want dignity, self-respect, and jobs in which they get credit for what they do.

These things must be provided not just here and there but on a large scale. I think the solutions to these problems can come largely from American businessmen.

In the first place, businessmen already occupy positions of leadership—positions achieved through the ways in which they met the demands of society when our problems were principally those of production. In attaining those positions, businessmen have accumulated valuable experience. They are accustomed to solving problems. They are used to getting things done. What is more, they have the will to find answers.

Look around you today. Already we can see that those who are assuming leadership in business recognize the important problems of our time and are moving toward their solution. Let me quote from a recent article by Russell Porter, of the New York Times, reporting his impression of American businessmen:

"A fundamental change has come over the American businessman since 1929. Elmer Gantry has gone and so has the stuffed shirt with a dollar sign on front. * * * The typical businessman and industrialist whom one meets when traveling around the country is a keen specialist in management, production, engineering, or one or other technical professions. * * * He wants sustained high levels of production and employment at good productive wages, in an atmosphere of industrial peace at home and world peace abroad * * * he takes a great deal of pride in the fact that the American system outproduced all the totalitarian regimes in the world combined during the war and considers it a matter of prestige as well as survival to do the same in time of peace. He is very conscious of the cause-and-effect relationship between depression, war and revolution and he is out to prove that the United States, with its free enterprise system, regulated of course for the public good and in the national interest, but not controlled by Government bureaucrats and secret police, can and will avoid the debacle suffered in other countries where the inefficiency of diluted brands of democracy has paved the way to power for reactionary elements; right in some cases, left in others."

The experience of the American businessman is a very valuable social asset. It is this experience which enables him to see the dangers in those "crackpot ideas" I have mentioned. It is important that such dangers be pointed out. But we should not stop with criticism. Showing up fallacies is a very important job, but when business stops there, it risks appearing negative or obstructive. Let us never be so intent on pointing out the 10 good reasons why something won't work that we give the impression we don't want it to work.

In criticizing, let us always remember that many innovations which at first appeared impractical later turned out to be of great benefit. Consider, for example, that in 1832 a Boston newspaper, discussing a proposal to shorten the customary working day from 14 to 10 hours, commented as follows:

"It strikes the very nerve of industry and good morals by dictating the hours of labor, abrogating the good old rules of our fathers and pointing out the most direct course to poverty; for to be idle several of the most useful hours of the morning and evening will surely lead to intemperance and ruin."

In addition to offering our sound appraisal of programs proposed by others, let us present our own plans for change of American life where there is greatest demand for progress.

If we are to exercise leadership, we cannot sit on the sidelines. We must examine trends and ideas, many of which are related only indirectly to our immediate business concerns. We should furnish ourselves with facts, not prejudices—form accurate opinions, make plans and expound them.

When we say that we have experience, we are saying that we have experimented, that we have tested and tried. The words "experience" and "experiment" come from the same root, meaning "to test", "to try."

American business won its position of leadership by its willingness to push out into uncharted territory, to measure with skilled judgment the risks connected with such enterprise, and to move ahead with daring and vigor.

Now, as never before, there are new trails to be blazed through the social-economic territories of the modern world—pathways to new and better forms of human achievement.

Let us lead the way!

I sincerely trust and hope that this company will always follow the ideals and principles as laid down by Mr. Gallagher.

The Battle for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 14 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on the topic, The Battle for Peace, delivered by me over the radio on the program Congress Speaks, on November 13, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am grateful to the Columbia Broadcasting Co. for this opportunity to address you on the program Congress Speaks.

I want to talk to you tonight about the future—our future and the future of our children. If we are to have a future as a Nation, even a future as individuals, if we are to keep the human race and the creatures of the earth alive much longer, there are some things to be done. We haven't much time in which to do them.

Twenty-seven years ago, America was delirious with joy. The war to end wars had been fought and won. The world had been saved for democracy. The boys were coming home. A defeated Germany, we were told, lay prostrate and gasping. There were plans then, fine, courageous, and practical plans, to make into reality the dream of enduring peace.

Those of you who learned about them only from history books no less than those who lived them as teen-agers or as adults know what happened in the days that followed. The plans were sabotaged and wrecked; the dream became a nightmare.

As soon as the frightful job of war was over in 1918, America washed its hands of world affairs and went in for having fun and making money. America was rich and powerful, who would dare bother us? Behind our false security and with our false prosperity, we had a crazy wonderful time. It was nice while it lasted, but it gave us an awful hangover.

Well, the shooting is over once again. We are at the threshold of another era. Other dreams. Where do we go from here?

There are some things in our favor this time which weren't there after 1918. With the end of the shooting that time, we quit. We'd done our part, we thought. Now it was up to those foreigners abroad to get together.

This time, however, I think every American realizes the war is not over, that only the worst phase of it, the horror phase, is over.

We know that we face now yet another battle, a bloodless but extraordinarily difficult battle, the battle for peace. We've got some good, but far from perfect, weapons to help us, such as the United Nations Organization and its agencies, UNRRA, and the Council of Foreign Ministers. We must make them work. We must strive with all our might against fear and want and intolerance here at home as well as overseas.

During the shooting war, during the battles for military victory, we never dared relax, we stifled our doubts, we lived and thought with the spur of our emotions. Victory was our only business. It was comparatively easy to formulate our national policies in those days. The test was simple: Would it shorten or prolong the war? Little else mattered.

The kind of battle we're fighting now requires something altogether different. This time, in the battle for peace, we must painstakingly think our way to victory. We must use our reason all the time and use it sometimes till our heads ache with the effort. We can't do our best thinking if we are suffering from the jitters. And, ladies and gentlemen, America has the jitters—bad.

We in America have decided we want no more wars. At this moment the whole world wants peace.

One problem is to make the desire permanent in nations where it might be temporary. We're working on that now. These nations are Germany and Japan. I trust we will never give up our control over them until their present peacefulness of expediency becomes one of conviction. That will take time and it will take occupation forces. Already many voices are urging us to pull up stakes in Europe and Asia.

With regard to the members of the United Nations, there is no need to convince one another that war is horrible and should be outlawed.

The other problem is to prove that war can be outlawed and that each nation is ready to do its part.

I don't have to dwell on how necessary it is for us to achieve that aim. Everybody knows by now what a couple of atoms can do when induced to explode.

So far there are no insurmountable obstacles in our path to peace. The obstacles which do stand in the way in the battle for peace are mental hazards, road blocks of the mind, buzzbombs of the intellect. We can have peace only if we think in terms of peace.

Well, mark you, ladies and gentlemen, the way a lot of people are thinking these days, World War III is inevitable.

They are thinking war.

It is not that they want war. It is that they expect war. They are speculating on who the future enemy will be. There is frenzied talk of preparations for war.

War with whom?

Let's look at it in another way. Suppose in some powerful foreign land, which had many powerful weapons of destruction, many people were daily speculating about the inevitability of war with America.

As lovers of peace, we wouldn't be pleased to hear about it. But because the talk was there to be heard, to be freely expressed and duly reported in their newspapers and in turn relayed to us by correspondents for our newspapers, we couldn't very well ignore the implications. There would be only one result.

We, peace-loving America, would get ready to fight. With Pearl Harbor in mind, we would be on the alert constantly for the signal to attack. If the situation persisted long enough it would become so intolerable that it is conceivable we, peace-loving America, might strike the first blow. In atomic warfare, the attack is the only defense we have yet discovered.

Were that to happen, peace-loving America would find itself literally talked—yes talked—into war.

Does anyone want that to happen?

Yet consider for a moment what is happening in America these days. Daily, in the Congress, in the newspapers, over the radio, in our meetings, on street corners, there are new expressions of fear of possible aggression from a particular source.

Sometimes the source is named, sometimes implied. Always, however, it is Russia.

The Russians don't want to fight us any more than we want to fight them. But the constant needling, the daily accusations, the scare stories, the expressions of fear and suspicions can have, if they are not already having, a tragic and disastrous effect.

No marriage of man and wife could stand up under such a steady barrage of recriminations and blame. How, then, could peoples of divergent interests, different languages, conflicting immediate goals and deep-seated and historic suspicions remain friendly for long under such conditions?

The answer is, They could not.

But the world's future requires that they must.

Instead of working in that direction, however, much of the effort in many quarters in many countries, including our own country, seems to be devoted to magnifying the differences, ballooning the fears, fanning the fires of suspicion—building little things into monsters of importance and nurturing them.

Of course we've got differences with Russia. We don't like some of the policies they espouse for eastern Europe; they don't seem to like those we propose instead. We don't like their political philosophy or their brand of democracy. We don't like their attacks upon religion. We don't like communism. In Japan we are far apart on a program for control and reconstruction.

As peoples we are comparative strangers. I feel if the Russian people were less a mystery to us the differences might be fewer. We msut not allow our differences to permit the world to drift into hostile camps and armed blocs. If it does war will be inevitable in another generation.

We must seek to find some common footings, to become better acquainted as peoples. All that will help. But we have to work at it.

We have differences with Great Britain, with France, with other nations. Does that mean we must prepare to fight them, too? Of course it doesn't.

Ladies and gentlemen, we must get over the jitters and do it soon.

Our mediums of information in this country are doing a generally thorough job. We are getting all the facts which can be gotten, and that is all to the good. But minor facts and major facts frequently are not clearly defined as such.

As a result, every instance of thoughtlessness, every omission, every misunderstanding, every disagreement, becomes a new crisis.

The result in America has been a disheartening retreat into isolationism. We are beginning to think too much and too often in terms of power, of our great military might, of the secret of atomic energy.

Haven't we learned power politics won't work? Haven't we found isolationism a prelude to disaster? The more we retreat into nationalism the more we inspire counterpart nationalisms elsewhere. They can't exist side by side for long without exploding.

I do not propose appeasement, surrender of principle, timidity, and national helplessness in our diplomatic dealings. But at the same time, I want to warn against complete dependence on the atomic bomb.

We can't hide behind it for long, any more than we were able to hide behind the oceans of the Atlantic and the Pacific. We can't keep the atomic secret for long and unless we win the battle for peace, the next war will be a push-button war. Cities, major cities, will be utterly destroyed in a matter of minutes.

Both policies are disastrous—appeasement or arrogance.

There is a middle ground.

Our Government is, I am convinced, trying to find that middle ground and follow it. There have been failures. Conferences have ended in stalemate. Well, then, we must have more conferences. Personalities have clashed. They must learn to get along on common ground. Russian statesmen have been unbending at times, and arrogant. The spirit of compromise has oftimes been missing from their agenda.

But agreements have been reached before on issues of transcendent importance and difficulty by the heads of states at the topmost level. They must continue to talk these problems out. The peoples of the world have a right to demand it.

In the meantime, of course, America must remain strong. Of course, we must retain a vigorous armed force. The aggressor nations we have just defeated recognize now, and unfortunately will recognize for many years to come only one restraint, and that is the restraint of force. We must help provide that force.

We must have a career army of men, devoted to democracy, who will represent us for years to come as the guardians of our victory over Germany and Japan.

Those same career peace-keepers must also be available to the forces of decency of the United Nations for the suppression anywhere in the world, of aggressive war.

And at home, we must keep our eyes peeled for the thoughtless, the selfish peace criminal who may rise in our own midst, who would beckon us again down the road to isolationism—and to the world's end.

As a great President whose life was sacrificed in this victory told us only a few short years ago:

"This generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny."

My fellow Americans, we have made the commitment at a thousand places all over the world—at Normandy—at Okinawa—at San Francisco—yes; we have made the commitment, and with God's help we must keep the date. We must win the final battle—the battle for peace.

Statement by Dr. H. C. Urey on May-Johnson Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, Dr. H. C. Urey, of Columbia University, member of the Uranium Section of the Natural Research Defense Committee, a recognized expert on atomic energy who played an important part in the development and production of the atomic bomb, met recently with a group of Congressmen to discuss pending legislation on atomic energy. At this meeting Dr. Urey made the following remarks:

As Dr. Szilard has pointed out to you, there are perhaps a variety of reasons why we should wish to develop the consciousness of atomic energy in this Nation. It may be we will need many bombs. We hope not, but perhaps that is possible. In the second place, we may wish to develop to the greatest extent the peacetime use of atomic energy. What I wish to say this afternoon deals with the possibility of getting an effective scientific organization in the United States for whatever purpose may be necessary in the future.

The remarks that you will hear expressed by the various scientists on this subject are conditioned by the fact that we have worked for a number of years under the Manhattan Engineering District of the United States Army Engineer Corps. The May-Johnson bill reads to many of us just like a continuation of the Manhattan District. We can find many analogies between the organization set-up in these bills and what did occur in the last few years under the Manhattan District Division of the Army. Now, the over-all problem of atomic energy is very interesting. It was really very exciting to work on the project that produced atomic bombs. There is much work in the future to be done that is also very interesting to a certain number of scientists, but by and large a great fraction of the work that we did on atomic bombs and will have to do in the future is scientific drudgery. I emphasize that because I think it is necessary, in drafting legislation, to realize that fact and not feel that it may be possible to get scientists and engineers working on this problem regardless of handicaps that may be set up. Take for example the problem of the production of atomic bombs. Oppenheimer, Fermi, Teller, Smythe, and Allison are all leaving this project and going to universities, and regardless of legislation will still leave and go.

Scientists are not generally interested in producing destructive weapons. Their work and interest lies on the side of positive results to their labors. Now the continued manufacture of atomic bombs along lines they are made at the present time is possible, but any new development on bombs will be difficult to secure. I believe that there is only one way that we can get a concentrated effort on the new development of atomic bombs, and that is for the United States to be approaching a state of war, in which case these scientists of the country will rally to the defense of this country as in the past. But if it appears that we are entering a period of peace, then the scientists will want to direct their efforts to that end. It takes top-flight scientists to make new developments for atomic bombs. The one thing that will be done is to develop fundamental science that underlies any such military preparation, providing the conditions are not made unfavorable.

Now the problem of peacetime development—a certain fraction of the work again is quite interesting, but a large fraction of it is no more interesting than the petroleum industry, or railroad, or making automobiles, or a large number of jobs of that kind. If we continue to put high barbed-wire fences around laboratories where men work and security regulations that go with such high barbed-wire fences, most of the scientists—the better ones—are going to find it desirable to accept positions with Standard Oil of New Jersey, or du Pont, or something else. It's just the idea that one type of employment looks more interesting than another. At the same time let us recognize that our large industrial companies are not greatly interested in this problem. They do not see anything to sell. You can sell plutonium to the United States Government, and that is all, and they do not know at what price the United States Government will buy plutonium if they make it. The problem of getting peacetime power is a very difficult one, indeed. I am not nearly so afraid of monopoly, as many other people are. My greatest fear is that there won't be much worth monopolizing by anybody. To get power out of uranium means that we must be able to utilize the heat that is generated. The problem of getting useful energy out of burning coal or getting it out of uranium fission results in much the same reaction and the same magnitude of problem. So in carrying forward such a large peacetime problem as the getting of energy out of uranium, it is necessary to have the help of our large industrial companies that have the requisite engineering experience to carry on such problems, and it does not really exist anywhere else.

I wish to mention with these preliminary remarks, a few things in the May-Johnson bill. The security threats—and I don't care much whether it is thousands or millions of dollars, the effect will be precisely the same. Why should one work under the possibility of disgrace, when all one has to do is to go somewhere else and do work of precisely the same kind, on another subject. There are only a few scientific people attracted to this because of the problem per se. Most of the people that must work on this will find their little corner of the job no more interesting than another job, and they don't see why they should spend their lives under threat of imprisonment and fine.

Now we have to remember that in trying to recruit men to work on the problem in peacetime, the endless rules and regulations of the Manhattan district frustrates scientific men more than anyone could possibly understand, unless you actually worked in the organization for some time. The prohibition that I cannot talk to my scientific colleagues on the subject of our work is trying. The danger of explosion in the diffusion plant, while I was directing research on the problem, that was one piece of information that was forbidden to me. The men were not allowed to talk to me about details of the possibility of explosion in that diffusion plant. My colleagues will give you endless examples of the same sort of thing. We are afraid the May-Johnson bill would make inevitable the continuance of these security regulations together with all its frustrations.

I mentioned the other night that scientists are like a great fleet of ships of many different sizes, and they should sail on the infinite sea of the unknown. The effect of these compartmental regulations is to scatter these ships in small inland lakes with no possibility of the exchange of information in a large way. Now it is all right to complain about these things, but it is not very constructive.

I wish to make a few suggestions in regard to what can be done in legislation to make the conditions what they should be in order to get the maximum effort on this problem. First, I do not believe there should be any security regulations whatever except in connection with the immediate military application. The structure of the bomb itself, details of the large production plants—these are things which are usually kept secret in the manufacture of munitions. All scientific information should have no curb on it whatever. Remember that is the way we worked before the war and it brought forward a great deal of trained scientists and a great deal of scientific information which could be applied to war problems in an emergency. Remember also that the scientists on the atomic bomb project brought this problem to the United States Government and imposed a secrecy on themselves before the Government did because they felt it

would be important for the war that was coming, and that it would be important for the defense of the United States, and their patriotism is a greater protection to the Government than any rules or regulations that can possibly be made. In order to bring individuals and industry into this problem there should be a minimum of regulation and control. I have a firm faith in the system of free enterprise.

Now, some of the things that need to be done. In the first place, there is the matter of hazards. Pilot plants and large-scale establishments looking toward production of bombs or production of power are dangerous. It is only right and proper that the Government should regulate any phase of this work with respect to actual hazards. Permission should be given by some Government authority before a large pile can be put up in any given community.

In the second place, we must be careful that fissionable material, such as uranium 235, plutonium, etc., are not diverted to improper uses, namely, making of explosives. We can imagine what would happen if we had a large number of plants in the country generating power and hundreds of the plants should be withdrawn and turned into the manufacture of bombs. We must be careful that does not happen. Control by the Commission along that line is virtually necessary.

In the third place, as long as the state of the world is what it is, we must expect there will be security regulations, but to the military applications only.

In the fourth place, since this has been developed by the people of the United States, we should try to prevent monopolies, but at the same time not prevent legitimate private enterprise and legitimate profit for work that is done by our industrialists themselves.

Some of the things I definitely think we should not do: In the first place, we should not attempt to control research at all. Research is a thing that withers under control. Neither I, my best scientific colleagues, nor anyone else that is acquainted with research activity would attempt in any way to say what shall or shall not be done in the field of research. I may think a given experiment is foolish. That opinion should have no value, because my young colleague may have a much better idea than I have. We should not try to control this research any more than you should try to control literature. Perhaps you have observed the effect of control on the literature of Russia. It runs down rather narrow lines. Control of any intellectual activity will prevent it from blossoming the way it should. We should not try to prevent private persons, universities, or industrial companies from doing research in any field of pure science.

I think with these remarks I have presented to you some of the problems that we have in inducing people and companies to work on this problem. I think it is vitally important that we stimulate as many people as possible to work on the problem with enthusiasm. The May-Johnson bill would greatly discourage such efforts because of its restrictive clauses.

Resettlement of Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, November 14 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able, instructive, and timely address delivered by the former Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau, Jr., at a dinner given in his honor on November 7 at the Hotel Astor in New York by B'nai B'rith.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A few months ago a wave of horror swept the civilized world. Photographs and moving pictures were released showing the manner in which Germany treated slave labor and persecuted prisoners. Everywhere men stood amazed, enraged, horrified. These are uncomfortable sentiments to hold, but it is important that we should remember them, for it is important that we should do something promptly about those victims of the bestial system which we have overthrown. The horrors that those pictures made known to the world confirmed what we at the War Refugee Board had long known about the tragedy of those who were in Germany's power.

Many of those emaciated walking skeletons who roused our pity are still in Germany. They are the men, women, and children who bore the brunt of Nazi terror and survived. For as much as 6 years they went through more than the torments of death for the same cause for which we in this country were fighting.

They are dying by the hundreds. Before midwinter, they will be dying by the thousands, unless our efforts on their behalf are multiplied many times over. While we have been enjoying this excellent dinner, with nothing more serious in our own lives to fret about than when we are going to get a new car, a new refrigerator, or a new pair of nylons, men have been dying of starvation and exposure. I am informed that this death rate among the displaced is so high that between now and this time tomorrow night, 50 of them will have died. And the next night, and the next.

In the cold-blooded language of diplomacy these people today are "displaced persons," and are the subject of notes, memoranda, orders and agreements, couched in the necessarily chilly prose of official documents.

"Displaced persons" is a pitifully inadequate phrase to describe this multitude of misery. They have witnessed the murder of their kinsmen and friends. They have been beaten and starved. They have been driven mercilessly at forced labor. They have been penned up amid indescribable filth. But it is hardly necessary to attempt a description of what these people have suffered. You and I know the story all too well. It has been a goad to our consciences, and I daresay that most of you have spent sleepless nights worrying over the tragedy of displaced persons, as I know I have, and as I am sure Franklin Roosevelt did and President Truman does.

When Germany collapsed there were 8,000,000 of these displaced persons in that country. By dint of really herculean efforts, the Allies have repatriated about 6,000,000 of them. Our pride in that accomplishment, our relief in delivering these millions out of bondage, cannot obscure the fact that almost 2,000,000 more human beings in Germany alone must look to the United Nations for life and hope. Furthermore, these constitute the most difficult group among all the displaced persons. They are the ones who are too weak to be moved. They are the ones who have no homes and no countries to which they can return. They are the hopelessly lost human debris of war. Surely, nothing that we can do to restore these derelicts to normal life can be too much trouble or too great an expense. This is a work that cannot be translated into dollars, for who is to say what a man is worth?

It seems clear to me that this work is one of the prime responsibilities of the United Nations. We all fought to liberate these people, and we have a duty to them and to ourselves. This is nothing less than the reestablishment of the displaced people in the common task of building a decent world.

This would be the true spirit of reconstruction. It is the spirit in which Franklin Roosevelt set his name to the Atlantic Charter and laid the basis for the United Nations Organization. It rests with us to carry out the obligation to make the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations Organization into an active force for peace and justice, not just another couple of scraps of paper.

I have been profoundly disturbed, as I know you have, to realize that our responsibility has not been discharged any too well. The Harrison report, with its evidence that the lot of displaced persons had been little improved since liberation from Nazi rule, was a shock, but a wholesome shock. President Truman promptly forwarded a copy to General Eisenhower with strongly worded instructions to remedy the situation. The general undertook personal inspection tours, and within a few weeks reported to the President that conditions had been materially improved. We can hope that the improvement will continue.

But that is not the end of the problem. There remains the question of what to do with these people beyond the immediate task of feeding, clothing, and sheltering them. So far, the burden has fallen upon the Army, aided by 300 to 400 UNRRA teams operating in Germany. Eventually the whole problem of the displaced will have to be shouldered by UNRRA, in Germany as well as elsewhere.

In recent weeks we have heard a great deal of criticism of UNRRA. No doubt some of it was justified. But a great deal of it was based on a misunderstanding of the limitations imposed by UNRRA's Constitution. It cannot work in such countries as France and Holland, which pay their own way. It cannot make distribution to individuals but only to the governments with which it has entered into agreements.

But under the magnificent leadership of Gov. Herbert Lehman, UNRRA has gone far to overcome the handicaps of the difficulties it had to face and the lack of appropriations. No one could have done more than Governor Lehman, I know no one who could have done as much.

UNRRA has suffered, no doubt, from an inability to get field people of the highest type and capacity. And its avowed objective is to care for only 10 percent of the many millions in need of its services.

It is easy to criticize shortcomings in a task of such magnitude. But it is plain that our choice is not between UNRRA and something better. Our choice is between UNRRA and nothing. That was recognized by the responsible leaders of both parties in Congress during the debate on granting UNRRA the rest of our first installment on our commitment to the organization.

It is almost unbelievable that the balance still due on our first installment is $550,000,000. It was solemnly pledged by our Government in an act of Congress passed more than a year and a half ago—on March 28, 1944. The total United States contribution—the same as that of every country—was 1 percent of the national income. After a year and a half, the balance of that appropriation has still to pass the Senate. The commitment has been fulfilled by the House of Representatives, although tardily, somewhat grudgingly, and with imperfect understanding of what it was doing. In fixing conditions under which the American share of the funds must be spent, the House has failed to grasp the fact that it was not appropriating for an agency of the United States Government, but for an organization set up by 44 sovereign countries. UNRRA represents one of the first efforts of the United Nations to carry out a common peacetime task. For one nation's legislature to

attempt to govern it even in the most laudable of aims is to disavow the principle of international cooperation.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will promptly recognize the responsibility of America to take the lead in genuine collaboration if the nations of the world are to work together as partners.

I am sure that all of us here tonight are disturbed and uneasy over the lag in meeting our commitments. The need is so urgent, the case of millions of human beings so desperate, that it comes as a painful shock to learn that while our own Congress debates an appropriation pledged a year and a half ago, other nations have appropriated their share of UNRRA's expenses for next year. Instead of being the straggler in the parade, we ought to be up front, leading it.

The fate of the displaced persons in Germany and all the rest of Europe, or at least those sections of Europe where UNRRA can operate, rests upon our action. No one knows very accurately how many of them there are. Those who are actually in assembly centers can be counted. Thus we know that there are 1,300,000 in the assembly centers in Germany alone. But tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands more are scattered through a dozen countries or more. Fifteen thousand have recently wandered from Austria and Czechoslovakia to Italy. Thousands of others have taken to the roads, hopelessly seeking shelter or a bit of bread. Other thousands are in hiding, fearing to return to their native lands.

All these people present many and special problems. But there is one group set apart from the rest by its sufferings and its fears. The remnants of Europe's Jews are a small minority of the displaced persons, but they are the most difficult to resettle.

The total Jewish population of Europe outside Russia is now estimated at about 1,333,000. Of these, only about 100,000 are believed to have survived in Germany and Austria. Virtually all of them have passed through the inhuman tortures of the labor camp and the concentration camp.

By the very nature of the Nazi, these 100,000 German and Austrian Jews are the ones whose sufferings stood out even among the general misery of the displaced. Few of them have any homes to which they can return. And yet they, like most of their comrades in despair, are singularly in need of aid that will go beyond the mere handing out of a few bits of clothing, a minimum relief diet, and medical care. Spiritual and economic rehabilitation are equally essential. For years these people have lived abnormal lives. They have been deprived of any trace of the amenities of family, community, and religious life. They have been thoroughly brutalized and regimented by the Nazis. Our obligation does not stop with feeding and clothing them. We must provide the understanding, tact, and social wisdom that will permit these victims of war to enter a new environment as fit members of society.

I am convinced that there is only one solution for the homeless, stateless Jews—the immediate admission of at least 100,000 to Palestine. For Palestine is the one refuge where they could be assured of achieving at once the status of welcome and respected citizens.

This solution is by no means a new thought. It is the one ardently desired by a great many of the displaced Jews themselves, as all competent observers have noted. Earl Harrison, in his report to the President, said:

"For some of the European Jews there is no acceptable or decent solution for their future other than Palestine."

Harvey Gibson, of the American Red Cross, who made a tour of the displaced-persons camps at General Eisenhower's invitation, says that 95 percent of the Jewish refugees in Europe want to emigrate to Palestine.

This was the thought, too, behind President Truman's request to Prime Minister Attlee that 100,000 Jews be admitted to Palestine. I sincerely hope that President Truman will renew his request during Mr. Attlee's visit to this country. Mr. Truman expressed the same thought in a letter to General Eisenhower: "I am communicating directly with the British Government in an effort to have the doors of Palestine opened to such of these displaced persons as wish to go there."

That was a thoroughly statesmanlike and a thoroughly humanitarian appeal. It should be put into effect by application of an old and cherished American principle—the right of self-determination. The displaced Jews of Europe should have the right to decide whether they wish to remain as citizens of the countries in which they have lived or decide whether they want to go to Palestine.

The 100,000 whose need is most urgent and who have expressed a desire to emigrate, should be admitted without delay.

But the problem of the displaced Jew is not the sole concern of any single nation, nor of any small group of nations. It is the responsibility of all the peoples who fought fascism and won a new opportunity for democracy.

Therefore the whole question of the future of Palestine should be placed under the auspices of the United Nations Organization. This was the kind of procedure most people had in mind when they acclaimed the result of the San Francisco Conference as a long step toward peace. We felt that at last we had an organization big enough to do the really big jobs.

If we are to tread the paths of peace, we must get used to working with the machinery of peace. Such a resettlement as I have proposed, such a use of the right of self-determination, can only be achieved by the joint determination and common efforts of all free peoples. A world problem must have behind its solution the force of a world authority. Only so can we achieve the goal of justice and freedom for which we have fought and for which we know in our hearts we must continue to fight, replacing the weapons of war with the weapons of peace.

Armistice Day Address by Edward M. Scheiberling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 14 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered on Armistice Day, November 11, by Hon. Edward M. Scheiberling, national commander of the American Legion, at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, Arlington National Cemetery.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We mark the twenty-seventh anniversary of a day of jubilance: When millions of men laid down their arms, when a vast campaign of death and blood letting was over, when a whole world looked forward to an everlasting peace, when all mankind lifted eyes to Heaven and thanked God that war had ended.

Yet while we gather here today in the awesome presence of a soul whose worldly name is known only to our Divine Father we are again drawing the curtain on another and more terrible conflict than any which the world has known before.

That November eleventh of 1918—that day of jubilance and the hope that it raised in human hearts have been proved by subsequent years to have been but empty myths.

We named that day Armistice Day and it is Armistice Day as we know it now.

It is a tragically suitable, appropriate name, for it marked the making of a truce and not the birth of peace. It was merely the beginning of a pause between conflicts.

And so I say to you here, in the presence of the soul that is the symbol of priceless sacrifices, that we as a nation and we as individuals have the burden of appalling responsibilities upon us. None of us dares shed those responsibilities. No loyal American will shirk them.

Foremost of those responsibilities is wholehearted and unselfish support of American policies—both foreign and domestic—which will most contribute to the peace of the world.

Second is establishment of the means by which those policies can be carried out.

The time in which we live and the years before us are such that the United States can never again safely isolate itself from the rest of the world. Our standards of living rest upon foundations implanted every place the world around. There were practical examples of it in the war just past when our Government was forced to resort to rationing of the most basic necessities of life as well as the items of pleasure and luxury.

What we experienced in America was multiplied a thousand, perhaps 10,000, times among other peoples in other lands who turn to us with lifted eyes and outstretched arms, imploring us in the name of Christian principle to assume our responsibility for the preservation of world peace.

Look where you will in the world, no other nation nor any combination of nations is ready to assume that responsibility. Perhaps we may soon have all of the appropriate machinery to carry out the purposes for which two World Wars were fought, but meanwhile the burden is ours. The world knows that. We ought to know it, for our freedom is a thing that knows no boundaries.

Moreover, our duty is fixed upon us by the preamble of our own Constitution, which plainly states that among the purposes of our Government are the "promotion of the general welfare and the securing of the blessing of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

Row upon row of white crosses in Normandy, Italy, Okinawa, and Guadalcanal are mute testimony to how close we came to losing that we are charged as individual citizens with protecting.

What means, then, must we adopt to insure our own security and to assure the world that the United States has grown to that mature stature which makes it capable of acting in the interests of world peace?

There is but one answer. We must keep ourselves strong so that no future Hitler, no future Mussolini or Hirohito will dare to challenge us. We cannot do that painlessly. We must give of our time and our pleasure. We must reach into our pockets for a money contribution in the form of taxes.

Our Navy must be large enough, strong enough, and modern enough to maintain the freedom of the seas. Our Army must be similarly strong. Our citizenry must be prepared both militarily and industrially.

To make the citizenry ready we must have men and women trained in industrial and military ways.

The American Legion, of which I have the honor to be the national commander, has fought for 25 years to establish a plan of universal military training.

A contribution of only a few months, at the most a year of time, by the youth of our country for universal military training would be a small price to pay for our future security. There would be ample time left

for industrial, scientific, and professional training.

Unless we are willing to accept these responsibilities, to face them courageously, and to assure nations both large and small that out of an armistice America will forge a peace, then we shall not have performed our duties to God and country and the thousands whose names are emblazoned in the history of our wars will have died in vain.

Minimum Wage Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 14 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding Senate bill 1349, the minimum-wage bill, made by me before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor on October 16, 1945.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I should like to urge that the bill before this committee, S. 1349, be given favorable consideration and that it be reported out of committee in its present form as soon as possible. By increasing the present minimum wage rate to 65 cents and by extending coverage to maritime and agricultural processing workers who are not now affected by minimum wage legislation, this bill goes a long way toward the recognition of the doctrine set forth in 1906 by the recently deceased Msgr. John A. Ryan. In his book, the Living Wage, Monsignor Ryan states: "The laborer's right to a living wage is as valid as his right to life; the difference is merely in degree of importance. The State is morally bound to compel employers to pay a living wage whenever and wherever it can, with a moderate degree of success, put into effect the appropriate legislation."

The enactment of S. 1349 is a step that is long overdue; furthermore failure to enact this bill will seriously affect the smooth operation of our economy. Since 1938 when the Fair Labor Standards Act went into effect the cost of living increased approximately one-third, causing the present statutory rate of 40 cents per hour (which, even in 1938, according to budget estimates, failed to provide adequate subsistence) to trail far behind the living-wage rate and the wage rate now being paid the majority of the workers. In the words of President Truman, the Fair Labor Standards Act, in its present form, has become "obsolete." The proposed 65-cent minimum which would be put into effect under this legislation and the 75-cent rate which would become effective 2 years hence would yield, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, an estimated $1,300 and $1,500 per year, respectively, provided continuous and regular employement were available to the worker. This is barely the minimum cost of an adequate family budget at the present time. Furthermore, it is the rate that is now in effect among 80 percent of all factory workers.

In the State of Pennsylvania, where most of the major industries are already paying high wages, particularly the basic steel industry and nearly all branches of the metal-working industries, there are still a number of industries such as textile and apparel, tobacco, fertilizer, stone and clay products, and leather products where the workers receive less than 65 cents. The Food, Tobacco, Agricultural and Allied Workers Union of America has estimated that 11,250 cigar workers in Pennsylvania receive less than 65 cents per hour, and a considerable number of the 5,000 cannery workers in the State are paid under the 65-cent rate. While no exact figures are available on the rates paid textile and lumber workers, it has been generally revealed that large numbers of the approximately 180,000 Pennsylvania textile workers and a considerable number of workers in the manufacture of pulpwood products receive less than 65 cents. The United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America estimate that of their 150,000 members about 10 percent are paid below the 65-cent minimum. Of those plants that are not unionized the percentage is as high as 30 percent. It should also be noted that women workers in this industry bear the brunt of the low wage rates.

I should like at this time to read you a portion of a letter from Mr. Batz, president of the American Federation of Hosiery Workers, Branch No. 10, who in his own words tells what this legislation will mean to the hosiery workers:

"DEAR SIR: On behalf of the thousands of hosiery workers who are members of Branch No. 10, American Federation of Hosiery Workers, Reading, Pa., I am calling your attention to the Pepper minimum wage bill, H. R. 3914 and S. 1349, which will provide an immediate minimum wage of 65 cents per hour and increase minimum wages to 70 cents per hour during the second year and 75 cents per hour following the second year.

"We hear much talk about full employment. However, full employment at substandard wages can only become a disguise for human exploitation. A nation whose workers are paid so little that they cannot purchase the goods and services they produce can never be a fully employed nation. Workers must be able to earn enough money to maintain their health and welfare in order to live a truly democratic life in this great democracy of ours.

"Let us hope that victory has not been in vain by forgetting our own people who have done so much to preserve a real honest-to-goodness democratic nation. I trust you can realize how important this 65-cent minimum wage is to our people and what it means, not only to them but to the whole Nation.

"Sincerely yours,

"JAMES W. BATZ."

The benefits of a living wage are confined not merely to the substandard worker. Its advantages extend to every class of worker and every type of employer. Increased wages among the lowest paid workers means an immediate expenditure for goods and services and this will tend to support a high level of production and full employment. Furthermore, low wage rates tend to depress high wage rates in the same area and in neighboring areas.

The protests from employers who claim they will have to go out of business should 65 cents become the minimum wage rate do not seem to have much justification. Most employees of major manufacturing industry groups already receive 65 cents per hour. Only 330,000 employees in manufacturing industries receive less than 50 cents. Even among those industries that pay a substantial proportion of their workers less than 65 cents an hour many of the workers receive almost as much as 65 cents. Thus, the increase in pay rolls that would be required to raise all these workers to the 65-cent minimum would be relatively small. In only three industry groups would pay rolls be increased by more than 5 percent: tobacco, 11 percent; basic lumber and timber products, 9 percent; and textiles, 6 percent. Wage payments in these three industries typically constitute only about one-quarter of the value of the product and considerably less than this—about 6 percent—in the tobacco industry.

When the 40-cent minimum was proposed, examples were cited of establishments that would have to go out of business, resulting in serious unemployment. Actually there does not appear to have been any serious result of this kind.

There are inefficient producers in practically all industries, and firms are constantly failing with or without a minimum wage. It is not surprising that some of these firms blame their failure on the minimum wage, others on Government interference. But it will usually be found that competitors of these firms in the same communities continue to operate and make money apparently unaffected by the minimum wage. The truth of the matter is that some producers are so inefficient that they cannot stay in business without being subsidized from the wages of their own workers. The minimum wage is particularly designed to put an end to such practices.

It will be found that most employers will pay the minimum wage because it protects them from unfair competition. Mr. Baer, manufacturer of silk and rayon throwsters, supports the 65 cent minimum for this reason. In a letter to me he writes:

"The Baer Co. has been in the business for 50 years and we consider that minimum wages are absolutely an essential thing if utter chaos is to be averted. We have seen the times when through competition we have been forced to bring wages to an absolutely ridiculous figure and we feel that if we, as well as our competitors, have an irreducible minimum it will endow to the advantage of not only our labor and ourselves but also to the industry as a whole. We likewise believe that the small added expense that would have to be made and the price of the finished product would be that small that it would not harm the sales of the products representing these minimum wage structures. We have seen a lot of economic experiments in America—some have been good and some have been bad. However, this is to be expected. We feel that adequate wages and just minimum hours are things that should remain and stay with the textile industry.

"Bear in mind that textiles in America create a large employment pool and if our people can be given fair wages it must follow the collective purchasing power. This would be a very sizable sum. We therefore, ask you to use your good influence in seeing that this textile field receives and gets a fair minimum wage and that same shall be retained regardless of peacetime conditions. The opposite of any other action but this means a chaotic labor market with wages of 15 to 20 cents per hour. It will likewise mean labor disturbances, uncalled-for union action, and so forth. The writer has gone to business school and knows there is something like the law of supply and demand. But at the same time can see no reason why this law can't operate at a fair livable minimum wage as well as an unfair, unlivable, unjustifiable starvation condition. We likewise, feel that if all our competitors are made to pay the same irreducible minimum it would put none of us in an unfair competitive position."

It should not be overlooked that the minimum wage stimulates improved organization and the introduction of efficient equipment and methods. Often the savings resulting from these improvements more than offset the cost of the higher wage. In a study of the seamless hosiery industry, after the enactment of the FLSA in 1938, it appeared

that about 10 percent of the establishments in the industry were faced with serious operating difficulties. On the other hand there were instances where an adaptation of the machinery permitted so great an increase in the productivity of labor that labor costs were lower after the 25-cent-minimum wage became effective than they had been before.

I am confident that just as occurred with the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Act in 1938, enactment of the 65-cent-minimum hourly wage, and increasing this minimum to 75 cents in 2 years (which sum is barely adequate to provide minimum subsistence) will greatly benefit industry and labor. Furthermore these benefits will far outweigh any resulting hardship to individually isolated plants.

Tribute to Mountains by Jane Marie Surface

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 14 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the Congressional RECORD an article entitled "I Love Mountains." This article was printed in the November 11 issue of the Washington Sunday Star as a prize contribution. It was written by a young lady 15 years of age, Jane Marie Surface, who is a student at the Western High School in the District of Columbia. Its beauty of thought has appealed to me, and I desire to take notice of it in this manner. I congratulate the very capable young lady for this beautifully expressed tribute to mountains, which I, too, sincerely love. I think her expression that they are "symbolic of high ambitions" is quite worthy of sincere meditation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I LOVE MOUNTAINS

(Prize contribution by Jane Marie Surface, 15, Western High School)

To me, mountains are the most majestic form of beauty in the whole wide world. They tower so high into the sky, and some are so very tall that I think if you could ever reach the top you would truly be at the very gate of heaven.

My love for the mountains is, perhaps, very natural, for I have taken many trips through them. When I am there, I have a feeling of such deep peace, it seems to me that if anything were coming my way which would cause sorrow or grief, the mountains would shut it off and it wouldn't reach me.

A place surrounded by high, beautiful mountains is a place I should call a realm of everlasting happiness.

Yes, I know many of you must feel as I do. I hope so, for it is a feeling of wondrous joy. Love of the mountains is love of all good things. They symbolize to me high ambitions, ambitions of only honor and achievement; and so, if you strive high, high as the tallest mountain, your reward can only be one of the highest success, greatest joy, and eternal happiness.

Labor Unions and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 14 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials published in the Fairmont Times. The first is entitled "Labor Unions and Politics," and it was published in the October 23 issue of the Times. The second, entitled "Political Education," was published in the October 13 issue.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times of October 23, 1945]

LABOR UNIONS AND POLITICS

We have just read an account in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of an interesting discussion of the part taken in politics by the labor unions with particular reference to the activities of the Political Action Committee.

A distinguished Senator states that it is apparent that the political high-pressure drive which was organized by labor dictators in 1944 was a mild effort compared to the onslaught which these dictators are preparing for the 1946 and 1948 elections. It is asserted that these labor leaders aim at a power which will enable them to pull the strings and make puppet legislators jump. We infer from this debate that union labor when it engages in political activity becomes communistic. We also note that such participation is antagonistic to our constitutional form of government.

The Political Action Committee distributed 100,000,000 pieces of literature in the last elections. According to our alarmists this is leading our Nation straight toward a totalitarian form of government. This movement is all the more meanacing because the unions have a reserve of $160,000,000 in their treasuries.

It would be very disturbing if the political activities of the unions were unusual or subversive. We make no defense for the mistakes or blunders of labor leaders. If they are fighting to elect legislators who are favorable to their cause, they are doing nothing more than is being done by other groups. The Senator who made all the above charges against the political activities of the labor unions says he is not the servant of any one group or interest and yet if the National Dairy Association should find its interests jeopardized by the development and improvement of oleomargarine to compete with butter, he would be the first to hop if not jump to its protection.

This leads to the observation that people who live in glass houses should not be hurling stones.

The United States Chamber of Commerce owns and occupies a palatial marble building in Washington. It is not unfair to say that it maintains its organization in the Capital of the Nation for one purpose, and one only, and that is to promote Federal legislation in its interest, and to fight all measures that do not meet its approval.

The manufacturing association has an organization of national scope which does not hesitate to take part in politics, and to elect candidates that it considers safe, and to defeat those considered inimical to its interests.

Even the American Bankers Association has not been averse to promoting or opposing political movement.

With reference to campaign expenditures we would surmise from what we have heard and know that the big interests have spent thousands where the labor unions have spent hundreds. The offense of the unions seems to be in getting out the vote. Special interests are best served by restrictions on suffrage. Our form of government will not be ruined when 90 percent of the qualified voters go to the polls. This will do much to eliminate the legislative puppets of special groups and interests.

We like the idea of the league for political education. Back of the conflict between ambitious labor leaders and captains of industry is the movement of great social and economic forces. In spite of themselves men are swept forward by those forces. We refuse to accept the philosophy that men are traveling the road to serfdom. We are less than a hundred years from human slavery, and we will not be satisfied until man is entirely free.

We may concede that labor leaders are often narrow in their thinking and selfish in their actions, that the managers of industry in many instances have been short-sighted and stupid, and that big business at times seems more concerned about property than about the welfare of human beings. After making such concessions however we still have faith to believe that the great majority of men are at heart humanitarians and not selfish brutes. We are a long way from practicing the principles of the Golden Rule but we are more and more realizing that our own well-being is wrapped up in that of others.

Anyhow we are not disturbed or frightened by the efforts of the Political Action Committee, nor by the activities of all the other leagues and groups that are carrying on programs of political education It may annoy the undercover politicians, but it will be wholesome for our representative form of government.

[From the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times of October 13, 1945]

POLITICAL EDUCATION

We noticed in the papers that a committee of the United States Senate is engaged in a controversy over the confirmation of the appointment to Federal office of a man who worked for the Political Action Committee in the campaign last year. The ostensible reason given by the opposition is that he was allied with one particular labor organization and that his appointment would not be acceptable to other organizations. The real reason, of course, is resentment towards the Political Action Committee for its activities in the campaign.

In this connection it might be well to discuss the program of that committee and other movements for the instruction of voters. There has been a widespread movement for the study of legislative procedures in recent years.

The League of Women Voters has pioneered in this type of work and other organizations have carried on similar programs. The Political Action Committee aroused criticisms and opposition because it aimed at the reelection of President Roosevelt.

The opposition to its purposes did not invalidate the value and importance of the work which the committee did. Its main objective was to get voters registered and qualified to vote and then to prevail upon them to go to the polls.

For years a large segment of our citizens never took the bother to register or vote. They had not been made to realize their stake in government and the steps which they must take to promote and protect their interests.

Political candidates are disturbed and apprehensive when a large proportion of the voters goes to the polls. For illustration, the Republicans felt their chances for winning in 1944 would be greater if there was a small turnout of voters.

Limitation on the number of voters in certain southern States gives a tremendous advantage to candiates who want to continue in office. The poll tax is manipulated so as to keep the majority of citizens from voting. It it easier to handle a small minority of the voters than it is to secure the support of a substantial majority.

There has been a growing interest in recent years in legislation and the actions of public officials. Labor organizations, educational associations and many other groups keep a close tab on the record of their Representatives. Members of Congress and the legislature sometimes attempt to confuse their constituents by subterfuges in defeating desirable legislation. Owing to wider knowlege of such matters this becomes increasingly difficult. The legislator who tries to serve special and selfish interests while pretending to be devoted to the general welfare cannot dodge his record.

A favorable plan for killing legislation for which a Member of Congress does not want to be responsible on the record is found in the congressional committee where many bills are strangled or defeated. There has been a movement recently to require a record of the voting in committees. The House and the Senate may avoid the record by a voice vote or by standing for the count.

Both in Congress and in the legislature the dodging of votes on a question on which the Member does not want to take a positive position has become an art. Often, when there is no other way to evade the issue, the Member may be unavoidably absent. There are many members of our legislative bodies whose position on matters of legislation is never uncertain. They are definitely classified with some group or school of thought.

We hold to the theory that the best cure for the evils of democracy is more democracy.

When a majority of our citizens have an intelligent understanding of representative government and are able to evaluate the services of their lawmakers and public officials, we will have more efficiency and honesty in public life.

It may disturb Members of Congress and the legislature for the labor organizations and other associations and groups to have active legislative committees to check on their record but, in our opinion, such activities make for better government.

Representatives go wrong when they seek the promotion of their individual and personal interests instead of the welfare of the State and the Nation. It is a hopeful sign that more of our citizens are voting and that many more are learning what government means to them.

Relation of Wages and Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 14 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Drop Anchor, but Full Speed Ahead," published in a recent issue of the Philadelphia Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DROP ANCHOR, BUT FULL SPEED AHEAD

"Drop anchor and full speed ahead."

The skipper who gave that order would be guilty of no more absurd contradiction than the administration when it says: "Hold prices; raise wages."

Of course, President Truman faces a dilemma.

If, in order to control prices, he freezes wages, we face an epidemic of strikes which may well force us into a postwar deflation.

If he takes the ceiling off prices to raise wages, he faces the danger of inflation.

President Truman tried to solve this dilemma in his speech of October 30 when he said:

"After a reasonable test period which, save in exceptional cases, will be 6 months, if the industry has been unable to produce at a fair profit, the entire wage increase will be taken into account in passing upon applications for price ceiling increases."

But this is obviously an unrealistic and inadequate solution. Industrialists will not and cannot spend millions in big production on the chance that 6 months from now they may or may not be able to persuade OPA to grant higher prices.

A big factory is not going to grant higher wages and spend millions for material and machinery when its accountants report that the greater its production, the more money it will lose.

Of course, there are some industries which could grant higher wages without raising prices. But it would take months, if not years, to settle such controversies throughout the United States.

If the administration had no better solution than this to the wage and price problem, it should never have called the labor-management conference. To allow the conference to evade the main issue and bog down in a morass of empty words will do more harm than good.

The Record believes there is a sure, adequate, and fool-proof solution to the dilemma. It could be enacted immediately as an addition to the new 1946 tax law. Here it is:

Allow business to raise prices on condition that thereby it subjects itself to the excess-profits tax.

This will produce the following results:

1. Business would only raise prices when absolutely necessary in order to meet increased wages and other costs. Business would raise prices only so much as was absolutely necessary to maintain normal profits, since practically all of any additional profits would be taken away from it in taxes.

2. Any inflationary effect of increased prices would be counteracted by increased taxation which would allow Government to reduce the national debt and thereby the excess of credit dollars.

3. Labor and management would be free to carry out collective bargaining on a sane basis. Whether management could grant labor's demand for the same take-home pay in peacetime as in war would depend upon whether the particular business could meet competition and upon whether the public would be willing to pay a higher price for the product.

The Record believes that the majority of labor leaders are intelligent enough to realize that these factors are as important to the members of the union as to the owners of the business.

Is labor's demand for the same take-home pay in peace as in war unreasonable?

Most of the criticism comes from men whose incomes are well up in five figures. A few dollars a week more or less doesn't seem very important to them.

But take the case of the man supporting a wife and two children, earning 80 cents per hour. He has been working 48 hours and has been paid for 52 hours, or $41.60 per week, less 80 cents withholding tax. He has taken home $40.80 per week.

Now he is working 40 hours for $32, less 70 cents withholding tax, or $31.30 per week. The $9.50 reduction, 23 percent of the wage to which he has become accustomed, may well be the difference between comfort and penury.

Perhaps it is impossible to grant everyone the same take-home pay as he had before. But we can't blame labor for asking for it, and management should strive to come as close to that figure as is possible.

Tomb of the Unknown Warriors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 14 (legislative day Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have before me an editorial entitled "Tomb of the Unknown Warriors," from the Detroit Times for Monday, November 12, 1945. It also appears in the other Hearst newspapers. I consider it very timely, and for that reason I ask to have it printed in the RECORD for the benefit of the Senate and others who read the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOMB OF THE UNKNOWN WARRIORS

The Tomb of the Unknown Soldier is our national memorial to our American dead of World War I.

It is time now to consider a memorial as beautiful and as inspiring to our nearly 300,000 dead in the war recently ended.

The white marble Tomb of the Unknown Soldier stands silhouetted above the trees in our National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., bearing the simple inscription: "Here rests in honored glory an American soldier known but to God."

None but God knew the identity, the race, the religion of this soldier brought home from France a quarter century ago to "rest in honored glory"—a symbol of all who gave their lives for our country. As he became a symbol so did his tomb become a shrine, and there over the years America has paid tribute and the families of our hero dead have found consolation in prayer.

A new memorial is in order, and it is appropriate to bring home for similar tribute two of our unidentified dead of World War II—one from the Pacific war and one from the Atlantic theater. For these were in reality two wars, each more terrible than any in history and one fought beyond the span of the other.

We believe the men who fought on these two battle fronts and the families of the men who died on these battle fronts will wish this distinction made.

It would also seem appropriate to erect the Tomb of the Unknown Warriors rather than another Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. In this way all branches of our armed services will be symbolized. For our dead of these latest conflicts, sleeping now in the far lands and the alien seas, were members of all branches—Army, Navy, Marines, Coast Guard, and the Air Corps of each service—warriors all.

The Atomic Jag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. REED OF New York. Mr. Speaker, a heated and continuous discussion of the atomic bomb is furnishing a convenient smoke screen to hide the utter failure of the domestic and the foreign policy of the New Deal. Hysteria is the stock in trade of the administration.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an article entitled "The Atomic Jag," by Milton Mayer, which appeared in the Progressive, Madison, Wis., Monday, November 12, 1945, as follows:

THE ATOMIC JAG

(By Milton Mayer)

The brave new world is upon us—if only we can control the atomic bomb.

The kingdom of heaven is here—if only we can control the atomic bomb.

The shoeless are shod, the hungry are fed, the homeless are housed—if only we can control the atomic bomb.

The slaves are freed, the lowly are risen, the dawn is here, and our troubles are over—

If only we can control the atomic bomb.

And even if we can't control it, we can still run away from it. The discussion of what to do with our shattered civilization has sunk so low that eminent social scientists can participate in it. One says to decentralize our cities—as if the shotgun principle, devised to frustrate the decentralization of quail, would not be applied to the bomb. Another says to go underground—as if mankind had struggled up from the cave, only to go back to it in the end. If we can't control it, we can still run away from it, and the brave new world will be here.

Of course, there's still China, ablaze between two nonatomic totalitarianisms. And the Baltic and Balkan and half the Korean and German people transferred from a variety of slaveries to the nonatomic slavery of Stalinism or western power politics. And the nonatomic British shooting the Dutch East Indians and the French Indo-Chinese—with American guns—until the French and the Dutch can take over the shooting themselves. And our own nonatomic conversion of Germany into what the London Economist calls "a vast derelict human slum," with its ex-soldiers enslaved by the French and the Russians, its children and aged facing death from incapacity to resist the cold, 25 percent of its arable land gone, and, in the American zone, only 15 percent of what industry remains working at 5-percent capacity.

And then there are—or are there?—a few little nonatomic problems still unsolved here at home. There is skyrocketing unemployment on the horizon, with its accompaniment of racial and religious tension. There's a little matter of hopelessly inadequate unemployment insurance, not to mention medical care, housing (formerly known as slum clearance), and education. There's the cost of a $2,000,000,000-a-week war, still on the cuff. There's the poll tax, the restrictive covenant, the social segregation, the exclusion of ten or twelve million workers from social insurance, child labor, and the monster of municipal corruption. And the steady trend, in and out of Congress, to reaction.

If only we can control the atomic bomb.

Or run away from it.

Or sell it, or give it away.

Or organize it. Or federate it.

Or drop it, in concert with peace-loving Britain and Russia, on the Guatemalans or the Koreans.

When men like Robert M. Hutchins say that "the atomic bomb is the only thing worth talking about," it is time to realize that the country has gone on an atom jag. The bomb has succeeded the Nazi death camps and the trials of the war criminals as national diversions. While we fiddle with the bomb, the world is burning. While we gape and gawp at an impotent invention—impotent to solve our preatomic problems—the problems fester on. And, while we marvel and wonder and shudder at the newest implement of destruction, the problems that are really destroying us fester faster and faster.

The atomic bomb is the only thing worth ignoring in this desperate condition of our civilization. If we are bent on exterminating ourselves, we will do it with or without the atomic bomb. If we are bent on saving ourselves, we will do it with either primitive or advanced technology. If we are bent on going to war, we will go to war with what we've got, or, like Hitler, with what we haven't got. If we are bent on being at peace, we will tackle the causes of war first.

The atomic bomb is simply the latest circus in a long, long line of bread and circuses. We are face to face with the fact that we lost the war and that Hitler is winning it, and we want to think about something else. It isn't the atom bomb that's caught up with us—it's our misspent faith and hope and blood and money. It isn't the atom bomb we're running away from—it's ourselves. It's pleasanter now to forget Pearl Harbor than it is to remember the "four freedoms." And who of us now wants to face the haunting fact that we went to war in 1917 against imperialism, militarism, treaty-breaking, and atrocities against civilian populations?

The problems we had before World War II—the problems that cause the wars we lose—were still unsolved when the Messrs. Roosevelt and Willkie started accusing each other of leading us down the road to war. The problems we had were still unsolved when, after the collapse of 1937, and the concomitant end of the New Deal reforms, the war boom began. In 4 years of blood, sweat, toil, and tears, we have succeeded only in adding to our unsolved problems the paradox of a Jim Crow army fighting against nazism; the paradox of peacetime conscription—the cornerstone of the Prussianism we thought we defeated 25 years ago; and the paradox of participation by the land of the free in the maintenance and extension of slavery all over the world.

Even if the control of the atomic bomb would, somehow, solve our unsolved problems, we cannot control it. The scientists estimate that any nation can solve the few technical problems, which we call "secrets," in perhaps 2 years. The process, they admit, is simply one of trial and error common to all industrial research. And since we do not know how far the other countries have advanced under the cloak of secrecy, it may not be 2 years at all, but 6 months, or a month, or tomorrow, or yesterday. One of the half dozen greatest atomic physicists is in Russia. Professor Urey, whose discovery of "heavy water" made the bomb possible, warns us that one of the leading physicists on the bomb project here is a Dane now in Denmark, and another a Frenchman now in France.

Just what are the secrets on which we are trading? Just what have we got to offer Russia or anyone else? A 6-month advantage in industrial research in exchange for the surrender of the dream of world conquest and the regurgitation of the peoples and resources they have conquered? And to whom will the secrets, if there are any, be "entrusted"? To a unilateral organization of the three senior and two junior victorious powers, not one of whom, except China, which has nothing to lose, was or is willing to surrender any part of its sovereignty? To an organization which has not been able to meet, has no meeting in sight, has not been able (or willing) to write a peace anywhere, even in Italy, and whose minor representatives were unable to keep one meeting together?

The victorious nations did not even pretend to try to organize the world in San Francisco. They pretended to try to organize the victorious nations, as if the peace of the world would be menaced by the totally conquered and half-destroyed losers. And even the pretense was patent when the organization proved to be no organization at all in the sense of having its members bound by the rules. Are we to suppose that a sort of atomic shotgun wedding of nations will now hold them together when they could not bring themselves, in San Francisco, to promise to love, honor, and obey?

The atomic bomb is the last straw of the "one worlders," as it is the last circus of the rest of us. Since we could not get "one world" the only way it can ever be got—by the people of the world everywhere wanting it and willing to pay for it—perhaps we can get it by force and fear and distrust and terror.

If we will all go around with our pockets full of atomic bombs, we shall all be happy. If we will threaten each other with nonexistent secrets, we shall all knuckle under. Justice—which as Plato pointed out long ago, holds even a band of thieves together—is dispensable. War makers will suppress war with bombs, just the way criminals suppress crime with guns. And when the great big supercolossal bombs now in preparation everywhere hangs over everybody, peace will prevail, the way it prevailed after the invention of gunpowder.

True, the atomic bomb will blow us up faster than the blockbuster, or weekday bomb. But, as Major de Seversky pointed out after looking at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, a sortie of 200 flying fortresses with weekday bombs would have made as big a hole. True, too, atomic energy will clothe and feed and house the world much faster than steam or electrical energy. But if we are thinking in terms of clothing and feeding and housing the world, why are we helpless to touch the slums here at home with the energy we have, and why are we using the energy we have to convert Germany into a desert?

When the atomic jag is over, we shall have to face our plight in the sober daylight. When the beautiful dream of painless extermination is over, we shall have to get up and go to work on the reality of economic, political, and social injustice all around us. We are late for work already; we have slept and slept, dreaming dream after dream, of a car in every garage, of a new deal with free chips, of Hitler as our destruction, and the atom as our salvation. Now we have got to work fast.

When our economic system broke down we plowed under cotton and corn though millions were cold and hungry. Now that our moral system has broken down, we might just as well plow under laboratories and physicists. We did not know how to use the cotton and corn we needed. We do not know how to use the power we need. If all we can do with the wonders of our age is throw them at each other, we might be better off with nothing to throw more dreadful than rocks. At least the Egyptians built the pyramids.

Of course the third atomic bomb has got to be kept from being dropped. But to keep it from being dropped is only to obtain a reprieve. If we cannot use the reprieve to regenerate our civilization there is no point in stewing around to get the reprieve. And we, who dropped the first two bombs, have got to give the world, which now stands in

terror of our might, the first evidence of moral regeneration.

We can do it by fighting, along with Congressman JOE MARTIN, for the abolition of peacetime conscription everywhere; by fighting, not merely for the control of the atomic bomb, but for the international abolition of national armaments, including the blockbuster, or weekday bomb; by dredging up the Atlantic Charter and supporting the struggle for the liberty of all people everywhere, not only in India, but also in Puerto Rico; and by fighting, above all and before everything else, for the forgotten "four freedoms" here at home. Only then will we persuade suffering and cynical humanity everywhere that we mean what we say.

If we cannot make democracy work in the richest nation on earth, we cannot export it to our enemies or our friends. If we cannot control ourselves, we cannot control the atom.

The Truth About Foreign-Trade Zones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Thomas E. Lyons, Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Department of Commerce, before the Boston Lions Club in the crystal ballroom, Hotel Kenmore, Boston, Mass., November 1, 1945:

When young Frederic Tudor advanced the idea of shipping ice from his father's pond at Saugus to the Tropics in the early 1800's, Boston thought him mad. Shipping men said that such a cargo would melt and swamp the vessel. Tudor's first venture was a failure as he had provided no means to insulate the cargo. Later he experimented with all sorts of filler material available in his day, including rice, wheat chaff, hay, tan bark and even coal-dust and finally discovered that sawdust was useful for purposes other than stuffing dolls.

When Congress passed the Celler foreign-trade zones bill in 1934, before the ink had dried on the enrolled act and months prior to the issuance of regulations under which these zones would function, certain Boston foreign trade and allied interests began to assail the measure. Every conceivable kind of objection was raised in a lengthy report prepared under the guidance of a reputable foreign-trade group. At the time this report was written its sponsors had no reason to know whether or not the foreign-trade zone had any advantages over the conventional customs methods of handling imports, but as in Fred Tudor's day they were out to melt the ice and swamp the boat even before its keel had been laid.

Unfortunately, Washington officials responsible for the administration of the act and especially some of us in the Department of Commerce, had not had time to develop insulating material to offset these attacks. With our meager knowledge of the subject we felt that the only proper way to determine the value and usefulness of the foreign-trade zone for promoting foreign-trade was to await the establishment of one or more such facilities and then examine the results.

Furthermore, this Boston assault was entirely unexpected—for only a few short months before a recognized authority on maritime matters, representing the Boston Port Authority, the Boston Chamber of Commerce, the Boston Maritime Exchange and the Boston Retail Trade Board, had appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee and urged enactment of the foreign-trade zone bill. This spokesman for the foregoing Boston interests also placed in the RECORD a statement showing that the Massachusetts Department of Public Works had inquired into the subject a few years earlier and reported that a foreign-trade zone was needed for New England manufacturers and urging the Federal Government to enact appropriate legislation.

No doubt by this time many of you are thoroughly mystified as to the purposes and objectives of the foreign-trade zone and how it functions in the field of foreign commerce. Let me first explain the conventional procedure for handling foreign merchandise seeking admission into the United States. Under the various tariff acts importers have a choice of several methods for the handling of dutiable merchandise when it arrives at a designated port of entry. If the goods are ready for entry into our commerce a consumption entry is made at the customs-house, duties are assessed and paid and merchandise thereafter is free to enter domestic distribution.

If the importer chooses he may make a warehouse entry wherein duties are estimated and a bond for double the amount of duty is posted with the collector. The goods must then be moved in a bonded conveyance to a bonded warehouse, where they may be stored for a period not exceeding 3 years, after which the duties must be paid or the merchandise exported.

Should the importer pay the duties upon the commodity instead of posting bond, and retain it continuously in a bonded warehouse or otherwise in the control or custody of custom officials, he may later withdraw it for transshipment within a 3-year period from the date of importation. Upon such withdrawal 99 percent of the duty paid is returned by the Government to the importer. Similarly, in the case of articles manufactured or produced in this country in conjunction with imported merchandise but later exported in the combined state, the duties paid on the foreign goods, if previously arranged with customs, are refunded except for the 1-percent deduction.

The procedure described in the previous paragraph is known as drawback and in the past it was a vital index to the two-way movement of foreign commerce in the United States, imported for reexport.

If the importer fails to make one of the foregoing entries within 48 hours after the goods are unladened, or unless for valid reasons he obtains an extension, the collector of customs will take them into his custody as unclaimed merchandise. This procedure is known as general order and if not claimed within 1 year, the collector is authorized to sell the merchandise.

These restrictions and formalities were not calculated to encourage trade and commerce in this country. Opportunities for freedom in the manipulation and transshipment of cargoes which were available in at least 43 strategically located foreign free ports placed this country in a clearly disadvantageous position for competition with European trade centers.

Such was the economic background that led to the agitation and original overwhelming support in 1934 for the establishment of the American prototype of the foreign free port.

A foreign-trade zone is a segregated, fenced-off, policed area in a port of entry equipped with piers, warehouses, and other essential facilities where foreign merchandise may be deposited without being subject to customs laws. In these zones merchandise may be manipulated in various ways, but manufacturing and exhibition are not permitted. The zone is a sort of hospitable island where an importer can set his merchandise down while he makes up his mind what he wants to do with it. If the owner decides to reexport the goods, he may do so without customs formalities or he may leave them in the zone for an indefinite period, while he finds a market either here or abroad. Further, he may mix such merchandise with other foreign or domestic goods and then bring the resultant product into the country upon payment of appropriate duties or he may decide to ship the combined product to some more favorable market abroad. While foreign merchandise is in a zone, prospective purchasers may examine it and the owner may even sell at auction if he selects this method of marketing his goods. All these activities may be carried on with the minimum customs supervision and without expense for bonds or inconvenience of drawback restrictions.

As already indicated, some of our foreign trade friends here in Boston seized the opportunity to interpret the new law. Their report, issued October 5, 1934 (legislative committee of the Foreign Commerce Club of Boston), stated that the committee was setting out both the pros and cons of the question. The document then proceeded to set out all the bad features, both real and fancied, of the foreign-trade zone, but if any good points were perceived in the idea, they were carefully omitted. Following the release of this report several shipping papers in the Boston area took the cue and started to ridicule the zone idea.

The furore raised by these militant and unexpected objections caused Boston port authority officials to decide that they should sponsor another study of the foreign-trade zone and funds were appropriated to engage a well-known European for this work.

It was into this atmosphere of hostility and indecision that Mr. H. Fugl-Meyer, director of the free port of Copenhagen, arrived in Boston early in November 1934 to conduct the study. Fugl-Meyer's report has done more mischief to the port of Boston than it has to the foreign-trade zone program, and I am not minimizing the harm to the progress of the zone plan either. Unfortunately, because of his limited knowledge of American customs, port practices and laws, Fugl-Meyer was led inadvertently into diagnosing all of Boston's chronic transportation ills and his adverse report, based primarily on collateral issues, related to the weaknesses of the port rather than to the utility of the foreign-trade zone.

It appeared that each of Fugl-Meyer's Boston advisers had some pet aversion, in most cases remotely connected with the free port study, which he wanted aired; matters that Fugl-Meyer, a stranger in a strange land, could hardly have exhumed in his brief 2 months' study. Without trepidation, Fugl-Meyer chided the United States Supreme Court for distinguishing a port from a locality, a practice which more appropriately might have been left to our own nationals, while his fluent discussion of our complicated territorial rate structure as between competing ports betrayed an intimate knowledge of the subject which could have been acquired only after years of study and association.

With regard to the free-port idea, however, Fugl-Meyer was not so sure of his ground so he hedged by reporting both for and against the project. For instance, Fugl-Meyer says (p. 17, his report):

"Although many difficulties may arise there is a possibility that a free zone, run commercially, may some day be needed, when conditions change."

Well, conditions certainly have changed since 1934 when it is recalled that we were then emerging from the depths of a depression. Fugl-Meyer, in his conclusions, states (p. 36):

"As soon as the major ills of the port are cured, an extension is warranted," and further, "It would be possible to build this so it could be converted into a free zone if desired."

In another conclusion Fugl-Meyer says (p. 36):

"There are many improvements to be made, one of them may one day be the establishment of a free zone * * *," and on page 20, "When it is decided to make an extension, it would be reasonable to build it in such a way as it could be used some day as a free zone."

Fugl-Meyer further states (ch. IV, p. 10 of the report) that Hamburg and Copenhagen are no criteria to show the need for free ports in the United States and he cites the fact that the great ports of London and Antwerp have been developed without free-port facilities. Here Fugl-Meyer has completely ignored the one prerequisite which must inevitably be present to warrant the existence of a free port or foreign-trade zone, they are useful only in countries having protective-tariff systems such as Germany, Denmark, and the United States. Both England and Belgium were free-trade countries during the period when their great ports were being developed, and even today foreign merchandise is handled in the ports of these two countries with a minimum of customs interference. From the standpoint of entrepot trade, both England and Belgium may still be regarded as free-trade countries.

In addition, it might also be pointed out that many of Fugl-Meyer's statements are both conflicting and confusing. For instance, he states (p. 15):

"It (the bonded warehouse system) has this advantage over a free port, that the bonded goods can be stored at any point to which the steamer happens to bring it, or wherever the owner of the goods wants to have it stored for future use."

Although later on he refutes all this by his one logical conclusion (p. 25):

"The fact that most of the warehouses are located far from the terminal facilities reduces the transport economy of the port."

Of course anyone familiar with our customs laws and port practices knows that Fugl-Meyer was wrong when he stated "Bonded goods can be stored at any point at which the steamer happens to bring it." Storage warehouses are bonded by the Treasury Department and imported merchandise must be removed from the piers to these bonded warehouses within 48 hours after landing or as I previously stated, the collector will take custody of the shipment as abandoned merchandise. Usually such warehouses are located a considerable distance from the pier where the goods are landed and transfer to these inland warehouses must be performed by bonded truckers at the expense of the owner of the merchandise.

Furthermore, a part of the imported merchandise must be sent by bonded truck, also at the owner's expense, to the appraiser's stores for appraisal. Later these goods are sent to the bonded warehouse, at owner's expense, for storage with the balance of the shipment.

Although Fugl-Meyer needed only 60 days to assemble his material and submit his report, during this time he found an opportunity to lecture on free ports at New York. On December 28, 1934, while still engaged in the Boston study he spoke at a meeting sponsored by the New York Port Authority, and from the remarks made at the meeting it appears he discussed matters which were not embodied in the Boston report. For instance, he stated that the creation of the foreign-trade zone at Copenhagen was violently opposed at its inception (1894) by storage warehouse and allied interests. Further, the theme throughout Fugl-Meyer's report was that there were no existing facilities at Boston which could be adopted to foreign-trade zone use. Yet in his New York talk he conceded that $8,000,000 were expended on new Copenhagen free port facilities at a time when the opening of the Kiel Canal was threatening Copenhagen's strategic Baltic position.

A final reference to Mr. Fugl-Meyer. Upon his return to Copenhagen from Boston, Fugl-Meyer was interviewed in Berlin by local newspapers on his American visit. Fugl-Meyer told the Berlin reporter that Boston, at least for the time being, should abandon the plan of having a free harbor. His reasons were the following: The traffic-geographic conditions are not in favor of Boston; secondly, there are technical difficulties, much construction work will be required; in the third place Boston does not have internationally trained importers and exporters, i. e., no merchants who specialize in foreign trade.

Apparently the Peabodys, the Perkinses, the Pierces, the Forbeses, the Spragues, and the Winsors were not at home when Fugl-Meyer called.

In a supplemental report to the State Legislature (House No. 1951) 1936, the Port Authority cited the uneconomic position of the port of Boston resulting from loss of traffic as the basic reason for turning down the foreign-trade zone. The Port Authority advanced dire arguments that the establishment of a foreign-trade zone would cause the abandonment of warehouses located in other sections of the port. Why warehouses in the same section but not in the zone would not be affected is not explained.

While it is possible that a harbor warehouse wherever located might lose some of its bonded business, increased port activities resulting from operations of a foreign-trade zone are calculated to create additional bonded and free traffic for these warehouses. Ordinarily only a small part of a public merchandise warehouse is used for the storage of bonded imports so that the loss of bonded business under any circumstances would not be serious.

Other arguments advanced by the Port Authority against the zone were (a) only 19 percent of the inbound cargo at the port of Boston was from foreign countries, the other 81 percent being United States coastwise trade; (b) foreign reexport is so small at the present time (1936) as to be considered negligible. It might be pointed out that the primary purpose of a foreign-trade zone is to overcome these two weaknesses. Obviously, if Boston enjoyed a large import trade and if reexports were substantial and satisfactory, the need for a foreign-trade zone might be questioned. On the other hand, where these weaknesses are readily admitted, it seems that you Boston businessmen would not overlook installing any device or facility which might correct this unhealthy situation.

Just why Boston's predominantly inbound waterborne domestic traffic should be a factor in deciding the fate of a foreign-trade zone is not clear to me. In determining this matter it would seem much more important to analyze Boston's total foreign trade—exports as well as imports. For example, in 1938, 85 percent by weight of Boston's foreign commerce consisted of imports while only 15 percent comprised exports. In terms of value, the picture of this unbalanced trade is even more striking: 88 percent imports as compared with 12 percent exports. Boston's exports in 1938 were about one-half of 1 percent of the United States total.

This brief analysis of Boston's place in the field of foreign trade and shipping leads to the inevitable conclusion that her main weakness is in her export trade. Correct this deficiency and the other problems will solve themselves.

A foreign-trade zone would aid materially in developing this badly needed export traffic. "How," you query, "can this be possible when the foreign-trade zone is designed for imports?" The answer is simple—traffic generates traffic. Ships arriving at the zone to discharge foreign cargoes for storage and reconsignment would be available to load export merchandise designated to the same foreign areas. While such exports could be handled at piers outside the zone, obviously it would be more economical to assemble export merchandise in the foreign-trade zone where it could be loaded along with foreign merchandise awaiting transshipment, thus avoiding expense of shifting the ship.

Possibly, at first the radius of the area for originating exports might be restricted to the local community but as dependable shipping services increase Boston's tributary regions will also expand and there is no reason to conclude that the area would of necessity be limited to New England.

During the immediate prewar years (1938–39) about 1,200 vessels in foreign trade were entered at the port of Boston. About one-third of these were engaged in trade with the Maritime Provinces and eastern Canada, leaving about 800 ships to transport Boston's substantial flow of imports from every part of the globe and over every important trade route. While some incoming vessels were fully loaded it may be safely assumed that half of the 800 ships arrived with unused cargo space. Suppose each of the remaining 400 vessels carried on additional 500 tons of cargo for the Boston foreign-trade zone it would have amounted to the substantial total of 200,000 tons annually.

If only half—or 100,000 tons—of this potential foreign cargo had been reexported it would have doubled Boston's 1938 export tonnage and increased by more than 50 percent that for 1939. Scrap-metal shipments for both years have been omitted from these calculations as at best they represented an abnormal prewar movement of little value to any port

You query, what right have I to assume that ships on trade routes serving Boston would lift cargo for this port not previously carried? The answer is that the foreign-trade zone provides the foreign shipper with an entirely new and competitive facility not heretofore available to him. Under existing practices, an exporter in Calcutta or Glasgow is not going to risk sending his valuable merchandise to this country until he has complete plans for its disposal. The operation of our bonded warehouse laws generally work to discourage a shipper 10,000 miles away from consigning his goods to an American port.

Let me illustrate with a case that happened here in Boston recently. Our tariff laws provide for lower duty rates on certain merchandise when used for specific manufacturing purposes. Leather and wool—both vital in Boston's trade—are included on the list. Recently an English exporter consigned leather to a broker here who paid the duty at the reduced rate. As no market was found the leather was later returned to England. The collector not only refused to refund the duty paid but required the owner to pay the difference at the higher rate. The Customs Court supported the collector as he had followed the law, but this English firm and many others will hesitate before sending subsequent consignments to this country. Had the leather been sent to a foreign-trade zone—where prospective customers could examine it, such a situation just could not happen.

Here is another advantage of the foreign-trade zone. Foreign shippers seldom have advance knowledge of warehousing and handling costs, especially over long periods. Such a speculation would of course dissuade an owner abroad from sending his goods to distant shores hoping to find a purchaser after its arrival here. On the other hand, the foreign-trade zone must operate as a public utility; rates and charges must be just and reasonable, and rate schedules must be published, a foreign shippers knows exactly what his American costs will be before the goods are loaded on vessel abroad. Privately owned

commercial warehouses are under no such obligation to the shipping public.

Although the Boston report (Fugl-Meyer's), which by the way was sent to port officials all over the country, and the recent war, both served to retard the foreign-trade zone program, the establishment of such facilities in several additional major ports is now assured. Aside from the New York zone which was opened in 1937, several other ports, including New Orleans and San Francisco, are scheduled to establish foreign-trade zones as soon as the facilities are no longer needed for military purposes.

It is my understanding that the functions of the Boston Port Authority recently have been greatly expanded and that appropriations have been made for port improvements. May I hazard the suggestion that a master plan be developed now for integrated ocean-freight terminals which can be built as funds become available. Such a program would offer a much better opportunity for attracting ships and trade to Boston than the erection of a number of separated pier units scattered over the waterfront. If the former procedure is followed, there would be no difficulty and little expense in turning a part or all of these facilities into a foreign-trade zone.

In conclusion, may I again refer to our friend from Saugus; while his first venture was a failure, Frederic Tudor went on to become the first international iceman, serving every important port in South America and the Far East. His flourishing Calcutta trade came just in time to preserve Boston's East India commerce from ruin. If Frederic Tudor were here today I am sure he would say "Let's give this foreign-trade zone a fair trial; let's put Boston's foreign-trade future on ice."

Radio Address of Hon. Fred Bradley, of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my radio broadcast of this week over Stations WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.; WDBC, Escanaba, Mich.; and WMAM, Marinette, Wis:

Last week, if you will recall, I had as my guest on this program the Honorable BARTEL J. JONKMAN representing the Fifth District of Michigan who, as a member of the subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, recently completed a 7 weeks' tour of Europe studying the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration program and the lend-lease program insofar as both are concerned with feeding, clothing, and otherwise rehabilitating what we are told are the starving peoples of Europe.

We had before us on the floor of the House October 31 and November 1, the appropriation measure to provide an additional $550,000,000, as our previously committed balance in our total appropriation of roughly $1,350,000,000 out of a total appropriated by all of 45 countries of roughly $1,875,000,000. This measure, of course, passed the House overwhelmingly inasmuch as it was a previous commitment. It did not do so, however, without some amendments and considerable arguments about the administrative inefficiency in the operation of the UNRRA program and considerable discussion about the interference that UNRRA is receiving from certain of our allies in the last war, notably in the instance of Russian-dominated countries.

From the figures that I have given you previously, you can see that the United States—which was in the forefront in organizing UNRRA—is putting up about 72 percent of the total cost of this program whereas some other 44 nations are putting up but 28 percent of the total funds.

You ask, How does this all come about? Let me take just a few minutes to give you the history of UNRRA. Some of you will recall that in May of 1943, I took it upon myself to go down to a certain mysterious conference of United Nations representatives that was being held at Hot Springs, W. Va. The newspapers said I crashed the gate. That is not exactly correct because I was greeted very cordially by Judge Marvin Jones who presided at that conference and who formerly had served as a Member of Congress and as chairman of the House Agriculture Committee. Judge Jones assured me there was nothing mysterious about the meeting and that I could assure the House membership they would be free to attend any and all sessions of the conference. Armed with that assurance I then returned to Washington, after being certain that I had a room reserved in the hotel proper where the meetings were being held and on my return the following day, after having made a speech on the floor, had with me the Honorable FREDERICK C. SMITH of Ohio. We spent several days in Hot Springs thereafter but found on our return that we, and every other Member of Congress, were definitely barred from all sessions at which any work was being accomplished. We, and so could anyone else in the United States, have attended either the opening and closing sessions both open to the public of these momentous meetings. Everything else was in secret or closed sessions.

It was at this so-called food conference that UNRRA was born, after it had been conceived in London and rejected by the rest of our allies because of proposed British domination, at the expense of the United States, of course. In other words the British brought to us their proposal for a world rehabilitation organization to take care of the starving peoples in the conquered nations of Europe and elsewhere in the world and as is seemingly customary with the British their proposal called for Uncle Sam to foot most of the bill. Our State Department had fallen for the bait, hook, line, and sinker. Representative SMITH and myself were denied any access to any information of value and could not determine just exactly what was in the cards.

Several months later, at the request of the Honorable FRANCES BOLTON, Congresswoman from Ohio and a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, that committee held a closed session with secret minutes being taken down and not available to any other Member of Congress, outside of the great Committee on Foreign Affairs. They called before that committee Mr. Dean Acheson, of the State Department, who had been noted by Representative SMITH and myself at the meetings after our arrival and who it was noted invariably sat with the British rather than the American delegates at that conference during their meals. Dean Acheson explained to the committee, at Mrs. BOLTON'S request, the proposal to which the State Department had in effect already committed this counry to participate in this UNRRA program, the funds for which were to be based upon 1 percent of the national income of each of the participating nations but the disposition of those funds to be controlled by a central committee consisting of a representative from each of the various nations contributing thereto and the supervisory and immediate control vested in the hands of a small group consisting of the so-called Big Four powers—United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China.

In the minutes of that momentous meeting of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the chairman of that committee expressed considerable surprise that the State Department had gone ahead with this program, apparently with the approval of the White House, without even taking into its confidence either the Senate or House Committees on Foreign Affairs.

It was obvious that the State Department had in effect committed us without any legal authority whatsoever and it was at that time that a younger member of that committee, Representative FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, suggested that perhaps it might be well that the Congress give some legal status to this our first participation in a United Nations agreement. He suggested that a simple resolution be drawn up stating in effect that it was the sense of the Congress that we should participate in this and other world-wide United Nations programs. This was approved by the committee and later by the House and Senate and was known as the famous Fulbright resolution, probably upon the strength of which Mr. FULBRIGHT later was elected to the United States Senate, where he now serves. A point to be remembered, however, is that this resolution was in substantiation of a commitment already made by the State Department with the approval of our late President Roosevelt and was in effect nothing more than a face-saving gesture for both. Of this angle, the public has heretofore been told nothing.

The Congress later committed this Nation to an appropriation of roughly $1,350,000,000 as our share in this UNRRA program. Our first appropriation toward this sum amounting to $800,000,000 has already been made and we were thus obligated to furnish an additional $550,000,000, which as I have said previously was voted favorably on November 1 and which, having been a previous commitment, I naturally supported although I voted against and spoke against the original idea of our joining UNRRA in the first place.

Why the rest of the world, and more especially our State Department, should expect that we should put up 72 cents on the dollar while 44 other nations put up 28 cents on the dollar for each dollar expended by UNRRA, and concerning which we are but one lone voice in the control of the disposition of that huge fund as opposed to six for the British Empire is beyond my comprehension. This is especially true when it has been proven beyond all shadow of doubt that much of the contribution we are making in the form of tangible goods has our own labels removed therefrom and other nations take the credit for being the benefactor to the starving peoples of Europe and elsewhere. That in brief is the history of the start of UNRRA. We did control the appointment of the chief official of UNRRA and President Roosevelt appointed former Governor Lehman of New York as that guiding genius. It is but natural to assume, as we pointed out in last week's broadcast by Mr. JONKMAN, that UNRRA has made a great many mistakes and has exhibited a tremendous amount of inefficiency—which was freely admitted by members of the UNRRA staff—to all of which it has been subject to much criticism by the press and by Members of Congress. Such criticism has served to keep that organization more on its toes and much of the previously exhibited inefficiency and incompetency has since been corrected. It still remains a fact, however, that much of UNRRA's beneficence has admittedly gone into black markets and whole shiploads of food, medicine, clothing, etc., have been diverted and sold by the starving nations we were trying to help and unquestionably much of our largess has been appropriated by the armies of occupation on the eastern side of Europe and especially in the Balkan countries overrun by Russia.

One of the reasons this has come to pass has been due to the fact that UNRRA simply delivers the goods to the borders and the governments of these countries then take over and distribute our alms as they see fit without any further supervision by UNRRA. In many instances heretofore we have been denied the opportunity to have duly accredited representatives of the American press or radio visit those countries for the express purpose of finding out just where the American taxpayers' money was going.

Consequently in passing this additional appropriation on November 1, the House of Representatives was fortunate indeed to be able to write into this appropriation two definite restrictions as to the further operation of UNRRA which I believe sincerely will improve the situation if they are carried out.

The most important amendment introduced by Representative DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, and amended by Representative CLARENCE BROWN, Republican, of Ohio, provided that hereafter no largess from UNRRA should be distributed in any nation unless accredited representatives of the American press and radio were permitted free access to these countries to see how our taxpayers' dollars are being expended and to see to it that an honest distribution is being made to those who are genuinely in need of same and above all to make sure that none of our largess is being used to feed and clothe the Communist dominated armies of those nations nor indeed the Russian armies of occupation themselves. This amendment was supported almost unanimously by the Republicans and with the support of a goodly number of southern Democrats carried on a roll call vote by a margin of 20 votes. It was, of course, vigorously opposed by the administration forces.

Another rather minor, but I think a very important amendment, was adopted as proposed by Representative CHRISTIAN HERTER, Republican, of Massachusetts. As Mr. JONKMAN pointed out to you last week, a major difficulty in the feeding of Europe stems from lack of transportation through the ravages of war. UNRRA has admittedly been handicapped heretofore in the disposition of its largess by a lack of truck, rail, and vessel transportation. Arrangements have been made for the American Army of Occupation to turn over to UNRRA a considerable number of trucks for this purpose. However, it was learned that when UNRRA took a truck load of produce, food, medicine, or clothing to the border of one of the recipient countries that country in turn not only took over the contents but the truck itself and then distributed it in its own manner. Mr. HERTER'S amendment will henceforth put a stop to this practice of taking over our trucks.

Further, the bill itself provided that henceforth duly designated officials of UNRRA shall be permitted to enter these recipient countries and satisfy themselves and so report to Congress that our largess is being properly distributed to the right people. Nevertheless, the House felt that we should have still a further check through the agencies of our press and radio reporters and thus adopted the Dirksen-Brown amendment.

Last week, due to many important local elections all over the country, the House had no legislative program, but of course some mittees were continuing hearings on legislation requested by the President. That brings me to the reaction in the House to the President's so-called wage-price speech. The reaction was very definitely unfavorable even to some staunch administration supporters. For instance, I spoke with a number of southern Representatives who all agreed that it was about time President Truman got rid of some of his White House advisers, holdovers from F. D. R.'s "palace guard," who were leading him astray and very far away from his own personal policies exhibited so admirably when he first assumed the Presidency after the death of Mr. Roosevelt. Some Washington news commentators reported that his speeches were being written for him by Judge Samuel Rosenman, who wrote most of Mr. Roosevelt's speeches in his later days. It is to be recalled, for instance, that when Mr. Truman assumed the Presidency he stated in effect that hereafter Congress would do the legislating for this country free from White House influence, and that he would tend to his knitting as the administrator of the executive branch, charged by the Constitution to carry out the mandates of the Congress. Surely if left to his own conscience and his own resources, based upon his many years of service in the Senate of the United States, Mr. Truman personally would not have stooped to such an absurd position as attacking two outstanding committees of the House of Representatives which failed to jump at the crack of his whip and report legislation the need for which both of those committees conscientiously felt had not been shown to be paramount at the moment. Mr. Truman well knows that the Congress is fed up on taking orders from the White House on important and far-reaching legislation and that he can expect little cooperation by indicting either the great Ways and Means Committee or the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. For that reason I predict to you right now, you will not see any unemployment compensation bill come out of the Ways and Means Committee, nor any full employment bill come out of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments—at least not for some time.

Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a radio address I delivered opposing conscription in a debate of this subject with Mr. Edward M. Scheiberling, national commander of the American Legion, over WRC, the Washington outlet of the National Broadcasting Co., 1:30 p. m. Tuesday, November 13, in conjunction with the twenty-fifth anniversary of American Education Week:

Ladies and gentlemen, the subject of this discussion is wrongly stated. It should be Universal Military Conscription to Train for Combat and War Service as a Part of the Program of the Education of American Youth instead of just Military Training as a part of such program.

President Truman, in urging the adoption of the plan, calls it universal military training, tries to make out it is not conscription, but refers to it as being compulsory training for combat and war service. The dictionary defines conscription and compulsory military or naval service as being synonymous. Until the movement to set up this program was started no one thought of conscription and compulsory universal military training as being anything else but the same thing.

Let us be honest in discussing this subject and call things by their right names.

This is a plan to conscript the youth of our Nation for military training in the art of war.

The reasoning and devices now being used to press the one year conscription through would have much more force for extending the period later. That has been the experience. The pattern never changes.

Let us not be deceived. If we approve conscription for 1 year now, we should be prepared for 2 or 3 years' conscription later.

And if our physically fit and crippled male youth are to be conscripted now, why not the same for our female youth later? Should we not be prepared for that, too?

To connect conscription with education creates a decidedly false notion. In America education has always meant preparation of our youth for industrial pursuits, and in contrast conscription has meant preparation for war. Our people have always associated education with liberty and conscription with militarism, and properly so.

Reason is the law of education, obedience to command that of military training.

We ought to go to the bottom of this question. It was the conception of education as preparation to fit our youth for industrial service that made America. Here is the source of her great strength, her ability to out-produce, live better, and achieve the almost miraculous in military might.

Why now throw away this precious jewel and adopt that which we just spilled our blood to destroy? History has demonstrated that conscription and freedom will not mix, one or the other must go.

What are the forces which motivate this movement? A few honestly believe it is needed to make us militarily secure.

But is this all that motivates the generals and admirals and power seeking group in the Government to make peacetime conscription a permanent institution? Do not believe it. Self-aggrandizement plays a prominent role.

What more than this program of conscription is needed to complete the regimentation of our people?

The argument that conscription would improve the health of our male youth is wholly without foundation. There is no scientific evidence in medical literature that I know of to support this allegation. Unrealism like this claim has contributed powerfully to bring this Nation to the deplorable condition it is now experiencing.

Will anyone argue that in peace or war the men comprising the German conscript army were more physically fit than our civilian soldiers who have just defeated them so disastrously?

Conscripton is unconstitutional.

Why the hurry, pressure, coercion and deception to induce Congress to pass this act? The war is over.

The answer is that the leaders of this program know they could not possibly put it through in any other manner. They know that they dare not permit the matter to become a public issue, and that if the people could express themselves at the ballot box they would turn it down overwhelmingly.

They have no respect for representative government, and seek to replace public servants by public masters.

Those who complain of OPA or other bureaucratic restrictions, or that demobilization is being deliberately retarded, cannot consistently support conscription, since this would enhance the power to regulate their lives.

The proposal to institute conscription is a part of the program to set up a dictatorship, as is also the proposal before the Senate now to give the President power to declare war.

Let us stop building a dictatorship, let us stop fighting wars to aggrandize imperialism of other countries, and let us relieve our minds of the crazy delusion that providence has directed us to finance the world, to police the world, and to reform the world, and to mind everybody's business but our own. This done, conscription will not be needed.

Expediting the Army Demobilization Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, there is so much misunderstanding and criticism of the War Department in demobilizing our armed forces that the facts presented in a letter just received from the War Department in response to a protest which reached this office are enlightening and, I am sure, of national interest. The letters are inserted herewith.

Representative COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: We are writing in strong protest against the continued unnecessary delay in Army demobilization of soldiers who are anxious to resume their civilian status.

The flood of reports coming from boys held needlessly in camps, doing nothing, wasting time, becoming bitter at the slow unwinding of army red tape, is arousing a hot resentment among thousands of folks back home. Hundreds of reports are coming from army camps that soldiers are being held in the Army just to provide high-salaried jobs for commissioned officers.

We voters are demanding prompt congressional action to prove definitely that the peoples' representative still have the final control and authority over any military clique that might be endeavoring to perpetuate itself in office.

We rely upon you to vindicate our faith in your ability to interpret the wishes of the home folks in adequate congressional action.

Sincerely yours,
L. A. WILLIAMS.
Mrs. L. A. WILLIAMS.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C., November 8, 1945.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. WHITE: I refer to a communication received by you from Mr. and Mrs. L. A. Williams, protesting against delay of demobilization of the Army.

There has been no delay in the demobilization program, on the other hand, demobilization is far in advance of the anticipated schedule. Since May 12, 1945, 2,500,000 soldiers have been discharged from the Army, and the War Department contemplates that all those eligible for discharge in the European theater, of whom there are about 2,000,000, will be returned to the United States for demobilization by February 1946 and that all those eligible for discharge in the Pacific theater, of whom there remain about 1,600,000, will be returned to the United States by June 1946.

It is to be particularly noted that the rate of demobilization at the close of World War II is about three and one-half times faster than was in the case of World War I. It is the further intention of the War Department to return to the United States for demobilization in 10 months an Army which it took 4 years to deploy in the various overseas theaters.

There are considerable misunderstandings in the public mind relative the matter of demobilization. Your constituent may be assured that the Army is being demobilized as rapidly as is humanly possible. So far as any knowledge of military history goes, no country in the world has ever before attempted to demobilize an Army of 7,000,000 soldiers in 10 months.

Sincerely yours,
WM. F. PEARSON,
Colonel, General Staff Corps, Liaison.

Shipping Facilities for Return of Members of the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have here an editorial which I wish every Member would read. It calls attention to a very serious situation. Danger threatens and this newspaper has very clearly pointed out the root of our trouble.

Every day brings new complaints from the men stranded overseas. I have had complaints from men in southern France stating that United States transports are being used to carry French colonial troops to Indochina and points in that area. There are thousands of men growing frantic in the Pacific and in Europe while our armed forces either neglect or refuse to make use of available shipping to bring them home.

I think it is time we spoke out. I think every Member should join in a general demand that all shipping be concentrated on the one most important task—bring the men home now.

If we raise our voice—if we make enough noise—we will get action.

It is time we stopped taking excuses.

[From the Providence (R. I.) Journal of November 13, 1945]

SNAFU

After a good many weeks of inexplicable delay, during which a near-explosive situation has developed at American embarkation points overseas, Washington at last is taking steps to speed up the return of high-point American veterans. Six battleships, 18 aircraft carriers, and 20 cruisers have been earmarked for the work and the job of converting them into transports is expected to be completed in 30 days.

If all goes well the prospect is that accommodations on home-bound ships soon will be found for all the fighting men with long service records who have been cooling their heels and living on unfulfilled promises at dismal, crowded camps in France and at bleak, half-forgotten outposts in the Pacific.

The daily notices of troop-ship arrivals in this country, plus the repeated assurances of redeployment officials in Washington that all is going well, give the impression that the program is moving smoothly and swiftly. But from the other side of the water, where tens of thousands of veterans sit waiting, a different impression prevails. More than 100,000 American soldiers are crammed in the redeployment camps at Marseilles alone.

Just where the responsibility lies is not at all clear. What is clear is that since VE- and VJ-days thousands of veterans have piled up at ports overseas, heard promises that they would soon be on board ships headed home, and then been forced to sit waiting for ships that didn't come.

When days dragged into weeks—and under these circumstances a week is eternity—the men squawked loudly and emphatically. It was explained that there weren't enough ships for the work. Against this the GI's read reports that of the several thousand Liberty and Victory ships plying the seas only about 400 were engaged in carrying troops home. It was explained that every available oceangoing ship already was engaged in vital work. Against this the Stars and Stripes published a picture of six Liberty ships anchored and abandoned as surplus in Mobile Bay.

Perhaps the most irritating facet of the whole tangled business, from the stranded GI's point of view, was the picture of hundreds of big Navy ships tied up for review at Navy Day ceremonies at dozens of United States ports. The Navy's explanation that the warships were not suitable for transports sounded hollow at the time. The Navy's decision now to put these same ships into transport work supports what the GI's believed all along, namely, that the Navy was concerned with the fanfare of Navy Day and wasn't at all concerned with the plight of the stranded veterans.

There have been hints that the Government deliberately has slowed down the homecoming on the ground that a sudden inflow of large numbers of veterans would complicate even further the home-front problems of reconversion, employment, and strikes. If this is so, clearly the mistake was in making promises to the veterans which couldn't be kept.

Out of this snafu a number of subsidiary problems have developed. The idle, homesick, and angry veterans in France have taken out some of the irritation on the French people. They have built up an artificial dislike of the French and made themselves so obnoxious that the dislike has become mutual. The result is that French-American relations have deteriorated at an alarming rate and the effects of this ill-will are certain to be felt for years.

Havens for Homeless Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication published in the New York Times of October 9, 1945:

HAVENS FOR HOMELESS JEWS—ALL UNITED NATIONS HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR PROPORTIONATE SHARE

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The situation in the Near East is apparently approaching a crisis; very soon violence and bloodshed may result. For this I fear our country is partly responsible.

I believe sincerely in the peaceful settlement of disputes, a policy to which the United States is now committed, and I am deeply interested in the Near East through connections with American colleges and universities in that area. I am therefore greatly distressed by the policies now being urged on our Government, policies which threaten violence and upheaval in that critical region of the world.

Sooner or later Arabs and Jews must sit down together and reach an agreement regarding life in Palestine. Why should they not now gather about a conference table to

arrive at some adjustment and avoid violence?

Surely it will be no kindness to the Jews to secure by force their admittance in very large numbers to a section of the world where they will have as neighbors many millions of enemies.

Are not some Americans urging the plan of forcing Britain to force the Arabs to admit the homeless Jews in order to escape our own responsibility toward these unfortunate persons? The conscience of the world should recognize the obligation of us all to help the homeless Jews whose persecution by Hitler we have so bitterly denounced. Each of the United Nations should accept its proportionate share of those Jews who seek new homes. The Arab nations have already offered to accept their share.

What will be the number the United States should admit? Perhaps 200,000? Then let Congress admit these over and above the usual immigration quotas. And let us stop evading our responsibility by urging that our Government force Britain to force Palestine to take in far more than its share. Thus we may avoid setting the Near East aflame.

VIRGINIA C. GILDERSLEEVE.

NEW YORK, *October 6, 1945.*

UNRRA Appropriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of November 2:

STUPID AND CALLOUS

The action of the House of Representatives in amending the UNRRA appropriation bill so as to forbid use of the fund in any country which puts restraints upon American correspondents' activities would be ludicrous if it were not so callously inhumane.

No reader will need to be told that we are as much devoted as any representative to the principle of press freedom. All men of good will must ardently wish to see that principle accepted and honored throughout the world. But it will not be advanced by withholding assistance from hungry peoples; men are not brought to see the light by denying food to them and their children.

Indeed, the whole basis of this action of the House is characterized by a kind of moral irresponsibility. If there is a nation—say Finland—whose population faces a lean and bitter winter but whose current government maintains a censorship over press and radio, then the denial of UNRRA help lays a most cruel punishment upon their people for a condition for which the government is to blame. It is as if a physician refused treatment to a child injured in a traffic accident because he, the physician, strongly disagreed with some of the political opinions held by the child's father.

A concept repugnant alike in ethics and simple human feeling underlies the position adopted by the House. The concept is this: The succoring of a suffering people is not an obligation, is not an act which is good in itself, but is a political means, a form of coercion. Even within the sphere of expediency it is a stupid position, since we are not likely to persuade peoples of the rightness of our faith in a free press by telling them they shall not eat.

The excuse that freedom of reporting is necessary to the right use of UNRRA supplies is patently a flimsy invention, because UNRRA officials themselves will be able to check on the operations of their organization in any country in which that organization functions. Approval of the UNRRA appropriation is right. for Europe's hungry peoples cannot be left to starve; but this shocking amendment ought to be eliminated before the bill is passed by the Senate.

Equalization of Freight Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following copy of a letter from a farm lady of central Texas to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

NOVEMBER 14, 1945.

The Honorable CLARENCE F. LEA,
Chairman, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEA: The subcommittee studying the Bulwinkle bill (H. R. 2536) has closed its hearings after 9 days of testimony. During that time, many persons testified for the bill and not one against it.

The only opposition to the bill is a report from the Department of Justice and a telegram from Gov. Ellis Arnall of Georgia. In 419 pages of testimony, not a single verbal statement of opposition appears. Governor Arnall requested permission to appear before the subcommittee but was unable to be in Washington on the day the committee designated. The hearings are now closed.

As a southerner who has fought long and hard against freight-rate conspiracy, I urge your committee to reopen hearings and to hear Governor Arnall or anyone else who wishes to testify against the bill.

The record has presented only one side of the picture. The full committee and the Congress should have both sides presented before they act.

We in the South want Congresss to know that our fight for equalization of freight rates is lost if the Bulwinkle bill passes.

What does the Bulwinkle bill do?

1. It takes the rate-making bureaus or "conference methods" of the railroad companies out from under the scrutiny of the Department of Justice's Antitrust Division and makes them subject only to the scrutiny of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

It is a bad precedent for the Congress to start exempting large corporations or parts of large corporations from our antitrust laws.

2. It legalizes the rate-making bureaus of railroads, if and when the ICC approves the agreements among railroads by which they are organized, while at this very moment these bureaus are object of court suits in the Supreme Court and in Nebraska.

In other words, the Bulwinkle bill and the procedures provided for therein will undoubtedly pardon the man before he comes to trial.

The South sees in Governor Arnall's case in the Supreme Court and in the Department of Justice's case in Nebraska important steps toward the final goal of freight rate equalization. If the Bulwinkle bill passes and if, under it, rate-making bureaus are legalized, then notwithstanding these cases, we're licked before we get started.

We southerners have long been victim to the freight rates cooked up in the conferences of railroads. We are well aware and enraged that it costs more to send first-class freight from Mumford, Tex., to New York than from New York to Mumford—the same distance in miles. In other words, it is not the distance that counts but the direction in which it is going.

We're tired of this nonsense. We want a national integrated rate system where it costs the same, mile for mile and pound for pound. Why not pattern after the parcel-post system? It works. It is fair.

The passage of the Bulwinkle bill would set us back 100 years—perhaps forever—in our fight for fairer freight rates. The railroads know this. That's why they have come forth with it on the very eve of court decisions which, I feel sure, will not treat their rate-making bureaus kindly.

Since the South has so much at stake in the bill, I urge you to reopen hearings and let Governor Arnall and those associated with him in his remarkable fight on behalf of the South be heard.

Sincerely,

MRS. JUD COLLIER.

Civil War in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of November 9, 1945:

CIVIL WAR IN CHINA

Although Chinese politics are often not what they appear and sometimes take surprising turns, current events point ominously to full-scale civil war between the Communists and the Nationalist Kuomintang Government headed by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The main battleground is logically the group of northeastern provinces, formerly under Japanese occupation. The struggle here is complicated by the presence of some 60,000 United States marines, garrisoning Peiping, Tientsin, and other key cities under an agreement with the national government to facilitate the surrender and evacuation of Japanese troops. This has been bitterly denounced by the Communists as intervention, and the prompt removal of the American detachments is demanded. The State Department has announced that it is planned to withdraw them.

At so crucial a moment it is well to analyze the basic factors behind the current situation, and on the basis of such analysis to attempt an evaluation of the deeper trends.

The first thing to understand is that the present armed clash in China is merely the latest stage of a Kuomintang-Communist struggle which has been going on for the past two decades. The Japanese invasion of China merely banked the fires of factional strife without quenching them, and now that the common Japanese menace has been removed the strife is being resumed.

The main reason why the two factions have been unable to compose their quarrel is that, in the last analysis, both aim to control the

whole of China and guide its national evolution. However, this does not mean that the two should be considered in terms of equality by outsiders. Despite their best efforts the Communists have never been more than a local rebellious opposition to a Central Government that has consistently controlled most of China and has been recognized and dealt with as such by nearly all foreign nations. America, like Britain and Russia, are under treaty obligations to aid the National Government in promoting China's postwar reconstruction, and it would appear to be in our interest that such assistance should be continued. We certainly would gain nothing and would lose much by seeing China devastated by a prolonged civil war. To avert that evil we could well afford to risk the displeasure of the Communists, who would be genuinely satisfied only if we withdrew all support from the National Government and thereby tacitly acknowledged the claim of the Communist regime to equality of status. There would seem to be no reason why Washington should now alter the policy of full recognition and support for the National Government which it has hitherto pursued.

Dry-Goods Merchants Present Interesting Exhibit in Connection With OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, renewed interest in the activities of the Office of Price Administration is manifest in a variety of ways. In the House Office Building there is an OPA exhibit which the retail dry-goods merchants say tells its own story. This is not exactly a rival attraction intended to take interest away from the retail dealers in automobiles and trucks, who are having their hearings before the Committee on Small Business in the House caucus room. However, it would appear to a casual observer that the men who retail dry goods for a living have a great deal in common with the men who sell automobiles and trucks for a living.

In spite of constant protests by OPA officials that they are keeping prices down, in a newspaper item today I noted a news story to the effect that OPA has raised the ceiling 15 percent on underwear, shirts, and so forth. This means that the manufacturers can charge 15 percent more on some two dozen items than has heretofore been possible. This story in itself shows the inefficiency and dreamland-like atmosphere which surrounds OPA. They had to either increase the price which the manufacturers could charge or else there would be no underwear for returning veterans from World War II. The story which really shows what happens when you interfere with the law of supply and demand is found in the Washington Daily News for today, November 14, and is as follows:

OPA UPS CEILING 15 PERCENT ON UNDERWEAR, SHIRTS

To spur production of low-cost clothing needed by veterans, their families, and "others with limited incomes," the Office of Price Administration today had authorized a 15-percent increase in manufacturer's ceilings on some two dozen items.

Items included in the order issued late yesterday include those which returned GI's have found hardest to obtain—underclothing, socks, handkerchiefs, pajamas, shirts. Especially shirts. Also included are training pants and shirts for small children, knit vests for women.

The OPA order, effective tomorrow, gave retail ceilings which will vary according to the article. Examples: Men's shorts now 40 cents, up to 50 cents, those selling now at $1.35 up to $1.70; men's pajamas now $1.35, up to $1.65. OPA said increases would be less on knit than woven goods.

The above item shows what is happening to the dry-goods business when Government experts try to control the law of supply and demand, prices, and other matters that have to do with the manufacture and distribution of any kind of merchandise. The item also disproves the suggestion that OPA has kept prices down.

DRY-GOODS ASSOCIATION EXHIBIT

The article that is of particular interest and which tells its own story is the item in the Washington Daily News for today, November 14. This relates to the exhibition of the Dry-Goods Association. The item in part reads as follows:

THE CONSUMER PAYS AND PAYS—MERCHANTS' EXHIBIT TRIES TO BLAME OPA

OPA is doing everything from "discouraging childbirth" by the price on scooters to knocking the bottom out of the men's shorts business, according to merchants who have opened a "let's knock some sense into the OPA" exhibit in the New House Office Building.

In an effort to pressure Congressmen into voting out the OPA "hold the line" policy, Representative FRED A. HARTLEY (Republican, New Jersey), of the Smith Committee To Investigate Executive Agencies, and the National Retail Dry Goods Association are putting on a display of alleged pricing inequalities—which yesterday nearly led to blows between an OPA man and a dime-to-dollar store magnate—over an electric iron.

VERBAL BATTLE

In a roomful of rayon petticoats, men's balbriggan knit pajamas, and electric appliances, Robert Seidel, of W. T. Grant Co., and Louis A. Williams, OPA chief of housewares and hardwares, faced each other over an electric iron which Mr. Williams claimed "we never put a price ceiling on at all." "You did," retaliated Seidel. "We didn't," growled Williams, which led to an exchange of "dids" and "didn't" which ended only when Williams grabbed an electric heater and stalked away.

The dry goods association is attempting to prove that OPA is forcing inferior goods at high prices on the consumer because OPA is holding the line on ceiling to established manufacturers.

SCOOTER EXHIBIT

Prize display at the exhibit are two scooters, one a sturdy little vehicle, the other a spindly imitation. Allegedly the manufacturer of scooter No. 1 was forced out of the business when OPA refused to lift the 1941 ceiling wholesale price from $1.92. But manufacturer of scooter No. 2 applied to OPA in 1945 for a ceiling based on current costs and was given a ceiling of $3.75, according to Dr. Paul C. Olson, official of the NRDGA. He added, "It's discouraging childbirth—it's race suicide."

"It Starts in the Cradle," shouts a red-letter sign over two baby dresses. OPA is making babies wear obviously inferior little garments which cost wholesale $10.50 per dozen, while manufacturers refuse to make organdy whatnots at $8.50 per dozen, claim the baby dress people.

The dry goods merchants are expecting OPA Chief Chester Bowles to visit the display. Yesterday they kept peering out the door anxiously. One commented repeatedly, "Boy, will Chester's face be red."

Mr. Speaker, we will, of course, be met with the argument that the OPA is necessary to prevent inflation. In my opinion, that is not true. We need price controls but they should be administered by some branch of the Government with men of some practical experience in charge, who know what the normal business requirements demand and who use some common sense in establishing whatever regulations are needed. You will find none of these elements in OPA. It is a failure and is retarding economic recovery and production on a peacetime basis. Just bear in mind that as long as OPA carries out its theory, making it impossible for people to make a profit, just so long will we follow the economic program that prevents production of goods. This means no jobs. So when the unemployment lines begin to lengthen and that is very likely to happen, just remember that OPA has done everything it could to create unemployment.

Suggestions for Improved Occupation of Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hubert W. Kregeloh is a commentator on Station WSPR at Springfield, Mass., who has gained widespread recognition as a scholarly, thought-provoking analyst of world affairs. He brings to his large audience of listeners carefully prepared essays on international problems. He has lived overseas for many years, has studied and worked in foreign countries, and has gained an insight into the character, outlook, and ambitions of many foreign groups with different ideologies.

Recently Mr. Kregeloh discussed conditions in Germany. Some of his remarks have been devoted to the administration of internal affairs in Germany by the Russians, British, French, and Americans.

Because of his background, experience, and personal knowledge of the people of Germany I am certain that all Americans can gain a better understanding of the part played by our Government in postwar Germany at the present time by reading the remarks of Mr. Kregeloh, which I herewith quote:

Since 1942 the best American experts had warned the military and civilian authorities that once again the German problem would not be resolved satisfactorily if the conquering Allied Powers assumed the administration of a defeated Germany without a detailed blueprint, on which they could jointly agree, to cover the requirements of the assignment. Such a blueprint was never drafted and Allied rule in the Reich tragi-

cally bears out the warning. Some United States Army officers connected with the European Allied Military Government have endeavored to paint a relatively bright picture of the situation, which is understandable; all of these men are naturally eager to give the impression that they have done a good job. But General Eisenhower himself has warned that the situation is bad and that, apparently, is the opinion of all competent authorities.

Chief blame for failure rests with the inability of the Allies to agree on a joint program for all of Germany. It was, for example, impossible to hope for genuine democratization of the German people after the division of the country into separate zones. In every zone the population is exposed to different forms of indoctrination—with the difference between the Russian sector on the one hand and the Anglo-American-French zones on the other especially pronounced. This can only result in confusion when eventually the zones are eliminated and Germans again intermingle freely. Recently, the unsatisfactory consequences of the division of Germany into separate zones were admitted publicly, among others, by General Eisenhower and British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin. Under these circumstances the occupation in the American sector separately could never have been a complete success even if a workable blueprint and better men had been available.

Yet the division of the Reich must be accepted as a fact. Plans are being submitted from various quarters for remedial action applicable to the whole Reich, but cannot be considered at this time because approval from the non-American occupying powers is probably unobtainable. The necessity remains, as far as we are concerned, to strive for every possible improvement of conditions in our own zone. Top-ranking correspondents whose dependability has never been questioned (including Drew Middleton, Raymond Daniell, Tania Long and Anne O'Hare McCormick of the New York Times, Pat Frank of Overseas News Agency) have reported conditions of such seriousness that we cannot afford to leave them unattended irrespective of the policies pursued by our allies in their zones.

On the basis of a conscientious study of all available information and personal observations in Nazi Germany over a number of years prior to the outbreak of World War II, I would propose certain measures to improve the situation. My suggestions fall into two main categories, the problem of the army of occupation and the civilian administrators who will replace Army personnel.

ARMY OF OCCUPATION

The morale of our Army in Europe, magnificent in the days of fighting, is poor now that it has switched to the task of occupation. The soldiers are dominated by the desire to get home because they have never been informed intelligently why their presence now is as vital to the winning of the peace as it was before to the winning of the war, because the vacillating policies tried out in Germany do not convey the impression of purpose and efficiency, and because the officers themselves are not uniformly an inspiration to the men. Especially grave is the circumstance that with increasing frequency Germans, instead of absorbing American democracy, are indoctrinating our troops with many of the Nazi ideas.

Knowledge of this situation will help us to cope with it insofar as its effects might be felt in the United States. We shall be able to steel ourselves against the popular misconception that GI Johnnie, having been there, must be right; we shall be capable of spotting the poison when contaminated servicemen espouse it on their return; and we should succeed in applying effective countermeasures. Countermeasures will be needed. Correspondents report that many servicemen in Germany now voice such alarming thoughts as "the Jews and their practices were responsible for Hitler's rise to power in the first place." These ideas, if left unattended, could fan to dangerous proportions already existing anti-Semitism in the United States.

More effectively, steps should be taken at the source of the trouble—in Germany. Since our troops presently over there are of low morale and in peril of infection with Nazi ideology, their value is doubtful and in any case limited. In the long run their contribution to the objectives we set out to accomplish might be completely negative. Under these circumstances, they should be pulled out at the earliest possible moment and replaced with an entirely new force, specially trained and streamlined for the occupation. In this way much of the harm already done could be neutralized.

A. Composition

1. Volunteers: The Army should at once begin to assemble in the United States an entirely new occupation force, composed exclusively of volunteers. The question whether in the future America's entire needs for military manpower can be met through voluntary enlistments is controversial. But it should at least be possible to find a sufficient number of volunteers for the task of occupying Germany among officers and men already in uniform—especially if that service is rendered more attractive than it is now. Volunteers should be used for this important task because their morale is always higher than that of draftees.

2. Selection: Officers as well as men for this purpose should be carefully selected for above-average intelligence and education. Recruits should all be 21 years or older. Germany today is a moral cesspool, and there is validity in public protests against exposing 18- or 19-year-old youngsters to the unusual immoral temptations over there.

B. Training

1. Indoctrination: Since the purpose of the recruiting drive would be the creation of a special occupation force, in preference to sending just anyone to Germany, the selection of volunteers of above-average intelligence and education must be implemented with other requirements. Training must take full advantage of the higher mental level of the recruits and avoid the mistake of creating lack of interest, a frequent cause of low morale with high-caliber men.

Emphasis must be overwhelmingly on spiritual and political indoctrination. All will have had combat training, many combat experience, before taking this course. Moreover, the probability of their having to fight as soldiers of occupation is small, whereas administrative ability and political astuteness will be needed every day. Therefore, physical instruction can be restricted to refresher and fitness courses, and instruction in new weapons introduced since their combat training. For the rest, training should be on a mental level comparable to college instruction, designed to equip the trainees with a type of knowledge which is now completely lacking in our army of occupation.

2. Period of training: In view of the facts that the men are already soldiers, have volunteered, and are specially selected, indoctrination training (once the program has been blueprinted) should require a relatively short period. On the basis of my own experience in conducting certain types of indoctrination courses for unselected military personnel, I should estimate that 3 to 4 months of intensified training would suffice, provided the instructors are thoroughly qualified.

3. Instructors: Qualifications include a thorough grasp of the material, efficiency in selecting the necessary while omitting the superfluous, ability to include a maximum amount of useful knowledge in the time available, and—especially important—a talent to stimulate enthusiasm in the trainees. The instructors must be international relations and current events experts with a progressive outlook. The faculties of colleges and universities should be able to provide a portion of the instructors. Other competent men will be found among newspapermen and radio news analysts with lecture experience, especially among foreign correspondents, some of whom are deeply concerned with the problem.

To attract good men and to do the job right, remuneration should be satisfactory. Many individuals qualifying eminently as instructors would be interested if they could work on the project on a part-time basis.

C. Service

1. Period of time: This should be limited. Soldiers who do not become desperately homesick after a certain length of time in Europe are in danger of starting to feel at home in the enemy country, and even a strong character with the best political training may find it difficult to resist German influences. To some extent this threat can be countered by providing adequate American recreation and education facilities and opportunity for leaves and furloughs in European countries outside Germany.

It is nevertheless advisable that the members of the occupation force, as a rule, not be left in Germany longer than from 6 to 12 months. After that period officers and men should be returned to the United States even if they desire to stay, and they should be replaced with a new force that had undergone the same training in the interim. Exceptions, especially among the officers, would be men who had proved themselves extraordinarily efficient in the field. These could be retained for additional terms if they desire, and could break in the new arrivals.

The limitation of the occupation service to a relatively short period is also desirable because it will stimulate the enlistment of qualified military personnel who would be rebuffed by the prospect of additional service for a long time.

2. Rotation: The military authorities will no doubt find it desirable to institute some rotation system, especially at the start of the new program, under which a portion of the force would stay one or more months longer than others. This will forestall the total disappearance of seasoned occupation troops before the replacements have had a chance to familiarize themselves with the service in practice.

CIVILIAN ADMINISTRATION

It has been officially announced that, while the army of occupation is to be retained, the American military administrators are to be replaced by civilians before June 1946. We assume that in the future the Army officers in the American zone will be in charge only of the army of occupation, which would constitute the enforcement instrument of the newly appointed civilian administration. A distinct probability of improvement is to be anticipated. With notable exceptions, the Army officers now in charge of administrative functions have not done an outstanding job—chiefly because, despite the brilliant record many of them made on the field of battle, they did not have the training, talents, knowledge, and taste for the peculiar complexities of the administrative task. They were needed during the transition from war to peace, when the job continued to be as much military as administrative, but (again with notable exceptions) they are not now in functions suited to their qualifications and training.

Apparently the civilian administrators are to be selected on a voluntary basis, with special attention paid their qualifications, such as the ability to speak German, understanding of the broad problems involved, and specialized experience in such fields as public relations, industrial supervision, banking, transportation, food distribution, and others. The civilian volunteers will approach their

assignments with greater enthusiasm and more competence than most of the men running the administration of Germany now. To mention one crucial element, our correspondents have reported that much too large a number of United States Army officers are wanting in efficiency because they do not know enough German and are forced to rely on native translators and interpreters of uncertain dependability.

Yet encouraging as the prospect of the change appears, those familiar with the German mentality will voice a serious objection. Germans, even before Hitler's rise to power, had been trained to associate authority with a uniform of some sort. The American who would attempt to boss them in a business suit has a serious disadvantage against him in comparison to the American in uniform—even though the latter might be much less competent. Ridiculous as it sounds to Americans, modern Germans are not awed by a civilian irrespective of his authority, while they will bow and scrape before almost any man in uniform, especially if added to the uniform is a string of pompous titles. Under nazism this cult reached its most grotesque excesses, largely because uniforms and titles made zealous Nazis of mediocre men who would never have amounted to much in our society. Shortly before the war, the streets of German cities were crowded with men in all sorts of uniforms, some of them fantastic. Inquiry often resulted in information that the wearers were officials in the forestry department, electric light company, and similar nonmartial institutions.

I suggest, therefore, that we should be making a grave mistake if we dispatched administrators in business suits to Germany. They should be given a specially designed uniform, distinctive in appearance, however, from the uniforms of our armed services. The fancier that uniform is, the better. It would be worn exclusively by American civilian administrators and would pass out of existence with the termination of the occupation. We may expect that the idea, so much in conflict with American tradition, will not be palatable to the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, the public, nor to the men who wear the uniforms. However, we must bear in mind that we are dealing with a people of strange ways and we want results. We wish to develop a better policy in Germany, and we also want the Germans to carry out our orders with promptness, not with the secret suspicion that the American does not have the authority he assumes. A uniform, any uniform, is exceedingly necessary in the Allied administration of Germany.

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Rev. Sam H. Zealy, of Washington, N. C.:

LOCAL MINISTER DISCUSSES COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING

(By Sam H. Zealy)

"I am clear in my own mind that, as an essential factor in the maintenance of peace in the future we must have universal military training after this war." These pertinent words were penned and spoken by the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. It is very apparent that our President advocates universal training for the youth of these United States. Since these lines were spoken the present President has called for universal military training.

The American Legion together with other military organizations concur in the same view. Here and there we find ministers of the gospel and even some denominations who favor the idea.

However, in a recent coast to coast survey sponsored by the Aeronautical Training Society only 67 percent of the civilian population favored making military training compulsory. This, too, is a wartime survey. Militarists are of the opinon that when peace comes, this percentage will decrease considerably.

But the clergy seems to be alining itself together on the issue to oppose any compulsory training in peacetime, though some think we should be better prepared than we were before Pearl Harbor. The Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, supposing to speak for some 22,000,000 Protestants in 25 denominations is unalterably opposed.

A spokesman for the Committee on World Peace for the Southern Baptist Convention has declared that a compulsory law now enacted is a defeatist view.

The Roman Catholic Church has firmly opposed the principle. The Committee of the Roman Catholic Association for International Peace says, "America's new position in world affairs calls for a reorganization for our traditional defense policy but universal peacetime military service should be a last resort."

The National Commission on Christian Higher Education of the Association of American Colleges has asked for a delay in congressional action on this matter.

It is repugnant to a right-thinking citizen who lives in "the land of the free, and the home of the brave" to think of such a law being enacted and enforced in peacetime. But there are certain facts which the same citizen must face.

First, we must admit that the world is not Christian but pagan. There are 2,500,000,000 persons on this globe and only 500,000,000 profess the Christian religion (this group includes Protestants, Catholics of all types, Syrians, and Christian cults). There are four pagans to every Christian.

Second, we must admit and deplore the fact that Germany, the cradle of Reformation Protestant Christianity, and Italy, the seat of Roman Catholicism both were the instigators of this global conflagration.

Third, we must concede that the Bible is true and that this is not the last war and that there "will be wars and rumors of war" throughout the human history of man. Because of the above, I think we as custodians of this world ought to be realist enough to see that "this war is not to be waged to end all wars," and we ought to be better prepared to forestall the propensity of human nature.

I repeat, "It is repugnant to a right thinking citizen who lives in 'the land of the free and the home of the brave' to think of such a law being enacted and enforced in peacetime, but some such law is necessary, if we are to strive for security for our children and those yet unborn.

There have been presented as far as I have read, three such plans for securing peace for the future. Let us dwell upon each plan and evaluate it.

First, the plan for drafting our youth for 1 year's time in military training. The idea has in mind compelling the boy when he reaches a certain age to cease his schooling or resign his work and train in the arts of war for 1 year, part of the time, say 3 months, be spent in this country training and 9 months outside our borders patrolling the world.

This training would be disciplinary, educational, and extremely broadening. But it also would be very expensive to the Government and would break into the youth's line of study or work. Educators feel that this plan will make of our youth will-of-the-wisps, dreamers, and twentieth century nomads. In other words, after this training they will not immediately take up where they left off.

Second, a plan to draft our youth in the same manner as the plan above mentioned but to train them in camps of this country similar to the former Civilian Conservation Corps camps. They would not learn the arts of war except close order drill without guns. They would do the same type of work that the boys in the CCC camps did. This type of training would also be disciplinary but not as educational and broadening as the former plan.

To the Government this too would be expensive and it also would break into that adolescent period when a youth is busily engaged in preparing himself for life.

Some have suggested that there be courses taught to supplement their school. This would be splendid but the problem of expense and the impossible problem of finding teachers is unsolved.

Third, this plan calls for compulsory sports. The idea I suppose is that in each preparatory school, college, or university we have a period of athletics during the day as we have mathematics or English. This would be placed in the curriculum as a required subject.

This idea strikes a responsive chord in a peacetime citizen. Coaches are already provided for the regular program of athletics. There would be facilities available for gymnastics and all types of athletic contests. It would be conceded that this would cost incalculably less than the former two plans.

But I believe this would not be the answer to our problem. Sound bodies do not necessarily make good soldiers. There would not be the discipline taught in compulsory sports as is needed in the making of a good soldier. Some have advanced the theory that our high school and college athletics have made excellent soldiers. To that I agree, but who has sought to ascertain what percentage of them had also military training to increase their usefulness.

In my opinion, the plan that has been used in my life and in thousands of young men who attended the Academy of Richmond County in Augusta, Ga., and similar schools all over the country is the solution to our problem. I speak in regards to the Reserve Officers Training Corps, 4 years of high school and 2 years of college military training.

Let us have an expanded program of military training to reach every preparatory school in the United States where there are 100 boys who are eligible and offer this same training to the State universities and colleges as well as privately owned schools of higher education. In the latter schools the Government should issue clothing, equipment, and underwrite the youth's sustenance. This would give to nearly every boy the opportunity to have at least 2 years of college and many of them would be able to gain their degree by this initial help.

Let me say in my own military training that the groundwork for discipline, coordination, cooperation with people, public speaking, dignity, and physical development was laid. This program did not make us military minded but it did give us a feeling of security for the future.

This set-up will be more expensive than the compulsory sports plan but much less expensive than the 1 year military training. Every small town or community in which is located a consolidated school where there are 100 boys who are eligible could share in such a plan. This training should be compulsory unless the boy was excused by a reputable medical doctor. Then the 2-year college training which would be voluntary but which would provide room and board and equipment so that youths from small schools who desire college would profit thereby, together with any others who desired.

In the academy, during the years 1827–1931, we had 700 in the military department. It was staffed adequately by one commissioned officer and one enlisted man. The Government should pay one-half of the cost of the uniforms to be bought through a local clothier who would bid in on the business directly to the Government. This idea of finding clothes for a boy of this age would be highly acceptable also to the mothers.

In my 4 years of ROTC there was not one, to my knowledge, who had a legitimate excuse for not taking military training unless it was medical. Even today as a minister I still see no grounds for objecting.

This is the solution to our problem of being prepared for war in time of peace. A Reserve Officers Training Corps in every preparatory school in these United States with an enrollment of over 100 boys, and a similar unit in our school of higher learning for the first and second years, the Government in the latter schools underwriting clothing, equipment, and sustenance.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. HOCH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the enclosed letter from Mrs. May Chapman, 1230 Schuylkill Avenue, Reading, Pa., with regard to universal military training:

READING, PA., *November 12, 1945.*
Hon. DANIEL HOCH,
Washington; D. C.

DEAR SIR: I understand we are facing the issue of whether to have our sons serve under a system of military training for 1 year after completion of high school, or not. Having a son of my own, I have given this issue much thought and have come to some conclusions which I feel I must express:

1. While I agree that a certain amount of military training would benefit our boys, I feel that it should not be done by taking 1 year of their lives after completion of high school.

2. Yes, do let us keep our boys physically fit—at all times—examine them each year through high school, and correct any irregularities.

3. If military discipline is to be taught, why not do it during the summer months, or just during the summer following graduation? After all, our boys during this war had only a basic training of 13 weeks and sometimes were in actual combat shortly afterward.

4. If it is necessary that they should be educated as to the scientific advancements of war, in such subjects as ballistics, aeronautics, etc., as mentioned by our Honorable President, why not incorporate these subjects in the high-school curriculum; if necessary, eliminate some other subjects and have each boy select which type of service he would prefer, and study the subjects pertaining to that service? After all, it is claimed that the knowledge the boys acquired of these subjects during the war would benefit them in peacetime employment, why then would not the same thing apply if these same subjects were presented during peacetime? Also, by educating during the 4 years of high school we could teach them all the new advancements as they are made.

5. Due to the rapid change in our living standards, and the constantly increasing need for advanced education, our marriage age has advanced several years beyond that of several generations ago, thus producing moral problems which were unknown when the common marriage age was lower.

6. To take 1 year after high school would not only advance the marriage age, but also add 1 year to the period of years of completion of a subsequent college course, or any further advancement in a trade, starting a business, or at least putting another year between the age of actually earning a living.

7. In many cases I feel this year of interruption would mean a loss of incentive to continue on to college or higher education, especially in families of modest incomes.

8. In concluding, I do feel that we would be making a grave mistake if this measure becomes a law. Why train our boys to defend our democracy if we have lost the freedom we would train them supposedly to defend? Our dictators made soldiers of their men, not to preserve their freedom, but to take freedom away from other nations. Let us not make the same mistake. We mothers beg you to voice your protest against this measure.

Sincerely,

MRS. MAY CHAPMAN.

The Owners and Employees of the Aluminum Co. of America Rendered Such Outstanding Service to the Nation They Were Twice Awarded the Army and Navy E—Will This Administration Be Permitted To Use the Taxpayers' Money To Destroy This Great Enterprise?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a statement made by me and published in the Knoxville News-Sentinel of November 4, the Maryville and Alcoa Daily Times, and the Maryville Enterprise, and an editorial of the Knoxville News-Sentinel of Saturday, November 10, Baiting Alcoa.

The article follows:

The attack of the United States Government on the Aluminum Co. of America is the boldest, most unwarranted and the longest step that has been attempted by this administration and that of President Roosevelt to destroy private enterprise in this country. The great plant of the company at Alcoa in Blount County is the largest single industrial plant in this congressional district or in the entire State.

The Aluminum Co. came to this section more than 40 years ago because of the availability of hydroelectric power and the reservoir of the best and highest type of labor in the Nation. It built dams on the waters of the rivers in the mountains of Blount County and North Carolina and spent millions of dollars in our midst.

The company pioneered in the production of aluminum. It developed, trained, and maintained a department of research and has constantly increased the production of this wonder metal and constantly lowered its price. It expanded the use of its product so that today it is used to make countless household articles—pots and pans, dishes, furniture, and other articles too numerous to mention. Its industrial use is constantly expanding—in the automobile, railroad equipment—and the production of aluminum gave us the air supremacy without which we could not have won this war.

The company's plant in our midst more than doubled its capacity since 1940, and it built for the United States Government 52 aluminum plants throughout the country. It made no charge for these services, and it furnished the know-how that operated 50 of these plants for the Government. The profit from the operation of these 50 plants was divided between the company and the Government. When the company paid taxes on its $6,000,000 of profits, it received virtually nothing from its operation of these Government plants.

The company has violated no law against monopoly. If it had, the Government would have indicted it under the antimonopoly law.

The Government is attacking the company solely on the ground that it is big and that the company has created a demand for aluminum and has supplied that demand at constantly lowered prices.

The company owns only a small percentage of the bauxite from which aluminum is made. It has never prevented any other company from entering into competition with it.

This great enterprise built by the savings of private individuals and developed by the research, skill, and ability of citizens of this country is guilty of what the New Dealers consider a crime—the crime of success.

It has succeeded because it has kept in advance of the people's need for aluminum. Its growth has brought indispensable articles into the homes and lives of our people, has created wealth and comforts shared by millions of Americans, and has poured, and is pouring, millions in taxes into the Treasury of the United States, of the State of Tennessee, and of Blount County.

To give you some idea of the benefits to the State of Tennessee, and especially to Blount, Knox, Monroe, and Loudon Counties, I call your attention to the following facts:

During the years 1942, 1943, and 1944 the Aluminum Co. of America at its great plant at Alcoa, in Blount County, paid to its employees $65,462,000. This great plant in Blount County paid out in express and freight rates $14,472,000. It purchased materials in Tennessee to the amount of $12,786,000. It paid in taxes in Tennessee $4,943,000. It purchased from the Tennessee Valley Authority electric power in the sum of $20,372,000. In these 3 years it spent in our midst $118,035,000.

The Aluminum Co. is the only company in the country that will pay the Government anything like the value of the Government-owned plants that are now idle and that cost the taxpayers $700,000,000.

The Government is proposing to virtually give these plants to anyone other than the Aluminum Co., and to subsidize the company that takes them as a virtual gift, and to guarantee such company against loss in their operation. This proposal is so raw that the administration will have to come to Congress for its approval. Congress in my opinion will not approve such a scheme.

The editorial is as follows:

BAITING ALCOA

Whether or not it was the polite thing to do at the time and place, Attorney General Clark's recent remark about the Government's insistence that the Aluminum Co. of America be held a monopoly and split up were only a reiteration. The United States official who heads the Department of Justice said in an interview while here to address the State bar last week substantially what he had asserted earlier in official utterances

in Washington. But the fact that this area is the seat of the Aluminum Co.'s huge plants at Alcoa, Tenn., made his remarks here all the more pointed.

We were not surprised that General Clark's controversial attitude was to draw fire in return. And Congressman JOHN JENNINGS certainly made a vigorous retort.

"This great enterprise (Alcoa) built by the savings of private individuals and developed by the research, skill, and ability of citizens of this country, is guilty of what the New Dealers consider a crime—the crime of success," said Mr. JENNINGS.

Now the question of whether the Alcoa as a corporation is a monopoly is one that is still not finally settled. But that question is one for the courts and perhaps Congress to settle and not other Government agencies.

During the war Alcoa built and operated at Government request half a dozen plants over the country. Now, that it is time for disposal of these plants, Alcoa has waived any claim to buying and operating them under the terms laid down by the administration. But along comes the Surplus Property Administrator and offers to let competing companies obtain these plants under most favored terms—more favorable than were offered to Alcoa.

As our sister paper, the Pittsburgh Press, said recently in an editorial reprinted on this page, the question of whether Alcoa is a monopoly is one thing and whether Government subsidies should be employed to set up competitors to Alcoa in business is quite another. We feel quite sure that the payers of withholding and income taxes and buyers of war bonds did not intend for their money to be used to provide competitors for a corporation which, even though big, was big enough to pay its own way and get along for years. Alcoa did not take one dime's worth of Federal subsidy for its own benefit even during the war.

The role of the Surplus Property Division in helping to break up Alcoa as a monopoly is one that seems out of order. What the Surplus Property Administrator should do is to recapture as much as possible of the money furnished by the taxpayers of the United States that went into Defense Plant Corporation properties built to increase aluminum production during the war. That and that alone is his function, not to feed new money into the venture merely to create competition. If Alcoa is to have competitors let them earn and pay their own way.

Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement of Dr. J. C. Stearns, who was in charge of personnel relations in the production of the atomic bomb and was director of the laboratory in Chicago during the last year. This statement was made in a meeting on atomic energy in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building on Thursday, November 8:

I am glad that Dr. Urey said a number of things I had in mind because I am sure that he can say them much better than I. Also, for your own sakes, it will allow me to shorten my own remarks. As always, I say again that I feel I have a right to speak on this subject with humility and earnestness of the same degree—both intense.

In the first place I came to Chicago at the very time the project was organized. All of you know the relation of Chicago to the atomic bomb project on the whole was much the same as the relation is between the Bell Telephone laboratories and the world-wide telephone system. Chicago was the original laboratory at which the original scientific work for the production of plutonium was consummated. It then became an advisory laboratory to all other parts of the atomic bomb project. I lived with these scientists. As a matter of fact, it was my privilege to settle and live with their troubles. My first problem on this atomic bomb project was to put Dr. Szilard on and off the pay roll three times on the same day. That gives you some idea of the way military regulations work on such a job.

I want to discuss with you what I consider scientific capital. I want to make inventory of the scientific capital that we had at the beginning of this war out of which the atomic bomb was built. I would like to divide this scientific capital into two categories, one of which, scientific principles, facts, and knowledge, was possessed by the scientists of this country at that time. And secondly, the scientific capital in terms of personnel which we had in this country at that time.

Now the scientific capital in terms of principles and knowledge was simply the knowledge of the atom. We knew it was mostly empty space with a little bit of a center. Under certain conditions we transmuted the atom into another atom. You may make the atom radioactive in which the bomb becomes a little radio sending station, or like a little machine gun which throws out bullets. The neutron is such a bullet which could be used to cause an atom to split into two atoms which become two lesser atoms and release some 200,000,000 electronic volts of energy as compared with just a few volts in an ordinary chemical reaction.

One thing I would like to make clear is that most of the scientific capital of which I have spoken was not developed in this country but came from abroad. It came from England, France, Germany, and from Italy. We were the possessors of this because it was a free interchange of scientific information. It came to us via that route and a large fraction or large percentage of this was imported capital.

Secondly, I would like to mention the kind of capital we had in the way of scientific personnel. If you have read the Smyth report you will realize that among the first five men who proposed to our country the possibility of using fission to produce a military instrument, was Szilard, who is with us, and Fermi, Teller, Weisskopf. A majority of these people were not citizens at that time. Much of the scientific capital which went all the way through the project making it possible to develop military weapons which ended—did not win, but ended the war quickly—was imported. It came to us because we have what I believe was the greatest asset in the world for defense; that is, a haven to those scientists who wished to have free expression to work in terms of free enterprise and to live in a country in which freedom existed.

What is the future of our country with respect to this instrument? I think Szilard made it perfectly clear that while it has given us an advantage and has saved many lives by ending this war quickly, we may have something which places us at a great disadvantage in the years to come if we fail now in making proper use of this energy. First of all, in living with all these scientists as I do, I know that all of them believe that this Nation must remain strong whatever its future function in the world—come war or peace. To survive we must remain strong, and no nation is going to remain strong if any of these sources of scientific capital are in any way hampered. We may remain a physically strong nation. We may remain strong if we make wise use of scientific capital, as I have already said, which during the war was greatly depleted. No more scientists were trained, nor new principles discovered, and we have a 4-year period that has been almost bankrupt from the point of view of the production of scientific capital. We must again get immediately to this phase of the work if the Nation is to remain strong.

Secondly, we must develop the second phase of scientific capital; namely, we must develop new scientific facts, principles, and laws. In other words, it means we must enter upon a vigorous wholehearted program of research which again stimulates free enterprise and research which has given rise to these unexpected things which man makes use of in times of need and in other times as well. Let me mention two things. I think we are likely to be led completely astray by thinking only of the atomic bomb. What one has done is to split the uranium atom, and in language which we all know, namely, we have chosen one main course and went down the course without investigating the side avenues. That is the one thing the military and other people did for us during the war. Our primary job was to get the bomb made. We took only one scientific fact and followed it through to its conclusion.

It is known to all scientists that if you could convert hydrogen to make helium, the amount of energy would be far greater than the amount of energy we now have by splitting the uranium atom. In my own field, a field which appears to have no social or military significance, the field of cosmic rays in which you sit up on top of a mountain during the summer and count little rays coming in. It is a practice which was almost completely dropped at the beginning of the war. This research has shown the presence of particles known as mesatrons, which release not millions or hundreds of millions of volts of energy but release hundreds of billions of volts of energy.

What I am mentioning is that if there should be another war, the strength of the country in all probability will depend as much upon new discoveries which are made as it will upon the utilization of scientific principles we already know. If we do not make provision for both the discovering and creating of these and also acquiring them from other places, we are short-sighted, indeed, as regards the strength of our own Nation.

The particular part of this May-Johnson bill which I think will be very dangerous to the country is the part upon which Dr. Urey has talked, namely, that is the part with respect to security. Let's ask what this sort of thing would do. The bill says that it is in the power of the commission to decide whether or not a harmful amount of energy has been released. Under those conditions can I work on mesatrons? I just don't know. I don't know what harmful amounts of energy are concerned. And may I join with the other speakers in my concern of the last 4 years under an organization similar to this suggested in the bill which gives me very grave doubt as to whether or not I could start in on any such thing with any assurance I could go through with it.

What would happen with the results would be twofold. First of all, we have security. If we have secrecy with respect to our own research other nations will reciprocate. They couldn't do anything else. Remember what we said at first—that a large fraction of our scientific capital in the way of fundamental research came from foreign countries. That is one field in which we cannot compete with other nations—that is the field of keeping secrecy, and I am glad we cannot.

Secondly, I am not different from other scientists. A scientist is not going to work

in a field in which he has to have freedom of thought and freedom of enterprise when he knows at any moment someone from a commission not responsible to anyone may within their own judgment say, "No, this experiment cannot go on." So we will do two things. We will lock the door to information coming in from outside—being imported. We will also make ourselves weaker with respect to research being done in this country. I think security as shown in this bill, or any security at all, will materially weaken our standing and strength of our Nation among other nations. Finally, just let me say that if security concerning fundamental research is insisted upon, that we may expect to happen here what has happened in other places. Instead of Fermi, Szilard, and Wigner coming to our shores we may expect them to emigrate to such shores where such and such a thing may be done. I feel the very bill itself sabotages—no, that is not a good word, for it is one they use on us—the very bill destroys the very thing that we want to make strong. I think it will be fine for you to hear from the next scientist, who is a young man who worked on this project.

I might say this—that the scientists entered upon this project first of all to find out whether or not an atomic bomb could be made. I think it was the hope of most of them to find out it couldn't be done and so could go home and know there was no such danger. But every step indicated it could be done, and when it was done the primary and all-important motive was that this must be done before Germany did it. They hoped that when that happened the war would end and lives would be saved and it would prevent future wars. I have seen, actually, Fermi age some 25 years on the project and each and every man who has lived for this thing comes to know, as people cannot know who hear of it overnight, what the thing means. A most enlightening statement was made by Wigner to General Groves when he said, "You will do a disservice to the American people by keeping this information from them because the American people are going to have to decide after the war what should be done with this type of energy, when they themselves have not had the time to assimilate the facts and decide what this means." I listened to this statement, and it didn't mean much to me at the time. I didn't realize it takes years of living with a thing to realize its potentialities. Secondly, that secrecy keeps from the American people the very facts that we have to know to be strong as a democracy and strong as a physical Nation. Secrecy as such in fundamental research has no place in the American scheme of things.

Declaration of Principles of Republican State Central Committee of Arizona

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a declaration of principles by the Republican State Central Committee of Arizona, dated November 7, 1945.

Mr. Speaker, from out in the great Southwest comes a declaration of principles and fundamentals which, in my humble opinion, clearly presents the issues between the two major political parties in this country. It is radicalism versus prudent conservatism. Otherwise stated, the New Deal Democratic philosophy based upon a supernatural state embracing the fundamentals of state socialism versus a policy based upon the fundamental concepts of a republican form of government as contemplated and practiced by Jefferson and Lincoln.

This declaration of principles by the Republican State Central Committee of Arizona is, to my way of thinking, so timely and so clearly states the issues, as to recommend its reading to all citizens, regardless of present party affiliations, who have hope and faith in the future of a free America.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES BY REPUBLICAN STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF ARIZONA, NOVEMBER 7, 1945

The Republican Party of the State of Arizona recognizes that the major political issue in this State and in the Nation is between extreme radicalism and prudent conservatism.

We intend to meet this issue without evasion or equivocation and to fight it with every honorable resource within our power and our abilities.

Therefore the Republican Party of Arizona declares itself to be the Conservative Party of this State, and to be in militant opposition to the Democratic or Radical Party which by word, plan, and action is striving to fasten communistic theories and practices upon this State and upon this Nation.

We believe it to be our duty to give the voters of this State the opportunity to make a definite choice between the unwholesome trend of the Democratic Party toward state socialism or communism or unbridled radicalism, and a sane, wholesome, statesmanlike conservatism aimed to preserve the democratic form of government of the State and the Nation, and the freedom of the individual within the framework of fair and just and impartial laws courageously and impartially administered for the common good.

We believe that the only device by which a republican form of government can be maintained is through the operation of the two-party system. A strong, alert, intelligent, patriotic minority party vigilant in its opposition, firm in its criticism, efficient in its alternative proposition, is indispensable to the permanence of the Republic.

The existence of the two-party system requires the statement of opposed principles and program in clear terms in order that the citizens may make a choice at election time. There must be a defined battle line between the two parties which must be stated clearly and adhered to faithfully by the minority party. Only by this conduct can it hope to become the majority party.

The Republican Party of this State desires to compel a choice between its program and principles, and the program and principles of the Democratic Party.

Therefore, after solemn deliberations the Republican Party makes public this declaration of its principles, its program, and its plan.

President Truman has by word and act established the party line for the Democratic Party. Explicitly and clearly he has declared the Democratic Party to be the radical party of the Nation and of the States. He has made it explicit that the Democratic Party, under his leadership, will turn to the left, and that his program of legislation will carry the country in the direction of state socialism. He has made it explicit that his program shall include further centralization of Federal authority, deficit spending, radical class legislation, administration of the law to favor radical groups, curtailment of individual freedoms, a progressive nullification of the rights and privileges of the 48 States and increasing circumscription and strangling of the American system of fair and free competition in business.

In each instance, to the detriment of the State of Arizona, this radical party line has been echoed and aped by the imitative State administration of Governor Osborn.

The Republican Party of this State, therefore, true to its obligations to the State and to the Nation, declares itself to be in determined opposition to these principles and to this program. It offers a home and a rallying place for that vast body of American voters of all parties who wish to express their disapproval of 13 years of radical encroachment; and who wish to preserve that form of government and that way of life and that wise method of conducting our private and our business affairs which has made the United States the greatest, most progressive, most powerful, and most happy nation on the earth.

The Republican Party of Arizona defines its conception of the meaning of the word "conservative." To conserve means to save. A conservative party, first, is a party opposed to unbridled radicalism. It is not a party of reaction nor one whose mind is closed to suggestions for moral, political, and social improvement. It is not a party that places property rights above human rights, but a party that recognizes the importance both of property and human rights, and protects both from impairment or destruction. It means a party devoted to saving and protecting our republican form of government with its guaranties of equal opportunity for all. It does not believe in government by minorities, in class or race prejudice, or in favoring one section of our population above any other section, but it does believe in protecting all the citizens in all the rights by requiring all citizens, all classes, all groups to work for the common good. It means a party devoted to saving the right of every individual to make the most of his abilities in any business or calling he chocses, and to lay aside and keep and invest his surplus to insure security in old age; it means a party that shall devote itself to saving the United States and the State of Arizona from aping and adopting the evils of communism or socialism or any other foreign philosophy which may impair the right of each citizen to live his own life as he shall choose within the framework of just laws enacted for the protection of his neighbors.

The aims of a conservative party must be to save to the citizen his rights to maintain his home, create a family and educate it, and within his doors to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience. It must conserve his right to choose whatever calling may appeal to him as a means of livelihood, and to change that calling at will. It must conserve his right to go into any business he desires and to conduct that business without improper Government meddling. It must conserve his right to compete fairly with his business rivals, and to conduct his store, his shop, his farm, his factory according to his best judgment. The only laws that shall limit his freedom of action shall be those properly enacted to protect his neighbors, customers, and competitors from dishonesty and unfair practices and his employees from injustice and exploitation. It must conserve his right to make a profit, and amount of that profit shall be limited only by regulations against greed, extortion, dishonesty, the rights of his employees, and the health of the community. It must conserve his right not to be limited in the amount of his sales or of his production or his crops, and his right to buy where he will and to sell where he can. It must conserve and foster his right to risk his capital in new ventures and to make a reasonable profit thereby, and to compete, to invent, to expand for the benefit of himself and the community in which he dwells. This and

only this is the definition of the word "conservative" as it shall be applied to the program of the Republican Party.

The Republican Party of Arizona believes that the American system of private business and private capital has proven its excellence and its efficiency through the century and a half of the life of this nation. It must not be impaired nor destroyed. It is this American system that won the war by applying its genius, knowledge, and technique to the production and invention of ammunitions and instruments of war. This system, in operation, came to the aid of the world and saved the world. In competition with the systems of state socialism and communism it proved itself to be superior. Nations which do not believe in our system were compelled to call upon us for aid and would have gone down to defeat had not that aid been generously given. Other nations which did not believe in our system were decisively defeated. It has proved itself to be superior to any other system in war, as it has demonstrated its superiority in times of peace. The Republican Party of Arizona will fight to maintain that system against its enemies in the opposition party and the communistic allies of the opposition party.

The Republican Party of Arizona recognizes that the second of the great issues before this country is this: Shall organized labor rule the United States, or shall the United States govern organized labor?

The Republican Party of Arizona asserts that we must protect organized labor in each and every one of its just rights, but that we must not submit to be governed by it.

Organized labor comprises but a fraction of our population. We believe it dangerous to our future that a fraction of our citizens should be permitted to assume the dictatorship over all our citizens.

The Republican Party of Arizona believes that the great majority of the members of labor organizations are bewildered and appalled by the tactics and conduct of some of their leaders which have thrown this country into a turmoil of class strife, resulting in unnecessary, ill-advised and destructive strikes at a moment when unity and cooperation is necessary to undo the destruction of war, and to return this country to peace and prosperity.

We believe that the majority of the members of labor organizations desire that all unions be rescued from the hands of racketeers who have seized dictatorial powers in too many of the unions; and that they desire their unions to be purged of communistic influences which seek to make of a proper labor movement an instrumentality of revolution.

Because the Republican Party of Arizona is the sincere friend of responsible labor, and desires that labor shall be protected in all its basic rights, and assisted in its wise and prudent programs for the betterment of the workers of the country and of the State, it asserts that it will do all that lies within its power to assist the labor movement to free itself from the influence of racketeers, communists, and revolutionists, in order that the labor movement may be safe in the hands of the honest, industrious, patriotic, and moderate men who make up the majority of all labor unions.

The Republican Party proposes that all labor organizations shall be required to reorganize themselves according to republican forms and that each union, under proper law, shall become a responsible legal entity, whose rights, powers, privileges, and responsibilities shall be clearly defined, and that no labor organization shall be permitted to force its members by unwilling assessment to furnish money or to use its funds for the support of any political party or matters submitted to the votes of the people.

Labor should have its just share in the prosperity and the profits of industry; and that share should take the form of the highest possible wages, the best conditions in which to work, and the shortest practicable hours. But the public must be protected by measures that see to it that labor shall not take more than its just share to the detriment of the public at large. There exists no right in any minority group to monopolize prosperity, nor, by demanding more than its share, to prevent any other group, or the unorganized public, from participating equitably in the good things of life.

Send Daddy Back to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. HOCH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a poem by one of my juvenile constituents:

I am a little girl, you see, and trying to find a friend
Who'll be so kind and help me out with a lending hand.
You see, my problem is so big and I am just quite small,
I guess I'll never be able to understand it quite at all.

I have a daddy sweet and kind but he is far away,
And mommy always tells me we don't know how long he'll stay.
But gee, I miss him very much and want him to come home.
So mister, could you help me please, and try to bring him home?

I didn't understand, at first, why daddy went away—so
Mommy told me everything—just why he had to go.
But now the war is over and he's still across the sea.
Oh please, kind mister, help me, and bring him back to me.

I miss my daddy very much and feel so very sad
When I see some other children a-playing with their dad.
I have my mommy, it is true, but she is just like me,
So very lonesome and so blue for dad across the sea.

Now when I think of Christmas, I can think of only this
That my daddy would be the nicest gift of all the ones I wish.
But I know that good old Santa just can't bring him like a toy,
So I'm asking you to help me, please, and bring me all that joy.

I've tried to be so big and brave and not get feeling blue,
But now it seems so very long, I guess you'd feel sad too.
That's why I'm pleading for your help to make my daddy free,
And bring him home for Christmas so he can be with me.

So please be kind and help me out and I am sure there'll be
A thousand blessings from the Lord and a thousand thanks from me.
We'll all be happy once again when he comes home to stay,
And I'm counting on you, mister, to hasten on that day.

—*Sandra Leimbach.*

Letter of Bernard M. Baruch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *October 25, 1945.*

Hon. ALBERT GORE,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. GORE: It was nice seeing you and your friends the other night. My only regret is that after such wonderful stories from all parts of the country, I should have been called upon to speak on so serious a subject as inflation. Whether I succeeded or not at that late hour—perhaps all of our minds were on pleasanter subjects—I do not know.

Here is what I wanted to say: Before we can decide the question of inflation and all the other economic problems, domestic and foreign, facing us we must get an over-all picture of the balance sheet of the country—a kind of inventory that would show these facts:

What are our present debts? These must be divided into what the public holds in bonds which is more or less a demand debt, and what is owed to others. Also how much further do we have to go in debt to pay for war contracts terminated with the goods delivered and contracts still to run? How much will we have to raise for Bretton Woods, UNRRA, and foreign loans of every type?

Then, we ought to examine our productive capacity and determine how to divide that production, first, to see that enough of what is produced remains in the United States to avoid disastrous inflation, and then how much to allocate for the rehabilitation of Europe, China, the Philippines. Unless this dividing is done wisely, we will sink and the whole world will go down with us. We should direct our aid to foreign countries by giving priority to those who need the most and who will use it to help set themselves on their own feet.

If we promise loans to foreigners, the money will be useless if they cannot buy the goods from our production here. Such demands will further inflation temporarily because they aggravate demands here. There is no use giving foreigners credit (or our citizens greater buying power through increased wages and decreased taxes) unless we are willing to establish priorities which will ration our production where we want it to go until production increases.

We must be careful, when we give aid to other countries, that this aid is not used to nationalize their industries against us, to destroy our own competitive system which, I think, should be preserved. England, Czechoslovakia, France, and other countries are nationalizing or are about to nationalize their industries. Russia has totalized herself—one buyer and one seller—and is totalizing all countries coming under her aegis.

While examining our production here, we must survey all our mineral, agricultural, and other natural resources. We should not dispose of raw material surpluses unless they really are surplus for the whole United States, not simply surplus for some one Government department. On everything else, on all that is really surplus, sell, sell, sell. We cannot go on depleting our soil and mineral resources as we have in the past 7 years without tragic results to our whole economy and national life. A study of our resources and modern scientific methods to replenish them must be undertaken quickly.

The demand for goods and increased wages—the race between prices and the cost of living—is going on here and all over the world. Last night, different men raised this question. Being the host I wanted to say as gently as I could that the conditions we are facing were brought about by our own procrastination and negligence in not having faced the issue when the first price control bill was enacted into law. All elements of cost, wages, rents—everything—should have been included in the original bill. Failure to do so started the race—as was then predicted by yourself, Monroney, and a few others. That failure is the basic cause of the present, continuous spiralling of prices.

I think that in the present circumstances reducing taxes too much now, and with no indication of future plans, is unwise—and may be seriously inflationary—until we have a better conspectus of our financial and economic condition. I had hoped this "scuttle and run" policy which is evidenced throughout our life—military, economic, spiritual—should have been held off and made parallel with peace and as we knew what our demands and obligations were. As I tried to say last night, tax reductions should have been more considered, outlined, and then put into effect, and only after the inventory into our national wealth and liabilities was known. Perhaps the experts had this before them. Even now it would not take long, perhaps a month. Then we would have had facts—not fictions stirred by all the contending pressure groups trying to help themselves in prices, wages, and taxes for their own interests and ignoring the general good. The race of selfishness is on. It plays an important part in the inflationary process.

One other thing I tried to bring out was that we must have full production. Without it we cannot keep any semblance of modern, civilized government. We risk inflation. We mute the voice with which we speak for peace in this world. With this full production we can escape inflation. Labor and management must be made to realize this. Labor disputes cannot continue to interfere with production as they do. In our civilization, where people are induced to buy things and to make them a part of their daily lives, a deep obligation rests on management and labor to fill those needs.

For years I have had high hopes of collective bargaining and intelligent leadership in management and labor to bring about understanding without interference of Government.

Reaction from the war effort has caused much of the unrest, but unless strife ceases soon, Government must take a hand, and a strong one, in the interest of the contestants, the public, and itself.

Whole segments of society have lost their perspective as to the rights of others. Worse yet, many have lost their capacity for indignation over their own wrongs and the wrongs inflicted upon others.

Sincerely,

BERNARD M. BARUCH.

P. S.—The miracle of American production can save the situation now, as it did in war, but it must hurry, hurry, hurry.

Premium for Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interesting editorial from the Pittsburgh Press dated October 19, 1945:

PREMIUM FOR FAILURE

For a long time the Government has been after the Aluminum Co. of America.

By antitrust suit and other actions it has tried to break up or punish the company. The litigation has been so involved, with proceedings of such record-breaking length, that it has been difficult for a layman to determine its merits.

Frankly, we don't know whether the Aluminum Co. is as bad as the Government says it is, or as good as its officials contend. We suspect it's in between.

We do know that when war came and aluminum was needed for planes and other weapons in undreamed-of quantities, the Aluminum Co. used its wealth and know-how and facilities to do a job so magnificent that the war could not have been won without it.

But the demand for aluminum was beyond the capacity of any private company. So the Government spent some $700,000,000 to build aluminum plants.

Now the question of disposing of these plants arises.

And the Justice Department and Surplus Property Board are determined they must go to competitors of the Aluminum Co., in order to break up what they contend is a monopoly.

But apparently this can't be done just by selling the plants to competing companies, even at very low prices.

I. W. Wilson, vice president of the company, charges that the Government proposes to provide six different subsidies to enable other companies to operate the new plants. Amid the charges and confusion, it does seem clear that various subsidies are intended.

Subsidies, of course, come out of the pockets of taxpayers.

Once started, they tend never to cease.

They are, as Mr. Wilson charged, "an invitation to reckless, extravagant, and calculated mismanagement."

We are inclined to agree that it would be a good thing if there were more competition in the aluminum industry. But not at the price of subsidies. President Truman yesterday indicated that he, too, is against subsidies.

New plants are available for companies that want to make aluminum, at low prices. Ore and waterpower and the other essentials of aluminum production are available.

If other companies still cannot compete with the Aluminum Co. under those conditions, then it doesn't seem to be a case of monopoly but rather of too much smartness and efficiency on the part of Alcoa. And surely it is bad business to use public funds to offset the lower efficiency of competing firms.

This country has a lot of other Government plants—magnesium, synthetic rubber, aviation gasoline, radio, and electrical equipment, etc.

If we start subsidizing aluminum companies that can't stand on their own business feet, then why not follow the same policy with these other plants?

Just as surely as we start it with aluminum there'll be demands to do the same thing in other fields. Then we'll have taxpayers helping sustain a lot of firms that aren't capable of competing on their own.

It's one thing to sell surplus war plants to firms that can operate them on their own money and initiative. It's quite another to use public funds to bolster poor operators so they can compete with good ones.

"Not Unduly Exacting"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, until last June the foreign policy of this administration in relation to the Soviet Union was well described in the memorable words of Acting Secretary of State Joseph C. Grew, when he said that we were "leaning over backward to avoid offending Russia."

Last month, our Secretary of State, Mr. James Byrnes, reported on the failure of the London Conference of Foreign Ministers. Mr. Byrnes' analysis of our present attitude toward Soviet Russia is, in his own words, that "we are not unduly exacting."

Today, many competent observers of our foreign policy claim that our failure to be firm, precise, and clear in our foreign policy exactions toward Russian rearmament and territorial and political demands in all quarters of the globe, will result in an increasing drift toward world catastrophe.

Here are three articles by distinguished commentators which have appeared in recent weeks emphasizing the dangers to world peace in this policy of laissez faire and laissez aller, that has been characterized by the Secretary of State as one of being "not unduly exacting":

PERILOUS DRIFT

(By Walter Lippmann)

With the President the men who have the chief responsibility for our foreign relations are Mr. Byrnes, Mr. Vinson, Mr. Patterson, and Mr. Forrestal. They too must be asking themselves what is the matter, and why the external influence of the United States is now so much less constructive and beneficent than might reasonably—even after grandiose hopes are discounted—have been expected of the strongest and richest power on earth. They must be aware of the mounting discouragement and dismay, and of the need to search out the causes of what is now, prospectively, a gigantic historic failure.

It is quite clear, so it seems to me, that our foreign relations are not under control, that decisions of the greatest moment are being made in bits and pieces without the exercise of any sufficient over-all judgment and general conception by the President and his chief advisers acting in consultation. Thus lend-lease was terminated abruptly and brutally, and the immediate post-war situation was aggravated quite unnecessarily; this was done not as a considered decision by the chief Cabinet officers who have to deal with other phases of our foreign relations. It is impossible to determine who is making our China policy and our Japanese policy. But the policy cannot have been reviewed by the same men who are making our eastern European policy. The contradictions are too glaring between our opposition to spheres of influence and unilateralism in Europe and our insistence upon them in the Far East. It is no less impossible to believe that the problem of the atomic bomb has been handled by men who have paused long enough to listen to the scientists who understand its nature or to thoughtful laymen who are capable of appraising its political consequences.

The fact of the matter, to put it bluntly, is that the administration is not in control of its policy. It is allowing policies to be made in the departments, in the bureaus, here and there in isolated fragments, without proper recognition of the fact that our relations with Russia or Great Britain are the net result of all the decisions which we make that affect them. It would be very convenient, no doubt, if we could take each question by itself, deal with it "on its merits" or perhaps in the light of domestic politics. But it cannot be done.

We cannot shape a foreign policy as we used to frame a tariff bill, treating each item as a local issue. But that is the way the administration is shaping its foreign policy. It is dealing separately with a whole series of questions—British finance, Bulgarian elections, Italian colonies, Jewish immigration in Palestine, the atomic bomb, the postwar Navy, the postwar Army, island bases, etc., etc. But separately these problems are quite insoluble. For they arise from a greater problem which underlies them all—whether the Big Three are settling this war or are in the opening phases of a race of armaments.

The people of this country had better realize now, before it is too late to do anything about it, how far we have drifted into accepting the supremely defeatist idea that, while paying lip service to the organization of peace, we are in fact in a race of armaments. It has, of course, been nobody's—or at least almost nobody's—deliberate intention to engage in a race of armaments. We have drifted into it by a series of isolated decisions, of which no one in high place seems to have foreseen the whole consequences.

Yet there they are, unmistakable to any one who does not let himself be confused by the complicated arguments over each one of the bits and pieces. We have drifted into a race of armaments with the Soviet Union, not only in respect to the atomic bomb, and to postwar military programs, but no less in respect to what is called power politics—that is to say, into a competition for the control of the weak but strategically important regions that lie between the Soviet Union and the United States.

How far this is Russia's fault, Britain's fault, or our own, no honest man can say; what matters is that the thing is happening, that we are all being sucked into conflict, and that we are not now using a fraction of our power and influence to avert it.

Let no one deceive himself; we are drifting.

We are drifting toward a catastrophe.

Woe be to those who, when they have the responsibility to steer the ship, do not make for a safe harbor but drift with the wind and the tide.

LET'S TRY AGAIN

(By William Philip Simms)

It had been hoped here that the Red celebration in Moscow would lift the pall which of late has settled more darkly over the international situation. Instead, the effect has been the reverse. Three major factors are cited:

First, the mysterious and unprecedented absence of Generalissimo Stalin from both Tuesday night's gathering of Soviet big-wigs in the Kremlin and yesterday's annual parade in Red Square. Also missed were President Kalinin and Marshals Voroshilov and Zhukov.

Should Stalin disappear from the scene, there is no telling what direction Russian policy might take. Those who know him best—though none seems to know him well—claim he is a moderate among present-day Soviet officials and inclined to world cooperation. Possible successors have shown signs of chip-on-the-shoulder isolationism.

Second, the tone of Foreign Commissar Molotov's lengthy speech, delivered in the Generalissimo's absence. It came pretty near being saber-rattling. It gave the Red army principal credit for winning the war and sounded several warnings against Russia's allies. It hit the United States on account of the atomic bomb and raised evening's biggest round of applause when the Commissar said Russia not only would have atomic energy but many more things besides.

There was a dig at England and France—without mentioning names—in connection with regional blocs. Moscow has been fulminating against blocs for several weeks, charging the western democracies with anti-Soviet intentions. Mr. Molotov's speech made clear the source of this inspiration.

The Commissar's words are almost certain to arouse resentment in London and Paris. Since Russia herself first began to organize eastern Europe and the Balkans into a bloc of puppet states, western Europe has shown signs of alarm. Thus, as British Foreign Minister Bevin remarked with some feeling last night, there ought to be "nothing criminal" about the cultivation of friendship among democracies in the west.

Third factor in the gloomy outlook is the significant emphasis Mr. Molotov placed on the difference between democracy as the Soviet Union sees it and democracy as practiced in the United States, Britain, and elsewhere. It is remarked here that if establishment of democracy as a means to lasting peace is the fundamental aim of the United Nations, the outlook for Big Three cooperation is dismal indeed.

True democracy, said Mr. Molotov, "cannot exist in any other states, divided as they are into classes of oppressors and oppressed." Quite clearly, it is observed, this places all western democracies in Moscow's book of reactionaries.

The question uppermost here now is when, where, and how the Big Three can put their reactions back on the track, now that the Foreign Ministers' Council failed and confidence in meetings at highest levels has largely waned. A new effort, however, and soon, is indicated.

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

On Tuesday President Truman addressed Congress on the necessity of universal military training in peacetime. Wednesday Secretary of State Byrnes signed the text of the protocol of deposit of the United Nations Charter, which formally brought the World Security Organization into being, calling it a "memorable day for the peace-loving peoples of all nations."

There is something strangely ironic in this combination of events. On one day it is proposed that the United States train all its male youth for war; on the next the United Nations of the world solemnly covenant to live together in peace.

The President says, "The sincerity of our intention to support the world organization will be judged partly by our willingness to maintain the power with which to assist other peace-loving nations to enforce its authority."

To enforce its authority over whom?

The only nations not counted among the "peace lovers" are utterly vanquished and unconditionally surrendered. The victors are about to put on trial as criminals those who resorted to a war of aggression.

At such a moment the "peace lovers" enter an armament race.

The President says, "The United States now has a fighting strength greater than any other time in our history. It is greater than any other nation in the world."

But the President asks for more power. Power for what purpose?

"Until we are sure that our peace machinery is functioning adequately, we must relentlessly preserve our superiority on land and sea and in the air." * * * "Research, new materials, and new weapons will never, by themselves, be sufficient to withstand a powerful enemy."

What powerful enemy? What member of the United Nations? Superiority over whom?

The President makes another plea for "realism." So, by all means, let us look at the reality.

The reality is that at Teheran, Yalta, San Francisco, and Potsdam our political leaders gave away the power that America had built up for the cause of justice, liberty, and peace. So today they must ask for more power.

The political leaders of the three great powers rejected the Atlantic Charter, first as its provisions applied to the vanquished, then as its provisions applied to any nation weak enough to be bullied.

The political leaders of the three great powers rejected, at San Francisco, the thesis that great powers must be subject to any law governing their sovereign actions, and in the name of law established lawlessness for the powerful and servitude for the weak.

The political leaders of the three great powers threw into the wastepaper basket at Potsdam every shred of historical and ethnographical principle and human rights. By extending the frontiers of Poland under a thoroughly unrepresentative government to the Oder and the Neisse, and agreeing to the expropriation and deportation of indigenous populations, they compounded the crimes of Hitler himself—the very crimes of which the Nazi leaders stand accused before the world—and condemned millions of absolutely helpless men, women, and children to terror, migration, and starvation.

By agreeing to divide vast parts of Europe into zones within each of which four armies would have, in effect, unrestricted license to do as they pleased, they made inevitable the division of Europe into two blocs, and the break-down of the London Conference.

By agreeing, in the name of "reparations" and "industrial disarmament," to a four-way loot in countries already devastated beyond imagination, they initiated in the name of peace a new scorched-earth policy; set adrift the last remnants of order; betrayed the hopes and prayers of all Christendom, and sowed the seeds of anarchy, nihilism, and despair.

All this was done while the United States had the mightiest Army, Navy, and Air Force the world had ever seen—and the atomic bomb on the verge of perfection.

Let us then, face the reality. Universal military training is not for the "enforcement of peace." It is asked because there is no peace—in our consciences, our minds, our hearts, our policies, our societies. It is asked in the frantic hope that the great nations, estimating each other's terrifying power and maneuvering against each other over the moans of the real "peace lovers"—the suffering, sacrificing, believing, hoping, and broken-hearted people of the world—will fear to attack each other, lest the result be mutual annihilation.

This is our peace, for which the youngest and noblest died.

OPA Propaganda Pressure Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, saturated in his own honeyed phrases, ensnared by his own double talk, trapped by his own perfidy, Chester Bowles has finally

torn off the mask and exposed his contempt for the Constitution of the United States when he denounces citizens the right of petition.

No better evidence can be presented to the American public as to Mr. Bowles' own peculiar philosophy of regimentation, direction, and centralization than his attack on the National Automobile Dealers' Association before the House of Representatives Small Business Committee on Tuesday in Washington. In a statement which would have been amazing and startling had it not fallen from the lips of Mr. Bowles, the Bill of Rights of the Constitution was torn to threads and one of the cardinal principles of our democracy was pitched out of the window.

Mr. Bowles viciously criticized the National Automobile Dealers' Association for sending an estimated 25,000 telegrams to Capitol Hill in an effort to interest the representatives of the people who, unlike Mr. Bowles, were elected to office and hold office by virtue of the will of the people themselves. If Mr. Bowles would trouble himself to read the Constitution of the United States he would find in amendment No. 1, which is the first amendment in the Bill of Rights which guarantees freedom of religion, speech, and the press, also the right of assembly, and the right "to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Surely the telegrams which were sent by the National Automobile Dealers' Association to their elected representatives were petitions to the Government as they believe the Government to be. If these automobile dealers and other citizens could not petition their own representatives, who could they petition?

Certainly not Mr. Bowles, whose ears have constantly been deaf to any request for reason and justice in the administration of his office.

Mr. Bowles falls back on the flimsy statement that he is carrying out the will of the Congress. If he is carrying out the will of the Congress then what answer has he to the fact that more than 325 Senators and Representatives, more than half the combined strength of the Senate and the House, presented themselves at the dealers' protest hearing. Simple arithmetic indicates that 325 is far in excess of one-half of a total 531. Mr. Bowles would have you believe that these 325 elected Representatives who took time out from a busy day to present themselves at this meeting in protest against Mr. Bowles, were all wrong and Mr. Bowles is right.

Mr. Bowles talks from both sides of his mouth as usual. He, of all people, should be the last to criticize so-called pressure tactics. Throughout the year the office of every Congressman is flooded with literature from Mr. Bowles' office in a high-pressure campaign to maintain OPA. Adroit and clever manipulation of regional and district offices are used to contact Members of Congress by Mr. Bowles to promote his campaign for perpetuation of OPA. Dare he deny that he has sent impressive and misleading charts to each Member of Congress shortly before consideration of OPA legislation? Can he deny that he has badgered and high-pressured members of the cognizant committee in an effort to get the kind of legislation he wants? Can he deny that he has used the press and radio of the Nation for a propaganda pressure campaign in an effort to mislead the people and intimidate Members of Congress? Can he deny these and other things he did at the expense of the taxpayer?

And this is the man who talks about pressure campaigns and denies the right of the citizens of this country to petition their elected representatives for redress and grievances caused by the maladministration of Mr. Bowles. What meat has this our Caesar feasted upon that he has grown so strong!

Mr. Bowles if further exposed in his double dealing when he throws out the sop to cognizant and misguided citizens, who happen in this instance to be members of the Automobile Dealers' Association, by delaying announcement of his price policy until a meeting in Washington could be held. Mr. Bowles, in typical fashion, gave these people a fair and impartial trial before he hanged them. His mind was made up before anybody ever came to Washington and he merely led these poor, unsuspecting lambs to the slaughter, knowing all the time what the ultimate result would be. The hearings were nothing more or less than kangaroo court proceedings, as far as Mr. Bowles was concerned. As an example, when Louisiana automobile dealers attending the hearings become optimistic over the fine attendance of Members of the House and Senate, and were led to believe that Mr. Bowles was sincere in delaying his decision until he could get all the facts in the case, I warned them at the time not to be misled by the show. I told them that it was all an act and the guillotine was merely being set up to chop their heads off. I did not say this after Mr. Bowles made his decision public, I said it before he had anything to say, because, after all, you know I have been dealing with Mr. Bowles for a long time and the leopard has not changed its spots.

The day before the hearings were held I told Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, who presided, that it was all much ado about nothing as far as Mr. Bowles was concerned, and that Mr. Bowles would do what he wanted to do. Mr. PATMAN told me that at least Mr. Bowles had been induced to hold up his ruling until after the hearing. I then said it was just so much grandstand play and that in the end Mr. Bowles would do what he wanted to do all the time.

In a long-distance conversation with Mr. Bill Willkohm, of New Orleans, an automobile dealer, I told Mr. Willkohm that the automobile dealers could expect nothing at all from Mr. Bowles or his Office. I have never claimed being a fortune-teller or a clairvoyant, nor a seer of things to come, but you do not have to be one of these three to predict what Mr. Bowles will do in a case like this. These automobile dealers went into a game where the deck was stacked and the cards were marked with Mr. Bowles doing the dealing. They never had a chance.

This was merely a repetition of his machinations in deceit and misrepresentation in the administration of his office.

Mr. Bowles, an advertising man, with authoritative and dogmatic conclusions, tells automobile dealers what is best for them although he has never been an automobile dealer, while these men who petitioned their representatives have made their livelihood at the business. The dealers themselves say Mr. Bowles' ruling is unjust to them and they cannot exist at a fair profit. Mr. Bowles, in contrast, tells these people they will make more money than they ever made before. He tells them they will take their medicine whether they like it or not because he, the great know-all, says it is the proper medicine for them.

Mr. Bowles' braggadocio statements about curbing prices is just so much hot air. He is supposed to have been a protector of the poor man, but many are the days that the poor man could not buy the commodity on which Mr. Bowles had set a price, while the rich man was able to buy anything he wanted in the black market, which was the illegitimate offspring of Mr. Bowles' program of stupidity.

It is about time that the American people wake up and bowl Chester Bowles out.

Security and the Atom Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by me at the Pulpit Forum, Peoria, Ill., Sunday, November 4, 1945:

Three months ago the first atomic bomb was dropped upon Hiroshima and a few days later, the second leveled Nagasaki. While the use of this terrible weapon shortened the war with Japan and probably saved the lives of hundreds of thousands of our boys, it has filled the people of this and of every other nation with justified foreboding as to how this frightful power of atomic energy may be used in the future.

Since much of the preparatory work in developing the bomb was carried on near my home, I have naturally received many letters from scientists and informed students about the problems which it presents. I think all reputable physicists agree on the following points:

1. Bombs, even more terrible than those dropped on Japan, can be constructed on the basis of present knowledge and more terrible explosives can probably be developed in the future.

2. With the development of jet-propelled planes and rockets, these bombs cannot only be dropped upon a nation by aircraft, but as rockets may be electrically guided to their targets. Saboteurs may also store them in suitcases and trunks to explode at a given moment.

3. So far, in spite of the hopes of certain military minds, there is no effective defense against the bomb and there is small prospect of developing any such defense in the near future. Dangers from aggression have therefore been immeasurably increased and it may

shortly be possible to destroy most, if not all, of the citizens of a nation by a push-button attack waged without warning.

4. There is little prospect that the main technical features of the bomb or of its production can be for long kept secret. The basic principle involved in splitting the atom are already known to the scientists of all nations. We, like other countries, will therefore shortly be exposed to possible attack. Neither the oceans nor science can by themselves isolate or protect us.

5. If war should occur in the future, tens of millions and possibly hundreds of millions of people would be killed. The virtal annihilation of mankind would in all probability result. Decentralization of cities and living underground might lessen but would not avert the carnage.

These prospects, when combined with the break-up of the conference of foreign ministers in London and the worsening of our relations with Russia are frightening. As far back as 1914 H. G. Wells, in prophesying the use of atomic energy in future war, wrote: "The old tendencies of human nature, suspicion, jealousy, and particularism" could not exist alongside "the destructive power of the new appliances, the inhuman logic of science had produced." This is true. If we and the people of other countries allow these baser elements of our nature to dominate us as individuals or as nations, then we are doomed to collective suicide.

But it is pure defeatism to declare as Mr. Wells did the other day: "There is no way out, around or through this impasse." Humanity has come "to the end of its tether." We have instead the chance to save ourselves and in so doing prove Mr. Wells' second conclusion wrong. We start with this great asset. The plain peoples of all countries want to live, not to die. They want the unleashed power of the atom to lift the burden of toil, to reduce disease, and to raise the standard of living. May not the sharpness of the choice before us force us all to subordinate those evil parts of our nature so that we may cooperate together to save curselves from destruction and to bring mankind into the sunlight? At its root, the issue before us is both moral and practical. In making it, we need as never before the spirit of the founder of Christianity who by word and deed proved that love and active good-will are the supreme powers of life and can win the mastery over death and destruction.

But this spirit has to be quickly translated into action. Since we are now the strongest nation in the world and for the moment possess the secret, such action can best come from us. The strong can always offer what the weak feel too proud to ask. Without appeasing aggression and still standing firm for the principles of democratic freedom, can we not take the lead in making the two following proposals to all countries:

1. That if other nations will give up conscription, we will not introduce it in this country. Instead, we shall agree on a pooled force to put down aggression and a drastic limitation of other armaments.

2. That we, along with the other nations, shall renounce the use of atomic power for purposes of war and submit to an international inspection system.

While I am aware of the practical difficulties of such a system, I am told that they are not insurmountable.

Physicists point out that to make a bomb, huge installations are needed, the assemblage of vast materials, and the teamwork of thousands of scientists and engineers. Control over the source of supplies and inspection of factories would be among the safeguards. Certainly inspection is needed to prevent any such pledge from degenerating into the empty futility of the Kellogg Pact.

The obvious time and place for us to make such a proposal would be at the first meeting of the Assembly of the United Nations and thus would breathe life into that organization. Such an offer would be a proof of our good faith. At worst, it would spotlight any nation which is not ready to renounce aggression. At best, it would transform this atomic age into an era of real collective security and peace.

Address to the Students in Seton Hill College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an address by the Reverend Dr. James A. W. Reeves, president of Seton Hill College, Greensburg, Pa., to the students on October 25, 1945. This splended address vividly points to our responsibilities in these times in our desire to achieve a peaceful world.

The year 1945 will be notable in history. The end of the German war, the end of the war with Japan, the great conferences on war and peace, the British elections, the report of the Harvard committee abrogating the elective system, the Yale declaration on religion in education, the release of energy through atomic disintegration—these events terminate an era. They open another. They represent a time sequence not a casual sequence, but it would be rash to infer that the consequences of these events will go unrelated. They represent civilization with newer problems—moral, social, and geographic. However, this year of unmatched accomplishments will abide in history as a point of unparalleled failure. Men have achieved in thought, but they have failed to embody their ideas in institutions, they have not reduced them to facts. They have devised the greatest military machine the world has known. They have planned and studied, cooperated and driven in the mighty efforts of war. They have regimented the civilian population to sustain that machine. They have subdued enemies. They have won. But they have not succeeded. At least the initial efforts for peace are discouraging. Victory in war has not brought an enduring peace. That is failure.

This weakness apparently derives from the human will, the power to achieve what the intellect has created, to realize in fact or value what the mind conceives. Men can plan better than they can manage and control. This is not new. Obviously there is a gap between man's power to evaluate and his power to control and to govern, a gap between his theory and his practice, between his ideas and his actions. A wide breach intervenes between what man can foresee, plan, and create and his ability to check, to govern, and control, to use what he has devised for his own moral progress and that of his fellows, their mutual well-being and happiness. A man's motives are usually finer than his behavior. This fact education would stress.

While knowledge of any kind is a blessing, it is not the whole of life. Life is also moral. Conduct is the product of a disciplined will, and a disciplined will is the source of our checks and controls. No matter how extensively man may conquer the physical environment, there is that other world of right and wrong that depends upon his will, and you are here at Seton Hill to learn about this. To do the right, man must conquer self, and he learns self-control not by any easy method, but by determined sacrifice and pain. Indeed this issue of the intellect versus the will comes down to us in the literatures of most peoples, in the figures of Lucifer and Gargantua, one seeking to be as God, the other seeking to be a god to self, inviting to do as one pleases. Educators know these points of view. At times they have taken sides, choosing now one, now the other, even as philosophers and politicians have taken sides, always to the detriment of mankind. For if educators overdevelop one faculty of the mind, the imbalance can issue only in conflict and disaster.

Men have dreamed of a peaceful world. They have striven for it. Lately they have fought for it in the most terrible of wars. Surely we should expect that newer world order of liberty, understanding, cooperation, and confidence we imagined would appear when hostilities ceased and which our leaders prophesied. Something is wrong. Something has been wrong. Directly in front of us is a rising new nationalism. It claims to be humanitarian in outlook, affirming that economics is the whole of life and that men should be willing to trade freedom for security. This is not unknown among us, but our people reject it. To exchange freedom for security, they know leads to the compulsion state, to some form of totalitarian government which means tyranny. They know that the totalitarian state can get things done and done quickly, but the American people apparently prefer to trust to the happier if slower ways of free government under the laws they as a people make. Others do not accept this social philosophy. It is outmoded, they say. In place of it they have created a state that sets economic security, not liberty and freedom, as its goal. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics continues to experiment with its theory and has shaped a political system to protect the experiment, but this protecting system conflicts with the political arrangements of other states. The compulsion government is basically at odds with free government, democracy as we have known it—so much so that some today, even as Karl Marx in the nineteenth century, question whether there is room on the globe for systems so contradictory.

Through long years men have striven for free governments. These governments regarded the human person as the most sacred reality they knew, the individual human person with his inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Freedom, they believed to be the essential condition for man's growth, progress, and happiness along with his claims to education and to marriage. They affirmed his right to a livelihood, to a job, to property which his nature demanded. His talents, his industry, all his abilities were to find expression in his work and in the products of his resourcefulness. He was not to be hampered in his endeavors. He was to live under law and the law was viewed as the outcome of his organized thinking and experience, administered by an authority that in every instance should consult his welfare. They also contended that man was not the slave of the state, much less the creature of the state. This is basic and unequivocal democracy. But the new nationalism will have none of it.

The whole matter of peace and a new world order is before you. It is a moral issue that depends upon man's willingness to take the right road. He knows that road and its direction. He knows how to plan and to construct a new world. He can engineer it. He sees clearly ahead. The difficulty is simply—is he willing to pay the price, to forego some advantages, some prejudices, some errors that coddle his self-importance and his selfishness? His intellect yields the truth. As a race man is old enough to have tested that truth by experience. Which way will he determine? He knows the truth, he knows the

good, he cannot live for self alone, he must live for mankind. Justice, not power, will secure the well-being and prosperity of the Nation and of the race. Justice is a matter of the will.

One might find in history epochs wherein men have trusted to intellect rather than to will and inversely, cultivating one capacity to the detriment of the other and to the peril of both.

The golden age of Athenian philosophy stressed both human capacities—intellect and will. The unmatchable Aristotle taught men to be moderate—"measure in everything is always best," he said. Intellect and will, he teaches, must be equally developed. There must be no imbalance, no disproportion among the powers and faculties of men's minds. Man must be able for high thinking and grand virtue. This philosophy of life you will know at Seton Hill. It is our tradition. It is humanism. Alone it is not enough. The physical environment and man in its midst are not the whole universe. The Christian tradition declares there is another aspect of the universe—God and His revelation. This is integral humanism. We hope you will know it and fashion your behavior by it. As a system it is tested and revered, with power to guide you and to support you in the confusion and anxiety that plague our people. It liberates a man, it does not fetter him. It will help you to keep your soul, to remain your imperishable and sacred self; holding to it you will not fall victims to sensualism or sophistry. We invite you to it as best equipping you to live in the modern world and to deal with it. May you prosper!

Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I think that all Members of Congress who were unable to attend the recent conference held in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building on the subject of atomic energy will be interested in reading the text of the speech made on that occasion by Dr. Leo Szilard.

Dr. Szilard's speech is as follows:

I have to apologize for not having prepared a speech for this occasion, but only after my colleagues and I met today in Washington were we able to discuss what aspect of the subject each one of us might cover. We all are interested in the May-Johnson bill, but it is not possible to discuss this bill or any other bill until it is made clear what the purpose is for which the proposed legislation is intended. Let me, therefore, say what I believe to be the real problem for which a solution must be found and you will see that that problem cannot be solved by an act of Congress alone.

It seems to me that the existence of the atomic bomb will profoundly affect the military position of the United States and that it will affect her position not favorably but adversely. You can easily judge this for yourselves if you will consider the following. As long as the chief weapons of aggression were tanks, guns, and airplanes the United States could easily out-produce any other nation or combinations of nations. If the United States produced 10 times as many tanks, guns, and airplanes as another country, her military position could be considered strong. When it comes to atomic bombs the United States has again an advantage at the outset. At first, if she has more atomic bombs this means that she could destroy more cities of another country. But if we get into an armament race, very soon we will have enough bombs to be able to destroy all the cities of a potential enemy. Additional bombs would then have very little value to us. There are no more worthy targets for them after we have enough bombs to cover all the cities of the "enemy." Therefore, if we have plenty of bombs and our "enemy" has plenty of bombs we will derive no great advantage of having 10 times as many bombs as they have. When this stage is reached (and it can be reached very fast, in the course of an armament race), when two countries have as many bombs as they can use, their relative strengths will no longer be determined by the number of bombs they have but rather by the number of cities which they have exposed to destruction. In the United States 30,000,000 people live in cities of over 250,000. Altogether 70,000,000 people live in metropolitan areas. When the armament race reaches the stage where this country and other countries have plenty of bombs ours will be one of the more vulnerable nations. In the long run it is not possible for us to win an armament race. We can do something in order to avoid losing the armament race, but the main thing that we can do in this respect is to relocate 30 to 70 million people. If we should do this, our position may not be weaker but it still will not be stronger than the position of other large countries which have plenty of bombs. I believe that it is possible to relocate 30 to 70 million people. If we are willing to spend $15,000,000,000 a year for 10 years we might very considerably decrease our vulnerability by decentralizing our cities. It we do that we may avoid losing the armament race, but that does not mean that we can win such an armament race.

From this remark it would seem that the problem which faces us cannot be solved on the domestic scale; it has to be solved on an international or world scale. I am not saying that it can be solved on a world scale either, but we have to try it. If we have tried it and failed we may be faced with a new situation. Up to now we have not tried it.

Now if you are willing to adopt this point of view that we have to make an attempt to solve this problem on an international scale then it is quite clear that sooner or later we will have to establish collaboration in this field of atomic energy with other nations. With this in view, I am more disturbed about the independence from the government of the commission, which the May-Johnson bill proposes to set up, than I am about any of the other provisions of the bill.

The greatest danger that we as a Nation face is a war which may arise more or less automatically from an armament race—a war which no nation really wants. Even if we feel that the general problem of war cannot be solved in the next 2 or 3 years at least we will want to avoid the additional danger of war which arises out of the existence of atomic bombs. It is not possible to discuss here the various methods by which this could be attempted, but most of these attempts would involve collaboration with other nations in the field of atomic energy as well as other fields. If the Government of the United States should decide in favor of such a collaboration, under the May-Johnson bill the President would presumably issue a directive to this effect to the commission, and it would be for the commission to give effect to this directive by issuing appropriate rules and regulations. Now this commission is practically independent from the Government. It has nine members who will meet at least four times a year and who are supposed to run the show. The members of the commission cannot be removed by the President except for cause. If the President wants a majority on the commission he may have to serve two terms before, by means of new appointments, he can secure such a majority.

Even if the President saw his way to remove some of the members in an emergency, he might not know which member to remove on account of the secrecy under which this Commission would operate. In the circumstances our relations with other nations might suffer because the members of the Commission have a different idea about what our foreign policy ought to be than the President. If this were the case, the danger would be great that the rules and regulations issued by the Commission would create the impression that we as a nation do not want to collaborate with other nations in the field of atomic energy. I am not inventing something that might happen in the future so much as I am thinking of similar events that have happened in the past.

During this war we have received directives which I believe originated with President Roosevelt instructing us to collaborate with a joint British-Canadian project set up in Canada. Rules and regulations issued by the Manhattan district rendered this collaboration ineffective. I do not believe that we should create in the future a Commission which is so independent from the administration that it can easily counteract, by means of rules and regulations, the directives of the administration.

You may raise the question, "What shall we do if in spite of sincere efforts our attempts to avoid an armament race should fail?" There will be those who will then begin to think about the possibility of waging a war within the next 3 or 4 years before other nations have bombs that will threaten our security. While I personally find it difficult to get enthusiastic about this solution, I recognize that from the purely logical point of view this possibility will have to be considered if all other methods fail. But however that may be right now this possibility can hardly take first place in our attention. The May-Johnson bill attempts to solve the difficult problem of setting up machinery which can be used for both purposes, that is, making preparations for a preventive war and establishing cooperation with other nations in order to avoid an armament race. If you wish to have machinery which can serve both of these purposes, you make it very difficult for anyone to provide you with a design for your machinery. I am not saying that it is impossible to design machinery which could serve well either of these two purposes but in my opinion the May-Johnson bill as it is before us cannot serve either purpose well.

In discussing the bill further let me limit my remarks to one single point, that is the question of secrecy. The question is what kind of information do you want to have kept secret? No doubt we might have to keep secret, even though we may not like to do so, technical information relating to the process of manufacture of fissionable materials and the construction of bombs. There is, however, another kind of information which you may or may not wish to keep secret and that is information which has neither scientific nor engineering character but has political implications.

Let me give you an example. The greatest secret during the war was the fact that atomic bombs could be made. Under war conditions it was perhaps legitimate to keep this information secret. But I remember that at the approach of the San Francisco Conference, many of my friends became exceedingly uneasy because they felt that the people and the delegates of the United States to San Francisco could not live up to their obligations unless they knew that atomic bombs would exist. How could they take a stand on the question of the Charter if they did not know what the situation will be with which the world will have to cope?

As a result of representations made by a number of scientists which reached President Roosevelt, the President asked that Stettinius be informed of the existence of the bomb, and I wouldn't be astonished to hear that our delegation to San Francisco also knew of the bomb.

If we go on after the war keeping information of such general type secret from the American people we prevent the American people from discussing intelligently questions of our foreign policy on the basis of facts. For instance, if we succeeded in making bombs which could destroy 400 square miles in place of the 4 square miles, destroyed by the bomb detonated over Hiroshima, would you wish to keep such a fact secret from the American people, or would you want them to know about it?

I think Congress will have to decide whether it wants to give the administration the right to withhold in peacetime information of a nontechnical nature which has far-reaching political implications. In my opinion, if bombs could be made which can destroy hundreds of square miles this would be a fact which people would have to know in order to know how to vote. There would be no need for them to know how such bombs are constructed.

Perhaps there will be an opportunity later on, during the discussion, to mention other points connected with the bill which will have to be discussed if we want to understand what this bill means—what it means to scientists and more important what it means to the country as a whole.

Army Demobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, today every Congressman is under extreme pressure from our men with sufficient points in the armed forces overseas, to urge upon the War Department that they be rapidly shipped home.

The following letter is only one of literally hundreds which have come to my office demanding more efficient demobilization.

All these letters are instantly referred to the War Department with an urgent request that the Department act as fast as possible to cut all red tape, and release shipping for high-point men who are awaiting embarkation.

HEADQUARTERS BATTERY, SEVEN HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SIXTH AAA AUTOMATIC WEAPONS BATTALION, APO 638, CARE OF POSTMASTER,
New York, N. Y., October 29, 1945.

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to cause an investigation of the War Department's apparent deviation from its system of discharge of personnel by points.

According to today's radio announcements, 80,000 sixty-point service personnel are on the high seas homeward bound, whereas this category IV battalion, whose personnel have an average of over 80 points, is still stationed in Germany, with no assurance as to when we may expect to proceed to a port of embarkation.

Twenty months ago the War Department speedily landed this battalion in the United Kingdom, after transporting us through enemy-submarine-infested waters with fewer ships than are available today.

Our foremost desire is to be returned home to our loved ones as soon as possible. Now that the moot point system is supposed to be in effect, do you think service personnel with 60 points should be returned to the States before service personnel with higher points?

This battalion is assigned to the Ninth Air Defense Command, under the Ninth Air Force. Personnel of this battalion are not considered to be Air Force personnel, and neither are we part of any army; therefore our priority for return to the States is zero.

We shall appreciate any action you may institute in our behalf which will return us home in the very near future. We desire immediate action by the War Department, and not promises.

Respectfully,

Tech. Sgt. FRANK H. DURAND, *Milford, Conn.*
T4 RICHARD E. FLANDERS, *Lincoln, Maine.*
Pfc ANTHONY A. GUISTO, *Waterbury, Conn.*
T5 THOMAS F. DRISCOLL, *Waterbury, Conn.*
Sgt. ROBERT G. BOUCHER, *Waterbury, Conn.*

Signatures continued on petition to cause an investigation of the War Department's apparent deviation from its system of discharge of personnel by points:

Master Sgt. Fenton S. Roskelley, Challis, Idaho, 84 points.

T4 Mark I. Jurras, Jr., Montpelier, Vt., 79 points.

Tech. Sgt. William J. Kopia, Wierton, W. Va., 97 points.

Staff Sgt. Robert P. Borzakian, Cambridge, Mass., 79 points.

Staff Sgt. Lester D. Benno, Santa Ana, Calif., 90 points.

T5 Armand Friedland, Pittsfield, Mass., 79 points.

Corp. William A. Richardson, Detroit, Mich., 76 points.

T3 Earl M. Crawford, Nashville, Tenn., 84 points.

Corp. Rudolph C. Fischer, Chicago, Ill., 82 points.

Pfc Donald D. Fowler, Hinsdale, N. H., 79 points.

Pfc John P. Tumulty, Cleveland, Ohio, 76 points.

T5 Walter F. Day, Dedham, Mass., 79 points.

T4 Norman C. Matlack, Butler, Pa., 71 points.

T5 Benjamin J. Soep, Roxbury, Mass., 79 points.

Tech. Sgt. Clifford H. Enderle, New York City, N. Y., 88 points.

Tech. Sgt. Alfred K. Scharlemann, St. Paul, Minn., 81 points.

Pfc Robert W. Long, Millersville, Pa., 81 points.

First Sgt. John Kosowicz, Jr., Irvington, N. J., 87 points.

5 Paul R. Willard, Hershey, Pa., 80 points.

WO (jg) Eugene A. Souders, Bourbon, Mo., 88 points.

T4 Robert E. Adelson, Boston, Mass., 79 points.

Pfc George Feddock, Nesquehoning, Pa., 79 points.

T4 John H. Otten, Chicago, Ill., 83 points; age 25.

Corp. John L. Clark, East St. Louis, Ill., 98 points.

Pfc Robert G. Seidman, Baltimore, Md., 77 points.

Tech. Sgt. David J. McGuire, Jr., Hyattsville, Md., 88 points.

T5 Reginald Bouthot, Fort Kent, Maine, 79 points.

Pfc Kenneth J. Rapose, Fort Devens, Mass., 79 points.

T5 Gustaf O. Nelson, Worcester, Mass., 79 points.

Pfc Walter Zukowski, Chicopee, Mass., 75 points.

Staff Sgt. Gustave Blumenthal, New York City, N. Y., 74 points.

Tech. Sgt. Leonard A. Coffey, South Natick, Mass., 73 points.

T5 Howard A. Sanders, Canaan, Maine, 79 points.

T4 Francis J. Baranauskas, Aberdeen, S. Dak., 82 points.

T5 Harold G. Manning, Boston, Mass., 79 points.

Pfc Edward J. Florczyk, Pittsfield, Mass., 79 points.

Pfc Melvin H. Williams, Barre, Vt., 79 points.

Pfc Truman H. Jones, Roanoke, Va., 75 points.

Tech. Sgt. Frank W. Long, South Braintree, Mass., 83 points.

Pfc Gerald Legault, New Bedford, Mass., 79 points.

T5 John J. Doris, Jr., Valley Falls, R. I., 79 points.

T4 Andrew Lohr, Huntington Station, N. Y., 82 points.

Pfc Angelo C. Minotte, 1022 West Second Street, Duluth, Minn., 89 points.

Pfc Louis M. Tiso, 145 Transit Street, Waterbury, Conn.

Pfc Marvin E. Carter, Oregon City, Oreg., 82 points.

T5 Earl G. Wicks, Cambridge, Mass., 79 points.

T5 Lucian M. Santora, Milford, Conn., 79 points.

T5 Harry J. Dunbar, Jr., Dedham, Mass., 79 points.

Pfc Dale Burdick, Foxboro, Wis., 86 points.

Pfc Ralph A. Wernholm, Holden, Mass., 79 points.

Corp. Edmund J. Kenney, Dorchester, Mass., 79 points.

Pfc John J. Flammia, Waterbury, Conn., 79 points.

Sgt. Richard O'Donnell, Cambridge, Mass., 79 points.

T4 Theodore Pulit, New Haven, Conn., 79 points.

Alfred L. Rigali, 41 Essex Street, Charleston, Mass., 83 points.

Adam S. Herman, 53 Andrew Avenue, Milford, Conn., 79 points.

When the Ordinary Is Extraordinary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Tribune, Grand Haven, Mich., for November 6, 1945:

WHEN THE ORDINARY IS EXTRAORDINARY

Sometimes the average or typical behavior of a community attracts more interests than unusual achievements. This seems to be the case lately for Grand Haven was selected both by the Western Newspaper Union and the American Broadcasting Co. as a representative American small city facing the problems of reconversion and transition to peace.

Some weeks ago a writer of syndicated articles for the Western Newspaper Union, which supplies feature material for hundreds of weeklies and small dailies throughout the country, contacted the local Committee for Economic Development with the purpose of writing up Grand Haven. He paid a visit here and interviewed a number of people.

Excerpts from his story will be published in a later issue of the Tribune. (The local story appeared in the November 3 issue of the Publishers Auxiliary and is currently being released to various papers throughout the United States.)

Last Wednesday the New York office of the ABC network, having heard of the Western Newspaper Union article, called the CED here. By Friday their representative was in the city to put Grand Haven on the air. The broadcast time coincided with the West Shore symphony concert and the program was worked out to include part of a concert number as well as the voices of several local people.

All of this was unsolicited. In fact most people here were surprised that Grand Haven would attract so much attention. They had not regarded their local activities as extraordinary, and they naturally supposed that only extraordinary events and personalities make the "big time."

Typical behavior, of course, is sometimes more extraordinary than we suspect. Reports filed by the local committee for economic development with State and national headquarters were sufficiently impressive to attract the attention of the big syndicates and networks. They showed that thorough surveys were made of the community's civic, commercial, and industrial life by the CED, city planning committee and chamber of commerce. Perhaps few of the cities of comparable size had done as good a job of appraising the problem of reconversion.

Grand Haven had done these things as a matter of course. And that was what made the story so genuine. It was not just "publicity" but an honest community effort packed with significance for the future.

Probably there is no such animal as a typical American city. That is to say, a city may typify America itself but its own individuality is something else.

Grand Haven would not be representative of an agricultural community. But its industrial diversification, its popularity as a summer resort, its progress in vocational education, its handling of the youth recreation problem, its splendid achievements in music, its well-managed municipal power plant, its hospital and other public buildings, its leadership in the veterans' counseling work are outstanding. And the loss of the *Escanaba* in war symbolized the sacrifices which war involves, just as the bond-purchasing record here dramatized individual cooperation in the war.

Which leads us to the conviction that being ordinary is sometimes being extraordinary, especially if it represents teamwork and self-analysis. Certainly it is through ordinary, everyday plugging that communities not only may hope to win a place in the sun but also to enjoy the real blessings of a happy home life and neighborly relations.

Cost Absorption Policy of OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. F. NORRELL
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me today before the Committee on Small Business regarding the cost absorption policy of the Office of Price Administration:

On August 18, 1945, promptly after the cessation of hostilities with Japan, the President issued an Executive order setting forth a stabilization program for the transition period from war to peace. The order stated that the cost of living and general level of prices should be held at the then existing levels, and that pricing of reconversion products must be on a basis of full volume rather than on volume that will be limited during the changeover from war goods to peacetime production.

Acting under this order the Office of Price Administration has devised means of holding the line on prices to the consumer. These means include a cost absorption policy whereby the retailer is being required to absorb an increase in production costs being allowed the manufacturer.

In my opinion such cost absorption policy is patently unfair to the retailers. It may also be unfair to the wholesalers, though I am not advised regarding that.

The idea of requiring retailers to absorb increased costs allowed to manufacturers is, in my opinion unreasonable, economically unsound, and should be cancelled. The Nation cannot on the one hand provide for increased cost allowances on material and labor to the manufacturer, as has been the case during the war, and expect retail business to absorb such increases and continue to remain in business on retail ceiling prices allowed.

Contrary to statements of officials of the OPA, the retailers have had increased operating costs, including higher rents, higher salaries to their employees, identical to the increased costs of the manufacturers, and I am strongly of the opinion that relief must be given to the retailers from the policy abovementioned, if they are to survive.

I quote below a representative number of messages which I have received from retailers of automobiles, furniture, and clothing on the same general subject:

"OPA's proposed reduction in dealers' discounts would force many dealers (auto) to operate at a loss. Much of the profit dealers have made in the past has been invested in new buildings, equipment, and general improvements. To operate at a loss now with most of their capital invested would force many dealers to go out of business. We have no doubt that if OPA would make a thorough study of the dealers' costs and earnings they would conclude it to be unwise to decrease dealers' discounts." (Union Motor Co., Monticello, Ark.)

"Automobile dealers cannot endure lower discount from factory." (Critz Chevrolet Co., North Little Rock, Ark.)

"The small automobile dealer is not in a position to absorb any part in price adjustments on new cars due to the fact that we were not in war work, were limited in parts received, and held to minimum of labor by War Labor Board. Therefore the small dealer was fortunate to subsist for the duration." (Hart Cruggs Motor Co., Pine Bluff, Ark.)

"The proposal of OPA to decrease discounts of automobile dealers is grossly unfair, particularly since we have been without cars since 1942." (F. G. Smart Motor Co., Pine Bluff, Ark.)

"We, the undersigned automobile dealers in Stuttgart, Ark., vigorously protest OPA proposal that dealers absorb increased cost of automobile production as such a plan would probably result in selling new cars at a loss in the coming critical months. The future success or failure of many automobile dealers is dependent upon a just and fair pricing procedure and we therefore respectfully request and solicit your cooperation and effort in our behalf." (McCallister Motor Co., Ford Main Motor Co., Moll Motor Co., Thad McCollum Sales Co., Rice Chevrolet Co., all of Stuttgart, Ark.)

"We are of the opinion that increase of prices allowed manufacturing concerns will stop normal profit of retailers if retail merchants are forced to absorb further increase and not be allowed to raise prices accordingly. We solicit your support in obtaining relief." (Reap & Crawford Furniture Co., Pine Bluff, Ark.)

"The retailers cost of operation has increased as rapidly as that of manufacturers increase. It will be impossible for merchants to operate profitably. We earnestly solicit your support and vigorously protest this procedure." (John A. Simpson Furniture Co., Pine Bluff, Ark.)

"The practice of allowing manufacturers to increase wholesale prices and forcing retailers to absorb the full amount will force many of us out of business. At best it will cause all to operate at a loss until relief is obtained or until whatever surplus we have is used up. We vigorously protest this procedure." (O. H. Harding Furniture Co., Pine Bluff, Ark.)

"We wish to go on record as vigorously protesting Government allowing manufacturing concerns to increase wholesale prices and forcing retailers to absorb. Our overhead has increased proportionate to others and we cannot stand any further absorption and stay in business." (John A. Pope Furniture Co., Pine Bluff, Ark.)

"Anyone in business is entitled to a reasonable profit on invested capital. The Government's policy of allowing manufacturers an increase in its prices and forcing retailers to absorb the entire amount automatically removes that privilege. We implore you to do what you can to obtain relief for us." (Moore's Furniture Co., Pine Bluff, Ark.)

"We feel that we are entitled to make a legitimate profit as the manufacturers. The policy of allowing manufacturers an increase in prices and forcing retailers to absorb full amount is unjust and we protest this action." (Pine Bluff Furniture Co., Pine Bluff, Ark.)

"OPA preticketing order 578, second revision, is contrary to practices of sound business and discriminatory against retailer." (American Clothing Store, Pine Bluff, Ark.)

"Request immediate repeal OPA preticketing order 578, second revision. With operating expenses increased, retailer cannot survive if selling price cut below prewar level." (Samuel Baim & Sons, Pine Bluff, Ark.)

"In view of fact operating expenses increased from prewar, feel we are not given a fair deal in OPA preticketing order 578, second revision." (Cohen's, Pine Bluff, Ark.)

No blanket cost absorption policy should be established. Each item should net a fair and reasonable profit to the dealer.

I think Mr. Chester Bowles made a mistake yesterday in criticizing the automobile dealers for making their position known. They have as much right to be heard from as any other group of citizens.

Truth About Germany Seen in House Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting below a column, Truth About Germany Seen in House Report, by David Lawrence, one of the outstanding editors and columnists in the country, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on yesterday, November 13. The article follows:

TRUTH ABOUT GERMANY SEEN IN HOUSE REPORT—WRITER CALLS ALLIED POLICY ON INDUSTRY MISGUIDED

(By David Lawrence)

It has taken a committee of the House of Representatives, Republicans and Democrats, to inject some sober truth into the story of the plight of the German people.

Writing a report that is unanimously signed by all 18 members, the House committee of which Representative COLMER, Democrat, of Mississippi, is chairman, tells the world that the cruelty being inflicted on the German people is something that should weigh heavily on the conscience of the American people and their Allies.

"If a hard peace," says the committee report, "requires the elimination of 8,000,000 or 10,000,000 Germans, it would be much more humane to eliminate them at once. The committee feels that the American antipathy to theories of racism includes an antipathy to the theory of racial guilt. Those Germans who will suffer will in the main be the very old who generally opposed Hitler and the very young who were hardly responsible for him.

"It would not be feasible to make Germany pay for the war without reconstituting its industries beyond the point needed for the support of the population at a minimum level. The committee warns that the prevention of a catastrophe in middle Europe will impose a further heavy burden on the taxpayers of the United States and on our occupying armies, if the present contradictory directives stress reparations and the elimination of all industry that can even indirectly support a war as against the necessity for a minimum standard of living for the German people.

SIMPLE QUESTION ASKED

"The committee cannot refrain from asking the simple question: 'What incentive under this plan exists for Germany to turn to democratic ways?' The committee would like to recall the origins of the Nazi movement in the disintegration of Germany during the period of inflation after the last war. The plight of German cities will certainly be worse this winter unless fuel and food are provided on a scale beyond that presently planned."

The foregoing is no surprise to those who followed minutely the events after the World War when the policies of the Allies directly aggravated Germany's plight and forced the German people to accept the domination of the military group in a desperate attempt to restore their economic equilibrium.

After Yalta, the same warning was issued in these dispatches and likewise after the Potsdam Conference. It is remarkable that an official committee of the American Congress should so soon after the war proclaim to the world such a frank criticism of Allied policy which, if it follows the pattern after the World War, may sow the seeds of World War III and again cause the American people to make sacrifices of blood and treasure.

The committee points out, in effect, that the American people will be held responsible, for we have allowed the Russians to partition Germany and strip the country of food, which is but another way of saying the American taxpayer must pay for the looting done by the Red army of the food needed to keep the German people from starving.

ONE OF TWO THINGS

The committee points out that to strip Germany of her transportation equipment and the machinery of her factories beyond the point recommended by General Clay's advisory committee of experts, can mean "only one of two things:

"(a) That a considerable part of the German population must be 'liquidated' through disease, malnutrition and slow starvation for a period of years to come, with the resultant dangers to the rest of Europe from pestilence and the spread of plagues that know no boundaries;

"Or (b) the continuation both of large occupying forces to hold down 'unrest' and the affording of relief mainly drawn from the United States to prevent actual starvation."

Very soon if the American news photographers do an honest job, as there is every reason to believe they will, the American people will see movies of starving German men, women, and children which will rival in their horror the pictures of the Buchenwald concentration camps. But these will be pictures of torture inflicted by reason of an Allied policy of indifference or misguided revenge or plain blundering.

Young GI's Seek Educational Opportunities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter that I have received from a GI stationed in Bamberg, Germany, regarding the present discharge system:

BAMEERG, GERMANY, *October 27, 1945.*

DEAR SIR: I don't suppose, sir, that many days go by that you don't receive some kind of a gripe in one form or another from men in the service from our State, Illinois. That is why I must ask you to please not take this letter as a gripe, for I know you have more important subjects on your mind than to read such. The reason I am writing this letter is because I (like many other soldiers of my age) am confused.

I have a lot on my mind, sir, and would appreciate it if you would bear with me the rest of this letter. I don't intend to put you to the trouble of answering this letter, for I want to take as little of your time as possible. Due to the fact that you have spent most of your time in Washington, it is impossible for you to obtain the knowledge of what the men in the service think overseas. If it pleases you, sir, I would like to tell you just what goes on in the young soldiers' minds and what he thinks of the present discharge system. I know those last two words—discharge system—have been giving you and the few like you a real headache, especially the last several months. With your permission I'd like to put in front of you several questions and points that may help you in the future as far as the discharge system goes, and I know it will help the soldier that deserves the help, and by those soldiers I mean the combat men. The soldier that won the war the hard way.

Sir, I just celebrated my twentieth birthday here in Bamburg, Germany, this last September 28, 1945. I consider myself one of the luckiest men in the Army today for the simple reason that I went through combat and came out, with the grace of God, without a scratch. I'm sorry I can't say the same for many of my young buddies. I came overseas last January 14 and saw combat from northern France to the heart of Germany. Deep down inside of me, sir, I feel that I've done my job well, and I know that I, like many others, helped to win the war the hard way. Now that I have done my small bit for my country, why can't my country do something for me and the many other young men like me?

By that I mean why can't my country let me finish the education that I've longed for so much. If there is any reward our young soldiers deserve—the least our country can give is an education. I consider myself very fortunate that I was able to finish high school before I stepped into the life of being a soldier. Many young men were not able to do so but were taken into the Army before they were able to finish. Why keep these young soldiers in the Army when they should be in school? Why? I think we have found the reason. Congress and the Senate have stated that the way the discharge was put into effect was voted on by war veterans. If I were talking to you instead of writing could you tell me how many of these veterans were of teen age? Few, if any. How many of these teen aged soldiers were able to voice themselves? I say again—few, if any. It seems that the married man in the Army has forgotten about the young man and is thinking only of himself. I'm afraid, sir, that our Government is making a grave mistake by not letting these young men finish their education.

After all they are doing a man's job and they aren't even men. The Russian Government is way ahead of the United States as far as the discharge system is concerned. They give discharges to young men who wish to continue their education. Why can't Congress give young men who have the ability and the ambition a break? In God's name I ask again, sir, why keep these young kids in the army of occupation when they should be home in school?

Next—we young soldiers are inclined to believe that the discharge system as it is today is very unfair. It seems that the point system as it stands today is getting the men out in the States and not us over here. We read every day in the papers that men in the States are receiving discharges from the Army. I, and the rest of us realize that these men are high-point men and that they have been in the Army 2 and 3 years. But I will say this, sir, I would rather have spent 3 years in the States than see 3 days of rough combat. Now I ask you don't you think that the men who have seen combat should get out first? The men in the States didn't have to sweat out a burp gun or an on-coming enemy. They knew they would live till the next day, but we prayed that we could live until the next day.

Why can't the Army send some of these men who have seen no combat over to relieve us who have? They should—you must admit that.

You know when the Army set up its I and E program or in other words education in Europe I had great hopes. I was waiting for the day that I could get into one of Europe's best colleges for I knew it would be a great opportunity. I was going to jump at the chance. Not only I but many other young men like me had the same idea. I tried to get in more than one of these colleges, sir, but to no avail; I found that in order to attend one of these schools you had to have two or more years of college education. It was impossible for me to attend college, sir, for I took the roll of a soldier upon my graduating from high school. I'm afraid that the way things look the ending of this war is turning to be the same as the last. The soldier that won the war is now being stepped on and finally all washed up. I'll fight against it as long as I can hold a pen in my hand, these young kids deserve the best.

I see that I have taken too much of your time already and I wish to thank you for letting me have it. I hope that with the little information you have gained from this letter you may be able to help us young soldiers. We are looking forward to the help you may possibly give us—little or big. We will appreciate it more than words can express. Thank you very much.

Yours truly,

A GI.

This Is America!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the New York Daily Mirror, which is received in the spirit of good fellowship and racial tolerance, which I believe should be commended by all men of good will. It follows:

THIS IS AMERICA!

Let us call the roll of our newly elected top officials and see if there is any hope for the country.

What a mixture!

O'Dwyer, William: An Irish immigrant from County Mayo, who came here in 1910 at the age of 20 with a few dollars in his pocket. He worked as a coal passer on a steamer, as a plasterer, bartender and policeman. Now he's to be mayor of the world's most wonderful city.

Joseph, Lazarus: A Jewish boy from Manhattan's east side; son of a devoutly religious family; had odd jobs, public schools, the law, finance, the State senate. Our new comptroller.

Impellitteri, Vincent: It's an Italian name which the printers of the city are beginning to learn to spell; he is the son of a shoemaker; he worked as a bellboy, nights, so he could study law. The new president of our city council.

Politicians here are always talking about the Irish vote, the Jewish vote, and the Italian vote.

NOT ENOUGH OF THEM

Yet, if Bill O'Dwyer had had to depend on the Irish vote, he would hardly have carried 4,032 of the city's 4,033 election districts. And he would hardly have polled 1,119,225 out of a total of 1,952,762 votes cast in the entire election by those whose roots are in every creed and clime on earth.

Similarly, the 1,115,158 persons who voted for Impellitteri could hardly all trace their ancestry back to Italy. He didn't run stronger in "Little Italy" than he did in Harlem.

And it seems quite probable that Senator Joseph has plenty of gentile friends among the 1,075,507 voters who pulled his lever and gave him a plurality of 417,832 over McGoldrick and a majority of 270,195 over the combined totals of McGoldrick and the No Dealer, Levine, also of Jewish blood and faith.

We prefer to view the returns as an indication of an American vote, which has small truck on election day with race or class or church; as an indication of strong party politics; as a healthy revulsion against any partry or clique which stays too long in office, despite the New Deal breach of sacred tradition.

And we wish the political professionals would shut their big mouths about various racial votes, which have less and less basis in fact.

As for O'Dwyer, Joseph, and Impellitteri, we have no way of knowing how good their administration will be.

Their life stories illustrate that the spirit of Horatio Alger is not yet dead in the land, for which God be thanked.

NO SIN CARNIVAL

We can imagine that men who have made such records so far would be pretty jealous about those records in the future. We feel quite sure, for instance, that Mr. O'Dwyer is not going to throw open the city gates and invite sin in for a carnival—as some people seem to fear—or hope.

Nor will Mr. Impellitteri and Senator Joseph, on the basis of their past records, play too fast and too loose with the people's interests and money.

Yes, we think there is hope for the city and the country; and we are naive enough to find inspiration in the success stories of three men who started from scratch.

There's hope for America. Indeed, America is the most, and virtually the last, hopeful country in the world.

Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by James A. Farley at the opening session of the Thirty-second National Foreign Trade Convention, Hotel Waldorf-Astoria, New York, November 12, 1945:

I am very happy to have this opportunity to speak on the subject of foreign trade. With the ending of the war, we are moving into the difficult, complex, and baffling era of postwar reconstruction. We are beginning to lay the foundations of enduring peace and advancing prosperity. In connection with this transition from war to peace, there is no more important topic of public policy confronting us than the rebuilding of our foreign trade. And there is no more appropriate forum for a thorough-going discussion of that topic than this National Foreign Trade Convention.

Trade is the lifeblood of business, and, in the interdependent world of today, foreign trade is an indispensable part of the whole stream of trade. The war, with its inescapable stoppages and distortions of international commerce, has taught us many lessons which we are not likely soon to forget. It has made clearer to us than ever before both the value of foreign trade and the pitfalls which abound in the decisions of governments and businessmen as to the basis on which trade will be conducted in the future.

The first great question about foreign trade is whether it is going to be managed by businessmen on business principles, or conducted or closely controlled by governments on government principles.

American businessmen know what answer they want given to that question, and I think it is perfectly clear that the United States Government agrees with them. I am not relying on speeches when I say that, but on what the Government has done.

Wartime conditions made necessary many Government controls and many other unusual practices. Since VJ-day many wartime controls of all sorts, including those on exports and imports, have been taken off, lend-lease has ended, and the Government is getting out of the importing business as fast as its commitments will allow it. So far as our own Government is concerned we can count on its doing everything it can to turn trade back rapidly to private hands.

Things are not going so fast in many foreign countries, and we ought to take a good look at the reasons for this.

In some countries there is a preference in principle for the conduct of trade by government rather than by private traders. We think these countries are mistaken, but we have no quarrel with them. Such things are ther own affair. What we do want is that they conduct their foreign trade on trading principles, and buy and sell where goods are sound and prices right and payment prompt. If they do that—and leave political preference out of the conduct of trading operations—we will take our chance on getting, in fair and open competition our share of whatever foreign business they originate.

Other countries prefer private business in principle, but they are still conducting their foreign trade directly through the government, or controlling it very closely. They are doing this, not because they want to, but because they think they have to. We need to understand the reasons why this is so, so that we can deal with them.

One of the main reasons is the difficulty of the job of reconstruction. When a country has been smashed as thoroughly as some of the United Nations have been, the job of putting the pieces together and getting production started again is so hard and so complicated that everyone concerned seems to feel that only government has enough authority to handle it. Therefore, while that is going on, foreign trade is closely controlled by government order along with everything else. Whatever emergency help we can give on reconstruction will hasten by so much the return to private trading.

Another reason for the close control of foreign trade and especially of imports by some governments is a financial reason. They are short of foreign exchange and need to apply what they have to the most essential purposes.

This is wholly natural. If our industry and transportation had been bombed nearly out of existence—if the only place we could get much of the equipment necessary to rebuild it was abroad—and if our supplies of foreign money and foreign credit were limited, we would insist on using them for the equipment that we needed and not for unessentials. That is exactly what several European countries are now doing, and they will go on doing it until they can see their way clear to release their control.

For this reason also, emergency help in reconstruction, especially financial help, will hasten the day when foreign countries can return their foreign trade to private hands and can remove the strict control of imports and exchange which is now the greatest impediment our exporters face.

Shortage of foreign exchange is, of course, a long-time as well as an emergency problem for many countries. This was recognized at Bretton Woods, and even under the Bretton Woods agreements restrictions are permitted on scarce currencies. It is important to all American exporters that dollars should not in the long run be scarce in foreign hands. It is for that reason that exporters think importers are pretty good people. Strength to your arms, we say!

One extremely important thing that we can do to prevent dollars from becoming scarce is to maintain full and regular operation of American industry. Whenever American industry operates in high gear, it chews up enormous amounts of raw materials. Many of these come from abroad, and our purchases of them produce many dollars which mean orders to American exporters. But the building up of a high level of business activity at home itself requires the maintenance and expansion of a brisk foreign trade in all directions. To bring this about, we must use, intelligently and vigorously, the increased authority conferred by the

recent renewal of the Trade Agreements Act to make reductions in our tariff. When we do that we are, of course, entitled to ask that other countries reduce their tariffs and other restrictions on our goods, and in particular that they eliminate discriminations against us.

There has been a good deal of silence in official quarters about trade agreements since the revised act was passed by Congress last June. I suggest that it is time for the announcement of trade-agreement negotiations with several important countries. When that announcement is made the Foreign Trade Council will do everything it can to support a program of really effective reductions on both sides. We ought to do our best to demonstrate that the United States means business in this matter and that when we talk about the reduction of trade barriers and the removal of discriminations all around the trading circle, we mean exactly that.

It is time for some international organization in the field of trade. We now have United Nations organizations set up or proposed for security, for relief, for banking, for investment, for food and agriculture, for labor, and for aviation. Trade is at least as international as any of these, and at least as important. We already have an international organization of businessmen, but governments also act on trade matters, and so far they have no organized international forum where problems and policies can be discussed, information and ideas exchanged, and agreements reached. The United Nations ought to get together to discuss trade matters, and they ought to do it now.

All these are elements of an American program for world trade. The formulation and carrying out of such a program imposes great responsibilities upon both government and business. I am confident that neither will fail to do its part.

Take Randolph Churchill to Task on Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint statement by me and Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY, of New York:

Randolph Churchill in a Scripps-Howard syndicated article, How has Ireland survived the war? has aspersed Ireland and the Irish in a most unjust manner. He would revive bitter Irish-British feuds.

He covets Irish affection but conveniently forgets the Black and Tan riots, the repression of liberties, the economic isolation, the plunder, pillage, and rapine, of Ireland by the British over the years.

Britain would still keep Eire an agricultural nation. Industry ist verboten. Industry is reserved for Ulster. On all that he is silent.

The Irish in Eire and in America cannot so easily forget the past.

Churchill admits Eire was England's bread basket during the war. Irish youth from south Ireland volunteered for British service during the war in greater ratio than British youth were drafted. Scores of citations for bravery and intrepidity have been awarded to Irish soldiers.

There is more democracy in Eire than in England today. Dail Eireen is more like our American Congress than any other parliamentary body.

Randolph Churchill, steeped in imperialism, says blatantly that Ireland could be united if Ulster were not coerced. That is the old British dodge. India could be free if the Moslems were not coerced. Jews would be admitted to Palestine according to British pledges if the Moslem Arabs were not hurt. Yet this very day thousands of Moslem Javanese civilians are strafed and machine-gunned by the British in American tanks and planes in Indonesia. Hurting Moslems, Ulsterites, and others is the old fake argument. It is as false as a mirage in the desert.

"Divide and rule" has been the British imperialism practice. Set Ulster against Eire, Hindu against Moslem, Arab against Jew, Protestant against Catholic. Then step in and rule.

The American public will not be deceived by propagandist Randolph Churchill. He does not speak for the English people. He is the mouthpiece of British landed and vested interests.

Despite Britain, with her socialism at home and too much imperialism abroad, a united Ireland will come into her own and the six northern counties must join Eire.

Representative EMANUEL CELLER,
of New York.
Representative JOHN J. ROONEY,
of New York.

State Officials Advise States Not To Depend Upon the Federal Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, recently the drafting committee of the Council of State Governments met in the city of Washington with the Federal-State Relations Section of the Department of Justice, of which John W. Andrews, is Chief.

This was the sort meeting which ordinarily in these times points its program toward the Federal Treasury for the money to finance its program. Instead of doing that, however, this group of State officials made a recommendation which shows them to be worthy representatives of self-reliant, self-respecting citizens of sovereign States; fit agents of democratic government. This is the recommendation which they adopted:

It is the recommendation of the drafting committee of State officials of the Council of State Governments that, in the interest of the development of State responsibilities, the States are urged to rely on their own resources and not to turn to the Federal Government for financial assistance in the development of the facilities.

I want to incorporate this recommendation in the permanent records of this country to the eternal honor of those who are responsible for this recommendation, indicating the policy, and embodying the spirit which will save for us our democracy, if the democracy is saved. I want also to put in the RECORD in this connection, the list of these officials to whom this credit is due. Following are the names and titles of these fine American citizens:

Harrington Adams, deputy attorney general, Pennsylvania.

Cassius M. Chichester, commissioner on uniform State laws, Virginia.

Brevard Crihfield, Washington representative, Council of State Governments, Washington, D. C.

Sidney Clifford, commissioner on uniform State laws, Rhode Island.

Hubert R. Gallagher, associate director, Council of State Governments, Washington, D. C.

Representative George W. Henley, commissioner on interstate cooperation, Indiana.

Gardiner Johnson, commissioner on interstate cooperation, California.

Walter R. Johnson, attorney general of Nebraska.

James P. Kendall, assistant attorney general, Mississippi.

E. Paul Mason, commissioner of uniform State laws, Maryland.

A. B. Mitchell, attorney general of Kansas.

Harold C. Ostertag, Committee on Interstate Cooperation, New York.

Abram P. Staples, attorney general of Virginia.

Henry P. Thomas, commissioner on uniform State laws, Virginia.

James C. Wilkes, chairman of drafting committee and commissioner on uniform State laws of the District of Columbia.

R. G. Yoder, deputy attorney general of Iowa.

Lester Orfield, Chicago representative, Council of State Governments, Illinois.

J. H. Meek, director, Division of Markets, Virginia Department of Agriculture.

Benjamin P. Storrs, director, Bureau of Markets, Connecticut.

Webster J. Birdsall, director, Bureau of Markets, New York.

W. Kerr Scott, chairman, commissioner of agriculture, North Carolina.

George R. Ross, marketing specialist, Department of Agriculture, North Carolina.

Tom Linder, commissioner of agriculture, State of Georgia.

Guy Jackson, assistant to commissioner of agriculture, State of Georgia.

Chovine Sprott, deputy commissioner, Department of Agriculture, South Carolina.

W. D. Outman, Washington representative, Florida Department of Agriculture, Florida.

C. C. Hanson, secretary, Association of Southern Commissioners of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

Walker L. Mifflin, president, State Board of Agriculture, Delaware.

W. W. Oley, chief, Bureau of Markets, State of New Jersey Department of Agriculture.

H. K. Thatcher, president, National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

Charles S. Rhyne, executive director, National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, Washington, D. C.

Donoh W. Hanks, Jr., executive assistant, American Municipal Association, Washington, D. C.

Harry Betters, assistant director, United States Conference of Mayors, Washington, D. C.

Keith L. Seegmiller, Washington representative, National Association of County Officials, Washington, D. C.

Credit is due also to the fine Federal official, John W. Andrews, for his cooperation with his fellow officials from the States, who recognize the fundamental fact that our States, on their own responsibility, must deal with their problems of government and finance their own institutions if they are to avoid the Federal Government cutting deeper and deeper into the sources of State revenue in order to get the money with which to make the States more and more dependent and less sovereign as they resort to the Federal Treasury to get back a part of the money which their citizens have paid into the Federal Treasury.

New Second Assistant Postmaster General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article that appeared in the Union Postal Clerk magazine, November issue, entitled "New Second Assistant Postmaster General":

NEW SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

Gael E. Sullivan, of Chicago, took office as Second Assistant Postmaster General on October 1, 1945. Sullivan, a 40-year-old former college professor and public administrator, was discharged as an Army major to head the vast transportation system of the postal service.

Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas administered the oath.

Referring briefly to Mr. Sullivan's experience in mapping Chicago's future transportation needs and his accomplishments as a port officer in the Mediterranean, Postmaster General Robert E. Hannegan told of his confidence in the new Second Assistant.

Difficult transportation problems demand prompt solution, Mr. Hannegan said. He paid tribute to the long service of Smith W. Purdum, who retired as Second Assistant Postmaster General because of ill health.

"Happily we knew of Gael Sullivan, an energetic young man in Chicago, well equipped to deal with the transportation problems which confront us," he declared. "We are very fortunate in getting such a man as Gael Sullivan."

Mr. Sullivan expressed his appreciation to President Truman, Mr. Hannegan, and to Mr. Justice Douglas.

"I want to be worthy of this assignment and at this moment words lose their meaning, whether promises or prophecies," he declared. "I am going to let you look at the performance a year from now. At that time I will either have made the grade or not."

In welcoming Mr. Sullivan to the Department First Assistant Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson paid warm tribute to the service of Mr. Purdum. Judge Ambrose O'Connell, of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, a former Second Assistant Postmaster General, referred to the strong organization of transportation experts within the Second Assistant's Bureau, and told of the feeling of pride and fellowship that unites all who have been identified with the Postal Service.

As Second Assistant Postmaster General, Mr. Sullivan will be in charge of railway mail, air mail, and international mail. A native of Providence, R. I., Mr. Sullivan went to Chicago 19 years ago. Following his graduation from Providence College and Thomas Aquinas University, at River Forest, Ill., he taught at DePaul, Loyola, and Northwestern Universities. After being identified with an advertising firm for a time, he became associated with the management of the Chicago World's Fair. Subsequently, he served as Associate State Director of the Federal Housing Administration, Administrative Assistant to the mayor of Chicago, and Illinois State director of the Federal Housing Administration.

He entered the Army in 1943, serving in the north African and Italian campaigns.

His work as port officer at Cagliari, Sardinia, won high commendation from military authorities and he was appointed food officer for all military and civilian personnel on the entire island. He was cited for outstanding work in quartermaster methods of procurement and control. Special assignments included service on the Henry L. Grady mission to Italy for the State Department and as personal aide to Gen. William O'Dwyer on his special economic mission to Italy. From February 1945 to VJ-day, he served as chief labor relations officer for the Army at Detroit.

Army Discharges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a soldier to his brother, a resident of my district:

OCTOBER 31, 1945.

DEAR SAM: I am going to write you quite a letter here, and it is going to be one that I have never written before, and I hope I never have to ever write again. What I am about to say I think is news of great importance to every American who has men or women in the armed forces, namely the Army. This would never pass the censors, but now we are at liberty to speak more freely. Now, don't think that I am a rabble rouser, because I am far from that. I would like you to write an article in the Sun and Gazette trying to crack wide open this Army demobilization. It is fouled up (we have much stronger language to use but it wouldn't be fit). I would like you to read all the clippings, etc., and see if a suitable story could be written. Of course, by all means, show it to your boss and see if he thinks it is fit to print. I wouldn't want you to lose your job through it or getting the paper in dutch. And if it is printed, please send me a copy of it.

I have been urged by a fellow who was from our unit who has 86 points and is out at the Replacement Depot awaiting shipment to the United States for discharge. Now, these fellows have been out there for 23 days and have only moved from 4,300 on the list to 4,000 in that time, so you can see only 300 went out of the depot. They tell us to do this so that the other fellows won't have to go through the same thing, as this won't do them any good, but may help some poor guy sweating it out to get home. The fellows out there all send home a copy of our Daily Pacifican and there are over 4,000 of them going to various newspapers throughout the country to try and crack this thing wide open. We think the public should know because they are writing Congressmen and get little results. Did you know that the Senators and Representatives have Wacs answering the mail from the people and they answer it by a previously typed form letter? The Senators don't even get to see most of the mail, as these Wacs read it and that is all. These fellows in our unit were all eligible over a month ago to go home for discharge but are still here in the depots. Now, the divisions going home take with them 60-point men and this is what is causing a lot of stink. There are men out in the depots now with as high as 96 points and more, while some of these guys with 60 go home before them. These fellows at the depots say the food is terrible and you must wait in a line 8 blocks long and stand so long that it is pathetic. The 70-point men have been eligible since October 1 and tomorrow the 60 points become eligible, tomorrow November 1. So you can see how fouled up it really is.

Men back in the States with as low as 36 points don't have to go overseas any more, so how are we ever going to get home. They discharge these men becoming eligible back there in the States very quickly because they have no transportation problem and they keep lowering the score in order to make their figures look good for discharge. By the way, I have 56 points and according to plan I should become eligible in December, but I doubt if I even get home in time for my third wedding anniversary on March 6, 1946. Willie and I have spent both of the others across the seas and would like so very much to be together for our third.

Now, the Army is making a lot of lame excuses which we know aren't true. One of them is the transportation. Well, I thought that we were supposed to have the largest Navy and merchant fleet in the world. The Japs could come out with the statement that they sank out Navy during the war and we would believe them.

Another thing is they say that the Liberty and cargo ships aren't fit to carry troops. Well, they hauled us around during the war when there was far greater risk in these "tubs." Now why not, as I'm sure that everyone of us would be more than willing to put up with all these so-called inconveniences. Many hundreds of men have volunteered to work on these ships in their spare time to reconvert these ships with temporary quarters for ships going home. Well, one lieutenant colonel got the ball rolling for us and now they are reconverting a few, but they only carry three to five hundred men. An article was in the paper, of which the clipping is submitted, that a lot of good Liberty ships are in dry docks in the South going to ruin and rust. They also claim that the ships aren't being unloaded very quickly. Well, one of the GI's suggested that they let all these men at the replacement depot help unload the ships while waiting to go home and he guaranteed that the ships would be unloaded and loaded in record time. (Please excuse this typing as I am hurrying like the dickens because we don't get too much time to ourselves just now as things are pretty "chicken ——" around here. They don't even let us read our mail or the daily papers during duty hours.) General Marshall just came out with a statement that the world would disintegrate because of us letting the Army go so fast. Time, in its copy of October 22, inferred that Marshall had to sit idly by while his big Army was being taken from

him, thus cutting his prestige and power. Now these Army career men all think only in terms of war because that is what they study and it is their work. If we make the country so war conscious we are bound to have another war very soon. I believe in preparedness but not a military power. We are a peace-loving Nation. We all think the President has done a fine job so far and we admire him for it. It was fine of him to cut down on the Army's appropriations, thus compelling them to let some of them go. If it was up to the Army and the War Department to let men go we would never get out. It is only through public sentiment that something is done, as the people are supposed to be the Government. I tell you Sam, the men are very bitter about this thing and they have lost all patriotism and even have lost respect for our lawmakers, and that is very bad. I never saw the morale of the troops ever lower even after the beatings by the Japs, which they gave us on Guadalcanal, Tinian, Saipan, and the German Bulge of Christmas 1944.

These strikes back home aren't helping things either, as they are tying up our important ports thus cutting the shipping. We suggest that all labor radicals be inducted into the Army and sent overseas as occupation troops and release us men over here. I'm sure that would soon break it up. It looks as though they all stayed on the job until the war was over and now want so much more money and less hours. It looks as though they don't want us home at all because of unemployment. What do you think would happen if we in the Army would refuse to work and do our part? They soon would have us in Leavenworth serving time.

Now the British have pulled a "lousy" trick of taking away some of the big liners so now we can't send as many men home from Europe. This indirectly affects us because they will take the ships from us to use in Europe. That was awful after we gave Britain so much lend-lease which we shall never get back. What is this world coming to?

I have never hated anything in all my life as I do the Army and I bet I have aged mentally 10 years while in the Army 3 years. Of course don't tell mother or Willie this as I don't write them stuff like that and make them feel bad and sorry for me. I never "bitch" much in my letters to them and Willie knows how it is in the Army.

Both Willie and I have spent long periods of time overseas and feel as though we have done our part, and now want to get home very much. She is very disgusted with the Army and is quite bitter too. Luckily she got a vacation to go to the French Riviera, for which I am glad. It was nice that she gets to see things. We over here in the Pacific don't have it that nice as in Europe, because there is nothing to see over on these islands. We have a lot of fellows here now from Europe who served over there and they say this place is a hell hole and hate it. We always thought that it was better serving in the ETO than over here, and now we know. Well Willie has 54 points and they left all the nurses with 55 points go home for discharge in October. Well, she missed that by one point. Their score is 35 points but their going home is just as "fouled up" as ours. She can also get out for being married, but it may take time. I hope and pray that she gets home in time for Christmas, as it would be nice to be home for that. I know that I shall spend by third Christmas over here in the Pacific, but I hope and pray that by some good fortune that I am able to be home with Willie for our third wedding anniversary. Oh, by the way, in case you are interested and if I haven't already said it I have 56 points.

You see we paid for staying at a nice place like New Caledonia because we got no "battle stars" for it which count a very important 5 points. We luckily got one for up here in the Philippines which helped a little. A lot of outfits got more battle stars for being over here only about 18 months. They have four battle stars while we only have one and have been over here for 30 months. I have been over only 25 months now.

I'll have to close now for awhile, as I must go to work for the afternoon, but I'll finish this tonight, I hope.

Back again, Sam, at 5:30 p. m.

They are making us work still longer so we will have still less time to ourselves. I wouldn't be surprised to see us work for 12 hours again like we did a month ago. I tell you this so-called "peacetime Army" is terrible, and we are working harder, longer, and taking more "crap" than we ever did while the war was on.

I don't want you to use my name, but if I wanted to take the time and bother I could get thousands of signers.

What I have written before and am about to write is gotten from what I have seen, read, and heard, directly and indirectly so you can take it at what it is worth, as I can't absolutely prove all this. The magazine clippings submitted are from Time, Newsweek, and our paper, the Daily Pacifican. Please read all of them carefully and then use your own opinion and conclusion.

As I was talking about the replacement depots in one of my other pages I omitted this. This actually happened to one of our fellows here who left for discharge. He is from Reading, Pa. Now in order for them to keep up any kind of morale at all at these depots they get a man all ready to leave and put him in a truck and you think you are going to a dock to board a ship; but no, they are only transferring you to another depot which is twice as discouraging. They tell me when you are out there even though you aren't doing anything, each passing day seems like a year.

Now people back home write me and say they read in the paper that they are getting back troops from overseas so fast that I will soon be home. They even ask me if I can go out with them on New Year's Eve and Christmas. The actual figures, if published, would show you that between VJ-day, September 2, and October 15, there were actually more troops brought into the Philippines than were sent back home. These figures were published in the Daily Pacifican, our paper.

The civilian air lines are going to start operating from and to the Orient on November 1. How come they can't use these planes to get us home? There are a lot of idle planes around here that have to be used to keep in condition and should be used to take us home faster. Also the Dollar Steamship Lines are going to operate civilian service on December 1. What is this thing?

The British brides are clamoring to get back to the States to see their husbands. Well, I have a wife overseas too; only she is a nurse and in the service and an American. What gives, do these English girls expect to get to the United States before us GI's?

Ordnance has often said that if our trucks were kept in repair better by the drivers they could get us to and from the depots and to the docks faster. Well, here is an incident that happened to us 2 days ago. We order another command car from Ordnance. Well, I think one of the officers was driving it to here. Well, on the way the engine just fell right out from under the hood. I never heard of such a thing. Many big lots or rice paddies are sitting full of good trucks still serviceable, just rusting away. The Army is so wasteful that we will never catch up with the Nation's debt.

If you ever get a chance to read Bill Mauldin's book, Up Front, please do so, as every person having a son or relative in the service should read it. He writes the truth, and just like a GI would talk. He, you know, is the famous war cartoonist who was all over Europe during the war. Yes; even fighting himself before getting on the Stars and Stripes staff.

Another big farce is the Inspector General's Department inspections every so often. Everyone concerned is tipped off when they are coming, and, of course, everything is in proper order. What an inspection, even through it is thorough. Another big joke is Officer Candidate School and how you got into it. Sometime I would like to sit down and tell you all about the Army. I could go on for hours and make your ears ring.

I am mentioning nothing in here about officers, as everyone should be fairly familiar with those things by now, except for this one thing. When an officer doesn't take his leave since he is overseas, he accrues all this money, and in some cases it reaches as high as $1,200. He gets all this for nothing, plus a big leave upon getting home to the States. Now an enlisted man when he gets home from overseas and never had a furlough while there he gets exactly nothing, and you lose all of that. You get your furlough, and that is all. What is fair about that?

Another thing is an Army court martial. They are very unfair, and all that sit on the board are officers. Who can say anything against them, or they will get you for insubordination. We all think that is what our country stands for, a fair trial by jury. War criminals get nearly as fair a trial. We think enlisted men should sit in on the trial just as well as officers. We have no representation. How can anyone be justly tried. The person accused is so nervous with all the big brass that he is scared to death. This Army is never democratic.

The caste system is worked to death, and I hate it terribly. I'll tell you that when I see you in person. I was never treated like this in all my life.

Notice on the front and back of this envelope the rubber stamp in red, "Get the Boys Home." Well, we all stamp that on our letters, and we have told the mail clerk to put it on if the sender didn't already.

The next page will be purely personal stuff.

The weather here is terrible. It is so hot and the heat is almost unbearable. It rains a lot, too, and everything gets moldy and musky. Your clothes smell awful. You take cold showers to cool off, but as soon as you are dry you are perspiring again so very much. We usually sit around the tent in the daytime with just a pair of shorts and sometimes not even that and you sit there with the perspiration running off of you like rain. You must have a towel handy to wipe it off.

Now, here is a personal complaint which happened to me this morning: They changed mess hours this morning and I didn't get anything to eat as a result of it. They changed them late last night and didn't notify me or all the fellows. I went up to the mess hall at the usual time and they refused to feed me. Well, that right there is against the A. R.'s (Army Rule) because they must feed you even though it is late. They told me that the mess hours had been changed. I put up a squawk, but they wouldn't feed me. They had eggs, too, and gave each one two. We seldom get them and I like them. Our other breakfasts are pretty poor. I went to see the mess sergeant and he still wouldn't give me any satisfaction, so I went to the commanding officer. This is the first time I ever went to the commanding officer with a complaint. You see, they feed the officers there, too, and they fed some officers after I got there and also a technical sergeant and staff. I told the majors—both of them—my story and they told me they were very sorry it happened and that it wouldn't happen again and would look into the matter. But that still didn't get me fed. So I had to eat a banana, peanuts, a candy bar, and some cookies. Well, that isn't much of a meal to work the hours we do. I could have gone to the inspector

general's department and put in my complaint, as that is what they are for, but I knew it wouldn't help as all they would say is T. S.

Here is another thing: I am tired of being a technician 5 so long, so I went up to see my section head. You see, I have been in grade 20 months and in the department 2 years. I work hard and get nowhere. I asked for a transfer to another section, but he talked me out of it, saying that I should be getting a rating soon. He almost guaranteed it. I said if my work wasn't satisfactory I wanted to know. He said no; that my work was very satisfactory. I don't care for myself, but the people back home all think that since you are only a corporal or technician 5 that you must be very dull. If they only knew how this thing worked. You see, I don't kiss enough "——." But if I were to get a rating that way, I wouldn't want it.

It is remarkable how much better one feels after getting all these things off of your chest and you feel relieved. That is the only way you have of letting off steam. If you didn't do it, you would soon be a goner and a mental case.

I am now starting my twenty-fifth month overseas and Willie her twenty-third, so you can see we have been overseas too long. She is very much fed up with the Army, too, and detests it. That goes for me, too, and double. We both need each other and are very lonely over here and there.

* * * * *

I hope you didn't think I was too windy and a radical in this letter as it wasn't meant that way at all.

Gee, how I'd love to be up there for deer hunting.

Your brother,

FRANKIE.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under previous authority to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit the following newspaper article by Mr. Richard J. Smith, in regard to the OPA, as follows:

(By Richard J. Smith)

Girls, if your one-way stretch girdle goes limp after only a few wearings and washings and the elastic of your new panties fails without warning, you are very likely a victim of inflation.

OPA is blamed by the National Retail Dry Goods Association for creating this inflation by favoring fly-by-night manufacturers of women's and men's apparel and household goods and stifling quality production by old-line firms.

UNEMPLOYMENT INCREASED

They also charge that OPA's back-door inflation, aside from flooding retail markets with inferior merchandise at exorbitant prices and causing a scarcity of quality goods, already has caused unemployment of thousands.

To back up their arguments they opened yesterday in Room 213, Old House Office Building, a display entitled, "The Consumer Sufferers," exhibiting some 60 standard items of clothing and household goods, side by side with more costly similar items of inferior quality.

HOW INFLATION RESULTS

Robert Seidel, vice president of W. T. Grant Company, New York City, one of the drygoodsmen in charge of the exhibit, explained how the inflation appears and its effects:

"OPA pricing policies," he said "hold standard manufacturers to their 1942 price ceilings. These concerns, converting from war to peacetime production, cannot produce their normal products at those prices, unless they lose money.

"However, newcomers, 'fly-by-nighters,' are allowed to enter these fields and are given by OPA liberal ceilings. They can and do make money."

SO CONSUMER SUFFERS

The newcomers, he said, are not concerned with quality.

"The result is," he declared, "the consumer suffers through inferior merchandise at prices far above what would be paid if standard manufacturers could get back in their normal fields."

One manufacturer, he said, unable to make profitably the lamp shades he produced before entering war production, has turned to medicine cabinets, and another from "occasional furniture" to coffins. Entering fields new to them, they were able to get profitable ceilings.

"Instead of holding the line," Seidel said, "OPA is furthering inflation. Newcomers begin with a higher markup and retailers increase the price to the consumer."

CITES INEXPENSIVE BLOUSE

He pointed out a $17.95 woman's topper blouse, made by a newcomer firm of refugees in New York. The blouse is inferior in fabric and tailoring to one which could be sold for $3.50 by a standard manufacturer, he said, if he could get a slight ceiling adjustment.

In a number of instances, the OPA policy, according to Seidel, has resulted in standard manufacturers returning to peacetime operations as subcontractors to turn out their normal products for a newcomer granted a profitable ceiling by OPA, which had denied them readjustments on their 1942 ceilings.

Seidel admitted it is pretty confused, and was showing an electric flatiron selling retail for $5.50 and another iron of superior quality which would sell for less than $3 if OPA would hoist the ceiling a few pennies, when a man from OPA came in.

He was Louis A. Williams, chief of OPA's hardware and houseware section. Seidel was joined by several other drygoodsmen. Williams seemed embarrassed and said he'd dropped in because he'd heard there was no admission charge.

The drygoodsmen said: "That's typically OPA. That's about as much as they think of the 135,000,000 consumer Americans."

Williams and Seidel argued briefly over the electric irons and Williams presently left, declining to be quoted.

The show, which is open to the public and will continue through Friday, was set up in connection with the investigation being conducted by the special congressional committee to investigate executive agencies.

Veterans of Foreign Wars Protest Delay in Return of Troops From Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing herewith a copy of a letter received by members of the Junker-Ball Post, No. 1865, Veterans of Foreign Wars, located at Kenosha, Wis., within my congressional district. The action taken by members of that post is in line with the attitude of the great majority of the people in this country to the effect that there has been undue delay in the return of high-point men to the United States from the Pacific theater of operations. The time has come for prompt action and not mealy-mouthed promises on the part of authorities that they are doing their best. The record shows that their best is not producing results—and that is the test. As part of these remarks, I am including herein a letter dated October 23 from Luzon Island in the Philippines:

UNITED STATES ARMY
FORCES BASE M APO 70,
Luzon Island, Philippines,
October 23, 1945.

To Whom It May Concern:

We, the undersigned, hope the people back home will see fit to help the cause of thousands of veterans overseas—as far as getting them home.

Promises have been made to us, and morale building propaganda printed in our daily newspaper, Daily Pacifican, (which is controlled by "AFWESPAC," Army Forces Western Pacific) stating that all shipping space is being utilized for the sole purpose of returning high-point men home for discharge from the armed forces. Our big question is, Where is the efficiency of the Army? Why doesn't the Army back up some of their statements? We have done our part. Why can't the politicians and "brass hats" get together and fulfill their many promises and do their part in getting all of us home? We want action—not just meaningless promises.

Why do we keep hearing the same old story—"No ships"? Where are the hundreds and thousands of Liberty ships that our people back home bought war bonds to furnish the necessary capital to build? Where is the vast Navy armada that proved such a decisive factor in the winning of this war? Why weren't the Navy vessels that were sent back to the west coast—empty of personnel except Navy crewmen—used to convey troops back home? Surely the people back home would rather see their sons, sweethearts and husbands come home than to watch a lot of empty vessels maneuver around in the water. Why not postpone Navy day until the boys overseas are brought home?

As a Congressman in the States recently said, "The attitude of the soldier overseas has almost reached the point of bitterness." We wish to add that "bitter" is hardly the proper word to describe our feelings.

Directly after the close of the war here in the Pacific, we were content to sit back, be patient, and wait our turn to go home. That has all changed now. Who do the "brass hats" and politicians think they are fooling? They are not dealing with babies or a mass of illiterate men. No; they are dealing with men who have been away from their homes, their families, and their friends from 1 to 3 years—men who have had to live like animals at times, have seen their buddies killed and wounded, and yet have gone on because we knew what we were over here for and that some day we would win and could look forward to being home again. We have fought for the rights that the people back home are enjoying now. Again we ask ourselves, "Why can't we be home to enjoy the peace that we helped bring to this world?" All we get for our effort is promises.

The announcement was made official that the October 1 point system would be lowered from 80 points to 70 points, and the November 1, to 60 points. Here it is almost the

last of October, and there are still 80 and 90 point men waiting to be sent to disposition centers for shipment home. To top it all, ships are leaving Manila Harbor carrying 60- and 70-point men. Why have a point system if the officials don't abide by it?

Now we reach the so-called red apple program. That takes the booby prize. Why should the soldiers, who have only 6 to 12 months Army service and have just come overseas, be given priority on going home first equal to that of the high-point men who have spent 2 or 3 years overseas? What were the "brass hats" thinking about when they made these statements? Surely they don't expect us old timers to sit back and take that. What's happened to our democratic government?

It's getting pretty bad when our base headquarters have to establish armed guards around headquarters to keep out bad boys. Yes some of the boys have tried to find out from our I. G. and A. G. office on when they can expect to leave for home. Some of the men with 87 points and above were alerted to leave for the disposition center in Manila in preparation to going home. An order came from headquarters in Manila canceling that order. Why? No one had an answer. You can imagine how low the morale of these men was at that time. Why can't our commanding generals give us a decent answer? The answer we get is "No shipping space."

Recently we over here read an article in the Daily Pacifican where two officers from the European theater wrote to their Congressman and stated that something must be done quickly to relieve the tension and prevent outright desertion by the enlisted men of the armed forces, stating that almost every statement the Army officials have made so far have proven to be false, and that it is a discredit to their country for their fighting men to be played with as a cat might play with a mouse and to have their hopes and morale so high only to be let down by their own people. What kind of an example is our country setting for other nations to follow? Why let other countries know about the uneasiness of our powerful fighting forces? Our morale is supposed to be the highest of all fighting forces. The same conditions that prevail in our forces in Europe also pertains to the armed forces in the Pacific. The statements of these two officers were recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in Washington.

We are still wondering why we have to sit over here and wait while back home men with 41 points—such as football stars—are being discharged from the service. Surely they are not considered as a back log. We can understand the men in the States being discharged with 60 and more points to pave the way for the returning vets, but why should men with below 60 points be discharged before the high-point veterans overseas are brought home? We don't want excuses or literature in form of pamphlets sent to our people at home in answer to their inquiries. We want results.

Recently the War Department published statements corncerning the release of men 35 years of age with 2 years of service. Up until a day ago those men were given a priority equal to the high-point men. Now we get word from our headquarters that there were no official orders received verifying the Associated Press dispatch covering the release of those men, yet we have received circulars, bulletins, and directives on sending those men home. Why were some of these men sent home and others in the same category given the story that there has been no official directive received covering their release? We understand now that they will be released some time in March 1946 with the other 2-year servicemen.

As each day goes by the overseas veteran, who sees no early possible date that he can ben sent home, gets more disgusted with the "brass hats" and politicians. What kind of people are running our Government back home? Can they do nothing to fulfill the promises made to the men overseas?

We have seen training films and received War Department directives, bulletins, and circulars concerning the redeployment and readjustment of military personnel eligible for return home and discharge from the armed forces, but the information contained in those official directives has proven insufficient as far as getting us home is concerned. We want true facts on the whole situation. Forget the promises and give us results.

Here is another incident that has taken place here in the Pacific. Cargo ships have left the docks and harbors barren of all personnel except for the merchant seamen assigned to duty on the vessels. During the war those ships were jammed with thousands of troops and used to shuttle them from one battle zone to another. Living conditions on those ships at that time were at a very low standard. The men were fed C and K rations. Now certain "brass hats" under AFWESPAC tell us that it is not a very desirable way of transporting us home. The way we feel we would gladly spend all of our time in the hold of a cargo vessel just to get home. We would gladly eat C and K rations. All we want to do is get home. Traveling by cargo ship is a way to get us home, but it is made impossible by "swivel-chair brass hats." Captains in charge of cargo ships even went to the commanding generals and stated that they could carry from 500 to 750 men home. They were refused their request, and the ships left for the States empty. This is going on every day. Why can't something be done? All we oversea veterans want is to get home to our families and loved ones. We are not particular how we get there. We have done our part. Now the politicians and "brass hats" in charge of our Government and armed forces must do theirs.

Attached to this letter are clippings from our daily newspaper, Daily Pacifican, which will substantiate our statements that we are not the only ones feeling that we are being let down. These letters are sent to the newspaper from enlisted men and officers all over the Pacific.

We sincerely hope that this will open the eyes of the right persons, and that all the veterans can expect a square deal. We want nothing but to get home. Is that asking too much?

Respectfully yours,

D. E. Hartung, technician, fifth grade; K. M. Wright, technician, fourth grade; Edward F. Gedmin, private, first class; Ernest W. Feksite, technician, fourth grade; R. G. Davenport, technician, fifth grade; R. J. Koekek, master sergeant; Woodrow Morris, technician, third grade; Carl S. Carlson, technician, fifth grade; Wm. R. Murray, private, first class; Michael A. Pastone, technician, fifth grade; Robert J. Le Gros, technician, fifth grade; F. F. Fasano, technician, fourth grade; W. H. Klicker, technician, fifth grade; Alfred A. Doney, technician, fourth grade; Leopoldo R. Ponce, technician, fourth grade; A. C. Shipley, technician, third grade; L. B. Johnson, technician, fifth grade; Julian I. Rachow, technician, fourth grade; Irving Ginsberg, technician, fifth grade; Vincent Sarch, technician, fifth grade; C. W. Sughrue, first sergeant.

American-Soviet Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 15 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today the maintenance of friendly relations between nations and peoples transcends any other problem before any nation or people in the world. When I say "friendship" I do not mean a vague, indefinite, sentimental attachment based upon some passing whim or fancy. I refer to that strong and deep friendship which comes with mutual esteem, mutual understanding, and mutual respect. I stress the word "mutual" because friendship cannot abide on one side alone.

Last night at Madison Square Garden the Under Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, delivered an address at a rally sponsored by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. In that address he ably discussed those factors necessary to encourage and maintain friendship between these two great nations—the United States and the Soviet Union. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friendship between nations, as between individuals—genuine friendship—is something that grows spontaneously. It isn't easy to promote. It never can be forced. Governments can set the tone of international relations, but in the long run it's the people who call the tune.

The word "friendship" has been applied so liberally and so loosely to international relations, that it has lost much of its meaning. On this important occasion I shall try to use the word with all the care and respect that it deserves.

What are the factors that encourage close and friendly relations between the American and Soviet peoples? What are the obstacles in the way of a satisfactory friendship between us?

To say that there are overwhelming reasons why we should be friends is not to say that we are friends. To describe the bonds that unite us for better or for worse, on this miniature and crowded planet, is not to prove that we are happily united.

Now, I don't propose to enter tonight into a philosophical discussion of the anatomy of friendship. But there are certain conditions that usually exist between friends, and where they don't exist, you are almost certain to find something less than complete friendship.

One of those conditions might be described as an absence of tension. Friends may argue, disagree, and even quarrel—but they are relaxed with each other, in spite of their differences. They accept their disagreements as a normal part of the give and take of friendship.

To put it another way, friends are not forever taking each other apart—until each becomes obsessed and exasperated with the contradictions of the other's personality. They have accepted the terms of friendship, and they are not impelled to dig up the

roots of friendship daily to see how the plant is growing.

To do this seems to me both silly and futile. Certainly it's not the way personal or international friendships are made or preserved. But in all honesty it must be admitted that there is a good deal of this sort of thing going on in both countries.

Judging from the way our national temperatures rise and fall in relation to day-to-day events, you would think we had had no experience of living together in the same world. As a matter of fact, we have had a long and close experience, dating from the time when President Jefferson and Czar Alexander the First carried on a warm and friendly correspondence.

For nearly a century and a half we have gotten along well—remarkably well, when you consider that our forms of government, our economic systems, and our social habits have never been similar.

Certainly the contrast between our ways of life and our political institutions is no greater today, with a Communist Russia, than it was in the time of Jefferson and Czar Alexander the First, or during the period of the Civil War when Abraham Lincoln and Czar Alexander the Second guided our respective nations in a friendly collaboration of vital importance to us in our time of trial.

In perspective, the long history of amicable relations between the American and Russian peoples compares favorably with the history of our relations with the other great nations—not excluding France and Great Britain. By any standards of international relations, the record is good.

When I say this I am not for a moment forgetting or underestimating the tremendous events of 1917 and 1918 which eliminated Russia from the ranks of our allies at a crucial moment of the First World War, or the 16-year period of black-out between our two peoples, during which we withheld diplomatic recognition of each other's existence and suspended the normal contacts without which friendship cannot flourish.

But however great the loss to both our peoples from that gap in our relations, we need not regard it as irretrievable. Already a substantial part of it has been offset by our working partnership of World War II and the start toward peaceful cooperation that was made at the Moscow, Teheran, Crimean, and San Francisco Conferences, and by our joint membership in the United Nations Organization.

Taken as a whole, I repeat, the long record of common interest and common action is good. Can we put it down to chance? Can we ascribe it to all-wise governments or impeccable diplomacy? I don't think so. Forgetting governments and diplomats for the moment let's look at more immutable facts of history and geography.

There is the fact, for example, that never, in the past, has there been any place on the globe where the vital interests of the American and Russian people have clashed or even been antagonistic—and there is no objective reason to suppose that there should, now or in the future, ever be such a place. There is an obvious reason for this. We are both continental peoples with adequate living space—interested in developing and enjoying the living space we have. Our ambition is to achieve the highest possible standards of living among our own peoples, and we have the wherewithal to achieve high standards of living without conquest, through peaceful developments and trade.

We have that opportunity, moreover, only to the extent that we can create conditions of peace and prevent war. Thus, the paramount interest, the only conceivable hope of both nations, lies in the cooperative enterprise of peace.

What, then, are the difficulties which lie across the path of this cooperative enterprise?

I believe the problem is capable of rational examination. I believe, also, that it is capable of solution. The hard core of the problem has two major aspects: First, the problem of security; and, second, the problem of understanding.

Both countries have been wantonly attacked. Both have suffered grievously, but differently. Both are determined that aggression shall have no such opportunity in the future.

The attack upon the Soviet Union came from just beyond her western borders. There was grave danger of attack from just beyond her eastern border. We can get some idea of the consequences of this attack—the second of its kind in a quarter of a century—if we imagine the United States invaded by the German Wehrmacht, and an area roughly comparable to the New England and Middle Atlantic States almost completely devastated. If we imagine this area as including not only the industrial centers of New York, Boston, and Pittsburgh, but a large part of the Middle Western bread basket and a third of our population as well, we can learn what aggression means to the Soviet people. We can understand also the measure of their determination to prevent it.

We understand and agree with them that to have friendly governments along her borders is essential both for the security of the Soviet Union and for the peace of the world. Secretary Byrnes made this clear beyond doubt in his speech of October 31.

But it seems equally clear to us that the interest in security must take into account and respect other basic interests of nations and men, such as the interest of other peoples to choose the general surroundings of their own lives and of all men to be secure in their persons. We believe that that adjustment of interests should take place short of the point where persuasion and firmness become coercion, where a knock on the door at night strikes terror into men and women.

In this area where the room for adjustment is broad and where the necessity for extreme measures is absent, the problem seems wholly possible of friendly solution.

We, too, have our problem of security. The attack upon us came, not from close at hand, but from an aggressor, on two occasions, many thousands of miles away. The attacks were made upon a nation patently undesirous of and unprepared for war and solely because of our refusal supinely to acquiesce in conduct which outraged every sense of decency and right. This has led us to look for security through bases and methods which will keep danger far from us and stop the aggressor before he can again develop the power of his attack.

Our friends do not object to this but point out to us that we, too, must adjust our interest in security to the general interest in security and with the principles and organizations which have been agreed upon to insure it.

In the case of both the Soviet Union and ourselves the necessity to seek security by extreme measures or unilateral action is absent. Mr. Molotov has truly said:

"We have lived through difficult years and now each one of us can say: 'We have won and from now on we can consider our motherland rid from the menace of German invasion from the west and from the menace of Japanese invasion from the east.' The long-awaited peace has come for the peoples of the whole world."

With the menaces to the security of both countries removed it would seem that there is both time and area within which to solve all questions arising out of the need of our two countries for security. The path to solution is both through the United Nations Organization, which we have joined in establishing, and in following in our dealings with other nations the principles upon which we have agreed in the Charter.

One of these is to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples. Another is to take collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace.

These are principles of restraint and moderation and patience and respect for the dignity and integrity of nations and individuals. They furnish the best and surest foundations of friendship.

Then there is the second aspect of our problem of friendship—the second essential ingredient of friendship. I refer to the necessity for understanding and communication between the American and Soviet people.

Enduring friendship must be based on understanding and trust, not only between governments, but between peoples. But we are faced with an immediate and practical question: How are we to know one another? Here are two peoples of strong convictions and different backgrounds. Each is committed to its way of life. Neither has the least desire to change the other. Yet each has an overwhelming desire to know and understand the other.

I confess I see no way to draw our peoples into closer understanding except by persistent efforts, on both sides, to free the lines of communication through the press and the radio, through books and magazines, through the exchange of knowledge and culture, and through travel and personal acquaintance. What we and the Soviet people need from each other and what we are entitled to ask was summed up by Marshal Stalin in a talk with Senator PEPPER. "Just judge the Soviet Union objectively," said Marshal Stalin. "Do not either praise us or scold us. Just know us and judge us as we are, and base your estimate of us upon facts and not rumors."

We have so much to learn and, what is more difficult, to understand about each other that we cannot hope to succeed except in the spacious atmosphere of honesty, candor, and knowledge. Only in that atmosphere can we keep our minds and emotions on an even keel and avoid the pitfalls of overoptimism on the one side and despair on the other. Both are equally dangerous and equally unjustified.

Another Race in Armaments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 15 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting article written by A. Q. Miller, editor of the Belleville Telescope, who is well known in the West as one of the ablest editors in Kansas. His views on the race in armaments are sound.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER RACE IN ARMAMENTS

If this country follows the course mapped out by extreme militarists and echoed by President Truman, who does not want to relinquish his wartime powers, we are in for the greatest armament race in history, declares John M. Hightower, writer for the Associated Press.

Before the ink is dry on the United Nations' Charter and without giving this peace document, in which the world has pinned its faith, a chance to work, military influences in this country are trying to create war hysteria and rush the people into a huge military program, unprecedented in the Nation's history, which would cost $5,000,000,000, and which cannot be justified by any sound basis of reasoning. Such a proposal ignores the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, the Atlantic Charter, the Yalta Agreement, and makes a mockery out of the San Francisco Charter, which has been solemnly signed and ratified by all participating nations. In a Nation-wide address the other day when the President flouted all our peace efforts, which have been the hope of the war-weary world, and declared, "Peace must be built on power," he dashed the hopes of millions of subjugated people who have looked forward with faith to this country, believing we would assume the leadership in taking the world out of the barbaric practice of war. Top-ranking militarists, who live in a military atmosphere, and military-minded Congressmen, have systematically tried to build up a war psychology, and it has temporarily influenced the thinking of the President and some of the people.

Both General MacArthur and General Eisenhower, who are doing a fine job restoring peace in their respective spheres, and have practical knowledge of civilian as well as military affairs, have told the country that there is no threat of war in the foreseeable future, and that Germany and Japan are completely subjugated militarily and economically. We still have nearly 8,000,000 men in uniform, with no military threat from any quarter, and the United States is the only solvent nation in the world. Frankly, there are only two powers in the world who could, by any stretch of the imagination, be considered potential economic enemies, and they are begging the United States today for billions of dollars to rehabilitate their countries. In the face of such world conditions, it does not make sense for this country to suddenly abandon peaceful efforts, now in the process of being tried, and tell the world force is the only power that can be recognized, thereby suggesting a race in armaments.

What a disillusionment this must be to the American people, who were told that this was to end war, a war to make the world safe for democracy, and were solemnly promised that American boys would not fight on foreign soil. How can the Government and men in authority reconcile these things with present military proposals and make them square with the Atlantic Charter, Yalta Agreement, and San Francisco Charter? A leading educator cannot reconcile our position in disarming Germany and Japan, destroying their war text books and teaching them the ways of peace, while we propose to abandon our present educational system in high schools, colleges, and universities and teach the youth of the country the arts of war in West Point and Annapolis. While the President proposes to take out of the normal lives of our youth only 1 year for military training, Admiral King told the country Saturday that on account of the atomic bomb and other modern weapons, it should call for at least 18 months of military training for the youth of the country. This would mean that we are to take the youth of the land out of the home with its ideals and wholesome influence and place them in Army camps with the influence and environment which usually goes with such an abnormal life. It is admitted that the atomic bomb has completely revolutionized the problem of national defense and introduced the potency of science and technology. Present methods of warfare are completely outmoded, and the training of soldiers in routine Army tactics for a year or 18 months would be completely wasted. Any physical training needed can be secured in high schools and colleges, and certainly such limited training they would get in Army camps would have no technical value 5 or 10 years hence.

Nobody in this country is advocating "pacifism." (That is just a catchword used by militarists to fool people.) Everybody in this country, so far as has been revealed, wants adequate national defense, but they do not want to leave this responsibility to military-minded people who have given other groups but little opportunity to be heard in Washington.

One high-ranking military officer said if quick action was not had he was afraid the country would grow cold on the subject. The people have a right to expect their Congressmen, who are elected by the people, to give full and impartial appraisal of the whole question of national defense without being rushed into such a gigantic program with all its implications. Why not also give the boys in uniform some voice in the matter? They know more about war and the needs of the country militarily than do some of the swivel-chair generals in the Pentagon Building.

Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, born in Republic County, head of the Military Affairs Committee, who is opposed to such a program, says no matter what kind of sugar-coated name is given the plan it is still conscription. Congressman BENNETT of Missouri said: "Before militarism is saddled upon the country I would like to see the administration use its influence to induce other countries to abandon universal military training." Winston Churchill, speaking in Commons the other day, said: "The task of holding Germany down will not be as hard a task as holding Germany up." Churchill further said: "The RAF should be reduced to a personnel of 40,000 and the Navy should be brought back to prewar strength." Obviously Churchill does not see the need of a big Military Establishment. The Kansas delegation in Congress, expressing the sentiment of the home people, has committed itself against universal military training in peacetime as being a departure from our constitutional form of government and the principles of democracy.

Unless the people of this country become aroused to the dangers ahead—and how rapidly a military form of government is encroaching upon them and their civil liberties—they will wake up someday and find themselves in the clutches of military rule instead of civil government under our boasted democracy. Congress, the last remaining link between the people and their Government, is their only recourse.

Cotton and Other Problems

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to know some of the fine outstanding leaders of the great American cotton industry. Anyone who has sufficiently applied himself to a study of this commodity and its relationship to Federal legislation, the Federal Treasury, the internal economy of the United States, and the position which the commodity occupies in our export markets, must necessarily be interested in two memorandums which appeared under date of October 29 and November 9, 1945.

These comments were submitted by two of the outstanding members of the cotton industry. The first by a cotton man, of Houston, Tex., and the November 9 memorandum by Mr. C. T. Revere, of New York City, who is internationally recognized as one of the best posted men in the industry.

For the benefit of those who are continuing their study of this commodity and its problems, I submit for the RECORD the comments of these two gentlemen:

Annual United States consumption of cotton and alternative fibers is the equivalent of about 10,000,000 bales of 500 pounds.

The present price landed at American mills is in excess of 24 cents gross weights or 25 cents net weights.

It is commonly stated that the chemical industry can and will deliver rayon staple fiber to the United States mills at 15 cents per pound net weights and rayon filament at a corresponding price. It also is commonly stated that cotton will have to sell at or about the price of rayon staple fiber to continue to hold its share of textile consumption, and therefore that it would sell at 15 cents net weights delivered at the United States mills if the price of it were not sustained by the cotton purchase program and the cotton loan program of the United States Government.

If these statements are correct, the Government cotton programs are adding 10 cents per pound, or $50 a bale to the raw material cost for United States mills consuming cotton and alternative fibers. On a 10,000,000 bale annual consumption, the additional cost to the mills is $500,000,000 annually.

The additional cost to the American consuming public is greater than the additional cost of raw material to the mills, because of the percentage factors of manufacture and distribution.

The American public also will pay as taxpayers the cost to the United States Treasury of the purchase program, the loan program, and the cotton export subsidy program.

It is difficult to forecast the costs of these programs. However, if cotton is accumulated under the purchase and loan programs, it incurs carrying costs and winds up costing the Government 25 cents or more, and if eventually it will have to be liquidated at a level established by 15-cent competition, one must be prepared for a loss not far from 10 cents per pound or $50 per bale.

The present rate of subsidy on cotton export is 4 cents a pound, or $20 a bale. Considerable cotton has been sold for export under this subsidy. To some extent, the buyers of this cotton have been confined to the United States market by the fact of being able to secure freight and credit here and not elsewhere. However, under normal conditions it is hardly to be expected that the competitive influence of rayon and rayon staple fiber will be felt less in the export market than in the domestic market, to say nothing of the competitive effect of foreign cottons.

If it continues to be the policy of the United States to maintain an artificially high price for cotton within the United States, it will become necessary to restrict production, because it is common knowledge that cotton production under scientific and mechanized conditions is most highly profitable at these artificial prices. By precedent, the restriction would take the form of protection of old cotton farms and prevention of new cotton farms. The effect of it, therefore, would be to a large extent to protect production on old cotton farms on hilly lands unsuitable for mechanization, and prevent it on new flat lands that are suitable for mechanization—

in other words, to protect high-cost, inefficient production and to prevent low-cost efficient production.

If there is a beneficiary, he will be the owner of high-cost, unsuitable cotton farms in hilly country. It is questionable, though, whether anybody can benefit by perpetuation of inefficient production. The people of the South will suffer by being deprived of the opportunity for efficient mechanized production on suitable lands which ought to be profitable at a considerably lower price.

Outside of cotton circles, the beneficiary will be the promoter of rayon manufacture. I doubt if the industry itself will prosper in the end, if mushroomed on a situation so utterly artificial and uneconomic, and therefore incapable of enduring.

And, Mr. Speaker, I now present the views of Mr. C. T. Revere:

COTTON AND OTHER PROBLEMS

Inasmuch as prices tell their own story, it is hardly necessary to state that cotton in the last day or so has reached new high levels for more than 18 years. The validity of this advance has come in for question, for despite its extent, it seems to have been largely lacking in spontaneity. There has been plenty of propaganda to the effect that the upward movement in prices has taken place in the face of "strong administration opposition." However, aside from plenty of efforts to publicize this conception, the attempts have the ring of insincerity. For one thing, Government in these times of unrest would not relish being open to the charge of sponsoring inflation.

On the other hand, while it has proclaimed its adherence to a program of stabilization, the record shows that most of its policies, to say nothing of the character of its so-called directives, have provided price stimuli that otherwise would have been absent. In spite of its attempt at thunderous rhetoric, that widely advertised declamation, "hold the line," has been under suspicion of being uttered with a pious tongue in the cheek. However, it sounded well as a slogan.

Of course, the fate of the Pace bill has not yet been settled. Nobody knows what it will be and perhaps nobody cares, but if the advocates of this measure get what they want, the matter of a further rise is largely a question of the moderation with which the proponents of the bill push their advantage. Everything then will be settled except the broad problem of cotton, which in this welter of politics and general world confusion apparently has been overlooked.

In fact, the solution of our cotton problem in its relation to the future welfare of the South and effect on world economy has been subordinated to the matter of cotton price, and particularly the price received by the inefficient producer. In order to enable our cotton South to make its most effective contribution to world recovery, we should adopt a policy calling for a substantial increase in acreage and utilizing the land best suited to producing superior qualities of cotton. Everything should be done to encourage maximum production on selected acreage. This would involve an almost complete reversal of agricultural policy, for in the past the inefficient producer for political reasons has been virtually a ward of Government.

To the industrial engineer it seems little short of tragic that political considerations should stand in the way of the utilization of the land most suitable for the production of cotton. To him such a policy would be comparable in industry to diluting our efficiency by the employment of inferior plant equipment to the detriment of needed production.

Even a casual geographical survey will convince us that we have within our borders enough land suitable for the maximum production of cotton of the more desirable quality to meet requirements that we never yet have been called upon to fill.

Here it is, America's cotton empire:

"This natural cotton land includes the flat alluvial valley of the Mississippi, from southern Missouri southward, the high plains of west Texas, the flat coastal country around Corpus Christi, the flat alluvial bottomlands throughout the south, and the irrigable desert valleys from El Paso to the west, of which the greatest is the San Joaquin Valley in California. This is country which requires neither expensive terracing, ditching, cultivation, nor picking. Efficiently farmed, with the use of machinery which already has been devised and of new types which will be developed, these lands can produce more cotton per man-hour than they have produced heretofore—and more cotton per man-hour than has been produced in any other country.

"The superior knack of the American with machinery and with engineering puzzles and the fact that our country is more fully equipped with gins, oil mills and transportation than any other cotton growing country leads one to believe that our cost in terms of man-hours will be much lower than the cost in any other cotton growing country if we apply to cotton growing the same progressive genius that we apply to other pursuits and if we grow our cotton on the abundant lands that are suited to it by nature. We can grow so much more per man-hour as to offset the advantage some foreign landowners have in labor which costs less per man-hour—the more so since experience shows that wage scales are rather definitely in proportion to the productivity of the wage earner."

There it is, America's cotton empire, with its jobs for millions and its solution of our cotton problem. Yet for 15 years under planned economy we have been building up a national policy of reducing cotton acreage in order to hold up the price, the principle of the reduction being that it shall be roughly uniform geographically, the good cotton farm cutting down its cotton acreage proportionately with the poor cotton farm (and in even greater proportion considering the special exemptions for the small farm).

If we had set out deliberately to find a way to increase the man-hour cost of cotton, we could have found no more effective way than to reduce the cotton acreage of each cotton farm and to freeze quotas of the acreage to the high-cost farms, checkmating the natural shift of production to low-cost areas.

When we begin to recognize the constructive advantages to be derived from the full utilization of America's cotton empire, we shall be on our way toward a real solution of our cotton problem, with the benefits accruing to the South as well as the rest of the world. We need have no fear of overproduction, so long as we concentrate our efforts on the selection of acreage suitable for the production of the qualities the world so urgently needs. Equipped for taking advantage of the full possibilities of mechanization in production, as we undoubtedly shall be, the American cotton grower will be in a position to meet the challenge from all sources, including foreign growths and the menace of expanded production in synthetics.

Unemployment Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House have made extravagant statements on the floor claiming that workers receiving unemployment compensation were loafers and that they were refusing to accept jobs. Other Members have correctly stated that unemployed workers who refused to accept suitable employment were immediately deprived of unemployment-compensation benefits.

To date we are experiencing a shortage of well-paid jobs suitable for skilled workers. That is the reason for the seeming paradox that jobs are going begging while comparatively large numbers of workers draw unemployment-compensation benefits. I hope the Members will study carefully the summary of a recent study of this question, which I am inserting in the record, as follows:

Why are there large numbers of workers seeking employment when there are also large numbers of job openings?

Seeking an answer to this important reconversion question, the United States Employment Service, of the Department of Labor and the Social Security Board, Federal Security Agency, sent teams of investigators from Washington to three typical American cities. Chosen for the study were Atlanta, Ga., Columbus, Ohio, and Trenton, N. J. In each, officials had noted, unemployment compensation claims and listed job openings had remained at consistently high levels after the crest of post-VJ-day lay-offs had passed.

Today, the two agencies announced the results of what had become essentially a study of war workers in a peacetime economy. The study confirmed what was already suspected: (1) that the labor market had been inflated during the war by the inclusion of many workers who had learned only a single skill; (2) that there were few, if any, peacetime jobs calling for these limited skills; (3) that there has been a sharp reduction in the number of jobs available in the skilled categories; (4) that lower-skilled jobs pay smaller wages and workers' incomes have been further reduced by the return to the 40-hour week; if all the claimants in the three cities matched job openings and could be reemployed on the jobs available, they would receive a cut in take-home pay averaging from 34 to 49 percent for men and from 49 to 53 percent for women; (5) most of the available jobs were for men only, most of the job seekers were women.

Women represented 6 percent of the total claimants in Atlanta, 69 percent in Trenton, and 77 percent in Columbus. Of the job openings, from 6 to 81 percent specified "men only." While 40 percent of the women claimants had been housewives or had had no work experience before the war. But more of the women claimants who had been employed in a skilled or semiskilled job before the war than there were openings for them in the present market.

Although the studies were limited to unemployment-compensation claimants and job openings listed in local USES offices, the conclusions were found to be representative of the labor-market conditions in each of the communities, since the survey also revealed that the types of jobs offered through the USES represented typical cross-sections of current employment opportunities.

Large numbers of workers are accepting jobs notwithstanding the wage and sex limitations. This was reflected in the high rate of turn-over of unemployment-compensation claimants during the 8-week period following VJ-day. In each of the three cities, slightly over 40 percent in Atlanta stopped reporting because of ineligibility or disqualification. Of the eligible claimants, 77 percent in Atlanta and 53 percent in Columbus discontinued their claims before drawing any benefits.

The disparity between skills and job openings was clearly demonstrated. For women, clerical, sales, and service jobs constituted from 40 to 61 percent of all jobs open to them, yet only 15 to 18 percent of the women claimants had last worked in these fields. Jobs requiring high skills were all but closed to women claimants in Atlanta, although almost a fourth of them had last worked on a skilled job.

Men were similarly situated. Although more than half of the Atlanta men claimants had worked on a skilled job, only 15 percent of the openings called for skilled workers. Only 2 percent of their number had last been employed on an unskilled job, yet 59 percent of the job openings for men were classified as unskilled. Much the same situation was found to exist in Columbus and Trenton.

Comparisons of present job openings with the prewar jobs of the claimants showed a somewhat different relationship. Forty-nine percent of the Atlanta men had worked in a skilled or semiskilled capacity before the war, but only 30 percent of the present jobs called for those skills. Indeed, 59 percent of the jobs open to men were in unskilled occupations, whereas only 11 percent of the men claimants had worked in these occupations before Pearl Harbor and an additional 3 percent had not worked at all before the war.

More than half the Atlanta men earned more than $50 a week on their latest jobs, but such wages can be earned on only 12 percent of the jobs open to men in Atlanta at the time of the survey. No jobs open to women in Atlanta paid as much as $45 per week, although 70 percent of the women claimants had at least earned this much. Half the jobs listed for women in Atlanta pay $20 to $29 per week, and an additional 41 percent less than $20.

More than 60 percent of the Trenton men earned $60 a week or more on their last jobs, but 95 percent of the available jobs pay less than this amount, and two out of three pay less than $40. A majority of the Trenton women claimants had earned $55 a week or more, but less than 1 percent of the jobs open to them offered such pay.

In Columbus the majority of male claimants had recent earnings of $55 or more, but now only 7 percent of the jobs pay this much. And no jobs open only to women offer as much as $40 a week, although three-fourths of the Columbus women had last earned $40 a week or more.

Although some of the disparities cited above are due to a reduction in the workweek from 48 to 40 hours, such a reduction in hours results in only a 23-percent reduction in weekly earnings. Actually the average hourly wage rates on open jobs were 37 to 48 percent below wage rates last earned by the men and 43 to 52 percent below wage rates last earned by the women.

This is illustrated by the following table:

	Men		Women	
	Last jobs	Jobs open	Last jobs	Jobs open
Atlanta	$1.10	$0.57	$0.95	$0.46
Columbus	1.11	.72	.99	.54
Trenton	1.18	.75	1.05	.60

The types of jobs offered by the USES in the three cities covered a wide range of occupational skills and hourly wage rates. For example, male job openings in Trenton included 2 percent in the professional and managerial occupational, 21 percent in the skilled crafts, and another 21 percent in the semiskilled classification. Most of the remainder called for unskilled workers. Generally similar patterns were found in the other two cities.

Among females the number of professional, managerial, and skilled jobs was representative of the more limited opportunities for women which generally prevail in those fields. Clerical, sales, and service opportunities predominated in all three areas, as might have been expected, although a significant proportion of the jobs called for semiskilled workers.

Compulsory Peacetime Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of a Gallup poll on compulsory military training:

PRESSURE ON CONGRESS NO INDEX—UNITED STATES FAVORS MILITARY TRAINING 7 TO 3, DESPITE LOUD PROTESTS

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

Repeatedly for the past 3 years public-opinion surveys have found a substantial majority of the American people favoring peacetime military training of young men. In the latest test of public sentiment the vote runs approximately 7 to 3 for the adoption of this much-discussed measure now before Congress.

The principle of compulsory peacetime training is one on which there has been a remarkable stability of public sentiment in recent years. The vote in favor has always ranged between 63 percent and 70 percent in eight institute surveys made during the period December 1942 through late October 1945.

The trend, including the latest figures, is shown below. The wording of the question in the most recent test was the same as that used in earlier years, with two exceptions. The phrase "in the future" has been substituted for "after the war," and the question concerns military or naval training for 1 year rather than 1 year in the Army or Navy.

TAKEN BEFORE MESSAGE

The latest poll was completed just before President Truman's message to Congress advocating passage of a peacetime military-training bill.

"In the future, do you think every able-bodied young man should be required to take military and naval training for 1 year?"

	Yes	No	No opinion
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
December 1942	66	27	7
November 1943	63	29	8
September 1944	63	23	14
December 1944	70	25	5
February 1945	69	22	9
May 1945	70	24	6
July 1945	69	24	7
October 1945	70	24	6

A new survey is now in progress to test public reaction following President Truman's message to Congress on military training, in which he proposed that all young men, except those completely incapacitated physically, should start a 1-year training course before reaching their twentieth birthday.

The peacetime training issue is a good illustration of the fact that there are often differences in the intensity of public opinion for and against a proposal.

Congress has been hearing, by mail and by telegram, from groups in the population who are opposed to the bill. The same thing happened in 1940, during debate on the bill for the selective service draft. Congressional mail at that time was overwhelmingly against passage of the act, because more of the people opposed to it took more trouble to bombard Congress by mail and postcard than did the people in favor.

Yet the views of the group with the more outspoken opinions were not a reliable index of the views of the whole country.

Carefully conducted sampling surveys at the time found a national vote of approximately 60 percent in favor of passage of the Selective Service Act.

Plea for Harmony in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress the text of a resolution which was adopted at a public mass meeting in San Francisco, sponsored by the Zionist Emergency Council and the American Christian Palestine Committee, on November 1, 1945. This resolution was issued under the signatures of the following rabbis of San Francisco: Rabbi Morris Goldstein, Rabbi E. Burstein, Rabbi Rudolph Coffee, Rabbi Morris Fischel, Rabbi Mayer Hirsch, Rabbi G. Katzman, Rabbi Bernard Marton, Rabbi Saul E. White.

The resolution is as follows:

On this twenty-eighth anniversary of the issuance of the now historic Balfour Declaration by which Great Britain officially acknowledged the special claim and right of the Jewish people to a national home in Palestine and by which Great Britain pledged her best endeavors to facilitate the immigration of Jews there and their settlement on the land; be it resolved that

Whereas the Chamberlain white paper of 1939, part of a policy of appeasement, nullified the intent and purpose of the historic declaration notwithstanding the tremendous achievement wrought by the Jewish settlement in Palestine and its magnificent contribution to the winning of the war; and

Whereas the civil and religious rights of the non-Jewish communities of Palestine are explicitly protected in the stipulation of the Balfour Declaration; and

Whereas the mandate of Palestine was awarded to Great Britain by the nations of the world solely on the terms of the Balfour declaration; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America, which shared in the agreement with Great Britain on the establishment of the Jewish national home, has urged admission into Palestine of 100,000 Jews; and

Whereas the conscience of humanity must heed the plight of the Jewish people, which during the war now ended has suffered torture and death in proportions greater than any other people and whose European remnants now desperately seek a homeland and find the gates of the world shut before them.

Therefore, we the undersigned, rabbis of the city of San Francisco call upon the Government of Great Britain to fulfill the spirit and the word of the solemn pledge made in the Balfour declaration so that the maximum number of Jews, survivors of the concentration camps, be permitted to enter Palestine and settle and cultivate its soil without restriction or hindrance—to the end that in time they may reconstitute themselves as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth.

We further urge our Government that in conformity with its traditional policy of friendship toward a Jewish Palestine and in the spirit of the appeal so nobly voiced by President Truman in a communication to Prime Minister Attlee, it continue to exercise concern and earnest efforts to bring about a true fulfillment of the promises and commitments made in the Balfour declaration. We extend our wholehearted greetings and promise of continued support to our brethren in Palestine who by their patience, valor and industry have created favorable conditions to successful absorption of a large Jewish immigration. We voice an earnest plea to all the people of Palestine for understanding harmony and good will—to the end that in the not distant future the world witness the realization of the words of its prophet of old, "Out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem."

Annual Fertilizer Consumption in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, to listen to some of the political agriculturalists of the New Deal one might imagine that farmers did not know anything about plant fertility until they appeared in the picture.

The following table shows the annual consumption from 1880 to 1944:

Annual fertilizer consumption in the United States

[Short tons]

Year	Tonnage
1880	1,150,000
1890	1,950,000
1900	2,200,000
1910	5,453,000
1911	6,024,000
1912	5,767,000
1913	6,337,000
1914	7,100,000
1915	5,324,000
1916	5,125,000
1917	5,926,000
1918	6,467,000
1919	6,626,000
1920	7,177,000
1921	4,863,000
1922	5,671,000
1923	6,445,000
1924	6,826,000
1925	7,334,000
1926	7,329,000
1927	6,844,000
1928	7,986,000
1929	8,012,000
1930	8,222,000
1931	6,354,000
1932	4,385,000
1933	4,908,000
1934	5,583,000
1935	6,274,000
1936	6,902,000
1937	8,179,000
1938	7,467,000
1939	7,532,000
1940	7,778,000
1941	8,332,000
1942	8,722,000
1943	10,564,000
1944	11,219,000

Year	Tonnage		
	Commercial sales	Government distribution	Total tonnage
1934	5,583,000		
1935	6,274,000	2,000	6,276,000
1936	6,902,000	29,000	6,931,000
1937	8,179,000	47,000	8,226,000
1938	7,467,000	81,000	7,548,000
1939	7,532,000	175,000	7,707,000
1940	7,778,000	471,000	8,249,000
1941	8,332,000	851,000	9,183,000
1942	8,722,000	1,227,000	9,949,000
1943	10,564,000	899,000	11,463,000
1944	11,219,000	853,000	12,072,000

The 1945 tag sales up to November 1, 1945, show an increase of 12 percent over 1944 consumption or an evident total consumption of about 13,500,000 tons in 1945. These figures do not include lime or raw phosphate rock.

There is a rather limited use of fertilizers in many States some of which use only 400 to 500 tons. War prices for crops have increased the use and demand. Part of this increased use was the result of the ability of the producers to obtain the fertilizer free or at a reduced price.

Questions that arise are, first, How many of these producers will continue to use commercial fertilizer in the future? Second, What increase in consumption can be expected? Third, What influence will the increased production as a result of their use have on farm prices especially if the American producer does not have the American market for his product? Fourth, Should the producers use additional millions of tons of fertilizer especially potash and phosphate in order to even maintain the soil fertility of the United States? Fifth, Should the American producer be asked to maintain his soil and buy the fertilizer to maintain it and then be compelled to compete with agricultural products shipped in from countries that mine their land of its fertility? Sixth, Do you believe in the nationalization of the fertilizer business?

We must answer these questions correctly or we are apt to find ourselves in a rather embarrassing position legislatively. We cannot expect to continue appropriating public funds in an effort to maintain our soil fertility if the American producer is not allowed to have the rewards of his effort.

Maternal and Child Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 15 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Six Words and a Date," written by Clara Savage Littledale, editor of Parents' Magazine. The editorial is in support of the Maternal and Child Welfare Act of 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIX WORDS AND A DATE

(By Clara Savage Littledale)

"Do we as a nation intend to provide every mother, regardless of where she lives or what the family income is, with an opportunity to get modern, scientific maternity care? Or shall we remain content with present conditions under which some mothers and babies get the best care available anywhere in the world while others get little or no skilled medical attention?"

It's Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, speaking as he introduces a bill in Congress—the same bill that Mrs. MARY NORTON introduced in the House. The bill has a name which is Maternal and Child Welfare Act of 1945. Odd how prosaic and even dull that collection of six words and a date sounds. Actually, back of those words lie more child-bed tragedy, more heart-rending need and more regard for human life than has ever before wrapped itself up in a bill before Congress—a bill that looks as though it might pass.

And that's just the point. This bill has a chance, if you and I and our neighbors know enough about it, and care enough about it to help. And if we don't—well, put it this way:

Each year some 200,000 mothers in this country go through childbirth without the care of a physician. Think back to the hours when you were bringing a child into the world. The doctor was there, nurses were there, an anesthetist stood ready. You were suffering and in pain, perhaps in terror, but you knew everything was being done that could be done to safeguard you and your baby. Then think of the 200,000 other women who knew no such care. They struggled through without a doctor—or perhaps they died.

And again thousands of babies die at birth or soon after birth in this country. Thousands of these babies would not die if their mothers had the right care before and after childbirth. It is common knowledge that a large proportion of these baby deaths, as well as mother deaths, are preventable. Then what on earth is the matter? Why isn't something done?

That's not as simple a question as it may appear. For instance, the lives of 31,000 babies could have been saved in 1 year, if every State had given its babies as good care as did the State of Connecticut. The lives of 3,000 mothers could have been saved that same year, if every State had given its mothers as good car as did the State of Minnesota. It sounds as though one were talking in riddles, doesn't it? Just what has geography to do with the life and death of thousands of women and babies? It has a lot to do with it. The richer States—those whose per capita wealth is relatively high—can collect ample money via taxes to provide prenatal clinics and well-baby clinics and all sorts of desirable health care. Per capita wealth also makes a State a good place for doctors and nurses to locate and assures well-equipped, well-supported hospitals. It is the poorer States and rural districts that run up our horrifying maternal and baby death figures.

Is there any justice or democracy in a situation that safeguards the life of a baby if he happens to be lucky enough to be born in Connecticut or some one of the other well-to-do States, but stacks the cards against him and his mother if he lives in one of the poorer States? Do we, as Americans, believe in that kind of thing?

No; we don't, and we never did. It is just that we haven't been aware—haven't seen clearly enough—what was happening, and

why—and, interestingly enough, what brought us to a realization of the situation was the conviction that servicemen's wives and babies should have the best possible care at a cost they could afford. Patriotism, gratitude, warm-hearted humanity resulted in wartime legislation which made this possible.

Now it's peacetime. And the question before the House and the Senate and the country is whether we care enough about babies and their mothers—all babies and all mothers, no matter where they live, no matter how much money they have, no matter what their color, race, or religion—to see that not one of them shall die needlessly. Do we care enough? If we do, we will get behind this bill now up for consideration and push with all our might. This bill means that money will be appropriated for a 10-year program of necessary infant and maternal care. The United States Children's Bureau will be the administrative agency that will work with the States to see that the best in health care is provided for mothers and babies and young children, in every State, without fear or favor or duplication.

Those leaders in this country who know how shameful are our maternal and infant death rates and who know, from wartime experience, what can and should be done about them, are behind this bill 100 percent. Where do you stand? What will you do? You can discuss this legislation, you can work for it as an individual or in your woman's club, child-study group, or your parent-teacher association. You can write or telegraph the Senators from your State in favor of bill S. 1318, and your Representatives in the House in favor of H. R. 3922. (They are the same bills.) Address Senators care of the Senate Office Building, and Representatives in care of the House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C. Do something and do it now.

National Representation for the District of Columbia—Let the State Legislatures Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, November 15 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able article by Jesse C. Suter entitled "Let State Legislatures Act on National Representation," which was printed in the Washington Sunday Star on November 11.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET STATE LEGISLATURES ACT ON NATIONAL REPRESENTATION

(By Jesse C. Suter)

The plea today of the voteless and unrepresented Americans of the National Capital community is for the Congress to send to the States for their consideration and action the question of national representation for the District of Columbia. To do this it would be necessary for the Senate and the House of Representatives, each by a two-thirds vote, to pass the Sumners-Capper proposed constitutional amendment or its equivalent.

Under such amendment the Congress would be empowered to provide that in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President there be members elected by the people of the District of Columbia. These are fundamental American rights for which these people have been petitioning the Congress for more than half a century and on which numerous hearings have been held by committees of Congress.

The petitions have been made through the channel of the organized groups of citizens representing, with practical unanimity, all of the public-spirited activities of this great American community. These petitions speak with the official authorization and direction of the respective groups. Civic, trade, professional, labor, veterans, and other groups of men and women join their prayers for the grant of that natural right of American citizens to participate in the Government of their country.

These local organizations are supported in their earnest plea by a number of the great national, regional, and State organizations which desire to see the permanent residents of the National Capital attain the status of participating Americans and to blot out forever the anomalous and un-American condition which has prevailed at the heart of the Nation for 145 years.

Can any sound reason be given for the Congress not putting the proposed amendment in the form which it considers proper for inclusion in the Constitution of the United States and sending it on to the States for consideration and action by the State legislatures?

The intelligent, loyal, patriotic people of the District of Columbia would appreciate a frank statement of such reasons, if any exist. If there are such valid reasons, they have yet to learn of them.

Proponents of the proposal, which means more to this community than any other, feel that if there ever was a one-sided question before Congress it is that of national representation for the people of the District. They are unable to see how anything can be said to sustain any opposition. To oppose it is to repudiate the fundamental principles of American representative government. Reduced to its lowest terms the proposal is designed to provide the required power, under the Constitution, to make American citizens of the more than half a million political aliens af the National Capital community.

Surely any true American who will be perfectly fair with himself, as well as with the underlying principles of our National Government, down deep in his innermost soul must discover that he favors the Americanization of the Washingtonian. To proponents, it is inconceivable that anyone of intelligence and a practical mind should close his eyes to the self-evident fact that these voteless and unrepresented people can only be assured freedom and a square deal through the application at the seat of Government of the same rule which guarantees to the people of the States their rights as freemen.

It would seem to be entirely unnecessary to continue to reiterate to an American Congress the many reasons which support this claim of their fellow Americans of the Capital for the grant of this act of simple justice.

Twice the National Democratic Party platform has recorded its approval of the principle of this proposal. When the matter was on the House Calendar in 1940, Republican leaders in that body were ready to join their Democratic colleagues to pass the resolution if it could be brought to the floor for consideration.

The Charter of the United Nations having been ratified by the Senate and now approved by the requisite number of nations, the United Nations Organization is now a going concern and the Charter is recognized as the law of nations. But some may ask, what has the Charter of the United Nations to do with national representation for the people of the District of Columbia?

While that question has been answered before in this column, some have missed the very important point involved. A fundamental characteristic of the Charter is its solicitude for all peoples of all lands and its very definite aim to insure them the right to participate in the government of their country. A number of quotations might be given by way of illustration, but one or two should suffice.

From the preamble of the Charter we learn one of the purposes to be: "To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small."

And in article 73 of chapter XI we read:

"Members of the United Nations which have or assumed responsibilities for the administration of territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government, recognize the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount, and accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost, within the system of international peace and security established by the present Charter, the well-being of the inhabitants of these territories; and * * *

"(B) To develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, according to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and their varying stages of advancement."

The proponents of national representation for the people of the District continue hopeful that before the close of the present session of the Seventy-ninth Congress the joint resolution proposing the Sumners-Capper amendment to the Constitution will be favorably reported to both the Senate and the House of Representatives, be passed by each House by the required two-thirds vote and be sent forward to the several States for ratification.

They can see no reason for further delay nor for any failure to pass and send this question on to the States. Any other action or inaction would be clearly repudiation of the Democratic Party national platform, of the United Nations Charter, of the underlying principles of the Constitution, and the Declaration of Independence.

Such wholesale repudiation of fundamental American justice would be sufficient reason for the nations of the world to challenge the sincerity of our belief in these principles advocated by our Nation.

Death Rate Among Military Flying Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, November 15 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a memorandum from the Air Corps of the Army relating to the death rate among military flying personnel in continental United States during 1944, which I think will be of intense interest in view of the appropriation bill which will shortly be before the Senate for consideration.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTS ABOUT MILITARY FLYING

1. In continental United States during 1944 the death rate among flying personnel from aircraft accidents was approximately 30 times that of nonflying personnel from all causes.

2. At the age of 20, life expectancy of the flying officer is 12 years less than that of the nonflying officer.

3. Pilots at the age of 20 may not expect to live any longer than other officers at the age of 32.

4. One out of every four pilots will die before his thirty-ninth birthday.

5. The necessity for minimizing losses in combat while maintaining military effectiveness accents design for aircraft performance at the expense of aircraft safety factors. Developments in aircraft design results in increased performance in military aircraft while it results in both increased safety and performance in commercial aircraft.

6. To be fully effective military aviation must have the most vigorous leadership. Reduced compensation in the face of the constantly high military flying fatality rate may fail to provide the requisite air leaders for war.

NOVEMBER 12, 1945.

Subject: Justification of flying pay.

1. The necessity for recognizing the hazards of military flying has been accepted by all nations since the initial development of military aviation.

2. Congress first authorized flying pay in 1913 because of the hazardous nature of flying. The National Defense Act of 1920, and the Pay Readjustment Act of 1922 provided 50 percent extra flying pay for those who participated in regular and frequent flights.

3. In 1939 a special board consisting predominantly of nonflying officers appointed by the War Department to study the flying pay problem made a careful investigation into all aspects of military flying hazard and justification of flying pay. I quote from their report (p. 14): "Adverse criticism has been heard of the principle of paying military personnel for flying duty. In view of this criticism the board has reinvestigated the subject carefully and in detail. This investigation has shown that this criticism was unjustified. It has been demonstrated conclusively that any flying involves a hazard above that incurred in routine military duties which do not involve flying, and the board is further convinced that continual flying jeopardizes the mental and physical well-being of the average man. Further, the board believes that the experiences of the past 20 years indicate that the average useful service life of the flying officer will be markedly shorter than the service life of the officer on nonflying duties, due to the necessity for youthful physical and mental alertness and stamina demanded by the operations of modern airplanes in military flying. The increased hazards and expectancy of a shorter service life fully justify extra compensation to the men who subject themselves to the risks incident to flying."

4. The facts presently on hand indicate that the hazards of military flying are as prevalent today as they were in 1939. The following figures and fatality rates were computed from records available in the Office of the Air Surgeon.

TABLE I.—*Death rates per 1,000 per annum, 1944, continental United States*

FLYING VERSUS NONFLYING PERSONNEL

	Number	Aircraft accidents		Other than Air Corps accidents		Total	
		Number	Rate	Number	Rate	Number	Rate
Flying personnel	235,242	4,207	17.9	220	0.9	4,427	18.8
Nonflying personnel	1,134,265	227	.2	516	.4	743	.6
Total	1,369,507	4,434	3.2	736	.6	5,170	3.8

The greatest number of deaths in the Army Air Forces is among flying personnel and the greatest single cause is aircraft accident. The death rate among flying personnel in aircraft accidents (17.9) is approximately 30 times the death rate among nonflying personnel due to all causes.

TABLE II.—*Fatality rates—flying personnel*

RATE PER 1,000 PER ANNUM

Year:	*Rate*
1932	17
1934	16
1936	20
1938	14
1944	18

Notice the rate of fatalities per 1,000 flying personnel per annum in 1944 is greater than in 1938, 1934, or 1932. At the same time the fatalities per hours flown in 1938 were 1 per 15,553 hours of flight as compared to the rate in 1944 which was 1 per 8,000 plus hours of flight.

5. The following comparisons of life expectancy between flying and nonflying officers were made from a study by the Office of the Air Surgeon.

Average expectation of life of men at age 20

	Years
Regular Army officers, nonflying	49.3
General United States population, white males	46.0
Rated observers (Regular Army officers)	43.4
Pilots (Regular Army officers)	37.2

Pilots may expect 12 years less of life than nonflying Regular Army officers. Rated observers may expect 6 years less of life than nonflying Regular Army officers.

Pilots at the age of 20 may not expect to live any longer than other officers at the age of 32.

One out of every four pilots will die before his thirty-ninth birthday.

6. Insurance companies are exhibiting new interest in writing aviation insurance. However, only one company (Travelers) have announced their rates ($12 per year per $1,000 in addition to normal rate—same as before war). Some companies are writing some at lower rates, but until the military aviation risk tables are backed up by facts they are doing so only on a tentative basis and are not publishing their rates. It is the opinion of our life-insurance contact (Colonel Grayson, of Personal Affairs Branch) that most companies will go back to old rates for military aviators as soon as risk tables, based on the facts, are worked out. There is an indication that lower rates might be available, for bombardiers, navigators, and flight surgeons.

7. It can be seen that in spite of great advances in military aircraft design and vigorous safety measures within the Air Force during the past 10 years the accident rate has not decreased. This is not comparable with the records of commercial air lines for many reasons. In the first place, performance is inimical to safety factors in aircraft design. The exigencies of aerial combat has forced the Air Forces to utilize the advancement in aircraft construction to increase combat performance rather than to use this advancement to increase aircraft safety factors. The necessity for minimizing losses in combat while maintaining military effectiveness establishes the balance between design performance and design safety factors. Military flying as a type in itself is more hazardous than normal flying. The introductions of new aircraft operated under hazardous weather and terrain conditions tend to maintain the hazard of military flying compared to the routine, constantly repetitious route flying of commercial air lines.

8. Flying pay as compensation for extra hazard inherent to military flying is as necessary today as it has been in the past. Until further developments alter the conditions in the interest of a strong Air Force there should be no change in the basic principle of flying pay.

With reference to the amendment which provides that no flying officer shall receive flight pay in excess of that paid to a major in the Army or a lieutenant commander in the Navy receiving the minimum pay of the fourth pay period: provided that no flight pay shall be paid to any officer unless the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, shall certify that the duties of the officer affected are essentially related to the air service on a flying status, I would like to bring the following information to your attention.

In 1939 a special board consisting predominately of nonflying officers appointed by the War Department to study the flying pay problem made a careful investigation into all aspects of military flying hazard and justification of flying pay. I quote from their report (p. 14). "Adverse criticism has been heard of the principle of paying military personnel for flying duty. In view of this criticism the board has reinvestigated the subject carefully and in detail. This investigation has shown that this criticism is unjustified. It has been demonstrated conclusively that flying involves a hazard above that incurred in routine military duties which do not involve flying, and the board is further convinced that continual flying jeopardizes the mental and physical well-being of the average man. Further, the board believes that the experiences of the past 20 years indicates that the average useful service life of the flying officer will be markedly shorter than the service life of the officer on nonflying duties, due to the necessity for youthful, physical, and mental alertness and stamina demanded by the operations of modern airplanes in military flying. The increased hazards and expectancy of a shorter service life fully justify extra compensation to the men who subject themselves to the risks incident to flying." The facts presently on hand indicate that the hazards of military flying are as prevalent today as they were in 1938.

The implementation of the proposed amendment with reference to flying pay will be prejudicial to the best interests of the Army Air Forces. The dual hazards of military flying, an accident hazard encountered by the individual during every minute of every flight and a career hazard which must be faced day by day throughout every year of the individual's active service life, are recognized. Any compensation for flying must provide for both of these hazards. The proposed limitation will not provide adequately for the career hazard, nor will it provide sufficient compensation for senior flying officers who are preparing themselves for positions of great responsibility in times of emergency.

When a man at the age of 20 chooses military aviation as a career, he must face the following facts: one out of four military pilots will be dead before he reaches his 39 birthday. The average life expectancy of a military pilot is 12 years less than that of those not required to participate in regular and frequent aerial flights. If there is an

inadequate compensation for the career hazards involved, few young men will decide upon military aviation as a career. It would be obviously impossible for them to provide adequately for their families in view of their shorter life expectancy.

Many of the senior positions in the AAF structure are occupied today by officers who have completed highly successful combat flying assignments. It is on their intelligence and combat experience that the foundation of leadership in the postwar Air Force will rest for the next 40 years. Few of these men will elect to remain in the service if the compensation for the hazards of their profession are reduced and their ability to provide for their families is lessened in any way. They will seek naturally a type of employment which will compensate them more adequately for their services and for the occupational hazards involved.

I particularly deplore the present approach to the question of additional pay for flying. It is my hope that the present amendment to the first supplemental surplus appropriation rescission bill, 1946, will be removed. If the Congress desires that the question of flying pay be considered at this time, I hope that it can be presented in a separate bill. In this manner it would be possible for the War Department and the Army Air Forces to present the factual records in justification of the payment of additional pay for flying as accomplished under the present system.

What Will Congress Do About It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, an interesting circular has come to my attention regarding OPA and order 3 under 159e MPR 188. Here is another illustration as to what is transpiring in OPA and shows the utter ridiculousness of pricing policies established by that agency. The time has come for a show-down. Reconversion is a long way off if we permit OPA to control our economy. I am submitting herewith the information contained in that circular:

WHAT WILL CONGRESS DO ABOUT IT?

OPA has issued order 3 under 159e MPR 188 (Federal Register, Oct. 12, 1945), which permits manufacturers of hand lawn mowers to increase their prices 17 percent above those charged in the fall of 1941.

OPA says retailers and wholesalers must absorb this increase out of their customary margins on lawn mowers. Retailers absorb two-thirds of the increase, wholesalers, one-third. Retailers, says OPA, must sell lawn mowers, regardless of this increase of 17 percent, at the same prices they asked in 1942.

The order allows retailers who buy from wholesalers—and most of them do—a margin of 27 percent on hand lawn mowers. This 27 percent does not include the freight the dealer must pay as part of his cost, though this is an important item.

A number of hardware retailers were asked by the National Retail Hardware Association, 333 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind., to supply the following information:

(a) The delivered cost and the retail selling price of each hand lawn mower sold by the dealer in 1942.

(b) The number of each kind of lawn mower sold.

The results of that survey are tabulated below, listing the State in which the reporting dealer is located, instead of the dealer's name:

State in which dealer is located	Total cost of mowers sold during 1942	Total selling price of mowers sold during 1942	Margin
			Percent
Arkansas	$304.38	$532.10	42.80
California	542.20	781.25	30.60
Do	628.80	993.80	36.73
Georgia	462.10	749.50	38.35
Idaho	309.85	468.35	33.84
Illinois	445.10	689.50	35.45
Do	1,126.25	1,743.75	35.41
Minnesota	674.11	1,088.50	38.07
Do	961.45	1,402.20	31.43
Michigan	373.74	564.50	33.79
Montana	164.14	266.30	38.36
New Mexico	853.66	1,119.00	23.77
New York	479.80	899.10	46.64
Ohio	644.34	1,058.65	39.14
Oklahoma	1,269.10	2,369.95	46.45
South Dakota	76.50	117.50	34.89
Tennessee	1,576.28	2,611.00	39.63
Wisconsin	1,791.33	3,026.70	40.82
Total	12,682.53	20,481.65	38.08

Hardware retailers cannot afford to sell lawn mowers on a 27-percent margin, even if freight were included.

Mail-order and chain-store operators are permitted a margin of 33⅓ percent.

It is useless to appeal to OPA. The hope of retailers for relief from this situation must lie in Congress.

The National Retail Hardware Association strongly endorses the report recently issued by the Select Committee To Investigate Executive Agencies. It directs your special attention to the following recommendation which is a part of that report:

"(4) That prices at retail be adjusted so as to reflect any dollar increase allowed manufacturers, except where the mark-up on the particular item is already sufficient to reflect a normal profit."

The question retailers all over the Nation are asking is:

What will Congress do about it?

The Members of Congress have shown proper interest in wanting to be sure that OPA employees who establish consumer prices and dealer margins under OPA regulations are experienced men, fully qualified to do this important work.

The National Retail Hardware Association believes that Members of Congress will be interested in the following extracts of testimony of OPA employees before the Select Committee To Investigate Acts of Executive Agencies Which Exceed Their Authority:

TESTIMONY OF LOUIS A. WILLIAMS, HEAD, HOUSEWARE AND HARDWARE SECTION, DURABLE GOODS BRANCH, OPA

(Mr. Williams was duly sworn by the chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. State your name.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Louis A. Williams.

The CHAIRMAN. And what position do you hold with the OPA?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am head of the Houseware and Hardware Section of the Consumer Durable Goods Price Branch.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been with OPA?

Mr. WILLIAMS. A little over 3 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Where was your home before you came here?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Before I came to Washington, sir?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Puerto Rico.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you come from Puerto Rico to take this job that you mentioned?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was transferred up to Washington. Prior to that time I lived in Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. You were transferred here by whom, what agency?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Office of Price Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. I ask you where you lived before you went with the Office of Price Administration.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh—in Michigan, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Your home is in Michigan?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And what is your previous business experience in the manufacturing line?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have never actually manufactured merchandise.

The CHAIRMAN. What has been your experience in business?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was a sales manager.

The CHAIRMAN. For what?

Mr. WILLIAMS. McKesson & Robbins, Inc.

The CHAIRMAN. What do they do?

Mr. WILLIAMS. They were wholesale distributors of soda-fountain equipment, store fixtures, drugs, chemicals, pharmaceuticals, electric appliances, and other items amounting to about 150,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you the company sales manager or a salesman?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was the sales manager, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. For the whole company?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, for the Farrand Williams division. McKesson & Robbins are a corporation controlling approximately 68 wholesale institutions in the country dealing in heavy chemicals and other allied products, store fixtures, soda fountain equipment, and so forth, and they distribute approximately 65 percent of the drugs and soda fountain equipment that is sold in the United States.

(EDITORIAL NOTE.—The Farrand Williams division of McKesson-Robbins is a wholesale drug firm located in Detroit, Mich. Based on the salary he received, Mr. Williams was probably a territorial sales manager, not sales manager for the entire division.)

Mr. FISBACH. What is your salary at the OPA?

Mr. WILLIAMS. How does that concern what we are discussing before the committee? Judge Smith, do you wish me to answer that, sir?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; answer the question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think it is $6,230, but I don't know. It has gone up and down lately with the 48-hour week, the 44-hour week, and the 40-hour week.

Mr. FISBACH. According to your personnel file, in 1936 your salary was $1,500.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It might have been.

Mr. FISBACH. In 1937, according to your file, it was $2,080.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It could have been.

Mr. FISBACH. And in 1939, $2,450.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That might have been.

Mr. FISBACH. My associate here gives me an average of $1,625 over that period of time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not familiar with that, so I couldn't tell you.

EXTRACTS FROM TESTIMONY OF ERNEST W. HEILMANN, PRICE EXECUTIVE OF THE HOUSEWARE AND ACCESSORY PRICE BRANCH, OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. FISBACH. You are a businessman, aren't you.

Mr. HEILMANN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I beg your pardon—are you?

Mr. HEILMANN. Yes, sir.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. FISBACH. You have had some 20 years' business experience, haven't you?

Mr. HEILMANN. That is right, sir.

Mr. FISBACH. Most of which has been with Spalding?

Mr. HEILMANN. It has been entirely with Spalding.

The CHAIRMAN. Doing what?

Mr. HEILMANN. In various capacities, from bookkeeping work up to sales manager of a local branch.

The CHAIRMAN. Selling what?

Mr. HEILMANN. Sporting goods.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you had any manufacturing experience?

Mr. HEILMANN. They also manufacture.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have any experience along that line?

Mr. HEILMANN. Not in the actual manufacture, although I spent some time in the factories.

Arctic Cradle of the Atom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, with the Prime Minister of Canada in our city as a distinguished visitor, it is well that we consider the contribution which our northern neighbor has made to victory over the fascist foe. We of Alaska are well aware of the importance of the Canadian Arctic, both in war and peace. Uppermost in mind now is the fact that one of the world's great sources of pitchblende is on Great Bear Lake in Canada's Northwest Territories. Pitchblende is the raw material of atomic energy.

I ask that I be permitted to include in the RECORD excerpts from an article by Richard L. Neuberger, in the November 24 issue of Liberty magazine, called "Arctic Cradle of the Atom." This article from Liberty describes the great pitchblende deposits on Great Bear Lake. Captain Neuberger served 2 years with the Army engineers in Alaska and the Canadian Arctic.

I am particularly interested in this subject because one of the discoverers of the fabulously valuable uranium deposits in the Northwest Territories was a Canadian named Charles Camsell. In 1900 he undertook to guide an exploration which first came across the Great Bear Lake pitchblende veins. He then rose in the Canadian Government service to become commissioner of Northwest Territories. In the autumn of 1942 I had the privilege of participating with Charles Camsell in the dedication of the Alaska Military Highway at Kluane Lake, near Soldier's Summit in the Yukon Territory. I found him a distinguished and outstanding scientist.

The article from the November 24 issue of Liberty magazine follows:

ARCTIC CRADLE OF THE ATOM

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

URANIUM IS APT TO BECOME THE WORLD'S MOST PRECIOUS METAL. THE RUSTY NOTES SET DOWN 45 YEARS AGO BY A CANADIAN GEOLOGIST LED TO THE WORLD'S RICHEST SOURCE, WHENCE CAME THE ATOM BOMB

With numb fingers a hungry and half-frozen Canadian geologist, engaged in a pioneer exploration of a vast lake on the Arctic Circle, scribbled a few words as he looked up at cliffs tinted with strange pinkish seams. Then he and his guide hurried south to beat the winter that was closing down on the Barren Lands. In his wildest fantasies, the geologist could never know that the single sentence he had written would help make possible, nearly half a century later, a pair of frightful explosions which would end the most devastating war in history.

Uranium atoms, disintegrating with force beyond human understanding, blew apart over two Japanese cities, and the Imperial Government at Tokyo surrendered. Uranium was the tragic ingredient in this incredible conclusion to the second World War. Of the 92 different kinds of atoms, the uranium atom is the heaviest and has properties that no other element has. A uranium atom with 143 neutrons is known to science as U-235. Working in secrecy and haste, scientists discovered that U-235 could be split.

Thus was the atomic bomb born. It is the product of uranium atoms as they disintegrate and explode.

But where is the source of the mysterious and fabulous element which ended World War II and heralded, for better or for worse, a new era in the development of science?

Uranium comes from the bleak spot in the Canadian Arctic where, in the autumn of 1900, Dr. James Mackintosh Bell of the Canadian Geological Survey scrawled this obscure sentence in his notebook:

"In the greenstones east of McTavish Arm, the steep rock shores, which here present themselves to the lake, are often stained with cobalt-bloom and copper-green."

The sentence written, Dr. Bell and his young guide, Charley Camsell, slogged southward from Great Bear Lake. Fourteen hundred wilderness miles separated them from civilization. When finally they reached Edmonton, both were gaunt and exhausted.

For three decades Dr. Bell's sentence about the rocky shores east of McTavish Arm gathered dust in the archives of the Canadian Geological Survey. Dr. Bell died, and the guide, Charley Camsell, finally became Commissioner of the Northwest Territories.

Then, one afternoon in 1930, a prospector named Gilbert La Bine was rummaging through the reports of the Geological Survey. He was looking for likely sources of copper. Suddenly he jumped excitedly to his feet. He had read the sentence describing the rocks "stained with cobalt-bloom." He remembered a lecture he had attended at the University of Manitoba a few years earlier explaining what the pinkish stains of cobalt-bloom on rock might mean. No longer was La Bine looking for copper. Bigger game in the mineral field was now his goal—the biggest game of all—game worth a king's ransom for a single tiny gram.

That night, while his small son looked on in wonder, La Bine told his wife, "I'll get it! I'll get it! I'm on the track this time." He went to see Camsell. Where was McTavish Arm? Camsell turned to a map of Canada and pointed to Great Bear Lake. At the east end of the lake is an inlet almost on the Arctic Circle. "This is Echo Bay," Camsell told La Bine. "Right here is McTavish Arm. At this spot you will find the rocks with the pink stains."

La Bine rose to go. "It is a big, tough country," said the commissioner. "Good luck!"

It was tough indeed. Winter temperatures crowded 80° below. La Bine's partner, Charles St. Paul, fell a victim to snow blindness. But La Bine was on the trail. He and St. Paul waited out the long winter. In May, when the snow was gone, they resumed their quest. La Bine found a silver strike of inestimable riches. It left him singularly unmoved. He searched farther, examining each inch of ground.

And there at last, on a long, treeless point extending into Great Bear Lake, his search ended. He scraped at a black substance like hard dried-up tar. He examined it in the sunlight. He tapped it with his hammer. He turned to St. Paul tensely, for in his gloved hand was one of the rare substances of the earth—pitchblende, source of radium.

Canadian bush pilots flew La Bine south. He took a piece of his prize to an editor in Toronto. The editor put the black-veined mass in a box with an undeveloped photographic plate. When he opened the box, there was a picture of the rock on the plate. The pitchblende had taken its own picture. Only one substance could do that—radium.

It proved to be the greatest pitchblende strike ever found. Only one other substantial deposit was known to exist—in the Katanga district of the Belgian Congo in Africa. There is a supply of pitchblende in Czechoslovakia, where the Curies obtained the radium for their experiments. However, this supply is relatively submarginal and ceased to be used when the Congo deposit was discovered.

Between the Canadian and Congo deposits there was no comparison. The Congo pitchblende yielded 20 milligrams of radium to the ton. The pitchblende discovered by La Bine yielded 120 milligrams. When La Bine set out for Great Bear Lake, the price of radium was $80,000 a gram. After he revealed his discovery, the price dropped to $25,000.

La Bine's discovery broke the hold of the Belgium radium monopoly, L'Union Miniére de Haut-Katanga. In 1930, only 300 grams of radium had existed in the entire world. A few years later, with Gilbert La Bine tapping the deposits on Great Bear Lake, 800 grams were available to treat the dreaded cell-berserk disease known as cancer. Dr. Howard A. Kelly, the famous radiologist, of Johns Hopkins University, said La Bine's discovery was of immeasurable benefit to all mankind.

Where the campfire of Dr. James Mackintosh Bell and Charley Camsell once gleamed in the wilderness now stands Port Radium, largest known source of pitchblende on earth.

For almost 10 years La Bine and his associates paid little attention to the fact that one of the byproducts of the Port Radium deposits was a substance called uranium oxide. The byproduct was useful in glass pigments and porcelain manufacture and brought a good return. In fact, in a year when 23 grams of radium sold for approximately $570,000, the resulting byproduct of 211,857 pounds of uranium salts returned a respectable $271,100. La Bine's Arctic find not only sliced two-thirds off the price of radium, but also cut 38 percent off the cost of uranium byproducts.

Yet, despite the reduction which the Port Radium deposits caused in world prices, the income of the La Bine operations steadily soared. In a single year radium and uranium concentrates valued at $2,391,000 came from the deposits on Echo Bay, with uranium contributing nearly a third of the total value. And scientists said the Great Bear Lake pitchblende veins would last for at least a century.

La Bine still paid exclusive attention to the radium. The uranium was a convenient source of auxiliary income, and that was all; but radium was vital to the treatment of cancer.

Then, in 1942, the Canadian Government omitted from its Yearbook the value of the radium and uranium shipments from Port Radium.

"The value of shipments during 1940 and 1941 will not be published separately," the Yearbook significantly noted.

In laboratories in the United States scientists were experimenting with uranium. They studied all the 92 elements thus far isolated by man. But always they returned to uranium, and invariably the uranium that was the object of their studies came

from Gilbert La Bine's pitchblende deposits, 26 miles south of the Arctic Circle.

On January 28, 1944, Gilbert La Bine's Eldorado Mining & Refining Co., Ltd., was expropriated by the Canadian Government. It was not a wartime lease or rental. It was done in perpetuity—forever. La Bine and his staff were retained to operate the Port Radium deposits and the refining plant at Port Hope in Ontario, but the shareholders in the company were paid off at $1.35 a share. The purchase cost the Government of Canada $5,000,000. When indignant and mystified stockholders wrote protesting letters, military security agencies advised them not to ask questions.

Nor was there an explanation until the first atomic bomb exploded over Hiroshima on August 5, 1945, a year and a half after the Port Radium deposits had been made the property of the Dominion Government.

Gilbert La Bine, who is 55, is still somewhat shaken by all that has happened. 't was astounding enough to find himself on top of the planet's principal supply of radium. But to learn that the Eldorado, which he discovered in the northern solitudes, also produces the source of atomic energy has been a colossal and disturbing experience, yet, most vividly of all, he still remembers the moment that he stood on Echo Bay, 15 years ago, and held that first chunk of pitchblende in his hand.

The site of that first pitchblende vein, from which the radium and uranium ore is still extracted is now listed on the official maps as La Bine Point. But Gilbert La Bine is glad there is a Camsell River, and he wishes there were more recognition for Dr. James Mackintosh Bell. He gives full credit to the old geologist. Dr. Bell had not the benefit of all the researchers of the Curies and their successors, and he did not realize what those pinkish streaks might indicate. Yet he felt he was in the presence of important mineral deposits, for he added to his report that conditions at Echo Bay "suggest a locality to lure the prospector."

Great Bear Lake is 12,000 square miles in area, far larger, for example, than the State of Maryland. Storms toss it in summer. Ice 8 feet thick sheathes it in the 10-month-long winter. "There are two seasons up here" joked an American mining engineer working at the La Bine Point pitchblende deposits. "One is the Fourth of July, the other is winter." Indians have long hesitated to venture out on the lake beyond sight of land, so sudden and fierce are the winds which arise. Thomas Simpson, pioneer Hudson's Bay Co. explorer, told his superiors that "a calm day scarcely happens once a month on Great Bear Lake."

Thousands of United States soldiers are now familiar with this formidable region. They went into Canada's Northwest Territories, under Brig. Gen. James A. (Patsy) O'Connor, when the Alcan Highway was constructed. One of their missions was to develop an inland water transportation route along the broad Mackenzie River from Fort Resolution on Great Slave Lake to the Arctic Circle. Over this route was shipped much of the ore from Port Radium. The ore was hauled up the Mackenzie. Using two of the Mackenzie's tributaries, the Slave and Athabaska Rivers, barges and sternwheelers finally brought it to Waterways in the Province of Alberta, 1,400 miles from Port Radium.

But this wilderness waterway could be used only 3 months of the year. The rest of the time it was locked in a barricade of ice. Troops even saw ice form in antifreeze solution and Scotch whisky. Not until July do the huge floes and bergs wash out of Great Bear Lake. With Arctic weather immobilizing the water route, planes were used. The pitchblende was flown out of the wilderness 6 and 7 tons at a time.

Canadian bush pilots, RCAF fliers, and United States Army Air Forces crews participated in the winter flights. Using ski-equipped planes, they landed on fields hacked out of the timber and muskeg by American Army engineer regiments. When open water began to lick at the mantle of ice, pilots changed the landing gear to pontoons. Because Great Bear Lake was so storm-tossed, most of the fliers took to using a small feeder lake a few miles eastward, which a bush pilot named Lake Contact.

The bush pilots flew hundreds of tons of pitchblende south to the railhead at Waterways. One of them was Leigh Brintnell, who in 1930 had flown Gilbert La Bine's first mining equipment into Echo Bay. Another bush pilot made 19 trips in a single month between Waterways and Port Radium. It took 4 weeks to traverse the Mackenzie River route from the end of steel to the world's greatest pitchblende deposit. An airplane flew the shorter course across the tundra in 8 hours.

Sixty tons of chemicals are required to reduce 10 tons of pitchblende to the radium and uranium concentrates, and it was easier to transport the pitchblende to the refinery than to assemble a refinery on Great Bear Lake. Thus aerial augmenting of the summer barge shipments was essential to the atomic-bomb experiments. If it had not been for the airplane, transportation of ore from Port Radium would have been confined to the short period of the midnight sun, from July until mid-September.

The RCAF and the mounted police developed a big airfield at Fort McMurray, near Waterways. This became a major take-off point for Great Bear Lake. At rail's end the ancient equipment of the Northern Alberta Railways hauled the ore into Edmonton, and freights of the Canadian National then carried it to Port Hope for refining. From Port Hope, the uranium, extracted by a long process from the pitchblende, went to United States laboratories.

Pitchblende is still being chopped from the veins and seams on Great Bear Lake to be reduced to radium for the treatment of cancer, and to its byproduct uranium for purposes which only the future can tell.

Dr. Albert Einstein, realizing that uranium was the key to atomic energy, wrote the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt in August 1939 that "uranium may be turned into a new and important source of energy in the immediate future." His letter added that "extremely powerful bombs of a new type may thus be constructed."

President Roosevelt at once grasped the significance of these facts, and the atomic-bomb project was begun.

In 1941, two scientists, Jack DeMent and H. C. Dake, published a book called Uranium and Atomic Power. As the major source of uranium they looked to Port Radium on Great Bear Lake. The deposits of pitchblende in the Canadian Arctic, said these prophetic scientists, were the most extensive on earth, from both the standpoint of quality and that of quantity.

The world of war and crises and atomic bombs seems far from the Arctic pitchblende deposits. Indians trek in with pelts to be traded over the Hudson Bay Co. counter, and a Mountie sergeant arrives on patrol behind a team of huskies. Great Bear Lake is still the north country of Jack London and Robert W. Service. Along its rocky beaches lies the ore that is the source of atomic energy, but only a few bunkhouses, ore bins, and timber docks change it from the wilderness that the pioneer geologist visited when he wrote about the shores "stained with cobalt-bloom."

What About Another Possibility?—Could There Be a Better Plan?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, under date of November 12, I extended my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and indicated therein the very great importance of the study now going on, and partially completed, by joint action of the United States Bureau of Reclamation and the State of Arizona to determine the most feasible route to divert water from the Colorado River into central Arizona. I have examined with great solicitude the preliminary report recently placed in my hands, for it means so much to the future of my State to have some of the waters of the Colorado River diverted into the central part of Arizona to vivify and revivify the splendid lands there which have such marvelous possibilities. I notice in this preliminary report that an invitation is extended to all concerned to make further suggestions if a more feasible idea can be advanced toward the solution of this complex problem and that such suggestions should be made on or before November 15. I now wish to make that further suggestion for the consideration of the engineers and officials before the investigation is complete.

It is apparent, from a study of this preliminary report, that the Bureau of Reclamation engineers, in their investigation of the various routes and plans for this project, were careful not to encroach upon the jurisdiction of any other agency of the Federal Government. They were careful to avoid infringing upon the Grand Canyon National Park and Monument. Likewise, they seemed to take no thought of the Indian Office where Indian irrigation might be combined with Bureau of Reclamation efforts, to mutual advantage and the Nation's great profit. Of course, Reclamation engineers must be guided by the law as it affects their agency and the other various Federal agencies, but it must be remembered that Congress may change the law in the interest of the general good. It seems to me that by the cooperatively working together of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Office of Indian Affairs, and the National Park Service a total good in Arizona can be accomplished far greater than either could accomplish alone and each of the agencies would profit thereby. This I now propose.

During the hearings before the Senate committee at Florence, Ariz., on August 2, 1944, as recorded on page 156 of those hearings, I called the attention of Commissioner Bashore to the fact that there were several points of contact between the Office of Indian Affairs and the Bureau of Reclamation within the State of Arizona where the two agencies

needed to cooperate to the best advantage of the State and Nation. I was thinking of the San Carlos project and the need of its expansion by acquiring more water, possibly by storing the floodwaters of the San Pedro River tributary to the Gila River and possibly by acquiring supplemental waters from the Salt River Basin.

In this latter case, such supplemental waters would have to be supplied from any waters diverted from the main stem of the Colorado River. As a second instance of needed cooperation, I had in mind the Indian reservation along the Colorado River south of Parker and its conflicting interests, which should be harmonized with the Palo Verde reclamation project directly across the river in California, deriving its water supply from the Colorado River near Blythe, Calif. As a third instance of possible and profitable cooperation, I was thinking of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations in northern Arizona, desperately in need of water, and in which the Federal Government might, through the cooperation of the Indian Service and the Bureau of Reclamation, furnish water to Indian lands to keep them from direst poverty and also to the farmers of central Arizona—at the same time with mutual benefit all around. It is this third plan of cooperation which I wish to suggest for study by the Bureau of Reclamation and by the State officials of Arizona, as well as the Indian Service.

WHY NOT BUILD THESE DAMS HIGHER?

Before submitting my suggestion of a combined project to furnish Colorado River water to the western portion of the Navajo Indian Reservation while bringing most of it to central-southern Arizona, I would like to point out some other respects wherein I differ with the finding of the engineers in the preliminary report under consideration. This report calls for the building of a 700-foot dam at or near Bridge Canyon at the head of Lake Mead. It provides for a comparatively low dam near Lees Ferry. Now, it is my information that it would be engineeringly possible to build a much higher dam at Bridge Canyon and also at Lees Ferry than the Bureau of Reclamation contemplates. Since both of these dams are for power production, why should they not be built higher and thus produce more power? I believe that it would be best to produce all the hydroelectric power that it is engineeringly possible to produce by building dams at those two points as high as it is engineeringly possible to build them.

I would be delighted to see, if it is possible, a dam at Bridge Canyon for power production only, and a dam near Lees Ferry for power production only, each as much as a thousand feet in height if the sites will permit the building of such a dam.

The particular site near Lees Ferry that I have in mind is the one recommended by E. C. LaRue in paper No. 1512, and published in the transactions of the American Society of Civil Engineers in 1923. It is true that Mr. LaRue recommended a dam about 780 feet high there, but he stated that the site would permit the building of a much higher dam. The LaRue proposal was unanimously rejected at that time, but that was because of his unique and fantastic proposal of a rock-filled dam created all at one time by blasting the towering cliffs into the river by a single great explosion. Rejecting that method of building, it is not unreasonable to assume that a concrete dam, like that of Boulder, could be built on that same site and at a greater height than LaRue proposed for his earthen dam. At least, so it seems to me, and I would like to have any fallacies of my view shown up by engineers before I am willing to reject the idea.

I know it will be said, "Why build such high dams at Bridge Canyon and at Lee's Ferry to produce a greater quantity of power than can be marketed immediately?" Now, I doubt whether we can produce too much hydroelectric power in Arizona when we consider how it could be used. I shall want to clarify this a little further on. Again, I know that it will be contended that a dam the height that I would build it at Bridge Canyon would back the water up into the Grand Canyon National Monument and a few miles into the park. This might be objectionable to the Park Service. I cannot believe that it ought to be objectionable. The western end of the park and the monument are not now visited by tourists and are seldom seen by white men and are extremely inaccessible. If an artificial lake were backed up a few miles into those park areas, as it would be by my high dam, it would make accessible some of the sublimest scenery on earth, which would certainly be to the advantage of the public and the Park Service.

If the Park Service could reasonably object to the principle of the thing, on the ground that the formation of such a lake would be commercializing a portion of the park area, that could easily be remedied without sacrifice of any principle and without any physical injury, but rather improvement to the park itself, by a change in the legal park boundary line by indicating a certain contour line as boundary rather than the river's edge. This is a matter that I feel sure can be worked out agreeably by cooperation between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Park Service, both of which agencies are in the Department of the Interior. It would, indeed, be very regrettable if lack of cooperation between these two agencies of Government, or any other two agencies of Government, resulted in minimizing the benefits which both have to offer to the taxpaying public, the American people.

I DO NOT LIKE THE B PLAN

I know it is contended that a tunnel 42 miles in length could be bored from Marble Canyon westward to the canyon of Kanab Creek, and thus a large part of the water, used for power production, would bypass the Grand Canyon National Park and thus not infringe upon it. We are told, too, that such a tunnel would enable the total fall of the river to be utilized for power production, including the fall within the Grand Canyon National Park itself. I can understand that fact, but look at the cost of it. Compare costs with results. In the report the provision of this tunnel and its appurtenances are scheduled to cost the astronomical sum of $344,000,000. To my mind that is an entirely unnecessary expense, and I am wondering how long it would take such a tunnel to pay for itself through the sale of power alone. The report virtually throws out of the window the Marble Gorge plan, or A plan, of diversion, chiefly because it calls for an unheard of tunnel 143 miles long. Now this 42-mile Kanab tunnel is no plaything. It seems to me that no part of the cost of the Kanab tunnel could properly be charged to irrigation. Therefore I think that tunnel is entirely unnecessary, regardless of what plan is finally adopted to divert a part of this river into central Arizona.

True, we would like to utilize the total fall of the river in Arizona which this Kanab tunnel would enable us to do, but there are several factors against it. By dispensing with it and building a dam at Bridge Canyon two or three hundred feet higher than the one contemplated by the Bureau in conjunction with the proposed tunnel, we could utilize a part of the head, or fall within the park, without having the tunnel. Another point—if and when we should build that Kanab tunnel we propose to divert practically the whole Colorado River through it, leaving only just a small flow in the channel of the river through the canyon in the national park for scenic purposes. I should think the lovers of the Grand Canyon National Park would far rather have a clear lake at the west end of the park and a full river flowing through it, naturally, than they would prefer a trickle through the park and no inviting lake at the west end to make entrance possible and convenient.

ENGINEERS HESITATE ON SUCH A TUNNEL

Evidently the reason for the rejection of the Bureau of Reclamation's plan of a diversion directly south from Marble Gorge through a 143-mile tunnel to the Verde River is the uncertainty and hazard of such an undertaking. I do not blame engineers for hesitating to recommend a tunnel 143 miles along, especially through such mountain country of volcanic origin. Heaven only knows what such a tunnel would encounter at such great depth underneath the San Francisco mountains. I would much prefer that any necessary tunneling for this central Arizona project be under different terrain and have much less than half such a distance to go, and I believe it can be done with much less tunneling.

WHAT IS WRONG WITH THIS PLAN?

Here is my thought. If the highest possible dam be built near Lees Ferry on the site that LaRue describes, enormous quantities of hydroelectric power can be very cheaply produced. I believe the level of such a lake at that point could be raised to about 4,000 feet above sea level. Now, I would like to see central Arizona's quota of water, plus a quota for the Indian lands, plus a quota for

certain lands in white ownership in the lower valley of the Little Colorado River, all pumped out of the lake there and lifted about a thousand feet up into an aqueduct located about on the 5,000-foot contour line. This aqueduct could run south through the west end of the Navajo Indian Reservation. Such an aqueduct would carry water by gravity to many thousands of acres of Indian land belonging to both the Navajos and the Hopis and would reach and cross the Little Colorado River between Holbrook and Winslow. This canal could also furnish water to the lands in white ownership lower in the valley of the Little Colorado and could terminate at a point about south of Winslow where it would reach the mountain wall and its waters could be tunneled into the Salt River system.

Of course, most of the water carried by this proposed aqueduct would be intended for central Arizona, to be delivered at a point above Granite Reef Diversion Dam for proper distribution. Once this aqueduct reached the mountain walls, approximately south of Winslow, it could be tunneled either into the tributaries of the Verde River or it could be tunneled into the tributaries of the Salt River, such as Tonto Creek, above Roosevelt Dam. In either case, the tunneling there would not exceed 60 miles in length and might be made considerably less than that.

Even considering a 60-mile tunnel into the Salt River Basin from a point south of Winslow, that would be much less an engineering job than the proposed 72-mile tunnel south from the Bridge Canyon Dam, contemplated in the Bureau's second or B diversion plan. I repeat, I do not look with favor upon the second proposal put forth by the Bureau's engineers, because it contains two immense tunnels, the one from Marble Gorge to Kanab Creek Canyon, 42 miles in length, and the other a tunnel from Bridge Canyon Dam to Cunningham, Wash., a distance of about 72 miles. Although this would be in two parts, it involves a total of 114 miles of tunneling—which staggers my imagination almost as much as the proposed 143 miles of tunnel under the San Francisco mountains. Of course, if there is nothing better to accomplish the purpose, I will work for it.

An aqueduct from Lee's Ferry on the 5,000-foot contour line across the Navajo Reservation and across the valley of the Little Colorado to a point south of Winslow would be no greater in length than the open canal proposed from the Cunningham, Wash., to the Granite Reef diversion dam, as contemplated in the third Bureau plan contained in this report. I believe that the aqueduct across the Indian land would cost no more than the one proposed in the third plan, and the pump lift at Lee's Ferry would be about the same as the Parker pump lift, called for in the third plan.

Comparing the third plan in the Bureau's report and my own proposal, it seems to me that my proposal here would involve much less cost. The tunneling I am suggesting would not exceed 60 miles, as contrasted with 114 miles in the second of the Bureau's plans. Let it be held in mind also that even if the third Bureau plan should be followed, those two long tunnels of the second plan, totaling 114 miles in length, would be built eventually, even under the third plan. I have difficulty figuring the repayment of such tremendous costs under either the Bureau's second or third plan. What about repayment under my own plan?

My plan involves close cooperation between the Indian Service and the Bureau of Reclamation and contemplates that at least 50,000 acres of Indian land shall be irrigated and an equal amount of other lands in the valley of the Little Colorado River, all of which could contribute to the total of the entire project perhaps as much as $20,000,000. That contribution, plus the additional fact that such water as comes to central Arizona would come into the Salt River Valley where dams and power plants are already constructed and where facilities are now available to utilize such water for irrigation and power to the greatest possible extent through such existing facilities. All of this would further reduce the total cost and make repayment on this vast central Arizona project possible and assured.

Reflection on Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's Washington Post:

REFLECTION ON CONGRESS

The House Committee on Un-American Activities, reincarnated at the behest of Representative JOHN RANKIN after the political demise of its former chairman, Martin Dies, shows how strong a force heredity can be. The present group, controlled by Mr. RANKIN, although Representative JOHN WOOD is its nominal chairman, is a chip off the old block. Whatever hope may have existed for a reform in its manners and morals has by now been altogether dissipated. Like its forebear, it is up to the old and ugly tricks of imputing guilt by association, blackening reputations by unsubstantial allegations and witch hunting among progressives. It continues to be a sleazy reflection upon the great legislative body in the name of which it is permitted to speak.

The latest item in the catalog of this committee's assaults on traditional American freedom is its action in requesting the scripts of seven radio commentators. What legitimate concern can it have with them? That Mr. RANKIN will disapprove of the views voiced by these men is scarcely to be doubted, since they have from time to time been no less critical of him than has this newspaper. That Mr. RANKIN will consider this difference of opinion incontrovertible proof of their un-Americanism is to be taken for granted from his past leaps in logic. He is entitled, of course, to his own judgment of them. But his attempt to use the power of his congressional position to brand them as subversive is an attempt to intimidate them and their sponsors, an attempt to limit freedom of speech and an attempt, indeed, to subvert basic American institutions, which is itself the worst form of un-Americanism.

Under Mr. RANKIN's guidance the House Committee on Un-American Activities has undermined the prestige of Congress by its fatuity no less than by its bigotry. Like its predecessor, it has provided a forum for crackpots. It has darted from charges against UNRRA to an investigation of Hollywood. It has subpenaed and cross-examined a gentleman from Bridgeport—simply because he happened to be a relative of the Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs. It has elucidated the obvious by hailing into its presence Earl Browder and William Z. Foster. It has made a travesty of the investigative process and has caused Congress to look ludicrous. Congress, for its own sake, ought to put a prompt end to its antics.

Lt. Gen. James H. Doolittle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on November 2, the city of Alameda welcomed back from the war one of its distinguished sons, Lt. Gen. James H. Doolittle.

Jimmy Doolittle was born in Alameda on December 14, 1896. He holds a bachelor of arts degree from the University of California and took postgraduate work at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, receiving the degree of doctor of science in 1925.

His record in and out of the Army is too well known to the American public to touch on here.

The people of Alameda are proud of General Doolittle and wanted to express that pride. The Lions Club of Alameda through its public-relations chairman Albert G. Burns conceived the idea of honoring the general at a luncheon to be sponsored by district 4–B of that organization consisting of some 64 Lions Clubs.

Immediate arrangements for the homecoming were under the jurisdiction of a committee appointed by the Honorable W. J. Branscheid, mayor of Alameda, headed by Mr. Sumner Graham, past president of the Alameda Chamber of Commerce, with Mr. John Rooks as secretary. Mr. Burns and Mr. James K. Barnett, president of the Alameda Lions Club, served on this committee also.

The program of the day consisted of luncheon served at the Hotel Alameda at noon with Supreme Court Justice Homer Spence presiding. In the Doolittle party were Mrs. Jo Doolittle, Lt. Col. Stan. Chester, Maj. Walter Masters, Warrant Officer WAC Mary E. Gill, who is personal secretary to the general. High-ranking officers in this area from the Army, Navy, Marines, Coast Guard, Air Force, and merchant marine were in attendance at this affair.

After the luncheon a parade was held through the streets of Alameda. The largest celebration of its kind in the past 35 years. After the parade the

Doolittle party were given a reception on the steps of the city hall in Oakland. Later in the evening the great dinner party was held at the Scottish Rite Temple in Oakland with about 1,300 present. District Gov. Loren A. Critser, of Lions International, was the presiding officer. Distinguished guests were high-ranking service personnel and past director Thomas S. Neilson, of Lions International. James K. Barnett, president of the Alameda Club, presented Doolittle with his membership certificate in the Lions. Miss May Ward, 1945 winner of the Lions student speakers' contest in California and Nevada spoke briefly.

Lieutenant General Doolittle's address on this occasion is a masterful one. He brought a message of importance touching on lasting peace and the continued welfare of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to live in and represent the city that give the daring and courageous Jimmy Doolittle to the Nation and under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert, at this place in the RECORD, his speech on this occasion:

I am particularly glad to be with you in Oakland today and I'd like now to express my appreciation for the heart-warming welcome you have given me.

California is my home State—and it is great to get back. Circumstances and a nomadic nature have taken me away from time to time, but, like all native sons, I always come back. I plan, some day, to retire from the more active life and settle down here to live—and I mean live with a capital "L."

I am delighted to have an opportunity to talk to you businessmen of the Lions Club. Civic organizations such as yours have played an important part in the welfare of the people, not only in communities throughout this country, but in other parts of the world as well. You tart in where charity leaves off. With your 220,000 members in 4,750 clubs in the United States, China, Central and South America, Cuba, and other countries, you have taken advantage of your splendid opportunity to do good—both by precept and example. I am well aware that you have participated in €9,000 separate welfare activities for the good of man. Your program of aid to the blind is outstanding among the efforts of all civic organizations.

I say this to you—not so much by way of complimenting you; I know you want no praise—but rather to remind you of the importance of the Lions Club and its capabilities for the even greater things you may accomplish.

Our Nation is now in a most difficult transitional period. We are seeking to adjust ourselves from the requirements of war to the requirements of peace. We are confronted with problems which might easily have a disastrous effect upon our national welfare. We are confused about many things. I shall speak about one phase of the situation—the importance of preparing for peace. This ties in—directly or indirectly—with almost all of our problems.

One extremely important and difficult phase of this problem is the physical, mental, and spiritual rehabilitation of our wounded and the readjustment of our returning combat troops. Everyone must get behind the program to take care of our wounded and help them help themselves—and back an educational program which has as its objective correction of the war-affected thinking—and particularly in the case of our younger people, warped development—of our returning airmen, soldiers, sailors, and marines. Equally important is the development of tolerance, patience, and understanding on the part of the folks at home. The first thing is to realize that a serious problem exists. Next analyze the problem and then solve it.

There is no need for me to tell you businessmen that profitable contracts do not grow on trees. Neither does peace. A business venture, to succeed, must be sound—well planned and executed—and it must perform a service to the public. Otherwise, it will inevitably fail. That is good common sense, and its application has made our country the richest and most prosperous nation in the world.

Peace is an elusive thing; we have not been able, through the ages, to hold on to it for more than a few years at a time. But peace is also a precious thing, and we must fight as hard to retain it as we did to gain it.

I said we are confused about many things. We are, however, certain of one thing: We hope we are done with war. We know what another war with modern weapons would mean. The statement has been made that another war would mean the end of civilization. At first that sounds like an exaggeration, but when you think of what can be accomplished with a proper—or should I say improper—application of known scientific developments, then it becomes a very real threat. We merely have to consider the full destructive capacity of an improper use of atomic energy to come to the realization that we could not survive another long war.

So, we want world peace. Well, to realize it, we must plan and prepare for it. The first step—obviously—is a world organization devoted to world peace, in which every nation pledges itself to strive, through a world council, to solve any problems which may arise. Such an organization would be set up for the good of the world, to maintain peace everywhere, just as laws and statutes are established to maintain order within a city. Such an agency, to be effective, must be capable of making any nation that doesn't choose to abide by the ruling of the majority comply with their desires.

Now for the second step. America must take an active part in world affairs. We must take a dominant part in assuring world peace. We cannot afford to take a chance on some nation or group of nations repeating the tragedy of World War II. There is only one way to avoid this possibility: We must be able to impose our will for peace upon any nation that doesn't want peace. To do this we must be strong militarily.

A sound Department of National Defense, in which land, sea, and air are coequal—where one head will establish policies and advance the desires and necessities of the three individual components according to their respective values—offers the most economical organization which can assure the safety of our Nation.

We must have an adequate Army, Navy, and Air Force—in being—ready for any eventuality.

Such an organization should be small but adequate for our requirements. It should be ultramodern, readily expandable, highly mobile, with air as the first line of defense, and, if necessary, the first line of offense. Our Air Force will be composed of high-performance fighters for the defense of America, and long-range bombers, long-range escort fighters and long-range transports for offensive operations. We must have a strong, flexible aircraft industry, which in time of peace will build commercial planes, but which can readily be converted to the manufacture of military aircraft in case of war.

Furthermore, until such time—and that time is not far off—as airplanes are available with sufficient range to permit them to go to any part of the world with a bomb load and return to the United States, we must have under our control prepared and stocked outlying bases that will allow us to operate anywhere in the world.

The need for an autonomous air force and unification of our armed forces is realized and advocated by such outstanding military figures as Secretary of War Patterson, General Marshall, General Arnold, General MacArthur, and General Eisenhower, Admiral Nimitz and Admiral Halsey, in their testimony last year, before a special committee appointed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, joined the Army generals in favoring a single department of national defense, with independent and co-equal land, sea, and air.

Economy is today the watchword of a war-weary people. Taxes are very properly being reduced. The road to stabilization is open to us. The people must select agencies for the present and future according to the ability of those agencies to do the job and our ability to finance them. We should studiously avoid building any equipment that is not required—nor should we produce any large amount of equipment—for Army, Navy, or Air—that we feel will be ineffective in the near future.

Our air power must continue to be revolutionary. This means a continuation and expansion of the research so splendidly carried on during the war, both by the Government and by industry. We must have a well-financed national fundamental or basic research agency. Each manufacturer must maintain an aggressive engineering section—self-supporting, if possible—and if this is not possible, maintained through Government subsidy.

We must keep a step ahead of any potential enemy. An adequate air force is the best investment in defense the American people can make. It should assure peace—but if war does come, it will assure victory—quickly, economically, efficiently, and with a minimum loss of precious American lives.

The air force didn't do a great deal, relatively, in the First World War. It won its right to parity with the Army and Navy in this war. It is certain that air—due to the speed and facility with which we can travel through it and the limitations inherent in land and sea—will be the medium that will be used by the weapons of the future. This becomes particularly apparent when we realize that future wars may be fought across the Arctic wastes, and air is the only unobstructed medium of travel there. Air power will eventually become not only the decisive but the dominant military agency. We must face this fact and plan accordingly.

Our Air Force started from scratch in this war. In a short space of time it developed into a powerful striking force of more than 2,400,000 men. In less than 4 years the people on the home front built nearly 300,000 airplanes for us and for our allies. In the defense organization which I envision, I see an Air Force in the order of a half million men, with a minimum of 6,500 combat aircraft. We must also have an adequate Army and Navy. Then, with a continuation of scientific research, with air removed from Army and Navy control, with a single department of national defense assuring cooperation and coordination, all three agencies would be free to develop according to their respective values, and the United States of America would be assured of the greatest return on each dollar spent for national security.

The merger of land, sea, and air into a single department, each on a parity with the other, is essential to the safety of America. It is essential in the interest of national economy, because it will reduce the size of our defense organization to an absolute minimum and useless duplication of effort and waste. It will assure the purchase of modern and effective equipment and gradually eliminate obsolete and obsolescent equipment. When this is accomplished, America will have a modern, efficient, and economical defense organization. Then, and

only then, will we be able to face the future with the assurance that we have done everything possible to maintain the peace.

You, members of the Lions Club—in Oakland and in every city, town, and village in the country—can help to bring this about. You can do it by expressing your approval of the defense organization, which I have outlined, to your legislators. In the interest of national safety and economy, in the interest of maintaining the peace, I urge you to accept this responsibility.

Transportation of Veterans Serving Overseas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter from a soldier now stationed in Hiro, Honshu, Japan. I also include some extracts from an editorial published in Japan.

Mr. Speaker, this letter and parts of the editorials indicate that all is not well in getting the high-point men back from the Pacific area. There ought to be more cooperation between the transportation division of the armed forces. Ships that are now idle should be made available for the transportation of troops.

The Senate Naval Affairs Committee received testimony November 13 that the Army had discharged a total of 2,827,000 as of November 10, 1945, and that the Navy had discharged 607,000, making a total of 3,434,000 Army and Navy discharges as of November 10. If the total number of men in all branches of the armed forces at its peak totaled about 11,000,000 men, this would still leave something over 7,500,000 men in all branches of the armed forces as of November 10. At the present rate of discharge, there will be not only many high-point men in the armed forces who are entitled to a discharge but many men who are married and have families at home still in military service at Christmas time. I have repeatedly stated that the armed forces would have more than 5,000,000 men under arms the first of the year.

Members of this Congress who have been concerned about speeding up demobilization should immediately sign the discharge petition on the Clerk's desk which would bring this subject before the Congress for consideration. It seems to me it is time for the Congress to take definite action. Otherwise, demobilization will lag and many complaints will come to Members of Congress.

The letter and editorials follow:

HIRO, HONSHU, JAPAN, *November 1, 1945.*
Hon. A. L. MILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: You will, I hope, give a bit of your valuable time to listen to a plaint from one of your constituents. Perhaps you will remember me as ———. My trouble is that of thousands—return and discharge of overseas veterans.

I have spent only 25 months overseas and consider myself very fortunate indeed. Less than a week ago I bade good-by to a number of my friends who had spent 43 and 44 months over here.

Such a thing is inexcusable. And equally inexcusable is the way so-called spokesmen for the department are daily reporting that so-and-so-many-thousand men will be released during a given month, reducing the critical discharge score to such-and-such a figure. And no one goes home. Soon everyone will be eligible and none will be home.

The enclosed editorial will perhaps throw a little light on the problem. Facts on the Jap civilians were taken from G–2 reports. The facts on the *Admiral Benson* were ascertained from conversation with an officer of that ship, and about the overflowing conditions at disposition centers on Leyte and at Manila from correspondence with friends who waited at those places for more than a month for transportation home.

My thanks for your consideration.

Very truly yours.

EDITORIALS

Today is November 1. Today thousands upon thousands of men serving in the Army of the United States became eligible for return to the United States from overseas duty, and for discharge. News releases blazon the fact: "All 60-point men will be discharged by November 30."

When do we go home?

Newscasts from the United States state that men are being discharged from the armed forces at prodigious rates. According to Stars and Stripes, quoting General Marshall on Wednesday, October 31, the United States is demobilizing too fast.

But when do we go home?

Less than a week ago, the Forty-first Infantry Division, which sailed overseas in February and March of 1942, sent home some 250 men who came overseas with the division. These men had served only 43 and 44 months overseas in the first and worst of the jungle fighting. More than 2 months have passed since the War Department authorized the release of men over 38 years of age. But these men are just leaving their units.

According to news releases and War Department statements, all men with down to 60 points will be discharged by November 30. But on November 1 the Forty-first Infantry Division, only one of many, has more than 2,000 men still on the morning reports who have over 70 points, some with over 90.

When do we go home?

One of the reasons advanced for the delay is that the harbor at Nagoya is still filled with mines and sunken ships, and only one ship at a time can enter the harbor. The Forty-first has been at Kure and Hiroshima for nearly a month, and since that time many men have gone from here to Osaka and Nagoya on official business—by rail. The harbor here at Kure is open, and is a large one. Large enough to hold enough ships at one time to haul all the noneligible home. And the same rail line which carries men from here to Nagoya could certainly carry the men here from other places. And living accommodations were here, ready for occupancy when we came in. Why not for a separation center?

When do we go home?

On October 23, the U. S. S. *John Hanson*, an APA, arrived in Kure Harbor laden with 1,382 Japanese civilians, 15 Japanese Army personnel and 5 Japanese nurses brought here from Manila. Didn't MacArthur refuse American shipping to the Japanese? Again, on October 27, two Liberty ships, the U. S. S. *Silcox* and the U. S. S. *Joseph K. Toole* arrived from Davao, Mindanao, in the Philippines with 2,935 Japanese civilians. At that time separation centers at Leyte and Manila were overflowing with homeward bound troops awaiting transportation.

Supposedly Libertys aren't fitted to carry troops. But a hell of a lot of them came from Stateside on Libertys. And I've ridden on stinking Aussie ships, filthy and unsanitary. I—and thousands of others—would gladly ride these Libertys back to the States. Let the Japs get their own soldiers and civilians home.

On October 25, the U. S. S. *Admiral Benson*, a United States Army troop transport, dropped anchor in Kure Bay. Aboard the transport were 1,800 sailors fresh from the United States. This ship had sailed first to Okinawa to unload the sailors and pick up troops to be returned to the States. But at Okinawa, no one wanted the sailors. (Ships are crying for replacements too.) So the men upped anchor and sailed for Sasebo, Japan. But again they were not allowed to unload their men. Once again this huge transport pulled out, starting for Nagasaki, but was sidetracked before reaching there. At that place, the sailors weren't wanted. So the ship then stopped at the port near Matsuyama, but still no go. In desperation, the *Admiral Benson* came to Kure. Again it was turned away. Where did it go from here? No one knows. But still there is no transportation available.

When do we go home?

The people at home can get us home if they want us. Every person who has a loved one in the armed forces should write their Congressman and Senator the facts they learn from the men overseas. Every newspaper should publish these easily obtained facts. Then enough pressure would be placed squarely on the heads of those at fault—the War Department—and the men would be brought home.

We've won the war. Please get us home where we can win peace and happiness for ourselves.

GI Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. KELLY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by me on the GI bill of rights, given over Station WIND, November 3, 1945, Chicago, Ill., on program Congress Reports:

There are many controversial questions being raised by veterans, who are constantly being released from the armed service, seeking aid to rehabilitate themselves to the normalcy of life. They naturally look to the act of 1944, which may be cited as the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, or otherwise known as the GI bill of rights.

Solution of the veterans' problems does not—cannot—proceed alone. During the period when our soldiers and sailors will be shedding their uniforms, six to eight million workers in strictly war industries will be shifting jobs or homes. The ultimate goal of any veterans' program must be to restore the returning soldier and sailor to the community—socially, economically, and humanly. This cannot be accomplished except as part of the larger program embracing the whole of human demobilization. Our terrible danger of failure may be to set the veteran off from the rest of the Nation, cherishing the grievance of having been wronged, at odds with fellow-Americans, his feelings an explosive fuel, ready to be ignited by future demagogues.

The very first need in the present situation is to end neglect of the human problems of the change-over from war to peace.

In the report of recent date submitted by Bernard M. Baruch to Gen. Omar N. Bradley, he urged General Bradley to set up three different committees: One, to make an impartial study and public report, aiming at the complete transformation of the veterans' medical service; second, to make a similar study of nonmedical matters of the Veterans' Administration, to simplify and decentralize its procedures; and third, to work with Congress in making an intensive review of all existing GI legislation in need of amending.

I have recently received a letter from a veteran still in camp, who states:

"As my Representative, I bring to your attention a discrepancy which you can help to correct.

"I am certain my complaint has your consideration already.

"Soon I will become an ex-serviceman, and will therefore be eligible under the GI bill of rights for a few benefits.

"I am interested mainly in becoming an educated, worth-while citizen. Therefore, I am interested in the educational clause of this bill.

"Mr. KELLY, why has Congress put school within the veteran's reach, yet only allowed a coolie subsistence

"Is it possible for a married man to live on a $75 monthly budget? Indeed, it is not.

"Try to amend this unjust subsistence."

This letter is one of many received each day in our offices showing the desire on the part of these boys to complete their education.

Considering the present living costs, it seems that some reconsideration should be given to the question of training pay or subsistence allowance while pursuing vocational rehabilitation or education or training. The Veterans' Administration recommended a change in the rates of increased pension for the former and the House bill raises the latter $10 per month. The Bureau of the Budget suggested that, instead, consideration be given to a flat rate for veterans without dependents, with increased amount for veterans with dependents, and that the amounts be the same under both acts but with provisions that the veteran may, notwithstanding such allowances, continue to receive whatever pension, retirement pay, or compensation he may otherwise be entitled to receive. Adoption of such flat rate would solve many administrative difficulties now inherent in the provisions of the two acts and would go far to prevent attempts to switch back and forth as between vocational rehabilitation training under Public Law 16 and education or training under Public Law 346.

The age factor has caused much criticism, possibly through lack of understanding of the exact intent and purpose thereof. The education provisions of the Readjustment Act were intended as a benefit to those whose education or training was prevented or interrupted by active service. A proviso was added to the effect that anyone under 25 years of age at the time of entrance into active service would be presumed or deemed to have had his education or training interrupted. This was merely a rule of evidence in favor of the younger veterans. However, the older veterans feel that it places an undue burden of proof upon them to show eligibility for education or training other than a refresher or retraining course limited to 1 year. While it is believed that there will not be a great number of older veterans desiring to take advantage of these educational opportunities, it is realized that the mere existence of purpose or intent is difficult of proof. The Veterans' Administration has been very liberal in applying this provision but it has nevertheless created a great deal of dissatisfaction and charges of discrimination. It is believed the Congress may well desire to reexamine this subject and possibly also the question of more adequately defining the extent of courses of education or training.

However, with regard to the age factor, I am glad to note that a Senate Finance subcommittee voted yesterday to remove all restrictions on veterans' education under the GI bill of rights.

Experience would indicate need for some leeway in paying for short, intensive courses. Under the formula prescribed in the act, it is necessary to prorate the maximum amount of $500 over the period constituting an ordinary school year. It is believed that veterans who desire only such short courses should be permitted to have them with all expenses paid within the limitation of the $500 maximum. However, in order to provide adequate protection to both the veterans and the Government, it is felt that the Administration should have the authority to enter into contracts respecting rates. It would still be required that the institutions be approved by the appropriate State agencies.

Similar recommendation is made with respect to the use of correspondence courses and correspondence schools. It seems only appropriate that there should exist authority to protect against overselling of such courses.

Perhaps it is safe to say that the greatest amount of interest has been evidenced in, and the greatest amount of controversy has arisen over, the loan-guaranty provisions of title III of the act. The financial journals and the public press generally have displayed prominently criticisms and suggestions concerning such provisions. These range all of the way from minor modifications with a view to expedition of administrative procedures, to the entire elimination of the provision or the transfer of the functions to other governmental agencies. Particular emphasis has been placed by some upon the transfer of the home-loan functions to the Federal Housing Administration. No recommendations with respect to this matter have been made for the reason it is felt to be the duty of the Veterans' Administration to perform to the best of its ability those functions and responsibilities placed upon it by the Congress. Concededly, from the standpoint of purely functional operations, all responsibilities of the Veterans' Administration could be transferred to other agencies. It is believed, however, that it has been and will continue to be the view of the Congress that all veterans' benefits as such should be administered by one agency rather than being scattered among a number of agencies.

Great misunderstanding has existed from the very beginning with respect to the loan features of the act. In some way, the impression was broadcasted, even to the most far-flung battle fronts, that all the discharged veteran had to do was to take his honorable discharge certificate to some place and be handed out $2,000. Consequently, disappointment is expressed when he finds out that he has to go through the ordinary procedures with respect to getting a loan. It should be kept in mind, too, that the act was intended, as the name implies, as a readjustment measure. Literally, the guaranty provision was intended to provide what ordinarily is required as a down payment in connection with purchasing a home, farm, business, or whatever he may desire.

This provision of the GI bill should be overhauled. Congress is quite alert to the need for such changes, and I believe swift corrective action can be had with good executive ability to bring together the best thought of the executive branch on these matters with that of the Congress.

As an example of how loosely drawn some features of the GI law are, under the act each enlisted veteran is authorized to borrow for either the purchase of a home or farm or to go into business, but this must be done in 2 years. The Government will guarantee $2,000 of such loans. Let us say, the unguaranteed portion is another $2,000, or $4,000 in all. If one-half the 10,000,000 eligible veterans take advantage of it, that means $20,000,000,000 of borrowings. Think of that pressure going into the market for homes, farms, or businesses in 2 years. What a harvest high-pressure salesmen will reap unless the time is extended.

Spread over 10 years, the GI loans can serve as a stabilizing force, humanly as well as economically. Many veterans may prefer attending school before buying a home, farm, or business. Others, who plan on going into business, will have a better chance to succeed if they first gain experience by taking a job in their particular line.

Some recommendations are being considered. Many suggestions are being made over the feature of the loan provision of this act.

The greatest obstacle encountered to date is the reasonable normal value provision of the law. This requirement has made it almost impossible for lenders to make loans on existing properties. The demand for existing properties in most of the larger cities, due to wartime congestion and swollen incomes, has made it practically impossible to buy existing properties at prices equivalent to reproduction costs less depreciation. Generally speaking, and putting it in the briefest possible language, that is about what is meant by reasonable normal value.

The Veterans' Administration cannot insure under the present law any loan, no matter how small or how good it may look to the lender, if the GI is paying a price higher than the reasonable normal value. This is true even though the GI is ready, willing, and able to pay out of his own funds the difference between the mortgage loan (100 percent of reasonable normal value) and the purchase price.

The time element required in processing these home loans is unworkable. Admitting that whenever any new system is first set up it takes longer to process than it does later on, if everybody connected with the transaction becomes familiar with the procedure, still the present rules and regulations are unnecessarily detailed and cumbersome. I know that the Veterans' Administration, of course, were trying to throw all of the safeguards they possibly could around the transaction to protect the veteran, but they have done it so well and so completely that the average employee in a bank, mortgage house, or other qualified lending institution just cannot comprehend all of the details, and as a result his attitude in the first place discourages the veterans, not because the lending institution he represents doesn't want to cooperate, but it is simply the whole human factor that whenever anything gets too complicated nobody wants to have anything to do with it.

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following article which appeared in the Washington Post, today, November 15, 1945, entitled,

"Bishops Back Army Training in United States Manner":

EISHOPS BACK ARMY TRAINING IN UNITED STATES MANNER

If this Nation must have compulsory military training, it should be in keeping with American tradition, the Catholic bishops of America declared here yesterday.

In a resolution drafted at the opening session of the annual 3-day meeting of the bishops at Catholic University, it was suggested that our Government explore the possibility of having military conscription abolished in all countries.

CARDINAL PRESIDES

The meeting, presided over by His Eminence Dennis Cardinal Dougherty, archbishop of Philadelphia and America's only cardinal, brought together approximately 100 bishops and archbishops from all parts of the country.

In their resolution, the bishops said:

"We recognize the imperative need for preparedness for the adequate defense of our country in all circumstances.

"In determining what constitutes national defense in our present circumstances, our Government, we feel, should explore the possibility of having military conscription abolished in all countries, and, to that end, might well consider how our control of economic assistance to other countries may be used to lend weight to our plea for such abolition."

WANTS TRADITION UPHELD

"If a wide extension of military training is found necessary for present adequate defense of our Nation, we feel that such training should be in keeping with American tradition, and that, specifically:

"1. Voluntary enlistments in the armed forces should be stimulated as much as possible, to provide our first line of defense;

"2. Any period of enforced training should be integrated with normal school life; and,

"3. The War and Navy Departments should work with recognized moral leadership to correct certain policies and attitudes which have wrought grave moral damage to great numbers of young people in the armed services during the last 5 years.

"The bishops are much concerned with regard to the situation in Europe and are much in favor of American relief aid to Germany, Austria, and Hungary."

Has Civil Service Any Meaning Under the New Deal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from a constituent, I have personally known for a quarter of a century, confirms many of the observations I have made of civil service under the present administration:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *November 14, 1945.*

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This letter may serve as a revelation to those of you who are unaware of what is happening in our so-called civil-service system. I will relate a personal experience which I had today in order that you may know that I have first evidence of what I am about to tell you.

First of all, I am a permanent civil-service employee, having become such by virtue of an examination which I passed in Wisconsin, back in 1934. I have had 10 years unbroken service, am a widow of a veteran of the First World War, have a permanent status and all the other requirements which are necessary to maintain my position with the Government.

Since 1942 I have been employed in one or two war agencies; it happens that the second agency employed me because I was unwilling to move out of the city with the first agency by which I was employed.

Since the war has ended the present agency — Foreign Economic Administration—has or is being liquidated. According to the rules and regulations announced, my qualifications have put me on the "A" list for retention; however, we have been taken over by the State Department and were called into a mass meeting and told that by April 1946 there would only be 400 employees left.

This fact caused me some little apprehension, due to the fact that I have no assurance that I will be one to be retained. Therefore, I filled out my Form 57 application blank, and because of the fact that General Accounting Office is in need of employees went there for an interview.

My salary is CAF–5, and due to two automatic raises it is now $2,540, including our basic pay raise. As you know, I am a fiscal account clerk.

I was told when I had my interview in General Accounting Office that my salary was too high, that the only grade 5 position available at this time was in St. Louis, Mo. Was likewise told that if I were hired by the General Accounting Office I would lose my permanent status, would have to work there 1 year on probation, and likely as not if they decided to cut the force would be the first to go because I would be hired as a war appointee. The gentleman suggested that I leave my application and call him from time to time in case something might turn up.

I was accompanied by a friend of mine, really a war appointee, having been in the Government only 3 years, but also a grade CAF–5 without automatic raises as she has not had her CAF–5 12 months, which is the required time for an automatic raise, but with the basic pay raise her salary is approximately $2,320.

This friend of mine was called for an interview after I was; incidentally she is a native of one of the Southern States, and her application bore the name of a relative, namely a southern ——.

Understand me now, she has had 3 years in the Government, is a war appointee with no civil-service status.

Her grade CAF–5 was remarked upon but, after considerable conversation it was practically decided that she was to have a position, would be rated as a grade 4, but would retain her same salary which is one of the steps in grade 4, meaning the top salary of grade 4 is $2,560. The gentleman is to call her, after which she will go there as an employee.

When she came back where I was waiting and told me, I calmly walked up to the interviewer and requested my application, telling the gentleman that I had reconsidered and did not wish to be connected with any agency which discriminated against a permanent civil-service employee, a veterans' widow, one with a permanent status, and 10 years' unbroken service, qualifications which had put me in the A bracket. I told him there was no mention made of giving me a position at grade 4 and still retaining my $2,540 which is included in that grade, therefore, I felt I had been unfairly treated and would thank him for my application back.

The gentleman asked me to have a seat, said he was not there to apologize for anything but that our cases were different. He said she was a war appointee and I had a status and that he thought it would be unwise for me to be hired as a war appointee. He said ,"She might be let out anyway where she is." I wanted to tell him that she would never be let out of anywhere regardless of her being a war appointee, with that name on her application, but the lady is a friend of mine and felt it might be disloyal. He said that he had not promised her a position and I told him I had not said that he had, but that she as good as had it.

When he said, "Of course, I am not here to apologize to anyone, I do not have to," I said I realized that, but that America was a free country and that he could do as he wished and I would demand the same privilege; so wanted him to know I was no longer interested; I also told him that I guessed this would be the last position I would try for, even though I was a widow, as it rather went against my principles to shove myself ahead of the many veterans of this war who were sitting there, patiently waiting for a chance to find a position.

I was prompted to make this remark by the fact that the lady being discussed has a husband making in the neighborhood of $300 per month. She is only one of hundreds of women war appointees who are being given preference over those who have to work and who have all the qualifications necessary, together with a permanent status.

Thought some of you legislators would like to know what is going on in this so-called merit system, and wish you would find out for me if one has to be born south of the Mason-Dixon line to hold a position with the Government during this administration which is maintained by the taxes paid by all regardless of any line.

Sincerely,

A DISILLUSIONED CIVIL-SERVICE EMPLOYEE.

Mr. Speaker, we have read about the 41-point football player released from the Army. We have known New Deal job holders in Wisconsin who never made $1,800 a year before joining the New Deal forces and have seen them blossom forth with a $4,400 a year job although they had never had the background to qualify for the job in the first place.

This type of procedure may be good politics and we can expect more of it as the Pendergastian approach is added, but it does not make for good government regardless of what administration is in power.

A Great Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include a tribute to a great agricultural leader, Ralph K. Bliss, Iowa director of agricultural extension work, made by Paul A. Johnson, Crawford County extension director, Denison, Iowa.

Let me say that I heartily concur in all the praise given Director Bliss by my friend Johnson. For many years a great degree of the agricultural progress, education, and information in Iowa may be attributed to Dr. Bliss and his coworkers. His service during the war has been outstanding in inspiring and leading our Iowa farmers to even greater production of food for war.

A GREAT LEADER

Iowa rural folks astounded the Nation by their record production of food for victory. Five years of war saw Iowa leading the Nation, not alone in the amount of meat, butter, milk, and eggs, but also in the percent increase over the three highest prewar years. Hard work, planning, cooperation, and informed rural leadership did the job. A divine providence kept off drouth and helped the farmer by giving good growing weather.

A great leader, who more than anyone else inspired Iowa farm folk to have an understanding of the need for food and who devised a system of community leaders to aid in spreading knowledge of how best to produce it, was Iowa's director of agricultural extension work, Ralph K. Bliss.

Director Bliss has spent a lifetime in the service of the rural folks of Iowa. He early learned to know them, to understand them, to work with them. Before the United States entered the war he was planning and working to carry the message that "Food will win the war and write the peace" to every family in Iowa. Food was vital for victory. The more quickly victory could be won the less would be the loss in lives and in destruction of property. Our allies must be fed so that they could carry on. It could be no halfway effort. Three sons in the armed service were an inspiration to Director Bliss.

With a shortage of labor and of farm machinery—that could not be replaced by new equipment—Iowa farm folks on the home front backed up their sons and daughters on the fighting front by an all-out effort that got results.

The clear vision, the driving purpose, the inspired leadership of R. K. Bliss was one of the prime factors in uniting Iowa farm folk to do the job. The director has a right to feel proud of this record and the part agriculture extension played in it. Iowa has a right to be proud of the record. Iowa went over the top every victory drive, in feed, and in industrial production. Iowa's sons and daughters wrote their names on the records of the armed forces of the Nation.

"A great task now lies ahead," said Director Bliss at a recent extension conference. "Peace has harder problems to solve than the war. There was no division of opinion as to the need of victory in war. There is a great need now for a common purpose and a united front to solve the problems of winning the peace or we will lose the victory won on the battlefield.

"A hungry world must be fed. Starving people cannot live in peace. Desperate people will follow dictators. America must develop peace or all the victory will be lost. Rural folk must study these problems and knowing the facts must see that our leaders choose the roads to world unity; to keep the peace and outlaw war."

Iowa rural people must keep informed. That is the big job extension has to do.

More Support From California and Michigan for H. R. 3939 To Eradicate Cancer and Polio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I desire to set forth two letters: one from the secretary of Western Yolo Grange, of Brooks, Calif., enclosing copy of a resolution passed by Western Yolo Grange, No. 423, in support of my bill, H. R. 3939, to appropriate funds for research into the causes and cure of cancer and infantile paralysis; the other, a letter from Birmingham, Mich., commending my bill:

BROOKS, CALIF., *October 23, 1945.*

Hon. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed is a copy of four resolutions recently passed by Western Yolo Grange, the fourth of which is in support of your measure on cancer and polio.

We have written our Congressman asking his support of the measure.

Yours very truly,

HELEN PIEZZI,
Secretary.

* * * * *

"4. CANCER AND INFANTILE PARALYSIS

"*Resolved,* That Western Yolo Grange, No. 423, recommends that Congress appropriate up to $2,000,000,000 for research by Government and private agencies into the cause and cure of cancer and poliomyelitis."

The above four resolutions passed by Western Yolo Grange October 17, 1945.

HELEN PIEZZI,
Secretary.

BIRMINGHAM, MICH., *October 31, 1945.*

Representative WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE STEVENSON: I have just read of your proposed bill for an appropriation for research for the cause and cure of cancer and poliomyelitis.

You can justly be proud of your bill, for it is something not only for the good and benefit of your country, but of all humanity.

It is one thing to spend money, although possibly necessary, for destruction, but entirely another for the good of mankind.

Millions of people in our country have lost relatives and friends through these causes and are anxiously awaiting the passage of this bill.

Respectfully yours,

B. F. HORN.

Former Congressman Nichols Killed in Army Plane Crash When Curtiss-Wright Motor Failed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include main passages of an interesting statement sent me by Mr. Joseph Leib, past vice commander, Costello Post, No. 15.

Mr. Leib is known to many of us as having interested himself actively in the causes of airplane accidents.

His statement follows:

FORMER CONGRESSMAN NICHOLS KILLED IN ARMY PLANE CRASH WHEN CURTISS-WRIGHT MOTOR FAILED

(By Joseph Leib)

On November 8, 1945, the Washington Daily News carried a banner headline announcing the tragic death of Jack Nichols, former Member of Congress from Oklahoma. Nichols and seven other passengers and crewmen lost their lives in a B-25 shortly after the ill-fated plane took off from Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, airport.

Why Nichols was riding around in an Army plane promoting the interest of Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc., has become a $64 question. Is it not about time that the American people be informed about what is going on and how their money is being spent, not only here in the United States, but throughout the world, to build private airfields with service personnel that should be sent home, and in the purchase of defective planes.

The Congress may well deliberate the following facts in the hope of sparing human lives in the future. We all must agree that certain air accidents are inevitable. On the other hand, however, it is of public record that a number of crashes could have been avoided had proper action been taken by the Government.

Jack Nichols prior to his resignation from Congress was chairman of a House select committee to investigate air accidents. He issued a number of stinging reports and then suddenly the committee was dissolved. Soon after Nichols became vice president of the Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc.

During this same period I was extremely interested in service crashes. I had discussed this matter with Mr. Nichols on numerous occasions with the hope that he would probe conditions within a number of our aircraft plants. These efforts I regret to say were in vain.

Now it is tragic to read that Mr. Nichols died in a plane manufactured by a company that was under severe criticism for assembling defective aircraft.

On two separate occasions the Senate War Investigating Committee lashed out at the Curtiss-Wright Corp.—once on July 10, 1943 (S. Rept. No. 10), and again on July 26, 1945 (S. Rept. No. 110). The history and background of these reports are too well known to repeat at this time. Curtiss-Wright produced the engines, one of which failed, that ended the life of Jack Nichols. Why this engine failed we may never know. Perhaps Curtiss-Wright is not to be censured for this tragedy—who knows. Yet the Nichols plane was powered by C-W engines.

Along these same lines, however, it should be pointed out that the B-25's are made by the North American Aviation Corp. Without further comment, I quote a story that appeared in the St. Louis Post Dispatch on January 22, 1943. It was an Associated Press dispatch from Kansas City, Mo., and it reads:

"Practices at war plants in this area which tolerate, encourage, or overlook defective products or assembly in war materials were condemned by a Federal grand jury here. The report was made in the case of a foreman of the North American bomber plant, who was arrested by Government agents and charged with concealing a defect on an engine part with chewing gum so it could pass inspection."

In addition to this Verne T. Irons, of Irving, Tex., who worked for the Transcontinental & Western Airlines for 10 years and then became a chief test pilot for the North American Aviation plant at Dallas, Tex., resigned from that aircraft plant in disgust early in 1944 after he had registered vigorous protests that the company was pushing out defective planes.

Said Mr. Irons in a sworn affidavit: "I feel sure that the priceless lives of young aviators have already been lost due to such defects and surely more will be sacrificed if these planes are to continue in production under the slogan 'Push 'em out and deliver 'em regardless of condition.'"

Won't we ever learn?

Address to the Vermont Society of the District of Columbia by William D. Hassett, Secretary to President Truman. Memorial to Charles A. Webb, 1880–1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, consent having heretofore been granted, I am extending my remarks and including a tribute to the late Charles A. Webb, longtime congressional secretary, prepared for delivery to the Vermont Society of the District of Columbia, on the evening of November 10, by William D. Hassett, secretary to President Truman. Because of the enforced absence of Mr. Hassett on official business, at his request I read the address, which follows:

CHARLES A. WEBB, 1880–1945

Between the "sugar" party which closed last year's season and this, our first meeting of the autumn, Charles Webb left us. He had been for so long an intimate part of this society of which he had been the head—and for so many years such an active force in our Vermont community in Washington—that we are lost tonight without his presence.

To collect one's thoughts to pay tribute to him before a Vermont gathering is not easy. The sense of relief at his release from the burdens of the flesh does not lessen the sense of grief in the hearts of the countless friends that he made in Washington.

So much of him went into this society, whether in the period when he was its moderator or during all the rest of the more than 30 years of his active life in Washington, that it is hard to realize he has left us. We shall miss him through long years to come. But there should come nevertheless to all of us relief in reflection on the character and the career of a man who in all of the great emergencies of life was never doubted nor found inadequate.

It is fitting, therefore, that some one of us in the name of all should say a word to this society in tribute to the departed friend. Perhaps this task has fallen to me because my friendship with Charlie Webb began in our slate-and-pencil days back in the primary grade of the Northfield school and I need hardly add: that was a long time ago. By another happy coincidence we arrived in Washington the same year and resumed an association that grew closer with every passing year and which I count among the blessings of my life. As I speak these words, inadequate though they be, I like to think also that in a measure I am speaking for those friends of his and of ours of other days no longer with us. There come to mind the names of two particularly stanch friends of his—Walter Husband and George Wales, to mention only two members of the Vermont Society. Who, that ever heard their priceless stories or was privileged with their friendship, could ever forget Walter Husband or George Wales?

Then there were Mr. Webb's Vermont newspaper friends. Good friends of mine, too, and of many of those here tonight who are graying a little at the temples. First, there comes out of past years the towering figure of Arthur Ropes. When Mr. Webb and I were in short pants, Arthur Ropes was editor of the old Vermont Watchman—the Walter's paper that afterward became the Montpelier Daily Journal. Arthur Ropes, under whom he received his first newspaper training, was among Charles' heroes to the end of his days. It was a happy circumstance that he finally succeeded Mr. Ropes as editor of the paper. Farther up Main Street in Montpelier, C. A. G. Jackson presided over the destinies of the Montpelier Daily Argus, successor to Hiram Atkins' Argus and Patriot. In the neighboring city of Barre, Frank Langley was editing the Barre Times, whose editor of a later day, Dean Perry, was best man at Mr. Webb's wedding.

Then there were Mason Green and Howard Hindley of the Rutland Herald; John Southwick and Walter Gates of the Burlington Free Press, whose editor in chief was a great victorian—Mr. G. G. Benedict; Joseph Auld of the Burlington News; Harry Whitehill of the Waterbury Record; Joe Sault of the Ludlow Tribune; Fred Whitney of the Northfield News, my own early guide, counselor, and friend; Arthur Stone of the St. Johnsbury Caledonian; Charlie Walters of the St. Johnsbury Republican; L. P. Thayer, newspaper publisher at large, probably owner of more papers than any other man in the history of Vermont journalism; one-time partner of Lynn Hays in the publication of the Burlington Suburban List at Essex Junction; Jack Harris of the Hardwick Gazette; Harry Parker of the Bradford Opinion; Frank Greene of the St. Albans Messenger, Senator and editor, too. There were some memorable reporters in those days, always familiar figures about the State House: Jim Healy of the Argus; C. V. Poulin of the old Rutland News; Ed Nutt of the Montpelier Journal; P. C. Dodge, newspapersman-at-large; Colby Stoddard of Barton; Jack Norton of the St. Albans Messenger. I remember, also, Miss Georgia White, the first woman columnist in Vermont. She received an opportunity to exercise her superb talents through the enterprise and sagacity of Luther Johnson, of the Randolph Herald and News, dean of Vermont editors, still going strong. Good Vermonters and competent workers, all of them, and all good friends of the friend who has so lately left us. Charles Webb was at heart a newspaperman all his life and found zest to the last in his work as Washington correspondent of the Burlington Free Press and the Rutland Herald. On that account I like to mention these old friends and coworkers.

Down the bypath of memory they come, a procession out of the spirit land. In retrospect we see them again in all their old activities: their humor, their foibles, their whims, their fights, and their hobbies, their successes, and their failures. You could always find them at the State House during the sessions of the legislature; at the political conventions whether in Burlington, Montpelier, White River Junction, or Rutland; at pow-wows at the Pavilion in Montpelier or the Van Ness House in Burlington; at the annual outings of the Vermont Fish and Game League, at the Bluff Point Hotel on the New York side of Lake Champlain. And by the way what has become of the Vermont Fish and Game League, whose concern in the days I speak about was so largely with political fish and political game? In their work and in their play these men whose names I have mentioned sum up Vermont newspaperdom at the turn of the century. This gathering of Vermonters brings them back to us tonight like friendly spirits visiting momentarily the scenes of their labors. Well, all I can say is that if they get out newspapers in the Great Beyond, Charlie Webb and his old cronies are having a wonderful time.

After his early schooling in Northfield, Mr. Webb went on to the old Vermont Methodist Seminary at Montpelier and thence to Dartmouth College. That famous seat of learning at Hanover never sent forth a more loyal son nor one who exemplified in more striking terms what Dartmouth men call the Dartmouth spirit.

It was soon after he left Dartmouth that Mr. Webb went to work on the Montpelier Daily Journal, there to begin his association with Walter Husband, ever after one of his closest friends. He was editor of this paper when he came to Washington as secretary to Senator William P. Dillingham. Subsequently he became secretary to Representative—afterward Senator—Gibson and then served in like capacity with Senator AUSTIN until failing health forced him to retire.

Through his Washington secretarial work exceeding 30 years in the aggregate, he not only gave faithful and efficient service to his chiefs but rendered a singularly valuable service to the people of the State of Vermont. No one knew better than Mr. Webb the workings of the various departments and agencies of government in Washington. Tactful, courteous, he made friends easily and because of this had a genius for getting things done. One thing deserves special mention. Since his death, one of his colleagues of the old days in Senator Dillingham's office, Mr. Pierce, of the National Life, has emphasized it. No one in Washington had a more detailed knowledge of soldier-benefits legislation and its administration than he. The last days of many a Vermont veteran and his widow were made easier because Mr. Webb knew what their rights were and worked unceasingly until he had obtained the financial aid that the Congress had authorized.

How often in word and work and deed he exemplified what the poet calls—

> "That best portion of a good man's life—
> His little nameless, unremembered acts
> Of kindness and of love."

Charles Webb was born in a Vermont Methodist parsonage in Irasburg. His youth was nurtured in a home of plain living and high thinking. From his English-born father, Rev. Alfred H. Webb, one of the most eminent of Vermont Methodist divines, he inherited many of those characteristics that in England are summed up in the designation "the nonconformist conscience." His dominant trait was an ardent sense of justice, and nothing could dissuade him from a cause or a conviction once he made up his mind as to what was just and right and true. Conscience was ever his guide; and if he knew that righteousness was on his side, he cared not for the consequences.

Hospitable and generous to the point of prodigality, he was blessed with an ideally happy home life. It was his privilege to have had as mother, wife, daughter, and sister what the ancient Book of Proverbs calls valiant women. In the great relationships of son, husband, father, brother, and friend, he carried himself with the honor of a noble chivalry and the love of a mighty heart.

Since all men must die, it is well if they can die grandly with a record of work well done and duty faithfully performed. Tonight, as we recall our departed friend, it is inevitable that "pleasant thoughts bring sad thoughts to the mind," but because of all the sacred memories which he has left—for him and for us—death has no sting.

On the peaceful slopes of Green Mount Cemetery in Montpelier he was laid to rest. His lifelong friend, Dr. Hewitt, of Northfield, friend also and successor to Mr. Webb's father in the pastorate of the Methodist Church in Northfield, performed the last sad offices. For him the evening had come—the busy world was hushed. In the mercy of God he had found "a safe lodging, a holy rest, and peace at the last."

As I think of Charles Webb's passing on that quiet August morning when all the world was waiting for the surrender of the Japanese, there comes to mind a grand old English classic as well known in Vermont a hundred years ago as the Bible itself. I mean, of course, the Pilgrim's Progress. Here and now I want to say to this Vermont

audience that if you do not know the Pilgrim's Progress you are not as wise as your forebears.

In this great work John Bunyan always speaks cheerfully of death, and Mr. Webb's own passing is not unlike that of Mr. Valiant-for-Truth's. You will remember that the author tells us that Mr. Valiant-for-Truth was taken with a summons and had as a token that the summons was true—that his pitcher had been broken at the fountain. When he understood it he called for his friends and told them of it. Then, said he:

"I am going to my Father's; and though with great difficulty I am got hither, yet now I do not repent me of all the trouble I have been at to arrive where I am. My sword I give to him that shall succeed me in my pilgrimage, and my courage and skill to him that can get it. My marks and scars I carry with me to be a witness for me that I have fought His battles who now will be my Rewarder."

So Valiant-for-Truth "passed over and all the trumpets sounded for him on the other side."

The Ruins of Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting of the many interesting human documents that has come in the aftermath of war is a letter describing the ruins of Berlin written by Pfc Elliott Goodman, of Indianapolis, to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. L. L. Goodman. This young man is a keen observer and a brilliant writer and no one can read his description of the Berlin of today without a harrowing sense of the tragedies of war.

The letter follows:

DEAR FOLKS: Greetings from the ruins of Berlin. Though Berlin and the state of the Germans has been replaced in the public eye by the spectacular happenings in the East, the atom bomb, Russia's entry into the Pacific war, Japanese capitulation—that, unfortunately, does not in the slightest change the basic problems that exist, and will continue to exist, over here.

The smashed buildings will remain smashed; the hungry populace will, if anything, approach closer to starvation as winter comes on; the coal supply will only dwindle, and then there will be no more coal; the fantastic black market, despite all attempts to the contrary, will continue to be fantastic.

Berlin, this winter, will not be a pleasant place for Germans to live—nor I suppose, will the rest of Germany—but Berlin is expected to be the worst of all, as they have some 2,785,000 people here and adequate facilities for probably about half that number. The war completely disrupted the transportation system so that, even if coal and food were available in sufficient quantities, they couldn't get it to the right place at the right time.

But that is the least of the difficulties, for almost no one is left on the farms to produce food or in the mines to mine coal, and it is an established policy to give a good portion of what production will be available to the liberated countries, like France, Belgium, etc., first. As a result, there will be no coal for any German homes this winter, and it will not be surprising if there are frequent food riots in store for us, nor would I be surprised if Berliners died of starvation this winter.

It's not hard to figure out, then, why such a black market flourishes. Most of the Germans have a lot of money made from war industries, but saved because there was little to buy, and they are all hungry. The one English word every German knows is "hunger," which they generally pronounce "oongur."

The first day I got here I saw a GI sell the little can of ham and eggs from a C ration box for $15. But that is only an example—a rather poor one at that.

Now, if only the Germans and the Americans were involved in the black market, it would be relatively simple. But there are also the British, French, and the Russians, and it is the Russians that really liven things up. First of all, because, believe it or not, most of them have not been paid in 5 years and then they got it all at once here in Berlin, and, secondly, because they are not allowed to take any more than $75 back to the Soviet Union with them, and therefore they must spend it all here in Berlin.

So, while the Germans want food, the Russians want watches, cameras, radios, jewelry, etc. I doubt if the Russians have ever seen much of this sort of thing because they practically tramp all over you and outbid each other to get it. The bigger the watch, the better the Russians like it. A fine ladies' watch would sell for practically nothing—a mere $200 or $300. But, believe it or not, I saw a Russian buy a watch which looked more like an alarm clock on a wrist band for $750. Personally, I wouldn't be seen with a thing like that in a dark alley at midnight. I asked the GI who sold it where he got it. He said he took it off a dead German.

Now the market is pretty well shot because new troops coming in here have heard reports and knew what to bring with them. Lots of them come in wearing watches up to their elbows, but only for a day or so. Then they join in asking Berlin's standing joke, namely, "What time is it?"

But the boys who came up on the advance parties and brought the trading materials with them were the ones who really cleaned up. Then, when the market was just opening up, one fellow I know got two Leica cameras for a pound of coffee.

Lots of them sent home as much as $15,000 in a couple weeks' time. So, when the Army learned that the 33,000 Yanks in Berlin sent home over $4,000,000 in July alone, they decided to limit the amount you could send home to your salary plus 10 percent. Now everyone goes around with big rolls of money in their pockets.

Cigarettes are acceptable as money among all the five major nationalities—preferred oftentimes. One pack plus a candy bar and you pay for your week's laundry. The standard price, if you want to sell cigarettes, is $10 a pack—but if you are really avaricious and press the deal, you could get $15—and I've still got my watch. Every time a Russian approaches me I explain that it was given to me by my parents and I don't want to sell it, and, anyway, I want to know what time it is.

When our advance party first came to Berlin they couldn't find any decent living quarters and they didn't have the use of public utilities or any sort of convenience because there just weren't any. But by the time I came up on the third movement (and they are still coming up little by little) they had most of the public utilities under control and solved our housing problem very simply. They found a whole area of two-story apartments in the suburb of the United States section. They had hardly been touched, and, what was more remarkable, they still had all the furnishings in them because the Germans had continued to live there and kept everything pretty well intact. Only here and there can you see any bomb damage and even a great percentage of the glass is still in the windows.

So the Army told all these Germans one fine rainy morning (Berlin has bad weather constantly; it has rained every day for 3 weeks now) that they could politely move out, and pronto. The story goes that they thought they were moving out temporarily for the Potsdam Conference, and after they got out they discovered it was for good. I don't know if that is true or not, but I do know that, except for valuables, they left everything behind.

So now some 3,000 of us are nicely settled in these apartments. I have a very nice, cozy room to myself and a cute porch and garden immediately outside.

The room had double storm windows, and only the outside ones are broken, so it will still be O. K. for the winter. As yet they haven't repaired the gas mains so we have no hot water, and the water is still polluted so we have no drinking water (but who wants to drink water, anyhow), and the swamps and debris have cultivated a fine bunch of mosquitoes sometimes confused with P–38's. So we have some difficulty sleeping at night. These mosquitoes are the most conscientious I've ever encountered; they just keep coming at you, and sound like a dive bomber with motor trouble. With cold weather coming on, they won't be so bad though.

But we do have electricity, and garbage disposal, and every part of the Metro is working. Our offices, the former Luftwaffe headquarters, are just one Metro stop from the billets, so every morning several thousand GI's, mess gear or German crockery in hand, ride the Metro to work. We eat near the offices, and that's why we ride the subway with our plates and cups. However, they are going to furnish them at the mess soon so we won't have to do that much longer.

The offices are not attractive. I have not seen one building built by the Nazis that I could call attractive. They all look hard and ugly. They are plain, not with the simple dignity of a New England house, but with simple proportions that have no charm or grace.

Little by little the building is getting fixed up. Most of the windows were out, so they are putting new ones in. Parts of the buildings were burned or hit by bombs or even small arms fire, so they are repairing that. All the building needs paint, so they are painting. In the midst of painters, plasterers, and window fitters, we do our work.

We had to bring our own furniture from Frankfurt because most everything in the building was looted and smashed. First, the nearby Germans looted it, then the Russians looted it and if anything was left the first Yankees in Berlin probably finished off the job. That is the pattern that most all buildings, especially public buildings, have undergone here.

Berlin itself is not flat. That is a popular misconception. On the other hand, I can only count a dozen spots which are absolutely intact, all of them in the suburbs. Except for the inner city, in which every single building without exception was bombed, burned or hit with artillery fire, there does not seem to be any pattern of destruction in Berlin.

This apparently planless destruction stood out clearly in my first view of the city which was from the window of an airplane. As we circled over blocks and blocks of apartment houses in preparation for the landing at Tempelhoff, you could see a row of buildings that looked almost perfect, and for a block on either side of it, you would see remains of similar apartments now almost leveled to the ground.

However, once on the ground, I found my first impressions somewhat deceiving. For

the buildings that looked good from the air, I found were often gutted by fire, and many of them were nothing but empty shells. The outside walls would be standing, but there would be nothing in between. Apparently, a lot of incendiary bombs were dropped here, as a tremendous number of houses and apartments are in this condition. The latest estimate I've seen reports that over 900,000 Berlin homes were destroyed and damaged. This report also stated that of Berlin's 125 important bridges, 111 are destroyed.

The first day I got here, I hitched a ride downtown. The first vehicle that stopped happened to be a Russian truck carrying five Red Army soldiers in the back. Like all the Russian trucks and cars I've seen, this one was at least a 1929 model and plenty beat up. Of course, the Russians are driving a number of the German de luxe cars, too, but even those don't stand up very well under their Russian drivers, who dash down the street at 60 miles per hour, blowing their horns.

These five soldiers were all obviously Mongolians of some sort as their features were typically Asiatic. However, they spoke good Moscow Russian and were exceptionally friendly as most all Russian soldiers are. After offering me part of his seat—looked like it might have been an orange crate once—one of them went through the usual routine of asking me where I learned Russian, how much I wanted for my watch, and asking if it is true that every American is a millionaire.

They told me that they had fought their way to Berlin from Stalingrad and showed me all the medals on their tunics, which indicated the various battles and awards for valor. The Russians don't wear the ribbons of the medals above the left breast pocket as the Americans, but wear the medals and all on both sides of their tunic from practically their belts to their collars.

As we moved through the city, I noticed more and more Russian graves on street corners, in parks, in front yards—you can expect to see them any place. Apparently, the Red Army didn't have the transportation available to collect the corpses and bury them in one big cemetery—so they just buried them where they fell. Most of the graves are crude, and on the tombstone—generally a piece of wood—is written something like "Pvt. So & So, Red Army, died of wounds received in the battle of Berlin, such and such a day 1945."

I rode from Zehlendorf to Alexander Platz, a distance of some 10 or 12 miles, and got a good look at the destruction throughout the city. At first it was not too bad, but as we approached the center, the devastation suddenly became much worse. We rode through blocks and blocks and blocks where bulldozers had pushed a path, but that's about all there was. Labor gangs of women and old men were stacking up the good bricks and casting the unusable rubble away. At this point, the Russian next to me began to grin broadly and kept repeating, "Berlin kaputt, Berlin kaputt."

When we arrived at Alexander Platz, one of the famous centers of downtown Berlin, we were greeted by the remains of modern, exclusive stores and a huge picture of Stalin. Underneath the picture, the slogan seen everywhere "Hitlers come and go, but the German people remain."

This does not mean that Stalin forgives the German people for everything. The Russians have been ruthless in their treatment of proven Nazis, especially those holding office of any sort. This statement is simply to give the German people some hope that they may earn their way back to decent government in time.

I got off the truck and started hitching again to get to the Brandenburg Gate. It so happened the first vehicle that stopped was a British armored reconnaissance car driven by a British captain. He said, "Hop in," and I said "Where?" The only place I could see where I could "hop in" was the turretway up on top. So I climbed up the side of the armor and stood on a little platform in the turret. Standing there not unlike General LeClerc making his triumphal entrance into Paris, I rode down the Champs Elysees of Berlin, the famous Unter den Linden.

I assure you Unter den Linden today is not a pretty sight. Every building on either side of the street is damaged—some almost totally destroyed, others with no more than a huge "nick" out here and there. But everything is a monotonous dreary gray—it seemed a once great street which is today without hope, without any suggestion of gaiety or joy.

I got out at the gate, thanked the captain and began walking around. This was indeed quite a sight. The gate marks the boundary between the Russian and British zones, with Russian signs on one side and British on the other. It is still substantially intact, although every pillar has various size pock marks in it from shrapnel, artillery and small arms fire, and the statue on top is sort of beaten up too, with a few stray legs and arms sticking out from nowhere.

To one side of the gate is the Reichstag, bombed and burned but still standing, and all around it and through the big square, thousands of people form in little groups of 10 or 12.

This is one of the better market places in town. Here some of Berlin's fantastic trading goes on. A German woman trading her wedding ring to a Russian for some American C rations and canned goods, a Russian buying a pair of woman's shoes—why no one seems to know, but a group of people crowd around anyway to watch.

Signs in four languages say it is illegal to trade in the black market, but no one pays any attention to the signs. The police raid the place regularly, but the effect is only momentary. If the police really get nasty about it, the market will find a new place, but it will not go out of existence.

The other day a fellow from my office was down there selling a few watches when the police suddenly closed in and threw some tear gas bombs. This fellow ran for the first American car he saw and jumped in. He looked at the person sitting next to him in the car and realized it was a two-star general. Immediately he apologized and started to get out when the general told him to relax, and that he would give him a ride back to the office if he wanted.

Then the general asked this fellow how much he got for his watch. He told him only $400. The general said, "Yes, the market is really shot to hell, isn't it—I hope my orderly gets more than that for mine." Officers of field grade and above don't have too much trouble getting money home, and believe me, I personally know a dozen who have already sent home a good sized fortune.

By the way, the only immediate effect of this raid seemed to be that the price of cigarettes jumped from $10 to $20 a pack.

From the Reichstag, I walked over to the Reich's Chancellory, Hitler's executive offices. It, too, is still standing, though there are huge gaping holes in the ceilings and floors where bombs were dropped. The inside of the chancellory was very beautiful once, for among the piles of trash and rubble strewn throughout it, you can still see beautiful marble pillars, wall paintings and the remains of real museum piece furniture.

Much of the damage done here was not from bombs, but from the bayonets and hands of Russian soldiers, who upon seeing such splendor, willfully looted and destroyed for the sheer pleasure they got from such destruction. I asked one Russian guard why they had done this instead of saving what they could for an official war museum of some sort. He said that after fighting their way back almost yard by yard over 2,000 miles of territory, which was practically completely devastated, they were simply enraged to find anything like this in Berlin. Hence, each one personally wanted to tear up the furniture of the Reich Chancellory—which, I might add, they did rather successfully.

The Russians had dug out all sorts of stuff from the rubble heaps—among them large collections of Fascist medals. Several of the Russian guards set up sort of concession stands in various corners of the building and were selling the medals for cigarettes. Fortunately, I had one pack with me, so I traded it for 18 different kinds of medals which I have since mailed to you.

Most of them are campaign medals, but one which says "Fur Reich Mutter" was awarded for any German woman bearing five children for the state. I understand they had a really fancy one of gold for eight children, but I didn't see that one.

People of all nationalties were milling through the place looking for souvenirs. A Polish lieutenant stopped me and offered to trade me his Polish cap insignia for something American. I didn't quite know what to do, but I hunted through my pockets to see what I could find. The only thing outside of my dog tags which had anything about America on it was my voting registration card from Marion County, so I gave him that. He seemed very impressed.

For an hour or so I walked around looking over the other government buildings in the same area. But it was the same story with each one—bombed, burned, looted and ugly. I had walked through and walked over so much rubble, I had seen so much unrelieved disorder and destruction, and I had smelled so much rotting debris that I began to feel completely unreal—as if I were walking about in a nightmare. I had a sudden urge to see a straight, clear street with no bomb-crater in it, a row of houses which were not twisted into foolish shapes. Fortunately, I had a decent place I could return to, but I knew—how very well—that literally millions of people on this continent have no such place.

Though somewhat belated, I should like to add a few interesting impressions I received in the air trip coming up to Berlin. It was a beautifully clear day when we flew up, and I could see the countryside perfectly. Though I have always thought the country of Germany was very pretty, I didn't realize how exceptionally beautiful it really is until I had a chance to view large areas of it from the air. The rolling hills, the intensively cultivated farm area, the forests and lakes compare favorably with any similar area in the world, I dare say.

Even the Russians admit that the country is beautiful. Paraphrasing somewhat a remark a Russian once made to me as we were driving through the hills of Bavaria together "The land of Germany is really very beautiful, but the people—fooey!"

I was interested to see how the farm villages were roughly in the form of a circle, and unlike the American farm villages which simply consist of a few straight streets, these houses were clustered together in a haphazard fashion without any straight avenues of any sort. It looked as if they had all huddled together for mutual warmth and protection—which, I suppose, is exactly what had happened.

I was also interested to see that not everything our Air Force dropped hit its target. For quite frequently you could see a big bomb crater right in the middle of a wheatfield or a whole row of craters marking a cornfield which ran adjacent to a railroad track. In one place I saw the complete outline of a factory reproduced in bomb craters several hundred yards to one side of the factory which was still intact.

But the most impressive sight by far was the view of the city of Magdeburg. We flew directly over the ruins of its downtown district. Everything, but absolutely everything, was colorless, smashed—odd-shaped walls in senseless designs. It was hard to believe this could exist in the midst of the

fertile agricultural plains which surrounded it. It looked as if it might have been ruins of the capital of some long-forgotten desert empire—maybe a newly discovered Carthage or Babylon. How completely ugly and absolutely stupid. It was somewhat a symbol not only of this war, but of the history of man. For here all around were the fertile fields, the raw material, and here in the middle was what man had built and man had destroyed.

Maybe it really was Carthage or Babylon after all. At any rate it made one wonder if man had developed his understanding to the point that he could justify the existence of the word "progress."

ELLIOT.

Discharge of Members of the Armed Forces in the Pacific Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter from a constituent of mine who is a representative of the American Red Cross, now located in Oahu, T. H.

Mr. Speaker, this letter, coming from the representative of the American Red Cross, I am sure, reflects quite accurately a cross section of the thinking of our soldiers located in the Pacific theater of war. It is worthy of our consideration.

AMERICAN RED CROSS,
OAHU, T. H., *October 25, 1945.*

A. L. MILLER,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DOCTOR MILLER: Greetings from Oahu—the land of the hula and pineapples. A very interesting spot but the novelty of it is wearing out and Nebraska will look very good to me and I hope it will not be long.

As a whole my work has been very pleasant and I feel that I have been of service to the men over here. The only unpleasant part of it is trying to cope with the usual inefficiency and bungling of the Army brass.

After living with Army officers and working with enlisted men these many months I think I have a pretty good idea of how they think regarding many things. The average EM can see no reason for being here since the war is over and thinks the regular Army should take over from here. Almost every day I talk to young farmers and married men with families who would do almost anything to get home for most of them are doing nothing and they are sick and tired of loafing when they are needed at home and could be doing something useful.

I find a surprisingly large number of officers hope to stay in the Army for obvious reasons. They are very much in favor of a large postwar Army and they like the idea of compulsory military training, thinking it will create a need for them. To me this line of reasoning is very futile. It seems to me that the post war Army and Navy should be small—yes, very small, but highly scientific and up to the minute. The fact is of course that with the advent of atomic energy a very large percent of the Army and Navy became obsolete—but try to convince an Army or Navy officer of that. A very few will admit it.

Doctor, you men in Congress have been doing a good job pounding away to get the men home and keep it up, for if you don't there will be a couple million men still in the service a year after Japan quit. There are many things I would like to talk to you about, such as surplus property and other things concerning this island, but that will have to wait until we can talk it over some time.

The big topic just now in Army circles is compulsory military training. Personally, I do not think the American people want it for a good many good reasons that could be enumerated, and will be in the coming weeks. I am not convinced that it would accomplish the purpose for which it is intended unless the Army brass can bring its thinking up to date, which is too much to expect.

Well, Doctor, I am trying to get home by Christmas, for I am pretty homesick for the family and the baby daughter I have not seen. Keep up the good work and with my best regards, I am,

Sincerely yours.

The Nation's Responsibility for the Education of Its Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 12, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the war has demonstrated that the greatest force in the world today is education. Without education the boundless energy of petroleum would still be dormant in the earth; without education the deposits of coal and iron in this country would still be left unutilized; without education the forests of America would still be a trackless wilderness and we would be as helpless as the American Indian who roamed the fertile prairies and through the vast forests and over the mineral-laden hills, running the course of their primitive lives with nothing to protect them from the elements but animal skins and frail wigwams.

Education and applied science have made the people of America triumphant in the world-wide war which has just closed and made this country preeminent among world powers. It is unthinkable that some short-sighted Government policy, now that the war has been won, would deprive this Nation of the preeminence attained by the superiority of its educational system by taking away from the youths of this country the opportunity to secure higher education. That we may more fully appreciate the vital importance of education to the future welfare of America there is inserted herewith an article appearing in the Magazine Digest entitled "We're Committing Scientific Suicide," by Dr. M. H. Trytten, of the National Research Council.

The facts presented by Dr. Trytten are stressed by former President Herbert Hoover in a recent address where he said:

The war has brought us a loss in our intellectual life from another direction. In our lists of dead are a multitude who would have given intellectual leadership to our people. Of those who survived, the draft and diversion to war have cost us the equivalent of six annual crops of young men trained in the professions and the arts. I regret to say that after the interruptions of war, too small a part of them are returning to colleges for training. Worst of all, by continuing the draft of boys between 18 and 21 since the war has ended we are destroying still another crop. There will sometime be a shortage in scientists, teachers, doctors, engineers, lawyers, and our leaders in the humanities. It is not even intelligent of our military forces to continue depriving our future defense of these skills.

The article follows:

WE'RE COMMITTING SCIENTIFIC SUICIDE

American applied science, which furnished the Allies with the means of winning this war, is in grave danger of losing the peace—and the next war, if and when it comes. A critical shortage exists of the very men who made possible both the victory and the promise of tomorrow's more abundant life: chemists, engineers, physicians, metallurgists, mathematicians, and researchers and practitioners in the fields of physical science on which the Nation's progress, welfare, and safety depend in peace and war.

It is estimated that not until 1950 will a new crop of graduates in the sciences be available to the thousands of organizations and industries that already lack trained personnel; and not until 1955 will the top men of science—those who earn doctorates—again be "in full production."

The most recent voice added to the protest against our "scientific suicide" is a joint report by the National Research Council and the American Council on Education. It urges all colleges, universities, Government leaders, and an aroused public opinion to unite in demanding a change in the military policy which, by abolishing deferments, sharply curtailing college military programs, and refusing to assign men for scientific training, has almost completely stopped the flow of men to the technological fields. "It is amazing," the report comments, "that in the very period when the worth of such personnel is so brilliantly demonstrated, the record shows we have canceled our production of reserves."

Drafting of graduate technicians—putting scientists to swabbing decks and making professors into privates—is also deplored. The Senate committee headed by Harry S. Truman before he became President found that there was either a partial or total waste of scientific training in 90 percent of the cases checked. This waste of technical wealth, however, cannot now affect the outcome of the war; the really permanent and tragic loss to the United States is the generation of scientists who will never exist because thousands of young men of promise were pressed into military service instead of being allowed to take or complete their scientific education. It is feared a second generation may be lost unless tomorrow's technicians are drafted into technical training just as today's potential ones have been into military training.

In 1940 there were 110,000 engineering students in America; today there are only 38,000, nearly half of whom are freshmen awaiting induction, and of the remainder 4,000 are Canadians. The net result is a shortage of nearly 100,000, and nobody believes that America will need 100,000 fewer engineers in 1950 than it did in 1940. One professor who normally teaches 100 students has a class of 4 today.

Physics and chemistry have suffered even more. Enrollment has been made up almost entirely of women, and a few IV–F men.

Even at present levels, which are not likely to be maintained, there will be 19,000 fewer physicians available. Only one dentistry student is being enrolled for every eight the Nation will need. In pharmacy, 3,600 students were registered in 1945, compared with 8,200 in 1942. Unless capable male students are allowed to complete college courses in pharmacy, there will be large gaps in the

ranks of trained personnel for laboratories, retail drugstores, and health and Government services. A lowering of standards might result, with serious consequences to the public health and welfare.

Only 11 percent of the number of students in 1940 were enrolled this year in agricultural sciences; only 9 percent in forestry; and only 16 percent in mining.

The shortage of men at the top of the scientific professions is even more impressive. The number of doctorates granted in physics, mathematics, geology, chemistry, and engineering, which had increased steadily for the past 35 years, has dropped sharply during the war years, and is now back to the 1920 level.

We have not only failed to safeguard our supply of trained men for our scientific and engineering preeminence, but we have actually followed policies which must weaken our technology for years. Our policies have actually seemed to class this type of training with the most disposable elements among our institutions. * * *

Two courses of action are open for America: A change in administrative policies, or new legislation. Authorities do not plan any modification of policy, and a change can be brought about only by an aroused public opinion acting through such Government agencies as Selective Service, the War Manpower Commission, and the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. The alternative: Legislation can be introduced and passed by a Congress made aware of what a lack of experts in applied science will mean to America's future.

Recommendations of Indiana Department, American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 8, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the Indiana Department of the American Legion, which at all times demonstrates leadership of the highest order in looking after the needs of veterans and their dependents, recently held a State convention and adopted four resolutions which I think are worthy of note as indicating the advanced thinking of the great veterans' organization in respect to specific proposals for the benefit of veterans.

The first is on the subject of the liberalization of nonservice pensions for men 55 years old and who are 50 percent or more disabled; the second, a resolution requesting a continuance of the high type of plastic surgery now being carried on in Wakeman Hospital in Indiana; the third, a resolution requesting that the Bunker Hill Naval Air Training Station be made available as a rehabilitation center and hospital; and the fourth, a resolution requesting that a tuberculosis hospital be set up centrally located in the State of Indiana.

By unanimous consent of the House I submit for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of these resolutions as follows:

LIBERALIZATION OF NONSERVICE PENSIONS

Whereas 26 years have elapsed since close of World War I and the average age of the veterans of said war is over 50 years; and

Whereas many World War I veterans have now reached the age where their earning power has been reduced, and under the existing insurance laws many of the veterans of both wars to be unemployable; and

Whereas many disabled veterans are denied benefits through the application of the existing regulations, and the "Combined Rating Schedule" and schedular requirement for a major disability: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the schedular requirement for the payment of nonservice be liberalized to the point that a nonservice pension shall be paid to war veterans who have reached the age of 55 years, and who are 50 percent disabled, that a straight computation of the disabilities be rated on the 1933 rating schedule and the combined schedule shall not be applied, and that there shall be no major disability requirement; be it further

Resolved, That need shall be shown as under present regulations, and that the amount shall be the same as that paid the present time, $50 per month; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the national rehabilitation committee, the legislative committee, and all Members of the Congress.

PLASTIC SURGERY

Whereas while facial injuries comprise but a small percentage of all types of casualties of war, yet they are the most important from a psychological standpoint of the patient due to the universal horror of facial disfigurement, and the ensuing mental inferiority complex is more acute than the feeling associated with loss of limb or even sight, and

Whereas there is not only great psychic trauma involved in severe wounds of the face, but also to be considered are the far-reaching social, economic, and rehabilitation problems, and

Whereas this problem is much more serious than it was during the First World War due to the use of more powerful explosives and because a far greater number of these casualties survive due to the routine use of blood plasma, sulfanilamides, penicillin, and more prompt use of modern field surgery, and

Whereas almost unanimously these patients insist upon surgery, and would rather have a lump of poor flesh for an ear or nose than the most perfect stage-property accessories that can be built from synthetic substitutes, and

Whereas the most wonderful plastic surgery is being afforded these men by the best talent in the country in the nine hospitals doing this type of work throughout the country, and especially at Wakeman Hospital Center, Camp Atterbury, Ind., and

Whereas the time for the completion of these most necessary medical services may run for many months and should be done by the same doctors now rendering that service, or others of equally highly efficient technical ability and knowledge: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it become the unswerving duty of the American Legion to take whatever action it deems necessary and see that this action be executed, be it legislative or otherwise, to insure these veterans and the casualties yet to come of the highest type medical service available after the war—said services being comparable to the excellency now being rendered in our hospitals for our armed forces; and be it further

Resolved, That there be a constant follow-up system inaugurated, thus making it sure that this fine facial plastic surgery be continued and made available for these men as long after the war as it may be found necessary.

PROPOSED REHABILITATION CENTER

Whereas there is a desperate need of additional hospital and rehabilitation facilities for veterans of the last war; and

Whereas the Bunker Hill Naval Air Training Station now being used to train flying cadets will be abandoned by the Navy on or before December 1, 1945; and

Whereas approximately $25,000,000 has been invested in acquiring and constructing this station; and

Whereas the facilities at this station are adequate and adaptable and should be utilized as a rehabilitation training center and hospital for veterans of this war; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration under existing law has the first priority in acquiring Government-owned properties being abandoned as surplus by the Federal Departments and agencies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion, Department of Indiana, in annual convention assembled, That, we appeal to and urge the Veterans' Administration to exercise its right and priority to acquire the Bunker Hill Naval Air Training Station and to convert the same into a rehabilitation center and hospital; and be it further

Resolved, That, copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, General Omar Bradley, Administrator, United States Veterans' Administration, and to the United States Senators and Congressmen from the State of Indiana.

PROPOSED TUBERCULOSIS HOSPITAL

Whereas World War II veterans are being discharged from the armed services suffering from tuberculosis; and

Whereas there is no United States Government tuberculosis hospital in the State of Indiana, and our veterans are required to go to a veterans' facility located in some other State; and

Whereas experience has shown that World War I veterans would not remain in hospitals so far away from their families, and that they would leave the sanitarium and return home and then later again reenter the hospital, and that some have been readmitted to different hospitals numerous times; and

Whereas a bulletin from the National Tuberculosis Association states very few of these patients have completely recovered and many of them have constituted an army of discouraged men spreading tuberculosis throughout the country; and

Whereas many of the World War II veterans who will be discharged suffering from tuberculosis have already been away from home 2 or 3 years and will not want to leave their families and friends for treatment in a remote veterans' hospital: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion use its influence to have tubercular veterans of World War I and World War II treated as near their homes as possible, and that a tuberculosis hospital be set up centrally located in the State of Indiana to remedy this situation; and further, that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the national executive committee and all Members of Congress from Indiana, and released to the press.

"Not Unduly Exacting" About Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, when Secretary of State James Byrnes said, in explaining the failure of the London Conference, that "we have not been unduly exacting" of Soviet Russia "in regard to Poland," he stated our foreign policy in relation to that unhappy country with painful accuracy.

The partition of Poland was a violation of the Atlantic Charter, of the Moscow agreement, and of every declaration of

intent toward Poland made during the war by the United States or its elected representatives. Our statesmen concurred in this partition on the ground that it would best serve the interests of world peace. Poland, our ally, was sacrificed on the altar of "peace" to Soviet Russia on the very same ground that the Czech Republic was sacrificed to Nazi Germany at Munich. At the time that the sacrifice was consummated, certain guaranties were given to the residual Poland by the great powers: freedom of elections, religion, publication.

How these guaranties have been observed is described by the New York Times correspondent, Gladwin Hill, in a recent series of dispatches, of which the following are excerpts:

One of the most frequent questions that a correspondent traveling in Poland is asked is: "When is the American Army coming to liberate us from the Russians?" As incredible and preposterous as this may seem, it is a widespread notion. The Moscow-created Polish Provisional Government admits the existence of this feeling. The Government-dominated newspapers have repeatedly acknowledged it. * * * The Government ascribes such talk as it ascribes virtually everything that does not please it—to reactionaries. However the explanation is not so simple as this. The writer has heard the talk from persons who definitely were not reactionaries, although they, of course, were indulging in wishful thinking. The fact is that the people of Poland today have ample reason for disliking the Russians. * * * Ancient animosity was intensified in 1939 when the Russians helped the Germans partition Poland for the fourth time in 150 years. This was not completely effaced by the Russians' subsequent arrival in the role of liberators, especially as their liberating extended to a lot of Polish property with a zeal hardly distinguishable from the Germans.

Russian authorities have in fact admitted that the Red Army, when it got to Poland, regarded it as enemy territory and drew little distinction between it and Germany.

The Russians have looted Polish industry * * * and * * * in the new western territories of Poland have taken away 30 percent of the industrial equipment. * * * The Russians have been herding farm animals by the thousands eastward * * * Russian supply troops by the thousands are settled down on the Polish countryside—the official figure is more than half a million Polish acres now being farmed by the Red Army—using the agricultural resources. * * * The Russians stripped the Polish ports of Danzig and Gdynia of most of their cranes and other maritime equipment and have taken at least three of the harbor's four important floating drydocks. This correspondent has visited Polish hospitals that have been stripped of their linen and other essential supplies by the Russians.

The Russian-Polish trade agreement * * * seems curiously one-sided. * * * Under it Poland gives Russia 5,000,000 tons of coal and coke. Silesian coal operators, 75 percent of whose production is going to the Russians (although thousands of Poles are going to freeze this winter for lack of fuel), say the Russians are paying a dollar a ton for coal, although it costs more than that to mine and the Russians are selling the same coal in southeastern Europe for ten times that price. * * *

In numerous conversations with Poles to discover the exact sources of their resentment toward the Russians the writer found that it was mostly the simple fact of the Russians' presence in Poland, not just physically but mentally, and the influence they evidently are trying to exert—the new occupation which some Poles even compare unfavorably with the German occupation. * * * They resent the setting up in their provinces of Russian military organizations under Russian generals to preserve order. They resent Russians' staffing their army and synthesizing a new Polish navy while the real Polish navy remains abroad. They resent a propaganda with the stamp of Moscow being sponsored to them by their Moscow-created provisional government.

Inflation has been added to the other troubles in Poland. Several weeks ago, to combat the trend, an offer was made to transfer the gold reserve of the old Polish Republic which is now on deposit in the United States and Canada. This offer was refused by the Polish Provisional Government by direction from Moscow, since the Kremlin—that is, the Politburo—does not trust even its own creation in Warsaw with any degree of financial independence. Under present conditions the only money circulating in Poland is unsecured paper notes, printed and issued by the Soviets, and guaranteed by them. The guaranty, of course, is simply a control of exchange which sets the rate of Polish zlotys with reference to Soviet rubles.

Every observer agrees on the prospect of a famine in Poland, due about equally to the hasty, unscientific splitting up of land and removal of practically all farm animals and tools, and the immense consumption or carrying off of foodstuffs by the various Red Army units en route home, or in garrison in Poland. In this connection many Poles recall the purge by famine of Russian peasants some 15 years ago, when the Moscow Government decided to liquidate the kulaks and other small landholders.

The details of the present situation in Poland, as given by Mr. Hill in a dispatch published by the New York Times on October 29, 1945, show living standards to have sunk to the barest subsistence level:

CHAOS MAY DEFEAT SOVIET IN POLAND—CONSERVATISM OF THE PEASANTS MAY ALSO BE A FACTOR TO CAUSE REDS' UNDOING

(By Gladwin Hill)

WARSAW, POLAND, October 17.—There are two things that may eventually defeat the Moscow-dominated Communist regime in Poland.

One is the fact that it is a tiny minority sustained by military force and disrupted conditions and that the majority of the Poles still are conservative farmers. The second thing is the extremely difficult economic situation, which would tax the resources of the ablest administration with unanimous support. The difficulty of coping with it may precipitate a reaction against the Moscow team that is running Poland by decree.

It is too early and the situation too muddled to appraise the effectiveness of the regime in dealing with conditions. Many bold steps have been taken, and conditions are improving, although it would have been hard for them to get much worse.

No one can find fault completely with the present economic system in Poland because it is a strange transitional economy with something in it to please everybody—collectivism, socialistic cooperatives, even nominal free enterprise.

SEEKS TO HELP TRADE

The Government has undertaken to ameliorate the paralysis of the normal interplay of agriculture—which constitutes two-thirds of Poland's life—and industry by stepping in and taking part in the production of each and supervising exchange. The farmers, in addition to their ordinary taxes, have to sell an average of 20 percent of their production to the Government at low fixed prices, which run as low as 5 percent of the prices the farmers could get on the free market.

This food is distributed in towns at fixed-price stores. Similarly, the Government buys up part of the manufactured goods and distributes them at low fixed prices to farmers through cooperative stores. However, this covers only a small part of the normal agriculture-industry interchange. The remainder in each case is left to find its way through free channels, which, because of the shortage of transportation and other distribution facilities, amount to a black market economically, although not juridically.

The system only scratches the surface of the problem, leaving urban people to scrounge for a lot of their food, and, in the present state of industry, leaving farmers shy a good deal of their needs of manufactured goods. The farmers are complaining that they are getting "gypped" even on the basis of the limited interchange. They say that, for every 3 zlotys' worth of produce that they are giving up to the Government at approximately double the prewar prices, they are getting back only 1 zloty's worth of manufactured goods priced up to six times the prewar values.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES HELPED

There is such a severe inflation, with bread costing a hundred times what it did before the war, while salaries are still close to the prewar basis, that the Government has been forced to make adjustments so that people can eat. All Government employees—whose monthly salaries don't average much over the cost of a pair of shoes—receive food rations. These are liberal enough so that if there are several in a family it may end up with an excess in some item like sugar, which they can sell on the free market to get additional cash, and this practice is officially countenanced.

Similar improvisation is in effect in industry—which is largely under Government control—and other fields. Workers in a typical textile mill in Lodz, for instance, get in cash only a few hundred zlotys weekly—a little over a dollar at the free rate of exchange and not worth much more in purchasing power. A loaf of bread costs 25 zlotys. But in addition to cash wage workers receive pieces of cloth to sell on the free market to get additional cash. Employees of hotels—virtually all of which have been taken from private owners and are now operated by municipal governments—get low cash pay but receive one or more meals daily.

Nurses in a typical hospital get only 800 zlotys a month for a nominal 46-hour week, which actually runs about 70, but they get their meals.

From the foregoing it will be seen that a large number of Poles are now working directly or indirectly for the Government for little more than their subsistence and that Government control has been extended far. This is done at present on the ground that the national emergency necessitates centralized control. Few would gainsay this any more than the United States after Pearl Harbor, although they might question the sort of centralized control that has been instituted. The Government's long-range economic program still is not precisely defined.

HAZE OVER THE DETAILS

It has been announced that heavy industry will be "nationalized," with a Government bureau controlling each industry, although such details as what industries will be considered "heavy" and what compensation may be arranged for the private owners, domestic or foreign, and what the system of management of the enterprises will be have not yet been revealed. Formal "nationalization" has not been applied anywhere yet, but virtually everything is under Government supervision,

and in many cases old managements have been replaced by persons whose background is obscure but whose political inclinations are obvious.

There are no indications of any scheme to collectivize farming generally, and this is hardly feasible. There are many peasants, albeit humble, whose holdings have been in the family for a century, and they are confirmed property owners.

The gist of official pronouncements is that it is intended ultimately to have a mixed economy, with enterprises of general public interest controlled by the Government, national, regional, or local; distribution concentrated in the socialistic cooperatives, of which there are said to be 6,500 (half of them consumers' cooperatives) with 2,000,000 participants; and some activities still under private enterprise.

There is no indication what ventures may be left under private enterprise. A cooperative system is declared the most desirable economy for Poland, on the ground that it preserves "the flexibility of private enterprise" with socialistic control.

It is intended to revive Poland's foreign trade, particularly with Russia, and it is hoped that at least half the imports and exports will be carried in ships of a Polish merchant marine; and to welcome again foreign capital, which before the war constituted 40 percent of the capital investments in Poland.

This is a good sounding program but its value depends, of course, on the execution. One school of thought is that the Communist regime stands to win either way. If it succeeds in getting Poland back on its feet the regime will have an argument for perpetuating itself, and if it does not, there will be such chaos that it will have grounds for keeping "emergency" control.

Another school of thought is that it stands to lose either way; that, regardless of whether it succeeds or fails, if the majority will manages to assert itself the regime will be thrown out in favor of one less Red and more Polish.

These conditions are substantiated by reports from Correspondent Chares P. Arnot, of United Press, reports which, like those of Gladwin Hill, were sent via the American wires in Berlin after the reporters themselves had returned from Poland and its censorship.

Mr. Arnot's views are taken from a somewhat different angle than those of Mr. Hill, but there is no difference in the basic facts disclosed.

POLAND FACING GRAVE PROBLEMS IN REBUILDING

(By Charles P. Arnot)

BERLIN, October 13, 1945.—Poland has come out of 6 years of war and occupation to be faced by the most difficult and delicate reconstruction problems of any country in Europe. The war also has left a great political wound which will take years to heal and may even require a major operation.

While the over-all picture today is not as chaotic as reports from exiled London Poles imply, neither is it as serene and optimistic as the present government of national unity would have the outside world believe.

SHARP POLITICS

There is a sharp political cleavage and both sides are eager to convince foreign visitors their case is right. It seems apparent that Poland is not well-informed on what is happening in the outside world—particularly concerning efforts to promote a lasting peace. If you have read one Polish newspaper you have read them all.

The entire nation is undergoing a transition and the sharp political differences naturally have bred suspicion on all sides.

The Poles generally fall into three broad categories—those who are avidly pro-Russian, those who are violently anti-Russian, and a middle-of-the-road group which believes that Poland can and will play the role of "bridge" between the Eastern and Western powers.

ELECTION IN SPRING

The present Government does not appear to have tremendous popular support, but only the forthcoming elections, set for next spring, can gage national sentiment.

The Poles admit that anti-Semitism still persists. However, the Germans virtually eliminated that problem by cutting down the Jewish population in Poland from some 4,000,000 to an estimated 150,000.

Economically and industrially the swing is to the left. Nationalization of all industries employing more than 50 workers and not financed by foreign capital is under way. The cooperative movement is growing more popular and is backed by the Government.

FEAR HUNGER

The Red Army is gradually returning the railroads to Polish use but there may be hunger in the midst of plenty this winter if the transport bottleneck is not eliminated.

You can drive for miles in western Poland without seeing a single cow or a horse. The Germans seized thousands of head of livestock and Red Army troops now maintain supply units to obtain food from local sources.

Throughout the entire trip I saw only one tractor in operation. Everywhere men, women, and boys were digging in the field with hand implements.

The Russian troops are generally unpopular in Poland but so are the American GI's in Paris, simply because they are foreign soldiers. What the Poles dislike most are the new Polish police, trained by the Russians.

If the material situation of the Poles is no less than desperate, their morale and spiritual strength is being tried almost beyond endurance. Thomas Babington Macaulay once said that his conception of hell was a place where the facts of history were constantly being distorted into the ears of an historian who was deprived of the power to correct his torturers. That is exactly what is happening in Poland today to millions of Poles who know their country's history and the tremendous efforts made by the Polish Republic from 1919 to 1939.

Luckily not all those who know the facts about Poland have yet been silenced. Here is one witness:

RELIGION FREE IN POLAND—STATEMENTS OF FOREIGN MINISTERS HELD CONTRARY TO FACTS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

As a Protestant minister who lived and worked in Poland from 1924 to 1941, I was struck by the statements of Wincenty Rzymowski, minister of Foreign Affairs in the present Warsaw Government, in an interview printed in your paper October 25. To quote: "In 1939, he recalled there was no freedom of religion, for example, because all other faiths were stamped out by the ruling Catholic church."

I, a member of one of these stamped-out religious minorities, hereby register my emphatic protest. Poland was only 75 percent Roman Catholic. Other Christian denominations and other faiths were not only guaranteed by the Polish Constitutions of 1921 and 1935 freedom of conscience and practice but actually enjoyed it. The fact that I, an American Methodist preacher, was able for so many years to live and propagate my religious beliefs in Poland sufficiently proves the falseness of Mr. Rzymowski's statement.

Mr. Rzymowski also states "that free education, abolition of class distinctions, and the improvement of the general standard of living were on his Government's program." He implies by this that Poland before 1939 had no free education.

As one who taught for a time in a Polish school, I am well acquainted with her prewar educational system. During 20 years of independence she established 28,722 free elementary schools for children between the ages of 7 and 14. In the year 1937–38, 4,851,000 children of all classes attended these public schools. In the same year there were 722 public secondary (high) schools with 221,200 pupils and 717 trade schools with 1,216 departments for special branches of industry. In the five State universities and two colleges of engineering the students paid only nominal fees for registration and examinations.

(The Reverend) GAITHER P. WARFIELD.
FREDERICK, MD., *October 25, 1945.*

From this evidence it should be perfectly plain to any impartial observer why our Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, said that we "have not been unduly exacting" in reference to our pledges—taken mutually with Soviet Russia—in safeguarding the freedom and self-government of the Polish people.

Jackson Hole National Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Wyoming Eagle of recent date. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the Eagle is the leading Democratic paper of Wyoming.

The people of Wyoming, regardless of party affiliation, were opposed to the dictatorial manner in which the Jackson Hole National Monument was created, and this editorial fairly reflects the sentiment of our people.

Congress alone has the power to create or extend a national park. The creation of this monument by Executive decree was merely a subterfuge to extend the boundaries of Teton National Park. Without a doubt this was clearly a usurpation of the powers of Congress. It constituted an unwarranted invasion of the rights of the sovereign State of Wyoming. The people of my State were pleased when the Congress passed my bill to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument.

In fairness to the people of Wyoming, the Congress insisted upon government by law instead of rule by Executive decree. The decision of Congress was eminently correct and it is the only way the matter can and will be settled.

The editorial follows:

IGNORANCE IN ST. LOUIS

Comes a copy of a recent issue of the St. Louis Times-Star containing an editorial based on the sale of a large block of Wyoming land. Before commenting on the Missouri editor's conclusions, we reprint in full what he has to say, as follows:

"INCONSISTENCY IN WYOMING

"The news wires the other day devoted a half dozen lines to a report from Cheyenne concerning the purchase by the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission of the entire

town of Lost Cabin, Wyo., and 58,000 acres of ranch land.

"If certain persons in Wyoming are in the frame of mind they were said to be in a year ago, there is trouble abrewing in old Cheyenne. Wyoming, if anyone has forgotten, is the State whose officials and other prominent citizens became almost hysterical when the late President Roosevelt set aside a parcel of scenic land to be known as the Jackson Hole National Monument. Too much of Wyoming's far-flung acreage already was publicly owned, it was argued. The idea of the President of the United States designating a few thousand more acres to be preserved in its natural state so that all America might enjoy it for generations to come was called a capricious encroachment on local rights.

"The area of privately owned land set aside for the Jackson Hole National Monument is 49,906 acres, and 33,795 of these acres had been acquired by John D. Rockefeller, Jr., for the specific purpose of turning them over to the Government for a national playground. If Wyoming could make such a fuss over 49,906 acres in Jackson Hole, how can it tolerate conversion of 58,000 acres at Lost Cabin into a State game preserve?"

The facts are these: The 58,000 acres of land in the Lost Cabin area were purchased by a Wyoming citizen, R. W. (Bill) Spratt. It happens that Mr. Spratt is a member of the State Game and Fish Commission, but this is irrelevant to the matter in hand. The land was bought by Mr. Spratt for ranching purposes, not by the commission for public-park purposes.

This leaves the St. Louis editor out on a limb, so to speak. There need be no more said. But it might be well to point out that even if he were correct in his assumption that the State game and fish commission had bought the Lost Cabin land for a game preserve, he still would be wrong in his assertion that there is anything inconsistent about Wyoming's position with respect to further Federal encroachment on State sovereignty.

It is one thing for the State to create and maintain a State game preserve and quite another thing for the Federal Government to take over a large block of Wyoming land for park purposes without consulting State government, the State's congressional delegation, or the citizens of the State.

Citizens and taxpayers have direct control over State government and over any enterprises in which it may engage. They have no control over and very little influence in management of any project which the Federal Government sets up. Where there might be no objection to State ownership of lands within the State, there could be serious objection to Federal ownership of such lands—especially when such a large proportion of the State's area already is federally owned.

It is worth noting in passing that St. Louis newspapers are the principal proponents of the MVA—a project which would deprive Wyoming of control over the waters of its principal streams. The St. Louis viewpoint seems to be that Federal encroachment is all right as long as the State of Missouri is not involved.

Regular Veterans Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following statement regarding the recent national convention of the Regular Veterans Association; also a news article from the Manchester (N. H.) Union of November 7, 1945, regarding a recent meeting by the Regular Veterans Association, honoring Earl Brennan:

The national convention of the Regular Veterans Association was held in Washington on November 4, 5, and 6. Under the direction of the National Council of Administration more than 138 delegates were represented in framing the slate of national officers and the program of the organization for the coming year.

William M. Floyd was again elected as national commander to guide the destiny of the RVA for another year.

With him were elected as his assistants Dr. Frank B. Gigliotti, Wardman Park Hotel, Washington, as senior vice commander, and Harold McIntyre, Van Nuys, Calif., as junior vice commander. Gigliotti is well known in Washington for services contributed by him to the Government during the war days in the OSS and other important committees, while McIntyre is well known on the Pacific Coast for his outstanding war service to our country.

Among the most important resolutions approved by the representatives of the RVA at the convention were:

1. To provide adjusted-service pay for veterans who have served in this war, as a practicable substitute for the present unsatisfactory provisions of the so-called G. I. Bill of Rights, under which the veteran receives injustice, generally, rather than benefits. Bills have already been submitted to Congress, and introduced by Congressmen IZAC and LESINSKI, to provide adjusted-service pay. They are H. R. 127 and H. R. 1176.

2. The 10-point program of the Regular Veterans Association which would provide inducements and incentive for the reenlistment of discharged personnel from our wartime Army in the Regular Establishment which must now be set up for future national security. The program provides for full payment of mustering-out pay for men reenlisting, a reenlistment allowance not to exceed $150, 30-day furloughs with pay to be granted for each year of service immediately, increase in pay levels of all officers and enlisted men, permanent commissions for the Nurse Corps of the armed forces, retirement after 25 years of active service, and retirement of officer personnel at 58 years of age with a minimum service of 34 years. Further recommendations of the program urge a peacetime Regular Establishment of such commissioned and enlisted strength as may be recommended by the War and Navy Departments.

3. Another resolution of the RVA urges Congress to take immediate action for the establishment of two veterans hospitals in the Territory of Alaska.

The organization was unalterably determined in its demand upon Congress that all members of the regular establishment should receive equal benefits with war veterans, in pension, hospitalization, domiciliary care and in civil service credits of 5 and 10 points for appointment in Federal jobs.

Congress and the War and Navy Departments were called upon for an effective program of universal military training. The RVA strongly recommended the famous Swiss system of military training or a limited modification of the system that would fit the conditions of our own country and the Western Hemisphere. It was stated that a program patterned after the Swiss system would guarantee the best possible defense of America against invasion which, the resolution stated, "will probably be the case in the next war into which we are forced by foreign ideologies and power politics."

The convention urged Congress and the Federal Government to see to it that all veterans be protected in their rights to jobs. It urged that the provisions of the selective service law guaranteeing veterans seniority above all others be enforced and that no veteran should be forced to join any union or any organization whatsoever, nor in any way be compelled to pay a tithe or tax to any group for the right to work.

One of the strongest resolutions adopted by the convention calls upon Congress to enact legislation making communism in this country a felony; calls for the indictment of ringleaders of the so-called Communist Party who made seditious speeches during war for the violent overthrow of our Government; and demands the immediate deportation of all aliens now in this country who advocate the overthrow of the Government or who are members or associates of any group which does.

The convention also went on record to restrict all immigration for a period of 10 years.

As honorary aides-de-camp of the national commander, the following veterans of past wars were appointed:

Elisha Ames, Sawtelle, Calif., Civil War veteran, 102 years of age.

Frank Conner, veteran of the Indian Wars, Arlington, Va., 82 years of age.

John Sullivan, a veteran of past wars and retired from the District of Columbia Police Department, 81 years of age.

Jack Price, a veteran of World War II, Burbank, Calif., 15 years old.

Out of a total of 23 national officers, 16 World War veterans were elected to office.

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Union of November 7, 1945]

HONOR OSS CHIEF FROM NEW HAMPSHIRE WHO HELPED LIBERATE ITALY

WASHINGTON, November 6.—Earl Brennan, New Hampshire-born Irishman who successfully united anti-Fascist Italians in a cloak-and-dagger enterprise to help liberate their country and hasten Allied victory in World War II, received a certificate of merit medal from the Regular Veterans Association tonight for distinguished service rendered as Chief of the Italian and Albanian Section of the Office of Strategic Services.

National Commander William M. Floyd, DSC, of Unalaska, Alaska, presented the award at a banquet attended by members of Brennan's secret team from all parts of the country, besides many prominent personages in and out of the Federal Government.

Speaker after speaker praised the modest New Englander for the 3½ years of unrewarded toil in which his agents gathered information and promoted anti-Axis sentiment among the subjects of Mussolini so that Allied invaders were hailed as liberators, fascism was overthrown, and thousands of lives were saved.

"Italy can never repay you, and America must never forget you," was the theme of the remarks by Dr. Frank Gigliotti, national adjutant of the RVA, who read the citation; Judge Eugene Alessandroni, of the Court of Common Pleas, Philadelphia; Dr. Charles Fama, president of the Osteopathic Medical Association; Prince Bomcompagni-Ludovisi, of Rome; Capt. Emilio Daddario, an OSS agent here; and the toastmaster, Victor Anfuso, of Italy, special assistant to the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization.

Moved almost to tears by their tributes, Mr. Brennan accepted the decoration on behalf of "his boys" everywhere who shared in the OSS achievements. In a lighter vein he remarked that his undercover work had given him the reputation of a combined Rasputin and Mephistopheles.

Mr. Brennan revealed he soon will return to his farm at East Westmoreland, N. H. He formerly practiced law at Keene and served in the legislature. He became acquainted with many of his Italian friends and fitted himself for his future war service as United States consul in Florence and Rome; also in Stettin, Germany; Gotesburg, Sweden; and Canada.

OPA Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a happy and prosperous people within the United States can only occur when justice accrues to all. There has been a constant barrage of propaganda, driving a deeper and deeper wedge between the peoples of the United States. This is no error of judgment, but it is malicious in its intent and dangerous in its results. There is evidence of this on every side today.

The Office of Price Administration is a symbol and a practical application of this policy. The idea of the Office of Price Administration yielding on the question of wages, but insisting that the business who pays the wages must absorb the increases, surpasses all understanding. The only answer to this question is that those who employ are fewer in number than those who work. It is pure and unadulterated politics.

The attitude of Chester Bowles on the automobile prices is reprehensible beyond question. The idea of some bureaucrat sitting in Washington, looking over the broad expanse of continental America, with no background of business experience, saying to the automobile dealers of the Nation, "You do so and so. I know more about your business than you do yourself." And we fought a war for freedom and for the democratic system.

Not alone is this policy being carried out against the automobile dealer. It is being carried out in many phases of American business, particularly in the lumber business and in the women's garment business. We were told many months ago that under new regulations they would channel vast quantities of cheaper goods into the hands of the people who had been deprived of having them for months preceding. The Office of Price Administration has had ample time to make effective its orders, and I say to this Congress unhesitatingly that they are failing miserably in every aspect of their endeavor to channel cheaper goods into the hands of the people in the lower income brackets.

Today, as has been the case down through the months, there is not yet available canvas gloves for workingmen and farmers. There is not yet available underwear for children, and it is almost totally impossible in many of the larger cities of the Nation to buy men's cotton or lisle undershirts. Many of the stores of the country today will show you these garments imported particularly from Switzerland, and some hosiery coming in from South America.

I reported to this Congress some few weeks ago an experience that I had in the women's garment industry in New York City, the greatest market in all the world. I have long been a buyer in that particular market. I said at that time, nearly a month ago, that the shortage of goods was more serious today than ever in the history of the Nation.

I have recently returned again from another visit to this market. I restate to this Congress that because of the maladministration and the ill-conceived methods of the Office of Price Administration, there never has existed a greater shortage of fabrics or manufactured goods in the city of New York than there is today. Contracts placed now for spring delivery are placed with an understanding that they will have the privilege of delivery dates as late as May and June. Remember, you are placing the contracts now, and you are told when you buy these goods that they will be delivered within this long period of time, only if they obtain the materials, and they have no assurance of securing materials.

The Office of Price Administration had for its purpose to hold the line against inflation. We are now face to face with the question of its having failed in that respect because it has yielded generally to wage increases. But because wages go to voters in great numbers, it has made this concession. By the same token, because the businessman is fewer in number, and less politically inclined, he is supposed to absorb the wage increases out of his volume of business. I want to make my case clear here. I think wages in many instances must be increased.

No more inconsistent or unreasonable policy, no more arbitrary and unbusinesslike method could ever have been engaged in. I do not want to go so far as to say that Congress should repeal the Emergency Price Control Act, but I do feel it is rapidly becoming an issue which must be decided, first because it is not stopping inflation, and for another and more important reason, namely, it is positively destroying production, when in the face of indisputable facts it goes on to issue arbitrary and unrighteous orders. The effort of the automobile dealers of the Nation was a clean understandable plan to present their case. There was nothing highjacking about it in any respect. It may be true that it was well organized, but it was carried forth on a high plane. Yet there is effort being made to indicate that the automobile dealers are a ruthless lobbying group, intent on destroying the American economic welfare. This, in spite of the fact that by and large the automobile retail dealers of the Nation sell an average of less than 30 units per year, and remember it has been many years since they had any units to sell.

Under unanimous consent, I include a statement on the question of the Office of Price Administration in a news item from the city of St. Louis, Mo.:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of November 12, 1945]

POLICY OF OPA CALLED MENACE TO DISTRIBUTION—STAND ON COST ABSORPTION HELD RECONVERSION CURB BY HEAD OF SALES GROUP

ST. LOUIS, November 11.—Charging that the present policy of the Office of Price Administration, requiring that increases in the cost of manufacture be absorbed in distribution, was doing irreparable harm to the Nation's distributive system and was retarding reconversion and full employment, George S. Jones, Jr., president of the National Federation of Sales Executives, urged yesterday in an open letter sent to 8,000 members of the organization that formal protests against the OPA's policy be sent to all Members of Congress as well as other key officials.

The OPA's present policy, Mr. Jones declared in his letter, was nullifying the efforts of the National Federation of Sales Executives and of all sales management in general to rebuild sales and distribution facilities so that the peacetime goal of 50 percent more goods can be sold, which is "essential to the support of the Nation's economy if maximum employment and prosperity can be accomplished."

"In face of the position now taken by the OPA," Mr. Jones said, "there can be only one conclusion and that is the OPA is refusing to give the green light to sales management in planning for postwar markets. Since OPA is basically an administrative division we can only conclude that this is the thinking of the majority of those people who at Washington are directing the affairs of the Nation at this time."

While part of this is due to a "deliberate intent to revise our entire economic structure," Mr. Jones continued, "much of it is due to a lack of interest and even to a lack of knowledge.

"The result is that through the OPA our Government seems to overlook the fact that the only possibility of maintaining a flow of business of sufficient size to support our postwar economy is in continued improvement in the distribution machinery."

Elephantine Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "Elephantine Outlook," which appeared in the November 12 edition of the Washington Post:

ELEPHANTINE OUTLOOK

The current issue of the Republican News, official organ of the national committee, is just to hand, and under the caption, "It's fun to be President," we note a front-page article set in parallel columns titled "Truman's 'My Day,'" on the one hand and "A Citizen's Diary" on the other. The publication endeavors to show—we suppose—that Mr. Truman is frittering away his time while the Nation burns.

This is meant to be comical, so we'll give you a sample in order to let you share in the elephantine mirth. The GOP version of the President's diary for Saturday, October 6, starts off as follows: "Motored to Berryville, Va., for Bennett Clark's marriage to Actress Violet Heming. Took part as best man. Back to Capital where three Government planes formed air party for a Missouri weekend to see Caruthersville County Fair. Smooth trip; slept and played poker. * * *" Since the imaginary citizen whose diary for the same day appears contiguously is concerned exclusively with strike problems, we take it that the GOP publicists are trying to prove that Mr. Truman's time is occupied exclusively with trivia. All that they have accomplished, however, so far as we can see, is to disparage as trivial three revered and firmly established American institutions, marriage, county fairs, and poker.

Morally, this is, perhaps, a peg above the party's recent efforts to prove that the late President Roosevelt deliberately invited the Japanese to destroy the United States Navy at Pearl Harbor. But, politically, it is un-

likely to prove any more effective for the simple reason that it is equally nonsensical. Whatever Mr. Truman's shortcomings, he has shown no lack of conscientiousness about his job. The GOP is likely to be no more successful in the future than it has been throughout the past decade if it persists in sterile negation and a juvenile carrying of the argument "ad hominem." The American people are looking for an affirmative program.

Matthew Fontaine Maury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis—a great university, and the finest naval training school in the world. The suggestion for the establishment of such a training school, on the work of which has been built the greatest Navy in the world, came from Matthew Fontaine Maury. He closed his distinguished career as a professor of physics at the Virginia Military Institute located in my home town of Lexington, Va., on whose board of visitors I now have the honor to serve.

In 2045 our Nation will be celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the discovery of how to split and harness the power of the atom, which we all hope will mean the end of future wars. That discovery of natural laws is no more remarkable than Maury's discovery of the natural laws of the sea, which gave to the mariner mastery over winds and tides and brought the nations of the world closer together than anything that had previously occurred in recorded history.

As a member of the State Senate of Virginia I secured the adoption of a resolution in 1922 to erect a monument to Commodore Matthew Fontaine Maury in Goshen Pass, Rockbridge County, Va. That monument was dedicated on July 9, 1923, by the great English scholar, C. Alphonso Smith, then head of the Department of English of the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis. On that occasion Dr. Smith said:

I

There is a peculiar propriety in the erection of a memorial to Matthew Fontaine Maury in Goshen Pass. Of all the pleasant places of earth, it was this place that swam last before his dying vision. It was from the beauty of this spot, treasured in his memory, that he passed into the realm of changeless and unfading beauty. It was the flowers that grow here, between Laurel Run and Anchor Rock, that he wished placed upon his coffined body as the last and only tribute of affection:

"Wait till the laurel bursts its buds,
And creeping ivy flings its graces
About the lichen'd rocks, and floods
Of sunshine fill the shady places.

"Then, when the sky, the air, the grass,
Sweet Nature all, is glad and tender,
Then bear me through the Goshen Pass
Amid its flush of May-day splendor."

Fifty years ago they bore him lovingly through this pass and heaped the flowers upon him. Today we wish him to abide here. As he did not forget Goshen Pass, so Goshen Pass has not forgotten him. This tablet is the pledge of a mutual love and constancy that will know neither variableness nor the shadow of turning.

II

This is neither the time nor the place for a biography of Matthew Fontaine Maury. I shall attempt only to say what seems to me the distinctive contribution that Maury has made to science and to civilization. That he has made such a contribution is evident. Why, for example, should a distinguished writer who had never heard of Maury till he visited Virginia, add after a few days of investigation: "Yet there is no one living in the United States, or in any civilized country, whose daily life is not affected through the scientific researches and attainments of this man?" Why is it that the United States Government publishes through the Hydrographic Office in Washington four great charts every month and puts at the top of each: "Founded upon the researches made and the data collected by Lt. M. F. Maury, United States Navy"? This is a recognition paid to no other naval officer, and these charts perform a service and have for three quarters of a century performed a service without parallel among Government publications. Something that Maury thought and something that he did have plainly become the heritage of the ages, and this heritage has grown rather than diminished with every passing year.

The great thought on which Maury was to build came to him at the age of 25. It was in the year 1831. This thought was that the sea, if investigated, would be found to have its laws as constant, as uniform, as variable as those of the land. Nature to Maury was one and indivisible. She was as sovereign over the three-fourths of the world which was fluid as over the one-fourth which was solid. The waves, the winds, the storms, the currents, the depths, and the temperatures of the sea were believed by Maury to constitute a system, a complex of cause and effect, constant in its regularity, perfect in its orderliness, and so mathematically interrelated that the mind of man could by patient investigation understand its phenomena and even forecast its processes. It was more than a theory with Maury. It was a faith, the kind of antecedent faith that had led Columbus, Galileo, Harvey, and Newton to their respective goals.

Tennyson makes Columbus say from his chains:

"The golden guess
Is morning star to the full round of truth.
No guesswork! I was certain of my goal."

So was Maury. Eleven years were to pass before he could put his faith to the test of actual proof. But the very intensity of his belief, the vividness with which he saw and felt the integrity of nature, and the inviolability of her laws on sea as well as on land, was to him in the nature of a demonstration.

It was easy for men to believe, even before proof came, that the quiet land was the abode of natural law. Its regularly recurrent seasons, its testimonials of evenly laid strata, its ancient forms of animal and vegetable life, its visible adaptations of form and function to climate and soil, all spoke of an orderly development which, by investigation, man could in part understand and control. But the sea was different. It was the very symbol of caprice and lawlessness; it suggested the unknown and the unknowable. If it had its laws, they seemed beyond the reach of rational explanation.

When Byron wrote, a few years before:

"Roll on, thou deep and dark blue ocean, roll!
Ten thousand fleets sweep over thee in vain;
Man marks the earth with ruin, his control
Stops with the shore."

He expressed the prevailing attitude. Fleets did sweep over the ocean in vain so far as collective research or helpful data were concerned. Man's control did stop with the shore so far as control was dependent on the understanding of winds and currents and a compliance with their inexorable demands. When Baron von Humboldt, 25 years later, wrote his monumental Cosmos, conditions were practically the same. Though his book was considered the last word on science up to the year 1844, his scant treatment of "oceanic discoveries" is but added proof that Maury was an unheralded pioneer. Had Humboldt deferred his discussion of the ocean until 1855, Maury's name instead of being unmentioned would have led the list of marine discoverers; for in 1855 Humboldt had recognized in Maury the master scientist of the sea and had acclaimed him as a world benefactor.

Whether Maury at the age of 25 had thought of any definite means of proving his faith in the sea, I do not know. I think that he had. In a letter written to his brother in 1833, Maury speaks of resigning from the Navy, adding, however, "I have too many notions." These notions held him, and they seem to imply not merely a new view about the sea but some hoped-for plan of carrying this view into effect. In the meanwhile, though only "a passed midshipman," he was growing in knowledge, range, and power. In 1836, he published his Navigation, a book that almost immediately displaced all rivals and remained till recent years the authoritative text on that subject. It is interesting to recall that Edgar Allan Poe was one of the first to proclaim the merits of the new book and to welcome in it the new spirit of research that was beginning to manifest itself in the American navy. In 1839, Maury's leg was broken in a stage-coach accident and he limped the rest of his life. He at once turned all the more resolutely to study and investigation and began to publish in the Southern Literary Messenger a series of articles called "Scraps from the Lucky Bag of Harry Bluff, U. S. N." Nobody knew who the author was but the criticisms of the Navy, though severe, were so wisely constructive that naval officers not only welcomed them but set about embodying them in a new and better naval organization. There can be little doubt that the Naval Academy, founded at Annapolis in 1845, is the product of the suggestions made by Maury in these articles.

III

In 1842 the great opportunity came. Maury was sent to Washington and placed in charge of the Depot of Charts and Instruments which he quickly converted into the National Observatory and Hydrographical Department of the United States. The man, the hour, and the task had met; and Maury was about to become the best known and most widely honored American living. He was to make our Hydrographic Office the observed of all observatories, and he was to prove to all scientists and to the mariners of all seas that the ocean is as law-abiding as the land.

The method that he pursued was almost as fruitful as the results obtained. It was the method of cooperation. He had blank forms, abstract logs, as he called them, prepared and sent out to all ships that would use them. These called for a sort of recorded diary of temperatures, air pressures, depths, winds, and currents over every surface of every sea that was traversed. The sea was asked to grant a continuous interview and thus to have its autobiography written. This it did willingly, never having been persuasively asked before. As soon as a thousand coworkers had submitted their chapters,

Maury was ready with his pilot charts and sailing directions, and these with a few changes but with Maury's name at the top are still piloting the ships of all the seas.

The effect on navigation was immediate and dramatic. As it was on the *Falmouth*, sailing from New York to Rio de Janeiro, that Maury had first thought about uniform winds and currents, he determined to make the first test of his charts on this route. The voyage was cut in half. In 1848 gold was discovered in California and our great clipper ships began to race with their freights from New York around Cape Horn to San Francisco. The average voyage was 183 days; it was reduced at once by Maury to 135 days. One American clipper, the *Flying Cloud*, keeping close to Maury's sea lanes, accomplished the trip in 89 days, making 374 miles in 1 day. No Atlantic steamer of the time had made such a day's run. So favoring were winds along Maury's routes that many an American clipper covered the 16,000 miles from New York to San Francisco without having to reef her topsails more than twice. Gold was discovered a little later in Australia and the average trip from England to the Australian mines was reduced from 124 days to 97 days. The annual saving to the United States alone on freight to and from South America, China, and the East Indies was estimated at $5,000,000. Maury found that zigzag routes had been followed from time immemorial on the trip from New York to Cape Horn and that the Atlantic was crossed nearly three times needlessly on each voyage. Sailors had heard of terrible currents if they sailed straight, currents which Maury found to be mythical, but the fear of which had lengthened the voyages and multiplied the disasters of ships for more than 200 years. It is easy to estimate the saving of time and money that Maury effected; it is impossible to estimate the number of lives saved or the number of shipwrecks avoided.

IV

But Maury's pinnacle moment was yet to come. His system of sea lanes had been utilized chiefly by American ships, his coworkers also being chiefly Americans. Wonders had been accomplished, it is true. Rivalry at sea had been stimulated; new instruments of measurement had been devised and old ones improved; Americanism had been quickened; a new pride in our naval prowess had been aroused; and the whole Nation had thrilled time and again when the news had come that an American clipper, following Maury's sea paths, had shown her heels to a British steamer, burdened with the coal that she had to carry on the long voyage to Australia. But Maury wanted all nations to cooperate with the United States Observatory and all ships and shipping to be correspondingly benefited.

An international conference was therefore called to meet in Brussels in August 1853, a memorable date not only for navigation but for international good will and cooperation. It was the first League of Nations. Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Russia, France, Portugal, Great Britain and the United States attended. Maury was at once nominated for president, but declined the honor in favor of the great Belgian scientist, Quetelet. The conference lasted 16 days. At its close Maury's meteorological charts had been unanimously adopted and nineteen-twentieths of the shipping of the world had come within the compass of his vast and beneficent design. When the count was made 50 years later it was found that Dutch seamen had turned in 3,500,000 of the prescribed log books accurately filled out, American seamen 5,500,000, British seamen 7,000,000, and German seamen more than 10,500,000. Maury, however, did not wait for these. One year after the great conference had met he was enabled from the data received to publish the first depth map of the North Atlantic and to point out the pathway for the first cable. In 1855 he published his Physical Geography of the Sea and inaugurated a new science. It was the first book to embrace the entire sea as its theme and thus to bring three-fourths of the world into the domain of recognized and intelligible principle. If some of its conclusions have been overthrown, as of course they have, let it be remembered that they were overthrown by a method of continuous cooperation which Maury originated and by the testimony of log books which he had drawn up. The trans-Atlantic sea routes, however, which Maury had already charted, have been changed in only one detail since his death. After the wreck of the *Titanic* in 1912 the great liners agreed to dip a little farther south to avoid the icebergs. This was not a modification of sea lane; it was a modification only in the time of changing from Maury's more northern to his more southern route.

But the Brussels Conference was more than a scientific triumph. It meant a new era in history. Never before had the great nations of the world come together to plan for the common welfare and to exclude no nation from their counsels. It was agreed that if war came Maury's logbooks should in no case be destroyed. Even if the ship were sunk in battle, the nations pledged themselves to rescue the logbooks and to transmit them to their destination. The data must not be lost. The observations of each must be harvested for the good of all. The past and the present must extend a helping hand to the future. Maury felt keenly the greatness of the moment and sought to turn the consideration of the conference from himself to the vast moral import of what they were witnessing. When Quetelet at the first meeting thanked Maury in behalf of all the delegates for his services to navigation, Maury replied:

"I am extremely grateful for the sympathy you have expressed and the praise you have been pleased to bestow on my humble efforts. On my part I beg to thank you for the kind assistance that you have afforded me. Allow me to add that we are taking part in a proceeding to which we should vainly seek for a parallel in history. Heretofore, when naval officers of different nations met in such numbers, it was to deliberate at the cannons' mouths upon the most efficacious means of destroying the human species. Today, on the contrary, we see assembled the delegates of almost every maritime nation for the noble purpose of serving humanity by seeking to render navigation more and more secure. I think, gentlemen, we may congratulate ourselves with pride upon the opening of this new era."

V

One other contribution to the new era Maury was yet to make, but a strange and tragic history was to release him for his new task. He had thought much and written much about the benefits that would accrue to the farmer if weather conditions could be anticipated on land as well as they had been anticipated on the sea. In the concluding remarks that he made in Brussels he expressed the hope that the time would soon come when a general system of observation would be established embracing both land and sea. In 1858 he wrote in one of his Sailing Directions To Accompany the Wind and Current Charts:

"As much as we have accomplished at sea, more yet can be accomplished through the magnetic telegraph on land. With a properly devised system of meteorological observations to be made at certain stations wherever the telegraph spreads its meshes, and to be reported daily by telegrams to a properly organized office, the shipping in the harbors of our seaport towns, the husbandman in the field, and the traveler on the road may all be warned of every extensive storm that visits our shores and while yet it is a great way off."

But there seemed little likelihood that Maury would ever have the opportunity to lead a crusade for a great weather bureau on land, though no one was so well fitted for it as he. Every moment of his time was occupied at the Naval Observatory. He had no thought of resigning. He was devoted to his tasks and problems. He was the recognized authority on marine meteorology in all lands. Honors such as no other American had ever received had come to him and were continuing to come to him from foreign governments. But all this was changed in the twinkling of an eye. War came, Maury resigned his position, was sent by the Confederate Government on a diplomatic mission to England, and did not see his native land again until 1868. In that year the University of Cambridge bestowed upon him and upon Tennyson the degree of LL. D. In the same year he declined the directorship of the French Imperial Observatory and accepted the call to the chair of physics in the Virginia Military Institute at Lexington.

Now began the last chapter in Maury's life. The thought of helping farmers, especially the cotton planters, by the establishment of a more effective Weather Bureau in Washington, inspired him with a zeal and enthusiasm that knew no bounds. He traveled and lectured in every section of the United States. The international mind had always been his and in a short time England and Russia were sending him resolutions of thanks for the stimulation of agriculture which his far-flung addresses had inspired. The chair of physics at the Virginia Military Institute had become the most potent platform in the United States for the propagation of the new movement.

But he had overtaxed his strength. Returning from a lecture in St. Louis he knew that his career was near its close. He must have known also that the victory had been won, that his sea charts had set the standard for the land charts, and that the task of interpreting nature in terms of help rather than of hindrance for mankind had been permanently advanced by his efforts. The end came quietly on February 1, 1873. "Do I drag my anchors?" he asked with a smile. "Yes," said his son. "All is well," he replied.

We dedicate this tablet to one who, though dead, yet lives and leads. We dedicate it to the founder of a new science, to the pilot of every ship that sails, to the herald of the new era of international cooperation. Matthew Fontaine Maury summed the past and projected the future. Over land and sea his spirit broods in abiding benediction.

Scientist Speaks on Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I have the honor to include the statement of Dr. Lyle B. Borst, of the Oak Ridge, Tenn., scientists' group, made before an informal meeting of Members of Congress held on Thursday, November 8:

You have heard eminent scientists. You now hear a nobody. My name is anonymous.

You have never heard of me. You have never heard of 95 percent of the people working on the atomic bomb. It is for this group I speak. We are the young people. No more than 5 percent of the scientists working on the bomb are of an age greater than 35. The bomb could not have been accomplished without the older, more mature, more skilled scientists. We, however, have been the backbone and the workmen of the project. Our jobs have not always been interesting. We have not been able to see where we are going because our information has been limited. We have been told what to do. We have done it.

I wish to speak in three capacities today. First, representing my Association of Oak Ridge Scientists at Clinton Laboratories as a group of scientists; second, representing my association as a group of citizens; third, representing a larger Federation of Atomic Scientists. As scientists many of us have been born and bred in the project. We have come to the project directly from school. We know nothing else. We look forward to future lives. We wish to live our future lives in an atmosphere of free discussion where we can talk about our work, where we can talk on street cars; where we do not have to use code names. I am sure you people would not like to confine your discussions of legislation to small private chambers. We do not like to confine our discussions of our work to restricted areas. We wish to be creative scientists—not purely destructive scientists.

During the war we have developed a bomb, the peacetime application of which may be of equal importance. We have had no opportunity to investigate it. We wish to live at peace with the world and with our consciences. We object to military security. We object to living on military reservations where a meeting of more than 10 people is a public gathering and must be approved by military intelligence. There are plenty of jobs, jobs as interesting as those we have undertaken, and which pay more. There is a great need for fundamental research. We wish to do these things. The May-Johnson bill continues military security as has been applied during the war, with the additional penalty of a $50 fine for willful or unknowing infraction of a security regulation of the presence of which we may not be conscious. There is no guarantee within the structure of the bill itself that security regulations shall be made known to those to whom they are to be applied. There is no appeal to the decision of the administrator or commission. If we are accused of infraction we have no defense. We are expelled from the project and prevented from taking a job associated with any project coming under the jurisdiction of the Atomic Commission. There isn't much attraction about working in this field except for the appropriations available to the workers. The fundamental work of science is often done with simple apparatus. A good brain is worth many thousands of dollars of apparatus. Fundamental work doesn't require the large-scale equipment that we have associated with the project. There is little to make us want to remain in the project. There is much to cause us to leave. In terms of the Nation's good the project must go on. We need excellent men in this field. We need excellent men in other fields as well.

We have had no advanced education in the last 3 or 4 years. There is a serious gap in our manpower. The younger people wish to return to school. When they get to school they must have instructors. For that reason many of the people on the project in peacetime will leave. The project must be set up in such a manner as to attract good men and not merely to repel them.

One small detail with respect to the May-Johnson bill. In amending it in the Military Affairs Committee the purposes of the bill were somewhat altered. In the original form the scope included research on the transmutation of atomic species; the study of nuclear fission; and the release of atomic energy. In the bill as reported from committee this phrase has been changed in two or three places, but has not been changed throughout the bill. The transmutation of atomic species is an extremely broad definition. If pursued to its logical conclusion it even involves potassium, a common element in the earth's crust. I personally feel that the bill should be gone over more carefully and the alterations made in some places applied to all pertinent passages.

Second, I wish to speak as a representative of my association as citizens. Our group has grown up within 2 months as a consequence of the use of the atomic bomb as a military weapon. Assertions were made in the papers that we felt were incorrect. We wished to correct these statements. It was a new movement in the realm of science for scientists to take social responsibility for the products of their science. We have restricted information. There are perhaps no more than 2,000 people within the United States who have adequate information upon the structure of the atomic bomb, its utility, its limitations, and its power. We have also had time to consider the problem. We have had years to consider the possible social consequences of the atomic bomb. These two categories place us in a different position from the rest of the citizens of the United States. It is, therefore, our duty to help to enlighten the people of our democracy so that the action of our Government will be in keeping with the informed opinion of the people. This we have organized to do. We must not only inform the public but we must also lead the public. That is why I am here today.

We are opposed to the administrative structure of the May-Johnson bill, since the Commission is composed of part-time men who appoint their Administrator not subject to recall. The Commission must meet at least four times each year. In reality the Commission will accept the recommendations of the Administrator and the Administrator will determine to a great extent the policies of the Commission. The Administrator is isolated with respect to the will of the people. He is appointed by the Commission, not subject to any approval by Congress, not subject to any recall by the Executive or Congress except for specified misdeeds. We want a civilian Administrator. We feel that the structure of the bill includes insufficient connection between the policy-making group and the rest of the Government. We feel that there is no close and necessary tie between the policy adopted by the Commission and the policy of the State Department with regard to foreign affairs. There are other legal aspects of the bill which we are not competent to consider. We are technical men. As citizens we feel that these things should be remedied. As legislators you may be able to see many other things not apparent to us.

In my third capacity, I wish to announce the formation of a Federation of Atomic Scientists. In the history of the last few months many groups have been organized in isolated locations, independent of each other. Each group has adopted the same platform, same purposes, and same aims. During the last week we have accomplished the coalition of six of these groups—yesterday it was four. These groups comprise more than well over a thousand scientists who have been working on atomic bomb projects. The aims of the federation are (1) to study the implications on our Nation and the world of the legislation of atomic energy; (2) to create a realization of the dangers that this Nation and all civilization will face if the tremendous destructive potentiality of nuclear energy is misused. Nuclear energy is atomic energy that you have read of in the papers. It is the technical term. (3) To help establish an atmosphere of world security in which the private possibility of nuclear energy may be developed; (4) to study the relation between the national legislation and the establishment of an adequate international policy.

We are also organized to give all possible publicity to the following convictions: (1) That a continuing monopoly of the atomic bomb by the United States is impossible; (2) that there can be no specific defenses against the destructive effects of the atomic bomb; (3) and by all odds the most important, that in view of the existence of atomic power no nation can in this new age feel secure until the problem of the control of atomic power is solved on a world level.

After-War Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK FELLOWS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bangor (Maine) Daily News of November 13, 1945:

AFTER-WAR WAGES

In all current debates over pay and prices, in the so-called non-white-collar brackets, two important factors seem to be overlooked:

1. The recent world conflict, and our share in it, forced this country into an abnormal economic condition.

2. With our expected return to a normal condition, the present emphasis on pay in the manufacturing industries will become disproportionate; our concern should have to do, not with that particular segment of pie, but with the concoction of "a real pie and a digestible one."

World War II did not start for Europe until September of 1938; for our country the shooting did not begin until the December of 1941. Yet, whereas only 29 percent of United States salaries and wages from all sources was paid by our manufacturing industries in 1939, they paid 43 percent of the total in 1944. The 1939 grand total was $43,800,000,000; the manufacturing industries' wage-and-salary share climbed in 1944 to $42,400,000,000—i. e., only $1,400,000,000 less than all the salaries and wages paid that year in all the country.

What that meant is clear: It meant that, thanks to war and the consequent rise of war industries, the country's economy had been completely transformed.

What it must soon mean should be equally clear. It must mean that today's demands for wage increases being concentrated on the field of manufacturing industry, they are concentrated on a field the great size of which is temporary and already shrinking. The war is over. We are supposed to be reconverting, with all possible speed, to a peace economy. The proportions may never again become what they were in the period just before World War I, but they will certainly not soon be what they were in 1944.

Moreover, if the present demands are carelessly granted, their effects will extend into far fields now unconsidered. Here is the case as a writer in the New York Sun sees it—and as it is:

"The grocer, the tailor, the shoe-repair man, the haberdasher—these are just as much concerned as are big operators in the manufacturing field with the effects of any

such national policy. Many of these small enterprises could be ruined by the application of a policy which big business might be able to survive. The little fellow, without financial reserves, cannot pay wages that are wholly out of proportion to what he takes in over the counter."

President Truman tells us we cannot hope, "with a reduced workweek to maintain * * * the same take-home pay for labor generally that it has had during the war."

He should add:

"During reconversion and later, we cannot hope to draw the same proportion of national income from manufacturing industry as during the war."

Demobilization Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, recently a number of my friends and constituents who are serving with the armed services in the Pacific have sent me copies of the Daily Pacifican. The issue of October 24 contains a careful analysis of conditions in the port of Manila in regard to the shipment of servicemen and servicewomen back home. The existing bottlenecks in the Atlantic and Pacific theaters stranding so many thousands of men and women eligible for release or at least relief in far-off areas are the major problems the armed services must now solve. A little initiative by the President—who after all is still the Commander in Chief, although this fact is not being given the wide advertisement it received during the summer and fall of 1944—immediately after VJ-day, and better management by the armed services could have prevented all this, because the Congress has provided everything the President and the armed services needed and requested. We provided also funds sufficient to solve all the supply problems of the war, and that material and money are still available. If it were only put to proper use, thousands of these men would already be back in the United States released from the Army and back in their homes.

To a great degree, the Army has solved its demobilization problem in the continental United States. There is no basic reason for these two distressing situations not being solved. Certainly Congress has done everything it can do and certainly Congress is ready to do more if called upon. If anything is needed, then let the executive department and these agencies just tell us what it is. I feel sure Congress would give unanimous approval to any suggestion designed to remedy this trouble.

As part of my remarks, I include the above referred to article from the Daily Pacifican, the Army newspaper in the western Pacific:

HOMEWARD SAILINGS LAG BEHIND GOAL—DEPOTS CROWDED; SHIPPING LIMITED; NO BIG EXODUS BEFORE NOVEMBER

(By Sgt. Dale Kramer)

MANILA.—Analysis of facts and figures gathered from various Army agencies concerned with moving troops home for discharge reveals that:

1. Shipments from Manila for the month of October will total about half the 77,700 called for in the troop-movement schedule announced by General MacArthur's headquarters earlier in the month, judging from the number already departed and shipping facilities in sight.

2. No large-scale movement of returnees can be expected before November 1. At best, about one-fourth of the returnees in the four depots which send personnel through the Manila port—Twenty-first, Twenty-second Twenty-ninth, and Women's Distribution Center—can hope to embark before November 1.

3. The crowded depots are accepting only a few returnees mostly over 90-point men, or men over 38 years old.

4. Returnees will leave the depots on a first-in-first-out basis, rather than according to their number of points.

5. As things look now not much help can be expected from cargo ships. Some returning Liberty ships carry a dozen or so returnees in vacant crew or guard spaces, and Transportation Corps is experimenting with a couple of Libertys. The War Department gives a flat "No" on hasty camping-out conversion.

6. No help from units of the fleet can be expected immediately. The Navy has been allotted troop transports for its own personnel.

The above conclusions are drawn from information gained in interviews with officials of AFWESPAC Transportation Corps, Replacement Command, and Far Eastern Air Force's Twenty-second Replacement Depot.

Military personnel sent home through the Manila port between October 1 and October 20 totaled 31,647, according to AFWESPAC Transportation Corps. The Thirty-eighth Division, shipped as a unit, comprised a little more than half of that figure.

If the schedule for shipping as of October 22 holds, places for 7,114 persons will be available during the balance of October, with the only big ship due at the very end of the month. Waiting to fill these places, besides regular returnees, are hospital patients and a few civilians who have been employed by the Army.

Thus if 7,000 Army returnees are given places the total shipped for October will be around 37,000, compared with the 77,700 goal set in the early October schedule.

Check of the four distribution depots which send personnel through the Manila port shows that between 30,000 and 35,000 men and women now occupy them. Exact figure on October 17 was 33,987, divided as follows:

Twenty-first depot: 1,043 officers, 1,919 enlisted men;

Twenty-second depot: 1,048 officers, 7,698 enlisted men;

Twenty-ninth depot: 2,040 officers, 10,969 enlisted men;

Women's distribution center: 768 officers (including nurses) and 512 enlisted women.

Not much change has occurred since then.

Length of time returnees have remained in the depots varies from a day or two for new arrivals, to a month and a half for Wacs. Average wait before shipment has been running about 3 weeks. Prospects are that the waiting period will increase rather than lessen.

At the two big AFWESPAC ground personnel depots—the Twenty-first and Twenty-ninth—men with less than 90 points who appear are being sent back to their units until such time as space becomes available. Men with over 90 points or who are over 38 years old are received if they have permission to enter from the replacement command, the Air Corps' Twenty-second depot, overcrowded, is not accepting men.

The depots are shipping personnel on a basis of first-in-first-out, rather than on a basis of high pointers first and on down. This will mean that many men with points in the seventies will leave before many with over 90. What happened was that some units made low-point men available before high-point men—quick-acting units moved low-point men to the depots faster than others got high-point men in.

Procedure for mustering men out of AFWESPAC depots is this:

Shipment orders are cut in groups (usually of 25) to separation centers in the States, according to the arrival of men in the depots. Replacement Command says that in the case of small separation centers it may require a couple or 3 days to fill a list of 25, but that the spread is never more than 3 days. Thus 2 men who come into a depot at the same time should leave within not more than 3 days of each other.

Cargo-ship commanders who have berths available are required to report them to Troop Movement. In this way small lots of a dozen or two returnees have been moved. But the War Department does not permit transportation of troops on unconverted cargo ships.

A few days ago the War Department did, however, grant permission to AFWESPAC Transportation Corps to convert Liberty ships under certain circumstances. But the change-over regulations are strict, with most of the usual transport conditions required—fresh vegetables, hot meals, bunks, refrigeration, and so on. Transportation Corps is now experimenting with a couple of Libertys. Once converted, a Liberty will be able to carry between 500 and 750 men.

Address of Hon. A. Pearley Feen Before the Vermont Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 5, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks, I wish to include an address of Hon. A. Pearley Feen, delivered as retiring president of the Vermont Bar Association before that association on October 2 entitled "A Code and a Court for a Developed Jurisprudence."

It is well worth the attention, not only of lawyers but of all citizens.

A CODE AND A COURT FOR A DEVELOPED JURISPRUDENCE

I have chosen a subject with which I feel that our bar and the profession in general will necessarily have frequent contact during the immediate and distant future.

A jurisprudence has been developing in which the Vermont lawyer has heretofore had little interest. It has now become our professional obligation to give attention to the field of labor law.

The importance of this problem is evidenced by the fact that very recently Mr. David A. Simmons, president of the American Bar Association, has publicly endorsed the program of voluntary conferences between management and labor organizations in order to avoid impending controversies between the groups. He has written the Secretary of Labor and offered the assistance of the American Bar Association to that end.

Gov. J. Howard McGrath, of Rhode Island, in his inaugural message to the last session of the legislature, proposed the establishment of a division of labor relations within the superior court of that State, but the recommendation did not provide a forum

for final adjudication (p. 15, Governor's Message, January sess., 1945).

In Vermont industry and labor have recently paved the way for the establishment of an industrial relations council.

These efforts relating to conciliation and arbitration are a necessary part of the program to insure industrial peace. This paper, however, deals with those matters which cannot be disposed of by conciliation or arbitration and should not be subjected to a decision by compromise.

It is impossible here to detail the progress of the development of many phases of this jurisprudence. I have therefore attempted to present a discussion of certain aspects which suggest the need for an orderly legislative scheme and a tribunal to administer the program.

It is my humble opinion that this jurisprudence has now reached the stage of necessary codification and that provision be made for its administration according to established judicial standards in order that both employer and employee may engage in their respective pursuits with a full understanding of their rights and obligations, not on the basis of the paternalistic whims of a political administrator who is solicitous of the good will of either employer or employee or a self-constituted arbiter of social policy. We need enactments and a tribunal which will provide certainty and not uncertainty and confusion with respect to labor relations.

Frequently the uninformed have taken the easy way out in considering the problem of labor relations by labeling employee activities as communistic. It has been interesting to note in pursuing the investigation for the preparation of this paper that such a conclusion is not warranted as a historical fact and actually is disputed by the development of industrial rights and obligations.

England is a constitutional monarchy. Nevertheless consideration of labor relations had a prominent part in England as early as the seventeenth century and all of this occurred long before bolshevism was conceived. Therefore, the answer does not lie in an antagonism to a consideration of industrial relations on the basis that it is communistic and has no place in a democratic civilization. We must meet the problem on some other and valid ground.

History establishes that it is not entirely a psychological change alone which develops labor reform. In other words, it is not solely the result of the activities of solicitous unions or solely the result of the activities of paternalistic employers. One factor has always been labor plenty or labor shortage. The treatment of labor plenty or labor shortage is the result of the attitude of a current civilization to the problem. Ultimately, it is to a large extent a practical result.

The development of certain phases of this jurisprudence in England has been strikingly similar to its development here. Let us briefly consider one form of similarity.

For example, during the recent war we naturally developed a labor shortage. Many employers were after the same workman. This form of competition was detrimental to the war effort. It could only ultimately result in an inflation which would take away from the employees the excessive wages which they could demand in such competition. In this country we met the situation in a practical way but incidentally in the very same way that an attempt was made to meet it in 1349 and 1351 in England.

In this country we enacted the Wage and Salary Stabilization Act, Public Laws 729, Seventy-seventh Congress, enacted on October 2, 1942, and there followed Executive Order 9250, which established the Office of Economic Stabilization and delegated certain powers to the War Labor Board. At the same time we amended and tied into the program the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, regulating prices. We attempted to solve the labor shortage problem by freezing the employee in his job and his wages and at the same time by similarly freezing the prices of the things which he must buy, except to the extent permitted by the statutes, as of a date prior to the enactment. All of this has historical precedent.

England suffered a pestilence, referred to as the Black Death, and mortality rose from 5 percent to 50 percent during 1348 and 1349, and there developed a labor shortage due to the resultant depopulation of the country. The remedy applied was the promulgation of the Ordinance of Labourers published in June 1349 and the enactment of the Statute of Labourers in February 1351 which provided severe penalties for leaving employment and froze hours of labor and rates of wages (Cunningham, Growth of English Industry and Commerce, 40). However, in England the effort was one-sided as the government was unable to stabilize prices and the program was not as successful as was our program during the war (Lipson, The Economic History of England. 90).

On the other hand, an oversupply of labor in this country brought about the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, enacted on June 25, 1938. One of the purposes was to extend employment by providing overtime compensation after 40 hours and thus spreading employment by reducing the normal workweek (*Williams* v. *General Mills, Inc.*, 39 Fed. Supp. 849).

The attitude toward combinations of employees has followed a parallel course in England and here. This may have been due either to our adoption of the common law of England or a similarity of industrial psychology. Let us first briefly consider the experience of employee combinations in England.

During the eighteenth century, Parliament termed such combinations and their purposes "evil examples" (7 Geo. 1 St. 1 c. 13).

In *Rex* v. *Eccles* (Leach CC 274, 1873), Lord Mansfield said:

"The illegal combination is the gist of the offense; persons in possession of any articles of trade may sell them at such prices as they may individually please, but if they confederate and agree not to sell them under certain prices, it is conspiracy; so every man may work at what price he pleases, but a combination not to work under certain prices is an indictable offense."

Conspiracy prosecutions continued in England into the nineteenth century and substantial departure from the conspiracy theory came with the enactment of the Molestation of Workmen Act of 1859 (22 Vict. c. 34). This legislation has been referred to as the peaceful-persuasion statute. The cases disclose prosecutions for conspiracy in the 1870's (*Regina* v. *Bunn*, 12 Cox CC 316). In 1875 the Conspiracy and Protection Act was enacted, and this statute permitted combinations in trade disputes and exempted the same from conspiracy prosecution, and in 1906 such combinations were exempted from liability for civil conspiracy (the Trade Disputes Act of 1906, sec. 2).

In this country the criminal-conspiracy issue seems to have been raised first in 1810 (*People* v. *Melvin*, 2 Wheeler CC 262 N. Y. 1810). The American concept was reasoned in 1935 by the chief judge of the New York Court of Appeals as follows:

"If combinations of this description are lawful in Geneva, they are so in every other place. If the bootmakers may say that boots shall not be made for less than $1 per pair, it is optional with them to say that $10 or even $50 shall be paid, and no man can wear a pair of boot without giving such price as the journeymen bootmakers may choose to require. This, I apprehend, would be a monopoly of the most odious kind. The journeymen mechanics might, by fixing their own wages, regulate the prices of all manufactured articles, and the community be enormously taxed. Should the journeymen bakers refuse to work, unless for enormous wages, which the master bakers could not afford to pay, and should they compel all the journeymen in a city to stop work, the whole population must be without bread. So of journeymen tailors, or mechanics of any description. Such combinations would be productive of derangement and confusion, which certainly must be considered 'injurious to trade.' Such consequences would follow were such combinations universal. It is true, that no great danger is to be apprehended on account of the impracticability of such universal combinations. But if universally or even generally entered into, they would be prejudicial to trade and to the public; they are wrong in each particular case. The truth is, that industry requires no such means to support it. Competition is the life of trade. If the defendants cannot make coarse boots for less than $1 per pair, let them refuse to do so; but let them not directly or indirectly undertake to say that others shall not do the work for a less price. It may be that Pennock, from greater industry or greater skill, made more profit by making boots at 75 cents per pair than the defendants at a dollar. He had a right to work for what he pleased. His employer had a right to employ him for such price as they could agree upon. The interference of the defendants was unlawful; its tendency is not only to individual oppression, but to public inconvenience and embarrassment." (*People* v. *Fisher* (14 Wendell 8, 28 Am. Dec. 501).)

Similar prosecutions were conducted in Massachusetts (*Commonwealth* v. *Hunt* (4 Metc. 111, 38 Am. Dec. 346)), New Jersey (*State* v. *Donaldson* (32 N. J. L. 151, 90 Am. Dec. 649)), Connecticut (*State* v. *Stockford* (77 Conn. 227, 58 Atl. 769)), Vermont (*State* v. *Dyer* (67 Vt. 690, 32 Atl. 814)). In the Vermont case the headnote clearly states the holding as follows:

"A combination of two or more persons to constrain an employer to discharge a particular workman by threatening to prevent his obtaining other workmen, or to constrain a workman to join a certain organization by threatening to prevent him from obtaining work unless he does so, is a criminal conspiracy at common law" (at p. 690).

And in this country we finally have the counterpart of the Trade Disputes Act in the Wagner Act (29 U. S. C. A. 157 et seq.).

It therefore becomes apparent that society in the two English-speaking nations has over the years recognized the problems of the worker and emancipated him from restraints rejected by an enlightened civilization. This was accomplished without the assistance of administrative agencies as self-constituted defenders of human liberties.

In this country during the present century many Federal and State laws have been enacted for the benefit of the worker, such as child labor laws, workmen's compensation acts, equal pay for equal work statutes, antidiscrimination laws, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Walsh-Healy Act, the Wagner Act, wage stabilization, and we now have pending the Federal industrial relations bill. All of these had for their purpose the improvement of the situation of the worker.

The United States Department of Labor publishes annually a pamphlet entitled "Digest of State and Federal Labor Legislation." During the period from September 15, 1935, to August 1, 1944, various State legislatures and Congress enacted 1,007 statutes classified as labor legislation, of which only 22 were enacted during the period between August 1, 1943, and August 1, 1944. A business enterprise operating in a number of States has before it a real task of compliance.

In our own State, labor legislation began in earnest in 1915 and has continued down through the last session of the legislature. It has followed the trend of safeguarding the

health of the employees, providing compensation for disability due to industrial accidents, and unemployment compensation insurance.

Having in mind this broad background of the development of labor law, and especially the fact that in a decade we enacted over 1,000 statutes upon the subject, we next inquire as to how this jurisprudence is administered.

On September 5, 1945, Comptroller General Lindsay C. Warren made the following statement to the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

"You need no bill of particulars from me to show that the field of labor relations is spread around the Government without rhyme or reason. I have a list of eight departments and agencies having a direct bearing in that field. Certainly this is a field for study under any reorganizing authority. It is reported that some efforts along that line already are under way, but nothing of real value and permanence can be accomplished unless we have a law (proposed bill for the reorganization of Government agencies) such as here suggested to make it effective."

Original jurisdiction for the disposition of controversies arising out of the Federal enactments is presently vested in administrative agencies who adjudicate by at the same time prosecuting and deciding liability of the employer or employee in every instance except under the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Walsh-Healy Act in which instances the agency must resort to the courts to enforce its administration of the statutes. The situation is not better with respect to the matter of jurisdiction over State enactments.

A brief consideration of some of the methods and theories of these agencies will establish that the adjudication of controversies by such agencies has not been judicial but rather autocratic and with a violent disregard of recognized judicial processes. They have administered the law according to their purpose and have made no effort to administer justice.

The State constitution of Arkansas was brushed aside by the National War Labor Board for Region VII in the Ward Furniture Manufacturing Co. case (case No. 111–14141–JB) upon the ground that the Federal Government had exclusive jurisdiction to settle labor disputes. In that case it appeared that the Arkansas Constitution prohibits the denial of employment because of membership or nonmembership in a union. However, the War Labor Board directed employer to include a union-shop provision in its contract while the constitutional provision was in full force and effect and its validity had not even been subjected to a court test. It justified its ruling on the basis that haste was necessary during the war period. It further justified its position on the ground that Congress, not the Federal Constitution, intended that the War Labor Board might disregard a State constitution. However, while the Stabilization Act was still in effect, so that the circumstances were the same, the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida in *American Federation of Labor* v. *Watson* (60 Fed. Supp. 1010) upheld an amendment to the Florida Constitution similar to the Arkansas amendment in a suit by a union seeking an injunction against its enforcement. The court sustained the Florida amendment against the charge that it violated the Federal organic law with the following clear statement:

"The wording of the Florida constitutional amendment is difficult, but it definitely does not violate the First Amendment by abridging freedom of speech or of the press or of the right of assembly, or the right of petition to the Government for redress. The assaulted amendment undertakes to preserve to employees, in full vigor, the right of collective bargaining. Instead of preventing or abridging the rights of speech, press, assembly, and petition, the amendment seeks to preserve it to those who do not join a labor union as well as to those who do. This amendment has no similarity to anti-picketing statutes or statutes which require the payment of a license by a labor organizer. The amendment is not in violation of the First Amendment to the Federal Constituion. The same is true of the allegations as to its violation of the Fourteenth Amendment. There is no prohibition against a citizen belonging to any union that he chooses, but the prohibition seems to be against requiring membership in the union in order for a citizen to be eligible for work. Under statutes of the United States, such as section 102, title 29, U. S. C. A., a citizen is declared to be free to join a union or not, and one of the purposes of that statute, as well as the National Labor Relations Act, was to accord to employees full freedom to belong or not to belong, to a union. The Florida constitutional amendment prohibits no one from joining a union but undertakes to declare that it shall not be a condition precedent to the right to work. It does not deny the labor union member the equal protection of the law, but appears to be designed to give to the non-union worker a protection of law which he had not theretofore enjoyed" (at p. 1015).

Every word of the above quotation is applicable to the Arkansas amendment.

This administrative agency followed the pattern of such institutions, that its purpose and that alone must determine the rights of the parties, that its power and authority is without constitutional restraint and that the citizen is without constitutional rights.

The dangers from an uncontrolled administrative agency are manifested with respect to one phase of activity on the part of the National Labor Relations Board. The Wagner Act, which the Board is committed to enforce, requires employers and unions to enter into collective-bargaining contracts. The contracts are in writing, and since the inception of the Wagner Act phrases and terminology having a recognized technical meaning have developed. From time immemorial written agreements have possessed a quality of binding force when entered into in the ordinary course of business. Such contracts have been protected by rules which prohibit the introduction of oral evidence to vary them. A well-known English writer has expressed the quality of such documents in the following language:

"It is likewise a general and most inflexible rule that wherever written instruments are appointed either by the requirement of law, or by the compact of the parties, to be the repository and memorials of truth, any other evidence is excluded from being used either as a substitute for such instruments or to contradict or alter them. This is a matter both of principle and policy—of principle because such instruments are, in their nature and origin, entitled to a much higher degree of credit than parol evidence; of policy, because it would be appended with great mischief if these instruments upon which men's rights depended were liable to be impeached by loose collateral evidence." (Starkie Evidence, 9th Am. ed. 587.)

This rule is ingrained in our American jurisprudence. Notwithstanding this well established obligation between the parties to a written contract the National Labor Relations Board so disregarded this fundamental principle that the United States Supreme Court in *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Sands Manufacturing Co.* (306 U. S. 332, 83 L. Ed. 683) was called upon to remind the Board that "the legislative history of the act goes far to indicate that the purpose of the statute was to compel employers to bargain collectively with their employees to the end that employment contracts binding on both parties should be made."

Again in an earlier trial of the Sands case (reported in 96 Fed. (2d) 721–725) the circuit court of appeals said: "The statute does not compel the employer to renounce reliance upon its rights under a valid agreement."

This willingness to disregard binding agreements by the National Labor Relations Board should be convincing proof of its inability to act in a judicial capacity. On this occasion the employer was the victim. On another occasion the employee might be the victim. In either case neither employer nor employee have a contract upon which they could place any reliance were it not for the intervention of the courts if the courts will have any influence upon this administrative agency and this is not a fanciful doubt.

Another phase of jurisprudence which has become ingrained in our system is the degree of proof required to establish a fact and reach a judicial conclusion. Administrative agencies have for a long time operated on the basis that they were not bound by the common-law rules of evidence. It is true that some laxity is allowed these tribunals but the State courts have generally jealously curtailed the extent to which the disregard of rules of evidence might be indulged in by such tribunals. In Vermont our supreme court cleared up the growing understanding that there were no rules of evidence which applied to the administrative tribunal when it laid down the rule that the commissioner of industries is bound, to a certain extent, by such rules. (*State* v. *Belfore*, 108 Vt. at p. 403.) The Federal courts have continuously found it necessary to remind the National Labor Relations Board that it must hear causes and determine them in accordance with judicial standards especially with respect to the degree of proof necessary to support a decision upon issues of fact (*National Labor Relations Board* v. *Atkins & Co.*, 147 Fed. (2d) 730 and *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Indiana Desk Co.*, 149 Fed. (2d) 987).

Very recently, one of the administrative agencies, in an employee controversy, assumed to interpret a statute contrary to the interpretation placed upon it by the courts for a long time. The issue is briefly put by Judge Hutcheson in the following language:

"But, says the Board in effect, the question is not what the courts think the act under construction here means, it is what the Board thinks it means, and the Board has spoken. Thus by virtue of being constituted the Board to administer the act, the Board has been endowed with a prescience, invested with a prepotence in respect of statutory construction to which the courts must bow, though the facts are undisputed and the question is entirely one of law. Thus by the simple expedient of having a lawyer, under the dignified name of general counsel for the Board issue an opinion and then adhering by a bare majority to that opinion, the Board is enabled to read the statutes as it will." (*Duquesne Warehouse Co.* v. *Railroad Retirement Board*, 148 Fed. (2d) (C. C. A. 2) 473, 477.)

In repudiating the claimed prerogative of the Railroad Retirement Board above described the court said:

"The very structure of our institutions, the very sources from which they derive, the judicial section of the Constitution itself all concur to make it crystal clear why Congress has never given, why it could not constitutionally give to the construction of a statute by the general counsel of an administrative body or by the body itself, controlling weight, and that the 'appropriate weight' which courts give to such construction is that which is not inconsistent with settled constitutional doctrine. The heresy eagerly advanced by some devotees of the administrative, as opposed to the judicial, process, and sometimes tolerated, sometimes toyed with judicially, that giving 'due weight' means the surrender of the judicial office of interpreter of statutes, has never had official sanction" (at p. 478).

What I have indicated to be the attitude of three labor relations agencies is true with

regard to all of them, both Federal and State. Any remedy must, therefore, be all inclusive.

We thus find ourselves in the situation of having established many rights and obligations of both employer and employee which are administered and controversies arising thereunder adjudicated on an independent basis by numerous administrative agencies.

The independence of this aristocracy of genius, uncontrolled by reason, precedent, and judicial restraint, is undesirable and this confused administrative process will only tend to engender and perpetuate problems and strife which will impede industrial activity and economic progress.

Do these examples of administrative judicial conduct inspire confidence in such tribunals? Does the conduct of the agencies just described tend to stabilize industrial relations? The answer is inescapable that the present system cannot endure and that while it lasts we can have only dissatisfaction and controversy between employer and employee.

I realize that we dislike to surrender State sovereignty. However, the power of Congress, in view of the modern interpretation of the commerce clause of the Constitution, is almost complete with respect to labor legislation. The only phase which is not now controlled is workmen's compensation. Codification therefore is simplified if the States would be willing to accommodate their own statutory set-up to a Federal scheme as the rare instances as yet held to be beyond regulation by Congress, because not involved in interstate commerce, are so few in number so that this need not be a consideration.

We are now ready for the codification of this developed jurisprudence either by means of a uniform State act, a Federal act, or both. The bills of lading acts are a good example of dual legislation, with the Federal statute and the State uniform acts practically identical. The proposed adoption of Federal procedure for State courts is another example. Thus a solution to the problem of codification has precedent.

In the event of a Federal act the assignment to a State tribunal of concurrent jurisdiction to administer such a code enacted by the Federal legislature is recognized as proper.

See *Fitzgerald Construction Co.* v. *Peterson* (89 Law Ed. 889).

Such code could be administered in the following manner:

1. That enforcement be assigned to the industrial department in each State and in Vermont to the commissioner of industrial relations and to the Federal agency administering the act. Such enforcement to be exclusive when once instituted by either agency.

2. That a special State court be established with specific and limited jurisdiction to hear and determine controversies under these laws. The Federal District Courts shall have concurrent jurisdiction. Jurisdiction acquired by one court to be exclusive.

3. That the trial shall be conducted in accordance with common law or statutory procedures binding upon courts in general.

4. That the decisions of this special court shall be subject to review by existing appellate courts which shall hear and determine appeals promptly.

A comprehensive code administered by a special court should be a fair exchange for the right to strike. As a matter of fact it would eliminate factors which invite strikes, slow-downs, lay-offs, and lock-outs. The parties would and should be bound to accept the result as any litigant must after a fair trial. We would avoid the present feeling that the judge is the prosecutor.

The court's jurisdiction should include the adjustment of controversies arising under all enactments relating to rights of and benefits for employees established in a comprehensive code.

The proposed code will eliminate the confusion resulting from such a large number of statutes and the disregard of a substantial body of common law developed by courts which administered justice, and now administered by administrative agencies administering laws without regard to justice. The special forum is suggested in order to remedy the present undesirable administrative procedure and rule of decision. Industrial controversies must be adjusted promptly in order that commerce may not be impeded and a separate tribunal would afford the specialized knowledge and speed necessary in the adjustment of industrial disagreements.

Such a code and a court will provide binding precedents which will establish rights and obligations and thereby eliminate uncertainty of status in a labor dispute and reduce disagreements. It will eliminate the necessity to resort to the gratuituous aid of conciliators and arbitrators who compromise by cutting down the rights of each party to the controversy. It will eliminate a decision by a tribunal which institutes the proceeding against the party whose activities it is to judge. Finally, such a code and a court will promote economic progress.

Employers and employees over the years have paid the price of industrial peace. We should crystallize the lessons of experience into a comprehensive code and establish a forum to administer it in accordance with legal concepts which have withstood the test of time, and which will preserve to industrial disputants a fair hearing and a just decision and achieve social justice without the sacrifice of human rights.

A Bad Habit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, many of the letters that I am receiving are from former GI's who are now back in this country trying to make a living.

Under the GI bill of rights, they were to get certain privileges in purchasing materials declared surplus by the various branches of the Government.

Recently one of my constituents who had served 3 years in the Navy during this war stood in line at Camp Devens for 6 or 7 hours in an attempt to purchase an automobile truck from the War Department. When his turn arrived he was told that no trucks were available, although the disposing agency, RFC of Boston, had advertised such trucks for sale and had advised this young man to be at Camp Devens on a day certain.

The disposal of surplus commodities is not working out in accordance with the intention of the Congress. The boys we were going to help are being quickly forgotten. The whole system is a mess.

I desire to include the following editorial entitled "A Bad Habit," printed in the Army Times on November 10, 1945:

A BAD HABIT

It begins to look as if the veteran is going to be left holding the bag insofar as surplus property is concerned.

Unless Congress or the Surplus Property Administration takes prompt action to remedy the existing situation, veterans are going to fail in all their efforts to buy jeeps, automobiles or other desirable items that are short in the civilian market.

We think that it is time for the Government either to give the veterans an out-and-out preference on scarce items, or quit overselling a program that has no real worth to the veteran.

Congress indicated that it wanted the veterans to have a definite preference. The Surplus Property Administration, however, placed them in line behind the Government agencies, the States and the municipalities, and experience has shown that the quantity of desirable surplus items has not been sufficient to outlast the demands of these agencies. Thus, the veteran is getting no more than a tiny trickle of surplus items.

Once again a Government program to aid veterans has been oversold. Once again congressional double talk, bureaucracy, and official muddling have, in effect, broken what amounts to a promise to the ex-GI's. It's a bad habit.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. EWING THOMASON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower, Commanding General, United States forces, European theater, and Military Governor, United States Zone in Germany, before the House Military Affairs Committee concerning universal-military training, Thursday, November 15, 1945:

Gentlemen, in the interests of conciseness I have prepared a brief statement which I will read; then, I would like to make a few extemporaneous remarks. After that, I will be glad to answer any questions.

I understand that the official views and detailed plans of the War Department are being presented to you by others. I hope you will allow me to speak, not as a representative of the War Department, but as a citizen and as a professional soldier to whom has been given a peculiar opportunity to participate in the greatest effort ever made by our citizen-soldiery. My personal views are largely based on that unique experience.

The men who won the victories of Africa, Sicily, Italy, France, and Germany were able to do so solely because of their individual and unit training—their ability to work as a team. The long periods spent in training camps in the United States and in England were essential to the perfection of this teamwork. Thereafter, brief battle-hardening and our teams were superb. Certain phases of this training are highly technical, involving radar, signal communications, air operations, construction, transportation, and ordnance. All this work is interdependent, and each part is vital to success. All of it was minutely geared to an equally complex schedule of tactical ground force movements which required perfect unit training and above all, timing.

Time has always been of the essence in warfare but never was it more essential than in our most recent war. With the introduction of atomic and electronic warfare and the astounding advances being made almost hourly in aerial warfare, the tempo is increasing in geometric progression. If war comes to us again the fact seems inescapable

that we will not have time to train units before we are faced with the final issue of defeat or victory. Certainly it would be unconscionable to gamble on a fortuitous recurrence of the time to prepare bought by the blood of our allies in 1917 and in 1942. We must be prepared on M-day—the day the enemy strikes—or we may never be prepared to avert defeat at the hands of any aggressor who uses against us the weapons of the future. Our weapons must be better than theirs on that day, our resources must be promptly available, and above all our manpower must have already been trained. This training must be given in time of peace. Without a standing army of prohibitive size this can only be accomplished by training our civilian reserve, our citizen army. The most democratic way to do this is by universal military training, in which every ablebodied young man is fitted to discharge his duty to protect our freedom. This has been the ultimate solution in every major military crisis this country has faced. The only difference now and the great lesson of World War II is that it must be done before, not after, the first shot is fired.

I understand that to be the issue before this committee. Although I know the general plans, I have not had time to familiarize myself with all the working details of the War Department's plan for universal military training, nor am I familiar with the testimony already presented to this committee. However, I am familiar with the President's message and with the Woodrum committee report. I cannot state too emphatically my concurrence with the recommendations contained in those documents. On the basis of my obligations to the 3,000,000 Americans that served under me in Europe, I strongly urge their early adoption. Upon the expiration of Selective Service we should be prepared to commence the training of young men who did not form a part of the armed forces in this war. Although the veterans of this war constitute at this moment a splendidly trained reserve, we must keep it constantly and currently reinforced by younger increments trained in all the most advanced techniques which research and development in the technology of warfare are bringing forth at such a rapid rate. We must train them to avert World War III, not refight World War II.

I believe that every combat leader in our armed forces agrees that success is possible only when the mass of the Army is composed of younger men. They are more readily adaptable to combat conditions and possess more vigor and dash. Certainly, the technical services must comprehend a high proportion of younger men who are capable of mastering the radically new techniques of future warfare. Therefore, it is a matter of necessity as well as fairness to add increments of currently trained young men to the civilian reserve. The alternatives are the criminal sacrifice of untrained young men, or calling on unfair proportions of older men who have already done their duty. In either event we would be without the services of trained technical specialists who will only be found among the younger men.

I have been privileged to represent the United States in a responsible position in the armed forces of the United Nations. In this capacity, I am intimately familiar with the attitude of the leaders of the other United Nations to the armed forces of the United States. This familiarity assures me that in their minds there exists no fear of our motives in keeping ourselves strong. It is my personal opinion, that the greatest single motivating force for world peace today is the organized military potential of the United States—its resources, its technological advancement and its superbly trained manpower. This organization is being demobilized at an unprecedented rate but its potential for the maintenance of peace will continue so long as the world is convinced of our willingness and ability to vitalize it in time to meet any threat of aggression from any other power. This is our greatest assurance of keeping the peace for which we fought. Far from being contrary to the purposes and intent of the United Nations Organization, I consider it to be essential to the success of that organization. I know of no better or more democratic way to demonstrate our willingness and ability than to adopt now a program of universal military training. It is eminently fair to our citizen army who fought and won this war in two ways: First, it is the best way of assuring them that they did not fight in vain; second, it will relieve them in the shortest possible time of continuing to bear the burden, as the current trained civilian reserve, of defending the peace.

Gentlemen, I have heard many arguments about the desirability or undesirability of universal military service from a moral, educational and religious standpoint. These factors have always been of the greatest concern to me in the discharge of my functions of command. There is no question but that the sum-total of these values makes up the very essence of the thing we fought to preserve—our American way of life. But the facts of today must be faced. The preservation of our way of life in a world which twice within a single generation has fought to virtual exhaustion depends squarely upon the national security. That is a truism. I sincerely believe that the only practicable way to assure the national security is by peace-time military training and that this must be universal. No practicable alternative, that I have heard of, has ever been suggested. Therefore, I believe arguments as to the incidental disadvantages or benefits to be foreign to the main issue. I feel completely confident that the Congress can provide all the necessary safeguards to prevent abuses of a method forced upon us by a necessity which must be faced.

I feel sure that no true American would be willing to take on his own shoulders the awful responsibility for actively prohibiting all training and thus leaving our country defenseless and naked before a future enemy armed with the weapons of that day. But our fighting forces in war are always made up of civilians, so a failure to provide for the training of the civilian reserve amounts to nothing less than condemning us to such a state of helplessness. A large standing army would certainly be much more objectionable on all of these grounds even if it were not economically impossible to maintain one of sufficient size without impoverishing the country.

An aspect of this whole problem that deeply concerns me is that of the rights and the best interests of the young men destined to receive the training. I wonder whether any honest opponent of peacetime training has any clear conception of the difference between the trained and untrained men on the battlefield? In terms of the larger issue of victory or defeat comparison is scarcely possible because in modern war it is not possible to win without training. But in the more personal matter of the individual's chances for survival I should say that the trained combat soldier has at least three times the chances of the untrained to live to become a veteran.

I have sincerely searched my mind on this whole problem. Through the past 3½ years the picture of the progressive destruction of civilization which war brings was constantly before me. I keenly felt the burden of the terrible responsibility I bore. I shuddered particularly at the thought how close our own beloved country came to being afflicted with the same devastation and our own people with the same indescribable sufferings that came to the peoples of Europe. I know that if it had not been for the time given us by the almost superhuman efforts of our allies, we would not have been able to mobilize our resources or to train our men to avert disaster. I know that the nature of the weapons available to future aggressors make it ridiculous to hope that we will somehow miraculously be given this same time again. Our resources must be already available, our weapons must be second to none in speed and effectiveness. This means that we must be preeminent in technical research and in industrial mobilization, and we must have a trained force large enough to make our resources and weapons instantly available for our needs.

Thus we will be a potent power to preserve the peace, and in position to act swiftly in our own preservation if the tragedy of war again appears. I do not see how we can escape the inexorable logic of the fact that if we are to attain and maintain this reasonable and necessary position we must have a trained reserve of citizens in being. This means that we must train them in peacetime.

Automobile Dealers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am intensely interested in the opposition of the automobile dealers to the proposal of the OPA to cut dealers' discounts over the old historic discount which has been in force for several years.

I am thoroughly conversant with the automobile dealers' situation in my own district—the Sixth District of Michigan—and know full well the long and difficult struggle they have had during the war years in continuing their business and giving to their patrons proper service.

It seems to me that the OPA is endeavoring to establish by arbitrary rule something that is not in the interests of the dealers nor our citizenry at large. Certainly, if our automobile dealers are not allowed a sufficient discount in order to operate their business with success, and with some profit at least, the only result can be that thousands of those dealers will be put out of business.

Anyone who has studied the matter at all knows full well that our automobile dealers are confronted with increasing expenses due to higher salaries, increased rent, and operational charges. It would not seem to be the time when any cut should be made in dealers' discount.

The fact that when the war started there were more than 40,000 dealers, and the further fact that at the present somewhere between 30,000 and 35,000 retail automobile dealers still continue to operate, shows a heavy mortality rate. Should the dealers' discount be reduced, this mortality rate will greatly increase.

President Mallon, of the National Automobile Dealers Association, in his speech before the House Small Business Committee on November 8, gave to that conference a wealth of information and data that merits the study of everyone interested, not only in the automobile dealers themselves, but in small business

in general. In Mr. Mallon's speech, he gave facts and figures pertaining to the increase in rent, to increase in salaries and wages for employees, and to the heavy increase in operational expenses and maintenance. It would seem to me that this is not the time for the OPA to use any such drastic measures as they have proposed.

In the reconversion period, through which we are now passing, it is absolutely essential that unemployment be reduced to the limit, and that small business should be given the right to conduct their business with a reasonable margin of profit.

I sincerely hope that the OPA will appreciate the magnitude of the present problem, leave the discount rates as they are, and thus enable our automobile dealers to sell their cars and properly service them in the best interests of the people of our country.

Alaskan Frontiers for GI's Called Myth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following article is from the November 13 Washington Post:

ALASKAN FRONTIER FOR GI'S CALLED MYTH
(By George Connery)

JUNEAU, ALASKA, November 13.—Gov. Ernest Gruening today called the veterans' situation here horrible and warned former servicemen to take a long, careful look before shipping up to Alaska. He said the problem was too big for the Territory and called on the Federal Government to take it over.

At a press conference with touring newspapermen the Governor said he would do everything he could to end the officially sponsored myth that Alaska is a great new frontier for all the veterans who want to come up. Gruening cautioned former servicemen not to venture to Alaska under any circumstances unless they—

1. Have $2,500 in the clear and that won't last long.

2. Have a job or a business already lined up, because Alaska isn't the land of opportunity. Opportunity has to be developed here.

3. Know exactly where they're going to get housing. There are no surplus houses in Alaska. He said this shortage also is a potential handicap to any potential industries which must build their own housing once up here.

Conditions are so bad the veteran won't get his GI bill of rights protection Gruening said. Banks will not grant loans and even if they do they charge 8 percent. Veterans' Administration machinery in Alaska is a joke, he said. One man in Juneau, another in Anchorage, and a stenographer for a Territory one fifth the size of the United States.

Alaska has no regional VA office. Its official regional business, including approval of loans, has to be done through Seattle, 3 days away by boat and 8 hours by air.

Gruening is asking that Alaska immediately be given regional status as the first step.

Alaska sent 7,000 men into every service, of whom between 1,000 and 2,000 have been demobilized. However, these are only a fraction of the veterans who have eyes on Alaska. Leading the postwar rush to the North country are hundreds who served here in the Army or the Navy and like the life.

Every Government agency in Alaska and most private ones are flooded with tens of thousands of letters from men getting out of uniform. Most haven't seen Alaska and don't know much about it, but are determined to come up anyway.

The pressure has completely swamped Alaska's year-old development board, which should be a normal source of information. If a veteran wants to learn about Alaska, the governor advised him not to write there. He suggested contacting, instead, the Director of Territories of the Department of the Interior, or chambers of commerce in Alaska. This problem, one of Alaska's biggest, was born long before demobilization descended on the Territory.

For reasons of national defense there is a theory that Alaska should have a white population of 250,000. The late President Roosevelt advanced this general idea to Gruening, but the governor said he did not recall Roosevelt using the specific population figure. Roosevelt put more steam behind the proposal on October 19, 1944, after a trip to Alaska and the Aleutians.

The President, in a radio talk invited all discharged servicemen to swing northward and seek their fortunes. A little publicized State Department report in existence at the time offers more conservative advice. The North Pacific study estimates that no more than 15,000 new jobs will open up in Alaska in the next 10 years.

A group of influential Alaskans have a novel plan in mind. They propose a careful screening of applicants at Seattle to keep out of the Territory the possible misfits. Even that hasn't general support; one Alaskan said the trouble is the screening at Seattle probably would be done by a lot of civil-service people who know nothing about Alaska.

"We'd be behind the eight ball again," he said.

The part of the article I wish to call particularly to your attention is:

Conditions are so bad the veteran won't get his GI bill of rights protection, Gruening said. Banks will not grant loans and even if they do they charge 8 percent. Veterans' Administration machinery in Alaska is a joke, he said. One man in Juneau, another in Anchorage, and a stenographer for a Territory one-fifth the size of the United States.

Here then we find the veteran required to pay an interest rate of 8 percent when this administration is furnishing millions of dollars to nonveterans to buy farms at 3 percent; when other groups are furnished money for 2 percent; and when loans are being recommended for foreign countries at 2 percent interest and even this 2 percent with strings on it and to be paid only when business is good—that is, good for them.

Speeding Doctors' Transfer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., September 8, 1945.

SPEEDING DOCTORS' TRANSFER

A move launched in Congress to speed the transfer of doctors from the armed forces back to civilian practice was justified by the high number of physicians in the armed forces in relation to their numerical strength and by the dearth of physicians on the home front.

With an Army of seven million men and with 48,000 physicians in the Army this branch of the armed forces has one physician for every 145.7 men.

Luzerne County, with 425,000 population or thereabouts, has only 185 physicians remaining in the county. To serve this population each physician must take care of some 2,30) patients. This condition in Luzerne County, while it is less serious than in many other counties in Pennsylvania and in the United States, is typical in a general way of the shortage of physicians existing throughout the country.

On the Army basis, one physician for every 145.7 soldiers, greater New York City would be entitled to some 50,000 physicians. Even in peacetime there is no such number of physicians in New York City.

Congressmen, medical societies and the public, in pressing for early release of physicians not needed in the service, have reasonable grounds for their action.

Armistice Day Address by Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, November 16 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an Armistice Day broadcast by Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Twenty-seven years ago the guns were silenced in Flanders Field. We had fought the last war for democracy. We gave of our sons and our treasure to destroy the Old World's tyranny, and we made our sacred pledges for a new age of human liberty. Now again we come to this Armistice Day and we stand aghast as we realize that our hopes were in vain, our dreams of the future were a snare and a delusion. With sorrowing hearts we realize that with all the pious sentiments with which we have paid our homage to our sacred dead, that for the second time in one generation we have been sucked into the terrifying vortex of death and devastation, only this last war has been far more destructive—infinitely more. We face today a world where more than half of mankind are without homes and without bread. We face a world where hundreds of millions stand prostrate before the terror of the morrow without, as they mourn their slain dear ones in their hearts.

On this day let us remember that the soldiers by their sacrifice had won the war, but the civilians, because of their failure to sacrifice, had lost the peace. Freemen had proven that they had the martial discipline to defeat the foe; but they had also proven that they did not have the vision and the moral discipline to build the peace. The

world stands today on the threshold of the most dangerous age of all of human history. Let us remember that if another war will come to this bleeding earth it will mean the end of all civilization. Let us remember that if that war is not to come it will take far more than the moralistic vocabularies of opportunist politicians. It demands a sense of a great covenant with a divine law that freemen must translate into commandments for a new age, for in the words of a great American statesman last week, "All of history says that good faith alone is not sufficient for the peaceful relationship between men. Good faith must be coupled with a framework of order, of law, and of justice."

Let us remember this day that all we have in the United Nations is another League of Nations, with all the weaknesses of the past that will lead again to the betrayal of the future, unless with penitent hearts, with discerning minds and with steadfast lives we will raise aloft a growing, secret covenant of righteousness with men of all races and all creeds, a covenant of which we will be the faithful witness by the resolute purpose of our lives, so that our sacred pledges will not again become a scrap of paper.

The arrival of Prime Minister Attlee of Great Britain and Prime Minister King of Canada in our city at this time is a startling symbol of the duty that now rests upon the English-speaking world: To face together the great moral challenge of this dangerous age. We will see that challenge only if we speak the truth to each other and demand the strength of each other. Without England and her great revolution of the seventeenth century there would not have been the American Revolution of the eighteenth century; but America has been able to rescue England out of the old world's cataclysmic evil only because America has revolted against England in the past. The English-speaking world has been able to advance the cause of human freedom only because America, with all her pride and respect for the England that gave her birth, has refused to be shackled by the reactionary opportunists who from time to time have been in the saddle in England. In every land and in the heart of every people, as in the soul of every man, there is the struggle of the good and the evil, the far-visioned and the blind, the opportunist and the morally resolute, the forward-looking and those who would turn the clock back, the righteousness that is faithful to the sacred pledge and the wickedness that would make of it a scrap of paper, the spiritually covetous and the villainous that would ever be treacherous and the morally courageous that would build the ramparts of righteousness. America has has been able to save the English-speaking world because in the eighteenth century we fought the motherland to become more free and in the nineteenth century we prevented the motherland from shackling our industrial freedom. America would never have become the arsenal of the world's freedom if, with every homage to the England that gave her birth, she did not revolt against the blindness of her reactionary imperialism that would have stifled her. America has helped England and the entire English-speaking world, even as she has helped to broaden the horizon of freedom for all men, only because she has been true to her own vision.

The world today is virtually a condominum of Russia and America. They are the two world federations whose power straddles the globe. We must be on guard lest we compromise our vision of the future by any myopia about Russia. With all our friendship we must be on guard lest we be betrayed there; and with equal vigilance we must be on guard lest we be misled by the blind compromises of our English-speaking brothers. All over the world, even though the pattern of the new British Commonwealth is a clear shift of its historic framework from the coercive to the cooperative, there are still the entanglements of empire, a confused web of reactionary atavism and imperial egotism that in many lands is only a hair-breadth from being the unwitting accomplice of human vandalism—in a pattern that runs counter to the best of her own native tradition. If America is now to help the rest of the English-speaking world; if America is not herself to be dragged down into the vortex of new global catastrophe we must, in this hour as never before, speak the truth to each other, the truth that will reveal our common challenge and our common duty.

This is in fullest accord with the noble tradition of freemen exemplified in the great Winston Churchill. Only a few days ago I re-read his book, While England Slept, where he preached that kind of truth to his people, the truth they would not believe until it was almost too late, that they were heading toward doom. When the English people voted him out a few months ago it was not in condemnation of his magnificent leadership since Dunkerque, but in condemnation of the party they believed had led them to Dunkerque. Let us not forget, even as many Englishmen have, that in the years between the last armistice and Dunkerque when England slept, and failed to do its duty to the forces that would have built freedom in the Old World, that the people responsible for the tragic paralysis of England in those pre-Dunkerque years were not all Tories; that it includes many of the men in Prime Minister Attlee's party and Cabinet today. The Pact of Munich was the result not only of the Chamberlains, but the end-result of a fateful slumber to which more than a few of the labor statesmen of the last decades of England have succumbed. A few weeks ago, in his report to the Secretary of War, General Marshall said that America too, up to the eve of the war, was a sick nation. If there is now to be the clarifying vision to arouse us to a a more life-giving decision for the future, the English-speaking world, even as freemen everywhere, must not be timorous and hesitate to speak the truth for this is our first duty to our brothers in this fateful hour.

It is said that Prime Minister Attlee will discuss the atomic bomb and its relation to the new United Nations; that he will discuss the help they seek from this land in order to restore their trade and to rebuild the peace of the world; that he will also discuss the imperial problems of the middle and the Far East. All these are tied together and an alert America will demand that they be understood together. The American people today, mindful of its own mistakes and the mistakes of other free nations in the past, dare not accede to every request that Prime Minister Attlee may make, for it cannot, in this land that has virtually become a have-not nation as the result of two global wars, it cannot underwrite the military or economic commitments of the British Empire without an agreement on the basic policy that will mold her future. After the last armistice England went to sleep and we, in all humility aware of our own past ills, dare not assume that our English brothers are fully awake today. We have a responsibility to the future; and we need a strong England at our side. We can only afford to stand by the England that is strong; strong in an awareness of her duties to the rest of the world, an England that is aware of the sources of her imperial power and her country's righteous purpose, an England that is ready to keep her sacred pledges in a covenant of righteousness for which freemen now pray.

The entire world is now in the valley of the shadow of death, the fate that has come to men because the powerful were not righteous and the decent were not vigilant. We are headed toward a totalitarian hell unless the free nations by their bold vision lay the groundwork for a free world. It demands sanity and integrity, moral realism and spiritual heroism, if the world is now not to descend into an abysmal tribalism or a class fanaticism. Many Americans, aware of the responsibility that now rests upon this land, are asking profound questions about their own commitments and their basic affirmations. We are asking the same question of all the English-speaking world, who are closest to us in tradition and must share our strength or drag us down in our weakness.

There are many Americans, aware of the great significance of the Middle East, from the Black Sea to the Persian Gulf, as a future bastion of freedom, who stand aghast at the seeming implications of British policy. The riots that last week swept through the Arab world, the result of obvious planning; there are many who say that it was done to seem plausible to the gullible, the old policy of divide and rule, the old techniques of evading sacred pledges made to innocent people, whereby behind a facade of democracy, England is virtually an accomplice of an Arab feudalism that is as dismally blind to the future of freedom, even as it is willfully a betraya' of her word to the oppressed. Far more is involved in this whittling away of the original pledge of a refuge to the afflicted of Israel to settle in Palestine; far more than the death of millions who were kept out of Palestine to die in the death chambers of Hitler's Europe or to languish in the despairing cemetery of the Old World from which they have yearned to flee. The promise of a free home to the oppressed of Israel, a pledge made by England, with the authority of more than 50 nations of the world, as well as the Arab leaders; the moral callousness with which colonial administrators and opportunist politicians have torn that promise to shreds, in spite of the darkest hour t' at came to the afflicted, the hypocrisy and obvious duplicity of the entire record—far more is involved than the lives of the innocent who have sought refuge and who may now be left to die trapped in a hostile world as evil as the hell from which some have fled. Here is revealed the integrity and sanity of England's honor and England's soundness of vision for the future. Palestine as a refuge for the oppressed of Israel, in honest accord with the promise made nearly three decade ago, would be a strong, productive democratic state, a creative hub of a vital democratic Middle East in an Arab world heading toward freedom, an integral part of a free world. But a Palestine thrown into the lap of the politicians of the Grand Mufti, who during the war was the guest of Hitler and served as the provacateur for every move made against the free nations in their fight for survival, would only be nurturing the very evil in the Arab world after this war that England in her blindness helped to spawn on the European continent after the last war. This is the judgment of some of the noblest statesmen in England, men like Winston Churchill and a host of others of every political party who strive for a better world. But this kind of insight did not dominate English policy in the past decades. The little bureaucrats who have determined her policy in her colonial office and elsewhere are the same ilk who have led England to the edge of the precipice. Will England that after this blood bath has recognized her great mistake on the Continent of Europe now arise from her lethargy in Asia, and especially in the Middle East, that must be—if peace is to be—the hub of the world's communications and transportation, the bridge between the East and the West, the nerve center of the new democratic world for which we now hope?

We have heard in the last days that the atomic bomb requires a newly strengthened

United Nations Government to control the production and the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. They point out that there can be no defense against the atomic bomb, which will soon be known through scientific research to other nations; and the United Nations Charter must now be amended so that it will have the power to limit the armaments of all nations and all these must be controlled by its world government, through its security council, a council that must relinquish its veto power, and be part of a world court with compulsory jurisdiction over all nations and over all its individuals.

This is all sound except that it will probably not be accomplished or implemented unless the strategic areas of the world have strong democratic foundations. The amended United Nations Charter will be a step in the right direction but this Charter, like any other, must rest upon patterns of freedom embodied in the way of life of its peoples. Any charter, like any other pledge, can be a scrap of paper, unless the minds and the hearts of people are with it. Never as today has there been the need, and nothing would be as self-deceptive as to deny, that whatever may be the new United Nations Charter we must safeguard the strategic areas of the world for a democratic way of life; and, if we do not, then, by default, we are inevitably catapulted by the pressure of internal forces, seeking to fill the vacuum that is left, into the very totalitarianism we may abhor. That is why, however high may be the present diplomatic priority in our discussion of the atomic bomb, we dare not overlook the needs of such areas as the Middle East. Never has there been a clearer challenge to the conscience of England that she must now make up for her tragic mistakes of the past and build Palestine into the haven of freedom she had once espoused. Her loyalty to that pledge is the test of whether any charter of any kind of united nations, with all its promise of the future, is to be more than a scrap of paper in the promise of the morrow for which we have prayed.

There is much more I would like to add as a rabbi of an ancient people that has seen the world drown in the blood of the innocent. All I would say now is that the men of our tradition, with men of good will of all creeds—we have refrained during the war from saying what we could have said in the past because we believed, even against our deeper instinct, that the military effort of the struggle in the war demanded that we wait until the Axis was defeated. Now that they are vanquished and we see how brutal was the butchery of the unfortunate, how easily we could have saved them, how needless it was, how callous were the diplomats who professed freedom; now that we see the hopeless fate of those who have survived all one can say now is that we will not keep silent. We will speak if it is the last word we will utter. We will speak until the most depraved will understand, until the morally deaf will hear, that there is a pledge to the innccent that men who profess freedom must keep if all our talk of the hopes of tomorrow are to have any meaning for the generations to come.

H. G. Wells a few years ago has said, "Mankind which began in a cave will end in the disease-soaked ruins of a slum." If that fate is not to come to the children of men, then let us arise and cry out to the lethargic conscience of men who slept from the time of the last armistice, men who were saved from the very edge of doom by the valiant few who stood alone at the breach, that if this second war is to be the last men must now arise with a new discipline of their plighted word to the innocent who pray for a world of peace; men must now rise with a new fidelity and a new integrity, if there is to be any hope of the legacy of humanity, if our precious dead are not to have died in vain. Amen.

A New Decade of False Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, November 16 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely and challenging editorial written by Mr. Walling Keith, editor of the Gadsden (Ala.) Times, and appearing in the Times of last Armistice Day, Sunday, November 1, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW DECADE OF FALSE PEACE?

This is November 11, 1945.

Does the date mean anything?

Do you remember another November 11—a day the whistles blew, a day that meant the end of the war to end wars?

Maybe you remember it.

But we talked to a young man yesterday who doesn't remember a thing about the first armistice.

No; he doesn't remember a thing about it.

He just folded away a uniform and put some medals on the shelf last week. He fought in five battles. He wears a scar under his brand-new suit.

"No," he said, "I don't remember the first armistice. How could I? I wasn't even born then. I'm not but 26."

By the grace of God and not through any foresight of America's leaders who talked so much and did so little between 1918 and 1940, this young man is back home in Gadsden. There were times when the Army doctors thought he wouldn't ever come back.

"No; I don't remember the first armistice, and as for celebrating this one, well, what the hell? We've had a war between—and what does it mean any more?"

His words cut deep. They dug ruthlessly and brutally into a feeling of sentiment grown tender with years and memory.

And with them there came the certain truth that must be faced by all who cherish memories of a wonderful day that was born in such golden hope at the end of World War I.

The new generations will not cling to old hopes they have seen die.

Those who are too young to know the pains of that war and the joys of peace that came with the armistice can see only that we didn't make it stick.

They carry their own pains and joys of a war that is very real to them.

Armistice Day hasn't meant the same thing since that "day that will live in infamy." It never will mean the same thing again. It will be a day for tribute and honor to the heroes of 1917–18, but the magical touch of peace, that confident hope which dwelt in American hearts—it's all gone from Armistice Day. It will never return.

Today is a grave reminder that after 27 years we must start all over again.

Yet today we seem to have only one advantage over that eager beginning we almost made in 1918. We are at least conscious something should be done.

But like a truant schoolboy whose conscience hurts for the whipping he's going to get when he does go home, we still cling to the fishing rod and try to put troubled thoughts out of mind, try to put hard decisions away, try to evade the harsh facts of war and peace.

Our statesmen are war weary. They are tired.

Yet, except for a crackpot here and there, one or two political accidents and a handful of tender-hearted souls who cannot stand the thought of giving pain to the moment to save the hour, there is hardly a man in the Congress of the United States who does not know that time is wasting and with it hopes for as permanent peace as man can devise.

What has happened to the world organization to which men gave such devoted lip service when the guns were firing?

Why isn't Congress working night and day on some plan for a world organization dedicated to the preservation of peace?

We'll tell you why:

Congress is busy acting as the messenger boy for the people. It is busy reducing taxes, which is all well and good, but which is secondary to permanent peace.

Congress is busy listening to pressure groups who want OPA ceiling prices lifted from merchandise these pressure groups make.

Congress is busy trying to effect peace between labor and industry, which is all well and good—except that it is a damnable thing that we should be so bitterly fighting among ourselves we can't take the time to try to find some way to keep from fighting another war.

How many citizens have sent a wire or a letter to a Congressman, saying: "Do what you can to guarantee peace in the world and help save my grandchildren from war"?

Yet wires and telegrams are flowing into Washington by the thousands and tens of thousands saying: "Demand reasonable profits for my product." Or, "Demand higher wages." Or, "Help the bean farmer get 10 cents more a pound."

Mind you we do not say that it is wrong for selfish groups to seek their own advancement, or to ask relief from burdensome legislation, or to ask for a decent wage level, or to seek more profit.

But we do say that it is a sign of human cussedness that at this time when America's millions might be thinking of the lives of little children who one day may be killed by atomic bombs, they are all busy thinking about their own bellies and their own pocketbooks and their own vanities.

Last time we blamed a small group of willful men who physically blocked the peace program of Woodrow Wilson. That small group deserves only a small share of the blame.

The same kind of American people—that's you, that's us—who went haywire chasing mythical profits on the stock market, who thought more of prosperity than politics, who blew bubbles in Florida, who counted dollar profits they never earned and spent money they didn't have on necessities they didn't need; this same kind of Americans were to blame for not making a try at world peace in the first place—and not preparing for war in the second place.

It is not so much the bathtub gin we drank while voting dry, not so much the debts we made that we couldn't pay, not so much the silly investments we made in stocks, time, and public leadership that count against us. It is the good work we failed to do that was our greatest sin against a possible world peace.

November 11, 1945.

If Armistice Day means anything to you, when you go to bed tonight, instead of trying to figure out another way to squeeze a new dime from the customer, the boss, the Government or even the soil, say a prayer for the sleeping babies over this country.

God help them if there is another war.

The United States Merchant Marine Cadet Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Academy at Kings Point is to the United States Merchant Marine what the United States Military Academy at West Point is to the Army and the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis is to the Navy. It contributed mightily to victory in the war just ended, and it must be maintained in peace. Recently the training organization of the War Shipping Administration prepared an Academy register. It shows that since the Academy establishment in 1938 a total of 7,038 officers have been graduated.

The summary on pages 269 to 271 of the Register indicates that:

1. Information is available on 6,823 graduates, or 96.1 percent of the total, since 1938. Some of the 260 graduates on whom no information is available may be attached to ships, ashore with the shipping industry, or missing in action.

2. Of the 7,083 graduates:

(a) Ninety-two and six-tenths percent are serving as officers of ships. Of this number, 60 percent are attached to merchant vessels, 24.6 percent are attached to naval vessels, and 8 percent are at officers' upgrade schools and on leave from ships.

(b) Two and four-tenths percent are on shore duty, attached to War Shipping Administration training and foreign service units.

(c) One and one-tenth percent are casualties, lost and missing in action, physical disability, and prisoners of war.

3. Approximately 170 graduates are masters and chief engineers of merchant vessels and 61 hold the rank of lieutenant commander or above on active duty with the Navy.

Approximately 200 cadet-midshipmen and graduates lost their lives or are missing in action. Two were prisoners of the Japanese. Many were awarded decorations. Six Liberty vessels honor their names and three Victorys honor their academy at Kings Point and their cadet schools at Pass Christian and San Mateo.

Home States of graduates of United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and its academy, Kings Point, as of June 30, 1945

Alabama	40
Arizona	16
Arkansas	25
California	1,106
Colorado	36
Connecticut	149
Delaware	19
District of Columbia	71
Florida	98
Georgia	51
Idaho	8
Illinois	209
Indiana	63
Iowa	49
Kansas	39
Kentucky	27
Louisiana	119
Maine	38
Maryland	122
Massachusetts	407
Michigan	177
Minnesota	88
Mississippi	40
Missouri	80
Montana	12
Nebraska	23
Nevada	5
New Hampshire	21
New Jersey	549
New Mexico	11
New York	1,658
North Carolina	70
North Dakota	9
Ohio	242
Oklahoma	43
Oregon	55
Pennsylvania	609
Rhode Island	34
South Carolina	22
South Dakota	9
Tennessee	37
Texas	124
Utah	30
Vermont	11
Virginia	139
Washington	125
West Virginia	34
Wisconsin	100
Wyoming	3
Puerto Rico	3
Alaska	4
Canal Zone	7
Hawaii	17
Total	7,083

Mutual Housing, a Means of Increasing Home Ownership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 16, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the mutual housing plan is sometimes called the REA plan for housing. When the Government decided to assist in the electrification of our farms and established the Rural Electrification Administration, we discovered that when the people are encouraged to help themselves and to manage and operate their own business, they not only respond, but succeed in their ventures. Farmers organized rural electric cooperatives, borrowed money from the Government, electrified their farms, and generally have kept ahead of schedule in repayments. The rapidity of development, the efficiency of the cooperatives, the progress made in this field bear abundant testimony to the soundness of these principles.

Now it is proposed that a somewhat similar plan shall be offered for the extension of home ownership in America. It is proopsed that groups of people needing homes shall be permitted and encouraged to organize mutual housing associations, to determine what they want in housing facilities and to present financial proposals to a Mutual Housing Administration, which would be organized by the Government. Upon approval of such plans such associations would be able to borrow from the Government or from private lenders who would have the mortgages guaranteed by the Government. The soundness of the plan has already been demonstrated by several mutual housing associations. One in Dayton, Ohio, and one in South Bend, Ind., have been operating for more than 2 years and both groups have made outstanding records for low-operation costs.

Because of the widespread interest in this proposal and the questions which have been asked me about it, I am presenting herewith in question and answer form a statement relative to the mutual home-ownership plan.

Question. What is the mutual home-ownership plan?

Answer. A group of people interested in building homes for themselves, under their own direction and at the lowest possible cost, organize a mutual or nonprofit corporation. They then confer with representatives of the Government agency and get approval of the project, of the architects to be employed, of the plan for development, and so forth. The authority of the Government representatives is limited to determining the financial soundness of the plan as the concern of the Government is only that of protecting the Government's grant of credit or the Government's guaranty of the mortgage involved.

The Mutual Housing Corporation elects its board of directors and the directors appoint a manager and thus direct the building of the group of home units and development and operation of the project. The occupants of the houses then begin payment to obtain ownership through monthly payments similar to monthly rental payments.

Question. Would the occupant of a home unit in a mutual housing project begin to buy that particular house or would he begin to buy ownership in all the houses through buying ownership in the mutual housing association or corporation?

Answer. That is a question to be answered in each instance. The people will determine it for themselves. These are democratic associations which provide for one vote for each member of the association and for not more than one vote. Of course, the Government must determine in each instance whether the proposal is sound so that the loan will be protected. Some people will insist on ownership of a particular house, and perhaps a majority will adopt such a plan. Those who do not want to participate in such a plan would, of course, not join the association. In another project, the majority might decide that stock ownership in the corporation would be better for them and a plan might be developed for a long-time lease on a house for each house occupant. Some people contend that an owner's equity, if represented by ownership of shares of stock in a corporation, would be disposed of more easily and thus be more liquid. Other people contend that the occupant of a house wants to own that particular house. The plan should be flexible enough to permit the people to decide. The Government's interest centers in the soundness of the loan. It might be that a loan to a corporation might be deemed sounder in one instance and that a group loan in which individual responsibility, associated with a particular house, might provide greater protection for the Government's money in another instance.

There are only two interests that have to be decided justly and soundly. One

interest is what the people in the particular enterprise want and the other is the soundness of the Government's loan. The object here is to encourage and to help people to manage their own affairs. That is necessary if democracy is to survive. The Federal Government must not impose itself or its wishes in this respect on the people. Therefore, the Federal Government should be concerned only with the soundness of the mortgage and plan.

Question. How much down payment would be required?

Answer. The Mutual Housing Administration would have to determine that, but the minimum of Government assistance should be the minimum established for Government guaranty of mortgages to other builders through the Federal Housing Administration. But there is sound argument for more than the minimum of credit in some circumstances.

The Federal Housing Administration may now guarantee mortgages up to 90 percent of the value of the property. In other words, the home buyer need only make a down payment of 10 percent. The home buyers under the mutual-ownership plan should certainly be given equality of treatment. The minimum of consideration given to them would, therefore, be a plan where they would have to make only a 10-percent down payment.

But, there is justification for presentation and consideration, at least, of proposals where the home buyers would pay less than 10 percent down, and the authority given to the Mutual Housing Administration should permit MHA to consider such proposals.

There are large numbers of our people who need homes and who might be able to make an initial payment of let us say 5 percent or 2 percent or 1 percent. Housing must be had by these people. They are going to get it through being forced into slums as renters, or into what is now marginal slum housing, or they may get it through public-housing projects where the public, or Government, pays the entire cost of the housing, and then rents the house at less than cost.

We have one of two or three choices to make in attacking the housing problem for these people. They must have shelter. They have a right to a chance to escape from slums and semislums. Let us be fair with these people. Some of them may be victims of bad habits, and perhaps entitled to no assistance if judgment is to be made on a cold judicial basis. But most of these people are victime of economic conditions beyond their control. And even if this were not true it has been abundantly proven that society cannot afford to permit slums to exist. They cost society too much money in the cost of crime, disease, or bad health, low productivity.

Obviously, then, a social responsibility exists here which must be discharged. We cannot afford to perpetuate the slum. It would be the rankest sort of heartlessness to do so. Nor can the people themselves meet the problem. Where people cannot possibly afford to make any initial payment on their housing, either some public agency is going to have to build the houses or else some such plan as here proposed will have to be employed.

Would it not be preferable, then, where a group of people could make an initial payment of 1 percent or 2 percent, to provide them with the opportunity to get housing on their own responsibility on that basis?

Would it not be preferable where people can make no initial payment, where they are able to organize themselves into a mutual association and to assume the obligation of paying for their houses through monthly payments, similar to rent, and where they are able to assume the obligation of managing their housing projects, to provide them with that opportunity?

Every intelligent man must agree that broad authority should be given to the Mutual Housing Administration to adjust its credit plan to meet the needs that exist, to grant or to guarantee a 90-percent mortgage where that is possible and to grant or guarantee a 95-percent mortgage or a 98-percent mortgage or a 100-percent mortgage where it would be in the public interest to do so.

Of course, the objective of every housing plan must be home ownership. The Mutual Housing Administration should have the obligation of carrying on a constant and continuing education campaign to impress every occupant of a house to free himself from mortgage debt as rapidly as possible. The Mutual Housing Administration should be obligated to assist our people to understand that debt makes prisoners of our people and that they should aspire to be free from debt and be freemen.

In other words, let us suppose 100 families in Indiana wanted to build houses for themselves and needed them. Let us suppose that the need was so great that they might justify asking for the formation of a public-housing authority and for the development of public housing which would involve total-cost investment by the Government or State or city. Let us suppose the 100 families would prefer to organize their own mutual association and assume the responsibilities of management and they would present a proposal to the Government which would involve no greater investment or risk than would be involved in the building of public-housing projects. The Mutual Housing Administration should, in that instance, have the houses built through a mutual housing association.

Question. Is the mutual housing proposal a substitute for public housing?

Answer. Not necessarily. There are and will be many situations where it will be necessary to subsidize a housing development, situations where people have been impoverished until they cannot afford to pay for a house under any condition, or even rent a decent house without subsidy. The mutual housing plan would not meet those demands. Certainly there will be and must be need for public-housing authorities to meet those demands.

Question. Will we not then be confronted with a demand from people for subsidies regardless of whether their economic conditions justify subsidies and would not that defeat the purpose of mutual housing?

Answer. Public housing should only be developed where there is a complete showing of necessity for the subsidy. The average man does not want and will not seek subsidies. He will only take a subsidy of this kind when his economic condition compels him to do so. There will be thousands of families which will not qualify for public housing or subsidized housing and who will prefer the mutual housing plan. And the presence of a mutual home-ownership program will make possible a great reduction of the need for subsidized housing.

Question. What would be the interest rate on the mortgage?

Answer. That would have to be determined. If the Government insures the mortgage the interest rate should be equal only to the cost of money to the Government plus the small service charge. The Government may be able to borrow money at 3 percent, guaranteed. If so, the interest rate should not be over 3½ percent, guaranteed. If the Government is able to borrow money at 2 percent, the interest rate should not be over 2½ percent. The Government should not want to and should not be permitted to make a profit from these lending operations.

Question. Would membership in a mutual housing association involve any membership fee?

Answer. That would have to be determined by the association. Usually a small membership fee is required and small monthly dues are fixed to pay for the administrative cost of the association.

Question. Is the association incorporated?

Answer. Yes, it always is or should be. It should be incorporated under the nonprofit laws of the State or under some other law which would provide for incorporation of such associations.

Question. Would the mutual housing association have any control over the houses occupied by the members.

Answer. The mutual association would determine that through the democratic processes provided for in the association. But certainly an association would want to make certain that the common good of all the members was not injured by some irresponsible member. The associations formed have been voted, by their members, the right to require that property is maintained to the point where it does not injure the community. For example, if a property owner does not cut the weeds, the association does so and charges the cost to the property owned. The occupant might be required to paint his house to protect the mortgage and to maintain the value of the adjoining houses.

Those are matters which are worked out through the democratic processes. Everything is voluntary. No one is required to be a member of such association or to have a house in such a project, or to remain there.

Question. How long does the mortgage on such projects ordinarily run?

Answer. The plan now in operation for two projects provides for a mortgage by

the Government of 45 years to the association. But the association usually fixes its mortgage term at 30 years. This requires the house occupant to make a slightly higher monthly payment, but in that way he builds up an equity in the property. The association then permits the house occupant, in time of emergency, such as unemployment, to draw on his excess equity and thus protection is given.

Question. What about sale of the property or equity?

Answer. The house occupant is permitted to sell his equity to anyone who would be permitted by the association to become a member of the association. If the house occupant should be able to sell his equity at a much higher price than is the appraised value and the buyer could become a member of the association, he would be assisted in doing so.

Question. What advantages have been proved for mutual housing?

Answer. There are seven mutual housing projects now in operation. They have been managed at far less cost than any other housing projects, regardless of how the other projects are organized—by private speculative housing interests or by public housing authorities. The people living in the mutual home-ownership projects have appreciated the opportunity they have to manage their own business and to operate it, and they have been anxious to save and own their homes. They have been knit more closely into a community than have the occupants of any other housing developments. They become a little town government of which they can feel themselves an intimate part. They work together. They become mutually interested in the common good.

Question. Is there any saving for the home buyers under this plan?

Answer. That is a question which would be determined by the ability of the directors of the mutual association. But it has been proved beyond question that where people are given the opportunity to manage their own business they are just as capable and just as efficient as are other businessmen. Certainly if they are just as efficient they save through joint purchasing in large amounts, through joint planning, through personal supervision, through elimination of waste of all kinds. They save in many other places in fees of various kinds. Some people estimate roughly that at least 10 percent of the cost of a house could be saved and some estimate the saving might be as much as 20 percent. But it is impossible to justify any precise statement of saving. The people would be their own bosses through the democratic processes. They would work out their own destiny. Incidentally, there would be a saving in the purchase of large tracts of ground and its subdivision. The speculative housing industry usually has a good profit from its land speculation.

Question. Why is there any objection to this plan? It seems so fair to the people who are most concerned, the home owners.

Answer. It is hard to find any grounds for objection to the plan, except for motives of downright selfishness. For clearly the plan provides greater opportunity and more assurance to the home buyer and the public welfare is helped by any sound plan to promote home ownership.

Question. Why cannot the people themselves develop their own mutual associations without the help of government?

Answer. They can. But the average home buyer cannot pay more than 10 percent of the cost as a down payment. The housing industry has accepted that and has gotten the Government to insure mortgages up to 90 percent. The great sources of credit, insurance companies, building and loans associations and banks, et cetera, will lend on an insured mortgage up to 90 percent. But they are not permitted, by law, to lend more than 60 percent of the value of a property, generally speaking, when it is not insured. Therefore, the mutual needs the assistance of a Government guarantee. Inasmuch as the Government gives such a guarantee to the speculative industry, there is no reason why it should not be given to a mutual association.

Question. Someone has said the Federal Housing Administration could now, under existing law, guarantee the mortgage of a mutual association.

Answer. It could, and in a few rare instances it has. But little imagination about the possibilities of mutual home ownership has been shown. It has not encouraged mutual housing and there is no good reason to hope that it will. FHA apparently conceives its function to be to serve the housing industry as it has traditionally functioned. The Mutual Housing Administration would be designed to serve the people, the home buyers.

Question. What then is needed in the form of legislation?

Answer. We need amendments to the law which would create a Mutual Housing Administration obligated to do for mutual housing just what FHA does for other forms of housing. But this law should provide sufficient authority to the Mutual Housing Administration to permit it to develop a housing project for people under terms which would fit their individual needs. Of course, MHA would have the obligation to make no greater commitments than would be justified in the public interest and be sound from the standpoint of the National Treasury.

Gold Miner Answers Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 16, 1945

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from the general manager of the Idaho Maryland Mines Corp., one of the largest gold-mining enterprises in the world, in regard to a recent editorial occurring in the New York Herald Tribune. This editorial attacks a bill introduced by me and by Senator MURRAY for the purpose of securing reimbursement to gold miners for losses suffered by reason of being arbitrarily closed down by the War Production Board. I feel that the answer of a practical gold miner will be of general interest.

NOVEMBER 1, 1945.

Hon. CLAIR ENGLE,

Member of Congress, Second Congressional District of California, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ENGLE: Relative to the editorial in the New York Herald Tribune of October 25 entitled, "Legislative 'Gold Digging.'" I would like to present to you and Senator MURRAY some facts relative to the gold-mining industry in refutation of statements made in the editorial.

Senate bill S. 1467 and H. R. 4393 request reimbursement of gold miners for losses suffered as a result of an edict known as limitation order No. 208, promulgated by the War Production Board. The avowed purpose of this bill was the diversion of miners to base metal mines. Gold-mine operators informed the War Production Board fully and clearly that the limitation order would have the result it actually had, namely, very few men would go to work in the base-metal mines. The chief results of L–208 was that it actually ruined all the small gold-mining companies and nearly all the larger companies as they were forced to close down for a period of nearly 3 years. In the hope of opening up some day they attempted to maintain their mines in working shape. Their taxes were not remitted; their staffs, limited though they were, had to be paid; their insurance on plants, buildings, and equipment went on day after day. What was the result? The result is obvious, in the 2 years and 7 months of complete closure, the capital of all the mines was drained away and the companies are broke. They had to resort to borrowing or to assessing their stockholders. I hold that the War Production Board has no right legal or implied to ruin any individual and even less right to ruin an industry, which is what they did. There is a grave doubt in my mind that the WPB had the legal right to issue such an order. However the damage has been done.

The article implies that all industries that suffered because of war would request compensation. The gold miners, one and all of them, suffered because of war long before the imposition of L–208. Their crews had shrunk materially from peacetime levels. They are not now asking nor never have asked assistance because of the war.

I further hold that the gold miner has equal rights with any contractor whose business has been terminated by official order, as have many in the past months. The settlement on termination of war contracts is being determined on the basis of actual loss plus a reasonable profit for time spent in reconverting. The gold miner is not asking for lost profits, he is not asking for a profit for reconverting his mine to peacetime operation, he is asking only for the losses he suffered because of L–208, no more and no less.

This request is not legislative gold digging, it is no more than a request for the same treatment afforded war contractors.

As for the Idaho Maryland Mines Corp. of which I am manager, we not only spent all the reserves the company possessed in October 1942, amounting to about a half million dollars, but today we are faced with the necessity of spending another half million which we do not possess in order to recapture miles of caved workings before we gain access to ore bodies which we were mining in the Idaho mine, so the closing order not only terminated all income from mining operation, it also loaded upon the companies a burden of maintenance for 3 years and now the problem of reopening the mines is upon us and we are unable to carry the burden.

If in the opinion of the Herald Tribune a request for return of our losses is legislative gold digging, I can only say that the Herald Tribune has a peculiar idea of fair play.

Sincerely,

NEIL O'DONNELL,
General Manager.

Operation of the Bankruptcy Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, November 16 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from a recent issue of the Pittsburgh Press, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, on the bankruptcy laws of our country. The editorial refers to a very gross abuse of those laws in a case in which no report was filed for 40 years.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT DOESN'T WORK; FIX IT

Every Congressman should be sent a copy of the report recently filed in Federal court here by the receiver for the Pittsburgh, Shawmut & Northern Railroad.

The company has been in receivership 40 years.

In that time, judging by the report, it has been going from bad to worse.

Until the miners employed by the coal subsidiary of this company walked out in protest against living conditions in company towns, no report ever had been filed by the receiver.

The attention directed to the company by the miner walkout got the Department of Justice on the trail and as a result a special judge was sent here to look into the receivership. He, District Judge Guy K. Bard, of Philadelphia, speedily ordered a report.

That report has now been filed.

The report shows that the company is more than $30,000,000 in debt. In other words, it has assets of less than twenty-nine millions and liabilities of more than fifty-nine millions.

Where it once had 24 locomotives and 2,598 other items of rolling stock, it now lists 16 locomotives and 161 cars. Its coal properties have depreciated similarly.

The debt is many times what it was when the company first went in receivership.

But all this time the receivers have been getting well paid. If they made any real efforts to get the company out of the hole, they failed, to put it mildly.

In all this time, it appears, the court never demanded a report and the receiver volunteered none.

It is the purpose of bankruptcy proceedings to do several things:

One is to get the troubled company back on its feet, to make it a going concern.

Another is to see that the creditors get what's coming to them, or as much as possible.

If it isn't possible to pull the company out of its financial fire and convert it to a successful operation, then it is the job of bankruptcy to liquidate the firm and pay off the creditors. This is the way it works with closed banks.

And when a bankruptcy proceeding is instituted, it is the job of the receiver and the Federal court to see to it that one of these results obtains—and as soon as possible.

In this case, and in many other cases, nothing of the sort happens. Bankruptcies go on and on. Some firms do get started again. But others merely get milked and milked and milked.

It is obvious that the bankruptcy law is not working. It needs to be fixed. That's a job for Congress.

Congress can see how the law doesn't work if it will examine the Shawmut case. It can see how it doesn't work if it will study the proceedings of one of its own committees in the case of Judge Johnson of the middle district court, now being tried for misconduct on the bench as a result of his manipulation of bankruptcy proceedings.

The whole bankruptcy law needs overhauling. It is Congress' job to do it.

America Plans Jobs for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 16, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Charles A. Merrill, from the Boston Sunday Globe of September 9, 1945:

AMERICA PLANS JOBS FOR ALL—IN DEBATING FULL EMPLOYMENT, CONGRESS IS MERELY ENDORSING THE ASPIRATION IN THE MINDS OF ALL AMERICANS AS WE TURN FROM WAR TO PEACE

(By Charles A. Merrill)

Better late than never, the Congress of the United States is reconvened and striving to catch up with the breathless rush of events. Having cleared the docket of all business which seemed of a pressing nature, it adjourned in July. July seems a long time ago. The war in Europe had been brought to a victorious conclusion, but our forces in the Pacific appeared only to have reached the preliminary stages of a conflict which military experts assured us could only be ended by a full-scale invasion of Japan, or China, or both. So Congress, having no premonition of the war's end, acted in July in international affairs, approving the Bretton Woods plan for currency stabilization, ratifying the United Nations security charter, and recessed. Suddenly the picture changed. Russia's entry into the war, the terrible atomic bomb, Japan's surrender. Domestic issues clamor for attention. As usual, the heartaches of war are followed by the headaches of peace and reconstruction. This time the demand is for a program which will ease the shock of shifting gears from a wartime to a peacetime economy. We are anxious to prove to the world and to ourselves that within the framework of what we call the free-enterprise system we can assure jobs and prosperity, and avoid the cycle of boom and depression which plagued the Nation after the First World War.

The task is complicated by a skepticism in some quarters about government planning. There are those who say that if the Government interferes wtih the functioning of our economic system there will be fewer, not more jobs. Suppose, to begin with, we examine this attitude and seek a rational philosophy with reference to the part we should expect our Government to play in the realm of economics. Perhaps public opinion is not so divided on the issue as has been assumed.

At this point, a witness appears in the person of Secretary of Commerce Henry A. Wallace about whom, when he stood on the threshold of the Presidential succession, the fires of controversy used to rage. Lo and behold, he talks like a chamber of commerce official. Writing in the New York Times, he says:

"Temperamentally, I like the idea of reducing Government interference in economic matters to the minimum. Most of our ancestors came to the United States from Europe because they thought there was more freedom here from the heavy hand of Government. It is in our blood and in the air we breathe to hate Government interference. We don't want to be dominated by either a permanent military or a Government bureaucracy. Both tend eventually to become bigoted, thoughtless, or arbitrary."

Mr. Wallace then lays down what must seem to most of us an eminently reasonable proposition. "To escape from excessive Government planning we must find out just what is the smallest amount of planning which will give us the greatest amount of freedom." There are, he points out, certain areas of Government responsibility which are accepted. First, the Government must plan with respect to taxes. Second, it must plan with respect to money, interes rates, and the floating of loans. Third, the Government must lay down tariff policies.

Surely, there are few among us who, viewing in retrospect our experience in the twenties and thirties, cannot go along with Mr. Wallace on the premise that what we should be on guard against, as the country seeks recovery from the impact of the biggest and worst of all wars, is not so much government planning as bad planning.

It was the lack of Government controls after World War I which produced the spiral of inflation, to be followed by deflation, bankruptcy, unemployment. When inflation was running wild the Federal Reserve Board did not even seek to check speculation by raising the rediscount rate. We are aware today that it was idiotic planning for the United States, a great creditor country, to expect to collect on foreign debts while blocking imports from debtor nations by a high-tariff policy.

The most pressing immediate matters now before Congress arise, of course, from the sudden ending of the war, cancellation of war orders, the Government's retirement as the largest buyer in the American market. A few days ago the number of workers thrown out of employment was estimated at 2,000,000. The figure is probably much higher now, but some allowance must be made for the fact that many war workers are willingly retiring from the labor market, women who are returning to their homes, younger people who will go back to school. Meanwhile, we must visualize the gradual demobilization of millions of service men and women. The problem of employment is staggering.

Fortunately, while industry is speeding reconversion, old-age and unemployment insurance are available to take up some of the slack. In his recommendation to Congress, last week, President Truman was only moving up the standard in the kind of planning which the Government embarked upon several years ago and which both political parties have accepted without reservation. He asked the Congress to supply Federal funds to the States so that unemployment compensation may be increased to a maximum of at least $25 a week over a period of 23 weeks.

This, of course, is only a stop-gap. It will help during the reconversion period. The larger, the long-range project, is the breathtaking vision of an industrial system which will provide jobs for all who are willing and able to work—permanently, year in and year out.

Here we encounter the most controversial issue which has been thrown into the congressional hopper, the so-called full employment bill. Examination of the bill, which

doubtless will be altered prior to its passage, would seem to indicate that it has stirred up more heat than is warranted. Far from being a drastic proposal for the socialization of our economy, the measure states as its objective the strengthening and preservation of our free enterprise system. Under its provisions the President would each year present a job budget to Congress. This would be an estimate of the number of jobs private industry might be expected to provide. If a deficit of jobs seemed in prospect, the President would be expected to propose legislation calculated to stimulate increased employment through non-Federal expenditure, and, also, if this appeared inadequate, to recommend Government expenditures to take up the slack.

Supporters of the bill hope it would help the country to create and maintain a stable economy. Opponents are fearful that it would inaugurate a new era of checks and controls and impose tax burdens on industry that would limit production and produce a lower standard of living.

Due caution is always in order in planning new social experiments, but is there not a greater danger in a critical hour like the present one, when mankind is emerging from the shadow of death and groping for a freer and fuller life, that we shall err on the side of timidity.

Over large sections of the earth a socialized economy now prevails. The people of England, weakened and impoverished, are turning to a program of evolutionary socialism. We in the United States, stimulated by the country's miraculous record of wartime production, still have tremendous faith in the vitality of our economic system.

As a result of our wartime experience, the people of this country, political leaders, industrialists, members of labor unions, are clinging to the vision of a system of free enterprise so integrated and efficient that it will not be subject to violent fluctuations, but will permit the American people to enjoy a high standard of living and to preserve their free political institutions. Indeed, we have always had this vision; increased efficiency, good wages, low prices, maximum purchasing power, and high volume of production.

This is the current American plan. If it is the policy of our Government to aid in this planning, why should we be cynical or pessimistic about it?

Constitutional Amendment Limiting the Tenure of Presidents of the United States to Two Terms of 4 Years Each

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 16, 1945

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Committee on Election of the President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress in support of House Joint Resolution 65, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President:

Mr. Chairman, in requesting a hearing before this committee, I have been prompted not so much by my own personal views on the no-third-term tradition as by the repeated urging of many Americans who feel the critical conditions of the world now make it more important than ever to set up safeguards to protect our traditional freedom under representative government. I don't believe any man on this committee, or in the whole Congress, will iew this subject from a partisan standpoint. Certainly we have had ample evidence in the past 20 years that governments can be overturned or undermined from within and that the wisdom of the founding fathers was profound. They sought to build into the Constitution the checks and balances and limitations of power which have so far been the bulwark of our personal liberties. The Bill of Rights amendments defined those liberties.

As you all know, the question of limiting the tenure of office of the President of the United States was seriously debated in the Constitutional Convention. Many of the most distinguished delegates urged on the Convention the adoption of a clause which would place a constitutional limitation upon the number of terms any President could serve. After serious deliberation the Convention finally decided not to adopt such a clause. Their failure to do so has often been cited by various persons as the authority for opposing such suggested limitations today.

I would like to point out, however, that the men who met in Constitution Hall in Philadelphia were assembled there because the framework of national government under the Articles of Confederation had already proven to be much too weak and disorganized to provide that stable and responsible government this Nation required. Their responsibility at the Convention, therefore, was to strengthen our National Government and to try to lay down principles of its functioning for succeeding generations. In a measure they were operating in a vacuum. They were forced to conjecture, and it was finally decided that limiting the President's tenure of office might place too great a limitation upon the functioning of the proposed government and that it might thereby weaken it. It is clear from the debates that this was a matter intentionally left by the framers of the Constitution for decision later in the operations of the new Government.

Actual experience in the functioning of our Government under the principles laid down in the Constitution quickly demonstrated that such limitation was practical, from the standpoint of efficiency. It also became apparent that the authority and prestige of the Presidency was so great it would be a constant temptation to an ambitious man to set himself up in office for life and so to control all the operations of Government as to be a virtual dictator.

Therefore, Thomas Jefferson and a succession of outstanding national leaders from that time until quite recently vigorously upheld the no-third-term tradition as one of the unwritten laws of our Nation and as one of the prime safeguards against tyranny.

Tyranny is a danger against which every American naturally must be vigilant. Our forefathers knew tyranny. They knew what it meant to live under an absolute ruler. They knew all the restraints and restrictions and all the discrimination and special privilege which prevail under any absolutism.

They thought, therefore, in terms of safeguarding this Nation against the establishment of a monarchy. They wanted no kings; no royal families; no dukes and duchesses; no princes; no earls; no barons. They wanted liberty; the right to determine their own form of government; the right to give to that government authority sufficient only to enable it to operate. They did not wish to submit to the personal whims of any monarch, or bow to the special privilege of caste.

Only men who have had personal experience with such tyrannical customs can fully appreciate the frustration and the misery they bring to a people. The men of that time had had very painful personal experience. They wanted to set up a government always to be under control of the governed; a government whose authority and power would be so clearly restricted as to guarantee that the instruments of power would rest in many hands under the system of checks and balances, and not in the hands of one or a few too powerful men.

Since the day Thomas Jefferson established the no-third-term principle as a primary rule in our political life, Americans have accepted it and endorsed it throughout succeeding generations. Yet, as the American people in each generation became farther removed from those men who had had personal experience with tyranny, the fear of tyranny lost its sharpness and, in time, Americans began to take for granted those personal liberties the price of which is eternal vigilance.

Now today Americans of this generation have seen with their own eyes the horrors, and have been touched in their own lives by the coercions and frustrations of a new kind of tyranny far more deadly than any the world has ever known before.

We of this generation have learned that today it is not kings we have to fear, but dictators. The twentieth-century tyrant is not one who inherits a throne, but one who seizes a government. Twentieth-century oppression is not carried on in the name of a crown; it is perpetuated in the name of democracy. We have learned that the first step in twentieth-century tyranny is popularizing a "supercolossal" leader.

We have seen the factions supporting such leaders infiltrate into the governments of Europe and of Asia. We have seen the brutality, the ruthlessness, and the utter disregard of humane principles which have been typical of all their scheming for power.

We have just fought a war because of them. We have sacrificed the lives or wounded the bodies of more than 1,000,000 Americans to defeat them. We have subjected other millions of men to the hardships, the privations, and the misery of the battlefields, of the skies, of the beaches, and the seas.

We have asked these men to make this sacrifice in the name of freedom. It is our duty to them and to our children, and to our children's children to set up those barriers to ambition which alone can guarantee that liberty.

Certainly there can be no partisan consideration today in strengthening our Constitution in such a way as to preserve its integrity and reinforce its guaranties of orderly liberty under the law to American citizens.

It is today no reflection upon any individual to adopt a constitutional amendment limiting Presidential tenure of office. We are dealing with a fundamental principle and a deadly danger, and not with personalities. Mr. Truman is at this time not a candidate to succeed himself for even a second term. There is no question, however, as to the propriety, under the traditional practices of American politics, of his doing so, if he chooses.

The tradition against a third term is broken. There are no further restraints upon the ambitious. We now have had the experience of continuing an administration in office for more than two terms.

It must now be apparent to all that any President who remains in office too long will naturally surround himself with a ring of palace favorites—men whose sole interest would be to perpetuate their patron in office and thus establish and maintain for themselves a vested interest in bureaucracy and power, and thus enjoy the selfish fruits of political monopoly. As the power of the Presidency increases, so does their power increase. And since their prestige and even, in some cases, their personal fortunes depend upon his remaining in office, they will seek in a hundred and one concealed and cynical ways to prevail upon him to do so. As he remains in office and their power in-

creases so is increasingly placed in the hands of irresponsible men the ability to maneuver whole departments and influence whole nations to foster their own personal interests, with cynical disregard of the rights or the welfare of American citizens.

How easy it would be, then, at some future time if, to remain in power, such men saw fit to overthrow our representative form of government; to establish over an unsuspecting people a dictatorship of such absolute tyranny that the rights of American citizens, and even their very lives, would be subject to the whims of men over whom the people would have no control. We have seen such events take place. We have seen wicked men in wicked ways accomplish those very evil designs in other countries in this generation.

Mr. Chairman, and honorable members of this committee, in the name of the millions of tortured and murdered, in the name of all those millions of starved and dejected humanity who know the brutality of the secret police and the horrors of the concentration camp—gentlemen, in the name of Americans of this generation, living and dead, and in the name of yet unborn generations of America, I ask that you take prompt action to start the machinery in motion for a constitutional amendment limiting the tenure of office in the Presidency to two terms of 4 years each. We must make certain that the kind of government which has made America the greatest Nation in the world is safeguarded.

I have several citations and quotations which I wish to submit as a part of my remarks to this committee. They are as follows:

Thomas Jefferson, among numerous other declarations against more than two terms in the Presidency, said:

"If some termination to the services of the Chief Magistrate be not fixed by the Constitution, or supplied by practice, his office, nominally for 4 years, will in fact become for life; and history shows how easily that degenerates into an inheritance."

Jefferson said again:

"Should a President consent to be a candidate for a third election I trust he would be rejected on this demonstration of ambitious views."

All down through our history are many incidents that prove how loyal our people and our Presidents have been to this tradition established by Washington. William Henry Harrison took office pledged to one term only. Rutherford B. Hayes favored only one term for a President and was not a candidate for a second term. Cleveland, in his characteristic strong language, declared himself against a third term. McKinley said, "I am not and will not be a candidate for a third term."

This question of limiting the Presidential term to two is not a partisan question. It has never been a partisan question.

As far back as December 15, 1875, in the Forty-fourth Congress, first session, in volume 4, part 1, page 228, we found that a Member, Mr. Springer, offered a resolution to limit the President to two terms. The resolution carried by 144 ayes to 2 noes.

In 1896 the Democratic convention adopted a plank as follows: "We declare it to be the unwritten law of the Republic established by custom and usage of a hundred years ago, and sanctioned by the example of the greatest and wisest of those who founded and maintained our Government, that no man should be elected for a third term of the Presidential office."

Again in 1912, the Democratic platform on which Woodrow Wilson was elected, and which Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt supported, said:

"No man should be eligible for a third term of the Presidential office."

In 1928, when some people imagined Mr. Calvin Coolidge might aspire to a third term, even though one of his terms was not elective, the Senate of the United States adopted a resolution against a third term. It was supported by practically all of the Democrats in the Senate. The resolution was as follows:

"Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the precedent established by Washington and other Presidents of the United States in retiring from the Presidential office after their second term has become, by a universal concurrence, a part of our republican system of government, and that any departure from this time-honored custom would be unwise, unpatriotic, and fraught with peril to our free institutions."

This resolution was introduced by Senator Robert M. La Follette, of Wisconsin, who was not a Democrat, and was supported by a vote of 56 yeas to 26 nays, with 12 not voting.

To show the nonpartisan character of this question, I desire to point out that among the Senators voting for the no-third-term resolution were the following:

Ashurst, Democrat, Arizona; Barkley (present majority leader in the Senate), Democrat, Kentucky; Black (now an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court), Democrat, Alabama; Blaine, Republican, Wisconsin; Borah, outstanding Republican, Idaho; Bratton (now Federal judge to New Mexico), Democrat, New Mexico. Among others were Senators Copeland, Democrat, of New York; Couzens, Republican, of Michigan; Curtis, Republican, of Kansas; Gerry, Democrat, of Rhode Island; Glass, Democrat, of Virginia; Harrison, Democrat, of Mississippi (since deceased); Hayden, Democrat, of Arizona; La Follette, Republican, of Wisconsin; McKellar (President pro tempore of the Senate), Democrat, Tennessee; Neely, Democrat, West Virginia; Norris (since deceased), Independent, Nebraska; Nye, Republican, of South Dakota; Pittman, Democrat, of Nevada; Robinson, Democrat, of Arkansas; Shipstead, Farmer-Labor, of Minnesota; Tydings, Democrat, Maryland; Wagner, Democrat, of New York; Walsh, Democrat (since deceased), Montana, and Wheeler, Democrat, Montana.

Many more citations could be made to show that this question is not in any sense partisan, but I believe, Mr. Chairman, these I have made will be sufficient to illustrate the point I wish to make.

It must be the determination all of these people showed in not wanting more than two terms in the Presidency for an individual still exists. The fact that the tradition was shattered has not minimized the dangers in the least. It has accentuated them.

Mr. Speaker, I have received letters from Mr. John W. Davis, candidate of the Democratic Party for the Presidency in 1924, and from Mr. Bainbridge Colby, Secretary of State under Woodrow Wilson, both of which I insert in the RECORD at this point:

DAVIS, POLK, WARDWELL,
SUNDERLAND & KIENDL,
New York, N. Y., November 13, 1945.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I understand that hearings are to be held on the 15th and 16th on House Joint Resolution 65 proposed by yourself limiting to two terms the occupancy of the Presidency of the United States.

It would be a great satisfaction to me to be able to appear before the committee and give my modest support to this resolution. Unfortunately, however, I am now in the midst of a trial which I am unable to leave on either of the dates mentioned. If there is any way in which it could be accomplished without my presence, I should like to be on record among those emphatically in favor of such an amendment.

It not only is expedient but, in my judgment, is imperative. For 150 years we got along with the two-term tradition. Many statesmen of all parties from time to time have raised their voices in favor of it, but a tradition once broken ceases to have binding power. Only law expressed in the Constitution can take its place.

The basis of the tradition and the reason for your amendment is the sound principle sanctioned by all history that no free government can survive the coming of a permanent Chief Executive, least of all an Executive with the vast and increasing powers which we have conferred upon the President. There is not and there can never be in this country an indispensable man. There cannot be under any system of self-government. The only check upon governmental error is a cleansing rotation in office.

I do not labor the point as I expressed myself somewhat fully on it in hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate in 1940 when the question was brought forward. I think my remarks appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 19 of that year. If I were free this week to appear before the committee, there is nothing I would subtract from what I then said, and I am not sure that I would have a great deal to add.

With every hope for the adoption of your resolution, I am

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN W. DAVIS.

NEW YORK CITY, *November 15, 1945.*

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MARTIN: I had hoped to attend the hearing called for today before the House Committee on the Election of the President, but I am unable to make the trip to Washington at this time.

May I, however, express to you briefly the great importance I attach to your resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the limitation of the terms of office of the President. I can hardly think of any subject more worthy of the serious study and attention of the Congress. It is not too much to say that the survival of the Republic may be wrapped up in it.

The members of your committee are too well grounded in the history of our country to make necessary a recital of the declarations of Washington and the great Presidents who for 150 years have adhered to the historical precedent which he established by refusal to accept election as President for a tenure beyond two terms. It was firmly imbedded in our national thinking until very recently that this precedent was a fixed and hallowed tradition with us and had acquired morally the force of a constitutional limitation, the validity of positive law.

Both the Senate and the House have declared repeatedly by formal resolution their belief in its wisdom and vital need.

Jefferson was strongly of the opinion that a definite period to the retention of the Presidential office was necessary to safeguard our elective form of government, thus ranging himself with Washington, who expressed the belief that no President would ever be able, by any practicable intrigue, to continue himself in office, much less perpetuate himself in it, but in "the last stage of corrupted morals and political depravity."

Grover Cleveland, at a much later date renewed the warning against a plurality of terms for a President, citing the "allurement of power, the temptation to retain public place once gained, and, more than all, the availability which his party finds in an incumbent, whom a hoard of office holders support, with a zeal born of benefits received and a hope of favors yet to come."

We have now seen, and recently, these evils, swollen beyond anything recorded in history, unleashed and shamelessly pressed into service in the effort to keep a President in office for a plurality of terms. The apprehended dangers against which we were warned have overtaken and enveloped us. We have even

heard men in high official position in a recent administration declare that the whole duty of a party in power is "to spend and spend, to tax and tax, and elect and elect."

Such has become apparently the whole gospel of bureaucracy, if not of politics in general.

Our Government is not built upon the theory that the powers we vest in an elected official shall be thrown into the scales of a political contest, to be exercised in his own interest or to insure his retention in office. This is something the people will not tolerate.

We have seen that we require a greater protection than is afforded by a "tradition" however sacred, and vital to our survival as a nation. We have reached the time when the limitation of tenure of the Presidential office must be safeguarded by express provision in our Constitution.

The proposed constitutional amendment, now before your committee with its express limitation upon a President's eligibility for reelection, provides a protection to our form of government which is sorely needed—a need which has been amply demonstrated in our experience.

Respectfully yours,

BAINBRIDGE COLBY.

For Better Occupational Troops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 16, 1945

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, little heralded, yet of tremendous possibilities, was a radio broadcast put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts, Hon. CHARLES R. CLASON. It was the broadcast of Mr. Hubert W. Kregeloh, commentator on a radio station, WSPR, at Springfield, Mass. It can be found on page A4866 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I commend it as good reading to thoughtful people everywhere.

Mr. Kregeloh comments on the difficulties we have found in occupying Germany. With certain modifications, his comments can be applied to the problems we encounter in the occupation of Japan. He suggests that we should have had troops especially trained for the occupation of the conquered countries. We have done it with combat troops and are now seeking replacements in order that these veterans may be brought home as speedily as possible.

Mr. Kregeloh's suggestions are worthy of note. Personally I think they are worthy of legislative action to put them into immediate effect. He suggests that occupational armies first should be volunteers—those who have a desire to take part in the work of occupying a conquered country. He further suggests that officers, as well as men for this purpose, should be carefully selected for above-average intelligence and that they should be over 21 years of age. For training he says that emphasis should be overwhelmingly placed on spiritual and political indoctrination, designed to equip the trainees with a type of knowledge naturally lacking in our army of occupation.

Under the circumstances, he feels that the period of training should be relatively short and that every facility available to American colleges should be used for this training immediately. He suggests that their pay be satisfactory. The period of service should be limited, and, lastly, he suggests that these occupational armies should have a distinctive uniform.

As a further comment on the unsatisfactory reports from our armies of occupation, Mr. Marquis Childs, commenting in the Washington Post recently, states that the school of military government gave only the most rudimentary grounding in how to fix sewers and organize soup kitchens. And, he concludes his column with a statement that "occupation is demoralizing to occupier and occupied. It is especially so for Americans with no background or preparation for the task. There are ways to control Germany and we must find them. The dangers in the present approach are too grave to ignore any longer."

And so it seems that in our occupational efforts, both in Germany and in Japan, things will not happen automatically. If we do not want this war to have been fought in vain, if we want to create an atmosphere which will breed good will, we had best give some thought and intelligent action to the development of occupational forces. Such a project could very easily have byproducts of experience and gathered knowledge that would help us tremendously as we contemplate our military preparedness for the peace to come. An improvement in our occupational program could definitely limit the threats to America. And it is these threats, unfortunately, which today appear to be shaping our policies for the future.

Mr. Childs' article follows:

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

DANGER SIGNALS FROM GERMANY

By various channels reports are coming out of Germany that make it plain the American occupying force in the American zone is suffering something approaching a break-down of discipline.

Shortly before he came to this country General Eisenhower told his commanders to see to it that regulations were observed more closely. Phrased in careful military language, it must be puzzling those who did not know the background.

Members of Congress have been told of looting and disorder on a scale too considerable to be ignored. Returning observers may have exaggerated what they saw and heard, but the feeling persists, nevertheless, that there is reason for worry.

This directly concerns an American who has come through the war not only with a very great reputation but with the deep regard of Americans everywhere. General Eisenhower is giving his views this week on the military problems that we face in the immediate future. He is taking a brief leave from his assignment in Germany as reports are circulated that he will soon succeed General Marshall as Chief of Staff.

The job of occupation commander would in any event have been a thankless one. Even with all the real diplomatic skill he possesses, Eisenhower was certain to find it difficult.

Given in the circumstances, the assignment was impossible. Preparation of personnel for the occupation was feeble to the point of being futile.

The School of Military Government at Charlottesville, Va., gave only the most rudimentary grounding in how to fix sewers and organize soup kitchens. It assumed that the occupation would go on in a social and political vacuum. The same officers in charge of that school later, in England, boondoggled with an unrealistic planning council for Germany which added little light or leading.

Then, after the occupation began, Eisenhower and his staff had the utmost difficulty in getting directions out of Washington. They were compelled to improvise and temporize, because they could get no policy line clearly laid down.

The reason was obvious. There has been a conflict within the Government and, in a sense, in public opinion.

Partly this grew out of a long-sustained propaganda for a "harsh peace." It grew out of the belief that the Allies, through their occupying forces, could impose on Germany a new and simplified economy and a new way of life.

While this may have been theoretically possible, it has not proved so in practice. A major obstacle has been in getting agreement on a common policy among the four occupying forces. Governing a Germany carved into four separate pieces has proved all but impossible.

As a congressional committee recently pointed out, the harvest of this policy, or lack of policy, will soon be reaped. It will be reaped in terms of mass starvation, mass death, mass disorder and the danger of an epidemic which will not be confined within the borders of Germany.

The British are already aware of this. They live next door to Europe. As recent debates in Parliament indicate, they are fearful of the consequences, with Socialist members more emphatic than Conservatives in warning of what is to come in the next few months.

When it is reflected in black headlines and appalling newsreels, many Americans will be shocked and surprised. They will look around for a scapegoat.

General Eisenhower should not be victimized. If he is to be made Chief of Staff, now is the time. It is time, too, to recast our German policy.

Occupation is demoralizing to occupier and occupied. It is especially so for Americans with no background or preparation for the task. There are ways to control Germany and we must find them. The dangers in the present approach are too grave to ignore any longer.

Watch Commodity Prices—Pressures Are Rising Right Across the Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 16, 1945

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, because of the apparent feeling of many in the House and also in the business world that the threat of real and devastating inflation has passed, I would like to call the attention of the House to the following editorial from the magazine, Business Week, dated November 3, 1945. This magazine, considered as an authoritative source on business information, definitely predicts the grave inflationary dangers the country is facing at this time if controls are not properly continued. The editorial follows:

WATCH COMMODITY PRICES—PRESSURES ARE RISING RIGHT ACROSS THE BOARD

Most talk has been about prices to the consumer. Actually, manufacturers' most immediate problems are in raw materials and parts. The lid would blow, without any question, but for OPA restraints.

Contracts are not being written today at fixed prices. Everybody is hedging so as to get the benefit of price increases, to pass on costs.

The President's latest wage-price order won't alter this. It strengthens labor's wage demands but doesn't promise price relief.

Expectations of a general upward revision of prices have more to do with today's markets than have the ordinary supply-demand factors.

Even so, demand has outrun the most optimistic estimates.

Many observers feared that serious deflation might threaten the Nation sometime within 6 months of Japan's surrender. As things are working out, the pull is almost entirely in the opposite direction.

Lay-offs have been below estimates, reconversion has started faster, inflationary pressures have been building steadily (Business Week, October 20, 1945, p. 9).

Manufacturers have been pressing for more raw materials than the mines and mills, for one reason or another, could turn out.

Extremely strong market situations have developed in practically all metals with steel and copper conspicuous examples.

Before the coal strike, steel mills were building up the biggest output since 1929 if not of all time. This despite labor shortages.

Use of copper appears to be breaking all peacetime records.

Deliveries of steel are falling farther and farther behind. And prices set are usually those prevailing on date of delivery.

Thus manufacturers have no idea what the steel is going to cost them.

Parts makers, too, are caught. They don't know how much they will have to pay for the labor and steel that go into a spring or a wheel so they can't quote a firm price to the builder of motorcars.

Construction contractors pad their bids to cover possible higher costs on steel and other materials. Consequently, many bids are rejected.

All this retards the rise in civilian production.

Market circles are talking 14 cents a pound for copper, up from the long-standing ceiling of 12 cents. This hasn't been put up to OPA, of course.

There is no doubt that the price would go up if the lid were tilted.

Domestic production is running about 65,000 tons a month, and consumption 100,000. The difference is made up from imported metal and drafts on inventories held by brass and copper fabricators.

All this is very different from the gloomy postwar picture painted for copper as recently as a few months ago. Then the main worry was how tightly the Government would keep its stock pile locked up.

Now it's how to get enough miners to dig the metal that is needed.

Use of lead is running 60,000 tons a month, just about duplicating the record of the late 1920's. During the last months of the war and thus far in reconversion, we have cut deeply into the stock pile of imported metal. This holding is down to 88,000 tons against the peak of 276,000.

The outlook on imports is uncertain. Suppliers are likely to hold back shipments in the hope of forcing a higher ceiling price.

Nevertheless, imports that we do get plus the stock pile should pad out domestic mine output sufficiently to meet 1946 needs.

Largest single demand factor is storage batteries, but both cable and paint are using large quantities.

Zinc, with record supplies in sight, might be described as being in the weakest market position of the major industrial metals. Yet its price is pressing against the ceiling right along with the rest.

And quicksilver, which had a frightful spell of peace jitters in August, has been rising the last few days.

Actually, though, quicksilver got some special help. The Government took 12,000 flasks (76 pounds each) off the market recently for stock pile, and 12,000 flasks are about one-third of a normal prewar year's use.

Hiking the price of silver from 45 to 71 cents has not yet brought sufficient supplies into sight to satisfy the rampant jewelry trade and other users. However, Canada hasn't raised its ceiling, and the differential of about 30 cents an ounce is beginning to draw concentrates over the border.

Meanwhile, the congressional silver bloc is trying hard to get the Treasury's buying price hoisted from 71.11 cents to $1.29 an ounce. It will never be happy with the metal bringing no more than the world price.

Difficulties in fixing prices in sales contracts are typified by the number of escalator clauses encountered these days. Bear in mind, too, that a parts maker who buys materials on such a clause must pass costs on to his own customers on some similar terms.

A similar pricing device is very prevalent in nonferrous metals. Most sales are on an average-price basis, the average being for a day or a week or a month as agreed upon between the principals.

Higher prices have resulted almost without exception on articles whose ceilings have been raised or removed lately.

Several such instances are mentioned by the National Association of Purchasing Agents in its current business survey.

Among finished products, there are construction machinery and electrical controllers.

Rises in components take in fractional horsepower motors, gray iron and copper castings, steel forgings, and die castings; prices have been withdrawn on valves, fittings, and cast-iron pipe.

Raw materials cited include alcohol, rosin, and carbon black; a request for higher prices on southern pine lumber is expected.

Many manufacturers have been pinched by costs and ceilings to a point where they no longer are making unprofitable or narrow-profit items.

That has been familiar for a long time in textiles. Now it is reported to have become general in heavy lines such as steel.

Generosity of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 13, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues another evidence of the generosity of the American people as evidenced by the following letter from the Young Women's Christian Association of Boise, Idaho, in which they offer to accept the continuation of rationing if necessary that the hungry peoples of all lands may be fed. Surely this and past evidences of our desire to assist the unfortunates of other lands should be sufficient evidence of our friendship and our desire for permanent peace. I feel very sure that if a vote of all the small nations of the world was taken that they would approve the retention of the atomic bomb in our keeping, for they know they have nothing to fear from the United States. They know we are not imperialistic, that we desire no territory from others, and all Asia knows that the Filipinos, temporarily placed in our keeping, enjoy the greatest freedom and the highest standard of living of any people in the Orient.

YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION,
Boise, Idaho, October 12, 1945.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WHITE: The board of directors of the Boise YWCA is vitally concerned about the lack of food for people in Europe and Asia who are starving. We believe that larger allocations of food can be sent abroad without impairing the food supply here in the United States. If a continuation of rationing is necessary to insure a greater food supply to foreign countries, we are in favor of it.

Yours sincerely,
Mrs. FRED W. CRICHFIELD,
President, Board of Directors.

Fact and Fiction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 16, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following enlightening editorial from the November 10 editions of the Chicago Tribune:

FACT AND FICTION

Attorney General Clark's account of the catching of eight Nazi saboteurs landed on the east coast in June 1942 provides an insight into the degree of credibility which can be accorded news put out by Government agencies, especially in wartime. Mr. Clark's story differs in important particulars from the romancing indulged in by the Office of War Information and the Federal Bureau of Investigation at the time the saboteurs were caught.

In releasing the record of the secret trial of the saboteurs before a military commission, Mr. Clark makes clear that the police work which led to their arrest was simplicity itself. Four of the Germans landed on Long Island, the other four in Florida. One of the Long Island party, George John Dasch, promptly gave the plot away, with the knowledge and consent of one of his partners, Ernest Peter Burger.

As soon as he had made his way from Long Island to New York City, Dasch telephoned the FBI and said he wanted it known that a few days later he would contact FBI headquarters in Washington. He then went to Washington and telephoned J. Edgar Hoover, director of the FBI, disclosing his identity and his mission and stating that he had important information on objectives marked for sabotage. All the FBI had to do was go to his hotel and pick him up. Burger was netted in New York with no more effort. With the information provided by the pair, the FBI rounded up the rest of the saboteurs within two weeks.

There wasn't enough melodrama in this prosaic piece of police work to satisfy the OWI and FBI when they put out their stories

3 years ago. The public was given the impression of Mr. Hoover, in Washington, a disembodied brain, directing a far-flung network of G-men, all of them with hats pulled low over their eyes and speaking out of the corners of their mouths in whispers. Then—flash! as Mr. Hoover's radio press agent puts it—the FBI had scored again.

The OWI also made its contribution to detective literature with the account of how a coast guardsman on Long Island encountered the saboteurs in the dark and, in looking into the eyes of their leader, "was afraid he might be hypnotized." It made quite a story. The saboteurs got away and were safely in hiding by the time the alarm was spread and the Coast Guard mustered its forces. The OWI reticently remarked, "FBI men under J. Edgar Hoover took up the chase from there and rounded up, not only the men who had landed in the fog on Amagansett beach, but another group that had been landed on the Florida coast." No vulgar reference to voluntary stool pigeoning was permitted to intrude.

The OWI had a lot of hack writers on the Government pay roll during the war. They weren't squeamish about facts. The FBI, of course, likes to portray its operations on the plane of high intrigue and master minding, which helps when appropriations are under discussion. Wartime censorship and secrecy made it possible to dish out hop dreams to the public as news. A secret trial before a military commission helped conceal the facts. The fake news about the saboteurs was relatively harmless, but other Government agencies were distorting facts about far more important matters. That always can be expected if government is allowed to report its own activities without interference from a free press. The bureaucrats are sure to make themselves look good.

Aside from this, the true story of the saboteurs indicates a grave miscarriage of justice. Dasch, who gave the Government its case on a platter, was sentenced to 30 years, and Burger to life imprisonment. If Mr. Clark is now telling the truth, these men never intended to carry out their mission. The worst they deserve is deportation.

Socialized Medicine, an Insidious Threat to Our Form of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 16, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am including an address I made this afternoon on Socialized Medicine, an Insidious Threat to Our Form of Government, before the Montgomery County Republican Women's Club, the Republican Women's Council of Arlington, and the Fairfax County Republican Women's Club, at the Broadmoor, in the District of Columbia:

Madam President, the National Resources Planning Board once upon a time said that the Federal Government should stimulate, assist, or undertake to provide adequate medical care for the millions of our people whose need cannot be fully met from their own resources. A glorious appeal. That is generalized paternalism raised to the *n*th degree, under cover of humanitarianism, impossible of realization in a democratic republic where free enterprise and individualism are measures of our ability to maintain a democracy.

That is what the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill under the cover of its alleged beneficent cloak undertakes to do for everybody—deserving or not. It is revolutionary.

Federal aid for medical care and socialized, federalized medicine are no more alike than a cat and a skunk. They may look alike, yet one is apt to regret it if he takes a skunk to his bosom thinking it is a cat.

Congress is now appropriating nearly 200 million dollars a year to assist the States in developing their own health and medical services. We provide Federal aid for maternal and child health, for services to crippled children, and for the prevention and control of tuberculosis, venereal diseases, and mental disease. Congress wishes to see States and localities develop their own health programs. Congress will aid them financially. But so far Congress has shown no desire to take the job away from the States by federalizing medicine. When the States do the job they lay down the rules; when the Federal Government does the job some official in Washington writes the rules and regulations.

I have no objection to using Federal funds to help the States provide medical care for persons with low incomes. But I do object to creating an enormous Federal insurance fund to be controlled by three Government officials, as is proposed in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, and to paying all the physicians in the country from that fund. I do not want to compel every physician to choose between being a Federal insurance practitioner or going out of business. And I do not want to compel every worker to pay an additional 1½ percent social security tax as well as a higher income tax to buy medical care furnished under conditions that would be intolerable for free, independent Americans.

Moreover, the Ways and Means Committee of the House agrees that the average wage earner cannot and will not tolerate a pay roll tax deduction of more than 2 percent for social security. The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill proposal for socialized medicine contemplates an all-over tax of 8 percent, 4 for worker and 4 for employer. That is one reason why the bill in question will not become law.

What the women of this country should understand is that if this bill becomes a law their lives are put under the control of the Surgeon General of the United States. Whether or not their unborn children shall live is put at a hazard for that they, the pregnant mothers, cannot be assured of any right to choose their doctor, or their hospital. These matters will be handled from Washington.

If only the real Americans among the women would realize what is being attempted to be done to them under the cover of something-for-nothing, there would be a revolution. And what a revolution!

Socialized medicine is the beginning of the end of this republican democracy, and no sane woman should be for it who loves her family and her country. She should be for a better public health, help from the Federal Government where the State cannot supply necessary aid, more hospitals, and so forth, but she should not yield up the control of her life to those who are really trying to take over this Government under the subterfuge of humanitarianism.

Behind this alleged humanitarian program of so-called planned economy is to be found the basis and thesis for a planned and socialized America. It undertakes insidiously the establishment of universal medical service for everybody for nothing.

Next will come the socialization of dentists, lawyers, undertakers, perhaps, and everybody else.

It is a proposal to establish a form of socialism, a socialistic movement as unadulterated as if it came from the sanctified pen of Karl Marx himself. It will not work out in a democratic republic.

If you are one of those intent upon changing the form of this Government, you will join the demagogs and Socialists and opportunists in their support of this measure which will destroy democracy—and it is so intended to do by the technique of infiltration—and by fooling the people into thinking they are getting something for nothing as against a bill of expense of $12,000,000,000 annually, which the taxpayer has to pay. Otherwise you should oppose the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, to save yourself from regimentation, and the country from the socialistic, demagogic-minded opportunists who are glad to live in the country so long as they can live off it—that is, off those who make it possible by hard work for them to loaf and strike.

It is high time to call a spade a spade. It is time for us who are definitely for our form of government to say so before we are sacrificed on the altar of socialism and demagogery and opportunism.

This so-called diaper-to-the-shroud bill undertakes to throw the mantle of its alleged security over everybody gainfully employed and most of their dependents at the expense of the Federal Government and under its control. But do not forget that it is the people who pay these bills.

It is undertaking by compulsion to establish a Nation-wide health program to provide alleged free medical, surgical, obstetrical, diagnostic, and hospital service to everybody, but the bill does not do it, despite its attempt to make the people think so, and in so doing to regiment the people

Every gainfully employed American would be compelled to pay a tax of 4 percent of his or her wages up to $3,600 a year to support this program. An additional 4 percent on pay rolls would be collected from employers. It is estimated that these taxes would take from the pockets of the American people at least $12,000,000,000 a year of which one-fourth would be allocated to the program for medical care and hospitalization. This is about the amount the Nation is estimated to have spent annually on such services before the war. But now the public is being asked to pay this money to the Government instead of to the doctors and hospitals. In addition, the public will have to pay the salaries of thousands of administrators, clerks, lawyers, statisticians, and investigators required to police the sickness insurance scheme. All this money for administration will be a new charge on the taxpayers. It will not be spent for medical care, but will be squandered on the salaries of Government insurance officials. These will constitute a Nation-wide bureaucratic network radiating from Washington into more than 150,000 counties, townships, municipalities, and school districts.

You must realize that the 3-billion dollar health fund, large as it is, will not be enough to pay for all the promised benefits. Expenditures for medical and hosiptal insurance services may easily cost from 5 billion dollars to 6 billion dollars a year for a population of 140 million persons. On top of that will be another billion dollars for public-health services, the construction of hospitals and health centers, and the care of the insane. Administrative costs are in addition to all expenditures for benefits.

This three billion in taxes to be collected annually toward the cost of the health program is an amount nearly equal to the average revenue of the Federal Government from all sources during the 10 immediate years of the New Deal. When were you born?

But the social-security taxes are not all you will have to pay. Large as they are they will not be sufficient to pay for all these so-called free services. There will be large deficits to be made up from general reve-

nues. That means higher State and Federal income taxes and higher real-estate taxes. Once the whole national insurance scheme planned in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill really gets into operation, it is estimated that about 18 percent of pay rolls will be required to finance it.

The bill undertakes to establish the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service as a medical dictator, a czar of medicine for the entire United States, in disregard of all the reserved rights of the States, or existing conditions. Under the terms of the act he would hire all the doctors, fix their fees, determine their qualifications, and in short would say who could and who could not practice medicine.

Wouldn't your grandmother rear in her chair at such a proposition? That old lady passing by would make small potatoes of such a mess.

This administrator could go further than that—for under this act he could tell you what doctor you should hire—great God; to what hospital you might go—worse yet; and what hospitals could operate, and at what price—the last straw.

He could allocate patients to such doctors as he chose; determine the number of patients a doctor might serve and a hundred other things. In short the rights of the people, of the doctors, of the hospitals would be at an end. Are you going to submit to such a program of regimentation?

Now, freedom of research and practice in the United States has brought the American people to the world's most advanced position in medical science. The history of American medicine is a consistent record of extended and expanded service, scientific achievement, and acknowledged social responsibility. These priceless national assets were not attained under a system of government control or compulsion. They were the direct result of individual initiative, of ambition, of vision, of courage, of study, of research and toil. Such blessings could come only to a people who cherished and still cling to the ideals of freedom of speech, freedom of worship, and freedom of opportunity.

Are we gone stark mad? I think not all of us anyway. For an overwhelming majority of the people are opposed to the suggested Federal system of compulsory medical supervision and control which is contemplated by the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. They still wish to be free. To have that freedom of thought, word, and deed which our forefathers valued above all else and fought, died, and bled to establish. They will be free!

The American people understand; they believe in our effective system of personalized medical care. They have confidence in their doctors. They demand the right of free choice of physician. They are opposed to Federal control of and interference with their lives by directing the care of their bodies, their general health, and care at the birth of their children.

The American Bar Association has declared: "The Constitution of the United States is designed to protect the citizens of this Republic in the exercise of the rights of freemen.

"The provisions of that instrument can be rendered impotent when our citizens for the sake of an apparent immediate benefit surrender to their Government such direct control over their lives that Government, by imposing a constant fear on them of having these benefits withheld and withdrawn can compel from them obedience and subservience to its dictates."

That is well said, and the peril suggested is found in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill in full measure, heaped up and running over.

"Those who promote this bill," says Dr. Morris Fishbein, "avoided as if it were a plague the word 'compulsory.' They do not use it anywhere. In fact, they insist that everyone will have freedom of choice of a doctor and that doctors will have complete freedom of choice of patients."

Now, I ask you, if the Federal Government regulates the provision of medical service through the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service under a system to which everybody must contribute; if it regulates the fees which doctors are to receive provided they are permitted to participate in the system; if it regulates those who are to be consultants, and determines if and when they shall be consulted, I ask you, I say, Why do they try to dodge the truth of the statement that the act is compulsory and does regiment the people as a herd of catile would be regimented if driven into a corral to be vaccinated against Bang's disease?

The modified bill which we are considering today is a measure which undertakes to establish a compulsory system of medical care to be administered by the Federal Government and controlled through funds which are held in the hands of the Federal Government. Its purpose is to provide for socialized medicine under the complete control of the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, and that is what we who are opposed to the socialization of America have to fight.

It is no easy task imposed—to meet, to fight, and to answer the powerful minorities which are out for all they can get. It is popular to be for everything they ask, to submit to and to endorse their demands that they shall have a chance to live off the rest of us. That is one way to get votes.

It may take intestinal fortitude to fight against those who for their own selfish ends would do almost anything to accomplish them. The time has come, however, when we who love liberty as our forefathers knew it must put it and the right to enjoy it in a democratic republic, against all these socialistic-CIO communistic theories of government, which can but lead to the destruction of this greatest experiment in political history, the United States of America. It is worth all it costs so far as individuals are concerned, to stand for the maintenance and continuance of our form of government.

In order that my position may be made plain, let me say that I am opposed to the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill to socialize the United States and to establish serfdom in this country. Every time we move one step toward giving up the rights reserved by the States and to and by the people of the several States to run their own business; every time we pat on the back those people who think this is a good Government to live in, so long as they can live off it; every time we surrender any of our rights we sacrifice our future and go a long way toward a totalitarian form of government. That is an easy way to travel. "Broad is the way that leadeth to destruction."

I was interested to learn that the International Labour Office in a recent volume entitled "Approaches to Social Security," has this to say:

"The fact is that once the whole employed population, wives and children included, is brought within the scope of compulsory sickness insurance, the great majority of doctors, dentists, nurses, and hospitals find themselves engaged in the insurance-medical service, which squeezes out most of the private practice on the one hand, and most of the medical care hitherto given by the public assistance authorities, on the other. The next step to a single national medical service is a short one."

Note that well. The International Labour Office itself points out clearly that a comprehensive compulsory sickness insurance scheme (of the type proposed in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill) leads inevitably to a "single national medical service."

The American people simply do not have the faintest idea of what is being planned in connection with the socialization of medicine. According to publicity releases that have been widely circulated, the public has been led to believe that by paying an additional social-security tax of 1½ percent of wages or salary (to be matched equally by the employer), all workers, including the self-employed, will in future be relieved of all expenses for medical care, hospitalization, and related services. Mr. John Q. Public is encouraged to believe that there will be no change in the relationship between himself and the physician of his choice. When he is ill, he is told, he will call his family physician who will see him through a long illness just as at present, the only difference being that no bill will be rendered for services. It sounds beautifully simple and most alluring. But that is not the way sickness insurance works.

To begin with, you may quite likely have to give up your family physician no matter how much you are attached to him. There are those who argue that you do not show good sense in picking your physician; you pick him for nonscientific reasons—because you like his personality, have confidence in him, and feel an emotional or psychological rapport with him. Supporters of socialized medicine claim that those are not good reasons, that you can get along as well with a physician whom you dislike intensely but who may have great professional competence which you are unable to appreciate. In any event, under sickness insurance, you will be expected to choose a doctor in your district who is among the group of those who have signed up with the Government. If your family physician has refused to sign up, you may not have his services unless you are prepared to pay for them yourself in addition to paying your social security tax of 1½ percent for insurance medical care which you may not want. Let us assume, for a moment, that your family physician has agreed to join the system. That is lucky for you, but if you move to another part of town you are expected to change physicians as you change apartments and grocers. You may have had the best baby doctor in the world in your estimation. If you should move out of his insurance district you would have to give him up.

There are administrative reasons for such restrictions. If all medical services throughout this vast Nation are to be distributed and paid for according to rules and regulations drafted in Washington, it is obvious that physicians and patients would have to be identified in Government records. Every change of address of every person in the country would become a matter of official record. Every physician would be registered either directly in Washington or in a regional insurance office. The names of all patients on his list would be similarly recorded and counted for the purpose of seeing that physicians received payment for services and that no recalcitrant person escaped inclusion in the system. Thus, if a capitation system of payment were generally adopted in this country, every insured person would be compelled to sign up with one of the insurance doctors in his area whether or not he wished to. This would be required by law, and if an insured person failed to select a doctor from the panel which might, for instance, be displayed in the nearest post office, he would be assigned arbitrarily to some physician whose list was not full.

I cannot stress too strongly how complete is the control over the individual under Government sickness insurance. Those of you who have small children will not be able to consult a pediatrician unless the general practitioner in the insurance system gives his consent. If a member of your family breaks his leg you cannot rush him to a specialist in fractures unless your regular

insurance doctor gives an official authorization. You will not even be able to get X-rays taken without the consent of the insurance doctor. Remember this: such limited freedom of choice as you will have will be confined to the selection you make when you enter the insurance system; you will have no freedom of choice at the time of sickness. If you have selected an insurance practitioner and decide you would prefer to have a physician who is practicing with a group of doctors, it may take 6 months to change your arrangements if we may judge from foreign experience.

Of course, you know as well as I that you are not very much concerned about freedom of choice when you are well, but that is the only kind of freedom you get under sickness insurance. The time you want freedom to get the best medical care you can obtain and to call in a specialist if you want one is when you or a member of your family is ill. And if you are not satisfied with results you want to be able to act fast. You cannot wait to fill out interminable Government forms and you cannot wait for a Government O.K. when quick action may be a matter of life or death for you or for your husband, or child, or mother, or father.

After you pick a doctor, you have no assurance that you will have the same one every time. You must realize that you will be expected to go to health centers, public clinics, dispensaries, and out-patient departments for many free municipal services in order to save the insurance funds. At a health center all you can count on is some insurance doctor to take care of you and your family.

You have no assurance that home visits will be free of charge because under the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill you may be compelled to pay for the first home visit, or for the first two visits, or for all home visits in addition to paying your social security and income taxes for insurance benefits.

I cannot begin in the short time at my disposal to enter into a discussion of the myriad regulations that would affect your every move under a compulsory sickness insurance scheme. Perhaps you can gain some faint idea as to the amount of regulation imposed on patients and physicians when I tell you that the ordinary office manual which the British physician has to master to be sure he is carrying out Government regulations is over 350 pages in length [1] while the book setting forth the British National Health Insurance Acts of 1936–38, together with the statutory rules and the decisions of the Minister of Health, is nearly 1,300 pages long.[2]

In order to assure that these multitudinous governmental rules and regulations are carried out, experience has shown that there must be an insurance system employee, outside the field of actual delivery of medical service, for at least every 100 insured persons.[3] Think what that would mean in this country. There would be approximately 1,500,000 Federal, State, and local employees to police the sickness insurance system, to check on physicians and patients, to investigate and report on infringements, real or imaginary, of the rules and regulations emanating from Washington. The point has been well made that "compulsory sickness insurance changes so many relationships in such a permanent fashion that its enactment is not an experiment." There is a terrible finality about compulsory insurance legislation. Once it is enacted, once the administrative machinery is set in motion, once the taxes are collected by the Government and control is handed over to the Government, there is no escape. Not one of the more than 30 countries that have enacted such legislation has ever succeeded in throwing it off, however unsatisfactory the results have proved.

I urge you, therefore, to make it your business to find out what restrictions are inherent in this type of medical practice. I hope you will go further. Organize discussion groups. Get at the facts and spread the information to your clubs, to parents and teachers associations, and to other civic organizations. Be informed, be on guard, and take appropriate action if you do not want to have the private practice of medicine destroyed in this country, and if you do not want to become the slaves of government.

It is also important for you to realize that this movement for the socialization of medicine is part of a world-wide scheme sponsored by political groups working through the International Labour Office.[4] Where did the idea originate? In Germany. In 1883 Bismarck forced on the German people the first compulsory sickness insurance legislation. It applied only to the 10 percent of the population in the lowest income group. Bismarck had two objectives: To pacify the Socialists who were becoming too powerful and to ease the financial burden on local communities which were compelled to support the sick poor, and furnish free medical care through poor relief. Bismarck hit on the plan of making the workers at the bottom of the income scale pay a small tax into a social insurance fund in which, thereby, they would have a vested interest. Their employers were compelled to pay half as much as the workers. There was no government subsidy. After 50 years the financing arrangements were changed and employers and employees have shared the costs of the sickness insurance scheme equally since 1934. In time coverage was expanded to two-thirds of the population. Both cash and medical benefits were provided to workers and their dependents when ill. More than 30 countries have followed in Germany's footsteps.

In New Zealand a comprehensive system of social insurance was inaugurated in 1939.

The law as originally passed in New Zealand in 1938 arranged for a panel system with capitation payment similar to the British scheme. The majority of physicians simply refused to sign up for insurance practice and consequently the program could not be put into operation. The government then proposed to let physicians elect a fee-for-service basis of payment if they so wished. As a result, both methods of payment have been operating side by side with resultant confusion and administrative chaos. These are the methods of payment which have been proposed in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. If the plan has resulted in signal failure in a small, homogeneous country like New Zealand, have we any reason to believe it would work in the United States?

The difficulties which have been encountered in the countries which have instituted comprehensive national systems for the provision of medical care should give us pause. We have more physicians per thousand of population than any other country in the world; our hospitals and clinics serve as models to be copied abroad; our death rates and sickness rates are in the main better than in the countries which have compulsory sickness insurance. Why should we wish to destroy the very characteristics of our health and medical services which have made them the envy of other countries? Why should we seek to level our services downward instead of building up and improving them by correcting the weak spots in our present distribution of health facilities and services?

We may well ask, Why is it that there has been such a consistent effort in this country during the past 10 years to foist upon us a system of medical practice which has not been successful elsewhere and which has caused a great increase in bureaucratic controls as well as a large financial outlay for services which are mediocre? A considerable part of this agitation is due to the tremendous possibilities for centralization of power and funds. Sickness-insurance legislation the world over has been peculiarly susceptible to political manipulation. In many countries it has been the entering wedge for social-insurance legislation and subsequent general socialization of industry, banks, communications, and so on. Certain groups and individuals have fostered this type of legislation because it attracted the labor vote and could at the same time be sold to many politicians as a clever device for raising revenues. Remember that Bismarck, as Chancelor, was in search of revenues when he gave Germany sickness insurance in 1883; Lloyd George, Chancelor of the Exchequer, was faced with a large national deficit when, almost singlehanded, he forced through the British National Insurance Act in 1911; and Walter Nash, as Minister of Finance, had his thoughts on sources of revenue when, in 1938, he engineered enactment of New Zealand's Social Security Act with its new program of taxation.

In the United States the chief sponsors of compulsory Federal sickness insurance legislation have been organized labor, a few officials in the Social Security Board, and a group of persons with miscellaneous interests including social workers, public health officials, and a small number of physicians.

Are we going to let these labor groups, CIO and others, dictate to us and cajole us into enactment of this socialistic legislation, which experience shows would lower our standards, and would not lower the death or sickness rates, but would destroy some of our individual freedom and choice, making us part and parcel of a socialistic scheme?

Since the passage of the Social Security Act in 1935 there has been a persistent effort in this direction on the part of Isidore S. Falk, Ph. D., formerly Chief of the Division of Health Studies in the Social Security Board and now Director of Research and Statistics in that Board. He was the prime mover in drafting the medical care and hospitalization provisions of the Wagner bill (S. 1620) in 1939, the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bills (S. 1161 and H. R. 2861) in 1943, and the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bills (S. 1050 and H. R. 3293) in 1945.

The persons most active in pushing this type of legislation designed to set up a cumbersome, costly bureaucracy in this country for the purpose of nationalizing medicine, aside from organized labor, are: Senator Robert F. Wagner; Arthur J. Altmeyer, chairman of the Social Security Board; Isidore S. Falk, Ph. D., Director of Research and Statistics, Social Security Board; Wilbur Cohen, Assistant Director of Research and Statistics, Social Security Board; and Michael M. Davis, Ph. D., member of PAC, consultant to Mr. Falk, and long-time advocate of socialized medicine, formerly subsidized by the Rosenwald Fund for the express purpose of socializing medicine.

The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill would put financial control of the Nation's [5] medical care and hospitalization program primarily in the hands of the already powerful Social

[1] Newman, T. S., and Leo, A. G., National Health Insurance Manual, Being a Handbook to the Law and Practice of National Health Insurance, London, 1934, 338 pp.

[2] Lesser, Henry, The National Health Insurance Acts, 1936–38, With Explanatory Notes, Reported Cases, Decisions of the Minister of Health, and Statutory Rules and Orders. London, 1939, 1281 pp.

[3] Crownhart, J. G., Sickness Insurance in Europe, 1938, p. 25.

[4] Labor's Program to Socialize Medicine Internationally, *Medical Economics*, vol. 23, No. 2, p. 36, Nov. 1945.

[5] Editorial on Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill for Social Security, Journal of the American Medical Association, 122, no. 9, pp. 600–601, June 26, 1943.

Security Board which has no health or medical staff. This control would be made possible by reason of the fact that the vast social insurance trust fund into which $10,000,000,000, or more, would pour each year from pay-roll taxes and other sources would have a three-man board of trustees on which the Social Security Board would be represented through its chairman, while there would be no representative of the health and medical professions.

The whole scheme, believe me, is directed toward the furtherance of the Socialist state in the United States. I therefore urge every one of you to consider well whether this is the form of Government you wish to live under. Centralization of power; bureaucratic control of the daily lives of every citizen; centralization of funds in the Federal Treasury; relinquishment of local autonomy and individual responsibility—these are the steps to state socialism. If this is what the country wants, the voters and the representatives of the people should come out openly and say so. It is time to put a stop to pious declarations that we want a democratic form of government while simultaneously sponsoring legislation designed to Germanize America and to deliver our citizenry to a powerful bureaucracy in Washington. It is obvious that socialized medicine is one of the best methods by which to gain control over all the people.

You have listened to me long and patiently. The subject deserved no light treatment. If you are socialistically minded, and after winning this war and all we have accomplished, you can have the nerve to wish to change our form of government or to let anybody even try to do it, of course you will be in favor of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. I am not.

I still believe in America—with liberty and justice for all: With its government based on sound fundamental principles, yet sufficiently flexible to be readily adaptable to all essential and proper changes to meet the expanding and advanced new era of civilization.

I still take off my hat to those who founded and made it at so great cost; fought for it, bled and died for it; that we and our posterity may continue to live in, enjoy and love our America—"The land of the free and the home of the brave."

A Practical Service by the Churches in Europe's Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, during the discussion on the resolution providing an appropriation for UNRRA reference was made to the importance of relief work being done by nongovernmental organizations, including some of the churches, and in view of the interest shown in this activity I requested officials of the Church of the Brethren to give me a detailed statement on the subject, members of this denomination having rendered a notable service in connection with relief and rehabilitation programs. Mr. Warren D. Bowman, pastor of the Washington congregation and Mr. John D. Metzler of the Service Center, New Windsor, Md., have submitted the following statement describing the work of their membership in supplying generous contributions for this practical service. Such voluntary contributions to augment the appropriation of tax funds should demonstrate to the distressed populations the great concern which the American people have for their welfare. The service of the Church of the Brethren is highly constructive and will undoubtedly be of permanent benefit. More than relief is involved. The gift of cattle is one of the first steps in restoring agricultural stability and represents not only a charitable spirit but imagination and skill in the work of reconstruction. The statement follows:

The Church of the Brethren by the end of this week will have already shipped through the Brethren Service Committee 783 head of cattle, all but 104 of which have gone to Europe. The Brethren Service Committee made the first delivery of livestock to Europe following the war, so far as we know. This consisted of six Brown Swiss sires sent to Greece for herd improvement work. It is a bit difficult to tell how many cattle we have ready to ship because they come to us in carload lots almost unannounced over the entire United States. California and Idaho have delivered two carloads each. A shipment will probably come in from the State of Washington. Nearby points are delivering cattle by truck. Please understand that not all of these cattle are contributed by members of the Church of the Brethren. They are given by many other groups including 4-H groups, radio stations, Kiwanis groups, public school groups, Catholics, and various Protestant groups. We hope to be able to ship many thousands of cattle next year.

We have two types of agreement with UNRRA. We are providing livestock attendants for UNRRA shipments. UNRRA pays these men $150 plus maintenance for one round trip. We simply secure the men and bring them to the port. This is a much-appreciated service because we have access to the quality of men which UNRRA would find difficult to secure through her channels. Our "seagoing cowboys" include most all professions and walks of life. We have ministers, school teachers, farmers, merchants, college students, high school boys, veterinarians and others assisting in the rehabilitation of livestock in Europe by this method.

In the shipping of cattle our agreement is that UNRRA is transporting Brethren Service cattle to the people of the receiving country. The Brown Swiss sires were sent through the Near East Foundation. We do not know what the agreement was between the Near East Foundation and UNRRA. We are expecting a shipment of 150 head of cattle to go this week from us through UNRRA to Poland.

We have spent considerable time in seeing that proper distribution of the cattle is made. We have worked with the governments of receiving countries to insure that proper distribution is made. In Poland the cattle are to be distributed through the National Cooperatives. We have representatives of the Brethren Service Committee in France and in Belgium to supervise distribution. In Italy a committee has been organized looking forward to the proper placing of the cattle. We are negotiating with groups in China, and if we ship to China we will probably have representatives there. Wherever possible we are using personnel already on the field to assist in the distribution.

The Brethren have been collecting wheat. Again not all of this wheat was contributed by members of the Church of the Brethren. We have provided approximately 60,000 bushels of wheat and have cash raised for the purchase of an additional 25,000 to 30,000 bushels which will be added to this shipment. This wheat is destined for Holland. We are sending carloads of rolled oats, flour, canned goods and similar foods, to Europe. At New Windsor, Md., and at Modesto, Calif., we are receiving and processing clothing for shipment. From Brethren sources already we have contributed perhaps 60 to 80 tons of clothing, shoes, soap, and similar relief materials during the past year. Beginning on October 1 our two centers are serving the church committee on overseas relief and reconstruction. This is a cooperative group organized by the Federal Council of Churches and the foreign mission conference. The first major project of that group which we have handled was linens and bedding for Protestant pastors of Europe. We are currently shipping two carloads of these baled units, one to France and one to Holland. Indications are that this material will reach a total of perhaps 60 tons. With the publicity which is now being sent out by the United Council of Church Women, the Southern Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and other groups, indications are that many, many tons of clothing will be collected and sent to both Europe and Asia from our two warehouses.

Training in the Military Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 16, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter from a recently discharged soldier upon the subject of compulsory military training.

Mr. Speaker, the letter I am enclosing sheds new light on a different angle of training in the military forces. The letter is from a man recently discharged after 3½ years of Army duty, most of it overseas. He has had a close-up view of what really happens back of the lines. It is worthy of our consideration.

The letter follows:

GERING, NEBR., *November 12, 1945.*

Mr. A. L. MILLER.

DEAR SIR: Just a note concerning the compulsory military training bill and why I am opposed to it. As you know, the modern army is composed of about 15 percent combat men and the rest technical experts working behind the lines. These are approximate figures. This 85 percent are soldiers who simply carried their civilian occupation over into the Army. I was one of these, having just been discharged after 3½ years of Army duty, most of it overseas. My point is this:

Our outfit was over at the start and was constantly reinforced over a period of 2½ years by recruits from the States. Invariably the men who were sent to us direct from civilian life were better men in every respect as to working, discipline, bad habits, etc., than the men who had spent considerable time in the Army. Some of the latter were not worth their passage over—or back either. I suppose other outfits noticed the same condition. Here is a case where Army training—as it is practiced—not only failed to fit a man for carrying on his part in the war, but was actually detrimental to the cause for which it was set up.

I mention only this one point. Undoubtedly you have many letters stressing others. For the 15 percent combat men I am not qualified to speak. This one thing, however, seems the most pertinent to me because it is representative of what Army life does to it's men. The Army can't help being what

it is, and if another war comes along it will again be the civilian people who put the punch into the military.

Sincerely yours,

FRED. A. SCHENBECK.

Speed Up Return of Overseas Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 16, 1945

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, we were able under the most dangerous and pressing conditions not only to land millions of men on foreign soil in this war but to supply them with billions of dollars worth of material.

Now that the war is over we hear the constant excuse that the boys are being delayed in being brought home by reason of lack of transportation. It is obvious that this problem is being neglected by the Government and the military leaders. We are lowering the morale of millions of men because of this neglect. We may cause them to become embittered to the point where it will have a very bad and continuing influence throughout their lives.

The majority of the Members of Congress feel that something should be done and have urged our military leaders to speed up the return of our men from overseas.

Congressman REED of New York has introduced a bill that would automatically release everyone from service who has served 18 months. The proper committee has not held hearings or reported this bill. Consequently, a petition has been filed by the gentleman from New York, Congressman REED, known as petition No. 8, which is on the Speaker's desk. Other petitions along this line have been filed by the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman SHAFER, and the gentleman from Mississippi, Congressman RANKIN. It will require 218 signatures to bring one of these bills to the floor of the House where, in my judgment, it will be passed by an overwhelming majority.

With the Speaker's permission, I am going to insert a letter in the RECORD which has been mailed to me from the boys on Okinawa by a boy from my district. I hope every Congressman will read this letter and when you read it I believe you will feel it your duty to come to the Speaker's desk and sign petition No. 8 which will help to get over a million men who helped to win this war back home. It is in substance a prayer from men who are becoming embittered, men who have won the war, because after having helped to win the war the Nation does not show gratitude enough to simply bring them back home.

This is a serious letter well worth your reading and worthy of action on your part after you have read it.

This boy from my district, still overseas, who sent this letter, served 18 months overseas and has 5 battle stars. Naturally, his parents also feel very keenly about it. I do hope, also, that the military leaders will hurry the return of our boys to their homeland.

The letter follows:

OKINAWA, *November 3, 1945.*

DEAR SIR: My name isn't MacArthur, Eisenhower, or Patton. Who am I? One of the many forgotten "dogfaces" exiled on Okinawa. The war's over, gentlemen. Will you listen to a soldier for a few minutes?

My buddies and I have been in the service from 2 to 5 years. We won't give you a long talk about heroes; no. Just a few plain facts. Now, we are told the war is over. Now, my buddies ask: "Why are we still here?" Could it be that Congress didn't declare the war ended? Or is it because our power-mad generals have bamboozled the public and Congress into believing that hundreds of thousands of war-scarred men are needed in policing innumerable islands dotting the Pacific—men who sit around and do nothing but grumble and yearn for home, whose lives are becoming filled with bitterness and disillusionment. Where is that glorious victory? Has the war ended for us? We wonder. Can it be the Army high command is actually making our Nation believe a need exists for keeping hundreds of thousands of men isolated in typhoon area and wastelands, living under almost battle conditions and eating miserable field rations?

There are many units on this island like ours, and scattered all over the Pacific. The War Department continually announces new point reductions and disseminates information to the public regarding efforts made to get us home. Yet nobody has been moved from our organization on time for return to the States under the point system. The men who have left were very few in number and men with extremely long service overseas who should have been rotated long ago under the War Department plan for rotation. Those men were a full month behind schedule leaving when they did get the chance. Why, all this, gentlemen, or don't we have the right to ask?

During the past few years the War Department has convinced the world that brilliant organizing skill of our military has surmounted some of the greatest logistic difficulties in our history. We moved millions of men and supplies to two far-flung war fronts. We also provided lend-lease to nations throughout the world, in addition to supplying the scattered armies of our allies. Today, when we ask our officers about our return, the answer is, "Transportation isn't available." What happened to our thousands of Liberty ships? our transports? our endless supply ships? our fleets of planes? our great Navy? And if these aren't enough, why can't we lease ships from other countries in return for some of the billions of dollars we gave them?

Men who have been separated from home for long, weary months, going through all the anxieties and dangers that a war brings, feel that returning home is the beautiful and important subject in their lives. Malaria, diseases, endless hours of work and suffering, being marooned in typhoons, were some of the minor inconveniences our jobs demanded, and none of us complained or expected less. But what about relief for us now? Taxes, reconversion, voting, and readjustments all pale into nothingness when compared to this shining dream of return.

Officials have filled our ears with platitudes about a nation's gratitude to its veterans. Gentlemen, we want nothing from our country in payment for our services. We feel proud and privileged to serve. Today the need for us no longer exists. If there's gratitude to be shown, let it be by returning veterans home at once. If ships and planes are lacking, we'll try rowboats and rafts. Let's substitute common sense for logistics, civilian thinking for Army blundering, democracy for militarism.

FUTURE CIVILIANS OF THE U. S. A.

The Weak Shall Be Made Strong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 16, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, in the light of recent scientific developments one immediate difference between military might of the future and that of the past 5,000 years becomes obvious. That difference is that, whereas in all past wars the size of a nation and the size of its army were the chief determining factors in its military might, now a country need be only large enough to hold a thousand atomic bombs and antisocial enough to use these bombs before anyone else does. A small nation like Sweden or Norway has uranium, iron, steel, and advanced scientists enough to destroy our entire civilization, if it so desires. A thousand atomic bombs can wipe out 40,000,000 people in 1 evening in our large cities. A few projectiles containing disease bacteria can wipe out a whole city in even less time. Modern marvels like the death ray, previously confined to comic-strip heroes, can help to destroy our world. Atomic energy and its uses for destruction are only the most spectacular of all the hundreds of new scientific devices which make it possible for one small nation to render the rest of the world impotent. We have now a very literal fulfillment of the Biblical prophecy that the weak shall be made strong, the humble exalted, and the meek shall inherit the earth, with the difference that the meek will also be in a position to destroy the earth.

There has been talk of decentralizing our cities or rebuilding them underground as a defense against future aggressions. However, scientists who are in a position to know affirm that no such devices can defend us against these latest scientific developments. There is only one obvious defense, one compelling need of our times—to permit a world organization to control all destructive devices by world policing and regular inspections so that any preparation for aggression, wherever it would be discovered, could be immediately curtailed.

Neither decentralized cities, nor underground dwellings, nor marching soldiers are going to be proof in the future against attempts at aggression. We must be careful therefore not to concentrate our energies in useless military training but to broaden our outlook and make effective our defense of the whole world by seeing this international problem in international terms.

Effective and Unanswerable Testimony Continues in Behalf of Need Now for Single Department of Defense—General Eisenhower Favors Merger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 16, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, when General Eisenhower testified today in favor of a unified command, he answered the criticisms of Navy Department spokesmen who have indicated that the job of heading a single Department of Defense was too difficult an assignment for one individual. Eisenhower said:

I am told that the task of the civilian secretary who would preside over such a department is beyond the capacity of any man. If this were true, then it follows that no man has the capacity to assume the Presidency of the United States.

I trust my colleagues will read the complete text of General Eisenhower's statement in behalf of legislation which is pending in both the House and the Senate. It is gratifying to follow the hearings being held before the Senate Military Affairs Committee, and it is my hope that hearings can begin soon before the House Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments on legislation which I have sponsored since 1940 to effect a consolidation.

The Hearst newspapers carried today the following editorial in support of the merger proposal:

ONE NATION, ONE DEFENSE

The merits and advantages of uniting the administrative direction of the Army, Navy, and Air Forces of the United States under a single Cabinet head are so evident that arguments against it appear to border on the specious and puerile.

In fact, to borrow the terminology of war, opponents of the proposal seem to have overlooked the broad strategic objective of the plan and wasted their efforts in attacking it piecemeal, in unimportant detail and at points that are neither significant nor decisive.

The special Army-Navy committee appointed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to study the matter, after hearing 80 high-ranking officers from all branches of the armed forces, recommended immediate legislation to create a single department so that the Army and Navy be kept free of the "alarming" lack of coordination that existed at the time of the Pearl Harbor attack.

And the committee sharply underlined the stubborn existence, after 3 years of war, of "inconsistencies, lack of understanding, jealousies, and duplications" between the services.

A single department, the committee reported, would furthermore operate more efficiently in harmonizing the all-too-frequent divergence between the national policies of the United States and their military implications.

Now what can be the objection to a proposal that is so simple, rational, practical, economic and, in the light of modern strategic concepts, so vitally necessary?

Where is there mention or intent of abolishing the Army, the Navy, or the Air Forces, or of interfering with local command, or of starving one service to feed another, or of depriving specialist officers from the opportunity within their own arm of gaining honors, authority, or victory?

Nowhere, of course.

The successful conclusion of operations in both the European and Asiatic theaters, and the crushing defeat of the Axis Powers, both proved once and for all that modern war demands the closest coordination of all arms under a responsible high command.

There is no longer such a thing as a naval war, an army war or an air war.

Actually, there is no such thing any longer as a war fought by the soldiers and sailors and aviators alone.

There is only all-out, total war, not only on the battlefield but at home, fought not only by men with arms but by the Nation's industries, science and economy.

General of the Army MacArthur, who brilliantly commanded land, sea and air forces, told General Kenney, head of the United States Far Eastern Air Forces, that he considered his opposition to unified air forces, in 1931, as "The biggest mistake of my military career."

General Kenney realized then that General MacArthur's mind "was not set in concrete. He understood the unlimited possibilities of warfare 20 years from today. Those terrible possibilities had altered his opinion."

Not all general officers have MacArthur's genius for learning nor his candor, but even the most hide-bound and tradition-ridden military mind must realize that warfare today cannot be waged successfully if men in responsible command still think in terms of "competition," which means simply haggling for advantages to the detriment of the only objective, the defense of America.

There is, and there will always be, a healthy competition between arms, and of units within the separate arms.

But it is an honorable rivalry, only to see who can most strongly and gloriously confound the enemy."

There is only one aim for Americans—be they soldiers, fliers, sailors, engineers, scientists, workmen or simple citizens—and that is to use our power justly, wisely, economically and efficiently toward the ends of safety and peace.

Compared to this objective, all others are trivial or illusory.

A single, united department of defense will take us a long way toward the objective and it should be brought to being without delay.

Mr. Speaker, we will continue to find certain individuals, largely from the Navy Department, who will oppose the merger. I pray that their efforts will fail. This is the time for Congress to show courage and vision because, in the words of Eisenhower:

Under a system of unification you could develop a more efficient organization with 75 percent of the men than you would need now.

He also declared that the Allies would have lost the war in northwest Europe and the Mediterranean without a single, over-all command. It was in this connection that he indicated that those who believed a single department would subordinate one service to another were absolutely wrong. The campaigns in Africa and Europe proved such fears to be groundless.

General Eisenhower, as well as other witnesses, has strongly supported the contention that air forces are now on a par with other branches of the military and naval services. On this subject, he said:

No sane officer can contest arguments that the air arm deserves equality with the Army and Navy.

Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, let us take to our hearts this warning from General Eisenhower:

The unification must be accomplished lest we lose the peace we have so dearly bought.

Veterans Cannot Take Jobs in Long Beach Area Because of Lack of Housing for Selves and Families—United States Employment Service Manager Reports Placement of World War II Veterans Are Needed by Navy and Industry but No Place To Live—Long Beach Job Placement Surpasses Five States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 16, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am materially helped in my work as Congressman from the Eighteenth Congressional District of California, by the cooperation of industry, management, labor, and Government in keeping me informed of data affecting said Eighteenth District and including, of course, specifically the problems of my home city of Long Beach, Calif. One of those able governmental representatives is Mr. George Toll, the manager of the Long Beach office of the United States Employment Service, and he now furnishes me the following facts:

Since VJ-day over 100,000 men have been discharged from the service through Fort MacArthur and Terminal Island separation stations. A large number of these men were inducted from southern California.

There is every indication that not only those inducted from southern California but many of those being released here who formerly lived in other States have expressed a desire to locate in the southern California area.

Eight percent of the Nation's armed forces were recruited in California; 10 to 12 percent of the Nation's armed forces are being discharged here with the intention of making California their permanent home. There is every indication that the ratio in Long Beach is even larger.

The following factors further complicate the problem: (1) Before they entered the service, a large percentage of the veterans were single and living at home. Thousands of these have married and are looking for homes of their own. (2) Housing has had to be made available to the families of men in the local United States naval hospital. It is only natural that families from every corner of the Nation flock to the bedsides of these men who were wounded in combat and who, in many cases, are back in the United States for the first time in many months. (3) While the population of the

Long Beach area has grown by leaps and bounds during the war years, housing facilities have increased by only a small percentage. (4) War-industry workers formerly housed in barracks or west-side housing projects now are seeking other types of work and moving into homes from the aircraft and shipbuilding districts. (5) Over 1,200 in-migrants are settling in the Long Beach area each month.

Long Beach has an unparalleled industrial growth ahead; it would indeed be unfortunate if the housing shortage were responsible for these veterans, whose skills will be so urgently needed, having to make their homes elsewhere.

That Long Beach holds an enviable place in the Nation's industrial growth was emphasized by George Toll, local USES manager, who revealed that in August alone the Long Beach United States Employment Service office made more placements of workers on jobs than were made in the entire States of Vermont, Delaware, North Dakota, South Dakota, or Wyoming over the same period of time.

Local placement figures for August totaled 1,849, although the workers hired throughout the Long Beach area during that time were far heavier than this figure indicated because the lifting of manpower controls made it possible for the first time since the inception of the manpower stabilization program for workers to accept any jobs they wished.

The Long Beach United States Employment Service made 1,147 placements in September and 1,435 during October, but as national statistics have not yet been made available it is not possible at the present time to compare these figures with placements made in other parts of the country during the last 2 months.

Toll stated that an analysis of his October records shows that placement of nonwhites increased 30 percent and that placements of World War II veterans almost doubled.

In September 467 workers were placed in manufacturing industries, whereas in October this figure reached 582. According to Toll, manufacturing-industry placements are expected to increase monthly, keeping pace with the growth in conversion activities.

October placements in the clerical and sales field more than doubled the September figure.

A month ago the majority of Long Beach job seekers were women; October figures show a reversal of the situation.

Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, the facts as herein set forth—furnished by George Toll—are not limited entirely to Long Beach and the Eighteenth Congressional District either, many of them are applicable to southern California at least. He reported that it was impossible for returning veterans who were being separated from military service through the Long Beach harbor area separation centers to find living quarters. They were being forced to look elsewhere for employment unless extended housing conditions can be made available immediately.

Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, I emphatically and specifically urge that all those concerned with it, to do their dead-level utmost, at the earliest possible date, to relieve this tragic housing shortage in this strategic area of Long Beach and of Los Angeles County and of southern California. We must not forget that into this already crowded area came many hundreds of thousands of folks from other States with their families to live and to work in industries in wartime manufacture and occupation. Nor have they returned to their home States since Japan's collapse. Surveys indicate that very few of them will return to their former abodes.

Then, when Long Beach and Los Angeles areas were designated as important separation centers, there naturally hastened thereto thousands of wives and children of men in uniform whom they anticipated would be separated in Long Beach and Los Angeles separation centers. The facts show that these men—these distinguished GI's—with their families do not choose to go back to their former States to reside. They have elected to become permanent California citizens and residents and workers and school and college attendants. But the continuing housing shortage because of the aforesaid other reasons given, is foreclosing thousands of these war veterans from doing other than living in garages or automobiles, or inadequate trailers, or in unhealthy, insanitary surroundings, or to return to their former States, or to take job opportunities elsewhere which are not nearly as advantageous or acceptable to them. So these veterans who fought and won the war for us are in practice being denied job opportunities where they are most happy to take them because there is no reasonable place to abide. This in effect Mr. Speaker, amounts to denying them their job opportunities. The American workingman, and the American war veteran, is one and the same in attitude, in opportunity, and in practice; he will not stay where he cannot earn or have decent food, housing, and clothing, and educational and recreational opportunities for his wife and children. I am sure we highly compliment him on being so sensibly American on these points. We would not respect him if he in turn did not expect and demand these reasonable opportunities as the result of his day's toil. It behooves all concerned to forthwith attack this unhappy and undemocratic condition and whip into a decent and democratic opportunity for these returning veterans with their loved ones.

Transportation Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 16, 1945

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, as the House is aware, our Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been making a survey of the transportation problems of the Nation, and particularly as to the constructive needs of transportation for the postwar period. We are approaching these problems from the long-time viewpoint rather than confining our consideration to purely temporary conditions. We have extended a widespread invitation for information and suggestions from every practicable available source.

The mass of material now in the hands of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, prepared by shippers, transportation agencies, economists, and others in all parts of the country, in response to the list of suggested topics sent out by the committee as a preliminary to a postwar transportation survey, indicates a tremendous public interest in national transportation problems.

The committee is now engaged in digesting and analyzing the material already in hand. The request that interested persons submit their statements by November 15 is not regarded by the committee as a deadline. Quite a number of persons and organizations have asked for an extension of time in which to present their statements. We have granted these requests and still invite all who care to do so to forward their statements as early as their convenience will permit. The analysis of the material being received by the committee will carry this preliminary work well into the New Year, giving those who have not replied time to make their views available to Congress.

The splendid cooperation received by the committee reflects a sincere and commendable desire on the part of users of transportation, transport agencies, investors, and economists to aid the Congress in reaching constructive and significant solutions of the Nation's many complicated and difficult transportation problems.

Our committee will devote all the time necessary for a thorough consideration and helpful revision of our transportation laws where we find a substantial need therefor. It is our desire to give all who can make contributions to this survey full opportunity to do so.

Big Business Must Rebuke Chiselers in Its Ranks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 16, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me, I insert an editorial appearing in the Philadelphia Record of November 16 entitled "Big Business Must Rebuke Chiselers in Its Ranks," as follows:

BIG BUSINESS MUST REBUKE CHISELERS IN ITS RANKS

What a wholesome thing it would be for the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers to rebuke publicly their members who violate elementary ethics.

Weirton Steel Co. has been fined $148,215 by a Federal court for unlawful diversion, in wartime, of vital war materials for improvement of a swank country club.

Manufacturing firms controlling 90 percent of United States artificial limb production have been indicted by a Federal grand jury on charges of conspiring to fix unreasonable and noncompetitive prices, thus working a hardship on military and civilian amputees.

Such contemptible chiseling blackens the good name of all industry. That should not be.

Dishonest, unpatriotic practices by a small minority of big business should no more be

an excuse to smear all big business than all labor should be defamed because of a wartime strike by John L. Lewis.

Everybody does not reason that fairly.

That is why it is so important that the majority of industry, which does have respect for the law and ethical practice, should condemn those among its members who step out of line.

We should like to hear the National Chamber of Commerce and the AMA speak out, make it clear that they are as disgusted as the general public by Weirton's snide trick and by the conspiracy to maintain high prices and retard development of lighter and improved artificial limbs.

They could hardly find a better way to serve the best interests of big business. They would be guarding its good name.

The fine imposed on Weirton Steel Co. was more of a farce than justice. It was less than 1½ percent of the profits last year of Weirton's parent concern, National Steel Co.

Even if it were proper to hold only the firm to blame, this was a slap on the wrist.

The responsible officials of the firm should have been indicted and brought to justice.

Crimes are committed by human beings, not corporations. Human beings can be sent to jail; corporations can't be.

The accused artificial-limb manufacturers, according to the Federal grand jury, bound themselves together in such a way that they could dictate prices to Government agencies, such as the Veterans' Administration.

In other words, no competition. As a result of its lack, the artificial limbs are little better, a congressional committee said recently, than those made in Civil War days. Legs and arms are cumbersome, almost useless in many cases.

While we should be providing military heroes who left arms and legs on battlefields with the best modern science can develop, modern science apparently hasn't been allowed to operate.

Is this free enterprise? No. Yet such firms probably would be among the first to shout that free enterprise was in jeopardy should Government impose controls on them.

Industry can purge itself, as can labor, of the few bad actors among its ranks if it has the courage and the will to denounce and discipline its own kind.

Navy Sex Laxity in Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 16, 1945

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter by Chaplain Lawrence L. Lacour, United States Naval Reserve, from Tokyo, to the Des Moines Register. He was the first Navy chaplain in Japan, landing ahead of General MacArthur, and is a member of the Des Moines Methodist Conference.

The letter was read over Radio Station WJAG, Norfolk, Nebr., on November 9, 1945.

The letter follows:

Since a large percentage of the Navy are reserves, many of them under 20, and we chaplains are entrusted with the moral and spiritual welfare of these men, we believe the American public should be informed when conditions and policies exist that jeopardize the morality and faith of our servicemen.

As a policy of venereal-disease control, the Navy is permitting unrestricted access, by all men on liberty in the Yokosuka area, to houses of prostitution where the venereal incidence among the prostitutes is considered 100 percent.

The control is the prophylaxis administered by naval corpsmen on duty in the house.

Since September 11, liberty parties have been permitted ashore in this area. Our ship was the first to be granted liberty, and as we are tied up in the navy yard, I have been able to observe the situation from the beginning. On September 2 the medical officer in charge of venereal control told me that it would be his policy to supervise the places of prostitution by examining the prostitutes, by segregating those infected, by insisting on cleanliness within the houses, and by establishing adequate numbers of prophylactic stations throughout the town.

When liberty parties went ashore men gathered the impression that the medical department had eliminated all immediate danger. Military police and naval corpsmen informed the men in the lines in front of the houses that everything was medically inspected. As a result many enlisted men and officers, including a number from our ship, had sexual contact without using any prophylaxis.

Prior to sending men ashore some ships ran training films on venereal disease, and announced that a high percentage of venereal disease could be expected in Japan. On other ships, the commands refused to do anything to discourage promiscuity, and gave no warning about expected venereal incidence.

On September 14 it was disclosed that out of a typical group of prostitutes, 51 out of 60 had syphilis, were not being treated, that there would be no further examinations, and that no policy of treatment or segregation would be followed.

Coincidental with Archbishop Spellman's visit here, by September 16 all red-light districts were declared out of bounds. A group of us chaplains inspected the restricted area after a week of suppression. We found that although the method was not totally effective, the number of offenders that got into the restricted area was small, as the geographic location of the area made policing comparatively easy.

It was not so easy to suppress the free-lance prostitutes and the smaller houses in the unrestricted area, but there was little open violation. A man intent on sexual contact could find it, but he had to exert considerable effort and run the risk of arrest. Men were treated as usual at prophylactic stations with no great threat of disciplinary action, and, during this period of suppression, the number of treatments ashore and afloat decreased remarkably.

At a meeting of the fleet medical officers on September 26 it was proposed that one large house be opened, that it be operated with the understanding that all the women were diseased, and that a voluntary system of prophylaxis be available by placing a Navy-operated treatment station within the house.

Although some medical officers and two chaplains in attendance protested, it was stated by the senior medical officer that this was to be the policy.

Subsequently, the chaplains of the fleet met, and submitted to the flag a memorandum that represented the unanimous opinion of the group. The action of the chaplains was ignored, and Sunday, October 7 the Yosuura house was opened to enlisted men, with geisha houses permitted to accept the patronage of chiefs and officers.

Although the number of men on liberty next day was considerably under normal because of rain, I observed, in company with four chaplains and the officer of the day of the military police, a line of enlisted men four abreast almost a block long, waiting their turn.

MP's kept the lines orderly, and permitted only as many as could be served to enter at a time. As men were admitted into the lobby, they would select a companion (113 on duty that day, according to one of the Japanese attendants), pay the 10 yen to the Japanese operator, and then go with the girl to her room. We inspected several of these rooms and found them to be reasonably clean.

When the men returned they were registered and administered prophylaxis by Navy corpsmen. Although approximately 20 men could be treated at a time, there was a line waiting. True, many of the men were the type one might expect to patronize such a place, but the bulk of the customers were younger men. The open accessibility of women in this place has been a factor contributing to the first sex experience of some of my men.

When one considers the rate of disease, that there are some forms of venereal disease in the Orient that do not respond to treatment, that some of the women have been exposed to leprosy. On the basis of these facts, it is contended that:

1. The Navy's policy of unrestricted sexual opportunities with diseased women is no solution for the problem of venereal control.

2. American people would insist that the Navy immediately adopt a policy of rigid suppression in regards to prostitution.

3. The Navy, which completely ignored moral implications in the present situation, be charged to consider the moral aspects of policies governing personnel.

4. The people who loan their sons to the Government demand moral protection or refuse to supply the personnel for our armed forces.

5. Although many naval officers are gentlemen, others by example and advice have encouraged immorality among our men.

6. The Navy's unlimited sale of beer, which has contributed to moral delinquency and numerous incidents here, be discontinued. And that throughout the Navy, soft drinks be made just as available as beer whenever beverages are provided by the Navy.

7. An organization that has demonstrated such brilliant strategy in defeating the Japanese military not permit our men to become the open victims of Japanese prostitutes in the final round.

United States Steel Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 16, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, a very informative and interesting editorial appeared in the splendid, independent Christian Science Monitor, under date of November 13, which I feel should be read by the officials of the United States Steel Corp. and other steel magnates who have refused to talk over the matter of wage increases with their employees. I am sure it will also prove of interest to the membership of the House and to the public generally. Under the leave given me, I insert it, as follows:

START TALKING, GENTLEMEN

United States Steel's attempt to place its whole wage problem on the shoulders of OPA appears both arbitrary and untenable.

President Fairless lets it be known that his company will not bargain with the United Steel Workers until and unless the OPA grants a price increase and consents to further increases should wages be raised. Secretary Schwellenbach writes Mr. Fairless

that the Government insists on no wage increase but does ask that the company sit down with the union and that they argue out their respective cases in the presence of a Labor Department conciliator. Mr. Fairless replies that President Murray of the CIO demands a yes-or-no answer to the union's bid for $2 a day higher wages and thereby brings collective bargaining to an end. Mr. Murray so far makes no comment.

The public is by now sufficiently sophisticated—and the United States Steel Corp. should be—to recognize conventional tactics when it sees them. Labor habitually states its first demands as irreducible. Industry's standard reply is a flat "No," at the same time flourishing a threatened price boost toward the public.

The public is not convinced that the steel workers' demand for $2 a day more is justified by the present price of steel. It doesn't know. But neither is it convinced that United States Steel can't afford the boost nor that steel prices must go up.

OPA has a responsibility in this situation. It is to act promptly on the steel company's pending petition. The findings can properly enter into the bargaining, or the results of the bargaining into a subsequent plea for a price concession.

But the public interest cannot permit any industry—which eventually would mean all industry—to automatically shift the cost of wage increases to the consumers, to stipulate at the start that there exists no margin of profit to be divided between stockholders and workers through collective bargaining.

Retail Automobile and Truck Dealers and Their Troubles With OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 16, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, as of this date, November 16, 1945, the numerous retail dealers in automobile and trucks are still in Washington, not exactly offering up their adoration to the infallible Office of Price Administration, but they are in trouble and they are pleading with that outfit to give them a chance. Is it not ridiculous that American citizens in the year of our Lord 1945 have to go to an arbitrary Government agency and do something akin to begging forgiveness for sins they have never committed. Yet, that is just what has been taking place under the guidance of the Select Committee on Small Business which has conducted elaborate hearings for the benefit of the retail automobile and truck dealers in this country and that committee has advised us today that these people have been granted an audience by the OPA officials, and that the weather is fine.

Things were a little bit cloudy on November 14, or else Chester Bowles, Administrator of OPA, had high blood pressure. Maybe it was a combination of both, but he certainly sounded off like one of the old Roman dictators. I want to be perfectly fair to OPA and its officials so without elaboration, or concealment, I incorporate in my remarks at this point a news item from the Evening Star published at Washington, D. C., November 13, 1945, which news item reads as follows:

OPA BARS BOOST IN AUTO PRICES; LOBBYISTS HIT—BOWLES TELLS HOUSE GROUP PRESSURE IS SIGN OF TIMES

Bitterly denouncing "government by pressure," Price Administrator Bowles told Congress today he is rejecting demands of automobile dealers for higher retail prices on new cars. He said OPA would announce the prices Thursday.

Mr. Bowles declared that government by lobby pressure "is an ominous sign of our times."

Appearing before the House Small Business Committee, the OPA chief estimated Members of Congress have received more than 5,000 telegrams protesting OPA's automobile price plans.

Describing this as "the greatest single pressure-group operation since OPA was established," Mr. Bowles declared:

"Two and one-half years in Washington has made me something of an expert on pressure groups, lobbyist, and pressure-group tactics. I have been alarmed at the tendency on the part of some to feel that Congress and governmental officials should base their decisions, not on the validity of a particular issue, but on the measure of pressure which could be focused at any given point."

THREAT TO RIGHTS SEEN

"This idea of Government by pressure is an ominous sign of our times. It is a threat to the democratic rights of all the inarticulate, silent, little people of America."

Mr. Bowles told the committee, in the presence of hundreds of automobile dealers gathered in the House caucus room, that under the OPA price schedules for new cars the dealers "are likely to have their best profit year in 1946."

Discussing the forthcoming price announcement, Mr. Bowles said:

"Actually, cost absorption which we will require of dealers in 1946 will not exceed 4 or 5 percent. We cannot reveal the exact amount at this time. At 4 percent a dealer will get a realized profit of 20 percent, compared with his actually realized profit of the prewar period of 11.5 percent."

ALTERNATIVES LISTED

He gave an illustration in an effort to prove that a dealer selling a $1,000 car would profit by $200 under the planned OPA prices, while his prewar profit—after considering losses on trade-in cars—would be only $115.

"I am very certain," Mr. Bowles said, "that the automobile dealers do not really understand that they are asking us to accept one of two impossible alternatives:

"Either abandon the basic principle of price control which has enabled us to hold the line against the most dangerous inflationary pressures this country has ever seen, or to bow before their organized power and exempt them from a rule to which legitimately and legally there can be no exceptions. * * *

"We are sitting uneasily on a keg of dynamite, and they are asking us via Western Union to put the fuse to the keg * * *."

BASIS OF NEEDS STRESSED

"Were we free to exempt automobile dealers—which we are not—the requirement of equality of treatment would then compel us to abandon cost absorption for all trades, and industries."

He said he wanted to declare, "with all possible emphasis," that: "We believe that price control policies, like other national policies, should result from careful consideration of the needs of the Nation, not from the numerous telegrams and phone calls a pressure group can pour into Washington."

The dealers, saying they were gravely concerned over the threatened cut in their established trade discount, had led the committee last week to request Mr. Bowles to delay any final action on automobile ceilings until all the facts are investigated.

Mr. Speaker, this was a remarkable and courageous declaration of Government policy and I marvelled at the courage displayed. Since November 13 the OPA has relented and as was stated today they are granting the right of further discussion to the representatives of the automobile dealers and truck dealers.

GOVERNMENT BY PRESSURE

It would appear that the Administrator of the OPA was very much concerned on November 13 because a group of American citizens were trying to influence his infallible judgment. I personally do not believe in the doctrine of infallibility in the business world. I like to think that a man can make a mistake, and that he does not amount to much, unless he makes a mistake occasionally. The test of his real worth depends on whether or not he will admit the mistake. It takes a real man to do that.

But to get back to the subject—was it proper for the automobile and truck dealers to appeal to their Government? That is the big question, and the Evening Star, of Washington, D. C., on November 14, 1945, tosses an atomic bomb toward the OPA in a powerful editorial, which reads as follows:

PRESSURE GROUPS

OPA Administrator Chester Bowles would be entitled to an award of some sort if he had been a bit more specific in denouncing pressure groups during his appearance before the House Small Business Committee. But it is difficult to tell, despite the vehemence of his language, whether he was after big game or little game.

Mr. Bowles said that "Government by pressure is an ominous sign of our times," and with that all thoughtful citizens will agree. He also said that during his stay in Washington he has become something of an expert on lobbying tactics and he regards them as "a threat to the democratic rights of all the inarticulate, silent, little people of America."

But what lobbies was he talking about? If he had reference to the organized labor lobby, which does not hesitate to tell Congress what it must and must not do, and whose wage demands are at the bottom of most of Mr. Bowles' present troubles, he did not mention it by name. If he had reference to the big industry lobbies, which still do a thriving business, he again failed to particularize. Nor did he mention by name any of the other better-known lobbies—the farm lobby, the group lobbying against military training, the various racial lobbies, and so forth. But he did mention the retail automobile dealers, and therefore the inference is that, primarily at least, he was talking about them.

The OPA wants the dealers to absorb some of the economic pressure which continued price ceilings are going to impose on the car manufacturers. Mr. Bowles thinks the dealers can do this and still enjoy higher profits than before. The dealers apparently think otherwise, and some 5,000 of them, it is said, have sent telegrams to their Congressmen to that effect.

Perhaps this was an iniquitous thing for the dealers to do. But at worst it is a trivial aspect of the lobbying problem, and if Mr. Bowles was shooting only at the auto dealers he was out for very small game, indeed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am just giving the views of one of the great newspapers of our country and am not trying to influence anybody one way or another at this particular moment. Regardless of

whether or not we agree with everything the Evening Star did say, it does have a rather original way of expression, and that is why the foregoing editorial will be welcomed by the retail automobile and truck dealers throughout America.

Farm Price Parity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 16, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me, I insert excerpts from an editorial appearing in the November 12 issue of the Baltimore Sun and an editorial appearing in the November 15 issue of the New York Times commenting on the proposed Pace and Thomas bills to boost parity prices, which would tremendously increase the price of foodstuffs should either of the bills be enacted. The editorials are as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of November 12, 1945]

NOW IT IS SENATOR THOMAS WHO WANTS TO BOOST PARITY

* * * * *

The reason why some of the political farmers want to change the parity formula at this time is clear enough. Current Agriculture Department figures show that farm prices are now above parity. This is awkward, because the farmers have been saying for 20 years that if they had parity, that is all they would want. Parity, they claimed, was the fair price relationship between farm commodities and manufactured articles which would give the farmer just purchasing power for what he raised. It follows by inescapable logic that prices above parity give farmers rather more than they have asked.

If the parity formula itself can be boosted, however, this logical embarrassment will be resolved, in the political farm view. But some difficulties remain in the way. Wise farm leaders know that labor costs were excluded from the parity formula to begin with because farm wages were so low that their inclusion would actually have pulled the formula down. Wise farm leaders are not at all sure that farm wages may not yet again drop to the point where they will at least offer little upward push in the farm-parity formula.

There is another and special difficulty with Senator THOMAS' idea of shifting the base date for parity from 1909–14 to 1919–29. It just happens that in the latter period cotton prices were better than in 1910–14 relative to the prices of the other major cash crops, mainly the grains. Hence, to shift the base, as Senator THOMAS proposes, would help cotton, but it would hurt the grains relative to cotton. So the grain people are apt to be less zealous for the Thomas change than the cotton people. Is it a coincidence that Senator THOMAS comes from a cotton State?

How the present agitation over the parity formula will come out, no one can tell. But in the past, splits within the farm ranks like that between the cotton men and the grain men on the Thomas bill have prevented any change. Some of the shrewder farmers realize, moreover, that they risk loss of public confidence in what they have always insisted was an objective and just principle if they keep tinkering with it to boost prices. How influential such considerations will be this time we have yet to see.

[From the New York Times of November 15, 1945]

FARM PRICE PARITY

The farm bloc has renewed its efforts to raise farm prices. Once more this effort is addressed to a redefinition of "parity" price to include the cost of farm labor in the index of things that the farmer buys. It will be recalled that farm price "parity" refers to the relationship between the things the farmer buys and the price of the product he is selling. By including labor costs in the comparative index, the parity price for farm products will be raised accordingly. Two bills have been introduced to accomplish this objective: The Pace bill, before the House, provides that the 1909–14 base period be used in figuring the labor increase; the Thomas bill, before the Senate, would use 1919–29 as the base period. The magnitude of the increases in parity price which would develop under these formulas is shown in the following tabulation:

Wheat:	*Bushel*
Present parity price	$1.55
Pace bill	2.02
Thomas bill	1.88
Corn:	
Present parity price	1.12
Pace bill	1.47
Thomas bill	1.26
Cotton:	*Pound*
Present parity price	$0.217
Pace bill	.284
Thomas bill	.305

Under the Pace bill, wheat parity would increase almost one-third, while under the Thomas bill it would increase more than 20 percent. The parity price for cotton would increase by more than 30 percent under the Pace bill and more than 40 percent under the Thomas proposal. These higher parity prices would be combined with an extension of the loan program, which is now 90 percent of parity for basic farm products except cotton, for which it is nearly 92½ percent. The adoption of these proposals, therefore, would mean a sharp rise in the cost of living.

The drive for higher farm prices, taken together with the 30-percent increase in wage rates demanded by labor, would make certain a sharp inflationary spiral. Higher costs for foods and other products would lead to demands for still further increases in wage rates. The combination of higher wage rates and higher prices for farm products would raise the cost of things which the farmer buys, and thus in turn lead to still higher parity prices. This in turn would again raise the cost of living and lead to renewed demands by labor.

During the war years farm income has risen to the highest levels on record—exceeding the inflated 1919 peak by 50 percent. As a reflection of this improvement in earnings, farmers have been reducing their mortgage debt in contrast with the sharp increase that took place during and immediately after the First World War. These data provide no evidence that the farmer is suffering any hardship. If we are to avoid an inflationary spiral these new and unwarranted demands must be rejected.

Industrial Use of Gold in War Exceeds Total United States Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 16, 1945

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article by W. F. Boericke from the New York Herald Tribune. This article shows that the industrial use of gold in this country is more than twice the production. When we have not enough gold in annual production to meet our industrial requirements, how are we going to get more gold to back our currency? This article points out the necessity of giving some encouragement and support to the gold-mining industry in this country:

Use of gold in industry during the war years has been vastly greater than is generally known. The prevailing conception of gold as a monetary medium gives little consideration to its place as a commodity in the arts and its part in the manufacture of special equipment for military demands. Yet the value of gold issued for industrial use in the United States was $96,864,000 in 1943, according to the Bureau of Mines, and this total exceeded the value of gold production from the mines in that year of $41,467,000, by $55,377,000, or more than 130 percent. While figures for the industrial consumption of gold in 1944 are not yet available, it is probable that with a mine production of only 1,000,000 ounces in the last year valued at $35,000,000, industry took three times the amount of bullion that was mined.

Beginning in 1940, the value of gold issued for industrial purposes in this country mounted from $41,178,000 to $96,864,000 in 1943. Formerly much of this gold was returned for resale and the net industrial consumption of new metal was far less. Thus in 1940 the net consumption was valued at $13,306,000 as $27,872,000 had been returned from industry. But in 1943 the value of the gold returned was only $10,521,000, leaving a net industrial consumption for the year of $86,343,000.

NEW ROLE PLAYED IN WAR

War industry has developed special needs for gold and, as noted by the Bureau of Mines, it continues to play an important part for use in many types of instruments, electrical and industrial equipment, and color photography. This is in addition to its normal use in jewelry, gold plating, dentistry, chemicalware, and therapeutics. Gold is also utilized as an alloy for brushes in motor generator sets employed in connection with electrical equipment that measures the speed of aircraft engines.

During the decade 1920–30 the net industrial consumption of gold was about 800,000 ounces annually, with a value at the then prevailing price of gold of some $16,500,000. In the following decade—1930–40—the net consumption was actually zero, although the value of the metal issued for industrial purposes exceeded $29,000,000 a year. This, no doubt, was due to the huge amounts returned to the market during the depression years, aided, of course, by the increase in the gold price from $20.67 to $35 an ounce, which made resale of gold acquired at the old price extremely profitable.

It is probably extravagant to assume that in the postwar era industrial demands for gold will approximate the present large figure of nearly $100,000,000 annually. Even if this should prove to be the case, the normal return from industry should reduce the net consumption to about one-third of this amount, or $33,000,000. If 1940 were accepted as a normal year, some 1,170,000 ounces of gold, valued at $41,000,000, went into industrial consumption, but new gold required was less than 400,000 ounces.

IMPROVED OUTPUT SEEN

Gold production in the United States for the first 5 months of 1945 has been estimated by the American Bureau of Metal Statistics at 346,922 ounces, compared with 436,117 ounces for a similar period in 1944. If

output does not improve during the rest of the year, total production for this country at this rate would approximate only 800,000 ounces in 1945. However, this appears to be too pessimistic a view. With the lifting of the L–208 order for the gold-mining industry, some improvement in production is certain to follow, and the final figures for the year should show an increase over those for 1944. But even if this occurs, the output of new bullion will apparently fall far short of supplying industrial needs for gold, without adding to the bullion reserve of the Government.

Decline in gold-mine output has not been confined exclusively to the United States. While the gold-mining industry has fared worse here than in other countries where gold is an important product, decreases in output have been universal. The year 1940 represented the peak in world gold production, and the total of 37,100,000 ounces—exclusive of Russian output—then achieved will not likely be exceeded for many years. Compared with records in that banner year, the output of gold in the United States had dropped 83 percent in 1944; that of Canada, 45 percent; Australia, 58 percent; and the world total—outside of Russia, data on which are unavailable—38 percent. Of all gold-producing countries, only the Union of South Africa held up its gold production, with a nominal 12 percent decline, receding from 14,000,000 ounces in 1940 to 12,300,000 in 1944.

To indicate just how badly the gold mines of the United States have been affected during the war years, only half the limited production of 1,000,000 ounces last year can be credited to the straight gold producers as the other 50 percent came from mining operations of copper, lead, and zinc producers, where gold is only a byproduct. The story was different in 1940 when gold mines accounted for 87 percent of the total gold, and base metal mines 13 percent. Lifting of the L–208 order will not act as sufficient incentive for reopening of many gold mines closed down since 1942, confronted as they are with shortage of manpower, need for paying substantially higher wages than prevailed in mining camps before the war, and burdensome taxation. Statistically, it would be easy to prove that gold mining will languish until economic conditions become more favorable, but this would not take into account the age-old willingness of the gold miner to take a chance in the face of difficulties that appear formidable.

World Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on Friday last the city of Charleston and its people welcomed home South Carolina's No. 1 citizen, the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State, a native of Charleston.

On this occasion the Secretary of State delivered a most able, courageous, and enlightening address, of world-wide significance and importance. It clearly sets forth the necessity for world cooperation, and states in a most able manner the leadership the United States must develop in perfecting world peace and the use of atomic energy. I therefore ask that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When I accepted Charleston's very gracious invitation to return to the city of my birth and the scenes of my younger days, I thought that nothing I could say here would interest you more than world trade.

Charleston, being one of the oldest ports in America, certainly has a vital interest in the restoration of world commerce.

Since accepting this invitation to be with you I have participated in a conference in Washington which concerns every human being and civilization itself.

Therefore, before expressing some views on international trade, I wish to comment briefly on the efforts we are making to control atomic energy so that it may be used, not for war and destruction, but for the peace and happiness of the world.

The full significance of the release of atomic energy is not quickly or easily comprehended. As it happened, in my capacity as Director of War Mobilization I was well aware of the awesome character of the great experiment that we then referred to as the Manhattan project.

Later, during the short period I was out of the Government service, it became clear to the scientists that an atomic bomb was an immediate practical possibility. At that time I was asked to serve as the President's representative on the committee, under the chairmanship of Secretary of War Stimson, which laid the plans for the New Mexico experiment.

Despite this experience, I know that I cannot presently evaluate the true impact of this discovery upon the future of the world.

But from the day the first bomb fell on Hiroshima, one thing has been clear to all of us. The civilized world cannot survive an atomic war.

This is the challenge to our generation. To meet it we must let our minds be bold. At the same time we must not imagine wishfully that overnight there can arise full-grown a world government wise and strong enough to protect all of us and tolerant and democratic enough to command our willing loyalty.

If we are to preserve the continuity of civilized life, we must work with the materials at hand, improving and adding to existing institutions until they can meet the stern test of our time.

Accordingly, the President of the United States and the Prime Ministers of Great Britain and Canada—the partners in the historic scientific and engineering undertaking that resulted in the release of atomic energy—have taken the first step in an effort to rescue the world from a desperate armament race.

In their statement, they declared their willingness to make immediate arrangements for the exchange of basic scientific information for peaceful purposes. Much of this kind of basic information essential to the development of atomic energy has already been disseminated. We shall continue to make such information available.

In addition to these immediate proposals the conference recommended that at the earliest practicable date a Commission should be established under the United Nations Organization. This can be done within 60 days.

It would be the duty of this Commission to draft recommendations for extending the international exchange of basic scientific information for peaceful purposes, for the control of atomic energy to the extent necessary to insure its use only for peaceful purposes, and for the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and of all other weapons adaptable to mass destruction.

The Commission would recommend effective safeguards by way of inspection of other means to protect complying States against the hazards of violations and evasions.

Such protection would be afforded by having the work proceed by stages.

As a starting point the Commission might recommend the wide exchange of scientists and scientific information. The next step might be the sharing of knowledge about the raw materials necessary to the release of atomic energy.

The successful completion of each stage would develop the confidence to proceed to the next stage.

A very serious question arises, however, when we reach the stage of exchanging detailed information about the practical industrial application of atomic energy. The thought to be borne in mind here is that up to a certain rather advanced point, the so-called know-how of production is the same whether atomic energy is to be stored in bombs or harnessed as power for a peaceful industrial purpose.

And so it was necessary for the conferees to determine in the light of this fact, how soon information concerning the practical application of atomic energy should be disseminated.

Only one answer was possible. Until effective safeguards can be developed, in the form of international inspection or otherwise, the secrets of production know-how must be held, in the words of the President, as a sacred trust—a trust in the exercise of which we are already under definite international obligation.

Under the Charter of the United Nations we have pledged ourselves not to use force except in support of the purposes and principles of the Charter. The suggestion that we are using the atomic bomb as a diplomatic or military threat against any nation is not only untrue in fact but is a wholly unwarranted reflection upon the American Government and people.

It is one of the inherent characteristics of our democracy that we can fight a war only with the genuine consent of our people. No President in the absence of a declaration of war by the Congress could authorize an atomic bombing without running the risk of impeachment.

No one who knows the peace-loving temper of our people can believe that our Congress would adopt a declaration of war contrary to our solemnly undertaken obligations under the United Nations Charter.

The history of 1914 to 1917 and of 1939 to 1941 is convincing proof of the slowness of Congress to declare war. There is surely no reason to believe that it would be more eager to engage in a future war more terrible than any we have known.

While we consider it proper and necessary, therefore, to continue for a time to hold these production secrets in trust, this period need not be unnecessarily prolonged.

As experience demonstrates that the sharing of information is full and unreserved, it is to be hoped that the exchange for peaceful purposes, can be extended to some and eventually to all the practical applications of atomic energy and of other scientific discoveries. This is the objective we seek.

It is our purpose and grave duty to act in our relations with other nations with the boldness and generosity that the atomic age demands of us. No officials of Government have ever been called upon to make a decision fraught with more serious consequences. We must act. But we will act in a manner that will not undermine our safety or the safety of the world.

Our declaration of willingness to exchange immediately the basic scientific information and our plans for the setting up of a commission under United Nations sponsorship have been sent by me to members of the United Nations Organization. We look forward to their cooperation.

No one appreciates more keenly than those who have advanced these proposals that they represent a very modest first step in what is certain to prove a long and difficult journey. I wish to emphasize our conviction that the creation and development of safeguards to protect us all from unspeakable destruction is not the exclusive responsibility of the United States or Great Britain or Canada. It is the responsibility of all governments.

Without the united effort and unremitting cooperation of all the nations of the world, there will be no enduring and effective protection against the atomic bomb. There will be no protection against bacteriological warfare, an even more frightful method of human destruction.

Atomic energy is a new instrument that has been given to man. He may use it to destroy himself and a civilization which centuries of sweat and toil and blood have built. Or he may use it to win for himself new dignity and a better and more abundant life.

If we can move gradually but surely toward free and unlimited exchange of scientific and industrial information, to control and perhaps eventually to eliminate the manufacture of atomic weapons and other weapons capable of mass destruction, we will have progressed toward achieving freedom from fear.

But it is not enough to banish atomic or bacteriological warfare. We must banish war. To that great goal of humanity we must ever rededicate our hearts and strength.

To help us move toward that goal we must guard not only against military threats to world security but economic threats to world well-being.

Political peace and economic warfare cannot long exist together. If we are going to have peace in this world, we must learn to live together and work together. We must be able to do business together.

Nations that will not do business with one another or try to exclude one another from doing business with other countries are not likely in the long run to be good neighbors.

Trade black-outs, just as much as other types of black-outs, breed distrust and disunity. Business relations bring nations and their peoples closer together and, perhaps more than anything else, promote good will and determination for peace.

Many of the existing restrictions on world trade result from present-day conditions and practices, largely growing out of the war.

Many countries, and not least Great Britain, had to sacrifice their foreign earning power to win the war. They have sold most of their foreign stocks and bonds, borrowed heavily abroad, let their foreign commerce go, and lost ships and factories to enemy attack.

Their needs for foreign goods are great and pressing but they lack foreign exchange, that is, purchasing power to buy abroad. Without aid they cannot see their way to buy as they used to abroad, not to speak of the additional things they need from abroad to rehabilitate their shattered and devastated economies.

In a situation of this kind what can a country do? It can seek to borrow the foreign currencies it needs, which will enable it to apply the liberal principles of trade which must be the basis of any permanent prosperity.

Or it can draw in its belt. It can reduce the standard of living of its people, conserve in every way the foreign currencies that it finds hard to get, and transfer its foreign trade by Government decree to countries whose currencies are easier to obtain.

In the latter way lies increased discrimination and the division of the commerce of the world into exclusive blocs. We cannot oppose exclusive blocs if we do not help remove the conditions which impel other nations, often against their will, to create them.

We must not only oppose these exclusive trading blocs but we must also cooperate with other nations in removing conditions which breed discrimination in world trade.

Whatever foreign loans we make will, of course, increase the markets for American products, for in the long run the dollars we lend can be spent only in this country.

The countries devastated by the war want to get back to work. They want to get back to production which will enable them to support themselves. When they can do this, they will buy goods from us. America, in helping them, will be helping herself.

We cannot play Santa Claus to the world, but we can make loans to governments whose credit is good, provided such governments will make changes in commercial policies which will make it possible for us to increase our trade with them.

In addition to loans, lend-lease settlements, and the disposal of our surplus war materials, we have been discussing with Great Britain the principle of commercial relations, principles we want to see applied by all nations in the postwar world.

These are the same liberal principles which my friend and predecessor, Cordell Hull, urged for so many years.

They are based on the conviction that what matters most in trade is not the buttressing of particular competitive positions, but the increase of productive employment, the increase of production, and the increase of general prosperity.

The reasons for poverty and hunger are no longer the stinginess of nature. Modern knowledge makes it technically possible for mankind to produce enough good things to go around. The world's present capacity to produce gives it the greatest opportunity in history to increase the standards of living for all peoples of the world.

Trade between countries is one of the greatest forces leading to the fuller use of these tremendously expanded productive powers. But the world will lose this opportunity to improve the lot of her peoples if their countries do not learn to trade as neighbors and friends. If we are going to have a real people's peace, world trade cannot be throttled by burdensome restrictions.

Some of these restrictions are imposed by Government decree; others by private combination. They must be removed if we are to have full employment.

To do this it will be necessary to agree upon some general rules, and to apply them in detail. We shall shortly submit to the peoples of the world our views about these matters.

We intend to propose that commercial quotas and embargoes be restricted to a few really necessary cases, and that discrimination in their application be avoided.

We intend to propose that tariffs be reduced and tariff preferences be eliminated. The Trade Agreements Act is our standing offer to negotiate to that end.

We intend to propose that subsidies, in general, should be the subject of international discussion, and that subsidies on exports should be confined to exceptional cases, under general rules, as soon as the period of emergency adjustment is over.

We intend to propose that governments conducting public enterprises in foreign trade should agree to give fair treatment to commerce of all friendly states, that they should make their purchases and sales on purely economic grounds, and that they should avoid using a monopoly of imports to give excessive protection to their own producers.

We intend to propose that international cartels and monopolies should be prevented by international action from restricting the commerce of the world.

We intend to propose that the special problems of the great primary commodities should be studied internationally, and that consuming countries should have an equal voice with producing countries in whatever decisions may be made.

We intend to propose that the efforts of all countries to maintain full and regular employment should be guided by the rule that no country should solve its domestic problems by measures that would prevent the expansion of world trade, and no country is at liberty to export its unemployment to its neighbors.

We intend to propose that an international trade organization be created, under the Economic and Social Council, as an integral part of the structure of the United Nations.

We intend to propose that the United Nations call an international conference on trade and employment to deal with all these problems.

In preparation for that conference we intend to go forward with actual negotiations with several countries for the reduction of trade barriers, under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Just when these negotiations will commence has not been determined. They will be announced in the usual way, as required by the act, and due notice will be given in order that all interested persons may be heard before the detailed offers to be made by the United States are settled.

Success in those negotiations will be the soundest preparation for the general conference we hope will be called by the United Nations Organization.

By proposing that the United Nations Organization appoint a commission to consider the subject of atomic energy and by proposing that the Organization likewise call a conference to enable nations to consider the problems of international trade, we demonstrate our confidence in that Organization as an effective instrumentality for world cooperation and world peace.

After the First World War we rejected the plea of Woodrow Wilson and refused to join the League of Nations. Our action contributed to the ineffectiveness of the League.

Now the situation is different. We have sponsored the United Nations Organization. We are giving it our whole-hearted and enthusiastic support. We recognize our responsibility in the affairs of the world. We shall not evade that responsibility.

With other nations of the world we shall walk hand in hand in the paths of peace in the hope that all peoples can find freedom from fear and freedom from want.

Recent Statement of Catholic Bishops of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, during the past week the annual conference of the Catholic bishops of the United States was held in Washington, after which a statement was issued by the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and in the light of existing world conditions, a well-considered statement made at an appropriate time, on the very important matters covered therein, and worthy of the profound consideration of all persons without regard to creed, color, or racial origin.

Under the consent granted I include the text of the bishops' statement in my remarks:

TEXT OF BISHOPS' STATEMENT

The war is over but there is no peace in the world. In the Atlantic Charter we were given the broad outline of the peace for which we fought and bled and, at an incalculable price, won a great martial victory.

It was that ideal of peace which sustained us through the war, which inspired the heroic defense of liberty by millions driven underground in enslaved countries. It made small, oppressed nations confide in us as the trustee of their freedoms. It was the broad outline of a good peace.

Are we going to give up this ideal of peace? If, under the pretext of a false realism, we do so, then we shall stand face to face with the awful catastrophe of atomic war.

Since the Moscow Conference of 1943 the United States, Great Britain, and Russia, have undertaken to shape gradually the peace which they are imposing on the nations. From the conferences of these victorious powers there is emerging slowly their pattern for the peace. It is disappointing in the extreme.

Assurances are given us in the announced peace principles of our country but so far results do not square with these principles. We are in perhaps the greatest crisis of human history. Our country has the power, the right and the responsibility to demand a genuine peace, based on justice which will answer the cry in the hearts of men across the world.

PROFOUND DIFFERENCES

We want to work in unity with other nations for the making of a good peace. During the war, perhaps, it may have been necessary for strategic reasons to postpone final decisions on many questions mooted at the conferences of the three great powers. Now we must face the facts.

There are profound differences of thought and policy between Russia and the western democracies. Russia has acted unilaterally on many important settlements. It has sought to establish its sphere of influence in eastern and southeastern Europe, not on the basis of sound regional agreements in which sovereignties and rights are respected, but by the imposition of its sovereignty and by ruthlessly setting up helpless puppet states. Its Asiatic policy, so important for the peace of the world, is an enigma.

The totalitarian dictators promised benefits to the masses through an omnipotent police-state which extends its authority to to all human relations and recognizes no innate freedoms. Their theories, moreover, look to the realization of world well-being as ultimately to be secured by the inclusion of all countries in their system.

Sometimes Russia uses our vocabulary and talks of democracy and rights, but it attaches distorted meanings to the words. We think in terms of our historic culture. We see God-given, inviolable human rights in every person and we know democracy as the free collaboration under law of citizens in a free country.

There is a clash of ideologies. The frank recognition of these differences is preliminary to any sincere effort in realistic world cooperation for peace. The basis of this cooperation must be mutual adherence to justice. It would be unjust for us to be an accomplice in violating the rights of nations, groups, and individuals anywhere in the world.

A first step toward effective negotiation for peace is to have a plan. A good plan states principles in terms of all the specific questions at issue. Instead, so far, we have compromised and sought to make mere piecemeal settlements.

RETURN TO POWER POLITICS

Instead of honest, promising discussion even on diverging plans, we are witnessing a return of the tragedy of power politics and the danger of balance of power arrangements which, with the substitution of mere expediency for justice, have begotten war after war. We must, indeed, aim at collaborating with all of our allies in the making of a good peace. There are, however, concessions which we dare not make because they are immoral and destructive of genuine peace.

Our peace program envisions a world organization of nations. The Charter which emerged from the San Francisco Conference, while undoubtedly an improvement on the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, does not provide for a sound, institutional organization of the international society. The Security Council provisions make it no more than a virtual alliance of the great powers for the maintenance of peace. These nations are given a status above the law.

Nevertheless, our country acted wisely in deciding to participate in this world organization. It is better than world chaos. From the provision in the Charter for calling a constituent assembly in the future, there comes the hope that in time the defects may be eliminated and we may have a sound, institutional organization of the international community which will develop, not through mere voluntary concessions of the nations, but from the recognition of the rights and duties of international society.

While peace is in the making, there are urgent issues which we can no longer evade. At Yalta we gave a pledge to the Polish people and assumed responsibility before the world that they would be unhampered in setting up their own independent, democratic government.

POLISH, BALKAN ISSUES

Are we working to the fulfillment of that pledge in the full measure of our responsibility and our power? What apology can be offered for the failure of the protagonists of democracy to protest the absorption by force and artifice of the Baltic countries into the Union of Soviet Republics?

We are shocked by the news which is leaking out from Slovakia, Croatia, Slovenia, and other southeastern European countries. Religious persecution, which is both brutal and cunning, rages in many lands. No reason of policy justifies our silence. What is happening behind the black-out of eastern and southeastern Europe is a stark contradiction to the high ideals which inspired our fighting to save the world from totalitarian aggression.

No one can fail to see the importance of a reconstructed, revitalized Europe, which is the cradle of western culture. We deplore the tragic indifference to the plight of the Italian people who threw off the chains of a Fascist regime, who fought side by side with us in ardent loyalty. For over two long years of agony the friends of democracy in that country have had to stand by in impotence while we have toyed with the vital problems of relief and rehabilitation and deferred the fulfillment of our own solemn promises.

Our own national interest, as well as the cause of world peace, and the fate of Christian culture are at stake in Italy. Today, it is an outpost of western civilization. We are fully confident that the Italian people, if we save them from despair by our helpful interest, will stand fast against the deceitful appeal of alien and subversive ideologies and shape their future in the spirit of their own noble Christian tradition.

We cannot be unconcerned about the future of Germany, Austria, and Hungary. Whatever period of probation must be imposed on the vanquished nations, we must help them to take their rightful place in the family of nations. To treat them in a spirit of vengeance is neither right nor politic.

RELIEF URGED ON CONGRESS

Justice demands the punishment of the guilty and reasonable reparations of damage done. But we cannot forget, or allow our representatives to forget, that our traditional system of punitive justice is anchored to the concept of individual responsibility. The inhumanities which now mark the mass transference of populations, the systematized use of slave labor and the cruel treatment of prisoners of war should have no place in our civilization.

Acute suffering is the daily lot of whole populations in many war-torn lands. Every report indicates that unless heroic measures are taken at once, millions will die from starvation and exposure during the coming winter. The feeding and clothing and sheltering of these suffering people is not a work which can be left to some future convenient date.

Our country, because of our greater resources, must do the major part of this work of relief. In it we have the right and duty to insist on the leadership which corresponds to our sacrifices and contributions. It is imperative that Congress make adequate appropriations for this work from the Public Treasury.

It is equally imperative that private relief agencies be given a full opportunity to carry on their beneficent work among all suffering peoples. And relief must envision something larger than merely feeding the starving and sheltering the homeless. Help must be given to peoples whose economies are ruined. They have the right to assistance in getting back to normal economic life. Neither the prosperity of the greater nations nor their might will prevent war unless conditions are removed in which poor, helpless peoples are denied the opportunity of a decent living standard. The world is one only insofar as men live together as brothers under God.

OUR GRAVE RESPONSIBILITY

Ours is a grave responsibility. The heart and hand of America are called upon in a way that is unique, not only in the history of our country but even in the annals of mankind. We know that democracy is as capable of solving the admittedly difficult problems of peace as it has shown itself in war. We must be true to ourselves. We must hold fast to our own free institutions. We must resolutely oppose the few among us who are trying to sabotage them. We may well pity those who in their half-veiled sympathy for totalitarianism are playing with the thought that perhaps in this great emergency its day is at hand. On bended knees let us ask God in His blessed Providence to help us to be the vigorous champion of democratic freedom and the generous friend of the needy and oppressed throughout the world.

Signed by the members of the administrative board, National Catholic Welfare Conference, in the names of the Bishops of the United States:

Samuel A. Stritch, Archbishop of Chicago; John Gregory Murray, Archbishop of St. Paul; Francis J. Spellman, Archbishop of New York; John Mark Gannon, Bishop of Erie; John J. Mitty, Archbishop of San Francisco; Joseph F. Rummel, Archbishop of New Orleans; Richard J. Cushing, Archbishop of Boston; James H. Ryan, Archbishop of Omaha; John F. Noll, Bishop of Fort Wayne; Karl J. Alter, Bishop of Toledo.

Pressure?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, article I of the Bill of Rights, an inherent part of our Constitution, states:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

It will be noted that our forefathers in their wisdom considered the right of petition to be such an important one that they included it in the first amendment to the Constitution, along with freedom of religion, freedom of speech and of the press. Even Congress, the lawmaker of the land, is expressly prohibited from enacting legislation which in any manner might abridge the right of petition.

Last week, in the lawful exercise of that right, a representative group of automobile dealers came to Washington to present to the House Small Business Committee, a special committee of the House of Representatives—a part of the Congress, a part of our Government—their views on the proposed OPA order to compel automobile dealers to absorb part or all of any price increase which might be granted to car manufacturers. In the lawful exercise of that right, dealers from all over the United States also presented their views to individual Members of Congress.

Subsequently, and on November 13, Mr. Chester Bowles, OPA's Administrator, appeared before the same House committee and, as a part of his attempt to justify his agency's proposed order, described the action of the automobile dealers in presenting their side of the issue as "the greatest single pressure group operation since OPA was established."

Well, it must be admitted that Mr. Bowles should know something about pressure and its use as a medium of coercion, for the administration which appointed him and which sponsors the policies of his agency has given many an object demonstration of its pressure tactics. Is there any businessman or, for that matter, anyone who has dealt with the Government, who cannot cite some instance of pressure exerted—directly or indirectly—not only by Mr. Bowles' own agency, but by many other administration agencies?

And what about the pressure which administration leaders attempt to exert upon Members of Congress? As a recent example: For some time, it has been the plan to recess for a short period so that Congressmen might have an opportunity to go home for the holidays; to visit their families, their neighbors and friends, during the festive season. But not many days ago, the Democratic leader in the Senate announced that Congress need not expect to leave the Capital until it had passed certain legislation on the must list of the administration.

Obviously, Congress does not consider the legislation with a favorable eye. Had Congress wished to pass it, that action could have been taken some weeks ago. If even a bare majority favored its passage or desired that it be brought up for consideration, it should not have been too difficult a matter to secure 218 signatures to a petition which would have forced the reporting out of the bill and its consideration on the floor of the House. But no such action was taken. So the administration leaders crack the whip—exert a little "pressure"; tell Congress it will do as ordered or else.

Yes, for examples of real "pressure," OPA's Administrator should observe the tactics of the party in power—of the administration under which he holds his appointment.

Mr. Bowles, in his statement to the House Small Business Committee, further said:

> This idea of government by pressure is an ominous sign of our times.

That may be, but the ominousness of the situation to which Mr. Bowles refers lies not in the fact that citizens exercise their constitutional right to petition their Government, to present their grievances, but in the fact that the administration in control of that Government should seek to stifle that right, to deny its citizens the opportunity to be heard, to present their case, and to have it decided on its merits. Appointive officials should realize that in our Government they are the servants, not the masters, of the people.

Is Compulsory Military Peacetime Training Adequate or Necessary?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GRAHAM A. BARDEN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I insert a most interesting and informative sermon delivered by the Reverend F. Hubert Morris, of the First Presbyterian Church, New Bern, N. C. I know Reverend Morris personally, and know him to be able, sincere, and courageous. Regardless of whether a person is for or against compulsory military training or peacetime draft, this sermon would prove to be quite interesting.

There are times in the history of a nation when it is necessary to make revolutionary changes in government. Governments are made for the people and not people for governments. At least that is true of democratic governments. We remember the early days of our country when we were willing to be under the government of the British Emipre, but there came a time when Thirteen Colonies decided that for the good of the people who dwelt in those colonies a new government should be established. That was revolution! It was costly as all revolutions are costly, but history has proved that the American Colonies made a wise choice by taking a path that led to revolution.

There are times when revolutionary changes have to be made within governments. But a people ought to think long and seriously before they make a radical departure from a traditional policy, especially if that policy has always worked effectively. The United States is facing the question today as to whether we should make a radical departure from a policy that has always proved effective. The question is this: Is compulsory military peacetime training adequate or necessary?

1. I maintain that peacetime conscription does not insure peace. We are told by the military men of our country that to preserve the peace we will have to have peacetime conscription. Our President has become convinced by the military men of our country that we need peacetime conscription. They believe it is necessary for the defense of our Nation. They believe it will build the health and the morale of the youth of the Nation. They believe it will teach discipline that will carry over into civilian life. They believe that with it we will be immune to attack in the future from any possible aggressor. Every one of these claims is debatable.

The first point I would like to emphasize is that peacetime conscription does not insure peace. It never has insured peace and it never will. The four tasks that the President wants this conscripted army to do, can be done by an army of regulars who delight in warfare. Germany has had universal military training for many years. The German people became more and more military-minded, a nation of goose-stepping soldiers. As Roy L. Ruth said: "They came to delight in flexing their martial muscles and growling out threats to small nations around them. And finally, conscious of great military might, they decided to strike out and take what they wanted." I am sure that we do not want the United States to become a goose-stepping nation of soldiers menacing the peace of the world. That must not happen here. The exponents of peacetime military training say it cannot happen here. They point out the fact that this military machine will not be an army, but civilians trained for national defense. The point remains that this so-called civilian army which in itself is a contradiction in terms, will be under the rigid discipline of our Army men, and armies make dictators possible.

In 1939 France had the finest and the best equipped army in the world. She also had peacetime conscription but that did not keep her from being attacked by Germany. France has had 12 wars under peacetime conscription and lost 5 of them. Under peacetime conscription Germany has participated in 10 wars. Frank L. Wright tells us in the Christian Century a few months ago, that in 1926 prominent citizens of 14 countries called upon the League of Nations to propose the abolition of compulsory military training in all countries. "It is our belief," the manifesto continued, "that conscript armies, with their large corps of professional officers, are a grave menace to peace." Consider if you will, the countries that have had peacetime conscription, Germany, Japan, Italy, and France. Have these countries been noted for their peace-loving natures? Did peacetime conscription keep them from war? Past history has proven concisely that peacetime conscription has not paved the way to peace, but to war.

At the request of the State Department, the committee of Congress which reports on the various bills designed to establish peacetime conscription last spring agreed to postpone consideration until summer. The reason given is interesting. "The State Department feared that if peacetime conscription should come up in Congress while the San Francisco Conference was in session some of the other nations might get mistaken ideas about the devotion of this country to the cause of peace and international collaboration." The newspaper release said, "Discussion at this time might muddy the waters at San Francisco." I am sure that it would have muddied the waters at that time, even as it has now. I have been thinking about Russia. She has gone ahead with demobilization of her troops faster than any other of the victor nations. How will she interpret the action of this country if we embrace peacetime military training? As Roy L. Ruth has said: "To talk about an international organization to keep the peace while advocating universal military training is the most nonsensical double-talk."

Then there is another question that I would like to raise. Why do we need peacetime military training? This question has never been answered satisfactorily. Who is the enemy that we will be prepared to fight? Have we not demanded and received unconditional surrender from Germany and Japan? Is there not to be a military occupation of these lands for many years, with periodic inspections of their factories to assure ourselves that they are not preparing for war? Are not the enemy countries completely disarmed? Are not the victor nations in the European theater united in their efforts for the preservation of peace? Did not Britain and Russia aid us in the fight against Japan? If all these things are true, why do we need compulsory military training in peacetime? Do the military men have plans for another war? Are they afraid we are facing another conflict? If so, the American people have the right to be told, and should be told.

This past summer 12 American generals landed one morning at LaGuardia Field. They gave a mass interview to the press, and Gen. Jacob L. Devers acted as spokesman for the group. The point that was stressed by General Devers was that Germany is through for a hundred years as a war-making power. This was the unanimous opinion of the 12 generals. Certainly we cannot expect Germany or Japan to be aggressors in the near future. Why is there such haste in getting conscription saddled on the American people?

General Eisenhower on his return home said: "The task of a commander is to send men into battle knowing some of them—often many—must be killed or wounded in order to achieve necessary missions. It is a soul-killing task. My sorrow is not only for the fine young lives lost or broken, but it is equally for the parents, the wives, and the friends who have been bereaved. The price they pay is possibly the greatest for the victory won. The blackness of their grief can be relieved only by the faith that all this shall not happen again." General Patton, however, in a speech to a kindergarten class in a Los Angeles Sunday school said: "You children here, whether you like it or not, are the soldiers of the next war. There will be war again, because there have always been such things." (Editorial, Christian Century, July 4, 1945.) Let us have the faith of General Eisenhower that "this shall not happen again."

It is my firm belief based on the facts already presented, that peacetime military conscription does not insure peace. In fact, it seems to breed wars. If peacetime conscription insured peace, then Europe would be the most peaceful continent in the world.

2. The second reason I am opposed to compulsory military training is because it is a form of totalitarianism. In other words, peacetime military training, as it is proposed at the present time is not in accord with democratic principles. We have fought wars to obtain freedom and to put in compulsory training is to destroy that freedom for which we have fought.

In time of war we surrender our personal judgment. We give the War Department the right to regulate industry and commerce, to control labor, and to mobilize the manpower of the Nation. War of necessity demands dictator methods and we gladly surrender our personal rights during a period of warfare, but the American people will not want to surrender their liberty a moment longer than is necessary.

Compulsory military training is not a democratic procedure. It is not fair to the youth of our country. The bills as they now stand (H. R. 515 and S. 188) provide for the compulsory induction into the armed service of our country every able-bodied male youth at the age of 18 for a year of military training. Special cases might be allowed to enter later, but not later than age 22. If the youth is able bodied there is no appeal, he has to enter into this military service. Is not that dictatorship?

Then too, there is the matter of religious freedom involved. You will find that all the major religious denominations, both Protestant and Catholic have spoken out against this proposed conscription. (It is interesting in this connection that not a single major religious denomination spoke out against the Selective Service Act when it was passed in 1940.) This matter of religious freedom is dear to my heart and to the hearts of most churchmen. Suppose a man's conscience will not permit him to bear arms? He must bear arms or suffer the consequences. If this bill is made law there are thousands in this fair land of ours who would be jailed, because according to their conscience, they must obey God rather than man. Now I am not a pacifist and have never been one. I feel it is necessary to restrain evil if that evil is embodied in a person or a State. I can, I hope, turn my other cheek, but I do not feel that I should turn the cheeks of my children or those of unborn generations to a savage enemy who would destroy, if he could, every vestige of Christianity. But on the other hand there are thousands who would have to disobey this law because their conscience would not permit them to take this training.

It seems strange to me that in a country where religious freedom has been guaranteed, that where a country was settled largely because people sought religious freedom, that those who love religious freedom would have to flee from it because of professional militariests who would rule the Nation. Have you thought about that?

We were thrilled last week to read in Time, [October 22, 1945] that President Harry Truman had presented the Congressional Medal of Honor to a conscientious objector. Here is the story. Desmond Doss was a carpenter, a Seventh-Day Adventist, and a pacifist. He refused to bear arms in World War II, but he did not object to serving as an Army medical corpsman. He asked for, and received assignments in the front lines. He knew fear, but conquered his fear through prayer and faith in his God. During the fighting on Guam and Leyte he became famous because of his fearlessness in the face of death. In the Okinawa campaign his fame grew. Twice he was wounded. Amid heavy artillery, mortar, and rifle fire he was exposed to the fire of the enemy, while lowering 75 wounded men down a rock wall to safety. I mention this story only as an illustration to show that even pacifists are willing to make any sacrifices for their country, except to deny the freedom of their conscience. Under peacetime compulsory military training, without some exemptions, Desmond Doss would never have received the Congressional Medal of Honor because he would have been behind bars for refusing to bear arms.

It is not strange that the majority of the educators of our country are opposed to peacetime training. It would wreck the educational system of our country. No edcational organization has gone on record for peacetime conscription whereas most of them have expressed their opposition. Some months ago, 12 university presidents wrote to the President of the United States expressing their opposition to peacetime military training and listed 6 reasons for their opposition. These presidents from Harvard, Chicago, Vanderbilt, Cornell, Princeton, Tulane, Missouri, Kansas, Indiana, California, Stanford, and Brown, have not received satisfactory answers to their opposition.

It is admitted that the Army life is an education in itself, but it is not the type of education a boy would need for his life work, unless he wants an Army career. As Dr. Walter L. Lingle has pointed out in the Christian Observer (July 18, 1945): "Gen. Robert E. Lee, who was one of the greatest soldiers of all time should be an authority on that point. In his great life of Lee, Dr. Douglas Freeman tells us that General Lee refused to introduce military training into Washington and Lee University when he was president of that institution, saying that 'military training is not the best to qualify men for the duties of citizenship, or for success in life.'"

When a boy goes to war, or is compelled to take military training, do you think it will be easy to come back to a college campus? It will not. For war is not a boy's game, but is conducted by boys who have become men through the processes of war. In other words, boys become men when they take military training, and you can't become a man and then easily go back to a boy's life. And the Army intends to make fighters out of these conscripted youths. In a circular distributed to officers the Army says: "There will be no place in a sound universal military training program for activities that are nonessential to the task of preparing our young men for combat." Is it not dictatorship for a government to insist on taking over a year of the education of its youth, whether the youth of the land wishes it or not? It is. As these 12 university presidents mentioned above said: "Moreover, we do not favor the control of even a year's education of young men by the Federal Government."

The exponents of peacetime-military training say that such a system will build the health and the morale of the youth of the Nation and will teach them discipline. Charles Clayton Morrison has pointed out this fact in regard to the health of the soldier: "If we are to head off the shocking incidence of physical and mental deficiency which the present war has revealed in our young men and women, it will be necessary to begin before they reach draft age. A large proportion of the defects which have incapacitated so many is the result of inadequate food, clothing, housing, and education in the growing years of adolescence and childhood."

Dr. W. W. Sikes, in the Presbyterian Outlook, quotes Hanson W. Baldwin, one of the foremost military analysts, as saying: "As to health, the benefits of peacetime conscription would be slight and slow, for the program would not strike at the root of our physical and mental deficiencies."

The discipline of Army life will not have any good carry-over value into civilian life. The American youth rebels against the discipline of the Army. He does not like it, nor does he want anything to do with it. It is the reaction to discipline that makes the soldier a problem when he is on furlough or on leave of liberty in a town. One youngster came to see me one Saturday night and he had been drinking heavily. He apologized for his condition and then he said: "If you had a top sergeant like mine, who was on your neck all the time, you would get drunk, too." Now, then, is it not reasonable to believe that in a conscripted peacetime Army our youth would rebel against this Army discipline? Would not this cause a problem when he returned to his home after serving his year in the conscripted Army? Can you not see the readjustments that he would have to make?

Then, too, I wonder if any student of adolescent psychology would agree that Army life is conducive to the moral development of an 18-year-old youngster? The boy is then at one of the most formative periods of his life, and everyone will admit that there are many demoralizing influences connected with Army life. An Army man wrote: "The average soldier is pretty much the same as he was in civilian life, except that his morals are lower, his conversation coarser, and his religious outlook more casual." The 18-year-old is in the period of his life when he doubts everything that he is told. It is the age when he begins to question the eternal truths he had been taught as a child. As a baby he simply believed everything his parents told

him because they were his parents. But by the time he is 18 he has studied science and he begins to question the spiritual truths he had learned as a child. Now, here is the question: Can he face this period of his life better in the Army than in his home surrounded by parents who love him and by a church that is interested in his moral development? Is it not the method of the dictator to make the youth leave his home whether he wants to leave or not? Our militarists in the United States are better men morally than Hitler or Tojo ever thought about being, but governmentally all militarists are the same stripe as any dictator we have ever seen.

I am thankful for Christian gentlemen as General Marshall and General Eisenhower who lead our armies, but is it not a fact that generally speaking, Army officers do not care about morals? Brig. Gen. Henry J. Reilly said: "Morale is more important than morals to the soldier. Leave the morale to the Army and to hell with morals. Some people want to keep the young soldier from women and liquor. That's what he needs." It is true that those who have strong Christian characters come out of the Army even stronger in their Christian convictions, but it leaves scars upon their souls. I have talked with many marines in my congregation, and have yet to find one who thinks the life in the service is conducive to moral Christian development.

3. The third thing I want you to consider is the economic burden of peacetime conscription. Frank L. Wright told us last March in the Christian Century, "that peacetime conscription will prove a serious economic burden to a Nation already staggering under an enormous debt. A committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce estimates the cost at three or possibly four billion dollars per year. The money expended on a million conscripts in 1 year would easily provide 4 to 7 years of academic, professional or technical training for these same youth."

The cost of this peacetime army that our military men want will run into astronomical figures. One who attended the military hearings in Washington recently said that the cost for every private in this proposed program would be $100 per month. Multiply that by 1,200,000 and you will have considered the cost of the privates alone.

I received a letter recently from the Honorable Josephus Daniels, who as you remember was the Secretary of the Navy under President Wilson for 8 years. He sent me his editorial which appeared in the Raleigh News and Observer of June 12. In that article he tells of a company of civilian officials and officers of the Army and Navy discussing this subject of peacetime conscription. A civilian was advancing the familiar arguments for conscription, advanced first by Bismarck and then by Hitler. The Honorable Josephus Daniels said an admiral interrupted to ask the question: "How much would it cost to give this universal training?" As argument after argument was brought forth, the admiral confounded the group with the same statement: "How much will it cost?" Finally one of the group said: "No matter what the cost, it will be cheaper than the two wars in which we have been engaged." The persistent admiral asked: "Did compulsory military service in France stop Hitler in 1940? And did it guarantee the peace you think that an un-American system would insure for us when a war lord is bent on military domination?" The question remains unanswered. Then the vice admiral said: "I have not forgotten the fundamentals of democracy I learned as a boy. Compulsory military service in peacetime is contrary to those principles. Let us stick to our Americanism and we have nothing to fear."

There is no present, immediate need to change our American system. The Selective Service Act is still in effect and will continue for 6 months after Congress has declared the war to be ended. "This act," as Dr. Sikes reminds us, "has completely mobilized our manpower. Every eligible boy 18 years old will not only be a soldier when the war ends, but by section 3 (c) of the act he and all his fellows inducted into service will remain as a reserve in the Army or Navy subject to call to active duty for a period of 10 years or until they are 45 years old." With from ten to thirteen million veterans subject to call if we need them, why then the haste to pass this legislation now? The War Department remembers with what ease the eighteenth amendment was passed during the last World War and they want to settle it now while the pressure is on the American people.

With a well-trained standing Army which we have—and it need not be large—and with a Navy that is equal to all the other navies of the world, and working with the Allies in keeping the peace secure in the defeated countries, there is no need for peacetime military training in the United States.

Both of the World Wars in which we have engaged have proved the fact that the graduates of our American high schools, colleges, and universities have shown an ability to think quickly and correctly when confronted by emergencies that transcended the achievements of those who have been trained from childhood in the science of warfare. Gen. Omar Bradley has said that the American soldier is the finest trained soldier in the world.

I pray God we may never have to fight another war. But if we do, remember the American way has always proved successful. We have never lost a war. Why copy a method that has been proved to be obsolete? Why change from one method that has always proved successful to one that has failed over and over again?

As we began, there are times when revolutionary changes have to be made in governments, but the American people ought to think long and seriously before we take the road to a militarized government.

F. HUBERT MORRIS,
Minister, First Presbyterian Church,
New Bern, N. C.

Statement by the American Slav Congress Before House Appropriations Committee Hearing on President Truman's Request for $550,000,000 UNRRA Allotment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 19, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement by the American Slav Congress before the House Appropriations Committee on October 11, 1945.

Mr. Speaker, peace is the objective of our foreign policy as it is the objective of the peoples of the world. But millions upon millions of people in the world will face starvation and cold this winter. We are the only nation which can greatly help. We help not only to succor those in dire need but so that we may help to bring about the healthy conditions which are essential to the establishment of a just and enduring peace.

Remembering that peace is our objective, I endorse the statement made by the American Slav Congress.

Mr. Chairman, members of the House Appropriations Committee, appearing on behalf of the American Slav Congress, we wish to state from the outset that our organization, representing millions of Slavic Americans throughout the country, wholeheartedly supports President Truman's request to Congress for an additional appropriation of $550,000,000 for UNRRA aid to the peoples of the liberated countries.

The urgency for such an appropriation has been amply emphasized in the President's message to Congress and in the reports by UNRRA representatives in the hunger-stricken regions of eastern Europe and elsewhere.

If additional proof is needed, here is a letter by a nurse who holds the rank of captain in the United States Public Health Service and is attached to UNRRA in Yugoslavia. She writes:

"I'm about to go to Bosnia to improve the orphan children's diet by adding two ounces of powdered milk to the one piece of bread they eat every other day. Of course, I'm supposed to teach nutrition—what they should eat if they had it. In case anyone at home wants to know—they've lost the victory if we don't feed southern Europe this winter. We hear that the United States of America is afraid to draw on its food reserves because the average American diet is down to 3,800 calories. Ask them how they'd like to live on 800 and watch their children starve to death. It's true that about two of the 15,000,000 people will have enough to eat. But there's no surplus, and even if there was, there's no transportation. Roads have to be rebuilt and railroads reestablished. Between Servia and Bosnia the railroad has 99 tunnels and every one is dynamited and mined. Hard manual labor is required and hungry people can't work very efficiently. The enemy has been brutally cruel to this nation that refused to capitulate and literally fought on with bare hands. For miles on end there isn't a village or farm left standing. I read somewhere that all America knows about Cassino, but there are thousands of Cassinos in Yugoslavia. Our nursing program is started. The girls want to learn, but I wonder if it's worth the effort if the nurses and patients are going to starve this winter. You may be sure the Yugoslavs will produce superhuman effort and if they're fed this winter they'll do the rest themselves."

Another heartbreaking story of the terrible sufferings of the people of Yugoslavia and how inadequate present UNRRA help is was offered by chief of UNRRA mission to that heroic country, Mr. Srgeychik; in a statement to the press he said:

"During the day the men and horses are dying. They bury men, women, and children but have no time to bury the horses. The urgent vision of winter drives them on. They and those who lie buried by the road are casualties, not of the war but of the liberation, victims of the promise that would make an ironic epitaph: 'Being determined that immediately upon the liberation of any area by the armed forces of the United Nations or as a consequence of the retreat of the enemy the population shall receive aid and relief from their sufferings; food, clothing, and shelter, and aid in the prevention of pestilence and in the recovery of the health of the people.' This was written in 1943 by the 44 nations setting up the UNRRA. The people who came back to their villages heard it on the radio or as it was repeated from mouth to mouth.

"You do not have to travel far in Yugoslavia to see the meaning of the facts and figures in terms of suffering and courage, life and death. The people in devastated Yugoslavia know that many will die this winter. Even on the hottest days, as they sweat at their work, the prospect of a winter without food, clothing, or shelter is before their eyes They know it is too late to save all, so their only concern is to make the death roll as short as possible. The time has come for more than promises. The UNRRA mission to Yugoslavia, aware of world shortages, advised the Yugoslav Government to prepare their requests, not on the basis laid down in 1943 but on their own bare minimum requirements. They were advised that the requests would stand a better chance of acceptance if this were done. But when these requests were submitted by UNRRA the combined boards in Washington drastically scaled down the total allocation for UNRRA.

"The area of western Yugoslavia is as large and as unfertile as Greece. Yet the allocation is eight times as much to Greece as to Yugoslavia. This does not mean to say that Greece does not need these supplies, but that Yugoslavia needs them equally. The point is that the total allocated by the combined boards to UNRRA countries is quite inadequate, no matter how it is divided. Washington is far from Europe, but if the members of the combined boards could spend a day in Lika and Bosnia and see with what courage the Yugoslavs are facing their grim present and their grimmer future, it would be impossible for them to continue the allocations at the present inadequate level. They would realize that reduction in Washington means the increase of the death rate in Europe."

In Central Poland, for instance, 9 out of 10 persons you meet, Gladwin Hill cabled New York Times the other day, from Stettin are those who have been uprooted, persons who came from somewhere else, persons whose normal livelihood has been wiped out and who are seeking an existence elsewhere, persons whose mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters, sons and daughters have been slaughtered by the Germans.

Ukraine and Byelorussia have been devastated beyond description. All these countries do not have foreign exchange and cannot buy any food even if they can find it somewhere. Their people depend entirely on UNRRA aid.

Letters from the people of these countries to relatives in the United States are full of the most terrible stories of the slow death by hunger. Most of these letters have been printed in the Slavic newspapers of Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, New York, and the large Slavic population of these and other vital centers of the country have been greatly aroused by the failure of Congress so far to allocate additional funds for UNRRA.

We have here with us a letter to Congress signed by 60 of the most outstanding Americans of Slav descent in which they urge every Congressman to give his or her support to the request of President Truman. We are submitting this letter with the names of the signers as part of our statement at this hearing. Millions of Slavic Americans throughout the country have been among the most conscientious and energetic participants in the war effort of our country and their view on this important question should be taken under the most serious consideration by Congress. We would like also to call your attention to an editorial in yesterday's New York Post entitled "Our Pledge to UNRRA" in which this problem is treated in a very concrete and simple way that makes the need for immediate action most obvious. The editorial states in one part:

"Deaths from tuberculosis, scarlet fever, diphtheria, etc., are sweeping Europe, claiming thousands more people than were killed by the fighting. In some areas, 8 out of 10 babies have been dying soon after birth.

"These decimating diseases are all spreading from the same cause—malnutrition. These hundreds of thousands of people are all dying by the same death—starvation."

The $550,000,000 which the President requests has been long overdue. This is the balance of the appropriation which we promised UNRRA more than a year ago. Frankly speaking, it seems inconceivable how any further delay in appropriating this sum can be justified on any humanitarian ground.

Representative CLARENCE BROWN from Ohio said a few days ago as reported in the press that no UNRRA funds should be used in foreign countries which do not accord free access to all news and do not permit freedom of the press as it is understood in the United States. But such a condition in granting aid to the hungry men, women, and children of the liberated countries will be a gross departure from and a clear violation of the basic humanitarian principles and purposes of UNRRA. Such a condition would mean that we would use food and clothing as a political weapon, as a club over the heads of our allies who happen to have a different concept of what constitutes a free press. No; a free country like ours cannot adopt a policy of using food to impose on its Allies its views on vital matters. We call upon Congress to reject such proposals. They are inconsistent with the spirit and the principles of our democracy.

In our opinion, Congress should approve speedily the appropriation on the basis of our freely arrived at and freely undertaken obligation to help save the lives of millions of hungry people who fought our common Nazi foe and whose towns and homes were destroyed by the Nazi hordes.

Any further delay in approving and giving this sum to UNRRA will mean an increase of the death rate in the liberated countries. America should not do that. Congress must not commit such an act.

We strongly urge immediate approval by Congress of the request of President Truman for $550,000,000 for UNRRA aid to the peoples of the liberated countries. We also urge favorable consideration by Congress of UNRRA's request for a second assessment of 1 percent of the national income of the member nations which have not suffered invasion. "Without food there can be no peace," General Eisenhower declared.

"We must act and act now. It is inconceivable that the United Nations could abandon the peoples of the liberated areas of Europe at the moment of their greatest peril," said UNRRA Director, former Governor Lehman.

Timely aid is a double aid.

ZLATKO BALOKOVIC,
Acting President.
GEORGE PIRINSKY,
Executive Secretary.

Palestine and the Jewish Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 8, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Clarence W. Efroymson, of Butler University, a brilliant educator and an outstanding authority on the Jewish homeland, has sent me a letter entitled "Palestine and the Jewish Need—1945 Summary," which contains a wealth of information in regard to the Palestine problem. By unanimous consent of the House I present this illuminating document for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is as follows:

PALESTINE AND THE JEWISH NEED—1945
SUMMARY

I. PLIGHT OF THE JEWS IN EUROPE

From the Jewish point of view, Continental Europe west of the old Soviet boundary is a charnel house. The indictment before the high tribunal at Nuremberg states that 5,700,000 Jews of the 9,600,000 formerly living in the areas dominated by the Nazis have disappeared. The most conservative estimates indicate that 4,000,000 Jews were slaughtered by the Nazis and their allies.

It is estimated that 1,250,000 Jews remain at this moment in Europe west of the old Soviet boundaries. (I think there is no point in this paper to attempt to account for the balance, 2,750,000, of the 5,700,000 who have not disappeared.)

Something of the plight of the million and a quarter who remain may be gleaned from the recently released report to President Truman of Earl G. Harrison. Mr. Harrison, who is dean of the law school of the University of Pennsylvania, was sent to Europe to inquire into the situation of displaced persons in western Europe and in the areas of Germany and Austria occupied by the United States. His report may be summarized in one sentence. In these occupied areas there are 100,000 Jews still in "camps" and who have no homes to go to. (Controversy has arisen with respect to conditions in these camps, but that is aside the present point.) Dean Harrison says these persons "want to be evacuated to Palestine now, just as other national groups are being evacuated to their homes."

There can be no doubt as to why these people want to go to Palestine and not back to the countries from which they fled or were evacuated. All reports agree on this—it is the legacy of Hitler. There is a vast difference in this respect between the countries of eastern Europe—Poland, Rumania, Hungary, etc.—where the bulk of the 1,250,000 survivors cower in terror; and western Europe—France, Belgium, Holland, etc. But even in the latter, where at least Jews are not today being openly murdered, an impossible situation confronts most of the returning Jews. In these western countries, in addition to the influence of a decade of intensive anti-Semitic propaganda from Germany, there are active groups who have special interests to defend. These are the—sometimes innocent—purchasers of Jewish property and occupants of former Jewish positions. They fear any attempt of returning Jews to reclaim properties, rented apartments and homes, and business which the Nazis took from Jews and then sold to Frenchmen, Belgians, Dutchmen, etc. In France De Gaulle abandoned the idea of prosecuting some thousands of Frenchmen who had cooperated in the Vichy measures of expropriation for fear lest such prosecutions would increase anti-Semitism, and a league of tenants (occupying properties stolen from Jews and other victims of Nazis) had to be dissolved by Government action. Even in Holland, classic land of European freedom, returning Jews fear to claim what once was theirs, and those who benefited by their expulsion are busy fanning the flames of hatred.

In eastern Europe the situation is infinitely worse. There Hitler's agents found all too much indigenous anti-Semitism on which to build their hate structure. Today Jews scurry from the smaller towns where they had lived for generations to the poor protection of numbers—and the presence of occupation troops—in the capitals, Budapest, Bucharest, Warsaw. American soldiers write from Berlin of Jews who returned to Poland

and now have sought temporary refuge in—of all places—Berlin.

II. PALESTINE THE HAVEN

Dean Harrison reported that some of the Jews in the camps which he inspected want to go to English-speaking countries—mostly those who have relatives there; and that some Polish and other Jews want to return—temporarily, to look for their families—to Poland and the Baltic countries; but that the mass know only one place to go to—Palestine.

In Palestine there is today an economically healthy Jewish community of about 650,000 persons. These men and women are anxious and prepared to receive immediately and take care of not less than 100,000 refugees, and many more in the months and years to follow.

The political foundation of this community is laid, of course, in the various papers and statements issued by the British, American, and other Allied governments in the closing phases of World War I, and in particular, in the mandate of July 24, 1922, whereby the Council of the League of Nations turned Palestine over to Great Britain, "to be placed under such political, administrative, and economic conditions * * * as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home * * * Jewish immigration under suitable conditions, is to be facilitated, * * * and close settlement by the Jews on the land * * * is to be encouraged."

On the basis of this international sanction the Jews have built a flourishing community which successfully absorbed 61,854 Jewish refugees in the single year 1935, when the community was less than half its present size. This is not the place to describe Jewish achievement in Palestine. Suffice to say that 150,000 of the immigrants are settled in 300 agricultural communities, deriving sustenance from diversified farming and citriculture; that the Jews have developed a great Hebrew university on Mount Scopus outside Jerusalem, and a thriving industry in Tel-Aviv and other towns, which contributed immeasurably to the success of Montgomery in Africa; and that the fact of the Jewish community in Palestine was a potent factor in discouraging the tendency of Fascist-minded Arab sheiks to revolt when Hitler's armies threatened Suez and the Middle East. Incidentally, all this was accomplished at a time when not less than 30,000 Palestinian Jewish volunteers had left their farms and shops to serve in the British ranks.

III. THE WHITE PAPER

The present impasse is the direct result of the issuance by the Chamberlain government in May 1939 of the so-called white paper. This document—which is still in force—provides that, from May 1939, not more than 75,000 Jews may emigrate to Palestine, except with Arab agreement. In addition, it severely restricts the right of Jews to purchase land in Palestine. At present the 75,000 quota of immigrants is exhausted, and no more may enter. Palestine is thus today the single country in the whole world with official, specifically racial restrictions—obviously based on the Nazi philosophy—against the Jews.

It is of little use to recount the charges against the white paper. Winston Churchill, in Parliament, May 23, 1939, said it "is a plain breach of a solemn obligation." The Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations unanimously declared: "The policy set out in the white paper was not in accordance with the interpretation which in agreement with the Mandatory Power and Council the Commission had placed upon the Palestine mandate." Herbert Morrison, of the Labor Party, in the Parliamentary debate of May 1939, said: "The Government must understand that this document will not be binding upon their successors in office, whatever the circumstances of the time may be."

IV. THE ARABS

The white paper was an attempt by the ill-fated Chamberlain government to appease certain elements among the Arabs. Like the effort which gave Hitler Czechoslovakia, it failed. Haj Amin el Husseim, one-time Mufti of Jerusalem, fled during the war to Rome and Berlin, broadcast in the interest of the Axis, and is now a war criminal. Iraq revolted when Rommel threatened Suez, and, as is well known, Egypt, when the Germans were at the gates of Alexandria, did not send a soldier to fend off the Nazis.

The Arab spokesmen for Palestine cite a long list of grievances, chiefly displacement of Arabs in Palestine by the Jews. Yet the truth is that the coming of the Jews—because their industry has developed new sources of livelihood, and restored the fertility of an eroding and neglected soil—has made more room for Arabs, even while the Jews were crowding in. The Arab population of Palestine grew from about 600,000 to over 1,000,000 during the very years of Jewish immigration. Malcolm MacDonald, Secretary of State for the Colonies (and as such the individual man who bears greatest responsibility for the white-paper policy), said in the House of Commons in 1938:

"The Arabs cannot say that the Jews are driving them out of their country. If not a single Jew had come to Palestine after 1918, I believe that the Arab population would still have been around the 600,000 figure (instead of over 1,000,000, as at present), at which it had been stable under Turkish rule. It is because the Jews who have come to Palestine bring modern health services and other advantages that Arab men and women who would have been dead are alive today, that Arab children who would never have drawn breath have been born and grow strong."

Actually, instead of being driven out, Arabs have immigrated into Palestine during the years of Jewish development. Officially registered Arab immigrants numbered 28,664 in the years 1923–43. This does not include the thousands who drifted across the desert frontiers. This immigration is explained by the higher wages and better living conditions in Palestine compared to any of the surrounding Arab communities.

Explanation of the paradox of Arab opposition to Jewish immigration in the face of immense benefits is not far to seek. The Arab countries are composed of masses of inarticulate and illiterate peasants—called fellahin—and Bedouins who are ruled and exploited by a few wealthy sheiks and effendi. The Arab countries are feudal societies, reminiscent of England in the so-called Dark Ages, and the feudal rulers fear that western ideas carried into the Middle East by Jewish immigration will destroy their hold. Dr. Wendell Phillips, now rector of Christ Church, Rye, N. Y., formerly at the American University of Cairo, says:

"The small group in power have everything; the rest of the people nothing. The leaders, the emirs and feudal owners, the professional classes, and clergy who benefit by serving them, are the recipients of whatever fruit the land bears.

"Between them and the masses there is a great gulf which no one is interested in bridging * * * there is no concern about the masses * * * this is the situation and it suits those on top very nicely."

These facts explain the Arab riots against the Jews and Arab sympathy with the Nazis. They also explain the ease with which the Jews of Palestine defended themselves against the rioters. It was not the Arabs who revolted or rioted, but the feudal exploiting classes, who are no more the enemies of the Jews than of the fellahin who suffer by their misrule and exploitation.

At present the Arab chieftains are threatening revolt or war if Jews are again admitted to Palestine. Competent observers—pointing out primitive conditions in Arab countries, the ease with which the wartime disturbances in Iraq and Syria were quelled, and the present inability of Iraq to end the Kurdish rebellion now going on—minimize these threats. They think that the Arab rulers will acquiesce in a firmly announced policy—that it is necessary merely to end the months and years of vacillation and appeasement in the face of threats.

V. AMERICA'S STAKE

What is America's interest in the matter? The answer is twofold: a legalistic and a humanitarian interest.

From the legal point of view we may recall that the wartime (World War I) pledge of Palestine as a Jewish homeland was submitted for President Wilson's approval before the British Cabinet announced it on November 2, 1917; that Congress in joint resolution in 1922 unanimously approved the pledge, and that the United States on December 3, 1924, entered into a convention with Great Britain whereby the United States consented to the administration of Palestine by Great Britain "pursuant to the mandate (of the League of Nations)," and specified that: "Nothing contained in the present convention shall be affected by any modification which may be made in the terms of the mandate, as recited above, unless such modification shall have been assented to by the United States."

The white paper, as pointed out above, is a modification—in fact a reversal—of the mandate; and the United States has not assented to it. In Germany and Japan we have abolished racial and other Fascist laws which violate the fundamental principles of human decency on which we stand. Since the days when Daniel Webster stood up in Congress to denounce Turkish misrule in Greece, American statesmen have realized that the United States does have an interest in the elimination of injustice and terror in other parts of the world. In the recent war and today in Indonesia, Indochina, and India, we were and are acutely aware of the danger to us of unenlightened policies which the backward and unimaginative colonial administrators of our allies may attempt to carry out, even in the face of the humane and sensible opinions which may prevail in the homelands. We in America may have a less direct interest than London. But our voice can be all the more powerful in encouraging the home government in London to throw out an antiquated and disaster-fraught colonial policy in Palestine.

Russia and the Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 19, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Freda Kerchivey from the Nation of November 17, 1945:

RUSSIA AND THE BOMB

(By Freda Kirchwey)

That Russia should be given full information about the atomic bomb is so evident that the question no longer seems arguable. The obvious objections have been answered with devasting finality in the last few weeks by many scientists and a few public men. They have proved beyond question that not even the narrowest concept of national security will be served by secrecy. Since this is so,

the longer the matter is discussed the worse for all of us, for the debate itself generates poisons out of which, if they are not soon neutralized and washed away, the next war—the atomic war—will certainly come.

Our secrecy policy, restated only the other day by President Truman, would have been accepted without question in other circumstances. A new weapon of ordinary dimensions, according to traditional practices, is kept for the use of the country that perfects it; only in the course of actual warfare would the secret be shared even with a trusted ally. The war was over almost immediately after the bombs hit Hiroshima and Nagasaki. And nothing that has happened since then has increased official American or British trust in our Russian ally. What more natural, therefore, than to sit tight on the secret of the bomb, particularly in view of its unprecedented destructive power?

Natural, but futile, and therefore stupid. For the destructive power of atomic explosion is exactly what makes an attempt to monopolize it more dangerous than the bomb itself. It is not merely a new weapon. It is a weapon which gives the Nation controlling it the power of life or death over any other nation. This is a situation which in its essence is intolerable. At the same time, as the nuclear scientists have patiently explained, it is a situation impossible to perpetuate. Put those two facts together in proper proportions and you have the makings of the greatest explosion on earth.

Many people, I believe, were temporarily deceived by the restraint exhibited by other nations in discussing America's monopoly on total destruction. It seemed at first as if our allies, grateful for the sudden ending of hostilities and awed by our overpowering display of energy, creative ability, and cold cash, were prepared to accept us as the appointed trustees on earth of the released power of the universe. Even Russia said not a word. But soon, very soon, the reaction began, and it has been growing steadily in many parts of the world; its most important manifestation has been a solid, total deadlock in our relations with Russia. It is that deadlock which strangled the Foreign Ministers' Conference in London and kept Russia out of the meeting of the Far Eastern Advisory Commission in Washington. It is that deadlock which has brought Prime Minister Attlee to the White House.

But what of it? some of the arguers may still ask. Suppose Russia doesn't like it, what then? Didn't Mr. Churchill have the answer when he said that even during the war Russia had shown little inclination to share its military secrets with its allies, and would hardly hand over the secret of the bomb today if it had it? This position might be worth considering—though at best it betrays a rather juvenile approach to a grimly adult problem—if the United States were permitted the freedom to decide, which Mr. Churchill and Mr. Truman and most of our military leaders assume for purposes of debate. The scientists have ruthlessly snatched away that freedom. We can't keep the secret because every advanced nation already knows all we know about atomic energy and how to release it, and even our last reserved area, the sacred American "know how," will be conquered soon.

This is accepted fact; neither General Marshall nor Mr. Truman would think of disputing it. What, then, do they hope to gain by hiding our technical knowledge behind barred gates and building stock piles of hatred and suspicion abroad? What do they hope to gain by legislation creating a Federal dictatorship over all atomic investigation, as well as production, and making the interchange of scientific information in the field of nuclear experiment impossible under threat of criminal prosecution? What is it all about, if Russia and Sweden and France, and perhaps Spain and Argentina, will be able to make bombs within the next 5 years?

The answer is a complex one. Chiefly, they hope to gain time. And in the time gained, they hope to do two incompatible things: First, accumulate a lot of improved atomic bombs so that we can maintain our head start in destructive power; and, second, create some sort of international control to take charge of the situation when other nations finally get around to manufacturing bombs themselves. This sounds, perhaps, too silly to be taken seriously, but it is the only explanation so far publicly offered for our policy of secrecy. If you suggest that secrecy plus bomb production makes difficult the achievement of that mutual trust—especially with Russia—on which any effective international control must rest, you will be fobbed off with the theme that ran through Mr. Truman's unfortunate Navy Day speech: The bomb is a sacred trust; everyone in the world believes us and knows that we will not violate that trust. The only catch is that the premise is inaccurate. How inaccurate, can be best realized if for a moment one imagines that Russia possesses the secret of the bomb and has announced in the same pious words its determination to hang on to it. Would we decide forthwith to drop our efforts to make a bomb of our own? Would we accept Russia's protestations of good will? The questions answer themselves, and demolish at the same time the position of those who hope to build a structure of international trust on a foundation of Anglo-American (though chiefly American) monopoly of atomic power.

Only one explanation of our policy would make sense. A short period of secrecy would be worth the cost if we intended to start an offensive war against Russia or if we expected Russia to attack us in the immediate future. In either case our temporary monopoly would give us an overwhelming advantage; we could destroy Russian cities and industries without fear of retaliation and quickly bring the Soviet Union to total defeat. But this, the one sensible explanation for our present policy, paradoxically makes no sense whatever. For in spite of our bluster and our camouflaged designs on strategic bases, and our shocked objections to other nations' similar designs; in spite of a few generals and Congressmen and newspaper editors who, accepting war with Russia as inevitable, argue with a sort of maniac's logic that it had best come soon while we have the upper hand; in spite of all this, the United States is not going to attack Russia. And Russia is not going to attack us, bomb or no bomb. One can be certain that no disagreements Moscow may have with any major power will be allowed to develop to the point of war as long as Russia is desperately struggling to restore its shattered economic life and rebuild its cities. The Soviet Union needs peace even more than we do.

In fact, the reality is exactly the opposite and the danger a very different one. Since the chance of our being involved in war in the next 2 or 3 years is remote, the possession of the bomb secret is a positive disadvantage and the bomb becomes a weapon aimed at ourselves. If we don't intend to use it first we are creating suspicion without any compensating benefit. By the time other nations have made bombs of their own the international situation may have so deteriorated as to make certain a war in which we shall be the attacked, not the attacker, and our guarded secret, our sacred trust, will ironically have been one of the chief factors in producing the break-down.

The position I have put here is not only supported by most liberal opinion in America; the British press, from left to right, accepts as a prerequisite to all further international action the necessity for conquering Russia's distrust by giving it the secret of the bomb. Presumably the Prime Minister will convey to the President that point of view and the various reasons for it. He must persuade Mr. Truman that those advisers are wrong who recently urged that Russia should not be let in on the secret "until the various peace settlements have been finally determined." Their insistence that the bomb gives the United States and Britain "dominance in current discussions" has been disproved by events. The contrary is the case. Only if we approach Russia with the secret (not the bomb) in one hand and our proposals in the other will the proposals be taken at their face value. At present they make a funny noise when we drop them on the conference table.

A decision to give the bomb to Russia would immediately shift to new ground the other urgent problems facing the powers. It would not solve those problems. The differences between Russia and the West are real differences; they existed long before the first bomb was dropped, and they would still exist if Russia had the secret. But the bomb has intensified them and stalled efforts to solve them. Mr. Molotov opened the way to a new attempt to overcome those differences in his speech last week. He stated clearly but moderately Russia's intention to develop the bomb through its own efforts, he offered a detailed explanation of Russian policy, domestic and foreign, and he emphasized the desire of the Government for close cooperation among the Big Three. "Expressions of good intentions are not enough," he said. "The Soviet Union has been and will continue to be a reliable bulwark in the defense of peace and the security of peoples, and is ready to prove this, not in words, but in deeds."

If Attlee and Truman want to put Molotov's promise to the test, they can easily do so. The bomb is not a bargaining counter to be used to extract from Russia concessions which would serve the national interests of Britain and the United States. It must be given freely. But in giving it, the western powers would have a right to assure themselves and the world that Russia will accept genuine international control of atomic power and will cooperate in converting the machinery of peace to the demands of the new age. Much needs to be done to the structure of the United Nations Organization and to the rules under which it operates before it can be trusted with powers of atomic control. Russia must be ready to accept such chances, as must the western powers themselves.

If the necessity to give Russia the secret of the bomb is self-evident, there are subsidiary questions of vast importance that require detailed consideration. Many dangers could be avoided if the conferees in Washington would settle the secrecy issue quickly and get on to those other matters. For the secret is only an obstacle; the real problems lie on the other side.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two letters, one from a major and the other from a captain, both of whom have served with distinction overseas, and have recently been discharged from the service. Both

of them discuss the important policy as it relates to our national defense.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUGGESTIONS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

NOVEMBER 7, 1945.

Senator CLYDE R. HOEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Apparently there will soon be under consideration by Congress legislation providing for a year of compulsory military training for all American youths. I have just returned from 20 months of service overseas, where I was a major in the Air Corps, and submit for your consideration in arriving at your conclusions on this proposal the following points.

1. The moral standards of the young men in the armed forces rapidly deteriorated. This was in part due to the fact that when large groups of men are gathered together and freed from the restraint of the opinion of the people of their homes and communities there is usually such a tendency. But it was also due in large measure to the lack of moral standards among many of the high ranking Regular Army officers themselves.

2. If it is decided that a year of compulsory military training is necessary for our security—it seems to me that this is doubtful—then a commission composed of men skilled in moral leadership of youth, including men of the type in charge of some of our outstanding private military schools, should be established and should have control of the daily life, as distinguished from the technical instruction, of the boys. Some of the military schools seem to have shown remarkable ability to develop the admirable qualities in boys. I have in mind such schools as Darlington and Shattuck.

3. I have never seen before, nor did I ever expect to see, such wholesale inefficiency as exists in the Army.

4. This is traceable in part to the relative idleness of Army officers between wars. Men with little to do commonly fail to do even that little effectively and well.

5. The Army needs a complete reexamination by a commission composed for the most part of civilians, together with Army officers of recognized efficiency and ability, such as, of course, General Eisenhower. Included among the civilians should be a number of outstanding men who served during the war and learned to evaluate the Army's output of publicity concerning the quality of its work in its various branches.

6. One objective of such a commission should be to see to it that the program of Army training and operations is constantly adjusted to the use of atomic weapons. Otherwise we are likely to have the atomic developments on the one hand and training in existing methods on the other, rather than a close coordination of the two into one system. Witness the fact that upon the outbreak of this war there was no complete and thorough adjustment of Army techniques to the airplane and the tank, nor to the innummerable technical skills a modern Army employs by drawing upon experts from civilian life.

7. Another objective should be a change in the type of personnel in the Regular Army and their activities between wars. Especially among the officers there is need for developing organizers, administrators, thinkers, and technicians.

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING

A captain who has served overseas and is fully convinced that we ought not adopt compulsory military training says:

"Compulsory military training has been recommended as a peacetime necessity. To say that we do not need adequate protection would be foolish. We must have adequate protection. There is such a thing as having too little or too much protection—one is as dangerous as the other.

"Germany and Japan felt before World War II that nothing less that a full size compulsory military training would give them adequate protection. We did not have compulsary training and we overcame those two nations. 'Not by power or strength but by spirit, sayeth the Lord.' That is still true. It is the spirit of the men behind the guns that wins or loses a war. In the Army it is called morale.

"This question of compulsory military training is a big one, one that will make itself felt in every home over a period of years.

"Let us ask ourselves two or three questions before final decision on this question.

"1. Why are our troops in Japan and Germany today: They are there to clear these two nations of militarism. What's the use of sending our troops to Japan and to Germany to pull up the tree of militarism and then to replant that tree at home. This is double talk, it is like the old saying about the mugwump. A mugwump, you know, is a bird sitting on the fence—his mug on one side, his wump on the other. Cleaning militarism out of Japan and Germany is the mug, bringing militarism back home is the wump.

"2. Who are we preparing to fight the next war against: If it is either Germany or Japan then we have already fought World War II in vain. Our occupational army is there to see that another war will not be possible.

"3. Why do we have to have another war: Some say prepare for you never know where lightning is going to strike. That is true, one never knows where lightning is going to strike and we put up lightning rods for self-protection. They call universal military training the lightning rods of self-protection. It must be remembered that too many lightning rods all over the house may draw the lightning which we are seeking to protect ourselves against. The lightning rods of militarism in Germany and Japan surely brought lightning from the rest of the world.

"The militarists say that compulsory military training is necessary. We must remember that there is no immediate danger of war. No nation is ready now. Furthermore, for the next 10 years at least we have a reserve force of around 12,000,000 which at the present we are demobilizing because there is no need for such a reserve. Twelve million have already been trained and there is no immediate danger for they can be recalled if necessary.

"This talk about the Army building up a boy is nonsense. Those who have been in service know what it does to our American boys. You cannot teach a boy to be a killer and say he has been built up. Hate, suspicion, mistrust of our enemies have to be taught in the Army. This is bad enough during wartime but many a good boy in spite of his attempts to avoid the evils of army life begins following the crowd. They become accustomed to working, moving, and thinking in groups. They eat together, they march together, they have the same problems. Regimentation is not the American way of life.

"It is time for our young manhood to begin training and thinking about peace instead of war. We cannot believe that because we have always had war we will always have it. We have always had smallpox and other diseases, but we are controlling these deadly diseases. At one time we had always had slavery, but we gave it up because slavery was wrong. World opinion has already outlawed war. World opinion outlawed the old-honored custom of settling disputes by the methods of dueling.

"Militarism forces a false philosophy upon draftees. It forces young men to believe in the power of force instead of righteousness and right relationships. The good will of other nations is a better security than to have them afraid of us.

"Compulsory military training in this country would start another world-armament race. This race would result in another world war and even those who advocate universal military training agree that mankind cannot survive another world war with our modern policy of destruction.

"Such training will destroy the confidence other nations are trying to place in us. It will breed mistrust and suspicion on the part of other nations toward us. It will furnish the background for the psychology of another war. The Japanese would not have struck without the background of universal military training.

"Who wants this universal military training:

"Not the mothers of our Nation.

"Not the boys who have to take the training.

"Not the ones who are now in the service (notice how rapidly they are trying to get out).

"Not the taxpayers who must foot the bill.

"The militarists want it, but this is a democracy and the militarists are the servants of the people. The militarists were in control of Japan and they made the people their servants. They were in control in Germany and they brought destruction upon themselves with their false philosophy of superman and might make right.

"We are told that military training is good national insurance. This policy did not save Japan and Germany. A nation can have too little or too much insurance. France had universal training and became a victim of overconfidence in her military training.

"The one outstanding thing our Nation is respected for is American ingenuity and initiative. Regimentation will kill this, our greatest and most respected weapon.

"This is a world problem. We no longer are an isolated nation seeking to protect ourselves. We are a part of a world drawn close together, so the problem is one which we must work out in cooperation with other nations. We cannot police the world alone, we must work with other nations in keeping down aggressors."

Critique of Labor Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an interesting address entitled "Critique of Labor Law" delivered by Prof. William Sternberg of Creighton University School of Law, Omaha, Nebr., before the Postwar Institute of the Nebraska Bar Association, held on October 31, 1945, at Creighton University.

The estimate from the Government Printing Office indicates that the address will exceed by one-third of a page the two pages allowed under the rule and that the printing will cost $121.40.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRITIQUE OF LABOR LAW

If you will bear with me a little longer, I would like to offer a few suggestions concerning the right approach to labor law and its

problems. Just to give this second part of my discourse some kind of name, I call it a critique. But there is a preliminary point that I would like to emphasize; namely, the need for legislation on this subject.

This need is ultimately traceable, I think, to the economic theory with which we began our economic history. I refer to the theory of economic individualism of which Adam Smith was the great apostle. His ideal in domestic affairs was unrestrained competition, not only in the commodity market, but in the labor market as well. Now individualism is not entirely wrong: it has its good points—notably the recognition of natural rights. But when unrestrained, it permits the rich and the strong to exploit the poor and the weak. And that is exactly what happened during the first sixty or seventy years of our national existence. When employers transformed themselves into large companies and immense corporations, the individual worker lost what little bargaining power he had. More and more he became the victim of unscrupulous exploitation. It was quite natural that the worker should be reminded of the maxim, "In union there is strength." It must be admitted that organized labor has gained tremendous advantages for the individual worker. It may have sometimes adopted tactics and pursued policies that are questionable both legally and morally, but it has certainly been a powerful weapon in the battle for higher wages and shorter hours. But capital acted on the same maxim and formed employer associations. They attempted to solve the labor problem by scientific management and personal technique. The result was that instead of having a fight between a giant and a pygmy, we have a battle between two giants, more damaging to the public interest than ever before.

There are especially two reasons why these two types of social control failed to put an end to industrial warfare. One is their lack of genuine interest in any measure designed to reduce unemployment. For both types of organization, this is merely incidental. Why should the employer worry about unemployment as long as he has all the workers he needs for his own business. About the only way that it affects him is some additional expense involved in a larger labor turn-over. On the other hand, it may seem somewhat surprising to say that unions are interested only incidentally. In our recent Labor Day celebration, labor leaders seemed to be greatly concerned about the threatening unemployment. Much of this concern was certainly genuine, because the unemployment threatens to become so extensive as to involve union members. That's when the unions become active and vocal. That's the very purpose of their organization: to protect and promote the interest of their members. Unemployment, as it affects 40,000,000 nonunion workers, is simply not within the scope of their aims. This comment is not intended as a criticism of either the employer or of the union. Each of these simply restricts itself to the purpose for which it is organized. You can't blame them for that. But it discloses their inherent limitations with respect to the general problem of unemployment and the necessity of interference by some other agency of social control.

Another reason why these agencies have so completely failed to bring industrial peace is their utter selfishness. The principal aim of employer associations is to help the employer get more for his money. Even when an employer has shown exceptional liberality and consideration for the personal welfare of the worker, it arouses resentment among union officials. They call it paternalism. They want higher wages, but they want it in recognition of their rights, not as a token of benevolence. In any event, any concession which scientific management and personal technique may make to the union demands is merely a means to the ultimate end of larger returns. But the same is true of organized labor, which is organized for the selfish end of more money and less work. Such things as the closed shop, the check-off, the maintenance of membership clauses in labor agreements, feather-bedding rules, and collective bargaining—these are all means to the same end.

This is true also of their demand for industrial democracy by which the workers get a share in the control of the business. It's not because they love democracy. If that were true, it would be more noticeable in their own organization. They have a better reason—from their own standpoint. They want industrial democracy, because they know that it is the most effective means of getting the other things they want: more money, less work, better working conditions. Nobody can blame them for wanting these things. Such desires are very natural. Nor do I blame them for organizing to get them, as long as their specific tactics and activity do not conflict with the statutes, the Constitution, or the moral law. My purpose just now is to point out the reason why these two agencies of scientific management and unionism fail to solve the problem. Each one works for a unilateral purpose. They do not even aim at the common good; whenever they talk about it, they identify their own interest with it. This is well exemplified by their actions with respect to unemployment compensation. At every session of the legislature, the employer groups exert pressure to prevent any increase of benefits without regard to their present insufficiency. Unionist groups seek to obtain all possible increase of benefits without regard to the solvency of the fund from which they are to be paid.

Under these circumstances it seems clear that any permanently harmonious cooperation between employers and unions cannot come from their voluntary agreements. It must be brought about by some independent agency strong enough to control both parties and courageous enough to prevent the use of force by either party. That, of course, means the Government. But since ours is a government of laws and not of men, this governmental interference itself must be according to law. Up to about 1911 the only law we had on the subject was the common law. But the common law certainly got a terribly wrong start when the first American labor case was decided in 1810, called the Cordwainers case, holding that a combination of laborers to raise wages was a criminal conspiracy. After that wrong start, it took them some years to gain recognition of their natural right to organize, and after it was recognized, it took more time to get organized and still more time to become strong enough to accomplish anything. After that first case was decided, it was a full hundred years before there was really any important legislation, but since 1911, when the first workmen's compensation laws and minimum-wage statutes were enacted, labor laws have been coming from the legislatures and Congress in a steady stream.

One reason for this accumulation of statutory law on this subject was the great increase in the complexity of our industrial system. The marvelous advance of technological improvements created new situations with such rapidity and in such variety that a more specific regulative standard was required than could be found in the broad principles of the common law. Another and more important reason is the radical change in government policy. It was felt that the development of the common law was proceeding along lines inimical to the interest and to the just demands of laborers and thus indirectly injurious to the common good. A corrective was needed. Consequently, some of these statutes not only establish more specific guides for the decision of cases involving labor regulations, but actually abrogate the old standard of the common law. The best known example of this is the common-law principle that no innocent man should be penalized or punished by law. Liability was based on culpability. A person who was in no way to blame for what happened was in no way responsible for what happened. One notable exception to this rule was the responsibility of the principal for the torts of his agent. But the common-law criterion of culpability has little, if any, application in cases involving modern labor legislation. Under those statutes, the doctrine of liability without fault is no longer open to question. They do not proceed on any theory of compensation for wrong done. Of course, where the perpetration of a wrong is alleged and some evidence is offered to prove it, the question of culpability and good faith becomes important. But modern labor laws rest upon a different policy and purpose. Some of them, like the Wagner Act and the wage-hour law, are directed toward the prevention rather than the redress of wrongs. Others, like the workmen's compensation law, aim at a situation where a loss occurs without anybody's fault. The statute then aims to place and apportion the loss which must be borne by somebody. Other statutes, like the unemployment insurance law, proceed upon a still different basis. When these statutes were first enacted, they were called unemployment compensation laws, but that was a misnomer. They did not contemplate compensation for wrong done or injury sustained. Of course, if the unemployment is due to the employee's own fault or the fault of the employer, the question of culpability again becomes important; but where it is not due to anybody's fault, most of these statutes, like the Nebraska statutes, assume that the employer should help to provide protection against that contingency.

Some of this legislation is frankly for the benefit of one class in the population at the expense of the rest. Ordinarily that would be a violation of distributive justice, but within proper limits, and under present circumstances, it can be justified. There was a time when the working class certainly needed the protection which the law now gives them. There may be some provisions in these laws which seriously conflict with their avowed purpose of protecting the workman against unscrupulous exploitation. There may also be some features in the policies adopted by the administrative agencies which go far beyond the scope of the statute by which they were created. These defects in the law and in its administration are often due to forgetfulness of the fact that improvement in the condition of the working classs, which form a large and important part of the social body, is only a means to the ultimate and only proper aim of legislation, to wit: the common good. Both employers and unionists have frequently overlooked this ultimate aim. That makes it difficult for them to understand the attitude of legislators and courts. Lawmakers and law interpreters must be guided by the public welfare. If they did anything else, they would be recreant to their trust.

THE NINE-POINT DEVICE

This brings us to the most fundamental problem in this whole field. How can we determine what is for the public good? In these immediately postwar days, that is a question of tremendous importance. Some of the present labor laws will be repealed, many will be amended; new laws of far-reaching consequence will be enacted. The time is at hand for a thorough revision of labor laws and the establishment of a complete labor code that will put an end to industrial warfare and inaugurate an era of domestic peace in which strikes will be unnecessary. This new code will conserve, consolidate, and coordinate what has thus far been gained. It will establish a procedure, by which labor disputes of every kind without exception can be settled peacefully—a procedure available to every person seeking

justice and terminating in a judgment binding on all the parties thereto and backed up by the power of the United States Government. With good will and courage it can be done.

But as men learned in the law and experienced in its practice, you well realize that there is not and cannot be any short and simple answer to this problem. There are no fool-proof scales that automatically adjust themselves to a fine equilibrium in the balance of conflicting interests. And yet there must be some basic consideration pertinent to labor law and indicating its relation to public welfare. I know you have never heard of my nine-point device which is the fruit of my deliberations on this topic. It consists of three parts with three points in each part. I venture to submit it to you for your consideration whenever you have anything to do with labor law.

A. The triplex of postulates

The first part is a triplex of postulates. Every science has its postulates, certain basic assumptions, essential to any reasoning on the subject and taken for granted without proof. I remember when at school we began to study algebra and geometry we started with certain axioms which were assumed to be true without proof. We assumed, for instance, that things equal to the same third thing are equal to each other. Even philosophy, which is the most fundamental of all science, has its postulates, like the principle of contradiction. So, in the study of labor relations, there are certain postulates necessary to any understanding of those relations and the laws applicable thereto.

The first postulate is the inherent dignity of man. When we study labor relations, it is not like studying physics or chemistry, where we deal with inanimate bodies. The factors in that problem are human beings, and no matter which side they are on, they are still human beings endowed by their Creator with free will and immortality. Sometimes writers on this subject put so much emphasis on heredity and environment as to forget that after all man is a free moral agent. He has his choice between right and wrong. Perhaps you remember the words of the Psalmist who says of man: "Thou hast crowned him with glory and made him a little less than the angels." I call this the philosophical postulate.

The second is a legal postulate. It affirms that a contract of employment is essentially different from a contract of sale. Over and over again in the discussion of this topic labor is referred to as though it were a commodity, like a bushel of potatoes which you can pick up and deliver. Labor is not a commodity. There is nothing in the nature of a title passing from one party to the other in a contract of employment. Labor is creative. It creates value, but the value that it creates is not susceptible of separate ownership. It is not something the laborer first owns and then passes to his employer. There is no transfer of any kind from one to the other, which is the essence of a contract of sale. In contemplation of law the two contracts belong to different categories. Only confusion and error can arise from treating them as though they were of the same nature.

The third postulate is an economic postulate, and it is known as the law of demand and supply. One reason for confusing contracts of employment with contracts of sale is the fact that both are affected by this so-called law. When a commodity becomes scare its price tends to rise. So also when the supply of labor is small in comparison with the demand the terms of the contract become more favorable to the worker. But just because these two contracts are different in their nature this economic principle does not affect them to the same extent. In the case of labor there are many factors which hinder its operation. In order to work properly, the demand and the supply must be capable of meeting in the same place. If, in New York, there is a demand for a commodity which is in San Francisco it won't be very long until the commodity is in New York. But if, in New York, there is a demand for a laborer who lives in San Francisco he may never get to New York. For personal and human reasons he may want to stay where he is.

So there may be in New York a great demand for law-school professors. But I like it in Omaha, and I have a hundred reasons for staying here. Thus the mobility of commodities is much greater than that of labor. Market analysis does show that this and other factors make the labor market much more imperfect than the commodity market; but the point of significance is that these factors do not disprove the economic theorem itself. When all due allowance is made for this difference there is still a very wide scope for the operation of this principle in the field of labor relations.

B. The triplex of fallacies

This, then, is the triplex of postulates which constitutes the first part in the nine-point device: the dignity of man, the legal distinction between sale and employment, and the real applicability of the law of demand and supply.

The second part of the nine-point device is a triplex of fallacies or false assumptions or wrong approaches which must be avoided.

One of these is the overoptimistic approach. We should frankly concede that no single expedient will obviate all labor difficulties. The factors of that problem are too many, too various, and too closely interrelated. It may be that such a result can be accomplished in a socialistic or communistic regime by abolishing private property if that were possible and feasible. So also Stalin and Hitler have proved that all labor difficulties can be avoided by the single measure of establishing a dictatorship. Needless to say, these methods are not open to us, at least as long as we pay homage to democratic ideals. For us there is no panacea for all labor problems, Henry Wallace to the contrary notwithstanding. And yet at various times such a panacea was proposed. A good example of this was the Clayton Act, which was the first anti-injunction statute. The platforms of both political parties in 1903 and 1912 expressly committed themselves to the enactment of such a statute. When Congress did enact it in 1914 labor leaders rejoiced. In their joyful optimism they hailed it as their magna charta and their bill of rights. The Clayton Act is still on the books but nobody regards it as magna charta of any kind.

Another wrong approach is the assumption that the inductive method of reasoning is the only scientific method. Certainly we all want to be scientific in this as in other things. But I contend that induction is not the whole of science. It may be the large portion of the physical science, but when science deals with the conduct of human beings and ignores deductive logic, it sinks to the level of a pseudo-science. This is vitally important, because wherever human conduct is involved the moral law is involved, and to insist that induction is the only scientific method is to deny that there are any principles, any concepts, any premises from which sound conclusions can be derived by deduction. The protagonists of this view tell us that industrial conditions are subject to constant change, so that what may have been a true premise yesterday is untrue today. They tell us that deduction loses sight of the realities. It deals with concepts instead of facts.

It seems to me, gentlemen, the requirements of the scientific method, in its application to labor law and labor relations, is fourfold. The first is the use of deductive as well as inductive reasoning, because it is only by deduction that we can apply the moral law to any situation. Among all men of probity and good will there is a certain moral code, containing the premises from which conclusion can be drawn deductively and applied to labor disputes. The second requirement is open-mindedness, or objectivity.

There is always a strong emotional pull in the dramatic conflict of interest involved in labor troubles which may influence both legislation and the interpretation of labor law. There is therefore an especial need for a scrupulously conscientious effort to confront the facts squarely. The third requirement is vigilance. When reasoning deductively, it is vigilance in the choice of the minor premise, being sure that it is clearly established. When reasoning inductively, it is vigilance in distinguishing fact from allegation. There is hardly any field in which truth and fiction are so finely interwoven as in this field. Both sides are constantly engaged in propaganda. Some time ago the NAM covered billboards with the slogan, "What helps business, helps you." The CIO responded by decorating the windows of their cars with the slogan, "What helps labor, helps everybody." Consequently, if you deal with labor relations, although you may come from Oshkosh, it behooves you to take the attitude ascribed to those who come from Missouri. The fourth requirement of the scientific method is the frank recognition of the evolutionary process in human institutions. Industrial conditions do change. They change constantly, rapidly and radically. Any new labor law and any application of an old law must always be suitable to the new need. This is sometimes called the dynamic concept of human institutions as distinguished from the static. I do not know of anyone who has the static concept, although we who believe in a natural order ordained and established by the Creator are often accused of having that concept. But the accusation is without foundation. We are not so blind we cannot see the changes that are taking place everywhere.

We may recognize the immutability of certain moral principles, but we know very well that living in the twentieth century is quite a different thing from living in the twelfth. Where we differ from our friends is not in the choice between the dynamic and the static concept, but in the kind of dynamic concept that we have. Theirs involves a denial of the natural order, ours does not. We hold that within this natural order there is ample room for growth, development, or evolution, whichever name you prefer. Pope Pius XI called it the reconstruction of the social order. The Latin motto in the great seal of the United States calls it "the new order of the ages" (novus ordo seclorum). In the spirit of this motto our forefathers established a democratic order which fits very neatly and nicely in the natural order, and we want to keep it that way. But that was more than 150 years ago, and things have changed since then. We hold that these substantial changes call for a new definition of rights. This new definition cannot be inconsistent with the old, so that what was right yesterday is wrong today; but it must be more specific in its reference to the new conditions. A definition of private ownership or freedom of contract, for instance, which was sufficient for a thirteenth century society may be quite inadequate for a society existing in the twentieth century. We therefore call for a new definition, reaffirming the old, but formulated with more specific reference to modern conditions.

The point I wish to emphasize at this moment is that the truly scientific method includes both deductive and inductive logic, that by eliminating the former we cast away the moral law, and that by retaining it we do not in any way hamper the desirable evolution of society. This disregard of deductive logic is something that irritates me.

If it were not for the fact that I have a certain distaste for vulgarity, I would express my disapproval by using that vulgar little phrase in favor with some people who, when they dislike a thing, pretend that it is offensive to their olfactory sensibilities.

The third wrong approach is the assumption that courts are naturally antagonistic to the workingman. I do not think that in an assembly of lawyers any argument is necessary to show that the assumption is altogether unwarranted. I get a little impatient when I see such aspersions cast upon the judiciary. The pet charge is that courts have put property rights above human rights.

The accusation in that form discloses a serious misconception. All rights are human rights, because only human beings have rights. These rights may or may not relate to property. Whether they do or not, one cannot be above another, except in the sense that one may be more valuable. Nor can the specific right of any person be in conflict with that of another person. Interests may conflict, as those of employer and employee frequently do. But one specific right cannot be in conflict with another any more than one true proposition can contradict another, because rights are created by law, and with reference to the same specific act the law cannot at the same time require it to be done and not to be done. Q. 76.

C. The triplex of standards

This, then, is the triplex of cautions which constitute the second part of the nine-point device: the caution against the search for a panacea; against the assumption that deductive processes are not truly scientific; and against the presumption of judicial hostility to labor. The third part of the nine-point device is a triplex of standards especially applicable to the enactment and interpretation of labor law. For convenience I call them the economic, the legal, and the moral criterion.

The economic criterion is maximum production at minimum cost. As a Nation, we have immense resources of raw materials, capital wealth, and manpower. Any legislation which regulates these three factors so as to increase production and reduce cost will redound to the public good. With scientific management and a wise regulation of labor relations, the raw material of the country, supplemented somewhat by importation, can be turned into consumable goods in such quantities that everybody will have at least enough if not plenty of everything. One of the great misfortunes that befell our country before the war was the scarcity theory of economics which unfortunately gained a wide acceptance among people in responsible positions. They thought that the general welfare could be promoted by creating an artificial scarcity of certain goods, particularly farm products. It was based on the false analogy that a policy which is good for an individual or private organization is also good governmental policy. Labor organizations often seek to raise wages by creating an artificial scarcity of labor; manufacturers seek to raise the price of their product in the same way. This policy may be good for these private organizations and they have a right to adopt it, but when the Government itself sets out to create an artificial scarcity by paying for nonproduction and in some instances even destroying what is produced, the first criterion of the general welfare is flagrantly disregarded. An honest subsidy would be better than that.

The legal criterion is the Constitution. If at some future time we should decide to adopt the English model of democracy and abandon our traditional form, then, of course, we will have no further use for this criterion. But as long as we believe in constitutional democracy, then we must assume that only such legislation can be for the common good which is consistent with the Constitution. Personally, I am convinced that American democracy is preferable to the English model both in principle and in practice.

In the past this criterion has too often been ignored. Sponsors of labor legislation, in their very laudable desire to help the workman and prevent his exploitation, have sometimes adopted the attitude recommended by President Roosevelt when the Guffey coal bill was pending in Congress. He told the Senators to disregard constitutional objections, no matter how reasonable they were. And the Senators did. No wonder the act was declared unconstitutional.

As far as labor legislation is concerned, the part of the Constitution most frequently involved is the clause which guarantees freedom of contract. Most of the difficulty and dissatisfaction in the application of this clause arises from the refusal to recognize anything beyond positive enactments and civil remedies as a means of determining the scope of this freedom; otherwise it must have been understood from the beginning that the constitutionally guaranteed freedom does not include making an unjust contract, or indeed, doing anything morally wrong. The whole difficulty is ultimately traceable to a positivist jurisprudence.

But more important than either the economic or the legal criterion is the standard of right and wrong. In the adjustment of human relations there can never be anything more important than the triumph of justice. No solution of any economic or social problem can in the long run be for the common good, unless it pays due respect to the moral law and to its author. Consequently, we must assume that this law applies to labor relations as well as to other transactions. Too often in recent discussions of labor law, the question of what is morally right or wrong has been conspicuous by its absence. I have just finished reading a book on labor relations by Carroll R. Daugherty. It is a book of a thousand pages, well written, and full of valuable information, but it is written on the assumption that moral questions have no connection with labor problems. The author has nothing but sarcasm and scorn for any theory of natural rights. He calls it armchair theorizing.

Another utterance of the same kind was more shocking to me because of the person from whom it came and the position that he later held. It was William M. Leiserson, who for a while was a member of the National Labor Relations Board. He bluntly declared, "There is no standard of right and wrong by which wages may be determined. What income working people ought to receive in return for their labor is a question that cannot be answered by any ethical judgment." It is true that the moral law allows a certain margin between the moral minimum and the moral maximum, within which any wage may be just which is fixed by the agreement of the parties acting without coercion. But certainly that is quite different from declaring that the moral standard has no application to wage determination. I think it is now generally conceded that in ordinary circumstances any compensation less than a living wage would be morally wrong. If those who negotiate labor agreements through collective bargaining, and those who enact labor laws and those who help to interpret and apply them, make it their aim in good faith to satisfy the requirement of commutative justice, then and not until then may we hope to see the end of industrial warfare. This may be a difficult task, but it is neither impossible nor impractical. In fact, we are in some respects already moving in that direction. This is strikingly illustrated in the history of minimum-wage legislation. The earlier laws appealed to humanitarian and charitable motives. They did not recognize the rights of labor. The later laws, which have been sustained, seek to use legislation as an instrument of justice. And we may be very sure that insofar as justice prevails, the common good will be promoted. There is no phase of governmental action which presents a finer opportunity for the application of the Biblical injunction: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His justice, and all these things will be added unto you."

At the recent Labor Day celebration Rev. Benjamin L. Masse preached a sermon at St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York City which, at the request of Senator WAGNER, is printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A3776. The text which he chose seemed to be especially appropriate for a Labor Day sermon. He spoke on the fourth beatitude: "Blessed are they who hunger and thirst for justice, for they shall be satisfied."

That, gentlemen, is my nine-point device for social legislation, of which labor law forms so large a part, including three postulates, three warnings, and three standards. As a kind of appendage to this nine-point device I would like to close my remarks by reminding you that the limits of effective legislation are inherent in its nature and are due principally to two factors—the insufficiency of human wisdom in formulating the rule and the insufficiency of any humanly devised sanction. No one is wise enough to foresee every possible contingency or to frame a rule that would clearly fit every actual case, and even if such a statute were enacted, there would still remain the impossible task of securing complete obedience. It has never been done, even with the powerful aid of religion. But as civilization advances and the beneficent influence of religion more and more controls the mind of men, we hope that the moral law will be more and more clearly reflected in the customs of the people and the laws of the land.

Postwar Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address on postwar problems delivered by me at the annual meeting of the Colorado State Chamber of Commerce at Colorado Springs, Colo., on November 9, 1945:

Ladies and gentlemen, the primary function of a chamber of commerce is to promote business and industry. The welfare of business and industry, however, is inseparably linked with the welfare of the communities in which they are located. It is, therefore, an important and necessary function of a chamber of commerce to promote the welfare of a community if it is to serve its members properly. Nor should we think of the community in the restricted and confined sense of the local neighborhood. Every business and industry is affected by local, State, national, and even international conditions, and businessmen and business organizations must broaden the scope of their thinking and extend their activities into wider fields if they are to measure up to their responsibilities and adequately discharge their functions.

With the rest of the world our thoughts have centered on war for the past 5 years, and we have devoted our entire energies and resources to the cause of victory. The powerful and irresponsible forces which sought world domination have now been completely subdued, and our priceless heritage of liberty and freedom has been preserved, at least for the time being.

We now face the period of reconversion. Since the cessation of hostilities there has been a noticeable tendency among our people to relax their efforts and rest from the arduous duties of winning the war. This is a perfectly natural tendency, in view of the fact that we have so constantly centered our attention on this one objective. We must not lose sight of the fact, however, that we won a World War in 1918 and were deprived of the fruits of victory because we relaxed our efforts and failed to follow through to win the peace.

At the conclusion of World War I, the balance of power for the first time in history switched from the continent of Europe to the United States of America. The nations looked to the United States for leadership. Our Nation faced an unprecedented opportunity; it likewise faced a grave responsibility. We were unwilling to accept the responsibility and we lost the opportunity. Instead of assuming a position of world leadership we adopted a policy of isolationism under the false assumption that we could isolate ourselves from the strife of the rest of the world. It cannot be said with certainty that a different policy would have prevented the Second World War, but certainly our aloofness from world affairs did not keep us out of it when it came.

At the conclusion of World War II the nations again look to the United States for leadership; once more the opportunity is ours; once again we face the responsibility, and what a responsibility it is, for unless the nations can chart a sound course to permanent peace, our entire civilization is in grave danger of destruction.

When we consider the progress that has been made within the last 25 years in the development of the technique of war and visualize the possibilities of future development, we must realize that our present civilization cannot survive periodic repetitions of such conflicts. The control of atomic energy and the development of jet propulsion now make it imperative that we devise means of settling international disputes without resort to war and of curbing aggressor nations who seek to dominate by the use of force.

We must, therefore, turn our attention to the development of the technique of peace rather than the technique of war. Already graifying progress has been made in this direction. When representatives of the nations gathered at the San Francisco Conference to frame the United Nations Charter and their deliberations extended into days and then into weeks, some of our people began to despair lest they would be unable to reach an agreement. But let us compare that assemblage with a similar situation in the history of our Nation. After the American Revolution it became increasingly evident that if the States of this Union were to be welded together into a strong and virile nation, a national government would have to be created with sufficient powers to insure domestic tranquillity and unity and to provide for the common defense. A convention was, therefore, called to meet in Philadelphia on May 14, 1787, for the purpose of drafting a Federal Constitution. This convention was attended by representatives from the various States, all of whom spoke the same language, had substantially the same interests, and followed the same ideologies of government, and yet so different were their opinions that it took over 4 months for them to reach a final agreement upon the provisions of the Constitution. At San Francisco the representatives of 50 nations assembled. Most of these representatives spoke different languages; many of them represented nations with conflicting interests, and many represented nations with different ideologies of government. Nevertheless, they were able to agree on the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations in 1 month and 1 day.

It is to be regretted that the recent conference of Prime Ministers in London did not show the same unanimity, but differences of opinion from time to time must be expected. Here again reference to our past history is encouraging, for even after the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, which, in my opinion, is one of the greatest documents penned by man, my own State of Virginia refused to ratify it until certain amendments were agreed upon, and a war between the States ensued before the solidarity of the union was firmly established.

We cannot look upon the Charter of the United Nations as a completed edifice; it must rather be regarded as the foundation upon which the superstructure of peace may be erected. The task is a difficult one, and its progress is now being impeded by hatreds, prejudices, selfishness, and suspicions. When the herald angels on the hills of Judea announced the birth of the Prince of Peace, they proclaimed "Peace on earth among men of good will," and the events of succeeding years have demonstrated that it is only among men of good will that peace can be maintained. If, therefore, we are to measure up to our responsibilities, we cannot be oblivious to the destitution and the needs of the rest of the world, but to the best of our ability we must cooperate in the work of establishing stable governments, of relieving distress, and otherwise creating the good will which is essential to durable peace.

Although we may indulge the hope and belief that our efforts for peace will succeed, we must resolve as a Nation that if another war should come, we will not again be caught totally unprepared. With this in view we must not repeat the mistake we made after World War I of junking our fleet. We now have the greatest Navy that ever sailed the seas. We, of course, will not need all the ships in active commission, but those which are not needed should constitute a reserve which may be brought into action on short notice. The House recently adopted a resolution prescribing the size of our postwar Navy. The resolution will not be effective without subsequent annual appropriations, but it at least outlines a definite policy which is a step in the right direction.

The discovery and liberation of atomic energy presents a problem of paramount importance to the future security of the world. If it is properly controlled untold uses for the benefit of mankind may be developed. The scientists who perfected the atomic bomb tell us, however, that the secrets of its construction cannot be safeguarded and, therefore, that a continuing monopoly by the United States is impossible; that there can be no specific defenses against its destructive effects; and that unless the use of the bomb is controlled by international agreements civilization is in constant peril of destruction. This situation emphasizes the absolute necessity for international cooperation and the establishment of an international organization with sufficient power to control atomic energy on a world level, so that in the future it may be developed for the benefit of mankind rather than for his destruction.

Although it now appears that an adequate national-defense program requires some form of postwar universal military training, I am constrained to believe that such a program should be coordinated with our existing educational system. A too large percentage of our boys was rejected by the selective service in this war because of physical defects. This situation can be corrected by installing an adequate system of physical development over a period of years. If, in addition, instructions in the fundamentals of military technique are given in the schools, whatever additional training may be necessary can be given in the camps without too seriously disrupting the training of our boys for peace, which to my mind is more important than training for war.

We cannot, however, maintain our influence and properly protect our interests abroad unless we remain strong at home. We face numerous domestic problems today, upon the proper solution of which largely depends our national destiny. Outstanding among these is our present fiscal situation. The national debt, which has increased steadily from $16,000,000,000 in 1930, is now approaching $275,000,000,000, and before the annual budget can be balanced it will probably reach the stupendous sum of $300,000,000,000. It is generally agreed by those in a position to know that to insure the payment of the interest on the public debt and to provide the funds for the necessary postwar expenditures of the Federal Government, the annual national income will have to be maintained at a level of from $125,000,000,000 to $150,000,000,000. The estimated national income for 1945 is $194,000,000,000. It must be remembered, however, that the largest national income prior to World War II was $99,000,000,000 in 1929.

If, therefore, we are to avoid fiscal chaos, we must maintain our national income at a much higher level than at any time prior to the beginning of the war. To do this, two things are essential. We must maintain a high level of production, and we also must maintain a high level of purchasing power. National income cannot be maintained at a high level without producing new wealth, and the production of commodities constituting wealth is useless unless there is someone to purchase them at a profitable price.

The most effective stimulus that can be given to production at the present time is a sound program of tax relief. It was my privilege to serve as a member of the Federal Taxation Committee of the National Association of State Chambers of Commerce until my election to the Congress in March of this year, and I have followed the work of the Committee very closely since that time. The members of the Committee have labored diligently and well, and they have prepared a program for Federal taxes, which has been approved by your Chamber and is worthy of the wholehearted support of every member.

The tax programs which have been presented to the Congress are legion, and the sponsors of a number of them undertake to speak for business. With various business and industrial organizations presenting different and conflicting views the Members of the Congress naturally become confused and uncertain as to what business and industry really want. The National Association of State Chambers of Commerce has striven for several years for the adoption of a unified program to be sponsored by all of the organizations. Numerous conferences have been held, and although complete unity has not been attained, substantial progress toward better cooperation has been made. Business would undoubtedly be more effective in achieving its aims if it spoke with a united voice.

The Congress, recognizing the need for immediate and thorough tax revision, determined to divide the program so that those measures necessary to speed reconversion might be immediately adopted and the more detailed considerations incident to a thorough revision might be postponed until 1946.

In conformity with that program the interim measure known as the Revenue Act of 1945 has already been enacted by the Congress and awaits the President's signature. It provides the largest reduction in tax liabilities ever granted in a single revenue measure. The repeal of the excess-profits tax as of January 1, 1946, the elimination of the capital-stock tax, and the reduction of surtax rates will result in savings to corporations on 1946 income estimated to aggregate $3,136,000,000 or 34.6 percent of total corporate liability under the present law.

In dealing with individual taxpayers the largest percentage reductions go to low-income-tax groups, but the dollar savings in the upper brackets are substantial. An increase of exemptions for the normal tax relieves 12,000,000 of the very low-income-tax

group from the payment of any tax whatever and the total savings to individuals are estimated to aggregate $2,644,000,000. In addition the repeal of the $5 automobile use tax will serve to abate a nuisance and will inure to the benefit of both corporations and individuals.

This law by increasing the rewards of risk-taking should encourage the investment of venture capital and should provide a tremendous stimulus to production and to business activities generally.

The purchasing power of the Nation depends largely upon full employment and the maintenance of an adequate wage scale. The cessation of war work has thrown large numbers of workers out of employment, has forced many to seek less profitable jobs and has resulted in the stoppage of overtime work, thereby drastically reducing the take home pay of millions. When a person who has been working a 48-hour week with time and a half for overtime is cut back to a 40-hour week, his take-home pay is reduced nearly 25 percent, and a large percentage of workers is suffering that reduction or more. We are, therefore, entering upon the reconversion period with steps toward deflation which will prove just as harmful to the national economy as uncontrolled inflation.

The situation certainly calls for some adjustment of our basic wage rates if our purchasing power is to be maintained and our national economy stabilized.

Our States and localities are facing postwar problems which demand serious and careful consideration. There was a growing feeling among the citizens of my State that our educational program was not keeping pace with the programs of other States and that our children were not receiving the educational advantages to which they were entitled. Our State chamber thought that this was a matter of interest to business and industry, and in 1943 we completed and published a study of high-school education in Virginia which received the first certificate of recognition for the John N. Van der Vries award of the National Institute of Commercial Organization and Trade Association Executives. The study was extended to vocational and technical education under the college level, and this year we are completing and publishing the results of that study.

The Committee on Taxation and Government of the Virginia Chamber has just completed a very thorough study of the State tax laws which have not been revised generally since 1927. The report of this committee will be published in time for the consideration of the General Assembly of Virginia which convenes in January of next year.

These and many other problems of the postwar period provide a broad field of opportunity in which State chambers of commerce are peculiarly qualified to serve. They can reach up to the national level through the national association and the United States Chamber of Commerce; they can reach down to the local level through the local chambers and their own members, who are scattered through the various localities.

If the voice of business and industry is to be heard in legislative councils, they must be properly organized, and they must speak with unity. Organization, however, in itself is not sufficient. Legislators are most responsive to their local constituents. The local businessman must, therefore, be brought to realize that eternal vigilance is the price of free enterprise as well as the price of liberty. There is a tendency among businessmen to treat politics with disdain and all aspirants for political office with contempt. Such an attitude is unfortunate and may result in deterring qualified men from seeking public office and in placing the control of government in the hands of those who are incompetent and seek to serve selfish interests. It is of the utmost importance that businessmen throw off their lethargy, inform themselves on public questions, and exert their influence in behalf of better government. The man who refuses to participate in governmental affairs has no legitimate right to complain of the kind of government he receives. A heavy responsibility rests upon State chambers of commerce to stimulate this interest among businessmen.

The future, which now appears uncertain, will depend to a large extent upon how well we discharge the many responsibilities which rest upon us. I prefer, however, to think of the opportunities rather than the responsibilities—opportunities which present a challenge and offer a supreme reward—opportunities to build a better America, a better world.

When our sturdy ancestors first set foot on the shores of the New World and viewed the vast wilderness before them, they did not falter, but rather they gave thanks to their God for the safe voyage over a treacherous sea and asked for divine guidance in the tasks that lay ahead. Such was the beginning of a great Nation. Their faith set the pattern for an annual custom which we still observe. May we on Thanksgiving Day of this year follow in the footsteps of those early builders of America and give thanks to our God for the victories which we have achieved and seek His guidance in the solution of the problems which lie ahead. With courage, determination, unity, and His help we may face the future with confidence.

The Prompt Discharge of the Men Who Have Won This War Is an Obligation of the Government That Cannot Be Escaped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the brave men who entered the service of our country to defeat Germany and Japan have completed their job. Neither country will rise again as a military power. Those men have wives, children, parents, and other relatives and friends here at home. They ought to be back with them. They ought to be back home to once more pick up the threads of their life plans. It is idle talk to speak of veterans' benefits, and at the same time deny discharges to the men who have spent years away from family and home.

The Congress should without further delay take a hand in this discharge program. No one is being fooled by the propaganda that is being put out about demobilization. We all know that men with 2, 3, and 4 years' service ought to be home, and they are not.

Mr. Speaker, without disclosing any name I wish to insert the major portion of a letter that arrived on my desk within the last day or two. Is there anyone who dares challenge the right of this young man, who wrote this letter, to speak out on the subject of discharges?

I have refrained from writing you up until this time about the discharge situation, thinking that one should be a little patient and give the War Department a chance to adjust themselves to the situation. But the air is so full of propaganda, half-truths, distortions, and outright lies, and conscious sabotage of the demobilization program that almost all of the thousands of men over here half way around the world are fully convinced that they are going to now have to fight for a freedom which the American people and "our way of life" said they would be returned to once they had fought for and secured the "freedom" of our country and the world.

One of the most vicious things that has been done is the attempt to confuse the necessity of adequately keeping the peace and maintaining an adequate defense program and troops, with the program of returning immediately the millions of us who have seen long service, much of it overseas away from our wives and families, and who now, if anybody does, have the right to return to this status of freedom, that was an axiom of our fighting morale.

I do not intend this letter to be a brief of specific instances of the above sabotage, half-truths, and so forth, that have been crammed down the throats of hundreds of thousands of men here completely helpless to do anything about it. In the meantime, back home propaganda is artfully handled to placate you and the American people. There are 8,000,000 men in this Army. Enough in numbers have been discharged in the States to temporarily placate a lot of people, no doubt. And false statements are released as to "eligibility" under the point system, and the number of men to be returned at a specific time, troop movements, and so forth. In the meantime ships are leaving here empty for the States, not one of them, but a lot of them. Marine crews are asking that their ships be used to take soldiers home and are being refused by the Army. Suddenly there is a big Navy Day program in New York, ostensibly, according to Secretary Forrestal, because these ships had to be refitted and recrewed on the east coast—Pearl Harbor, San Francisco, Seattle, Los Angles could not do this job. There is suddenly a "shipping shortage," but not one to take Jap prisoners home or to land Marines or nationalist troops in China, where they can, and are, getting into trouble with the Communist troops. The schedule released by the War Department on troop movement to AP and which was given the people back home called for 77,000 troops to leave here during October. Actually, somewhere between seven and nine thousand left, and the Army here having all the figures has refused to release to the Pacifican the figures so that they can carry a daily box score to see how things are going. By General MacArthur's official proclamation there is no occupation of the Philippines, and hundreds and thousands of soldiers are here doing nothing but taking care of themselves, miserable and away from their heritage, filling up the ranks so that the generals can maintain their commands. Every question as to using ships, all the thousands of planes, and so forth, is met by passing the buck to someone else, vague answers such as "improper facilities," "authority will have to be secured from Washington," "no replacements," "essentiality," and a thousand others. The miracle of transport and efficiency across the countless miles of the Pacific has suddenly vanished Though thousands of young single officers have signed up for the "emergency plus 6 months" and the streets are full of officers doing nothing, the War Department has not reduced the point system below 75 points for them. Do you realize that under the point system that a married officer would have to stay in the service for 6 years and 3 months to have 75 points, and then he would only be eligible for discharge. I am interested in this principle of freedom, but, incidentally, someone might stop and figure out what this is costing the American people.

The conclusion from what is happening over here is simple: The Army does not want to demobilize even men of long service, is consciously sabotaging the program to hold on to its tremendous entrenched power for

as long as possible and maintain the rank of all its generals, of which there are hundreds over here.

There is only one answer, and that is a simple one: Congress must take the matter in hand and pass a law requiring the immediate release of all men with at least 2 years' service. Something must be done. We are helpless over here and the people back home must know that.

I am enclosing a few clippings, just a few, to show you what the situation is over here. Letters come in every day to this Pacifican, the Army newspaper, and it is the only thing these men can do.

In my own personal case, and it is comparatively mild, what am I going to do? I am 35 years old, 44 months in the Infantry, 17 months overseas. In the 10 years I practiced law, I built up a good practice. If I don't get back soon even the possibility of salvaging something from what I have sacrificed will be gone. You men representing us are our only chances to get even an elementary application of justice. Have we earned the right to return to "our way of life"?

I am shocked that it would ever be necessary to write a letter such as this. Certainly no man in the service ever thought that once the war was over this would happen. His morale was the hope and promise of freedom and home. We were at first apprehensive, than alarmed, disillusioned, and soon desperate. Let's cut out the monkey business. Get us home and then form your plans for a postwar Army, if such be needed, and then everybody will be satisfied.

Radio Addresses of Hon. Fred Bradley, of Michigan, and Hon. Robert A. Grant, of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my broadcast of this week over the three Stations WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.; WDBC, Escanaba, Mich.; and WMAM, Marinette, Wis.:

Representative BRADLEY. Ladies and gentlemen, I have another very pleasant treat for you today in line with a policy which I hope to follow out in these broadcasts as frequently as possible; namely, to bring some of my colleagues into the studio with me to tell about some of their experiences on various official trips abroad. Today, I have with me my good friend the Honorable ROBERT A. GRANT, representing the Third District of Indiana, who is a member of the Naval Affairs Committee and who left these shores June 7 with a special committee to investigate conditions in the Pacific and other naval conditions in other parts of the globe. This committee traveled completely around the globe in a matter of about 6 weeks and covered approximately 35,000 miles. Inasmuch as Representative JONKMAN discussed the situation in Europe after VE-day, we will skip Europe today but I am going to ask Bob if he will tell us about some of the conditions he found in the Pacific; remembering, of course, that he was there through the month of June when the Pacific war was at its peak and we were beginning to get ready for the final assault on Japan proper. So I want to present to you now my good friend, BOB GRANT, and ask you, Bob, if you will not skip over the details of your trip to Pearl Harbor but bring us more quickly to the actual conditions in the Pacific theater as you found them when your committee arrived.

Representative GRANT. In the first place, Fred, may I tell you how glad I am to be with you on this program and to talk with you and to the good people of the Eleventh District of Michigan. I well recall the visit I made back home with you a few years ago when you crowned the Winter Sports Queen in Alpena. I have long looked forward to another visit back home with you.

Briefly our itinerary beyond the California coast was as follows: Pearl Harbor; Palmyra; American Samoa. Both Palmyra and Samoa have long been tiny installations of our Navy in the Pacific and although they served as vital stepping stones and as bases in the early days of the war, they did not figure much in the actual fighting. From there we went to Noumea in New Caledonia. America's large installation there was really the base for all large-scale fighting in the days of Guadalcanal and in general in the early days of the war in the South Pacific. That installation is, of course, "rolling up" quite rapidly today—to use the Navy's words.

Representative BRADLEY. By that, Bob, you mean closing down its activities?

Representative GRANT. That is right. The war had long since passed from these shores and instead we saw miles and miles of mechanized equipment of one sort or another and other stores and supplies packed around the harbor waiting for bottoms to move it up front. From there we hopped to Sidney and Brisbane, where this same story generally prevailed. From Brisbane we went north over Milne Bay and up to Manus in the Admiralty Islands. This tiny spot just a few degrees below the Equator was one of the most vital spots in our Navy's line of defense, in the southwest Pacific war. We find there one of the largest harbors in the world. Uncle Sam has spent tens of millions of dollars in building up our base there.

Representative BRADLEY. Is that one of the bases we intend to keep permanently?

Representative GRANT. I certainly hope so, Fred; the Admiralty Islands have been under an Australian mandate since the Treaty of Versailles following the First World War. While in Australia we talked with some of the officials of the Australian Government and we have no reason to believe that satisfactory arrangements cannot be made, whereby we shall maintain our installations at that vital outpost.

From Manus we flew north and spent some time in the Marianas—Guam, Tinian, and Saipan. Guam is an impressive looking place as you approach it from the air, jutting up from the sea as a natural fortress. It is more than 30 miles long, contains 225 square miles in all, and with the work on the breakwater that we have done during the war boasts a very fine harbor.

Representative BRADLEY. The construction of that breakwater, incidentally, is the only question that ever came before us on the floor of the House in connection with the so-called fortification of Guam, which you recall was quite a political issue not so many years back. Isn't that correct?

Representative GRANT. In fact, Fred, the question we were called upon to vote back in the days before the war wasn't even as broad as the breakwater. That harbor was pitted with tiny coral reefs that were a hindrance to the operation of Pan American seaplanes that were stopping at Guam on their long flights and the small item of $5,000,000 that was debated in the Congress was only a provision to clear the water for the operation of these seaplanes and had nothing whatsoever to do with the fortification of the island of Guam.

Representative BRADLEY. Have we since spent any money on the actual fortification of the island or did the Japs build fortifications while they were in control there for several years?

Representative GRANT. The Japs did not leave any permanent fortifications that were of any value to us but you may be sure that we have spent many tens of millions of dollars in fortifying Guam since we recaptured it in the summer of 1944. The same thing is true of Tinian and in Saipan. Where once impenetrable jungles grew, our Seabees and our Army engineers—God bless them all—have done a miraculous job. Fred, they have built many airports with runways 9,000 and more feet long to accommodate our B-29's. When you come upon one of these large airports you find not just one strip 9,000 feet long but four parallel strips made of coral, 100 yards apart, each of them pouring B-29's into the air at the same time.

Representative BRADLEY. I am glad to hear you comment on the Seabees and the Army engineers, because it has long been my opinion that they are among the unsung heroes of this war.

Representative GRANT. Fred, you really have to see the job they have done to truly appreciate the miracles they have performed in this war.

We spent a day up at the tiny island of Iwo Jima—perhaps the hottest and dustiest place in the world. That tiny island isn't more than 6 or 7 miles long. It is very narrow. As you survey this tiny spot from the top of Mount Suribachi your eye is caught by two very large marine cemeteries where rest the last remains of those thousands of our valiant men who made the supreme sacrifice to capture this island.

Representative BRADLEY. Bob, was it because of its location that Iwo Jima was regarded as such a strategic point that we had to spill all that blood to capture such a tiny spot?

Representative GRANT. Yes, Fred; to be out there or to examine your globe carefully you will see what I mean. It is roughly 1,500 miles from the Marianas to Tokio. Practically all of our big bomber operations originated in the Marianas. Iwo Jima was half way to Tokio and right on the beam. Jap fighters were rising up from Iwo Jima to intercept our bombing missions from the Marianas.

Representative BRADLEY. Well, of course, we had to wipe those out and not only that I have heard since that it became an invaluable haven for some of our returning bombers who might perhaps have suffered flak or fighter damage over Japan, or whose fuel might have been running low.

Representative GRANT. Yes, Fred; in fact I was on an airfield in the Marianas one day, watching the B-29's coming back from a raid over Tokio. Five hundred had gone out on that raid. Eventually every one of them got home but the point is that about 100 of the 500 landed at Iwo Jima on their return or might not otherwise have made it.

After going back to Guam, we then hopped to Leyte, the point of the initial Philippine landings by General MacArthur just a little over a year ago, and from there we went up to Manila. In Manila we saw the most complete destruction we found anywhere on our visit.

Representative BRADLEY. Was that destruction caused primarily by the retreating Japs when they saw their goose was cooked?

Representative GRANT. Undoubtedly they did a lot of it, but the finishing touches were supplied by our own heavy artillery after we had lost a lot of men in trying to recapture the city of Manila. Our big guns were drawn up and at point-blank range the walls of the inner city and every building within those walls was levelled to the ground.

Representative BRADLEY. In other words, MacArthur paid them back many times over for their devastation on him and on Wainwright's valiant men in the early days of the war.

Representative GRANT. You can be sure he did, in a thorough fashion.

Representative GRANT. We left Manila one night at midnight in a driving rain. All lights were extinguished aboard the plane as we neared the Japanese-held China coast just below Hongkong. We landed at Kunming—that vital cross-roads of the air that served all of our traffic coming into China—both that coming from the Philippines and that coming "over the hump" from India. We made a hop down to the war Capital of China—Chungking, and had some interesting sessions with our American Ambassador, Pat Hurley, and with our military and naval leaders in China.

Representative BRADLEY. What is your impression, Bob, of the interior of China?

Representative GRANT. Fred, when you have a first-hand look at the teeming, sweating millions in China and in India together with the conditions of squalor and of poverty under which they exist you become quite convinced that we could dump our whole much-prized American standard of living into that melting pot and not raise the average thereby an appreciable degree—and we would have lost ours in the bargain.

Representative BRADLEY. In other words, then, Bob, when we talk about making any appreciable contribution toward feeding the Chinese coolies under UNRRA or any other conceivable program, it seems like a most hopeless task, indeed. What, then, is the economic salvation for China?

Representative GRANT. That is true, Fred, you cannot make much of a dent in it. China is going to have to work out a lot of her own problems through her own people and that, of course, is a long process and one that America cannot solve with the stroke of a pen. About all we can hope to do is to teach them to help themselves.

We came home through the Middle East and through Europe—across the Atlantic by way of the Azores and Bermuda—but I know that BARNEY JONKMAN covered Europe well when he appeared on this program with you recently.

Representative BRADLEY. By the way, Bob, I am glad you mentioned the Azores and Bermuda because we are having discussions right now in our own Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee about postwar world-wide aviation; especially the question of permitting American steamship lines to operate air lines in conjunction with their foreign service. I assume that probably you landed not only at Bermuda and the Azores on fields which were constructed with American money but probably many others in the Far East. There is some question about just how much American commercial air lines are going to be permitted to use those fields in the future. I wonder if you would comment on that before we close.

Representative GRANT. Yes, Fred, the situation at Bermuda is a striking example. Our rights in Bermuda stem from that famous 50 destroyer deal that President Roosevelt made with Great Britain many months before our entrance into the war. You will recall that we gave Britain 50 of our destroyers in exchange for which we received certain rights in Atlantic bases. Following that up, our Government has spent about $90,000,000 of the taxpayers' money in Bermuda. We have there one of the finest airports in the world. It was constructed of made land sucked up out of the ocean. But the difficulty is this. Our only rights there are military rights. Our own Government by its voluntary act has denied the use of that vital airport to the commercial air lines of America for 99 years—95 of which are yet to run. Bermuda is 4 hours by air from New York. It is the same distance from Washington. Unless you cross the Atlantic by the northern route, Bermuda becomes a vital stepping stone in any trans-Atlantic travel. Our Government's failure to protect the interest of our own nationals is an outstanding example of the extent to which this Government has gone in playing Santa Claus to the world without any apparent concern for the future of our own people.

Representative BRADLEY. For which I assume we will get, as usual, very little thanks from the rest of the world.

Representative GRANT. I know how you feel about it, Fred. We have carried on this fight for a long time and the majority in Congress must soon come to the conclusion that it is long past time when we should be giving more concern to the interest of our own people.

Representative BRADLEY. Thank you very much, BOB GRANT, for joining me today.

Representative GRANT. Thank you, Fred, for the opportunity—and in conclusion may I say that I am sure that the people of the Eleventh District of Michigan realize the outstanding job that you are doing for them in Congress.

Our Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, humanity in this uncivilized world appears to be impotent and helpless to escape from the scourge of war and, therefore, does experience periodically the sorrow of parting with its only valuable asset—its young and robust youth.

In recent days all of us have witnessed the intense grief of parents whose sons have died in the terrible wars which, thank God, have now come to an end.

I have a very talented friend with whom I am often in disagreement, but for whom I have great respect and admiration. His name is Edward T. Paca, and he lives in Englewood, Colo. Mr. Paca's son was killed on Okinawa on May 20 of this year. In the bitter anguish of his grief he has composed a poem and dedicated it to those slaughtered and maimed in World War II. To understand the spirit of the great sacrifice which has been made by many parents, I urge that it be read by every Member of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to print this poem, which is titled "Our Children," in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR CHILDREN

(Dedicated to those slaughtered and maimed in World War II)

They stood upon the threshold of their years
Looking with eager eyes beyond our thoughts
Into their world of joyousness and dream.
They saw the future as the future is:
A place of plenty, full of thoughts and things,
Where the vast pageantry of life moves on
In harmony begot of gladsome deeds.
They pitied us because our gloomy thought
Built barriers between life's helping hand
And our decrepit vision, tinged with age.
Their bubbling mirth, their frolicsome delight.
Their clean, sweet trust, their guileless happy hearts,
These are the annals of their brief true youth.
Then came the demon, with his hand of law,
His lying tongue, his patriotic zeal,
And seized them as a hawk would seize a finch,
And bullied them, and filled them full of hate,
Then told them they must kill as they were bid.
One hundred million persons is the toll:
The fruit of lust, of envy, and of hate.
The hearts that sorrow for their own lost ones
Cannot be reckoned by the man who counts.
Hostilities have ceased, we pause, give thanks,
While God the mother folds her weary ones
Tender and lovingly in their last sleep,
Her heart is bleeding, and her eyes are wet,
While God the Father, her avenging one,
Looks on in pity, and with changeless mind
Declares His will: "Who did this deed shall die."

Full Employment for Returning Servicemen

REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 16, 1945

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the authors of the full-employment bill. We kept our soldiers employed at home and abroad, and, in my opinion, they are entitled to be employed when they return from the armed services. We hear much talk about taxation. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Lord gave the earth and all of its natural resources to the children of man so that they could be employed and enjoy life. The owners of these resources are taxing the people of the United States more than the Government does and it is time that we do some sane thinking.

Resolutions of Dutchess County Ministerial Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following resolutions received by me and recently passed by the Dutchess County Ministerial Association, one on Feeding Our Enemies and the other one Against Universal Peacetime Military Training:

FEEDING OUR ENEMIES

Nothing has shocked public sentiment in America more than the death march from Bataan, when Japanese soldiers were completely indifferent to the sufferings of our soldiers. It was a crime against civilization, for our men as prisoners of war, were at their mercy.

At the present moment, the Japanese and Germans are at our mercy. Through their surrender, they have become our wards. Regardless of whether we like them or not,

we will be held accountable at the bar of history for any unnecessary suffering we may inflict upon them.

This winter both Japanese and Germans are facing death by starvation by tens of thousands and possibly hundreds of thousands. Our administrators, on the spot, are aware of this, and are doing all they can to meet the situation. They can do more, if we, as a people recognize our humanitarian obligation to support them to the full in their efforts.

As an association, we, the Dutchess County Ministerial Association (State of New York), call for the united support of all American citizens, behind the efforts of our leaders to prevent this wholesale starvation which will inevitably involve women and children who have been innocent of war guilt.

(Copies to President Truman, Senators Wagner and Mead, Representative LeFevre, Administrator Herbert Lehman, the Poughkeepsie New Yorker.)

RESOLUTION AGAINST UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

We, the members of the Dutchess County Ministerial Association (State of New York), meeting November 5, 1945, reaffirm our long-maintained support of the national administration's participation in the United Nations Organization, but we deplore the lamentable contradiction of the program by President Truman's appeal for the continuance of conscription under the name of universal military training, as a permanent policy.

We, therefore, call upon Congress to end the draft now, because with the end of the war, and the gradual restoration of law and order, and economic relations, we believe that the time has come to reassert our commitment to the ways of freedom under law, to assure our allies that we are ending the use of force as an instrument of national policy, and are relying on goodwill, the use of conference, and the world court as the means of settling the difficulties that may arise.

Copies to President Truman, Senators Wagner and Mead, and Representative LeFevre.

The Pearl Harbor Inquiry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times:

THE PEARL HARBOR INQUIRY

The Congressional committee investigating the Pearl Harbor disaster has been so bedeviled from the start by partisan wrangling on both sides that it has already seriously undermined public confidence in its fairness and impartiality. But the latest conduct of some of its Republican members in particular can hardly bring comfort or satisfaction to the national leaders of that party.

The Republican party has provided distinguished leadership to the nation in the past and aspires to lead it again in the future. But Republican members on the Pearl Harbor committee have not only attempted to impugn the honesty of the American Navy; they are also espousing the cause of Japan against that of their own country. And they are doing so in defiance of all the historic evidence. The country has the right to know and know now, whether these tactics are merely the result of the strategy of the individual Republicans involved, or whether they are part of the calculated strategy of the Republican congressional leadership. It is up to that leadership either to repudiate the slurs cast upon the American fighting forces and American policy, or to stand convicted of identifying itself with them—if only by silence.

The thesis of some of the Republican members was stated most bluntly by Representative GEARHART, of California, when he declared: "The Japanese were doing everything in their power to get an acceptable agreement and got slapped in the face on November 26. That precipitated the war." Representative GEARHART was referring to the famous American note of November 26, 1941, which those of his persuasion prefer to call by its Japanese designation of the "Hull ultimatum." There was never an excuse for any mistake about that note. There is even less now in view of the evidence before the committee itself. And only deliberate misstatement of the facts can now sustain Representative GEARHART'S charge.

The record speaks for itself. As early as 1931, Japan embarked on a career of conquest as ambitious and as frankly avowed as was that of the Nazis. She first subjugated Manchuria over American protests. In 1936 she concluded the anti-Comintern pact with Germany and with that as a backing invaded China the next year. In 1940, when the western powers were engaged in a life-and-death struggle with Hitler, she concluded a hard and fast military alliance with Germany and Italy, and prepared not only to drive the "foreign barbarians" from the Far East, but also to swallow the whole Orient in her "coprosperity sphere," as a base for world conquest. As early as January 1941, the war lords began to prepare for war against the United States, including an attack on Pearl Harbor.

Her great opportunity, hailed in Japan as a "divine wind," came when Germany invaded Russia on June 22, 1941, thereby securing Japan's northern flank. Ten days later, an Imperial Conference presided over by the Japanese Emperor adopted a "crucial national policy" whose nature was revealed in another 10 days by orders for an all-out mobilization for total war. Within 2 weeks, Japan invaded French Indochina, to provide a base for attacks on the Netherland Indies and Singapore. This was followed by mutual freezing of assets and virtual suspension of trade. By August, the Japanese fleet began to assemble for "war games" to rehearse the attack on Pearl Harbor, and the plans for it were completed by September 13. On October 5, the date of the attack was fixed for December 7 our time; General Tojo took over the government October 17, and the fleet sailed on its fateful mission November 25, or 24 hours before the Hull note was even delivered.

True, the Japanese fleet could have been recalled if a settlement had been reached before December 7. But the only settlement that would have recalled it would have been an American acceptance of the Japanese note of November 20, which was a real ultimatum because, unlike the Hull note, it contained, even if unknown to the American Government, a time limit after which military action was to follow automatically. And that note demanded that the United States end her long-standing policy of supporting China, and not only supply Japan with all she wanted for the prosecution of her war in China, especially oil, but also compel the Netherlands East Indies to do likewise. Had the United States bowed to it, Germany and Japan would now control all Europe and Asia, and this country would stand alone against their might. Great Britain and France did not need such a humiliating ultimatum to declare war on Hitler. The American Government merely replied with a note offering a broad basis of agreement, which contained no threat whatever. General Tojo himself has declared that he accepts responsibility for the war. Does Mr. GEARHART wish to relieve him of it?

A Soldier's Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

DEAR FRIEND: It is possible that you previously received from me, copies of letters from Staff Sgt. Roderick Sheridan Cooney, MTO-UTC, from north Africa, Sicily, and Italy, but this is probably the last from overseas. Thought you might like to read the thoughts of a 22-year-old typical Los Angeles boy, proud to be a student of Loyola University, on his final experiences over there. He is a brother of Platoon Sgt. James G. Cooney, USMC, just discharged from Marine Officers Training at Quantico, Va., after 2½ years service in the Pacific with 11 battle stars, H. McKenzie Cooney SCU 1976, Enlisted Detachment, Torrey General Hospital, Palm Springs, Calif., and Jack Grattan Cooney formerly of the United States merchant marine, Neill Laurence Cooney, senior at Loyola High, Virginia Ann Harris, R. N., and Patricia K. Cooney, and a son of a much beloved mother, Marie Ready Cooney, who passed on while he was overseas.

PATRICK J. COONEY.

LEGHORN, ITALY, *October 29, 1945.*

DEAR POP: Here I am in Leghorn, Italy. Wish you were here instead of me.

I have deserted the lamp of learning and am now acting as a supply sergeant for an Army corrective detention camp. But not for long, however, since my number is coming up and, barring the unforeseen but expected hitch, I should be on orders to return stateside ere the week is out. I therefore should caution you about writing further since I will be leaving within a month and would probably not receive any correspondence mailed after the receipt of this letter.

And so, after 28 months of that war which was to perpetuate the rights of Joe Stalin to deprive half the world of theirs, your most disappointing offspring returns home to shed the vestige which was once the uniform of the United States Army but which now cloaks the backs of half the people of Europe. The afore-mentioned disappointing offspring is ready to come home, that definitely!

The Mediterranean theater of operations is fast becoming history and most of the heavy, and virtually all of the light, equipment is being turned over to UNRRA, AC, and other relief organizations for whatever misuse it may be put. All this would be acceptable since we cannot now use this stuff but the sight of an immense 10-ton truck to be used in a country where there is no gasoline causes me to fervently pray that the United States develops another source of power to replace the oil of which we will have none very shortly. We will furnish the gas for Italy and probably Europe and then we are committed in the Near East oil fields which are even now clamoring for a war to decide the issue.

Your son,

RODERICK SHERIDAN COONEY.

Statement of the Council for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

THE COUNCIL FOR DEMOCRACY URGES SIX-POINT PROGRAM TOWARD SETTING UP A WORLD GOVERNMENT FOR FIRST MEETING OF UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION ASSEMBLY IN JANUARY

In view of statements by Foreign Commissar Molotov and Winston Churchill concerning the atomic bomb, the Administrative Committee of the Council for Democracy, 11 West Forty-second Street, at a special meeting today issued a statement calling on President Truman and Secretary of State Byrnes to take steps toward a world government. The Council for Democracy, of which Raymond Swing is chairman, having considered the problem of sovereignty and security, recommends that the Assembly of the United Nations Organization at its first meeting in January consider the following steps towards conversion of the United Nations Organization into a world government to control production and use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. The statement follows:

The United States is faced with a choice between unlimited sovereignty and national security—it is no longer possible to have both. Those who think that the United States can "talk tough" because we are at present the most powerful nation on earth ignore the fact that with the development of the use of atomic energy we might become the most vulnerable nation on earth.

"Talking tough" makes other nations wonder where we are heading. What would America do if Russia, for example, had the strongest army, the largest fleet, the greatest air force, the atomic bomb, and was "talking tough"? There is no doubt but that we would regard Russia with suspicion and fear, and we would prod our military leaders into preparing for eventualities. The other nations of the world have reason for viewing us with suspicion in the light of our own tough statements, and suspicion breeds division and war.

If we allow our foreign policy to be based on preatomic concepts of national sovereignty, it will be the American people—you and yours, perhaps—who will pay with their lives.

Nations have frequently ceded a measure of sovereignty to gain an end of greater value. Most agreements into which this country has entered have meant some limitation of sovereignty. The important fact in each case has been the value of what we received in return for what we ceded.

That is the important fact now. Scientists tell us that there is no defense against the atomic bomb and that there is no secret about it which cannot be solved by other nations. Here, then, are the alternatives.

1. We can build and maintain strategically located rocket atomic bomb sites and, at the slightest sign of tension, have them alerted and the bombs trained on the principal cities of the disturbing nation. Then, if their rocket atomic bombs are launched and we detect them approaching, we can push our buttons, too. It would, of course, be too late to save our cities and millions of Americans might die before our bombs hit the enemy cities.

2. Or there can be created a world government having sovereignty in matters of security but allowing complete autonomy to each nation in internal affairs.

What we mean by sovereignty of the world government in matters of international security is the control of large-scale armaments including the new ultradestructive weapons. We do not mean sovereignty of the world government in matters such as tariffs, immigration, waterways, etc.

Once we realize that there is important compensation for the relinquishment of this measure of national sovereignty, our course is clear. The maintenance of national security must not be sacrificed to the illusion of absolute sovereignty.

The creation of a world government must not mean that the United Nations Organization be scrapped—it should be developed into a world government in matters of security by strengthening its functions and amending its Charter.

We urge the following measures as first steps toward such a development.

1. Limitation of the armaments controlled by individual nations to those arms essential for internal security, all other arms such as rocket and atomic bombs, tanks, bombing planes, etc., to be controlled by the World Government.

2. Effective and complete control in every country, by the Security Council of the United Nations Organization, of the production and use of atomic energy so that it will serve peaceful purposes.

3. Elimination of the veto power in the voting procedure of the Security Council.

4. Immediate universal acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court—not only over nations, but also over individuals.

5. Extension of self-government as soon as practicable to the dependent peoples.

6. The Assembly of the United Nations Organization, at its first meeting in January 1946, should give immediate consideration to the foregoing measures.

Suggestions for Success—Contributing Factors—Faith in the Ultimate Outcome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose herewith a copy of a most excellent address delivered by Prof. Louis D. Bliss to the Vaughn Sunday school class of Calvary Baptist Church on October 28, 1945.

Some half century ago, Commander Vaughn organized this Sunday school class for men here in the city of Washington. The class has gradually grown until now it is one of the great classes of the entire country. Maj. Daniel F. Boone, of the United States Army, is now president of the class.

My heart is filled with many happy memories as I think of the years long ago when I stood before you men of the Vaughn class regularly every Sunday.

At the Bliss Electrical School, where I work, we start the day each morning with a 10-minute chapel period. Everyone attends. We have a hymn, a few verses of Scripture and a prayer. Once a week I take a few extra minutes to bring the boys some suggestions for everyday living which we believe will be helpful.

Thirty years ago a Methodist minister, Dr. Frank Crane, wrote what were called Four Minute Essays. These were syndicated and widely published. He became the most widely read writer of his time. It was estimated that 20,000,000 people read his essays every day. I have found these so helpful that I have used them as a basis for my weekly chapel talks and hundreds of Bliss trained men throughout the world are constantly expressing their appreciation of the help they have derived therefrom.

This morning I am bringing you three of these essays in the hope that you, too, may find therein something of a practical, helpful nature.

In the first, Dr. Crane offers some suggestions for attaining success in life. He says, "I have before me a letter from a young man who says, 'What is a young man to do, when he has reached the age of 21, with no special training.' He has a lot of ambition beside ability, but he finds that all this talk about courage and will power is nothing but nonsense, for whenever he seeks an opportunity to start from the bottom, no one pays any attention. The very men who preach opportunity and rising to a high position in life by hard work refuse to make a place for him. They tell you about using your brains, but at the same time they don't give you a chance to use them. How is there a chance for such a man?"

Well, in the first place, living all those years until 21, without training, is a crime. But perhaps it was not your fault. If you ever have children, however, see that you do not wrong them as your parents, and the State, and possibly yourself wronged you.

Still, at 21, you have the world before you. Possibly these hints may help you:

1. Don't be impatient. It's a life job you are tackling. Set your jaw. Plan for years, not for tomorrow only.

Franklin Roosevelt once said, "The things we have determined wholeheartedly to do are not fulfilled merely by desire, but through painful toil."

2. Remember that your real success takes place inside your mind. It's not facts, or others' acts, nor events that matter. Nothing matters in the long run, but the temper of your spirit. Keep thinking success, and the more you are rebuffed, the harder you must think it.

3. You seem sorry for yourself. That looks bad. Flee thoughts of self-pity as you would the devil. Are you alive and kicking, and have you a clear head and two good hands, and are you out of jail? If so, you are in luck.

4. Study. I'll venture to say, your waste of spare time in 4 years is enough to make you eligible for a doctor's degree, if properly applied. Find out what you want to do. Say it's engineering. Take up a course of study in that direction.

5. Do well what you can find to do. Do it with all your skill and enthusiasm. Do it better than anyone else can do it. Do it! And, keep your eyes open for something better. Be efficient. Every factory, store, and farm in the world is hungry for the man who can do the business and not make excuses.

"Creation's cry goes up
From age to cheated age;
Give us the men who do the work
For which they get the wage."

6. Don't fret. Don't worry. Have faith. Believe in yourself. Believe in the world. Believe in eternal justice. If you do, the stars will fight for you. And if you don't believe, if you complain and get it into your head that this world is down on you, why, it will come down on you and smash you;

you'll get what you believed in. Everybody does.

Be persistent. In 1934 there was graduated from the Bliss Electrical School a young man named Morgan, from Nanticoke, Pa. It was in the depth of the long, hard depression. Morgan earnestly sought employment but could find nothing. He had a car and decided to drive to Endicott, N. Y., to interview the personnel representative of the International Business Machines Corp. This corporation employed a considerable number of Bliss men. He was courteously received, but they told him they could not use him. A few weeks later he drove back a second time and made a similar call. Again he was courteously received, but they told him they had no opening. After a while he drove back a third time, and then a fourth time, and then a fifth time. When he came in the sixth time they told him they were tired of seeing him around, and they did not want him to come around any more, but he went back the seventh time and they hired him.

7. Be persistent. Fortune's a fickle jade. If she does not say "Yes" the first five times you ask her, ask her 25 times. After awhile she will favor you, for she dearly loves importunity.

8 Get the luck idea out of your head. There is no such thing as luck, but that is not what you are looking for. What you want is success, and there is no luck about that. It's just as certain as the corn crop, for those who know how to raise it.

9. Don't expect anything of anybody except yourself.

Joshua 1: 7–8: "Only be thou strong and very courageous; then thou shalt make thy way prosperous, and thou shalt have good success."

10. And keep cheerful. It's all in a lifetime. Meanwhile, there are doughnuts and coffee, and the pleasant sun is shining. I suspect you are missing a lot of happiness because you don't recognize it when you see it.

"Getting what you go after is called success, but licking it while you are getting it is happiness."

Do you remember what Lincoln said? "I have noticed that most people in this world are about as happy as they have made up their minds to be."

Psalm 27: "The Lord is my light and my salvation. Whom shall I fear? The Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?"

"When the wicked, even mine enemies and my foes, came upon be to eat up my flesh, they stumbled and fell.

"Though an host should encamp against me, my heart shall not fear: though war should rise up against me, in this will I be confident.

"One thing have I desired of the Lord. That will I seek after. That I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, to behold the beauty of the Lord, and to enquire in His temple.

"For in the time of trouble shall He hide me in His pavilion; in the secret of His tabernacle shall He hide me; He shall set me up upon a rock.

"I had fainted unless I had believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living.

"Wait on the Lord: Be of good courage, and He shall strengthen thine heart: Wait, I say, on the Lord."

Twenty-seven years ago Dr. Crane wrote an editorial for a Washington paper in which he emphasized the importance of steadfastness and determination. He says:

"There are some men who can obey orders and there are some men who can get things done. It is well to be obedient. It is better to be resourceful.

"A resourceful man is one who when he cannot get a thing done one way does it another. He keeps trying. When it is time to quit, he begins. When he is licked, he starts fighting again.

"Attaining success in life is not like shooting at a mark with a rifle. It is more like trying to hit a mark with a stream of water from a hose. You just keep on trying until finally you hit it, maybe.

"It is well to know how; it is better to try, for by trying, you learn how.

"The achievement of success is like picking a lock; not like working an example in long division. It is like starting a fire with damp wood, more than it is like getting a chemical reaction in a laboratory.

"It is like fitting together the pieces of a torn letter, more than it is like building a wall of brick.

"All the big things of life are accomplished by trying, trying, trying. Only the little things can be done by rule and a cheap hand to do them.

"To paint a great picture means an infinite number of approximations. None is ever painted by rule.

"The man who fails is not the man who has no gift, no chance, no pull, no encouragement, no training; it is the man who quits."

Some years ago before the days of sound there was produced a silent movie entitled "The Midshipman." The scene was laid in the Naval Academy at Annapolis. The story was of a freshman who was having a hard time adjusting himself to his surroundings. He became so discouraged that he almost decided to quit. An upper classman took him under his wing in order to steady, stimulate, and encourage him. In the course of conversation the upper classman said to him, "Remember this, a quitter never wins and a winner never quits!" I have had that motto engrossed and a framed copy hangs upon the wall of our lecture room where our students may see it every day.

Genius is the inexhaustible capacity for going on. Edison said, "Genius is 1 percent inspiration and 99 percent perspiration."

In my office I have another framed motto attributed to Edison, "There is no substitute for hard work."

Training, education, and the like, before you go to work, are valuable, but it is the training and education you get, by and while doing your work, that count most.

There are three rules for success. The first is go on. The second is go on, and the third is go on.

You can't win a woman by the rules of a book, nor can you make biscuit. We had an old colored woman to whom my family was devoted, who worked in our home for 20 years. She had more common sense than many a white woman. She could not read nor write but oh what biscuits she could make.

You can't win a woman by the rules of a book, nor can you make biscuit, nor get elected to office, nor build up a trade, nor get yourself liked, nor achieve contentment, nor get to Heaven.

Life is an endless experiment.

Wisdom is the precipitate of experiment.

Belief is the spirit of experiment.

Character is the subjective result of experiment.

And success is the objective result of experiment.

Psalm 1: "Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful.

"But his delight is in the law of the Lord; and in His law doth he meditate day and night.

"And he shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season; his leaf also shall not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper.

"The ungodly are not so; but are like the chaff which the wind driveth away.

"Therefore, the ungodly shall not stand in the judgment, nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous.

"For the Lord knoweth the way of the righteous; but the way of the ungodly shall perish."

The third essay I want to bring to you represents Dr. Crane's faith in the ultimate outcome of life, if we do our part. He says, "Mine own will come to me." I like to repeat this magic formula over and over. It is not provable. The deepest truths of life never are.

The creeds of the world, that have led men up out of barbarism into civilization, out of war into law, out of lust into love, are all inherently dubitable.

We do not reach these sublime conclusions, that transform our lives, by building Babel Towers with bricks of logic, for the end of all such work is confusion of tongues. We fly to them by the airplanes of faith. We believe them. We do not know them, and the best things of existence are believed, not known. We believe them because we are drawn to them, because something in them appeals to something in us. We believe them for much the same kind of reason that impels us to love one woman.

The most usable and persuasive wisdom has never been included in the encyclopedias. It is felt by simple hearts, even as sunshine is felt. It comes to us by affinities and repulsions, as mysterious, yet as potent and undeniable, as electricity.

So, mine own will come to me,
Unhasting, my reward approaches,
Behind the mists of tomorrow, stands my Throne, made ready.

My place is prepared for me. In due time I shall occupy it, and all the world consent. Destiny makes no mistakes. It is not blinded by fear or favor. Every man shall receive his penny, and I mine.

The Great Shepherd never loses a sheep. I shall not want.

In my closet will always be clothes enough, in my pantry food enough, in my bank money enough, in my acquaintance friends enough, to last me my time, as long as I am needed in this world.

I shall not worry. Mine own will come to me. I shall not strain or chafe. I shall not drop into the weakness of petulance. I shall not allow the silly fevers of premonition. I shall not poison my strength with doubt. Why should I, when my own will surely come to me?

Mine own will doubtless not be what I fancy. What it will be is no business of mine. All the time I spend in speculating on what it may be is wasted and breeds disappointment.

Mine is the simpler task, just to do my work, to find the great cosmic laws and heed them, to love and be happy. For mine own will come to me. It is on its way. It is stepping surely down from the future, and one day will open the door of the present and come in, and I shall be satisfied.

Psalm 23: "The Lord is my Shepherd; I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures: He leadeth me beside the still waters.

"He restoreth my soul: He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for His name's sake.

"Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for Thou art with me; Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me.

"Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies: Thou anointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over.

"Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life; and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever."

"MY WORK

"Let me but do my work from day to day,
In field or forest, at the desk or loom,
In roaring market place, or tranquil room,
Let me but find it in my heart to say
When vagrant wishes beckon me astray,
This is my work, my blessing, not my doom;
Of all who live, I am the one, by whom
This work can best be done, in the right way.
"Then shall I see it not too great nor small
To suit my spirit, and so prove my powers;
Then shall I cheerfully greet the laboring hours
And cheerfully turn, when the long shadows fall
At eventide, to play, and love, and rest,
Because I know for me, my life is best."
—Henry Van Dyke.

Washington Star Demands Genuine Investigation of Sex Laxity by Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday Washington Star of yesterday carried in full the letter by Chaplain Lawrence Lacour detailing charges of naval sex laxity in Japan.

The publicity given this story is indicative of the growing concern over the social consequences of the tremendous military establishment.

Editorially, the Star proposes a genuine investigation, to be followed by court-martial proceedings if the facts warrant.

The Star editorial follows:

A SHOCKING ACCUSATION

In the news columns of today's Star there is reprinted the full text of a letter to the Des Moines Register from Navy Chaplain Lawrence L. Lacour, United States Naval Reserve. In substance, the letter charges that the Navy authorities at Yokosuka, over the unanimous protest of chaplains assigned to fleet units there, have set up what amounts to an organized system of prostitution for the personnel of the fleet. According to Chaplain Lacour, this has been done in a manner which virtually lends official Navy sanction to the practice, despite the fact that all or nearly all of the Japanese girls involved are afflicted with venereal disease.

This shocking accusation has been brought to the attention of the Navy Department by the Register, and Admiral King, asserting that such practices would be in conflict with Navy policy, has given assurance that an investigation is under way.

The investigation is one which must be pressed with vigor and without regard to any individuals who may be involved. If it is ascertained that the charges made in the chaplain's letter are true, the responsible Navy officers should be brought to this country and court martialed. If the investigators conclude that the facts do not support the charges, the Navy should make public a full statement of the basis for that conclusion.

The American people—and especially those with sons in the Navy—have too vital an interest in a matter of this kind to tolerate anything which smacks of complacency or whitewash. And if the Navy values its good reputation, it will see to it that its investigation and subsequent action are of the kind which will leave no room for doubt or suspicion.

Housing Situation in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Congress to the unsatisfactory housing situation which exists in the State of California.

The following thought-provoking newspaper article by Charles Raudebaugh indicates that although there is a large supply of surplus building materials held in storage very little is being released for home construction. I am of the opinion that the National Housing Agency and other interested Government agencies should immediately investigate this matter and ascertain how much of this surplus material can be made available for home construction. Certainly our returning veterans are entitled to a better break than they are receiving at the present time.

VETS CAN'T BUILD, BUT WAREHOUSES BULGE

(By Charles Raudebaugh)

STOCKTON, November 10.—Vast quantities of critical building material—almost fantastic amounts of sorely needed goods—are lying in nearby military and naval establishments while San Francisco and her veterans are experiencing an acute housing shortage.

Top Washington officials of the Civilian Production Agency, peacetime successor to the War Production Board, will be told Monday of a visit made by two San Franciscans to a single Army depot at Stockton which revealed billions of dollars of needed material.

Edward P. (Slip) Madigan, regional director here for the Smaller War Plants Corporation, checked the speedometer of his car and found that he drove 27½ miles through lanes of structural steel, water pipe, soil pipe, crated tractors, and other products now acutely short on the civilian market.

An official report of the Civilian Production Agency notes that the tractors alone have a value of $20,000,000 and are of the heavy type which the lumber industry has been trying vainly to get ever since the war ended.

There are 2,000 such tractors at the Army Engineers Holding and Issue Depot at Lathrop, near Stockton. They are still in their original crates.

In addition to the tractors there are acres of trailers and dollies equipped with rubber tires deteriorating in the sun, and more roofing and building material than I have ever seen.

His report states that there are tremendous quantities of steel pipe from 2 to 48 inches in diameter and several thousand tons of cast-iron pipe, including the critically short soil pipe so urgently needed in small-homes construction.

The whole picture of what was found at the Lathrop Depot fits perfectly into the gripes of returning servicemen who are unable to obtain housing. They can't rent houses or apartments in San Francisco, and they can't build because of inflated costs, due—among other things—to the shortage of much of this material.

Edward Halloran, regional director of the CPA, took the report on the Lathrop Depot back to Washington to present Monday at a national conference of Government executives which is to deal with reconversion problems.

The report was written to back up a suggestion that the CPA be authorized to go into depots and warehouses in search of items immediately needed for civilian production.

Executives of the CPA in San Francisco declare there is at present no way of estimating how much material is being held by the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

The ex-serviceman who desperately needs a house, or who wants to buy military equipment no longer essential to win a war, says bluntly that the Army and Navy are hoarding.

LUMBER HOARDS

A month ago, according to the CPA, there was 75,000,000 board feet of lumber at the Navy Hueneme base, another 20,000,000 in the Navy Oakland base, and 15,000,000 in the Islais Creek depot of the Marine Corps.

The lumber at the Hueneme base alone represents 3,000 carloads—enough for about 10,000 homes.

But it takes more than lumber to build homes. What of the other products?

The CPA executives who visited Lathrop said that he saw toilets, washbowls, and sinks by the thousands. He saw wire and cable by the thousands of reels. He saw everything, he said, needed to build a small city. Lathrop is 1 mile wide and 2 miles long—and is piled high with building material and equipment.

There is not a veteran who hesitates in telling you that what exists at Lathrop can be found over and over again at dozens of military or naval installations of the country.

Lathrop is merely an advance depot, a sort of a jobbing warehouse. Imagine, they say, what exists in the main supply dumps!

VETS' CENTER REPORT

In contrast to the vast pile of supplies at Lathrop is this statement by Russel A. Owen, acting director of the Veterans Information Center at San Francisco city hall:

"During October a daily average of 260 veterans came into the information center. The records show that 25.2 percent of them were in need of housing. The records in San Francisco show that housing is the biggest single problem facing the veterans."

Congressional Protector of Small Business—Article by Hon. Wright Patman, of Texas, on Activities of Select Committee on Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement by our colleague, Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, the able chairman of the House Small Business Committee, which was recently widely published.

The statement is as follows:

Small business is really the biggest business in this country from the standpoint of number of enterprises, number of people employed, combined production and importance in spreading prosperity and opportunities for individual initiative. It is vital therefore that all such enterprises are not only protected from elimination but their welfare promoted to the fullest extent if we are to reach the goal of full employment and enable returning service men and women to have a place in the business picture.

The House Committee on Small Business is, as a consequence, a vital congressional agency that concerns itself with the interest of the so-called little man to see that he is given every facility to develop a business of his own without restraint from monopoly or unfair competition. This applies to those now in business who have shouldered the difficulties of the past war as well as to GI Joes who have ambitions to enter some business upon their discharge from the armed forces.

Small businesses need a representative congressional committee that is independent of all Government agencies as a protector and champion. It is that kind of service which the House Committee on Small Business seeks to serve as a mouthpiece in all matters concerning their welfare. They cannot afford to employ a high-powered Washington representative, or to make expensive trips to Washington to get something of vital concern ironed out.

That is just where this committee can, and does, render service before such governmental agencies as the Office of Price Administration, War Food Administration, Civilian Production Administration (formerly War Production Board) or any other branches of the Government. Through these activities it has corrected many complaints or ironed out many problems that have been disconcerting without the necessity of an expensive trip to Washington.

Small business asks no favors and does not want an umbrella to cover up inefficiencies. By the same token it believes in equal opportunities for all and special privileges to none. The chief draw-back to the progress of small business has been the favoritism of the large operators whether in production or distribution which, though professing ability to do a better job invariably require special consideration.

The war has brought this out forcibly as the small manufacturer has had difficulty getting supplies until his ability to produce was demonstrated and congressional insistence was insisted upon. Likewise, the small crossroads merchant, so to speak, was handicapped in obtaining supplies of scarce merchandise. The big operators were favored as a course of least resistance by certain manufacturers. It has been the work of the House Committee to correct these abuses which have interfered with the progress of the small merchants in all lines.

Realizing this as a Member of Congress, I have introduced H. R. 4200, which is an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code. It provides that chain corporations operating stores without a profit to establish themselves in a community may not deduct such losses from their income-tax returns. It has been shown in evidence in a recent trial of the largest chain corporation that as many as 4,374 stores in 1 year were operated at a net loss.

This practice not only injures established retail merchants by forcing destructive prices but it is an unfair method of competition. Aside from this the Treasury of the United States loses revenue that would otherwise be payable. In addition competitors are not able to realize normal profits which likewise affects the flow of income taxes from that source. In the end small business and the Government are injured.

Another bill which I have introduced is H. R. 4201 to amend the Robinson-Patman Act. It has been learned that a few very large buyers are given secret advantages in prices despite the provisions of this law. Under this amendment all manufacturers and other sellers are required to make known to all their customers all their terms as to prices and discounts. With this knowledge public, secret deals with the few will automatically be overcome.

The House Committee on Small Business invites correspondence from small businessmen who have any discriminatory problems to contend with.

Eighty-Second Anniversary of the Gettysburg Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER H. GROSS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me on the occasion of the observance of the eighty-second anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address by the Gettysburg Camp, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, at Gettysburg, November 17, 1945.

It will be 82 years on November 19 since Abraham Lincoln stood on a platform at Gettysburg and in 2 minutes, and 270 words, delivered an address which has not "perished from the earth."

He was invited to make a few appropriate remarks, evidently not because of his ability as an orator nor for what he might say. He was President of the United States and, as such, would draw a crowd. The committee in charge of arrangements came very near not inviting him.

Lincoln spoke about the government of the people having a new birth of freedom and that it should not perish from the earth. The Civil War was at its height. He was not sure that the Nation would survive, but he did ask that the dead should not have died in vain.

The heartaches, the grief, the hopes, the prayers, and the faith of a liberty-loving people were expressed by him in simple words. They have become engraved in the minds of men forever.

Our Nation today needs leadership of his homely virtue and simple philosophy. Lincoln dedicated himself to the great task before him. Let us, a free people, rededicate ourselves to the principles for which he stood. This is the only way we can successfully solve the grave problems confronting us. We are the stewards of his trust and faith in us.

The beauty and the eloquence of the Gettysburg address remain undimmed with the passage of time. Rarely, if ever, has any man said so much in so few words. Its brevity, modesty, and simplicity, its charm and power, mark it a masterpiece of the purest English; and it still stands as the oration of the age. The cadence of its words makes it as beautiful as a psalm.

There were those who appreciated the address. But it was severly criticized by many of our newspapers, and even the London Times called it dull and commonplace.

In high places today we need men of his homely virtue; we need his simple philosophy throughout our national life.

If Lincoln were here speaking to us today I believe he would be saying: It is time for a new birth of freedom from regimentation in our America.

It is time for freedom from all forms of intolerance.

It is time for America to live within her income.

It is time to demonstrate that constitutionally organized freedom and truly representative government are far better for America than communism or national socialism.

It is time to emphasize the value of a reasonable separation of local from Federal functions and of the executive from the legislative branch of our Federal Government.

It is time to develop dependable prosperity through increased production and widened distribution of newly created wealth.

It is time to liberate the natural strength of large and small private enterprise and to encourage the production, distribution, and sale of the products of American shops, and farms, both at home and abroad. This means seeing to it that our economy and our Government are agencies of freedom and progress suited to our needs and equal to the hopes of our young people who have fought this war and who are looking for results worthy of their sacrifices and their efforts.

Since there can be no progress without the human effort needed to produce the standards or facilities sought, every advance in our standards of living comes from the efforts of someone who produces those benefits. One man alone on an island knows that his condition can be no better than he makes it by his personal efforts. He, therefore, gets to work on new facilities to improve his condition. There is nothing in the presence of 2 men on the island, or of 2,000,000,000 men on the earth, that changes that simple fact. It is through the combined efforts and exchange of efforts that men do more together than they can do alone. In any case, however, the gain depends upon someone's real effort.

Today great progress is being made through countless scientific advances, labor-saving devices, and inventions. Their benefits now contribute so widely to the advance of mankind that each generation is better off than its predecessors, although each individual expends less physical labor than did his ancestors. The advance of mankind will be substantially in proportion to the efforts of mankind, and civilization will suffer substantially in proportion as men fail to make the best productive use of their abilities.

If Lincoln were speaking to us today, he would say:

"Let freedom be our cause. Let us go to work. Lest we perish from the earth."

Truman, the Man of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYLE H. BOREN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, when Harry S. Truman became President of the United States, the people of Oklahoma, my people, in many towns on many occasions queried me on my appraisal of Truman as President.

I replied in earnest and heart-searching sincerity, "Truman will be a good President."

To my people I said, "Entertain no doubt about Truman, he merits your confidence."

In public, in private, on every occasion, I declared my faith that Truman would justify our full, wholehearted trust in him.

People asked, "What kind of a man is he?" and I replied, "He is not vastly different in any respect from you, from me, from us. He is one of us. He is a man of the people."

They asked, "Is he capable?" and I replied, "We, the people, rule America. If we are capable, he is capable. He is one of us. He is a man of the people."

They asked, "Can he solve our international problems?" and I replied, "Can you, can I, can we solve our international problems? It takes us all, he is one of us, he is a man of the people."

They asked, "Will he solve our domestic problems?" and I replied, "Will you, will I, will we solve our domestic problems? It takes all of us. He is one of us, he is a man of the people."

And so we reasoned together. We laughed together over the childs query, "How big was Alexander, pa, that people called him great?" And we realized that America is built on the principle that a king is just a man and every man a king might be.

When people asked, "Is Truman great?" I asked, "Are the American people great?"

We saw Truman as one of us. We asked ourselves, "What if my son were President?" We saw Truman and we asked ourselves, "What if my brother were President?" And we knew that if our son were President he would try so hard to do the right thing, and we would be anxious with him. We knew that if our brother were President he would with all his mind and heart try to do the right thing. We knew, each of us, that we would try so very, very earnestly to do the task and do it right. And we said to ourselves, "Truman is like us, like my son," said one. "Like my brother," said another, "like my father, like me." He is one of us. He is a man of the people. And we, each and all, were glad Truman was President. His being President made the story of democracy true.

In my public speeches I said, "I know Truman—I know him well—and I know he merits your confidence.

"I know he is a man of courage.

"I know he is a man of ability.

"I know he is a man of strong character.

"I know he is a man of experience.

"I know he is a man you can depend on.

"Truman is humble, he knows his own limitations, he is earnest, he is honest, he will do his dead level best. It is a good thing for America that Truman is our President."

Those were my words on that day when Truman became President.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I reiterate and reassert those same views.

Were I to speak to the people of Oklahoma, my people, today, I would say, "Truman is a good President, he merits your confidence."

If people asked, "Has he made any errors?" I would reply, "Yes, he is like us, he is one of us, he is human."

If they asked, "Is he capable?" I would reply, "Yes, he has demonstrated it—examine his every act. Look at every time he has been to bat—two home runs for every error. Can you do better?"

If they asked about our international problems, I would say, "He has done well—ask General Eisenhower, General MacArthur, Admiral Nimitz, Admiral Halsey—ask Stalin, ask Chiang, ask Britain, ask even the Mikado."

I would ask my people, "Did you want lower taxes? Did you want wartime controls like gasoline rationing, daylight saving time, and a hundred other things, to end?"

We expect him to be cautious and careful. Are we when we criticize?

We expect him to be patient and considerate. Are we?

We expect him to be thoughtful, judicious, and fair. Are we?

I think Truman is a good President.

I think Truman is a great President measured by the same rule that measured Jackson and Johnson and Garfield and Lincoln.

He is trying to do what is right, like you, like me. He is one of us. He is a man of the people.

Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, the inclosed message has just been mailed to me by my devoted friend, Dr. E. J. McCormick, of Toledo, Ohio, formerly president of the Academy of Medicine, past grand exalted ruler of the Elks of the United States of America, and one of Ohio's outstanding citizens—a man unselfishly devoting his good works to the service of others.

In addition to the statement in regard to socialized medicine, I wish to state I had the pleasure of visiting socialized medicine hospitals in Russia and the observations of the activities there constrains me to emphatically say I hope it never happens here. This is not said in criticism of that country nor of the doctors there. I merely hope no system ever arrives whereby human bodies, even though they be treated efficiently, are treated just as though they were another machine.

SOCIALISM IN NEW ZEALAND

New Zealand's state medical system, which is supposed to grant "free" medical care to all, is breaking down under the weight of abuse by patients, doctors, and political meddling in general. It is reported that the Government of New Zealand is seriously considering discontinuance of the system.

The experience of New Zealand is an example of why many people in this country are slow to favor committing the United States to a Nation-wide Government medical system. A mistake could cost the lives and health of millions of people. The position of the medical profession on the question of socialized medicin is ably stated by a leading doctor:

"No person of intelligence will oppose constructive social legislation, and least of all the medical profession whose chief concern is human welfare. It is extremely difficult, however, to determine where constructive measures end and destructive paternalism begins, especially when administered by an impersonal and an entrenched bureaucracy.

"Our problem is the provision of medical care of high quality to the Nation without sacrifice of liberty. Sacrifice of small liberties leads to sacrifice of greater liberties and eventual loss of all. It is not likely that the working people and the employers of this Nation are ready to submit to compulsory taxation to support a medical care plan administered by a Federal bureaucracy."

Letter From Overseas Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following letters that appeared in the Stars and Stripes on November 7, written by men in the service overseas:

REPLACEMENTS WANTED

Eighty points has been set as the critical score for discharge of medical officers, 5 points higher than for officers in all other branches. Newspapers and magazines spread the word that all Army medical officers of 80 points and over would be caring for civilians by December 15 if they so wished. A teletype from our higher headquarters confirmed that medical officers with 80-plus points were nonessential.

We doctors in the Ninth Air Force are now told that we will have to wait for replacements to come before we can be relieved. Instead of 80, our going-home score is set at 93 points. All this is supposedly due to difficulty in obtaining replacements from the States. We can get out of the Army with 80 points if we get to the States, but it takes 93 points to get to the States.

And the crowning low blow—for medical officers in the States, 45 points are enough to keep them there. This policy will reduce the amount of available replacements, and questions the all-out effort to obtain replacements that we believed was being made.

CAPTAIN ELKIN,
Eighty-sixth Fighter Group.

NO TIME FOR TOURISTS

I have just finished reading in a London paper that regular American liner services with weekly sailings between New York, Boston, Southampton, and Hamburg had commenced September 1. Each vessel is a 17,500-ton job, and there are six of them.

Is this the time to return to business as usual when a million GI's are awaiting transportation that will take them home? If it's just a case of money, we'll gladly pay our own way back on these civilian ships.

We unwilling ETO occupants deeply appreciate this catering to the tourist classes when we have been told that our redeployment schedule has been set back a month for "lack of shipping space."

THREE FRIENDS OF OLEM.

GUARD HAPPY

In basic we were told that the proper way to pull guard was for a man to be on for 2 hours and off for 4 for a 24-hour period and then he'd get 24 hours of rest. We are now pulling four on and eight off 7 days a week. This has been going on for several weeks now. We are promised relief when replacements arrive, but at least one bunch of replacements has just been turned down by Regiment.

One of our four-man posts is at a British camp, guarding British troops. And the British maintain a three-man MP patrol there, too.

The rate of courts-martial in our company is high now and it will go higher if we don't get a break soon. This schedule is too much.

(Signed by 23 EM's, Twenty-ninth Infantry Regiment.)

WHY NOT TAPER OFF?

Why is it that men of 60 points and over, now eligible for discharge and who must remain here until shipping space is available, still must work 8 and 9 hours a day 7 days a week?

Surplus pools should be created where all men with ASR scores over the discharge level should be stationed until shipping is available. At this place they should be accorded all the privileges denied them during the war. Sightseeing tours through the Continent, furloughs to cities that are a "must" for every European tourist, stays at various rest and recreational centers, so that the GI can get away from army routine as much as possible.

Sergeant GINZBURG,
Biarritz Army University.

Relief of Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take pleasure in calling attention to the following resolution recently adopted by the Campbell Post, No. 596, of the American Legion:

Whereas great pressure has been exerted upon the administrative agencies of the United States Government and its legislative branches to provide funds for the restoration of devastated countries throughout the world and for the rehabilitation of people in foreign lands whose lives have been disrupted by the ravages of war; and

Whereas it has been rumored and reported that the Government of the United States intends to provide funds for these purposes, directly or indirectly through legislative or administrative action, or through lend-lease; and

Whereas the United States Government owes a duty of care to its own disabled veterans and to able-bodied veterans whose homes and lives have been disrupted by reasons of the war. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That (without passing upon the merits or demerits of aid to the devastated countries of the world and to the needy people of foreign lands) the American Legion demand that the Government of the United States expend for the rehabilitation of disabled veterans of this country and for aid to veterans whose lives and homes have been disrupted during their service in the military forces of the United States a sum of money that shall not be less than that expended or advanced, directly or indirectly, for the restoration of devastated countries or the rehabilitation of needy people in foreign lands; and be it further

Resolved, That the Government of the United States, in every appropriation of moneys to be used, directly or indirectly, for the restoration of devastated countries or the rehabilitation of needy people in foreign lands, it be provided that a similar sum be appropriated and expended for the rehabilitation of disabled veterans of this country and for aid to veterans whose homes and lives have been disrupted by reason of the war; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Hon. SHERIDAN DOWNEY and Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Senators from the State of California, and Hon. JACK Z. ANDERSON, Congressman from the Eighth Congressional District of California.

(Approved October 10, 1945.)

Our Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to say that I am glad to have inserted in the RECORD an article written by Col. Francis Scott Key Smith, a member of the Washington, D. C., bar in which he shows the difference between a democracy and republic. Let us not forget that ours is a republic and recognized as the great American Republic.

OUR REPUBLIC

James Madison, a member of the Constitutional Convention which framed and proposed the Constitution for adoption, in advocating its adoption, declared:

"The first question that offers itself is whether the general form and aspect of the Government be strictly republican. It is evident that no other form would be reconcilable with the genius of the people * * *. If the plan of the Convention, therefore, be found to depart from the republican character, its advocates must abandon it as no longer defensible."

And he added:

"Democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention; have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property and have been in general as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths."

Samuel Adams also about the same time remarked:

"Democracy never lasts long. It soon wastes, exhausts, and murders itself. There never was a democracy that did not commit suicide."

The ordinance for the government of the great Northwest Territory passed by Congress in July 1787, during the time that the Constitutional Convention was in session in Philadelphia, provided, that the States formed in said territory when admitted into the Union may adopt State constitutions, *"Provided,* the constitution and government so to be formed shall be republican."

Likewise, section 4 of article IV of the Constitution provides: "The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government."

Andrew Jackson, seventh President of the United States and an acknowledged exponent of democracy even to this day, regarded the American constitutional Government as a republic. In all of his official and private utterances, Jackson, ever referred to the Federal Government as a republic never once speaking of it as a democracy in anything he wrote.

In his farewell address upon leaving the Presidency, he makes use of such expressions as "the history of republics," "citizens of this great republic," "this great and glorious republic." And he speaks of "principles of economy which ought to characterize every republican government."

Again in his appeal to South Carolina to abandon its nullification ordinances Jackson said, "To inspire new confidence in republican institutions."

Bequeathing the sword presented him by the citizens of Philadelphia to his grandson Jackson admonished that he "will always use it in defense of the Constitution and glorious Union, and the perpetuation of our republican system."

In his letter to Commodore J. D. Elliott, written in March 1845, a little over two months before his death, in which he declined a tendered honor of a Sarcophagus for his remains, Jackson wrote, "My republican feelings and principles forbid it; the simplicity of our system of government forbid it. Every monument erected to perpetuate the memory of our heroes and statesmen ought to bear evidence of the economy and simplicity of our republican institutions; and the plainness of our republican citizens."

General Washington also in his farewell address twice refers to the republican character of the American government and system. At one place, he wrote, "Foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government." At another, "Overgrown military establishments are particularly hostile to republican liberty."

The purpose throughout the entire Constitution is to subjugate power through combinations of instrumentalities—to create a government of the people by combining the principles of intelligent aristocracy with those of sound democracy. The check upon legislation established by the original set up for two houses of Congress; the one elected by a State agency to represent the sovereignty of the States and the other elected by the people at large to represent the people or populace clearly demonstrates the purpose to combine the aristocratic system with the democratic and so preserve both an intelligent and fair government along with them. It is a system for the protection and promotion of individual initiative and enterprise; for safeguarding personal security and private property and the encouragement of home and family. It is the diametrical opposite of socialism and communism and the two can not exist together. The one is for human progress and happiness, the other is destructive of both.

A system which acknowledges that free adult people sui juris, are better able to manage their private business than tax paid public servants. The allegiance of the American people is to the constitutional republic of the United States.

When Will the Boys in the Pacific Area Return Home?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter that I received from a mother who has a son on Luzon, together with a clipping from the Daily Pacifican dated November 1, 1945.

This letter is only one of many that I have received in the last few weeks from the boys in the Pacific or from their families at home. It is queer indeed that these men who have been overseas for so long still find themselves stranded out

there without any immediate prospects of being shipped home.

This policy of neglect and inaction on the part of the War Department is creating an army of occupation that is sullen and disgruntled. After all, these men are not professional soldiers and they have a right to feel that their job is finished, and that it was well done. They are longing to return home to their families—to get out of uniform and to resume civilian life. In my opinion, this policy of inaction in discharging and returning these men to their homes is one of the main reasons why there is so much opposition to the proposed conscription legislation. People are just losing confidence on the Army and the War Department.

Oh, I know the War Department is proud of the record they established in October on discharges, but that still does not explain why so few of the high-point men in the Pacific theater have been released. Every time the question is asked we get the same answer—a shortage of shipping space—a shortage of shipping space. This argument is wearing pretty thin with a good many of us. All the shipping space that we possessed could not have suddenly vanished into thin air.

What has happened to all the shipping space? Who is responsible? Both the Military Affairs Committee and the Naval Affairs Committee ought to make this question their first order of business. Yes, the conscription bill and a lot of other legislation can rest and wait awhile. But these committees of the House and Senate should start an investigation immediately and shake down a few of our generals and admirals, and I am sure that we would then find the shipping space.

HEADQUARTERS
DETACHMENT, SEVENTY-FIRST QUARTERMASTER BATTALION,
APO 70, CARE OF POSTMASTER,
San Francisco, Calif., November 2, 1945.

DEAR MOM: Well, the mail has been a little slow lately, but I guess everything is O. K. back there.

I don't know what information is being imparted to those at home concerning the rate of transfer of men from overseas stations to the States for discharge, but for your information, here are a few facts about the rate of transfer from Luzon.

At this date men who have waited as long as a month in disposition centers for transportation home are being sent back to their former units. Men now in disposition centers have adjusted service rating scores ranging from 70 to 100 points. Sixty-point men are still in their organizations with no prospect whatsoever of going home. Recently a small number of men left Manila Bay in a Liberty ship which they converted for troop use themselves.

GI's here are very bitter about the delay in their being sent home. Some of the fellows have been away from their families for 36 months. They have up to 100 points and can't go home.

Read some of the letters in the clipping I've inclosed.

Write when you can.

Till later,

JEROME.

[From the Daily Pacifican of November 1, 1945]

MAIL BAG

HOODWINKED

EDITOR: It is rather obvious to this writer that the War Department is saving face and hoodwinking Congress and the American people by discharging low-point men in the States and bringing them back from nearer theaters such as Europe and Hawaii. This compiles a fine statistical record to forestall domestic criticism ("foreign" criticism is of no account) and makes the point system as much a laughing stock among GI's as temporary duty and rotation have been.

It is our proposal that no man should be returned to the States or discharged within the States with less than 90 points until all men with over 90 points are brought back from all theaters. Nor should they be granted indefinite furloughs. This is not purely a spite suggestion. A bad situation should be spread out rather than directed against a minority which is so far from home they can't do anything about it. By thus bringing the true situation to all the American people some decent action might result rather than some high-flown figures that do not tell the whole truth.

We should like to see some transports in this theater. We did not ask to be sent here. Ninety-nine percent wanted to go to Europe. Why should a man actually be punished for spending years on such unsavory places as Guadalcanal, Saipan, or New Guinea?

We should like also not two Liberty ships to be converted (an obvious save-face policy) but 200, and not next week but now. It is nothing short of idiotic to "experiment" with something that has been put in practice for 3 years.

Screaming headlines state that 60-point men are eligible for return November 1. This makes wonderful reading for the folks back home. They do not know that there are 80- to 90-point men over here and not the slightest possibility of 60-point men returning in November or even December. Any day they miss a letter they figure their boys are on the way back home. Beautiful propaganda!

LT. COL. S. P. HUBBARD
And 25 others.
APO 718.

NUMBERS GAME

EDITOR: I see by the paper that the Army expects to ship only 77,000 home during the month of October and that only half that number have left so far. The other day the office of the commanding general, United States Army Forces, Western Pacific, published a circular (No. 46) giving the list of redeployed units presently located at Philippine bases. This list was 14 pages long. We added up the number of men in each unit on the first two pages and the total was 75,648. Multiply this by approximately seven and see what you get. The Army got them all over here in 3 months and all the way from Europe, too. Strange that it can't get a quarter of these troops half that distance now.

T/4 LAWRENCE GREEN,
APO 75.

BOX SCORE

EDITOR: Getting the box score on discharges was a fine accomplishment and now that those in charge have committed themselves we hope your paper will dig out the actual figures at the end of each month so we may see for ourselves just how accurate the estimates are.

According to one official at a replacement center here in Tacloban, one of the main reasons for the slowness of troop movements is the fact that Manila is "grabbing off" all the empty ships. We wonder if this condition was taken into consideration at the time the box-score figures were made up. Or is Manila going to be the only replacement center to make its quota?

In closing, we'd like to add that if some officer here in Tacloban will offer his services and experience in fitting out Liberty ships as Colonel Davidson has done in Manila, getting volunteers will never be a problem. Just say the word, sir. Furthermore, we'll personally make the rounds of all the mess halls on the island and plead with them to each contribute one M-37 cooking range for the best cause in the world.

T/4 DECKER SCHUCH and
T/3 JACK E. ALLEN.

REMOTE CONTROL

EDITOR: This outfit has nearly 2 years overseas. We came to the Pacific direct from the ETO. We did get a 5-hour stopover in Panama. After riding all over the Pacific Ocean we disembarked in Manila and were sent to a small village some 60 miles north of Manila. Since being here we have been pulling town patrol. The squawk is this—no mail, no cigarettes, no beer, no patches to clean our guns, no pay for 3 months, and no bread with our meals. The biggest yell of all is that the men with over 80 points can't even get as far as Manila.

CPL. JOHN TOROSINO,
APO 74.

Delay in Discharging Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I have a letter written to me by a soldier on Bataan, complaining about the slowness with which the servicemen are being sent home. I also have a letter dated Linden, Tex., November 5, from the wife of a soldier. She states that her husband has written to her on the same subject. I have also a letter dated Austin, Tex., November 8, from the wife of another soldier. The three letters all deal with the same subject. I have the originals of the letters in my files and they are properly signed. I am not divulging the names of the writers for the protection of those who wrote them. I ask unanimous consent that the three letters may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BATAAN, P. I., *November 4, 1945.*

DEAR SENATOR: It is highly improbable that you remember our meeting at the Fort Worth fat stock show some years back but it is a cherished memory to me. My approval of the many fine things you stand for is my reason for coming to you for assistance at this time.

My problem is the one of getting a whole lot of soldiers home in a manner similar to that which hurried us overseas when we were needed. Now that we have accomplished our mission which in itself was no Sunday school picnic, it would appear that our usefulness is ended and interest in us has been abandoned by those in authority to lend their influence in hastening the pace to return us to our homes and life as we choose to live. I know that no man with your affection for people has let this problem drop idle. We fellows over here are human and fully realize the enormity of the job but at the same time we are skeptical of the news that would lead us to believe that shipping is the bottleneck when we see daily the same ships laying idle at anchor in the bay.

It is hard to believe that the same type of ships we rode all over the Pacific are im-

mediately unsatisfactory for troop movement. Possibly the employment situation causes the delay. Or could it be the people in authority fear a control taken by those who have given a rich part of life to protect and hope for our homes when we completed our mission? Whatever be the cause of the slow operation I ask humbly of you to learn and shout it to the high heavens with a belief that once the true cause is brought to light we shall see an immediate increase in our numbers returning to life, love and home.

We want a lot of plain old-fashioned Texas truth—nothing more, nothing less.

Thanks for your very best efforts.

Sincerely.

LINDEN, TEX., *November 5, 1945.*

Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator from Texas,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'DANIEL: Is not there something that can be done to make Navy release their men faster? The Army, Marines, and Coast Guards are way ahead of the Navy with their demobilization of men.

My husband is stationed on Okinawa where he describes living conditions as terrible. He is a storekeeper with only 42 points and is not eligible for a discharge because SK's have been frozen to 44 points. Yet on that island and at other naval bases we have SK's doing carpenter's mate work, electrician's mate work, boatswain's mate work, mailman's work, even driving trucks and picking up rubbish; doing everything in the books but storekeeper work. Still, SK's are declared essential and have to stay in while those other rates get to come home. Is that fair? He states that there is no necessity for more than one-third of the men. They are actually in each other's way and that it is not a shortage of ships because between 50 and 100 passenger-carrying ships have left there in the past month without a single passenger. Many more that could have carried a few more men have left and hundreds are still in the bay.

My husband has been in 2½ years, and if the Navy high-ups have their way, they will keep them all in just as long as possible because they like their power and rank which they might lose when the men are discharged.

The waste and destruction of supplies he describes is beyond comprehension of the people here at home who have never seen it.

Are the people here in the States going to forget what we owe the servicemen now that the war is over? I do hope something can be done to get them home as soon as possible without harm to our Nation's security.

Sincerely.

AUSTIN, TEX., *November 8, 1945.*

DEAR SIR: I suppose you are tired of receiving complaints from the soldiers overseas and the soldiers' folks at home. However, I'd like to register my complaint chiefly because of what my husband's letters say.

He is at Manila awaiting transportation home. He has 71 points. He and all the rest of the boys are very much displeased with the slowness of shipping home. He sent me clippings from the soldiers' newspaper, the Pacifican, proving that the schedule for shipping is far behind. For instance the quota for October was 77,700 set by MacArthur; only approximately 37,000 men were shipped from Manila port in October.

The depots are overcrowded and are hardly accepting men. What is needed are more ships. The boys don't demand luxury liners. They will ride in anything so long as it is headed for home. The Liberty ships should all be reconverted instead of just a few experimentally.

One captain wrote in the Pacifican that at his base they were fixing Liberty ships to haul Jap POWs to their homes. I quote him, "It seems a pity that our own soldiers couldn't be given as much consideration as the Japs are receiving."

Help the boys get home faster. They all are so depressed. Thank you so much.

Postwar Peace Problems in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of discussion and have read a good many newspaper items dealing with plans of the United States in the postwar period in connection with occupied countries, as well as other countries, in Europe, following the ending of World War II. These reports have been disquieting and have led me to believe that something is wrong.

We are vitally interested in just what is going to be done among the conquered nations in Europe. Most of us want to see constructive work done there and proper measures taken so that those countries can again govern themselves. The only alternative is to have the United States of America keep our American soldiers there indefinitely as policemen. In plain language, that is just what military government means.

We have been reading newspaper articles which indicate that efforts to reconstruct these European countries are not working out satisfactorily. A few days ago I notice a newspaper item, written by a newspaper correspondent in Germany, who said that the United States Army was requesting American food supplies for Germany of over 750,000 tons, and that food was really needed to prevent starvation until the next harvest. There is, of course, more to this article, but it does not satisfy me that reconstruction work is going on properly in Europe.

Then there is another article in the same newspaper which purports to speak for official Washington and for the President's War Relief Control Board. This article conflicts in a way with the other article, and I quote it in full because of the many implications. It appears in the Washington Daily News for Friday, November 9, and is as follows:

PRIVATE UNITED STATES RELIEF DENIED GERMANS

Private and religious groups seeking to send food, clothing, and money into Germany have found no sympathy so far in official Washington.

The President's War Relief Control Board, which must grant permission for foreign relief activities, has denied the four applications made to it to date for German relief.

All of these, according to James Brunot, executive director, were by bona fide groups. Three of the applications were from church organizations.

A spokesman for the Civil Affairs Section of the War Department said the Army couldn't and wouldn't handle private relief for Germans unless it were so ordered.

HOW TO GET IT IN?

"If they raised $100,000 to send into Germany, there wouldn't be any way to get it in," said the Army spokesman. "If they got together 100,000 tons of sauerkraut, there wouldn't be any way to get that in either."

The spokesman pointed out that no communications of any sort are being permitted with Germans by persons outside the country. This policy was said to conform to the Potsdam Declaration.

LESSON IN SELF-SUPPORT

"Under that declaration," said the Army spokesman, "the German people are to be taught to depend upon themselves and not to lean on the Salvation Army, the Red Cross, or other relief agencies."

The Army itself, of course, is feeding Germans to prevent starvation and bloodshed and to help teach democracy.

"That is an Army mission," concluded the spokesman.

The foregoing article flatly contradicts another article to which I have referred which bears this headline: "Army asks food to feed Germany." There is just simply something wrong in the way the postwar program is being handled over there.

Then, Mr. Speaker, in another newspaper a few days ago we were told in headlines from a foreign correspondent that "prisoners returned to Yanks by French found unfit to work." Then follows a rather gruesome article, indicating that war prisoners had not been given sufficient food. This spells out a condition that is not exactly slavery. It is worse than slavery.

A couple of days ago I happened to meet an Army officer who had been in Europe, in occupied territory, and who was willing to answer some questions in reference to just what was being done to rehabilitate those war-torn countries. He could not, of course, permit his name to be used, but he told me plenty. He rather indicated that the Army was following orders from "higher-ups" somewhere here in Washington and without any hesitation expressed his rather vigorous disapproval of the entire program.

I do not now spell out the details, but they indicate that somebody, someplace, somewhere wants the reconstruction period to be a punishment period. The statements made to me also indicate clearly that policies are being formulated by some person or persons who are either lacking in common sense or else have a lot of wrong conceptions about things.

Naturally, with Gen. Dwight Eisenhower right here, I would like to ask him how he is getting along over there. But we are all familiar with Army procedure. No one talks out of turn. Naturally, if I asked Gen. Dwight Eisenhower any questions, he would look at me with an authoritative expression and answer me with an air of finality to the effect that our postwar program in conquered countries in Europe is going along fine. He might not mean a word of it, because he simply is not going to talk out of turn. He is carrying out orders, and part of his orders is to tell you that everything is fine.

This reminds me of what happened to Gen. George Patton, who is rated quite a soldier among some of our folks. He is supposed to have had a few original ideas about how to run the government of conquered countries. He expressed

opinions. He talked out of turn. And so they put him in the doghouse.

Who did this? Who ordered General Eisenhower to chastise this modest young fellow by the name of Patton? I would like to know. I think the Members of the House would like to know.

Let me say right here that the way things are being handled in occupied territory in Europe is horrible by comparison with the way Gen. Douglas MacArthur has handled the situation in Japan. MacArthur has his critics, and they are sharp ones. A lot of fellow travelers would like to catch him making mistakes. All reports we get indicate that the military government of Japan, contrasted with the dismal failure of the military goverment in Europe, has been efficient and highly satisfactory, and it is getting results.

Do you remember what a sensation took place down at the State Department when Gen. Douglas MacArthur said that he was going to demobilize the Army and get along with 200,000 soldiers, as I recall it. Well, something happened down at the State Department almost as demoralizing as the results of an atomic bomb. The spokesman down there admitted that the State Department had won the war against Japan with a little slight and inconsequential help from the War Department and Gen. Douglas MacArthur. This sounds foolish, but that is just what happened.

VENGEANCE IS MINE

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that somebody in some branch of our Government is looking for vengeance in the occupied countries of Europe. They have a blueprint for subjugating the civilian population in occupied countries so as to punish them for the misdeeds of their military leaders. There may be some people who want to follow this sort of a program because of what has happened in these European countries in the past. They feel that one wrong justifies the commission of another crime. Now is the time for them to learn that two wrongs do not make a right.

If I had any doubt as to the correctness of my position, that doubt was removed yesterday when the newspapers published the challenging statement of the Catholic bishops of the United States dealing with the postwar peace pattern. That statement is one of the most worthwhile declarations on this subject that has come to my notice. It uses the word "vengeance," and the statement contains this line:

> The statement denounced Russia for giving lip service to democracy, but actually following totalitarian practices. It protested against betrayal of Poland, the absorption of the Baltic countries by Russia, the indifference to the plight of the people of Italy, and the policy of vengeance in force against Germany, Austria, and Hungary.

So I think, with this official declaration from religious leaders, that I may properly suggest to the House of Representatives that we ought to find out who is responsible for this postwar program on the part of the United States to rehabilitate Europe. Is the State Department the guilty party? If so, who is there in the State Department that is committing these mistakes? If responsibility rests on some other agency of the administration, let us find out what branch of the Government issues orders to our military people in Europe. Let us find out the names of the men who are responsible.

Ordinarily, I do not get enthusiastic about congressional investigations. Here is one matter, however, that I think should be investigated by Congress. We ought to appoint a committee, and the committee ought to get the answer to this question as to who is responsible for a policy of vengeance.

The Suribachi Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Lt. (jg) Allan S. Wood, USNR, communications officer of the U. S. S. *LST 779* to Mrs. Ruth Tawney, wife of the minority clerk of the Ways and Means Committee. Lieutenant Wood is a resident of Pasadena, Calif.

The letter follows:

U. S. S. LST 779,
Care of F. P. O, San Francisco.

MY DEAR RUTH: I am sorry I have been so lazy about writing. Especially am I sorry that I didn't write you a first-hand account of our doings at Iwo. I thought I had written you, but apparently I didn't. Please forgive me.

I've written so many letters about Iwo that it's becoming a pretty dry subject to me, but I shall try and do my best by you. My little mother has been as busy as a little bee publicizing (?) my exploits. Besides the local papers and a local radio broadcast, the latest appears in the letter column of Time. I also got a letter from a certain Brigadier General Denig, of marine headquarters in Washington asking me for a fuller account of the flag (you don't know him by any chance, do you?). First time I've ever gotten chummy with a general. Speaking of generals, you're not doing so bad yourself. General LeMay is a big man out here—read about him in Time also. I have seen a lot of his B-29's and P-51's. They're really doing a bang-up job, those boys are.

But newspapers, radio, generals—they're not for me. I don't fancy publicity much, especially in the case of Iwo where the credit due belongs to the United States Marines. The Navy could have gone on pounding the hell out of that island with shells and bombs from now until doomsday, but it still couldn't have made the marine's job any easier, because the Japs had hidden themselves so well that they had to be burned and blasted out by hand. Everybody knew it was going to be tough, but it turned out even tougher, as you know. I'll never forget the look on the faces of a few of the marines I saw after the first two or three hellish nights on the beach. Some looked as though they wanted to cry but couldn't others had faces which showed absolutely no emotion at all. The total effect was heightened by a ghostly pallor on their faces—the result of several days' layers of dust.

Even more horrible were the twisted, mangled bodies of dead marines—and the stench of them up close. The whole area of the beach had that peculiar, faint, sickish-sweet odor of dead bodies.

Yet, through it all you never saw such a willing bunch of lads. They did all that was asked of them—sometimes more cheerfully and oftentimes humorously. Most of the marines were vete.ans. The ones we had on board—part of a 155-millimeter howitzer battalion—had been at Guadalcanal, Tarawa, Guam, Saipan, etc. Talking to them and watching them in action made me feel the greatest respect for them, and I thank God that I haven't as yet had to endure anything similar to what most of them have gone through. We had a few bad hours, but I'll get to that later.

It all started for us back at Pearl Harbor where we got all the advance information on Iwo, the operation plan (as thick as a New York City telephone book) etc. It was about that time that I ran across the flag at a salvage depot. I was just rummaging around looking for anything that might be of use when I found this apparently brand new flag in a duffle bag with some old signal flags. It was a large flag and I was glad to find it because we were out of large flags. Little did I know how famous it would one day become.

After going through extensive invasion rehearsals we set cut for Iwo. It was our first operation and naturally we were a little excited. We knew it would be pretty important because Iwo was so close to Japan.

After stopping at Eniwetok and Saipan for logistics, we set out on the last leg of our journey. The trip was uneventful and the sea fairly calm. We listened in on our radio and heard aircraft spotters giving spots for the big guns of the Navy, which were giving Iwo a preinvasion shelling.

On the 19th of February—a clear, cool, beautiful day—we rolled up to Iwo, which was a mass of smoke and dust. The big ships of the Navy circled the island and were leisurely pumping a steady barrage of shells at it. Overhead our planes buzzed and roared as wave after wave dove at the beaches and Mt. Suribachi. It didn't seem possible there could be a living thing left on Iwo when the marines got there. It looked like a pushover. But that afternoon as we cruised around, several thousand yards off the beach, we could tell by looking through binoculars that the Japs were doing a lot of fighting back. We could see burning tanks and LVT's, and, most disheartening for us, we could see the splash of mortar and artillery shells around beached LSM's. However, we figured we would be among the last of the LST's to beach so we weren't too worried. We were very much surprised the next day, however, when we were ordered into the beach. No LST's had beached up to that time. Apparently they needed our howitzers pretty bad, so in we went. The other two LST's that were supposed to come with us didn't show up, so we hit the beach all alone—the first to beach at Iwo. It wasn't until 2 days later that the rest came in. The beach was a madhouse of men, supplies, and noisy vehicles. Suribachi was a few thousand yards down the beach on our left and the front line, marked by some entrenched tanks, was only a few hundred yards down the beach. Our own artillery and mortars, dug in on the beach, were popping and banging continuously. Occasionally you could hear a spatter of small-arms fire, and all too often a big Jap mortar would explode with a shattering burst, and with terrible finality, right on the beach in the midst of all the men, supplies, and machines.

We unloaded the rest of the afternoon and most of that night. I'll never forget that night—the pale moon, the eerie yellow star shells, the black grotesque outline of Suribachi, the occasional burst of a shell, sometimes close at hand, and the continual clank

and groan of the tracked vehicles unloading our ship, and the wash of the surf on the wreckage which littered the shore line. There was a feeling of death in the air that was overpowering—almost stimulating—which prevented any weary eyes from closing for any length of time.

About 4 o'clock the next morning, when things were more or less quiet, the Japs suddenly cut loose with a mortar barrage on the beach and we found ourselves almost in the middle of it. Several mortars landed within a few feet of our ship causing it to tremble and shake. Shrapnel spraying against the steel plates sounded like someone was throwing great handfulls of gravel at us. How we missed being hit I don't know. If we had, the result would have been most disastrous, for we were loaded with ammunition and high octane gasoline—some of it right on our main deck out in the open. After that, the skipper decided it wasn't healthy for us to stay where we were any longer, so we pulled off the beach in record time. We beached again 2 days later, little closer to Suribachi. The marines were taking over Suribachi and late that morning (the 23d of February) they raised the first small flag on top of the mountain. The marines on the beach may have cheered (I was on the beach at the time) but if they did I didn't hear them. Most everyone was too busy for much more than a quick glance at the mountain.

Later a marine came aboard our ship and wanted to "borrow" a large flag. The skipper asked me how our flag situation was. I in turn asked the signalman. They said we had one large flag and several small ones. So I told the captain I thought it would be O. K. if we gave the marine our large flag. So we gave him the flag, and later we saw it fluttering from Suribachi. We were proud, of course, that our flag flew from that bloody mountain, but even then we didn't know that it was destined to become so famous.

One could hardly attach any significance to the fact that our LST happened to be the nearest one to Mount Suribachi and thus the logical one for the marines to borrow a flag from. However, it makes a good story to tell how the Iwo flag was salvaged at Pearl Harbor to be raised on Mount Suribachi, a fitting symbol of how Americans endured bitter defeat at the hands of the Japanese only to come back with stupendous military forces to crush Japan.

Well, Ruthie, there's your story—patriotic blandishments (?) and all. The crux of the whole matter is that it should never happen again. Our failure or the failure of the generations before us, was to let world conditions get to a point where war and battles like Iwo are a last resort and a most costly necessity. It hurts to think of what might have been done with all the human energy and all the material wealth that has been put into this war. If we could only think, invent, produce, and spend as lavishly on more peaceful pursuits.

As I see it now, it is our job and responsibility to straighten out the world and bring some semblance of order, and eventually see that every group of people and every nation is reasonably satisfied with what it has got. If a group of people or a nation are dissatisfied and needful, there's where trouble starts and there's where crackpots like Hitler will find fertile fields to sow their wild schemes. We can't be isolationists. The concern of every people is our concern.

But those are weighty subjects and I'm getting tired of same (you too probably by this time). Anyway, you can be sure I'll duck anytime anything comes flying at me. By this time it becomes a habit.

I've got 8 or 10 more months to go out here so you've got lots of time to buy your car and motor out to San Francisco and meet me when I come back.

Wartime Controls Should End Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the time has come to take the harness off the American people. Our so-called wartime controls were put on to help win the war. They have served their purpose, and should be terminated and terminated now.

Government controls, established in wartime, are today retarding reconversion. Factories are not producing goods or providing jobs while they are waiting for months on Washington for an approval of the prices for their articles. New industries are not started and new ideas are not being developed because of Government interference.

American farmers, laborers, manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers and professional people are not a group of infants that require the Government to act as their guardian. As law abiding, free men and free women they have faith in the system that has made America great. That system cannot survive, if Government consent must be obtained for a farmer to sell his city friend a pound of butter, of if Government consent must be obtained to rent a room, build a house, or make a contract for services. Our American system cannot survive if a Washington bureaucrat can keep factories and distributors idle under the guise of controlling prices.

Temporary continuance of wartime controls means in many instances permanent control. It is the sure way to strangle and kill private enterprise. It may be granted that the immediate removal of all wartime controls will make some situations a little rough, but in the long run its effect will be wholesome. It will make more goods available at a lower price, and thus combat inflation.

The greatest step that this Government can take in preventing inflation would be to end all wartime controls, discharge 2,000,000 Federal employees, and balance the Federal budget. If this is done, the system that has given us more good things, and at the same time paid higher wages than any other system in the world, will serve us well in the years that lie ahead.

Armistice Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an address which I delivered on Armistice Day, November 11, 1945, over radio station WLAW, Lawrence, Mass., under the auspices of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States:

The war is over. The peace remains to be won. As the echoes of the second and, as we hope, the last atom bomb still ring in our ears, we pause to count the cost we have paid for victory.

Some may say $300,000,000,000. They are right as far as they go. Tremendous quantities of material lie on the bottom of the ocean or have been consumed in the furnace of war. In time, this loss can be replaced. Work and wealth will build again. But the cost I speak of is beyond our poor power to replace. So many that we knew, gave all that we might win. Today as we meet to give thanks that the tragedy of war is over, there is an emptiness in our hearts. We think of the smiling faces of those who should be with us but never will. We miss the strength of their courage as we face an uncertain future. We cannot bring them back for they gave to the last full measure of their devotion. This then is the real and the terrible cost of war. Armistice means that the blood-letting has stopped. We look over the battlefields and count our dead.

The ravaged earth has been smoothed over. Man is trying to cover the scars left by the blistering fire of war. Damaged buildings are removed, splintered trees are cut down. The barbed wire and the wrecked tanks have been taken away. Bulldozers have leveled the gaping wounds dug by shell and bomb. Grass grows again to conceal the devastation of war.

Even the slit-trenches have been filled in and many of the men who used them to escape the flying steel have found permanent shelter. Wars and the threat of wars will torture them no more. They died. They sleep. Row upon row of crosses, interspersed with the star of David, cover the battlefields.

They tell of the sacrifices made for us by our American youth.

In happier days to come, as men travel in peace, they will come upon these cemeteries in strange and far away places; on a mountainside in Italy, on a tropical island in the Pacific, along a quiet roadside in France where cows graze in a nearby meadow, in Germany, Japan, China, and India. These simple white markers will face us everywhere we go, forever reminding us of the price which some Americans paid that all the rest of us might live.

Who were these few who were called upon to do so much? Were they Irish, English, Italian, French, Polish, Greek, or Jew? They were these and many more. But they fought as Americans, united by a bond which is greater than race or class or creed. They fought for tolerance and justice and for a world which must emphasize man's humanity to man.

Even as we speak these words, we know that evil forces which seek to divide men—to pit one against the other so that evil may profit—are at work in a war-torn world. In our own country they have started a campaign of lies to stir up hate and disunity. They have already begun to separate veteran from civilian and civilian from veteran. The servicemen have been urged, in tales which have gone out to the fighting fronts to "Come back and clean up the mess at home. The Government is full of reds, the unions are running the country, the war-workers have been banking millions and going on strike while you've been sacrificing everything. We're just waiting for you to get home and fix everything up and get rid of all these foreign agitators and subversive elements so America can be a country for Americans again."

It is such an old and vicious technique, this business of dividing people. It will always be used by the ignorant, the envious, the bigots, and the failures. And some people will always fall for it. For the peace and progress of our America, we must be everlastingly on guard against this subtle poison. We must cease talking about democracy and work to put these moral principles into action. We must practice tolerance and we must learn to puncture propaganda with fact and truth and charity.

That is why, on this Armistice Day, which observes the end of one war and which expresses the universal longing for the elimination of all war, we speak up against those who are trying to stir up civil war.

On street corners, in barrooms, at bridge parties, wherever people gather in small groups, these poisoners spread their evil. With half-truths and isolated examples, they foment racial and religious intolerance. Unfortunately, they succeed with those who have never learned to think.

"Blood money," you can hear them whispering, "While our men fight the wars the Jews get rich on them."

Let us give the answer to that lie from the record.

At the time of the Revolutionary War, though there were very few Jews in this country, the record states that 46 of them fought for the patriot cause. In the short War of 1812, 44 Jews took part, ranging in rank from private to colonel. Fifty-eight served in the Mexican War. At the outset of the Civil War, there were less than 200,000 Jews in the United States, yet more than 8,000 of them saw active military service. During the First World War, over 200,000 were in uniform. This was more than 4 percent of the armed forces of our country, while the Jewish population was but 3 percent of the total population. Over 1,100 citations for bravery were awarded to men of Jewish faith. One thousand five hundred were killed in action or died of wounds.

The greatest epic of courage to come out of that war—the exploits of the Lost Battalion—was essentially a Jewish achievement. For the members of the Lost Battalion, which refused to surrender even though it was cut off and surrounded for 4 days without food and with little ammunition, were a part of the Seventy-seventh Division, an East Side, Yiddish division. They fought like wildcats, these tailors, factory workers, clerks, and pushcart men from the crowded tenements of New York.

The many Jews who went from Lawrence and Boston and the other cities and towns of our Commonwealth gave Massachusetts the proud rank of fourth-highest State in the Union, in the number of Jews who fought as American soldiers and sailors in that conflict.

The Second World War began with the persecution of the Jews. A certain creature in Germany—I cannot abuse the word "man" by referring to him as such—this creature vaulted to power by appealing to mob passion and prejudice. The infamous Nuremberg racial laws, designed to exterminate the Jews, supplanted the laws of reason and justice. Thinking men all over the world saw in this a sign of the jungle terror to come. They warned us that evil was on the march inside Nazi Germany and that it was preparing to assault civilization. But the world, preoccupied with its own troubles, failed to heed. Then the beast struck. His armies and his air forces swept over Europe, enslaving all. Not content with these conquests, he set out to liquidate the Jewish people. With his concentration camps and his murder factories he made deliberate, hideous war on Jewish civilians.

Then the sluggish conscience of the world woke up. But hundreds of thousands of defenseless Jews had to stand and die for the common dignity of man before we saw the danger to ourselves. The contempt which this creature had for the Jews was a sign of his contempt for all mankind. After the Jews there would be other victims. No man was safe. All men of good will, no matter what their race or creed might be, knew they had to band together to fight for the humanity which made them brothers. And so the United States came into the war and we poured our wealth, our energy, our faith, and our lives into the struggle. There were years of dark days and anxious nights before we earned our victory. This ordeal has taught us a stern lesson. This war began with the persecution of a minority. Other wars may begin the same way unless we resolve to stamp out intolerance in time. The persecution of one is the persecution of all.

We shall not speak of the Jewish martyrs of our day. It is a chapter of history which fills us with shame at the thought that members of our human family should be capable of committing such fearful crimes against their brothers. Millions of victims point their fingers at us and say: "This must never happen again. This is the grim harvest of intolerance."

On this day, we have come to speak of the men and women of Jewish faith who fought and died with their fellow Americans as they beat back the surge of ignorance and hate and cruelty which was set in motion by evil men.

Out of the hundreds of thousands of Jews who fought for us, Mr. Bernard Postal, director of B'nai B'rith, has compiled a roll of honor entitled, "First for Freedom," a document worthy of our reverent attention. Among the firsts credited to Jewish men and women in the armed forces of the United States in World War II are these:

First American penetration of German soil was made by the Third Armored Division, commanded by Maj. Gen. Maurice Rose, of Denver, who gave his life for his country.

First American assault boat to hit the shore of France on D-day was commanded by Lt. Abe Condiotti, of Brooklyn.

First Nazi plane shot down for Uncle Sam is credited to Lt. William S. Beck, of Nashville, Tenn.

First American Red Cross nurse killed in World War II was Esther Richards, of San Francisco, who died of wounds received at Anzio beachhead.

First American Army nurse killed on the western front was Lt. Frances Slanger, of Boston, who died of wounds received in Belgium.

First American unit to break through to relieve the trapped American garrison in Bastogne was a tank unit commanded by Col. Creyton Abrams, of West Newton, Mass.

First American enlisted man to receive the Purple Heart in continental Europe was Sgt. Irving Allen, of Union City, N. J.

First American officer killed in the Philippines was Lt. Henry D. Mark, of Los Angeles.

First four-medal winner in the American Army in World War II was Lt. Morris Berenson, of Garfield, N. J.

First member of the WAVES to be killed in line of duty, was Elizabeth Korensky, of Philadelphia.

The first Japanese battleship sunk in the war was the *Haruna*, sent to the bottom by a plane piloted by Capt. Colin Kelly whose bombardier was Sgt. Meyer Levin.

The first Gold Star Mother of World War II, was Mrs. Gertrude Kram, of New York, whose son, Seaman Leonard Kram, was killed in action at sea.

This, in part, is the answer to those who would try to belittle the great contribution which the Jews of our country have made to the winning of the war. But it is more than this. The splendid record of the Jews is an affirmation of their passionate faith in our way of life and of their spiritual communion with all Americans of the right side—the fair, the tolerant, the progressive side.

The Jewish War Veterans of America meet this day to observe the ending of one war and to dedicate themselves to the great tasks of peace confronting the Nation. They know the terrible price we have paid for this second chance. Their dead—which are our dead—hold us to this responsibility. We, the living, must work hand-in-hand to earn opportunity and enlightenment for all. Before this teamwork, the forces which seek to divide us will collapse. For, out of our common sacrifices we have learned the lessons of understanding, cooperation and unity. As Americans we shall go forward together.

Sgt. Leonard A. Funk, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, among the great heroes of World War II, Sgt. Leonard A. Funk, Jr., Company C, Five Hundred and Eighth Parachute Infantry, United States Army, residing in my district in Braddock Township, Pa., will rank with the greatest. Always a modest, retiring young American, he was loved, admired, and respected in our community because he was a regular fellow. He hated war, but when the Japs attacked the United States at Pearl Harbor, Leonard was "rarin' " to go and he joined Uncle Sam's Parachute Infantry. The same blood that ran in the veins of our founding fathers at Valley Forge ran in the veins of Sgt. Leonard Funk. For gallantry, courage, and bravery far beyond the call of duty at Holzheim, Belgium, on January 29, 1945, he was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, America's highest war decoration. To all of us, Sergeant Funk is a symbol of American bravery and courage. I am happy to include as part of my remarks the citation granted him by the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman:

CITATION

The President of the United States takes pleasure in awarding the Medal of Honor to First Sgt. Leonard A. Funk, Jr., Company C, Five Hundred and Eighth Parachute Infantry, United States Army, for services as set forth in the following citation:

"Sergeant Funk distinguished himself by gallant, intrepid actions against the enemy at Holzheim, Belgium, on the 29th of January, 1945. After advancing 15 miles in a driving snowstorm, the American forces prepared to attack through waist-deep drifts. The company executive officer became a casualty, and Sergeant Funk immediately assumed his duties, forming headquarters soldiers into a combat unit for an assault in the face of direct artillery shelling and harassing fire from the right flank. Under his skilled and courageous leadership, this miscellaneous group, and the Third Platoon, attacked 15 houses, cleared them and took 30 prisoners without suffering a casualty.

"The fierce drive of Company C quickly overran Holzheim, netting some 80 prisoners, who were placed under a 4-man guard, all that could be spared, while the rest of the under-strength unit went about mopping up isolated points of resistance. An enemy patrol, by means of a ruse, succeeded in capturing the guards and freeing the prison-

ers, who had begun preparations to attack Company C from the rear, when Sergeant Funk walked around the building and into their midst. He was ordered to surrender by a German officer, who pushed a machine pistol into his stomach. Although overwhelmingly outnumbered and facing almost certain death, Sergeant Funk, pretending to comply with the order, began slowly to unsling his sub-machine gun from his shoulder; then, with lightning motion, brought the muzzle into line and riddled the German officer. He turned upon the other Germans, firing and shouting to the Americans to seize the enemy's weapons. In the ensuing fight 21 Germans were killed, many wounded, and the remainder recaptured.

"Sergeant Funk's bold action and heroic disregard for his own safety were directly responsible for the recapture of a vastly superior enemy force, which, if allowed to remain free, could have taken the widespread units of Company C by surprise, and endangered the entire attack plan."

HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States.

Now Is the Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of Saturday, November 17, 1945:

NOW IS THE TIME

This was the day, 145 years ago, when Congress was to hold its first meeting in the new city of Washington. There must have been considerable grumbling among the Members who had gotten here to keep the date, traveling over terrible roads, finding a place to live in the rough village being carved out of the wilderness. A quorum was not available and it was not until 3 days later that enough Members had straggled in to form one, and to hear President Adams' message calling their attention to the fact that one of the first things for Congress to decide was whether to assume immediate jurisdiction over this District, set aside as a Capital.

Seventeen years before, the constitutional provision had been written calling for establishment of an area which would be the Capital. The men who wrote it did not know where it would be, who would live there, what States, if they were willing to do it at all, would agree to cede the territory. They were not even sure that the baby Republic then being born would live long enough even to see the establishment of such a Capital. If they thought much about how the people there would vote, they probably decided that the States which ceded the territory would take care of the matter.

But the States of Maryland and Virginia—unlike the Czar of Russia, the King of Spain, or the Emperor Napoleon, when they sold their holdings in America to the infant Republic later on—failed to provide for the citizenship rights of the people who lived on the land. And in 1800 it is to be doubted that the voting question had been very seriously considered even by the people. Those who lived here voted as citizens of Maryland and Virginia in 1800—just before Congress came here. They may have thought they would keep right on voting.

When they found this was not the case the people of Virginia began an agitation which lasted until 1846, when Congress, making a fatal error, receded the Virginia portion of the District. The people of Georgetown were equally upset but were unable to do anything about it. And except for national elections, they were running their own affairs pretty much as they pleased without too much interference from Congress. It was not until 1874 that Congress really assumed the jurisdiction over the District as a whole as we understand it today.

On Monday the Senate Judiciary Committee may reach a vote on a proposed amendment to the Constitution giving to Congress the power to grant to the people of the District voting representation in Congress and in the electoral college. The resolution offers an opportunity not merely to correct a mistake and to right a wrong, but to take a great, progressive step in governing this Capital of the United States. It should be reported to the Senate by a great majority. For it is believed that if Congress and the people of the United States are given opportunity to vote on so simple and elementary a question of right and wrong, there can be only one answer and that the people of the American Capital will be admitted to membership in the Union they have served so well for so long.

Gen. George S. Patton, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I have always been an admirer of Gen. George S. Patton, Jr., as an outstanding military leader. His record as a hero of this war cannot be denied, and although General Patton failed in his administrative assignment following the end of the European war, his ability as a militarist will be recorded in history.

Columnist John O'Donnell's attempt to stigmatize General Patton's recent dismissal from his Third Army command as an anti-Semitic issue, boomeranged. The attached release dealing with correspondence between General Patton and Mr. Joseph Wilner, of Washington, D. C., deserves the attention of every American, and I therefore include it as part of my remarks:

CHICAGO, October 29.—General George S. Patton, Jr., in a letter made public here today, formally denied anti-Jewish remarks attributed to him by John O'Donnell, New York Daily News-Washington Times-Herald columnist.

In a letter to Joseph Wilner, of Washington, D. C., father of four servicemen, two of whom died in service, General Patton said:

"I am glad to have the opportunity of categorically denying that I have ever made any statement contrary to the Jewish or any other religious faith. I am a sincere believer in the Supreme Being and have never interfered with or even examined the religious or racial antecedence of the men I have the honor to command. My sole effort has been to provide victorious soldiers who can serve their country and defeat the enemy with the minimum loss to themselves."

Wilner, one of whose sons, Capt. John Wilner, was killed while serving with the Third Army under General Patton, had cabled the General that he was "deeply distressed at injustice being done your reputation" when O'Donnell's column appeared on October 3, and pointed out that the "whole implication of article is that you are guilty of sentiments contrary to the fair-mindedness which my son's correspondence described."

In a retraction and apology published October 19, O'Donnell admitted as untrue his statements attributing Patton's removal from command of the Third Army to pressure of influential Jews and that the soldier in the slapping incident in a Sicily hospital was Jewish, but made no specific retraction of the remarks he had attributed to Patton in the original column.

Wilner released the Patton correspondence while attending the annual meeting here of the executive committee of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, of which he is a member.

Text of his cablegram to General Patton and the latter's reply follow:

OCTOBER 11, 1945.

Gen. GEORGE S. PATTON, Jr.,
ASN O-2605,
Commander, Fifteenth Army,
APO 408, New York, N. Y.:

As bereaved father of two sons lost in service, one Capt. John Wilner, of your command, I am deeply distressed at injustice being done your reputation by Columnist O'Donnell of Patterson newspapers. Article attributes to you certain remarks derogatory of Jewish servicemen at time of Sicily hospital incident and falsely asserts soldier involved, Charles Herman Kuhl, was Jewish. Whole implication of article is that you are guilty of sentiments contrary to the fair-mindedness which my son's correspondence described. Would appreciate assurance of misrepresentation your attitude by afore-mentioned newspapers.

JOSEPH WILNER.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

HEADQUARTERS, FIFTEENTH
UNITED STATES ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE COMMANDING GENERAL,
APO 408, *October 15, 1945*

Mr. JOSEPH WILNER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WILNER. Replying to your Western Union telegram, I am glad to have the opportunity of categorically denying that I have ever made any statement contrary to the Jewish or any other religious faith. I am a sincere believer in the Supreme Being and have never interfered with or even examined the religious or racial antecedents of the men I have the honor to command. My sole effort has been to provide victorious soldiers who can serve their country and defeat the enemy with the minimum loss to themselves.

With appreciation of and thanks for your interest, I am

Yours truly,

GEORGE S. PATTON, Jr.

Not Unduly Exacting About Censorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 19, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, for some years now many friends of the Soviet Union have insisted that most American criticism of Soviet methods was due to American ignorance concerning the facts about Russia, and that it was only necessary to understand the Russians in

order to see the logic and righteousness of almost all their international attitudes, policies, and demands. But the long-standing difficulties of obtaining the facts which would enable us to understand Russia were clearly stated in the following editorial from the New York Times of October 2, 1945, and excerpts from a letter written this year by a former American correspondent in Moscow, who has now resigned his post:

[From the New York Times of October 2, 1945]

A MESSAGE FROM STALIN

When Senator PEPPER asked Generalissimo Stalin whether he wanted to send him away from his interview with any special message the Russian leader hesitated and then said: "Just judge the Soviet Union objectively. Do not either praise us or scold us. Just know us and judge us as we are, and base your estimate of us upon facts and not rumors."

It is an excellent prescription, but how are we to follow it? How are we to know Russia, how are we to base our estimate of Russia's purposes and aspirations "upon facts and not rumors," if the Russians themselves discourage us from doing this?

A Russian observer in the United States, whether he is a Soviet journalist or an official of the Soviet Government, can travel wherever he likes, see what he wants to see, talk with anyone he wants to talk with, and send back to Russia, wholly without censorship of any kind, a report on any given situation which is based to the best of his ability "upon facts and not rumors." But this is not true of an American observer in Russia. An American in Russia can travel only where the Government wishes him to travel, see only what he is permitted to see, and talk only with people the Government wishes him to talk with. He cannot separate facts from rumors because the Government will not give him the means to do so. And when, on the basis of evidence which is often insufficient, he prepares his report for transmission to the United States he must submit it to a heavy-handed censorship which is more interested in the propaganda values than the objectivity of his findings.

Moreover, this is true not only throughout the whole territory of the U. S. S. R. It is also true wherever, outside of the U. S. S. R. Russian influence is paramount today. For months our own Government was placed in the humiliating position of begging Russia to permit American newspaper correspondents to go into countries in eastern Europe—Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, etc.—which had been liberated from German domination with the aid of American arms. Now, when these correspondents have at last been permitted to visit such countries, they find obstacles placed in some cases in the way of transmitting their dispatches. Moreover, what has been happening in Russian-controlled Europe has been happening also in Russian-controlled Asia. The American public is now so thorcughly accustomed to Russian blackouts that it has seemed to be the most natural thing in the world that we should now be told not an inkling of what is happening in Soviet-controlled Korea. The moment the Soviet armies occupied Manchuria, the inevitable headline read, "Soviet blackout in Manchuria."

Why does Generalissimo Stalin's government pursue this policy, if Stalin himself really wants us to "judge the Soviet Union objectively," if he really wants us to "know" Russia, if he really wants us to "judge the Russians as they are" and "base our estimates of them upon facts and not rumors"?

This policy defeats its own purposes. Inevitably it feeds rumors instead of clearing them away. It creates suspicions. It handicaps good relations. It makes difficult certain actions which would otherwise be simple. When, for example, the American people are asked to make a very large loan to Russia, it is natural that they should want to be in the position of acquiring as much knowledge about Russia and Russian policies as any prudent private creditor would desire in similar circumstances. Certainly in private transactions of this kind full and willingly granted access to all relevant information is the sine qua non of extending credit. Present Russian policy does not encourage the acquisition of such information. It dos not encourage that mutual confidence which alone can serve as a sound basis for the pooling of Russian and American efforts in such matters, for example, as control of offensive weapons like the atomic bomb.

Probably nothing else in the world is so important at this moment as goo relations between Russia and the United States. Probably nothing would do so much to promote and cement those good relations as an end of Russian black-outs, foreign and domestic.

EXCERPTS FROM A LETTER WRITTEN BY A FORMER CORRESPONDENT IN MOSCOW ASKING FOR CHANGE OF ASSIGNMENT IN AUGUST 1945

I have to stay in spite of encouragement I have had from you; I have not been satisfied with what I have been able to accomplish. * * * No story I sent * * * was satisfactory to me. This feeling is partly due to censorship * * * and partly to indifference or hostility (I cannot decide which it is) on the part of Russian authorities. * * *

Taking the matter of censorship first, we have to start with the understanding that it is dishonest in that it not only kills news which has a bearing on United States' national interests but it also distorts dispatches by killing some portions and leaving others intact. Such a selection, sometimes done skillfully and sometimes ham-handedly, always serves to make the whole story read quite differently from the original. It raises in the writer's mind the question of whether to send the dispatch at all. Except on occasions where the violence done was so great as to become a total reserval of what I had originally intended, I have followed the practice of sending on censored stories in the hope that the necessary correctives would be seen and applied at the other end. This is far from satisfactory; it opens wide opportunities for blameless error. But the only alternative was no story at all.

On this subject of censorship there is as yet no real sign of change of policy. * * * There has been some scattered and wholly unofficial talk about abolishing censorship. But of recent weeks I have found it more unpredictable, senseless and onerous than at any time previous. Whole stories have quietly disappeared into the Foreign Office never to emerge. Every piece of any consequence on the activities of the Reparations Commission here was killed totally. If the United States Government is moving toward a policy of more public enlightenment on diplomatic deals, then it is to the interest of the United States public to see that no more international conferences are held here until censorship is totally abolished.

This examination of censorship leads to another consideration. That is the attitude and work of correspondents. Some correspondents, mentally excusing themselves on the grounds that if they write the full truth the censors will not pass it anyway, deliberately slant their conclusions and twist their incidents so that everything they write is calculated to be pleasing to the Russian authorities. If the volume of stuff they get past the censors is a sole criterion they can be praised for doing a good job. But is it good? Isn't it true that VOKS or any other wholly Russian agency devoted to propoganda could do the same job with greater authority and volume? It seems to me we have three choices:

1. To keep on doing the best we can to get at the facts while censorship goes on hindering or distorting the result of such effort;

2. To resign ourselves to propaganda whether distributed by a governmental agency or supplied by a supine correspondent;

3. To cancel all efforts to cover Russian news objectively, withdraw from Moscow, and depend on the hand outs for news of major events.

The foregoing letter is typical of honest reports which were steadily received by many American and British editors from their correspondents in Moscow all during the war and up until the 20th of last month. By the 20th of October the situation had reached such an impasse that the Anglo-American Correspondents' Association in Moscow addressed a letter to Mr. Molotov, Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs, stating that:

The Soviet Union is the only great power still retaining wartime censorship. * * * Censorship in peacetime of all dispatches relating not only to military affairs but to politics, economic and cultural affairs, and every aspect of life in the Soviet Union destroys the value of foreign correspondence in a free world and has created general distrust abroad of all news emanating from the Soviet Union.

Ten days went by before Mr. Molotov acknowledged receipt of the correspondents' protest. When he did so, it was through a spokesman from the Foreign Office staff. Mr. Molotov's acknowledgement, as translated was:

In the opinion of Comrade Molotov the association's letter in general was not solid and he did not find it necessary to give it his attention.

However, this apparent rebuff was not the final response. As shown by Associated Press dispatch to the New York Times on November 11, Moscow in its mysterious way, and without any official lifting of the censorship suddenly entered a phase of expediting uncensored news from Moscow.

[From the New York Times of November 11, 1945]

SOVIET APPARENTLY LIFTS CENSORSHIP AFTER MOLOTOV'S HINT TO UNITED STATES WRITER

Moscow, November 11.—Russian censorship of outgoing news dispatches appeared today to have been lifted, although there has been no official announcement and foreign correspondents are still submitting stories as previously for stamping by censors.

All Associated Press dispatches filed since November 7 have been passed without any deletions and the censorship process on political commentaries and similar stories, which often in the past have been held up for several hours, has been expedited. Other correspondents report similar experiences.

This marks the first time since the Germans invaded the Soviet Union and censorship was established that correspondents have been able to feel that their stories would go through without deletions or delay. The continuation of censorship after the end of the war was protested recently by the Anglo-American Correspondents Association of Moscow. It received a reply saying that Foreign Commissar Vyacheslav M. Molotov had found "without substance" certain points on which the protest was based.

The first and only mention of censorship came on November 7 at Mr. Molotov's reception during the celebration of the October revolution anniversary. Persons present ex-

pressed the opinion that he hinted then that censorship was being ended.

Carrying out his custom at the reception, Mr. Molotov at midnight began moving through the crowd of diplomats, military men, journalists, and other guests. He was accompanied by Deputy Foreign Commissar A. Y. Vyshinsky and was followed by waiters bearing vodka, wine, and glasses.

After drinking a toast with the Chinese Ambassador, Mr. Molotov walked up to an Associated Press correspondent, Eddy Gilmore, and said, "I want to drink a toast with American Correspondent Gilmore—if you were in my position, what sort of toast would you propose?"

Mr. Gilmore answered that he supposed that Mr. Molotov should propose a toast to a better understanding between the press of the Soviet Union and the United States.

"That is a good toast," Mr. Molotov said, "but what is your main issue as a correspondent now?"

"Mine is trying to write an interpretation of your speech last night at the Kremlin, which I thought was the most important in months," Mr. Gilmore replied.

Mr. Molotov said: "Now come on—you are not a politician, and I will not be one. You know correspondents do not like Soviet censorship. You want to wipe it out."

Mr. Gilmore answered: "Well, sir, you read our letter and our telegram."

Mr. Molotov said: "What would you say if I told you I would agree to reciprocity?"

Mr. Gilmore said: "I think it would be a very fine thing."

Mr. Molotov beamed and said: "Let us drink a toast, then."

Mr. Gilmore chose vodka instead of wine and Mr. Molotov smiled, saying: "That's a real Russian toast." They drank to a "better understanding of both our countries."

Mr. Molotov emptied his glass and held it upside down over his head, smiled again, and passed on.

A few minutes later a high foreign diplomat who had witnessed the toast approached Mr. Gilmore and said: "I think you have got censorship lifted."

During the past few years the Russian censor has assumed some responsibilities for the correctness of stories that he passed. If it is correct that censorship is now merely a formality, undoubtedly this responsibility is to be transferred directly to correspondents.

[From the New York Times of November 14, 1945]

RUSSIA'S CENSORSHIP

Though no change in policy has been announced officially, Brooks Atkinson reports from Moscow that the Russian censorship on outgoing news "seems to have been lifted." The censorship organization itself remains intact; but for a week, news dispatches have been passing through the censor's office without changes or deletions. "To correspondents accustomed to waiting 3 or 4 hours, and sometimes days, for the censor's decision, the speed has been astonishing."

We hope that the new policy sticks, and that it will be followed by other steps to encourage a freer flow of news from Russia. Censorship, of course, does not begin in the censor's office. It merely ends there. It begins in restrictions which prevent foreign correspondents from traveling where they wish to travel and talking with people who have information which they believe to be of interest and importance. Censorship of this kind shuts off free access to the news long before the stage of the censor's stamp is reached. As Mr. Atkinson points out, under such conditions the correspondent even begins to censor himself. "He does not write about subjects that he knows the censor is likely to refuse to pass. When writing on controversial subjects he does not write frankly; he writes by indirection, avoiding flat statements and indulging in hints, irony, and circumlocution. Under censorship, journalism becomes a pallid profession afflicted with petty nervous disorders."

Russian-American friendship would gain if the Soviet Government made a genuinely clean sweep of all controls on foreign correspondents who go to Russia in search of news. As the newsmen themselves said, in their recent protest to Mr. Molotov, peacetime censorship destroys the value of foreign correspondence in a free world, creates distrust abroad of news emanating from Russia, and prevents the growth of better understanding between the Soviet Union and the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to say what caused Molotov's change of heart on censorship, but it is possible to hazard a guess: It was the stiffening of American and British public opinion which has increasingly determined that cooperation with Russia must be a two-way street if there is to be harmony among the United Nations and peace in the world.

When Mr. Byrnes, the Secretary of State, after the failure of the London Conference, told us that our Government was "not unduly exacting" in its requests of the Soviet Union for the fulfillment of mutually token and mutually beneficial pledges, he did not specifically mention the question of a free press. But these developments in regard to getting factual information from Soviet-controlled areas seem to indicate that a policy of "due exaction" might produce the happiest results.

Home on the Range

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ROCKWELL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most popular western songs is entitled, "Home on the Range." There have been many stories about where it was written, and by whom. I desire to quote from an article in the November Rotarian, proving that the story was written in the year 1885 at a mining camp near Leadville, Colo., which is in my congressional district, and that its authors were Bob Swartz and some prospector friends of his:

It was the late Kenneth S. Clark, Princeton's favorite musical son, who dug up the story under Home on the Range. In the middle eighties a group of prospectors headed by C. O. (Bob) Swartz and including Bingham Graves, a certain Bill McCabe, and a gentleman known merely as Jim lived in a cabin, which they called the Junk Lane Hotel, near Leadville, Colo. All musical, they filled their evenings with friendly and often improvised harmony. On a night early in 1885 they worked out a melody and set words to it to create the song which the world now sings as Home on the Range. They, however, called it Colorado Home.

A letter from Bob Swartz to his "Dear Folks" dated February 15, 1885, describes the event and gives the complete words and music, which are almost identical with those of Home on the Range as it is known today. There are slight differences in the melodic line, and it was only later that the text acquired a definite cowboy slant. But the song is all there in the faded yellow letter which Bob's sister, Mrs. Laura M. Anderson, discovered among her belongings in 1930. Bob Swartz died in 1932, and 2 years later, at the suggestion of Mr. Clark, Mrs. Anderson signed an affidavit which credited her brother and his friends with the writing of the song. Financially it meant nothing to them, for even if there had been a copyright, it would have expired without renewal in 1913. The song is now in the public domain free from copyright restrictions. It is in the folk or traditional class.

Upon finding Bob's letter in 1930, Mrs. Anderson sent him a copy of it. In his reply, dated November 14, 1930, he said he could still see the whole gang setting around on soap boxes and on the bed, all trying to make the lines rhyme so they sounded like poetry.

I also wish to quote a few of the original verses:

Oh, give me a home, where the buffalo roam,
And the deer and the antelope play.
Where seldom is heard a discouraging word,
And the sky is not cloudy all day.

CHORUS

A home. A home.
Where the deer and the antelope play.
Where seldom is heard a discouraging word
And the sky is not cloudy all day.

Oh, give me the hill, and the ring of the drill
In the rich silver ore in the ground
And give me the gulch, where the miners can sluice
And the bright yellow gold can be found.

Oh, give me the gleam, of the swift mountain stream
And the place where no hurricanes blow
And give me the park, with the prairie dog bark
And the mountains all covered with snow.

Oh, give me the mines where the prospector finds
The gold in its own native land,
With the hot springs below, where the sick people go
And camp on the banks of the Grand.

Oh, show me the camp, where the prospectors tramp
And business is always alive,
Where dance halls come first, and faro banks burst
And every saloon is a dive.

German Business Still a Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "German Business—Still a Menace," written by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and published in the November 1945 issue of the American magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GERMAN BUSINESS—STILL A MENACE

(By ELBERT D. THOMAS, United States Senator from Utah)

Hitler is reported dead, the Reich destroyed, but the real war lords of Germany, the Nazi

industrialists, still remain to menace the peace of the world.

I am convinced that even now they are planning to outwit the Allies, as they did after the First World War, to refinance themselves at our expense, and to arm their nation for new and greater aggression. We can prevent this if we are stern and ever vigilant.

The average American assumes that the industrial might of Germany was shattered by bombs and shells. I wish it were so. The fact is, on competent authority, that three-fourths of the industrial power of wartime Germany remains relatively intact. The general manager of Krupp, the great German armament corporation, stated recently that his plants were operating at 60-percent capacity on VE-day and could resume full production within a few months.

While our planes played havoc with German industrial installations, the damage was only temporary. As rapidly as factories were destroyed, they were restored, often underground. When our troops occupied German cities they found armies of laborers cleaning up the debris of recent bombings and preparing to rebuild.

The great ball-bearing plant at Scheinfurt was flattened in the course of the war, but today its workers and machines are ready to produce again. We found one huge dye plant, which in 1 year could manufacture almost as much dye as all the plants in the United States combined, without even a window broken.

All Germany's great steel furnaces can be operated with only minor repairs. And Germany can produce 25,000,000 tons of steel a year, far more than she needs for the purposes of peace.

Most of her plants which make nitrogen out of the air are only slightly damaged. Twenty-eight percent of the contents of a bomb is nitrogen.

In 1939, with a population of only 70,000,000, Germany's machine-tool inventory and production capacity were greater even than that of the United States, with her population of 130,000,000, and it is safe to say that, after some plant repair, they will continue to be greater than ours. Machine tools, nitrogen, and dye and chemical works are the vital instruments of war making.

But German industry is not confined to Germany alone. Its ramifications are already known to be world wide and of ominous magnitude, and our Government is continuing investigations. Already we know of 750 affiliates and subsidiaries of German industries in neutral countries—233 in Sweden, 214 in Switzerland, 112 in Spain, 98 in the Argentine, 58 in Portugal, and 35 in Turkey—and there is every reason to believe that agreements made between some of our corporations and German industrialists before the war will take effect after the peace treaty. Under these agreements German industries may share ownership of some vital American factories, unless we move to prevent it.

German ownership of foreign industries is cloaked by every device known to high finance. Tracing the ownership of stock in these companies would baffle a Nero Wolfe. We have followed many of the devious trails back to Nazi domination, but our proof in most cases is still so fragile that few names can be mentioned. Let me give you an example of the intricacy of some of the ruses practiced today by Nazi industrialists:

Recently documents came into our hands showing that an agent for a German munitions family held for them in Switzerland a large number of shares in a Swedish holding company. This company, in turn, held the shares of a Portuguese holding company, which held the shares of another Swedish holding company, which, we discovered, held the shares of an American company. If your head is swimming now, consider the plight of those charged with the responsibility of tracking down the Nazis behind it all. Many of these foreign industries are masked with a mask, which is masked by another.

Some Nazi industries abroad no longer have their stock registered. It has been transferred to bearer shares, and the bearers are still in hiding. They intend to come out in the open when some kind German Government is set up again.

On the books of a certain corporation, not long ago, we found the name of a resident of a friendly country who was listed as having the right to purchase at any time a large block of shares in the corporation. He had not, of course, purchased them, but he was welcome to do so at any time. It was an unusual option, enough to attract the attention of investigators. The mystery was solved later when we found in a German vault a written promise by this same gentleman not to exercise his right except upon the demand of and in the interest of a German company. In effect, then, the German company already had its hands on the control of the foreign-owned industry.

There are many less spectacular forms of cloaking than these. In some cases a German industry does not own a foreign subsidary, in the true sense of the word. It simply keeps a firm grip on the patents involved in manufacture, and through this patent control can assume ownership at any time.

In neutral countries the German industrialists may merely share in ownership along with neutral capitalists, hoping by this device to keep the friendship of the neutral governments, making them less disposed to kick them out. German bank accounts are being kept in neutral banks by numbers, rather than names, and bank transfers are made by numbers. It is extremely difficult to trace the ownership of these accounts, and they may represent the earnings of German-owned industries.

It may seem fantastic to the average man that German industrialists, whom I have called the real Nazi war lords, could make a comeback after such a shattering defeat as that inflicted upon their country. Let us not be deceived, lest again we be lulled into the complacency of the 1920's and 1930's. We sat back and watched Germany collapse economically, and became so sorry for her that we rushed to her financial aid.

What we did not know was that the devastating inflation in the Reich, which followed the First World War, was engineered entirely by German industrialists. They were seeking to wipe out their debts and destroy small competitors with one coup. They succeeded. Then, while their coffers abroad bulged with gold, they sniveled at our gates and feigned poverty. It was they, not Dawes and Young, who wrote the Dawes plan, which enabled them to refinance themselves, and it was they who wrote the Hoover moratorium, which made it unnecessary for them to continue to pay their war debts.

Eager for world trade domination, as they were before the First World War, they financed Hitler. They backed him and equipped him. Even as the Mikado represents the great industrial families of Japan, the feudal capitalists, so did Hitler represent the power of the German industrialists, as the Kaiser did before him. Just before we entered this war, Fritz Thyssen, powerful German industrialist, admitted as much in a signed article, I Made a Mistake When I Backed Hitler,' in the American Magazine. And he was sorry, I presume, because he was one of the few German industrialists whom Hitler knifed. They not only backed Hitler, but they urged him to move against the world. Only recently one representative of I. G. Farben, chemical and dye producers, probably the greatest corporate financial structure on earth, admitted in a signed statement that his company encouraged the invasion of Austria, Czechoslovakia, and France.

But when the top officials of the company were questioned, they were hurt and indignant at any suggestion of their war guilt. That is the way most German businessmen are acting. Despite the known interlocking relationships between German Government and industry in the last two decades, businessmen in Germany are taking the attitude that neither the war nor its consequences have anything to do with them.

The officials of one great company in Germany actually said, "Now that the war is over, Americans should be helping us get back on our feet. Keep asking us questions and we'll get our American friends to come to our rescue."

One Nazi industrialist shrugged his shoulders at his interrogators and said, "I am just a plain, neutral businessman," and with that he produced a long list of names of American and British associates, who, he said, would be happy to supply character references.

And all of these Nazi businessmen professed to hate nazism and loathe Hitler. Yet, 6 months ago, Hitler was their god and their advocate. They escaped, before, only to wage a new war. They must not do it again.

A recently discovered document reveals that on August 10, 1944, when they were convinced of the inevitable defeat of Germany, a group of Nazi industrialists met in Strasbourg, France, to make plans to save their hides and restores their companies. They represented such powerful companies as Krupp, Messerschmitt, Hermadorff & Schenburg, Rheinmettal, Volkswegenwerk, and many other armament and chemicals companies. They discussed devices for escaping war guilt, sending and recovering funds abroad. It was agreed that when the Nazi party went underground, they would support it. Do not forget that, as you listen now to their indignant denials of war guilt, their quavering plea for help.

Soon after this meeting, Hitler ordered 650 economic leaders to leave the country to prepare for the industrial rehabilitation of the Reich. Fortunately, most of them were captured. How many others escaped into neutral countries later we do not yet know.

But more important than the escape of capitalists has been the escape of technicians. It was reported that a few were seized in a captured submarine. If a new war comes, it may be won by the brains of one or a dozen scientists. Consider the atomic bomb. two 28-pound packages of devastating neutrons and electrons destroyed two great cities. The Japanese Emperor, as you know, admitted that his nation had surrendered because of these bombs.

Germany, before her collapse, had almost fathomed the secret. Where are the scientists who did the research? Are they at large? Where are those who invented the V-2 jet bomb? One German industrialist told our investigators that if the war had lasted 6 months longer, Germany would have attacked New York and Washington, perhaps laid them waste, with larger bombs than were used in the war. Perhaps they even intended to jet atomic bombs across the ocean, each powerful enough to destroy a city.

Part of the plans of the German industrial war lords was to send these technicians, the brains of German manufacture, into underground hiding or enable them to escape into neutral countries. Wherever they are, they must be ferreted out and controlled. The world is not safe as long as they are free to experiment, backed by the hidden fortunes of German industry.

This is not mere alarmism. Telefunken, a German electrical company, purchased a plant in a neutral country as recently as the summer of 1943. With Nazi capital it was modernized and enlarged and completely equipped with facilities for testing and experimenting with intricate short-wave equipment. For what purpose? I do not know, but I do know it was not for the purposes of peace. As late as April of this year, negotiations were in progress between the Nazis

and the neutral nation to permit skilled German scientists to work in this plant. That is the last information I have received.

Pressure must be brought upon neutral countries, if necessary, to force them to stand guard upon such places or to legislate them out of existence. They may produce some unheard-of weapon of vast potentialities for evil—a weapon which, like the atomic bomb, can be produced by only one factory in quantities large enough to destroy the world.

Before VE-day a semiofficial German organization offered another neutral country, which was eager to encourage manufacturing, the means of establishing and equipping a technical school system. The Germans were to bring in quantities of machines and technical equipment for research and teaching, and to construct a plant for the manufacture of machine tools. Of course, the schools were to be staffed by German instructors and technicians. Since the Germans were then losing the war, it is evident that they were seeking to establish Nazi-dominated experimental laboratories out of the reach of the Allies. The scientists they intended to send as instructors may have been the very ones then experimenting in atomic explosion and the jet bombs.

What shall we do about the plotters, who are attempting to do the very same thing by the very same methods which they did after the First World War? Reformation, of course, must always begin at home. Who, for instance, were the American friends of the Nazi businessman who boasted that they would give him character references? I do not know who they were or whether they would recommend him, but there certainly were a number of American industries which, up until our entrance into this war, had friendly dealings with the German industrial war lords.

In the 1920's and 1930's, the Germans were buying heavily into foreign industry, including ours, trading patents, making cartel agreements to control world prices on strategic materials. An American company and Krupp of Germany formed a patent agreement to control the use of tungsten carbide. The result was that in the United States the price rose to $453 a pound, while in Germany it never exceeded $50 a pound. In 1941, Germany was using about 20 times as much of this strategic material in hardening steel as factories in America. We didn't know how to use it, because it was too expensive for experimentation.

In this same period an agreement was made between German Siemens & Hakske and an American corporation to restrict production of beryllium in the United States. Beryllium has contributed to the production of the atomic bomb. Another American company and I. G. Farben—which already had added to its dye-making business the business of spying upon the world—made an agreement to restrict American production of magnesium. And another cartel agreement was made to curtail our production of Diesel engines and to prevent our supplying tetracene to Great Britain.

It has been said that wherever America and the Allies felt a shortage of any strategic commodity during the war, that shortage could be traced to the cartel agreements of this or the subsequent period. So successful were the Germans in circumventing the provisions of the Versailles Treaty and outwitting the Control Commission that by 1939 they had industrial and technical facilities ranking second only to the United States.

Will some of our industrialists continue to play ball with the industrial war lords of Germany when peace comes? Will they connive with the Nazi schemers, deliver their secrets to them, help them to control prices to the detriment of our national defense? Since Germany's horrible behavior in the last 6 years, cartels have become a moral issue. To continue making such agreements would be evil. Whatever legislative steps we must take, cartels must be stamped out. We can begin by even a stricter enforcement of our own antitrust laws. But the burden rests with American business. It must not permit Germany to buy into our country again. It must trade no patents with her industrial leaders. You couldn't do business with Hitler; you mustn't do business with Germany. The Germans have proved themselves unworthy of trust and even of trusts.

Next, our occupation of Germany must not be a temporary farce, as it was after the last war. It must be stern and it must endure until the German people and their new leaders, whoever they may be, prove themselves worthy to associate with the other nations of the world. Until that time they must be reduced to an agricultural nation. Their fields, forests, sources of fertilizer, all remain relatively unimpaired. They must be permitted to manufacture, but they must produce no more than they require for domestic peacetime uses. Their steel manufacture must be greatly curtailed, their production of light metals stopped altogether.

After the last war, we forced them to stop the production of airplane motors. They produced gliders instead, and with them trained an army of pilots and parachute troops. Now they must not be permitted to produce anything that flies through the air. It is harsh treatment. It will deprive them of world trade, but they have proved themselves unfit to participate in the community of nations.

I believe, however, that we must first create in Germany an atmosphere in which reformation is possible. German labor should rebuild Germany. Free schools must be opened. The churches must be restored. Good leaders must be carefully selected from all walks of life. But there must be no coddling, no conniving, no succumbing to the wiles of German industrialists, who almost proved once that they were the smartest men on earth.

Above all, we must make a serious, permanent, and well-planned peace with the German Government when there is one. Today there is none. Hitler became the state. The state and all of its leaders perished with him. This peace must make it impossible for German industry to rise until Germany has reformed. It must provide the curtailment of the production of all instruments of war, directly or indirectly. It must provide for the policing even of German laboratories. But it must make it possible for the German people to be educated to the ways of peace.

In the meantime, our Government must unceasingly track down all private and public assets of the German people and ruthlessly expose all cartel and cloaking schemes. To do the job, we must have honest and efficient administrators of the highest caliber, trained in the subtleties of high finance, and avowed enemies of the cartel system.

This is not a criticism of the excellent work already done in this direction by Government agencies. It is merely a reminder that, after the first great war, we failed. It is so easy to forget, to fall back into the happy indifference of peace, to forget the world and its problems. We must remain vigilant and awake. We must be willing to back a world-wide investigation of the ramifications of German big business and be willing to foot the bill with appropriations.

To accomplish this investigation expeditiously, I think the Government should create a special agency to do the job. It should not be a temporary mushroom organization, but a highly specialized long-time agency, charged with the one task of digging out every root of the German industrial tree. While those now investigating are most competent, the operation is too diffused, spread as it is among various departments of the Government—State, Treasury, War, and others. The job should be done by one group, even if it takes years to do it.

Already suggestions are being made in high places to let Germany find her own way to normalcy. Our experience of the last 25 years should convince us that normalcy for Germany means one thing only—making war. She can't make war without the war lords—the German industrialists. We've still got them to lick.

Time for the Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Sunday Star of Sunday, November 18, 1945:

TIME FOR THE QUESTION

If members of the Senate Judiciary Committee were deciding for themselves whether or not they should have representation in the United States Government as voting citizens, there is no doubt about how they would answer. No man worth his salt is willing to forego without protest the exercise of a right that in this country is so closely linked with the dignity of the individual.

The fact that members of the Senate Judiciary Committee are not deciding a question which concerns them or the people whom they represent nearly so much as it concerns the people of the District of Columbia should make no difference in their approach to the basic issue of the right or wrong of voting representation in the American Government.

Nor is the responsibility which rests on them narrowed to the point where their own votes will decide the matter. All they are asked to decide is whether the question of voting representation for the people of Washington should be submitted, first, to Congress and, later, to the people of the United States. How can anybody oppose putting such a question.

Some friendly skepticism has been expressed as to whether the people of the States would be willing to admit the people of the District to equal representation with themselves in Congress. Even if the people of the District had equal representation in Congress, however, they would not be on an equal status with the people of a sovereign State—for Congress, representing the people of the States, would remain in exclusive control over the seat of government. This is as it should be.

But there is no reason to believe that the people of the States would oppose the pending Sumners-Capper resolution if they understood it. It merely empowers Congress, representing these people, to give the people of the District such representation in Congress and the electoral college as Congress may consider wise, so long as it does not exceed the representation of any State. How can any American citizen object to that? The people of the District, at any rate, are willing to submit the question to Congress and to the States for decision. Let us have an answer to this question, an answer given in accordance with the procedures laid down in the Constitution for determining the popular will. Let us have an answer in the open, where men stand up and make known their views so that all may hear them. All the people of the District are asking now is for a day in court.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer:

REPEATING AN ANCIENT FOLLY?

Hardly had the sound of President Truman's voice died away after he had asked Congress to effectuate General Marshall's sane and pertinent recommendation for universal military training before the pacifists began crying aloud their arguments against any kind of military protection for this country.

If this outcry came mainly from a few politicians with their eyes on the next election, it could be dismissed as merely politics.

But the chief opposition is coming from educators and ministers who ought to know better: educators who have seen their campuses almost depopulated of male students and their physical equipment converted into military laboratories; and ministers who have had to console hundreds of bereaved families and have watched their young people's organizations become almost exclusively feminine.

If the catastrophic events of the last decade have not taught these pacifists the plain truth of General Marshall's observation that a display of weakness has never yet kept this Nation or any nation out of war, they are certainly incapable of learning.

The person who never learns anything by experience is the worst possible adviser on matters of public safety.

After the First World War we tried the pacifist plan of making an open exhibition of our weakness in the naive hope that this display of helplessness would persuade avaricious and predatory neighbors to let us alone.

We sank the best of our naval vessels, disbanded the greater part of our Army, let our Air Force go to pot, made no effort to keep up with technological advances in warfare, and reduced our Military Establishment to a ridiculous little constabulary drilling in outmoded tactics with antiquated and rusty equipment.

This, we innocently thought, would convince the world that we had no aggressive intentions.

It did, and what did it get us?

It got us the most agonizing war in human history.

It prolonged that war for terrible, unnecessary years while we retreated across a half a world of land and ocean, trading space for time to repair the damage done by the pacifist doctrine; and before it was over we gave up 270,000 of our sons as living sacrifices to the folly of disarmament in an armed world.

And now these pacifists would have us do it all over again.

And what arguments do they offer in support of this counsel of folly?

Only these: That universal training is against our democratic traditions, that it will interfere with the education of the young men, and that it will create a spirit of militarism among our youth.

As to the first, democracy means nothing if not that each person should do his part. Nothing could be more democratic than a requirement that all young men, without favoritism, take their regular turn at training.

The expressed attitude of many Members of Congress is that some provision will be made for the boys to keep on with their education while they are in training.

And, as to the third objection, that the training will create a spirit of militarism among our youth, if the educators who persist in mouthing this absurdity will only open their eyes, they will see their arguments discredited within their own profession.

Land-grant colleges in every State in this Union have, for nearly 50 years, required military training of their students. If such training were ever going to create the militaristic spirit among our young men, certainly a half a century has been plenty of time to engender it.

Yet you would have to look long and diligently through the alumni lists of North Carolina State College, or Clemson, or a hundred other reputable schools, both public and private, in which military training is a regular part of the curriculum, before you could find a single militarist who got that way by wearing a cadet uniform.

Mere technical study of military science never made a militarist of anybody. Militarism is a thing of the spirit and not of the mind. It is generated by indoctrination begun in kindergarten and continued relentlessly throughout the educative period of youth.

A young man who gets his first contact with military training after these impressionable years are past and he has begun to use his own mind is very poor material for militarism.

Lithuania's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD for preservation and edification of all the address by His Excellency, P. Zadeikis, Minister of Lithuania, delivered at the banquet of Americans of Lithuanian descent held at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., November 16, 1945, in support of the Kelly-Willis congressional resolutions on Lithuania's independence:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished Members of the United States Congress, ladies, and gentlemen, in connection with the introduction of the resolutions in the House of Representatives and in the Senate of the United States, which favor the restoration of Lithuania's independence and which recommend appropriate action on the part of the executive branch of the United States Government, I wish to express to Senator WILLIS, of Indiana, and Representative KELLY, of Illinois, my sincere thanks for their interest in Lithuanian affairs and for the fine spirit in which those resolutions were conceived. I also wish to thank the various Lithuanian-American organizations whose members have come here to manifest their support of the ideas embodied in the said resolutions.

However, I have no intention of discussing this evening those resolutions; instead I wish to take this opportunity to address you concerning my country's situation and her future as I see it from here.

Though Lithuania, in the course of World War II, officially remained neutral, she suffered three foreign military invasions and occupations—by Soviet Russia in 1940, by Nazi Germany in 1941, and again by Soviet Russia in 1944. Lithuania has suffered immensely at the hands of both the Russians and the Germans. However, time does not permit me to describe those monstrous persecutions and the staggering sufferings of my people. As an illustration, I wish to make reference to the recent letter of the Lithuanian Catholic bishops addressed to the bishops of the Christian world, from which I quote:

"On June 15, 1940, with false accusations as a pretext, and in violation of the treaty of mutual assistance and of all other treaties still in operation, the Soviet Government addressed an ultimatum to Lithuania. In total disregard of all its solemn promises, Russia ordered the occupation of Lithuania by a strong contingent of troops, enforced the dissolution of the country's legal government, and abrogated the sovereignty of the nation. Within only a few weeks, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had perfidiously annexed Lithuania, together with the other two Baltic republics."

The United States Government on July 23, 1940, made a significant statement, which I quote in part:

"From the day when the peoples of these republics (Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia) first gained their independent and democratic form of government the people of the United States have watched their admirable progress in self-government with deep and sympathetic interest.

"The policy of this Government is universally known. The people of the United States are opposed * * * to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak.

"The United States will continue to stand by these principles."

The above statement was made in connection with "the devious processes whereunder the political independence and territorial integrity of the three small Baltic republics—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—were to be deliberately annihilated by one of their more powerful neighbors." It was a clear warning to the Soviet Union to avoid unilateral and arbitrary acts and to leave the independence of the Baltic States alone. However, the Moscow dictatorship, with Hitler's concurrence, thought otherwise and the illegal acts of the annexation, based on fraudulent elections which were conducted in an atmosphere of threat and compulsion, followed on August 3, 5, and 6, 1940. The Lithuanian people would be relieved and Russia would gain much in a moral sense if the acts of the annexation of the Baltic States were made void by supreme Soviet authority now, in accordance with the requirements of the Atlantic Charter. I again quote from the Lithuanian bishops' letter: "Although the first Soviet occupation did not last long (June 15, 1940–June 22, 1941), it was quite sufficient to dislocate the life of our people and to ruin our religious, cultural, economic, and political life. This evil year of terror, a year of tragedy and bloodshed, will be forever remembered for its toll of human lives."

The methodical extermination of the Baltic peoples, premeditated by the U. S. S. R., was in full swing when on June 22, 1941, the German armies pounced on the Russian armies through the Lithuanian and the Polish borders. Three years of German occupation of Lithuania followed. Because of the stubborn resistance of the Lithuanian people to the Nazi rule, Lithuania was treated worse than an enemy country and suffered greatly; about 150,000 Lithuanian citizens were forcibly deported to Germany as slave laborers; hundreds of Lithuanian intellectuals were tortured and put to death in Gestapo prisons and concentration camps of Stutthof, Dachau, Buechenwald, and others.

In 1944, the Russians, greatly aided by American-made instruments of war and by the establishment of the so-called second front in western Europe, reappeared in Lith-

uania again. Panic fear of a second Soviet occupation caused nearly 300,000 Lithuanians to leave their homeland. The Lithuanian people, of course, could not acquiesce in such a state of affairs. They did not accept the German enslavement and they will not accept intolerable Russian domination. The Lithuanian people with all means at their disposal are resisting all attempts to deprive them permanently of sovereignty rights, of self-government, and of independence. The Lithuanian people, though they possess the rights of sovereignty in the sense of law and of justice, in fact are now deprived of their independence, temporarily at least, by their "more powerful neighbor," the present "liberator."

Because of the Soviet and the Nazi occupations, Lithuania was prevented from joining the United Nations in the beginning of this war which has now ended. The Lithuanian nation deeply resents the continued attempts of Soviet diplomacy to sell to the western powers the idea that the destruction of the independence of the Baltic states (coupled with the violation of valid treaties) is a prerequisite to Russia's security.

The Lithuanians believe in the soundness of American policy, so forcefully restated by President Truman, and they see in it a new encouragement in their crucial efforts to regain their extorted freedom. America refuses to deal with puppets: "We shall refuse to recognize any government imposed upon any nation by the force of any foreign power," stated the President. Lithuania's case nevertheless appears to be an extraordinary exigency, especially when Soviet policy (as evidenced by Soviet Foreign Commissar Molotov's recent speech of November 7, 1945) continues to be that of imperialistic aggrandizement at the expense of her smaller neighbors, a policy characterized by brutal persecutions of democratic and patriotic elements, by mass deportations, and property expropriations.

As stated by the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State, in his speech of October 31, 1945, "The position of the United States will continue to be that the nations, large and small, which have borne the burdens of the war must participate in making the peace," and that "the world system which we seek to create must be based on the principle of the sovereign equality of nations." Lithuanians, therefore, hope for a strong helping hand from the United Nations, and they believe that the lofty principles of American policy will be applied universally and straightforwardly.

The Lithuanian people, who have suffered so greatly under the German and Russian occupations, are looking forward to real liberation of their country and to the establishment of a democratic government of their own choosing, and they confidently expect:

1. That Lithuanian citizens everywhere be now treated as nationals of one of the United Nations and that Lithuania be admitted into the family of the United Nations.

2. That Lithuanian organizations, forced to reside abroad, be accorded a greater degree of recognition and liberty of action.

3. That Lithuania be given an opportunity to participate officially in the peace conference.

4. That the Soviet military forces and the Soviet administration in occupied Lithuania be replaced with international control and with a legitimate Lithuanian administration so that free and democratic, and not regimented, elections may take place there.

In conclusion may I express the conviction that the military might of the United States, dedicated to self-defense and to world peace, and that the foreign policy of the United States, designed to promote good will among nations and to serve justice, freedom, and peace will bring desirable results before long and will help to adjust the exigencies of this uncertain world. As for the future of Lithuania, let there be no doubt that the Lithuanian people resolutely repudiate the present totalitarian puppet regime, imposed upon them by the Moscow dictatorship, and that they demand the restoration of their independence for which they will continue to fight until that goal is realized.

History Lesson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Washington Post of Monday, November 12, ably points out that we learn little from past experience. Too rapid removal of governmental controls took place after World War I with disastrous results, as the editorial so appropriately points out. I commend the editorial in question to the Members of the House as grounds for sober reflection. It reads as follows:

HISTORY LESSON

The more it changes, the more it remains the same thing. The present pattern of off-again, on-again controls, for instance, repeats the pattern after the last war. The businessmen of that period, like their present-day successors were sick and tired of Government interference and wanted to be freed from hampering restrictions. A clamor arose for a return to the system of free competition on the ground that, if left alone, industry would work out its own salvation. There was more excuse then than now for underrating the difficulties of the transition period and discounting the need for Government guidance, since we had had no experience in dealing with economic problems of the magnitude that confronted us. Moreover, our direct participation in the First World War lasted a very short time and did not produce the distortions in our economy to which the present war has given rise. Nevertheless, we had cause to regret bitterly the precipitancy with which the Nation tried to effect a return to so-called normal practices.

The hard lessons that were taught, but unfortunately not learned, at that time have been pointed out in a very instructive study of the Bureau of Labor Statistics dealing with postarmistice industrial developments in 1918–20. The study was published in January 1943; so conclusions have not been colored by the events of recent months. That makes all the more arresting the striking similarities between the disorders that followed the armistice of 1918, and those that have followed the collapse of Japan in 1945. Strikes for higher wages held up production and in the needle trade there was agitation for the "44–54 program"—that is, for a 44-hour week with wages for 54 hours. The similarity to current demands of CIO automobile workers is obvious. Congress, too, acted true to form by making the United States Employment Service the target of ill-directed economies. Its appropriations were so slashed after World War I as to reduce it to impotency. Congress likewise compelled the premature dissolution of the War Labor Board and attempts at price control by war agencies were discontinued after the armistice, industries being left to work out their price problems as best they could. The Government tried with little success to support voluntary stabilization agreements.

As most of us know, the result of this hands-off policy was at first a period of hesitation, retarding recovery and resulting in a rather pronounced temporary depression. That was followed by an unbalanced speculative upturn, bringing with it inflationary advances in wholesale and retail prices, and necessitating reimposition of controls. State fair-price committees were set up and legislation against profiteering and hoarding was passed. The President even asked Congress to continue and broaden the food control powers which had been dropped, and made abortive efforts to set up an industrial conference for labor relations to take the place of the defunct War Labor Board. The threat of a coal strike led to revival of the Fuel Administration, while the Secretary of the Treasury, reversing his earlier stand, urged resumption of aid to Europe.

By that time, however, it was too late to avert catastrophe. The period of inflation ended abruptly with a smashing drop in prices, to the accompaniment of industrial stagnation, severe declines in farm income and spreading unemployment. We pulled out of the depression of 1921 with surprising rapidity, considering the drastic readjustments that had to be effected. Nevertheless, the Nation experienced several years of turmoil that would have been made less tempestuous, or might even have been years of comparative stability, had the transition from war to peace been less abrupt. The lesson drawn from our own recent history is too obvious to call for elucidation. Equally obvious is the fact that we have learned little from past experience.

Can the Tiger Lick the Shark?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, this concise editorial from the Washington Times-Herald clearly expresses the opinion of many clear-thinking Americans:

CAN THE TIGER LICK THE SHARK?

The shark and the tiger are both elegant fighters, but not against each other. That is because they can't get at each other.

We are speaking, of course, of the United States and Russia. The United States in this simile is the shark; being just now the world's greatest sea and air power; and Russia, as the world's greatest land power, is the tiger.

A war between these two nations, we have long believed, would be madness, and it would be ridiculous. The Russians could not invade us successfully, so long as we maintained our sea and air superiority. They could not even hold the Kurile Islands, which they grabbed in the last hours of the Japanese war, if we wanted to take the Kuriles from them. On the other hand, we don't suppose there is a man in this country who would like to see American land armies try to get to Moscow to spend a winter. That has been tried by experts and it doesn't work.

OLD DIPLOMACY, NEW DIPLOMACY

Since the German war ended, however, and more especially since the Jap war ended, a lot of high-octane diplomatic talk has been sparking back and forth between Moscow and Washington. There has been so much of it

that many people fear a United States-Russian war is being cooked up behind the scenes.

Most of this provocative chatter has come from Moscow. The old czarist diplomats were smooth, suave fellows, who threw delightful parties, and who got results. A historical atlas will show you Russia getting bigger and bigger from century to century. The new proletarian Russian diplomatic technique is to climb aboard a microphone, throw the word "fascism" around at random and without regard to its true meaning, and make extreme, irritating demands.

At the moment, for example, the Russian Government is demanding a veto power over MacArthur in Japan. It is hinting through its press megaphone, the publication Red Star, that it wants a share in control of Iwo Jima, Saipan, Tinian, Guam, and other Pacific bases which our men took so bloodily from the Japs, because Russia "can't feel at ease with exclusively United States controlled islands on its Pacific flank."

Both of these demands are ridiculous. Russia had no part in beating Japan; we did that job almost single-handed. And Russia will always have somebody on its flanks, unless it extends all around the world.

Our answer to both of these demands should be and go on being a flat "No"—delivered in tones as brusque as Russia's spokesmen use.

Presumably both demands are being put forward as makeweights, so that by eventually dropping them Russia will seem to have made a generous concession, and then can advance some lesser demands.

Russia also has been filing urgent claims to the secrets of atomic bomb manufacture held by the United States, Great Britain, and Canada.

President Truman and Prime Ministers Attlee and King have now put their heads together and come up with a 1,000-word statement, couched in tactful and polite language, but boiling down to the one word "No." We are not releasing these secrets, to Russia or anybody else. We are holding on to them until they are bribed or stolen from under our guardianship, or until we are satisfied that the rest of the world can be trusted with them.

This is the correct answer.

THE CORRECT ANSWER ON THE ATOM BOMB

Russia, of course, will scream bloody murder about it. Its followers in this country, who love Russia first and the United States a long way second, are already tuning up a series of yells that Truman, Attlee, and King have betrayed humanity, set the stage for World War III, etc.

We can't see it. Russia knows that we do not dream of dropping any atom bombs on Russia, or of starting a war with Russia. We know we couldn't fight a victorious land war in Russia, even if Russia had anything we wanted, which it hasn't. Russia knows it could not make an invasion of the United States stick as long as we remain the world's greatest sea and air power.

While that state of affairs prevails—while the shark and the tiger continue to realize that a knock-down and drag-out fight is not for them—the world should remain free of major wars, which is what everybody is praying for. Unbreakable world peace can be won and maintained only if some one nation conquers and rules the whole world, as ancient Rome conquered and ruled the then known world. But it is highly improbable that either Russia or the United States is going to do that.

An arm's-length peace between these two giant nations is the next best bet. We can have that if we will, and for a long time. The way to preserve that peace is to remain strong, and to turn down all extreme Russian demands with the good old blunt and unmistakable word "no."

Speed Up Return of Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the young man who sent me the following clippings air mail headed it "No boats, no votes." I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that there has been some unnecessary delay in getting the men back from the several theaters of war.

The Army testified before a Senate committee last week that by December 1 they would have either discharged or have eligible for discharge about 5,000,000 men since VE-day. They also said that there would be about 1,483,000 men who would be eligible for discharge but still in the service. In other words, we would have approximately 5,000,000 men in the Army December 1 which does not include all the men taken in through inductions since VE-day nor does it include the voluntary enlistments. It is estimated that approximately 450,000 men have been taken into the Army, either through inductions or enlistments since VE-day. This latter figure has been rather hard to verify. In any event, it would seem that the Army would still have 5,500,000 men under arms at Christmas time unless something is done to speed up demobilization. The clippings from the Pacific Mail Bag follow:

WHAT TO DO

EDITOR: The GI wants to get home. As usual, he is doing everything he can to support an avowed program. He is willing to give his free time to convert Liberty ships into troop transports. But he doesn't quite understand the reason for the shipping shortage. He wonders why the powers that be are suddenly interested in his comfort in the matter of transportation. Things appear a bit confusing.

But the GI is using .30 caliber ammunition where he should, and can, use 155 mm.

The War Department and GHQ in this theater will get the GI home only when and if they are forced into doing so. Converting half a dozen Liberty ships or writing to the Pacifican won't do the job. Quit playing with the office boys and go to the boss. That boss is Congress. Tell the Member of Congress that if he wants to keep his job he'd better "Get these troops out of the sun." The GI can't tell the War Department what to do; he can tell Congress.

The war is over. The American soldier, thank God, is going to do the telling instead of the listening. Have your families and your friends keep the "heat" on Congress. Tell your Representative and your Senator that his continued tenure of office depends on how fast you get home. Tell him today, tell him tomorrow, keep telling him. You may not like him, but he certainly likes your vote. Turn on the heat where it counts.

For results use the club, not faith or hope.

HENRY H. BUCKMAN III,
APO 75.

HOME

EDITOR: The authorities tell us that the Jap PW's are being sent to their homeland to alleviate the shipping and manpower shortages in the Phillippines. But in contradiction to this they tell us that the same type of ship which brings in food and clothes to those PW's cannot be used as transports. As for the statement that when there are no longer any PW's here the guards can be sent home, I suggest that all PW camps be turned over to the Filipino Army. This should be done until all eligible Army men are shipped home. When the shipping situation is normal again is time enough to send Japs home. Until then I see no reason why Jap as well as American transports should not be used exclusively for the transportation home of the American servicemen.

Name withheld.

The Law of Supply and Demand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I want to call to your attention the rules and regulations prescribed by the Office of Price Administration that are actually driving butter away from the American dinner table. The following information has been received from the Challenge Cream and Butter Association of California:

In October 1942, the first month after the start of price control, the Challenge Cream and Butter Association received from 35 member and associated creameries, 3,159,225 pounds of butter. In October 1945, the association received from 14 member and associated creameries only 1,568,204 pounds of butter. Also, in October 1942, they were able to purchase 416,635 pounds of butter from the Central West. All such sources dried up as far as the association was concerned, soon after price control was inaugurated, because butter price ceilings applicable to the Pacific coast do not justify shipment of butter from the large sources of supply in the Central West to the Pacific coast, unless under the black market.

This downward trend is becoming progressively steeper, so that the Challenge Cream and Butter Association may lose practically all of its supply within a short time, unless there is a change in conditions. All of the larger creameries now supplying the association are considering making plastic cream. The situation would not be so serious for consumers were it not that other receivers of butter in this area appear to have suffered the loss of an even greater proportion of their butter supply than the association has.

You may wonder what has become of all the butter. A small part has been diverted into market milk. By far the greater part has gone into manufactured products which were favored with much higher price ceilings. Among these are evaporated milk, dried whole milk, dried ice-cream mix, cheese, and plastic cream. If it were necessary to penalize the churning of cream to win the war, that is one thing. To continue to penalize butter in time of peace is quite another

thing. The Challenge Cream and Butter Association asks that the ceiling prices on butter be raised at once to levels competitive with those for all other manufactured dairy products. Objection may be made to permitting butter prices to advance until in line with other manufactured products, that this would tend to increase the cost of living. How will the cost of living be benefited by pricing butter so low as to drive it out of existence?

In closing, here is a statement on the law of supply and demand, and also a resolution passed by the forty-sixth annual meeting of the California Creamery Operators Association:

THE LAW OF SUPPLY AND DEMAND

At the outset of the war, the balance which normally existed between prices for various dairy products was destroyed. Under price control, butter has been at the bottom of the list of edible dairy products. If this was necessary to hasten the days of peace, well and good. But there is no justice in such continuance now. As to that minor part of our butter supply which moved into market milk we have no complaint. But we submit that fine butter and the products of skim milk are just as necessary and wholesome in the human diet as if converted into those products favored in OPA price ceilings. Sweet cream is being trucked for upwards of 1,000 miles into California and plastic cream, almost identical in composition with unsalted butter, and really not so well suited for the same purposes, is freighted in frozen state all over our country without hindrance of OPA price, or ration restraint.

California's former butter industry of 70,000,000 pounds annually has been priced out of existence. Other Western States are rapidly following. Regional price ceilings prevent the import of any large amounts of butter from the Central West except under the black market. Therefore, in view of the foregoing, we offer the following resolution:

"Whereas present OPA price ceilings are depriving consumers on the Pacific coast of their accustomed supplies of butter; and

"Whereas many consumers are able and willing to pay for butter what it costs to produce it in comparison with other dairy products and prefer to do so rather than to enjoy prices below cost of production with attendant scarcity: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That in the event OPA will not immediately restore the law of supply and demand for all dairy products, that it at least act at once in relief of the butter industry; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary be hereby authorized and directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to President Truman and to the Honorable Chester Bowles, Administrator of Price Administration, and to Hon. Clinton Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture."

NOVEMBER 12, 1945.

To an Athlete Dying Young

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most outstanding sermon which was delivered by the Reverend Allen Pendergraft, of Buffalo, N. Y., on November 4, 1945. I consider it to be a remarkable address, very timely and very appropriate at this particular period.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are in the octave of all saints for the first time since the conclusion of the most deadly war in history. It is fitting that we should pause to remember the mortal sacrifices made during the last 6 years, especially fitting because we profit from those grim oblations on the altar of the world's sin. For a text, I have taken the following:

"The race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong; but time and chance happeneth to them all." (Ecclesiastes 9: 11.)

Thus spoke Koheleth the preacher in the Book of Ecclesiastes: "The race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong; but time and chance happeneth to them all." He seems to mean that those most fit for survival are the ones who go down to death first. It's another way of saying, "Those whom the gods love, die young." You see the truth of this observation in the death of our strongest men during the recent war. Millions of the finest and bravest of men in the world died. Included are some of the world's strongest leaders. Doubtless it was the pressure of the war that took from us Dr. Temple, perhaps the greatest Archbishop of Canterbury since the Reformation; it was the strain of the war that shortened the lives of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Wendell Willkie, two of the most gifted public leaders our country has produced in a long while. More important than these, was the grievous loss of millions of the finest young men of the world, the potential leaders of the future. What better government, what uplifting religion and poetry and philosophy, what great literature and beautiful music has been lost to the world through their death cannot be estimated.

First, let us pause to pay tribute to the memory of Dr. Temple, a fellow churchman. On the occasion of his enthronement as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1942, Time magazine observed a fact recognized throughout the world that "he was the nearest to an acknowledged leader that world-wide Protestantism has had since the Reformation." He was not only a great religious leader; he was also a great social leader; he outdid even Beveridge in his crusade for the little man's world order. During the two short years he was in office he performed a feat of prestidigitation unequaled in the history of English-speaking people. He translated an office of elevated austerity into a vital agency for one man's crusade on the side of the little man against two ogres: Money and profit. He exemplified better than any other man in England the ideal of St. Paul to be all things unto all men.

Second, let us recall to mind another fellow churchman of great vision who also was undoubtedly a war casualty—Wendell Willkie. In contrast to Dr. Temple, carefully groomed for his responsibilities, Mr. Willkie was an amateur in his field, politics. He stepped straight from a lawyer's office in lower Manhattan to a position of international influence, and for the rest of his foreshortened life, he remained a power for good opinions. He came to the front at a critical time and his message was tremendous: The message of human freedom. In the souring political atmosphere of the early 40's, he was like a breath of fresh air, even to his opponents. Here was an honest businessman who was not ashamed of his profession, who had a clear and progressive set of beliefs, and who did not consult a public-relations expert before uttering them. He wrote an electric declaration beginning with these words "We the people, we say to you, give up this vested interest that you have in depression, open your eyes to the future, help us to build a New World." His nomination to the Presidency gave millions a sense of release, no matter what their party. It was proof that America is not a racket, that courage and honesty and freedom are still great forces in the world. He asked us to lift up our eyes unto the hills ahead—the greater heights to which we can reasonably aspire. Sometimes the people respond to a man of vision. But whether they respond or not, to keep the vision unremittingly before the people is the final task of greatness.

Third, think with me for a moment on the loss of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Leaving politics aside and looking at him as an historical figure and a fellow churchman, we can agree, I think, that he was a political genius. The fact by itself that he was elected to four terms in the White House is enough to command respect. Much of his genius was wrapped up in two great qualities: First, he knew what the common man needed, what the hopes and dreams of the voiceless masses are; and he did his earnest best to help the underprivileged groups in this country, such as the Negroes, and he did it in a time of deepest need, during the dry agony of a cruel depression and later during a catastrophic war. Second, he carried an inherent authority when he tackled a problem, because of the personal handicap he himself bore like a cross. For he was a cripple. Most men with a private income would have given up and retired when they found themselves bedridden and half-paralyzed. But he was a game fighter, a human being with superb courage who did what he did not have to do, who took pain he did not have to take, to try to help his country. How far he succeeded only the distant result will tell. Whatever we may think of his political choices, our hats must be off to his kind of personal courage.

Other world leaders have been war casualties, but the loss of these three churchmen—Temple, Willkie, and Roosevelt—stand out. All of them died young, in the sense that they had not finished their work. They were young in their political and religious points of view, young in hope, young in the way they lived for the love of people. They rejoiced as strong men to run a race. But time and chance took them before their race was finished. Let us pay each the tribute that belongs to an athlete dying young.

Finally, and most important of all, it is fitting that we should remember all the young athletes who died in the struggle for a better world but who, because of their countless number, their obscurity, their youth, are nameless to the world. We think especially of the nine who went forth from this parish never to return. God help us if we forget them. They knew brief moments of triumph in school, among their friends, in jobs landed and begun in the business world, in positions demanding courage with the armed forces all over the globe. They died suddenly at Tarawa, at Monte Cassino, at Leyte, in Germany. And you and I are the benefactors, whether we face it or not, of their helpless sacrifice. They gave us, on a purple pall, another chance—perhaps our last chance—to build a better world, to live up to the will of God for the kingdoms of this earth.

They rejoiced as strong men to run a straight race. They died in the innocent faith of youth that we who remain would win that race, time and chance permitting. We owe each of them the loving oblation that belongs to an athlete dying young.

Over the gate of the American cemetery on Tarawa have been inscribed the verses of the English poet, A. E. Housman, written "To an

Athlete Dying Young." Housman puts it this way:

"The time you won your town the race
We bore you through the market place;
Man and boy stood cheering by,
And home we brought you shoulder high.

"Smart lad, to slip betimes away
From fields where glory does not stay.

"Now you'll not live to swell the rout
Of lads who wore their honors out,
Runners whom renoun outran,
And the name died before the man.

"But round your early-laureled head
Will flock to gaze the strengthless dead
And find unwithered on its curls
A garland briefer than a girl's."

I cannot say anything to comfort the world which has not already been said. I only know what all can see, that too often the race is not to the swift nor the battle to the strong, but that time and chance happeneth to them all. We know, too, that there are worse things than dying young. It is worse to live longer than your reputation.

We also know this profound fact. Their sacrifice puts us under bond. For each of us now owes to each of them a sacred duty—the solemn responsibility to try to finish the race which they began. We have much to do. We dare not fail to do it. What are you going to do about it yourself?

Wherefore, seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith.

Limitation Upon Length of Term of the President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress in opposition to resolutions limiting the terms of the office of President:

I oppose any attempt to place a limitation upon the length of service of the President of the United States. The tenure of office of the Chief Executive of the Nation has been established by the Constitution, the highest law of the land. Expressions of restriction by congressional resolution, inconsistent with constitutional provisions relating to the office of president, are futile. Constitutional lawyers know that a limitation upon the number of terms the Chief Executive of this Nation may serve must be set forth in the Constitution. Therefore, the delimiting of the office of President to two consecutive terms, other than by the expressed will of the people, must be by a constitutional amendment.

It is my purpose to discuss resolutions dealing with a constitutional amendment relating to the limitation upon the term of office of the President of the United States on the merits, and not from a political angle. The question of the length of service of the Chief Magistrate has been debated since the inception of these United States. I think it can be safely said that the age-worn controversy flared anew in the last decade as a result of the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt as President not only for three but for four consecutive terms of office. It is highly significant, however, that neither platform of either of the major political parties in this country mentioned this problem. Neither the Democratic nor the Republican Party advised the people of the United States that it was intended to impose limitation upon the term of the Chief Magistrate of this Nation. Congress has not, therefore, been mandated by the people to take any such action as is proposed by the resolutions under consideration. Any action taken by this committee which would favor a restriction or term of service would be but the consensus of personal opinions of voting members uninstructed in fact by the American people who, at the last two Presidential elections, decided against such limitation. The political campaign of 1940 and 1944 were replete with reference to the time-honored custom against a third term. Legal argument was advanced, specters of dictatorship were raised, and prognostications of the dire consequences to follow filled periodicals, press, and the air waves. The American people gave their answer.

I believe in the intelligence of the American electors. I trust the integrity of the American citizen. The hope of our republican form of government lies in our freedom of choice to elect our Chief Executive in accordance with the right given by the Constitution of the United States, untrammeled by any statutory-attempted limitation upon free elections which would deprive the American voter of his right to choose his President.

The Constitution of the United States in article II, section 1, paragraph 1, states: "The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America." This article was amended in 1803 by the twelfth amendment of the Constitution which provides that the qualifications of Vice President should be the same as those for a President. The constitutional provision, which states that the President shall hold his office during the term of 4 years, was not adopted by the Constitutional Convention in 1787 without thought. It was adopted after a lengthy debate in committee which considered numerous resolutions providing for various methods of election, various terms of office and the question of reeligibility of a President who had once been elected. From 1800 to the present date, various resolutions recommending constitutional amendments for a third term have been considered by Congress. In 1803 a resolution, that no person who had been successfully elected President shall be eligible as President until 4 years elapse, when he may be eligible for 4 years and no longer, was rejected in the Senate by a vote of 4 to 25. In 1804, when the twelfth amendment provided for a separate election of the President and Vice President was ratified and adopted, no attempt was made to provide for limitation of reeligibility of the President. In 1824, the Senate proposed a joint resolution that no man should be chosen President for more than two terms, but no action was taken on this resolution in the House. In 1826, a great many joint resolutions, recommending amendment to the Constitution on the method of election of the President and the Presidential term, were introduced. One of these resolutions, recommending a limit of terms for the President, passed the Senate, but nothing was done in the House. In 1826, Andrew Jackson, in this annual message, recommended the abolition of the electoral college of the President by direct vote and the limitation of the term of service of the President to a single term of either 4 or 6 years. This recommendation was repeated by him in his second annual message to Congress. During his administration 21 joint resolutions on this subject were introduced in Congress but none of them was acted upon.

In 1836, during Van Buren's administration, 10 joint resolutions were presented in Congress and no action was taken. In 1865, Johnson suggested a single term for President following the assassination of Lincoln, and during his administration 12 joint resolutions, recommending single Presidential terms, were introduced in Congress, but no action was taken upon them. In 1872, following the nomination of Grant, agitation demanded that the best interests of the Government imperatively required that no President shall be a candidate for reelection. In 1875, Grant stated that the Constitution did not restrict the Presidential term to two terms, and that under certain circumstances it might be unfortunate to make a change at the end of 8 years. On December 15, 1875, on a resolution introduced by William M. Springer, of Illinois, the House adopted, without a debate, "that, in the opinion of the House, the precedent established by Washington and other Presidents of the United States in retiring from the Presidential office after their second term has become, by universal concurrence, a part of our republican system of government, and that any departure from this time-honored custom would be unwise, unpatriotic, and fraught with peril to our free institutions." In 1876, President Hayes recommended an amendment to the Constitution limiting the President to a single term of 6 years. In 1877, Representative Springer offered another resolution embodying President Hayes' recommendation as to a single term, but no action was taken. In 1884, Grover Cleveland, in accepting the nomination as President, pointed to alleged dangers in the eligibility of a President for reelection, but, however, in 1888 was renominated and defeated but reelected in 1892, during which period 13 amendments were introduced in Congress to limit the Presidential term in various ways. In 1894, William Jennings Bryan proposed three single-term amendments, one making a President ineligible to succeed himself. In 1896, the Democratic platform contained a plank that no man should be eligible for a third term.

Theodore Roosevelt, after his election in 1904, stated that under no circumstances would he be candidate or accept another nomination, and yet in 1912 stated that he would accept the nomination if tendered. On June 13, 1912, the House Committee on the Judiciary submitted a favorable report on a resolution proposing a constitutional amendment limiting the President to a single 6-year term. No further action was taken on this resolution. During the period 21 amendments were introduced in Congress proposing a limitation on Presidential terms without congressional action. In February 1913 the Senate passed a joint resolution providing for a constitutional amendment limiting the President to a single 6-year term, but no action was taken on the resolution in the House. In February 1927 Representative Beck, of Wisconsin, Republican, introduced practically the same resolution as the Springer resolution of 1875, suggesting a constitutional amendment against the third term. Representative Fairchild, of New York, Republican, on February 21, 1927, offered a constitutional amendment limiting the term of office of the President. On February 22, 1927, Senator LA FOLLETTE introduced a corresponding resolution in the Senate. No action was taken on any of these resolutions in the Sixty-ninth Congress. In 1928, the La Follette resolution was reintroduced, amended, and passed by the Senate on February 10, 1928. No action was taken by the House thereon. This was the last consideration in Congress of the third-term question before it arose in connection with Franklin D. Roosevelt's plans for a third term.

At least 150 resolutions have been introduced in Congress to limit the Chief Executive's tenure in one way or another. Never has there been concurrent action upon any of these resolutions by both sides of the Capitol. Many statesmen, who have seriously pronounced that the term of office of the President should be limited, have failed to practice their preachments. Andrew Jackson, in spite of his constant effort through messages to Congress recommending a one-term limit, accepted a second term. Cleveland was favorably inclined toward a third-term invitation. Theodore Roosevelt accepted a third-term nomination. George W. Norris, who opposed the third term until late in life, supported Franklin D. Roosevelt for his third term. Thus many of our statesmen have, at one time or another, been both for and against the limitation of the Presidential term of office. The entire history of Congress, since the ratification and adoption of the Constitution of the United States, has been against any interference by Congress with the right of the American people to elect the President.

There is apparently a prevailing but mistaken belief that opposition to three or more consecutive terms as President originated with George Washington. Historians agree, however, that Washington declined a third term for purely personal reasons. The historian, McMaster, wrote concerning Washington's retirement, "No scruples about the third term troubled him in the least. He went back to private life solely because he was tired of the Presidency and because the state of the country did not demand a further sacrifice of his comfort." George Washington himself on April 28, 1788, wrote to the Marquis de Lafayette:

"Guarded so effectually as the proposed Constitution is, in respect to the prevention of bribery and undue influence in the choice of President, I confess I differ widely myself from Mr. Jefferson and you, as to the necessity of expedience of rotation in that appointment. The matter was fairly discussed in the Convention, and to my full conviction, though I cannot have time or room to sum up the argument in this letter. There cannot in my judgment be the least danger, that the President will by any practicable intrigue ever be able to continue himself one moment in office, much less perpetuate himself in it, but in the last stage of corrupted morals and political depravity; and even then, there is as much danger that any other species of domination would prevail. Though when a people shall have become incapable of government themselves, and fit for a master, it is of little consequence from what quarter he comes. Under an extended view of this part of the subject, I can see no propriety in precluding ourselves from the service of any man, who on some great emergency shall be deemed universally most capable of serving the public."

Thomas Jefferson was the first to express an objection to a third consecutive term on principle, but even he, in writing to his friend, Colonel Taylor, of Virginia, under date of January 6, 1805, stated:

"My opinion originally was that the President of the United States should have been elected for 7 years, and forever ineligible afterwards. I have since become sensible that even 7 years is too long to be irremovable, and that there should be a peaceable way of withdrawing a man in midway who is doing wrong. The service for 8 years, with a power to remove at the end of the first 4, comes nearly to my principle as corrected by experience; and it is in adherence to that that I determine to withdraw at the end of my second term. The danger is that the indulgence and attachments of the people will keep a man in the chair after he becomes a dotard, that reelection through life shall become habitual, and election for life follow that. General Washington set the example of voluntary retirement after 8 years. I shall follow it. And a few more precedents will oppose the obstacle of habit to anyone after awhile who shall endeavor to extend his term. Perhaps it may beget a disposition to establish it by an amendment to the Constitution. I believe I am doing right, therefore, in pursuing my principle. I had determined to declare my intention, but I have consented to be silent on the opinion of friends, who think it best not to put a continuance out of my power in defiance of all circumstances. There is, however, but one circumstance which could engage my acquiescence in another election; to wit, such a division about a successor as might bring in a monarchist. But that circumstance is impossible."

In other words, Jefferson, according to his own statements, would have run for a third consecutive term in order to prevent the election of a person whose views or principles Jefferson believed prejudicial to the interest of the country. Such a Jeffersonian attitude does not support the contention that Jefferson was unequivocally opposed to a third term.

General Grant went to the Republican Convention in Chicago on June 2, 1880, with more votes than any other single candidate. He was defeated for nomination on the thirty-sixth ballot, but the third term issue was not the cause of his failure to win the nomination. The historical and constitutional background of the third term tradition does not support the argument advanced by the proponents of the resolutions under consideration that the retirement from Presidential office after a second term was prior to 1936, and is now a part of our republican system of government.

The argument principally advanced in favor of the placement of limitation upon the number of terms a President of our Nation may serve is that continuity of leadership under one Chief Executive for more than 8 years means the sacrifice of freedom of political action and democracy. There is no substance of this assertion of the proponents of restriction upon freedom of voting choice. In the early days of our national existence. advocates of limitation cried, "Beware of a monarchy, beware of caesarism." Today the same cry has been raised in different words. "Beware of dictatorship." We are warned against absolutism in government. We are told that long tenure in the office of the President leads to totalitarianism. We are threatened that a dictatorship would result. The best answer comes from our recent national experience. The United States of America has had a President for three successive terms of office. More than that, he was elected for a fourth term only to fall in the performance of his duty as our Commander in Chief in war. America did not become Fascist. America has not become nazified. America suffers not from absolutism in government. It did not become totalitarian. The people of this Nation today enjoy more freedom than any other people in the world. They enjoy their lives free from those restrictions upon thought and action which have, from the beginning of time, led only to unholy dictatorships. They have been led to know that freedom from fear, freedom from want, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion are the bulwark and cornerstone of happiness in the democratic way of life.

Do these "four freedoms" proclaimed by a President, who magnificently led America through three consecutive terms of office, during which our national ship of state was threatened by storms and crises and from east and west sound in monarchy or totalitarianism. There will be no dictatorship in this country as long as America has freedom of religion, a free press, freedom of speech, and freedom of elections. But the American people must remain free to choose their Chief Executive without restriction apart from the Constitution. They have a right to resent, and will resent, any attempt to interfere with their constitutional right to vote for the man of their choice for the office of President. Any congressional attempt to impose the will of Congress upon the voters of America in a manner contrary to, or inconsistent with, present constitutional provisions for and guaranties of freedom of election for President will be met with justifiable protest against unjustifiable paternalism in government. I am of the firm conviction that the will of our citizens should not be denied opportunity of free choice in national elections until the people of this Nation unqualifiedly state, through the orderly process of government, their belief that our present constitutional provisions for the election of President are outmoded.

The failure of any President save one to run for a third term had been, prior to 1936, a custom of American politics. There is, however, a wide chasm between custom and restrictive legislation. The custom which existed prior to 1936 only became a custom by virtue of the will of the American voters. History does not portray any picture of any American being defeated for the office of President merely because he was a third term candidate. This statement merely followed the reasoning of other Presidents who had preceded Grant. Whatever the custom prior to 1936 relative to a third term, the tradition, if such it was, has now been broken by the voters of this country. If voters desire to return to such custom or tradition, they should be allowed to do so of their own will without the compelling force of legislation, which at this time they neither seek nor demand.

The third term issue in 1940 in reality revolved around the personality of the candidate for the third term. The best evidence of this truism lies in the campaign utterances of his opponent who attacked, not the Democratic Party, but its leaders. Roosevelt was laughed at as the indispensable man and jeered as the tired old man. An examination of history will show that each time the third-term issue has raised its head, the cause of controversy lay in the character and personality of the President who would, if a candidate, have been a third-term candidate. The people of America, without the aid of legislation, can be relied upon to analyze and choose the personality and character they desire for the office of Chief Executive.

The supreme power of government in the United States lies in the governed. The whole body of the American people control our national elections. Today, due to radio, airplane, and press, the voters of this country are better informed than ever in the history of the Nation. They will not be beguiled into false ideologies. The specter of usurpation of absolute power wielded by one man over a hundred-and-thirty-odd million people who are protected by constitutional guaranties is but the created image of selfish interests.

The experience of this Nation under a President who served three successive terms of office and was elected for a fourth term proves conclusively that the supposed evils lurking in the third-term custom have been considerably overestimated. The principal objection that the President, through extended service can perpetuate himself in office by political patronage is a mythical phantom under present-day conditions. The power of the voter, appreciative of not only domestic but international problems, completely controls the means to prevent such perpetuation in office. The present constitutional provision allows the people to send back to private life, at the end of every 4 years, any President who does not meet the American ideal of a Chief Executive, and I

recall in 1940 the fallacious argument that if Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected that it would be the last election in the United States.

The American people have taken full advantage of this provision when we consider that only 8 Presidents out of 33 have completed two full terms of office, and 5 of these held office before the Civil War. Political dynasties through patronage are more apt to be born when a President is limited to a given term, or series of terms, rather than under conditions wherein his term of office is entirely dependent upon the free vote of a free people. It can be truly stated that a President, knowing that his time is short and defined as to limit, would more likely feel the power of his office and for reasons of expedience or opportunism, looking to the time when he must return to private life, resort to theories and practices far removed from considerations of the public good or national weal. A limitation of the term of office of President would make for independence of action in the same magnitude and degree as would a life term. The pressure of public opinion is helpful and needed by our Chief Executive as he molds the course of our Nation. Public opinion is at once corrective and advisory. Limit the term of office of President and public opinion might well lead to the attitude of the person and party in power, "The public be damned." The seeds of social revolution might then grow into the red flower of communism.

Some of the resolutions before this committee call for a constitutional amendment limiting the term of office of President to a single term of 6 years. The same arguments advanced to limit the tenure of two successive terms apply with equal vigor to such a proposal. As has well be pointed out during the century-old debate on these proposals, 6 years is too long to ask the people to wait to recall a bad, though unimpeachable, President. Public policy may well change during a much lesser period of time. A single term of 6 years would hamper and embarrass the President in the performance of his duties. He might well miss that cooperation of political leaders with his national program which is necessary for good government.

I believe that there is no power as trustworthy in the election of a President as that possessed by the people. I repeat that I have faith and confidence in their educational qualifications, their integrity, judgment, and justice. The people of America in these years, and those beyond the horizon, want as their President a man who will be faithful and efficient. They expect their President today to be their leader in thought in time of peace, their Commander in Chief in time of war. The world today looks to our President as the symbol of American thought and the essence of American ideals. A limitation upon the term of service, practical politics being what they are, would remove both the incentive and the opportunity to fully determine the thought of the people which a President could express with confidence as the voice of America.

The Constitution of the United States is the character of a free people. Few amendments have been made thereto. Restrictive amendments should be cautiously approached. Any amendment which would interfere with the unqualified right of freedom of voting choice should not be authoritatively passed unless there is an inexorable demand for a limitation of such choice arising from the people. There is no evidence today that the people are asking to be saved from their own actions. There is no compelling cry for relief against a constitutional provision under which this Nation has progressed and grown to be the strongest and greatest Nation in the world. America is growing in international stature. Let us not impede that growth by unnecessary restrictive constitutional amendments. Let us not forget the fiasco of prohibition.

Any legislation or constitutional amendment limiting the tenure of the Presidential office would deprive the Nation of the invaluable experience gained in the exercise of his office, particularly in time of a national crisis. Any restriction to one or more terms might well destroy stability and continuity in international and foreign relations. A single term or two terms might only deprive America of a President when the continuation of his policies and personality is imperative for the public welfare.

Alexander Hamilton in a letter to the people of New York on March 21, 1788, pointed to give ill effect of a scheme of continuing the chief magistrate in office for a certain time and then excluding him from it, either for a limited period or forever after. He stated these effects would be for the most part rather pernicious than salutory. The following arguments of Alexander Hamilton against limitation ring as true and forceful in 1945 as they did 157 years ago.

1. A resultant diminution of the inducement to good behavior.

"There are few men who would not feel much less zeal in the discharge of a duty when they were conscious that the advantage of the station with which it was connected must be relinquished at a determinate period than when they were permitted to entertain a hope of obtaining by meriting a continuance of them."

2. The temptation to sordid views, to speculations, and in some instances to usurpation.

3. Depriving the community of the advantage of experience gained by the Chief Executive in the exercise of his office.

4. Banishing men from stations in which, in certain emergencies of state, their presence might be of the greatest moment to public interest and safety.

5. Exclusion at a fixed time would operate as a constitutional interdiction of stability in administration.

Balance against these evils greater independence of action and an alleged, but not proven, greater security of the people, the conclusion is compelling that there should be no limitation upon the tenure of the office of President nor restriction upon his reeligibility. I wholeheartedly agree with the conclusion expressed by Alexander Hamilton:

"There is an excess of refinement in the idea of disabling the people to continue in office men who had embittered themselves in their opinion to approbation and confidence, the advantages of which are at best speculative and equivocal and are overbalanced by disadvantages far more certain and decisive."

This is not a political problem. We consider in these resolutions not a measure of today but a policy for the Government of future generations. Does anyone see in the present-day attitude of man a desire for further restriction of freedom of action or independence of thought? The answer is obvious. Restrict free election and we gratuitously insult the American voter.

We deny that the American people cannot be trusted in the exercise of their right of franchise. We force the citizens of this Nation to retire from office a man in whom they have faith and hope because they through experience with him have come to know him and to trust him—and thus force upon the American electorate, at a time they may not choose, a man neither known nor tried in national office. Such an edict shocks common sense. We have faced national crises in the past. Crises more acute and critical may arise in the future. This country will never be barren of statesmanlike leaders. There is no indespensable man. However, future crises may demand the continued service of a particular man as President who has gained national confidence through faithful, efficient, patriotic leadership. The choice must be left to the people to continue such a man in office. If we cannot trust the American people to make this choice, then no matter what the length of term of office—God help America. We should not tie the hands or put into a strait-jacket future generations of Americans in the election of President. We should not impose upon them the tied hands of a past generation. No one can fortell the future, as what situation might confront a future generation of Americans after we are dead and gone.

There can be no serious danger to the liberties of our citizens under present constitutional guarantles in allowing more than two successive terms for a President. The theory that courage, loyalty, fidelity, and ability should be made constitutionally or by statute unavailable at any given date is unsound and to be deprecated. The framers of our Constitution recognized such an absurdity. The passing of time conclusively proves the soundness of the judgment of the signers of the Constitution in rejecting such a political principle as contrary to the first principles of sound reasoning.

I prefer to be counted with those who believe that the third-term question is an artificial, superficial contrivance designed to frustrate the will of the American people by preventing the renomination of a popular President; if adopted it could stop the election of a needed President. Democracy in America is vital—living. Let us not hamper or destroy our republican form of government in petty contraptions or devices to foil the American will to live the American way—under a President freely chosen, freely elected, by a great and free people.

The reasons against limitations are so logical and sound that the pending resolutions should receive nothing further than the dignity of a hearing.

Problems of American Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Raymond Moley from the Washington Evening Star:

SEES BUSINESS TOLERANT OF GLOOM RACKET—COMMENTATOR DISCOVERS PARALLEL TO PRACTICES OF MIDDLE AGES

(By Raymond Moley)

The problems before American businessmen never were more complex, perhaps they never were more serious. But there seems to be a tendency among members of the managerial group to seek the advice of those who paint only pictures of gloom.

I wonder sometimes, when I attend a meeting at which businessmen listen to discourses by one of their own members or to someone brought in for the purpose, what strange passion possesses them. For they never tire of hearing about their own horrible end. I feel certain, moreover, that the most pessimistic of those who lecture them are not of their number, but are secretaries of business associations, counsels on public relations, experts, company economists, or journalists who are in some way their employees. This cannot be because those people who perform services on the periphery of production are

by nature pessimists, for their own businesses seem to find plenty of customers. It must be that those who minister to business find a tremendous and unsatisfied demand from those who go to meetings and conferences for flagellation of a cruel and quite illogical sort.

In the thirteenth century great processions of the citizenry of northern Italian towns—thousands of them—marched around the country beating themselves with whips. Later, in the Teutonic nations, the flagellant business changed. Specific orders or societies were established, the members of which officiated at ceremonials. Those who craved spiritual uplift submitted themselves to being beaten for days. The master administered a beating, after which the patrons beat themselves for a while. Later the master read a message supposed to have been brought by an angel, and everybody felt better. Then the professionals went on to other towns and found new penitents. The point, it seems to me, is that this beating business became a profession—a paying profession apparently, for the masters toiled not and neither did they spin. They just made people feel unpleasant.

Something of this sort is happening at gatherings of businessmen. They are told that communism is sweeping the world, including the United States, that we are to have war with Russia, that military training is a scheme to regiment the Nation, that the Nation is bankrupt and the business never can prosper again.

Great names are part of the substance of these discussions, including Friederich Hayek's who seems to say in his very dull book, The Road to Serfdom, that if the village takes title to the town pump we will end up in communism. The argument repeatedly is made that any encroachment by government on private enterprise will progress until there is no liberty left. The plain facts of social evolution are ignored, which tell us over and over that the line dividing government and business is constantly changing. Sometimes it moves one way; sometimes another.

The humor and the hope are that these same willing consumers of the gospel of doom leave their seances, go back to their plants, roll out the blueprints, sign contracts for new machinery, pep up the sales force and prepare for a big year. Their actions have little to do with the words they hear and little more to do with what they say themselves. They know America is going places and they are going along. But they hate to be told so.

Meanwhile, a large and flourishing business is created whose purpose is the purveying of pessimism. To the extent that this business keeps a large number of organizers, statisticians, orators and writers employed, the problem of unemployment is partially solved. But this is about all that can be said for the gloom racket.

Mrs. Francis P. Tarnapowicz—A Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, there have been many outstanding heroes in World War II. Many of them have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor; many have received various battle decorations. Yet there are also many unsung heroes both on the battle front and on the home front who have unselfishly helped bring final victory over a ruthless foe. One of these unsung heroines is Mrs. Francis P. Tarnapowicz, of Pittsburgh, Pa., an outstanding American of whose record we in the great Pittsburgh industrial area are all proud. She is the chairman of the Nationality Groups Division, Fort Pitt area, War Finance Committee for Pennsylvania. She served in the same capacity during World War I—and without 1 cent remuneration—in order to help raise the billions necessary to pay for the terrific cost of a global war. Her success has been heralded throughout America, for hers was the difficult task of molding together the men and women of the nationality groups of western Pennsylvania—composed of 101 different nationalities—who sold $269,985,000 in War bonds over a period of approximately 4 years. This figure does not include the sales for the final Victory bond drive.

Mrs. Tarnapowicz has served her country faithfully and ably in two world wars, and I believe, is deserving of every honor and praise accorded heroes on the field of battle. As a representative of the greatest and richest industrial district in America, I salute Mrs. Francis P. Tarnapowicz—a great American.

Typical of her unselfish character is a letter written me by her on October 9, 1945, which I include as part of my remarks, wherein Mrs. Tarnapowicz gives complete credit for the outstanding war-bond sales to the patriotic men and women of the nationality groups:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
WAR FINANCE COMMITTEE,
PENNSYLVANIA,
Pittsburgh, Pa., October 9, 1945.

Hon. SAMUEL A. WEISS,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WEISS: I am happy to pay tribute to the men and women of the nationality groups of the war finance committee as volunteer workers they have given endless hours of patriotic service. The record showing $269,875,000 in war-bond sales in almost 4 years is deserving of praise—truly they remind me of a large orchestra each group playing a different instrument, thereby harmonizing a beautiful symphony of war-bond selling, always successfully reaching their goals.

Contrary to the general idea the nationality groups are composed of fine American citizens, the common bond that brings them together is that they possess traditional customs that are interesting and lovely, and therefore worthy of preservation. There has been no inclination to cleave to political lines of any kind.

There are at present 100 different units (as per list attached) each committee has a chairman and cochairman and each church and organization has captains and lieutenants, making a complete working unit. These units have not only worked to sell bonds during the regular bond drives, but have maintained a continuous sales effort * * * in between drives as well as during drives. The office of the nationality groups division is open from morning till night and special meetings and rallies are held in the evenings, Saturdays and Sundays and it can be said that the work never stops.

Some of the special projects which have been sponsored and completed by these groups are also listed on a separate sheet.

Some of the groups are so enthusiastic about the work that they have become issuing agents for the United States Treasury Department and thus are able to issue bonds in the evenings and Sundays, or any time we need them.

Hundreds of meetings, teas, luncheons, dedications, and christenings have taken place and to attempt to estimate the hours of time that have been applied to this work * * * well, all I can say is that for almost 4 years I have done nothing but war-bond work every day, that's how busy they have kept me.

The nationality groups have cooperated in many ways with the other divisions of the war finance committee. They have assisted the community division, the pay roll division, the sports committee, and the school division. On many occasions they have used their traditional costumes, adding color, luster, and interest to the occasions. A list of the events in which the groups have cooperated with other divisions of the war finance committee is attached.

At one time the groups had their own radio program known as the Let's Go America program and the interest was great and much good was accomplished.

We have just completed the drive for the two veteran hospitals, one to be built in Pittsburgh and one in Greenville, with the fine total of $18,900,425 and now we are on a fresh start, all out for the Victory drive, and I am sure that they will cooperate as they have cooperated on previous war-bond drives, they will give us full cooperation.

Sincerely,
MRS. FRANCIS P. TARNAPOWICZ,
Chairman, Nationality Groups Division, Fort Pitt Area.

NATIONALITY BOOTHS AND ORGANIZATIONS

BOOTHS

1. Lidice.
2. Warsaw.
3. China.
4. Gory.
5. American Serbian.
6. American Lithuanian.
7. American Greek.
8. Paderewski.
9. Wilhelmina.
10. Polonia.
11. B'nai B'rith.
12. American Carpatho Russian.
13. American Russian.
14. American Slovak.
15. American Lebanon.
16. American Syrian.
17. France.
18. American Ukrainian.
19. American Hungarian Pittsburgher.
20. American Hungarian McCrory's.
21. American Hungarian McKeesport.
22. American Hungarian Hazelwood.
23. American Hungarian Duquesne.
24. American Hungarian Homestead.
25. American Hungarian Leechburg.
26. American Hungarian East Pittsburgh.
27. American Lithuanian, South Side.
28. Czechoslovak, North Side.
29. Victory Nationality Booth, Braddock.
30. Victory Nationality Booth, Homestead.
31. Victory Nationality Booth, Glassport.
32. Victory Nationality Booth, McKeesport.
33. American-Rumanian.
34. Irish.
35. British.
36. Belgian.

ORGANIZATIONS

37. Ahepa.
38. American-Chinese War Bond Committee of Western Pennsylvania.
39. American-Czechoslovak War Bond Committee of Western Pennsylvania.

40. American-Greek War Bond Committee of Western Pennsylvania.
41. American-Hungarian War Bond Committee of Western Pennsylvania.
42. American-Italian War Bond Committee of Western Pennsylvania.
43. American-Lithuanian War Bond Committee of Western Pennsylvania.
44. American-Polish War Bond Committee of Western Pennsylvania.
45. American-Russian War Bond Committee of Western Pennsylvania.
46. American-Serbian War Bond Committee of Western Pennsylvania.
47. American-Slav Congress Bond Drive Committee of Johnstown.
48. American-Slovak War Bond Committee of Western Pennsylvania.
49. American-Syrian War Bond Committee of Western Pennsylvania.
50. Beth Israel Sisterhood.
51. Beth Shalom Congregation.
52. B'nai B'rith Council of Western Pennsylvania.
53. B'nai Israel Congregation.
54. B'nai Israel Sisterhood.
55. Cadet Club of A. Z. A. of B'nai B'rith.
56. Central Council of Polish Organizations.
57. Chian War Bond Committee.
58. Croatian Fraternal Union War Bond Committee.
59. Czechoslovak American National Alliance.
60. Czechoslovak Lodges of Allegheny County.
61. East Pittsburgh Hungarian Singing Society.
62. First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union of America.
63. First Catholic Slovak Union of America.
64. Greek Catholic Societies.
65. Greek Catholic Union of America.
66. Hellenic Post American Legion War Bond Committee.
67. Hungarian Reformed Federation of America.
68. International Workers Order.
69. Italian Sons and Daughters of America.
70. Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Post 299.
71. Jewish Women's Victory Club.
72. Junior Victory Nationality Group, Glassport.
73. Karpatheans War Bond Committee.
74. Ladies Philoptohos Adelfotis Society.
75. Lithuanian Beneficial Society.
76. Lithuanian Citizens Society.
77. Lithuanian Literary Association.
78. Lithuanian National Alliance of America.
79. Lithuanian National Chamber of Commerce.
80. Maids of Athens War Bond Committee.
81. National Slovak Society of U. S. A.
82. Netherlands War Bond Committee of Western Pennsylvania.
83. Polish Falcons of America.
84. Polish National Alliance.
85. Poniatowski Society.
86. Rodef Shalom Congregation.
87. Russian Orthodox Catholic Women's Mutual Aid Society.
88. Serb National Federation.
89. Slovak Catholic Sokol.
90. Slovak Evangelical Union.
91. Slovak Gymnastic Union Sokol.
92. Ukrainian National Aid Association.
93. United Magyar Civic Association of Western Pennsylvania.
94. United Polish Societies of Ambridge.
95. United Polish Societies of Braddock.
96. United Societies of Bohemian Hall.
97. Verhovey Fraternal Insurance Association.
98. Verhovay Girls Group.
99. Workingmen's Sick Benefit Federation.
100. Zionists War Bond Committee.
101. Zivena Beneficial Society.

Loans to Great Britain and Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS RIZLEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Enid Daily News and Eagle, a newspaper published at Enid, Okla., with both morning and evening editions and which has a wide circulation throughout northwestern Oklahoma and in the southern counties of the State of Kansas, has just conducted a very interesting poll on the question of loans to Great Britain and Russia. The results of the poll and the comments of the editor speak for themselves. Under permission granted, I insert the same in the RECORD, and I trust that Members of Congress will read the article and take heed as to how the people in this progressive and substantial agricultural and industrial section of the United States feel about the matter:

CRUSHING "NO" IS VOTE ON LOANS TO BRITAIN, RUSSIA

In an astounding and unequalled expression of public opinion and by a truly overwhelming majority, the people of northwest Oklahoma and southwest Kansas oppose the huge multibillion dollar loans sought by Great Britain and Russia from the United States.

This is the startling result shown by the tabulation yesterday of the News and Eagle ballots on the subject. On no other public question of recent times has the opinion been so solidified or the interest apparently as great; and the following tabular results show clearly how their readers reacted to the opportunity to vote on the question offered them in the ballots published in these newspapers:

FIFTY-NINE TO ONE AGAINST LOAN

Loan of three to five billion dollars to England to help nationalize her industries

Approving	41
Disapproving	2,375

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTEEN TO ONE AGAINST LOAN

Loan of $6,000,000,000 to Russia to help her restore her heavy industries

Approving	21
Disapproving	2,403

That is a truly overwhelming and utterly convincing majority of public opinion against such loans in the great two-State area in which the News and Eagle circulate. It shows that 98.3 percent of the people of this area oppose lending England billions of dollars to help nationalize her industries. It shows that only approximately 1.7 percent favor such loans. It means that the opinion against such a loan in this great Southwest area is 59 to 1.

TWENTY-FOUR HUNDRED AND THREE TO TWENTY-ONE

In the case of the loan sought by Russia, the adverse opinion is even more overwhelming. Only 21 persons out of the 2,424 who voted on that question in the News-Eagle balloting favor loan of $6,000,000,000 to Russia while 2,403 oppose such a loan. That is an adverse opinion of 115 to 1. Ninety-nine and six-tenths percent of those voting opposed the loan.

It was the purpose of these newspapers in presenting this ballot opportunity to secure the opinions of their readers in order that the Oklahoma Members of Congress, the entire Congress, and the President might be informed of the thought of the people of this area on these vital questions, involving such huge sums in a Nation already staggering under the greatest public debt ever known by any nation at any time in history.

The response was immediate and unexpectedly large, probably representing the greatest such vote ever had in Oklahoma under similar circumstances. For this vote was purely voluntary. It was without any personal solicitation, without any solicitation at all other than the mere offering of a ballot to readers in the News and Eagle. It required that the reader who wished to express his opinion must cut out the ballot, mark it, mail it at his own expense or bring it into the office of these newspapers.

VOTE SHOWS BIG INTEREST

And the result shows the astounding interest taken in the subject by these readers. Ballots came in from practically every community in northwest Oklahoma and Kansas. Many persons drove into Enid from distant points especially to bring their ballots and express their opinions in person, as well.

And among the truly significant things about this poll is that it was taken in an area which the census shows has the highest percentage of literacy, of native-born citizens, of any similar area in the United States.

That alone is something for Congressmen, for the administration, for commentators, to ponder in considering this overwhelming ballot against these huge foreign loans.

The ballots cast in the voting are now on file in the News-Eagle office. The results will be sent to Members of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress, to the President, to the chairmen of the appropriate congressional committees which will consider the loan proposals. They should prove truly revealing to these public officials, and leave no faint doubt but that the people of this section of the Nation are so nearly unanimous in their opposition to such loans that they scarcely would seem to deserve consideration at all.

AN ASTOUNDING BALLOT RESULT ON FOREIGN LOANS

If there ever was any doubt as to the position of the citizens of northwest Oklahoma and southwestern Kansas on the question of lending England and Russia huge multibillion dollar sums now that the war is over, that doubt should be thoroughly resolved by the results of the poll on this question conducted by the News and Eagle through their columns in the past 2 weeks. The vote as detailed on the front page of this issue of the News shows 2,403 ballots cast against a six billion loan to Russia, as against only 21 for such a loan. It shows 2,375 opposed to lending England three to five billions for nationalizing her industries, as against only 41 favoring such a loan.

No such an overwhelming ballot against any public proposal in recent years comes to mind. The voting was wholly voluntary. The News and Eagle, as a public service only, offered their readers the opportunity of expressing their opinion on the subject through a ballot form published in the papers. There was no personal solicitation. Those voting had to clip the ballot, mail it at their own expense. And the ballots poured in from practically every community in northwest Oklahoma and southwest Kansas, an area where literacy is the highest in the United States * * * with the result of a 115 to 1 vote against the Russian loan proposal, a 59 to 1 vote against the British proposal.

Such a result is highly significant; it shows the strong public feeling against such loans; and it should be informative and serve as a guide to Congress in acting on the loan proposals. Certainly Congressmen from this southwest area should note it and vote accordingly if they would represent their constituents' wishes. And it was the principal

idea of the News and Eagle in presenting this ballot opportunity to gather information to guide the lawmakers as to real public opinion on further lending of our taxpayers' money at a time when the national debt approaches $300,000,000,000.

The Promotion of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I include herewith the editorial of Spencer Canary, editor of the Daily Sentinel-Tribune, of Bowling Green, Ohio, on the promotion of peace and our retaining the secret of the atomic bomb against possible aggressors:

PREVENT OR PROMOTE?

It is pretty discouraging to those who hope for world peace to hear statesmen talk mostly about how to prevent war instead of how to promote peace.

Was the charter of peace adopted at San Francisco last May simply as a sop to peace-lovers? Was its principles then considered unattainable and not something by which to square the relations of one nation with another?

Why should our chief attention at the present time be drawn to disposal of the atomic bomb, to formation of a permanent navy of half a million men and to universal military training instead of to how to make the Nation's peace charter direct our ways?

How silly it is to approach the question of peace in a negative way. Success in everyday lines is not attained that way. Youth is not taught how to keep out of jail but how to act toward his fellows as to promote his own and their satisfaction. People are not asked to tax themselves for improvements to prevent something but to promote the general welfare. Why should not our statesmen stress the benefits of peace in all their public comments instead of stressing the need of individual national defense to prevent aggression?

This is not to say that disposal of the atomic bomb and efficient military and naval establishments are not proper and important questions for discussion. It simply is a protest against statesmen not making the World Peace Charter the first thing on the agenda of every international conference. What effect on world peace will such and such imposition of terms on Germany and Japan have? What effect on peace will fixing boundary lines on nations have? What effect on world peace will be the decision on raw materials, on shipping, on air routes, on import and export tariffs, on migration and immigration, on fixing rates of exchange and stabilizing currency, on international loans and debts, on freedom of the press, the radio, and worship? What will be the effect on world peace of laws governing labor and capital? What will be the effect on world peace of decisions that touch all phases of human relationships?

If the San Francisco Conference means little or nothing to nations of the world, let us withdraw from it, keep the atomic bomb hovering over the heads of nations which persist in thinking only of their temporary selfish advantage, maintain our great lead in military and naval supremacy, and quit trying to be nice to other nations who think only in terms of selfish aggrandizement.

If the San Francisco peace pact does mean what it purports to mean, play it up as the important factor in any equation that is sought. That nations' charter of peace seemed to mean something 6 months ago. It provides the military force to prevent aggression and to discuss freely the controversial matters that might lead to war and ways in which peaceful means of settling them may be used. Its chief weakness is the provision that enables any one of the five big powers to veto action. Those five are the United States, Great Britain, Russia, France, and China.

Perhaps our statesmen are too much aware of this weakness. Perhaps they look upon this San Francisco Peace Conference as merely a sedative for peoples of a nation, like a sleeping pill taken to lull one into the land of Nod.

It is time for the average American to awake and to demand that the charter of peace be activated. It is time to make our representatives in Congress and President Truman understand we want a showdown on whether or not the signatories of that peace pact mean to try to carry out its provisions.

If they look upon it as "a mere scrap of paper" which may be ignored, as Mussolini ignored the old League of Nations by shelling the Greek Island of Corfu and by invading Ethiopia, and as Hitler did by invading Austria, Danzig, Sudetenland, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and France, let us learn the facts now; and let us then use our own present "big stick" to force conditions that will assure us peace for at least another 25 years; and let us arm ourselves to the teeth and ally ourselves only with those nations that desire lasting peace and are willing and able to maintain it by force.

Let us then keep the secret of the atomic bomb as long as possible as a menace to possible aggressors and study it by ourselves. Let us then cease trying to placate any nation but to act as tough as any dare act toward us. Let us either demand that the world charter of peace be earnestly tried now or else frankly tell the world we have no confidence in it. Let our statesmen talk the peace charter.

A Hero Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., November 14, 1945, concerning a great naval hero, Commodore Dixie Kiefer, United States Navy:

A HERO DIES

Commodore Dixie Kiefer, USN, and six Navy colleagues, officers and enlisted men, died Armistice Day in a mountainside crash.

Commodore Kiefer, one of the most colorful men in the annals of Navy aviation, one of the outstanding heroes of naval warfare in the Pacific, beloved by all who served with him or under him, died in harness as he would like it, and his death brings sorrow into the hearts of men in every State in the Union who served with him.

Kiefer, hero of the U. S. S. *Yorktown*, of which he was executive officer, and also later of the great carrier the U. S. S. *Ticonderoga*, a big figure in six major Pacific naval engagements including the great battle of the Coral Sea, was referred to by Secretary of the Navy Forrestal as "the indestructible man," as he decorated him with the Distinguished Service Medal for his Pacific heroism. Others referred to him as "the greatest ambassador of good will for the United States Navy."

The brilliant naval officer served his country well from the date of his graduation and commission from Annapolis in 1918 until the hour of his death. His last and current assignment was commanding officer of the First Naval District Air Bases, stationed at Quonset, R. I., naval air station. His body was found close by the wrecked plant. His splint-bound arm stretched over a pile of soggy brown maple leaves. It had been in a cast since it was shattered when Jap suicide planes hit the bridge of the carrier *Ticonderoga* during a battle off Formosa and when he was in command. With 65 pieces of shrapnel in his body he lay on a mattress on the bridge, giving orders and refusing removal to the sick bay until the last of his wounded and dying men had been given care.

Commodore Kiefer came to Lawrence a few weeks ago and won the hearts and the admiration of the several hundred persons who were fortunate enough to meet him and hear him talk. At that time his right leg showed the effects of the shattering that it suffered, his left arm hung limp and lifeless and his right arm was carried in bandages and splints. His modesty with reference to his own heroism and his generous magnanimity in paying tribute to others was most impressive. His reference to the personnel under him as "my boys" and 'my babies," telling how they bravely suffered and died under terrific Pacific action, brought tears to the eyes of his listeners. There was no trace of anguish from pain as he talked but rather smile after smile of pride in a job well done, not by himself alone, but by those who served with him and under him. He had already earned the love of Lawrence men, those who served under him in the past, and several of them came to see him that evening.

Commodore Dixie Kiefer was a great man, a great hero, and his death is a distinct loss to the Navy and his country. It is sad that he had to die so young. His wracked body might not have permitted further fighting service but his noble mind and personality would have been of great value to the naval service. He earned his way and left much behind. May God grant him eternal rest.

Speaking Program of the Hall Canteen Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speaking program for the fourth annual benefit dinner dance of the Hall Canteen Clubs, Endicott Johnson Diner, Endicott, N. Y., Saturday evening, November 3, 1945.

MASTER OF CEREMONIES. Members of the Hall Canteen Clubs, the Hall Veterans League, Congressman HALL, ladies and gentlemen, as chairman of the committee selected to arrange this occasion, I have the pleasure of welcoming you here tonight.

Twelve long months have elapsed since we gathered in November of last year to pledge ourselves to total victory. Since then we have seen that victory realized and we have had reason to be happy indeed.

But this evening we are assembled to dedicate ourselves to perform a task fully as

difficult and monumental as that which we have already accomplished. We are assembled to determine a course to follow which will guarantee to the people of America a secure, lasting, and blessed peace and a century of future progress for the benefit of all mankind.

We are assembled to join with the thousands of veterans of the recent war in the continuation of the glorious fight which our leader, Mr. HALL, long ago started and which we have ever since kept up. That fight is for the boys of our armed forces and for you veterans of this great section.

The size and impressiveness of this dinner exceed all our anticipation: We knew many would come out of sheer affection for Congressman HALL. But our hopes are more than fulfilled tonight and we want you to know how much we appreciate your attendance.

I want to publicly thank the members of the program committee for the painstaking effort they put forth to make this affair the success it is.

We know you want to see action and we have provided it for you. Among the fine, representative veterans' group here, there are several who have consented to speak for their comrades. It goes without saying that we want to hear what their impressions are and what they have to suggest for the future.

I deem it a special privilege, then, to call upon Mr. Stanley Cachowski, whose record in the service of his country bespeaks his love and devotion to this cause. Mr. Cachowski.

Mr. STANLEY CACHOWSKI. Madam Toastmaster, members of Hall Canteen Clubs, fellow veterans, Congressman HALL, friends:

First of all, I want everybody to know I am having a wonderful time tonight. You ladies of the Hall Canteen Clubs certainly know how to put on a party. You have my thanks and the admiration of all of us.

Then, I want to say this is the first time I've been any place since I been back where it really looks like a crowd that knows what it wants to do. People here seem to want to help the veteran and God only knows he needs help.

I'm sick of listening to a lot of tripe that we usually hear about how much is being done for the returned soldier. I'm not saying folks haven't been nice to us. They have. But nobody seems to have any program or any plan.

I've always had a lot of admiration for Congressman HALL. Why, single-handed, he's had to battle down there in Congress for us when we were in service. He carried the ball alone and was opposed by a lot of reactionaries in Washington who sneered at his honest efforts. If we had a whole Congress of men with Mr. HALL's friendly feeling for soldiers in the ranks, we would be a lot better off today.

And Congressman HALL, I came here with one idea tonight. I am looking for a leader with a program. I'm looking for a leader who isn't afraid of being called names because he fights for the veteran. I believe you're that leader and I'm here to listen to the plan you've promised to outline tonight.

The man who digs this country out of the doldrums, and helps all us Americans build a new Nation of Peace is going to be needed in the days to come. Congressman HALL, I'm banking on you; I hope you're the man and I wish you the best success in the world.

Thank you.

MASTER OF CEREMONIES. Next, I wish to call on Mr. Kenneth Dean, recently home from foreign service. Mr. Dean.

Mr. KENNETH DEAN. Madam Toastmaster, members of Hall Canteen Clubs, veterans, soldiers, Congressman HALL.

Let me echo the sentiments expressed by my friend and fellow veteran, Mr. Cachowski, in saying you ladies have done a grand job, not only with this party but throughout the war.

Whatever front the fellows from Broome County happened to be on and wherever it was, we could always count on receiving some nice packages from the Hall Canteen Clubs. They might contain candy or magazines or a dozen other nice things. And they sure were welcome. We got so we knew the label on your bundles and looked forward to getting them. You've all done a great job and a patriotic one which the home folks ought never to forget.

And as for Congressman HALL, well, all I can say is, I feel toward him just like every other right-thinking American of this district feels about him. He's taken a lot on the chin for all of us. He's had an uphill fight simply because a lot of wrong-way men are in power down there in Washington. But he hasn't wavered. I'm for him and I don't see how any veteran who wants to see his rights maintained can be anything else but for him.

I am anxious to hear from Mr. HALL tonight so I'll close.

Thanks.

MASTER OF CEREMONIES. Another veteran, here tonight, who is a typical GI and has come back to our fine cities, is Mr. James Clark. Mr. Clark.

Mr. JAMES CLARK. Madam Toastmaster, ladies of Hall Canteen Clubs, men of the Hall Veterans League:

Although I've heard you boys pass a lot of bouquets tonight I haven't heard a word about the best project this Hall outfit ever had. Yes, I'm talking about the Hall Canteen up at the Erie Station in Binghamton. One of the girls told me a few minutes ago that the canteen has served since it started in December 1944, over 25,000 men in uniform.

If you can beat that record, you're going some. I'd like to see credit go where credit is due and I want to pay my respects to the girls who have put on this canteen. I think they ought to have public recognition like the Red Cross, the USO and other such organizations and I don't understand why we haven't been able to read more in the papers about their wonderful activities.

I have a word to say about Congressman HALL. You people here are his friends. He has a lot of your kind. The overwhelming majority of the people in his district are his friends, even though most of them only get a chance to express themselves in his favor every 2 years at the polls.

Since I've been home I've had a chance to learn from folks why they're for Mr. HALL. He's done a lot for them. There hasn't been a mother, or wife, or sister, or relative of a serviceman who has written to him that hasn't received prompt and ready attention. The requests he gets cover a wide range. Some are beyond his power to grant, but most of the people who go to him get results. At any rate he tries to help you.

As I said before, I don't have to tell you people these things. You know them. But I want to know why Mr. HALL isn't getting support he deserves from some quarters in this community. Why aren't certain people backing him up? Why don't they join with you people to help Congressman HALL help the veteran?

Those are the questions every veteran has the right to ask. A man who fights for our cause can expect our support. Let's pledge to Congressman HALL that support tonight in the trying days ahead.

Thanks.

MASTER OF CEREMONIES. In addition to the speakers you have just heard, all of whom are now wearing civilian clothes, since they are officially back home for good, we have another treat. Johnny De Serio has been a hero of Bataan and Corregidor. He has a long string of medals and ribbons which he won by long service overseas. He is still in the Army, about to go back on termination of his furlough.

He is here tonight and I am going to call on him for a few words. Sergeant De Serio.

Sgt. JOHN DE SERIO. Madam Toastmaster, I have but little to say this evening, except that I wish to pay my respects to you ladies of the Hall Canteen Clubs, and to you, Congressman HALL. We soldiers on active duty depend on you to fight for us. We ask you to look out for what we need and for the welfare of our families.

Thanks for everything.

INTRODUCTION OF CONGRESSMAN HALL

MASTER OF CEREMONIES. We have placed our faith and our confidence throughout the dark years of the recent war, and now, in one who has been close to the hearts of all the people of the Triple Cities for a long time. While our beloved husbands, brothers, and friends were scattered all over the world in the battle for freedom, one voice was raised in unfaltering devotion to their cause.

That voice is Mr. HALL'S. Sometimes he has called alone in the wilderness. But his position has been consistent for he challenged all who were against such a position.

Now serving his fourth term in the House of Representatives, Mr. HALL has proved that our American way of government can work. He is ready at all times to help the people of this district and the good work he is doing is a tribute to the freedom and liberty we cherish.

Fellow Americans, it is with great pleasure and anticipation of a message of hope for America that I give you the friend of the people of our section, your Congressman and mine, Hon. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. HALL.

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

Madam Chairman, members of the Hall Furlough and Canteen Clubs, the Hall Veterans League, friends, as on previous meetings of this great organization, I wish to greet you with the friendliest of outstretched hands. There will be little argument with the statement that here is by all odds our most successful gathering.

This, however, is only a prelude to the future activities of our friends, and because such a beginning is so important I wish to emphasize several points tonight which we can carry with us in the days to come.

But, first, may I express to you ladies who have worked so hard and so bravely since our clubs were first conceived my heartfelt thanks for your support and your loyalty. In the face of hidden but persistent opposition from those with un-American attitudes and with intolerance in their hearts, you have fought the good fight on the home front for your men at the fighting front.

The struggle has not been an easy one, but it has been worth while. It is worth while because it is a fight for a righteous cause. Those who would thwart you have no place on the American scene, for they would sabotage your sincere efforts for our heroes, who deserve so much.

The Hall Furlough Clubs have continued to grow. By your service to the soldier you have made life sweeter for many a boy in khaki or in blue who has so enjoyed the good things you sent afar to him or the coffee and doughnuts you handed him at the Erie Station.

Yes, ladies, with backing like that here at home, you boosted the morale of countless thousands of men who might have been otherwise unhappy or depressed.

And to you valiant members in the Hall Veterans League I say you can thank God our fair section had such patriots as these good women here assembled.

So one and all of you, my dear friends, will find strength for the future in the common affection and admiration you have for each other in the glorious cause of protecting the rights of our veterans the country over.

Tonight I wish to devote my humble efforts to pointing a path which will lead our Nation safely through the darkness of the

despair still gripping many of the American people.

The first, the very first step that will have to be taken before America is once more on her feet is the complete rehabilitation and reemployment of the veteran. Until that is accomplished there can be no success in any program.

I regret to say that the policies laid down by the Congress in the GI bill of rights last year are not being carried out with the vigor and thoroughness that Congress intended they should be.

Too many stumbling blocks have been placed in the way of the veteran for him to be able to help himself out.

Too many obstacles have been placed in the way of those of us in Congress who have striven to cut the red tape which harasses the veteran on every side.

The same forces of reaction who stood between the veteran and his rights after World War I are already raising their ugly heads to make life miserable for the veteran of World War II.

I say to you that these forces of reaction must be wiped off the face of the earth not only for the sake of the veteran but for the sake of America.

Probably the biggest farce that ever stalked the returning soldier of this war is the loan provision in the GI bill. Did you ever try to get a loan? Did you ever get any satisfaction out of one after you did?

The answer is that the country has failed to abide by the law that Congress passed which guarantees a $2,000 loan for overy GI with an honorable discharge. But how many of you find yourselves eligible for such a benefit? Yet Congress intended you should all be eligible.

The mockery of the veteran going to a lending agency and being given the cold shoulder when he applies for that $2,000 is becoming too much for me. I am sick and tired of all this double talk and double dealing when veterans are concerned. I want to see things made so simple that the soldier can get his hands on the money the minute he gets out.

I suppose there are those who will holler to high heaven at the proposal I am going to make tonight. I imagine a lot of reactionaries will set upon me after I have submitted it to you. But I have stood all I am going to of seeing the very laws I voted for in the best interests of the servicemen bog down in the quagmire and fail their purpose. I want to see some action before it is too late.

I propose, therefore, an outright payment of $2,000 cash bonus to every veteran of World War II just as quickly as Congress can approve of it.

This would wipe out the loan feature of the 1944 act and enable every man to use the money as he sees fit with no strings attached.

Such a plan would accomplish two things. It would give every veteran the start he needs and it would discharge any and all out and out financial obligations which the country has to the veteran.

Probably the best effect it would have is to prevent forever happening again the disgraceful scenes of 1932 when veterans were fired upon by the Regular Army, when they marched on Capitol Hill, agitating for the World War I bonus.

There are some who believe the bonus issue will never come up again. They think the GI bill of rights offers the veteran so many benefits that he won't want any more. But that is where they're wrong.

In the first place, the GI bill isn't being carried out right, as I said before. In the second place, the bonus is going to be a tougher issue in 5 more years than it possibly can be now and the hue and cry will be five or ten thousand instead of $2,000.

I hardly think it necessary to say you fellows deserve this bonus. The fact we are all here safe and sound with the war you won over, in the most wonderful country in the world, is sufficient to cover that.

So I give you this plan tonight. It is the first time I have heard it discussed but we will all hear a lot more about it and we may as well be ready.

Thank you so much for meeting here with us tonight. Let us go forward together in firm determination to win the unfinished fight so that never again will our fighting heroes be compelled to look askance to a government that should be all too grateful for what they have done.

Central Valley Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to the following well-written editorial with reference to the Central Valley project in California. This appeared in the San Francisco Examiner recently and I think it expresses the views of a vast majority of the citizens of our State:

CALIFORNIA PROTESTS SOCIAL PLANNING

The California State Chamber of Commerce is currently conducting an energetic campaign to persuade—and if necessary, to compel—the Federal Government to live up to its original obligations and commitments with respect to a Federally financed water project that has been in process of development in this State for a number of years.

The campaign is not of exclusive interest to California, but is of very real concern to many other States, where similar Federal projects are being developed or contemplated, and where the same questions of ultimate Federal intention may be raised.

The great Central Valley water project in California, designed to develop the fabulous agricultural, industrial, and mineral resources of the vast Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys, was originally undertaken by the Federal Government with the definite understanding that upon completion it would be controlled and operated solely under State authority—with reimbursement to the Federal Government out of water and power revenues over a period of 40 years.

Similar Federal projects have been undertaken in other States, with the same or similar understanding.

But now there are various bills pending in Congress, having as their purpose the creation of so-called regional authorities to rule permanently and totally over the areas in which such projects are located—the effect being, if the bills are passed, to forever deprive the individual States of all authority over the water and power and the infinite variety of other resources developed within their own domain.

The advocates of this policy of perpetual Federal power within the States are the bureaucratic, the communistic social planners in Washington and elsewhere who have a great appetite for a kind of power not ordinarily derived from water projects—namely, political and social power.

Their pattern is the extravagantly expensive and notoriously totalitarian Tennessee Valley Authority, which has reduced a good part of the American Southland to a virtual condition of political, social, and economic servitude.

The social planners have had their appetite for power whetted by this flagrant experiment in totalitarianism.

It is completely free of State authority.

It is even absolved of all responsibility to Congress in the matters of policy and expenditure.

It has created a new form of political and social domination in the United States that is alien to American democracy, and it has imposed a new form of slavery upon many Americans that is repugnant to all Americans.

Naturally and inevitably, the bureaucrats and totalitarians in Washington want more of that kind of power.

That is the reason behind the many bills now pending in Congress for the creation of more regional authorities patterned after the Tennessee Valley Authority, and designed to create permanent Federal powers in as many States as possible and probably in all States eventually.

California is protesting and opposing such a program in connection with the Central Valley project, as an unwarranted infringement upon the interests and rights of the people of California.

The other American States similarly threatened by the totalitarian scheme of regional authority should join with California in its protest and opposition.

As the California Chamber of Commerce says:

"Federal authorities like the Tennessee Valley Authority are a dangerous welding of economic control and political power which threaten interference in social and cultural activities.

"No proposed Federal regional authority is answerable to Congress for the expenditure of its revenues, and they are therefore dangerous instruments of government.

"When we surrender control over the spending of public money, we surrender control of Government."

Ireland's Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article which appeared in the Boston Globe, Boston, Mass., of recent date:

IRELAND'S NEUTRALITY HAD ODD PHASES; NAZIS WERE INTERNED, RAF WENT FREE

(By Randolph Churchill)

LONDON, November 12.—Small countries which wish to remain neutral when all the great powers are at war have a difficult role to play. Pressure is brought on them by both sides, and their life is bound to be uneasy in the extreme.

De Valera's neutrality was based on two considerations. It was partly intended as a protest against partition and a proof to the world of the complete independence of Ireland.

Even more, Dev was animated by a sincere desire to spare his country the horrors of war.

Irishmen are not slow to point out that even great powers like Russia and the United States remained neutral until they were attacked; they are puzzled that they should be criticized for successfully pursuing a policy to which so many other countries, albeit unsuccessfully, aspired.

At the outset of the war, De Valera told the Germans he did not propose to allow Ireland to be used as a base for Britain to attack Germany or for Germany to attack Britain. For the rest, he intended to interpret Irish neutrality in such a way as best served Irish interests.

He made it plain that Irish neutrality was not based on hostility to Great Britain and his administration has consistently followed a policy of being as friendly and helpful to the Allies as was possible whilst remaining neutral.

This did not arise from any love of Britain, but from De Valera's recognition of Ireland's geographical and economic position. Ireland's safety was bound up in Britain's survival.

USED BRITISH APPARATUS

De Valera's pledge that he would never allow Ireland to be used as a base for attacking Britain was honored with scrupulous punctilio. The German Legation was forbidden to employ any wireless equipment, and the Irish authorities, provided by the British with direction-finding apparatus, kept a permanent vigil to insure that these instructions were fulfilled.

It was known, however, that a wireless transmitter was in the German Legation and, as D-day approached, the Allied military authorities were alarmed lest a leakage should occur and lest the German Legation might send out a message which might do irreparable harm to the Allied cause.

When the possibility was made plain to De Valera, he forced the Germans to hand over their transmitter, which was safely stored in the vaults of a Dublin bank on Christmas Eve, 1943.

The significance of this story is underlined by the fact that the British representative in Dublin, Sir John Maffey, had three transmitters in constant use throughout the war. He also, of course, had the advantage of direct telephone communication with London.

NEUTRALITY VARIED

De Valera's conception of neutrality resulted in widely different treatment of Allied and German airmen who force-landed on Irish territory. All German air crews who landed on Irish soil were immediately interned on the grounds that they had been engaged on operational flights.

The proximity of England to Ireland, however, enabled the convenient fiction to be maintained that all British and American airmen, even if bombs were found in their aircraft, had only been out on training flights. This valuable formula enabled many hundreds of British and American airmen to cross the border into Ulster and so return to England.

At a later date, RAF ground crews were allowed to cross the border from Ulster and repair damaged aircraft, which were subsequently flown to England.

Whilst always refusing to allow Allies the open use of the treaty ports of Beerhaven, Queenstown, and Lough Swilly, the De Valera government allowed the British to station tugs there which were used for rescuing merchant ships which had been crippled by U-boats.

We were also permitted to base motor torpedo boats on the treaty ports for the purpose of air-sea rescue.

These boats were permitted to be armed for their own defense and, of course, if they met a U-boat, there was nothing to stop them from attacking it.

The De Valera government was also particularly vigilant in rounding up German agents landed by parachute or U-boat. All these agents were closely interrogated and the results of the interrogations were at once made available to the British authorities.

NOT PROPAGANDA

De Valera would be the last man to suggest that all this was done out of friendship for Britain. It was based on his view of the true interests of Ireland. Therefore I have recited the foregoing in no desire to make propaganda for De Valera, but only so that the true facts of the matter may be known.

Whether De Valera's neutrality served Ireland as well is another question. If De Valera had declared war on Germany in 1942 or 1943, he might well today be nearer to his goal of a united Ireland. For a declaration of war would have been the one decisive gesture that could have convinced both Ulster and Britain that we had nothing to fear from Irish hostility or neutrality when next we are at war.

An Epitaph for the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I am an optimist and I have just as much faith as ever in the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. That project is needed by the American people and the forces of the opposition can prevail against it only so long. Of course, it cannot stand too many mistakes on the part of well-meaning people, because mistakes are dangerous, delays are costly, and lip service never avoided a crucifixion. Like truth, the value of this project stands out as one of the virtues.

One of my friends suggested the other day, however, that the project needed an epitaph and he recited this verse:

Round and round, this old world goes,
Any kind of weather
Kiss your hand to all your foes
Soon you'll be together.

Sorrow, and a world of woes,
Reckon care a feather,
Yonder where the grave grass grows
Soon you'll sleep together.

The idea, of course, is that if we can delay things long enough, everybody will be dead and the St. Lawrence seaway and power project will not make any difference, anyhow. This, Mr. Speaker, is just the wrong kind of philosophy, and I vigorously protest against having any epitaph written at this time or any other time for a project that is of such tremendous value to the American people.

Those of us in the House of Representatives who are sincerly supporting development of the great St. Lawrence seaway are wondering just what is going on behind the scenes to hold up a vote, or at least hearings in another body. There the joint resolution so illustriously introduced some months back now rests. There can be no question that the seaway resolution originated in another body, backed as it is by some of the leading figures of that body. I have waited, along with others, with considerable patience to see if any attempt will be made to bring this matter to a head. I questioned the methods which were being employed from the very beginning, but because of the prominent men in civil life who were sold on that approach, I was willing to sit back and watch developments. Now I am one of those who fears men of importance, sincere men who believed they were using the best technique to win legislative favor for this great project, were hoodwinked with honeyed words by those with ulterior motives.

In the past, the St. Lawrence seaway bill has been fought in the open in the Senate. It has won favor in the House, and I do not doubt that the House stands ready to support this legislation again. This time, the bill enters another body surrounded with so much sweetness one wonders if it is not being killed with kindness. If there is no basis of truth in the reports that are now trickling into my office, to the effect that the joint resolution will be neatly tucked away in a dusty file tc repose until judgment day, then I challenge those who are presumably supporting this measure to step forward and demand action. I am not in the habit of predicting the fate of a measure which has not even reached the floor of either House, but I stand ready to make predictions today on the St. Lawrence waterway joint resolution. As it stands, I forecast every attempt will be made by its enemies to keep the bill buried in committee. I contend that its glorified language will never come before the other body in such a way that it will receive approval. It will be delayed and delayed until hearings can be started in committee at an appropriate time. That appropriate time will be in the middle of 1946 when it will become lost in the congressional and senatorial election shuffle. Can you imagine the attention that will be given those hearings next year when everyone is busy seeking the support of an electorate back home? I am told that there are two types of men now presumably supporting this measure. First, those who sincerely believe in its accomplishments and are giving their time and energy to see it become a reality during our lifetime. Secondly, those who, fearing this time it has too good a chance of passage, are pretending to favor the development, but in reality are sitting so hard upon the bill it will smother from lack of fresh air.

Address by Secretary of Agriculture to Southeastern Agricultural Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 20 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an informative and instructive address delivered by the Secretary of Agriculture in Anderson, S. C., to the southeastern agricultural conference. The address was published in the Anderson Independent on Thursday, November 15 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It gives me a great deal of personal satisfaction to be in Anderson County today. And when I say that, I'm not merely trying to be polite. First, it isn't often that an Anderson like myself gets a chance to talk to so many Andersonians. So, as one Anderson to another, this is a real treat.

And second, I have been hearing many things about Anderson County—things that seem to me to be highly significant not just to this one county alone, but to the South and to the country as a whole. So I'm glad to see first-hand just what you folks are doing.

I have heard so much about Anderson County because you people seem to have a special knack for studying your local problems, digging up a lot of facts, and making common-sense plans to meet those problems. As a result, a number of your studies and plans have passed across my desk in Washington and from them I have learned quite a bit about your community, its people, its agriculture, its business and industry.

Now I don't propose to try to tell Anderson County people what they already know about themselves. My point is that this county, along with other counties that are making realistic postwar plans, is getting right to the roots of the South's long-time problems. Basic facts are being brought to light, and those facts are being interpreted honestly and impartially—even though local pride may be hurt in some cases. An honest appraisal of a situation is half the battle. When we know just what we are, how our assets compare to our liabilities, how our strengths compare to our weaknesses, then and only then can we do a sound, strategic job of planning ahead.

That is why I have been so impressed by the candid self-appraisal in that most constructive survey, Anderson After the War, published by your chamber of commerce. This report does not content itself with puffs or recital of mere symptoms, but seeks out basic truths. It grasps clearly the interdependence between Anderson County's industry, business, and agriculture. It states boldly the need for full productivity and efficiency in the factory and on the farm—and I quote: "The full economic possibilities of the community have not been realized until every person willing and able to work has a regular full-time job or a combination of jobs which will give him full employment." This study recognizes the problems of low-income groups, who cannot be good customers of business or agriculture, who cannot contribute a fair share to community progress, until they have a chance to earn a decent living. It acknowledges that many adjustments must be made in the pattern of farming, and that nonagricultural employment must be found for people who now are or will be underemployed on too-small, crowded farms.

Anderson County has done a good fact-finding job and is to be congratulated for that accomplishment. But more than that, I deeply admire the manner in which the county is building wise plans on the sound foundation provided by these facts, how it is developing a rural-urban pattern for progress in the years ahead, and how it is displaying the imagination, inventiveness, and cooperation—so typically American—needed to convert so-called problems into positive opportunities for better living for more people.

It is this pattern of industrial-agricultural development that I want to talk about today. I deeply feel that this same pattern holds the key to the future of the South.

According to all signs—unmistakable signs—the cotton South is on the threshold of an industrial-agricultural revolution that will shake its economy right down to the cotton roots. The world, the United States, and the South are moving into a new age; in fact, we already are beyond its frontiers, brought there by scientific and economic discoveries of recent years. What were miracles a few years ago are now everyday operations. We are in an age of such things as atomic power, round-the-world air transportation, and greater mechanization of all lines of work—including farming. This is an age of new concepts, new understandings of the economic rights, obligations, and opportunities of mankind. It has brought us realization that to live well and peacefully, we must be increasingly productive, more efficient, and must provide useful work for all. We must develop and conserve our natural resources. And we must distribute the fruits of our increased productivity fairly among all our people who contribute to that productivity.

These broad goals are not generalities without substance. They point the way to such concrete accomplishments as soil conservation, diversification of farming, replacement of poorly paid, inefficient stoop labor with efficient machinery, and development of new industries to provide more production, more jobs, and more income. These aims look toward the time when every worker in the United States can afford a truly adequate diet for himself and his family, and can buy all the clothes they need; when the farmer will be kept busy—very busy—turning out all of the food and fiber his customers demand.

Yes, we are on the brink of great change, and that change will touch the lives of all of us, particularly those who live in the South. Just exactly how this tremendous industrial-agricultural revolution will affect the South remains to be seen. Undoubtedly, it will bring great pressures and great problems. At the same time, with forethought and planning, it can be made to bring great progress toward what the South hopes to become.

To be specific: I believe that the whole broad story of the past, present, and future of southern agriculture can be told in terms of what is happening right here in Anderson County.

Going back into the history of this county, I learn that your farmers for generations relied on cotton as the one big crop for cash income; that even in recent years nearly two-thirds of all farm income has been produced by cotton. King Cotton has been hard on the people and hard on the land. Cotton demands clean tilling, and soil erosion has become a major problem. Your lands can grow a wide variety of grains and forage, fruits and vegetables; but in the past all of these were subordinated to cotton. Food crops and livestock were produced only in small amounts on land not well suited to production of lint. Not enough milk, eggs, or meat were produced even to supply your farm families adequately, much less to develop a steady commercial output.

King Cotton hasn't been a benevolent despot—he has been a thoroughgoing tyrant. He hasn't even been dependable in performing his supposed main function of providing needed cash income. The season's price for this one commodity has spelled either feast or famine—and too often the latter. Furthermore, the exactions of this monarch, who until recent date required much slow hand labor, has resulted in a pattern of small farms carrying a staggering weight of people engaged mostly in seasonal work. Even with high cotton prices, the earnings per farm family generally average less than required for a decent living. This low limit on the earning capacity of many of your farmers and farm workers has denied them a truly American standard of living with good homes, telephones, automobiles, and electrical conveniences. Consequently, they have not been as good customers of industry and business as they should be.

What has been true in Anderson County has been true in the whole cotton South, where more than half of the Nation's farm population lives, tilling about one-third of the Nation's cropland, but receiving for their labors only one-fourth of the national farm income.

Now don't misunderstand me. I have nothing against cotton as a crop; in fact, I regard it as one of the most valuable plants in the service of humanity. But in my scale of values, I put people first, and crops second. If the South is to share fully in the benefits of the age we now are entering, King Cotton must be promoted to a good and useful servant, efficiently produced, and contributing to, not obstructing, development of a well-balanced, diversified and prosperous southern farm economy.

Furthermore, we might as well face the fact that cotton, as king, is in serious trouble. And, as long as this crop stays in the exalted position as dictator of an economy, instead of an obliging servant, there will be continual crises. Considered on a strictly crop-price basis, and leaving the human element out of it, cotton's difficulties arise from oversupply, artificial prices, increasing competition, and inefficient production methods. These elements are inextricably intertwined; each contributor to the other.

Even before the World War II, American cotton had lost nearly half the world markets it held in the 1920's. We raised our domestic prices above the world price to prevent bankruptcy of growers; this in turn encouraged cotton production in other countries. After the First World War the rest of the world produced only 7,000,000 bales of cotton yearly, but this swelled to a high of 18,000,000 bales in 1936, then dropped to 15,500,000 in 1939. During the period 1932 to 1939, when these world production changes were in progress, the consumption of American cotton abroad declined by 46 percent.

Furthermore, cotton acreage in this country has been declining steadily, and now is far less than half of what it was 20 years ago, but yields per acre have shot up. The average yield of lint in 1944 was more than 100 pounds higher per acre than in 1934. Here in Anderson County I understand that yields now average around 300 pounds of lint per acre, and that you expect yields to reach 400 pounds within 5 years.

During World War II our great military needs, plus civilian demand boosted domestic demand for cotton from 6,500,000 bales to 11,000,000. Still, despite that huge consumption at home, we produced about as much cotton as we sold. In fact, the cotton surplus now stands at more than 11,000,000 bales—two or three times what we formerly considered a normal carry-over.

At the same time, science has produced a number of fibers that compete with cotton—products like rayon, nylon, spun glass, and paper, which are bidding enthusiastically for the privilege of clothing our persons and decorating our homes, and for use in industry. Rayon now is produced in the United States in an amount equivalent to 1,700,000 bales of cotton, and rayon filament yarn is now cheaper than many of the better quality cotton yarns. Also, rayon has moved into industrial fields, such as in production of tire cords, which for years has been one of the most important industrial uses of cotton. Nylon played an important part in the war and doubtless will find its way into many peacetime products in addition to the sheer stockings that are so dear to the feminine heart. Paper has cut into the market for bagging, towels, tissues, napkins, window shades, and twine; even before the war it was equal, pound-for-pound, to a million bales of cotton a year in these products.

And lastly, King Cotton has demanded expensive, antiquated hand care while its competitors utilize low-cost mass production methods. In a world of jet airplanes, automatic assembly lines, and robot bombs, the

symbol of cotton farming still is the man and the mule, the field hand and chopping hoe. It takes little foresight to see that such a system cannot weather the years ahead. Terrific readjustments are bound to come. Cotton, too, must be produced with machinery; and then far fewer workers will be able to turn out all the cotton we can possibly use at home and sell abroad.

Now, how can cotton become a good and useful servant of southern agriculture? How can it be made to serve its highest purposes for the people and the land; to fit a pattern of diversified, mechanized farming?

I believe that Anderson and many other southern counties are building and working rapidly toward the pattern of the future; that they are, through the process of farsighted planning, turning the problems of cotton into positive opportunities for healthy progress. Anderson County's postwar report sums up one of the problems that is basic in the South, in this way: "It is to the advantage of business and industry, as well as agriculture, that nonagricultural employment at good wages be provided for all farm people who are not needed to produce raw materials on the farms." Anderson County is seeking to provide such employment and to broaden the base of its whole economy by encouraging the expansion of its present industries and the establishment of new business. This county is doing a splendid job of pointing out to businessmen the prospective markets that exist in its trade area for sales of new homes, new automobiles, new farm equipment; that capital is available to finance sound enterprises, and that this area has many workmen with a wide variety of skills. This sort of planning lays a foundation for the solution of the cotton problem in human as well as economic terms, because the South cannot achieve a well-balanced use of its lands, and cannot assure the well-being of its people, unless it can find off-the-farm work for perhaps 3,000,000 workers who won't be needed in a mechanized agriculture 5 or 10 years hence. Full industrial activity and employment throughout the South will speed and ease the desirable farm and human adjustments that must be made to mold the pattern of the future.

It is evident that farmers in Anderson County, in South Carolina, and through the whole South, are moving as rapidly as possible, under their own steam, toward the kind of agriculture they believe the future demands. They are redoubling their prewar trend toward mechanization. The Anderson County survey tells me that farmers in this county alone plan to buy more than 1,100 tractors in the next 2 years—just one item in their long list of unfilled wants—as compared to 300 purchased in 1939 and 1940. The same demand for tractors and other machinery is being exhibited all over the Cotton Belt.

Livestock raising, dairying, grain production, and raising of food crops are making giant strides in the South. I understand that Anderson County is one of the leaders in this respect, with more than 75,000 acres of grain, and an expanding production of cover crops, legumes, and fruits and vegetables. During the past 10 years this county has become one of the leaders in the State and in the South in the production of beef cattle. Your State experiment station believes that wtihin 5 years the number of dairy cattle in South Carolina may increase by 65 percent—and that they will be better cows, capable of producing possibly 88 percent more milk than at present. Where you now produce only 27,000,000 dozen eggs in South Carolina and import more than half of the eggs you eat—it is believed that by 1950 the State's poultry flocks will be shelling out 48,000,000 dozen eggs, and that your thriving broiler industry will have doubled its output.

The remarkable thing about this great potential expansion in Southern agriculture is that it won't have to "steal" its markets from other areas—these are right in the South, if the South can develop its industries as it would like to. The diversified products will supply great wants that are not yet being fully supplied. Practically all of the food and feed the South can produce is needed right on the farms and in the southern cities. For example, we estimate that it would have taken 2,000,000 more dairy cows in the South in 1940 to bring milk production up to the minimum needed in southern cities—and now the need is even greater.

One of the most vital tasks for the future of the South is being tackled with a will in South Carolina and Anderson County. That job is saving and improving the soil. This morning I had the great pleasure of seeing myself the excellent work that is being done by farmers in the Upper Savannah soil conservation district, one of the 21 districts which completely blanket the States. A high point in my tour was the presentation of certificates of award to 45 of your farmers who have made outstanding progress in soil conservation farming. I learned that more than 1,700 farms and more than 180,000 acres in this district are being protected and restored by terracing, rotation and strip cropping, contour farming, cover cropping, pasture improvement, and reforestation. That is a wonderful beginning, just as the whole State is making a determined start with conservation plans on 13,000 farms covering more than 2,000,000 acres. But I look forward to the day when every farm and every acre in the South is under similar plans. The Chinese from their ancient wisdom on the land, have a creed that "He who neglects the soil is unfaithful to himself." We must keep faith with ourselves and our future.

All in all, we can look ahead and see a pattern for southern agriculture brought by rapidly improving farm technology and full utilization of the South's magnificent industrial opportunities. More and better fertilizers will be used; improved varieties of crops and livestock will be grown in larger quantities. Better feeding and breeding will bring far greater production of livestock, dairy, and poultry products per pound of feed. Cotton and hay, the last strongholds of hand labor, will be conquered by new machines. In our hay fields the one-man pick-up baler is at work. Under conditions favorable to mechanized operations, tractors, mechanical cross cultivation, and mechanical picking can cut the man-hours required to produce a bale of cotton to one-fifth of old requirements.

These powerful economic forces will not be denied. They mean that southern farms will become larger and fewer, although not large scale on the average. There will be fewer farm operators, sharecroppers, and hired hands to divide the farm income—and that income can be much larger in total. Cotton will still be an important cash crop, but not the dictator of the farm economy. Indeed, on many farms where cotton now is the one and only source of cash income, there will be five or six cash-producing projects, such as dairy products, beef, poultry, eggs, truck crops, and woodland products. And some of these other products promise to bring more cash income, per enterprise, than cotton does now. What we want to shoot at is a diversified conservation type farming that is easy on the land, beneficial to the people who farm, and capable of supplying the food the South needs for good nutrition. We want a farming in which cotton produces a smaller part of a much larger farm income, instead of a third of a too-small farm income, as in the past.

Such a progressive southern agriculture, as it develops, will itself bring into being many off-the-farm jobs, and would stimulate—in fact require—the expansion and development of Southern industry and business in many lines. This isn't a guess. We have seen it happen in many communities and regions that developed a productive, well-balanced agriculture; we are seeing it in the South right now. Like a transfusion, the new farm dollars, coming steadily throughout the year and not just at cotton harvest, will course vigorously through southern business. A higher farm productivity, a larger variety of products, will call for more manufacturing and sales of farm equipment and machinery, and more processing industries, more transportation, and more services industries. We know that progress toward a well-rounded agriculture and industrialization brings a balanced, healthy growth of all parts of a region's economy.

Now I want to make this clear: Cotton production under such a pattern of industrial-agricultural development may be just as large, and, in fact, might be larger, than it is today. But cotton would be grown on those lands to which it is best suited, where it can be produced most cheaply by machine methods. Our ultimate goal must be to produce cotton so efficiently that it can compete in quality and price with foreign growths in the world market and with synthetic fibers in the home market.

Can that be done? Not only can it be done; we have to do it. Not just to save cotton, but to enable the South to move into the safe, stable, modern industrial-agriculture economy I have been talking about.

We are now doing much about it—and by "we" I mean all of us, farmers, communities, States, and the Federal Government. But I believe we should more clearly define our respective obligations and goals all along the line, just as you folks have done in your postwar planning.

Most important, I believe, we should distinguish carefully and clearly between short-range and long-range methods. Nothing can bring disaster more easily than relying on short-range palliatives for an ailment to the exculsion of long-range treatments that lead to a cure.

Frankly, the Nation has used many short-range devices to meet the serious problems of low cotton prices and shrinking demand in the past decade and a half. I'm not apologizing for those methods. They did meet the immediate problems; they saved the cotton South from bankruptcy; they enabled cotton growers and those dependent on them to keep going. We are still using and will have to continue to use many short-range prescriptions to avert critical situations that may arise. Right now, for example, we are trying to help American cotton compete in world markets through the export subsidy program of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

But we must honestly recognize such temporary expedients for what they are, and not mistake them for permanent solutions. That is just good common sense. It would be disservice to cotton and to the people who produce it to freeze it indefinitely to a rigid price. To do so in the long run will encourage inefficient production, build up competition, and destroy its markets. Let us be farsighted enough to keep temporary expedients and look in the long run to basic improvements and adjustments.

The real challenge is in the long-pull improvements needed in cotton and cotton growing. These promise the greatest pay-off. Many of the improvements can be made on the farms by the farmers themselves; others require wholehearted community cooperation; still others arise from the initiative of industry; and many others depend in part on State and Federal research and action.

The quality of American cotton is an example. The grade of our cotton isn't what it used to be. Fifteen years ago 40 percent or more of our total output was Strict Mid-

dling or better. In the 1941–42 season, it was less than 8 percent. Obviously growers should adopt varieties and methods that result in higher quality, and a more uniform product. This is the fundamental idea behind the United States Department of Agriculture's one-variety area plan. Under this plan, the growers in a market area agree to plant only one good variety. This enables the ginners to limit their ginning to one variety of cotton, making it easy to maintain pure seed stocks and to assemble large even-running lots of cotton of the same variety. This is just good business. Records show that ginners in Georgia and Alabama who adopted this plan have averaged an extra income of $6 to $11 per acre.

Research has been busy developing new and better cotton products, and thus widens the market for cotton. During the war it was feared we might run into a shortage of jute from India used for bagging. As a result of exhaustive experiments in United States Department of Agriculture laboratories, we have developed a cotton fabric for sandbags, a most durable material that will not rot or mildew even though buried for a year in ground where ordinary cloth would fall apart in a week. This process gives cotton a tremendous advantage in goods that must stand weather. We have a new method of flameproofing cotton cloth without altering its flexibility or laundering ability. And we now have cotton cords for tires with heat resistance and tensile strength far greater than the best of those used in the past. These are just a few samples of the way in which cotton is being improved for increased service in the modern world.

The greatest challenge of cotton is the cost of producing and distributing cotton. It must come down. This is a basic problem to which all of us must turn our heads and our hands. In achieving this low-cost production we can expect to see further adjustments in land use—further shifting of cotton to lands that produce the highest yields per dollar of cost, which will be the most fertile lands suited to machine methods of production. Great strides are being made in the improvement of cotton machinery toward complete mechanization of all cotton growing. It will require better use of fertilizer, superior varieties of cotton, and all-around improvements in farm management. Low-cost farm production must be accompanied by increased efficiency and lower costs in ginning and in all marketing steps from the farm to the ultimate consumer, I firmly believe we can do this.

Some may warn that I must not have my head in the clouds. But we all know that we must keep our feet on the ground—on ground like that of Anderson County—a typical southern county where a long-range program toward a progressive modern agriculture is on its way. For all who want to see them, the signs of the future are here.

Continuation of Employment Service as a Federal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 20 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by the International Association of Public Employment Services giving their reasons why the Employment Service should continue as a Federal service.

President Truman has recommended to the Congress that the Employment Service remain as a Federal system until June 30, 1947. In addition, several bills are now pending before the Committee on Education and Labor providing for basic changes in the existing legislation relating to the Employment Service. I urge Senators to read this statement by the State and local offices of the Employment Service before rushing to take action on any bill or proposal to return the Employment Service immediately to the States. The views of these State and local officials who operate the Employment Service—and who oppose the return of the Employment Service to the States—should be given very careful consideration.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT SERVICES,
Providence, R. I.

To Members of Congress:

The attached report from the International Association of Public Employment Services officials is being forwarded to you for the purpose of furnishing pertinent information in connection with the question of continued Federal operation of the employment service during the emergency. The association has no quarrel with any State or Federal agency. Our organization is purely technical and professional and we exist for the purpose of maintaining high standards in the employment service. We feel, however, that the association has an obligation to present the facts to those who feel that a federally operated employment service cannot continue to discharge its responsibilities to workers, veterans, employers, and the American public.

We understand certain Members of Congress have received protests against men or women drawing unemployment compensation when there were jobs available. If benefits are being paid to workers who have refused suitable work offers, they are being paid as a result of administrative determinations of the unemployment compensation agencies in the States, themselves, and after notice of job refusal by the employment service. Obviously correction of such administrative action cannot be obtained through a return of the employment service to State administration. It is their responsibility and prerogative to correct this condition now. Whether the employment service remains Federal or State has no bearing on this matter.

The problem of employment Nation-wide during this trying period of reconversion deserves intelligent handling by individuals well informed on the facts. It is with this thought in mind that this brief report is being furnished.

THOMAS H. BRIDE,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

STATUS OF THE EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

The announced transfer of the WMC and the USES to the Department of Labor was immediately followed by a move within the United States Senate for the return of the Employment Service to the States 90 days after final passage of the jobless benefit bill.

The Labor Department is earnestly desirous of improving the status of the USES as a public service agency and of the individual employment service employee. Judge Schwellenbach has indicated a lively interest in the organization and a determination to give it its rightful place and importance in the reconversion effort. The transfer of the USES is a most practicable move for the agency at this time.

At this writing the Lucas amendment has been added and the jobless benefit bill has been passed by the Senate. As an association the IAPES is not directly concerned with the general provisions of the jobless benefits bill, but is vitally concerned with the Lucas amendment, and it is the consensus of IAPES opinion that the Employment Service should not be returned to the States at this time.

The proponents of return to the States want State operation, but almost complete Federal financing of the Employment Service. Not one has suggested that the States bear the cost of the service. They have consistently based their advocacy of immediate return on the following points:

1. The State services were loaned for the emergency, and so with the emergency ended the repayment of the loan falls due.
2. That between a federally operated USES and a State operated UC, no effective coordination can exist.
3. That a labor exchange must be operated on a basis of local option and local control, and that the Federal operation of the Employment Service is an infringement of State's rights; and
4. The State operation of the ES is essential to, and a determining factor in, the effective administration of a State unemployment agency.

Back of these contentions are the real issues, never openly stated, of (1) the fear of an early federalization of the UC agencies, with (2) the fear of an increased employer UC tax rate.

As regards the first point of the proponents' argument, the emergency still exists both in form and in actuality and will legally continue until Congress or the President formally announces its ending.

In connection with point 2; the USES under WMC administration has operated, insofar as State UC agencies are concerned, in exactly the same manner as it did as a State agency under the Social Security Board. The UC agencies are currently informed on all job refusals and have the opportunity to determine who shall receive benefit payments and who shall not in every instance. It can be shown that in any instances of alleged lack of cooperation resulting in payment of benefits not due, the UC agencies have taken action on payment or nonpayment with the full facts before them. With their action in paying, or refusing to pay, the IAPES has no fault to find. The responsibility of determining eligibility for benefits is theirs and theirs alone. The ES has the responsibility of furnishing the UC the facts on job refusal, and that responsibility is being discharged in the same manner as it was discharged from the very beginning of benefit payments in this country.

As for point 3: Operation of the ES at the grass roots and on the basis of local conditions has been observed by the WMC in much greater degree than it ever was under a State controlled agency, as a result of WMC's constant policy of full use of local labor-management committees.

And, finally on point 4: Under present conditions the USES and the State UC agencies are still housed under the same local office roof, procedures practically identical with those promulgated by the State UC agencies themselves as far back as 1937, are still followed; local ES and UC personnel are still used interchangeably regardless of pay roll, and only with regard to office load. A legal responsibility of the UC is to determine what in any individual cases is deemed "suitable employment." The ES has the responsibility of locating jobs, and offering jobs to UC claimants—or potential claimants—solely on the basis of job specifications and worker qualifications. When a claimant refuses any such job offer, the ES simply reports the

facts to the UC. The UC investigators and examiners are required to determine whether the work was justified in such job refusal, or was not justified, and to allow, or to disallow benefits at their discretion. The merging of the ES with the UC will in no way alter these responsibilities, nor will it improve the internal operations or effectiveness of any State UC agency which may now be ineffectively operated.

Listed below are a number of reasons why the Employment Service should continue as a Federal service.

1. With millions of dischargees from the military, and millions of displaced war workers a national employment problem will exist greater than that of 1918, 1933, or 1942.

2. Veterans will constitute a highly mobile part of the labor force. They have traveled over the world and State lines will not concern them. They have a right to know where the best jobs are. They will need employment counseling. The GI bill established a veterans' placement service board to cooperate with and assist the USES. This Board's service to veterans would be greatly impeded if Federal operation of the Employment Service was abandoned.

3. Millions of workers have moved during the war. With peace, another shift of population will occur. Workers will be seeking jobs across State lines. These workers need information and advice on location of job opportunities. They will want to know where the best jobs are for them—without regard to what State they may be in.

4. State lines frequently cut across local labor market areas. Splitting them up with local offices operating under different laws and procedures established in two or more State capitals leads to confusion and ineffectiveness.

5. All the local labor markets in the country add up to one national labor market. A national employment service is needed to assist men seeking jobs and employers seeking workers to get together.

6. Modern industry is no respecter of State lines. Organizations representing management are national organizations. Labor unions are national. Farm organizations are national. These organizations can best coordinate their activities through cooperation with a national employment service.

7. Full employment is a national problem which requires a uniform index on all communities, and labor market reporting must be standardized.

8. Balancing of labor supply and demand between States requires a national system for channeling migration of workers between distress areas of unemployment and communities having labor shortages.

9. A national system of reporting demand and supply areas would reduce misdirected and aimless migration of job seekers.

10. During the war period and to present, unemployment compensation agencies have been advised on job acceptances or refusals of jobs by unemployment compensation claimants under the same procedures that were in effect during period employment service was part of unemployment compensation—with no lessening of effectiveness.

11. Unemployment compensation is primarily a tax-collecting, insurance-paying, and auditing function.

12. Employment service is primarily a placement function—if full employment is to be achieved, it will be aided through the prompt placement of workers in jobs. The placement function is of major importance, and should not be operated as a subordinate unit of the insurance agency which pays temporary benefits to workers between jobs.

13. Unemployment compensation and employment service offices are housed in some buildings, now, as in 1938, still work effectively together.

14. Unemployment compensation and employment service personnel in most States are trained in claims taking, and taking of applications for work, and this personnel of both agencies work interchangeably, regardless of pay roll.

15. No question of States' rights or local option, as federally operated employment service is a community service, with all problems other than basic policy resolved at grass roots.

16. Every time during past 30 years when a national employment crisis arose, the need for a national system of public-employment offices has been clearly demonstrated. (1918, USES; 1933 USES under Department of Labor with NRS; 1942 USES under WMC.)

17. A national agency is required to continually analyze trends in employment opportunities so as to advise vocational training agencies on forthcoming changes.

18. Employment Service employees deserve the protection and standards of pay and working conditions provided uniformly only under Federal civil service.

19. Under State administration there would be 48 different systems, 48 different pay scales, 48 different organizations, with no means of exchanging personnel, ideas, or solutions to mutual problems.

20. Who would finance State administered employment services? The States have never contributed more than $3,000,000 per year against an operation cost of approximately $54,000,000 per year. If the Federal Congress must make the operating funds available for an employment service it seems reasonable that such service should be federally administered.

21. This would allow for a national agency capable of providing sufficient uniformity in its rules, procedures, and reporting services to prevent confusion, and at the same time to provide sufficient decentralization in administration to permit adaptation to local needs.

The association has no quarrel with Unemployment Compensation as a State agency. It does have an obligation to present the facts to those who feel that a federally operated employment service cannot continue to discharge its responsibility to workers, veterans, employers, and the American public.

Address by Hon. James M. Tunnell, of Delaware, Before Conference on Atomic Power and Public Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 20 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on the 17th of November, in New York City, before the conference on atomic power and public policy, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] delivered an address on the subject of atomic power. The address is a most interesting one, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Perhaps no discovery in the history of mankind has so aroused fear as the discovery that atomic power could be harnessed. Fears of world destruction and dreams of new industrial worlds have vied with each other. Hundreds of speeches have been made about this discovery. Many have claimed that it is no longer necessary to have trained armies or naval ships. They state that from this time on, all acts of war will be by the atomic energy route. Many believe that a destruction of a very large proportion of the world's population is not only possible, but probable. One portion of our population is demanding that there be no further preparation for war, as the atomic bomb is all that we need to use. Another great sector of the people is attempting to pledge the United States not to use the atomic bomb. If both of these elements succeed, we shall be as defenseless as the Chinese Empire.

This is one of the great dangers of the present situation. We may be put in the same frame of mind as after World War I. Our people may object to more ships, to more Army training. They may object to more submarines and more airplanes. The shortsighted view of the average citizen is to assume that since this war has been won there is no preparation necessary to prevent or win any other war. Those who are conscious of the atomic bomb situation are devoting their time to pleas that we agree with all of the great nations of the world not to use it in time of war. Many believe that the Nation which first attacks will be a certain winner. Many believe that all the power used in civil life will have its origin in this new discovery. Electricity is to be discarded because it is considered out moded and feeble. Steam power is to be forgotten as belonging to the dark ages. Atomic power to which is ascribed all the powers of magic is in the opinion of these people to be the sole reliance of the civilization of the future. Scientists are telling us, however, that the use of atomic power for civilian purposes is not economically feasible at this time. Its cost is too great. Perhaps there may be discoveries of the future which will make its use a possibility. That time has certainly not yet arrived. Undoubtedly the developments which will follow this discovery will make it possible for mankind to use it for something other than purposes of destruction. When we realize that the stars, moons, and planets are kept in their orbits by some mysterious power, man will eventually use the same power for his prosperity and happiness. There are innumerable angles to the possible use of atomic power in either peace or war.

Since it was first used in war, man's first thought of it is as a weapon of war. Much of the discussions thus far have been as to who can or will use it in war. The United States, being the Nation that first developed it and first used it as a weapon of war, it is naturally interested in all plans and suggestions for its use. Knowing that the people of America are peace loving, we may assume that the United States will never attack an enemy with atomic power until it has itself been attacked with this power, if it agrees to this course. Our American citizens are so scrupulous about the use of this power for war that there are those who criticize its use at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. There are Americans who criticize the United States for using this terrific power as a war weapon, even though it may have saved a million American lives.

It is perhaps beside the point and useless to ask whether or not the Axis Powers would have used it against the Allies if they had been the first to discover and harness it. There was a time when war was directed principally against armies and military installations. In recent wars all this has been forgotten or at least ignored. Ask the women and children of London as to whether the Axis powers used their bombs against the civilian population of Great Britain. Ask the Poles and Russian civilians as to whether their civilian population, including women and children, were free from attack in the scourge of war. The days of war according to "gentlemen agreements" have passed. Nothing but power is effective in modern warfare. In fact international morality is seldom practiced. This virtue is left for in-

dividuals. There are those who inquire as to the outlawing of gas as a weapon of war. It was effectually prevented in World War II. Nations agreed not to use poison gas as a weapon of war. It was virtually outlawed. The outlawing of gas had very little connection with the fact that it was not used. Gas was not used during World War II for the reason that the antagonists knew that if they should begin the use of gas it would be used against them. The result was its effective elimination as an instrument of war in World War II. It is also a fact that at this time that scientists agree that there is no known defense from the use of atomic bombs in time of war. The future may disclose some method of excluding the atomic bomb by some proximity discharge method. Perhaps the men of science may discover some greater force which will lessen the fears of the atomic power or overshadow its might. At this time no such relief is hoped for by scientific men, and a defenseless world should not wait for such discovery. We are told that Mr. Einstein, in discussing the great power of atomic force, says he does not believe that all of the world will be destroyed by the atomic bomb, but that two-thirds of it may be.

Scientists have proven that there not only is the atomic power which they had long known to exist, but they have proven that it can be harnessed and used as an instrument of destruction. This having been done, there is no known method of preventing its discovery and use by other powers or even by individuals. In fact we are told by men of science that there is very little secret about atomic power. Its use may be difficult and expensive, but not impossible. Neither is a bomb the size of a football of such dimensions as to cause it to be certain to be discovered. The outlaw of the future may use the atomic bomb instead of the less powerful infernal machine. The nation which desires to make war in the future may attack with the atomic bomb, and in such numbers as to totally destroy its enemy. This is particularly true as to city dwellers. A small nation can use the atomic bomb as effectively as a large one. Therefore, our possible enemies of the future are much more numerous than those of the past. The size of the army will no longer be a criterion of the danger to us from an enemy. The size of the navy will no longer be conclusive of an enemy's power. The number of airplanes and the number of submarines may not determine the contest. One time bomb concealed in New York may destroy the city. One bomb dropped from an airplane may make of any of our largest cities, bits of wasteland, or one large bomb crater. Its widespread use might not be feared to the same extent if we could know that the bombs to be used by our enemies would cost $2,000,000,000 each to perfect. We have no way of knowing that the inventive genius of the future may not lessen this cost so that it can be used more generally. At present we must think of the atomic bomb as something which might become fatal to civilization, unless regulated or prevented. The question then arises as to how its possible use could be prevented. Since we receive no encouragement from science as to any defense against it, we can only turn to the possibilities of a defense through governmental precautions. There are those who advocate the release of all knowledge as to atomic power by the United States to the other nations of the world by some sort of treaty or agreement between our Nation and each of the other nations of the world as to its use for war purposes. It is very probable that every other nation in the world would agree not to use this power in time of war, since practically all of the other nations are now without either the knowledge or facilities for its use.

This idea presupposes the validity and sanctity of such agreements. One does not have to wonder what a nation like Japan would have done with the knowledge and facilities for the manufacture and use of the atomic bomb had such knowledge and facility belonged to the Japanese Nation in July of this year. What would Germany have done even during the early months of 1945, if it had had such knowledge and facilities. Of what value would an agreement not to use such power with either Germany or Japan have been? Could America have slept and eaten with any degree of satisfaction if we had known that they had such an instrument of death, and that the Allied Powers did not have such an instrument? It is not easy to believe that any treaty or series of treaties would be sufficient to prevent its use by an enemy of the United States in the future if we have such, and have no method of defense against it. There are those who suggest that our cities be depopulated and our people scattered to country districts making it impossible for large numbers of them to be destroyed at one time, or at least withone bomb. This is not feasible. Our economy and our civilization are based on at least a portion of our population being centralized in cities. While our agricultural products must necessarily be produced in rural areas, our automobiles must be manufactured in localities where the population is more dense. There are those who have suggested underground life for the Nation of the future. This method would be almost as vulnerable. Without knowing the depth to which an application of atomic power could penetrate the underground, one wonders what would happen to such an underground system if atomic power should be applied from within. The scattering of our urban population is not the answer to the atomic bomb problem. The underground system of living is not the answer. There are those who say that the United Nations Organization is the answer to the problem. They tell us that we should turn over to the United Nations Organization all facilities and all knowledge as to the discovery of the bomb and its use. I am not opposed to this with proper safeguards. What would happen in case one of the five great powers should veto any attack on the power which had manufactured and stored a large amount of atomic energy instruments is a problem of great difficulty.

At any time in the future by our system of inspection, we might learn that one of the five powers, having the veto power, had manufactured and stored sufficient instruments for the use of atomic energy to destroy our Nation. What would be our immediate relief? Before we could manufacture ready for use a store of atomic bombs, our prepared enemy would probably destroy our plants. However, we are told that if this is done all we shall have to do is to inspect the world to see that no atomic power is manufactured or used by any nation of the world. What size police force, or detective agency, or military force this plan will require has not been seriously considered. The United Nations Organization cannot prevent either the manufacture or use of atomic bombs by inspection. The job is too great, the territory is too large, the number of nations that might become interested in transgression of any regulation is too large. What size force would be necessary to inspect and keep inspected either Soviet Russia or the British Commonwealth of Nations? Perhaps this matter should be taken over by the United Nations Organization. What would be the next step of a nation that was manufacturing atomic bombs after it should learn that its manufacture had been discovered? Might it not turn loose its storehouse of bombs on civilization at once? There are those who object to any suggested method of meeting this terrible threat which may smack of force. Yet, it is doubtful if any nation in the world would be willing to trust the future of its homes, its women and children, its methods of sustaining life and health, to the integrity of any nation which might care to violate its agreement as to the use of the atomic bomb. This is what we shall be doing if we fail to prepare ourselves for the defense of our country by a stock of these same bombs. Knowing that atomic bombs might be manufactured by its enemies, what great security could any nation feel? What would our Nation do if its existence depended on the use of any instrument which it might have in a time of emergency? We probably should use whatever instruments we had. Then what would a future Germany or Japan do? If our cities were being destroyed, our homes blasted, our Nation on the verge of being destroyed, to what length might we go, especially if we were being attacked by atomic bombs?

The President of the United States, the Prime Minister of England, and the Prime Minister of Canada have written and executed a statement with reference to the atomic bomb. In paragraph 1 of that statement, it is admitted that there can be no adequate military defense to the atomic bomb. It is further admitted that in the employment of this bomb no single nation can have a monopoly. The three nations announced (a) their willingness to consider the possibility of prevention of the use of atomic energy for destructive purposes. (b) To promise the use of such energies for peaceful and humanitarian ends. In paragraph 3, it is set out that the only complete protection for the civilized world from the destructive use of scientific knowledge lies in the prevention of war. It is further admitted that no system of safeguards can be devised which will of itself provide an effective guaranty against production of atomic weapons by a nation bent on aggression. The three nations expressed their willingness to exchange fundamental scientific information and scientific literature for peaceful ends with any nation that will fully reciprocate. In paragraph 6, the three nations stated, "We are not convinced that the spreading of the specialized information regarding the practical application of atomic energy, before it is possible to devise effective, reciprocal, and enforceable safeguards acceptable to all nations, would contribute to a constructive solution of the problem of the atomic bomb." The three nations proposed to create a commission under the United Nations Organization to prepare recommendations for submission to the Organization. The commission is asked (a) to make specific proposals for extending between all nations the exchange of basic scientific information for peaceful purposes. (b) For control of atomic energy to the extent necessary to insure its use only for peaceful purposes. (c) For the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons. (d) For effective safeguards by way of inspection and other means to protect against hazards of violation and evasions.

Let us not surrender to any nation the favorable position which we occupy by reason of our having discovered and first used this great force. Let us not agree that we shall not for our defense or in case of attack use this weapon. Let every aggressor on the face of the globe know that we have the greatest stock of atomic energy in the world. Let us make treaties with all other nations of the world that we will not use atomic energy except in self defense, or after we have been attacked. Let us train for defense and fortify for defense, not relying entirely upon agreements with any or all nations. Let us treat as sacred our agreement not to use the atomic bomb unless it is necessary for us to do so in self defense, or after we have been attacked. This agreement will be kept by America. A sufficient stock of atomic bombs properly distributed with available airpower nearby will enable us to use the atomic bomb if we are attacked, or in self defense. No nation will dare to attack us if it knows that that

is our position. No enemy can destroy all of our bombs, or all of our bombers, which might be prepared to carry this death-dealing weapon to any treacherous enemy's home land. No nation will attack us under these conditions. This may be the gospel of force. I say that it is the gospel of the preservation of the species of the nearest security which is possible under the present condition of international relations. Steps of this sort by the United States, and sensible dependence upon the United Nations Organization will ensure peace to the world. Let us raise the standard of living of all the nations of the world. Also, for ourselves, let us continue to have powerful fortifications, trained men in armies, a powerful Navy, treaties with all the great nations of the world promising to refrain from the use of atomic energy as a weapon of war. Let us back the United Nations Organization, and let us have a store of atomic weapons to be used only after attack, or in self defense. Let us not trust our families or future generations to promises of aggressor nations, or nations that may become aggressors on slight temptation. Will America from the advantageous position which the atomic bomb has given her assume the leadership in compelling and maintaining world peace? This discovery makes it necessary for us all to use every honorable and possible means of defense against the very weapon which we have given to the world. Let us not attempt to become dictators, let us not attempt to conquer the world, but let us take every step possible to prevent being ourselves made the victim of our own handiwork.

Surplus-Property Disposal as It Relates to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, November 20 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter, dated November 9, 1945, from Mr. Stuart Symington, Surplus Property Administrator, dealing with the subject of veterans and surplus property. I ask that the enclosure with the letter be also included in the insertion.

There being no objection, the letter and its enclosure were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 9, 1945.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: You will recall that at our executive conference with your subcommittee on October 27, 1945, at your suggestion, it was agreed we would submit a report on the problem of disposing of surplus property to veterans, together with any suggestions that we might have for dealing with this problem.

As you know, the Surplus Property Act of 1944, the law under which this Administration functions, reads as follows:

"DISPOSITIONS TO VETERANS

"SEC. 16. The Board shall prescribe regulations to effectuate the objectives of this act to aid veterans to establish and maintain their own small business, professional, or agricultural enterprises by affording veterans suitable preferences to the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of this act in the acquisition of the types of surplus property useful in such enterprises."

The problems that have arisen in administering this section of the law may be classified under two headings.

In the first place, there is the problem of outlets. This is probably the basic problem that arises in disposing of surplus property to the veterans. We all know that to sell merchandise it must be presented first to the customer. There must be places where the veteran can see the merchandise prior to its purchase, or at least find out about the property and arrange to buy it.

Our particular problem in this connection is complicated by the fact that surplus property can never be presented with full knowledge of the condition it is in, because no disposal agency has any control over the condition of the property declared surplus.

At the beginning the Department of Commerce had been assigned the task of selling all consumer goods. It had only 11 regional offices from which the veteran could purchase. That meant, for example, that a man in Bismarck, N. Dak., had to go to Chicago, Ill., to obtain details about, or to look at, surplus property. Actually, he might have to go considerable farther if he wanted to inspect prior to purchase such an item as a truck which was located in the southeast, say, at Atlanta, Ga.

In an effort to deal with this problem of outlets, the Surplus Property Board had worked out an arrangement with the Smaller War Plants Corporation, which had 110 outlets over the country. The SWPC has been cooperative in every way in attempting to help the veteran to acquire surplus property, but for obvious reasons these offices of the SWPC were not equipped to and could not operate as disposal outlets.

Our belief that it was absolutely necessary to have more outlets if goods were to be available to the veterans was one of the reasons that led us to recommend the transfer of the disposal of consumer goods from the Department of Commerce to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. As the RFC has 31 regional offices, this transfer will alleviate to some degree the problem of disposal outlets.

We are sure, however, that even the 31 outlets of the RFC will not be adequate and that we are still going to be faced with the problem of devising the means to make surplus property available to veterans. In an attempt to solve this problem, we have prepared a plan entitled "Every Veteran a Dealer," copy of which is attached to this letter. This plan is designed to improve the distribution of surplus property among veterans by making it possible for them to exercise their preference directly through the normal channels of trade.

In presenting this plan to your subcommittee, we should emphasize that it is a result of weeks of work and thought that we have devoted to this problem. It is the best solution that we can devise for dealing with the problem of distribution. We are not convinced that the plan will be successful, although we think it should be tried, and we are going to make every effort to make it work.

In the event the plan is not successful, however, we think that we and your subcommittee must face the fact that there is only one alternative left if the present provisions of the statute are to be administered properly, and that is to establish veterans' stores all over the United States, that is to say, retail outlets. This would involve the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars.

If Congress is not inclined to authorize the expenditure of millions of dollars for this purpose, then we must face the question whether it would not be better to express the gratitude of the country to the veterans in some way other than a preference in the purchase of surplus property.

In this connection we call your attention to the fact the Canadian Government decided there was no way the veteran could receive a true preference or priority in the acquisition of surplus except by allowing him a straight cash bonus to be used in the purchase of surplus or other goods. A suggestion of this kind of course falls outside the scope of this agency and we make this comment only to call to your attention the fact that one country believed this was the only way to handle the problem we are now discussing.

So much for the problem of outlets which, as we have said, is the basic problem that we face in this field. But there is a second set of difficulties which arise because of the provisions of the statute, which we think we should call to your attention. The statute does not give the veteran an absolute priority but merely a preference. That is to say, before the veteran has any claim there are two priorities ahead of him. The first is the priority of the States and cities and other political subdivisions and of tax-supported charitable and educational institutions. It is estimated that there are some 285,000 priority claimants of this kind ahead of the veteran.

Furthermore, the veteran has no preference except for the purpose of establishing and maintaining his own business, agricultural or professional enterprise. The veteran may not buy simply for his own personal use. For example, the veteran can buy office furniture but he cannot buy dining room furniture in the exercise of his preference. Finally, the business which the veteran seeks to establish must be small.

We mention these particular aspects of the statute because we fear that neither the public nor the veterans in general understand the limitations that the Congress has placed upon their rights. It would be a comparatively simple matter to amend the statute so as to provide that the veteran had a priority ahead of all other dispositions except those to Federal agencies and to provide that the veteran could purchase for his own use.

We should like to emphasize, however, that amending the statute in this way would not touch the basic difficulty which is one of having adequate outlets through which the merchandise may be distributed directly to the veterans. That is a practical and administrative problem which no amendment of the details of the statute will touch. Until that problem is solved we fear that there can be no adequate and satisfactory distribution of surplus goods to veterans in any way that will give them a true preference.

We hope that we shall have an opportunity to discuss this report with your subcommittee and to receive the benefit of the views of its members. We assure you that we wish to do everything we can to give the veteran a real chance to obtain surplus property, and that we are prepared to entertain and to put into effect any suggestions or plans that seem designed to accomplish this result.

Sincerely yours,

STUART SYMINGTON,
Administrator.

EVERY VETERAN A DEALER IN SURPLUS PROPERTY

I. The Surplus Property Act of 1944 reads as follows with respect to veterans:

"DISPOSITIONS TO VETERANS

"SEC. 16. The Board shall prescribe regulations to effectuate the objectives of this act to aid veterans to establish and maintain their own small business, professional, or agricultural enterprises, by affording veterans suitable preferences to the extent fea-

sible and consistent with the policies of this act in the acquisition of the types of surplus property useful in such enterprises."

Congress intended therefore to help every veteran of World War II who wanted to start or maintain a small business, and has directed the Surplus Property Administration to treat the veteran as a preferred customer whenever the veteran desired to purchase any surplus property which would be used in establishing or carrying on such a business.

II. Complying with these instructions, SPA has now ordered that all veterans who are in business for themselves, or who will open up in business in the future, shall be classified as large dealers.

III. Under this classification, every veteran may purchase any surplus property offered for sale in the United States at as low a price as that paid by any dealer—no matter how large—in the country.

IV. In order to carry our this plan, the following procedures will be established at earliest opportunity:

(a) Whenever any surplus property is sold to wholesalers, it will be sold with the understanding that the wholesaler recognizes the classification established by the SPA insofar as it applies to veterans; and that will be part of the sales agreement.

(b) An agency (presumably the Veterans' Administration) will be designated to take the place of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. This agency will classify veterans into one of two groups, namely:

1. Veterans who are employees, but who need certain tools or equipment to carry on their work.

2. Veterans who actually operate a business or intend to start a business.

(c) After classification, the Veterans' Administration shall issue to the veterans a book of coupons in an amount equal to cost of the surplus property which the veteran desires to purchase.

(d) The veteran would then be in a position to go to any wholesale establishment in the United States which handles surplus property and purchase any surplus property of any kind up to the amount covered by his coupons.

(e) The wholesaler would then return the coupons to the disposal agency.

(f) The returned coupons will be an index of sales to veterans and records can be compiled by tabulating the coupons to show not only the volume of surplus property distributed to veterans but also a rough estimate of the kind of property purchased by veterans.

(g) The coupon plan limits the dollar preference right of purchase of each veteran. Veterans in class 1 to purchase $1,000 in preference merchandise, those in class 2 to $20,000. In addition, this $20,000 figure to be raised to $50,000 to purchase an individual unit, say an airplane.

This plan seems to have several advantages:

(a) It eliminates the great expense and delay incident to handling the veterans' business on a direct basis.

(b) It gives wide publicity as to the type and kind of surplus which is being offered for sale from day to day, this through wholesale advertising.

(c) It makes it possible for the veteran to examine the goods before he makes a purchase.

(d) No matter when the goods appear on the market, the veteran can always buy up to the limit of his coupons.

(e) The veteran can take advantage of surplus wherever offered, this by dealing with wholesalers through the mails.

(f) The veteran can buy in small quantities.

Abolition of the Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 20 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, last night the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] discussed very ably, I am sure, the proposed poll-tax legislation in radio addresses. I ask unanimous consent that both addresses be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, OF LOUISIANA, DELIVERED ON NOVEMBER 19, 1945, OVER THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO., STATION WMAL, ON THE SUBJECT OF POLL TAXES

Ladies and gentlemen, I am against the payment of a poll tax by any citizen of any State, as a prerequisite to voting. However, I am unalterably opposed to the abolition of the tax by an act of Congress, not only now, but at any time in the future. My objection to such a procedure is fundamental in that it violates the plain and unmistakable language of our Constitution.

The question of suffrage was always treated as a local prerogative, and jealously guarded by the men and women of the Colonies. I venture the assertion that if the right to determine the qualifications of voters had not been left to the States by the members of the Convention who drafted our Constitution, that great document would never have been ratified by a majority of the Thirteen Original States.

May I remind you that Congress has no authority to pass laws on matters which have been specifically reserved to the States. Or, permit me to put it this way, Congress has no right to pass laws affecting the internal affairs of the States unless our Federal Constitution gives it such a right.

I challenge my good friend, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. GUFFEY, to quote to you any language in our Constitution which gives the right to Congress to abolish poll taxes, or in anywise to fix the qualifications of voters in the States.

Listen to what our Constitution provides in article 1, section 2:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

Why, ladies and gentlemen, any school boy knows that the States have the undisputed right to fix the qualifications for those who vote in the election of the members of their respective legislatures. That provision of our Constitution guaranteeing that right has never been modified, but, on the contrary, it was reaffirmed when our Federal Constitution was amended to permit the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people. The identical language was used so that today we have two similar provisions in our Constitution providing that the qualifications of electors or those who vote for Congressmen and United States Senators shall be fixed by the States. The provisions are specific. They are direct as light, and subject to no other interpretation.

Such unqualified language should end all arguments, except possibly for some gullible politicians who are willing to trample on our sacred Constitution in order to appease certain pressure groups and who fear reprisals at the polls unless they lend their support to such pernicious legislation.

The question of qualifications of voters was interpreted by our courts in many cases involving the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments. In the case of *United States* v. *Cruikshank*, the Court declared "that the fifteenth amendment does not confer the right to vote. That is the prerogative of the State laws. It only confers the right not to be excluded from voting by reason of race, color, or previous conditions of servitude, and this is all the right that Congress can enforce." I quote further from the same decision: "The States may establish any other conditions and discriminations it pleases, whether as to age, property, education, or anything else."

Susan B. Anthony, the great suffragette, was sentenced to jail because she attempted to vote at an election, contrary to a State law which made it unlawful for women to vote. Our Supreme Court held in *Minor* v. *Hoppersett* that a State had the right to exclude women from voting. Why? Because, as the Court said in that case, and I quote:

"The United States has no voters in the States of its own creation. The elective officers of the United States are all elected directly or indirectly by State voters. The Members of the House of Representatives are to be chosen by the people of the States, and the electors in each State must have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

Can any language be more specific?

Although the bill before Congress to abolish the poll taxes has no merit in the light of our Constitution and by reason of the interpretations on the subject by the highest court of our land; although it is a direct encroachment on States' rights, many are willing to foster such legislation in order to satisfy a few groups who in my opinion, are being misled.

Such an issue tends to shatter our national unity; it revitalizes sectionalism; and in the wake of the long debates that will certainly occur in the Senate, bitterness, hatred, animosity and the like will be engendered to an alarming degree. My hope is that State governments will continue to function within the sphere prescribed by the Constitution and that no section of the country will be permitted to force its misguided viewpoint upon another.

REMARKS OF HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, OF PENNSYLVANIA; MADE OVER THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO. NETWORK, NOVEMBER 19, 1945, ON THE SUBJECT OF POLL-TAX LEGISLATION

The legalistic arguments of those who oppose the Federal repeal of the payment of poll taxes, and I appreciate their sturdy honesty and courageous intelligence, do not appeal to me.

It seems to me that their arguments are thin. They say that enactment of H. R. 7 lies beyond the constitutional power of the Congress. House Resolution 7 is a bill which just says that a man or woman otherwise qualified may not be kept from voting in a Federal election for failure to pay a tax.

Against this bill our legalistic opponents bring up a single paragraph of the Constitution.

That's their story, and if we're not careful, ladies and gentlemen, we'll be stuck with it.

We have a lot more arguments. We say that H. R. 7 is constitutional. We say the poll tax itself is not constitutional.

And to prove it we bring before you, the people, at the bar of public opinion, the entire United States Constitution except a single sentence; the readmission statutes of 1870, clearly violated by the poll tax; the majority report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, composed entirely of the outstanding lawyers of the Senate who have declared three times that H. R. 7 is constitutional; the tremendous majority given to the Federal antipoll tax bill three separate times by the House of Representatives, most of whom are lawyers, and very good lawyers; and the written opinions of the foremost authorities in the United States on constitutional law.

Insofar as the legal side of this poll tax issue is concerned, the whole issue of constitutionality rests upon the statement that: "The poll tax is not a qualificaton of voting."

Congress has the right and an imperative duty to protect the Constitution against inroads by the States against Federal Government. The poll tax is a wholly unconstitutional tax laid on a Federal function. It is a condition to be met by the voter before he casts his ballot. It has nothing to do with his qualifications as a citizen.

No less an authority than Gov. Chauncy Sparks, of Alabama, where the poll tax law is so severe that it can and does cost some citizens $36 to cast their first vote, tells us that the poll tax is not a qualification of voting, but "a condition prerequisite to voting." The poll-tax levy is part of the tax laws of the poll-tax States.

In short, the poll tax violates the Constitution by taxing a Federal function. The Senate Committee on the Judiciary says so. I hope that you will get a copy of the committee report on the Federal anti-poll-tax bill, and that you will take note that only 4 Senators, out of a total membership of 18, signed a minority report.

Now, Senator ELLENDER and I have been taking positions regarding the legalistic aspects of the subject of our discussion. We haven't said much about one thing which I think we agree on absolutely: That is, the poll tax must go.

The poll tax has no place in a modern system of government. It is undemocratic and discriminatory. It's a throw-back to the Middle Ages. Worst of all, it is in a pattern with the Nazi theories of government against which we have fought all over the world in the most terrible war of all history. The Nazi idea was that only a select few are entitled to rule, and that everybody not a member of the Nazi Party was a zero, without rights and without a voice in government.

The American way of life dictates that the Government is the people's Government. We say that public business is everybody's business. We say that it is not only a privilege and right of every American citizen to vote; it is also the first duty of citizenship.

In my own State of Pennsylvania we spend thousands of dollars every year to get the people out to vote. It makes no difference whether the voters are Democrats or Republicans, the candidates and the newspapers and the radio tell them to register and vote, and the political organizations send cars out to take the voters to the polls.

The result is that in my great State of Pennsylvania, with the second highest population of any State in the Union, 58 percent of the voters turn out and vote.

Ladies and gentlemen, it's been only 15 years since we got rid of the poll tax in Pennsylvania. We were glad to get rid of it. The poll tax resulted in one of the worst election scandals in our history. The poll tax is a standing invitation to corruption and bad government wherever it exists.

I have a high regard for my colleagues from the poll-tax States. They are gentlemen and statesmen. But sometimes I feel just a little sorry for them. When they get up on the Senate floor to speak I sometimes wonder whether they are speaking for the sovereign people of their States or just the 10 or 11 or 15 percent of the people who had the money to pay a poll tax. I think of that Virginia farmer who said, "A dollar ain't much * * * ef you got it." There are 10,000,000 American citizens in the seven poll-tax States who, as my farmer friend would say, "jist ain't got it."

There are almost 25,000,000 people in those States; but in the 1944 Presidential election less than 3,000,000 of them voted. Why, in Pennsylvania, with only little more than a third as many people, that many votes were cast.

The poll tax not only disfranchises 10,000,000 American citizens completely; it cuts down the voting power, in Congress, of every free voting citizen.

I say that there is not the slightest difference between most of my opponents and me on getting rid of the poll tax. The only argument is on how. I say that the Federal anti-poll-tax bill is simple, quick, easy, and constitutional, and should be passed. I say that the constitutional amendment proposed is slow, cumbersome, and unnecessary.

I hope you agree with me, and will make your opinions felt. The National Legislature must get busy and abolish the poll tax—right now—and not permit a filibuster or a threat of filibuster to stand in the way. I pledge myself to that purpose.

SUMMATION

I have stated my position on this question.

The opposition bases its position on the legalistic question of constitutionality. Congress should take cognizance of the question of constitutionality of legislation. A majority of the legalistic minds of the Congress claim that the proposed anti-poll-tax legislation is constitutional. We have a Supreme Court whose duty it is to pass upon constitutional questions. I suggest that the minority opposing this legislation step aside, permit the legislation to pass, and then let the constitutional question be determined by the highest court of the land.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 20 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD a statement on universal military training by Deane W. Malott, chancelor of the University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans., and published by the Kansas City Star. In this statement Chancellor Malott raises the question of why all the hurry about military conscription, which may or may not be a necessary part of the national defense, in view of the age of the atomic bomb, secret robots and rockets, and radar controls. I suggest to my colleagues that this statement is well worth study, and also that more and more people are coming to appreciate the views stated by Chancelor Malott.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

(By Deane W. Malott, chancelor, University of Kansas)

This week in the Nation's Capital hearings are being held on the proposal, advocated by the President of the United States and the top Army and Navy officers, to establish universal military training. The plan thus urged upon us is to take every able-bodied young man, at or around the age of 18, for a year of training. It does not involve the actual enlistment in the armed forces or serving as a fighting man either in this country or overseas. Apparently what is envisaged is a program of military and vocational training and education.

Upon this proposal both the President and the military appear to base their plans for our future security. The proposal, however, seems to be hastily formulated—and to represent an ineffectual attack on a major problem facing the Nation.

WHY 1 YEAR OF MILITARY TRAINING?

The present war was fought by highly skilled technical men. Some GI's were prepared in a few weeks of basic drill and discipline, but it required several years of education to produce the engineers of the Ledo road. The Medical Corps was composed of doctors with years of scientific study behind them; the bomber pilots were generally in training for 2 years at least; radar technicians received nearly a year of specialization. Both the Army and Navy specialists—and a very large proportion of the armed forces consisted of specialists—were given programs of training varying in length from a few weeks to several years. Basic training, however, never extended over more than a few weeks. What then will be done in the proposed 12-month period? Will basic training be stretched out for some three times its wartime length? If to this training there should be added (as seems likely) work in vocational education, the taxpayer would be asked to duplicate in part the already complex public education system of this country. Such a duplication would seem to be neither necessary nor desirable.

Rather than superimpose on a purely military program studies and techniques which are commonly found in civilian life, and which in civilian life can be integrated with continuing work, it would seem wise to utilize the curricula of existing educational institutions and add to them any needed work in military training, thus effecting a saving not only in money but in time. This step seems especially desirable in the light of the present importance of scientific and technical studies in warfare. To take a premedical or engineering student, for example, away from his studies for a year would mean withholding him from his greatest military usefulness for that period of time, because it is only as a physician or qualified engineer that he is of maximum use to the armed services. He would not be thus held back if kept at his regular curricular routine and at the same time given the necessary military drill and instruction.

WHY THE HASTE IN URGING MILITARY TRAINING LEGISLATION?

We now have trained men to the extent of more than 10,000,000. Considering the size of our potential fighting force we have little to concern us for a period of several years. During that time do we fear attack from England, seriously drained of men, materials, and money, as she is, by the war? Or from Russia, which certainly at the very least needs time for reconstruction and some semblance of naval power, before she could possibly attack our shores? Or do we fear Bolivia, or Costa Rica?

Or do we simply fear ourselves and our inability to make bold and purposeful decisions once the emotional stimulus of World War II has disappeared? Is that the real reason for the haste shown by our leaders? If so, what a sad commentary on our democratic processes. How disturbing to learn, if we should, that we can determine on positive action only if urged on by our emotions—the emotions of the moment. Surely a more sensible course is possible.

WHY NOT ATTACK THE WHOLE PROBLEM OF NATIONAL DEFENSE?

In our day of the atom bomb, of secret robots and rockets, and of radar controls, what is the whole picture of our defense needs? Obviously, those needs have changed overnight as the result of the work accomplished at Oak Ridge and elsewhere. On the basis of the techniques prevailing at the time of the blitz of London, it has been established that perhaps 30,000 bombs would be required to level New York City. In employing the techniques made inevitable by the destruction of the Hiroshima, an enemy might conceivably effect the same destruction by using six atomic bombs. Surely there must be some relation between this appalling lethal development and our manpower requirements. What that relation is, and specifically how atomic energy will change methods of warfare has so far been only superficially considered. How much of an army and navy do we need, and what will, in the future, be their tasks? The seasoned military man will probably continue to insist, as in the past, that only great masses of infantry can win a war. Imaginative and speculative men, however, will no longer be satisfied with this stock contention. The lad with the rifle and the bayonet is only one of many elements in the complex problem which those who plan against an attack upon us must face. The mobilization of industry and material, the dispersal of highly concentrated and exposed industrial areas, the continuance of a broad program of scientific research—these are equally as important as amassing bodies of troops. Furthermore, our commitments in the light of the yet undetermined peace treaties and of the actions of other major powers in armaments, as well as the responsibilities which we shall face in the yet untried United Nations Organization, are related to the problems of our country's protection. We need an integrated plan, not alone an isolated manpower program. We should not attempt to put any part of a defense plan into operation until we have envisaged the whole.

WHAT OF OUR OCCUPATION FORCES?

An illustration of our haphazard dealing with military affairs is found in the troubled state of our occupation forces in Germany and Japan. Is the President or any of our military leaders prepared to tell us how universal military service would presumably affect, or be affected by our troop requirements abroad?

There is an ominous quiet on the problem of occupation. Where are the troops to come from for the occupation? Will voluntary enlistments be enough? What is the situation at the moment, or dare it not be revealed until after the attempt has been made to pass universal training legislation? The pressure to return our boys is enormous; hundreds of them have long ago earned the right to come home. Yet American troops must be found to carry on. We must not lose the war by agreeing to a soft peace. Occupation may be desirable, if not essential, for a dozen years. But on what basis? Youngsters of 18 are still being drafted and under the present point system they face years of service. The curtain of the war is going down, but our young people are still being called into wartime training camps, where the business of fighting, not that of occupation, engrosses their attention. Is 18 the proper age for occupation troops? How long is the minimum training for occupation purposes, and what should it include? What would be a fair period of duty for occupation forces? These questions must be answered before we can formulate any full-scale military plans for the American people.

AN ALTERNATIVE SUGGESTION

No sensible American is presumably willing, under present world conditions, to withdraw to continental America, jump into bed, and pull the covers over his head. National defense, as opposed to mere universal manpower training, is a major and difficult problem, worthy of our best thought and effort. Let us, then, instead of offering emotional support of hastily proposed legislation, ask the President of the United States to appoint a small civilian commission, composed of distinguished scientists, civic leaders, and spokesmen for labor, industry, and agriculture, to study, promptly and fully during the coming months, the whole broad problem of our national defense. The Commission should seek the aid of the military high command and of others who have acquired intimate knowledge of modern warfare. It should try to determine the proper distribution of industrial plants for war purposes and the feasibility of their mobilization in case of attack. It should consider the changes in military techniques which are likely to be found in future warfare; and it should study the probable size of our future fighting force and the particular types of fighting men to be needed. It should, finally, attempt to learn what are the best methods of securing and training these forces for the Nation's protection. Then, if we will pass legislation based upon a study such as this, America may realistically, intelligently, and confidently prepare for the eventualities of an unknown future. Only then shall we have a fair chance of making secure our dearly won peace.

Relations Between America and Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 20 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Can America and Russia Stay Friends?" written by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and published in the November 1945 issue of Pageant magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN AMERICA AND RUSSIA STAY FRIENDS?

(By Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, chairman of the United States Senate Military Affairs Committee)

Winston Churchill once referred to Russia as "an enigma inside a riddle wrapped up in a mystery." To this, your average American, groping for light on today's most pressing international business, would murmur a fervent "amen."

Oddly enough, the key to the riddle has been right under our noses—a body of fact that reveals why we suspect Russia and vice versa, and the major compromises both nations must accept if they are to get along.

Reviewing our relations with Russia, one can only conclude that the forces binding the two nations together must be powerful indeed. For each has done everything imaginable to insult, antagonize, irritate, and thwart the other.

Russia has fomented civil strife in America, ridiculed ideals our citizens hold dear and, on three occasions, formally associated herself with our mortal enemies. We have libeled the heads of Russia's Government, invaded her territory, aided an insurrection against her Government, helped blockade her.

The highlights of the hysterical history, seen from both sides of the fence, appear on following pages. Such things have happened because both nations have been in mortal fear of each other. It is well worth the effort to understand how these fears arose and how they can be removed. For in the long run the citizen, not the diplomat, decides our future with Russia. If there is understanding and a desire for peace in the hearts of the two great peoples, nothing can prevent their attaining it.

THE CAPITALIST SCARE IN RUSSIA

The fear of capitalist countries that has colored so much of Russian policy goes back past the beginnings of the Red revolution. Like our own Revolution of 1776, the Bolshevist revolution had its dogmas, among them:

"A socialist state can exist only in a socialist world * * * democratic procedures are only tools of the ruling classes, and can never yield justice for the workers * * * capitalism is already tottering, and a small but disciplined cadre can overthrow it * * * capitalist powers will invariably join forces against a socialist state."

The old Bolshevists were cynical about liberal gestures of the ruling classes. To them it was laughable to imagine that the masses could obtain justice merely by asking for it.

But Russian suspicion of America had begun even before the Red revolution. During the Russo-Japanese War America was strongly pro-Japanese. Theodore Roosevelt found the Japanese victories bully and exuberantly wrote that "Japan is playing our game."

Too, before the Bolshevists came to power, the American Ambassador had denounced Lenin and Trotsky as German spies. When Lenin became the hero of the revolution, to the American Ambassador he was still a scoundrel who had betrayed his country for foreign gold. The Red regime was a disgrace to civilization. He urged revolt, clamored for Allied seizure of Petrograd and Moscow to wipe the scourge from the face of the earth.

It was 1918. The Germans on the eastern front were advancing relentlessly. The civil and military organization of Russia was in chaos.

Wilson made an impassioned plea to the people of Russia over the head of the government, urging continuance of the war. Millions of copies of this appeal were distributed by Americans in Russia. But still no help was forthcoming for the battered Russian armies. After a long delay Russia signed a separate peace at Brest-Litovsk.

The Allied world raged. Military occupation and destruction of the Red Government were everywhere demanded.

With Allied help the counterrevolutionary Admiral Kolchak established a rival government at Omsk. Allied, including American, forces landed at Archangel and Vladivostok and pushed inland, supporting anti-Bolshevist elements everywhere. While the Allies prepared a blockade of Red Russia, Kolchak established the notorious White Terror to exterminate Red resistance, and advanced on the citadel of Red power. However, the Red Army, reorganized by Trotsky, destroyed the White Army near the Volga, captured and

shot Kolchak. Bolshevist rule was now firmly established, and the gigantic task of building a modern socialist state on the ruins of feudal Russia got under way.

It was useless to look to America for aid. Our Secretary of State made this quite clear in 1919: "It is impossible," he announced, "to consider any dealing with the Red regime." For the next 14 years this was the prevailing American policy.

By 1935, Russia was well aware that the rise of fascism threatened world peace. She repeatedly urged a united front against fascism.

The answer of the capitalist world was soon forthcoming. As Hitler renounced the Versailles Treaty and built a huge army, the United States passed isolationist-neutrality laws denying aid to all comers. As Franco, Hitler, and Mussolini ravaged Spain, and Mussolini, Ethiopia, the great western powers remained largely inert. The climax came when England and France, pointedly excluding Russia, surrendered to Hitler at Munich. Russia decided that her dogma was right, that democracies were saving their own hides by diverting Hitler toward Moscow.

Russia now did her best to turn the tables. She signed nonaggression pacts with Germany and Japan, asked Finland for better defensive positions along her borders, and, being refused, took them. She moved into Bessarabia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland. This brought indignant howls from America, an embargo of American aircraft shipments to Russia and United States' cash and supplies to Finland. Russia was unimpressed. She had observed that, though Roosevelt had delivered a vigorous anti-Axis "quarantine" speech in 1937, his opponents made substantial gains in the congressional elections of 1938.

From the Russian point of view, the significant thing is this: Up to the outbreak of the war in 1939 almost every important point of Bolshevist dogma apparently had been borne out by history. As the fathers of the revolution had predicted, Russia seemed alone in a hostile, capitalist world.

THE RED SCARE IN AMERICA

American political philosophy rests on certain dogmas laid down during our own Revolution.

The first week of Bolshevist rule in Russia outraged every one of these sacred American precepts. Finding they lacked a majority in the elected assembly, the Bolshevists dissolved it. Finding resistance, they crushed it. Unreasonable searches and seizures were the order of the day. They even proposed that this should happen in America, too. It was to be a world revolution.

Americans had learned to prefer their revolution in the bucolic, colonial manner and a safe century or so in the past. The facts of modern insurrection were too gamey for them. The Red terror, bloody enough in fact, was fully reported in America. The White terror, also a grim piece of business, was practically unknown here. There was reason for this—it was wartime and the Whites talked of continuing the war with Germany while the Reds talked peace. We wanted to keep the Germans occupied in the east. Russia, however, signed that separate peace.

The Bolshevists continued to pour on hot coals. In 1919 the Third Communist International was announced, setting forth its aim to produce a world revolution. The American Communist Party became its official affiliate.

At this American blood pressures hit new highs, and with reason. We were demobilizing our armies, reconverting our industries; millions of people were at loose ends and therefore edgy. Besides, we had a tremendous unassimilated foreign-born population, and were not sure how Communist agitation might affect it.

When, in 1921, the Russians asked us to open diplomatic and trade relations, our officials could only scratch their heads in exasperation. How, exactly, did these Russians' minds work? On one hand they were doing everything to abolish our government, and on the other hand they want to make friends with it. The proposal was, of course, rejected.

After a bitter political struggle in Russia, Trotsky, advocate of world revolution, was deposed. Stalin, concentrating effort on building up the Soviet Union, took the helm. In theory, this should have allayed our fears of revolutionary agitation. Actually, it intensified suspicions. The old party line was at least consistent: it always stood for trouble. The new party line shifted with Soviet foreign policy. It lost even the pretense of being a spontaneous movement of American workers.

The year 1928 brought a peak load of strikes and labor unrest in America. Whether or not this was attributable to the third international or to less remote causes, our Secretary of State, in a blistering and widely publicized statement, denounced the Comintern.

To our other misgivings about Russia was added our innate abhorrence of the dictators' way of doing things. Just as we had begun to find excuses for some of the bloody goings-on of the Red Revolution, a new reign of terror swept Russia. Her development program was in full stride, and nothing was allowed to hinder it. From 1929 to 1931 the Red terror was revived and the kulaks (rich peasants) were liquidated. The repercussions here were hostile.

In 1933, President Roosevelt was inaugurated and events took a dramatic new turn. On Russia's promise that she would not support, or even allow on her territory, any organization preaching the overthrow of the United States Government, diplomatic relations were resumed.

As early as 1935, Russia had urged a united front against fascism. At that time, however, communism seemed a far more immediate menace. Neither the Fascist rape of Spain nor of Ethiopia roused us to the indignation we felt when Russia assaulted poor Finland. We saw that, not as preparation for the coming Nazi onslaught, but as an unprovoked attack on a helpless people.

When, in 1939, war finally came, and Russia signed nonaggression pacts with Germany and Japan, most Americans were resigned to the fact that the dictators had joined forces to carve up the world.

From the American point of view, the significant thing is this: Russia has fought a magnificent war and has been very friendly to us since peace came, but, up until the war, she had done nothing to convince us that she had abandoned plans for world revolution, including revolution in America.

NOW FOR THE FUTURE

Up to 1940, the 22 years of Soviet-American relations were bad. Now they faced the supreme crisis—world war. The cards were down. The whole structure of apparent motives collapsed. When real motives were revealed, Russia and America awoke to find themselves world partners. In 4 years of war, every major obstacle to successful Russo-American relations has broken down.

On the Russian side, the dogmas laid down by the fathers of the Red Revolution toppled:

The dogma that a socialist state could not exist in a capitalist world was refuted by the convincing existence of the Soviet Union itself.

The belief that capitalist states would gang up on Russia collapsed before the facts: several capitalist states joined with the Soviets to destroy other capitalist states.

The prophecy that capitalism was tottering proved false. America and Britain never have been more vigorous.

The tenet that the masses were being exploited by democratic methods did not hold up. The democracies showed an ability to adjust to the needs of their people that the old Bolshevists did not believe possible.

On the American side, the course of events put many of the Russian "outrages" in a new light.

The adjustments made in the Finnish border probably saved Leningrad, northern anchor of the whole Russian defense. Finland turned out an Axis collaborator.

Though memory of the purges was still unpleasant, it had to be admitted that there were no fifth columnists in Russia in 1941.

And though Russia's dictatorial methods were as unsavory as ever to American, they found mitigating circumstances. They reasoned: A nation so full of zest for the future has not had its spirit broken; a people which has fought so magnificently for its country must love it. True, Russia had compaigned against the churches, but the Russian churches seem to be back in business.

Even that perennial embarrassment, the Comintern, turned out to be more of a wasp than a dive bomber, for it never came close to decisive political power.

Suppose, now, we draw a line under all the breath-taking plusses and minuses of our experience with Russia to see what we have.

The difference in political philosophy seems to be permanent. Russia is a socialist dictatorship. Having survived in the days of its desperate weakness, it is not likely to be abandoned in triumph.

America is a capitalist democracy. Its tradition of free government under civil liberty has weathered a century and a half of strife and emerged stronger.

Can two such different ideologies live and work together in the family of nations? Obviously they can, because they are doing so. But can they continue to do so?

Here we venture into the realm of opinion. I think they can.

Each nation has a hard streak of realism in its thinking that saves it from pursuing even its most cherished ideals to dangerous extremes. Russia tried world revolution for 20 years. It didn't work. So, when she says she no longer intends to "reform" the United States, it seems reasonable to believe here. America, once morally insistent that all countries must have democratic rule, seems about ready to deal with the fact that some countries don't want it.

Both nations has sufficient opportunities at home to keep them occupied for all the foreseeable future. Both desperately desire peace. Both seem ready to throw dead-weight dogma overboard if necessary to get it. Russia has made several tentative moves toward greater civil liberty and private incentive. America moves toward extracting a greater social usefulness from her resources.

But the essential thing for the future is that the two nations stop fearing each other. We know well enough that Russia has nothing to fear from us. As long as we make democracy work, at home, we have little to fear from communism.

What's Wrong With Congress?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 20 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has written an interesting

article entitled "What's Wrong With Congress?" which appears in the October issue of Pageant magazine. I feel certain that those who are giving thought to this question will find the article of great interest, and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH CONGRESS?

(By STYLES BRIDGES, Senator from New Hampshire)

"The trouble with Congress is, briefly, Congressmen. Their two main interests—getting reelected and lining their pockets—shut out everything else. They are lazy and overpaid; they have it soft. The lobbyists write our laws, and, in a way, that is fortunate, for Congressmen are numbskulls. They are windbags. Obstructionists. And worse. Only a vigilant press deters them from looting the Treasury."

These charges against Congress are voiced on all sides and by all kinds of people. They are very interesting. But they are not true.

Something is wrong with Congress—radically wrong. So much so that one Congressman has publicly expressed doubt that "Congress can much longer function, or even survive, if it goes on the way it has been going in the past decade."

But the charges many people make against Congress are based on lack of knowledge. As an example, during a recent speech, I was interrupted by a booming voice from the rear of the auditorium. Would I please report the present status of the bill known as H. R. 7509? I replied that I was not familiar with the bill or its status.

"I always thought you fellows in Washington didn't know what you were doing," boomed my heckler. "Now I'm sure of it."

Now the fact is that during the last Congress nearly 9,000 bills and resolutions were introduced and nearly a thousand became law. No Congressman can be familiar with more than a hundred or so.

Not long ago a returning soldier visited the Senate, expecting to witness the clash and fire of debate. Instead, he said that he found a half-filled Chamber of grayheads doing nothing and that one was droning about Senate etiquette; the rest read, doodled, dozed, or gabbed. The soldier left in disgust. "So this," said he, "is what we've been fighting for."

Our disillusioned veteran did not know that most of the important business of Congress is handled in committees meeting at the same time as the regular session. On an average day little happens on the floor of either House except formal voting and housekeeping routine. Interesting and spirited debate takes place only on occasion.

Now let's face this matter of congressional caliber. I admit that Congress has its quota of blowhards, dullards, snoops, self-seekers, publicity hounds, soreheads, and crackpots. So has your town council, probably, and your lodge or your sewing circle. So has any sizable group of people.

Human nature is a factor we can't do much about. We may as well turn our attention to faults we can attempt to cure.

But the caliber of Congress as a whole needs no apology. Its ethics and abilities are far higher than the general run of folk can boast. This statement is not mere self-congratulation. It is the opinion of as objective a body as the American Political Science Association, rendered after study.

"We have been most favorably impressed," the association reports, "with the integrity and intelligence, the conscientiousness and courage, of the Members of Congress with whom we have conferred in the course of our inquiry."

What, then, is wrong with Congress? Plenty.

Congress is in the position of an overworked traffic cop, with some of the heaviest legislative traffic in history coming down the pike—world security, price control, reemployment, taxation, reconversion, and the international bank.

A legislative traffic jam of appalling proportions is possible.

Representative A. S. MIKE MONRONEY puts it this way: "Congress is trying to run the world's largest establishment as its board of directors. * * * Yet this mighty business, about 100 times as great as Ford, General Motors, and General Electric rolled into one, is being run by directors who are obliged to sit on an old-fashioned high stool and in an antiquated ledger scribble notes with a quill pen. Not even a board of geniuses could possibly run General Motors without modern mechanical aids, a thoroughgoing modernization, and adequate personnel."

Through its Joint Committee on Organization, Congress brings a damning list of complaints against itself. It is inexcusably slow. Its lack of teamwork with the executive branch sometimes interferes with the conduct of the Government. Congress is poorly informed, lacks leadership, has no over-all program. Its committees overlap and contradict one another. Its legislation is often vague, difficult to administer.

Why? Mainly because the system conceived in 1789 is inadequate to the needs of modern America. The Congress of 1789 served 13 States with about 4,000,000 people, and ran the whole Government for a year on $426,000. Our dealings with foreign nations were, by today's standards, negligible. Domestic problems were scarcely more complicated. During the next 160 years, America multiplied her population by 35, her Budget by 200,000, and stretched her borders across a continent. She assumed world leadership in diplomacy and fought two World Wars.

Few steps were taken to help Congress keep pace with the times. As Congress grew to an unwieldy body of 96 Senators and 435 Representatives, most of the constructive work was transferred from the floor to committee rooms. Committees were appointed to cover each specialized field of government, and make recommendations to their House as a whole.

As government grew more complex, the number of committees increased. Finally each Congressman belonged to so many committees that specialization became impossible. Instead of introducing the research methods that made modern business possible, Congress clung to postcolonial procedures.

Does this mean that the ideals of the founders must now go by the board in a sweeping reorganization? On the contrary, it means that reorganization is necessary to preserve those very ideals. Successful representative government demands well-informed representatives. As matters stand, the average Congressman simply hasn't time to be as well-informed as he should.

A Congressman's day usually begins before 9. From the time he arrives at his office, his phone is almost constantly a-jangle. Most of these calls require his personal attention—so many that he can scarcely carry on more than 10 minutes of uninterrupted work. There is usually at least 1 caller in the anteroom; sometimes there are 20 or 30.

Between the phone and the visitors your Congressman must make time for his mail. It is a rare congressional office that finds fewer than 5 letters in the morning mail; important public issues may boost this to 1,000 or more.

The mayor of an important city reports a coal famine—will the Congressman take steps? A manufacturer will go to the wall unless his ceiling price is raised—what can be done? A passport must be expedited; a naturalization case must have attention; a Federal building back home needs repair—what, dear Mr. Congressman, can you do for us?

Some Congressmen resent such errand-boy work; national legislators, they feel, should tend exclusively to national legislation. Others argue that citizens are entitled to the services of a friendly ambassador in Washington. One thing is certain: such work now consumes between half and three-quarters of a legislator's time.

The social life of Washington has been called frivolous, but much of it is in line of duty. Visitors from home and overseas have information vital to the Congressman's job, and they must be decently entertained. As absence may be interpreted as a snub, a Congressman several times each week must attend luncheon, reception, or meeting.

He must, of course, attend sessions of the branch to which he was elected, and participate in its business. His committee work is of first importance, for Congress often acts on committee decisions with little or no further inquiry. Your average Senator serves on five or six committees, your Representative on three. The more important committees deal with matters of great importance. Somehow your Congressman must cram into his head the salient facts on each of these questions, digest them and arrive at a statesmanlike decision.

Let me hastily add, in the light of certain lunatic performances, that there are committees and committees. Almost any resourceful Congressman or Senator can get a special committee or subcommitee appointed, and use it to ride his own pet hobby. Sometimes this result in outstanding public service, as in the case of the famous Truman committee. Sometimes it end in a wild witch-hunt—and the level-headed majority of Congressmen deplore the fact as whole-heartedly as anyone else does.

The real legislative work is done in the standing committees. It is hard, sober, unspectacular. It absorbs your Congressman's best thought and effort.

Time, in Congress, is always too short. "As a lawyer in public practice," one Congressman said, "I'd put months of study into an important case. Here we must decide issues sometimes after an hour or two of hearings. I'm amazed we do as well as we do."

This murderous pressure of time, combined with the lack of an expert congressional permanent staff of investigators, plays into the hands of pressure groups. To make up his mind, a man needs facts. These the lobbies are always willing to provide. But they are their facts. Members of Congress do not have proper facilities for getting or checking their own facts.

The pace is literally killing. During the past few years we have lost some of our ablest legislators to chronic overwork. Francis T. Maloney of Connecticut, Charles L. McNary of Washington, Pat Harrison of Mississippi, Alvah Adams of Colorado, and Joe Robinson are among the men who have been stricken by the excessive demands of their jobs and their own conscientious efforts.

Unless a Congressman or Senator has an independent income he is chronically broke. Of his $10,000 a year, the Government takes back about 25 percent as income taxes. On the remaining $7,500 he must maintain a home in his State, another in Washington and live in a manner fitting his position. He pays for his own long-distance phone tolls, and for the frequently necessary trips (except for one round trip home each session).

If, through Spartan economy, he gets by, his position is still less secure than that of any other occupation demanding comparable ability. When a man enters Congress he loses contact with the business world. The most fruitful years of his life go to Government service. When they're spent, he has in sight neither a job nor (alone among Government employees) a pension.

This leads sometimes to pathetic extremes. A well-known and respected former Member of Congress was recently picked up by police, apparently drunk. Taken to a hospital, it was found that he hadn't been near alcohol, but was suffering from acute malnutrition. A Member who had served Congress more than 20 years recently died not leaving sufficient funds to ship the body home.

Men who work under such conditions do not do their best. Moreover, there is danger that the Senate will become a millionaire's club and the House a coupon-clipper's lounge, simply because no one else can afford to take such jobs. This would be a severe blow to American democracy.

But while the outlook is gloomy, it is not by any means hopeless. Most of the needed remedies could be applied by Congress itself.

The first group of suggested reforms aims at facilitating the business of Congress as a whole. The committee structure should be reorganized. The present eighty-odd committees (in both Houses) should be reduced to about 30, roughly 15 to each House. Each committee should be planned to coincide with an opposite number in the other House and a major department of the executive branch. This would enable responsible Members of the Senate, the House and the Executive to plan together in each field of government.

Each committee should be provided with its own staff of investigators and other specialists, at salaries that will attract first-rate brains. Part of this staff should be hired and directed by the minority members of the committee, since a vigorous and well-informed opposition is essential to a democracy. The legislative legal staff should be enlarged.

Members of the Cabinet should appear before the Senate and House at stated intervals, and on special request, to report on the work of their departments. These sessions would be to exchange information and not to heckle.

Government outgo should be correlated with Government income. Today one set of congressional committees spends money and another set collects it, with no effective collaboration between the two. Appropriations are voted piecemeal; nobody ever knows our total expenditure until all appropriations bills are in. Joint meetings of committees and agencies concerned with spending money, and those concerned with raising it, would do much to put our national finances in order. Streamlined in organization, richer in facilities and relieved of nonessentials, Congress would soon become a far more effective tool of the people's will.

A second group of proposed reforms aims to unburden the individual Congressman of the needless harassments that now beset him. Tax deductions for professional expenses should be allowed Congressmen, as they are allowed other businessmen. The Civil Service Retirement Act should cover Congressmen. Salaries should be raised to at least $15,000.

President Truman, a congressional veteran, is emphatic on this point, asserting that Congressmen should receive between $15,000 and $25,000 a year. He tells how, as a Senator, he had to make his wife his secretary to assist him and to meet his bills. Though she was a good secretary, neither of them liked this resorting to subterfuge.

Each Senator and Congressman should have an executive assistant who could relieve him of the "errand-boy" functions which constituents demand and expect.

If these reforms are all that is necessary, and if most of them can be achieved by act of Congress, why, it may be asked, hasn't Congress already put them into effect?

There are two reasons. One is the inertia of tradition. People, including Congressmen, resist change As Jefferson put it, "It takes time to persuade men to do even what is for their own good."

The second reason is congressional sensitiveness to publicity. Early in 1942 Congress did amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to include its own Members. The public, which had never been told the circumstances, was up in arms. Newspapers whipped out at the "outrageous pension grab." Congress, instead of explaining itself, retired to nurse its injured fingers, and for 2 years took no further steps to rescue itself. Members of Congress take pride in their patriotism and devotion to duty. They are now beginning to realize, however, that even patriots are more effective when solvent.

Any economy objections to congressional streamlining are spurious, for Congress, financially speaking, is the poor relation of government. The entire cost of Congress is less than half the cost of the Department of Indian Affairs. The Department of Agriculture has 600 lawyers in its employ; the Senate has 4, the House 6.

For months the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, under the inspired leadership of Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., as chairman, and Representative A. S. MIKE MONRONEY as vice chairman, has been receiving testimony. It is my hope that the committee's recommendations will be promptly translated into action.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, on November 18 I participated in the Columbus, Ohio, town meeting in a forum on the subject of universal military training. I include my opening remarks, as follows:

SHALL WE HAVE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING NOW?

(Opening remarks of Congressman JOHN J. SPARKMAN on Columbus town meeting program, November 18, 1945)

Within our generation the United States has had to fight in two terrible wars. The First World War involved a great part of the civilized world. The one which we have just recently concluded victoriously touched practically every known spot of the globe. Both of these wars were won by the manpower and industrial might of America.

In the First World War we had more than two and a half years within which to take notice and to get ready. Even then we went into that war woefully unprepared.

In the recent war we had more than 3 years from the time of Munich in which to get ready to fight the fire that was coming nearer and nearer day by day to our shores. We went into this war better prepared than in 1917, and yet we were knocked off our balance by the suddenness of the attack on Pearl Harbor and were dangerously near defeat many times after that attack.

Had we been in front of the German blitz, I am not at all certain that our fate would have been in any way different from that of Poland, France, and the Low Countries.

Twice we have been extremely fortunate. Time has been our great ally. We cannot gamble on that being true again. In fact, general opinion seems to hold that the next war, if there is to be one, will come with a suddenness that will surpass that of Pearl Harbor. Most likely we shall never again have 2½ years in which to get ready.

The objective of universal military training is national security. I know that many people argue that other benefits are to be derived from such training, benefits to the boys themselves and benefits to the country as a whole. The fact remains, nevertheless, that these benefits are incidental and that the real objective is national security.

Under a properly conceived universal military training program, we would have at all times a large reserve of our trained young men ready to take their places immediately in case of an emergency and to do their respective jobs in defending our shores, our homes, and our institutions. The long period of training that has heretofore been required by us to put units in the field would be eliminated.

When I speak of units, I do not mean simply Infantry divisions. I mean every kind of unit that may be required to fight in the wars of the future regardless of what weapons we may have or what the requirements for defense may be.

Because of the discovery of atomic energy and the manner of using it for explosives in the closing days of the recent war, many people argue that military training is a thing of the past. I think there could be no more dangerous thing than for people to feel that because we have the secret of the atomic bomb we are safe for all time to come. Such a feeling is one of false security and tremendously dangerous to the safety of the Nation. The same is true of the other extreme. The atomic bomb may change the type of warfare just as did the ironclad ship in its day, the airplane more recently, and the blitz adopted by the Germans to show the way in the recent war. However, scientists best prepared to know do not envision a total destruction of a nation or its people by atomic bombs. Certainly, a nation as big as ours cannot be destroyed at a single blow. We shall need our young men trained in such a way that they can arise to any emergency. It is for that reason that universal military training has now become a necessity.

Much of the distrust in universal military training arises from confused thinking or a lack of proper conception. Many people can see only the old militaristic type of training such as various European nations have used. I certainly agree that that kind of a program will not work in America and I for one would never advocate or support it.

It is my idea that we can work out a training system in this country that will be truly American and acceptable to the American people. To do this, I would recommend the following requirements:

I. A minimum of military control. Of course, the program must be developed in such a way that it will meet military requirements, but in order to steer clear of militarism, which is wholly unacceptable to Americans, the program should be prepared and, insofar as practicable, administered under civilian control.

II. It should be set up in such a way as to provide a minimum interference with the normal life and schooling of a boy. This can be done by making the age for training flexible in order that the boy himself may have a certain option as to the time of taking his training.

III. The training should be integrated with the normal educational program. This can be done without losing effectiveness as to military preparedness and yet in such a way as to prevent the loss of a year from a boy's life and schooling.

IV. The greatest care must be exercised to make certain that sufficient numbers are trained in all of the various skills and techniques of modern war and modern weapons. As a corollary, we must keep abreast of the times in the development of weapons and in the designing of methods of warfare. This calls for continued scientific research

and development. It calls also for the maintenance of a plan of industrial mobilization whereby the great industrial might of America can be converted quickly, if need be, to the production of materials of war.

V. The civilian components of our National Army, that is, the National Guard and the Reserve elements, should be used fully for the purpose of affording a place in which the boys after completing training may fit.

Adoption of a program such as I have outlined does not mean that we are getting ready to fight any nation. As it happens, we are now the mightiest nation of the world. We have made commitments under the Charter of Nations and have agreed to do certain things through the Security Council. The nations of the world looked to us once before for carrying out similar commitments. We failed miserably then. The great nations of the world are wondering if we shall fail again. The only way in which we can convince them of our good faith now is by staying strong enough to carry out whatever obligations may be ours as one of the United Nations Organization and as a member of the Security Council.

I yield to no one in my advocacy of and confidence in the United Nations and the Security Council. I think it is the hope of the world in maintaining peace in the years that are ahead and I am optimistic enough to believe that it can be made to work. I believe, however, that in order to get it started, we must be prepared to back it up with armed force if necessary. The great weakness of the old League of Nations was that no one had power to enforce its mandates.

Many people think that a universal military training program would obligate us forever. My own view is that it need not be permanent. Personally, I look with much hope toward the establishment of a commission within the Security Council with the right of full inspection, not only as to the production of the atomic bombs and weapons capable of mass destruction, but of all weapons of war and with a right to propose to the Security Council a reduction from time to time in armaments. If we can work this out, we can look forward to the time when it will no longer be necessary to maintain a large reserve of trained men. Then, we can do without universal military training. Until that time, however, the safety of the Nation requires it.

It is interesting to read the Gallup Poll on this subject published on November 18, 1945, as follows:

GALLUP POLL RESULTS—MILLITARY TRAINING SENTIMENT RISING

PRINCETON, N. J., November 17.—Public approval of peacetime military training for young men has reached an all-time high.

The latest survey conducted by the institute, covering the period November 2 to 12, finds that 3 out of every 4 persons (75 percent) polled from coast to coast say they approve the idea of a training program.

This compares with 70 percent approval in a poll in late October, shortly before Presiden Truman sent a message to Congress in which he asked for a training bill.

Opposition to the proposal, the survey finds, totals a little more than one-fifth of the voting population sampled. However vocal and articulate, this minority is small, while opinion approving the measure is of even more overwhelming proportions now than it was during the war.

The vote in the poll follows:

"In the future, do you think every able-bodied young man should be required to take military and naval training for one year?"

	Yes (percent)	*No (percent)*	*No opinion (percent)*
Late October	70	24	6
Today	75	21	4

The 75 percent vote today for peacetime military training is higher than the vote in favor of a selective service draft was just before that bill was passed in the summer of 1940. A poll then found 68 percent in favor of selective service.

Today's survey is the tenth in 3 years to find a substantial sentiment in favor of the peacetime training measure. The trend through the years, as shown in polls on a question similar to that reported today, follows:

	Yes	No	No opinion
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
December 1942	66	27	7
November 1943	63	29	8
September 1944	63	23	14
December 1944	70	25	5
February 1945	69	22	9
May 1945	70	24	6
July 1945	69	24	7
September 1945	65	29	6
October 1945	70	24	6
Today	75	21	4

A new survey is under way to test the effect upon public opinion of testimony being heard for and against the bill by the House Military Affairs Committee.

The majority of voters favoring peacetime training—which would involve personal sacrifices for many—have not marched on Washington to present ultimatums to Congress or staged rallies on the steps of the Capitol—any more than did the majorities who favored the selective service draft in 1940, which called for sacrifices while the Nation was still at peace, or the levying of taxes on a broader scale in wartime, or any of the other far-reaching measures of recent years.

It is not the custom for citizens to go down to Washington to demand that they be made to sacrifice. But—and it is an important but—that does not mean they are unwilling to accept what is asked of them.

Two arguments often raised in connection with peacetime training are that it might give rise to a dangerous military caste in this country, and that with millions of trained fighters in reserve the chances of our getting into a war might be increased.

Both these ideas were tested on the public in today's poll, with the following result:

"Do you think that giving military training in this country will result in a group being formed of military men who will try to have too much power?"

	Percent
Yes	21
No	62
No opinion	17

"If the young men of this country receive this training, do you think the chances of our getting into another war are increased or decreased?"

	Percent
Increased	12
Decreased	59
Would make no difference	23
No opinion	6

In commenting on public opinion in a democracy, James Bryce, the historian, observed:

"Such is the din of voices that it is hard to say which cry prevails, which is swelled by many, which only by a few throats."

The function of the institute is to determine what the sentiments of the voting public are. As a fact-finding organization it has no interest in the question of whether a youth training law ought or ought not to be passed.

Another interesting poll was published just yesterday, taken by the Des Moines Register, covering Iowa. It follows:

THE IOWA POLL—MILITARY TRAINING SUPPORTED BY BOTH YOUTHS AND ADULTS

DES MOINES, IOWA.—Compulsory military training as proposed to Congress by President Truman is favored by 66 percent of Iowa's adults and 79 percent of Iowa's 15- to 17-year-old boys, a recent Iowa poll reveals.

About 69 percent—10 percent less than the whole sample—of the youth whose families include World War I and II veterans are favorable to the plan.

The following questions reflect favorable Iowa opinion on compulsory military training:

"Should Congress pass a law requiring military training for all young men between ages 17 and 20, as recommended by President Truman?"

	Men (Percent)	*Women (Percent)*	*Boys (Percent)*
Yes	68	63	79
No	28	32	20
No opinion	4	5	1

"Regarding the ages for military training, which would be better—requiring training between 17 and 20 or between 17 and 24?"

	Men (Percent)	*Women (Percent)*	*Boys (Percent)*
17–20	73	79	82
17–24	21	18	16
No opinion	6	3	2

"Under Truman's plan for military training, only those physically disqualified would be exempt. Do you approve or do you feel there should be other exemptions?"

	Men (Percent)	*Women (Percent)*	*Boys (Percent)*
Approve	66	62	66
Should be other exemptions	27	29	30
No opinion	7	9	4

"In his message to Congress Truman said we must have reserve strength on land, on the sea, and in the air because of our obligations under the United Nations Charter. Do you agree or disagree?"

	Men (Percent)	*Women (Percent)*	*Boys (Percent)*
Agree	82	86	91
Disagree	11	5	5
No opinion	7	9	4

Iowa's opinion on military training is about the same as last June when 65 percent of adults and 77 percent of the youth approved some sort of postwar military training.

Texas Editor Points to Rank Speculation in Home Prices—Asks for Home Price Control To Tide Nation Over Building Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, more and more the American people are crying out against the increasingly wild speculation in the sale of new homes. This indignation has been voiced by many editorial writers recently, but none have expressed it more clearly than the editor of the Bryan (Tex.) Eagle. Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to insert the following editorial from that newspaper:

NEW HOME PRICES

Admittedly there is danger, for a time at least, of rank speculation in the sale of new homes constructed by builders of a speculative turn. To prevent this Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, of New York, proponent of much social-security legislation, and Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, are reported ready to introduce a bill designed to curb speculative builders' profits.

The position is taken that many returned veterans are in the market for homes, as they go back into civilian life, but are dismayed at the prices asked for these structures—prices so high that they more than tax the ability to pay and so high, also, that eventually they will represent a poor rather than an even fair investment.

There is some control of building materials prices, now coming on the market in larger quantity, and price control on used lumber will go into effect early in November. Until these materials are in a supply more nearly equal to the demand, there is some reason for price control unless there is to be a more or less runaway speculation in this field. But no matter how closely the building material prices are controlled this will not mean any control of the completed home price, as the builder who is in a position to secure scarce materials and finance the construction will be free to ask any price he may decide to ask.

The worst of the situation is that the demand for homes is so great—there has been no new home construction since the outbreak of the war—that in desperation many will scrape the bottom of their resources in an effort to secure a home from which they might not be ordered to move at any time. The fact that rental properties also are so scarce in many communities increases the demand for home ownership.

A fair profit should be permitted for the builders of new homes, but exploitation of a normal desire to own a home as a shelter for one's family should not be permitted. Some such legislation as the New York and Texas solons propose should be regarded in order at least until building materials are in greater supply.

Navy's Beneficial-Suggestions System Results in Tangible Saving and Increased Efficiency—Encourages Independent Thinking and Volunteer Expression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the great United States Naval Drydocks at Long Beach, Calif., are a most inspiring and instructive place to visit. This short summer recess when I was home in Long Beach I was privileged to be a guest at the great ceremony when the Navy E was awarded the workers of these great drydocks, on account of the surpassing excellency of the workers there employed. Another one of the volunteer bulwarks of efficiency and patriotic endeavor and achievement there is the splendid newspaper which is published weekly and which is distributed without charge to all officers, men, and employees of the United States naval drydocks. This great naval installation is all within the city corporate limits of my home city of Long Beach, Calif. And, needless to say, the personnel there in command and all the employees thereof are a very strengthening and welcome addition to the community life of Long Beach and the other cities and towns in which they live.

The following editorial appeared in the United States Naval Drydocks Digest under date of November 7, 1945:

[U. S. Naval Drydocks Digest, volume III, Terminal Island, November 7, 1945, No. 43. Editorial office, building 151, extension 465. Capt. George T. Paine, USN, commanding officer; Lt. Comdr. W. A. Andrews, Jr., USNR, personnel relations officer; Lt. (jg) Mary V. Wells, USNR, supervisory editor. Staff: Margaret Anne Yandell, Elsie Krohn, Verna Smith. The Drydocks Digest, an authorized Navy publication, is printed weekly at a commercial print shop with appropriated funds and in compliance with SecNav Ltr. EXOS:AD (Pub) WBW:bmcd, May 28, 1945. The Digest is distributed without charge to all officers, men, and employees of the United States Naval Drydocks, Terminal Island, Calif. The Digest receives camp newspaper service material. Republication of credited matter prohibited without permission of CNS, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City, 17]

The beneficial-suggestions award ceremony to be held at the bandstand Friday when 49 employees will receive cash awards for their ideas is a tribute to the Navy's beneficial-suggestions system. The system, developed during the war period, has proved highly successful and has received such approbation from high Navy officials that it will be continued during peacetime.

Recently Under Secretary of the Navy Artemus Gates, in a statement concerning the Navy's suggestions program, voiced his desire that the submission of constructive ideas be continued, and stated that ideas such as the thousands submitted during the war period will enable the Navy to operate at the highest level of efficiency on a peacetime budget.

Here, at the naval drydocks, an estimated annual savings of $517,550 has resulted from the adoption of suggestions during the period from January 1 to October 31, 1945. During that time, 258 employees have been awarded prize money for their suggestions.

The employees who have received awards have done a great service to the Navy and at the same time have had the opportunity to capitalize on their ingenious ideas.

It is being urged that each employee turn in his suggestions to the committee on awards to civilian employees. Let's hope that the beneficial-awards ceremonies of the future include larger and larger numbers of employees whose ideas have increased the effectiveness of the naval drydocks.

The Inner Working

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that Walter Lippmann, who has carried the ball in behalf of the New Deal for 13 long years, now takes occasion to severely criticize the administration. I submit herewith his column appearing in today's issue of the Washington Post.

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

THE INNER WORKING

If the President realizes how great is the danger into which he is being drawn, he shows no sign of knowing which way to turn in order to prevent it. The ship of state is adrift upon ever more perilous waters, and, being the captain, he will not avert a disaster by reiterating his good intentions or by complaining that the sea is rough, the storms are violent, the rocks are many and treacherous. The fact of the matter is that there is no navigator, there is no helmsman, and the captain is not setting the course.

For the trouble is at the White House in Washington, and only Mr. Truman can cure it. Whatever the United States can do about the Soviet Union, the continent of Europe, the conflict in China, the disorders of southern Asia, it can do only if the Government in Washington knows how to use the influence and power of the United States. Mr. Truman is not using the immense influence and power which was entrusted to him when he became President of the United States. He is dissipating and squandering that influence and is allowing that power to disintegrate.

As the President is now conducting his administration, there is no prospect whatever of his becoming again, as he was 4 months ago, invested as few men in history have ever been, with the opportunity to shape events because he was the leader of a mighty and victorious people wanting above all things a decent and lasting peace. There is no prospect, as the Truman administration is organized and conducted today, of its recovering the control of the situation. Only a radical change in the inner working of the administration can now prevent the situation which is not under control from becoming uncontrollable.

Mr. Truman's trouble is that neither he nor his chief Cabinet officers, who conduct our foreign relations, are devoting enough of their time, their energy, or their minds to the great issues. They are all very busy men. But they are too busy to think seriously and constructively about the great decisions on which hang the vital interests of their country and the fate of nations.

If this seems astonishing and unlikely, let some energetic reporter collate the facts on these two points: in the past 90 days how many hours out of each day has the President devoted to little 15-minute interviews and conferences with a vast assortment of people? How often and for how long has he conferred with his Cabinet; how often and for how long have Messrs. Byrnes, Vinson, Patterson, and Forrestal—the key men in foreign affairs—conferred with him collectively about our relations with Russia, Britain, China, Germany, and Japan?

The daily diaries of the President and his four principal lieutenants would show objectively and conclusively—I have no doubt whatever—that each is caught in a daily routine of appointments, correspondence, telephone calls, which prevents any one of them from bringing an unhurried and fresh mind to bear upon the great questions. Down below in the departments there are men who manage to find some time to think. But at the top, while there is a good deal of fret and worry, there is really no time reserved for the full consideration of high policy. They are all much too busy with everything but the main things.

The President alone can cure this inner trouble of his administration—this failure to think out the great decisions because individually the top men fritter away their best energies and collectively they do not really take counsel together at all.

The President can cure it, but only by a drastic alteration of his own habits of work. The foreign relations of the Government cannot be conducted by any President—and certainly not by one who lacks background and experience—through spasmodic and hurried contact with his departmental chiefs separately and individually. The cure is obvious. It is to institute a regular daily meeting, lasting as long as may be necessary to finish its business, of the President and his four chief Cabinet officers concerned with foreign affairs, and to decide at that meeting, and nowhere else, all military, political, and economic questions of policy. That meeting should be held every morning until the present developing crisis has been mastered. It should have priority for the President, the Secretaries of State, Treasury, War, and Navy over all other engagements. There is nothing that they have to do, no matter who telephones for an appointment, which compares in urgency and importance with their need to take their decisions together.

Nothing less than this can begin to cure the trouble—no amount of separate conferences with this or that official, no amount of interdepartmental committees, or casual, spasmodic meetings of high officials. Nothing will do any real good except the habit of regular, prolonged daily meeting of these high officials collectively. But that will do good. They are able men: it would be hard to find available men who individually are more experienced or more qualified. But as the administration is now conducted, they are disorganized departmental heads and not statesmen, and their time and the President's time are, measured by their responsibilities, being wasted.

This is the kind of remedy that President Truman, like most of his recent predecessors, will find reasons, sufficient unto himself, for avoiding. It is inconvenient to change a regular schedule and to reform a habit of work. But in the art of government no other remedy is known when a state is in danger except for its leaders to sit in council until they have dealt with the danger and the emergency is over.

Later at least, if the degeneration of our affiairs brings us to the crisis which is impending, Mr. Truman will wish he had adopted it sooner.

United States Navy Is Trustee for Morals of American Youth Under Its Control as Well as Physical Well-Being—American People Will Not Tolerate Any Encouragement of Lessening of Emphasis on High Ethical and Moral Conduct of American Sailors—Statement of Policy of United States Navy in Relation to Open Practice of Attendance on Japanese Prostitution Is Demanded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, assuming that many other Members of this great House also have received memoranda in regard to a report of a United States naval chaplain that American sailors are encouraged to patronize the Japanese houses of prostitution I will state that I am immediately sending the following letter to the Secretary of the United States Navy on that subject. The letter hereafter set forth manifestly sets forth some of my immediate thinking in the premises. But I wish to state, Mr. Speaker, that if our great Navy—for any cause—is so little concerned with the manhood, character, and ethical conduct of the American lads in Japan—and other foreign nations—that any of its commanding officers and personnel tolerate, countenance, or approve—either directly or indirectly—such moral filth and degradation as is reported by the United States Navy chaplain—then it is high time that whoever it was who was responsible for such violation of all precepts of American progress and Christian citizens, should be dispelled, and the Nation made to understand that the American Navy does not intend to win the war of powder and shell and then lose the war to maintain decent, clean, morals, as well as physical conditions surrounding its personnel. My letter to the Secretary of the Navy follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., November 19, 1945.

Hon. JAMES FORRESTAL,
Secretary of the Navy, Washington, D. C.

Re American sailors and prostitution in Tokyo, Japan.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Knowing that you have no doubt been heretofore in receipt of at least one copy of the advices of United States Chaplain Lawrence Lacour about what he saw in Tokyo, Japan, directly relating to the conduct of United States Navy personnel in connection with attendance upon Japanese houses of prostitution, I respectfully ask you to immediately advise me whether or not there is anything substantially inaccurate or incorrect in his reported communication which was printed recently in the Des Moines Register and in the Christian Advocate—and more recently in certain newspapers here in Washington.

Especially will you kindly advise me whether or not it is a fact that it is on order and approval of a responsible officer of the United States Navy that this practice is encouraged and facilitated. I will say, sir, that to the extent to which it is encouraged and facilitated—and to the extent to which it is approved—I strenuously protest such policy by the United States Navy, or any officer or representative thereof in command.

I consider that when the people of the United States are compelled to place their sons and daughters in the custody and control of the United States Navy, or Army, that the United States Government thereupon accepts these young people in terms of an avowed trusteeship. That trusteeship extends at least to the point of a sincere and determined effort to return these young folks to their homes and their Nation not less lacking in moral and ethical concepts of conduct, as well as in good physical and mental conditions.

In other words, Mr. Secretary, the American people place upon the commanders of the armed forces the trusteeship which extends to the morals of the youth who are conscripted for war as well as their physical well-being.

Furthermore, the people of this Nation are about to consider and determine whether or not universal military training shall be adopted as a matter of military policy in times of peace. While it is true that this report comes of this terrible condition being in Tokyo, Japan, and therefore is not on the Continental United States, no doubt you will agree with me that the responsibility for the safety and security of the men and women in uniform extends to their safety and security in foreign lands as well as within our domestic borders. And, inasmuch as one argument given in favor of universal military training in times of peace is the need of having available and trained men in other lands, to keep the peace if need be, it would now appear that what the fixed policy of the United States Navy is, with reference to its trusteeship of the morality of the United States sailors, as well as to his apparent well-being, is a matter of immediate and deep concern to the American people.

I am very sure that the people of America do not think in terms of having any naval officer—or any Government officer or representative—either sponsoring approval or encouraging such misconduct as set forth in terms of deliberate intentional moral turpitude as is set forth by this naval chaplain.

In communicating this letter to you, I do it on two assumptions in which I believe I have a right to indulge in, to wit:

1. That the communication referred to by Chaplain Lawrence Lacour is substantially correct and accurate.

2. That you will know that this communication by me refers to that communication, of which you no doubt already have first-hand knowledge and report.

I do not have in mind that the United States Navy is expected to keep its personnel on a so-called "apron string," but I respectfully remind you that men and women in the United States under age of majority are still children under the law. This fact, then, cannot be ignored—in how or in what manner—the young men of the United States Navy are allowed or encouraged to do.

I am sure some Members of Congress, in addition to myself, have received copies of the letter which was written by Chaplain Lawrence Lacour. No doubt you have, also; therefore, I do not by this letter again communicate to you a copy thereof—as it has been so generally circulated by this time that you must have more than one copy thereof.

Awaiting your very earliest and fullest advices and statement of policy in the premises, I have the honor to remain, sir,

Yours sincerely,

CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress.

W. Frank James

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce the death of W. Frank James, a former distinguished Member of this House, on Saturday, November 17, who for 20 years represented Michigan's Twelfth Congressional District.

Mr. James was first elected in 1914 and served continuously until 1934. He was a member and later chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee where he served with distinction. During his service here he was noted for his independence, his devotion to the duties of his office, and his high regard for the Constitution of the United States and everything that implies.

One of his many close friends in the House of Representatives was the distinguished Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama. At this point in my remarks, Mr.

Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a letter I have just received from this Member of the other body who as a former Member of this House served on the Military Affairs Committee with Mr. James, and who through his constant contacts with Mr. James knew of the splendid character and ability of our colleague:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC WHIP,
Washington, D. C., November 13, 1945.

Hon. ROY O. WOODRUFF,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR ROY: At the time of the retirement from the House of Representatives of Hon. W. Frank James, of Michigan, the House Committee on Military Affairs under the chairmanship of Hon. John J. McSwain, of South Carolina, was engaged in the investigation of the procurement of aircraft, ordnance, and equipment by the War Department. A majority of the committee was composed of Democrats. Mr. McSwain, as you know, was the Democratic chairman of the committee. Under almost invariable procedure, the chief investigator for the committee would have been a Democrat. However, the membership of the committee, both Democrats and Republicans, had such great confidence in Frank James, his integrity, his fairness, his fine ability, and his indefatigable devotion, that he was unanimously selected by the committee as chief investigator for the investigation.

As chief investigator, Mr. James did a remarkable job. He put an end to certain loose practices in the War Department, stopped waste, made helpful exposures, offered suggestions of the greatest value with reference to changes in the procurement system, and made many splendid contributions to the procurement by the War Department. I do not believe that any investigation has ever been carried on by a committee of either House of Congress in an abler or more satisfactory manner than the investigation carried on by Mr. James. He won the gratitude of the committee and the thanks of the War Department.

I might say that in all my more than 20 years of service in Congress I have never known a finer, more conscientious, more indefatigable public servant than Frank James. He labored incessantly and with unremitting toil for the public welfare. He was a great servant of the people.

Sincerely yours,

LISTER HILL.

It is needless to say that I and every other Member who knew Mr. James concur in the splendid tribute of Senator HILL. I know every Member who knew Mr. James will join with me in extending our deepest sympathy to his wife and children.

William Elbert Orr, Home-Front Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, someone has said that old friends are the best unless you can catch a new one that is fit to make an old one out of.

I wish to address my remarks today about an old friend. He is William Elbert Orr, the brother of my new friend, Arthur Orr, who has seen so many years of service with the House Committee on Appropriations, of which I am a member.

Elbert Orr was my neighbor for many years in my home town of Norfolk, Nebr. He and his fine wife and their children represent a true American family which was greatly missed when the family moved from Nebraska to California. During my long acquaintance with Elbert Orr, I found that he typified that brand of American neighbor who lingers in memory because of his great faith in the Almighty and his homespun philosophy that "by the sweat of your brow you must earn your daily bread." He came to Nebraska as a contractor, a builder of homes. He had great skill and a determination to do well that which he could find to do. He was known to do his work with enthusiasm, and he usually did things a little better than anyone else could do them.

He was the first-born son of John Henry and Elizabeth Ann Orr, who married and began farming in Fremont County, Iowa, when the Middle West was just emerging from its primitive, backwoods condition, and who had an honorable and glorious part in the hewing of a nation from the wilderness and in the building of one of the world's mightiest inland empires. He was the idol of his younger brothers and sisters, who still regard him as the grandest brother any family of "kids" ever had.

Elbert Orr will celebrate his seventy-fifth birthday anniversary on next Sunday, November 25. Although he was retired from actual work when World War II broke out, because of his great patriotism and love of country he joined the forces of workers in a war plant on the western coast. Even though he was over 70 years of age, he took his place at the side of younger and more vigorous men. For nearly 3 years he performed meritorious work, and during those years missed but 4 days of labor in his determination to stay on the job and see it done.

Mr. Speaker, men like Elbert Orr must be recognized when the final word of praise is given for a job well done. To him and men like him this country owes a great debt of gratitude. As one of his old neighbors, I feel it an honor and a privilege to pay to Elbert Orr this word of praise:

Creation's cry goes up
From age to cheat age;
Give us the men who do the work
For which they get the wage.

While Labor Asks for 30-Percent Increase in Wages Farmers' Income Will Be 15 Percent Lower in 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under and by virtue of unanimous consent, I am including as an extension of my remarks an address which I delivered before the Eastern Milk Producers Cooperative Association, Inc., at Syracuse, N. Y., on November 8 last.

The audience I addressed was largely composed of farmers, but there were a few representatives of labor organizations present. It is at the insistence of members of the latter group that I am placing this speech in the RECORD.

They urge the fact that the average laboring man who belongs to a union is as helpless against the racketeers as he would be on a Monday morning with both hands caught in a wash-wringer.

The hope and the safety of America is found in the genuine Americanism of these folks who belong to these unions, tongue-tied only because they have to do and be so in order to work. What a situation in free America! And do not forget it; a great majority of these real American people so subjected to the serfdom imposed by the highjackers and racketeers are about ready to assert their independence. One thing they need is moral support by and from the public and the assurance of a job separated from mandatory contribution to support these people who foment strikes to make money for themselves. That is their language. They told me it was a graft and a game in which the American people are played as suckers. It might be so.

They cheered when I said: "The handwriting is on the wall" and that "labor is at a dead line."

These folks just cannot speak out in a union meeting, but confidentially, they told me I spoke the truth. They thanked me for it. So here it is in toto. They told me I was a real friend of the laboring man. That is good enough for me.

The address follows:

It was made plain to me in the invitation extended that I was not to talk about milk, although I come from a State that has a cow population exceeding in number its citizens. It was suggested that after your several sessions you would be too tired to listen to anything very serious, and I was asked if I could afford a restful 20 minutes to a tired group. What an assignment!

Let me disillusion you now. I am not going to talk about milk or cows. I am going to take advantage of an opportunity, suggested by your susceptibility and your alleged tired and weakened state of mind to try to put across a couple of things I propose to make you go home and talk about and give some serious thought to.

It is a psychological fact that absence of occupation is not rest. A mind quite vacant, it is said, is a mind distressed. So, in order to relieve a situation in which you ought not to be or to find yourselves, and of which burden I should relieve you, and in order to improve an opportunity seldom afforded me, I propose to visit seriously with you for a few moments, as nonpartisanly as a Vermont Republican ever can, with regard to a situation which confronts all Americans today.

Your troubles as milkmen and dairymen, producers and distributors, are more than skim deep. Your troubles stem from a disease in the body politic which, if not eradicated or cured by you as voters by the use of the antidote of united action on the part of all 100-percent Americans against the germ of destruction which has boiled out of the melting pot, will result in the death of the once greatest and strongest body politic the mind of man ever had the vision to create. That is no exaggerated statement. The facts

confront you. Can a minority run this Government? Will you tolerate it?

We have gone—or as somebody has said, "we have went"—too d—n far in affording opportunities to groups to come to our shores whose sole purpose has been to disrupt our established economy. It is time somebody said so. They were sent here to do a job. Will you let them do it to you?

So I am going to talk to you about our capitalistic system which these groups deliberately intend to destroy, and I emphasize what you already know—that its destruction is not to be contemplated and at all hazard must be prevented. We will prevent it.

Like you, I am for America and for its form of government because of what it has demonstrated its ability and capacity to be. It has shown the ability of a people, though unprepared and unwisely so, eventually to win a war greater than any conflict in which the civilized world has engaged, and demonstrated the fact that without us the war could not have been won. Nobody can successfully deny our capacity.

The contribution to victory made by the people of the United States of America has so far exceeded everybody's wildest dreams that it is the perfect answer to why our system of government should be preserved and continued.

The victory which was won was only made possible because of the contribution we made, due to our form of government and our desire to be independent. That needs no proof. What has been done is the answer. Of all the so-called democracies which have ever decorated or desecrated the face of the earth, this representative democracy of the United States of America is the only one which has ever survived for so many years and through so many wars as have we.

I do not intend to minimize the contribution made by our allies; yet I still insist that without us and the contribution we made the dream of Hitler might have come true. So why should a hundred million of us Americans let a helpless minority of restless, socialistic-minded agitators run our business? Why should we let the tail wag the dog? Why should we surrender?

If we had the intestinal fortitude and the ability to win a war for freedom internationally, why should we not get together to stabilize such freedom continentally, for ourselves? Why should we let the highjackers and the privateers and the racketeers scare us into submission and inactivity at a time when, if ever, we should fight to preserve our blood-bought liberties? We should organize and unite in our opposition to the communistic, anarchistic, socialistic efforts made by all the un-American groups who would Russianize this Government. And now.

If we could and would only unify and unite, we could almost overnight wipe them off the face of the earth, clean the page of history of the blot of this attempted socialistic revolution they contemplate, and reestablish and guarantee another 150 years at least of such a standard of living as has been enjoyed here thanks to the wisdom of the founding fathers. Are we too weak to do it?

It is time we got busy.

The idea that a minority group of selfish agitators can run your country and mine is too absurd to deserve anything more than our consideration of the fact that we will not allow it, as we get busy to prevent it.

Self-respecting labor leaders and laborers are not for it. They know it spells the ruin of organized labor. They are not for such demonstrations as those to which they and we have had to submit up to date. They need our help.

The situation really is terrible so far as the ordinary laborer is concerned. It certainly is time for 100,000,000 people to assert their independence of an organized group of some thirty millions who jumped out of the "melting pot" to try to socialize our Government and to run our affairs. Unless we do organize and unite, the end of the greatest God-given opportunity man has ever had to be an individual and to live in a Government respecting free enterprise without governmental regulation and interference will have gone. Nobody will be to blame except ourselves.

Believe it or not, it is so. The handwriting is on the wall. It needs no Joseph to interpret it. It is no dream. Either we, the people, will maintain our rights or lose them. The time has come for us to act, to unite, to organize, to fight the insidious octopus which is stretching out its tentacles in order to strangle you and me and all that for which you and I, the founding fathers, and America stand. Do not be fooled. This crowd which is un-American in concept is out to bring an end to the theory that a man has a right to make a profit out of his business. It is out to destroy capitalism.

"No experienced thinker," said the president of the Bridgeport Brass Co. the other day, "seriously questions the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively; no sensible person questions the right and responsibility of management to manage and to formulate policies. Furthermore, labor knows that industry can't hire people at all, much less pay substantial wages, unless it makes profits."

Martin Durkin, president of the United Association of Plumbers and Steamfitters, speaking on the same program, said that while collective bargaining was now accepted "it has not yet received a full and fair trial; the war intervened just as collective bargaining was gaining a foothold in many newly organized industries, and for 4 years emergency Government arbitration took the place of normal bargaining.

"Now that the war is over, the wiser leaders in labor and industry alike recognize the danger of continued Government intervention. It may appear convenient and efficient to have the Government decide thorny questions like wages and working conditions and union security. But the price is too heavy to pay. Nazism and fascism appeared to be efficient, too. But the people of Europe learned that they had to pay for government regimentation with their precious liberties."

So what is capitalism? What does it require?

There should be enough descendants of original Americans—and I do not mean Indians, though we could use a few—to help save America from the pirates of greed who are running organized labor into the hole of innocuous desuetude. The line which real Americans have drawn as the limit to tolerance will soon be reached.

The Smith-Connally Act is disintegrating and now in process of repeal. If the strikes continue and congressional sentiment remains as it is at present—and actually it will grow stronger—the legislation which will be enacted will make the Smith-Connally Act look like a zephyr.

The regulations to be substituted would include penalties to be imposed upon labor in several ways. It would among other things deprive unions so violating the provisions of the antistrike law of their collective bargaining rights for a year.

The bill also would prevent unions from entering primary campaigns, from making contributions or even printing literature to help out a candidate, nor could labor organizations levy assessments on members for political purposes. This would penalize and perhaps outlaw organizations like the CIO Political Action Committee.

While it is true that Congress often acts in haste and repents at its leisure, it may be said that it is more than possible that if the strikes now threatening in the auto and steel industries do materialize and are long drawn out, such restrictive legislation as that to which I have referred would be speedily enacted and enforced.

I hope most intensely that as the result of the management-labor conference held this week some of these very critical questions may be ironed out, but nobody expects all of the troubles can be cured that fast. We cannot expect the conference to accomplish the millennium or wipe the slate clear of all troubles between management and labor at one swoop or to solve the Nation's economic problems alone.

If it establishes the machinery to settle industrial disputes, it will have gone a long way. The difficulties facing the conference are vital and extreme, but the penalties of failure are colossal.

If nothing worth while comes of it, our revolution will be bloodless, but more effective. The pity of it will be that those who should suffer most have already padded their nests. The hoi polloi who have contributed the padding would starve and freeze, except for the fact we will not permit it. That we will not permit it is one of the levers the big pressure boys are using to establish themselves. We had better get busy, and now.

We had better save something while there is something to be saved.

As someone said, and it was put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Representative RICH, of Pennsylvania:

"Unless capitalism can regain the faith of young America, it will inevitably be defeated by totalitarian socialism. All the strength and power and wonder of free enterprise will avail it nothing if it has lost the belief of thinking Americans under the age of 30.

"How fantastic it seems that the American commies could take over the country. And how fantastic it seemed, 12 years ago, that a funny little man with a tooth-brush mustache could take over Europe.

"Capitalism has got to stop laughing at itself, has got to stop apologizing.

"Using its whole giant machinery of persuasion, capitalism must sell the truth to the Nation's youth.

"Youth must be shown that through its own lack of faith in a free way of life it stands in peril of living in a rationed world.

"Amusingly and dramatically, free enterprise must tell its story to the young people of America—tell it in all the mass-appeal mediums of which it is master.

"Capitalism must create an ideology to tell the truth about itself; a young and vigorous ideology managed, planned, and promoted by young men who are master mechanics in the vast apparatus of opinion and amusement.

"Capitalism has the voice. It has only to find the words."

Why should there be any argument? Are you for or against the theory on which our Government is founded? And have you or do you not have the courage to fight to maintain its fundamental privileges?

It is true we are the melting pot of the world. We are to blame because we have not thrown the scum into the sewage. We have been too kind—but not to ourselves. We have tolerated the un-American activities of a lot of people who might better never have come to our shores, for that they never will be real Americans. They are unappreciative of the benefits they have enjoyed. They are now and for some time have been determined to inject worn-out Old World ideologies into our form of government as against those fundamental principles for which our forefathers fought. They are determined to try to replace them with their own principles, principles similar to those from which our forefathers endeavored to escape many years ago. They just cannot do that to us!

This is a time to call a spade a spade. It is no time to be afraid. It is no time to hide behind ideologies. It is high time for those of us who stem from the stock which

made America what it is to tell those who would make it over just where they get off. We have delayed that action already too long.

It is time to "skim the scum" and hereafter to limit the accumulation thereof to the extent that only those who can appreciate what America means shall be given an opportunity to enjoy what America is. It might as well be said, and it should be.

There is nothing original in my opposition to any attempt to appease minority groups which seek to destroy this Government. Under our system, which is known as the capitalistic form of government, which affords freedom of enterprise and the right of the individual to work for himself, we have saved war chaos, past and present.

The time has now come to save ourselves.

I am an admirer of the stamina of the people of that little island over whose power and authority it was always said the sun never sets, but while I realize and appreciate all they did to make it possible for us to save the world, and I am not forgetful of all that the Russians did to stave off an awful day until we could get into the fight, yet it is true and not to be denied that we saved civilization. Who says that is not so?

It is no great credit to us that we were found, as we were, so unprepared, by reason of our shortsightedness, that we had to have such allies in order to take advantage of such an opportunity which they perhaps made possible. We should see to it as self-respecting Americans, as people of the greatest Republic the world ever made, that we should never again be caught under such obligations to anybody, anytime, anywhere.

Never again should our state of unpreparedness prevent our being ready to demonstrate the fact that we are the world power that God has made us. Great God! Can any American speak any other than such language? We just cannot help the fact that such an obligation is imposed upon us and is ours. Are we equal to it?

Now labor never had any better real friend anywhere, anytime, than I have been, but labor is crucifying itself.

I am not for strikes against the people at any time or anywhere. I am not for the arraigning of class against class at any time. I despise the attempts of some people legislatively to involve us in a world-wide conflict with respect to racial equality. The time for that has not come.

Bigotry and intolerance and discrimination cannot be corrected or controlled by compulsion or proclamation, emancipation, or legislation. The Negroes were emancipated nearly a hundred years ago. For 1,945 years we have been trying to establish the Christian religion in which are involved all the features of equality sought but unattained.

It will take a long while to educate the coming generations. Every attempt to array class against class and race against race by suggested legislation to bring about that equality which only time and education will accomplish is futile and adds fuel to the fire of prejudice. The more fat you throw in the fire the more sizzling you see, and somebody is often burned.

As Louis Adamic says, the pattern of the United States is not essentially Anglo-Saxon, although her language is English. Nor is the pattern Anglo-Saxon with a motley addition of darns and patches. The pattern of America is all of a piece, is American. It is the blend of cultures from many lands woven of threads from all corners of the earth. Diversity itself is the American pattern, is the stuff and color of the fabric.

Or, says Mr. Adamic, let's put it in another way: The United States of America is a new civilization, owing a great deal to the Anglo-Saxon strain, owing much to the other elements in its heritage and growth, owing much to the unique qualities and strong impetuses which stem from the sweep of the continent between two oceans, the mixture and interplay of its peoples, the plenitude of its resources, and the skill all of us—Britons, Irish, French, Spaniards, Scandinavians, Italians, Germans, Slavs, Greeks, Negroes, Orientals; Protestants, Catholics, Jews—have brought here or developed here in the past 300 years.

This is America. I am for America. I am for the American idea. I am for the continuation of our capitalistic system. It has established its right to be considered as the latest but best development of any form of government ever devised by man.

It is time for all real red-blooded Americans who love their country to become aroused to a realizing sense of their individual responsibility. It is time to protect and to preserve this country and its ideals and its ideologies. If we are to save and to transmit the American idea for which credit should be given to the founding fathers, we have to follow after those who are responsible for it. Not to do so is to be traitors and to betray a trust.

I, for one, will not condemn myself to the ignominy of inability to carry on to carry out the plan established by the wise founders of this Government to make free people free and to establish the freedoms and to guarantee the liberties which are the right of all free peoples.

Our forefathers were well-read. They were experienced and they were determined. They sought to establish a government based on the concept and the foundation of the belief in the supremacy, the real equality of opportunity, and the right of the individual; they appreciated the inherent value and the dignity of man. They sought to insure a recognition of the inalienable rights of every citizen and to protect them from subservience to the state. Equality meant more to them and still means more than those who would subvert the Constitution undertake to assert.

I for one do not propose to let my forebears down after 150 years or more of experimentation which has determined the fact that the beacon light they lit for the world still beams.

Due to them, and not to our credit, we have established the highest standard of living for all the people which was ever developed in the history of the world. So far as I am concerned I do not propose to sell it for a siren's song or a mess of pottage.

It is up to us not to take this thing as a matter of fact. It is up to us to get fighting mad in our own behalf. It is up to us to show some intestinal fortitude. Those of us who will not fight for what America means have no business to be in America or to complain if all is lost because we are yellow.

Now, practically, capitalism means production and services for profit. Under such a system individualism and free enterprise are protected and encouraged. We might as well be regimented serfs unless we can work, to earn, to save more than we spend, in order to exist, and in order to support ourselves and our families and the bill for the future. That is what captalism means.

Because of that fact and all it means, we have enjoyed the highest standard of living the world has ever seen or known. Do you want to wreck it? Will you let somebody wreck it? Well, they propose to wreck it and you had better know it now. What are you going to do about it? The time has come for each and every one of us to realize that there is a group that is out to wreck it, and unless you and I and all of us keep on our toes they will wreck it because of our indifference.

Are we going to submit to a plan of economy that will relegate us to the place of regimented serfs, a plan which will destroy all those things which those who have preceded us have enjoyed as well as all those things which those who follow us might hope for, on the basis of the Government established in the wisdom of our founders? Or shall we go on with democracy as we mean it and as we know it, minding our own business, taking care of ourselves while we assume the terrific burden as the greatest power the world has ever known of making sure free people shall be free?

My idea is that we should put our own house in order first, and that we should not, while we undertake to be a Santa Claus to the world in trying to save others, sacrifice our right to save ourselves. How shall we do it?

There is no time here to even outline what needs to be done if we are to master all the problems that confront us but as Lewis H. Brown recently said:

First, we must decide that our Government is going to be the servant and not the master of the people.

Second, we must discontinue Government controls and planned economy devices as rapidly as practicable.

Third, we must create an atmosphere that will reestablish and stimulate the economy of the market place.

Fourth, we must reeducate our people in the principles fought for in the American Revolution.

Fifth, we must enlist every citizen in this effort to maintain our system so that it will continue to increase the standard of living of all our people.

Now you will say, "This is all very exciting and interesting, but what can any one person do about it? How can I, one person, affect the destiny of more than 130,000,000 Americans?"

Let me answer in the words of George William Curtis, who said long ago:

"While good men sit at home, not knowing that there is anything to be done, nor caring to know; cultivating a feeling that politics are tiresome and dirty, and politicians, vulgar bullies and bravos; half persuaded that a republic is the contemptible rule of a mob, and secretly longing for a splendid and vigorous despotism—then remember, it is not a government mastered by ignorance, it is a government betrayed by intelligence."

You're a King in Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "You're a King in Arkansas" by Judge Robert W. Lyon, which appeared in Coronet magazine for October 1945:

YOU'RE A KING IN ARKANSAS

(By Judge Robert W. Lyon)

Everybody is planning for the postwar future, and the big idea almost everywhere is to get away from the humdrum grind of big cities to the ease and comfort of rural living. Well, it's easier than you think to do just that in Arkansas' Ozarks.

The proof that city folk can make a living in the Ozarks is best demonstrated by the fact that a goodly number of them are already making a living here, and more are seeking locations every day. From close observation and the experience gleaned from 10 years of living in the Ozarks, I list below a number of ways by which a city man can not only make a good living, but some money besides.

If you are fed up with big-city crowding, high living costs, food scarcities, noise, and

dirt, you can escape those things in the Ozarks. If winter winds freeze you to the bone and shoveling snow off the sidewalk gives you a crick in your back, come to the Ozarks. Should you be a retired person with a modest pension that scarcely covers city living expenses, you can sit on the top of the world down here, or if you want to work a little and fish or hunt a lot you can do that in the Ozarks. Just take your choice.

The closest any man can come to absolute security for himself and family is to own a little farm in the Ozarks. I have never seen or heard of anyone suffering the pangs of hunger here. And no one ever will be hungry if he will work half as hard on an Ozark farm as he does on a city job. Forty good acres of land, two milk cows, a hundred laying hens, and a well-tended garden will support a family of five persons comfortably. From such a farm you will have ample pasturage for your cows, and all the milk, cream, and butter you need. The hens will supply your household eggs, with enough left over to buy the family groceries, and the vegetables grown in the garden will be eaten when fresh and canned for the winter's needs. Fuel from the wooded part of your farm is free for the cutting.

For those who may wish to farm on a more extensive scale I recommend sheep raising as a very profitable enterprise. Our soil grows excellent grasses for pasturage and hay, while the mild climate allows the flock to run on range practically every day in the year. The sheep raiser gets two crops per year from his flock, lambs, and wool, and he still has his original sheep. Eight head of sheep will keep fat on the pasturage required for one cow, and a well-cared-for flock of ordinary grade ewes will bear an average of one and a half lambs each per year, for many ewes bear twins. With choice lambs bringing $16.75 per hundred-weight and wool 50 cents per pound, one can readily see the profits are very good indeed. A neighbor of mine who raises sheep successfully informs me that his flock of 150 ewes on 160 acres made him a net profit of $3,375 this past year.

Raising beef cattle for market has long been one of the most profitable lines of Ozark endeavor. In many parts of this region free range is still available so that a cattleman may graze his herd over miles of country the year around. I personally know many men who have grown wealthy running beef cattle on range in the Ozarks and many are still doing it.

A comparatively new Ozark enterprise that is proving to be highly successful is raising special breeds of thoroughbred goats whose milk is made into Greek and Italian types of cheese. This enterprise is conducted by means of cooperatives. Fifty farmers in a locality band together to raise the same breed of goats. All the milk from these herds is sold to the goat-cheese factory which, likewise, is owned by the goat owners. The cheese is shipped to a ready market at high prices and is in constantly increasing demand. The widow of a former Chicago physician is the leading goat herd owner of one such cooperative, as well as being one of its officials.

Poultry raising is always profitable in the Ozarks because of the long summer seasons, mild winters—and, consequently cheaper cost of production. One Arkansas county specializes in the raising of choice broilers. It is claimed that more broilers are shipped annually from this county than from any other area of similar size in the Nation. Driving through this county one sees an appearance of prosperity on every hand and everybody seems to be in the broiler business.

Another crop that brings rich returns, with proper culture, is strawberries. One small area near our farm shipped more than 285 express carloads of strawberries this year, for which it received the price of $7.80 per crate—the highest price received in Ozark history for this fruit.

The price was determined by the Government. Well-tended strawberry patches will return normally from $250 to $500 per acre. A near neighbor of mine has 4½ acres of strawberries growing among the stumps and rocks. He received enough cash from his crop last year to build himself a modern 5-room home. Ozark growing seasons for strawberries come early enough to get them on the northern markets before the crops in Michigan, Wisconsin, and Ohio are ripe. Early berries command the highest prices.

Perhaps you are just not ambitious enough to grow berries and fruits. Well then, the good Lord has you in mind too, for he has blessed this Ozark country most lavishly by having it produce a variety of wild fruit in the greatest abundance. Wild dewberries, wild blackberries, wild grapes, and wild plums make the most delicious jams and jellies to be found anywhere and here they are free, if you will just take the trouble to pick them. I know a man (a former Chicagoan) who conceived the idea of converting these wild fruits and berries into delicious jams, jellies, preserves, and butters for the commercial trade. He started with less than $100 in a small cabin with one cook. He picked the berries himself. In 2 years this man was shipping his products to top-flight food establishments in New York City and Los Angeles and from Minneapolis to the Gulf of Mexico. At no time has he been able to come anywhere near filling his orders.

It may be that you are a mining man looking for new fields to explore. The Ozarks will be an excellent place for you to look. Not 30 miles from my farm is a newly discovered vein of zinc and lead located by a Baltimore mining company. It is claimed that this vein has the largest and richest deposit of these ores ever discovered in the country. The United States Government is said to be shipping in drilling machinery for prospecting on its own account.

Down near Jasper, Ark., I visited a brand new mill that was ready to commence mining operations the very moment the war was over and manpower again available. And did you know that in the State of Arkansas is one of the richest diamond mines in the world? Various types of ore have been discovered in the Ozarks, and this field of mining will take on much life in the future.

How would you like to get into the summer resort business on the absolute ground floor? You can do just that in the Ozarks. The Government has built, and is still building, a number of huge water-power projects down here. A large dam is built across a river which backs up the water for many miles, thus covering thousands of acres of bottom lands.

One such project, located in Baxter County, Ark., is named Norfork Lake. This body of water equals in beauty any lake I have ever seen. It has a shore line of more than 500 miles. It is shaped like a huge octopus whose tentacles reach out hither and yon, following every depression and every former creek bed on either side of the original stream. Nestling as it does in the lap of green-covered mountains that rise in imposing grandeur on all sides, it creates a setting spectacularly beautiful.

This lake teems with game fish—with large- and small-mouthed bass, bluegills, crappies, and others. I can personally attest these facts, having but recently covered the lake in a motorboat and having gorged myself for 3 days on bass weighing from 2 to 5 pounds each. Right now the Government is completing plans for leasing shoreline property on this lake for commercial-resort purposes, under certain restrictions. Climatic gentleness in this area will make this a resort location that may well be operated 9 or 10 months of each year. If you are interested in acquiring a resort location now is the time to act.

There are many other opportunities for making a living in the Ozarks, and the keen observer will quickly spot them. The Ozark area is the last remaining section of the Nation that has been unexploited, but with the ending of the war I predict a steady stream of people will head this way in search of new homes, new ways of making a living, and new and beautiful surroundings.

It is dinnertime now and I see that we are having fried chicken again with hot buttered biscuits and country gravy, new potatoes, creamed new peas, tomato and lettuce salad covered with chopped hard-boiled eggs and topped with plenty of home-made boiled salad dressing. Dessert will be wild blackberry cobbler covered to a depth of 2 inches with rich cream from our registered Jersey cows, and the whole washed down by copious glasses of ice-cold Jersey milk. In the center of the table is a brick of homemade butter, churned an hour ago from more Jersey cream. All the items on this menu are grown on our own farm. Tomorrow we'll have either breast of guinea hen or roast duckling or perhaps a couple of juicy squabs. We raise them all. Ah, me, city life must be terrible.

The Suribachi Flag

REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to a letter concerning the Suribachi flag, which I am placing in the Appendix of the RECORD today.

The gentleman who wrote this letter, Lt. Alan S. Wood, of Pasadena, Calif., was communications officer on the U. S. S. *LST 779*, and it was he who furnished the flag to the Marine Corps which they raised over Mount Suribachi on Iwo Jima. It is one of the most beautifully written letters I think you have had the pleasure of reading and I commend it to your attention for reading in the RECORD tomorrow morning.

A Proposed Peace Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a very prominent constituent has forwarded to me a proposed peace plan which he has entitled "A Divine Command Regarding the Transformation of the World Order." It is indeed a novel and interesting exposition of a plan of world peace and, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting it verbatim:

Preamble: What became of civilization—the horror of war-suffering humanity all over this world—and when it is all over, what? The same old story? I hope not. But in God only can we trust.

He gives to the world this plan for a permanent peace.

God made this world for what is known as five continents. Let us have it that way. Only five nations, with the freedom of seas and equal opportunity of commerce, each to be unarmed, except to maintain a small militia. Possessing unity, the Universe will have peace; divided, it will ever face deceit, greed, and destruction.

A WORLD LEGION OF PEACE AND DEMOCRACY

We shall set aside the month of May as a period of time each year in which to promulgate world peace and democracy, and to honor the mothers who gave their sons to free the world—the Blessed Mother as I believe gave her Son for the same cause. He gave His life on the cross for the sins of the world.

A convention shall be held within the month of May, each year in a different part of the world, to foster constantly the cause of brotherhood toward men; to give thanks to God, our Creator, and to commemorate those who gave their lives in this world war, and to dedicate their actions to the cause of world peace and democracy and of the freedoms of humanity: Religion, speech, and from want and fear.

ORGANIZATION

As a distinct organization, it shall operate as a function of all interested national organizations.

Our organization shall be headed by the President of the United States of America, as honorary president.

Our national committee shall consist of the heads of all national organizations—the heads of their State and local organizations to account to them for their respective memberships.

Other local organizations may take active part, so that the gospel of peace is preached to all. Although some people believe not in God or war, still when war has come, everybody is affected.

OBJECTS

1. The main object is to establish throughout the world the principles of the four freedoms, the cause for which we understood this present war to be fought.

2. This organization shall do everything possible to create a workable plan for world peace, making for world order and the peaceful settlement of all international controversy, and the permanent blacklisting of war, as it is man made and man can stop it.

3. To accentuate the tenets of democracy, so that the right shall be vested in the people to take part in national and world affairs—to foredoom dictatorship.

4. To introduce into schools the study of world peace, so that an understanding of the beauty of peace and the horror of war may be engendered in the mind of youth—an ideology to be nurtured with age and growing intelligence and to eventually materialize into permanent action.

5. To be constantly aware of this world peace plan, received by the State Department in Washington, D. C., on March 2, 1945 (file OA500 CC/3-145) as the result of a divine manifestation, which has served to awaken me to the need of an organization such as I herewith am introducing to the world.

PROPOSED PROCEDURE OF ORGANIZATION

1. Meeting of all local national organization representatives and form a local committee.

2. Each national organization to call their State chairman to meet in Kenosha with the committee.

3. The State chairman to send to their national president this plan of proposed organization for their approval.

4. Upon receipt of their approval, the local committee shall designate a temporary national committee, they to call a meeting of all national presidents.

5. At the meeting of the national presidents, they shall elect the national officers.

6. They, in turn, shall carry the organization first within our Nation and then through the world.

CONCEPTION

On the morning of November 1, 1944, at 2:20, while I was sleeping, a voice awakened me, saying: "You are chosen as an apostle of peace to write a plan, the preamble to be in words and music.

"The world to be only five nations: North and South America, each to be one nation; Europe, North and West Africa, all to be one nation; South Africa for the black race; and Asia for the yellow race. Three nations for the Caucasian race, two for the colored races.

"I set up the Christian religion in Rome, the place for future world peace in North America.

"When your plan is complete, go to the veterans' organizations and all other national organizations and the war mothers. They will help you for they all know the horrors of war. Go to Congressman SMITH, of Racine, Wis. He will work for the plan.

"The United States of America to have domination over Italy and its colonies, and to have all the bases that she now holds or will occupy, until this plan is put into operation.

"The world to have one universal language, based chiefly on the Italian, that God's will, it shall be done."

While all this was being said, there was a visitation of God in the form of a statue, its lips moving as a live person.

On the morning of November 23, at 5 a. m., while I was sleeping, a voice said: "You have not started on your mission. Are you afraid? This is the will of God. None of my apostles were kings; the Blessed Mother is your guide."

On November 23, 1944, I wrote this plan, and on December 27, 1944, I went to Congressman SMITH.

On the morning of December 29, 1944, at 5 a. m., a vision of a woman appeared and said. "I am the Immaculate Conception, your guide. You feel confused as to how you would set up the organization to proceed with the plan for future world peace. The United States of America Government will call all nations to a conference to work out with them this plan. When the plan is approved, a temporary organization, composed of all the present nations, will establish the five nations' boundaries and their temporary governments and the first World Congress, Senate, and the Court, according to your plan, will be started.

"State all that has been said to you as part of the plan. As soon as this is done the world struggle will end."

PLAN FOR UNITED WORLD IN FIVE NATIONS

The five nations to be a democracy, chiefly on the pattern of the United States of America Constitution; each to be divided into 100 states, each free to elect their national and state officials. Each state to have one representative and one alternate to a world congress. Also one representative and one alternate to a world senate. Only the world congress and senate would have an army to police the world and to preclude any nation from building implements of war, except upon sanction of the world congress and senate for the world army.

Each nation to furnish the same number of officers and enlisted men to be stationed the world over, on land and on sea, to protect all alike, according to the international law.

The world congress and senate would appoint a commander in chief and a vice commander in chief for the world army from the personnel of the world army.

On the request of the government of any nation to the world congress and senate, the world army would take over that nation for the period of the emergency. The world congress and senate would enforce the policy whereby each nation would be free from outside interference in its election of national and state officials; would have the supervision of all international airways and harbors, collecting from all outgoing and incoming international commerce so that 75 percent of the costs of maintaining the world army and the expenses involved in all other international affairs would be paid therefrom; 25 percent to be paid by each nation.

A world bank: The capital to be furnished from the five nations; the world congress and senate through this bank would regulate the currency so that all of the five nations would have a fair and just standard of living.

The World Congress and Senate would set up the world army, bank, the universal language, and effect the relocating of the black race and the yellow race to their respective nations, and establish a permanent seat for the world government, somewhere in North America.

The World Court: Each nation would send five justices. The duty of this court would be to approve all acts of the World Congress and Senate, mindful of the international constitution, and to take final jurisdiction in all matters concerning international law.

Language: Each nation may retain its present language or languages; but the entire world to have one universal language, based chiefly on the Italian, presuming because of its kindred relation to music, understood universally. Basically, the universal language would be restricted to the use of the most common simple words.

AN APPEAL

My brothers in God, in considering future world peace, do not forget the Ten Commandments.

United, the world will prosper in peace; divided, will have the horrors of wars again and again.

The United States of America, as a nation, is a shining example of the benefits of unity. Had it lacked unity, it could very well have been the bloodiest battlefield of the world.

I beg of the human race to think of this plan very sincerely, putting all selfish thoughts aside. We are not going to stay on in this world forever.

My only son has been killed over the Ploesti oil fields, in Rumania. He died May 5, 1944, while serving with the United States Army Air Forces. If he were living, I would not desire him to be even a king of any nation under the present or past conditions of universal deceit and greed.

I appeal especially to the members of the colored races who are born or have been living where peoples of the Caucasian race are in the majority. Although by law you possess the same rights, are you able to exercise them? You would be much better off with members of your own race making up one free nation, with equal opportunity in the united world.

Let me truly state the firm belief that I have in this plan supplants all my worldly concern.

1. That it has been given to the world by the will of God. Because I have had a very limited education, I could not so write and arrange this plan.

2. I further believe that the will of God has been toward this for many years. The forefathers of the United States of America got their successful ideas in forming this Union by God being with them to show the world what could be accomplished by unity. God stated to me that the place for future world peace is to be North America.

3. That this horrible war and destruction of the world is to bring the human race to a realization of our sins. Now, therefore, the need of a total world unity to escape the recurrence; and that all the transformation of the world order is to be done at one time by mediation of all the nations.

History tells of God's warning: It was to be expected, before the great punishment of God would come, that our Lord and Saviour,

through his church, would give some striking warnings. Did he do so? Indeed he did.

His representatives on earth, the different Popes, have given to the world a number of special encyclicals, warning the world of the dangers of the false teachings which would lead to modern paganism, with its sad consequences for families, societies and for nations.

They demanded reconstruction of social order that capitalism must give to the laboring classes a just, Christian deal.

They reminded the world of the sanctity and the dignity of matrimony, of the purpose and need of Christian homes which are the foundation and the pillars of a healthy, strong nation.

They condemned immorality in picture shows and in literature which undermines not only the morals of youth but forced the curse of Heaven upon nations. The church of Christ warned not only the world, she also offered sure remedies to overcome the evils of the world.

Other warnings: In 1823, the mystic Catherine Emmerich, in one of her ecstasies, got a warning for the world.

"I hear that Lucifer shall be set free for some time, 50 or 60 years before the year two thousand after Christ."

Stop, think, do a little figuring, and then you will also do some serious thinking.

Twenty-five years later, in 1848 Karl Marx began to poison human society with satanic, Godless principles out of which grew communism, Hitlerism and all other devilisms which rebel against God and try to undermine and destroy Christianity. What fools they are! Have they never heard of the divine promise and guarantee of our Lord, that even the gates of hell will not prevail against His church? Does 2,000 years of history not teach them that no earthly power can destroy a divine institution?

In 1858, our Lord sent His beloved mother, the refuge of sinners, the help of Christians, from Heaven upon earth to warn the world.

But the proud world ignored all warnings. They acted as the people did in the days of Noah's warning, they did not want to hear. They wanted to live their own lives, they ate, drank, and danced, having good times until the sudden flood made an end to their Godless lives.

4. Why five nations? Why did I get the inspiration of 100 states to each nation, and 1 representative to the world congress and 1 representative to the world senate? This would give the human race in every part of the world a democratic representation in the world's affairs by a person of their choice.

5. I am not an expert on world affairs, but the taxation of all outgoing and incoming international commerce would satisfy the cost of maintaining the world's arms and all other international expense. A just portion would be paid by each nation according to their outgoing and incoming commerce.

6. Why this universal language, as stated to me in this vision? That in itself will bring humanity more closely together and so to live in peace with themselves and the creator of life. The former peace treaties were made with self-interest and greed, as it was in the peace treaty of Versailles, concluding the last World War which was to end all wars.

Wake up, America. Do not let it happen again. We have been mobilized for a total war, now lets organize ourselves for total peace. Now is the time to do some serious thinking. Most of us are affected by the world struggle, especially those of us that have received the grim message from the War Department.

The future world peace plan is in the making for good or evil. If based on God, love, and laws, it will last forever; but if based on selfishness and greed all of the sacrifices of winning the Second World War are in vain.

Abraham Lincoln: "United we stand, divided we fall." How true it is. If the human race continues to allow each group to have an army at their disposal there will be no world peace. Do something for the future peace of the world. Write to our State Department, Washington, D. C., in your own way or in support of this God-given plan.

O, God of love, make wars throughout the world to cease. Let righteousness and justice reign.

Fellow Christians, let us, too, remember the Lord's Prayer.

Sincerely yours in God,

LOUIS C. GENTILE.

Navy and War Shipping Administration Using Ships To Bring Boys Home—But Not Enough Ships and Too Many Boys for Ships—Parents Should Know Ships Are Being Used

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, several times recently on the floor of the House I have heard some distinguished Members thereof, directly and indirectly, criticize and condemn the Navy and War Shipping Administration, in fact, inferentially the Commander in Chief, and the administration of this Government, for not using ships to get the boys home. So I made it my business to try to find out how many ships were in use for this purpose, and herewith set them forth. This is for the further information of the Members of the House and any other readers.

In the Atlantic service there are 47 passenger liners, 217 converted Liberties, 87 converted Victories, *Queen Mary*, 8 large and small aircraft carriers, 1 battleship, and 6 cruisers being used.

In the Pacific service they have 164 passenger ships, 4 large and small aircraft carriers, 6 battleships, 21 cruisers, 165 transports, 13 hospital transports, and 24 miscellaneous ships, and in general service there are 29 passenger ships.

War Shipping Administration has only two passenger ships which are not carrying troops and they are ancient coastwise steamers which would not be safe for ocean crossing. There is 1 British ship, 1 Norwegian, and 15 Dutch ships being used as troop carriers.

Freight Rates and Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an interesting and thoughtful article by David E. Lilienthal, Chairman, Tennessee Valley Authority—TVA—on the relations of freight rates and wages. The article appeared in the magazine Ammunition for November 1945. It is as follows:

On May 15, 1945, the Interstate Commerce Commission issued an order that seems destined to have a far-reaching effect on the economic history and development of the United States.

On this date, the Commission ordered that a key group of freight rates be revised before the end of the year in order to bring closer to parity the freight rate levels in all the regions of the country east of the Rocky Mountains and laid the basis for eventual full parity of "class rates" throughout this entire area.

TO ELIMINATE "COLONIAL AREAS"

Thus a step was taken toward wiping out one of the artificial barriers which businessmen and officials in the South, and in other territories outside the Northeast, have long felt militated against the industrial development of these regions and have resulted in maintaining them as "colonial areas" of relatively low incomes. The order places manufacturers in the South on a more even footing with those of the Northeast, where industry has long been concentrated, in reaching markets which frequently are no farther away from southern centers—and often even closer to them—than from similar manufacturers in the Northeast.

The movement toward parity of freight rates can be viewed with alarm only by the few with little faith in America—those who believe that the country is not going on expanding and demanding, as time goes on, more goods and services which can only be supplied by increasing the total productiveness of the country. To a few, the encouragement to the development of industry in the South and other regions of the United States appears as an invitation to existing industry in the Northeast, where manufacturing has long been concentrated, to migrate to other regions. But any misguided efforts along these lines would be lacking in constructiveness, for a moving of existing plants would add nothing to the total productive enterprise of the Nation; and they are based on the false assumption that America is through industrially; that one region can gain only at expense of another.

But these are clearly narrow views of the case, particularly in view of the fact that all over the Nation today people are talking in terms of an expanding economy, of full production. This must mean more and larger manufacturing plants in all sections.

No region, economically speaking, can live to itself alone. If the people of the South prosper and raise their standard of living, if new industries based on new capital and on the South's resources are established and grow, if the land is made more productive and more secure against erosion and wasting—in short, if the general economic level of the region is raised and maintained—then the rest of the people of the country benefit. If the people of the South raise their economic level, then they have more to offer the rest of the country in terms of goods and services and also, by reason of their increased income, they have more money with which to buy the products and the services of other sections of the country.

Curiously enough, this fact is recognized on a world-wide basis, often by the same people who see in the development of low-income areas of the United States a danger to the more highly developed area in terms of industry and commerce.

A few months ago, a great American business leader returned after a trip through Soviet Russia to write with great enthusiasm about the potential benefits to the United States of continued Russian industrial development. He clearly saw that in the development of a Russian market for American goods lay an opportunity for America, and

he strongly recommended liberal American credits in order to speed up this industrial development of a far-off country. He is far from being alone in advocating this course.

And such a course has become national policy through the decision of Congress to participate in the Bretton Woods plan for the development of countries all over the world which, by increasing the development of their own natural resources and the skills of their people, will raise their incomes and standards of living and thereby make them better customers for goods produced in the United States and better contributors to world prosperity. Under the Bretton Woods plan, the United States becomes the heaviest contributor of funds to be loaned for such developmental purposes.

The same theory extends with equal if not greater force to regions within the United States; if the development of industry and higher standards of living in Soviet Russia, China, India, and other economically retarded regions is in the interests of the United States, as it undoubtedly is, then it follows that similar growth in the undeveloped regions of this country is also in the national interest.

AWAY FROM A RAW MATERIAL LOW-WAGES ECONOMY

Parity of freight rates for the South is a step toward such a development, for it will help open the way for the region to undertake to a greater extent the processing of its raw materials into finished or semifinished products with the consequent higher income and higher wages which such activities command. In other words, freight-rate parity is a step toward shifting the region away from the extractive, raw-materials economy, in which most of its effort is devoted to getting out timber, minerals, and other resources.

As the TVA pointed out in a report to the President and Congress in 1943, entitled "Regionalized Freight Rates: Barrier to National Productiveness":

"More abundant contribution by the South and West most definitely does not require a geographic redistribution of existing factories * * *. Hence there is * * * no real issue of region against region * * *. Every part of the country will benefit."

It should be made clear also that every segment of the population will benefit also, that labor will find its income, both individually and collectively, increased by the stimulation and growth of industry. Generally speaking, the wages in the extractive industries which provide the raw materials are not as high as they are in the manufacturing industries where higher degrees of skill are required with resultant higher earnings.

By the same token, wage earners who are paid relatively lower wages for their work in providing raw materials only do not have the buying power with which to purchase automobiles, radios, electric stoves, and countless other items. Higher labor income in the South means greater markets for the goods manufactured in all parts of the country.

The situation, which the changes in the freight rate structure are aimed at eliminating, is perhaps best pointed out by specific example. A stoker manufacturer at Gadsden, Ala., would in the past have had to overcome a rate handicap of $1.60 per stoker in shipping his product to Wilmington, Del., as compared with a Chicago manufacturer shipping to the same place, although the distances are approximately equal.

Ready-mixed paint produced at Montgomery, Ala., would have to overcome a rate handicap of 5.27 cents per gallon in competition with paint made at Peoria, Ill., in order to compete in the market at Baltimore, Md., which is about the same distance from both places. An electric refrigerator manufactured at Birmingham, Ala., would in the past have had to overcome a rate handicap of $1.31 to Battle Creek, Mich., as compared with a shipment from Philadelphia, Pa., about the same distance from the market.

Such unfair differentials, not justified by variations in the cost of providing service, have been one of the factors which have tended to discourage the development of manufacturing and industry in the South. And in cases where manufacturing has been undertaken despite the handicap, it is apparent that the difference had to be absorbed in one way or another—in lessened profits or lower wages.

In the above examples of freight-rate handicap, if the difference had come entirely out of wages they would have been reduced 6 percent in the case of stokers, 44 percent in the case of paint, and 9 percent in the case of refrigerators. If profits had absorbed all the difference they would have been reduced 12, 51, and 16 percent, respectively.

Liquid capital is more mobile than labor and therefore has more choice of location and kind of employment than labor has. For this reason it seems safe to say that capital, knowing the freight rate handicap, would not undertake to absorb it, but would either make sure of passing it on or locate in a more favorable place. Certainly, the consumer would not be expected to pay a higher price just because of the higher freight when he could buy goods shipped at lower rates. In these circumstances the burden would fall on wages and in this way the freight rate handicap of the South and West probably has contributed to differentials between northern and southern wages.

The freight rate order of the Interstate Commerce Commission is a hopeful sign, among other hopeful signs, that the South is on its way toward the development of its resources in a way which will raise incomes toward a parity with the rest of the country—making it a better market both for goods produced in its own plants and for those produced in other sections of the country.

The Nation has been made stronger in war due to the developments in the South; it will be stronger in peace, more productive and more prosperous. Parity of freight rates will help encourage the South and other industrially undeveloped sections to achieve higher standards of living and thus contribute to the national peacetime progress.

Expediency the Rule for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, on a recent visit back to Minnesota I was impressed with the fact that an increasing number of our people are becoming interested in the Government, more particularly in the executive and legislative branches. They are at a loss to explain to their own satisfaction many of the things that are being done in the name of "expediency," which is fast becoming the rule for action. Under permission granted by the House, I desire to insert in the RECORD two letters, one from Charles W. Briggs to myself, the other from E. R. Hicklin, a prominent attorney living in Wapello, Iowa, to Mr. Briggs. I may say, for the record, that Mr. Briggs is one of Minnesota's outstanding lawyers who is also unusually well versed in government:

ST. PAUL, MINN., *October 3, 1945.*
Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HAROLD: I enjoyed my visit with you while I was in Washington. While there I embraced every opportunity to discuss problems that are uppermost in the minds of people today. I have been reading in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in the printed reports of various committee hearings repeated references to the "little man" or the "little fellow." Perhaps I have the curiosity of a philosopher, but at any rate I cannot refrain from meditating upon the reason for such emphasis, and where it will eventually lead us.

If this emphasis springs from a motive to give every man his due, that is one thing. If it foreshadows a movement to afford preferential status to smallness, that is quite another thing. There is a vast difference between freeing the roads of life for the development of individual potentialities and routing traffic for the benefit of inefficient jitneys, no matter how much the movement of efficient vehicles may be blocked.

If this emphasis has as its objective permitting little men to grow big, or as big as they can, the purpose is certainly laudable. If it is to keep open the portals of opportunity, it is entirely justified. If it is to maintain a society in which the abilities of every citizen, big or little, shall have a chance to develop and claim a just and fair reward, it should receive universal approval. If it is to dissolve monopoly and unearned privilege, we may all say "amen." If it is to release every citizen from the exertion of power in any form that stifles hope and individual initiative and promote rewards commensurate with meritorious service, again we say "amen." If it is to nourish freedom of choice of a calling in life and opportunity to pursue it in fair competition, no amount of attention to the "little man" can be criticized. This is the very essence of sound enjoyment of life.

But if the aim is to equip the doors of opportunity with a lot of governmental door checks and trick locks to the end that inability and weakness is exalted above excellency and strength, an examination is certainly in order. Here sentimentality must not obtain mastery, and the stark realities and facts of human experience must be boldly faced. We cannot deny the existence of human inequities. Indeed, we cannot deny the inherent disposition of mankind ultimately and finally to demand and accord rewards proportionate to the value of services performed. Appraisement of value cannot be made by exact formula, but it is nevertheless made, and we cannot and do not ignore the fact that a man's earnings and accumulations in the long run are one test of his abilities. No amount of artificial regulation or manipulation can long prevent the appraisal of human character and worth. In truth, this appraisal has gone on through the ages. Envy and prejudice have impinged upon the process of judging a man's worth, but never have these traits obliterated the individual desire to get along and at the same time to give due credit to the man who does. Demonstrated ability and earned success have been constant parts of the scheme of things from the beginning. It has always been recognized that a man gets out of life what he puts into it.

Competition has always been the life of society—it is life itself. Men have been picked for their faculties, their prowess, their acumen—their ability to carry the ball. By and large they have advanced accordingly. How long could athletic games survive if the "little men" (speaking in terms of comparative abilities) were on the team, and the

"all-Americans" were on the side lines? How long could our marvelous industrial machine function if top men, specialists, and executives with the know-how were relegated to the assembly line, the mine, or the forest, or if left where they now are, their rewards were reduced to those of others with lesser capabilities? In the field of education, how long can excellency in training be maintained if competent educators are paid less than the janitors of the buildings in which they serve? The whole course of nature, evolution, and progress is based upon competition and the rewards that come to superior qualities.

But we hear it said that the aim is to raise the standards of living of the "little fellow" with no purpose to handicap his more capable brother. But what is actually going on and being proposed belies that statement. All disclaimers to the contrary notwithstanding, the tide of collectivism is running in this country. It is manifested by erection of barriers to opportunity, by discriminatory taxation that saps the strength and resources of those who fashion the wheels of economic and cultural progress, and by various devices to level off incomes and property holdings. No amount of rhetorical phrasing can disguise the fact that the plan to be pursued is an arbitrary and artificial distribution (or redistribution) of the total national income, regardless of comparative earning abilities or contributions. Where this will lead ought to be no mystery. It will lead to the discouragement of individual effort and the destruction of private property. Even before this leveling process is complete we shall have ushered in an authoritarian state.

The present plan seems to be to siphon off the avails of superior effort by ever-increasing wages and progressive taxation so arranged that incomes below $4,000 pay little or no taxes. Where, then, does the burden of taxation fall? Principally upon the middle-bracket earners, among whom are found the managers, the specialists, and the men who design and speed the whole industrial structure. Among these are also the men of science, of the professions, and men of small business, seeking expansion.

If this plan is followed, eventually the source of income taxes will be dried up, as the inevitable result of increased cost of doing business and the destruction of the will to persevere.

Scant attention seems to be paid to the principle that although a laborer in any field is worthy of his hire, giving him more than he is worth in the end destroys his usefulness. Gving him less comes to the same end. Mr. Stalin found out in the most advanced socialism of today that he could afford to pay men only for what they could do, and no more. While we do not subscribe to his coercive methods, it is fair to say that he probably saved his regime by paying people what they really earned. Acceptance of a principle is what is being pointed out. But we seem bent upon ignoring the teachings of painful experience. We seem determined, by a system of steeply progressive taxation, elaborate Government spending, and muzzling competitive effort, to erect arbitrary and artificial rewards for work done or not done. We are perilously near beginning to think that accomplishment is its own reward. In a practical world that is indeed unsound enough, but when we undertake to reward the lack of accomplishment we are on the brink of destroying the very basis upon which society must rest. Getting something for nothing corrodes and corrupts and demoralizes.

Favoring people merely because they are "little fellows" to the detriment of other people merely because they are big is a policy no society can adopt and long survive. Nothing but a dictatorship could enforce such a policy, even for a time. In the end, the unfairness of it, the inherent antipathy of mankind to it, will break it down, and people will again start back on the road to competition and life as it was meant to be lived.

There is manifest in certain tax proposals, including those of Mr. Vinson, ultimately to lift direct tax burdens from those whose incomes are less than $4,000, or reduce them radically, and to repeal most, if not all, of the taxes on corporate income. Scant concern is exhibited for individual incomes above $4,000 that are personally earned. The effect is clear—the burdens on this latter class must remain. There will be no opportunity for savings. These disproportionate burdens are cast upon middle-class earners who are not in the wage class, and not in commercial production, where the advantages in our economy apparently are to be conferred. It seems to be the intention to inflate the costs of living and of business which members of this class cannot escape, and coldly to require them to remit their balances in the form of taxes. They have no recourse for recoupment. These people are consumers, and the process seems to be to shift to them a killing load of the total cost of society. Any tax law, now that the war is over, that does not give at least a tax reduction of 20 percent across the board, is a rank discrimination against these personal earners. If existing accumulations of capital are rendered secure, even though taxes on the gains thereof are considerable, and it is made impossible for competent earners in our economy to accumulate any capital, no words are needed to portray the injustice and inequity done.

Personal abilities are a wasting asset. What can be the urge to expend them for nothing? Take away the incentive to earn and get ahead in productive years, and the mainspring of our system is destroyed. Mr. Stalin said he had to "liquidate a whole generation." Is that what we propose to do, or do we propose to permit the strong indivdual to enter in the race without hobbles and to enjoy whatever premium he can fairly win—in this generation and in the generations to come?

Shall we be able to say to our child as of old: "He rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race"? or shall we train him to say: "What's the use, I will get something anyway"?

This is a long letter, but I have strong feelings on the subject, and I know that an increasing number of people are intensely interested. In it is a note of frankness, but is it not a time for frankness in both thought and action?

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES W. BRIGGS.

WAPELLO, IOWA, *November 13, 1945.*

Mr. CHARLES W. BRIGGS,
First National Bank Building,
St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR CHARLES: Thanks very much for your letter. I like to hear from you because your letters are so stimulating to thought, and I want to answer you right away because you have crystallized something that has been working in the back of my mind for quite a while. I should see you more often because your thoughts are always helpful.

I believe that the fundamental disease of the American people is that they have yielded to doctrine of expediency. Unless this is stopped it is a cancer which will destroy our Government. As you point out in your letter we are ready to discount expedients which are arrived at on account of war. Yet it is one further step to magnify other crises to similar proportions and to use them as excuses for expediency.

It occurs to me that we can cover the whole governmental illness which has descended upon us since the thirties in this category.

I myself sat in the aisle of legislature and saw passed act after act of revolting law which was made appetizing by the fact that it was called emergency legislation. The emergency never ceased. From higher and higher places of expediency came the excuse for departure from established principles of law and government. You are familiar with the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States which were justified on the grounds of expediency. The whole New Deal philosophy was one of expediency. Bankrupting of the Government, the recognition, growth, and eventual triumph of labor racketeering was the result of expediency. I am not so sure that it has not pervaded our churches when we see that it has become a part and parcel of organized charity and Red Cross.

Perhaps the legal profession has contributed to this situation. The fact that it is often more financially profitable to settle disputed matters and to go on with business than to reckon with the violation of established principle in a conclusive manner has played its full part. Business has been entirely willing to do so, and of course the lawyers hired by business are prone to go along with their clients.

Men like Sewell Avery are as scarce as nails in a tree. Sewell Avery stood only for a principle and was almost the subject of ridicule. You have very few men like Sewell Avery in public life. Somehow they don't seem to last long.

I think the future of the Republican Party may depend upon an assertion against this condition. The difficulty is that we have sought to produce candidates who could get votes rather than who would abide by principles. We wanted them to attract away from the New Deal by exceeding the New Deal. We did not want them to carry out such promises, we wanted them to fool the people. Thus we were guilty of expediency, and I think we deserve to lose when I look back.

I don't know how it is going to be done, Charley, but I am convinced that people who are through with all forms of expediency must be the nucleus for a political organization. I believe this will cut squarely across both of the existing political parties. I am sure that our great Democratic leaders who must now be sufficiently puzzled that they would sigh with relief to be a part of such an organization if only it did not emanate from some Republican source.

To begin with, I think we have examples of expedient departure which should be cataloged so that people could be awakened. I should not blame them all onto politics nor political groups. Nevertheless I should hope to demonstrate that the survival of capital and that the independence of man in this country rest upon an about face in the moral conduct and philosophy of the Government and upon return to ways of thinking like old Sam Baird, who would sue the M. & St. L. Ry. for the death of a $15 shoat that would cost him $50 to do so.

Sincerely,

E. R. HICKLIN.

Judaic Research at Yale University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article on the Judaic research at Yale University, which was made possible by the generosity of Mr.

Louis M. Rabinowitz, vice president of the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn:

In the summer of 1944 Mr. Louis M. Rabinowitz of New York City offered to provide Yale University with funds for the purpose of promoting research in Hebrew lore and literature. The funds were designed to finance an initial, experimental period of 5 years of work. The task of defining a plan of procedure and of working out details was entrusted to a group of faculty members representing the Semitic-Judaic fields of oriental studies at Yale. Eventually, this group was appointed as the administrative committee of the project, with the undersigned as its chairman. The project, itself, was named Judaica Research at Yale University of the Rabinowitz Foundation. Room 321 of the Hall of Graduate Studies was assigned as its headquarters.

The committee decided at the outset that during the initial 5-year period its primary object would be to prepare and publish translations of outstanding works of Jewish literature, both ancient and medieval. It further realized that, as a matter of course, the translations should be done from the originals, whether Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, or Arabic; that they should be assigned individually to the most competent scholars available; and that only such works should be considered as had not been translated before, or, at least, had not been translated before into English. It was further understood that the committee would take every precaution to guard against duplication of scholarly effort.

Early in the year, too, the committee proposed to President Seymour that it should be augmented by a number of advisers, Herbert Danby, Oxford University; Louis Finkelstein, the Jewish Theological Seminary of America; Judah L. Magnes, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem; Julian Morgenstern, the Hebrew Union College; Charles C. Torrey, Yale University, through whom it would maintain contact with other institutions of learning, both in this country and abroad, and who would help to avoid duplication of specific projects. It also proposed that the task of supervising and editing publications resulting from the plan should be entrusted to a board of editors. As a result additional appointments were made by the president, so that at present the personnel of Judaica Research at Yale University consists of (2) the administrative committee of five members, Julian J. Obermann, chairman; Provost Edgar S. Furniss, ex-officio; James T. Babb; Millar Burrows; Edwin R. Goodenough; and Carl H. Kraeling, with the provost of the university as member ex-officio; (b) the board of editors of three members, Louis Ginsberg, the Jewish Theological Seminary of America; Julian J. Obermann, Yale University; and Harry A. Wolfson, Harvard University; and (c) five advisers to the committee.

Address of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was my rare privilege to listen to the remarks of the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey at the convocation of the New York School of Industrial and Labor Relations, held at Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., and broadcast over a Nation-wide network by the National Broadcasting Co. from 12:45 to 1 p. m., Monday, November 12, 1945. It was an inspiring address, thought-provoking and profound. It gives new courage to all of us who believe in the ability of the American people to solve their industrial problems on a basis which is fair to labor, to capital, and to management. It renews our faith in democratic processes and American determination to preserve the American way of life and free enterprise under harmonious relationships. For the benefit of any of my colleagues who may not have been privileged to listen to the remarks of the distinguished Governor of the great State of New York, I include it in the RECORD as follows:

We are here to launch the New York School of Industrial and Labor Relations during the most serious period of labor difficulty in our history.

The best thing of all about this new school is that none of us regards it as a cure-all for every one of our troubles. It is a trail-blazing effort. We are pioneering in a vital field of human relations.

These problems of labor relations were important yesterday; they will be even more important tomorrow. Ten years after this Nation was founded, in 1786, the printers in Philadelphia struck for a minimum wage of $6 a week. Today the newspapers are full of reports of strikes to increase wages.

The biggest strike in our early days as a nation was a walk-out of house carpenters who quit work in 1791 to fight for a 10-hour day. We are all familiar with current strikes called to shorten the workday.

In 1877 a 10 percent pay reduction on the three railroads running west led to our greatest strike up to that time. There were pitched battles between workers and militia, railroad yards set afire, and scores killed in riots.

These strikes failed, but labor learned from them that its welfare could only be protected by organization and collective bargaining. Four years later, in 1881, there was founded the modern, indigenously American form of unionism we know as the American Federation of Labor.

As our transportation system grew it brought competition between the products of different localities in the same market. Stoves made in Albany were displayed in St. Louis right beside stoves made in Detroit. The Albany stove molder could no longer be indifferent to the wage scale of his fellow craftsmen in other cities. If labor costs in Detroit were too far below Albany scales, there would be no market for Albany-made stoves and no jobs for Albany stove molders.

So, as industry grew, the union movement grew and the clashes between labor and management were of greater and greater magnitude. Year in and year out, the battles on the labor front were fought over the same issues. Wages, hours, conditions of employment—these were the issues in colonial times; they remain the issues today.

In most cases these issues are settled peacefully without an interruption of work. Public attention focuses on those cases where collective bargaining fails and strikes result. Peaceful settlements do not make big news. Recurrent outbreaks of strikes underline the fact that labor relations are never static and that no formula can be devised within the democratic framework which will wholly wipe out disputes. Nor does anyone who values our way of life wish to end the continuing effort by both labor and management to advance their own interests. But the old rule of the tooth and claw is out of date and should come to an end.

Our labor movement is still young. It is only a very few years since the right to organize a labor union was a matter which had to be settled with bare fists, clubs, sticks, and stones. It was inevitable that undesirable characters and racketeers found their way into so many unions in days gone by. They were able to create unions for their own purposes where a union was needed and nobody else created it. We were entirely lacking in the kind of labor education long sponsored by the mature labor movement which existed in Great Britain and other European countries. Some of our union organizers were distinguished by their physical force rather than by their training in economics, industrial, and social relations.

In many respects the same was true with industry. Our great industries grew so fast that they had no time to learn the complicated business of labor relations. Many of our industries, too, were built by aggressive and dominant men who were impatient with the practice or even the idea of dealing with their employees as equals. Even now, there are some who have refused to learn the facts of modern, industrial life.

Today, the old rules of force and violence are as out of date as the posse which strung up a horse thief on sight. We are growing up. We must now attain the age of reason. One of the things of which I have been proudest during my 3 years in Albany is our splendid record in the relationship between capital and labor in the State of New York. During the war we led the Nation in avoiding strikes on the production front. We still maintain this leadership, thanks to the wisdom and understanding that business and labor leaders of our State have shown. Now, at this school, we propose to develop the trained leaders who will know how to solve our industrial and labor problems of the future.

We know now that the negotiation and debate involved in labor relations must be based upon a knowledge and understanding of the economic process, of the history of industrial development, of the effects of technological advances and, of course, of the complicated inter-relationship of prices, costs, and wages. We can no longer afford to have among our leaders of labor and industry men who do not know the economic effect of many factors in our financial system, of tariffs, of the myriad types of taxation, and the delicate balance between production and consumption.

Our whole future depends on the intellectual capacity and the moral determination to work out our problems peaceably at the conference table. But this capacity and this determination must be solidly based upon knowledge and training. The future leaders in this field must understand the broad fundamentals that men can only earn more in the long run by producing more with modern facilities; that business can exist and get the capital which creates jobs only if it makes a good profit; that no one piece of our economy can be happy or prosperous if it attempts to profit at the expense of the rest. Both sides must learn that the interest of the public at large is paramount and that the bargaining between capital and labor must scrupulously avoid putting a burden on the public too great for it to bear. Excessive wages or excessive hours of work can be such a burden. Strikes which interfere with the public generally can be such a burden. Too high prices can be such a burden. In short, a trained understanding of all the factors in industrial relationships must take the place of force. The yes or the no from either side of the conference table must be accompanied by reason and sound argument.

To serve the general welfare, the State of New York is establishing here at Cornell a unique educational institution to train the men and women who will deal with these problems of ours in the future. It is an adventure in broadening the horizon of the mind of man. It is an effort to expand men's knowledge in a field where too often pas-

sion and prejudice override judgment and truth.

This is no labor school where dogma will be taught, from which trained zealots will go forth. This is no management school where students will learn only to think of working men and women as items on a balance sheet. This is a State school under the sponsorship of our great, progressive land-grant university and under the direct control of a board of trustees selected from all walks of life—from education, from business, from labor, from agriculture, and from the professions.

It is a school which denies the alien theory that there are classes in our society and that they must wage war against each other. This is a school dedicated to the common interest of employer and employee and of the whole of the American people. It is dedicated to the concept that when men understand each other and work together harmoniously, then and only then do they succeed.

The State of New York will here provide the equipment to abate the fevers which rise from claims and counter-claims which are now the language of industrial relations. We will be applying the tested techniques of study, research, and analysis to the crucial, social, and economic problems of our time. The future leaders in industrial relations for both labor and management will learn here to do the sifting and winnowing by which alone the truth may be found.

Second only to the need for leaders of broad vision is the need for a community which takes an alert and informed interest in those problems which affect us all. Public opinion is often the final arbiter in a labor dispute and this school will seek to make the whole community better informed about the problems of both management and labor.

These, then, are the great purposes to which this school is dedicated. We entrust its destiny to a distinguished faculty under the leadership of a great public service who led the way in its creation—Dean Irving Ives. I know it will receive the support of men of good will everywhere.

I am happy and proud to dedicate this, the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, to the increased productivity of our economic system, to peaceable relations between management and labor, to an ever higher living standard for all our people, and to the inner security of the human soul which can come only to freemen.

Disposition of Surplus War Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the disposition of surplus war materials in our country has been not only a headache but a heartbreak. Not only is there red tape and confusion, which discourages the vast majority of the American people in the handling of surplus war materials, but there is also wanton waste which discourages humanity.

The destruction of many of our surplus war materials is so heartbreaking that the mail coming in from the people throughout the country ought to cause the Members of Congress to stop and consider. How can we, as Members of Congress, expect the taxpayers to have any respect for us if we permit the Federal Government employees to destroy surplus property which would be of great use to many of our schools and training centers?

To give an idea of just what is going on, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a letter just received from a very outstanding citizen in Ashland County, Wis. How can we Members of Congress stand idly by and see this destruction of property going on? Would it not be better if such property were turned over to our schools free of charge?

OFFICE OF HIGHWAY COMMISSIONER,
ASHLAND COUNTY, WIS.,
Ashland, Wis., November 17, 1945.

Mr. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'KONSKI: One of our truck drivers returned from Madison yesterday with a truckload of surplus war materials for the high school and the Ashland Vocational School and when in Madison he saw men destroying new tools; wrench sets, etc., by cutting them to pieces with acetylene torches. Being a mechanic of sorts, it made him feel sick to see this wanton destruction of tools, some sets he would estimate were worth fifty to sixty dollars new.

There are many vocational schools and county and city highway departments that could make good use of this material rather than have it made into scrap.

Assuming that you cannot know everything that goes on, I thought it proper to advise you of this so that you can do what you can to avoid such waste.

Thanking you for past favors and with best personal regards, I am,

Yours truly,
ASHLAND COUNTY HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT,
By FRANK ANDERSEN,
Highway Commissioner.

A President on Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include herein a well-considered and timely editorial appearing in the Boston Post of November 17, 1945, entitled "A President on Trial."

The last paragraph of the editorial states:

Whatever else the Members of Congress may care to believe, they have President Roosevelt on trial, and they must not stain our history with an act of shameless partisanship.

Such an admonition is timely and appropriate and should be followed.

A PRESIDENT ON TRIAL

Long shuttered behind stern official silence, the baleful fires that smoldered in the Pacific before the attack upon Pearl Harbor have been fanned into blinding brilliance by the congressional inquiry into the military disaster to our strongest outpost, which ushered us into war.

All the facts have not been brought out, and probably all the facts will never be known, but, on the basis of the evidence presented to date, it appears incontrovertible that the late President Roosevelt, and a few of the higher officials surrounding him, were in some degree aware that Japan was moving rapidly toward an attack upon the United States, Great Britain's possessions in the Far East, and the Dutch East Indies.

President Roosevelt is dead, and he died without releasing men who were taken into his confidence from a pledge to remain mum on the controversial facts about Pearl Harbor. It is conceivable that the congressional inquiry may succeed only in lending support to the Japanese officials who have insisted that American policy and bellicose American actions forced them into an attack before they were cut off from raw materials by blockade.

In short, the late President would be blamed for plunging the country into war, and the Japanese aggressors would obtain amelioration of the harsh peace conditions and start planning another aggression.

To be fair and reasonable about Pearl Harbor the situation as it existed on December 7, 1941, must be kept in the foreground, and all that is learned about the Pearl Harbor disaster matched against that situation. Briefly, the people of the country did not want to go to war, and their reluctance was fortunate because we secured precious time in which to rearm.

Any public statement by the late President in the months before Pearl Harbor that Japan was preparing to attack would most certainly have been denounced by a large segment of the American people as warmongering and provocation.

The "wind" messages which were decoded from Japanese diplomatic code heralded an ill wind that by a paradox blew the Nation some good. We went to war with the bulk of our Navy on the bottom, our strongest outpost shattered, and it was this fact that spurred the tremendous production which in less than 4 years made the United States the strongest nation on earth.

None of this, of course, justified keeping commanders in the Hawaiian Islands in ignorance of the actual situation. If the late President and his advisers knew that such an attack was in the making, and deliberately withheld this intelligence from the commanders at their advanced base, they are guilty of an offense against the national security in violation of their most sacred oath. If they only feared such an attack and had no actual information beyond their suspicions, their error is one of omission. By the same token the war leaders in Great Britain, with Singapore, Burma, and Hong Kong at stake, must share the blame.

It is amazingly simple and requires no courage to place a dead man on trial and convict him in absentia, but when the man happens to be the President of the United States, who served longer and more momentously in the White House than any other President, more scrupulous care should be taken in weighing the evidence.

Whatever else the Members of Congress may care to believe, they have President Roosevelt on trial, and they must not stain our history with an act of shameless partisanship.

Workable Plan Necessary To Sell Surpluses to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the handling of the problem of selling surplus

Government property to veterans and carrying out the intent of Congress to give preference and priority to war veterans seems to be getting more bungled up and complicated than ever as each day passes.

The various veterans' organizations are aware of the bungling done by the Surplus Property Administration and are taking action.

This is evidenced by a statement issued Monday by Joseph Leib, past vice commander and present service officer of the Vincent B. Costello Post, No. 15, of the American Legion, Department of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Leib now is in Chicago to attend a national convention of the American Legion, November 18, 19, 20, and 21, and he has presented the problem to the resolutions committee of the convention for consideration.

His statement to the Legion convention committee follows:

Discharged World War veterans seeking surplus Government property are being daily subjected to one of the grandest run-arounds that the National Capital has ever witnessed. This condition should be corrected immediately.

The high priority which the United States Government solemnly promised the veterans of World War II in these transactions has become nothing but a mirage of the first order.

Veterans armed with proper letters of authorization to purchase needy trucks or other vital and necessary commodities are finding Government doors literally slammed in their faces or else they are whipsawed by disheartening and buck-passing tactics.

When is the Congress going to take matters in its own hands and make it possible for the veterans to purchase surplus goods that would enable them to get into or allow them to set up a business of their own?

As this is written, veterans must make their purchases through either the Smaller War Plants Corporation or through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. This cumbersome procedure is full of bureaucratic red tape and is extremely discouraging. In addition they are obliged to limit their purchases to $2,500 worth of goods. Restrictions are placed upon the use of such goods. Veterans under existing regulations are not given priorities as far as clothing, furniture, food, or other types of consumer goods are concerned.

No one in authority seems to know what it is all about. The veterans are becoming sick and tired of these long-winded promises and complete misunderstanding.

In the midst of this confusion the Surplus Property Administration on November 15, 1945, announced that it planned to propose that an estimated 30,000 wholesalers throughout the Nation be permitted an act as outlets for surplus goods.

This stupid scheme has been publicized as giving the veteran "the best possible break" under present legislation.

To buy under the new plan it was explained the veteran would be required to pay the dealer's price, whereas now he can buy direct from an RFC disposal agency at wholesale price.

The announcement of the new plan further added that all veterans who are in business for themselves or who plan to open up a business in the future will be classified as "large dealers." In this category, the Surplus Property Administration advised, veterans could purchase any surplus property offered for sale at as low a price as any dealer would pay. To top this off, wholesalers would be sold surplus goods by the Government with the understanding that they would accept certain classification of veterans as will be established by the Surplus Property Administration.

It must be obvious to very sincere thinking Members of Congress that there is something fundamentally wrong with the SPA. Unless some constructive action is taken the veterans will be blitzed in their hope of securing surplus products, and we can expect a new crop of millionaires in the near future—at the expense of the men and women who fought and won this war.

President Truman Endorses the Purposes and Spirit of H. R. 3939 To Further Research for the Cause and Cure of Cancer and Other Dreaded Diseases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, in the President's message to Congress on yesterday President Truman said:

We must learn and understand more about health, and how to prevent and cure disease. Research well directed and continuously supported can do much to develop ways to reduce those diseases of body and mind which now cause most sickness, disability, and premature death.

And then the President went on to say:

Cancer is among the leading causes of death. It is responsible for over 160,000 recorded deaths a year, and should receive special attention. Though we already have the National Cancer Institute of the Public Health Service, we need still more coordinated research on the cause, prevention, and cure of this disease. We need more financial support for research and to establish special clinics and hospitals for diagnosis and treatment of the disease, especially in its early stages. We need to train more physicians for the highly specialized services so essential for effective control of cancer.

Mr. Speaker, that is the very purpose of my bill, H. R. 3939, which I introduced in this House on September 5 of this year. I am very happy that the President has endorsed the purposes and the spirit of my bill. In an analysis of my bill and to acquaint the public more fully as to its purposes I am setting forth a recent news release which I sent to the newspapers of my district regarding H. R. 3939 and the favorable reception it has received throughout the United States:

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER FROM CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

I am sure you will be interested in the bill I have introduced in Congress, H. R. 3939, which authorizes an appropriation of $500,000,000 to be used from time to time under the guidance of the Public Health Service of the United States to establish institutions and research laboratories throughout the country to find the cause or causes of cancer and infantile paralysis, thus saving untold suffering and the hundreds of thousands of deaths that occur every year from the scourge of these dread diseases. In 1942 cancer alone killed 163,000 people in this country. The total deaths in all our armed forces in the World War are less than twice that number. We built entire cities and employed 125,000 workers and scientists to develop the atomic bomb at a cost of two billions. We do not consider that money wasted. The National Cancer Institute has been conducting a research program in cancer for nearly 20 years without finding the cure.

The purpose of my bill is to make possible the construction of many more research laboratories and institutions throughout the United States, to be equipped with the most modern scientific machinery and apparatus, where the keenest brains of the entire world may carry on independent research, with the one purpose and determination in mind—the establishment of the cause and cure of cancer and infantile paralysis. If by the construction of laboratories and plants throughout the Nation equipped with the most modern scientific machinery our scientists were enabled to discover how to harness atomic energy, surely with the aid of many more modern research laboratories and with the concentrated attention of the best scientific brains in the world, the scourge of dreaded diseases likewise should be conquered. Is it not worth the effort and expenditure of a mere fraction of the cost of the atomic bomb to make much greater the possibility of discovering the cure for cancer and infantile paralysis?

During the past several months an epidemic of infantile paralysis has been raging in Wisconsin, as you know, striking down many young lives and causing several deaths. These epidemics have been plaguing the human race from time out of mind, with no cure having yet been discovered. Experience has proved that infantile paralysis has not been conquered by the means provided by the usual endowments and foundations established for that purpose, because it has not been possible to assemble the thousands of scientists and medical men and women necessary to make a concentrated attack upon this disease. The necessary scientific resources apparently have not been made available because of the limited funds at the disposal of scientists and medical men.

I have received letters from people and institutions from every State in the Union, including large corporations, insurance companies, women's clubs, farmers' organizations, and doctors endorsing my bill and my efforts to help eradicate these scourges of all humanity. The seventh district of the department of Wisconsin of the American Legion at their last district convention went on record as heartily endorsing my bill.

It's Time To Start Saving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of November 14, 1945:

IT'S TIME TO START SAVING

Marooned vets in Hawaii protested because the aircraft carrier *Hornet* fetched 1,000 Federal civil employees home while they were waiting for ship space. They were not impressed by the plea that the civilians were under contracts providing for their return when their work was completed.

The reaction is natural and will evoke sympathy. It will also call attention to the lack of speed in demobilizing the civilian war agencies. Apparently no great part of

the civilians hired for war duties are under contracts that provide for terminating their jobs and salaries.

There are 23 "emergency" war agencies, with a total of 364 subdivisions. Expansion of these agencies must have been responsible for most of the increase of Federal employees from 932,953 in August 1939, to 3,649,769 now.

Of the total, 848,644 are outside the continental United States. That leaves a probable 1,800,000 civilians hired because of the war now drawing pay right here at home.

None of these 1,800,000 is a possible competitor for ship space with the GI's. The war has been over 3 months. But the home-front civilian war pay rolls just keep rollin' along.

If some politicians have their way, they will keep on rolling until next election day. And President Truman has asked that every civilian on the Federal pay rolls be given a 20-percent raise.

Congress has cut your next year's income-tax bill. To that extent your take-home pay next year will be a little more each pay day. Veterans will not have to pay income tax on their Army and Navy pay. That $5 Federal auto tax sticker will go off the windshield. Business will pay a little less taxes on the profits of 1945, if any. For that we are all grateful to Congress.

But all that joy is to come next year, not now. Meanwhile, take a look at your monthly bills. Are they going up?

They can go up quickly enough to offset on your family budget every one of those tax cuts, before next year is out. Not only can that happen, it will happen unless inflation by wasteful Government spending is checked and checked quick. Cutting Government expenses is more important to you than cutting your taxes.

The Government can shave taxes only by slices, and not very big slices at that. Even the $5,000,000,000 reductions voted for 1946 will put a strain on the United States Treasury. But prices can grow like mushrooms.

Labor and management are now wrangling over the rise in living costs since we got into the war. No one denies that they have risen sharply, and they are probably up by nearly a third. The experience of World War I and its aftermath suggests that most of the price rise from World War II is ahead, not behind us, unless the reins are pulled tight on Government spending.

Prices for items purchased by wage earners and low-salaried workers rose twice as high in the 2 years following the last war as they had risen in the 2 years the war was going on.

Government spending was the reason for the rise of prices then. It will be the reason for whatever price increases we have to pay from now on. Unless we cut Federal pay rolls, the upward rush of prices will be swifter this time because we had only 917,976 civilians drawing pay from Uncle Sam on Armistice Day, 1918, and we now have 3,649,769.

In the light of present facts and past experiences the place to start holding down the cost of living is to demobilize those 1,800,000 civilians working here at home for those emergency war agencies.

Unless we get that done, and quickly, we'll probably be in for some emergencies later.

Our Federal Labor Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Milwaukee Journal of November 18, 1945:

Mr. Speaker, in these difficult times it is well that we make a full appraisal of our situation to learn some of the basic causes for the strife existing in industry, labor, and the home.

In the Milwaukee Journal of November 18, 1945, appears a sketchy account of a recent study made by the Brookings Institution on this important problem. The editorial follows:

OUR FEDERAL LABOR POLICY

The Brookings Institution, which has a habit of investigating touchy subjects and reporting its findings regardless of where the chips may fall, has been studying Federal labor laws and policies. It finds the Government's attitude neither coherent nor integrated. The general effect, however, is to give labor full rein to act much as it pleases, turning down all methods of settlement when it desires and refusing to abide by the terms of settlements when they are finally and freely accepted.

Strikes, picketing, and boycotts are permitted, it is pointed out, even though the public interest is seriously affected. Fulfillment of collective bargaining agreements is not enforced. The result is that labor is free to follow paths of irresponsibility, with what amounts to Government protection in such a course.

The author of the Brookings study says that he did not consider whether present policy has an objective, whether it achieves it or whether the objective is wise. Perhaps others can be of help here.

Labor's freedom to do practically what it wants, and its choice of the ultimatum and the strike as its weapons, have led it at least toward the ways of a dictatorship. At a time when production is vitally important, unions have lowered production. In fields where cessation of production may seriously affect public health and welfare, walkouts have occurred, or have been threatened, without regard for consequences. Real collective bargaining has gone by the board, fair settlements have been summarily refused and when agreement has finally been reached there has been no assurance that its terms would be lived up to for more than a few days or weeks.

The economic consequences of such a policy may well be disastrous particularly in a period when the national economy is under the unusual strains of reconversion. The social consequences may also be disastrous.

The Nation is now concerned about an increase in juvenile delinquency and crime. Is it not at least possible that part of that increase is due to the fact that youngsters and others see labor using to the full strange license it has to defy order and the conventions to enforce its demands?

Go Back to San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following constructive, and at the same time challenging, article written by James Morgan and appearing in the Boston Globe of November 18, 1945:

GO BACK TO SAN FRANCISCO—AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY STALLED AND CAN REGAIN LEADERSHIP ONLY BY BUILDING UP UNITED NATIONS AS A BASE FOR ALL OUR INTERNATIONAL DEALINGS, INCLUDING LOANS AND ATOMIC BOMB

(By James Morgan)

As happened to their fathers before them in World War I, the veterans of World War II are coming home to find the peace they won at great price being kicked about like a football. A similar spectacle drove the iron of bitter cynicism into the soul of one generation of our youth. Lest we poison the minds of our returning youths today with a like sense of betrayal, we must hasten to convince them that they are not coming back to the America of 25 years ago, heedless of what her warriors had fought to win.

By every test of public opinion, the American people today are ready to throw the whole great weight of this country into the scales on the side of preserving the victory purchased by the daring and sacrifice of our young men and of saving their sons from having to endure a worse ordeal in a third world war. Yet, the homecoming soldiers and sailors are greeted with clamors for universal military training in preparation for "the next war," and for strategic bases. They hear many voices raised in favor of putting our trust in a "secret" weapon. Such a secrecy could be protected, if at all, only by suppressing free scientific research into atomic energy for the discovery of a power that might revolutionize the industrial revolution itself and bring in a warless world of plenty for all.

The most welcome proposals agreed upon last week by the President and the Prime Ministers of Britain and Canada are that the problem raised by the unlocking of the atom should be referred to a commission under the United Nations and that the three Governments which cooperated in developing the bomb should extend that cooperation to all the United Nations as soon as assured of complete reciprocity in such sharing.

The veterans will mark with satisfaction the contrast between this Washington Conference and the London Conference of Foreign Ministers which was broken up by a chip-on-the-shoulder, small-boy quarrel over piffling questions. They read of our troops and transports messing in what may become a civil war among the Chinese, possibly with Russia on the other side. They note the protests of the Indonesians against our lend-lease supplies being used by the British to crush a struggle for the independence of the Dutch East Indies. They wonder at the sight of our being drawn into the old war-breeding game of power politics in Europe. They find us busy-bodying in the tinder box of the Balkans and in Palestine.

A TOO-INNOCENT BYSTANDER

The boys with the shining new discharge buttons are no more bewildered than the American people as a whole are as they watch this Leviathan among nations seemingly helpless to steer a course of its own and drifting like a cockboat, as John Quincy Adams said, in the wake of others. When we sit in with the Old World powers at their own game on their own grounds, we lose before we start, for the very good reason that we hold no cards in our hands and have none up our sleeve.

We can only take sides; to be a "me too" in disputes that are none of our business. We become a buffer in the collisions of interests among trans-Atlantic nations, in the conflicts of their outworn policies and in their immemorial blood-feuds, which had been ravishing Europe no one knows how many centuries when the Romans first introduced them to written history more than 2,000 years ago.

It is proverbially dangerous to be an innocent bystander in other people's brawls.

THREE CHOICES FOR AMERICA

There are three courses open to us. We could relapse into isolation. Emotionally, most Americans, I think, would like to do just that. But the minds of an overwhelming majority of them have been convinced by this Second World War that isolation is a fool's paradise, in which we would be led blindfolded into the hell, perhaps the everlasting hell of an atomic war waged by robots.

Or we could get into the played-out game of imperialism and its armed alliances. Emotionally, not a few of our isolationists are imperialists. But I, for one, cannot take seriously the fear that we shall go in for empire, because I was an eyewitness to what happened in 1898, when an attempt was made to drag us in that direction. Over the protests of the anti-imperialists, the McKinley-Hanna administration grabbed the Philippines and Puerto Rico in haste, but we have been repenting it at our leisure ever since.

The Philippines are a monument of our final renunciation of imperialism. In the American way, we sent school teachers and public health experts out to the unwanted islands, instead of carpet-bag politicians and commercial exploiters. We trained the Filipinos in self-government, and soon they are to have their independence. President Truman now has indorsed the proposal to permit the Puerto Ricans also to exercise self-determination as to whether they shall go on their own or stay with us.

The one other course that remains for our choice is a world organized for peace and against war. The United Nations will not work? We cannot know that until we have tried to make it work. The League of Nations might have succeeded if we had not rejected the leadership which the other World War brought us. It never had a chance without our backing.

Opportunity now is knocking at our door a second time. Leadership has come to us again. VJ-day left us in the position of the most powerful Nation. Let us stop wasting that prestige and the world-wide hope and confidence we inspired in a measure never enjoyed by any other nation. Let us stop being the tail to anyone else's kite.

BIG THREE NOT BIG ENOUGH

"Just how big are the Big Three?" was the question asked in this place on the eve of the Yalta Conference last winter. Subsequent events have answered that they were not big enough. Yet, there were giants in the earth in those days.

Of the triumvirate who met on the Crimean shore of the Black Sea in February to wrestle with global problems, Roosevelt now lies at rest in his garden, Churchill is retired to his easel, and Stalin? The Big Three served a purpose in the war by umpiring on the spot any differences among the Allied general staffs on questions of strategy. But we have learned that this world is too big to be run in secret by any three men sitting at a table behind locked doors at Yalta or Potsdam.

By trial and error, we have found that we are unable to develop a consistent and understandable American foreign policy in the old balance-of-power system. And why? Because we alone among the great powers have not and cannot have an exclusive or distinctive national objective. We need and we want beyond our shores only what all nations alike need and virtually all the peoples want, if their governments don't. This simply is to do business in a peaceable world, free from special nationalistic privileges and discriminatory barriers.

BACK TO SAN FRANCISCO

The one alternative left us is to go back to San Francisco and revive the April hopes raised by the Golden Gate Conference. Too long we have been indulging in the double talk of diplomacy and attempting the impossible feat of riding two horses headed in opposite directions, one toward a united world, the other away from it toward a world divided by alliances.

To be sure, we have not neglected meanwhile to build the structure of the United Nations Organization, but we have yet to move into it. We have yet to make it the home base of our foreign policy and strengthen it by insisting that all our postwar international relations, including loans and the subject of the atomic bomb, shall be fitted into its framework.

It is cheering to have the President and the British and Canadian Prime Ministers at Washington pledge whole-hearted support of the United Nations Organization, promise to consolidate and extend its authority.

We should serve notice that henceforth we will do business only through the Security and Economic Councils and the Assembly of the United Nations, or the Bretton Woods and other established agencies. The problems of this one world never can be solved piecemeal.

The San Francisco Charter was ratified by an almost unanimous Senate. The members of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate now have voted, without a dissenting voice, to put teeth in the Charter by giving the President authority, through our delegate on the Security Council, to commit American military support for the decisions of the Council. The United Nations is our one and only avowed war aim. Nothing else is understandable by our people, and they will uphold no other policy.

It is time we disentangled ourselves from a situation where we cannot make a move without risk of having it interpreted as anti-Russian or anti-British. To be either is to be anti-American. To be either is to belittle the one great detached and disinterested power, whose free spirit and independent leadership a sick world needs for its healing.

Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER K. GRANGER
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial that appeared in the Washington Post on November 7, 1945.

This editorial very clearly points out the desirable effect that the raising of the minimum wage from 40 cents an hour to 65 cents an hour would have on our national economy.

MINIMUM WAGE

If a man works for 40 cents an hour, the present minimum wage under the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act, he can bring $16 home to his family at the end of a 40-hour week. Price Administrator Chester Bowles is quite right in calling such a wage "a national disgrace." It affords no chance for decent housing or even for reasonable standards of nutrition. And, of course, it rules the families limited to such an income out of consideration for the purchase of all the luxury goods—automobiles, radios, household appliances, and the like—which American industry is seeking to sell and which go together to make the high living scale in which we take pride as a nation.

It is this latter consideration which makes the proposed lifting of the wage floor to 65 cents an hour "imperative," as Mr. Bowles put it, to the health of the national economy. "Right here at our feet," he declared in a letter to the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, "lies our greatest undeveloped market—a market which can be tapped to improve income and employment opportunities for everybody simply by raising the level of minimum wages." Farmers and manufacturers will find new customers if purchasing power is put into the hands of this undeveloped market. With new customers they can provide jobs for more workers.

Mr. Bowles, whose task it is to hold the line against inflation, has little fear that such an increase in minimum rates of pay for workers engaged in interstate commerce would be reflected in higher prices. On the contrary, he argued persuasively that in the long run prices would probably be lowered rather than increased by the assurance of a more decent living standard. "The increase in output per worker, which I believe would surely result from the proposed increase to 65 cents," he asserted, "would in itself go far to pay for the higher wage bill." There is not much efficiency in sweatshops. Indeed there is a close correlation between high productivity and high wage rates.

It was one of the tragic ironies of the great depression that at its very height billboards boasted that America enjoyed the highest standard of living in the world. So it did—for those who shared in the enjoyment. But there were millions whose standard of living was pitifully inadequate; gradually they depressed the living standards of all. An economy must be judged not by what it produces for its most fortunate members but by the kind of life it affords for the least of those who share in it. We can reasonably claim again a high standard of living for America only when all Americans have within their grasp the necessities of life and at least the elementary comforts.

Dorothy Thompson Faces the Basic Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, once again, under consent, I include in the RECORD a column written by Miss Dorothy Thompson. In my opinion, she has penetrated to the very heart the problems which our country faces along with the rest of the world. I recommend the reading of this column to every Member of Congress, and only wish I could put a copy of it into the hands of every American citizen:

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

In my previous column I spoke of the fictions which are being disseminated as a substitute for policy by statesmen speaking on the atomic bomb and the future of scientific weapons in general. It is amazing how they dismiss as impossible control measures which, in comparison with the fabulous genius of mind which created the incredible modern instruments of war, are child's play. Mr. Attlee, for instance, has been quoted as saying that he regarded as impractical the possibility of any formal international inspection, since it would involve the detailed investigative efforts of thousands of top-flight scientists.

With all due respect to the British Prime Minister, this seems as exaggerated as it would be to say that to investigate the accuracy of individual income-tax returns would involve the detailed investigative effort of thousands of top-flight bankers. It doesn't take a top-flight scientist to find out what is going on in a factory, or where uranium ores, etc., are going. Any skilled worker could be fitted for the job. If formal international inspection would not be acceptable to one or another of the great powers, the difficulties are not bureaucratic but political.

The peoples of the world must know where the difficulties really lie, and who is responsible for them. The peoples of the whole world are peace loving, all, without exception. No mother on earth wants her son slaughtered on a battlefield, or her children blown to bits in a cellar. The peoples of the world have laid mandates on their governments to stop war. Every government gave a solemn agreement in the form of a treaty, long before this war, not to "resort to war as an instrument of national policy." Every person who can add two and two and make four out of it knows that such treaties, unimplemented, are useless.

On the other hand, no peoples anywhere are ready for one world at the cost of their own way of life. After all, Hitler was for one world, too—one world of domination and tyranny. The people want one world, free, cooperative, and associative, with liberty and security for all.

That one world can be created without the sacrifice of a single sovereign right except the one which was formally renounced years ago—the sovereign right to make war. And they are awakening to the fact that the United Nations Charter is, as it stands, worthless to accomplish the only thing for which it was created.

To make it work, three basic reforms are needed. First, the Security Council must be made more democratic and representative. The great powers should be balanced by collective representatives of the small nations, who, altogether, contain more people than any one of the great powers, and it should be supplemented by a real international supreme court of justice. The veto right should be abolished.

Secondly, while national states should retain their own armed forces, for home defense, the Security Council should be empowered strictly to limit the national production of heavy armaments of all kinds, according to reasonable quotas, and it should have full rights of inspection.

Finally, the Council must establish and maintain a true international professional force, recruited by preference and certainly in the majority from the smaller nonimperialist states, which force should be equal to the greatest force of any one of the great powers. Violation of the quota limitations agreed on, or production of any weapons outlawed—which certainly ought to include all weapons based on the use of atomic energy—should be regarded as an act of aggression per se.

Under such regulations, the people in every country—the workers in every factory—would have a personal, direct, citizens' interest and responsibility in seeing that their country did not become an aggressor by breaking the rules.

All the newer weapons of war are, by their nature, offensive, and are driving every general staff to plan to take the initiative in case war seems likely. Every country will plan to attack first. Under these conditions the old definitions of aggressor are useless.

It is certainly possible so to design an international police force that it cannot become, in itself, an instrument to bring down states, and an international system that will both give self-protection to nations and mutual protection. It is a far less difficult intellectual problem than how to effect the fission of uranium. Nor is the failure that of the peoples. It is the inadequacy of the men who compose their governments and listen to the militarists.

The National Science Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILBUR D. MILLS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Journal of the American Medical Association for November 10, 1945:

THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

For some weeks hearings have been held by the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs of the United States Senate on the proposals to create a National Science Foundation, a Government agency to be charged with encouragement of scientific research. Several measures have been presented to the Congress to effectuate this objective. Their number and diversity indicate the difficulty of finding the best possible formula. Care is necessary if the objects sought are to be achieved without permitting domination of research by a Federal bureaucracy and inhibition of private initiative or the spending of vast funds without adequate return. The work of the Committee on Medical Research and of the Office of Scientific Research and Development during the war proved that funds can be used satisfactorily to encourage research and to coordinate and intensify the speed with which the results of research can be applied. Much was accomplished toward diminishing the lag between the introduction of a new remedy and the determination of its toxicity and its field of usefulness.

Fundamental to the creation of the National Science Foundation is its structural organization. With but few exceptions, leaders of science who appeared in the hearings approved an organization which would be under the control of a directing board which would have as an executive officer a director whom the executive board would nominate to the President. The director would be responsible for administration of affairs of the National Science Foundation, but policies would be determined by the directing board and it would have the responsibility for selecting the universities, hospitals, institutes of research, and other agencies to which grants could be made.

Under the directing board would be a number of subsidiary boards dealing with such subjects as the national defense, medicine, and the basic sciences. Possibly there might be, in accordance with the recommendation of President Truman, a division for the social sciences, although the point has been made that much research in the field of the social sciences is developed and promoted primarily with a view to securing political and legislative action. The social sciences are themselves so young and their techniques at present so experimental and so poorly controlled as to indicate some doubt as to whether or not their development has proceeded sufficiently to warrant incorporation at this time in the proposed agency.

Great care must obviously be exercised as to the technique by which various Federal agencies, such as the War, Navy, United States Public Health Service, maternal and infant welfare and similar groups are coordinated with the National Science Foundation.

Again the question of patents is introduced by some of the legislative proposals for the creation of the National Science Foundation. A majority of those who participated in the hearings are convinced that the whole question of patents requires far more study than is now being given to it and that patents might well form the subject of subsequent action, perhaps with the recommendation of the directing board once the agency is established.

Among the best possible activities to be conducted by the proposed National Science Foundation is the creation of fellowships, residencies, traveling scholarships and similar positions to be subsidized with the aid of Federal funds. By this technique young men of promise may be given opportunity to show their worth and thus far more competent scientists mobilized in the field of research.

Another function is the encouragement of national and international exchange of scientific and technical information. Unquestionably progress was intensified during the war by the interchange of medical information between the medical research councils of Great Britain, Canada, and our own country. In the postwar period a similar organization might involve inclusion of all the nations of the world, perhaps with the aid of a suitable health section developed under the organization of the United Nations.

By the system which prevailed during the war, invaluable time was saved in extending the uses of penicillin and in promoting its manufacture on a large scale and its availability at a small cost. The number of lives thus saved is tremendous, indeed incalculable. Similar investigations in the uses of the sulfonamide drugs, in the development of the uses of blood and the various derivatives of blood and investigations in the treatment of burns, in the control of malaria and many tropical disorders, in diet and in nutrition have brought fruitful results by the utilization of a well coordinated and intensified program of study.

The board of trustees of the American Medical Association and a special committee representing the American College of Physicians, the American College of Surgeons, and the American Medical Association through the committee on postwar medical service have recommended enactment of a suitable measure for the creation of a National Science Foundation. As Torald Sollmann has said, "Research is a bird that sings only when it is free. Discovery requires the broadest possible liberty to search in as many places as possible, by as many competent scientists as possible, in any manner and any means that they themselves consider possible." In the structural organization of the proposed National Science Foundation the recommendations of the Magnuson bill (S. 1285) seem to approach more nearly the type of structure that would achieve the objective sought and conserve the factors of private initiative and liberty that have given the United States a place in the sun where scientific research is concerned.

UNRRA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS RIZLEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter about UNRRA as soldier over there sees it. His

name I have eliminated for security reasons:

OCTOBER 3, 1945.

Hon. ROSS RIZLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RIZLEY: Everyone is interested in the discussion now taking place in Congress about UNRRA. Of course, all I know about the discussion is what we can hear over the radio BBC, and occasionally an American broadcast. Recently the Thirty-fourth Division newspaper in Italy carried an article concerning it. It seems that some of the Members of Congress are not exactly satisfied with the supervision set-up of UNRRA, and there are other phases of it that probably are under discussion.

Since the United States has been asked for another 1 percent of its national income, certainly every thinking person should be interested in where the money is going. Is it doing the job that we think it is doing? Is it being properly supervised, etc.? Yugoslavia is one of the nations receiving aid under UNRRA and I have had an opportunity to discuss the matter first-hand with the UNRRA officials in charge of the aid going to Yugosalvia. I talked to the supervisors, visited with the "hired help," most of them Italians, some of Yugosolvene extraction, visited the "battle line" where the Yugoslav troops are on one side and the Allied troops are on the other, and saw a part of the equipment being turned over to them, but most of what follows, in fact all of it, is the views of the persons talked to. Certainly it is not the view of the writer. He has no views, since he did not have time or opportunity to make a thorough investigation of the situation. The items which follow are merely notes taken down from various persons interviewed, without giving their names. Since Trieste, Italy, is the main receiving center for all the UNRRA materials for Yugoslavia, I violate no confidence in stating that the information was gathered between the 23d of September and the 29th of September while there.

There is a mild revolution going on in Yugoslavia. Tito has charge and the government is a one-party communistic form. Yugoslav persons are hired locally to help the UNRRA officials. People are forbidden in Yugoslavia to talk to UNRRA representatives. In Split (Splitano), Yugoslavia, the office manager of UNRRA disappeared a month ago and has not been heard of since. This is not an isolated case. It happens often—a knock at the door at night and whole families disappear never to be heard of again. The Yugoslavs have left Trieste officially, but there is a battle line about 4½ miles from the city up in the mountains. The Yugoslavs, armed, are on one side and the Allied troops, also armed, are on the other side. In the city of Trieste there are still about 10,000 Yugoslav armed troops roaming in civilian clothes awaiting orders. In Yugoslavia, Tito has his own version of GPU which functions day and night.

There is more terror and fear among the Yugoslavs today than during the period when the Germans and Italians were there. Terrorist groups are operating; people are forbidden, as stated before, to talk to UNRRA officials, and the officials have been refused cooperation by the central government in Belgrade. They have been told they could not have a free hand. In Kastel, one of the UNRRA officials was taken into custody by the Yugoslavs and kept from 8:30 p. m. to 1:30 a. m. the next morning although he had his official documents and was wearing an American uniform with the UNRRA insignia on it. They refused him permission to talk to anyone or to call anyone.

Where is the food going? They say to Tito's army and not to the people, although under the agreement none is to go to the army. During July and August 1945 the people of Split received only one ration of food, 8 kilos of wheat (a kilo is roughly 2⅙ pounds), three-fourths kilo of canned meat and one-fourth kilo of lard. During that period the warehouses were loaded to capacity and the docks also. If food that came into the Dalmatian area from UNRRA during those 2 months had been distributed it would have fed 7,000,000 people with a bare sustenance. Since July and August the program has been stepped up between 25 and 40 percent and enough food has been received to feed about 12,000,000 people a bare sustenance.

At present UNRRA is buying from the United States Government—anyhow it is coming from the War Department—5,000 trucks equipped with trailers and winches. These are now in the process of being turned over to Yugoslavia. These trucks are coming from all over Italy. Some of them were used in the African, Sicilian, and Italian campaigns, and also against the Gothic line. Most of them are being driven from Leghorn up to Trieste and taken by UNRRA out to the border line 4½ miles, and upon being receipted for are turned over. Up to September 29, 1945, about 2,500 trucks and trailers had been turned over, with some 2,500 yet to arrive. My informant said that the trucks were sold to UNRRA, $1,500 for the truck and $500 for the trailer and winch. I went out with an UNRRA official to turn over a convoy to the Yugoslavs. We drove out to the line and couldn't find anyone to deliver them to, so we drove down into Yugoslav territory a couple of miles on a country road. We came to a sentry who stopped us and turned us around. We were not permitted to go on down to their encampment to talk to a superior officer about getting someone to take charge of the trucks. Going back to the line, just over in Yugoslav territory, there were five trucks that had been turned over to them the day before. In the back of one of the trucks and trailer were about a couple of thousand brand new fan belts, and dozens upon dozens of electric drills, new car tools that had never been used. Upon inquiry we were informed those things had just been thrown in; that UNRRA wasn't paying the Army for them. There were easily three or four thousand dollars' worth of electrical equipment and tools in the trucks there, such as drills, punches, electric grinders. Some of them were old and may have needed repairing, but it is equipment that couldn't be purchased back in the States for love or money.

Only one UNRRA official that I talked to thought he was receiving proper cooperation in his territory, and that cooperation was coming, so he stated, only from the local officials, not the central government. He was assigned to the area of Slovenia. He said the people there are more progressive; that the official news agency Tanjung had given UNRRA credit through the papers for foodstuff coming in; that the people from peasants to high officials know it is coming from UNRRA. He agrees, however, that it is impossible to find out where the food is going although some food is being given to the people in his area. Outside of this one investigator, the stories told by other investigators were different. He also stated that the food is being used for the army and being stored to be used for political purposes.

Notes at random: No political party will be out against Tito; either the people will vote for him or they won't vote because they will be afraid to oppose him. Mikhailovitch collaborated with the Nazis and has no following in Yugoslavia. Partisan propaganda is that Mihailovitch is in London being protected by British as is King Peter. The government restriction appears to be loosening up somewhat. The people want to look to the West for leadership rather than Russia but know that with Tito in power their destinies and those of the Soviet Union will be linked. Tito is doing a good job of propaganda with the press and especially with the radio. I talked to a captain, John A. Blatnik, One Hundred and Twenty-fourth Street SW., Chisholm, Minn., not about UNRRA, but about conditions generally in Yugloslavia. Captain Blatnik had performed a special mission for the Army, being employed in strategic forces during the last 9 months of the war, with the partisans in Yugoslavia. His job was to locate German forces and material and relay the information back behind the lines, then planes would come over and destroy them. After the war and his mission ended he spent about 14 days in Yugoslavia visiting his relatives. He can perhaps throw more light on what the people think of Tito and the chances of the unification of the country, etc., than any other person I talked to. I talked to him for only a few minutes and his name is not included in connection with UNRRA. He is at the present time en route to the States for a well-deserved rest.

At present the person in charge of UNRRA for Yugoslavia is a Russian, as head of the mission. UNRRA needs a general housecleaning in procuring competent investigators to find out where our millions and millions are going. The local men admit this.

During the months of July and August, although the food was coming in regularly (up to September 15 there had been 103 ships carrying over 285,000 tons come in) the UNRRA officials, when they finally put the pressure on, could not find out where it was going or how it was being used. The ships are unloaded on the grounds at the dock in Trieste, Split, and other Yugoslav ports. The goods are turned over to the Yugoslavs at the dock and a receipt taken therefor but the UNRRA officials couldn't find out where it was going. UNRRA is certainly to blame for the personnel hired. There are about 20 investigators in this Dalmatian area (this refers to all the Yugoslavia territory where the goods are going). Six of these men are fairly competent investigators; 14 are less than mediocre and either don't care or are just generally incompetent. The least salary an investigator receives from UNRRA funds is $6,000 per year with a per diem of $7 per day, and in addition is allowed some other expenses which the writer didn't go into in detail.

The assignments are made in the following manner: An investigator is given an assignment to cover 12 to 14 Yugoslav towns with a certain space of time within which to bring back reports. It is his job to go into the area assigned, talk to the people and see what foods they are receiving from UNRRA, etc. Too many reports are collected by visiting only one town in the area, visiting the local person having charge of the disposition of UNRRA materials, asking him if everything is O. K., spending the time visiting over a cup of coffee and turning in a favorable report. Not all reports are made in such a manner, but most of them are. Some of the towns are not even visited and generally the reports are taken merely from the Yugoslav official in the town.

Propaganda is going the rounds that the goods are coming from Russia. The wheat sacks generally have been made in Wichita, Kans., or Minneapolis, Minn. That is explained away by stating that the sack comes from the United States but that the flour comes from Russia. Of course the sack, as I understand it from them, has something about UNRRA on it so not all the people are fooled, but those who can't read are, and even some that read swallow the yarn about only the sacks coming from the States.

Eighty-five percent of the people don't want Tito; they want a democracy. They don't want to live in terror from day to day. They say they'd rather take the Germans or Italians back than have what they have today. Tito has about a million men under arms. To say that it is hard to get into Yugoslavia to investigate anything is true. Recently the official government at Belgrade asked that a tractor man and a Ford ma-

chinery man be sent into the area to assist them. Two were sent from the Ford Motor Co. in England. They arrived in Trieste and it took exactly 30 days for them to receive clearance papers from Belgrade. In the meantime the experts who had been asked for cooled their heels in Trieste. The visas came through on September 23d. Every person applying for visa permit is checked and double checked; many are refused visas. Recently a secretary to UNRRA in Split waited 60 days for a permit to leave the country. When it didn't come through the UNRRA official there put her on an American Liberty ship that was ready to sail back to the States. She was removed by Tito's soldiers.

One of the UNRRA representatives is a Yugoslav by birth. He spent 7 months in Split and made many attempts to be permitted to go into the country to investigate conditions but permission was refused him and recently the government asked that he be removed from duty for UNRRA in Split. Today he is working in Trieste. He told the writer that the Yugoslavs feared him more than any other person on the UNRRA investigation staff because of his knowledge of the language and the people. In fairness it should be stated that the Yugoslavs accused him of having something to do with some coffee or other foodstuffs that the Yugoslavs claim came into the country illegally. However, he was not accorded a hearing by his superior officer in UNRRA but was summarily removed from his post at the request of Belgrade and sent to Trieste. This man, before leaving Split, had talked to several hundred persons there.

UNRRA personnel cannot go outside of the specific territory assigned to them without special permission from the Government at Belgrade.

That something should be done immediately to see that the food and clothing and other materials are going where they should go is also a fact. Of course, as long as the United Nations turn over the materials with no questions asked it will be stored, hoarded, and used for political purposes within and without Yugoslavia. For instance, there are a lot of Yugoslavs living in Trieste and its environs that is a part of Italy. Politically speaking, as a matter of jurisdicton, those persons are Italians, and under UNRRA are not entitled to receive any of the foodstuffs going to Yugoslavia, yet it is coming back into Italy for the Yugoslavs. About 2,000 persons a day come from Fuime, Italy, to Trieste, Italy, by train. It is estimated that they carry home with them 500 tons of flour per day.

A Negro soldier that had driven a truck from Leghorn, Italy, to Trieste to deliver to them stated it about as well as anyone could when he said, "It's a helluva note when you can't get into a man's country to give him something." It is a helluva note that the American people are asked to give another billion and a half dollars and not know where it is going. It isn't that we shouldn't help feed those less fortunate than ourselves; we should. But when it isn't going where we want it to go, then we should have the right to say "no" and that no more will be forthcoming until we know and can see that it is going to feed the hungry. What we want to do is to send it directly to the people, not through a middleman. Who ever heard of spending such fantastic sums of money on the say so of so few who investigate and find out so little and who receive no cooperation from those who tell them nothing.

One other thing I'd just like to mention and that is censorship in Trieste and environs by the United Nations. The folks back home have been taught that Americans are entitled to a free press and they read daily in the newspapers about the Russians restricting the reporters from coming into certain areas dominated by the Russians. The only newspaper reporters today reporting what is happening in Trieste are reporters employed by the Department of State of the United States and United Nations. There are no newspaper reporters other than those. Where is the free press we so loudly proclaim? The British and the Americans alone are in charge of matters in Trieste at this moment. Perhaps because of the seriousness of the situation our reporters must be excluded.

The UNRRA needs an overhauling and investigation by Congress, not Mr. Lehman and the high-ups. The men in the field, the small fry that work in the offices, the clerks and interpreters (local folks) know more about what is going on than anyone else. Anyhow I'm interested as a citizen in having it made as right as it can be, and I feel that Congress and the folks back home should know so that you may be made aware of what is happening in UNRRA in Yugoslavia. Certainly it is something which vitally affects each of you. And another thing, if the present UNRRA contract doesn't give us the right to direct where it should go and the power to see by investigation that it reaches the persons for whom it is intended, then the contract should be amended.

I hope your secretary will permit you to read this letter.

Very truly yours.

UNRRA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I made in the House on January 24, 1944:

(By unanimous consent, Mr. REED of New York was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, this proposed UNRRA is an anti-Christian approach to a traditional Christian problem. I am sure that the overwhelming sentiment of the American people, true to a long and honorable tradition, is favorable to rendering aid to the sick, hungry, and suffering men, women, and children of Europe and Asia. I dare say that of the 2,000,000,000 people in this world, that of this number the 700,000,000 adherents of the Christian faith wish to give concrete expression to that faith by rendering aid and mercy to the suffering, hungry victims of this devastating war. Believing, as I do, that such is the sentiment of the Christian people everywhere, I stand ready at any and all times to vote the necessary funds to the extent that reasonable assurance can be given that such funds will be used for the high and noble humanitarian purpose which our traditionally generous people have in mind.

I do not intend to permit myself, under the pressure of the hysteria of the moment, to give support to legislation clothed in the habiliment of human sympathy as a means of obscuring from public view the world political power of Frankenstein concealed within.

It is not the amount of money involved in this bill that is important just now because it is a matter of recorded history that as a nation drifts and finally faces insolvency the most plentiful and cheapest product of that nation at such a time is money. This Nation is surfeited with money, borrowed money. In every step taken by the New Deal in its all-inclusive program of enforced scarcity, money is the one thing that has become increasingly and dangerously plentiful.

Is it necessary to set up this UNRRA machinery for becoming extangled in a new world order of power politics to effectively distribute $1,350,000,000 to starving men, women, and children throughout Europe and Asia? Are there no existing Christian organizations with long and honorable records of humanitarian achievement, fully equipped in every way to administer the desired relief? Of course there are such organizations, ready and prepared to act. They are now operating in the field. What is wrong with the National Red Cross, the Society of Friends, and others? Who objects to utilizing the facilities and personnel of these great agencies of mercy?

I will tell you who they are: They are the alien-minded power politicians who seek to build a new world order, who see in this fund of $1,300,000,000 and other billions to follow the very elements of political domination of starving populations. No tears will be shed over the ghastly victims of starvation by those who will control the organization set up by this legislation. The alien-minded manipulators of our declarations of policy do not favor, but instead desperately fear, the adoption of a plan by which distribution of food and clothing will be made by Christian agencies. What has been the excuse given by some of our allies in justification of letting little innocent, starving, pot-bellied, moaning babies starve? Why, they say: "What if the Nazis should steal it and thus prolong the war?" But does the evidence show that this danger exists? Dr. Howard E. Kershner, director of relief in Europe from 1939 to 1942 for the American Friends Service Committee, stated that not a mouthful of food sent to the people in other occupied countries ever reached the mouths of the enemy. Does not our State Department bear witness to the fact that the enemy forces or populations have never had access to the 19,000 tons of food going to Greece each month?

This piece of legislation, like so many New Deal proposals, has set forth in it a worthy objective, but concealed within its provisions are commitments to further alien intrigues in the field of world power politics.

The printed pages of the hearings on this resolution (H. J. Res. 192) are as barren of facts pertinent to the real issues involved as the Sahara Desert is destitute of fertile soil and moisture to produce food.

It was not until pressure was applied to Russia that she let her people know that help was being furnished to her by the United States. If the United States is to raise the morale of Europe and Asia through benefactions, then let it be distributed through the channels of charitable agencies already organized and equipped to render such a service, and do it free from political manipulation on the part of any one or all of our allies. I am not in favor of voting $1,300,000,000 under the alien terms of this resolution to enable any part of the fund to be used to undermine the Christian concept of religion. I do not believe it will be sacrilegious or unpatriotic to show some concern now and then for the welfare and protection of our own people, especially when passing on these potential postwar hand-out proposals.

With an estimated future debt of from $300,000,000,000 to $500,000,000,000, and a postwar peacetime budget of from $20,000,000,000 to $30,000,000,000, our appropriations for world-wide charity must have some limit if this Republic is to survive the drain that will be made upon it.

I want to say further that this war will not end famine, pestilence, revolutions, nor war. There will still be the menace to this Republic from within and from without from the impact of fascism, communism, or collectivism in one form or another. There will

be unemployment here and abroad and political master minds will be on hand to play upon the discontented and the revolutionaries. The witches' kettle of class hatred will be well stirred as a means to political power.

Let us not by this unwise, un-American legislation arm the international political manipulators with an instrumentality of power with which they can exercise control of life and death over the starving victims of war.

Buy Victory Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a speech which I delivered over radio station WLAW, Lawrence, Sunday, November 18, 1945:

The other seven, we called war bond drives. This, the eighth, is the Victory loan drive.

The fighting is over and the war has been won but the Nation cannot change from all-out war to all-out peace overnight. First we must go through a period of reconversion. Millions of soldiers must be demobilized, millions of war workers must seek other jobs, thousands of plants must change their machinery to fit the new needs of peace. This takes time and money.

The United States Government is calling upon you and me and all of us, as partners in that Government, to follow through and complete the job. The hardest part of the job is over: the sacrifices on the battle front, and the sacrifices you made on the home front to win the victory. Here we stand, a Nation geared for war. Now we must change from war-ways back to peace-ways. And that takes time and money.

There are two solid reasons why you should buy Victory bonds and keep Victory bonds. The first, is to help your Government. The second, is to help yourself.

Why does the Government need your help? It must pay bills for munitions and material already delivered and used. It must keep the lid on prices to avoid inflation. It must pay the cost of guarding Germany and Japan. It must pay for the care of our wounded and disabled. It must pay off and provide benefits for 8,000,000 or more veterans to be discharged by next July or earlier. There it is in a nutshell. Let's spread it out and see what it means.

You know that prices have gone up, which means the purchasing power of your wages has gone down. This will continue unless cash is put into savings. There is more cash in circulation in this country today than ever before. The temptation is to go out and buy when there are so few things to buy. Everyone wants a new refrigerator, a new radio, a new car, and hundreds of lesser items. We'll all scramble to get the first few items of civilian goods which come back on the market. We'll bid against each other to get those first few items, and that will send prices up. We'll do this to ourselves unless we realize that we're all in the same boat. Teamwork is just as much needed now as it was during the war. Your Government wants to see that money safely invested by you in Victory bonds, earning money for you, instead of competing for an increase in prices. In connection with this it is well to remember that Uncle Sam always pays his bills. Bonds guaranteed by the United States are the best investment in the world, barring none.

The Government needs these loans from you to pay the cost of guarding Germany and Japan. Until order is restored throughout the world we must protect our victory. Occupation forces, their equipment, their supplies, their pay, these are needed to insure our victory. The Army estimates that as late as July 1, 1946, some 1,400,000 of our men will be doing this job, backed up by 1,100,000 in this country. The Navy will have 550,000 in service. Both services have a big police job to do so that you may live in peace.

This war has cost us 1,000,000 casualties. The families of the 250,000 who gave up their lives to save us must be provided for. Hundreds of thousands of other men are disabled. When we sent our men forth to do the toughest and most dangerous job in all of human experience we said, "Nothing is too good for you. We shall not forget."

Remember?

Now these wounded are coming back, disabled in our service, having given up sight and limb and health and mind for us. Common decency demands that we shall not fail them now. They did a job for us. Now it is our turn to do a job for them. These men need help and hospital care. Your Government is determined to stand by these men—your men—to heal the terrible wounds they suffered in protecting us from harm. Your bonds will provide that merciful care.

Eight million or more veterans will be coming home in the months ahead. We want them home as quickly as possible but that is easier said than done. Many are in Europe, which is 3,000 miles away; others are in the far Pacific, ten to twelve thousand miles away. It took money to get them out there; it will take money to bring them home. But this is an expense we'll gladly pay by purchasing Victory bonds.

These men must be paid. For $60 a month these men fought and bled for us, who were earning many times this paltry sum in the security of America. These returning soldiers and sailors must have a stake to start again in civilian life. The law provides up to $300 per man. If our reduction in armed forces goes as per schedule, this item adds up to something like $2,000,000,000 in the next year.

Your Victory bonds will finance the GI loans which will help veterans establish themselves and their families in civilian life. Your bonds will give some kid who dropped his books to fight for you, a chance to resume his education. He is 3 or 4 years behind his stride, but we are going to give him a chance to try and catch up through the Victory bonds we buy.

We shall not talk about the suffering he went through so that this Nation of ours might survive, because we, the stay-at-homes, can never match the sacrifices he made. We can, however, talk about bonds and how these kids, on $50 and $60 a month bought bonds. Think of it. In addition to all his other contributions to victory he bought bonds. God knows he was entitled to spend all of the $12 to $15 a week he got and more, to get away for a few moments from the drudgery and the agony of war. Instead, he and millions of his brothers and sisters in uniform bought bonds.

What is our answer to this?

Buy bonds and more bonds.

It is the only way to maintain our self-respect as we face these homecoming men. For they will ask the question: "What did you do to keep the home front strong while we were away?"

Your Government needs these loans from you to pay for contract cancellations so that industry may change over to peacetime production just as soon as possible, so that the millions of war workers and millions of returning veterans may all have new jobs without delay.

I have given you some of the reasons why you should buy Victory bonds to help your Government. Here are some of the reasons why you should buy them to help yourself.

In the first place, if you don't loan this money to your Government, it may be forced to take it from you for keeps through taxation.

In the second place, when you buy bonds, you are not giving up anything. Money in your pocket earns nothing. Money invested in bonds, if held to maturity, will obtain 2.9 interest for your money. Just look around. Where else can your money earn as much interest on such a sound basis? Some private investments are risky, not so the Government of the United States. Behind it stands the total wealth of the Nation. Government bonds are the best investment in the world.

If an emergency arises, these bonds can be turned into cash immediately. Furthermore, if your bond is lost or destroyed, a substitute bond, bearing the same date of issue as the original bond, will be issued to you, without charge, upon proper identification.

These bonds spell victory for you, so that some day you will be able to buy that home you've dreamed of, or travel, or retire, or to give an education to, or create a business opportunity for your children.

If you keep the money in your pocket, you will surely spend it in the mad rush for things at high prices. You will not be getting your money's worth. The wise man puts that money into bonds. He knows it is safe there. When reconversion is complete and consumer goods are plentiful again and prices come back to normal, he can then spend with a free mind, knowing that his money, in Victory bonds, has been earning for him—earning extra dividends in thrift and security.

Here is a chance for all of us to do good and to earn money while doing it. Truly, it is a victory opportunity.

Buy bonds today.
Put them away.
You'll find they pay.

Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. KELLY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include an address made by me at a dinner of the American Lithuanian-Mission, held at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., November 16, as follows:

Mr Toastmaster, Your Excellency, the Minister of Lithuania, distinguished guests, assembled here this evening is a representative group of American people who believe that the freedom of small nations shall be retained—nations which, because of their size and location, have been and are now being used as buffer nations for the protection of warring nations.

This is the condition that Lithuania finds itself in today.

It struck me, as I listened to Mr. Olis, that he made a singular point in his reference to the atomic bomb.

It used to be that in discussion of the rights and defenses of nations, the question of control of certain so-called buffer states was frequently raised, and in many cases the justification on a basis of defense through buffer states was recognized.

Today, the atomic bomb has indeed made obsolete the whole consideration of the buffer state.

For no nation can be used as a protection against another in the atomic age, and the only certain guaranty of peace is a general, firm, and fast agreement among the nations, to keep the peace—a peace based on the fundamental rights of man.

We are all familiar with the recent address of the President of the United States on Navy Day—setting forth the 12-point foreign policy of America, in which he emphasized our belief in the eventual return of sovereign rights and self-government to all peoples who have been deprived of them by force, and further stated that we shall refuse to recognize any government imposed on any nation by force of any foreign power.

I recently introduced a resolution in the House, and Senator WILLIS introduced one in the Senate, referring to those principles and to secure for the people of the Republic of Lithuania a restoration of their independence, that they may in the future enjoy the blessing and happiness of peace.

Knowing the Americans of Lithuanian descent, I know no greater patriotic group of Americans, whether this be the land of their birth or the land of their adoption, who have steadfastly fought for independence.

No man can know a Lithuanian without discovering that a never-dying passion for the independence of his country is eating into his soul.

Out of the depths there comes a cry from this Nation which for centuries has been forced to be inarticulate.

It is not a demand for privilege, for territory to which it might have only a historical claim; it is a cry for life, and if we really believe in our own profession, if the traditions of 1776 have not been effaced, if the definition of self-determinism with which President Wilson sought to change the evil systems of lust and avarice in Europe and the rest of the world, after the First World War, we Americans must listen to this cry from the core of the hearts of the Lithuanians.

We cannot close our ears to it.

A Foundation of National Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Assistant Secretary of the Navy H. Struve Hensel at the San Francisco Commonwealth Club, San Francisco, Calif., November 9, 1945:

After our recent war experiences, I trust that not much time need be spent in arguing the need for national power. Once frank discussions of that subject were regarded as indiscreet. The term "power politics" was a reproachful term. Fortunately, there has been a very healthy change in our thinking. After war spilled its hot fire all over us, we needed no inspired dialectician to demonstrate the absolute necessity of national power. The lesson was taught to us one Sunday morning in December 1941 with surprising suddenness. Our lack of power at that time likewise sharpened our intellects. We knew we had to win this war and no one more than you on this coast realized the gravity of our situation. Our past, present, and future were at stake. Power was the price of survival. We had to have it at any cost.

I hope that such realism will continue throughout the peace. The ostrich has no place in world affairs. Continued power in our hands is absolutely essential, if our ideals of justice and freedom are to have a prominent place in this world. If power passes to other hands, we cannot be sure of the aspirations of the next possessor. We must remember—only the strong can enforce justice—only the strong can insist upon freedom—and only the strong can afford tolerance.

In the past we have failed to recognize the extent to which power is the ultimate sanction in political relations. That error has, in my opinion, been the basic reason for our past ineffective attempts to outlaw war and to establish an international form of government. The success of the United Nations Organization, launched so auspiciously in this city, will depend on the retention of power in the hands of the just.

We all know the type of weapons through which power is exerted. We have seen segments of our military power in being. Everyone is familiar with the struggle of this Nation to build and support that power. From our war experiences, we have discovered that the thread of power runs down through almost every sinew of our industrial and social worlds. We also became aware of the need for a healthy and intelligent citizenry not only to man our ships and staff our armies, but also to produce the materials and agricultural products upon which our armies, navies and supporting population had to live. All of the activities required to exert power have been known to our leaders and to us for some time. Furthermore, we always had at our disposal the necessary raw materials, man-made tools and individual skills to produce and maintain such power.

Yet before 1940 we did not have any semblance of present power. We were definitely living in the future and relying upon our potentialities. We risked our entire country in the hope that, if called upon, we could somehow generate enough power in time to save us. We were the flabby fat boy with the candy. We had no military force worthy to be called by that name in the world of Hitler and Tojo. Our sea power had been decimated by the Washington Conference of 1921-22. Military research and development were hardly noticeable. Money was not available and scientists were not interested. Does anyone have any doubt that if we had been suddenly attacked in 1939, this great Nation would have gone down in the dust with a suddenness and ease that would have made the Polish resistance seem stubborn and rugged?

I attribute our weakness of the twenties and thirties to the thinking of our people—my thinking and your thinking. It was obviously not the result of any lack of materials or manpower. As a matter of fact, we then had more resources than later when we had lost access to our sources of tin and rubber and had our sea lanes restricted by enemy submarines. We were weak because we wanted to be weak. When our thinking changed, we became strong.

A brief analysis of our underlying thinking in those days might be profitable. You will recall that we were extremely sophisticated. We knew all the answers. We had lived a long time. We knew better than to indulge in that patriotic emotionalism which leads to sacrifice and service. We believed in little except the search for the maximum of creature comforts and creature luxuries. The intelligent man was expected to turn his attention to the furtherance of his own interests without any concern as to others or as to his country. Patriotism was tagged as provincialism. Public service was looked upon as a second-grade endeavor, reserved for those who did not quite have enough vision to do better for themselves. Sacrifice for the Nation at large was regarded as downright foolishness. We might have talked about national needs, but we never let ourselves be carried away too far. We had our own affairs to look after.

That sort of thinking was, in my opinion, the fundamental cause of our weakness. We did not want to stir ourselves. Of course, we developed a number of mental salves or defense arguments to screen the basic tenet of faith. There was the oft-repeated maxim: "War never settles anything." With that mumbo-jumbo we tried to convince ourselves that no one else would start a war and that we could dismiss that phenomenon from our planning. Yet we really knew that war had settled many countries. The passing through military attack of Carthage and Rome, never to rise again, was known to all. The collapse of Spain had occurred within the lifetime of many. We knew we had to be strong and secretly thought of ourselves as strong. All of the sophisticated twaddle was used to fool the young and cover up the fundamental yearning—freedom from care about the state and freedom to think only of oneself. It was an animal emotion which for long masqueraded as an intellectual masterpiece.

The contagion of lack of belief in our Nation and in ourselves spread fast. Our governmental administration suffered. National problems went unsolved. Dissensions among our people multiplied. We degenerated into a collection of warring tribes, each intent on securing the maximum for itself. We no longer thought and acted as a great country. That is what our enemies saw when they called us "soft." They did not think we could ever pull ourselves together.

Just as thinking made this Nation weak, so we have examples of thinking which made weak nations comparatively strong. Before this war Germany and Japan were weak according to all standards of power. Most school boys could explain with clarity their lack of resources and their inability long to wage war. Yet they very nearly conquered the world. Their primary source of strength was belief in themselves and in their states—a belief so strong and pervading that they were willing to sacrifice all to attain it. It almost seems that the mere fact of really believing—rather than the character of belief—is the source of strength.

The strength of Russia is also grounded in the spirit and service of her people. For a long time she carried on without much more. Today she has achieved power.

Our escape from destruction may be attributed to three circumstances. First, our potential power—as distinguished from power in being—was firmly grounded in our natural resources and the aptitudes of our people. Second, the inner belief of our Nation in itself and the will to serve was kept alive by a small group, of which our military profession formed a large part. Third, the final impact of war upon us was delayed over 2 years by distance and the sacrifices of gallant allies. When war finally came to us we had started up the road. We had acquired some beliefs. Yet complete conversion did not sweep the country until December 1941. When we regained our beliefs service and sacrifice came to us naturally and the restoration of the giant to health and strength was irresistible, although slow.

Our national thinking is clearly fundamental. That is why the present rush to demobilize physically and thus to embrace weakness is disheartening. We seem to be trying to emulate a punctured balloon. What is most terrifying is that we have already demobilized our thinking. There is a startling resemblance in our expressions of thought to those of the thirties. There are the clichés to the effect that we fought for the right to avoid fighting again. There are the suggestions that everyone now should look out for himself. The country is not

even paced on a par with self—much less above self. It is said that we have devoted enough time to the affairs of the Nation—now is the time for us.

Scarcely a vestige of our war attitude prevails. We may still realize that there are problems to be solved if we are to remain secure. But we want an easy solution—a stroke of magic. We are completely enchanted with the thought hat our security may be preserved by the simple sweep of the pen, such as a revolutionary merger of the armed services. We are carried away by the suggestion that future wars will be fought with push buttons. That will mean nothing for us to do. There does not seem to exist any longer the sturdy belief that trained men, mobilized materials, applied brains and patriotic self-sacrifice are the essentials of strength. Such elements never made anyone rich. The importance of research is admitted, but thoughts of economy spring up when the research budgets are presented. We concentrate on reducing taxes rather than the national debt. We have a thousand reasons for our actions. All of them are sound from the individual point of view. Whether we want to face it, our thinking has turned away from country to self. That is the path which leads to weakness and not strength.

A foundation of power is crumbling. The base of the pyramid—the spirit, purpose, and psychology of our people—is showing signs of decay. Armies, navies, and research—the air corps and all other elements of military strength—are only the apex of the pyramid. They cannot exist suspended in midair. Important though the apex may be, I submit that we must turn our attention to the base—a solid belief in ourselves and our particular ideals, sufficiently compelling to engender action.

It is up to our generation to lead this renascence of national spirit. For a short time only will we be able to influence national thinking and to guide our destiny. We have a tremendous advantage—not available 20 years ago. It is also a danger. There is about to be pumped back into our blood stream the richest fluid ever known—the men of our fighting forces. They are already turned in the desired direction. They have the needed beliefs. If their present spirit can be retained and built upon, they will furnish the greatest strength imaginable. If we fail them and they turn to cynicism about their comrades' sacrifice, we are due for lowest depths. We have in our hands the bricks and mortar for a foundation of national power for all time.

I can speak with some positiveness on this subject. I saw these young men in the field while the war was still in progress. When I went to the Pacific last August I had expected to be impressed with our material strength. I was, but I was not fully prepared for the calm distilled spirit of Americanism which gave real force to our might. I did not expect the full measure of vitality, unselfishness, and comradeship which I saw displayed. These men were aware of being Americans and as a part of that awareness displayed a pride in association with comrades equally aware. They were intent on furthering the interest of their country and utterly unmindful of the price which might be exacted from them as individuals. I have never been so proud of being an American in my whole life. Identification with the same country to which those men belonged was obviously the highest reward obtainable.

From the harassed flight-deck crews to the lonely guardians of the desolate atolls, the spirit was the same. I never believed that men could accomplish so much. Flight-deck crews worked continously from dawn until late at night moving planes in preparation for launching and receiving flights. Our men built roads through swamps and jungles. The tangle and growth of those swamps and jungles cannot be adequately described. Doctors stripped to the waist cleared the jungle and erected hospital buildings themselves because of the shortage of other help. Crews of ammunition ships cheerfully piloted cargoes of destruction across the seas to service the fleet. Battleship crews stood for hours at general quarters throughout the day and night.

Great as were their accomplishments, the spirit which animated them was even more magnificent. Their movements were easy and confident, displaying complete satisfaction in their jobs. They cheerfully rose above all hardships. I remember being shown over a particularly dusty and barren strip. I had been told of the wonderful climate, the good swimming, and the strategic advantages of the atoll. Riding in a jeep, I was almost blinded with dust. I finally asked if it were not a bit dusty. "Yes," admitted my guide, but quickly added, "but it's nice clean dust." For such spirit all things are possible.

Theirs is the spirit which we must cultivate. I cannot define it precisely. It springs from that pride of being an American which engenders an irresistible desire to make America great. It involves a realization that some of our time must be spent on the Nation's business and that our actions must be dictated as much, if not more, by unselfishness with respect to the Nation as by personal interest. It is the direct opposite of the sophisticated self-indulgence and self-worship which led us astray before. It is a real belief which strengthens, inspires, and solves difficulties.

If we can tie into that central theme, not only will our national thinking return to sound lines but all things will be possible. I am sure we will find a ready response in the men returning from across the seas. They will be searching for a leadership to meet the aspirations developed under fire.

No matter how much I may emphasize the importance of sacrifice and service, there is little, if any, idealism in my approach. I am animated by the coldest realism I know. This country must remain strong. Of course, we need universal military training, retention of sea power, conservation of natural resources, inventories of critical materials, augmentation of scientific research, preservation of our productive capacities, the maintenance of a healthy population, and intelligent and forceful foreign relations. Those are essentials of power. Our country must possess them. Proper national thinking is, however, the primary source from which all such trappings of power will flow.

From the power angle alone, we cannot afford the luxuries of discord and internal strife. Our Nation is now a sorry picture—bleeding at all seams of productivity with strikes and industrial disputes. The losses in production we are now suffering will never be overcome. Rich in resources though we be, we cannot continue this bleeding for long. International competition is as keen as it ever was, even if the combat phase of war has ended.

There are many other maladies which weaken our national body and which could be cured by nationalized and unified thinking. There is the confusion bred by our vague antitrust statutes, the interpretations of which are uncertain to say the least. There is the restrictive influence of an unscientific tax system which threatens, if it does not restrict, initiative. Antiquated banking approaches make it doubtful whether private enterprise or Government credit can supply our financial needs. There are other less fundamental but equally vexatious troubles—such as the proper governmental organization for national security, the pay and other rewards to be offered the men who make the military service their careers, the efficient method of public purchasing, and other administrative problems.

The ideas, clear thinking, and moral courage to solve all such problems lie dormant. The group which today constitutes Government is too restricted a field to do all the thinking for the Nation. Furthermore, that group does not have any monopoly of ideas nor more than its proportionate share of our intelligence. As a matter of fact, our best brains gravitate often to business, industry, and the professions. The necessary new thinking and new ideas will follow the new spirit of being proud of America and ready to serve that pride.

This is not a call for anyone to enter a contest for elective office. It is ideas rather than candidates which are needed. As a matter of fact, most of our problems are economic and social. They should never have become involved in party politics. The difficulties of our labor relations and our banking procedures should be solved without recourse to the polls. We ought to be able also to generate ideas as to antitrust legislation, taxes, and similar problems. We are all a part of this country and we must make our ideas felt.

Of course, many of us should go beyond that and participate actively in the administrative side of government. Our administration needs help in many ways—ideas and services. For America's sake, you should supply both. Believe it or not, you can afford it. You cannot afford to miss it. Had anyone in 1940 suggested that I spend the next 5 years in the Government service, I would have sadly explained my inability to afford it. Since then I have frequently been complimented for my sacrifices. But I have made no sacrifice of any kind. I have enjoyed every moment and I have been well rewarded. I would not have missed the experience for anything.

In addition to the personal satisfaction at the time, service by you in government would also mean that government, business, and labor would get to know each other better. There will be more general knowledge of the individual problems of each and their relation to the strength of the whole. That is of inestimable value and will feed our beliefs and pride.

We stand today at a crossroads. We can slip back into the doldrums of the twenties. In that direction lie risk, dissensions, and weakness. On the other hand, we can easily maintain the sound thinking and patriotic emotion of the war, when our country and its survival received a fair share of our working hours. That psychology will lead to a retention of our strength and a solution of our problems. No difficulty can remain unsolvable if approached by our collective genius in that frame of mind. I submit that in our own thinking and in our own spirit lies the foundation of national power.

The Honorable James W. Mott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to express my thoughts in regard to our late colleague, the Honorable James W. Mott. He was my neighbor on the fifth floor of the new House Office Building. He was a good neighbor, the kind of a man any good American would like to have live beside him. "Jim," as most of his colleagues called him, was a hard-working and loyal American, who rendered outstanding service for his constituents and his country. As a neighbor, I learned to

respect Jim Mott for his many outstanding qualities. He will be missed by all of us, and remembered as a colleague whose life and character upheld the highest traditions of a faithful public servant.

In memory of our late friend from Oregon, Mr. Horace C. Carlisle, a long-time employee in the office of the Architect of the Capitol, has written the following verse, which I am sure appropriately expresses our feelings over the sudden passing of our colleague the Honorable James W. Mott:

REPRESENTATIVE MOTT

When Congressman James W. Mott
From heaven heard the call
Of Death, he hesitated not,
Nor questioned it at all—
Methinks he'd been expecting it
Awhile before it came—
And he was ready to submit
When Death called out his name.

In this dread age of strain and strife,
Amid its toils and tears,
He lived a great and useful life,
Revered by all his peers—
Yet, he was everybody's friend—
For charity he stood,
And loved to be spent and to spend
For other people's good.

That warm hand-clasp and good-will smile
Of his we'll miss down here,
But we, in just a little while,
Will meet him over there,
If we, too, walk the narrow path
In which he ever trod,
And win the love, and not the wrath,
Of his most gracious God.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Experiments in Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, with many of the countries of the world going hog wild for socialism as if it were a new found panacea for all the ills and troubles experienced by the peoples of the world, it is well that we examine the success and failures in recent days of countries that have given a full and fair trial to the Marxian theories by putting them into practice. May we profit from their example.

The following article, which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal of November 20, 1945, gives Australia's experience with the nationalization of vital industries and public utilities, as written by one of Australia's leading newspaper publishers.

The account of Sir Keith Murdoch follows:

Except for the hydroelectric supply in Tasmania and the brown coal electric supply in Victoria, both of which are Government monopolies and which charge all the traffic will bear, Government adventures into business in Australia are marked by ugly deficits, losses of capital, and inefficiencies.

Australians are not the race of socialized paragons that Mr. Atlee, British Prime Minister, has conjured up. They are, alas, so very human that, when governments have gone into industry, those concerned have used their unions and their pressure politics, their votes and their influence to get personal advantage.

Actually, the list of Government enterprises is really not large. And one wonders how Australia got its name for advanced socialization.

It is advanced in pension schemes, childhood endowment, arbitration systems, and a genuine desire to protect workers from bad bosses.

But when scanning the list of Government businesses one must remember that Australia has seven governments—one sovereign government for each state and one for the federation—and that all have been, sometimes all together, Labor governments.

LISTS GOVERNMENT BUSINESSES

Railways: Services are sound in Victoria and South Australia, two conservative states; but elsewhere pressure politics have been much too strong for cleanliness, modernity, or efficiency.

The annual money losses have been fantastic since 1915. They reached a zenith of £10,000,000 in 1931, and in the year before the war were still £2,750,000. And this, it should be noted, was without adequate depreciations and after scores of millions of pounds of capital had been written off. (The Australian pound at present is worth $3.23¼.)

We have no idea at present of abolishing government ownership of railways, because there are advantages from a national as well as a profit-taking viewpoint. But we may find a way to incorporate both, by lease or conditioned concessions.

Although the managers have been first-class, skillful men, able to take their place in any country—as indeed, have been the superintendents of other government enterprises—they have been powerless against constant political interference, leading to overdevelopment, overcapitalization, and faulty finance.

There are dirt, slovenliness, and slackness. In quietness, comfort, speed, and service the British railways eclipse our best.

QUEENSLAND LOST MUCH IN SEVERAL VENTURES

Water supply systems: These irrigation systems are state owned. The deficits in Victoria alone in 10 years were £5,400,000. Other states had similar experiences, and huge capital losses were written off.

Shipping: The commonwealth government established an overseas shipping line. The government charged the same as other people, but in 5 years lost £2,500,000 and then sold out at a great capital loss.

Queensland, for a time, really got going with socialism. It lost: £1,669,804, plus £324,000 uncharged interest, on cattle stations and closed them down (private owners made good money); £28,014, plus £3,396 uncharged interest, on butchers' shops; £18,686 on a produce agency; £143,000 on a cannery; £52,000 on a fish supply venture; £68,000 on cold stores; £375,000, plus £110,000 uncharged interest, on five coal mines; £89,000 on an arsenic mine; £1,196,347, plus £385,000 uncharged interest, on zinc mines and smelters; £75,000 on some metal treatment works; £44,000 on a gem pool; £37,000 on an iron and steel project; £45,000 on a trawler; £34,000 on a trading steamer.

In the midst of all these failures—and the great money drain of the state railways drifting back all the time—the government had two successes, the Babina Hotel, out of which in 13 years £62,000 was made, and some metropolitan sawmills which showed a profit.

SOLD IN DISGUST

Everything was finally sold in disgust, and Queensland, like other states, is now out of the trading business, except for the railways and a new wartime shipbuilding yard.

At one time she had 111 shops, stations, and other government trading shows. They all went west. She has nothing now.

Coal mines: The commonwealth has taken over two coal mines and some States own a mine or two.

My first observation must be that strikes occur in them as frequently as elsewhere. The miner, in other words, does not really care.

Victoria's mine, Wonthaggi, although its product is absorbed by the railways, has accumulated losses of more than £1,000,000 in 11 years. In 1941 it was still losing £2,337 a week.

A township has been built upon it, so it must be kept going.

The New South Wales Government's mine at Lithgow charges the state railways 2 shillings 6 pence a ton above ruling prices, but in 1941 was losing £300 a week.

In western Australia the socialistic enterprises are an implement works, with an accumulated loss of £343,334; state sawmills with losses of £44,566, and state brickworks, which lost £1,266 in the last year for which I have figures.

In the 1920's the New South Wales labor government also had bakeries, state fish shops, quarries, brickworks, and timber yards, including one on which £314,000 was lost.

Where are they now? All gone, sold at job prices because they gave neither service nor profit.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE CAME OUT ON TOP

Australia is, in fact, stripped of her socialist enterprises, except such major concerns as railways, some water services, some electric undertakings, and her recent ventuers into banking and broadcasting.

All the others faced the competition with private enterprise and—although private enterprise paid heavy taxes while they paid none, and private enterprise had no government favoritism, and they had much—they all fell by the wayside.

They proved wanting in a world which demanded efficiency and which is demanding it now.

Whether the electric systems of Victoria and Tasmania will survive the dead hand of political interference remains to be seen. They are young.

GOOD JOB IN RADIO

In broadcasting, the national stations have done a splendid educational and cultural job, while the commercial stations, many owned by newspapers, have run away with the listeners.

The government bank, started in 1908 by Mrs. Andrew Fisher, has made colossal profits (no taxation) out of its share of the note issue, its control over private bank deposits, and its small trading business.

It is in a special position, and has been managed by a nonpolitical board, now, also to be abolished by the Labor government in favor of direct treasury control.

Looking now to the future, Australia wants busy employment and full production.

NATION HATES CONTROLS

But there is no sign of her going back to her expensive, inefficient, and unproductive socialistic enterprises.

Controls? She hates them, but will probably admit that the national interest, which moves alongside private enterprise, must be given the voice and power of a partner in the wider issues of the national economy.

Otherwise the voice of the government grabber and nationalizer is almost silent. The plain fact is that government enterprise lives in Australia only when protected by law from competition.

Resolution of International Fur and Leather Workers Union, of Peabody, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include herein a resolution adopted by Local 21, International Fur and Leather Workers Union, Peabody, Mass., on November 15, 1945.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, SENATORS WALSH AND SALTONSTALL, CONGRESSMEN LANE AND BATES, AND GOVERNOR TOBIN:

The members of local 21, assembled on November 15, 1945, at 10 a. m. and unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the cost of living has risen and is rising to unbearable heights; and

"Whereas the real wages of our workers have decreased and are dropping to the extent that we are not able to maintain a human standard of living; and

"Whereas our great Nation with the complete support of labor for our armed forces and our Government has just completed and won with our allies a war against fascism and all it represents; and

"Whereas the mandate of our late Commander in Chief, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, was that victory will bring a better world, 'freedom from want and freedom from fear'; and

"Whereas the employers of our Nation have not honestly attempted to meet the postwar problems of full employment and decent wages, which if left unanswered will plunge our Nation into the most disastrous crisis in its history with all the accompanying deprivations and suffering in store for us; and

"Whereas our Government has as yet failed to provide a solution to this grave problem: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, We, the assembled workers of local 21, city of Peabody, demand an immediate program that will effectively solve our economic needs and compel employers to increase wages without any accompanying increase in the cost of living which will destroy any raising of the real wages of labor in America; and be it further

"*Resolved*, We call on your good offices in the legislature and upon the labor-management conference and the employers of our Nation to carry out the economic program laid down by President Roosevelt in his new economic bill of rights."

LOCAL NO. 21, IFLWU-CIO,
RICHARD B. O'KEEFE,
Business Manager.

Veterans of World War II Given Raw Deal on GI Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Joseph Leib, service officer, Vincent B. Costello Post, of the American Legion:

VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II GIVEN RAW DEAL ON GI INSURANCE

(By Joseph Leib)

Here of late the Veterans' Administration has carried on a high-pressure campaign urging discharged veterans to continue their GI insurance. This is fine. Every veteran should be insured. But why has this campaign become necessary? Oddly enough, private insurance companies are spearheading this drive. Recently there appeared in the newspapers from coast to coast full-page ads entitled "A Message of Importance to Veterans and Their Families," carrying a letter from General Hines, as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and signed by the life insurance companies in America and their agents.

Naturally one asks why all this generosity? Why are these private insurance companies so interested in spending many thousands of dollars in advocating that veterans retain their Government insurance policies? These ads were published in over 300 daily newspapers.

One wonders if the answer could be that the rates being charged World War II men are the same or close to being identical to the old line companies that the Government's use of these premiums justifies the old line company rates. You will recall that these same rates and premiums of these companies were the subject of antitrust scrutiny some years ago.

During the month of September 1945, General Bradley announced that 14 out of every 15 veterans discharged from this war have permitted their national service life insurance to lapse without converting it into some form of old line policy. As an indication of how serious the matter has become the new veterans' chief explained that of the four and one-half million veterans who took out insurance during the last war, little more than a half million veterans have continued to pay their premiums.

It is obvious why the GI's of this war are turning down their insurance policies. They are fully cognizant of the fact that they have been given a raw deal. They know that they have been discriminated against and that their policies do not compare with the broad benefits given soldiers of the last war.

Last February this writer respectfully requested from General Hines a clarification as well as a break-down on the basic differences between war-risk insurance as it was called during the last war and the national service life insurance of this conflagration. Here is what he had to say, one month later, under date of March 26, 1945:

"War-risk insurance provides protection against both permanent total disability and death, whereas national service life insurance provides protection against death only."

Then he went into a long and complicated explanation which only served to confuse the issue even more.

However, it was obvious from the above quotation that the men who served in the last war got a better break in their insurance.

For instance, the War II policies are not like the insurance of War I in that they are not payable in a lump sum. Instead they are paid off in small monthly installments.

Among other specific objections, as reported by veterans, we find the following:

The insurance is limited to straight life—20- or 30-pay life, while war-risk policies permitted seven different plans of converted insurance.

The insured cannot designate whomever he wishes as the beneficiary and must name either his wife or a member of his immediate family.

Monthly payments are dependent on the age of the beneficiary at the time of the veteran's death and cover a range from $3.29 to $9.61 per month for each $1,000 coverage.

The rates on policies issued are considerably higher in this war than they were during the last war despite the fact that mortality figures have shown a downward trend for the last decade. In addition the premium charges made for the type of policy issued to War II men—this type of policy being pure term insurance—were in many cases in excess of the premium charges made by private carriers for the same type of insurance except that private carriers were not including war risk.

An indication of how far this alleged discrimination goes I would like to cite one plausible example:

Say a War I man was fighting alongside of a War II man each having taken out their respective Government insurance policy. Along comes a shell and injures both soldiers. Now the doughboy of the last war would receive monthly payments of $5.75 for each $1,000 of insurance upon proof of total permanent disability. The GI of this war would get absolutely nothing from his national life insurance policy.

Is there any wonder that the veterans of this war are rejecting their Government insurance? They look to Congress for a satisfactory explanation. They want nothing more—or nothing less in the way of protection or benefits than was given the veterans of the last war. What's more they want to know who were the instigators and who were the authors of the discriminatory and amazing National Service Life Insurance Act?

The various veterans' organizations should support H. R. 2996. Bills H. R. 1277, H. R. 1580, H. R. 2459, H. R. 2260, H. R 3114, H. R. 3537, H. R. 3088, S. 112, S. 650, are some of the bills to correct the above situation in part.

United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me in the House on January 25, 1944:

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

(Speech of Hon. DANIEL A. REED, of New York, in the House of Representatives Monday, January 24, 1944)

(The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation organization.)

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I understand when I was absent from the House engaged in conference on the tax bill, the very distinguished leader from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] made some observations in regard to a speech which I made on the floor, in which my friends tell me he intimated that I was interfering with the Christian people and their purposes insofar as this legislation is concerned.

I want it definitely understood, and I have said it before on the floor of this House, that I owe allegiance to no country except to the United States of America. I am more interested in what comes out of this war than I am about ordinary observations on this floor.

What I was trying to do was to point out that you have scrambled a great humanitarian process with certain economic problems that are going to plague us abroad in the future. When I say "economic problems," remember that the European countries each year for 20 years have had government doles of some kind or other unemployment insurance, or what not, for 60,000,000 people. That is what they faced during a period of peace. I do not propose to support any legislation on this floor that is going to put into the hands of the ruler of any country, any dictator, whether he is an ally now or not, the power of saying to the subjected country of which he has control, "You will not get food for your babies or for yourself unless you vote as I want you to vote in this plebiscite."

I am trying to prevent the Christian faith being attacked, possibly destroyed, by Communists.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] said on November 1, 1939:

"Within the past few weeks there came from Moscow itself the admission that Catholic priests were murdered, with the lying statement that they were resisting the Communist army. They were murdered in Christian Poland for the same reason that they have been murdered for 20 years in Soviet Russia, priests, ministers, and rabbis, because they were messengers of God, doing the work of God on earth."

I would call the attention of the House to the fact that when the State, Commerce, and Justice Departments appropriation bill for 1941 was under consideration on February 7, 1940, which was to provide for the salaries of ambassadors and ministers, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] offered an amendment to strike out the words "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

That shows that he then felt, as he must feel now, that the Christian organizations should still fear the attitude of Communist countries toward Christian churches and organizations in this country and in foreign countries.

These funds with which it is proposed to feed the destitude of Europe and Asia, which is under consideration today, should be handled, as I have said before, by the Christian organizations now operating and prepared to operate, wherever there are hungry and starving people to be fed. The money should not be made available to dictators, to make as a condition precedent to feeding those people, their willingness to sacrifice their independence, and support of a Communist regime. That is his indictment. I am trying to save the Christian religion all over the world from having to be dominated or disturbed by the work of this communistic society. I do not propose by my vote to put any implement of domination in their hands to carry on their subversive activities here, and we know they will do it. What I want to do is to put these funds, if we are going to legislate this way, into the hands of the services of the Christian organizations of this and other countries now organized, now in the field ready to carry on this work. Let us separate and unscramble this from the economic situation and drilling oil wells and building factories to compete with this country after the war. So I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that every word I have said here is in the interests of the Christian faith and its organizations.

Resolutions by the Board of Directors of the Cooperative League of the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 16, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions recently passed by the board of directors of the Cooperative League of the United States:

Whereas the Government of the United States has built with public money what are generally known as the Big Inch and Little Inch pipe lines; and

Whereas practically the entire investment of approximately $142,000,000 in these pipe lines has been paid by the consuming public through the purchase of oil and gasoline, and these pipe lines are now practically debt free; and

Whereas pipe-line transportation of oil and gasoline to interior United States or to a large part of the consuming public is the most efficient and most economical transportation; and

Whereas pipe-line transportation, other than the Big Inch and Little Inch lines, is now and always has been owned and controlled, with few exceptions, by the major oil companies and this ownership and control has resulted in high profits which have been paid by the consuming public; and

Whereas ownership and control of pipe lines have been and still are major factors in the development and maintenance of a virtual monopoly for the major oil companies: Therefore be it

Resolved, That National Cooperatives, Inc., and the Cooperative League, U. S. A., owned and controlled by millions of consumers, do hereby protest any decision or action by the Government to abandon these pipe lines or to prevent or discourage their usefulness in the public interest; and

That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be urged to call, immediately, a conference of independent oil marketers, and of cooperative organizations, for the purpose of discussing the possibility of these groups organizing a corporation which would thus be helpful to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Government in carrying out the mandate of the Surplus Property Act which is to dispose of surplus property to independent and small industrial organizations as far as possible; and

That copies of this resolution shall go to all Government officials who are trustees for this public property, to the President of the United States, to the Petroleum Administrator for War, to the Surplus Property Administrator and to the Congress of the United States and to all cooperative organizations in the United States.

Whereas the future peace of the world and the future well being of democracy throughout the world will be greatly influenced and determined by the ownership and control of the crude-oil resources of the world; and

Whereas various oil corporations, often with the aid of their governments, have gained control over vast oil deposits in the Middle East; and a condition has been developed thereby which threatens the peace of the world and incidentally provides opportunity for the development of international oil cartels, and for the exploitation of the consumers throughout the world; and

Whereas a treaty is now proposed between governments which gives Government sanction to oil agreements for the benefit and profit of cartels, and hence to the exploitation of the consuming public: Therefore be it

Resolved, That National Cooperatives, Inc., and the Cooperative League U. S. A. do hereby advise the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Senate of the United States that the future peace of the world must not be traded away for the benefit of those who are seeking to gain control and to perpetuate control over these oil deposits, and that these cooperative organizations believe and insist that the provisions of the Atlantic Charter should not be ignored, that these supplies of petroleum "should be available in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, and in order to serve the needs of collective security"; and

That an international oil authority should be created under the control of the United Nations Organization to own and control the development of these oil resources, and to thus give meaning to the provisions of the Atlantic Charter; and

That a copy of this resolution shall go to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, and to the Senate of the United States, and to cooperative organizations throughout the United States and the world.

Whereas the preservation and welfare of a democratic state is dependent upon the education of the people and upon their participation in the process of democracy; and

Whereas radio communications are a most important facility for the education of people, and they could be, and should be, used to the uttermost in the education of our people for the preservation of democracy; and

Whereas the Cooperative League of the U. S. A. is the educational organization of the consumer cooperative movement through which millions of families are united in a continuing educational program for the preservation of democracy: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Cooperative League of the U. S. A. believes the Federal Communications Commission should order that at least 25 percent of the frequency modulation radio frequencies should be reserved for educational purposes, and the licenses for these frequencies should be granted to nonprofit corporations, such as educational, religious, cooperative, farm, and labor corporations, and so forth, and for nonprofit operation by such corporations; and

That a copy of this resolution shall go to the Congress of the United States, to the President of the United States, to the Commission on Communications, to all cooperative organizations, to educational, religious, farm, and labor organizations, and to any other organization devoted to the preservation of democracy.

Whereas the Surplus Property Administration is now the trustee for large quantities of goods and materials owned by the Government, or by the people; and

Whereas the obligation of the Surplus Property Administration is to return these surplus goods to the owners—the people—without adding to the cost any unnecessary charges; and

Whereas cooperative organizations, owned by the people and operated on a nonprofit basis, are the only economic systems of distribution which can insure the return of these goods to the people without the imposition of additional unnecessary costs or profits; and

Whereas the Surplus Property Administration has established systems of discounts which discriminate against cooperative organizations and, therefore, discriminate against owners of these goods: Therefore be it

Resolved, That National Cooperatives, Inc., and the Cooperative League U. S. A., owned by and representing millions of families, do hereby protest any policy or program adopted by the Surplus Property Administration which discriminates against cooperatives or cooperative enterprise; and

That these cooperative organizations request that the Surplus Property Administration shall establish and enforce a program of distribution which shall allow equal discounts to organizations which perform what is generally known as a wholesale function, and equal discounts to organizations which perform what is known as a retail function, and equal discounts to organizations which perform what is known as a manufacturer's function.

No Time To Be Returning Alien Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have been one who is very interested in preventing the Alien Property Custodian from returning the property he has in his possession until the claims of all citizens of America are satisfied to the fullest possible extent. I believe it most unwise to begin at this early date to return the property. Investigations in Europe and in other parts of the world are in no sense complete. People in Europe or Japan or other parts of the world who seem innocent today of having sympathized with or done business with the Axis Powers in such a manner as to aid them to make war may be found guilty tomorrow. The trials we shall have in Europe and doubtless in Japan in the near future should shed light on some of the intricacies of ownership of the property our Alien Property Custodian for good and sufficient cause took over.

It is my belief that the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee should begin immediately to consider or to make a study of what is to be done with this alien property. I feel very strongly that no disposition should be made of any of the property until a thorough study has been made. Be it recalled that the Trading With the Enemy Act was considered and reported by this committee in 1917; as I understand it the basic act was written by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Although there have been amendments to the Trading With the Enemy Act since—amendments written by other committees—at times, in my opinion, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee does have and should have legislative jurisdiction on this entire subject.

A bill is before the House, H. R. 4571, which, I believe, should have very close scrutiny. In my opinion, it could be an opening wedge which will initiate a policy similar to the one we followed after World War I that permitted Germany to regain some 80 percent of the property which our Alien Property Custodian took over during World I.

I trust the letters, and the newspaper clipping I am including in my remarks will be carefully read by the membership of the House. The Marran letter is in the hearings recently held on H. R. 4571; the news item appeared in the Washington Post November 15, 1945.

OFFICE OF ALIEN
PROPERTY CUSTODIAN,
Washington, November 13, 1945.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I am happy to answer the questions raised in your letter of November 5, 1945. H. R. 3750 has been superseded by H. R. 4571, which I understand will shortly be reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary. Accordingly, I believe it will be more useful for me to address myself to H. R. 4571 in responding to your inquiries and I enclose a copy of that bill for your convenient reference.

The plan of the bill, as you of course appreciate, is to permit return of vested property only to American and to foreign nationals who have never been hostile to the United States, and it would not permit returns to be made to enemy citizens in enemy or formerly enemy-occupied territory or to corporations owned or controlled by such persons. An important purpose is to restore their vested property to those nationals of the liberated areas who were innocent victims of aggression, since such property was vested for protective purposes (to keep the Germans, for example, from using it to bring pressure on the owners) and to utilize it in our war effort. I believe the bill provides appropriate safeguards to prevent returns being made to enemies or enemy collaborators.

With reference to your specific questions: The only German citizens who would benefit under the bill would be those continuously resident in and loyal to the United States since before Pearl Harbor, in the event any of their property had been mistakenly vested. Persons resident in the United States are not "enemies" as that terms is defined in section 2 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, even though they may be of German citizenship, and their property has been vested only in a few cases where there was evidence of aid or active sympathy on their part to the enemy cause so as to warrant treating them as enemies. In any cases of this latter category, return of property would not be made, because it would not be possible to determine that such return was in the interest of the United States—a determination which must be made before a return is authorized, as provided in paragraph (5), lines 3 and 4, on page 6 of H. R. 4571. In addition, no property which has been used since September 1, 1939, by or with the assent of the former owner, to cloak (i. e. conceal) enemy property, may be returned, by virtue of paragraph (3) on page 5.

Citizens of Austria, Norway, France, Luxemburg, or Denmark may also benefit under the bill only if the return of their property would be in the interest of the United States, under the provision noted. The facts as to their actions and affiliations during the war will be carefully weighed. Of course justice should be done to truly friendly foreign nationals, but it would be adverse to the interests of the United States to return property to collaborators or those who in any way favored the Nazi cause. A strict duty is imposed on the administrator so to apply the act.

The cases of persons in Europe outside of Germany who did business with Hitler until December 7, 1941, will be examined in a similar manner, although I should state that a small tradesman, for example, who merely pursued his ordinary livelihood, without active pro-German leanings, should probably not be penalized without more.

I do not have sufficient information for a complete answer to your questions whether any citizens of this country owning property in Europe, or any American corporations, derived incomes from Germany until December 7, 1941. Such activity was, of course, lawful under certain conditions, and I call your attention to the fact that the "freezing" controls of the Foreign Funds Control of the United States Treasury Department went into effect as to Germany on July 14, 1941.

Corporations organized under the laws of the United States or of any State in this country are already eligible to receive return of seized property under existing law—in fact, such seizure could only have been made by mistake—provided they were not owned or controlled by the enemy and did not use their property to "cloak" enemy property. In the latter event, they would be treated as nationals of the enemy country concerned, and would not be in a position to benefit under the terms of the bill. Again, any return to such corporations would have to rest on a determination that it was in the interest of the United States.

I shall be pleased to furnish you, to the best of my ability, any further information that you may desire.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MARKHAM,
Alien Property Custodian.

CHADBOURNE, WALLACE,
PARKE & WHITESIDE,
New York, N. Y., October 10, 1945.

Re House bill H. R. 3750, Seventy-ninth Congress.

Hon. HATTON W. SUMNERS,
Chairman of the House
Judiciary Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE SUMNERS: I am writing this letter pursuant to our recent talk with respect to the need of an amendment to the above bill in order to protect the rights of certain United States corporations one of which is represented by my firm and by the firm of Smith, Shaw, Reed & McClay of Pittsburgh.

A Delaware corporation, American Austrian Magnesite Corp. (herein called American Magnesite), having its office in Pittsburgh, which is now and since its incorporation in 1923 has been owned entirely by United States citizens, owns 100 percent of the capital stock of a former Austrian corporation, Oesterreichische Magnesit A. G. (herein called Austrian company) which after the invasion of Austria by Germany in March 1938 was required by German law put in force in Austria to change from an Austrian into a German corporation. The Austrian company owns 1,886 shares (40 percent) of the preferred stock of another Delaware corporation, American Magnesium Metals Corp. (herein called Metals Co.). American Magnesite owns the remaining 60 percent of the preferred stock (2,950 shares) and 6,500 shares (65 percent) of the common stock of the Metals Co.

By vesting order No. 223, dated October 9, 1942, Leo T. Crowley as Alien Property Custodian vested said 1,886 shares of preferred stock of the Metals Co. belonging to the Austrian company.

A supervisory order, also dated October 9, 1942, was issued by the Alien Property Custodian and the Metals Co. has since that date been limited to transactions authorized by the Alien Property Custodian.

Subsequently, on October 7, 1943, American Magnesite filed with the Alien Property Custodian a notice of claim that said 1,886 shares of preferred stock of the Metals Co., be released from vesting and that a new certificate for said shares be issued in the name of the claimant, American Austrian, as the true owner of the stock. The position which the attorneys for the Alien Property Custodian have taken in discussing the case is that since the preferred stock is technically owned

by a German corporation not only was the vesting authorized, notwithstanding the fact that the German corporation owning the preferred stock was a 100-percent subsidiary of a Delaware corporation owned at all times entirely by United States citizens, but that there is no provision of law which authorizes the Alien Property Custodian to release the stock from vesting. Apparently therefore unless statutory relief is afforded, American Austrian and its wholly owned subsidiary will be permanently deprived of the preferred stock in question, although there is no real Austrian or German investment involved, the ownership being wholly in United States citizens through the corporate holdings above referred to.

There is attached hereto a chart which indicates the United States ownership in the various corporations.

At your suggestion, I arranged a conference with Mr. Markham, Alien Property Custodian, and discussed the problem with him. It was at first suggested by Mr. Markham that the bill in its present form protected the rights of United States citizens owning 100 percent of the stock in Austrian corporations, in view of the fact that the Alien Property Custodian had stated that citizens of Austria were not to be considered enemy nationals and that their property would be returned. However, after further discussion with Mr. John Cutler, associate general counsel, and Mr. Searles, Chief of the Claims Division of the Office of the Alien Property Custodian, it was the consensus of opinion that an amendment would be necessary in order to permit the return of the vested stock above mentioned belonging to the Austrian company because of the fact that that corporation had, after the seizure of Austria by Germany in March 1938, been required, together with all other Austrian corporations, to become a German corporation.

Mr. Markham then suggested that an amendment be prepared for submission to the committee providing for the return of property owned by corporations of enemy countries if such corporations were 100 percent owned by United States citizens or corporations organized under laws of the States of the United States, and that in such event he would interpose no objection.

There is enclosed herewith a proposed amendment which we believe will protect the interests of United States citizens who find themselves in the same position as the American Austrian Magnesite Corp.

There is also enclosed herewith, for use if deemed material by you, a complete history and background of our clients and of the ownership of the shares of stock above referred to.

Respectfully yours,

DONALD J. MARRAN.

Stock ownership in American Austrian Magnesite Corp., a Delaware corporation

	Percent
Emil Winter Estate, Pittsburgh, Pa	73.64
Dwight Winter, Pittsburgh, Pa	11.5
Workingmans Savings Bank & Trust Co., a Pennsylvania State bank; and American Magnesium Metals Corp., a Delaware corporation, both controlled by estate of Emil Winter	14.86
Controlled by American Austrian Magnesite Corp.:	
Austrian Magnesite Co., Ltd., originally Austrian (now German) company	100
Kaningwerk Aktiengesellschaft originally Austrian (now German) company	100
Alpenminen Aktiengesellschaft originally Austrian (now German) corporation	100
American Magnesium Metals Corp., a Delaware corporation (preferred)	40
Deutsche Heraklith, A. G., a German corporation	25
Deutsche Heraklith, A. G., a German corporation	75

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO HOUSE BILL H. R. 3750

Change subdivision (B) of section 32 (a) (2) to read as follows:

"(B) a corporation or association organized under the laws of such nation: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision (B), return may be made to a corporation or association organized under the laws of such nation if all the outstanding shares of stock of such corporation were on October 1, 1938, and continuously thereafter to the date of such return, owned by one or more corporations organized under the laws of the United States or of any State thereof or by individual citizens of the United States; or"

[From the Washington Post]

SENATE GROUP CHARGES SWISS COLLABORATED ON NAZIS ASSETS

A Senate Military Affairs Subcommittee charged last night that Swiss Government and banking officials collaborated in a Nazi attempt to preserve German economic assets for another try at world domination.

It released four letters written from Switzerland in the early part of this year by Emil Puhl, former vice president of the Reichsbank, to Dr. Walter Funk, Reichsbank president and German Minister of Economics. Funk is under indictment as a Nazi war criminal.

The Germans sent Puhl to Switzerland to nullify the work of an Allied mission, headed by Lauchlin Currie, personal representative of the late President Roosevelt.

OBTAINED AGREEMENT

Currie obtained from the Swiss Government an agreement that it would immobilize all German assets in Switzerland, but Puhl reported to Funk on April 6 that the "absolute stopping of payments between Germany and Switzerland which our opponents tried to obtain did not materialize."

Chairman HARLEY M. KILGORE, Democrat, of West Virginia, of the subcommittee on elimination of German resources for war, said the Puhl-Funk correspondence "makes it clear that the principal concern of the Swiss was the prospect of future business dealings with a postwar Germany, irrespective of its political character and its relationship to the peace and freedom-loving nations of the world."

"Despite the efforts of the Currie mission and the assurances of the Swiss Government that German accounts would be blocked," he said, "the Germans maneuvered themselves back into a position where they could utilize their assets in Switzerland to support their war effort, could acquire desperately needed foreign exchange by the sale of looted gold, and could conceal economic reserves for another war.

"These moves were made possible by the willingness of Swiss Government and banking officials, in violation of their agreement with the Allied Powers, to make a secret deal with the Nazis."

KILGORE said that German assets in Switzerland and other neutral countries must be seized in order to destroy Germany's economic potential for another war and to rehabilitate nations which were victims of German attack. He said that United Nations collaboration was necessary to carry out such action.

Puhl, who went to Switzerland even as Allied armies were sweeping across Germany, reported to Funk when he first arrived that it looked as if Swiss authorities would accede to Allied demands that Nazi assets be frozen.

SYMPATHETICALLY RECEIVED

He said, however, that he was urged to continue his endeavors by the President (Ernest) Weber of the Swiss Nationalbank, who pointed out that "under the given present-day conditions, an agreement between the Nationalbank and the Reichsbank would be of far-reaching importance beyond the present day."

Puhl wrote that he was received sympathetically by Swiss bankers and government officials and "in the last analysis found much understanding from the Swiss side."

Not Unduly Exacting About Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Secretary of State Byrnes' characterization last month of our foreign policy as "not being unduly exacting" in our relations with the Soviet Government has a wider application in fact than the Secretary himself may truly wish.

Let us examine our American-Russian policy in relation to the subject of refugees, or displaced persons as they are called today. Of these, in Europe alone there are estimated to be upward of twenty million. Some scores of thousands are natives of what is now the Soviet Union; other scores of thousands are natives of lands now embraced or claimed as Soviet territory. These individuals are stated by the Soviet Government to be subject to repatriation, by force, if necessary, behind Soviet borders. On Sunday, November 18, a dispatch from Moscow announced that the Supreme Soviet has decreed restoration of citizenship to all former Russian subjects now in Manchurian territory. This adds at least a hundred thousand other persons whose return is sought by the Government at Moscow. In nearly all cases these latest additions to the swelling Soviet population are Russians, or the sons and daughters of Russians, who fled from the Bolshevik revolution of 1918.

It has never been either the policy or the practice of the United States to deliver up to any foreign government nationals who have fled because of real political persecution. This tradition of political sanctuary has been one of the oldest and most carefully observed policies of our Government since its foundation. At present, however, we have cause to question whether, by as a result of the private agreements at Yalta between President Roosevelt and Premier Stalin, this basic American principle has not been abandoned on the ground that it is unduly exacting when applied to individuals claimed by the Soviet Government.

How this abandonment is viewed by those whom it most affects—the refugees in our zones of occupied Europe—can be seen in the following articles from the Washington bureau of the Journal-American. Likewise the official attitude of the War Department, reflecting the view of the administration, can be determined from the correspondence regarding this subject which I have held with Secretary Stimson and Secretary Patterson. In fairness to the War Department, it should be recalled that overall policy in such matters is determined by the Commander in Chief and not by a department head.

UNITED STATES POLICY ON SOVIET REFUGEES

(By David Sentner)

WASHINGTON, November 3.—Representative CLARE LUCE, Republican, Connecticut, has protested to the War Department against refugees in the American-occupied German zone who disclaim Russian citizenship being "forced by our troops at the point of guns to return to Soviet areas."

In releasing her correspondence with the Secretary of War, Mrs. LUCE attached a dossier containing 300 affidavits by former Soviet nationals. They pleaded for asylum from the terrorism and tyranny of the Communist regime.

At the recent London Conference of Foreign Ministers, Soviet Foreign Commissar Molotov insisted on a more speedy repatriation of so-called Russian citizens from the Allied zones.

The Soviet repatriation representatives earmarked as Russian citizens all those displaced persons originating in territory absorbed by the Soviet Union despite any repudiation of allegiance to the U. S. S. R.

Mrs. LUCE and other Members of Congress charge the current appeasement policy of the State Department toward the Soviet Union has resulted in thousands of "DP's" being pushed over the border to face Soviet labor camps, persecution, or death.

Mrs. LUCE still is awaiting a reply to her letter to Secretary of War Patterson, dated October 5, which read:

"I want to call your attention to what appears to be a serious conflict between an official statement furnished me by your office on July 11, 1945, concerning American policy towards refugees from areas under Soviet control, and the actual conditions obtaining in the matter.

"Today an Associated Press dispatch, dated Frankfort am Main, Germany, says:

CITES EISENHOWER'S ORDER

"'General Eisenhower, in an order amounting to temporary abrogation of one phase of the Yalta agreement, has instructed that American troops discontinue forcing Russian nationals to return home unless the United States rules otherwise.

"'The existence of the order, affecting 26,400 Russians still in the American zone of Germany, was disclosed today by commanders of displaced persons camps.

"'Questioned on reports that troops had fired over the heads or near the feet of some Russians to compel them to board Soviet-bound trains, one officer said:

"'Possibly for a time some of them were pushed into trains without asking many questions but that's all stopped now'."

Please compare this with the following letter from the War Department, dated July 11, 1945:

ASSURANCE BY STIMSON

"'DEAR MRS. LUCE: In response to your letter of July 5, I can assure you that refugees from areas now under Soviet control are not being repatriated unless they claim citizenship in Soviet Russia and their claims are accepted by Soviet reparation representatives.

"'I may add that this policy has been observed by our authorities overseas for a considerable time * * *.'

"HENRY L. STIMSON,
"Secretary of War."

Mrs. LUCE'S letter to Patterson continued:

"Based on this assurance I have given a number of my constituents to understand that they need not worry about relatives who might find themselves in the American zone, but who were natives of various parts of the expanded Soviet Union, or nationals of the U. S. S. R. unwilling to claim citizenship.

"It appears now that these reassurances were not altogether justified and that refugees who did not wish to claim citizenship in Soviet Russia have been forced by our troops at the points of guns to return to Soviet areas.

"What shall I write to my constituents now, who feared the unwilling repatriation of their relatives, and who were reassured by Mr. Stimson's letter that it was against our policy to do so, and that that policy was being observed, in view of the fact that General Eisenhower's order seems to show it has not been observed?"

Shortly after publication of this article, the above-quoted letter, I received the following answer from Secretary of War Patterson on November 7:

DEAR MRS. LUCE: I am advised that the subject matter of your letter to me of October 5 concerning the policy which has prevailed in the United States Zone of Occupation in Germany with respect to repatriation of displaced persons has been discussed with you by members of the War Department Staff and that you desire confirmation of the policy outlined to you at that time.

In his letter to you of July 11, 1945, in reply to your letter of July 5, 1945, concerning the policies being following by the military authorities with respect to the repatriation of refugees from the Baltic countries of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, Secretary Stimson communicated to you the policy of the War Department that refugees from such areas are not being returned to areas under Soviet control unless they claim citizenship in Soviet Russia and their claims are accepted by Soviet repatriation representatives. I understand from those members of the War Department staff that, in reply to your letter of October 5, you desire an over-all expression of the policy being applied in United States zones of Germany and Austria with regard to the repatriation of displaced persons found in those countries upon the defeat of the German Armies rather than merely the policy with respect to the repatriation of Balts about which you inquired in your earlier letter.

With the exception of Soviet citizens, United States policy consistently has been that no such displaced person would be repatriated against his will. Persons formerly domiciled in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, or Poland east of the Curzon Line, have not been considered by the United States as Soviet citizens unless, as stated in Mr. Stimson's letter of July 11, they claim citizenship in Soviet Russia and their claims are accepted by the Soviets. The repatriation of Soviet citizens is controlled by the agreement entered into at Yalta between the United States and the U. S. S. R. An interdepartmental committee of the Departments of State, War, and Navy is giving urgent consideration to the question as to whether or not this Government is obliged under the Yalta agreement to repatriate acknowledged Soviet citizens involuntarily. Pending determination of the Government's policy in this matter, General Eisenhower has suspended the use of troops for the purpose of forcible collection or repatriation of acknowledged Soviet citizens.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

Two further articles appeared in the Journal American quoting from affidavits in my possession from Soviet refugees, under David Sentner's byline:

REIGN OF TERROR CHARGED TO SOVIET

(By David Sentner)

WASHINGTON, November 3.—Death in the cellars of the NKVD—torture, terrorism, slave labor; Siberia for being 40 minutes late on the job, starvation, blood purges.

The communist regime of the Soviet Union was pictured as a mammoth "chamber of horrors" in a dossier of affidavits from 300 former Russians in the American-occupied zone in Germany released today by Representative CLARE LUCE, Republican, of Connecticut.

Many threatened to commit suicide rather than return to the "paradise of Bolsheviks."

All virtually signed their death warrants in publicly attesting to the hellish conditions existing under the Red state in the event their pleas were denied to remain in the American zone.

PROTEST LODGED

Mrs. LUCE had lodged a protest with the War Department against refugees who repudiate Russian allegiance from being forced over the border of the Soviet at the point of guns.

Extracts from the affidavits of the hapless Russian-displaced persons follow:

"I, Philip Mouha, refuse to go to Russia for the following reasons: My father perished in the cellars of NKVD and mother and four brothers were starved to death in the year 1933 which I can prove by documents in my possession. I, accused of being the son of a physician, was exiled for 3 years to the Far East."

FEARS SIBERIA

From Gregory Yancenko:

"I, and my wife, Barbara, do not want to return to the U. S. S. R. My father and the brother of my wife were sent to Siberia because they had seven acres of land and I was nearly sent, too, because I got married to the daughter of a well-to-do man."

From Nina Firfaroff:

"I shall not go to the Soviet Union because my brother was shot as an officer and my sister was decapitated. My husband's three brothers—one officer and two engineers, were tortured to death in prison and my husband, a physician, was sent to concentration camp."

SPURNS DICTATOR

From Ivan Dolgopitoff:

"I do not go voluntarily to the U. S. S. R. as long as my native country is ferociously dominated by the dictatorship of the Communist Party whose aim is communistic revolution in all the world.

"As long as despotism, terror, violation, and humiliation of human beings reign and are systematically carried out by the Communist Party, its government and NKVD—this punishing sword of the proletarian revolution.

"As long as freedom and rights of men will be found only on the pages of the party press and in slogans but not in reality."

CITES PERSECUTION

From Olga Borisova:

"I do not intend to return to the Soviet Union because during my whole life there I was persecuted only for the reason that the brother of my mother was living in America. My two brothers were sent to Siberia because they were suspected to have corresponded with him."

CITIZENS IN EXILE

(By David Sentner)

WASHINGTON, November 5.—Moscow's global propaganda tinseling the Communist regime of Soviet Russia as a proletarian paradise was punctured today in a series of affidavits.

Former Soviet citizens in the American occupation zone in Germany depicted the U. S. S. R. as a veritable hell and pleaded against repatriation.

The majority of the signed declarations, released by Representative LUCE (Republican of Connecticut), are from peasants, workers, and the "little folk" who have suffered under the Communist regime.

Tales of death, torture and imprisonment to loved ones, seizure of farmland, starvation, and persecution by the dreaded NKVD are grimly reiterated in the sworn affidavits.

"I cannot live under a government of lies and deceit and constant terror of NKVD and severe exploitation of forced labor," asserts J. M. Timoshenko.

"I cannot see my own compatriots suffering under the government of dictatorship and being too frightened to talk about it.

"I cannot trust a power which for decades has been repressing the church and then begins acting the reverse. For years they have been killing faith in God by methods of killing and sending innocent people to concentration camps.

"I do not want to be tortured by the executioners of NKVD who are now governing in U. S. S. R."

The affidavits continued:

Kirichenko Afanassy: "Our life under the Soviet regime was nothing but a nightmare, not only materially but especially spiritually."

S. Solovieff: "I prefer death to living in the Soviet Union—a place of the most dreadful tyranny of Stalin."

Nicoli Gorbatshevsky: "I do not want to go back to the Soviet Union because as a son of a priest I was persecuted and deprived of my property. My mother and three sisters died of hunger."

S. Borodin: "I refuse to return to the Soviet Union because I was all the time persecuted as daughter of a Leningrad merchant."

Alex Andrianoff: "I do not want to go back to the U. S. S. R. because in 1933 my whole family died of starvation. They imprisoned me and put me out of work because my uncle used to be a well-to-do farmer."

These few examples are sufficient indication of the feelings of those men and women who had to be pushed into cattle cars at the points of American bayonets in order to expedite their return to their native country. That we are responsible for such enforced repatriation is ample evidence that this country is also being "not unduly exacting" in the interpretation of its own historic traditions in the whole question of sanctuary to the refugees of political persecution.

Consumers Demand No Crippling of Price and Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a digest of the testimony offered by 15 national consumer, educational, religious, and women's organizations at a meeting held on November 14 in the House Labor Committee room by the Committee for the Protection of the Consumer. Representative AIME J. FORAND, of Rhode Island, presided. Members of our committee were delighted to note the deep interest of consumers in price control. We realize all too well that run-away prices will prove disastrous to all sections of the community—to businessmen and farmers as well as to consumers. It will be especially hard on the white-collar worker, the veteran returning to finish his education or trying to start a small business or getting back to his former job, and on all older people and widows living on annuities and pensions. For this reason we were glad to note the strong support of these groups for the renewal of the Second War Powers Act and their opposition to all efforts to relax the controls which have held inflation in check during the war and which experience after World War I teaches us are needed to avoid inflation in the coming months while reconversion is under way.

The digest of testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF COLSTON E. WARNE, PRESIDENT OF CONSUMERS UNION OF UNITED STATES, IN INTRODUCING THE ORGANIZATIONAL REPRESENTATIVES

If any evidence were needed that American consumers are excited about the maintenance of adequate safeguards against inflation, this meeting should be adequate proof. We have here representatives of leading national organizations, each of which is deeply concerned with the attainment of high living standards under stable prices. We appreciate the kind invitation of Congresswoman CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE and your group to come here to testify and are delighted that so many Members of the Congress are in attendance.

Each group, here represented, will make its own statement. I am sure, however, that you will note strong support for the continuation of the rationing and allocation controls in the Second War Powers Act; a demand for the retention of essential price and rent controls; an endorsement of ceiling prices for old and new dwellings; and an approval of the principle of cost absorption at both the manufacturing and retail levels as a means of protection against price advances while still allowing a reasonable over-all profit in each field.

From the beginning of OPA, these groups have been most active in its support. Their members have volunteered for price panel, rationing, and informational work. Whenever business lobbies have threatened the Act, these consumer groups have been vocal in backing effective price control. We appreciate that OPA has not had an unblemished record; yet we have no disposition to withdraw our support of price and rent control at this time when such controls are still critically needed.

Consumers Union, which I represent, is a national membership organization of 100,000 consumers, which tests and appraises consumer goods as well as affording to its members a collective voice in legislation affecting the consumer. Our members are bitterly opposed to the business lobbies which are now urging the too-hasty liquidation of wartime controls. No family wants rationing or price control for 1 day longer than necessary. But neither do our members want the Second War Powers Act and the Price Control Act emasculated or wiped prematurely from the books, bringing a mad scramble for goods and a runaway inflation, 1919 style.

With our Nation's money supply tripled and with the flow of many commodities now being blocked by sit-down strikes of manufacturers for higher prices, we think it fantastic that reactionary groups are now pressing for the complete elimination of OPA and all its work. We see the spectacle of an auto dealers' lobby championing exorbitant profits through the elimination of the cost-absorption principle in retailing. We see the Retail Dry Goods Association lobby invading this very building with an elaborately falsified exhibit which proves only that the OPA has not been infallible and that certain textile producers have taken advantage of OPA's inadequate appropriations and the congressional prohibition of quality standards to manufacture shoddy articles at high prices. We see the real-estate lobby setting aside the L–41 order and moving to eliminate OPA rent controls as well as to block the imposition of ceilings on old and new housing.

In coming months, Members of the Congress will have to choose whether they will back the millions of consumers with fixed incomes and the millions of workers whose take-home pay has been drastically cut since VJ-day or whether they will yield to high-pressure lobbies bent on the destruction of the Price Control Act. We as a consumer group think that businessmen across the country are not supporting the selfish attitude taken by their own lobbies. Inflation, in the long run, is as much a menace to business as it is to the consumer.

Consumers in America are rapidly identifying their friends on Capitol Hill and are also making a careful catalog of those who consider legislation to advance the profits of particular groups more important than victory over inflation. We shall watch the course of this price-control legislation closely.

STATEMENT BY MRS. LA FELL DICKINSON, PRESIDENT, GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

The General Federation of Women's Clubs, which is in reality a great adult education agency, has been reaching its vast membership continuously with letters and news releases in support of the OPA program. The pages of its monthly magazines have also carried articles and communications from leaders in the antiinflation movement as well as messages direct from heads of the various divisions of the OPA. Thousands of clubs have held programs on anti-inflation and many hundreds of club women have served on local panel boards.

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

There is no question but that our economy is in a disturbed and unstable condition. Conversion from war to peacetime production has created problems of enormous magnitude. Not the least of these is the one of increased availability of money with only slow increases in the availability of civilian goods. The inflation threat is greater at this time than it has been at any time during the war. We have said again and again that we must profit by the lessons of the last war, that we must take active steps to see that the disasters of that inflation do not again have such serious effects on the economy. But in spite of all these good intentions, the situation is worsening rather than bettering.

In one specific instance it is particularly noticeable. Returning veterans and others are acutely conscious of the spiraling prices in the field of housing. It is imperative at the present time that we consider means of preventing speculation in this essential factor in the cost of living. Rent control should be maintained and adequately enforced. Controls on building materials and services should be continued and strengthened. And ceiling prices on new and existing housing should be authorized by law.

It should be recognized that the inflation in housing prices is the result of a tremendous demand for shelter and an accumulated shortage of housing throughout the war. The only long-range solution must of course lie in the filling of this shortage by building programs. And it is important that controls at this time be such as to encourage building, not discourage it. Such encouragement, however, must not be at the expense of those who must live in houses while we are trying to fill the shortage.

Another essential to maintaining our stabilization program will be the renewal of the Second War Powers Act which expires at the end of this year. While it is desirable that we end rationing and allocations programs as rapidly as feasible, the process must be a gradual one and surely cannot be completed by December 31. Control for the sake of control is to be avoided at all costs, but it is obviously foolhardy to throw off the stabilization program at the very moment it is most needed. The relaxation of controls must be a

gradual and specific process. The National League of Women Voters urges Congress to consider seriously its role in contributing to economic stability.

STATEMENT BY AGNES WINN FOR THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

The 1,000,000 teachers in the United States have a deep and practical interest in holding firmly the price line against inflation. For this reason the National Education Association, speaking for the teachers, strongly advocates:

1. Renewal of the Second War Powers Act which expires December 31, 1945, unless renewed.

2. Extension of the Stabilization Acts beyond June 30, 1946.

3. Control over the sale prices of houses.

It can easily be seen why teachers have a special stake in the success of any legislation that would hold the line against rising prices. No group of salaried workers would be more adversely affected by rapid lifting of all controls because public school teachers receive relatively low salaries which respond slowly to changes in prices of commodities and in wage rates in private employment. The salaries of many teachers in the United States are below subsistence level and they have no margin of income on which to draw when prices rise.

Therefore we urge Congress to give the most thoughtful consideration to all legislation that will prevent a rise in living costs during this reconstruction period.

STATEMENT OF MRS. HENRY A. INGRAHAM, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL BOARD OF THE YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION

The national board of the YWCA recently joined other organizations in support of a resolution calling for extension of the Second War Powers Act. We have supported price control and rationing throughout the war and in June we supported extension of the Price Control Act.

The dangers of inflation are clear to the women and girls of the YWCA. The national board's professional staff working in foreign lands could add to the testimony of returning veterans regarding the effects of inflation in other lands. Countries in the midst of economic chaos see their only promise for the future in the stability of the American economic system. An inflationary boom followed by depression would ruin this country and render it incapable of assuming a position of leadership in the world organization.

In addition to our interest in world economic stability, we have a deep personal concern for the welfare of each woman and girl in the YWCA's of America. Our constituents represent a large cross section of American society. * * *

One of the most serious problems, housing, disturbs us greatly. The YWCA has cooperated in providing temporary war housing for women workers in crowded industrial centers. Its existing residences have been filled beyond normal capacity to meet the needs of working girls for decent shelter. It is hot hard to imagine what the demoralizing effect would have been on girls during the war had they been unable to find moderately priced, comfortable, warm accommodations. War production would have suffered and human beings would have been sacrificed. We cannot allow them to be sacrificed now. We firmly believe that, for the best safety of all economic groups in our society, controls should be maintained on rents in crowded areas and on prices of consumers' goods that are still very scarce.

Many businessmen admit freely that they want necessary controls on rents and prices of scarce consumers' goods because they know that they could not survive the competition of an uncontrolled price war. If inflation should hit the country no one would be safe. Even those who would make high profits for a while would suffer in the long run. The small wage earner and business man and woman would suffer most of all. It is a risk this country cannot afford to take.

STATEMENT OF MRS. PAUL E. HOWE ON BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN HOME ECONOMICS ASSOCIATION

Because the primary concern of the American Home Economics Association is the welfare of the American family, it was logical that 48 of the leaders of that organization, at the annual meeting last summer, selected as 2 of the 10 points in its legislative program for 1945–46: "Legislation to prevent increases in the cost of living and insure fair distribution of scarce commodities" and "Programs for consumer protection in government agencies."

Our economists, our home management specialists, our nutritionists, our councillors in social welfare agencies, our directors of cafeterias and other eating places, our rural extension workers—in fact our entire organization—earnestly urge the Congress to extend the War Powers Act, not merely to June 31, 1946, but to such a time as inflationary pressures have been reduced below the danger point. We urge further that the OPA and the Civilian Production Administration be given adequate funds with which to administer their programs, and that no hampering amendments be affixed to the extended act.

We point especially to the need (1) for extension of rent controls throughout the year of 1946 (in part due to the returning veterans and the slowness with which building for the lower and lower middle income groups is going forward); (2) for controls of prices of building materials throughout 1946, to prevent repetition of the boom-bust situation after the last World War which resulted in the most severe real estate depression ever seen in this Nation; (3) for insuring the success of the low-price clothing program developed by the WPB and the OPA. If these safeguards go, the situation of the majority of American families will be critical.

STATEMENT OF CAROLINE WARE FOR THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN

The American Association of University Women, which supported price control before the original Price Control Act was passed, believes that there has never been greater need than in the months ahead. Many of our 929 branches are making the fight on inflation their No. 1 business for this year.

When the Act was first renewed we asked that it then be extended for 2 years beyond the end of hostilities. We now believe that unless it is promptly extended some producers will refrain from producing, waiting for price control to end and prices to soar, delaying reconversion and preventing full employment. We urge Congress without delay to extend the Price Control Act for an additional year.

The most serious inflationary threat is in housing. Rent control must be held while the housing shortage continues—at least another year—and extended to new areas, such as college towns, where necessary to protect veterans. With regulation L–41 gone, there is now absolutely no protection against speculation in building. We hope that a bill providing for legal ceilings on the sale price of old and new houses will be enacted before the spring building season.

Though housing is central, inflation must be fought on all fronts. We, therefore, call upon Congress to hold food subsidies until they are no longer necessary to prevent increases in food prices; to maintain the authority to allocate scarce materials by renewing the Second War Powers Act; to support OPA's price policy by means of which, under Congressional direction, it has held the price line during the war, and not yield to pressures to substitute inflationary price policies for the postwar period.

STATEMENT BY RUTH CRAVEN, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY FOR THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CATHOLIC WOMEN

A serious inflationary spiral is now under way. Because inflation affects family welfare and stability, we urge the continuance of such price and rent controls as are necessary to prevent inflation.

We also urge the continuance of the rationing system for items in short supply so that our people at home may be equitably fed, and so that we may assist in the feeding of the starving peoples of war-torn countries.

We support legislation to extend powers of allocating scarce materials in order to insure orderly reconversion.

STATEMENT OF DR. RICHARD MORFORD, ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED CHRISTIAN COUNCIL FOR DEMOCRACY

This council is one of six associations for social betterment within the churches of the country. In January 1944 the council began a series of leaflets entitled "The Six Battles for Peace," which corresponded to the title of the "Six Pillars for Peace," put out by the Federal Council of Churches. In January 1944 the first in that series of six pamphlets for peace was published entitled "Stop Inflation." One hundred thousand of those leaflets went into the hands of church people.

UCC has followed with legislative steps toward curbing inflation and supporting price control. This afternoon renews the contact for further work against inflation. The UCC takes the lead in accepting responsibility in protecting the consumer. Churchmen over the country are coming more and more to appreciate the total welfare and must concern themselves with the proper kind of balance between profits to business and industry, the wages paid to workmen, the prices paid for goods manufactured, and public purchasing power in order to buy the goods of the industry. UCC endeavors to work to this end, and is here today to work with the legislators on behalf of the people in support of price control.

STATEMENT OF HELEN HALL FOR THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF SETTLEMENTS

Men and women in industrial neighborhoods come to settlement houses in 63 cities and 23 States. Settlement leaders from many parts of the country, meeting last week-end at Niagara Falls, reported the change this winter was bringing their neighbors deep fear of both unemployment and inflation. They have just seen the cost of butter go up 6 cents with the removal of the butter subsidies. They have seen already the buying up of small homes by real estate people, so to sell at inflationary prices. They are wondering where their sons are going to live, and whether ceilings on building materials will hold down the cost of the necessary new homes. They are wondering whether their representatives in Congress will see that a law is passed putting a ceiling on the sale price of new and old houses. Whether the OPA will be able to keep its rent ceilings.

In other words, they are wondering whether real-estate interests are stronger than the interests of the soldiers who are just coming home.

Those of them who are consumer-wise, feel that the OPA has probably lost its fight to protect them in their need for low-cost clothing. The others just see their money go for shoddy, expensive clothing and know they aren't getting the low-cost clothes that have been promised so often.

There is much confusion among working people and the newly returned veterans and their families, but it is beginning to crystallize into a feeling that while they seem to have won a war in Europe and the Pacific, they are certainly losing one in Washington. The full employment bill is held in committee. The unemployment-insurance bill is held in committee. The Wagner health bill is held in committee. The Wagner-Ellender housing bill has had no hearing yet. There is no bill as yet to protect the ceiling on new and old houses. Subsidies are being removed with an inevitable rise in food costs. Unemployment is increasing and pay envelopes are thinner. Families are doubling up to make room for the soldier son and his new wife. This is the way it looks to the people in hundreds of industrial neighborhoods in the United States and it does not seem to add up to what they fought for.

STATEMENT OF MRS. LEONA RULLER ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN

At the recent meeting of our national board, our members expressed themselves in the strongest possible terms in favor of the continuation of price control during the present critical period. In a formal statement to the press we declared, "Unless there is continuation of a strong price control program under the authority of the Office of Price Administration, it is inevitable that inflation of the wildest kind will result. We feel that the whole social and economic order in the United States is being threatened. We therefore urge that the OPA be continued until such time when an orderly reconversion and reemployment process has occurred and the supply and demand of food, housing, and commodities have moved toward a normal balance."

In order to continue an effective price control program, we believe that the following specific measures are necessary:

1. Consumer subsidies must be maintained for goods in which the supply is still too short to meet the demand and in which, if subsidies were removed too soon, price increases would result.

2. We most urgently support the continuation of rent control for the present. Besides contributing to the general danger of inflation, any relaxation of rent control would penalize our returning veterans who are now seeking to reestablish their homes. We are determined that these men must be protected.

3. We support the OPA in its request for the authority to fix prices on all residential real estate. This would include both old and new homes and building lots. We are particularly eager to see price ceilings established on the sale of homes.

4. We support the OPA's insistence that distributors absorb increased costs where such absorption does not impair prewar levels of profit. To pass increased manufacturing costs on to the consumer would, in our opinion, wreck our whole price control structure.

5. And, finally, we are concerned about the expiration on December 31, 1945, of the Second War Powers Act. For it is under that act that the President is empowered to set controls over allocations, rationing, and production. We respectfully urge that, in the renewal of the act, no crippling amendments be attached which would limit the authority to exercise the necessary controls as long as they are so urgently needed.

STATEMENT OF MRS. HERMAN H. LOEW ON BEHALF OF THE WOMEN'S AUXILIARIES OF LABOR (AFL)

We are unalterably opposed to inflation that will cause increases in the cost of living and housing. We believe price controls should be extended to such time as both rent and prices have reached a normal level.

STATEMENT OF MPS. FAYE STEPHENSON, PRESIDENT, CONGRESS OF WOMEN'S AUXILIARIES OF THE CIO

Women in workers families are deeply disturbed by the present drive on price control. They are trying to feed and clothe their families on wages that have been cut from 25 to 50 percent and even more. They are having a very hard time now, using up what savings they have, rapidly going into debt. Any further increase in prices would be disastrous.

We feel that maintenance and strengthening of price controls are especially important to protect our veterans and their families. We do not want our boys to come back to find their families starving on their allotments. We do not want them to find that their civilian pay will not buy the essentials of life for their families.

The greatest immediate threat to our price control program is the complete lack of controls on housing since the lifting of WPB Order L-41. Lifting of that order has resulted in the development of a real-estate boom. Such a boom is bound to bring greatly increased pressure for higher rent ceilings. Any such development would be a major disaster to the great mass of Americans and especially to our veterans.

We urge you to work for maintenance and strengthening of price controls, to vote against any new limitations on the powers of OPA and to give all-out support to legislation to curb the real-estate boom and put ceiling prices on houses.

STATEMENT OF RUSSELL SMITH, LEGISLATIVE SECRETARY, NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

The National Farmers Union strongly believes that the Price Control Act should be extended for another year. Farmers now are in a particularly vulnerable position. They face the prospect of postwar deflation in the not too distant future, so far as farm prices are concerned. If this deflation is accompanied by rising costs of things they must buy, farmers will suffer more, proportionately, than any other economic group.

The immediate future presents no great problem for farmers. If the removal of food subsidies is accomplished smoothly and effectively, then prices of farm products will remain high for approximately another year because of the still strong foreign and domestic demand. At the end of that time, however, barring strong Government action to the contrary, prices of farm products will decline, probably to the approximate level of the support prices guaranteed under the Steagall amendment.

If this decline is accompanied by some form of production control to reduce volume of farm production—which the Farmers Union opposes—and this decline in production is accompanied by rising living costs of farmers as consumers, then they will be caught in a serious squeeze. Even if production volume is sought, through Government action, at about war levels, there is a strong probability that the cycle of good growing years will end within the next 2 or 3 years and that some decline in volume of production will occur regardless of man-made programs.

For the protection of agriculture, therefore, we strongly favor the retention of price controls and the continuance of rationing for as long a time as necessary to insure the smoothest possible transition to full peacetime conditions.

STATEMENT OF MRS. ELEANOR AARON FOR THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN SHOPPERS

These are the days of gravest danger to our economic stability.

The League of Women Shoppers wants especially to point up the critical problem the country faces in housing. During the absence of husbands overseas many families were forced to double up for economic reasons. With the return of thousands of servicemen to civilian life their families need to find homes of their own. Many thousands of servicemen have recently married and are creating an additional market for homes.

These demands for homes cannot be satisfied for a long time. Meanwhile, sale prices of homes are spiraling far beyond the ability to pay of returning servicemen. This is due to the failure to establish ceiling prices on the sale and resale of houses before the shortage became so acute. However, it is still not too late and we strongly urge Congress to enact legislation which will put an end to these skyrocketing prices.

Mr. Bowles has testified before the Senate Small Business Committee that in his opinion the steadily rising prices of homes present the most critical inflationary danger American families and the building industry face today. The need for price ceilings on homes is as great as was the need for price controls at the beginning of the war.

STATEMENT OF NATIONAL COUNCIL OF NEGRO WOMEN

The National Council of Negro Women, representing millions of Negro women in this country, wishes to join in the fight for strong policies to prevent inflation in the reconversion period. So far America has established an enviable record of inflation control, but now that the war is over some people feel that we should relax and return to business as usual. The facts show, however, that we still face a dangerous inflationary period, and the real test of price control is under way now.

The National Council of Negro Women supports the Office of Price Administration in its effort to resist certain inflationary pressures.

We call upon Congress to use its authority to implement strong, anti-inflation policies during this crucial period. Specifically, we believe in and support the following measures.

1. The renewal of the Second War Powers Act which will expire on December 31, 1945. We urge that in the repassage of this act there be no crippling amendments attached which would limit controls over allocations, rationing, and production.

2. We urge the maintenance of consumer subsidies for those commodities in which supplies remain short, in order to avoid price increases resulting from premature removal.

3. We strongly support the maintenance of a tight rent control, and the granting of powers to the Office of Price Administration to fix prices on residential real estate, including both old and new homes and building lots.

4. We also support the policy adopted by the Office of Price Administration of insisting that distributors absorb increased costs where such absorption would not impair prewar levels of profit.

Alien Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from our Secretary of State,

Hon. James F. Byrnes, with reference to alien property:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 20, 1945.

The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is with reference to your letter of November 1, 1945, advising me that you are one of those who believes that the Germans and Japanese should not get back the property which the Alien Property Custodian has vested during this war as the Germans did get back some of the property the Custodian seized during and after the First World War. You wish to be advised whether or not any State Department agreements or agreements of any other department are being considered whereby Germans and Japanese may regain some of the property which has been vested by the Alien Property Custodian.

The Department has supported the policy which is embodied in House Joint Resolution 178, introduced by you in this Congress, that assets of Germany and Japan in this country should be used by the United States for its purposes in connection with claims arising from the war. Your attention is called to Executive Order 9567 dated June 8, 1945, which authorized the Alien Property Custodian to vest all assets, including cash and securities, of nationals of Germany and Japan. There was thus transferred to the Alien Property Custodian authority to vest certain properties which had previously been merely frozen under the controls administered by the Treasury. This Department has supported the policy embodied in this Executive order and the policy of liquidation of such assets by the Alien Property Custodian at the earliest possible date, considering, of course, the best interests of this country in the formulation of his policy of liquidation.

The Department has also, in the same connection, approved the statement of the Alien Property Custodian to the subcommittee on War Mobilization of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs in which under date of June 28, 1945, the Custodian indicated that his agency and the Treasury Department were agreed that recommendations by these agencies with respect to plans for the ultimate disposition of the funds realized from vested German and Japanese property should make no provision for any return or compensation, direct or indirect, by the United States to the former owners. Under this recommendation, the net proceeds of such property would be available for claims which this Government has against Germany and Japan or for any other purpose that Congress may determine.

The Department is now preparing further detailed comments with respect to House Joint Resolution 178 in response to the request of the chairman of the committee to which this proposed resolution has been referred.

I appreciate your interest concerning the disposition of enemy assets in the United States and if I may be of any further assistance to you in this matter please advise me.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BYRNES.

Must Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the administration and its congressional leaders seem determined to push through Congress certain spending measures which, if the past is any criterion of what may happen in the future, will be used to swing the national election in 1946 through the distribution of Federal funds in congested city areas.

The Supreme Court's strained construction of an antiracketeering statute still permits its allies to levy tribute upon every citizen who purchases the necessities of life.

A specific instance is referred to by Westbrook Pegler in his today's piece. There is nothing new about it, and within 4 days after the Supreme Court of the United States in January of 1942 handed down its decision legalizing such racketeering I introduced a bill to correct the claimed defect in the antiracketeering statute. Around a year later the House passed the so-called Hobbs bill, which was designed to accomplish the same purpose. It went over to the Senate, and there it still lies buried.

Yes; the administration and the congressional leaders of the Democratic Party insist upon new legislation which will enable them to spend public funds for political purposes, but they cannot find time to protect the peaceful citizen seeking to use the highways in the transportation of food, clothing, and other necessary merchandise from the demands of their political supporters.

Pegler's piece reads as follows:

FAIR ENOUGH
(By Westbrook Pegler)

When the citizen reads that the National Government under President Roosevelt delivered him into the power of gangsters, thieves, sluggers, and racketeers, operating under union charters, he may think that that is an exaggerated statement.

However, this is literally true and the Department of Justice did consult the wishes of Joseph Padway, a lawyer and counselor and friend of some of the most loathesome underworld criminals of our time, in modifying the language of the Antiracketeering Act. This modification made it possible for union gangsters to continue to prey on the public and it still protects them.

Padway is the general counsel of the American Federation of Labor. He is loudmouthed and pushful and has long purported to be a spokesman for American labor when the fact is that he holds no credentials at all from labor and is merely a lawyer with a rich practice specializing in union law. He represents various unions, as distinguished from American labor, only in the role of counsel acting for his fee. For a long time he got away with a role of spokesman for American labor and statesmen were afraid to cross him. However, publicity has shown him up so that if today he should start bellowing demands and threats to committees of legislative bodies a sergeant at arms or exasperated lawmaker should not hesitate to treat him as they would any obstreperous persons.

Padway was general counsel for the dirty Bioff-Browne underworld gang in the movie industry and did some legal work for George Scalise, of the Building Service Workers Union racket, who, like Willie Bioff, began his career as a bargaining agent by sharing in the wages of prostitution. At least he says he did some legal work to justify a fee of $1,000 from Scalise. Both of these rackets were operations of the Capone gang.

In those early days, and before the facts of his practice and clientele were known, Padway could walk in on the Attorney General of the United States and lay down demands in the name of labor.

In the particular case referred to here, the flaw in the Anti-Racketeering Act is still preserved, enabling gangsters of the teamsters union to practice highway robbery against the owners of trucks freighting food and other consumer goods across State lines. That this privilege obviously increases the cost of living to those citizens who must eventually pay the amounts thus extorted goes without argument.

This was the celebrated teamsters case in which local 807 of the teamsters and 26 individuals were convicted of shaking down the owners of trucks entering New York from the south by way of New Jersey. They charged $8.41 to let a small truck enter the tunnel and $9.42 for free passage for a big truck.

A number of the individual defendants were ordinary police characters with FBI records, and weren't even eligible for drivers' licenses, and therefore couldn't have been hired.

On the appeal to the Supreme Court, Justice James Byrnes, now our Secretary of State, wrote the majority opinion, affirming the Court of Appeals which had reversed the District Court.

He admitted that the gangsters did use violence to obtain the money and, in some cases, refused to perform even the nominal work which was the pretext for the holdup, namely, driving or merely riding the trucks under the river.

Justice Byrnes held that the law against racketeering in interstate commerce excepted any person who attempted to obtain wages from a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee. This was the exception which was inserted in the law before its final passage by Congress, at the demand of Padway and William Green, president of the AFL. Congress gave way, never imagining that, in a few years, the Court would hold that this language, offered as an honest and legitimate protection to labor, gave immunity to criminals who got the money by violence and threats and then refused to do any work.

Chief Justice Stone, for the minority, wrote that when Congress was considering the act no member "and no labor leader had the temerity to suggest that such payments, made only to secure immunity from violence, could be regarded as the payment of wages." And he added that the compulsion of such payment never was made a legitimate object of any union by any statute.

Padway remains general counsel of the teamsters union. Many of its locals are mere fronts for racketeers but nevertheless, as recently as the start of his fourth-term campaign, Roosevelt selected the arrogant bosses of the union as the primary audience for his first big speech.

Padway tried to disown his old friend Scalise, after these dispatches revealed Scalise's criminal record and Tom Dewey uncovered the racketeering of the Capone gang in the guise of the Building Service Workers' Union.

But finally, he was confronted with a letter that he had written to Scalise, promising to intercede for him with the Attorney General in Washington and closing with the pledge "you can certainly count on me to help you in every way possible, and I will consider it a privilege."

Since then Padway has been less noisy. Legislative committees and Government officials are onto him and other lawyers specializing in union law are grabbing big fees from the faceless people who have to belong or starve.

Nevertheless, the law stands today as Mr. Byrnes interpreted it. And the citizen, including the worker and union members as well, thus remains in the power of gangsters, thieves, sluggers, and racketeers.

Because, having planned it that way, the Roosevelt government passed the word to some henchmen in the Senate who quietly killed a bill passed by the House which would have revoked this special privilege of Padway's client, the teamsters' union.

Postal Service During War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. BURCH
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important problems confronting the Army when it was getting ready to wage a world-wide war was to provide postal service for our millions of men in uniform. That was a huge task, but the manner in which the Army organized a global postal system almost overnight is a story of a job well done.

Several days ago I had the pleasure of attending a dinner, along with some of my colleagues on the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, that featured the theme, postal service in war. Present at this affair were a large number of Post Office Department officials as well as the top officers of the Army postal service.

Lt. Col. Burris C. Jackson, who represents the War Department in the conduct of business with the Post Office Department, acted as master of ceremonies, and gave to those present a brief report of the far-flung operations of postal service in war with special emphasis on the team work that existed between our civilian postal establishment and the armed forces.

Col. C. C. Garner, acting director of the Army postal service, and a well-known post-office inspector in civil life, told of some of the problems of organizing a competent personnel and the troubles of transportation.

Jesse M. Donaldson, First Assistant Postmaster General, who was designated as the honored guest of the occasion, gave a brief outline of how the Post Office Department aided the Army in setting up a postal branch, and how the Army had later on erected buildings and furnished manpower to the Department in order that the tremendous volume of mail could be handled.

I was privileged to speak for the committee of the House which I have the honor of heading, and to stress the role that Congress played in this important undertaking by passing the necessary legislation.

The speakers, together with specially prepared charts, told a most interesting story concerning the postal service during war, and I am herewith inserting in the RECORD some information and data that was presented:

HIGH LIGHTS OF THE ARMY POSTAL SERVICE

1. Perhaps the greatest single morale factor during the war was mail. The tremendous task of supplying a rapid mail service to and from soldiers overseas was undertaken by the Army postal service, established under The Adjutant General in 1942. Literally starting from scratch the Army postal service grew rapidly to a world-wide organization which handled millions of letters and millions of dollars each month; provided the same postal service to which Americans are used to, to our fighting forces in practically every country in the world. The magnitude of the Army postal service is reflected in the following data:

(a) Army post offices overseas sold during the war more than $1,500,000,000 worth of money orders. This was an average of $55,000,000 each month and in terms of soldiers represent a $10 money-order purchase each month by every soldier overseas. More than $100,000,000 worth of postage stamps and stamped envelopes were sold, averaging $4,000,000 monthly or approximately 75 cents a soldier.

(b) At the end of the war there were 800 APO's providing normal postal service to soldiers in 55 foreign countries. At each one of these soldiers were able to obtain exactly the same services available at post offices located in the cities, towns, and hamlets in the United States.

(c) More mail was dispatched overseas during the war than in any period in the history of this country. From 22,000,000 pieces in July 1942 the volume rose steadily to more than 266,000,000 pieces in March 1945. This was equivalent to more than 50 pieces of mail a month for each soldier overseas. This mail was delivered with speed unheard of before the war notwithstanding the hazards encountered, such as enemy submarines, bombings, and the shortage of cargo space needed for vital war materials. For example, the average time of delivery for air mail under normal conditions is shown to certain typical areas where United States forces were stationed:

	Days
New Guinea	9
Philippines	8
France	8
Germany	9
Italy	8
Egypt	7
China	12
India-Burma	10
Aleutian Islands	6

(d) In July 1942 only 22 percent of letter mail was transported overseas by air, whereas by March 1945 the percentage had risen to the remarkable figure of 87 percent.

(e) During the 1944 Christmas mailing period, when the forces overseas were at their peak, the Army postal service successfully transported and delivered by Christmas more than 60,000,000 gift packages, an average of 13 parcels for each soldier overseas.

(f) When the Army postal service took over the courier service in May 1942, which was designed to provide a speedy and safe means of delivering highly classified official matter, there were 2 international routes of less than 17,000 miles, only 5 stations and 14 officer couriers. Seven hundred and thirty-seven pounds of classified material were handled that month. By June 1945, there were 7 international routes covering more than 92,000 miles and 319 officer couriers were handling more than 3,000 pounds of material each month.

(g) V-mail service was instituted in June 1942 with nine stations located in the United States and overseas. In December of that year approximately 5,000,000 letters in microfilmed form were sent to and from overseas. The system rapidly grew to a world-wide network of stations which prior to discontinuance on November 1, 1945, had microfilmed more than 1,250,000,000 letters, and which at its peak transported in 1 month more than 60,000,000 letters in microfilmed form to and from overseas. During its entire period an average of 16,000,000 V-mail letters a month were sent to our fighting forces. V-mail contributed greatly to the war effort. It released vital cargo space on planes and vessels and permitted the expeditious movement of regular mail, essential personnel, munitions and other critical supplies vitally necessary to the successful prosecution of the war.

(h) The Army postal service, in addition to handling of mail for the armed forces abroad, had charge of the personal radio and cable services. It was possible to send an EFM (fixed text) cable overseas for approximately 60 cents. These consisted of fixed texts of which there were more than 260 from which the sender could choose. In addition, regular cable service for transmission of messages of the sender's composition at the commercial rate was also provided. In 1942 the average monthly volume was 158,000 incoming EFM messages and 74,000 outgoing messages. This service became so popular that these figures rose to a monthly average of 314,000 incoming EFM messages and 85,000 outgoing messages.

(i) As a result of legislation providing for absentee voting by Army personnel in this country and overseas, the Army postal service in conjunction with the Post Office Department developed a world-wide plan whereby all ballots and ballot material between the soldiers and the various States were included in bags conspicuously marked to assure top priority in transit and promptly handled at mailing and delivery points. Such ballots and ballot material were contained in distinctively marked envelopes and covers and were given precedence in handling and transmission in Army postal service channels over all classes of personal mail, with the result that the program was completed successfully without criticism from any source.

Congress Should Act To Speed Up Demobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the records prove the military authorities are inconsistent in handling the demobilization program and are not fully utilizing the equipment we have available. They tell us we have no ships to bring the boys home. Where are the $22,000,000,000 worth of ships built for war? We had plenty of ships to take them over—why can't we have the same number to bring them back?

On October 9, 1945, I made a speech on the floor of this House, and I quote the last paragraph of that speech—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Tuesday, October 9, 1945, page 9501:

Mr. Speaker, we must bring these boys and girls home so they can be with their families, finish their education, and again get started in civilian life. It is time for Congress to once again become a truly legislative body governed only by the people as a whole and not by one group or a few individuals.

Mr. Speaker, that Congress might have that opportunity, I introduced H. R. 4498 on October 25, 1945, which reads as follows:

A bill to provide for the discharge or release from active duty of certain members of the armed forces, and restrict jurisdiction of commanding officers in declaring essentiality, and for terminal leave for enlisted personnel

Be it enacted, etc., That without delay any person upon request shall be discharged from, or released from active duty in, the military or naval forces of the United States and who—

(1) has served on active duty 12 months or more since September 16, 1940; or

(2) has, at the time of making such request, a wife or a child or children with whom

he maintains (or would but for his service maintain) a bona fide family relationship in his home; or

(3) has, at the time of making such request, a mother or father dependent upon him for chief support; or

(4) desires to resume his education or training by enrolling in an educational or training institution, if his education or training was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with by reason of his entrance into the service. Any such person who was not over 25 years of age at the time he entered the service shall be deemed to have had his education or training impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with; or

(5) has, at the time of making such request, a status of being essential to the operation of a farm; or

(6) has the desire and requests to be returned to his business or profession, which he was forced to discontinue or place in other hands at the time of his induction or enlistment into the military service.

SEC. 2. It shall not be within the jurisdiction of any commanding officer to declare anyone in the military or naval forces essential who meets the requirements in section 1 of this act.

SEC. 3. All enlisted personnel and noncommissioned officers shall be granted the same terminal leave which is now allowed to commissioned officers.

Mr. Speaker, there has been some talk of a recess of Congress within a few days. I will oppose such recess, as I strongly feel and urge that we should act on the demobilization program. I request the passage of H. R. 4498, which I have introduced. I am satisfied if the leadership of the House will permit a vote on this bill it will be approved by a large majority.

Dedication of Albert J. Carter, Jr., Square

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an address delivered by me at the dedication of a square at the intersection of Andover and Newton Streets, Lawrence, Mass., on November 12, 1945, in memory of Sgt. Albert J. Carter, Jr., who made the supreme sacrifice on November 21, 1944, in France while serving with Company K, Twenty-sixth Division in the One Hundred and First Infantry. Sgt. Albert J. Carter disregarded his own personal safety and went forth under enemy fire to the rescue of three of his wounded comrades by risking his own life. Sergeant Carter helped to save the lives of three of his comrades. For heroic service beyond the call of duty, he merited the Bronze Star Medal, but he did not live to receive his country's award.

We have come here to honor the memory of one of our finest citizens. He was not an educator, a clergyman, an industrialist, a public official, a labor leader, he was much more than all of these combined. Out of the tens of thousands who have come and gone since the birth of our city, few are remembered, because so few have given to the welfare of the community in a way that commands our undying respect. Albert J. Carter, Jr., is one of the precious few.

He gave all that we might live. In that giving of the fullness of his youth, with all its eager hopes and dreams, he has put before us an example that humbles and shames us. In the secrecy of our hearts we know how little we have given, how much remains for us to give in mind and spirit and devotion to humanity, so that we may win a world of peace and security and progress for all.

In the confusion of life we are apt to forget our goal. Knowing this, we gather here today to dedicate this square to Albert J. Carter, Jr., to the memory of his courage, his sincerity, his sacrifice. He was the great citizen, which each of us might become.

Lest we forget, we meet to dedicate this square in his honor. In the days to come, passing here, we shall be reminded of him and of the duties we owe to our community and our Nation. School children, seeing his name and the star which symbolizes his sacrifice, will stop and wonder and ask, "Who was Albert J. Carter, Jr.?" And we shall take them aside and tell them this.

Like you, he was born here, in South Lawrence. He went to the same schools as you do. He played the same games. He grew up, wanting the same chance in life which would be lived here in the valley of the Merrimack. The outside world seemed very far away. But it wasn't as far away as most of us thought. Great inventions, like the radio and the airplane, came along and boundary lines couldn't stop them. Even the oceans were no longer a protection between our Nation and other nations. Evil men were the first to see how these great gifts might be used, not to help people but to enslave them. And they used the radio to spread falsehoods and fear, to divide and weaken people. Great fleets of airplanes were assembled and they dropped bombs on the peace-loving nations who were unprepared. These evil men won victory after victory and the world was in darkness for it seemed that they could not be stopped and soon all men would be slaves, as they were many centuries ago. Then these evil men struck at our Nation, at the very moment when they talked soft words of peace. And our country was in danger because we were not ready to meet this attack. We suffered defeat after defeat while we tried desperately to arm ourselves. The Nation called on its young men for help. Albert J. Carter, Jr., was one of the first to respond.

Here, in Lawrence, it was hard to realize that a deadly war was going on many miles away, a war which threatened the freedoms of every man, woman, and child in Lawrence; a war which would demand all of our strength before it could be won. For the skies over Lawrence were clear, the people walked the streets erect and without fear, there was food and clothing for all, and no secret police hammered on our doors in the middle of the night to take away someone whom we would never see or hear from again. Children played in the streets as they always have in peace-loving America where we have never seen our cities destroyed or our citizens killed. We had no idea how much a small bomb, dropped from the sky, could destroy.

Albert J. Carter might have said: "This is no concern of mine. I want to live my own life." Or he might have said: "Why should I go when so many others stay at home?" He might have, as any other young man might have, but he didn't. Though he stood on the threshold of life, in the prime of his youth and with all the promise of life before him, he knew in this fateful period, that there were other things of greater importance. His family, his friends, his neighbors, his city, and his Nation. They were in danger and someone must save them.

As Americans, we have enjoyed more liberty of action than any other people on earth. It is doubly difficult for us to give up the free ways of peace for the regimentation of war. But thanks to our homes, our churches, and our schools, there is deep down within us, a recognition that freedom has responsibilities as well as rights. It is this which enabled our men to adjust themselves to the grim discipline of war.

Albert J. Carter, Jr., went to military camps where men must learn how to meet force with force. He knew what was ahead of him. All the misery and pain and weariness of combat. He knew the price which would have to be paid because our Nation was asleep to the realities of this world. He knew it would have to be paid by some to save the many at home. His prayer was that we might learn and remember the lesson we so often forget that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. He knew that all the love and tenderness we profess for our children is a mockery if we allow them to grow up in a world which demands this bloody tribute from them. For we are to blame if, by our indifference, we ever permit aggressors to catch us napping again.

In 1940 and 1941 it was too late to repent of our carelessness during the 1920's and the 1930's. Our backs were to the wall and the only question was that of survival. And so the cream of our youth went into the caldron of war to save us from our mistakes.

Albert J. Carter, Jr., was one of those who went to Europe to fight our battle there, before the enemy could fight it here. He went to save the homes and factories of Lawrence from destruction; to save our women and children from the death and mutilation, the hunger and fear and disease which follow in the wake of war from the air.

Our men carried the battle to the enemy. They stormed the beaches of Normandy and after bitter fighting, broke through the enemy's fortifications. They pushed him back across the rolling hills of France. But each day, the casualty lists told us the price we were paying for our victories. They could not tell the full story of this ordeal, of the terrible fears which men had to overcome, of the burning heat and the bitter cold and the hollow-eyed sleeplessness and the ear-splitting noises, of the rain of death in the air, and the cries of the wounded.

They do not tell the story of unsung heroism, of the great unselfishness that made men brothers, of the dark night when Sergeant Carter, disregarding his personal safety, went forth under enemy fire to come to the rescue of three wounded comrades. For here, in the throes of man's bitter tragedy, great qualities were born. As if the human soul stood up against this horror and said: "Though all the destructive power of evil is here, so is the individual man, standing up to it with a courage that can never be destroyed and tempering that courage with the gentle quality of mercy. War is huge and terrifying but the unconquerable spirit in the individual man can rise above this. In time it will, with God's help, eliminate war itself. For these qualities in man are the hope of a weary world."

By risking his own life, Sergeant Carter helped to save the lives of three of his comrades. For heroic service beyond the call of duty, he merited the Bronze Star Medal, but he did not live to receive his country's award. On November 21, 1944, 26 years after the war to end all wars was terminated on Armistice Day, Sergeant Carter was killed in action. Mercy and courage and self-sacrifice, these he laid on the altar of his country's freedom. These, we reverence today. He is gone, but in spirit he is still with us, reminding us of the duties which we, the living, must fulfill. Through us and what we must do to be worthy of him, he still lives. If we fail, we fail him, and we fail the children who look to us for leadership.

So on this day let us make a solemn compact with the spirit of our honored dead. Let each of us work and pray and think and feel, in every way we know how, to achieve a realistic and permanent peace among the nations of the world. In a democracy like ours, this responsibility is ours. In this we must not, cannot fail. This and this alone can justify the sacrifice which Sergeant Carter made for us.

To the Lawrence Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars, in charge of this dedication, we extend our thanks. They are performing a civic duty in keeping ever before our eyes the memory of our heroic dead that we may be inspired, by their example, to live up to the ideals of our American citizenship, in peace as well as war.

To the members of the Sacred Heart and LaSalle Clubs, of which the deceased was a member, we say: "Yours is a just and honorable pride, for you have been associated with one who lived and died in the highest tradition of American manhood."

The friends and relatives and neighbors have memories of his boyhood and his youth. These will never die. At unexpected moments, through the years, they will come to the mind, so vivid in sight and sound and movement, as to warm the heart. And it will seem that he has never really gone from us.

To his father, who also shares in the perpetual honor which the name Albert J. Carter, Jr., brings to this square, we speak the humble gratitude of our community. For it is the home which molds the child into manhood. And it is from such homes as these that the men and women were developed who went forth to save America. In honoring the hero, we honor the parents. They, like he, have served their country with unselfish devotion.

The Lawrence City Council has decreed that this square, at the intersection of Andover and Newton Streets, shall forevermore be known as the Albert J. Carter, Jr. Square in tribute to one who, far from home, brought credit to himself, his family, and his community. Today we dedicate this square to his memory and enshrine him in our hearts.

As the requiem notes of the bugle echo in the wind, we bow our heads in prayer. "Well done, thou good and faithful servant. You have earned a hero's rest. May we, your fellow Americans, be worthy of your immortal sacrifice."

Requested Termination of United States Ambassadorship to the Vatican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MALCOLM C. TARVER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

The following resolution was offered by Dr. Louie D. Newton, pastor of the Druid Hills Baptist Church, Atlanta:

"Whereas the statement appearing in Newsweek, October 29, that the President may soon be requested by Myron C. Taylor to relieve him as the President's representative at the Vatican would seem to indicate that our Government is expected to continue its Embassy at the Vatican, without approval of the Senate; and

"Whereas the only justification President Roosevelt ever offered for his appointment of Mr. Taylor was an emergency measure in connection with the war; and

"Whereas the war is now ended; and

"Whereas we consider the appointment of Mr. Taylor, even as a war measure, a direct violation of the Constitution of the United States (see the first amendment to the Constitution): Therefore be it

"Resolved by the messengers from the 2,511 churches of the one hundred and twenty-fourth annual session of the Georgia Baptist Convention, meeting at Macon, Ga., this November 13, 1945, with a total membership of 566,231 persons, That we do most earnestly and respectfully petition President Harry S. Truman to immediately terminate the appointment of Mr. Taylor, and call home the steadily increasing staff of the United States Embassy at the Vatican. We believe that such action on the part of the President will meet with widespread approval and relieve our Nation from a growing discontent with a situation which complicates our foreign relations and endangers the cherished principle of complete separation of church and State—the acknowledged guaranty of religious freedom; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, signed by the officers of the convention, be forwarded immediately to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, and to the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives from Georgia."

J. C. WILKINSON, *President.*
JAS. L. CLEGG, *Secretary.*

NOVEMBER 13, 1945.

San Francisco's Postwar Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to direct the attention of the Congress to the forthright, intelligent manner in which my city of San Francisco is dealing with the problems of postwar reconversion. Under the leadership of the San Francisco Chronicle, one of the oldest and most influential daily newspapers in California, a community forum has been organized to study the postwar needs of northern California and to recommend a program of community action designed to solve the problems of peace in that great area of western America. Leaders of industry, labor, government, and civic activities participated in this forum, and joined together in many days of shirt-sleeve working sessions to formulate their recommendations for a peacetime program.

When the program was completed it was presented to a great mass meeting of citizens in San Francisco Civic Auditorium, and the proposals for postwar progress were voted upon, item by item, by secret ballot by all of the thousands of people who attended the mass meeting.

Subsequently the community program was reprinted daily in the Chronicle in a number of successive issues, and all citizens of northern California who were not able to attend the mass meeting were invited to express their opinions by filling in printed ballots and sending them to the Chronicle.

The result has been an overwhelming expression of popular approval of the Chronicle's Community Forum program.

Among those who participated in the preparation of the program were Dr. Henry F. Grady, president of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce and former United States Assistant Secretary of State, George T. Cameron, publisher of the Chronicle; Harry Bridges, California CIO director; State Senator John F. Shelley; president of the San Francisco American Federation of Labor Council, Harold J. Boyd; controller of the city and county of San Francisco, Ray B. Wiser; president of the California Farm Bureau Federation, Robert W. Kenny; attorney general of California, Bartley C. Crum; attorney at law and formerly western director of the campaign of Wendell Willkie for President, Francis V. Keesling; president of the West Coast Life Insurance Co., Adrian J. Falk; former president of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce and prominent business executive, Wendell Phillips; AFL labor council official, Paul Heide, and Mervyn Rathborner, CIO leaders, and many other representative citizens.

For many decades the San Francisco Chronicle has been recognized as the leading organ of the Republican Party in northern California.

The following is a summary of the recommendations made by the panels of the Chronicle Community Forum, and approved by popular vote of northern California citizens:

PANEL NO. 1. MANAGEMENT-LABOR RELATIONS, INCLUDING AGRICULTURE

1. Community labor-management councils should be established to develop better industrial relations.

2. Legislation should be enacted guaranteeing the right of workers engaged in intrastate commerce to organize and bargain collectively.

3. Use of arbitration, mediation, and conciliation to settle industrial disputes should be expanded.

4. All union contracts should provide for settlement of questions by final and binding arbitration.

5. The standard of living can only be improved by over-all increased productivity; therefore this factor should be considered in all bargaining and arbitration on wage issues.

6. The Federal Government should extend arbitration facilities to those mutually agreeing to use them without cost.

7. Labor-management groups should give further study to the machinery and techniques of arbitration.

8. Any law which would make arbitration compulsory is unanimously opposed.

9. In order to give good, permanent jobs to veterans, the objectives of full employment, should be supported.

PANEL NO. 2. URBAN-RURAL RELATIONS, INCLUDING SUCH PROBLEMS AS BAY AREA, NORTHERN CALIFORNIA, STATE AND WESTERN REGIONAL UNITY

1. Full employment at relatively high wages is necessary in order to create a market for California's farm products.

2. Communication, transportation, marketing, hydroelectric development, and other economic problems can be solved only by a regional-wide approach to State and local trade barriers.

3. San Francisco should immediately plan better facilities for the distribution of fruits and vegetables, including an up-to-date wholesale produce market and a direct farmer's market.

4. Social security should be extended to agricultural workers.

5. Farmers should diversify operations to put farm labor on a year-round employment basis.

6. Rural housing should be developed by private enterprise wherever possible, but Government housing agencies should be available to fill any gaps.

7. The city press should print more news about agriculture, mining, forestry, and fishing.

8. The minimum wage law should be increased by upward of 50 percent.

9. Price-support measures during the postwar readjustment period should be extended to all farm products.

10. Farmers should pool their employment needs to stabilize the labor living in their communities.

11. War-housing facilities should be moved to farm localities where needed and where practical.

12. The State department of education should extend curricula to include basic information on urban-rural problems and relationships.

13. There should be a free exchange of information and opinion on urban-rural relationships, including a regular column service for the press.

14. Consideration should be given by the legislature to improving rural roads.

15. City residents should join with the rural in a program of preservation of California's natural resources.

16. There is need for the development of new industries that can be carried on in or close to the agricultural areas.

17. Urban and rural communities should exchange speakers in other's organization meetings.

18. A world trade center for San Francisco should be supported, with farmer, labor, and business representatives on the governing board. The center should include an expanded livestock pavilion.

19. All groups—agriculture, labor, business—should recognize their obligation to consider the effect of their acts on the others' welfare.

20. The Chronicle Forum should be continued next year, with conferences to be held in the interim.

PANEL NO. 3. GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS WITH INDUSTRY AND LABOR, INCLUDING THE ROLE GOVERNMENT SHOULD PLAY IN MEETING POSTWAR PROBLEMS

1. Governmental agencies should act to whatever extent is necessary to assure equality of opportunity, to maintain economic stability and to stimulate the continuing improvement of our standard of living.

2. Rationing, control of prices, and control of wages are essential to avoid further inflation during transition from war to peace.

3. The United States Employment Service should continue as a national agency during the transition, but there should be no control over the free migration of workers across the Nation.

4. Essential public works should be carried on regardless of the employment situation, and since private enterprise will be unable to furnish full employment during the transition period, Government should also plan public works to absorb some of the unemployed.

5. Surplus plants and property should be disposed of promptly without handicapping competitive industry.

6. Government should provide research and service, including sponsorship of loans, to put small business on an equal footing with large corporate business.

7. Social insurance should be strengthened and extended to all gainfully employed workers.

8. Old-age benefits and unemployment insurance should be revised and increased in line with the new level of wages and prices.

9. A compulsory health insurance system should be added to the present Federal-State provisions for social insurance.

10. Retirement age should be reduced from 65 to 60, with the test being whether any part-time earnings of the individual when added to his benefits, exceed the amount he would receive if employed full time.

PANEL NO. 4. PRESERVING THE DEMOCRATIC WAY OF LIFE

1. The Chronicle Forum should continue panel discussions on a month-to-month basis.

2. All Americans should stand united against native Fascists who are still among us with their "divide and conquer" efforts.

3. Federal, State, and city fair-employment practice agencies should be established as quasi-judicial, educational bodies.

4. All communities should train their police officers and other public officials in the best methods of fostering understanding and bettering relations among all citizens.

5. Methods of eliminating segregation should be given further study, since discrimination in housing creates serious community problems.

6. Cultural education and vocational training in our schools are not mutually exclusive, but are mutually necessary to our democracy.

7. Vocational training should be made available to students, to war adult apprentices in industry, and to employed adults.

8. There is a need for more adequate elementary and secondary schools in rural areas.

9. There should be improved methods for the recruitment, selection, and maintenance of school teachers on the basis of fitness for teaching without distinction as to race, sex, or creed.

10. Teaching throughout all of the school system should be unbiased and should develop attitudes of mutual understanding among all students.

11. There should be more scholarships for students of ability who need financial aid.

12. All community groups should support the use by veterans of State and Federal aids for educational purposes.

13. Public-school systems should be adapted toward solving the juvenile-delinquency problem through parental schools, close cooperation between parents and teachers, and development of child-guidance and mental-hygiene facilities.

14. Preschool day-care centers and nursery schools for the children of mothers who must work should be supported by public funds, supplemented by parents' payments.

15. The parents as well as the children should be educated in any nursery-school program.

16. Adult-education facilities should be expanded.

17. The public libraries should take a larger share in both adult and juvenile education, should receive their full share of public tax moneys, and should carry on constructive programs of general community activity.

18. In order to obtain adequate housing, and remove all blighted areas, 780,000 homes must be built in northern California.

19. Existing temporary war housing should be eliminated when it is possible to provide decent housing for the present occupants and at the prices they can afford to pay.

20. The objectives of the Wagner-Ellender bill in the United States Senate—which is intended to aid public housing programs—should be supported.

21. There is need for an extensive health educational program.

22. Hospitals in San Francisco are crowded, old, and in need of replacement.

23. San Francisco should combine many of its existing clinical and hospital facilities in a few modern structures.

24. Health insurance is needed to assure to every person of California the opportunity for comprehensive medical services of the highest standard; it is therefore necessary to establish a contributory medical insurance plan to accomplish this.

25 Community resources such as schools, parks, churches, and public areas should be put to maximum use for the recreation of the public.

26. Long-range recreational programs should be planned on a community-wide basis, in all communities.

27. It is to be deprecated that certain public officials and some private citizens have made it impossible to build a new juvenile-delinquency home in San Francisco, although bonds were approved almost a year ago. Action should be taken at once to end the intolerable conditions that now prevail.

PANEL NO. 5—WHAT PRIVATE ENTERPRISE CAN DO TO INVIGORATE AND BEAUTIFY THE REGION

1. The many existing agencies which represent the collective thinking of business—chambers of commerce, better business bureau, area councils, and so on—should be integrated.

2. A research center should be established to study markets and manufacturing opportunities, establish the bay area as a foreign trade center, and to attract risk capital.

3. Business leaders of the future should act boldly and with vision adequate to match the natural beauty and geographical advantages of the area.

4. Private enterprise should do everything possible to provide a maximum of employment with maximum wages and at the same time, whenever possible, reduce consumer prices.

5. Small business for veterans and war workers should be stimulated by councils of well-disposed businessmen in each community who will lend their experience and advice.

6. Western capital should bid for and operate the war plants at Geneva and Fontana to assure western manufacturers a constant supply of steel at prices competitive with the East.

7. A world trade center should be established in San Francisco, centralizing all consulates, railroad and steamship lines, exporters, importers, overseas trade office, and exhibit space.

8. The immediate promotion and financing of the trade center, an apparel center, and a producer center is a duty of private enterprise in this region.

9. As a minimum requirement to remove transportation bottlenecks which have retarded this area, surface streetcar lines on Market Street should be replaced by a trunk subway, there should be more automobile parking spaces, and the $20,000,000 airport bond issue should be supported and endorsed.

10. The tourist industry in California which now suffers from an antiquated Pullman system and lack of competition between carriers, should be revived.

11. The advisory committee of the Chronicle forum should be continued in existence to plan for subsequent forums.

Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an editorial from the Harrington school-news section of the Harrington Citizen,

published in the city of that name in my district.

This editorial, written by a member of the high school, shows a fine, clear grasp of the basic strength of our Nation. It follows:

EDUCATION AND FOUNDATIONS

American Education Week grew out of the First World War, first being observed in 1921. Twenty-five percent of the men examined in the draft were illiterate, and many more were foreign-born and had little understanding of American life. Today, we have almost a parallel situation. The need for public enlightenment concerning education is urgent. The United States failed to heed the lessons the last war taught concerning our human resources. America cannot afford to repeat that tragic mistake.

Education is a great power which teaches men how to control the forces of nature and changes the thoughts and actions of man himself.

Our enemies demonstrated the power of education for destruction. Hitler built his whole scheme of world conquest upon a program of education beginning with the smallest child.

On every hand people are planning for the future. Labor, industry, business, and government are all looking ahead. But our plan for the future will fail unless these people are capable of carrying them out. This is why we must provide an educational opportunity for every citizen wherever he lives—regardless of race, creed, color.

We must find and develop our best potential leadership for there is no substitute for human resources. There is no short cut in the development of men and women fit for the free world of today.

A Price Ticket on Aid to Others

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT K. HENRY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Oconomowoc Enterprise, Oconomowoc, Wis., on November 15, 1945:

A PRICE TICKET ON AID TO OTHERS

Emotions of local citizens ran the gantlet from amazement and revolt to chagrin and dismay upon the revelation in recently published articles that the CIO and AFL had received huge sums from the National War Fund (USO and allied relief agencies), the American Red Cross, and community chests in large cities to reimburse the unions for expenses in aiding the service agencies. In the case of the Red Cross the amount is revealed as $450,000 during the last 3 years.

The information which has been published reveals that the arrangement was known to only the top heads of the unions and, in the case of the Red Cross, to only the central committee and then only when one year's $200,000 payment was revealed for the first time to the committee members. Protests and a split in its ranks resulted but because of the war and damage to the war effort that might be expected to result from its revelation it was hushed up and kept secret. However, the arrangement still continues and resignations and public airing by other protesting central committee members are taking place now that the war is over.

It should be stressed that no one below the national heads apparently knew of the arrangement. This applies to regional and local Red Cross chapters, National War Fund offices and workers as well as members and locals of the two unions.

Those who defend the arrangement point out that it brought results and that no fraud was involved. That may be technically true but is basically wrong. The huge funds that were paid the unions meant just that much less for hungry human beings for whom the money was intended. If it was right to pay the unions for services rendered, so should every voluntary worker be paid. If such work now carries a price ticket in this country, God help America. The practice should be stopped at once and refunds should be made voluntarily by the two national unions who collected their drag from the pennies school children gave and from the dollars, representing sacrifice, from practically every American home, given for the purpose of bringing life itself to those less fortunate.

Let it be understood that union members and workers in the agencies had no part in the deal. Remember, too, the wonderful work was carried on. The point is that all the money should have gone for the purposes intended. The trouble is at the top and those responsible should be eliminated from their leadership which they have shown unworthy of holding.

The attitude of union members is probably reflected by the expressions of Clairborne F. Spaulding who, as delegate of local 695 of the teamsters union (AFL), heads the local group. He described the arrangement, if correctly reported, as rotten and stated he intended to bring it before his local as well as inquire as to the facts and the disposal of the funds.

Said Mr. Spaulding, "I was a Red Cross worker and solicited funds with the understanding that every cent went to the purpose intended. That is what the money was for. I am going to find out about it." It has been predicted that union members will force a correction of this grab done behind their backs which takes the money they themselves help raise, away from those it was intended to aid. Mr. Spaulding described the deal as one which would give a black eye to the unions whose sole purpose is properly representing the interests of workingmen in their relations with their employers. This reaction of Mr. Spaulding is as expected from any American citizen whose heart places his money in the pot for the relief of others without thought of selfish gain or reward. In that reaction lies the correction which everyone hopes will be the immediate result of the now published arrangement.

Let no citizen gain a wrong prospectus as the result of the revelation of this hand-out of funds. The Red Cross, greatest mother of all, still stands in spotless white with the pure cross of red. Her errands of mercy have been faithfully performed. Funds handed out for expediency at the top make the work no less merciful. The Red Cross must not be hurt. The acts of a few, regardless of their logic which prompted their acts, cannot stand astride the Red Cross which is an institution in the hearts of men, far above and bigger than these things which pass in the night. That the correction must be made stands without question, but the Red Cross will go on in its greatness. We would have it no other way. And the correction will probably be brought about principally by the members of the unions whose heads made the arrangements as their protests are registered in no uncertain terms in their national offices and as these same men join with all citizens in seeing to it that such a practice is stopped by all service agencies—that of paying some for what others give—and worst of all, under the hush-hush system.

Daniel Webster on the Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States is not a representative of the people in the same sense in which Members of Congress are. He is merely a ministerial officer, an executive.

The extravagant claims of President Jackson led to a public consideration of that question and in reference to the claim of Jackson that he—the President—was the representative of the people, Daniel Webster in a speech made in New York City said:

In some loose, indefinite, and unknown sense, the President has been called the representative of the whole American people. He has called himself so repeatedly, and been so denominated by his friends a thousand times. Acts, for which no specific authority has been found either in the Constitution or the laws, have been justified on the ground that the President is the representative of the whole American people. Certainly this is not constitutional language.

Certainly, the Constitution nowhere calls the President the universal representative of the people. The constitutional representatives of the people are in the House of Representatives, exercising powers of legislation. The President is an executive officer, appointed in a particular manner, and clothed with prescribed and limited powers.

It may be thought to be of no great consequence, that the President should call himself, or that others should call him, the sole representative of the people, although he has no such appellation or character in the Constitution.

But, in these matters, words are things. If he is the people's representative, and as such may exercise power, without any other grant, what is the limit to that power? When the Constitution expressly created representatives, as Members of Congress, it regulates, defines, and limits their authority. But if the executive Chief Magistrate may assume to himself another character, and call himself the representative of the whole people, what is to limit or restrain this representative power in his hands?

The Price of Victory and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave given me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a sermon preached by Theodore Ainsworth Greene, D. D., at a union service of thanksgiving in the First Church of Christ, New Britain, Conn., on Sunday, August 19, 1945:

THE PRICE OF VICTORY AND PEACE

I

At the end of a long war and the beginning of a new era—in obedience to the proclamation of our President—we are gathered in this

old New England meeting house, Christians of various churches and denominations, to thank God for victory, and to prepare our souls for the tasks of peace.

The events of the past fortnight have been so momentous and surprising that none of us can fully take them in. The invention and use of the atomic bomb against the Japanese, let loose by our Air Force on the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, killing hundreds of thousands and reducing steel and stone to dust and vapor; the declaration of war against Japan by our ally, Russia, with the subsequent advance of her armies into Manchuria; the unconditional surrender of Japan, or last Axis enemy; plus the acceptance of her surrender by the United Nations—a ceremony to be officially consummated soon in Tokyo: All these events have alternately stunned us and elated us. No man living today is wise enough to speak prophetically upon the tremendous issues involved in our present victory and the problems of the peace to follow. The end of this Second World War has arrived surprisingly soon. We did not expect it so quickly. As a Nation and as individuals, therefore, we are not yet prepared to meet the consequent changes that will inevitably follow the cessation of hostilities.

At the present moment—even after 2 days of holiday making and rejoicing—we can hardly master our emotions, set our minds and gear our wills to the next task, that of winning that just and lasting peace which alone can justify the awful price which America and her allies have paid to win this final victory. We are not so overawed and stunned, however, that we are without the capacity to speak or sing or pray.

Therefore, with one mind and heart, we lift our voices here in praise and gratitude to God, the Creator of this world and the Ruler of all nations, and the giver of every good and perfect gift. In deep humility, in sincere contrition, yet in genuine thanksgiving, we bow our heads in prayer. Beneath the persistent shadow of war on three fronts, we have lived and labored in this city ever since 1939. At long last that shadow has been rolled away altogether. The battle in the Pacific area of operations is ended. And we have every right to gather in this House of God again to let Him know the satisfaction that is still burning in our hearts.

And the prophet Isaiah, speaking to his people in that first section of our Scripture lesson, puts acceptable words of thanksgiving onto our lips today, when he exclaims:

"The spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; He hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted; to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God; and to comfort all that mourn."

It matters not one whit that these words were written 2,700 years ago, for these words are immortal. And they express in spiritual terms with moral meaning the divine lesson of such an hour in human history as that through which we are now passing.

What is more, that second section of our Scripture lesson, taken from the Book of the Acts, reminds us not only of the price which the Apostles paid to keep our Christian faith alive and pass it on to us intact but also of the incalculable and staggering price which we and our allies have paid for our sins of omission and neglect ever since 1931, when the Japanese took Manchuria from China and let loose that series of aggressive wars, which have since involved Africa, Europe, Asia, Australia, and the Americas in ever-widening waves of conflict. For, in the words of this Roman centurion, captain of the Praetorian guard and keeper of the prisoner Paul of Tarsus, we are brought face to face today with the cost of this victory and the price of the peace, which has been paid for us and by us, and must continue to be paid for years to come.

"With a great sum—that is, price—obtained I this freedom."

II

What are we to think of this final victory for which so many lives and so much treasure has been sacrificed, and into which we have poured the works of our hands and the hopes of our hearts? How shall we interpret it as Christians and Americans? Are we to think of this final victory of the Allied Powers over their Axis enemies as something won by accident? As a piece of mere good fortune? As just one more demonstration of the inevitability of victory for the big battalions, and therefore not in any way to be associated with our faith in God?

I cannot know today what all of you are thinking about this last of three long contested victories, won in slow but sure succession over Italy, Germany, and Japan. I can only speak my own mind as I have done before from this pulpit on VE-day. But I say, and I believe it with all my heart and mind and soul, that this victory is not just another tremendous and lucky accident. Instead, it is the outcome of our fighting and that of all the nations who have contributed in any way to the winning of this victory. What is more, our fighting is the outcome of our faith. If we may not thank God—and I, for one, believe that we may—then we may at least thank ourselves. And in thanking God, we know that we are thanking the power of God working through us to win the right to build after this last victory an ordered world and a just and durable peace. I hold that it was God's power that drive us into this war against evil forces, and which nerved us to face all perils, even defeat itself, rather than to yield to those evil forces. If anyone in this church today hesitates to say a plain "Thank God for victory," then let him at least use the prayer of Admiral Nelson as he lay dying on board his flagship *Victory* in the battle of Trafalgar. As his sight grew dimmer and he felt the end approaching, Nelson asked Hardy to kiss him.

"Now I am satisfied," he said, "Thank God, I have done my duty."

That we should be given power to do our duty, when we set out to fight this Second World War after the dastardly attack on Pearl Harbor, is what we asked of God. Very well, then, may we not thank God now for answering that prayer?

Make no mistake about this awful business of war in which we have been so long engaged in the far eastern area of operations. God does not make wars. Man makes war, when and as and because he sins against God and his neighbor in direct disobedience to God's law and God's will. But God and man together can win every fight against evil in the long run. Therefore, I want us—as Christians and as Americans—to come out of this last phase of our long struggle with a new and unshakable kind of Christian faith. We cannot put tyrants down, nor set wrong things right by any lack of faith, either in God or in ourselves. When this war was forced upon us by our enemies, we had faith to believe that neither God's resources nor man's were at an end. We had faith to believe that a way out could and must be found. Yes. And it was found. From the destruction of Pearl Harbor and the defeats of Bataan and Corregidor, from the set-backs in Africa and the long-delayed campaigns in Italy and Germany, through all the hard-won battles of the Pacific, taking island after island with tremendous losses—we have kept pressing steadily forward in the faith that this war must be won for keeps. The Christian way out of trouble is never found by fearing and worrying. It is always found by a new call upon God for power to work, to think, to devise, and to fight. Therefore, out of our experiences in this Second World War now ended, out of those past defeats turned at last into victory with the help of God and our allies—let us take to ourselves new hope, fresh resolve, and a certain amount of good cheer with which to meet the dangers, difficulties, and problems that still lie ahead of us in the winning of the peace to follow victory.

When we begin to count the cost of victory already paid, the very counting causes us to stir with wonder and amazement. The full cost in life and treasure for all the nations—victors and vanquished—cannot possibly be counted here and now. But what this victory has cost our community can at least be indicated. This industrial city has done its bit and its best toward the winning of the victory we celebrate today. For 6 long years, capital and labor—yoked together under direction from government—have kept the wheels of industry in constant motion. Nor is this all that we have accomplished on the home front. Beside producing the munitions of war, we have helped to supply the sinews and the balm as well. We have met our quotas in seven Victory bond sales, in Red Cross war fund campaigns, and in United Service Organization drives. We take pride in this record on the home front, where 70,000 civilians, old and young, have been "standing by the stuff." But all this is only the beginning of the price that has been paid for victory today.

In every war, the real blows must be struck, and the real dangers met, and the real suffering endured and the enemy finally defeated on the far-flung fields of battle. Ten thousand young men and women—more than 12½ percent of our total population—have entered the service of the Nation with our armed forces or allied organizations. They have trained and traveled far and fast. They have seen service on nearly every distant field of battle. They have sailed the seven seas. They have flown around the world. And now—praise God—before many months those who are still whole and in one piece will be coming back to rejoin us in our family circles, to engage in manufacturing and commerce, to practice their chosen professions, to continue the interrupted years of education and apprenticeship, to settle down and marry and to take up the tasks of life each according to his or her ambition or capacity. And—as we gather here today—we thank God for all these individual contributions made by our sons and daughters to the common cause of the Allies.

Alas, however, not all of these 10,000 will be coming back to walk our streets, to work in our factories, and to grace our homes. With profound respect for all those who have paid that last full measure of devotion making possible this final victory, and with sympathy and prayers for their bereaved families, we would note here those 240 gold stars on the city's honor roll. All these men were either killed in action or died of wounds or disease in the service of this Nation. Six others are still prisoners of war. And 20 more are reported missing. In addition—though the full number is not yet known—several hundred have been wounded in combat. And the casualty lists are not even yet complete.

I speak for all of you, when I say that we honor these our dead and wounded in this union service. Humbly we pray God to make us worthy now of their sacrifice for us. We remember them and their gallant conduct. We salute them for their courage and obedience to the call of duty. We shall never forget those, whom we ourselves have known. In the language of the Bible, we can say of them now:

"The righteous shall be had in everlasting remembrance. The memorial of virtue is immortal because it is known with God and with men. When it is present, men take example of it; and when it is gone, they desire it."

As we think of those that have fallen, we shall associate them always in memory with these words of our Saviour:

"Greater love hath no man than this: that a man shall lay down his life for his friends."

It is no exaggeration to point out here that by their sacrifices ourselves, our homes, our institutions, everything we still possess and all we still hope to do and to be—all these, plus this final victory, have been bought at a tremendous price, an incalculable price, paid both by the fallen and those who will soon return to us. How deeply the sights and sounds, the scenes and odors, the brutality and boredom and ennui of total war and military life have touched their minds or scarred their souls, only God and time can tell us. All we can do now is to wait patiently until they can come home. But when they get here we must deal with them kindly and understandingly. Many of them went away boys. But they will come back men—men disciplined, developed, sobered by the experience of danger and the routine discipline and regimentation of living all together for a common purpose. They will come home with their dreams of what America ought to be. They will bring back trophies of battle and souvenirs of foreign lands. And we must listen when and as they may want to talk. But we must not press them when they desire to be silent. We must exercise imagination and tact and patience to help them first to reveal and then to fulfill the aims and ideals of their hearts. The peace and security of home will be doubly precious to them from now on, for it has been dearly bought, and they themselves have helped to pay that price. Therefore, you and I may well kneel down by our beds at home tonight and pray to God that these, our sons and daughters, may never be disappointed in us, their parents, nor in the homes and institutions which they fought to keep safe and unharmed by the distant enemy.

In his proclamation setting apart this particular Sunday as a day of prayer and thanksgiving, President Truman calls our attention to the end of a cruel war, but he does not stop there. Rightly, he goes on to point out that:

"This is the end of the grandiose schemes of the dictators to enslave the peoples of the world, to destroy their civilization, and to institute a new era of darkness and degradation. This day is a new beginning in the history of freedom on this earth."

Well, I believe that last-quoted sentence is perhaps the most important thought in President Truman's proclamation. I refer here to that last line:

"This day is a new beginning in the history of freedom on this earth."

If you and I can only see it so, and believe it, and live and labor henceforth in the light of that new day, there is no telling what benefits may yet be derived from this world's recent trial and turmoil. And President Truman goes on to add:

"Let us give thanks to God, and remember that we have now dedicated ourselves to follow in His ways to a lasting and just peace and to a better world."

And I say, "Amen, so be it." Let us do exactly that today and pledge ourselves to follow through with the pursuit of peace, come what may and cost what it will. For to thank God here and now, and then to go on willingly, cheerfully, freely, and sacrificially paying the price required of us to win the peace as we have won the war, that is our present duty as Christians and Americans.

Liberty, unity, and peace—in all our national and international relations—these are the triple goals for which we must now work and plan and sacrifice henceforth. Liberty and unity come only to those who have learned to know and to trust the right to be free. And peace comes only to those who have discovered and accepted for themselves the disciplines of Christian liberty. So long as there are those within a social or political group, who believe in freedom for themselves or their class alone, social and political cohesion is a fraud. So long as there are nations in this world who believe in liberty only for themselves and for their fellow nationals, the idea of world unity is chimerical. To talk about it deceives nobody except those persons encrusted in the pride of race or class, a condition as hopeless today as it is ancient and outworn. We can talk and plan for a united world today only after we have conceded the right to freedom to everybody everywhere.

When the captain of the Praetorian Guard, who held Paul prisoner in our Scripture lesson, boasted that he had bought his freedom "with a great price," the apostle of Jesus Christ—his prisoner—reminded his jailer that he—Paul—was "born free." Well—praise God—you and I were "born free" also. And our precious American Declaration of Independence teaches us today that beyond and above all the experience of freedom as an accident of birth is the concept of freedom as the endowment of every human soul, as the very essence of the spirit of God latent in every man. Let me remind you that this idea was but a feeble infant, when it first saw the light of day in Philadelphia in 1776. But it has grown to be a giant now. And still—as Christians—we need to be reminded again and yet again on this day of national thanksgiving for final victory that this cardinal tenet of our democratic faith came to us from the reservoir of our religious heritage. In fact it was taken straight out of the New Testament:

"Know ye not that One is your Father, even God, and that all ye are brethren?"

To forget this now at the beginning of a new era is to invite confusion again. To deny this is to repudiate our faith in the Christian God and in our American ideal. To treat it casually or as a matter to play with is to cast away our spiritual estate, to let go our precious heritage. For it is to the preservation and extension of nothing less than this that we have committed ourselves as Americans in adopting the Charter of the United Nations.

This is the time for us as Christians and Americans to venture beyond the mood of caution and to exercise the aggressive quality of faith, faith in God's way, faith in democracy's way. If you and I and all men—in these days of atomic bombs and world-encircling airplanes—are ever to be freed from our fears by learning how to live together in peace, we had better begin now, for we cannot delay action in that direction until perfect certainty is won.

III

The mystery, the wonder, the potential possibility of this hour in human history confronts us all. As Moses stood before the burning bush and heard the voice of God saying unto him:

"Put off the shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground," so we may be silent and hear God speaking to us and to our world today. The realization of the victory of right over might in the spirit of man convinces us. The newly aroused feelings of sympathy and tolerance sweeping over a suffering world strengthen our faith in the Christian God of Love.

It may be that some of us are still afraid to commit ourselves, our Nation and our manner of living to the way of Christ, which teaches that all men are the sons of God, and therefore free and equal. Well, if such there be, let me once more remind you, as I try frequently to remind myself, that the winning of this war and the winning of whatever peace may follow has been secured for us at an inestimable price on the bloody scenes of battle, and in the conference halls at the Golden Gate in San Francisco.

There is no question about the price that has been paid. Ah! No! The only question left for you and me today is this:

Will we join with this great army of the world's redeemers?

Will we go on now to pay the price of peace as well as victory?

Will we follow in the train of those who are to be known someday as the sons of God because they are the peacemakers of this world?

Will we follow in their train?

Or will we, as individuals and as a Nation, go our own perverted, selfish, futile way to death and Hell alone?

PRAYER

"Almighty God, ruler of all men and nations, we praise Thee for the comfort and assurance that comes to us in this service of Thanksgiving for the victory that has been won. But we pray likewise and with equal sincerity and intensity that Thou wouldst give us wisdom and fortitude, courage, and strength, power and persistence cheerfully to continue our service and sacrifice for the bringing in of Thy kingdom upon earth, and for the building of a just and lasting peace among all nations, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen."

"Not Unduly Exacting" About Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I noted the heartbreaks, misery, and suffering occasioned by American policy in regard to displaced persons from the Soviet Union.

I would like to add a few more words on the subject of the Ukrainian refugees. Ukrainians, who have no government recognized by any of the powers, are in particularly a tragic case as they are claimed as Soviet nationals since the inclusion of all Ukrainian territory by the Moscow Government.

Here are a few examples of Ukrainian sentiments on the subject of repatriation to the Soviet Union:

FROM A LETTER WRITTEN BY A FORMER UKRAINIAN MEMBER AND DEPUTY SPEAKER OF PREWAR POLISH PARLIAMENT

AUGSBURG, GERMANY, *July 16, 1945.*

According to approximate estimate there are about 250,000 Ukrainian refugees under the Anglo-American occupation in western Germany. Among them are highly qualified intellectuals: engineers, architects, judges, lawyers, teachers, and clergymen; there are also merchants, journalists, editors, and even printers. All of them, voluntarily or otherwise, fled as far as possible away from the Soviet regime. Many of them have already experienced life under the Communist rule. * * * Besides these 250,000 there are many thousands of laborers and farmers.

The repatriation is now in full swing. * * * These people should be saved at all costs. If Bolsheviks get hold of them, they will destroy at least 90 percent of them. * * * The American policy relative to repatriation is not clear, and is being differently interpreted in different localities. Theoretically all refugees from the east territories, under the Soviet rule prior to September 3, 1939, are subject to forced repatriation, while all former Polish citizens have right to choose whether they wish to go back,

or not. But in practice this policy is not adhered to as is shown by the following incident: At Kaufbeurin, Bavaria, the Bolsheviks, with the assistance of the American authorities, arrested all members of the Ukrainian aid committee. They kidnapped the president of this committee, Mr. Fedoryshyn, and we cannot locate him. Imagine the Bolsheviks permitting the American authorities to arrest people living under the Soviet occupation! A most significant and characteristic feature of this incident is the fact that Mr. Fedoryshyn came from the western Ukraine and is therefore a Polish citizen.

FROM A RECENT LETTER TO AMERICA, TRIWEEKLY PUBLISHED BY PROVIDENCE ASSOCIATION OF UKRAINIAN CATHOLICS OF AMERICA, WRITTEN BY A UKRAINIAN JOURNALIST AND AUTHOR

FRANKFURT-ON-MAIN.

This forced repatriation is a tragedy. Recently, a Soviet officer, Colonel Davidov, arrived with about 60 officers and officials at Frankfurt-on-Main, General Eisenhower's capital. Officially he came to aid the people to return to their country. Actually, however, it turned out differently. Having first obtained lists of the refugees, drawn up by local American authorities, Davidov's NKVD agents swept through the American occupation zone "collecting our own" people forcibly, often with American help. People, who for 6 years suffered in German slavery, got married and places to live in—now don't know what to do with themselves, fleeing from one place to another, confused and terror-stricken.

For example, in Bad Kreuznach, where there is a large Ukranian camp, Soviet officers entered the camp headquarters, arrested its personnel, thrust them into an adjoining room, and taking possession of the place they seized everyone coming in and locked them up in the adjoining room. In this manner they caught about 30 persons, including Professor Prykhodko. Then they packed them into Soviet trucks and began to drive away. Beside himself with despair, Professor Prykhodko started to shout for help. As luck would have it, an American officer of Ukrainian extraction happened to pass by just then. He stopped the trucks and upon learning who was in them called out the guards and liberated the refugees. The Soviets were taken to the American headquarters and after being interrogated were permitted to go free.

Among those held by the Soviets is Bishop Platon from Ukraine. His illness prevents the Soviets from taking him away.

At a gathering of our refugees in Leipzig, which a Soviet official was haranguing in an attempt to persuade them to return to Soviet rule, an old man with an ax in his hand mounted the speaker's platform and extending to the Soviet officer the ax, said: "Here is my ax, and here is my head. Chop it off, but I won't go back." An American officer witnessed this scene and upon learning what the old man had said, promptly ordered the Soviet officials to leave.

It should be noted here that in many cases American officers defend those who refuse to return to their doom under the Soviets, and for this they deserve praise. After having helped to destroy the Nazi and Fascist hydra, it is difficult for them to reconcile their democratic sentiments with one of the most terrible dictatorships in world history—the Soviet dictatorship.

We realize the American situation here. It is hard for Americans here to reconcile with logic the fact that people whom they would help to return to their homeland refuse to return to it. The trouble is that America has a faulty conception of the Soviet land. Only people who lived there know from painful experience what it means to live there. So it is no wonder that at a gathering of refugees being harangued by a Soviet agitator some old man got up and cried: "You came here to persuade us to return to our homeland? Whoever heard of a country being forced to send agitators to persuade its people to return to it? Do you think that we do not love our native land? When it becomes as it should be, we shall be glad even to crawl on our knees to it and with our last bit of strength. Do you understand?"

With these words this simple peasant made clear why Russian Ukrainians, Poles, Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, hundreds of thousands, millions of them, refuse to return to their homeland. We feel sorry here that this matter is not clear, however, in America, to which we are very grateful for having destroyed Hitler and which waged this war for the rights of man, for freedom, peace, and happiness on this world.

FROM A LETTER TO THE NARODNA VOLYA WEEKLY OF THE UKRAINIAN WORKINGMEN'S ASSOCIATION, WRITTEN BY PFC DMYTRO STAROSCHAK, MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF ADVISERS OF THAT ORGANIZATION

Perhaps the Ukrainians in America are not very aware of the tragic plight of our people here in Germany now.

Having had an opportunity of seeing thousands of Ukrainians and talking with hundreds of them, I am convinced that not all of them want to return beneath Soviet rule. On the contrary they greatly fear that if they do return "Father Stalin" will reward them either by banishing them into Siberia or by slaughtering them like animals. Hailing from Galicia, as well as from eastern Ukraine, these Ukrainians existed from 2 to 25 years under Soviet rule and want no more of that "paradise."

When I informed them that a small portion of the Ukrainian people in America is well disposed and loyal to the Soviets, they replied, "Let those people go and live in the Soviet Union for 1 or 2 months, and if they manage to escape from that 'Soviet paradise' then they'll surely be rid of their pro-Soviet sickness."

Agents of the Soviet secret police (NKVD) swarm all over Germany. Sometimes they abduct persons at night. Why do they attempt to force people to return to their homeland? The answer is clear. They know that as long as these people remain free they will continue to talk and write what they experienced and witnessed in the "Soviet paradise." In this manner the world will soon learn that the Communist dictatorship in the Soviet Union is terrible. That is why the Red agents want to return these people to "Father Stalin."

I am not certain concerning the number of our Ukrainians in Germany, but according to available information there are more than a million of them.

The Ukrainians in the United States and Canada ought to interest themselves in the plight of these refugees and save them, else they will perish.

This is no phantasy. The Soviets are trying to persuade America to return to the Soviets all those who were under Soviet care before 1939. Rumors are going around that the Reds are demanding that even those who were under the Soviets before 1942 be returned, too. You can see now how "Father Stalin" takes care of his children.

I anticipate that our Ukrainian Communists in America will immediately say that, "These people are Fascists, and that is why they don't want to go back to Soviet rule." To call them Fascists is mere nonsense and a bluff.

I personally spoke with many of them. Among them are intellectuals, professors, teachers, students, tradesmen, and even most backward peasants. All of them refuse to return to the Soviets and all of them suffer from Soviet inhuman economic and political persecution.

They told me that if the time arrives when they will be compelled to return they will slay their families and commit suicide, or let themselves be killed by their captors, rather than return to Soviet rule.

I am certain that if our Communists in America and Canada had an opportunity of talking with these refugees who lead a gypsy-like existence in Germany they would realize that what the Soviets tell the world is entirely different from what is actually happening in the Soviet Union.

Why do I write this? There is but one answer. These refugees need immediate help. A month or two hence may be too late. The Ukrainian people have no communal life here, but flock together wherever they can to save themselves, irrespective of their religious or political differences. The Ukranians in America and Canada ought to organize help to save their kinsmen here from extinction. Time is costly, do it now, for tomorrow will be too late.

FROM A PERSONAL LETTER ADDRESSED TO THE CHANCELLOR OF THE UKRAINIAN GREEK CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF THE U. S. A., PHILADELPHIA, PA.

DIEHL (NEAR COBLENZ), GERMANY,
September 11, 1945.

Shocking events are taking place here. Soviet officers enter camps in the American zone which contain Ukrainians and demand that they be repatriated. News of their arrival stirs alarm and terror. Some attempt to hide, while others step forward boldly and announce their determination not to return to their "country" because they know death awaits them there, either by execution or by banishment to concentration camps in the Solovecki Islands and elsewhere.

To the camp at Mannheim, south of Frankfurt, wherein dwell 3,000 Ukrainians from Eastern Ukraine and from Galicia there recently came Soviet officials who demanded the surrender of the Ukrainians to them. The American authorities ordered the Ukrainians to prepare to leave. But the Ukrainians refused to obey. A tug-of-war ensued. Women and children began to cry and throw themselves before the feet of the Americans. But to no avail. The Americans threatened to shoot. Then one peasant from eastern Ukraine tore open his shirt and pointing toward his bared chest said, "Shoot, but I won't go to the Solovki." The American officer once more ordered them to prepare to leave and those who refused were beaten with rubber clubs. Nevertheless the Ukrainians did not give in. The crowd began to mill. Outcries and threats were directed from it at the Bolsheviks. Seeing that bloodshed was imminent, the Americans attempted to reason with the people: "We are trying to help you to return to your homes, and yet you refuse. The Big Three decreed your return. Do you want to remain dependent on German rations?" All replied: "We don't care on what we live here, but we won't return to the Soviets." To this the officer said: "If that's the case I'll give you 4 days to think the matter over. In the meanwhile I'll consult my superiors and inform you accordingly." Throughout all this an American, Dr. Dudra, acted as an intermediary on behalf the Ukrainians. Later the Ukrainians sent an appeal to the Pope at Rome and to President Truman. And there the matter rests at present. What of the future, no one knows.

All this is taking place at a time when we hear much about the freedom of person, individual, religion, and expression. * * * That is why I appeal to Ukrainians in America to bring our plight to the attention of the American Government with the plea to provide asylum for us. We exist in a state of alarm every day, while winter draws closer and closer.

Great Daily Newspaper Editorial Charges That Congress Sleeps and Identifies Some Major Problems It Believes Obstructed—Criticizes Congress Re FEPC and Compliments Wendell Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in Los Angeles County, Calif., in which great county the Eighteenth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, is located, is published the Daily News, a daily newspaper with great and increasing circulation, the editor of which is Manchester Bodie. The editorial speaks for itself, and word that I believe reliable comes to me from thereabouts and to the effect that increasing numbers of responsible citizens are emphatically stating that it is true that "Congress sleeps." Manifestly there are Members of this House who will not agree with the fundamentals of this editorial; but no doubt those Members will be tolerant enough to recognize that the safety of our great democracy depends upon the freedom of the press, the freedom of the radio, the freedom of religion, and the freedom of worship. Likewise, Mr. Speaker, our democracy will only endure as such because of adequate opportunity for American men and women to find and fill jobs and occupations sufficient to support themselves and their loved ones with American decency and daily happiness and good health, which they are ready and willing to earn by the sweat of their brow. Less than such reasonable opportunity for American men and women who have to work and are willing so to do will definitely contribute to holding back of those finer instincts in American life, which will build instead of weaken our American system of free enterprise. Good food, adequate housing, decent wearing apparel, adequate education, participation in recreation, these, Mr. Speaker, are essentials of daily life and without which the daily life of American men and women is inadequate and insufficient to perpetuate enduring standards of living in our democracy. The editorial follows:

[From the Los Angeles Daily News of November 17, 1945]

WHILE CONGRESS SLEEPS

Their hoppers bulging with unfinished business, President Harry S. Truman's 21-page program hardly scratched, measures introduced during the Roosevelt administration sleeping soundly in committees, our lawmakers in Washington are discussing plans for the Christmas recess. Despite urgent requests from the White House, proddings from Majority Leaders BARKLEY and MCCORMACK, and crucial national problems calling for legislative action, Congress seems to be engaged in a sit-down strike.

Ironical feature of the situation is that in the face of this tragic obstruction and temporization, hardly a day passes that some irate solon does not call for the transfer of Executive authority to the States or to Congress itself. One group is ardently opposing the bill, approved unanimously by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, delegating to the President the power to declare war. Time—more specifically, the atomic bomb—is now the essence of national security. No longer is war a slow development. It comes out of the night.

It took Pearl Harbor to silence many of the gentlemen now protesting against this new invasion of the legislative function.

Paradoxically enough, these same protectors of congressional prerogatives include many who now see nothing so important as an investigation to determine the blame for Pearl Harbor.

History will record that by this treacherous coup, the Japs brought about their own destruction, that it disillusioned Herr Hitler's confident belief that the United States would not get into the war—an item that by its own weight hastened the end of gangster rule in Europe.

States rights, the ever-ready weapon of bungling political strategists, won a victory, at least temporarily, during the week when a Senate appropriations subcommittee voted to return the United States Employment Service to the States. When Franklin D. Roosevelt saved the country from economic disaster by inaugurating his vast and highly successful construction program under Federal aid and direction—work, not the dole—to meet unemployment, he delegated the employment service to the States.

In the main it functioned capably, but in a number of States, the politicos utilized the power to build up patronage. When the United States entered the war, the President, recognizing that interstate migrations of war workers made centralized control necessary, took it over under the emergency authority invested in him. Existing necessities due to uncertainty in the national employment field make it unwise to make a change at this time. The presence of Republican executives in many States overwhelmingly Democratic on national issues, and their advantage of presiding at the pie counter during the coming congressional elections have much to do with the noisy demand for the immediate return of the service to the individual Commonwealth.

The clamor for State control of OPA and other war agencies appears to be prompted by no nobler motive.

Of particular interest to southern California is the announcement from Washington that the Fair Employment Practice Committee is forced to close, for want of funds, seven field offices including that in Los Angeles. This step confirms the suspicion that Congress is slowly choking this valuable agency to death.

During the Presidential campaign last year, a powerful voice, a voice unfortunately now stilled, was raised in protest against GOP indifference to unjust treatment of Negro workers. Said Wendell Willkie, with almost prophetic vision, after he had been discarded by the Republicans for Dewey: "It is strange that the Republicans year after year yield to the old States' rights argument, and the narrow interpretation of Federal power, to prevent the passage of Federal statutes which constitute the only practical method by which the Negro's rights can be assured him. The very fact that the Republican Party was the instrumentality through which the Negroes were given freedom makes them the more resentful that it should join in acts which prevent them from obtaining the substance of freedom. They have known the brief security of good jobs while their help was needed to make the tools of war, only to be filled with deep anxiety for fear that in the readjustments of peace, they will be shuffled off into unemployment and poverty."

The admonition may well be extended to those Republicans who participate in obstructionist tactics to withhold security from millions of other citizens—the vast army of workers of America, now watching the delaying tactics on such measures as the full employment and the unemployment compensation measures.

It is a travesty on that strong shield of democracy, the existence of an aggressive two-party system, to find Republicans in the House and Senate presenting no constructive plan of their own, following blindly in the paths of the Bilbos and the Rankins, at a time when economic peace is so vital to the safety and progress of the Nation. Hardly less fatal to labor than its own international dissensions is this unholy alliance against groups constituting the predominant majority.

R. R. K.

Our National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 20, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable Kenneth C. Royall, Under Secretary of War, at the American Legion convention, Chicago, Ill., November 19, 1945:

The United Nations have won the greatest war in man's history. Fifty-one countries, representing every race and religion and social culture of the free world, were joined together against a giant conspiracy of gangsters. The United Nations achieved victory because we first achieved international cooperation.

But for us here today, the victory has a special and unique significance. Our country armed and powered and, to a large extent, spearheaded the decisive battle drives in Africa, Italy, France, and western Germany, in the Far East, and the vast reaches of the Pacific.

We criss-crossed the oceans and airways of the world with our supply lines. We replenished the losses our allies suffered in the terrible months when every battle seemed a triumph for the aggressor. We built the mightiest fleet and Army of all time. Then we struck.

Our sea forces purged the oceans of menace. Our ground forces strangled the aggressors in a steel noose. Our air forces smashed the enemy in his own homeland.

But the cost to the United States was stupendous. In money—almost $300,000,000,000—it cost us more than any of our allies. The cost in lives was tragic—the million names and more on our casualty lists include 265,000 who made the supreme sacrifice in battle—more than four times as many men killed in action as in all America's wars with other nations from the Revolution up to World War II. And to that total must be added 30 percent of nonbattle deaths, also sacrifices for freedom.

Our allies paid an even higher cost than we did in lives, losing millions of their best young men. In addition they suffered the ravages of war at home on an appalling scale. Their cities and towns were bombed and burned; great areas of their countries were devastated; millions of men and women were enslaved. They paid a terrible price for the delays they won for us.

We Americans shall be forever in debt to our gallant allies in the community of nations who, in the dark days of the war, refused to admit defeat or treat with the enemy. But we Americans, too, have every reason to be proud of the valor and achievements of our own fighting men and their contribution to victory.

Like most of you, I am one of the old Legionnaires. My real field experience ended with the First World War. This time I served largely in an office with only an occasional staff-carred or jeeped trip to the forward areas in Europe. But from my various seats I saw enough of our fighting men to know first-hand the greatness of their job and the price they paid in accomplishing it.

It is no disloyalty to my comrades of the First World War to say that the combat veteran of this Second World War has, in my opinion, never been surpassed in stamina, in determination, in the will to win, and in sheer physical courage when confronted with a fanatical and savage enemy.

The men who are now returning to their homes have added luster to our military traditions and written new pages in the world's history. Their battle record will endure so long as there is a United States. But, more than that, they, along with their allies, have proved for all time that freemen so cherish their freedom as to be prepared to pay any price rather than surrender it.

Yes; we have every reason to be proud of their valor. Their defeat of aggressive and lustful foes preserved our Nation from foreign conquest and foreign exploitation. But our pride in their accomplishment means little unless at the same time we take steps to assure the permanence of their victory.

The prize for which they were ready to die is now the responsibility of every American. That prize is the security of the United States and the free world. If we are not to lose what many millions of men in their valor and sacrifices won for us, we must in these present days take measures that will prevent a repetition of an aggressor's holocaust during the foreseeable future.

And yet, with our dead scarcely buried and in some cases not yet even known, some of us are already succumbing to the two chief faults of a democracy—apathy and the pendulum psychosis, a state of national mind that sweeps from one extreme to another. Because we are free, not subject to the inviolable decrees of a dictator, not living under the surveillance of a Gestapo, we can, each one of us, choose our own path. Too many of us either take the soft and easy life of do-nothingness or fling ourselves into that extreme most contrary to our recent past.

Already, in some measure, we are beginning to forget the sacrifices of war. Those who really suffered want to forget and to lose themselves in visions of an uncomplicated and happy future. Those who have not suffered—and there are many who have not, either personally or financially—welcome the disappearance of wartime restrictions and inconveniences, and prepare to settle back in their old or a new and better plushness.

And, moreover, the pendulum of American thought is rapidly descending from the high point of war consciousness. Unless a strong and concerted effort is made now, it soon will pass its nadir and swing swiftly over into the dangerous rosy zone of ostrich-thinking.

That is typical of the United States. We shift violently from strict prohibition to monkey rum and stump juice and back to $10 bonded whisky, from the imaginary affluence of 1928–29 to 1932–33's unimagined and unimaginative 5-cent cotton and 30-cent wheat and busted banks back to the easy money of those recent days. And our mental attitudes follow those shifts—even lead them.

We can laugh at these wild gyrations when they affect liquor or styles or even money. But we have just learned—or should have learned—that we cannot let the pendulum swing unrestrained when we are dealing with the very life of the Republic.

In his last biennial report, General Marshall warned us that, despite the magnitude of our victory, we won this war by a close margin; that in 1942 Germany and Japan came so close to complete domination of the world that we do not realize yet how thin the thread of allied survival had been stretched.

We barely caught the pigskin of victory. We caught it behind a staunch line of allies that held while we got set for the throw and the catch. It was a strange and marvelous line of allies. In it were some traditional friends, some new friends, some with our ideas and ideals of Government, and some with vastly different.

We hope that this line of freedom will hold in the years ahead and that, if another aggressor strikes, we will have the same teammates who will give us the same high measure of heroic aid and cooperation as they have in the dark days behind us.

We are now engaged in the perpetuation of that team through the establishment of the United Nations Organization. Because the hope of a peaceful world rests on its success, America as a whole is behind that organization and strong in its support.

We are pledged as a people to strive for its success. But in the unsettled world of today, with the lessons of recent history and the defects that crop up in national as well as human nature fresh in our minds, we cannot risk our Nation's future entirely on a yet untried organization. As of now, we have no certainty that there never again will be aggression.

We must realize that war is still a possibility. If it comes in this new atomic age it will be more terrible and total than anything we have known in the past. Neither the doctrine of "sweetness and light" nor solemn pledges will stop the bombs of a fanatical aggressor.

It was proven nine centuries ago—at the time of the Children's Crusade against the Saracens—that unsophistication and mildness and childlike faith and simplicity, and kindness of heart and complete trust in the essential goodness of man will not stop the weapons of a savage.

The same was proved in every conference with the totalitarian aggressors from 1931 on. From Manchuria to Munich it became more and more evident that words and reliance on promises, meekness, and love of peace do not slow down a nation bent on aggression. Rather they excite the aggressor to further violations of the world's peace.

Some may charge that this lack of faith in solemn pledges condemns the United Nations Organization to failure before it starts. I do not agree.

We have faith in our law-enforcement authorities, but we don't leave our bank vaults or our homes unlocked. We trust the neighbors in our community, but we have policemen patrolling our streets.

The United Nations Organization itself implements its compacts with the power of an armed force. That is the firmest basis for our hope in its success. The Organization is not only pledged to maintain world peace, but it will have the power to help enforce world peace. We realize now the possibility that some nations will recognize only the persuasion of force. And our world organization is prepared to use that form of persuasion.

Further, the United Nations Organization is careful in its compacts not to exclude armed forces of the individual nations. But its very existence will tend to prevent a headlong and competitive arms race. Because it will develop international contacts and world-wide comradeship, it should eventually result in the reduction of national armaments. But that reduction will be gradual and slow and cannot be completed until the Organization has been tested by experience.

Until then, the United States must be able to guarantee its own national security. But to come back to the pendulum analogy, the armed forces do not want a preparedness swing that will make this country an armed camp. We want no part of militarism in the United tates. But there are certain minimum measures which the World War II and the unsettled state of the world today prescribe.

We must, at least to a reasonable extent, fortify ourselves against a sudden surprise attack. Any lack of such preparation might prove suicidal. In the future, the unprepared will almost certainly be the vanquished. And no future aggressor will permit us the respite we were given in the last two World Wars. The aggressor bent on ruling the world will attack us first—and suddenly.

But we cannot adopt even the minimum security measures on a business-as-usual or life-as-usual basis. We must have men serving in the armed forces or trained to serve, industry prepared to produce quickly, scientific facilities coordinated with our defense requirements.

These do not drop like manna from heaven. For security we must depend on the men and the industry and the scientific facilities now available in this country. They must depart from the strict paths of peace to the extent necessary to meet our preparedness needs. But how great or severe that departure must be is dependent on the size of our intended military establishment, its nature and armament. That must be fixed—and fixed promptly.

With this in mind, to clear the situation and provide for adequate defense with as little peacetime dislocation as possible, the War Department, speaking through the Secretary of War, has proposed:

1. That we adopt a system of universal military training that will prepare our young men for service in the armed forces whenever the Nation is in danger.

2. That we develop an alert and integrated intelligence service that will keep us informed of hostile moves anywhere in the world.

3. That we prepare a plan for industrial mobilization that will assure us a speedy conversion to a war footing and adequate war supplies whenever needed.

4. That we establish a program for scientific research and development to guarantee ourselves continued leadership in the perfection of weapons to protect our Nation and the peace of the world.

The Congress will determine these matters and other aspects of our security establishment. But it is not fair to Congress to leave the burden entirely on them. They are elected to represent the people and cannot properly function unless the wishes of the people are known and manifest.

The Congress is subject to great pressure and distortions of the popular will from conscientious individuals unintentionally short-sighted, from selfish individuals purposely short-sighted, and from organized minority groups.

The latter are increasingly powerful today, not only because they bring the greatest pressure on Congress by organized mail, telegraph and personal visit campaigns, but also because by the same tactics they influence public sentiment.

These minority groups are frequently organizations whose pronouncements are controlled by the small percentage who attend meetings or the smaller group who, with or without meetings, assume to speak for the entire organization, when in fact a true poll of the members would show a contrary sentiment.

I do not want to discuss specific measures today. They will be discussed by others. But I would like to illustrate my point by

the confusion that surrounds public attitudes on universal military training.

In the newspapers there are almost daily stories of organizations attacking the proposed year of military training. This would indicate that opposed such training are enough groups to include a majority of our people. And yet the plain fact of the matter is the direct opposite. The Gallup poll, which has shown that it reflects the public opinion accurately, shows that for the past year, month after month, 70 percent of the people have been in favor of universal military training. Other polls show a similar overwhelming majority. On few issues that affect every family so directly has there been such national support. But the voice of the many has been almost drowned by the clamor of the few.

Here is where the Legion comes in. You are, of course, another organization, but you are by far the largest organization that touches and includes a real cross section of every other organization—religious, racial, social, political, labor, and management. You are organized America.

And you are more than an organization. You are a typical sample—and a very large sample—of the ex-servicemen of two wars and you reflect the sentiments of these ex-servicemen, whether they are members of the American Legion or not. It is equally important that you are the best source of communication to these ex-servicemen, these citizens who have the greatest stake in, and the greatest right to decide, the welfare and future of our Nation. Had your counsel been followed in the twenties and thirties when the Legion, time and again, strove to arouse public opinion as to the necessity of military preparedness, it is doubtful that the totalitarian powers would have dared embark on world conquest. It is certain that Pearl Harbor would not have caught us perilously unprepared to defend ourselves.

But minority groups with restricted points of view were able to aline public opinion with them in opposition to your counsel. Now you have public opinion overwhelmingly with you. But those minority groups are more clamorous than ever. Unless your organization—unless the mass of ex-servicemen in the country—are both alert and active, we may return to the lethargy that doomed us to almost 4 years of war.

It is your duty—and I am sure it will be your privilege—to study all the problems of adequate national defense, reach your conclusions, circulate them among the veterans of this great country, and thoroughly make your influence and the influence of all other ex-servicemen felt to the point where sound legislation will be adopted.

Outstanding Reconversion Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, at a time when American eyes are focused on the reconversion front as they were during the war on the battle fronts, it is gratifying to report the remarkable record made by a company in my district, the Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co. It has carried into the peace the same efficiency and speed which enabled it, prior to VJ-day, to turn out huge numbers of critically essential optical and electronic instruments for our planes, ships, tanks, and so forth.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of November 18, 1945, and a press statement regarding the way in which this company's management and workers have cooperated to make so rapid a shift to peacetime production with maximum benefit to the consuming public and to the Nation's economy, as well as to themselves:

A SHORT STRING

How long is a piece of string? Twice as long as from its midpoint to one end, replies the wag.

How long is the reconversion period for industry? That's a question which requires considerably more thought to answer, but when the answer is arrived at it, too, will be twice the distance from its midpoint to one end. If we want the reconversion period to be a short piece of string, we must reduce the length from one end to the middle. That is not always as easy as it sounds. Shortages of materials, of labor, and of machines must be considered. Each time they are encountered they lengthen the piece of string. Sometimes, too, management and labor get mixed up in disputes and valuable time is lost.

The shortest possible reconversion period benefits everyone. Workers have jobs and pay checks, business has output and profits, and consumers have civilian goods at reasonable prices. Can the reconversion period be kept short? The report of one Minneapolis manufacturing firm indicates it can.

Just 90 days after the end of the war, the Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co. has manufactured more products than in any previous 3-month period, has almost doubled its 1939 pay roll and has on the market products which never before were available in addition to its prewar products.

Harold W. Sweatt, president of the firm, says his firm expects to expand its total employment even more because of the great demand for its products. This will happen, he says, provided labor-management disputes in other areas of the Nation do not reduce his firm's supply of raw materials. If that happens Sweatt says, the employment trend here may be downward rather than upward.

Minnesota is doing its part. Management and labor are getting together in most instances and the reconversion "string" is being kept short. Let management and labor in other areas look at what is happening here and then go and do likewise.

The basis for the above editorial is a press statement, as follows:

The Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co., of Minneapolis, Minn., manufacturers of heat-regulating equipment, today reported that in the 90 days since VJ-day it had manufactured more products than in any previous 3-month period, had doubled its prewar employment peak, and was already delivering a number of new devices never before available on the consumer market.

In a report believed to be the first of its kind on what one company had accomplished during the first period of reconversion and the start of unrestricted civilian production, Harold W. Sweatt, president of the Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co., told reporters that today the number of people on the company's pay roll stands at 194.2 percent of the prewar level. In 1939 there were 3,600 people working in the manufacturing divisions in Minneapolis, he said; and when new machines can be procured, factory employees are expected to total 7,125. The company also operates plants in Chicago, Wabash, Ind., and Philadelphia, where the current employment picture is substantially the same as at the main plant.

"As far as we can determine from surveys and studies of future market possibilities, there is a large demand for our products," Mr. Sweatt continued, "and we believe that in the years ahead the demand will increase. We expect, therefore, to be able to expand our total employment, providing that labor difficulties in other areas of the Nation do not affect our supplies of raw materials. On the other hand, supplies of some of our basic raw materials are dangerously low now; and if this situation continues, our employment trend may be reversed."

Sweatt said that in September of this year the company had granted a wage increase which took into consideration shorter working hours. The company has a contract with the United Electrical Radio and Machine Operators, CIO, he said.

With 78 of the estimated 200 discharged veterans back on the job, the company is finding the program for employment of returning servicemen in fairly smooth operation, he said. The few rough spots, such as the fact that 190 of the 1,395 company men in the services went into the Army and Navy from departments now discontinued, have not proved to be serious, Sweatt said. Physical disabilities or handicaps do not eliminate a veteran from his old job again because a careful selection program has been worked out to provide the best job and opportunity for any ex-employee who has suffered a physical loss in combat.

Manufacturing more than 3,000 different automatic-control instruments in the heating, ventilating, and air-conditioning fields, Minneapolis-Honeywell developed during the war years some new controls for such varied industries as the railroads, air lines, apartment houses, and private dwellings, he said. These include an electronic "hot box" alarm to guard against overheated railroad bearings which frequently cause dangerous wrecks, an electronic automatic pilot for aircraft, a new cabin temperature-control system for aircraft, a system of personalized heating control for apartment dwellers so that each may adjust the amount of heat delivered to his living space, and a new domestic heating-control system which, Sweatt said, brings an end to drafts and cold floors.

Because his company supplies controls for all types of domestic and commercial heating plants made by hundreds of different manufacturers, the official explained that "the heat was really on to try and keep up with the demands of our customers." This is further accentuated, he said, because of the anticipated housing boom which is expected to result in at least 1,000,000 new homes being built each year for the next decade. In addition, wide-scale remodeling in all parts of the country, coupled with the fact that the fall of the year is normally the peak season in the heating industry anyway, "makes our problem a tough one."

"But we did it in war and I can see no reason why we can't do it in peace," Sweatt said, in pointing out that his company had won five Army-Navy E's and had delivered more than $184,000,000 worth of specialized weapons to the armed services during the war.

High-Point Men in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C., November 17, 1945.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CASE: I refer to your inquiry as to the number of men with 90 points who still remain in the southwest Pacific and Asiatic theaters.

While we do not have a breakdown of our troop strength by point totals which shows this specific group, our figures do show that as of October 15, 1945, there were approximately 75,000 enlisted men in the Pacific theater and 5,000 in the China and India-Burma theaters who had as many as 87 points on the basis of the September 2 computation.

The reports of troop arrivals in the United States which we receive in the War Department do not show a break-down by point-total groups. For this reason it is impossible for us to say precisely how many of the foregoing 80,000 men have been returned since October 15 or to compute the exact number that still remain in the Pacific and Asiatic theaters who have as many as 85 points as of VJ-day.

We do know, however, that there has been a substantial flow of troops from those theaters since October 15. During the month of October 187,000 troops arrived in the United States from the Pacific, India-Burma, and China theaters.

While we cannot say exactly how many men with 85 points or more were included in the number reaching this country, we do know that in view of the efforts which we are making to return high-point men first and in view of the large number of troops that have left the Pacific theater since October 15, the great proportion of men who had as many as 85 points on VJ-day have already been returned or are en route. The remainder unquestionably will be on their way home very soon.

There is every reason to believe that we will substantially achieve the goal which we announced in September of completing by the end of November the return to this country of all enlisted men overseas who had as many as 85 points on the original May 12 computation.

I am sorry that, for the reasons I have mentioned, I cannot furnish you an exact figure as of today in response to your inquiry. I trust, however, that you will find the information in this letter adequate for your purposes.

Sincerely yours,

MILES REBER,
Brigadier General, Deputy Chief,
Legislative and Liaison Division.

Letter From an American Soldier in Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I attach hereto a letter dated November 10 from one of my young constituents in Fukuyama, Japan. The purpose of inserting this letter in the RECORD is to call its contents to the attention of my colleagues and the country generally. I believe this typical American boy voices the sentiments of the average serviceman:

FUKUYAMA, JAPAN, *November 10, 1945.*

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you not only in my own interest but in the interest of many of my friends.

I have lived in Greenville, S. C., all of my life. I was going to Greenville High at the same time your son Billy was. Therefore I know you are quite competent.

My friends and I are members of the Forty-first Division. We are now in Fukuyama on the so-called mission of occupation. But all we are doing is wasting time.

In the mornings we have an hour of close order drill and an hour of manual of arms.

Now will you please tell me what good that does now that the war is over! In the afternoon we clean up the trash around here so the Japs can come in and make themselves a garden.

We are supposed to be a conquering nation but all we are doing over here is working for the Japanese. They actually walk by and laugh at us because we are doing the work they should be doing.

All that talk about the soldiers in Japan going to health resorts and sleeping in nice beds is all a lot of bull.

We are sleeping on cots in a building without any means of heat. We nearly freeze to death because we aren't supplied with sufficient cover to keep warm.

It seems that the Government just doesn't care what happens to us. If they did they would stop shooting the bull and start some action.

They don't even care enough about us to send us ample supplies. Some of the men here don't even have decent shoes to wear. Often we don't get enough food to keep us feeling well.

The other day we received a newspaper which showed a picture of United States Army trucks carrying food to the Germans.

Now if the Germans can get food supplied by America, why in the name of God can't we get some?

There are some high pointers here who deserve to be home. In fact they should have been home long ago.

There are also some young fellows here who want to go home and continue their education.

Now all we want to know is what in the Hell is the matter with you people in Washington? Please get on the ball and get us home.

Christmas is nearly here and we sure would like to be home with our families and friends. There is no excuse for us not to be if something is done.

I am not asking, but begging you to do everything possible to get us home.

We are getting damn tired of reading about all the strikes back home. Just ask any of the strikers if they want to swap jobs with us.

Please help us out because if you people in Washington don't help us out then who in the Hell is?

Get the troops home!

Thanking you for your consideration I am,
Sincerely yours.

Attention, Army and Navy Intelligence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months we have been reading in the Spanish press of an alleged shortage of electric power for private use in Spain.

I have just received a letter from a friend of mine who has lived in Spain, and who knows what is going on there. This friend informs me there is a connection between the so-called shortage of electric power for private use in Spain and the great increase in the use of electric power by the Spanish Government, together with the fact that thousands of German scientists who have specialized on atomic energy took refuge in Spain about the time of the Allied invasion of Germany. It follows:

NOVEMBER 3, 1945.

Congressman WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEVENSON: It must not be forgotten that the Spanish and German specialists in higher physics have been working intensely for over a year, and in the same direction as our own men of science, to arrive at the utilization of atomic energy. Nor must it be forgotten that if they succeed in making use of the arm that put an end to Japan's power the danger for us would be most grave now that the Spaniards with their German friends (of whom there are half a million in Spain) utterly lack those democratic and humanitarian scruples that inspire our international behavior.

Think, Congressman STEVENSON, of the terrible responsibility that would fall upon our Government in such a case as I dare to imagine: For some weeks now I have been reading in the papers of a critical shortage of electricity for industrial and private use in Spain, and I feel absolutely certain that I am conjecturing right in believing that two-thirds of that energy is being dedicated to experiments relating to the smashing of the atom and the isolation of its energy. Would that I were mistaken, but every indication authorizes me, and all Americans with some political sense, to keep that fear alive.

With best wishes to you always for the carrying out of your good work.

Very sincerely yours.

On reading the following Associated Press release from Stockholm under date of November 17, 1945, I am convinced of the truth of the statement of my friend that Franco Spain is collaborating with the German scientists who took refuge in Spain to produce atomic bombs which may be used to destroy our cities:

HEAR 20 NAZIS PURSUE A-BOMB SECRET IN SPAIN

STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN, November 17.—The newspaper Expressen said today it had been informed that 20 Nazi scientists were working feverishly in Spain to solve the secrets of production of the atomic bomb. The paper said the experiments were being conducted with the approval of Generalissimo Franco.

The Housing Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include comments of Robert L. Norton,

appearing in the Boston Post of November 19, 1945, in relation to the critical housing shortage that exists:

With the Nation facing a housing shortage of critical proportions, Congress is still dallying with legislation intended to remedy this situation. Some attention is being given to slum clearance in the cities with the cooperation of local, State, and municipal governments, but the approach to the problems on a national scale is still confused and indecisive.

HOPE IN WAGNER BILL

Providing Congress is spurred to action, there is some hope of straightening out the housing troubles of the country in the bill introduced in the Senate by Senator WAGNER, of New York, and supported by Senator TAFT, of Ohio.

This bill, if adopted, would help the middle income groups which have hitherto been neglected in government planning. It strengthens the FHA system so as to reach the great number of families in this market. The plan is limited to houses where the principal loan is more than $5,000, which means about a $5,300 house. It raises the amount eligible for insurance from 80 percent or 90 percent of the cost of housing to 95 percent, thus reducing the down payment for a middle income family to 5 percent.

To make the terms more favorable, it extends the period of amortization from 20 to 25 years to 32 years. It also reduces the maximum interest rate allowable under the statute from 5 percent to 4 percent. Under the 5-year program for urban redevelopment, which is also set forth in the measure, the Federal Government could loan $500,000,000 to cities and towns to get land assembly and clearance projects started.

MANY VETERANS MARRIED

From all over the country comes the same story of a search for apartments and homes, any kind of a place to live. And the situation is made worse by the fact that a large proportion of the veterans coming back are married men anxious to establish themselves in their own homes.

One gets an idea of the seriousness of the situation from figures made available here. It is stated that a Government survey shows that some 1,200,000 families have doubled up and that more than 2,000,000 more families will be compelled to double up in 1946, whatever improvement is made in the building of new housing units.

Included in the 2,000,000 are the families of more than 1,100,000 veterans. One gets the idea of the problem facing the veterans from the estimate that 1,600,000 married veterans without homes are to be discharged. And the Army survey shows 1,300,000 additional veterans intend to marry within the next year.

Thus, there is a prospective total of 2,900,000 veterans without homes.

Present conditions are aggravated by the fact that between the First and Second World Wars, the housing supply did not catch up with the increase in the population. There are now nearly 3,000,000 more families in the country than in 1940.

Meaning of Armistice Day for United States Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave given me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the Armistice Day message written by Mr. Cecil P. Dickson, of the Gannett News Service. Mr. Dickson's thoughts are pertinent to the moral turmoil which seems to have enveloped the world since VJ-day:

NOTES ON MEANING OF ARMISTICE DAY FOR UNITED STATES CITIZENS

(By Cecil B. Dickson)

WASHINGTON.—Yesterday was Armistice Day. It was celebrated at the end of World War I. That was supposed to be on November 11, 1918.

The Germans suspended fighting 27 years ago—in 1918, when Kaiser Wilhelm's forces failed.

A score of years later the Germans rose again.

This time it was under madman Hitler and his hoodlums.

They terrorized the world for 7 long years.

Several times they almost won World War II.

Victory slipped from their grasp by scant margins.

But they surrendered May 8, 1945, to the overwhelming Allies.

The Japanese, our ally in 1918, fought us from 1941.

The atomic bomb closed the Pacific war August 14, 1945.

The armistice of November 11, 1918, was a hollow victory.

For World War I was fought under appealing slogans—

"The war to end wars."

"Make the world safe for democracy."

The armistice 27 years ago did not bring an end to war.

It failed to save the world for democracy—dictators rose.

Even in democratic countries, one-man-rule increased.

Dictatorial rulers prevailed in all countries of the world.

Democracy lost ground.

Diplomacy lost the peace.

Now there remains one excuse for Armistice Day observance.

That is to mourn the loss of men, money, and materials.

True, two decades of nonhostilities followed.

Lavish living first, then masses of hungry.

The "have-nots" fought, but the "haves" had.

Hostilities resumed.

World War II spread over the planet.

After all, "armistice" means but a temporary peace—a stay of hostilities until fighting resumes.

Sentimentalists will add May 8 and August 14 to November 11.

But, what have the victories of 1945 brought to America and her allies?

Civil war is raging in war-weary China.

Battered and broken England is under drastic war rule.

South American governments fall; rise; and fall again.

In the United States, labor fights business and business fights back at labor.

Strikes and other economic disturbances stalk the land.

Stirred by bigots and demagogs, racial hatreds are rising.

Army and Navy war leaders are bickering over service unification.

Left- and right-wing Congressmen battle over governmental philosophies.

Scientists, legislators, and Government leaders squabble over atomic energy.

Servicemen flee from the Army and Navy.

Restlessness dominates the Nation.

There is no happiness.

The war just ended brought victory, but no peace of mind.

Other than for the destruction of the German Nation and the Japanese Empire, there is no satisfaction.

The returning warriors feel not as victors, but as victims.

Their attitude is that another war will come.

Their hope is that they will not have to fight it.

America gained a great position in world estimation during the war.

She is losing it now that peace is upon us.

Each Armistice Day should be a day of prayers—prayers that the men charged with leadership are capable of keeping America at peace.

Address of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Armistice Day of this year, General and Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower honored Boston by a visit, receiving a welcome from over 1,000,000 persons.

In the evening, at a State banquet, General Eisenhower made the following remarks:

Your Excellency, for me it is a most happy circumstance that my orders to proceed to Washington for temporary duty afforded opportunity to accept the gracious invitation of this city and State to pay here a brief visit. The warmth of your welcome to Mrs. Eisenhower and myself will live with us always. We are most truly and humbly grateful.

It is always a pleasant task to report to Americans upon the character of the service performed by the soldiers our country sent to Europe. My admiration, respect, and affection for the trained American soldier, sailor, and airman are without limits. So, it is a special privilege to assure you that your own Twenty-sixth Division, commanded by a great leader, General Paul, established a record in Europe that measures up fully to the highest American standard. The division was first committed to battle under such conditions of terrain, weather, and enemy resistance as to be classed as frightful. But from its first day of action until the whole job was done, it never faltered, never hesitated. Every man entitled to wear the YD of the Yankee Division on his shoulder will do so in honor and in pride for the remainder of his life. I am told that your Forty-third Division in the far Pacific established for itself an equally brilliant battle record. The minute men of Lexington and Concord would be proud to acclaim the brilliant performance of New England's representative of numberless battlefields in World War II.

In both hemispheres victory has crowned the efforts of our fighting forces, but in the aftermath of major conflicts there is invariably and inescapably experienced throughout the world a feeling of confusion, uneasiness, doubt, and indecision. These create unrest in many fields—industrial, political, financial, and international. Though we in America do not wholly escape these universal problems, we are, in one vital respect, extremely fortunate. We know, at the very least, that each of us has the treasured opportunity to exert his own influence in seeking solutions. We, any of us, may express freely our own convictions in the confidence that the will of the majority, peaceably expressed, will prevail, and that the rights of the minority will not suffer thereby.

It is in the role of a citizen exercising this American right that I venture to address to you today a few thoughts which, in my trip across the Atlantic, I have attempted to reduce to writing in order that I might not trespass too excessively upon your time.

As a preliminary I should like to suggest the importance of remembering, always—though with undiminished appreciation and obligation for the vital work of our great allies—the accomplishments of this country in the late war. Undismayed by the black outlook of the early months, when it seemed that the all-conquering hordes of Germany, Japan, and their partners were in an unassailable position, you, by your sweat, your blood, and your undaunted spirit contributed mightily and decisively to the greatest global victory of all time.

Never has more dismal prospect been transformed into more glorious result. The conclusion is that when America clearly visualizes the task she has to do, so that all may rally as one toward its accomplishment, there are few things that for her can logically be classed as impossible. She, and her allies, can even win the peace!

In Europe there were more than 3,000,000 Americans on the day of victory. The final division to reach us disembarked last April and promptly participated in battle to hasten and clinch the victory. In passing, it is significant to note that this division came into action 3 years and 4 months after Pearl Harbor day, a fact that gives some inkling of the tremendous task and the time involved in gearing a nation to the requirements of the battlefield.

Within 6 weeks after the arrival of this final fighting division the entire process of pouring our resources into Europe was reversed. The business of tearing down that mighty battle machine properly began, so as to provide additional strength in the Pacific and to return our uniformed men to their pursuits of peace. Ever since that day the War Department has constantly accelerated the pace of demobilization, using every ounce of energy at its command to restore those men to their family circles, where you are so anxious to welcome them. Up to a certain, definite point, this process of disintegration is wise, commendable, necessary. But a conviction that I want to leave with you today is that there is developing a situation that is bringing that limiting point into sharp focus.

Peace did not descend upon central Europe with the cessation of hostilities. It marked the end of killing and it provided an opportunity to begin the laborious business of restoring order from chaos; of imposing upon a conquered people methods and processes which we consider appropriate to peaceful pursuits; of cooperating with our allies in regulating the economy, the industry, the education—indeed, every activity of the conquered country—and to compel democratic reform and virtual rebirth of the German people.

Enforcement of this intricate program requires military strength. If disintegration of our forces proceeds too far, it will become quickly evident to the Germans, who are expert in this type of appraisal. If we become incompetent or unequal to the task, not only will we be humiliated and shamed, but America's influence in building the foundations of an enduring peace in Europe will disappear, and the great costs of the war may have been paid in vain.

May I point out that in addition to all the normal tasks devolving upon an occupational force in a thickly populated, hostile country, we cannot neglect our responsibilities to millions of unfortunate people that we call displaced persons.

The agonies they have suffered, the injustices they have helplessly borne, have left them a charge upon the democratic world. They are exceedingly grateful for what the American Government and soldiers have done and are doing for them. But the sad fact is that that job will be a continuing one until those people can return to their homes, or have beer given opportunity, in some spot upon the earth, to develop for themselves a respectable standard of self-sustained living.

Beyond all these tasks there is another one for our soldiers that touches upon our immediate interests. In Europe there are now more than 6,000,000 tons of valuable American property. The processes of hasty redeployment have necessarily left much of it in condition where only deterioration and destruction will result if we are robbed completely of our own men to take care of it, and to provide for its orderly disposal. Though we are making in those areas the maximum use of local civilian labor, responsibility in this task can be faithfully discharged by no one except Americans, the owners of the property. We must take care of our own.

All of these tasks are now largely being performed by soldiers. Some of them will always have to be, as long as the task remains.

The plain and unpalatable fact is that accomplishment of America's war purposes—which I take to be the establishment of an enduring peace—requires, for a period of which the length cannot now clearly be foreseen, the maintenance of adequate American military forces in Europe.

Moreover, you and I, all of us, should help in making those men understand the depth of our appreciation for the distasteful but vitally necessary work they are doing for us.

Please do not think that I would agree to any unconscionable delay in sending back to his home the man who has borne the brunt of the battle. No one, anywhere, could have greater concern than I for the human desire and the logical right of the American who has faced the fury of the enemy in the field to have further military duties carried on by those who have not been so exposed. Certainly, we must recognize and plan for realization of this rightful desire.

In outlining this problem I am merely pointing out to you that a day of critical decision is rushing upon the American people. That decision in simplest terms is merely this: Are we going so far in weakening ourselves in Europe as to turn our backs upon a problem critically involving the future peace and the world, including this country? Are we going to abandon, unfulfilled, the great purposes for which we fought this war? Or, are we going sanely and logically to provide the means and the strength in Europe that will see that job through to the end?

In my opinion there can be no temporizing, no compromising, with this issue. I feel that I owe it to every man who loyally, uncomplainingly and successfully carried out the tasks that I placed before him in Europe—particularly I owe it to those and to the families of those who gave their all that America's purposes might be served—to urge the instant adoption of a system whereby America's wartime soldiers may be returned to their homes but under which America's obligations to the world and to herself may, in this regard, be satisfactorily met.

It is not easy, but it can, it must, be done.

As the representative of all the men you sent across the Atlantic and vigorously supported as they helped to crush Hitlerism and restore peace, I express our confidence that you, again, will meet the challenge.

Rioting in Egypt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following correspondence between Mr. Peter H. Bergson, chairman of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, and His Excellency, Mr. Anis Azer, Chargé d'Affaires of Egypt, regarding the recent rioting against Hebrews in Egypt. It is noteworthy to point out that these riots took their usual course, beginning with anti-Semitic outbreaks and ending with vandalism and destruction upon churches and mosques, together with places of business of Christians and Moslems as well as Jews.

NOVEMBER 7, 1945.

His Excellency Mr. ANIS AZER,
Chargé d'Affaires of Egypt,
Washington, D. C.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: It has always been a source of gratification to us that in the conversations we have been privileged to have with some of Egypt's foremost statesmen, including His Excellency the Minister for Foreign Affairs Abdel Hamid Bedawi Pasha and His Excellency the Minister to the United States Mohmoud Hassan Pasha, we have always found ourselves in full accord on the premise that there is no basis for antagonism between Hebrews and Arabs. Whenever, in history, our two peoples have lived together, they have cooperated admirably to the greater glory of civilized mankind.

It was with great perturbation, therefore, that we learned of the recent shocking events that occurred in Egyptian cities. According to reports which we must credit, Egyptian mobs indulged in practices clearly paralleling the pogroms of Czarist Russia and Hitler Germany. Shops were looted, synagogues were profaned and fired, holy scrolls of law a thousand years old were destroyed and burned in the streets, venerable institutions of learning were pillaged, and defenseless men and women were mercilessly attacked.

We are regretfully impelled to reject the assumption that the events which occurred in Cairo, Alexandria, and other places were of a spontaneous and insignificantly casual character. Such an assumption is excluded by the fact that Arab spokesmen, both in the Middle East and elsewhere, have been repeatedly quoted as making inciting statements; the tenor of these statements was generally that Jewish citizens in Arab countries should and would be made responsible for political events in Palestine. The Nazis of Germany were infamous for similar practices with respect to hostages.

We do not overlook the possibility that these spokesmen might have been influenced by British agents not too scrupulous in their choice of means of extending and perpetuating British imperialism in the Middle East, but such a possibility does not absolve these Arab spokesmen from liability for the consequences of their acts.

This deplorable situation is the more incomprehensible to us in the light of the fact that Egypt itself has only recently succeeded in achieving its freedom, and that it only

this year joined the family of the United Nations. The regrettable events which are the subject of this communication can scarcely be considered to contribute to international understanding, world security, or the prestige or efficiency of the nascent United Nations Organization. Our regret at having to review these events is heightened by our deep appreciation of Egypt's importance in the international structure and particularly in the structure of the Middle East as it relates to the future of world peace and security. We are sincerely desirous that nothing should endanger the friendly relations between your great country and people, and our people.

It was for this reason that we read with satisfaction unofficial reports concerning condemnation of the riots by your Prime Minister, who was said to have expressed his conviction that no reasonable Egyptian will subscribe to what has occurred. It is our belief that the evil hands described by your Prime Minister as being the inspiration of the riots will be exposed, and that all those criminally guilty will be punished according to law. Liberal public opinion of the world will judge these events by the measures taken by your government to redress the wrongs committed and to prevent their recurrence.

We should greatly appreciate an official statement from Your Excellency as to your government's attitude and course of action.

Respectfully yours,

PETER H. BERGSON,
Chairman.

NOVEMBER 9, 1945.

Mr. PETER H. BERGSON,
Chairman, Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated November 7, 1945, and we reciprocate the feeling of gratification that in the conversations you have had with some of Egypt's foremost statesmen, including His Excellency the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Abdel Hamid Badawi Pasha, and His Excellency the Minister to the United States, Mahmoud Hassan Pasha, you have always found yourselves in full accord on the premise that there is no basis for antagonism between Hebrews and Arabs.

However, we beg to disagree with your insinuations that Arab spokesmen have been quoted as making what you have chosen to describe as inciting statements. Such connection between their statements and the late events is totally unwarranted.

We are gratified that you have taken note of the Prime Minister's pronouncements to the effect that "no reasonable Egyptian will subscribe to what has occurred." The vigorous measures undertaken by the Egyptian Government have resulted in reestablishing complete order and we assure you that the situation is well under control.

Yours very truly,

ANIS AZER,
Chargé d'Affaires ad interim.

A Raw Deal for Our Enlisted Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, Army Regulation 605–115, governing leaves of absence of commissioned personnel, states, in substance:

A leave credit of 1 month per year with full pay and allowances will accrue to each officer in the Army of the United States on active duty for each year of service up to a maximum of 120 days.

Army Regulation 615–275, governing authorized absence—furlough—of enlisted personnel, states, in substance:

Authorized absence is a privilege granted to enlisted men under certain conditions. This privilege may be denied for disciplinary reasons or for the good of the service. No right will accrue to any enlisted man as a result of authorized absence not availed of or denied.

Again, the privates, privates first class, corporals, sergeants, and so forth, get a dirty deal. To give commissioned officers a 120-day leave with pay and deny same to the enlisted men is one of the most disgraceful and dishonorable acts perpetrated on all mankind.

It is the enlisted men who have the brunt of this war. It is the enlisted men who endured more and suffered more. It is the enlisted men who paid the heaviest price. Why in heaven's name deny them the privilege of 120 accrued days' leave with pay we give our officers?

The officers for the most part had soft, privileged jobs. Hundreds and thousands of officers here in Washington who never saw a Jap or Hun—who lived in luxury and ease—are given 120 days' accrued leave and pay.

Yet the privates who starved, who contracted diseases, who fought the war and did the dirty work and paid the heaviest price are denied that privilege.

It is coming to pass that we are establishing a military privileged class of officers in our country. God forbid. There is no excuse whatever for this crude deal. Wake up Members of Congress. Let us take the bull by the horns and remedy this rotten deal. If we allow this raw deal to continue we do not deserve the respect of the people we represent. Let us act now. In all decency let us act now.

Mr. Speaker, the morale of our enlisted men is breaking. It is a wonder it has kept up as long as it has. Are our enlisted men to suffer and endure only so that our officers can keep their jobs and enjoy privileges? God forbid. Members of Congress are we men or are we mice? Where is our manhood—when we permit this to continue?

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert an article from a service paper published in the Pacific. It gives an idea of how they feel about it. If we Members of Congress permit this condition of privilege to continue—we do not deserve to be Members of Congress. These boys in the Pacific—many of them have been in action 3 years or more. Are not these boys entitled to an accumulated furlough? There can be no furloughs while they are in fox holes or rotting in dungeons. Why not give them a furlough with pay now—since they were not given a furlough while in action?

ACCRUED LEAVE—A CRUDE LAW

Army regulation 605–115, governing leaves of absence of commissioned personnel, states in substance: A leave credit of 1 month per year with full pay and allowances will accrue to each officer in the Army of the United States on active duty for each year of service up to a maximum of 120 days.

Army regulation 615–275, governing authorized absence (furlough), of enlisted personnel, states in substance: Authorized absence is a privilege granted to enlisted men under certain conditions. This privilege may be denied for disciplinary reasons or for the good of the service. No right will accrue to any enlisted man as a result of authorized absence not availed of or denied.

Under these regulations there is one striking difference—the officer automatically receives accrued leave with full pay and allowances up to 120 days. The enlisted man receives nothing as a matter of right, regardless of how exemplary his record.

Why is it possible for an enlisted man to serve in the same theater of operations with an officer for a period of 3 to 4 years where conditions have not allowed receiving the benefits of accrued furlough time or a terminal leave based upon 30 days per year for total service? At the separation center the enlisted man receives his discharge button denoting an honorable discharge, travel pay from the center to his home at the rate of 5 cents per mile, and the first of three $100 payments commonly referred to as mustering-out pay.

The officer who has been in the same theater and subject to the same conditions, climate, diseases, hardships, and various other hazards, will receive accrued leave of 30 days per year, with full pay and allowances up to the maximum of 120 days. In addition the officer receives the discharge button denoting honorable service, railroad fare and, if he is of company grade (lieutenants and captains), will receive the first of three $100 payments of his mustering-out pay. All of which will total in the case of the average officer who has 120 days of accrued leave approximately $1,000 to $1,600, depending upon whether the officer is single or married. Which when contrasted to the $300 mustering-out pay that the enlisted men receives, plus mileage at the rate of 5 cents per mile to his home, is a glaring inequality which the citizens of the United States are no doubt unaware of in my estimation.

It is the opinion of all personnel with whom I have discussed this matter, both commissioned and enlisted, that the variance between these two regulations is an oversight on the part of the War Department. It is inconceivable that any branch of the American armed forces would willingly and intentionally keep a regulation in effect which unjustly discriminates against any group simply because they are enlisted men. But it appears to every enlisted man that AR 615–275 in its present form is completely out of harmony with the best customs and traditions of the service and unfair to the men who have been selected for the service but who, due to the exigencies of the war, have spent the majority of their army career in the forgotten, little-known and bypassed corners of the globe, where furloughs and rest camps were virtually unheard of, but hardships, loneliness, disease, dehydrated food, constant danger, and even death were SOP.

Under present regulations inequality exists. The choice should not be difficult. What are the enlisted men in this theater doing to bring this injustice to the attention of the War Department and Congress? (Reprinted from a letter by Master Sgt. John A. Johnson to the Daily Pacifican.)

It's Time To Be Afraid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Armistice Day message by Booth Tarkington:

IT'S TIME TO BE AFRAID

* * * * *

When anyone says that we must face the future with courage he is omitting the atomic bomb from his calculations. What we need is fear. Before atomic bombs go into mass production in Russia, in Britain, in France, in China, in Mexico and Cuba, and in Italy, Germany, and Japan, God give us grace to be cowardly enough to save ourselves by common sense.

For decades with every improvement of artillery, airplanes, or explosives, optimists have said, "Now there will be no more wars because the destruction would be too horrible." But there were more wars. The holocausts and the massacres destroyed human beings by tens of thousands and all their works and property with them—and the wars went on.

Thirty million people perished in this war. Many of those millions were people of the conqueror countries, for in such conflicts the winners are only less horribly damaged than the losers. And the atomic bomb says to mankind. "You ain't seen nothin yet. Wait till your next war."

Reality demands that we divest ourselves immediately of the idea that the atomic bomb is American. It was created by cosmopolitan physicists. But no matter who made the first one, the thing can no more be an American property than can earthquake or steam or photography. A shower of atomic bombs from Guatemala could write finis to the United States.

From now on the nations are like a family in a house with walls built of dynamite.

What would the members of such a family do if, like ourselves, they could not move to another house? I think they would walk softly and take care not to irritate one another.

Fortunately, at the moment when the means to destroy life arrived in man's hands there developed into his mind the conception that could save him from his dreadful machine.

The Security Council of the United Nations could protect the world against the atomic bomb. It must have a force of international and scientifically trained inspectors. The inspectors must have access to every country. Then a small police force under the Council would be able to insure the peace of the world. Aggressor countries could no longer be aggressive and exist.

Any isolationism, old or new, is now a peril. We cannot be or call ourselves the most powerful Nation in the world without rousing such mistrust and dislike of the United States as was roused in us when Germany set up to be a world dictator.

Our military forces, 12,000,000 strong at their best and supported by our industrial might, do not make us the most powerful Nation. Showered by atomic bombs, that whole power vanishes into less than dust. For the magnificent fight our forces have made we should be sorrowfully proud—sorrowful for their suffering and proud that they are our countrymen. But they cannot do it again.

That is the lesson of Armistice Day, 1945.

BOOTH TARKINGTON.

Long Beach, Calif., Labor Market Report; An Indicative Report From Significant and Strategic Industrial Area of Nation—Long Beach and Southern California Testing Ground of Industrial Advancement or Set-Back—USES Renders Great Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in the great Eighteenth Congressional District of California which I represent, and which district is in my home State of California, is the great metropolitan city of Long Beach. During the war, aircraft, shipbuilding, naval drydocks, and other great naval installations, factories, small war plants, and great war plants by the dozens, because of patriotic, untiring work, contribution by loyal Americans, more than produced their share of the material things and spiritual forces which helped win the war.

The United States Employment Service there has done a great service from its inception and more recently it has begun to publish labor-market bulletins such as the copy of the one I hereinafter include in these remarks. You will see by its content that it undertakes to frankly and impartially analyze the labor market as it is from month to month. While this labor bulletin refers to the labor market of my home city of Long Beach, and its immediate vicinity, I understand that this same material is placed at the disposal and for the information of management and labor throughout the Nation at strategic centers.

Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in bespeaking my utmost appreciation and high regard for the efficiency and loyalty of the personnel of the United States Employment Service in my native State of California and the great patriotic and devoted and able service which it has continuously rendered.

The text of the Labor Market Bulletin follows:

LABOR MARKET DEVELOPMENTS

Employment trend: A war production city for the past 4 years, Long Beach faces heavy odds in conversion to peacetime living. Now, 2½ months after VJ-day, it reports only partial conversion to civilian economy with several large companies still producing on remaining war contracts. Employment has dropped materially from the wartime peak but is still at a considerably higher level than that of the prewar period.

The character of Long Beach changed completely during the war years. Before the war, development of the harbor had given impetus to the growth of Navy and shipping activities. Small manufacturers had assembled automobiles, canned fish, produced oil well tools, edible fats and soap products, and built and repaired pleasure craft and fishing boats. Trade and service firms employed large numbers of people to serve tourists and residents. With the discovery of oil, a substantial petroleum industry developed.

With the declaration of the national emergency, the industrial growth of Long Beach was accelerated. The harbor facilities provided opportunity for large-scale expansion of shipbuilding and Navy facilities. A large air-frame plant located in the community. Small manufacturers converted to the production of parts for aircraft and ships, and new parts and assembly plants were opened. Manpower and material shortages kept trade and service establishments from expanding to any extent despite the heavily increased population and buying power. The influx of war workers and servicemen and their families swelled the population from 164,270 before the war to more than 260,000 at the present time.

Production cut-backs following the day of final victory brought sudden changes to the Long Beach industrial picture. Manufacturing which had mushroomed during the war was the chief industry affected by the quick stop of war production; about 16,870 workers were released from August to October, according to 40 reporting companies. Manufacturing had been decreasing steadily over the past year, however, and working forces in the reporting companies were 15,543 less on the day of surrender than they were a year earlier; increased plant efficiency, previous schedule cuts, and small plants' inability to maintain or expand civilian production because of material and manpower shortages had contributed to these previous employment declines. Aircraft companies and those producing ships' parts experienced the most severe reductions at the end of the war. Employment in private shipyards has remained relatively stable since August, as the companies still have a backlog of Government contracts for construction, repair, and conversion to complete. These companies employ 8,350 fewer workers than they did a year ago, however, because of schedule cuts made early in 1945. Navy establishments also have had an employment drop since VJ-day; the two reporting companies have lost more than 4,200 workers since August.

Unemployment: Unemployment increased sharply immediately after the end of the war. In addition to the workers released from local war plants, many Long Beach residents who worked in nearby war production areas have been released. The rise in the number of persons requesting service from the local USES office illustrates the volume of job seekers. Local office applications for work were 400 percent higher in September and 340 percent higher in October than they were in August. Barriers to the reemployment of war workers include: (1) Lack of job opportunities in which wartime skills can be used; (2) the surplus of women and over-age men over the demand for their services; (3) the reduction in "take-home" pay because of the 40-hour workweek in many industries; (4) the increased selectivity of employers. In addition, many employers have reached their peacetime employment peaks and are hiring only for replacement.

Migration: The continued and acute housing shortage points toward a balance of in-and-out migration. The war workers who have left the area, even temporarily, are being replaced by newcomers. Returning servicemen as well as veterans from other areas who are moving to Long Beach also have compensated for any out-migration of former workers. A sampling of work applications indicates that 7.5 percent of the work applicants are persons new to the community.

Conversion: Most of the aircraft and shipbuilding feeder and parts companies have been able to convert to civilian production without extensive retooling. The companies established before the war have returned to their former production, and several companies are now manufacturing toys, lawn mowers, phonograph records, civilian aircraft, and other products. Airframe and shipbuilding and repair companies are still working on Government contracts. Trade and service firms have added workers and have replaced less qualified ones as the manpower situation has loosened.

EMPLOYMENT OUTLOOK

Job opportunities: The number of unfilled openings, totaling 1,409 the last of October, remained practically unchanged from that of the last of September. The character of the openings has varied somewhat during the past month, however; fewer orders from manufacturers and more from trade, service, food processing, and construction companies were received in October. The construction industry accounts for the bulk of the need for skilled workers, although some are needed in manufacturing. Unskilled men are required in the manufacturing and construction industries chiefly. Most of the demand for women is in trade, service, and Government establishments, and are in the clerical, sales, or service occupations. About 15 percent of the openings pay from 50 to 75 cents an hour, while the balance pay over 75 cents an hour. Less opportunity for overtime pay is evidenced by the fact that only 1 percent of the jobs offer more than 48 hours of work a week, while 24 percent are for a work-week of 44 hours or less.

Future employment trend. Construction will expand materially and offer job opportunities in home and bridge building and in other planned public works as soon as materials are available. Ship repair in private yards will continue for several months at about current levels and hiring will be for replacement only. The future of the airframe industry depends upon the continuance of present Government and private contracts and the Government's disposition of the plants. Most of the other manufacturing industries have almost reached their peacetime employment peaks; some contemplate expansion as soon as plant additions can be erected and new markets can be developed. Some expansion in trade and service will occur, the employment increases being dependent upon the availability of experienced workers and goods and upon the continuance of buying power. Little change is anticipated in employment of naval establishments and the petroleum industry.

LOCAL LABOR-MARKET PROBLEMS

Conversion hindrances: Shortages of materials have deterred expansion in construction, as has the shortage of experienced and skilled construction workers. The lowered pay rates and working hours of civilian industry discourage the recruitment of workers for those companies that are expanding or are hiring for replacement.

Housing: Housing shortages prevent new workers from entering the community and handicap returning veterans in entering civilian life. About 185 dwellings are now under construction or are planned, many of which have already been spoken for; all are for sale, and substantial down payments are required. About 250 apartments will be built in the next 18 months. Civilian workers have difficulty in finding housing of any kind; priorities on public housing limit occupancy to servicemen, returning veterans, and civilians working in specific plants. New applications for public housing average more than 1,000 a month. The disposal of the 3,490 temporary public housing units will create a severe hardship; these units were to have been disposed of within 2 years of the time they were built, and the time limit is about to elapse. At least 11,750 houses must be constructed within the next 3 years in order to keep pace with the expanded growth of the city.

Labor surpluses: Reemployment of large numbers of displaced war workers is hindered by the difficulty in matching workers and jobs. Women and overage men who left their homes or retirement to accept employment during the war are not readily placeable. While some of these workers left the labor market at the close of the war, many are seeking jobs to supplement their incomes or to meet new financial responsibilities.

	Number of of establishments	April 1940	Year ago	1945		
				August	September	October
EMPLOYMENT TRENDS						
Total employment	80	6,459	71,682	60,766	46,167	39,573
Petroleum (drilling and refining)	19	1,280	1,942	1,670	1,461	1,525
Manufacturing	40	2,498	55,350	39,807	25,417	22,940
Food processing	4	660	625	425	657	662
Ship construction and repair (private yards)	5	300	23,530	15,195	15,190	15,180
Other manufacturing	31	1,539	31,195	24,187	9,570	7,038
Trade and service	19	2,680	2,815	2,900	2,925	2,938
Navy shore installations	2	0	11,575	16,389	14,654	12,170
SEPARATION RATES						
All employees		INA	10.1	46.1	22.1	15.9
Petroleum		INA	9.9	10.2	10.1	10.0
Manufacturing		INA	10.1	116.2	27.6	12.5
Food processing		INA	34.6	26.5	27.1	14.5
Ship construction and repair		INA	10.5	15.6	13.1	12.2
Other manufacturing		INA	8.3	153.6	28.7	12.2
Trade and service		INA	25.2	19.8	18.1	17.2
Navy shore installations		0	7.5	9.5	14.6	17.9
USES OFFICE ACTIVITIES						
Total individuals requesting service		INA	15,587	27,723	38,195	68,226
Total job referrals		INA	5,814	1,942	3,811	4,620
World War II veterans requesting service		INA	1,052	1,358	1,924	5,182
World War II veterans' referrals		0	532	702	813	1,655

	All industries	Manufactories	Trade service	Government	Construction	Other
Total, all occupations	1,409	284	410	218	400	97
Skilled	368	84	30	0	254	0
Semiskilled	56	21	11	10	10	4
Unskilled	366	167	5	7	134	53
Service	268	0	268	0	0	0
Clerical and sales	326	7	83	201	1	34
Professional and managerial	25	5	13	0	1	6
Women	522	80	172	200	1	69

The Political Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Rothwell Brown from the New York Journal-American of November 19, 1945:

THE POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

WASHINGTON, November 19.—In the matter of the proposed grant, loan, or gift to Britain of five or six billions of dollars, Uncle Sam is going to be gypped twice in a very clever squeeze play.

While the new Socialist government at London maneuvers in Washington for this fabulous sum, the same government at London is putting over a fast one.

When the Bretton Woods Monetary Agreement was rushed through Congress, many who did not like the idea supported it on the theory, carefully stated in debate, that America's contribution of $2,750,000,000 to the Monetary Fund, and $3,175,000,000 to the International Bank, would be used to finance the postwar needs of friendly countries, without further drain on the United States Treasury.

That was the assumption of certain influential Republicans who supported the scheme, and whose argument was sufficient to muster enough votes to put it over.

But Great Britain is playing a far smarter game, from her point of view than that.

Although the United States Congress, in a gush of slobby sentimentality, rushed through approval of Bretton Woods, Great Britain has not yet approved it, and it has not yet even been brought up for debate in Parliament.

Now comes the proposal to advance Britain five or six billions—outside the Bretton Woods set-up—and those in Congress who are beginning to realize they have been hoodwinked, are asking "why?"

They answer their own question by saying that Britain is deliberately holding up endorsement of the Bretton Woods plan until after a huge loan (many in Washington call it a gift) has been negotiated here for Great Britain, and another one for Russia.

If this scheme can be put over it will be seen at a glance that the new loans, having been made by new legislation, drawing new money from the Treasury for the purpose, once they have been obtained, will leave rich reserves of the International Monetary Fund, and International Bank, untapped, all ready to be drawn upon over and above the vast sums previously obtained in separate negotiations.

Meanwhile, Members of Congress have been informed that Great Britain, pending her approval of Bretton Woods, is negotiating bilateral trade agreements with many countries.

This would be prohibited after the full acceptance of Bretton Woods, but the scheme itself provides that bilateral agreements already in existence when the pact goes into effect shall not be disturbed.

If Great Britain is indeed doing this, and the evidence that she is is said to be convincing, it is pretty slick work, at the expense of American trade and the American taxpayers.

All of this is certain to have a thorough exposure when the British loan bill finally

reaches the stage of legislative enactment, and it should have, for quite aside from the fact that the United States is in effect being asked to finance the new British Socialist experiment in government, it doesn't seem quite like what the British themselves would call cricket.

The American people are entitled to all the facts about what has been going on in the monetary conference in Washington.

They are entitled to see all the cards on the table, face up.

Control of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from Americans United for World Organization, Inc.:

AMERICANS UNITED FOR WORLD ORGANIZATION, INC.,
New York, N. Y., November 15, 1945.

DEAR SIR: This ad was refused by the Washington Post. We are taking this means of drawing it to your attention:

"We are alarmed.

"The freedom from fear we pledged to humanity is today neither ours nor the world's. We Americans are proclaiming foreign policies based on a spirit of nationalistic smugness and worse. We are using the same weapon to keep fear alive that we used to end the war against fascism—the atom bomb.

"Today the fate of our children rests in your hands.

"We implore you to listen to the scientists who built our atom bomb, who unleashed the power of the atom—to listen and listen carefully as they tell us that what we have is no long-term secret, that what we have is either a power for good or for the destruction of all mankind.

"We implore you to listen to them and to listen to the people who will not and do not believe that more war is necessary. We implore you to listen to the hearts of men everywhere, quickened with fear where they were once filled with hope.

"We implore you to listen and to act.

"We urge an end to policies and proclamations which stir international uneasiness and distrust and plunge us into a new and final game of power politics.

"We urge that the United States take the initiative through the United Nations Organization to bring about a meeting of the representatives of the nations of the world in order to plan the control of atomic energy as a weapon of war and in order to strengthen the United Nations Organization so that it will be truly effective.

"We are alarmed. We want to be free from fear.

"Americans United for World Organization; Friends of Democracy; Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions; National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; National Citizens Political Action Committee; National Council of Negro Women; National Farmers Union; National Lawyers Guild; Southern Conference for Human Welfare; United Christian Council for Democracy."

Letters From GI's Still in Uniform to Their Own Mail Bag in Philippines Tell Their Thinking, Hopes, and Objectives—Tell What Congress Should Do

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in the Philippine Islands there is published the Daily Pacifican newspaper, editorialized by the GI's themselves. One of these distinguished gentlemen and his family live in the great Eighteenth District of California. The distinguished GI himself is still in the Philippines, from where I received the service newspaper in which appeared the following letters.

I recommend that instead of listening to gossip and rumor and false report and instead of any of us making speeches on the floor of this great House which are based on rumor and gossip and hearsay, that we note what these distinguished GI's communicate to their own newspaper. Here they are:

ADVICE

EDITOR: We, the undersigned, have been in the the Army for periods varying from 2 to more than 5 years, with many having long combat service.

We feel that our congressmen are giving us a "run around," by not demanding a clear-cut discharge policy from the War Department.

The congressmen have not insisted that the 1,500-plus Liberty ships be converted to troop transports which, the port commander of Manila says, can be easily done in 48 hours if 50 construction men be assigned to each vessel. Each vessel would then be capable of transporting 750 men to the States.

They, the Congressmen, have not demanded that the 1,000-plus B-29's, now in existence, be used to ferry troops home. Each B-29 requires 20 man-hours of labor to enable it to carry more than 60 troops with all baggage, in less than three days, to the States. This amounts to more than 60,000 troops each week, even with the exclusion of the thousands of available C-46's, C-47's, C-54's, B-17's, and B-24's in themselves capable of transporting thousands weekly.

Records of all Congressmen will be scrutinized very carefully upon our return to civilian status to see what the record of actual legislation accomplished has been in each individual case. You may rest assured that those who have been resigned to no progressive action, when opportunities were at hand to benefit the overseas veteran, will be voted out.

Consequently, to those Congressmen who do not accelerate our return to our homes and loved ones from whom we have been too long separated, we pledge ourselves to vote against all Senators and Representatives now holding office who, within 25 days, do not assist us to return to our homes as quickly as posible.

Master Sgt. JOSEPH HUBNER
(And 317 others),
APO 707.

OFFER

EDITOR: Our unit, the Eight Hundred and First Army Marine Ship Repair Company, aboard the Army repair ship *Wm. F. Fitch*, is in the harbor with men qualified to supervise and carry out ship conversion work through experience gained on maintenance and repair of over 1,000 ships during the past year. The Eight Hundred and Third Merchant Marine Ship Repair Company, aboard the repair ship *Gorman*, is also in the harbor with similar qualifications and experience.

We can't speak for the fellows on the *Gorman* but as for ourselves we'd like to, if the Army will give us the go-ahead, sink our teeth into the job of converting enough Liberties or other cargo ships to enable all eligible men to get home by Christmas.

Our ship was the first Army repair ship in the Pacific and we'd like to get home as badly as anyone. However, if going home, even for high-point eligible men, is impossible as it seems to be, at least we would like to be doing work to help get the fellows home rather than the minor repair of small harbor craft we have been doing since our arrival in Manila Bay.

We've got the experienced men, the equipment and the material to do the job—just give us the damn job.

T3g WILLIAM SEARS
(And 100 others),
APO 75.

EAGER

EDITOR: In regard to the school program which is now beginning; we have talked it over and have decided that it is very good as far as it goes. However, we think something is being overlooked that could become a very important part of the program. We would like very much to see a trade school, where anyone interested could learn a useful trade, or improve on the one he had before the war.

We ourselves would like to go to a heavy engineering school where we could learn to operate bulldozers, power shovels and other equipment that would qualify us to take part in the big construction program that is going to take place after the war. We know that the Army has the equipment to train us with, how about giving us a chance to improve our position in the labor market after we change to civilian clothes again?

T4g DANIEL ROLFE
(And four others),
APO 75.

ANALYSIS

EDITOR: Can it be that the slow-down of redeployment is due to more than the usual snafu and the turning over of ships to private enterprises for commercial use? Can it be that as many soldiers as possible are purposely being held in this theater? What does General Devers, CG of AGF, mean when he says (as reported over WVTM) that the Army is discharging men so rapidly that there is a critical shortage of keymen in all departments?

I am wondering whether the current flare-up of fighting in China fits in here somewhere. The latest reports tell us that fighting has been going on for 2 weeks between the forces of Chiang Kai-shek and the forces of the north China autonomous region (so-called Reds). These two groups were apparently getting together on the questions of disarming Jap and puppet troops, restoring democratic methods in the Chinese Government, and establishing national unity. Then we heard of 53,000 United States marines, backed up by the Seventh Fleet, going to north China, supposedly to help disarm the Japs in these areas. The Red Chinese forces were already on the spot to disarm the Japs, but Chiang didn't want them to do it, for some strange reason. The Jap and puppet troops still have their arms. (The puppet collaborationists have sworn loyalty to Chiang.) And the marines are guarding Chinese railroads. Meanwhile the United

States Air Force hurriedly flies two of Chiang's armies to north China.

The picture of American soldiers fighting side by side with Japs and puppets in support of Chiang's feudal regime may be a fanciful one. But it certainly isn't a pretty one. If the Army should tell us that the redeployment program is scrapped, and should order us to China, we would, of course, obey as good soldiers.

However, if our folks back home told their Congressmen in no uncertain terms that they don't want us meddling in the internal affairs of other nations, the above picture would remain in the imagination. And who knows, redeployment might even be speeded up.

Corp. HENRY FRIEMAN,
APO 500.

Filibusters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Southern Patriot for October 1945:

"THE TIME TO PERMIT FILIBUSTERS IN AMERICA HAS PASSED"

Majority rule is fundamental to democracy and the constitutional process.

A filibuster obstructs majority rule and gives supreme power to a small minority.

It is a disgraceful and intolerable situation when the highest legislative body of the land is placed at the mercy of the vocal chords of one man.

"The time to permit filibusters in America has passed," said Senator PEPPER, of Florida. * * * "Give one-tenth of the body the power to muzzle nine-tenths, and democracy, as a functioning institution in the Senate, has been destroyed."

We southern citizens, proud of the part played by southerners in establishing these United States of America and in drafting its Constitution, declare that Senators engaging in filibuster flaunt not only the will of the Senate, but the best traditions of the South.

We respectfully urge the Senate of the United States, after giving adequate opportunity for full discussion, to halt any filibuster by invoking cloture, to maintain majority rule, and preserve democracy.

T. D. Davis, Assistant Director, Mississippi Agricultural and Industrial Board, Jackson, Miss.; Mark Ethridge, Publisher, Courier-Journal and Louisville Times, Louisville, Ky.; Charles S. Johnson, Social Science Instftute, Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn.; H. V. Reid, Chairman of Legislative Board, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Memphis, Tenn.; Carter Wesley, President, Informer Publishing Co., Houston, Tex.; Mortimer May, May Hosiery Mills, Nashville, Tenn.; Harry W. Schacter, President, Kentucky Merchants Association, Louisville, Ky.; Mrs. Alfred Taylor, Director, Organization and Education, Democratic Party, Austin, Tex.; Lucy Randolph Mason, CIO Southern Public Relations Representative, Atlanta, Ga.; S. A. Para, State Legislative Representative, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Memphis, Tenn.; Homer P. Rainey, Austin, Tex.; Mrs. W. H. Ratliff, Member, Southeastern Jurisdictional Council, the Methodist Church, Sherard, Miss.; Aubrey Williams, Publisher, Southern Farmer, Montgomery, Ala.; Mrs. M. E. Tilly, Woman's Society of Christian Service, Southeast Jurisdiction, the Methodist Church, Atlanta, Ga.; P. B. Young, President, Journal and Guide, Norfolk, Va.; Harry W. Acreman, Executive Secretary, Texas State Federation of Labor, Austin, Tex.; Roscoe Dunjee, President, National Negro Business League, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Samuel Freeman, Jr., Minister, Pulaski Heights Christian Church, Little Rock, Ark.; A. W. McAlister, Past President, Pilot Life Insurance Co., Greensboro, N. C.

Organizations are named for identification only.

Writer Warns Congress and President of Dangers in Housing Crisis—Urges Consideration of Plight of Homeless Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday. November 21, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I desire to transmit to the Members of the House another sincere warning that the National Government must wake up and acknowledge the problem of finding shelter for our returning veterans this winter is our most pressing national crisis.

This warning comes from a trained, impartial observer, Marquis Childs, one of Washington's most highly respected columnists.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Congressional RECORD, for the benefit of the Members, I would like to include Mr. Child's column for November 20, 1945, as it appeared in the Washington Post:

WASHINGTON CALLING
(By Marquis Childs)
HOMES FOR VETERANS

The White House is being told in no uncertain terms that the problem of finding homes for veterans to live in is one that carries a dangerous charge of political dynamite.

One of those who talked to the President about it recently was Mayor Edward J. Kelly, of Chicago. Whatever else Mayor Kelly may be, he is a shrewd politician who can see trouble on the horizon when it is still a small cloud.

The figures on the number of married veterans who will want places to live far exceed the number of houses and apartments that will be available even by the most optimistic estimates. The deficit adds up to a question mark bound to loom larger as the months go by.

By the end of 1946, it is estimated, 2,900,000 married veterans will need homes. Of this total, 800,000 will be doubled up voluntarily with parents and relatives.

Another 1,000,000 veteran families can be taken care of in existing housing. This is counting on the construction of 475,000 units during next year, which is probably an optimistic estimate. On this basis, 1,100,000 families would have no place to live.

Not long ago, National Housing Administrator John D. Blandford went up to Capitol Hill to suggest to Congress the need for a fund to move government housing so that it would be available for veterans. He recommended appropriation of $24,500,000 for dismounting and shipping houses from areas where war industry has now receded to cities where the need is most acute.

A House Appropriations Subcommittee received him with scant courtesy. When he presented figures from out in the country to show how serious were the shortages, Chairman CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, accused him of whipping up a fictitious demand for new housing

This week, some of the leaders in the National Association of Housing Officials are meeting in Washington. They were called together by Hugh R. Pomeroy, executive director, not to consider the problem of veterans, as such, but the whole picture of future home building in the next four or five critical years.

One of the most powerful of the lobbies that now infest the Capital is the real estate lobby. It is made up of two wings, the National Association of Real Estate Boards and the National Association of Home Builders. They are fighting rent control on new-house construction and price controls on new houses.

The real estate boards are opposed to all rent controls after June 30, when the OPA Act expires unless Congress takes action to renew it. They say that after that date controls should be left to local communities.

This substitute might work in some places. But, for the most part, it would be a frail reed to lean on in the face of (1) the serious shortage that will persist long after next June and (2) the unspent billions in bank accounts.

No statistical charts are necessary to show that a degree of inflation in the real estate field is already here. Everyone knows in his own neighborhood the example of the house that sold one month for so much and the next month for 10 or 20 percent more.

As to the long-term public housing problem, there is hope in the fact that Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, a Republican, has come together with Senators ROBERT WAGNER and ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Democrats, on a bill which will soon be presented. WAGNER and ELLENDER accepted certain improvements that TAFT suggested.

Not long ago TAFT took part in a radio debate in which he argued the need for the Government to do part of the national housing job. He developed considerable heat in championing public housing to clear slums and give the lowest income groups a break.

Ever since then the real estate lobby has looked on TAFT with dark suspicion as a dangerous radical. That is a measure of the reactionary attitude of the lobby—that a TAFT, a Republican TAFT, could be mistaken for a radical. It is a measure, too, of the forces to be overcome if the housing job is to be done.

Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts on Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks on the question of universal military training and the desirability for further study thereof

before definite action, I include herewith the following resolution passed unanimously by the Department of Social Service of the Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts.

The resolution follows:

Whereas:

1. President Truman's action in placing before Congress a recommendation for universal military training is one which demands the most serious consideration of every American; and

2. This proposal appears to run counter to the fact that our foreign policy is committed to the support of the United Nations Organization which includes arrangements for military sanctions against possible aggressors and breakers of the peace; and

3. The discovery of the use of atomic energy has led even military experts to question the value of the future of universal military training along the lines suggested by the President; and

4. The future of the world is so obviously dependent upon the work and research of scientists in every field whose skills are attained only through long and persistent training that educators are greatly concerned with the serious loss of young men of college and graduate school age such a program would entail; and

5. Many thoughtful citizens are properly concerned with the inadvisability of instituting such training at this time because of considerations varying from the belief that eighteen is too young for the training to the belief that for the Federal Government to enter the States with a program of compulsory education is an invasion of our traditional conception of free educational system upon which our democracy has always depended for its perpetuation:

Therefore, we, the members of the Department of Social Service of the Diocese of Massachusetts resolve:

1. That it would be most ill-advised for Congress to act on any of the present proposals for compulsory military education until a more adequate study be made of their implications in terms both of our foreign and our domestic policies;

2. That Congress establish a civilian commission comprising leaders in education, business, industry, and public life who with the aid of military advisors should make a survey of what, in the light of such considerations as those noted above, would be the best over-all plan for the security not only of the United States but of all mankind from war in the future.

Lebanon Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the people of Lebanon on the second anniversary of their day of independence, which falls on our Thanksgiving Day, November 22.

I have had the pleasure of meeting the distinguished Minister from Lebanon yesterday. With his coming to Washington, the cycle of friendship between our two peoples has been made complete.

We are young as a people, but old as a Nation; while you are old as a people, but young as a nation. Still, we have a common denominator in our way of life, our governments exist by the consent of the governed and we enjoy the mutual rights and responsibilities of living under the democratic processes of law.

The wise Solomon chose the "cedars of Lebanon" as his symbol for that which long endures. May the friendship between our two peoples outlast even the endurance of the "cedars of Lebanon" and link us together although seas and continents intervene.

A New Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Life magazine for October 27, 1944:

A NEW OUTLOOK

SIRS: A year ago if someone had told me that today I would have a complete new outlook on the racial question of Mississippi, I would have laughed at him. That was before I joined the Navy. * * *

I was born in Mississippi and grew up like any other kid in that State. I grew to understand that there were only two kinds of people, the white and black, and that the Negro was not my equal. That was never said to me in so many words, but you could always hear it in such things as "Nigger, you cain't sit there—you cain't eat here—not in our schools—not in this theater." That was my democracy in action. * * *

In the Navy there were a great many Negroes, and it was not easy at first to eat, sleep, and wash by them. I brushed off those thoughts with "the Navy is run by a gang of damyankees." But when I became very seasick and couldn't eat, it was a big colored guy named Lewis from Florida who fixed me something that would stay on my stomach. When I was broke in Hawaii it was a colored guy who lent me money.

At night, when there was not much to do on the ship, we used to sit out on the rail and talk till all hours of the night * * * and it was not too long before I realized that they wanted the same out of life as I did, had the same dreams as I. They were fighting for a democracy they had hardly shared, one that had given them only poverty. Yet they have been willing to give their lives for that. I, too, was willing to fight for a democracy, one in which I had shared every benefit. Who was a better American? I'm sure it was not I.

* * * I never had the privilege of fighting beside a Negro, but I have talked to countless numbers of white men who have, men who fought on Iwo Jima and Okinawa. And they can all tell instances of uncommon valor among the Negroes fighting beside them. * * * I had felt if the Negroes worked and proved themselves worthy of democracy they would obtain it. But now I see that I was wrong to have thought such a thing, for what right did I have? * * *

The Negro in this war has proven himself entitled to the benefits of democracy above and beyond the call of expectation. If this be denied then we are frauds.

In what I have written I by no means wish to condemn the State of Mississippi, but only some of the people of Mississippi for their selfishness and narrow-mindedness.

JAMES P. O'BRYAN.

FPO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Addresses by Maj. William Moiselle Before the State Convention, AFL, and Minnesota State Convention, CIO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 16 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the Labor Relations Section of the Army is a major whose name is William Moiselle. On October 22, 1945, he made an address before the State convention of American Federation of Labor at Duluth, Minn., and on November 10, 1945, he made another address before the Minnesota State Convention, CIO, at Minneapolis, Minn.

I believe that in those two addresses the major demonstrated a very keen insight into some of the basic problems affecting employer-labor relations of this country. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the two addresses to which I have referred.

I am advised by the Government Printing Office that the addresses of Major Moiselle will occupy in the RECORD two-thirds of a page more than is allowed under the rule, and the estimate of cost is $138.80.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY MAJ. WILLIAM MOISELLE, OCTOBER 22, 1945, AT DULUTH, MINN., STATE CONVENTION, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

You are gathered at the well springs of the Nation's industry.

It is proper that this, your first postwar convention, should be held in Duluth, situated in the Lake Superior region from whence comes, in peace or war, the immense quantities of iron ore for our manufacturing needs. It is fitting, too, that the representatives of a large section of America's working people should meet here as a tribute to the mighty effort of those valiant Americans on the iron ranges whose production achievements, when translated into tons of ore per man, stands as the greatest human accomplishment by workers for the successful prosecution of the war. Not a single dispute, not a minute's loss of time, not an ounce of ore delayed—and all this under situations beyond the understanding of those unfamiliar with range conditions. How many people know that the very shape of the earth itself was changed in northern Minnesota? That the bed of a river was rerouted, or that millions upon millions of tons of earth were moved in the passage of a season, during subzero weather, to uncover new deposits for war's seemingly endless requirements. Nevertheless, under hardship and personal inconvenience, with a minimum of manpower and a maximum of will, here was demonstrated the way to the perfect objective. Management, skill, experience, and competent labor leadership working in unity and concert toward maximum production and industrial peace.

Let this performance stand as an example and monumental pattern for others to observe, and may a grateful Nation be ever mindful of the unmedalled men on the iron ranges, employers and workers alike, for their

patriotic devotion and industrial contribution.

As the Nation makes ready to produce for peacetime business we find ourselves again confronted with what men call labor trouble. It is one of society's age-old riddles. Five thousand years ago the first known wage law in Biblical times provided: "Thou shalt not abide the wages of the workingman with thee overnight." Society and civilization have come a long way since that 50-century old ordinance, and still men and governments have failed to produce a lasting formula for industrial peace, with universal and full justice to wage earners and investors alike.

Let us, then, in the light of recent experience, examine the underlying cause of the problem and by careful steps reach the path to permanent solution.

If we really want prosperity and industrial peace, the most important step by employers, or management groups, and trade-unions is to jointly and immediately abandon forever the false conception that they are opposing factors, possessed of the attributes of enemies, with irreconcilable differences. For too many years and too long a time this fallacy has been permitted to infect our thinking, with disturbing results. The real truth is that the employer and the wage earner have a common problem to solve. Hence, they must now, and forever should, be allied against the unrelenting and inexorable vicissitudes of time, natural developments, scientific evolutions, and technological advances, all of which have a very important relationship to our economic scheme of things and standard of living. If we spike the lie and abide by this obvious truth we will have opportunity and understanding to live in continued prosperity—friction free.

In order to approach this truism, it at once becomes necessary for all to accept two fundamental facts.

1. Every intelligent employer, be he a manufacturer, distributor, or service businessman, knows that if he is to have a market for his wares or services, he must have buyers. Since people live not by bread alone, they must have the price for all other desirable and useful goods. It results, therefore, that he must find his sales in a community of plenty since there are none in sections of poverty.

This, then, establishes a factual generalization—"that there can be no business prosperity in a community of poverty." Businessman and employers understanding this deduction must make their plans to build their markets with an original sound contribution toward the desired goal.

2. If trade-unionism is to flourish, so as to be of value to the wage earner and benefit to the Nation, it must recognize that it can only survive in a healthy and orderly system of free enterprise, through the agency of free capital. The union must, therefore, become the blossom in industry's flower bed, and not its thorny weed. Modern history has repeatedly shown that trade-unions cannot and do not exist in a totalitarian state. Let there be no mistake about that.

It follows, then, as our second generalization—"that organized labor, if it is to exist, must preserve and protect the only system which can sustain it." Whether you like it or not, there is just one such system. It is the free capitalist system operating freely in a republic of freemen.

Undoubtedly these two propositions have always been known to both industrial and labor leaders. The aggravating question has been how to make them work.

It will serve no purpose now to discuss the well-known reasons for previous failures. Let us instead recognize the focal point at which these two principles can merge and form a perfect junction for beneficial action. Thus we discover what that object is. At once we determine it is the place of employment. Be it mill, mine, factory, warehouse, railroad, or what. For convenience of discussion we will call it the house. Since the house is the maker of jobs and the source of profit necessary to the continuity of employment within and beyond its own premises, it becomes the object of our highest concern and prime consideration. This is equally true for management as it is for the worker. It is in fact a subject of much greater anxiety to the wage earner than it is to the stockholder. In time of stress it engages the worker's most serious interest. It follows then as a logical conclusion that for the protection and security of the wage earner the house must be made to be and remain financially strong, safe in its trade, and beyond hazard of failure in time of distress. There can be no substitute then for the resolution by labor that the house comes first.

This being true from the standpoint of labor, it is, as previously remarked, true also in the interest of management and capital. For a weak or bankrupt business will not only fail to provide good jobs but it will default all its other obligations, waste its substance, and degenerate its position by insufficiency. So we ask: Has capital any alternative to protect its investment, its trade, its market, in fact, its own existence, by any other formula than that the house must come first.

There is no other answer, no other substitute, no other alternative.

Granting that in the times past, some men of capital were greedy and mayhap ruthless. It has since become common knowledge to men of commerce that the day of cruelly exploiting the investor or the worker is not to be practiced without penalty of law. Nor may a few willful executives drain away profits and bleed business in such disastrous proportions that decent wages become impossible and dividends waived. There is no virtue in such selfishness and no future in such establishment.

Management henceforth must and will see to it that the house prospers, that production is profitable, and wages high so that ready markets are handy for its goods, that capitalism is not an adventure for quick rich schemes and that capital itself in the form of profits and surplus are reinvested and made productive; not to be squandered in vain and destructive fashion, but, like plasma in humans, to reinvigorate and strengthen the house that it may, in the words of the Psalmist, "be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth fruit in his season; his leaf also shall not wither, and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper."

This is management's duty and responsibility. Thus is truly demonstrated that if the house comes first in the doings of employers, there will be abundance for the wage earners and prosperity in their midst.

But what of the trade union in this combination of things for the attainment of a desired end. It, too, has an inescapable duty and responsibility.

Since it is given to the union the right to represent the wage earner, it does not follow that the exercise of this right shall injure or impair the worker's source of earnings. On the contrary, it is the moral obligation of the union, that it shall contribute in every known way possible its cooperation, its skill and resource towards the successful development and operation of the house, so that its members may attain and derive the greatest measure of benefit from its labors.

The goal of the union and the house must be one.

Existing legislation has bestowed on the trade-union movement certain immunities not enjoyed by others. Such benefits are not transferable to individuals. They must be jealously guarded for the protection of the organization as a whole and never be permitted to shield the wrongdoings of malcontents within its own ranks.

To appreciate the full advantage of the trade-union movement and to evaluate its responsible position with respect to modern business, it will have to be understood that it is not the primary purpose of industry to provide security for organized labor as such. On the contrary, the very reverse of the idea is now mandatory. It is the union which must now help to make industry safe and sound so that good jobs may be secure. In that way and that way only can the trade-union movement establish its own security. For no matter how you argue the proposition there can be no free wage earners without prosperous industry and no trade unions without free workers.

This, then, again confirms the cardinal rule that the house comes first.

Admitting that the formula is contrary to the original concept of trade unionism, there must be an awareness that both capital and the labor movement have gone through a revolutionary change in the past decade. We therefore must bring our thinking and our doings up to the modern tempo of things and accept the fact that the rules of the nineteenth century, or even 10 years ago, are no longer useful for today's needs.

Be, therefore, wise and temperate in your demands—let common sense, sound judgment, and economic justice guide you in your dealings—with fair consideration to the house, that it may prosper and survive and be an everlasting institution of nourishment to a free system of business whose builders and workers may, through the agency of the trade-union, make the Nation and its citizens as well as its institutions the desired hope of a distressed world.

By dedicating the trade-union to the task of industrial peace founded on an understanding alliance with management to make the house prosper you will achieve, with prestige, independence and honor, greater gains far beyond the grants of Government or legislation, which at best temporizes with humanity's plight and leaves meaningless the words of its enactment.

The labor officer of the United States Army, together with the United States Conciliation Service in this area, working as one from Pearl Harbor unto this day, in the position of an honest and impartial friend has attempted to point the way as set forth in this discourse. Believing always in what is right, not who is wrong, to guide us to equitable attainments.

The Minnesota State Federation of Labor is, indeed, fortunate to be able to share in the commendation for extraordinary performance by its constituent members in the herculean task of war production.

Yours is an accomplishment well known to the military and governmental officials. It is fitting to note that in Minnesota your body cooperated completely with the several war agencies and gave full support to the other governmental offices and lightened their burdens thereby immensely.

As you now proceed to your deliberations, an anxious Nation hopes that just as you set an example for industrial peace during the trying war days, you will now formulate here, a similar pattern for peace and prosperity. May the Great Creator bless you with wisdom and courage and endow you with a firm resolve to light the way of industrial America to its appointed and happy eminence.

ADDRESS BY MAJ. WILLIAM MOISELLE, NOVEMBER 10, 1945, MINNESOTA STATE CONVENTION, CIO, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

The true course to prosperity and industrial tranquility can indeed be chartered here by this gathering.

It can well be that out of this convention may come a lasting solution for the Nation's industrial distress.

Let not this possibility be discounted—for Minneapolis has already set a pattern during and since the war days, which both a troubled

nation and a worried government can observe and appreciate with profitable guidance.

It will interest you to know that in Washington Cabinet members, Congressional leaders, commentators and other distinguished personages, including those expert in industrial relations and concerned in industrial transition, are still pondering in strange wonderment the marvel of Minnesota's recent accomplishments.

You will therefore be gratified and encouraged by this knowledge. But do not let it spoil you. Instead it must continue to provoke and promote the realization that Minnesota demonstrated the only effective way to a full life in peace or war.

You have repeatedly proven that by intelligent and willing cooperation with capital and management there need be no work stoppages, slow-downs or other detrimental activities with its attendant strife, injurious to maximum output. But over and beyond all this, the workers and employers in Minnesota have given new life to the old aim—that men achieve great ends without the aid or interference of government—if they are but free from the obstacles of mandatory regulation.

No legislation, no government, no boards or bureaus, no panels or directives, no hearings or conferences in this or distant cities sharpened the sense or developed the competency of our local leaders. None was needed—for here was a richness of experience, an acquired wisdom, and a wealth of devotion to a great cause, which when summoned to serve, in the time of travail, combined and brought forth production from the mines, forests, shops, mills, factories and foundries to a volume which excited the admiration of understanding peoples beyond anything heretofore known—and all this friction free—to a degree unequaled elsewhere, in all the world of free men.

Only a free and independent community, relying on its own resource, exercising the full rights of free negotiations as practiced in true collective bargaining could have brought this about.

Upon you therefore as leaders in the trade union movement has been thrust a new and added responsibility. It is the inevitable responsibility of leadership—you cannot—you dare not attempt to avoid it. The penalty for failure will be your undoing.

Let it not then be said of the trade unions that the limit of your ability was attained because of war necessity. But that an orderly and systematic change to the needs of a peacetime economy is beyond your competence, or that your vision is dimmed, your judgment warped, or your experience a myth.

Here is a challenge not from employers, not from industry or capital and not from the needs of war—but rather from the demands of peace and the resultant relentlessness of the requirements of human progress and advancement.

Everywhere the question is now asked: "Are you—the trade-union movement and its leaders in Minnesota—equal to the task?" It will be the verdict of reasonable and understanding men that in Minnesota the answer is "Yes." But you will have to prove it again—and maybe yet again.

Admittedly your task is not an easy one. It will need to have the full support of all concerned, which includes capital, employers, management groups, and the public confidence.

Let us, therefore, examine the situation and bring to light the cause of cur present dilemma. Then produce the best calculated adjustment to make the formula for the future as nearly perfect as humans may devise.

Now then: Reducing the subject to the simplest consideration, it is necessary to recognize that out of the depression in the 1930's came two unrelated propositions. One of these, although very old and always true, required an economic disaster to rediscover and prove it. It is the accepted annunciation that: "There can be no prosperity in the midst of poverty." The second proposition is the institution by law of collective bargaining.

When these two propositions function properly the natural result is an amalgamation of two economic streams, like the confluence of a mighty river, which in turn creates a corollary result consisting of economic plenty. It is economic plenty that makes wealth for everybody.

Let us now skip the economist's phrase "purchasing power" and all the theories of the political professors who with their conflicting theses and confounding dissertations have brought us to a befogged pass, out of which only sane and clear thinking to logical conclusions will guide us toward the path of progress.

If a full and abundant life is to be achieved, then both capital through its agent—management—on one side, and the trade union as the agent of the wage earner on the other side, will each have to faithfully perform its full duty and discharge its sacred obligation without stint or reservation to all the people.

Let us see what management's part is in the scheme of things.

1. It must at once burst the dams that have held back the free flow of capital into free enterprise and increased industrial activity. It may be necessary to persuade the Congress to remove existing stifling restrictions but capitalism cannot at this date confess failure by hiding behind legislative imperfections.

2. There must be liberal extension of credits on a reasonable and wholesome basis to widen markets and increase purchases.

3. Profits must be reinvested into business and industry and all other channels of legitimate trade, to make the community, its industry, and capitalism itself strong, and not to enrich a few selected individuals at the expense of the worker and consumer.

4. Find and develop new industries and new methods. The old ones are fast ripening and soon due to rot.

5. Eliminate the exploitation of the small investor and the general public by the unscrupulous. So that the strength and character of commerce and its system will not be hinged on the cheat and the chiseler. Thus must also industry keep itself policed for its own safety and standing.

6. Create in appropriate areas and by localities, but free from politics and Government interference, study groups, to change the present unsound wage structure and local earning abilities to provide regular and good annual wages on a weekly basis for all production workers and establish a system in industry to make it work permanently.

7. Promote collective bargaining in good faith and make it work. Get rid of those elements and self-appointed labor relation experts who stand between the parties and keep them divided, who are expert only in stalling and trouble making, seeking refuge in doubtful technicalities to prolong insincere negotiations and pretending to give unneeded legal sanctuary to poorly advised employers.

8. Abandon once and for all the erroneous concept that the wage earner is a commodity—something to bid for in a misnamed and unworthy labor market. There is no such thing as a labor market in America. Society had better beware that none such ever develops in a republic of freemen. The labor market is the congregation of slaves, and slavery is the sire of poverty.

9. Management must from here out scientifically develop intelligent and understanding supervisory personnel—based on proven qualifications to handle and direct other people—leadership is an altogether different attribute than skill or craft ability. Too often a fine craftsman has been turned into a poor foreman. Sense, not seniority, is a virtue which time alone cannot produce. A good foreman like the honest policeman on the beat will have no trouble if he means to have none.

These, and no doubt some other points which time will not permit to dwell on at this meeting, are the primary functions and responsibilities of management. It will enrich the traditions of the trade-union movement to assist in making the proposals fruitful. But even greater than the responsibilities here set forth there is the paramount and transcendent obligation of capitalism and the society which sustains it, to abolish poverty and its wretched offsprings—slums, disease and dispair. Enlightened management now knows that its field of opportunity lies in good homes and more new good homes, in vastly increased distribution of all the products of industry from lamp bulbs to locomotives, hats to houses, radios to railroads, bath tubs to boats, and so on to the inclusion of every article for human need and human comfort. Yet, all of this can only be attained by work and earnings. Work must be plentiful and earnings abundant so that the producers may buy and enjoy the products of their labor in contentment and satisfaction. This, management knows. This, management must make possible or give way for capital to put men in the proper places who will courageously and honestly bring into existence the desired state of happiness which a nation of uneasy citizens seek to attain.

There is nothing new in the proposition—all it needs is to be put into effect. It is at this point, however, that the trade-union movement must decide to make it feasible and beneficent.

Be then prepared to do your part in its entirety.

If the trade-union movement is to be free and strong it must be composed of free, strong, and prosperous citizens sustained by and in turn sustaining a free economy unhampered by strangulating restrictions from any source. As your first step then, is the assumption that the destination of labor and good management is the same. It results as a consequence—if labor is to benefit—its leaders must support the true usages of capital by helping management through free channels to do for the wage earner all the desirable things which society seeks to do but which cannot be accomplished by the unions alone or by management alone. It must be done jointly and earnestly.

What are these desirable things? High wages, good working conditions, and good living conditions. How go about getting them? That's the intriguing question. The solution to wages will have to be divided into three parts.

First. Make up your mind that the worker can take no more out of industry than he puts into it. It is fair then to say that in order to earn a day's pay there must be given in return an honest day's work.

Second. The amount of money received as a day's pay must reflect the productive value of the worker.

Third. The true productive value of a worker is determined by his output in quality as well as quantity. The real judge of his value and his true earnings should be the employer and, mind you, he must be fair and sound in his judgment.

Thus we have the true formula for arriving at "what"—not how little or much is a day's pay for work performed.

Make up your mind that the hourly rate is as dead as yesterday's newspaper. In the

postwar expanding economy which we hope to attain, labor costs per unit is the thing that will count. Moreover, as the labor cost per unit comes down wages can go up without price increases to the ultimate consumer. Otherwise it economically results that the most costly labor in the world is the lowest paid, while the least costly labor when production is at its highest can be the most highly paid.

It follows then that restrictive quotas, or limitations on production by union edicts are disastrous to the wage earner, for by such means are the wages of workers held down to the detriment of himself. Nothing is so poisonous to full production as the planned slow down. Nothing will hasten economic chaos as quickly as provoked reduced earnings. Nothing is as suicidal to the prosperity of the worker and the community as predetermined scarcity of purchasable products. There must be plenty for low prices to prevail and high wages to be a reality. Any other formula defeats the purpose and blocks the path to prosperity.

The trade-union movement is not the instituted authority to manage the plant. Nor do the laws which bestow upon organized labor certain defined benefits and immunities grant such rights. That is not your affair. It is management's duty and responsibility, and management in the future may be depended on to do it a great deal better than it did in the past. If it fails to do so, enlightened and far seeing competition will attend to its misdeeds. That is, if the interests of invested capital doesn't do it first.

The trade-union movement in order to make itself secure and be of service to the Nation will be wise to bring the standards of its membership and its activities to a high level. It is now too important a factor in the lives of all the citizens to spread its protective influences over a disturbing element in industry, or give aid to its own malcontents who in the end have always proven to begin as a troublemaker in the plant and end up a traitor to the union. Do not be deceived by the "guardhouse lawyer" who mouths his condemnations to the delight of the unthinking. Be rid of him early and spare yourself the strife and subsequent embarrassment within both your organization and the place of employment.

The union and the plant are part of the community. Teach and develop loyalty to both. There can be no rift in trust. Prepare and train competent and understanding stewards and business agents. They are persons of responsible stature and like foremen must be possessed of the talents of constructive leadership. They, too, if fitted for their assignment, will have no trouble if they seek to have none.

Finally, collective bargaining is your structure. Labor designed it, labor fashioned and built it. But it is the employer who has to live in it. Be a good landlord; make his tenancy a decent one, so that more and more industry will seek its comforting shelter. Do not either condone or permit abuses to pollute the other stream at the conflux, lest the river of prosperity be muddied beyond useful human advantage.

All these things you have known, many of the points are labor's own. They are the fundamentals to joint action. If through the agency of the trade-union movement under the auspices of the men of Minnesota you will take heart and together with the employer continue to strive, regardless of the seemingly unending struggle toward perfection, you will give the Nation and a frustrated world a demonstration of capacity, a sample of stability, a guide to prosperity, and an everlasting manifestation that in America free men can light the way of an industrial nation to a happy and exalted destiny.

National Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 23 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address on the housing situation, delivered on November 20, 1945, by the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, a most critical housing shortage confronts our Nation. The main victims, although by no means the only ones, are our returning veterans and their families. Many have arrived from the battle fronts to find themselves literally homeless. It seems most unjust that thousands of our soldiers should live permanently in slums and substandard housing, when the Nation they defended so valiantly can well afford to assist them in obtaining decent homes.

Unless we act to relieve this situation, it is estimated that by the end of next year more than 6,000,000 American families will be living under deplorable conditions of doubling and overcrowding. Our remedy, therefore, is to immediately provide ways and means of building more homes.

The housing difficulties confronting us result from causes of many years' standing. These causes may be simply stated. One is that even in prosperous times a large proportion of our population has not been able to afford the price of decent housing. Therefore, living in horrible slums or under unhealthful conditions of overcrowding has resulted. Another cause has been that private enterprise was not sufficiently encouraged to build adequate housing for middle-income families—those families who earn too much to get into public-housing projects but too little to buy the new housing that private enterprise has been providing. Still another cause has been that the many Government agencies dealing with housing, while doing good work, have not been sufficiently related and coordinated to be entirely successful.

I share the view of many that residential construction offers the greatest single possibility for the expansion of peacetime job opportunity. More than any other single industry, it can absorb those released from the armed forces and from war plants. The jobs provided by residential construction are not for carpenters, bricklayers, or building tradesmen only, but also for those employed in every type of facility which serves home building—whether it be the furniture business, the electrical-appliances industry, the paint manufacturer, or other undertakings too numerous to mention. It has frequently been stated that, for every individual employed on the site of a construction job, two and a half persons are engaged off the site. Every veteran therefore has a double interest in a large home-building program; first because of the high level of prosperity and employment made available; and second, because of his opportunity to secure the kind of home he wants for his family and himself. I appeal to veterans in the course of this discussion, but may I say that the same arguments I make to them are applicable to all Americans.

The general housing bill, which I am sponsoring along with Senators WAGNER of New York and TAFT of Ohio, is pointed directly toward removing the underlying causes of our housing obstacles. I sincerely believe that it will provide an effective remedy for these difficulties. Let me say, that during my many years in the Senate, no bill has been the result of more detailed and careful study by the Congress. For more than a year and a half, a Senate subcommitte studied every phase of the housing problem. We heard witnesses representing every type of group. We took counsel with them. We examined their suggestions and weighed them impartially and objectively. The bill introduced on November 14 is the product of all this effort.

Now, what does this bill do? Because of the lack of time, I shall only summarize its main provisions. If any of you desire more specific information I will cheerfully furnish it.

In the first place, the bill recognizes that the overwhelming portion of the housing need must be served by private enterprise. It would utilize the Federal Housing Authority, which is so well known and so highly regarded throughout the country, to encourage private enterprise to build more houses within the means of middle-income families. These are the families whose incomes, generally speaking, range between twelve hundred and twenty-four hundred dollars annually and who can afford to pay, on the average, between twenty and forty dollars a month for their housing, whether they buy or rent. These are the families in the economic classification in which a majority of our veterans' families are to be found.

The bill sets up a home-ownership plan. The essence of the plan is that more favorable and attractive financing terms will be made available—through loans for a longer period, running up to 32 years, and at a rate of interest not exceeding 4 percent. I wish to emphasize that these are to be private loans insured by the FHA, and not public loans or credits. This plan will give private enterprise more to do, by expanding its mass markets. The down payment required of the family will be reduced to 5 percent, in contrast to the 10 percent or more which prevailed in the past. And of course, veterans could meet this down payment with a loan under the GI bill of rights. It is my belief that this home-ownership plan, especially when we take into account the lower construction costs which it will stimulate, will enable private enterprise to serve hundreds of thousands of additional families of moderate income.

I regard this home-ownership plan for the average family as the heart of the bill. However, the bill justly recognizes that there are countless families who prefer to rent rather than to buy homes. This will be especially true in the next few years, when many newly married families of veterans will not be certain as to their ultimate place of permanent residence. For this reason, the bill sets forth the plan for mutual ownership and rental housing at reasonable costs, for families of moderate income. It does this, also, through encouraging private enterprise to do the job with the aid of FHA insurance. The broad outline of this plan would be to induce private loans for rental housing, for periods up to 40 years, and interest rates not exceeding 3½ percent. It is estimated that these more favorable terms will reduce by 20 percent the monthly charges at which these houses will be made available.

There is another plan provided for in the bill, with the same objective. It sets up, under the FHA, inducements to large financial institutions, such as life-insurance

companies and savings banks, to invest their funds in housing projects for long periods of years at low rental rates.

As the veteran contemplates his opportunities for steady employment, he realizes that these prospects depend upon new outlets for the free flow of capital investment. One of the greatest of these opportunities is the rebuilding of the slums and blighted areas of our cities. It has been estimated that, over the next 10 years, between sixty and seventy billion dollars could be spent streamlining our urban areas so that we could have modern, up-to-date, 20th century cities. The great part of this rebuilding activity can be carried on by private enterprise—in the building of houses, stores, commercial facilities, and places of recreation. But the great obstacle which stands in the way is the excessive cost of the land in slum areas. This high cost makes it unprofitable to acquire the land and redevelop it.

The bill suggests Federal and local aid, to write down the cost of this land, so that it may be profitably rebuilt. In my judgment, every taxpayer, every municipal government, in fact every citizen, stands to benefit by this vital clearing up of the decaying cores of our cities. We must provide means to rid our great cities of slums, else our National will be plagued with disease, with increased delinquency among our children, and with all other evils that follow in the wake of indecent housing conditions.

In all these ways the bill will help to provide both homes and jobs for our citizens. In fact, homes and jobs are inseparable, because the construction of homes provides employment, and employment furnishes the income to pay for homes.

While the bill concentrates upon private enterprise, all fair-minded people realize that, for groups in the lowest income brackets, public low-rent housing is necessary. The opposition to public housing has been reduced to those who have a selfish, pecuniary interest in slums, or who mistakenly refuse to face the clear facts. The bill provides for Federal aid to localities, to build half a million units of public low-rent housing over the next 4 years. It provides similar aid for decent housing for low income farm families. I am doubly gratified that the farm-housing problem, so long neglected and discriminated against, is now to be given attention.

The bill also provides that the permanent war housing, now owned by the Government, may be sold for low-rent housing where communities need it. In all types of publicly assisted housing, the bill provides for preference, as to occupancy, for veterans and their families.

And finally, the bill consolidates all the housing activities of the Government into a single national housing agency. This will promote efficiency and economy. More important, it will fix responsibility in one place, and enable the people of the country to judge more accurately how well the Government is doing its part of the housing job.

Nothing stands in the way of decent housing for all our veterans, and for every American family—nothing stands in the way but ignorance, or fear, or selfishness. America as a Nation is rich and strong enough to reach this goal. With courage and determination, we Americans will attain it.

I believe that every veteran in the country, in fact, every American, should study the general housing bill carefully. I feel that every veteran's family should unite with other Americans to insist that the Congress act speedily upon this bill, which lies so close to the health, welfare, and prosperity of all our people.

Thank you for listening. Good night.

Two-Way Responsibility Needed for Labor Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, as every Member of the Congress is aware, Michigan, the automobile capital of the world, is in the throes of the great General Motors strike. Naturally, strikes in general, and Michigan strikes in particular, are the chief subject of conversation of an apprehensive and a worried people. Just how long will it last? How many industries outside of General Motors will be affected? What will be the general effect on reconversion and jobs for all? Are hundreds and thousands of innocent Michigan citizens to be deprived of the right to earn a livelihood at a time when their work is so essential? These and many more questions are being propounded to Michigan Congressmen, and I for one am being bombarded with demands that the Congress do something about it.

On Wednesday, the day before Thanksgiving, I addressed the House in regard to this matter and appealed to the President to take immediate action. Later that day the President did take action which resulted in stopping the transportation strike then in progress in Washington. By order of the President the Army took over. Today the Government is functioning because the employees and the officials are permitted to get to their work. For this I am sure the public in general is grateful. They are back of you, Mr. President, and it is to be hoped that you will make a similar declaration with reference to other similar strikes throughout the country.

There should be arbitration and settlement between directly interested parties without bringing misery, suffering, and worse things to the innocent bystanders—all the rest of the people. There should be fair and enforceable collective bargaining. A contract should mean something.

Mr. Speaker, the President's courageous statement with reference to the Washington transportation strike secured the predicted results and, in behalf of the general public, I appeal to him to use every power at his command to keep the wheels of industry going, the people working, the pay checks going home to the family on Saturday night, and the disputes settled by arbitration and in accordance with the law.

In this connection I am presenting to the Congress an editorial appearing in the Anne Arbor (Mich.) News, one of our leading daily papers. Listen to that editorial:

TWO-WAY RESPONSIBILITY NEEDED FOR LABOR PEACE

Two-way security—security for the company as well as for the employees—under terms of union contracts is asked by the Ford Motor Co. in a statement issued to the CIO United Automobile Workers on the eve of negotiations over 30-percent wage-increase demands.

It is a subject that merits serious discussion in all negotiations or conferences seeking a formula for industrial peace.

"The company proposes that the union present a plan, to be incorporated in the agreement, which will assure company security, through exercise of union responsibility, which the union shop and check-off plan have not provided; further, that such plan provide effective guaranties against work stoppages and for increased productivity on the part of its members," says the Ford statement.

Regardless of the merits of the union demands for a 30-percent wage increase, the present industrial situation obviously calls for a show-down on several important principles, one of these being union responsibility. Any manufacturing organization has a right to protection of its interests in a contract which is designed primarily by the union to protect its members. One-sided responsibility cannot be regarded as fair by any known method of analysis.

The Ford company observes that it made contracts with the union in 1941, with shop and dues check-off provisions, in the hope of eliminating "a great deal of friction, dispute, and downright industrial strife. But our experiences of the last 4 years have substantially dispelled this hope. The peaceful relations have not been realized, the experiment has been an unhappy one. The record shows, for example, 773 work stoppages since the signing of that contract in 1941."

In discussing union responsibility, the Ford statement suggests a provision whereby the union undertakes to reimburse the company for any damages it may suffer from violations of no-strike provisions and "other interference with production."

The suggested provisions, if written into contracts, ought to go a long way toward the establishment of industrial peace.

When a contract is signed, a labor union obtains guaranties of certain rights for its members. It even obtains cooperation from the company in collecting union dues. The company deals with union leaders in all its relations with the workers. When it signs a contract, it buys work at a specified price and under certain conditions, the same as it buys steel when it orders this essential metal from a steel mill.

The steel manufacturing firm guarantees the quality of its product at a specified price. The labor union should also guarantee the quality of its product, which is work, when it signs an agreement concerning wages and working conditions. Collective bargaining has been generally accepted by American industry as the proper method for employing large numbers of laborers, but collective bargaining cannot be acceptable indefinitely unless it offers advantages to both employer and employee. It ought to provide the method for harmonious relationships with cooperation to promote the common interests of labor and industry.

It ought to be possible, when an industrial concern has signed a labor contract, for the management to consider its labor problem solved during the period of the contract, as its raw product problems are solved when orders have been placed. Then management could plan for the future, feeling secure in its commitments concerning labor and other essential materials, knowing where it was at.

Mr. Speaker, that editorial, written by Mr. Arthur Stace, the publisher, is not only pertinent, but it is sound and demands the attention of management, labor, and the Congress.

The Military's Drug for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., has had published in the Progressive magazine in the issue of November 19, 1945, a powerful argument against universal military training. It is, in fact, an indictment of militarism and ought to be read by every patriotic American who does not wish to see the youth of this country mentally enslaved and made the physical robot of a goose-stepping military machine. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the article entitled "The Military's Drug for Democracy" be inserted as part of my remarks in the RECORD:

THE MILITARY'S DRUG FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.)

Once again we have the issue of peacetime compulsory military training squarely before the Congress. After considerable vacillation, the President recently recommended the enactment of such legislation.

This endorsement was the signal the militarists were waiting for. We shall shortly witness a gigantic propaganda drive in the public press and over the radio designed to push the legislation through Congress early next year at the latest. Proponents frankly admit that this is their last big chance to fasten peacetime conscription on America. They know all too well that the opinions of returning veterans and the considered judgments of more normal times will do their cause no good. So they choose to strike for their objective before the reaction against the plan becomes too great.

There are some well-meaning people in their ranks who firmly believe that we should have a large training program. There are other well-meaning people among them who confuse mere numbers with true military security. There are still others who have suffered irreparable losses in this war and who seize upon this in desperation as insurance against repetition.

The militarists know full well that calm, full, and frank discussion of the facts involved will cause large deflections in the ranks of these people, and so they want to push the program while the aftermath of war still beclouds the issues and facts.

In my brief discussion of this subject, I want to say at the outset that I advocate that we fulfill our international responsibilities. I favor adequate military security for our Nation and the winning of the peace. And no responsible official in the Government or Congress who is either for or against military training is advocating any other course.

I make that statement to clear the atmosphere of debate upon one of the most far-reaching decisions in our history—because some of the supporters of this adjunct of totalitarianism attempt to brand those who oppose it as having no concern for winning the peace or maintaining our national military strength. I shall endeavor to explain later why it is my firm conviction that compulsory military training will actually weaken us in a military way, as well as in economic and social respects, while at the same time lulling us into a false sense of security.

It was apparent even before this war that the science of war was rapidly becoming a contest of technology. The war proved this and clearly showed that manpower without the latest weapons of war is virtually helpless. High-performance airplanes, radar, and other electronic equipment, guided missiles and rockets, the proximity fuze, and the atomic bomb are the spectacular weapons that immediately come to mind. Other thousands of technical inventions and improvements serve to emphasize further the point, as we look back on the war.

It is true that we still required many millions of men to win the war, despite our mighty technical weapons. One reason is that our activities were expanded over the entire world, over much more territory than a previous war had ever been fought.

Another reason is that all too often we were not efficiently organized. But perhaps the primary reason, other than the necessity of occupying territory, is the fact that modern technological warfare requires tremendous numbers of men behind the lines repairing and maintaining equipment. In general, the men behind the lines, the ground crews and maintenance personnel, are more closely associated with the normal activities of industry and the laboratory than they are with the military.

It is undoubtedly true that our future military strength will require us to make sure that we have available for any emergency a sufficient number of technically trained men who can perform technical war jobs without too much conversion. Apparently some who desire a military training program for all youth think the Army should do this. This is a rash conclusion.

A strong industrial economy is rich with technical personnel who can do the job. Any additional training along this line that needs to be done can best be done within our present technical schools and industrial organization. What we need most is a good corps around which to build—an efficient professional Army, well organized, surrounded by proper technical personnel and up-to-date weapons, and loaded with practical plans for rapid expansion if the occasion demands.

The modern criterion for war strength is not manpower, but rather it is technical and industrial power and the requisite raw materials to feed the industrial activity. We are proceeding in the wrong direction when we indiscriminately draft prospective scientists, and put them in uniform.

We came dangerously close in the recent war to the point of destroying the source of our own strength. We blindly drafted young scientists and then put them in routine jobs in the Army and Navy, where no use was made of their exceptional talents.

So firmly entrenched was the idea of mass service, and mass training, and mass conscription that a few leaders who did recognize the indispensability of the services of these men had to go to the absurd lengths of blanketing these men into uniform by Presidential order, in order to keep intact the personnel of certain Government laboratories. This is an excellent example of the kind of Frankenstein we can create for ourselves when we make a fetish of universal training, or place our complete confidence in brute numbers.

I cite the previous situation as a case where blind action tended to retard technical progress. It could be worse. And peacetime military training would be precisely the factor that would produce the worst condition; namely, not merely retarding, but choking off the ideas for technical progress even before the ideas are born.

It is a well-known fact that most of the startling technical progress of the past war came from outside the armed forces. And many a scientist and engineer will bitterly tell you that his developments and contributions were made in spite of, not with the help of the services.

The military atmosphere simply is not conducive to progresss in science. And I am frankly concerned over the numerous reports in the press and elsewhere telling how the services have largely alienated those who did the work behind the scenes and received very little credit when the cloak of secrecy was lifted.

The plain fact is that science and the military do not mix. If we seek to inculcate the youth of America with what the military proudly calls discipline—then simultaneously we destroy the creative, the inquisitive, and other special aptitudes of our youth which make for technical progress. There would be exceptions, I know, but the general result would be a leveling process, regimenting all to a general pattern.

News correspondents filing stories from Germany nowadays are continually writing about the amazing servility of the German people in accepting and obeying any orders issued, no matter how harsh. They are unanimous in reporting that it is no particular deference that is being shown to the victors, but simply an acceptance of the fact that the Allies are the successor government to a previous government that demanded and instilled this militaristic servility in its people.

If that is what we want in our youth, we will get it with mass compulsory military training. Even if we don't want it, we will get it with peacetime military training.

Advocates of military training are always enthusiastic about training young men. They explain that young men don't have set ideas and prejudices against military training and take to it. What better proof can be had that militarism takes advantage of immaturity and distorts normal thought processes? It is no credit to those who teach military discipline that they can break the spirit and imagination of a boy more easily than a man.

Mass peacetime military training is not only a drug to youth, it is also a drug to the members of the professional army who must do the training. Several of the military historians who have studied the mass training programs in Europe in the past two centuries have commented on the problems of assigning top-notch military men to teach civilian armies.

They point out that insofar as military training is concerned mass teaching is not akin to generalship on the field of battle; that a long tour of duty as an instructor, especially if kept in the same surroundings, tends to weaken him as a battle commander; that he becomes imbued with the fixed dogmas that he teaches, if not totally discouraged with the impossible task of making a military man out of every boy. This, of course, is the directly opposite situation to that which prevails when a select few who desire military training are chosen for such training in institutions comparable to our present Military and Naval Academies.

I repeat, there is a very real danger that mass training on a grandiose scale can seriously dilute and impair the effectiveness of a professional army that we need for adequate military security.

That brings me directly to several questions I want to pose. What can we expect to teach the trainees? It is generally admitted that in peacetime the prospective trainee will be apathetic, if not actually unwilling, to undergo training. That is definitely "strike one" on the teacher in any training program. As to a course of training, proponents of the training have widely separate views in what they advocate for the curriculum.

We have those who want to use training to promote the health of the Nation. We have those who want the program to be

strictly military. We have those who want a broad training. We have those who want a specialized training to suit the individual. We have those who want to train all youth, men and women. We have those who want to select only the best specimens of young manhood.

My own personal opinion is that some health benefits might be derived from the training. We have many undernourished and underprivileged youth who might benefit physically. But if health be our objective, why not go to the root of the health problem directly? And why must we tie military training to it? If it is necessary and desirable to insure better health for our youth—and few will argue against it—the corrective proposition should stand or fall on its own merits, and not be a subordinate side issue to military training.

It is frequently argued that universal training will have democratic benefits socially. This is not true. Instead of promoting wholesome social conditions, the segregation of large masses of men for prolonged periods undermines accepted social attitudes and standards of values. The reason is simple; it is an unnatural life and conducive to many warped attitudes and behaviors. This is an important part of the heavy social price we would pay for compulsory military training.

Some of the advocates of training try to make it more palatable by suggesting that the curriculum be partially elective and include a variety of subjects among which they cite aerodynamics, electronics, jet propulsion, rocket missiles, and allied subjects. They may be excellent sugar coating and may entice some to swallow the bitter pill that goes with it, but it is sheer folly to imagine that any effective results along these lines could be obtained in any short training course or with any trainee who had a limited background.

Subjects like this can be taught much more effectively within the framework of our present educational system, including the technical schools operated in conjunction with certain industrial organizations. During the recent war it was the technical experts brought in from the various schools and industrial organizations who carried the brunt of the training programs for the services. Why should we try to make a technical college out of the Army when we are better equipped to do general training in our present educational system?

It is a different matter when we come to specialized military applications of highly confidential nature. Many of these devices will be developed and studied behind the closed doors of Government laboratories. But it would be a nonsensical policy to allow every Tom, Dick, and Harry in any civilian training program to have access to equipment of highly classified nature.

Let us suppose for a moment that we have trained one class of trainees. How much time was necessary or how much money it cost is for the moment irrelevant. The real question is, How long will this training be valuable to the Nation? The answer is found in our experience in the recent war. In many branches of the Army and Navy it was the established policy to train and retrain, or train and "refresh" at periodic intervals for the reason that technical progress was so rapid it was necessary to do so.

This will be equally true in peacetime. Hence, with the diversions of civil life, the ravages of time, and the changes in militiary tactics, it is not unreasonable to expect that the potential value of the training will be almost zero less than 5 years thereafter. A single weapon can change military tactics overnight, as we have learned in connection with the atomic bomb.

What are the costs of a system of military training? In a study on postwar fiscal requirements, the Brookings Institution has estimated the direct costs of training would be a minimum of $1,360 per man per year, based on a trainee wage of $30 per month, and excluding instructional and supervisional costs which would be considered a part of regular Army and Navy costs.

Multiply this by 600,000 trainees and you get a bill for military training that is in excess of $1,000,000,000. Now, contrast this with the total public expenditures for education: Federal, State, local; boys and girls, men and women; full-time day schools, vocational schools, night schools, part-time schools; colleges, universities, libraries. Toward the support of all of these institutions with about 26,000,000 persons attending school, total support, including various grants and aids, is only about $2,500,000,000. If we are to spend money on training, we might do better to spend more of it on our established educational institutions.

Financial costs to the Government are only one of the costs involved. I have already mentioned other social and human costs. But over and above these there are still other intangible costs that will be very serious. One is the loss that will result from the interruption of education. Educators confirm the statement that too often an interrupted education—for whatever the reason—means the end of education for that person. Too often the student does not return to finish. This is just another social cost we would have to pay.

I feel strongly that the mere existence of the universal philosophy of militarism would stunt our national growth. Ask anyone who has served for any length of time in the military establishments. If he is candid he will confirm the fact that the accepted attitude all along the line is, in vernacular language: "Don't worry about it; don't stick out your neck; keep your own skirts clean; let the next fellow do it."

I don't have to convince you that such an attitude is not conducive to progress.

What are the ingredients of national strength? Everyone will agree it is a combination of manpower, economic resources, and national morale. However, a mere reservoir of any or all of these factors is not enough. The speed and mobility of modern war requires that we be able to translate these factors into offensive striking power and that we maintain a proper balance between peacetime uses and probable wartime needs.

On the one extreme, we could devote all our manpower and resources for military purposes. Obviously, unlss we intended it for aggression and plunder, this would be a national folly of protecting an empty cupboard; because economic wealth and strength can arise only from creative economic activity. Such a policy could lead only to national financial suicide.

On the other extreme, we could devote no manpower or resources for peacetime military purposes. This would be the cheapest, but a disastrous policy.

As long as international relations remain uncertain we have no alternative but to maintain sufficient military power to cope with eventualities. How much manpower will be necessary to maintain sufficient military power is a decision that must be squarely met on the basis of three factors: The world outlook with respect to international relations, the extent of our foreign policy commitments, and the security of the United States and its interests.

Our forefathers recognized the danger of militarism to the democratic way of life. Ever since the founding of the Republic we have resisted every effort to fasten compulsory military service upon the people except in time of war. This traditional resistance of the citizens of the United States is not based on mere theory nor prejudice. It has been clear through all history down to this very hour that universal compulsory service in peacetime has been the characteristic of governments which have been to a greater or lesser degree totalitarian and despotic.

We should not reverse our policy without complete understanding of its far-reaching devastating effect on fundamental human rights, and the political, economic, and social consequences which it will bring about in the years to come.

We have always depended upon the family, our educational system, and the church to build the moral and intellectual strength of American youth. A year of universal, compulsory peacetime conscription will snatch every youth away from these three great institutions of American society at the most critical period in their lives. It is no reflection on the military to deny that they cannot provide adequate substitutes for the family, the school, and the church.

In fact, every thinking person knows, if he is honest with himself, that the military, despite any efforts they may make, is an organization radically different from any of those we have relied upon in the past to build for better citizenship and higher moral values.

In the world in which we now live it was never more important for ourselves and for humanity as a whole that we strengthen and foster the family, the schools, and the churches as the institutions for the development and attainment of the highest ideals of human conduct. Can anyone seriously argue that a year away from these institutions which have been the source of development of American civilization will weaken their influence upon American youth?

And here let me warn you not to be taken in by the window dressing which the advocates of peacetime conscription will set up to make the proposal more attractive. They will talk about giving educational courses; they will shout about the religious opportunities which they will provide. If they could get by with it they would cook up some military substitute for the influence of the family.

No! A thousand times no! Despite all their efforts the military cannot provide an adequate substitute for the family, the school, and the church when it comes to developing and improving the moral and intellectual values of our society.

I think any thoughtful citizen will admit that the burden of proof is upon those who advocate that we reverse our national policy and adopt the abhorrent system of universal compulsory military service, and they have not proved their case. It does not make it so just because men in high places say it is so.

The experience in two World Wars should make us pause before we take the first step toward totalitarianism. Twice in my lifetime we have furnished the decisive military force to defeat nations which have relied upon universal military service for vast numbers of trained reserves for their military power.

In this war one of the first nations to fall was France. She relied upon universal service for her national security. I can recall early in this war that some of those—both military and civilians—who are now loudest in their support of universal service were saying that the French Army was the greatest in the world. They pointed to the huge reserves trained as a result of the French policy of universal compulsory training. We all know now that mere numbers of trained reserves proved to be a false base of security for France.

If someone says that the atom and the V-bombs have changed the situation, I ask, in turn, what evidence is there that these discoveries and others yet to come point to building our military security on masses of men trained for a year?

On the contrary, the logic of scientific developments for war point in the opposite direction. They indicate the need for vast, well-organized research, and the maintenance of highly trained and constantly retrained military forces of sufficient size to provide adequate security for America and to fulfill our international responsibilities and obligations.

There is no evidence to prove that we cannot have such military forces as we require on a voluntary basis. On the contrary, the results now being obtained in the recently launched voluntary recruiting program indicate that it will be a success.

Only last week Washington enlistments were being made at the rate of 2,500 per day and the drive is just beginning to gain momentum. This rate will produce 75,000 per month which now exceeds the quotas being inducted under the Selective Service Act. This record is being made at a time when we still have to maintain large occupational forces in both Europe and Asia.

To make the voluntary system work over a period of years we will have to reassess the compensation offered and the conditions of service.

We will have to provide more opportunities for promotion, in-service training for skills and professions, as well as additional retirement benefits, but I am convinced the job can be done.

Others may disagree but before we break our national life-long tradition and take the consequences in social, educational, and moral retrogression, let us make the effort.

Let no man say we do not have time to try the voluntary plan. We are getting all the men the military now require by voluntary enlistments and the Wartime Conscription Act. For the immediate future, we have millions of men who have had the best training the military can now provide. In case of an emergency in the immediate future, they will be available.

There is no need for a hasty decision to fasten peacetime conscription on American youth forever. It is the proponents of this alien system who are in a hurry. They have everything to gain and nothing to lose if they can stampede the people and the Congress into making this initial move toward totalitarianism.

No; the evidence is clear that we do not have to take this decision on the basis of any immediate situation.

If it is argued that peacetime conscription is required for the more distant future, I ask who is it we are preparing to fight?

Certainly no informed person can contend it is one or all of the enemies we have just defeated. They have been crushed, their ability to wage war destroyed or in the process of destruction. They will not be able to wage war in the "foreseeable future," as Gen. Douglas MacArthur has said, and every competent military authority I know agrees with him.

Then, is it one or more of our allies we are preparing against? If the proponents of conscription in peacetime answer "Yes," then I say let us propose to our allies the universal abolition of peacetime conscription before we launch on another destructive, mad rush among our allies for rearmament and peacetime conscription.

The mothers and fathers, the educators, the clergy, the citizens and the youth of America are entitled to frank answers to these momentous questions before we sentence our youth to involuntary servitude even for 1 year.

Let us not import this alien philosophy and stunt our growth as a Nation with militarism. Let us maintain adequate military security by voluntary methods and free the people of this great Nation to devote their energies toward building a better America, a better world, and winning the peace.

Statement on Palestine by Hon. Guy M. Gillette, Representative Andrew L. Somers, of New York, and J. David Stern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 23 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unamious consent to have printed in the RECORD an important statement made by Mr. J. David Stern, publisher of the Philadelphia Record, the Honorable Guy M. Gillette, and Representative Andrew L. Somers, of New York, on November 15, 1945, on the eve of their departure for London to discuss a final solution of the problems of Palestine, with officials of the British Government.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

The decision to create a joint Anglo-American commission of inquiry on Palestine is in line with American treaty obligations toward Palestine and the Hebrew people.

But we must sound a note of caution. Creation of the commission of inquiry must not delay for one moment the repatriation to Palestine of the Hebrews still surviving in European concentration camps, or living under conditions little improved over those preceding VE-day. It has been established by competent authority that these wretched remnants will not wholly survive the coming winter unless they are removed. No commission could establish the facts of that situation with greater force or with clearer competence than was shown by Mr. Earl Harrison, the President's investigator, Mr. Harvey Gibson of the Red Cross, or Judge Rifkind of General Eisenhower's staff.

The British Government has thus far failed to respond to the request by President Truman for the immediate transfer of the 100,000 in the American and British zones of occupation, or to the vociferous American public opinion supporting that request. We nevertheless feel it our sacred duty to sustain and not to abandon these martyrs in the cause of the United Nations. Our prime task in London will be to demonstrate to official and unofficial British opinion the error of British policy, and to point out that this policy is detrimental both to the interests of the British people and to Anglo-American friendship. The failure to have a "decent respect for the opinions of mankind" is a point on which our country is still very sensitive; and we can safely say that there has rarely been a phase of foreign affairs on which the American people have been so united as on the moral and legal right of the surviving Hebrews of Europe to enter Palestine.

We shall point out to our British friends that Palestine is not a British territory and that they cannot administer it in a manner that arouses such sharp criticism and dissatisfaction amongst the people and Congress of the United States. We shall point out to them that it will be highly injurious to the good name of Great Britain if they maintain that the Committee of Inquiry should also have to "inquire" into the position of the Hebrews now in concentration camps; it would be like appointing a commission to investigate a drowning man.

Now that a joint Anglo-American body is to review the broader aspects of the problem, surely the British Government can readily afford a gesture of good will toward these long-suffering people. They should no longer be denied the freedom of self-determination which is the right of other peoples. Under it they have applied for Palestinian residence and citizenship.

But the fate of the Hebrews on German soil is merely a fraction of the problem. Its core is the future of some 2,000,000 Hebrews in central and eastern Europe whose problem must also be solved and whose right of self-determination must also be assured. It is not only a humanitarian question; it is a matter of direct consequence to the stability and peace of Europe and the stability and peace of the whole world.

Our delegation will advocate a full and integral solution of this entire problem, believing as we do that further delay and postponement is detrimental to all concerned. Anti-Semitism has proven to be one of the deadliest weapons in the hands of Fascism and the dark forces of reaction. By leaving the problem unsolved there is created a tremendous source of anti-Semitic propaganda in Europe, in the Middle East, and even here in our own country. It is a test case of the principles upon which the United Nations Organization was founded; for of what avail are pronouncements of the "four freedoms" when pogroms again rage in Europe, and the Hebrews are denied the right of self-determination and a voice in the government of their own territory?

Our delegation will therefore back the proposals of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation which distinguish between the status of people of many lands who are of Jewish faith and the status of the Hebrews of Europe and Palestine who regard themselves as members of the Hebrew Nation. The recognition of this normal national status of the Hebrew people will of itself and the anomalous position in which they now find themselves will make possible an amicable solution of the political and boundary disputes over Palestine. By eliminating the controversial issue of a state religion, such as the very term "Jewish commonwealth" inevitably signifies, it will be possible, once the present barriers have been lifted and the right of Hebrew repatriation assured, to grant Palestine its independence as a free republic with full equality in citizenship and government to Jews, Moslems, and Christians alike.

There is ample evidence that an overwhelming majority of the Moslems now residing in Palestine will be very happy with such a solution.

It is also proposed that in the interim period Palestine be placed under a United Nations trusteeship and that the United Nations Organization supervise and assist in the repatriation of the Hebrews and in preparing the country for the exercise of its freedom.

We wish to stress again the urgency of the first part of our task. Former Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, stated last week that according to official information more than 50 displaced persons die every day in the British and American zones alone. This figure is bound to double and triple during the severe winter months now at hand. It is imperative to make sure that millions of Hebrew dead have not made us callous to the useless loss of even one more Hebrew life, hence the extreme urgency of our mission.

It is important to note that in his statement about the committee of inquiry, President Truman also made public the text of his strong communication to Prime Minister Attlee, asking the immediate transfer of all the Hebrews from Germany to Palestine; he reiterated his position by stating that "I continue to ahere to the views expressed in that letter."

We feel confident that our endeavor will succeed and that the present victimized

inhabitants of Dachau, Bergen-Belsen, and Buchenwald will not be forced to die there this winter, but rather that American Liberty ships will soon carry them to safety and dignity in their own homeland.

Judge William S. Bennett and Dr. Johan J. Smertenko, of New York; Mr. Fowler Harper, of Indiana; and Mr. Joseph Sharfsin, of Philadelphia, are already in London and have joined with a considerable body of Members of Parliament and civic leaders who are in agreement with our endeavor. We are leaving today with the strength of the knowledge that the people of the United States are behind us in this mission, and the hope that better judgment will prevail and the British Government will abandon its present indefensible position.

We wish to thank Secretary of State James F. Byrnes and British Ambassador Lord Halifax as well as officials of the State Department and British Embassy for having so helpfully expedited the arrangements for our mission.

(During the press conference in which the foregoing statement was made, Mr. J. David Stern disclosed that he had called upon President Truman and Secretary Byrnes yesterday to take his leave. Mr. Stern said he was "deeply gratified and encouraged" by their expressions of good wishes and their hopes for the success of the mission of rescue.)

Statements in the House of Commons of Mr. Attlee and Mr. Eden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 23 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, before I begin the remarks which I have prepared to make today I wish to comment briefly on a most important debate which took place yesterday in the House of Commons. I have read with intense interest this morning's news account of that debate, and I wish to commend the House of Commons for having full dress debates on the vital and all-important question of foreign relations. Especially was I gratified to read in the press report the statements of Mr. Anthony Eden and Mr. Attlee, among other things advocating a revision of the San Francisco Charter and doing away with the veto power, and strongly condemning that nationalism which stands almost as a complete barrier to world cooperation.

I approve of those statements and wish that I might comment at length upon them, but at this time I ask unanimous consent that the text of the speech of Mr. Attlee and excerpts from Anthony Eden's address before the House of Commons, as published in the New York Times, be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. President, an estimate I have received from the Government Printing Office indicates that printing the addresses of Mr. Attlee and Mr. Eden will exceed by one page the two pages allowed under the rule and that the cost will be $156. Notwithstanding this, I desire to have the addresses printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF PRIME MINISTER ATTLEE

In addressing the House this afternoon I am speaking in the third legislative chamber in 10 days. On Tuesday, November 13, I had the honor of addressing the joint session of Congress at Washington and on Monday last I had the privilege of speaking to the two houses of the Canadian Parliament at Ottawa.

I am speaking in this debate on foreign affairs because I thought it right to take the earliest opportunity of giving the house an account of my visit to the United States and Canada and to amplify in some degree the joint declaration which was made by President Truman, the Prime Minister of Canada, and myself on atomic energy. I also thought it right that the house should have an opportunity of expressing their views.

It will, I am sure, be realized that I have not had very much time to prepare myself since landing on Tuesday night, and I, therefore, do not propose to range over a large number of topics which may properly be raised on debate on foreign affairs but shall confine myself to the main subject of discussions which I had across the Atlantic.

NO CURB ON DEBATE SOUGHT

In doing so I should, however, make it clear that the Government have no desire or expectation that this debate should be restricted to this topic.

The Foreign Secretary will be speaking tomorrow and will reply to today's debate.

I would like to say a word here as to the circumstances which gave rise to the visit.

Toward the end of September last, I made known to the President of the United States my views on the vital importance to the world of the discovery of atomic energy, and of its application to warfare which made it essential that those in responsible positions should consider the problems to which it had given rise, and the implications which emergence of this weapon has on the endeavors we are all making to banish war from the world.

In conveying to him tentative conclusions to which the Government had arrived, I suggested a personal discussion which might follow, and in October I received an invitation from President Truman to visit Washington to discuss the whole matter with him and the Prime Minister of Canada. The Prime Minister of Canada had been over here on a visit and I had the advantage of exchanging views with him.

I am very grateful to Sir John Anderson, whose knowledge of the subject and of the circumstances attending working with the Americans and Canadians on atomic energy research was so great, and for being so good as to accompany me. His knowledge, advice, and help at all times were invaluable, and I am very greatly indebted to him.

During my stay in Washington I was most kindly entertained and had numerous meetings with Cabinet Members, Senators, Congressmen, and other leading figures in the political world.

FRUITFUL TALK ON YACHT

From the day of my arrival I had constant meetings and talks, most of them taking place at the White House, and one long, fruitful, and pleasant talk on a yacht in the Potomac River.

While the principal subject of the talk concerned problems they had met to consider, I naturally discussed with the President and Mr. Byrnes and others matters of common interest, and I found as always a friendly and cooperative attitude.

I had the honor of addressing a joint session of Congress, and I paid tribute, as I feel sure that House would have wished me to do, to the unsurpassed war effort of the United States. I also told them I had come with the united good wishes of the House of Commons in the task which lay ahead.

I was quite sure in the United States it was fully realized that there was no difference of opinion in this House about its desire for the utmost cooperation in world affairs with the great Republic across the Atlantic.

I would like to acknowledge here the great assistance I had from our Ambassador, Lord Halifax, from Field Marshal Sir Henry Maitland Wilson, and from all members of our staff in Washington.

I then went to Canada, where I was immensely struck by the deep desire of the Canadian people to do all they could to help this country in the difficult circumstances of the present time.

I told them very frankly of our difficulties, but I assured them that we were meeting them in a spirit of resolution and confidence. The Prime Minister of Canada assured me of the affection and admiration of the people of Canada for the people of this country.

Indeed, I found that assurance in the demeanor of everyone with whom I came into contact. I had the honor to lay a wreath at the foot of the War Memorial in Ottawa and in Ottawa I also had the benefit of the extremely able help of the Lord High Commissioner.

I now turn to the principal matters which I discussed with the President [Truman] and Mackenzie King. I should like to say something first of all with regard to the approach I made to this question of atomic energy as applied to war. In my view it is impossible to isolate the problem of the atomic bomb from that of the use of other destructive weapons.

There was a time when wars were locally fought out with weapons which to us seem extraordinarily primitive. In those days losses and destruction caused by war could often be made up in a few years and great as was the misery caused the thing was measurable. Sometimes even the losses were slight and men in authority might count the cost of war as worth while for the advantages, but those advantages seem to us sometimes today to be trivial. Such an attitude toward war is impossible to our generation. We have seen two world conflagrations, and we know the cost or at least we know something of the cost in human suffering and in the destruction of the work of generations of man.

The practical obliteration of great cities which took place in the last war as a result of shelling and bombing was bad enough. We know too well what the effect of the bombing was in London, Coventry, Plymouth, and other cities, and anyone who has seen Aachen and Stalingrad or Warsaw knows how infinitely greater is the ruin on the continent of Europe.

BOMB MAY NOT BE LAST WORD

It was with that object lesson in their minds that representatives of nations met at San Francisco. But since then we have had the atomic bomb. Two only were dropped on Japan, but in each instance a large part of a great city with its inhabitants was wiped out. The atomic bomb is the latest word in destructiveness, but it may not be the last.

It brought home as nothing else has done that if civilization is to survive there must be no repetition of the First and Second World Wars. Therefore, when I spoke in Mansion House—and in all my discussions—I have considered not just the elimination of atomic bombs from the armory of nations but what kind of a world order is necessary in an epoch in which science has placed in man's hands such terrible weapons. I emphasize this because there have been attempts in the past to eliminate certain weapons and certain methods of warfare, and there were certain successes in the past. There have been wars in which the Geneva

Convention has been pretty fairly observed on both sides, but broadly speaking, the attempt to abandon certain weapons has failed.

Gas was banned before the 1914–18 war but was used, and I have no doubt that if the Nazis had thought it worth while they would have used it once again. The bombing of open cities once filled the world with horror, but it became the everyday experience of the citizens of London in the last war. I do not believe that in a warring world, except to a very little extent, there can be a set of Queensberry rules.

I think an attempt on those lines is as futile as an attempt of knightly contestants of the Middle Ages to ban that unsporting thing—gunpowder.

I think it is well that we should make up our minds that if the world is again involved in a war on a scale comparable with that from which we have just emerged, every weapon will be used. We may confidently expect full-scale atomic warfare which will result in the destruction of great cities, in the death of millions and the setting back of civilization to an unimaginable extent. You will find this thought expressed in the joint declaration.

UNITED NATIONS OFFERS HOPE

We have in process a meeting of the United Nations Organization, and there is an instrument which, if all nations resolve to use it, can establish a rule of law and prevent war.

I say resolve to use it because to my mind here is the essence of the problem. Just as no system of inspection or control of weapons is to avail without good will, so no international organization, however carefully framed, will be of any avail unless the nations resolve to lay aside war and threat of war as an instrument of policy, unless they determine to establish between themselves such mutual confidence that war is unthinkable. This is the only real solution. No safeguard offering any chance of success should be overlooked or ignored.

I say mutual confidence is needed, but it is as well to remember that over great areas of the earth's surface this confidence is already established. War between Britain and any of the dominions is unthinkable.

War between Britain, Canada, or the United States is unthinkable. It is the task of statesmen to spread that confidence throughout the world. The declaration which we made at Washington was made with this object of increasing confidence in order that we may press on with the great task of ridding the world of the fear of war.

Let me turn now to what we have actually done. First, we three countries were concerned in the discovery and development of atomic energy. Countries which possess the knowledge have already made available to the world the basic scientific information essential to its development for peaceful purposes.

We declare our readiness to make available any further basic scientific information of this kind for the whole world. We desire to promote the use of advances in scientific knowledge to peaceful and humanitarian ends, and we declare our readiness to exchange fundamental knowledge and to arrange for interchange of scientists with any nation that will fully reciprocate. I ask the House to note that desire for reciprocity. We cannot tell what scientific discoveries may be made and used for warfare. Therefore, we ask that all should be prepared to do what we have done and what we are prepared to do.

INDUSTRIAL ENERGY YEARS AHEAD

I now turn to the question of the disclosure of detailed information from the practical industrial application of atomic energy. Atomic energy already has been used for destruction. Its development for peaceful purposes, for helping instead of destroying the human race, is not likely to be perfected for some years at all events. Meanwhile, methods and processes already developed can lead to either purpose. The proposal has been urged in some quarters that knowledge of these processes should be broadcast to the world in the same way as fundamental scientific information has been given.

I cannot think this would be wise. In the first place this knowledge cannot be given in formula or blueprint. It can only be done by scientists and technicians being taken to the plant to explain everything in detail involving numbers of men with specialized knowledge.

That is a matter which would take a long time, and to do this for all nations would clearly be a matter of very great difficulty, and I can see no reason for singling out particular nations.

Secondly, this discovery can be used either for peace or war. Can it be wise then when the United Nations Organization is only just formed and not out of its cradle to broadcast to the world methods of making such a destructive weapon?

In our view, this must await the growth of confidence and the development of safeguards. It may be said, what safeguards are any use?

CONFIDENCE IS ESSENTIAL

I may be told that I have already said no system of safeguards can be devised to make an effective guarantee, but I ask the House to note the words about a nation bent on aggression in the declaration. Where there is no mutual confidence, no system will be effective. Where it exists there will be no difficulty. For instance, there is no difficulty between Britain and Canada and the United States. We trust each other. We are able to have free, full and frank discussions.

We wish to establish between all nations just such confidence. It is to be remembered that although the processes for producing atomic energy are complicated and require a great plant, the product itself is a small thing. The weight of the bomb on Hiroshima was not great. Clearly there must be most sedulous care taken in the control of this most dangerous substance.

The three signatories declare, however, their readiness to share with other nations on a reciprocal basis the practical industrial application of this discovery just as soon as effective and foreseeable safeguards can be devised and to this end they propose a commission under the United Nations Organization.

The House will have seen the duties it is proposed to entrust to the commission.

It will be remembered that the United Nations Organization is set up for the prevention of wars and the establishment of peace. It is, therefore, natural to entrust this work to the commission which will make recommendations to that organization. I draw special attention to the provision that the work of this commission is to proceed by stages.

There is not only atomic energy to be dealt with, but all weapons adaptable for mass production. Not one of these weapons has a legitimate place in the armaments needed for ordinary internal security or protection of a government. They are weapons for total war designed for mass destruction, and we must banish total war from the world if civilization is to continue.

Here is our declaration. I hope that there will be a world-wide response to its principles and proposals here made for spreading scientific information for peaceful purposes and the prevention of these perversions for war. The United Nations Organization will soon be meeting when these matters will be brought up. This cannot be solved by America, Canada, and this country alone and it would be a disservice to pretend that it could.

This is a world question, and for its solution we need not merely agreements of governments but the wills and faiths of the peoples of the world.

Lost friends, ruined homes are fresh in the memory of us all. We have been through so many horrors that perhaps it is difficult for most people to grasp the threat there is still stretching before us unless men can so order their affairs as not to be destroyed by their own invention.

The atomic bomb is here. It is not something just noted, nor a newspaper sensation to be read about in comfort. It is a danger that hangs over every one of us here in this country and over all the peoples of the world.

The United Nations Organization is now here. It is here, present in the world. It was born almost at the same time as the atomic bomb. It is not something vaguely heard of and outside the range of our life. It is fraught with tremendous possibilities, and I want everyone here in this country and in the world to feel their personal concern in the success of the United Nations Organization.

I would like to end with some words I used on Monday in addressing the Canadian Parliament:

"Unless we apply to these problems the moral enthusiasm as great as that which the scientists bring to bear on our research work, then our civilization built up for so many centuries will surely perish."

ADDRESS OF FORMER FOREIGN SECRETARY ANTHONY EDEN

All sections of the House will join in welcoming home the Prime Minister and Sir John Anderson. A flight across the Atlantic in midwinter is not without its risks, and it is characteristic of both of them that they covered with becoming modesty the fact that there was only one airdrome left in England upon which they could land. It is part of the business of Ministers in these days to take such risks.

We are happy that Mr. Attlee has done so this time without any unhappy consequences. We are glad to see him looking well, here with us again.

I had hoped the Prime Minister would tell us a little more about what steps are to be taken now to give effect to the conclusions reached in Washington. As I understand it, a really new departure at the Washington discussions was that the three powers there charged with this particular responsibility decided it was their duty to take the initiative in this matter in relation to the other nations of the world, and their initiative had been to ask that a commission of the United Nations should be set up which would, by stages it was hoped, and by agreement, deal with this subject.

ASKS ABOUT COMPOSITION

Who is going to compose that commission? Presumably it would be the members of the Security Council. Are there to be any others as well? If so who else, and have the invitations gone out? If they had not when would they go out, and who would send them? When would this commission meet? Those were the kinds of questions which we had in mind when we read the admirable basis of work agreed on in Washington.

As I understand the commission was to proceed by stages. In view of the immense intricacy of this subject I think that is right. As I see it, what will happen is, if these invitations are accepted, the United Nations commission will meet together and will first exchange this information.

If this exchange is accepted by all of them they had the first stage in the creation of international confidence and would move to the next stage, to the control of atomic energy to the extent necessary to insure its use for peaceful measures.

The other thing we would like to know is if communications have gone to other nations since the talks were completed. Have any communications gone to Russia about the outcome of the talks?

(Mr. Attlee interposed here and said the Washington declaration was communicated to the Russian Government before it was made public.)

I am much obliged. I think it was useful to get that out.

(Mr. Attlee interposed that the United Nations Organization would itself set up the commission, saying, "Therefore, until you have got the United Nations Organization I cannot tell you what the composition of the commission would be. It would be a matter for the United Nations.")

Is the conception that there will be a special meeting of the United Nations Organization to set up this commission? Otherwise, it may be a long time before anything will happen. I understand there is an acting chairman, and his suggestion is that someone should send a communication and ask for the commission to be set up; otherwise we may have to wait a long time before even the preliminary stages were taken.

This is what seems to be the fundamental of this problem: The truth is that by the discovery of this atomic energy science has placed us several laps ahead of our international political development, and yet unless we can catch up politically to the point we have reached in science and thus command the power which at present threatens us, we are all going to be blown to smithereens.

Mr. Byrnes put it well when he said the civilized world cannot survive atomic war. I agree with the Prime Minister that no set of rules is going to enable us to survive a future war when this weapon is latent for use, and no safeguards by themselves are going to provide an effective guaranty. They have got to be accompanied by the acceptance of the rule of law among nations.

During this war we had thought at San Francisco to lay the foundations of a new world order. But the truth is that all the events of recent years have tended the same way: to narrow the world and bring us closer together and, therefore, to intensify the shocks and sharpen the reactions before the shock absorbers are ready.

SOVEREIGNTY CRUX OF PROBLEM

Every succeeding scientific discovery makes greater nonsense of old-time conceptions of sovereignty, yet it is not the least use deluding ourselves. It is yet true that national sentiment is still as strong as ever, and here and there it is strengthened by this further complication—the differing conceptions of forms of government and differing conceptions of what words like freedom and democracy mean. So despite some stirrings the world has not been ready to abandon or to modify its old conceptions of sovereignty.

Now atomic energy has come to enforce the call for something more. The world family is smaller today than was the European family at the end of the last war. I have thought much of this business of atomic energy both before and since that bomb burst on Nagasaki, and for the life of me I have been unable to see—and I am still unable to see—any final solution that will make the world safe from atomic power other than that we all abate our present ideas of sovereignty. We have got somehow to take the sting out of nationalism. We cannot hope to do this at once. But we ought to start working for it now, and that I submit should be the first duty of the United Nations.

We should make up our minds where we want to go. I know in this respect where I want to go. I want to go to a world where the relations between nations can be transformed in a given period of time. As the relations between England, Scotland, and Wales have been transformed.

In the light of discoveries about atomic energy I think that the San Francisco Charter should be reviewed particularly with respect to the veto which is an anachronism in the modern world.

Nobody here will deny that there has been an increase of suspicion and mistrust recently between the Soviet Union and the other two great partners in victory, the United States and ourselves. We all deplore that, and if I make some remarks upon it I hope it will be understood that those remarks are made by one who always has been convinced, and is still convinced, that the future peace of the world depends upon understanding between ourselves, the United States and Russia.

RUSSIANS WANT SECURITY

We want the fullest Russian participation in all world affairs on equal terms. Many times Russian statesmen have spoken to me and Mr. Churchill of their need for security and the anxiety they feel for friendly relations with their neighbors. We have never disputed that.

The Russians had gone very far in making arrangements with all their neighbors. Against whom are all these Russian arrangements being made? I know the answer. They have given it to us many times. They are made against a possible resurgence of German plans for domination of Europe. The Russians are not as convinced as some people that the Nazi spirit is entirely dead.

Any arrangements between us and our western neighbors are no more aimed against Russia than are Russian arrangements with her neighbors aimed at us. I think it is desirable that that should be plainly stated because I am convinced it is the literal truth. We know that Russian arrangements are not aimed against us.

There continues to be in Britain amongst virtually all sections of the people, a deep desire for friendship with Russia as close and as cordial as we have with the U. S. A. But there is another unhelpful influence which militates against this and which I think should be mentioned. It is the difficulty of getting information out of Russia and out of territories controlled by the Soviet Union.

I would beg our Russian friends to believe that they could make no greater contribution to real understanding between our countries than to allow foreign correspondents in their territory or in territories under their control, the same full freedom as is allowed Russian correspondents here. We have got to get to know each other, and that involves freedom to speak and to comment across frontiers. Drop those barriers of censorship and you will blow away in one gust much of those black fogs of suspicion.

THE IRANIAN TROUBLES

We have read with some concern in the press of recent disturbances in northwest Persia [Iran] and of a decision by the Persian Government to send troops to deal with those disturbances and a report that those troops were turned back by the Soviet authorities.

I must say that I find it impossible to reconcile such action either with the Anglo-Soviet-Persian treaty of 1942 or with the Teheran declaration of 1943. That declaration said "the Governments of the United States, the U. S. S. R., and the United Kingdom are at one with the Government of Iran in their desire for the maintenance of the independent sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iran."

From 1940 and still more in 1941, when Russia was attacked, Persia became the happy hunting ground for German agents. The moment that Russia was attacked we had need of those communications through Persia as the only alternative route to the northern convoys, the full story of whose gallantry I pray somebody will one day write as it should be written. To deal with the German agents and to prevent sabotage to the railway it was necessary to take certain military steps. We did so, but we made it plain it was only to insure our supplies to Russia that we intervened in Persia and that we wished to interfere as little as we could with Persian sovereignty.

We were most anxious not to revert to that past and pernicious policy which was called the "spheres of influence" in Persia.

In view of that, when the German war began to come to an end we became anxious to withdraw our troops and we first raised this matter at Yalta. No decision was reached then about the withdrawal of troops but the Russians there did reaffirm to us their determination to stand by the Teheran agreement. Later, at an early stage of the Potsdam Conference, we raised the matter again, and our desire then was to arrange for an early withdrawal, even before the treaty obligation came into force.

The treaty obligation is to withdraw 6 months after the close of the Japanese war. In London agreement was reached to withdraw by March 2.

Our task in Persia, and our only task, was to guard the lines of communication and supply, and not to interfere in internal affairs in Persia. Those lines of supply are no longer of any importance except for the maintenance of our troops and the Soviet troops who are there. I am afraid this incident is not the only occasion when the Soviets have refused permission to Persians to move their troops and gendarmerie about in the area under their control, and in consequence it is not very surprising that suspicions have been raised.

There are two steps that our Russian allies could take that would remove suspicion. They could make it plain that they have no objection to the free movement of Persian troops in their area and that they would be prepared to give those forces opportunity to move and act when they reached the area. I might also add that here, as elsewhere, the Soviet Union would greatly strengthen its case and remove suspicion and charges by inviting the press of the world to go and see for themselves what is going on in that area and allowing them freely to publish their observations.

I do think it is better in the long run for our relations with Russia, which I hope my record shows I care very deeply about, that one should thus speak frankly when the occasion arises.

I should like to ask what exactly was going on in Greece. We read that the Archbishop has resigned. That is deplorable if it is true, because he had given very valued service to Greece at a very critical time; but perhaps resignations in Greece are not quite so serious as they are in this country. Maybe he will come back again.

Even more serious is the news of the postponement for 2 or 3 years of the plebiscite in respect of the constitutional future of Greece.

I am not going into the merits of my desire, if I have any, as to the outcome of the plebiscite, but what I want to say about this delay is that it does run counter to the undertakings which were given to the King by the then Prime Minister and myself when he himself offered not to go back to his country until the country had voted.

We then said and we told the House that the idea was that the plebiscite would be held at an early date. No one in the world can think that 2 or 3 years from now can be regarded as an early date.

Regarding the report of financial assistance being conditioned in some way, perhaps he can give some information about that also.

I know the Foreign Secretary was disappointed by the break-down of the London Conference. Despite that it is hoped that he would persevere in his efforts to bring about another meeting at which we could do better.

It is, I am sure, only through direct contacts with the Russians and other allies that suspicions can be ventilated and allayed, as they must be if the world is to have a chance to enjoy the enduring peace it deserves.

Earlier, I spoke of the destructive possibilities of atomic energy, but there is another side to this stupendous discovery—the possibilities for good, though not so immediate. The world sees, perhaps not so far away, the chance of security or even plenty for all. The world must seize that chance if we are to prove worthy of those who fought and died that we might have it.

The Red Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from yesterday's Washington Post written by the talented and brilliant Agnes C. Meyer in a critical spirit of the centralization of the Red Cross, and urging that that organization lead the democratic trend in welfare.

I am familiar with the situation about which Mrs. Meyer writes, and I am entirely in sympathy with what she has said, since World War I.

I have received an estimate from the Government Printing Office indicating that the article will exceed by two-thirds of a page the two printed pages allowed under the rule and will cost $138.80.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED CROSS URGED TO LEAD DEMOCRATIC TREND IN WELFARE—CABINET POST PROPOSED, ALSO NATIONAL COUNCIL INCLUDING ALL AGENCIES

(This is the text of a much-publicized address delivered Thursday before the regional conference of the American Red Cross in New York)

(By Agnes E. Meyer)

Why am I here today? Because I made in a recent address to the trustees of voluntary welfare groups some sharp criticisms of the Red Cross. Some of your own liberal leaders now have given me the great opportunity and serious responsibility of amplifying those statements directly to you. Such an invitation is a mark of confidence which moves me profoundly. Surely democracy is safe when there are people left in our country who respond to criticism with such tolerance. I am, to be sure, in the position of a guest who has been invited to dinner to criticize the hostess. But your hospitality cannot absolve me from duty toward my country—and toward you—of speaking the truth as I see it. Your invitation obligates me to describe some of the dangers that beset not only the Red Cross but all voluntary welfare agencies in this period of social revolution.

For the Red Cross finds itself in exactly the same dilemma as many another American institution, not excepting the churches. A part of your leadership sees the urgent need for a revaluation of values in the light of social conditions and evolving contemporary needs. But another element clings with desperation to the worship of entrenched power and of certain authoritarian ideas that are now dead as a door nail. Your situation is more difficult than that of the other private welfare organizations because of your numbers, your wealth, and therefore of the power involved.

There are other obstacles which make it difficult for the Red Cross to find its way out of this dilemma. The Red Cross has a head and a body but these two parts have no life-giving relationship. The central committee or mind of your organization functions in an exalted isolation which the body—local chapters and contributors—has no means of enriching with a vigorous blood stream of opinion. On the other hand, your bodily functions cannot be guided by the head through uniform standard setting and speedy assistance, whether of a financial, advisory, or other nature. Often the chapters in the same State or even the same city do not know what the others are doing or thinking.

NEED STATE SET-UP

Instead of a few area boards, what the Red Cross needs is a State-wide federation of chapters under an elected State council, the chairman of the State council to have a voice in major proposals of your central committee. Without a State agency, you can never cooperate effectively with a peacetime welfare program, since all welfare work in our country is organized on a State and community basis. But I bring up this point now because my appeal is addressed to the rank and file membership. To become articulate in a fluid moment such as this when your group, like any other, is torn between progress and reaction, the membership, the great body of people who contribute their funds and services, must become the deciding factor, must achieve machinery by which it can reject at a moment of crisis its reactionary leaders and support those whose policies seem in harmony with the Nation's welfare.

No American who has the future of our country at heart can be indifferent to the choice you make between these contending forces. The Red Cross has the greatest potentialities for good of any single welfare organization in the country if only because of its size, wealth, and prestige. But it also has possibilities for evil. Unless you see to it that your progressive leadership is upheld, the Red Cross can easily become a menace to the progress of democratic ideas and their effective implementation.

Let me begin by giving you an illustration of undemocratic leadership by your small but powerful group of reactionaries who strive to keep the reins of control in their hands. I refer to the distorted version of the relationship between the Red Cross and our two major labor organizations which lately have been fed to the press. These relations are based upon an honorable and businesslike agreement which does credit both to the Red Cross and to the labor organizations involved. Yet for devious purposes this contractual relationship has been painted as a stain on the otherwise untarnished reputation of the Red Cross and an unpatriotic act on the part of labor unions.

Let me outline the history of that agreement as given to me by members of your central committee and by the war relief committee of the labor unions.

RED CROSS AND LABOR

Early in 1942, A. F. of L. and CIO proved they could act together when the welfare of the country is involved by making an agreement with the Community War Chests and councils to collect at least 1 hour's pay each month from every union member. These labor leaders were among the first to recognize that the total efforts of the American people could be mobilized only if a unified approach were substituted for innumerable separate campaigns. They also wished to protect their members from the confusion of multiple appeals. The plan was worked out on a community basis with careful supervision. When the National War Fund was organized in January 1943, the arrangement was continued and extended. As the war fund had its own administrative budget covering campaign and promotional expenses, it preferred to meet the administrative budgets of the two labor committees and receive in return their total collection.

Then came the eternal problem of the separate Red Cross drive. The unions solved it by allocating 4 months of their annual intake to the Red Cross and 8 to the War Fund. Their combined budgets for the year beginning May 1, 1945, are $698,000, of which one-third is provided by the American Red Cross and two-thirds by the National War Fund.

In return for its $232,000, the Red Cross received from CIO and A. F. of L. $30,000,000 last year, or at an overhead of less than 1 percent. If the Red Cross received all of its contributions at so small a cost, we would consider it very efficient. Yet your reactionaries talk as if the rest of the Red Cross funds just drop into its lap like manna from heaven. Their loud cries that something has been put over on the dear Red Cross is hyprocritical hokum. Your central committee voted for the contract with a majority of 16 to 2. It made no secret of the arrangement. Copies of the agreement were given to the press and to every one of 3,750 chapters.

The plan has worked remarkably well. Every group involved has expressed its satisfaction publicly, including the National War Fund and the Red Cross. It represents a great step forward in the relations of the Red Cross with working people. This agreement is no more a disgrace to Norman Davis, your former director, or to Mr. O'Connor, the present one, than it is to Winthrop Aldrich, head of the War Fund. It is, indeed, a tribute to their intelligence, business ability, and good sense. It is also a magnificent tribute to the statesmanlike vision and executive skill of the two labor groups.

DEVIOUS METHODS

But do not blame the press for the way this highly creditable arrangement was used to frighten Red Cross members and vilify union leadership. That story was given to the press in that biased light by your respectable, supposedly honorable but very bitter and very obtuse old fuddy-duddy leaders who resent the fact that labor is gaining a foothold in the management of the Red Cross. They shudder at the thought that their holy of holies—the central committee—may be polluted by representation from labor, a move the Red Cross should have made long ago, considering it is so dependent on labor contributions and is becoming more so every year. These reactionaries have decided to force Mr. O'Connor out of the directorship on the theory that he is too friendly to labor. If you don't believe me, let me quote from the last article for which this type of Red Cross leader is responsible. "Perhaps Mr. O'Connor will be reappointed and the labor-Red Cross agreement renewed. But the true interests of the Red Cross will not be served by either, Mr. O'Connor's reappointment, it is contended, will further demoralize the organization. (Contended by whom you members should ask yourselves.) Renewal of the agreement will not end the Red Cross opposition." There you have the die-hard psychology of leaders who would rather wreck the Red Cross than see it become democratic. Now I do not know Mr. O'Connor personally. It is of no interest to me whether he is reappointed director or not. But, judging by his enemies, he must be a person of some merit.

COULD PROVIDE LEADERSHIP

Now why should the rest of us care—why should I care—whether the Red Cross remains under the domination of a small, powerful reactionary group? Because what you do with the people's money under your control, with the more than $70,000,000 which, I am told, is left over from your war chest, can make or mar a trend now well under way in our country for the integration and cooperation of education, health, and welfare on the local, State, and Federal level. It has become obvious that far more effective

organization and administration of all welfare services are immediately required to meet postwar needs of the American family, of returning veterans, and dislocated war workers.

In such a program the Red Cross can play a leading part. But it will not lead unless it abandons the destructive influence of its stand-pat elements and rejuvenates its antiquated organization to match already existing State welfare machinery. Above all, it must cooperate unselfishly and wholeheartedly with the Nation-wide effort to strengthen public and private local community welfare agencies.

To cooperate humbling, sincerely, and successfully in this national endeavor you first will have to recapture what you so proudly define as "the Red Cross spirit." The public respects what it knew as "the Red Cross spirit." But your reactionary leaders have perverted this spirit until it has achieved a genius for making enemies and has made the Red Cross the object of repressed fears, resentment, and even hatred. The fact that most Americans give money to the Red Cross is sometimes interpreted as proof that everybody loves you. That is fallacious. People have a long-standing reverence for the Red Cross, gained in simpler, happier days, which your well-publicized campaign methods always have exploited successfully.

MUST CORRECT MISTAKES

Red Cross traditions were so powerful that they led many chapters to fight a total war on the home front as if it were your own private war. But let me not give the impression that only you made this mistake. The suffering of war workers' families possibly was greater than those of many military men. Nobody in or out of the Government had the vision to foresee that a total war demands an all-inclusive democratic mobilization of our whole welfare structure. Even before the atomic bomb shocked us into realization that a new era has dawned, it became evident that the homeland, too, is a battlefield in modern warfare. We must begin at once a more democratic, better organized, more inclusive approach to our immense social problems, not only to handle our social reconversion successfully. If ever there should be another war, which heaven forbid, we must not make the same mistakes we did this time. An all-inclusive social strategy is as necessary as military strategy for the protection and safety of the home front.

If I now remind you of some of the strategic and psychological errors of the Red Cross, I do it only because they illustrate to an extreme degree a monopolistic, competitive and paternalistic attitude toward welfare problems. All voluntary organizations are more or less afflicted with these attitudes. All must strive to overcome them.

ARMY RELIEF GOBBLED UP

Take, for example, the hard-hearted way in which your leadership frustrated efforts of the Army Emergency Relief to help their own families at a time of dire need. The Army first made an agreement in 1942 that the Red Cross should contribute $1,500,000 to found Army Emergency Relief. The Army had to agree not to solicit funds but Irving Berlin's show and various athletic contests brought in gifts of $17,000,000. Then your leaders produced your famous charter to prove that only the Red Cross could administer home relief to the armed forces and induced Army's authorities to issue a directive in 1944 not to consider the Army Emergency Relief as a separate agency. The plea of your leaders was duplication of functions, although any intelligent person knew that no one organization could handle so gigantic a task.

Even had you made a huge success of home service, there would be no excuse for this arbitrary behavior.

"What right had the Red Cross to make a monopoly of mercy?" said one general's wife to me. "To be sure, there was amateurish incompetence among our people to which the Red Cross could point. But how competent was the Red Cross? Why and through what power," she demanded, "could the Red Cross forbid the Army to dispense as it liked money which it had received from a grateful public?"

I can tell you why Army Emergency Relief was assimilated by the Red Cross and its activities drastically curtailed. This unwise decision was defended by one of your most arbitrary old leaders as necessary because, if any other agency were known to be serving the needs of our soldiers, it would weaken the logic and appeal of your separate drive for funds. There, my friends, is the source of your obsession that the Red Cross must have a monopoly of service to our military forces. Your charter, which is not mandatory but only permissive, is a mere pretext in such conflicts. Bureaucratic power rather than service to mankind are the prime objectives of your reactionary element. This dire influence is indeed the crux of all your difficulties with the public. Therefore, it seems obvious to me that the country will never get wholehearted cooperation from the Red Cross, in peace or war, until its separate, expensive, drum-beating financial campaign has been eliminated and combined with the National War Fund. For the need to continue the War Fund I shall later make a plea. Your isolation, I feel sure, cannot be overcome until this supreme symbol of your isolation, your separate financial campaign, is sacrificed to the common good.

"NOBODY WOULD DARE"

The hot dispute between the Red Cross and Army emergency relief was carried above generals, who dared not commit themselves, to the War Department. It decided in favor of the Red Cross because the Red Cross dictates to Army leaders instead of cooperating with them, because everyone from the highest to the lowest in the land must bow to the prestige and to the financial and political power of the Red Cross. In one community the Red Cross marched into the largest church parish house, tossed an old established religious and social program out of the window, and told the clergyman calmly: "We'll use this room for the blood bank, that one for home service, this for bandage rolling, etc." When I asked this clergyman why he didn't toss the Red Cross out of the window, he looked aghast and stuttered, "Why, I wouldn't dare. Nobody can oppose the Red Cross."

The Red Cross can scarcely be blamed for regarding itself as sacred because it is never publicly criticized. But the mere fact that all criticism is repressed partly through fear of hurting your campaign appeal and partly through fear of your power, makes it all the more violent. Now isn't it fair to say that, when people high and low are afraid—are literally terrorized—by a voluntary benevolent society, something must be radically wrong at the very heart of its being?

It is but natural that the authoritarian, fear-inspiring attitude of your traditional old leadership is imitated and reflected by many local female gauleiters who rule the roost with a rod of iron, especially in smaller cities and towns. To me the most tragic thing about the Red Cross is the undemocratic influence upon many members which filters down from above. In too many of your offices people who want to ask questions or volunteer services are met not only with indifference but rudeness. When the Army sent out a hurried call for more trained nurses after the Normandy landing the professional women who volunteered, often at great personal sacrifice, were treated with such inefficiency and scorn at one of your largest recruiting centers that they complained to Washington headquarters. To investigators the local chapter replied that the woman responsible for this behavior could not be fired because she was one of the largest contributors to the Red Cross. Again money was more important than service.

Now you have thousands upon thousands of stanch members who resent this kind of thing. These are the women to whom I am trying to bring courage and support with this frank analysis of the conflict going on not only among your leaders but in your ranks. Again and again your forward looking, intelligent members, especially younger ones, would ask me in community conferences: "But what can we do, Mrs. Meyer, to make our Red Cross leaders see their mistakes? They slap us down if we criticize and tell us firmly that we aren't "good Red Crossers."

WE OR NOBODY

In many a community these tyrants will kill an idea no matter how valuable, if the Red Cross cannot carry it out and get credit for it. Their motto is: "Either we do it or nobody does it." This dog-in-the-manger psychology, this mania for "credit" in all but your truly modern-minded chapters, is again the result of pressure from above, from publicity and finance committees whose business it is to prove that the annual high-pressure drive for funds is justified by results.

Proof of this statement lies in the fact that a wholly different genuinely democratic psychology exists in your liberal national leaders and in local Red Cross chapters that weld their programs harmoniously with the local welfare program. For example, the five New York City chapters have combined to form a cooperative health council. San Francisco and St. Louis also have well-integrated community programs. But I should particularly like to quote the wise advice of William J. Norton, chairman of your Detroit board of directors, who in my limited experience is doing one of the most outstanding local Red Cross jobs in the country. "The Red Cross is just one of many voluntary agencies and must not look upon itself as a sacred cow," he said. "The paternalistic outlook in voluntary welfare work is outmoded and in its place must come a more democratic spirit. When you take people's money, they have rights. They are all entitled to know their money is well spent and therefore they must have representation on our boards.

PUBLIC OR PRIVATE?

"In Detroit," he continued, "we are a smoothly functioning part of the general community picture and do not act as if we had a halo around our heads. We believe the usual competition, jealousy, and desire for credit between agencies have to be overcome by working out channels through which they can act together and yet maintain their own functions to full capacity."

I wish I had time to describe in detail the extensive postwar program of the Detroit chapter because it is a model of social imagination and democratic procedure. Mr. Norton sees, for example, that professional people must conduct all technical programs. The blood bank, for example, will be conducted by State and local public-health officials, while the Red Cross confines itself to the no less important task of publicizing the program. He sums up the Detroit philosophy of action as follows: "The Red Cross should be promoters, salesmen, and publicists to get social programs going, to spur public officials into speedier action on a local level, then leave the program that emerges to trained and technical leadership."

Mr. Norton here defines what should be the role of the Red Cross and all other private agencies in the postwar world and sums up the central thought that I wish to leave with you. Private agencies should pioneer activities. When these are generally accepted and established, they must step aside and leave the administration to public agencies while they pioneer in new directions.

To accept that clear-cut philosophy and to achieve a genuinely democratic organization, the Red Cross must finally make up its mind whether it is, in fact, a "public" or a "private" agency. A little straight thinking on this basic problem of purpose and philosophy is essential now that your war jobs are evaporating and the Red Cross must decide what contribution it proposes to make to the "home service" community job. If you don't face this decision, your reactionaries will continue to make trouble by playing both sides of the fence as their own advantage dictates.

SURVEY WORTH STUDY

Fortunately your constructive national leaders had the social vision to anticipate the need for guidance on this subject. This group recently inspired a survey and report on the medical and health program of the Red Cross which will be of the greatest benefit to the Nation's health if it is carried out. This report is worthy of the closest study by every Red Cross volunteer. Although confined to medical problems, it is an excellent guide to step-by-step procedures that the Red Cross should follow in its endeavor to cooperate with local agencies. There you also will find an explanation of reasons why it is essential for the Red Cross to have State headquarters to work effectively. This State organization would be advantageous to the Red Cross if only for greater efficiency in times of disaster. The arrival of your area directors at points of disaster often has been delayed because they may reside hundreds of miles away. With a well-integrated State program the chances are that you could cover the scenes of sudden flood or conflagration with greater promptness, effectiveness, and expeditious community collaboration.

Your Red Cross medical report in its concepts of community reorganization fits in perfectly with the present general trend in Nation-wide social planning. To furnish a guide for such efforts, some 27 experts in government, education, health, and welfare have drawn up a report entitled "The Road to Community Reorganization," which was presented to the President, Congress, and the country last month. This report suggests community service centers as a joint clearing-house of all local welfare endeavor. To hasten local efficiency, it points out methods by which State governments can be improved.

NATIONAL COUNCIL NEEDED

Because community services are now more than ever the concern of all people, because they are needed by all the people and because they never will assume their proper place in national life unless and until effective national leadership is provided, the report proposes that there be established in the Federal Government a Cabinet post, to include the functions of education, health, welfare, and social insurance, designed to provide appropriate coordination and leadership of the basic community services that are essential to the well-being of the Nation.

But it takes time to pass legislation for this Cabinet post and as an immediate step to accelerate the happy return of the veteran to civil life, I wish to urge upon your attention a plan that has the approval not only of some of your own leaders but of those at the head of many other national health and welfare organizations. This plan calls for the unification of all national organizations including veteran groups, Red Cross, welfare organizations of labor groups, national community chests and councils, the YW and YMCA, national health organizations—in short, all national groups concerned with the welfare of the veteran—in a council of national welfare agencies.

At present only two States have an efficient, strongly organized movement that encourages local community service centers where the veteran, war worker, or any other citizen can get help and guidance in any and all problems. This is essential if the veteran is not to get the run-around.

Yet many of these veterans' or community centers now are worse than useless because they look pretty on charts but do not succeed in bringing to the veteran all the services of the community, the State and Federal Governments.

MANY DRIVES WASTEFUL

If the national organizations should pool their efforts through a national council, expert advice in the setting up of veterans' centers and financial aid wherever needed by States and localities could rapidly be extended to all parts of the country. It would pool the immense resources and trained staffs these groups can put at the disposal of the States and communities. It would encourage this trend at the State and local level and hasten the day when the veteran can feel the whole country has been mobilized to receive him in a worthy fashion.

Such a council of national welfare agencies could cooperate quickly on a Federal level with the new Cabinet officer and we would have on every governmental level harmonious interaction between public and private community services. The war fund should be continued to raise through one annual drive the separate budgets of the council of national welfare agencies, including that of the Red Cross. The combined drive could raise as much if not more money than your separate drive and at the same time increase your prestige through your willingness to cooperate democratically.

Just as we continued the Community Chest after the last war, so also we should not let the National War Fund go out of business. Many separate national drives are wasteful and we can no longer afford them. Moreover, they throw the welfare picture out of balance when, for example, we commit such follies as raising millions for infantile paralysis and nothing for more prevalent children's diseases such as cerebral palsy and cardiac ailments.

Why shouldn't the Red Cross join with other national agencies in asking the President to call together all the leaders of the voluntary national organizations to consider the plan? The country would then have proof that the Red Cross is supporting its liberal leaders and inaugurating a new era of mutual assistance, good will, and democratic solidarity.

The Red Cross must play a role in the complex industrialized economy of the future equal but not identical with that which earned it the reverence and gratitude of a simpler, smaller nation in the past. In its national councils, as in each local chapter, all classes of citizens should have a voice in its decisions as well as the right to contribute. In coping with the vast welfare responsibility of the next decades, a vigorous, democratic Red Cross must share and collaborate flexibility with other public and private welfare agencies in serving all members of the community, regardless of race, color, or creed.

"There is a tide in the affairs of men,
Which taken at the flood, leads on to fortune."

The tide is running fast and the fortune involved is not only the welfare of our own country but the well-being of all other nations. For only if we are strong here at home, spiritually, morally, and physically, can we redeem the blood of our sons and carry out the obligations growing out of this war. Only if democracy finds new, more generous, more inclusive social patterns here at home, will it be strong enough to hold aloft its banners as beacons of promise for universal peace and freedom.

Thoughts and Wishes of the Man in the Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY
OF CALIFORNIA

Friday, November 23 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address by Mr. Robert E. Hannegan, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, at a dinner of the Indiana Democratic Editorial Association held at French Lick, Ind., November 17, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have always considered it an important part of my business to keep posted as thoroughly as I can on the thoughts and wishes of that anonymous individual whom we in America are in the habit of calling the man in the street.

To me, that man is important—the most important figure in the whole United States. Having no name, he may be a big industrialist or a small businessman or a farmer or a factory hand. He may be a Democrat or a Republican or an Independent. But as the man in the street he is all of them. He is all of them. He is bigger than any of them. His interests come first.

Now, for those of us who are in politics, this man without a name, without a stated occupation, is a very sound consultant. His thinking, you know, is usually pretty clear. He is a pretty level-headed fellow.

That is why it is always smart politics to find out, between elections, what he is saying, what he is thinking about, what he wants. You ignore him, minimize his importance, put your own objectives above his, and—well, look what has happened to the Republican Party.

But if it is a general rule of good politics to go to the man in the street and try to get his responses and discover his thinking, if this is important any time, then it is even more important now.

We are at this time in a period of transition, of change from war to peace. With that far-reaching shift, most of us realize and expect an atmosphere charged with new political and economic currents, a change in the approach of our people toward many issues and controversies that affect us all. It is natural and logical that this should happen. If anyone is surprised by it, I say such a person does not know the American people very well. He hasn't been talking very much with the man in the street.

While war lasted, we preserved a national unity in the defense of our country against a foreign aggressor. Even under the stress of this great conflict, we were not forced to give up our right of free expression.

We held a national election in the very midst of war. But we subordinated all our interests to the winning of that war. We not only placed restraints on ourselves by law, but we voluntarily refrained from trying to advance private causes that would have imperiled the great cause of our country. I say "we" and I mean most of us—all but a small minority.

Then, overnight, came an end to war, and an end to the extreme calls and exactions it had imposed upon us. This means, in a free country, the moral right to speak out again on any subject or for any cause, public or

private, within the limits of legality; and certainly it includes the right of any faction, any organization, and individual, when he thinks he is being hurt, to say so.

Inevitably, when this happens, our national unity is put to a test. But we have stood countless such tests in the past, and we shall go through many more in the future.

If anyone tries to tell me that it is unnatural for an American who has a grievance, or thinks he has one, to speak out about it, I say that person does not know his Americans.

And if anyone tries to tell me that our country cannot stand up under the strain of this free give and take, I say that person underestimates the tensile strength of our democracy.

We are just now hearing a good many of these alarms. They are coming from people who seem to think that America cannot pass this test of our national unity; people who fail to see the difference between controversy and catastrophe. They are people who think America can't take it.

Well, when I hear of these fits of self-induced hysteria, I set aside my copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where most of the outbursts first see print. I throw away the editorial and columnists' page of the newspaper, where they are echoed. And I go out and have a talk with my level-headed friend, the man in the street.

I think some of his reactions are worth passing along.

You recall that back in 1940 and 1941, when war threatened us, there were people who said the many groups and factions in America with diverse viewpoints would be unable or unwilling to set aside their differences in defending the Nation against an outside aggressor. That was supposed to be democracy's fatal weakness. There were certain people in Europe saying that, and there were certain people over here, echoing them word for word.

Today the people in Europe who were most vitally interested in spreading that kind of talk are silent. Some of them have poisoned themselves. Some, for the same purpose, use a rope, others a revolver. Still others are on trial and will be taken care of in due course.

But what about the people in America—those who interested themselves in spreading the same doubt of our democracy over here?

Those people are not silent today. As leaders in the Republican Party, they used their membership in Congress 5 years ago as a sounding board. And they are using that same sounding board now.

They are still voicing defeatism—as loudly in peace as they did in war. Yesterday they were trying to break down the faith of the American people in their gallant commander in chief, the late Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Today they are trying to shake America's faith in the man who has quickly and ably shouldered the responsibility of leading this Nation to peace and postwar prosperity, President Harry S. Truman.

It is these opposition leaders who are now howling calamity and who are hoping that a great show of dissent will break the confidence of the people in Harry Truman—and who are doing their best to create and aggravate that dissent.

Well, they are wrong both ways. And do not be deceived, the man in the street knows it. He knows that the people who failed to realize the seriousness of this country's situation in 1940 are the same people who are voicing hysterical fears for the Nation in 1945.

When America stood in real danger for her very life, when complete national unity was vital and every disruptive word might have meant the death of a soldier on the battlefield, these were the people who complained of rationing and the OPA, who grumbled about the WPB, who shouted their pet grievances recklessly.

Now, with the crisis of war behind us, at a time when Americans have once more earned the right to assert themselves and to contend for that which they believe is their due, now these same people are suddenly alarmed for the survival of the Nation.

Well, the man in the street knows this. He does not like disputes, international, industrial, or domestic. About the only thing he likes to argue is politics.

Certainly he does not approve of strikes. He is both employer and employee. He is producer and consumer. He is labor, management, and the public. And he knows that industrial shut-downs hurt him, that he is the fellow who pays, any way he looks at it.

But when a Member of the United States Senate gets up and in his great fears for the safety of America, launches a bitter attack on President Truman for his effort to bring labor and management together in conference so that a way may be sought to resolve their differences, that Senator may be speaking for the Republican Party—of which he is a prominent member—but he is not speaking for my friend, the man in the street. He is not speaking for the employee nor the employer. He is not speaking for labor nor for management. And he is not speaking for the American public.

Yet only a few days ago such a speech was made on the floor of the United States Senate by Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin. And that speech, which was made in direct criticism of President Truman, was a very revealing one.

It revealed exactly what is behind all this sudden patriotic fervor on the part of the Republicans in Congress, these pious fears for America which they began voicing after America had won the war, but which they had never expressed while America's enemies were still on the march.

Now, what does this Republican Senator want? What has he been leading up to? What does he think President Truman ought to do so that his own fears wil be quieted?

Only this: Throw overboard the principles of the Democratic Party. Cancel out the social gains that have been made in recent years. Raise the tariff, and abandon the principle of collective bargaining.

"I know," he says, "that these realistic views will invite upon all those who voice them the accusations of labor baiting and union busting. I, for one, deny both charges with all the vigor at my command."

And in the same breath—with all the vigor at his command—he demands that President Truman outlaw the principle of collective bargaining—a principle to which both management and labor in all our big industries have long subscribed, a principle which they reaffirmed only the other day at the conference called by the President.

But this same Republican leader was not nearly so concerned for the safety of America a few years ago when war threatened us. Back in February of 1941, less than a year before Pearl Harbor, he told the people he did not believe Japan would be foolish enough to attack American interests.

From the record of his voting, one would not judge that the Senator was very greatly impressed with America's danger then. I think the time has come to cite the various items of that record having to do with the strengthening of this nation to meet the greatest war crisis that ever threatened its existence. Here is the way Senator WILEY voted:

Against revision of the Neutrality Act.

Against military conscription.

Against offering effective aid to Allied countries.

Against lend-lease.

Against lend-lease appropriation.

Against transfer of Axis ships to Britain.

Against extension of the draft.

Against belligerent zone restrictions to make possible the delivery of lend-lease shipments to nations fighting Nazi Germany and her allies.

Against the armed ship bill, to protect American vessels from submarine attacks. Against the ship seizure bill enabling us to take over ships belonging to countries occupied by German forces.

Against the second lend-lease bill.

And so on—all down the line of preparedness against the most dangerous enemy America has ever had, this Republican leader voted against every one of the measures of the Roosevelt administration to safeguard and strengthen America while there was still time—measures which, as later events proved, saved the lives of thousands of American boys.

Yes, Senator WILEY, "the man in the street" of today, who was also the man on the battlefield and the high seas of yesterday, remembers you and your Republican colleagues in Congress. He remembers you well.

And now he is the man, Senator, who has come home alive and safe, to a Nation that has been saved, because a Democratic majority in Congress backed up a Democractic President in an American program of preparedness against the aggressor.

That is why this man is coming home alive and safe today, Senator. And in a matter of life or death—his life or his death—don't you think it is natural, Senator, that he and his family should remember you?

And don't you think it is natural that now, when this man is home again, wanting to go to work, and wanting protection in his job—isn't it natural, Senator, that he should be a little puzzled by your sudden fears for America unless his protection is sacrificed?

My fellow Democrats, I do not expect this Senator or any of those of his party who voted with him in 1940 and 1941 to answer these questions. I expect, rather, that they will go on with their determined effort to smear the memory of one of the greatest Americans who ever lived—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I expect these Republican leaders to continue turning their faces away from the postwar problems of our country, problems of reconversion and the maintenance of employment—the whole field that has been covered in the 21-point program set forth by President Truman.

I expect them, in their bitterness and their complete lack of a program of their own, to carry on this desperate search for a political smudgepot, a muck rake, and some way of making their accusations and innuendoes stick where they are trying to plaster them—on our country's great and honored dead.

In the beginning, you know, the man in the street—and I am talking now of the fellow who may be a Democrat or a Republican or an independent—welcomed the investigation of Pearl Harbor.

He thought the purpose was to get facts. He assumed that there would be a proper investigation of those facts. He expected the facts would be pertinent to the case.

That is what we all want. And what we did not want was a smear. What we did not want was to create the opportunity for an embittered political clique to use this investigation for indiscriminate muckrakng or as a sounding board for broadcasting unrelated findings which it may dig up and distort at will in a prejudiced resolve to destroy the name of the unanswering dead.

We have relied on the Senators of our own party who are on that Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee to prevent it from becoming just such a sounding board, and our confidence was well placed. They are going to see that this investigation is a clean job.

The Republican Senators were told that the committee would have access to any and all necessary sources of information through its legally constituted committee counsel.

In other words, the information was to be supplied to the committee as a committee for committee purposes. Files of the Roosevelt administration were to be opened and documents made available in this manner.

As a safeguard against the threat of political abuse of the investigation, the files were not to be made accessible to individual members of the committee as individuals for their individual purposes, whatever these might be.

But was this what those Republican members of the committee wanted?

They demanded, instead, that they be allowed to go themselves, as individuals, direct to the Roosevelt files and search through them for anything they wished, whether it was relevant or not, and to do anything they wished with whatever they might find.

Now, what do you think these Republican Senators could have had in mind when they made that demand? And from the fury they showed when the demand was not granted what do you suppose they could have been hoping for from this investigation? What plans have been thwarted?

One of them has since lamented that because he was not allowed this privilege, the investigation has been crippled. Crippled as what, Senator? As a congressional investigation with a proper and legitimate purpose, or as a political fishing expedition?

But what is behind this desperate effort to smear Roosevelt? What is the political significance, now, in 1945, of an attempt to turn and twist the history of 1941 so that it might discredit the memory of a man who is no longer President?

If you want the answer to that question, the man in the street can give it to you.

He will tell you that the Republican Party has not once offered a positive, constructive program for America in the past 20 years.

When a political party lacks a program of its own, there is not much else for it to do than attempt to discredit the opposition. When that doesn't work—and it hasn't worked in four national elections—the party is left in a pretty desperate plight.

Clearly, the attempt to smear Roosevelt is a tactic of desperation by a party without a program.

From election day of last year up to the time when President Truman offered his postwar economic program in his message to Congress last month, the American people had been given no sign of what the Republican leadership might have had in mind as a policy for the future of this country.

But at that time a brief but revealing expression of Republican sentiment was given us. It came from Congressman CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana. And we can accept it as authoritative, because Congressman HALLECK is not only chairman of the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee, but he is also head of a seven-man group named by the party especially to draft a new program of its objectives.

HALLECK and his clique of Republican leaders didn't like the Truman program. And this is what he said:

"This (the President's message) is the kick-off. This begins the campaign of 1946. * * * And in waging the Republican congressional campaign, we will go back to old-fashioned conservatism."

That is all he could offer. "Back to old-fashioned conservatism," the kind which the Republican Party gave us when it was last in power. With it, you remember, they gave us corruption in government, depredation in Wall Street, depression in Main Street, foreclosure on the farm, ineptitude in foreign policy, and consistency and purpose in only one direction, the further aggrandizement of a favored, powerful, wealthy minority.

But a return to those ruinous practices which led to the crash of 1929 would never be accepted by the majority of the people as a program for the America of 1945. And the Republican leaders know it and admit it.

Accordingly, they have once more set out in search of a program which they can offer the electorate.

More than 9 weeks ago Congressman MARTIN, the House minority leader, made it known that the perennial quest was on again. He and his colleagues in Congress held a 2-hour caucus, which they announced as the first step toward drafting what they described as a positive program for America. A committee of seven Republican Congressmen was appointed to do the actual drafting, MARTIN said:

"We plan to set before the country a definite and concise statement of the aims and objectives of the Republican Party as represented by Republican Members of Congress. We plan to do this in such manner as will leave no room for questioning as to where the Republican Members stand on the issues before the country."

Well, that was very fine. But it was more than 9 weeks ago and the country is still waiting. To date there has been no definite and concise statement, no program, nothing that might bring to an end the questioning as to where these Republican Members of Congress stand.

A couple of weeks ago I remarked on this at a Democratic dinner in Philadelphia. At that time 7 weeks had passed, and no Republican program. I remembered it because I had marked my calendar on the day of JOE MARTIN'S fine promise, and I had crossed off every day that passed since then. I had at that time 51 crosses on my calendar.

But the very next day JOE MARTIN'S Republican steering committee made an announcement. It was great news. We learned in the newspaper, I quote:

"The Republican committee met for what they said was an attempt to bring closer to realization their 'statement of principles,' which will be the GOP platform yardstick for the 1946 congressional elections.

"Foreign affairs, labor and unemployment, soldiers and the returning veteran, were among the subjects discussed, but the conferees said no definite conclusion had been reached."

That story was accurate as far as it went. These members of the Republican steering committee failed to reach any conclusion because they failed to reach any agreement.

You see, they were split by the question whether to come out with Congressman HALLECK'S old-fashioned conservatism—which means no solution to any of the problems of the country—or to endorse in principle the program which the Democratic Party has already set forth.

They have been warned by members of their own party to drop the "me, too" tactic. They have been told that you have to have something better than "me, too" to win an election. And the last two Presidential elections have proved this.

On the other hand, they have also been warned against the consequences of having no program of their own—warned by men prominent in their own party.

A few of the more thoughtful and self-analytical Republicans have come out and stated this publicly. John D. M. Hamilton, for example, who was the party's campaign manager in 1936, recently contributed an article to Liberty magazine entitled "What the GOP Needs."

He writes:

"Over the last few years there has been a growing restlessness within the rank and file of the Republican Party, which does not bode well for its future. Too many Republicans, after years of loyalty, find themselves wondering where their party is going, and, worse, whether they will be obliged to go along with it as a matter of party regularity rather than through conviction. * * * Possibly our party will win even though it adheres to a negative program based on the other fellow's mistakes. If so, the victory will be neither creditable nor permanent, and the party will have destroyed its usefulness to the Nation and forsaken its destiny."

Well, such are the difficulties of a party without a program. That was the trouble when the Republican steering committee met. The result was, no agreement, no conclusions.

Now this report of progress was made public last November 2. But since then I have had to go on crossing the days off my calendar, because there is still no program, the Republican leaders continue reaching no definite conclusions. I now have 67 crosses.

But I do not want to predict that nothing will ever come from this Republican committee. What I do predict is this alternative:

These Republican leaders will either have to eat their words of criticism of Harry Truman's program for postwar America and go back to the tactic of crying "Me, too"—a tactic which they have already tried without success—or go even further back to the old familiar negatives, the do-nothing, offer-nothing kind of government which they practiced with such disaster to the country in three administrations.

To the people of America, to the man in the street, it is a matter of small concern which horn of this dilemma the Republican leadership decides to hang on. What he wants is settlement of our labor troubles without sacrifice of the right of collective bargaining.

What he wants is protection of American workers and American soldiers coming back to their jobs without leaving the matter of their future to chance or charity.

What he wants is maintenance of public purchasing power without price inflation.

Historic Strato Flight Aided Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, on November 11, 1945, the National Geographic Society conducted an anniversary ceremony at the rim of the bowl in the Black Hills of South Dakota, where 10 years before, a balloon manned by officers of the old Air Corps, ascended to an elevation of 72,395 feet, highest point ever reached by man, and obtained scientific data that has proven of the utmost importance.

These ceremonies, which it was my privilege to attend, were there participated in by Dr. Gilbert Grosvenor, president, and Dr. Thomas W. McKnew, secretary of the National Geographic Society; Gov. M. Q. Sharpe of South Dakota, and Maj. Gen. Curtis LeMay, personal representative of Gen. H. H. Arnold, commanding general of the Army Air Forces, and supplemented by overseas broadcasts from the men of the old Air Corps who had participated in the flight, Maj. Gen. Orvil A. Anderson, in Tokyo and Lt. Col. Albert W. Stevens in San Francisco, and from Gen. William E. Kepner in Berlin, who had a part in the preparations, having been an officer in a flight earlier attempted.

The address of General LeMay at the anniversary ceremonies was outstanding and is so significant when we consider

questions involving scientific research that, with the permission of the House, I am placing it in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS BY MAJ. GEN. CURTIS E. LEMAY, TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF STRATOSPHERE FLIGHT AT RAPID CITY, S. DAK., NOVEMBER 11, 1945

As I participate out here in South Dakota's beautiful Black Hills as the official representative of the Army Air Forces in this impressive dedication ceremony, my thoughts go back to that time 10 years ago when the flight was made. It is my recollection that some of our newspapers, commentators, columnists—quite a few people—criticized this flight as a stunt, called it a publicity-seeking proposition.

I remember how most of us in the Air Force then boiled inside because of such short-sighted thinking on the part of so-called thinking men. All they had to do was think through to the reason why the AAF was so anxious to have this pioneering flight to be a success.

All of us can remember back—even so recent as 10 years ago—that there wasn't much money available for the Air Force to use for experimental work—work most of us knew had to be done to assure America air supremacy in a war obviously forming in a not too distant future.

So what happened? Here was a group of far-seeing, public-spirited men, a splendid organization, the National Geographic Society, which unstintingly undertook something which the AAF needed—not only undertook the job but furnished the money to do the job.

Personally, for General Arnold, and for every member of the Air Forces, I want to extend heartfelt thanks to the National Geographic Society, to you, Dr. Grosvenor, as its head, thanks for what you did for us then, that helped to give us the air superiority which did so much to bring defeat to both Germany and Japan.

I am well acquainted with what came out of the stratosphere flight which bore such fruit in World War II.

As you know, the B–29 was "my baby" out there in the Pacific.

To fly the superfort we had to have a pressurized cabin. A lot of the apparatus developed on the strato flight was the forerunner of the equipment used in later types of high-altitude pressurized-cabin planes—notably the B–29. And you know what they did to make the Japs yap for peace.

We learned a lot from that flight about aerial camera equipment. And I can tell you, we were mighty grateful out there in the Pacific to have photo equipment that would work—that would bring back vital reconnaissance pictures taken by our B–29 snoopers from 35,000 feet above Japan.

Still another first came from the epic undertaking—the extensive use of magnesium, a new metal then, which was lighter than aluminum and strong. It worked satisfactorily—so satisfactorily it has been used ever since in our aircraft.

I know, too, that many then unknown—or little known—scientific questions were answered when the ton or so of instruments were finally studied—answers that help us when we needed to have the answers right away. For out at Wright Field—where the Army Air Force usually gives birth to everything new and improved—the voluminous report prepared by the National Geographic Society from the data obtained during the balloon's flight has been, and is being continually used by research and development engineers as a reference guide in the development of important equipment—personnel, clothing, oxygen masks, cameras, instruments, aircraft design and construction.

Now, I come to a point I want to make when I referred to the scoffers who dubbed the flight a stunt. For just as we had scoffers, then, we have them now.

They are the people who think we don't have to keep ahead—and when I say ahead, I mean ahead in military aviation.

In two world wars the aggressors suddenly struck peaceful nations, believing that America would remain aloof or that our power couldn't be marshaled in time. Both times, however, we eventually mobilized our vast might. Twice we have been the determining factor in the defense of civilization.

Remember too: Both aggressors in this war struck first with air power—and we beat both when they lost air supremacy to us.

The lesson for the future is clear. The degree of our national security declines rapidly when reliance is placed on standing still, on doing with existing equipment.

Consequently—and I say this with all my heart—we must continually maintain scientific and technological advances—in and out of the services—to be sure that we have the most advanced air force in the world, for that is the only means we have of assuring national security and world-wide peace.

Gallup Poll of Veterans on Peacetime Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 23 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Gallup poll, published in the Washington Post of November 21, 1945, entitled "War Veterans Found Strong for Peacetime Army Training." It shows the position of veterans regarding the necessity for peacetime Army training. I ask that the poll be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, because if any group knows about war and its horrors and knows what is best for this country, it is the war veterans who now are returning from all sections of the world.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR VETERANS FOUND STRONG FOR PEACETIME ARMY TRAINING

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N. J., November 20.—Veterans of this war are overwhelmingly in favor of universal military training in peacetime.

Eight in every 10 in a cross-section survey of the men who have been discharged from the service so far think all able-bodied young men should be required in the future to have a year's military or naval training.

This vote on the part of the men who have had first-hand experience with military life is actually more in favor of universal peacetime training than the vote of the civilian population.

The results:

"In the future do you think every able-bodied young man should be required to take military or naval training for 1 year?"

Veterans of World War II

	Percent
Yes	80
No	18
No opinion	2

The vote for the Nation as a whole is 75 percent in favor, 21 percent opposed, and 4 percent no opinion, as reported earlier this week.

In the House Military Affairs Committee the peacetime training bill has taken on a partisan aspect, a group of Republican members having last week moved unsuccessfully to delay consideration of the measure.

Among the rank and file of the country's voters, however, postwar military training is overwhelmingly supported by the voters of both parties, judging by the following poll results:

	Percent
Yes:	
Republicans	70
Democrats	79
No:	
Republicans	27
Democrats	18
No opinion:	
Republicans	3
Democrats	3

A test of sentiment by age groups in the adult population, by sex and by occupation has likewise been made by the institute, with the following results:

	Yes	No	No opinion
	Percent	Percent	Percent
By age:			
21–29	78	19	3
30–49	75	21	4
50 and over	73	23	4
By sex:			
Men	76	21	3
Women	74	21	5
By occupation:			
Professional and business	74	23	3
White collar	76	22	2
Farmers	68	28	4
Manual workers	78	17	5
All union members	76	19	5

General Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of Chicago, Ill., on November 19, 1945, indorsing the Wagner-Ellender-Taft general housing bill, and the five-point program recommended by Maj. Edward J. Kelly, to the National Housing Agency.

I believe these recommendations are very sound and most appropriate, and should be given the consideration they deserve in our postwar building program.

Whereas there exists an extreme shortage of housing accommodations throughout the Nation, which will be intensified and aggravated as additional numbers of our veterans return to civilian life; and

Whereas it is imperative that prompt action be taken by the National Government to stop the spread of urban and rural blight, eliminate the slums, and provide decent homes for all our citizens; and

Whereas the immensity of the task requires the joint cooperation and assistance of all private and public agencies, local, State, and National; and

Whereas the Wagner-Ellender-Taft general housing bill, recently introduced in the Congress, provides for a unified national housing agency and a coordinated national attack on the housing problem through adequate research, active local planning, a liberal home-loan plan, the construction of homes for low-, medium-, and high-income families, and au-

thorizes assistance to localities for public and private slum-clearance projects; and

Whereas Mayor Edward J. Kelly has recommended to the National Housing Agency an emergency program, which includes, in addition to the support of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft general housing bill, the following:

(a) That temporary housing be provided by the Federal Government immediately to be utilized for the duration of the emergency.

(b) That the National Housing Act be amended to provide 90 percent financing of rental war housing, with an increased construction cost of $7,500 and provision for sale of the house to the occupant at his option within 3 years.

(c) That provisions be made for 100 percent loans to local housing authorities for the construction of permanent housing facilities to be rented at moderate costs to veterans for the period of emergency and thereafter sold.

(d) That the home use conversion program of the Federal Government which proved so useful during the war be reactivated for the duration of the emergency to provide an additional number of housing units.

(e) That priorities of materials be reestablished and be extended for the construction of homes for veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Chicago:

SECTION 1. The city council hereby endorses and supports the Wagner-Ellender-Taft general housing bill and urges its prompt enactment by the Congress.

SEC. 2. The city council hereby endorses and supports the five-point program recommended by Mayor Edward J. Kelly to the National Housing Agency.

SEC. 3. That copies of this resolution be directed to all Members of the Congress from Chicago and to the Senators from Illinois, and to any other persons who may be helpful in effectuating its execution.

Petition of Group of Rhode Island Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 19, 1945

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition:

A PETITION BY A GROUP OF RHODE ISLAND CITIZENS

To the President and Members of the Congress:

We, the undersigned, citizens of the State of Rhode Island, believing that our American form of Government and our private enterprise system are seriously theatened by proposals now being considered by the Congress of the United States, join in this petition to the President and the Congress.

To our great disappointment, Mr. President, your message to Congress of September 6, 1945, advocates the adoption of measures the effect of which in our opinion would be to substitute national socialism for our American form of Government and our private enterprise system. This course you have chosen despite the fact that the country's experience during the 7 years prior to the starting of the national-defense program in the spring of 1940 clearly demonstrated that the policies which you advocate failed utterly to bring about prosperity and to prevent large-scale unemployment. What reason is there, we ask you, for believing that these policies will have any different effect in the postwar period?

After the costs of this war have been fully paid, we shall have a net Federal debt of not less than $250,000,000,000, and probably considerably more. Furthermore, we shall have a postwar budget greatly exceeding anything we have hitherto known in peacetime. A debt of $250,000,000,000 would mean an average per person of over $1,800. For a family of five the amount would be $9,000.

Let us take the figure of $1,800 per person, which is a conservative estimate, and apply it to the State of Rhode Island. According to the 1940 census, Rhode Island then had a population of 713,346. At $1,800 per person, Rhode Island's share of the Federal debt at the end of the war would be $1,284,000,000 as compared with its own State debt at the present time of a little more than $21,000,000.

The average rate of interest on the Federal debt at the present time is about 2 percent. On the basis of population, Rhode Island's share of the interest alone on a Federal debt of $250,000,000,000 would be $25,680,000, a sum which is over $4,000,000 greater than the principal of the State's present debt. In other words, the amount of interest payable in 1 year on Rhode Island's share of the Federal debt at the end of the war would retire the entire State debt and leave over $4,000,000 besides. Rhode Island's case, we believe, is not unique.

A Federal debt of $250,000,000,000 and a prospective Federal Budget in the postwar period of four or five times the size of the Budget at the time the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt first took office present a problem of vastly greater difficulty than that which then faced Mr. Roosevelt. Only through the adoption of thoroughly sound policies and the most skillful handling of our national affairs can we have to avert ultimate financial disaster.

To continue the policies which have been so signally unsuccessful would, we are convinced, lead to the destruction of the American form of government and private enterprise, and the substitution of some form of national socialism.

We believe that the American people do not want this, and that if the issue were squarely presented to them the vote would be an overwhelming "No."

I. STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

We submit that adherence to the following principles is essential if our present form of government and our existing economic system are to be preserved:

1. Legislation which tends to strengthen the Federal Government and weaken the States should not be passed. Otherwise, the States will ultimately become in effect but mere instrumentalities of the Federal Government.

2. Legislation which tends to increase the power of the executive branch of the Federal Government at the expense of the legislative and judicial branches should not be enacted.

3. The strictest economy should be exercised by the Federal Government, and the number of bureaus and employees should be reduced to a minimum, in order that the Budget may be balanced. There is an alarming lack of evidence of any disposition to economize. The press reports indicate that much of the thinking is in terms of a normal postwar budget of not less than $25,000,000,000. A budget of this size would wreck the country. The Budget should not exceed $18,000,000,000.

4. Legislation which tends to discourage private enterprise should not be passed. Otherwise, it will be impossible to raise sufficient revenue to balance the Federal Budget.

II. CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN MEASURES

With these principles in mind, let us consider some of the matters now before Congress.

1. The Murray full employment bill (S. 380)

We regard this bill, the speedy passage of which is being demanded by the CIO, as carrying the greatest threat to our American governmental and economic systems of any measure now before Congress. Although the bill professes a purpose and desire to aid private enterprise, the principles declared by it, if followed to their logical conclusion, would, we submit, lead to the destruction of private enterprise and our present form of government and the substitution of national socialism. We are in complete accord with the objective of having full employment, but the means prescribed are wholly impractical. For example, it is ridiculous to suppose that the President or anyone else could at the beginning of each year estimate with any degree of accuracy whatsoever the prospective amount of business to be done during the year and the number of persons to be employed, the estimate on which the bill bases the action of Congress in determining "the volume of Federal investment and expenditure * * * needed to assure continuing full employment." It would merely constitute an invitation to large-scale Federal spending with the disastrous effects to the Nation which such practice has caused in the past.

The only way, if any, that the plan could be made to work would be by completely regimenting the American people.

The character and ultimate effect of this bill have been most clearly and forcefully described by Dr. Virgil Jordan, president of the National Industrial Conference Board, in an address delivered before the St. Louis Control of the Controllers Institute of America, on May 31, 1945. Dr. Jordan concludes his address in the following words:

"So I can sum up for you the written and unwritten conditions of the full employment contract, in these terms: The Government will give you full employment and guarantee your income provided you will let it use your money as it pleases; if you will buy for your own use what it tells you, at the price it fixes, or let it do the buying for you; if you will save as much money as it says and let it invest it as it pleases; if you will work at whatever it says, when and where it says, and as much as it says for what it says you can be paid; and if you will hear, read and think what it tells you and keep your mouth shut. Beneath the elaborate and complex apparatus of fiscal and monetary policy, social insurance, price and wage fixing, rationing, conscription, and propaganda by which it is operated in the modern State, the compulsory collective economy, which this contract calls for to replace the voluntary competitive economy, is a simple and primitive bargain. It means merely that if most men in any community expect or compel a masterman or government—to promise to employ, support, or protect them as a matter of legal or political right, they must obey that master, do what work he makes them, live and move where he tells them; eat, wear, and buy what he tells them; save what he tells them; and ultimately believe and say what he tells them. Even if they do all of that, in the end their master can guarantee support and security to them only if some of them are able and willing to produce by their work somewhat more than the master permits them to consume for themselves. And since those who are able to produce more than they consume won't keep on working forever to support the rest, the standard of living must ultimately descend to the subsistence level unless the community can beg, borrow, or steal enough wealth and labor from some outside source to keep up the show. This is what has been happening in Europe and Russia in the past 5 years, and it will begin to happen in England and America if they follow the road laid down in the full employment bill and the Beveridge program.

"So, when we are told today that we must choose between full employment by this road or dictatorship and serfdom, I say you will get both, and must take both, for both are

stipulated in the bond of this bargain with compulsory collectivism, and if you ask me what we should do instead, I say that anything or nothing would be better than that. The colossal structure of international statism that has been erected as a monument to the dogma of unlimited government during the past decade is already collapsing into a rubble of bankruptcy and a brutal struggle for power and we have nothing to hope from it by way of peace or prosperity. Whatever the rest of the world may decide to do, let us in America make a stand for freedom here at home, and pay the price. It will be worth whatever it costs, and this may be our last chance to get it."

There should be no compromise with this issue. The bill should not be passed.

If the real purpose is to help the American people and to reduce unemployment to a minimum, let the Government refrain from actions which unduly hamper business, let it put its own house in order and practice the strictest economy, and let it drastically reduce its tax rates so that there will be an incentive for the production of wealth and at the same time more money in the hands of the taxpayers which can be devoted to the production of wealth. In such an atmosphere private industry would do the job that this bill aims to accomplish.

2. The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill to provide for the national security, health, and public welfare (S. 1050)

Under the guise of amending and extending the Social Security Act this bill would impose an annual $12,000,000,000 pay-roll employment tax upon the country, would establish socialized medicine under the dictatorship of the Surgeon General of the United States, and would expand the existing Social Security Agency into a vast irresponsible bureaucracy with coercive political powers. Incentive to progress in medicine would in large measure be destroyed. This is but another step toward absolute unlimited government at the expense of the freedom of the individual. The bill should not be passed.

3. Federal aid to education

We are opposed to the measures providing for Federal aid to education as being unnecessary and as constituting a direct threat to the continuance of State control of education. The purpose of these measures is obviously political and funds would be apportioned politically, irrespective of State or local need.

In testifying on this subject before a congressional committee, Dr. George S. Benson, the able and patriotic president of Harding College, Searcy, Ark., said:

"The question involved is whether or not we want to keep a decentralized Government with State rights and local responsibilities and local freedoms, or whether we want to become a highly centralized Government with a regimented people. This, gentlemen, is the issue involved. Federal aid to education is the key to the entire situation. Given Federal aid to education we would soon have Federal control of education. Then with that type of political influence predominant in the school system we would soon have a public wanting Federal control of everything, because people are what they are taught.

"Under a planned economy I believe our national income would fall off by fully 50 percent, our wages by fully 50 percent, and our standard of living by fully 50 percent. I say this because no country in the world with a centralized government has yet achieved a standard of living one-half as high as our American standard of living, even though Russia has twice our resources. The reasons are easy to explain, but not necessary to this discussion.

"A very small percentage of the world's population has never enjoyed any reasonable measure of freedom or liberty or prosperity at any given time in the history of the world. With the eyes of the world upon America in this crucial period our responsibility is great. My prayer is that God will bless our lawgivers in guiding our course into still greater freedom and greater liberty and greater prosperity rather than toward less freedom, less liberty, and less prosperity.

"May I call your attention to the fact that Greece achieved her best during the days of her democracy, that Rome achieved her best during the days of the Republic, and that England established her great empire following the days of the Magna Carta. America, under still greater freedom, and still greater liberty, has achieved still greater power and prosperity. Individual freedom and prosperity go hand in hand, while regimentation and poverty likewise go hand in hand. I conclude by saying again, Federal aid is neither necessary nor desirable in public education in America. Moreover, Federal aid would, in my opinion, lead to a complete about-face in a system which has succeeded in making America the most desirable place in the world in which to live."

4. The Kilgore unemployment compensation bill (S. 1274)

This bill in its original form provides for the supplementation out of Federal funds of benefits payable to workers now covered under State unemployment compensation laws so that every eligible unemployed worker would be entitled to 26 weeks of benefits in an amount based on past wages up to a ceiling of $25, the financing of similar benefits to Federal workers and others who are not now covered by State laws, and the payment of traveling allowances to workers referred to employment in another city by the United States Employment Service.

This bill is objectionable for the reason that it would put a premium on loafing at a time when it is of the utmost importance that people work and produce.

It is also objectionable for the reason that it would lead to the federalization of unemployment compensation. At the present time it is administered by the States, which know best how to handle their own unemployment problems. The States are amply able to take care of their own unemployed.

In our opinion the bill should not be passed.

5. Elimination of wartime controls, especially OPA

The policy with respect to the fixing of prices and the regulation of profits which OPA is pursuing is unsound, and is destructive of the incentive to business which is necessary if there is to be a prompt reconversion to peacetime operations and a prosperous economy in the postwar period.

6. Missouri Valley Authority bill and other similar projects

Such measures as these are utterly unsound, constitute a wanton waste of the taxpayers' money, and tend through unfair competition to destroy one of the major industries of the country in which the people have over $13,000,000,000 of their funds invested. The example of the TVA should be sufficient to convince any fair-minded person that there should be no further extension of such projects. It is difficult to see why the people of New England and other sections of the country should have been forced to contribute money for the development of a huge project in Tennessee which could benefit no one at all except the people of that region, and which probably has not benefited even them after all the factors have been taken into account.

A most able discussion of this subject is contained in an article by Congressman ANDREW J. MAY, of Kentucky, published in the July and August issues of the National Republic under the title "TVA—The Great Myth of America." At the close of this article Congressman MAY says:

"Except for the artificial location of aluminum industries for war purpose, there is no evidence that TVA has been able to lure any new industries away from the present establishment.

"I hope and believe that the case against TVA could rest at this point. It has been demonstrated to be a flagrant failure in all of its pretentions to success. We have spent a great deal of money on a sort of laboratory experiment in water control and it has proven to be a failure. Logically it follows that the Federal Government should cut its losses and get out of the Valley Authority business.

"But the case against creation of further valley authorities will not necessarily be closed on the basis of the conclusion that our first experience in a Valley Authority has proved a failure. There are fanatical advocates of a certain philosophy of government who would merely argue that we should profit by the mistakes of TVA and create better and finer authorities on the basis of that experience.

"It seems to me that, instead of creating more valley authorities, the proper job of Congress today is to go into a reexamination of the merits of the TVA, to clip its wings where it oversteps the bounds of congressional intent, and bring this vast sprawling agency to heel, responsible to the wishes of Congress. It should be made to pay its way and it should be converted into a real flood-control project.

"If there is any doubt in your minds as to the direction in which the authoritarian road leads, I recommend as must reading a new and profound book called The Road to Serfdom. Between the lines of every sentence one sees the technique of propaganda of David Lilienthal and other apologists for the authoritarian state. I'm sure that Mr. Lilienthal would hotly and sincerely deny such intent. That is how far we have gone down the road of acceptance of these alien ideals of government."

7. Fair Employment Practices Act (H. R. 2232)

This bill, in an attempt to attain a social ideal, seeks to restrain persons in the exercise of their right to select their employees. We have no sympathy with race or class prejudice, but we are convinced that this measure would not accomplish the objective of its sponsors, and that, on the contrary, it would do more harm than good. We believe that it should be defeated.

8. Aid to foreign countries

There has been much discussion of the subject of aid to foreign countries, and among other things whether such aid should take the form of loans or gifts. In deciding what action this country should take in these matters, there are certain important considerations that should not be overlooked.

In the first place, there would appear to be no chance that loans to foreign countries by the United States now would be paid to any greater extent than they were after the First World War. Obviously, they cannot be paid in gold, and if they should be paid in goods such action would be fatal to a number of our industries.

In the second place, this country has made an enormous contribution to the winning of the war—both in blood and treasure. Our lend-lease contributions to our allies have alone amounted to over $42,000,000,000—which is within $8,000,000,000 of the country's total debt at the beginning of 1941, and $17,000,000,000 greater than the country's total debt at the end of the First World War.

In the third place, we have a very serious problem here at home, and it is by no means certain that we shall be able ourselves to avoid a disastrous economic collapse. As above pointed out, after the payment of the costs of the war have been completed our national debt will undoubtedly be at least $250,000,000,000.

In the fourth place, it is of the utmost importance to the future peace of the world that this country continue sound and strong.

In these circumstances, we should not embark upon a program of giving further billions of dollars to foreign nations, no matter what the form of the transaction may be, and whether it may be by way of a "stabilization fund," or otherwise. To do so would be to add to the already well-nigh intolerable burdens which the people of this country must bear.

In our opinion, whatever is done for foreign nations should be done by way of gift and should be so labeled. We should do what we can to prevent suffering and starvation, and to this end we should render assistance by sending needed supplies, such as food, medicine and clothing. Loans of money should not, we think, be made.

Recovery from the effects of the war is a job for each individual country, and its people must undergo privations and economize to the limit if success is to be achieved. The trouble, we fear, is that the other countries expect to saddle us with the load, when we have already more than we can carry. One would think at times that they regarded us as responsible for the war.

The views here expressed cannot be characterized as "isolationist." We believe in the fullest cooperation with other nations in maintaining world peace and by force of arms, if necessary.

9. Taxation

The adoption of a sound tax program is essential if industry is to be kept operating at a satisfactory level, an adequate market for the products of the farm and the factory provided, and employment furnished for all at satisfactory wages.

The all-important thing is to increase production and the national income. This cannot be accomplished under laws which deprive the taxpayer of the greater portion of his gains. It can be accomplished only by providing a proper incentive for people to labor and to invest in productive enterprises. This incentive is furnished by the reward of profits measured by the labor and risk involved and the right to transfer one's property to others, either during life or on death. Excessive taxation takes away this reward, and at the same time reduces the funds in the hands of the taxpayers available for investment.

This is true not only of the income tax, but also of the death and gift taxes.

The tax laws are much too complicated. They should be simplified and the field of taxation equitably divided among the Federal, State, and municipal governments.

We, therefore, favor—

1. The repeal at December 31; 1945, of the excess-profits tax.

2. The drastic reduction of income-tax rates for both individuals and corporations.

3. The repeal of the capital stock and declared value excess-profits taxes.

4. The elimination of the tax on intercorporate dividends.

5. Permitting the filing of consolidated returns by affiliated corporations for all purposes, with no penalty imposed for exercising such right.

6. The reduction of the rate of tax on capital gains from 25 to 15 percent, with the retention of the 6-month holding period.

7. The repeal of the death and gift taxes, so that this field of taxation will be left exclusively to the States.

10. Reorganization of the executive branch of the Federal Government

The executive branch of the Federal Government has grown to extreme proportions, and it should be reorganized as early as possible and unnecessary bureaus eliminated and personnel discharged. As of April 1, 1945, there were 3,553,639 civilian employees of the Federal Government, an increase of 10 percent over March 31, 1944. There can be no excuse for continuing any such number on the civilian pay roll. The essential work could readily be done by far less.

11. Control of Government corporations (S. 469)

Government corporations should be brought under the annual scrutiny of the Budget, the Treasury, and Congress. Testifying before a Senate committee on the Byrd-Butler Government Corporation Control bill (S. 469), Mr. Lindsay C. Warren, the Comptroller General, made the following statements:

"The General Accounting Office is vitally interested in the bill as a whole and in the principle of financial control of Government corporations for which it stands. * * * [It] is strongly in favor of the enactment of this legislation. * * * Government corporations have assumed a tremendously increased importance in their financial activities and their impact upon our daily lives. There is hardly a person in this country who has not felt directly or indirectly the effects of the farm and food programs of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Congress has entrusted billions of dollars of public money to such enterprises. There are 45 individual corporations or groups of corporations listed in this bill engaged in every imaginable type of activity. Counting individual corporations under the agricultural and home loan credit systems, the number reaches 101. * * * On June 30, 1943, these corporations had total assets of over $27,000,000,000 and total liabilities of over $22,000,000,000, including the intercorporate items. * * *

"Mr. Chairman, I am firmly of the opinion that if the present trend continues, i. e., the creation of Government corporations, or if it is not curbed, we will soon have a government by Government corporations. A large segment of the Government is today operating independently of congressional control and free from accountability to the Executive. Indeed, this thing we call 'government' has reached such Gargantuan proportions that it is sprawled all over the lot.

"The most necessary thing that I know of today along governmental lines is a thorough-going reorganization of the executive branch of the Government. It should be done scientifically, but once the decision is made then a bush axe or a meat cleaver should be used. The only way to reorganize is to reorganize. It calls for great courage.

"Duplications and overlapping are widely prevalent and untold millions could be saved and efficiency increased to a high degree. Of course, there would be loud yelps and snarls, but that is always true when powers are curbed, consolidations made, or appropriations reduced or discontinued.

"In my opinion if you exempt one corporation from the bill you will have many more requesting like treatment. * * * If you grant exemptions you will destroy the whole purpose of the bill to set a uniform pattern of control."

12. National Labor Relations Act

The National Labor Relations Act should be amended so as

(a) To make it fair and equitable to employees, employers, and the public.

(b) To protect the right to work—the right of the individual citizen to earn his living at a job of his own choice, without being forced by the Government, or any individual or group, against his will, to pay tribute to a private organization in order to secure and hold a job.

(c) To outlaw all assessments, voluntary or otherwise, imposed by labor unions upon members for political purposes.

(d) To make unlawful all combinations in restraint of trade, whether entered into by employers or employees, or the organizations of either.

13. Legislation providing for a code of administrative procedure for the Federal executive departments and agencies

We favor the passage of legislation, such as the McCarran-Sumners bill, providing for a code of administrative procedure for the Federal executive departments and agencies. Such legislation is long overdue.

III. CONCLUSION

The major nations of the world have been bled white by 6 years of the most devastating war in all history. To repair the damage wrought will require labor to the utmost by the people of all these countries, including our own. It will also require the investment of large amounts of capital, the savings of the people, in productive enterprises. In no other way can the needed things be produced, the wealth of the nations restored, and their economic collapse averted.

In this country, success in this struggle depends in large part upon the sound settlement of the issues which we have discussed. Let, therefore, each person holding public office remember that he is first of all an American, and let him, disregarding partisan political considerations, honestly and courageously support the policies and measures which he knows to be sound. The fate of 135,000,000 people is in the hands of you to whom this appeal is addressed.

On February 4, 1940, a group of leaders of the American Federation of Labor issued a statement the concluding paragraphs of which are as applicable today as they were then:

"As labor and industry survey what has happened to labor and industry in those lands where all powers have been concentrated in the central authority, they fear and oppose the steps which thus far have been taken here to enlarge the dominion of the Federal Government over the lives and fortunes of the American people.

"It is not a problem for labor alone, or industry and agriculture alone. It is a problem which must be solved by an awakened citizenship. It is a problem to be discussed at every fireside, to be dealt with by every publicist, to be prayerfully considered by those Americans who this year will be called upon to draft the platforms of both political parties.

"The hour has come for Americans to recognize the dangers that confront them, and to join in a united effort to halt the drift toward national insolvency and industrial collapse, and to extend opportunity for the Americans of today and tomorrow."

Accordingly, we most earnestly entreat you, Mr. President, and the Members of Congress to stop the trend toward national socialism and to take the steps that are essential to the preservation of our American form of government and our system of private enterprise.

Respectfully submitted.

DeForest W. Abel, Harald L. Amrhein, Theodore H. Belling, Albro N. Dana, Robert B. Dresser, Hovey T. Freeman, Edward B. Hough, Norman A. MacColl, Norman D. MacLeod, Harry R. Milner, Albert E. Noelte, George R. Ramsbottom, Harry Sandager, George E. Sinkinson, Harold W. Tucker.

PROVIDENCE, R. I., *October 18, 1945.*

Policy in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times:

POLICY IN CHINA

On the basis of first-hand investigation on the spot, Under Secretary of the Navy Gates sends back to us that the situation in China is more serious and the danger of American involvement more acute than is generally realized. The Chinese civil war, which is rapidly passing from a war of words to a war of arms, is lighting new fires in the East which could set all Asia aflame again. It was Asia rather than Europe that was the immediate cause of America's entry into the war, and American forces are now deployed throughout the Orient to help liquidate that war, a fact which puts them in the direct path of any new conflagration.

Under these circumstances it behooves the American Government and the American people to be very clear about the reasons which brought our forces to the Orient, and about the policy we wish to pursue there. The temptation is great to avoid possible danger simply by withdrawing all Americans from the danger zone, and old isolationist voices mingle with those of partisanship to urge such a step. But an examination of the fundamental causes, principles, and methods of our policy in the Far East reveals how contrary such an act would be to everything we have stood and fought for, and how futile and how dangerous such a course might be. For these causes, principles, and methods may be summarized as follows:

1. The immediate issue over which the United States was plunged into war was American aid to China, which prevented Japan from conquering that great and friendly nation. America aided China for three reasons. The first was that we stand for a free world and that it is part of our policy to aid victims of aggression. The second was that we were specifically pledged by policy to defend the "open door" of China, and by the nine-power treaty to uphold "the sovereignty, the independence, and the territorial and administrative integrity of China." The third and most fundamental reason, proceeding from the elemental instinct of self-preservation, was the realization that the domination of Asia by Japan would represent a mortal threat to the security of the United States.

2. American aid to China was extended to the only authority to which it could be extended—the Chinese National Government under Chiang Kai-shek, which all Chinese factions still recognize. This government was America's ally during the war. It is now a charter member of the United Nations. To extend aid to any other authority in China would have been tantamount to fomenting rebellion against our ally and a flagrant intervention in China's internal affairs. It is a curious but revealing sidelight on the situation that some of the same voices which properly demanded American aid to the Spanish Loyalists as the legitimate government of a neutral country now cry out against American aid to the legitimate government of our ally China.

3. Before Japan surrendered it was feared that American forces would have to fight the Japanese across China even after Japan herself had been conquered. The Japanese surrender fortunately made that great and perilous task unnecessary, but by the surrender terms signed by all the Powers the Japanese armies in China have been ordered to surrender to Chiang Kai-shek, together with their arms and equipment. Because of the Communist revolt, Chiang Kai-shek has been delayed in carrying out his part of the surrender terms, and American forces are now aiding him in doing so. They are not there to fight the Chinese Communists, or to take part in a Chinese civil war, but to complete the Japanese surrender in conformity with obligations assumed by the American Government. In the performance of that duty they are entitled to understanding and support at home.

4. Whatever aid must still be extended to China must likewise go to the National Government, because any other course would undermine the United Nations. In this connection we must note that the other great Western Power in Asia, Soviet Russia, has pledged itself in the Russian-Chinese treaty to extend moral and military support to the National Government and no other.

5. The National Government of China is not yet as democratic as we should like it to be, but it offers more hope for liberty than the totalitarian regime of the Chinese Communists. The National Government is not only pledged to the establishment of democracy after a long period of tutelage; it is already beginning to extend democracy to the opposition. The Chinese Communists liquidate all opposition.

These are the principles and the practical considerations which have shaped, and should continue to shape, our policies.

Detroit and the National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, as evidence bearing upon the economic condition of the United States, I offer for the RECORD a statement issued by the Michigan Survey on the pro rata share of the national debt of the people of Detroit, Mich.

It will be noticed that their share of the national debt is now 115 percent of the total assessed valuation of all of their taxable property and 11 times greater than the debt owed by the city itself.

What applies to the city of Detroit no doubt applies also with equal force to the entire country. In the face of that fact Members of Congress are being petitioned, lobbyists come to Washington, and demands are made for new and increasing Federal appropriations for every conceivable activity of the American citizen.

The statement follows:

DETROIT AND THE NATIONAL DEBT

TO COMPREHEND THE ENORMITY OF THE NATIONAL DEBT, IT IS COMPARED WITH SOME MUNICIPAL COSTS

Succinctly, Detroit citizens' pro rata share of the national debt amounts to 115 percent of the total assessed valuation of their taxable property.

This is more than 11 times greater than obligations owed by the city itself.

The city's public-school system could operate for more than a year on the amount represented by her pro rata share of the interest on the national debt alone.

The school bonded debt could be paid in full in less than 1½ years if a sum equal to the city's annual pro rata share of the interest on the Federal debt were used for that purpose.

Detroit's operations require about 25,000 people. The pro rata share of Federal employees is 48,000.

The city of Detroit is prohibited by statutes from incurring debts exceeding 9 percent of its total assessed valuation on taxable property.

No true counterpart of this local safeguard exists in our National Government. Control of the Federal debt is entirely in the hands of Congress and may be changed at its will. Omission of such a protective device may have been necessary to permit the Government to develop and meet unforeseeable circumstances, but it also has permitted much ill-advised spending.

The facts presented constitute a most serious problem for every citizen. These data necessarily cannot tell the whole story of actual need for the many expenditures that are constantly pushing our national debt upward. Regardless of purpose or need, however, this steady upward trend merits the serious consideration of every taxpayer. The problem of inefficient, wasteful spending no longer is a matter of partisan politics. It must be the object of closest scrutiny by all citizens interested in preserving and increasing the financial security and efficiency of our democracy.

Detroit's pro rata share of the national debt was established by determining the national per capita debt and multiplying this figure by the city's population. The pro rata interest share was found in the same manner.

The pro rata share of Federal employees for Detroit was established according to the relationship of the Federal Government's collection of taxes from Michigan residents to its total collections.

UNRRA: A Duty and a Bargain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of November 18, 1945:

UNRRA: A DUTY AND A BARGAIN

Six and a half weeks have gone by since President Truman called on Congress for appropriation of the last $550,000,000 of its initial pledge to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

The delay of even a few weeks would be extremely serious, warned Assistant Secretary of State William L. Clayton, who headed the United States delegation to the UNRRA Conference in London last August at which next year's work was lined out. But delay has occurred, and the appropriation bill has been stuck in the Senate Appropriations Committee for more than 2 weeks, with the serious results which Mr. Clayton predicted. Those results are becoming graver with every passing day.

The consequences of Congress' dawdling are becoming disastrous not only to the shivering and hungry peoples of Europe and Asia but also to the warm and well-fed people of the United States. In terms of pure self-interest, the inexcusable delays in a laggard Congress are causing us to lose on three counts:

First, we are subjecting ourselves to steadily mounting hazards of a world epidemic such as the fearful plague of influenza which swept the world in the winter of 1918–19. Hunger-weakened peoples of Europe, lacking coal and food and medicine, ill-clothed and living in windowless shells of houses in freezing weather, are vulnerable and helpless to resist the spread of disease—in Berlin, in Arnhem, in Sofia, and Vienna and Budapest, in Poland and Yugoslavia, Italy, and Greece and Rumania.

DANGER IN SPREAD OF DISEASE

Richard L. Stoke's dispatches from Berlin have told how the people of that ruined capital are ravenous with hunger, reduced to sifting street debris for acorns to be made into bread. Though rural Germany is relatively well off, famine is breaking out in the British-occupied Ruhr, owing to a transpor-

tation break-down and the shortcomings of Allied administration.

Tuberculosis has increased dangerously in Italy, and 10,000 a month are dying of it in Poland; 350,000 Czechoslovak children are infected with the disease, and an equal number are suffering from other diseases induced by slow starvation. From various diseases 5,000 a month are dying in Vienna, and the rate is expected to be 10,000 by Christmas. Influenza threatens to reach epidemic proportions. Spots of bubonic plague have appeared in Europe. In Warsaw, 100,000 disintegrating bodies feed hordes of disease-spreading rats.

Leave our humanity out of it. Our self-preservation depends on our doing something about it, and doing plenty, and doing it in time.

Second, we are deferring indefinitely the day when we can call our job in the relief and rehabilitation of Europe done, and can pull out. Already our tardiness in keeping our pledged word has required UNRRA to cancel $50,000,000 worth of rehabilitation supplies—and until those supplies and much more of the same sort flow stoutly and steadily, the stricken countries cannot begin to travel the long, hard road back to self-reliance.

Most of the $550,000,000 still owing by the United States to UNRRA is needed now for supplies to be sent in December and January, Director General Lehman has said. By February UNRRA should be moving supplies bought out of a second $1,350,000,000 appropriation by the United States—which Mr. Truman also has asked for, but which Congress has not even begun to discuss.

SUPPLIES CANNOT BE BOUGHT

Until Congress makes this second needed grant available, UNRRA cannot purchase supplies for shipment starting in February, the critical period of the winter. If the grant is too long delayed, the flow of goods will be interrupted, with appalling effects on those who depend on this help for bare existence. Unless it is forthcoming, UNRRA—the only hope of millions of the cold and starving and ill—will collapse, for the United States' share is 65 percent of the total expense borne by the 31 participating nations.

Third, we cannot sensibly expect democratic minds to rise from unrelieved misery and unreconstructed ruin. Without our relief and reconstruction aid, the results can be only bitterness, cynicism, a hopeless turning to any authority that can and will help. Orphan children in Bosnia living on a piece of bread and two ounces of powdered milk every other day—that is not a prelude to democracy. While Americans eat 3,800 calories a day, and go on diets of 1,200 calories to reduce their weight 2 or 3 pounds a week, millions of Europeans are doomed to that gradual wasting away month after month.

WHAT TWO LEADERS SAID

As Franklin Roosevelt said in another November, 2 years ago: "It would be supreme irony for us to win a victory and then to inherit world chaos simply because we were unprepared to meet what we know we shall have to meet. We know the common wants, the human wants, that follow liberation."

As Foreign Minister Jan Masaryk, of Czechoslovakia, said this November: "The next 6 months are going to be as critical as the next 6 years."

There is no time for congressional leisureliness. Millions will die this winter in spite of everything we can do. Millions more will die, or be stunted and crippled for life, unless we do all we can, as quickly as we can. We could no more escape the consequences, in terms of disease and bankruptcy and citizen selfdom, than we can escape tomorrow.

Every dollar we put into UNRRA is good, hard-boiled business for our country's profit. Congress should act promptly and plentifully, if it knows a bargain when it sees one, without first having to gaze at it for weeks.

United Auto Workers State Their Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the public should know the facts which the UAW feel justify its position with respect to the current dispute with General Motors. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times:

TEXT OF UAW STATEMENT IN DEFENSE OF STRIKE

DETROIT, November 20.—Following is the text of the statement issued by the United Automobile Workers, CIO, explaining the position of the union on the strike called against the General Motors Corp.:

"General Motors' reply to our arbitration proposal is a stall, pure and simple. It does not contain even a hint that the corporation accepts the principle of arbitration.

"The corporation management has heard from Wall Street and Wilmington, Del., and has made its choice. It has stated its decision.

"We have had 97 days of stalling, of refusal of this corporation to meet its responsibilities to its workers and to the public.

"The workers and the union have exhibited the utmost patience in the face of the most flagrant provocation, intimidation, and inflammatory challenges to strike ever exhibited by an American employer. We have exerted every effort to settle this issue on the basis of economic facts, rather than on the basis of economic power. We have laid our full case before the corporation and before the public in terms of facts and figures, while the corporation has delayed, evaded issues and refused to make available to the union and to the public information essential to the settlement of this dispute. The records of this case in the Nation's press show that this is true."

MANAGEMENT HAS REFUSED PUBLIC NEGOTIATION

"Even behind closed doors GM has refused to negotiate in good faith.

"It has refused conciliation.

"Now, by its stall, it has in effect refused arbitration.

"The General Motors Corp. knows now, in fact, it knew last night, whether it would accept our proposal to arbitrate. Arbitration is not an economic matter that requires extensive research and study. It's a simple question that demands only a simple answer.

"Management either believes in arbitration, or it does not. It is a yes or no proposition.

"Is General Motors willing to lay the facts of this case before an impartial board and accept that board's decision on the basis of the facts? Yes or no?"

PRESIDENT IS QUOTED

"For 3 weeks C. E. Wilson has been attending the Labor-Management Conference in Washington. On the first day of that conference he heard the President of the United States say:

" 'Management too often has looked upon labor relations as a stepchild of its business, to be disregarded until the controversy has reached a point where real collective bargaining becomes very difficult—if not almost impossible.

" 'It happens all too frequently that in the actual process of collective bargaining, delaying tactics are practiced, with the result that there is no real bargaining. There can be no justification for such tactics at the present time or in the future.'

"Only yesterday, at the same conference, Wilson listened to discussions specifically on the question of voluntary arbitration.

"There is nothing complicated about his making up his mind as to whether he favors voluntary arbitration or not. His mind is already made up. If it isn't, then he is certainly derelict in his responsibility to the people of the Nation as president of the wealthiest, most powerful corporation in the world.

"If he needs consultation with other officers of the General Motors Corp., he has had plenty of opportunity for such consultation. The telephone and telegraph of this country are still operating. You can even reach Wilmington, Del., the home of the du Ponts, through such means.

"If Wilson and the corporation agree on the principle of arbitration, but have certain disagreements with the details of our proposal, they should have submitted a counter-proposal or have accepted the principle of arbitration and arranged an immediate meeting with the union to work out an agreement on the details."

ALLEGES UNCHANGEABLE STAND

"They have not done this because they know now, they knew last night, and they knew before we submitted our proposal, that they would never agree to voluntary arbitration—that they don't dare submit to public and impartial scrutiny the economic facts in this case.

"President Truman has urged voluntary arbitration.

"Eric Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, urged acceptance of voluntary arbitration before the labor-management conference yesterday.

"George Romney, manager of the Automobile Manufacturers' Association, reputedly spokesman for the entire automotive industry, including GM, said yesterday that he favored voluntary arbitration.

"Yet, General Motors asks more time without even hinting that it favors the principle of arbitration.

"In the light of all these facts, delegates to the national UAW-CIO-General Motors conference have unanimously rejected this last attempt by the corporation to stall and delay a solution to this problem—a problem of urgent importance to General Motors workers and to the Nation.

"Speaking for the workers in more than 100 GM bargaining units, the delegates to the General Motors conference, having seen every effort at peaceful settlement blocked by the corporation, have today voted unanimously to recommend that the UAW-CIO strike-strategy committee authorize a strike in all the plants of the General Motors Corp. under contract to the UAW-CIO."

CHARGES OF DU PONT CONTROL

"The deliberate provocation and capricious irresponsibility of the small group of industrial and financial bureaucrats who control General Motors, and who contemptuously disregard the interest of workers, consumers, and stockholders alike have left us no choice.

"The GM front for the great du Pont industrial empire and its entire economic and political allies had a choice between stable industries peace and unstable industrial dictatorship. Peace could have been achieved by open arbitration of the economic facts of this dispute, along lines long accepted and practiced by thousands of employers, as we pointed out yesterday in addressing our appeal to the corporation. Instead, General Motors has been and still is driving straight toward industrial dictatorship by a management group responsible in turn to the du Pont interests, who hold 23 percent of GM stock.

"The UAW-CIO sincerely regrets the necessity for this conflict.

"We have presented our case to the public and we believe that never before has it been so clear in the minds of the public that an arrogant corporation, which has refused to bargain collectively, refused public negotiations, refused conciliation and has now refused arbitration, is solely and exclusively responsible for the strike which is about to occur.

"We want to take this occasion to thank the press and radio of the Nation for their full and accurate presentation of the union's case to date. We hope their impartiality and accuracy will be continued through the emotional pressures and stresses of a strike situation that General Motors has forced upon its employees and upon the Nation.

"We are confident that this dispute will ultimately be settled on the basis of the economic facts, including the arithmetic which the corporation has kept locked up in its vaults, inaccessible to the negotiators, to the public, and even to the corporation's own stockholders. For our part we shall make every effort to settle it quickly.

"We take this occasion to restate our proposal:

"We demand 30-percent increase in wage rates to maintain take-home pay without increasing prices. If the corporation can show that it is impossible to pay 30 percent higher wage rates without increasing prices and at the same time to continue to pay substantial profits to its stockholders, we will scale down our demands to the point the arithmetic of the case requires. But until such proof is made, we will not reduce our demands by one red cent.

"That, we submit, is a firm, fair offer. On it we stand."

What About the Farmer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Nashville Banner:

WHAT ABOUT THE FARMER?

The largest single industry in the United States—in point of those working at it, as those, certainly, depending on it—is agriculture. Its "take-home pay" is the difference between its cost of production and the price received for its products. Here, then, is a basic test of the squeeze between wages (increased) and prices (static). What is the outlook, as officially forecast?

The Department of Agriculture Wednesday predicted "a decline of as much as 15 percent in the net income of farmers in 1946." How's that again? We thought everybody was getting a raise. What is the basis for evaluating the need, and justice, of a raise?

Working? Hours worked? Fidelity to the job in the face of an overwhelming war emergency?

Well, the farmer works; none harder. He works, not by a 40-hour week or a 45- or 52-hour week; but around the week; 7 days per week, and 10 to 16 hours per day. Fidelity to the job? Who stayed more faithfully on the job when the demand was for more and more production? Without stint, regardless of labor shortage or machinery shortage or any other shortage.

But not one time in his outline of policy to govern the economic order, and adjust it to a proper balance between wages and prices, did the President mention specific policy relating to balance in this industry, and the only major "official" acknowledgement of an impending plight for the farmer—most definitely caught in the middle of a pincers movement—is the Agriculture Department's prophecy that next year he will make 15 percent less. How then, is he to pay higher wages to attract enough help to raise the Nation's food supply?

Is there any good reason he should not sit in on the labor management conference? His is "labor," certainly. His is "management," certainly. His an industry millions strong.

What about the farmer?

Housing for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on November 19, 1945, my colleague, Mrs. LUCE, of Connecticut, introduced H. R. 4742, which has for its purpose giving of more liberal provisions for veterans in the procurement of farms. The bill increases the amount which veterans may borrow from $2,000 to $5,000 and it reduces the interest rate from 4 percent to 2 percent. Also, the bill provides that veterans shall be given a vehicle, through the Veterans' Administration, in obtaining the housing priorities to which they are entitled under present laws.

With the provisions and purpose of this act I am in thorough accord. I hope that the bill may become law soon. There has been a unanimously favorable reaction to this measure. During her career in Congress, Mrs. LUCE has taken a practical and aggressive part in trying to bring justice to our veterans, who have done so much for the American people.

As an example of the reaction to this proposal, under unanimous consent, I include as part of my remarks an editorial from the Bridgeport Post, which is as follows:

HOUSING FOR VETERANS

Once again the representative from Fairfield County is attracting Nation-wide attention by her intelligent and practical helpfulness toward returning servicemen. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE has introduced a bill which would give to these returning veterans unconditional priority for building materials for homes, or farms.

Everybody knows the acute nature of the present housing shortage and everybody realizes that it falls hardest on these returning men who have looked forward so eagerly to their own homecoming.

What is their reaction to find themselves harried from pillar to post with no shelter over their heads?

And what is a practical solution?

Obviously one practical solution is just what Mrs. LUCE has outlined—that in the present shortage of building materials—a shortage destined to continue some years in the opinion of experts—these men should be given priorites. The war has taught us the meaning of priorities. When it comes to building their homes veterans should be first.

As for financing, Mrs. LUCE thinks the present arrangement which allows a veteran a Government guaranteed loan of $2,000 to build a home is insufficient and should be increased to $5,000. With this as a backlog, any veteran can finance the building of a home. The repayment of the money on a monthly basis will amount to no more than rent and the veteran will have the advantage of buying his own home back by paying rent for it.

It should be observed that this is a loan, not a gift. There isn't any charity involved in it, only justice to the men who sacrificed all their immediate happiness, gave years of their lives, and sustained wounds and hardship to save the rest of us.

As Mrs. LUCE says: "If we can afford to lend billions to foreign governments, we can afford to lend money to our own veterans."

Right!

Congress Could Go Far Toward Solving Problems by Making Labor Responsible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Knoxville Journal of November 12, 1945:

CONGRESS COULD GO FAR TOWARD SOLVING PROBLEMS BY MAKING LABOR RESPONSIBLE

Members of Congress are thoroughly aware of the clamor from one end of the country to the other that it "do something about labor."

What to do about it, or the phrases of its activities that recurrently arouse the ire of our citizenship, is a question tremendously complicated by the nature of politics and the inescapable fact that legislators are politicians.

Members of Congress are being constantly pulled at and prodded by extremists on the labor question. On one side are those who are definitely and clearly antilabor; people who would, if they could, turn back the labor picture to 1890. On the other side are extremists who would place the rest of the country firmly under the heel of a labor dictatorship, utilizing such extreme measures as the so-called full employment bill and the $25-per-week unemployment bonus as steps in that direction.

Realizing that neither of these groups represents a majority of sentiment, one element of Congress takes no steps whatever to bring about a correction of those things which are wrong with the Nation's labor set-up. Another element undertakes to meet the issue by devising complicated systems for the settlement of labor ills which are completely unworkable and frequently threaten to do violence to labor's universally admitted rights. * * *

Yet while the President calls labor conferences, such as the one now in progress in Washington, and Congress chews its nails in indecision, labor strife continues with little abatement and the basic causes of the Nation's labor troubles remain untouched.

Our main trouble, as has been pointed out here on several occasions previously, is the ancient one of power without responsibility. Labor is now big business in terms of money.

In terms of power it is even bigger than business ever was, because it has in its hands the ability to paralyze whole industries at a time, or even all industry.

Yet labor operates, by comparison with other big business, completely outside the law. It pays no taxes; it cannot be held liable for damages; it is accountable to no government for its actions, and yet every resource of the Government is at its disposal. Furthermore, it controls the economic destiny of millions of United States citizens, levies head taxes on them, and yet in many cases deprives the individual member of any appreciable voice in the mass action to which he is committed.

We submit that here is the place for sensible and fair-minded action; that in remedying the obvious injustices that grow out of the facts enumerated above there is a fruitful field for congressional activity.

We speak not in behalf of the extremists who would disarm labor and not in behalf of the equally dangerous extremists who would place the heel of labor on the whole Nation's neck but in the name of that great majority of Americans who are neither prolabor nor antilabor, but who want labor to get and give a fair deal.

Let labor be given a responsibility under the law identical with all other business enterprises—perhaps by incorporation.

Let it be made responsible financially for its contracts and subject to damages in the courts, as any other business is, for failure to perform them.

Let it pay taxes to the Government, just as any other business does, and in conformity with its ability to pay.

Let it make an accounting of its income and expenditures to the Government, and make these figures available also to union members (some unions already submit detailed financial reports to their members).

Finally, let Congress devise some method under which the constitutional rights of union members cannot be violated by forced membership or coercive action by a majority of members against a minority.

There is certainly nothing antilabor about such a program as this and we are confident that it would find wide support among millions of union members themselves—if they dared to express their views.

With such legislation on the books, a sound basis would be established for union responsibility commensurate with union power. Ninety-five percent of the Nation's labor troubles of the kind that now spring from union irresponsibility would be eliminated.

Strikes and work stoppages springing from the growing yen of labor politicians for personal power would be reduced to a minimum. Labor would, we are convinced, settle down to the role of being substantial, responsible business and abandon permanently its present one of being the naughty boy in the Nation's economic school.

Repeating an Ancient Folly?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Charlotte Observer of November 3, 1945:

REPEATING AN ANCIENT FOLLY?

Hardly had the sound of President Truman's voice died away after he had asked Congress to effectuate General Marshall's sane and pertinent recommendation for universal military training before the pacifists began crying aloud their arguments against any kind of military protection for this country.

If this outcry came mainly from a few politicians with their eyes on the next election, it could be dismissed as merely politics.

But the chief opposition is coming from educators and ministers who ought to know better: Educators who have seen their campuses almost depopulated of male students and their physical equipment converted into military laboratories; and ministers who have had to console hundreds of bereaved families and have watched their young people's organizations become almost exclusively feminine.

If the catastrophic events of the last decade have not taught these pacifists the plain truth of General Marshall's observation that a display of weakness has never yet kept this Nation or any nation out of war, they are certainly incapable of learning.

The person who never learns anything by experience is the worst possible advisor on matters of public safety.

After the First World War we tried the pacifist plan of making an open exhibition of our weakness in the naive hope that this display of helplessness would persuade avaricious and predatory neighbors to let us alone.

We sank the best of our naval vessels, disbanded the greater part of our Army, let our air force go to pot, made no effort to keep up with technological advances in warfare, and reduced our Military Establishment to a ridiculous little constabulary drilling in outmoded tactics with antiquated and rusty equipment.

This, we innocently thought, would convince the world that we had no aggressive intentions.

It did, and what did it get us?

It got us the most agonizing war in human history.

It prolonged that war for terrible, unnecessary years while we retreated across a half a world of land and ocean, trading space for time to repair the damage done by the pacifist doctrine; and before it was over we gave up 270,000 of our sons as living sacrifices to the folly of disarmament in an armed world.

And now, these pacifists would have us do it all over again.

And what arguments do they offer in support of this counsel of folly?

Only these: That universal training is against our democratic traditions, that it will interfere with the education of the young men, and that it will create a spirit of militarism among our youth.

As to the first, democracy means nothing if not that each person should do his part. Nothing could be more democratic than a requirement that all young men, without favoritism, take their regular turn at training.

The expressed attitude of many Members of Congress is that some provision will be made for the boys to keep on with their education while they are in training.

And, as to the third objection, that the training will create a spirit of militarism among our youth, if the educators who persist in mouthing this absurdity will only open their eyes, they will see their argument discredited within their own profession.

Land-grant colleges in every State in this Union have, for nearly 50 years, required military training of their students. If such training were ever going to create the militaristic spirit among our young men, certainly a half a century has been plenty of time to engender it.

Yet you would have to look long and diligently through the alumni lists of North Carolina State College, or Clemson, or a hundred other reputable schools, both public and private, in which military training is a regular part of the curriculum, before you could find a single militarist who got that way by wearing a cadet uniform.

Mere technical study of military science never made a militarist of anybody. Militarism is a thing of the spirit and not of the mind. It is generated by indoctrination begun in kindergarten and continued relentlessly throughout the educative period of youth.

A young man who gets his first contact with military training after these impressionable years are past and he has begun to use his own mind is very poor material for militarism.

Views of the Propeller Club of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include several resolutions adopted by the Propeller Club of the United States, sponsor of the American Merchant Marine Conference, nineteenth annual meeting, in New York City, October 19, 1945. I have carefully read each of the resolutions and agree with each of them wholeheartedly:

AIR TRANSPORTATION POLICY

The war has brought great improvement in airplane service facilities and equipment throughout the world and demonstrated the necessity of commercial air power to national defense and the establishment of a comprehensive overseas transport service in the postwar period.

It is in the public interest that American steamship lines participate in the development of transoceanic air service to the end that an efficient and adequate American transport service be established and maintained under competitive conditions.

Steamship lines have long engaged in transportation of passengers, mails, and cargo by water and have contributed to the development of international trade and established the organizations and relationships essential to efficient overseas air service.

A complete coordinated sea-air service under a single management affords the shipper and the traveler the most efficient, adequate, and up-to-date facilities in transportation, and is demanded by the public and affects the public interest.

Foreign countries, particularly England, France, and Holland have long been active in the field of air transportation through the facilities of the steamship companies of their respective countries, and these and other foreign countries propose to press the development of overseas transportation service in this manner in the postwar period. It is essential to protect the American merchant marine from the threat of foreign competition that it likewise be permitted and encouraged to engage in transoceanic air transport service to the end that it will be enabled to meet the inevitable competition of foreign steamship lines.

The Propeller Club of the United States urges:

1. That steamship companies are entitled to certificates of convenience and necessity, without discrimination, upon a proper showing before the Civil Aeronautics Board that the proposed air service is required by public convenience and necessity and the applicant steamship company is fit, willing, and able to perform the service properly.

2. That it is vitally essential to the operation of a sound and adequate American merchant marine that the right of American steamship companies to engage in air transport, as an auxiliary and supplemental service to their service operations, should be fully recognized and established at the earliest possible date.

The secretary is directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, all Cabinet officers, to the United States Maritime Commission, to the Civil Aeronautics Board, to the Senate Committee on Commerce, to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to all Members of Congress, chambers of commerce, and boards of trade in the United States.

H. J. HARDING,
National Secretary, the Propeller Club of the United States.

SHIPBUILDING

The experience of two World Wars has shown that the shipbuilding and ship-repairing industry is vital to national security; and the existence of a shipbuilding and ship-repairing industry in time of war requires the effective continuous operation of the industry in time of peace.

The continuous employment of a substantial staff of technical employees and a nucleus of mechanical employees at all times is essential to the national defense and the existence of the industry.

The Propeller Club of the United States urges the continuance of a long-range annual building program of merchant ships such as that provided for in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, together with a naval replacement program and the building of experimental new types of ships, sufficient to keep our Navy and merchant marine up to date, and for the preservation of the shipbuilding industry.

The secretary is hereby instructed to send copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the Navy, The United States Maritime Commission, the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and the Senate Committee on Commerce.

H. J. HARDING,
National Secretary, the Propeller Club of the United States.

NONDISCRIMINATION AGAINST AMERICAN VESSELS

The Propeller Club of the United States commends such efforts of the United States as have been made to accomplish the elimination of blocked currency restrictions, Empire preferences, tax discriminations, and other discriminatory practices which militate against the best interests of the American merchant marine and the American producer, as one of the conditions to the granting of foreign loans.

The convention of the Propeller Club of the United States urges that the United States exert even greater influence to bring about a return throughout the world to sound principles of nondiscriminatory, multilateral trade in accordance with the spirit of the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations agreements. Loans or credits should not be made by the United States or agencies thereof to foreign governments which persist in discriminations, direct or indirect, against Amercan foreign trade or American shipping.

The Propeller Club of the United States recommends that Joint Resolution No. 17, dated March 26, 1934 (48 U. S. Stats. 500), which, in effect, provides that all products purchased with the proceeds of loans from the United States be carried exclusively in American bottoms, be not repealed unless and until the United States has been concretely assured that such discriminatory practices will be eliminated and unless provision is made for the carriage in American bottoms of a reasonable portion of cargoes financed with American loans.

The Secretary is instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, the Director of Mobilization and Reconversion, the Director of the Budget, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, and the chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. J. HARDING,
National Secretary, the Propeller Club of the United States.

MARITIME RESEARCH

The United States of America possesses the greatest collection of research facilities of all types in the world, and there are many outstanding examples of leadership of our country's industries in competition with corresponding industries in foreign countries due to the extensive use of research.

The American merchant marine has already achieved world leadership by the use of the products of the country's research laboratories.

The Propeller Club of the United States recommends that the laws and regulations pertinent to the operation of the American merchant marine be formulated or modified in such a way as to encourage the vessel operator to employ our national heritage of inventive genius, natural resources, and enormous research facilities to the fullest possible extent.

The secretary is instructed to send copies of this resolution to the United States Maritime Commission, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, the chairman of the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard.

H. J. HARDING,
National Secretary, the Propeller Club of the United States.

FIRE PROTECTION

The Propeller Club of the United States urges that the Coast Guard Fire Fighting Service be extended and made permanent, and further urges upon Congress that it adopt any appropriate acts or other legislation which may be necessary to that end.

The secretary is instructed to send copies of this resolution to the Commandant of the Coast Guard, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House, and the Commerce Committee of the Senate.

H. J. HARDING,
National Secretary, the Propeller Club of the United States.

EXEMPTION OF THE UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION FROM REORGANIZATION OF AGENCIES

There has been passed by the House and will probably be acted upon by the Senate, legislation (H. R. 4129) providing for reorganizing agencies of the Government, from which the Interstate Commerce Commission and other agencies have been exempted, but from which has not been exempted the United States Maritime Commission. The Senate bill is S. 1120.

The magnitude of the American merchant marine and its importance to the national defense as well as the country's commerce are too great to be entrusted to any governmental department other than an independent establishment. Continuity of policy, administration, and personnel is essential to the proper maintenance and development of an adequate American merchant marine. The lack of such continuity is criticized in the recently issued Harvard report.

The first effort of the United States in the present century to revive the American merchant marine was the creation of the United States Shipping Board under the Shipping Act of 1916. This Board functioned through World War I and until 1933, when, under legislation similar to that contemplated in H. R. 4129, the Board was abolished and its functions were transferred to the Department of Commerce. The result was so disastrous that the Congress, in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, recreated an independent establishment, the United States Maritime Commission, to perform the functions which from 1916 to 1933 were exercised by the United States Shipping Board.

The progress made by the entire maritime industry under the 1936 act and under the direction of an independent Maritime Commission in the prewar years cannot be denied. The outstanding record of the Maritime Commission during World War II in the construction of ships, their operation, and the administration of the laws affecting shipping is such as to more than justify its continued independent existence. The need for the Maritime Commission as an independent establishment in postwar international relations is of utmost importance to the maritime industry and the Nation's welfare.

Therefore, the Propeller Club of the United States strongly recommends that the United States Maritime Commission be excluded from the Government agencies whose reorganization is covered in the pending legislation.

The secretary is instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and to each Member of Congress.

H. J. HARDING,
National Secretary, the Propeller Club of the United States.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER CANAL PROJECT

The Propeller Club of the United States expresses its disapproval of the Barkley Senate Joint Resolution 104, which has for its purpose the ratification of an agreement dated March 19, 1941, with Canada for the construction of dams and power works, and a 27-foot canal in the international rapids section of the St. Lawrence River, and hereby voices its opposition to this bill and any other bill which may be introduced in Congress having a similar purpose. Furthermore, any effort to obtain authorization of this project shall require ratification of a treaty and shall not be accomplished by approval of an agreement.

The Secretary is hereby instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State and to all Members of Congress.

H J. HARDING,
National Secretary, the Propeller Club of the United States.

Demobilization of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, if the mail which comes to

my desk from men still in the armed forces is a sample of the mail that reaches the desks of other Members of Congress, then there is every reason to expect that this Congress should take some definite and immediate action in behalf of these men and pass legislation to return them at the earliest possible moment.

I should like to be among the number of the Members of Congress who feel that matters of this kind should be dealt with with justice and with an understanding of the wishes of the people themselves, as well as the officers of the armed forces and the United States Government. At the same time, there is a veritable revolution going on, and until a tangible understandable method has been adopted that will return these men more rapidly, letters of this type will continue to come to the desk of every Member of Congress.

Under unanimous consent, I include a letter from an officer expressing his views on this important question:

NOVEMBER 13, 1945.

Representative ROBERTSON: I, being a native North Dakotan and a member of the armed forces for over 3 years on active duty, would like to take this privilege of writing to you on the unfairness of the demobilization program.

Men with a long time of service are still in the Army and men with as little as 16 to 18 months of service are already out and in the civilian jobs. The reason being the unfairness of the point system. Men that actually had engagements with the enemy should have gotten some preference by the awards of the battle stars. But men with no contact, such as service troops and other headquarters troops should not have received them. Many were awarded them and the additional 20 or 25 points makes a great difference on their points. A lot of these men are home and have had less than 2 years of service.

I happen to be one of the men that was stuck in the States for a little less than 3 years in a training center and sent overseas at the end of the war. Twice previously I had asked for overseas duty but was told they needed me at the center. It was not of our own choosing we stayed where we did. I see no reason why men that were held in those places for that purpose should serve from 3 to 5 years and men with much less service are already out. We have one officer who happened to be with me most of my Army career who has been in a little less than 5 years and has a total of 65 points, and that includes one child. Yet the man is still not eligible to return under the point system. Furthermore a circular just came out to segregate all officers' papers with less than 50 points for further assignments. I have been in over 3 years and have a child and only have a point score of 46. I ask, Is it fair to let men out with less than 2 years' service and the men that were first in are still in? Men with the longest service are the last ones out.

I read some of the protests that you got from the people in the States as to the year's conscription of the younger men. Is it asking too much for them to give 1 year to relieve men who have been in for years? We had no choice or time limit that it would take us this long to win the war. Our time was indefinite. I have a wife and child just as dear to me as any son is to his mother. Yet some of them think it is asking too much for her son to put in a year to relieve some other man that put in over two.

Men in this area have developed a slogan, "No boats—no votes," and all are very serious about the matter. Redeployment here could be speeded up considerably if some of this brass of majors and above who were bellhops and wheelbarrow pushers before they came in were relieved. It is to their advantage because as long as they have troops they have a job, and they make more money now than they ever made before. Therefore they hold troops as long as possible.

I am asking something be done for the men and officers who find themselves in the same predicament. Men with over 2 years' service and low points through no fault of their own.

Sincerely yours.

Improvement of Big Sandy River and Tug and Levisa Forks, Ky., W. Va., and Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Board of Review of the War Department:

STATEMENT OF HON. ANDREW JACKSON MAY, MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE SEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF KENTUCKY

Congressman MAY. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the Board of Review, it may have been rumored around here that I was interested in this project and, if it has been, I want to enthusiastically confirm that rumor and say that it is a reality.

I think I have more reasons for sponsoring this program and prosecuting the hearing and the development of it than probably any other man who has appeared here as a witness either for or against it.

I don't know whether the press boys present will record it or not, but I am past 70 years of age and I have spent all of those years, except what time I have been in Congress, in the Big Sandy River Valley. I am mighty proud of it; that is, the part of my life I spent in the Big Sandy Valley. I do not know whether I have reason to be proud of what I have done since I have been here. That is a matter for the people to determine.

I want to qualify myself as a witness, if I can, in addition to expressing my age, by telling you of my experiences:

I would hate to hazard a guess of how many times I have met Uncle Tom Vaughn, the captain who has testified here on the Big Sandy River and, practically every time I met him I was riding a raft of logs and he was steaming up this great river, particularly fast, it always appeared, in order to make the waves that much higher. Often I passed him on another steamboat, and I never had a collision of those boats at either one of those short curves you have heard talked about, and I have been right on them, two steamers passing each other.

After I was a practicing lawyer for 15 years, and I have been at it 46 years, I happened to be a logger also and I have piloted, and I was pilot, because that is the steersman on the rear end of the raft, on more than 100 rafts from Beaver Creek at Allen, Ky., to Catlettsburg, and I beached them and tied them up and sold them. I did that for years. I have been caught out in the night on fleets of timber in the Big Sandy River and I even hired a Chesapeake & Ohio Railway towboat to tow me out.

But I think I ought to give this review board just a few facts about towing freights up and down the Big Sandy River while I am on my feet.

I have stood on the banks of the Big Sandy at Prestonburg and seen towboats owned by the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co. and operated by it all through the spring and summer of 1903 and 1904, towing four large barges up the Big Sandy River loaded with barrels of cement to build the bridges and the piers at the mouth of all of the creeks, over which the railroad was being built. That is not second hand. That is eye-witness testimony. That is the kind of a witness I used to want awfully bad, sometimes, when I was defending some fellow for murder or for housebreaking, or for something else.

Now I want to tell you who I speak for and who I represent.

I represent the Seventh Kentucky District, the Seventh Congressional District in the State of Kentucky.

That same area covers the thirtieth district of the United Mine Workers of America, and I represent that 20,000 coal loaders that you were told about yesterday by Mr. Caddy. I not only represent them but I represent every man, woman, and child in that area; and I not only represent that area but I represent that great industrial development composed of workers and farmers and businessmen and industry in the great Middle West. I not only represent them but I represent the American Railway System. I have even voted votes for the railroads, no longer ago than last week.

I want to represent everybody that I ought to represent.

I want to say that the district engineer who prepared this report that is attacked here does not hold the burden of proof on this thing. His report is conclusive until it is disproven, and we have a law provision in my State, and it is true in every other State, it is fundamental in elementary law that the party who holds the burden of proof is the party who would fail if no evidence was offered. Thus these two railroads must fail. They hold the burden of proof.

So here we are with a glowing, justified, truthful report being attacked by two railroads. They have the right to attack it.

Now, let's indulge in just a little bit of common sense ordinary reasoning and logic, if you want to carry it that far: If this project is not going to be a success when it is developed as is proposed in this report, if it is not going to be an improved inland waterway, then, why the alarm of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co. and of the Norfolk & Western? If it is going to carry no coal on the waters, why be disturbed about it?

It simply means, gentlemen, that they know it is going to be a success and that they don't want competition. They don't want legitimate competition. Now, let me lay down two propositions here, just this way:

You gentlemen are officers of the United States Army. You are in what we know in Congress as the Corps of Engineers. You belong to a service that is 175 years old, that has an office and a district in every community in almost all the United States that has stood the test of time.

Now, what is the problem?

The United States Government has declared, promulgated, and enforced, and is today engaged in enforcing, two great Federal policies: One, a policy of developing and improving inland waterways; and the other, a policy against trusts and combinations in restraint of fair competition and legitimate trade.

Now, those two things are directly involved in this proposition and when I saw this array of witnesses coming here from Pittsburgh and the Allegheny River and all those important streams, the railroad representatives, the coal operators' representatives, water transportation institutions, I was reminded of the old, 25-year-old, dispute called and known as the Lake Cargo case,

when they were trying to keep this coal out of the Lake markets and did succeed in doing it so far as that case is concerned.

Now, with these two policies, what do we have?

We have about 6,000 miles of developed inland waterways that gets up to Catlettsburg, Ky., and it was testified to here yesterday, I believe, that there was very little freight and there was very little traffic on the main stem of the Big Sandy from Louisa to Catlettsburg. That is very simple to understand. That is, there is nothing there to handle. They just went far enough with the original navigation dams to get up within sight of the storehouse of coal, lumber, and oil, and other products that come out of that great area.

Now, then, as representative of the great developing industries of the Middle West, as a representative of the workers of the Middle West, as a representative of the developing industries in the entire Mississippi Valley, I want to see a link made, and I have a secondary reason for it, down here in the Big Sandy Valley because there is the great storehouse of the finest metallurgical by-product coal in the world. I used to mine it, and when the analyses were made in sulfur it was .65; less than 1 percent. In ash it was 2 plus. In British thermal units it was 15,500. It had a fusing point of 2,700. That cannot be excelled anywhere in the world, not even in Connellsville, Pa. That is better metallurgical coal than can be found anywhere else in the world.

Now, they attack this proposal by arguing here that there is not enough coal up there to justify it.

Well, I want to pay tribute to the District Engineer again by saying that he is a very modest man. He perhaps contented himself with taking from the United States Geological Survey the figures that they have in Document No. 876, designated United States Department of the Interior, Coal Deposits of Pike County, Kentucky—just one county. Get that. And don't forget it is just one county, and that geological report shows this: After a long surveying expedition of core drilling, and drift mine opening, after going around and inspecting the log on gas and oil wells that had been drilled all over the county, getting the thickness of seams underneath, the United States Geological Survey group made a report, and it is this public document to which is attached 52 maps. They say this in the very first page of their report:

"The county—meaning Pike County—contains an estimated reserve of about 8,000,000,000 tons of coal in beds 12 inches or more thick that are minable by drift mines. That means coming out of the hill and going over a tipple. In addition, probably several times this quantity is available to shaft mining in the lower Pennsylvania rocks below the level of the stream."

In other words, 8,000,000,000 known and several times that much more down underneath, and that is just Pike County. That does not include Floyd County, a great coal county; it does not include Johnson County; it does not include Lawrence County in Kentucky; it does not include Martin County in Kentucky; and neither does it include any of the West Virginian counties. It includes merely to the Tug River in Pike County, and that county is larger than the State of Rhode Island.

Well, when my friend, Tom Townsend, was talking yesterday about the comparison between the Kanawha River and the Big Sandy River, I believe he said that there was no more comparison between the two than "there was between midnight and the noonday sun." Those are his exact words. I am sure that he is not the brother Townsend that developed the old-age pension system, but he is guilty of either of one or two things: Talking about something that he does not know about—and I think that is the trouble with the good friend—or that he just doesn't know. I do not think he would make a willful misstatement.

With all of this coal, and with all of the timber we have standing in that area, with nearly all of the natural gas they burn in Charleston, W. Va., and up and down the Kanawha coming out of the Big Sandy Valley—except, of course, as a war measure we developed the 24-inch main from Corpus Christi, Tex., to the Appalachian area as a war measure in the last 2 or 3 years to suppy the additional need—we have more natural wealth for development in the Big Sandy Valley than the Kanawha can ever have.

Therefore, I take it for granted that Mr. Townsend was speaking without proper information.

Now, having developed and spent about a billion and a half dollars—and, of course, that is not much money these days—on inland waterways reaching up to Catlettsburg, what kind of common sense and common judgment is it to refuse to spend $65,000,000 more to get to the real product that the waterways were built to reach? It is like curing blood poison up to the wrist and then inoculating it in the shoulder. You are cutting off the source of coal that goes to the Middle West to develop a great inland area. Bring coal and iron together.

Now, I want to put it on another ground—and when I talk about this, I am talking about something that has grown and grown on me and in my mind for the last 8 or 10 years during the time in which I have been the chairman of the great war committee of the Congress. I am putting this on the ground of national defense for the future.

And why do I say that?

I say it because, with the development of the jet-propelled plane, with the development of the rocket, with the rapid development, the unprecedented development, of radar and radio, with the development, even, of the atomic bomb, what does the great general of the United States Army Air Forces say to the world and to the Secretary of War in his report made public a few days ago? He said the time is coming when we will have to depopulate the great cities of the Atlantic seaboard; that we would have to go underground for protection unless, of course, the human race becomes sane and decides that we will live in peace rather than prosecute war—and he is advocating going underground.

Now, let us make it possible to develop great metallurgical industries essential to any war program in the Middle West, out in the Mississippi River Valley, where we are just a few miles farther from the Atlantic seaboard than is New York, Philadelphia, Boston, or Baltimore. Let us not go underground. Let us stay on top of the ground. Let us have an industrial empire in the great Sandy Valley and one in the great Mississippi Valley. The one way to do it is to establish the transportation link between the two areas by building the dams proposed in the Big Sandy River as recommended in this engineer's report.

Now, of course, I have heard this young gentleman who is an experienced pilot that followed in the footsteps of his father, as did Uncle Tom Vaughn follow in the footsteps of his father, Captain Elsey, or whatever it is, who said yesterday that he was such a good pilot—and I am sure he is—that they were able to save the difference between $1.36 and 36 cents on a river, saving for Raymond City coal from the Kanawha River to Cincinnati. Well, the difference between $1.36 and 36 cents is exactly one dollar.

You save one dollar a ton or you save 89 cents a ton, as is shown in this Engineer's report that you will, on three, four, five, six, thirteen, or fifteen million tons of coal that will come out of the Big Sandy River to go into the Ohio and the markets of the West, and you will have saved enough to liquidate the cost of this project in a very short time.

It is feasible.

It is justifiable.

It is the last chance of a great people to appeal to their Government, through its agents, for the development of a great industrial area based on a great metallurgical product.

And, when I leave here this evening to go back to my post of duty, I want to leave with the belief in my mind that this Board of Engineers will not determine this question upon anything except cold logic and common sense based on this report and the facts with which it has been supported.

Now, of course, I don't want to detain you any longer. I think you have been punished enough and sometimes when I get the Army officers up before my committee I think they would like to see the shoe on the other foot every now and then. If you have any questions you want to ask me I will be glad to be a willing witness, but I want to serve notice on you now that I am a partial witness on this project.

Thank you, gentlemen.

I hope we may have an early decision on this matter.

Brigadier General DUNN. Thank you, Mr. MAY.

Jewish Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a letter from Judge Samuel Barnet, president of the New England section, Jewish Welfare Board, with offices in Boston, Mass., in support of a resolution adopted at the thirty-fifth annual convention of the New England section, Jewish Welfare Board, held in Springfield, Mass., on November 10–11, 1945. This resolution has my unqualified support.

NEW ENGLAND SECTION,
JEWISH WELFARE BOARD,
Boston, Mass., November 19, 1945.

Representative THOMAS J. LANE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LANE: We petition your support of the following resolution adopted at the thirty-fifth annual convention of the New England section, Jewish Welfare Board, held in Springfield, Mass., on November 10–11, 1945:

"In the present war Jews fought heroically and in great numbers in every Allied army, on every battlefield, in every land, on every sea. In Nazi dominated Europe over 6,000,000 Jewish men, women, and children were mercilessly slaughtered in cold blood by every means which diabolical Nazi ingenuity could devise. They are dead, but hundreds of thousands of persecuted Jewish survivors still remain in Europe and they live in misery and despair. They stretch out their hands to the conscience of the world for help. They ask for life. They ask for a home. Their only hope is Palestine. Is their appeal to be answered merely with sympathetic words and more investigating commissions? Aren't 6,000,000 dead enough?

"We ask that their lives be saved now. We ask for a home for the Jewish people now. We ask for action now. The Balfour Declaration, endorsed by 52 nations, including the United States, and by the mandate of the League of Nations and the treaties thereto, solemnly pledged the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine. We ask that that solemn pledge be kept. We ask that the

infamous white paper of 1939, which is a relic of the policy appeasement and which was then bitterly denounced by the Rt. Hon. Winston Churchill and by present members of the British Cabinet, be abrogated immediately.

"Time and again the British Labor Party, before it was in power and as recently as May 1945, pledged its support to the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine. We ask the present Labor Government, now that it is in power, to keep its pledged word.

"We ask that the doors of Palestine be opened at once to admit 100,000 displaced Jews of Europe. We ask that Palestine be opened to unrestricted Jewish immigration. We ask that Palestine be reconstituted as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth. We ask our Government to use its best efforts to achieve these results; and be it

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the British Ambassador at Washington, to the governors of the New England States, and to the New England Senators and Representatives in Congress."

Respectfully submitted.

Judge SAMUEL BARNET,
President.

Baltic Refugees in Sweden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, information has been received from Sweden that the Swedish Government has agreed to surrender to Soviet Russia 157 Baltic refugees. This has been confirmed by a United Press dispatch datelined Stockholm, Sweden, November 19, 1945, and carried in the New York Times, November 20, 1945.

There are approximately 36,000 Baltic refugees in Sweden now. Among them are people of all walks of life and of all political parties, except Bolsheviks. The leftist Social Democrats are represented among these Baltic refugees by numerous prominent Socialist leaders, who felt that their only chance of survival was flight from the advancing Soviet forces last year.

This indicates the scope of Bolshevik terror as practiced by the Soviet in the Baltic countries in 1940–41 when they first invaded Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania.

The 157 refugees, whose fate and, indeed, whose lives are now at stake, are former soldiers, forcibly mobilized by the Germans and impressed into German uniforms.

These forcibly mobilized Baltic youths escaped from the Germans at their very first opportunity. Some of them surrendered to the American Army, some to British forces and those now in Sweden escaped by way of sea.

The American and the British authorities treat these Baltic peoples as displaced persons. None of them have been surrendered to the Soviet, and according to numerous pronouncements of the American and British Governments, respectively, there is not the slightest intention on the part of the United States or Great Britain to surrender any of the Baltic refugees to the Soviets.

The United States first denounced the Soviet aggression against the Baltic States on July 23, 1940, when Hon. Sumner Welles as Acting Secretary of State characterized this Soviet aggression as "predatory activities" and "devious processes," to destroy the political independence of the Baltic Republics—Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania. Hon. Sumner Welles went on to say that unless the principles of American policy—the principles of nonintervention, the principles of opposition to predatory activities by force or by threats of force—are sustained the basis of modern civilization cannot be preserved.

I respectfully submit that this was true in 1940 and that it remains just as true today.

Former Governor Lehman, of New York proclaimed June 15, 1941, as Baltic States Day and in his proclamation he conveyed the sympathies of the people of the State of New York to these enslaved nations.

I respectfully submit that this is as true today as was in 1941. And it is just as true with reference to the period of 1941–44 when the Baltic peoples were oppressed and enslaved by the brutal Nazi German invaders.

Among the many acts of brutality and oppression, perpetrated by the Nazis in the Baltic States was the forcible mobilization of Baltic youths and their impressment into German service.

The Baltic peoples did not accept the German occupation. Fighting undergrounds were formed in Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania, and these undergrounds denounced both German and Soviet occupations and succeeded in furnishing the western allies with considerable information regarding German atrocities and other matters.

The policy of the United States is a matter of record. The attempted legal absorption of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union has not been recognized by the United States. Neither has Great Britain, nor the western democracies, nor any of the American Republics, recognized Soviet aggression against Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania.

As far as the United States is concerned, the aggression of the Soviets against these republics stands condemned as predatory activity, carried out by force and by threats of force.

The United States, by their unequivocal denunciation of these Soviet actions, by the proclaimed principles of the Atlantic Charter, and by their continued recognition of the legal existence of the Baltic Republics, has indeed given moral support and encouragement to the Baltic peoples in their hopes and struggles for freedom and independence.

Also, American public opinion has been well-nigh unanimous in the support of the independence of the Baltic Republics. As characteristic, in this connection, I should like to quote the concluding paragraph from an editorial published in the New York Times, on November 18, 1941—the anniversary of Latvia's Independence Day:

> But the present struggle against Hitler will fail, and civilization will be the worse, if European minorities like that of Latvia are not able to control their domestic affairs in their own way, to develop their own cultures and to be safe from armed aggression. The great powers will never have peace unless the little nations, such as Latvia, are secure.

In view of the above, I respectfully submit that we Americans have a moral duty to give every succor and protection to the Baltic refugees. We have denounced the Soviet aggression against them. We have repeatedly and continuously in our pronouncements, statements, and declarations held out to these peoples the hope for their independence. It is not surprising that the Baltic peoples have felt themselves encouraged to hope for and to fight for their very survival.

Now we are faced by the fact that Sweden, a country of a high civilization, of noble purposes, and a genuine democracy, is forced, under continuous and unrelenting pressure of the Soviets, to surrender the first group of the Baltic refugees to Soviet Russia, under the pretext that these people fought against the Soviets. It is, of course, entirely overlooked that these people were forcibly mobilized. And their sovereign rights—as citizens of recognized independent republics—to fight against any and all aggressors are denied and ignored.

If these 157 unfortunates classed are political refugees, then their right to asylum in Sweden should be unquestioned. The last people in the world to question the right of asylum for political refugees should be the Bolsheviks, because they have most freely availed themselves of this right in the past. The United States has given refuge and asylum to thousands of Bolsheviks who have come here since 1905—the first, abortive, Russian revolution—and even before, and have found here liberty, opportunity, and prosperity.

If these 157 unfortunates are classed as escaped prisoners of war, then, by gaining the neutral territory of Sweden, they have regained their freedom under international law.

In either case, it is against all precepts of international procedure, against all canons of international law, to even consider the surrender of these 157 unfortunates to a hostile power, whose actions we have condemned in an official statement of the State Department as "devious processes" and "predatory activities."

Especially since we well know the horrible fate that awaits them at the hands of NKVD—secret police—of the Soviets. In this connection, I should like to quote the following from a recent editorial—October 20, 1945—of the New York Times:

> But the vast majority of these people are refugees who opposed both Germany and Russia in the name of the independence of their countries, which the United States still recognizes. Germany is powerless to harm them, but Russia, having annexed their countries, considers them to be at the very least oppositionists to the Communist Party line and perhaps even traitors. And the fate which awaits them on "repatriation" can be easily imagined. The American and British Governments have given assurance that no

one will be compelled to return to the Russian zone against his will, and it is to be hoped that this pledge will be kept.

Latvian, Estonian, Lithuanian organizations have addressed telegrams and letters to the President, to the Secretary of State, to the Pope, the King of Sweden, the Presidents of both Houses of the Swedish Parliament, the Swedish Minister in Washington, to our Representatives and Senators.

It is a question of life and death for 157 innocent victims of war and aggression. But it also means more than that—it is the setting up of an insidious precedent, which the Soviets will exploit in a continued endeavor to obtain the surrender of other Baltic refugees in the hands of States unable to resist the powerful and ruthless pressure of Soviet Russia.

United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. FOLGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast of Raymond Swing on November 22, 1945:

What ails the world at large is that there is not enough of doing things together. The war had to be fought together. If it had not been, the Axis powers would have won it. The pressure of peril drove people out of their individual and national separateness, and together they could muster the might which forged the victory. During the war, skeptics dared not scoff at doing things together. More cooperation was obtained, within nations, and among nations, than has ever before been seen. It was clear, too, that after the war the need of doing things together would be just as great as during the war. The need would be as great, but the peril would not appear to be as great, so cooperation was going to be harder to obtain.

That consideration was in the minds of Allied leaders in deciding to set up an international relief organization for the postwar period, and to do it while the war still was being fought. No more wholesome thinking was done by this country and its allies than when they decided to set up UNRRA. Since we were fighting for the preservation of civilization, since ours was the cause of decency, since devotion to the rights and sensibilities of man was to be found only on the Allied side, it was imperative that we take thought of the need for relief and rehabilitation, and be prepared to bestow them on the victims of German savagery, having the organization already launched and the funds in hand.

Nothing done by the Allies so closely conformed to the best American standards of humanitarianism. And it was a matter of gratification to most Americans that while they were going to make the largest contribution to UNRRA, the task of relief after the war should be a joint one, something done together, each contributing according to his ability. That, many felt, would help along the work of peace, and peace itself would never be secured if people did not establish it together.

THANKSGIVING AND RELIEF

This first Thanksgiving Day since the war surely is an appropriate moment to take stock of what we have done about UNRRA, as well as our reasons for gratitude. As a Nation we are bound to be thankful that we won the war, that our freedom and our power have not been impaired, and that we have indeed been vested with as great a responsibility as any nation in history. It adds up to a tremendous amount to be grateful for, and to be humble about. But we have not expressed our gratitude or our humility with the prompt fulfillment of our pledge to the work of UNRRA. That would seem to be the least we could expect of ourselves. Some of our international problems are beyond our experience, and we are entitled to a little fumbling and delay in solving them. But this problem of feeding the hungry, and aiding the impoverished to aid themselves, is an old and familiar one. Our interest in it and ability to cope with it are part of our civilization. This is something Americans understand, believe in, and accomplish. It is what Americans can be relied upon to see through. But, in regard to UNRRA, it is not what we have accomplished or seen through.

The $550,000,000 underwritten on our behalf for the work of this year has not yet been voted, and the $1,350,000,000, our quota for the work of the new year, faces strong opposition in Congress. Doing things together is indeed harder in peace than it was in war. It is easier now for the skeptics to scoff, and for the fault finders to score with exaggerated criticisms. What is most disconcerting, perhaps, is that the attitude of the opponents of UNRRA in Congress so completely misrepresents every generous instinct in this country, and makes us smack of a meanness and selfishness which, in all objectivity, cannot be said to predominate in the American nature. Never before have American Thanksgiving dinners been more bountiful, or have a greater number of our families enjoyed them, than on this day. This, of all seasons, is the one in which Americans are ready to give thought to those not replenished as we are, who so recently were our associates in the war.

CRITICISMS OF UNRRA

Some of the criticisms of UNRRA are justified. It has not been a faultless organization by any means, partly because it came on the scene when the best administrators were already working for other Government agencies. It has bungled, and its supplies have been stolen, just like other agencies, and not much worse than others. It is doing a more extended job than did the Hoover relief agency after the last war, and at lower cost. It is a job that cannot well be turned over to any other agency at this time. General Eisenhower told the House Committee on Foreign Affairs today that the Army could not do the work, and no other organization could do it as well as UNRRA. Certainly no agency of any single country could do as well what requires international cooperation, and it would be a loss to the world if the international nature of the work were abolished.

Much of the criticism of UNRRA is the same kind of carping that was done against Lend-Lease. A good deal of it comes from individuals with personal grievances to air, and still more is the output of the rumor factory that always works overtime when a Government spending agency is involved.

The House, in voting the final $550,000,000 of our contribution for 1945, tacked on an amendment stipulating that the money could not be spent in any country which does not give full access to newspapers as to the expenditure of the fund. In the Senate, such leaders as Senator MCKELLAR and VANDENBERG have spoken out against this amendment, and it now looks as though it would be defeated in the Upper House. If it is not the fund will not become available in time to do the work planned for it. For a limiting condition adopted by one country has to be accepted by all the other countries comprising UNRRA. And if we set down conditions, other governments may do so, requiring still more time for general adoption. To use the threat of starvation as a means of freeing the press in impoverished countries is getting values badly mixed, and serving freedom by a strange compulsion. The people who are hungry and who need rehabilitation are not the ones who keep the press in their countries from being free.

When these amendments to international agreements are added in Congress, one is entitled to ask whether the real purpose of them, no matter what they say, is not to kill the agreement. For the additions have that effect, and Members of Congress who vote for them cannot be excused for not knowing it.

EISENHOWER'S EVIDENCE

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs held a special session today to listen to the evidence of General Eisenhower. The new Chief of Staff was suffering from a severe cold, which prevented him from undergoing prolonged questioning. He told the committee that Europe is making every effort to rebuild its own economy. But he pointed out that no matter how vigorously these efforts are pursued "there will," he said, "inevitably be a grave transition period through which these countries will have to pass, when they will have to receive outside assistance.

"I am fully confident," he declared, "that the people of Europe can recover from the grievous blows they have suffered if they can be helped through this period. However, if this bitter situation is not to be so disastrous as to make men wonder if it was worthwhile to have taken up arms against the Nazis, we in the United States must be prepared to discharge a very heavy responsibility. We must, now, make our proportionate contribution to the relief of Europe, in order to insure the permanence of our military victory."

"UNRRA," he continued, "represents one major effort of the United Nations to act constructively in meeting the challenge of the peace. The United States assumed leadership in organizing UNRRA. The United States has also assumed leadership in urging upon other nations of the world the thought that by united action and consultation through such a medium as the United Nations Organization, resort to war shall not again be necessary. If UNRRA were to fail them, they could not help but feel that not only had the United States failed them, but that the hope of solution of world problems through United Nations action was an illusory one."

And he described Europe as prostrate, with many of its cities devastated beyond imagination. River, rail, and water transportation are still disrupted. The harvest was poor due to lack of farm labor and fertilizer. "There are few places in Europe," he said, "where people are not cold, hungry, and apprehensive of the future."

DIRECTOR LEHMAN'S TESTIMONY

Director General Lehman of UNRRA today pleaded for immediate legislative action on the two UNRRA appropriations. The administration has, he said, already exhausted all its resources and must have additional funds immediately to save millions of Europeans from starvation, disease, and exposure in the coming winter. "This month," he said, "the month in which we celebrate Thanksgiving in America, 10,000 people in Warsaw alone will die of starvation and disease."

He said that UNRRA is pumping overseas more than a hundred Liberty shiploads of supplies a month, but added that lack of funds had forced it to suspend $50,000,000 in orders for medicine, clothing, and other critical items. Another $50,000,000 worth of

United States Army supplies already in Europe also have had to be withheld for the same reason. Even with the $550,000,000 appropriation, UNRRA will be out of funds again in mid-February. "The ships are here," he said, "the supplies are on hand. A ton of supplies now will achieve immeasurably more than 5 tons shipped 6 months from now, after famine and disease have got out of control. It represents a saving of lives by the millions."

Mr. Lehman admitted that some of the criticism of UNRRA was justified, but pointed out that in these cases "we have recognized it and have rectified the situation. It comes as a disheartening surprise," he said, "that by far the greatest amount of criticism is heard in this country—the richest, healthiest, and best fed in the world. Whereas in those countries which have suffered—as we have never been called upon to suffer—there is solid support for UNRRA and the heartiest praise for its work."

Control of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

TRUMAN-ATTLEE-KING PLAN ANNOUNCED NOVEMBER 15 FOR CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY COINCIDES WITH CONGRESSMAN M'DONOUGH'S RECOMMENDATIONS OF OCTOBER 29

The plan for control and development of atomic energy as set forth in the declaration of the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, and the Prime Minister of Canada on November 15 at a Washington conference, is strikingly similar to the recommendation for foreign and domestic control of atomic energy presented in a speech October 29, in the House of Representatives by Congressman GORDON L. McDONOUGH, of California.

Congressman McDONOUGH urged, we should exchange our knowledge of atomic energy with other nations for peacetime pursuits for knowledge they have. Mr. Truman, Mr. Attlee, and Mr. King stated, "We declare at the outset our willingness, as a first contribution, to proceed with the exchange of fundamental scientific information for peaceful ends with any nation that will fully reciprocate."

Congressman McDONOUGH further stated that the United States should not reveal the secret of the atomic bomb at this time and that we should urge the abolition of the atomic bomb by all nations in the world for military purposes. Both of these recommendations were stressed by the declaration of Truman, Attlee, and King which stated in part, "We are not convinced that the spreading of the specialized information regarding the practical application of atomic energy. * * * would contribute to a constructive solution of the problem of the atomic bomb." This was followed by a strong plea for the universal elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons adaptable to mass destruction.

Congressman McDONOUGH with his background of experience in scientific research has a clear picture and thorough understanding of what is necessary for the protection of the American people from the atomic bomb and of the control of atomic energy to further the preservation of peace.

Discharge of Physicians From the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter from a doctor now in Japan.

Mr. Speaker, you will note that this doctor, and I know him very well, states that he has not done a bit of medicine since January of this year and most of the other doctors over here say the same thing.

Last Tuesday, I had a conference with six other Members of Congress in my office. Surgeon General Kirk was present. We pointed out to the general that many complaints were coming to Members of Congress relative to keeping physicians who were not needed in the armed forces. General Kirk assured us that they were now giving first priority to the returning of physicians, dentists, and nurses to this country. They should then be discharged at the earliest possible moment. The difficulty in the discharge system is one which requires a medical man to have 80 points, be 48 years of age or in service before Pearl Harbor before he is entitled to a discharge from the Army medical service.

The discharge points are to be lowered to 70 the first of December. Even at this rate, there will be entirely too many medical men in the Army medical service. The ratio at the present time is about one physician to 110 soldiers. This is entirely out of proportion and even higher than the 5½ medical men to 1,000 soldiers during the war. Unless the Army reduces the number of points and other restrictions, we will see far too many medical men retained in the Army. These men are desperately needed in many communities where the mothers, the children, and the old folks have a much higher medical and surgical care need than the young healthy men in the Army.

KOKURA, KYUSHU, JAPAN,
November 8, 1945.

A. L. MILLER, M. D.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DOCTOR: Now that the war is over in the Pacific, we doctors who have been in the Army for some time, who left practices and families, would like to get back. I have been in the Army nearly 3 years and overseas 15 months. I practiced at ———, Nebr., for 7 years before going into the service and at present my wife and two daughters are now residing there.

There has been no policy for getting general practitioners out of the Army. The work of the general practitioner in the Army has been nothing more than a first-year intern and he could easily be replaced by men just finishing their first year internship. The general practitioner at the present time certainly should not be essential now that the war is over and our communities are in need of medical care; I know the one I left is.

Something should be done to get the oversupply of medical men overseas home. Personally, I haven't done a bit of medicine since January of this year and most of the other doctors over here say the same thing. Why attempt to keep the same number of doctors in peacetime as in actual combat? Why, with an oversupply of doctors over here, they keep the number of points necessary for discharge so much higher than other Army officers. We doctors, who have given 2½ to 3 years in service, feel we should be allowed to return without the usual Army delays, especially when we know definitely that we aren't needed here.

I know that you have been receiving considerable correspondence from Army men and I wouldn't bother you except for the deplorable situation that exists in the returning of doctors, especially those overseas.

DOCTOR C. C.

OPA Must Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this country is about to witness a national scandal all because Chester Bowles and his organization is either too stubborn or too dumb to see the real effect of its automobile pricing policies. Not only is it forcing auto manufacturers to stop production lines but as a result thousands of workingmen will be out of jobs. This nonsensical policy will surely retard reconversion at a time when our boys are returning from the armed services. These men, Mr. Speaker, have a right to more consideration than Mr. Bowles is giving them, but he shuts his eyes to the facts and says: "The public be damned."

Then, too, Mr. Speaker, he is placing in jeopardy thousands and thousands of small businessmen who have for more than 20 years been establishing a profitable business through hard work, precarious investments and long hours. And by a stroke of the pen, an executive order, these men stand to lose their entire investments. This situation is brought forcibly to my attention by a letter I have just received from a personal friend who by the dint of his own ability in the last 25 years has established a fine business and an enviable reputation for honesty and integrity. He writes with a good deal of feeling and with every justification, for he believes that Mr. Bowles is driving him out of business. I insert at this point all of his letter. I withhold his name for obvious reasons, but will gladly furnish it to any Member of the House, upon request:

Mr. LAWRENCE SMITH,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR LAWRENCE: I am surely glad to know that we have men of your type in Congress, who have guts enough to tell OPA and Bowles and his gang where they fit, and that they are a bunch of bungling fools who will run the country to hell, if they can.

So he proposes to cut the car dealers discount of 25 years standing, and calls us a lot of selfish power lobbyists? Well, even a dog has a right to squeak, if his tail is being

cut off. Lawrence, if they cut our discount by even 1 percent I promise you the greatest scandal and racketeering the country has ever seen. The bootlegging days of the twenties will seem like a Sunday school picnic by comparison. Do you know why? Well, if new cars are held at 1942 prices here would be the picture:

New 1946 Chevrolet sedan, including all tax and charges (this was the price in Racine in 1942), $940.

Used 1942 Chevrolet sedan, same model, present OPA ceiling, $1,134.

In other words, a used 1942 Chevrolet sedan could be legally sold—a car which is 4 years old and at least half worn out—for $200 more than a brand-new one. In proposing to hold the price of new cars to the 1942 level, has he proposed to cut the OPA ceiling of the used one to $470, which it would be worth as a true value? No; he has not. Check this one with Bowles; he can't deny it. Why, in the name of God, has he ever permitted, as shown, a used car to be sold for more than it was worth when it was new.

Now, normally, I employ 14 retail salesmen; 4 are here now, and I expect 9 of my former salesmen to return from the Army and Navy in the near future to their old jobs with me. Bowles says we will need no salesmen. Shall I tell them to go to work in the coal mines or shall we shoot them?

So, Mr. Smith (or Jones, as the case may be), if you want to buy a new car—and about 15,000,000 will—you won't be able to buy your new car from any dealer unless, as a condition to the sale, you will agree to trade in your car that is actually worth $400 for a $200 allowance. So you won't trade it in? Good; you can keep on using it or walk. If you have no used car, O. K., we'll play a game of gin rummy for $200, and you'd better let me win or you'll keep on walking. Oh, yes, there are many more in the book. Does Bowles and the OPA want some scandal? They'll get it, and plenty.

In 1942 I paid my mechanics $1 per hour. I now pay them $1.25. The rent on my garage building in Kenosha has been increased just 100 percent since 1942. In 1942 the Government requested me to sell them my last 90 new cars in stock—they said they needed them, and it would be unpatriotic to hold them for customers at the regular price. They then chiseled me 7 percent discount, which was O. K. because I was supposed to be a patriot.

The OPA waited until 1944 (why?) and then put a ceiling on used cars. It was so high that it had no semblance of true values. So I quit handling used cars and haven't handled one since. Only the law violators and racketeers kept on—and got fat—and paid no tax—they all carry $100 and $500 bills in their vest pockets. Want me to prove it? O. K. I will, when you ask me to.

So Bowles and OPA want to hold 1942 car prices. They want to cut the car dealers' discount. Yet they approve wage increases—why I even read that Mr. Truman wants you Congressmen to get a raise of 100 percent. (God knows you are entitled to it.)

Don't let the OPA and their bungling-dam policies put us all on the rocks. We don't deserve it, this kind of treatment. But I promise, if we get it, that we car dealers can take care of ourselves, and let the stink go up to high heavens or higher.

You are right, especially in your last bulletin. OPA must go out the window before it is too late. Out with the rascals, before they ruin us all, and our country besides. Tell Mr. Bowles, since he has said he would like to be in the business, that he can buy this one. The purchasing price will be the figure of a fair, impartial appraiser of the physical assets. I have spent 25 years in building it up, only to see it jeopardized by a bunch of laughing insane hyenas.

I belong to no association, national or State. So OPA and Bowles are liars and stinkers besides, when they say I am a selfish unfair lobbyist. Who can I appeal to? Only you, as my Representative in Congress, and you are O. K. with me. I wish we had a lot more like you there.

With kindest personal regards,
Yours very truly.

One World or None

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I shall not attempt to comment on the following article which appeared in the Bulletin of Pacific School of Religion written by Mr. Buell G. Gallagher. The article will recommend itself to everyone who reads it as one of the most powerful things that he has ever read:

ONE WORLD OR NONE

(By Buell G. Gallagher)

All through the war, some of us were saying that the world was going through a revolution, but few of us dreamed how profound and tremendous that revolution actually was to be. Just how true these predictions of revolution were is now made clear in the flashes over Hiroshima and Nagasaki which literally wrote the story in columns of boiling smoke 50,000 feet high for all mankind to see.

It was a thousand years ago, August 5, 1945, that a single plane flew over Hiroshima, a single bomb floated earthward, suspended from two parachutes, and the atomic age burst upon us. Between one and two hundred thousand people were crushed and cremated by that bomb. Scores of thousands more have since died of its effects.

Never before has man possessed such power. Never before have the inadequacies of ethical controls been as clearly revealed. There is little point in arguing at what stage modern warfare violated the old Hague Covenant, or by what nations the violations were perpetrated. The effort to bring under ethical controls an essentially unethical practice is as absurd as to argue that murder by poisoning is immoral while murder by malnutrition is permissible. The point is that all participants in the war, Americans no less than their enemies, came out of war with radically different standards. There has been a profound revolution in our morals, no less profound than the new technology of neutron fission.

In this atomic age, certain conclusions already are redundantly clear:

1. That the old ways (particularly national sovereignty and its corollary, international war) are no longer usable. It was General MacArthur who said: "We have had our last chance, if we do not devise some greater and more equitable system. Armageddon will be at our door. The problem is basically theological." General Eisenhower put the matter more bluntly when he said, "Now mankind may be blackmailed into peace." The ways of war and the premises of nationalism are unusable in the atomic age. This is not pious sentiment; it is stark realism. Show me a man who today believes in the war method, and I will show you a man who is either a complete romanticist, refusing to face facts, or else one who, knowing the facts, is a sadist who believes in race suicide. Just as gunpower ended the feudal classes, so atomic energy has ended the nations. As Raymond Fosdick puts it, our choice is simple: One world or none.

2. Hiroshima made San Francisco obsolete. Fairly good in its day, the United Nations Organization is as outmoded in the atomic age as a crossbow in a day of buzz bombs. Nothing short of a genuine world government, to which the United States, as well as all other nations, is subject, will suffice to save us from the fearful frightfulness of an atomic war—over in a few hours, with the attacked nation obliterated.

3. The time is short. Not more than 10 years are available before the atomic war is an instantaneous possibility, the victory resting with that nation which acts first, before its mutually mistrustful opponent obliterates it. The time is now.

4. The only adequate method of controlling the fearsome atom is to bring the consciences and actions of all men under the control of a greater fear—the fear of the Lord which is the beginning of wisdom.

Since that day when (in the words of Horace):

"Prometheus first transmuted
Atoms culled for human clay,"

down to the present moment when atomic fission threatens to give humanity back to the dust, man has never stood in greater peril. In this brief half-second of history's time, we can escape the fear of our fellows only by a genuine fear of the Lord, which begets a love of mankind. We can be very specific about the price of survival under a just God: (1) An end of national sovereignty, in world government; (2) justice and equity among all peoples of whatever race or culture as the basis for this world government; (3) the speedy end of all forms of economic and political exploitation and domination. These things on the world level we will do only if we also do them on the local level, by ending restrictive residential covenants in our cities and discrimination because of race in employment or in social life; and by the rapid creation of the inclusive church, instead of the segregated churches we now have.

Atoms like those that were split over Hiroshima make up all matter, all energy, all flesh—whether it be the flesh of Greek or Jew, barbarian, Scythian; bond or free. We have a terrible and portentous choice to make. We can say with Pilate, "I have power," and we shall be answered with the words of Leviticus, "I will break the pride of your power." The other choice is hidden deep in the prophecy of Zecharaiah, "Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts."

Roosevelt Amateur Strategist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at this Thanksgiving season of 1945 the Nation should offer its sincere thanks to Admiral Richardson who has just completed his testimony before the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee. He has rendered an outstanding service to the country by revealing that he had notified President Roosevelt that the Pacific Fleet was not ready for war 10 months before Pearl Harbor and that the fleet should not be based at that place. In an editorial appearing in the Washington Post for November 22, 1945, it is pointed out that the President overruled the admiral for what appeared to have

been political considerations. This editorial intimates also that Mr. Roosevelt might have been using the fleet for purposes of diplomacy and not defense. The plain fact emerges, Mr. Speaker, that the keeping of the fleet in Pearl Harbor was upon the orders of the President and responsibility for the final disaster is upon him. As a part of this extension, I include herein the editorial in question:

RICHARDSON'S TESTIMONY

Until the appearance of Admiral Richardson as a witness, the congressional investigation of the Pearl Harbor disaster of December 7, 1941, had, despite all the publicity given to it, added very little to what was covered or implied in the previously published report of the Army Pearl Harbor Board. Admiral Richardson's testimony is, however, quite new and startling, and introduces another question into the controversy, namely, whether the late President Roosevelt was not using the Navy as an instrument of diplomacy rather than of defense.

Admiral Richardson was known in the service as one of the naval officers who had given a large part of their lives to the study of the Pacific problem and to the possibility of war between the Japanese Empire and the United States. Besides, as commander in chief in the Pacific, his was the responsibility for the safety of the fleet. Thus, his opinion, expressed before both President Roosevelt and Admiral Leahy at a luncheon in the White House just 14 months before Pearl Harbor, should have carried unusual weight. Admiral Richardson testified that he told the President that it was a strategic mistake to keep the fleet, undermanned as it then was, based at Pearl Harbor. It was in no condition, the Admiral said, to conduct operations against the Japanese. Preparations for war could be made more rapidly if all the fleet, except the Hawaiian detachment, were returned to its natural base on the American west coast. Among other things, Admiral Richardson believed that, whether there was to be peace or war in the Pacific, the thing most immediately necessary was to recruit the fleet to full strength, to have it fully supplied with provisions and ammunition, and generally placed in a condition of readiness for war at any moment.

On both these points he was overruled by the President, and for what appear to have been purely political considerations. The President said that the fleet must be kept at Pearl Harbor, first, because its presence there would have a restraining influence on the actions of the Japanese Government and, secondly, because the withdrawal of the fleet would, rightly or wrongly, give the impression at home that the United States was weakening in its attitude toward Japanese aggression.

To the first point Admiral Richardson retorted that a civilian government in Japan might be impressed by such a gesture, but that a military government, such as then existed, would be impressed only by the knowledge that the American Fleet was actually capable of war. The President, however, replied that he would not approve the removal of the fleet from Pearl Harbor unless it could be done in such a way as to convince both the American people and the Japanese Government that we were not weakening in our far eastern policy. Yet, at the same time, according to Admiral Richardson, the President made it plain that we had no intention of going to war because of impending aggression by Japan against Thailand or the Dutch East Indies, and that it was very doubtful that we would fight even if the Philippines were attacked, although sooner or later Japan would inevitably make some move that would draw us into conflict with her. Admiral Richardson's second point, that the fleet must be recruited to full strength, Mr. Roosevelt dismissed on the ground that, if the need arose, it would be easy enough to take in and train civilian mechanics and technicians.

Neither Admiral Richardson's testimony nor anything else that has thus far been disclosed by the Pearl Harbor investigation in the least justifies the accusation of certain partisan Republicans and fanatical isolationists that President Roosevelt actually desired, and conspired, to bring about the destruction of the Pacific Fleet as the only means of reconciling public opinion to a long and costly war against the Axis Powers. It does, however, indicate that Mr. Roosevelt was taking some very extravagant risks in his efforts to apply his foreign policies by political and diplomatic means. It does suggest an extraordinary overconfidence and a dangerous disregard for realities which seem to have spread from the White House to the military, naval, and diplomatic bureaucracies. There is no question that Admiral Richardson was right and the President wrong about the folly of exposing the fleet to risk of annihilation by a surprise attack on Hawaii. And in this respect it is ironical but not unjust to recall the President's subsequent lecture to those "typewriter strategists" who had ventured to question on some minor points the omniscience of military and naval experts.

Dorothy Thompson on What It Will Take To Prevent an Atomic War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, repeatedly I have proposed in the House that the United States, in conjunction with Britain, take the measures advocated by Dorothy Thompson in the column which follows. In my opinion, Miss Thompson has been doing the most outstanding job of analyzing the world's present problem that has been done by any writer:

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The joint statement of President Truman and Prime Minister Attlee on the atomic bomb rejects the idea that by distributing atomic bombs to all and sundry anything would be clarified. Maybe the atomic bomb is no secret, but for the time being only the western powers have the thing itself. So, for the time being, they are in a unique position—either to save the world or perhaps to send it to hell.

The joint statement of the United States President and the British and Canadian Prime Ministers adds up to declaring: First, we get secure peace; first, we get a real world authority; first, we fix it so no nation can make war, and then we will be free to use atomic energy for human welfare without fear of human destruction.

When the first atomic bomb fell on Hiroshima the common man recognized that nations must not only consider but decide to stop the nonsense that ceases to be fun when it involves suicide.

The uncommon man, of systematically trained intellect, must, however, answer the question "What kind of world?" and face the full portent of all alternatives. "Agreements," "negotiations," "conferences," and cries for universal disarmament will not pass muster before the dialectic of the atomic bomb. Previous talk about "using force to prevent aggression" is babbling. The mathematics of the atomic bomb is aggress-victor. Every war college in the world knows it.

Even without the atomic bomb, the logic of total war leads to elimination of nations. The defeated becomes a policed colony, as far as military and foreign policy are concerned. This war reduced the world to only a few power unities. Serious tensions can arise only between these and all issues between these become issues of life or death.

Thus, with the atomic bomb, the struggle for power becomes inevitably a struggle for world mastery. The existence of a few great powers, each sovereign, can only precipitate further tests—and eliminations. Only one authority, with world control, ultimately can have the atomic bomb, because only a world of one authority can abandon its use.

If this is not recognized, we shall have an atomic war—this time a war genuinely to end war, by the establishment of the world mastery of the victor. The question is, of course, How much would be left of the one world thus created as the outcome of another war?

Must we fight that war to establish world unity by domination of the victor? Or, shall we now establish world unity by a cooperative pooling and delegation of power to one single world authority?

Obviously only the second answer is sane. But this is possible only if we are prepared to use all we have—even the atomic bomb—to create it. At this moment, the western powers have the necessary ingredient for world mastery. They will probably not have it long; they may lose it at any moment; but right now they have it. World peace demands one world; one world can only be created by power, and power is relative to force.

The western powers possess, for this fleeting historical moment, the power and the force to compel the creation of a genuine United Nations of the World, united not under Anglo-American domination but by Anglo-American power in behalf of all peoples through cooperative authority and mutual policing by great nations and collectives of small nations. One single authority whose business, backed by overwhelming power, must be maintain the union—secession thereafter being agression.

The choice in the world is self-mastery through cooperative action or mastery through domination. In the long run there are no other alternatives. Either will be accomplished only by the test of power, which means the test of willingness to use force, if it is necessary to use force to achieve it.

Force is seldom used, where power is so overwhelming that to challenge it is catastrophe—unless the alternative is patently inacceptable. Desperation, of course, knows no restraints of cold calculation. Therefore the Anglo-American world must not only offer the world, but be prepared to impose on the world, a world authority offering no nations, including our own, any advantage not enjoyed by others, nor any obligation not undertaken by all: "To each according to its needs, from each according to its abilities."

Ultimatum Was Japan's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from the Christian Science Monitor of November 20, 1945:

ULTIMATUM WAS JAPAN'S

The Pearl Harbor inquiry has now added another "if" to the astounding story of measures which might have prevented or sharply curtailed the destruction of December 7, 1941. If the Navy had flown long-range reconnaissance with the 69 PBY's it had available, the Japanese carriers might have been spotted.

Senator BREWSTER has done well to bring this out, and it seems to us that the Navy's defense that it didn't do any patrolling because it couldn't do enough to cover the whole perimeter is a poor excuse. But we can only decry continuing efforts by Republican members of the committee to make it appear that it was not Japan but President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull who started the war.

The claim that Mr. Hull "pushed the button" that set off hostilities by an "ultimatum" on November 26 was always a dangerous and partisan one, playing directly into the hands of the enemy. In the light of evidence now piling up it is clearly unjustified. An examination of Japanese officers and dispatches fills in and corroborates information showing that Tokyo had decided on war long before Mr. Hull on November 26 gave Japan's envoys a statement of the American position.

The evidence now discloses that Admiral Yamamoto briefed the Japanese pilots on October 5 to "hit the American fleet" on December 8 (Japanese time). Moreover, the force that struck Pearl Harbor started out the day before Mr. Hull's statement was supposed to have "pushed the button." The real ultimatum was the Japanese statement of November 20, to which Mr. Hull said "No" 6 days later.

It is now shown that had the Secretary of State tried to follow the course urged by the Army and Navy—to stall the Japanese off—he could not have succeeded. For Japan had set a secret deadline. Agreement by November 27 or the attack plan was to be set in motion—although apparently open to counterorders up to December 5. But only complete acceptance of Japan's terms—American aid and supplies for Japan's career of conquest—would have turned back the attack.

Who is the American who wishes to stand up and say the United States should have accepted? But that is precisely the position into which those who try to pin the war on Mr. Hull are getting themselves.

Battle-Participation Stars for Prisoners of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, as evidence of the feeling of veterans toward the War Department ruling denying a battle-participation star to American soldiers captured and made prisoners of war, I bring to the attention of the Members the following resolution passed by the Middlesex County Council, Department of Massachusetts, Veterans of Foreign Wars:

Whereas the War Department's ruling that American soldiers captured and made prisoners of war while in action are not entitled to battle participation stars conferred upon their contingents during their imprisonment; and

Whereas these decorations are worth five points each in the process of discharge; and

Whereas most men captured were at the front lines and no doubt fought bravely before surrendering, and on some occasions surrendered only when ordered to do so by their commanding officer; and

Whereas on some occasions their outfit as a whole has been honored, and battle participation stars awarded to their rear guard troops: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of Middlesex County Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, at a regular meeting assembled at Newton Center, Mass., on October 28, 1945, do hereby go on record as being opposed to the War Department's ruling, and respectfully request that it be changed, so that these unfortunate men who have been prisoners of war may be accorded the same honors as their comrades in arms.

PHILIP J. GIBBONS,
Adjutant.

The Art of Living Together

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLOS P. ROMULO

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER OF THE PHILIPPINES TO THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, it is my privilege to insert in the RECORD a speech delivered by the Honorable Abe Fortas, Under Secretary of the Interior, at the celebration of the one-hundredth anniversary of the City College of the City of New York, Saturday, November 17, 1945.

Under Secretary Fortas is one of the most efficient and able public servants of the United States. Since my appointment as Resident Commissioner of the Philippines to the United States more than a year ago, I have had the pleasure of working with him, and I have found his cooperation and sympathetic interest in the Philippines and the Filipino people both inspiring and stimulating. He is a liberal in the truest sense of the word, and this speech of his entitled "The Art of Living Together," should be read by every American who believes in enhancing the greatness of the United States through "an understanding of the essential equality of men and a recognition that civilization is based upon the dignity and freedom of the individual." It is to Americans with the breadth of vision and liberalism of Under Secretary Fortas that the world should look for guidance in these uncertain and troubled days.

I am honored to have been asked to speak to you on the occasion of the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the City College of the City of New York. In the uncertainties of our world we do well to celebrate those institutions which are dedicated to the task of training our people for life in an ever-changing world. For we have come again to a crisis point in the history of our country and in the education of our people—a crisis which will test our fiber, the validity of our institutions, the resiliency of our precepts, and the strength and adaptability of our education and training. The centennial of this great institution affords us the opportunity in the perspective of its many yesterdays to contemplate our countless tomorrows.

Since the beginning of history there has been remarkable constancy in the aspirations of civilized man. Man has striven for the same simple, fundamental objectives—food, shelter, security, freedom, and dignity. And since the beginning of community life the degree to which he has attained these has depended upon the understanding and goodness of himself and the members of his community.

I learn from a speech of our chairman, Mr. Mark Eisner, that many years ago, one of the legislators who supported the founding of this great college, advanced as the reason for its creation the cultivation of "the virtue and intelligence of the people." That is still the commanding duty of educational institutions. If the natural virtue and intelligence of the people are not cultivated but become smothered in a rank growth of fear, suspicions, and prejudice, civilization is in danger.

In a speech which Franklin Roosevelt prepared just before his sudden death, he said, "Today we are faced with the preeminent fact that, if civilization is to profit, we must cultivate the science of human relationships—the ability of all peoples, of all kinds to live together, to work together in the same world, at peace."

The religious and secular literature of mankind have always glorified the science of human relationships, the art of living together in peace and dignity, with a feeling of security, free from the torment of hunger and want. But practice has widely departed from preachment. Men are, with few exceptions, in agreement upon the objective; but in the pursuit of avenues to its achievement, they have too frequently flailed about like feeble-minded rats in a maze. Upon occasion, disregarding the fact that their problem is to get out of the trap, they have turned upon one another, with frightful destructiveness, in the blind belief that the other occupants of the maze are the cause of the misery and frustrations of life.

Man has written a history of warfare, plague, fear, and strife. Cities have been razed, civilizations destroyed, glorious cultures stamped into dust by the savagery of man toward man. Men have raped, pillaged, and burned in the name of their gods—for riches, for power, for fear, and for glory. Man has too often used his physical dexterity, his superior ability to recall past experience and to connect cause and effect, to build strange and wonderful contrivances for the destruction of his fellow men. The miracle of it all is that through the carnage and horror of the ages, man has survived; even more, than he has steadily progressed toward the realization of his aspirations.

But the fact of this slow progress is small comfort to those of us who must live through the years ahead, and who feel the burden of responsibility for the generations that will inherit our world. For our crisis, though its nature is as old as recorded history, has a new and terrifying urgency. The tempo of events has accelerated as the speed of man's locomotion has increased from the two legs with which he is born to the supersonic projection of the jet airplane. The volume and pitch of man's crises have swelled in a deafening and stupefying crescendo.

We are, in brief, in a race between man's destructive powers and his ability to construct a civilized way of life. For a few billion dollars, within a few years, we have created atomic bombs capable of unprecedented destruction. Only one thing seems clear—that given the world of today, destruction on a massive scale may confidently be predicted. The burning question is whether we have the ability, within the time that remains, to change today's world sufficiently to avoid this holocaust.

The answer to this question is so largely dependent upon the people of the United

States that everyone of us shares an immediate and compelling responsibility. We are the one Nation in the world that can sucessfully assert the moral leadership which is necessary to guide the world to peace and civilized living. We are the one Nation in the world that, in terms of physical resources, is in a position to provide the economic foundation of nonaggressive life to the people of the world. We are the one Nation in the world that can give to others hope for a better world, for a society in which they may, by their own peaceful efforts, obtain those simple things which are the basis of civilized living: an adequate measure of food, shelter, and security, and freedom and dignity.

But how, how can we do this? How can we, the people of the United States, lead ourselves and the world to a better life?

We have by no means learned how to solve our own domestic problems. Within our own borders, there are the same conflicts, insecurities, provincialism, passions, and prejudices which beset the world, and they are rising to fever pitch.

Even within this country where the simple addition of economic arithmetic would show that there is enough for all, we have not solved the problem of division, of distributing what we have and can produce, so that no one feels the sharp stab of hunger and insecurity. Indeed, we are already beginning to see the familiar outcroppings of not-enough-to-go-around, the effort of each unit of our society to shift the burden of too-little to the other fellow. And in this shifting process within our own country are involved the same hideous stratagems which we have observed internationally. Any element of vulnerability—in fact, any difference from the majority, whether it be race, religion, national origin, sex, or political belief—will do. The tactic is to narrow the group that can share in the distribution of goods produced and benefits conferred by the society, so that the remainder can (or so they are led to think—get a bigger portion.

Our problem, therefore, is not merely as big as the world; it is as immediate as our own Nation and our own community. In broad outlines, its pattern is the same, internationally and domestically. Its basic motif is economic, but woven throughout, disarranging the perspective and fundamentally distorting the impression upon the eye of the observer, are the passionate themes of religion, race, custom, and nationalism. It is the familiar design of primitive man's struggle individually to obtain increased security, more goods, and greater power at the expense of other men; and to establish the validity and superiority of his individual and community personality.

What approach, then, may profitably be made to problems which are so fundamental and comprehensive; conflicts which are as familiar as our own houses and shops and factories, and at the same time as remote geographically as Indonesia and Mongolia? Or must we, with H. G. Wells, accept and embrace what he has announced as "the end of everything we call life?"

Obviously, despite Mr. Wells, the human race is not ready to turn in its chips. Obviously, we shall try to resolve our problems. There can be no doubt that they are capable of resolution. The difficulty lies not in our stars, but in ourselves.

We can be sure that we will not cure the ills that beset us unless we are ready and willing—all of us, in our daily lives, in our homes and schools and churches—to set about the task boldly and fearlessly. And to do this, to rid ourselves of the plague of conflict, destitution, and fear, we must first relentlessly face and frankly admit our difficulties.

There are still too many of us who prefer to regard the atomic bomb as the weapon that isn't there, just as there were too many of us who chose to consider Adolf Hitler as the little man who wasn't there. And there are still thousands of us who seek escape from our domestic problems by tracing their cause to John Lewis or the CIO or the NAM or Father Coughlin or reactionary groups in government.

Others try to find refuge from the troubles that beset us by a return to the past: the good old days when there was no Labor Relations Act, when labor unions were curiosities; when small business was the order of our economy instead of its fringe; when taxes were insignificant; when government was a remote, scarcely-noticed agency instead of an omnipresent force in everyday life; when an individual and his family, if they were moderately sober, industrious and thrifty, could cope with the exigencies and hazards of living; and when the oceans were our majestic and unconquerable guardians against foreign foe.

This, then, I suggest, is the first task: We must strip our minds of escape traps and of antiquities. We must realize that today is today and yesterday was long, long ago. We must acknowledge that there is no returning; that events have washed away forever the familiar monuments of the years that have passed. We must face the present candidly if we are to face the future effectively.

We are today experiencing the full power of the industrial revolution. From humble beginnings, mechanization has reached a point where now it threatens the existence of its creator. Man's machines have at this moment in history surpassed man's ability to control. We must quickly make social and moral changes which will match and subdue to the service of mankind the tremendous force of these machines. Man has remade the world. It is time that man reformed himself.

In this great task of catching up with our own ingenuity, every segment of our society—all men of virtue and intelligence, our schools and churches—must play a part. The principles of religion and morality must become more than cliches, offered on authority and accepted and repeated with all of the understanding and conviction of a parrot. The precepts of civilized living should be a summons to action; not merely statements of doctrine, piously mouthed on ancient and current authority.

The assault that is being made upon the precepts of humanity does not, in my opinion, challenge their validity. Civilization today and tomorrow depends as it always has upon a few simple postulates: that each human being is entitled to dignity and respect; that no one is entitled to injure his fellow man; and that each is, in truth and in fact, his brother's keeper. These are the principles that must govern the relationships of man to man in the world community as well as in the village and the family.

The question which we must ponder is whether our people have the comprehension and the skill to salvage these doctrines and to make them the working principles of a world which is in the throes of gigantic upheaval. That, after all, is the task of civilization, of government, of the churches, schools, and homes. If we fail to preserve the principles of humanity and civilization and to practice them in our economic and political society, we can be sure that not only our morality, but our very lives are in mortal danger.

We have seen the results of a collapse of civilization's doctrines. In Nazi Germany, authority had supplanted reason; blind obedience had displaced understanding. It was not long before humanism and civilization gave way to a new order. A new set of rules, supported again only by authority, but this time by the authority of a government of evil men, quickly took hold. Its course was comparatively easy. It had no barriers of virtue and intelligence to surmount. It had merely to displace one kind of authority, one folk lore, with another.

The pattern of Nazi Germany is not unique. Wherever the people have failed to study and apply the art of civilized living, wherever reason and intelligence have not been brought to the support of decency and community living, the structure of civilized life is in peril. Particularly in this exploding world in which we live, full of combat and passion, when the people are unable to reason from cause to effect, from malady to prescription, there is but one short step to savagery.

If the education and training of our people will clear away irrational fears and anxieties; if our people can be induced to reason—to examine their problems thoughtfully and rationally; if with the power of reason we make a determined assault upon prejudice and superstition; then, I think, we will begin to take the measure of our problem and to find a solution.

The basic desires of ordinary people everywhere are the same, and the world is rich enough to satisfy these desires if only man will devise the method. And it is in the satisfaction of these basic needs that, in my opinion, salvation lies both within our own borders and internationally. We must provide for the people of our own country, and we must help to furnish for the people of the world, an understanding of the essential equality of men and a recognition that civilization is based upon the dignity and freedom of the individual. We must help to provide people with security, the minimum essentials of livelihood, and a basis for hope that with industry and effort they can improve their lot.

Within our own country, we must assure our people against destitution. We must give them confidence that illness, old age, and unemployment—the basic hazards of nature and of man's economy—will not destroy them or their families. We must provide for each person willing and able to work the opportunity to do so. Without this, without a job of work to do, self-respect is threatened and dignity is in jeopardy. If each family can be sure that its basic livelihood is provided for—that the parents and the children will eat, that they will have shelter and clothing, that the children may be educated—much of the bitterness and venom will be drawn from the strife and competition and oppositions of life. We will still have conflict; we will still have aggressive rivalry. But we will have provided a floor of economic security which will raise these conflicts from the fearful, clawing, primitive struggle for existence to civilized competition.

Internationally, I think that the prescription is similar, although its compounding is more difficult. There is room to doubt that statecraft alone can bring peace. Wisdom and sagacity may guide the fixing of Poland's boundaries, but Poland and her neighbors are hungry, fearful, fretful, and insecure. The statesmen of the world may create a United Nations Organization which may gradually become a mechanism of world governance. But meanwhile the specters of fear and famine stalk the people of the United Nations, and the god of war is armed with new and incredibly devastating weapons.

Nor can I believe that the overweening military might of any nation or group of nations can bring peace. Armaments are designed to win wars. They are not a Magna Carta or a world constitution, nor are they themselves the cause of war. Armaments are merely the means, a factor to be taken into account by the nation which is otherwise moved to warfare. A set of burglar's tools do not cause a man to rob a house, but if he is hungry or avaricious or fearful of tomorrow's destitution, and if he believes his tools will do the job, he may break and enter another's property. The problem with the burglar as with the nation centers not on the tools, but on the psychological and economic factors that are involved.

We can, therefore, best contribute to the construction of a peaceful world by a wholehearted, generous effort to provide the people of the various nations with economic assistance and a feeling of security against aggression. We must realize that the best assurance of our own wealth and possessions is the well-being of all of the people of the world. So long as millions of people are starving or fearful of their neighbors, so long as millions lack the materials necessary to enable them to till their fields and operate their factories, so long as people lack an opportunity to buy what they need and to sell a fair share of what they reasonably can produce, just so long will the shadow of war darken the earth.

We cannot, of course, feed and clothe the world, nor would the people of the world welcome this. But we can lend of our surplus; we can arrange to buy as well as sell; and we can furnish technical advice and assistance. In short, we can help others to help themselves, and we will thereby mightily help ourselves.

Nor can we alone preserve the peace of the world. We cannot bring security to the world by declaring ourselves its self-appointed policeman. But we can seek to press the development of a world order—the evolution, if you like, of the United Nations Organization—with vigor and spirit and idealism. A world organization, created and functioning by consent of a majority of people and nations, and properly equipped for policing, is an imperative of a world which is only a few hours' large.

There is much to be done and little time within which to do it. There is much that each of us can do, in the ordering of his own life; through his participation in government, in great institutions of training like that which we celebrate tonight; and even in his daily conversation with others. Those who are trustees for the lives and affairs of others, whether their positions are in government, educational institutions, religious organizations, or in private groups should feel that the difficulties which we confront are a challenge to their conscience and an urgent call to their greatest effort.

Neither the immediate crises of domestic and foreign policy, nor the basic necessity of vitalizing morality and social intelligence presents an impossible task. If we have the conviction and the daring, the freedom from anachronistic thinking and the good will, we can make it possible for all people to obtain the bases of civilized living—food, shelter, security, dignity, and freedom. And if all of us who are devoted to the cause of mankind's survival and progress will undertake a responsibility for the cultivation of the virtue and intelligence of our people—for the substitution in the place of passion and prejudice, of a reasoned understanding and application of the principles of civilized living, we can build a world that will move steadily forward to the realization of man's highest aspirations.

It is to this task that this great College of the City of New York has in the past dedicated itself; and it is to this task that I am sure it will address itself in the future with renewed zeal.

Not Unduly Exacting About Iran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 23, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, what Secretary Byrnes meant by his statement that we are "not unduly exacting" in our relation with the Soviet Union can be seen very clearly from the present situation in three Oriental countries—Iran, China, and Korea.

Each of these three is important to us and to the creation of a peaceful world. In each country, under private agreements between the heads of the executive branch of the United States Government and the Generalissimo-Premier of the Soviet Union, Russia was given a free and concealed hand in the northern areas. Not only were allied observers excluded from these areas, but the ordinary governmental process of the various recognized governments of Iran, China, and, lately, Korea, have been given over to secessionist groups under tutelage of Moscow-trained leaders.

To understand the relationship of these movements it is necessary to look at the map of Asia. One glance discloses the fact that Iran is important to a peaceful world because of its own oil reserves, and because it is a military base from which the much greater oil deposits of Arabia can be controlled, and the rich Empire of India can be encroached upon.

China, of course, is important because it contains nearly one-quarter of the human population of the earth. Likewise, it is important because a peaceful China following its high ethical principles has always been, and can increasingly become, a force for peaceful civilized exchange between nations. The Chinese tradition and philosophy is that of productive peace.

Korea's importance materially is less obvious, but of no less moral responsibility on our part. It is by our connivance that today Korea is cut into two parts, with the majority of the population in our area, and the bulk of its industries, mineral deposits, and food production separated artificially under Soviet "closed economic policy" from its proper contribution to the peace and welfare of the Korean nation.

At this moment the Iranian problem is most acute, and the attention of this House and of Americans should be called to it, not only for what it means in the loss of oil reserves, but as a pattern which we are likely to see repeated over and over again, so long as our foreign policy remains not unduly exacting instead of being based on principles which we mean to uphold.

The following dispatches from the New York Times of November 20 give a general outline of the situation in Iran:

IRAN RUSHES FORCE TO TROUBLED ZONE—GOVERNMENT FEARS RUSSIANS IN AZERBAIJAN WILL BAR TROOPS SENT TO QUELL REVOLT—MOSCOW SILENT ON LINK—TEHRAN PAPERS COMPLAIN OF NEGLECT BY ALLIES—DECLARE PEOPLE OF PROVINCE LOYAL

TEHRAN, IRAN, November 19.—Iranian troops were rushed tonight to Soviet-garrisoned Azerbaijan Province, scene of armed outbreaks, despite uncertainty whether the Russians would permit them to enter the trouble zone, where seven persons were reported killed.

On previous occasions Iranian forces dispatched to the north had been turned back and Iranians reported that Soviet forces had prohibited the government from sending gendarme reinforcements into the Province.

Parliament decided, however, in a special session to send two battalions to try to halt armed members of the Separatist Democratic Party reported advancing down the 230-mile railway from Mianeh to Tehran. (The Democratic Party is the former Tuden party, led by Communists.)

(In Moscow there was no comment of the Iranian rising. Reports that the rebels were being supplied with weapons by the Russians are being officially called to the attention of Soviet authorities, Moscow diplomatic quarters said.)

Iranian concern was increased tonight by a Government spokesman's assertion that rifles and machine guns were distributed to the Separatists from trucks bearing Russian Army insignia.

Tehran newspapers said editorially that the patriotism of Azerbaijan citizens was well known and asserted the rebels were recently immigrated strangers wearing military boots and trousers, with civilian jackets and hats.

One editorial complained that "certain enemies of this war have been better treated than Iran, which has been a faithful ally, one that made her roads and communications available for the aid of Russia."

With all communication with Azerbaijan, northwesternmost province of Iran, severed, there has been no news of the rising since last night's statement by a Government spokesman that members of the Separatist movement had occupied Mianeh and were marching toward the capital.

The spokesman said that the dead included an Iranian gendarme captain, 4 soldiers, and 2 railway station employees. Three towns with Iranian garrisons were reported to have been isolated in 2 days of fighting, which was said to be threatening Zenjan and Kazvin, respectively 165 and 80 miles northwest of Tehran.

The newly nominated Governor of Azerbaijan was scheduled to leave by plane today for Tabriz, main city of the province.

IRAN ENVOY BLAMES SOVIET FOR REVOLT IN CALL ON BYRNES—RISING WAS "ENGINEERED," HE SAYS, CHARGING FOREIGN TROOPS IN COUNTRY FOMENT DISCORD—SECRETARY SEES TRUMAN—TROUBLE IN AZERBAIJAN, LONG EXPECTED, MAY FOCUS ISSUE BETWEEN BIG THREE ON OIL

(By W. H. Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, November 19.—An indirect charge that the revolt in the Iranian province of Azerbaijan had "most certainly" been "engineered" by the Soviet Union was made today at the State Department by Hussein Ala, Iran's new Ambassador to the United States, who conferred for the first time with Secretary of State James F. Byrnes.

Mr. Byrnes, who saw President Truman later to discuss a wide range of "important" foreign policy questions, confirmed that he and the Iranian envoy had touched on the rising in that country but declined comment in the absence of official and detailed information. He said that he had not talked with the President about it.

The revolt was no surprise to Washington officials who had long feared trouble in that part of Iran because of the Soviet Union's desire for important oil concessions and the Iranian Government's persistent refusal to grant them.

DEPARTURE SET FOR MARCH 2

That area has been garrisoned by Soviet troops since 1941 to protect the lend-lease supply line from the Persian Gulf to the Soviet Union. Red army troops, under recent agreements, are scheduled to leave March 2.

Asserting that his country had been the bridge to victory over which moved American arms and supplies that enabled Russia to defeat Germany, the Ambassador declared:

"This so-called revolution or separatist movement doesn't in the least represent the feeling of the people. It is not spontaneous. It was most certainly engineered. We have tried our utmost to have friendly relations

with our powerful neighbor to the north and have shown the greatest forbearance in our dealings with them."

He said his government had been apprehensive all along of some such development because of the continued presence of foreign troops on Iranian soil, even after the victory over Germany and the cessation of lend-lease shipments to Russia.

GUARDING BORDER HELD DIFFICULT

He added that the presence of foreign garrison troops "aggravated disruptive influences" and made it difficult, if not impossible, for the Government to maintain order and keep a close watch on the frontier to prevent infiltration from the Caucasus.

If the indirect Iranian charge that the Russians have assisted this revolt are borne out, it will constitute a major diplomatic issue between the Soviet Union on the one hand and Britain and the United States on the other. The three countries are rivals for oil and other economic concessions in Iran, but all are bound by terms of the Tehran declaration, signed by President Roosevelt, Premier Stalin, and former Prime Minister Churchill, to respect the territorial sovereignty and independence of Iran.

The dispute has been brewing since September 1945, when the Soviet Government dispatched a mission to Tehran to demand oil concessions although the Iranian Government had already decided to take no action on further concessions until after the war. Iran refused to change that decision and the Rusisans became angry, so that the government of Premier Mohammed Said Maraghei toppled. His successor, backed by the British and United States Governments, also refused to bow to Russian demands.

LONDON PROTEST UNLIKELY

LONDON, November 19.—The British Government received today confirmation of an outbreak against the Iranian Government in the Russian-occupied zone. It is understood that this is not thought to warrant a British protest to the Soviet Government for permitting a separatist movement in its zone.

No protest has been received from Iran's Government, nor has a request been made by Iran for Britain to intercede. Iranian circles here believe that their Government may appeal to the United States, however.

A point raised by an Iranian spokesman in London is whether Russian authorities are interfering with security arrangement of the Government and preventing Iranian police and military from dealing with the outbreak.

The Iranian spokesman asserted that because his country had 120,000 troops under arms, about 300 aircraft, and a number of tanks, the Government would be competent to deal with the outbreak if it had the opportunity.

It is understood that the authoritative British view is that under the British-Soviet-Iranian Treaty the British Government would consider it wrong to interfere in the operation of Iranian troops under Government orders.

Official Iranian circles here emphatically denied that there could be any real connection between the Azerbaijan people of Iran and the Soviet Union. They assert that the Soviet Azerbaijan Republic, though using a similar language, is distinct in culture and background. Its two parts have never been joined. Iranians add that Soviet Azerbaijan was so named by Enver Pasha when this territory was still Turkish before the 1914 war, but that there was no real justification for his doing so.

The situation is being closely followed in political circles, particularly since northern Iran adjoins the area of the Kurdish revolt of northern Iraq. This was reported to be spreading into Turkish territory, less than 100 miles from the rich oil fields of Mosul.

CRISIS FOR IRAN FEARED

CAIRO, Egypt, November 19.—The outbreak in Azerbaijan caused no surprise in Cairo today because an independence movement under Soviet auspices had been expected any day. Iranians here regarded the revolt as a supreme crisis for their country. They blamed the Soviet Union for it.

It is generally agreed that the Iranian Government alone is powerless to check the revolt.

Official quarters had no information on the course of events beyond that in news dispatches. There were no reports that the rising had affected British or United States troops in Iran. The American forces are concentrated about a supply base and an airfield in the south, and only a few detachments are protecting American property strung throughout the country as far north as Tehran.

Neither the British nor the Americans ever had forces in the province where the outbreak occurred; in fact, Azerbaijan had been barred to them by the Red Army and, according to Iranian complaints, to Iranian officials as well.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post, last week, published an editorial which indicates that our failure to be firm and exacting in decisions made according to our principles has encouraged Soviet Russia to embark in Iran on a policy of interference in that country which may lead to war in the Orient:

TROUBLE IN IRAN

At the close of the Tehran Conference on December 1, 1943, the late President Roosevelt, Marshal Stalin, and Prime Minister Winston Churchill issued a joint statement concerning Iran which has a rather melancholy interest in view of developments now taking place in that country. The three powers, said the statement, "are at one with the Government of Iran in their desire for the maintenance of the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Iran." Together with the pledge given earlier by Russia and Great Britain that their troops would be withdrawn from that country as soon as the war emergency had come to an end, this meant, if it meant anything at all, that the Big Three proposed to pursue a hands-off policy toward Iran in the postwar period.

That policy is already an actuality so far as the United States is concerned. The former Persian Gulf command, which rendered such valiant service in moving lend-lease supplies into Russia, has now passed into history. Great Britain, too, has shown a disposition to restore the status quo ante in Iran, although she hesitates to recall her entire garrison until the Russians have done so. But there is so far no indication that the Soviet Government is prepared to carry out promptly and in full the pledges it made with respect to Iran. On the contrary, many signs point to the possibility that now, as in czarist days, Russia aims to make Iran, particularly northern Iran, a Russian sphere of influence. Certainly it is more than a coincidence that at this particular juncture when all the way from the Adriatic to the China Sea, relations between Russia and her wartime partners are strained, an armed uprising by the ominously named Separatist Democratic Party has broken out in the Russian-garrisoned area in Iran.

It is difficult to avoid the suspicion that this uprising, if not started by the Russians, which is certainly not unlikely, was at least encouraged by them. Nor can the possibility be discounted that the development cloaks a Russian attempt to extend her sovereignty over a section of Iran, or at least to establish there a regime similar to the governments that Russia set up in areas adjoining European Russia. Certainly thus far Russia has shown no particular inclination to permit Iran to reestablish her independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity.

Southern California Scientists Declare Almost Any Sacrifice To Bring About International Peace Is Justified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I asked unanimous consent because of its extreme importance to insert here with my remarks the statement of a number of southern California scientists connected with the California Institute of Technology and other institutions concerning the control of atomic energy. Their statement is quoted in part in the following article which appeared in the Los Angeles Daily News:

SOUTHLAND SCIENTISTS WARN OF ATOMIC ENERGY'S FEARFUL THREAT

The awesome responsibility of humankind to itself in exploitation of atomic energy on planet Earth received definition today in an open letter bearing the signature of 192 leading southern California savants.

It was addressed to President Truman and to Congress.

"We pledge support to an all-out effort in the cause of international cooperation," promised the scientists, technicians, chemists, physicists, and teachers—and added the following solemn warning:

"Almost any sacrifice to bring about international responsibility is justified."

The scientists, most of whom are on the faculty at the California Institute of Technology, are now active in almost every field of research.

A group of them were drafted for the research and other laboratory activity that resulted in the creation of the atomic bomb which rocked New Mexico, obliterated Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The letter follows, in part:

"We, the undersigned, address you in our capacity as private citizens concerned about the future of our country and of civilization itself if faced with another war.

"We believe that World War II has demonstrated with fearful clarity the urgency of intellectual, informed, persistent, and sacrificial effort by all nations to prevent the occurrence of a still greater catastrophe.

"We believe that scientific facts cannot be kept secret for long, and that other nations will discover how to make atomic bombs within a few years.

"Unless that short time is used to establish international control, an armament race may ensue with results even more disastrous than they have been in the past.

"We believe, therefore, that the United States should take the lead in negotiations seeking to establish this international control with its appropriate inspection procedures.

"The first step is national control. Immediate action is necessary. Therefore a national commission should be set up immediately to execute this control.

"We believe that additional functions of this commission should be to advise in the

formulation of policies and procedures for international control and to protect and foster scientific research on atomic energy and its utilization for nonmilitary purposes in order that the achievement of nuclear fission may provide a boon to mankind instead of a menace to civilization."

The letter added that the composition of the proposed commission was of utmost importance, should be chosen from science, industry, government, with science heavily represented.

"We believe moreover, that the personnel of the commission should represent in knowledge, integrity, and ability the best that is available without regard to political affiliation or political position."

Speaking directly to the President and Congress, the scientists and intellectual leaders said:

"We believe that you, truly representing the desires of the American people, are exerting yourselves to the utmost in the cause of a new world order of international cooperation in which the menace and fear of war will be eliminated. To this end we pledge our support.

"We believe that you will not fail us. You will not fail a world which is looking to you for courageous leadership."

Signers of the historic letter, which may well serve as the basis for policies covering national as well as international control of nuclear fission, were:

Walter S. Adams, director of the Mount Wilson Observatory; C. D. Anderson, professor of physics; Fern Ansorge, research assistant; Harold D. Babcock, astronomer; Horace W. Babcock, research staff member; Richard M. Badger, professor of chemistry; John E. Barber, associate at Caltech and steel executive; Z. J. Barnett, research assistant at Caltech and professor emeritus, UCLA; Edward C. Barrett, comptroller, Caltech; Roland Baughman, associate curator, Huntington library; Virginia Baygulow, librarian; E. T. Bell, professor, mathematics, Caltech; Solange Berczeller, research, biology, Caltech; Henry D. Blankenship, radio technolcgist, Caltech; Carey S. Bliss, supervisor, Huntington library, Walter D. Bonner, Jr., biology, Caltech; H. Borsook, professor, biochemistry, Caltech; Dorothy Bowen, assistant, Huntington library; I. S. Bowen, professor, physics, Caltech; Paul Bowman, professor, languages, Caltech; Anthony Briglio, Jr., research, chemistry, Caltech; Stanley C. Burket, research, chemistry, Caltech; Margaret L. Campbell, research, biology, Caltech; Barbara Chase, secretary, Caltech; Donald S. Clark, professor, engineering, Caltech; Robert Clelland, research, Huntington Library; Anthony L. Cohen, researeh, biology, Caltech; Richard Cohen, physicist, Caltech; David S. Collins, research, Caltech; Dorothy Ceone, research, biology, Caltech; Stanley Corrsin, research, aeronautics, Caltech; Hardin Craig, Jr., professor, history, Caltech; Howard Hugh Crawford, physiology, Caltech; Norma B. Cuthbert, manuscript cataloger, Caltech; James W. Bailey, instructor, engineering, Caltech; William H. Davenport, professor, English, USC and Caltech; Godfrey Davies, research, Huntington Library; Leverett Davis, Jr., research, Caltech; A. O. Bekker, research, chemistry, Caltech; J. A. Dubuff, research, biology, Caltech; Jesse W. M. Du Mond, professor, physics, Caltech; Harvey Eagleson, professor, English, Caltech; Garford G. Gordon, physics teacher; Hermoine Grant, research, biology, Caltech; H. M. Greene, Jr., scientist, Caltech; A. G. Haagerford, professor, biorganic chemistry, Caltech; A. Van Harrevold, professor, physiology, Caltech; P. Hayward, research, chemistry, Caltech; A. Hollander, professor, engineering, Caltech; Mark Holzman, radio engineer, Caltech; Milton L. Humason, astronomer, Mount Wilson; J. Stanley Johnson, alumnus, Caltech, and manufacturing executive; Louis W. Jones, professor, English, registrar, Caltech; Alfred H. Joy, astronomer, Mount Wilson; C. K. Judy, professor, English and literature, Caltech; George Henry Keighley, instructor physiology, Caltech; Edith Koltz, research, Huntington library; Robert T. Knapp, professor, engineering, Caltech; Walden H. Kunz, research, Caltech; J. Malcolm Miller, research, chemistry, Caltech; Clark B. Millikan, professor, aeronautics, Caltech; Robert A. Millikan, emeritus professor, physics, Caltech; Lillian V. Morgan, biologist, Caltech; Thomas H. Morgan, emeritus professor, biology, Caltech; William B. Munro, emeritus professor, history and government, Caltech; Kenneth R. Mussen, radio technologist, Caltech; R. R. Martel, professor, engineering, Caltech; H. Victor Neher, professor, physics, Caltech; Seth B. Nicholson, astronomer, Mount Wilson Observatory; W. D. Nickerson, accounting expert, Caltech; Carl Niemann, professor, organic chemistry, Caltech; Esther Novitski, technician, Caltech; Haydee Noya,. cataloger, Huntington library; Richard M. Noyes, research, chemistry, Caltech; Ruth Oliver, cataloger, Huntington library; G. A.. Oppenheimer, research, biology, Caltech; J. R. Oppenheimer, professor, theoretical physics, Caltech; Ernest E. Seckler, professor, airplane structures, Caltech; Robert W. Schad, curator, Huntington library; Edward Philip Sheridan, instructor, English, Caltech; David R. Shoemaker, research, chemistry, Caltech; Nathan R. Silk, research, Caltech; Richard C. Sill, research, jet propulsion, Caltech; Royal W. Sorensen, professor electrical engineering, Caltech; Conway W. Snyder, research physics, Caltech; Roger Stanton, professor, English, Caltech; J. Wallace Sterling, professor, history, Caltech; H. J. Steward, professor, aeronautics, Caltech; Robert I. Stirton, alumnus, Caltech, executive, research corporation; Chester Stock, professor, paleontology, Caltech; W. R. Stott, comptroller, Caltech; Gustaf Stromberg, astronomer, Mount Wilsqn Observatory; Foster Strong, professor, physics, Caltech; A. H. Sturtevant, professor, genetics, Gertrude Mae Wilson, research, Caltech; Ralph E. Wilson, astronomer, Mount Wilson Observatory; R. N. Wimpress, research, chemical engineering, Caltech; Ralph E. Winger, research staff, Caltech; O. O. Wintler, research, Huntington library; Doris Marion Wright, cataloger, Huntington library; Ernest B. Wright, research physiology, Caltech; Louis B. Wright, research Huntington library; Don M. Yost, professor, inorganic chemistry, Caltech; H. A. Bateman, professor, mathematics, theoretical physics and aeronautics, Caltech; Edward Maxwell, research, Caltech; R. L. Daugherty, professor, engineering, Caltech; Robert P. Dilworth, professor, mathematics, Caltech; R. Von Huene, geologist, Caltech; Spiro Kyropoulos, research, Caltech; John F. Lance, geologist, Caltech; Frank J. Malina, professor, aeronautics, Caltech; S. V. Martner, geophysics technologist, Caltech; Sterling Emerson, professor, genetics, Caltech; Mary R. Emerson, research, biology, Caltech; Paul S. Epstein, professor, theoretical physics, Caltech; Ruth E. Estey, technician, Caltech; John Farquhar, biologist, Caltech; George Feigen, research, chemistry, Caltech; Mario Ferry, professor, biology, Caltech; Joseph Foladare, professor, English, University of California, Los Angeles, and research, Caltech; James W. Follis, Jr., research, Caltech; Conrad Fong, biologist, Caltech; William Fowler, professor, physics, Caltech; Josephine Glarst, medical instructor, University of Southern California; Edwin F. Gay, research chairman, Huntington library; Horace N. Gilbert, professor, economics, Caltech; Theodore S. Gilman, research, chemistry, Caltech; Joe R. Goodman, chemist, Caltech; P. Kyropoulos, instructor, engineering, Caltech; William N. Lacey, professor, chemical engineering, Caltech; Graham Laing, professor, economics, Caltech; R. C. Lauritsen, professor, physics, Caltech; Thomas Lauritsen, research, Caltech; M. B. Lewis, accountant, Caltech.

Thanksgiving and Dedication Service at Washington Cathedral

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 26 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon a service of thanksgiving and dedication for the community of the Nation's Capital was held at the Washington Cathedral. It was sponsored by the Washington Board of Trade, in cooperation with the Washington Federation of Churches and the Washington Cathedral.

The sermon was delivered by Rev. Oscar F. Blackwelder, D. D., and the address entitled "Thanksgiving—A Dedication," was given by our fellow Senator the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

In addition to those before mentioned, participants in this service were Rev. Carroll C. Roberts, D. D., president of the Washington Federation of Churches and pastor of the Ninth Street Christian Church; Rev. L. Ralph Tabor, chairman of the public meetings committee of the federation and pastor of the Luther Place Memorial Church; Rev. John F. McClelland, pastor of the Silver Spring Congregational Church; Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, minister of the Washington Hebrew Congregation; and Very Rev. John W. Suter, D. D., dean of the cathedral.

I ask, Mr. President, that the address delivered by the Senator from Wisconsin be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This Thanksgiving season of 1945 is one of special significance and inspiration for all of us.

The guns of war have ceased firing. The foes of freedom have been vanquished. The labor of reconstruction has begun. Unfortunately, there are still clouds of strife in many quarters of the world, particularly in Asia. And in our own land there is still some disharmony and disagreement. Yet these discordant conditions only serve to spur us on to their solution, when we consider all the things for which we are grateful.

You remember those lovely verses from the Book of Psalms:

"It is a good thing to give thanks unto the Lord, and to sing praises unto Thy name, O most high; to show forth Thy loving kindness in the morning, and Thy faithfulness every night."

These beautiful words have been known and lived through countless generations by good men and women. Now, another season of Thanksgiving has come, and the verses shine forth with greater meaning than ever before to the people of America. It was Browning who said: "Life has meaning, and to find its meaning is my meat and drink." Through the manifestation of gratitude, life's meaning becomes more apparent.

This new atomic age offers great challenges to us. But it also offers so many opportunities for constructive living, for dynamic action, that we may well offer up our thanks to our Creator and say from the depths of our hearts: "We are grateful to be alive."

Now, just what specifically should we be thankful for? We can note at least six cate-

gories in which every American can count his blessings:

1. The horror of war has come to an end. The world has another chance. Our boys are coming home. Families are being reunited. Sweethearts are joining one another and they are planning their union. There is a boom in babies. This year we are going to welcome 2,800,000 new-born Americans into our fold. In 1933, only 2,000,000 babies were born in this country. We are grateful that these young citizens will enter an America at peace.

And so for this first reason, for an earth above which the dove of peace now flies, we are duly thankful—to our allies, to our men and women of the services, to our home front that went into unified action, and to our God who blessed our efforts.

2. Let us now turn to the second reason why we are grateful. It is that the America for which our boys fought and sacrificed is still the America of old, with all its spiritual blessings, and freedoms intact.

Yes, all of the great freedoms and liberties known to our people in the past are still our cherished possessions.

The first Thanksgiving was, as we all know, celebrated by the Pilgrim fathers. They came to these blessed shores in order that they might worship their Creator according to the dictates of their own conscience. They found freedom of worship here, and now, over three centuries later, freedom of worship still prevails.

Other millions followed in the Pilgrims' wake, some seeking adventure, some seeking release from the thralldom of serfdom—political and economic, some seeking freedoms of speech and press. All found here a land overflowing with opportunities to satisfy their heart's desire.

Here a man's home has always been his castle. Here public officials are the servants, not the masters, of the public. Here the humblest citizen can aspire to the highest office in the land if he has been born on this soil. Here a man is entitled to a trial by a jury of his peers.

For all this we humbly give thanks.

3. The third reason for which we are grateful is that our land still abounds in material blessings.

We are now turning our magnificent production toward peace. The autos, the refrigerators, the washing machines, the new plastic products, for which we have waited so long, will soon be a reality. American common sense will see to that. Yes, our land abounds in material blessings unmatched anywhere else on earth.

America has only 7 percent of the world's population (140,000,000 people out of a world total of 2,000,000,000). It has only 6 percent of the world's land surface (3,000,000 out of a total of 51,000,000 square miles).

Yet we possessed even before the war—

Seventy-one percent of the world's automobiles; 59 percent of the world's telephones; 52 percent of the radio sets; 31 percent of the world's railroad mileage. We drink 55 percent of all the coffee consumed in the world; roll on 63 percent of the petroleum, and 66 percent of the rubber; and used 75 percent of all the silk in the world.

Twenty-six million of our children normally attend school. We have over 900 radio stations and 20,000 motion picture theaters, and countless other material blessings.

We know it was our skillful workmen, the ability of American brains and the resourcefulness of our industrial system, plus the political system under the Republic, that gave us our high standard of living. We are grateful that these material blessings are ours in this hour to share with those in need—feeding the hungry and clothing the naked in Europe, aiding other nations to restore their economy.

And so, for all our material blessings and opportunities to serve mankind, we offer up our thanks to our God.

4. The fourth reason for our gratitude is that the peoples of the earth are on the march toward a just and enduring peace. Our people have learned the lesson of Pearl Harbor—America must be constantly alert, on guard, and equal to any emergency.

The United Nations Charter has just been ratified by the number of nations necessary to make that document legal and binding. Soon the United Nations Organization will inaugurate its opening session. Soon we hope to see a vitalized new league go into action to iron out the postwar difficulties and usher in "the thousand years of peace." The world is aware of its need for teamwork among the nations; the establishment of wise and just relations among the nations; the cultivation of sympathy, understanding, tolerance, helpfulness, and good will among the nations; but this awareness, to be effective, must be translated into action. That is the job for each of us. Actions—deeds—speak louder than words. The Golden Rule put into action by individuals and nations casts out fear and distrust and establishes good will. It is the omnipotent panacea for the ills of mankind.

For all the steps which have gone before in bringing this new league into being, for all the spiritual forces that make for the unity of the nations, for all Thy goodness, Lord, we are grateful.

5. The fifth reason for gratitude is that America is resolutely facing her postwar problems.

We have difficulties with regard to labor and management, with regard to Government, with regard to insuring the welfare of America's agriculture and of American free enterprise.

But I am convinced that we will be adequate to solve all these problems. Our people face the future with their traditional confidence, faith, and hope. A nation which could defeat some of the most powerful aggressors ever seen on the face of the earth can solve its domestic problems, which by comparison seem puny.

For the confidence and adequacy of America, for its hope and its faith in this hour, we are duly thankful.

6. The sixth reason why we are grateful is that men in increasing numbers are becoming aware of the abundant life of spiritual living. Political and physical freedom alone do not satisfy. Men are seeking the larger liberation, which is the inheritance of the children of God. Jesus spake of the truth that makes free. When the race has absorbed the truth He taught, the way for peace will be found.

Ralph Cushman has written:

"I met God in the morning,
When my day was at its best;
And His Presence came like sunrise
With a glory in my breast.

"All day long the Presence lingered,
All day long He stayed with me;
And we sailed in perfect calmness
O'er a very troubled sea.

"So I think I know the secret
Learned from many a troubled way;
You must seek Him in the morning,
If you want Him through the day."

For the awakened spiritual interest, for the kindlier approach, for the more tolerant attitude, for the restless seething within men to know the truth, which blots out all fear and hate and sin—for all this we give thanks.

These, then, are six reasons, among countless others, for our gratitude unto God—for peace, for the American Republic intact, for spiritual blessings, for material blessings, for world cooperation, for American adequacy.

There are so many other things for which we can offer up thanksgiving at this time—for sunset and sunrise, for happy homes, unseared cities and countryside, for the beauties of the day and night, for loyal friends, for the companionship of great minds, for the devotion of loved ones and the new challenges of each new day, for a land in which we can enjoy all of these, and more—a land around which "the everlasting arms of our Maker" will be found, guarding and guiding this people.

Therefore, all of us are joined in offering up a fervent thanksgiving. Next year we are certain that we will have even more things for which to be grateful. Next year, some of the constructive possibilities of the atomic age, which we at this time can only glimpse, will have come into fruition.

This indeed is a thanksgiving season of which we dreamed fondly during the years of war.

This is a thanksgiving season which we shall remember in time to come. For we will say then, that in the year 1945, America stood on the threshold of an even greater future than the great past she has already had.

And so with gratitude in our hearts, let us here dedicate ourselves to the unfinished task—the accomplishment of reconstruction; of reconversion; of full production; the square deal for labor and management and the public; the eradication of ill will, mistrust, and misunderstanding, at home and abroad.

Thus will we of this generation manifest our gratitude in action and make our contribution to world order and peace. Thus only will we measure up to our responsibility and earn the gratitude of those who come after us.

Remuneration of the President of the United States

REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the sheriff of Knox County, Tenn., my home county, and the city manager of Knoxville, my home, each receive a larger net salary than the President realizes out of his salary of $75,000 per year. Hundreds of county and city officials in this country each receive for their services larger net salaries than the President realizes out of his.

Former Senator A. B. "Happy" Chandler and Eric Johnston, czars, respectively, of organized baseball and of the movie industry, are each paid much larger net salaries than the President of this great country.

The Chief Executive of the greatest and richest nation on earth should not be forced to work for nothing and board himself.

The Presidential office is a man-killing job. There is only one living ex-President. The President must stand silent and expend virtually the whole of his salary for upkeep of the White House and the payment of income taxes. Congress is the only body that can remedy this gross mistreatment of the President. As a Member of this body I am ready and anxious to remedy this injustice and to do it now.

The salary of the Chief Executive should be commensurate with the power, the responsibility, and the dignity of this high office. I am for economy in government, but am opposed to a penny-pinching policy in the treatment of the President.

I include as a part of these remarks an article on the President's inadequate compensation appearing in the December 1 issue of Collier's, written by Jonathan Daniels:

THAT POOR MAN IN THE WHITE HOUSE

(By Jonathan Daniels)

The poorest-paid man in the United States is the gentleman who lives at the request of the American people in their big house at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington.

The President of the United States does not look poor. He is not chosen to play philanthropist. But so far as the pay he gets from the people of the United States is concerned, he is both.

President Truman has not complained about it. He won't ask for more money for himself. In his last report to Congress he said that Members of Congress ought to be raised from $10,000 to $20,000 a year, but the fact is that Congressmen, even at $10,000 per year, are well off in comparison with the President.

Unfortunately for Presidents, they are not merely men but institutions. They have to live in that big White House. They move in grandeur, not as men but as America. They personify the pomp and the glory of a great Nation. They are provided with a mansion and doctors, aides, servants, gardeners—almost everything except enough cash to meet their bills.

They get what sounds like the grand salary of $75,000 a year and some opulent-looking funds for travel and official entertainment. The only trouble is that what the American people pay their President and what they expect of him, in terms of his living standards as their Chief Executive, do not meet—or meet only by a miracle.

No President of the United States has had a pay increase since March 4, 1909. And the last President known to have voiced satisfaction in the pay was William Howard Taft, who got the raise. He was almost lyric about it when he wrote the incoming Woodrow Wilson in 1913:

"You will find that Congress is very generous to the President. You have all your transportation paid for, and all servants in the White House except such valet and maid as you and Mrs. Wilson choose to employ. Music for all your entertainments by the Marine Band, or some other band, is always at hand. Provision is made by which when you leave in the summer you may at Government expense take such of the household as you need to your summer home, and the expense of their traveling and living is met under the appropriation. Your laundry is looked after in the White House, both when you are here and when you are away.

"Altogether, you can calculate that your expenses are only those of furnishing food to a large boarding house of servants and to your family, and your own personal expenses of clothing, etc. This, of course, makes the salary of $75,000 with $25,000 for traveling expenses very much more than is generally supposed. I have been able to save from my 4 years about $100,000."

Americans have no wish to be stingy with their Presidents. Most of them are under the impression that they are paying the man well for his work. Unfortunately, that "large boarding house" is still there, but the $100,000 saving has gone forever. It is at least as dead as Taft.

DISTAFF SIDE KNOWS THE FACTS

Mr. Taft's successors have expressed a good deal less enthusiasm. Their wives have occasionally indicated an entire lack of rejoicing about the pay. Mrs. Woodrow Wilson, as she left the White House, was happy that her husband planned to go into law practice, because it would keep him in the stream of active affairs and also because "there were some unpaid bills." Mrs. Franklin Roosevelt rather tartly answered a citizen who suggested that one way to get rich was to get to be President.

"I know that as far as my husband is concerned," she said, "he has spent in fulfilling the obligations of his office as President somewhat more than his salary."

If President Truman were able to buy his groceries and other necessities as cheaply as President Taft could from 1909 to 1913, and if he were able to save at the same rate, the best he could do would be to leave the White House $100,000 in debt. For Harry S. Truman will have to pay in a 4-year term nearly $200,000 in State and Federal taxes which did not exist when Taft counted his luck and his thrift.

The President is just as liable to the tax laws as anybody else and his returns are just as secret. A man with a net income of $75,000 with a wife and one other dependent is due to pay a tax of $46,770. The President may have some other deductions. But experts figure that out of his $75,000 salary he probably has to pay around $46,000 to the Federal Government and another $1,000 or so to the State of Missouri. Take $47,000 from $75,000 and that leaves $28,000—still a tidy sum. Unfortunately, however, it is not quite left intact.

The President receives a fund from Congress of $30,000 a year for travel and official entertainment. Official entertaining, however, is a small part of the entertaining he must inevitably do. Presidents before Truman have found that their personal expenses in the White House have amounted to around $2,000 a month—with, say a couple of thousand more at Christmastime for presents to the staff—usually pictures, books, and the like. That would amount to about $25,000 a year, which would theoretically leave $3,000, after taxes and household expenses, for all other Presidential needs and savings.

The big expense item is that "large boarding house" about which even the enthusiastic President Taft spoke. In the last days of the Roosevelt administration there were 31 servants on the White House staff. Their wages were paid by the Government, but the President had to feed them 93 meals a day, which added up to well over 2,000 means a month—counting days off. This does not include any meals for the President, his family, or a single guest. That seems not only a lot of food but also a lot of servants today. But the White House is a lot of house.

THE FORCE BEHIND FORMALITY

All visitors are attended with a nice combination of vigilance and formality. Three thousand square feet of hardwood floor must be kept polished in the East Room alone. In the great chandeliers in the state chambers there are 5,000 pieces of crystal which must be polished by hand. Just making up the huge Lincoln bed must be a job for more than 1 maid, and a household staff of 31 people requires a lot of care. Sometimes, strangely, in recent years the White House problem has seemed to be too little instead of too much help on those inevitable and recurring elaborate occasions when extra servants have to be brought in.

Nevertheless, under the Trumans, the number of servants was reduced last summer from 31 to 24. And there has been some experimenting with a plan by which servants eat fewer meals at the White House.

All White House visitors come by appointment, but every day she is in the residence a First Lady probably sees at least as many people as the President sees in his office. They will not only be callers. There must be teas and luncheons, their number dictated not only by the inclinations of the President's wife but by inescapable responsibility. Some visitors will be official; the Government will pay the cost of entertaining them. Others, almost equally inescapable, will be personal as far as payment goes, though Mrs. Truman would personally never have even contemplated such entertaining when she lived in servantless simplicity on Connecticut Avenue. There are Democratic women, newspaperwomen, senatorial, and Cabinet wives. There are the ladies of good causes.

Fortunately for Mrs. Truman, the Government provides a housekeeper, a secretary, and a social secretary, and such other staff as is necessary to her in doing her big, entirely unpaid and, often from the entertaining standpoint, unofficial job.

Unavoidably, a good many White House visitors come to eat. Hoover and Roosevelt rarely dined without a few or many guests. The elaborateness of the food depends on who is to eat it. Indeed, because of the number of guests and servants who eat there, the White House was classified under OPA regulations as an "institution"—a designation which served as a constant source of amusement to President Truman's predecessor.

There are, of course, many details of White House housekeeping divided between the President and the people by two sets of bookkeeping. When a King and Queen, a Governor General of Canada, a Prime Minister, a Regent of Iraq come visiting, the Nation entertains them and pays the bill. The Government furnishes the gas and the electricity. The Government mows the lawns and maintains the house and grounds. (Truman does not have to feed gardeners). The Government pays for the laundering of sheets, pillowcases, towels and table linens, and for the cleaning of drapes and spreads.

The Trumans pay for their own personal laundry and cleaning. Books and magazines are no expense. The Government provides the White House staff (including the President) with daily papers. Periodicals come in a flood. At regular periods the book publishers of America present the White House with copies of the best American books.

Clothes are a personal matter. Americans do not expect their President to be a dandy. But Mrs. Truman and Mary Margaret are undoubtedly going to have a good many more clothes than hung in the closets of their Connecticut Avenue apartment.

REQUESTS GREATER THAN RECEIPTS

The President is expected to set an example in buying war bonds. A man with no fortune to leave his family must be concerned with insurance. The Democratic Party will be interested in a contribution; and the appeals from charities, the invitations to join organizations and pay dues, the personal appeals, are overwhelming. A President could give away his salary very easily if he responded as requested to almost any week's mail. There was a personally richer President than Truman recently who sometimes complained that he didn't have a dime.

Roosevelt, Hoover, Harding all had some private means. Coolidge made a Presidential profession of being thrifty. Wilson's second wife was wealthy. President Truman has made it clear that he has no private fortune.

The Trumans may be able to do better with the pay than other Presidents have been able to do. President Truman has a smaller family than any other President except Harding has had in this century. He hopes, it is said, to feed his "large boarding house" and pay his other personal expenses in connection with the White House for $12,000 to $15,000 a year. If he does, it will be by the most rigid economy. It will also be well under the $25,000 it has cost recent Presidents.

President Truman's hopes are for the future. They are hopes which run against past Presidential experience which would make his situation look like this:

Salary	$75,000
Federal taxes	46,000
White House expenses over and above those met by the Government	25,000
State taxes	1,000
	72,000
Left for other personal expenses, and savings	3,000

It is a great job—the greatest job on earth. But from the pay standpoint, the President only gets the privilege of handling a nice chunk of money in order that he may pay back practically all of it to the American people in taxes and for living in their big White House behind the clipped green lawn and the high iron fence.

The Christian Century Asks: Shall the Church Become an Accessory to Murder?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article from the November 28, 1945, issue of the Christian Century. The article follows:

SHALL THE CHURCH BECOME AN ACCESSORY TO MURDER?

Silent concurrence by the churches in murder by starvation makes the church an accessory to the crime. As a result of the Potsdam decisions, millions of Germans are starving now. Before the winter is over, five times as many Germans will die as died in the recent war, according to Bishop Dibelius of Berlin. By no stretch of the imagination can these doomed babies, their mothers, and the aged be called war criminals. They have had no trial. What is happening to them is therefore not retributive justice, but murder.

Is the church to remain silent while wholesale murder by starvation is committed? An individual who knows that a crime is being committed and who does not communicate that knowledge or go to the aid of the person in peril is held legally responsible for his silence. He is held to be an accessory to the crime. Will history try and condemn the Christian church as an accessory to the infamy of Potsdam? It will and should do so unless the churches cry out in the name of the compassionate Christ against this high crime against humanity. It will and should do so unless the churches immediately mobilize all their resources to aid this part of the world Christian community.

This aid can be given. It can be given by telling as much of the truth as the churches have been permitted to learn. It can be given by immediate, concerted, and large-scale efforts to breach the wall of silence which is raised by Potsdam around the millions of dead and dying in central Europe. Public opinion in Great Britain has swung in the last 3 weeks against the Potsdam policy of mass starvation. The bishops of the Roman Catholic Church, meeting in Washington in their annual conference, have just denounced our treatment of the people of Germany, Austria, and Hungary in a spirit of vengeance. They declare that every report indicates that unless heroic measures are taken at once, millions will die from starvation and exposure during the coming winter. The feeding and clothing and sheltering of these suffering people is not a work which can be left to some future convenient date. They hold that Congress must promptly appropriate funds for this purpose and that private relief agencies must be freed to do their part. In this category they, of course, include church relief agencies.

We rejoice to hear Catholic leadership in America speaking to the Government in this unequivocal tone. How long will it be before Protestant leadership summons equal courage?

Opinion will change here if the people are given the truth. The church dare not withhold what it already knows. Its mission is to speak for humanity. It is commanded to work for forgiveness and reconciliation. If it fails in this crisis, it has not only missed an opportunity to set its record straight before history, it has also betrayed its mandate from Christ who is its head.

If every person in America should immediately start doing everything in his power to save the helpless victims of Potsdam, great numbers would die in spite of all that could be done. But the fate of even greater numbers depends upon the American people, and particularly upon the American churches. The churches are the conscience of the Nation. That conscience must now speak to President Truman. It must thunder through the quiet corridors of the Department of State. It must demand that the United States Government order the release of the 200,000 tons of Army rations which were sent to Europe for the use of soldiers who have now returned. It must demand that the ban which prevents all private agencies, including the churches, from sending food or other material relief into Germany, be immediately lifted.

In addition, the churches must use their own facilities with far greater intelligence and devotion than they have yet displayed. Nothing that is being done to aid the people in other countries of Europe should be stopped or diminished in volume. But the same church relief warehouse in New Windsor, Md., to which shoes, clothing, and blankets are being sent for France and other countries can also take care of shipments for use in Germany when the way opens. So rapidly is public opinion changing even here that it is not impossible that Washington may relent before the churches are ready to act. On the other hand, the most convincing argument that could be used to change official attitudes would be the accumulation in New Windsor of a great stock pile of lifesaving supplies ready for shipment. Every church in the country could and should take steps without delay to collect and ship to this warehouse its own sacrificial share of what is so desperately needed.

Funds for food for the starving, for shelter for the homeless millions who are freezing in the ruins of a shattered continent, for medicine and vitamins for the sick, can be sent to World Council Service, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York 10. Word has just been received in this country that the newly constituted Evangelical Church in Germany has appointed Bishop Wurm, fearless Confessional Church leader who stood out against Hitler throughout more than a decade of Nazi terror, to head a nation-wide relief organization. Every Protestant parish in Germany is united in this organization. It is already at work gathering up the pitiable crusts of bread and the clothing that Christian Germans can spare out of their poverty to help the millions of refugees who are wandering on every road in the country.

This relief organization is known to center its work for the American sector in Stuttgart, where Bishop Wurm is now located. Its headquarters for the British zone is Bielefeld. A document which has reached this paper from the director of Evangelical Church relief work for the British zone says that "the population in Bielefeld has no fuel at all." Evangelical Relief is building there and elsewhere sheds "where the frozen population will be able to get warm." The town is overrun with refugees from the East. "In our railway-station shelter, where we have every night 700 refugees and returned soldiers, we have a terrible picture of the dying of a whole nation. There is hardly a complete family. As a result of an appeal made from the pulpit we have received for these refugees and ex-prisoners of war from Russia bread and other foodstuffs, so that we have been able to give each a piece of bread and butter. It is for us a wonderful thing to see how people who themselves have insufficient food can still give from their poverty for those who are even worse off. If only we could see that the Christian churches of the world have not forgotten us." * * *

Shall this appeal fall on deaf ears? After the last war all ecumenical discussions were handicapped for years by the German church's determination to argue the question of war guilt. The recent Treysa Conference settled that question in 2 days. There the leaders of the Evangelical churches fully confessed, not only the wrongdoing of the German people but the church's own sin. They were thereafter accepted into membership in the World Council of Churches. Now it remains for the churches of other lands to demonstrate in deeds of forgiveness the restoration of ecumenical fellowship in the world-wide Church of Christ.

In what beter way could the churches of America confess our own share in the sins which led to the war than by providing out of our abundance concrete symbols of assurance that the Christians of the world have not forgotten their brothers in Germany? How could we more effectively express our faith in the reality of the ecumenical principle? In what other way can we lift ourselves from the position of being an accessory to the crime of Potsdam to our rightful place as members of the body of Christ? A statement which recently reached America from the church at Hannover says: "It is the church toward which all hope is directed now. The only general body which enjoys confidence is the church. People set their hopes on Christians within and without. Come over and help us." Shall that last hope be betrayed? American Christians will give the answer.

Control of Barbiturates

REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 26, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have asked to have inserted as part of my remarks an article appearing in the American Weekly in the Hearst papers. It describes very vividly the great danger of the use of barbiturates, not only by high-school boys and girls who take these tablets innocently thinking it is just a stimulation, but there have been suicides, there have been shootings as a result of overdoses of

these drugs. Also, unfortunately, I am told there are nervous veterans who are taking them today to excess.

Anyone can go into a drug store and purchase these barbiturates, coal-tar derivatives. Sale of these drugs has increased enormously. I am introducing a bill which would limit their use to prescription only.

(The article referred to follows:)

SLAVES OF THE DEVIL'S CAPSULES

(By Samuel Hopkins Adams)

ARTICLE I

The lady is worried. She tries to sleep. She tosses about for a little while that seems longer, and then she opens a brown glass bottle and pours out one or two brilliant red, yellow, orange, blue, or green capsules. She swallows the dose and shortly thereafter the evil demon in the little capsule takes her over, body and soul.

The lady took the pills to put her to sleep. The devilish cunning of these sleeping pills, however, is that their first effect is to destroy the lady's remembrance that she has already taken a potent dose of poison. She forgets she has taken the pill and takes some more.

When they find her dead next morning—and they are finding them dead at the rate of 10 to 20 a day all over America—an autopsy and an inquest may decide from something she said during her waking hours that the lady is a suicide and not entitled to be buried in holy ground.

The drug thus widely used is a barbiturate, a sedative. Properly employed under expert supervision, it is a valuable agent in the practice of medicine. Indiscriminately thrown open to public use, it is a threat. Fifty thousand drug stores over the length and breadth of the Nation are dispensing the various forms of this subtle drug under restrictions so loose that they count for little in the protection of the ignorant public.

"America's opium," an experienced public health official terms the little "harmless" sleeping, pills the use of which in this country is reaching such ominous proportions.

"A national menace," adds a law enforcement officer.

They are a menace because it is so easy to buy them legally; almost as easy, illegally. Now glance at some of the results.

A car goes zigzagging from side to side of a Los Angeles thoroughfare. A woman with glazed and staring eyes sits beside the wheel. The car hits the curb and luckily stops before anyone is injured. "Drunk," say the police. But there is no liquor on the woman's breath. In her pocket is found a vial containing 96 sleeping tablets. That is the answer to her wild, half-conscious ride.

A Massachusetts woman buys 200 of these pills, murders her lover, and goes to jail after ineffectually poisoning herself.

A laboratory scientist in a mountain town dopes up on a form of the drug, robs his best friend, and terrorizes the streets with a loaded revolver.

A car full of high school boys and girls go out on a "Geronimo jag" (barbiturates taken with liquor) in a borrowed car, and, when the party is over, the car is a wreck, and the boys are crazed and fighting.

A once prosperous real estate man is admitted to a Chicago hospital, both legs rotted to the bone with ulcerous sores. He has been taking his drug in the form of self-administered hypodermic injections.

An 18-year-old Ohio boy becomes an addict and is arrested 6 times in 3 months for violence against his family while under the influence.

Juvenile courts in our cities note an increasing record of barbiturate drugs use among the boys and girls brought before them. Out of 200 delinquents questioned in one court, 7 percent confessed to indulgence in "goof balls."

A motion picture headliner of 10 years ago is a nervous wreck in a sanitarium, having formed a habit from taking "sleepers" for the very nervousness which they served only to fix upon her. Nearly 5 percent of all suicides, excluding self-destruction by gas, are attributed to these easily procured poisons. A popular movie actress finds the bedside pills too convenient a form of escape to resist and, in a fit of lovesick melancholia, takes a fatal dose.

A distinguished woman religious leader swallows her self-prescribed allowance, forgets it in the daze which it produces, repeats, and dies.

A young man, his imagination overstimulated by a mixture of drug and alcohol, confesses to a serious crime of which he is innocent.

Hospitals report increased admissions of returned veterans who seek relief from shattered nerves by drugging themselves, and of overstrained war workers who, trying to keep up to the demands of the job, found themselves with a habit fixed upon them.

Criminals stimulate themselves to committing their crimes by dosing themselves.

Former opium, morphine, and cocaine addicts are turning to these substitutes. A New York druggist is found to have built up a thriving trade exclusively among the Chinese.

The widening recourse to these preparations is proved by the United States Department of Commerce figures, showing an increase in 5 years from 4,500,000 to 2,500,000,000 grains. In other words, the total of doses taken every year has jumped to a grant total of 5,000,000,000, allowing half a grain to a dose. At last reports it was a $20,000,000 industry. Experts on the subject believe that the next fixures will nearly double this. Uncle Sam is on an unparalleled barbiturate binge.

Among some drug manufacturers, the incentive to push sales mountainously high is great, since the profit is large. Any company can perfect a new barbiturate by having its chemists slightly alter the molecular structure of a previously made barbiturate.

The new product then may be patented under a trade name, and the sale price of the product can be fixed by the maker.

Since the makers decide on their own prices, the limit is what the trade will bear; steadily rising sales are reflected in steadily rising returns.

Sleeping pills—barbiturates—made newspaper headlines last year when the famous evangelist, Sister Aimee Semple McPherson, founder of the Four-Square Gospel and leader of its thronged Los Angeles revivals, was found dying in an Oakland hotel room. Two physicians, summoned hastily and apparently acting with equal haste, gave heart attack as the cause of death.

This is a common error in barbiturate poisonings. How they happened to overlook a red capsule near the dying woman's cheek, and four others in the bed, has not been explained.

The authorities were more observant. An autopsy was performed and the death reported due to "undetermined causes." Analysis showed traces of a barbiturate. White mice, injected with secretions from the body, died in 4 hours.

At the inquiry, Dr. Rolf McPherson, the revivalist's son, testified that she had been accustomed to take the drug to calm her nerves after the excitement and emotional strain of a revival service. She had formed a habit, probably without realizing it. Certainly her personal physician knew nothing of it. He had never prescribed barbiturates for her, nor would he have done so without warning her of the danger consequent upon over-use. The container in which the drug came bore neither warning, stated dosage, or indication of the source as required by California law.

Suicide was suspected at first. But there is a more probable explanation. The barbiturates not only lull the nerves and stupefy the mind, they also impair the memory. It is logical to suppose that Sister Aimee, having dropped into a drugged sleep from her usual bedtime dose, half woke up some time in the night, dully conscious of nervousness; that, having no memory of the capsules already ingested, she instinctively reached for more, and that the move proved too much.

What are these barbiturates? All have a common base in barbituric acid, a derivative of coal tar. A German chemist, Emil Fischer, experimenting in 1903, transformed the inert barbituric acid into diethyl barbiturin, which he named veronal. Since then some 1,500 variants have been turned out of the chemical laboratories, of which 60 are in general use. Most familiar of these synthetics are phenobarbital, pentobarbital, nembutal, seconal, and amytal. In their original form they are an odorless, almost tasteless, white crystalline powder. Manufacturers, making up the various types for the trade, give them different colors—white pills and red, yellow, orange, blue, and green capsules. They look as harmless as so many sugar pills. Too often they reach the public with no sufficient indication that they are not as innocent as they look.

Properly administered, the barbiturates are of great value. As a sedative or hypnotic, they are a stand-by of medical practice. Dr. Louis Goodman and Dr. Alfred Gilman, in their exhaustive treatise on them in The Pharmacological Basis of Therapeutics, write:

"Any degree of depression from slight sedation to deep coma may be obtained with the barbiturates. The central depressant effects are employed to produce calmness, to induce sleep, to depress the motor cortex, and thus inhibit convulsions, and to cause partial or complete surgical anesthesia."

The medical profession, itself, cannot be wholly absolved for blame for the spread of these medicines. It is always easy to treat symptoms, rather than underlying causes, and too often the careless or overworked physician yields to the temptation.

Few pharmaceutical firms are as frank and conscientious as the nembutal manufacturer who issues this warning:

"Like all other barbiturates, nembutal may be habit-forming to persons of weak, unstable, or neurotic personality. For this reason, the physician should take steps to assure himself that the administration of the drug remains always under his control and supervision, and that the patient is prevented from believing that self-administration is safe or allowed."

Self-administration of the pills is obviously dangerous, since even physicians must be well grounded in the action of various barbiturates if they are to prescribe them effectively. Some pills are quick in action; others are delayed. The effects of some are brief; of others, much longer.

The University of Maryland Medical School is one institution which trains its students to understand the properties of the barbiturates. On the theory that some people react to these drugs differently from others, Dr. John C. Krantz, Jr., professor of pharmacology, advises his classes to experiment on themselves, having first tried out the brands most in use on himself. One morning a promising student failed to appear in class. His roommate reported for him:

"He's awake, but he can't get out of bed. Seems numb."

Dr. Krantz hurried over to see the youth. He was just recovering from what amounted to a minor paralysis affecting his whole muscular system. He is one of those who are allergic to the action of barbiturates.

Recovery was prompt. But the class had a first-hand illustration of one of the dangers inherent in these medicines.

For many years stringent laws have controlled such perilous and habit-forming

drugs as morphine, heroin, cocaine, hasheesh, and the like. The public is well instructed in the risks which their use involves. Traffic among addicts has been sharply cut down. Some victims have now turned to the less enslaving and destructive but still dangerous barbiturates.

Legislation is urgently needed classing these drugs with the narcotics and limiting their sale.

Without such safeguards, the public will lack necessary protection, and the record of barbiturate suicides, crime, and delinquency will continue to climb.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 16, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me on universal military training, November 5, 1945, over radio stations WHN of New York and WOL of Washington:

The fighting is now over and the demobilization is proceeding at an unprecedented rate. This fact is meeting with the complete approval of our people; but time has come—is at hand at this very hour—to consider our postwar responsibilities and to decide upon our peacetime Military Establishment. What shall we have? The answer is universal military training for the young men of the Nation.

This program of universal military training has the approval and support of the military and naval leaders of the Nation. On Tuesday, the President of the United States publicly urged upon the people of this country the necessity of immediately adopting a program of universal military training. This recommendation of the Chief Executive was in line with the previous endorsements of our leaders after the last war that, included in our permanent Military Establishments, should be a program for the training of all our young men in military defense as they became 18 years of age. Such a program has been in the minds of our leaders from the very birth of this Republic. George Washington, for instance, recommended a program of universal military training as the best means of preventing war and of maintaining peace.

Those who have given these matters much thought believe that there would have been no Pearl Harbor disaster on that fatal December 7 morning in 1941 had we previously accepted and put into operation this fundamental measure of national defense. I do not believe that Japan would have dared to risk an attack had those gangsters of the Pacific known that our outpost defenses were backed by a well-organized and well-trained citizens' army of many millions of men who were ready and able to respond to an instant call to the colors. I am most certain that had this Nation, when it was attacked, been fully prepared to defend itself the war would have ended months and even years sooner, with a consequent saving of billions of dollars in money and perhaps hundreds of thousands of lives.

Anyone who reads the newspapers or listens to the radio must know that the world is in a troublesome mood today. Wars, riots, insurrections, and disorders are occurring daily in all parts of the globe. In such a world, respect comes from power and power comes from a well-trained civilian defense army. The very easiest way of preserving order and maintaining peace is by universal military training.

Such a program should be separate from the Regular Army. If it is to last one full year, the first 13 to 17 weeks of the training should be given over to the basic physical and field training; and the latter part of the period should be devoted to specialized and advance training of these young men. In the latter stage of the training the men should be selected for the type of work which they prefer and they should be sent to specialized schools for this purpose. For instance, a mechanic, machinist, technician, radioman, radarman, and artisan should be sent to schools which will train them along the line of their proposed life's work, with especial emphasis always being placed upon the military features of the education. In this manner the education which these young men receive as a part of their training will be invaluable to them for the rest of their lives and will serve to compensate many of them for the interruption of their schooling at this early age.

Between 800,000 and 900,000 of these young men may be trained each year. At the end of the training they are to be placed in a general civilian reserve and are to be called into active service only upon an act of the Congress and then only when war is at our very doorstep. Every young trainee should be encouraged to become a commissioned officer; and when the proper ones are selected they should be sent to an officers' candidate school or an ROTC unit.

We fought the last war because we were treacherously attacked by a hostile power and our people were killed by the thousands. We fought the war to drive brigands from the face of the earth and to make the world safe for decent people and self-respecting nations. For the purpose of maintaining global peace, the nations of the earth have since then organized the United Nations Organization; and we as a Nation are called upon to implement this organization and to make sure that it has the force and power to maintain world peace. As the most powerful and the richest nation, we must assume a major part of this responsibility. A well-organized and well-trained civilian army ready to respond instantly if our land is attacked will go far to prevent future wars and will be our best means of maintaining peace throughout the earth. There must be no World War III.

Payments to Veterans During Labor Disputes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Frank D. Scriven, national executive secretary of American Veterans of World War II:

The issue involving veterans of this war as a result of the Detroit strike is not to be construed as an issue between the veteran and the UAW-CIO union, nor between the veteran and the General Motors Corp. It is an issue affecting veterans of this war, who are now idle due to the strike, and the Veterans' Administration.

Under provisions of the GI bill of rights, chapter 8, section 800, an unemployed veteran is entitled to unemployment compensation and/or readjustment allowances within certain limitations provided in said bill, which deal with labor disputes. Great leeway is provided in determining the rights to payments to veterans in the event of a labor dispute which leads to a strike and consequent unemployment for both union and nonunion veterans. We, the American Veterans of World War II, protect the Veterans' Administration ruling which denies all veterans of World War II, protest the Veterans' the rights to those payments as prescribed by law and as set forth in the GI bill.

Veterans have been made idle by a labor-management dispute which, irrespective of its merits, is depriving them of their earning power. In the case of apprentice-employed veterans, who were receiving readjustment allowances, the strike has deprived them of their labor and the Veterans' Administration has deprived them of their readjustment payments.

Without taking sides in the strike issues, which have resulted in the present labor dispute, we, Amvets, representing many thousands of veterans of this war, protest to the Veterans' Administration and to the Michigan Unemployment Compensation Commission for denying veterans their rights under the law. We demand an immediate review of the ruling which has left many veterans and their families without adequate compensation. We demand that the Veterans' Administration reverse the aforementioned ruling, and so inform the Michigan Unemployment Compensation Commission, so that payments on applications already presented and the thousands which will be filed be made at once.

Let Us Not Forget the Pilgrims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, November 26 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Let Us Not Forget the Pilgrims," delivered by me at the annual dinner of the Mayflower Society of the District of Columbia, held in Washington, D. C., on Friday evening, November 23, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET US NOT FORGET THE PILGRIMS

Governor Thatcher, Mrs. Doolittle, greetings to you and all in this gathering of loyal Americans. We have gathered tonight to make an annual payment on our unending debt to the Pilgrim Fathers. In all American history there is no saga more dramatic, none so filled with deeds of heroism and courage as those performed by that intrepid band of fourscore men and women. They braved the dangers of an uncharted ocean, of the stormy landing, of the wilderness and savages, of a strange country. They were in search, not of wealth or ease, but only of freedom. Indeed, there is no adventure in all history that compares with the noble purpose, the sacrifice, and the determination which attended their effort. This gallant band faced unknown hazards, untried foes, dangers of which they little dreamed. With scant protection, they

endured the hardships incident to a New England winter. They suffered from lack of food, lack of protection from the elements, and from disease which demanded the lives of half of the gallant band that first winter. Yet when spring came, and the *Mayflower* set out on its return journey, not a single one of those who were possessed of a great vision, turned back. The fleshpots of their former bondage had no attraction for them. They were in search of the holy grail of freedom of conscience and worship, leaving all else to the justice and benevolence of Providence.

We do ourselves a service in gathering tonight to reappraise the contribution of that brave group to the blessings which we enjoy in our present-day civilization, and perhaps to set ourselves aright on a course which alone will save us out of the confusion and discouragements which press upon us so heavily today.

Since the day when he first stood erect and started on that long march toward the goal of freedom, there have been many brilliant epochs in which men first lighted the torch of freedom, preserved it through storms and tribulations, nursed it when it flickered and all but died out. We have caught its ever-expanding gleam throughout the centuries. In our Anglo-Saxon history, the earliest battle for freedom was when the knights wrested from King John at Runnymede the recognition that the subjects of the king had personal and individual rights to be respected and safeguarded. The Magna Carta was the beginning of English law, and is the basis for the legal rights which we as citizens enjoy today. But, legal rights alone are not sufficient to maintain the progress of man on his progressive march. That which the Pilgrims brought across the sea was not alone the right of the protection of the individual from the injustices of a sovereign. They sought also the right of freedom of conscience and freedom of worship through which alone the individual rises to the dignity of a sovereign. They sought for him the right to expand his aspirations, to seek for the realization of his vision, and to preserve for himself these rights against the intrusion of any earthly authority.

If tonight I were to ask you to name America's greatest anniversary, I am sure you would quickly say that the Fourth of July is America's greatest holiday, as it celebrates the signing of the Declaration of Independence of this Nation from the authority of any other sovereignty anywhere in the world. I would not say a word to detract from the courage and bravery of those men who affixed their names to that great document, nor would I minimize its importance in the development of our Nation. But there was a former declaration which to me seems to be the real birthday of America and without which this country would not have come to its present high position among the nations of the world.

When the Pilgrim Fathers approached the end of their journey and the shores of their new home were in sight, they were confronted with the problem of definitely outlining the purpose of their expedition and the means for governing themselves as a civil body. Before they landed they assembled in the dimly lighted cabin of the *Mayflower* and wrote down and signed in solemn obligation the document which became known as the Mayflower Compact. We can well define that document as the declaration of dependence, for you will recall that it began with these words, "In the name of God, Amen," and then, "We whose names are underwritten, the loyal subjects of our dread Sovereign Lord, King James, having undertaken for the glory of God and the advancement of the Christian faith, and honor of our King and country, a voyage to plant the first colony in the northern parts of Virginia, do by these presents solemnly in the presence of God and one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politic."

In making this declaration of dependence they expressed their conviction that all men are equal in the sight of God because they have a common Creator who knows no distinction between race, class, or temporal authority. With such a conviction the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness set forth in the Declaration of Independence, which followed nearly eightscore years later, was self-evident. In all sincerity I make this statement, and I believe few will dispute it, that the great height to which America has come today stems not so much from the Declaration of Independence signed at Philadelphia as it does from the declaration of dependence signed in the cabin of the *Mayflower*.

Freedom of conscience is a cell implanted in each human being which urges him to strive toward the pattern of his Maker. It urges him to accept justice and right as impelling forces of action. Freedom of conscience alone gives a man liberty. It helps him to know the truth, and in the conviction of truth he is free.

Our Pilgrim fathers found that freedom of conscience had its sublimest expression in freedom of worship, in which they had been restricted in the lands from which they came. It was in worship that they revived and made strong the sense of right within themselves. It was through worship that conscience was cleansed and became a safe guide to right conduct. We are neglecting this safeguard to freedom today. We have gone too far in accepting "freedom of worship" as meaning "freedom from worship." There can be no substitute purchased by money or ease or pleasure which takes the place of the need to preserve conscience through freedom of worship.

The Pilgrim fathers, as well as every individual who is motivated by a free working conscience, knows that liberty is not a "one-way street"; that liberty connotes a complete respect for the rights of others—that the freedom which he jealously holds for himself must be granted to every other human being, not only in our own Nation but in all the world. The source of confusion in the world and in our own Nation today is because we have set selfish rights as a nation and as individuals above those of common good. In these days of suspicion and fear and hate growing out of a great war, we do not accept for ourselves that high plane of human society established by the Pilgrims. Only insofar as we do accept it can we have permanent peace in the world.

We shall never have peace among the nations until we respect the rights of the smallest nation and hear their demands for freedom and justice as quickly and as fully as we accord those rights to the mighty powers of the world. Until we establish that principle in the world we might just as well make up our minds that wars and rumors of war will continue. America must set the example among the nations of the world in respecting the rights of every other nation and in the abandonment of hatred and suspicion toward other nations; yes, even toward those who have been our recent mortal foes.

This same reckless disregard of the equal rights of others is the disease germ of our domestic problems. I have not come to point the finger of blame at any special group.

It is well for everyone to search for himself, and for the group with which he is associated, how this evil may be eradicated. The United States is too rapidly breaking up into selfish groups seeking group advantage, denying privileges to others which they ask for themselves. We shall never have peace at home, in fact the whole stability of our national life will be in jeopardy, while we have this struggle of class against class, race against race, and creed against creed. Only when we free our consciences and set right and justice on the throne shall we prosper as a great nation.

We cannot long exist as a society when such groups are asserting the right to endanger the life and safety and welfare of the great body of American people. It is unthinkable, that in a land such as the Pilgrims envisoned, a body of striking longshoremen should delay the landing of soldiers anxious to get home to their loved ones in a land for whose protection they offered their lives. It is unthinkable that in such a land, the common services which have come to be a vital part of everyday necessity and safety, such as elevator service, street-car transportation, food distributing agencies, utilities which supply light and heat and telephones—all of which involve the lives of innocent men, women, and babies—should be interrupted while grievances of infinitely lesser importance are being debated by those who profit from their operation. When freedom of conscience has full play in America, the rights and welfare of the great body of American people will be the supreme objective of our efforts.

Public sentiment is rapidly finding its conscience in these trying days, and louder and louder is the demand growing that we establish agencies through which the rights of management and labor may be resolved without interruption of the productivity and services upon which the welfare and the safety of the country and its citizens depend.

There are other important freedoms which were brought to us by the Pilgrims through freedom of conscience. Important among them are freedom of thought and freedom of expression—in the press, in the pulpit, and on the floor of the Congress of the United States. The abuse of these freedoms by vicious and thoughtless persons is a great threat to our national safety.

In spite of these abuses we must maintain these freedoms. For as long as we can have freedom of conscience, freedom of the press and freedom of the Congress, we need never fear that this Nation will fall into a dictatorship of individuals or of a communistic group. It is a patriotic duty of every citizen to do his own thinking and make up his own mind on the pressing problems of the day. May I also suggest that you be sparing of hasty criticism of your Congress, for in it lies the protection of all free institutions.

When on April 30, 1789, George Washington was sworn in as the first President of the United States there was inaugurated a Government which continues today the oldest unchanged Government in the world. It is the Government of a Nation which has become the strongest among the nations of the world. It would seem like vain boasting to recount the greatness of the United States. Suffice it is to say that all the other nations of the world are looking to this Nation to save them out of their confusion and their economic distress. The portion of humility in us today must be very great in recalling this high position to which we have come.

More than ever it is important now that we keep firmly before us the source of our greatness. It doesn't serve us well in the days of our confusion to borrow from other nations ideas which have brought them to the brink of ruin. It won't serve us well to give too much of our substance to other nations beyond the humane obligation which rests upon all peoples to heal the wounds and assuage the suffering of the weak and innocent. No nation can stand secure until it recognizes the sovereignty and the rights of its individual citizens, and this message must be impressed with our contributions of physical relief. We will serve ourselves well only if we keep this Nation strong among the troubled nations of the world.

This Nation with all its vast resources and the marvelous discoveries of its scientists is

today facing opportunity far greater than it has experienced in any period of its history. There is no reason why the advancement of our standard of living in the next two decades should not exceed that made since the discovery of electricity. We shall go forward and realize this opportunity only if we hold fast to the vision of the Pilgrims and remember always the purpose for which they came to this land was not selfish gain, nor national greatness, but "for the glory of God, and advancement of the Christian faith" throughout the world.

Let us not forget the Pilgrims.

Sentiments of a Great American, Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in the last war I subscribed wholeheartedly to the principles for which we proposed to wage war, the 14 points enumerated by President Wilson.

In this war I fully subscribed to the principles of the so-called Atlantic Charter.

Now that we have won the war I want the solemn promises made to us, that we waged war to liberate the oppressed and bring the blessing of the "four freedoms" to all mankind, redeemed. I am sick and disheartened with the talk of retribution and vengeance and slavery now being waged on the helpless people of the so-called liberated countries.

I commend the sentiments expressed by a great American, a former President, in a college address which I have taken the liberty of condensing for the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues:

MORAL AND SPIRITUAL RECOVERY FROM WAR
(By Herbert Hoover)

We have ended a bloody and horrible era of history. It has been a war in which the enslavement, the starvation and killing of women, children, and civilian men have returned to the levels which we thought had gone by a thousand years ago.

Thousands of people are still being committed to concentration camps in eastern Europe without a semblance of justice or compassion. Under the name of reparations men are being seized, and prisoners are being worked under conditions reminiscent of Roman slavery.

We find hundreds of millions of human beings breathe less independence, less liberty, less freedom from fear than before we started on this crusade. Their successful rescue at that time was the justification of our first crusade. Can we honestly say that we have not surrendered these peoples on the altar of appeasement?

The immediate danger to the world is a sense of frustration in America at the failure of our crusade for freedom and our continued moral and spiritual losses from the war. For from frustration can come bitter isolationism.

We went into the war under the persuasion of such ideas as the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter. This was to be our second and last crusade to free the world from domination, from despotism, from imperialism, from brutality, from fear. Our banners have always proclaimed the freedom and the rights of nations and of men.

Surely, if the new era upon which we enter is to be an era of progress it must rest upon the rebirth of truth and justice and tolerance. It must rest upon intellectual and spiritual freedom and upon a live public sensitiveness to wrong and a resentment of brutality. The redemption of mankind will depend upon those who can give intellectual, moral, and spiritual leadership in these immediate years.

And by leadership I do not speak of public life alone. We must have leadership in every branch of life from the shop foreman to the President. We must have leadership among the neighbors and in the home.

One of the riches of American life is the vast reservoir of leadership in the people. It is our educational system rooted in the whole people upon which we must depend to develop leaders.

To sum up, may I say that the colleges have a great obligation courageously to restore our moral and spiritual losses from the war, to renew our ideals of freedom, to regain our sensitiveness to wrong, and to provide the Nation with renewed supply of trained leadership. Unless we rebuild this new era on these foundations, it means the war has been lost. It means more. It means that civilization is lost. I am convinced that our educational institutions are equal to this—the greatest of tasks.

Demobilization of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, November 26 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address on the subject of demobilization of the armed forces, delivered by me on last Saturday evening over the facilities of radio station WTIC, in Hartford, Conn.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Two weeks ago over station WTIC I discussed the GI bill of rights, explaining the changes which had been made in this most important act for the benefit of veterans.

There are many Connecticut young men still in uniform who are not yet able to take advantage of this act. These men are scattered all over the world, many of them waiting for transports to bring them home. Some of them have many more than the points needed for discharge.

Some have written me, asking my assistance in getting home. The fathers, mothers, and wives of others have written me. They want their loved ones home for Christmas.

I can deeply sympathize with them. I understand fully their desire to have the fighting man back at home and in civilian clothes. For the most part the job of our draft Army is done. The Big War is over and we have won a splendid victory. These combat veterans feel that it is the turn of other men to take up the task of policing the conquered areas.

My attention was caught, and quite forcibly, by a letter which I received just the other day from a young man stationed at McCook, Nebr. I would like to read his letter to you. I quote:

"I am writing you as a counterpart of Paul Revere in an attempt to awaken both you and your fellow colleagues in Congress to a grave injustice. Certainly, if Congress had not been stalled by the Army, this could have been done before.

"Some time ago General Marshall set up a policy for the entire Army that stated men with 2 years' service would no longer be sent overseas. This served to lull Congress into not bringing up H. R. 4013. Now that everything has again quieted down, the Army has my own and four other similar groups on the ready for immediate shipment to Europe for Air Corps occupation groups. Conservatively, 60 percent of us have 2 years of service and have asked for overseas shipment while the war was on. Now I feel that our prime obligation is with our families. Personally, I am supporting my mother, brother, and wife. My wife is also with child, so that will make four dependents. It is fair for us to go overseas?

"Enough of the preliminaries," continues this soldier's letter. "Based on knowledge of what has been said above, I should like to know how you will vote on H. R. 4013 to discharge 2-year men?

"Also, we've been writing the Members to ask for an investigation into the needs for a B–29 group in Europe. What will you do about it?

"The above matter calls for immediate action as we are slated for New Year's in Germany.

"I shall appreciate an immediate reply to my letter. Thank you for your kind consideration."

Now, I can't blame this young man. His mind must continually be with his family, and especially with his wife. He has given up 2 or more years for his country, doing what was asked of him. He has a justifiable complaint, and I feel his case should be given consideration.

But I do not believe he alone should be singled out for assistance. It has been my policy from immediately after VJ-day that we should proceed with our demobilization plans on a democratic basis. In other words, it should not be brought about through political favoritism but on the basis of every man being treated on the same basis.

After all, through our Selective Service System, our men were drafted into the armed forces on that kind of a system. Deferments were granted, on the whole, impartially to those entitled to them. Of course, there were a few abuses of this, but I think they were the exception.

I felt very strongly that discharges should be granted on the same impartial basis, with consideration given to the needs of the man. For that reason I accepted the Army's point-score system as being inherently fair. The Navy's point system too I thought was an equitable method of making possible a speedy demobilization program.

Protests have been mounting over the past few weeks regarding the slowness of the entire plan. Here is another letter which I received recently, and again I quote:

"I am writing you as a constituent, Senator, being a resident of Greens Farms, and voting in the township of Westport. I know how busy you are, the enormous problems you have to face and the pressure put upon your time, so please don't bother to acknowledge this letter.

"Its purpose is to join the thousands of other mothers and fathers who are asking the same thing of Congress—that you keep up pressure on the Army and Navy to demobilize as rapidly as is humanly possible. I am an old Annapolis man myself and it is simply against human nature for a huge organization like the Army and the Navy to put itself out of business without pressure from on top—constant and increasing pressure.

"There may be reasons—I am still reading this letter—reasons for a great many things which the Army and Navy do that the average citizen does not know about, but my own particular case may give you two illustrations. These might be useful in putting on the proper pressure.

"First is the case of my oldest boy—he continues—who is 1 of 24 officers on a destroyer now stationed at Ulithi with 2 new officers coming out to join the ship. This is a destroyer and the peacetime complement of officers is 7.

"If this ship were off Japan or if it were clearing mines, etc., I could see some sense to holding these excess officers in the service, but this destroyer is doing none of these things—it is just lying at anchor in the harbor, acting as the headquarters ship for the commander of that particular squadron.

"The second illustration is my second son, aged 19, who had 6 months' combat experience in France as a private in the Infantry ending up at Pilsen, Czechoslovakia. He is now at Camp Swift, Tex. There is no particular reason for holding this boy—if needed he, and hundreds of thousands like him, could be brought back into service within the next year or so. But, unless he is let out soon, he will not get his college education. He had just finished high school when he entered service.

"Can anything be done for these 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old boys who ought to be getting on with their education at the earliest possible moment?"

This writer brings up a most pertinent point. During the war years hundreds of thousands of boys who would normally have been spending their time in college and in postgraduate schools training to be doctors, dentists, scientists, technologists, and trained men of the highest skills needed in our highly developed technological world were taken from the classrooms and laboratories and put into uniform on the drilling fields. Their deferred education is going to cause a serious deficit in skilled men in the very near future. We should be making every effort to get these men back to their textbooks and test tubes. The welfare of America demands it.

Because I have become impressed with the stories the thousands of letters I have received have told, I have written Secretary of War Patterson and Secretary of Navy Forrestal the following identical letters:

NOVEMBER 24, 1945.

Hon ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War, War Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have carefully refrained from issuing statements calling upon the Army and Navy to completely demobilize its forces to a point where the national security might be endangered.

It is the constitutional duty of the Congress to raise and maintain armies. Our agreement to provide funds for an army and navy is based upon the recommendations of the military for that number of men and amount of equipment which is necessary to effectuate that purpose.

It is not necessary to point out to you the feeling on the part of many of our good citizens that the demobilization process has not proceeded in a satisfactory manner. Frequent stories that appear in the press announcing changes in the point system serve only to further complicate an understanding of the problem.

Might I suggest to you the advisability of preparing a comprehensive statement concerning the minimum needs of the Army, the approximate allocations of the forces involved, the numbers of men who have already been released and returned to civilian life, and a redefinition in as exact terms as may be possible of those who it is intended to release within the next 3 months. Such an authoritative statement, based upon reasonable and defendable estimates, will in my opinion do much to satisfy the American people that demobilization and the return of their loved ones has not been unduly delayed.

You will appreciate that any such statement will, of course, be most critically examined—not only by the American people, but by the Members of Congress. I therefore urge upon you a most careful and well-considered report on this subject.

Sincerely yours,

BRIEN MCMAHON,
United States Senator.

That is the letter which I sent to Secretaries Patterson and Forrestal.

In writing that letter I was not trying to help one isolated Connecticut GI. I was trying to speed the demobilization of the approximately 200,000 Connecticut men still in uniform. I want all of them to share and to share alike in getting their discharges, just as they shared the privations and difficulties of war.

We Americans will forever be indebted to these brave men who fought for us on the far-flung battle fronts of this Second World War. It seems to me that all of us should be glad to do whatever is within our power to speed their return home.

I sincerely hope that what I and the other Members of Congress are trying to do in behalf of these gallant young men will be rewarded by a speed-up of the demobilization consistent with our national security.

I hope there will be no ships kept anchored in harbors in this country or abroad and that they will be used to their full efficiency for the transportation of our men back to America. I hope that every available warship will be put to work for the same purpose.

All of us know that every available inch of ship space was used to take men to foreign battle fronts when our country was endangered. We were glad that our leaders had the courage and the vision to utilize the shipping we had for the transport of men and supplies.

I feel that they should show the same kind of imagination to bring our men back home.

You may be assured that I will continue to do everything I can toward the end of getting the boys home and out of the armed services that can possibly be spared. I wish it were possible to have the residents of every home which boasts a service flag made happy by having their serviceman home for Christmas.

Revival of Olympic Games

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 26 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement signed by a group of students of Colby Junior College of New London, N. H., urging the revival of the Olympic games.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLBY JUNIOR COLLEGE,
New London, N. H., November 21, 1945.

Senator STYLES BRIDGES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: We are the members of the international relations class at Colby Junior College. In our studies we have learned of the Olympic games revival in 1896 and of the quadrennial recurrences of these games since.

We believe that such international activities are conducive to international understanding and good will. We believe also that such emotions and feelings are most important in the present postwar period. Therefore, we respectfully urge you to use your great influence to have the Olympic games revived, and, if possible, have the 1948 games held in the United States.

Thanking you for your interest in this matter, we are,

Very sincerely yours,

Mary Elizabeth Day, Peterborough, N. H.; Joan Curtis, Derry, N. H.; Leona Curley, Waterbury, Conn.; Emily Blunt, Passaic, N. J.; Elizabeth Bisset, Harrisburg, Pa.; Barbara Harrington, Wellesley Hills, Mass.; Jane Hatch, Worcester, Mass.; Helen Kaplan, Baltimore, Md.; Mary Rose Hennessy, Buffalo, N. Y.; Barbara Hunt, Wellesley Hills, Mass.; Elizabeth A. Joel, New York City, N. Y.; Lois Lippincott, Plainfield, N. J.; Miriam Towart, Bennington, Vt.; Elinor L. Thistle, Melrose, Mass.; Mary Lou Stover, Fall River, Mass.; Margaret Reynolds, Mansfield, Ohio; Marjorie Nayer, Portsmouth, N. H.; Lila Labovitz, Marblehead, Mass.; Patricia Whitby, Detroit, Mich.; Anne Walker, Montreal, Canada; Charlene Waugh, Whitman, Mass.; Lydia Klein, New York; Nancy Olcott, Waterbury, Conn.; Jean Goubert, Englewood, N. J.

Production in the Automobile Industry

REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the following is not a statement from the automobile industry, or the manufacturers' association, but from the Reuthers and Thomases of the CIO, as appearing in the New York Times of yesterday:

CONTENTIONS ON PRODUCTIVITY

The evidence of all the facts and figures demonstrates the mounting efficiency of the prewar auto industry. It was true that man-killing speed-up of the old days, before the union, was largely eliminated in 1937 and the years following. But continued technological advances and increased worker efficiency brought constantly higher man-hour productivity.

Productivity per worker increased sensationally in the years from 1919 to 1940. In the first postwar years output per worker-hour will increase even more rapidly. When Department of Commerce statisticians assumed only the prewar rate for this period, they were making the most conservative estimate that could be fitted to the facts.

Everything points to a far greater rise in productivity.

Hundreds of thousands of new, improved, and highly productive machine tools will be available to auto corporations.

General Motors is spending over $500,000,000 for new plants and for streamlined postwar efficiency in its old plants during the reconversion period. Other auto producers are following suit. This by itself should

bring the sharpest rise in efficiency the industry has ever known.

Wartime research, paid for at Government expense, has greatly increased the productive knowledge of auto corporations.

Mr. Speaker, here we have an admission by the Reuthers and the Thomases of the value of capital and its use by management to create technological advances. Here we have an admission that these elements have made a greater contribution to the war effort than labor leadership. Here we have an admission that they will make a greater contribution to the public in providing it with the comforts of life than labor leaders can ever hope for.

Certainly, this statement shows that labor needs capital just as much as if not more than capital needs labor, because capital can increase labor's output by furnishing the technologically improved machinery to increase productivity. Yet, notwithstanding all these admissions, certain labor leaders are seeking to slit the throats of capital and management. In doing this they are, according to the above admission, slitting the throats of honest labor and of the consumer public as well.

It is high time that these labor leaders, misleading the highest paid labor in industry, which is enjoying the highest, namely, wartime wages, and which is now offered a 10-percent increase, come to their senses and do their share toward furnishing the American people with the comforts of life by stopping all these ill-founded strikes.

It is time that we get our minds on facts and fundamentals instead of fallacies and votes.

Tax Exemptions to International Organizations and Their Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not able to be present when our committee considered H. R. 4489, granting certain tax exemptions to international organizations and their employees.

I have always held to the view that residents of other countries working alongside of our citizens and living in this country should pay the same tax as our citizens. Under the bill, as I see it, if a resident of the United States is employed by one of these international organizations, he is freed from the Federal income tax. In many cases, this means he will be entirely freed of any income tax on such compensation, since the country of his origin does not ordinarily subject him to tax on his income earned within the United States. On the other hand, a citizen of the United States who goes to work for one of these organizations, will be subject to withholding and income tax on the compensation he receives from such an organization. This is a direct departure from our Federal income-tax law, which has always treated citizens and residents of this country alike as far as Federal income taxes are concerned. It seems to me that the resident should be exempt only to the extent that he pays an equivalent tax to the country of his origin.

I notice that the Canadians in providing for a United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration were very careful to allow an exemption from their income tax for "Representatives, officials or other employees of the Administration, resident in Canada, other than persons who were ordinarily resident in Canada prior to their employment with the Administration." While I have some doubt as to whether we should exempt non-residents on their income received in this country from these organizations located here, I feel very strongly that we should not extend such an exemption to persons in this country who were residents at the time they were employed by such organizations.

Another feature, is that the organizations which are to be exempt from Federal income tax are not enumerated nor are their activities clearly defined. The bill amends section 116 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code, and as amended exempts these organizations not only on their income from investments in the United States, but also from any other source within the United States. The language is so broad that one of these organizations could engage in trading activities in competition with our own domestic corporations and be free of Federal income tax. I believe when any corporation whether owned by a national, state, or foreign government enters the market-place in competition with our own domestic corporations, it should pay the same tax on its trading income as our own corporations. From the broad language used in the bill, it might be possible for all the governments concerned to permit one of these organizations to engage in trading activities and be free of Federal tax on such income. I also note that the baggage and effects of alien officers and employees of international organizations, or their families, suites, and servants are made free of custom duties when imported in connection with the arrival of the owner. These are just a few of the many features of this bill, which require careful study.

Statements by William Green and Philip Murray on the President's National Health Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 26 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two statements—one issued by Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, and the other by Mr. Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

These statements pledge the support of both great labor organizations to the principles set forth in President Truman's special message proposing a five-point national health program and to the health bill, S. 1606, which I introduced on November 19 for myself and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

I urge all Senators to give Mr. Green's and Mr. Murray's statements their earnest study and consideration.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Federation of Labor Weekly News Service of November 20, 1945]

PRESIDENT GIVES CONGRESS NEW NATIONAL HEALTH PLAN—ALL WORKERS AND DEPENDENTS TO BE COVERED BY HEALTH INSURANCE

WASHINGTON, D. C.—President Truman called upon Congress to enact a broad national health insurance program which would cover and protect all Americans who work for a living and their dependents.

His message was immediately hailed by A. F. of L. President William Green as embodying the principles which the federation has long espoused. Mr. Green called for universal support of legislation to carry out the President's plan.

This legislation was promptly introduced in Congress by Senators WAGNER and MURRAY and Representative DINGELL.

The President reiterated several times in his message that the five-point program he submitted is not socialized medicine and should not be misrepresented as such.

He insisted that the health of the American people is a national concern and must be treated as a national problem on an insurance basis.

Besides health insurance, the President's program included increased grants to States for construction of hospital facilities; expansion of public health, maternal and child-care services; sickness and disability insurance for workers, and Federal grants to public and nonprofit institutions to promote medical education and research.

In most respects the program was similar to that contained in the original Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill which was originally drafted by the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. Green pledged support to the President in a telegram which said:

"I congratulate you on your vigorous and forward looking message to Congress on national health. Your five-point program is in complete accord with the program initiated and supported by the A. F. of L. It meets the urgent human needs of our Nation and merits support of all men of good will."

In his message the President said:

"Under the plan I suggest, our people would continue to get medical and hospital services just as they do now—on the basis of their own voluntary decisions and choices. Our doctors and hospitals would continue to deal with disease with the same professional freedom as now. There would, however, be this all-important difference: Whether or not patients get the services they need would not depend on how much they can afford to pay at the time."

Mr. Truman said that Americans would be free to choose their own physicians and hospitals, and free also to pay for medical service outside the health insurance system—just as they are free to send their children to private instead of public schools, although they must pay taxes for public schools.

Likewise, he said, physicians would remain free to accept or reject patients. They would

be allowed to decide for themselves whether they would participate in the health insurance system full time, part time, or not at all.

Hospitals, he said, would have the same freedom of action.

President Truman told Congress that he favored the broadest possible coverage for the national health insurance system.

"I believe," he said, "that all persons who work for a living and their dependents should be covered under such an insurance plan. This would include wage and salary earners, those in business for themselves, professional persons, farmers, agricultural labor, domestic employees, Government employees, and employees of nonprofit institutions and their families."

In addition, the President said, needy persons and other groups should be covered through premiums paid for them by public agencies. Congress, he said, should vote appropriations to reimburse the States for such premiums as well as for expenditures made by the States in paying for medical services provided by doctors and hospitals to needy persons.

The program would be financed largely through increases in social-security taxes.

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., November 20, 1945.

CIO President Philip Murray today issued the following statement on President Harry S. Truman's message to Congress on health legislation:

"The CIO lends its hearty support to the general principles set forth in President Truman's special message proposing a five-point national health program. This organization and its affiliated international unions is already on record in favor of the five recommendations laid down by the President for legislative action. We commend Senators WAGNER and MURRAY for offering a bill embodying the President's recommendations.

"The CIO takes the following stand on the President's five-point program:

"1. We congratulate the President on his statement with respect to the construction of hospitals and related facilities and for saying that 'in approving State plans and individual projects, and in fixing the national standards, the Federal agency should have the help of a strictly advisory body that includes both public and professional members.'

"In our testimony on the Hill-Burton bill—S. 191—we have been emphatic that the form of advisory board called for by the President is to be desired instead of that embodied in the Hill-Burton bill as reported to the Senate. We urge all Senators, in voting on this bill which is now being debated, to restore the advisory commission to the form asked by the President.

"2. The CIO is on record supporting the expansion of public health and maternal and child-care services as called for both in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill (S. 1050) and in the Pepper maternal and child-care bill (S. 1318). The record of maternal and infant care for wives and children of servicemen has demonstrated the need for expansion of this program. Furthermore, no program for construction of hospital and clinical facilities can be adequately maintained if other parts of the President's program are not undertaken.

"3. The CIO has already endorsed the Kilgore bill (S. 1297) for scientific research, including the sections on medical education and research. We are also on record as supporting the related provisions in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill.

"4 It has long been apparent to the CIO that a national health-insurance system for prepayment of the costs of medical care is a necessary next step. We have indicated our willingness to consider the participation of voluntary organizations in the insurance system, but favor the general principle of compulsory insurance as necessary to Nation-wide coverage.

"5. No group in the community knows better than organized labor the importance of disability insurance as protection against the loss of wages from sickness and disability. The CIO is already on record as supporting this principle as set forth in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill.

"We urge Congress to proceed at once to a consideration of these measures, and especially to the immediate passage of an amended Hill-Burton bill to meet the objections set forth by President Truman and by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY in is minority report, in their opposition to turning over control of hospital construction to a private organization or group."

OPA Rent Division Under Investigation in Los Angeles

REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, Los Angeles County, already aggravated almost beyond endurance with overpopulation and overcrowded housing conditions and facing a heavy increase in taxes in real property to maintain local government, has the additional burden of maladministration in the Rental Division in OPA, which is causing serious friction between tenants and landlords.

The following is a copy of a letter to Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors and was sent to me by Mr. John Anson Ford, a member of that board, asking them to appoint a special committee to investigate these intolerable conditions. They are not asking for removal of rent ceilings. All they ask is fair and efficient administration:

APARTMENT ASSOCIATION OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY, INC.,
Los Angeles, Calif., October 9, 1945.

To the honorable the Board of Supervisors, County of Los Angeles, Hall of Records, Los Angeles, Calif.

GENTLEMEN: The county assessor proposes to increase the assessed values of rental housing properties effective next year. A sampling of member properties discloses that the increase will be as high as 120 percent in the case of many properties and will average 54 percent above present assessed values.

We recognize that governmental costs, as well as other prices, have risen sharply and we fully expect to pay our share.

However, for 3 years the income of rental housing properties has been frozen. Meanwhile, maintenance costs have skyrocketed, prices now being two and three times prewar levels.

Property owners have had to choose between paying these costs or making only essential repairs and allowing the property to deteriorate. Many have chosen the latter course, also reducing services and discharging employees. Total rental income has not been sufficient otherwise to cover inflated costs.

The blight already begun will spread like a disease into every neighborhood of the county if our citizens must absorb new tax burdens, bled from fixed rental incomes.

We see little possibility of adjustment of rent ceilings. Rather, the trend is quite the opposite in this area. The Office of Price Administration has made the operation of rental housing increasingly difficult and expensive. Our people are discouraged and disinterested in their properties. Friction between management and tenants is mounting. Litigation is crowding the court calendars and is increasingly costly.

It is the mismanagement of the rent-control program that is spreading this blight upon rental properties throughout the county. Fair and reasonable administration of the law will permit adjustments to be made.

An investigation into the administration of the program will reveal such conditions as the following:

1. Landlords and tenants alike have lost all confidence in the ability of the rent department to administer fairly the law.

2. Hidden evasions of rent controls are running riot, especially in the cheaper properties and slum areas.

3. Petitions of landlords and complaints of tenants even now remain for weeks and months unanswered in the files.

4. Rent department employees, misrepresenting themselves to be agents of the FBI, visit tenants and incite them against the landlord.

5. Employees, while in the employ of the rent department, have offered to serve for compensation the interests of individual landlords.

6. Rent department investigators, making highly technical appraisals and decisions, are without prior experience or qualifications.

7. Undesirable tenants are so protected in their occupancy that the owner may obtain possession only after protracted and expensive litigation.

8. Landlords who rely upon the advice and instructions of rent department employees subsequently have been prosecuted or otherwise penalized for having so acted in good faith.

9. Landlords who defy arbitrary decisions of rent department employees and appeal to the courts for protection of their constitutional rights subsequently are subjected to persecution.

10. Rent department employees withhold documents before recording their receipt in the area rent office, thus subjecting landlords to penalties for alleged failure to file within required time limits.

11. Rent department proposals for reduction in rents are made without verification of complaints, thus causing the landlord great expense and effort to answer and prove false any fictitious complaints.

12. Petitions for adjustments because of hardship due to greatly increased costs have been denied without reason, although conforming entirely to regulations publicized as the basis for adjustment.

13. Rents are reduced and refunds ordered retroactively for long periods of time, although the owner has filed a lawful appeal with the proper higher authorities. He is not permitted to deposit the disputed amounts with a trustee. When the order is reversed on appeal, the owner is estopped from recovering the refunds wrongfully ordered by the rent office.

14. Employees acting arbitrarily and without prior inspection reduce the rents of newly rented properties. This not only discourages any offering of new rental units but has caused owners to place exhorbitant first rentals on the property in the hope of salvaging a reasonable rate in the end.

Only through immediate relief from these abuses can we avoid the grave threat of continued deterioration of income properties that ultimately will be reflected in lowered values of all properties in the county. We ask that you, as the representatives of all the citizens of the county, order an investigation into the practices of the OPA Rent Department which threatens the welfare of the county and the soundness of the tax base. We suggest this be done by a special com-

mittee of independently representative citizens equipped with qualified investigators and counsel to hear evidence of such charges as we herein make.

Respectfully submitted by order of the board of directors, Apartment Association of Los Angeles County, Inc.

E. P. CONSER,
Secretary-Manager.

Following is a resolution recently adopted by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors asking aid from the state:

Whereas the housing situation in California, and particularly in Los Angeles County, has reached a serious crisis resulting in great hardship to returning servicemen and many other persons; and

Whereas there is no expectancy of immediate relief from the Federal Government; and,

Whereas, the solution of the housing problem is a joint responsibility of Federal, State, and local governments: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles as follows:

1. That Gov. Earl Warren be respectfully urged to include in his agenda for the special session of the legislature, provision for the legislature to grant or loan sufficient funds to the proper public agency in Los Angeles and other counties, in order to provide construction costs for temporary housing for returning war veterans and their families and others in such distress, such grant or loan to be repaid from rents and income derived from the project.

2. That such measures be undertaken as soon as possible to afford temporary relief until the Federal Government discharges its responsibility and until such time as private construction can adequately take care of the housing needs.

3. That a meeting be called of the representatives of Federal, State, county and city agencies interested in the housing problem in order to decide the proper authority or agency to operate such temporary housing projects.

It is further resolved and directed that copies of this resolution be sent to the Governor, to members of the California Legislature, Congressional representatives from Los Angeles County, and to the official housing agencies in this area, Federal, State, and local.

Frightened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, you better be frightened. I am. You will be, too, if you do a little thinking. Then we all, once we have thought the situation through, may be able to reach the inevitable conclusion that, while we may not all hang together—if we do not all stick together—we may all be hungry, lack the necessities of life, and come, as did France, to civil strife, if we do not all now act for the common good.

The strike of the bus and streetcar workers here in Washington, which twice within a month tied up the Government's business, delayed the processing of the discharge papers of veterans being demobilized, did not hurt or frighten me. I live within walking distance of the Capitol. A telephone operators' strike will not seriously hurt me. I will not miss the service half as much as the operator, after a few weeks, will miss her pay check.

Waking up hungry this morning, I remembered that I could not, as in days gone by, go to the kitchen, get some eggs that my own hens had laid, go into the cellar for a ham that came from my own farm, bring up a few potatoes grown in my own garden, get some milk and butter from a nearby farmer, and, with a little coffee and some bread my wife had baked, have breakfast. I realized that everything edible in the house came from grocery or market. All those items reached Washington only because someone had grown, processed, and transported each item.

If 150,000 General Motors employees go out on strike and they, with perhaps a half million or more others—automobile dealers, salesmen, mechanics—those dependent upon the automobile business for their livelihood—all lose their pay checks; if the demands of the CIO steel workers are not met and the production of steel is cut off and a million or more others go unpaid for a week or two, someone—in fact, several million someones besides myself—may be hungry, either through lack of pay checks or a scarcity of food.

If the bus drivers and teamsters go on strike, just what will happen—not to me, because you do not care anything about that—but to you, to all of us who are in the same boat? Do I hear you saying, "That will not happen—not to us"? It may. Do you ask, "What are you, Mr. Congressman, going to do about it? Why do you not pass a law to stop it all?"

Well, one answer is that, as long as the administration continues its political alliance with the labor leaders and politicians who are demanding and getting special favors, there is small prospect of getting any legislation, no matter how beneficial to the union worker himself, through this Congress. When the administration sees the necessity of legislating in behalf of all the people, instead of in behalf of Sidney Hillman and his PAC, Murray and his UAW-CIO, we will get some relief.

Now, do not fly off on a tangent. I am not "mad" at anyone. I do not know whether motors, steel, the telephone company, or other corporations, can or cannot give a 30-percent increase in wages without increasing the cost of the things they sell. I am not talking about the merits of any controversies.

Ford; Wilson of General Motors; Mosher, president of the NAM; Fairless of steel; a thousand other big businessmen; Hillman of the PAC; Philip Murray of the CIO; William Green of the A. F. of L.; John Lewis, and many other labor organizers and officials, will continue to have an adequate income, but the pay checks of the rank and file of the unions will cease when they quit work.

An employee cannot exist unless he receives an adequate wage. An employer will not create a job, operate a factory unless he makes a profit. Labor leaders advocating and calling strikes will not give any worker a worth-while job. A job must come from men who want to make money, who have the ability and the desire to build and operate a factory, open a business and hire others.

It is time we do a little sober thinking—act intelligently—remember that, if what appears to be coming actually comes, we will all suffer. Today, as always, to those who are dependent upon pay checks for their livelihood hardships come first; their suffering is always the most grievous.

The Fords, Wilsons, Chryslers, the Hillmans, the Murrays, and the Thomases—can get along all right. But what about you and me? If the strikes continue to spread, if violence, rioting, and civil strife come, just what will happen to you and to me—the average citizen? What will we eat? Wear? How continue in business?

Of what I see coming, I am afraid. Are you?

Postwar Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio speech which I made last night at Baltimore:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I am delighted to have this opportunity to speak to you tonight. Our good friend, Mr. Ian Ross MacFarlane, is ill and confined to his bed and has asked me to speak to you over this network. I know you all join with me in wishing for him a speedy recovery and a quick return to the microphone.

I have served in Congress in the prewar years, during the war, and now in this postwar era. It is hard to imagine any period in our history that was more important. This time we must view events from a world-wide perspective rather than from any narrow point of view. You have heard so many people say, "Now that we have won the war, we must not lose the peace.". This is a trite expression, but it is nevertheless true. I am thinking of the millions of inhabitants of Europe suffering from starvation and disease, whose homes were bombed out and who are living in cellars and attics. Their clothing is gone, and they face a terrible winter. Fuel supplies will be short and there will be starvation, disease, and death stalking over Europe. We cannot say this is not our problem, for it is out of the seeds of misery that new wars are born. It is from these distressing conditions that hates are engendered.

Today in Congress we are asked to keep our promise to save the starving men, women, and children of the occupied countries, a promise made by President Roosevelt and ratified by Congress. We pledged ourselves to contribute to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration certain sums of money. Of course, there has been inefficiency and waste. Some say the job could have been done better. But that's not the question. Should we allow these horrible, distressing conditions to continue, or should we keep our promise to pay the balance of our obligation into the treasury of UNRRA for the relief of the sick, the needy, and the dying.

I am on the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, and I voted

in the committee and on the floor of Congress for this appropriation, with no political strings attached to it. There are some who would play politics with misery, but they are unthinking and do not realize what they are doing. The Senate of the United States has agreed to strike out the unfair provision inserted in this bill to prevent the relief being administered to the poor peoples of some of the occupied countries unless certain conditions were met. I am confident that when the bill is returned to the House of Representatives it will approve the action of the Senate, and I am glad that I consistently took the stand in committee and on the floor that this money must be paid to UNRRA to save the starving, sick, and homeless millions.

I say that we dare not lose the peace, but if we do not come to the aid of these starving, homeless people, then we cannot escape our full measure of responsibility for what follows.

This has been a war of liberation, a war against fascism and its evil threat to civilization. Our armies, together with the armies of our allies, have liberated Europe, but it will prove a miserable liberation indeed if we have simply smashed the gates of tyranny and oppression to let in final destruction by starvation, disease, and political strife. I hope that in a few days Congress will finally approve this appropriation, and the supply of food and clothing can continue on its way to these war-stricken inhabitants of the occupied countries.

While we are talking about the possibilities of losing the peace, let me call your attention to a domestic situation that I believe needs to see the light of day. Recently I wrote to the chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, calling his attention to the fact that there has been an insidious "klandestin" revival of the Ku Klux Klan. I pointed out in my letter to him that we had concluded a world-wide war to preserve the principles of democracy, liberty, and freedom. We cannot permit organizations like the Ku Klux Klan and others of like type, by whatever name they may be called, to bore from within. They aim to array citizens against citizens and to strike at minorities. There were no racial groups in fox holes and no bullet asked a man's religion before it struck. I hope that my request for a complete investigation of this organization will bear fruit and that its membership, small as it may be, will scurry to cover. The dangers to domestic peace and tranquillity that such an organization means are perfectly apparent. True Americans will not tolerate subversive groups, whether they take the name of fascism, communism, Ku Klux Klanism, or any other. There has been criticism of this Un-American Activities Committee in Congress because of emphasis claimed by some on investigation of certain groups. This is an opportunity for the Un-American Activities Committee to show in a forthright way that un-American activities means exactly what it says, and that it is just as un-American to be a Ku Kluxer as it is to be a Fascist or a Communist.

Now for a moment let me come back to another subject. Just a day or so ago all foods were made ration-point free, except sugar. Housewives I know will rejoice, and rightly so. Still we have to be sure of what we are doing and watch those in power to prevent any serious mistakes being made. Just the other day I saw in the public press that someone in Washington was talking about slaughtering a hundred millions hens so they would stop laying eggs and this would keep up the price of eggs. Somebody in the Department of Agriculture was more anxious to keep up the price of eggs for the benefit of the farmers than he was to help the housewives of America. I promptly wrote to Mr. Clinton Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, and told him that I could never believe that there could be a surplus of food as long as there existed hungry people. There might be something wrong with distribution of food to consumers, but you don't solve the problem by destroying food. If they want to find some way to protect the farmers, there are better ways than by destroying eggs. I reminded the Secretary of Agriculture that 150 years ago Marie Antoinette said to the starving people of Paris, "Let them eat cake," when the poor people were only crying for bread. "Mr. Secretary of Agriculture, you say, 'Let them eat hens,' when what they want is a continual supply of eggs." Marie Antoinette lost her head. Let's make sure we don't lose our heads because of the clamor of one group for special costly favors to the detriment of the great masses. It is not the philosophy of destruction but the philosophy of production upon which national prosperity depends.

My time is growing short, but I cannot close without reminding you of a few recent events in history. There are many who today have brilliant hindsight but when our country faced its greatest challenge had no foresight at all. They are investigating the Pearl Harbor disaster. That's good. But don't let us ever lose sight of events as they really happened. I was in Congress when a bill was presented to fortify the Island of Guam, one of the outposts in the Pacific protecting our country. That appropriation was defeated by a group who believed that an ocean constituted a real barrier against our enemies. There were some of us who joined with our great President in voting for this appropriation, not because we could anticipate events yet to come, but because we believed that it was wise to prepare ourselves against events that were likely to happen. Then later came Germany's attack on Russia. Japan welcomed this war because it meant that she need fear no attack from Russia. So Japan looked southward toward our country. Then came the occupation by Japan of Indochina, and yet in the face of that—known as it was to every American, indeed to everyone who could read the newspapers—I repeat, in the face of what was so obvious, there were men in this country who on August 12, 1941, after all of these events, voted to discontinue our Selective Service System. It was saved by only one vote. I am glad that I was with that majority who believed in preparedness, and each of us has a warm feeling in his heart knowing that it was his vote that helped bring about that slim majority that prevented the abandonment of our civilian army.

I ask you to bear these facts in mind when you hear criticisms of events of the past.

Let me close now by saying that I am one of those optimists who believe that our domestic affairs will soon be on a less chaotic and more tranquil plane. I believe, too, that under the leadership of President Truman and Secretary of State Byrnes that our Nation will steer the proper course in this new atomic world that faces us, and I believe that as the weeks pass on into months and years, and as Mr. Ian Ross MacFarlane continues to keep you abreast of current events, you, too, will agree with me that events will so shape themselves that we will have a lasting peace and a prosperous Nation.

Letter of Beverly-Westwood Citizens Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I received this letter from one of the largest functioning citizens groups in my district this morning, and feel that their voice should be heard.

The Beverly-Westwood Citizens Committee has expressed herein the sentiments of many of my constituents who are addressing me daily on the subject.

I am sure that many of my colleagues here have gotten similar reactions from their constituents, and are concerned themselves over our departure from the traditional American foreign policy of self-determination for all peoples in the nations of the world.

The letter reads as follows:

NOVEMBER 20, 1945.

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The executive board of the Beverly-Westwood Citizens Committee, representing 1,500 precinct workers in the fifty-ninth and sixtieth assembly districts of California, who in turn influence 15,000 voters, decided unanimously to communicate to you our concern over your departure from basic policies which had guided this Nation during the war and which were to have laid the foundations for a durable peace.

When we organized and voted for the Roosevelt-Truman ticket in 1944 we were not supporting a political party or pledging allegiance to a personality. We were registering our approval of principles which we deemed essential to the future security of our country.

The basic question in the 1944 elections was whether the keystone of American foreign policy would be the growing unity of the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union for the preservation of world peace or whether we were to embark on a new era of power politics with nations taking unilateral action and developing blocs that must inevitably lead to new, disastrous war.

The American people chose the former policy and gave a mandate to your administration to carry it out.

It is our considered opinion that your administration has departed from that policy.

Wars cannot be prevented by armament races, by military conscription, by threats of secret weapons, or by swinging a big stick. The German Nation is a classic example of the failure of such policies.

Wars can be prevented only when the Big Three act in unison to create the conditions of peace.

Mr. President, what has become of the spirit of Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods and the Potsdam Declarations?

Are our American marines in China carrying out a policy of nonintervention? Are we furthering the cause of democracy and peace by giving material aid to Chiang Kai-shek—a dictator who has resisted every effort to broaden the democratic base in his country, a man who has expressed in writing his contempt for western cultures, an inept statesman who has brought his country to the verge of ruin, and who now coddles the Japanese and their puppet troops while he uses American arms and men to force civil war upon 90,000,000 anti-Fascist Chinese?

And Mr. President, if American troops are used against the Chinese people today, and if American materials of war are used against the Indonesian people, what guaranty have we that the atomic bomb will not be used tomorrow to further American interests which do not happen to coincide with the interests of some other foreign power?

We can no longer be content with verbal gestures toward unity while act after act of your administration runs counter to these promises. The time has come to call a halt

to this spirit of nationalism that is permeating our State Department.

Therefore we are calling upon you to take immediate positive steps to set the machinery of the United Nations Organizations into motion and to make that organization the decisive factor in all international questions. Let the United Nations Security Council decide on common policies for handling the atomic bomb, Japan, China, Indonesia, Spain, and all other explosive forces which may now or in the future threaten the peace of the world.

To do less is to depart from the Roosevelt tradition and to split the forces forming the democratic coalition both internally and on a world scale.

For all the A-bombs, battleships, and pious phrases in the world cannot change the basic truth that peace is indivisible.

Sincerely yours,

NELDA SALINGER,
Executive Secretary, Beverly-Westwood Citizens Committee.

Peacetime Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House this letter from Mr. Paul Shoup, president of the Los Angeles Merchants and Manufacturers Association. I believe that Mr. Shoup has given a very good analysis of the peacetime conscription question, and feel it most worth while to be included in the RECORD:

MERCHANTS AND MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,
Los Angeles, November 16, 1945.

The Honorable ELLIS E. PATTERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATTERSON: The Merchants and Manufacturers Association as an association does not deal with such questions as peacetime conscription, our problems being entirely those related to labor relations.

Speaking personally, I feel that the present Army and Navy organizations should be preserved in such numerical strength as will give them the necessary vitality; in other words, that the fire should not be allowed to go out and that there should be plenty of material available to make it as large as needs require. Aside from that, I do not at this time believe there should be peacetime conscription, taking young men a year out of their natural activities in order to give them military knowledge. I have reviewed the subject with President Tresidder, of Stanford University, where I am a trustee, at some length. He was a flyer in the First World War and as a trained observer found, after the war, that the discipline and training of the young men in the war did not better them materially in any way subsequent thereto. With that premise the only question, then, is of military necessity.

Before determining military necessity and involving the great expense to the country and deprivation of young men of free control over their own time for a year, it should be, in my judgment, very clearly and fully developed as to what the changes are in the art of war that have been brought about by science and its application. Certainly the public has no clear idea as to that. No one knows what has been made obsolescent, temporarily at least, or not. Obviously if control of the air and of effective bombing either through that control or long-range guns has the power with use of the atomic bomb now attributed thereto, then arises the question of what use our present Army and Navy will be, aside from occupation following the powers of destruction.

Putting it briefly, what are these young men to be trained to do? Until we have an answer to that I do not see the value of peacetime conscription.

With respect to what we might call the science end of warfare, the situation is much more clear, and volunteers should be asked for with ample preparation and ample pay, not only to provide the necessary force through training, but develop further power through research. And the pay should be such as will be attractive. Fifty thousand men at eight or ten thousand dollars a year, if qualified for such work, might well be worth a great deal more in event of conflict than an army of 5,000,000 men with a military training that they could achieve in a year; and the expense would be very much less, and certainly our Nation needs to guard the use of expenditure of the Government dollar as it never did before.

The foregoing is rather by way of illustration than presenting any conclusions; but leads to the suggestion that the present Congress pass up for this session the question of a universal or widespread peacetime conscription and devote the money and thought of the country to the development of science and its application; and make room for the use of highly qualified men in limited number in that work.

Yours truly,

PAUL SHOUP, *President.*

A bill relating to the reentry of Chinese laborers and Chinese wives and children into the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That any wife or child of a Chinese merchant and any Chinese wife of a citizen of the United States who, after May 27, 1941, and before the date of enactment of this act, received a permit (commonly referred to as form 631) to reenter the United States under section 10 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 210), shall be permitted to reenter the United States as though such permit was issued on the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. Any person temporarily admitted to the United States under section 6 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to prohibit the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States," approved September 13, 1888, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 277), as a merchant and any person temporarily admitted to the United States as a wife or child of a Chinese merchant shall be considered for purposes of section 10 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 210), as having been admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

Where Do Wages Come From?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOREST A. HARNESS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Peter F. Drucker from the Saturday Evening Post of November 17, 1945:

WHERE DO WAGES COME FROM?
(By Peter F. Drucker)

In the welter of claims and counterclaims, charges and countercharges, which accompany the current union drive for higher wages, one question is rarely discussed: Where will the higher wages come from?

Union leaders, if they raise the question at all, try to answer it with the time-worn slogan of high business profits out of which labor's demand for higher wages will be satisfied. But this is really only an attempt to evade the answer by playing on popular ignorance. In the most successful business, profits are only a tiny fraction of wages—less than 5 percent, to be correct. Even a very small boost in wages could not be paid for out of profits, let alone the large increases the unions demand today.

If we take the income of all American business in 1944—the last year for which complete statistics are available—and take out all the money paid to people outside the business—the supplies of raw materials and machines, the creditors, the Government in the form of taxes—we find that labor got practically all the rest. Out of each dollar available after obligations to outside suppliers and creditors had been paid, 92 cents went to labor in the form of wages. Even of the remaining 8 cents a large share—actually, more than half—was not profit available to the shareholders and owners, but had to be plowed back into the business for future expansion from which labor benefits as much as shareholders. Actually, only 3½ cents out of each dollar available in American business and industry last year went to the owner of the business as a profit. Even if we distributed all business profits to labor, wages would only be increased by less than 4 percent as against the 30 percent increase demanded by the unions.

We find the same situation if we look at individual businesses rather than at the national average. In the United States Steel Corp., the worker received, in 1944, 93 cents of every available dollar; in Bethlehem Steel, 95 cents; in General Motors, 90 cents; and at Goodyear Rubber, 91 cents. In some industries such as railroading, labor's share is even larger; 97½ cents out of every dollar available at the Illinois Central Railroad was spent on wages.

Nor is the picture very different if we analyze the prewar period. In 1941, the year during which American business made its highest profits, labor received a little more than 88 cents out of every dollar of available income, with the rest split halfway between the shareholders and the future expansion needs of business. In bad years, such as 1932 or 1938, labor gets 100 cents of each dollar of available income or more; in other words, the business operates at a loss. In other countries it may still be possible to pay higher wages by whittling down the profits of business; for in no other country does labor obtain anywhere near the share in business income it receives in this country. But in the United States surely higher wages cannot be paid for out of business profits.

There are thus only two sources of higher wages. Industry can charge higher prices for its products. Or we can obtain the money for higher wages by a greater efficiency of labor under which the worker produces more goods in the same period of work. In either case, a surplus income would be available with which to increase wage rates.

The first way—higher prices—clearly defeats its own purpose. If we increase prices in order to increase wages, the worker would simply lose as a consumer what he has just gained as a producer. Actually, the worker would not only not gain anything, he would lose on balance. The people whose incomes have not risen together with that of the worker—employees on fixed salaries, farmers, small businessmen, and professional men—would be unable to buy as much as

before. Thus the demand for the workers' products would go down, and with it employment. And high wage rates are of no use to the worker who cannot find a job.

There is thus only one real source of higher wages—increased productivity. Greater output per man-hour alone makes it possible for the workers to get a higher income. The whole tremendous increase of the standard of living since the industrial revolution has been based on a steady increase in productivity per man-hour. And of the additional wealth created by higher productivity, the worker has always received the lion's share. Real wages—that is, the amount of goods and services which the worker's wage will buy—have actually risen considerably faster than has productivity. In other words, the greater the industrial efficiency, the less will be the shares that go to the middleman and to the owner.

The best recent example is the rayon industry. Between 1929 and 1941, the productivity of the worker in the rayon industry was increased more than fourfold by technological progress. This made possible a cutting of the rayon price by almost two-thirds, which, in turn, led to a sixfold increase in the consumption of rayon goods. But during the same period the wage of the rayon worker also increase two-thirds; and even though technological progress made it possible for each worker to turn out more than four times as much as he had done in 1929, the industry employed one-third more men than at the peak of the boom.

Although few industries equaled rayon in technological progress in the years before the war, the general picture was the same: steady increase in productivity per man-hour, resulting in steady cuts in prices and a steady increase in the wage rate. Since the war, however, things have changed considerably. Of the 21 industries on which the Department of Labor published detailed figures, 11 have managed to continue the increase in productivity right through the war, in two industries the output per man-hour is the same as before the war, but in 8 industries it has gone down. These figures do not include the new industries such as aircraft, nor the industries which changed to completely new products, such as, for instance, the automobile industry. But we know that in these war industries productivity per man-hour fell sharply—though less in this country apparently than in Great Britain or Germany.

Wages at the same time have gone up steeply everywhere throughout industry. As a result, it costs, today, much more to produce goods than it did before the war in practically all American plants. In the cement industry, for instance, the 1944 worker turned out only four-fifths as much cement as before the war, but his income was 50 percent higher. In the cotton industry, production per man-hour was maintained, but for the same work the worker received twice as much money. In the production of boots and shoes, a worker turned out in 1 hour about as much as he turned out in 1939, though less than he produced in 1941. But his pay was half as high again as it was before the war started.

This does not mean that American industry or American labor is less efficient than it used to be. Actually, it is remarkable that American industry and American labor could be as efficient as they have been, considering the inexperience of our wartime labor force, the change in products and in methods of production, and the strain under which the industrial machine has been laboring. And the main reason why wage costs have risen so much faster than productivity was the widespread use of overtime and nightwork with higher wage rates. Altogether, there can be little doubt that American industry has learned a great deal during this war and that we can expect a very rapid rise of industrial efficiency and productivity, now that the war is over. Many industrial leaders are certain that an increase of 15 percent in wage rates on top of the 20-percent wartime increase can be balanced by higher productivity. Nevertheless, the question remains: Can we satisfy the unions' demands that the worker receive as much for a 40-hour week as he now receives for 52 hours of work—the slogan of the "unchanged take-home pay"—without raising prices so high as to make inevitable an economic collapse? Can we expect productivity per man-hour to go up so fast during the next year or two as to catch up with a jump of one-third in labor costs?

Even if productivity increases fast enough to make possible the satisfaction of the unions' demand, there would still be the question whether all this increase should go to the worker or whether it is not more equitable and also more profitable for the worker himself to cut in the consumer through lower prices. But before we can even discuss this much-debated and difficult question, we must realize that the only source of higher wages for the worker is the worker himself.

Statement of Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, of Boston, on Peacetime Military Conscription

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement opposing peacetime military conscription by Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, of Boston. This statement appeared in the Pilot, official publication of the archdiocese of Boston:

HIS EXCELLENCY OPPOSES PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION

Speaking at the communion breakfast of St. Patrick's Alumnae, Roxbury, and later at a similar event sponsored by St. Joseph's Alumni, Archbishop Cushing repeated his opposition to peacetime military conscription. "There is another matter," he said, "on which I wish to comment briefly. It is a matter which would affect the lives of all. It would affect the future of individuals and their personal, vocational plans. It would affect the futures of families and their morality. It might even have a serious indirect effect upon the church itself, especially upon the future of its education and the vocations to its priesthood. It would radically change, in many important respects, our whole American way of life.

"I refer to the proposal that we adopt a program of permanent conscription of young men for peacetime military training.

"Judging from the daily papers, many people propose to defeat this program for political and military reasons. There are many good grounds upon which, apparently, they can do so. I am not concerned with these. I am concerned with moral and social reasons why peacetime conscription would be disastrous for our democracy."

NOT A NEW IDEA

"First of all, let it be remembered that this idea is not a new one. If we adopt it, we will not be the first nation to have done so. Wherever permanent conscription has been tried by any major nation, it has a bad history. Since first Napoleon used peacetime conscription and Prussia followed his bad example, the system invariably led to dictatorship, to militarism, and to those competitive armaments which have been the curse of Europe and the crippling of its culture.

"That is what Cardinal Gasparri meant when he counseled the nations to outlaw this system after the last war. Cardinal Gasparri knew Europe well. He knew its history and the causes of its wars. He knew the things which alone could save Europe; he knew the things which had ruined it. He blamed peacetime conscription for the conditions and the atmosphere in Europe which produced wars in every generation. He said 'Peacetime conscription in Europe has been the true cause of so many and such great evils for more than a century that the only hope (for the future) lies in its total, simultaneous abolition by the nations.'

"The great Cardinal was right, and those who refused to heed his advice on this point were wrong. By tolerating the continuance of peacetime conscription in Europe, they made World War II inevitable. God forbid that we now imitate Europe in her worst systems. God forbid that a program which has been so bloodily discredited in Europe should now become part of our postwar program. It may interest you to know that many of America's greatest peoples came to this country precisely in order to escape the moral and social conditions in the Europe of the last century which conscription caused. One of America's most envied characteristics in the years before the war was her freedom from the regimentation and the moral decay which permanent conscription has always brought with it in Europe."

APPALLING EFFECTS

"Our people have never refused their wholehearted cooperation to any military program made necessary by a real emergency. But, emergencies are by their very nature temporary. If a temporary emergency ever exists which appears to require conscription, then people living in a democracy have a right to know what that emergency is, what is being done about it, and why military measures are necessary in order to meet it. But no temporary emergency should be made the excuse for a permanent program of militarism, a program spelling the end of our total way of life.

"Religious people have further grounds for reservation with regard to these proposals. We are faced with appalling evidence of the effects on national morality of conscription in Japan, in France, in Germany, and in the other major nations which have established this system. We hear disturbing reports of what the Army policies on morality, especially sex morality, can do and have done to the moral philosophies and practices of even our boys. Even temporary, necessary wartime conscription brings with it serious moral problems. I do not need to elaborate that point. But the proposals to make this permanent and part of our permanent peacetime set-up are frightening. If every American boy in his late teens is going to be exposed to this system and to all that goes with it in the way of "moral" and "hygienic" education, then America and religion have some dark days ahead for them. We are going to be a very different people, and the history of Europe and of Asia gives us no reason to believe that we are going to be a better people or a more prosperous people.

"That same history makes us fear that we will not even have the peace which, we are told, conscription will protect. Germany had peacetime conscription, and Germany did not keep the peace. France had peacetime conscription and France could not keep the peace. Every losing nation in World War II was a nation which relied for its defense on peacetime conscription, and which had been bled white in its moral and physical life by the conditions which peacetime conscription

makes inevitable. I hope you will not be deceived by emotional arguments in favor of this system; read its actual history elsewhere and meditate on its moral implications before you decide that it is a good idea for America."

Foreign Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting herewith a copy of the speech which I made before the National Industrial Conference Board, an organization composed of some of the leading businessmen in the country, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City on November 20, last, on the subject of foreign loans.

The speech follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the National Industrial Conference Board, I feel very highly honored to be invited to discuss such an important subject as that of foreign loans before such a distinguished and enlightened assemblage of American business leaders. Permit me in the premises to acknowledge with humility my own knowledge of my inability to appropriately and adequately do the job. I should also like to disclaim in the beginning any pretense to a knowledge of world economics or, for that matter, to being an economist. But after some 2 years of arduous application to the job of serving as chairman of the Special House Committee on Postwar Economic Policy, I do modestly confess that I have arrived at some definite conclusions about the common horse-sense variety of economics.

FOREIGN TRADE AND LOANS

The subject assigned me for discussion is foreign loans. But, Mr. Chairman, since the question of foreign American loans is inseparable from American foreign trade, it is impossible to deal with the one without discussing the other. I assume that my invitation to appear here before you this evening arises from the fact that seven members of the full Postwar Economic Policy Committee recently returned from a mission to Europe to study first-hand the economic situation there and to check up on the sixth report of that committee dealing with foreign trade, which was issued last May. That subcommittee was composed of Representatives ZIMMERMAN of Missouri, WOLVERTON of New Jersey, HOPE of Kansas, WOLCOTT of MICHIGAN, LEFEVRE of New York, SIMPSON of Illinois, and myself; we were accompanied by Messrs. Marion B. Folsom, our staff director, and Dr. William Y. Elliott, as special consultant. Upon our return we made a report of our findings to the full committee, which consists of 10 Democrats and 8 Republicans. In addition to the 7 who made the European trip, the committee is made up of the following: Representatives COOPER of Tennessee, WALTER of Pennsylvania, VOORHIS of California, MURDOCK of Arizona, LYNCH of New York, O'BRIEN of Illinois, FOGARTY of Rhode Island, WORLEY of Texas, GIFFORD of Massachusetts, REECE of Tennessee, and WELCH of California.

And I am happy to be able to report to you that those findings were unanimously approved, without dissent, by this full committee. In fact, I hope I may be pardoned in expressing justifiable pride in the fact that all of the eight reports filed by this committee, composed of men representing various phases of our political and geographical views—and dealing with a wide variety of subjects—have all been unanimously reported to the Congress and the country.

This report, which was filed with the Congress last week, deals with the whole subject of the economic reconstruction of Europe. Foreign loans and foreign trade are but two aspects of the report. And I hope it will be borne in mind that in the discussion of foreign loans, with which the report deals in part, it is assumed that private loans will follow if suitable conditions for those loans are made by the borrowing countries.

FOREIGN LOANS

Foreign loans in our opinion can only be justified (1) on the broad basis of humanity and good will; (2) for economic reasons, including the fostering of American trade; and (3) for political purposes, looking to world economic rehabilitation coupled with a resultant world peace.

On the first justified principle it will be borne in mind that the United States today is contributing, as a gift, approximately 80 percent of all of the funds and goods that go to the relief of the stricken countries of Europe under the administration of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. And while that laudable undertaking is rendering a very high and noble purpose, there are many barriers—due to the conflicting interests of the various foreign states—which substantially handicap the purpose undertaken of feeding and clothing, to a subsistence level, the unfortunate peoples of war-ridden Europe, it is nevertheless recognized that in the name of humanity that work must continue.

The objective of American policy with reference to foreign loans should be primarily to increase in every way possible the total trade of the world as a contribution to a stable and enduring peace. It is recognized that America's share in this increased world prosperity would play a very important part in determining the size of the national income in the United States and the extent of its employment and production. Without a substantial world trade it is difficult to foresee just how America is going to be enabled to maintain its goal of full employment, its high standard of living, and at the same time retire or even carry, without inflation, any substantial portion of its stupendous national debt.

But while the opportunities for American foreign trade are more than an idle dream, there are many obstacles to overcome. There must first be a rehabilitated Europe. Those of us who visited postwar Europe a few weeks ago were nothing short of amazed, in spite of our reading knowledge, of the destruction that exists there. The economic plight of Europe beggars description. The destruction of many of the principal cities of Europe is beyond belief. One sees piles of debris where once beautiful cities thrived and then cannot believe his eyes. While the destruction of the factories—the source of production of raw materials into finished products—is not as complete as one might have anticipated from the heavy bombardments that took place, the ability of the remaining factories to produce and of the remnants of those cities to function and thereby furnish employment and facilities for livelihood is shattered. The whole transportation system is so completely devastated that orderly economic functioning is not possible. In fact, the prospects for the people in parts of France, Norway, Belgium, Russia, and all of Germany, to come through the ensuing winter without serious hardships and deterioration below minimum levels of subsistence are anything but good. Moreover, ruinous inflation is the rule in most of these countries rather than the exception. If some of these countries, and particularly Germany, are not driven into communism or anarchy within the next few years it will be most surprising. That there is a necessity and a crying need for financial assistance in the form of long-term loans to most of these countries is unquestioned. Of the 14 countries which we visited, Sweden alone bears any resemblance to a normal peacetime economy and degree of prosperity, and even Sweden's industries are marking time for lack of coal.

As a part of the short-term problems these countries must have dollar exchange with which to purchase capital goods, all types of locomotives, rolling stock, trucks, rails, and other items of transportation and communication. The housing problem is most acute. Some cities had as much as 50 percent of their dwellings destroyed. In Germany most cities ran to a much higher percentage. Moreover, these people must have food, raw materials, medicine, and other immediate necessities if millions are not to die from the slow and pitiful process of starvation.

Next to the transportation and communication difficulties of Europe and perhaps on a par in importance is the shortage of coal and other fuels for the resumption of industrial production. France, for example, always had to import at least one-third of its requirements and was in very large measure dependent upon coal from the Ruhr and the Saar areas. Belgium and Holland require special coal from the Ruhr areas; and Luxemburg is dependent upon the Ruhr for its whole industrial life. In addition to these sources, the large centers of coal production of Europe were in former German Silesia, now Polish territory, and in Czechoslovakia. In spite of the machinery afforded by this country under lend-lease to improve British production, coal production in England is still far short of the needs for industry and heating plus the necessary bunker exports of coal. The coal problem presents not only the difficulties of securing adequate transportation but of getting miners and skilled operators as well as management. The removal of Polish and Russian coal miners from the liberated areas of France and Belgium has further complicated the picture.

SOURCE OF LOANS

Unfortunately, from our point of view, there is only one substantial source to which these countries can look for financial assistance in the form of loans to rehabilitate their devastated countries and that country is America. While it is true that Britain is offering credits, Canada is making sizable loans, and Sweden, Switzerland, and some of the South American countries are making comparatively small loans, in the final analysis these countries turn their eyes again toward Washington for relief from the chaos that threatens their economies and their governments. As one who believes and has repeatedly stated that America cannot forever be expected to play the role of a gargantuan Santa Claus, I am nevertheless convinced that there is a place in this dismal picture for American loans.

But, like most average American citizens, I am not unmindful of what happened after World War I when America, playing its traditional role of big brother, made large loans to the European nations who had suffered from the ravages of that war. Then the immediate post-armistice loans suffered the same general fate as the war debts. Neither am I unmindful of American public opinion today. And it is to be doubted whether American public opinion currently would approve of large-scale loans without assurances and guaranties of the protection of our interests, even though the economic and humanitarian aspects abroad are more forceful now than then. The fact that those loans were largely repudiated is sure to be revived in any argument for large American loans now. Moreover, that situation today is aggravated by the reaction toward some of the recent policies of our allies in the late European war.

All through its trip the committee found that the countries visited, almost without exception, were returning to the principles of

bilateralism; barter, with the accompanying features of frozen or controlled exchanges; quotas on imports; subsidized exports; and other devices which hamper world trade. This was due, it was recognized, to the present lack of adequate holdings of foreign assets to support large import programs and the inevitable absence of exports that accompanied the destruction of the productive systems, or their almost total use for war purposes.

With a view to seeking remedies for these conditions the committee interviewed the heads of the governments concerned, including Generalissimo Stalin and Prime Minister Attlee, the finance and commerce ministers, and the heads of the planning agencies. In nearly all countries the foreign ministers were included because of the direct bearing of political obligations on economic policy.

CONDITIONS OF LOANS

As imperatively needed as this financial assistance is to these war-devastated countries, and as strong as is our desire to assist in their rehabilitation and to bring about the coveted goal of a stabilized peace, we are convinced that our assistance and cooperation should not continue to be a unilateral undertaking. And while the barriers previously mentioned, as well as others, are being raised by most of the countries now seeking, or which will hereafter seek, loans from this country, it is recognized that the largest loans sought are those by Great Britain and Russia, with France a close third. China is sure to follow, and many another country is lined up with outstretched hands. Throughout this war, as in the previous one and the peace that followed it, America is called upon to play the role of the good Samaritan. And though this role has been a laudable one, it is doubtful that we can always continue it. Somewhere along the line America's own interest must be considered. Cooperation cannot always be a one-way street. And in this connection I should like to repeat here that, in my judgment, there must be a stiffening of our collective backbones in dealing with some of our allies of the late war. The policy of coddling can be taken for weakness.

Assuming that world economic stabilization and world peace were our only goals, one could well visualize America's unrestricted contribution of fifty or even another hundred billion dollars, added to its already staggering national debt, if, by such contribution or gift, it had definite assurance of that peace. But in the light of present events, and in the knowledge of the selfishness of human beings, which is reflected in human organizations called governments, we are forced to realize that perpetual peace among men cannot be bought that way. We must consider the practical aspects of the situation which confronts us.

Therefore, our committee has recommended to the American Congress and through it to the American people that before such large-scale loans can be made the borrowing nations should make certain reasonable concessions, and that our financial assistance should redound to the interest of the creditor as well as the debtor. The committee, broadly representative of the House of Representatives, felt that loans should be used to increase world production and get other nations on their feet and off relief. But it felt strongly that we should not let nations use our funds to flout our own policies, loans must be made an instrument of our total foreign-economic policy.

GREAT BRITAIN

Our recent mission brought about a rather lengthy stay in London and extended conferences with our American officials there and the responsible British officials, including Prime Minister Attlee, Mr. Bevin, Sir Stafford Cripps, Mr. Dalton, and other cabinet ministers, as well as business leaders and former cabinet ministers.

With the political situation existing in Europe today, our committee could certainly not be charged with approaching the question of British economy and security with a lack of sympathy. The committee appreciates the extremely difficult economic problems which the United Kingdom faces as the result of 6 years of war. Prior to the war, Great Britain met her unfavorable balance of trade by the income received from overseas investments, and the income from shipping, insurance, and other services. Not only has she been forced to sell a substantial proportion of her investments but new overseas debts to the extent of $14,000,000,000 were incurred. Her income from shipping and other services has also been greatly reduced. On the other hand, she faces the problem of repairing and replacing homes damaged by the war and of making up the deficit incurred in the war years when no houses were built. The committee was informed that over 200,000 houses have been damaged beyond repair and 3,000,000 others damaged to some extent. Industry is also in need of new machinery and new buildings and must repair or replace those damaged during the war.

Britain's foreign assets have diminished by one-third, or perhaps nearly one-half. But she still controls the richest raw material resources of the world.

Our trade with Great Britain in the past has been greater than with any other single nation. Britain's present position requires assistance to get back on a sound trading basis. To facilitate this recovery is to facilitate our own trade and to promote world stability and recovery. Over 5 to 7 percent of foreign trade, in terms of our national income, fertilizes all the rest of our trade and transportation, and make up 30 to 40 percent of some of our most important industry—total trade.

The committee feels that a solution to the present problems involved in American foreign trade with countries within the so-called sterling area must be worked out as a prime requisite for large-scale loans to Britain. It recognizes the basic need of Britain for exports in order to maintain the living standards of its population. The great burden of loans from Empire and other countries has resulted in sterling balances in London that cannot be liquidated on any short-term basis.

It is clear that under the present conditions of a shortage of foreign exchange, and without the availability of large-scale loans, some temporary restrictions on British imports are necessary. These measures, however, should not be continued beyond such time as loans are made available to clear up outstanding difficulties of exchange shortage. The committee feels that while it is natural for England to resort to a continuation of import controls, government purchases, and quotas, there must be assurance of freeing trade within the shortest possible period. Exchange controls through London should be the first to go. It is also felt that productive loans can be made to England and to the countries to whom England owes large sums of blocked sterling for war debts. We are convinced that scaling down and funding of the war debts of Britain to these countries is a preliminary step to any agreement to furnish loans by the United States. All loans, settlements, of lend-lease agreements, and surplus property agreements should be made contingent upon the willingness of England to remove the temporary restrictions on imports, with a schedule agreed upon for their timely removal.

The same principle would apply to the removal of exchange controls which have been made necessary in wartime and are continued as a result of war debts in neutral areas and countries of the sterling area. These controls effectively prevent at the present time any large purchases from the United States by countries like India and Egypt. They are supplemented by bilateral agreements presently being negotiated and by a continuation of the Ottawa agreements affording tariff preferences within the Empire. These should also be modified.

SOVIET REPUBLIC

Among the countries visited by our committee was that of the Soviet Republic. We spent a strenuous and productive week there endeavoring to learn first-hand the economic structure of that great country—to determine as far as possible what portion of Russia's economy was going into armaments and, generally, to ascertain just what this resurrected giant of the Old World had as its objective in a world remade by World War II. Of course, in the proper appraisal of Russia and its objectives, as well as its needs, one must take into consideration the inherent differences that exist between the peoples of that republic and their political system as contrasted with the English-speaking races. But notwithstanding this, the committee was amazed—in spite of the efforts of the Government to make our stay there as pleasant as possible—at the lack of economic and political freedom of the individual as compared with that of the average American citizen. It was disappointed in the absence of opportunities afforded other peoples to visit Russia and to fraternize with a friendly ally. Likewise, the committee was disappointed in its inability to find the answer to some of the questions that it asked. It was difficult for a committee of American Congressmen to understand, for instance, why our great and friendly ally, the Soviet Republic, would not permit American planes to fly into Russia, or why even the figures on gold production should be treated as an official secret. In general, the large degree of secrecy with which the Russian Government surrounds itself and its people, preventing friendly commercial and even diplomatic relations between itself and its recent allies in war, is difficult to understand. Unless Russia reconverts its war machine to peace, why should we support it? It may mean business, but from the world point of view, as well as our own, it may not be good business. And our committee upon its return made some very pointed references to that policy, and particularly pointed out that the almost complete Russian censorship of news by the correspondents of her allies since the war was highly deplorable. In this connection, it might be interesting to note that as a result, certainly in part, of that criticism, we are told that this ban is now being removed.

But the committee fully recognizes the tremendous destruction in Russia caused by Hitler's armies. At least 40 percent of the industrial capacity of Russia was at one time under German domination; its coal mines in the Don Basin were largely wrecked; Stalingrad, a center of important industrial production, was reduced to ruins. The all-out war efforts of its people, the loss of many millions of men, and the destruction and scattering of many more millions of the civilian population, as well as the "scorched earth" policy that covered large parts of the farming areas of Russia, have reduced the standard of living of the people far below the levels—never high—of prewar Soviet Russia.

There would seem to be a real economic opportunity for extensive trade between the United States and Russia. The committee was informed that Russia needs immediately and during the next few years a wide variety of tremendous quantities of goods produced by the United States—locomotives, rolling stock, transportation equipment of all kinds, machine tools, construction equipment, and capital goods in general. On the other hand, Russia can supply the United States with minerals such as manganese, chrome, and asbestos, as well as timber, various wood products, and furs in limited amounts, as well as large amounts of gold. How much of the latter can we reasonably continue to take raises another question.

Whether these possibilities of trade expansion can be realized for the benefit of both countries depends not only on the possibility of granting productive loans by the United States to Russia but also upon the full cooperation of both countries in respect to working out the economic conditions for repayment of loans and for working together on equal terms. Cooperation with Soviet Russia on equal terms is certainly a basic objective of the foreign policy of the United States. If, however, the Russian policy continues to insist upon a high degree of secrecy on fundamental aspects of its economy, including its armament policy, and to prevent the entry into Russia and the free passage within Russian boundaries of technicians and members of the press from the United States and other countries, a barrier exists against real cooperation.

It is therefore our opinion that a sound relationship between the United States and Russia, which is obviously an important objective, and the granting of loans, must in the nature of the case be dependent upon the satisfactory clarification of the following points:

(a) What is to be the policy of Russia in devoting to armaments the production over which it has control? What portion of Russian production will continue to be devoted to armaments and what relation does this bear to her needs? How does Russian policy in this regard compare with that of other countries?

(b) The full and frank disclosure of Russian statistics and an opportunity to scrutinize the facts upon which they are based with regard to economic production in all parts of Russia.

(c) The fulfillment of Russia's political obligations on the same terms as those of other governments. This includes the withdrawal of Russian occupation forces in accordance with the Potsdam agreements and the Yalta Conference and other agreements.

(d) The disclosure of the terms of the trade treaties made by Russia with the eastern European countries now under Russian occupation and control. Without this information it is impossible to estimate what should be American policy toward these countries as well as Russia.

(e) The administration of relief in these areas on nonpolitical lines and in a way that does not permit the siphoning off of supplies to Russia which will have to be replaced by the relief afforded from the United States and UNRRA sources.

(f) The committee feels that the protection of American property, including copyrights, in the countries under Russian control in eastern Europe should be a condition for loans to these countries. We cannot see our books, periodicals, newspapers, and movies blocked out in countries asking us for aid and loans.

The Department of State has insisted upon the protection of the freedoms guaranteed at the Yalta Conference—freedom of religion, press, and elections. The committee feels that Russia itself should afford adequate opportunities both for diplomatic and uncensored journalistic inquiries and representation within Russia, and should agree to the rights of entry of planes such as is accorded freely to Russia by other countries.

While I have singled out England and Russia for consideration, there are some general conditions attaching to loans to any country that the committee also felt should be borne in mind if congressional support is to be had for a constructive loan policy.

1. Lend-lease settlements and surplus property should be made a first requirement for cleaning up outstanding problems through earmarking such parts of the loans to be made as may be required for these settlements. There is a real question about the return of unexpired lend-lease materials or its payment on the same terms as other surpluses. We feel that no country which has refused to make an equitable settlement for the disposal of our permanent installations under lend-lease is entitled to come in once again for aid from the American taxpayer.

2. The equitable protection of our civil aviation rights, communications and the exports of our most valuable advertising media, such as books, periodicals, newspapers and movies, ought to be insisted upon as a condition for loans.

3. Countries which have not shown their willingness to support the Bretton Woods program, supported by the American Congress and public as a means of internationalizing the burden of large-scale rehabilitation and exchange stabilization, have small claim for sympathetic consideration for purely American loans until they at least show a disposition to cooperate in getting Bretton Woods underway.

CONCLUSION

Sirs, in conclusion, permit me to reiterate that it is not the position of either the chairman or the members of the Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy of your House of Representatives to strike a hard bargain, or to attempt to play the role of a Shylock in dealing with our less fortunate Allies of the recent deplorable conflict. But I believe that even a casual reading of the report of this committee will convince any fair-minded person that we believe in and earnestly desire to cooperate in the rehabilitation of these devastated countries, and to relieve the suffering occasioned by the mad dreams of the fanatical, totalitarian Hitler and his comic puppet, Mussolini. But in this desire we must be realistic; we must see to it that our efforts are not again in vain. We must insofar as possible keep the faith with our own returning soldiers and with those of our sacred dead who lie beneath the soil of foreign lands.

The United States of America entered this war with but one objective—the prevention of the realization of the dreams of world conquest, the destruction of the freedom of humanity, and the setting up of a world dictatorship. While it is true that her cities escaped the ravages of bombardment and her civilians the unprovoked death of the innocent, it is also a salient fact that America suffered more than a million casualties and today faces a staggering national war debt never heretofore approached in even a slight degree by any other people. The United States has freely and boldly made this tremendous contribution with but one goal in sight—peace on earth and good-will toward men. Assuredly, now that the bugle of peace has sounded, the American people should have a voice in the use to be made of additional billions of financial assistance to her Allies. Certainly we have a duty to see that such financial assistance so granted should be expended with the least possible injury to our own economy. In the name of justice and humanity it is our duty to see to it that our dollars shall never again be used to break the peace.

Black-Market Thievery Multiplied by OPA Stupidity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, racketeering and gangsterism was a dangerous moral illness in America during the prohibition days. However, that evil situation will look like a game of post office at a Christian Endeavor social alongside the black-market thievery now developing, unless the OPA and the administration have the honesty and the courage to face our economic problems realistically.

The following editorial from the New York Times outlines this problem with simplicity and frankness:

BLACK MARKETS

A study by the Office of Price Administration has revealed that for many goods and services black-market transactions have become more frequent and of greater significance since VJ-day. The goods and services for which illegal prices are still being charged include coal, furniture, housewares, clothing, building materials, used cars, apartments, and repairs and other services. For food it was reported that there were more than twice as many criminal prosecutions in the 3 months since VJ-day as in any previous 3-month period.

The black market arises because the demand for goods and services at the fixed prices is substantially in excess of the supply available. Normally this disequilibrium between supply and demand would be adjusted through rising prices. With prices fixed, however, the adjustment takes place through a deterioration in the quality of the goods sold and supplementary payments. When there is a serious unbalance between supply and demand we have a choice of paying higher prices over the counter or paying them under the counter. Today the payments are being made under the counter. While this procedure may slow up the advance in some cases, it tends to increase the size of the price rise in others because there must be included in the illegal price a sum adequate to cover the penalties and the risks incurred by the seller, who may be caught.

We will continue to have black markets as long as prices are fixed below levels which would be warranted in a free market. Moreover, as long as OPA attempts to control practically all prices it is faced with an impossible enforcement job. There is no reason why luxury products should continue under price control. OPA should confine its activities only to the fundamental necessities. The alternative is black-market prices and a smaller volume of supplies as producers refuse to go into production or to send their products to the market at what they consider to be low prices.

How "Dry" Are the "Dry" States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the so-called "dry" States are still at the old game of buncombe—exacting taxes and license fees from purveyors of liquor and thereby placing halos over the heads of bootleggers.

The Associated Press recently had a story in the Washington Post. It contained a compilation from official reports of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. United States Treasury Department, showing the number of special taxpayers purchasing special-tax stamps in the

State of Kansas during the fiscal years 1944 and 1945, as follows:

	1944	1945
Wholesale liquor dealers	18	19
Retail liquor dealers	546	603
Retail dealers in medicinal liquors	7	6
Manufacturers of nonbeverage products:		
Less than 25 gallons	1	1
50 gallons or more	2	3
Not exceeding 50 gallons		1
Retail dealers in wines and malt liquors	132	68
Wholesale dealers in fermented malt liquors	148	167
Retail dealers in fermented malt liquors	3,157	3,140
Temporary dealers in liquors (beer or wine)	5	50

In other words, if you want to sell liquor in Kansas, all you need do is to get a Federal license, Kansas State laws to the contrary notwithstanding. A Federal license is the open sesame to a lucrative liquor business.

I insert hereby an interesting statement appearing in Collier's of November 24 entitled "The Sip in Mississippi," by an outstanding writer, Carlisle Bargeron.

THE SIP IN MISSISSIPPI

(By Carlisle Bargeron)

The muttering around the State capitol in Jackson is growing louder every day. Many of the citizens are growling that Mississippi's black-market law makes the State look a little silly. The law, a little more than a year old, ostensibly collects taxes on commodities the sale of which is forbidden by law. But no matter how the legislature says it, it comes up liquor, and everybody knows that Mississippi is dry.

Mississippi was the first State to ratify the eighteenth amendment and, with Oklahoma and Kansas, has never repealed it. And the people in Jackson and down on the Gulf coast are saying that it looks ridiculous to be as officially dry as all that and then go out and collect $550,000 in liquor taxes. On the other hand, the realists in the State say that it is reasonable to have a prohibition law on the one hand and a law to collect liquor taxes, too. "Get this straight," they say, "we Mississippians will vote dry just as long as we can stagger to the polls."

Gov. Thomas L. Bailey, in a din of W. C. T. U. protests, signed the bill in April 1944, and denied that the law legalized the sale of liquor by placing a 10-percent tax on it.

"Its purpose is to place a greater penalty on law violators, and not to encourage them or make it easy for them." He invited the good people of his State to inform Carl Craig, the State tax collector, of any bootlegging activities within their ken.

Craig's collectors are everywhere, disguised as thirsty men who would like to know where a man can have the sand washed out of his throat. They collect a lot of taxes that way. Craig's second check on the liquor business is to get reports from Federal authorities and jobbers and distillers, which show sales of liquor to Mississippians. This information tells Craig how much, where to, the name of the purchaser, and the license number of the truck used to transport the stuff into the State. Several traveling auditors check the State liquor records of Louisiana, Illinois, Arkansas, Alabama, Tennessee, and Kentucky. They check on how much is headed for Mississippi and who bought it.

"Of course," says Craig, manfully, "some liquor is slipping by the 10-percent tax, but we have them on the run." He has the names, addresses, and places of business of 800 self-confessed bootleggers who lay the 10 percent on the line and remain unconvinced of violating the State prohibition law. Craig figures that parched citizens drank $17,000,000 worth of the stuff in 1942 and he can't for the life of him see why the State should not collect the revenue.

Mr. N. S. Jackson doesn't share this view. Jackson is superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League and he had been concentrating on the evils of 4-percent beer, which is legal in otherwise bone-dry Mississippi. His campaign was to concentrate on one of the State's 82 counties and dry it up, then proceed to the next one. So far, 35 counties have outlawed even 4-percent beer. However, when the State beer industry's representative heard the roar emitted by the antisaloon group over the black-market law, he knew that a division had been created and that Mr. Jackson would be far too busy on liquor to be able to concentrate on liberating the people from the evils of beer.

Mr. Jackson is now positive that the black-market law will be repealed in January. However, the Methodists, in their annual north Mississippi conference, refused to pass a resolution calling for repeal of the black-market law.

Some of the drys accuse Tax Collector Craig of wanting to continue the law because his office gets 10 percent of all collections. On $550,000 in 1944, this would mean $55,000. The law also removes the ceiling on Craig's earnings, which were $5,000 per year. However, his enemies fail to mention that Craig has had to hire 12 agents for work in Louisiana alone. The drys hoot down this statistic and say that Craig now has the bootleggers so tame that they walk into his office once a month, books in hand, and permit Craig to tell them how much they owe. Further, they charge him with neglect of Mississippi's old triple five-hundred law, under which a convicted bootlegger is liable to a fine of $1,500, which must be split equally among the municipality, the county, and the State.

This, they say, is the more drastic way of handling bootlegging. They point out that one bootlegger who wouldn't permit examination of his books and wouldn't pay the 10 percent was suddenly charged with violation of the triple five-hundred law, and he promptly came through handsomely with books and money.

As of April 1945, the Internal Revenue Bureau lists 1,078 Mississippians as holders of $25 Federal liquor licenses. The Government looks with a jaundiced eye on Mississippi's official bias against spirits. In fact, early in 1945, the OPA threatened nine wholesalers with prosecution for violating liquor price ceilings. The State is now dotted with places advertised as lounge, cocktail lounge, drinks of all kinds, and others which dilute the word drinks with quotation marks. In most of them, a bonded whisky highball costs 60 to 65 cents. There is no longer any attempt to run speakeasies as such, even though the saloons are not wide open.

Probably the biggest liquor operator in the State is Pete Martin, a squat man of 60, who gives Craig the 10 percent without quibbling. He averages $60,000 a year in taxes. Pete's wife wears a diamond as big as a quarter.

Another prosperous liquor man is Frank Schenck. He has a big air-cooled cocktail lounge in the business section of Biloxi. During the war he needed more trucks to transport bottles, and no trucks were to be had. So he purchased four Army ambulances at a surplus property sale. He was too busy to take the red cross off the sides, so he ran the liquor in the ambulances with the insignia still on them. The citizens thought that this was a bit too rich, so they applied the heat, and Frank removed the red crosses. Another operator, who had much liquor to transport and one truck, applied to the OPA for gasoline coupons and new tires and got them.

The drys regard characters like these as "beyond salvation." But this should alarm no one because, among the drys, it has been noised about that the Governor himself fell from grace in merely signing the black-market tax bill.

There is a sign over a Gulfport bar which I can't forget:

"The right to drink is ours
And we will not lose it
If you and I are wise
And do not abuse it."

The Housing Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the first signpost on the road to permanent regimentation of American lives has been erected by the proposal to set up a so-called housing czar.

It was my impression that we were going to get rid of controls, Government regimentation, and centralization of government as quickly as possible. There had been reports for a long time that efforts under some guise or other would be made to continue controls after the desirable death of the OPA on June 30, 1946.

I think it about time that those of us who believe in free enterprise, private initiative, and the American way of life, alert ourselves to a constant vigil against any encroachment which tends to curb the right of every American to conduct his own way.

I do not challenge the sincerity of those who disagree with my point of view, nor do I impugn their motives, but I vigorously voice objection to any proposal which is going to regiment this Nation.

Even the word "czar" is repulsive to the better American instincts. It was my appreciation that we had fought this war to destroy czars, fuehrers, dictators, and so on ad infinitum. This plan for a housing czar is merely an expression of the real thoughts and purposes of Chester Bowles to perpetuate himself and his administration in power over the lives of Americans.

Why do we need further dictatorship and regimentation when the builders of America, the men who actually build the homes, stand ready and willing to do a job without first heiling some autocratic, bureaucratic would-be czar. These builders, through such organizations as the National Association of Homebuilders, have fought and are fighting a valiant fight to preserve the American way of life.

The men who compose the National Association of Homebuilders are not dreamers or theorists. They are practical, realistic men who have come up the hard way, the American way, and have made success of themselves and supplied homes to Americans without benefit of regimentation and the blessing of any czar.

These people have steadfastly said they could do the job if only the Government would let them alone and let them perform in the only way they know how to

perform—the American way of free initiative and free enterprise.

While the announced purpose of such legislation may be laudible, the results would be disastrous.

The time has come, I believe, for a clear-cut statement answering various charges, proposals, and counterproposals in connection with the effort to hamstring the American businessman.

No one will deny that there exists a housing shortage which began with the migration of some millions of war workers in 1941. Nearly 2,000,000 dwelling units have been made available since then by private builders and Government construction in congested war areas, part of which is becoming vacant as war plants have closed and workers return to their former homes. Many veterans now being discharged from the armed forces would like and should certainly have a new home at the earliest possible moment. Until such time as building materials are available and the new homes can be supplied it will be necessary for them to live with their families. Others whose earnings have been high during the war period would naturally like to purchase a new home, but it will be necessary for them to continue for a time in their present homes.

Never before have we had such an immense demand for new housing just as we have never had a similar demand for new automobiles, radios, washing machines, and all consumer durable goods. It is this demand which comprises our primary hope for a continued new housing market in the first postwar decade. Its existence is certainly nothing to become hysterical about.

The National Housing Administrator, John B. Blandford, Jr., has served as a housing czar since April 1942. The establishment of a competing czar would create considerable confusion if not actual revolution. Certainly the building industry is seeking to be freed of all bureaucratic domination.

War Mobilizer John Snyder with almost unlimited authority over all agencies of government concerned with the production of materials has that responsibility. During the last 5 months great progress has been made under the direction of a Construction Coordinator and encouraging reports as to the production of these materials are being received daily. Recent price increases by OPA to brick manufacturers, producers of gypsum products, lumber, soil pipe, and so forth, are giving these industries the necessary incentive. Nothing would be accomplished by duplication of this effort on a lower level than the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

It would be no less than disastrous to channel the present inadequate flow of building materials into Federal projects, much of which would be barracks-type shelter. The draining off of construction labor and mechanics and building materials would completely destroy the private-building industry now struggling to rebuild its organization after nearly 4 years of inactivity—excepting for the small percentage of home builders who built war housing. Some proponents of public or socialized housing would, of course, welcome this as a means of advancing their plans and proving the inadequacies of private-enterprise operations.

After many weeks of careful study the Government agencies concerned determined that the only method of reestablishing private residential construction was to remove all controls instituted during the war period. Although it was realized there would be some isolated abuses, it was agreed that the industry should have an opportunity to resume normal operation on the premise that the best answer to inflation in housing is the maximum production of new housing. Home builders in every city in the country, recognizing the inherent dangers have established committees to police the pricing of new houses in their communities. The public is being urged not to buy at inflated levels and to report individual cases where unfair prices are being asked. Normal competition will soon operate to remedy this condition. The great majority of builders operate over a period of years in the same neighborhood and cannot afford to lose the good will of the buying public by overpricing. Theoretically desirable, pricing controls simply will not work in housing under current conditions where costs are in a constant state of flux and have moved up from 30 to 50 percent since 1940.

Granting that the demand far exceeds the supply; that patience in waiting for new housing and good judgment in buying must be urged upon the public; that price controls of new construction would retard such construction; that until there is an adequate flow of building materials in the spring, materials and manpower should not be drained off into public construction; granting all this, it is clear that the remedy does not lie in the establishment of additional czars or agencies. The home-building industry like all other industries in this country must go through a difficult period of conversion during the next 6 to 12 months. The fewer restrictions imposed upon it the more rapidly it can supply new housing in volume. In this way the veteran will be housed, the industry rebuilt and the threat of inflation eliminated, and the American way of life preserved without assistance from czar, fuehrer, or dictator.

Let us have free American enterprise for free Americans if we really mean what we preach. If we do not mean it then let those that advocate such proposals come out frankly and admit that what they want is a completely regimented and centralized government where even the right to live will be rationed and controlled by some super authority instead of the will of the people themselves.

Labor-Management Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

SAGINAW, MICH., *November 21, 1945.*

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It appears that small business is not represented at the labor-management conference now taking place in Washington, and yet small business in the aggregate employs more people than all of the giant corporations combined.

Small business is also much more representative of the great majority of our population whose incomes are not influenced by so-called pressure groups and consequently average much below the incomes that organized labor already enjoys. The great majority of our people are the involuntary victims of strife between management and labor. Therefore, I respectfully submit that small business should have been represented at the labor-management conference.

As a member of National Small Business Men's Association, and as an individual, I also wish to endorse the recommendations of Judge Tiffany, counsel, and DeWitt Emery, president, recently submitted to you that manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers, and dealers be free to fix their own prices, provided the maximum increase in price is not more than 15 percent above October 1941.

Competition is so very keen and the great majority of our business enterprises honest and intelligent enough to continue the widely established principle of building for the future. They vie with each other to make the best possible article for the lowest price. They expect to be in business for a long time, and common sense is their motive for treating the public fairly.

Reconversion should not be handicapped nor inflation augmented by penalizing honest business with an endless amount of wartime limitations in order to control a few chiselers or black-market operators. These, like gold-brick traders, we always have had with us in one way or another, and there should be more simple methods of curbing their activities.

Sincerely yours,

J. B. PITCHER.

Fire and Police Departments of the City of New York

REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, this morning I addressed a letter to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy asking for the release of all policemen of the city of New York who are now in the armed services. Unfortunately, our city is in the midst of the greatest crime wave that it has ever had to face.

New York City, despite its size and tremendous cross currents is one of the most peaceful communities in the world. We are now facing a backwash from the hysteria which existed during the war. Ordinary restraints have broken down and our splendid police department, due to its great manpower shortage, is faced with a herculean task.

At the time the original conscription bill was before the House I went to Police Commissioner Valentine, Fire Commissioner McElligott, and Mayor LaGuardia and discussed with them the likelihood of the war creating an emergency such as now exists. I suggested that I offer an amendment to the Selective Service Act exempting policemen and firemen from the large cities from the provisions of that act. The police and fire commissioners agreed with me, but the mayor said that that might be true in the case of firemen who were technically trained men, but did not believe it to be so in the case of the police. He further advised me not to do anything, that he would take care of the matter in Washington.

Sometime later, noticing that Mr. LaGuardia had not done anything on the situation, and that our fire and police departments were sadly depleted, I introduced into the House a resolution calling for the exemption of all policemen and firemen from cities containing more than 250,000 population. Due to lack of support, I was not successful with the measure.

I believe that the manpower shortage in the New York Police Department may also be charged to the actions of the present city administration in reducing the salaries of probationary policemen from $2,000 to $1,200 a year. This was done despite the fact that the country was facing the highest cost-of-living scale in its history. From this measly $1,200 was deducted the withholding tax, several hundred dollars for equipment, a considerable item for the pension and matron's fees in the stationhouse. After these deductions, a probationary policeman would receive a sum far less than that paid to a messenger boy. As a result, during the late conflict it was impossible to obtain men to accept these extremely essential positions.

It is my sincere hope that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy will answer my request in the affirmative and relieve the crime situation in the city of New York.

Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, much is being written and said about the so-called full employment bill. My attention has just been called to an article appearing in the Concord News, one of the oldest weekly newspapers published in Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, the average small-town newspaper is pretty close to the thinking of the people in the community and the publishers of these papers usually have a pungent, common-sense way of telling their story. In this case D. W. Rutz, the publisher, speaks a lot of truth in understandable language and I commend the article to all Members of Congress. It reads as follows:

YOUR COUNTRY EDITOR LOOKS INTO FUTURE—FULL EMPLOYMENT ADVOCATED FOR EVERYONE

"Full employment for everyone? Sure, I'm for it, and so is everyone else in Michigan," replied the country editor. He adjusted the green visor over his eyes and smiled.

"I'm also in favor of having good government and having all the churches packed every Sunday morning and abolishing war and the atomic bomb. Jobs for all? Of course, I'm for it."

We had dropped into the newspaper office for one of our occasional chats. The country editor had a habit of keeping his finger on the public pulse in his home town. As the saying goes, he "got around" quite a bit and he did a lot of listening.

"Now I've been reading up about this so-called full employment bill," the editor continued, pointing to a stack of CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS and Government reports. "Senator VANDENBERG'S first bill in the Senate back in May 1928, was a plan for a 'prosperity reserve,' to use the Senator's own words. The Government was to plan for useful public works in advance of a possible depression. When a depression threatened, this reserve was to cushion the shock by providing jobs.

"In Michigan the State Legislature created a prosperity reserve during the recent World War boom. It impounded millions of surplus State revenue into a postwar fund for needed public improvements and also for aid of Michigan's returning veterans.

"Now take my own home town here. We paid off some of our bonded indebtedness, just like many a farmer reduced his mortgage. We planned public improvements to provide jobs.

"Let's see what the bill at Washington calls for. One provision is to stimulate, encourage, and assist State and local governments, through the exercise of their respective functions, to make their own effective contribution to assuring full employment—to use the official language. Michigan has already done that. So has my own home town.

"The Federal bill goes on to say that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to foster free competitive private enterprise and the investment of private capital and furthermore that all Americans able to work and seeking to work are entitled to an opportunity for useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment.

"Now that's a mighty constructive idea. Jobs for all. We're for it.

"You will note there are no partisan lines to the idea. Michigan's own Tom Dewey went on record in a campaign talk at San Francisco that the Government can and must create job opportunities because there must be jobs for all in this country of ours. There you have it, jobs for all.

"Senator HATCH, Democrat of New Mexico, proposed an amendment which was adopted by the Senate. It proposed that the government's underwriting of full employment should be 'consistent with the needs and obligations of the Federal Government and other essential considerations of national policy' to quote the Senator's own words. Senator TAFT, Republican of Ohio, sponsored another amendment, also adopted, which would require the Government to finance all this by 'a program of taxation designed and calculated to prevent any net increase in the national debt.'

"Apparently these two senators don't favor perpetual deficit spending at Washington any more than you or I. Pay as you go is just as sound for the Government as it is sound for your family and my family. To do otherwise is to invite disaster.

"What I am wondering about is this: What's the chance of the idea working? The president would have to estimate the number of jobs needed, estimate the number of jobs industry is likely to provide, and finally estimate the amount of Government spending needed to make up the difference. Simple, isn't it?

"Well, let's look at the actual record of the Federal budget at Washington and see how successful the President and the Budget Director have been in their estimates of Federal expenditures, revenues, and deficits during peacetime fiscal years. You'll recall that Harold Smith, the present Budget Director at Washington, was formerly State budget director at Lansing and left Michigan in the spring of 1939.

"The average error in Budget estimates of Federal receipts in 7 of the 10 years, 1935–41, omitting our war years, was 9 to 10 percent. The average error in estimates of Federal expenditures during these peacetime years was 23 percent. And remember, exactly 23 percent of American workers were unemployed in 1933—the same percentage.

"How about the Budget's estimates of the annual net deficit? Well, hold on tight. The Budget's error averaged just 150 percent in these peacetime years.

"Now, if the above is true and here are the official figures, what I'd like to know is this:

"If the President and the Budget Director cannot estimate accurately what Congress is going to spend, even though the President has a veto power to control spending, how can the Government estimate accurately what 48 State governments, thousands of local governments, hundreds of thousands of business firms, and 140,000,000 people are going to spend, when a lot of them don't know themselves?"

The country editor paused. Outside of the office window the autumn foliage was turning to bright gold. It was harvest time in Michigan. There was work to be done.

"That just reminds me," he said. "My wife hopes to finish her canning this afternoon. We like good things to eat. We had our own garden. One way to make sure you're not going to be hungry is to grow food, can food, and cook or bake food yourself. Maybe there's still something to the old saying, 'God helps those who help themselves.' I wonder."

And so do we.

Starvation in Central Europe

REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, "If a hard peace requires the elimination of eight to ten million Germans, it would be much more humane to eliminate them at once," is the declaration of the House Postwar Committee.

The Treasury Department last week advised me that no communication is permitted from America to natives of Germany and Austria, so that Americans with relatives in these countries today must stand by helplessly while their own kinfolk die of cold, starvation, or disease.

Also, the State Department informed me that no American churches or private charities are allowed to send relief into Germany or Austria.

If the foregoing policies are not changed immediately, the victims of the

ruthless barbarism of the Nazis may yet be outnumbered by a mass extermination in which many American people shall be unwilling partners.

Mr. Speaker, I protest a Government policy which forces 70,000,000 Christians in America to stand by helplessly while eight or ten million old men, women, and children of their faith die needlessly in central Europe.

If anyone can square the foregoing situation with the pledge made in 1943 by President Roosevelt, I believe the people should have that explanation. The pledge follows:

Except for the responsible Fascist leaders, the people of the Axis need not fear unconditional surrender to the United Nations. I have said that we shall bring food for the starving and medicine for the sick in the areas liberated by the United Nations. We have done so, under lend-lease, in north Africa. We are doing so in Sicily. We shall continue to do so in other areas, as they are liberated, to prevent economic break-down and to aid the liberated peoples to produce and to help themselves. We shall provide these necessary civilian supplies in support of our military operations and as a matter of simply humanity. The people of Axis-controlled areas may be assured that when they agree to unconditional surrender they will not be trading Axis despotism for ruin under the United Nations.

Moreover, no such obvious policy of vengeance has been followed in the case of Italy. So I ask this question, What is behind the administration's cold-blooded refusal to allow relief in central Europe?

Full Employment and World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement entitled "Full Employment and World Peace":

When we fired at Hiroshima the blast that was heard around the world, it became clear beyond any possibility of doubt that the only hope for world peace—indeed the only hope for survival—lies in genuine international cooperation.

And more and more men everywhere are beginning to recognize that this necessarily implies genuine economic cooperation throughout the world. Which means, however, that we in America must bear the brunt of the responsibility, simply because we are the world's leading industrial nation.

I want to try to outline for you in about 2 minutes just why it is that the burden falls so largely upon us.

The first prerequisite of international cooperation is expansion of world trade, because this leads to international specialization, growing productivity, and rising living standards throughout the world, and rising living standards are the answer to those economic ills which cause nations to wage war.

Expansion of world trade requires an increase in imports and exports—both of them, mind you, since an increase in either one alone inevitably leads to the kind of international snarls which severely restrict the volume of world trade.

Now, the chief point I want to make is that there can be no significant expansion of trade throughout the world unless we achieve and maintain a full employment level of activity right here at home in the United States.

For one thing, such a level of activity would mean a large increase in the demand for both imports and exports. Full employment increases imports because the size of our national income is so great relative to the rest of the world. When our national income goes up our imports increase by a few billion dollars, and these few billions can make the difference between prosperity and depression in many of the nations with which we trade.

And full employment increases exports because other nations can buy from us only when they have a way of paying us, and their means of payment depends upon how much we buy from them. We can always count on a huge demand for America's goods and capital if that demand can be made effective, which means if other nations have the necessary dollar exchange. If any of you want to be convinced of this point, I recommend that you take a look at a chart of how industrial production, imports, and exports rise and fall together.

In the second place, full employment in the United States would not only create a greater demand for exports and imports throughout the world, but it would automatically reduce the barriers to such two-way exchange. Both export and import barriers grow out of the fear of depression, and they will vanish along with that fear.

Import barriers, or tariffs for instance, reflect a fear of foreign competition, which in turn reflects inadequate markets at home. The only reason we ever want to protect our home industries and steal markets abroad is because we think there is not enough consuming power on this side of the water. So what we try to do is export our unemployment by shutting out imports.

Of course, we are only fooling ourselves, and we never actually succeed. Protection of this kind is always illusory, because the balance of payments sooner or later collapses under this one-way kind of exchange. Meanwhile other nations in self-defense retaliate with restrictive measures of their own, and we lose our markets abroad. And it is this kind of economic warfare which eventually leads to military conflict.

In short, if we have full employment at home, there will be no motive for export barriers. And full employment will make it possible to reduce tariffs or other barriers, because it provides alternative opportunities for displaced resources. Finally, full employment and increased imports will create dollars in other nations so that they can buy from us instead of shutting out our goods.

What would all of this mean for world peace?

In the first place, it would mean elimination of the motive for imperialism. It would mean that all nations would have access to colonial markets and raw materials through free trade, and that there would be nothing to be gained by colonial domination. Lebensraum would no longer serve as an excuse for war.

In the second place it would mean that other nations would cease to fear us. If we maintain full employment, they would no longer find it necessary to take restrictive measures to insulate themselves against depression in the United States. And they would be more willing to bind themselves in international agreements—for example on the international bank, currency stabilization, and an international food organization. These economic arrangements are basic to political organization for peace.

In the third place, it would mean that we would cease to fear other nations. Isolationism and distrust stem from depression at home, from fear of the breakdown of capitalism and infiltration of other isms. If we can make our own system work, we can freely cooperate with other nations in building toward peace.

This, gentlemen, is what full employment here at home would mean for world peace.

Cost of St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, November 19, I addressed the House in connection with the St. Lawrence project, and my remarks will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date on page 10810. I pointed out the physical aspects of this project, because a great many people want to know what it is all about. So, I told you where it started and where it stopped, and just what it meant. My remarks were factual and the chief witness for the project was Gen. Thomas M. Robins, of the War Department engineers. I quoted from his testimony. Today I want to discuss the proposed cost of the project, and I again want to put General Robins on the witness stand, because he is a disinterested witness.

FALSE PROPAGANDA OF WATERWAY OPPONENTS

It is well known that the opponents of the waterway project consistently circulate all sorts of falsehoods and resort to every trick and subterfuge to mislead the people and to defeat favorable action. I quote exactly from a propaganda sheet issued by an outfit which has unlimited resources to fight the project. This outfit in discussing the seaway says:

Conservative estimates indicate that it will cause the expenditure of more than a billion dollars of the taxpayers' money, diverted from other needed things to a project which is unnecessary and at present economically unsound.

Now this is a fine bit of skillful and resourceful propaganda. It is just as false as hell itself, but there are no standards of integrity employed by professional lobbyists who feel that the end justifies the means and that everything is fair in love, war, politics, and the assassination of the seaway project. Now listen to what a disinterested and impartial and high type of American citizen has to say about this.

GENERAL ROBINS TESTIFIES AS TO COST

As I pointed out in my remarks on November 19, General Robins, of the War Department engineers, testified before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House, June 19, 1941, and I quoted part of his testimony. I now quote

exactly what he has to say on this subject of costs:

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE BASIN

(Thursday, June 19, 1941)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met at 10 a. m., Hon. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD (chairman), presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, we have General Robins before us this morning. You may proceed, General.

STATEMENT OF BRIG. GEN. THOMAS M. ROBINS, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, UNITED STATES ARMY

General ROBINS. Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen:

The plans for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power projects are now complete, having been worked out in detail and agreed upon wholeheartedly by duly accredited representatives of both the countries concerned.

There is no longer any argument as to what should be done and it is possible to make reliable estimates of costs of the undertaking.

This cost is not unreasonable or excessive and under the pending agreement will be divided as equitably as possible between the United States and Canada. The State of New York offers to take over and operate the power facilities that will be built on the American side of the border and to reimburse the United States for the cost of these power facilities.

It is safe to assume that the net outlay to the United States Government, that is the first cost of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, will not exceed $200,000,000, a sum that this country can well afford to invest in such a worthy project.

It must be obvious to all thoughtful people how thankful we would be today if the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project were completed and available for use in the present emergency. No one knows how long the emergency will last or how soon it will occur again. I am convinced that immediate authorization of the St. Lawrence project is essential to all-out defense effort and that it is advisable to proceed with construction at as fast a rate as may be consistent with other pressing needs of national defense. * * *

The total cost of the project as now estimated, with the best figures available—and I may say we have reestimated the cost of all these works in the light of the investigations, borings, and surveys and studies that have been going on for the past year.

The total cost of the project now figures $579,252,000, of which $277,090,000 is chargeable to Canada under the agreement, and $302,162,000 is chargeable to the United States.

Canada has spent to date $132,672,000 on the project; the United States has spent to date, $17,105,485. The total spent to date by both countries is $149,777,485, leaving the cost to complete for the entire project, $429,474,515, of which $144,418,000 is to be expended by Canada; $285,056,515 by the United States.

New York State offers to pay, under the terms of the bill before the committee, $93,300,000. Subtracting that from the $285,000,000 that the United States still has to spend makes a net cost to the United States, based on these estimates, of $200,000,000, as I stated before.

I have copies of this estimate that I will be glad to pass around to the members of the committee.

(The estimate passed around to the members of the committee is as follows:)

Estimate of cost of St. Lawrence waterway

	Canada	United States	Total
Great Lakes section:			
New lock at Sault Ste. Marie, with approach channels		$8,000,000	$8,000,000
Connecting channels		66,029,000	66,029,000
Welland Canal	$133,000,000		133,000,000
St. Lawrence River:			
Thousand Islands section	772,000	516,000	1,288,000
International Rapids section:			
(*a*) Works solely for navigation		48,857,000	48,857,000
(*b*) Works primarily for power	39,950,000	78,550,000	116,500,000
(*c*) Works common to navigation and power	22,414,000	100,210,000	122,624,000
Canadian section:			
St. Francis channel	1,330,000		1,330,000
Soulanges Reach	25,785,000		25,785,000
Lachine Reach	55,839,000		55,839,000
Total	277,090,000	302,162,090	579,252,000
Expenditures to date	132,672,000	17,105,485	149,777,485
Cost to complete	144,418,000	285,056,515	429,474,515

FACTS DISPROVE CLAIMS OF WATERWAY OPPONENTS

So, there you are, Mr. Speaker, with figures furnished by a representative of the United States Government, namely, General Robins, of the War Department engineers. He says the net cost to the United States of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project would be $200,000,000. Are you going to believe him, or are you going to believe these apostles of falsehood who know they are not telling the truth when they broadcast to the American taxpayers that this project will cost the American people an expenditure of more than $1,000,000,000? How are you going to answer the question?

Incidentally, do not forget that the expenditure the United States made to carry on World War II for a single day was about $200,000,000. So the money we spent in 1 day for destructive purposes would pay for one of the most constructive projects to be found anywhere in the world measured in terms of benefits to the people.

Delay Is Seen for Bretton Woods Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that the large nations among our allies are not so anxious to approve the Bretton Woods plan as they are to get a huge loan or gift of many billions of dollars with no strings attached. They seem to be sensitive about its being made a part of their national debt. It seems to me that I have heard the doctrine preached that a national debt and a deficit financing program are conditions precedent to peace, happiness, and prosperity. We were told by an eminent economist along in 1933 that such would be the case if we adopted such a program, and this foreign policy was adopted by the Roosevelt administration and put into practice. If it be true that this philosophy of deficit financing and an ever increasing national debt is as sound a public policy as was then recommended by our foreign economists, why should not the same philosophy be applied by our foreign allies in handling their own debt and deficit problems? Why turn to us for help?

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Sunday, November 25, 1945:

DELAY IS SEEN FOR BRETTON WOODS PLAN—APPROVAL OF PROGRAM BY 43 NATIONS IS AWAITED BY DECEMBER 31 DEAD LINE—BRITISH LOAN TALKS PARTLY RESPONSIBLE—NEW CONFERENCE IS HELD POSSIBILITY UNLESS ACTION IS TAKEN IMMEDIATELY

(By H. Eugene Dickhuth)

Unless 65 percent of the exchange quota has been approved by December 31 next, the Bretton Woods program to which the United States is committed to the extent of about $6,000,000,000 will have to be taken up again with the 43 other governments which concluded the original agreements.

When the deadline was set in the summer of 1944, it seemed sufficiently remote so that the majority of the participants would have ample time to pass the necessary legislation or decrees. At this time, there are only five more weeks to go and none of the nations except the United States has taken any official action as yet.

While the reason for this state of affairs is well understood in financial circles, particularly among those who were articulate in their beliefs that Bretton Woods would solve little unless other basic conditions were straightened out, the general public has only a vague idea of what is going on.

BANKERS WERE CRITICIZED

When bankers argued in print and before congressional committees that international financial machinery would be incapable of coming into play without taking care of the war-disrupted British balance of payments, they were labeled as "saboteurs of international cooperation."

Pointed references were made in official quarters at the time that isolationist elements in the United States Senate had similarly prevented participation of this country in the League of Nations. But what has happened since?

The Bretton Woods Agreement Act finally became law with the blessings of most interested factions by President Truman's signature on August 4 last. Since that time there has been a good deal of discussions and for the last 10 weeks almost daily negotiations between United States and British financial experts for some financial assistance to the United Kingdom.

Treasury officials say privately they have been much disturbed to find from samplings of public opinion by independent agencies that an increasing number of individuals throughout the Nation with the advent of peace are losing their internationalist fervor and are beginning to even question the necessity of financial aid to Britain, not knowing, of course, that without such support, the

entire program of international economic and other cooperation may collapse.

Unfortunately, once the Bretton Woods enabling legislation was passed by the Congress little official effort has been made to explain the relationship between the British loan negotiations and the blueprint for world trade and finance, it is held here.

LITTLE OPPOSITION SEEN

The polls clearly reflect this misunderstanding or lack of understanding. Washington authorities continue to be extremely confident that the negotiations with London will be successfully concluded in the near future and that following an agreement Britain and the Dominions will immediately approve participation in Bretton Woods before the December 31 dead line.

The quotas for the international monetary fund aggregate $8,800,000,000. The required 65 percent would amount to $5,720,000,000. Nearly one-half of this sum is assured by the United States whose share is $2,750,000,000.

If the contention of Washington experts is correct, provided the loan discussions are concluded and Britain and the Dominions ratify their participation, another $2,350,000,000 would be added to the pledged quotas. This would still be about $600,000,000 short.

Should Russia decide to approve its share of $1,200,000,000, the dead line could be kept, also by addition of a number of other countries such as Belgium and Holland, Norway, France, and China, coupled with perhaps Brazil and a combination of Latin countries in this hemisphere.

It is true that outside of the United States, the United Kingdom and some other countries little, if any, parliamentary opposition is expected. In fact, the decision of the executive may constitute legal approval and participation to the Bretton Woods plan in many nations, experts maintain.

Every day which passes with the Anglo-American loan talks hanging in the air makes it less likely that the December 31 dead line can be met. In theory, it might just be necessary to ask authorized representatives of 43 countries to agree to an extension of the date.

Since the dead line is not part of the Bretton Woods Agreement Act passed this year, congressional approval for prolongation may not be required. The danger, however, as seen in informed quarters, is that once the subject of Bretton Woods is taken up again with foreign emissaries, the capitals in question may raise new questions creating new problems which may require a new conference and thus postpone materialization of the entire program.

Nation's Home Crisis Calls for Drastic Action—Housing Bill Would Give President Power To Name Housing Director With Authority To Meet Crisis on Wartime Basis, To Control Home Prices and Give Veterans Priority

REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, providing adequate housing for the people now has become one of the Nation's gravest domestic problems.

Hundreds of thousands of servicemen are vainly seeking shelter, with thousands more returning daily from Europe and the Pacific to add to the demand. In our major cities people are scrambling grimly for any kind of a place to stay. In metropolitan areas from Boston to Chicago, to Dallas, to Los Angeles, city governments already are being forced to take emergency action to meet the housing crisis.

Meanwhile prices on homes are soaring to fantastic levels, with unscrupulous speculators piling profit on profit at the expense of the home seekers. Supplies of building materials have sunk to an all-time low.

During the war, when similar problems arose, we did not hesitate to take swift and drastic action in meeting them, and the people fully approved. When rubber became critically scarce a rubber czar with real power to cut red tape and increase supplies was appointed, the money spent, and the problem was solved.

Now we are faced with a housing scarcity, a problem just as critical as many of those we successfully met during the war. We must and can meet it with the same vigor and speed we used in dealing with wartime bottlenecks.

However, there has arisen considerable question as to whether the executive branch of government now possesses sufficient authority to take the drastic action necessary, since the end of the war.

In order to arm the executive branch with power to meet the housing problem, the same emergency power it used during the war period in similar crises, I have introduced H. R. 4761.

This bill has been referred to the Banking and Currency Committee. The urgency of the emergency is such that I have requested the chairman of that committee to hold hearings on the measure at the earliest possible moment.

The bill has two major objectives:

First. To give first priority to returning veterans on every apartment and home that can be made available or built. It provides that scarce construction materials be channeled into reasonably priced homes for veterans' rental and purchase.

Second. To halt some of the inflationary pressure ballooning into our business economy by holding down home prices to fair and reasonable levels.

The bill creates an Office of Housing Stabilization. Its director would have full authority to cut governmental red tape to speed production of construction materials to provide additional housing and to make the maximum usage of existing housing.

He would be empowered to issue directives to any administrative agency dealing with housing, so as to fully coordinate all Government activity in dealing with the housing problem. In this way, the ultimate effort could be made in breaking bottlenecks slowing down production of materials in all lines.

A priorities and allocation system would be set up to channel available stocks of construction materials for the most urgent purposes, with veterans given top priority. At present, farmers of the country are finding it almost impossible to find any kind of lumber for their uses, while much of the Nation's timber supply is being drained into high-cost, high-profit country homes and mansions. The director would be empowered to see to it that such hardship cases could be taken care of.

Prices of new construction would be controlled. A builder would be allowed the full legal price of his materials and services, plus current labor costs, plus the same margin of profit made on comparable construction in his community in 1941.

A similar control would be used to hold down prices on existing houses. Present owners would be permitted to sell their homes one time after the effective date of the act, at whatever price they could get. However, that price would become during the emergency the automatic ceiling price plus the cost of improvements. This provision would give a bona fide home owner complete freedom of sale, but would prohibit the speculative resales which now are causing much of the inflationary danger.

However, I would like to point out that it would not be mandatory for the director to clamp ceiling prices on all old and new houses in the Nation.

He is given the discretion to use his pricing power only in areas where, in his judgment, prices have gone so far out of line as to demand such drastic action. Furthermore, such ceiling would apply only to nonfarm dwellings.

This bill is designed solely as an emergency measure, to meet the crisis that confronts us now. It would expire December 31, 1947, but can be rescinded sooner at any time the two Houses of Congress, by concurrent resolution, determined that the housing emergency had ceased to exist.

When that time comes, I will be the first Member of Congress to vote to remove control of housing prices and construction. However, I sincerely feel that we need such strong legislation during this next critical 8 or 9 months if we are to meet the crisis and intend to prevent the economic boom-bust cycle of World War I.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include the text of H. R. 4761:

H. R. 4761

A bill to amend the National Housing Act by adding thereto a new title relating to the prevention of speculation and excessive profits in the sale of housing, and to insure the availability of real estate for housing purposes at fair and reasonable prices, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after title VI thereof a new title, as follows:

"TITLE VII—STABILIZATION OF HOUSING PRICES

"SEC. 701. (a) The purposes of this title are to stabilize the prices of real estate to be used for housing purposes, and to prevent speculative, unwarranted, and abnormal increases in the selling prices of such real estate; to eliminate and prevent profiteering in the sale of real estate for housing purposes, the hoarding of materials necessary for the construction of housing and other buildings, and other disruptive practices; to encourage the production of housing at a fair profit; to improve the housing of the people of the Nation in order to foster their health and general welfare; to encourage employment in the housing construction industry, and to maintain such industry at a high level of

productivity; to prohibit an undue dissipation of the savings of the people in the Nation in the purchase of homes at speculative prices; to permit returning veterans to acquire housing at fair prices; and to prevent a post-emergency collapse of values in the housing field and to promote a swift and orderly transition to a peacetime economy.

"(b) The provisions of this title, and all regulations and orders issued thereunder, shall terminate on December 31, 1947, or upon the date specified in a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of the Congress, declaring that the provisions of the act are no longer necessary to deal with the existing national emergency, whichever date is the earlier.

"(c) The provisions of this act shall be applicable to the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 702. (a) There is hereby created the Office of Housing Stabilization, which shall be headed by a Director of Housing Stabilization (hereinafter called the "Director"). The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum. The Director may, subject to the civil-service laws, appoint such employees as he deems necessary in order to carry out his functions and duties under this title, and shall fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

"(b) The Director shall formulate and develop a comprehensive national program to effectuate the purposes of this title. In order to carry out this program, the Director shall have the power to issue directives on policy to those Federal departments and agencies which have functions relating to or affecting housing.

"SEC. 703. The Director is authorized to make such studies and investigations, to conduct such hearings, and to obtain such information as he deems necessary or proper to assist him in formulating policies, issuing regulations, and performing any other functions under this title. The Director is authorized to require any person who owns, holds an interest in, deals in, or offers to sell or to buy any housing accommodations to furnish information under oath or affirmation or otherwise, to make and keep records, and to make reports. The Director may require any such person to permit the inspection and copying of records and other documents and the inspection of housing accommodations. For the purpose of obtaining any information under this section, the Director may by subpena require any such person to appear and testify or to appear and produce documents, or both, at any designated place. In case of refusal to obey a subpena served upon any person under this section, the court for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Director, shall have jurisdiction to compel compliance with such subpena.

"No person shall be excused from complying with any requirements under this section because of his privilege against self-incrimination, but the immunity provisions of the Compulsory Testimony Act of February 11, 1893 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 49, sec. 46), shall apply with respect to any individual who specifically claims such privilege.

"SEC. 704. (a) Whenever in the judgment of the Director the sales prices of housing accommodations have risen or threaten to rise to an extent or in a manner inconsistent with the purposes of this act, he may by regulation or order establish maximum sales prices for housing accommodations in accordance with the provisions of this title. Any such regulation or order may be limited in its scope to such geographical area or areas and to such types or classifications of housing accommodations as in the judgment of the Director may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this title. Before issuing any regulation or order under this section, the Director shall, so far as practicable, advise and consult with representative members of industries affected by such regulation or order, and he shall give consideration to their recommendations and to any recommendations which may be made by State and local officials concerned with housing conditions in any area affected by such regulation or order.

"(b) Any regulation or order issued under the authority of this title establishing maximum sales prices for housing accommodations the construction of which is completed after the effective date of this title shall provide for the fixing of a maximum sales price consisting of (i) the actual costs of the construction of the unit which are not in excess of the legal maximum prices of the materials and services entering into such construction, (ii) the fair market value of the land sold with the housing accommodation, but in no event less than the actual cost of land purchased prior to the effective date of this act, and (iii) a margin of profit reflecting the generally prevailing margin of profit upon comparable units during the calendar year 1941. Any prospective seller of such housing accommodations may apply for the establishment of a maximum sales price at any time, including before the commencement of construction, during its progress, or after its completion. In any case where a maximum sales price has been fixed on a basis of estimated costs the prospective seller may, at any time before the first sale and upon a showing that the actual legal costs have substantially exceeded the estimated costs, apply for such revision of the maximum sales price as may be justified under the circumstances; and the Director may similarly reduce the maximum sales price if the estimated costs were substantially in excess of the actual legal costs. No subsequent sale of such newly constructed housing accommodation shall be at a higher price than that established for the first sale.

"(c) Any regulation or order issued under the authority of this title establishing maximum sales prices for housing accommodations in existence and occupied on or prior to the effective date of this title shall establish as the maximum prices the price of the first bona fide sale of such housing accommodations after the effective date of this title.

"Any regulation or order under this subsection shall provide for the making of appropriate adjustments in the maximum sales price where substantial improvements have been made subsequent to the last sale.

"(d) The Director may promulgate such regulations as he deems necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of the title and may exercise any power or authority conferred upon him by this title through such department, agency, or officer as he shall direct. Any regulation or order under this title may contain such classifications and differentiations and may provide for such adjustments and reasonable exceptions as in the judgment of the Director are necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this title.

"(e) Whenever in the judgment of the Director such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this title, he may by regulation or order make such provisions as he deems necessary to prevent the circumvention or evasion thereof and he may regulate or prohibit speculative or manipulative practices (including the requiring of the purchase of land prior to or as a condition of undertaking construction work or the requiring of the purchaser of housing accommodations to buy additional land or any commodity or service as a condition of securing such housing accommodation) in connection with the sale of any housing accommodation which in his judgment are equivalent to or likely to result in price increases inconsistent with the purposes of this title.

"SEC. 705. (a) Whenever in the judgment of the Director there is a shortage of building materials for the construction of needed housing accommodations, he may by regulation or order allocate such materials in such manner and upon such conditions as he deems necessary and appropriate in order to effectuate the purposes of this title, with particular regard for the need for the construction of low-cost housing accommodations and the need for housing accommodations for rental.

"(b) Whenever in the judgment of the Director there is a shortage of housing accommodations, he may by regulation or order give preference in purchase or renting of housing accommodations, the construction of which is completed after the effective date of this title, in such manner and upon such conditions as will effectuate the purposes of this title, with particular regard for the housing needs of veterans of World War II and their immediate families.

"SEC. 706. Whenever in the judgment of the Director there is no practicable alternative method for securing the construction of adequate housing accommodations in an area where the shortage of housing accommodations is acute, he is authorized to subsidize the construction of new low-cost housing accommodations. Any such subsidy assistance shall be granted on terms involving the minimum expenditure of funds necessary to secure the needed construction, and upon such other terms as are necessary and approximate to effectuate the purposes of this title. Appropriations are hereby authorized to be made for subsidy payments under this section.

"SEC. 707. It shall be unlawful for any person to effect, either as principal or broker, a sale of a housing unit at a price in excess of the ceiling price which shall be applicable under the provisions of this title, or to offer, solicit, attempt, or agree to making any such sale. Notwithstanding any termination of this title as contemplated in section 701 (b) hereinabove, the provisions of this title, and of all regulations and orders issued thereunder, shall be treated as remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit, action, or prosecution with respect to any such right, liability, or offense.

"SEC. 708. Any person who is aggrieved by any action taken pursuant to any regulation or order issued under the authority of this title may petition the district court of the district in which he resides or has his place of business for a review of such action, and such district court shall have jurisdiction to enjoin or set aside, in whole or in part, such action or to dismiss the petition. No such action shall be enjoined or set aside, in whole or in part, unless the petitioner establishes to the satisfaction of the court that such action is not in accordance with law or is arbitrary or capricious.

"SEC. 709. (a) Whenever in the judgment of the Director any person has engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of any provision of section 707 of this title, he may make application to the appropriate court for an order enjoining such acts or practices, or for an order enforcing compliance with such provision, and upon a showing by the Administrator that such person has engaged or is about to engage in any such acts or practices a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order shall be granted without bond.

"(b) Any person who willfully violates any provision of section 704 of this title, and any person who makes any statement or entry false in any material respect in any document or report required to be kept or filed under section 703, shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000, or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or to both such fine and imprisonment. Whenever the Director has reason to believe that any person is liable to punishment under this

subsection, he may certify the facts to the Attorney General, who may, in his discretion, cause appropriate proceedings to be brought.

"(c) The district courts shall have jurisdiction of criminal proceedings for violations of section 707 of this title, and, concurrently with State and Territorial courts, of all other proceedings under the section. Such criminal proceedings may be brought in any district in which any part of any act or transaction constituting the violation occurred. Such other proceedings may be brought in any district in which any part of any act or transaction constituting the violation occurred, and may also be brought in the district in which the defendant resides or transacts business, and process in such cases may be served in any district wherein the defendant resides or transacts business or wherever the defendant may be found. Any such court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of any criminal or other proceedings brought before it under this section. No costs shall be assessed against the Director or the United States Government in any proceeding under this title.

"(d) If any person selling housing accommodations violates a regulation or order prescribing a maximum selling price, the person who buys such housing accommodations may, within 1 year from the date of the occurrence of the violation, bring an action for treble the amount by which the consideration exceeded the maximum selling price, plus reasonable attorney's fees and costs as determined by the court. If the buyer fails to bring an action under this subsection within 60 days from the date of the violation, the Director may bring such action on behalf of the United States within 1 year from the date of the violation. If such action is brought by the Administrator, the buyer shall thereafter be barred from bringing an action for the same violation.

"SEC. 710. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary or proper to carry out the provisions and purposes of this title.

"SEC. 711. If any provision of this title or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the title and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

VETERAN FINDS INFLATION AND DOESN'T LIKE IT

The following is a letter to the editor of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch from a returned veteran, William Howard Morgan:

Early in 1943 I sold my new home in St. Louis County to enter the Army. At that time there was no inflation in real estate, and the price I got just about covered what I had put into it. I was in the Army 28 months, 18 of which were spent overseas, and during that time I dreamed of the home I left behind and the postwar home I'd have some day.

Well, I did get home, and was discharged in September. Since the first day of October my wife and I have left no stone unturned in trying to locate a home, but up to this moment the best we have been able to do is get a hotel room, which is too expensive for us and which is certainly not the home I dreamed of while I was in the ETO.

I'd like to buy a home like the one I left behind, but the inflated real-estate prices prohibit that. Homes similar to mine have gone up as much as $4,000 and $5,000. Is it fair to returning GIs to have to pay the inflated price after having paid sweat and blood as our part in the war?

The Veterans' Administration's only hope of finding a place for me is "in a rooming house in one of the less desirable locations in St. Louis." That is quoted because that's all I was promised when my name was put on the list.

Since that time I have called on real-estate people in the hope of finding a reasonably modestly priced home. I learned that most of the real-estate operators are promising to find places for rent to people who are selling their homes at handsome profits today, leaving the ex-GI at the bottom of the ladder on rentals, which are at least controlled by the OPA.

Heed These Scientists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Chattanooga Times, Chattanooga, Tenn., of November 20, 1945, and also a letter entitled "Russia and Atom" which appeared in the Chattanooga Times and written by Charles W. Heard of East Chattanooga, Tenn.:

HEED THESE SCIENTISTS

The grim warning given America by the scientists who led in developing the atomic bomb should not go unheeded. These scientists were brought together at a joint meeting of the American Philosophical Society and the National Academy of Sciences in Philadelphia last week. They pictured disaster for America if wise measures are not taken to prevent the use of atomic energy as a military weapon, and they all agreed that the only way to prevent it was to prevent war.

In an account of the meeting, on the first page of Saturday's New York Times, Dr. Irving Langmuir, Nobel Prize chemist, is quoted as saying that if an atomic bomb war is ever allowed to come to pass the whole earth may become uninhabitable. Dr. Langmuir said that such a war would release radioactivity in the atmosphere which would be distributed by winds.

Dr. Arthur H. Compton warned that one-tenth of any country's population would be destroyed in the first night of atomic bombing and that no city of more than 100,000 would remain as an effective operating center after the first hour of the war.

Dr. Langmuir said that if the United States is short-sighted enough to engage in an atomic armament race, the condition of insecurity resulting from the threat of the atomic bomb will probably develop in four stages. He outlined those stages as follows:

"There will be a period in which we alone will have the atomic bomb and during this stage we may perhaps acquire a stock pile sufficient to wipe out all the cities of any nation that we might wish to attack.

"In the second stage one or more other nations have begun to produce atomic bombs, but have not yet acquired a sufficient stock pile to wipe out all our cities.

"In the third stage one or more other nations will have enough bombs to wipe out all our cities.

"If the armament race continues, a fourth stage will probably be ultimately reached in which one nation (possibly not the United States) has bombs of such high power, or in such large numbers, that in one surprise attack an enemy nation can be so completely incapacitated that no retaliation can occur.

"It may well be that it will take a thousand times more power for bombs to reach stage 4 than to reach stage 3, but we can have no assurance that stage 4 will not be reached with the further development of nuclear knowledge and the improvement of technical processes."

In the opinion of Dr. Langmuir Russia might reach stage 4 before we do. She is more willing to make sacrifices in living standards in order to develop atomic superiority.

Other atomic bomb makers declared at the meeting that atomic bombs will be produced cheaply and in abundance if they are permitted.

The need for an understanding with Russia is obvious. Dr. Langmuir said, "We must break down the barriers between ourselves and Russia. Neither of us has the desire to go out and conquer the world. The Russians desire peaceful development as much as we do."

The outstanding scientists for the first time gave a true picture of what we may expect if we have any more wars.

The most pressing issue facing the world today is a good understanding between the United States and Russia so that we may go into the United Nations Organization with the certainty that wars will be avoided and that there will be no need for use of the atomic bomb.

RUSSIA AND ATOM

WRITER STATES WASHINGTON COULD USE A SEEING-EYE DOG

To the EDITOR OF THE CHATTANOOGA TIMES:

In re your editorial, "Russia and the A-bomb," in today's Times.

Statesmen solve problems; politicians never solve anything.

We are told that whatever is wrong with our domestic economy is due to communistic influence; that whatever is wrong with our foreign policy is due largely to Russian stubbornness or desire for war.

There is no evidence of the existence of a single convinced Democrat in Rumania or Bulgaria. Yet we tell Russia to set up "democratic governments" in those countries and warn her to keep out of the Western Hemisphere, and that we intend to rule Japan.

This despite the fact that for years we have coddled Franco, Vichy, the House of Savoy, and the Argentine Fascist dictatorship—and are now backing the Chungking government which, on the record, is bitterly opposed to freedom for the Chinese people.

Russia has one-sixth of the land surface of the globe; has every variety of climate, and its natural resources exceed those of any other nation. Perhaps 140,000,000 or 150,000,000 people there survived Hitler's onslaughts.

And these people have a domestic economy that is a cross between socialism and state capitalism which includes the most potent forces of collectivism and individualism; namely, production for use plus the incentive wage, plus freedom to adventure in the realms of discovery, invention, and social experimentation; with abundant rewards to the individual for outstanding discoveries, inventions, or service to the state.

And they have security from the cradle to the grave, which inspires faith in the present and hope for the future of Russia. Faith and hope abundantly justified by Russian achievements in the war.

But the Russian people cannot produce for use as long as they are forced to produce for war or preparation for war in an armament race under threat of the atomic bomb in order to survive in this chaotic world.

The interests of the peoples of Russia and the United States have never conflicted and do not conflict now. Therefore the assumption that Russia wants war with the United States is sheer lunacy.

Said Ruskin: "Hundreds can talk to one who can think; thousands can think to one who can see."

Official Washington could do with a good seeing-eye dog.

Massachusetts Clerical Association on Control of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with current consideration and discussion concerning the control of atomic energy, I believe a most intelligent and valuable contribution is found in a resolution passed unanimously by the Massachusetts Clerical Association, comprising 240 clergy of the Episcopal diocese of Massachusetts, and which I include herewith under consent to extend my remarks:

Whereas:

1. The use of the atomic bomb marks the discovery of the most destructive force known to mankind;

2. Any attempt to formulate our foreign policy on the basis of temporary superiority in atomic weapons will force other nations, as well as ourselves, into an atomic armaments race;

3. A domestic policy providing for free scientific investigation and discussion as well as public surveillance and criticisms of the application of atomic energy is the best guaranty that peace will be secured and that the public will be given full use of any scientific developments which, furthered under Government sponsorship, belong primarily to the people;

We, the members of the Massachusetts Clerical Association, comprising the clergy of the Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts, resolve:

1. That a system of international control and cooperation be established in order to safeguard world peace, and we urge that the President of the United States immediately invite the governments of Great Britain and the Soviet Union to a conference to prevent a competitive armament race, to plan international control of mankind's most devastating weapon, and jointly to utilize international machinery to make available to all people the peacetime benefits of atomic energy.

2. That a domestic policy for the control and development of atomic energy, in harmony with an international system of control and cooperation, be established by the President and the Congress of the United States providing for scientific freedom and a peacetime utilization of atomic energy in the interests of the people as a whole.

School and College Teachers Need Better Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, during these days when labor groups all over the country are asking for higher wages, it behooves us to look around us to determine whether or not there are other sections of our population which need special attention in the way of wage increases at this time.

An editorial recently appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune setting forth the case for the school-teaching profession. It struck me as being such a strong argument in behalf of an increase in wages and salaries for teachers and instructors that I am reprinting it here for your information. I sincerely hope that in the scramble for increased wages, the fine citizens engaged in the teaching profession will not be forgotten.

LET'S NOT BE TIGHTWADS

Writing in the October Reader's Digest, Robert Littell cites some startling evidences of a "tightwad tradition" which is largely responsible for the Nation-wide teacher shortage.

Flint, Mich., starts its school teachers at $400 a year less than it starts its garbage collector.

At Salt Lake City teachers can attain a maximum of $2,724 yearly after 16 years' experience while the dog catcher makes $10,000 a year.

In Tuscumbia, Mo., the salary of the school janitor with less than an eighth-grade education is the same as that of a teacher with a university degree.

A $30-a-week teacher in South Omaha had in her class a 15-year-old boy earning $35 weekly for part-time work in a packing plant.

In Georgia the minimum salary for teachers works out to $4.25 a week less than the compensation to the unemployed.

Prodded by the pinch of rising living costs, enough teachers were lured away from their profession last year to "hold classes for a million and a half pupils," Littell says. In addition, competent men and women have in many cases been replaced by "anyone whose wages were low enough to make teaching seem a step upward." About half of the Nation's 850,000 teachers were paid less than $1,800; 200,000 less than $1,200 and 25,000 less than $600.

Obviously there's something wrong here. We don't begrudge janitors, dog catchers, or garbage collectors whatever incomes they can command. We need their services, too. But taxpaying parents ought to be in there bidding for the services of more competent teachers to educate their children. As Littell points out, we can immeasurably improve American education by paying more for it. He is talking to America at large, but what he has to say is applicable to Minnesota. There are from 2,500 to 3,000 fewer available teachers in the State today than in 1940–41. Digging a little deeper to make the profession more attractive is the only realistic corrective.

OPA Price Regulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE S & M CO.,
Minneapolis, Minn., November 2, 1945.
The Honorable WALTER H. JUDD,
United States Congressman,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JUDD: We would like to bring to your attention certain practices of the Office of Price Administration which create an adverse effect on business, thereby retarding what would otherwise be a rapid and orderly conversion to peacetime trade and commerce.

This letter does not originate with a pressure group or organized lobby, but comes to you from a firm with 145 employees, doing an annual business of $2,500,000. We have no criticism of the principle of price control, but we do criticize the administration of OPA.

We have put forth every effort to comply with OPA regulations, even though many of them are conflicting and even contradictory, and have received letters from the OPA district office commending us for our cooperation. In many cases OPA representatives themselves do not agree on the interpretation of various regulations which is evidenced by the fact that within the last 2 years we have prepared two different sets of current records at the insistence of OPA examiners. This constant pressure has required so much time and effort on the part of our key personnel that they have lost their effectiveness in the discharge of their regular duties.

We hired additional help, at considerable expense, to complete the records demanded in the limited time, but in spite of our prodigious efforts we learned through the daily press that our firm and six other large, reputable business firms were being sued by OPA for failure to prepare "adequate records." All of this, of course, has a very detrimental effect on business. We are not pleading our cause alone, but the cause of business as a whole and its effect on the welfare of the Nation.

It would require too voluminous a report to give you complete details on all of the difficulties we have encountered, but we are enclosing brief outlines on two specific cases, and will be glad to send you innumerable specific instances if you are interested.

Yours very truly,

THE S & M CO.,
PHIL SIEFF.

ILLUSTRATION OF OPA PRICE REGULATION

In 1942 we handled bicycles on which we realized a gross margin of 31 percent, which is a normal mark-up for this class of merchandise. We are handling a similar bicycle today. OPA has allowed the manufacturer a price adjustment and has also set a dollar and cents ceiling on our resale price, which allows us a gross margin of 12 percent. You can readily see that the permitted margin is not sufficient to allow us to operate without a loss on this item. A comparison of 1942 and 1945 prices follows:

Year 1942:	
Our cost	$22.96
Our selling price	$33.90
Margin, percent	31
Year 1945:	
Our cost	$23.21
Our selling price	$26.52
Margin, percent	12

We also sell an electric toaster which is not the same finish as the one sold in 1942. The manufacturer has been permitted a price adjustment but we must, under OPA regulations, sell at the same or a lower price. Price comparison follows:

Year 1942:	
Our cost	$1.37
Our selling price	$2.19
Margin, percent	28
Year 1945:	
Our cost	$1.97
Our selling price	$2.19
Margin, percent	10

Our operating cost for the first 9 months of 1944 was 19.19 percent of gross sales. In 1945 our operating costs have been 21.15 percent of gross sales for the first 9 months.

The Republican Party and the Democratic Process

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS RIZLEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a recent editorial from the Los Angeles Times. It is timely and to the point and I recommend its reading, especially to those Republicans who have in the past and who continue to try to out-deal the New Deal. After they have read this article, I hope they will come back home where they belong.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AND THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS

One of the first necessities of successful democratic process is two major political parties. The party in power must have the full responsibility of administration and positive action. The party out of power must be the check upon the majority by debate, by vigorous opposition to extremes, and by constant exposure of misdoing. It must constantly voice the rights of minorities.

Ten democratic governments set up after the last war in Europe failed largely because they could not concentrate into two major parties. They degenerated into bloc government where agreement on positive constructive policies and action could seldom be obtained. They survived for a few years by compromise of negative action until they died.

But the purpose of two major parties is wider than this. They must present alternative programs and issues in government. It is only thus that our revolutions are at the ballot box and not by street mobs.

The natural division between men in private life and the natural division between old age and youth is conservatism and radicalism. Interpreted into our present political scene it is the division between those on the "right" and those on the "left."

Today the radicals on the left are organized and vigorous. The conservatives on the right are unorganized and impotent. The American people need and have a right to organized expression of conservative thought. Being a conservative is not a sin. It is not fascism or reaction. It means today the conservation of representative government, of intellectual freedom, and of economic freedom within the limits of what does not harm fellow men. It means the conservation of natural resources, of national health, education, and employment. A conservative is not allergic to new ideas. He wants to try them slowly without destroying what is already good.

This division between conservatism and radicalism, between the right and the left, as the basis of our political parties has been developing slowly in America. The roots of the old party division grew out of the Civil War with its echoes of major territorial locus of the Republican Party in the North and of the Democratic Party in the South. There were also differences of economic interest of the two regions and attitudes on race questions. In the reshuffle of ideas during the past few years, the Democratic Party has adopted the radical field. And the radical parties are infected with bureaucracy, with socialism and with communistic ideas. The Republican Party has been uncertain and divided.

If there were a man-in-the-moon, who understood the ways of democracy and the imperative need in that process for a two-party system, who had never heard of the United States but who came down here and stayed 24 hours, he would say: "If you Republicans wish to give the country the service of a real two-party system and if you wish to prevent disintegration of your party, you will at once take the conservative position and gladly declare it. The Democratic Party holds the radical fort. There is no room for you in it and there is no position to the left of it. You have tried to compromise, you have tried to outdo the radicals in promises; you have failed, and you will disappear, as the Whigs did, if you continue to try to straddle."

The people deserve an opportunity to express the conservative point of view. Such a party could eventually come into power against the radical excesses and the accumulation of errors and blunders which are the inevitable result of long continuance of one party in power.

The Republican Party should proclaim itself the conservative party—the party on the right—and do it with pride in its principles and in the service it can perform for the country. It does not need to be afraid of a word. Whatever party opposes radicalism is going to be smeared. That is their technique. The American people see through smears sooner or later. Republicans should have the courage to adopt the word that means what a large part of the American people are—conservative.

P. S.—We do not use the word "liberal." That word has been polluted and raped of all its real meanings. The fundamentals of political liberalism were established by Morley, Gladstone, John Stuart Mill in the nineteenth century in England. Liberalism was founded to further more liberty for men, not less freedom. Therefore, it was militant against the expansion of bureaucracy, against socialism, and all of its ilk. The conservatives in America are akin to the nineteenth century liberals of England.

Lenin's instructions on propaganda included the deliberate distortion of accepted words and terms and Lenin has surely had his way with the word "liberalism." The Socialists and Communists daily announce that they are "liberals." They have nested in this word until it stinks. Let them have the word. It no longer makes sense.

Amendment of the Federal Trade Commission Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include an address which I delivered at the annual meeting of the Association of National Advertisers in New York November 20, 1945:

It is a pleasure to be your guest today and afforded the opportunity to meet so many of my old friends and to get acquainted with other members of your fine association, which is making so valuable a contribution to sound national economy and free enterprise on a basis to best serve the highest public interest.

I experienced some difficulty in getting away from Washington on schedule. In fact, I missed one train. In the effort to make it, I hurriedly rushed up to one of the porters and asked him how much time I had to make the train, and he replied, "Boss, if you hurry you won't miss but 5 minutes." In my effort, I was hardly in the position of a countryman down home who decided after a season's hard work to go on one of the railroad's advertised excursions to the Natural Tunnel. He had his savings for the trip all in one big bill. He went down to the station on Sunday morning, got in line, and finally worked his way up to the ticket window. He laid his 10-dollar bill down and asked for his ticket. The agent in a very businesslike manner shoved his ticket and his considerable change out through the window. The countryman, always careful about his money, began to finger through his change, counting it. The ticket agent, busy and getting nervous that the line was being held up, called out in a brusque manner, "What in the hell's the matter? Didn't I give you the right change?" By this time, having carefully completed the count, the old gentleman calmly replied, "Yes; but you just barely did."

H. R. 2390. A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT

It has been suggested by the chairman that I talk about H. R. 2390 which I introduced in the present Congress. It is a bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act in the following respects: (1) to afford effective judicial review of the Commission's cease and desist orders; (2) to put a ceiling upon the aggregate amount of penalties which may be assessed for a single violation of these orders; and (3) to avoid duplication of administration between the Commission and the Food and Drug Administration.

The Federal Trade Commission Act deals with methods of competition and acts and practices in commerce. Except as to banks, common carriers, air carriers, meat packers, and operators of stockyards, which are covered by special statutes, the act applies to all commerce, and just to mention the scope of it makes manifest its relation to private enterprise and to a competitive economy.

Therefore, the bill, in amending that act, would have an important influence upon our basic industry. In one part the bill deals particularly with advertising of specified products—foods, drugs, and cosmetics; but in other parts it affects generally all advertising and all methods of competition and acts and practices in commerce.

Thus the bill has considerable to do with private enterprise and a competitive economy—subjects which are identified in an interdependent way with advertisers and advertising. Thriving enterprise needs alert advertising—advertising which heralds the coming of new goods and opens and expands markets; which creates demands for which production sources must produce new goods and increased quantities of old goods; which assumes proportionate public responsibilities, recognizing that the higher the standards for truthfulness and sales appeal in the advertising message, and the stricter the adherence to them, the more surely and the more effectively does advertising serve a system of free enterprise.

THE PROBLEM OF ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES GENERALLY

No phase of Government activity is more closely related to our economy of the future—to our system of free enterprise—than the regulation of business and other private activity by agencies of the central government. All of us know of the vast extension of this form of government during recent years. In my considered judgment, one of the most important postwar mandates is a restudying of the administrative agency in our Federal Government.

I am not certain how many such commissions, boards, and other agencies are now in operation, either including or excluding wartime agencies. Estimates vary, depending, perhaps, on how one defines the term "administrative agency." But by any computation there are a great many of them, and the exact number does not matter.

What does matter is that some of these agencies have gradually spread out from the field of legislation into the field of adjudication. Once the legislative, the executive, and the judicial functions of government were separate powers. Today numerous agencies, regulating much of daily business and private life, combine these powers and in the exercise of them combine multiple and contradictory offices. Of the Federal Trade Commission, with which my bill deals, the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit said:

"It is called upon simultaneously to enact the roles of complainant, jury, judge, and prosecutor." (*John Bene* v. *F. T. C.* (229 Fed. 468, 471).)

The Lord Chancelor sings in Iolanthe:

"The law is the true embodiment
Of everything that is excellent.
It has no kind of fault or flaw,
And I, my lords, embody the law."

And in the Mikado, before consulting Pooh-Bah, it is necessary to indicate in which of his many capacities he is to be consulted. But we are not accustomed to conducting our affairs that way. The Anglo-Saxon fight for freedom was to get away from the enactment of multiple roles by one authority. Our general concept of justice is grounded in the ancient doctrine that no man should be judge in his own cause.

But in the field of administrative regulation, the agency acts as both prosecutor and judge; and then, to aggravate the matter, the agency is immune to judicial supervision if its findings are supported by evidence. It is sometimes stated that the findings must be supported by substantial evidence, but I cannot discover that the word "substantial" is of any practical significance. The situation—so held by many authoritative cases—is that the agency's position cannot be disturbed by the court unless it is plainly arbitrary. That is, beyond the scope of the agency's statutory authority or in abuse of its discretion. The net effect of this is that there is really no court review of the facts or of the remedy.

This problem has attracted the attention of the Government and of the organized bar. Several years ago there was a committee appointed by the Attorney General at the request of the President, to study administrative practices and procedures. A committee of the American Bar Association also studied the problem for several years and drafted a proposed bill, which has been introduced in the present Congress. It seeks to reform the administrative practice with respect to all except certain-named agencies. It does not accomplish a separation of the legislative, executive, and judicial functions and does not provide for any expansion of court review. In fact, the report of the committee of the American Bar Association explains that its bill would merely reenact the existing form of review and that it would do that merely to avoid the bill being construed, by virtue of an omission, to exclude or diminish the existing court review.

It seems to me a very difficult matter to deal in one bill with all of the many agencies and to deal with them in so many of the details pertaining to practice before them, as the bar bill attempts to do. The details of practice vary among the agencies. So does subject matter. The problem as to many of these agencies may be resolved or materially changed by what the President may do under the pending reorganization bills when they are finally enacted. Those bills, it is estimated, deal with over 100 agencies. The Senate bill exempts 13 and applies, it is said, to 90. The House bill exempts only 3. The Federal Trade Commission is exempted in both.

THE PROBLEM OF PROCEDURE IN THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The bill deals only with the Federal Trade Commission. This is an old agency with a fine record of service, especially in supplying the facts from which the Congress has formulated such memorable statutes as the Export Trade Act, also known as the Webb-Pomerene Act, which gives small businessmen the right to combine against the big cartels of Europe; the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921; the Federal Communications Act of 1934; the Securities Act of 1933; the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935; and the Federal Power Act of 1935.

In this realm the Commission has functioned notably as an aid to the Congress. That was one of the great intentions inspiring its formation, and my bill does not affect in any way its powers with respect to this phase of its work. The bill deals with other powers which have been enlarged to encompass subject matter and activity far beyond what was contemplated when the Commission was created in 1914. It deals with the parts of the Commission Act under which the Commission is widely engaged in the trial of specific issues of fact between the Government and its citizens.

The bill does not relate just to advertising cases. It would, of course, affect all such cases, whatever the advertised goods might be; but it would also apply to all the actions which the Commission may institute under section 5 of its act. Those actions involve, in the words of the act, "unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts and practices in commerce." The subject matter for these cases is just as broad as the terms "unfair methods of competition" and "unfair or deceptive acts and practices" and can involve almost anything a man does in the conduct of his business.

The bill would take nothing away from the Commission that should not be taken away from it or that the Commission should object to having taken away from it. Indeed, the bill may not go far enough. Perhaps it should go to the extent of separating the functions which the Commission exercises, so that the trial of issues of fact would be transferred to the courts, the Commission being the complainant or the prosecuting agency, but the adjudication being by the courts which regularly determine issues of fact in specific cases and have been doing it for generations.

However, it has seemed to me that perhaps it might not be necessary to go that far if a material correction could be made with respect to court supervision. Perhaps it is not so objectionable for the agency to combine these functions if there is available a review whereby the courts may examine what the Commission has done in its multiple capacities; whereby the courts may determine whether the Commission has acted contrary to the weight of the evidence; whereby the court may examine the whole record; whereby the court's power to modify the order of the Commission is not limited to a showing that the order is plainly arbitrary.

It does not offend the stature or the dignity of the Commission to say that, if it is to exercise judicial functions, it should be subjected to the same review that pertains in the judiciary. The Commission, in the unusual circumstances pertaining to it, should not be given the same finality on findings of fact as pertains to a jury's verdict. Certainly, it should not be more immune to review than is the district judge in the trial of cases without a jury. The findings of the judge may be disturbed if they are against the clear weight of the evidence. It is not unreasonable to put the Commission's findings on the same basis for appellate review. It seems to me quite unreasonable not to do so.

THE REVIEW OF THE COMMISSION PROCEEDING

It is true that the Federal Trade Commission Act in present form contains a provision for court review of a Commission order. That review is, however, so limited as to be of little avail in the ordinary case. The courts say that as the law now stands they cannot weigh either the force of the evidence or the propriety of the remedy.

The obstacle to court review of the facts at present is the provision that the Commission's findings of fact shall be conclusive if supported by evidence. This means that the reviewing court must take the case on what the Commission says are the facts. The Commission may pick and choose from the record as it pleases, to select evidence in support of its findings. The court cannot look beyond that to see what may be in the record in denial or explanation. On the whole record there may be a serious conflict in the evidence, or a heavy preponderance of evidence in a direction contrary to that taken by the Commission. Nevertheless, the court is bound to the Commission's view.

There is no logical reason why the Commission should be the complete arbiter of the facts. It doesn't see the witness or hear the evidence. It often knows no more of the proofs than what is disclosed by the trial examiner's report on them. When a conflict in evidence arises, the courts are the proper place to resolve it—historically, traditionally, and by practice and experience. From their very inception courts have been dealing with cases of unfair competition and commercial dishonesty. My proposal to require support of the Commission's findings by a preponderance of evidence will give the courts an opportunity to consider and evaluate testimony on both sides of the case.

Furthermore, the bill would permit the courts to resume the exercise of some discretion over restrictions laid upon a respondent by a Commission order. The act now says that the courts may modify the order, and they used to do so. In recent years, however, judicial construction has almost read the word "modify" out of the act. Courts now take the view that the Federal Trade Commission has absolute authority as to remedy, and refuse to interfere even while expressing their own opinion that the ends of justice would be served by less-drastic measures. This is illustrative of an alarming trend in the administration of justice. It represents a transfer of power from the hands of the judiciary to an administrative agency which is naturally concerned with the exercise of its authority on a broad scale.

THE PENALTY PROVISIONS

The importance of adequate review of Commission orders is emphasized by the fact that, when such an order has become final, the respondent is subject to a severe penalty if in any respect he fails to comply with it. In other words, the cease-and-desist order which has resulted from the proceeding in which the Commission has been prosecutor and judge and which has not been subject to adequate court review is enforceable by heavy monetary penalties.

As the law now stands there is a civil penalty of not more than $5,000 for "each violation." In dealing with advertisements, for example, each single advertisement may be a separate violation, and, as the order frequently includes numerous prohibitions, each advertisement may violate several separate prohibitions in one order. Thus, the aggregate penalty may be computed by multiplying the number of violations in an advertisement by the number of publications of the advertisement in all kinds of media. Considering the wide variety of means which may be used to disseminate a single advertisement, the total penalties may run into a fantastically high figure.

The proposed amendment is for the purpose of putting a ceiling on the accumulation of penalties for a single violation. The figures I have suggested—not more than $1,000 with a top limit of $10,000—may not be the right ones and I am not particularly concerned to use these exact figures. My concern is with the principle that the penalty should be large enough to be effective

without the possibility of becoming so large as to be confiscatory.

THE PROBLEM OF DUAL JURISDICTION

The other principal feature of the bill is of primary importance only to the food, drug, and cosmetic industries, but it is especially close to my heart because of the measure of responsibility I feel for the present situation. I was on the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which dealt with the food, drug, and cosmetic bill and the Wheeler-Lea bill in the period 1935-38. I felt then that no legislation was more important than that having to do with the purity and the truthful labeling and advertising of the country's food, drug, and cosmetic supplies. The years which have passed since have confirmed my estimate of its importance and have brought me a sense of pride in having had an active part in it.

When this legislation was formulated, I advocated the arrangement whereby the jurisdiction over advertising of the commodities was left with the Federal Trade Commission, the Commission's powers in that respect being substantially enlarged by the Wheeler-Lea bill. The Commission had exercised jurisdiction over the advertising of these commodities only as advertising had been construed to be a method of competition. The Commission desired to retain this jurisdiction and to have its powers enlarged in order the more adequately to cope with advertising of foods, drugs, and cosmetics. It was my thought that the Commission's position was correct and that the way we separated the jurisdiction of the Food and Drug Administration from that of the Commission represented a clear division of authority. I have been distressed, however, to find that the division was not as clear as we thought it. I have, therefore, felt out of my own responsibility an urgent desire to remedy the situation.

Overlapping of the activities of these two agencies apparently has grown out of the administration of section 15 (a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, which contains the definition of "false advertisement," expressly excluding "labeling" from it. Now the purpose of that exclusion was to prevent dual administration, the regulation of labeling being under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. However, either directly or indirectly, the Commission has undertaken to deal with the labeling. Even more often the two agencies, the Food and Drug Administration and the Commission, are found dealing with the same subject matter—the same representations. The Food and Drug Administration will deal with such representations in labeling which includes the package, the label, and circulars which accompany the goods; the Commission will deal with the same representations in advertising.

Although these two agencies desire to have a harmonious relationship, they are not under common control and it is inevitable that divergent opinions and approaches to some problems should arise. The result has been that the action of one sometimes hampers or forestalls the other, each spending great effort, time and money on subject matter that could be disposed of in one procedure.

The purpose of the bill is to correct that situation. The bill would amend the Commission Act to insert a definition of the word "labeling" in the identical language which the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act uses to define the term. It also would alter the definition of a "false advertisement" by a change to language which more clearly expresses what section 15 (a) sought to accomplish. That was to reach advertisements which, although not false by express statement, were misleading by indirection, implication, and ambiguity. The commission has construed its present language as a requirement for advertisements to contain directions for using and various warnings with respect to contra-indications. Those matters are expressly dealt with in the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act as to labeling. They were not intended to be required as to advertising unless the affirmative and express portions of the advertisements were such as to make some additional disclosure necessary for accuracy or safety.

Certainly speaking for myself as one who took an active part in the work of the subcommittee, in the deliberations of the full committee, and in the discussions on the floor of the House in formulating the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act and the Wheeler-Lea amendments to the Federal Trade Commission Act, I can say that it was our intention to separate the jurisdiction of the two agencies so that there would not be any duplication.

I think that purpose was clear in the report on the Wheeler-Lea Act by our committee to the House (Rept. No. 1613, Aug. 19, 1937, 75th Cong., 1st sess., p. 5):

"It will be observed that it is not mandatory on the advertiser to state anything. The only requirement is in case he does advertise, he shall not make statements that are misleading in a material respect.

"It is incumbent on the advertiser to reveal facts material in the light of representations made in the advertisement."

Also, when the bill was under discussion on the floor of the House there were several interesting and revealing colloquies. One of them appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 12, 1938 (vol. 83, p. 412), as follows:

"Mr. WHITE of Ohio. Let us take, for example, the manufacturer of cosmetics. If cosmetics are used for normal purposes and injury occurs, the gentleman would want to punish the man who put out the cosmetics, but on the other hand if these cosmetics are eaten by somebody or used for a purpose other than prescribed, certainly the gentleman would not want to hold the manufacturer responsible?

"Mr. LEA. No. We are shortly going to come along with a food and drug bill which is pretty well prepared for presentation to the House. The gentleman referred to cosmetics. The new food and drug bill will require a warning of what may be the deleterious effects if used under certain conditions. We are going to take care of that in the label and misbranding features."

My bill, therefore, proposes deletion of the clause in section 15 (a) which has been the basis for the Commission dealing with warnings and directions, and which has, it seems to me, been chiefly responsible for the Commission trying cases which involve protracted investigations into therapeutics. I realize that one cannot avoid the subject of therapeutics when dealing with advertisements of drug products. But one cannot deal with directions and warnings without protracted investigations into therapeutics. And we thought the Food and Drug Administration, by experience, equipment, and tradition, was better suited to deal with that subject than was the Commission; that the Administration could do that as it administered its law, which applies directly to the composition of articles, the sanitary conditions which surround their production, the packaging of them, the labeling and the formulation of the indications, and contraindications for their use.

The final provision—section 19—of the bill would seem to end conflict by providing that "food, drugs, devices, and cosmetics shall be exempt from the provisions of this act to the extent of the application or the extension thereto of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, approved June 25, 1938, as amended." In framing that section, language already used by the Congress has been employed—the language used in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prevent dual jurisdiction with the Meat Inspection Act. The virtue of this language is that by express statement it gives effect to the intent of the Congress. It expresses what ought to be the situation. There ought to be a clear demarcation between the jurisdiction of these two agencies. With a law as comprehensive as the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act there is no reason to have a second agency dealing with the labeling of these products or duplicating, under the guise of regulating advertisements, the work of another agency under another statute.

I have only this to say in conclusion. The purposes of the bill and my intentions for it are as I have stated them to you in these remarks. My brief is for these intentions and purposes—not for the bill itself. If there are better ways of accomplishing these purposes, I will accord them a cordial welcome, and in the consideration of the bill, it is not my purpose to interject any hostility with reference to the Federal Trade Commission. So far as my own relationships to the Commissio- are concerned, they have been cordial. In fact, I am looked upon as one of the stanch supporters of the Federal Trade Commission on our committee and one of its advocates, and with respect to the introduction of the bill, it is not unlikely the Commission experienced some disappointment that one who had been and is such a close friend of the Commission should have introduced a bill placing limitations upon its authority and to do so was not a pleasant responsibility for me.

But, as I stated earlier in my remarks, I do not think this is an unfriendly gesture toward the Commission. It is simply an attempt to develop good procedure based upon long years of experience. I expect the hearings to be conducted in such a manner as not to give opportunity for any antagonisms or antipathies to be aroused so far as the Federal Trade Commission itself is concerned. I think every member of that fine body is a personal friend of mine, and I have a high regard for the Commission and for the individual members and its capable and experienced staff, as well as for the work of the Commission itself and certainly for the purposes for which it was organized and I would be the last person to knowingly offend its dignity or stature.

Chronological History of the Negotiations Between the UAW and General Motors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following chronological history of the negotiations between the UAW and General Motors:

July 3, 1945: OWMR Director Fred Vinson says, of our postwar capacity to produce and consume, we "are in the pleasant predicament of having to learn to live 50 percent better than (we) have ever lived before." (See pp. 4 and 5 of UAW-CIO Economic Brief.)

August 14: VJ-day. War ends. Shutdowns, change-overs, with thousands laid off. Workweek drops to 40 hours; take-home pay falls 23 percent for those still working.

August 18: President Truman announces a reconversion wage policy providing for free collective bargaining between labor and management, with wage increases allowable up to point where price increases would be required.

August 18: General Motors department, UAW-CIO, files demand with General Motors Corp. for a 30-percent increase in wage rates without increase in prices.

August 19–September 17: Silence by the corporation. No acknowledgment of August 18 letter transmitting the union demands; no counterproposal; three verbal requests by the union that negotiations begin draw reply that the corporation is not ready.

September 18: The corporation, without making any counterproposal, offers to begin negotiations "on dates that will be mutually satisfactory."

September 19: UAW-CIO wires offer to meet at once and again asks for counterproposal. No acknowledgment.

October 2: First negotiation meeting, 6 weeks after demands were filed. Corporation representative hands union representative a letter. Same published in newspaper advertisements. Offers no counterproposal, makes no reply to our August 18 arguments and economic data in suppoft of our wage demands, corporation gives no reasons for claiming it is unable to make any wage increases. The corporation refuses to discuss its financial position or ability to pay higher wage rates. Corporation flatly rejects our demands as "unreasonable."

October 5: Meeting. Corporation again refuses to discuss its ability to pay higher wage rates.

October 8: Same.

October 12: The union writes the corporation, reciting previous efforts to negotiate and to bargain collectively. The union renews its proposal that negotiations be public so that the public can know the economic facts and thereby expedite a fair settlement. Union again asks corporation to submit a counterproposal by October 16, and serves notice that the union will begin presentation of its economic brief October 19.

October 18: Twenty-four hours before union begins its presentation of facts, figures, and arguments in support of its wage demands, corporation mails to wage and salaried employees warning to get ready to go home for the strike, which "may be a long one." Office help were told, "Your checks will follow." Same propaganda, including Danger on the Production Front pamphlet and false news story, was mailed to Congress and governors—a plea for Congress to pass union-busting laws; for governors to be ready to call out State militia.

October 19: Corporation holds up negotiations for 90 minutes, figuring how to throw out press and radio correspondents. Says that if union insists on public sessions, union is breaking off negotiations. Reuther, to save negotiations, asks correspondents to leave. Behind closed doors, union begins presenting economic brief, showing healthy national economy depends on maintaining take-home pay during reconversion. Corporation representatives refuse to discuss facts and arguments as presented (pp. 60–61 of transcript).

October 19: At NAM press conference in Book-Cadillac Hotel, GM president, C. E. Wilson, gives union, the public, and Federal Government an "either or" ultimatum: Lower wages, or higher prices, or change the Wages and Hours Act, raising the normal workweek from 40 to 45 hours. With a longer workweek, he says, GM will raise hourly wage rates 5 to 8 percent and work 48 hours. Says "workmen of other nations will work far more than 45 hours." Calls other employers who "have stepped out and raised wages" unfair. If GM doesn't get action on prices or hours, and if labor insists on wage-rate increases, GM will push out sample cars to bait the car-hungry public and then shut down.

October 22: Following October 21 publication of Wilson's 45-hour workweek offer, Reuther wires Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Chairman of Senate Labor Committee, quotations from Wilson's statement supporting UAW-CIO charge that "General Motors wants a strike. It is baiting labor; it is baiting the Government; it is planning to use its vast economic power to coerce Congress."

October 23: Union begins presenting part II of economic brief, proving that General Motors can pay 30 percent higher wage rates without higher prices and can do it now. corporation again refuses to discuss case point by point as presented. GM representatives read papers and magazines while brief is being presented. Although Wilson said (October 2 and October 19) that corporation cannot afford to pay higher wage rates, GM Vice President Harry Anderson says (p. 134) that GM's ability to pay is not a factor in the wage negotiations. Admits GM is preparing for strike (p. 294).

October 24: Union continues to present facts, figures, and argument showing General Motors can pay higher wage rates now without price increases. One corporation representative, objecting to union reports to press on previous meeting, compares principal union representative with a skunk. Union again challenges corporation to open the negotiations to the press and radio. "Never mind that," says the corporation (pp. 298–299).

October 24: GM workers vote 6 to 1 to authorize a strike under provisions of Smith-Connally Act. Elections in union locals by secret ballot under UAW–CIO constitution, show 9 to 1 majority for strike authorization.

October 24: In United States Senate Wilson's 45-hour work week proposal is denounced as unthinkable by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman of the Senate Education and Labor Committee. Inserting the UAW-CIO economic brief in the RECORD as a clear-cut statement of the facts Chairman MURRAY called on General Motors to make an equally clear statement of the facts. He said:

"It is vitally important that both sides to this controversy make clear to the American people without equivocation or deception the facts upon which they stand. They owe an obligation to the American people to prevent the dangerous consequences of a strike which will demoralize the country. Both sides must take the public into their full confidence and give a straightforward, honest statement of the facts so that the American people may know whether this demanded increase in wages may be made without an increase in prices." (Pp. 10092–10099, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Oct. 24, 1945.)

October 26: Union completes presentation of its economic brief in support of its demand that General Motors wage rates be increased 30 percent now without increasing prices. Corporation asks for 10 days in which to prepare its answer to union's brief.

October 26: That same night, on the Mutual Network, discussing the General Motors case with UAW-CIO, Vice President Reuther, General Motors vice president, Harry Anderson announces: "The unreasonable demand of UAW-CIO has been rejected by General Motors."

Referring to corporation offers to talk wage increases if the union would stop talking about costs and profits and prices, Reuther says that the General Motors workers will not accept "the wooden nickels of inflation" because "we do not propose to eat the bitter bread of a new depression."

October 27: In a letter, General Motors President C. E. Wilson formally propositions the union, urging that the corporation and the union gang up on Congress to change the Wages and Hours Act's normal workweek from 40 to 45 hours. He repeats October 19 argument that workers in other nations will be working longer hours, so should we.

October 28: Union rejects the corporation's proposal of "a conspiracy to slam the door of job opportunity in the faces of millions of returning veterans and laid-off war workers."

Wilson was reminded that 45-hour week would add 1,500,000 to 8,000,000 unemployed estimated for 1946.

Union again proposed, as more efficient, three-shift operation to insure maximum production and employment.

November 3: Union wires Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach asking conciliation commissioners to attend future meetings with the corporation.

November 7: Meeting to receive corporation's reply brief. Corporation refuses to admit United States conciliators.

Corporation brief asks union to reconsider Wilson's proposal that the union join the corporation in persuading Congress to lengthen normal workweek under Wages and Hours Act from 40 to 45 hours.

Corporation also offers 8- to 10-percent wage increases to bring classification rates up in line with cost-of-living increases, where they have not already been so adjusted.

Union asks if such wage increases would then be used to get higher prices. Corporation replies that it is its business, not the union's (pp. 507–509).

Union asks the corporation if it will offer even 1-percent wage increase without tying it to cost-of-living adjustment and OPA prices. Corporation says, "No" (p. 512).

November 8: Union charges the corporation with unfair labor practices. In complaint filed with National Labor Relations Board, union points out that the corporation, after pleading financial inability to pay (1) Refused to discuss its ability to pay; (2) refused to disclose information essential to collective bargaining within the intent of section 8, subsection 5 of the National Labor Relations Act; (3) warned in advance that it was determined not to let ability to pay become a subject of discussion in the negotiations; (4) treated the negotiating meetings with contempt; (5) prior to negotiations, wrote its employees to discredit the negotiations and to warn them that a strike (perhaps a big one) was inevitable; (6) made a fake offer in bad faith (the proposal to conspire with the corporation to force Congress to change the normal work week to 45 hours); (7) and, in violation of section 8, subsection 1, sought to and did discourage membership in the union, and activity on its behalf, "thus interfering with, restraining, and coercing its employees."

November 9: Corporation permits United States conciliators to sit in negotiations, but as obesrvers only, despite the union invitation to become full participants.

Union presents its supplemental brief in reply to the corporation brief in November 27. In addition to defending its facts against corporation criticism, the union reply cites corporation statements proving "the corporation's determination to write and enforce, for itself and all of American industry, a policy of reckless and irresponsible economic imperalism within the United States of America and throughout the world"—longer hours, lower pay, higher prices, and inflated dollar with which to carry on economic warfare in the world's markets. (Conclusions, p. 1).

The corporation's wage-price-profit policy, as stated in its brief, in negotiations, letters, and advertisements, was summed up by the union:

"High" wages, but 23 percent less than enough to maintain GM workers take-home pay equal in purchasing power to 1944; prices, as high as the traffic will bear; "reasonable profits," whatever is left after wages, materials and parts costs, and so forth; prices and profits, none of labor's business; profits and costs, nobody's business but the corporation's (conclusions, p. 3).

General Motors Vice President Harry Anderson, replying to a union plea that the corporation change its position, said "We say the ability to pay is not an economic factor in a wage negotiation" (p. 560).

November 9: In a press conference 2 hours later, General Motors Vice President Harry Anderson says, according to the New York Times (p. 1, Nov. 10), "We don't even open our books to our stockholders. Anyway, the

books reflect only past events and do not contain an index to the future."

November 11–12: UAW-CIO international executive board receives report on General Motors department's efforts to negotiate with General Motors Corp.

Board gives the strategy committee full power to act.

General Motors Department Director Reuther calls conference of delegates from General Motors locals to meet in Detroit November 19–20.

November 12: Reuther calls on consumers, auto dealers, House Small Business Committee, and OPA Administrator Bowles to block a $150,000,000 holdup of a car-hungry public by a fifth column of inflationists within OPA who have threatened to resign unless manufacturers' car prices are raised.

OPA announcement of car price increases is blocked. Union's proof that General Motors can pay 30 percent higher wage rates, cut car prices and still earn high profits gets attention. Also, fact that, if OPA raises General Motors prices without a wage increase, OPA will, in effect, be siding with the corporation against the union's contentions.

November 14: The corporation announces a 10 percent increase for salaried employees, except higher paid officials, whose salaries and bonuses are to be reviewed in the light of the corporation's ability to pay and the value of their services to the corporation.

November 15: The corporation presents a second reply brief, squawking about the rough language of the union's supplemental brief of Novembe: 9, attempting to contradict some of its arithmetic and making a new wage offer: A flat 10 percent increase in wage rates, but still tied to regulations and formulas for increasing OPA prices.

The union again asks whether the corporation will make any offer, even a 1-percent wage increase, without tying it to OPA prices. Again the corporation's answer is "No."

General Motors Vice President Anderson admitted that the consumer will pay any increases in car prices if granted by OPA.

For the union's General Motors negotiating committee, Reuther announces that the committee will report the offer, and all previous offers, to the November 19–20 conference and the strategy committee and will recommend rejection "because it is an attempt to bribe General Motors workers with the wooden nickels of inflation.

"You put a dime in one pocket and take 15 cents out of the other pocket."

November 17: Union presents its reply to the corporation's November 15 brief and points out several errors in arithmetic.

Original position is reaffirmed:

1. Take-home pay must be maintained during reconversion in order to start "to live 50 percent better than we have ever lived before."

2. General Motors Corp. can pay 30 percent higher wage rates without increasing prices and can do it now.

November 19: UAW-CIO strategy meets, 9 a. m.

General Motors department, UAW-CIO conference meets, 1 p. m., Barlum Hotel.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, every day in every way the duplicity and perfidy of the OPA under Chester Bowles spreads its dark and ominous shadows over the American public. These observations are not exclusive to me. The eyes of the American public and the American press are being opened wider every day.

I direct your attention to the following editorial from the New Orleans Item which speaks for itself. After you read it, can you honestly say that the OPA has held down anything except jobs at the taxpayers' expense:

WEIRD BENEFACTION

Queer indeed are the evolutions by which Reconversion, OPA, and Stabilization directors have gone around Robin Hood's barn to pay some Latin-American coffee growers more than the ceiling on which the retail price of coffee in this country is based.

The Central Americans declared this price to be insufficient to make coffee production possible at a living wage for the labor producing it. Matters came to such a pass, finally, that sales to importers in the United States were drastically cut down, to say nothing of the fact that a number of devious expedients were adopted to make additional payments "under the table" by accepting short shipments without complaint, and the like.

Naturally, our importers found this situation gradually becoming intolerable, and besieged Washington with requests for relief which would permit them to compete in the world market for coffee, by paying comparable prices. The master minds who control such matters finally evolved this amazing scheme:

American importers will be permitted to pay Central American producers 3 cents a pound more than heretofore—but must not raise their price in turn to the domestic distributors. To make this possible, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will pay the importers the 3 cents a pound from the United States Treasury.

In other words, in order to maintain the pleasant but fraudulent fiction that the price John Citizen pays for coffee at the grocery counter has not been increased, the Government is making up the difference—with John Citizen's own tax-dollars. You pay no more for coffee, but you do pay more in taxes, for no other purpose than to permit New Deal politicians falsely to proclaim that producers are getting more for their coffee but consumers are not paying any more for it. And they call that holding the price line!

Your spending-dollar is reduced by about the same amount in either case. But by the bureaucrats' roundabout path, all that is actually accomplished is to sluice a subsidy of about $24,000,000 to the coffee growers of Latin-America, without satisfying anyone; for the growers are loud in their complaints that the increase is not enough. And this is what the New Dealers call a good neighbor policy.

General Motors Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial by Mark Sullivan taken from today's New York Herald Tribune.

What are we waiting for? The people are enraged. Where are the freedoms that the boys fought to preserve? With such an enormous backlog for the necessities needed by all in this country and in every nation in the world, why is it possible for a minority of workers to tie up production and strangle reconversion? If our disgruntled labor would only take the time to check the disastrous results in totalitarian countries, they would appreciate what benefits they are enjoying today, far beyond anything that labor ever can hope to expect in the referred to countries. They would appreciate what free private enterprise and collective bargaining have done for them.

Since the administration has failed, it is up to Congress and I hope every Congressman gives this present situation his sincere attention. When the bills to correct the present weak legislation are brought to the floor, we must all work together to save America, and the world for that matter, as all nations look to see whether our democratic form of government can pull through on this post-war crisis.

Let us save our face.

ENTIRE RECONVERSION PROGRAM SEEN BLOCKED BY GENERAL MOTORS STRIKERS—MARK SULLIVAN SAYS ONLY 70,853 VOTED TO WALK OUT, YET WHOLE UNITED STATES PROGRAM IS HELD UP; REITERATES CONGRESS ALONE CAN PROVIDE CURE

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, November 25.—The deep consequences of the General Motors strike begin with, but are by no means limited to, its postponement of reconversion. For getting volume of reconversion under way, the motor industry was the country's second reliance, the only one exceeding it being housing. And here, stalled, is the company that makes just under half of all the cars and trucks normally made in the country. To measure the widespread stalling of reconversion, it is necessary to bear in mind the resulting semiparalysis of the country's other industries. Of steel products, the motor industry as a whole consumes nearly 20 percent, of rubber products 80 percent, of many other products large percentages.

In addition to the direct stalling of reconversion is a psychological effect, on all business and on the public. That there is an immense demand for new automobiles, the public knows; the average man knows it in the form of his own personal demand. Industry knows it in the form of a figure; there are in the country 5,000,000 fewer cars than when we entered the war, and of those that remain most are in serious disrepair. Both business and the average man are apt to ask, if so enormous a demand, accompanied by abundance of money to pay for new cars, does not start reconversion, what will?

A deeply disturbing condition, only sensed by the average man but expressed clearly in a startling figure, is the spectacle of reconversion held up by a very small group. In the election that brought about this strike, conducted by the National Labor Relations Board, a total of 350,000 General Motors employees were entitled to vote. Only 83,655 voted at all, only 70,853 for the strike. The power of a tiny fraction of the people to hold up a national objective so necessary and popular as reconversion is impressive in a disquieting way.

WHAT CAN THE GOVERNMENT DO?

If the average man reflects upon the helplessness of the great majority against a small group and its leaders, the reflection is deepened when he turns to consider what can be or ought to be done by his Government.

There he finds the administration partly reluctant, partly unable. Omit the reluctance, consider only the inability. For ending such a strike as this, the only statutory mechanism possessed by the Government is the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor. (In strikes of a different kind, considered by the President to interfere with the war effort, or directly with the operation of Government, he has used seizure of plants by the Navy, a dubious remedy for any kind of strike in peacetime.)

The only power possessed by the Conciliation Service is what its name implies, conciliation. It can ask the parties to the strike to arbitrate, but if either party declines the Conciliation Service is at the end of its statutory rope. Even if both agree to arbitrate, both are free to refuse to abide by the arbitrator's judgment. This spectacle of the impotence of government in the General Motors strike, so far as any existing agency or statute goes, is made more serious by its equal impotence in strikes of a different kind, such as the telephone strike, which completely suspend public services.

EFFECT ON OTHER COUNTRIES

If the impotence of government were to be accepted by the people as an incurable condition, that would be the sign of a terrifying malady of both government and society, a malady of weakness and disunity, of inability of government to be supreme over all groups. Throughout history, and conspicuously in recent years, disease of this type has led to national calamity. It was such a malady that made France too weak to put up strong resistance against Germany, that led to the rise of Mussolini in Italy, that preceded the rise of Hitler in Germany.

Fortunately, in the United States the impotence of government is not accepted as incurable. Proposals for remedy exist in Congress, conspicuously, for example, the comprehensive labor-relations measure known as the Ball-Burton-Hatch bill. Action on some such measure has been suspended until it could be seen whether a voluntary preventive and remedy of strikes could be worked out by the labor-management conference called by President Truman for that purpose.

It is already foreseen that the labor-management conference, whatever its minor and valuable accomplishments, can hardly succeed in the central purpose of voluntary extra legal prevention of strikes. To give the idea a hopeful trial was the spirit in which Mr. Truman called the conference. Once the impossibility of cure by voluntary action becomes fully apparent, there is little doubt a vigorous Congress will act and that Mr. Truman will assent.

Will Bureau of Medicine Be the Solution To Existing Problems Within Veterans Administration?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement by Joseph Leib, service officer and past vice commander of Vincent B. Costello Post of American Legion. This statement is persuasive for the early passage of H. R. 4717:

Critical analyses of our veterans hospitals has shown beyond all question of doubt the urgent necessity for revamping and modernization of these institutions. There are numerous examples of shocking deficiencies both in equipment as well as in the treatment of patients.

This writer has done a great deal of research in this connection and has consulted the most eminent authorities in the medical profession in the hope of finding the cause and cure of this unfortunate situation.

When a legal problem arises one naturally goes to a lawyer. If one has a toothache they go to a dentist. Obviously when poor and inadequate hospital care is given to veterans, the place to go is to the medical profession.

For years there has existed a Special Medical Advisory Board to assist the Administrator of Veterans Affairs. This Board has been a paper organization and for many years the Veterans' Administration has either ignored this Board entirely or else pigeon-holed its findings and reports.

Since last May I have been in touch with these authorities representing all branches of medicine. I present herewith some of their criticism and observations. Perhaps in these recommendations we may find a working solution to the vexing problems confronting the Veterans' Administration. The following speaks for itself:

From Kendall Emerson, M. D., director, National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.:

"Tremendous advances in the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of tuberculous patients have been made during the past 25 years. No comparable improvement in the veterans facilities have taken place. The National Turberculosis Association is convinced that competent medical administration, unhampered by lay authority, should be immediately instituted to correct very obviously disabilities in the existing veterans institutions.

"There is no question of the Veterans' Administration's capacity to handle the business and insurance aspects of its work. By act of Congress, however, medical decisions are left in the hands of a nonmedical administrator. The separation of medical care from the business and insurance aspects would give an opportunity to build up a medical service which would insure for every veteran the best that medical science has to offer in the care of tuberculous patients."

From Robert U. Patterson, dean, University of Maryland School of Medicine, Baltimore, Md.:

"I have been a member of the medical council of the Veterans' Administration since 1923. There has been no full meeting of that committee for approximately 10 years. The Veterans' Administration has never in my opinion been able to attract and retain the services of physicians for the subordinate positions comparable to the other governmental medical services. The principal reason this has been is because it has not been able to offer as attractive a career to physicians as those commissioned in the Army, Navy, or public-health services. The greatest criticism from the viewpoint of the medical profession has been that in a service in which medicine is the basic and one of its principal activities, the head of the medical service (medical director) has never been accorded the dignified position and authority that he should hold under the circumstances."

From Willard C. Rappleye, dean, Columbia University, College of Physicians and Surgeons, New York, N. Y.:

"The physical plants of most of the veterans' hospitals appear to be reasonably satisfactory although their locations in many instances make it difficult or impossible to provide for adequate consulting services of outstanding medical men, a provision which is most important for the completely satisfactory care of servicemen. Many of these hospitals are in rural districts where there is beautiful scenery and quiet environment but quite inaccessible in many instances.

"Perhaps the greatest weakness of the Veterans' Administration is the lack of a staff of the highest order. For many years the proposal has been made to create a medical corps of the Veterans' Administration with opportunities for progressive advancement, for security, and for scientific and educational self-development of the members of the staff. There has been very little inducement on the part of the Veterans' Administration for competent, younger, well-trained physicians to go into this important service. At different times during the last 25 years efforts have been made to create a medical corps that has characteristics similar to that of the United States Public Health Service or the Army or Navy. These efforts have been unsuccessful with the result that the medical services are not as adequate as required by modern standards."

From Winford H. Smith, M. D., director Johns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore, Md.:

"One of the greatest difficulties is that of attracting competent medical men to staff the veterans' hospitals. Why should competent medical men join the staff of the veterans' hospitals? The patients are for the most part chronic cases; the salaries paid are comparatively small. If the doctors were really competent, they could make, in private practice, several times the amount they receive from the Government. It is the sort of a career that I think will not appeal to well-trained medical men. I remember, twenty-odd years ago, the establishment of a veterans' medical corps was considered with the thought that the uniform or the rank would attract men. I don't think that would be the attractive feature because it would not have the glamour that service with the Army or Navy has."

From A. W. Adson, M. D., Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minn.:

"Unfortunately, the medical and surgical services of the Veterans' Administration have been placed in a subservient position to that of the Administrator. Therefore, I believe that the medical and surgical services should be placed on an equal status with that of the other branches of the Administration, since the primary objective of all hospitals is to provide medical and surgical care.

"The present arrangement of selecting professional personnel from a civil-service list makes it difficult for the Medical Director to secure the best professional talent. Therefore, I believe that changes should be made and have suggested that a medical corps be created, similar to the corps of the Army and Navy. I further believe that graduate training should be offered to younger men and remunerative inducements made to encourage outstanding professional men to accept positions in the various veterans hospitals. I also believe that the various medical and surgical chiefs should be relieved of certain administration duties in order that they will have more time available for rendering professional services, since there will be available a large group of young officers who have been trained to do routine hospital administration."

From Benjamin Warren Black, M. D., Oakland, Calif.:

"More important is the idea that funds be sufficient to attract a permanent medical corps by offering commissions to physicians, dentists, nurses, and others with permanent rank on the same basis as is now found in the Army and Navy, and preferably to commission them in the United States Public Health Service. This is the only civilian commissioned service in the United States Government and the job of taking care of the veterans is a civilian not a military function. With such an arrangement a physician may be provided with a career and with retirement outside of civil service. It will offer

reasonable opportunity for advancement and rank, with a career service and retirement, the only way that competent, expert medical care will be continually available for the injured, disabled, and sick veteran."

From James Alexander Lyon, M. D., chairman, Wartime Graduate Medical Meetings, Washington, D. C.:

"I have suggested that after the cessation of the war, many young doctors in the United States Army and Navy, as well as the Public Health Service, who will be discharged from active service might find it very desirable to take up medical work in the veterans hospitals, providing the Bureau could conform to the same standards as those of the Army, Navy, and Public Health."

These are but a few of many expressions from medical authorities. To quote all of them would be useless. The above statements are typical of replies received.

The Operators Go Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of November 22, 1945:

THE OPERATORS GO BACK

With Washington's second wildcat transit strike apparently collapsing under the impact of Government seizure of the lines, some serious thought should be given to the implications of this type of union irresponsibility.

In his stinging rebuke to the strikers, President Truman described their action as "a blow at the sanctity of labor agreements," and said that "the action of this union brings discredit upon the whole body of organized labor." That is true, but it does not go far enough. Actually, the local transit strike also reflects discredit on, and reveals the serious weakness of, our whole system of collective bargaining.

The law applicable to collective bargaining lays down certain standards of conduct for employers and provides penalties for those who fail to meet the standards. But it sets out no standards of conduct applicable to unions and provides no penalties whatsoever for union activities which reduce collective bargaining to a mockery.

Until this weakness is recognized and dealt with by Congress, it is idle to hope for any peace or stability in industrial relations. And it is difficult to see why a union man, unless he is seeking some selfish or improper advantage, should object to the imposition of appropriate standards on unions.

Spurred to action by the local transit strike, the House Rules Committee yesterday reported out a bill which, with other things, would establish penalties for strikes in violation of contract. In its entirety, the bill may or may not be desirable. Certainly it needs more careful consideration than it has received. But the significant thing is that its opponents in the House sought to combat it by raising the familiar cry that its provisions would "stab labor in the back."

So far as compelling respect for contracts and imposing reasonable standards on unions are concerned, that protest is utter nonsense. If organized labor, on the whole, is not indulging in the practices at which the bill is aimed, the great majority of workers would not be affected by it at all. It would reach only the irresponsible union elements, and any man who undertakes to put the selfish interests of these groups ahead of the interests of the people of the country actually is proving himself to be an exceedingly poor "friend" of labor.

Six-Year Agreement Has No Strike and No Lock-Outs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the St. Louis (Mo.) Labor Tribune of November 21, 1945, concerning a 6-year agreement between 42 laundry and cleaning firms in St. Louis and organized labor.

The feature of the agreement is that it forbids strikes and lock-outs and provides a three-man arbitration panel composed of a representative of the public, labor, and industry who will settle all disputes that arise in these two industries for the duration of the contract.

It is unfortunate that such unfair legislation as H. R. 3937, with its labor-baiting amendments, should rear its ugly head at a time when it is evident there is a growing desire of both labor and management everywhere to settle their labor-relations problems in the manner set forth in the following article.

Enactment of H. R. 3937 into law would only create chaos and distrust and would be a step backward in the field of labor relations—plans such as the laundry and cleaning workers have adopted would not result under such ill-advised restraint suggested in H. R. 3937.

6-YEAR AGREEMENT HAS NO STRIKES AND NO LOCK-OUTS

An intensive and determined drive launched last July under direct order of William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, to organize the open-shop laundry and dry-cleaning industries in St. Louis, was brought to a most successful and gratifying conclusion last Monday with the announcement of the signing of a 6-year agreement between the three dominant employer organizations in these two local industries and representatives of three AFL unions.

These were the St. Louis Laundry Board of Trade, Progressive Laundry Owners Association, and the St. Louis Dry Cleaners Exchange representing the employers; and the St. Louis Teamsters Joint Council and its affiliated Laundry, Linen, Cleaning and Dye House Chauffeurs Local 366, the Laundry Workers Local 108, and Cleaning and Dye House Workers Local 161 representing the employees.

This master agreement, covering over 3,000 workers, is one of the most comprehensive and progressive union contracts ever negotiated for workers in these low-paying industries. One of its most distinctive features forbids strikes and lock-outs and provides a three-man arbitration panel composed of a representative of the public, labor, and industry who will settle all disputes that arise in these two industries for the duration of the contract.

The tripartite panel will consist of the Reverand Leo C. Brown, S. J., impartial chairman; A. A. Ahner, industrial relations counselor, representing the employers; and Lawrence Camie, a business representative of the St. Louis Teamsters Joint Council, representing labor.

Other features provided for in the current contract are wage increases, a 1-week paid vacation, and the reopening of the contract every 2 years for the purpose of making proper wage adjustments.

BEGINNING OF DRIVE

Last July AFL President William Green sent an AFL organizer, Harry Karsh, to St. Louis with instructions to cooperate with the three AFL unions and aggressively undertake the complete organization of the local laundry and cleaning and dying industries which heretofore had successfully resisted separate attempts by the unions to organize these workers coming under their jurisdictions.

Karsh, a militant and experienced organizer of such campaigns, joined with Ben Bishop, international representative of the laundry workers union; Richard Rochester, international representative of the cleaning and dye house workers union; and William F. Frenger, business representative of Teamsters Local 366, whose locals have jurisdiction in these industries and mapped out the successful campaign. Sam Gross, international president of the cleaners, and Sam Byers, international president of the laundry workers also assisted.

They were given strong support by the powerful teamsters district council, which assigned Lawrence Camie, an astute veteran union official of that organization to lend his prestige and assistance.

The good offices of the officials of other large and influential AFL affiliates that had cordial labor relations with the employers and employer representatives also were enlisted in the drive to organize and stabilize these industries and bring about better wage and working conditions in them.

Outstanding among local labor officials who gave their wholehearted moral support and assistance to the AFL unions in their organization drive were John J. Church, secretary of the Building and Construction Trades Council, Lloyd Weber, business representative of Machinist District No. 9, Patrick J. Burke, business representative of Teamsters Local 603, John I. Rollings, secretary of the Central Trades and Labor Union, Mary E. Ryder, of the typo union, and others. Both Church and Weber were key men in assisting in preliminary negotiations and their participation played a vital part in the successful culmination of the 6-year agreement.

EMPLOYERS' SPOKESMEN CONCILIATORY

Two of the employer representatives who played a dominant role in the long and tedious negotiations which lead to the agreement are Charles H. Spoehrer, widely known local attorney who specializes in labor relations and represents various employers' groups, and Al A. Ahner, a labor relations counselor.

In a public statement Spoehrer said that the contract "would benefit the employees, the public, and the companies. It is the considered opinion of all concerned that the formula employed in this case represents an approach to practical labor relations."

Ahner stated that "to a large extent the affected plants were nonunion, and the parties take pride in accomplishing this result without any disservice to the public and without the usual attendant strife and turmoil."

GOOD CONTRACT, SAYS CAMIE

Speaking for the unions, Camie said he thought it was a good initial contract and the machinery set-up provided was flexible enough for future wage and work progress through negotiations. He added that the

employers and the public would benefit from the union standards and work qualifications demanded.

Other labor spokesmen expressed confidence in the Reverend Leo C. Brown, who was named impartial chairman. Father Brown is an authority on labor matters and is founder and head of the St. Louis University labor college. He is also assistant professor of mathematics and a director of the institute of social sciences at the university. During the war he served as a public tripartite panel member of the Seventh Regional War Labor Board.

FORTY-TWO FIRMS INVOLVED

Some forty-two laundries and dry cleaning establishments are covered by the agreement, including large firms with many branch stores who heretofore have bitterly and at great expense fought the unionization of their employees. They are:

Excelsior-Leader Laundry, Superior Laundry, Bright & Free Laundry, Selmier-Peerless Laundry, Mid-West Laundry, "The" Laundry, Anchor Laundry, Hyde Park Laundry, National Laundry, Landau Towel & Linen Co., Sunshine Family Service Laundry, Morgan's Laundry, Grand Laundry & Cleaning Co., Acme Laundry, Bass & Sons Laundry, P. J. Holloran Laundry, Broadway Laundry, Hollis E. Suits Laundry, City Towel Co., Cascade Wet Wash Laundry, Victor Linen & Towel Supply Co., Colonial Towel & Linen Co., Justin T. Flint Laundry, Home Laundry Co., St. Louis Bachelor and Family Laundry, Glick Laundry, Inc.; West End Laundry Co., White-Line Launderers, Hy-Grade Laundry and Dry Cleaners, Chenoweth Dyeing and Cleaning, Lungstras Dyeing and Cleaning, Morganthaler's Dyeing and Cleaning, Burger Cleaning Co., Enterprise Cleaning Co., Chapman Bros. Cleaning and Dyeing, Guard Cleaners, Criner-Stein Cleaning Co., Wolfram Cleaning and Dyeing Co., Banner Cleaning and Dyeing Service, Washington Cleaning and Dyeing, Crescent Cleaning and Dyeing, and Schuck's Cleaning Co.

David Lawrence Writes on Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence has been bringing to our present crucial national and international problems a depth of understanding and a fundamentally religious interpretation which is desperately needed if we are to come through these times safely. Under unanimous consent, I include a recent column by Mr. Lawrence on the subject of universal military training, which includes a most important quotation from the Catholic bishops of the United States:

BRITAIN SEEN DELAYING WAR-TRAINING ACTION—OFFICIALS DO NOT SHARE "PANIC" OF UNITED STATES MILITARY MEN, SAYS WRITER

(By David Lawrence)

Great Britain is postponing action on the subject of universal military training. The British Government is much too busy on other matters to take the subject up at this time. When the whole question of national security is examined in the light of the United Nations Organization commitments, Great Britain will deal with military training as a part of an over-all national military program.

The foregoing is an authoritative statement of the position of Great Britain as outlined by a high source this week.

What it means is that British officials do not share the panic which has seized American military men who are demanding that the question of military training be acted on immediately by Congress even before the plans of other nations to furnish manpower to carry out United Nations Organization commitments are known.

URGENCY NOT SHARED

There is no evidence either that Canada or Australia or any other members of the British Empire have instituted plans for a universal military training program of their youth, which would indicate not only that the urgency which is expressed in Washington is not shared by other nations, but that American policy is presumably related to an effort to use military force as an instrument of immediate diplomacy rather than as a protection against some would-be aggressor in the future.

Many members of Congress feel that the United States should not be asked to furnish all the manpower to support the decrees of the United Nations Organization, but that all countries which are members of it should assume their logical share of the obligation. The theory of some military men that only by a universal military training bill passed now can other would-be aggressors be adequately impressed is not accepted by any large number of Senators or Representatives.

Public opinion, as recorded by the Gallup poll, appears to favor some form of military training, but the kind of program to be adopted or the timing of it are matters on which it is not believed that public opinion has as yet crystallized.

Certainly the resolution adopted by the Catholic bishops of the United States at their annual general meeting here this week indicates that there are grave doubts felt by the Catholic Church—doubts, indeed, shared by many Protestant churchman, too—as to how the military men have handled the 18-year-olds and other youth on the matter of morals in the camps.

NEED RECOGNIZED

The Catholic bishops say:

"We recognize the imperative need of preparedness for the adequate defense of our country in all circumstances.

"In determining what constitutes national defense in our present circumstances, our Government, we feel, should explore the possibility of having military conscription abolished in all countries, and, to that end, might well consider how our control of economic assistance to other countries may be used to lend weight to our plea for such abolition.

"If a wide extension of military training is found necessary for present adequate defense of our Nation, we feel that such training should be in keeping with American traditions, and that, specifically:

"1. Voluntary enlistments in the armed forces should be stimulated as much as possible, to provide our first line of defense;

"2. Any period of enforced training should be integrated with normal school life; and

"3. The War and Navy Departments should work with recognized moral leadership to correct certain policies and attitudes which have wrought grave moral damage to great numbers of young people in the armed services during the past 5 years."

Chicago for the World Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations Organization has wisely decided that the future world capital should be located somewhere in the United States. It is my purpose to urge that Chicago be chosen as the city and that our Government exert its influence to bring this about. Under permission granted me to extend my remarks I include an article by a well known Chicagoan with whose views I concur. The article, Chicago for the World Capital, follows:

When the United States was chosen as the seat of the new world organization, the nations recognized where the main sources of power and inspiration now lie and where they will develop in the centuries which lie ahead. Prior to 1917, the world was centered in Europe, from which radiated the movement of science, art, populations, and government. It was appropriate therefore that the capital of the League of Nations should then have been located in the beautiful city of Geneva, in the mountain republic of Switzerland.

But today the situation is far different. Europe at the moment is shattered as the result of the evil movement of nazism. We wish it well for the future and I hope and believe we shall use our best efforts to bring healing and reconstruction to that unhappy continent. But for the present, western Europe is greatly weakened and there is small prospect that it will ever again become the center of the world's life. It is westward that the star of power and of democracy now takes its way.

It is not boasting but merely recognizing the plain truth when we say that our North American Continent has now become the center of the world. Here are approximately 200,000,000 people and the richest national resources of the world. The United States and Canada are firmly based on the principles of popular government, expanding opportunities for the common man, the development and broad sharing of science, technology, the arts and education. The other countries of the continent are moving rapidly in this direction.

The United States, moreover, is both the geographical and spiritual mediator between Europe on the one hand and two other great continents, South America and Asia. In our sister republics of the Southern Hemisphere we have 90,000,000 people and as economic and political opportunities are broadened for them and as modern methods of production and farming are extended there, we may expect an increase to at least 125,000,000 by the end of the century.

Beyond the vast Pacific lies Asia with its close to one billion inhabitants. This vast continent is rapidly stirring to life and in the coming century bids fair to be one of the great centers of the world.

America is therefore not only itself the most powerful and progressive area on the globe, but it is also the center and crossroads of the world. Although out of modesty we have never urged our own case, it is true

that the United Nations have done well to recognize these facts and to choose the United States as the center for its government.

And now we come to the specific point I wish to raise at this time: Where in the United States shall this world capital be located? The four chief cities which are spoken of are San Francisco, Philadelphia, Boston, and Chicago. With full appreciation of the many splendid attractions of San Francisco, is it not apparent that this city or any other city on the Pacific coast would be regarded by Europe as too far from it and as too close to Asia? The world's center of gravity has not shifted that far. On the other hand, would not the selection of Philadelphia, Boston, or any other Atlantic-coast city be regarded by Asia as too close to Europe and too far from Asia? The only logical solution is, therefore, to locate the capital in the center of the country in the great valley of the Mississippi, which the far-seeing French writer De Tocqueville with deep insight described over a century ago as "the most magnificent dwelling place prepared by God for man's abode." Here in the valley of democracy with its wide distribution of land among the people and in the region which gave the great defenders of the common man, Lincoln, Jane Addams, Altgeld, Robert La Follette, and George Norris to the ages may the United Nations fitly settle. Here the representatives of Europe, Asia, and South America may meet on equal terms. Here may they derive renewed devotion to the principles for which our great saint of the Middle West spoke, worked, and died, namely, that government of the people should also be for and by them.

I hope that our friends of the east and west coasts will not take it amiss if I point out that from the standpoint of both geograph, and national ideals the chief future function of these seaboard strips is to furnish peripheral flanking protection for that great heart of the country between the Alleghenies and the Rockies where the main life of the Nation now resides and where in increasing measure it will develop.

And if the Middle West is the only logical general location for the future world's capital, is not its center, Chicago, marked out as the inevitable site? Indeed with the shortened aviation routes over the great northern circles, Chicago is destined to be the aviation center of the world. Chicago, moreover, is awake to its destiny and is prepared to welcome the United Nations with that same hospitality with which it has taken care of millions of servicemen during the war. At this moment, Mayor Edward J. Kelly, Corporation Counsel Hodes, and representatives of industry, labor, and education are in London extending our cordial invitation for the United Nations to abide with us. We are prepared to set aside over 2,000 acres on the lake front in the region occupied by the recent World's Fair as a home and sanctuary for the new international city. Just as Vatican City with its 109 acres on the banks of the Tiber is the physical setting for the spiritual center of a great section of the Christian faith, so may the new city on the shores of the inland sea be the center for the world's striving for political unity.

If the United Nations come to Chicago, they will find there no self-centered provincialism and no mean city. Near them on that same lake front they will find one of the best art museums of the world with perhaps the finest collection of French paintings outside of the Louvre. In the Field Museum they will find one of the best natural history and anthropological museums with its noble Hall of Man where Malvina Hoffman has sculptured marvelous specimens of the races of the world. They will find the Rosenwald Museum of Science and Technology with its demonstration of how man can master the forces of nature for the benefit of the human race, and nearby they will see the playing field where in December 1942 scientists first set up the chain explosion of the atom and loosed the modern box of Pandora. And to inculcate humility they can go to the adjoining Adler Planetarium and witness the movements of the sun and stars which God has ordained and ponder over what is man that He should be mindful of him. About them will be fitting sculpture by the Yugoslav Mestrovich, by the Czech Polachek, and by numerous American sculptors.

But perhaps they can gain most of all from the city itself and from the surrounding country. The rich yields of the farm lands do not spring from a slave or sterile society. They are produced by freemen who in the main own their own land, produce the abundant crops by the sweat of their brows but lead in the true sense educated and cultivated lives. They demonstrate that agriculture can flourish better when it is based on true democracy rather than upon a small group of masters ruling over a teeming mass of serfs. Within the city itself they will find all the races of the world living together on terms of sturdy mutual respect and relative friendship. For here in addition to the basic Anglo-Saxon stock are hundreds of thousands of Germans, Slavs, Italians, Jews, Irish, Negroes, and Scandinavians. They are not at each other's throats. They cooperate together to a degree which surprises outsiders. In this as in other ways, they demonstrate the fine genius of America. By thus dwelling together in relative harmony at close quarters they will offer a graphic proof to the representatives of the nations that under guidance the races of man can dwell together in peace on the planet Earth.

That Chicago has its faults is well known. I do not seek to palliate nor to deny them. But we are not smugly self-satisfied. We recognize our weaknesses but in true American fashion we are seeking to overcome them and to build a still finer city. But we can say with our Chicago poet, Carl Sandburg:

"Come and show me another city with lifted
head singing so proud to be alive and
coarse and strong and cunning.
Flinging magnetic curses amid the toil of
piling job on job, here is a tall bold
slugger set vivid against the little
soft cities;
Fierce as a dog with tongue lapping for
action, cunning as a savage pitted
against the wilderness,
Bareheaded, shoveling, wrecking, planning,
building, breaking, rebuilding,
Under the smoke, dust all over his mouth,
laughing with white teeth,
Under the terrible burden of destiny laughing as a young man laughs,
Laughing even as an ignorant fighter laughs
who has never lost a battle,
Bragging and laughing that under his wrist
is the pulse, and under his ribs the
heart of the people,
Laughing!
Laughing the stormy, husky, brawling
laughter of
Youth, half-naked, sweating, proud to be
Hog Butcher,
Tool Maker, Stocker of Wheat, Player with
Railroads and
Freight Handler to the Nation."

Mr. Speaker, it is for these reasons that I urge that our Government use its best offices to have the capital of the United Nations located in the heart of the valley of democracy, in that most American of cities—Chicago.

Scientists and Scientific Organizations Endorse McDonough Bill, H. R. 2827

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the urgent necessity of the McDonough bill, H. R. 2827, has been recognized by thousands of individual citizens throughout the Nation who realize the importance of protecting our scientists and returning them to civilian life as quickly as possible to help in the national postwar reconversion program.

Today scientists are needed in all manufacturing and commercial operations. Without them production lags and our needed supplies are slow or not produced at all. Since the revelation of atomic energy, they are more essential than ever before to carry on experiments and future developments of this great discovery for peacetime uses.

Here is an imposing list of important and recognized scientists and scientific organizations who have endorsed the passage of H. R. 2827:

LIST OF PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS ENDORSING SCIENTIFIC BILL H. R. 2827

C. T. Burke, General Radio Co., 30 State Street, Cambridge 39, Mass.

Society of Economic Geologists, C. H. Behre, Jr., secretary, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md.

Julian Dorsky, secretary, Baton Rouge section of the American Chemical Society, Box 341, Baton Rouge 1, La.

Sterling L. Redman, secretary, California section, American Chemical Society, 585 Howard Street, San Francisco, Calif.

H. Rupert Hanmer, president, Virginia Academy of Science, Medical College of Virginia, Richmond 19, Va.

Mary E. Kapp, secretary, American Chemical Society, Virginia section, box 1477, Richmond, Va.

George Greenbaum, chairman, political analysis section, Citizens Public Affairs Committee, 97 St. Paul Street, Brookline 46, Mass.

C. W. Bishop, personnel director, Lycoming, The Aviation Corporation, Williamsport 38, Pa.

J. I. Routh, chairman, Iowa section, A. C. S., the State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

C. E. Lashbrook, executive secretary, Y. M. C. A., 1106 Fair Oaks Avenue, South Pasadena, Calif.

Glen E. Ullyot, Ph. D., organic chemistry division, Smith, Kline & French Laboratories, 800 North Delaware Avenue, Philadelphia 23, Pa.

Harsed Vagtborg, president, Midwest Research Institute, 4049 Pennsylvania, Kansas City 2, Mo.

Charles W. Crouch, secretary-treasurer, Dayton Society of Professional Engineers, Dayton, Ohio.

C. Kerby Stoddard, chairman, Boulder Dam section, American Chemical Society, Boulder City, Nev.

John D. Coleman, president, Dayton Society of Professional Engineers, Dayton, Ohio.

Lloyd A. Chacey, executive secretary, the Ohio Society of Professional Engineers, 63 South High Street, Columbus, Ohio.

C. H. Sondhaus, comptroller, the National Lead Co. (Pacific Coast branch), 2240 Twenty-fourth Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Doris Cattell, executive secretary, American Association of Scientific Workers, 28 Washington Square North, New York, N. Y.

Charles L. Parsons, secretary, American Chemical Society, 1155 Sixteenth Street NW.

E. L. Chandler, room 703, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

E. P. Querl, manager, industrial department, the Chicago Association of Commerce, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

Harry V. Welch, secretary, the American Association of Scientific Workers, Southern California section, 1016 South Ninth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

Will Rodgers, secretary of the faculty, College of Osteopathic Physicians and Surgeons, 1721 Griffin Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

Prof. Stanley D. Wilson, department of chemistry, Pomona College, Claremont, Calif.

Harold P. Gaw, national president, Alpha Chi Sigma Fraternity, 218 Bellemonte Street, Middletown, Ohio.

Alvin C. Eurich, acting president, Stanford University, Calif.

B. D. Van Evera, department of chemistry, the George Washington University, Washington, D. C.

G. Ross Robertson, director, chemical laboratories, department of chemistry, University of California, Los Angeles, Calif.

Stewart E. Hazlet, State College of Washington, department of chemistry, Pullman, Wash.

Robert D. Vold, associate professor of chemistry, the University of Southern California, University Park, Los Angeles, Calif.

Prof. Edward A. Doisy, St. Louis University School of Medicine, 1402 South Grand Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

R. H. Everett, head of the department of mechanical engineering, Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.

John Q. Stewart, associate professor of astronomical physics, Princeton University Observatory, Princeton, N. J.

W. B. Meldrum, professor of chemistry, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.

Alfred Brauer, secretary, Kentucky Academy of Science, Lexington, Ky.

Leland C. Clark, Ph. D., Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Hyde Park, Dutchess County, N. Y.

P. W. Boynton, employment division, Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

H. H. Kaverler, Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.

Kenneth D. Bair, 4620 Adams Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.

John R. Kuebler, past chairman, Indiana section, American Chemical Society, and member Alpha Chi Sigma Fraternity (Grand Chapter), 5503 E. Washington St., Indianapolis, Ind.

Clinton Dornfeld, research chemist, the State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

C. M. Wakeman, testing engineer, Los Angeles Harbor Department, testing laboratory, P. O. Box 786, Wilmington, Calif.

G. F. Dwyer, M. D., Starks Building, Louisville, Ky.

C. H. Sondhaus, comptroller, National Lead Co., 2240 Twenty-fourth St., San Francisco, Calif.

O. R. Brashear (works in the California Research Corp., Standard Oil of Calif.), 2630 Channing Way, Berkeley, Calif.

Robert F. Furchgott, the Society of the New York Hospital, 525 East Sixty-eighth Street, New York, N. Y.

The Challenge to America's Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 27 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio transcription entitled "The Challenge to America's Veterans," prepared by me and broadcast from Station WIND in Chicago, November 24, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE TO AMERICA'S VETERANS

It is a pleasure to greet you and have a brief chat with you on the subject of America's returning servicemen. I am grateful to Station WIND for its courtesy in allowing me to come into your home and talk over with you this matter which is so close to all our hearts.

Right off the bat, let's get some facts into the picture.

You know that we now have about 19,000,000 veterans, including 15,000,000 from World War II, 1,250,000 veterans from all our wars are drawing service or disability pensions. Over 400,000 veterans' widows and dependents are receiving allowances. Almost 75,000 of our disabled heroes are receiving hospital treatment. About 18,000,000 veterans hold National Service Life Insurance policies.

With these facts in mind, let's survey the veterans' present picture.

There is much good news these days for our gallant servicemen and their loved ones. The good news comes from three quarters.

1. Our men are coming home. They are being released into civilian life with ever-increasing speed.

Since VJ-day on September 2, 1945, well over 2,250,000 soldiers alone have been released. Almost three-fourths of a million sailors have been released. Our soldiers are now putting on their civilian clothes at the rate of about 300,000 per week, and our sailors at the rate of about 100,000 per week.

2. The next bit of good news is that Congress has kept step with the speedy demobilization.

The Senate has just acted to liberalize the GI bill of rights. It has just passed certain amendments, the effect of which is to achieve these goals.

(a) To make Government-guaranteed loans easier for the veteran who wants to buy a home, a business, or a farm.

(b) To raise the subsistence allowance of veterans who are taking advantage of the free-education provision of the GI bill.

(c) To permit veterans to get correspondence-school courses and other short-period technical courses which they were not permitted under the original GI bill of rights.

3. The next bit of good news is that the Veterans' Administration (the Federal organization which serves the veterans) is stepping up its efficiency.

The Veterans' Administration is unsnarling much of its red tape. It is decentralizing its organization instead of having all documents clear through the bottleneck of Washington, D. C.

It is my earnest hope that this decentralization is a good omen of things to come, for too long Washington, D. C., has sought to dictate long range to the grassroots of our Nation. Let's decentralize more of the bureaucrats. In fact, let's demobilize and get rid of every one of them that is unnecessary to the Federal pay roll.

When we do that—when we cut the Federal overhead—we will be helping our veterans just that much. Don't forget that our veterans are taxpayers. On them America will lean heavily in the future to maintain America American.

Now, that's not all the good news. I could add the good news of Congress' earnest consideration of the entire matter of ex-servicemen's rights and benefits. There are many bills now pending in the congressional hopper to make certain that our heroes get the fair break they deserve. You remember the way Abe Lincoln put it:

"To care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and for his orphans."

One of the congressional bills is my own—Senate bill 1070. Under this bill, every United States Senator who requested it could have a trained ex-serviceman in his office. This ex-serviceman would help the Senator in all the problems which come in to the Senator from his constituents on such matters as veterans' insurance, disability claims, loans, and so on.

I have also suggested on the floor that the laws be amended so that veteran reemployment rights be protected by law in the labor mart.

Another front on which I, for one, am doing everything within my humble power is that of insuring the veteran his legal civil-service preference. One particular flagrant violation of the veterans' preference law has occurred in my own State, and I am now fighting to correct that violation.

That brings us into the not-so-good news dealing with our veterans' welfare.

One such bad piece of news deals with strikes. Another consists of Government's regimentation of private enterprise. The net effect of these is to kill the veterans' prospective jobs, to impair production, to reduce sales, to encourage inflation, to reduce the Government's taxable revenue.

You can see that these conditions—labor troubles and Federal muddling—hurt America as a whole. And they hurt the veterans in particular. The veterans are eager to fill jobs, create jobs, create wealth, and make this America secure. They are not going to allow the strike road-block and the bureaucratic road-block to hold up the Nation's and their own progress. The veterans smashed enemy road-blocks while in the service. They will smash domestic road-blocks now that interfere with reconversion and make it impossible for them to get started in life. They want wife and home and opportunities.

There is too much talking down to the veteran. There is too much nonsensical moaning about the veterans' problem. There are too many crocodile tears about the veterans' difficulties in readjustment. "The son is father of the man." He is the future builder of America.

He is our youth—courageous, indomitable, unafraid. He is the leader of tomorrow. He has already proved his patriotism by deeds of sweat and blood and tears. I repeat, he is going to prove the bulwark of our American way, of our constitutional Republic, of checks and balances.

I have faith in him. I know that his readjustment into civilian life will be comparatively quick and smooth if the rest of us just demonstrate a little horse sense and a little sympathetic understanding and demonstrate our unity on the home front in peace as he demonstrated unity of action in war.

The veteran asks only a fair break. He asks that his reemployment rights be insured. He asks that Government get its nose out of private enterprise and its weight off the back of private enterprise.

The veteran knows that he faces greater challenges now than ever before. The Nation needs him in its defense—in defense of the American way—now more than ever before.

The veteran will prove adequate, I am certain, to those challenges.

In this Thanksgiving season, we Americans raise our voice in thanksgiving to Almighty God for the valor, courage, and manhood of our veterans.

Grants, Gifts, or Loans to Foreign Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 27 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, during the recent war the American people poured out their resources with almost complete abandon to aid all people everywhere whose resistance to the common foe would aid in ultimate victory.

Today, they face a world of chaos, with many millions facing starvation and slavery under the domination of those who were our allies in the war.

Many Americans today are truly anxious that before we add to the tremendous burden caused by the war by any additional grants, gifts, or loans to foreign countries, we should appraise carefully the purposes and possible effect of such grants, gifts, or loans.

Recently Col. Robert R. McCormick, editor and publisher of the Chicago Tribune, addressed the Foreign Policy Association on this subject, and I ask unanimous consent that this very able address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I was on a pilgrimage to the Lincoln country when I received your invitation. I had seen the grave of Ann Rutledge, marked by a simple stone picked up on the hillside with only her name chiseled on it, and a large granite footstone which has since been erected. I had been to New Salem, the city built by the State of Illinois exactly as it stood when Lincoln tended store and studied law there. I had stood in the tomb where Lincoln reposes.

I do not suppose you have ever considered that Lincoln could not have developed into the greatest statesman of all time anywhere else than in the Northwest Territory.

GREATEST POLITICAL INSTRUMENT

Every leader is representative of his environment. The Northwest Territory had been organized by the last act of the Continental Congress. Largely forgotten today, this act is the greatest political instrument ever framed. It is greater than the Declaration of Independence because in it that declaration of principles was incorporated in legislation.

It is greater than the Constitution of the United States, as it contained a bill of rights which Hamilton, mysterious man of contradictions, had kept out of the Constitution; and it forbade slavery, which the Constitution expressly permitted; and the slave trade, in which all the other States participated.

In the Northwest Territory alone was indenture forbidden.

Adopted for the Northwest Territory alone, it became the model upon which our Nation took form under Lincoln's leadership. Inevitably the Northwest Territory was to destroy slavery and hold the Union together as a republic.

A DISCIPLE BEARING MESSAGE

Therefore, I accepted your invitation in the spirit of a disciple bearing a message.

As I returned home along the route taken by the Army which conquered this Territory, under the commission of Gov. Patrick Henry, I was reminded that it was he who did more to make the United States than any other individual—for if the Northwest Territory had not been acquired, the expansion to the Pacific would not have been started and in all probability the Union of the States never would have taken place.

It was Patrick Henry who said, "I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience; I know of no way of judging the future, but by the past."

It will be useful to glance briefly at past Anglo-American relations. At most it may help in planning for their future course. At worst it will show the reason for divided counsel.

TALKING PURE HISTORY

While I talk history, it will be pure history—history that was not taught in the school I attended in Massachusetts or the college I graduated from in Connecticut. When it comes to argument, you will recognize that I am voicing opinion.

There are those who say we should not mention the Revolutionary War. That is a matter of point of view. Those whose ancestors served in it honorably like to recall it with filial piety. Those whose anvestors were of another kind naturally would like to have it forgotten.

The pedagogs coming mostly from Boston have written of the war as arising from taxation without representation. That was one reason. There were others. Men of large affairs, like Washington and Franklin, resented the closing of the West to them by the royal proclamation of 1763. But the elements that furnished the rank and file of the armies and did most to win the victory had entirely different motives.

DUTCH FIGHTING FOR LIBERTY

The Dutch in New York had been conquered and oppressed. One of them, Peter Zenger, has become a national hero. They were fighting to regain their liberty.

The Scotch-Irish in Virginia had been harried from home; had not been given religious liberty in Virginia, and were even threatened that bishops would be sent to compel them to conform to the doctrines of the established church. To them the war was against the Church of England.

These two elements formed the backbone of the army Washington took to Boston, from which he drove General Howe, his army, and the Boston tories.

The Dutch troops return to New York and under their protection the Sons of Liberty forced the New York Legislature to adopt the Declaration of Independence.

The Virginians marched on to defeat before Quebec and were the chief factors in the decisive victories of Freeman's farm, King's Mountain, and Cowpens.

OTHER IMPORTANT ELEMENTS

The other important elements in the first campaign were the Vermonters, the Dutch, and Palatines who fought with Gansevoort and Herkimer at Fort Stanwix and who kept messengers from passing between Burgoyne and Clinton. A Dutchman was among those who captured the spy Andre buying the treason of Arnold.

When many of these Dutchmen sought to return home after their victory, they found their lands in the hands of Tories who had squatted on them under protection of British muskets, so they had to go west.

The Continental Congress, unable to pay its soldiers, gave them titles to land in the Northwest Territory. Many of them settled there. They and veterans of other wars furnished the point of view of later arrivals. Here also settled the patriot refugees from Canada and Nova Scotia.

TORIES PROTECTED BY HAMILTON

The Tories, who revelled in condescension from the British aristocrats and in abuse of the patriots, were protected in their pilferings by Alexander Hamilton—the same Hamilton who, when the Jay Treaty was under fire and the British minister was prepared to accept amendments, told that minister this would not be necessary. Let it be said for Hamilton, however, that when Aaron Burr wished to join New York to the New England States in seceding from the Republic, Hamilton prevented it.

In this connection it is interesting to note that when Canada obtained its first measure of self-government from Great Britain, it was an instrument copied after the one submitted by Hamilton to our Constitutional Convention.

Hamilton's action left the Tories dominant in New York. Their descendants have always remained dominant, and continue to act as their forefathers did. They dominate today. They dominate the parvenus, be these mechanics from Detroit, magazine editors from China, hams from Broadway, raucous radio commentators, or preachers who performed trial marriages.

WAR CONTINUED IN WEST

The war ended in the East with the treaty of peace and a profitable trade sprang up between the seaboard States and their former masters. In the West, the war continued the full length of the frontier, where for 30 years the settlers were raided by Indian war parties who sold their scalps to the British general in Canada.

There were a number of full-scale campaigns fought by the western settlers. The first resulted in the defeat of St. Clair, which was followed by the victories of Fallen Timbers, Tippecanoe, and Horseshoe Bend, and the occupation of Florida.

Even these measures did not bring quiet, and the westerners insisted upon the War of 1812.

This war opened with the massacre of Fort Dearborn, now known as Chicago, instigated by the British. Medals were given to its perpetrators. In this war, the Indian and British power west of New York was broken at the Battle of the Thames, though it was not until 1820 that the British flag was finally hauled down in Michigan by General Cass.

EFFECT OF JACKSON'S VICTORY

Some historians emphasize that Jackson's great victory at New Orleans came after peace had been signed, in which the plan to take Louisiana from us had been abandoned, and therefore had no effect on the course of the war. That is true, but it had a much greater effect than anything that happened in the war.

New England opposed the war. It did not allow its large and well-trained militia to be used. It refused to buy American bonds and bought British bonds. It furnished the supplies which made possible the existence of the British armies.

According to the monumental history edited by the Harvard professor, Albert Bushnell

Hart, its leaders resolved to secede from the Union and form an alliance with Great Britain. They were in Washington, resolved to separate "peaceably if they might, but forcibly if they must" when the news of Jackson's victory reached Washington. They sneaked out of town and secession was never heard of again from that quarter. The language is from Hart's history.

BRITISH DOMINATION HALTED

Britain resisted by means short of war the annexation of Texas, the annexation of California, and the annexation of Oregon. She joined in the invasion of Mexico in 1861; threatened war over Venezuela in 1896; joined in the concert of Europe to prevent the freedom of Cuba in 1898; and with her allies, Germany and Italy, blockaded Venezuela in 1902 and desisted only when Admiral Dewey was ordered to break the blockade by force.

She resisted the birth of the nation and its expansion to the Pacific from start to finish. When it had been accomplished she participated in its success by investments made mostly through Boston, New York, and Philadelphia banks.

So you will note that while in the east your relations have been those of profitable trade, or as broker between Europe and America, in the West they have been continual struggle. We consider also that we won Britain's last two wars for her.

There are those among us, of course—I am not one of them—who think that easterners lock up to the English and profess to despise Americans west of the Hudson.

PURELY NATIONALISTIC VIEW

Our view is purely nationalistic. I remember a gentleman who called it narrowly nationalistic. So when the proposal is made to give Great Britain $5,000,000,000 more, we are inclined to scrutinize the request carefully. This is what we find:

The standard of living of the average American before the war was twice as high as that of the average Englishman. This was discovered by Dr. Leon Rostas in a study for the National Institute of Economic and Social Research, a British scientific organization, and has been confirmed by other investigations.

The London Economist, in a series of articles published last year, sought to determine the reason for the inferior status of the ordinary citizen of Britain. For just as living standards, in Britain and America are as one is to two, so production per worker in the countries is in similar proportion.

RESULT OF EQUIPMENT

American superiority is the result of equipment. According to Carl Snyder, a noted statistician, the industries have been thus supplied by devoting between 5 and 6 percent of the national income each year to this purpose. The use of so small a part of our total income has made possible a persistent rise, averaging 3 percent per annum, in our product per capita.

In England only 3 percent of the national income per year has been invested in new capital assets. The advance in production per worker has averaged no more than 1½ percent a year. The increase in the size of each worker's income has been at a correspondingly slower rate.

It is obvious that if we dissipate our national income, by whatever means, our productivity and living standards must suffer.

Last fall a committee of Lancashire textile men came to America to see if they could learn anything about how their line of business was conducted here, feeling certain that they could not. They were shocked.

EXCEED BRITISH PRODUCTION

According to the report issued after their return home, output here in this—the leading British industry—far exceeds their standards. Production per worker, they found, was from 1¼ to 10 times as great as in Britain.

The main reasons for American superiority were given in the report as follows: "The use of high-speed and automatic machinery wherever possible; the use of up-to-date plants; the application of scientific methods to the utilization of labor, which permits a relatively large number of units or machines to be supervised by the machine operatives; the policy of concentrating on machines in terms of output."

Coal is Britain's second greatest industry and in 1938 gave employment to 780,000 men. Output here also lags far behind American standards. The Reid report issued in London in April told of this. British mines are undermechanized and have especially antiquated underground haulage systems. There is one underground haulage worker for each 5 tons of coal produced in England and one for each 50 tons in America.

COAL IN UNITED STATES AND BRITAIN

Two high ranking authorities last week told about the coal industry in Britain today. Dr. Charles J. Potter, Solid Fuels Administrator of the Department of the Interior, stated in an address before the Academy of Political Science in New York: "Europe's desperate need for warmth, production, transportation, and employment hinges upon the supply of coal. * * * Britain is able to keep her industrial machine operating at a prewar level only by severely rationing fuel. She has no coal for export. She has not kept pace with technological advances in mining, and has increased miners' wages from an average of $11 per week before the war to $25 per week. Thus Britain's coal has become the most costly to mine in the world."

And the other high authority, John L. Lewis, told the labor-management conference in Washington: "American miners produce 6 tons of coal a man to 1 ton a man in Britain. While American miners' wages are three times as high as those of the British, prices to the consumer were less than one-third those charged for British coal. The reason lies in Britain's failure to modernize. That has placed the British Empire at an economic disadvantage in the postwar world."

HELP FROM UNITED STATES

Because Britain's coal-mining methods are so bad, and return of the Ruhr to full output is going so slowly, suffering in Europe will be no worse than it is going to be because the United States is now shipping 2,000,000 tons a month all the way across the ocean. The 2,000,000 tons constitute the top capacity of American ports to load coal.

In steel—another high ranking industry—it is the same story. Rostas found production per worker here to be twice what it is in Britain.

Alfred Landon says that whereas American labor has always been willing to accept improved machinery, demanding an increased share of the increased profits resulting, British labor has always resisted technological progress.

The British Government has insisted upon such low depreciation rates as to keep obsolete machinery in use. The owners have sought to overcome these handicaps by agreements in restraint of trade. From these conditions, British industry is in a vicious downward spiral.

This is not a condition that we can remedy.

WHAT LABOR PARTY CAN DO

The Labor Party has been put in charge of the Government because the common man there believes that it will help to lift his standard of living.

If we can accept the thesis of the Economist, that the amount of capital applied to an industry determines the productivity and living standards, then the Labor Party can deliver only by adding to the supply of capital equipment of its industries. How can the new rulers of Britain bring this result about?

Either by borrowing or by saving. Canada used the first and has welcomed the investment of large amounts of American and British capital there, raising productivity and living standards to a high level. That method is not available to Britain while the Labor Party threatens to take over, first, the Bank of England, then the mines, electric power, iron and steel, and transport. New capital will not flow to a country which has confiscation as a national policy, and exchange control which may act as a bar to the recovery of the principal.

SAVING IS OTHER METHOD

The other means of adding to capital equipment is saving. This means that the country consumes less than it produces, using the surplus to invest in capital goods. Russia followed this policy under Stalin. Industries largely useful in war were developed by maintaining a standard of living below that under the czars.

If the British were willing to keep consumption at a low level, work hard, and be content to wait some years for the reconstruction of their homes and public buildings, they could modernize their factories and mines in a fairly short time. Only the event will tell how British labor will react to its new status.

England has always been divided into classes—called upper class, upper middle class, lower middle class, and the lower class. The upper class and the upper middle class also have been the ruling classes and the leisure classes. Work and industrial achievement have never ranked in Britain as with us. Even the great industrialist was not highly thought of and had to convert a part of his accumulations into a title and a landed estate and join the leisure class before his success was acknowledged.

NO INCENTIVE TO WORK

With leisure the ideal of the nation, there has been no incentive for the lower class to work hard, and it has not.

It would help England for us to send a delegation of energetic Americans to teach the English workmen how to work. That would be better than to strain our own workmen to still greater efforts to keep English workmen in semi-idleness.

Great Britain has certain economic policies injurious to us, but quite within her rights, however much they violate the doctrine of United Nations.

There is the pound bloc—an arrangement among the members of the Empire (except Canada) and Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Holland, France, Portugal, and Egypt, to trade with each other only in pounds; to deposit any other currencies they receive in the Bank of England and to discourage trade outside of their number.

In this arrangement, of course, India and Egypt are not free contracting parties, but are under complete military coercion.

NOT A FREE AGENT

Again there is the Empire preference in which the constituent members of the Empire give tariff preference to each other. Again India is not a free agent.

On top of this the totalitarian government of New Zealand denies import licenses to Americans while granting them to British exporters.

As I say, these arrangements are entirely within the rights of the contracting parties, but they are disadvantageous to us and we have a perfectly good right to require their abolishment or modification in consideration of any gifts or loans to the Empire.

We believe there should be other conditions imposed in consideration of gifts or loans.

The people of the Northwest Territory, followers of Lincoln, cannot support slavery in any form. The British are in India, Burma, Malaya, and Java only because the Americans defeated the Japanese, who had defeated all their other enemies.

WE HAVE RESPONSIBILITY

We cannot escape responsibility for evils being perpetrated on helpless people by the British and Dutch and French using American lend-lease weapons to force natives to work in the rubber plantations for $3.29 a month * * * 11 cents a day. We must insist that these outrages stop at once.

We have still another demand to make upon Great Britain, both in the name of humanity and of national security. It is to evacuate all of her possessions in this hemisphere.

Canada has finally achieved her independence. The small colonies in and near the Caribbean Sea are not strong enough to do so. They are of no economic value to the Empire, although politically they support a number of place holders.

They should be set free just as Cuba was set free. They have been used in the past as bases to attack us, and upon occasion, at need, could so be used again perhaps to launch atom bombs.

There are people here, no doubt, who will be indignant at such a suggestion, but I have not forgotten the Fort Dearborn massacre and I have learned of the massacres in Java.

Have lend-gift if you will, but get quid pro quo for America.

Discharge of Men From Civilian Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 27 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter regarding the discharge of men in civilian public service, from Rev. Paul G. Hayes, pastor of the McCabe Methodist Church, of Bismarck, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

McCABE METHODIST CHURCH,
Bismarck, N. Dak., November 21, 1945.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: May I call your attention to what seems to be an oversight in the administration of the Selective Service Act.

I refer to the fact that the men in civilian public service are not being discharged from that service in the same proportion as men in the Army and Navy.

Figures recently released in Washington indicate that by the end of the year the Army expects to discharge 37 percent of its VE-day strength, the Navy 32 percent, but that Selective Service plans to discharge only about 15 percent. What grounds can there be for this discrimination? These men are in civilian service of national importance under the same act that sent the others into armed services. They have done what was required of them. They should be discharged in the same ratio.

Would you be willing to phone to General Hershey, the Director of Selective Service, and ask him for a fairer rate of discharge for these men? I have quite a number of personal friends in various CPS units, and feel quite strongly that they should have a fairer deal.

Then, too, there are some 3,000 men in prison for violating the selective-service law on grounds of conscience. I do not know if you and I would have the strength of character to go to prison for conscience' sake. But I admire the men who sincerely did so. May I suggest that you ask President Truman to follow the precedent set by President Wilson, who proclaimed a general amnesty for the CO's in prison. Effective Christmas, 1945, would be a good date to suggest for such amnesty. Nothing can be gained by keeping these men in prison. An amnesty would show that the old-fashioned American way of life is still working among us.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL G. HAYES.

The City and Uncle Sam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Administrator, Federal Works Agency, delivered a timely address at the recent meeting of the American Municipal Association in Chicago on November 17, 1945. Under unanimous consent, I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

The rise of the city to a fairly dominant place in American life has taken place within the lifetime of most of us in this room.

A few comparisons illustrate some of the reasons for this dominance. New York City has a larger population than any State in the Union except four—one of the four, of course, being New York State. Only 13 States have a larger population than Chicago. St. Louis, although eighth among American cities, has a greater population than any one of a dozen States. Most of these great population centers have sprung up within the last half century.

When the founding fathers met to draft the Constitution, Philadelphia was about the size of the present Massillon, Ohio. New York was about the size Watertown is today. Milton, Mass., is about the size Boston was in 1790, while Baltimore was in a population class with the present Emporia, Kans.

Since the city was a negligible factor in the life of the young Republic, it is understandable that the new Constitution made no mention of it. We were a nation of farmers and there was no reason to suppose that we would not always continue to be a nation of farmers. Moreover the outstanding statesmen and philosophers of the time held the city in rather low esteem. They believed that the virtues of honesty, industry, and thrift sprang directly from the soil, and that the city was the seat of extravagance and corruption. This opinion persists in some quarters even today.

In any event, the Constitution is silent so far as the city is concerned. The States only are recognized, and powers not delegated remained with the States. Thus, the city, even though it came in time to be the metropolitan tail that wagged the State dog—even though it may have come to contain most of the population of the State and the greater part of its wealth—was subject to the State which could closely regulate its affairs, prescribe its borrowing authority, and limit its tax revenues. As between the Federal Government and the city, no provision was made for a point of direct contact.

Even the States were pretty much on their own. The doctrine of States' rights seemed to square with the realities of American life. Men lived out their lives and died without once leaving the counties in which they were born. The Nation's capital was anywhere from a week to a month away in travel time from the bulk of the population. What could the Federal Government know about the needs and desires of the people in such remote places? If the western pioneers needed a road through the clearing, they built it themselves and asked no favors from the Federal Government. If they needed a school, the men of the community cut down and hewed the logs and put them together, and the roof-raising was a social function at which the women and girls served food and coffee, perhaps with a barn dance in the evening to conclude the festivities.

But even in the early days there was considerable agitation for what were called internal improvements but which today we would call public works. George Washington was an enthusiastic supporter of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. Others urged the building of national roads to the western settlements. Few of these projects were realized, however. Conservatives and strict constructionists argued that the expenditure of Federal funds on such projects within the States was clearly unconstitutional, or at least that they were not expressly authorized by that great charter.

For the first time in American history, a Treasury surplus had accumulated during the administration of Andrew Jackson. Many urged that this money be used for internal improvements. The constitutional argument prevailed, however, and a formula of subterfuge was evolved. The legislation finally approved provided for the deposit of the surplus in the State treasuries without interest, to be repaid upon demand. Of course, nobody at the time believed the money would ever be repaid and it never was repaid. It was assumed that the States would use the funds for internal improvements. What actually happened to them does not make a pretty chapter in our history, but at any rate the procedure was a roundabout way of trying to get legally, at the expense of the Federal Government, improvements which everybody recognized to be necessary.

The position of the strict constructionists was that the Federal Government ought not to make improvements within the States because the burdens would be general while the benefits would be local and partial, "involving an obnoxious inequality," to use President Polk's expression. Abraham Lincoln, while a Member of Congress, made a speech in 1848 in refutation of that argument.

Admitting some truth in Polk's contention, he urged that "the converse is also true. Nothing is so local as not to be of some general benefit." He continued:

"Take, for instance, the Illinois and Michigan Canal. Considered apart from its effects, it is perfectly local. Every inch of it is within the State of Illinois. That canal was first opened for business last April. In a very few days we were gratified to learn, among other things, that sugar had been carried from New Orleans through this canal to Buffalo, in New York. This sugar took this route, doubtless,

because it was cheaper than the old route. Supposing benefit of the reduction in cost of carriage to be shared between seller and buyer, the result is that the New Orleans merchant sold his sugar a little dearer, and the people of Buffalo sweetened their coffee a little cheaper than before—a benefit resulting from the canal, not to Illinois, where the canal is, but to Louisiana and New York where it is not. In other transactions Illinois will, of course, have her share, and perhaps the larger share, too, of the benefits of the canal; but this instance of the sugar clearly shows that the benefits of an improvement are by no means confined to the particular locality of the improvement itself.

"A State may well say to the Nation, 'If you will do nothing for me, I will do nothing for you.' Thus it is seen that if their argument of 'inequality' is sufficient anywhere, it is sufficient everywhere, and puts an end to improvements altogether."

A form of indirect Federal aid to the cities began in the nineteenth century when the War Department, under the guise of military necessity, began a program of river and harbor improvement. These aids to navigation were unquestionably of assistance to the whole economy, yet the cities situated on harbors that were improved experienced direct benefits, as did cities on river channels that were deepened and cleared of obstructions.

In the nineties an Office of Road Inquiry was established in the Department of Agriculture. For many years, however, it functioned only as an agency of research and advice, and it was not until 1916 that Federal legislation first authorized direct assistance in highway construction. The assistance, however, was to the States direct with no provision for assistance to the cities. It was not until the enactment of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 that the cities were admitted to the benefits of Federal assistance in provisions which made possible the expenditure of some Federal funds on city streets—but only on those streets which are integral parts of the Federal-aid highway network.

Until the depression Federal aid to cities was channeled through the States. This still is the pattern with respect to funds of the Public Health Service, aid to highway improvement, and aids to vocational education. The pending Federal-aid airport bill follows the same pattern as it passed the Senate. Although the airports will be built in cities and must be maintained by the cities, the States, through their aeronautical commissions or similar authorities, would, under the Senate version, parcel out the Federal money and determine where and how the airports would be built.

In the depression, the Work Projects Administration and the Public Works Administration dealt directly with the cities. This was at least logical because mass unemployment, in the large, was an urban problem, and because the need was for greater speed than might have been expected if funds had been channeled through some State agency and thereafter doled out among the cities from the State capital.

Similarly, Federal aid for the construction, maintenance, and operation of public works in war-congested areas under title II of the Lanham Act was channeled directly to the cities. The appropriate State agencies were consulted with regard to health and educational projects, as were the United States Public Health Service and the United States Office of Education, but the final decision remained with the Federal Works Administrator under the law. Federal participation in the actual operation of either schools or hospitals was forbidden.

In administering the Lanham Act, as a matter of fact, we did not find that the States themselves were overly anxious to have any part in the program. Twice I appealed to the governors to take action looking toward the assumption of some State responsibility for certain wartime services, especially aid to child care and regular school assistance, and found them disinterested. Generally, they took the position that they would be willing, if necessary, to provide additional State assistance to all the schools of the State, but that they could not be expected to discriminate between schools in war-congested districts and schools in areas which had felt no impact from the war in the form of increased attendance. In short, the war was a Federal enterprise, and the Federal Government alone should assume all responsibility for its domestic consequences. It may be asked, incidentally, if some of the problems of postwar readjustment may not also be similarly localized.

In the administration of Federal advance assistance to public-works planning, as authorized in the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, we are also dealing direct with the cities and other public agencies. While the allocation of funds are made, in accordance with the law, on a State basis, the division of the funds within each State, as among cities, counties, and other taxing authorities, are made by the Federal Works Agency. Indeed, we have taken the position that the States, which generally are in a stronger financial position than the cities, shou'd be excluded from the benefits in favor of municipalities, counties, boards of education, and special districts which are less well situated.

The doctrine of States' rights, however, will not down. Perhaps a representative comment of its adherents was that made on the floor of the House during debate on the Federal-aid airport bill.

"There are some things that we do here that are not healthy for democracy," one representative said. "We are just beginning to realize that we have been sleeping at the switch. We have allowed part of our form of government to slip away from us. We have accepted Federal domination and regimentation. In the past we asked our Uncle Sam for donations, relief, and aid for all kinds of projects. These he has given us, but the price he exacted—government by bureaucracy—has come too high. In our desire to get something for nothing we sometimes forget that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. * * *

"It has been suggested that there may be State politics in this if the funds are channeled through the States. I would just as soon have State politics in it as Federal politics. If you accept this amendment (which would have prohibited the Federal Aeronautics Administrator to deal directly with the cities), there will be State and Federal supervision, and one will check the politics of the other. * * * Anyway, I believe that the Federal politics is more pernicious; it is further away, the people cannot see it as easily as they can local politics. I still have confidence in the Government, but I have just as much confidence in the government of my State as I have in the Federal Government. * * *

"The question is very simple. We are one Nation, and we have 48 sovereign States. If this bill is passed you will create sovereignty in municipalities. You will create friction between State and municipalities. * * * The big cities want to run the States. They forget that they are but a part of the States."

Well, that is one point of view. From another standpoint it is a fact that we have become far more citizens of the United States than we are citizens of any one State. A hundred years ago we tended to think of ourselves primarily as Virginians, or Carolinians, or Ohioans. Today the State as such commands somewhat less of our loyalties. Recently, among a group of my friends, I discovered that not one of them could tell me the motto of the State in which he was born, or the State flower. Indeed, we are far less attached to any one geographical location than we used to be. I was born in Iowa. I went to school in Wisconsin, also at West Point. I have lived and worked in the Philippines, the Canal Zone, in Maine, in Minnesota, and in Washington, among other places. I have a home in New Hampshire. And my case is not at all exceptional.

Out of curiosity I recently leafed through the Congressional Directory and noted that of 88 United States Senators whose place of birth was noted, 32, or more than a third, represent some other State than the one in which they were born. I didn't have time to examine the data for the Members of the House, but I have no doubt the same situation would be found to prevail. I am reminded of the story of the little Ohio girl who, learning that her father was born in California and her mother in Maine, exclaimed, "How in the world did we all happen to get together?"

The American people are on the move. Their mobility was greatly accentuated by the war when millions of men left their native States and migrated to distant parts of the country to work in war production. The forty-niners spent months in their painful trek to California. The trip can be made in comfort today from the Atlantic seaboard in as many hours. The radio, the moving picture, the automobile, and the airplane have obliterated differences of customs, of manners, and of speech, and attenuated local loyalties.

American industry has become national in scope and our large corporations do business in every State in the Union. Our more pressing problems are national rather than State problems. In a highly integrated economy, new questions press for answer.

Lincoln remarked that "nothing is so local as not to be of some general benefit." It may also be said, conversely, that there is nothing of general benefit that does not produce some local benefits.

Take public health. If your city is still dumping raw sewage into the river, that fact has consequences to public health for a hundred miles down stream. Disease germs are notoriously indifferent to State boundaries. A disease epidemic starting in one State can very quickly spread, by the help of the railroad, the auto and the airplane, to adjoining States. Or take education. Hundreds of thousands of American children are still going to school in unsanitary, ramshackle school houses. Selective Service rejected a million men for illiteracy—which meant, of course, that other men from some other part of the country, had to take the place on the firing line of those who were rejected. Is education of local concern, only? If so, how can we prevent illiterates from one State migrating into another State and infecting it with Ku Klux Klanism and thus impose additional burdens on the educators, the police, the courts, and people of good will, in the second State?

Is unemployment a matter purely of local concern or should the Federal Government attempt to do something about it? If the automobile industry falters the effects are not limited to Detroit or even to Michigan. Steel workers in Pittsburgh, miners in Minnesota, glass workers in Ohio, leather workers in Illinois, are soon affected. Can the resulting depression satisfactorily be dealt with on a State basis?

In passing, I might observe that even when the Federal Government tries to assist either the States, the local communities, or the people as a whole, it finds itself seriously handicapped by the present diffusion of its authority through numerous departments, agencies, and establishments. These establishments have grown in size and increased in number with little thought to their coordination.

For example, construction activities of the Government are scattered hither and yon through half a dozen or more agencies—in-

cluding Federal Works, the Corps of Engineers, the National Housing Agency, the Veterans' Bureau, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Rural Electrification Administration. Duplication of like functions, or at least overlapping, exists not only in Washington but throughout the field service. Thus a dozen regional directors grow where there was only one before.

A municipality looking to the Federal Government for help in housing construction would have to go to the National Housing Agency. For assistance in providing sewer and water connections for the housing, it would come to Federal Works. For flood control to keep the houses from washing away, it would go to the Corps of Engineers. In providing light for rural houses, the Rural Electrification Administration comes into the picture.

The techniques used in building an airport are largely the same as those used in building highways; in fact, the Public Roads Administration of FWA built a considerable number of flight strips for the Army during the war—and a flight strip is nothing but an airport in miniature. An airport is useless until highway access is provided, yet the building of airports is under the jurisdiction of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and highways under the jurisdiction of Federal Works.

The need for reorganizing the Federal establishment has been recognized for almost 150 years. Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Cleveland, McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, Wilson, Harding, Hoover, and Franklin D. Roosevelt were among the Presidents who tried to bring it about. Congress either refused to confer the necessary authority, or it did it so grudgingly that little could be accomplished. Now President Truman once more is seeking power to act. A bill to give him that power is pending in Congress. The danger is that it will emerge so loaded down with exceptions and exemptions, and contain such stringent requirements as to congressional approval for every step taken, however minute, as to tie the President's hands in advance.

Certainly it is obvious enough by this time that efficiency is a managerial problem, and not one for the board of directors. Unless reorganization is done by the President it isn't going to be done at all.

The problem is one which ought to interest every citizen who wants from his Government the best possible service at the least possible cost.

But to return to my main theme.

If Federal funds are to be appropriated hereafter in aid to local public-works construction as a partial answer to mass unemployment, how shall those funds be administered? Should they be channeled through the State governments and thence to the counties and municipalities, or should they be allotted directly to the cities and counties as in the old PWA program? What should be the role of the Federal Administrator? Should he be a person who simply writes 48 checks, one for each State, and then steps out of the picture, leaving the States themselves to prescribe rules, regulations, and standards for the expenditure of the funds? Or should he deal with the cities directly, at the same time prescribing regulations to insure that the resulting public works will fit together into a consistent, over-all national pattern?

You see, I do not have all the answers. But these are questions that have troubled us for a good many years, and will continue increasingly to trouble us unless we can come to some agreement as to how they should be answered. It is time to clarify our thinking.

I pass the problem along to you in the belief that the municipal officials of the country, who have much at stake, may, better than anyone else, chart the course we ought to pursue.

Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article written by me and published in the November 1945 issue of the Tennessee Teacher. Federal aid for education is essential to an equitable distribution of the blessings of education among children of this country. I hope the bill now pending before the Committee on Education may be reported at an early date.

The article is as follows:

FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION

(Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER, Representative in Congress, Third Tennessee District)

To people who do not believe that education is essential to the creation and maintenance of a high economic and social status for the people of America there is no need to discuss Federal aid or even State aid for education. To those who do not believe that the opportunity to attend a good school throughout childhood and youth is a right that should be enjoyed by all there is not much point to the discussion of devising methods of school finance to place a floor under a desirable minimum of educational opportunity all for American children and youth. To such persons it seems all right that educational opportunity should be left to the chance of being a member of a family or the resident of a community that possesses the financial means to pay for education. To them it seems all right that the children of the masses of the people regardless of talent, ability, and character should become the hewers of wood and drawers of water for privileged persons.

Fortunately a very large majority of American people accept equality of opportunity, especially equality of educational opportunity, as the birthright of every American child and agree that a legitimate function of democratic government is to sustain and make a reality of that birthright. The American people, by and large, believe that the kind, quality, and amount of education received by our people is a primary factor in their economic, political, and social welfare.

We know that there is a direct relationship between the educational attainments of the people and a nation's wealth. Recently the Chamber of Commerce of the United States published a bulletin, Education Steps Up Living Standards, that reveals that the level of understanding and technical knowledge of all the people of a nation is an indispensable factor in national economic well-being. By comparison it is shown that some countries have great resources such as rich land, oil, minerals, low-cost electric power, and good climate, while at the same time they tolerate low standards of education and technical training and extremely high rates of illiteracy. Such countries, lacking the knowledge necessary to use these resources properly, have low income and extremely low standards of living. Other countries have poor soil, few minerals, no oil, inclement climate, short growing season, and poor sources of power, but high standards of education and technical training and illiteracy is practically nonexistent. Such countries have high incomes and high standards of living for practically everyone. "The lack of resources did not prevent the development of a high standard of living when the people had sufficient skill."

Within the United States the evidence is replete that high education and high income and high standards of living go hand in hand. Average public-school expenditures in Nevada for 1910, 1920, and 1930 were $102 per pupil; in New York, $83; in Tennessee, $24; in Mississippi, $21. Retail sales per capita in 1940 in Nevada were $564; in New York, $414; in Tennessee, $208; in Mississippi $129. The number of telephones per 1,000 population in Nevada is 175; in New York, 206; in Tennessee, 79; in Mississippi, 36. The circulation of 18 nationally known magazines per 1,000 population in Nevada is 509; in New York, 300; in Tennessee, 151; in Mississippi, 104. During the present war the rejection of draftees because of lack of education per 100 men examined in Nevada was 1.3; in New York, 1.4; in Tennessee, 9.1; in Mississippi, 12.4.

Evidently education is an investment in people that pays enormous dividends in dollars and cents, to say nothing of the cultural advantages of an eduacted people as contrasted with an uneducated people.

Granting that education is essential to our national well-being, is Federal assistance in financing schools a necessity? This question has too often been answered by merely citing the tradition that the support of public schools is a State responsibility. It is a fact that under the tenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States the control of education is a power reserved to the States or to the people. But from the earliest days of the Republic the Congress has been upheld by the courts in exercising the right to grant financial assistance to the States to promote the general welfare. In so doing the Congress does not gain the right or power to take from the States the control of the activity or agency aided.

Merely citing the doctrine of States' rights and responsibilities does not remove the economic necessity for Federal participation in the support of public education. The economic necessity for Federal aid has been so thoroughly established and should now be so well known as to require no further discussion. In a nutshell it is this: There are great inequalities in the economic ability of the States to pay for education. These inequalities have been relatively constant for many decades. Furthermore, the States with the least economic ability to raise public revenues have many more children in proportion to adult population than the richer States. A few pertinent facts will illustrate the point.

In 1943 the per capita income in California was $1,429; in Tennessee, $649; in West Virginia, $688. The number of children 5 to 17 years old per 1,000 population in 1943 in California was 172; in Tennessee, 249; in West Virginia, 281 (the highest in the Nation).

These facts mean that in order to raise the same amount of money per child of school age in 1943, West Virginia would have had to make about three and one-half times as much effort, and Tennessee about three times as much effort as would California. In order to raise $105 per school-age child in 1942–43 (which was the average amount actually spent per pupil in average daily attendance in the Nation as a whole that year) West Virginia and Tennessee would have had to make two and eight-tenths and two and six-tenths times the actual national effort, while California could have raised the same amount per child with only eight-tenths times the national effort.

The inequalities of educational opportunity resulting from the unequal educational burdens and the unequal ability to pay for schools have for a long time been well known. The average expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance ranges from $35 in Mississippi to $179 in New York (Tennessee, $55). The average salary of teachers (1942–43) ranges from $654 in Mississippi to $2,697 in New York (Tennessee, $963). The

average salary of a rural teacher in the United States is only $959 as compared to $1,955 per urban teacher. The percent of youth of high-school age actually in school ranges from 40 percent in Mississippi to 95 percent in Washington (Tennessee, 45.6 percent). These inequalities of opportunity constitute an intolerable situation in a democratic Nation.

There is now pending in Congress legislation calculated to remedy the situation, the Thomas-Hill-Ramspeck bill (S. 181 and H. R. 2869). Hearings have been held and the Senate and House committees should lose little time in reporting them to the Senate and House for a vote. Without doubt a majority of both Houses is favorable to such legislation.

The bugaboo of Federal control of schools should not be permitted longer to deny adequate educational opportunity to several million of our Nation's children. We can have Federal aid without Federal control. To deny that we can is to deny the successful operation of our form of government.

I believe that if the Federal Government has the right to reach into the most remote corners of the Nation and call youth to the defense of the country that same Government has the obligation to support a program of education that will enable them to perform such a duty well.

The heaviest burden for paying for this war will be laid upon those who are now the Nation's youth. I believe it will strengthen the faith of youth in their country's future if the National Government will guarantee the financial support of a program of education which will enable them to pay this debt.

I for one believe that the school teachers of America are the first and chiefest servants of the Nation, and that the laborer is worthy of his hire. Federal aid is necessary to adequate remuneration of our teachers.

Public education is a public necessity. Federal aid for public education is essential to an equitable distribution of the blessings of education among the children and youth of America.

The Dies Committee Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I want Congress to read an article from the independent Methodist weekly, Zion's Herald, of October 24, 1945:

THE DIES COMMITTEE AGAIN

(By Richard Morford)

The American people endured the Dies Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities more than 6 years. We say endured because its publicity-mad chairman, Martin Dies, provided us with overwhelming evidence week by week that the committee which he ran was engaged in a witch hunt first, last, and all the time. Liberal Congressmen attempted to get rid of the malicious committee each time a renewal of the committee's life and appropriation was asked. Those willing to stand up in Congress and be counted against the inquisitorial Dies grew from year to year, but at most fell far short of the necessary number to retire the committee. Finally the American people took the business in hand in democratic fashion. They mobilized the voters to defeat the unsatisfactory members of the committee when they came up for reelection in Congress in 1944, beginning with Mr. Dies. Mr. Dies saw the handwriting on the wall and quit the race. Three others were counted out at the polls. When still another member resigned in protest against the undemocratic procedure, it appeared that the committee would pass into limbo.

But today the American people are faced with a repetition of the same ugly conspiracy against all that is decent and democratic. The Dies committee is back again. Only this time it is the Rankin committee, which is an accurate title, we insist, for while the full title is "House Committee on Un-American Activities," and its chairman is Congressman JOHN S. WOOD, Democrat, of Georgia, Congressman JOHN E. RANKIN, Democrat, of Mississippi, has long since proved himself to be the committee's master schemer and the director of its operations.

Mr. RANKIN made his own bid for the mantle of Martin Dies and was rewarded. By a surprise legislative coup in the opening hour of the first day of the present session of the Congress, January 3, 1945, Mr. RANKIN jammed through the reestablishment of the Committee on Un-American Activities. More than that, by an amendment of the House rules, it was made a permanent standing committee. The vote was 207-186. There was no time for new Congressmen to get their guard up for one such as RANKIN, who took advantage of the day's confusion. All too many of the rest could discern precisely what was being put over and helped it along by their vote. This produced the first victory in this session of Congress for a reactionary coalition that still rides with ominous power. The 207 who voted for the committee included 137 Republicans and 70 Democrats; 63 of the latter were southern.

Members appointed to the committee besides Mr. RANKIN, were EDWARD J. HART, Democrat, New Jersey; J. HARDIN PETERSON, Democrat, Florida; J. W. ROBINSON, Democrat, Utah; JOHN R. MURDOCK, Democrat, Arizona; HERBERT C. BONNER, Democrat, North Carolina; J. PARNELL THOMAS, Republican, New Jersey; KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, South Dakota; GERALD W. LANDIS, Republican, Indiana; Mr. THOMAS, ranking Republican member of the present committee, was also a member of the Dies committee, as was Mr. MUNDT.

ITS PURPOSE

For the first 6 months of this year the committee undertook no startling campaigns, although Mr. RANKIN, in Mr. HART'S absence, directed an abortive attempt to smear OPA. At least the press dropped the headlines which had been the means earlier of arousing the people to action in the November elections. Some entertained hopes the committee might do the right thing when it got organized; others thought it might fade out. That there was little committee action in this period is partly explained by the persistent report that Congressman EDWARD J. HART, the committee's first chairman, did not go along peaceably with RANKIN'S dictates, and that the committee vote on many proposals stood at 5 to 4, with Mr. HART in the minority, and Mr. RANKIN barely able to keep control. HART moved out on July 2. JOHN S. WOOD came in as chairman. It is significant that Mr. WOOD resigned the highly desirable position he held as a member of the top-ranking Foreign Affairs Committee in order to take the chairmanship of the Un-American Committee. Yet no one, certainly not Mr. RANKIN'S southern colleague, Mr. WOOD, seems concerned to challenge the current Washington belief that RANKIN continues to dominate the scene. It appears that there are not more than three members out of the nine now who will lift a voice against RANKIN.

Who's the committee out to knife this time? The answer: Everybody the Dies committee sought to undermine—the Jew and the Negro, the labor union leader, the Communist and the New Dealer, the foreign born and every friend of the Soviet Union, every liberal and democratic fighter for the people's cause. Given time enough, the only people that RANKIN intends shall be left out are the America Firsters, the isolationists, the seditionists, labor's enemies, Jew and Negro haters, Red-baiters, and certainly Mr. Hearst and the rest of the Axis-press crowd.

THE WITCH HUNT

That's putting the matter extremely! Examine the record. The new committee possesses the million-name blacklist of anti-Fascists collected by Martin Dies and already has started to enlarge it. They have asked President Truman for the personnel and social-security records of all temporary Government war agencies. This will give them data on thousands of persons employed, or rejected for employment, by these agencies. With jaundiced eye the committee's snoopers will hunt particularly for persons upon whose organizational affiliations they can hang the label "Communist" or "subversive." The committee may get these records unless many of us insist to President Truman that he refuse the request.

Yes, the committee is getting set for wholesale operations. Do you remember how on October 19, 1941, Dies sent to the Attorney General a list of 1,124 persons employed by the Government whom he alleges were Communists or affiliates of Communist-front organizations? It is noteworthy that in submitting these names, and in releasing to the press the list of Government employees allegedly belonging to the Washington chapter of the American League for Peace and Democracy, the committee never produced a bit of evidence to show that individually the persons on the list were Communist sympathizers. While Dies continued a public persecution of honorable and efficient public servants, the Attorney General did his best over 10 months, with the aid of FBI investigators, to gather incriminating evidence against the 1,124. What was the result? On September 3, 1942, Attorney General Francis Biddle sent a letter to Congress reporting that the Justice Department had fired two men as the result of the FBI investigations. Out of 1,124 that's all who proved liable. On his record you may be certain that J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI had not participated in any whitewashing operation. Said Mr. Biddle: "As regards a large proportion of the complaints, it is now evident that they were clearly unfounded and that they should never have been submitted for investigation in the first instance."

But the principal point at the moment is not the failure to produce indictments, but rather an indication that the Rankin committee is following the Dies committee pattern. It is a witch hunt aimed at thousands of ordinary American citizens, as well as their leaders. To disrupt the normal activities of Government employees by an overhanging Damoclean sword; to drive out from Government service as many New Dealers and other progressives as possible; to spread fear not only among Government employees but among liberals everywhere; to intimidate progressive organizations. These are the purposes of the hunt.

With a campaign under way to put Government employees on the fire, whom else does the Rankin committee intend to burn? In early July, while RANKIN was looking for a suitable chairman after Mr. HART had resigned, he joined Gerald L. K. Smith in denouncing the Red propaganda of Hollywood. The committee forthwith dispatched two investigators to the movie capital, which RANKIN declared was the new hotbed of communism. The purpose of the investigation, said Mr. RANKIN, was to probe one of the most dangerous plots ever instigated for overthrow of this Government. Before the investigators presented their report to the committee the Hearst press presented an exclusive story purported to be based upon the findings of the would-be investigators.

Indeed, at this writing the Hearst press insists upon sharing honors with Mr. RANKIN for the committee's plan and progress. There can be little doubt that the Hearst press enjoys an "open door" into the inner sanctum of Mr. RANKIN's committee.

THE PROSPECTS

The pillorying of Communists has always been counted an easy way to get popular approval. It was a "natural" for the committee's fall program announced suddenly by the Hearst press on September 19 and confirmed by the committee's chairman next day. For at this particular time an investigation of Communists could be fitted nicely into a grand strategy which, in this writer's opinion, is nothing short of Fascist.

Subpena Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., national officer of the Communist Party, a Negro and a candidate for reelection as councilman in the City of New York. He can be victim of a three-way smear. Mr. RANKIN never passes up the chance for an attack on the Negro as well as the Communist. As for interfering in local elections, that's an old Dies tactic. It is recalled that Dies in 1938 used his committee to smear three progressive gubernatorial candidates in the pending elections: Benson in Minnesota, Murphy in Michigan, and Olson in California. The tactics used in attempting to link Mr. Murphy, now associate justice of the United States Supreme Court, with the Communists, were so reprehensible that President Roosevelt branded the action "a flagrantly unfair and un-American attempt to influence an election," and indicted the committee for making "no effort to get at the truth, either by calling for facts or by allowing facts and personal opinion on the other side."

Earlier the committee announced that it would investigate labor troubles over the Nation, particularly in Detroit, to discover whether they were Communist fomented. It's election time in Detroit, too, with labor and progressive forces rallying around a people's man, Richard Frankensteen, United Automobile Workers' vice president, whom they intend to make their mayor. A number of men, in and out of Congress, are glad to have RANKIN serve their interests by attacking labor, as he has been accustomed to do, with the backing now of a Government committee. Especially are they happy to see Mr. RANKIN sowing disruption that might split labor off from its progressive friends in other groups.

It must be recognized that the result of the committee's operations, if successful, will be to destroy American unity. Our united effort proved effective in winning the war. All forces in the Nation must pull together in democratic fashion to meet the problems of reconversion and to win the peace at home. RANKIN and his colleagues know that if America is to be saved for a return to Hoover normalcy, in which a small clique of native fuehrers dictate the life and destiny of the American people, their game must be to divide the people. That's the only way to conquer them.

Subpena Mr. Earl Browder, recently ousted from the leadership of the American Communist movement, secure a public rehearsal of its recent internal fight, and so discredit the Communist Party before the American people. If Mr. Browder could be made to spill the beans and tell the committee that there is a direct link today between Moscow and the American Communist Party, that would help. Or possibly a confession could be wrangled from Mr. William Z. Foster, present party chief, about Moscow connections. In any case, surely enough would be said so that the Hearst press could work up a rousing story about an international plot to overthrow the Government of the United States. Subpena Sam Carp, of Bridgeport, Conn., brother-in-law of the Soviet Union's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Molotov. To tie the American Communists and Mr. Molotov together in some way would add to the anti-Russian ferment in this country. This committee's activities are not the only threat to friendly relations with Russia, we grant, but they could be as dangerous as any. If we would save the peace, we should rise from every corner of the Nation and in one voice repudiate this committee and all its works.

ABOLISH THE COMMITTEE

Can we not force this committee to do the job that needs doing and do it in the proper way? The answer is "No." If RANKIN has his way, and he has, there never will be a thorough investigation of the truly un-American activities which flourish in every section of the country. Last month the dean of the House of Representatives, Congressman ADOLPH J. SABATH, Democrat, Illinois, rose in the Chamber to submit the names of 24 persons and organizations which, in his judgment, are guilty of subversive activities and should be investigated. Among others were included Gerald L. K. Smith, Joe E. McWilliams, E. A. Rumley, Gerald B. Winrod, Edmund James Smythe, Col. Eugene N. Sanctuary, Merwin K. Hart, Joseph P. Kamp. He offered to submit a list of many others to Mr. RANKIN. Mr. SABATH might well have included JOHN E. RANKIN in his list. In a reference to the fears of communism to which Mr. RANKIN and others continuously give vent on the floor of the House, Mr. SABATH said: "Personally I think their statements are far-fetched and invariably are made to detract the attention of the American people from the real danger to our country, namely, the Fascist activities. What I would advise these gentlemen to investigate is some of the Fascist groups in this country who I think are going much further in disrupting conditions in the United States than the much abused so-called Communists."

In its latest publicity the committee suggests that it may investigate Gerald L. K. Smith. RANKIN's handling of Gerald L. K. Smith would probably turn out like the whitewashing that Dies provided for another domestic Fascist, William Dudley Pelley, the Silver Shirt leader and professed anti-Semite, when he appeared before the Dies committee in 1940. Mr. Pelley declared: "I subscribe to that (Dies committee) so completely * * * with the work which has been done by the Dies committee * * * and I have expressed it outside in publications * * * that if its work continues and goes on, the Silver Shirt Legion stops. We have no more use for it."

Would it be enough to rid the committee of Mr. RANKIN. No. Were Mr. RANKIN to give way, Mr. THOMAS would step in. There is little to choose between them. Mr. THOMAS has relished and upheld his share of the inquisition from the early days in partnership with Mr. Dies to the present. The majority of the committee will follow either RANKIN or THOMAS. The clique behind the committee has no intentions of reforming the undemocratic procedures or objectives of this committee. On a straight vote in the House to abolish the committee, the forces of decency and democracy could win, we believe. That vote should be forced by the American people.

The Nation's Chief Concern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House to extend my remarks, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial published in the Standard Star of New Rochelle, N. Y., entitled "The Nation's Chief Concern."

THE NATION'S CHIEF CONCERN

This is more than a strike for higher wages. It is more than a demand for 52 hours' pay for 40 hours' work. It is more than a fight between the biggest, richest labor union against the biggest, richest employer. It is more, far more, than the battle of Detroit.

It is, in effect, the culmination of labor's unrest and of political manipulation of labor's problems that began with the inauguration of Franklin D. Roosevelt. It is the chicken which has at last come home to roost.

This is a struggle to determine whether organized labor leaders shall sit on both sides of the conference table, as representing not only employee but employer. It is the longest step yet taken toward the real goal of organized labor, access to full, intimate knowledge of the employer's earnings and the right to participate in determination of the price which the employer shall ask for his product.

Organized labor wants to maintain the high plane of earnings which is attained during the war years of abnormally great productivity. It bases this desire upon its economic concept that high purchasing power always creates production, choosing to ignore the contrary orthodox philosophy that this condition invites inflation.

But organized labor wants more than high wages, much more. It wants fortification in its war-gained status, it wants absolute assurance that no interference by any employer shall ever be permitted to seek to undermine unionism. It wants a Federal underwriting of not only collective-bargaining rights but also of the privilege to sit with management while it bargains for labor.

The employer, on his part, asks wherein is the logic that a prosecuting attorney shall also be the judge.

He, too, wants security, and in view of repeated violations of the wartime no-strike pledge of labor and the frequent repudiation of contracts containing no-strike clauses, he asks what labor is prepared to offer in return for its own demands.

Young Henry Ford outlined this viewpoint of business when he related that under the enforced check-off system his company has collected for the union in dues, initiation fees, and special assessments a total of $7,799,924.

"The result has been," advised Mr. Ford, "that the union has had membership and financial security, but the company has had no compensating security * * * peaceful relations have not materialized. The experiment has been an unhappy one * * * we must insist upon guaranties by the union against work stoppages and losses in productivity."

Further, as to opening his books to the union leaders, the employer wants to know what is his assurance that this vital information will not reach his competitor. Along the same line, he asks why a prosperous, efficient concern should be called upon to pay more for commodities and labor than a company less intelligently guided.

Should a man with a bank account who enters a haberdashery be charged more for a hat than the customer who has only a few dollars in his pocket?

No; this is far more than an ordinary strike for more pay. It is a signpost of the times which will show where we are to go and how far we are to stray from the economic principles which made this Nation the most prosperous, with the highest living standards, in the entire history of civilization.

Immigration, Naturalization, and Deportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion, last week at its annual national convention, adopted an important resolution with respect to immigration, naturalization, and deportation. The Legion and other ex-servicemen's organizations have at all times shown a deep interest in this problem.

I am including herewith, as a part of my statement, a copy of the resolution and invite the attention of the Members of the House to its careful consideration.

The question of immigration, naturalization, and deportation is going to be one of the most important problems to be considered by this country in the postwar period. I call particular attention to that portion of the resolution that provides:

That immigration should be made truly selective and confined to the present quota or such reduced quotas as may herafter be established and that only such persons shall be admitted from any country who may be found to be assimilable and well disposed to the basic principles of our American form of government and way of life.

The resolution follows:

IMMIGRATION, NATURALIZATION, AND DEPORTATION

Resolution unanimously adopted by the American Legion, Monday, November 19, at its annual national convention

Whereas certain foreign countries refuse to receive their nationals found to be deportable under our laws; and

Whereas remedial legislation appears to be impractical, we strongly urge that an international conference, or convention, be held for the purpose of giving full faith and credit to the decrees of the United States Government ordering the deportation of aliens, particularly those convicted of criminal deportable offenses.

Whereas the present administrative practice of granting lawful entry through the process of pre-examination to aliens who have entered illegally or otherwise have not qualified for admission for permanent residence affords to such aliens an unwarranted preference over those who, in good faith and reliance upon the fair administration of our quota laws, are awaiting their turn under the quota of their respective quota; and

Whereas this process of reexamination is not in accord with the principle of the examination at the source; be it

Resolved, That this administrative practice be discontinued and if, in the opinion of the administrative authorities, this extra legal practice is in the best interests of the Nation, legislative authority should be obtained and in that event, we recommend that a minimum period of residence of 5 years be established as a prerequisite for this extraordinary privilege, and that no alien who claimed exemption from military service should ever receive this extraordinary privilege; and

Whereas, naturalization is a privilege extended to aliens seeking the status of citizenship and contemplates that their admission should be mutually beneficial to the government and themselves, and that the applicants upon admission should be citizens in fact as well as in name, we recommend the adoption of legislation that will provide as additional requisites for naturalization:

(a) Ability to read English understandingly.

(b) A uniform period of residence in the United States which in no case should be less than 3 years.

(c) An unequivocal obligation to bear arms.

Resolved, That immigration should be made truly selective and confined to the present quota or such reduced quotas as may hereafter be established and that only such persons shall be admitted from any country who may be found to be assimilable and well disposed to the basic principles of our American form of government and way of life.

Resolved, That we support legislation designed to facilitate the admission to this country of such nationals of other countries, racially eligible to citizenship, married abroad to members of our armed forces, upon application of the citizen's spouse: *Provided*, That whenever it is found any such immigrants may be afflicted with excludable diseases or defects that are not quarantinable, notice of such immigrant's destination to any community shall be promptly delivered to the appropriate health authorities: *And provided further*, That such aliens spouses are otherwise qualified for admission.

Resolved, That all war refugees who have been enjoying our sanctuary, haven and hospitality shall be returned promptly to the countries from whence they came.

Since H. R. 3663 introduced by Representative GOSSETT, of Texas, now pending in the Congress, is so embracive of the Legion's long-established policy restricting immigration and its attitude toward the war criminal classes: Be it

Resolved, That we pledge our support for the enactment of this legislation.

Resolved, That article 75 of the Geneva Convention which calls for the return of prisoners of war to their own countries be strictly enforced and that no exceptions be made by permitting them to remain in the United States or otherwise facilitating their readmission.

Post-war immigration will receive the very earnest attention of the Congress during the current session; in fact a special subcommittee of the Congress has been engaged since early summer in a survey, not only on the broad subject of immigration, but also on deportation and naturalization legislation. Already available reports of their meetings indicate a coalition of various types of organizations and minority groups whose particular functions appear to be the allevation of the conditions of alleged oppressed persons and groups, and of assisting the aliens within the deportable classes to avoid deportation, and in aiding and abetting the naturalization of aliens generally. Their primary interest is in the alien rather than the general welfare of their country.

Some of the legislative proposals of these groups would increase immigration; grant lawful entry to aliens now here in violation of our laws; confer citizenship on certain persons lacking the ordinary educational requirements; confer upon alien merchant seaman the same naturalization privileges now temporarily accorded our combat men in the armed forces and relax existing deportation laws. Previous convention mandates, together with mandates of this convention, present basic ideals that would be contravened by proposed legislation already submitted to the subcommittee of the Congress. Having in mind the extreme importance of this subject matter; be it

Resolved, That convention mandates on immigration, naturalization, and deportation be placed in the category of major legislation.

Pioneer Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from yesterday's Boston Daily Globe:

PIONEER WOMEN

The section of the paper headed "GI Gangplank" has a tremendous number of women readers, especially among the young married and the long engaged. Husbands and fiancés are coming back and the women whose lives are bound up with theirs are eager to welcome their particular veterans.

As one young wife and mother, who went through the experience a few weeks ago, expressed it, "In the last 2 minutes before the train comes in you think you are going to die." No doubt others feel the same way. These reunions, mostly after years of separation, are an ordeal.

The atmosphere surcharged with happiness, often attested by sobs of delight and tears of joy, is also diluted by something else. The wife or sweetheart has almost certainly been looking ahead to the months and years to come. Perhaps the soldier or sailor headed for the separation center is not yet attempting to set his face to the future, but the woman has had a great deal of time to spend on such considerations. The men of other families in the neighborhood have returned, become settled or unsettled, and she wonders about the one who means so much to her.

If the job he left still exists he has a legal right to return to it. But in many cases this is not the situation. There is the young man who found the prewar employment very trying because he could not sympathize either with its method or its purposes. Another man, whose education was interrupted, has been thinking about a return to learning. There are other men who dream of going on the land trying subsistence farming. If a large proportion of the men have in mind making their future very different from their past it is not strange. They are young, have traveled far, seen much of their own country and some of the world. If they return with new ideas no one need be surprised.

For countless women, perhaps rather more than a million of them, the situation is a test of mental and emotional stamina. But that is nothing new in this part of America. The migration to the Atlantic seaboard was somewhat different from that which brought white settlers to other portions of the New World. When Spaniards set out to see what treasure they could bring back it was an expedition for men only. Their women stayed at home. To the north were French adventurers bent on killing and skinning wild beasts and sending the fur to Europe. But in the part of the country where the Thirteen Colonies were organized, the migration was to a great extent a family affair. On the incoming ships there were more men than women, but always there were women along.

And when the urge to press on into the interior took hold of the New England mind the covered wagon carried wives, daughters, and small children. In later years the streams of settlers from several European countries were never masculine, although the males were in the majority. The object was homemaking. That needs experience at the fire and the mending basket.

The pioneer woman has been one of the most significant symbols of American life. In the outlying districts of New England she fought off Indian raids. Her hands were the forerunners of factories producing household goods. She spun yarn, wove cloth, and took on a thousand duties of which her great-great-grandchildren do not even know the names.

She was, with all the drudgery, something more than a drudge. She was a helpmate, instilling spirit into her husband and her sons; comforting them in disappointments and searching the possibilities to decide what would be best to do next.

And today there are thousands upon thousands of young American women, most of them married and the rest expecting to be soon, whose immediate office in their families is to be pioneer women. It may look like the prewar America, but it simply cannot be quite that. To find a satisfactory part in it requires adjustment by the young veteran and also by his wife. She may realize this before he does, and she must comprehend that she is important. The pioneer woman of today is the cocaptain of the future.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Time To Throw Off Our Fears

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a well-considered and forward-looking article, Time To Throw Off Our Fears, written by Charles A. Merrill and appearing in the Boston Globe of November 25, 1945:

TIME TO THROW OFF OUR FEARS—SUSPICION OF OTHERS AND MISTRUST OF OURSELVES WILL HARDLY AVAIL TO SOLVE THE PROBLEMS NOW CONFRONTING THIS NATION AND THE WORLD

(By Charles A. Merrill)

We are indeed living in a weird atmosphere, and we are a strange people. Reading the current headlines, a visitor from Mars, if he could drop in on us, would doubtless conclude that by scandalous corruption and inefficiency we had just lost a war instead of having emerged victorious from the best-managed war in our history. We are really desperate. To satisfy our craving for a scandal and a scapegoat or scapegoats, we actually have to go back to the first day of the conflict. We cannot find anything to complain about after December 7, 1941.

Nor is this the whole story. The psychologists will find our case history extremely interesting. The excuse for this fact-finding orgy now underway in Washington, in which observers are beginning to detect strong political overtones, was to place the blame for the tragedy at Pearl Harbor. But, lo and behold, the inquiry has taken a new turn. We are now trying to ascertain whether the Japanese war lords or our own public servants started the shooting. Perhaps we had better call off the trials of the German and Japanese war criminals.

From the Pearl Harbor inquiry will doubtless come evidence of which historians will make good use in recording the story of the irrepressible conflict between fascism and democracy. But historians, we may be sure, will require a decade or two to weigh the evidence. For the sake of our own peace of mind, we had better stop asking ourselves whether we deliberately entered the war or were, like Russia, a victim of aggression, and reflect upon what our situation would be today if we had remained isolated and aloof and had permitted the Fascist aggressors in Europe and Asia to liquidate all resistance in their respective continents and then put the squeeze on the United States.

A SHELL-SHOCKED NATION

The American people hate war, and well they may. After two bitter experiences in a quarter of a century, Old World quarrels about which we were not consulted until our weight was needed to tip the scales in favor of justice and decency, we are probably a shell-shocked nation. Perhaps this is the meaning of the Pearl Harbor investigation. The agony of World War II has seared our souls, and we cry out: "Who did this to us?"

The sooner we throw off this mood the better it will be for ourselves and those who come after us. Crying over spilled milk will get us exactly nowhere. If we really hate war as much as we say we do and wish to avoid another one, the time to prepare for peace is now.

In one respect, our mood today is the same as it was 25 years ago. The war has left us nervous and depressed. Postwar complications sicken us. We would like to place the blame somewhere, liquidate the whole business, and forget it. But we are wiser now than we were then. We know very well that there is no such easy way out. We have learned the hard way, and we are keenly aware that this time we cannot return to normalcy. We are no longer a nation of ostriches.

Frankly, our state of mind today is one of confusion and fear. What a paradox this is, that, after having demonstrated our unrivaled power, we are afraid. Afraid of what? Afraid of the power which we have just exhibited? We have assisted in knocking out the two great aggressor nations left in the world. In the process, we have seen one of our allies, Great Britain, reduced in strength to a position where she is no longer a dominating force in international affairs. There is today only one nation in the world capable of challenging us, Soviet Russia, and Russia has no navy, no air force that could compete with ours, no such industrial strength as we have and she has suffered so grievously in her hand-to-hand encounter with nazism that she will need a quarter of a century to bind up her wounds. Ideologically, she differs from us. But she inherits such a large portion of the earth that she will be fully occupied for a century exploiting it. At the present time it would be difficult to find any really worth-while, full-time conflict of interests between Soviet Russia and the United States of America.

PERHAPS WE LACK CONFIDENCE

Are we then afraid of our own strength? Perhaps what we really lack is confidence in ourselves. We have a secret weapon and the secret is too much for us. Why? Because the scientists tell us that the secret cannot be kept.

What, then, can we do to snap out of this negative mood in which we find ourselves enmeshed? Instead of wasting our substance on a witch hunt, we might tackle some of the problems that are awaiting solution. There happen to be quite a few of them.

After all is said and done, General MacArthur is carrying out his orders in Japan. He has liquidated the big business combines that sinewed the Japanese war potential. Just now he is revising the feudal system of land tenure that kept the Japanese a backward people of tenant farmers. It will be no surprise to some observers if the Japanese turn out to be the No. 1 converts to democracy.

Strangely enough, progress is slower in Germany. To be sure, the question of dealing with one of the great industrial nations which we always considered an essential part of our economy is a bigger problem than emasculating Japan. But why not make up our minds? We must decide what level of economic activity is required in Germany in order to keep that country self-sufficient, and what degree of industrialization might make her a menace to the peace of the world. The chances are that she will never again be an offender.

Soon, carrying out the terms of the Potsdam Declaration, we must supplant military rule in Germany with a civilian administration. Is it a fact that we cannot find in this country competent, public-spirited administrators to take over and complete the job that our military experts so courageously tackled?

There are thousands of homesick boys pining away in Europe. They have a right to come home. Well, let's bring them home. Is it not reasonable to assume that, if we make Army careers attractive, we can, from our vast population, attract to this job which has to be done thousands of American boys who have not been called upon to fight the recent war and who may not be immediately committed to careers in civilian life? Evidently Lt. Gen. Lucius D. Clay, General Eisenhower's deputy in Europe, thinks this is possible. "The sooner we get out the I-want-to-go-homes," says General Clay, "and replace them with personnel who want to stay, the better off we shall be. We want people who will stay and make a serious career of this job." Thank heaven for such American common sense.

ABOUT THAT SECRET WEAPON

If Congress is itching to assert itself, let it cease worrying about how the last war started and appropriate the money needed by UNRRA to prevent starvation and anarchy from sweeping around the earth. Our representatives in Washington might also see what they can do about supplying housing accommodations for returning veterans who find themselves with no place to park their families.

And, oh, yes, about the secret weapon. Has it occurred to our agents in Washington that this time the American people have not turned their backs upon the ideal of international cooperation, but have decided that the only way to stop war is to gang up against it?

The world happens to be in a desperate situation. This calls for drastic measures. Suppose we take the risks, set up the United Nations Organization as speedily as may be, and entrust to it control of the atomic bomb. It is quite possible that, having done this, we shall breathe easier.

As our late President Franklin D. Roosevelt asserted some years ago in the midst of a domestic crisis, perhaps "we have nothing to fear save fear itself."

Commendation of Cordell Hull's Testimony Before Pearl Harbor Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, it is fortunate that ex-Secretary of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull, is still living so that he can refute some of the unjust and untrue charges made against him and President Roosevelt with reference to the attack by the Japanese at Pearl Harbor.

Death has removed President Roosevelt and he is not here to answer these charges, but ex-Secretary Hull is familiar with the facts relating to our foreign policy, and his testimony before the Congressional Pearl Harbor Committee was a complete answer to many of these vicious and unjustified attacks.

The New York Times of November 24 has an editorial reviewing and commending Mr. Hull's testimony before this committee under the heading "Mr. Hull's Testimony," and immediately following this editorial the Times has another entitled "The Narrow Margin." Both of these editorials are of interest and should be preserved, and under leave granted, same are submitted herewith:

MR. HULL'S TESTIMONY

In his testimony before the Congressional Pearl Harbor Committee former Secretary Hull has performed still another distinguished service, both to his country and to history. He has swept away the accusations and distortions of political partisanship, and in a detailed and unchallengeable presentation of America's policy toward Japan has not only set the record straight, but has also squarely put the blame for the Pacific war where it belongs—where the Japanese themselves now acknowledge that it belongs—on the mad Japanese policy of expansion and world conquest in collaboration with Nazi Germany. In so doing he has not only answered the critics of America's diplomacy who through him would strike at President Roosevelt's whole foreign policy, but has also cleared the way for the committee itself to get down to the business for which it was appointed—the investigation of the Pearl Harbor disaster and the military reasons for it.

Mr. Hull makes it plain that the Japanese war lords had confronted the United States with the alternative of either bowing to their very real ultimatum of November 20, 1941, which would have made the United States an ally of Japan at the price of a surrender of American principles as abject as Munich, or facing the risk of a Japanese attack. In that situation the American Government, far from provoking a Japanese attack, or holding out the Pacific Fleet as bait for it, not only played for time to permit the armed forces to prepare but also presented a counter proposal in line with the basic American principles of peaceful cooperation and nonaggression, which, even if the Japanese failed to accept it, would have produced a diplomatic stalemate that did not necessarily involve war. Yet it is this counter proposal which Japanese propaganda has distorted into an ultimatum, and it is no credit to President Roosevelt's opponents that they had to stoop to Japanese propaganda to find their material.

The correctness of Mr. Hull's presentation is evident from the two decisive notes themselves. In their note of November 20 the Japanese demanded that in return for a partial withdrawal of their troops in Indo-China the United States should give Japan a free hand in "restoring general peace between Japan and China," which meant a Japanese conquest of that country, and that for this purpose the United States should supply Japan with all necessary materials, especially oil, and induce the Netherlands East Indies to do likewise. Mr. Hull's note of November 26, on the other hand, proposed a broad and straightforward settlement on the basis of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of all nations and noninterference in their internal affairs, to be accompanied by a complete restoration of trade relations and the greatest possible economic cooperation.

That Mr. Hull had little hope of a Japanese acceptance does not detract from the merit of his proposal, which was the only one that could have been made in the circumstances. In point of fact, as was evident at the time, the Japanese had already gone too far in their career of conquest to stop, and Mr. Hull is quite right in his statement that not even a surrender to the Japanese ultimatum would have averted the Japanese sneak attack; it would have merely postponed that attack until Japan had consolidated her gains and could strike with all the greater force. For that reason Mr. Hull warned repeatedly that Japan could be expected to strike "anywhere, any time." If there was any mistake made by our Government it was its assumption that the Japanese would strike primarily at the Kra peninsula and the Netherlands East Indies rather than at Pearl Harbor.

But the direction from which a Japanese blow could be expected was a military and strategic, not a political, calculation. It will be up to the committee to find out whether, in view of the steadily worsening international situation during the years preceding the war, America had been properly armed to meet the foes closing in upon it, and how in the face of all the many warnings it was still possible for the Japanese to surprise the American Fleet at Pearl Harbor set up for a killing.

THE NARROW MARGIN

One section of Mr. Hull's statement yesterday dealt with the evidence by which Japan gave unmistakable notice of her aggressive purposes in the months shortly before Pearl Harbor. The sequence of events—all in the summer of 1941—ran as follows:

On June 22 Germany attacked Russia, thus tying up the Russian armies and freeing Japan's western flank from the danger of a Russian attack in the event that Japan's own armies embarked upon a new adventure.

On July 2 a hastily assembled Imperial conference in Tokyo reached decisions "on important national policies to meet the current situation."

On July 24 the character of these important decisions was revealed when a Japanese fleet appeared off Indochina and a Japanese Army proceeeded to occupy that country in a maneuver which plainly flanked the Philippines and exposed those islands to attack.

All of these events were matters of public knowledge. There was no secrecy about any of them. All of them were spread all over the front pages of the newspapers. All of them were talked about everywhere.

Yet the astonishing fact remains that in the face of these clear and explicit warnings of danger the House of Representatives of the United States voted 3 weeks later—on August 12—to continue the Selective Service System only by the razor-edged vote of 203 to 202. On that decision the House Democrats voted 182 to 65 to continue Selective Service. The House Republicans voted 133 to 21 to end it.

That was the narrow margin by which the American Army was kept from almost complete dissolution on the eve of Pearl Harbor.

Relationship of Management and Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include an interesting interview by Eleanor Roberts of Rev. Father Thomas E. Shortell, S. J., of the College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass., on the relationship of management and labor appearing in the Boston Post of November 25, 1945.

Father Shortell is one of the country's most eminent authorities on labor problems and is director of the famous Institute of Industrial Relations at Holy Cross College. His views, as expressed in the interview, are worthy of deep consideration by all fair-minded persons.

SEES BASIS FOR LABOR-MANAGEMENT PEACE—FATHER SHORTELL, OF HOLY CROSS INSTITUTE OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS, POINTS OUT PUBLIC KNOWS ONLY SENSATIONAL SIDE OF SUBJECT

(By Eleanor Roberts)

Although the labor picture looked pretty dark last week with President Truman's labor-management conference hopelessly deadlocked over collective bargaining and the Nation's idle topping the 500,000 mark as over 200,000 General Motors employees struck, one of the country's most eminent authorities on labor problems, the Reverend Thomas E. Shortell, S. J., newly returned from the Washington parley, declared in an exclusive interview that with this conference we have reached one of the most important milestones in the social and economic progress of the United States.

"The very fact that we have been able to get labor and capital together under one roof is of great significance," Father Shortell, who is director of the famous Institute of Industrial Relations at Holy Cross College in Worcester, pointed out.

"The trouble with the American public and the way they feel about strikes is that they see only the sensational part of them."

A DISTORTED PICTURE

"But they hear very little about the good, constructive work between labor and management that has been accomplished."

Frowning upon the people who censor strikes simply because they are strikes—without knowing all the details—Father Shortell declared: "After all, there were 50,000,000 workers in this country during the war, and only a very small portion, about 250,000, went out on strike.

"It is like picking up the paper and counting off the divorce cases. There are thousands of happy, peaceful homes blessed with love and devotion that you never hear anything about. That's because they're normal. It's the abnormalities in marriage that capture the news.

"The same is true of labor. There are 50,000 contracts in the United States today, yet only the dissensions come to the attention of the public. Actually 90 percent of the labor disputes are settled quietly. You don't hear about them because they are the normal procedures in labor conciliation.

"The public expects too much of a conference. They think that with one meeting of labor and management the industrial relations picture will be rosy.

"What can we hope for out of this conference? We can hope to minimize strikes—bring them down to the least possible number. And how can we do that? A strike, to be justified, must have a just cause. It should be carried on by legitimate means. It should also have a reasonable hope of accomplishing more good than the harm it causes."

MANY UNIONS ARE YOUNG

"Strikes should be used only as a last resort. The real job of the conference was to put so many resorts in between a conflict and a strike that a strike won't be necessary."

Father Shortell, who has always been considered something of a prophet in the labor-management field, has the patience of a

pediatrician with small children, in his viewpoint on unions.

"Did a thinking person ever say 'Why aren't unions 50 years old or even older?'

"Why aren't they? Because they were smashed! They were born in an era when they had to fight their way up. They have all the resentment of 50 years of fighting against spies, detective agencies, and yellow-dog contracts behind them.

"How long have the automobile workers had a union? They're practically infants—born in 1936. Yet their critics ask why they are not more disciplined. Are children that age as well-disciplined as adults with years of experience behind them?

"You seldom see strikes in the railroad workers union which was organized about 1880. Because they were allowed to organize they have tradition, experience behind them. For instance, if there are any difficulties between labor and management in this industry the mediation board first takes up the dispute.

"There is a cooling-off period of 30 days where a strike or lock-out cannot take place. Secondly, there is company investigation and fact-finding and the union can study the ability of the company to pay or the necessity for making wage cuts.

"Thirdly, they have the authority to publicize these findings, and fourth, to make a decision."

NEED FOR TEAMWORK

"With voluntary award arbitration that decision can be accepted or rejected. Every industry could have the same thing. But many don't want it chiefly because the fact-finding and investigating period could be used as a stalling period.

"A strike is like a football play. It has to be pulled suddenly. If there's a 30-day wait the company is prepared."

Firm in his belief that once the union gets fuller recognition by management it ceases to be a militant, fighting group and becomes cooperative, Father Shortell feels that it is a natural right to associate and to bargain with one's fellowmen.

A close friend of both industrial tycoons and labor leaders, this quiet, soft-speaking priest who is regarded as such a power in the industrial relations field, maintained that the saddest thing about the Washington labor-management parley was the dispute between CIO chief Philip Murray and United Mine Workers' John L. Lewis that keeps them both separated.

"If they were on the same side, they would make a perfect team," he bemoaned. "The tremendous power and resourcefulness of Lewis coupled with the smoothness of Murray as a negotiator would make a terrific impact.

"There is no question but that the bad split between CIO and the A. F. of L. has had a retarding effect on the progress of the conference. Wage increase is the foremost concern of the CIO, while the A. F. of L. considers the industrial peace formula most important. On the other hand, the A. F. of L. and the United Mine Workers were unwilling to risk a split in the conference on the issue of wage increase. They wanted to talk on a formula for collective bargaining and let the wage situation be settled by collective bargaining between management and labor."

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

The forward strides that have been made in collective bargaining during the last few years have, to Father Shortell's mind, been responsible for the greatest advancements in industrial relations.

"When we recognize that labor-management conferences in the past have broken up over the right and the desirability of collective bargaining, it is worthy to note that great progress has been made.

"I cannot lay enough stress upon the importance of the statement made by one of the two main speakers for management at the conference, Eric Johnston, the president of the United States Chamber of Commerce. He said: 'Labor unions are now woven into our economic fabric, and collective bargaining is an essential part of the democratic process. The Nation must accept this as a fact. I mean accept it, not from the lips, but from the heart.'

"Isn't it true," demanded Father Shortell, "that people haven't accepted unionism as a part and parcel of American life? Why do men organize into unions? Because only through organization can they maintain their livelihood when conflict starts.

"In collective bargaining and unionism the bargainer and native worker is no longer satisfied to be a mere material cog in the machinery of production. He knows he is important. He realizes his dignity and personality and he feels a fulfillment of that in the fact that he elects representatives of his own choosing who stand face to face with management with equal knowledge of the conditions in industry and who can take an active part in determining wages, hours, and working conditions."

RIGHT TO ORGANIZE

"Besides that he elects his own shop steward and agreements—men who see that the contract is applied in everyday working conditions on the floor of the factory and who bring his grievances to the management for orderly discussion and settlement.

"In the old days the manager's door was always open so the employee could take his differences to him for personal settlement. Today, all that is changed. Can you imagine a steel worker marching up to the office of Benjamin Fairless, president of the United States Steel Corp.? Can you see how far he'd get?

"The head of the Nunn-Busch Corp. in Milwaukee once declared that as long as he knew the men personally they could get along fine through personal relationships. But the minute the company got so big that labor relations had to be carried on by a hired foreman, that was the time they needed a union.

"What is the right these men have to organize? The National Association of Manufacturers composed of 13,000 different companies organized. What for? For self protection, to exchange trade information and unfortunately, during 1902 to 1936, for the purpose of smashing unions. The unions never came back till 1936 when the CIO organized them in a resurgence of the democratic way of life."

In a plea to keep labor unions as well as management and economy free in this country, Father Shortell revealed that during the war, there was a tendency in the United States for unions to lean on the Government for decisions.

"We must insist upon free collective bargaining without undue Government restraints. The Government has a place, of course. It comes in legitimately, for instance, when it passes a minimum wage law. During the war, however, there was no collective bargaining except with the United Mine Workers. It was WLB dictatorship during the war."

THE GRIEVANCE CLINIC

As head of the Institute of Industrial Relations at Holy Cross College, Father Shortell has created his own little labor-management utopia where weighty problems are settled in a Friday evening grievance clinic, and where workingmen in overalls sit next to their bosses in a mutual desire to learn all they can about the intelligent settlement of their differences.

In much the same manner that pseudo-disputes are settled in this grievance clinic, real difficulties in the labor-management field can be taken care of, according to Father Shortell.

"Cooperation between labor and management is the order of the day. I also maintain that the application of intelligence and good will can solve most labor-management problems, that our American methods outdistance any system based on class hatred, suspicion, or dictatorship and that union recognition, collective bargaining, and intelligent union-management dealings have come to stay. This requires informed citizens to make them serviceable adjuncts of our social scheme.

"The labor-management conference will prove an imporatnt milestone in the social and economic progress of the United States.

"Its purpose, namely to lay the ground work for peace with justice on the home front, is agreed upon by all parties. There is a common interest in substituting industrial peace for industrial warfare. In this fundamental choice which confronted the conference a decision was being made between fateful alternatives—peace or war, cooperation or violence, self-regulation or coercion by law," declared Father Shortell.

A BETTER TOMORROW

"People should not expect sudden results nor miracles. One of the real purposes of this conference was to define the area of agreement and disagreement between labor and management.

"There is one important point which should be made clear to everyone—that the delegate to the labor-management conference had no power to make agreements which are binding on the group or industry that he represented. This was not a national collective-bargaining conference. The function of the conference was to simply recommend those procedures by which industrial relations could be conducted more effectively.

"And while the function of the conference was purely advisory and inspirational, the conclusions arrived at should have a considerable influence in shaping a better tomorrow for all our fellow citizens and they should chart the road to productive peace instead of disruptive war on the industrial front. Such are the principles and aims with which management entered the conference."

Bring the Service Men and Women Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Christmas season is fast approaching; a sacred time in the lives of men, women, and children. Mothers, fathers, wives, sisters, and sweethearts are praying for the return of their loved ones for the day of days. Our service men and women now widely scattered over the earth; some on remote islands of the Pacific, others in India, in China, Alaska, Iceland and in other far away places feel and rightly so that they have earned the right to spend Christmas with their loved ones at home.

The President and the Congress have turned a deaf ear to the appeals of those who fought and won a great victory. Those individual Members of Congress who refuse to sign a petition to make it possible for the service men and women and their families to be reunited on Christmas Day are looking forward to the joy of their own home on the sacred day

of Christmas. Lip service is not what the service people want; they want congressional action.

I urge my colleagues who are sincere in their interest in soldiers to sign petition No. 8 now on the Speaker's desk to hasten the return of our soldiers and sailors to their homes.

Under leave to extend, I insert the following letters:

From Lodi, Miss., comes the following letter:

NOVEMBER 24, 1945.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REED: God bless you for your stand to get the students out of the Army soon. My son, 19 years old, was in the study of medicine at the time he went into the Army. He ought to be discharged in order that he might reenter the study of medicine. These United States need doctors, and you know they do. In a few years we will be without any doctors at all, it looks like.

Please let me know when do you think this will be passed. Surely, surely, for God's sake, you won't let Congress leave Washington for Christmas until you get the law passed to put these students out in order that they might reenter school in January of 1946. Go to it. You are a good one, and RANKIN, and several more can pass this and we are depending upon you all to do so.

God bless you.

Yours truly.

This next letter was written by a corporal at the Amarillo Army Air Field in Texas:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This letter is being written to convey to you the thoughts and feelings of a large group of men, and in an effort to enlist your power and aid to adjust an unfair situation which now exists in the Army Air Forces.

This group of men have all served on honorable active duty for a period of from 3 to 4 years.

By a policy recently adopted by the Army Air Forces, men who have served 42 months by the 15th of December 1945, will be eligible for discharge and are to start processing immediately.

Effective yesterday, a wire was received from the headquarters of this command, St. Louis, Mo., stating that all men with classification numbers such as we all have, namely, finance clerk among others, have been declared ineligible for discharge, regardless of the amount of service or points a man may have.

The Army says we are essential. We are, for the most part, men who are engaged in finance, personnel, and administrative work.

Since the 1st of November, we finance personnel have discharged 283 officers, with a staff of 16 enlisted men and 3 officers. The same amount of work could have been accomplished with a staff of, at the most, half that large, yet all of us have been declared essential—essential for what; that is the mystery. The number of enlisted men discharged from this station for the same period is equally proportionally small with even a larger staff. It is known that this situation exists at other stations in this command, and that the separation centers at Keesler Field, Miss., and Gulfport, Miss., have closed down completely for lack of men to separate, and not for lack of men to operate them.

The Army Air Forces is now conducting a finance school at Maxwell Field, Ala., to train newly inducted men to work in finance offices of separation centers with the primary purpose of being replacements for men who are now, or soon will be eligible for discharge. We have in the finance office at this station a sufficient number of these graduates who are capable of taking over the entire functions of this office. Since this school at Maxwell Field, Ala., is turning out approximately 100 men a week, certainly there can be no shortage of finance personnel, and more replacements are available upon request. Therefore we cannot see how we can be called, or classified as essential.

Since the Army Air Forces has adopted the policy of discharging men on the basis of service, we strongly feel that we men who now have, or soon will have, the required amount of service should be released immediately, or as soon as we become eligible, without any discrimination shown. At the present time there are finance clerks at this station, MOS 622, who are eligible for discharge under the above-mentioned plan, and they are being held as essential. In addition, there are many more finance men who have 3 years service and who will become eligible for discharge shortly, and they too will be held, unless some action is taken. It is utterly ridiculous to declare finance personnel ineligible for discharge when replacements are available.

It is with you men in whom we have placed our confidence to represent us as civilians, and to protect us as soldiers that we write, with the hopes that you will see that immediate action is taken, so that we too may spend Christmas at home.

Sincerely yours.

American Legion National Convention Asks Elimination of Pauper Oath—Adopts Costello Post Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE B. BATES

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Joseph Leib, service officer of Vincent B. Costello Post No. 15 of the American Legion:

AMERICAN LEGION NATIONAL CONVENTION ASKS ELIMINATION OF PAUPER OATH—ADOPTS COSTELLO POST RESOLUTION

(By Joseph Leib, service officer, past vice commander)

At the national convention held in Chicago, Ill., November 22, 1945, the American Legion unanimously adopted a resolution (No. 39) scoring the Veterans' Administration use of a pauper oath prior to the granting of Government hospitalization.

The oath, which appears on form P–10, Application for Hospitalization and Domiciliary Care, became the subject of bitter criticism by veterans' organizations throughout the Nation after Costello Post of the American Legion launched a drive to discontinue the obnoxious and bureaucratic edict.

In the Congress today there are six individual bills calling for the elimination of this disgraceful and un-American procedure, as follows:

H. R. 599, Representative SPRINGER.

H. R. 1923, Representative MORRISON.

H. R. 2413, Representative WICKERSHAM.

H. R. 2587, Representative MARTIN of Massachusetts.

H. R. 2717, Representative SASSCER.

H. R. 3332, Representative BARRY.

The power to remove this oath lies only with the Congress. It was prescribed by law at the urgent request of the Veterans' Administration when the economy bill was debated by the Congress in 1933. It has never been repealed.

Veterans were sent off to war with a promise in their ears that nothing would be too good for them upon their return. They resent in no uncertain terms the existing requirement that they affix their signatures to any paper which says, "I cannot afford to pay," for medical care, and this oath is flanked by threats of penal punishment and high fines. Those who have sacrificed months of their lives and years of their earning power are asking that this oath be abandoned, once and for all time.

General Bradley, in an article appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer of September 23, 1945, said, "In no sense of the word can a benefit of any nature to a war veteran be considered as charity." This is a clear-cut statement.

However, General Bradley has not as yet taken a stand on the pauper oath required by the Veterans' Administration, although veterans from coast to coast have pleaded that this bureaucratic whim be stopped.

Now it is up to General Bradley to make it indelibly clear whether or not he included hospitalization in his statement to the Philadelphia newspaper—or whether he regards medical care to a veteran as charity.

The history of the pauper oath is that it not only breeds deceit, but that it also destroys dignity, confidence, and morale. If the time ever was that it was the fault of any veteran that he could not afford to pay for necessary medical care, then the social and economic evolutions of this generation have eradicated such conceptions of a nation's obligation and responsibility to a needy veteran.

In additin, the pauper oath question, "Are you financially able to pay the necessary expenses of hospital or domiciliary care? Yes or no," calls for an answer of opinion and interpretation of the veteran's ability. It asks for his opinion of whether or not he is financially able to bear the expense. If the veteran honestly answers that question as "No" he may be giving the Government a sincere and frank answer as to his financial ability and for which statement he later may be punished under the penalty clause, section 15, to have knowingly made a false affidavit in order to obtain hospitalization. On the other hand should he answer "Yes" he, of course, would be refused hospital care. So, what is the veteran to do? One naturally asks what is the purpose of this horrible pauper oath? What are the reasons for its retention on the statute books?

Again I repeat, that it appears to me, that the one basic reason for this oath is to threaten and to discourage veterans from applying for Government hospitalization and to encourage former soldiers to give their business to private hospitals or to civilian doctors. If this is not a logical conclusion, then what is the reason behind the insistence of this oath?

When a veteran reaches a point where he must go to a Government hospital, I contend that there should be no conditional admission To force a veteran to swear under oath that he is a pauper is unfair and disgraceful. As it stands now, a veteran to be admitted to a bed must declare himself either a pauper or make of himself a deliberate liar. Certainly, Congress never intended such a requirement.

Here is a copy of the American Legion resolution as passed by the national convention held in Chicago, Ill., last week; and a copy of VA Form P–10 bearing the pauper oath:

"Whereas it is deemed that certain information requested on VA Form P–10 is unnecessary and whereas in replying to certain questions the applicant may subject himself to unwarranted criticisms and possible prosecution: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the American Legion recommend a change on Form VA P–10, revised in May 1945, under question 4, as follows:

'Where application is for condition for which applicant was discharged for disability in line of duty, or held service-connected by Veterans' Administration questions 5 and 7 need not be answered; be it further

"Resolved, in this connection, That question 6, which reads 'Are you financially able to pay the necessary expenses of hospital or domiciliary care?' be entirely eliminated; be it further

"*Resolved,* That question 7 be changed to read 'Are you able to pay transportation to and from a Veterans' Administration facility without causing undue hardship?' "

Veterans' Administration
Form P-10

APPLICATION FOR HOSPITAL TREATMENT OR DOMICILIARY CARE

The applicant should forward this form, when fully executed, with the original or a certified copy of his discharge or release from last period of service, to the Veterans' Administration facility nearest his home, which is located at _____ (Location of facility)

1. I, _____ (Print) (Last name) (First name) (Middle name) C-No. _____ Social Security No. _____
hereby apply for admission to a Veterans' Administration facility for *(hospital treatment) (domiciliary care) _____
(Date of birth) (Color) (Sex) (Place of birth) (Present place of residence)

2. My entire service in the active military or naval service of the United States has been as follows:

Enlisted		Serial No.	Discharged		Rank and organization	Character of discharge
Date	Place		Date	Place		

NOTE.—If you served under a name other than the one used in this application, indicate the name under which you served and the period of service.

3. Have you filed claim for pension, compensation, or retirement pay? _____ (Yes or no)
What office has your case file? _____ (Location)

4. Give the name and address of your wife, or nearest relative, or guardian, or other person to notify in event of emergency.
_____ (Name) (Relationship) (Address)

NOTE.—Where application is for condition for which applicant was discharged for disability in line of duty, or held service connected by Veterans' Administration, questions 5, 6, and 7 need not be answered.

5. Are you entitled to hospital care by membership in a lodge, society, community group treatment plan, etc., or as a beneficiary of an insurance company, workmen's compensation commission, industrial accident board, etc.? _____ (Yes or no) If "Yes," give name of agency or organization _____

6. Are you financially able to pay the necessary expenses of hospital or domiciliary care? _____ (Yes or no)

7. Are you able to pay transportation to and from a Veterans' Administration facility? _____ (Yes or no)

8. Have you received hospital or domiciliary care from the Veterans' Administration? _____ (Yes or no)
If "Yes," state when _____ (Give most recent dates) and where _____ (Name of facility, home, or hospital)

8a. If discharged against medical advice, absence without official leave, for disciplinary reasons, or given an enforced furlough, underline applicable term.

I *{have read / have had read to me} and understand all questions and answers on this form, and the printed provisions on the reverse hereof.

The answers to all questions are true and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief. The foregoing questions and answers are made a part hereof with full knowledge of the penalty provided for making a false statement as to material fact in this application.

Witnesses to signature by mark (X)

1. _____ (Signature)
_____ (Address)

2. _____ (Signature)
_____ (Address)

_____ (Signature of applicant or representative)

Post office address _____ (Number) (Street)
_____ (City) (State)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____, 19____, by _____, claimant, to whom the statements herein were fully made known and explained. I certify that the questions and answers thereto have, in my presence, been *{read to / read by} the claimant.

[SEAL]

_____ *Notary Public.*

*Strike out inapplicable words or phrases.

PENAL PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO TITLE I, PUBLIC, NO. 2, 73D CONGRESS

SECTION 15. Any person who shall knowingly make or cause to be made, or conspire, combine, aid or assist in, agree to, arrange for, or in anywise procure the making or presentation of a false or fraudulent affidavit, declaration certificate, statement, voucher, or paper, or writing purporting to be such, concerning any claim for benefits under this title, shall forfeit all rights, claims, and benefits under this title, and, in addition to any and all other penalties imposed by law, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

REDUCTION OF PENSION, COMPENSATION, OR EMERGENCY OFFICERS' RETIREMENT PAY WHILE RECEIVING HOSPITAL OR DOMICILIARY CARE

Where any disabled veteran having neither wife, child, nor dependent parent is being furnished hospital treatment, institutional or domiciliary care by the United States or any political subdivision thereof, the pension, compensation, or emergency officers' retirement pay shall not exceed $20 per month, provided that the amount payable for such disabled veteran entitled to pension under Part III, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, for nonservice connected disability shall not exceed $8 per month, and provided further, that where any disabled veteran who is being furnished hospital treatment, institutional or domiciliary care by the United States or any political subdivision thereof, has a wife, child, or dependent parent the pension, compensation, or emergency officers' retirement pay may, in the discretion of the Administrator, be apportioned on behalf of such wife, child, or dependent parent, in accordance with instructions issued by the Administrator.

NOTE

This application is made with notice of Public Law No. 382 approved December 26, 1941 (38 U. S. Code 17-17j) which in effect provides that upon the death of any veteran receiving care or treatment by the Veterans' Administration in any institution leaving no widow (widower), next of kin or heir entitled to inherit, all personal property, including money or balances in bank, and all claims and choses in action, owned by such veteran, and not disposed of by will or otherwise, will become the property of the United States as trustee for the Post Fund.

MEDICAL CERTIFICATE

A careful physical (including mental) examination of the applicant discloses these findings and diagnosis:
(1) Brief history:
(2) Symptoms:
(3) Physical findings:
(4) Diagnosis:
(5) Strike out the clauses not applicable: The applicant (is) (is not) ambulant. He (is) (is not) mentally competent. He (will) (will not) need an attendant during his travel. The proposed attendant's name is _____ address _____ The attendant (is) (is not) a relative of the patient. It is proposed that travel, to the hospital will be made by (train), (bus), (automobile).

_____ (Date) _____ (Signature of examining physician) _____ (Street) _____ (City) _____ (State)

Saratoga Springs, N. Y., for World Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it is my fervent hope that the United Nations Organization will select some place in the United States for its permanent headquarters. It is my purpose to urge that Saratoga Springs, N. Y., be chosen as the city, and that our Government exert every influence to bring this about. Under permission granted to extend my remarks, I include copy of an invitation to the United Nations Organization from Saratoga Springs, N. Y., United States of America:

AN INVITATION TO THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION FROM SARATOGA SPRINGS, N. Y., U. S. A.

To Mr. Cladwyn Jebb, Executive Secretary of the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations Organization, Church House, Dean's Yard, London.

From: William E. Benton, Chairman, Committee on Advocation of Saratoga Springs for the Permanent Headquarters of the United Nations Organization.

NOVEMBER 8, 1945.

Nothing in technicolor, no elaborate brochures, no fanfare of publicity accompanies Saratoga Springs' (New York, U. S. A.) invitation to the United Nations Organization to locate its permanent headquarters in its vicinity. Our simple facts, stated briefly, need only the vertification of personal observation by those of the United Nations Organization to ascertain the validity which we claim for them.

Our invitation represents an even balancing of the two fundamental requisites for the location of the Permanent United Nations Organization headquarters—a balance between the significance in an historical sense of Saratoga on the one hand, and the practicability of Saratoga's location on the other.

Saratoga was the scene of one of the world's most decisive battles, an occasion remembered as "The Birthplace of Freedom." The United Nations Organization is certainly an institution founded upon Democratic principles, and thus shares the symbolic tradition that surrounds the site of the Battle of Saratoga, the birthplace of freedom. The significance of Saratoga lies in the fact of its appropriateness as the home of the United Nations Organization.

Historians have long written about Saratoga; the United States Government has created extensive park lands monumentalizing the battlefield. The destiny of the shrine would be justly that of serving the world with its symbolic reverance for everlasting hope, courage, and faith in the principles of freedom.

From the point of view of being a practical location for the headquarters of the United Nations Organization, Saratoga offers many unexcelled advantages. Stated briefly, they include:

1. Convenience to European and North American cities, yet apart from them in the foothills of the Adirondack Mountains of northern New York State, where the congestion and confusions of large populated centers would not be a distracting factor.

2. Accessibility by air, rail, and highway from all points of the compass. Map inspection will bear out this important fact.

3. Federally owned land offers a number of beautiful sites. Rolling hills with distant views of mountain ranges comprise the advantages of site location that would be difficult to equal on the eastern seaboard of America.

4. Healthful climate comparable with few other localities in the Western Hemisphere is to be found in the vicinity of Saratoga Springs, the home of one of the world's largest spas—the New York State-owned Saratoga Springs Authority. Millions share the pride of Saratogians in this wonderful $10,000,000 institution that has built for itself an enviable record. The treatment of a large number of Army personnel at this cure center has heightened interest in its great potentialities.

The offering of this brief statement is predicated by the belief that the United Nations Organization will not make a final selection of any site for its headquarters without investigating first-hand the various possibilities in the United States and other countries. Also, we in Saratoga are convinced that a voluminous report at this time would not do justice to our community with all its advantages, or would such a voluminous report form a suitable case to be considered at this stage of the decision-making process. Localities should be judged from definite and uniform standards set by the committee. These standards, once defined, should be made known to all who desire the opportunity of inviting the United Nations Organization to consider their respective sites as suitable for the Organization's headquarters.

Saratogians are joined by millions who share the breadth and depth of tremendous responsibility that is yours in deciding upon the location of the United Nations Organization headquarters. Our wishes and hopes are with you, who have been entrusted with the perpetuation of a lasting peace.

This invitation is extended by William E. Benton, chairman, Committee on Advocation of Saratoga Springs for the Permanent Headquarters of the United Nations Organization.

Submitted by:

STEWART H. JOHNSON,
Executive Secretary,
Saratoga Springs Chamber of Commerce.

Civilian Specialists Praise Army's Handling of Amputees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article from an Atlanta, Ga., newspaper praising the Army's handling of amputee cases:

WASHINGTON, November 18.—Three civilian orthopedic specialists reported tonight that the Army's 14,000 amputees have received the best surgery and treatment possible and generally are satisfied with their GI artificial limbs.

They ridiculed charges made in and out of Congress that the Army has supplied amputees with limbs of the cheapest possible construction and countered that the patients are provided equipment of the most costly type obtained from civilian shops.

The specialists are Dr. Harold Conn, Akron, Ohio, Dr. Paul B. Magnuson, associate professor of surgery at the Northwestern University Medical School, and Dr. Philip D. Wilson, clinical professor of orthopedic surgery at Columbia University's College of Physicians and Surgeons. They comprised a civilian consultant committee which studied Army techniques at first hand during an inspection tour of six amputation centers.

FINDINGS LISTED

In a report made public by the War Department, they listed these findings:

1. The Army's standardization of frontline amputation procedures saved countless lives and provided the best amputation stumps ever obtained.

2. Its program for training amputees after fitting of their artificial limbs is well considered and planned.

3. Army limb shops are adequately housed and well equipped and compare favorably with the best civilian shops.

KEYMEN UNREWARDED

The committee reported, however, that morale among Army shop personnel is poor and that steps should be taken immediately to correct it. Many workers who have become keymen have not been rewarded with adequate promotions and many believe they are being kept in the Army longer than necessary, it said.

But in general, the program has been administered in a more efficient manner than could have been possible had these unfortunate war victims been referred to civilian fitters.

Fortunately the war ended before their number exceeded 14,000, but if it had been two or three times as many, the services were such that all could have been handled with the same good care, expedition, and good results, it said. We feel that exceptional commendation is due the Surgeon General and the Medical Department of the Army for having successfully handled an emergency problem the like of which had never previously been encountered in modern times.

August Charles Backus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the State of Wisconsin has given the Nation many outstanding statesmen. One of the outstanding contemporary contributions to our national life is a lawyer, jurist, publisher, civic leader and public benefactor. He was my professor in criminal law at the Marquette University Law School.

The story of the life and achievement of this man is so American that I believe it will prove to be an inspiration to all. Under unanimous consent, I incorporate in my remarks at this time a biographical sketch of a man who helped make Wisconsin, the Honorable August Charles Backus, as prepared by Oliver E. Remey in his series, Men Who Have Made Wisconsin.

MEN WHO HAVE MADE WISCONSIN: AUGUST CHARLES BACKUS

(By Oliver E. Remey)

August Charles Backus, of the law firm of Backus & Parson, of Milwaukee, a leading member of the Wisconsin bar for many years, is notable for the many honors he has declined as well as for his exceptional attainments in the public life of Milwaukee and the Badger State. Since the beginning of the present century, he has been active in a wide range of civic projects, important war work, enforcement of law, and establishment of provisions to improve the status of first offenders against the law. As a legal adviser,

he includes among his clients executives of great industries of Milwaukee and leaders of that city's commercial and professional life. In the field of public service he has been assistant prosecuting attorney, district attorney, and municipal judge of Milwaukee County. In the educational field he has been regent of the University of Wisconsin and professor of criminal law at Marquette University, where he serves at present as chairmar of the advisory board and as trustee of the Marquette Medical School. From 1924 to 1930 he was president and publisher of the Milwaukee Sentinel. Since that time he has practiced law with his sons.

It was during his term of office as municipal judge of Milwaukee County, from 1910 to 1924, that he originated and subsequently developed the present adult probation system. By this means he has given thousands of young men and women first offenders an opportunity to make something of their lives, and, with his probation officers, has rehabilitated and reclaimed them as useful citizens. Forty-two States have followed his original idea in establishing the same system within their own jurisdictions.

In an address before the American Crime Commission in Chicago on May 30, 1927, Judge Backus stressed the need for understanding the first offender and justified his probation methods, which should be understood not as a species of leniency, as some seem to believe, nor a license for first offenders to commit a crime, but a scientific method of treating offenders who are relatively socialized and who are in good environment. "It is the showing of the way, it is to protect the offender against himself, to aid him and reclaim him, not to crush him. The home, the church, and the school must be called upon to aid in this important work of rehabilitation. I know they will respond."

The judge's address won the approval of the convention, which adopted all of his suggestions and elected him president of the organization. His treatment of the first offender was the result of an exhaustive study made during his long experience on the bench and as prosecuting attorney; for the hardened criminal he advised segregation from society. Milwaukee had the lowest crime rate of any city in the world.

At the conclusion of this address Governor Whitman, of New York, president of the American Bar Association and president of the Crime Commission, said, addressing Judge Backus:

"I know I speak the sentiments of everybody here when I tell you we have enjoyed your wonderful address. It is just what we need. I wish the public had it as we have had it. Judge Backus' address is vital at this time. He has absolutely proven from the experience of Milwaukee that severity in punishment is not a remedy for crime. He has outlined clearly what we should do with them, and the first offenders. I have never heard an abler argument in my life than the one he has just given us."

Another of the outstanding judicial accomplishments of Judge Backus was to effect a change in existing laws promulgating a procedure which substituted a board of alienists in trying insanity cases, for the old method of tedious and protracted trials before a jury. A dramatic example of this was the case of the State of Wisconsin vs. John Flammang Schrank, at which Judge Backus presided. Schrank was on trial on October 14, 1912, for the attempted assassination of ex-President Theodore Roosevelt in Milwaukee on October 12, 1912, just 2 days before. Instead of permitting the confusion of testimony by partisan alienists, Judge Backus appointed an impartial commission of five outstanding alienists to examine Schrank's mental condition. The commission unanimously reported to the court that in their opinion Schrank was insane. On November 22, 1912, Judge Backus committed Schrank to the Central Hospital for the Insane at Waupun, Wis., with the provision that in the event of Schrank's return to sanity, the man must stand trial for his attempt on the life of Theodore Roosevelt. Schrank died on September 16, 1943, without having regained sanity.

These two leading paragraphs from an editorial presented by the Chicago Record-Herald, in which they commented upon Judge Backus' appointment of the sanity commission which passed upon Schrank's mental condition represent the concensus of world-wide newspaper editorial opinion of a method that freed the court once and for all from the babble of testimony of interested alienists:

"It is notorious that 'expert testimony' is too often confusing testimony which judges and juries feel themselves bound to disregard in favor of mere horse sense. The State's experts are matched or overmatched by the experts for the defense, and the conflict of scientific testimony assumes in many cases the proportion of public scandal.

"Hence the 'Wisconsin idea,' as introduced by Judge Backus, of Milwaukee, who is presiding over the trial of John Schrank, is an admirable one. Under the statute of Wisconsin a Wisconsin judge may summon a certain number of experts and make them officers of the court. They testify as such officers, and presumably the State pays them reasonable fees. Under such a plan as this there is no temptation to strain science in the interest of a long purse, and impartial opinion is likely to be the rule."

President Herbert Hoover offered Judge Backus several judicial appointments, among them one to the Federal court, but all were declined. A letter from President Hoover to Judge Backus sets forth this information as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 21, 1932.

Judge A. C. BACKUS,
Milwaukee, Wis.

MY DEAR JUDGE BACKUS: As I shall be leaving public office in a few months it occurs to me that it might be of interest to your family at some time if I make a record of the fact that I suggested to you over a year ago that I would like to nominate you for a position on the Federal bench; that you informed me your private affairs were such that you could not at that time accept such an appointment; that I have renewed the suggestion from time to time since, and being convinced that you would render valuable service, that I had fully intended to press this matter upon you if the Republican Party had been returned to power.

While many years of friendship might enter into such relations, in making judicial suggestions I think you will find that I have disregarded all questions of friendship and based my views solely upon merit and fitness.

With kind regards, I am

Yours fatihfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

August C. Backus was born at Kewaskum, Wis., on April 24, 1877. His father, August F. Backus, was a friend of President Lincoln and had served with Wisconsin troops in the Civil War.

After receiving a first-grade teachers' certificate, he taught school for a period before entering upon the study of law. Later he attended the University of Wisconsin, from which he was graduated in 1900 with a degree of bachelor of law. In 1918 Marquette University gave him an honorary doctor of law. Admitted to the bar in 1900, he became in 1905 an assistant district attorney of Milwaukee County In 1909 he was elected by the people district attorney and served in that capacity until his appointment as municipal judge in 1910.

From 1901 to 1904, Judge Backus served as chairman of the International Child Labor Committee, having been appointed to that position at the World's Fair convention at St. Louis, Mo. The activities of the committee were sponsored by the United States, England and Canada. During the first year of his chairmanship, he took 4600 children from industries and sweatshops and put them in school. All were under 14 years of age.

His interest in child welfare has continued to the present day, and for more than 25 years he has been actively interested in the Boy Scout movement. For his quarter of a century in their interests, he was recently awarded the highest honor that organization bestows. For more than 30 years the Boy Scouts have had use of a camp site at Fox Point that was donated by Judge Backus.

At the conclusion of World War I, Judge Backus was awarded a gold medal by the American Legion for his patriotic service during that war in aiding the activities of the following organizations: American Defense Society; American Red Cross; American Relief Association; Council of National Defense; Salvation Army; United States Food Administration; United States Liberty Loan Committee; United States War Savings Committee; War Camp Community Service; YMCA; as city chairman of the American Legion Endowment Fund Committee of Milwaukee which raised a quota, and another large amount for the Boy Scouts of America.

Judge Backus was also chairman of committees which raised more than a million dollars each for the Milwaukee Children's Hospital and for a recreational center for the Boys of the American Luther Association of Milwaukee. He was chairman of a committee which raised more than $2,000,000 for Marquette University and the Marquette Medical School, and has served in similar capacities in the interests of the blind, many other hospitals, community and civic drives.

In 1923 Judge Backus was elected president of the National Probation Association and through the efforts of President Coolidge and the organization, an act was passed on March 4, 1925, giving the Federal Judges the power to put first offenders on probation.

In 1922 the Wisconsin Supreme Court paid tribute to Judge Backus in an opinion (178 Wis. 202) rendered by Chief Justice Aad J. Vinge:

"Judge Backus has had a long experience as judge of a court that hears nothing but criminal cases and is kept busy all the time. He has besides, by his interest in a rational treatment of criminals, earned a reputation for fairness and insight that is enviable."

During the Second World War Judge Backus has been very active in the national war interest. For "uncompensated services patriotically rendered his country in the administration of the Selective Service System for a period of 3 years", he was awarded in September 1943 a certificate of appreciation signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Gov. Walter S. Goodland of Wisconsin.

For his service in helping to raise part of $5,000,000 in the nation last year (1942) for immediate relief for wounded soldiers and widows and children of men who lost their lives at Pearl Harbor, Judge Backus received an acknowledgment of that patriotic service from the United States Navy Relief Society, signed by Admiral Ernest J. King, commanding the United States Navy. Judge Backus is Milwaukee chairman of the Board of Appeals for Selective Draft of the Fifth Congressional District.

Judge Backus married Elizabeth Housman on August 27, 1902. They have two daughters and two sons. The daughters are the wives, respectively, of Dr. Claus Jordan, of Stroudsburg, Pa., and Dr. Alvah Newcomb, of Wilmette, Ill., now in war service as lieutenant commanders, Medical Corps of the Navy. The sons, August C., Jr., and Walter A., are Milwaukee attorneys, associated with their father in the practice of law. The Backus

residence is at 722 East Lakeview Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.

The story of August Backus cannot be told merely in a cold, printed list of achievements. It cannot be written solely by recording the honors and the recognitions which have come to him. The achievements and the recognitions are but the lengthening shadow of a man whose warm human traits have endeared him to his friends fully as much as to his accomplishments.

The printed record does not tell of that humble background from which he has drawn the fundamental simplicity, innate dignity, and rugged honesty of God-loving parents. The printed record tells of his outstanding contributions in initiating a model program of probation, but it does not tell of the deep, kindly, personal interest and the hours of Christian, character-building counsel he gave to those who sought rehabilitation. The records of a distinguished career as a jurist and civic leader do not show the indulgent grandfather with 14 adored grandchildren gathered about him.

Today, with the sturdy vigor of his 6-foot-1 frame unimpaired, and with a mind mellowed by the rich experiences of crowded years, Judge Backus is a valued elder counselor whose life accomplishments as a jurist, humanitarian, and civic leader over the decades are a very real part of the historic legend of Wisconsin leadership.

Surplus Goods Gag America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very well written editorial by Mr. Gordon Bush, the editor of the Athens Messenger of Athens, Ohio.

Mr. Bush has discussed a timely subject with clarity and conviction. The editorial is as follows:

SURPLUS GOODS GAG AMERICA

Think of anything you want to buy, and the Government has it to sell. The list of war surplus goods includes 150,000 kinds of consumer goods.

They are supposed to be for sale, yet few of them have been offered through the confused, red-tape channels for disposal of surplus property; and few people have been allowed to get at them.

The story is a long one. It varies with almost each classification of goods. But the fact remains that billions of dollars' worth of usable goods and supplies, articles and equipment, machines and raw stock are lying around right in this country with the problem yet unsolved as to what to do with the stuff.

These goods were paid for with the taxpayers' dollars. They represent much of what war-bond funds went to buy. They may or may not represent overbuying by the military authorities, but the fact remains they have not been used, will not be used by the armed forces, and millions of dollars' worth of them are rotting, rusting, weathering away. While it is true that some disposition has been and is being made, the accomplishments are not a drop in the bucket to the total physical stock pile nor to the total first cost.

Because industry is not able to reconvert and produce as rapidly as pent-up demand wants the products of industry, is one reason why these surpluses should be made available to anyone who can put up a fair price and take the goods away to places where they will be serviceable.

Another reason is that many potential users of much materials would never be able to buy these things in the open market at standard prices.

Another reason is that the public welfare—education and governmental institutions, political subdivisions, and public works—have a crying need for these goods and an ability to use them in the broadest sense of the general good.

Another reason for disposing of them widely and quickly is that many of these goods are, by postwar standards, obsolete, yet perfectly useful and usable. On top of it all is the weakest reason, that any money derived from distribution of war surpluses to the public will lessen the public debt created by their original purchase.

Against these reasons for distribution is the old saw about interfering with production and employment in the next few years to come. Yet the best arguments for distribution hit that one right in the head. Nor has it ever proven true that waste is justified anywhere for any reason.

Warehouses are full of these thousands of articles. Army depots are crammed with stuff civilians could use. Most pressing, probably, is the serious shortage of building materials, supplies, and home equipment. The manufacturers see no chance to meet the demands for postwar building for 2 years. Returning veterans are walking the streets, looking for shelter for themselves and their new young families.

At the same time demountable housing stands crated and useless; prefabricated houses by the thousands clutter the landscape, empty, around shut-down war plants. Critical parts of homes are stored in unbelievable quantities and are staying stored—becoming less useful every season and virtually impossible to get hold of.

But under the present law managing this great wealth of wasted American work, nothing can be done except what is being done. The law is a strait-jacket. The people are impatient and angry. The heads of Government are afraid to act for fear they will make a mistake that would anger the United States Chamber of Commerce, or somebody. The Army is reluctant to give up anything it has acquired. No one knows just what is where, nor what discretion might be exercised in making it available. It is the scandal of our postwar home economy.

Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I believe the attention of the House should be called to the following telegram which I received from the American Federation of Radio Artists, comprising over 19,000 members, in regard to the abolition of the Committee on Un-American Activities. This telegram represents the thought not only of persons connected with radio but all those people who value the basic right of free speech guaranteed by our Constitution:

Representative ELLIS E. PATTERSON,

House of Representatives Office Building:

The American Federation of Radio Artists has sent the following telegram to Representative JOHN S. WOOD and members of House Committee on Un-American Activities:

"The American Federation of Radio Artists, the union of all actors, singers, and announcers, and persons who speak or sing over the microphone in the United States of America, comprising over 19,000 members and affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, is shocked at the violation of the right of free speech and the unconstitutional exercise of censorship by the majority action of your committee in demanding certain radio scripts from designated radio artists who have exercised their legitimate right of employment in broadcasting over stations and networks in this country. The demand of your committee under cloak of congressional privilege, freely publicized in the press, is tantamount to the star-chamber proceedings which were outlawed by the Bill of Rights. In certain instances your action has even threatened the livelihood of American citizens who are privileged to speak as all citizens are in open meeting, on the air, or in the press, without fear or favor of censorship. In our opinion your action transgresses the boundaries of congressional privileges and by selecting a few named individuals out of the many artists who broadcast news, commentation, and analyses to the American public. You editorialize the entire field and by your action you stigmatize those few whose scripts you demand. The very name of your committee calls for the highest degree of integrity in investigation and we earnestly submit that in this instance you have fallen short as committee members of that degree of integrity and we protest that action and any continuation of such tactics."

So grievous do we regard the injury done to our members, to the public, and over all to the principles of free speech in this country that we desire to go on record on behalf of the entire membership as seeking the dissolution of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Sincerely yours,

NATIONAL BOARD, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF RADIO ARTISTS,

By EMILY HOLT,

National Executive Secretary,

GEORGE HELLER,

Associate Secretary and Treasurer.

An Invitation to the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the Governors of South Dakota, Nebraska, and Wyoming have joined in submitting an invitation to the United Nations Organization to establish the site of the permanent United Nations capital in the Black Hills.

To accompany the official invitation an illustrated brochure has been prepared. This brochure, along with pictures of the Black Hills area, carries the

facsimile of the official invitation signed by the Governors and a facsimile of the letter which the late President, Franklin D. Rosevelt, wrote April 7, 1945, only 4 days before his death, expressing his interest in the invitation.

Because of the great importance to this Nation and to the world of a proper location for the capital of the United Nations Organization, I place in the RECORD, with the permission of the House, the text of this brochure entitled:

AN INVITATION DEDICATED TO THE PURPOSE OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR THEIR PERMANENT CAPITAL IN THE BLACK HILLS COUNTRY

(From Gov. Dwight Griswold, Nebraska; Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, South Dakota; Gov. Lester C. Hunt, Wyoming)

AN INVITATION

To the United Nations:

We, the Governors of the sovereign States of Nebraska, South Dakota, and Wyoming, cordially invite you to select within our beautiful and interesting Black Hills country a site for the permanent capital of the United Nations.

This booklet gives you a general idea of the Black Hills country. We invite your representatives to visit it, experience its delightful climate, variety of altitudes, valleys, plateaus, forests, lakes, and streams. Soon you would be conscious of its adaptability for the majestic purpose to which we wish to dedicate it.

Equally important with its natural environment are some facts of its history and location, as follows:

1. The most equally convenient by air travel to all the nations of the world of any place on earth. (See map enclosed.)

2. At the junction of three sovereign States in the center of the North American Continent.

3. The States which invite you are a part of the United States, which has been able to maintain peace among sovereign States as the United Nations may do among sovereign nations.

4. No large city will absorb your capital's identity. Build your own capital on natural location with its own individuality, in your own time, in your own way, adaptable to your own purposes.

5. No racial, religious, or nationalistic controversies exist. Complete freedom of religion and equality of persons before the law have always existed here.

Most cordially and earnestly do we invite you to come and see, to investigate and analyze, and then to make this Black Hills country, these mountains of the prairies, the permanent peace capital of the world.

DWIGHT GRISWOLD,
Governor, State of Nebraska.
M. Q. SHARPE,
Governor, State of South Dakota.
LESTER C. HUNT,
Governor, State of Wyoming.

TO FORM A MORE PERFECT UNION

The invitation to the United Nations is not a one-State or one-region invitation. Gov. Dwight Griswold, of Nebraska, and Gov. Lester C. Hunt, of Wyoming, join Gov. M. Q. Sharpe in suggesting the Black Hills country as an ideal permanent capital.

THE WHITE HOUSE COMMENTS

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 7, 1945.

MY DEAR MR. CASE: I have before me your letter of March 15, 1945, suggesting the suitability of the Black Hills as a permanent headquarters for the proposed organization of the United Nations.

In thanking you for your interesting suggestion, I assure you that it will receive full consideration whenever the question of the location of the permanent seat of the proposed organization is under discussion.

Very sincerely yours,
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives.

(The above letter was signed at Warm Springs, Ga., 4 days before the death of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. In conversation, too, President Roosevelt expressed his keen interest in the Black Hills country as a permanent capital.)

PRESIDENT FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT AT MOUNT RUSHMORE IN THE BLACK HILLS, WHEN HE DEDICATED THE LIKENESS OF THOMAS JEFFERSON

Sculptor Gutzon Borglum has his hand raised toward the great memorial while former Gov. Tom Berry, of South Dakota; is at Roosevelt's side.

Roosevelt proclaimed: "I am very happy to congratulate all of you, not only on what we see today but on what is going to happen in the future at Mount Rushmore. Mr. Borglum has well said that this can be a monument and an inspiration for the continuance of the democratic republican form of government, not only in our own beloved country, but, we hope, throughout the world."

PRESIDENT CALVIN COOLIDGE IN FRONT OF STATE GAME LODGE IN BLACK HILLS—SUMMER WHITE HOUSE FOR 3 MONTHS IN 1927

On August 2, 1927, President Coolidge made his famous statement from Rapid City: "I do not choose to run for President in 1928." Handed to newsmen on small typewritten slips of paper, it electrified the Nation.

It was also in the Black Hills that Coolidge made one of his first informal speeches after being in the White House. He said:

"I doubt if anyone went to any part of the country that he would find it more interesting and more inspiring than this locality.

"I am glad to be in this beautiful country. I have never seen anything which excels it.

"I am 1,800 miles from Washington but I am in just as intimate touch as if I were in Baltimore, Philadelphia, or Cleveland."

When he left in September, Coolidge said: "I want to express my very deep appreciation of your fine hospitality and it is my hope that in the future I may make many visits to this pleasant and restful country of yours."

WENDELL L. WILLKIE AT MOUNT RUSHMORE REPORTS TO THE NATION

Wendell L. Willkie stressed his dominant love for freedom, patriotism, and better understanding among nations while standing at the base of Rushmore Memorial in the Black Hills. This was shortly after he returned from Russia.

Pointing to the great growth of Russia he emphasized the importance of the American people having a better understanding of that great Nation. His book, One World had been released to the public but a short time before that.

He praised the Black Hills for the beauty Nature had bestowed upon it.

Shown with him in the picture above are Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, left of microphone, and Congressman FRANCIS CASE.

THE BLACK HILLS AREA IS THE OLDEST KNOWN BY MAN

The rocky and mountainous region of the Black Hills has been traced from the beginning of time by geologists. This "oldest region known to man" is recognized for its spirit of friendliness and fair play. Racial discriminations are unknown in the Black Hills and our Constitution guarantees complete religious freedom.

Location

The Black Hills is in the center of the North American Continent, at the apex of South Dakota, Wyoming, and Nebraska. It is an area 50 miles wide and 100 miles long. Vast amounts of gold have been found in the hills—it has been mined there since 1876.

Climate and health

The ideal all-year-round climate is conducive to excellent health and invigorating living. Elevations range from 3,200 to 7,242 feet. There is freedom from stifling humidity and mosquitos and other insects, making a veritable paradise in which to live. It is nonvolcanic and free from earthquakes. South Dakota ranks as the first State in the Nation in health among the American armed forces.

Transportation

The Rapid City Army Air Base, a training base for B–17's, at the edge of the Black Hills, ranks first in the Second Air Force for hours of flying time. It is an excellent post, with full concrete runways, and accommodates the largest land planes used by the Air Force.

Air lines operate passenger service with connections for all points in the Nation. They place the Black Hills within 24 hours of the most distant places in the world.

Three railways serve the region—the Chicago & North Western, the Milwaukee road, and the Burlington route—providing rail transportation from all principal cities of the Nation.

Tourist facilities

In 1941, the last normal tourist year, more than 1,000,000 vacationists visited this beautiful and mountainous Switzerland of America. Ample accommodations are provided in the cities, the national forests, Custer State Park, and on the lakes.

A significant name—Dakota

The Sioux Indians, first to inhabit this land, sacred to them, named the region "Dakota." In their language, this means "An alliance of friends."

United Nations capital location

Wide plateaus amid towering peaks provide ample space to build a city for an alliance of nations. This would be a permanent home, free from outside influences, and which would be declared an international area. Not only would it be erected to suit the purpose, but it would be easily accessible from anywhere in the world.

AN ATMOSPHERE OF PEACE

Abundant broad valleys amongst the wooded mountains suggest a lasting peace and tranquillity. Clear, quiet, spring-fed streams run through the mountains and jewel-like lakes dot the Black Hills region. Wild deer, elk, buffalo, and mountain goats graze in the forests.

NOTED PEOPLE KNOW THE BLACK HILLS COUNTRY

The Black Hills region has entertained an increasing number of noted people from this country and abroad following President Coolidge's visit in 1927. There have been many nationally important events take place in the region in the past 25 years.

President Theodore "Teddy" Roosevelt was probably the first famous visitor following, of course, Gen. George A. Custer and other prominent soldiers of the early pioneer days. Historic Deadwood has a monument honoring President "Teddy" Roosevelt.

Gen. H. H. "Hap" Arnold was in charge of airplane activities and air mail during President Coolidge's visit. Other famous visitors were Gen. John J. Pershing, former Presidents W. H. Taft, Herbert Hoover, Calvin Coolidge, and Franklin D. Roosevelt; James R Sheffield, former Ambassador to Mexico; Secretary of the Interior Curtis Wilbur, Maj. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Gen. Hanford MacNider, Senator Arthur Capper, Gov. Gen. Leonard Wood, Secretary of the Interior Hubert Work, Secretary of Labor John T. Davis, Senator Smoot, Senator Fess, and many other Cabinet members, Congressmen, Senators, and Governors.

Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, former Secretary of War, and Frank Knox, former Secretary of the Navy, were notable visitors within recent years.

Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., visited Mount Rushmore to see his father's likeness on the mountain. Hollywood too has sent famous people to visit the hills, including Clark Gable, Elsie Janis, Carole Lombard, Elyse Knox, Mary Garden, George Raft and Jack Benny, as well as many of the outstanding producers.

John W. Bricker, of Ohio, Vice Presidential candidate in 1944, former Gov. Frank Lowden, of Illinois, Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Frank Lloyd Wright, the noted architect, Cornelius Vanderbilt, Amelia Earhart, Charles A. Lindbergh, Mackenzie King, Julius Rosenwald, Sir Gerald Campbell, British Minister, are but some of the others who have visited and praised the Black Hills region.

One of the notable events to take place in the Black Hills was the record-breaking stratosphere flight. Two such flights were sponsored by the National Geographic Society and the Army Air Corps in 1934 and 1935. The second flight attained the world's altitude record of 73,000 feet, or 14 miles. Gen. William Kepner and Gen. Orville A. Anderson, presently with the Air Force, were pilot and observer. Col. Albert W. Stevens was photographic scientist developing much of the high altitude photography now being used so successfully in this war.

The Black Hills region was a mecca for world-known scientists and Army Air Corps officials for weeks before the flights took place. Dr. Gilbert Grosvenor, president of the National Geographic Society, and Dr. Lyman J. Briggs, Director of National Bureau of Standards, were among the many.

HARNEY PEAK

Harney Peak, near the center of the Black Hills, rising to 7,242 feet from the broad plains and spacious plateaus, acts as a sentinel for this 35-by-110-mile area. It is the highest mountain peak east of the Rocky Mountains in the United States.

Mountain streams and lakes provide plenty of water and are responsible for the lush vegetation in valleys and fields.

Three national forests, Government-owned, cover 5,000 square miles.

Custer State Park is the largest State-owned park in America, covering 130,000 acres.

Many beautiful lakes, nestled in mountain pine, birch, and spruce provide cool and comfortable recreation centers. There are four State-owned lodges.

YEAR-ROUND ACTIVITIES

Lakes and streams offer opportunities to fish, boat, and swim in the summer, and to skate, coast, and ski in the winter. Cities and groups in the hills provide a year-round program of activities, educational and historical, as well as entertaining. From any of the several sites that might be selected as permanent headquarters, opportunities abound for hiking, horseback riding, golfing, and other outdoor sports.

CATHEDRAL SPIRES

Nature's own work of awe-inspiring beauty—a place where travelers stop by the road to meditate on its greatness. Like the flutes of a majestic organ, the Cathedral Spires greet sun and stars.

RESTFUL LAKES

Sylvan Lake, shown above, is but one of many in the Black Hills region. It is the highest in the hills—more than 1 mile above sea level and is walled by granite pinnacles. The new lodge is atop the pine-clad mountain at left, center.

Build in the Black Hills country a United Nations capital for world peace, where the last frontier of the world still remains in natural condition, free from embarrassing historical influences, awaiting the United Nations Charter to free the world of war.

Whence Comes the Explosive Atom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, to those who have followed the record of mineral discoveries throughout the world as reported in the mining journals published in this country, the discovery and utilization of the rare minerals have been most interesting. First, the discovery of radium and then its gradual application to medicine and science with a new source of supply found in the heart of Africa followed by a discovery in the frozen fastness of the Arctic where it was found associated with another rare element, uranium, the heaviest of minerals.

Little did the world realize the significance and import to humanity of the discovery of these rare elements in the Arctic fastness of northern Canada reported in mining journals of a few years ago, a mining development which is reviewed in an illuminating article entitled "Arctic Cradle of the Atom," by Richard L. Neuberger, and which I have taken the liberty of condensing and rearranging for presentation herewith:

ARCTIC CRADLE OF THE ATOM

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

With numb fingers a hungry and half-frozen Canadian geologist, engaged in a pioneer exploration of a vast lake on the Arctic Circle, scribbled a few words as he looked up at cliffs tinted with strange pinkish seams. Then he and his guide hurried south to beat the winter that was closing down on the barren lands. In his wildest fantasies the geologist could never know that the single sentence he had written would help make possible, nearly half a century later, a pair of frightful explosions which would end the most devastating war in history.

Uranium atoms, disintegrating with force beyond human understanding blew apart over two Japanese cities and the Imperial Government at Tokyo surrendered. Uranium was the tragic ingredient in this incredible conclusion to the Second World War. Of the 92 different kinds of atoms, the uranium atom is the heaviest and has properties that no other element has. A uranium atom with 143 neutrons is known to science as U–235. Working in secrecy and haste, scientists discovered that U–235 could be split.

Thus was the atomic bomb born. It is the product of uranium atoms as they disintegrate and explode.

Uranium comes from the bleak spot in the Canadian Arctic where, in the autumn of 1900, Dr. James Mackintosh Bell, of the Canadian Geological Survey, scrawled this obscure sentence in his notebook:

"In the greenstones east of McTavish Arm the steep rock shores, which here present themselves to the lake, are often stained with cobalt bloom and copper green."

One afternoon in 1930, a prospector named Gilbert La Bine was rummaging through the reports of the Geological Survey. He was looking for likely sources of copper. Suddenly he jumped excitedly to his feet. He had read the sentence describing the rocks stained with cobalt bloom.

Where was McTavish Arm? Camsell turned to a map of Canada and pointed to Great Bear Lake. At the east end of the lake is an inlet almost on the Arctic Circle. "This is Echo Bay," Camsell told La Bine. "Right here is McTavish Arm. At this spot you will find the rocks with the pink stains."

La Bine rose to go. "It is a big, tough country," said the commissioner. Good luck.

It was tough indeed. Winter temperatures crowded 80 degrees below.

On a long, treeless point extending into Great Bear Lake, his search ended. He scraped at a black substance like hard dried-up tar. He examined it in the sunlight. He tapped it with his hammer. He turned to St. Paul tensely, for in his gloved hand was one of the rare substances of the earth, pitchblende, source of radium.

It proved to be the greatest pitchblende strike ever found. Only one other substantial deposit was known to exist in the Katanga district of the Belgian Congo in Africa. There is a supply of pitchblende in Czechoslovakia, where the Curies obtained the radium for their experiments. However, this supply is relatively submarginal and ceased to be used when the Congo deposit was discovered.

Between the Canadian and Congo deposits there was no comparison. The Congo pitchblende yielded 20 milligrams of radium to the ton. The pitchblende discovered by La Bine yielded 120 milligrams. When La Bine set out for Great Bear Lake, the price of radium was $80,000 a gram. After he revealed his discovery, the price dropped to $25,000.

For almost 10 years La Bine and his associates paid little attention to the fact that one of the byproducts of the Port Radium deposits was a substance called uranium oxide. The byproduct was useful in glass pigments and porcelain manufacture and brought a good return. In fact, in a year when 23 grams of radium sold for approximately $570,000, the resulting byproduct of 211,857 pounds of uranium salts returned a respectable $271,100. La Bine's Arctic find not only sliced two-thirds off the price of radium, but also cut 38 percent off the cost of uranium byproducts.

In 1941 two scientists, Jack DeMent and H. C. Drake, published a book called uranium and atomic power. As the major source of uranium they looked to Port Radium on Great Bear Lake. The deposits of pitchblende in the Canadian Arctic, said these prophetic scientists, were the most extensive on earth, from both the standpoint of quality and that of quantity.

In laboratories in the United States, scientists were experimenting with uranium. They studied all the 92 elements thus far isolated by man. But always they returned to uranium. And invariably the uranium that was the object of their studies came from Gilbert La Bine's pitchblende deposits, 26 miles south of the Arctic Circle.

Great Bear Lake is 12,000 square miles in area, far larger, for example, than the State of Maryland. Storms toss it in summer. Ice 8 feet thick sheathes it in the 10-month-long winter. "There are two seasons up here," joked an American mining engineer working at the La Bine Point pitchblende deposits. "One is the Fourth of July, the other is winter."

On January 28, 1944, Gilbert La Bine's Eldorado Mining & Refining Co., Ltd., was expropriated by the Canadian Government. It was not a wartime lease or rental. It was done in perpetuity—forever. La Bine and his staff were retained to operate the Port Radium deposits and the refining plant at Port Hope in Ontario, but the shareholders in the company were paid at $1.35 a share. The purchase cost the Government of Canada $5,000,000. When indignant and mystified stockholders wrote protesting letters, military security agencies advised them not to ask questions.

Nor was there an explanation until the first atomic bomb exploded over Hiroshima on August 5, 1945, a year and a half after the Port Radium deposits had been made the property of the Dominion Government.

Sixty tons of chemicals are required to reduce 10 tons of pitchblende to the radium and uranium concentrates and it was easier to transport the pitchblende to the refinery than to assemble a refinery on Great Bear Lake. Thus aerial augmenting of the summer barge shipments was essential to the atomic-bomb experiments.

Using two of the Mackenzie's tributaries, the Slave and Athabaska Rivers, barges, and sternwheelers finally brought it (pitchblende) to waterways in the Province of Alberta, 1,400 miles from Port Radium.

But this wilderness waterway could be used only 3 months of the year. The rest of the time it was locked in a barricade of ice.

If it had not been for the airplane, transportation of ore from Port Radium would have been confined to the short period of the midnight sun, from July until mid-September.

Pitchblende is still being chopped from the veins and seams on Great Bear Lake to be reduced to radium for the treatment of cancer, and to its byproduct uranium for purposes which only the future can tell.

Iowa, the Great State With Unlimited Opportunities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, "Iowa, the great State with unlimited opportunities" is the caption of an interesting and instructive statement published in the Oskaloosa (Iowa) Daily Herald of November 22. It gives a number of pertinent facts about Iowa and its opportunities that I am certain will be of interest to every Member of Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a portion of the story of Iowa, probably the greatest agricultural area on the face of the globe:

IOWA, THE GREAT STATE WITH UNLIMITED OPPORTUNITIES

The surface is a rolling prairie. No civilized area in the world of equal size has such consistently fertile soil. Altitudes range from 477 feet above sea level to 1,670 feet at the highest point.

The proportion of area actually under cultivation is larger than any other State. The diversity of its crops is unexcelled anywhere in the world.

The Iowa farm census showed that there were (January 1, 1940) on Iowa farms 117,838 tractors, an average of 1 tractor for each farm and one-half.—Taken from the 1945 World Almanac.

IOWA FACTS

Iowa produces more corn than any other State or foreign country.

Iowa produces and markets more hogs than any other two States in the Union.

Iowa in 1944 marketed 15,800,000 head of hogs, over half which were slaughtered by packing plants within the State.

Iowa is the leading poultry State in the Nation and in 1944, Iowa hens produced over 4,000,000 eggs.

Iowa supplies the consumer of the Nation with more corn-fattened beef than any other State.

Iowa in 1944 produced 213,000,000 pounds of creamery butter.

Iowa produces more popcorn and is the world center for this industry.

Iowa produces more oats than any other State.

Iowa produces one-half of the timothy seed raised in the United States.

Iowa's soil produces more wealth each year than all the gold mines of the world.

Iowa has 43 daily and 441 weekly newspapers.

Iowa has 25 radio broadcasting stations located in 18 different cities.

IOWA INDUSTRY

Over 4,000,000 tons of coal is mined annually and great quantities of gypsum plaster, building stone, clay products, cement, sand, and gravel are produced.

Iowa ranks high as a manufacturing State. There are 2,760 manufacturing establishments located throughout the State, and in 1941, the value of their output was more than $800,000,000 as compared to its cash farm income of $919,515,000. Important industries are the processing of its agricultural products and the handling of grain and livestock. Farm implements, washing machines, fountain pens, cosmetics, buttons, railroad equipment, furnaces of all types, lawn mowers, calendars, batteries, auto accessories, and office equipment are among the items manufactured.

IOWA EDUCATION

In Iowa there are 912 high schools, with an enrollment of 72,000 students. Iowa has 25 institutions of higher learning, including the University of Iowa and the State College of Agriculture. In addition, there is a teachers college, two professional and technical schools, and 34 junior colleges. Iowa has 299 public libraries. As has been said, "Of all that is good, Iowa affords the best."

* * * * *

IOWA TALKS

Iowa stands first, of all the States in the Nation, in rural telephone development. This is consistent with the fact that a larger percent of Iowa's land is under cultivation than any other State. About 80 percent of the farms in the State are served by telephone. In urban residential telephone development, Iowa ranks third, with a telephone for every five persons. When business installations, including hotels and offices, are considered, only seven States outrank Iowa. Hotel and extensive business installations in large cities are mostly responsible for this standing.

There are 610,000 telephones in Iowa, of which 54 percent are owned and operated by the Northwestern Bell Telephone Co. and 46 percent by the 767 independent companies. The lines of the independent companies interconnect with the long-distance lines of the Bell company in providing long-distance service throughout the State and to points over the Nation. Iowa is well served by transcontinental trunk lines, both east-west and north-south. Iowa telephone users made over 22,000,000 long-distance calls during 1944.

The Bell company's construction program in Iowa for the 5 postwar years calls for an annual expenditure of $5,500,000. This will be spent for replacements deferred during the war and for service improvements and extensions. One of the most important aims of this program is to make telephone service available to every farm in the territory served by the company which may require an expenditure of around $1,000,000.

IOWA SEES AND LISTENS

Here is another big and interesting first for Iowa. It is of striking importance to note that today 99.9 percent of the urban population of Iowa has electrical service available. Of the 700,000 Iowa families, 557,343 dwelling units have electrical lighting. There just isn't a location in Iowa which any manufacturer would select for his plant where he wouldn't find electrical service awaiting for him. The Rural Electrical News, prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture, taken from the 1940 census, shows that 61.4 percent of Iowa farms have electrical service available. With the war ended and materials fast becoming available, this percentage will show a tremendous increase in the next 2 years. * * *

Ninety-nine percent of Iowa families enjoy radio reception in their homes. There are 25 radio stations ranging from 250 watts to 50,000 watts power to service them. These radio broadcasting stations are located in 18 Iowa cities. According to the Iowa poll of September 1945, Iowans in 238,000 homes are ready to purchase new radios to the tune of $12,000,000.

Resolutions of Marshall County (Iowa) Farm Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, as part of these remarks I include resolutions adopted recently by the Marshall County (Iowa) Farm Bureau. This organization has a membership of 1,221 families, living in one of the best farming communities of the United States. The resolutions which were adopted unanimously are a very sensible statement on some of the great problems concerning the country.

The resolutions are as follows:

PAID PERSONNEL

We view with great satisfaction the progress of the Marshall County Farm Bureau during the past year, and wish to compliment the entire salaried group of officers and helpers for their loyal service and notable achievements. Good gains have been made in membership. The Farm Service Co. has had a liberal increase in volume of business. The gains in the insurance department have been remarkable. The serum business has had a wonderful growth.

The REA is giving satisfactory service. Club work has gone forward and is in a healthy condition. In spite of many handicaps it has been a good year in Marshall County.

4–H CLUBS

We believe that in the membership of the 4–H clubs will be found our farm leaders of the future. We therefore urge every possible assistance in furthering and improving the organization with a challenge to higher standards.

GOVERNMENT FISCAL POLICY

Deep concern is in the heart of every American in contemplating the size of our national debt, and the dangers attendant therein. While we urge individual citizens to avoid inflationary practices we believe that needless governmental expense is the most inflationary factor. For this reason we urge our Representatives in Congress to use their influence and vote in eliminating useless governmental agencies and duplication of governmental functions. We believe that the Federal Budget should be brought into balance and deficit financing stopped.

CROP LOANS

The question of crop surpluses may again soon confront us and, remembering the sad experiences of the past through forced marketings, we urge a continuance through private or public sources of commodity loans in

order that marketings may be orderly and surplus feed supplies be carried over against a later possible shortage.

DEPARTMENT OF PEACE

We favor the immediate creation of a department of peace with a secretary holding full Cabinet position.

CONSCRIPTION

We believe the energies of all Americans through their Government should be concentrated on the solution of the economic and social problems which produce war and not on the development and acceptance of a policy of militarization which defies the ideals for which we so recently have been fighting. We cannot have both collective security and overwhelming national armament.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT

We believe the prosperity of agriculture to be dependent on full employment at wages in keeping with the cost of living. We believe in the principle of collective bargaining and the right of workers to organize, but we believe that labor and management, in the public interest, should submit their differences to an impartial board representing labor, management, and the public, clothed with authority to adjudicate differences with penalties for violation to be applied against labor and management alike.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

We approve of unemployment insurance. Unemployment is a social loss. But losses must be paid from Government funds with the same care and scrutiny as used in paying a fire loss. We condemn subsidized loafing under the name of unemployment compensation.

SUBSIDIES

Bureaucratic control of the price of farm products has proved unsatisfactory. We approve the removal of food subsidies, but demand that with their removal the law of supply and demand be again allowed to function in the market place.

PARITY

The price relationship between industry, labor, and agriculture is of paramount importance in the Nation's economic future. We reaffirm our belief in 100-percent parity, and we urge upon our leaders in the American Farm Bureau and our representatives in Congress the importance of eternal vigilance that this relationship be maintained. We condemn the brazen attempt of certain labor groups to break this parity formula and remind such groups that the price of farm products is the farmers' wage, a wage that has not been allowed to rise during the entire war period.

INFLATION

Inflation is increasingly here. We would suggest to our membership that inflation brings few headaches to the farmer who keeps his investment almost wholly in his farm plant, and deflation has few terrors to the farmer who is debt free.

We believe that only by the continuance of a high price and wage level can national solvency be maintained under our enormous load of national debt.

Full Employment Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DUDLEY G. ROE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Baltimore Sun on so-called full employment.

Mr. Speaker, every Member in this House wants to see every American employed gainfully, healthily, and usefully. Every Member of this body wants to see every American receive an adequate wage so that he can live in accordance with the American standards of life. However, I am one who believes in the theory that our Government is a servant of the people; that we should pass the kind of legislation that the people ask us to pass; that we should see to it that all legislation results in full justice to all and special privileges to none.

The so-called full employment bill, which would create the greatest unemployment America has ever had, would make our people the slaves of the Government and would give us the same sort of despotism that we have just defeated in Germany and Japan. We had all kinds of dire predictions about 5,000,000 unemployed by such and such a date and 8,000,000 unemployed by such and such a date. As a matter of fact, the number of unemployed, according to the Census Bureau, is less than 20 percent of the wild guesses we were given—this in spite of the strikes and in spite of the hindrance caused by the OPA. If our people would just go to work and produce the things which the masses of the people so badly need, we would have the greatest era of prosperity for years to come that this Nation has ever witnessed.

I believe the so-called national vacation bill—$25 for loafing for 26 weeks—and the so-called full employment bill, have had their part in causing our present epidemic of strikes. The sooner we defeat these two bills and the sooner the workers of America return to their jobs, the sooner we will have peace, plenty and prosperity for all.

The editorial follows:

FULL EMPLOYMENT BILLS AND THE FACTS OF ECONOMIC LIFE

On the third day of the General Motors strike, a House subcommittee member lets the public have a peek at the full employment bill as it now stands in his committee. The third day of the General Motors strike is a wryly appropriate time to discuss the plans of the full employment people.

But before getting to that point, let's take a look at some of the provisions of the House bill as it is said now to stand. The first thing that will strike the eye is that the annual production and employment budget which the original bill provided for is at present out of the House version.

Can it be that the House committee's tentative decision to drop this part of the bill is related to the rather spectacularly cockeyed unemployment predictions laid down by the Government agencies for the period following VJ-day? For instance, on August 15, Stabilization Director Snyder said, "It is expected there will be 5,000,000 or more unemployed in 3 months"—that is, by November 15. Pulling the corners of his mouth even further down, Mr. Snyder was willing to believe that "by spring, unemployment may reach about 8,000,000." Mr. Snyder seems to have taken his figures from the War Manpower Commission, because the WMC prediction was for 5,000,000 unemployed in the last quarter of 1945. The Social Security Board guessed the figure might go as high as 7,500,000.

What has actually happened? The Census Bureau found that the unemployed in October numbered 1,520,000, which was a decrease of 130,000 from September. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has reported that layoffs were dropping away even in September. And in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor, Dr. Sumner H. Slichter, of Harvard University, one of the country's leading economists, says flatly, "Conversion unemployment has passed its peak and employment is now rising."

So much for the Government predictions of unemployment against what actually has happened. The figures show that the Government planners, the logarithm boys in the agencies, the slide-rule jockeys and lightning calculators who say they know more about business than business—all these groups were spectacularly wrong.

They were wrong, that is, up to the minute of the General Motors strike. The unemployment that the strike causes and will cause has yet to be measured, but it may be general and distressing. However, the point is that just as the planners couldn't guess unemployment accurately, neither could they foretell this strike. Yet even had their employment guesses aligned with the facts, the strike would have thrown them off the track.

In other words, strikes are incompatible with the kind of Government planning which the full employment people want to do. That means the wholesome American institution of independent unionism is incompatible with their schemes. But no group is more in favor of independent unionism than they. Their calculations on this larger problem are as screwy as their guesses about postwar unemployment.

To Make the Charter Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the New York Times of November 27, 1945:

TO MAKE THE CHARTER WORK

Nearly 4 months have passed since the United States Senate ratified the Charter of the United Nations Organization, and a little over a month since, by a prescribed number of ratifications by other nations, the Charter became operative. This week the second step is being undertaken, the passage in the Senate of the United Nations Participation Act by which we will begin to carry out the obligations assumed in the Charter. This bill, introduced by Senator CONNALLY with the warm backing of Senator VANDENBERG, will become law when approved by a simple majority in both Houses and signed by the President.

The Connally bill contains five major provisions. First, it establishes an American representative at the seat of the UNO, with ambassadorial rank and a salary of $20,000 a year, and a deputy representative, with a salary of $12,000 a year. The President may also appoint American representatives to the General Assembly and to other UNO organs and agencies. Except for the Assembly delegates, and excepting also cases in which appointees already hold Federal offices by senatorial confirmation, the consent of the Senate will be required.

Second, the President is to report to Congress at least once a year on American activities under UNO, with special reports on enforcement measures taken by the Security Council and our participation in them.

Third, he is empowered to commit the country to measures short of war without first consulting Congress. Fourth, he is authorized to negotiate agreements with the Security Council to make available specified "numbers and types of armed forces" when the armed enforcement of a Council decision is undertaken. Such agreements are to be approved by act of Congress or joint resolution, which means by majority vote in each House. The President may then commit the agreed contingents in an emergency without resorting to Congress for specific approval. He may not, however, enlarge the contingents without going to Congress. Finally, authority is given for the annual appropriation of such sums as are necessary to pay for our participation in UNO.

The items in this bill which stand out in letters of fire are, of course, those which authorize the President to act in emergencies on a general delegation of power from Congress without waiting specific consent. He can, in fact, on his own initiative, as the isolationists will be saying, "send our boys overseas to fight." But the "boys" will presumably be professional soldiers, who have enlisted on this understanding, and their function will be to join with other UNO fighters in extinguishing wars before they get well started. If the President doesn't have this power, UNO will be a research institution and a debating society, but it will not preserve the peace.

The forthcoming debates will smoke out the isolationists, including some who voted for the Charter last July. For now we approach a critical point. Either we want peace enough to take risks and make sacrifices or we do not. The indications are that the Connally bill will pass Congress though perhaps not by last July's Senate ratio of 89 to 2. It must, for we are committed to its principles both by self-interest and by honor.

Increasing Wages Without Increasing Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the CIO and affiliated organizations, such as UAW-CIO and CIO's unions in the steel industry, insist that wages can be increased 30 percent without an increase in prices.

In his book, Walter Reuther says that the increase can be taken out of profits. Perhaps you have your own opinion on that subject. In any event, here is one reply of the steel industry:

THERE ARE NO HIDDEN STEEL PROFITS

United Steelworkers of America-CIO charges that steel companies piled up huge hidden profits during the war. It insists that the steel companies now can use their swollen wartime profits in order to pay a $225,000,000-a-year wage increase.

The union's charge of hidden profits during the war is false. That was shown conclusively by the fact-finding panel of the National War Labor Board. In September 1944 that Government agency declared in an official report that what the union calls hidden profits are necessary reserves, and that such reserves "are proper and cannot be considered as steel profits."

The truth about profits in the steel industry during the war is that they were not swollen. They were less than in any good peacetime year. After all bills were paid, net earnings after taxes during the three war years, 1942 to 1944, represented an average return of 5 percent on the money invested. That was a lower return on investment than in any peacetime year of high steel production.

There is no mystery about reserves in the steel industry. Workers as well as stockholders are protected by these reserves. Machines wear out and must be replaced. During the war the wear and tear under capacity operations was without precedent. When necessary reserves are not provided, any company will run down. Then there are fewer jobs, smaller pay checks. These principles of sound management apply to a one-man garage or any small business as well as to a million-dollar corporation.

Every cent that steel companies set aside for future needs is checked by your Government. Nothing can be hidden. The tax collectors, renegotiation boards, and many other Government agencies have reviewed the figures year after year. They recognize reserves as an essential part of the cost of doing business.

Reserves set aside for wear and tear of factilities and for contingencies do not constitute a fund out of which wages can be paid. To do so would quickly exhaust the reservoir on which the steel companies depend for their future lives.

Any solution of the present wage-price issue in the steel industry must take into consideration these clearly established facts.

AMERICAN IRON AND STEEL INSTITUTE,
New York, N. Y.

Our company members employ 95 percent of the workers in the steel industry.

Control of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT M. COLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Resolution submitted to the Honorable ALBERT M. COLE, Representative from the First Congressional District of Kansas, November 20, 1945

We, the undersigned members of the staff of Washburn Municipal University of Topeka, aware of the tremendous import of atomic energy and atomic weapons to all mankind, believe that the security of the United States can be achieved ultimately only through international cooperation for the joint control of these new forces. We believe that a permanent policy of secret fundamental research and exclusive national control on the part of any nation can only result in a ruinous competitive armaments race in which all the nations of the world will join, leading to a new and catastrophic world war. From such a war no people will emerge free, if indeed they survive at all.

We believe that, while secrecy regarding the release of atomic energy may be the safest policy under present conditions, such secrecy can keep the basic knowledge the property of the United States only very temporarily, and that permanent policies of secrecy in such matters will in the long run produce international distrust and fear, creating a world atmosphere which will render the permanent preservation of peace impossible. We believe that the mutual confidence and good will among nations which is necessary for permanent peace can only be fostered by a world-wide policy of open and uncensored interchange of ideas and information between all nations.

We therefore resolve and urge:

1. That the United States, as the country that has opened the way for the development of atomic energy, should immediately invite the Governments of Great Britain and the Soviet Union to a conference to prevent competitive armaments and consider the problems arising from this overwhelming development.

2. That the United States champion the need for international development with the broadest utilization of all resources and the widest freedom of research and interchange of ideas.

We believe furthermore that any legislative effort which stifles free and open scientific investigation, which seeks to prevent public surveillance and criticism of the applications of atomic energy, will stifle scientific progress, undermine peace and is therefore harmful to the national interest.

We therefore urge the Congress:

1. That legislative action for the control of atomic energy be preceded by full, free, and public discussion.

2. That the authority for the guidance of the development of atomic energy shall consist of men of scientific competence, fully compensated for their services, and able to work towards the maximum utilization of atomic energy for the welfare of the public and not for the interests of any special group.

3. That the administration chosen to direct the work of such an authority be civilian.

4. That security regulations be limited to direct military application of atomic power and that free research and right of publication be immediately resumed in the field of atomic physics.

Bryan S. Stopfer, Hugh T. Wale, Arthur G. Sellen, Gladys Phinney, T. L. Callens, Philip S. Riggs, Esther M. Bauman, Amanda Lee Bauer, Richard G. Vogel, Clara E. Elledge, Ira Pratt, Mrs. Paul M. Hansen, L. B. Fulbright, Faye H. Beard, Chas. D. Erickson, Faye Waddle, Catherine Conard, Burleigh Reed, Edith E. Larson, Robert H. Kingman, Elizabeth Ebright, Marjorie Clinton, Helen T. Fisher, Elisabeth D. Van Schaack, J. F. Zimmerman, E. Ruth van Appledoun, Mrs. Charles L. Lyman, Ruth Parker, John D. Bright, Dorothy L. Porter, Kathleen Martin Rewe, Bernice M. Burbank, Dorothy M. Porterfield, Hazel J. Nitcher, Barbara L. Neff, N. E. Saxe, Janet L. Mack, Alexander Tillotson, Donald H. Webb, R. H. Alexander, Joseph M. Free, Mrs. N. E. Saxe, J. H. Froth, Paul Eberhart, Esther H. Vanderlas, Wm. J. Morgan, Mrs. H. M. Callaway, Jean A. Smith, Christine A. Johnson, Harold E. Conrad, J. E. Gardner, David E. Beck, Oscar P. Moyer, H. P. German, and E. L. Burke.

Apprenticeship Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted to me to extend my remarks, I would like to comment briefly

upon the soundness of our national apprenticeship training program under the Department of Labor.

An appropriation to continue this program is included in the present deficiency measure now before us. I urge upon the House the fullest possible consideration for this appropriation since now, as hundreds of thousands of returning servicemen are anxious to take their proper place in industry, apprentice training becomes more important than at any time in our national history.

In order that I might fully understand the scope of the apprenticeship program, I asked some questions of the Department of Labor. The Department's answers to my inquiries were so well stated and presented such an accurate view of the entire program that I desire to include both the questions and answers as part of these remarks. They follow:

NATIONAL APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAM

Question. How many apprenticeship programs does the Department of Labor have in the United States?

Answer. As of September 30, 1945, there were 4,846 registered apprenticeship programs covering 30,339 industrial establishments. Of these there are 76 programs in the State of Washington covering 1,404 establishments.

In addition to the apprenticeship programs there were set up during the war about 2,500 advancing worker programs for war production. A large percentage of these programs will now be converted to apprenticeship.

Question. How many apprenticeship programs were set up in the United States in the last year?

Answer. From October 1, 1944, to September 30, 1945, 1,739 apprenticeship programs were established in the United States. In the State of Washington two programs covering 32 establishments were completed. In addition 149 new establishments have joined existing programs. Development work on a number of large programs, begun since the close of the war, has relieved the need for heavy attention to war production programs.

Question. Is this number an increase or decrease over the average number set up in past years, and to what do you attribute the increase or decrease?

Answer. An increase.

To the fact that the field and national staffs have been working with management and labor for years, endeavoring to persuade them to participate in bona fide apprenticeship programs. Added to this is the fact that during the war period our staff proved to these groups the value of formal training programs by its work on short term training for war production However, the most pertinent thing at the present time is the returning veteran The experiences of veterans in the armed forces has convinced them that thorough and complete training is necessary if they expect to be a success in civilian life. Accordingly, more and more returning veterans wish to take advantage of apprenticeship training under the provisions of the veterans' acts. Unless we have adequate programs set up that will provide these veterans with the proper, all-round training required for journeymanship, they will not be able to reach the skill they desire and the skill so badly needed by industry for the post-war period.

Question. Should additional aprenticeship programs be set up in this country during the remainder of the fiscal year? How many?

Answer. Yes, it is estimated that a minimum of 3,500 programs can be established during fiscal year 1946.

Question. Will additional field men be required to carry out that program during the remainder of the fiscal year? How many?

Answer. Yes; 150 additional field representatives would be needed in order to establish the minimum of 3,500 programs which are available during the year and serve existing programs, especially with respect to apprenticeship for veterans.

Question. Will additional positions be needed in your national office and in the field clerical staff?

Answer. Seventeen additional positions in the national office and 55 in the field, clerical positions.

Question. How many apprentices should there be in the country in all apprenticeable trades?

Answer. There should be approximately 500,000 apprentices in training at all times.

Question. Where will these apprentices come from?

Answer. During the next 3 or 4 years some few will be 18- and 19-year-old boys graduating from high school; but the vast majority of them will be World War II veterans.

Question. What percentage will or could be World War II veterans?

Answer. For the next few years probably about 80 percent of apprentices can be veterans.

Question. If the deficiency appropriation presently sought is not granted, what percentage of reduction in personnel will be required in the field and national staffs?

Answer. Fifty-two percent.

Question. Does the apprentice program division have any functions other than setting up such programs? If so, what?

Answer. Once the program has been set up and operating it is the duty of the field men to continue to service each of his programs. Apprenticeship practically died in this country in the past, and unless these programs are constantly serviced by our field staff we can expect nothing else but that they will again die. If this is to be permitted to happen, we are most certain that we will be faced once again with the shortage of skill and workers that evidenced itself prior to World War II.

Question. If you are not granted sufficient money to carry out your program, who will be affected most seriously?

Answer. At the present time the returning serviceman who wishes to enter the skilled trades under the provisions of the G. I. bill. Small businesses who require assistance in establishing programs will not secure that help and apprenticeship opportunities for veterans in such establishments will not be available. In the long run the Nation as a whole will suffer from the continuation of serious shortage of skilled workers.

Question. To ensure that there will continue to be enough apprentices trained, as estimated above, how many apprenticeship programs should be in operation in the country?

Answer. There are about 400,000 establishments in the country which employ skilled workers and should be training apprentices. On the basis of an average of about 7 establishments per program there should be about 57,000 programs.

Question. Do you believe that the number of apprenticeship programs needed will increase after this fiscal year? Why or why not?

Answer. It is obvious that the need will continue when there could and should be over 50,000 programs and there are now less than 5,000.

Question. How long do you believe it will be before you will have the number of apprenticeship programs in operation that will assure us a sufficient number of skilled journeymen throughout the country?

Answer. This will depend upon the provision of adequate funds for this activity and the continuation of the interest and support of management and labor. The second depends upon the first. If the present interest of industry can be maintained, there is no reason why the country could not have an adequate apprenticeship system within 5 years.

Realistic Training Seen in Legion Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article by David Lawrence, highly respected news analyst and editor, in which he comments on a new proposal for universal military training advanced by the new national commander of the American Legion, John Stelle. Contrary to the Legion's former stand for compulsory military training of 1 year for all youths who reach the age of 18 years, National Commander Stelle advocates a program that would integrate the youth of America into the Nation's preparedness set-up. Mr. Lawrence's comments on Commander Stelle's proposal should be of interest to every Member of Congress.

REALISTIC TRAINING SEEN IN LEGION PLAN

(By David Lawrence)

The American Legion, through its national commander, John Stelle, has just come forward with a sensible program for military training that eliminates virtually all the objectionable features of the plan presented by President Truman and Gen. George Marshall.

Instead of taking a whole year out of the life of American boys and giving them no further training that could be useful 5 or 10 years later, the Legion is to present to Congress a bill which requires only 4 months of basic training but provides for integration of the trained youth into some organization which has a continuing relationship to preparedness.

Under the proposed bill a boy of 18 who is physically qualified would take 4 months of training. Then he could return to school or college or join a National Guard unit or a Naval Reserve unit, or, if at college or school, he could join a Civilian Military Training Corps unit or an ROTC unit. If he were not going to college, the boy could spend "8 months or the equivalent working in some industrial plant engaged in national defense work of a type set up by the civilian authority."

WAR NEEDS TRADES

This is a realistic approach. It recognizes that training in modern times doesn't consist merely of drilling and marching and saluting but of mobilizing young men in mechanical pursuits as well. Training in certain trades is just as essential to a mechanized military service of the future as marching or drilling. Certainly air power needs men in ground crews for repair and maintenance who have had the background of work in factories and plants.

The Legion's proposal is significant because it offers the first important digression from the administration's plan which, incidentally, has no chance of passage anyway. Another interesting proposal is that which comes to the writer from the Regular Veterans' Association, an organization founded by but by no means confined to officers who have

served in the Regular Army and Navy. It says:

"We are convinced that some form of military training is a very real 'must' for this country. * * * But we are not agreed on placing the whole burden on young men of high-school or college age. These boys, for that is all they are, have their lives ahead of them. They are at the place where an education means a great deal to them, especially the ones who are choosing careers in medicine, law, science, and many other professions which require more than the usual 4-year course, and a year from their lives at this time would be a very real loss. Not only that, but they are not yet men with an adult sense of values and to train them fully in the art of killing would be foolhardy indeed."

SWISS PLAN RECOMMENDED

"Hitler proved what one can do with the younger generation by training them in certain arts. In Germany, the youth, not the older folks, were the backbone of his plan of conquest and cruelty. Why, then, should we teach our youngsters this same science and expect them to return calmly to commonplace things without ever having a chance to practice the lessons thus learned? Taken at a time when their minds are pliable, they may wish to use their knowledge at the slightest provocation.

"We indorse a plan, proven by the Swiss to be workable and which has kept them at peace for many years, whereby the adults, who after all are the ones who should carry the burden of responsibility, comprise the civilian army of defense. We ask that all men between the ages decided on as being physically able to fight be given military training each year until they reach an age when they no longer need be called upon to take the training. By this means no undue hardship is placed on any one group.

"Not only that, but returning yearly for a few weeks' training, we will have a male population in better physical health than ever before. By spending a few weeks of each year in this way the men thus taught will not forget the lessons learned nor will they become 'rusty,' which is what will happen under a plan whereby a man receives a full year's training, then forgets about it until such time as he may be called on suddenly and without warning to use what was taught to him maybe 10 years before."

Congress will have before it many plans but the two foregoing proposals begin to tackle the problem on a practical basis and out of many ideas may ultimately come some form of training that does not establish a militaristic tradition but accomplishes the main purpose—preparedness for defense.

Resolution of Catholic Bishops of the United States on Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOREST A. HARNESS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution which was adopted by the Catholic bishops of the United States on the subject of compulsory military training at their meeting in Washington, D. C., on Wednesday, November 14, 1945:

We recognize the imperative need of preparedness for the adequate defense of our country in all circumstances.

In determining what constitutes national defense in our present circumstances, our Government, we feel, should explore the possibility of having military conscription abolished in all countries, and, to that end, might well consider how our control of economic assistance to other countries may be used to lend weight to our plea for such abolition.

If a wide extension of military training is found necessary for present adequate defense of our Nation, we feel that such training should be in keeping with American traditions, and that, specifically:

1. Voluntary enlistments in the armed forces should be stimulated as much as possible, to provide our first line of defense;

2. Any period of enforced training should be integrated with normal school life; and,

3. The War and Navy Departments should work with recognized moral leadership to correct certain policies and attitudes which have wrought grave moral damage to great numbers of young people in the armed services during the past 5 years.

Erection of a Post Office Building at Cudahy, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Resolution 681

Resolution proposing erection of new post office building

Whereas the city of Cudahy, Wis., is a municipality situated on the shores of Lake Michigan, in the county of Milwaukee, and has a population of 10,550; and

Whereas this city is the most progressive city in the State of Wisconsin, having 14 major industries, among them such nationally known firms as Ladish Drop Forge Co., George J. Meyer Manufacturing Co., Cudahy Bros. Co., and others; and

Whereas this city has a history of steady and conservative growth and harbors many types of civic and fraternal organizations as the Chamber of Commerce, Junior Chamber of Commerce, Kiwanis Club, Moose Club, Eagles Club, Knights of Columbus, Knights of Pythias, Cudahy Women's Club, American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Cudahy (Veterans) Service League, and others; and

Whereas this community is in dire need of a United States post-office building commensurate with its growth and progress to replace the leased quarters now housing the post office, which are too small and inadequate and uncentrally located on a side street: Now, therefore, it is hereby

Resolved, That the mayor and Common Council of the City of Cudahy do hereby formally endorse and subscribe to a petition for the erection of a new post-office building to be centrally located on the main street in the heart of the city; it is further

Resolved, That a new post office housed in a modern building will be in accord with the progressive development of this city and will be justified not by civic pride alone, but also by the steady, conservative growth of the city and its industries during the past 50 years and the immediate urgent need for adequate modern quarters; it is further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon and made a part of the minutes of this meeting and that the city clerk cause suitable copies thereof to be forwarded to the United States Postmaster General, to the two Senators and Congressmen representing this district for early favorable action upon this petition.

Passed and approved this October 2, 1945.

VINCENT TOTKA, *Mayor.*

Attest:

JAMES F. KELLER, *City Clerk.*

Vengeance Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me to extend my remarks, I insert a timely article appearing in today's issue of the Washington News written by Thomas L. Stokes, entitled "Vengeance Legislation." I most respectfully ask that the Members read it and I feel that after it has been perused by those who have favored this legislation being reported to the House they will come to the conclusion that they have been imposed upon. The article is as follows:

VENGEANCE LEGISLATION

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

There's a right way and a wrong way to do things—including legislating.

An example of the wrong way may be seen currently in the attempt to rush drastic penalties against labor through the House of Representatives. They are contained in a bill prepared by the Military Affairs Committee. The measure has been ordered to the floor by the Rules Committee for early consideration.

The effort is to exploit the present strike situation. That offers provocation for labor-law reform, certainly, but not through such hasty and ill-considered legislation whipped up hurriedly in a spirit of vengeance. Long-time changes in labor law should be considered carefully and soberly.

The penalizing provisions were inserted in a bill that originally was designed only to repeal the wartime Smith-Connally anti-strike law, so-called. Repeal of that act meets general approval. But the provisions added by the Military Affairs Committee do not. Labor is complaining bitterly, and with reason.

One provision would punish any labor union which struck in violation of a no-strike clause in its contract by suspending its collective bargaining provisions for a year and making it subject to suits for damages incurred by work stoppages.

The obvious effect would be refusal by labor unions thereafter to accept no-strike clauses. Further, it would open the way for employers, so inclined, to provoke strikes themselves and drain union treasuries. There is no penalty for employers who might themselves induce strikes by their conduct.

Another provision would prohibit contributions by labor unions for political convention and primary election campaigns. This would extend the ban already imposed by the Smith-Connally Act against such contributions for general election campaigns, which is to be retained. The latter somewhat restricted the scope of CIO's Political Action

Committee in last year's general election campaign, though it did not interfere much with its ultimate effectiveness. It operated under the exception permitting use of union funds for educational purposes. Former Attorney General Biddle, over protests from some Members of Congress, held that PAC was not violating the law.

The purpose of the prohibition in the case of conventions and primary elections is clear. Members with antilabor records fear CIO attempts to eliminate them in next year's primaries, and with reason. The CIO had some primary successes last year, even in the South. That served as a warning.

Aside from the injustices and the dubious constitutionality of these provisions, and the hasty method of legislating, there is something else wrong with this whole procedure.

This is the matter of jurisdiction. All this was done by the Military Affairs Committee and not the regularly constituted House Labor Committee. The Military Affairs Committee proved its ineptness and lack of experience and judgment in framing labor legislation when it handled the original Connally bill, 2 years ago.

Administration leaders sought in vain to get the Rules Committee to withhold report of the bill for House action until the labor-management conference here had finished its work. But the Republican southern conservative Democrat coalition in the committee, which holds the whiphand, seized the second streetcar and bus strike here and beginning of the General Motors strike to shove the measure to the floor.

Who Has the Right To Determine What Is Un-American?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, recently one of America's greatest newspapers, the New York Times, editorially discussed the adjective "un-American." Is it possible in the United States for one to designate the attitudes, philosophy, or political viewpoints of a fellow citizen as un-American if the same happens to be contrary to the views one entertains in his own behalf? The successor to the Dies committee is now undertaking to censor the radio. This is indicative of a dangerous trend. Just who has the right to impose his views upon any vehicle of public expression? What then becomes of free speech or freedom of the press? The air waves should be equally free. I have always insisted that every facility should be afforded to newspapers to permit their columnists and editorial writers to express themselves freely and fearlessly on any controversial subject. The laws of libel and slander will take care of any excesses such as the dissemination of untruths. One of the characteristics of totalitarianism is to require the submission of newspaper stories and radio scripts in advance to official censors. Let us not emulate the sorry example set for us in the recent past by the Mussolinis, Hitlers, Francos, and Perons.

The editorial is as follows:

WHAT IS "UN-AMERICAN"?

The House Committee on Un-American Activities has subpenaed the scripts of seven radio station commentators and may subpena all or some of the commentators themselves. A committee spokesman told a reporter for this newspaper that the committee had received many letters complaining of "communistic views" reputedly expressed over the air waves by commentators. In the spokesman's opinion, "the time has come to determine how far you can go with free speech."

The committee's mandate is clear up to a certain point. It has the usual and often useful investigating powers of any congressional committee of inquiry. It might use those powers to look into actual breaches of law. But it is handicapped, as the Dies committee was before it, by any precise definition of what is an "un-American activity." In the absence of such definition the matter is left to prejudice. None of the seven commentators mentioned is charged or suspected, so far as we know, with advocating the communization of this country by force and violence. They are said, or some of them are, to have "praised the Russian Army and other Soviet actions, rather than similar American activities." If this is true, which has not been established, have they committed a crime? Obviously not—they have, at the worst, "paralleled" the Daily Worker. Or is material privileged in print to be barred from the air?

We do not believe the committee will find any legitimate excuse to penalize the commentators or the networks over which they speak. It might succeed in scaring the networks, so that they will hesitate to permit a free and lawful expression of opinion. We believe this indirect suppression would be as "un-American" an activity as some others the committee is gunning for. We hope the committee will Americanize its procedure before this happens.

Russia and Iran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Washington Post of November 27, 1945:

RUSSIA AND IRAN

Following the Iranian Government's protest to the United States regarding recent developments in Azerbaijan Province, the State Department has acted with refreshing vigor and promptness in reminding Moscow of obligations which Russia, as well as the United States and Great Britain, assumed at the Tehran Conference. At that time Marshal Stalin, Prime Minister Churchill, and President Roosevelt signed a declaration in which they declared themselves "at one with the Government of Iran in their desire for the maintenance of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iran." In view of that declaration it is certainly strange that Russian troops have prevented the Iranian Government, anxious to put down a rebellion, from moving troops through territory under its sovereignty.

Allowing a face-saving loophole of escape for the Soviet regime, the State Department note suggests the possibility that the obstacles in the way of the free movement of Iranian forces may have been put there by local Soviet commanders acting without authorization from Moscow or even in contravention of the latter's orders. Since Soviet agents are not usually given to acting very much on their own, this thesis is questionable. Nonetheless it offers the Soviet government a way out of what may prove a dangerous dilemma—if it really wants to find a way out.

Actually the American note goes even further. It suggests the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Iran by January 1, 1946. In view of the fact that the war has long since ended, this suggestion is very decidedly in order. Certainly the continued maintenance on Iranian soil of foreign contingents, when the reason for their presence there has altogether disappeared, can only lead to the suspicion that those troops are there for reasons that are at variance with repeated professions made by the great powers. As the American note pointedly suggests, in dealing with a country such as Iran, the great powers are under obligations "to follow a line of action which will make it clear that the trust of these nations in the permanent members of the Security Council has not been misplaced."

Not Unduly Exacting in Korea—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the present situation in Korea is a significant example of the postwar policy of the United States which has been described by our Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, as "not unduly exacting" in our dealings with the Soviet Government.

Korea was the second victim of Japanese imperialist strategy and for the past half century has been exploited by Japanese methods and occupied by Japanese troops and colonists. At the Yalta Conference it was agreed by Messrs. Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin that, after the defeat of Japan, Korea would be restored to its national integrity, and eventually to its independent sovereignty.

Allied occupation of northern Korea was achieved first by Soviet troops in the 3-week war between the Soviet Union and the Japanese. As described in a letter from a Korean:

About the time when American arms and blood compelled Japan to surrender, Russia was permitted to rush into Korea. Some thirty thousand Communists were turned loose to preach their ideology. The Korean people, however, are sincerely eager to establish a democratic form of government modeled after America's. Southern Korea now is occupied by the United States Army while the northern half is in Russian hands.

This shortsighted arbitrary arrangement, no matter how short-lived it may be, is bound to wreak havoc on national unity, spiritual and social tranquillity. This deliberate and arbitrary division of Korea is an evil thing. If there is to be peace in the Far East, and therefore in the world, the whole of homogenous Korea must become a bulwark of Christian democracy, not an arena of ideological collisions. * * * It is to the great powers' own interests that Korea, whole and unmolested, become her own master, free and independent.

The importance attached to a rapid and satisfactory solution of the Korean demand by our friends and allies throughout Asia is shown in the following statement of Chinese Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, as reported by United Press from Chungking, November 4, 1945:

CHIANG ASSERTS KOREA IS KEY TO EAST ASIA PEACE—CALLS INDEPENDENCE VITAL TO WORLD; PROVISIONAL REGIME OFF FOR CAPITAL

CHUNGKING, November 4.—Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek said today that peace for East Asia and the world hinged upon speedy achievement of independence for Korea. He promised China would consult with Russia, the United States and Great Britain on self-government for Korea, which was ruled by the Japanese for 35 years.

Chiang delivered an address to about 200 Korean Nationalist leaders and members of the Kuomintang (Chinese Nationalist Party) central executive committee on the eve of the departure for Seoul, Korean capital, of the "provisional Korean government" which has maintained headquarters at Chungking for 8 years.

MUST AID IN OCCUPATION

All groups in Korea must cooperate fully with the American and Soviet occupation troops, Chiang said, pending a time when a decision can be reached regarding independence. He announced that the "fixed policy" of the Chinese Government was to aid in such an achievement. Chiang was emphatic in warning that all East Asia was watching the fate of Korea.

"Korea's failure to achieve independence, freedom, and equality would be equal to China's failure to achieve independence, freedom, and equality," Chiang said. "If Korea is not independent, not only China's independence cannot be complete, but the peace of East Asia and the world cannot be secure.

"For the sake of peace * * * and the freedom of all East Asiatic peoples, we must first achieve independence and freedom in Korea. This is the Kuomintang's only principle toward Korea."

He called for Korea to unite under the leadership of Kim Koo, the president of the provisional government.

Koo, Foreign Minister Josowang, and Minister of Information David Um will leave by plane with about 30 other Korean Nationalist leaders tomorrow for Shanghai. From there they will be taken in American transport planes to Seoul.

WON'T TOLERATE PARTITION

Koo told newspapermen here today that he and his associates could not tolerate any partition of Korea. Apparently he referred to the present division of the country into two zones, one occupied by American and the other by Soviet forces.

Koo said he hoped to strengthen Korea's friendship with the United States and Britain and with China and Russia, whose borders adjoin Korea. He pledged establishment of a democratic government through a popular election.

[Dispatches from Seoul said that the military government was giving support to the Korean Democratic Party, which is composed of conservative, land-owning elements. Dr. Syngman Rhee, Nationalist leader, went to Seoul from Washington to head that party.]

Under the present arrangement of complete separation of the two zones in Korea, the majority of the population is in the American area, and the chief production of food, fuel, and raw materials in the Soviet sphere. To this burden has been added the danger outlined by Mr. Kim, in his letter of November 19, 1945, that some of these badly needed articles will be sent to Japan. This certainly comes under the supervision of our authorities in the Far East, and merits attention:

KOREA SEEKS RESTITUTION—HEAD OF INSTITUTE HERE WANTS JAPAN TO RETURN STOLEN TREASURE

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

According to a press report from Tokyo, the Japanese Government has formally requested the Allies to permit Japan to import foodstuffs and raw materials, including grains, cotton, coal, iron ore, and nonferrous ore from Korea.

If the Allied Powers permit Japan to import the above items from Korea, Korea will be put under Japanese economic bondage. During the Japanese enslavement, more than 40 percent of the Korean grain crops was taken to Japan; consequently Koreans were underfed.

It is about time that the liberated people be given the right to enjoy their own food products. If grains are permitted to be exported to Japan, I am afraid the price of foodstuffs will rise so that the poor people will have a great deal of hardship, even if they do not go hungry again. Korea has insufficient foodstuffs for a proper diet—certainly not enough to be exported at present.

There is no surplus cotton and coal in Korea for export. If they are taken out of Korea, Koreans will again be unclothed and suffer from the lack of fuel for the comfort of the Japanese. Korea needs her mineral ores for her own industrialization.

Furthermore, the Japanese Government proposes to pay for the imports with gold, diamonds, silk and other goods. In other words, the enemy is proposing to pay for his purchases with stolen treasure. The gold and treasure taken from Korea during the last 35 years should be returned to Korea. According to the enemy's own figures, in 1939 alone, 29 tons and 192 kilograms of gold were produced in Korea.

It is well known that during the war the Japanese even went so far as to take practically all the spoons and doorknobs from Korea, and to rob the Korean Red Cross fund of 5,000,000 yen just before the surrender, and yet the enemy is again casting greedy eyes on Korea.

Korea has been exploited by Japan long enough, and an enormous loss of economic wealth has already been sustained which must be recovered.

There should be no commercial arrangement made for Korea with Japan until Japan fully restores to Korea all the gold, treasure, funds and other property taken to Japan, and not until all Koreans who were forced to serve Japan are adequately indemnified.

YONGJEUNG KIM,
President Korean Affairs Institute.
WASHINGTON, *November 19, 1945.*

On November 21, 1945, Dr. Syngman Rhee, leader of Korean independence efforts since 1919 and long head of the Korean Provisional Government, broadcast from the capital of Korea, Seoul, a warning to the Korean people, which was cabled in translation to the New York Times:

KOREAN RED GROUP ASSAILED BY RHEE—RETURNED LEADER ASSERTS THAT PLAN OF DISORDERS HAS BEEN FOSTERED BY JAPANESE

(By Richard J. H. Johnston)

SEOUL, KOREA, November 21.—In a radio address to the nation here tonight, Dr. Syngman Rhee, former president of the Korean provisional government and returned exile who is here as a private citizen working for the unity of Korean political parties, clarified his position in regard to the Korean Communists.

Dr. Rhee divided the Communists here into two distinct classes. First, he said, are "those who believe in Communist principles and believe that some of the economic principles of communism will be beneficial to our people." The second group, he asserted, are those who "are not interested in the economic development of the country, but are interested in the establishment of a Communist government." The latter, he said, create agitation, which causes dissension and division among the people.

Declaring, "I believe in some of the Communist ideas," Dr. Rhee said that when the Korean government was established and would undertake to set up its economic policies, he would work for the adoption of many of these theories.

ATTACK UPON RADICALS

After paying tribute to those Communists who fought the Japanese and engaged in underground activities as "patriots," Dr. Rhee vigorously attacked radicals supported by the Japanese. The Japanese, he said, had financed such activities and supported their movements throughout the country to excite the people and instigate an antiforeign spirit.

Dr. Rhee charged these radicals with "creating agitation against the provisional government," and said that these forces were inspired by the Japanese, whose secret aim was to cause a misunderstanding between the Americans and the Koreans so that the allied military government would soon leave Korea. Dr. Rhee charged further that Communists in this group were "determined to create misunderstanding between the Soviet Government and Korea with the hope of leading to international complications."

These forces, by threats and coercion, are creating a state of confusion and fear, Dr. Rhee stated.

The only and best way to solve this problem, Dr. Rhee declared, is for all "good and loyal Koreans" to refuse to be influenced by these agitators and to organize loyal societies in the cities and villages.

Behind all the political maneuvers in Korea, there are certain inescapable material facts which will affect the lives both of Koreans, Chinese, and Manchurians for many years to come. These facts are the removal of basic industries, of transportation facilities, and of food reserves. That such removals are taking place is indicated by a series of reports from northern Korea and adjacent areas in Manchuria, of which the following dispatch is typical:

CHARGES AGAINST RUSSIANS

SEOUL, KOREA, November 21.—The Russians are removing industrial machinery and consumer goods from northern Korea and Manchuria into Russia and Outer Mongolia, Koreans reported today.

The President of the Korea Federation in Manchuria, who has just arrived in Seoul from Mukden, reported that the Russians were moving surplus steel rails throughout Manchuria. They removed one complete line of a double-track railway between Mukden and Antung, he said.

The huge Showa steel mills at Anshan have been dismantled and units were shipped to Siberia, he said. Other industrial machinery has been shipped to Outer Mongolia, the Korean executive said.

A Korean from Hamgyong Province in northeast Korea said that the Russian Army was requisitioning its own supplies and sending surpluses to Russia. He said that the Russian Army had ordered 200,000 pairs of shoes, but the Province could supply only 20,000 pairs. The Russian Army ordered 20 tons of sugar, but only 4 were available in the Province. When Koreans protested that this supply would not even be enough for infant feeding through the winter, the Russians agreed to take 2 tons and leave 2 for the Province.

Rural Industrialization Will Help the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch of November 26, 1945, commenting upon H. R. 4068 and S. 1385. It was written by the distinguished editor Virginius Dabney, and is an excellent statement of the advantages offered by small industries:

FOR THE SOUTH AND NATION

A bill which deserves the support of the Nation, and particularly of the South, is the Bailey-Hays bill which provides for Federal aid in the industrialization of the country's undeveloped areas. It is sometimes termed the "rural industrialization bill," and the characterization is apt.

Sponsored by Senator JOSIAH W. BAILEY, of North Carolina, and Representative BROOKS HAYS, of Arkansas, the bill appropriates $5,000,000 for the general purpose outlined, the money to be spent by the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, and Labor. It is not designed to injure the highly industrialized sections of the country, but merely to give the areas which have little or no industry now a better balance between industry and agriculture with a view to improving the national economy. As Mr. HAYS said in an address to the House in support of the measure, the only opposition that he could envision would come from "those who believe that the great industrial cities should be bigger, that Detroit ought to grow at the expense of the rural sections."

Such concept seems outmoded. Great concentrations of industry have served useful purposes up to now, but in the atomic age the planners for this country's future doubtless will insist upon a much greater dispersal. The Bailey-Hays bill fits this program perfectly. It would tend to scatter industrial production through the sparsely settled sections of the South and West, and make the United States much less vulnerable to atomic bomb attacks.

Even if it were not for the far-reaching changes brought about by the harnessing of nuclear energy, the desirability of building factories in the rural regions of America is obvious. Such factories afford employment to the people of those regions, something which in a few years will become a dire necessity in the Cotton Belt, owing to the fact that the mechanical cotton picker seems to be introduced on a wide scale.

Such a program also will tend to eliminate the need for the vast subsidies which the Federal Government has been giving to agriculture. Even today, as Mr. HAYS points out, we have a larger number of people in cotton production than can possibly maintain a fair standard of living, and the present artificial price supports cannot be maintained forever.

The fact that every Southern State except Virginia and Florida lost population between 1940 and 1945 considerably beyond the number of its inhabitants in the armed forces signifies that the people of this region had to go elsewhere, or thought they did, in order to find employment. Some Northern States lost heavily, too, including New York, which had a population decline of over 1,000,000 in the 5 years, but the belief is that a larger percentage will return to New York, since industry already is highly diversified there.

The program by which the Federal Government would promote the establishment of industries in the undeveloped regions is elaborately outlined in the Bailey-Hays bill. It includes providing technical assistance to individuals and groups, helping in the vocational training of returning servicemen and others, giving advice to expanding new enterprises, cooperating with public utilities in enlarging facilities, and in every way furthering maximum expansion in private employment and private enterprise.

It is a worthy objective, and one definitely in the national interest.

General Motors Makes a Whipping Boy of OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED BRADLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that you found it necessary not to recognize Members for brief speeches this morning because I want to call the Members' attention to a matter which I think is of importance, representing as it does an unfair and unjust accusation against the Office of Price Administration.

My record will show that I consistently voted against the OPA and I presume I have been as critical of its policies and operations as any Member of this body.

However, in the interest of fair play I resent the present effort of the huge General Motors Corp. to make a whipping boy out of the OPA and represent to the public through its vast organization of distributors and dealers that the only reason General Motors is not delivering cars to the hungry buying public today is because OPA will not release their 1946 prices. This is absolutely not true. OPA has leaned over backward to do everything it can to obtain from the General Motors and its various subsidiary companies their cost figures for the 1946 model cars so that these cars can be released. The fact of the matter is OPA has not yet gotten that information and cannot set those ceiling prices because General Motors, itself, is holding up the information and has notified the OPA that they do not want these prices released because they have no cars available for distribution at this time. Everyone knows, of course, that the present strike which has completely tied up General Motors has been threatened for some time and it was, therefore, but logical for General Motors to make every possible effort to get salesroom cars in the hands of their dealers before the strike set in. In order to move these cars off the end of the production line and into the salesrooms, the OPA—at the written request of General Motors—issued what they call an open billing order or an adjustable pricing order by the terms of which these cars could be delivered to the dealers subject to later price adjustment. General Motors, then—or at least one branch of it, the Buick Motor Co.—forced their distributors and their dealers to sign a written agreement that they would not deliver these cars to the buying public until permitted to do so by the factory which, in turn, would be done only after OPA had issued the new prices.

Subsequently, the distributors and dealers have been informing the public that the only reason they could not deliver cars for which they had bona fide orders and which are on the showroom floor was because OPA would not release the 1946 price schedule. In fact, I was personally told that to deliver a car would subject the dealer to a $5,000 fine imposed by the OPA. This is absolutely false information and is an obvious attempt on the part of General Motors to gain public sympathy in their present strike crisis by blaming the cooperative OPA for the failure of dealers to release cars.

It is and has been perfectly legal insofar as OPA is concerned for the dealers to deliver the new cars at the 1942 price schedule with an adjustment downward for the spare tire and tube that is not included with the cars now in the showrooms.

General Motors is, of course, entitled to set its own sales policy anytime it wants, but I regret the statement repeatedly made to me by a local dealer, the sales manager for one of their large distributors and, indeed, the statement made to me only yesterday by the general sales manager of the Buick Motor Co. that not only was it OPA that was holding up the distribution of their cars but the latter individual went still further and told me that the cars would not be released until Congress woke up and forced the OPA to release their 1946 prices.

President, Vandenberg, Commended for Labor-Management Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the finer parts of our American system is that it does provide means to bring people together. All things can be served, solved and saved if men, in the right spirit, will sit down and talk impassionately about their mutual problems.

I am pleased, in this line, to include a resolution recently received from a Pomona grange in the State of Washington:

Whereas this grange views with alarm the growing unrest of labor and the mounting disputes between labor and management, resulting in strikes and walk-outs, which in turn cause inconvenience, hardships, loss of time, and millions of dollars of damage to thousands of innocent people. It is our opinion that an intelligent and enlightened people and Nation such as ours should be able to work out a better way to settle their disputes than by the strike method.

Whereas Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, on August 2, recommended that labor, man-

agement, and Government leaders meet to negotiate the end of labor strife, and the President did on August 25, instruct his Secretaries of Labor and Commerce to plan such a conference as proposed by the Senator.

Whereas this grange is very much in favor of such a conference and sincerely hopes that such a meeting can work out a solution fair and favorable to all: Therefore, be it

Resolved by Columbia Grange No. 87, That we go on record as commending Senator VANDENBERG and President Truman for such a conference; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of our Senators and Representatives with a further recommendation that they set up a permanent tribunal for settlement of disputes between labor and management. Such a law would outlaw strikes and make labor unions responsible if they do. Surely Congress can work out some way to settle these disputes that will be fair to both labor and management and still prevent a minority group from tying up the Nation or a large section of the Nation and causing loss and suffering to millions of citizens as they have in the past.

Passed by West Klickitat Pomona Grange No. 32.

WALTER OMEG, *Master.*
ALICE K. SCHMIDT, *Secretary.*

The Coffee Situation Is Hot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the coffee situation is still hot; the following letter received by Congressman HALE is directly in point. I will let the letter speak for itself:

Hon. ROBERT HALE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: After reading the article relative to coffee conditions in yesterday's World-Telegram and today's Journal of Commerce, you are to be commended in bringing to light the chaotic conditions that exist in this commodity.

Inquiries are coming into the New York market from roasters all over, but the importers, agents, and brokers are unable to furnish or fill these inquiries for coffee, simply because they cannot buy it at source. Reason, our ceiling is from 2 to 5 cents below.

Many of these small roasters have been in business anywhere from 35 to 50 years and now they have to close their plants if they do not obtain coffees within the next few weeks. Relief in the form of the removal of all restrictions is the only cure. By that the law of supply and demand will tend to regulate prices and the good coffees will sell at market or competitive prices and the poor coffees will sell at a much lower basis than present, or whatever the traffic will stand.

The coffee trade throughout the entire United States stands ready to put on additional help, but with the possibility of plants closing up on account of not being able to obtain coffees to roast, it will mean that employers will have to let their help go.

How can one pay taxes if he hardly makes a living? How can one purchase bonds or even hold what he has already? Existing conditions deprive one of doing both. Where is that good-neighbor policy?

Nobody wants inferior coffees, neither do you want to drink a cup of poor coffee, but that's what you will have to take if it keeps up.

I sincerely hope that you will, along with your committee, attain some success in bringing about a very much needed change which will help not only the trade but also the consumer and the neighbor in the South Americas. Best of luck to you.

Respectfully yours.

Radio Address of Hon. Fred Bradley of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED BRADLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my weekly radio broadcast over Stations WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie, and WDBC, Escanaba, Mich., and WMAM, Marinette, Wis.:

The House had no legislative program last week which, as usual, meant that many Members returned to their districts, but a surprisingly large number of Members remained in Washington to take care of ever-increasing quantities of correspondence. Also there were several matters of tremendous national interest and importance to which the Members wished to give their personal attention, as a result of which the daily sessions of the House were attended by an unusually large membership.

Possibly the matter of greatest national interest was the hearings conducted by the Special Joint Committee from both Houses to probe into the Pearl Harbor catastrophe. The public has every right to expect, and I believe will eventually learn, much of the truth about the events leading up to the Pearl Harbor disaster; and it is to be hoped that the Nation will benefit from the disclosure of these facts to the end that we may never again suffer such a disgraceful defeat. For that reason it should have been a strictly bipartisan committee from the very start, with equal representation from both parties. The administration, however, refused to see it in this light and with its greater political strength in both Houses forced the establishment of a 10-man committee composed of 6 Democrats and 4 Republicans, equally divided between both Houses of Congress. In the establishment of the procedure, once again the Democrats voted solidly along partisan lines and thereby set up their own method of procedure and for which, if it is later proven unsatisfactory, they must assume the blame.

On the other hand, in my opinion, some of the Republican members of this committee have not in at least one instance kept the interrogation of witnesses on the high plane that such an important investigation demands.

The first witness to be called before the committee was Rear Adm. Thomas Browning Inglis. Admiral Inglis had just been promoted to his present rank and had assumed the position of Chief of Naval Intelligence about a week previous. In the course of a rather vicious cross-examination of the admiral, his veracity was attacked. To this I personally strenuously objected in a speech on the House floor and in which I was ably supported not only by the majority leader, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, but also by the dean of our Michigan Republican delegation, the Honorable ROY O. WOODRUFF, of Bay City. The last time I saw Admiral Inglis was at the naval hospital in Bethesda last April. At that time he was a captain who was just completing a 7-month stretch of hospitalization for serious injuries received while he was in command of the cruiser U. S. S. *Birmingham*. I want to give you just a bit of his background up to this event. In 1914, Mr. WOODRUFF appointed young Inglis to the Naval Academy, when he was 16 years old. His father had been the pastor of Mr. WOODRUFF's Presbyterian Church in Bay City. His mother was a school teacher. Following the death of the father, Mrs. Inglis, together with her six children, had moved to a small farm near Cheboygan. Young Tom was not the beneficiary of a high-school education but instead his mother tutored him specifically for the entrance examinations at Annapolis and finally was able to send him to a naval preparatory school for the last 3 months. Out of some 600 boys, who wrote the entrance examinations, Tom stood at the top of the list, and it is noteworthy that he passed the very difficult geography, mathematics, and English entrance examinations with an absolutely perfect mark, which is, of course, practically unheard of. While he was in command of the *Birmingham* in this war, he served with distinction in practically every theater. He was awarded the Bronze Star for their close-in shore bombardment of Saipan in the Marianas. He was awarded the Silver Star when the *Birmingham* served as part of what the Navy called the "bait squadron." In an action off the island of Formosa our new cruisers *Houston* and *Canberra* had been seriously damaged. These ships had been named for our own U. S. S. *Houston* and the Australian cruiser *Canberra* which had been sunk in the early days of the war. The *Birmingham* and other ships got between them and the Japanese at Formosa and tried to bait their fleet to coming out and going into action.

It was a very ticklish spot to be in for the *Birmingham;* but had the Japanese actually come into action, we had a trap waiting for them with a heavy force ready to pounce on them. A little later in another action the aircraft carrier *Princeton* had been severely damaged by the Japs. The order to abandon ship had been given and the *Birmingham* pulled alongside to evacuate her crew and at the same time made a noble effort to put out her fires. The fires had almost been extinguished when another Jap air-raid warning was sounded and the *Birmingham* was told to pull away to protect herself. As soon as the raid was over—with no further damage to the *Princeton*—the *Birmingham* again sought to return to complete here fire-extinguishing job. She had just pulled close enough alongside to get one line over to the *Princeton* when the *Princeton's* aft magazine blew up. About one-half of the *Birmingham's* crew became instant casualties, including her intrepid skipper, Captain Inglis. He received many wounds from flying fragments and a broken arm. He was removed to a hospital ship, but the next day insisted on returning to his own badly damaged craft and personally reassumed command and she was successfully sailed some five thousands of miles back to Pearl Harbor. Because of this heroic action, for which he received the Navy Cross and the Purple Heart, it became necessary for him to undergo further serious painful operations, including the rebreaking and resetting of his arm. It was from this latter siege that I saw him recuperating and talked with him on many occasions at length while I myself was a patient at Bethesda. And so, with a record like that behind him, I felt that it was not only bad taste but certainly extremely poor judgment to attack the personal

integrity and honesty and patriotism and courage of a sterling character such as Rear Admiral Thomas B. Inglis. What I was, and am, most concerned about is the fact that I do not want the impression to go out to the people of the United States that a dignified and extremely important committee of Congress should, in the handling of their witnesses, spread the false belief that those witnesses are not honorable men giving testimony which is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth insofar as they are capable of so doing in accordance with the oath taken when they are sworn in on the stand. And I want to say right now that I shall continue to voice my criticism of any such unwise procedure in the future, be it on the part of members of my own party or of the administration party.

Admiral Inglis was followed on the stand by Admiral James O. Richardson, who was in command of our fleet from early 1940 until he was removed unceremoniously by the late President Roosevelt early in February 1941 and succeeded by then Rear Admiral Husband E. Kimmel, whom the President jumped some 46 ranks over the heads of his superior officers to this high command, which command he retained, of course, until removed immediately after the Pearl Harbor debacle. Admiral Richardson gave some very interesting testimony, but it must be admitted that much of his testimony was in the nature of corroboration of information and rumors of which many Members of Congress and many members of the press and radio commentators had knowledge. For instance, many of us had long before been told that Admiral Richardson was removed by the President because of his insistence that it was wrong from a naval standpoint to have our fleet bottled up in Pearl Harbor. Admiral Richardson testified that at a luncheon at the White House with President Roosevelt in October 1940 he had insisted that if there were danger of war with the Japanese that the fleet should be put in battle readiness, and that the only place that could be done, and the only place where the fleet could put aboard a full complement of men and officers, was back on the west coast of the United States. To this practical naval strategy Mr. Roosevelt strenuously objected. And it must have come as quite a shock to many of those who repeatedly stated and believed that the President was a very close student of naval affairs and, therefore, somewhat of a naval strategist in his own right, that he should have objected to taking the advice of his own appointed fleet commander, who was basing his recommendations upon some 40 years of practical naval experience. Richardson had pointed out that the fleet was at only 85 percent of its wartime personnel strength and yet the President had ample authority from the Congress to bring it up to full strength. Then he pointed out that in the event a war did come the fleet could not hope to carry on an extended campaign against the Japanese without a train of supply ships and without considerable repair work having been done in advance, and for which the facilities at Pearl Harbor were totally inadequate. The vulnerability of Pearl Harbor to air attack was acknowledged both by the Navy and the Army, yet because of our haste to get equipment into the hands of the British in the Atlantic theater the improvement of protective facilities at Pearl Harbor was allowed to lag and lag.

It is to be remembered that this luncheon conversation took place in October 1940, just about a month before the people of the United States elected Mr. Roosevelt to his unprecedented third term. Not a little of his support in that reelection campaign was based upon his repeated promises to the American people that we were not going to war and his often-repeated statement that, "I tell you, fathers and mothers, again and again and again, that your boys are not going to be sent to fight another war on foreign soil." Yet, Admiral Richardson testified that at that October 1940 luncheon the President told him that there was definite danger of war and that sooner or later the Japanese would make a mistake which would bring us into the war. That to me was an amazing revelation in view of the President's campaign promises. In February 1941, while he was still insisting that our fleet should be returned to the Pacific coast for adequate preparation for possible warfare, Admiral Richardson was most unceremoniously removed. He was denied even the privilege of an audience with the President upon his return to the United States to inquire why he had been so displaced. He was informed merely by the Secretary of the Navy, Colonel Knox, that he was removed because he had offended the President at the October luncheon. The admiral said he had not heard from nor seen the President following that luncheon up to the time of his death.

There is another interesting angle that we can get from Admiral Richardson's testimony. Despite the fact that he had repeatedly insisted the fleet was not ready for war, yet Secretary of the Navy Knox wrote a magazine article shortly before Pearl Harbor, and later made a speech, both to the effect that our fleet would whip the Japs within 2 weeks anytime. As a matter of fact, I recall an interesting statement made to the Members of Congress by one of the bomber pilots, who sought to defend the Philippines at the time when the White House and the Navy were both trying to calm the fears of the American people, and above all to keep away from the American people the truth of the damage at Pearl Harbor. This pilot and his crew had gone out from the Philippines to bomb the Jap fleet. On their way home the radio operator handed the pilot a copy of a broadcast just received from the States quoting Mr. Knox as saying that the war would be over in 2 weeks if our fleet could locate the Japs in that time. Were it not for the radio silence necessary for that plane to maintain at that moment, the pilot suggested that they might inform the Secretary that they had long since located the Jap fleet and thus might shorten the war perceptibly.

Admiral Richardson was followed to the stand by Admiral William D. Leahy, who was present at that October 1940 luncheon, at which time he was serving as the Governor of Puerto Rico. While he did not recall all of the conversation between Admiral Richardson and the President, he did not question Richardson's testimony, which the latter had prepared from copious notes and memoranda which he maintained at all times. Admiral Leahy did say that he had been amazed at Richardson's disclosures that the Navy was not prepared for war and that he, too, felt that it was necessary to return it to the States to get it ready rather than leave it out on a limb at Pearl Harbor.

There is no question but that this committee can, and should be able to, give to the American people the whole truth and nothing but the truth about Pearl Harbor. Surely the American people are entitled to know and they must know. Let the chips fall where they may. None of the preceding reports, each of which has been released from, and as later has been proved, seriously deleted by the White House, have given the American people all the facts to which they are entitled. It is to be hoped that in the uncovering of further testimony the committee will be as thorough and as painstaking as possible and of which there is no doubt as to its capability. The hearings are open to the public and all the facts can, and should be, laid on the table.

Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a speech I delivered at the Massachusetts State Convention of the Massachusetts Federation of Post Office Clerks held on Sunday, November 25, 1945, at Haverhill, Mass., under the auspices of Local 540. This convention was well attended and considerable interest was shown by the delegates on matters of vital importance to the post-office employees. Following the business meeting, the banquet of the delegates and friends was held in the auditorium of the Haverhill City Hall and was presided over by Earl E. Ryan, of Haverhill, State chairman of the Massachusetts Federation of Post Office Clerks.

The speech follows:

As one who is on the pay roll of the Government, it is always a pleasure for me to speak to Federal employees. We work for the same boss, and we share many of the same problems.

When I read, the other day, that the President is lucky to have $3,000 left from his $75,000 salary, after paying various taxes and White House expenses, I felt closer to Harry S. Truman than at any time since he assumed the leadership of our Nation. Taxation and the high cost of living make all men kin. By that same token, President Truman is keenly aware of the problems of Federal employees.

In a democracy, where the various agencies of government are constantly exposed to savage criticism, the Congress is glad that there is one strong arm to save the day. That is the Post Office Department, a vital and difficult service which operates with a high morale and on a sound and businesslike basis.

During the past 4 years, quietly and without fanfare, this Department has performed a back-breaking job with a remarkable degree of efficiency. For my part, I do not believe that it has received enough recognition for the great job it has done.

Ask any man or woman among the millions who served in the armed forces what was the most popular line-up for the day and you will discover that mail call ran a close second to mess call. The tremendous number of letters and boxes sent out to our fighting men was the most important factor in the top morale which led to victory. This was your unsung contribution to the war effort. It is high time that it received due credit. For the purposes of the record I personally want to acknowledge my debt to the members of the Department for the prompt and uncomplaining manner in which they handled the vast correspondence of the Congress during these past and trying years. It was a job well and faithfully done.

During the lush years of the war, however, the post office clerks were not sufficiently compensated for the work they did. What wages and working conditions they did enjoy came to them only through organized effort. Theirs has been a long and difficult battle for economic recognition. It is only half won. In the uncertain days ahead, the postal clerks need more than ever to fight for a just ratio between wages and prices. For

this is the only yardstick by which we may measure a living income. That yardstick, showing a sizable margin of wages over prices, can be won only through organization.

The post office clerks have come a long way since 1813, when a yellow fever epidemic reduced New York's postal staff from three to two clerks. A long climb since the days, 100 years ago, when postal clerks came to work in tall beaver hats and usually sported silver-topped canes. Those were the days when the enemies of labor tried to sell the idea that joining a labor union was somehow vulgar. Postal clerks were told that, being gentlemen, it would be undignified for them to associate with sweaty teamsters and lowbrow hodcarriers, even though these despised workers made more money than Uncle Sam's white-collar mail handlers. This type of propaganda failed completely when it was discovered that clerks in foreign countries got more money, because they belonged to labor unions. Postal clerks have had an uphill fight since 1898, when a Chicago postmaster got the bright idea that he would make his postal clerks, who got the unheard of pay of $600 a year, buy uniforms at their own expense, from a firm in which he was interested. There was not any clerk's organization then of any consequence, but organized labor came to their aid and stopped the uniform racket. Technically, postal clerks owed Uncle Sam 24 hours of work a day for 365 days in the year, 366 in leap year, and exactions of killing overtime hours for months on end reduced them to the position of white-collar slaves. As a matter of fact, this technical requirement of work for unlimited hours ended, so far as Classification Act employees are concerned, only when the new pay law was adopted in 1945.

The postal clerks had to fight for their living rights in 1926, 1927, and 1928, which saw the continuation of President Coolidge's unswerving policy of opposing any and all postal legislation even if such remedial legislation would not cost the Government 1 cent. Employees' contributions to the pension fund had built up a huge surplus without the Treasury having to contribute a nickel, yet Coolidge and his close-fisted Secretary of the Treasury were dead set against the smallest liberalization of annuities above the $60 a month maximum. Tax reductions for the rich remained the highest good and the political horizon of the Coolidge administration. The year 1928 marked the end of an era now gone forever. Characteristic of that remote period of American history and characteristic of that administration was his disapproval of some RFD carrier legislation which would have cost the Government $25,000 the first year and $16,000 the second year. It is interesting to speculate what his reaction would have been to social security legislation.

The first economies of the Hoover regime began in the summer of 1930. While his Secretary of Labor, Davis, was constantly pleading with employers not to lengthen hours, cut wages, or discharge any workers, Postmaster General Brown was speeding up postal workers, eliminating thousands of jobs, refusing to fill vacancies and dumping out thousands of "subs" to fend for themselves in an already glutted labor market. It was during this period that Secretary-Treasurer Tom Flaherty of the NFPOC, said in his annual report:

"The pioneers of our movement were not content to leave things as they found them. They were considered radicals because they dared to criticize and protest against existing wrongs. They had an abiding faith in the destiny of our organization and this faith has been fully justified. On this occasion, marking the twenty-fifth anniversary, we can view with satisfaction their monument in its present form—an aggressive, virile, forward-moving organization, one that has fought the fight and kept the faith."

Then, the depression came, gripping the country in blackest fear and despair. At Detroit, 400 "subs" were dismissed in a wholesale "canning fest." Flaherty took a group of Baltimore "subs" to the White House to leave a petition with Mr. Hoover's secretary for some sort of relief for the distressed substitutes. Drastic wage cuts and wholesale discharges pushed with merciless severity to the very limit was the only practical solution that Republican economists could devise for getting out of the economic morass; that and handing out some $36,000,000 a year in subsidies, most of it pure "pork," to air-line and steamship companies. The West African Line received $87,862 for carrying 133 pounds of mail or $660.62 per pound. The wage-slashing drive obviously came entirely from the great captains of industry who in their panic and fear could devise no other solution for a problem for which all their vision and heretofore supposed economic genius had not prepared them. President Hoover signed the so-called economy bill with limited satisfaction. His chief complaint was that the wage cuts he had hoped for were not drastic enough. Even $300-a-year messengers and $25-a-month "subs" had these already pitifully low wages trimmed down still more. Congress had specifically exempted salaries under $1,000 a year from any cuts whatever, but the Republican administration of the Department interpreted otherwise, reaching down even into the pay envelopes of $300-a-year messengers.

Postmaster General Brown, who had been most active in behalf of postal economies, ranging from salvaging used string to wholesale lay-offs of pauper "subs," was revealed as having bought with Government funds a new and unneeded $3,500 Lincoln car because all the other limousines available for his use were too low for his high silk hat. None of the postal economy experts had the courage to suggest to his excellency that he could save the hard-pressed Government $3,500 merely by doffing his silk topper and carrying it in his lap. Political commentators had a field day with Mr. Brown's high silk hat and the resultant publicity and ridicule added gall and wormwood to the bitter last days of Hoover's Postmaster General.

With their backs to the wall, during the depression, the NFPOC had to fight long and bitter battles against wage-reduction legislation. But the summer of 1935 saw the marshaling of forces behind the 40-hour-week bill sponsored by Representative James Mead. Although the estimated cost of the bill was some $22,000,000, Postmaster General James Farley heartily endorsed the bill in contrast to previous administrations which balked at $25,000 expenditures. With ten to twelve millions still out of work, men were beginning to see the simple, elemental logic in the contention of the A. F. of L. that only the reduction of the workweek would create more jobs. Farley wrote Senator McKELLAR: "I am pleased to advise you that at this time there is every indication that the increase in postal revenues will continue, and it is believed that better working conditions for the employees can be provided. I have talked with the President and he believes that, in view of the increase in receipts and the general objectives of giving additional employment, the bill to reduce the hours of labor of postal employees from 44 to 40 per week is sound. It gives me great pleasure, therefore, to advise you of my approval of H. R. 6990. I cannot forget the splendid spirit of cooperation in which the postal employees accepted the reductions in their salaries and the payless furloughs during the period when it was necessary for the Department to observe the strictest economy." On August 14, President Roosevelt signed the bill.

Years of persistent and persuasive Federation effort in behalf of the post office's forgotten men, the subs, was finally rewarded in 1939 when H. R. 5479 narrowly squeezed through the millstones of Congress. President Roosevelt's signature to the measure granted sick leave and vacations to the substitutes, the first break they had received in many years.

The outbreak of war saw the postal clerks faced with the greatest work load in their history. All claims of upward revision in pay were waived as all pitched in to help in the war effort.

With the coming of peace, however, they must be vigilant, realizing that any increases granted to labor in industry must be compensated for by any increase for Government workers. The upward pressure of prices for consumer goods has already sabotaged your incomes. As members of the white-collar class, who have not enjoyed the huge wartime earnings of those in industry, it is up to you, with the same will to win which you have so ably demonstrated in your long, hard, climb from the days when John J. White and Charles Dvorak in Chicago, had the courage to buck big business and Republican reactionaries, to organize the postal clerks as men and women who are worthy of their hire.

Organization has brought you thus far, and it is organization alone that will surely win for you the decent standard of living which you so richly deserve. In this fight I hope that you will call upon me as your friend—to help you in any way that I possibly can.

Local Consumer Groups Demand Retention of Price and Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from statements presented by local consumer, labor, church, and settlement groups with reference to subsidies, rent, and price control. These statements were offered at a meeting held on November 14 in the House Labor Committee room by the Congressional Committee for the Protection of the Consumer. More than 200 consumer organizations from a dozen major cities were represented. In arranging this meeting which afforded these groups the opportunity to present their views, I was moved by appreciation of the fact that we should, as Members of Congress, secure a first-hand picture of how American families view price and rent controls.

Statement of Colston E. Warne, president of Consumers Union of United States, in introducing the local consumer groups:

The last 10 years have brought the rapid growth of local consumer organizations and of local federations to protect consumers' interests. We have large federated efforts in Chicago, New York, St. Louis, and Cincinnati. We have the Organized Housewives of Syracuse, N. Y. In Boston, Philadelphia, Albany, Cleveland—indeed, in every major urban center—a spontaneous but little-noted development has occurred under the impact of war and rising prices. Consumers are awakening and are becoming a potent influence in our economic life. This growth has been stimulated by the experience afforded by work on price panels and on rationing boards; by the many hours of educational

work which these groups have spent on problems of price control; and, most of all, by the experience of trying to make personal budgets balance through a difficult war period. Today we have the opportunity to have local consumer groups speak for themselves. They will state what they feel the Congress should do about price and rent control.

We shall first hear from a returning veteran, who has a dramatic statement of how the housing problem affects him. His experience could be duplicated in many cities.

Statement of Lt. Erling W. Eng, Hull House, Chicago:

Homecoming without homes for their families is what growing thousands of angry war veterans all over the United States are up against today.

They have long ago overflowed the already crowded nomes of near and distant relatives. They are being driven into the slums.

If the war had continued, many of these men would have died in the service of their country. They have come back, and their country has made no plans to receive them.

The patience of these men is becoming short. Many of them served in units that made the proud claim: "We do the difficult immediately; the impossible takes us a little longer." And their successes over insuperable obstacles tested the truth of their assertion. These men want to know why the unprepared America to which they have come home does not feel that way about making housing available for the families of the men who lived in tents and in the ground for years in other countries.

The GI bill of rights has turned out to be a mere straw in the rising gale of the ex-serviceman's and his family's griefs. Three hundred dollars and a reverent pat on the back is not taking care of the veteran's return to civilian life.

After he has been driven back into the slums (if he is "lucky" enough to find a place there) he wants to know why there is a still further move to deny his family milk and bread and clothing. He does not understand why OPA price controls should be jeopardized. Because he also knows that present plans under way to house veterans will be damaged by resultant soaring prices on building materials.

A chain is as strong as its weakest link; all the essential and interrelated price controls must be maintained to insure the protection that veterans' families are demanding.

The war abroad was won; and now the success achieved by cooperative effort during the war at home must be maintained if we are not to lose the victory that counts—the victory in living.

The veteran, as your representative, used what you held out to him to win the war in foreign countries. Now, if that victory is not to be a hollow one in the homecoming, you, as his representative, must use the support he holds out to you to insure the victory at home.

Statement of Mrs. James R. Wilson, president, Organized Housewives, Syracuse, N. Y.:

"What we need is another good depression to drive these ex-war-workers back into our kitchens." This shocking statement was made by a well-bred young matron at a dinner party in Syracuse last week. And a more shocking fact was that there were nods of agreement around that table. That same young lady sees no sense in continuing rationing or price control.

Yes, there are those who look on a depression with no horror. Perhaps they are very young or quite uninformed or maybe just stupid. Most certainly they are a small minority. However, there are others in Syracuse who are mature in their comprehension, informed on the facts of living costs, and clear in their thinking.

It is this latter group whom I represent here today. They have asked me to tell you that they believe that rationing and ceiling prices on foods and clothing must be maintained in order to control the cost of living and prevent serious inflation. They are concerned about the price increases that have come about just in the past year and urge you to do all in your power to maintain subsidies to farmers and to take any other appropriate action which will help to hold the line on food and clothing prices. They have indicated this on a petition which I have with me.

We housewives know what we are talking about because prices to us are not vague economic statistics; because we are the people whose purchases finance this Nation. * * *

The American Institute of Public Opinion in their news letter dated November 13 indicates that the country as a whole agrees with the Syracuse Housewives. According to the Gallup figures 77 percent of the American public want wages and price ceilings maintained.

Statement of Mildred A. Gutwillig, chairman, New York City Consumer Council:

Today, 60 delegates from the 63 affiliates of the New York City Consumer Council are here in this room. We represent trade unions, settlements, consumer councils, women's groups, churches, and cooperatives, thousands of low- and middle-income consumers. A few of us are professional workers from these organizations, but the vast majority are housewives with husbands and children to feed and clothe on strictly limited incomes. Chester Bowles tells us that from the outbreak of World War II to the end of 1944 living costs rose 28.8 percent. By and large, the wages of the husbands in our groups have not kept pace, and costs are still rising. This is the group that from the beginning of the war has faithfully fought the black market in food with every kind of ingenious device possible, appeared in court against overcharging merchants, served on OPA advisory committees, and trudged from store to store as price-panel assistants. In short, we have done everything within our power to try to uphold rationing and keep prices down. We are a working group. As such, I believe, we have the right to appeal to this body for protection.

Since VJ-day, in spite of the official pronouncement of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion that it would hold the line, there has been almost indecent haste in lifting controls. One business interest after another has successfully lobbied for price rises on its particular products. It looks now as if we were about to take a headlong plunge into inflation—a threat as serious as war itself to the living standard of low- and middle-income groups.

I would like to sketch briefly the picture as we see it.

1. We are told that almost all food subsidies will be abolished between now and June 30. These are months in which unemployment is expected to rise from the present two million to a high of six to eight million. On top of unemployment, the low-income family is expected to take out of its own pocket the following amounts which the subsidy previously covered:

Five to six cents a pound on butter (this has already occurred), 1.3 cents a quart on milk, 4.8 cents a pound on cheese, 8.8 cents on 10 pounds of flour, 2.6 cents on a No. 2 can of grapefruit juice, 4.2 cents a pound on prunes, 4.4 cents a pound on pork.

These are only a few staples in ordinary demand and the item of food constitutes 40 percent of total living costs. Therefore we want you ladies and gentlemen to introduce a bill requiring the continuation of subsidies until prices of other items of food have decreased to such an extent as to absorb these increases. At the moment there is no indication that this is happening with the lonely exception of potatoes.

2. Shortages in building materials are delaying the construction of urgently needed new low-cost housing. New York is suffering from the greatest lack of apartments in its history. Our boys did not endure the fox holes of Anzio in order to double up with their new families in congested tenements and overcrowded dwellings. We need new housing but along with it, we need price ceilings on old and new houses to avoid a speculative orgy at the expense of a million and a half GI's as well as the rest of the population. Rent control is a must for New York City.

3. Low priced clothing has been promised but not produced. It literally does not exist on the New York market, the garment center for the whole United States. We want inexpensive yard goods channeled to manufacturers of cheap clothing, pretricketed with the price to the consumer. Clothing represents 13 percent of living costs and from May 1943 to December 1944, its cost rose 11.6 percent, the greatest single factor in jumping the cost of living.

* * * * *

In this brief statement I have emphasized food, shelter, and clothing because these constitute 70 percent of the cost of living index and because the low income budget in general does not stretch much beyond these. We have fought the good fight to help keep the economy stable all during the war years but we cannot proceed without congressional action for stabilization and against inflation. The Second War Powers Act which expires on December 31, 1945, must be renewed without crippling amendments. We talked with Mr. Snyder last week on all of these points and his answer was, "It's up to Congress." That's why we are here today so that you may know how deeply we, from your home communities, feel.

Statement of Mrs. Iris Brown, New York Auxiliary of the National Maritime Union:

We cannot afford increases in food costs. We urge that food subsidies be retained in order to keep prices down. We also urge that price control be maintained until all threat of inflation disappears. * * *

We urge increased production of low priced clothing of improved qualities. * * *

We urge that all rent ceilings be continued, and that ceilings be placed on all new houses as they become available for occupancy.

Statement of Mrs. Dorothy Silvergleit of the Women's Auxiliary of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Local 251, Brooklyn, N. Y.:

Government workers are in a singularly unfortunate position during a period of inflation. Their salaries are fixed by Congressional act, and cannot be raised without further recourse to Congress and the President. * * *

Certain subsidies on food, cattle, and farm products were granted by Congress, after much wrangling. Their purpose was to keep prices on certain products at an even level, in order to enable consumers to maintain as much as possible their standards of living. It was necessary for the common man to exert considerable pressure on Congress to overcome the propaganda of a few selfish, self-seeking interests.

These subsidies have proven very effective. Staple foods, essential in the everyday life of the consumer, have been made available at reasonable prices. This has been of particular importance to Government and fixed income workers.

If subsidies were canceled at this time, with mass unemployment impending, the effect would be disastrous. With the war

over, our worst enemy at this time would be runaway inflation. This must not happen.

Statement of Mary Goldstein of Madison House, New York City:

I am here to speak for the wives of postal clerks. We have suffered a big cut in take-home pay since the first of October. In my case this cut amounts to over $60 per month. We have never lived high and this cut comes right out of our food, clothing and other necessities. * * *

With inflation on, we find it impossible to get along. We will have to go to work in order to make ends meet, and that will mean that we will take jobs which could be filled by our home-coming GI's. * * *

We feel that we work for the Government and that the Government ought to set standards for its employees. We want to be proud to work for the Government, but it's hard to be proud when you can't get what you need for rent, clothing, or food. We are entitled to live like human beings.

We ask that the Government look into the matter and make adjustments. We are sure that if the Government does this, they will know we are speaking the truth, and we are sure they will do the right thing.

Statement of Ruth Kuperstein, United Housewives, Bronx, N. Y.:

The housewives in my community want, first, over-all continued rent control. The lifting of rent ceilings offers the greatest inflationary threat to our economy. Second, they want an adequate housing program. Third, they want ceilings on building materials so that their sons can buy the homes they waited so long for. They want continued price control that will make for a stable, secure economy.

Statement of Ethel Lax, United Women's Committee of Parkchester, Bronx, N. Y.:

If subsidies are removed on staples, as has been the case on butter, food prices will necessarily rise. In conjunction with the possibility of increased rentals and prices on clothing, the cost of living will far exceed our husbands' salaries. This is not the time to cancel food subsidies. When our country is back to normal peacetime production and buying, when all war industry is reconverted, when our men in service and our war workers are back in peacetime jobs and earning a living wage, that will be the time to cancel food subsidies.

Statement of Sylvia Tuck, of the Bronx Consumers Coordinating Council:

I am speaking for the housewives of the Bronx, and as a serviceman's wife. On $80 a month it is difficult to manage with prices soaring in all fields. Adults can get along without some things, but our children must have clothing, food, medication, and a home.

Chester Bowles asked for ceiling prices on new houses to guard against inflation, but Reconversion Director Snyder gave builders the go-ahead signal, control free, which will not alleviate the problem for us.

* * * * *

Lifting rent control is not only our problem but lies heavily upon the shoulders of our lawmakers, whose duty it is to prevent chaos, inflation, and then a depression with bread lines.

Statement of Alice Shapiro, Joan of Arc Council for Community Activity, New York City:

During the war our organization did much for the people in our block—and in many other blocks. The people in our block know us and we know them.

* * * * *

We enacted laws, reorganized industries, built communities overnight to turn out the death-dealing weapons our boys used on the enemy. The boys are back now, but on our block they are taking a licking because the "boys" on the Hill are selling them short. "Full rations in war—empty promises in peace."

The people on our block don't like it. They want action. They want it now. Food and clothing at prices they can pay; houses and enough of them at rents they can afford.

We gave them all they needed when they faced death. Mr. Congressman, what are you doing to help them face life?

Statement of Rose G. Goldberg, president of the Franklin Consumer Council, Brooklyn, N. Y.:

In our community the rent problem will become acute if ceilings are lifted.

* * * * *

Food prices have continued to rise until they are out of all proportion to income. With the proposed removal of subsidies it will become impossible for the average wage earner to feed his family adequately. * * *

In our community, where most wage earners are white-collar workers or engaged in manufacturing trades, women have been forced to go to work, to the neglect of their homes and children in order to balance the family budget. We urge the continuance of subsidies and price and rent controls to alleviate these conditions.

Statement of Ann Singer, of the United Club of the American Labor Party, Brooklyn, N. Y.:

Our membership consists of the lower- and middle-class income group—the shopkeeper, the white-collar worker, and the weekly wage earner. Although we are a part of one of the largest cities in the world, we find it well-nigh impossible to obtain low-priced clothing of reasonable wearing strength for the members of our family. * * *

We respectfully petition your aid in obtaining for us durable low-cost clothing that will not receive a disproportionate share of our income.

Statement of Sadie Cohen, of the Grant Street Settlement, New York City:

We need price control now, more than ever. We can hardly make ends meet, and if prices go up even more, it will be impossible to feed and clothe our families.

* * * * *

We in our community appeal to you to do everything in your power to maintain price ceilings and enforce them. If you don't, the people of the East Side and other communities in America will suffer untold hardship in the coming months and years.

Statement of Erna V. Rose, of the Midwood Consumer Council, Brooklyn, N. Y.:

The Midwood Consumer Council represents a community of at least 17,000 families. We urge that your committee enforce a law placing ceilings on low-priced clothing and stimulating production of these items so desperately needed. * * *

We also strongly urge immediate action to maintain present ceilings on rents and resale prices of present housing, and of building costs on new housing. If such action is not taken, the resulting situation in New York, for example, will be indescribable. * * *

We protest the removal of the subsidy on food items. This causes a substantial increase in our food budget and all these tendencies together are plunging us into immediate inflation, which, as you all know, means suffering for the average citizen.

Statement of Mrs. Fay Winston, Midwood American Labor Party, Brooklyn, N. Y.:

In consideration of the fact that the take-home pay of workers has decreased so much, it is imperative that the cost of living should not increase.

Since all economists are agreed that inflation is the greatest evil confronting us, it is imperative that any attempt to create an inflationary current must be stifled. Therefore, I urge that you bend every effort to continue subsidies and help maintain the American standard of living.

Statement of L. Shirley Tark, Independent Voters of Illinois:

We have waged the world's most costly and devastating war with a fair measure of control of prices. The cost of living has gone up decisively, but not a fraction of the extent it would have reached without these controls. Since VJ-day controls have been released on various items and in many instances prices spiraled upward at once. Agitation to remove all controls is definitely inimical to the best interests of our country, and will, if successful, benefit only speculators—a small section of the American public in the form of some businessmen—lead to a boom and speculative orgy, and wind up with a bust. Price control must be retained especially on those items that affect the cost of living to a large extent. It must be maintained over items such as bread, milk and rent, until the supply of bread and milk and housing is balanced by the demand for these items.

If control of these items is not maintained, our average American will find his living costs tremendously increased, will find too much of his income expended to buy these essentials, and find he is left with too little purchasing power for other necessities and luxuries, resulting in reduced consumption of these other items. Instead of a period of healthy prosperity, we will head into a period of inflation with its accompanying sufferings for the masses, and finally conclude in lay-offs, shut-downs, curtailed production, and depression.

Statement of Mrs. Leonard Fuchs, Erika Mann Chapter of the WIVES, Inc., Chicago, Ill.:

The Erika Mann Chapter of the WIVES, Inc., affiliated with the national WIVES, an organization of servicemen's wives, wishes to go on record as strongly opposed to any weakening of the OPA price ceilings. * * *

We must be helped to begin life again with courage and faith in our Government's interest in the ordinary people and we can be helped in this faith by the retention of OPA and price ceilings on the things without which life could not be sustained.

Mrs. Hayes Swanson, of the Chicago Federation of Consumers, said:

We urge renewal of the Second War Powers Act, to continue as long as necessary, the power to ration scarce commodities and further urge that there be no amendments to the Price Control Act which would take from OPA the power to compel absorption of increases at either manufacturer or retail levels.

We also favor the retention and extension of rent controls and the placing of ceilings on prices of houses—old and new.

It is our opinion that the whole price control and rationing structure must be maintained intact so long as goods remain in short supply if we are to dispel the specter of inflation which haunts us.

Statement by Glenford W. Lawrence, representing the Chicago settlements and neighborhood houses:

Having worked at a settlement house for 27 years among the low income groups I have some convictions on the need for holding the line on prices, especially on essential foods.

* * * * *

During the unemployment era I have seen a mother of nine children try to feed them 1 week on a single dollar—stale bread and onion soup was the diet. * * *

The great mass of these foreign-born mothers are not articulate in English and do not speak for themselves, but they give birth to large families of children, many of whom survived for the ranks of our armed forces and of our war workers. There were far too many IV-F's and later medical discharges traceable to malnutrition. If anyone needs proof of the connection between nutrition and food prices in our settlement house communities, I should like to take him into our neighborhood groceries under OPA controlled prices to see the people buying milk, eggs, and vegetables. Now with lay-offs and fear of vast unemployment growing daily among our neighbors, I shudder to think of any rise in prices. The dark days of 1930–32 are too vivid.

I cannot make too strong my plea for subsidies and whatever else is necessary to hold the line on prices—or even push them back if possible.

Statement of Mrs. Dennis E. Jackson, Consumer Conference of Greater Cincinnati:

The Consumer Conference of Greater Cincinnati has 56 affiliated clubs representing a membership of many thousands of homes. We reach members not only around Cincinnati but in many States through monthly meetings, a monthly newspaper and weekly radio programs.

Yesterday we saw an example of special interest group pressure—the auto dealers hearing. We hope Congress remembers that there are hundreds of consumers to every dealer with a few cars, consumers whose interests must be protected.

Inflation is now well under way. Many of the controls necessary to combat inflation will expire December 31 if Congress does not extend the Second War Powers Act. Since there are 212,000,000,000 of money to spend and only 101,000,000,000 worth of goods and services available the results following World War I will be a drop in the bucket to what will happen now if action is not taken to allocate services and materials to relieve the housing, clothing and food situations.

* * * * *

The Consumer Conference of Greater Cincinnati believes that the Second War Powers Act must be extended. We believe that OPA must be continued with adequate appropriations.

We should like to leave with the Congressmen this thought: Business has its Department of Commerce; labor its Department of Labor; the farmers, their Department of Agriculture; why not a department of the consumer in the Government?

Statement of Mrs. John E. Burk, Representative of the Consumers League of Miami, Fla.:

The Consumers League of Miami, Fla., earnestly urges Congress to retain all curbs on inflation—subsidies, rationing, ceiling prices on food, clothing, and housing—both rental and sale properties. We believe we are representative of thinking women everywhere in the United States who would prefer the minor irritations of such curbs to the major disaster of runaway inflation.

We believe this is the only practical way to insure a peace-time economy which would not only give our own people a decent standard of living but would also permit us to give generous aid to less fortunate countries in achieving freedom from want.

Telegram from Harold B. Feinmark, Secretary-Treasurer, Connecticut Federation of Labor:

Connecticut Federation of Labor warmly endorses plan for retention of milk subsidy by Government. In view of drastic cuts in workers' take-home pay, this is no time to raise prices of a necessity such as milk.

Treatment of Political Refugees in Sweden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN
INFORMATION CENTER,
New York, N. Y., November 23, 1945.

The Honorable DANIEL FLOOD,
Congressman from Pennsylvania,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Enclosed herewith are the latest radiogram from Sweden, and our prepared "Pro Memoria" which states the entire case quite clearly.

We have been asked if these prisoners know that they are to be turned over to the Russians, a radiogram from Sweden informed a member of one of our committees that they have been informed and that they have gone on a hunger strike.

Mere words fail to express our appreciation for your efforts and your help in this crisis.

Respectfully yours,

MARY M. KIZIS,
Secretary.

NEW YORK, *November 22, 1935.*

In the morning on November 20 the Government decided not to revise its decision concerning the delivery of 157 Baltic soldiers, including 9 Lithuanians among them, to the Soviets.

On the same day the bishops of Sweden and delegates of the entire Evangelical Church intervened with the foreign office in behalf of the internees. In the lower and upper chambers of the Riksdag (Parliament) the Conservatives and Liberals presented an interpellation.

The official organ of the Social Democrats finds no basis for making a distinction between the interned Germans and the Balts. However, all other press with the exception of the Communists is demanding that the interned Balts be treated as political refugees, and attacks the Government for its intention to surrender the Balts secretly. Regardless of the pressure of the public opinion, the Government does not intend to revise its decision.

A Soviet ship is on her way to pick up the internees. Their transfer may take place within a week. Please take urgent steps to save the Lithuanians; inform (Minister) Zadeikis and Lithuanian Relief.

IGNAS J. SCHEYNIUS.
VLADAS ZILINSKAS.

PRO MEMORIA—TREATMENT OF POLITICAL REFUGEES IN SWEDEN

This office is in receipt of the following radiogram from Stockholm, Sweden, dated November 16:

"Grafstroem, chief of the political division of the Swedish Foreign Office, informed us in the name of the Government, that members of the Lithuanian Battalion, who had been forcibly dispatched by the Germans to the Eastern Front and who after the capitulation of Kurland (in Latvia), fled to Sweden, would soon be surrendered to the Russians.

"Their names are Major Ambraziunas; Captain Langis; Dr. Zenkevicius; First Lieutenants Jancys, Plevokas; Second Lieutenants Lengvelis, Vosylius, noncommissioned officers Ingelevicius, Dranseika.

"Our arguments, that the Germans had, in violation of international law, placed them forcibly at the front; that, in view of the position of the Baltic States vis a vis the Soviet Union, they should be treated as political refugees; and that their surrender would be tantamount to certain death—were answered as invalid. We were told that the deciding factor is the fact that they had taken part on the German side.

"The Swedes have already promised to surrender them to the Russians who will claim them shortly. The Swedes say that they had approached London to accept those Baltic soldiers at Luebeck in the British zone, but that the British refused.

"Please do everything with a view that the U. S. A. Government accept these nine Lithuanians into the American zone in Germany. Please save the lives of innocent Lithuanians, and inform Lithuanian Relief and (Minister) Zadeikis.

"Scheynius and Zilinskas."

November 20, the New York Times and other papers carried the following dispatch:

"SWEDEN YIELDS BALTIC FUGITIVES

"STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN, November 19.—Sweden has decided to accede to a Russian demand for the extradition of approximately 157 Baltic refugees who served in the German Army and escaped to Sweden immediately after the end of the war, it was disclosed tonight. A Russian vessel is already reported to be en route to Sweden to pick up the men and is expected to arrive within 10 days."

Obviously, these two items refer to the same subject. The nine Lithuanians listed in the radiogram from Sweden are included in the number of 157 Baltic refugees. Additional information received from Sweden points out that the Soviet demand for extradition of these unfortunate victims of German lawlessness and German-Russian partnership in aggression in 1939, is based on the following reasoning:

(A) They had fought on the German side as members of the Wehrmacht;

(B) They are "Soviet citizens" inasmuch as Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are claimed to be "constituent parts of the USSR" and, consequently, qualification of "prisoners of war" is not applicable to them. From the Soviet point of view, these men are "traitors to their own country, the USSR."

To what extent the Swedish Government accepted this Russian argumentation, this office is not in a position to know. But, it is known that—

(a) The Swedish Government tacitly recognized the attempted Russian absorption of the Baltic States in the Soviet Union;

(b) One hundred and fifty-seven Balts are under the threat of imminent delivery into the military-political police arm of the Soviet Union, the NKVD;

(c) Sweden is making exception only to civilian Baltic refugees.

Our point of view is that—

1. Some Baltic people had been forcibly inducted into the Wehrmacht formations or in the so-called SS legions following manhunts and forcible seizures in violation of international law governing the rights and conduct of a military occupant. German lawlessness went to the extent of threatening and imprisoning members of the families of the men in hiding.

2. Forcibly inducted Baltic youths, members of the Wehrmacht and/or SS legions, used the very first opportunity to desert or to surrender.

3. They consider themselves citizens of the independent republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and claim the right of asylum on the soil of neutral Sweden as full-fledged political refugees.

4. No criminal charges are made against these Baltic refugees; they are simply unfortunate victims of Russo-German aggression.

5. Sweden is a neutral country, under no obligation to the Soviet Union to extradite victims of aggression who have done nothing against Sweden and against whom no criminal charges are pending.

This point of view was expressed is the following cablegram dispatched to Swedish Foreign Minister, the Honorable Oesten Unden, on November 20:

"News of Swedish acceptance of Russian demand for surrender of 157 Baltic political refugees, previously forcibly inducted in German armed forces in violation of international law, caused greatest concern among American believers in God-given rights of man.

"Nearly 1,000,000 Americans of Lithuanian descent refuse to believe that democratic Sweden, of immaculate traditions of human liberty, would deliberately deliver innocent victims of Nazi lawlessness to certain death at hands of Russians, former partners of Hitler.

"We appeal through Your Excellency to Swedish Government to reconsider death sentences inadvertently imposed on Baltic victims of German-Russian aggression and to grant them asylum on Swedish soil. Please save these victims, including nine Lithuanians, in upholding ancient Swedish tradition of humanitarianism so greatly admired in America.

"LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN COUNCIL,
"LEONARD SIMUTIS, *President*,
"PIUS GRIGAITIS, *Secretary*,
"MICHAEL VAIDYLA, *Treasurer*."

Some Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Czechs, Slovacks, Poles, Belgians, etc., were taken prisoners in German garb or surrendered themselves to the western Allies whenever the opportunity presented itself. Some were brought to prisoner of war camps in this country. In no instance were they considered traitors to their own country, except in a few individual cases of men with Fascist tendencies which were brought out after a thorough examination of their background. The Allied authorities are fully aware of the fact of forcible induction and the element of duress. It is a fact that some Lithuanians, forcibly inducted in the Germany army, were recently released in Germany as displaced persons and are cared for in displaced persons assembly centers.

Analyzing the status of Baltic refugees, the New York Times gave the following conclusion in an editorial October 20, 1945:

"But the vast majority of these people are refugees who opposed both Germany and Russia in the name of the independence of their countries, which the United States still recognizes. Germany is powerless to harm them, but Russia, having annexed their countries, considers them to be at the very least oppositionists to the Communist Party line and perhaps even traitors; and the fate which awaits them on repatriation can be easily imagined. The American and British Governments have given assurance that no one will be compelled to return to the Russian zone against his will, and it is to be hoped that this pledge will be kept."

On humanitarian grounds, appeals were dispatched to His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, His Majesty Gustav V King of Sweden, presiding officers of both chambers of the Swedish Riksdag, leading Swedish dailies.

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, INC.

The Army and Navy Should Clarify and Equalize Their Demobilization Programs

---

REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, like most of you, I am one of those Members of Congress who throughout the war refrained from voicing criticisms against the heads of our War and Navy Departments. Even when mistakes seemed obvious I did not desire by any criticism of mine to detract a moment's time from the all-important job of winning the war.

Now that the war is over, Mr. Speaker, I am greatly disturbed, however, by the vast amount of correspondence reaching me from service men and women in all parts of the world, and from the parents of service people calling attention to the fact that their son or daughter has sufficient points to be discharged but still they are being retained in the service. Some of these letters have come from men who are close friends of mine and whose accuracy cannot be questioned.

Certainly, sir, where there is so much smoke there must be some fire and in my opinion the Army and Navy without any further delay should clarify and equalize their demobilization programs so that equity and alacrity may displace the present situation which can best be characterized by such terms as confusion, contradition, procrastination, and perpetual uncertainty of plan and purpose.

I have been in contact with both the War Department and the Navy Department urging that in the matter of demobilization first things be placed first and that an over-all policy be formulated and proclaimed which will be fair to all and understood by all. Instead, we continue to receive notices of piecemeal changes in the point system or the demobilization program while reports flow in both from abroad and from within this country to the effect that manpower is being hoarded in uniform and in area after area we hear of servicemen being kept idle while their officers—of whom, incidentally, there appear to be far more than necessary—are unable to find constructive services for them to render.

Mr. Speaker, a long time ago Benjamin Franklin warned his associates saying, "Do not waste time for that is the stuff of which life is made." The sands of the hour glass of time are continuing to flow away for the fine young American men and women who served so unselfishly and valorously in our recent war. Precious weeks and months of irreplaceable time are depriving them of opportunity to complete their education, to establish homes, to get started in their business, farming, or professional careers. For those not expecting to make a career of service in the armed forces, sir, it is unconscionable that any reason or excuse save the absolute necessity for their continued service should be advanced for longer delaying the operation of a demobilization program which will promptly release men and women with substantial service records.

That other reasons and excuses for the retention of service people in uniform are being advanced, Mr. Speaker, is demonstrated by the mail reaching the desk of every Representative and Senator. The most cursory reading of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the past few weeks will provide the most skeptical administrative officer of our Army or Navy with abundant testimony.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to call attention to two letters which I have recently received and to an editorial appearing in the November 16 issue of Gateway, the official publication of the ATC at the Karachi, India, Air Base. Incidentally, the letter transmitting this editorial to me is from a very good friend of mine—a GI Joe whose first name happens to be Joe but whom I shall not more specifically identify. My correspondent tells me in his letter that he personally handled the currency exchanges for the Indian students mentioned in the following editorial and that he talked with the students who were boarding the ship for the United States while homesick GI's stood on the dock to get the bad news that they were being left behind.

He tells me several of these students were bound for the University of California, one to Pittsburgh, one to Wisconsin, one to Michigan, and one or two to Columbia University. But the American boys who fought to make freedom and travel and education possible were being left behind not because they were needed in India where they are stationed in friendly territory and where there are no occupation duties but because their space was being given to foreign students to attend the American universities these GI's had hoped to attend. Here is the editorial from the service paper:

[From the Daily Gateway, official publication at Karachi, India, ATC base, of November 15, 16, 1945]

STANDING SHORT

(By Kenn Pothoven and Hal Walker)

KARACHI, INDIA, November 16.—The *Santa Rosa*, the *Torrens*, the *General Meigs*, the *General McRea*, the *General Richardson*.

These are the names of a few of the ships which have been allocated to the India-Burma theater for the purpose of evacuating American soldiers.

They are precious ships. They are the most precious ships in the world. They are the ships that were allocated to take us home. That is the purpose for which they were sent to India.

But it seems that they—as has been the case with many less-precious commodities—have been wilfully misappropriated.

And the ticket of admission home is higher than the value of American citizenship and the debt owed to victorious soldiers for a victory.

The gratitude of an Army and a Nation to its soldiers is measured in dollars and cents—translated into terms of fare-paying civilians of another land.

Because civilians—Indian students—are returning to America on these ships as paid passengers. They are visiting America to study—at the expense of the home-hungry GI's who thought the ships came for them.

These students are occupying space that belongs to men with no greater claim to

transportation than the fact they are tired, homesick, and eligible for discharge. And they just want to go home.

There have been rumors that these ships were carrying Indian students. Rumors that the American soldier is being deprived of his right to return to that which he temporarily forsook so that he might return and find it safe.

We discounted most of these rumors. The words didn't translate easily into the familiar idiom of loyalty and faith in the leaders appointed over us. Maybe we didn't want to believe these reports. But at least part of them are true. Terribly true.

FIFTY STUDENTS SAIL ON "TORRENS"

The sobering reality of an official passenger list from the S. S. *Torrens* contains the names of 50 Indian students. Traveling troop class.

And 50 American soldiers are being delayed in favor of 50 paid passengers. Fifty Americans have been sold down the river for American dollars.

There have been other rumors. There are reports that 200 students sailed on the *Santa Rosa*, 59 on the *Meigs*, 68 on the *Richardson*, and 37 on the *McRea*.

These reports may not be true. We will accept them as rumors for the time being. But the civilians now on their way to America on the *Torrens* are not rumors. The Karachi Gazette printed the story yesterday, and we have an official passenger list in the files of the Gateway.

It's pretty hard to take. It's going to be even harder to explain.

No doubt they could write it off as cementing international relations. Or they may simply say, "No comment." It is possible that your correspondents will be taken to task.

But whatever they say or do it will not correct what has been done. And the GI's who watched the *Torrens* weigh anchor will have another name for it. They won't call it "cementing our international relations."

They will call it what it is—the best (and rottenest) example of misplaced authority yet recorded—and the dirtiest trick ever played upon the men who deserve it least. The matter will doubtless be investigated.

And while the band plays the second chorus we will listen to the official explanations.

But the guy that's sitting on his barracks bag watching the civilians walk up the gangplank and dreaming of Christmas at home won't be listening.

He will be tuned to the music of a baby's laughter and the Christmas carols on the radio.

STANDING SHORT

And when the noise of truth and sensibility rings louder than the bells 12,000 miles away, he'll look around him. And he won't like what he sees.

Because somebody is standing short! Whoever is responsible for mixing the cement of international relations with tears of wives and sweethearts, at the expense of the men who underwrote our so-called foreign policy—sold these men short!

GI's expected better treatment at the hands of those they served. They are entitled to better treatment.

The man left on the dock probably has at least 2 years away from home. Ample time to reflect upon the dangerous rumors that were said to be spread by enemy spoilers.

He doesn't want to believe those rumors. "Demobilization deliberately being delayed," and "the military are seeking to build an empire," were reputedly the mouthings of popagandists from abroad. But the meter strangely fits the essentially American official reports and no comment communiques. And while the military band plays the music GI Joe hums the words.

The 50 civilians who walked up the gangplank of the *Torrens* should have been Jones and Smith and Kowalski and Ferranchini. But they were Lal and Abdul and Mohd and Sundar.

And their ages were from 25 to 45—late in life to start an education.

They were authorized passage by USF, IBT, APO 885. That was on the top of the list of paid passengers. GI's have seen those letters before. They were on the orders to reduce the quotas of men for shipment.

But the trouble didn't start in APO 885. It probably started in Washington, D. C. Where the GI used to think his court of last appeal was always in session—assuring him that while in service his rights were equal and his treatment normal.

GI Joe never completely understood the complicated ramifications of foreign policy and diplomatic intrigue. But he's learning. He's learning fast, because the medicine is stronger and the doses larger. No one will blame the India civilians who seek to improve their education at 45.

They are entitled to all that America can offer, and welcome.

But Joe wants to go home first. He wants to go to school too. He has a lot of reasons that are important to him alone—and therefore important to us all.

He's learned that a good soldier does not question executive procedure. But Joe isn't thinking in terms of a good soldier. Joe never was a soldier. He was a civilian in uniform. A curious civilian who had learned to ask "why" as soon as he could talk.

The phony excuses and ridiculous communiqués from the War Department are wearing a little thin. It's high time the lawmakers of the Nation Joe represented abroad did something about him.

ACTION—NOT EXCUSES

It's high time Congress—

(A) Declared the war ended and stripped the extraordinary powers from those not used to or qualified for it.

(B) Did something about getting American citizens back on American soil.

(C) Stopped the use of American troop ships for such things as hauling Dutch munitions and Chinese nationals.

(D) Stopped sending Indian civilians or any civilians other than American to America on troop ships.

(E) Demobilized the Army and Navy.

In 99 cases out of 100 the American soldier has done his best. He's played the game with his officers and his country and himself. He's complained no more or less than the healthy release of steam dictates, and will fight at the suggestion his isn't the best army and country in the world.

But the GI in India has been sold short. He's confused. He doesn't want to believe what he sees. He's that loyal.

Now, he wants to know the rules of the new game. He wants to know so that he can continue to play the game fairly.

Nobody ever accused Joe of standing short.

Mr. Speaker, the following paragraphs are from a letter received from a GI stationed at the McCook Army Air Base of McCook, Nebr. It tells its own story and it provides additional food for thought for those charged with the responsibility of formulating and administering an equitable program of demobilization which will remember that the GI is a human being with ambitions, aspirations, and amours, and that in peacetime as in time of war his well being and his personal security are factors which wise leadership should not and must not ignore.

At the McCook Air Base, where this is written, there are over 300 officers who have served over 45 months in the Army and who want discharges. Since VJ-day less than 10 percent of the officers have had duties that even approximate a full day's work. The 90 percent are kept idle almost all of the time. They wait for the discharge plan to get around to them. As things stand now, it appears they must wait until March to July of next year because only then will they have the required 4 years, 3 months of service. Yet they are idle as idle can be, sitting around wasting the taxpayers' money. Although the AAF 2 months ago discharged thousands of flying officers who had served 1½ to 2½ years on the ground they were surplus, these nonflying officers, who are equally surplus are forced to remain on "inactive" active duty. When asked about it, Second Air Force Headquarters claims that these men are essential—yet any officer on the base will testify this is not true. Sir, that is an example of how the point system works out. The system is arbitrary, outrageously unfair, and it discriminates against the very men to whom the Army is most indebted, the long-servicemen. If you by some chance feel this is an unrepresentative opinion, then by all means talk to groups of soldiers and to groups of officers at any Army camp now. In the past 3 months the writer has interviewed thousands of GI's and officers alike—they are unanimous and vocal in their opinions: "The point system stinks" and other comments not fit to print. The censure against the present discharge plan is universal. Only a small group, composed largely of men who feel they have a stake in continued service, uphold it.

Pauper Oath for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission heretofore granted, I include as part of these remarks an article on the pauper oath for veterans, written by Joseph Leib, service officer and past vice commander of the Vincent B. Costello Post of the American Legion of the District of Columbia, and also an editorial from the National Tribune:

WHEN WILL CONGRESS ACT TO ELIMINATE PAUPER OATH FOR VETERANS?

(By Joseph Leib)

Veterans from coast to coast are now unanimous in their demand that Congress enact legislation outlawing the use of a pauper oath on Veterans' Administration hospitalization questionnaires.

The American Legion last week officially went on record as opposed to this un-American and bureau-inspired regulation. For a year and a half legislation to remove this oath has been pigeonholed in the World War Veterans' Committee. No hearings have been held and no hearings are scheduled.

Why are the six bills (H. R. 599, SPRINGER; H. R. 1923, MORRISON; H. R. 2413, WICKERSHAM; H. R. 2717, SASSCER; H. R. 2587, MARTIN of Massachusetts; H. R. 3332, BARRY) being ignored and allowed to be gathering cobwebs in a musty file case?

This type of humiliation that now exists in our veterans' facilities must be eliminated. No veteran should be required to swear that they are indigent in order to be admitted to a hospital bed.

Many Members of Congress have expressed deep resentment and astonishment when informed of the existence of the pauper's oath. The pauper's oath in form P-10 reads: "Are you financially able to pay the necessary ex-

penses of hospital or domiciliary care—answer yes or no?" Yet there has never been a clear-cut definition of what constitutes ability to pay and the bewildered veteran who applies for help must virtually declare himself a pauper or make a deliberate liar of himself. This requirement exists on the statute books of the Nation. Congress must have passed this law on one of its off days.

The following editorial which will appear in the Stars and Stripes-National Tribune on November 29, 1945, should be read carefully by every Member on Capitol Hill. It says:

"THE PAUPER OATH

"Although we have not yet had made available to us a copy of the resolution, the National Tribune staff representative who covered the American Legion convention in Chicago last week advises that the delegates placed themselves squarely on record in opposition to the use of the 'pauper oath' on applications by veterans for admission to veterans' hospitals. That lines up with the attitude in convention of the other major veterans' organizations. They can now seek unanimously action on one of the many bills pending in the Congress that propose to wipe out the hateful practice of making a disabled veteran state on oath, or on honor, that he cannot afford to pay for hospital treatment.

"From time to time down through the years there have appeared in legislation clauses that would compel veterans to demonstrate 'need' before they could establish title to benefits. The Tribune has always fought those provisions bitterly and in most instances they have been stricken from the laws, but the 'needs clause,' or 'pauper oath,' still remains in some laws and must come out.

"The application of the provision to hospital rights came by authority of the Congress at the request of the Veterans' Administration, and that agency went to town with bold-faced type that either made a pauper or a liar out of every veteran who signed a hospital application blank. Many of our friends among organized veterans enlisted with us in a campaign to overcome the administration attitude. After a prolonged fight in which Legion rehabilitation officials only half-heartedly joined, the hospital form was modified so that it did not apply to the directly service-connected, penalty provisions were placed on the reverse of the form to make them less offensive and 'the word' of other veterans was accepted on the question of ability to pay. Nevertheless, the needs provision still remains in the law, and what should be a veteran's right is still considered to be a privilege handed out or withheld at the pleasure of the Veterans' Administration.

"We are delighted that the Legion convention has again taken affirmative and positive action. We hope that the resolution is so worded that its purpose cannot be nullified by inaction. Legislation is in fact required to discontinue a practice that is offensive to all thinking veterans. Now that everybody thinks alike, and now that the organizations have expressed themselves in convention mandates, let us go to Capitol Hill and quickly seek action."

American Foreign Policy

REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, an attack was made on this floor against Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, commanding general of our forces in China. General Wedemeyer is a fine, loyal, patriotic American, whose record is outstanding. He is a distinguished Nebraskan. General Wedemeyer needs no defense but I rise to ask the question, Who are his accusers, whom do they represent, and from whom do they get the material for their charges? The spearhead of these attacks in the press is the Communist Daily Worker and their uptown echo, PM.

Mr. Speaker, the message of resignation of Gen. Pat Hurley as an Ambassador to China is a sober warning to the American people. The way to peace is a forthright American foreign policy administered by individuals whose loyalty to the United States is beyond reproach.

I call upon the Secretary of State to discharge from the pay roll of the State Department every Communist and near Communist. We have heard considerable about one John Service. This man was arrested by the FBI on charges of turning documents over to Communist agents. His case was dropped and John Service was placed in charge of the Far Eastern Division as a diplomatic officer to General MacArthur.

Mr. Speaker, if the efforts of General MacArthur, General Wedemeyer, and General Marshall, our new Ambassador to China, are going to be successful in maintaining peace, their efforts must not be sabotaged by underlings in the State Department. The Secretary of State owes it to his country and to his President, who is responsible for our foreign policy, to have the Federal Bureau of Investigation thoroughly investigate such men of his Department as John Service, Alger Hiss, Rowena Rommel, Emile Despres, John Carter Vincent, Abraham H. Feller, Benjamin Gerig, and others and make that record public.

The influence of the United States in the diplomatic world should not be on the side of colonial imperialism or on the side of communistic imperialism.

Favoritism

REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have a profound admiration for Gen. Hanford MacNider, and I appreciate the distinguished service he has rendered his country; but, notwithstanding this, I deplore the favoritism shown in the case of his son's discharge. I have many cases far more meritorious, both as to points and as to heroic service who should have been released. Moreover, I have in the district which I have the honor to represent, numerous lads in the Army and Navy and Air Corps who ought to be in school or college finishing their uncompleted education. Militarism is now in the saddle and riding roughshod over the rights of the civilian population. The favoritism now being practiced by some commanding officers is ruthless and indefensible. On the other hand, there are some commanding officers who are showing the utmost consideration in cases presented to them for the discharge of the men under their command. The tyrannical type of officer, those who are failing to cooperate, are doing a great disservice to the Military Establishment as a whole. I am keeping a record of cases in which the commanding officers have shown a spirit unworthy of their high positions as American officers. There is no reason why a few officers should destroy the confidence of the American servicemen and their parents and relatives in our Government. The Congress has a duty to perform right now lest the cruel and vindictive attitude of certain officers toward their men furnish aid and comfort to the communistic saboteurs now holding key positions in the Government.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an item appearing in the Washington Times-Herald, November 27, 1945, as follows:

FRIENDSHIP PAYS OFF—GENERAL MAC NIDER'S SON TO GET MARINE DISCHARGE ON 38 POINTS

CHICAGO, November 26.—Pvt. Jack MacNider, 18, will be discharged from the Marines at the Great Lakes naval training center tomorrow on 38 service points, 12 points less than the Marines' current discharge standard, because of friendship between his father, Brig. Gen. Hanford MacNider, and the marine corps commandant, Lieutenant General Vandegrift. The friendship has extended through two wars.

"Jack and I were together in Tokyo last month and I thought it would be fine if he could come home with me and go back to school to continue his premedical training," said General MacNider over the telephone from his home in Mason City tonight.

"General Vandegrift is an old friend of mine. I got in touch with him and asked if he thought it could be arranged. Jack enlisted on his seventeenth birthday. He has had nearly 2 years' service, including the landing on Iwo Jima."

Honoring Brig. Gen. Robert F. Travis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter I asked Brig. Gen. Robert F. Travis to write me, setting forth the manner in which his camp is accomplishing such excellent results in the demobilization program. When he assumed command at the Sioux Falls Army Air Field at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., there were assigned at that station 56,773 officers and men. This was on August 21. On October 30 he had processed many thousands of men and had only 2 days work left before his camp would be "completely out of work" unless the inflow of men increased in the period thereafter. I was so impressed with the efficiency of his demobilization program that I asked if he would not explain its workings so that others

might benefit from his experience. This is his reply to me:

NOVEMBER 7, 1945.

Mr. GEORGE H. BENDER,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BENDER: In reply to your kind telegram of November 5, 1945, I give you the following facts relative to Sioux Falls Army Air Base.

As you may note from the heading of this letter, my work there was completed on November 2, and I have been replaced by Col. George Blakey as commanding officer of that base. I have returned to my old job of commanding general of the Seventeenth EOTW with headquarters at Sioux City; but to assure the continued smooth operation at Sioux Falls until it becomes inactivated on December 31, that base has been placed under the command of the Seventeenth Wing. This is a bit out of the ordinary as this wing is primarily interested in B-29 training and not separations.

I was too young to have served in the First World War, but I am informed that the difficulties faced by the armed forces in returning to a peacetime status created the same problems and headaches which we are now passing through. I hope from these two experiences we may be able to set up an efficient and permanent method of demobilization which could be used following any future war. I join all American citizens in hoping that no such war ever occurs, but history proves that war will continue as long as mankind and human nature remains what they are and have been for centuries.

What we accomplished at Sioux Falls was not done by any particular clever or radical changes in known healthy American production-line methods. To put it briefly, we set up our processing and separation lines on exactly the same principles and policies as would, say, an automobile manufacturer who wished to establish a smooth-flowing assembly line. There was a group of some 12 large buildings stretching through the center of the post. My idea was to start the men in at one end of these buildings as soldiers and bring them out the other end as civilians. Each function in their separation procedure was arranged logically in the order in which it should be accomplished, and men proceeded through railed-in passageways so that no confusion could possibly exist. Personnel were staggered in their arrival for separation so that the pipe line of men was full at all times, and every expert used in this system was working steadily 7 days a week from early morning until 5 p. m. As soon as these lines were set up properly I watched the flow of men, and wherever bottlenecks occurred the processing personnel were increased at this point to where the flow became normal and steady. Shortages of key personnel, such as finance clerks, typists, consultants, etc., existed on this base and were not procurable elsewhere in the Army Air Forces, as the demand was critical everywhere. After ascertaining their inaccessibility we established our own schools for training these experts and drew from the pool of redeployable personnel (men who were not then eligible for discharge) for students in these schools.

Quite a few of these separatees presented particular problems due to the fact that they had lost their records, required medical attention, were awaiting disciplinary action, or had other reasons for which they could not be separated as smoothly as the average soldier. These men were not put through the regular line, but were sent to other buildings, properly equipped and staffed to solve their particular problems.

As is easily understandable a soldier who knows that he is returning to civilian life is anxious to get his separation over with as soon as possible. Once a man was up for separation we completed converting him to a civilian status in less than 48 hours. However, there was one part of this separation which I felt was extremely important and upon which I put great emphasis.

As a final part of the ceremony I chose, not one of the regular buildings, but the post chapel to tell these men good-by. We made their departure ceremony as impressive as possible, and I had present besides myself a group of the best public speakers available on the base. The ceremony did not take longer than an hour and during this period we attempted to instill in the minds of the departing soldiers the fact that they had entered the armed services as boys and were returning as men with a much wider knowledge of their responsibilities to this great and powerful Nation. It was not my desire to influence them in what opinions they should hold with respect to the Army or politics, but it was my desire to impress them with their duties as American citizens in participating and forming future policies which would guide our Nation to ever increasing greatness as a democratic and liberal country.

Any success which I may have accomplished at Sioux Falls is not attributable to my personal efforts but mostly to the very capable and enthusiastic group of young officers who served with me on my staff.

With kindest regards,

ROBERT F. TRAVIS,
Brigadier General, United States Army.

Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the reply of John J. Reilly, national president of the American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, to the recent series on Ireland by Mr. Randolph Churchill, which has appeared in the newspapers throughout the country:

Having read his series on Ireland, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Mr. Churchill was motivated, in part at least, by the popular desire to disseminate false propaganda about that country. The conclusion is supported by the observation that his articles are interspersed with many items of fact—sufficient to gain the confidence of his readers—a characteristic common to the best propagandists. This, in brief, may explain the over-all yes-no tenor of his series. Among those who are familiar with the subject it is doubtful if Mr. Churchill's profession has benefited by his contribution.

No attempt will be made here to reply to all the misleading statements contained in the articles. Some are too trivial, while others are obviously so involved and technical that they require the efforts of experts.

Surely no one who is familiar with current and recent Irish history—and Mr. Churchill certainly is—would seriously repeat the well-worn canard that Ulster "upholds the union (with England) with abiding fervor." The assertion is entirely correct if Mr. Churchill has in mind the subsidized government at Belfast, which was set up in the first instance without the consent of the people's representatives, either Unionist or Republican. It is a matter of historical record, however, that 2 years prior to the inauguration of that government the people of all Ireland voted, by approximately 80 percent, in favor of a republic. In the area now under the jurisdiction of the Belfast government—the "loyal" north—approximately two-thirds of the electorate voted with the rest of Ireland for that republic. But once in operation, the first duty of the Belfast government was to gerrymander the electoral districts, with the result that the voice of the electorate is silenced; the power of their vote nullified. Mr. Churchill's statement is, perhaps, the greatest calumny perpetrated upon the people of the northern section of Ireland. To persistently accuse a politically intelligent people of favoring such an antidemocratic regime is a cruel demonstration of insult added to injury. It is particularly nauseating in the light of our recent experiences with the Quislings on the continent.

Discussing Ireland and the war, Mr. Churchill blames the English people themselves for the gratuitous surrender of their "rights" to the southern Irish ports. A strange philosophy indeed: that restitution being long delayed, the trespasser acquires the right of ownership. It is a philosophy unknown to the people of Ireland. May Providence decree that it shall never become universally adopted.

Like many others, Mr. Churchill attempts to explain the reasons for Irish neutrality, but he seems to have missed the point. A reference to an address by Mr. de Valera before a special session of the League of Nations on July 2, 1936, should be of help. "Despite our juridical equality here, in matters such as European peace, the small states are powerless," de Valera said. "As I have already said, peace is dependent upon the will of the great states. All the small states can do, if the statesmen of the greater states fail in their duty, is resolutely to determine that they will not become the tools of any great power, and that they will resist with whatever strength they may possess, every attempt to force them into a war against their will." Had the League but followed the advice of de Valera in this and previous talks, the world might well have been spared its most terrifying blood-bath. But the statesmen failed in their duty, and therein lies the answer to Ireland's neutrality.

The history of Anglo-Irish relations, and the postwar fate of the small nations of Europe, particularly that of Poland, do not clarify the reason, in the minds of the Irish people, for Britain's participation in the war. An ostensible reason has been furnished, it is true, but if Mr. Churchill can restate it convincingly, he should prove himself to be a journalist of uncanny ability indeed.

A Soldier Views Peacetime Military Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in our democracy, citizens in all walks of life have a say in formulating the policies of our Government. In considering the proposed legislation for peacetime military conscription, the young men who have been called to military service and have gone to the defense of our country with all the sacrifice that service implies should be heard. It is with serious reflection that I submit a letter from a re-

turned veteran, the son of a prominent educator, for the consideration of my colleagues and the people of this country:

MOSCOW, IDAHO, *October 25, 1945.*
Congressman COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHITE: It looks very much like our President has been taken in by our country's militarists. By militarists, I mean the high-ranking officers of the Army and Navy who know nothing or very little of civilian life and education. These men have been graduated from the Nation's academies and, naturally, they have been taught the militaristic ways of life. Their mind is of one track—war, Army, Navy. That is all they know. They have been trained in aristocratic institutions where they were taught discrimination between themselves and the enlisted men—the common man. Is that very democratic? Is that the American way of life? I am asking you. I claim that it definitely is not. They want to take the young men out of high schools, send them off to military camps, and occupational duties. Tell me, is this the betterment of the common man, the thing the late President Roosevelt based his successful campaigns on? It merely serves to delay the young man from attending college, sometimes turning him away from college entirely. And, as a rule, college is the final touch to a person's education.

The young men attending college are required to take 2 years of military training as a part of their college course. In this training they are given all the basic ideas of military life and routine. Now, is it not better to give them these 2 years of military in college than to send them away for a whole year, away from their homes, their friends, and the environment that is going to improve them educationally and morally—the benefits that a military camp cannot offer. In this proposed training plan of the President's he would train men for military duties or tasks in the wartime industries. However, he forgets that this training is going to be just as obsolete, if not more so, as the training given to the men in the last war was for the entirely rejuvenated industrial and military tasks of World War II, with the exception of the fundamentals which I advocate can and should be given to them in the schools they are already attending, not in military camps.

Of course, there are the young men who do not go to college; why not have military training in high schools all over the country as there are in some? This gives them a good basis for entering the service in time of war. When war strikes again, the men will all have to be retrained for the battle, which will differ entirely from the battles of this war, whether they have been trained under the President's proposed plan or trained by our public-school system. So the logical conclusion is to incorporate new systems in the schools of the Nation and not to try and set up some undemocratic system of forcing the young men into the service.

I sincerely hope that our Nation's Congressmen will not be as gullible as the President and that they will realize what they owe the young men of the country, and that is: More complete training in the public-school system. By doing this there will be no necessity for sending them off to the military camps that help to tear down the worthwhile things that had been built up in them prior to this time.

At present I am attending the University of Idaho, having just returned from 18 months' war duty. I don't want to see the young men coming up have to go into something they don't like as I did. So let's get back to our democratic ways, abolish this conscription and squelch the power of the militarists.

Very truly yours,

R. E. FAHRENWALD.

Not Unduly Exacting in Korea—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, here are additional facts which cast an unhappy light on the failure of our foreign policy in relation to the liberated country of Korea:

On November 23 the New York Post's correspondent, Robert P. Martin, cabling from Shanghai—a city some 550 miles from Seoul across the Yellow Sea—gives the left-wing "liberal" appraisal of American errors in Korea. Mr. Martin's conclusions about the difficulties facing any Korean administration seem to substantiate the claim that Korea as a whole is neither "left" nor "right," but a sincere seeker after the "middle way," which is the essence of Confucian teaching.

KIM KOO: KOREA'S HOPE?
(By Robert P. Martin)

SHANGHAI, November 23.—One hundred days ago Kim Koo, the veteran Korean revolutionary exile and President of the so-called Korean Provisional Government, requested permission from American authorities to return to his homeland. Today he boarded a United States Army transport plane here and took off for Seoul and an unfathomable political future.

Why the American authorities did not want Kim Koo in Korea has not been explained. The past reason for that transportation from Chungking was unavailable, but it is noteworthy that 12 former exiles who lived in the United States, including Dr. Syngman Rhee, had no trouble obtaining high air priorities with the State Department's blessing.

It would seem, therefore, that the United States wanted to give Syngman Rhee the first opportunity to organize Korea politically. Rhee had lived in the United States for decades, speaks English, and is pro-American. Obviously, he would be an easier man to work with than Kim Koo, who had lived in China, speaks no English, and has even permitted Communists to participate in his provisional government, which was not recognized by any foreign power.

For weeks Koreans have trooped faithfully to the airfield there whenever it was rumored that their most famous exile was returning.

BIG JOB AHEAD

But prestige will not carry Kim Koo to political leadership in Korea. He will first have to prove that he is capable of rescuing his people from the mess created by 35 years of Jap occupation, and 2 months of bungling ineptitude by American Military Government officials.

Kim Koo will be an alien in his own country. He frankly admits he has had no contact with Korean underground or patriotic societies since Japan invaded China in 1937. He has received no communications from Korea since Japan's surrender.

Rhee is extremely conservative, dogmatic, and dictatorial. He is firmly entrenched with the right wing Democratic Party and has accepted wholeheartedly the military government attitude that anyone who has liberal tendencies is a Communist.

Although Kim Koo arrives in Korea later than any of the exiles, he will enjoy the distinct advantage of studying the mistakes that Rhee and the other exiles from the United States have made.

If he and his advisers can chart their political course to avoid any of the extremes of current Korean politicals, he will be in an excellent position to fulfill his avowed aim of unifying Koreans as the first step toward independence.

DOMINATING INFLUENCE

Kim Koo will find the Democratic Party the dominating influence in Seoul, the capital. The party has the O. K. of Korea's four big families—Kim, Yunchi, Pak, and Han—which control Korea's land and industry.

These families form the core of the Yangpan or upper class, and they are using their financial position and close relationship with the AMG to purchase the 80 percent of Korea's land and property which until the end of the war had been owned by Japanese nationals.

They frown on anything that would encourage economic liberalism. Opposing this landlord-industrialist coalition is the self-styled Peoples Republic group which has a nucleus of Korean patriots who served in the anti-Jap underground and many of whom were imprisoned by the Japs for sabotage or their political activities.

WANTS CONFISCATION

This group urges outright confiscation and free distribution rather than sale of Japanese property. Generally speaking, the party also advocates government ownership of major industries.

This group has little financial backing and its leadership is impractical, but it has tremendous appeal among the Korean masses who intend to resist any exploitation by their richer countrymen.

It is not uncommon for landowners to collect 66 percent of the crop as rent from peasants.

Kim Koo believes in agrarian and economic reform for Korea but is not yet certain how it should be accomplished. If he speaks too strongly for these aims he will find himself branded by the American Military Government as a "Communist," which will result in a serious curtailment of his freedom to speak and write under the American "benevolent dictatorship."

DEFINITELY REPRESENTATIVE

If he does not speak strongly enough he will be classed as ultrareactionary by the Peoples Republic group and their satellites which, regardless of their leftist tinges in leadership, are definitely representative of the great masses of Koreans.

If Kim Koo does not cooperate with AMG he will be considered a saboteur of "law and order" and if he does jump through the AMG's "hoop" his prestige among the Korean people will be lost because AMG officials are largely recruited from among Korean businessmen and industrialists who cooperated with the Japanese and are scathingly called pro-Japanese still by other Koreans.

In this muddle of political alinements Kim Koo must walk carefully and quietly.

Korea's request for an independent existence appear modest and reasonable in comparison with those of several other nations, even smaller in area and population, whose policies have only recently turned away from aid to the Axis. Mr. Kim Koo, President of the Korean Provisional Government, has just expressed

the aims of his Cabinet in a dispatch from Seoul dated November 23, 1945, the day Mr. Kim arrived in the Korean capital:

KIM KOO ARRIVES IN KOREAN CAPITAL—HEAD OF PROVISIONAL REGIME SAYS HE EXPECTS DIVIDING WILL BE ELIMINATED

(By Richard J. H. Johnston)

SEOUL, KOREA, November 23.—Kim Koo, President of the Provisional Government of Korea, arrived here tonight from Shanghai. Returning for the first time since 1919, the 69-year-old patriot arrived with five members of his Cabinet and eight aides as a "private citizen."

"I do not intend to ask the United States for recognition of the provisional government in the immediate future," Mr. Kim announced. "I might do so at a later date.

"I don't like the idea of dividing Korea into two military zones. I do not know the military or political situation between the Allies, but I believe the dividing line will be eliminated and that Korea will be one united force."

Mr. Kim had been long awaited by Koreans and Americans. Expected momentarily for nearly 2 months, he did not explain the long delay in his taking off from Shanghai.

"The arrangements for my return home were made by Chinese and Americans," he said.

Immediately after his arrival in a Seoul house that had been prepared for him by friends, Mr. Kim was greeted by Dr. Syngman Rhee, former President of the Provisional Government and life-long friend of Mr. Kim, whom he had not seen since a meeting in Shanghai in 1921. Dr. Rhee, who returned here October 16, also as a "private citizen," has been trying to unite Korea's 55 political parties.

Mr. Kim refused to express his thoughts on Korea's internal situation. He said he had been unable to obtain full information.

"I have heard some rumors of what is going on in Russian territories," he said, "but I'll not express ideas on rumors."

He said he was unable to say whether the Koreans wished to go Communist or to the extreme right.

"I shall meet with the political parties and talk over the question of unity," he went on. "I think that in the future there might be several parties. I think it will be necessary as a first step to reduce the number of parties."

The large house in which Mr. Kim and other Government members are staying is surrounded by an armed guard of Koreans and Americans. A large group of Korean reporters clamored at the gates seeking interviews.

At least three times in the last several weeks Seoul suspended business and children were turned out of schools to welcome Mr. Kim on false reports of his coming. This afternoon the only persons aware of his arrival were the American headquarters staff and the American press.

All the facts now being disclosed about our policies toward Korea led the editors of the New York Times to sum up the situation on November 25, 1945, as follows:

KEYSTONE OF ASIA

One of the sore spots of the Far East today is Korea, divided into American and Russian zones of occupation by a decision that never has been explained either by our own State Department or by the Russian Foreign Office. Not the least of the tragic aspects of the situation is that a policy could be initiated there that could make of Korea a symbol of Allied good intentions to which all Asia could look with hope for the future.

Korea is the one place in Asia where the world's two most powerful countries have direct contact. There lies an opportunity to exhibit a unity of purpose and a sober acceptance of joint American-Russian responsibility for Asia's future that could have almost incalculable consequences for that continent where dwell half of the world's peoples. Yet there is no evidence that there is any unity at all. American and Russian soldiers face each other across the Thirty-eighth Parallel with little opportunity even to become acquainted. There is no evidence that the Governments even are consulting each other. Our State Department seems to feel that Korea is one of the minor problems which it will get around to in due course. It is too important, we believe, for that.

According to a dispatch to this newspaper from its correspondent in Seoul, Richard Johnston, and private advices to friends from Dr. Syngman Rhee, first President of the Provisional Government, who is in Korea now working as a private citizen, the Koreans are showing increasing signs of political unity, considerably more, at least, than are our State Department and the Foreign Office in Moscow.

With Korea's former Japanese overlords largely shipped back to Japan there would seem to be no reason why some formula for withdrawing occupation forces and eliminating the present division of that small country cannot be worked out promptly. As Dr. Rhee says, the Koreans at least deserve the opportunity to make the attempt to govern themselves. There is nothing in their history to indicate that they will not succeed. All their traditions are to the contrary. Their only great historical fault has been that they are small, and weaker than their powerful neighbors. This country betrayed the Koreans once, when we gave Japan a free hand there in 1905. Our effort now should be to do all that we can to correct this injustice and give the Koreans their chance.

If it is true, as stated by the Times, that our State Department is not even consulting regularly with the Moscow Government in regard to the occupation of Korea, which is a responsibility both Governments have assumed, Mr. Byrnes grossly understated the fact when he announced that we "are not unduly exacting" in our relationships with Russia over the fates of our friendly allies.

Hon. Samuel Dickstein: Our Best Choice for Justice of the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 15, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by Prof. James H. Sheldon over Station WMCA, New York City, Monday, November 5, 1945:

I am not going to make a political speech in the usual sense tonight, because the election of a judge ought not to be undertaken as a political matter. The men and women of New York, and our returning soldiers and sailors, must look to the courts of our city for even-handed justice—justice uninfluenced by any consideration except for the rights of the citizens.

On this standard there is one candidate for supreme court in New York whose record makes him preeminently deserving of your vote tomorrow. This man is Congressman Samuel Dickstein, a man who has spent the better part of his life as a Member of Congress representing the people of our city. In his long years in Congress Mr. Dickstein has become chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and the senior member of the Committee on Claims, two committees whose decisions have touched with particular closeness the affairs of millions of New Yorkers.

I want you to vote for SAMUEL DICKSTEIN for supreme court, however, not so much because he has been a good and hard-working Congressman or an able lawyer, but rather because I am convinced that the things he has fought for during his long years in public service are the things for which you want a supreme court justice in our city to stand during the critical years after the war.

SAMUEL DICKSTEIN was the first Member of Congress—in fact, the first public official of any importance—to become aware of the danger to America from the infiltration of Nazi propagandists and the operations of German agents. He did not wait until the enemy dropped bombs on Pearl Harbor to start his battle against the Axis—for as far back as 1934, when Adolf Hitler and Benito Mussolini were merely comic-strip characters to many Americans, Mr. DICKSTEIN introduced into Congress a resolution to investigate and punish these dangerous and un-American agitators who were coming here supplied with huge funds from the Nazi party of Berlin, to corrupt America and to undermine our form of government. In the beginning of this fight, Congressman DICKSTEIN was a prophet crying in the wilderness—but today there are millions of New Yorkers who know that their sons, their brothers and husbands, are coming home sooner from the battle fronts because Congressman DICKSTEIN kept urging, day in and day out, that we must prepare for the Axis menace, and must punish Hitler's agitators and saboteurs here in America, if we were to be strong in the war which he saw coming.

Mr. DICKSTEIN'S preeminent service to our country in this regard was repeatedly recognized and praised by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, whom New Yorkers know fought a heroic battle during the dark years of the early thirties, in trying to prepare our country for the terrible war which finally burst upon us. There are thousands of other New Yorkers whose sons or husbands lie buried in the battlefields of Europe and Asia, who know today that these dead sons and husbands might be landing from a ship over in the North River, if there had only been a few more men like DICKSTEIN and Roosevelt who saw the dangers in store for our country, and saw them in time, and dared to act. Had we but had more men of DICKSTEIN'S type on the bench 10 years ago, it is quite possible that, as a result of a proper enforcement of penalties against un-American or pro-Nazi agitators, many of those sacrifices might have been avoided.

Now, I have found in my experience that it is a fairly easy thing to buy certain kinds of friends, but you can tell a man's true colors by the enemies that he makes, because they are an index to the policies that he has stood for and the things he has fought to achieve. Here on the night before election I can think of no better way to tell you the kind of man SAMUEL DICKSTEIN is, than to tell you about some of the enemies he has made.

First off, there are the Nazi agents in jail, or interned over on Ellis Island. If you happened to go to the movie that everybody is talking about, The House on Ninety-second Street, which tells how the FBI apprehended thousands of these dangerous characters, you will have seen portrayed on the screen some of these men who do not like SAMUEL DICKSTEIN. There is, for example, the central figure of Col. Edwin Emerson—and in the movie you see him

coming in to sell the secret plans of American guns to Hitler's pay-off man at a hang-out up near Columbus Circle. In SAMUEL DICKSTEIN'S report to Congress in 1935—10 long years ago—this same Colonel Emerson was exposed—and that was the beginning of the downfall of Hitler's ace agent in New York. If I had the time I could call a long roll of men like this Nazi agent Emerson, and the bund leader, Elmhurst (whose real name is Fleishkopp) and the notorious Fritz Kuhn and the equally notorious Gerald L. K. Smith, who tries to set Jew against Christian and Christian against Jew, and who thinks Negroes should be deported back to Africa, and who stirs up his followers to hate immigrants like the millions of hard-working Italians, Poles, Greeks, and Czechs who have come to our shores in recent years. Fellows such as Kuhn, and such as Gerald Smith and Elmhurst, do not like DICKSTEIN, they hate him so much that they have circulated pamphlets around New York trying to stop his election—and that is one of the very best reasons why I feel sure that he will be elected to the supreme court tomorrow, through the votes of the decent law-abiding people of this city.

I have here in my hands a publication which is well known for its extreme pan-Germanism. It is the current issue of the Steuben Society News, and the whole back page of this publication is an attack on Mr. DICKSTEIN. It is quite obvious that this Steuben Society does not like him—and it is quite obvious that that is one of the best reasons why you should vote for him tomorrow. This editorial is signed by a man who in 1934 came back from Germany and told New Yorkers that he considered Hitler one of the world's greatest leaders. "Hitler is an idealist * * * honest and sincere," are the very words that he used. That is what the writer of this Steuben News editorial said about Hitler in 1934. No wonder that he spends a whole page attacking SAMUEL DICKSTEIN in 1945—and by the way, if any of you people listening in tonight want to come up to WMCA tomorrow morning, I will leave this document here for you to look at, and then I know that unless I happen to be talking to someone who is still, in the blackness of his heart, an admirer of Adolf Hitler, you will go home and urge your neighbors to do their duty and elect SAMUEL DICKSTEIN to the supreme court.

There are even some New York lawyers who have banded together to attack him—the same kind of lawyers who attacked Abraham Lincoln because they said he did not have enough education to be President, and who fought Felix Frankfurter because they said he had never been a judge before Franklin Roosevelt appointed him to the Supreme Court.

Now my friends, I think it is enough if I tell you that this particular group of lawyers is the very same group I met last winter when it was my privilege to organize the public support in favor of the Ives-Quinn bill, an excellent law which provides that employers in New York must not discriminate against citizens because of their race or their color or their religion or because of the country from which they came. This is the law to which many thousands of our returning soldiers in New York must look for the opportunity to have a square deal. I first met this group of lawyers, who don't like DICKSTEIN, when they came up to Albany to oppose and obstruct this patriotically conceived legislation. On the very day that these lawyers were opposing New York's anti-discrimination law in Albany, SAMUEL DICKSTEIN was busy in Washington advocating a Federal Fair Employment Practice Act.

No wonder that this self-appointed group of lawyers do not like SAMUEL DICKSTEIN—and no wonder that selfish, rapacious interests who would like to keep for themselves the lion's share of the good jobs available in our city should be out fighting tooth and nail against my good friend and yours, Congressman DICKSTEIN. When a man has made enemies such as these because he has honestly fought your battles, you can safely rely upon him to continue to fight for you in the future. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN is a man whom you can be proud to honor with the title of justice of the Supreme Court of New York, and for whom you can be proud to cast your vote tomorrow.

Now, in the 2 or 3 minutes remaining I want to say something about the functions of our court system. As that great writer of American Government, James Bryce, once pointed out, the courts touch the citizen more directly and more closely than perhaps any other part of the Government; yet, because their activity is not particularly spectacular, we oftentimes pay little attention to choosing our judges. For this very reason, it is of tremendous importance that our judges be men who can be trusted to think as you would have them think. Congressman DICKSTEIN in 30 years of public service has, in my opinion, turned out to be just the kind of man that I think you would want to find on the bench, if you knew that you had to appear in court tomorrow and had to depend upon the judge to see to it that you got even-handed justice.

Congressman DICKSTEIN has never been a man to seek monetary or political rewards for his own sake. I recall, for example, that back in 1933, when he was first starting his investigation of the Nazi agitators and propagandists who were trying to undermine our American Government, he conducted that investigation for nine long months at his own expense before he was finally able to persuade Congress to vote him a budget for the purpose; and because SAMUEL DICKSTEIN came from an ordinary, hard-working New York family and never inherited any large sums of money I happen to know that it took him a long while to pay off the cost of that investigation, which he undertook because he was so convinced that your safety and my safety depended on somehow exposing the secret un-American plots of these German spies.

Some people laughed at DICKSTEIN in those years—and the Deutscher Weckruf, the official organ of Hitler's Nazi bund in America, laughed loudest of all, and put cartoons of DICKSTEIN on its front page. These bundists ridiculed him—and I quote the bunds own newspaper—as the man who wanted to put "that sterling citizen Fritz Kuhn out of the country as an enemy." That is what the bund said, and why they hated him. How right SAMUEL DICKSTEIN has since turned out to have been, and how much better off America would have been if the bund leader Fritz Kuhn had been sent to jail 10 years ago, instead of going free to carry out his evil plots until the very hour of Pearl Harbor. I tell you, my friends, that when history has shown a man's judgment to be so often right as it has in the case of Congressman DICKSTEIN, he is a safe and desirable choice for our Supreme Court.

Throughout his career he has been a friend of the downtrodden—and an opponent of those who would discriminate against people because of their religion or color. As far back as '24 he spoke out vigorously against the Ku Klux Klan, which he characterized as the worst enemy of all Catholics, Jews, Negroes, and immigrants. In those early fights, he won the friendship of men of both our political parties, and the Democratic Al Smith and the Republican Calvin Coolidge were equally lavish in their praise of the battle which DICKSTEIN fought against the forces of bigotry.

And, as I mention such names as Calvin Coolidge and Al Smith, it occurs to me that perhaps you would like to hear the names of some other people whom you respect and whom I respect, and who in turn respect Congressman DICKSTEIN. I have already mentioned the friendship which President Roosevelt so often showed toward the Congressman—and if public considerations did not prevent me, I would like to tell you of the intimate way in which Mr. Roosevelt depended upon the Congressman's advice in his dealings with the thousands of men and women who have come to our shores from all over the world, before and during the war.

Another man who has felt no hesitation in breaking a precedent to express his friendship and support for Mr. DICKSTEIN as a candidate for our New York Supreme Court is Harry S. Truman, the President of the United States, who, when in the Senate, as chairman of the Truman committee to investigate the conduct of the war effort, came to realize in a very special way the services which DICKSTEIN had performed for our country. Then there is the head of the legal work of the Justice Department, Hon. James McGranery, and our own senior Senator from New York, ROBERT WAGNER, and the majority leader in Congress, my good friend Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, all of whom have repeatedly and publicly expressed their appreciation of Mr. DICKSTEIN and his work.

Another of his friends and supporters in this campaign is the Honorable James W. Gerard, our Ambassador to Germany during the First World War, a man who is peculiarly qualified to say how much New Yorkers—and, in fact, all Americans—owe to Mr. DICKSTEIN'S foresight in routing out and punishing the Nazi enemies of our country, as well as in judging the thousands of immigrants from all over the world who have come to our shores during Mr. DICKSTEIN'S long and able chairmanship of the Immigration Committee. Then there are such distinguished jurists as Judge Jeremiah Mahoney and the able judge and lieutenant governor, Charles Poletti—these men and a hundred organizations speaking for the rank and file of the citizens of our great city, are behind SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, and with their support he will become your next supreme court justice from the district which comprises Manhattan and the Bronx, to be sure that when you go into the election booth tomorrow you not only indicate your choice for mayor, but be sure before you open the curtain to pull down the lever under the name of SAMUEL DICKSTEIN for supreme court. That is one of the most important responsibilities that you have to perform tomorrow, and that is the reason I have spent the last 15 minutes reviewing with you the history of this distinguished New Yorker and elder statesman—a man whose 30 years in public service qualify him above any of his opponents for the high post of justice of the Supreme Court of New York.

The Luce Bill on Housing for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial and poem by Sgt. Smith Dawless, a veteran of the CBI theater, appeared in the Army Times on November 24, 1945, in support of H. R. 4742:

CONGRATULATIONS, MRS. LUCE

Last week Army Times called upon the President, Congress, and the National Housing Agency to act immediately to alleviate the acute housing shortage in this country, which is keeping thousands of veterans and their families homeless.

On Monday, just 2 days after the editorial appeared, Representative CLARE BOOTHE LUCE (Republican, Connecticut), introduced in the House a bill to give veterans an unconditional priority on building materials; to guarantee loans up to $5,000 for home- or farm-buying purposes, and to set up a Veterans' Housing Bureau in the Veterans' Administration to facilitate the handling of home loans.

Army Times congratulates Mrs. LUCE on her prompt action. We hope the House Veterans' Committee will act with equal promptness.

CURBSTONE LAMENT

Ah, chill were the Normandy fox holes
And bitter and dank was Attu.
But far more disturbing
Is life on this curbing
Where the cold is fast turning us blue.
The Housing Committees are buzzing,
But though their proposals sound fine
There's no satisfaction
In words without action—
It's shelter we need, me and mine!

My wife has turned suddenly frigid,
The winter winds wrinkle her face.
Her once-fetching dimples
Are lost in goose-pimples,
Can't somebody find us a place?
The building authorities holler,
"Priorities keep our hands tied!"
And we've been unable
To locate a stable
Or Chic Sale that is not occupied.

All vets, states the FHA's Blandford,
Should "double-up" now without fuss.
But letters from Mother
And my younger brother
Say they plan to move in with us!
The landladies laugh at our misery,
The future's appallingly black.
We're plumb out of plumbing
And Christmas is coming—
Oh, Santa, please bring us a shack!

Four walls and a roof are sufficient,
Just cardboard—we don't hope for brick.
I've begged and petitioned,
For my wife's heir-conditioned
And we've got to be off the streets quick.
Dear Congress, I'm not a brass monkey,
And I long to defrost my poor spouse.
Be assured my selections
For next year's elections
Will be men who can find me a house!

—*Ye Olde Vette.*

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, while the impractical dreamers play with the thought of a universal peace brought about through some super world organization, such as Union Now, Super United States of the World, United Nations Organization, knowing, as they do, that the world has always known war and that now, despite the unconditional surrender of Germany and Japan, there is fighting throughout the world, to my mind a more powerful incentive to universal peace are the writings of Lt. Henry G. Lee, of the Headquarters and Military Police Company, Philippine Division, United States Army, who met death when a Japanese prisoner ship was bombed off Formosa by his comrades on January 9, 1945, 21 days before he would have been liberated had he not been moved from his Philippine prison camp where the verses were written.

The heart-rending, thought-provoking lines, which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of November 24, 1945, are as follows:

PRAYER BEFORE BATTLE

TO MARS

Before thine ancient altar, God of War,
Forlorn, afraid, alone, I kneel to pray.
The gentle Shepherd whom I would adore,
Faced by thy blazing playthings, slips away
And I am drained of faith, alone, alone,
Who now need faith to face thy outthrust sword.
Bereft of hope, turned pagan to the bone,
I kneel to thee and hail thee as my Lord.
From such a God as thee I ask not life;
My life is forfeited, the hour is late.
Thou need not swerve the bullet, dull the knife.
I ask but strength to ride the wave of fate,
And one thing more—to validate this strife
And my own sacrifice—teach me to hate.

MAIL INCIDENT

He clutched the precious letter in the hand,
Unopened and unread, and in his eyes
The nearest saw and could not understand
The weary, listless look of one who dies
Replace the eager, glad, expectant glow;
And then, with neither anger nor in hate,
He tore it into bits, precise and slow.
The nearest heard him whisper, "Late—too late,"
And watched him—with a strange untroubled mask,
Watch till the tiny pieces ceased to blow,
And then resumed some trivial daily task.

MANILA

SATURDAY NIGHT, DECEMBER 6, 1941

Dark-eyed girl toes a conga's beat,
Beckons with her shoulders and hips asway,
Colorful, exotic in the moist night's heat,
Lips half parted in a smile that is fey.

CHORUS (repeat after each verse)

This was a city—this now is dead.
This was Manila when the rains had gone.
Do the wild birds scatter when the thunderhead
Looms upwind in the summer sun?

Blond-head viking in a sharkskin suit,
Feet unsteady and a wolf-gleam eye,
Pounds on the bar in a loud dispute,
Forgotten each time that a girl goes by.

Flat-back German in a stiff-front shirt
Whispers to a Russian with a painted frown;
Eyes which flicker like a riding quirt
Play on the contours of her sleek black gown.

Turbaned Hindu with an ox-eyed face
Drums soft fingers on a whisky glass,
Clean-cut features of his dusky race
Changeless and calm as the hours pass.

White-haired tourist with a false-tooth grin
Prowls through the alleys where the girls are sought;
Finds a mestiza with a cream-gold skin;
They can't be won, but they can be bought.

Grinning corporal with tousled hair,
Shirt thrown open and a golden curl,
Cross-stitched chevrons lend a martial air,
Sentimental drink with a fat brown girl.

Englishman, Dutchman, Spaniard, Jew,
Soldierman, sailorman, and pioneer,
Get yourself a girl and a bottle, too,
Blind yourself, hide yourself; the storm is near.

TO OUR WOMEN

If you could hear us mock the lonely night
With tales of amorous conquest from our past,
In little huddled groups that shun the light,
Each story more erotic than the last,
Till we betray our tenderest memory
And drag it nude before the common ear
In all its detail, anatomically,
You would not wait for us if you could hear.

We offer no excuse here in our pen,
Our servile heads pressed down into the dust,
Who, though confined alone, are no less men,
And if we need your bodies for our lust,
Much more we need your gentleness again,
Your beauty and your patience and your trust.

AN EXCEPTION

Red in the eastern sun, before he died
We saw his glinting hair; his arms were tied.
There by his lonely form, ugly and grim,
We saw an open grave, waiting for him.
We watched him from our fence, in silent throng,
Each with the fervent prayer, "God make him strong."
They offered him a smoke; he'd not have that.
Then at his captor's feet coldly he spat.
He faced the leaden hail, his eyes were bare;
We saw the Tropic rays glint in his hair.
What matter why he stood facing the gun?
We saw a nation's pride there in the sun.

LETHAL EPIDEMIC

I could not know the meaning nor the way,
I was not one with all that time must end,
Until one hopeless, joyless, bitter day
I looked on unmasked death and saw a friend.

STARVATION ROMANCE

I dream so often of the days we knew—
Those days when love was like a guiding light—
And yet, although I know your eyes were blue,
Although I swore to be forever true,
Although I dream of going home to you,
Your name has slipped my memory tonight.

PRISON CAMP REVERIE

THREE YEARS FROM HOME

The right or wrong we cannot judge or know,
We only see that here a few must pay
A bitter penance, living day to day
And watching years unfold unused and slow.
We only feel our hungers wax and wane
To suit the whim that guides our captor's hate.
We only see the palsied hand of fate
Grope blindly in the tangled threads of pain
And leave this man untouched and that man dead.
We only feel the dream fade at the test,
The spirit quenched, the youth starved in the breast,
The heart-grown calloused and the once-proud head
Bowed low beneath the captor's iron hand.
We only know our candle gleam of hope
Glows in a darkness where our minds must grope,
Lost and forsaken, through a strange gray land.
My country—oh, my country—well we know,
Each one a soldier trained, that sacrifice
Is war itself, and some must pay a price
To cultivate the fields where victories grow.
And we were sacrificed—perhaps to gain
That little time that warded off defeat
In those first awful months of swift retreat.
If that be true, dare we begrudge our pain?
And yet we walk in fear, for we can see,
Clear-eyed across the path the years have flown,

Your failings and your sins which were our own,
Your selfishness, your smug complacency,
Your foolish bickering, your selfish lusts
To gain your end while others pay the price,
The cautious hand that will not throw the dice
Till they are loaded, and the foolish trust
In each new demigod who takes your mind
And shapes it to his own false dream of gain.
Your inability to see the pain,
The bitterness, the suffering you find
In your own life is only magnified
In other lives around the wailing earth.
You who regard the accident of birth
Not humbly, but with boastful pride.
And still we have our faith—faith in your might,
Slow to arouse and still more slowly cooled.
If faith moves mountains, then our faith is tooled
In each bright weapon in the far-flung fight;
Our faith is echoed in the smudge-dark sky
That clouds your roaring cities; in the grains
Of each ripe golden shock of prairie wheat;
Our faith is in the blood of weary men
Who take the coral beaches back again.
For we have seen their brothers in defeat,
For we have seen their brothers meet their end,
Unsuccored on a jungled foreign shore;
Nor did they question if their lives meant more
Than that small plot of ground they must defend.
My country—oh, my country—well we know
That final victory will be your part,
But bitterness claws at the waiting heart,
And still the years go by unused and slow.

AWAKENING

All night I lie with eyes that ache to close,
And fight my mind, which cannot find repose,
And listen to the soft familiar sound of rain,
Distorted by the tenseness of my brain,
Play on the nipa with a rhythmic stamp,
And hear the mutter of the prison camp,
And wonder if I ever will be sane.

All night in endless circles that return
Each to the same beginning, I discern
The deep-grooved wheel ruts of the captive's mind
Obliterate the path I search to find—
The well-marked trail I followed through Bataan.
And so the circle ends where it began;
The trail was blazed and marked, but I am blind.

There was a bomb-pocked, dusty jungle hill;
The trail was there and I was on it still,
And there were shambling men whose eyes were bright
Hollows of suffering touched with fevered light.
I felt my way with weary, stumbling feet,
Between the broken fragments of defeat.
There was a homemade flag of dirty white.

There was a broken murmur in my ear,
And as I forced my sleep-dazed mind to hear,
One sentence caught and stung like wind-blown hail:
"We have our honor. We were meant to fail."
"Now I can sleep," my mind said, with a smile.
I threw my loaded pistol on the pile,
And when I turned to look, there was no trail.

There was no trail, and I am wandering still
In search of something lost upon a hill;
The cadence of the rain above my bed
Beats out familiar rhythms in my head—
The shambling walk of driven, tortured men.
I stumble into line and smell again
The carrion pungence of our sun-black dead.
There was a blazing road that had no end;
Eight thousand captives, not a single friend;
A dry canteen and an artesian well
Where it was death to drink. We spread the smell
Across the miles of sun-baked tropic plain,
Marching in step with death and drugged with pain.
There was a bayonet for those who fell.

Then came the bitter days when those alive
Fought in a vicious struggle to survive,
When we begrudged the little strength we gave
To dig our withered dead a shallow grave.
Behind the wire, the sleepless nights have taught
That our escape from death was dearly bought,
And honor is a luxury to slaves.

The rain has ceased; the camp lies deadly still;
The circle has returned upon a hill.
I find my way with weary, stumbling feet
Between the broken fragments of defeat.
"We have our honor. We were meant to fail,"
I hear the words, but still there is the trail,
Well-blazed and with no symbol of defeat.

The ground is littered with the waste of war;
I choose a rifle with a perfect bore
From off a pile, and with a practiced hand
I check the working parts for clogging sand.
An extra bandoleer. I'll travel light;
I'll need no blanket roll to sleep tonight.
My needs are few to do the thing I've planned.

I find my place upon an open slope.
Methodically, with hands that do not grope,
I dig my elbow holes; arrange my gear;
Easy to hand I place my bandoleer.
I tie my pistol's greasy lanyard string
Around my wrist, adjust the rifle sling
And wait exultant and released from fear.

I am awake. Across the prison yard
I hear the challenge where a foreign guard
Patrols the wire. The camp is deadly still,
And now I know the truth. I never will
Again be free to see and choose my way.
I barter choice for life, and I must pay.
The trail I followed ended on a hill.

What To Do With Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, what to do with Germany is one of the most complex problems facing the United Nations. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting herewith a radio talk by the well-known commentator, Mr. Robert St. John, over the National Broadcasting Co. on Monday, November 5. Attention is called to a suggestion made by a listener in New Hampshire in response to the question "What to do with Germany." Her suggestion is a novel one and quite pertinent. I am sure that Members of the House will appreciate the opportunity to read them herein:

Now I want to tell you about a new answer to the old, old question of "what to do with Germany?" But first, let me explain where the answer came from. The source of ideas is sometimes surprising. All the experts have long ago been heard from. We have had the Morgenthau plan, deindustrializing Germany. We have had plans from London, from Washington, from all the free capitals of the world. We have heard from politicians and from statesmen, from dreamers, and from "doers," from Europeans and from Americans, from those who argue that the only good German is a dead German, and from those who want to recreate Germany, "just as she was," in that Cliveden-set-hope that maybe someday Germany and Russia will destroy each other. Yes, we have heard from them all. And still we don't seem to have decided on any concrete, long-range, constructive scheme for solving the long-standing problem of "what to do with Germany?" But the other day I received, from a woman listener to this program, her ideas on the subject. I had never heard of her before. She is just one of the ordinary people, one of that vast multitude whose ideas never get much circulation. She lives in the small city of Lebanon, N. H. But I think that if the great statesmen of the world adopted her plan the problem of Germany might well be solved for all time and that we might achieve some good and lasting results from World War II. My friend in Lebanon, N. H., starts out like this:

"The German people are hard working, industrial-minded, and ambitious; but, their belief that their goal justifies any means, regardless of honor or decency, makes them a threat to world peace. The following proposition is offered because I believe that first, it would make it impossible for Germany ever to wage war again; second, it would make use of the very qualities in the German people which make them good citizens when they are working constructively, but dangerous under the leadership of an Adolf Hitler; and third, it would make Germany pay for the suffering she has caused the world in the past decade in a way that she can pay."

That is the introduction to the plan. And now, here is the idea itself:

"The world needs a place which is not part of any country, but belongs to all countries, a place where every nationality can meet, on an equal footing, and exchange ideas and culture. Therefore, the proposal is made that the land of Germany be taken by the United Nations and made the capital of the world. Every country in the world, except Japan, would henceforth be a part owner of Germany, which would become the District of Cooperation, and would be to the world what Washington, D. C., is to the United States. Germany would not have its own government of its own people, anymore than Washington, D. C., has. It would be governed by a commission of the United Nations, just as Washington is governed by a commission appointed by Congress. Germany's industries would also be owned and controlled by the United Nations. The profits would not go, as in the past, to German financiers and industrialists, who would support Hitler regimes and finance wars, but instead would be used to support the institutions of the United Nations.

This new world capital would be the seat of the United Nations Government, of the World Court, and there we would also establish a permanent world's fair which would present a continuous exhibition of the wonders created by the genius of man. There also would be established a world university, where the culture of all nations would be taught. There also would be established a world library. There the literature, the art, the music, and the theater of each country would be represented. The new world capital would become the place where there would be a continuous exchange of ideas in world progress. If the great powers are going in for universal military training, let's make it universal throughout the world. If boys of 18 are to be taken into armies, let them all be trained at the world capital. Let them form part of an international police force. Let them be trained together and thus learn to understand the men of other nationalities, and then maybe

the fears and the suspicions which create wars would gradually vanish. There in the new world capital they would learn to respect and appreciate the peoples of other lands. Such a world capital would become the Mecca of all travelers. Customs and boundary lines and perhaps even tariffs and economic barriers would gradually melt away. The very act of building such a capital in the center of a country which spread fear and hatred throughout Europe would help the people to forget and forgive. It would be a practical step toward doing away with war, for there men of all nations would be working together on a project of universal interest, each country training its soldiers under the very noses of all other countries, with no hidden secrets, with scientific research and international affair, with a continuous exchange of ideas and a sharing of progress in medicine, science, politics. This is the way to do away with war. For example, if at the world university there was a college of government where each country's system could be studied in comparison with others each country would then tend to borrow the best from others and would thus better its own system. A good law would spread from nation to nation. The whole idea is exciting and challenging. Science has tackled the smashing of atoms and other ideas which a generation ago even scientists would have called crazy and fantastic, yet look how far the scientists have gone. It's about time that we, the rest of us, became bold and forward-looking. Now is the golden chance. If we wait it will be too late. The very methods which science has developed for wiping out civilization make it imperative that we get out of our rut of thinking and start to work quickly and eagerly to create that world state which Einstein and so many others with vision have been talking about. And here is a way to commence. Create the center of the world state there in the heart of Europe, taking over Germany as the place. The germ of this idea came from a modest woman in the hills of New Hampshire. I pass it on to you with a few of my own elaborations. I want your reaction. If you have suggestions to offer, any modifications or revisions of the idea, or any objections, send them to me quickly. If this or any other constructive idea is even to be given consideration, there's no time to be lost. Let's change war plants to peace plants. Let's convert a dozen armies into one police force. Let's use the same intelligence and energy in organizing for peace as we did in organizing for war. Let's give democracy a chance.

Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a resolution unanimously passed by the members of Local 227, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, on November 18, 1945:

Whereas the Fair Labor Standards Act now places a floor under wages in interstate commerce, a notable achievement for organized labor since, when the law was passed, wages in a large part of American industry were far below the level set by the act; and

Whereas since the passage of the Fair Labor Standards Act, the cost of living has increased so that the present 40 cents an hour minimum is no protection against substandard conditions of living; and

Whereas approximately 4,000,000 workers in interstate commerce are now receiving less than 65 cents an hour, among whom are approximately half a million textile workers; and

Whereas the payment of low wages to so many American workers shows itself in the high rate of illness among these groups and the impossibility of these people to complete their education and to live in decent homes; and

Whereas a higher minimum wage is necessary to create the additional purchasing power which is essential to the promotion of full prosperity, full production, and full employment in these postwar years; and

Whereas there is presently before the Senate a bill S. 1349 and before the House a companion measure H. R. 3914, which would make the legal minimum wage 65 cents an hour immediately, 70 cents an hour after 1 year, and 75 cents an hour after 2 years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this local union, No. 227 of the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, endorse these amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act, and call upon our Senators and Representative to support them.

ALFRED BRENNAN,
President.
JOHN O. ROSS,
Vice President.
EDWARD J. KELLERER,
Secretary-Treasurer.

NOVEMBER 18, 1945.

Our Foreign Service in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in the morning paper is the text of a statement issued by Ambassador Hurley upon his resignation. I have read it several times and find myself confused. He attacks the members of our foreign service in blaming them for the lack of foreign policy and for the failure of our efforts. These men of whom he speaks are career men. They have chosen to serve the United States in the far-flung offices maintained by this country. Most of them are underpaid, many of them are separated from their wives and children because of the impossibility of education.

Before criticizing these particular public servants because of the lack of cohesion it might be well for any critic to take cognizance of the complete confusion existing in the State Department itself. The lack of trained personnel; indeed, the lack of adequate personnel.

Information from the field is sent into the State Department with great regularity. How much of it is even read? How much of it is even given consideration in the formulating of opinion by the "tops"? I am in complete accord with Mr. Hurley when he says that all too little information is given the people of the United States in the matter of what we are doing and attempting to do in the foreign fields. There can be nothing but confusion in the minds of the people in a representative republic such as ours unless there can be an informed public opinion. I trust that the State Department will make some effort to inform the public.

Is it not possible that it would have been wise if the State Department listened more sympathetically to the reports and advises sent them by the career men who have been in the field far longer than the administration-appointed ambassadors? Is it not possible that they might know these situations more intimately even than these ambassadors? I wonder if the ex-Ambassador knows that many Army men—men of both experience and judgment have differed quite violently with the methods we have employed toward and in China. He failed to mention them.

Mr. Hurley graciously admits that there are a few loyal members of the foreign service. That is generous of him. Having recently talked with many of our very fine foreign service men and women out in the European field and seen the evidence of their loyal, honest work, I could do no less than protest the accusations made by the just-resigned Ambassador to China. Certainly they cannot be allowed to go unnoticed by this House. They should be given examination by the proper authorities.

Aluminum Plant Disposal

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago my distinguished colleague from the State of Washington, Senator MITCHELL, introduced in the Senate a bill, S. 1612, to authorize and direct the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase for stock piling purposes pig aluminum to be produced by Government-constructed aluminum plants to the extent that such production is in excess of current industrial demand limited, however, to one and one-half billion pounds of primary aluminum. I am thoroughly in accord with the sense and purpose of this bill, and in the hope of expediting action by the Congress I am today introducing an identical bill in the House of Representatives. I understand that Senator MITCHELL's bill has been referred to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, of which the distinguished Senator WAGNER, of New York, is chairman. It is my sincere hope that that committee will act favorably upon the bill without delay so that this session of Congress may vote on it before adjourning for recess.

Necessities of the war resulted in the taxpayers of this Government having invested today in production plant and equipment over $16,000,000,000 of which over $1,000,000,000 is accounted for in aluminum and related facilities, and in

turn almost half of this investment was made in my own State of Washington and in the neighboring State of Oregon. The problem of aluminum plant disposal, therefore, while being of great national importance, is of particular importance to our people in the Pacific Northwest and it is for that reason that I feel it is my privileged duty to bend my best efforts in the direction of a sound and constructive resolution of this very important national and regional problem.

Of all the surplus plant disposal problems there is none more complicated nor more difficult than this aluminum plant disposal problem. At the same time there is no single problem of surplus property disposal that will do more to spark reconversion than this one. There are a billion dollars of taxpayers' money and over a million jobs at stake.

I have read and studied the reports of the Attorney General and of the Surplus Property Administrator. I have followed with great interest the proceedings of the various investigating committees, including the hearings of the Murray Small Business Committee in March of this year, the hearings of Senator MITCHELL's committee at Spokane in August, and the joint hearings so ably conducted by Senator O'MAHONEY here in October, all of which should have served splendidly to enlighten the people and the Congress upon the problems involved. Such enlightenment, however, in the absence of affirmative action by the Congress, not only falls short of its objective, but serves to complicate the problem further.

Time does not permit of a full and complete treatment of this problem before this body, but the more pertinent facts and observations, briefly stated, are as follows:

First. For 50 years prior to the war the Aluminum Co. of America not only dominated the aluminum industry, but owned it lock, stock, and barrel. No stronger, tighter, nor more effectively dictated monopoly ever existed in any industry, with the result that the price of aluminum was high and the production was restricted.

Second. The highest court in the land has not only adjudged the Aluminum Co. of America a monopoly, but it has charged the Surplus Property Administrator with a mandate to see to it, through proper disposition of Government-owned aluminum facilities, which incidentally now accounts for more than half the entire industry, that that monopoly is forever broken up.

Third. The Congress, through the Surplus Property Act, has directed and charged the Surplus Property Administrator with the responsibility of disposing of these facilities in such a manner as to prevent monopoly and promote a maximum of free private enterprise.

Fourth. In 1940 the Reynolds Metals Co. entered the aluminum industry in a comparatively small way by borrowing money from the Government and mortgaging all of its assets. Although Reynolds Metals Co. has done an outstanding job and, I am informed, still owes the Government some $35,000,000, its operations do not afford either enough or sufficiently strong competition in the industry.

Fifth. With the exception of the small reduction plant at Tacoma, Wash., and a few scattered prefabricating facilities, the Aluminum Co. of America operated under lease during the war all Government-owned aluminum plants. As of August 30 this year these leases became subject to cancellation upon 60 days' notice. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation undertook to keep the plants going by offering the Aluminum Co. of America a 1-year lease subject to cancellation upon 60 days' notice. The Aluminum Co. of America refused to cooperate with the Government on this basis, with the result that all leases were canceled as of October 31. This meant that thousands of employees who could have been gainfully employed lost their jobs and hundreds of millions of dollars worth of highly efficient Government-owned property is standing idle and depreciating at a greater rate than if in operation. It also meant that hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of Government power is going to waste over the Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams, never to be retrieved.

Sixth. The Surplus Property Administrator has recommended that these plants be leased or sold to bidders other than the Aluminum Co. of America. I am informed that the disposal agency, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, has received offers from only two bidders other than the Aluminum Co. of America for any substantial portion of these plants; namely, Reynolds Metals Co. and the Columbia Metals Corp.

With regard to the Reynolds Metals Co., I understand that certain of the Government-owned facilities are needed by it properly to balance its operations, and, assuming that satisfactory financial arrangements can be made, every consideration should be given to this company.

With regard to the Columbia Metals Corp., this company is composed of a group of outstandingly successful businessmen and bankers in the Pacific Northwest. This company launched its program of establishing an integrated light-metals industry in the Pacific Northwest almost 5 years ago. To begin with, it showed rare good judgment in selecting the Chemical Construction Corp., one of the most outstanding and competent engineering firms in the country, to design and build the $5,000,000 aluminum-from-clay plant now in operation at Salem, Oreg. By way of a temporary digression from its main purpose of making alumina, this plant is now turning out very much needed ammonium sulphate, thus helping to relieve the fertilizer shortage in that area. In addition to sponsoring the establishment of the Salem alumina-from-clay plant at substantial expense to itself, I am informed that the Columbia Metals Corp. has conducted extensive surveys and has made exhaustive studies of the problems involved in connection with developing a completely integrated aluminum operation, and that it was the first to propose taking over certain Government-owned plants. Although the Salem operation is a comparatively small one, I have heard nothing but good reports upon the manner in which the Columbia Metals Corp. has discharged its responsibilities in connection with that project. Having done well in the handling of smaller responsibilities, it can be expected to do well in larger ones, and I unhesitatingly bespeak for this company every consideration on the part of the proper governmental authorities.

Seventh. Both of the above offers are conditioned upon the Reconstruction Finance Corporation agreeing to purchase for stock-piling purposes a portion of the pig aluminum production for an interim period of time. All members of the Congress are undoubtedly aware of stock-piling legislation as proposed in S. 752 and S. 1481, bills relating to the acquisition of stocks of strategic and critical materials for national defense purposes as recommended by the Army and Navy Munitions Board. At the hearing before the Subcommittee on Surplus Property of the Committee on Military Affairs on October 30 this year, the following testimony was recorded:

(a) From the statement of Commodore Lewis L. Strauss, United States Naval Reserve, Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy:

> It is our confirmed belief that one of the essential elements of national defense is the maintenance of really adequate stock piles of those strategic materials needed to supply the military, industrial, and essential civilian requirements of a country such as ours conducting a major war. We think it is the safest investment of the public wealth and manpower. * * * They Navy believes, therefore, that S. 1481 is constructive legislation to this end.

(b) From the statement of Col. William H. Hutchinson, United States Army, Army executive secretary, Army and Navy Munitions Board:

> For years the War Department has been interested in a program for the stock-piling of strategic materials. Since 1921 it has made in conjunction with the Navy Department, continuing studies for the development of such program. Accordingly, it has recommended and supported appropriate legislation at every opportunity. * * * In the light of these factors the War Department is of the opinion that Senate bill 1481 is the more appropriate and effective legislation to accomplish the basic purposes of national defense stock piles.

(c) From the statement of John W. Snyder, Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion:

> Above all else we believe that so long as there is any possibility that we may be forced again to face the great calamity of war, the United States should establish stock piles of strategic materials to help preserve our national interests. I can only express the hope that the stock piles is never used. But until national defense measures become unnecessary, stock piling must be maintained as an essential guaranty of our security. * * * I believe that S. 1481 fulfills those requirements.

Thus it appears that there is general agreement as to the wisdom of stock piling strategic materials, and since aluminum is and has been classified as one of the most strategic materials, it can be expected that stock piling of primary aluminum will be authorized in time, but probably not in time to facilitate a prompt disposition of this aluminum

plant-disposal problem. I am, therefore, in complete agreement with Senator MITCHELL when he said in his remarks in the Senate last Friday that since an aluminum stock pile is generally accepted as vital to national security and since such purchase by the Government will expedite the resolution of this problem, there should be no reason why the two programs cannot be coordinated.

Eighth. In 1939 the shameful amount of a little over 150,000 tons of aluminum was produced in this country. This compares with over 60,000,000 tons of steel produced in the same year. Today, with the price of aluminum at two-thirds of its 1939 price, and with over 2,000,000 new workers having learned how to use aluminum, industry generally, and the automobile, railroad, aircraft, and electric industries in particular, are yearning for the establishment of competition in the aluminum industry so that they will be assured of a stable and continuing supply of aluminum at reasonable prices. I wholeheartedly share the opinions of many authorities who have predicted that, with the establishment of free competition in the aluminum industry, our present production capacity, although seven times as great as it was in 1939, will not be adequate to supply the demand.

CONCLUSION

It is not enough for the Court and the Congress to command and direct without at the same time making it possible for those commands and directions to be carried out. Looking at the situation realistically, we have tied the hands of the administrators of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Surplus Property Administration. Now we must untie them. The situation calls for affirmative action on the part of Congress. The people will not tolerate a do-nothing policy which not only will play into the hands of monopoly but will defeat the very objectives that have already been defined by Congress as set forth in the Surplus Property Act. I urge, Mr. Speaker, the immediate passage of this bill.

Showing of American Films in Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I noted in a recent issue of a Hollywood motion-picture trade paper that the British newspapers and motion picture industry are attempting to put a ban on the showing of American feature films in the British Empire. I am amazed at this shortsighted view, on the part of our wartime partner and ally. The dependence on each other for trade by all nations is one of the keys to peacetime prosperity, and yet a policy of discriminating against American products is now being promoted by British interests.

I am sure that Britain does not intend to establish such actions as her postwar policy. As a nation asking us for billions to set herself back on her feet, I do not see how she can expect the loan to be made, if it is to be reciprocated only by a boycott of our manufactured products.

It is my feeling that the attitude of the British motion picture industry and its press be admonished by this House, which will have to raise the revenue and authorize the loans requested. Certainly, no one is more in favor of helping to establish stable trade relations with our world neighbors than I, but I could not put my stamp of approval on a loan to be made if the recipient were to deny us the right to trade with her nation.

I hope that present policy reflecting such thought by the British motion picture industry will be rescinded, and that all trade between our two nations will again become peaceful and harmonious.

Keep It Fair

REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an article by former Marine Sgt. Jim Lucas, now of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, on the maintenance of the point system without favoritism to special cases. I would also like to include an editorial from the mid-Pacific edition of the Stars and Stripes, service newspaper, on this same matter.

The article by Jim Lucas is as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of November 28, 1945]

PRO FOOTBALLERS' ATC TRIP HOME AHEAD OF GI'S DRAWS HOUSE FIRE

(By Jim G. Lucas)

Use of Army transport planes to fly professional football players back from the Pacific to finish the 1945 season with their old teams while thousands of high-point combat veterans waited for any kind of transportation drew fire from Congressmen today.

Representative MONRONEY (Democrat, Oklahoma) said he would call the matter to the attention of the House.

"If the point system is going to work we should stick to it," Mr. MONRONEY said. "Air transportation should go only to high-point men, the sick, and the wounded. I am shocked that the Army has extended itself to accommodate professional football teams at the expense of combat veterans."

Air Force public relations had "no information" on the subject but had asked the Fourth Air Force in Hawaii for details.

THREE PRO PLAYERS

At least three pro players whose names have appeared in National League line-up recently—Bill Dudley of the Pittsburgh Steelers, Jack Jacobs of the Cleveland Rams, and Elmer "Tippy" Madarik of the Detroit Lions—are among 54 members of the AAF Hawaiian Flyers team reported by Stars and Stripes, Mid-Pacific edition, to have flown home since the end of the season, November 12.

Awaiting transportation on November 17, in Hawaii, were 5,154 combat veterans. An additional 8,318 were on Saipan and New Caledonia.

"Five of the players had 60 or more points and were returned to the States for discharge," Stars and Stripes said. "Of those being returned for reassignment, some have point totals as low as 24 and only 8 months overseas."

Only 13 of the 54 will be eligible for discharge even after the Army lowers its points to 55 on December 1, the service paper said.

"In most cases," it added, "they will be given furloughs upon arrival."

In Detroit, Madarik said he had "enough points to get out" but would not give his total. He said he is in a Detroit preseparation center and will report to Chanute Field, Ill. "All of us had enough," he said.

Louis Cromwell, Lions' general manager, said his team did not request Madarik's return.

"As a matter of fact," he added, "it was a complete surprise to us when he showed up. Naturally, we were pleased, because he is a whale of a ball player and we need him. I understand he had a furlough due him and decided to spend it in Detroit."

Stars and Stripes reported that Jacobs, a former Oklahoma University star, was "reassigned" to the States and received "an extended furlough during which he will play professional football for the Cleveland Rams."

Cleveland officials said Jacobs, an Air Force lieutenant who spent all his Army career on the gridiron, still is wearing his Army uniform and "it is our impression he is on terminal leave."

A spokesman for the Steelers said Lieutenant Dudley came home on emergency leave several weeks ago because his father was ill. Dudley later was discharged, and the Pittsburgh spokesman said he "understood reliably" he qualified on points. Dudley, a former Virginia University star, could not be reached.

A directive issued by ATC, Pacific Division, states that "personnel requesting assignment to the continental United States must have a minimum of 18 months' continuous service overseas prior to July 1, 1945."

Air Force athletes saw little combat, if any. Their activity was confined almost wholly to barnstorming tours and exhibition games, principally in Hawaii and on the west coast.

The editorial from the Stars and Stripes is as follows:

LET'S STICK TO THE RULES

Service athletic contests were instituted chiefly to build the morale of servicemen.

Now it seems the function of some big-name baseball, football, and other athletic stars is—perhaps unwittingly—to help lower the morale of overseas servicemen.

A case in point is the local AAF Hawaiian Flyers eleven. Gathered together from scattered points—through more than coincidence—star footballers were molded together into a local championship eleven. Now the grid season is over, and instead of taking their place in the demobilization parade in routine fashion according to point totals, 54 players are scheduled to fly home to the States, some for reassignment and some for discharge.

The majority of them are not eligible under current readjustment regulations for return homeward. One such is Lt. Jack Jacobs, who has 53 points, 12 shy of the necessary officer discharge total. He's already gone, and after landing at Hamilton Field was given an "extended furlough." He is scheduled to play for the professional Cleveland Rams in coming football tilts.

Members of the team who haven't already departed are at present waiting for stateside

air lift. One is a strapping 19-year-old with a grand total of 24 points.

Early in November, 37 baseball stars, also AAF athletes in uniform, were flown home after playing exhibitions in Central Pacific areas. Among them were Enos Slaughter, Dario Lodigiani, Joe Marty, Walt Judnich, George Tebbetts, Joe Gordon, Max West, Cecil Hudson, Howie Pollett, and Al Dean. They were excellent baseballers and good morale builders during their tour; somehow that doesn't provide sufficient justification for their air return to the States, when most of them lacked sufficient points for discharge.

Too, it doesn't strike so well that the baseballers went ahead of guys with more points who sometimes had to go later in LST's or worse. Some of those men were combat veterans. Some of them are still in the forward areas. Right at present some of those baseballers with less than 60 points are being discharged as "surplus," under Army regulations pertaining to stateside EM only.

Then there's tennis player Frankie Parker, who not too long ago was flown from Guam to participate in the national amateur at Forest Hills. Since then Staff Sergeant Parker has competed in several other tournaments, including one in Mexico, no doubt scheduled as military duty.

In Sunday's sports headlines is the name of halfback Charles Trippi, who is sparking the University of Georgia football team. Just a little more than a month ago he was discharged as a "surplus" staff sergeant with 41 points; Georgia Senators insisted they had requested his discharge on a "genuine hardship" basis, because his father, mother, wife, and child were dependent on him for support. Apparently the collegiate "amateur" football wage scale has gone up considerably since prewar days.

It may be argued that the release of all these athletes and their quick transportation home is justified because they have completed their jobs and there is nothing for them to do. The same situation exists today for thousands and thousands of other GIs, not athletic stars, who are still sweating out point drops in the Pacific and elsewhere. Surely the fact they aren't great halfbacks or pro fullbacks shouldn't be prejudicial to their interests.

The Stars and Stripes is not interested in smearing anybody or anything, least of all athletes and athletics, which have important morale value for servicemen when handled correctly.

But before the sport world and the Army demobilization system suffers a black eye from these proceedings, we ask that "reassignment," transportation, and discharge of athletes be handled the same as for every GI, swabbie, and gyrene now in service.

Frankly, we don't want the demobilization program degenerating into a wild scramble for discharges based upon who you know, how much dough you've got, how much seniority your Senator has on a certain committee, or whether you're a star for Deplorable State. We think this type of "angling" should be thoroughly investigated to prevent any recurrences.

Speaking for Pacific servicemen, the Stars and Stripes emphasizes once more we want a sensible, speedy, and fair demobilization. You can underline "fair."

Mr. Speaker, most of the Members of the House have loyally supported the fairness of the Army's point discharge system and believe in the equity of these combat veterans with the longest service being given first opportunities for transportation back to the States.

I was shocked at the recent revelation by the mid-Pacific edition of the Stars and Stripes and by the Scripps-Howard newspapers over the Army's flagrant disregard of their own system. I refer to the recent action of the Army flying 54 members of the Army Air Forces' Hawaiian football team back to the States after their football season had ended November 12.

Despite the fact that only 13 of the 54 will be eligible for discharge even after the Army lowers its points to 55 on December 1, air transportation was furnished these men. According to the Stars and Stripes, most of the cases involved included furloughs in the States and for reassignment.

At the same time that these football players were given air priorities to make the trip, 5,154 high-point combat veterans were waiting for transportation in Hawaii and 8,313 in Saipan and New Caledonia. Only 5 of the players involved had 60 or more points, according to the Stars and Stripes.

If the point system is to work, it must be handled in a way fair for all and with no favoritism shown. The Army should jealously guard the system or it will itself destroy all confidence that the combat veterans and the public have in it. Air transportation should go to those veterans with the greatest amount of combat service and to the sick and the wounded and to run in ahead of these cases others with lower points is destructive of the system.

The Army should investigate this case to prevent a recurrence of this favoritism.

Pre-New Deal Idealism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of David M. Proctor, of Kansas City, Mo., to the chairman, board of directors, William Jewell College, disapproving conferring an honorary degree on Harry S. Truman. Mr. Proctor states very clearly the idealism for which America has always stood in the training of our youth. I do not consider that this letter is a personal condemnation of Mr. Truman so much as a denunciation of the New Deal's straying away from fundamental truths on which our country was founded, which has had a disastrous effect on the morals of our country, and because of its seeming generosity has fooled millions of good American citizens.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *November 21, 1945.*
Hon. JOHN B. PEW,
Kansas City, Mo.

DEAR JOHN: Please find enclosed my signed pledge for $500 to be credited to the class of '02 as part of the Fruit Memorial Fund. This subscription completes the quota of $2,500, and a little more, allocated to my class.

I congratulate you on your effective work for William Jewell College. You have been almost slavish in your untiring efforts to promote the welfare of three institutions—your family, your church, and your alma mater. There will be many lustrous stars in your crown. Other friends of the college, both alumni and nonalumni, have contributed generously to its present stature. I am thankful for such men.

While my service and direct contribution to the college has been negligible, my interest in its welfare has never waned. As a result, the recent publicity with reference to the proposed conferring of an honorary degree upon President Truman deeply stirred me. The trustees probably foresaw only the advertising it would give and possibly had an eye on Federal aid. Some actually believe that even bad advertising is better than none. I am not in sympathy with that school of thought.

You will recall that some 20 years ago a storm threatened William Jewell in connection with the published scholastic degrees of Dr. H. C. Wayman, then president. After prolonged conferences I advised him, in the interest of the college and himself, to immediately tender his resignation. I prepared the draft. The trustees refused to accept it. The storm gathered and finally burst in all of its fury, sweeping Dr. Wayman from the scene in disgrace and seriously retarding the growth of the college over a period of years. That was costly advertising. I sought to avoid it, but was unsuccessful.

I admire you and your associates on the board in your desire to promote the best interests of William Jewell. In the move to confer a degree on Mr. Truman, however, you have been blinded by your own zeal.

Many friends of the college, including Dr. Green, your parents and mine, who nurtured the institution when it was struggling, sometimes against heavy odds, would not approve the conferring of an honorary degree on Harry S. Truman. In support of country, its Government, William Jewell, and church, they clung to a definite pattern. They saved, stinted, and sacrificed for their families, their church, and the college. Neither glamour nor fame marked their lives. They subscribed to the Ten Commandments as a code of human conduct, and the Sermon on the Mount as a formula for human souls. To "do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly before their God" was their goal; they believed in thrift, economy, self-reliance, and individual initiative, in representative government without the lash of regimentation and private enterprise without hobbling verbotens. Undoubtedly they would have been opposed to encouraging idleness by placing unemployment on a salary, because they spent no time inventing an ointment to take the place of sweat.

"Trust in God and work" was the framed motto that greeted you at their door. They supported the Constitution of the United States and had reverence for the Supreme Court, the only tribunal created in the document itself. Yet, complete separation of church and state was an important item in their political code. To them, the ballot box stood as a symbol of freedom—not as a handy device for fraudulent voting to enrich political spoilsmen and to promote their candidates. While recognizing that a full complement of officials is necessary to enforce the law, they knew, as did Thomas Jefferson, that "swarms of officials" would "harass the people and eat out their substance"; they sided with Grover Cleveland, who without fear proclaimed, "Though the people support the Government, the Government should not support the people." They worshipped no idols, no golden calves, no graven images, and seldom were they deceived by "false lights on the shore." In short, they were rugged, home-loving, God-fearing, patriotic American citizens, possessing the qualities that produced the miracle nation of the world. I ask you, in all fairness, would they approve conferring an honorary degree on Harry S. Truman?

For 12 years the New Dealers have controlled the Federal Government. There are

millions of American citizens in the very section from which the college draws its students who sincerely believe that the New Deal in all of its ramifications and implications is the greatest curse, scourge, blight, and calamity that ever befell America. They actually believe that there are many common denominators of nazism, fascism, and new dealism. Whether this is correct or not, it will always be historically significant that the Lord in His infinite wisdom removed from the earthly scene Hitler, Mussolini, and Mr. Roosevelt in April 1945—all in a single anniversary month of the Resurrection. In any event, millions of good citizens—God-fearing, tax-paying, patriotic—many of whom are friends of William Jewell College, will never forget the overt acts of the New Deal, some of which I list:

Deficit spending; increasing our national debt $30,000,000,000 in peacetime; filling the civil list of our Federal pay rolls until we now have more than 3,000,000, apparently frozen in office, who may be a self-perpetuating bureaucracy which only the dynamite of revolution can dislodge; the sinister attempt to pack the Supreme Court and make it a rubber stamp for the Executive; fanning the flames of racial and class hatreds until today we have the spectacle of a Negro of New York City referring to Mrs. Truman as "the last lady of the land"; the coddling of communistic and racketeering labor leaders, representing vote-producing groups, raising them up from harmless cubs to roaring lions seeking whom they would devour and who are now lunging and plunging at the very throat of our Government and industry; tripping the light fantastic down the corridors of a fool's paradise and fiddling to the rhythm of oft-repeated phrases—"I hate war" and "the more abundant life," while the Japs meticulously planned, with sinews of war we furnished, our most humiliating military debacle.

You may say Mr. Truman is not responsible for these tragic follies. But he admittedly supported them a hundred percent. He aided the "indispensable" man in his attempt to pack the Supreme Court; he voted for the back-breaking appropriations now a part of a staggering national debt which for a hundred years will impress its lien on every drop of American sweat. He is a product of one of the most brazenly criminal political machines which for a dozen years looted and plundered Kansas City to the very brink of bankruptcy; he was catapulted into the Senate by the satanic power of a debauched primary election; he opposed for reappointment a courageous public official merely because he successfully prosecuted election crooks and his own political creator.

No, Mr. Truman, though likable, friendly, and normally possessed of good impulses, is not worthy of an honorary degree at the hands of William Jewell College. The presidential oath does not a benefactor make nor high office a hero. Though not in any sense a quack or a charlatan, his background is tainted. His foreground is devoid of personal achievement. He is merely an outstanding example of the quixotic quirks of a distorted political fate. He received his nomination for the Vice Presidency, on the second bounce, through the maneuverings of Mr. Browder, an ex-convict and Communist, and Mr. Hillman, labor racketeer. Then he became President through the grim accident of death. Conferring an honorary degree on Mr. Truman would reflect adversely on the college without aiding one cubit to his stature or erasing the indelible record.

Will the youth of this country construe the honorary degree as approval of the New Deal and Mr. Truman's record? Bear it in mind that friends of William Jewell, opposed to the New Deal and its titular head past and present, are not asking the college to condemn or even criticize Mr. Truman. But will conferring the degree cause them to conclude that the college at last has launched upon a course of political partisanship and become a substation for a highly vulnerable, if not sinister, philosophy of government? The reputation of a denominational college is a good deal like that of a woman—it is either good or bad. It is never just medium.

The trustees should quietly, without publicity, withdraw their proffer. President Truman's overlapping engagements will make this easy of accomplishment. The college should not slap in the face thousands of its friends. It cannot be done with impunity. They should not run the risk of misleading thousands of boys and girls by the implications. William Jewell should avoid the pitfalls of partisan politics. Standing as a spiritual Gibraltar, it must resist the lure of golden calves, graven images, and fleshpots. In an era of confused action and blurred thinking it should retain its accustomed poise. In a period of cross currents and the "madding crowd's ignoble strife" it should not join but pray for the throng and place on the hill a burning beacon that will send its "blaze afar." If it would survive, it must ever cherish the inspiring ideals of its founders and the dreams of its faithful friends through the years.

If my position is wrong, don't place the blame on my doorstep. It merely reflects the teachings received in my youth from my parents, a Baptist pulpit, Dr. Green, Professor Semple, Dr. Clark, Dr. Stafford, Dr. Fruit, and other sturdy patriarchs, who helped build William Jewell and America. If I am wrong, they deceived and mislead us.

With kindest regards, I am

Yours sincerely,

DAVID M. PROCTOR.

Copy to Dr. Binns and each member of the board.

Time for a Show-Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, some folks are parasites. They want to live in comfort without making their fair contribution to the welfare of all. They are insistent and loud-mouthed, though comparatively few in number. They, their theories, and their demands are the cause of much of our present trouble. Every American who is not a businessman or an employer wants and should have a job at a fair wage and most of them are willing to earn the wage paid.

In theory we are all born with equal opportunity, and we would like to believe with equal ability, but in reality neither is true. We cannot all have a business of our own, be employers; some must work for others, others must provide the jobs. The job providers are comparatively few in number but they are governed by the same motives, they have the same desires as do those who must work for them.

Unless a potential employer thinks he can make a profit, he will neither create nor maintain a job. Fortunately, or unfortunately, a majority of the employers possess competency and they can during a strike eat, wear clothing, and have a shelter for a longer period of time than can the average employee.

For the last 12 years those who must work for a livelihood have been told by politicians and agitators that employers, as a class, were a bad lot, intent only on serving their own interest, while every witness, including Director of the Budget Smith, Director of Reconversion Snyder, Secretaries of Commerce, the Treasury, and Labor, Wallace, Vinson and Schwellenbach, and representatives of the A. F. of L. and the CIO, appearing before the committee considering the so-called full employment bill, admitted that we have here in this country a system of government and economy which has given the man who must work for a livelihood a greater prosperity and happiness, more of every desirable thing, than any other system anywhere in the world. Each, while giving lip-service to that system, advocated a policy which, in my judgment, would destroy it.

The last administration and the present one each has been sowing seeds of discord and the harvest is now with us with strikes and threatened strikes throughout the country. Today this Nation is confronted with a situation which is the direct result of the teachings of the last administration and of its corrupt alliance with politicians and racketeers in the so-called labor movement.

Sidney Hillman with his Political Action Committee, Phil Murray, R. G. Thomas, Walter and Victor Reuther, and Richard Frankensteen, with their UAW-CIO, in effect over the years have been telling employees who have been receiving higher wages, under better working conditions and for shorter hours than any group of employees anywhere in the whole world, that the men who gave them employment were greedy, selfish, arbitrary, unfair, unpatriotic, and inhuman profiteers. The result is a strike against General Motors, a threatened strike in the steel industry, and here in Washington a strike which affects the everyday operation of the Government.

Hundreds of thousands of employees have been, or will be, thrown out of their jobs, deprived of their means of livelihood by these strikes which either now exist or are threatened. Millions of others who are dependent upon the operation of our industrial system will suffer.

What has Sidney Hillman and his PAC, Philip Murray, R. G. Thomas, Walter and Victor Reuther—who received part of their training in Russia—and Richard Frankensteen and the others who are advocating these strikes, to offer the employees of General Motors and others who go on strike in lieu of their pay checks? Do not the gentlemen who are causing these strikes, who have created the conditions which have brought them about, realize that Wilson of General Motors, that the Fords, in fact a majority of the employers, can if they wish, when a strike is called, just close shop and go on a vacation?

If General Motors, Chrysler, Ford, Steel, and the Transit Co. here in Washington in answer to the demands of the union and in reply to the strikes should say, "All right, boys, we cannot compel you to work. We cannot meet your demands. We are closing shop and going on a vacation. When you get ready to work let us know—we are going to Miami, Fla." Just what would Sidney

and his cohorts offer? Just what will they do to meet the unemployment? The answer is obvious. Nothing constructive. As wreckers they are superb. As creators of jobs, meeters of pay rolls, they are worse than failures—they never even started.

What is their answer? Permit me to anticipate. They will ask the President to take over private industry, meet their demands, and charge the cost to the taxpayer. That would be fine and a convenient solution were it not for the fact that neither they nor the administration has the ability or the experience, the thrift nor the willingness to work, to successfully operate any of the businesses which give their adherents the bread, the butter, the clothing, and the shelter they enjoy. And unfortunately for them the Federal Government has only one source of revenue—taxes—and again unfortunately, if private enterprise is put out of existence, there will be insufficient tax money.

When the agitators and the politicians have destroyed private enterprise, ended the ability of the businessman and the industrialist to pay taxes, Sidney, Murray, and the rest of the wrecking crew will discover they are trying to lift themselves by their own bootstraps, and that procedure has never been strikingly successful.

Yes; it is time for a show-down, and the Federal Government here in Washington should, as an example, authorize the Capital Transit Co. to employ the necessary help, to use the armed forces of this country to operate the system which here in the Capital must function if the Government itself is to transact its business. (See H. R. 4612.)

Employees cannot, they should not, be forced to work; but if they do not want to work under the terms the employers can give them, they should get out of the way for those who are willing to accept the jobs.

If the taxi drivers call a sympathetic strike, a short cut to the solution to that would be the revocation of their licenses or a transfer of Federal employees competent to operate until other drivers come in.

This is supposed to be a free country. No man should be compelled to work against his will nor should any man be permitted to stand in the way of another willing and eager to work at an offered job.

Sidney and his outfit should discover now that while they have the right to advocate a strike, while their membership has the right to strike, employers may also reach the conclusion that they too have the right to quit providing jobs.

Heretofore, strikes have been "duck soup" for some labor agitators, organizers, and some union officials. This has been especially true during the wartime, when, no matter what the cost, production was necessary.

The Government cannot indefinitely meet the demands of union leaders and, unfortunately, while the organizers and the leaders of these strikes will not themselves, because of the salaries which they receive, suffer, the members of the unions, like the rest of us, who must work for the money which we need to purchase food, clothing—the necessities of life—may be out on a limb if employers, adopting the policy of the agitators, go on strike.

The rain, we are told, falls on the just and the unjust. Unfortunately and regrettably, the hardships of a strike fall not only upon those who cause it but upon the innocent worker and the innocent bystander.

UNRRA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, no one who has had the experience of seeing the ravages of war as I have seen them could fail to be torn by the need that exists for relief—immediate and basic. Nor could one fail to wish that the machinery for which we supply 72 percent of the fuel were less ponderous, more efficient, and more effective. In addition no one could fail to wish to recognize the earnest, sincere work being done by a very major portion of the employees of UNRRA. Personally I have no question of the sincerity of purpose of the Director, the Honorable Herbert Lehman. His task is a herculean one and his problems many.

UNRRA has come to us at this time for additional funds to continue beyond the time originally agreed to. This would seem to be the moment when careful and conscientious study of the actual machinery should have been made with a view to insuring greater efficiency within the organization so that the actual relief got to those who need it in the shortest conceivable time with as little waste as possible.

The Foreign Affairs Committee has held hearings for several weeks. With one exception the witnesses were administration witnesses and had only praise to give. One witness came before us as a good American who felt the committee should and would welcome a frank presentation of some of the criticisms being made of UNRRA methods and mistakes. It was disillusioning to find that the questions asked him by the administration members of the committee were those of discrediting the witness rather than of getting from him all the information possible.

I should like to be able to tell this House that after the hearings were closed the committee had met and made a careful study of the evidence and of the information requested by members of the minority. Unfortunately I cannot do so. I can say only that the committee met on November 26 and voted the bill out. We could not study the evidence because we did not have it before us. Galley proofs will eventually be given us when we have opportunity to correct whatever we ourselves have said; the requested information will probably be secured by that time as UNRRA officials constantly expressed themselves as more than ready to supply it. Ultimately this testimony will be available to committee members and to all who desire it.

The bill, H. R. 4649, will come to the House without amendments, even the five which I understand the Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, has agreed would not be inimicable to the continuance of the international procedures.

When we helped set up this international relief administration we were deeply influenced by the need to pool all food and other basic supplies and by our desire to hold the United Nations together after the capitulation of the enemy. The ponderous machinery, the fundamental difficulty presented by the language problem, the slowness with which mistakes of personnel and method have been corrected, added to difficulties of transportation and of distribution, have without question stood between food and hunger. But we are faced with the fact that the Administration has not had imagination enough either to provide a better machinery by which we can give of the much that is ours to the starving of the war-torn areas of the world. We are faced with a need so great that even an inefficient method is better than none at all.

Postwar Operation of Los Angeles Aluminum War Plant Feasible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. The postwar operation of the aluminum plant built in Los Angeles for war production by the Defense Plant Corporation is feasible and essentially necessary to supply a large and growing consuming market as well as supplying profitable employment to returning veterans, according to a comprehensive survey recently made by Mr. E. F. Scattergood, advisory engineer of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, who is a nationally recognized authority on hydroelectric power.

Here are excerpts from Mr. Scattergood's survey:

HEARINGS BEFORE THE SENATE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ALUMINUM PLANT DISPOSAL PROGRAM OF THE SURPLUS PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT BY E. F. SCATTERGOOD, OCTOBER 19, 1945

The Pacific Southwest will afford an ample market in the immediate future for an integrated aluminum industry, of appropriate capacity, located in the Los Angeles area. In dependent estimates, checked by the engineers of the department of water and power of Los Angeles, indicate an available market on the Pacific coast of 120,000,000 pounds per year of aluminum—15,000,000 pounds in the Northwest and 105,000,000 pounds in the Pacific Southwest. These estimates seem definitely conservative and presumably the Pacific trade portion of this market will be much greater than the allowance.

Such an available local market emphasizes Los Angeles as an advantageous location for

an integrated aluminum industry giving the industry a goodly cushion for margins of profits resulting from the substantial transportation costs for shipping aluminum, particularly partially fabricated aluminum products, from other centers in the Northwest or the East.

Transportation of such aluminum products is comparatively costly and generally represents a substantial part of total costs in the production and marketing of the same. This results from the fact that partially fabricated aluminum, that is, aluminum sheet and the products of extrusion, rod, and forge plants, generally require costly crating and are very bulky in proportion to the weight of metal, thus requiring large space in first-class transportation carriers.

The Pacific Southwest is unique in that it has a very substantial market isolated, economically, from other production centers by long distance transportation, but available to an integrated aluminum industry located in the Los Angeles area.

As shown in the statement, which we will read into the record, available for discussion, an alumina plant, an extrusion plant, a sheet rolling mill, and an aluminum reduction plant all may be operated with economic advantage in the Los Angeles area as compared with other sections provided, only, that an adjustment in the power rate for the reduction plant equal to one-half mill per kilowatt-hour may be worked out as suggested in the statement.

The department of water and power of Los Angeles most heartily endorses the policies expressed in the report of Surplus Property Administrator Symington to Congress dated September 21, 1945, the report of Attorney General Clark on the aluminum industry, and the interim report of the surplus war property subcommittee of the Small Business Committee of the Senate and desires to cooperate in every possible way to the end that an integrated aluminum industry may be maintained in the Los Angeles area under terms and conditions which are in harmony with the policies so set forth

We feel there is ample justification for presenting these suggestions to your committees respecting establishment of an integrated aluminum project in the Los Angeles area in the fact that an aluminum rolling mill can be maintained and operated in that area on a very favorable competitive basis aside from the advantage in transportation costs in furnishing its local and prospective foreign markets, and in the further fact that the Los Angeles area is a natural point for such an integrated operation, as it is not only the center of the aluminum market in the West—in part because of the extensive use in airplane production—but also because the area provides other favorable factors, such as an ample and skilled labor supply, desirable living conditions and forward looking community leaders.

Conservative estimates indicate that there can be no question as to the adequacy of the market for an integrated aluminum industry centered in the Los Angeles area. There is attached a tabulation prepared by the business agents' division of the department of water and power in collaboration with industrial leaders and interested civic groups indicating for California and the Pacific Southwest a market of 105,800,000 pounds of aluminum per annum. This quantity is predicated, of course, on a stable price on aluminum resulting from free competition.

An estimate of market for aluminum for Pacific southwest industries prepared by business agent's division, department of water and power

(Estimates based upon information obtained from local and national markets and from executives of local manufacturing companies.)

END PRODUCT AND ANNUAL QUANTITY OF ALUMINUM

	Pounds
Airplanes	30,000,000
Automobiles	50,000,000
Furniture	2,500,000
Auto trailers	2,000,000
Truck trailers	3,750,000
Residential building: Construction materials	2,250,000
Commercial, architectural, and decorative materials	5,000,000
Cooking utensils	5,000,000
Aluminum foil	1,000,000
Home appliances	2,350,000
Miscellaneous: Fixtures, reflectors, hardware, aluminum powders, refrigeration, pistons, heaters, containers and a multitude of extruded-pressed and die-cast articles	2,000,000
Total	105,800,000

A Children's Crusade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I include a letter proposing a children's crusade. The plan was started this summer when some American children raised money for toys for some of the orphaned displaced children of Europe. Later the project has grown into a wider and more imaginative plan which should capture the hearts of children in all parts of the world. The letter, from Miss Mabel Katherine Pearse, 4700 Kenwood, Chicago 15, Ill., follows:

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: Knowing that children of all races and creeds are dear to your heart, I am appealing to you on their behalf. Will you help create a Children's Crusade for the children of Europe, including those of our former enemies, to be carried out by our children of America?

Let me tell you how it started. Last summer a very wonderful thing happened to a group of children at a camp on Washington Island, Wis. The 6 oldest of a group of 30 children between the ages of 8 and 17 had a dream—a vision. All summer they had listened with deepening understanding and interest to the real-life stories which had been read to them from letters written me by my sister, Dorothy T. Pearse, child welfare officer for UNRRA in the British zone of occupation in Germany. Her work is specifically with children. As the campers listened they could see those who for years had lived in concentration camps, often with only one parent, and in most cases separated entirely from their families. They wondered what it would be like always to be hungry, cold, dirty, and clothed in rags, afraid of everyone and everything; never to have gone to school, played games, or had toys, even a ball; never to have had the narrowest gay hair ribbon to wear. They rejoiced that the 337 blond and blue-eyed Latvian children, all under 8, had been found and rescued from the boat in the Baltic, where before VE-day they had been left and forgotten for 12 days alone, without even one adult. It was too bad, though, that UNRRA didn't have the things to help them get well more quickly, for it would be hard to sleep really well four on a mattress. But how wonderful that the women who had been sent to help them, few and overworked as they were, could be so kind and loving. That there are not many children under 12 alive today in Holland and her neighboring countries again made them sad and thoughtful, although a few of the older ones thought it might be better at that. The Polish children have not known for many months where they belonged, while the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians are still unable to return to their own countries for fear the Russians would claim them.

Then, no one knows how it happened, but on July 25 the six oldest campers surprised everyone with a midsummer Christmas party. So genuine was the feeling, so sincere the spirit of giving in that evergreen festooned and bewreathed old barn, with the simply decorated tree, filled stockings for one and all at the fireplace, the Christmas carols, and finally jolly old St. Nick himself, that I'm sure all Christmases forever will take on a deeper meaning for everyone present that night. Here, in a sincerity that was almost reverent, was being lived what Christmas must finally come to mean, a true giving of self in service to others. And out of that moment was born a desire for a farther reaching activity, the carrying of Christmas to the children overseas. Within 5 days the islanders were invited to a "Benefit for a European Children's Christmas" where they, too, for a few hours on that warm July evening actually lived Christmas again as they watched the play, created and acted by the campers, culminate in the colorful tableaux. To most of the audience it was a new and never to be forgotten experience. The free will offerings and later contributions from parents totaled $200. This will be converted into the necessary Christmas cheer, sweets, toys, and gifts of warm clothing, etc., and sent to my sister for a party for the children in her center.

To date, however, no way of sending the supplies has opened. UNRRA, to whom naturally the first appeal was made, can do nothing. Avenues through the Red Cross and British Consulate are closed. The American Friends Service Committee, which is sending packages of food and clothing to the liberated countries of western Europe, and whose combined efforts with the Brethren organization are reaching perhaps 100,000, feel definitely only a very small part of the need is actually met, in spite of the additional outstanding work of the Unitarian Service Committee, the American Relief Organization, the Save the Children Federation and others. Moreover, their work must of necessity be for physical welfare only. Our aim should be to satisfy their hunger for spiritual food. And there is ample evidence that countless groups and individuals all over the United States are seething to help, but are completely bottled up because of lack of channels.

Therefore, I turn to you. Will you help open a way whereby the free, strong, and alert children of this country can build a bridge of international amity to reach their less fortunate, innocent, helpless contemporaries overseas? Think what it will do also for our American children. The interchange of resulting benefits can never be estimated. On these other children, as well as our own, rests the hope of the world tomorrow.

As it is now late, could our Children's Crusade be started in the following way? Broadcast an appeal throughout at least this city and environs, asking our children through their schools, churches, play-clubs, etc., to write a note on a Christmas card to an unnamed child in Europe, telling him (1) His

own special Christmas box will be sent him as soon as ships are available; (2) On Christmas Eve if he will, with his little friends, sing first Holy Night, and then any other carols for 10 minutes or so, at the usual time of 6 p. m., the children of this country will join them in singing the same songs at the same hour, which will be 12 o'clock noon here.

The letters could be sent perhaps to the various UNRRA and other relief heads working throughout Europe, who in turn can address each letter and forward it to an individual child in his district. Or, perhaps, they can all go to UNRRA headquarters in London to be forwarded. Before making the necessary contact with UNRRA and any other agencies regarding this, I am writing you that you may evaluate the possibility of bringing it into reality. You, of course, realize that we must act immediately. The voices of the children of liberated countries and our allies also must ring out as well that Christmas Eve.

Then having utilized the approaching Christmas season to get the people working, a follow-up article in the Reader's Digest should, by the time the ships are available for the delivery and distribution of our Christmas boxes, make possible a midsummer Christmas celebration in Europe, probably on July 25, or earlier, should the way be opened. No harm in having Christmas last a little longer, surely.

We are not attempting to solve the food or clothing problems, nor do we feel that what we will do will be more than a pathetic drop in the bottomless bucket of need. We only hope to put out a hand, or many hands, of warm friendship to those other children everywhere, to let them know that in a very real way the children of this democracy care.

In her letter of late October, my sister wrote that many of the children of the group to whom England is opening her doors, in spite of her continued stiff rationing and personally grim winter ahead, had come from Belsen, where they had kept themselves alive by eating the hearts of corpses. England is taking 1,000 of these orphans; Switzerland 500. Why can't we, in this enormously wealthy country, be equally humane? If any of us have once visualized the suffering of children everywhere, other than our own, how can we enjoy Christmas this year, or even see the elaborate window displays and other decorations, without feeling at least shoddy?

The foreign arrangements for the international carols of Holy Night, etc., will have to be made through the proper sources here—perhaps by cable or telephone—but what a superb prelude and opening chorus for our crusade.

The Palestine Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by former President Hoover in regard to Palestine:

There is a possible plan of settling the Palestine question and providing ample Jewish refuge. It is at least worth serious investigation, for it offers a constructive humanitarian solution.

IRRIGATION THEORY

In ancient times the irrigation of the Tigris and Euphrates Valleys supported probably 10,000,000 people in the kingdoms of Babylon and Nineveh. The deterioration and destruction of their irrigation works by the Mongol invasion centuries ago, and their neglect for ages, are responsible for the shrinkage of the population to about 3,500,000 people in modern Iraq. Some 30 years ago, Sir William Willcocks, an eminent British engineer, completed a study of the restoration of the old irrigation system. He estimated that about 2,800,000 acres of the most fertile land in the world could be recovered at a cost of under $150,000,000.

Some progress has been made under the Iraq Government, but their lack of financial resources and the delays of the war have retarded the work greatly. Some years ago it was proposed that this area should be developed for settlement by Jewish refugees. This did not, however, satisfy the Jewish desire for a homeland.

ARABS WOULD BENEFIT

My own suggestion is that Iraq might be financed to complete this great land development on the consideration that it be made the scene of resettlement of the Arabs from Palestine. This would clear Palestine completely for a large Jewish emigration and colonization. A suggestion of transfer of the Arab people of Palestine was made by the British Labor Party in December 1944, but no adequate plan was proposed as to where or how they were to go.

There is room for many more Arabs in such a development in Iraq than the total of Arabs in Palestine. The soil is more fertile. They would be among their own race which is Arab speaking and Mohammedan. The Arab population of Palestine would be the gainer from better lands in exchange for their present holdings. Iraq would be the gainer for it badly needs agricultural population.

MODEL MIGRATION

Today, millions of people are being moved from one land to another. If the lands were organized and homes provided, this particular movement could be made the model migration of history. It would be a solution by engineering instead of by conflict.

I realize that the plan offers a challenge both to the statesmanship of the Great Powers as well as to the good will of all parties concerned. However, I submit it and it does offer a method of settlement with both honor and wisdom.

Development of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN ADAMS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit a resolution of the physics department of Dartmouth College, in my district of New Hampshire, concerning the development of atomic energy and the need for legislation to control its use under the guidance of men competent to understand the import of this discovery:

We, the undersigned members of the physics department of Dartmouth College, aware of the tremendous import of atomic energy and atomic weapons to all mankind, believe that the security of the United States can be achieved only through international cooperation for the joint control of these new forces. We believe that a policy of secret research and exclusive national control can only result in a ruinous competitive armaments race in which all the nations of the world will join, leading to the danger of a new and catastrophic world war. From such a war no people will emerge free, if indeed they survive at all.

We therefore resolve and urge:

1. That the United States, as the country that has opened the way for the development of atomic energy, should immediately invite the Governments of Great Britain and the Soviet Union to a conference to prevent competitive armaments and consider the problems arising from this overwhelming development.

2. That the United States champion the need for international development with the broadest utilization of all resources and the widest freedom of research and interchange of ideas.

We believe furthermore that any legislative effort which stifles free and open scientific investigation, which seeks to prevent public surveillance and criticism of the application of atomic energy, will stifle scientific progress, undermine peace, and is therefore harmful to the national interest.

We therefore urge the Congress:

1. That legislative action for the control of atomic energy be preceded by full, free, and public discussion.

2. That the authority for the guidance of the development of atomic energy shall consist of men of scientific competence, fully compensated for their services and able to work toward the maximum utilization of atomic energy for the welfare of the public and not for the interests of any special group.

3. That the administration chosen to direct the work of such an authority be a civilian.

4. That security regulations be limited to direct military application of atomic power and that free research and right of publication be immediately resumed in the field of atomic physics.

A. B. Meservey; A. L. King; G. F. Hull, Jr.; Leslie F. Murch; Rupert H. Hopkins; J. W. Tanch; Gordon H. Gliddon; W. M. Rayton; Robert I. Haseltine; C. A. Proctor; G. F. Hull, Sr.

HANOVER, N. H., *November 26, 1945.*

Discharge of Medical Students From the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday it became known that the son of Gen. Hanford MacNider had been discharged from the Marine Corps, although he had not accumulated sufficient points, and because of the request of his father. General MacNider is an excellent officer, who has rendered distinguished service in two wars. He is an exemplar of that body to which we owe so much—the citizen soldier. He was one of the few Reserve officers to see service at the front in general rank and he acquitted himself in accordance with the best traditions of the citizen soldier.

Still, his son should not be entitled to release because thereof. This evidence of preference will be deeply resented by many men held in the service and by their families. Similar instances must be prevented and, I am sure, the publicity attending this incident will serve to do so.

However, the incident does serve to bring forward a very critical situation confronting the Nation. General MacNider explains that his son had completed 1 year of his premedical education and he was anxious for him to resume his studies because of the long course of study necessary. It is essential to the well-being and future health of the Nation that premedical and medical students be released from the armed forces at once. It is also necessary that students of other specialties be released just as quickly as possible. The medical students cannot be longer delayed. In most courses of study a student may enter at the beginning of any semester during the year. Medical students must enter in the fall or lose a complete year of study. Their absence from their studies renders it essential that they take refresher courses in chemistry and other subjects prior to the opening of the fall term of the medical schools. No delay can be permitted.

In his message on a national health program the President recognizes a serious shortage of doctors and urges the expansion of medical education. I call upon him, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, to direct the immediate release of all medical and premedical students, that they may return to medical school or enter upon refresher courses. To fail to do so will seriously aggravate the critical shortage of medical men. Should the President not see fit to exercise his power in this regard, Congress must take action.

Medical students are not entitled to any preferential treatment because of themselves. The Nation does require that they be returned to the pursuit in which they can render the greatest amount of service to mankind.

The Late Dr. Jacob Thorkelson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, November 26, I addressed the House in regard to the death of an ex-Representative from Montana, Dr. Jacob Thorkelson, which address will be found on page 10986 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for November 26. Today I should like to add to these remarks the article taken from the Evening Star, of Washington, D. C., Wednesday, November 21, which tells in more detail of the career of Dr. Thorkelson:

Dr. Jacob Thorkelson, 69, physician and surgeon and one of the Nation's most vociferous isolationists during the 2 years he served in Congress as a Representative from Montana between 1939 and 1941, died yesterday of a heart ailment in Butte, Mont., according to the Associated Press.

The Norwegian-born doctor's political career was short, but during the single term he served in the House he remained an articulate foe of Communism and of all acts on the part of the Government which he felt would draw this country into war. He was outspoken in his opposition to revising the Neutrality Act in 1940, through which the United States was able to furnish Great Britain with supplies.

Only 2 days after Germany invaded Poland he wrote a letter to the editor of the Star in which he referred to the "absurdity of meddling in European affairs."

"UNADULTERATED DEMOCRACIES"

"The unadulterated democracies of Europe are Russia, Germany, and Italy," he wrote, "and not * * * autocratic England and republican France. We are entirely too liberal with the word democracy because it is synonymous with socialism and communism."

Dr. Thorkelson's passion for absolute American neutrality led him to champion many isolationist movements. During the 1940 Christian Front trial in New York, when 16 men were charged with sedition, testimony was given attempting to show that the legislator was a member of the action committee of one of the defendants.

Dr. Thorkelson denied this, but at the same time he described the Government's charges against the Christian Fronters as laughable. He termed the trial a fiasco and said it was a childish attempt to shield the Communists, who operate openly and with the utmost freedom in the attempted destruction of our Government.

FILED LIBEL ACTION

Dr. Thorkelson filed a $300,000 libel suit against Kenneth Crawford, author, and Julian Messner, Inc., publishers, in November 1939, charging his professional reputation had been damaged by reference to him in a book called The Pressure Boys. The suit was dismissed the following year after Mr. Crawford apologized to Dr. Thorkelson.

Dr. Thorkelson worked as a deckhand on a Norwegian ship to come to this country in 1892. He eventually became captain of a three-masted schooner, and during one of his voyages his leaking ship was blown out to sea during a storm off the Argentine coast.

He became a naturalized citizen in 1900 and was graduated from the medical school of the University of Maryland, in Baltimore, in 1911.

Dr. Thorkelson was a licensed airplane pilot and a member of the Naval Reserve.

Statement of Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, who is perhaps Oklahoma's most distinguished citizen, warrior, and statesman, dropped an atomic bomb, so to speak, on the heads of some of the so-called career diplomats in the State Department who, as he put it, have constantly "sided with and aided the Chinese Communists" and the "imperialistic bloc," and whose policy it is to "keep China divided against herself" and who are contributing to a third world war in the making and are endeavoring to suck the United States into a power bloc of "colonial imperialism versus Communist imperialism."

It is not surprising that some of the little people in this country who style themselves as Liberals and who are constantly condemning our American system of government, its free institutions, and our system of free enterprise; and who are from day to day continuously endeavoring to stir up and breed hatred, discord and division among our people, have let out a terrific "squawk" with respect to General Hurley's courageous exposure.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent approval, I include the full text of the statement made yesterday by General Hurley, as it appears in the press reports of today:

[From the Washington Post of November 28, 1945]

TEXT OF STATEMENT ISSUED BY AMBASSADOR HURLEY ON RESIGNING

The statement issued yesterday by Ambassador Pat Hurley in announcing his resignation follows:

"I am grateful to both the President and the Secretary of State for the support they have given me and for their kind offer in requesting me to return to China as Ambassador.

"In one capacity or another I have been on the perimeter of America's influence since the beginning of the war. During the war I have served in Java, Australia, New Zealand, and generally in the southwest Pacific, in Egypt, Palestine, the Lebanon, Syria, Trans-Jordan, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Russia, Afghanistan, India, Ceylon, Burma, and China. Of all of the assignments, China was the most intricate and the most difficult. It is a source of gratification to me that in all my missions I had the support of President Roosevelt, Secretary Hull, Secretary Stettinius, President Truman, and Secretary Byrnes.

"In the higher echelon of our policy-making officials American objectives were nearly always clearly defined. The astonishing feature of our foreign policy is the wide discrepancy between our announced policies and our conduct of international relations. For instance, we began the war with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and democracy as our goal. Our associates in the war at that time gave eloquent lip service to the principles of democracy. We finished the war in the Far East furnishing lend-lease supplies and using all our reputation to undermine democracy and bolster imperialism and communism. Inasmuch as I am in agreement with the President and the Secretary of State on our foreign policy I think I owe it to them as well as to the country to point out the reasons for the failure of the American foreign policy in reaching the objectives for which we said we were fighting the war. I will confine my remarks in this statement to Asia, although I wish to assure both the President and the Secretary of State that I will be at their service in discussing frankly other phases of our international relations."

PREDICTED COLLAPSE

"I was assigned to China at a time when statesmen were openly predicting the collapse of the National government of the Republic of China and the disintegration of the Chinese army. I was directed by President Roosevelt to prevent the collapse of the government and to keep the Chinese army in the war. From both a strategical and diplomatic viewpoint the foregoing constituted our chief objective. The next in importance

was the directive to harmonize the relations between the Chinese and American military establishments and between the American embassy in Chungking and the Chinese Government. It will readily appear that the former objective could not be accomplished without the accomplishment of the secondary objective as a condition precedent. Both of these objectives were accomplished.

"While these objectives had the support of the President and the Secretary of State it is no secret that the American policy in China did not have the support of all the career men in the State Department. The professional foreign-service men sided with the Chinese Communist armed party and the imperialist bloc of nations whose policy it was to keep China divided against herself. Our professional diplomats continuously advised the Communists that my efforts in preventing the collapse of the National government did not represent the policy of the United States. These same professionals openly advised the Communist armed party to decline unification of the Chinese Communist army with the National army unless the Chinese Communists were given control.

"Despite these handicaps we did make progress toward unification of the armed forces of China. We did prevent civil war between the rival factions, at least until after I had left China. We did bring the leaders of the rival parties together for peaceful discussions. Throughout this period the chief opposition to the accomplishment of our mission came from the American career diplomats in the Embassy at Chungking and in the Chinese and Far Eastern Divisions of the State Department."

SOME SIDE WITH REDS

"I requested the relief of the career men who were opposing the American policy in the Chinese theater of war. These professional diplomats were returned to Washington and placed in the Chinese Far Eastern Divisions of the State Department as my supervisors. Some of these same career men whom I relieved have been assigned as advisers to the supreme commander in Asia. In such positions most of them have continued to side with the Communist armed party and at times with the imperialist bloc against American policy. This is an outline of one of the reasons why American foreign policy announced by the highest authority is rendered ineffective by another section of diplomatic officials.

"The weakness of American foreign policy has backed us into two world wars. We had no part in shaping the conditions that brought about these two wars. There is a third world war in the making. In diplomacy today we are permitting ourselves to be sucked into a power bloc on the side of colonial imperialism against Communist imperialism. I am opposed to both. I still favor democracy and free enterprise.

"Our announced policy in the First World War was to make the world safe for democracy. That slogan was elaborated for the Second World War by a definite statement of principles in the Atlantic Charter and the Iran Declaration. We won both wars, but in both instances we failed to establish the principles for which we alleged we were fighting. America's foreign-policy officials have always been divided against themselves. Consequently, we have always been a prey to the nations that give lip service to our ideals and principles in order to obtain our material support. The war that is now in the making is not even intended to defend or establish democratic ideals. Instead of putting our weight behind the Charter of the United Nations we have been definitely supporting the imperialistic bloc. At the same time a considerable section of our State Department is endeavoring to support communism generally as well as specifically in China."

CHARGES CONFUSION

"The hydra-headed direction and confusion of our foreign policy in Washington during the late war is chargeable to the weakness of our Foreign Service. If our Foreign Service had been capable of understanding and sympathetic effectuation of our announced war aims it would not have failed so completely to couple our logistical strength with our foreign policy to obtain commitments to the principles for which we claimed to be fighting from the nations to which we gave the strength of our productivity and manpower.

"A democracy must live on its intelligence and its integrity and its courage. The people of a democracy should be given all the facts to enable them to form correct opinions. The discrepancy between American foreign policy as announced in the Atlantic Charter and the Iran Declaration and in the President's recent Navy Day address and as carried into effect may be attributed in large measure to the secrecy which has shrouded the actions of the State Department. All too frequently information concerning the conduct of our foreign relations 'leaks' out to the public in distorted, garbled, or partial form. The result is that the American people have too little basic information to judge the extent to which their State Department correctly interprets and administers the foreign policies of the Nation.

"During the war we had to maintain secrecy to prevent giving aid to the enemy. I grant that sometimes during the war we had to be expedient. Now we should endeavor to be right. I raise this issue because I am firmly convinced that at this particular juncture in our history an informed public opinion would do much to give intelligent direction and implementation to our international objectives."

POSITION MISUNDERSTOOD

"With special reference to China and the other nations where I have served in the last 4 years, the blessings of factual publicity would be manifold. Now that the war is over I am willing that all my reports be made public, together with the reports made by those officials in the Foreign Service who have differed with the promulgated American policy.

"Our true position in China is misunderstood abroad because of this confusion of policy within our own Government. This situation suggests the need for a complete reorganization of our policy-making machinery beginning at the lower official levels. No international policy can succeed without loyal and intelligent implementation. Because of the confusion in our own international policy America has been excluded economically from every part of the world controlled by colonial imperialism and communist imperialism. America's economic strength has been used all over the world to defeat American policies and interests. This is chargeable to a weak American foreign service.

"I wish to absolve from this general indictment some of our career men. Some of them are very admirable and well-equipped public servants who have fought in the State Department and in other countries against overwhelming odds to advance American ideals and interests.

"America's economic and diplomatic policies should be coordinated. America's strength should not be allied with any predatory ideology.

"America should support the amendment or revision of the San Francisco United Nations Charter to make it democratic. Our strength should be used to uphold the decisions of the United Nations rather than to support conflicting ideologies or warmaking power blocs."

The Bulwinkle Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I present for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Indianapolis Star on November 25, 1945:

SQUARE DEAL FOR CARRIERS

The railways of the country, in supporting the Bulwinkle bill now before Congress, are not asking concessions or favors. All they seek is to know where they stand. They are entitled to that.

The Interstate Commerce Commission was created back in 1887 to have supervision of the operation of interstate carriers. It was authorized to adjust rates and to regulate the carriers in the interest of the public.

The law has been amended many times since 1887 to make it meet changing conditions. The original commission of five has been enlarged to 11 members to handle the present volume of business. The Commission has done a good job. The Bulwinkle bill would put regulation of the carriers squarely up to the Commission, where it has been for years and belongs.

Need for such a law has resulted from tactics of the Federal prosecutors who have taken carriers into court on the theory that some of their policies are violations of the Sherman antitrust law. The roads were trying to do what the Interstate Commerce Commission had said they legally can do. They cannot serve two masters when those would-be bosses do not agree.

The Bulwinkle bill would put final authority up to the Commission. It would not relieve the carriers of any regulatory restriction, but could let them know what to expect, which is fair.

Republicans Urged To Declare Themselves Conservatives To Assure Party's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank R. Kent, from the Washington Evening Star:

REPUBLICANS URGED TO DECLARE THEMSELVES CONSERVATIVES TO ASSURE PARTY'S FUTURE

(By Frank R. Kent)

Soon the Republican National Committee will meet in Chicago to make plans for the 1946 and 1948 campaigns. And the Republican State leaders of New York also will gather to map out their fight for next year. Some of these Republicans recently were asking for "suggestions for a program."

In this connection, it is interesting that the increasingly important part in politics which the new parties in New York—the American Labor Party and the Liberal Party,

to say nothing of the Communist Party—are coming to play has brought out more clearly than before the necessity for the maintenance of the two-party system—that is, if the Nation is to remain healthy.

At any rate, such is the view of many thoughtful men who feel that the lack of character and sense among the national Republican leaders which led them in three campaigns to imitate the New Deal and foolishly bid for the support of the so-called liberals and professional labor leaders stands in the way of a strong two-party system and thus damages the national interests and paralyzes party prospects.

DEGENERATED INTO BLOCS

Their argument seems sound. Ten democratic governments, it is pointed out, set up in Europe after the World War, failed largely because they could not concentrate into two major parties. They degenerated into bloc governments, survived for a few years through compromise and negative action. Then they died. But, it is urged, the basic purpose of two major parties is much wider than this. They must present alternative programs and issues. It is only thus that our revolutions are at the ballot box and not by street mobs.

The natural division between men in private life is conservatism and radicalism. Today, with us, the radicals on the "left" are organized and vigorous; the conservatives on the "right" are unorganized and impotent.

The American people have a right to an organized expression of conservative thought. It is no crime to be a conservative. Neither is it fascism nor reaction. A conservative is not allergic to new ideas. He only wants to try them out slowly and without destroying what we have that is good.

In the last 12 years the Democratic Party has preempted the radical field. And the radical parties are infected with bureaucracy, with socialism, and communism. During this time the Republican Party has been divided and uncertain.

If the Republicans really believe in the two-party system and want to prevent the disintegration of their own party, it is argued, they would at once take the conservative position and gladly declare it. The Democrats completely hold the radical fort. They cannot be dislodged from it. There is no room for the Republicans in it and no position to the left of it.

TOWARD DISAPPEARANCE

Republicans have tried to compromise, they have tried to outdo the radicals in promises and they have straddled repeatedly. The results have been bad for the party and bad for the country. If they continue along these lines the Republican Party will as certainly disappear as did the old Whig Party.

Eventually a conservative party will come into power as a result of radical excesses and accumulated blunders, which are inevitable for any party too long in power. The Republicans should take the conservative position without apologies, but with pride in conservative priniciples and the service they offer to the country. It is absurd to be afraid of the word.

Whatever party opposes the radicals will be smeared. That is the radical technique, but it is losing its effectiveness. Soon or late the American people as a whole see through the smears.

The Republicans should stop shrinking from the charge that they are not "liberal." Let the radicals have that word. It has been thoroughly polluted. It has been robbed of all its real meanings. The Socialists, the Communists, the labor bosses and the crackpots of every variety daily announce that they are "liberals." They have nested in the word until it smells very badly. It no longer makes sense.

Communism or Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS RIZLEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a very interesting letter from a young woman in Oklahoma, who will reach her twenty-first birthday in time to cast her first vote next year. She is not a resident of my congressional district, and I happen to know that she was born and reared south of the Mason and Dixon's line and that her parents not only grew up in the Jeffersonian faith but have been active in democratic politics in Oklahoma for many years.

One of the important things about the letter, as I view it, is that this young lady is doing her own thinking. Certainly the letter furnishes much food for thought for those who pretend to believe in a republican form of government and the democratic processes that flow from such, and for those who believe that the people should support the Government instead of the Government supporting the people.

I include as a part of my remarks this very interesting letter:

As one who will vote for the first time next year, I find myself 6 months before election with the conviction that a choice between the Democratic and Republican Parties may also be a choice between communism and democracy.

I arrived at this conclusion because of the following facts:

In Russia the government is responsible for jobs; there are no private profit-making employers.

Here in America the CIO is demanding passage of House bill 2202 known as the full employment bill which sets forth Government policy to aid in creating jobs.

President Truman recommended passage of this bill; has taken Congress to task for pigeonholing it.

In Russia labor unions operate the social security system for all wage and salary earners.

The CIO is demanding passage of the Wagner-Murray bill to extend social security coverage under the Federal system.

President Truman sent a message to Congress November 19 asking passage of this bill.

Up until 1930 unemployment insurance was included in the social security system in Russia.

The CIO is demanding passage of the unemployment compensation bill to pay $25 for 26 weeks to unemployed.

Mr. Truman also asked Congress to pass this.

Medical and hospital care is free for all citizens of the Soviet Union.

The Wagner-Murray bill also sets up health facilities, provides funds for medical care.

As stated above Truman recommended this on November 19.

Soviet unions also concern themselves with workers' housing.

On the CIO calendar is S. 1592 to provide funds for study and building of low- and middle-cost housing.

I don't know whether Mr. Truman has recommended this one or not.

Soviet unions also conduct educational activities.

The November 24 issue of the Washington Post says: "Look for President Truman to send a message to Congress soon on Federal participation in education. It's a good bet he will ask legislative provisions designed to keep teachers up to date professionally, perhaps by making available books, laboratories, and refresher courses."

My authority for the statements about the Soviet trade unions is an article in the November 26 issue of the CIO News by Len de Caux, the editor. In the same paper on another page appears the list of bills the CIO wants passed. President Truman's recommendations are a matter of record.

Maybe you will draw a different conclusion from finding that the legislation recommended by Mr. Truman is almost a carbon copy of the bills demanded by the CIO and the CIO's list of bills reads like a carbon copy of the list of activities of the Russian labor unions. But it leads me to believe that in choosing between our two major parties, I may also be choosing between a government which calls for the complete abolition of all private property of every description and the absolute control by the community in all matters pertaining to labor, religion, social relations, etc., and our present form of government where the supreme power rests with the people.

I do not mean to say that Mr. Truman is a Communist. I think he believes he must play ball with the labor unions in order to stay in office.

I know Detroit and the other centers of these activities seem as remote as Russia to most of us in the Middle West, but if we don't wake up and take note of what they are doing we may find they are a lot closer home than we think.

Civil War in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me, I desire to insert as part of these remarks an intelligent article by Edwin A. Lahey, of the Chicago Daily News, on the situation in China.

This article, by an outstanding newspaper columnist, is an important contribution to our thinking on the present undeclared civil war in China. Published last August 22, when many of us were unaware of the implications of our policy of all-out aid short of war to the reactionary Chunking regime in China, it predicted with unerring accuracy the present armed conflict within China's boundaries.

Mr. Lahey, who has been in China and seen the situation there, lays the blame for civil war squarely at the door of our Ambassador who resigned yesterday with a fanfare of charges against those whose policy he changed. He speaks of Gen. Patrick J. Hurley's "tortured" American policy. He said last August that the real alternatives in China were to "set up a democratic coalition government or produce a civil war." Those are still the alternatives today.

Mr. Speaker, if we return to the policy of President Roosevelt, former Ambassador Gauss, and General Stilwell in China and abandon our present course of aiding the side which is suppressing the

struggle for democracy and self-government in China, we can bring peace and a democratic coalition government to China.

With that purpose in mind, several Members of this House, including myself, recently introduced identical resolutions calling for the recall of all troops, transports, and supplies now in China.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I desire to insert the article from the Chicago Daily News. It reads:

HURLEY FOR CHIANG

(By Edwin A. Lahey)

WASHINGTON.—Since the death of President Roosevelt, our Ambassador at Chungking, Patrick J. Hurley, has tortured American policy in China to fit the assumption that our only alternatives were to deal exclusively with the government of Chiang Kai-shek or with the Communist government at Yenan, described by Hurley as an "armed political party."

In the private view of many Americans in China, whose opinions are suppressed by strictly military orders against "political discussion," or by the creeping Chinese censorship encouraged by Hurley himself, the real alternatives in China are either to persuade Chiang Kai-shek to set up a democratic coalition government or to produce a civil war.

It will be difficult at best for Americans to appraise what goes on in China during the ensuing months, for at least three reasons: (1) the censorship exercised by the Nationalist government; (2) the engaging subtlety of the Chinese, which makes their political motives elusive to a naive Occidental; and (3) the passion with which our Ambassador, Mr. Hurley, clings to the belief that it is his mission to preserve Chiang Kai-shek and his government, as they are, come what may.

It is impossible for American newspapermen in China to report the extent toward which the Chiang Kai-shek government has drifted away from the democratic principles upon which the Kuomintang was founded and into the excesses of one-party dictatorship, including the use of secret police, concentration camps, and the suppression of civil liberties. The Chungking government recently refused to allow two American correspondents to reenter China because they had written reports considered hostile.

The issue in China is presented to American readers by the generalissimo and by Ambassador Hurley as a dispute between a bona fide government in Chungking and an "armed political party" in Yenan.

It is more than that, however. Chiang Kai-shek has a war on his hands right in Nationalist China, in repressing demands for the restoration of democratic rights. How much of this unrest within Chiang Kai-shek's China can be traced directly to the Communists in Yenan seems beside the point. The fact appears to be that all the inegredients of a savage civil war are bubbling throughout China.

Return of Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following letter and resolution of the United Mine Workers of America:

WESLEY A. D'EWART,
United States Representative,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE D'EWART: The following letter from Local Union 1095 is self-explanatory and has been endorsed by Local 2301, U. M. W. of A., Stockett, Mont., and is submitted to you for your consideration.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN MOTIL,
Recording Secretary.

"In behalf of the soldiers who have fought and bled to bring this war to an end and whereas these men have not been able to get passage home, to which they are rightfully entitled: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That Local 1095 of the United Mine Workers of America urge all locals and districts of the United Mine Workers of America and the Honorable President of the United States, as well as the Honorable Senators and Representatives of our Nation, that they do all in their power to get all available transportation to bring these soldiers home from foreign shores. We demand immediate action for these soldiers who have waited months for a ship to take them home.

"Sincerely submitted.

"C. A. REAT,
"WILLIAM GODINA,
"WAITO KOSKI,
"Resolution Committee, Local 1095."

Better Medical Care Is Inevitable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times:

BETTER MEDICAL CARE IS INEVITABLE

In calling upon Congress to establish a compulsory national health insurance system and to provide for greater Federal aid in the field of public health, President Truman recommended the inevitable. It is what Mr. Justice Holmes used to call one of the felt necessities of the time.

The experience of Selective Service has dramatically underscored the national need for better medical care. The fact that 30 percent of the Americans—men and women—who were examined for military duty had to be rejected as unfit, not to mention the large number subsequently discharged from the services or treated for preinduction disabilities—came as a shock to a nation proud of its high standards. Yet it was not a surprise to expert medical and social workers. They long knew how spotty our health facilities really are.

However, no people were better aware of the shortcomings than the victims. Agitation for better service and better facilities was growing steadily in volume before the war. It is sure to continue after the military interruption. As President Truman said, decent care is part and parcel of freedom from want.

The stand-pat leadership of the American Medical Association may raise its old hue and cry against the President's proposals, but the rank and file of practicing physicians will know that their own leadership is wrong and that the President is right. If they are completely frank with themselves—and we are sure that the great majority of them will be—the doctors will acknowledge that present medical economics means adequate care only for the privileged few. They will also acknowledge that with almost painless reforms in business practices, the medical profession can meet the demands of the many.

Under the proposed system, patients will still be free to go to doctors and hospitals of their own choice. Such patients simply will be the beneficiaries of a plan which insures them of being able to pay their bills. This would be supplemented by disability insurance to guard against loss of income during the period of sickness and treatment. The purse no longer would stand in the way of the health. Without argument, that is how it should be.

In addition to compulsory national health insurance—which would also cover dental work—Mr. Truman's proposals call for Federal aid in the building of hospitals and health facilities where these are needed. This means particularly the rural sections of America. The country dweller is the real forgotten man of modern medicine.

There would also be more Federal funds for the expansion of cooperative State-Federal public-health, maternal, and child-health services. There would be Federal aid for the medical schools so that hospitals and clinics could be adequately staffed. There would be aid also for research so that a more widely spread medical service might become ever more efficient.

Better medical care means a better Nation. It is inconceivable that we should willingly make it possible for a future President to report as Mr. Truman did yesterday that "about 12,000 counties, 40 percent of the total in the country with some 15,000,000 people, have either no local hospitals, or none that meets even the minimum standards of national professional association."

It is inconceivable that we should willingly permit a future President to make a report similar to Mr. Truman's on the state of the health of our young people, not to mention the undoubtedly worse lot of those in older age groups. America can afford to be strong, and America will be strong.

One hopes against hope that the organized doctors will take a more enlightened position on these proposals than that of Dr. Fishbein and Senator TAFT. One hopes that Members of Congress will solidly support the legislation introduced immediately by Senators WAGNER and MURRAY to bring the President's plan into being. There may be some valid criticism of details, but there can be no sound opposition to its basic principles.

If there is to be a fight, it will be a fight against the people—and in such fights the people always are eventually victorious. How soon the victory comes will depend largely on the vigor with which the President backs up his plan.

An Unsung Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, immediately after the attack on Pearl Harbor Col. Charles A. Lindbergh came to Washington and offered his services in any capacity he could be used. Both the Army and the Navy wanted him as an expert flyer and technical adviser, but the White House said "No." United Air

Lines and Pan American also wanted him as a civilian expert in connection with their war activities, and again the White House said "No." Then Ford called Lindbergh in and asked him to do research work and conduct experiments in connection with the war planes that Ford was building for the United States Government. Lindbergh said he would be glad to do so but warned Ford about possible White House objection. Ford took Lindbergh on in spite of White House opposition, and Lindbergh went to the Southwest Pacific to test war planes under actual combat conditions.

In demonstration test flights—as a technical civilian adviser to our fighting forces—he actually shot down several enemy planes, all of course off the record because he was a civilian and noncombatant. Thus did this 43-year-old civilian flier, far beyond the regular age of Army fighter pilots, demonstrate what fighter planes could do under actual combat conditions. Not only that, but he demonstrated what American bombers could do. On one test he piloted a bomber loaded with a bomb load three times as heavy as the regular bomb load and took off after a much shorter run than our regular bomber pilots thought safe even with a normal bomb load. Lindbergh risked his life time after time in order to demonstrate to our Army pilots what could be done with our fighter planes and with our bombers.

Mr. Speaker, previous to Pearl Harbor, because of his testimony before congressional committees concerning Germany's war preparations and Germany's superiority in fighter planes, and also because of a startling report made to the Roosevelt administration as a result of an official European inspection trip—which report was pigeonholed and entirely ignored by our War Department—Lindbergh was forced by Roosevelt to hand in his commission as a colonel in the Army Air Force Reserve. His recent war services warrant not only the award of a Distinguished Service Medal, but the full restoration of his rank in the Army Air Force Reserve. Only thus can partial atonement be made for the great wrong done this great American. Lindbergh is the Billy Mitchell of this war. Will Lindbergh, like Mitchell, have to wait 20 years after his death for suitable recognition of his services?

Higher Pay and Allotments for Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Stars and Stripes, there appeared a provocative article interesting to people all over the country. It discusses a burning question of growing concern to servicemen everywhere. Many men in uniform have called it to my attention and have suggested that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It carries a strong and pertinent message. I believe the recommendation to be sound; it is based on common sense. Here is the editorial:

HIGHER PAY AND ALLOTMENTS FOR SERVICEMEN

There has been much talk recently of raising the wages of mainland civilian workers in order that take-home pay may be held at something approaching wartime levels.

The Stars and Stripes suggests that any such wage increases be accompanied by reasonable increases in servicemen's pay and dependency allotments.

The United Automobile Workers union has asked for a 30-percent boost in basic wage rates.

Henry Ford II, president of the Ford Motor Co., may agree to a 15-percent increase for Ford workers.

Secretary of Commerce Wallace has suggested a 15-percent increase in wages and around a 10-percent increase in manufactured goods prices.

The higher wages, it is argued, are to come out of increased production efficiency, business savings due to lower taxes, and higher prices.

The Stars and Stripes does not wish to enter the dispute over whether or not the wage increases can be justified. That is a matter to be settled by genuine collective bargaining between unions and management, with impartial assistance from Government.

But the Stars and Stripes does wish to make the point that if wages of civilian workers are to go up—10, 20, 30 percent—and in prices are to go up as well, then the serviceman's pay and his dependency allotment should be raised correspondingly.

If, in the national economic picture, civilian wage increases, with accompanying price rises can be justified, then surely a similar increase in the soldier's, sailor's, and marine's pay is no more than fair.

To be sure, the serviceman has no union to bargain for him, and rightly so. But, if Army and Navy careers, whether for a lifetime or only a year, are to be made as attractive as civilian jobs, and especially if voluntary enlistments are to amount to much, someone must see to it that the financial rewards of the man who chooses to remain in the service of his country keep pace with what he might be making as a civilian. The waiving of income tax on wartime service of enlisted men is merely a step in the right direction.

Dependents of servicemen have to pay for food, housing, clothing, transportation, and recreation in the same markets as other civilians. The price level, if it goes up, will affect everybody at home, not just those who get the higher wages.

The Stars and Stripes has no intention of driving a wedge between civilian wage earners and servicemen and their dependents. That would be foolish because most servicemen are wage earners at heart and want nothing so much as to get back into overalls.

We are merely putting in a bid for readjustments in servicemen's pay and dependency allotments commensurate with any widespread increase in civilian wage rates.

Increased Sugar Supplies for 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the improved sugar situation for the American people, I have written the following letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, urging an increase in the sugar allotment for home and industrial use. Considering the supply situation, I feel that the American people should be given an additional supply of sugar for the month of December to take care of the needs for the Christmas holidays.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., November 26, 1945.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

Re increase in sugar allotments for civilian and industrial uses for December 1945.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Sugar supplies for American consumption for the coming year are now fairly well determined. The sugar crop has been made, and prospects for harvest and refining in this country and the insular areas which supply the United States are greatly improved as compared with the 1945 supply picture. A few months ago we were threatened with a sugar famine due to the severe drought in Cuba, our main source of supply, but satisfactory moisture in Cuba since the latter part of June has greatly improved the sugar supply in that area.

Furthermore, with the British having the largest stock pile of sugar in history, and with a prospective additional supply of 1,600,000 tons from Java and certain unknown quantities from the Philippines and other sugar-producing areas available for world consumption, the demand on supplies of sugar available for this country should be materially decreased. It is very doubtful if the British and Dutch will share the Java sugar trove with the United States. Also, it must not be overlooked that at least one-half of our Army and Navy has been promised for demobilization by Christmas, which will provide more sugar for civilian consumption.

Reliable estimates of raw sugar production for the 1945–46 crop year are shown to be: Cuba, 4,700,000 tons; Puerto Rico, 1,000,000 tons; Hawaii, 900,000 tons; domestic (United States) sugar beets (including carry-over), 1,400,000 tons; Florida and Louisiana sugarcane, 600,000 tons; Virgin Islands and other Caribbean areas, 50,000 tons. This makes a total of 8,650,000 tons of sugar, from which must be deducted approximately 450,000 tons for use in the areas of production and for coastal export, which leaves 8,200,000 tons for the United States and export. Supplies allotted to domestic consumption for 1945 amounted to 5,092,000 tons.

The war is over, and millions of American fighting men are returning to civilian life. Rationing of all foods except sugar has been discontinued. I do not suggest that rationing of sugar be discontinued until greater production is secured, but in view of prospective supplies, which are now being harvested and refined, I wish to urge that for the month of December 1945, the sugar allotment for home use be increased by 2 pounds per capita, and that the quotas of sugar for industrial users, including bakeries, soft drink beverage producers, ice cream and candy manufacturers, be increased to 70 percent of 1941 usage as compared to the present 50 percent allotment.

I also desire to call to your attention that most of the refineries of sugar are now operating in all parts of the country, and therefore, supplies of sugar are readily available to carry out my suggestion to you.

With kindest personal regard, I remain

Sincerely yours,

AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
Member of Congress, First District, Minnesota.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include resolutions adopted at a conference at Canton, N. Y., November 15, 1945, on the St. Lawrence seaway and New York State power project:

Resolutions adopted at a conference at Canton, N. Y., November 15, 1945, on the St. Lawrence seaway and New York State power project

Whereas the United States and Canada on March 19, 1941, signed an agreement to complete the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and

Whereas most of the construction work needed to complete this great development, the Nation's No. 1 postwar project, is to be undertaken in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River in boundary waters of the State of New York and the Province of Ontario; and

Whereas the completion of the seaway will modernize an existing channel for commerce already improved for use by ocean cargo vessels over 90 percent of the distance from the head of the Great Lakes to the open sea; and

Whereas the dual-purpose navigation and power project to be built in the International Rapids section will develop 2,200,000 horsepower of the cheapest electric power in the world, to be divided equally between the State of New York and the Province of Ontario; and

Whereas the State of New York in 1931, through the adoption of the Power Authority Act, by a unanimous vote of the legislature, declared it to be the public policy of this State to develop the International Rapids section for both power and navigation, and authorized the Power Authority, as the accredited public agency of the State, to take over the ownership and operation of the St. Lawrence power project to be constructed in this State, upon assuming the construction costs thereof; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of New York, in March 1944, again declared by unanimous vote that New York State's power project should be completed to serve the postwar needs and interests of the people of this State; and

Whereas President Truman and Governor Dewey in September 1945, by an exchange of telegrams reaffirmed their nonpartisan support of the development authorized by the United States-Canadian agreement of 1941 and specifically recommended the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and the New York State power project under the terms of the Federal-State accord of February 7, 1933: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we favor the approval of the United States-Canadian agreement of 1941 and the prompt enactment of legislation to authorize completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and the New York State power project, in full conformance with the recommendations contained in the statements of President Truman and Governor Dewey, made public at the White House, September 27, 1945; and be it further

Resolved, That we who live in the St. Lawrence Valley and for years have seen the waste of its mighty resources, declare the proposed project to be the greatest public improvement now available for postwar completion, in any part of the world, and strongly favor its construction in order to provide tens of thousands of postwar jobs for returning veterans and displaced war workers, to promote the foreign trade and domestic commerce of all parts of the United States and to furnish 4,000,000 industrial, commercial, domestic, and rural consumers in New York State with power and electricity, at low rates which will permit increased use of electrical energy and electrical appliances, and be it further

Resolved, That we commend the non-partisan support given to the St. Lawrence seaway and New York State power project by such outstanding leaders as Governors Roosevelt, Lehman, and Dewey, Senator Wagner, President Truman and all Presidents of the United States, regardless of party, since World War I; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Honorable Harry S. Truman, to the Governor of the State of New York, Hon. Thomas E. Dewey, to the senior Senator from the State of New York, Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER, to the junior Senator from the State of New York, Hon. JAMES M. MEAD, and to members of the New York delegation in the United States House of Representatives, together with a list of the civic organizations of northern New York represented at this conference.

A committee was appointed at the conference, which was sponsored by the Northern Federation of Chambers of Commerce, to cooperate with farm, labor, and civic organizations in support of the project, as follows: Dr. Rollin A. Newton, president, Northern Federation of Chambers of Commerce, Massena; Clarence F. Hall, Clayton; Ernest C. Gould, Secretary, Chamber of Commerce, Watertown; Charles McHenry, Cape Vincent; Assemblyman William L. Doige, Chateaugay; Franklin R. Little, Editor, Journal, Ogdensburg; W. Allen Newell, Ogdensburg; W. Preston Loomis, Gouverneur; Edward B. Crosby, Massena; Ernest Mason, Malone; M. H. Ginsberg, Tupper Lake; H. L. Garren, Lake Placid; George W. Sisson, 3d, Potsdam; William T. Field, Watertown; and A. F. Shortt, Saranac Lake.

Among the speakers at the Conference were Dr. Eugene G. Bewkes, President of St. Lawrence University, Canton; City Manager C. Leland Wood, Watertown; Assemblyman William L. Doige, Chateaugay; Mayor O. T. McGuiggan, Massena; and former assemblyman Grant F. Daniels, Massena, joint author of the St. Lawrence resolutions adopted in 1944 by the New York State Legislature.

Run It for All the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Waterbury Republican of Waterbury, Conn.:

RUN IT FOR ALL THE PEOPLE

General Motors is a colossus. CIO is a colossus. Both are awake in a gigantic strike battle. United States Steel is another colossus. Its CIO union is taking a strike vote tomorrow and we doubt that there is anyone who believes that it will not favor a strike. There is a colossus bigger than any of these but it is sound asleep. It constitutes the consumers of our Nation, the rank and file of the people. Efforts are being made to keep it asleep, but maybe these efforts will not be successful. Just as the people must pay for the great war just ended, they also will have to pay for whatever is decided upon in the strike war now raging.

Sleepy and powerless as they may seem, the rank and file of the people who must pay the bills for everything that goes on in this world are capable of a terrific punch when once they make up their minds to deliver it. This is the punch that goes into an election when they are aroused. Congress is aware of this even in a period when the administration running our Nation has shown such reluctance to face the realities of what the Nation is up against in this labor war.

The mind of the administration is disclosed in the statement of House Democratic Leader MCCORMACK to the effect that he fears "there is danger Congress will pass vicious antilabor legislation if strife and unrest remain acute." No one wants vicious legislation, but there is no reason to fear legislation long overdue that will put governmental controls on labor even as it has upon management.

Long ago, at the insistence of the American people, legislation was enacted controlling trusts and monopolies of corporations. As new evils of this character arose, more legislation went on the books. Our laws obligate companies to keep contracts. Unions should be likewise obligated. No company making a contract with a union should be permitted to violate it. Nor should a union be permitted to violate its contract with a corporation. Why, then should anyone fear legislation as proposed that would take away for a year the collective bargaining rights of any union striking in violation of no-strike agreements? Why should not unions be liable for civil damages even as corporations are? Why should either corporations or unions, especially these tremendous unions, be permitted to gang up tremendous funds to pour into elections so that the men nominated and the men elected shall be under their power when they get to Washington? Where do the people get off with such control in Washington?

The cry of the automobile strike leaders to the effect that they are against price increases for cars is but dust thrown to blind the people. They are out for increase after increase for their workers. They demand domination of the business. They want to dictate everything about the work, the amount of production permitted for each worker, the prices charged for the product, the finances, in short the entire control. Right now the CIO is permitted to be a colossal monopoly of unionism spread over countless plants using its tremendous power to force what it demands. But it would be against the law for the various managements so to be united in monopoly to battle the unions or do anything else in unison.

What Congress needs to do is give its attention to protecting the rank and file of the people in these strikes and all strike wars. It should still see to it that management does not practice monopoly and likewise see to it that unions do not. We still want this an America of free enterprise, run in behalf of all the people.

The Pulse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I am inserting a letter which appeared recently in the Atlanta Constitution, Atlanta, Ga. The writer of the letter, Lewis Ayer Smith,

draws a deadly parallel between the peacetime conscription of the American youth for war, and the conscription of young men for our domestic police force. There is real logic behind the sarcastic presentation of the comparison of the two types of the proposed conscription.

THE PULSE

COMPULSORY COPS

EDITOR, CONSTITUTION: Few Atlanta citizens realize how inadequate our police force is to protect us in case of any sudden large-scale outbreak of lawlessness. Riots have occurred in Atlanta in the past, and may occur again. Is anyone so foolish as to believe that our present police force could effectively cope with large organized bands of gangsters armed with machine guns and other modern weapons?

The obvious answer is "No." We must have more protection. We cannot continue jeopardizing our lives and property. We must so prepare ourselves that no gangster mob will dare start anything here, and that presents the question: "How can we get more police protection?"

Our city government tells us that we cannot get a sufficient number of men to join the police force to give us adequate protection, no matter how much we may offer to pay. Furthermore, they say it has always been customary to underpay policemen. It's good for their morale, keeps them obedient, etc.

But let us not be discouraged. There is an alternative. We can compel every Atlanta boy, on reaching 18, to take basic police training for 1 year. Then we will always have a police force in training, and a backlog of previously trained men who with a little extra training, we can call upon in time of emergency to quell any riot, and make any gangster think twice before starting anything in Atlanta.

Of course, this will entail some sacrifice on the part of the young men. But postponing going to college for 1 year; or of delaying starting a career—even though it means passing up a present opportunity for attractive employment—should not be too big a price to pay for insuring the safety of the older people.

And there are compensations. The boys will learn about the facts of life—especially criminal life. They will get a liberal education and learn the meaning of such words as "moll," "stir," "soup," and "rod." And their basic training will include courses in crap-shooting, beer-drinking and prostitute-hunting.

Of course, there will be some who will contend that recruiting a police force by conscription of boys is a violation of the rights of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." But this is no time to quibble over such outmoded principles. Already, the Marietta Communists are menacing us. Let us begin conscripting while there is yet time.

LEWIS AYER SMITH.

ATLANTA.

Humanity Waits While America Chooses—Total War Against World War III, or Conscription for Annihilation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial appearing in the Catholic Universe Bulletin, of Cleveland, Ohio, in its issue of Friday, November 16, 1945:

HUMANITY WAITS WHILE AMERICA CHOOSES—TOTAL WAR AGAINST WORLD WAR III, OR CONSCRIPTION FOR ANNIHILATION?

We Americans are about to make the most important decision in our history.

It is more than that.

It is the most important national decision in the history of mankind.

We the American people are about to decide:

Whether civilization is to continue.

Whether the human race is to survive in any very large sense of the word.

The enormity of the question before us is something to stagger the imagination.

But it need not stagger the intellect. We can grasp it if we will open our minds to all the facts.

We can understand it if we will think big.

All the thinking we have had to date on the subject of universal compulsory military training is small thinking.

It is thinking that is chained to the past. It is thinking in terms of World War I and World War II.

But the past is dead.

Our thinking now must be in terms of World War III.

And on that basis our choice is clear.

It is the choice between peace and a catastrophe that makes the mind reel.

We have been talking about total war, but we have not seen it yet.

We will see it in World War III, if we permit World War III to come.

There will be no such thing as a noncombatant.

There will be no safety anywhere for anyone or anything.

World War III will be total war in the full and absolute sense of the words.

And the question before us is this:

Shall we prepare for it, or shall we forbid it?

The advocates of universal compulsory military training want us to prepare for it.

But they are thinking small, either because they are incapable of thinking big, or because they don't want us to have the whole truth.

The whole truth is this: that universal compulsory military training is only the first drop in the bucket.

It is only the first tiny step toward preparation for Total World War III.

It is the molehill which will grow into the mountain; and then fall on us.

If we are going to prepare for World War III, this is what we must do:

We must put all thought of peace behind us, and gear ourselves totally to war.

We must not stop at conscripting boys.

We must conscript everybody and everything in America.

We must prepare totally for total war.

We must conscript all citizens, male and female, of all ages.

We must conscript capital, labor, business, industry, communications, transportation, science, scholarship, literature, music—everyone and everything.

We must leave nothing to chance.

We must yield nothing to peace.

We must harness all our energies and all our resources to war.

And we will be wasting our time.

We will not be prepared.

We cannot be prepared for World War III.

No one can be prepared for it.

We can only be prepared for universal destruction.

We would be wiser to dig a few caves hundreds of feet underground in some uninhabited wilderness and stock them with food and human beings so that the race shall not totally perish.

We have not been told the whole truth about the atomic bomb.

Its apocalyptic powers of destruction have not even begun to be tapped.

Its development in the next quarter century, if it is developed, will make all present concepts of warfare plain nonsense.

One atomic bomb will be able to wipe out the greatest fleet ever assembled—to disintegrate it so that not even debris will be left to float on the ocean.

One atomic bomb will be sufficient to eliminate any army with all its equipment—to atomize a million men and a million guns into primeval dust.

One atomic bomb will reduce any city to nothingness with all its inhabitants.

It is perfectly possible that one atomic bomb might start a series of atomic explosions which would dispose of all our problems by disposing of all of us.

In the light of such cataclysmic facts—which at that may be less than the whole terrible truth—all talk of preparing for World War III becomes what Shakespeare called a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.

We can prepare for it if we choose, but to do so we shall have to surrender all our freedoms, only to discover in the end that we were preparing for suicide.

For if we accept World War III as inevitable, so will the other nations; and the whole world will engage in a race of armaments which cannot have any result but the elimination of all but a few scattered remnants of the human race, wandering through a man-made desert and lapsing back into savagery.

Have we any other choice? We have.

We can set the face of America against war.

We can lead the world in the absolute outlawing of war.

We can turn our tremendous energies and brains and power into a total war against war.

We can insist upon the setting up of a real working world organization, with a world court settling disputes, and a world police force keeping order.

We can recognize the simple fact that the world has become as small as a village, and the whole human race as interdependent as a family.

And we can act accordingly.

In our village of the world, we can have a mayor and a judge and a constable and a town council, laboring for the welfare of all and supported by the force of public opinion.

That way lies peace and the kind of world of which mankind has dreamed for thousands of years.

The other way lies the apocalyptic disaster of an earth in atomic ruins and a human race self-destroyed by its own folly.

Upon us, the American people, in the providence of God, the choice has fallen.

Do we conscript our young men, and ultimately everyone and everything, for the world-wide race to destruction?

Or do we enlist ourselves and ultimately all nations in the march toward peace on earth?

It is for us to choose.

God guide us.

Universal Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a letter written by Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, pastor of the

Riverside Church, in New York City, which outlines forcefully his reasons for being against universal compulsory military training.

As we all know, Dr. Fosdick is one of America's greatest thinkers and preachers. He is known and respected throughout the United States and the world.

His logic is so impelling and his reasons for opposing universal compulsory military training are so valid that I believe millions of persons who thoughtlessly have decided in favor of universal, compulsory military training will be influenced to reexamine their thinking on the subject.

This letter was sent to members of the House Committee on Military Affairs:

DEAR SIR: Like millions of our fellow citizens I am profoundly disturbed by the insistent pressure being put on Congress to fasten on this country a policy of universal, compulsory military training in peacetime.

I honor the sincerity of those who favor it; I understand the arguments by which they have been persuaded; but I am convinced that they are being blinded by immediate circumstances to the long-range consequences of the policy they are backing.

To say that this policy does not mean conscription seems to me obviously false. A system of universal compulsory military training will reach into all our homes and will conscript a year out of the life of all our young men. This is the most radical break with our American tradition ever proposed, and for the United States to install this system now is to follow our victory over fascism by surrendering our liberties to one of the most central factors in fascism—a factor, moreover, that far from preventing wars has been one of the chief elements in causing them.

I am convinced that the resentment of millions of our people against this system will be deep-seated and continuous, growing more intense as the system's incidence upon our youth becomes more acute. The endeavor to fasten prohibition on an unwilling people will, I think, have been easy compared with the endeavor to fasten universal compulsory military training on the liberty-loving people of the United States. If this system is introduced there will be no rest from attack on it, and from mounting resentment against it, until it is repealed.

Millions of our citizens are convinced that we do not yet know enough about what kind or new world order can be established, about the degree of security that may be achieved under the United Nations Organization, about the nature of future war, and the place that vast masses of men will play in it, or about the value for such war of the halfway training a single year can assure, to make it wise now to plunge into so radical a break with our American tradition, and so dangerous a conflict with the liberty-loving instincts of our people.

We are convinced that the policy now being insisted on will inevitably mean the growing dominance of a powerful military class—not primarily the young men who are being trained, but the continuous, official, military caste, who must be maintained to do the training. That they will insist on more power, more money, more control over our youth's education, and in the end more time than 1 year, seems to me so probable as to be a practical certainty if the system persists for any length of time.

No such vast potential army as this measure proposes is needed for the immediate tasks of occupation. That immediate problem can be met by measures scaled to the numbers needed and to the length of time the forces of occupation will be required. We have never yet explored the possibilities of the volunteer system with inducements sufficient to attract the number of men wanted, and until that has been thoroughly and honestly tried, no system of compulsory military training should be introduced into this country.

This conviction, I am sure, represents the judgment of millions of Americans now, and these millions will be increased if and when the impact of the proposed conscription begins to hit their homes.

Additional Appropriation for UNRRA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the American Slav Congress before House Appropriations Committee hearing on President Truman's request for $550,000,000 UNRRA allotment, Washington, D. C., October 11, 1945:

Mr. Chairman, members of the House Appropriations Committee, appearing on behalf of the American Slav Congress, we wish to state from the outset that our organization, representing millions of Slavic Americans throughout the country, wholeheartedly supports President Truman's request to Congress for an additional appropriation of $550,000,000 for UNRRA aid to the peoples of the liberated countries.

The urgency for such an appropriation has been amply emphasized in the President's message to Congress and in the reports by UNRRA representatives in the hunger-stricken regions of Eastern Europe and elsewhere.

If additional proof is needed, here is a letter by a nurse who holds the rank of captain in the United States Public Health Service and is attached to UNRRA in Yugoslavia. She writes:

"I'm about to go to Bosnia to improve the orphan children's diet by adding 2 ounces of powdered milk to the one piece of bread they eat every other day. Of course, I'm supposed to teach nutrition—what they should eat if they had it. In case anyone at home wants to know—they've lost the victory if we don't feed Southern Europe this winter. We hear that the United States of America is afraid to draw on its food reserves because the average American diet is down to 3,800 calories. Ask them how they'd like to live on 800 and watch their children starve to death. It's true that about two of the fifteen million people will have enough to eat. But there's no surplus, and even if there was, there's no transportation. Roads have to be rebuilt and railroads reestablished. Between Servia and Bosnia the railroad has 99 tunnels and everyone is dynamited and mined. Hard manual labor is required and hungry people can't work very efficiently. The enemy has been brutally cruel to this nation that refused to capitulate and literally fought on with bare hands. For miles on end there isn't a village or farm left standing. I read somewhere that all America knows about Cassino, but there are thousands of Cassinos in Yugoslavia. Our nursing program is started. The girls want to learn, but I wonder if it's worth the effort if the nurses and patients are going to starve this winter. You may be sure the Yugoslavs will produce superhuman effort, and if they're fed this winter they'll do the rest themselves."

Another heartbreaking story of the terrible sufferings of the people of Yugoslavia and how inadequate present UNRRA help is was offered by chief of UNRRA mission to that heroic country, Mr. Srgeychik. In a statement to the press he said:

"During the day the men and horses are dying. They bury men, women, and children, but have no time to bury the horses. The urgent vision of winter drives them on. They and those who lie buried by the road are casualties, not of the war but of the liberation, victims of the promise that would make an ironic epitaph: 'Being determined that immediately upon the liberation of any area by the armed force of the United Nations or as a consequence of the retreat of the enemy the population shall receive aid and relief from their sufferings; food, clothing, and shelter, and aid in the prevention of pestilence and in the recovery of the health of the people.' This was written in 1943 by the 44 nations setting up the UNRRA. The people who came back to their villages heard it on the radio or as it was repeated from mouth to mouth.

"You do not have to travel far in Yugoslavia to see the meaning of the facts and figures in terms of suffering and courage, life and death. The people in devastated Yugoslavia know that many will die this winter. Even on the hottest days, as they sweat at their work, the prospect of a winter without food, clothing, or shelter is before their eyes. They know it is too late to save all, so their only concern is to make the death roll as short as possible. The time has come for more than promises. The UNRRA mission to Yugoslavia, aware of world shortages, advised the Yugoslav Government to prepare their requests, not on the basis laid down in 1943 but on their own bare minimum requirements. They were advised that the requests would stand a better chance of acceptance if this were done. But when these requests were submitted by UNRRA the Combined Boards in Washington drastically scaled down the total allocation for UNRRA.

"The area of western Yugoslavia is as large and as unfertile as Greece. Yet the allocation is eight times as much to Greece as to Yugoslavia. This does not mean to say that Greece does not need these supplies, but that Yugoslavia needs them equally. The point is that the total allocated by the Combined Boards to UNRRA countries is quite inadequate, no matter how it is divided. Washington is far from Europe, but if the members of the Combined Board could spend a day in Lika and Bosnia and see with what courage the Yugoslavs are facing their grim present and their grimmer future, it would be impossible for them to continue the allocations at the present inadequate level. They would realize that reduction in Washington means the increase of the death rate in Europe."

In central Poland, for instance, nine out of ten persons you meet, Gladwin Hill cabled New York Times the other day from Stettin, are those who have been uprooted, persons who came from somewhere else, persons whose normal livelihood has been wiped out and who are seeking an existence elsewhere, persons whose mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters, sons, and daughters have been slaughtered by the Germans.

Ukraine and Byelorussia have been devastated beyond description. All these countries do not have foreign exchange and cannot buy any food even if they can find it somewhere. Their people depend entirely on UNRRA aid.

Letters from the people of these countries to relatives in the United States are full of the most terrible stories of the slow death by hunger. Most of these letters have been printed in the Slavic newspapers of Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, New York, and the large Slavic population of these and other vital centers of the country have been greatly aroused by the failure of Congress so far to allocate additional funds for UNRRA.

We have with us a letter to Congress signed by 60 of the most outstanding Americans of Slav descent in which they urge every Congressman to give his or her support to the request of President Truman. We are submitting this letter with the names of the signers as part of our statement at this hearing. Millions of Slavic Americans throughout the country have been among the most conscientious and energetic participants in the war effort of our country and their views on this important question should be taken under most serious consideration by Congress.

We would like also to call your attention to an editorial in yesterday's New York Post entitled "Our Pledge to UNRRA," in which this problem is treated in a very concrete and simple way that makes the need for immediate action now most obvious. The editorial states—in one part:

"Deaths from tuberculosis, scarlet fever, diphtheria, etc., are sweeping Europe, claiming thousands more people than were killed by the fighting. In some areas, 8 out of 10 babies have been dying soon after birth.

"These decimating diseases are all spreading from the same cause—malnutrition. These hundreds of thousands of people are all dying by the same death—starvation."

The $550,000,000 which the President requests has been long overdue. This is the balance of the appropriation which we promised UNRRA more than a year ago. Frankly speaking, it seems inconceivable how any further delay in appropriating this sum can be justified on any humanitarian ground.

Representative CLARENCE BROWN, from Ohio, said a few days ago, as reported in the press, that no UNRRA funds should be used in foreign countries which do not accord free access to all news and do not permit freedom of the press as it is understood in the United States. But such a condition in granting aid to hungry men, women, and children of the liberated countries will be a gross departure from, and a clear violation of, the basic humanitarian principles and purposes of UNRRA. Such a condition would mean that we would use food and clothing as a political weapon, as a club, over the heads of our allies who happen to have a different concept of what constitutes a free press. No; a free country like ours cannot adopt a policy of using food to impose on its allies its views on vital matters. We call upon Congress to reject such proposals. They are inconsistent with the spirit and the principles of our democracy.

In our opinion, Congress should approve speedily the appropriation on the basis of our freely arrived at and freely undertaken obligation to help save the lives of millions of hungry people who fought our common Nazi foe and whose towns and homes were destroyed by the Nazi hordes.

Any further delay in approving and giving this sum to UNRRA will mean an increase of the death rate in the liberated countries. America should not do that. Congress must not commit such an act.

We strongly urge immediate approval by Congress of the request of President Truman for $550,000,000 for UNRRA aid to the peoples of the liberated countries. We also urge favorable consideration by Congress of UNRRA's request for a second assessment of 1 percent of the national income of the member nations which have not suffered invasion. "Without food there can be no peace," General Eisenhower declared.

"We must act, and act now. It is inconceivable that the United Nations could abandon the peoples of the liberated areas of Europe at the moment of their greatest peril," said UNRRA Director, former Governor Lehman.

Timely aid is a double aid.

AMERICAN SLAV CONGRESS,
ZLATKO BALOKOVIC,
Acting President.
GEORGE PIRINSKY,
Executive Secretary.

A LETTER TO CONGRESS—AMERICAN SLAVS CALL ON CONGRESS TO APPROPRIATE FUNDS FOR UNRRA RELIEF TO EUROPE—IMMEDIATE ACTION NEEDED TO PREVENT STARVATION

Starvation and misery face untold millions of Europe's liberated peoples this winter unless American aid is rushed with the utmost speed.

In the message to Congress asking for the appropriation of $550,000,000 for immediate aid, President Truman declared:

"The peoples of the liberated countries who so gallantly resisted Axis oppression throughout the war now face a winter of acute need and privation.

"They look to UNRRA for assistance.

"Unless UNRRA is enabled to speed ample shipments of supplies to these war-stricken areas, widespread starvation and disease will result.

"Our wholehearted support will be a real contribution toward a stable and enduring peace.

"We must help to the limits of our strength. And we will."

This pledge, made not only to our allies but to the American people, now awaits the action of Congress for fulfillment. The $550,000,000 authorized for UNRRA, but not yet appropriated, must be acted upon with speed.

America must fulfill this sacred pledge. It has the means to fulfill it. The peace and security not only of Europe but of America as well rest upon our speedy honoring of this wise obligation strictly on a humanitarian basis and not as a political weapon, as some Congressmen have suggested recently.

On behalf of millions of Slavic Americans, who have worked unflinchingly in the war and whose kinsmen in Europe made so great a contribution toward our common victory, we appeal to Congress to take immediate action to appropriate the already authorized sum and the additional $1,350,000,000 needed to maintain even the below-subsistence level of life in the liberated countries.

Signers of letter—partial list:

Archbishop Adam, New York, N. Y.; Louis Adamic, writer, Milford, N. J.; Prof. Igor Nicholas Astrow, Boston, Mass.; Zlatko Balokovic, violinist, New York, N. Y.; Very Rev. G. S. Barany, Central City, Pa.; Thomas Bell, writer, New York, N. Y.; Nicolai Berezowsky, composer, New York, N. Y.; Nick Bez, industrialist, Seattle, Wash.; Zarko M. Buncick, attorney, Akron, Ohio; Thomas Capek, author, New York, N. Y.; Otakar Charvat, editor, Omaha, Nebr.; Jaro Sokol Churain, conductor, Hollywood, Calif.; Dr. Alois Cibulka, engineer, Highlands, Tex.; F. J. Docktor, attorney, Washington, Pa.; Boleslaw Gebert, writer, New York, N. Y.; Very Rev. Daniel Gilevich, Bridgeport, Conn.; Prof. G. D. Grebenstchikoff, Lakeland, Fla.; Peter Grigoroff, journalist, Detroit, Mich.; Prof. Vladimir N. Ipatieff, Chicago, Ill.; Very Rev. Michael Jackovics, Passaic, N. J.; Dr. E. V. Jasinski, New York, N. Y.; Dr. M. N. Kalantar, author, lecturer, New York, N. Y.; Stanley Kazorski, engineer, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Joseph F. Krizek, city councilman, Cleveland, Ohio; Leo Krzycki, Milwaukee, Wis.; Maria Kurenko, opera singer, New York, N. Y.; Very Rev. Nicholas Levitsky, Youngstown, Ohio; Vladimir Levitsky, editor, New York, N. Y.; Maxim Lieber, authors' representative, New York, N. Y.; Joseph Martinek, editor, Chicago, Ill.; Zinka Milanov, opera singer, New York, N. Y.; W. J. Muzik, Chicago, Ill.; Prof. George R. Noyes, Berkeley, Calif.; George Pirinsky, New York, N. Y.; V. S. Platek, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Alexander Portnoff, sculptor, Philadelphia, Pa.; Dr. Simeon Pyzh, editor, Yonkers, N. Y.; Charles Recht, attorney, New York, N. Y.; Walter Riback, New York, N. Y.; Janko N. Rogelj, editor, Cleveland, Ohio; Serge Semenenko, banker, Boston, Mass.; Dr. Victor Sharenkoff, New York, N. Y.; Prof. Pitrim A. Sorokin, Harvard University; Dr. C. M. Stoycoff, Gary, Ind.; Arthur Szyk, artist, New York, N. Y.; Valery J. Tereshtenko, adviser, UNRRA, Washington, D. C.; Marie Tolstoy, teacher, lecturer, New York, N. Y.; Smeale Voydanoff, Pontiac, Mich.; Sigmund J. Wlodarczyk, Chicago, Ill.; Victor A. Yakhontoff, author, lecturer, New York, N. Y.; Blanche Yurka, actress, New York, N. Y.; John A. Zaremba, Detroit, Mich.; Prof. Casimir D. Zdanowicz, Madison, Wis.; Stephen Zeman, Jr., Pittsburgh, Pa.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. O. Zlamal, Cleveland, Ohio; Prof. Ignace Zlotowski, Columbus, Ohio; Prof. J. J. Zurhal, Chicago, Ill.

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN SLAV CONGRESS BEFORE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S REQUEST FOR $1,350,000,000 UNRRA APPROPRIATION FOR 1946

The national committee of the American Slav Congress, representing millions of Americans of Slav descent throughout the United States, fully supports President Truman's request to Congress for an appropriation of $1,350,000,000 for UNRRA relief to the peoples of the liberated countries of Europe and Asia in 1946.

We consider this appropriation vitally necessary to help save the lives of hundreds of thousands of starving people and urge every Member of Congress to vote for it.

As President Truman stated in his message to Congress on this urgent matter, "This country has pledged itself to do all that is reasonably possible to alleviate the suffering of our war-torn allies and to help them begin the task of restoring their economic productivity."

Congress and the country as a whole cannot afford to break this pledge to the people of the liberated countries, who by sacrifice and courage kept the enemy from realizing the fruits of his early victories and from bringing his military might to bear upon our shores.

Millions of Slavic Americans, who, like all true patriots, worked day and night to help win the war, have been shocked by the recent disgraceful performance of the House of Representatives in delaying previously authorized UNRRA funds and playing politics with the lives of starving people in Allied countries. We refer to the Brown-Dirksen free-press amendment to the House Joint Resolution N.. 226 for the appropriation of the long overdue $550,000,000 to the UNRRA fund for 1945.

We fully agree with the Washington Post, when it wrote editorially on Nov. 11 that "when people are suffering cruelly from hunger we can no more ask them to embrace freedom of the press in return for food than we can buy a change in politics or religion by domestic relief grants. It is an outrageous misconception of democratic principles to suppose that they can be fostered by this means. Throw freedom of the press up as a barrier between starving people and the food they crave and we shall create everlasting hatred of that principle and those who so stupidly espouse it."

As the Post correctly stated, "UNRRA was established not for the purpose of opening foreign doors to American newspapermen but for the simple humanitarian purpose of getting food to starving human beings."

We are sure that all conscientious newspapermen will themselves abhor the idea of purchasing their right to report freely on UNRRA activities at the price of the lives of thousands of starving people. This right they have even now. The newspapers are full of reports from countries where UNRRA relief is being distributed. It is reactionary politicians in Congress and outside that are trying to make such an issue of this question.

Many of our members in the great industrial centers of the country as Detroit, Pittsburgh, Chicago, Cleveland, and New York, have been receiving heartbreaking letters from their starving relatives and friends in the liberated countries. The stories of these hungry people who fought the Nazis so bravely and did so much for our common victory over Germany are too long to recite here. That they are in desperate need of immediate help is generally recognized.

What is not recognized yet is the fact that every day of delay in appropriating UNRRA funds increases the death rate in the liberated countries. To withhold, to sabotage the appropriation of funds for UNRRA means to cause the death of thousands and millions of freedom-loving people in allied countries.

UNRRA's director, Mr. Herbert Lehman, is 100-percent right when he says that the catastrophe which would be caused by the stoppage of UNRRA aid to nations dependent upon it because of lack of funds "is too serious to contemplate."

AMERICAN SLAV CONGRESS,
ZLATKO BALOKOVIC,
Acting President.
GEORGE PIRINSKY,
Executive Secretary.

NOVEMBER 15, 1945.

Aluminum Plants Disposal Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, November 29 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, because of the importance of the aluminum plants disposal program, I ask permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD part of a letter showing the general reception to my speech on the subject of November 23, and a telegram which my colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], referred to me, together with my reply. I should also like to have Senate bill 1612 printed following the telegrams.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REYNOLDS METALS COMPANY,
REYNOLDS METALS BUILDING,
Richmond, Va., November 26, 1945.

Senator HUGH B. MITCHELL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I read with much interest your speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 23 in which you discussed the disposal of aluminum plants.

I want to congratulate you upon a clear and pointed analysis of the situation as it now exists. Your speech came out at an opportune time and was an excellent presentation of the problem. I think it quite probable that your remarks will expedite action.

With assurance of my great admiration for you, I am

Cordially yours,
KEEN JOHNSON,
Vice President.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

It is costing Defense Plant Corporation $400,000 a year to maintain our aluminum rolling mill idle. It is costing $350,000 a year to maintain our aluminum-reduction plant idle. It will cost between seven and eight million dollars to terminate power contracts with Bonneville Power Administration. What does the Reconstruction Finance Corporation mean by subsidies? This is subsidy on a gigantic scale. They had better make a deal with private operators and get these plants going.

J. A. FORD,
Manager, Spokane Chamber of Commerce, Spokane, Wash.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *November 29, 1945.*

JAMES A. FORD,
Manager, Chamber of Commerce,
Spokane, Wash.:

Senator MAGNUSON has referred to me your wire regarding the cost of maintaining idle aluminum plants and urging that Government-constructed plants be turned over to private operators. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation contends it does not have the power to purchase aluminum from Government plants. Such aluminum is vital to private operation. I have introduced Senate bill 1612 which will allow the RFC to purchase aluminum for national defense stock piles. Congressman COFFEE has introduced a companion bill in the House. The greatest service the Spokane Chamber of Commerce could give to the cause of permanent employment in the Pacific Northwest aluminum industry would be to obtain support of the National Chamber of Commerce for our legislation which would enable the Government to work out leasing arrangements with private operators.

HUGH B. MITCHELL,
United States Senate.

S. 1612

A bill to amend the act of January 22, 1932, as amended (47 Stat. 5), to authorize and direct the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase aluminum for stockpiling purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of January 22, 1932, as amended (47 Stat. 5), is hereby amended by adding at the end of section 5 (d) thereof the following new paragraphs:

"The Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to purchase not to exceed 1,500,000,000 pounds of primary aluminum at not to exceed the current market price, which primary aluminum is—

"(a) in excess of current industrial demand; and

"(b) is produced in a Government-constructed aluminum plant.

Such purchases shall be made in such amounts and at such times as will enable the lessees, purchasers, and operators of such Government-constructed plants to supply such Government requirements in a manner which will best promote the development of an expanding commercial market for primary aluminum.

"Any aluminum so acquired shall be transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to any stock pile of strategic materials, the creation of which is or may hereafter be authorized and directed, and upon any such transfer from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or any corporation organized by virtue of the authority contained in the act of January 22, 1932, as amended (47 Stat. 5), the Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel notes of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and sums due and unpaid upon or in connection with such notes at the time of such cancellation, in an amount equal to the cost to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of the aluminum so transferred."

The Luce Bill on Veterans' Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 29, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, on November 19, I introduced H. R. 4742, a bill to provide housing for World War veterans.

Just recently an article appeared in The Nation, by Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Jr., on this very question. I invite the attention of my colleagues who are interested in this issue to some excerpts from that article. The son of our late President, who is now aspiring to political leadership, has some very true things to say on this very important subject of finding homes for our veterans, which is the sole object of my bill:

NO HOMES FOR VETERANS
(By Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.)

Only last year men slept on the frozen ground in Belgium or stood watch on deck in the freezing winds of the North Atlantic. This year they don't want to sleep on a park bench in the cold of an American winter. Yet we may see them there, and possibly much worse sights, unless immediate action is taken to remedy the housing shortage.

The scarcity of housing has been an acute national problem all during the war years. Now, with service men and women being discharged daily in increasing numbers, the problem has become more critical than ever before. If the situation in New York City can be taken as an index, it has already, even in these early stages of demobilization and reconversion, reached the proportions of a major crisis and even scandal.

For a long time many New York City officials have recognized that some provision would have to be made to bridge the gap between the very little new building and the demand for housing. But while there have been many conferences and a great deal of talk, talk is all the city has done. The men and women who have been discharged or are about to be discharged, who have had all they want of fox holes and now seek homes, are becoming disillusioned, bewildered, and bitter. Today in New York City 20,000 veterans and their families are searching for places to live. With every week that passes their number increases by 3,500. By next summer more than 100,000 veterans and their families will be in need of housing in New York City alone. But nothing has been done to provide homes even for the 20,000 veterans now demobilized and badly in need of a place to live.

Home is probably the most precious thing in the world to a man who endured war. There is hardly a man who didn't spend hours remembering his home, how it used to look, or how it was going to look when he and his wife got a place and bought their furniture. Most soldiers dreamed of a clean little place, all-American, with good plumbing, plenty of heat, a bathtub, and unlimited hot water. But the only places now available in New York City for the veterans are substandard tenement dwellings—cold-water flats where you are lucky to find one toilet for a whole floor instead of one for the whole building out in the backyard, and where the tenant has to heat his water, heat his own apartment, and wage continual war against roaches and rats. Medium-priced and even the highest priced buildings are fully rented and have waiting lists that don't give the veteran a chance. And even if the veteran were willing to move into the tenements—and they are not willing, I can tell you—there still would not be enough apartments to take care of all of them.

Are returned servicemen and their families actually going to have to set up housekeeping in pup tents in the parks before the city provides immediate temporary housing as a stopgap?

Unless something is done quickly, the veterans will become more and more cynical—just what we do not want to happen this time. A man has to have a home before he can look for a job and become again a productive part of community and national life. In even larger aspects, we have learned through grim experience in a global war the dangers inherent in a dissatisfied group which considers itself cheated of its rights.

* * * * *

This is a critical period for veterans. It is imperative that we secure the minimum

essential of life—a home—for the men and women who fought for the life of this Nation. It is also imperative that the veterans be made to feel that their Government recognizes their problem and is at least doing something to solve it. The public officials of our Government have a great responsibility to act in a way that will preserve the faith and confidence of the veterans in the American way of life.

Point System a Farce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps have made a farce of the so-called point system for discharges. They have made a mockery of the plan through the granting of discharges to sons of generals, movie actors, football players, and other low-point favorites. In the meantime Congress is being blamed. And rightly so. The majority of Members are doing nothing to correct the situation.

There are three discharge petitions on the desk, Mr. Speaker, that would bring to the floor legislation that at least would show the GI that he has not been forgotten by Congress. The most signatures on any of the three petitions today is around 130.

I urge those Members who have not yet signed petitions Nos. 7, 8, and 9 to read the following letter from a high-point GI from my district—not the son of a general or a football player—and then attach your signatures to bring out these bills.

Make no mistake. The GI's are going to ask you next year what you did to expedite the release of fathers and high-point men of World War II.

Since the war with Germany and VJ-day was announced we men with 63 points have been constantly on the move. We are shipped to an outfit that has a point bracket of from 60 to 64 points, and we are told we should hit a port soon when the so-called readiness date is reached. What happens? Orders are changed and the point bracket is changed, and we are told that we will be shipped to another outfit with the same point bracket. Which was true until now.

We have been eligible for discharge since the 1st of November, and we're still beating our heads against the wall here in Germany. Being still in Germany when we were eligible for discharge was hard enough to take, but when we heard that men in the States were being discharged with far less points topped everything.

You people at home there in the good old U. S. A. certainly cannot realize how these men here in this theater with over 60 points feel. It's as if our best friends were turning against us and saying, "Oh, well, those Joes beat the hell out of the Jerries and Japs, the war's over, and I don't have to worry about us losing."

If there are any Americans who feel this way, and I doubt it, they had better think again, because just having an excombat man sitting around and brooding about this thing isn't going to make him forget the war, not by a darn long ways. Most of the Joes I know are bitter and getting more so every day.

Some people seem to think that men with from 60 points couldn't have seen much combat. That's where they are wrong. Number of points means nothing; it's just who you know, proven simply by checking records. Cases I know where men with not enough points to stay with a homeward bound unit were given the Bronze Star to boost their points up enough.

Maybe I'm wrong in thinking that it isn't fair to a man who had to earn his Bronze Star the hard way, and believe me most combat men had no Bronze Star in mind when we pulled off some of those stunts; more often he was thinking of his sweetheart, wife, Mom and Dad, and how much he wanted them to keep on enjoying the life you free Americans are leading now. We who seem to be lost men since the war is over would like a chance to enjoy the life we think is entitled to us; we don't want much, just a boat to come home on; just 1 of those 4,000 ships that the Joint Chiefs of Staff haven't decided what to do with yet. All of us would be willing to stand on the deck of any boat, all the way home; even a rowboat.

If in a 3 months' time we can ship 750,000 tons of food to England, why can't some of those ships take GI's back to the States? Don't say they are, because if they were, there wouldn't be much more than 400,000 troops left in the ETO now, which are occupation forces. I understand that most of the ships that are bringing food to England are Liberty ships that are poorly ventilated, slow and unsanitary. It didn't make any difference when we were coming over here, why should it going back? I would sooner be on a Liberty ship that was about to sink than spend one more month in this Godforsaken country, and I know I'm speaking for thousands of GI's when I say it.

Is the Construction of Veterans' Hospitals Becoming a Political Football?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 29, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Joseph Leib, service officer of Vincent B. Costello Post of the American Legion:

IS THE CONSTRUCTION OF VETERANS' HOSPITALS BECOMING A POLITICAL FOOTBALL?

(By Joseph Leib, service officer, past vice commander)

In the first deficiency appropriation bill of 1946—debated on the House flood Tuesday—an allotment of $158,320,000 for the construction and extension of veterans' hospitals was rejected. The next day the House overrode its Appropriations Committee. On page 11046 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, November 27, Representative CANNON of Missouri is quoted as having said:

"It is felt that the Congress should have some voice in the location of hospitals and in the priority of providing for such locations."

This very question has become a sore spot in official Washington. General Bradley has stated that he wants the new hospitals located near medical schools or big cities so that patients can have the benefit of experienced practitioners. General Hawley, Surgeon General of the Veterans' Administration, has explained why such a program was necessary in these words:

"The best medical work today is done around teaching institutions, and we do not have money enough to employ these men, even if there were enough of them to go round. That means that we must build our hospitals around those institutions so the veterans can have the benefit of the consultant service."

Shortly before General Bradley took over the Veterans' Administration (August 15) the Federal Board of Hospitalization approved the construction of 29,000 additional beds. The Hospital Board, however, gave no indication or recommendation as to possible locations. Immediately a storm of inquiry arose from interested cities throughout the Nation. They exerted powerful pressure in behalf of a local Government hospital. Criticism that started then has continued to this day, involving more than 250 cities that do not wish to be left out of any extensive building program.

President Truman was obliged to step into the picture by stating that no location was to be made public because he believed that General Bradley was entitled to the fullest leeway in getting this program under way.

Now, the fight over the $158,000,000 appropriation seems to be the result of this unfortunate controversy and bickering. Everyone wants to be in at the pie counter, and in the meantime needy and disabled veterans are standing in line or being turned away because of the lack of accommodations in Federal hospitals. Why is this situation being permitted? Every day lost is going to be a hardship on some veteran.

Since June 30, 1941—approximately 6 months before Pearl Harbor—there have been added to veterans' hospitals merely 8,404 beds. Think of it. Then consider also the fact that over one million and a half veterans of this war alone have been discharged from the armed forces for medical and disability reasons—with over 300,000 drawing health pensions—all potential hospital cases—yet only 8,404 beds have been added to date.

In this connection I would like to call attention to hearings held before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives, relative to the bill to provide for an Administrator of Surplus Property. Dated August 28, 1945, pages 37 and 38, there appears some amazing testimony.

Congressman COCHRAN was discussing the dangerous predicament within the veterans' hospitals, pointing out that Congress authorized the Veterans' Administration to construct facilities throughout the Nation but refused to give them a dime to go ahead. That was 8 months ago. The situation remains the same. Here are the comments as they appeared in the hearings. Every Member of Congress should read the following very carefully:

"Representative GOSSETT. The hospital problem is arising all over the country.

"Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes, sir.

"Representative COCHRAN. That is our own fault. We authorized the Veterans' Administration to construct hospitals all over the United States and we did not give them a dime. They had plans and specifications to build, but we did not give them a dime when we authorized it. I know as a fact that the Bureau of the Budget has had the plans and specifications from the Veterans' Administration for new construction in present facilities and the Veterans' Administration has not had 5 cents to go ahead and construct them, because all we did in the GI bill was to give them the authorization. There is upward of $700,000,000, I think, needed to go ahead and build additional hospitals and enlarge the present ones.

"Representative JUDD. Will the gentleman yield for a comment?

"I cannot let the statement of the gentleman from Missouri about the Veterans' Ad-

ministration stand without some comment. It is true that we authorized the appropriation of several hundred millions of dollars for hospitals, but in March and April when we actually appropriated seventy or eighty million dollars, as I recall, some of us said we were going to need more hospitals for the veterans. At that time General Hines said that Congress has never failed to give the Veterans' Administration whatever it asked for. I cannot see that the present need was the fault of Congress, when we appropriated all the money for hospitals that the Veterans' Administration asked for.

"Representative COCHRAN. The Veterans' Administration made a mistake in not coming down and asking for more appropriations.

"Representative JUDD. Some of us went down and talked the matter over with General Hines and told him that he had a bigger problem than in the last war. However, Congress gave him every dime he asked.

"Representative COCHRAN. The Army today has thousands upon thousands of men who are ready to be turned over to the Veterans' Administration, but they cannot discharge them because the Veterans' Administration has no place to put them and they still must be hospitalized by the Army although they have received the maximum treatment by the Army; and that applies to the Navy.

"Representative JUDD. We tried to correct it but did not succeed.

"Representative ERVIN. The Army cannot discharge them until they are physically able to be discharged, but when they are discharged they will be turned over to the Veterans' Administration.

"Representative COCHRAN. And the Veterans' Administration has no place to put them.

"Representative ERVIN. And I think that is why the President appointed a new head for the Veterans' Administration.

John J. McCloy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1945

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith a speech made by the Honorable John J. McCloy, the Assistant Secretary of War, before the Academy of Political Science at the Hotel Astor in New York City on November 8 last. I am sure that the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the country generally will be interested in this splendid statement.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, Mr. McCloy retired on Saturday of last week from the position which he has so ably filled as Assistant Secretary of War for the past several years and will shortly return to his home in up-State New York, where he plans to again enjoy the life of a private citizen.

On this occasion I should like to add my word of praise to that of many other people who knew him while he was engaged in performing his responsible and arduous duties here during the late war. It was my pleasure to know John McCloy both in his official capacity and personally. From the very first time I met him I was impressed with his sincerity, his high sense of duty, and his devotion to his Government and his country. The zeal with which he attacked the many problems of his office during that global conflict was indeed inspiring.

The speech follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, my assigned subject is Our Policy in Germany, but I hope you will excuse me if I vary it somewhat. It is more fitting that I talk of the problems of our occupation in Germany and make some observations on the operations of our administration there rather than to discuss our policy. After all, our policies have been pretty well stated. The directives to General Eisenhower have been published. The Potsdam Declaration has been promulgated and at least our general objectives have been well advertised. Moreover, as a representative of the Army, it is not my province to discuss our state policy. General Eisenhower is correct when he says that he and the Army are the instruments and not the makers of policy.

The Army is in Germany to achieve the objectives which are given to it, and in talking briefly of the problems the Army is facing and how it is coping with them, I know that I can be more informative than if I attempt to expound our policy or discuss its merits. Moreover, I feel better qualified to speak, for I have just returned from a trip which has taken me around the world, during which it was my chief task to observe on the ground something of the operations of our occupational administration in Germany, Austria, and Japan.

Again, I know you will forgive me if I only give you my first-hand impressions. They are bound to be sketchy and I fear incomplete. I returned to this country only a few days ago after an absence of a little over a month from my desk. Since I landed from my plane there have been people to see and things to do in such quantity that I have not had an opportunity to prepare a thoughtful and balanced analysis of the problems of occupation. However, I will attempt to give you a sort of running account of the things that come to my mind, as a result not only of my observations on this trip but of a rather sustained and continuous association with the problems of German occupation from the invasion of Germany to the present.

I can pass quickly over the period of the fighting when it was the duty of the military government to keep the lines of communication open, to keep the civilian population out of the way of the armies; in short, to relieve the combat forces of concern for the enemy population behind the lines. This in itself was an enormous task, and men had to be trained for it, and they were trained for it. The training commenced before our initial landing in Africa and it continued throughout the period of the hostilities. Men were selected in and out of the Army who had knowledge and experience in administration of cities, towns, and States—sanitary engineers, city managers, public officials, lawyers, financiers, economists, administrators of every sort. We recruited the leaders of the country, men who had records of capacity and who were induced through patriotic appeal to give up their jobs and take on the rigors and inconvenience of army life. These men were given courses in the form of government of the countries we might be called on to occupy and training in dealing with the problems they would be called upon to meet. The courses were well instructed, or as well instructed as the facilities of the country could supply.

We had no large corps of civilian administrators, such as the British Empire could call on from their colonial administration, but we recruited an excellent body of highly experienced professional and business men, government officials, and representatives of labor. They were men of devoted spirit, and it is these men who constitute in the main the men who are now carrying on our occupational job in Germany. They did their job well during the period of combat—we had no disturbances behind the lines, the troops moved ahead freely, and the rear was organized by teams of these men as the armies moved ahead. The test of their efficiency was the repose which everywhere followed the progress of the combat troops. Refugees were cared for, food was distributed, sewers were repaired, dead were buried—all of the enormous problems of reorganization and stabilization which follow the wake of battle were dealt with, and they were dealt with well.

Then came the victory—a victory almost unparalleled in history—a Russian, a British, a French, and an American Army bore in on Germany. They met in the center of Germany—a once highly organized country, centralized and articulated. The forces and the conflict surged right up to the very desk of the Fuehrer in the Chancellery in Berlin—some of the heaviest fighting took place in the portico of his office.

The result was the most complete economic and political collapse, at least of modern times. There was no government, there was no economy left, and the American Army had on hand a group of men and officers whose duty it was to take over the administration of Germany. But the American Army was not the only army which had conquered Germany. There were three other armies and all four were faced with plans for the government of Germany contained in Allied decisions, made long before, which necessitated joint control of a nation of 70,000,000 people.

It is a novel situation in history—four nations have assumed and exercised supreme governmental authority over an area which was once the most vigorous political and economic unit in Europe. The objective agreed to by the four powers is the complete demilitarization of that area, the drastic reorganization of the political, economic and ideological life of these people and their ultimate reeducation and redevelopment as a self-governing democratic body.

The peoples of these four governing nations are themselves widely scattered over the world. Their histories are diverse. The four nations differ radically in their prior experience, methods, and objectives in the government of other areas and peoples. Their fears and hopes and interests with respect to the future of the people in the territory to be governed were and are different and to some extent widely apart. There is the tremendous barrier of three different languages which impedes communication and accurate understanding among the governing groups. There is the further barrier of the fourth language of those who are governed.

It would be idle to expect any simple and entirely satisfactory results from any such novel and complex undertaking.

With the victory, additional specialists were recruited to supplement those already in the Army or connected with it. New staffs were organized—a council of the four nations was set up—each nation had contributed to the victory, each had an obvious and a deep interest in the area to be occupied. But the negotiations and agreements effecting central control take time to evolve, and pending the achievement of these agreements the commander in chief of each of the armies was given the authority to exercise complete governmental functions in the area his army occupied until common agreement could be reached.

I think it is safe to say that no zone commander was faced with as many diverse and heavy problems as was General Eisenhower. It is difficult for anyone who has not observed conditions in Germany during the last stages of the war and after the defeat to begin to

appreciate the complexity of the task of reconstituting the functions of government in the conquered area. Not only did he and General Clay have the task of handling the great military forces involved in the reshuffling of the armies, the movement of their supplies as they settled themselves, the quartering of the troops, but immediately they were plunged deeply in the problem of redeployment for the Pacific war, and, shortly thereafter, in the even more greatly complicated process of demobilization.

The varied functions of government had to be set up in accordance with the drastic denazification directives which General Eisenhower received. Communications, transportation, and practically all productive facilities were either shattered or paralyzed, and on top of it all came the monumental influx of the refugees. The millions of persons cast loose by the Nazi collapse, former prisoners, and the so-called displaced persons drawn from every nation in Europe and many from Africa and Asia, flooded the American zone seeking refuge. In numbers they exceeded the greatest European migrations of history and they were more disorganized. They had to be sorted out, transshipped, deloused, fed, tended to, relocated. People of every condition, of age, and health—men, women, children. The conditions were literally indescribable, yet the Army set about the task, checked disease, supplied clothes, organized camps, fed, and moved these people by the millions. There are hard cases yet to be dealt with—those who do not want to move or cannot move or those for whom no arrangements can be made for their reception in other countries—but the great bulk of the displaced persons have been cared for and transferred to the lands of their choice.

No one has yet adequately appraised the size and complexity of this task. Yet while it was going on the process of reorganizing the German communities was also proceeding. Take the city of Nuremberg—many of you are familiar with it—you would not recognize it now. All of the old city—the city enclosed by the old wall—is virtually a rubble heap—and Nuremberg is not unique—most of the wall is torn down and the entire city is a great wreck. It was a center of Nazi activity and consequently there were many Nazis in office. They were either apprehended or discharged from their administrative posts which they held. Although they were the skilled, energetic people, under our rules they had to be replaced. Water had to be made available and centers of food distribution set up, sewers repaired, streets made passable, power reinstalled. This was not done to rebuild our former enemy but to make it barely possible for people to live and function on anything other than an animal basis. The military government people tackled the job and something resembling livable conditions have been restored.

Our short-range policy included the demilitarization and denazification of our zone. Today there is no German Army, there is no Gestapo, and there is no Nazi administration left in the country.

From some of the reporting which we have had in this country one would get the impression that the Army had been very lax in its execution of the denazification policy. On the contrary, it is demonstrable that we have been drastic. Indeed, in our zone our policy has been more severe than has been the case in any other zone. The English, for better or worse, have not gone half so far. Nazi specialists discharged by us have been reemployed by the French and even the Russians are not so strict in rooting out these former German leaders. We have not been able to obtain Russian or English concurrence to our denazification policy for both of these Governments feel that it does not allow sufficient leeway to utilize the services of those Germans who have special aptitudes or experience. To date we have about 87,000 former Gestapo, SS troops, Nazi leaders, military officers, and industrialists in detention. We have removed more than 100,000 Nazis from office. I doubt whether the record of the armies of the other powers is an consistent or far reaching. At least, if it is, we have no knowledge of it.

As I have indicated, we have carried out our immediate demilitarization plans completely. The German Army no longer exists. The general staff is dissolved and many of its former members are in jail or awaiting trial. German war materials have been taken into our custody. Much of their war-making industrial plant was destroyed during the war or is awaiting removal pursuant to the Potsdam reparations policy. We have taken complete control of all of the I. G. Farben combine which lies within our power and at American instigation a four-party agency has been set up to deal with its dissolution.

Criticism there has been. Where it is founded on fact the Army welcomes it. In a task so complex, so far flung, it is inconceivable that we should not make mistakes. When they are discovered, every effort is made to correct them promptly.

I want to say a further word about the men who are doing this job for they are a group of which this country can be proud. Most of them are older men, former leaders in their communities. Perhaps the majority of them are "retreads"—officers or veterans of the last World War who came forward to serve their country again in this war. They have given up established homes and livelihoods to undertake the unglamorous tasks of cleaning up after the battle and the shouting have passed. They have to live in the most depressing of surroundings and deal every day with the headaches of a destroyed and dislocated society. It is their task to furnish the follow-through while the nation demands and obtains the quick demobilization of its forces. There is nowhere in this country a comparable group of such devoted, experienced, and skilled men as the Army has called upon to perform this task. Those who have taken the pains to examine with any reasonable care the work they are performing, and who are objective in their observations, recognize and appreciate the work of these public-spirited men and officers. Some of the irresponsible and outrageous attacks which have been made on the competence of these officers, and, in some cases, even on their motives, are hard to understand or condone. The views of the attackers, safe in their remoteness from the problem, should be properly discounted.

Many of these men are classed by the Army as essential and in spite of the fact that they may have served in Africa, up through Italy and then in France, they still have to remain on the job in Germany. Very few sought the job, the job sought them and they forever deserve well of their country.

Without the follow-through the objectives for which the battle was fought and won may be dissipated. Today we have Germany and Japan stricken and conquered. It is our aim to create the conditions which will make them peaceful and law-abiding members of the world community. It is a long process requiring the use of sustained force and enlightened administration. The future destiny of our country is closely related to the manner in which we cope with the problems of administration in the conquered areas. The work of the men who are charged with the task, for your own sake and interest, should be intelligently followed and upheld no less than was the case of the combat troops without whose efforts we should never have had the opportunity to concentrate on the achievement of our peace objectives. I urge all of you who do have an interest in this great problem to read the excellent monthly reports which General Eisenhower is making to the Secretary of War on the administration of the occupation. No other nation publishes so full and frank reports.

I have given you some of the short-range objectives which either have been achieved or which are well on the way to being achieved in Germany. Our objectives, however, cannot all be negative ones. If Germany is not to be a burden on the American taxpayer, constructive steps have to be taken to enable the German people to work out their own political and economic reconversion.

The situation in Germany today as the Army finds it is not a pleasant one. Industry and commerce is at so low a scale as practically to be nonexistent—clothing, food, transportation, are scanty with the result that every city is full of long queues of people waiting to obtain the simplest necessities of life. There will be very little coal except for some meager heating of such institutions as hospitals and the supply of food processing plants. There is a fiscal and currency situation which hovers on the brink of complete collapse. In short, on every side there is the evidence of complete demoralization. Every town of any size, main or provincial, with almost no exception, has been heavily bombed. On this stage we must erect a new society—a peaceful society and a democratic, liberty-loving one.

The Army has not yet been able to reconstruct in anything like adequate measure such services as the postal system and the general communication and transportation systems, to make it possible for people to exchange things and distribute the limited quantities of goods which are available. If there is famine and freezing on top of the other depressing conditions which are to be found in middle Europe, there will be a very scanty soil in which political wisdom or liberal political thinking can be nurtured. By February 1, a determination will have been made as to the amount of industry which can safely be left in Germany; give her a standard of living not exceeding that of her surrounding countries, and prevent her from becoming a public charge. The rest will presumably be destroyed as a war menace or transferred as reparations to those countries who wish to receive it. The reports show that 25 percent of the industrial plants of Germany have been destroyed by bombing or war damage, with, I do not know how much already removed from the Russian and French areas. Vast removals of industrial plants are still to take place under the reparations program. General Eisenhower reports that less than 5 percent of industry in the western zone is operating, and we know that Germany normally has a large food deficit. On these facts, you cannot envy the Army its task of achieving one of the objectives given it by the Berlin protocol, namely to permit Germany to sustain a peace economy without external assistance.

Germany is not primarily an agricultural country, in fact it is far from it and with the resources it possesses and the needs which the world demands I personally do not believe it can ever be turned into an exclusively agricultural or pastoral society. I have seen reports which show how relatively little of the existing German industrial plant has been destroyed but in all conscience there would appear to any visitor to Germany to be enough destroyed to give a terrific set-back to German industry when it is compared to that of her neighbors among the Allies. Particularly is this true when one has in mind the removals already effected on the Russian side and those still contemplated throughout Germany. But even if not destroyed in large, or even substantial part, the plant is idle. Plants do not operate of themselves. They are merely part of a great nexus of communication and transportation facilities, of trade, and raw materials.

I do not believe that it is in our interest, or possible while we have any responsibility in the matter, to permit famine and disease, or even malnutrition to ravage our occupation area. The Germans may deserve such treatment for the much worse which they have visited upon the other peoples of Europe. Yet we know that the American people will not long tolerate such conditions and the directives to the Army and the Berlin agreements do not contemplate that they shall exist. We must be prepared to provide for the time being such basic food supplies as may be deemed essential and the Berlin agreements themselves state that measures shall be taken promptly to repair transport, to enlarge coal production, to increase agricultural output, and to effect emergency repair utilities and housing. These are the essential, immediate prerequisites of restoring the possibility of any economic life in Germany. Without these immediate steps the Germans cannot assume the responsibility of operating the little German industry, which immediately can be restored, to pay for food which must be imported. Without this minimum degree of rehabilitation there will be no portion of the peaceful domestic industry which the Berlin agreements permit the Germans to develop. In the next months it will be a struggle to get some economic life going and, with the almost total absence of coal, there will be little enough. Certainly for a long time to come there is no justifiable fear that Germany's war potential is being rebuilt.

The immediate task is the avoidance of epidemics, famine and unrest and the restoration of stable conditions in which a political rebirth of Germany can take place. It is time that the American people realize that this short-range task is now the important issue and not whether there is still some Nazi in the town of Obersdorf or Nuremberg whom the Army has overlooked.

I am convinced that the danger from Germany at the present time is not in any tendency toward loose control and quick or even ultimate revival. It lies rather in the immediate prostration which can readily produce a state of permanent desolation likely to defeat our objectives even if it does not turn the stomachs of our own and other peoples. It may lead later to a too great relaxation of controls and perhaps at the same time to a degree of civil disturbance and strife which will make the task of our military government officials even more difficult than it is at the moment.

Even those most determined to defeat Germany completely and see that Germany shall not again become a menace to the world, if they are thoughtful, must realize that we cannot now draw back from taking at least the immediate sensible and constructive steps which are necessary, to use the words of the Potsdam Declaration, to enable the German people to subsist without external assistance.

In accordance with a policy with which, because of its military implications, the Army and the War Department are in complete agreement, the highly centralized and subsidized economic controls of old Germany are being destroyed. The same is true of Germany's excess industrial plant but what that excess is should be determined by the most objective scientific appraisal which the experts of this country and our allies can furnish. It cannot be settled by passion or ideology nor by impugning the motives of those who differ. When that decision is made the Army will carry it out but in the meantime there is the immediate necessity of keeping body and soul together. We must understand that the Army's job in Germany cannot be successfully accomplished unless there ultimately emerges in that area a people or peoples who are conditioned and prepared to take a useful place in the society of nations. It is the duty of our Government and of the Allied governments to see that the Army commanders who are now controlling the situation receive directives which make this possible.

The Army is, of course, hampered in its effort to decentralize industry and at the same time achieve a self-sustaining Germany by the existence of the separate zones. It is only by operating the zones as an over-all unit with a balanced distribution of supplies between them that such an objective becomes feasible. The greatest credit is due to General Eisenhower and General Clay for their persistent and untiring efforts to obtain agreement in the Council for the central administration of the fundamental services of the country, such as transportation and communication. In spite of many trials and tribulations real cooperation was achieved in the first meetings of the Council and the difficulty we are now encountering in our attempt to achieve a central machinery for the Nation-wide services, contrary to the general conception, does not emanate from the Soviets but from France, one of the western democracies. The French have been reluctant to permit any form of central administration which would include all areas in the west. They are afraid, I assume, that if they do, a pattern will be set for the west as the turning of the administration of the area east of the Oder to the Poles and the Russians is likely to set the permanent pattern in the east. At the bottom of this is, of course, the desire of the French for the separation, if not the annexation, of the Ruhr and the Rhineland. I think that but for this difficulty there would have been a very substantial measure of four-party agreement in the Council. Whatever the cause, matters of the utmost consequence have been held in abeyance—banking, currency, taxation, for example, and until such problems are dealt with there can be very little progress made in treating Germany as a unit—which is the agreement of the four powers. Of no less significance is the question of the public debt on which is built the whole structure of savings banks, life insurance, social insurance, and bank deposits. Exports and imports should also be treated centrally if Germany is to be regarded as a unit but all these vitally important matters seem to be held up by France pending the settlement of Germany's western frontier.

The Army has about accomplished the short range objectives of our occupational policy in Germany though there is still considerable work in the way of basic reconstruction to be done under that program. I venture to give the assurance that nothing has been done by the Army or will be done by it which will in any way prejudice the long-range objectives of the country in relation to Germany. How much industry will eventually be left to Germany can later be determined unprejudiced by any steps the Army may now be taking to keep things barely afloat in the areas of Germany over which it exercises jurisdiction.

There is one more thought I should like to leave with you before I close and that is that if we seek security there is only one way to achieve it. It is as it always has been, by eternal vigilance. There is no high short road to the permanent pacification of either Germany or Japan. It cannot be accomplished by a single once and for all blow of destruction. I have no illusions about the repentant character of either the German or the Japanese people. In my judgment there will be a prolonged period before we can hope that the roots of free living, free thinking, and peaceful conduct are seated in German soil. This means that this country must not only have the will, but the continued capacity to step forward and check, as it appears, any recrudescence of aggression in Germany. It is mainly in our own strength and steadfastness of purpose that the future peace of the world lies and we must never forget it.

Medical and Hospital Care of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 29, 1945

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remaks in the RECORD, I include the following telegrams:

ALBANY, N. Y., *November 29, 1945.*
Hon. WILLIAM T. BYRNE,
House Office Building:

As of November 24, 1945, veterans' waiting list, Veterans' Administration, Bronx (N. Y.) Base Hospital 81, has mounted to 1,053. We understand they are not admitting pneumonia cases, No. 4 heart cases, and cancer cases. Same thing was not known in the annals of the Veterans' Administration prior to this date. Kindly do all things possible so that our hospital at Albany, N. Y., will be built within the very near future.

GEORGE J. PICKETT,
Veterans County Service Office.

ALBANY, N. Y., *November 29, 1945.*
Representative WILLIAM T. BYRNE:

The Victory War Loan drive is nearing the climax. Purchase of bonds by individuals is lagging. Posters urging the public to buy bonds depict wounded veterans, present the argument funds are needed to provide medical and hospital care for them. How can Congress deny an appropriation for new veterans' hospitals, particularly when facilities in New York State are inadequate now for wounded and disabled veterans of World War II? A vote for the veterans' hospital fund will help the victory loan.

THE TIMES UNION.

The Chinese Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 29, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am very much disturbed by recent press and radio reports concerning the status and activity of our troops in China. These reports have created much confusion and distrust in the minds of our people because of the seeming conflict with the President's declared statement that—

All peoples who are prepared for self-government should be permitted to choose their own government by their own freely expressed choice, without interference from any foreign source.

The recent events in China involving the use of American servicemen to transport Chungking troops to battle fronts with the Chinese Communists amounts to unjustifiable intervention in the internal affairs of China, and is consequently a grave mistake on our part.

The internal strife within China is added incentive for our speeding up the establishment of the United Nations Organization for the maintenance of world peace and justice, and the self-determination of the peoples of the world. In

the absence of such an organization at this time, this country can play a vital role toward attaining these objectives in China, not through intervention and taking sides, but through encouraging the unification of all forces in China by peaceful negotiations between representatives of all sections of the Chinese people, leading to a free national election in which the people of China can express their own desires and draw up a people's constitution in accord with the type of rule they wish to adopt.

I am not questioning the necessity of maintaining American troops in China and Manchuria to complete the Japanese surrender. I respect the decision of the military in this regard. However, the use of American troops or American arms in any way indicating an act of intervention or taking sides cannot be condoned. Our marines should be withdrawn from this area as quickly as is feasible.

It is the duty of this Nation to foster and encourage a functioning democracy in China through free elections and a coalition government. Such action will be not only to the interests of a peaceful, unified, democratic China, but also to the interests of the people of our own Nation. For only through a democratic China, organized for the welfare, and economic and political freedom of its people, can we promote international cooperation, international trade, and further our goals of a lasting and enduring peace.

I ask that our acts of intervention come to a halt immediately, and that our troops be withdrawn from northern China and Manchuria. This is absolutely necessary in the interest of world peace, democracy, and self-determination of the people.

Republic Steel and the CIO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1945

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following reprint from the Washington Post of November 27, 1945:

CIO UNION STRIKE VOTE THREATENS CONTRACT VIOLATION

On August 11, 1942, Republic Steel Corp. signed a contract with the United Steelworkers Union (CIO).

On April 11, 1945, a new contract was signed. It runs until October 15, 1946.

The union's contract with Republic is a written document, signed by national officers and the local union presidents of the United Steelworkers Union, as well as by Republic.

Both the 1942 and the 1945 contracts contain a specific agreement on the part of the union that there will not be any strikes for the duration of such contracts.

This no-strike pledge in the existing contract reads as follows:

"During the term of the agreement, neither the union nor any employee, individually or collectively, shall cause or take part in any strike or other interruption or any impeding of production at any plant of the company covered by this agreement."

In return for this no-strike pledge and for the express purpose of enabling the union to discipline any members who might violate such pledge, the union was granted maintenance of union membership and the compulsory check-off of union dues.

In the face of this solemn pledge not to strike for the duration of the contract, the union has petitioned for, and the National Labor Relations Board—at public expense—will conduct a vote on November 28, 1945, to determine whether or not Republic employees want to go on strike.

Republic protested the taking of this strike vote and so informed the National Labor Relations Board. The Board, through its Chairman, informed Republic, "Let me state at the outset that the National Labor Relations Board would much prefer not to take any action which might encourage strikes in violation of collective bargaining agreements." The Board then pointed out that when a petition is filed, the Board has no alternative but must hold the election.

Regardless of what the Board may be required to do—regardless of what the outcome of this strike vote may be—the United Steelworkers Union (CIO) and Republic employees are definitely bound by their contract not to strike.

Any strike of Republic employees during the life of this contract—whether it has been approved by a vote or not—would be a direct, flagrant violation of the contract which the union has with the company.

REPUBLIC STEEL CORP.

Transportation of Troops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks a letter from the Secretary of War concerning the transportation of troops back to the United States.

This letter was in answer to one which I addressed to the Secretary on October 31 and concerning which I made comment in a speech in the House on November 16. Both because of these facts and also because of the important contents of the letter, I am inserting it in the RECORD:

NOVEMBER 20, 1945.

Hon. JERRY VOORHIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JERRY: After receiving your letter of October 31, concerning the return of servicemen from overseas, I asked the Chief of Transportation to look into the matter very thoroughly and then submit a report to me. Although this has caused some delay in replying to your letter, I wanted to be sure of the facts and satisfied that every available piece of adequate transport equipment was being utilized.

I have read with interest your remarks addressed to the House on this subject on November 16, and have noted your proposals in this connection. Please be assured that all available shipping, both Army and Navy, suitable for the transport of troops is being utilized to its fullest extent.

Allocations of available shipping to theaters is based on the theater commander's space requirements predicated on the number of men eligible for return under the current War Department readjustment procedure. This procedure is the basis for the determination of military personnel's adjusted service-rating scores. In its computation, consideration is given, among other factors, to each man's length of service, both overseas and within the continental United States. From this score, each man's priority for return to the United States is established.

Theater commanders have been instructed to utilize all available space, including that allocated to another service which should happen to be in excess of its requirements for any particular voyage. In accordance with these instructions, joint loadings between services, including Navy battle craft, have been effected.

A large percentage of vessels, designed primarily for cargo, have been converted in part for the carrying of personnel. In seeking the maximum use for each vessel, many factors must be considered. Among these are the vessel's construction, type, speed, reefer, and dry-storage capacity, life-saving equipment, as well as the personnel and supply requirements of the theater. These factors largely determine the number and particular vessels for conversion. All ships, including those converted in part for carrying of passengers returning from the Pacific theater, are filled to maximum passenger capacity. This applies, also, to aircraft.

During the month of October, about 160,000 Army personnel arrived in the United States from the Pacific area. It is anticipated that approximately 190,000 Army personnel will arrive during November, and 200,000 in December.

I am keeping after this matter, and assure you that everything possible is being and will be done to bring our veterans back home as soon as possible.

With best personal wishes,
Sincerely yours,
ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

Army Discharges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1945

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the enclosed letter has been received by me today, and I am refraining from leaving the signature attached to the letter for obvious reasons. This letter, however, has been sent to me by a man whom I have known for years and in whom I have the utmost confidence.

On November 8 this battalion was informed that they would embark from the port of Manila on the 11th; however, on the 11th they were told that they might possibly leave sometime between November 20 and December 1. Such indecision is wearing upon these boys who are waiting to come home, and I sincerely hope that every possible effort

will be made by the Army to prevent what is described in the letter as "sweating out." The letter is as follows:

FIVE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FIFTH
SIGNAL AIRCRAFT WARNING
BATTALION, LUZON, P. I.,
San Francisco, Calif., November 14, 1945.

DEAR SIR: I am one of 2,700 enlisted men of the Five Hundred and Sixty-fifth Signal Aircraft Warning Battalion located near Clark Field, Luzon, P. I. Fifty-two percent of my organization have 70 or more points or are over 35 years of age. No man has less than 60 points. The organization is a class IV unit.

Hostilities have ceased and I no longer feel it a duty or obligation to refrain from asking for answers to questions that are vital importance to me. I feel, rather, that now we should have the facts—and all of them. These questions I list as being most important at this time.

First. Why is it not possible to return personnel from this theatre so that they may be discharged on a par, in regard to points, with Stateside personnel?

Second. If there is no possibility of doing so, why cannot we be told definitely when we will return? This would eliminate "sweating out" an indefinite period of time, mail stoppage, the let down following false rumors, and the many other disappointments.

Third. The publicity attending the return of divisions, etc., is grossly misleading in that it tends to indicate that personnel of all units or organizations of comparable point average are also on their way home. Must this publicity continue to confuse our families and lower our morals?

Yes, hostilities ceased some time ago. The Japs aren't shooting at us now, but the insects are—and their aim is better. The boredom is here—and the heat—the poor chow—and the regimentation. Our mail has been stopped at San Francisco and we are stopped here.

I would be sincerely grateful, if through any means available to you, something might be done to bring us back to our families and loved ones.

What's the Word, Mac?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 29, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, if any piece of writing ever carried its own message and required no comment from me or anyone else, it is the following feature editorial written by Paul C. Smith, editor of the San Francisco Chronicle and appearing in that paper on November 18. Without saying more than simply that it should be read by every single Member of Congress and every American citizen, under unanimous consent, I include it with my remarks herewith:

WHAT'S THE WORD, MAC?
(By Paul C. Smith)

Last night I had a little bull session with an ex-marine friend of mine. Never mind his name. You will find it on a white cross in a former rice paddy out on Guam. He wasn't a hero. That is, he wasn't a hero because nobody decorated him for anything. He just got his head cut off by a concealed machine gun shortly after he jumped out of the amphtrac down on the left flank, by Adelup Point.

He is buried out there now, but he has been dropping in on me lately to bat the breeze.

Last night he started off the conversation by saying: "Say, Mac, what the hell is going on back there Stateside?

"When we hit the beach out here, 16 months ago, everybody said he knew what it was all about.

"We had a war on. The job was to win it. Some of us didn't get far as individuals, but you people who had the luck to make Stateside again got your victory, and so did the people who never left the States.

"We're not beefing, but it seems to some of us out here, stirring around under our crosses, that a lot of you back there have been doing some awful fast forgetting.

"Where are you headed back there anyway? Give us the scoop. Don't you know there's a peace on?

"Don't you know there are a lot of 'beach heads' that have to be taken if you are going to win this peace? We can't win it for you, Buddy."

"Well, it's pretty complex, you know," I interrupted. But he went right on.

"Maybe so, Mac, maybe so. It all depends on your point of view, I guess. But what's everybody scared of back there? They look to me like they've got the old stuff right up to their necks. Fear, fear, fear—doom, doom, doom—what a battle cry. I don't remember the boys yellin' that on the way up to the top of Suribachi. So you're scared of the atomic bomb? It's complex and so you are in a dither. Well, isn't that tough? What's the matter? Are you afraid it'll kill you any deader than a couple of machine-gun slugs? As long as you've got something so hot in the atomic bomb, why don't you knock off the blue funk and settle down to figure out how to use atomic energy to remove the basic causes of war?

"What's that stuff the papers are full of about the mistakes of the past? Of course, there were a lot of dumb people in the war, along with a lot of pretty solid Joes who turned in performances that got you your victory. But that's water over the dam. Why are you wasting your time and substance in sneers and jeers? Why not concentrate your brains and energy on the present and the future, and make some honest effort to whip up a deal without some of the dumbness of the past?"

"Well, now, in politics you know—." The very expression on his face interrupted me.

"Politics, my aching back," he said. "I didn't get my noggin shot off for a lot of dopey politicians. Or did I? And speaking of politics, what's going on in this Indonesian and this China show? I see some big four-star man—I forget his name—is telling my old buddies to 'shoot back' out in China. Well, O. K., they'll shoot when they're told. But just why are we out there? Why is anybody shooting at us? Yeah, I heard that part about guarding coal trains. O. K., Mac, but who are we guarding them against? Where's the coal coming from and who is it going to and why? Why doesn't somebody cut us in on the know? It doesn't take much shooting to start the whole works over again. Maybe this is the time we ought to know what we are trying to do.

"I know that if the next crop of marines and soldiers and sailors are caught up in another war, they're not going to run from it any more than we did this time. But what are the reasons for getting caught up in another mess?

"Who are your leaders back there now, anyway? Nobody seems to be putting out the plain, ungarbled word. What's your foreign policy? What's your national policy? What's this so-called industrial warfare all about? Isn't that just a fancy-pants term plain dump anarchy? In a nutshell, Mac, what's it all about? Have you lost your sense of direction? Where are you headed for?

"As you know, I'm not getting home on points, but Stateside still looks pretty good from over here. Botch it up much more, Mac, and—well, don't say I didn't warn you.

"What's the word, Mac?"

Surplus Doctors in Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 29, 1945

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I only want a minute on this busy day to read a letter from a constituent now stationed in Germany. The letter is self-explanatory.

We all know that our civilian population is in dire need of more physicians and surgeons, commonly called doctors. We all know that our veterans' hospitals are understaffed because of an apparent scarcity of medical men. In the light of these facts, my constituent's letter, written in Germany, is most revealing. It is difficult for me to answer his questions, and every Member of Congress will understand why. The conditions outlined must not be permitted to continue. I am not using my constituent's name for obvious reasons. I can, however, assure the House of his reliability. His letter is unusual, in that he does not insist on his discharge, other than in his regular turn under the regulations. He is interested in keeping doctors where they are needed, and not detaining them in the service for the purpose mentioned in his communication. The letter reads:

NOVEMBER 10, 1945.
Representative EARL C. MICHENER,
House of Representatives,
The United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MICHENER: This is to introduce myself. I am a captain in the Medical Corps of the United States Army. My home is ———, Mich., and I graduated from the University of Michigan Medical School.

I am seeking information as to the status of the redeployment of medical officers. From my personal experience and talking with other medical men, I have verified what is common knowledge over here; that is, a majority of medical men in the Third Army area have little or nothing to do. In this field hospital, we have 15 medical officers, and I can assure you that 3 doctors doing a reasonable day's work could easily handle all the work we have to do. Furthermore, in this same town is a clearing station with another six doctors, who have next to nothing to do.

There is no question in the minds of my fellow officers and myself that this installation is entirely superfluous. Yet why is it being kept open? So far as I can see there is only one answer to that question. We have a Regular Army commanding officer, and this hospital is maintained mainly so that he can have a command. Since he has come here he has made every effort to build up the patient census, in certain cases to the actual detriment of the patient. The

Regular Army officers will give us absolutely no satisfaction as to our status, and in every way indicate that they simply do not care whether we ever get home or not.

Another question I would like to have answered is why should there be such a disparagement in the critical point score for medical officers and enlisted men? We are just as much in excess and just as useless over here, and we believe we should be sent home on the same basis.

Furthermore if the Army is to persist in its stupid and costly policy in regard to doctors, is anything being done to send over replacements for us? I understand that about 15,000 doctors have graduated under the ASTP. Are these men being taken into the Army and will they be sent overseas to replace us? So far I have not met or heard of any of these individuals being over here.

Can you give us any information in regard to the shipping situation? From our point of view the whole picture is very confused and it does not appear that every effort is being made to hasten the homeward redeployment of troops. According to the figures in the Stars and Stripes shipments are falling off steadily. Yet there are still hundreds of thousands of men over here and, believe me, we are as anxious to get home as the men who have gone before us.

Incidentally, I have 65 points and I do not want to go home before my just turn. But I am anxious to see results and to obtain just redeployment of medical officers. The men who helped win this war for the United States do not relish lingering over here as the forgotten Army.

I certainly will appreciate any information and help you can give us in regard to the above problems.

Very sincerely yours.

Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 29, 1945

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in the past week, since the General Motors strike began, we have heard Members of this House ask anxiously about innocent citizens who have no part in the present conflict. I wish to include in my remarks an excerpt from the diary of one of our most distinguished citizens, the former First Lady of the Land, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt:

STRIKES

So far, in the General Motors strike, I think the labor representatives are showing a more public-spirited attitude than the company officials. Why should anyone in any business these days refuse to conduct further negotiations if these will lead to production? When labor is willing to have the Government conciliators present there should be no objection. It looks as though the company officials were not interested in production. Of course, we know that it would probably not hurt the company financially if they were not to be in active production until the first of the year. But even if they do not lose money, they should be interested in the public.

We are anxious to get new cars, and we are also anxious to see the resumption of work in all lines of business production in this country. It is bad for the morale of the rest of the world when we do not produce.

Wrong Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 29, 1945

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Akron Beacon Journal of November 27, 1945:

WRONG APPROACH

There's no doubt about it. Relations between management and labor are in a mess.

Collective bargaining sessions are hopelessly deadlocked over the wage issue. Interpretations of existing contracts are miles apart. Strikes are breaking out all over the country.

So far as we know, no one has a sure-fire remedy. The trouble is that too many people and organizations are trying to take advantage of the situation to put across their own favorite schemes. In most cases, they would kill rather than cure.

Congress has a whole hopper full of labor legislation. As public sentiment against crippling strikes rises, there is a hazard that laws will be passed which will do more harm than good.

For instance, the Rules Committee of the House is giving the green light to the Military Affairs Committee on a bill which originally was designed to repeal the Smith-Connally antistrike law, so called, but which now has all manner of antilabor clauses tacked to it.

The Smith-Connally law was a poor piece of legislation in the first place. It is ridiculous now, because of the way in which it involves the Government as a virtual sponsor of strike votes.

Without question, repeal of the Smith-Connally law is long overdue. But the ill-conceived new restrictions which antilabor Congressmen are trying to sneak through at the same time will only make things worse.

For instance, the provision that would punish a labor union which struck in violation of a no-strike clause by suspending its collective bargaining provisions for a year and by making it subject to suits for damages.

Obviously, the effect would be that labor unions would no longer accept no-strike clauses. So that restraining influence, for whatever it is worth, would be lost.

Nor can we approve of the clause that would further restrict union activity and contributions in political campaigns.

Most union members are citizens and if they want to throw their weight around in an organized way for certain candidates, we don't see but what they have a right to do so. Business and industrial organizations have always had their say in politics.

It's not too surprising that there should be a lot of strikes at this time. During the war there was a moral compulsion to stay on the job. That has been removed. The result is obvious.

It is understandable that the workers want upward wage adjustments to offset loss of overtime pay during the war. It is also understandable that in the present state of uncertainty, employers are hesitant about committing themselves to paying more money. That makes it doubly hard to reach agreement on this most vital of issues.

We'd like to see unions become more responsible, more conscientious about living up to their contracts. We'd also like to see unionists more anxious to give a full money's worth of productive activity during their working hours.

We wish that more employers would discard double talk and stalling as tactics in collective bargaining.

Perhaps it's too idealistic to hope for such enlightened attitudes in this time of turmoil.

Of this, however, we are convinced: The labor turmoil won't be cured by repressive legislation. The lasting cure must come from within—by both labor and management taking saner, more realistic attitudes.

Hon. Edward E. Browne

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERLIN HULL
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Hon. Edward Everett Browne, a Member of the House of Representatives for 18 years, closes the long and honorable career of one of Wisconsin's ablest men whose great service to his State and to his Nation was marked by his sterling character and unimpeachable integrity. The news of his passing on November 23, 1945, at the age of 77 years, brings sorrow to his former colleagues in Congress, and to his host of friends in his native State.

Mr. Browne was born at Waupaca, Wis., on February 16, 1868. He graduated from the law school of the University of Wisconsin in 1892, and at once entered in the practice of his profession in his native city. He served three terms as district attorney of Waupaca County. Gaining early distinction as an attorney, he was elected to the Wisconsin State Senate, in which he served 8 years. Among the many good laws of which he was the author and sponsor were Wisconsin's first highway aid law and an enactment establishing a system of State parks.

He served as a member of the board of regents of the University of Wisconsin from 1905 to 1907. Later he was a member of the Wisconsin Conservation Commission from 1937 to 1941, and for several years past he was curator of the Wisconsin Historical Society.

He was elected to Congress in 1912, and continuously was reelected by large majorities, serving in the House of Representatives until 1931. His congressional career was of broad service to his constituency and to the Nation. He was an earnest student of public affairs, and conscientiously enlisted his support in favor of measures in which the welfare of the common people was advanced.

Upon retiring from Congress he again resumed the practice of his profession at Waupaca and continued active until his final illness. In later years he was associated in his practice with his son, Thomas.

Of sincere Christian training, he exemplified his faith in his daily life and it was his guide in his public as well as professional career. He was a good man, one whose years were spent in the cause of humanity, and his great following of

friends attest the high esteem in which he was held by all.

The following eloquent tribute to Mr. Browne is from the Capital Times at Madison, an editorial by his long-time friend, Hon. William T. Evjue:

EDWARD E. BROWNE

One of the great names of Wisconsin's golden era has quietly closed a life of service to the people and stepped out of a world for whose betterment he had made a lifelong fight.

Few men have dedicated their time, energy, and ability to serve the public as wholeheartedly and unselfishly as did Edward E. Browne, of Waupaca. He came early in the fight for a people's government and he stayed late. He asked but one thing of the world and that was to serve the people he loved.

As a young man just starting out in his law practice he saw the great challenge of his day—the slow strangulation of America's new-born democracy by a rising industrial feudalism. Like the elder La Follette, he accepted the challenge. He joined Wisconsin's Progressive movement and plunged into a fight that was to electrify the Nation and offer inspiration to all who believed in good, clean, democratic government.

There was hardly a field of public activity in which he did not share and leave his stamp. The people of Waupaca County three times asked him to serve them as district attorney. As the Progressive cause broadened and intensified for State-wide reforms they sent him to Madison as their representative in the State senate. In the two terms he served in that body he erected a living memorial to himself by writing and fighting through the first highway-aid bill and State park-extension measure.

Progressives then were determined to carry the fight into the national level. The people of his congressional district asked him to represent them in that historic battle. He served for 18 years as a Member of the House of Representatives with honor and distinction.

The University of Wisconsin felt the influence of his ideals when he served for a time on the board of regents. For 4 years he helped to shape the policies of Wisconsin's conservation department.

Much of the good in the lives of the people of this State and Nation is due to the devotion and high sense of public responsibility of Edward E. Browne. Much of the bad is still with us because the world has too few men of his caliber.

Stamp Honoring Commodore John Barry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I have today written to Postmaster General Robert E. Hannegan, urging that he expedite the departmental approval of design for the stamp commemorating the bicentennial anniversary of the birth of Commodore John Barry, "Father of the American Navy," proposed in S. 1620 by Senator JAMES MEAD, and H. R. 4787 by Representative WILLIAM B. BARRY. I intend to actively cooperate with these colleagues in having the legislation promptly approved by the House and Senate.

Many important organizations of men and women of Irish blood in my district have for years sought this recognition for Commodore Barry, who fought in the Revolution both on land and sea, cooperated with the founding fathers in establishing this Nation. It was he who outfitted the first fleet of the Colonies, who carried our emissaries to solicit, successfully, aid from France, including food, clothing, and munitions for Washington's suffering army, who fired the last gun at sea in the Revolution. In our Navy under the Constitution he received the commission No. 1, and was at the head of the United States Navy under three Presidents—from June 5, 1794, until his death September 14, 1803—under Presidents Washington, Adams, and Jefferson. It was he who first advocated a Navy Department separate from the War Department, supported by President Adams, was retained as senior captain by President Jefferson when the then existing Navy was taken off the seven seas.

Truly, "no American naval hero was deserved of posterity greater appreciation of his career and received less than John Barry," and truly, as was written into his first appreciative biography in the leading magazine of those days, the Port Folio, in July 1813:

So many of the distinguished naval men of the present day commenced their career under Commodore Barry, that he may justly be considered as the "Father of our Navy."

Unique Philippine-United States Relationship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLOS P. ROMULO

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1945

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the November 9, 1945, issue of the Washington Post, and my reply thereto which appeared in the November 13, 1945, issue of the same paper.

At this critical juncture in Filipino-American relations I feel that it is of the utmost importance that we understand clearly the true nature of the absolutely unique relationship between the two peoples. This editorial is clearly indicative of the confusion which exists in the public mind concerning the bonds existing between the United States and the Philippines, and I deem it my duty to clarify what I believe is the fundamental relationship between the United States and the Philippines.

[From the Washington Post of November 9, 1945]

CONSISTENCY

Consistency is a jewel, but of late it has become pretty tarnished in our foreign policy. Consider the British-American negotiations in the light of our colonial policy. With Presidential approval Senator TYDINGS introduced a bill last May which would permit the Puerto Ricans to decide by referendum vote whether they desired independence, statehood, or some form of dominion status. The bill also provided that, whatever the form of government chosen, free-trade relationships would be maintained between the island and the United States except for tariffs imposed by mutual consent. It specifically declared that the importation of Puerto Rican sugar into this country should continue "on a basis not more restrictive in principle than that which has prevailed during the last 5 years in which a quota was imposed under United States law."

A few days ago Senator TYDINGS introduced another bill, this time for the rehabilitation of the Philippine Islands, permitting establishment of preferential tariff rates and duty-free quotas on a specified list of articles, under the terms of an executive agreement to be authorized between the President of the United States and the President of the Philippines. The bill provides also for the duty-free admission of 850,000 tons of Philippine sugars and the allocation of quotas among island mills that were exporting to the United States in 1940.

Undoubtedly the United States is under obligation to see that Puerto Rico and the Philippines do not pay too great an economic price for political independence. Special agreements and concessions are undoubtedly justified to assist them to raise living standards. But it is at the same time necessary to view specific concessions in relation to long-range policies and objectives and to consider the effect of such concessions upon other countries. More particularly, we shall run the risk once again of being inconsistent in our foreign policy. At the moment we are negotiating with the British for the abandonment of their trade preferences and their empire preferences. Talking one way and acting another is not the way to behave for a great power anxious to keep world goodwill.

NOVEMBER 9, 1945.

To the EDITOR OF THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I should like to record my astonishment at the inconsistencies revealed in the editorial on consistency which appears in this morning's Washington Post.

The writer of this editorial claims that proposals for a special Philippine-American trade relationship are inconsistent with American desires that Britain abandon her system of Empire preferences.

To my knowledge, there is no British dominion or colony which holds the same relationship to the United Kingdom as the relationship of the Philippines to the United States. If there were, I doubt whether many Americans would object to British treatment of such dominion or colony that would correspond to the proposed American assistance to the Philippines.

Ours is the only subject people in the world who have grown toward independent status with the help of the colonizing power. That was the reason why our people fought when American sovereignty was attacked in the Philippines—which, as you know, cannot be said of any other area in the Orient where a western flag flew. Our reward for the bitter resistance we put up to the enemy was total destruction. Our cities and homes are rubble. Our fields have been ravaged and are now barren. Our industries are gone.

To help us get back on our feet, we need assistance from the United States, not as charity but as simple justice. Getting back on our feet is a business proposition. No businessman is going to rebuild his factory unless he has reasonable assurance that he will be able to sell his products. Our only market outside the Philippines—as a result

of American policy since 1909—has been the United States. It is, therefore, proposed that 20 years of quota-limited free trade be assured our two countries, thereby giving our farmers and businessmen the opportunity to restore our shattered economy.

This is no revolutionary idea. It is the logical end product of America's commitment, which began when the United States assumed sovereignty over the Philippines, deepened when the United States insisted on tying our economy to its own, intensified when the United States admitted its economic responsibilities to the Philippines in the words of the Philippine Independence Act, and wound up in the many pledges made to us by your Congress and your elected leaders during and after World War II. If there is any consistency to be asked for, I suggest that you look to the consistency of American pledges to recognize and protect—economically as well as militarily—our forthcoming independence. Among them was President Roosevelt's message broadcast to us while we were fighting in Bataan in which he said, "I give to the people of the Philippines my solemn pledge that their freedom will be redeemed and their independence established and protected."

CARLOS P. ROMULO,
Resident Commissioner from the Philippines to the United States.

Three Sides to a Labor Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 29, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence:

[From the United States News of November 30, 1945]

THREE SIDES TO A LABOR DISPUTE

(By David Lawrence)

PUBLIC IS THE INNOCENT BYSTANDER WHO GETS HURT IN CONFLICT BETWEEN MANAGEMENT AND WORKERS—THE GOVERNMENT'S OBLIGATION TO SEE THAT BOTH PARTIES MEDIATE THEIR DIFFERENCES

The general impression is that labor and management are the only parties to a labor dispute. Hence they fight it out by strikes or lock-outs and insist that the rest of the citizens must await the outcome.

But in all this strife there is an innocent bystander who gets hurt. He is the party of the third part—the public.

The public at the moment needs motor-vehicle transportation. Not only is there a shortage of new cars due to the restrictions on production during the war period, but many automobiles now operating on the roads are a menace to safety.

The public needs jobs.

The armed services are being demobilized and the returning soldiers and sailors have expected to return to a peaceful America where they could resume their normal occupations.

What do they find today? Two powerful economic groups engaged in bitter strife while the public interest is apparently unrepresented by anybody. The curious tendency of President Truman and his administration to assume that Government must keep its hands off while an internal war goes on is merely the supine acceptance of economic anarchy.

For neither labor nor management has a right to commit the Nation to economic war. They cannot exert economic pressure on each other without impinging on the rights of the public.

People's interest paramount

Mr. Truman has been told that the way to convert from wartime to peacetime is to abolish the war boards and let nature take its course. This is a philosophy more reminiscent of the Harding-Coolidge-Hoover attitude than the Grover Cleveland-Theodore Roosevelt-Woodrow Wilson-Franklin Roosevelt concept of the Federal obligation. It is Republican conservatism rather than Democratic liberalism which Mr. Truman has evidently adopted as his guide.

The American people want a President to exercise and assert leadership when economic anarchy approaches. They are not concerned with technicalities or prejudices—they want the people's interest protected by orderly and courageous government.

Labor disputes are not novel. The fundamental issues surrounding them are decades old. What is needed is clear and forthright action to protect the public as against encroachments by both labor and management. Mr. Truman is mistaken if he continues to assume that the labor controversies are two-sided. They are three-sided and he not only is a party to the automobile strike, but he represents by far the largest interest involved—the public interest.

Paper plans impractical

Mr. Truman is new at his job. He is cautious about taking a stand because perhaps he is unfamiliar with the background. He started out with the theory that if he appointed a disinterested and honest man as Secretary of Labor he could delegate to that Cabinet officer the whole problem of labor. He took a paper plan and decided to assemble all bureaus and boards into one department. This was a grave error.

It is unwise to group administrative and judicial functions in the same department. Commissions and boards must remain free from political or executive influence. The way to handle these matters is to deal with labor problems as such irrespective of what jurisdictions or functions are involved and thus to provide effective facilities—not one but several—so as to encourage the settlement of labor disputes.

Mr. Truman was told that one trouble with the War Labor Board was that it became a sort of compulsory arbitration agency and that labor and management didn't bargain collectively but simply passed the buck to the tribunal. The War Labor Board, on the whole, administered its job fairly well but it was not responsible for the break-down of collective bargaining. War conditions which brought wage control did that. As long as it was the Federal Government which controlled both wages and prices it was inevitable that the Government should be required to act as a means of compelling arbitration.

But when VJ-day came, the President was mistaken in announcing the liquidation of the War Labor Board without setting up immediately some other tribunal to take care of the public interest. Neither he nor his Secretary of Labor saw that what labor and management really were urging was a free hand to do as they pleased—to demand the highest wages and to refuse to grant such demands without increases in price.

Since the administration retained control of prices it was illogical to say to the management group that it could nevertheless raise wages and adhere to ceiling prices just the same. The situation was not helped by the President's vague proposal that industry and business might well increase prices somewhat and absorb the increased costs out of profits while waiting for volume to grow and efficiency in production to rise.

America's economic system is much too complex to be dealt with by blanket pronouncements or by an inflexible formula. The theory that prices can be maintained at the same level or even reduced as volume grows is in itself inapplicable to many lines of business which make high-cost products in a narrow market. It is also impractical in those industries where basic costs of materials or labor are subject to fluctuation or seasonal variation.

A wage inflation can be as dangerous as an inflation resulting from speculation in securities. The whole economic mechanism can get out of gear and be wrecked if any two wheels start going opposite ways.

The Government of the United States, as the representative of the American people, must steer away from the perils of economic anarchy.

How shall this be done? By compulsory arbitration? By prohibiting strikes and lock-outs? By a system of voluntary arbitration?

Groups are amenable to law

The American people do not wish individual or group rights to be abridged. The right of an employee to quit work is basic in the right to strike. The right of an employer to shut down a plant is the right to strike. But when individuals conspire to bring about a strike or a lock-out they are subject to public regulation.

We have for years conceded that big corporations must be regulated by law. We have not conceded as yet that big labor unions must be regulated by law. The public interest demands both up to and including certain obligations to the people as a corollary to the operation of businesses or organizations.

The process of regulation need not in any sense impair individual freedoms or the freedom of private enterprise. A simple solution has been indicated for many years. The time has come to put it into effect.

First of all while the right to collective bargaining has been recognized, there are no written rules for its conduct. Congress must provide those rules.

When two parties to a dispute get irritated or angry with one another, as happens often in labor disputes, it is desirable that a third party who doesn't get angry and is interested only in healing verbal wounds and bringing the parties together should come into the picture. The method of selecting such mediators, not arbitrators, can be prescribed by Congress. The Federal and State governments can train and supply them.

Compulsory mediation

Existing statutes should be amended by Congress so that both parties will be required to avail themselves of mediating machinery before resorting to strikes or lock-outs. The public is entitled to that much consideration. If this be deemed compulsory, then it may be recalled that the obligation to bargain collectively with a bona fide majority of the employees is already compulsory.

So long as agreement on terms isn't compulsory the public interest demands that the parties shall at least be required to follow orderly processes in attempting to arrive at voluntary agreements. But, supposing mediation does occur? What then? The mediator can suggest arbitration but this should also be voluntary—not obligatory on the parties. And supposing one side or the other still refuses? Then the Government should require the appointment of a fact-finding panel in each case and the parties must be required by law to await the publication of these fact-finding reports—not later than 60 days after submission of the cases.

When the facts are given to the public, one side or the other will yield. Most disputes will never get to that stage. The vice of the present system is that, under cover of secrecy, selfishness and greed are common on both

sides of labor disputes. The public is entitled to have these arbitrary positions exposed to the healthy air of discussion.

This method has, in a sense, been used in the field of railway transportation under the Railroad Mediation Act. It has been tried. It is effective. Why not protect the public interest by extending the principle at once to all labor disputes?

If President Truman falls down on the job—as he apparently has in failing to prevent the auto strike—then it is up to Congress.

When will Congress act or will the American people be compelled to weed out the timid and the passive from the ranks of both the Republican and Democratic Parties in the primaries a few months hence?

Plenty of returning servicemen are talking of running for Congress. They may find political ammunition in the failue of the present Congress to provide effective means of settling labor-management disputes.

Veterans' Hospital Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Lt. Col. Harry E. Brown, Acting Director, Hospitalization Service, gave the following talk to the house of delegates, American Hospital Association, Chicago, Ill., November 5, 1945.

Later a resolution was passed by delegates of the American Hospital Association to assist Veterans' Administration at cost.

General Hawley regrets that he is unable to be with you this evening. I, too, regret that his plans had to be changed very suddenly, for he, more than anyone else, could give you a clear picture of the problems with which he is faced.

When General Bradley was appointed Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, he asked and received permission from the President to select a few key officers from the Army as his advisers. Among these officers was Maj. Gen. Paul R. Hawley, Medical Corps, United States Army. General Hawley was Chief Surgeon, Communication Zone, European Theater of Operations, and Chief Surgeon, European Theater of Operations, from June 1944 to May 1945. In addition to his primary responsibility for the health of more than 3,000,000 American military personnel, he was responsible to a very large degree for the care of the civilian population in the areas of Europe in which the American armies were engaged, prisoners of war, and Italian service units.

General Hawley established a medical service which reached far forward to the battle lines to give immediate support to the wounded and to see that they were rapidly evacuated to areas where they could be treated by the most modern methods. Through his knowledge, gained over many years, and recognized ability, it was possible to set a record of saving the lives of 96 out of every 100 wounded soldiers. He supervised over 318 hospitals and convalescent units, the evacuation of more than one-half million casualties from the Army areas, and nearly 200,000 to the United States. This task required superior coordination and management.

This is the officer that General Bradley has selected as Acting Surgeon General of the Veterans' Administration to reorganize the Medical Service of the Administration.

The Veterans' Administration, insofar as the medical service is concerned, is faced with three major problems:

1. Quantity and quality of professional personnel.

2. Lack of bed capacity to care for the veterans who are entitled to such care under the present laws.

3. Out-patient service.

The shortage of personnel will not be discussed at this time. No doubt all of you have or are experiencing this in the operation of your own hospitals.

At the present time the Veterans' Administration is operating 97 hospitals and, in addition, has in excess of 5,000 patients hospitalized in other governmental and civilian hospitals.

As of October 18, 1945, the census of the veterans hospitals was 69,661, of whom 45,605 are non-service-connected.

The bed capacity of the veterans' hospitals is 72,157. In addition there are approximately 11,000 emergency beds that must be eliminated at the earliest possible moment. It can be very readily seen that the facilities of the Veterans' Administration are sadly overtaxed.

Authorization has been received to increase this capacity by approximately 50,000 beds, consisting of additions to present hospitals; the construction of new hospitals and the acquisition of approximately 3,500 beds constructed by the Army and Navy for the Veterans' Administration. It will be at least 2 years before all of these beds will be available for use by the Veterans' Administration. The present planning indicates that by 1950 there will be need of additional 15,000 beds.

New hospitals and additions must be located according to the veteran population of the various States.

Hospitals will be of four standard sizes: 200, 500, 750 and 1,000 beds. The larger hospitals will be built near medical and teaching centers. The smaller hospitals will augment the larger ones. Although there are no available statistics, it is believed that approximately 25 percent of all patients admitted to the smaller hospitals will require hospitalization in the larger units where specialized care may be obtained.

In addition to providing hospital facilities, the medical service is faced with the problem of conducting a large number of physical examinations and applicants claims for compensation and pension. It is anticipated that approximately 1,300,000 veterans will require physical examinations during the year 1946, and 1,500,000 during the year 1947. The same number of examinations for other than claims for hospitalization purposes is anticipated. We do not have the adequate medical staff to conduct this large number of examinations, and consequently must ask the help of the medical profession throughout the United States to aid us in this work.

It is General Hawley's aim to raise the standard of the veterans hospitals to such an extent that they will be recognized for internship and residencies. To do this he must, and will, have the complete support of the American Medical Association. As a matter of fact, the medical profession has shown its willingness to cooperate to the fullest extent.

General Hawley desires very much to secure the help of the American Hospital Association in the vast program with which he is confronted. It is hoped that he will receive the same support and cooperation from you gentlemn that he has received from the medical profession. Unless he does receive this support, and I am sure he will, his task will be much more difficult.

We hope that arrangements can be made whereby private hospitals throughout the United States will hospitalize a large number, perhaps 20,000, veterans in their own hospitals on a contractual basis. It is realized that many problems will have to be solved so that your hospitals will be reimbursed for the care they will give to our patients. There is no doubt, however, that some sort of formula can be worked out whereby hospitals can determine their cost in exactly the same way. We all realize that the operating cost of hospitals varies sometimes to a large extent, even though the general service is approximately the same. It is not the desire of the Administration that any hospital care for our patients at a loss.

If desired, the Veterans' Administration will furnish clerical help to those hospitals caring for our patients, provided the number of patients will justify it. I can assure you that regulations and red tape will be cut to a minimum in any contract that may be agreed upon.

I again express my regret that General Hawley could not be with you for I know he would have presented his problem in a much more enlightening way. However, I am sure that all of you agree that we are faced with a very difficult problem and that you will help us solve it.

Discharge of Soldiers in the Western Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER H. GROSS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1945

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

OKINAWA, *November 18, 1495.*

The Congressmen from the State of Pennsylvania, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIRS: As Representatives of the people of the State of Pennsylvania, you are entitled to know certain facts and figures concerning the readjustment of Army personnel whom you represent. It is therefore the purpose of this letter to inform you of certain deficiencies which exist on the island of Okinawa, Ryukyu group.

The writer has personally seen a certain wire or radiogram, an official document, which was sent from the commanding general, Okinawa Base Command, to the commanding general, Armed Forces Western Pacific. The document was far more in detail than I can now remember since the "wire" is no longer available to me, however, I shall relate the contents as nearly correct as I remember them—they will be neither enlarged upon or exaggerated.

Based upon the contents of the document, which was compiled as of November 17, 1945, the data therefrom follows:

1. There are in the vicinity of 3,000 men with points from 80 to 105, inclusive.

2. There are 3,500 men who are 35 to 38 years of age.

3. There are approximately 8,500 men in the groups 75 points to 105 points, and the 35- to 38-year-old-man group.

4. There are over 39,000 men in all eligible groups—including the 60-point group.

5. As of the date of this document, there were, I believe, a total of six ships en route Okinawa to return eligible men to the States.

Of this total, one ship was in Okinawa waters undergoing repairs, to be made available between the 25th and the 28th of November with a loading capacity of approximately 1,100 men; another ship was still in port in the United States; the remaining ships were en route Okinawa, via Japan, date of arrival at either point was unknown. The total loading capacity of the six ships combined was 6,012 spaces.

6. It was alluded by subtle intonation of the document that Okinawa was not on parity in allocation of available shipping spaces for men of this base compared with other bases of the Western Pacific area. This statement may be true if news items from Pacific edition of Stars and Stripes can be relied upon.

The difference between the total men eligible for readjustment and the total spaces available to return these men, as set forth in items 4 and 5 above, are far too vast. Coupled with a radio news item from San Francisco, November 17, 1945, to the effect that men who have 55 points, 3 children, or 4 years of active duty become eligible for readjustment as of December 1, 1945, the difference will assume astronomical proportions by comparison if the condition is not alleviated in the meantime.

You are reminded that the total number of men set forth in item 3 above have been eligible for discharge for a period from almost 2 months to more than 6 months that the total available spaces available to the island does not meet even the requirements of this group alone.

The situation has become desperate; the men's morale is at a low ebb. From groups with whom I have come in contact there is considerable talk, which cannot be entirely discounted, that the men would have been not much worse off had the United States been defeated in this war. There is also the opinion expressed that democracy is decadent, out of control, and needs to be curbed. Men are laying plans definitely not along democratic lines, principles, or ideals to replace this so-called decadent democracy with a government that will represent their views and principles. This, Mr. Congressmen, is detrimental to the country itself. I've heard men say the type government they desire is a "government even more democratic than a democratic government itself." This quotation, you will find, is direct from Karl Marx' Das Kapital, whose principles I'm sure you will agree are also not in line with a democratic government such as our own. The situation is alarming, and it is with this thought that this letter is written.

As representatives of the State of Pennsylvania, your representation on behalf of the men is sorely needed. It is requested you express the opinion of the thousands of men on Okinawa in order that they may return to their loved ones. In this manner you can perhaps help to heal the wounds of war and appease these men's bitterness, thereby perhaps helping to save America itself.

Yours sincerely.

Compulsory Peacetime Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, during the current widespread discussions on the subject of peacetime compulsory military training, I found of interest the following article written by Wendell Knoche, a senior in high school in my district. The author is one of those young men whose occupational and educational plans would be interrupted by the initiation of such a system in this country, and I believe he has expressed very well the hope of the vast majority of the people of this Nation that we will follow programs which will build a strong peace rather than embark on programs which breed distrust among nations and war:

Many people are of the opinion that wars are inevitable and that we shall have wars as long as civilization exists. The destructiveness and deadliness of the World Wars in the last century has proven without a question of a doubt that if we are to continue to exist, a method of ending wars must be found before much time has elapsed. Otherwise civilization shall perish. Military preparation and activity is certainly not a logical path for us to follow if our goal is the establishment of worldwide peace.

Peacetime military conscription has been weighed in the balance and found wanting in many European countries. This policy has led many countries to the brink of destruction and utter collapse. Militarism in some of our sister American republics has bred internal dissension and civil wars. Compulsory peacetime military training is in fact a breeder of wars. The conquests of Alexander, Caesar, and Napoleon have proven that military-minded nations have become aggressor nations. When nations arm to the teeth and put forth their energies into the establishment of huge armies and navies, situations arise or create themselves for the use of these forces.

We are interested in preserving our American form of democracy and this can be best accomplished by devoting our energies toward the establishment and maintenance of world-wide lasting peace. Much preparation and activity went into the much sought for United Nations. It is inconceivable that we, who were leaders in the creation of this idea, should take any course of action which would create disunity among the members of the very organization on which we are building our faith.

Compulsory peacetime military training forces upon an impressionable youth a type of discipline which is not in keeping with our peaceful democratic form of life. This form of training would bring a peace-loving America into an alinement with those European and Asiatic nations whose military activities have been the chief source of international fear and alarm in the past. These military activities have created incidents which have had a disturbing effect on neighboring nations and have often led to bloodshed.

Due to the rapid progress in the field of scientific inventions, it has been clearly proven that the super military minds of the present generation cannot prepare for the next war. France sealed her own doom by her blind faith in the invulnerability of the Maginot Line which was supposedly to act as a protection against any future wars. Instead of being a protection, it actually was the very cause of her collapse and subsequent defeat.

The Japanese relied on the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor as a means of a speedy victory in the Pacific. Instead of this, opinion was united in this country in a short period of 24 hours to make possible a Nation-wide activity in an all-out production effort which was to later be the very means of ending the Japanese threat to our security.

We are embarked upon a good-neighbor policy especially as it involves our sister nations. Intensive maneuvers, especially on our borders and on the high seas, will tend to disturb and alarm the very nations whose friendship we are striving so hard to obtain and hold. How are we to serve as an instrument of international peace and goodwill if we have not the confidence of the border nations?

Forced military training will make our neighboring countries embark on a similar policy even if it is contrary to their own ideals. Arming to keep up with the armaments of one's neighbors can lead to economic collapse and utter ruin.

After previous wars our leaders have striven diligently to steer our Nation on the paths that lead to lasting peace but somewhere along the road we were misguided by a few men in high places who succeeded in their own personal ambitions. This led us to the most disastrous and costly war in our entire history. Now that we are again seeking the road back to peace we are again confronted by leaders who are also trying to force on us a policy which will eventually lead to another devastating war.

Lawrence's Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., November 16, 1945:

LAWRENCE'S EXAMPLE

The neighboring community of Lawrence recently concluded a campaign to raise $600,000 for a new hospital.

After 3 months of intensive effort in which civic spirit and community morale rose to new peaks, more than $1,000,000 had been secured, or 166 percent of the original quota.

As a result, Lawrence will not only have a new, modern hospital, completely equipped, but a training school for nurses as well.

The purely financial results of the Lawrence campaign for the Bon Secours Hospital are impressive, but the demonstration of community cooperation, the ability to cross racial and creedal lines in a common cause, are even more notable.

Lawrence was faced with a need—a great need. A new hospital was urgently required to meet the demands of a growing area whose residents were becoming increasingly health-minded and who wanted the best care modern medical and surgical science can provide. Once the objective was clear Lawrence residents headed straight for the goal and they reached it in a surprisingly short time. When a community can raise more than $1,000,000 in 3 months, it means business.

Archbishop Richard J. Cushing summed up the secret of the success of the Lawrence drive when he said at its conclusion: "Here people of all nationalities and all faiths worked together in unity for a great cause."

We believe Lynn civic leaders and the community as a whole can profit from a study of Lawrence's achievement. Whether we decide we want a new hospital or new factories or new schools in Lynn, we can rest assured that we can attain them most speedily and most assuredly by uniting all the elements of the community behind the common cause, just as Lawrence did.

It is interesting to note, too, that Lawrence was fortunate to have the support of its banks and larger corporations as well as the rank and file of individual citizens. A good

part of the success of the drive was attributed to the assistance of the Lawrence Eagle-Tribune and its publisher, Irving E. Rogers, who went "all out" in support of the project. Lynn residents can be assured of similar support by The Item for any worthwhile local project. Any community undertaking will succeed only to the extent that the entire community gets behind it.

The Luce Resolution on Atomic Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 29, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Hartford Courant of November 22, and, under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MRS. LUCE ON ARMAMENTS

Connecticut's Representative CLARE BOOTHE LUCE has introduced into Congress a concurrent resolution into whose 46 words is packed a great deal of sense. The resolution, now before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, says simply this: "The Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery within the existing framework of the United Nations Organization for international control and reduction of armaments and weapons, especially those involving atomic power."

This resolution would take Congress even further than the Truman-Attlee-King proposal for a United Nations commission to make recommendations on atomic energy and weapons. Mrs. LUCE believes it would do much to clear the international air of suspicion as to our intentions, and to improve proposed domestic legislation on the atom. She is right. Just as the Connally and Fulbright resolutions were essential to making the United Nations Organization a reality, so Mrs. LUCE'S resolution might extricate the world from the exceedingly dangerous impasse into which our handling of the atomic bomb has put it. For no matter how innocent our intentions appear to ourselves, the fact is that not only Russia but all other nations suspect us of hugging the atomic bomb to our chests for our own purposes. To have Congress say that it wants the United Nations Organization to control and reduce atomic and other weapons would cut the ground out from under the world's conviction that this Nation, the supposed leader in world justice, would rather trust its own armed might than international action.

The resolution has added value in calling attention to the urgent need of reducing armaments all around. After the last war the Allies imposed disarmament on Germany under the plea that it was necessary "in order to render possible the initiation of a general limitation of the armaments of all nations." The League of Nations Covenant also called for the reduction of national armaments. But this time the United Nations Charter says nothing on the subject. And while the victor nations all sing the praises of international cooperation, they show their real thoughts by keeping their powder dry—in quantities unsurpassed in the history of the world. In this the United States, with its agitation for universal military training, its demand for bases far from our own shores but near other people's, its vast Navy and air fleets, is far from being without sin.

If Congress should pass Mrs. LUCE'S resolution, and make it a standard against which to measure its action on universal military training, and indeed all matters of armaments, it would do much to pump life into the United Nations Organization. And that Organization remains the only protection we have against the cataclysmic explosion another war would be.

Bankers' Splendid Activities in War Financing

REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 29, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I had occasion to make a statement on the floor of the House concerning the magnificent job that has been done by 6,000,000 of the people of the Nation in selling hundreds of billions of dollars of war bonds during the last 4½ years. Today I want to make a few further remarks covering the part that the bankers of the country have played in the completion of this extraordinary financing activity. I find that it is impossible to cite a body of statistics that measure the bankers' activities in connection with war financing, because bankers have been so intertwined in the entire sales program that their part cannot be taken out from the whole and set aside to be measured statistically. There is in this country no banker who has not participated in the war-financing program. There is hardly a bank teller who has not sold war bonds across the counter. There is hardly a bank employee who has not participated one way or another in the greatest war bond sales program ever undertaken in the world. The Treasury has relied on the help of the Nation's bankers during the 4½ years of defense and war financing, and it was happy and eager to accept their assistance in selling the bonds of freedom to the people of the country.

In peacetime as well as in wartime the banks of the country are styled the "prime official receivers" of subscriptions to the marketable securities issued by the Government. In this capacity they serve to help the Treasury with the distribution job by acting as thousands of outlets for the securities. But the banks did more than this. They solicited their customers and asked them to buy the securities.

Banks play even a greater role in the distribution of the savings bonds, particularly the series E bonds. These are the bonds upon which the Treasury has relied so much to hold the anti-inflation line. It astounds the imagination to realize that during the past 4½ years almost a billion separate and distinct savings bonds have been issued. That was a tremendous operating job. Practically every bank in the country enlisted in the ranks of those who helped put this large number of securities in the hands of 85,000,000 patriotic Americans. For this and for their services as "prime official receivers" of subscriptions to marketable securities, the United States Government has paid the banks not a single penny.

In addition, the Treasury had the problem of finding adequate redemption facilities as purchasers of series E bonds found that redemption of some of their purchases was necessary. More than 90 percent of the banks in the country—about 13,500 in the aggregate—have signed up to render this very important service.

AMBASSADORS OF THRIFT

In playing their part as sellers of Government bonds to the public, the bankers have justly been called ambassadors of thrift. The banks have been acutely familiar with the problems of war financing, dealing, as they do, with the savings of the public. Early in the war-financing program they realized the necessity of going down the line with the Treasury in siphoning off the increased earnings of the public in order to hold down the price level and to prevent inflation.

EXCELLENT COORDINATION JOB

The American Bankers Association and the Mutual Savings Bank Association have been active on the national level in coordinating the efforts of the banks in war financing. Committees on war bond drives were organized by both of these organizations with the idea of formulating a national program and presenting it to the member institutions through the State and local banking associations. Plans of action were created for the member banks and a wide variety of promotional material was distributed. The associations encouraged the use of State, regional, and city bank quotas for the sale of Government securities. They engendered the competition between banks in various communities. By use of national publicity they endeavored to elicit the fullest cooperation of the banks.

CUSTOMERS URGED TO BUY

Throughout the country individual banks have spent large sums of their own money in advertising the war bond drives. They have used newspaper advertisements, radio programs, bank-lobby displays, outdoor billboards, and the like. In addition, they personally solicited depositors and members of the public coming into the bank. The bankers have sent large quantities of literature explaining the war loan and the securities offered to their depositors and have continually urged them to buy as many securities as they possibly could.

Organization by banks of $1,000 bond clubs have been instrumental in many localities in reaching thousands of depositors who would have otherwise been missed by other war-bond-promotion activities. Many banks have allowed customers to withdraw funds from their savings accounts without loss of interest to the next interest date if such withdrawals were directly invested in Government bonds purchased through their institutions.

UNUSUAL PROMOTIONAL PLANS DEVELOPED

Many individual banks have been extremely active on their own account in other promotion activities. In a great many parts of the country, for example,

bank teams have been organized among bank employees for the solicitation of potential buyers. One large bank in Connecticut, for example, enrolled every male employee during the Sixth War Loan drive in a special campaign during which personal calls were made on a large number of depositors. Banks in some of the farm States, such as North Dakota, have made it a point of soliciting personally every depositor with about $500 or more for the purpose of selling him some war bonds. In Massachusetts, to take another example, several banks jointly sponsored a sound truck which moved around town on a previously published schedule to conduct a bond canvass in each neighborhood. As for other activities, thousands of banks have set up lobby displays and war-bond posters on their outer walls and have participated in community exhibitions and other war-bond-promotion programs. These operations have not been concentrated in the big cities, but have extended throughout the country and have been prominent even among the smaller country banks. Some banks, such as one in Indiana, go out of their way to personalize the war-bond campaign. Others, such as one in Illinois, open a full-sized movie theater in its lobby showing to its depositors a series of 16-millimeter films supplied by the war finance committee.

WAR FINANCE COMMITTEE WORKERS

In addition to actively soliciting their depositors, the banks of the country have furnished many of the war finance committee workers. Hundreds of bankers serve on State, county, and local executive and advisory committees and thousands of bank employees are included among the 6,000,000 volunteer salesmen. Half of the war finance committee State chairmen are bankers and so are half of the vice chairmen. The State war finance committees have banking and investment divisions which coordinate the joint selling program with the banks. Every State has an American Bankers Association representative who joins in the activity.

Every State also has representatives of other financial institutions who are associated in the war bond sales operation. Included among these are representatives of the building and loan associations and savings and loan associations, cooperative banks, insurance companies, credit unions, farmers credit organizations, and the like. From the records that are available it seems that every financial institution in the country has played its role during the long period of war financing.

CITATIONS TO BE DISTRIBUTED

The United States Treasury has always been ready to recognize the volume and extent of the patriotic service rendered by the banks in the seven war loans and in the final Victory loan. I am advised that the Treasury is awarding special citations to the banks of the country, signed by Secretary Fred Vinson, and will distribute these soon after the conclusion of the Victory loan. I am advised further that a citation to members of the Investment Bankers Association was awarded to them at their annual meeting in Chicago on November 27. It seems to me that the bankers of the country are well entitled to their citations and that their patriotic efforts in connection with the financing of World War II will stand as a monument to them for many years to come.

A Single Department of Defense Is Favored by National Aeronautic Association and National Aviation Clinic—Gen. Ira C. Eaker Makes Strong Appeal for Continuing Air Power and Tells Facts About Air Forces in Our Victory

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to participate in the Third Annual National Aviation Clinic at Oklahoma City, November 19–21, and I am pleased to report that more than 1,200 delegates, consultants, and observers were in attendance.

The clinic adopted many worth-while resolutions, including a strong endorsement for the immediate establishment of a Secretary of Defense with coequal status for air, land, and sea forces. It is also gratifying to report that the National Aeronautic Association board of directors urged that Congress enact as soon as possible appropriate legislation to create a unified command The board requested its more than 18,000 members to inform other citizens of the United States the compelling reasons for the passage of the proposed legislation.

One of the most informative and challenging addresses was the one delivered by Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker, Deputy Commander of the Army Air Forces. In this speech he urged a single defense organization. At this point I quote, in part, from General Eaker's remarks:

WINNING STRATEGIES IN AERIAL WARFARE

Against Germany we dropped 1,500,000 tons of bombs. Our total tonnage against Japan was about one-third of this, making 2,000,000 tons in all dropped against the two enemies. To do this we flew roughly one airplane flight per ton, or a little more than 2,000,000 flights in all.

In the war against Germany individual airmen of the Army Air Forces crossed enemy lines and penetrated deep into German territory 7,235,000 times. That is equivalent to 482 divisions of 15,000 men going over the top.

We destroyed in all 40,000 enemy aircraft, 30,000 of these German and 10,000 of them Japanese. We wrecked the German system of communications; we virtually eliminated the German oil industry. We dealt crushing blows to the Japanese homeland from which the Japanese people never will entirely recover.

Our losses were 18,000 airplanes in Europe and 4,000 in the East. More important, our total casualties killed, wounded, and missing were 115,000. These are sobering facts, and I assure you that the senior officers of the Air Forces are well aware of their implications.

* * * * *

Further, we were convinced that we had to reduce the German Air Force. Large-scale amphibious operations against Europe were contemplated. To insure the success of these landings, to guarantee the required lines of supply and communication—to make it possible for the men on the ground to advance once the beachhead had been secured—the German Air Force had to be taken out of the air.

These were moments to pause.

We had to get air superiority.

And we couldn't get it by a series of dog fights over the Channel and France.

We had to uproot the industrial structure that supported the German Air Force. The greater part of this industry was deep in Germany.

To destroy it we had to bomb with great accuracy. We had to fly in the daylight over the Reich.

Time, as usual, favored the defender. We assumed that eventually we would be on the offense. If we waited for an ideal set of circumstances—for our forces to arrive in large numbers—we donated the same amount of time to the German to stiffen his defenses—to get ready for the punch.

In a nutshell—we had to start fighting.

And so on August 17, 1942, we sent out our first force.

Our beginnings were modest. We only had 4 squadrons in England—of 12 aircraft each. We had no fighters for protective cover. We had to fly shallow penetrations into enemy territory to feel the situation out—we had to walk before we could run.

There was another reason we felt we had to engage the enemy without delay. This was 1942—American industry was gearing up for tremendous production. Our planes were designed for precision bombing—they were capable of long flights. They were equipped to defend themselves against enemy fighters. Our crews had been trained to do their jobs.

* * * * *

We picked a fight with the German Air Force—an opponent who up until then had run things his own way.

This was the situation in 1942:

Numerical superiority rested with the Germans.

We had no battle experience—only untested doctrines.

Our program called for an attack.

The picture was hardly auspicious.

Much has been written—much more will be written—on what happened in the months that followed. We did engage the German Air Force and we made the Hun fight.

I would like here to tell you that in my opinion there are no braver men in this war than those early crews of the Eighth Air Force who fought over Europe against terrific odds—and without the benefit of fighter protection. They well knew that it was their lot to spearhead an attack. They knew that thousands of American boys would follow in their footsteps in the air, and that millions would fight on the ground beneath them. And they recognized that before there could ever be a D-day the enemy had to be driven from the skies. For air superiority is a prerequisite of invasion. They knew they had to win—that they couldn't be licked.

I have said that our force was small at that time. Further we had few replacement crews coming through. Some of our early groups, normally organized with four squadrons, were down to two and three squadrons. The

messes were only half full. It was a grim picture. But our formations never were turned back by the enemy—the crews flew sometimes on three successive days.

These were brave men. I cannot speak too highly of them.

I do not want to give you the impression that our only targets were the aircraft and engine plants supporting the German Air Force. This was our first important system. The Luftwaffe had been an important factor in the war in Europe. It had to be trimmed down to size. That it was trimmed down is history now—well known to all of us. It did not operate effectively against the invasion fleets either in Normandy or in southern France. As a matter of fact, the German Air Force flew only a small number of sorties on the two D days; I think it was about 30 in southern France.

Another target system, perhaps the most important, was oil. It is no fable that an army moves on fuel. If we could hit the German refineries and the storage depots it was apparent to us, as it will be to you, that we would be striking a telling blow against all of the German war machine. For the Panzers required fuel, and the training planes of the Luftwaffe needed it, and, to the truck convoys supplying the Germans on half a dozen fronts, fuel was vital.

Fuel, in fact, was a natural.

The story of the fuel campaign, like the story of the rise and decline of the German Air Force is a subject for a full-length book. We followed the progress of this campaign step by step while it was being conducted, almost bomb by bomb. In addition to the Eighth Air Force, based in England, the Fifteenth Air Force, as you know, was located on the Foggia Plain in eastern Italy and played a most important role in bringing the full impact of American air power to bear on the German oil industry—especially in connection with the series of attacks carried out against the Ploesti refineries in Rumania.

* * * * *

German stocks of aviation gasoline fell from 500,000 tons in May 1944 to 230,000 tons in September 1944 to 84,000 tons in March 1945. More revealing, perhaps, was the production figure which had gone from 150,000 tons per month in May 1944 to 7,000 tons in September 1944 to 40 tons in March 1945.

When the war with Germany ended we were simultaneously presented with an opportunity to talk to the leading German military, naval, and air commanders. You can be sure that we grasped at this chance with enthusiasm. The stories that they told of the war from the German side of the line were intensely interesting, often dramatic, and sometimes very amusing. Had we heard these reports during the course of the war, I am sure that they would have brought us comfort during some of the trying times.

The Reichsmarshal himself, Hermann Goering, was a favorite topic with the senior officers of the German Air Force who had served under him.

Here is what one colonel of the Luftwaffe had to say showing the easy manner with which Goering issued detailed orders telling others how to fight a war. I will quote the colonel verbatim:

"A Fortress, a Boeing B–17, was flying home in the early days of the war alone after a raid, one engine shot to pieces. Four of our Me–109s attacked. Three were shot down and the fourth made off. As a result an order was issued that for the time being the Fortresses were not to be attacked as apparently no fighter could shoot them down. That was the first terrible blow to the morale of the German fighter pilots.

"Personally I had the feeling that if we made our attacks from the front that we would have a reasonable chance of success. From the front you are only faced with the fire power of two to four guns and you have the tremendous passing speed in your favor at which you approach the American bomber. Another advantage to the frontal attack is that you are aiming at the crew and the four engines and the tanks, all of which are vulnerable.

"But the results did not satisfy Goering who issued a strongly worded order in which he again reminded the pilots of their duty to protect the fatherland and ordered that the attacks be delivered from the rear and that fire was not to be opened until the range had closed to 400 meters. If one can get within that distance, there's a lot of point in what he said. But when one of our fighters attacked a B–17 from the rear it was faced by six or seven machine guns. Eighty to a hundred and twenty American aircraft used to fly over the Reich in the very closest formation, a flying achievement of the first order. If you take the average of 80 aircraft approaching in close formation, you have to reckon with 560 machine guns firing out to the rear at you, 560. Figuring the rate of fire roughly at rounds a second it can be seen that we expected our men to go through an actual curtain of fire. You were almost certainly hit at a distance of 1,000 meters.

"As a result of the Reichmarshal's order, our pilots approached from the rear doing only a slightly greater speed than the enemy, and 50, 60, 70 percent or even a greater percentage of them were shot down. It was dreadful to see," the German officer concluded. Well, dreadful or not, I am sorry I didn't get a chance to see it.

* * * * *

I believe that the small-plane enthusiasts will be interested to know that the light airplanes not only carried out the many tasks to which they were assigned such as courier service, reconnaissance and artillery spotting, but that the little ships actually had a bad morale effect on the supermen of Hitler's Wehrmacht.

General Leutnant Linnarz, who commanded the crack Twenty-sixth Panzer Division in Italy, had this to say about the small planes. I quote the general:

"The really demoralizing experience for the ground soldier is the sight of the artillery directing aircraft circling over our positions for hours. You know for a certainty that if you make one move, you will have a shell in your fox hole within 2 minutes. The troops were afraid to move about, and when the fighting started they were reluctant to come out and fight, feeling that they were constantly being observed. The light artillery-directing aircraft seem to have a personal grudge against you. Toward the end of the war, movement in vehicles and on foot became almost impossible, and during the last stages of the battle of the Appenines I reported that our troops could accomplish movements only during a 3-hour period at night. At dawn their positions were frozen by the fighter bombers and by the small artillery-directing planes."

Frequently I have been asked to name the important winning combinations of the war, the vital things that turned the tide in our favor.

One of the most decisive factors in winning the air victory in Europe was the close cooperation that existed between the crews that flew our ships against the enemy, and the engineers and designers here at home. It was this teamwork between American industry and the fighting men overseas that gave the Germans some of their worst moments, and they had many.

* * * * *

No less an authority than Field Marshal Keitel, Chief of the German High Command, stated to American officers when he was interrogated that, "The principal reason for Germany's defeat was that we had not preserved our technical superiority." Keitel was responsible directly to Hitler for the coordination of the three military services. I think his statement illustrates clearly the importance of keeping pace after a war has started.

We kept pace.

Another thing that contributed materially to victory was the natural resourcefulness and inventiveness of the American boys that were sent over to man our bomber, fighter, and service groups. It has been said that the American is the greatest of improvisers. I don't believe that there has ever been a truer statement.

* * * * *

Operationally our young commanders in the field displayed this same resourcefulness. Many of the group commanders with four squadrons of fighting airplanes on their field were between 24 and 27 years of age. These young men, many of whom only a few months before had been college students, varied our tactical doctrine, added to it and improved it. This was of the greatest importance. In warfare, a commander can ask no better break than to be pitted against an opponent that follows the book without varying his plan of attack. The young American group commanders did not cede to our enemy any such advantage. They were willing to try anything. They mixed up the tactical pattern as they would mix up plays in a football game. They employed deception in a way that kept the German always on the jump and never allowed him to get set for the punch. He never knew what was coming next. When we wanted to cut off a tunnel and all other means had failed, one group skipped the bombs into the tunnel opening and caused a landslide that blocked the line for a week. And when, in the oil campaign, our intelligence officers said that a few hundred more well-placed tons on the Ploesti refineries in Rumania would pay big dividends, the boys hung bombs on fighter airplanes and went out and did the job, and did it with great accuracy. They exploited to the utmost the great flexibility of the airplane, and in doing so they made it a weapon feared as much by the enemy ground soldier as by the German pilot. These characteristics, resourcefulness, inventiveness, and adaptability are priceless in a military campaign. Conditions in a theater of war are never exactly as anticipated. The speed and enthusiasm with which these boys tackled the job of getting the most out of our equipment was a major factor in winning the war. This national trait is one of America's great assets.

A word about the future.

Wars are fought today not solely by ground, naval, and air forces, but by all citizens unified in a joint effort which touches every phase of national and private life. The danger zone of modern war is not restricted to the battle lines and adjacent areas, but extends to the innermost parts of a nation. No one is immune from the ravages of war.

With present equipment, an enemy air power can, without warning, pass over all formerly visualized barriers or so-called "lines of defense" and can deliver devastating blows at our populations centers and our industrial, economic, or governmental heart even before surface forces can be deployed. Our own air force, when mobilized and deployed, would have a similar capability and might attack an enemy within hours instead of the days, weeks, or months required by our surface forces.

In any future war the air force, being unique among armed services in its ability to reach any possible enemy without long delay, will undoubtedly be the first to engage the enemy, and, if this is done early

enough, it may remove the necessity for extended surface conflict.

Air superiority accordingly is the first essential for effective offense as well as defense. A modern, autonomous, and thoroughly trained air force in being at all times will not alone be sufficient, but without it there can be no national security.

In the future we must anticipate that aircraft, either with or without pilots, will move at speeds far beyond the velocity of sound, well over 700 miles an hour.

Improvements in aerodynamics, propulsion, and electronic control will enable unmanned devices to transport means of destruction to targets at distances up to many thousands of miles. However, until such time as guided missiles are so developed that there is no further need for manned aircraft, research in the field of conventional aircraft of improved design must be pursued vigorously.

It is possible that a defense against present-day aircraft may be perfected by target-seeking missiles. Under these circumstances only aircraft moving at extreme speeds will be able to penetrate enemy territory protected by such a system of defense.

From what we have already seen, especially in the closing phases of World War II, I think it is obvious to all that fully equipped airborne task forces will be able to strike at far distant points and will be totally supported by air.

Regarding atomic energy, I believe that its influence on air power can be stated very simply. It has made air power all-important. Air power provides not only the best present means of striking an enemy with atomic bombs, but also the only available protection against the misuse of atomic explosives.

The atomic weapon thus makes offensive and defensive air power in a state of immediate readiness the primary requisite of national survival.

To illustrate this, let us suppose for a moment, that you are a member of the Japanese war cabinet and that you are charged with the responsibility of preventing the atomic attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

How could you have prevented these bombings?

The first and only sure course of action open to you would be to attack the elaborate research laboratories and production facilities where the bomb itself was developed and produced. In other words, you would first elect to strike at the source to insure cutting down the enemy's atomic potential.

An alternative course would be to hit at the air bases from which atomic bombs might be launched. However, this is an unsure method of defense.

But whether you chose to strike at the source, or whether you decided to go after the operational bases, you would have to have a strong air force before you could even consider taking countermeasures against atomic attacks. Without an air force with an attached guarantee of air superiority you would be helpless.

The spectacular innovations in technological warfare which appeared with ever increasing momentum in World War II and culminated with the atomic bomb must make it clear to all of us that scientific research to insure the maintenance of our national security is vital.

I believe it is in the national interest to establish a national research foundation composed of the most highly qualified scientists in the United States and charged with the responsibility of furthering basic research and development in all fields of science, and the scientific training of adequate numbers of highly qualified men. Scientific planning must be years in advance of the actual research and development work. The Air Force must be advised continuously on the progress of scientific research and development in view of the new discoveries and improvements in aerial warfare.

Philippines Face Economic Struggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this very significant article by Vicente Villamin. It is copied from the Washington Evening Star of November 25, 1945.

Mr. Villamin is a distinguished lawyer and economist and since coming to America from his native land of the Philippines has proven a source of reliable information about those important islands:

PHILIPPINES FACE ECONOMIC STRUGGLE

(By Vincent Villamin)

Not as a result of the war, but by virtue of the act of Congress of March 24, 1934 (the Philippine Independence Act), the United States will declare and recognize Philippine independence on July 4, 1946. If the date is to be postponed for any reason, the Philippines, not the United States, will have to move for its postponement and the American Government will consider it.

However, if before independence there is a revolution, the United States may, under section 2 (a-14) of the act, "intervene for the preservation of the government of the commonwealth * * * and for the protection of life, property and individual liberty. * * *" The Philippine Army of around 20,000 men is not yet fully organized, while there are between 200,000 and 400,000 persons who obtained firearms during the war. The American Army is the greatest stabilizing force in the Philippines today.

After it becomes an independent nation, the Philippines will virtually be an American protectorate. This is the logical effection of section 2 of the Joint Resolution of Congress No. 93, dated June 29, 1944, which provides for the establishment of naval and air bases in the Philippines "for the mutual protection of the Philippine Islands and of the United States."

According to tentative plans, the American military establishments in the Philippines will be much greater and stronger after independence than before it.

LARGE BASES PLANNED

A subcommittee of the House Naval Affairs Committee, in an elaborate report dated August 6, 1945, recommends the following bases in the Philippines: A main fleet base in Iloilo, a secondary base in Subic Bay, a main naval air base in Mactan, landplane and seaplane bases at Guimaras and Puerto Princesa, and a fleet or task force anchorage with seaplane bases at Coron Bay and Tawi-Tawi.

It is an elemental fact that if the Philippines is to play its role effectively as America's military spearhead in the western Pacific she should be strong, prosperous, and cooperative.

There are five elements that could bring that about. They are: (a) The continuation of free-trade relations with the United States, (b) the rehabilitation of the war's devastations, (c) the receipt of surplus property from the United States, (d) the reparations from Japan in the form of materials, utilities, facilities, and industries, and (e) most important of all, the creation of a new domestic economy—a producer-consumer economy that will, on the one hand, expand the domestic economic activities and, on the other, lessen the country's dependence on overseas markets. At present the Philippines exports over 70 percent of its total production as compared to 6 percent of that of the United States. That is an unsound condition. It should relax its emphasis on products like sugar and coconut oil, which are considered competitive in the United States, and direct its efforts to the production of noncompetitive articles of which it has a great many that have not been developed. A complementary, instead of a conflicting, economy with the United States should at last be the basic economic policy of the Philippines.

FREE TRADE IS URGED

Free trade with the United States is essential. Today, and for some years to come, it is the main support of the Philippine economic structure. It should not be for a period of years but should continue as long as the military position of America in the Philippines is maintained.

The bill also provides that the difference between the total losses of a minimum of $800,000,000 and the amounts appropriated will be made up by the reparations and indemnities which may be acquired from Japan. It is relevant to state here that war damages are for losses to property, while reparations are for the enemy's aggression which caused deaths, sufferings, and moral injuries. The two reliefs are for two separate causes and purposes.

The report on the bill states clearly that the participation of the Filipinos in the war shortened it considerably.

A House committee is considering a bill giving the Philippines 8 years of free trade after independence and a progressively increasing tariff for 25 years.

A strong producer-consumer economy must be established in the Philippines. It calls for the creation of many small industries, businesses, trades, occupations, and services as well as the diversification of agricultural production. To do these things there must be legions of trained Filipinos enthusiastic to build their country. Technicians, including Japanese technicians, must be used.

The vast amounts of money that the United States will grant the Philippines will give tremendous impetus to the implementation of the domestic economy.

The Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have stated before on the floor that the atomic bomb is serving as New Deal propaganda very effectively. It tends to keep people frightened and jittery, so much so that their minds are not disturbed by the communistic activities within the Government itself. It serves another useful purpose and that is to "black out" the failure of the entire domestic program and the extent to which the administration has stirred up trouble in almost every part of the globe. It is refreshing to know, however, that many people have their feet on the ground and they are not confused by atomic bomb hysteria, but instead are giving careful thought to public questions and are giving their Member of Congress the benefit of the reflections and studies. Under

leave to extend, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the issue of the Evening Observer under date of November 24, 1945, and published in the city of Dunkirk, N. Y., my home town:

CLAUSEWITZ MAY BE OBSOLETE

If there were no atom bomb we would have little to fear in the way of foreign aggression for at least a quarter of a century. The aggressors are too badly defeated to revive within that time.

With the atom bomb it is possible that we will be attacked within the next quarter of a century. It is conceivable that we must defend ourselves some time against that form of attack.

No one knows at this time what type of defense, if any, can be used against the atom bomb. Almost, certainly, however, the defense will not be possible through the old-fashioned infantry, artillery, and naval tactics.

To the layman it seems as if any defensive scheme based on universal military training is aimed at the last war, not the next one. It is a little disheartening to see so much stress being placed on obsolete ideas. For want of a knowledge of how to proceed our military men are resorting to the only thing they know.

How much better if a dozen or more military-scientific institutes were established throughout the country, with highly specialized courses and carefully selected enrollees. The general of the next war will be a laboratory man. His troops will be highly trained technicians and far fewer in numbers than the millions of doughboys of this war. All officers from the commander in chief down to the shavetail will have to know more about Einstein than Clausewitz. The next war may be too fast for the movement of masses of men.

The old-fashioned parade ground, spit-and-polish military technique may be useful only as a pastime for obsolete generals.

Of course this thought will be brushed aside by the so-called military experts as typical of the ignorance of the layman. But there are no experts in military science for the new atomic age. Everyone begins at scratch, without precedents, without accumulated learning, and the theories of the layman are quite as valid as the theories of the military authority. In fact the layman is apt to be less hidebound and less steeped in tradition.

Twelve thousand military-scientific men trained each year will give the country a greater feeling of security than an old-fashioned standing Army of 4,000,000 men.

Sudden War End Brings Sudden Impact to Western States—War Has Brought Basic Change Equalizing Prior Handicaps—West Possesses Natural Assets and Advantages—Amazing Productivity of War Industries in West Proves Reality of Natural Advantages of the West—Distinguished Assistant Attorney General Illuminates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, being a native son of the Golden West, history records that you can expect a boost for California from me as a native son of that great State which has already contributed so much to our natural progress and our national solidarity and security.

But, I rise today to also include in my brief remarks specifically the West and all the romance, history, advantages it is already known to possess and enjoy and also, to urge that you read and reflect upon the contents of the pages of remarks made by the distinguished Assistant Attorney General of the United States on two recent occasions in Los Angeles County. Some of the residents of Long Beach, my home city, heard him deliver same and called my attention to their timeliness and richness of contribution to the economic thinking of our Nation.

I therefore am honored to call them to your reading benefit:

THE WEST COAST'S STAKE IN MAINTAINING A COMPETITIVE ECONOMY

(By Wendell Berge, Assistant Attorney General of the United States)

During the past few years the American economy has moved forward at a rate which is perhaps unique in modern history. Despite severe initial handicaps, this country created in record time a war economy whose productive power the aggressor nations could not hope to match. To the Axis this economic accomplishment spelled final disaster. To our own people and to millions throughout the world the economic performance of the United States represents one of the most amazing and heartening chapters in the story of democracy.

As a result of the labor and sacrifices made during the war years, this country now can turn toward the building of peace and toward the resumption of efforts to fulfill the aims of a free society. We are equipped with a strong, productive industrial system. We are equipped, moreover, with that will to progress, which is the surest guaranty of the continued advancement of democratic institutions. In the larger aspects of our political and economic life this war has made us more aware than ever before that we are a nation. The same unity of purpose and desire to cooperate which enabled this country to turn its full strength into victory can now serve to create a sound and enduring prosperity for the American people.

We have come to realize that what injures one section of the country injures all others, and that what benefits one section accrues to the credit of all of us. We have come to recognize from a national standpoint how vital it is that every region of the economy should have every possible chance and all possible equality of opportunity to develop its own resources, and thus to make its distinctive contribution to a balanced and prosperous national life.

To the West the sudden end of the war has brought the full impact of reconversion. More immediately than most other areas the West is confronted with the attendant difficulties of reconversion and is compelled to face squarely the problems of the present, at the same time keeping in sight the long-range considerations which will affect permanet industrial development.

The problems of western industry, both now and in the years ahead, will require careful analysis and thoughtful action for their solution. It is on the basis of realistic appraisal that we must assess the opportunities and the obstacles which are present. Someone has properly said that the great war plants open a new frontier in American economic development. This is especially true for the West. In the past the West has lacked factory and plant facilities. Now it has scores of them scattered all over the vast area from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean.

The total war-plant facilities built from June 1940 through December 1944 were something over $21,000,000,000 in value, of which the Government supplied $16,000,000,000 and private enterprise about $5,000,000,000. Of the total facilities, the 15 States of the West [1] have war plants valued at about $3,130,000,000, of which slightly less than $2,475,000,000 was supplied by public funds and about $675,000,000 by private funds.

In effect these industrial facilities constitute a drastic and far-reaching change in the economic position of the West. The contrast is striking if we compare the picture as it is now with the situation which existed only a few years ago. Before the war the West was far behind the country as a whole in the value of its industrial products. In 1939 manufacturing industries in the United States produced approximately $57,000,000,000 worth of goods. The factory products of the 15 Western States were valued at about $5,500,000,000, or less than 10 percent of the total for the country.

It is possible to present the very essence of the economic problem of the West as it was at that time in terms of a few figures. These same 15 Western States contain 50 percent of the land area of the United States. Yet in 1939 they had only 14 percent of the population, 8 percent of the factory employment, and 10 percent of the value of factory products out of the national totals. In 1939, in other words, the West had a long way to go if it was ever to achieve its fullest economic development.

There is still a long way to go, but the war has brought about a basic change. The problem of the West is to prevent these gains from being dissipated and to add to them the elements required for economic balance. This means that as far as possible the war industries must be kept going to produce articles of peacetime trade. This applies equally to the enormous plants on the coast and to the thousands of smaller plants here and inland which came into existence during the war. It means that western capital must have an opportunity not only to continue in industries already established, but must also be able to enter new fields.

Although it is not possible to examine in detail all of the various industries which the West now has, I should like to discuss a few of the more important ones and to draw attention to some of the fields which, I believe, will afford the greatest room for expansion in the years ahead. In doing so it should be understood that not all of the war plants can be expected to survive the peace, particularly those producing arms and munitions. Our concern is the degree to which industries capable of reconversion will be given a fair chance, and with the more important problems which will be encountered in this respect. With these limitations in mind, it is possible to consider some specific fields such as aluminum, steel, and chemicals.

Before the war the aluminum industry in this country was dominated by a single producer. All of us are familiar with the pattern of monopoly under which the aluminum industry operated for so long. War demands and Government action have resulted in the establishment of a new aluminum industry in the West. Six major plants are now in existence, four of them in the State of Washington, one in California, and one in Oregon. These western plants have a combined aluminum ingot capacity of nearly 820,000,000 pounds annually, or more than two and a half times the average annual consumption

---

[1] The 15 States west of the Missouri River and north of Oklahoma and Texas: i. e., Washington, Oregon, California, Montana, Idaho, Nevada, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas.

of aluminum in the whole of the United States before the war. In the 5 years from 1935 to 1940, the average annual consumption was approximately 316,000,000 pounds, which is nearly 40 percent of the present ingot capacity of the western plants alone.

These plants cost a lot of money. The one at Spokane cost the Government $23,000,000; at Torrence, Calif., nearly $25,000,000; and at Troutdale, Oreg., about $19,000,000. There is therefore a total Government investment in western aluminum ingot plants of nearly $75,000,000. If to this figure are added the Government loans to private companies of at least $65,000,000, we have a total Government investment in western aluminum plants of $140,000,000 for ingot aluminum. In addition to the ingot plants, there is a sheet mill up at Spokane which cost the Government more than $47,000,000. In round figures, therefore, the Government has $200,000,000 in western aluminum plants. What is to become of them?

It is not possible to trace all of the ramifications or all of the intricate issues which stem from this question. It must be recognized, however, that the character of the policies adopted in the aluminum industry and the success with which decisions are carried out will affect the entire pattern of reconversion. It is generally agreed that, although the demand for aluminum for some time will not attain the proportions of wartime consumption, the ultimate market for aluminum will be much greater than it ever was before the war. It is agreed also that the establishment of competition in the aluminum industry is a test of economic policy which must be met if we are not to invite once more the domination of the field by monopoly.

The Department of Justice has already submitted for the consideration of the Congress its recommendations concerning the best means of providing healthy competition in aluminum. In general, these recommendations and the facts upon which they are based set forth at length the conditions which must be sought if competition with a minimum of Government participation is to operate by a self-sustaining process in the aluminum industry. I need hardly add that a successful competitive solution of the problem of aluminum would make possible the survival and growth of a western aluminum industry. In turn, a western aluminum industry would provide material for many new fabricating facilities, to produce planes, household articles, and other aluminum products. A whole cluster of new industries would grow up around aluminum.

Aluminum is only one branch of production in which the West has made tremendous strides during the war. It is an economic event of the first magnitude that there is now a sizable steel industry in the West. Before the war the bulk of all steel consumed in Western States was shipped several thousand miles by rail and water to Pacific ports and then moved inland to its final destination. The annual consumption of steel in the 15 Western States in the prewar years amounted to some 3,000,000 tons, most of which was used by the Pacific Coast States. Some steel was also produced west of the Rockies before the war, but total productive capacity was only about 1,000,000 tons. By 1944, western steel capacity had expanded more than four times, attaining a level estimated at some 4,700,000 tons, which is the equivalent of 3,300,000 tons of finished mill products. This new production is considerably in excess of the annual consumption of steel by Western States up to 1940.

To say the least, there are some real difficulties ahead in seeking to maintain a new steel industry in the West. There is no question, however, of the desirability of a western steel industry, both from the point of view of competition and of the western market. There is one aspect of this problem which merits attention because it underscores a difficulty with which all western industry has had to contend for many years. This is the prevalence of the basing-point system of pricing in the steel industry.

Under this system, in the past the prices of the various steel products have been quoted at a few base mills, all of which are east of the Mississippi River. To these base prices the cost of freight to the point of consumption is then added. By means of this formula the price of steel at any delivery point in the United States is set at exactly the same figure. Thus, if a contractor in Omaha asks for quotations on steel, he will get under the basing-point system exactly the same figure from all suppliers whether they are located in Chicago, Kansas City, or Pueblo, Colo. He then discovers that the price of steel products produced by a mill in, let us say, Pueblo, is not a mill price, but rather a Chicago price to which is added the cost of transport by rail from Chicago to the Pueblo mill. Because Pueblo is not a basing point its prices are governed by the nearest base in the Chicago area. Even though the steel may be shipped from Colorado, its cost to the ultimate consumer will include a "phantom freight" charge as though it had been shipped from Chicago. One result of this system has been that the Intermountain States have had to pay a higher price for steel than any other section of the country.

It is obvious that there is no glib solution to western steel problems. Strong support by western interests will be required to sustain the western mills until a variety of steel products can be produced in sufficient quantity and an ample market developed in competition with eastern mills. It will require determined effort and intelligent management to attain these objectives, but there is much ground for hope that the West can, if it will, acquire a successful steel industry of its own.

It may be remarked that the fate of western steel rests almost as much with the railroads as it does with the decisions of steel producers or the ability of management. Unless freight rates on finished steel products are sharply reduced, it will prove extremely difficult to overcome the handicap of transportation costs. In this respect the western steel problem is another illustration of that persistent dilemma which the West has faced for so many years, resulting from discrimination in freight rates. In fact, the growth of all of western industry is dependent and contingent upon the eradication of arbitrary and unreasonable differences in freight rates.

As in so many other fields, the chemical industries of the West have been greatly enlarged during the war and new chemical facilities have been established. All of us are aware to some extent of the ways in which chemical discovery is constantly enlarging industrial horizons. Some have compared the advancement made in the field of chemicals to the industrial revolution of the eighteenth century. All sectors of technology are today in a process of dynamic and rapid change but it is not an exaggeration to describe this era as the age of synthetic chemistry. Literally hundreds of new chemical products have come onto the market within the last decade, and during the war, chemical production in this country reached unparalleled heights.

One example may be cited which will indicate why chemical industries can be especially significant in western development. In one Western State there is a nitrogen plant. It cost $30,000,000 and it turned out thousands of tons of nitrogen for making war explosives. Now that the war is over the operating company is faced with a problem of closing or making nitrogen fertilizer for the farmers. Given half a chance, this plant and two or three others in the West and South will make all the nitrogen the farmers will need literally for a thousand miles around. What is more, they will be able to make and sell it much cheaper than the old plants of the East.

The basic raw materials for the synthetic nitrogen operations are hydrocarbons in various forms. The older plants of the East get them from coal gas and the new plants of the West from the much cheaper natural gas. In addition to the cheaper raw material, the western plants seem to have developed an efficiency of manufacture which has astonished the established eastern producers. At the beginning of the process the older plant advisers said, "You can't do this or that and you must do it the other way," but the western management went ahead, put the plant in operation, and exceeded capacity production practically from the first day it began to function. It turned out nitrogen products at a cost so low that it has caused much consternation among the eastern monopoly interests. They do not yet believe the cost figures which the new western plants are able to show. As one executive of this plant said in discussing his experience, "We were not handicapped by a generation of tradition as to how nitrogen should not be made, so we went ahead and made it."

The West possesses many other new chemical industries. It possesses also many sources of raw materials other than hydrocarbons for a strong and competitive chemical industry. We know that the chemical industry in the past, both in this country and in the international market, has been thoroughly carterized. We know also that major branches of chemical production have been dominated by huge patent pools and patent cartels. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to estimate at this time exactly what situations will be encountered by western chemical producers with respect to their patent position. To the extent that major abuses of patents can be eliminated and to the degree that advances in chemical technology made in recent years can be preserved from domination by monopoly groups, it will be possible for western producers to enter chemical industries. If the obstacles to its development can be overcome, there are few limits which could be placed upon chemical production in the West. New industries and new products in great numbers would flow from a competitive western chemical industry in a continuously greater array.

I have stated elsewhere that I believe air transport and shipping can have the same meaning for the West in the years to come that railroads had in the nineteenth century. The expansion of manufacturing facilities for planes and ships on the west coast constituted one of the outstanding achievements of the war. They can have even greater significance for the West in peacetime, not only because they will provide markets for western materials and employment for western workers, and investment for western capital, but because they will enable all of western industry to overcome in large measure the barriers of distance which have constituted so great a handicap to western development. Not only will eastern markets in this country become far more accessible, but new routes for international trade can be developed. Western air transport and shipping can serve the immense areas of the Pacific with marked advantage.

There are, of course, numerous other fields of industrial expansion which have not been touched. Throughout all of them the difficulties encountered are much the same in character. In some cases there are natural handicaps which can only gradually be overcome. In many more, however, it is the pattern of artificial hindrances, of restraints and discriminations, of monopolistic practices and cartel controls which must be fought. Discrimination in transport costs has an adverse effect upon all western industry. Basing-point systems, patent abuses, and cartel restrictions have made it almost impossible in the past for the initiative and skill of western enterprise and labor to enter such fields as chemicals, light metals, and electrical equipment.

If we view the problems of western industry as a whole, it is apparent that constant vigilance and unceasing effort will be necessary to free western industry from the pattern of restraints inherited from the past. The rewards of such effort will make themselves felt immediately, not only in terms of opportunity for employment and freedom for enterprise, but also in an increasing rate of growth in western population, higher standards of living, new outlets for capital investment, and accelerated economic activity in all fields.

The tremendous resources, the energetic outlook of westerners, and the variety of opportunities which are present represent the greatest combination of assets that an area can have. If the same virility of competition which was responsible for America's industrial growth is maintained, the West will have its chance. There is no question that the West will know what to do with it.

THE ECONOMIC FUTURE OF THE WEST

(By Wendell Berge, Assistant Attorney General of the United States)

When we think of the pioneer age of the United States, we think of the West. It is with the exploration and the settlement of the West that we associate many of the most stirring episodes of our history. It is the spirit of the western frontier which we identify most directly with the growth of the American Nation to continental size. The lives and experience of the people who tamed a wilderness and finally reached the Pacific have left a legend and a heritage which symbolize the essence of America's adventure in freedom.

No better criterion of the continued vigor of democracy could be found than the economic contributions which the Western States have made to victory in the war. The energy and initiative of western industrialists in creating and expanding plants and facilities to produce armaments, ships, planes, and numerous other war supplies, aroused national admiration. The zest, skill, and determination with which western workers and technicians performed their tasks set a pace for the entire country. The great storehouse of raw materials in this area opened and poured out its wealth of mineral, forest, farm, and other products to supply a large part of our war needs. From all points of view the war effort of the West is a record of splendid achievement. It can also be the herald of even more impressive performance in the years of peace.

Now that the war is over, all areas of our economy are confronted by problems of reconversion second in their urgency and importance only to the necessities which followed Pearl Harbor. In many respects there is no section of the country where the difficulties involved in redirecting industry from war to peace are as challenging as they are on the west coast. The scope and speed with which war production here sprang into being have an inevitable sequel in the sudden cessation of demands immediately related to the prosecution of the war.

In the aftermath of war it may seem at times as though the economic problems are baffling and insuperable. Reconversion, however, is only a partial and temporary phase of transition. The dislocations and readjustments which inescapably follow war are immediate and pressing, and they understandably occupy the major place in our attention. But in a broader and deeper perspective it is apparent that there are certain fundamental considerations which must be taken into account that will affect both the success of reconversion efforts and the economic position of the West in the years ahead. It is in the light of basic principles and clear objectives that the West, as well as the East, must approach issues of economic policy and economic development.

Certain questions at once stand out: What is the economic future of the West to be? How can the West transform its natural endowment and its rich potential capacities into economic accomplishment? What role is the West able and entitled to play in an expanding and balanced national economy, and beyond that, in the world economy? What obstacles must be met in order for the West to achieve its fullest desirable growth? What measures are available to surmount these hazards?

Obviously no one can pretend to know all the answers to these queries, nor to have smooth solutions to all of the intricate problems which will be encountered. I believe it is possible, however, to define some of the elements involved and to obtain a rather accurate indication of the direction which must be sought if the West is to reach its rightful economic stature and to acquire full partnership in the national economy.

It is always somewhat astounding to contemplate the possibilities of this region. In terms of space, the West is an empire within itself. Some of the States are larger than entire sections of the East. Many western States are larger than whole nations of Europe. These great spaces and the distances they represent set the scale upon which economic activity must be measured. Hence, transportation is a vital and recurring theme in western history. Both as a production center and as a market, the West had had to contend in the past with transportation monopolies and resulting discrimination which did much to retard its evolution. It has been a pattern of artificial restraints and monopoly practices in transport as much as any other single factor that has prevented some industries from coming into existence here and has inhibited the growth of many more. Inequities in transportation costs have held the West down almost to the status of an economic colony. Because the conditions of transportation will influence the success or failure of all other programs intended to stimulate western industry, the removal of arbitrary and unreasonable differentials is an absolute prerequisite to continued advancement. At the same time it is hopeful to recognize that in the era of air transport which has now begun in earnest, mountains, deserts, and seas are traversed with equal facility, and from this standpoint the West has many advantages. It is perhaps not too much to say that air transport can have the same significance for the West tomorrow that railroads had two generations ago. The great expansion of western shipping will also constitute an invaluable asset to industries located on the coast.

The resources of the West correspond to its dimensions. The diversity and extent of natural wealth in this section make it the great reservoir of the Nation for many of the most essential materials of American industry. Agricultural products ranging from fruits and vegetables to sheep and cattle provide sustenance for national markets. Minerals, such as gold, silver, copper, and lead, are primarily the products of the West. Industrially necessary ores and strategic metals, such as tungsten, molybdenum, vanadium, and manganese, are all found here. Many other special types of minerals may become even more important in the future. Among these are radioactive ores scattered throughout the West which have been or may be used in the development of atomic energy and power. Should this occur, these substances would rank among the most important raw materials in the world. The lumber and timber resources of the West are calculated in astronomical figures, and, with reasonable care of the forests, they are capable of supplying wide markets for generations.

If we add to this roster the vast energy resources which the West possesses in coal, water power, oil, and natural gas, it is evident that only by taxing our imaginations can we comprehend more than a fragment of the total wealth which is present. After more than 50 years of western growth, we realize that we have only begun to see what developments could occur. We realize that in terms of opportunity for enterprise, for capital, and for employment, the West is still a frontier.

Because the West is in so many ways still a frontier one of the principal question marks of its future is population. Although 15 Western States contain 50 percent of the land area of the country, in 1940 they had only 14 percent of the national population. Here again the war has brought about rapid increase, especially in the metropolitan centers of the coast, some of which now have more than one and one-half times as many people as they did a few years ago. Nevertheless, it must be recognized that over the general area there are both underpopulation and very uneven distribution. The West needs people if it is to have large industries; it needs large industries if it is to attract and hold an adequate population. Some idea of the room for growth in this respect is given by the opinion of experts in such matters that 50,000,000 people would be needed within the next half century for the optimum development of western resources. In other words the West needs symmetry and growth in population as well as industrial expansion if its capacities are to be translated into economic reality.

The swift construction and amazing productivity of war industries in the West have given us a glimpse of what this economic reality can be like. In concrete terms the total war supplies produced represent huge quantities of ships, airplanes, foodstuffs, mineral products, chemicals, light metals, and a host of other goods which before the war were produced in moderate amounts or not at all. The war plants and facilities which have been built here can provide an excellent foundation for the industrialization of the West. They will not in the main continue to produce war supplies. While a few of them may perhaps prove inconvertible, the majority can be turned to peacetime production.

What is important, however, is that these plants and their enormous output have demonstrated beyond argument what the West can do. The same qualities of creative imagination and enterprise, managerial ability, and craftsmanship, which successfully constructed and operated entirely new industries for war purposes, can certainly unite to produce goods for peaceful commerce. Many industrial organizations which were born during the war years will be able to use their equipment and know-how to enter new fields. This is true not only of the great war plants; it is true also of the numerous smaller factories and going concerns which the war called into being. They will have the support of a trained and intelligent working population. It is the initial impetus to activity which is most necessary to industrial development, and in this respect the war has telescoped years of change into a comparatively short period.

For the West as for our national economy, the aims of full production and full employment must guide our thinking and our policies in this post-war period. As a people we cannot be content with any less than the highest standard of living which our industrial system has shown can be ours. We cannot permit a repetition of the inflated, hollow prosperity which collapsed into depression after the last war. We cannot tolerate mass unemployment and lack of opportunity for individuals and for enterprise. It is our determination to prove that political democracy and free enterprise can function as effectively in peace as they have under the stress of conflict.

It is at this point that the economic future of the West assumes a special significance for the country as a whole. The war has made

us aware more than ever before that all sections of the Nation are economically interdependent. It is not possible for prosperity to continue very long in one part of the economy if other parts are depressed, unable to expand their output, and consequently unable to increase their volume of consumption and raise their standards of living. The national volume of production and the national income cannot rise to higher levels unless the potential output of the West is turned to account. The national market cannot be firmly sustained unless the ability of the West to obtain the things it needs and wants is also sustained. It is not on any narrow sectional basis, therefore, that the problems of the West must be considered. Rather the basis of approach is the consciousness that henceforth we must strive for a balanced national economy in which the West shall participate in accordance with its capabilities.

There are further equally important considerations which merit attention. The United States now has responsibilities in shaping and maintaining a healthy world economy. A firm economic basis is needed for our participation in world affairs. We cannot allow our industrial strength to be diluted. On the contrary, our industrial power which provided the winning margin in the battle of production against the Axis must be continued, and even increased, to correspond to our role in making peace secure. From this standpoint the western industries are a major addition to our industrial potential. Aside from the beneficial effects on the national economy of decentralizing some basic industries, it is in the foremost national interest to preserve the productive power of the West as an asset of freedom. It would be tragic irony, as well as a blunder, if these facilities built for the purpose of defending democracy against aggression were not utilized to promote the welfare and security of democracy in peace.

The conditions which are necessary to the attainment of an enduring prosperity in the West are more sharply visible, in some ways, than in any other part of the country. Similarly, the threats and obstacles to development are more apparent. If the inherent wealth which the West possesses is to be utilized in production, not only must the adaptable war industries be transferred to a sound peacetime basis, but new industries must emerge. To bring this development about will not be easy. It will require foresight, energy, resourcefulness, and cooperation. Moreover, constant vigilance will be necessary to keep the avenues of opportunity and the channels of distribution free from artificial restraints and controls imposed by monopolistic practices on the part of entrenched groups. These barriers are formidable and should not be underestimated. Their consideration brings us very close to the root problem which the West must face.

Monopoly is not a novelty, but the events of recent years have increasingly underscored the fact that there is a direct and profound association between the presence and power of monopoly in American economic life and the failure of western industry to expand as it could and should. The effects of monopoly on the West have been in some cases remote and subtle, and in others immediate and obvious. But they have been everywhere persistent and extensive, when judged by the degree to which western enterprise has been discouraged or stifled. From this standpoint the West has been almost continuously subjected in one way or another to the effects of monopoly in all its modes and forms.

Both as a producing and consuming area, the West has felt the consequences of monopoly domination of the market. Characteristically, raw materials of the West have been shipped to the East for fabrication and then shipped back to western markets. In consequence a vicious circle has operated to limit opportunities for employment of industry and labor in the Western States, at the same time that westerners have been compelled to pay higher prices for the commodities they consume.

How could local enterprise and capital enter such fields as chemicals, aluminum, magnesium, steel, or electrical equipment when these industries, like so many others, were ruled by national monopolies and even governed by the remote control of international cartels? In numerous instances in the years before the war, efforts of western businessmen to get started in various sectors of production encountered an impenetrable wall of monopoly or cartel control.

On frequent occasions, it was the decision of cartel groups to prevent the establishment of industries in the West, and the power which such groups wielded rendered their decisions notoriously effective. Because cartel regulations were as final as they were secret, independent action contrary to their dictates was practically impossible. No matter how much vision or initiative or technological skill and capital were available they could not engage in production unless monopoly was willing. In effect this meant that only in special circumstances and at rare intervals could new concerns in the West arise in an industry ruled by cartels. Even if a new concern were established, its survival was contingent upon the whim of monopoly or the calculated restrictions by which cartels attempt to preserve their privileges. Indeed, if we consider the extent to which monopoly prevailed before the war over whole spheres of technology and over world markets it is remarkable that the West was able to progress as far as it did.

Some of these bottlenecks have been broken by the necessities of war. To a much more considerable degree, however, the enforcement of the antitrust laws in recent years has loosened the grip of monopoly from many of the most important sectors of industry.

If a reasonable proportion of the war plants can be continued in operation on terms of independence from monopolistic control and freedom from selective attack by cartels, there is every ground for belief that the West can compete on its merit in these branches of production.

The revolution in technology which is now in progress can open brilliant prospects for the West. The inventions and discoveries which have come cut of the war have thrust before us manifold opportunities for adding to the array of goods and services which American industry can place on the market. New raw materials, new processes of manufacture, and entirely new fields of production have been explored. It is readily appreciated that as yet only a small beginning has been made in this direction, and that immense and intriguing advances are yet to come. It is hardly necessary to emphasize what this could mean in terms of opportunity for investment by western capital, enterprise by western businessmen, and employment for western workers. Every industry and every type of service from transportation and communication to health, housing, and recreation will be ultimately influenced by these changes. In such fields, freedom for initiative is at its maximum in the West and will continue to be at a maximum for years to come.

In this regard it is particularly important that as far as possible we shall prevent the new technology from becoming the preserve of monopoly groups. We know what the effects of the domination of research and technology by cartel interests have been in the past. We cannot risk a repetition of the restriction and suppression of invention by secret agreements among industrial giants here and abroad, or by the short-sighted action of monopolists in our domestic economy who fear competition and who seek to protect vested position by preventing the appearance of rival producers or the introduction of improved processes. Much progress has been made in eliminating the worst abuses of patent pools and other devices by which monopoly endeavors to control technological change. Nevertheless, to keep technology free will require alertness and active support on the part of western industry.

The United States, along with the other United Nations, recently met in San Francisco to prepare the political basis of international cooperation. The United Nations Organization, which had its inception at that time, is now an established fact. On the same level this country is engaged in cooperative efforts to bring about the reconstruction of world trade. For the West there is a direct connection between the success of these efforts and its own industrial future. The American West is on the border of the great Pacific Basin, and a revival of world trade will open 10,000 miles of markets in the Orient to western producers. The countries of Asia which have been stricken by war will need innumerable commodities in great quantities to restore their shattered economic life. Industrially backward regions seeking to develop their own resources will ultimately prove to be eager purchasers of every type of commodity which the West can make. Western shipping and air transport have a definite advantage as well as a genuine responsibility in opening up new trade routes to the East and providing transportation service for a large part of the Pacific area.

The possibilities which have been sketched cannot come into being overnight nor without resolute cooperation. There are many things that Government can do in assisting and expediting the industrial development of the West. There are many things that business and labor and capital can do, and, indeed, must do, if the advances which have been made in the last few years are to be carried over into peace and promoted in the future.

Like other parts of our economy, the West would suffer if we permit inflation to overtake us. Similarly, the West has a stake and a positive interest in efforts of the Government to establish taxation incentives to investment in new enterprise. One type of Government activity has special significance for the West. This is the development of public power projects of the TVA variety, not as emergency or relief measures, but as a proper contribution to the conditions necessary for industrial investment and expansion.

Above all, the promotion of western industry hinges upon the maintenance of competitive freedom. The development of the West would be completely jeopardized if enterprise and initiative were not free to function in the market or if monopoly succeeded in limiting the scope of competition. The enforcement of the antitrust laws is, therefore, a primary concern to the people of the West if they are to achieve full economic independence. All the means of action, all the incentives, and all the opportunities necessary to the realization of this goal are present. I believe that the flexibility and vigor of the West are the best possible guaranty of its successful attainment.

The Future of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN J. RABIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1945

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Speaker, Col. Charles Poletti, who has recently returned after 2½ years of service in Italy as Allied Military Government Administrator, delivered a timely address entitled "The

Future of Italy." This address was broadcast over a national hook-up of the Columbia Broadcasting Corp. on Saturday, November 24, 1945.

Colonel Poletti is most qualified to talk on the subject of the future of Italy. He entered Sicily as a member of the general staff of Gen. George Patton. Went in with the troops on D-day, July 10, 1943. Administered Sicily until February 1944, when Sicily was transferred to the Italian Government, which the Allies had just recognized. Then went to Naples to administer that city and southern Italy provinces. Had many difficulties there, including the eruption unexpectedly of Vesuvius. Moved to Rome when it was liberated, and administered Rome and central Italy from June 1944 until April 1945. Then established headquarters in Milan where he administered military government for Lombardy in northern Italy.

He was decorated by the American and British Armies, Italian Government, the Vatican, and the National Committee of Liberation.

I believe that this address will be of great interest to the Members of the House, and, therefore, under unanimous consent of the House to extend my remarks, I insert this address in the RECORD, as follows:

Italy—the new democratic Italy—faces a trying winter. The lives of 45,000,000 men, women, and children are at stake. They look to Americans for help. There is a crying need for food, clothing, medicines, and fuel.

During the past summer, Italy had a terrific drought—one of the worst droughts in its history. The production of wheat alone fell off 2,250,000 tons. That is not a large amount in relation to the total wheat production of the United States or Canada. But for the Italian who finds in bread and macaroni the basic staple of his meager daily rations, it represents a loss of one-third. In simple terms, if we are not to allow the Italians to starve, we must furnish them with more than 2,000,000 tons of wheat during the next 6 or 7 months. And when we do that, you and I should not get the impression that the Italians will have an abundance of food. Each person will be getting only 200 grams per day—four small slices of bread.

In Italy, as you know, there has been tremendous destruction of homes, apartment houses and other buildings. A good bit of the destruction was done by our bombs and shells. Then the Nazis added their bombings and their methodic, ruthless mining on the heels of their retreat. Now the country must have large quantities of cement, bricks, and tiles for roofing. Of course, it makes no sense to import such materials at excessive cost. Italy can make them—provided it has coal.

In northern Italy especially there are wonderfully efficient manufacturing plants. Some of them function with hydroelectric power. Others need coal. Millions of men and women are dependent on these industries.

In cities of the north, large industrial populations have been distressed not only by two decades of fascism in which they did not believe, but they have also suffered from brutal Nazi occupation. With liberation and democracy, these workers expect a better life. If they remain idle, risks of social unrest and even upheaval are intensified. They become cynical and distrustful of the liberation and democracy of which they have long dreamed.

During the first winter we administered Naples city we obtained firewood by salvaging the timber of bombed buildings. Wooden park benches disappeared during the night in Rome. And in Milan it took tremendous effort to produce the adequate supplies of wood which the bakeries needed to make the daily rationed supply of bread and to permit the people to cook their very humble meals. In general it was impossible to operate the gas plants because of utter lack of coal. In order to maintain public health and avoid epidemics a hot meal and hot water are essential.

With the exception of a small production of an inferior variety which is on the island of Sardinia, Italy has no coal. In normal times Italy imported 1,000,000 tons of coal each month. At this time Italy is forced to satisfy all its needs with 350,000 tons a month. America must send coal to Italy.

Only an insignificant amount of iron is found in its mountains. Italy has no colonies that can give it rubber or copper. There is frightful scarcity of consumer goods. Fine industrial plants are available in Italy to fill up the gaps if we send raw materials like cotton. Italy grows very little cotton. The warehouses of America are bulging with raw cotton.

Italy will survive this harassing winter. It will do so because the men and women of America as well as the people of other nations stand ready to give substantial assistance to preserve the lives of 45,000,000 Italians. We Americans can help by seeing to it that Congress gives UNRRA the funds to carry on its splendid, humanitarian work. Congress must act at once. Winter is here. Let us be realistic. Even after we give this help, Italy will only be enjoying a minimum standard of well-being. Italy will still have to suffer much hunger, endure biting cold, go without homes.

If we help Italy through this winter, can it then get on its feet? Will it pull through? Since my return many Americans have asked me this.

Let me say with deep conviction, and on the basis of intimate work with Italians in mitigating their hardships during the past 2½ years, that I have great faith in the future of Italy as a democratic, peace-loving nation. They will be able to take care of themselves if we give them a lift now.

An incredible amount of reconstruction has already been achieved since the liberation of Italy. Although Allied military government directed much of this reconstruction, we know that little could have been done without the efficient, hard-working collaboration of millions of Italians. Italy today is not a people dragging its feet in the mood of despair and discouragement through piles of war ruins. For those of us in Allied military government who have pushed north behind the advance of our victorious armies, the exciting experience, the one which most satisfied our souls, was to take an area with streets blocked by debris, houses tottering, destroyed water works, bridges demolished, with no motor or railway transportation, no electricity, no food, countless refugees without homes, and to transform that area into a living organism—to restore to it the breath of life. That was our job. It is not a simple task. No army can do it alone. The patience, courage, hard work, and resourcefulness of millions of Italians was needed. And the Italian people have all those qualities in abundance.

It seems to be not generally understood here in America that large masses of the Italian people never embraced fascism. During the years immediately preceding the war even the adherents of fascism diminished greatly. The command which forced Italy into war alongside Hitler was given by one man—Mussolini—against the wishes of the people. The fact that the Italian people did not want the war remains indisputable.

Throughout the 22 years of fascism there were substantial numbers who had the courage to oppose the dictatorship at the risk of death or concentration camp on the island of Lipari. Italy always had an active underground movement.

When the Allied soldiers reached any part of Italy, we invariably found splendid anti-Fascists who were ready to go to work with us. These men and women understood democracy. They had refused to corrupt their consciences with fascism. All they asked us was the chance to aid in establishing the democratic way of life. And they must now have that chance.

While general elections will not be held until this spring, Italy is well on the road to the fulfillment of the democratic ideals. There is unrestricted freedom of the press. Scores of newspapers and magazines of all shades of political opinion are published. Foreign correspondents are at liberty to go anywhere they desire, to investigate any matter, to interview any person.

The political parties enjoy complete freedom of speech. And, of course, there is total freedom of religion. And now there is freedom from fear. Secret police no longer lurk around every corner to overhear opinions. Merciless Fascist thugs, cloaked with the authority of government, no longer break into a home to snatch away the father before the eyes of his wife and children and cause him to disappear forever.

In Rome a few weeks ago we attended the first sessions of the National Assembly. Anti-Fascist men and women from all over Italy, and of all parties, met in the Parliament Hall of Montecitorio. They are beginning to hold local elections in the areas first liberated by the Allied armies.

The Italians have given proof that they understand the principles of democracy and that they have the courage to fight and die to maintain democracy. In my opinion, it can be safely stated that the Italians are determined not to permit the return of a dictatorship in Italy—whether it is of the right or the left. And I believe the Italians will succeed. However, should countries like America disregard Italy and fail to give it the material and moral assistance it needs, anything may happen.

The National Government was until this morning headed by a first-rate man—Prime Minister Ferruccio Parri. He never appeased fascism. During the war, Parri became the leader of the partisans who fought the Nazis in northern Italy. Parri and Foreign Minister De Gasperi understand the role Italy should play in this atomic age. Again and again they have implored the Allies to treat Italy justly. Italy has not asserted unreasonable demands. The country desires to become an independent, peace-loving member in the international family of nations.

This basic right has not been granted. The rehabilitation of Italy has been handicapped and delayed by the failure on the part of the Allies to treat the new Italy as a peace-loving, independent nation. It is time to remove the heavy shackles. It is time to recognize Italy as a member of the United Nations.

The armistice terms were signed in the late summer of 1943. They have just been made public. This should have been done long ago. There is no desire on my part to criticize any particular nation. I am merely pointing out the net results on the relations between the Allies, and more particularly America, and Italy. We Americans really want Italy to get back on its feet. That has been the policy of our Government.

Today Italy is still treated as an enemy nation. We do not deal with it as an independent, free country. Some of us who were in Italy realized more than a year ago that it was unfair and unjust to Italy, and unintelligent policy on the part of the Allies, to continue to shackle Italy with the armistice terms. They no longer fitted the situation. They were an affront to the anti-Fascist forces we were encouraging. So more than a year ago we began recommending that the United States and its allies wipe out the armistice terms and conclude a preliminary peace treaty with Italy. Last December I flew to Washington from Rome to

support the recommendation. Conferences with the British representatives went on for several weeks in Washington. It is most regrettable that we could not agree a year ago to abolish the armistice and to sign a peace treaty with Italy.

Why was it so important in December 1944? And why even more vital in December 1945?

The abolition of the armistice terms and the substitution of a peace treaty will serve to remove the heavy shackles which still seriously impede the rehabilitation of Italy.

The Italian Government is not free to take steps to restore its international trade. Italy is not now permitted to act without the specific approval of the Allies. Take just one instance. During this summer, Switzerland offered a substantial loan to Italy and desired to make a new trade agreement with it. The Italian and Swiss Governments discussed the matter and reached an agreement perfectly satisfactory to both. A few days ago we were advised by a report from Rome that the Allies have prohibited Italy from doing it. Are Americans or the British to presume that Italy, which in normal times carries on substantial trade with Switzerland, does not know what is in the interests of the Italian people? Why should an outside nation still be in a position to dictate to Italy with respect to its trade?

The short of it is that neither the Italian Government nor Italian businessmen can resume proper commercial transactions with industrial and commercial interests of the United States or of any other country until a peace treaty is signed with the new Italy.

Remember that commencing in 1943 we recognized the existence of an anti-Fascist government in Italy. Later on the Allies sent ambassadors to Rome. Nor should it ever be forgotten that Italian troops fought and died as part of the Allied armies in Italy. The Italian Air Force fought on our side. The Italian Navy performed distinguished services in the war against Hitler. Two hundred thousand partisans in northern Italy were carrying out risky sabotage missions and battling the Nazis under the orders of the Allied command and with arms and ammunition which we sent in to them. Still the new Italy remains shackled with the armistice terms. Italy remains an enemy nation until we sign a peace treaty. On the basis of their splendid performances, the democratic forces of the new Italy have merited a peace treaty for more than a year.

America has been generous. Italians like Americans. They consider us their real friends. They are counting on our help to rebuild Italy as a democratic, peace-loving, stable country in the midst of the turmoil and confusion of European political strife. The Italians appreciate not only the food and clothing we have sent to them, but they look to us for moral and spiritual assistance. There is no doubt that a democratic, economically prosperous Italy will serve as a stabilizing factor in the peace of Europe and of the world. Italians are looking to us to remove their shackles and to give them real independence. It is my earnest hope that we Americans will do so promptly.

Mayflower Compact Day Address by Maurice H. Thatcher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 30 (legislative day of Monday, October 29) 1945

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, recently in an extension of my remarks I included an address delivered by me at the Compact Day Dinner of the Society of Mayflower Descendants in the District of Columbia, in the city of Washington. The dinner was held on the evening of November 23, 1945, in celebration of the three hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the signing of the famous document. Another feature of this celebration was a radio address delivered on the evening of Thanksgiving Day, November 22, by the governor of the society, Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher, formerly a Member of Congress from Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent to have his address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Governor THATCHER. Permit me to thank WINX for the courtesy, again accorded me, to speak over its station upon an anniversary of the signing of the world-famed Mayflower Compact. This simple, but comprehensive document, was drafted and signed on board the gallant little ship, the *Mayflower*, in Cape Cod waters on November 21 (old style, November 11), 1620. Circumstances arose which made it necessary for the Pilgrims who had made the fateful voyage from the Old to the New World to adopt a plan for their colonization and government when they should land on the wintry Cape Cod coast. This landing followed one month later; that is to say, on December 21, 1620, at the spot known as Plymouth Rock.

Under the instrument, thus formulated, the colony was founded, and long and wisely ruled. The language of the Compact was that of the period, but it was broad and ample in its scope. For generations it has been acclaimed as the first authoritative document promulgating, in the Western Hemisphere, the purpose and plan of free and representative government. It contained the seeds of the Declaration of Independence and our Federal Constitution. In his third inaugural the late President Roosevelt bracketed together Magna Carta, the Mayflower Compact, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the Gettysburg Address as milestones in the development of free institutions. Let me read the Compact:

"In ye name of God, Amen. We whose names are underwritten, the loyale subjects of our dread Soveraigne Lord King James, by ye grace of God of Great Britaine, Franc & Ireland King, Defender of the Faith, &c.

"Having undertaken for ye glorie of God, and advancemente of ye Christian faith, and honour of our King & Countrie, a voyage to plant ye first colonie in ye northerne parts of Virginia, doe by these presents solemnly & mutually in ye presence of God and one another, covenant & combine our selves togeather into a civill body politick, for our better ordering and preservation, and furtherance of ye ends aforesaid: and by vertue hearof to enact constitute and frame such just and equall lawes, ordinances, acts, constitutions & offices from time to time, as shall be thought most meete & convenient for ye generall good of ye Colonie, unto which we promise all due submission and obedience.

"In witness whereof we have hereunder subscribed our names at Cape Cod ye 11 day of November, in ye year of ye raigne of our Soveraigne Lord King James of England, Franc & Ireland ye eighteenth, and of Scotland ye fifty-fourth, Ano. Dom. 1620."

This ends the reading. There were 41 signers of the Compact, or a little less than half of the total number of passengers—men, women, and children—on the *Mayflower*.

The story of the persecution of the Pilgrims, because of their religious beliefs, of their long exile from England, in Holland; of their difficult preparation for the venture into the New World; of their stormy voyage across the Atlantic seas; of their founding and maintenance—under fearful hardship and loss—of the Plymouth colony; and of its success and splendid example in the early and formative days of American life and character—the story of all this constitutes an epic in world history which yet remains adequately to be written. The Pilgrims brought with them the concepts of freedom of conscience and free government; they brought with them the Christian home; and all these were established and maintained at Plymouth. There is the record. It is imperishable, immortal. Not only the United States of America, but, as well, all lands and peoples, are the everlasting debtors of this heroic little band of men and women whose achievement and example have meant so much to the cause of liberty. The postwar chaos that today fills the earth can be lifted only by the application of the simple principles set forth in the *Mayflower* Compact, and practiced in the Plymouth colony. On this Thanksgiving Day—itself a Pilgrim institution—we have, in America, much for which to be thankful, though we have serious problems—domestic and foreign—to face. Let us give thanks for the glorious triumph of the Allied forces in the great struggle just ended; and let us approach the difficult tasks which lie ahead, in the spirit and character of the Pilgrim fathers and mothers, who, under great trial and tribulation, wrought so mightily for good at the dawn of American history.

On tomorrow evening, at Hotel 2400—Sixteenth Street, in Washington, our society, following its established custom, will celebrate the signing of the Compact 325 years ago, by a dinner meeting. The speakers will be United States Senator RAYMOND E. WILLIS, of Indiana, and Mrs. James H. Doolittle, wife of the famous flier and aviation commander. the United States Marine Band orchestra, as heretofore, will furnish music for the occasion.

Permit me to conclude by reading some lines I have written for this anniversary occasion.

O little ship of troubled yester-time,
What precious burthen you were called to bear
From old-world wrongs, unto a virgin clime
Within the west, ordained to be the heir,
For all the ages, of the dream and hope
For freedom of man's conscience, thought, and deed;
For all that widens spirit and its scope,
And yields largess for vital human need!
O sacred ark, you were divinely sent,
To bring across the stormy wastes of sea,
The humble group, which was the instrument
To found a new concept of liberty!
In Voyage, Compact, Plymouth there was wrought
The Goal, itself, which man, through God, had sought!

Situation at Yukosuka Naval Base

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

NOVEMBER 27, 1945.

Hon EDITH N. ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: In accordance with telephone conversation with you, I am glad

to give you the following information on the situation at Yokosuka Naval Base, concerning which an article first appeared in the Des Moines Register on November 1.

First, let me assure you that the problems involved are matters of genuine and deep concern to us. This bureau considers it vital that the men we return to their homes after discharge are fit, and reflect credit upon the naval service. The situation as presented in the article in the Register does not represent the policy of the United States Navy, nor does it have our approval.

Instructions stating that the aim of the Navy Department is "suppression" were issued on March 25, 1941. Upon receipt of information concerning the situation at Yokosuka, Japan, on September 27, 1945, action was initiated that day, and on October 31, further steps were taken by the Secretary of the Navy to insure strict and effective compliance with this policy. The commander in chief of the United States Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean areas on November 2 published the directive of the Secretary of the Navy.

You will be interested to know that all places of prostitution in Yokosuka have now been closed, and the policy of the Navy is being effectively carried out.

With warm appreciation of your interest in the welfare of our naval personnel, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS DENFELD,
Vice Admiral, United States Navy,
Chief of Naval Personnel.

Cotton Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN PACE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1945

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, under the consent granted, I present for the RECORD a copy of my address before the Cotton Textile Institute on Wednesday, November 28:

From the program I observe I have been assigned as my subject "The Trend of Legislative Thinking."

Of course, no single Member is privileged or capable of speaking for the Congress, but I have tried to be helpful in working out farm programs and have some knowledge of the views of those who have the responsibility of fixing policies.

It is agreed that cotton offers the most serious and difficult problems of any agricultural commodity. It relates directly to the economic welfare of more people and has greater bearing upon the economy of the Nation than any other crop grown. The solution of the problems is most difficult on account of (1) the enormous surplus of cotton at home and abroad, (2) the cost of production in this country, (3) the price at home and on the world market, (4) the possibility of increased foreign production, and (5) the increasing competition of synthetics and other fibers.

Until these difficulties are overcome and a sound and sensible long-time program for the future can be agreed upon, it is my opinion the Congress will maintain in general the program now authorized by law.

As you all know, we assembled in Washington last December a national cotton conference. It was the greatest meeting of its kind I have ever attended. For the first time in the history of the Nation we assembled at one place at one time every group and interest concerned with the production, handling, marketing, and processing of cotton. While this meeting did not produce the answer, it did, through the assembling of all the facts, through the clash of views and the numerous suggestions, thoroughly and completely develop the problem. And certainly that must be the first step in finding the remedy or working out the solution.

After that meeting it was clearly understood by all that the solution to our cotton problem is going to require many steps and will not be found in some simple or single proposal. We cannot solve it through price alone. Nor just with or without an export subsidy, or with or without payments from the United States Treasury, or merely with a domestic allotment plan or a mechanical cotton picker. The problem is too complex and there are many things that need be done to assure the welfare of those who grow cotton, those who handle cotton, and those who process cotton.

And strange as it may sound, the Congress and the Department of Agriculture need more facts than are now available before a sound long-time solution of the cotton problem can be formulated.

Following the December meeting another conference was held last May. Again, all the groups were represented. Time had been given for everyone to study and digest all the facts and the numerous problems and proposals presented at the December conference. We had hope that we could at least make a start in formulating definite recommendations for the future. Many of us had ideas and there were a few proposals upon which we were in complete accord. But in every instance when the time came to set up the details we found there were certain facts we needed to have and which no one—either in or out of Government could give us.

As a simple example. There was unanimous agreement at the May meeting that the one-variety program was proving most beneficial, both to the producers, the mills, and the users. It resulted in increased yields, in a better sample, in a higher price and the mills could turn out a better product. We all agreed that this one-variety program should be encouraged, that it should be greatly expanded on a Nation-wide basis.

But such a program does not work out itself. The varieties must be determined, the staple lengths must be selected, the necessary seed must be made available. This all meant we had to know what varieties, what types, what staple lengths the American mills and the export trade was taking and would want in the future.

Did you know such information is not now available—nowhere in this country? We encountered the same lack of facts on every proposal considered. You will recall the suggestion was made at the December conference that cotton production should be shifted from the high-cost production areas to the low-cost areas. But no living person could tell us how much cotton was produced in the high-cost areas or how much cotton land was available for low-cost mechanized production.

Certainly it is common sense to have all the facts before we undertake to recommend policy decisions on a problem as big and complex, and involving as many millions of people, as the cotton problem. So our May meeting had to abandon its effort to reach decisions and turn to the task of finding the facts we must have to reach intelligent decisions.

Our committee immediately requested that every organization in this country which was conducting or planning any economic research on cotton, including both public and private agencies, hold a joint meeting and combine their efforts in a well-organized, short-term fact-finding program. The idea was received with considerable enthusiasm. A total of 45 research executives, representing almost as many different agencies, met for 2 days, on May 30 and 31, and agreed upon a cooperative investigation which will give us within a few months, we hope, the best available answers as to the present competitive position and the future outlook of cotton. The Cotton-Textile Institute was represented at this meeting. The National Cotton Council and officials of the Department of Agriculture were most helpful in setting up the program. The work was divided into the following projects:

1. PRODUCTION ADJUSTMENTS TO IMPROVE FARMING OPPORTUNITIES

In this project we are trying to find out how much can be saved on the cost of growing cotton by the use of the latest and best scientific methods. We want to know what can be done to produce a stronger, cleaner, more uniform, more spinnable fiber. And we also want to know what other crops might offer the farmer a better income in the parts of the South where the cost of growing cotton is high.

2. COTTON HANDLING AND MARKETING PROBLEMS

This requires a survey of what the mills and the export trade want in the way of cotton and how those wants can be filled more satisfactorily. We need to know what qualities of cotton to push in a rapidly expanding one-variety program. We want to know how to make the ginning, the warehousing, and the merchandising of cotton more efficient and economical.

3. COTTON GOODS PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION TECHNIQUE, COSTS, AND MARGINS

In this project we are following cotton on its whole journey through the spinning, the weaving, the knitting, the finishing, the fabricating, the wholesaling, and the retailing. It is in these processes that the real costs of producing a cotton article are to be found. We want to take a look at the chances of making any of these processes more efficient, so that the final consumer will get a cheaper and a better product.

4. THE COMPETITIVE POSITION OF FIBERS AND SUBSTITUTE PRODUCTS IN SPECIFIC END-USE MARKETS

Here we are trying to find out why cotton is selected for each of its important end uses, such as shirts, sheets, bags, and towels. How much of each end-use market is governed chiefly by fiber price, by fiber quality, by merchandising, and by other things. We want to know the same thing about the end uses of other fibers. We need to put all this information together in order to find out how much market cotton might gain or lose because of price, quality, merchandising, and other influences.

5. PRODUCTION STUDIES OF SYNTHETIC AND OTHER SUBSTITUTE PRODUCTS

What does it cost to make rayon, nylon, and the other synthetics? What facts do we have that will show what to expect in the future price trends of these fibers? What about costs and price trends in the paper industry? How much expansion are we going to get in the production of all these things, and what can we foresee about further improvements in the quality of each of them?

6. FOREIGN MARKET OUTLETS FOR AMERICAN COTTON AND COTTON PRODUCTS

How cheap and how plentiful can we expect foreign cotton to be? How cheap and how plentiful can we expect foreign rayon to be? How much can we learn about the influence of exchange rates, Government loans, and international trade barriers upon the foreign markets for cotton? In a word, how much foreign market do we have a right to expect for American cotton and cotton textile products?

7. AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS AND POLICIES

We are reviewing, in a matter-of-fact and unbiased way, the effects of all the Government's efforts of recent years to help the cotton farmer.

8. PROBLEMS OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE COTTON BELT

We want to know what it will take to get enough industry in the South to give useful employment to the people who no longer have any real opportunities in the cotton fields.

9. EDUCATION PROBLEMS

The Cotton Belt, with the lowest per capita farm income, has been gravely handicapped in the field of education. How can we make the people happier and more productive by improving educational standards?

10. HEALTH PROBLEMS

The Cotton Belt is likewise handicapped in the field of health. How can we raise its health standards?

These investigations are now well under way. They will be completed some time next year. They will be presented to the committee as the combined work of some of the most respected research agencies, both public and private, in this country. They will be prepared and edited in such a way that the accuracy of the facts cannot be challenged and that the differences of opinion, where differences exist among outstanding experts in the field, are clearly set forth.

The Cotton Textile Institute has an essential part to play in this program. Your expert knowledge and opinions are needed. The members of your staff have given us some splendid cooperation already, and we are anxious to have your participation continued and increased.

In considering the importance of this fact-finding program, let us take as an illustration project 4 which deals with the competitive position of cotton in its end-use markets. I have chosen this illustration because project 4 is one in which the institute can supply a great deal of helpful information and guidance. In this project we have selected the 45 biggest end uses of cotton, such as shirts, dresses, bags, and automobile tires, and we have begun a study of the factors and influences which are responsible for cotton's competitive position in each use. Only in this way can we get a fair picture of the total market which cotton holds primarily on the basis of the price of the fiber, and of the amount of market which cotton might gain or lose as a result of changes in its price. Only in this way can we find out how much of the market is governed primarily by advertising and merchandising policies. Only in this way can we determine how much market cotton holds by virtue of its various quality characteristics, how much market it might lose if the quality of other fibers were improved in specific ways, and how much market cotton might gain if its own quality were improved in specific ways. We need to study the influence of price, quality, and merchandising not only upon the choices of the final consumers, but also upon the choices of the spinners, the weavers, the knitters, the converters, the fabricators, the wholesalers, and the retailers. Before we undertake to make basic decisions on the cotton problem, we owe it to this Nation's millions of cotton farmers to get the whole picture in the clearest possible perspective.

The argument over cotton and rayon tire cord is in a highly technical field, which I am not qualified to discuss in any detail; but I have received enough information from experts in the Department of Agriculture to become convinced that the sweeping claims of rayon superiority which have been made in recent advertisements are utterly unwarranted. In the passenger tires, the Government tests which have recently been released show that regular commercial cord made of cotton is good enough to outlast the rubber in the original tire plus the rubber in the recap. In tests conducted by the Rubber Reserve Company at Normoyle, Tex., tires made of cotton cord were run at a speed of 60 miles an hour, and no failures whatever had occurred as a result of cord weaknesses when the tests were brought to an end after about 68,000 miles of driving. In the important 7.00-20 truck-tire field, the test results were most complicated. Experts have been able to single out points on which both cotton and rayon proved superior. There are strong indications that cotton would have given a better performance if a lower-gage cord had been used, and there are also strong indications that cotton cord far better than any yet tested can be made available. The Department of Agriculture is preparing for our committee a summary report of this whole subject.

There are some people in this country who believe that the price of cotton is too high and who say that all of our cotton problems can be solved simply by striking down all supports and leave the producers to accept whatever price is offered them. There are some people who question whether the farmer should be able to purchase with the proceeds from the sale of a pound of cotton as much as he could purchase 35 years ago, even though the amount of cotton produced with an hour's labor has seen no sharp increase, while the productivity of labor in other fields has gone forward by leaps and bounds under the influence of technological progress.

There are some people who question whether parity price—the price which would give a pound of cotton the same real value that it possessed in 1909–14—should be calculated so as to take into account the largest item of cost in the production of cotton—namely, the labor cost. But to anyone who states that the problems of the Cotton Belt can be solved merely by a low price for cotton, let me say in all sincerity that he is taking upon himself a grave and a dreadful responsibility. It is a serious thing to tell any man that the way to solve his problems is to cut his income. It is more serious to tell the man who is already at the bottom of the economic ladder that the way to solve his problems is to drop down lower. There are 2,500,000 families on the cotton farms of this Nation. Cotton provides half the farm income in nine of our great agricultural States.

For this reason I feel that the cotton farmer and the entire Nation are entitled to have the whole market for cotton studied in the most thorough possible way. The subject is most complicated. There are hundreds of important uses for cotton, and each is different from the others in the factors that influence fiber selection. I have found that a man can justify almost any attitude he chooses about the price of cotton by concentrating attention upon that part of the market which suits his purpose. We cannot accept any biased or piece-meal or superficial answers. We are bound to study the whole market and study it most thoroughly. With the stakes so high in terms of human welfare, we can afford to do no less.

Now, in addition to this short-term study of the cotton problem there are other fundamental things that have to be done if we are to put cotton on a permanently sound basis. The fundamental problems are those of supply and demand. On the supply side, we must learn how to produce cotton more efficiently and economically and improve its quality. On the demand side, we must learn how to make cotton more useful and increase its uses.

In both of these objectives we come face to face with the need for scientific research on cotton. Any product which competes in the fiber market has the choice of moving forward technologically or losing out to its competitors. The fundamental trouble with cotton is that in the generation which is just past—a generation of tremendous scientific progress in many fields, including the field of fibers—cotton technology has failed to keep pace. This failure cannot be attributed to the inherent nature of the cotton fiber. The problems of growing and processing cotton lie in the same fields of scientific research which have yielded miraculous results for other commodities. I refer to the fields of biology, chemistry, physics, and engineering. The possibilities for improving cotton's competitive position through research are sensational and unlimited. We have seen an inkling of these possibilities in the mechanical cotton picker, in the flame chopper, in the improvements in fiber strength through seed breeding and selection, and in improved methods of fertilization and soil building. We realize the possibilities for improving the quality and attractiveness of cotton to both the manufacturers and the final consumers if we approach the problem with the necessary amount of scientific skill, imagination—and money.

The trouble in the past has been the unwillingness of anybody to invest in cotton research an amount of money commensurate with the size and scope of the problem. The two groups most deeply concerned have been the producers and the textile manufacturers, I am sure you will agree with me that the textile manufacturers on the whole have been somewhat indifferent to research. Their general policy has been to leave the burden of research to the Government and the producers of their raw materials. This policy has militated greatly to the advantage of rayon, because the rayon producers are a few large corporations with ample funds, while the cotton producers are millions of farmers without any funds for such purposes. I am glad to note that the textile manufacturers in recent years have taken an increased interest in scientific research. I hope that your efforts in this line will continue to multiply very rapidly.

What man can guess the many secrets still hidden away in the cotton fiber. For example, by testing methods recently developed, specifically X-ray diffraction and the Pressley breaker, it is found that the present leading improved varieties of cotton may not have the particular fiber properties most suitable for individual use. The X-ray diffraction photographs show the cellulose structure of the individual fibers. The more nearly parallel the cellulose elements are to the main axis of the fiber the stronger the yarn.

This may mean a complete change in fiber selection and buying methods. Heretofore cotton has been bought entirely on grade and staple lengths. But now we are learning that the angle of growth of the cellulose element inside of the fiber wall may be far more important than the length of the fiber. Of the varieties classified 1 inch in staple length, some given yarn strengths equivalent to thirty-one thirty-seconds of an inch, while others are equivalent to $1\frac{3}{32}$. And some varieties of seven-eighths inch staples show tensile strength higher than those of some 1-inch varieties.

Anyone, I think, will agree that the cotton producers are in no position to conduct their own research. They operate very small units, they are financially weak as individuals, and they have never been able to form an organization capable of doing the job on the right scale. A great part of the responsibility for cotton research therefore rests squarely upon you. It is my personal conviction that, while the Government has done some good things in the field of cotton research, these activities have been on too small a scale for the size of the job to be done. The inadequacy of the Government's cotton research budget has been partially responsible for cotton's backwardness in technology, which in turn is the very core of the

whole cotton problem today. I feel very strongly that this situation ought to be corrected.

If we give cotton the research program that it needs and deserves, I can see no fundamental reason for pessimism about the future of this fiber. It is still the most popular and useful fiber in the world. The people of the whole world have come to appreciate the good properties of cotton more strongly during the long war years, when they were obliged to rely on other fibers. If we give cotton a chance, it will become as dynamic and progressive as any fiber on the market today—constantly improving its usefulness to mankind and its attractiveness to the people who grow and process it. There is no cause or excuse for defeatism among the friends of cotton. If we will give it the aggressive support that it should have in the laboratories of research, it will become evident that in the heightening competition among fibers that tough old warrior, King Cotton, tested in the battles of many centuries, has only just begun to fight.

The Radio-Proximity Fuze Stopped the Germans and the Japs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the employees of the Sylvania Electric Products, Inc., are entitled to justifiable pride and satisfaction in helping to bring victory over the Japs and Germans and a speedy end to the war. Next to the atomic bomb, the radio proximity fuse was the most effective secret weapon used by the Army and the Navy against our enemies.

Here is an account of this unbelievable weapon, the production of which is a tribute to the ingenuity and resourcefulness of American initiative and determination to win the war as quickly as possible, as published in the October issue of the Sylvania Beam:

The first Japanese plane to be shot down by a radio proximity fuze projectile was destroyed by the cruiser *Helena* January 5, 1943. During the siege of Okinawa, the destroyers *Hadley* and *Evans* used the fuze in standing off 156 enemy planes including Kamikaze suicide craft.

An official report describing the defense by six destroyers with radio proximity fuze projectiles against Jap planes gives a typical picture. "The horizon," it says, "was filled with burning planes from east to northwest. There were too many to count."

Hundreds, in fact thousands, of Jap planes attacking United States battleships, carriers and other naval vessels were shot down by radio fuzed projectiles.

It would be impossible to estimate the number of American lives that were thus saved by the improvement in effectiveness due solely to the use of the radio fuze as compared with previous equipment.

The radio proximity fuze was America's answer to the dive bomber, most deadly and terrifying weapon of the Axis in World War II.

The strategic military importance of the radio fuze, coming as it did at a highly critical moment of the war, is absolutely second to none.

At the heart of this outstanding device, gravely written off by Nazi scientists as "impossible," is the tiny radio tube designed and built by the men and women of Sylvania Electric Products, Inc. Not only did Sylvanians make a large share of the complete fuzes, but they manufactured every fuze tube used by the Navy from January, 1944 until victory. The Germans had concluded that even if such a tube could be made in the laboratory it never could be manufactured in sufficient quantities to be an effective war weapon.

Sylvania scientists in cooperation with members of the OSRD staff were the ones who achieved the goal of a tube that would work under the conditions demanded of the fuze. They contributed with associates in the industry to the invention of the fuze itself; and Sylvania's production men and women achieved the production rate of a million tubes every 2½ days, two-thirds the rate of tube production of America's entire peacetime radio industry.

TUBE VERSUS BOMBER

In material terms, a tube one-third the size of a cigarette was thrown into battle January 5, 1943,[1] against the screaming Axis dive bomber, the hitherto irresistible blitzkrieg weapon that had already destroyed the French Army, routed the British at Dunkirk, scuttled a United States Fleet at Pearl Harbor, and sunk the British Navy's mighty dreadnaughts *Prince of Wales* and *Repulse*—a tiny tube against the dive bomber; and the tiny, titanic tube won.

At Sylvania, there were miracles of imaginative creation, miracles of invention and design, and miracles of production and management. Every experienced production manager was working as never before on war projects, but more were needed. Men who had been foremen or accountants were enabled by intensive training to take responsible positions in plants employing hundreds or even thousands of employees.

Thousands upon thousands of women who had never performed such work—many who had never been inside a factory before—rallied to the call for help on essential war work and in a space of time that before the war would have seemed impossible had learned to assemble the intricate tubes and fuzes.

Highest job priority ratings were given to the work. Housewives, schoolgirls, secretaries, women from almost every walk of life streamed into Sylvania plants from the hills of Kentucky to the seacoast of Maine.

* * * * *

History alone can determine what weapon won the war, and even history's verdict may be indecisive. There is credit enough for all. In judging the importance of the radio proximity fuze, it is necessary only to consider five facts:

1. It provided decisive help in winning the Battle of the Bulge.

2. It helped neutralize the V–1 over Britain and made it possible to keep the port of Antwerp from destruction by this weapon. If the Germans had put Antwerp out, Allied offensives would have been stalled for lack of regular supplies.

3. It checkmated Japanese planes and dive bombers, and was the factor that permitted Admiral Halsey's fleet to steam off the Japanese shore in relative security.

4. Because of the timeliness of its perfection and Sylvania's ability to supply it in needed quantities, it proved to be of superlative strategic importance.

5. The radio proximity fuze by paralyzing the activities of Japanese air power permitted American naval and army forces to set the stage for the application of the final treatment—the atomic bomb.

[1] The U. S. S. *Helena* used it in the Pacific.

Favoritism in the Discharge of Servicemen

REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, there is little wonder that our boys who are still in the service, but who are entitled to release and discharge, are greatly discouraged and despondent because they cannot come home. Many of the GI's have more than enough points for discharge, but they are not being sent home. Many others who have less than enough points for discharge, or who appear to have some unknown preference or priority, are being sent home ahead of those eligible for discharge.

Recently it was discovered that 54 football players, of the Hawaiian football team, many of whom lacked many points for discharge, were flown back to this country just as soon as the football season closed. These football players were flown back ahead of 13,400 veterans, all of whom had high points sufficient for discharge. This preferential treatment is entirely unfair.

Pfc Jack MacNider, a son of Gen. Hanford MacNider, was flown back home, although he had only 38 points, while 50 points are required for discharge. This was done, it is said, at the request of General MacNider in order that his son can continue his medical studies. Young MacNider is returned, while untold thousands of our boys, with more than 50 points, and who desire to continue their education, both in high school and college, are forced to await transportation. When our boys ask their superior officers, "when they will get to return home," the usual response is, "There is no transportation available." This preferential treatment of a few of these men in the service is breaking the morale of our boys who are still waiting for a chance to get home and who are entitled by all of the rules of the game to come home.

Today I read in the daily papers that S2c Paul T. Stewart, the son of Senator STEWART, of Tennessee, who has but 18 points, and has been overseas less than 9 months, has been returned to this country. The servicemen's newspaper has reported that young Stewart "bragged to all hands about his connections that swung the deal." This 18-year-old boy, the son of a United States Senator, is brought back to his homeland while the real veterans of this war, with points far in excess of the number required for discharge, have to remain on foreign soil—some of them separated from their wives and families, and all of them entitled to be returned, under the point system, to this country. It is my considered judgment that this discharge system has been terribly bungled. This preferential treatment must be stopped. Is there any wonder that the morale of our veterans with high points is low and that they are disgusted over this very unfair treatment?

Mr. Speaker, I urge—yes; I demand—that this very unfair preferential treatment of the boys "with a pull" be discontinued, and that our boys be returned to their homeland and to their homes in an orderly manner and in the manner indicated by the War Department under the point system, and with hardship cases standing on the merit each one deserves from the evidence presented. Any further favoritism shown in the matter of discharging our boys from the service must be entirely eliminated. Such a policy is entirely revolting and unfair.

Mr. Speaker, with my remarks herein, I ask unanimous consent to include three newspaper articles bearing upon this same subject, which read as follows:

ONLY 13 WERE ELIGIBLE—WAR DEPARTMENT PROBES RETURN OF 54 FOOTBALL PLAYERS—CONGRESS TOLD LOW-POINT ATHLETES WERE FLOWN AHEAD OF 13,400 VETERANS

The War Department disclosed last night that it is investigating the return to this country of 54 members of the Army Air Forces Hawaiian football team, many of whom lacked sufficient points for discharge.

The action followed blistering congressional criticism of the players' reported return.

QUOTES STARS AND STRIPES

Representative MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, quoting from the mid-Pacific edition of the Army newspaper Stars and Stripes, charged in the House Wednesday that the men were flown back to this country just as soon as the football season ended in Hawaii November 12. He said only 13 of the players had enough points for discharge.

MONRONEY said that at the time the men were flown back 5,154 high-point veterans were awaiting transportation in Hawaii and 8,313 in Saipan and New Caledonia.

Sid Carroll, general manager of the Washington Redskins, told the Times-Herald yesterday that Bob De Fruiter, halfback now playing with the Redskins, had been a member of the Army Air Forces Hawaiian team, which recently was returned by air from Hawaii.

DE FRUITER'S CASE EXPLAINED

He added: "De Fruiter was flown to Hawaii in December 1944 to play in a military bowl game there for the Army. Some of the 54 players were returned to the States after the game and some were ordered stationed in Hawaii." Carroll added that De Fruiter would be eligible for discharge from the Army in January under the point system.

The War Department said in a statement that the theater commander, Lt. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, had been asked for a report on the matter.

MACNIDER FLIGHT HOME OFFERED BY MACARTHUR

TOKYO, November 28.—Gen. Douglas MacArthur offered to arrange air transportation to the United States for Marine Pfc Jack MacNider, 18-year-old son of Brig. Gen. Hanford MacNider, but had no knowledge of his subsequent discharge, a spokesman said today. MacNider had 38 points, although 50 are required for discharge.

The spokesman's statement was made in response to queries prompted by a Marine Corps announcement in Washington that young MacNider was returned from Tokyo and discharged at the request of General MacArthur.

The MacArthur spokesman said the supreme commander's only part in the matter was to send the following radiogram to Marine Commandant Lt. Gen. A. A. Vandegrift at the father's request:

"MacNider very anxious to bring his son, Pfc Jack MacNider, Fifth Marine Division, now on furlough Tokyo, back with him to the United States to continue medical schooling. If you can authorize such procedure, I'll be glad to arrange air transportation for return with his father to United States where he will report to any station you may designate."

The spokesman said MacArthur "had no administration over Marine Corps personnel and the radiogram speaks for itself."

18-POINT SON OF SENATOR HOME—BOASTS FATHER IS STEWART, OF TENNESSEE

HONOLULU, November 29.—The Army newspaper Stars and Stripes said tonight that S2c Paul T. Stewart, 18, son of Senator STEWART, of Tennessee, has been ordered returned to the mainland from Hawaii, although he has only 18 points and has been overseas less than 9 months.

Stars and Stripes said young Stewart has been recommended for assignment to Norfolk, Va., although Navy policy has been not to reassign men to the States until they have been overseas 18 months.

The servicemen's newspaper said a letter to the paper said Stewart had been "bragging to all hands about his connections that swung the deal."

The commanding officer at the Waipio amphibious operating base where Stewart is stationed said, "Had I known all this sooner I'd sent him to a forward area."

Mrs. Mabel T. Boardman Answers Mrs. Agnes Meyer's Attack on the American Red Cross

---

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, only a few days ago it was my privilege to rise on the floor of this House and defend the Daughters of the American Revolution against communistic attacks.

Today it becomes my duty to defend the American Red Cross against the attack by Mrs. Agnes Meyer, wife of the owner of the Washington Post. This attempt to discredit the Red Cross forcefully reminds us of those smear attacks made by this same Mrs. Meyer against the white people of the South a few months ago.

I know that these advocates of UNRRA want to discredit the American Red Cross, because many Americans—and I am one of them—want to turn these funds over to the Red Cross in order that we may not have the scandals of graft, fraud, and racketeering that are now coming out against UNRRA.

There will be no scandals, there will be no slander, there will be no graft or racketeering if this money is turned over to the American Red Cross, which organization would see to it that the hungry people of Europe are fed.

Remember that when disaster comes to your community, as it has come to mine, the Red Cross will be there, like angels of mercy, to minister to the sick or injured, and will remain until the last victim is cared for.

The following letter from Mrs. Mabel T. Boardman is a complete answer to Mrs. Meyer's attack:

The American Red Cross, since its reorganization, in 1905, has aided nearly 10,000,000 victims in approximately 6,000 disasters. For this purpose it has expended well over $100,000,000. This did not include the expenditure of local chapter funds for the same purpose. In addition, it expended in the First World War $273,000,000, and in the Second World War has expended considerably over $200,000,000 a year.

The American Red Cross has a membership of from 15,000,000 to 20,000,000 adults and approximately the same number of junior members. Considering these facts, it is difficult to take seriously the charge that it is undemocratic. It also seems slightly ridiculous to say that the Red Cross is afraid that labor may gain a foothold in its management, since the Red Cross years ago put labor-union leaders on its board of incorporators.

By its charter from Congress it is required that Red Cross receipts and expenditures be audited by the War Department.

The central committee, or governing body, consists of 18 members. Of these, the President of the United States, who is also president of the America Red Cross ex officio, appoints 6—the chairman, and representatives of the State, Treasury, War, Justice, and Navy Departments. Six are elected by the board of 65 incorporators, and 6 are elected by the delegates of its 3,757 chapters. The chairman of the central committee is chief executive officer.

The members of the governing body have lately been entitled by a writer as "old fuddy-duddy leaders." It will be interesting to note who these 18 "old fuddy-duddies" are: The chairman, Basil O'Connor, was appointed by the late President Roosevelt, of whom he was a former law partner, upon the death of Norman Davis, in July 1944. The members are Mr. William Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State; Hon. Daniel W. Bell, Under Secretary of the Treasury; Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, Surgeon General of the Army; Hon. Tom C. Clark, Attorney General of the Department of Justice; Vice Adm. Ross T McIntire, Surgeon General of the Navy; James B. Forgan, vice president and director of the First National Bank, Chicago, Ill.; Arthur Hays Sulzberger, president and publisher of the New York Times; Edward Dana, railway executive and banker, Boston, Mass.; Lloyd B. Wilson, president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Dwight Davis, former director of the Volunteer Special Services, American Red Cross; Mrs. Mason Colt, former deputy commissioner of the American Red Cross in London, World War II, now, director of Volunteer Special Services, American Red Cross; Dr. Oliver C. Carmichael, president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching; George L. Harrison, president and director, New York Life Insurance Co.; Charles H. Kellstadt, former chairman of the Cleveland (Ohio) chapter; Harry L. Hopkins, former Secretary of Commerce; Gurney Newlin, lawyer and banker, chairman of the Los Angeles chapter; Mrs. William O. Rowland, Jr., vice chairman of the Philadelphia chapter. The approximate average age of the present central committee is 55½ years.

The country is divided into five areas to facilitate rapid action in case of serious disasters, and in addition there are the insular and foreign operations departments. Under the regulations of the Red Cross, members of the Central Committee may be elected for only three terms, each term consisting of 3 years. Therefore, no member of this governing board has served over 9 years and the regulations do not permit anyone over 59 years of age being elected for the first term on the Central Committee.

As to the suggestion for State councils, this proposed organization was originally tried by the Red Cross and proved unsuccessful. In all larger States it was found impossible to secure meetings of the State groups. Annual meetings of chapter delegates with the Central Committee and other national representatives were arranged. These meetings have been held in Washington, D. C., Chicago, St. Louis, San Francisco and various other localities. During the war, because of governmental requests for limiting travel, the national convention has not convened, though State and regional meetings have been held.

The speaker I quote refers to the fact that labor assistance to the Red Cross has been presented in a "biased light." I see no foundation for this statement, as only the facts of the labor agreement were given.

As to the speaker's recommendation for the future reorganization of education, health, welfare services, that may be left to the consideration of those best qualified from experience to study and plan such reorganization to meet the needs of community, Nation and the world.

MABEL T. BOARDMAN.

WASHINGTON, *November 21.*

Transportation Home for Military Personnel

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1945

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, conditions at Leyte in respect to the return of troops apparently are the same as those existing in Manila, Okinawa, Wakayama, and other ports all over the world. There seems to be a great deal of misinformation being given out officially regarding conditions there. Here is a quotation from a letter written November 9, 1945, by one young man now being held there. It was written to his parents, and given to me by his parents:

When I last wrote I told you that in the past week 250 men had been sent home from this outfit. That was 2 weeks ago. Since then 550 additional men have gone. Our battalion receives 25 percent of all shipping space leaving the island of Leyte, so you can see for yourself how many soldiers have been repatriated in the last month. To rub salt into this wound—read in a news clipping that in one of those weeks military authorities announced that 17,000 men had left this island. Even counting the men who left with the Thirty-first Division, I don't see how this amount of shipping could come anywhere close to that figure. The Thirty-first Division, I had better say, is supposed to have been shipped as such, and not through any of the replacement units.

Yet every day almost, and we have this from members of the ships' crews, ships leave the harbor at Tagloban with comfortable berths for 40 or 50 additional men.

Why then should it be that one out of nine Liberty ships being counted in this harbor is scheduled to return personnel to the United States, while the others are to be used for prisoners-of-war transports? You should see the Japs on this island, incidentally. They live better and do less work than we do.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the President, who is still the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, just as much as he was last summer and fall, to show at least a little interest in executing the laws of the land by requiring the Army and the Navy to obey their own rules and regulations. Legislation will not fill boats with American soldiers, nor will it bring them across the ocean unless those charged with the duty of carrying out the will of Congress actually do the job.

Well-Timed Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1945

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the Nation fully appreciate the great service rendered by ex-Secretary of State Cordell Hull toward future world peace. Mr. Hull's name takes a place in American history toward the top of the long list of outstanding American statesmen who helped place this country as the world's most powerful Nation.

We heartily endorse the sentiments set out in the following editorial by H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary Post-Tribune, Gary, Ind.

WELL-TIMED AWARD

It is not always that public homage is as nicely timed as it was in the Nobel peace prize award to Cordell Hull. The honor comes to him soon after the close of an active, distinguished career that included more than 50 years of public service. It also comes at a time when the United Nations Organization, for which Mr. Hull deserves major credit, is assuming new importance.

It is generally conceded that Mr. Hull took the United Nations over the first and highest hurdle in the path of world organization when he went to Moscow 2 years ago. His diplomatic success there especially with the somewhat reluctant Foreign Commissar Molotov and Premier Stalin paved the way for Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco.

The actual ratification by the United Nations of the Charter drawn up at San Francisco came at a time of strained relations among the Big Three, and aroused little enthusiasm. Since then, however, it is becoming more and more apparent that the threat of atomic destruction must be solved within the framework of the United Nations Organization which Mr. Hull fathered.

Thus the Nobel award comes near the flood tide of world appreciation for Mr. Hull's work. We hope that the award will serve as a tonic to speed his convalescence from the long illness that forced him to leave public life, and that his wise counsel will long be available to those who carry on the work that he began.

Saving Our Precious Soil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1945

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include a letter from Mr. T. J. Powell, a most able and conscientious district conservationist, also newspaper clippings relative to prizes won by farmers in my district for proper soil conservation practiced in cooperation with Mr. Powell and his able staff of district commissioners. Being a stanch advocate of soil conservation myself, it goes without saying that I am proud of the fact that farmers in my district won these prizes. All of the 14 counties in the Seventh Iowa District, which I have the honor to represent in Congress, are organized into soil-conservation districts, and the very effective work to conserve our precious soil by the farmers and the men in the Soil Conservation Service deserve the highest commendation by every American who wants our rich soil preserved for posterity.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Shenandoah, Iowa.

Hon. BEN JENSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JENSEN: In September I sent you the story about the World-Herald soil conservation contest. All the districts in Nebraska were eligible to enter the contest. The 15 districts in southwest Iowa were eligible and all 15 of them entered the contest. The premium money is $500 to two winning districts in Iowa and to eight districts in Nebraska. The contest is about closed.

The awards will be made and released to the press within the next 10 days. * * * Page County and Mills County are the winners in Iowa. You will note that both of these districts are in your congressional district, also in my work group.

The award is $500 to each winning county for the commissioners to use as they see fit in promoting soil conservation in their respective districts. When the World-Herald makes the announcement I will send you a copy of the release.

The district commissioners in Page County are Joe O'Hara, Jr., Shenandoah, Iowa; V. E. Lewis, Villisca, Iowa; and Dave Cutter, Shenandoah, Iowa; and the three farmers who made the county a winner are John S. Snyder, Shenandoah, Iowa; Paul G. Williams, Villisca, Iowa; and Verne E. Lewis, Villisca, Iowa.

In Mills County the commissioners are J. F. Wearin, Jr., Hastings, Iowa; Dallas N. McGrew, Henderson, Iowa; J. M. Steele, Malvern, Iowa; and the winners' names in Mills County are Harry F. Clark, Malvern, Iowa; Reuel T. Harman, Tabor, Iowa; and J. F. Wearin, Jr., Hastings, Iowa.

It is interesting to me to note that a commissioner in each of the counties is also the man whose farm was used in the contest. I am very proud of having these awards won in my work group. No doubt you will want to show this information to some of your friends in Congress.

Hoping to see you during the holidays, I am,

Very truly yours,

T. J. POWELL,
District Conservationist.

IOWA COUNTY FIRST TO PICK SOIL LEADERS

(By Carl Deitemeyer)

The first district to announce its three leaders in the World-Herald $5,000 soil-conservation contest is Mills County, Iowa.

The leaders are Harry F. Clark, Malvern; Reuel T. Harmon, Tabor, and J. F. Wearin, Jr., Hastings.

Mr. Clark is the dean of the soil conservationists in Mills County. At 75, he is actively working the farm he purchased 37 years ago.

His farm is representative of the rougher land of the county. Mr. Clark has constructed 6½ miles of terraces to hold moisture and prevent soil erosion.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS LISTED

His soil-conservation accomplishments are: Crop rotation on 107 acres; terraces on 75,500 feet of waterway, 14 acres of permanent seeding, contouring 50 acres a year until farm is completed, 50 acres of crop-residue management, 39 acres of rotation hay and pasture, 80 acres on lime application, 35 acres in which livestock harvest the crop; fence construction, removal, and field arrangement.

The cost has been $1,473.

Mr. Clark says, "Sure soil conservation pays." During the first years he farmed his place corn yields ran from 25 to 40 bushels per acre. Corn yields the last few years have run from 75 to 80 bushels. His other crop yields also have been boosted.

"On my farm I can prove to any man that conservation pays," he says. "If all farmers in the Missouri River watershed would practice conservation, there would be but little need for extensive flood-control work."

NINETY-EIGHT PERCENT COMPLETE

Mr. Harmon has completed 98 percent of his soil conservation work since January 1945. He first became interested in 1942, and planned his first contouring. The results were so good that he decided to go all out this year.

His soil conservation accomplishments are: Constructed 6½ miles of terrace, removed 400 feet of fence and constructed 400 feet more; changed field arrangement on 127 acres; seeded down 33 acres; contoured 127 acres; practiced crop residue management on 127 acres; 45 acres in rotation hay and pasture.

His total cost was $1,174.

All feed he raises is marketed on the hoof. He finishes about 75 head of steers and 135 head of hogs each year. The livestock is fed on pasture and all rough forage is fed out. He takes pride in the fact that no crop residue has been burned on this farm since he purchased it.

WINNER IN OTHER FIELDS

Mr. Harmon has also won honors in other fields. In 1928 he was the Iowa State cornhusking champion, and he placed fifth in the national cornhusking contest that year. This year he placed third in the Cass County terrace building contest.

Mr. Wearin was born in Mills County in 1913, and spent his boyhood there. He holds a degree from Chicago University.

He has been farming on a bottom-land farm since 1937. Since 1942 he has developed a soil-conservation program. This meant changing the type of farming, field divisions, and cropping practices.

His accomplishments: Five and one-half miles of terraces on 30 acres of land; 2,600 feet of grassed waterway; 1,050 feet of diversion ditch; 500 feet of drainage ditch, 365 acres contoured and crop-residue managed; lime applied on 55 acres; 280 rods of fence removed, and 420 rods constructed.

His total cost, $1,381.

DISTRICT COMMISSIONER

Because of his interest in soil conservation, he was elected district commissioner of the Mills County District in 1941 and reelected in 1945. At present he is serving his fifth year as chairman of commissioners.

In the spring of 1945, Mr. Wearin was elected chairman of the Southwest Iowa Association of Conservation Districts. He was also a pioneer in developing the Mills County method of terrace construction.

State judging committees of Iowa and Nebraska have urged all districts to submit their winners as soon as possible. The dead line is October 15. The State committees will make their selections immediately after that.

Ten awards will be given. Two Iowa districts will receive $500 each, and eight districts in Nebraska a like amount each.

CONSERVATION GAINS IN IOWA—59 DISTRICTS EXIST; 9 BEING FORMED

Iowans are fast becoming more soil-saving conscious.

To date there are 59 soil-conservation districts in the 99 counties of the State. State Conservationist Frank Mendell, Ames, reports that landowners in nine other counties are circulating petitions for formation of districts.

Fifteen of the 59 districts in southwest Iowa are competing in the World-Herald's soil-conservation contest. Prizes of $500 each will go to 2 of the 15 districts whose members have done the best job of soil and moisture saving this year.

VETERANS IN WORK

Tuesday the Page County District commissioners announced their leaders in the World-Herald contest. Named were Paul G. Williams, Villisca; John S. Snyder, Shenandoah; and Verne E. Lewis, Villisca—all veterans in soil-saving operations.

Mr. Williams got his start when he was county agent of Shelby County. He started farming for himself in 1929.

His farm was rough. Straight farming was suicide, he said. Since 1932 he has performed all of his tillage operations on the contour.

In 1933 he built his first terrace with a Texas terracer. In recent years he has switched to the moldboard plow.

CCC CAMP HELPS

In 1936 Mr. Williams, aided by CCC camp workers, did some gully-control work by planting trees. In another field a pasture gully was controlled with a concrete drop inlet dam. Control of erosion is now 100 percent.

There are over 16 miles of terraces on his 580-acre farm.

To build up soil fertility, over 700 tons of lime have been spread. Practically all waterways are seeded to bromegrass.

The farm is essentially for livestock. He raises over 500 head of hogs a year, has never sold a bushel of corn.

Mr. Snyder started his conservation program in 1934. His farm of 160 acres now has more conservation practices, both in number and amount, than any other farm in southwestern Iowa.

BUILT TERRACES HIMSELF

Eleven miles of terraces have been built by Mr. Snyder himself. He has built 160 rods of contour fencing to facilitate the livestock-grazing program.

All waterways are sodded and no gullies exist anywhere. A wildlife area of about 2 acres was planted along a drainageway. It has become a good wildlife refuge.

One slope on the farm was considered too steep for regular rotated crops. It was terraced and seeded to permanent pasture.

Lime has been an important part of the program. Over 320 tons have been spread in the past 10 years.

Mr. Lewis started his program in 1935. The farm covers only 120 acres, but erosion problems were all out of proportion to the size of the farm.

GULLY CONTROLLED

There was one bad gully which had forked and eroded for several hundred yards up two drainage ways. Fourteen acres were fenced for a planting of black locust trees in 1937. Since then the banks of these gullies have sodded completely over. Erosion is under control. Last winter part of this stand of trees was harvested for posts.

There is a stock water pond near the buildings where part of the terrace system empties. Along with the terrace system, a strip-cropping program is used.

Contour pasture furrows were installed in the permanent pasture in 1937.

During the last 10 years he has spread 225 tons of lime on all crop and pasture land.

GOOD CORN DRYING WEATHER IN IOWA

DES MOINES, IOWA.—Good weather conditions for drying the wettest corn crop in many years prevailed throughout the week ended Sunday.

The Weather Bureau reported Wednesday that temperatures and sunshine averaged near normal and winds helped dry the crop.

Mr. Hurley's Charges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of November 28, 1945:

MR. HURLEY'S CHARGES

The gist of Mr. Hurley's charges, in announcing his resignation as Ambassador to China, is that a Roosevelt-Hull-Truman-Byrnes foreign policy which he heartily endorses is being sabotaged in Asia, and particularly in China, by officials in the lower ranks of the State Department and the diplomatic service, and that the result is to encourage simultaneously both "colonial imperialism and Communist imperialism." This charge covers a good deal of ground, and in view of the gravity of his accusations it seems to us that Mr. Hurley ought to be more specific than he has permitted himself to be in most of what he has to say. He is, however, entirely specific on one point. This is his charge that while he was attempting, on official instructions, to help negotiate a settlement between the Chinese Nationalists and the Chinese Communists "our professional diplomats continuously advised" the Communists that his efforts to prevent a collapse of the Nationalist Government "did not represent the policy of the United States," and that the same diplomats further advised the Communists "to decline unification of the Chinese Communist Army with the Nationalist Army unless the Chinese Communists were given control." On this point Secretary Byrnes will doubtless wish to look into the record, and in due course give assurance to the country, by one means or another, that policy adopted at the top is actually followed faithfully down the line.

For the present, the net effect of Mr. Hurley's statement must be to increase current confusion about our policy in China, and at the same time emphasize the need of a new statement, either by the President himself or by Mr. Byrnes, which will clear the air. The prompt appointment of General Marshall as Mr. Hurley's successor provides the occasion for such a statement. And certainly the fundamentals of our policy, as shaped by our pledged word, by our long friendship for China and by considerations of our own self-interest, can be stated plainly.

We are committed to the unification of the whole of China, Manchuria included. We are pledged to the abolition of all spheres of foreign influence within China, and of extraterritoriality and all other special foreign

privileges. We hope for a fair and generous settlement of the long dispute between the Nationalists and Communists, but we do not believe it is possible to have a unified China with two independent armies in the field. As between Nationalists and the Communists we have recognized, and we shall continue to recognize and to support, the Nationalists as the legitimate Government of China. A limited number of American troops are now in China, not to aid that government in fighting the Communists, or to take part in Chinese civil war, but to complete the Japanese surrender there in conformity with obligations formally assumed by the American Government. In the performance of that duty they are entitled to understanding and support at home.

Refund of Retirement Deductions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., November 19, 1945.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MCCORMACK: You have been receiving an increasing volume of letters and calls from your constituents regarding delays in obtaining refunds of retirement deductions.

Naturally, the Commission is concerned over this increased correspondence, and it has been endeavoring to find out what it can do about it. It has already taken steps so far as its own force is concerned; but in order for these refund claims to be paid promptly, it will be necessary to get more expeditious reporting of them from the places of employment.

To get at the root of the problem, our Retirement Division has carefully analyzed the 23,000 claims certified to the Treasury Department during the second and fourth weeks of October. This analysis clearly reflects that there are two significant time factors in processing refund claims. These are:

(a) The time required by the employing agency to furnish the Commission with the record of pay-roll deductions and the application for refund following the date of separation of the employee;

(b) The time required by the Commission to examine the claim for its validity and to certify the claim to the Treasury Department for payment.

The analysis of the 23,000 claims shows that 58 percent were received in the Commission from the agencies 3 months or more after separation; that 22 percent were received in the Commission 6 months or more after separation; and that 6 percent were received 1 year or more after separation.

The same record shows that 66 percent of the claims were paid during the same calendar month that the claims were received in the Commission, and that 27 percent were paid in the first calendar month following the date the claims were received in the Commission. We have recently installed an assembly line operation which completely processes 80 percent of the claims received from the agencies within four working days. The remaining 20 percent take a somewhat longer period depending upon the need for obtaining additional information, offsetting Government claims, locating prior records, etc. This improved procedure will have the effect of greatly accelerating processing time within the Commission.

The necessity for paying refund claims with greater promptness becomes more significant as each month passes when we consider it is anticipated that 900,000 employees will leave the Federal service throughout this fiscal year because of reductions in force. Separated employees will need the refunds due them to tide them over between loss of Federal employment and reestablishment in private industry. It is most important that each agency of the Government, including the Civil Service Commission, handle applications for refund with the realization that they owe these separated employees an obligation to process their claims with maximum speed.

It needs to be pointed out that regardless of how rapidly we in the Commission do our share of the load, you will continue to receive an unduly large volume of complaints from your constituents unless the agencies forward the applications for refund and the pay-roll deduction records to us much more promptly than is reflected in this study of claims.

This letter is being sent to each Member of Congress, and a copy is being sent to each department and agency head with a letter showing the precise record made by each agency in the handling of applications for refund.

Sincerely,

HARRY B. MITCHELL,
President.

NOVEMBER 29, 1945.

Hon. HARRY B. MITCHELL,
President, Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MITCHELL: I am in receipt of your most interesting and informative letter of November 19, 1945, relative to the efforts of the Civil Service Commission to expedite consideration of the payment of refunds of retirement deductions.

I want you to know that I consider your letter to be excellent because it conveys to me the information that the Commission is acting upon these applications for refunds as soon as possible and that the delay is caused elsewhere than at the Civil Service Commission.

I believe your letter contains much information of value and if it is not already a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I shall insert it therein.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Majority Leader.

The News Behind the News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article by Paul Mallon:

THE NEWS BEHIND THE NEWS

(By Paul Mallon)

WASHINGTON, November 29.—A photographically nosey weekly magazine is out currently with a yarn that Washington and Congress have begun to turn against President Truman; that the Truman policy of getting good men and letting them have their heads in the Cabinet and sub-Cabinet is not working out efficiently, presumably because the men are not good enough; that the departure of Judge Rosenman, the Roosevelt fixer and the arrival at the Presidential right hand of George Allen, a fine democratic fellow, presages trouble; that the Republicans have awakened to expectations of victory—and so on.

That is not the way I get it. Such a picture presents merely the visible froth of a boiling internal condition of the Government; true as far as it penetrates, but not penetrating. More thorough digging would reveal the matter something like this:

A tremendous inner struggle for direction of President Truman is going on between the old Roosevelt crowd and the party people; it ebbs and flows from week to week, day to day, and has not been concluded.

The Ickes-Wallace wing in the Cabinet, together with the old New Deal clique in Congress, view with alarm the fact that the Roosevelt policies are not popular in the country and they are inclined to blame Truman. When they dare not express themselves openly, they spread their viewpoint in private and it reaches print in forms like the above-mentioned magazine story.

It is customary in politics for parties to follow their great beyond the grave. The Republicans ran on Abraham Lincoln for more than 50 years. The Rooseveltian associates would like to build up a political legend like that for the Democrats.

Unfortunately the times today do not fit the Roosevelt labor and spending doctrines, which were contrived for an era of depression and seem foolish in a postwar era of inflation.

Now Mr. Truman has followed and fought for every one of those policies from unemployment insurance and full employment (while there are still many more jobs than workers) up to spending (keeping his budget more than double Roosevelt's greatest peacetime expenditure). And he is maintaining expenditure at a time when purchasing power is much too strong for the amount of goods available.

He wanted to give labor a tremendous wage increase, and permitted the issue to go to negotiations, only when associates convinced him such a boost would add to purchasing power during the shortage of goods and surely bring inflationary ruin.

Thus he has doggedly stuck to a losing game, the Roosevelt game, and with normal human perversity, the New Dealers blame him because their program failed to hold water. He did not "fight enough," they say.

Rosenman has now gone home for the final time, they also say. (He worked up the Roosevelt CIO-labor-spending program for Truman.) But Ickes, Wallace, and the New Dealers are still around, and as for the political angle, Democratic Chairman Bob Hannegan is heavily and exclusively playing the Roosevelt game, trying to save the Pearl Harbor inquiry from too much inquisitiveness, lauding Mrs. Roosevelt, etc.

Now Congress is scared of this, which it sees. Congress faces the polls next year, long before Truman. Congressmen are preponderantly against the program and would take leadership openly to face the economic facts of the hour, but they feel the necessity for political caution. They are trimming expenditures, delaying the CIO bills—but quietly.

The worst of the matter is labor picked a bad time to strike. With people panting for automobiles, and the Nation eager for humming production in all lines; high prices going higher and higher, money, money, money everywhere anxious to be spent—the unions stop production.

Their strikes, therefore, developed the nature of revolt against the public, the Government, and postwar success of the Nation. If

they had waited until purchasing power started to lag, and the goods shortage was absorbed by production, they would have had a better case, and would have gained public support.

This is the long running inner condition, which, as I said, fluctuates from week to week. Published political prophesies about Mr. Truman, then, merely represent pressure to force him to act one way or another.

Veterans Given Greater Opportunities To Buy Surplus Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I reprinted a statement relative to veterans buying of war surplus, made at the recent American Legion convention in Chicago, by Mr. Joseph Leib, a service officer of the Legion Post No. 15, Department of the District of Columbia.

I was prompted to do so by the many letters which I have received from veterans of World War II who have been frustrated in their efforts to secure surplus property, even though they were given priorities.

Some criticisms would appear to be partly justified, but not altogether so. Although the veterans are not getting the break they are entitled to, it is not the fault of the Surplus Property Administration, according to a letter received by me this morning from Mr. W. Stuart Symington, Administrator.

In fairness to the Surplus Property Administration, I am reprinting his excellent letter addressed to me under date of November 30. It follows:

SURPLUS PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., November 29, 1945.

Hon. HAROLD C. HAGEN,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAGEN: Our attention has been called to the extension of your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 20 entitled, "Workable Plan Necessary to Sell Surpluses to Veterans," in which you incorporated a statement by Mr. Joseph Leib, past vice commander and present service officer of the Vincent B. Costello Post, No. 15, of the American Legion, District of Columbia.

There are several points in Mr. Leib's letter on which we should like to comment.

Devising a workable plan to insure veterans being able to purchase surplus property has been the most difficult problem faced by the Surplus Property Administration and its predecessor, the Surplus Property Board. Mr. Leib has stated "the high priority which the United States Government solemnly promised the veteran of World War II * * * has become * * * a mirage."

Specifically, the Surplus Property Act of 1944, section 16, prescribed "The Board shall prescribe regulations to effectuate the objectives of this act to aid veterans to establish and maintain their own small business, professional, or agricultural enteprises, by affording veterans suitable preferences to the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of this act in the acquisition of the types of surplus property useful in such enterprises."

The act also prescribed in section 12 and in section 13 that priorities in the purchase of surplus property be set up by regulation giving priority to (1) the Federal agencies and (2) State and local governments and their instrumentalities. Thus it can be seen that the "high priority" mentioned by Mr. Leib is, in fact, a No. 3 preference. Also, when you consider that there are approximately 285,000 claimant agencies, either Federal, State, or local Governments and their instrumentalities, which exercise priorities ahead of the veteran, it can be readily seen why the veteran has his difficulties under this act.

This problem of priority was one of the difficulties we faced several months ago when we sat down to work out a revision of Surplus Property Board regulation 7, the veterans' preference regulation. On October 10 the revised regulation implementing the Surplus Property Act of 1944 in respect to veterans' preferences was announced.

This new regulation contained many liberalized provisions to help the veteran. Directly to the point erroneously made by Mr. Leib in his letter to you, this new regulation removed the $2,500 limit on the veterans' purchase.

The statute and new regulation 7 give the veteran the following rights:

1. The statute authorizes SWPC to buy for small business when, in the judgment of SWPC, such purchase will strengthen the competitive position of small business. If a veteran is a small businessman, SWPC can purchase under its No. 1 Federal priority for resale to the veteran under such cimcumstances.

(Under the old SPB regulation, veterans could acquire property only in this way. The new regulation has not taken away this right under the statute, and also gives additional methods to purchase.)

2. Under the new regulation the veteran as a veteran can buy directly from the disposal agency, this after he has been certified by SWPC as a veteran and shows that he needs the property for business, professional or agricultural use. This right to purchase direct is given a preference, as Congress specified, immediately following the priorities of the Federal agencies and State and local governments.

3. Under the new regulation SWPC may act as an agent in making purchases for veterans, but in doing so it does not exercise its Federal priority. It employs the veteran's money, not SWPC money, and the sale is made directly to the veteran by the disposal agency.

That such purchases are being made is demonstrated by the recent announcement that SWPC will buy 2,500 of the first 9,100 surplus jeeps placed on the market, using their top priority as a Federal agency, and will then resell them to veterans.

As for Mr. Leib's complaint that the veterans must buy from a Federal agency, the Surplus Property Act of 1944 specifically declares that surplus goods shall be disposed of by Federal agencies named by the Administration.

Complaint is also made that "restrictions are placed upon the use of such goods. Veterans under existing regulations are not given priorities as far as clothing, furniture, food, or other types of consumer goods are concerned." In answer to this, let us cite the act which, in section 16, relating to disposition to veterans, states:

"The Administration shall prescribe regulations to effectuate the objectives of this act to aid veterans to establish and maintain their own small business, professional, or agricultural enterprises, by affording veterans suitable preferences to the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of this act in the acquisition of surplus property useful in such enterprises."

There is no provision in the act under which the Administration may sell consumer items to the ultimate consumer; to the contrary, we are specifically charged with utilizing, wherever possible, the normal channels of trade in the disposition of such items.

There is one final point of Mr. Leib's statement on which we should like to comment. This is his reference to the proposal to permit veterans to purchase surplus property from the Nation's wholesalers at lowest price made to retailers.

First, let us emphasize that this is proposed not as a substitute for, but as a supplement to, existing regulations.

One of the greatest difficulties facing veterans in purchasing surplus property is the limited number of outlets from which such purchases can be made. Even though RFC has taken over disposal of consumer goods, as well as capital and producers goods, there are still only 31 regional sales offices in the Nation through which their disposals can be made.

This means that in many cases the veteran is forced to travel considerable distances, at considerable expense, in order to examine and choose the property he needs. Sometimes such property is not exactly what the veteran wants and the expenses of his trip are lost.

An alternative solution would be the establishment by the Government of hundreds of other disposal agency sales outlets—in effect, a Nation-wide network of retail stores to sell to veterans direct at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars to the Nation.

Another plan which we are now discussing with Members of Congress and other interested groups is the suggestion that veterans be permitted to purchase from wholesalers all over the Nation under the pricing classification of large dealers, or at the lowest price offered any retail group. This price would be offered by the wholesalers, even though the veteran's purchase was in far smaller lots than those of the large retailer.

Such a plan would tend to solve the problem of outlets, because it would offer to the veteran many thousands of points where he could purchase surplus property at a favorable price; this in comparison to the 31 outlets now available through RFC.

This plan has already been proposed to the Wholesalers Industry Advisory Committee, which has patriotically and enthusiastically agreed to cooperate with us in it.

But it should be remembered that the adoption of this plan will in no way affect existing veterans' preferences. The veteran will still be able to purchase directly from the disposal agency, or through SWPC, and at the lowest trade—or wholesale—price level. He will be permitted to exercise his choice. If it seems desirable to him to pay the profit which wholesalers regularly realize only on large lot sales, he may do so. He still has the right to travel to the regional office of a Government disposal agency and buy at the price to wholesalers himself.

This program is still only a proposal. While it offers a method of greatly expediting sales to veterans through the addition of thousands of new outlets, we realize that it still may be improved upon.

We have submitted the plan to Members of Congress and other interested groups, and are assured by Senator O'MAHONEY that his Senate committee will soon hold hearings to discuss its merits before a final decision is reached. We are anxious for such a discussion, and will welcome any comments, criticisms, or suggestions.

In conclusion, may we assure you that the Surplus Property Administration is thoroughly conscious of the veterans' problems and our obligations to these returning men and women. We have spent more time on this phase of surplus disposal than on any other, and have consulted widely with leading veterans' organizations, Members of Con-

gress, and many other people in an effort to come up with a workable plan under the provisions of the Surplus Property Act.

With appreciation for your interest,

Sincerely yours,

W. STUART SYMINGTON,
Administrator.

President General of the Daughters of the American Revolution Answers Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most gratuitous insults that has yet been hurled at the Daughters of the American Revolution was a statement made by one Judge Phillip Forman, judge of the United States district court, at Trenton, N. J., on November 13, 1945, in which he uses his power as a circuit court judge in New Jersey to try to coerce the Daughters of the American Revolution in Washington into abandoning their policy with reference to Constitution Hall.

Speaking of his letter to Mrs. Lyman Leavitt, chairman of the Americanization committee of the local chapters of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Judge Forman said:

The action of the national body of the DAR in restricting the use of its hall in the Capital at Washington against Negroes was the kind of policy that could not be reconciled with the doctrines of American citizenship as expounded in the Declaration of Independence, wherein it is asserted that all men are created equal. That text embodies the spirit of naturalization in this court, and the reported action of the national body of the DAR was, in my opinion, diametrically opposed to it.

I suggested that unless the chapters desiring to participate in these proceedings would repudiate the action of their national body, their introduction would be embarrassing to the new citizens, the court, and the Daughters of the American Revolution itself.

It is becoming more and more apparent that Congress is going to have to use the power of impeachment to protect the American people from the abuse of certain individuals who now occupy positions in the Federal judiciary.

If this arrogant occupant of the Federal bench can dictate to the Daughters of the American Revolution in Washington what they shall do with their own building, he can do the same thing with the American Legion, the Masonic Lodge, the public schools, and every religious organization in the city.

I repeat what I have said before, that there has never been a more patriotic organization of real American women in this country than the Daughters of the American Revolution.

The following letter from Mrs. Julius Y. Talmadge, president general of the Daughters of the American Revolution, to Judge Forman, is a complete and dignified answer which every real American should read.

The matter referred to follows:

NOVEMBER 28, 1945.

The Honorable PHILLIP FORMAN,
United States Circuit Court of Appeals,
Federal Building, Trenton, N. J.

MY DEAR MR. JUSTICE: This is an answer to your statement published in the Trenton Times of November 13.

When anyone strikes at the Americanization program of the Daughters of the American Revolution we must keep the record straight.

According to your published statement, you telephoned a DAR Americanization committee officer and "suggested" that the introduction of DAR members who distribute the DAR Manual of Citizenship to applicants for citizenship would be embarrassing to new citizens in your naturalization court.

Your reason for this is stated to be based on the action of the DAR in restricting use of Constitution Hall to white concert artists. Your statement said:

"I suggested that unless the chapters desiring to participate in these proceedings would repudiate the action of their national body, their introduction would be embarrassing to the new citizens, the court, and the Daughters of the American Revolution itself."

The reason why you injected yourself into the Hazel Scott controversy still appears unclear despite your explanation. As a member of the Federal bench, you are familiar with the rules and customs prevailing in the District of Columbia, where separate schools and playgrounds, separate restaurants, auditoriums, hotels, and theaters are provided for whites and colored.

The Daughters of the American Revolution, in spite of attacks by politicians, radicals, Communists, and other enemies, refuses to violate these customs. The DAR operates Constitution Hall as a cultural center in accordance with these prevailing customs. Moreover, since we own Constitution Hall, we do not permit its use by radicals, by propagandists, by those who do not measure up to true American ideals, and by those who cannot qualify to high cultural standards.

The DAR is not at all "embarrassed," as you suggest, in meeting newly naturalized citizens in your court or in any other naturalization court. And many letters of appreciation from new citizens are evidence they are not embarrassed to meet a DAR citizenship worker. Therefore, our Americanization work will continue in full force despite suggestions or objections from any source.

The help given new citizens by the DAR Manual for Citizenship has won widespread praise for years. The manual is recognized by many as the best handbook on American citizenship ever published. Its use is encouraged.

The manual was first published by the DAR in 1921. It is printed in English and in 17 other languages. To date over 7,000,000 copies have been distributed free of charge.

The DAR strives for better citizenship in other ways, aiding under-privileged youths of all race, creeds, and color. Our Junior American Citizens Clubs, our Girl Home Makers, our Good Citizenship Pilgrims, and our mountain schools, entirely supported by DAR funds, are examples.

The rules and regulations upon which prevailing customs in this city are based were formulated by the Senate and House of Representatives. For example, the Senate, as you know, does not permit Negro newspapermen to sit in the Senate Press Gallery. To use your own published words in regard to the DAR you might also declare that "kind of policy could not be reconciled with the doctrines of American citizenship as expounded in the Declaration of Independence wherein it is asserted that all men are created equal."

The Senate confirmed your appointment to the Federal bench. We do not suggest, however, that you are embarrassed.

The DAR has been most unfairly attacked. We expect this from some sources. However, we ask you to remain neutral in this controversy and to welcome DAR representatives in your naturalization court the same as they are welcomed in the other courts of the land.

A copy of this letter is being sent to the editor of the Trenton Times with a request that it be published in full. Another copy is being sent to the Attorney General of the United States for his information.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JULIUS Y. TALMADGE,
President General, NSDAR.

UNRRA Criticism Answered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement in answer to certain criticisms of UNRRA and the conduct of hearings by the Foreign Affairs Committee:

In view of the fact that sharp criticisms have recently been directed on the floor of the House concerning the matter in which the House Foreign Affairs Committee has conducted the recent hearings on the second authorization to UNRRA, I believe it important to set the record straight. In what follows I want to address myself primarily to the attacks made by my distinguished colleague from Ohio as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 27 on page 11058.

1. The gentleman from Ohio implies that UNRRA refused access to the Army report on the alleged black-market operations at the UNRRA set-up at Granville, France. The chairman stated that since it was an Army report he would ask the Army for the material, and with its permission the report would be made available.

2. The gentleman from Ohio complains that we were not told why UNRRA had turned down a process for the use of soybeans. I had not thought this was a matter of major importance but I am informed that material on this question was forwarded to him on November 27 but naturally did not reach him until after he had made his speech. I am adding this material at the close of my statement.

3. The gentleman from Ohio makes much of the fact that we did not call 449 ex-employees of UNRRA to testify. The gentleman in question wanted us to delay action not only until we wrote each of these 449 persons and received their replies but also until these replies were collated and they testified before us. Obviously this would have dragged out the proceedings not only for weeks, but for months. In the meantime hundreds of thousands of innocent women and children would have starved. I should like to ask if it is seriously contended that it would have been useful for us to have delayed so long in order to obtain somewhat doubtful testimony.

In this connection it should be noted that Director Lehman stated that any member of the committee was free to examine the record of the exit interviews given to everyone who left the service of UNRRA. Certainly the doors of our committee were open to any witness who wished to come forward and testify.

4. The gentleman from Ohio accuses UNRRA of being inefficient because it is not

able to ship the goods immediately after it gets the necessary funds from us. It would be fine if we could have a magic wand which would sweep away time and space and enable grain, meats, fats, sugar, clothes, shoes, seed, and tractors to pour into ships at a moment's notice. But my distinguished colleague must realize that this only happens in fairy tales and not in a world of business. It is necessary to get the Central Committee of UNRRA to allocate the available funds for 1946 between the various countries. It then requires some time to place the necessary orders. For if abuses and wastes were to develop because of excessive waste on UNRRA's part I am extremely doubtful whether the critics of UNRRA would, on the basis of their past record, overflow with forgiveness. Businesses, moreover, in view of present shortages, need some time in which to make deliveries to the docks. If the gentleman in question and his minority colleagues are truly anxious to get the goods to the stricken countries in a hurry, may I invite them to have the bill brought up for debate quickly before the House and acted upon? Thus far the delay has been far more ours than it has been UNRRA's. It now lies within the power of the gentleman and his associates to remedy this uncertain situation. Until this is done, such criticism would seem to come from those who dwell in glass houses.

5. It is complained that the tentative allocations between the countries of the funds for 1946, while made out, have not yet been published. I have already suggested the reason for this. It is because they have not yet been submitted to the Central Committee of UNRRA upon which we of course are represented. To publish the figures in advance of such submission might start an open struggle between the various countries to increase their shares which to put it mildly would not be helpful. It is better to have this done within the body charged with that responsibility.

The gentleman in question admits that he was shown the proposed figures which it is planned to submit to the Central Committee of UNRRA and he is at liberty to use them if he so desires.

The gentleman from Ohio does not mention the fact that while our committee was ready to call any opposition witness which he or any other Member wished to bring forward that only one such individual appeared. He also does not mention the fact that representatives of the National Catholic Welfare Conference and the Friends Service Committee, which have had a great deal of experience in foreign relief, testified strongly in behalf of UNRRA, as did representatives of most of the public-spirited organizations of the country.

It would be much more forthright if the opponents of UNRRA were to come out in the open and state their opposition instead of sniping at it behind technicalities and conducting a delaying operation at this stage of a cold, grim winter. In any event, in order that the cause of UNRRA may not be unjustly prejudiced in advance of debate I believe these facts should in simple fairness be made a matter of public record.

STATEMENT BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF UNRRA, HERBERT H. LEHMAN, IN REPLY TO QUESTIONS RAISED ON NOVEMBER 20 BY CONGRESSMAN VORYS, OF OHIO, WITH RESPECT TO SOYA FLOUR

Question. Did UNRRA buy about 60,000,000 pounds of soya flour, all or part of which spoiled?

Answer. No. The War Food Administration and UNRRA agreed on March 22, 1945, to transfer from the inventory of the former to the inventory of the latter approximately 56,000,000 pounds of low-fat soya flour, and approximately 16,000,000 pounds of low-fat soya grits. On May 15, 1945, the WFA advised UNRRA of its intention to reduce the amount of the transfer of low-fat soya flour from about 56,000,000 to 22,000,000 pounds, because (a) about 18,500,000 pounds could not, on account of ODT restrictions, be moved east from the Pacific coast and had, therefore, been made available on the U. S. S. R. lend-lease program; and (b) about 14,000,000 pounds was found on inspection to be out of condition. UNRRA shipped to the countries receiving its assistance, the 22,000,000 pounds delivered to it by the WFA. The entire quantity arrived in good condition and every country to which part of it was sent requested more.

Question. Why did UNRRA refuse to purchase full-fat soya flour from the Soya Corporation of America which product (produced by a patented process which it is claimed removes all bitterness and prevents the development of rancidity) was approved by the Army, the Navy, and the Bureau of Standards?

Answer. UNRRA made no such refusal. UNRRA does not buy its supplies from vendors. The Department of Agriculture procures all the foods shipped by UNRRA from the United States. That Department is entirely free to place UNRRA's orders with whatever vendors it sees fit. Should that Department contract with the Soya Corp. of America, or with any other vendor, UNRRA would accept the product provided only that it passed official inspection.

Question. Why does not UNRRA specifically requisition the soy flour produced by the Soya Corp. of America?

Answer. UNRRA to date has not specifically requisitioned the full-fat soy flour produced by the Soya Corp. of America for the reason that it has not to date been convinced that this product differs so materially from that of other manufacturers of full-fat soy flour as to warrant the exclusion of other manufacturers from participation in orders placed by the Department of Agriculture on behalf of UNRRA. In this connection UNRRA has sought the views of technologists and Dr. L. S. Stuart, of the United States Department of Agriculture, has stated that "in our experience we have not found the full-fat soy flour produced by the Soya Corp. of America to be materially different in its properties from the full-fat soy flour produced by four or five other manufacturers of this product."

The requisition which UNRRA has recently placed for 4,000 tons of full-fat soy flour will be filled under the usual procedures of the United States Department of Agriculture in which all suppliers are given an opportunity to offer their product. Should the Agriculture Department purchase the product of the Soya Corp. of America, UNRRA will be more than happy to accept it.

It should perhaps be added that UNRRA's efforts over the past 2 years to encourage, in every one of the countries receiving its aid, greater use of soy products, as a substitute for scarce animal proteins, have met with great success. That encouragement has included (a) the circulation of literature emphasizing the high nutritional value of both full and low-fat soy flour, (b) extensive experiments incorporating up to 10 percent of soy flour in bread, and (c) the free, first-hand assistance in every country of an outstanding United States expert on a great range of uses of soy products. As a result UNRRA has been receiving for some months orders for soy products in excess of the quantities it is able to procure out of its meager available financial resources. UNRRA has programed for shipment, during December 1945, 4,000, 6,000, and 5,000 tons, respectively, of full fat (about 22 percent fat), expeller type (4 to 7 percent fat), and solvent type (about 1 percent fat) of soy flour. Every one of the countries (Albania, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Poland, and Yugoslavia) to which these soy flours are being sent would gladly accept much larger quantities if UNRRA had the funds with which to buy the amounts requested.

Our Policy in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan, from the Washington Post of November 30, 1945:

OUR POLICY IN CHINA

(By Mark Sullivan)

The outcry of Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, until this week Ambassador to China, covered substantially the whole of our foreign relations—our policies about Russia, Britain, China, the United Nations; and the administration of these policies, both by our ambassadors abroad and internally within the State Department. Within so large a field are many problems. One among them, China, which General Hurley emphasized, lends itself to comparatively simple statements. It is to China that the very capable Gen. George C. Marshall is being sent.

When we were drawn into the war, China, was divided. There was a central government, headed by Chiang Kai-shek, covering much the larger part of the country and embracing much the larger part of the population. A dissident group consisted of Communists. Both groups fought the Japanese. The Communists demanded that we provide them with arms, the same as Chiang Kai-shek, and that we otherwise treat them on a basis of equality.

To handle the problems thus presented, and in general to try to bring about cooperation between the Communists and the central government, President Roosevelt sent General Hurley to China.

As to the demands for arms from us, General Hurley took the ground that on the broadest principles we could not give arms to a dissident group within a nation that was our ally. Further, it was clear that a gift of arms by us to the Communists, however it might help the Communists to fight Japan, would have a deadly effect of discouraging the central government, which was our main reliance. To keep the central government and its armed forces alive was our constant and extreme anxiety. This course by General Hurley accorded with the specific and direct instructions he had received from President Roosevelt.

After the war against Japan was won, the cleavage in China continued. What to do about it is our present problem. It is determinable by whatever is to be our future interest and policy about the Far East, especially China and Japan.

We fought the war to resist an aggression by Japan. Our principal future interest is to keep Japan incapable of another such aggression. We think of this as our responsibility, alone. But a strong and united China is a better assurance of keeping Japan down than large American forces kept in the Far East indefinitely.

In China the Communists and the central government continue to battle. What to do about this is our immediate problem. For us the answer is the same, it is to have a strong and united China. This cannot be, so long as there are within China's territory two governments with two armies. Diplomatically our task is to bring the two governments together. If that cannot be, we are led by our self-interest and bound by our pledged word to support the central government.

The situation brings up an immediate problem. In the territory covered by the

Communist government are American troops. They went there to aid in receiving the surrender of the Japanese. The Communists demand that we withdraw them. This demand has some support in our own country. Some of this support is motivated by the simple wish to get our soldiers home, to end involvement in foreign disputes. Some of this no doubt comes from sympathy with the Communists.

We want to bring about an orderly and peaceful world, everywhere. To that end we keep troops in Germany, and assume we may have to keep them there for decades.

The fact that Germany was a conquered country does not, in its bearing on the broad problem, make it different from China as an allied country. Without a unified China, there cannot be order in that country nor elsewhere in the Far East. If the attainment of a unified China and an orderly world will be furthered by presence of our troops in that country until order is restored, our world purpose calls for us to keep them there.

Effect of Strikes on Veterans

REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1945

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, it is estimated by the Michigan State Office of Veterans' Affairs, that 40,000 veterans are out of work in Michigan this morning because of labor strikes. It seems too bad that these returning veterans should be confronted with a situation of this kind. On October 19 I called the attention of the House to a new kind of strike, initiated in Michigan, in which World War I veterans were striking against World War II veterans because of union seniority rights. My remarks are found on page A4402 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This morning my attention has been called to an article appearing in the Ann Arbor (Mich.) News which throws considerable light on the unemployment compensation law as it affects veterans who are presumed to be entitled to their jobs. The article is as follows:

STATE PREPARING TEST CASES OF VETERANS INVOLVED IN GM DISPUTE

(By William Kulsea)

LANSING.—The State office of veterans' affairs is preparing test cases of veterans involved in the GM-UAW (CIO) wage dispute for final adjudication before the Veterans' Administration in Washington, in order to clarify the right of ex-servicemen to unemployment benefits under the GI bill of rights.

Col. Philip C. Pack, of Ann Arbor, said two or three test cases will be chosen with the help of veterans' counselors in Detroit and Flint, and the results will be taken to Washington by special courier. He estimated that 40,000 veterans are involved in the present labor tie-up.

Pack has told veterans' counselors to tell every veteran involved to file a claim for unemployment benefits with the Michigan Unemployment Compensation Commission, the State agency that handles payments under the GI bill, and to appeal them to the readjustment agent if they are turned down.

Veterans cannot draw benefits under the State compensation law, because it states specifically that persons involved in labor disputes are not eligible for payments.

John Reid, of Lansing, member of the unemployment compensation commission, said that the GI bill contains almost the same clause as the Michigan statute in prohibiting payment of benefits to veterans interested in a labor dispute.

Pack asserted that his agency's interpretation is that the Federal act contains nothing relative to the current labor strife and the law should be further clarified by a ruling from the Veterans' Administration.

Pack said the Federal act disqualifies a veteran if he leaves "suitable work voluntarily, without good cause," but he went on to say that the same law also states this language shall not apply if it is shown that the veteran is "not participating in or directly interested in the labor dispute which causes the work stoppage.

The State law provides payment of up to $28 a week for 20 weeks, and the Federal law $20 a week up to a maximum of 52 weeks.

The Army-Navy Football Game

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to take your mind off of the real serious problems for just a moment. Tomorrow many of us are going to the Army-Navy football game. It will be a classic. This year it will determine the national championship.

The boys on these teams come from all parts of the Nation. The teams and the activities which they represent are national teams and national institutions. They are not the team of any locality or any segment of our country. They represent all of us, and in the schools which they represent are men from every congressional district and every territory of the United States.

I believe that no part of the country should have a monopoly on this game. This is especially true now that we are in the air age and the country can be crossed in less than 10 hours by plane.

For this reason I seriously suggest that in the future the Army and Navy game be played in a different part of the country each year. One Army-Navy game was played in Chicago and one was played in Pittsburgh. Otherwise, they have all been played on the eastern seaboard.

I think, therefore, that if this program is inaugurated that the first game played away from the eastern seaboard should be on the Pacific coast. Also, I believe that the most appropriate place to play the first Army-Navy game on the Pacific coast would be in the memorial stadium of the University of California at Berkeley, Calif. This is centrally located and has a beautiful stadium, erected in the honor of the men who served in the First World War. It seats 90,000, and the capacity could be increased to over 100,000 very easily.

This is a practical suggestion. The Army and the Navy have planes available to carry the teams and even the entire student body to the Pacific coast. The trip could be an exercise in the rapid transport of troops across the continent. The cost would not be great because the equipment and personnel to handle the transportation problem are now, and will be in the future, in the armed forces. The mere job of transporting would be an excellent exercise in the training of the cadets.

Also, it would let the people get a view of the men who will be the future custodians of our national security. These men are the future guardians of our safety. They come from every segment of our population and every part of our country, and, therefore, all parts of the country should have a chance to see them and also to entertain them in their largest and most colorful athletic event. I do hope that the appropriate committees of Congress will take steps to implement this idea. I am presenting a resolution to carry out this idea.

Furlough or Leave Time for Privates and Noncommissioned Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. GIBSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1945

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that more rapidity has not been exercised to bring H. R. 4051, introduced by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS], and H. R. 4743, introduced by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], to the floor of the House that the same may be enacted into law with the least delay possible.

The purpose of this legislation is to provide for enlisted men—that is, privates and noncommissioned officers—furlough or leave time equal to 2½ days per month, or 30 days per year; and further, on discharge, such private or noncommissioned officer would be entitled to receive reimbursement for full pay and allowances of accrued leave not used by him, at the pay of his rating at the time of discharge. In short, this legislation would place privates and noncommissioned officers on a par with commissioned officers.

The benefits flowing to such privates and noncommissioned officers cannot in any sense be considered a gratuity.

It is true at this time that commissioned officers receive leave equal to 30 days per year and the right to apply for all accrued leave just prior to discharge, which in many instances run to high salaries and constitutes an inexcusable and an abominable discrimination against the men, as a class, who have done the real fighting. For example: A major receives in salary and allowances approximately $420 per month, and in many instances he is discharged, free to go about his business, reestablish himself, and draw this pay for 3 or 4 months while he is so engaged. Majors in many

instances draw sums of twelve or fifteen hundred dollars for what is known as terminal leave after they are actually discharged and, of course, other officers in sums according to their rank. In no sense of the word can this discrimination against the privates and noncommissioned officers be justified. We all know, and it must be accepted as a fact, that the privates and noncommissioned officers are the ones who suffered the hardships, who fought in the mud and mire, and whose very souls were drenched in the blood of battle. Then, how can we as the representatives of this great mass of our fighting forces and their fathers and mothers, be derelict in our duty to the extent of permitting this grave injustice to be practiced on them.

If I may, I would like to suggest to the author of this legislation that he get out a discharge petition if the committee does not promptly bring this bill to the floor, and if such discharge petition is filed, then I request the membership of this House to sign it in sufficient numbers to bring the legislation to the floor for action.

Who's Running This Government—Directive Government Has Succeeded Where the Democratic Legislative Process Has Failed

---

REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John W. Snyder, Director, Office of Mobilization and Reconversion, is to be congratulated for his wisdom and foresight in his recent order to General Hershey directing the deferment from military service of physicists and scientists at the draft-board level, and his directive to Army and Navy Staff Headquarters ordering release from the armed forces of physicists and scientists.

Mr. Snyder's keen perception of the value of scientific manpower supersedes that of the Military Affairs Committee who have had before them H. R. 2827 which I introduced April 2, 1945. This bill would have done the same thing, if approved by the committee and passed by the House, that Mr. Snyder's directive has done.

H. R. 2827 was endorsed by most of the leading scientists and universities of the Nation who fully realized the crying need of scientific manpower behind the lines during the war and the urgent necessity of their knowledge and talents during the postwar period. We have been very short-sighted in this Nation as compared with our allies in drafting men into the armed forces with scientific talent and not using their scientific abilities in the best interests of the Nation.

I have repeatedly appealed to the Military Affairs Committee to consider this bill which they have, up to date, refused to consider. This is an example of where government by directive has become necessary when a government by the democratic process has failed to act.

H. R. 2827, which I introduced April 2, 1945, would have provided the means for restoring to civilian life scientists which are badly needed for the development of peace and reconversion. Since I have introduced this bill, my mail has been flooded with urgent demands and requests that it be acted upon. With the discovery and revelation of atomic energy for military purposes which has stunned the world with its potentialities, it is now necessary that scientists be released from the monotony and inactivity of Army life so that they may continue to develop and expand the use of atomic energy for peacetime pursuits, and most important of all, to find ways and means for neutralizing, controlling, and making ineffective the unbelievable destructive powers of atomic energy for military purposes which was revealed in the atomic bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

We must not, we cannot allow any other nation to move ahead of us scientifically by discovering how the atomic bomb operates without first discovering scientific counteraction which will make their bombs ineffective.

We have been permitting this to become possible by holding scientists in the armed services and drafting them through selective service while other nations, such as Great Britain, France, and Russia, have carefully preserved their scientists by keeping them at work in the laboratory instead of digging ditches and doing KP duty, even when they were threatened with defeat.

622.21
622.22–2
622.23

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C.

LOCAL BOARD MEMORANDUM NO. 115–M, ISSUED: NOVEMBER 26, 1945

SUBJECT: SPECIAL CONSIDERATION FOR CERTAIN STUDENTS, TEACHERS, AND RESEARCH WORKERS IN THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Part I—Statement of general policies and procedures

1. General: The demands of the armed forces and industry during the emergency have resulted in a curtailment in advanced studies for men having high technical and scientific qualifications. Since the cessation of active fighting, the demand of long-range national interest require a resumption of these studies in order to fully develop the technical and scientific skills which have been acquired and to provide adequate teaching facilities for returning veterans who desire to resume their studies in these fields.

2. Reconversion Working Committee on Deferment and Selective Release: (a) Pursuant to a request from the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, the Reconversion Working Committee on Deferment and Selective Release has been established to assist in the accomplishment of this purpose. The Committee is composed of representatives of the (1) Office of Scientific Research and Development, (2) Civilian Production Administration, (3) Office of Rubber Reserve, (4) Petroleum Administration for War, (5) War Department, (6) Navy Department, (7) United States Employment Service, (8) Office of Education, (9) National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel, and (10) the Selective Service System. The Chairman of the Committee will be the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, or a staff member designed by him. The functions of the Committee are to:

(1) Indicate to the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion the specific occupations in which shortages of personnel threaten to interfere with the national health, safety, or interest.

(2) Formulate the specific standards indicating that a man is qualified to engage in a selected occupation.

(3) Certify to the Director of the Selective Service System those individuals meeting the standards established by the Committee.

(4) Indicate to the War and Navy Departments the categories of occupations in which shortages detrimental to the national interest could be relieved by release of men from the armed forces.

Part II—Certification Plan

1. Operation of plan: The Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion will examine all proposals by the committee relating to deferment and release, and shall transmit to the Selective Service System and the War and Navy Departments all approved proposals. The Director of Selective Service will transmit the recommendations for deferment to local boards through the appropriate State directors.

2. Classification policies: Pursuant to the provisions of this memorandum and under the general authority contained in paragraph 5 of part II of Local Board Memorandum No. 115, as amended, local boards will give serious consideration to the occupational deferment of registrants engaged in the technical and scientific fields set forth in part III of this memorandum.

Part III—Standards and Procedures

1. Advanced studies in the physical sciences or engineering: (a) Any registrant who is accepted by an accredited college or university as a candidate for a master's or doctor's degree in the physical sciences or engineering may be certified by the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion to the Director of Selective Service as essential to the national interest in a civilian capacity.

(b) The fact that a candidate for a master's or a doctor's degree may engage in part-time employment or other activities will not affect his certification under this paragraph so long as his academic standing is satisfactory.

2. University teaching in the physical sciences or engineering: Any registrant who is to be employed by an accredited college or university as a teacher of physical sciences or engineering may be certified by the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion to the Director of Selective Service as essential to the national interest in a civilian capacity.

3. University research in the physical sciences or engineering: (a) Any registrant (1) who is to be employed by or attached to the staff of an accredited college or university for research in the physical sciences or engineering, and (2) who signifies his intention to engage in such an activity may be certified to the Director of Selective Service as essential to the national interest in a civilian capacity.

(b) Such a registrant will be certified only if (1) the research to be undertaken by the registrant contributes significantly to the national interest, and (2) inability of the individual registrant to undertake the research will result in its delay.

4. Submission of information in certain cases: Any registrant who wishes to be certified under the provisions of paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 above, must present to the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, Washington, D. C., the following documents in triplicate:

(a) A notarized statement of his intention:

(1) To undertake graduate studies leading to a master's or doctor's degree in the physical sciences or engineering; or

(2) To engage in the teaching of physical sciences or engineering; or

(3) To undertake advanced research in the physical sciences or engineering on the staff of or attached to a college or university.

(b) A statement from an accredited college or university signed by a responsible official of the college or university, indicating that the registrant:

(1) Has been accepted as a candidate for a master's or doctor's degree in the physical sciences or engineering; or

(2) Has been accepted as a teacher of a physical sciences or engineering; or

(3) Is to be employed by or attached to the staff of the college or university for research in the physical sciences or engineering, together with a statement indicating in detail the nature of the research to be performed by the registrant, the scope of the registrant's responsibilities for the research, and the necessity for securing the individual registrant for the work.

(c) A statement showing the registrant's name, address, age, selective service local board number and address, classification, and educational qualifications.

5. Study leading to a B. S. or B. A. degree in physical sciences or engineering: (a) Any registrant who has satisfactorily completed at least 3 years of work leading to a bachelor's degree in the physical sciences or engineering may be certified by the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion to the Director of Selective Service as essential to the national interest in a civilian capacity, provided such registrant has served for a period of not less than 2 years in a project directly connected with the war effort.

(b) Any registrant who wishes to be certified under the provisions of this paragraph must present to the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, Washington, D. C., the following documents in triplicate:

(1) A notarized statement of his intention to continue undergraduate studies leading to a B. S. or B. A. degree in the physical sciences or engineering.

(2) A statement from an accredited college or university, signed by a responsible official of the college or university, indicating that the registrant has been accepted for the fourth year of study in a course leading to a B. S. or B. A. degree in the physical sciences or engineering.

(3) A statement showing the registrant's name, address, age, selective service local board number and address, classification, and educational qualifications.

(4) A statement from the registrant's employer that he has been engaged for at least 2 years in scientific war work.

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director.

H. R. 2827

A bill to authorize the release of persons from active military service and the deferment of persons from military service, in order to aid in making possible the education and training and utilization of scientific and technological manpower to meet essential needs both in war and in peace

Be it enacted, etc., That (1) in order to make possible the training, education, and availability of such numbers of persons as are necessary for the health, safety, and welfare of the Nation in the sciences of fundamental importance to the conclusion of the war, the safe reconversion of the national life to the ways of peace, and the Nation's potency in the world's future economy, the President shall, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, provide for the deferment from military service of—

(a) not to exceed 20,000 young men annually for training to meet essential needs in the physical sciences and in their application to technology and engineering, and of teachers to conduct said training program; and

(b) 15,000 trained scientists and engineers now employed in research or by industry in work essential to the health, safety, and welfare of the Nation.

SEC. 2. The discharge or assignment to essential civilian pursuits of—

(a) not to exceed 20,000 technically trained enlisted men, especially chemists, chemical engineers, physicists, and mathematicians, not utilizing their highest skills in the practice of their professions in the Army or Navy, to industries and educational institutions urgently in need of such men; and

(b) not to exceed 15,000 enlisted men partially trained in those branches of science and engineering in which shortages exist, but whose collegiate training was interrupted by military service and who had shown promise of completing with distinction their preparation for professional work; providing they undertake to immediately resume and continue their collegiate training to graduation.

SEC. 3. No provision of law in force on the date of enactment of this act shall be construed to authorize any action inconsistent with the provisions and purposes of this act.

Disposition of Displaced Polish Nationals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 30, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a portion of a letter received from Brig. Gen. Miles Reber, Deputy Chief, Legislative and Liaison Division of the War Department, regarding the disposition of displaced Polish nationals, conveying to me information which I believe is of interest to many persons in the United States:

As you perhaps know, our forces have, in the past few months, assisted several million displaced persons in their return to their homelands, and among this number were many Polish people.

Under our present policy, no Polish nationals found in the United States zone of occupation in Germany are being repatriated against their will. Included in our interpretation of the term "Polish nationals" are those persons who formerly resided in that part of Poland which was east of the Curzon line. This policy has been communicated to the commanding general of our forces in the European theater, and all information that has been received by the War Department indicates that it is being fully carried out.

One More Difficult Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 30, 1945

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit for the attention of the Congress some timely thoughts set out in an editorial on the Palestine question by H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary Post-Tribune, Gary, Ind.:

ONE MORE DIFFICULT PROBLEM

In accepting a place on the Anglo-American committee of inquiry on Palestine, this Government has taken on another difficult problem. It also has accepted the role which America's strength and influence make inevitable. We are perhaps the biggest of the Big Three, when all the assets are counted. Any trouble in the world concerns us, for it will affect us in the end whether we ignore it or not.

Thus far we have not done too well in the world's sorry aftermath of war. We run the risk of dangerous involvements in China. We have remained diplomatically aloof from the struggle in Indonesia and Indochina, while allowing our arms to be used in the fighting there. Let us hope we shall do better with the problem of Palestine.

The British can use some help. They have handled the problem rather badly, though it is doubtful that any power could have handled it well. But Britain's delays and inconsistencies of the past 25 years, intensified from 1939 to the present, can't be said to represent the happiest efforts to solve a sorry situation.

It was only natural that Foreign Minister Bevin's statement on Palestine should have proved unsatisfactory to both parties. Zionists are angry because he backed down on previous British promises of a national Jewish homeland in Palestine and proposed a Jewish community there. They foresee only trouble if the Jews are to be a minority in Palestine as they are in the rest of the world, abiding in the ancient homeland only by the majority's consent.

The Arabs are displeased because they view Zionism as an imperialistic movement which is perverting the humanitarian aim of finding a haven for the victims of Axis persecution. Their more extreme politicans favor an immediate and total ban of Jewish immigration into Palestine.

To reconcile these opposing views Bevin proposes a thorough inquiry in Europe and Palestine leading to interim recommendations and a permament solution to be presented to the United Nations Conference, which Bevin would have assume trusteeship of a Palestinian state.

Bevin seems convinced, even before the inquiry, that Palestine itself does not provide opportunity for grappling with the whole problem of Europe's surviving Jews. Such authorities as Dr. Walter C. Lowdermilk of the United States Department of Agriculture, however, hold that an intelligent program of soil conservation, reforestation and power development (such as Palestinian Jews have begun already) would make the country capable of supporting as many Jews as wished to live there, and the Arab population besides.

It may be hoped that American members of the new inquiry committee will consider the possibilities of this long-range program, and that they will also give more immediate attention to the desperate plight of the ill, hungry and homeless survivors of Nazi-Fascist pogroms than Bevin apparently has planned.

Compulsory Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FADJO CRAVENS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 30, 1945

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by C. F. Byrns, from the Fort Smith Times-Record:

TAKING A LOOK AT THAT HEALTH INSURANCE PROPOSAL

(By C. F. Byrns)

Compulsory health insurance as proposed by President Truman this week is a long way off, if indeed it is ever adopted in this country.

The President's proposal fits in perfectly with the social ideas of a considerable segment of Americans. They believe that Government should undertake to protect all humanity against all the ills of existence, at public expense—and collect the cost off somebody else.

It will be opposed by a large number of people who believe that compulsory health insurance and Government control of medical care will produce less health at more cost.

The medical profession will oppose the President's proposal, I think, practically to a man. The reasons were admirably presented in a statement prepared by Dr. W. R. Brooksher, of Fort Smith, at the request of these newspapers, and published immediately after the President's proposal was made. Dr. Brooksher is secretary of the Arkansas Medical Society and his views may be accepted as an accurate reflection of the opinion of most if not all his colleagues.

It seems to me there are two things fundamentally wrong with the proposal for compulsory health insurance and governmental supervision of medical care.

One is that the nations which have had it for many years have made materially less progress in health than the United States has made under its system of free enterprise in medical practice.

Another is that the cost of medical care as proposed by the President is materially higher than the average cost now paid by the people who have the very best of care.

Aside from these two basic objections, which ought to be enough, there are other reasons for opposing the President's plan.

Among them is the fact, demonstrated on a thousand fronts, that bureaucracy tends to produce mediocre performance, to discourage inventiveness, risk taking, and new ideas and to encourage strict conformity with a set pattern of behavior. If you don't believe that, ask anyone you know who is now and has been for sometime an employee of a far-flung Government bureau. They'll tell you, off the record. They won't tell you for publication. That very fact demonstrates what I'm saying—bureaucracy constantly exerts pressure on everybody to conform to the rules and regulations and never, on any account, say or do anything which a superior may disapprove because he didn't think of it first.

American medicine has achieved tremendously for a great variety of reasons. An important one is that every medical man is stimulated to do his very best by the prodding of his own conscience, by the constant competition within his own profession, by the knowledge that his earnings from his practice are not guaranteed by anybody and must be earned by his own initiative and skill.

The record of achievement in health improvement in this country of free-enterprise medicine and in the older countries with their socialized medicine is available to anyone who wants to trail it down. I have read considerably on the subject. It is clear to me that government-controlled medicine has fallen short of the American system in results.

The President proposed a tax of 4 percent on all incomes up to $3,600 a year to pay the cost. That's $144 a year or $12 a month. Relatively few families pay that much for medical care, even if they use all they need of the best available.

Everyone recognizes that we need to make competent medical care available for more people on a cost they can afford. We are making definite progress in that direction through prepayment medical care plans, Blue Cross hospital plans, free clinics, and free hospital care for the indigent, and through a large and growing public health service. We have yet much to do. It is my own opinion that we shall be wiser to push these means for spreading medical care to more people, preserve the undoubted virtues of our present system of private medical practice, and avoid the excessive cost and deadening influence of political medicine.

Indian Students Get GI Space on United States-Bound Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, how much longer will this Congress ignore the increasing demand for a square deal for our servicemen? How much longer are we going to take what the War and Navy Departments are throwing at us? They feed us sop about the point system. They keep high-point men in and release low-point favorites. Now they are assigning shipping space intended for war-weary, homesick veterans to Indian students.

I am beginning to wonder if the War and Navy Departments are not conspiring to defeat the Members of this Congress at the polls next year. They most certainly know that we are being blamed for bungling and broken promises in relation to demobilization.

I have asked the War Department for an explanation of this latest GI insult. Kicking homeward bound boys off our boats to make room for some 266 Indian students, some of them 45 years old, is, in my opinion, one of the rankest deals that could be perpetrated on our servicemen.

Under permission to extend my remarks I include a short article which appeared in the November 30 editions of the Washington Times Herald.

INDIAN STUDENTS REPLACE GI'S ON AMERICAN-BOUND BOATS

(By Ed Sullivan)

From Karachi, India: GI publication The Gateway bitterly tells why hundreds of American soldiers won't spend Christmas with their families. The paper documents its charges that 50 GI's were put off the *Stet* to make way for 50 Indian students en route to United States schools, and records the current Karachi rumor that 200 Indian students sailed on the *Santa Rosa*, 59 on the *Meigo*, 68 on the *Richardson*, 37 on the *McCrea* * * *. "Let the brass hats explain this dirtiest trick ever played," says The Gateway. "But the guy sitting on his barracks bag, watching the young Indian civilians walk up the gangplank, and dreaming of Christmas won't be listening."

I understand, too, Mr. Speaker, that Chinese students are now being brought to America on transports sailing out of Calcutta, all occupying spaces that had been intended for returning American GI's. I have no proof of this, but you can be sure I shall demand the truth from the War Department.

We Should Have an Import Quota on Eggs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1945

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to put a quota on the imports of eggs. This appears to be a desirable and a necessary approach. We are going to have considerable difficulty in maintaining the 90-percent floor price for eggs if we do not have a quota on imports of eggs.

I wish to include the following article from the November Farm Journal that gives a picture of the serious situation that exists in regard to eggs:

WHAT'LL WE DO WITH THE EGGS?—THIRTY-FOUR MILLION CASES TOO MANY WILL GIVE FIRST REAL TEST TO PRICE SUPPORT

An egg surplus that may make all previous surpluses look like chicken feed is likely to begin in December. It may come earlier.

Already some Midwest egg prices have fallen below 90 percent of parity. On the east coast, however, they still push against the ceiling.

This surplus will be the first real challenge the Government has had to make good on its promise to support post-war farm prices.

Under the Steagall amendment, prices of eggs and other war-needed commodities are to be maintained at not less than 90 percent of parity until 2 years after the end of hostilities has been declared. The end has not yet been declared. What happens to eggs will give farmers some idea of what may happen to other product prices.

The simple mathematics of the egg outlook are these: United States citizens will have eaten 385 eggs apiece in 1945. They had more money and bigger appetites while doing war work than when working on peacetime jobs, and they were able to get less meat than they wanted.

Next year there will be more meat and less money. Egg consumption is expected to drop to 330 eggs apiece.

If poultrymen produce at the same rate next year as this, that will mean about 34,000,000 cases of surplus eggs for the Government to buy. The bill for that many eggs will be about $400,000,000. Present support prices are 27 cents a dozen for candled eggs, and 24 cents a dozen for ungraded eggs.

The Doane Agricultural Service, biggest farm-management organization in the country, says that by March, "when even the crows are laying eggs," the egg market will be absolutely dependent on Government support prices, unless production is cut.

The United States Department of Agriculture probably will announce 1946 egg goals soon. They will be put out in the hopes that last year's history won't be repeated. A year ago, when it looked like feed was going to be tight and the war would end soon, USDA asked hatcheries to shut down, and urged poultrymen to cull to the bone. Poultrymen figured that if some cutting was good, more would be better.

The result was last summer's egg shortage and the poultry freeze orders. Planners don't want another egg famine on top of this winter's surplus.

A committee of the National Poultry Producers Federation last week found out how seriously Washington regards the situation.

Secretary of Agriculture Anderson not only sent his top poultry experts to meet with the committee, but his executive assistant, Nathan Koenig. Two days after the meeting, the Department appointed Hobart Creighton, nationally known poultry breeder of Warsaw, Ind., to head the poultry branch of the Production and Marketing Administration. (Creighton is a life-long Republican, and Speaker of the Indiana House of Representatives.)

The Marketing Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee met with the poultrymen, and Chairman Flannagan promptly appointed a poultry committee to hold a special hearing. It was the first time a special congressional committee ever was appointed to work with the poultry industry.

The poultry delegation thinks its 3-point program stands a good chance of adoption. Those points are:

1. An orderly program of Government purchase of surplus eggs.

2. Government support for poultry (including broilers) which was raised in expectation that it would be needed to fill Government orders.

3. Removal of ceiling prices on eggs and poultry as soon as prices paid to farmers drop below ceilings.

Letter of Japanese Residents of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 30, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following interesting letter and my reply:

UNITED CHRISTIAN MINISTRY,
MINNEAPOLIS CHURCH FEDERATION,
Minneapolis, Minn., November 14, 1945.

The Honorable WALTER H. JUDD,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. JUDD: We Japanese people, who happen to have settled in Minnesota as the result of the War Relocation Authority's program, met at the St. Paul International Institute on November 11 for a monthly social gathering.

We wish to express our sincere appreciation for the most cordial and friendly way in which the residents of this State have received us into their midst. In spite of the fact that we had to go through a great deal of affliction and material loss by the mass evacuation and life in the relocation centers, we feel we have been richly rewarded by coming here. It is our feeling that the State of Minnesota, and the Midwest on the whole, with its population of numerous national and racial backgrounds, is the place from which real American and democratic life is developed. In view of the privilege of sharing in this magnificent experience, the hardship of the past few years can easily be forgotten.

During the course of the afternoon, our conversation turned to the subject of our homeland. We felt that the only way to save Japan and a wholesome relationship between this country and Japan is to have General MacArthur continue his present policy of occupation, which has more than proved his deep understanding of not only the problems involved but the people and their needs. We are not in a position politically to raise our voices, but as people who are familiar with the situation of that country we would like to express our wholehearted endorsement of his policy. We sincerely hope he will be able to continue in his present capacity without interference either from his fellow citizens at home or from any other nation.

We are writing to you, as a Congressman from this State, because your name has been mentioned in the public press most frequently; and we feel that you, with your background, would best appreciate our feeling. Please convey our sentiments to your fellow Congressmen.

Respectfully yours,

THE JAPANESE RESIDENTS OF MINNESOTA,
By Rev. DAISUKE KITAGAWA.

NOVEMBER 27, 1945.

Rev. DAISUKE KITAGAWA,
Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR MR. KITAGAWA: It was with great pleasure that I received your letter of November 14th, expressing your appreciation of the way in which the people of Minnesota have on the whole welcomed you into their midst and helped you find useful and happy places in our society. I was privileged to have a small part in setting up the original committee of Minneapolis citizens when you were first being transferred to our State in considerable numbers. The fact that so extensive a readjustment could be made in a time when feelings were high is a tribute to the understanding and good sense both of your people and of ours.

I agree wholeheartedly with your estimate of the remarkable way in which General MacArthur has handled the very delicate task of the occupation of Japan. Surely it has been done with a maximum of benefit to all concerned. We have defeated the Japanese militarists. Now we must so behave as to win the Japanese people to a more democratic way of life than was previously possible for them.

Very sincerely yours.

Vengeance Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 30, 1945

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes:

VENGEANCE LEGISLATION
(By Thomas L. Stokes)

There's a right way and a wrong way to do things—including legislating.

An example of the wrong way may be seen currently in the attempt to rush drastic penalties against labor through the House of Representatives. They are contained in a bill prepared by the Military Affairs Committee. The measure has been ordered to the floor by the Rules Committee for early consideration.

The effort is to exploit the present strike situation. That offers provocation for labor-law reform, certainly, but not through such hasty and ill-considered legislation whipped up hurriedly in a spirit of vengeance. Long-time changes in labor law should be considered carefully and soberly.

The penalizing provisions were inserted in a bill that originally was designed only to repeal the wartime Smith-Connally anti-strike law, so-called. Repeal of that act meets general approval. But the provisions added by the Military Affairs Committee do not. Labor is complaining bitterly, and with reason.

One provision would punish any labor union which struck in violation of a no-strike clause in its contract by suspending its collective bargaining provisions for a year and making it subject to suits for damages incurred by work stoppages.

The obvious effect would be refusal by labor unions thereafter to accept no-strike clauses. Further, it would open the way for employers, so inclined, to provoke strikes themselves and drain union treasuries. There is no penalty for employers who might themselves induce strikes by their conduct.

Another provision would prohibit contributions by labor unions for political convention and primary election campaigns. This would extend the ban already imposed by the Smith-Connally Act against such contributions for general election campaigns, which is to be retained. The latter somewhat restricted the scope of CIO's Political Action Committee in last year's general election campaign, though it did not interfere much with its ultimate effectiveness. It operated under the exception permitting use of union funds for educational purposes. Former Attorney General Biddle, over protests from some Members of Congress, held that PAC was not violating the law.

The purpose of the prohibition in the case of conventions and primary elections is clear. Members with anti-labor records fear CIO attempts to eliminate them in next year's primaries, and with reason. The CIO had some primary successes last year, even in the South. That served as a warning.

Aside from the injustices and the dubious constitutionality of these provisions, and the hasty method of legislating, there is something else wrong with this whole procedure.

This is the matter of jurisdiction. All this was done by the Military Affairs Committee and not the regularly constituted House Labor Committee. The Military Affairs Committee proved its ineptness and lack of experience and judgment in framing labor legislation when it handled the original Connally bill, 2 years ago.

Administration leaders sought in vain to get the Rules Committee to withhold report of the bill for House action until the Labor-Management Conference here had finished its work. But the Republic-southern conservative Democrat coalition in the committee, which holds the whip-hand, seized the second streetcar and bus strike here and beginning of the General Motors strike to shove the measure to the floor.

Let's Keep the Discharge System Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 30, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am very much perturbed by the favoritism shown in certain cases to sons of generals and legislators in facilitating their discharges from the service. I am also against the idea of athletes being given special consideration in this respect.

I would like to urge, Mr. Speaker, that the point system for discharge from the service be operated on an equitable basis

so that all men may be given the same consideration. There should be no favoritism shown to anyone. It is my hope also that the number of points necessary for discharge will be lowered and, in a short while, done away with completely so that these men who have done their full share will be allowed to return to their country and their loved ones. It is imperative that we continue to exert all our efforts toward this end.

The British Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 21, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

THE BRITISH LOANS

The Government of the United States is mobilizing all its propaganda resources, according to a recent article in the Wall Street Journal, in support of a purported postwar loan of $4,000,000,000 to Great Britain—a proposition which the people of the United States definitely and almost unanimously do not approve.

This is an amazing situation.

Why should the Government of the United States, which is not the master of the American people but only their servant, be so anxious and determined to make a disposition of the resources of the country contrary to the wishes of the people?

The Government does not have any money in its own right, to loan to foreign governments or even to spend for its own purposes.

The only money available to the Government is that which it exacts from the people in taxes, or borrows against future taxes.

In all matters, but especially in matters pertaining to the expenditure or other disposition of money, the Government should respect and abide by the wishes of the people, and not impose its own contrary wishes upon the people.

In the matter of the proposed British loans, the American people have clearly indicated their overwhelming opposition—as many as 7 persons in 10 having declared their opposition in comprehensive polls of public opinion.

Nevertheless, as the Wall Street Journal reports:

"Five top Government agencies are mobilizing their opinion-manufacturing machinery for a campaign which will start soon and which officials say will be running at full tilt by December when Members of Congress will be home listening to constituents.

"The pay-off will be legislative action in January.

"Between now and then the pressure will pile up * * *.

"The American strategy is all drawn up.

"It is incorporated in a State Department document bulking 100 pages or so which has been distributed to key officials in the Treasury Department, Commerce Department, Federal Reserve Board, and Agriculture Department."

But of course the truly amazing factor in this situation is not alone in the Government's efforts to influence the people against their own wishes and interest.

It is also in the Government's deliberate and callous effort to deceive the people.

The so-called British "loans" are not in fact loans at all.

They are intended to be and are going to be outright gifts.

The British Government frankly does not want and will not accept loans, for the very substantial reason that it does not want to pay them back and knows very well it would never be able to pay them back.

An editorial in the trans-Atlantic edition of the London Daily Mail makes this point perfectly clear when it says that, however badly Britain wants and needs the money:

"There is a limit beyond which Britain will not go.

"The British people are determined not to enter the postwar world with a millstone of foreign debt around their necks.

"That could only mean one of two things.

"Either we should become a dependency of the United States or we should have to incur the odium of repudiating a debt which we should be unable to carry.

"The United States should propose some means of assisting Britain which would not confront us with such a dilemma."

This is far nearer the truth of the matter than American propaganda in support of the loans to Britain has ever come.

If the American people must be deluged with propaganda by the Government of the United States, at least it should be as truthfully presented as the British propaganda relating to the same subject.

Continue Small Business Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 30, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter which I have received from Mr. Louis W. Oswald, of Naperville, Ill., secretary of the DuPage County Retail Druggists' Association, and a member of the national committee on legislation of the National Association of Retail Druggists. The letter follows:

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: There are other problems before the Congress besides the atomic bomb and the investigation of the Pearl Harbor disaster.

One of these is the plight of the small businessman, with the threat of extinction by monopolistic interests. Today there is a concerted under-cover move in Congress to scuttle the Small Business Committee, of which WRIGHT PATMAN is chairman, by denying sufficient funds to carry on.

Says WRIGHT PATMAN, "There is a sinister force in this country that is trying to break down any sincere efforts to help small business during the transition period, thereby aiding big business and monopoly."

We must not permit the congressional saboteurs to scuttle this committee under any pretense whatsoever and should expose those charlatans who masquerade as representatives of the people.

The matter is urgent. We ask that you take immediate action to save our cause and that of all small business. I will anticipate your cooperation, in the interests of true democracy and American free enterprise.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS WILLIAM OSWALD.

Robert Ramspeck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL BROWN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 30, 1945

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Atlanta Journal on November 27, and an editorial appearing in The Atlanta Constitution on November 28, in eulogy of our colleague, ROBERT RAMSPECK:

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal of November 27, 1945]

ROBERT RAMSPECK RESIGNS

The Journal shares a widespread regret over the announcement that Representative ROBERT RAMSPECK of the Fifth Georgia District is to resign. His 16 years in Congress are a record of growing usefulness to his constituents, his State, his party and his country. He earned the confidence of them all, and they are all losers by his resignation. Good sense, hard work and high integrity, combined with a native aptitude for dealing with men and affairs, carried "BOB" RAMSPECK to the foreranks of the House of Representatives and of Democratic leadership. The hope was that many more years of his increasingly valuable experience would be given to such service.

It is peculiarly regrettable that the office of Congressman is not sufficiently rewardful or attractive to compete with private enterprise for a man of his caliber. His new post as executive vice president of the Air Transport Association of America insures him a salary several times larger than that he has received and also releases him from the petty worries and uncertainties of a political job. He felt, as we can well understand, that in justice to his family and his future he could not afford to reject so inviting an offer. Is it not equally true, however, that the public cannot afford less than the highest order of ability in the business of Government? Something should be done to attract to the public office, and to hold, more men of the efficiency and character of ROBERT RAMSPECK.

We wish him a full measure of success in his new and important field, and trust that the voters of the fifth district will be thoughtful and vigilant in choosing his successor.

[From The Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution of November 28, 1945]

RAMSPECK WORTH MORE TO US

After 16 years in Congress, Representative ROBERT RAMSPECK, is resigning.

Representative RAMSPECK has served this district—and the Nation—intelligently and untiringly.

He has made a record such as few have equaled.

As Democratic whip in the House, he has played a major role in the formulation of the momentous legislation enacted during the turbulent past decade and a half.

It is with genuine concern that we witness Representative RAMSPECK'S departure from public life. For he is a valuable man.

Indeed, it is one of the anomalies of our system of government that men like RAMSPECK must be lost to public service: For, while his salary in his new connection will be several times his congressional pay, Representative RAMSPECK, by virtue of his ability and experience, is worth far more to the people of the Fifth District.

It is a tragedy that, because of the relative pittance we pay our Congressmen, we must ever go on losing good, experienced men from congressional halls.

Representative RAMSPECK, as many honest, conscientious Congressmen before him, has found it necessary—in the absence of an outside source of income—to turn to other fields to earn a living.

Moreover, fewer and fewer capable men are being attracted to Congress, with the result that more and more grossly incompetent ne'er-do-wells, usually of the demagogic type, are making successful bids for congressional posts.

Of course, we can never hope to compete, dollar for dollar, with private industry in the search for character and ability. But we can certainly close the gap between the remunerations offered by public and private life to the point that, while it may still be something of an economic sacrifice, Government service will at least pay a living wage.

Ten thousand dollars is a ridiculously inadequate compensation for Congressmen, considering all the demands which are made upon them.

Until such time as congressional pay is revised sharply upward, we shall go on losing capable, experienced men like BOB RAMSPECK.

And that we can ill afford.

OPA's Cost-Absorption Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a letter from Administrator Chester Bowles with accompanying questionnaire, as follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
November 28, 1945.

DEAR MR. CANNON: I have been deeply disturbed during the last few weeks over the apparent misunderstanding of one of OPA's basic policies—the policy of cost absorption at the manufacturer and distributor levels.

From the many statements which have been made about this policy, it is apparent that most of the objections are due to confusion as to just what the policy is, how it is applied, and the necessity for its use.

In this letter I would like to sketch very briefly the most important points about this policy so that you may be familiar with it. I want also to point out the serious consequences were cost absorption abandoned.

This policy is, first of all, an old policy. It has been in effect during the entire period of price control. It has been discussed before congressional committees and debated on the floor of both the Senate and the House. It has been reviewed and affirmed by the courts.

On numerous occasions I have stated that this policy is the very cornerstone of effective price control. Without it we would surely face a substantially higher price level and the rapidly growing danger of runaway inflation.

Let me emphasize this by a brief outline of the direct result if the cost-absorption policy were eliminated at the distributive levels alone:

The public would be immediately forced to pay $700,000,000 a year more for food. Not one penny of this would go to the farmer.

The public would be forced to pay at least $300,000,000 more for apparel in the lower and medium-priced ranges. Clothing prices are already high.

The public would be forced to pay at least $400,000,000 additional for automobiles, radios, washing machines, refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, and other so-called reconversion products.

These sweeping price increases to the public would result solely from the elimination of cost absorption by distributors. It would be impossible, however, to eliminate this pricing standard for one group without eliminating it for others. This would mean sweeping increases in most manufacturers' prices totaling additional billions of dollars. These increases would be pyramided into still higher increases to the general public.

The two principal groups which have been opposed to this policy are the National Retail Dry Goods Association and the distributors of reconversion products. It is my belief that the great majority of merchants and dealers who have offered their protests have not thoroughly understood the distinctly limited effect which this policy has had and will have on their present and future profits.

Department stores, both large and small, are enjoying peak prosperity. Department store earnings, including both large and small companies, are estimated at 13 times their average 1936–39 profits.

Nineteen hundred and forty-four was the biggest year in their history. Sales at present are running 12 percent above 1944 levels, with the prospect of the greatest Christmas business in all time. The outlook for 1946 is excellent.

Dealers in electrical appliances, automobiles, and other reconversion goods, should look forward during the next 2 or 3 years to a period of unprecedented prosperity. The country is hungry for the goods which they will sell.

The War Production Board—now the Civilian Production Administration—estimates that production of automobiles, electric refrigerators, washing machines, vacuum cleaners, radios, and other such products will by June 30, 1946, exceed average 1939 monthly shipments by from 70 to 300 percent.

In no instance will our cost-absorption policy allow the dealers less than their actually realized profit margin on each unit in 1941 (their biggest prewar year). With few exceptions this policy will in practice allow them a profit per unit far in excess of that which they secured in 1941. Thus, with very few exceptions, they can look forward to higher profit margins per unit with a tremendous increase in the number of units sold.

I have never been more alarmed by the inflationary danger confronting us than I am at present. It is not the fantastic total of liquid assets alone that frightens me, although they could easily cause an inflationary explosion if the public ever loses confidence that the price line would be held. The inflationary psychology that has now taken hold of the country is at least equally dangerous.

The real-estate market is booming, with prices already way out of line with what the market can sustain. Nonetheless, these prices move up week by week.

The stock market is spurting and the "inside" speculative dope being passed on by the taxi drivers and elevator boys is reminiscent of 1928 and 1929.

And all over the country sober businessmen are writing escalator clauses into their contracts.

It's going to take everything we've got to keep prices from tearing loose.

The administration of the price control program has never been an easy task. It is much more difficult today. Although we shall strive with every possible means to ease hardships, to eliminate inequities, and to make sure that price control in no sense stands in the way of production, I cannot guarantee a wholly painless operation.

During the 2½ years in which I have been in Washington I have tried to keep Congress thoroughly informed about what we are doing and why we are doing it. Congress is in a sense our board of directors—the group which sets the basic policies on which we operate. I believe that all the Members of Congress—whether they agree with us or not—are entitled to full, frank, and complete information on the progress of this program and the dangers which we see ahead.

I am writing you this letter now because we need your help and I want to have you see the situation at least as we see it—particularly on this widely misunderstood question of manufacturer and distributor absorption.

For your further information on this question of cost absorption and to aid you in answering constituents' letters, I am attaching a "question and answer" memorandum which may be helpful to you.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

SIX QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON OPA'S COST-ABSORPTION POLICY

Question 1. Exactly what is this policy?

Answer. Cost absorption is the balancing of cost decreases against cost increases in the determination of prices, with no increase when decreases and other benefits of war-economy volume exceed cost increases.

Business itself in peacetime generally has absorbed cost increases without price increases when there were offsetting cost decreases to cover them. This is clearly seen if one studies what happened to wages, costs, and prices between the two World Wars. The average hourly earnings of industrial workers went up 37 percent between 1923 and 1941. But did industrial prices go up? They did not. They declined 15 percent. How could this be? Because better machines and techniques increased output per man-hour 88 percent, reducing labor cost per unit of output 27 percent. Industry balanced cost decreases against cost increases, and gave the public much more for its money.

During World War II wage rates went up 73 percent (1944 over average 1936–39); raw material prices went up 53 percent. The prices of finished manufactured goods rose only 21 percent, yet manufacturing profits rose 450 percent. How could this be? Because industrial output rose 126 percent, greatly reducing overhead costs. There were, also, in many cases improved methods. Cost decreases, over-all, far exceeded cost increases. Cost absorption saved billions on the cost of the war; billions in living costs to consumers, yet business earned more than ever in history.

That is all there is to OPA's cost absorption policy: a balancing of cost decreases against cost increases and the benefits of war—economy volume—with maintenance of existing prices so long as—

(1) Industries and trades make not less than their normal—usually their 1936–39 profits before taxes.

(2) Industries making multiple products recover at least their out-of-pocket costs on all individual products, even when their over-all earnings exceed prewar profits.

(3) Trades recover at least their expense rates on the sale of all individual products, even when their over-all earnings exceed their prewar earnings (save where traditionally the margin has been lower).

(4) Distributive trades handling such products as automobiles and electrical household appliances receive not less than their actually realized prewar gross margins.

During the war we also made increases to stimulate the production of goods essential to prosecution of the war.

That is all there is to OPA's much debated cost-absorption policy.

Question 2. Does this policy apply to everyone?

Answer. The policy has been applied in general to every industry and every distributive trade since price control was adopted. In all cases cost absorption ends if and when cost increases—

(1) Reduce over-all industry or trade profits before taxes below prewar levels.

(2) Cuts a multiple product industry's prices on an individual product below out-of-pocket expense for the bulk of the output.

(3) Cuts a distributive trade's price on any article below its expense rate.

(4) Cuts a reconversion goods distributive trade's gross margin (on such as automobiles and appliances) below its actually realized prewar gross margin.

Question 3. Just what is the legal basis of the policy?

Answer. The Emergency Price Control Act, passed in January 1942, left the Administrator with considerable leeway in adjusting price ceilings upward, so long as the purposes of the act were achieved. These were to "stabilize prices and to prevent speculative and unwarranted increases in prices, to protect persons with relatively fixed and limited incomes, and to prevent post-emergency collapse of values." etc. Ceiling prices fixed, however, were to be "generally fair and equitable."

The Stabilization Act which became law in October 1942 removed much of the Administrator's discretion. It directed the President to stabilize prices affecting the cost of living on the basis of September 15, 1942, levels. Authority was given for upward adjustments only to aid in the effective prosecution of the war or to correct gross inequities.

Reading the two acts together it is apparent that September 15, 1942, price levels must not be exceeded, save in the above-named instances, so long as they are "generally fair and equitable."

Congress thus ruled out cost increases as grounds for price increases except in certain specified circumstances. Accordingly, OPA is required by law to apply its cost-absorption policy.

That OPA is correct in its views as to the law has been sustained by the Emergency Court of Appeals. See *Gillespie, Rogers, Pyatt Co.* v. *Bowles* 144 F. (2d) 361 (1944) and *Philadelphia Coke Co.* v. *Bowles* 139 F. (2d) 349 (1943).

In the Philadelphia coke case mentioned above the court said that when producers' prices have to be increased to meet the standards of the act, "it is the duty of the Administrator, so far as possible, to require them to be absorbed at some appropriate intermediate stage in the process of production or distribution at which there may be an existing margin of profit reasonably sufficient to absorb it."

Cost absorption at retail occurs when retail prices are not increased to offset manufacturers' increases. Under the standards of the original Price Control Act, retail increases are not required by law merely because manufacturers' prices are increased. They are required only when over-all earnings of the retail trade groups affected are reduced below peacetime levels (the earnings standard) or when retail prices on individual products become unreasonably low in relation to operating expenses (the product standard). Under the standard covering price increases to aid in the effective prosecution of the war or to remove gross inequities, increases in retail prices to offset manufacturers' increases are not proper. Consequently, Congress has clearly directed that retail ceilings are to be held even when manufacturer's increases are granted, provided that the standards of the original Price Control Act are at all times met.

Furthermore, failure to apply the cost-absorption policy at retail would conflict with Executive Order 9599, promulgated by President Truman on August 18, 1945, which states that one of the guiding policies of the reconversion period shall be "To continue the stabilization of the economy as authorized and directed by the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended," and directs the Price Administrator to "take all necessary steps to assure that the cost of living and the general level of prices shall not rise." Even where a price increase is necessary to correct a gross inequity or a maladjustment interfering with effective transition to a peacetime economy, President Truman's Executive order directs the Price Administrator "so far as is reasonable, practicable, and necessary for this purpose, to see that such price increases do not cause price increases at later levels of production or distribution."

Question 4. What has been gained through the policy?

Answer. By using some of the benefits of large, war-created volume to absorb cost increases without price increases, the Government has held the price line far better than otherwise would have been possible.

Living costs in World War II rose 31 percent from September 1939. Only 3 percent of the rise came after May 1943, when the hold-the-line order was issued. In the World War I inflation—when pressures were far less powerful—they rose 108 percent. The difference is due in great degree to the fact that when Congress passed the Price Control Act it made possible the cost-absorption policy in establishing maximum prices.

Had every cost increase been translated into a price increase, billions would have been added to the public's cost of living; tens of billions would have been added to the cost of the war. Prices would be far above present levels. There would be no effective check on a spiral of wage-price rises.

Question 5. Has this policy unfairly curbed the profits of industry or distributors?

Answer. The facts tell the story. Industry profits in 1944—after cost absorption—were 4½ times average 1936–39 profits; 1½ times 1941 profits. They would have been far greater under a policy of cost-plus pricing; but greater profits would have resulted in widespread charges of profiteering and demands for compensating increases by persons whose incomes were subject to stabilization.

Profit figures for the distributive trades are less readily available. The published figures of the National Retail Drygoods Association, the most persistent critic of cost absorption, show profits for 1944—after cost absorption—13 times the average 1936–39 profits.

Other gains in trade profits after cost absorption are as follows:

1944 over average 1936–39 earnings

	Percent
Hardware retailers	464
Small furniture stores	185
Variety chain stores	339
Men's apparel stores	398
Chain grocery stores	152
Independent grocery stores	117
Music stores	210

Lest anyone imagine that small business has suffered, we cite the following figures from the Department of Commerce:

Profits of unincorporated firms

[In millions of dollars]

	1939	1944 (after cost absorption)
Manufacturers	315	712
Wholesale	723	1,507
Retail	1,517	3,416

Total corporation profits have risen as follows:

Corporation profits

[In billions of dollars]

Year:	Before taxes	After taxes
1939	5.3	4.0
1944 (after cost absorption)	24.8	10.0

In peacetime as in wartimes there always are some high-cost firms experiencing hardship. That these have been abnormally few during the period of price control is shown by Dun & Bradstreet's reports of business failures as shown below:

Year:	Failures
1929	22,909
1939	14,763
1941	11,848
1944 (with cost absorption)	1,222

Recent complaint has come from wholesale and retail distributors of automobiles, electrical appliances, and other reconversion goods, to whom it has come as a new idea that under price control business has not been assured its prewar gross percentage margins before mark-downs and other allowances. Lacking recent cost and profit figures to establish limitations upon cost absorption by wholesale and retail distributors of reconversion goods, OPA has earmarked for absorption, where necessary, the difference between prewar list price percentage margins and the prewar percentage margins they actually realized. The list price margins never were realized because of mark-downs, losses on trade-ins and various other margin-reducing practices that will not be necessary in order to make sales in the months ahead. Under any and all conditions, however, and whatever are their cost increases, these trades will be protected in their prewar realized percentage margins.

Actually, in very few cases are increases in manufacturers' prices sufficiently large to reduce unit realized margins of reconversion trades to prewar levels. And with manufacturers predicting to the War Production Board that 1946 volume will exceed all previous records, distributors of reconversion goods seem certain in 1946 to enjoy one of their most profitable years. Cost-absorption requirements under these conditions cannot possibly prove a hardship.

Question 6. What would happen if this policy were abandoned?

Answer. Abandonment of the policy at wholesale and retail would have these results:

The cost of foods to the public would increase by $700,000,000, not one cent of which would go to the farmers.

The public would be forced to pay at least $300,000,000 more for lower- and medium-priced clothing

The public would have to pay at least $400,000,000 more for automobiles, radios, washing machines, refrigerators, and other reconversion products.

Several percentage points would be added in the retail prices of furniture and dozens of other less-important groups of commodities.

Abolition of cost absorption by manufacturers would have even more far-reaching results. Rises in prices of hundreds of industrial materials and parts would become cost increases to producers of finished goods. Thus, one price increase would be pyramided upon another, setting an inflationary spiral into motion. This would be accentuated when wholesalers' and retailers' margins were added to these increased prices.

Still more tinder would be added to the inflationary fire when labor demanded compensating increases to offset rises in living costs and farmers demanded higher support prices and other increased compensation to counteract increases in prices of industrial goods.

What would be the final result no one can predict. We know, however, that when prices soared after World War I the public began to spend its twenty-seven billions of wartime savings, seeking to satisfy future needs ahead of price increases. The mad scramble for goods that followed sent living costs to a peak 108 percent above prewar levels.

This time wartime savings of the people total not twenty-seven but $145,000,000,000—

a sum equal to the total spendable income of the public in our two most prosperous prewar years. Should people, whether consumers or businessmen, once lose confidence that the price line will be held and rush to meet future needs ahead of anticipated price increases, these vast wartime savings could throw the Nation into a wild inflationary scramble, exceeding any this Nation ever has experienced.

Raw material production rose so sharply during the war that we hoped for an early balancing of supply and demand that would permit the lifting of price ceilings. On November 6, however, Business Week reported to its readers that "without any question" but for OPA restraints, "the lid would blow" on materials and parts prices. "Expectations of a general upward revision of prices," the magazine said, "have more to do with today's markets than have the ordinary supply-demand factors."

In other fields, too, recent tendencies are menacing. Speculation has replaced investment in the stock market, sending security prices to a 14-year high and with the peak of the rise not yet in sight. Small people are taking fliers in a way reminiscent of 1928 and 1929. Uncontrolled commercial, residential and farm real estate prices also are rising sharply without controls.

In view of these conditions this does not appear to be a propitious time to substitute cost plus for cost-absorption pricing. To do so would be to run unwarranted and dangerous risks with the welfare of the American people.

With final victory over inflation in sight, but with this dangerous situation immediately ahead, the Office of Price Administration will take no step to weaken price controls or the confidence of the people that the price line will be held.

Hurley's Resignation—The Muddle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein two editorials, one from the Manchester Union, Manchester, N. H., of November 29 entitled "Hurley's Resignation," and the other from the New York Herald Tribune of November 30 entitled "The Muddle":

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Union of November 29, 1945]

HURLEY'S RESIGNATION

Brigadier General Hurley's dramatic outburst accompanying his resignation as Ambassador to China brings to light a situation that merits attention. General Hurley's charge is that a group of professional career men in the State Department are wrecking American foreign policy by working secretly against it. High officials, he declares, shape that policy, and this clique within the State Department renders it impotent.

Referring specifically to the Chinese situation, General Hurley states that while he was trying to carry out the instructions of the United States Government, professional career men deliberately sided with the Chinese Communists, advising them that he did not represent the true policy of the United States. This they did to keep China divided against itself so that it might be a more easy prey to exploitation. Thus, he says, the principles of the Atlantic Charter are being frustrated, and "in diplomacy today we are permitting ourselves to be sucked into a power bloc on the side of colonial imperialism against Communist imperialism."

This is one of the frankest resignation statements made in a long time. It obviously demands fuller explanation by General Hurley. When the Ambassador came home from China, it is understood, he told President Truman he was tired and would like to be relieved of his position. The President persuaded him that his continued services were still needed, and he agreed to return to China. Whereupon a group of leftists in Congress introduced a resolution against him, and he suddenly decided to resign and delivered his blast against subversive elements.

The situation in China is most perplexing to most Americans. Our official policy is said to be to support Chiang Kai-shek's government as the established governmental authority in China until the Chinese people are able to decide what government they want. American troops, we are told, still remain in China to carry out our pledge to disarm the Japs and send them home. But this policy is not working out favorably.

Now General Hurley has added to the confusion. President Truman has taken a forthright step in asking General Marshall to go to China as his special envoy. Here would seem to be the right man for the job. General Marshall's ability has been attested not only as a military leader but as a man of judgment and diplomacy. He is one of the great Americans of all time. If any man can bring order out of the present chaos in China, it is he.

Incidentally, if the leftists in Congress or in the State Department hoped to gain anything by slugging General Hurley, they would seem to have failed. They will get no sympathy from General Marshall. He knows Chiang Kai-shek personally and is acquainted with the situation in China. He has little confidence in communism. Obviously, then, the leftists have gained nothing by the shift in ambassadors to China. In any case it would seem that the situation demands a clarification of American policy in the Far East. If the Hurley charges are correct, there should also be a housecleaning in the State Department. It will not be forgotten that General Stilwell came home from China in disgust before Hurley went there. Now Hurley returns in disgust. Something must be wrong, and the American people have a right to demand that they be given a clearer understanding of what it is all about.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of November 30, 1945]

THE MUDDLE

Just as the Hurley explosion over American far eastern policy is reverberating through the country Mr. Byron Price returns from a special mission to Germany to set off a bomb under our European policy. What we are doing in Germany is all wrong; there must immediately be a whole set of new decisions. Mr. Price castigates the French with severity; he thinks the denazification program should be slowed down, that more food must at once be shipped in to the Germans, that censorship and educational policies should be revised and that the basic directive to the military government should be re-revised and boiled down. These criticisms no doubt deserve attention on their merits. But the episode, like that of the vehement Mr. Hurley, adds up to an overall criticism of the present conduct of American foreign policy too searching to be longer neglected.

They add up to the fact that in Germany, as in the Far East, there is no American foreign policy. There is a tangled legacy from all sorts of conflicting policies and personalities, being administered by an equal tangle of conflicting agencies and authorities. It is a muddle which cannot be cleared up, on the one hand, by simply grabbing some able and politically impressive figure, like General Marshall, and throwing him into the middle of it. It cannot be cleared up, on the other, by sending even the most expert of observers, like Mr. Price, to criticize the conduct of operations for which the observer has no responsibility.

The fact is that the United States has simply failed to develop the agencies of policy formation and administration in the field of foreign affairs which are absolutely essential if we are to meet the staggering problems before us. To take only one example, raised by the price report. It may be true that French intransigence over the Rhineland question is the one great obstacle to satisfactory solutions in Germany. If that is true, then the French attitude should be the primary present concern of American policy. To the lay observer it is not immediately obvious that the French are wrong in their position; but it is obvious that, whether the French are right or wrong, there is no agency of American policy which can meet the challenge thus raised, win the French to an agreed Anglo-Russian-American view or modify our views to accord with the French position. At half a dozen other points in German as in Chinese affairs it is not that the policy is mistaken but that there simply is no policy of any kind, only the inevitably conflicting views of many different subordinate officers wanting clear direction from the top.

To win the war we were compelled completely to remake our Military Establishment, to expand it enormously, to provide it with innumerable complex agencies of research, intelligence, planning, coordination, administration, and policy formation. Something of the same kind, if on a lesser scale, will have to be done in the field of civilian foreign affairs. President Truman cannot be in Berlin on one day and in Chungking on the next, especially when he should at the same time be in Washington or Detroit. Mr. Byrnes cannot be in six places or think with six different brains at the same time. Still more, the United States cannot indefinitely leave its foreign policies to the accidental interplay of the brilliant amateur, the opinionated eccentric, the bureaucratic intriguer. We need adequate planning and administrative staffs at the top; we need a much greater professional expertness, discipline, and sense of responsibility all down the line. We shall not get these things easily. But get them we must, if our whole foreign policy and with it many of the hopes of the world are not to sink into a muddle of hopeless cynicism and frustration.

Price Controls Disrupting Paper Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SHERMAN ADAMS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1945

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, the production of pulp and paper is one of the most important industries in the Northeast. As a result of OPA's pricing policies, the industry finds itself in a most difficult situation. At a recent meeting of the representatives of the industry and of OPA, the industry made certain statements concerning serious changes in production brought about by present pricing policies. In order to meet the demand for low-priced papers, which comprise a large percentage of total paper production, price levels for the lower grades must be such as to induce

their production as against higher-priced grades.

The textile industry has been in much the same situation and the Price Administrator has already recognized that essential changes must be made in order to provide for the continuation of certain essential production lines.

The present pricing policy is well illustrated in a statement made by the paper industry which, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith:

AMERICAN PAPER AND PULP ASSOCIATION,
New York, N. Y.

PRICE CONTROLS DISRUPTING PAPER DISTRIBUTION

At a recent meeting between representatives of the pulp and paper industry and representatives of OPA, consideration was given to the outlook for pulp and paper production under existing price controls. The views expressed by the industry's representatives may be summarized as follows:

With regard to the supply and demand situation, it was the consensus of opinion that they would never be in balance until the present rigid OPA policies and procedures were brought into alinement with present day economic conditions, or until natural economic laws are permitted to operate without price regulation. In fact the conditions as between a balanced supply and demand situation promise to get rapidly worse unless OPA will recognize the inevitable grade shifting that is taking place as a result of the impact of increased production costs particularly on items in the low-priced field. Several illustrations of this situation were cited, including the current shift from the production of unprofitable grocery bag paper which, in the final analysis, involves the question of public sanitation, to more expensive lines upon which a reasonable profit can be realized.

Present OPA pricing policies, by denying adjustments in the price of unprofitable low-priced grades of paper that normally constitute an important percentage of total paper production, will, if continued, bring about to an increasing extent a situation where surpluses will exist in higher priced items and acute shortages in low-priced items. This problem of grade shifting is one that is inherent in the character of the paper industry. Industry representatives were unanimously of the opinion that current OPA policies were forcing the industry to resort to this device in order to protect itself against inordinate profit declines. The result is a serious unbalancing of paper production, with resulting inflation and economic disruption in the channels of consumption.

With regard to the effect of shortages of fibre supply, it was the consensus of opinion of the industry representatives that here again this was incident to the unrealistic approach of OPA in not adopting pricing practices suitable to the character of the industry. It was the general belief that production would be maintained at maximum levels if reasonable profit incentives were offered to stimulate this production. Lacking such incentives essential production is bound to decline, as operating conditions become more difficult and as fibre continues to remain scarce. The issue was raised that with the elimination of the War Production Board, whose interests lay in production, OPA must recognize in a realistic way the effect of its pricing policies on production. The chaotic condition that now exists within the industry in its production schedule is bound to become more aggravated unless recognition is had in OPA of the character of the industry and the effect of the inflexible application of its rules and practices as now applied.

With regard to new capacity that will be brought in with new machines installed or machinery built, it was the general opinion of the industry representatives present that this capacity could not be in production in sufficient time to materially affect the present situation. If mills could give their sole attention to more output instead of having to schedule mill operations with profit margins in mind, it was felt that the output of existing capacity could be increased approximately 10 percent.

While the impact of the labor situation was not discussed as thoroughly as it probably deserved, the general opinion of the industry representatives was to the effect that with skyrocketing wages many mills would be forced to curtail operations and return to a 40-hour workweek in order to survive at all. Even under the best of conditions, with the rapidly narrowing margin between costs and the existing price ceilings, marginal capacity in the industry will operate under great difficulties and there is little doubt if conditions continue to follow the trends that now exist, much of this capacity will disappear from the picture. Unfortunately, this loss of production will occur chiefly in the field of low-cost grades where the resulting injury to the consumer will be most serious.

With regard to the general effect of the criteria used as related to low-priced end products, it seemed to the industry representatives that this effect is distinctly inflationary in character. OPA is forcing customers of the industry to buy high-priced products when normally lower-priced products would be used. Customers are forced to this extreme by the fact that the paper mills of the country are forced out of the production of low end products in order to protect their economic position and survive. OPA has had some experience with a situation of this type in the textile industry. While the situation in the paper industry may not be equally dramatic, it certainly is comparable and carries the same implications.

E. W. TINKER,
Executive Secretary.

NOVEMBER 27, 1945.

Letter From a Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein copy of a letter sent by one of my constituents to his mother from Heidelberg, Germany. This soldier, who is only 20 years of age, has participated in three major battles and has served 142 consecutive days in combat area. Evidently he is justified in his criticism of the conduct and actions of the officers toward the men as he states in his letter which reads as follows:

PFC JOHN C. WALSH, 31371036,
BATTERY A, 387 AAA, APO 758,
C/O POSTMASTER, NEW YORK, N. Y.
Heidelberg, October 30, 1945.

DEAR MOTHER: I thought I had been in some pretty poor outfits in this Army but this one has no equal. If it has I pity the men in it. We have a man, he looks like a man anyway, in command of this battery that must have taken his training under Simon Legree. Of all the 90-day "blunders" I've seen, he is by far the worst I've met. I once read in the paper that some Congressmen expect riots and mass desertions over here this winter. Well they will get them if these dogs continue to treat us the way they do. The officers over here have a life they have never had before or will have again—with as little work as they do. They have all the liquor they need; they all have a car or means to command a vehicle and the hotels and houses where they live are nothing but houses of prostitution. Every last one of them leads the life of a big playboy. Yet they make life miserable for us. I won't bother to tell you how, for you wouldn't understand it too well and I'd have to write a sizeable book to cite every case I know. You'll have to take my word for it.

So don't be surprised if I land in a guardhouse. They worry about keeping the peace with other nations, yet they can't even keep it in their own Army. They make me sick, but they sure pull the wool over the people's noses.

Newsy letter isn't it? Maybe some day I'll be able to even score a little.

Give my regards to the rest of the family,

Love,

JOHN.

P. S.—I know you won't like this but that's how I feel.

The Cost Absorption Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 3 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me by James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, endorsing Administrator Chester Bowles' policy of cost absorption at the manufacturer and distributor levels. I also ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Bowles' letter to me, explaining his belief that this policy is the cornerstone of effective price control.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS EDUCATIONAL AND
COOPERATIVE UNION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., November 28, 1945.

Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: Members of the National Farmers Union have anxiously watched the reaction of Congress and the executive offices to recent pressure campaigns by manufacturers and distributors upon the Government's price control program. It is regrettable that a number of Congressmen have been actively supporting these campaigns.

Our farm families know from first-hand experience what price control has meant to them during the war and they know further what price control can mean to them—the difference between success and failure—during the reconversion period. In fact, as you know, the National Farmers Union was the first farm organization to put its full force behind the objective of the price-control program and has continued its full support each time the act has come up for renewal.

In order to help our farm people have a greater share of the good things of life, the National Farmers Union has consistently fought for lower costs and greater efficiency in the distribution of all goods and services. It seems to us that this goal is of major im-

portance if we are to reach full employment or anything like it in this country.

Farm families stand ready to buy huge quantities of business and household equipment and supplies if these items can be bought at reasonable prices. Since their farms were greatly worn in bringing to all America the benefit of record wartime production, it does not seem unreasonable to me to ask that they be able to rebuild their plant and reequip their farms at a reasonable cost.

The National Farmers Union agrees with Administrator Bowles, of the Office of Price Administration, in his statement that a genuine, vigorous cost absorption policy is the keystone of price control.

The only alternative as we see it is, as he indicated, cost-plus pricing. The cost absorption policy seeks to allow manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers generally to operate at record profits even after income and excess profit taxes were paid.

We have given this policy very earnest consideration and find nothing unfair to business in it. Prewar realized margins and current costs of doing business do not appear to be interfered with, since costs are to be absorbed out of profits and margins greatly above anything these firms realized in peacetime.

For these reasons and since the absence of such a policy would be eminently unfair to millions of farmers and other consumers in the country—in that it would mean much higher prices for such things as clothing, automobiles, furniture, refrigerators, and even food sold in the grocery stores—as president of the National Farmers Union I respectfully urge that you and other members of Congress support the OPA and support principles of cost absorption.

Sincerely,

JAMES G. PATTON,
President, National Farmers Union.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., November 28, 1945.

The Honorable ROBERT F. WAGNER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: I have been deeply disturbed during the last few weeks over the apparent misunderstanding of one of OPA's basic policies—the policy of cost absorption at the manufacturer and distributor levels.

From the many statements which have been made about this policy, it is apparent that most of the objections are due to confusion as to just what the policy is, how it is applied, and the necessity for its use.

In this letter I would like to sketch very briefly the most important points about this policy so that you may be familiar with it. I want also to point out the serious consequences were cost absorption abandoned.

This policy is, first of all, an old policy. It has been in effect during the entire period of price control. It has been discussed before congressional committees, and debated on the floor of both the Senate and the House. It has been reviewed and affirmed by the courts.

On numerous occasions I have stated that this policy is the very cornerstone of effective price control. Without it we would surely face a substantially higher price level and the rapidly growing danger of runaway inflation.

Let me emphasize this by a brief outline of the direct result if the cost absorption policy were eliminated at the distributive levels alone:

The public would be immediately forced to pay $700,000,000 a year more for food. Not one penny of this would go to the farmer.

The public would be forced to pay at least $300,000,000 more for apparel in the lower and medium priced ranges. Clothing prices are already high.

The public would be forced to pay at least $400,000,000 additional for automobiles, radios, washing machines, refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, and other so-called reconversion products.

These sweeping price increases to the public would result solely from the elimination of cost absorption by distributors. It would be impossible, however, to eliminate this pricing standard for one group without eliminating it for others. This would mean sweeping increases in most manufacturers' prices totaling additional billions of dollars. These increases would be pyramided into still higher increases to the general public.

The two principal groups which have been opposed to this policy are the National Retail Dry Goods Association and the distributors of reconversion products. It is my belief that the great majority of merchants and dealers who have offered their protests have not thoroughly understood the distinctly limited effect which this policy has had and will have on their present and future profits.

Department stores, both large and small, are enjoying peak prosperity. Department-store earnings, including both large and small companies, are estimated at 13 times their average 1936–39 profits.

Nineteen hundred and forty-four was the biggest year in their history. Sales at present are running 12 percent above 1944 levels, with the prospect of the greatest Christmas business in all time. The outlook for 1946 is excellent.

Dealers in electrical appliances, automobiles, and other reconversion goods, should look forward during the next 2 or 3 years to a period of unprecedented prosperity. The country is hungry for the goods which they will sell.

The War Production Board (now the Civilian Production Administration) estimates that production of automobiles, electric refrigerators, washing machines, vacuum cleaners, radios, and other such products will by June 30, 1946, exceed average 1939 monthly shipments by from 70 to 300 percent.

In no instance will our cost-absorption policy allow the dealers less than their actually realized profit margin on each unit in 1941 (their biggest prewar year). With few exceptions this policy will in practice allow them a profit per unit far in excess of that which they secured in 1941. Thus, with very few exceptions, they can look forward to higher profit margins per unit with a tremendous increase in the number of units sold.

I have never been more alarmed by the inflationary danger confronting us than I am at present. It is not the fantastic total of liquid assets alone that frightens me, although they could easily cause an inflationary explosion if the public ever loses confidence that the price line would be held. The inflationary psychology that has now taken hold of the country is at least equally dangerous.

The real-estate market is booming, with prices already way out of line with what the market can sustain. Nonetheless, these prices move up week by week.

The stock market is spurting and the "inside" speculative dope being passed on by the taxi drivers and elevator boys is reminiscent of 1928 and 1929.

And all over the country, sober businessmen are writing escalator clauses into their contracts.

It's going to take everything we've got to keep prices from tearing loose.

The administration of the price-control program has never been an easy task. It is much more difficult today. Although we shall strive with every possible means to ease hardships, to eliminate inequities, and to make sure that price control in no sense stands in the way of production, I cannot guarantee a wholly painless operation.

During the two and a half years in which I have been in Washington I have tried to keep Congress thoroughly informed about what we are doing and why we are doing it. Congress is in a sense our Board of Directors—the group which sets the basic policies on which we operate. I believe that all the Members of Congress—whether they agree with us or not—are entitled to full, frank, and complete information on the progress of this program and the dangers which we see ahead.

I am writing you this letter now because we need your help and I want to have you see the situation at least as we see it—particularly on this widely misunderstood question of manufacturer and distributor absorption.

For your further information on this question of cost absorption and to aid you in answering constituents' letters, I am attaching a "question and answer" memorandum which may be helpful to you.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

[Enclosure]

SIX QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON OPA'S COST-ABSORPTION POLICY

Question 1. Exactly what is this policy?

Answer. Cost absorption is the balancing of cost decreases against cost increases in the determination of prices, with no increase when decreases and other benefits of war-economy volume exceed cost increases.

Business itself in peacetime generally has absorbed cost increases without price increases when there were offsetting cost decreases to cover them. This is clearly seen if one studies what happened to wages, costs, and prices between the two World Wars. The average hourly earnings of industrial workers went up 37 percent between 1923 and 1941. But did industrial prices go up? They did not. They declined 15 percent. How could this be? Because better machines and techniques increased output per man-hour 88 percent, reducing labor cost per unit of output 27 percent. Industry balanced cost decreases against cost increases, and gave the public much more for its money.

During World War II wage rates went up 73 percent (1944 over average 1936–39); raw material prices went up 53 percent. The prices of finished manufactured goods rose only 21 percent, yet manufacturing profits rose 450 percent. How could this be? Because industrial output rose 126 percent, greatly reducing overhead costs. There were, also, in many cases improved methods. Cost decreases, over-all, far exceeded cost increases. Cost absorption saved billions on the cost of the war; billions in living costs to consumers, yet business earned more than ever in history.

That is all there is to OPA's cost absorption policy; a balancing of cost decreases against cost increases and the benefits of war—economy volume—with maintenance of existing prices so long as—

(1) Industries and trades make not less than their normal—usually their 1936–39 profits before taxes.

(2) Industries making multiple products recover at least their out-of-pocket costs on all individual products, even when their over-all earnings exceed prewar profits.

(3) Trades recover at least their expense rates on the sale of all individual products, even when their over-all earnings exceed their prewar earnings (save where traditionally the margin has been lower).

(4) Distributive trades handling such products as automobiles and electrical household appliances receive not less than their actually realized prewar gross margins.

During the war we also made increases to stimulate the production of goods essential to prosecution of the war.

That is all there is to OPA's much debated cost absorption policy.

Question 2. Does this policy apply to everyone?

Answer. The policy has been applied in general to every industry and every distributive trade since price control was adopted.

In all cases cost absorption ends if and when cost increases—

(1) Reduce over-all industry or trade profit before taxes below prewar levels.

(2) Cuts a multiple product industry's prices on an individual product below out-of-pocket expense for the bulk of the output.

(3) Cuts a distributive trade's price on any article below its expense rate.

(4) Cuts a reconversion goods distributive trade's gross margin (on such as automobiles and appliances) below its actually realized prewar gross margin.

Question 3. Just what is the legal basis of the policy?

Answer. The Emergency Price Control Act, passed in January 1942, left the Administrator with considerable leeway in adjusting price ceilings upward, so long as the purposes of the act were achieved. These were to "stabilize prices and to prevent speculative and unwarranted increases in prices, to protect persons with relatively fixed and limited incomes, and to prevent post-emergency collapse of values," etc. Ceiling prices fixed, however, were to be "generally fair and equitable."

The Stabilization Act which became law in October 1942 removed much of the Administrator's discretion. It directed the President to stabilize prices affecting the cost of living on the basis of September 15, 1942, levels. Authority was given for upward adjustments only to aid in the effective prosecution of the war or to correct gross inequities.

Reading the two acts together it is apparent that September 15, 1942, price levels must not be exceeded, save in the above-named instances, so long as they are "generally fair and equitable."

Congress thus ruled out cost increases as grounds for price increases except in certain specified circumstances. Accordingly, OPA is required by law to apply its cost-absorption policy.

That OPA is correct in its views as to the law has been sustained by the Emergency Court of Appeals. See *Gillespie, Rogers, Pyatt Co.* v. *Bowles* (144 F. (2d) 361 (1944)) and *Philadelphia Coke Co.* v. *Bowles* (139 F. (2d) 349 (1943)).

In the Philadelphia coke case mentioned above the court said that when producers' prices have to be increased to met the standards of the act, "it is the duty of the Administrator, so far as possible, to require them to be absorbed at some appropriate intermediate stage in the process of production or distribution at which there may be an existing margin of profit reasonably sufficient to absorb it."

Cost absorption at retail occurs when retail prices are not increased to offset manufacturers' increases. Under the standards of the original Price Control Act, retail increases are not required by law merely because manufacturers' prices are increased. They are required only when over-all earnings of the retail trade groups affected are reduced below peacetime level (the earnings standard) or when retail prices on individual products become unreasonably low in relation to operating expenses (the product standard). Under the standard covering price increases to aid in the effective prosecution of the war or to remove gross inequities, increases in retail prices to offset manufacturers' increases are not proper. Consequently, Congress has clearly directed that retail ceilings are to be held even when manufacturers' increases are granted, provided that the standards of the original Price Control Act are at all times met.

Furthermore, failure to apply the cost-absorption policy at retail would conflict with Executive Order 9599, promulgated by President Truman on August 18, 1945, which states that one of the guiding policies of the reconversion period shall be "To continue the stabilization of the economy as authorized and directed by the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended" and directs the Price Administrator to "take all necessary steps to assure that the cost of living and the general level of prices shall not rise." Even where a price increase is necessary to correct a gross inequity or a maladjustment interfering with effective transition to a peactime economy, President Truman's Executive order directs the Price Administrator "so far as is reasonable, practicable, and necessary for this purpose, to see that such price increases do not cause price increases at later levels of production or distribution."

Question 4. What has been gained through the policy?

Answer. By using some of the benefits of large, war-created volume to absorb cost increases without price increases, the Government has held the price line far better than otherwise would have been possible.

Living costs in World War II rose 31 percent from September 1939. Only 3 percent of the rise came after May 1943, when the hold-the-line order was issued. In the World War I inflation—when pressures were far less powerful—they rose 103 percent. The difference is due in great degree to the fact that when Congress passed the Price Control Act it made possible the cost-absorption policy in establishing maximum prices.

Had every cost increase been translated into a price increase, billions would have been added to the public's cost of living; tens of billions would have been added to the cost of the war. Prices would be far above present levels. There would be no effective check on a spiral of wage-price rises.

Question 5. Has this policy entirely curbed the profits of industry or distributors?

Answer. The facts tell the story. Industry profits in 1944—after cost absorption—were 4½ times average 1936–39 profits; 1½ times 1941 profits. They would have been far greater under a policy of cost-plus pricing; but greater profits would have resulted in widespread charges of profiteering and demands for compensating increases by persons whose incomes were subject to stabilization.

Profit figures for the distributive trades are less readily available. The published figures of the National Retail Drygoods Association, the most persistent critic of cost absorption, show profits for 1944—after cost absorption—13 times the average 1936–39 profits.

Other gains in trade profits after cost absorption are as follows:

1944 over average 1936–39 earnings

	Percent
Hardware retailers	464
Small furniture stores	185
Variety chain stores	339
Men's apparel stores	398
Chain grocery stores	152
Independent grocery stores	117
Music stores	210

Lest anyone imagine that small business has suffered, we cite the following figures from the Department of Commerce:

Profits of unincorporated firms

[In millions of dollars]

	1939	*1944 (After cost absorption)*
Manufacturers	315	712
Wholesale	723	1,507
Retail	1,517	3,416

Total corporation profits have risen as follows:

Corporation profits

[In billions of dollars]

Year:	*Before taxes*	*After taxes*
1939	5.3	4.0
1944 (after cost absorption)	24.8	10.0

In peacetime as in wartimes there always are some high-cost firms experiencing hardship. That these have been abnormally few during the period of price control is shown by Dun & Bradstreet's reports of business failures as shown below:

Year:	*Failures*
1929	22,909
1939	14,768
1941	11,848
1944 (with cost absorption)	1,222

Recent complaint has come from wholesale and retail distributors of automobiles, electrical appliances, and other reconversion goods, to whom it has come as a new idea that under price control business has not been assured its prewar gross percentage margins before mark-downs and other allowances. Lacking recent cost and profit figures to establish limitations upon cost absorption by wholesale and retail distributors of reconversion goods, OPA has earmarked for absorption, where necessary, the difference between prewar list price percentage margins and the prewar percentage margins they actually realized. The list price margins never were realized because of mark-downs, losses on trade-ins, and various other margin-reducing practices that will not be necessary in order to make sales in the months ahead. Under any and all conditions, however, and whatever are their cost increases, these trades will be protected in their prewar realized percentage margins.

Actually, in very few cases are increases in manufacturers' prices sufficiently large to reduce unit realized margins of reconversion trades to prewar levels. And with manufacturers predicting to the War Production Board that 1946 volume will exceed all previous records, distributors of reconversion goods seem certain in 1946 to enjoy one of their most profitable years. Cost-absorption requirements under these conditions cannot possibly prove a hardship.

Question 6. What would happen if this policy were abandoned?

Answer. Abandonment of the policy at wholesale and retail would have these results:

The cost of foods to the public would increase by $700,000,000, not one cent of which would go to the farmers.

The public would be forced to pay at least $300,000,000 more for lower- and medium-priced clothing.

The public would have to pay at least $400,000,000 more for automobiles, radios, washing machines, refrigerators, and other reconversion products.

Several percentage points would be added in the retail prices of furniture and dozens of other less-important groups of commodities.

Abolition of cost absorption by manufacturers would have even more far-reaching results. Rises in prices of hundreds of industrial materials and parts would become cost increases to producers of finished goods. Thus, one price increase would be pyramided upon another, setting an inflationary spiral into motion. This would be accentuated when wholesalers' and retailers' margins were added to these increased prices.

Still more tinder would be added to the inflationary fire when labor demanded compensating increases to offset rises in living costs and farmers demanded higher support prices and other increased compensation to counteract increases in prices of industrial goods.

What would be the final result no one can predict. We know, however, that when prices soared after World War I the public began to spend its twenty-seven billions of wartime savings, seeking to satisfy future needs ahead of price increases. The mad scramble for goods that followed sent living costs to a peak 108 percent above prewar levels.

This time wartime savings of the people total not twenty-seven but $145,000,000,000—a sum equal to the total spendable income of the public in our two most prosperous prewar years. Should people, whether consumers or businessmen, once lose confidence that the price line will be held and rush to meet future needs ahead of anticipated price increases, these vast wartime savings could throw the Nation into a wild inflationary scramble, exceeding any this Nation ever has experienced.

Raw material production rose so sharply during the war that we hoped for an early balancing of supply and demand that would permit the lifting of price ceilings. On November 6, however, Business Week reported to its readers that "without any question" but for OPA restraints, "the lid would blow" on materials and parts prices. "Expectations of a general upward revision of prices," the magazine said, "have more to do with today's markets than have the ordinary supply-demand factors."

In other fields, too, recent tendencies are menacing. Speculation has replaced investment in the stock market, sending security prices to a 14-year high and with the peak of the rise not yet in sight. Small people are taking fliers in a way reminiscent of 1928 and 1929. Uncontrolled commercial, residential and farm real estate prices also are rising sharply without controls.

In view of these conditions this does not appear to be a propitious time to substitute cost-plus for cost-absorption pricing. To do so would be to run unwarranted and dangerous risks with the welfare of the American people.

With final victory over inflation in sight, but with this dangerous situation immediately ahead, the Office of Price Administration will take no step to weaken price controls or the confidence of the people that the price line will be held.

History and Program of Amvets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, heretofore I have had the privilege and honor of inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, by reason of your approval and the unanimous consent of this great legislative body, the articles of incorporation and statement of purposes of the Amvets.

Now having been furnished with further important data with reference to this recently formed veterans' organization, I am pleased to ask that this also be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I think it highly important and in the interests of sound public opinion that this and every other veterans' organization let the general public know of their high purposes and program. This is good for these war veterans. It is also good for those who are not members of these organizations.

The matter follows:

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY OF AMVETS

(By Jack W. Hardy, national commander)

Our present organization was established on December 9–10, 1944, at Kansas City, Mo., by a merger of a representative group of independent veterans' organizations which covered practically every section of the country. Our name was adopted from the American Veterans of World War II, Inc., Washington, D. C., which called the Kansas City conference. The popular title "Amvets" was first given the organization by a newspaper reporter.

THE AMVETS PROGRAM

We believe that no group has a greater stake in the present and future of America than the 13,500,000 or more men and women who served in the armed forces in World War II. A large percentage of our local and national leadership will undoubtedly come from this group. The character of that leadership in terms of integrity and ability will have much to do with the advancement of the finest that can and must be America.

Veterans and nonveterans alike have become cynical of persons, ideas, ideals, and things. There is a deep common need for a new faith in ourselves and in the America for which we fought. Amvets are determined to renew that faith by building and justifying the confidence of all veterans and the American people. We propose to do this firstly by implementing our declaration of principles by action.

We believe that the combined voice of the veteran should be known and made articulate; that in matters of national importance the veteran should be an informed citizen, and that by actual poll his opinion should be known and made publicly available; thus, when the national commander speaks for Amvets he speaks as their true representative.

A national service officer and service organization shall serve the veteran in the practical problems connected with his military service. Legislative council will keep close liaison with all legislative matters of interest to veterans, and reports and analysis of these matters will be distributed to posts and the membership.

American Veterans of World War II have a deep interest in the peace and in the preservation of the peace. To that end a peace division has been established in the Amvets organization to keep abreast world conditions and all matters relative to the peace and its preservation. The veteran wants and demands an informed voice in both making and keeping the international peace.

Local posts and State departments will serve as a working center to assist local veterans in their problems of housing, employment, reorientation as well as a social center and forum where old acquaintances will be renewed and new ones made, and problems of common interest met and solved.

It is the overwhelming choice of veterans of World War II to have their own organization. Following each war the veterans of that war naturally formed an organization of those who had fought and served together—theirs was a community of interest, age, and experiences, and those of earlier wars had their interest together.

Amvets will, of course, cooperate with all legitimate veterans' organizations of all wars in matters relating to the welfare of veterans, provided such matters do not operate to the detriment of the people as a whole, for Amvets believe that nothing which operates to the harm of all the American people can be of ultimate value to the veteran. We will insist that veterans' affairs be administered competently and fairly, and that the wounded veteran have the best facilities and appliances this great Nation can provide.

The benefits to which the veteran is entitled under present laws, or may have under later legislation must be workable and fair, and present conflicts and ambiguities in the law must be eliminated. The people have granted veterans certain rights, and these should not be lost or ineffective because of faulty administration. Amvets propose to keep their members advised of such rights and benefits and the simplest means by which they can be realized upon.

As an active and interested member of his community, the returned veteran should affiliate himself with organizations which have as its sincere objective the betterment of the community, State, and Nation. Amvets should be interested in politics, for by political means our country is governed. It is of utmost importance that the most competent and unselfish representatives be elected to public office. Amvets, as individuals, should aid their community, State, and Nation in accomplishing this end.

Amvets is your organization—it reflects your opinions, aims, and aspirations. Through polls of opinion, posts, State departments, and elected representatives and officers, your ideas are made known to national headquarters and the Nation. The slogan, "We fought together—now let's build together" best expresses the goal of Amvets.

Other members of the official family of Amvets include Frank Dee Scriven, 756 Crenshaw Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif., national executive secretary; Raymond Sawyer, 609 South Walter Reed Drive, Arlington, Va., national service officer; J. H. Leib, 3908 North Fourth Street, Arlington, Va., national legislative director; and Commander J. T. O'Callahan, care of U. S. S. *Franklin D. Roosevelt*, Brooklyn, N. Y., national chaplain.

APPLICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP—AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II—AMVETS—1507 M STREET NW., WASHINGTON, D. C.

Name _____
(Last name) (Middle name) (First name)
Branch of service _____
Service serial No. _____
Date and place of entry into service _____
(Date)
_____
(Place)
Date and place of separation from service
_____ _____
(Date) (Place)
Present home address _____
Occupation _____
Business address _____
Business phone No. _____
Membership for Post _____
(Indicate Post, if any)

I certify that I have been honorably discharged from the armed forces.

_____
(Signature of applicant)

Annual dues, $4.

"We fought together—now let's build together."

Religious and Racial Intolerance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, December 3 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at Chicago on December 1, on the question of religious and racial intolerance.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentleman, of all the issues confronting our country today, the issue of racial and religious discrimination is at once the most neglected and the most critical. There is no

victory over Hitler and Tojo which by itself will erase the injustice of economic discrimination practiced against the minority groups among our people. Full employment without fair employment means the fastening of religious and racial minorities to the bottom rung of the economic ladder regardless of their education, abilities, and skills. Unemployment compensation will not break down the barrier of prejudice. There is nothing in the so-called GI bill of rights which will protect the returning two millions of minority veterans from the pattern of job discrimination which exists in this country.

We in this Nation stand at a crossroads in history. Either we will take the road which will lead us past another goalpost of human progress or we will be forced into the path riddled with the pitfalls of human hatreds which led Europe into World War II. We shall not be permitted to stand still. Whichever road we take will be for you, the people, to choose.

Every great crisis in American history has thus far had the moral result of increased protection and increased liberty for the individual. This country's first great crisis—the American Revolution—gave us political and religious independence. The crisis which was the Civil War gave us freedom from bondage for all men and women. Out of the crisis of the First World War came women's suffrage. Out of this World War II, with all its terrifying implications, comes: What?

This present-day crisis must at least give us true democracy, and the kernel of that is equality of economic opportunity. We must pluck down from the thin air the Atlantic Charter's "freedom from fear" and "freedom from want" and ground those freedoms not on the Government dole, but upon the right to work and the opportunity to work for every man and every woman according to his skill, his experience, and his ability.

This is no new ideal in the development of American life. It is common knowledge that the struggle for that ideal began when the first paths were cut through the virgin wilderness by the first settlers—victims of religious and economic persecution themselves—who came to these shores. The Pilgrims in Massachusetts, the English Catholics of Maryland, the French Huguenots of the Carolinas, the Scotch Presbyterians of Georgia, the Quakers of Pennsylvania, the Jews, the Irish, the Dutch, the Germans, and even the poverty-stricken debtors of the English prisons came to this country as to a refuge, to a haven of new, unshackled opportunity.

The translation into law of the new concepts of religious and economic liberty was not easily achieved any more than the enactment of fair-employment legislation will be easily won. Rigid religious conformity was woven into the law of some of the separate colonies, and rebellious sects were driven forth to found new colonies where religious freedom could flourish. At one point, Catholics and Jews were not allowed to vote. For many years people without property were denied the franchise. But the ideal of freedom was not to be downed, and when the crisis which precipitated the American Revolution came about, the cornerstone of liberty upon which our country was founded was given deathless voice in the Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from among the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

These words of the great leader of humanistic democracy, Thomas Jefferson, have captured the philosophy of the American ideal. Indeed, they are reechoed and restated in the American creed—the Constitution's Bill of Rights. I often think, humbly, of the prophetic recognition Jefferson gave to the three basics from which this country draws so much of its strength—political independence, religious tolerance, and public education—when I remember the simple epitaph he ordered engraved upon his tombstone:

"Here was buried Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, of the Statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom, and Father of the University of Virginia."

The people's determination to cling to this heritage of the protection of human rights under law was challenged in the ratification of the Constitution itself when it was discovered that that original document failed to guarantee them. It was only after amendments, constituting the so-called Bill of Rights, were agreed to that the Constitution was finally adopted. It is no accident that the first of these amendments pledged this Government's protection of the individual's freedom of worship, freedom of speech and of press, and "the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievance." Need I remind you that it is under that right you are now here assembled?

These were rights such as the Old World had never known, and the lack of which blocked the forward march of civilization. As this country flourished and grew strong on roots fed by all its people, in other lands struggling people took them for their own and mankind moved up and onward. Nevertheless, the freedom-loving people of this Nation were not yet satisfied. They saw the horror, the injustice, and the inhumanity of the institution of slavery and rose against it. Then one of them, a Kentucky rail splitter, an Illinois and Indiana farmer, a country lawyer who was way ahead of his time, came and enunciated to the whole world that this country could not exist "half slave and half free." A great war which rocked the new Nation was fought between the citizens of this country to decide that question. The answer was written in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments to our Constitution—this Nation's second bill of rights.

These rights are now in our care to preserve and to strengthen for our children, and our children's children. How well our citizenry appreciated those rights and those freedoms was proved by their willingness to fight for them when they became endangered. Even during the memory of the living, two great wars have been fought. And while those wars were fought, it was proved conclusively that on the battlefield where suffering takes place, where men are mutilated, where men die, you do not see the attempts that are made in normal times within our own country to set aside those principles for which the soldier and the sailor have suffered.

No discrimination was shown by the Japanese enemy in his treatment of the Negro or the Jew or the Mexican or the so-called Anglo-Saxon stock—he murdered them all irrespective of their religion, color, or politics. On the beachheads of Tarawa, Okinawa, or Guam there was no discrimination. Along the sandbanks of Anzio no discrimination was shown by the German or any other common enemy. But here in our own country by people who should know better, and do know better, discrimination at times becomes rampant. Even now, the ugly head of racial and religious prejudice shows itself too vividly to be ignored.

To outlaw the discriminatory employment practices stemming from racial and religious bigotry is the new task which must now engage us. We have seen, in wartime, the effectiveness of a Fair Employment Practice Committee. It gave hope and courage to those on the battlefields and new opportunities for those at home to test their mettle on the production lines. Aircraft plants were persuaded to upgrade Mexican-Americans; white workers to cooperate with colored workers. Government agencies accepted in new positions qualified minority workers referred by Civil Service. Trade-unions policed their own nondiscrimination policy among their locals. Employers rearranged work schedules to permit Sabbatarians and orthodox Jews opportunity to observe religious customs. The theory of fair employment became a successful practice.

For that reason, some of us in Congress have determined that now we must have a basic law to carry out the purport of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. That is why Senate bill 101 and House bill 2232 were introduced. The bill to establish a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission is designed to have but one function—to eliminate unfair employment practices based on discrimination on grounds of race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry. Under the bill, management continues free to set its own hiring, training, and upgrading practices; to adjust its internal plant policy; and to discharge according to any standard it may adopt so long as there is no arbitrary discrimination because of race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry. In the same way, organized labor continues free to manage its internal affairs according to its own lights, except that it cannot deny any of the advantages or opportunities of union organization and collective bargaining to any person because of race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry. The bill covers all Federal agencies, firms having Federal contracts, and firms in or affecting interstate commerce having six or more employees. The agency cannot enforce its own orders, but it is empowered to go to the courts to request enforcement when firms or unions coming under its jurisdiction refuse to discontinue discriminatory employment policies.

Of course, there are those who say, "Why not just investigate discrimination and educate those who persist in erecting barriers of prejudice?" But experience has shown that education is not enough. Even on the basic principles of nature and the Mosaic laws, murder is denounced, but nevertheless, every civilized nation in the world has laws against murder. We are instructed to love our fellow men, but we still take the precaution of establishing laws to protect them from fraud or violence.

It was my privilege to serve as chairman of the subcommittee which held hearings on S. 101. Representatives of every faith, every race, every walk of life testified on this measure. I think I lean to the side of conservatism when I estimate that 60,000,000 Americans were represented in those hearings. That is an amazing expression of popular interest in any legislation. To me, the most encouraging thing that was developed at these hearings was that the representatives of all the different faiths of our American people—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish—have been unanimous in coming before the Senate committee to plead for the enactment of the bill to establish a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission with enforcement powers. The position of the church leadership on this question is very clear. So, too, has been the supporting role played by the two leading houses of labor—the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

After those hearings, the Senate Committee on Education and Labor recommended S. 101 to the full Senate for favorable action by a 12-to-6 vote. This bill is now high on the Senate calendar ready for debate and vote. It is also on the President's "must" list of legislation. I think I am safe in saying that the majority of the Senate body is favorably disposed toward this legislation. What, then, keeps the bill from the Senate floor? Unfortunately, there are men in the Senate who are adamant and, I believe, mistaken in their opposition to the enactment of this measure. These Senators, recognizing that the tide of human progress has outpaced them, would try to stem its onrush by the extreme tactic of filibustering the bill. To meet that kind of opposition we need not only a majority of Senators to support the bill—we must have, in addition, the cloture vote of two-thirds of the entire Senate to successfully counterattack the threatened filibuster.

Because of the nature of these parliamentary obstacles, it is my considered opinion that only by efforts of an alert and vigilant people will we be able to get successful action on this legislation. In other words, this is the time to let your elected representatives in the Senate know of your wishes regarding their actions both on the bill and on cloture. The Senate is made up of men who will understand your concern once they are informed and who always give a sympathetic ear to the voting public. If there is one thing which is certain about the outcome of this struggle for equal job opportunity, it is that its success depends upon the people. This is a people's bill and a people's fight.

What we want most now is action. We know that practices growing out of discrimination and intolerance, which are thoroughly un-American, must not be allowed to continue. The American way of protecting human rights against such practices is by law. We have the backing of our President. We have the commitment of the Republican Party. Therefore, whether you are a Democrat or a Republican, you have the right and the responsibility to remind your leadership that these promises are yet to be fulfilled. You have it in your hands to get such a law. Make your voices heard.

In doing this you will be promoting Americanism. You will perform a service to your country by eradicating an evil that is foreign and un-American, an evil that smacks of the racial theories of Hitler and Goebbels and not of the "four freedoms" of the Atlantic Charter. You will be performing further service to our country by thus furnishing proof to fellow peoples throughout the world that we mean to live the letter and the spirit of our American creed and that our Nation is sincere in championing the cause of the democracies and the rights of man.

We have just fought a great war to a successful conclusion. It would be a national disaster and humiliation if those who have fought valiantly abroad to defend the freedom and dignity of the individual against racial barbarism should now come home to find that the bringing of peace meant a wiping out of the antidiscrimination policy that we achieved in wartime. Today we stand embarked upon the task of reconversion for peace. Shall we reconvert to racial prejudice, national bigotry, and religious discrimination, or shall we reconvert to full peacetime employment based on the American principle of equality of human rights?

Let me give you an example of what I mean. During this war, 245 Congressional Medals of Honor—the highest honor our Nation can give its war heroes—were awarded. Six of these were given to servicemen who in ordinary times would be referred to as "these Mexicans." They were Joe Martinez, who died from Japanese bullets at Attu; Ysmael Vellegas, who gave his life at Luzon; Jose Calugas, who distinguished himself at Bataan; Joe Lopez, who saved his entire company in Belgium; Cleto Rodriguez, who with one other overcame 300 Japanese soldiers at Manila; and Marcario Garcia, who singlehanded assaulted two enemy machine-gun emplacements in Germany. Honors and awards of every description—the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Purple Heart, the Silver Star, the Air Medal, etc.—were given to members of all the minorities who make up the American people. Would it be their just due, when these heroes apply for a job, to have them turned down on account of the accident of their birth or their religious belief?

Do you remember the timeless words uttered by Lincoln at Gettysburg at the close of the Civil War? Let me repeat just two sentences to you, for they epitomize the spirit in which we must put our shoulders to the wheel if we are to move forward:

"It is rather for us (the living) to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not had died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

A Simple Money System That Built America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, so much confusion appears to exist in the public mind concerning the present money system that in reading the diverse opinions in monetary plans presented in the daily Congressional mail, I am reminded of Ella Wheeler Wilcox's couplet which I quote from memory:

So many creeds and so many minds,
With religions that wind and wind;
When all this old world needs,
Is the simple art of being kind.

We are told money is a complex subject and the shelves of our libraries are loaded down with books on money when the principles of sound money are so simple and apparently were well understood by our Nation's founders as stated in a recent letter which I have written to one of the numerous contributors to the Congressional mail on this subject, submitted herewith:

NOVEMBER 26, 1945.

DEAR COMPTON I.: Under the law (ch. 8, title 31, U. S. C. A.) our silver money is nothing but the obligation of the United States coined on a piece of metal containing 412½ grains of silver. The market value of the silver in foreign countries is worth less than 32 cents. The legal tender value of the coin is 100 cents in the payment of debts, public and private. As a lawyer I am telling you this; I will not argue any further about it.

ANDREW N. HILDEBRAND,
South Bend, Ind.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON COINAGE,
WEIGHTS, AND MEASURES,
Washington, D. C., November 28, 1945.

Mr. ANDREW N. HILDEBRAND,
South Bend, Ind.

Listen ANDREW: Speaking of price of the money metals—did it ever occur to you that money is a function and is as indispensable to the health of any national economy as the blood stream is to a healthy animal body? We might prate about the value of the rare chemical that is contained in our blood but the fact remains that function of the blood stream in bearing the various materials used by nature in upbuilding, repairing, and keeping the body alive and healthy is the thing; not the value of the ingredients in the blood. Blood that conveys the materials in our food to build up and restore body tissues, the material in our eyes, our bones, our hair, and fingernails—all of which may be diverse in commercial value—but nevertheless are indispensable in a healthy body, just as money is indispensable in inducing labor to plow and plant the fields of wheat, to harvest the grain, to transport it to the mill, and grind it into flour, to bring flour to the bakery and the bread to your table.

It isn't the price of silver or gold with which we are chiefly concerned—any more than the price of gold and silver was the objective of the Congress that established our monetary system and set up the first mint in 1792. When Congress decreed by law that 27 grains of standard gold and 416 grains of standard silver was the dollar and proceeded to levy taxes, duties on imports, and set Government salaries in dollars, no price was set on gold and no price was set on silver. The price of all commodities and service was adjusted to the value of the dollar as established by Congress—gold and silver thus became money of ultimate redemption and the increase in production and mintage of both metals into lawful money kept pace with money needs of growing population and commerce—the best plan yet devised, a plan which the world will have to readopt and reestablish if we are ever to have a sound, stable, adequate, workable money system—the sound kind of money you, no doubt, advocated from the hustings in the days of McKinley and Bryan.

It is too bad for the American people that yours and the Nation's efforts to achieve a sound money system were misdirected in that memorable campaign.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Control of Barbiturates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Samuel Hopkins Adams, in the American Weekly of November 25, 1945:

SLAVES OF THE DEVIL'S CAPSULES

(By Samuel Hopkins Adams)

ARTICLE II

They are so easy to get, so easy to take, these mild little sleeping pills. You have only to go to your physician and complain of

insomnia or "nerves," to secure a prescription. If he is careless or overworked he may not even warn you that you are playing with a subtle fire.

In many parts of the country the original prescription can be refilled as often as you wish, and within the present laws. Many States do not even require a prescription.

In these days of strain, worry, uncertainty, there is special temptation to the artificial and pernicious relief of drugs. Though these barbiturates are called "sedatives" they often give a deceptive lift to the spirits.

For example, you may be feeling "down," you lack poise and assurance to meet some business or social test. You would not think of indulging in a drink at midmorning. But you take a little tablet as a bracer. Then, at night, you take another tablet, or two.

There is no disagreeable aftermath; nothing like the hang-over of liquor; nothing that you can notice next day. So why not repeat? For such indulgence there is always a payoff, and it may be a tragic one. For you may have started a habit. The habit becomes a vice; the vice a peril.

Increasing use of this drug—of any sedative drug, in fact—will eventually damage both mind and body. At the end of that road lie shattered nerves, a weakened mind, a depressed spirit and perhaps total wreckage or suicide.

These are, of course, the extreme cases. No responsible physician would pretend that such moderate use as a daily pill brings about any such results. But how long does the use continue to be moderate? The official Federal figures, showing a rise in sales over a period of 5 years from 4,500,000 to 2,500,000,000 grains are not exactly reassuring.

A majority of those who take sleeping pills are unaware of their poisonous potentialities, but some know all about the venom that lies in those little tablets and use the knowledge to advantage. Such a one was Charles E. Bedaux, the French-born ex-sandhog who became a world-famous "speed up" engineer and an intimate of the Duke of Windsor.

[The Duke of Windsor and Mrs. Wallis Simpson were married in 1937 in Bedaux's Chateau de Cande, near Tours, France, and later that year Bedaux prepared to sponsor an American tour for them. Widespread opposition to the visit developed in the United States because of Bedaux's speed-up labor system, which made him a millionaire at the expense of the workers. The Windsors later canceled the United States tour.]

Arrested in north Africa, Bedaux was brought to Miami and held incommunicado in a detention home while awaiting a decision by the Immigration and Naturalization Service on whether he was a citizen of the United States and could be tried for treason. It was charged that he had hobnobbed with Nazi and Vichy leaders and had prepared plans for the Germans, despite the fact that he was naturalized in Grand Rapids, Mich., in 1917.

On February 14, 1944, he was informed that his citizenship had been established and that his case would go before a grand jury. That night, according to John E. Burling, an immigration agent, the 58-year-old industrialist took a large overdose of sleeping pills in his bedroom.

"These had been issued to him from time to time when he complained about sleeplessness," Burling said, "and it is clear he had been hoarding them. A note indicated he had been retaining the tablets, apparently with suicide in mind."

He was found unconscious and died a few hours later.

Even more sensational, because of the circumstances, was the death from poisoning of the Mexican motion picture star, Lupe Velez, a few months later. It was officially determined to be suicide. Lupe had for years been taking sleeping pills to pacify her high-strung nerves. Mercurial, intense, living always on the heights or in the depths of emotional stress, she was the type to which drug relief is most dangerous.

Late in November 1944 she had announced her engagement to the handsome Austrian-born actor, Harald Ramond, the "only man who is able to control Lupe, so naturally I am going to marry him." There was reason for her to marry, since she was an expectant mother.

She was found dead in bed in her luxurious Beverly Hills home. Several seconal capsules were scattered upon the satin coverlet. On the bed table was a vial bearing a Mexican label. She had written this note:

"Harald: May God forgive you and forgive me, too, but I prefer to take my life away and our baby's before I bring him in shame or kill him. How could you, Harald, fake such great love for me and our baby when all the time you didn't want us? I see no other way for me, so good-by and good luck to you.

"Love,

"LUPE."

Unquestionably the convenience of these potentially deadly drugs may be an incentive to suicide. Nobody would think of leaving a loaded pistol or a bottle of carbolic acid handy to the bedside of a person racked with nervousness or suffering from depression. Yet a handful of sleeping pills will do the work with far less harrowing accompaniments.

How simple it is to obtain these drugs even in preposterous quantities is illustrated in the case of a woman brought, unconscious and apparently at the point of death, into a New York City hospital. Emergency treatment saved her life, by the thinnest margin.

She had been supplying herself for nearly 3 years on an original prescription calling for a normal barbiturate dosage, as relief from insomnia. She gained the relief, but at the high price of drug habituation.

Soon her original dose was not enough. She doubled it. A year later she doubled it again. At the time of her collapse, she had taken, in all, 4,640 capsules on a single prescription calling for 10. The $288.50 expenditure on the drug was a small part of it. The real cost was the damage to her health, which may never be wholly repaired.

A minor corporation official began the use of barbiturates to bolster his spirits and give him confidence when he had to present a report to his superiors, or address the board of directors. They did the work, and presently he found himself dependent upon the use of the drug.

When at the age of 60 he retired and moved to a Los Angeles suburb, he was in the grip of it. He became nervous and sleepless, lost 25 pounds—and kept right on poisoning himself, until he had a convulsion and the alarmed nurse who was looking after him, since he was no longer fit to take care of himself, called a doctor.

The physician found that the patient had brought back with him from a trip to the east what would be, for a normal user, a year's supply of barbiturates. The victim's life was saved, but he continues his use of the drug which he gets without a prescription from a local druggist.

Other known addicts in the locality whose sources of supply are illegal, are a schoolteacher, a clergyman, a motion-picture director, a prominent racing man, and a number of war-plant executives and workers who have been driven by overstrain into use of the drugs. One local source is an obliging dentist in Beverly Hills.

The most difficult cases for the physician to handle are those where alcohol and the drug are alternated. The aftermath of drink leaves the victim shaky. He goes to sleeping pills for relief.

True addiction is comparately rare, though becoming commoner. The barbiturates do not enslave their victims as easily or as completely as the opiates. Medical men draw a distinction between merely taking a pill at bedtime, even though this be done regularly, and forming a dependence upon the drug through using it night and day.

The pill-swallower who sticks to a prescribed dosage is in no danger of becoming an addict, even a habituate. No case of habituation, and certainly no death, so far as the records show, has ever been the result of a daily pill. But how many sufferers from insomnia stick to the safe and moderate dose? It is so easy, if one pellet fails to do the business, to reach for another, or two more—or three.

Wartime and its sequel of economic and emotional readjustment tend to increase the use of sedatives, and to render a nerve-strained people peculiarly susceptible to these insidious "pacifiers." Dr. Clinton R. Thienes of the College of Medicine, University of Southern California, foresaw this danger and warned of it while the war was still in progress. He said:

"It is my anticipation that soldiers returning from the front, who are in a highly nervous state because of shock, noise, fatigue, and harrowing experiences relating to the war, will seek aid in such depressant drugs as the barbituric acid derivatives. This will become, no doubt, a very serious problem."

An Army nurse, 33 years old, honorably discharged, came back from the Pacific with her nerves wrecked. Service on Guadalcanal had left her with memories which she could not dismiss from her mind. Working sometimes 24 hours on end, she lost the faculty of normal sleep.

Experience had familiarized her with barbituric acid medicines. They offered relief to her tortured hours of insomnia. Beginning with normal doses, she increased them. Soon she had a fixed sleeping pill habit. It culminated in collapse. She was rushed to a hospital and died there without regaining consciousness.

Cases like these are to be found in all sections of the country. They will continue until the law steps in and takes control.

Report on State of the Union to the American People Concerning the St. Lawrence Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my practice to report to the American people each week as to the progress made in connection with the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Last Monday, I made a report and today I am talking again to let the American people know the facts.

Christmas will soon be here, Mr. Speaker, and by the way, I do not mean December 25, 1945. I am talking about December 25 in the year of our Lord 1946, with relation to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Evidently those people in the administration circles who allegedly are in favor of the project look upon it is an engineering proposition like building the pyramids of Egypt. Building the pyramids was a matter that ran over the lifetime of several of the Pharaohs.

I had the impression that the State Department was interested in this project

but it has done nothing since the days of Adolph Augustus Berle, Jr., who was Assistant Secretary of State in 1941 and who evidently got so good that they decided to ship him to Brazil. I noticed in the newspapers that he is referred to as a fair-haired boy and likely to come back to the United States. That is the wrong color scheme. Adolph has black hair. If they need a new color scheme in the State Department and that great American citizen, Patrick J. Hurley, cannot help them out, then somebody down there better dye his hair red because if we cannot get a man like Adolph Augustus Berle, Jr., then a redhead would do.

Anyhow, may I suggest meekly and with a spirit of humility to the State Department, that someplace, somewhere, somebody has fallen down on the job. Let us have some action on the St. Lawrence project.

Mr. Speaker, as of December 3, 1945, we find no progress made on the St. Lawrence matter since January 3, 1945, when the new Congress convened. A bill was introduced on that date, but speaking in the language of the present this is what we find:

Senate Joint Resolution 104 authorizing construction, introduced by Senator BARKLEY and others, October 2, 1945, and referred to the Foreign Relations Committee.

October 3, 1945, President Truman sent a message to Congress calling for construction of the St. Lawrence project.

October 4, 1945, I called for immediate action on the Barkley resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 104. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix, page A4170.

On November 12, 1945, I called attention to delay, and no action on the Barkley resolution. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 10601; also Appendix, page A4835.

On November 19, 1945, I called attention to delay. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 10811; also Appendix, page A4988; RECORD for November 19.

On November 20, 1945, this matter was discussed in the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives. (See proceedings hereinafter set forth).

On November 26, 1945, I called attention to continued delay. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for November 26, page 10985; also CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix, page A5109.

DIFFICULTY IN SPELLING THE WORD "AGREEMENT"

Very frankly, Mr. Speaker, the delay may be partially explained by reason of the failure to properly spell the word "agreement." Some folks want to spell it "t-r-e-a-t-y." To my way of thinking, that is just jumbling up words and we will never get anywhere until somebody conducts some classes in spelling. I do not refer to simplified spelling, because that is the trouble. Somebody wants to simplify the spelling of "agreement," which has nine letters, and substitute only six letters in the English alphabet. Now, I am for the English alphabet—all of its 26 letters. You simply cannot spell "agreement" using only the six little letters "t-r-e-a-t-y." You might do it if you used some international alphabet—but just the good old plain American spelling is sufficient for me. This difficulty in spelling the word "agreement" is very clearly set forth in the proceedings before the Rivers and Harbors Committee on November 20, and so that I may be eminently fair and 100 percent accurate I quote those proceedings which are as follows:

RIVERS AND HARBORS COMMITTEE,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., November 20, 1945.

Hon. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, chairman, presiding.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire what the committee plan is, if there is any plan, with reference to the legislation in relation to the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence seaway project.

I understand there is legislation pending, but I was under the impression that it was the thought of the committee that the proposed legislation would be taken up after the Senate acted on it. I wanted to find out whether my impression was correct and what the ideas of the members might be.

The CHAIRMAN. A resolution of the House was introduced by Mr. SABATH, of Chicago, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, and he has urged that a hearing be held on it.

I will read a copy of a letter I wrote to him last week and see if it meets with your approval.

The letter is as follows:

NOVEMBER 17, 1945.

Hon. A. J. SABATH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SABATH: I am in receipt of your letter of November 13 inquiring as to when you can be heard on your resolution (248) to approve the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin.

In reply will say that the Senate has not yet determined whether the matter will be considered as a joint resolution or treaty. If they decide it is a treaty, then, of course, the matter will be considered by the Senate only.

I understand the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has authorized its chairman to appoint a subcommittee to decide the question, but that the subcommittee has not yet been appointed.

It occurs to me that it is useless for us to go through with hearings until we first know what is to be its legal status.

I will be glad to give you a hearing at any time after we get through with the stream pollution bill now before the committee, but I thought the logical way to proceed would be to let the Senate act first, as they have the final say as to whether it is a treaty.

Awaiting your further wishes, I am,

Yours sincerely,

J. J. MANSFIELD,
Chairman.

Mr. PITTENGER. What date was that letter?

The CHAIRMAN. November 17, 1945.

Mr. PITTENGER. Of course, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of the record, without in any way undertaking to raise any question about the wisdom of the chairman or the propriety of what the committee may do, I want to say, as a member from the Great Lakes Basin, I am very much interested in the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence seaway project. I had hoped it would be considered a long time ago, and I am still hoping.

Last December the matter was brought up again in the Senate. It was tacked on to another bill and a record vote was had there, without any hearings. A great deal of progress was made at that time by friends of the project because it so happened that some men who were United States Senators then went on record as favoring this project. One of them in particular has since become an international character. That was very helpful and very hopeful, and very encouraging, to read the names of those distinguished friends of civilization and progress who cast their votes for this measure in December.

Of course, every President of the United States since time immemorial has endorsed this project, in spite of the railroads and the utilities of Boston, Philadelphia, and New York.

The CHAIRMAN. You might say the Atlantic coast.

Mr. PITTENGER. Yes, that is true. You can get their letters against the seaway for a dime a dozen, and they have all got about the same language saying they are opposed to this project. They go ahead and talk about the benefit of ocean commerce and they are terribly afraid of other people in the land-locked empire of the Great Lakes, and they don't want them to get the benefit of ocean commerce. If we dig this channel to a depth of 27 feet it will help the people in Duluth, Chicago, Detroit, and a number of other cities.

So they have always been able to use the old-fashioned brakes like those we used to have on the old-fashioned four-wheel wagon that our farmers used, and the ports put the brakes on even when the wagon is not going down hill. They have blocked the path of progress and worked a real injury to the American people.

I recognize the great economic value and the great service that the railroads and utilities have rendered to the citizens and particularly the value of ports like the port of New York. They are all giving us great economic aid and help and have contributed to the welfare of the people. But when they try to stand in the way of progress, they undo all the good they have done.

They remind me of the fellows on the farms when they used to cut wheat with a scythe, and then the binder was invented, and that put the boys operating scythes out of business, when the binders were put in. The scythes were in the way of progress, but these fellows who used them did more harm than good. They put charges of dynamite in the binders and wrecked them so the boys could go back to the old-fashioned way.

The outfits opposing the St. Lawrence seaway are pretty much in a position of the fellows who put the dynamite into the binders.

Water transportation the world over, Mr. Chairman, has always contributed to the wealth of the country, to the wealth of a people, and to the wealth of a nation, and to their taxes, and their prosperity.

Everybody who has no ax to grind, who has looked over the St. Lawrence River, and the possibilities that would come about by this great development—everybody says it is a project that should be constructed.

General Markham testified before the Senate committee a number of years ago that the benefits which would go to the American people in the first year when this project would be in operation would be $80,000,000. This was in peacetime.

Of course, we spent in the way of freight rates, and in time and money and in other ways for the hauling of materials for our war projects from the East to the West—and back again—we spent hundreds of millions of dollars that would not have had to be spent on this war effort if the Great Lakes seaway and power project had been completed.

I do not want to go into details, but we are losing $1,000 of electric energy every hour that the construction of this project is delayed, $24,000 a day—that is about the amount of money that the American people are losing. This is the great hydroelectric power project that is held up by these delays.

I wanted to take this moment to emphasize to the committee the tremendous need of this project and the urgency of this project.

I recognize, as the able chairman of the committee pointed out—and I might say

that there has never been a more fair and able chairman than Congressman MANSFIELD—I recognize that until the Senate takes up the thread where they left off last December—and that was an effective procedure last December even in its defeat; you never get anything unless you keep fighting for it; so it is unfortunate that almost 11 months have been wasted since January 1, 1945, and not another bridge crossed.

The quicker they take up the threads the quicker it will take them back again and the quicker they can get action in the Senate.

Of course, if the House is held back by the Senate, with the Senate taking the position that this has to be a treaty, we would be wasting the time of the committee to hold hearings, because a treaty never comes to the House of Representatives.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. You have made a very eloquent speech, and I judge you are in favor of this project. [Laughter.]

Mr. PITTENGER. I am very much in favor of it.

I want the record to show that I am sorry the Senate hearings have been delayed so long, and I hope they will get some action there.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. I would like to ask Mr. PITTENGER how much Canada contributed.

Mr. PITTENGER. Canada contributed 50 percent. That was carefully worked out by the Army engineers. If you will read Gen. Thomas Robins' statement you will find out how that was done. There is no more distinguished engineer in the world than General Robins.

The CHAIRMAN. Unfortunately, he retires next Friday.

Mr. PITTENGER. But he can still talk right on. He is a man of courage, and is one of the finest public servants in America. He will give you the figures on the cost.

I want to say you will be ashamed of what these lobbyists against the seaway have done if you read what these lobbyists have circulated, all of this dirty, damnable rot, saying that the St. Lawrence seaway is going to bankrupt the United States. I am ashamed of them; they know they are not telling you the truth.

I am glad you asked me that question, Mr. MCDONOUGH. It was a friendly question and my answer is a most friendly answer, and I hope enlightening. For the price we paid to carry on the World War II for 1 day we could build our share of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. I would like to say to the gentleman I appreciate what Mr. PITTENGER said about this measure being in the Senate.

We discovered, in connection with the Mexican water treaty, so far as California is concerned, that the House slept on its rights, that there is a privilege which the House did not exercise in connection with the depreciation of property, and we believe that the effect on the transfer of property and resources are the same and that the House has a right to say something about it.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to take so much of the committee's time, but with your indulgence I would like to say I do not agree that the ratification of this agreement with Canada has to be done by treaty. I think that the agreement method of ratification by the House and Senate by concurrent resolution is perfectly legal, and I think it is perfectly proper and the point that the chairman was trying to make was that the question as to whether it could be a treaty or an agreement has already been raised in the Senate, and until the Senate settles that we do not know whether we will get this measure up for consideration.

The House committee did have hearings in 1941 on a proposed agreement, and this committee by a vote of 2 to 1 took the position that the treaty method was not needed, and that the agreement method was proper. This committee acted at that time, but there was no action on the floor of the House because the leaders never permitted the concurrent resolution to be brought up.

I agree with you, Mr. MCDONOUGH, and there are thousands of convincing reasons.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Your position is correct and my position is also correct.

Mr. PITTENGER. They do not need to suggest things about the need for a treaty in connection with the building of the St. Lawrence waterway and power project.

The CHAIRMAN. You will find it discussed by Mr. Berle, now our Ambassador to Brazil, in the hearings held in 1941. He was then the Assistant Secretary of State and he discussed that legal question very thoroughly.

Mr. PITTENGER. I very well remember the testimony given by Mr. Berle at that time, and if you have an opportunity to read Mr. Berle's testimony in the 1941 hearings, you will find it is very conclusive on the subject.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. If, for instance, the Senate were to take the position that a treaty is necessary, in that event the House still would have a position in the matter inasmuch as it has to deal with the question of the disposal of the property of the United States.

Mr. PITTENGER. I hope your optimism is justified but I am afraid if the Senate took the position that a treaty was necessary, I fear if the House did pass a concurrent resolution, it would not be passed upon in the Senate and we would not get anywhere.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. If the Senate decided it was a treaty and sent it back to the House, I doubt if the House would act contrary to the treaty opinion; but if the Senate acted contrary to the opinion of the House, there might be some way that the House could still act. That is what I am thinking. For example, the Mexican water treaty is not settled insofar as California is concerned because in the treaty there is the disposal of certain property rights of the United States, and under the Constitution the House still has the right to step in and have something to say; and we have something to say about the Mexican water.

Mr. PITTENGER. Is California taking legal steps to try out that question in the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. MCDONOUGH. We have not gone as far as that. We are proceeding to appear before the Appropriations Committee of the House to contest certain appropriations that will come within this session of Congress in connection with the Mexican water treaty. It is the first step where the rights of property of the United States is being disposed of in the interests of a foreign country and the House has nothing to say about it. If we fail in the Appropriations Committee hearings why then we may go further. Yes.

Mr. PITTENGER. I certainly am glad to get that information.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. It is the same thing.

Mr. PITTENGER. Yes; the two cases appear to be analogous.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. It relates to the same subject matter along the St. Lawrence.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is nothing further to come before us, we will stand adjourned.

(Thereupon the hearing was concluded.)

IN CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, I am giving a verbatim record of the hearings on November 20, so that every sincere friend of the St. Lawrence project may know exactly the correct situation from a parliamentary standpoint. I do not care to add to or subtract from anything contained in this record before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors on November 20. I leave it up to the friends of the project to study this matter and then use their own best judgment as to what we can do toward this problem of proper spelling of the word "agreement." That is where our trouble starts. That is where our trouble is at the present time. That is where our trouble is going to be in the future. It is really funny what tremendous import a simple little word can have when someone thinks it appropriate.

Trade Groups Pass Strong Resolutions Favoring Air-Power Development and Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my attention two resolutions which clearly indicate that citizens of the United States, through their appropriate trade organizations, are thinking constructively about the need for the maintenance of aeronautical research and development as the primary ingredient of continued American leadership in civil and military aviation.

Because of the decisive character of air power in the victory just won, its importance to maintenance of the peace and to our economic welfare, the responsibility of maintaining our air power falls on the country as a whole. This responsibility is well expressed in the following resolutions by the National Grange and the International Association of Machinists, which, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith.

Resolution adopted by the National Grange in national convention, November 14, 1945, at Kansas City, Mo.:

In technical proficiency and production capacity in both the military and transportation fields, American aviation today leads the world. In order to maintain this leadership for the benefit of our country and preservation of world peace, we recommend that the National Grange support all sound programs directed toward the advancement of American aviation. Such programs should include adequate research and development of the most modern designs of commercial and military aircraft made possible by the latest scientific discoveries.

Resolution adopted by the International Association of Machinists, in national convention, October 29, 1945, at New York, N. Y.:

Whereas the airplane has proven throughout the war to be the most powerful instrument, both for offense and defense; and

Whereas there has developed in the United States the greatest aircraft industry in the world; and

Whereas this industry is now in the process of reconversion, and it is generally recognized that it is necessary to retain the aircraft industry as a major industry; and

Whereas there is now developing within the country a sentiment contrary to the best interests of the Nation, and

Whereas we recognize that there is now no program developed nor legislation enacted to enable the air forces to proceed on a postwar program.

Whereas we recognize the necessity for a well-planned and full program for the maintenance of world peace: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the delegates to the International Association of Machinists Convention in session in New York City on October 29, 1945, do in the interest of national prosperity, unity, and defense call upon our congressional delegations to immediately enact legislation to allow the air forces to proceed with a postwar program embodying full experimental and continuing technological improvements in the latest type aircraft to keep this Nation always ahead in air power and to assure continued peace; and be it further

Resolved, That we unalterably oppose the sale or transfer of surplus military aircraft for use of private air lines.

Confusing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, though the national debt is on its way to the $300,000,000,000 mark, with a prospective interest charge of $6,000,000,000 annually, demands for additional appropriations pour in on Congress. At the end of the World War there was some $5,000,000,000 in circulation in the hands of the people. Today we have some $27,000,000,000 in circulation. Everyone has more money, a pleasant fact to contemplate, but unfortunately it also means that prices are up.

It is a question whether the additional dollars which everyone has or is assumed to have in his pocket will buy more than the fewer dollars which we had after the last World War or prior thereto. There may be fun in spending, but if the dollar buys but half as much, little is gained. Most of us either forget or ignore that fact.

Notwithstanding the fact that ever since 1928 the Federal Government has each year spent several billion dollars than it was able to collect, today there is no tendency whatever upon the part of our people or of Congress to curtail our spending program. Almost everyone seems to have a pet project which he wants the Federal Government to finance, regardless of the fact that we must borrow the money, though we all know that that policy means disaster.

There are thousands of spending programs, for each of which some good reason can be advanced. Neither President Truman nor Congress has shown any disposition to practice economy. The national debt keeps piling up by the billion. To me it is confusing to have the home folks write in asking if I do not know that if the Congress continues to spend, to increase the number of Federal employees and their compensation, we will meet financial ruin; then to turn to the next page where the writer not only asks, but demands, that I vote an additional million or two for the pet activity of the writer.

MORE CONFUSING

More confusing yet is it when supposedly reliable and informed individuals tell us that we may have war with Russia within the year, and others insist that we now loan Russia an additional $6,000,000,000. We furnished Japan with the metal scrap which aided her in preparing for war. Shall we loan Russia money to prepare for a possible war? Will the American people, the mothers and the fathers and the wives permit the internationalists, the one worlders, the advocates of union now, to involve us in another world war? Where is our common sense?

STILL CONFUSING

We went into this war to enable people everywhere to select their own form of government. Yet munitions of war furnished by us are being used to suppress the rebellions of people seeking to establish their independence in more than one foreign land. We are being asked to send our troops to join the British troops in forcing the Arabs to admit to their country people they do not want. Our marines are fighting in China to aid one of the Big Five Nations in carrying on a civil war. No opinion is expressed as to the merits of any particular controversy. Reference is made to them only to point out the confusion of thought and action.

WORLD OBJECTIVE

The world objective is universal and enduring peace, but the Senate is passing legislation empowering a representative of the President to conscript young American men to fight anywhere and everywhere and as long as the Council of the United Nations Organization may direct. We all want peace. We are willing to try almost anything in the effort to get peace. But authorizing a representative of the President to use our men as world police and to carry on a war to impose peace seems to me a queer way of getting peace. Embarking and sailing on the UNO's ship may be, as one Senator put it, "the great adventure," but to me it looks something like the method under which Great Britain sends conscripted natives from India to fight wherever the British Empire wills.

UNRRA

I am asked to give UNRRA millions of the taxpayers' money to relieve suffering in Germany while 600 members of that organization are caught using UNRRA supplies in black-market operations and while, at the same time, the President's representative tells us we are following a policy in Germany which prevents the Germans helping and reestablishing themselves. Those seeking revenge insist that we destroy the German's ability to feed and clothe themselves, rebuild their homes, yet ask that we contribute billions of dollars to an organization which, in many instances, is corrupt, which prevents some of the supplies we furnish reaching the hungry, the starving.

To chart a true course, one must be guided by common sense, recognize facts, instead of following his emotions and theories.

Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include some recent correspondence I have had with the Secretary of the Navy. This correspondence is self-explanatory and has reference to the visit the Territories Committee made to Alaska this summer under a properly authorized resolution passed by the Congress.

The purpose of the visit was to study certain problems relating to the Territory, and part of the itinerary included a trip of a subcommittee to Point Barrow and to Nome. It was my privilege to be the chairman of this subcommittee.

SEPTEMBER 18, 1945.

Hon. JAMES FORRESTAL,
The Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During the month of August the House Territories Committee visited Alaska under authorization by the House of Representatives. While there, several members of the committee desired to make a trip to Point Barrow from Fairbanks and accordingly inquired of the Admiral of the Seventeenth Naval District if he could provide transportation on a given date.

I wish to call your attention to the fact that the admiral made no effort to assist us and replied very curtly that no transportation facilities were available. We knew that facilities were available, and I question why a committee authorized by Congress to make a trip should be refused Government facilities, whether Army or Navy, when they are available.

I think it might be well, also, to call your attention to the fact that sanitary facilities at the naval base at Point Barrow are entirely inadequate, and I would suggest that you determine for us what improvements should be made there.

Very truly yours,

AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY,
Member of Congress.

OCTOBER 20, 1945.

Hon. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. KELLEY: Reference is made to your letter of September 18, 1945, concerning the visit to Alaska in August 1945 of the House Territories Committee.

It is noted that you state that the commandant, Seventeenth Naval District, made no effort to assist several members of the committee who desired to visit Point Barrow, indicating that no transportation facilities were available, and that the committee knew facilities were available, and that you question why a committee authorized by Congress to make a trip should be refused Government facilities when they are available.

It is noted also that you state that sanitary facilities at the naval base at Point Barrow are entirely inadequate, and that you suggest that a determination concerning what improvements should be effected there be made for the committee.

I am inquiring into the above-mentioned matters and will advise you further as soon as I have the necessary information at hand.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

NOVEMBER 9, 1945.

Hon. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. KELLEY: Reference is made to your letter of September 18, 1945, concerning the visit to Alaska in August 1945, of the House Territories Committee, and to my reply of October 2, 1945, informing you that I was inquiring into the matters discussed in your letter, notably a visit by certain members of the committee to Point Barrow and the adequacy of the sanitary facilities there.

Early in the summer the Navy Department gave consideration to the increasing activity at Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 and the demands being placed thereby on transportation to Point Barrow and the housing and other facilities in the area. Foreseeing even greater demands during the course of the summer months with added numbers of geologists, geophysicists, and drilling parties visiting the reserve in connection with operations there, the Navy Department, on July 5, 1945, ordered the commandant, Seventeenth Naval District, to place stringent restrictions on travel thereto.

On or about August 1, the War Department informed the Navy Department of the desire of certain members of the House Territories Committee to visit Point Barrow and inquired whether such a visit could be arranged. The Navy Department gave this inquiry serious consideration. It was found, however, that certain important operations were impending, including the hazardous delivery of yearly supplies from three cargo ships in icebound waters, and that these operations would severely tax all available personnel and facilities. The Navy Department, therefore, reluctantly informed the War Department that it was not practicable to comply with the desire of the members of the House Territories Committee to visit Point Barrow.

The foregoing indicates the basis of the position taken by the commandant, Seventeenth Naval District, in connection with the trip under discussion. I regret that any misunderstanding or inconvenience should have resulted in this matter and trust that you will appreciate that the action of the naval authorities was dictated by the exigencies of the local situation.

With regard to sanitary facilities at Point Barrow, it is pointed out that the naval activity there is an "advanced base" in every sense of the term. Many privations necessarily exist there as compared to regular naval establishments. The camp, however, has been inspected by naval authorities well versed in such matters and is considered to be satisfactory and as comfortable as the extremely difficult circumstances permit. At the same time, you may be sure that improvements will be made as they become practicable.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

NOVEMBER 20, 1945.

The Honorable JAMES FORRESTAL,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of November 9 in reply to mine of September concerning the visit to Alaska of the House Territories Committee and the refusal of the commandant of the Seventeenth Naval District to provide transportation to a subcommittee wishing to travel to Point Barrow, and calling attention to the insanitary conditions prevailing at the naval base at Point Barrow.

The explanation in your letter certainly cannot be accepted as satisfactory. The Territories Committee was authorized by the Congress under House Resolution 236 to make an investigation and study in the Territory of Alaska. No possible excuse can be offered for interference with the performance of the duty imposed on the committee by the House of Representatives. The will of the House has precedence over any orders issued by an agency of the Federal Government which might forestall the carrying out of the will of the House. A principle is involved here, which is that the representatives of the people have a right to proceed anywhere to study and investigate when they are so authorized. That right should not be abridged or denied, even by the Navy Department.

I still maintain that the sanitary conditions at Point Barrow were gravely in need of correction. I am not writing this letter to continue the debate, but am simply setting forth my final position in the matter.

Very truly yours,

AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY,
Member of Congress.

Critical Colonels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, certain colonels in the Army seem to be greatly disturbed over the fact that there is a demand on the part of the people, now that peace is here, to have their boys returned home. A communication from one of these critical colonels recently came to the attention of a very distinguished editor, a serviceman in World War I, who has seen fit to write a very fine editorial relating to the subject of demobilization of our soldiers.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting the editorial which appeared in the Jamestown Post-Journal, Wednesday evening, November 23, 1945. I am also inserting, under leave to extend, the letter which Col. Robert O. Wright criticized so severely and to which the Post-Journal made reference:

GETTING THE BOYS HOME

For weeks complaints have trickled through to the news department of this paper hinting that the servicemen in the Pacific felt they were not getting home as rapidly as they should. The editor has received letters directly from soldiers—he has heard from parents.

Now comes an interesting Associated Press dispatch from Manila that a former California newsman now a sergeant may be demoted for issuing a circular giving details of the ship-conversion program, allegedly taken from Army records, and, incidentally, received by this newspaper from a soldier in the Pacific.

The Twenty-eighth Replacement Depot commander, Col. Robert O. Wright, is quoted as saying he deemed it "a personal affront for anyone to take it upon himself to inflame members of the Army. I can't let people stand up and rock the boat."

We do not presume to know the problems of the Army in getting the Army home. We assume the colonel should. Neither do we condemn soldiers far from home for becoming impatient, particularly when there is evidence, real or imagined, that would tend to indicate some laxity existed.

We hope the Army is just as much on the ball in getting soldiers home to their loved ones in peace as it was in getting them overseas to face Jap bullets. The Lord knows they nearly performed the impossible in that effort.

Certainly, if the complaint has enough grounds to demote a man for so declaring, it should be proven false and broadcast to those men who are still overseas, listening eagerly to the grapevine, as well as for the purpose of satisfying the millions of parents involved. It is well known that a great many, both in and out of the service, feel the complicated point system unfair—even if you forget entirely the charges that ships are coming into San Francisco from the Pacific empty.

The writer of this editorial, who served in France in the First World War and didn't get home until July 1919, knows exactly the mental reaction of those boys who would trade an arm to get home, even without the promise of a job or a future. He also remembers the time when his commanding officer called the entire battalion together and talked to the men like a father, and how it helped to quiet pent-up emotions—but only partially succeeded.

Maybe the lad who faces demotion was only partially right in his charges that nine ships went for carrying Jap prisoners home to Japan while only one was utilized to take Americans back to the good old U. S. A.

Maybe it's time Congress, always ready with lip service, prodded the Army a bit. Anyhow, the Post-Journal can say to the boys from Jamestown who are still away from home that we want you back just as much as you want to get back. We are even going to see that this editorial gets in the hands of Congressman DANIEL A. REED immediately. For, after all, all the folks at home can do at the moment is keep a light burning in the window—and we are sure doing that.

The following about reconversion of Liberty ships came direct from Tacloban, Leyte, P. I.:

It has been learned, authoritatively, that the conversion program for Liberty ships, has resulted in nine ships being converted for transportation for prisoners of war, while one converted ship only will be used for American troops. Although volunteers are not being used for this work, Army personnel is being used to remodel the ships.

Present plans call for conversion of five Liberty ships to be converted by the Army, and four Libertys by the Navy. The ships which are to be converted by the Army came from the port of Manila, and one from Batangas. One ship that the Army is converting came from Manila, and ships coming from Manila are shipping under the authorization of base X, and AFWESPAC, controlling the movement of troops in this area.

One ship to be converted by the Army is the *Chatten Lyons,* and will be used as a prisoner of war ship, according to orders issued for the conversion. The *Horace Lurton* will be converted for the use of transporting American troops Stateside. The other ships to be converted by the Army for prisoners of war ships are: *Ed. Everett, M. Stewart, R. L. Stevenson,* and the *Frank Sprague*

The Navy will convert the prisoner of war ships, *Harry Kirby, Stephen M. White, Keith Palmer,* and the *William H. Allen.*

The dates scheduled for completion of the ships are: *Chatten Lyons,* indefinite; *Horace Lurton,* indefinite; *Ed. Everett,* November 6; *M. Stewart,* November 10; *R. L. Stevenson,* November 15; and the *Frank Sprague,* indefinite.

The dates for the completion of the conversion of the Navy ships are all indefinite.

Ed. Everett and *Chatten Lyons* will carry 2,000 prisoners of war each. The *Stewart, Stevenson,* and *Sprague* will carry 1,500 prisoners of war each.

At this date, November 4, the *W. L. Gable* is awaiting Navy orders. This is a ship which has been converted to carry prisoners of war.

The foregoing article was prepared for print in the Homeward Herald, published at the Twenty-eighth Replacement Depot, but the permission to print the article was denied the editor by officers in charge. The foun-

dation for the article was taken directly from the daily port status report of the office of the base port command. It was suggested by the major in charge that some item be printed about the progress being made in the conversion of the *Horace Lurton*, but nothing must be printed about the conversion of ships for prisoners of war.

Only Lip Service to Our Fighters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter received from a man in the armed forces showing the very poor treatment given to our men now stationed in France. This letter paints a picture of how the Army is merely giving lip service to the return of our men. It is no wonder that those who have long served and suffered are growing bitter because of the indifference of those in high places in the executive side of the Government. This boy has 74 points and represents only a small part of those who have long earned the right to be returned to their parents.

PARIS, FRANCE.

DEAREST MOM AND DAD: Well morale is really at a new low. As usual, the Army and its big shots have fouled up the works in big style. Here goes the latest redeployment news: Don't expect me home for Christmas. It looked like a sure bet before, but being misled as we usually are, we don't or didn't expect it. They decided to give Le Bourget Airfield back to the French, so that outfit we were in moved to Munich and sent us to another camp on the other side of Paris. The camp is terrible. It has absolutely nothing, and if you are lucky, you can get an evening pass to Paris about once a week. When they speak of concentration camps, the United States Army doesn't do bad. We live in tents, no floors, no heat, and the food is terrible. All in the middle of November, of course. Before we left Germany we were stripped to the base essentials in clothing. Luckily, I hid a fur jacket in my bag. Priority at the camp is given to all over 80 points and overage. They have no quotas for 70 points and have no prospects in the future. It adds up to this. I was talking to the inspector general yesterday and he gave us this. The only Air Corps men shipping out are the 80-pointers and overage. The Army can't decide what to do with the rest. Ship them as casuals or home in companies. The indecision delays us that much longer as it continues. We asked him if 70-pointers could expect to be home for Christmas. He laughed in our faces. They certainly made a nice mess of everything. Talk about bitterness, you should see it around here. We all are happy to know how they are taking care of us. Some of the big brass might lose their jobs if things are finished too quickly. The best thing a man could do now is reenlist, but that is just what they want us to do. Everybody knows that. If we didn't want to come home so badly, we certainly wouldn't take the running around we are getting. All the work, no matter how dirty the detail, is done by the men. Of all the kraut prisoners, they don't have them here. Here is a good one: We have no electricity in the tents. Here is the reason we were told: No bulbs. That's the limit.

You know, I have never complained about the Army before, but I think you should know the full details on how they are treating us over here and what they might be telling you at home. There are hundreds of other fellows here who are writing the same thing and would back up any statement I might make. The trouble is, we have no one to complain to over here. It is you at home that should know it. There are Negroes stationed in the camp and use all the same facilities. The bitterness and idleness has bred contempt, at least in two instances. There was a fight in the Red Cross on the field and on the same night a white soldier was stabbed by a Negro.

Just try and hand some of this stuff to the fellows when they finally get home and the mighties will find out what their position is.

When I think of them discharging all the 60-pointers in the States, it makes me think.

Enclosed are some of the articles we have to read or some of the stuff they give us to read. From the Stars and Stripes dated November 7, 1945. I could give you more details, but this is a good example.

I hope everything is well at home. I still can't receive mail as we have no permanent address. By the way, this place is the One Hundred and Thirty-fourth Reinforcement Battalion right on the outskirts of Paris. I wish some of the stuff these fellows write would get into the right hands. It may not help us while we are here, but it may help fellows coming in here in the future. That is all I have for now. Hope to see you soon. If you want to show this to mother, it's all right, but I will send it to the office. She might as well know how her's and the other mothers' sons are being treated. Take good care of yourselves, and I love you both.

All my love and kisses.

P. S.—Reminds me of another instance. We came to Paris from Frankfort in boxcars. Officers and enlisted men. The only passenger train we saw in Germany was comfortably occupied by German civilians.

There Is Work To Be Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article written by our colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], There Is Work To Be Done, appearing in the December issue of the Young Democrat, the official organ of the affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., of New York State:

THERE IS WORK TO BE DONE

(By JOHN W. MCCORMACK, United States Congressman from Massachusetts, majority leader)

The catastrophic destruction of World War II has ended. The horrors and desolation of those years of cannon and death may be the cornerstone of the peace with justice of tomorrow. We in America are far removed from the material rubble of man's bestiality which covers many of the capitals of the world. We are not, however, unconscious of the conditions which exist in those countries which felt the full fury of the armed conflict so recently stilled. We must never be forgetful of our obligation to those who have paid full sacrifice that we, in our homes and hearts, might enjoy the peace of God.

History will relate the causes of the past war. The madness which deprived mother of son, wife of husband, and millions of their natural rights as human beings, drove before it entire populations with intolerant ferocity and fiendish hate. Nations after nations fell before the gigantic machines of war of the now destroyed leaders of the Axis—enemies of mankind and partners with Satan. The youth of America must learn from this holocaust—and, having learned, must stand ready to lead their fellow man from the edge of chaos into a world where law, order, and justice will prevail. Statesmen of today in America carry high the ideals of our great country. But as daytime quickly fades into night, and as the stars in the heavens disappear with the rising sun, so will tomorrow call from the ranks of youth new faces for greater responsibilities. Youth must be prepared.

The story of the victory of Franklin D. Roosevelt over the Axis was never finished. Death prevented the writing of the last glorious chapter. The happiness which spread over the world with the submission of Germany, the unrestrained joy which engulfed America with the capitulation of Japan, planned, as they were, even to the atomic bomb, by that fearless, intrepid leader, the late President of the United States, came a little too late. He never lived to smile with those who, with him, won the victory over the enemies of man. Conqueror of the totalitarian destroyers, through the development of the greatest military force in history, aided by the miracle of American production under the guidance of American industrial genius and the patriotic devotion of labor to its duty, Roosevelt, world leader and hope of the man in the street, wherever the street, passed to his eternity. His earthly reward would now be smeared and stained, his honor blackened, his reputation besmirched, his family reviled, by those psychopathic harbingers of hate who gave nothing but reveled in the power of a dirty pen to cast coals of doubt and disturbance upon the fires of present-day postwar turbulence and unrest. Such is the fate of greatness. Thus may true leadership expect to be rewarded.

The Democratic Party during the past decade saved our system of free enterprise. Under its leadership, democracy was a living reality. The powers of government were utilized to provide employment for industry and agriculture under rules which gave labor new meaning and dignified being. Social security, old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, security for the disabled and the unseeing, Federal bank-deposit insurance, flood prevention, soil conservation, prevention of stock-market abuses, homeowners' loan protection are but part of the heritage the elders of the Democratic Party have given to the young Democrats. Before Pearl Harbor, ever mindful of the dangers to our national existence which lurked in the ideologies of our enemies, aware of the dark clouds of war which were gathering in the East and in the West, the Democratic administration, under inspired leadership, succeeded in building and maintaining the best trained and equipped army in the world, the most powerful Navy, and the greatest Air Force, as well as the largest merchant marine in the world. The result was triumph—conquest without vindictiveness, but with vindictive justice for the Axis and its satellites.

There remains great work to be done. The world must never again be subjected to possible annihilation by international gangsters and criminals. The rule of reason must prevail in future international differences. Bold, straight thinking is necessary. We have pledged "to join with other United Nations in the establishment of an international organization based on the principles of the sovereign equality of peace-loving states, open to the membership by all such states, large and small, for the prevention

of aggression and the maintenance of international peace and security." That pledge of the Democratic Party in 1944 can never become mere words more observed in negation than in action. One must realize that during the prevailing armistice between erstwhile warring countries, unrest is rampant, starvation threatens nations, death and pestilence walk hand in hand in many cities of the world. Revolutions are conceived under such conditions. Prevention is better than futile abortive measures when false philosophies have successfully appealed to the hungry body and the tired mind. World peace is essential. World peace can be maintained under a leadership cognizant of the problems, conscious of an ability to present a solution, confident in the success of the objectives of practical idealism sought to be obtained.

All is not quiet on the domestic front. Strikes and rumors of strikes by some, as well as lock-outs by some management, rising prices for necessaries, and clamors for increased wages to meet the ever-threatening inflation which, like the ground hog, with less wartime restrictions, has come out of its hole to see its shadow, confront America. The incalculable cost of war must be paid without confiscatory tax burdens upon business and industry, or destroying tax obligation on those who do not enjoy a plentitude. Agriculture must be maintained on a parity with industry. Home ownership must be encouraged.

The returned veteran, deprived of home and family during the war, must be given his chance once again to enjoy the privilege and immunity of his castle among his family and friends. The veteran must be aided in readjustment and rehabilitation without paternalistic governmental interference in his daily life to the fullest power of a grateful America. Additional humanitarian measures for the aid and betterment of all our citizens should be adopted as time and experience indicate. Above all, racial and religious minorities must have the right to share the rights that are guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

Recovery and reconversion face us all. However, the success of each carries greater practical significance to those who will live the more years during its aftermath. And there falls upon the shoulders of the youths of today, joined by those who step out of the ranks of the military into civilian files, greater responsibilities with corresponding opportunities. It will be for the younger Democrats—nay, more—for the younger generation to carry the torch for domestic tranquillity and world peace. The will to accomplish will not suffice. The heart and the mind of the youth of today, educated to the problems and dedicated, under God, to their achievement, shall with intelligent effort, under competent leadership, bring about the fruition of those ideals for which, from Salerno to Berlin and from Bataan to Tokyo, the sons and daughters of America fought, died, and today live in hope, with hatred for none and charity for all—these American men and women of tomorrow.

The Dumping of United States Gear at Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, more than a year ago Congress provided laws for the disposition of surplus materials in order that the Federal Government and the taxpayers might recapture, so far as possible, some of the expenditures required during the war. However, according to reports which have been appearing in the press, it seems that our armed forces have completely ignored the attempt of Congress to salvage some of the war expenditures and have been wantonly "dumping into the sea or are burning millions of pounds worth of gear," according to C. A. Burley, correspondent for the Sydney Sun, in a dispatch from Rabaul, as published in the Milwaukee Journal of November 28, 1945.

Burley further says that Australian officers passing through Pacific areas called the destruction "staggering in scope and thoroughness."

The correspondent listed these incidents as having been reported by Australians:

In the Admiralties: Two hundred Hellcat fighters dumped into the sea.

Finschhafen: Complete dental outfits in the sea. Pontoons loaded with jeeps putting to sea with a bulldozer aboard to push them off. Mobile radio outfits in four-wheeled caravans dumped at sea. Small vessels burned in the harbor. Huge stocks of clothing, including windproof jackets, burned.

Jacquinto Bay: Bargeloads of jeeps tipped into the sea.

Nadzab: Outbreaks of drunkenness among the natives traced to dumping of tinned beer, which had been bulldozed into the earth.

Lae: Warehouses filled with photographic equipment abandoned.

Saigon: Tons of food dumped into the sea.

If anyone should think that this is mere propaganda, then there is the statement appearing in a report by Stefan Andrews, Milwaukee Journal Special correspondent, published on November 28, 1945:

> Tons of ammunition, battle rockets, and reportedly, fighter planes, and bombers are being dumped into the Pacific in a wholesale junking of surplus military property. The equipment is being junked by Navy ships en route home from the Pacific on direct orders from naval commanders to get rid of "nonusable" property.
>
> The fighters and patrol bombers reportedly are being dumped into the sea from aircraft carriers, because, it is alleged, the Navy doesn't know what to do with its vast accumulation of surplus property and because it is "easier and cheaper to do it that way."
>
> Dumping of ammunition—largely of small arms and antiaircraft caliber—I have myself verified. I have seen copies of radioed orders to that effect and have talked with officers who have received such orders.
>
> The dumping of planes from carriers—all supposedly still equipped with radios, compasses, gyroscopes, and navigation instruments—I have not myself verified. It is, however, the subject of persistent reports in ports from Tokyo to Pearl Harbor. These reports have been so numerous the last several weeks that in Okinawa Capt. John McCain, surplus disposal head of the Yonabaru naval base, has had to deny them flatly.
>
> "We have never authorized destruction of equipment that has commercial value," he said, "We are exhausting every means to distribute the surplus among other military units here."

During the war we have greatly drained our natural resources and it is, therefore, important that we exercise every caution to conserve our metals and materials. Let us not delude ourselves that we are still so rich that we can be wasteful. The United States is no longer so rich that it can afford to scrap valuable metals or lose out on material which may be salvaged.

It is small wonder, with such reports coming to the attention of the people, that we are finding difficulty in meeting our quota in the Victory bond drive. Certainly this prodigal, wanton, and criminal waste of natural resources, does not inspire patriotism or a will to invest money in Government bonds. Our armed forces should make those responsible for this criminal waste answer for their actions.

The Labor Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with President Truman that our labor legislation is in need of vital and fundamental correction.

A labor situation which reeks with disregard for law, flaunting of all human rights, and organized attack on law-abiding citizens to rob them of their property and livelihood by irresponsible labor leaders of the A. F. of L. International Teamsters Union, now exists in my district.

It concerns only a small company with 34 employees, but that makes the reprehensible conduct of the labor leaders all the more heinous for pouncing on this helpless little business, which is perfectly willing to cooperate with the unions, is willing that its employees shall be unionized with either the A. F. of L. or the CIO; but because its employees 100 percent refuse, it is being strangled by the union labor leaders.

I am speaking of the Standard Grocer Co., Inc., of Holland, Mich. This is a small wholesale grocer business, and operates branches and maintains warehouses in Grand Rapids, Mich., and Muskegon, Mich.

I will now read from a statement which the Holland Grocer Co., Inc., requested me to make to Congress and the people of the United States:

> The union has been trying for several years to line up our truck drivers in the A. F. of L. truckers union. About 6 months ago one of the union men came into our office and asked that we sign a contract forcing our men to join the union, suggesting that that might be the only way of getting supplies. We informed him that we would not coerce our men to join any organization, that that was their privilege and choice. If the majority of our men chose the A. F. of L. we would be required to recognize the union.
>
> Little was heard from them since that meeting until 5 weeks ago when they began picketing our Grand Rapids branch. After 3 weeks of picketing we telephoned Representative JONKMAN, at Washington, for relief and he sent in the National Labor Relations Board. After meeting with union officials on

Friday, November 2, at the suggestion of the Labor Board we agreed to post notices announcing a meeting to be held at the Warm Friend Tavern Monday evening, November 5, for the Holland employees, and Tuesday, November 6, at the Labor Hall in Grand Rapids for our Grand Rapids employees. With the endorsement of the Labor Board we called our men together on Friday afternoon, November 2, telling them of the union activity and desires. We expressed to the men our views, putting it squarely before the employees that if they desired to join the union we would have to recognize it and would do so willingly. The result of the union election was a 100-percent turn-down by our employees.

On Monday morning, November 12, the union began picketing our local main warehouse, tying up all truck freight shipments and insisting we would either operate under the union or we would not operate at all. It has been necessary for 4 weeks now to file suit to replevin our own merchandise at transfer companies. The union has been going to companies and threatening to tie up the home plant if they deliver merchandise to us. They threatened the General Foods representative with the boycotting of their merchandise in this area if they ship.

Since picketing began here at Holland, the union men carry a sign stating that this plant is unfair to organized labor. Our employees became so incensed that they had a counteracting sign made and placed on the front lawn stating:

"Union Unfair—We voted 100 percent against the A. F. of L.

"EMPLOYEES OF THE STANDARD GROCER CO."

We are wondering what has happened to justice and freedom. We trust that this case of injustice against our employees, as well as ourselves, is not the handwriting on the walls of American freedom.

Mr. Speaker, this statement, of course, speaks for itself. The American people has legislatively disarmed itself and handed all legal guns and ammunition to labor leaders for the protection of labor. Now we have come to a stage where power-drunk labor leaders are turning these guns on the public and on labor itself to extort dues for the enrichment of their treasury.

When, as recited in the statement, the Holland Grocer Co. wired me about their predicament, I immediately took it up with Mr. Howard Colvin of the Labor Conciliation Board. He sent an agent in to investigate, and take necessary action. And here we have an instance of the Holland Grocer Co. placing itself in the hands of the United States Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor, passively following its instructions to the letter, and meeting all its terms and instructions, with the result that in a few days Mr. Colvin notified me that the boycott had been stopped. However, such was not the case. After a few more interviews with Mr. Colvin, he finally told me that the union's action was without authority of law, in other words was lawless, and if they insisted on and persisted in their lawless conduct he was just as helpless as the Holland Grocer Co.

And so my constituents, the Holland Grocer Co., must engage the services of a lawyer and a costly replevin proceeding every time they want merchandise from their warehouses. Their truck service, railroad service, and even unloading service is all hamstrung by the International Teamsters Union.

Such high-handed brigandage by labor leaders places the duty in Congress to protect honest labor and the American public by legislation against labor-leader lawlessness without delay.

Transportation of Soldiers From Overseas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, today, December 3, a great number of the Nation's maritime unions are participating in a 24-hour mass work stoppage, in protest to the slow shipment of our troops from overseas. All shipping, barring troop and legitimate relief ships, are being halted in American ports on this day, in order to call the attention of the Nation to the crying need for prompt action on the part of the military authorities to expedite the return of our men.

The Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission have tried to place the blame for their own incompetence in handling the shipping problem on the American workingman. Irresponsible statements have been made to excuse the unnecessary tying up of huge tonnages of shipping by the military, who have tried to pass the buck onto someone else's shoulders, and at the same time create antilabor sentiment. Our brass hats will not succeed in deterring our servicemen's fathers and brothers in the maritime unions from bringing their GI's home. These men, united in purpose as well as in their respective unions, are determined to see that every cubic inch of shipping is used for transporting troops back home. The merchant seamen, oilers, stevedores, longshoremen know just which ships are being used, and which are not. Only recently they saw to it that five ships, a total of 35,000 tons of shipping, were put back into service transporting GI's from the Pacific. I commend these men of our maritime industry for their courage in standing up for the rights of their fellows in the war effort.

I feel that the protest should be carried on. I am strongly opposed to the diversion of ships to foreign powers to help them suppress peoples' independence movements. I am opposed to tying up ships in American ports, harbors, and rivers until the last man is home from overseas. I protest the allocation of ships at this early date for commercial operations. Six thousand American boys lost their lives in the merchant marine during the war, and while their buddies sit and wait for ships to bring them home, our Government has allowed ships to be diverted into commercial trade with Fascist Spain. The steamship *Spofford* will arrive from a Spanish port in a few days. Why isn't she bringing men home for Christmas?

The answer given by the Maritime Commission regarding the time it takes to convert Liberty ships into transports is refuted by the action of the homesick GI's themselves. The Maritime Commission stated that it takes 2 months to convert these ships into transports; whereas, when given some Liberty ships to convert, the Mid-Pacifican, their paper, reports the GI's themselves in 2 days converted a Liberty into a ship to carry 500 of them home.

I do not mean these to be idle words. If something is not done immediately by the military and maritime authorities, I think Congress must take some action. I know that many of my colleagues here feel strongly on this subject too, and hope that the House will recommend to the authorities concerned that more prompt action be taken in returning our boys to their families by Christmas.

Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the President's recent message recommending the passage of a health program, including compulsory health insurance is one of the most important that has ever reached the Congress. The President has ably outlined the need for better facilities and for a modern system of medical economics. Medical science and research would gain immeasurably from the proposals. The President rightly insists there would be no interference with the practice of medicine.

However, the reactionary medical politicians are already trying to confuse the issue. Newspapers are being flooded with propaganda and sly hints about advertising revenue.

I desire to include with my remarks two editorials from the Capital Times, of Madison, Wis., one praising the President's plan, the other exposing the techniques of the opposition:

PRESIDENT TRUMAN CALLS THE MEDICAL POLITICIANS' BLUFF

A wild cry of horror can be expected to follow President Truman's recommendation that Congress adopt legislation providing for compulsory health insurance for people in low income groups. It will come full-throated from the medical politicians and the common, garden variety politicians who have fought relentlessly against any plan that would provide the mass of Americans the adequate medical care they need.

It will be denounced as communism, fascism, and most of all, as "socialized medicine." Of course, it is none of these and, as the President made clear, it is least of all "socialized medicine." It does not seek to bring the private practitioner into the employ of the Government to dispense medical service. It merely proposes a sound insurance principle for raising the health standards of this Nation—standards which the Pepper-La Follette committee has shown to be deplorably low at the present time.

It suggests no interference with medical science, but it does propose a sound, practical reform in our eighteenth century medical economics. Under its terms no one will be compelled to go to a doctor he or she does not want. And no doctor will be compelled to take a patient who comes under the insurance plan. It would merely provide

that the medical bills of the average American would be paid from funds raised in a manner similar to the present social security fund.

It is difficult to see what objection the medical politicians could find in the plan. But a considerable group has made known its opposition to similar proposals. This group urges that doctors refuse to treat the sick whose bills would be paid out of the insurance fund.

There is little prospect that legislation containing the President's proposals will be passed by the present reactionary Congress. The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, after which the President's plan is patterned, has been marked for perpetual care in a congressional committee dominated by tory Republicans and Democrats.

No doubt the President is aware of the hopeless chances for such legislation in a Congress which has ignored and scuttled his 21-point reconversion program. His strategy, no doubt, is to force the medical profession itself to take steps to improve health standards in the Nation.

The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill has had some effect along these lines. It has forced the medical politicians away from their old position of opposing any and all types of prepaid medical care. Unfortunately, however, they have done little outside of dream up tricky propaganda stunts in a vain attempt to convince people that plans and programs are being formulated to provide more comprehensive care.

The much ballyhooed "Wisconsin plan," which was recently revealed by the Wisconsin Medical Society, is a good example of this fakery. Indeed, many of the doctors in this State are disgusted with the Medical Society's fiasco. Dr. Harry R. Foerster, president of the Milwaukee County Medical Society, recently characterized the Wisconsin plan as neither revolutionary nor evolutionary, but a plan to give insurance companies greater control over medical practice.

President Truman's proposal may or may not force a few more grudging steps out of the medical profession along the road to progress. Whether it does, seems to us to be of little significance as far as an adequate program of health insurance is concerned. Sooner or later the people are going to demand such a program and when they do they will send men to our National Legislature who will translate those demands into national policy.

A BROAD HINT FROM THE MEDICAL POLITICIANS TO NEWSPAPER EDITORS

A few days ago, when President Truman asked for a compulsory health insurance program for America, the Capital Times predicted that the medical politicians would let loose with a loud yelp that this was "communism," "socialism" and "totalitarianism." We have already been hit by the first broadside.

The National Physicians Committee, which proposes to keep medical economics in the Dark Ages, has favored us with a fat envelope full of antihealth-insurance propaganda. Among the various specimens of how to deceive and mislead people is one in which we think you will be especially interested.

A series of newspaper ads, already canned for reprinting, are included. There are no instructions directly telling the editors to whom these ads are sent how they can go about getting sponsors for them. But there are some powerful hints.

Each of the ads carries a list of fictitious sponsors across the bottom. In most cases the sponsors just happen to be druggists. We wonder if anyone will miss the implications of this none-too-subtle suggestion that druggists, to whom a doctor's good will means prescription business, should be shook down to pay for political advertising.

Control of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a communication from Lawrence A. Kimpton, secretary of the faculties of the University of Chicago, and include a resolution by the council of the University of Chicago, which is the ruling body of that institution. The resolution, which was unanimously passed, expresses the serious concern of the university faculty over the implications of atomic energy control for the freedom and development of scientific research:

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,
November 16, 1945.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The council of the University of Chicago, which is the ruling body of the university, has unanimously passed a resolution which expresses the serious concern of the university faculty over the implications of atomic energy control for the freedom and development of scientific research.

Respectfully yours,
LAWRENCE A. KIMPTON,
Secretary of the Faculty of the University of Chicago.

RESOLUTION ON THE CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY PASSED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

The council of the University of Chicago (the supreme academic body) is deeply concerned with the maintenance of the freedom of research and the unrestricted dissemination of scientific knowledge.

The development of mankind requires that the freedom of inquiry and the dissemination of knowledge be protected in order to preserve and enrich our civilization. The enormous advances in our time in the sciences and arts have come about in large part because men have been free to pursue their researches and to publish freely their discoveries. The Constitution of the United States not only granted freedom of speech and of the press, but specifically recognized "the progress of science and useful arts" as a basic object of American government.

The successful application of scientific knowledge to the development of many devices of warfare, including the atomic bomb, under conditions of rigid control, has led to a widespread misconception that scientific research can and should be permanently organized in this way. It should be recognized that the growth of scientific knowledge before the war and the development of the men who were responsible for its wartime applications were only possible under conditions in which uncensored communication of ideas and unrestricted freedom of research prevailed, permitting the free play of scientific imagination. Progress in nuclear studies and the industrial and military applications of atomic energy will wither at the root if the constant influx of young men of the highest ability into the field is discouraged by such controls as have been suggested in Congress. National safety would be impaired, not conserved.

Moreover, nuclear studies occupy such a pivotal position in science today that discoveries in this field may be expected to revolutionize many collateral branches from astronomy to medicine. By controlling nuclear research all science may be shackled.

We therefore respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to impose no restrictions on teaching, research, or communication of the results of basic scientific research (other than those required to guard against hazards to personal safety), and to promote individual research by such measures as are necessary to provide access to essential materials.

Even if national control of atomic energy is restricted to industrial and military applications, we are concerned over the form of control proposed in the Johnson-May bill. We affirm our conviction that a public agency dealing with atomic energy should be subject to the usual control of the Chief Executive, the Congress, and the courts, and that the traditional predominance of the civil over the military authority should be jealously preserved.

Members of the council of the University of Chicago: Robert Maynard Hutchins, chancelor; Ernest C. Colwell, president; Reuben G. Gustavson, vice president; Wilbur C. Munnecke, vice president; Emmet B. Bay, professor of medicine; Ralph A. Beals, professor of library science; George G. Bogert, professor of law; Alexander Brunschwig, professor of surgery and roentgenology; Guy T. Buswell, professor of educational psychology; Charles C. Colby, chairman of the department of geography; Fay-Cooper Cole, chairman of the department of anthropology; Garfield V. Cox, acting dean of the school of business; Ronald S. Crane, professor of English; Avery O. Craven, professor of American history; Arthur J. Dempster, professor of physics; Lester R. Dragstedt, professor of surgery; Graham P. DuShane, assistant professor of zoology; Earl A. Evans, Jr., professor of biochemistry; Clarence H. Faust, dean of the college; Michael Ference, Jr., associate professor of meteorology; James Franck, professor of physical chemistry; Henri Frankfort, research professor of Oriental archeology; E. M. K. Geiling, professor of pharmacology; Lawrence M. Graves, professor of mathematics; Robert J. Havighurst, professor of education; Paul C. Hodges, professor of roentgenology (medicine); William A. Irwin, professor of Old Testament language and literature; Neil H. Jacoby; vice president; Wilber G. Katz, dean of the law school; Ezra J. Kraus, professor of botany; Maynard C Krueger, assistant professor of economics; George K. K. Link, professor of plant pathology; Sidney E. Mead, assistant professor of the history of Christian thought in America; Richard P. McKeon, dean of the division of the humanities; Carl R. Moore, professor of zoology; Joseph F. Mullin, assistant professor of physiology; Walter L. Palmer, professor of medicine; Clarence E. Parmenter, chairman of the department of romance languages and literature; Wilhelm Pauck, professor of historical theology; Dallas B. Phemister, professor of surgery; Thelma Porter, professor of nutrition; Ernst W. Puttkammer, professor of law; Floyd W. Reeves, professor of administration; Hermann I. Schlesinger, professor of chemistry; Joseph J. Schwab, assistant professor of education; Gertrude E. Smith, professor of Greek; Otto Struve, professor of astrophysics; Ralph W. Tyler, chairman of the department of education; Jacob Viner, professor of economics;

Leonard D. White, professor of public administration, chairman of the administrative committee of the department of political science; John A. Wilson, director of the Oriental institute; Napier Wilt, professor of English; Louis Wirth, professor of sociology; Helen R. Wright, professor of social service administration, dean of the school of social service administration; Sewall Wright, professor of zoology.

General Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the deficiency appropriation bill, I called the attention of the Members of Congress to the highly critical housing shortage in the Calumet industrial region of Indiana.

Thousands of families moved into this area during the war period to aid in the work of our defense plants and factories.

Owing to the high cost of building materials, and war restrictions today, these families were unable to secure homes.

Thousands of ex-servicemen are now returning from their military duties and are unable to find homes or shelter for themselves or their families.

I am herewith submitting a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Gary, Ind., asking for immediate action on the Wagner-Ellender-Taft general housing bill:

Resolution 768

Resolution of support of Wagner-Ellender-Taft general housing bill

Whereas there exists an extreme shortage of housing accommodations throughout the Nation which will be intensified and aggravated as additional numbers of our veterans return to civilian life; and

Whereas it is imperative that prompt action be taken by the National Government to stop the spread of urban and rural blight, eliminate the slums, and provide decent homes for all our citizens; and

Whereas the immensity of the task requires the joint cooperation and assistance of all private and public agencies, local, State, and National; and

Whereas the Wagner-Ellender-Taft general housing bill, recently introduced in the Congress, provides for a unified national housing agency and a coordinated national attack on the housing problem through adequate research, active local planning, a liberal home-loan plan, the construction of homes for low-, medium-, and high-income families, and authorizes assistance to localities for public and private slum-clearance projects: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Gary:

SECTION 1. The city of Gary hereby endorses and supports the Wagner-Ellender-Taft general housing bill and urges its prompt enactment by the Congress.

SEC. 2. The city clerk is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, to the chairman of the appropriate Senate and House committees, Senators Wagner, Ellender, Taft, and President Truman, and to Congressman Ray Madden.

Passed by the Common Council of the City of Gary, Lake County, Ind., this 26th day of November 1945.

OSCAR L. CONWAY,
Presiding Officer.

Attest:

ANTHONY E. DOBIS, Jr.,
City Clerk.

Presented by me to the mayor for his approval and signature, this 28th day of November 1945.

ANTHONY E. DOBIS, Jr.,
City Clerk.

Approved and signed by me this 28th day of November 1945.

JOSEPH E. FINERTY,
Mayor, City of Gary, Ind.

Homestead Lien Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to the fact that only 13 States in the Union have homestead lien laws, and require a lien upon the property of old-age assistance recipients. Under such a law, these States, upon the death of the old-age assistance recipient, sell his property and reimburse the State and Federal Treasury from such receipts.

When we consider that the State of Minnesota, on the one hand, returned to the Federal Government last year $321,765, there were on the other hand 35 States which did not return to the Federal Government a single dollar in connection with homestead liens. The question would naturally arise as to whether it is fair for these 13 States, including Minnesota, to have such a law in effect, and if such laws in these 13 States do not operate as class legislation against the people of these particular States. Such laws should either be national in scope or nonexistent.

The average payment this past year to old-age assistance recipients was $29.35. Three States paid above $40 a month, and these States were Washington, California, and Massachusetts. On the other hand, I am surprised to see that there are six States that pay less than $15 per month.

Mr. Speaker, when we consider how much our cost of living has risen during the past 5 years, it is difficult to see how we can in all good conscience expect the old-age assistance recipients of this Nation to exist on the small payments they receive. We hear a lot about social security, but if you will go back into the nonindustrial sections of the Nation, you will find that social security as such affects comparatively few people in those areas. Yet the taxpayers of those particular areas, mostly agricultural, small business, and white-collared workers, help pay their share of the social-security tax added to the manufacturers' cost of production, and get nothing whatsoever in the line of benefits therefrom. This, in my opinion, is not real social security, Mr. Speaker.

The figures that I have quoted above were compiled through the diligence of Mr. Charles Nelson, of Willmar, Minn., who took it upon himself to secure that information from the attorneys general of the 48 States of the Union. Personally, I have never agreed with the theory that we should take away from the family of these old-age assistance recipients at their death the little home they might have had, nor am I at all sympathetic with the manner in which the present social security provides for coverage for scarcely half of the people of America, and leaves the others with nothing whatsoever to depend upon in their old age.

Can we as a Nation in fairness uphold the theory that while one great segment of our population is protected by social security, an equally large segment is entirely disregarded and must, in case of need, go on the rolls as old-age assistance recipients?

It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the only fair treatment of our old people is some form of a universal old-age pension, and until that day comes here in America injustices, such as homestead lien law, and the noncoverage of large segments of our population by the Social Security Act, will prevail. Such injustices are not my conception of the way in which our American way of life should operate.

Italian Cardinal Stresses Civic Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert an article from the Michigan Catholic, the weekly newspaper of the archdiocese of Detroit, containing an address delivered by Elia Cardinal Dalla Costa, archbishop of Florence, Italy. The advice is timely and should be heeded not only where it was delivered, but all over the world:

ASKS CHRISTIANS TO USE BALLOT—ITALIAN CARDINAL STRESSES CIVIC DUTY

ROME.—The duty of Christians to take part in the political life of their country was stressed by Elia Cardinal Della Costa, Archbishop of Florence, in an address at the opening session of the "Social Week" in Florence.

"Many peaceful, intelligent, modest Christians shun political life, thus abandoning their country to its own devices," he said. "Many abstain from voting because they consider politics a mass of jealousies and intrigues.

"The time has come to understand that such mistaken ideas keep the best citizens away from public interest, leaving power in the hands of a few who are perhaps, incapable and unworthy.

"Politics represent the government of the people; politics is the science necessary to promote the common good. Until worthy citizens take part in political life, especially through the ballot, the way will be left open

for abuse, violence, sectarianism, and dictatorship, with a resulting damage to religion, morality, family life, and the commonweal."

Referring to the need for a constitution, the cardinal said: "Owing to the religious spirit of our people there could never be a solid peace in Italy without a constitution with a Christian imprint."

Statement on Behalf of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to include with my remarks herewith a forthright statement on the need for appropriations for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration recently issued by the District of Columbia branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BRANCH,
November 24, 1945

STATEMENT ON UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION TO THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

The District of Columbia Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is seriously concerned over the plight of the persons in liberated areas. We feel that the United States should assume its full share of responsibility in helping these nations to adjust themselves for the following reasons:

1. In the interest of economic stability we should help these nations back to their feet as quickly as possible so that world trade may resume its normal channels and expected growth.

2. In the interest of political stability and world peace these people should be quickly brought up to some minimum standard of living, for masses of starving people provide a fertile field for the seeds of political unrest and revolution.

3. In the interest of human kindness we cannot allow the peoples of China, Austria, the Phillipines and other liberated countries to face starvation and complete annihilation while we enjoy prosperity. The war through which we have just come has shown that the world must be considered in the light of all its peoples, and in the peace which we are attempting to cement, a similar conception is evidenced. It is our responsibility therefore, as a necessary step to maintain world peace, to see that those less fortunate than we are supplied with at least the barest fundamentals for existence.

The job for which the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was set up is just half done. Unless it is completed almost all that was previously given will, in effect, be thrown away—people have been tided over half the winter, but they are just as liable to starvation in the second half; they will need suplies until they can build their own economy.

We respectfully urge therefore, that you do everything in your power to approve authorization of the $1,350,000,000 requested by UNRRA and that this authorization be made in a democratic manner with no strings attached—such as the "free press amendment" so that we may demonstrate to all the world our sincerity and good faith as a world citizen.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BRANCH OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,
GEORGE E. C. HAYS, *President*.

The Future of Inland Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the Calship News of Chicago:

THE FUTURE OF INLAND WATERWAYS

There can be no intelligent discussion or consideration of the future of inland waterways without a review of their development and progress during the past two and one-half decades. In World War I the railroads of the Nation were taken over and operated by the United States Government through an agency called the Railroad Administration, and in an effort to alleviate the congestion on the railroads during that period they organized a barge line. From then on the river barge lines became an increasingly important element in the transportation needed to support the peacetime economy of our Nation.

The new agency was mandated by Congress to join the railroads in through joint barge-rail, rail-barge and rail-barge-rail rates, so the benefits of low-cost transportation would not only be confined to industries, distributors, manufacturers, and communities located on the rivers and waterways, but would also benefit those in the interior regions. Since 1942, however, the railroads have resisted the establishment of such joint rates, with the result that those now in effect do not cover as much territory nor do they apply on as many commodities as could be desired.

Notwithstanding the resistance of a competing form of transportation, the barge lines have made much progress and are recognized as a most important factor in the areas served by them. Nearly all the major oil companies and many so-called independent oil companies own or use tank barges, towboats, and tugs for the movement of their products on the inland waterways. The reason for the establishment and growth of these private carriers is the low-cost transportation and in moving petroleum products only one other method is cheaper—the ocean-going tanker.

The service rendered the Nation by the inland water industry during the war has been outstanding and has fully justified its existence. Millions of tons of petroleum products have moved by river tank barge. The movement of this important war commodity in this way has spelled the difference between keeping industrial plants on the eastern seaboard as well as in the Middle West operating at full speed or curtailing operations; of keeping people warm or having them freeze; of using combat training planes or having them remain on the ground.

The Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, and War Shipping Administration found it absolutely imperative to use the vast productive capacity of the Great Lakes and the Mississippi and Ohio River Valley regions for the building of submarines, patrol cruisers, landing craft of all types and sizes, mine layers and sweepers as well as tugs and cargo vessels as produced by the Calumet Shipyard & Dry Dock Co. Many such craft had to be pontooned or otherwise floated and towed to deep water. There can be no doubt that the ships built in the "interior country," even in the cornfields of the Midwest away from the seaboards, were of tremendous help toward victory.

Certainly even the severest critics of the use of the inland waterways should admit that transportation thereon during the war alone has fully justified their development, and on the basis of this past performance the industry looks forward to the future with the utmost confidence, realizing full well that competition in postwar years will be keen. It may not be generally realized, but throughout the period of the war these carriers have been defending themselves before the courts and the Interstate Commerce Commission against deliberate attacks on their rate structures, their right to participate in transit arrangements, and to move ex-barge traffic on equal proportional rates.

All types of transportation have given exceptionally fine performance during the war. The railroads, barge lines, pipe lines, and motortrucks all stepped into the breech left open by the withdrawal of coastwise tankers, with the result that the industrial East never suffered a serious petroleum shortage. The barge lines operating on the inland rivers, intracoastal canals and waterways, bays, sounds, and harbors of the United States expect to retain much of this traffic. Freight carriage by this form of transportation is cheap and reliable and in the highly competitive postwar years it is believed that all traffic will seek the service provided at the lowest possible cost.

The inland water carrier industry is firmly of the belief that they must have the fullest cooperation and support of the shippers and public generally if low-cost water transportation is to be preserved. The shippers of freight and the general public must be made to fully realize that one agency must never again be permitted to hold an absolute monopoly on the transportation needs of this great Nation.

There must be competition, but it must be honest and fair if prosperity for all is to prevail in the years to come. There must be competition among the different modes of transportation if shippers and the public are to have an unrestricted choice of the type of transportation needed at fair rates. There must also be a coordination of these services so they will be in the interest of the public.

The inland water carriers have no criticism of the railroads, as they have given the Nation the best possible transportation during the war. We have the finest railroad system in the world and their magnificent performance has been accomplished under private management, as contrasted with World War I, when Government operation was not an outstanding success. However, these same railroads have been the severest critics of the development and use of the inland waterways as well as other forms of competing transportation.

The general public must be convinced of the necessity of preserving all forms of transportation and avoiding a monopoly of any one form. The unfair and unwarranted attacks on inland waterways transportation must cease and everyone interested in a prosperous nation should insist on fair treatment for all. Each such service should have the opportunity to do the job for which it is best fitted and equipped.

Expedite Return of Medical Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a letter from a representative group of medical officers now being detained in the medical service in France, which is sufficient proof to me, and should be sufficient proof for the Surgeon General of the Army that his department is not moving with sufficient speed for the return of medical men from overseas who are surplus and are not needed in their present positions.

I think when you Members of Congress read this letter you will be alarmed at its contents and the very serious effect the retaining of these men in foreign service who have little or nothing to do is having on their morale. I know it will cause you to redouble your efforts to cure this situation and your insistence on expediting demobilization so that they may return to their professions in their various home localities where their services are so urgently needed by our civilian population.

The letter is as follows:

FRANCE, *November 9, 1945.*

Hon. C. W. VURSELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: There are existing at this time in the European Theater of Operations, conditions which are the seedlings for planned changes in the future practice of medicine. They have been present all during the actual war and were the stimulus for many thousands of rightful "gripes" by the doctors in the service. Now that the war is over these injustices are still present, and it is high time that they be aired, so as to preserve our present standards of medical practice and thus continue to insure the American people the highest degree of health.

We are writing this letter to you to acquaint you with these conditions which are planned adjuncts to the collaring and slow choking of the American medical profession.

1. Much has already been said and written concerning the surplus of doctors in service, and the hoarding of this surplus by the military. This unnecessary disproportion was present, but tolerated, during the actual time of combat. At that time there was one doctor per 200 soldiers. From the available casualty figures published by the Army and Navy during the entire European and Pacific war, there was available one doctor for every 10 soldiers injured. Compare this figure with the civilian figures where one doctor serves 1,000 people of all ages and of both sexes. Now with the war over, combat casualties nonexisting, and redeployment of the troops "excluding medical officers," this disproportion grows even more alarming and ridiculous. We find ourselves with no work to do, sitting idly here, simply political prisoners. Is this not a sufficient contradiction to the plea of "necessity" to arouse in us a suspicion and fear of a sinister plot of the greedy social planners? Do we read socialized medicine in the offing? We are sure we do. We don't like it. We don't want it.

2. A second inciting factor of the present medical situation is the policy of the Army to refrain from inducting into the service those young men who were given a medical and dental education at the expense of the Government. These young men are not being sent overseas as replacements, while doctors with 15 to 24 months overseas service or 2 to 3 years total service are being kept here, many to serve in the army of occupation. This contradiction to logic, this breech of everything that is right, just, and holy is leaving a mark of bitterness in us doctors that even time will not erase. We ask, "Is the Army keeping the older men, those with long overseas service, away from the States to curry favor with the younger man in the hope and play of entwining him in their scheme of socialization?"

3. Along the same line, doctors at home, who have never left the States, are being discharged with fewer points than many doctors have who are overseas. They are being discharged, and we can't even get home. Again we ask ourselves a question, "Is this justice, or are we making a mistake by expecting justice?"

The result of these injustices is becoming very evident to us who are witnessing these experiences. The doctor has no work, he is loafing, he is losing his initiative, his desire for and interest in medicine. He is developing a mental attitude which if it continues to be nourished by instances as above, will solidify into a bloc, not only willing to accept, but encouraging socialized medicine. This is not an idle dream, this is now an everyday conversation and admission, spoken no longer with hesitancy, nor with shame, and with less and less regrets. The future is not rosy. Is it the desire of the representative leaders of our profession to see as a result of this neglect, an embittered bloc of medical people arise? A bloc so frustrated that the advent of socialized medicine would be a welcome refuge. We think not, and we hope not. Unless something is done immediately, these grave fears will come to pass.

In an effort to avoid this we offer the following suggestions:

1. Let there be adequate medical personnel for American soldiers in each theater—no more, no less.

2. Get the surplus of those overseas home immediately. There is an overwhelming surplus. Get those with long overseas service home now. They can't take much more now.

3. Let the ASTP and V-12 doctors earn their Government education by a tour of duty overseas, thereby allowing the poor, forgotten, disillusioned, lethargic doctor a chance to return home because he is now filled with ennui such that he doesn't know if he is coming or going.

4. The American Medical Association should pursue its function of protecting the rights of its members. Let us not again see the journal repeat, without criticism, the exorbitant demands of the Army. It nauseates us who know the true state of affairs, and is an insult to our intelligence.

5. We think, too, that after the cessation of hostilities there ought to be at least a degree of medical autonomy. A representative committee of the profession should have the power to decide how many doctors for the military and how many for the civilian population.

The future of individualistic American medicine is in the balance. You can tip the scales in the right direction, but it must be done now.

A REPRESENTATIVE GROUP
OF MEDICAL OFFICERS.

Distribution:

1. Deans of approved medical colleges.
2. Secretaries of the State medical societies.
3. Representative individual leaders of the medical profession.
4. Secretaries of the American College of Physicians and the American College of Surgeons.
5. Leading newspapers and periodicals.

District Committee Chairman Expresses Appreciation for Cooperation of Fellow Members, Officials, and Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, in relinquishing, in the near future, the chairmanship of the House District Committee, I especially appreciate and recall the cordial relationships with officials and residents of the National Capital.

It has been a privilege to work with the District of Columbia Commissioners, and other agency heads, including the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. Civic organizations and individual citizens have also aided in promoting legislative programs necessary to the growth of Washington and the well-being of the approximately one million persons who live in the metropolitan area.

I feel that it is important that the citizens who live here understand the prompt and helpful cooperation given to the consideration of District bills by the leadership of the House of Representatives, including the Speaker, majority and minority leaders. It is appropriate also to make public the fact that no partisanship has existed within our committee.

The Washington newspapers and radio stations have, in my opinion, cooperated with the committee chairman and members in behalf of a constantly improved metropolis.

By leaving the chairmanship of the District Committee, I shall not lack a continuing interest in the work of this group. It is my desire to remain a member and to aid the incoming chairman in his important duties.

There are many opportunities for local and national service on the District Committee. My efforts will be directed in the future, as in the past, to accomplish with the help of others those objectives so vital to this city's widening influence. Washington increasingly becomes the world capital because here are shaped so many policies which will determine the peace and security of mankind everywhere.

In assuming new and challenging duties with the Civil Service Committee I genuinely thank those friends and coworkers who have helped my staff and myself in our pleasant tasks.

Veteran Red Tape Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, recently when Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, appeared before the Deficiencies Subcommittee on Appropriations, I took occasion to make known to him certain information that had been disclosed to me by men released from the services.

The complaint of some of the new veterans was that when they reported to a draft board in an endeavor to obtain DSS Form 57, Notice of Classification, they were requested to furnish the draft board with a photostatic copy of their discharge certificate at their own expense. This I felt to be positively wrong, and I so expressed myself on the occasion.

As a result, General Bradley presented the matter to the Director of the Selective Service System, Lewis B. Hershey, who has written to me as follows:

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., November 21, 1945.

The Honorable LEWIS C. RABAUT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. RABAUT: This headquarters has been advised of your statement before a recent congressional hearing relative to the requirement by certain local boards of selective service that the returning veteran, upon reporting to his local board, file a photostatic copy of his discharge. This matter was discussed with you by Colonel Renfrow, chief legislative officer of this headquarters, and the local board to which you referred was ascertained to be in the District of Columbia.

In reference to this information, inquiry was made of the director of selective service for the District of Columbia, and the attached Bulletin No. 738 (VAD-12), issued on November 5, 1945, was the action taken by the District of Columbia headquarters, to discontinue the practice of requiring photostatic copies of discharge.

In addition, you will find that the attached Bulletin No. 707 (VAD-6), dated August 5, 1945, will give the procedure previously outlined to the local boards for the District of Columbia for the assisting of veterans by local boards.

Also attached is form (VAD-6), which is completed at the time a discharged veteran reports to a local board in the District of Columbia, requesting assistance or notification of his local board of origin.

It is believed that this will clarify the situation and establish the fact that it was never the policy of the Selective Service System to require a photostatic copy of his discharge at the time the veteran reports to his local board upon discharge.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., November 5, 1945.

Bulletin No. 738 (VAD-12).

Memorandum to local boards and reemployment committeemen:

It has been reported to this headquarters that certain of the District of Columbia local boards have been requiring veterans to present photostatic copies of their discharges either for their own use in connection with the issuance of classification cards (DSS Form 57) or duplicates of registration certificates (DSS Form 2) or for the use of other local boards either in or out of the District of Columbia. This requirement is felt to be wholly unnecessary and the practice should be discontinued.

District of Columbia Form VAD-6 was designed to obviate the necessity of requiring photostatic copies of discharges for any purpose and the use of this form to record pertinent data taken from discharge certificates was outlined in our VAD Bulletin No. 707 (VAD-6), dated August 20, 1945. Further, Instruction No. 1 for Form 14 issued August 20, 1945, very adequately covers the application for issuance of duplicate registration certificates (DSS Form 2) insofar as registrants who have been separated from the land or naval forces are concerned.

Very truly yours,

FRANK D. NORTON,
Administrative Officer.

Women's Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

WOMEN'S CHANCE

United States Representatives EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts, plans to introduce in Congress a bill which would establish a veterans' job and integrated national program to provide the maximum amount of job opportunities and careers for veterans. Mrs. ROGERS' proposal would bring together present efforts being made on the behalf of veterans in agriculture, industry, labor, foreign trade, private agencies, State and local governments, and the Federal Government. The bill would not interfere with the jobs of nonveterans but would create new opportunities by using unused capacities and undeveloped resources of the United States.

It is pointed out by Mrs. ROGERS that we have now about 20,000,000 veterans of the last two wars, constituting a potential new power. To these 20,000,000 veterans may be added all their female relations of voting age, who are primarily interested in what these men must have to reenter civil life on a basis of opportunity to those men who didn't fight in either one of the wars. And it is clearly up to the women to make certain that such a bill for an integrated national program for veterans be passed by Congress.

It is an actual fact that women have a greater chance today than ever before to make sure there will be no World War III and build up bulwarks in this Nation against another depression and consequent unemployment. Educated women must strive to teach others not so well educated and, therefore, not so well informed, the power for good they can be if they will. If the women of this country, for instance, will put their full strength behind this veterans' bill to be proposed by Mrs. ROGERS, they will, in the Congresswoman's own words, "exert more power on the distaff side than all of the male warmongers combined."

Mrs. ROGERS said also: "Their (women's) courage and high-mindedness is now needed to help give birth to this veterans' job and integrated national program. The women of America can strike a new note in applying their abilities in the community centers, and by using the ballot to make this program successful."

The Lowell Congresswoman is by no means the only one who believes that the franchise gives the women of this Nation an opportunity to push through the kind of legislation needed to prevent war and bolster a poorly adjusted national economy. It is the women of the country who suffer the most when they see their husbands, sons, and brothers off to war, who in times of peace fear for their families while legislators fool around with silly and futile proposals and leave high on the shelf the bills which would save the United States and its people from much suffering. Let us hope that from many platforms, pulpits, and publications will come words of encouragement to women so that they will exercise this franchise for the most good.

Women should write their Representatives in Congress asking for support of Mrs. ROGERS' measure when it is introduced. If they are anxious to help matters along further, they should write to Mrs. ROGERS and ask her what they can do in their own communities to push through the legislation.

San Francisco Favored as Permanent Home of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished Indiana editor, writing in the Gary Post-Tribune of last Saturday, has presented a very interesting summary of the reasons which, in his impartial opinion, make San Francisco an "odds-on choice" to be selected as the permanent home of the United Nations.

The editorial follows:

London must be a busy place these days, with hotel rooms about as scarce as in some American cities we know, as our United States delegations arrive to press their offers of sites for the permanent home of the United Nations.

We didn't realize there were so many ideal American locations until the invitations began to take shape. Mayor Kelly has been across the Atlantic on a flying trip to urge Chicago's advantages; Philadelphia, Boston, and San Francisco have sent similar delegations to plead their cause.

Then there's a bid from New York, with the 1939 World's Fair site proposed, and other invitations from Poughkeepsie, the Black Hills of South Dakota and the Territory of Hawaii. We're not forgetting, either, Indiana's own proposal that the United Nations select a Hoosier site—most any site, just so long as it is in Indiana.

The choice will go to an American location. Preliminary discussions in London have indicated as much. There is some sentiment there for Geneva, home of the ill-fated League of Nations, but Russia probably never would consent to that; the Soviet recalls too well the assassination of its chief delegate to the Lausanne Conference in 1923 and its expulsion from the League in 1939. And there are other nations to whom the ghosts of Geneva's past are not attractive.

We'd like to have the United Nations come to Indiana, of course. Any State would be delighted to welcome the delegates of the world's nations. And our Hoosier hospitality probably would make them feel right at home among us.

But as best we can ascertain, San Francisco is the "odds on" choice to win the final selection. It has prestige as the birthplace of the UNO; it is nearer than Europe to most of the British dominions and to most of South America, and it faces both China and Siberia across the Pacific.

With its steep hills, Frisco has one of the most picturesque sites in the world. Its bay, entered from the Pacific through the deep and wide Golden Gate, is the best natural harbor between Puget Sound and San Diego. It is a city with a distinct international flavor. And, a factor that might be important, it is the width of the continent distant from Washington and the center of our domestic politics.

The converging of various delegations on London to urge rival sites may help to convince the UNO delegates that the new world league will have a hearty welcome in the United States. In that respect, a suggested Indiana delegation might be of some value. But otherwise we doubt that there's any good reason for sending a Hoosier committee to London. It would be a nice trip but that's about all. As loyal Hoosiers, we join in urging the UNO to come to Indiana but, thinking practically, we haven't much expectation that it's even a slight possibility.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 29, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I wish to support the appropriation of $15,000,000 for flood control on the Mississippi River and its tributaries and the other appropriations for certain similar projects in southern Illinois.

We are losing each year a considerable fraction of our most fertile Illinois soil. It is being washed away into the Mississippi. Unless something effective is done to stop this waste, we shall be an agriculturally impoverished State by the end of the century. Combined Federal, State, and local action is needed if we are to save our land. Local and State governments can do much to help the farmers hold the rainfall in the soil and lessen its rate of run-off. Among these measures are, first, contour plowing and the use of sod strips; second, the development of small forests on low-grade land; third, the planting of nitrogen fixing plants to build up depleted soil and on the the banks of streams; fourth, the building of small rock dams on creeks and larger dams on rivers to hold back the spring floods and create lakes which will furnish needed water supplies and provide recreation.

I hope the Federal Government will help more actively in these projects. In the long run it will be a sound investment. In the meantime the proposed public works to control floods and promote navigation will be of distinct public benefit, and in my judgment should be carried through. But we need a larger plan to prevent floods, lessen erosion, and safeguard our soil on the tributaries of the Illinois, the Kaskaskia, and the Wabash, and I hope all our levels of government may work together to accomplish this.

Low-Wage Policy Threatens Economy of Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, up to this date the General Motors Corp. has refused to discuss profits or prices with the UAW-CIO. The officials of the corporation have stated flatly that it is none of the union's business. This reluctance on the part of General Motors to consider profits in relation to wages is understandable when one reads the Federal Trade Commission Report, which stated that the corporation averaged 35.5 percent in profits from 1927 through 1937, inclusive. It is well to point out that $1,000 invested in 10 shares of General Motors stock in 1917 have earned the investor $930 a year in dividends and increase in value. This is a 93-percent return.

Mr. Walter Reuther, vice president of the UAW-CIO, has pointed out that General Motors could have paid 30 percent greater wages than it did pay from 1926 to 1941 and would have earned an average net income after taxes of $132,000,000 a year. This is more than 12 percent a year on its investment. For every dollar paid to the workers from 1936 to 1941, inclusive, General Motors earned 91 cents in profits before taxes. Mr. Reuther points out that in its postwar production, General Motors can make as much profit before taxes as in the best profit year of its history which was in 1941—this in spite of the fact that even though it may be producing at less than capacity and even though it pays 30 percent higher wages rates than it now pays. Mr. Reuther seems to have the facts and statistics. General Motors' answer to all of this is simply "It's none of your doggone business."

How can we have a balanced economy in the Nation and avoid inflation and depression if we do not consider prices, profits, and wages jointly in connection with the whole problem? It appears to me that the UAW-CIO officials are talking plain horse-sense economics that every American can readily understand. One of the General Motors officials recently stated that he would not show his books even to his stockholders. The most simple-minded person will understand that you cannot have a balanced economy in the Nation by regulating wages only. It is like riding a tricycle on only one wheel.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include editorials by Mr. R. J. Thomas, president, UAW-CIO, and Mr. George F. Addes, secretary-treasurer, UAW-CIO, that appeared in this week's issue of the United Automobile Worker:

THE SHOW-DOWN IS HERE

(By R. J. Thomas, president, UAW-CIO)

I am writing this column as the showdown between your union and the Big Three in the automobile industry moves to a climax.

Just before the Auto Worker went to press, negotiations with General Motors were to be resumed, but there seemed little hope that anything worth while would result. The corporation, the largest, richest, money-making enterprise in the world, has refused utterly to grant any increase in wages without corresponding price increases, and treats our fully justified demands for wage increases to take care of the losses in take-home pay as something on which they will not negotiate. The company "negotiators" listen—but they laugh at the idea of paying the wage rates they can so well afford.

It is regrettable that an outfit which sets the pace for the whole auto industry should be operated by socially irresponsible men. The perfect illustration of that was GM vice president Harry Anderson's now classic remark a few days ago that they would not open their books, even to their own stockholders. The corporation is being operated, not by its owners, but by a managerial clique whose entire financial investment represents at best a minority of the stock. It is this little group, responsible only to themselves and entirely lacking in any consciousness of their obligations to society as the operators of the world's largest business, which is, in effect, forcing a costly and terrible strike upon us.

God knows the top leadership of the UAW-CIO has neither sought nor wanted a collision of this kind. But I think the people of America will agree with our own membership that we have been patient, we have been fair, we have sought to do no more than maintain the economic well-being of our people and of the country as a whole in our proposals to General Motors Corp. and to Chrysler and Ford.

Since the beginning of the present controversy, GM has never indicated in word or in deed its willingness to give an inch on wages. Its attitude is clear indication that the corporation is not only expecting a strike but welcomes the test of strength. No doubt this tough policy is because of the provisions of the Federal tax laws under which GM's strike losses would largely be repaid out of the Federal Treasury through tax refunds. The corporation is acting on the assumption that this is a fine time to decide the issues, when it will have the Treasury of the United States to finance it, and the workers will have to depend upon their limited resources.

Should there be a strike, it must be conducted on our part with complete and orderly discipline, and with full confidence that the du Pont family cannot successfully flout the just demands of the automobile workers.

SECRETARY ADDES SAYS

(By George F. Addes, secretary-treasurer, UAW-CIO)

Industrial unrest and discontent in the United States flow directly and inevitably from the economic situation in which the Nation and its workers find themselves.

The national income, we have been told by Government economists, will drop to only $130,000,000,000 in 1946, or $36,000,000,000 less than during the first 6 months of 1945. A national income of only $130,000,000,000 with a civilian labor force expanding rapidly because of the demobilization of the armed

forces means—and no statistical sleight-of-hand or mumbo-jumbo talk about collective bargaining procedures can deny it—unemployment for between 8 and 10 million workers. It means joblessness for returning veterans; it means a 20 to 25 percent drop in farm income; it means that our country has been sucked once again into the vicious downward spiral of deflation and depression.

The task of the Nation in this time of crisis is to find ways and means of compensating for the spectacular decline in Government war spending—from $87,000,000,000 to $25,000,000,000—and thereby to reduce the hazards of deflation and unemployment. It has been estimated that the total of Federal, business, and consumer expenditures, which amounted to $199,000,000,000 in the first half of 1945, will sink to only $155,000,000,000 in 1946. It will take an increase in expenditures of $44,000,000,000—or 28 percent—to fill this deflationary gap. Of the three components of total expenditures, only one—consumer expenditures—is subject to considerable increase, and this increase can come about only through raising wage rates.

A substantial wage increase is, therefore, a basic necessity not only for the reduction of industrial strife but for the partial offsetting of the shrinkage in the national pay envelope. It, and it alone, can lay the basis for the level of consumer expenditures necessary to replace dwindling Government spending for war.

It is obvious, however, that consumer expenditures cannot be increased when wage cuts are the order of the day. According to the United States Department of Commerce, restoration of the prewar workweek means that average weekly wages in manufacturing industries will decline from $46.35 (June 1945) to $35.60, a cut of almost one-fourth. For workers shifting from munitions industries to nondurable goods industries at prewar hours, the cut will be even greater, amounting at least to 45 percent.

With wage cuts of such magnitude, it will be impossible to increase consumer expenditures to compensate for the decline in Government spending.

With wage cuts of such magnitude, it will be impossible for the workers of this Nation to earn the $3,075 which the Heller Committee finds necessary for a minimum American health and decency standard of living at wartime price levels.

With wage cuts of such magnitude, it will be impossible for the American people, in the words of Mr. Vinson, to "learn to live 50 percent better than they have ever lived before."

Is it any wonder, then, that there is industrial discontent in the United States?

There is now and there can be no doubt that the basic reason underlying the great wave of resentment that permeates the minds of the American workers is that the wartime wage policy of the Government created injustices and inequities which threaten not only the living standards of the workers themselves but the economy of the entire Nation.

Courts-Martial Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 3 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Courts-Martial Review," from the San Francisco Chronicle. It is an editorial in complete support of a resolution now pending before a committee of the Senate providing for a senatorial investigation of the courts-martial systems and places of incarceration of those sentenced before Army and Navy courts martial.

Let me add that since my resolution was submitted I have received for my files ample evidence to satisfy me that there is rampant abuse of the courts-martial system in the Army and Navy, so that I stand ready to prove the charge I made.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COURTS-MARTIAL REVIEW

The Senate should not lose a moment's time in adopting the resolution of Senator MORSE, of Oregon, calling for a Senate investigation of Army and Navy courts martial. Simultaneously, the investigation should put a crusher on the harsh, war-excited sentences that Senator KNOWLAND says are still being carried out.

In addition to review of specific cases, Senator MORSE's resolution proposes examination of the whole court-martial tradition. That also is needed.

There is a natural lack of godlike uniformity in even the civil courts' dispensation of justice, but civil justice at least is dispensed by men trained in the law and men who are accountable to the public.

Against this, military judges are officers who may or may not have broad legal background; often they have very little. Serving in an organism dedicated to victory above all else, they understandably place a high premium upon discipline; consequently there develops a tendency in every war to use military courts as instruments of exemplary discipline instead of justice. In the main, proceedings are conducted without accountability to public opinion or conscience, and there is a corresponding lack of publicity at the appellate levels.

This is a general rule of war. It has happened in this one, and as a consequence countless sentences have been outrageously harsh. Not only is there a large number of wartime judgments crying loudly for review, but beyond a doubt there are thousands containing lesser miscarriages. It is a public right and duty to know the number of such cases and their nature—that is, to know what has been going on behind the wartime screen. And it is a public duty to remember that the sentence will stand unless they are reviewed in cool blood by authorities more experienced in the dispensation of justice than the authorities who passed them. Where injustice has been done, redress will come belatedly as it is; there is no excuse for further delay.

Two Trials in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 3 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Two Trials in Germany," published in the Memphis Press-Scimitar of December 1, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO TRIALS IN GERMANY

The trial at Nuremberg goes well. Evidence, shocking even to a world that thought it had plumbed the depths of Nazi devilishness, steadily unfolds. The trial is being conducted with fairness and dignity. Few doubt that the guilty will be punished and in measure proportioned to their guilt.

There is another trial going on in Germany—the trial of our ability to transform the German nation from a menace into a reliable member of the society of nations. A successful outcome of this other trial depends on our ability to save the innocent—to get Germany to running in such a way that the lives of today's children, and even children yet unborn, will not be warped by starvation and injustice so that they will be made into Nazis or Communists of tomorrow.

This other trial isn't going well. That we learn from Byron Price, former head of censorship, who was sent into Germany by President Truman to find out conditions and has reported to him that the situation is growing worse hourly.

Germans who live in unheated homes and must walk to work, aren't getting enough food to keep their bodies warm, much less enough to give them enough energy to work.

Mr. Price recommends that additional food be shipped to Germany on credit to provide at least the minimum ration which doctors say is necessary to prevent starvation.

For which starvation would come epidemics and probably riots.

Desperation, he says, might produce a new fuehrer, and embittered Germans would listen to him.

It is right and it is sensible for us to give food and hope to those Germans, however few or many they may be, who will turn to the western world and its democracy if we give them a chance. Food and hope, too, for the children who, if not molded by our kindness, will be molded by a future fuehrer's cruelty.

For the spirit in which to do this, we may turn to Justice Robert H. Jackson, prosecutor of the Nazis at Nuremberg.

In the great speech with which he opened the trial, at the same time that he was relentlessly indicting the Nazis, he made it clear that the United States was not incriminating the whole German people. He said:

"We know that the Nazi Party was not put in power by a majority of the German vote. We know it came to power by an evil alliance between the most extreme of the Nazi revolutionaries, the most unrestrained of the German reactionaries, and the most aggressive of the German militarists."

The German people cannot be absolved from the sin of yielding to this evil minority. But it is unlikely they would have yielded had they not been brought to an economic desperation by the triple disasters of defeat in World War I, a destructive inflation, and a depression.

Let us do what is necessary to prevent a greater economic desperation which would make Germany prey to a new crew of desperadoes.

Let's see that Byron Price's recommendations are carried out.

Let's punish the guilty and rescue the innocent.

Let neither of our great trials in Germany miscarry.

Leave Privileges and Allowances of Enlisted Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, as early as March 5, this year, I introduced H. R. 2454 which was referred to and is still pending before the House Committee on Military Affairs.

The title of the bill reads as follows: "To grant to enlisted personnel in the armed forces of the United States upon their separation from the service certain benefits with respect to accumulated leave."

The purpose of the bill is to extend leave privileges and or pay allowances to enlisted personnel on the same basis as is now granted to officers.

In campaigning for the passage of the measure, I have as yet found no opposition. Everyone seems favorable to the bill, but no one seems willing to press for its enactment. In view of the admitted discriminations against our enlisted men and women, the measure should pass without delay. On the Speaker's desk you will find Discharge Petition No. 13, which I hope you will sign and thus aid in the passage of this long-past-due law.

Attention is called to what I believe is a grave but unintentional error committed against the almost 15,000,000 men and women who have served as enlisted personnel in our Army, Navy, Marines, or Coast Guard. We have granted to the officers who commanded these men and women a highly deserved reward for faithful duty well performed, but we have failed to equally reward the equally deserving men and women who make up the rank and file of our national-defense force.

I am referring specifically to a bill recently passed by both this House and the Senate, and very recently signed by our President. This bill was intended to prevent an unjust hardship which had resulted upon the discharge of officers who had accumulated annual leave during their period of military service. Upon discharge, they were unable to accept civilian jobs until such time as they had expended this unused leave if that civilian job were with some other branch of Government. For the officer this meant choosing between losing the accumulated annual leave or postponing the acceptance of a civilian job until the leave had expired.

In some cases where the officer was badly needed in a civilian capacity and where a manpower shortage in that particular skill made the situation even more aggravated, we found that conversion was being handicapped by the failure of men to accept employment. In other cases we found the men actually accepting employment but working without salary until their leave had expired. Perhaps even more serious, many discharged officers were finding that by the time their leave had expired the good jobs were already filled.

To eliminate this problem Congress passed and the President signed a bill authorizing the payment of a lump sum to officers upon discharge, equivalent to the annual leave which they had acquired, thus permitting them to have the income from the unused annual leave and yet be eligible for employment to reconverting industry. I believe, with the majority of my colleagues, that it was a happy solution, and a well deserved one. Men who were too busy on the firing line to take the 2-day-a-month vacation which the Government service provides deserve to have it after they return to civilian ranks.

From these remarks I believe that you will all understand that I was a firm supporter of the earlier legislation, and am in no way attempting to detract from it or condemn it.

Yet, I would like to point out that in passing this legislation, we were discriminating against the enlisted personnel unless we offer them a similar advantage. To equalize this unintentional discrimination against our enlisted men and women I submitted early this year H. R. 2454, a bill to grant enlisted personnel in the armed forces of the United States upon their separation from the service certain benefits with respect to accumulated leave.

In preparing H. R. 2454 I discovered that it was necessary to go somewhat further before we could help enlisted personnel than was necessary with officers. For some—by me—misunderstood reason officers are entitled to receive annual leave at the rate of 2½ days for each calendar month of service in the armed forces, and may accumulate any unused leave; but enlisted personnel do not have this privilege. While it has been customary to grant enlisted men and women furloughs from duty upon frequent occasions, there has never been any provision whereby these men automatically received so many days each month as the officers do. Nor do enlisted personnel accumulate leave which is not used. It would be possible for an enlisted man to serve continuously without furlough from before Pearl Harbor until the present; and still not have a day of annual leave coming to him upon discharge.

Is that the extent of our gratitude to these real patriots who have battled through heat and mud and blizzard for us, who have faced enemy gunfire in order that this Nation might remain free and uninvaded, who have fought on seven seas and in seven times seven different nations to protect you and I?

Are we going to be satisfied to hand to these heroes a small button and say to him "Wear this, son, so that we can know a hero when we see one" and yet not offer to him the same rights which come by law to the officers who commanded him in those battles? Are we going to distinguish between the officer-pilot of a plane and the enlisted gunner on the same plane?

To correct these inequalities, H. R. 2454 does two things. It first creates a reward for enlisted personnel commensurate to that which the law already provides for their officers. Then, once created, this reward is treated in exactly the same manner as we have wisely decided to treat the similar reward which officers receive.

H. R. 2454 provides that each enlisted man or woman shall be entitled to 2½ days annual leave for each month of service, such eligibility to become effective upon their discharge. I do not believe that this is in any way different from the amount of annual leave now being given to officers.

H. R. 2454 further provides that enlisted personnel shall have charged against them such leave as they may have been formally granted while in service; and that any balance shall accumulate until their discharge. Again, this is comparable to the privileges extended to officers under existing regulations.

H. R. 2454 also provides that upon discharge the enlisted man shall receive a lump-sum payment equivalent to the number of days of accumulated leave, to be paid at the rate of pay and allowances of the enlisted personnel on his last day prior to discharge. This, too, is similar to the recently passed legislation for officers.

Finally H. R. 2454 is made retroactive so that enlisted personnel already discharged prior to the passage of this bill shall also be compensated. This feature of the bill specifies that such lump-sum payment shall be made within 90 days after date of enactment of this act. I am sure that you will all agree with the justice of this section of H. R. 2454, since none of us would want to discriminate between men simply because some were discharged before others. Because of our point discharge system the men who have already been released are, in many cases, the ones who have had the longest periods of service or have distinguished themselves in the most outstanding manner.

I call upon you to sign discharge petition No. 13 today.

World Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SHERMAN ADAMS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter directed to the editor of Union-Leader of Manchester, N. H., written by Charles A. Holden, of Hanover, concerning world federation:

WORLD FEDERATION

Editor, Union-Leader—The increasing number of people who are saying that a world federal government must come soon is encouraging. Many other people say that ultimately it must come—some impose the limitation that it cannot come in the next 15 or 20 years. It well may be that a more

nearly accurate statement would be "We have only the next 15 or 20 years in which to form a world federal government."

We should realize that the people in the United States Confederation were just as sorely beset as are we today. When the Confederation was "descending into the vale of confusion and darkness" and "anarchy," a convention was called "for the sole and express purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation." Not all the accredited delegates attended, some left before the session was completed and only about one-half the number of delegates for which provision had been made, signed the proposed Constitution for the federation of the United States. The proposed constitution was adopted because the far-seeing statesmen in the convention had discerned that no revision of the Articles of Confederation could form an effective government and that a federation was required. During the consideration of the proposed Constitution heated arguments, pro and con, were advanced. Some of the States voted to adopt the Constitution by a very small margin—two did not do so until after Washington was inaugurated. Many of today's problems can be found duplicated in the years before and after 1787.

The Confederation of the United States failed, among other reasons because its fundamental concern was with purposes. The fundamental concern of the federation was with powers. When the United States Federal Government combined adequate powers with wise purposes, the Government changed from verging on anarchy to enjoying in the words of Washington, "a scene of prosperity and tranquillity under the new Government that could hardly have been hoped for."

Such a federation of the world is not something new or strange but is simply an extension to the world of the principles of the Government under which we live, the Federation of the United States, which has functioned well for over a century and one-half.

Each nation would be free to continue its form of government and to develop its culture without fear of foreign domination so long as it had the will, purpose, and determination to maintain peace in the world and to abide by the provisions of the world federation constitution.

Since there would be a world government, there could be international law; an international court; federal courts, officers, and enforcement agencies in each nation; the world federation could allocate to each nation for police uses the quantities of weapons, equipment, materials and manpower which it might have; the federal officers could have full right of access to determine whether any provisions of the licenses were being violated and thus prevent preparation for war by stealth; and, as in the United States, the world federation authorities could deal with individual violators and they only, not governments, would be punished. The latter is a fundamental and vital condition for the maintenance of peace.

Plans to stop aggression are plans to win wars; plans to prevent aggression are plans to maintain peace.

I think that the President and the Congress of the United States should do that which already has been proposed by the Legislature of New Hampshire and 12 other States: "* * * initiate the procedure necessary to formulate a constitution for the federation of the world" and do all that they can to bring about such a federation. Until there is a proposed constitution, no nation can decide whether it will or will not enter a federation. Nor can it effectively consider the subject.

I cannot believe that we have lost the pioneer spirit which says "It can be done" and not "It cannot be done." I cannot believe that we have lost the spirit of Washington and others who, in spite of the fact that it was "too probable no plan we propose will be adopted" and "perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained," persisted in their efforts and today we are enjoying the fruits of their labors. Can we do less than attempt to have the benefits of our federation expanded to the world?

I believe that the vision of forward-looking people in the world, as did the vision of similar people in the 1787 Convention, can and will take action for a world federation which will bring peace to the United States and to the world.

CHARLES A. HOLDEN.

HANOVER, November 17.

Former State Department Official Endorses Agreement Method of Ratifying St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the objections which the railroads and utilities and the ports of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Mobile, New Orleans, et cetera, raise against this project has to do with the method of procedure. I want to have an expert witness testify for the benefit of the American people. This witness will tell you that the agreement method is a perfectly proper method whereby we can ratify the agreement with Canada, and this witness will also tell you that it is not necessary to have this project considered as a treaty.

1941 HEARINGS

When hearings were held before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives on June 17, 1941, one of the witnesses was the Honorable Adolph Augustus Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State. Mr. Berle was then and still is one of our outstanding public officials. He is a man of wide learning, sound judgment, and knows how to reach correct conclusions on any problem that confronts him. His testimony before the committee was helpful in 1941, and is invaluable at this time when there is a discussion as to whether or not the treaty method is proper, rather than the agreement method of ratifying the agreement between the United States and Canada, on this subject. In the interests of accuracy, I quote from the printed hearings before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, June 17, 1941:

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE BASIN

(Tuesday, June 17, 1941)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:30 a. m., in the committee room, New House Office Building, Hon. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

We have before us for consideration this morning H. R. 4927 to provide for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes. * * *

STATEMENT OF ADOLPH AUGUSTUS BERLE, JR., ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Berle, we will be glad to hear from you. Mr. Berle is from the Secretary of State's office and is here representing the Secretary of State. * * *

Mr. BERLE. * * * On January 3, the report which is in the record was made, and on March 19, 1941, an agreement was signed between Canada and the United States, providing for the utilization of this water. This agreement was sent by the President to the Congress of the United States on March 21, 1941, and that is the agreement in respect of which H. R. 4927 proposes approval.

On that point I should like to add that the agreement, by its terms, will go into force when it is approved by the legislative bodies of the two countries. That is to say, by the Congress of the United States and by the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada, respectively.

The question was very carefully considered as to whether or not it was legal to proceed by an agreement, and I should like to read into the record the opinion of the Attorney General obtained on that point. Without trying to read a lengthy legal argument, let me perhaps ask that it be inserted in the record. It consists of the letter of the Secretary of State to the Attorney General, dated March 13, 1941, and the question asked is:

I should appreciate it if you would advise me whether you agree that the arrangement may be effectuated by an agreement signed under the authority of the Executives of the two countries and approved by legislative enactments by the Congress and the Canadian Parliament. * * *

LETTER FROM THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE

MARCH 14, 1941.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have your letter of March 13 and concur in the conclusion reached by your legal adviser that it is legally unobjectionable so far as this country is concerned for the Executives of the United States and Canada to enter into an agreement regarding the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence deep waterway project conditioned for its effectiveness upon the subsequent enactment of necessary legislation by the Congress and by the Canadian Parliament.

If an agreement is executed and approved in this manner, its provisions would be binding upon the United States as respects Canada.

Respectfully,

ROBERT H. JACKSON.

The problem as to whether this would be submitted in the form of an agreement or in the form of a treaty was a problem which engaged the most careful consideration of the Department of State.

This agreement differs from many treaties in that the effect of it is quite as great in terms of domestic matters as in terms of foreign affairs. It differs, for instance, from the kind of treaty which one might make, as, for instance, a treaty of alliance or a treaty regarding arms limitation, or things of that kind. It accordingly agreed that, in view of the fact that the issues were very largely domestic, the considered opinion of the House of Representatives, as well as of the Senate, was advisable and desirable, and that it was only fair that it should be submitted also to that tribunal.

I should like to add that that form of submission of agreement is in no way unusual in our history. The Texas agreement has been already adverted to here. One could cite a very, very long list of other precedents which I do not care to do here by reference unless someone is interested in that point. But I might note, among others, that there was a legislative authorization of agreement relating to reciprocal reductions of duties more than 30 years ago, and that this procedure was declared constitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Altman* v. *United States* (224 U. S. 583, especially p. 600). That, under like congressional approval an agreement was entered into by which the United States entered the International Labor Office in 1934, and that by like congressional authority agreements were entered into relating to the limitation of supplying arms to belligerent countries in this hemisphere.

An agreement on that point was upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States in what is, I suppose, the classic case on executive power—*United States* v. *Curtiss Wright Co.* (299 U. S. 304).

Mr. BELL. Pardon me, Mr. Berle, 299 United States Reports?

Mr. BERLE. Two Hundred and Ninety-ninth United States Reports Three Hundred and Four, which exempts such executive power.

For those who have a real scholarly interest in the question and are interested in a thorough statement of it, which I profess myself both unable to make and I think probably none of us would care to take the time, I should like to refer to the authoritative work on the subject which is a book entitled "International Executive Agreements," by Dr. Wallace McClure, published by the Columbia University Press, 1941, which takes in all of the long history beginning even in the days of the Continental Congress, and coming down to substantially the day of the date of these presents.

Mr. GAVAGAN. What is the name of it, Mr. Secretary?

Mr. BERLE. It is called International Executive Agreements, by Dr. Wallace McClure.

Mr. GAVAGAN. Yes.

Mr. BERLE. I merely mentioned this to indicate that this is not a new and casual idea. It is a thing which has been repeatedly done, and the United States Department of State functions now under a considerable number of agreements of that kind. One of them, for instance, the Finnish debt settlement, is familiar to you all, and the reciprocal trade agreements, of course, have been a part of the history of the past 8 years.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, there is a great deal of other testimony on the part of Mr. Berle having to do with the discussion as to whether or not the agreement method is proper. If you are interested I commend to you the further reading of Mr. Berle's testimony found in the 1941 hearings.

Why a Private Did Not Sign His Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from a private in the Army who gives his reason for not attaching his signature to his complaint:

NOVEMBER 3, 1945.

Hon. WILL A. ROWAN,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States of America, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The prompt adjustment of complaints directed you in the past leads me to direct this appeal to you for consideration and for the information of the fellow Congressmen who seem to be unaware of the situation under which enlisted men are struggling for relief and assistance in correcting hardship situations as well as the other supplementary discharge cases General Marshall spoke so enthusiastically of in his appeal to Congress not to interfere in the discharge of men from the Army.

First, it is very apparent that the Army is not being so speedily reduced as the brass hats would have you believe. The draft boards are still drafting large numbers of men and they are not all under 26 years of age and single. The congestion in various training camps and fields is acute; so acute that men have been sent home on furlough from this field in order to provide housing facilities for others.

Secondly, there is no indication that the local Army commanders are willing to separate men who are deserving of discharge of necessity. Men who are desperately needed at home have the most difficult time convincing CO's that the necessary papers should be signed, and then the papers lay around on desks in the orderly rooms for weeks. The commander of this field enunciates his policy as being: No dependency discharges; that is the responsibility of the local board, and I won't have the buck shifted to me.

In the third instance, utilization of the men is criminal. At this time men 30 years old and more (young ones do it, too) are repeating their basic training, or simply marching about the streets, singing and shouting cadence, because there seems to be nothing for them to do and nowhere to send them. To the few men here who in college or civilian life had experiences which prepared them for some special skill this is destructive of every sane thought they have left, and those are too few. Their morale has long since departed, and with the feeling of waste and uselessness of their enforced separations from their wives and children, it is very evident that the Army is going to have to create some new disciplinary abuses to suppress the demands of these men.

You know, of course, why this letter is not signed, but the revenge of the Army is more powerful than the ability of a private to withstand. I hope you will be able to bring this to light soon.

Sincerely,

A DISGUSTED PRIVATE.

Report on Riot at Honolulu

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report on riot in Honolulu:

NOVEMBER 15, 1945.

Hon. INGRAM M. STAINBACK,
Governor of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H.

SIR: This report concerns the riot which occurred at the Damon Tract on the evening of Monday, November 12. The information below submitted was obtained from Chief of Police Gabrielson and Captain Kennedy of the detective bureau at a conference held November 14, at which were also present the public prosecutor, Mr. Corbett, and the undersigned.

On Thursday, November 8, Lieutenant Singer, public relations officer of naval air station, Honolulu, came to see Chief Gabrielson and said that several sailors had been beaten up by hoodlums in the Damon Tract area—one quite badly the night before and altogether four in the last 3 days. Lieutenant Singer then suggested that it would be a good idea to let the sailors go out and clean up that gang. Chief Gabrielson told him absolutely no, that when a gang goes out there are always innocent people hurt, that the best thing to do would be to let the police handle it.

On the same occasion Lieutenant Singer suggested that police be sent out into the Damon Tract area in Navy uniform. The chief of police said he would be glad to do it if permission could be obtained from the admiral, that there was a Federal statute prohibiting the unauthorized wearing of Navy uniform. Lieutenant Singer said he would see the commandant of the base about this. Nothing further was heard of this matter.

Chief Gabrielson told Lieutenant Singer that if there were any further incidents an immediate call should be put into the police station, and police detectives would be sent out to investigate the case immediately. With reference to the incident already occurred the chief of police made arrangements with Lieutenant Singer for the men concerned to come in and give their story to Captain Kennedy, of the detective bureau. Lieutenant Singer said he would do this. Captain Kennedy was called into the office and the matter of making this investigation was referred to him.

On Friday, November 9, shortly after 8 o'clock, Lieutenant Singer called Captain Kennedy and said that it would be no good to send the men in as they could not identify their assailants. Captain Kennedy told him that the police nevertheless wanted to interview the men and have a report made showing the location and the time and circumstances of the attacks made.

On the occasion of Lieutenant Singer's call on Chief Gabrielson on November 8 the chief told him that he would strengthen the force in the Damon Tract area. One extra patrolman was placed in the area on Friday, November 9, for the afternoon and early evening shift. The chief also checked in the Record Bureau relative to incidents in which servicemen were involved in the Damon Tract area and the last report which the police had was on September 9, 1945. Since that date no complaint had been made to the department relative to incidents in that area in which servicemen were involved, except to the extent indicated above concerning Lieutenant Singer's call.

The first knowledge the police had of the riot on Monday night, November 12, was about 10:15 p. m. As Officer Kaiser approached gate No. 2 of the naval air station he saw the street filled with sailors. They were armed with sticks, clubs, rocks, bars, and knives. This group consisted of about 250. At about the same time a call came in to the police station from Mrs. Nunes on Kaimana Road, another road, reporting the activities of another group which turned out to be about 500 men.

Immediately all available officers were sent into the Damon Tract area. The shore patrol responded with a detachment of shore patrolmen. The military police were not called out but some were present because they regularly ride with the police and shore patrol.

With the assistance of the officers of the day from the airport the men were gotten

back into the reservation. By 11:20 p. m. when the chief got there they were all back in the reservation.

There were approximately 45 enlisted men arrested, and a Lieutenant Coleman was arrested by Police Lieutenant Wilson on information that he told the sailors to go back to the airport, throw their identification cards away, and come out again with sticks and clubs. This was later denied by Lieutenant Coleman, but three military police heard some sailors say Lieutenant Coleman told them that. These sailors were not identified, although they were pointed out in the mob by the military police.

Officer Kaiser saw Lieutenant Coleman going up and down P Road in a jeep with a red signal light in the front of the jeep. He stopped Lieutenant Coleman and asked him for assistance in talking to the crowd and trying to get them back into the reservation. Lieutenant Coleman said that he was only junior officer of the day and that they would have to see the senior officer of the day. So far as the police know, it had never been the practice for the junior officer of the day to patrol outside the naval reservation.

After Lieutenant Coleman was arrested by Police Lieutenant Wilson, he was questioned, and a transcribed statement was taken by Officer Harry H. Phillips. He stated that the incident had been called to his attention while he was in the reservation, and he had come out through one of the other gates and worked his way back; that he was investigating. Coleman was not charged by the police; he was held for investigation and turned back to the Navy that night at approximately 2 a. m.

The sailors in the mob told the police officers that two sailors had been killed that night, which was not the truth. The source of that rumor was not discovered.

The mob got up as far as Kamehameha Highway; that is, about two blocks up from the naval reservation, a distance of about one-third of a mile. Generally speaking, they went into very few yards. Most of the damage was done by the throwing of rocks and other missiles from the street. A window was broken and screens were broken where rocks had been thrown through.

Two men riding by on motorcycles were yanked off and picked up and beaten. Paul Shaw, a defense worker, was pushed into his house. He bolted his door and turned his lights off (at the demand of the sailors). His screaming and shouting attracted Mrs. Nunes (who put in the call). A. D. Ortiz, Kaimana Road, was at the front gate of his yard when a group of 40 sailors got hold of him and said they were going to beat up all the men but they weren't going to molest the women. He told them that he was an ex-Navy man and has a son in the Navy now and that he was their friend. This group said two sailors had been murdered, which wasn't true. They let Ortiz go back into his house and told him to put out the lights.

One car was damaged, not to a great extent. The body was dented in spots. This car was in a private garage. Another car, on the street, was pushed along and left near the entrance to the reservation.

Police collected a large envelope full of knives. From one car a bayonet was recovered. This car was found at a gate of the reservation. Earlier, it had been stopped by civilian police who found it contained four sailors, each armed with a hammer. The driver of the car gunned it through the crowd and narrowly missed running over some police officers.

At 12 m. on Monday, November 12, another call came in reporting the sailors were throwing rocks from the naval area at civilian houses outside of the naval reservation. Another group of officers was sent out. That is when Mr. Gutheridge, a 74-year-old man died. They were throwing rocks at the house next to him and he was looking out the window and keeled over. The Navy got a detachment of marines from Camp Catlin and posted them to stop any further disturbance.

On November 13, at 11 a. m., a meeting was held with Admiral H. E. Overesch, chief of staff, Fourteenth Naval District. Present were senior shore patrol officer Commander Morris and several other Navy officers, Chief of Police Gabrielson, Captain Kennedy, and Lieutenant Wilson. Lieutenant Wilson told the admiral just what he saw. Admiral Overesch stated that he would convene a board of inquiry to go into the causes of the riot, and that further investigations were being made.

At the meeting with Admiral Overesch a lieutenant of the air base made a statement that there was a sailor who came back to the base before the riot and reported that he had been beaten up and robbed of $60, that this took place someplace near the civic auditorium. A shore patrol officer and a detective investigated this alleged robbery and it turned out that the man was drunk and doesn't know what happened, also that it happened after the riot instead of before.

There are 15 streets in Damon Tract. Only three lead to entrances into naval air station. There are no street lights. The area concerned consists of about three-fourths of a square mile, which includes the three streets leading to gates into the reservation. At this time the force in this area consists of a prowl car manned by two police officers, a Navy jeep with a shore patrol, and a police officer, and another car with a police sergeant. These three cars have nothing else to do but to prevent any disturbance in this area. There also is one marine jeep with two marines patrolling that area.

On Wednesday, November 14, Chief Gabrielson assigned two cars, one of them to work the area Ewa of Nuuanu as far out as Damon Tract, and the other Waikiki of Nuuanu out to Kaimuki. Each car has a police officer, a shore patrol, and a military police. Their duty is to watch out for hoodlums and break up fights. Also, a month ago, the evening watch was instructed to pay particular attention to any groups of these young fellows and to bust them up.

For months past police detectives have been assigned at night to investigate every assault case and the investigation shows that 50 percent of the time local men and 50 percent of the time men of the armed forces are causing fights. Generally, there have been no greater number of complaints of sailors from the naval air station being beaten up in the Damon Tract area than there have been complaints from other sections of the city.

Captain Kennedy states that of the complaints reported of assaults on members of the armed forces better than three-fourths of the cases have been cleared, that is, arrests have been made. When the cases come on for trial many of them are thrown out because the prosecution's witnesses, men of the armed forces, have left the islands. Mr. Fairbanks, the public prosecutor, concurred in this statement.

With reference to the incidents which Lieutenant Singer reported on November 8, although the men have not been sent in to make reports, the police department started investigations Tuesday night and has evidence as to the identity of four of the "residents" of Damon Tract involved, some of whom are former residents now in the Army. Detectives have been sent out to interview the sailors who reported the incidents Lieutenant Singer mentioned.

So far as investigation discloses in cases of similar intidents between sailors and so-called hoodlums the civilians have been between the ages of 14 and 20. There is no evidence of organized criminal gangs, nor of any grouping of racial lines.

In conclusion, it is my opinion that the police department is doing everything in its power to prevent fights between civilians and men of the armed forces or crimes against men of the armed forces and to apprehend the offenders; in short, that proper police protection is being furnished. Furthermore there is no evidence that, aside from the riot of the sailors in the Damon Tract, anything has occurred which is unusual, considering the size of the city, the large number of men as compared with women, the free availability of liquor, and the fact that since the surrender of Japan there has been a general let-down of morale and many men of the armed forces have little to do except await transportation home. The high degree of morale among men of the armed forces and civilians, present before the surrender of Japan, cannot be expected now.

Respectfully,

RHODA V. LEWIS,
Acting Attorney General.

Proposed Acquisition of St. Johns College by the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 3 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Annapolis Shadow," from the Washington Post. It pertains to the attempt on the part of the Navy to bring about the condemnation of St. John's College. The editorial speaks for itself, and makes perfectly clear, in my judgment, that the National Government should proceed without delay to notify the college in the immediate future whether it is going to be allowed to function as one of the little colleges of this country. It cannot do so with this constant shadow of destruction hanging over its head. I think the Navy should be big enough to inform the Government what its final plans are in regard to St. John's College, and to call upon the Congress of the United States to vote it up or down. As for me, I intend to cast my vote against the attempt to destroy the college.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNAPOLIS SHADOW

The long, dark shadow of the United States Naval Academy continues to hang over the campus of St. John's College at Annapolis. It is a shadow which does serious injury to the college even if the ugly intent which casts it should never be realized. For the threat of the Naval Academy to take over St. John's—a threat which can be carried into execution if the Naval Affairs Committees of Congress authorize the Navy to undertake such arbitrary action—puts the college in a most unhappy and precarious position. Students who may wish to enroll in the institution have no way of knowing that it will remain at its present site long enough for them to complete their academic careers. The faculty and trustees have no way of planning for the future.

The shadow ought to have been removed long ago. The House Naval Affairs Committee which held extensive hearings on the Navy Department's request for power to ac-

quire St. John's has had ample time to reach a decision. It has complicated its deliberations on the subject by taking into account wholly extraneous considerations such as the nature of the Navy's postwar educational program. Whatever this program may be, it is absurd to pretend that its execution can depend upon the acquisition of a single small piece of land belonging to a neighboring seat of learning. The issue to be determined by the Naval Affairs Committee, so far as St. John's is concerned, is a very simple one—whether the existence of an old and honored academic institution is to be sacrificed to suit the convenience of a service school on the transparent pretext that such a seizure is essential to the national security.

The issue stated in this way answers itself. There is room enough in a free society for liberal arts colleges to exist along with training schools for the armed forces. Indeed, as independent experts have testified, there is room enough for the two to exist side by side even in Annapolis—at only a slight sacrifice of convenience and only a negligible added dollar cost. We cannot doubt that the House Naval Affairs Committee will think the preservation of St. John's worth this extra expense and this relatively trivial inconvenience to the Naval Academy. The committee ought to separate this simple problem from the larger problem of the Navy's postwar education program and render a verdict on it without any more delay. We hope that it will erase the shadow over St. John's—and erase it so definitely that it can never be cast again.

American Chosen for Vatican Mission to Yugoslavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Boston Daily Globe of November 26, 1945:

AMERICAN CHOSEN FOR VATICAN MISSION TO YUGOSLAVIA

(By John G. Harris)

WASHINGTON, November 24.—Americans of all walks of life will follow with interest the unique mission on which Most Rev. Joseph P. Hurley, D. D., Catholic bishop of St. Augustine, Fla., internationally noted for his vigorous condemnation of Nazi inhumanities, will leave the United States soon for Yugoslavia.

The bishop will undertake a diplomatic service for the Pope, in that war-ravaged country. He will leave America, according to present preparations, early next month. En route to the scene of his endeavors he will stop at the Vatican for an audience.

Bishop Hurley will be the first Catholic clergyman to go officially to Europe on a postwar mission for the Pope. Only a few weeks ago he was named by the Pope as regent ad interim of the Apostolic Nunciature in Belgrade.

Friends and admirers of the bishop in America are numberless. During the war Bishop Hurley strenuously assailed Nazi tyranny and deplored consistently the shameful treatment of Poland. He devoted himself to the welfare of members of our armed forces and was indefatigable in his efforts on behalf of persecuted peoples all over the world. He is held in the highest regard by Americans regardless of creed. They will follow with interest his mission. Though no announcement has been made, the objective appears to be, the reestablishment of the Catholic Church in Yugoslavia.

The importance of such a mission is understood fully in the United States. Bishop Hurley's progress will be closely observed. He has a singular background for his task. He was formerly secretary to the Most Reverend Edward Mooney, now Archbishop of Detroit, when the latter served as apostolic delegate to India from 1928 to 1931. In 1931 through 1933 he continued as secretary to Archbishop Mooney when the latter went to Japan as apostolic delegate to that country.

Bishop Hurley continued in Japan t> the winter of 1933 as charge d'affaires of the apostolic delegation in Tokyo. From 1934 until his appointment as Bishop of St. Augustine in 1940 Bishop Hurley was an attaché of the secretariate of state of the Vatican.

The ceremony of his consecration as bishop on October 6, 1940, took place in the chapel of Propaganda College. The late Cardinal Luigi Maglione, then papal secretary of state, officiated. In attendance were three cardinals, eight archbishops, numerous prelates, members of the diplomatic corps, representatives of various ecclesiastical and missionary congregations.

Pope Pius XII received Bishop Hurley in private audience and give him a pectoral cross, a gold ring set with a topaz, and a gold cross engraved with eucharistic symbols. Many other gifts were presented the new bishop by the staff of the papal secretariate of state.

Bishop Hurley was born in Cleveland, Ohio, January 21, 1894. He attended Holy Name School and St. Ignatius High School there. He made his philosophical studies at St. Bernard's Seminary, Rochester, N. Y., and his theological studies at St. Mary's Seminary, Cleveland. He was ordained to the priesthood May 29, 1910, by Bishop John F. Farreley, fourth bishop of Cleveland. He served as assistant pastor at Youngstown and Cleveland and for a time was professor of psychology at the Ursuline College, Cleveland.

Bishop Hurley, the sixth Ordinary of St. Augustine, has found time to engage in many charitable endeavors. He is episcopal moderator of the family life conference, National Catholic Welfare Conference. It was under his guidance that two important national Catholic conferences on family life were conducted at the Catholic University of America.

His past life is grounds for the hope that his forthcoming mission will contribute to the firmer establishment of peace.

Sympathetic Relief Tends To Encourage Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am glad to submit for the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Des Moines Tribune and which speaks for itself. I am proud that it compliments a committee of which I have the honor to be the chairman. It follows:

G. O. P. STATESMANSHIP

House Republicans appointed a food study committee not long ago to look into the matter of European relief policies and report back to the minority party.

The committee sent its conclusions to Floor Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Sunday. It recommended that $550,000,000 of additional United States funds be appropriated to UNRRA immediately and that more be supplied during the coming winter if necessary.

Relief of the desperate peoples of Europe, so recently our allies, said the committee, is in "our own security and self-interest."

But what impresses us even more is the broad, statesmanlike reasons why the committee recommends these humanitarian, enlightened attitudes toward Europe's needs. Listen to this:

"The atomic bomb cannot be successfully outlawed, suppressed, or monopolized. We can prevent its use in warfare again only by building a world in which there will be no war.

"The seeds of peace do not thrive in an environment of hunger, disillusionment, and disease. Everything we can do, therefore, to alleviate suffering in Europe this winter will be a sound investment in peace for the world, security for ourselves, and control of the atomic bomb in the only way it can be controlled—by removing the desire to make war."

Now we're beginning to exercise some gray matter!

This is the most fundamental common sense about the interrelationship of hunger and security and war that we have seen in a long time, not excluding recent official pronouncements.

It is significant that it comes from members of the Republican side, which is frequently accused of isolationism and reaction.

What a difference it will make—what incalculable promise it will hold—if the G. O. P. "hooks on" to this thoughtful, reasoned line and really takes the leadership in implementing it!

Bring the Marines Out of China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, today I want to insert a letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of the Members, all of whom are deeply interested in conditions confronting our Government and, particularly, our troops who are still stationed in China.

This letter comes from a soldier of the First Marine Division, who has been through the Guadalcanal and Okinawa campaigns and who, after the surrender of Japan, was transferred to Peiping, China, in the middle of the Nationalist-Communist Chinese trouble.

His letter gives some interesting first-hand information and indicates the seriousness of the situation, and certainly indicates the necessity for the withdrawal of our troops from China.

The letter follows:

TANGKU, CHINA, *November 13, 1945.*

DEAR DAD: This letter is meant mainly for you. I'd like to have you pass on its contents to the St. Louis papers, or one of them and put your name on it, or the usual "officer's name withheld." Here's the scoop.

Today General Wedemeyer stated that the marines would remain in north China until the "unsettled affairs are settled." That means that we must repatriate the Japs at

the rate of 76,000 a month for 33 months as there are 2,500,000 of them here. That means we are protecting the Chinese nationalists from the Communists. That is the truth. We are preventing the Communists from controlling this area until the Nationalists get here. In short we're deciding what government China should have. We are doing exactly what we told Russia not to do. No wonder they don't trust us in Russia.

Third, today a Jap came up to one of our officers and asked, "I'm looking for some Standard Oil men to come in here. I want an inventory before they arrive." We're protecting their tanks against the Chinese Communists.

Fourth, we are protecting the Japs from the Chinese. Boy, what a set-up.

Now, then a few arguments that we out here feel are justified:

1. Are Americans repatriating Germans out of Russia? Or are Russians repatriating Japs out of China? Both answers are "No." China now has troops enough for repatriation. The Japs are disarmed and completely willing to obey their Emperor's order. My point is that the United States job is finished here. We accepted the Jap surrender, but we are in an Allied nation and they should take care of their own repatriation problems. Russia is doing it, so can China. A question: If Russia was threatened by civil war would we rush troops in there to prevent it? Well, that's just what we're doing here. Are Wedemeyer and Truman using the repatriation as a pretext for actually settling Chiang's revolution for him? The price for it is keeping a corps of marines here under an Army commander who will keep us here while sending his own troops home. Dad, if I could only impress you with the bitter hatred that exists among the marines over this, perhaps you could understand how we feel.

2. Is the foreign policy of America going to be that of preventing revolutions in other nations? We are following that policy now here in China. Soon this war will break and we'll be in the middle of it, unable to get out. We are protecting Chiang's men and cities now, but when the Communists start trouble we can't prevent them from taking over. We are being eased into war with these Communists because if they shoot at us, as they have and will, we must shoot back. It is rotten, Dad, and you people must act and act at once. The only thing to prevent the inevitable is for Chiang and the Communists to call off the war. It looks from here as though even that is too late.

3. Is our Navy to be used for ferrying supplies to the Dutch in Java or for getting our troops home? Sure, the Dutch are in trouble in Java, but the British have ships as do the Aussies and French. We have a great fleet, but when a group of ships carrying United States troops are stopped at Hollandia, the troops ordered off, and supplies for Java put aboard, then it is time to call a halt. That little story we got from our First Marine Division news sheet.

Well, Dad, there you have it. Am I griping too much, or am I asking the same things you are? What the hell is the trouble back there? * * * Byrnes says, "All marines in north China will leave immediately." Wedemeyer says a couple of days later, "All marines will remain in China until the unsettled affairs are settled." What the devil is coming off? We—yes, we—are the ones who should say: We're here, not in Washington. * * *

Today Wedemeyer says, "A few clashes between marines and Communists have taken place. It is regrettable." You are damn right it is regrettable. A few marines have been hurt. Sure, he'll keep the marines here while the Army goes home. * * *

Dad, I've written a lot. I've made my words and sentences strong. I don't like to swear in writing, but I'm boiling and so is everyone else. We've all been writing home. * * * We will assist other nations, but we will not run their governments. We can't do everything and we can't carry the whole world on our shoulders. So forgive me if I seem bitter or seditious, but this sort of thing must stop, and you people must force the withdrawal of marines from China before some of our men, possibly me or anyone, gets his Purple Heart for doing China's job for the Chinese for no purpose or reason.

Best of luck, Dad.

Your son.

Resolutions of Wayne County Farm Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, timely and important resolutions were adopted by the Wayne County (Iowa) Farm Bureau Federation at its annual meeting.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein this set of resolutions:

WAYNE COUNTY FARM BUREAU RESOLUTIONS FOR 1945–46

I. STATE INCOME TAX

We favor the return of 100 percent collection of the State income tax. Income and sales tax is the fair way of taxation.

II. REA

We favor the establishment of rural electric lines to furnish electricity for all farm homes in the county, and we believe that the REA serving farm families through nonprofit cooperatives should be exempt from taxation. We also favor the establishment of legislation to compel the public utilities to service all farms in a community or sell out to a company that will service all homes.

III. PERFECTING AND MAINTAINING WORLD ORDER

We know that war can and must be prevented. We believe that the work started at the San Francisco Conference by more than 50 different nations to maintain world order should be continued and given full support by our Government. We believe that our agricultural problem is international and should be treated as such. We favor military training in peacetime only when it is used to prepare a defense for our country and to train our young men for a vocation.

IV. NATIONAL AND DOMESTIC ECONOMY

We believe that in order to pay our high war debt that we must maintain a high economy. To accomplish this we believe labor, industry, and agriculture must work together in every way possible for a full production and full employment.

V. AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION AND PRICING

We believe: (a) Retain parity as a permanent guide and work toward a program of "parity at the market place," which would include farm wages; (b) encourage full production with support prices; (c) retain commodity loans; (d) further develop foreign markets; and (e) crop insurance should be further studied.

VI. SOIL CONSERVATION AND FERTILITY

We believe that the Soil Conservation Service should be further developed and that a major part of AAA should be to develop soil conservation and more emphasis placed on the pasture-improvement project. We favor the national fertilizer program as has been outlined and suggested to Congress by the American Farm Bureau.

VII

We favor a school reorganization program which includes a maximum of local control consistent with equalization, taxing the wealth where it is, and spending it on children where they are.

VIII

We wish to commend the work of AAA, PCA, SCS, FSA, Extension Service, and REA, and especially wish to recommend that the REA be expanded as soon as possible as a postwar measure. We feel, however, that some of these credit agencies might be combined. We urge the continuation of AAA as a medium of balance between production and consumption and also favor an economy of abundance rather than one of scarcity. We recommend more Farm Bureau members avail themselves of the benefits of the Iowa Farm Mutual Insurance Co. and also those contemplating buying life insurance should investigate the new Iowa Farm Bureau Life Insurance Co.

IX

We urge the holding of township monthly Farm Bureau meetings and believe the Farm Bureau should be advertised by local newspapers and billboard and feel that the State office should stand a part of such expense. We believe the encouragement of 4–H Club work to be one of the best means of developing active, well-informed agricultural leadership; also group discussion of timely topics at township meetings. We believe it to be highly important to maintain an aggressive, militant nongovernmental organization of farmers to give united voice of agriculture during the postwar period of reconstruction. We reaffirm our commendation of the Wayne County newspapers, Chamber of Commerce and businessmen of Corydon, for their cooperation and financial aid in 4–H work, pasture improvement contest, and other Farm Bureau activities. We wish to thank all of those who have volunteered to take part in the program of work, membership drive, and this annual meeting.

X

We believe that the improvement of farm-to-market roads should be made a No. 1 postwar program, with emphasis being placed on rural mail routes and school-bus routes. We recommend that the State highway road law or routings and specifications in regard to width of grade, preparation of roadbed, etc., be changed in order to allow the use of State and Federal funds in the surfacing of the same. We believe that this should be done with a maximum of efficiency.

KENNEDY FENNELL,
Chairman.
Mrs. G. D. GARTON.
J. C. KURTZ.
HOWARD VINCENT.
Mrs. LOUDENE EMPEY.

A Tribute To American Fairness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLOS P. ROMULO

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, the other day I included in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the November 9 issue of the Washington Post and also my reply to it published on November 13. The day following my insertion of these articles in the RECORD, the Washington Post printed an editorial entitled "Philippine Future"

which, under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to insert herein.

The Washington Post once more shows that American sense of fairness which I have always admired and praised. In taking the stand that it does in this second editorial, it reveals how anxious it is to do us justice in the Philippines. And it touches on what I consider the core of Filipino-American relations when it stresses that Philippine independence on July 4, 1946, does not mean cutting us loose from the United States. As the editorial aptly says: "We shall only be entering upon another type of relationship which must remain intimate and cordial for the sake of both peoples and for the sake of world peace."

As we now undertake the task of adjusting the economic relations between the Philippines and the United States, I wish to call the attention of this Congress particularly to the reference in the editorial to the American air and naval bases in the Philippines after independence:

Powerful American bases are to be built in the Philippines for the purpose of keeping enemies more distant from our shores, for protection of the islands, and preservation of peace in the Pacific. Use of those bases will necessitate unity of action between the United States and the Philippines in any future war in the Pacific. In fact, the islands will continue to be dependent upon the United States for defense and the United States will be dependent upon them for support of our foreign policy in the Far East. The relationship might be described as that of associate nations.

It is most appropriate that on the same day, Saturday, December 1, the New York Times published an editorial entitled "In Memory of a Lost Battle," which recalls that the Filipinos and Americans fought together as brothers in arms for the same cause—a comradeship that will weld our two nations more strongly together as the years pass by, regardless of whatever political ties there may be between our two countries.

The two editorials I refer to follow:

[From the Washington Post]

PHILIPPINE FUTURE

One key to the future of the turbulent Far East is certain to be the relationship between the United States and the Philippine Islands. It follows that this relationship ought to be thoughtfully analyzed now that Congress is interesting itself in rehabilitation of the Philippines and readjustment of trade relations between the islands and the United States. We do not believe that either of these problems can be solved satisfactorily without a realistic understanding as to what the basic relation between the two countries will be.

It is well known that the Philippines will become independent next July 4. Some Filipinos and some Americans regret this fact, but it is unlikely that the law will be changed. The Filipinos still cherish the idea of independence. Certainly they have earned the right to manage their own affairs. The United States, for its part, is thoroughly committed to the principle of self-government for all peoples capable of it. That is the key to the policy which we have tried to establish through the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations Organization. The fact remains that the United States and the Philippines have mutual interests which continue to tie them together.

Powerful American bases are to be built in the Philippines for the purpose of keeping enemies more distant from our shores, for protection of the islands and preservation of peace in the Pacific. Use of those bases will necessitate unity of action between the United States and the Philippines in any future war in the Pacific. In fact, the islands will continue to be dependent upon the United States for defense and the United States will be dependent upon them for support of our foreign policy in the Far East. The relationship might be described as that of associate nations.

We think this overshadowing fact should guide Congress in adjusting our economic relations with the Philippines. The Bell bill before the Ways and Means Committee gives fleeting recognition of this fact by providing that free trade with the Philippines shall continue for 8 years after independence becomes effective. Such trade would then be gradually strangled by applying 4 percent of the normal duty and increasing it 4 percent each year. In short, this measure attempts to encourage the development of Philippine industries that could not be expected to continue operating after the full duties became effective. There would certainly be much confusion, too, from the annual shift in duty rates. If a staggered duty system is to be applied, we think it would be much better to start with a low rate of, say, 5 percent, with increases every 5 or 6 years. But the special relationship between the two countries makes it doubtful whether full duties should ever be applied.

We appreciate the fact that the United States is urging Great Britain and other countries to liberalize their preferential tariff systems. If this movement should succeed on a world-wide basis, the effect would be to ease the trade problem everywhere, including the Philippines. Meanwhile it appears essential to give special consideration to Philippine trade. Overextension of such industries as sugar and coconut oil can be prevented, as contemplated in the Bell bill, through the maintenance of quotas.

The rehabilitation bill, too, can be used to strengthen the islands economically. As reported to the Senate, it calls for $480,000,000 to pay Filipino claims for damages, for public works, and training of Filipinos to speed up reconstruction. Actual wartime damages in the Philippines, however, are variously estimated from $800,000,000 up. Why should not compensation be made in full, except to collaborators, with the proviso that funds granted because of industrial destruction be reinvested in Philippine industry? The United States clearly has a powerful interest in restoring the islands to economic health and in retaining the good will of the Filipino people. For we shall not be cutting them loose next July. We shall only be entering upon another type of relationship which must remain intimate and cordial for the sake of both peoples and for the sake of world peace.

[From the New York Times]

IN MEMORY OF A LOST BATTLE

While General Yamashita, the conqueror of 1942, sat in a Manila courtroom this week President Osmeña, of the Philippine Commonwealth, signed an order creating a national park on the Bataan Peninsula. No battleground more richly deserves to be set aside in this way. To the end of human time Bataan will speak of the common heroism of Filipinos fighting for the freedom of their islands and of Americans defending a soil to which the United States intended soon to relinquish all claim. About 5,000 Americans, including infantry, grounded airmen, Signal Corps men and engineers, and about 30,000 Filipinos, half of them recruits who learned war by waging it, held the lines on this peninsula for 3 months. They did not surrender until two out of every three were sick or wounded and Yamashita, riding high, was pounding them from planes they could not rise to meet and overwhelming them with fresh troops landed in their rear.

The times have changed. The Japanese tide has receded. Yamashita, who won at Bataan, may envy Homma, who failed. An episode in a war which engulfed millions might be forgotten. But it will not be. Bataan is sacred to something nobler than victory; to sacrifice in a battle that could not be won, to the mutual devotion of men from the east and men from the west shedding their blood for a cause that each, speaking his own dialect, understood.

An American Soldier Writes Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1945

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter:

I wish there was some way that we, the American soldier, could get it across to the people of the United States that it is essential to keep drafting young men and to have a much larger Army, Navy, and Air Force from now on, than we did before this war started. If they would just sit down and think about it they would see for themselves. But, no, they have almost forgotten that nazism and fascism almost ruled the world. I am afraid people have been led to believe that the States were never in real danger. We were just lucky, that's all. The Germans were not in Norway and Denmark for training purposes alone. Congress had better get down to business and establish a draft law that will hold water for some time to come.

After redeployment is over, the Army had better be revamped, too. There are many reasons why I say this. First of all, there are too many officers, too much rank, and too many unnecessary jobs. There is too much red tape to have anything work freely. While we were at war smart officers did not wait for red tape to be cut. They went ahead and did what had been proven to be the best after being tested in combat. That is why Patton, Bradley, Eisenhower, were such wonderful leaders. You'd be surprised how many times the "book" was thrown away. Things we learned in tank classes in the States would have meant sudden death over here if we had followed them. Those men knew that.

You wonder why I write you this instead of waiting until I get home. Well, we know it can't wait. The soldiers coming over from the States to relieve the Army of Occupation don't have the slightest idea of what the basic reasons are. They think they are going to have fun, make friends, and influence people. They are partially right in their thinking. They will undoubtedly make friends, but the Germans, through the frauleins (our weakest spot), are going to influence them. I know. I saw it happen time and time again. GI's fighting among themselves, defending what each other's so-called girl friend said. Even some of the combat men forgot that these girls' brothers or fathers undoubtedly killed a good many of our boys. "It is hard to see," say the boys. The propoganda these German girls are putting across gripes me. At times I think the nonfraternization policy was too lenient. It is too late to try to enforce it now, but classes could be and should be open to the Army of Occupation men, combating this propaganda. The Army could put it across, I know.

The Germans are better fed than any other country. They aren't starving—that's for sure. When we were in Germany the waitresses were being better fed than the GI's, and they don't do housework and waiting on tables alone. It's disgusting. How can an enlisted man respect officers with this going on? The German prisoners of war are fed better than the Geneva Convention stipulates. I know this for a fact, too. If the people don't get on the ball back there we will lose the peace, just as we did the last time. The Germans haven't lost yet. They are still getting their sweet, innocent propaganda across. This might be a little contradictory to what I wrote you shortly after the surrender, but the poor (?) farmers had me starting to believe their stories of hatred for Hitler. Ha! The majority of the German people were behind nazism all the way through. Some still are, only they try to hide it. If they weren't they could have stopped Hitler any time.

The more articles printed in popular magazines, such as Reader's Digest, Coronet, and a few others, along with talks by men who know what they are saying—who give facts, examples—men who hold public attention and respect, will help much. Films produced and shown with popular pictures, that put across just what the people of Germany are trying to do now might open some eyes. The Germans are trying, and succeeding, too, in shortening the period of our occupation. The quicker, then, will they be able to start building toward another war.

The next war will be a dilly if the four great powers, United States, England, Russia, and China, don't keep up their military might. Russia and the United States will not fight each other. They are each afraid of the other. The Germans would love to see a war between them. I know that, as a fact, too. The Russians are great people. The people of the United States should know more about them. Basically they think the same. The only difference is in the methods they employ to make their ideas work. Well, that's enough of that for now.

False Teaching Shown Cause of Atrocities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by C. H. Rutherford from the Morristown (N. J.) Daily Record of November 28, 1945:

FALSE TEACHING SHOWN CAUSE OF ATROCITIES

(By C. H. Rutherford, minister, Little Church in the Wildwood)

Japanese atrocity stories, now being released from Manila, are almost too cruel to believe. Little 11-year-old Rosalinda Andoy with her mother and hundreds of other women and children were crowded into a church and grenades thrown in which killed the majority, including her mother. The rest were then bayoneted. Little Rosalinda has the scars of 38 bayonet wounds. When rescued, her intestines were protruding through these wounds. This same Jap commander crowded several hundred women and children into a large public room, placed food and candy upon a table in the center of the room and as they all rushed for the food, a huge bomb was exploded in their midst. He also ordered systematic rape among the best families in Manila. We explained these inhuman actions by saying, "The Japs are savages. These atrocities result from the lack of civilization."

We were just as greatly shocked and also puzzled when we read about the German atrocities and saw pictures of the prison camps in the movies. Many asked, "How is it possible for civilized people to do these things?" They referred to such things as the German girl leaders tying women's legs together at childbirth and laughing while they died in pain, or to the male attendants who deliberately killed thousands of women in gas chambers and starved many more thousands. When one stops to think of the atrocities that were practiced in Germany under the direction of highly educated leaders, we know that lack of civilization was not the reason why.

WHY BRUTALITY OF CIVILIZED GERMANS EQUALED CRUELTY OF BARBARIC JAPANESE

There is a reason, however, which explains why the German cruelty equaled that of the Japs—a reason why the actions of both were so similar. It is important for everyone to understand this reason, so that the United States in its race for higher educational standards will not make the same mistake which Germany and Japan made.

Students of history know that what happened in the German and Japanese prison camps was not abnormal or unnatural. What we, today, call inhuman treatment of prisoners of war was customary and expected, prior to the Christian era, and is still normal procedure where the teachings of Christ have not permeated. Those who have read Beau Geste and the other stories of Sir Christopher Wren regarding the activities of the French Foreign Legion in north Africa shuddered with horror as they read how some tribes treated captured Christians. One method was to lift up a live man and with great force impale his body upon a meat hook on an outside wall. He would not die rapidly but the hot sun, the thousands of flies, the muscular pain of his body hanging on the hook, as well as the infected wound, made him long for death. When our soldiers took part in the early battles of north Africa, they could not understand why free hospital and medical service was not given by the wealthy natives to their fellow citizens who lined the streets with open sores around their eyes and other parts of the body, begging, begging, begging. Our boys had forgotten that free hospitals, orphans' homes, public sanitation, and other evidences of real love for fellow men, progressed with Christianity and not with civilization. Our boys saw the same inhuman conditions in north Africa that existed there 2,000 years ago. There is just one reason why—and that is Christianity had not permeated that section of the country.

JAPANESE INHUMANITY ANTEDATED WAR

The same applies to Japan. Forty-five years ago, a friend of mine returned from Japan as a missionary and told a story which makes every nerve in my body tingle with horror. Along with others, he rushed to a building which was burning down and was told that it contained girls who had been sold, for immoral purposes, to the owner of the building. If he let the girls out, they might escape and he would lose valuable property. If he locked them in and the fire extinguished in time, he would save valuable property. If the fire was not extinguished in time he would, of course, lose the girls but would be no worse off than if they escaped, so he locked the girls in and my friend witnessed their enforced cremation. He was amazed at no one objecting or forcing the owner to liberate the girls. The bystanders all agreed that he had a perfect right to use this means of trying to protect his property.

The inhumanity of the Japs did not begin with this war and is not confined to their national enemies. It is one of the normal, natural qualities found among the majority of the people who have not been affected either directly or indirectly by the teachings of God.

ROME CIVILIZED BUT INHUMAN

For example, after Rome had reached a high degree of civilization, the Roman senate promised Carthage that its freedom and territorial integrity would be preserved provided Carthage turned over to the Roman consuls 300 children of the noblest families as hostages. The Carthaginians compiled, relatives crowded the shores crying and screaming and some mothers committed suicide. After receiving the hostages Carthage was attacked, homes with their owners in them destroyed by fire and the survivors sold as slaves.

Yes; civilization, both ancient and modern, is filled with inhumanity, brutality and blood-spilling atrocities. On the other hand, national brutality is reduced in proportion to the degree in which Christianity controls the population. The more Christianity, the less brutality.

GERMAN LEADERS REPUDIATED CHRISTIANITY

One might well ask, "How, then do you account for the German brutality which equaled that of the Japanese?" "It is due to Christianity losing control in Germany." The fact that nazism attempted to replace Christianity with a new, pagan belief is known by all newspaper readers. Our general public, however, does not know that the Prussian militarists and intellectual leaders of Germany have for several generations repudiated Christ, denied the historic character of the Gospels and have referred to the entire New Testament as a collection of myths. The Prussian militarists and the intellectual leaders of Germany were more civilized than the Japanese and the fanatical Bedouins but they had no greater belief in the Bible, in Christ, and in the Christian religion than these pagans.

It is vitally important for us to follow from the beginning the progress of the atheistic teaching in Germany which finally controlled the thinking of more than 90 percent of the leaders because as it spread through their universities, it was taken over by a few of the educational leaders in England and the United States and later on under the title of "higher criticism," it permeated the postgraduate schools in this country, and then started on its course of saturating every educational organization—first the colleges, then the science and history teachers in high schools, and it is even heard today in upper grades of the public grammar schools throughout the entire United States.

MADE IN GERMANY AND TAUGHT IN OUR SCHOOLS

Many teachers who today are teaching our children that the miracles recorded in the New Testament never happened; that the Old Testament stores are merely fables and folk lore; that Jesus Christ is no more God's son than you and I are; and that the Bible is no better than Shakespeare, do not realize that this teaching originated in Germany and was the cause of Germany's downfall, so I shall briefly trace from the beginning the history of this atheistic teaching which is called higher criticism.

In 1706 the University of Halle in Prussia appointed Christian Wolff professor of philosophy. In 1719 he published a book stating that either the doctrines and miracles claimed by Christianity are capable of demonstration or are not worthy of belief. In many state universities today students are being taught that if God cannot be seen, heard, felt, tasted, or smelt he does not exist, but they do not know that this teaching bears an unseen label, "Made in Germany." Acceptance by other German theologians of Professor Wolff's teachings resulted in a translation of the Bible to embody them and by 1740 many German philosophers had been won over to

his skeptical teachings. At that time a popular, keen-witted prince (Frederick the Great) ascended the throne and made Wolff his protégé. History says that this king contributed more than any other man of his day to the progress of skepticism.

GERMAN ATHEISTS' CLAIMS PROVEN FALSE

In 1745 Professor Reimarus at Hamburg wrote a 1,400-page manuscript criticizing the orthodox belief in Christ; in 1796 Herder, another German, made skeptical statements regarding the Four Gospels; and in 1828 Heinrich Paulus taught that there were no evidences of Christ having miraculous power. In 1835 Davis Strauss wrote massive volumes claiming the miracles were myths and that Jesus was a mere human. Ferdinand C. Baur likewise attacked the Epistles of St. Paul in 1836 and in 1840 Bruno Bauer wrote passionately trying to show that Jesus was a myth and that the doctrine regarding Him was devised in the second century from a fusion of Jewish, Greek, and Roman religion.

Other German educators who taught that the fundamental Christian doctrines were "superstitious folly" or who repudiated Christ or promoted anti-Christian thinking were J. G. Fichte, who lived from 1762 to 1814, Jocobi (1743–1819), Hegel (1770–1831), J. H. Rohr (court preacher and superintendent at Weimar, Wegscheider (1771–1849), J. E. G. Paulus (1761–1851).

The German skeptics who were called "higher critics" claimed falsely in hundreds of instances that certain Bible statements were not true. For example, the seventh verse of the thirteenth chapter of Acts refers to a proconsul named Sergius Paulus. The critics claimed that the title of the chief ruler of this island was not proconsul, that the Bible was not accurate and the writer of Acts therefore was not to be credited. Later on, however, coins of this epoch were found bearing the inscription "proconsul" and still later a coin was found on this island with the inscription "Paulus the Proconsul."

The faith of the great majority of the intellectual leaders of Germany was undermined by hundreds of instances in which these higher critics falsely claimed that statements in the Bible were historically incorrect, although time and time again in literally hundreds of cases, archeology has proven the questioned Bible statements to be correct.

Likewise many of our young people are today losing their faith in the Bible and in Christ because professors in our schools and universities have borrowed from German teachers a philosophy which destroyed, in German leaders, all the advances Christianity had made in almost 2,000 years and which replaced Christian ideals with the same kind of brutality and inhumanity that existed before Christ was born.

AND THEN CAME NIETZSCHE, THE MAD PHILOSOPHER

The seeds of this destructive teaching in Germany bore fruit in the life of a more recent philosopher whose philosophy was adopted by the Prussian militarists and who had a profound influence upon modern German spirit. I refer to Nietzsche who died only 45 years ago. He began the works for which he was noted in 1878. He denounced all religion and taught that might makes right. He claimed that anything that enables an individual to have victory over others is good and true. That anything which is useful to maintain the German people as a master race is true and right. This philosophy enabled the German leaders to starve and massacre millions of helpless individuals while maintaining clear consciences themselves. They reasoned that if by massacring the entire Jewish race they helped Germany maintain its position as a master race, they did no wrong. According to Nietzsche they did good. Nietzsche became insane and was confined in an insane asylum in 1895 but even so his teaching has dominated the thinking of the German militarists for about 50 years.

HITLER REPLACES CHRISTIANITY WITH NAZISM

Hitler's writing and actions were the natural outgrowth of the work of Germany's intellectual leaders during the last 200 years. The seeds of atheism which they sowed resulted in Hitler trying to establish a new pagan religion—a German religion—to replace Christianity. These same skeptical seeds which grew into the ruthless cruel teaching of Nietzsche enabled Hitler to kill millions of helpless people and enslave whole nations in the name of Truth and Goodness.

STOP PLANTING GERMANY'S ATHEISTIC SEEDS

When corn is planted we expect a crop of corn, and when thistle seed is planted we can expect to reap thistles. Unless something is done to counteract the German "higher criticism" ideology, which is being taught in the schools of this country, we can expect the same results here within a few generations. Just recently a mother wrote, "I have a son, finely educated, but his years in the university have undermined his faith. He confessed Christ Jesus as Saviour and was baptized and joined the church as a boy. When he came home last year, after being 8 years away, he called God's Holy Word 'twaddle,' taunting me for believing it. It has almost broken my heart. * * * We denied ourselves to send our boy to college, little dreaming what the result would be."

Fortunately, something is being done in America to counteract this atheistic teaching. I refer to the churches and church schools. The only place in this country where this destructive teaching is being counteracted today is in the parochial schools, the Sunday schools, and the church-affiliated colleges. When you send your children to Sunday school and to church, you are not only helping them to lead happier and more profitable lives but you are doing the most patriotic thing you can do. There is nothing you can do that will benefit the future of your country as much as sending your children to Sunday school every Sunday, unless it is going there with them.

Housing in Southern California a First Problem—GI Boys Denied Prompt Enough GI Loans To Help—Thousands of Servicemen Being Discharged Daily and No Place To Live

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, having frequently called your attention to the fact of the serious and tragic conditions which confront the returning GI boys as they land at the rate of about 100,000 a day at Long Beach and Los Angeles separation centers, I want to again say to you that it is absolutely imperative that ways and means be found—and immediately, too—whereby this housing stress and strain may be relieved.

It certainly is no fault of these single lads, nor was it the fault of these married men, that they were placed in uniform and sent overseas, leaving their wives and children behind them. Nor is it their fault, nor neglect of planning or preparation that they now return home to their own immediate home town and vicinity from which they were drafted, and find that they cannot now find a place to live, either by themselves or with their loved ones.

You can talk about the GI loan provisions all you want as being sufficient and adequate—but the fact is that they are not adequate and sufficient for the reason that it is taking an average of 45 days, I am told, for a boy in Los Angeles County to get his loan through. This amounts in practice as estoppel and denial of use of these GI loans for these distinguished lads.

Not having been in this Congress when the GI bill was written, I did not have the privilege of working in connection with same. But as hundreds and hundreds of just criticisms and complaints come in about it being inadequate in matters of loans, about its red-tape provisions, and about the inadequacy of its educational provisions and other similar benefits, I am constrained to say that I feel the fundamental policy and principle of this bill should immediately show it does as much as possible as promptly as possible for these distinguished lads. The fact that there was not adequate provision or speedy enough ways and means set up to anticipate the surrender of Germany and Japan is not the fault of these distinguished GI's who are now returning. I do not criticize anyone in connection therewith, but I am pleased to have the privilege to include in my remarks a letter from the able and respected clerk of the city of South Gate, Calif., which relates a typical example of how the GI bill is not functioning. And as the letter refers to a newspaper article dated from Santa Ana, Calif., on this subject, I am going to include that article also. For, Mr. Speaker, Santa Ana, Calif., is in Orange County, which is a few miles from Long Beach and South Gate, both of which are in the Eighteenth District of California, which I represent. My files are full of facts and evidence, all of which go to the point that everyone charged with any obligation and responsibility in connection therewith should immediately correct this tragic housing condition.

The letter and editorial follow:

CITY OF SOUTH GATE,
South Gate, Calif., November 28, 1945.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: I am enclosing a clipping from the Los Angeles Times, issue of November 20, 1945, which correctly states the working of the GI bill in our city. Practically daily I am in contact with young veterans inquiring about the purchasing of tax-delinquent lots and only one out of the many has secured a GI loan, the others have given up in disgust. Also I am reliably informed that when the builders and contractors are approached by these fellows, they give them very cool treatment due to the long delay required to complete a deal.

Undoubtedly the Congress had good intentions when passing this bill but from practical experience, it has proved to be very impractical and is the cause of much embarrassment and disappointment on the part of these brave lads who, upon discharge from the Army, were given such optimistic statements about what the Government is doing for them.

Only recently I knew of a case of a distinguished boy who was transferred from the Great Lakes Naval Training Station to California and he has been unable, during a period of 2 months, to find any sort of apartment or house to fit his needs. He did find one moderately furnished five-room house at $80 per month but the tenant demanded $150 bonus before he would move out. There are thousands of servicemen being discharged in this immediate area daily, the majority of whom want to join their families but are unable to find any sort of place in which to live.

It does therefore seem to me that one of the urgent matters before our Congress should be to immediately provide living quarters for these young fellows so recently put on their own, practically without funds and apparently without friends.

Very sincerely,

HERBERT C. PEIFFER.

[From the Los Angeles Times of November 20, 1945]

RED TAPE BLAMED AS 30 GI'S FAIL TO GET LOANS—VETERANS FACE LOSS OF HOMES AS SANTA ANA FIRM DECLARES UNITED STATES AGENCY HAS BOGGED DOWN

SANTA ANA, November 19.—Because the Veterans' Administration "has bogged down and it is impossible to do business with them," the Santa Ana Building & Loan Co. today refused to complete GI loans. As a result 30 war veterans will go homeless.

This was the announcement today of George W. Cooper, secretary-manager of the association, who said his organization had made every effort to complete the loans for the veterans but was unable to do so because of the red tape involved.

HOMES ON MARKET

In several instances homes for the veterans were virtually completed, but because of the association's action they will be placed on the open market instead. The home of one former soldier, Charles L. Barr, at 215 East St. Gertrude Place, was completed and he already had bought linoleum and other furnishings when he found he was without a resident.

"We have gone all out for the veterans," Cooper said, "and have made every effort to process loans for the boys. Eleven have been completed and the 30 we had in the process would have made us 4 percent when we easily could have made 5 percent on other types of loans. That shows our sincerity."

VETERAN ACTION HOPED

In a letter to Col. L. C. Chapman, manager of the regional office of the Veterans' Administration in Los Angeles, Cooper said his association was forced to take the action and that he hoped the veterans would be so aroused they would force further action on the loans.

Local American Legion officials and Ben Liebermann, head of the county veterans' service center, aroused by protests of the servicemen, will meet here tomorrow with Paul J. Torelli, field administrator for the California Veterans Commission, to investigate the situation.

Rehabilitation of Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a resolution approved by Provo Post, No. 13, of the American Legion.

This resolution expresses the sincere desire of this organization that returning veterans, especially those suffering from nervous, mental, and physical disabilities, be given every opportunity for rehabilitation, and that a grateful Nation should see to it that all the necessary facilities are provided to bring about these desirable objectives. It follows:

Whereas the exigencies of war have made necessary the calling of millions of the young men and women of America to the defense of their country in the military and naval services of the United States; and

Whereas the training necessary to organize and make efficient defensive and offensive forces has required these millions of young people to make violent adjustment to regimented living, to rigid discipline, and to otherwise unnatural physical and social conditions, and these conditions, added to an unprecedented efficiency for violence and terror of modern methods of war, have placed extreme stress upon them for long and trying periods of time; and

Whereas the results of such tribulation upon the human body, mind, and nervous structure are becoming increasingly more apparent as our service people in increasingly greater numbers are being returned to civil life, many suffering complete and total nervous, mental, or physical collapse, and even greater numbers suffering nervous, mental, or physical disorders of lesser grade, but nevertheless to such an extent as to greatly handicap their rehabilitation into civil life; and

Whereas because of such conditions many of them are committing unsocial acts and are becoming involved in crime; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has provided, or is providing, facilities for the care and treatment of those who have suffered complete mental, physical, or nervous collapse, but has done nothing to provide for those who, though as definitely suffering from service disability, have not reached such a condition of mental, physical, or nervous disintegration as to entitle them to care and treatment in established facilities, under existing provision; and

Whereas the responsibility of society at large, under the representation of the Government of the United States, to this lesser but equally definite class of unfortunates, seems as manifest as its duty to those wholly disabled: Be it therefore

Resolved—

1. That we call upon the Government of the United States to make prompt and adequate provision for, and establishment of, facilities for the care and treatment of those persons whose service-connected affliction has not reached the stage where treatment may be had in present established facilities, but which has nevertheless so far afflicted them that they find difficulty in rehabilitating themselves into civil living, and thus are finding themselves involved in unsocial and illegal activity.

2. That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Department of Utah delegation to the national convention of the American Legion, with the request that the subject matter contained herein be brought before the resolutions committee of the convention, for such action as it may deem advisable.

3. That copies of this resolution be forwarded to each member of the congressional delegation from Utah.

4. That this resolution be made a part of the minutes of the Veterans' Council of Provo, and of Provo Post, No. 13, of the American Legion, Department of Utah.

Dated at Provo, Utah County, Utah, this 14th day of November A. D. 1945.

VETERANS' COUNCIL OF PROVO,
By FRED ADAMSON, *Chairman.*
RUSSEL L. TRAHEN,
Secretary.

Attest:

PROVO POST, NO. 13, DEPARTMENT OF UTAH, AMERICAN LEGION,
By L. GRONEMAN, *Commander.*

Attest:

STANFORD W. GEASE,
Adjutant.

Tribute to American Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention of the Members of the House to the great wartime record of the transportation facilities of our Nation. The railroads, in particular, have done a great job hauling freight and troops since Pearl Harbor.

For most of American industry, the war now is over. Not so for the railroads. They still have the tremendous task of redeploying millions of returning troops and equipment and supplies. Their facilities will be taxed to capacity for many months to come.

For example, my attention has been called to a press statement issued recently by the Pullman Co. which shows that in the 4 years since Pearl Harbor, the Pullman Co. has carried approximately 125,000,000 passengers an average of 784 miles each at a net profit of about 25 cents on each passenger. The Pullman Co. has provided approximately 98,000,000,000 passenger-miles of service for troops and civilians—more than the total mileage for the 11-year period between 1930 and 1940.

So that you can better appreciate the contribution as well as the burden of the Nation's railroads and the Pullman Co. in this connection, I wish to include in the RECORD the complete text of the Pullman press statement, as follows:

In the last 4 years, the Pullman Co. has averaged only about 25 cents net profit on each of its 125,000,000 passengers who traveled an average of 784 miles each, a distance greater than from New York to Detroit, George A. Kelly, Pullman vice president, reported today.

Since Pearl Harbor, Pullman has provided approximately 98,000,000,000 passenger-miles of service for troops and civilians, more than the total for the 11-year period from 1930 through 1940, he added. Of this total, approximately 44,000,000,000 passenger-miles were performed for 33,000,000 troops in military movements—an average trip of 1,300 miles for each GI moved. About two-thirds of all troops in organized travel since the start of the war have been handled in sleeping cars, and the peak concentrated load of military travel still is ahead.

Three months after VJ-day, Pullman's performance still is at or near the all-time records set in 1944, when revenue passengers numbered two and one-half times the 1940 peacetime total, with an average loading of 21.31 passengers per car, more than double the 1940 figure.

While other transportation agencies are reconverting to peacetime activities, Pullman and the railroads face their most critical period in the next 2 months. An estimated 2,000,000 veterans from Europe and the Pacific are scheduled to reach this country during November and December, according to military figures, and must be transported to their homes. During the early months of 1946, more than a half million veterans are scheduled to arrive monthly at west coast ports, and 90 percent of them are expected to ride Pullmans to their home stations.

This means fewer sleeping-car accommodations will be available for holiday travelers this year than in any previous Christmas season, with approximately 151,000 of the Nation's estimated 208,000 berths available exclusively to the military for organized troop travel.

Although the picture is not too encouraging for civilian travel, we urge that you check with your railroad passenger agent regarding Pullman accommodations if you must travel.

Stoppage of Work on Ships To Be Used for Demobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 3 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD material in the form of a speech which I understand was delivered by Joseph Curran, president of the National Maritime Union, in which he sets forth the reasons for the stoppage of work on certain ships which he thinks should be used in the demobilization program.

I put this in the RECORD in order that Mr. Curran's views may be made a matter of record. My record is perfectly clear that I do not believe in the use of the strike for demonstration purposes. I believe there is only one legitimate field for the use of the strike weapon, and that is in the field where there is a deadlock between an employer and a union over hours, wages, and conditions of employment. I do not feel that any stoppage of work should be used for political purposes, or as a political demonstration, or as a demonstration in favor of any particular point of view in connection with demobilization or any other national issue; but I do think the union is entitled to have the record show its reasons for the stoppage that is called, so that those reasons may be judged by the Senate of the United States upon their merit.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am glad to be here tonight to discuss a matter of vital concern to millions of American families—the problem of quickly bringing home the hundreds of thousands of troops overseas. I want to thank the Mutual Broadcasting System for making its facilities available to me for this purpose.

There has been a lot of confusion over the delays in bringing our boys home. Conflicting excuses and deliberate distortions have been coming out of Washington in a steady stream. For what purpose? The answer is simply that the agencies responsible for demobilization have been, and still are, trying to escape the justified anger of the GI's and the public over the shipping snafu. So Washington is blaming delays on a "shortage" of ships, on strikes, stoppages, lack of seamen, and any other handy excuse.

It is high time the American people were given the true facts. On VJ-day, we had about 4,500 ocean-going merchant ships. When the National Maritime Union started its campaign to help speed the return of our GI's, only 450 of those 4,500 ships were being used as troop transports. Early this month, the figure was increased to 470 ships, and a few days ago, a Deputy Administrator of the War Shipping Administration told the press it is now operating 551 troopships. That's an increase of 101 ships since we began our drive. Why weren't they used before? Where were the authorities long months ago when the GI's begged for ships from Manila to the Aleutians?

The Army is issuing statements that strikes on both coasts and shorter working hours are the reason why ships are being held up. The next thing we may expect is for the authorities to blame the striking auto workers for holding up our troops. No strikes have delayed the return of our troops. The longshore strike in New York, for example, held up no troopships. But the Army told our boys overseas, and it was published in Stars and Stripes, that the strike was responsible for holding up 400 troopships. Once the strike was over, however, the troops began to ask, "Where are those 400 ships?" The Army was put on a spot. They finally confessed to the GI's that no troopships were held up.

Because of the pressure and actions already exerted by the maritime unions upon the War and Navy Departments and WSA, five ships on the west coast have been kept out of private runs and reassigned to carry troops. They are the *Monterey, Lurline, Matsonia, President Johnson*, and *Brazil*. Those ships have a troop-carrying capacity of 35,000.

However, WSA has laid up over 300 ships in domestic ports while GI's are awaiting transportation home from foreign ports. When we criticized that policy, the WSA replied that it would take 2 months to properly refit Liberty ships to carry troops.

Well, the GI's answered that one, and in a pretty convincing manner. GI's in Manila converted the Liberty ship *Otto Mears* to a troopship. And they did it not in 2 months but in 2 days. Furthermore, they put in a sick bay, post exchange, movies, and a radio in each of the four troop compartments. As a result, 500 happy troops aboard the *Otto Mears* arrived in San Francisco last Saturday.

These GI's did the same kind of job on two more Liberty ships, the *Carole Lombard* and the *Joseph Pulitzer*, and repaired two additional ships, the *Kent* and the *Wardell*.

If the GI's could do such quick conversions, why couldn't the Army, Navy, and War Shipping Administration? Our shipyard workers could do it. They have produced records showing that during the war ships were converted to troopships in less than one day. They have advised the War Shipping Administration that they could do the same thing now. But Washington turned a deaf ear to that proposal.

Here's a sample of the way Washington is thinking about this situation. Rear Admiral William Callaghan, who is Assistant Chief of Naval Operations, told a Senate Naval Affairs Committee, and I quote: "It's unprofitable, unsanitary, and sometimes hazardous to bring men home on freighters."

His concern for the welfare of our troops is commendable. But there was no talk of unprofitable, unsanitary, or hazardous conditions when our troops were transported on combat-loaded cargo ships to Pacific beachheads. Troops remained on those Liberty ships as long as 90 days. The men slept on the decks in rain and in hot, unventilated holds. Latrines and mess lines ran side by side on the open decks. The men endured those hardships because they knew it was war. They are willing to endure them again in order to come home. As one foreign correspondent put it, "The average soldier would happily go home lashed to the mast." I spoke to hundreds of GI's while in France last month, and that statement is no exaggeration.

You can imagine how our stranded GI's become demoralized when they see ships returning to the States with empty bunks; ships carrying civilian passenger, horses, and what not from overseas; ships debarking homeward-bound troops in a foreign port because the authorities suddenly ordered those ships turned over to another country. No wonder our boys feel they are the "forgotten men."

The facts show that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the WSA, and other authorities involved have badly bungled the troop-return program up to the present time. We see continued evasions and broken promises to our GI's.

On October 23, for example, we charged that 55 fast Victory-type ships were being turned over to private companies for coastwise operations. In a New York Times article of November 18, a War Shipping Administration spokesman stated that: "No American vessels, either cargo or passenger, had been redelivered to private owners, 'despite propaganda to the contrary.'" That WSA spokesman on Saturday repeated that no ships "had been returned to private owners."

Well, I'm not interested, and I'm sure the GI's aren't, in whether ships are "delivered," "redelivered," or 'returned" to private owners. The WSA is playing with words. For I'm holding here in my hand tonight a list of 14 Victory and C-type vessels which the War Shipping Administration did allocate for private intercoastal runs. It doesn't matter whether those ships are owned by private companies or operated for the WSA. But the fact is that they are assigned for commercial operations and not to carry troops. It is also a fact that those 14 ships have already made their initial coastwise voyages. I now give the names of those ships to you—the American people—for your information and action. They are the *Water Witch, Billings Victory, Baylor Victory, Archer, Pampero, Sioux Falls Victory, Ames Victory, Ocala, Victory, Pass Christian Victory, Malden Victory, Lynchburg Victory, Beaver Victory, Parkersburg Victory, Atlantic City Victory.*

If the WSA does not know it, here are the dates those vessels left east and west coast ports on their private-profit runs: The *Water Witch* and the *Billings* left Seattle on November 7. The *Baylor* left San Francisco on the 8th. The *Archer* left Seattle on the 8th. The *Pampero* left Seattle on the 10th. The *Sioux Falls* left Seattle the 14th. And the *Ames* sailed from San Francisco on the 15th.

The *Ocala* left Philadelphia on November 6. On the 7th, the *Pass Christian* left Baltimore, the *Malden* left New York, and the *Lynchburg* left Philadelphia. On the 8th, the *Beaver* sailed from Baltimore and the *Parkersburg* left from Philadelphia. On the 9th, the *Atlantic City* left New York.

The WSA also claims that there are not enough seamen to man the ships. If that is true, why did Admiral Land, of WSA, join with General Hershey, of selective service, to further aggravate the situation? Why did they issue a directive, effective November 15, stating that any seaman who had 32 months of substantial service could leave the industry and not be subject to the draft?

I have here a letter from a member of our union which he sent me from the South Pacific. It lists 87 ships, including Victory ships, which are idle in the Saipan-Tinian

harbor area and in the Carolines. Some of those 87 ships have been there since June 17—more than 5 months. Only 5 out of 41 ships in the Carolines had arrived there in October.

Among the 46 ships in Saipan-Tinian harbor, this NMU member writes, "are many which, after a long wait at another harbor, have arrived here for a further wait."

What are all those ships waiting for? The WSA tells us it expects to have 34,000 extra berths in the European run next month, and plans to send 50 Victory ships to the Pacific. That's good news. But thousands of our boys in the Pacific theater could have been home for Christmas if only some of those 87 ships had been used.

On the one hand the Army had told the GI's there is a shortage of ships. On the other hand the troops saw with their own eyes scores of ships that were doing absolutely nothing and costing American taxpayers millions of dollars.

I am turning this list over to the Army, Navy, and the War Shipping Administration for their information and action.

Now, as for the 300-odd American ships lying idle in domestic anchorages, the GI's have been told that those ships are "over-age, battle-damaged, or unsuitable for conversion to carry troops." It's strange how ships that were doing a job carrying troops and supplies suddenly became "useless" overnight.

I say, and organized labor says, let us use our cargo ships—let us use every vessel that can carry troops—to speed the return of our heroic fighting men. To do less would be to make a mockery of the outstanding services they have rendered to our Nation and to the world.

Look at Life magazine, dated November 26. Page 75 shows some of those ships that the War Shipping Administration decided are "useless." A number of those vessels were launched as late as May of this year.

Our campaign and public protests have succeeded in getting the WSA to speed up the troop-return program. It has anounced that no more ships would be laid up on the Atlantic coast. A few ships have been brought out of the "boneyards," thanks to the support of our drive by the trade unions, the veterans' organizations, and many other groups. It is not clear whether those ships will be used for troops, however. But the fact is ships are being brought out.

I have received thousands of letters and cables protesting the disgraceful transportation delays and praising the stand taken by the National Maritime Union. But how many letters have been sent to Congress? How many have been sent to President Truman? More letters and telegrams must be sent to Congress and to the President to guarantee that the promises to our GI's will be kept.

The seamen alone cannot clear up the situation. This is a job for all the American people. Speaking for the National Maritime Union, and since the authorities have failed to allocate enough ships to speed demobilization, I have recommended to our members, as a first step, that on Monday, December 3, there is to be a 24-hour Nationwide work stoppage on all ships except certified troop ships and legitimate relief ships. In addition, I am authorized to say on behalf of the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union, CIO, the Marine Firemen, Oilers and Watertenders, unaffiliated, the Marine Cooks and Stewards Association, CIO, and the Inland Boatmen's Union, CIO, that they are taking joint action with the National Maritime Union on this issue in all American ports.

We fought against the diversion of ships to foreign powers for use in suppressing people's independence movements. We sharply opposed the policy of sending ships to rust in American ports. We protested the allocation of ships for commercial operations. We did not do this for publicity. Nearly 6,000 of our shipmates died to "keep 'em sailing" during the war. We want to speed the return of our boys so that they may help to build the kind of America and the kind of world for which they fought and bled.

We are determined to fulfill our responsibilities to our servicemen. The continued active help and participation of the American people is urgently needed to make sure that our boys will be brought home quickly.

S1c Paul T. Stewart

REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, the Washington papers carried news items that S1c Paul T. Stewart, an 18-year-old son of Senator TOM STEWART, of Tennessee, had been returned from the Pacific, which indicated that he is being returned for release. The inference was clearly drawn that this action was taken at the instance of his father.

His father never requested his transfer from the Pacific nor did he know anything about the order for his transfer. This dispatch does Senator STEWART a great injustice, and both the press and the Navy officials owe him an apology. Senator STEWART is a fine American, of profound loyalty and deep interest in his country and its institutions, and, although United States Senator, he has not in any way attempted to shield his boys or soften the blows of war for them.

The Senator has only three sons. All of them volunteered for the service. One of them has been in the service over 4 years, another 3½ years, and young Paul T. Steward joined the Navy with the consent of his father and mother when he was 17½ years of age. All of these boys have fine records in the service. He has never made a request of any kind for any of them. No family has displayed a more patriotic spirit. This family should be praised and not castigated by the press, whether it be the Stars and Stripes or the regular news services.

The news dispatch from Honolulu quotes the commanding officer at the Waipio amphibious operating base, where Paul was stationed, as having said, "Had I known all this sooner, I'd have sent him to a forward area." This is an outrageous statement. The position which a boy's father occupies should have no bearing upon his son's assignment, and for a commanding officer to say that he would send a boy to a forward station because his father happened to be a United States Senator should not be condoned.

If Paul Stewart was placed on orders in due course for return, I do not think that he should be removed merely because of the position which his father occupies, but to alleviate any embarrassment I understand he has requested his orders for return be canceled.

World Free Press Urged by American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion, during its deliberations at Chicago, Ill., on November 19, 1945, approved the principle of a world free press as one of the requisites in the maintenance of universal and lasting peace. The petition embodying this objective was submitted by Costello Post, of Washington, D. C.

History teaches that dictatorships and war lords live and prosper when protected by a stifled and corrupt press. As witness Germany under Hitler, Italy under Mussolini, and Russia under Stalin. Both Germany and Italy have paid the price of a stifled press but Stalin is still capitalizing upon one. When the newspapers of a nation are truly alert and free, tyrannical and domineering men of evil design find it difficult to exist.

The widespread demand for freedom of the public press—not only here in the United States—but throughout the entire globe is certainly encouraging and reassuring. Through the medium of an absolute free exchange of news we have an opportunity to bring about a thorough understanding among the peoples of the world. It is our duty and obligation to see to it that this objective is accomplished.

A copy of the resolution adopted by the American Legion in connection with this matter follows:

Resolution 122

Complete freedom of press

Whereas the American Legion has always supported freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of the press, as set forth in the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas the American Legion wants a free and unhampered flow of news between nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, in National Convention assembled at Chicago, Illinois, these days of November 18, 19 and 20, 1945, does hereby demand complete freedom of the press and expresses itself as opposed to any movement which would make the press the instrument of the Government.

Federal Reserve Banks

REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in both France and England, the other two great western democracies beside our own, the central banks of issue are being made the property of all the people of the Nation.

For 9 years, ever since I first became a Member of the House, I have, along with certain other Members, continuously worked to bring about the ownership by the American people of our own bank of issue which is the 12 Federal Reserve banks. I believe it wrong to permit any private agency to usurp the essentially governmental power of creating the money of a great nation. I believe that whenever economic conditions justify the creation of a single new dollar of money, the whole people, not a privileged few, should benefit. I believe that not a dime of interest-bearing debt should be required as a condition of maintaining in circulation an amount of money which will always correspond correctly to the volume of production.

The moves being made by France and England will strengthen, not weaken, their democracy. They will make it possible for industry to operate more smoothly, and under far-sighted policies this move can mean in those countries or in this country a far greater stability, an effective avoidance of inflation and deflation and consequently greater hope for true private enterprise.

The governments of France and England are in my judgment committed to the principles of individual liberty—religious, political, and economic—and to the principles of democratic government. The approach of the British Government to the problems of the time would appear, judging from Prime Minister Attlee's speech, to be a fundamentally religious approach.

It is my earnest hope, Mr. Speaker, that the day is not far distant when we in the United States will have the vision and good judgment to make our central bank of issue likewise an institution belonging to the entire American people.

It is my sincere belief that this would lead to fewer governmental controls over the economic activities of our people rather than to more of them. There have been times when even my good friends have told me that my work in this field would never lead to success—that it was a matter for the dim and distant future. It is therefore encouraging to find the other great democracies of the world already taking this step.

The question will be raised by some whether in France they are not going considerably beyond the nationalization of the central bank of issue since four other huge banks in addition to the Bank of France are also being nationalized. To this I would reply that these other four banks in France have to a considerable extent shared with the Bank of France the power of money creation in that nation, particularly from the point of view of the creation of demand deposits for industrial investment purposes. This, however, should be a lesson to us for France failed to prevent the concentration of a major share of the banking business in her country in the hands of these four huge institutions. This is the reason some of us have so vigorously opposed the growth of bank-holding companies in our own country believing as we have in a system of small private banks as the best means of avoiding monopoly of this all-important line of business and thus avoiding the coming of the time when it would be necessary in the people's interest to go beyond the nationalization of the central bank of issue in our country. The right monetary system is one wherein the banks do the banking business and the Government does the Government's business. The banking business is the acceptance of deposits and the making of loans. The Governments's business is the creation of money and the maintenance of a stable value in the monetary unit.

Misuse of Barbiturates

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mrs ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, to show how alarmed the American Pharmaceutical Association is regarding the misuse of barbiturates, I am extending as a part of my remarks information regarding their conference which was held recently. They are very much disturbed, because doctors attempting to secure barbiturates from drug stores find difficulty sometimes in getting them; so they are convinced, as is proven by this statement, that a great many of the barbiturates are bought on the bootleg plan. The sale of them has increased enormously in the past months. This record shows that it has an effect on criminals. These barbiturate tablets sometimes are put into drinks such as soft drinks, and they are affecting the high school boys and girls most disastrously. They do not realize there is danger in putting these tablets in soft drinks.

AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION INAUGURATES PROGRAM TO CURB MISUSE OF BARBITURATES—HOLDS CONFERENCE OF HEALTH AUTHORITIES AS FIRST STEP

American pharmacy is coming to grips with the problems arising from promiscuous distribution of barbiturates. One of the most forward-looking steps in the direction of meeting these problems was taken by the American Pharmaceutical Association when it called a conference of representatives of medicine, pharmacy, public health, and government at its headquarters building in Washington on October 12 to discuss the regulation of use and distribution of barbiturates.

The discussions covered barbiturate habituation and tolerance, the degree of compliance with existing regulations on the part of physicians and pharmacists; the present status of barbiturate regulation by laws specifically directed toward regulation of distribution of barbiturates and by State pharmacy laws, State food and drug acts, the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and other regulatory procedures.

Every aspect of the problem was explored and commented on in detail by a group of experts in the field of medical and pharmaceutical practice, law enforcement, and public health.

The conference was called by the Committee on Legislation of the American Pharmaceutical Association to whom the council of the association had referred the problem, with instructions to study the laws of the various States governing the dispensing of barbituric-acid compounds. In addition to studying legislation on the subject, the committee had also ascertained the opinions of pharmacists and physicians with respect to the type of regulation believed necessary to correct the evil of promiscuous use and distribution of hypnotic drugs.

In opening the conference, Chairman A. L. I. Winne, of the Committee on Legislation of the American Pharmaceutical Association, who presided, stated that various ideas had been expressed regarding the manner in which barbiturates are promiscuously distributed. He pointed out that careless prescribing and dispensing on the part of physicians and their office assistants may be a factor. He likewise called attention to the problem of uncontrolled renewal of prescriptions and "over-the-counter sales" in States where there is no law governing distribution of barbiturates and "bootleg" distribution where there is a law. Mr. Winne pointed out that the conference had been called to receive the comment and opinion of representatives of the profession and the industry involved in prescribing, dispensing, and distribution of barbiturates, and indicated that the American Pharmaceutical Association's committee on legislation will carefully review the factual data submitted and the opinions expressed, as a basis for recommendations to be made to the council of the American Pharmaceutical Association.

Leading off the discussion on the part of the medical experts present, Dr. Robert H. Felix, chief of the Mental Hygiene Division of the United States Public Health Service, discussed barbiturate habituation and tolerance. He was followed by Commissioner H. J. Anslinger, of the United States Bureau of Narcotics, who discussed the law-enforcement problem from the standpoint of his long experience in the control of distribution of narcotic drugs.

Dr. Austin Smith, secretary of the Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry of the American Medical Association, in discussing the medical aspects of the problem, pointed out the necessity for continuous education of both physicians and pharmacists on their responsibilities in connection with the distribution of all drugs. He indicated that physicians could be counted on to cooperate through their organizations in any procedure which will correct the difficulties of the present situation.

Dr. Robin C. Buerki, chairman of the Council on Professional Practice of the American Hospital Association, mentioned the importance of reducing record-keeping to a minimum in connection with the control of drugs, but expressed appreciation of the problem connected with barbiturate control, and indicated that hospitals would cooperate in any program which is soundly conceived to correct the evils arising from indiscriminate use of barbiturates.

Speaking for the dental profession, Dr. Donald A. Wallace, secretary of the Council on Dental Therapeutics of the American Dental Association, voiced the interest of dentists in proper control of habit-forming drugs, but indicated that promiscuous distribution could not be associated to any extent with dental practice because of the limited use of such products by that profession.

Prof. Robert C. Wilson, of the College of Pharmacy, University of Georgia, expressed great concern over the possible unfavorable public reaction toward the practice of pharmacy caused by derelictions of a few members of the profession. He pointed out that it was the underworld interest and traffic in these drugs which is the real menace. He voiced the opinion that control of the illicit distribution of these drugs involves more than regulation of the professions. It was his feeling

that a licensing system applied to manufacturers should be a part of any system of control that may be devised.

Mr. Carson P. Frailey, executive vice president of the American Drug Manufacturers' Association, attributed current interest in the regulation of the distribution of barbiturates to a wave of suicides and accidental deaths resulting from overdoses of these drugs. He advocated State, rather than Federal, legislation, and expressed the view that an investigation of the beneficial effects of barbiturates would offset much of the sentiment against the use of such products occasioned by sensational reports of their misuse.

Other participants in the conference on the pharmaceutical aspects of the problem included Mr. P. H. Costello, secretary of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, who pointed out the difficulties of adequate enforcement under pharmacy acts and barbiturate laws which are enforced by Boards of Pharmacy; Mr. George Frates, spoke in behalf of the National Association of Retail Druggists; Mr. H. M. Bingham represented the National Wholesale Druggists' Association, and Mr. John A. Crozier represented the Federal Wholesale Druggists' Association.

On the public-health aspects of the problem, Dr. Ernest L. Stebbins, Commissioner of Health of New York City drew attention to experiences in metropolitan centers where accidental deaths and suicides from misuse of barbiturates have apparently been on the increase, as compared with the legitimate use of these drugs. He also touched upon the effect of barbiturates on persons who are criminally inclined.

Dr. Robert P. Herwick, chief of the Division of Drug Control of the Food and Drug Administration, expressed the view that misuse of barbiturates is rather widespread, and he included over-the-counter sales in his definition of the term "misuse." He indicated that inspectors of the Food and Drug Administration have found it difficult to purchase barbiturates from most pharmacists, which is an indication that considerable quantities are obtained by the public through bootleg channels. He pointed out that the Food and Drug Administration cannot be expected to control the distribution of these drugs alone and, like Commissioner Anslinger, he explained that congressional appropriations are very difficult to obtain for enforcement purposes. This is responsible for the reduction in personnel for control work. It was his opinion that adequate enforcement of regulations governing the sale of barbiturates would have to be conducted at the State level for the present to be effective, and stressed the importance of concerted enforcement under all existing statutes.

Other comments on the legal and public-health aspects were made by Mr. Leslie C. Jayne, New York State Board of Pharmacy, Mr. Walter Scofield, chief of the Bureau of Food and Drugs of the New Jersey State Board of Health, Mr. W. A. Queen, chief of the Division of State Cooperation of the Food and Drug Administration, and Mr. J. W. Holloway of the American Medical Association.

Mr. Charles V. Imlay, representing the National Conference of Commissioners of Uniform State Laws, offered the cooperation of the conference in formulating and promoting uniform State legislation for control of the distribution of barbiturates.

At the conclusion of the conference the members of the committee on legislation of the American Pharmaceutical Association summarized the suggestions and views which had been presented, and Chairman Winne thanked the participants at the conference for their contribution in securing factual data for the preparation of a program of action in this field.

Dr. Robert P. Fischelis, secretary of the American Pharmaceutical Association, reviewed the present status of barbiturate regulation, summarizing the provisions of present State laws on the subject, and citing opinions of State officials and practicing pharmacists as to the proper method of control. He assured the conference that the American Pharmaceutical Association would concentrate on the completion of its study of the present situation and the need for future action.

Dr. R. L. Swain pointed out the importance of formulating a program, and perhaps drawing up a model bill which could be made available to the legislatures of the various States.

The committee on legislation of the American Pharmaceutical Association, which is continuing its study of this problem and will make its report to the council, consists of A. L. I. Winne, Richmond, Va., chairman; Martin E. Adamo, Boston, Mass.; A. G. DuMez, Baltimore; George A. Frates, Washington, D. C.; Nicholas S. Gesoalde, New York, N. Y.; John A. Goode, Asheville, N. C.; L. M. Kantner, Baltimore, Md.; H. H. Schaefer, Brooklyn, N. Y.; R. L. Swain, New York, N. Y.; and Robert P. Fischelis, Washington, D. C.

St. Lawrence Waterway

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, a minute ago we heard a phrase in the deliverance of the divine message about America's being liberty's wonderland. I thoroughly believe that statement. I want to see it made a wonderland and kept a wonderland by utilizing all our resources and labor to the best interest of all people. It is for that reason that I include in my remarks the following article by Dean Acheson appearing in the Democratic Digest:

THE ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

(By Dean Acheson, Under Secretary of State)

The development of the navigation and power resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway has been envisioned by the United States and Canada as a joint enterprise for half a century. The completion of this long-planned project will add a fourth coast line to the United States, thus opening the midlands of this continent to ocean shipping, and will create an annual capacity of 2,200,000 horsepower of hydroelectricity, to be shared equally by this country and Canada.

The economic value of the proposed project to this country promises to rival the TVA and the Panama Canal combined. On a comparative basis, the opening of the Midwest—which is the world's greatest production center both agriculturally and industrially—to ocean shipping holds even greater promise to this country than the opening of the Suez Canal or the Dardanelles held for the countries of the Old World. From the standpoint of power, there are only eight countries of the world that produce more electricity than will be produced by the St. Lawrence project.

There is legislation now before Congress providing for approval of the major portions of a 1941 agreement between the United States and Canada to develop the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

This legislation has strong bipartisan sponsorship. In the Senate, Senate Joint Resolution 104 was introduced, on October 2, as a joint resolution, by Senator BARKLEY, Democrat, Kentucky, for himself and Senators WAGNER, Democrat, New York; HILL, Democrat, Alabama; TAYLOR, Democrat, Idaho; AIKEN, Republican, Vermont; FERGUSON, Republican, Michigan; LANGER, Republican, North Dakota; VANDENBERG, Republican, Michigan; SHIPSTEAD, Republican, Minnesota; and LA FOLLETTE, Progressive, Wisconsin. In the House, identical resolutions have been introduced by Representatives SABATH, Democrat, Illinois; DINGELL, Democrat, Michigan; WASIELEWSKI, Democrat, Wisconsin; ROBERTSON, Republican, North Dakota; and DONDERO, Republican, Michigan.

The United States Congress has shown a definite interest in the navigation and power aspects of the St. Lawrence Basin since 1916, when that body ordered an investigation into the project's possibilities. During the ensuing years not only the Congress but the executive branch of the Government and the public have displayed sustained interest in the development of this great undeveloped natural resource.

Every Chief Executive since Woodrow Wilson, irrespective of party affiliation, has supported the project. In a special message to Congress concerning the St. Lawrence project on October 3, President Truman said:

"As a part of our program of international cooperation, expanding foreign trade, and domestic progress in commerce and industry, I recommend the speedy approval by the Congress of the agreement of March 19, 1941, between the United States and Canada for the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin. When approved, the two countries will be able to harness for the public benefit one of the greatest natural resources of North America. * * *

"The Congress and the people of our country can take just pride and satisfaction in the foresight they showed by developing the Tennessee and Columbia Rivers and the rivers in the Central Valley of California. Without the power from these rivers, the goal of 50,000 airplanes a year—considered fantastic only five short years ago but actually surpassed twice over—would have been impossible. Nor could we have developed the atomic bomb as early as we did without the large blocks of power we used from the Tennessee and Columbia Rivers. The timely development of these rivers shortened the war by many years and saved countless American lives."

Price Control

REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time Members of this House have come down in the well and urged that the OPA be abolished and all price control lifted. I hope all of those Members are taking cognizance of what has happened to the price of citrus fruit in this country. Price control on lemons and

oranges was lifted recently by the OPA. The result has been increases on those items of from 50 to 100 percent in the various cities of this country. I think it is a good sample of what can happen to us if we are foolish enough to throw price control overboard.

I will include in my remarks a letter from a Milwaukee manufacturer protesting this situation and pointing out that if we let price control go overboard you can really look for an increase in the cost of living in the United States. In the event price control is beaten in this House the wrath of the people will justly descend on those responsible.

MILPRINT, INC.,
Milwaukee, Wis., November 26, 1945.

Hon. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Attached please find a newspaper clipping out of last night's Milwaukee Journal showing where oranges that were selling at $7.80 a case have jumped to $11.50 and $12 a case. Some of the men who own commission houses on Commission Row are charging as high as $15 a case.

This is serious inflation and must be retarded at once before it gets too strong a toe-hold, as it is apt to spread to other products as well.

For the many GI's who are coming back from the armed services, who have babies who must have orange juice—this is a very bad dose to give them.

Now, my dear sir, if there was an increase of 5 percent or something like that and if the cost had risen so that they had to get something more, there would be no fault to find—but when they go up almost 100 percent overnight—action should be taken in Congress. It seems like some people in Washington have forgotten the 1921 inflation and history will again repeat itself, if proper action is not taken.

We do hope that action will be taken at once to put the controls back again on food products and that you will act just as quickly as you possibly can.

We have 2,000 employees and I speak for them in attempting to fight this inflationary movement, which is apt to ruin what is left of our good United States of America.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, we are,

Most sincerely,

WILLIAM HELLER,
Vice President.

Willful Waste Makes Woeful Want

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, today the American people are paying high taxes as cost of war, and if the Congress and the administration ever tries to place this Government on a self-sustaining basis by making the Government income pay current Government expenses—to say nothing of reducing the stupendous national debt—taxes will be higher and people in every line of endeavor will have to take advantage of every opportunity to save and economize to make both ends meet.

The reports coming from every theater of activity of wanton waste and destruction of property bought with taxpayers' hard-earned money is nothing short of distressing. Today I have received such a report from my home county, up where most of us have put in a lifetime of hard work and pinch-saving economy to reclaim a farm and home from the cut-over lands of northern Idaho. It certainly is discouraging to hear of and see the waste of so many things which would be invaluable to the people everywhere, particularly those engaged in reclaiming the partly cleared farms of the timbered sections of the great Northwest, where so many of our good citizens are just eking out a living as they toil to build up estates by hewing farms and homes from forest lands as they did in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Minnesota as civilization progressed westward.

What would the pioneers of those days have thought of the waste reported in the enclosed press clipping and the letter from a neighbor of mine inserted here:

SAYS WASTE NOT HEARSAY

TACOMA, November 28.—Pfc Robert R. Moore wrote to his mother here that thousands of dollars' worth of Army equipment is being dumped into the ocean at Guam every day and he has seen hundreds of jeeps ploughed under by tractors.

"My lowest estimate would be that I have seen the destruction of $1,000,000 worth of equipment," Moore, a marine, wrote from Guam where he is stationed. "None of this is hearsay but what I have personally observed."

HILL TOP FARM,
Sandpoint, Idaho, November 30, 1945.

Hon. COMPTON WHITE,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHITE: I append hereto an AP clipping as of this date which is appalling to the lay mind, and leaves one apprehensive as to just where the Army is leading us; evidently to the abyss of economic insolvency.

Either the Army is an ass, or our Uncle Samuel really, truly, and literally is the Purse of Fortunatus—the more you take out the more the replenishment.

This kind of thing is the greatest deterrent against buying Victory bonds to save the peace that could be devised, even by an enemy of our country.

My son, recently discharged, possessor of the Bronze Star Medal, for capturing 27 Germans single handed, and also of the Good Conduct Medal, tells me that 33 percent of the goods, matériel, and supplies of the Army is wasted. He cites me case after case which had come under his personal observation. While all war is waste because all war is destructive, wanton waste is not to be condoned. After reading this excerpt one asks himself the question, Why buy Victory bonds committing himself as an accessory both before and after the fact—to the crime of waste?

There is just one recipe for the total abolishment of war, for all time, and that is for the United Nations, once organized, and with plenary power, to put every signer on the dotted line to the effect that no person, male or female, under 60 years of age, is eligible for military duty. That will effect the complete emasculation of war.

With kind personal regards, and best wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

MARK HUNT.

New England and the St. Lawrence Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 4 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, on November 14 last our friend and colleague, the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], delivered an address in Boston before the Boston City Club on the subject of the development of the St. Lawrence waterway, a development which has been approved as necessary for our defense by both the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War. The address was very well received. Therefore, in order to insure as wide dissemination of it as possible, I respectfully ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It was with a great deal of pleasure that I received the invitation to speak to you today.

I am a New Englander and, next to the Nation as a whole, my loyalties will always be with the people here in the Northeast.

I am optimistic about the future of New England. I am optimistic about the future of the country as a whole.

Any Nation that can do what we have done in a period of 100 years can look forward with confidence that we shall solve every new problem and go straight forward on the path of progress.

I am much encouraged to note that there is now in progress a healthy self-examination to discover the weak spots in our social and economic fiber, and to repair and reinforce it in order to secure our proper position in the future world.

In recent weeks you have undertaken, under the leadership of Governor Tobin and Mr. Joseph Kennedy, a highly useful investigation to find out how you can improve economic conditions in Massachusetts.

A review of industrial development in Massachusetts will indicate that this State has been a leader in manufacturing and commerce just as in the cultural and political field.

It was here that large-scale manufacturing first flourished. It was also out of Boston that 100 years ago the clipper ships ranged the farflung ports of the world, bringing prosperity to Boston and the rest of the country.

It is significant to note that in achieving this leadership New England, and Massachusetts in particular, had the blessing of three important factors contributing to prosperity:

First, Massachusetts was the leader in the development of its water-power resources for manufacturing purposes. It was on water power that its industrial supremacy was established.

Second, it had the blessing of a vast and efficient fleet of ships that utilized cheap water transportation.

Third, it had the advantage of a plentiful supply of skilled labor.

During the last century New England, and especially Massachusetts, held a dominant position in the field of industrial production. Even as late as 1909 New England produced nearly 13 percent of the total value of manufactured products of the whole country.

Twenty years later, in 1929, a year of prosperity, the contribution of New England to the total manufacturing output of the Nation was only 9 percent. Ten years later, in 1939, the proportion of New England's contribution was down to 7 percent.

Massachusetts was also losing ground relatively to the rest of the Nation during the same period. In 1909 the contribution of Massachusetts to the total value of manufacturing production was 7.3 percent. In 1929 it was 4.9 percent, and in 1939, 4.4 percent.

These figures do not necessarily mean that New England and Massachusetts had lost industries to the extent of 40 to 50 percent during this 30-year period. They do mean, however, that whereas the rest of the country was growing by leaps and bounds, the Northeast was not keeping pace.

The same experience continued during the war years. Industry, as well as per capita income, increased much more rapidly in other parts of the country than in New England.

It is interesting to note that the greatest increase of industry and income was in those States where we had a definite program of river-basin development, such as the States of Tennessee, Washington, and Oregon. The total and per capita income in those areas went up more than the national average, whereas the increase in the Northeast was less than the national average.

What is the answer to this dilemma? Is it to hold back other parts of the country, or to accelerate our own pace?

Should we, through political sabotage, prevent the development of other sections, thereby permanently impairing the industrial vitality and military strength of our whole Nation?

Or should we adopt measures to help our section of the country at the same time as we assist the betterment of other areas, thus increasing wealth and industry all around?

Your representatives in Congress are confronted with this question on every important economic issue. In your sober judgment, do you want us to consider the interest of our Nation as a whole, or do you wish us to take a narrow, sectional view of every issue before Congress?

We have given up, by and large, international isolation, as impractical, unrealistic, and against the enlightened self-interest of our country.

We frown upon the old, discredited colonial imperialism of other countries which retard world economic improvement.

But in this country we tolerate, fortunately in ever-decreasing degree, economic sectionalism which is the national equivalent of international isolation, and there are some among us who want to control or retard economic development in other areas. This is colonialism of the old pattern at its worst.

In a world as small as ours where the actions and economic policies of every other country of the world affect our national security and prosperity, we can ill afford to adopt such narrow-minded domestic policies that we thwart the growth of our own national domain.

How tragic it would have been in our recent struggle for survival if we had allowed a few obstructionists to prevent the development of the Tennessee Valley and the Columbia River. As President Truman said in a recent message to the Congress:

"Without the power from these rivers the goal of 50,000 airplanes a year—considered fantastic only 5 short years ago but actually surpassed twice over—would have been impossible. Nor could we have developed the atomic bomb as early as we did without the large blocks of power we used from the Tennessee and Columbia Rivers. The timely development of these rivers shortened the war by many years and saved countless American lives. * * *"

The answer to New England's industrial problem is not in stopping or slowing the development of the rest of the country; nor is it in any artificial advantages obtained at the expense of the rest of the country. I know you agree with me in this. The solution of our desire for an equal opportunity with the rest of the country is in the spirit of enterprise and adventure, in the eagerness to pioneer in a new and better world.

It is within the scope of our ability to create new opportunities in the production of new products, improved methods of manufacture, development of water resources, and new methods of transportation.

Why do I emphasize these general principles when I was asked to come here to discuss the St. Lawrence project? I do this because it is important to put the discussion of this project in the proper perspective of national and local affairs. For this project, more than any other in the past 50 years, has aroused the worst manifestations of sectionalism; and what is even worse, sectional passions are aroused by misrepresentations and false arguments by a small group who are perpetrating a new colonialism—a remote control over the economic destinies of our people.

I shall, therefore, try to show you that in the best opinion of the country the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is of great national advantage and should be speedily developed. Also that it is to the best interests of New England and Massachusetts in particular; and, that the narrow, self-seeking propaganda that has been loosed upon New England is of comparatively recent origin in the long history of this controversy and is not expressive of our local interest.

First, let me briefly state, for the benefit of those not entirely familiar with it, what the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is.

The project contemplates building the necessary dams, canals, locks, and powerhouses which will permit oceangoing vessels to travel from Montreal to the Great Lakes, and also to develop 2,200,000 horsepower of hydroelectric capacity, to be divided equally between Canada and the United States.

You know, of course, that there is deep sea navigation to Montreal which is 1,000 miles inland from the Atlantic Ocean. There is also deep-draft navigation from Ogdensburg, N. Y., to Duluth and Chicago, 1,300 miles beyond.

The Welland Canal was completed by Canada in 1932 to scale the Niagara escapement, and this canal only needs a little dredging. We built the MacArthur lock at St. Mary's River, and that too is a link in the seaway already completed.

With the exception of some dredging in various channels, the main works still to be built are in the 119-mile stretch between Ogdensburg, N. Y., and Montreal, Canada, where the water drops 243 feet over a series of rapids between the level of Lake Ontario and the level of Montreal Harbor.

There is an agreement between Canada and the United States whereby we undertake to construct the necessary works at the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River and Canada undertakes to do the work in the Canadian sections.

Without going into detail here, let me say that the remaining cost of the project to the United States will be less than $300,000,000, of which at least a third will be paid for by the power project, leaving around $200,000,000 for the seaway from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic.

Considering every item of expenditure, the seaway will cost about $10,000,000 a year to maintain. When completed, it will accommodate not less than 25,000,000 tons of traffic annually. At present nine to ten million tons move over the existing 14-foot waterway.

There will also be available at the International Rapids annually 13,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, more than the total output produced by the Tennessee Valley Authority in 1944. It is the cheapest undeveloped power in America, costing about 1 mill per kilowatt-hour at the station.

This power will be available for distribution within 300 miles of the site in Canada and the United States.

The project will also make ocean seaports of all the principal cities on the Great Lakes. Rochester, Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, Milwaukee, Chicago, and Duluth will be accessible by oceangoing vessels without transshipment.

On October 2 Senate Majority Leader ALBEN BARKLEY introduced Senate Joint Resolution 104, which was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, to approve this Canadian-American Agreement and authorize construction of the project. The resolution is sponsored, in addition to Senator BARKLEY, by Senators FERGUSON, HILL, LA FOLLETTE, LANGER, VANDENBERG, WAGNER, SHIPSTEAD, TAYLOR, and myself.

That this is a national project of the first magnitude is attested by the nonpartisan and nonsectional support it has received during the past three decades.

On October 3 President Truman urged speedy approval of the Canadian-American St. Lawrence agreement, stating:

"One of the great constructive projects of the North American Continent, in fact, one of the great projects of the world, which was delayed by the exigencies of war, is the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

"For 50 years the United States and Canada under both Republican and Democratic administrations, under Liberal and Conservative governments, have envisioned the development of the project together, as a joint enterprise.

"Upon the expectation that we would join with them in completing this great engineering project, Canada has already built more than half its share of the undertaking.

"We, however, still have our major contribution to make.

"Every engineering investigation during the past 50 years, every economic study in the past 25 years, has found the project feasible and economically desirable. The case has been proved; the plans are ready."

President Truman is from the State of Missouri where opinion for this project is divided. But the President is speaking for the country as a whole, and not for any one section.

President Truman is but one of the illustrious spokesmen for this great undertaking. In 1941, when the country was upon the threshold of war, President Roosevelt recommended it in these words:

"I know of no single project of this nature more important to this country's future in peace or war. Its authorization will demonstrate to all the enemies of democracy that, however long the effort, we intend to outstrip them in the race of production. In the modern world that race determines the rise and fall of nations.

"I hope that authorization will not be delayed."

Before President Roosevelt, President Hoover was eager to see this project constructed, and he and his Secretary of State, Henry Stimson, negotiated a treaty with Canada for that purpose. On July 18, 1932, President Hoover recommended this project in these words:

"The signing of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty marks another step forward in this the greatest internal improvement yet undertaken on the North American Continent. * * * Its completion will have a profoundly favorable effect upon the development of agriculture and industry throughout the Midwest. The large byproduct of power will benefit the Northeast."

We need not go to Missouri, New York, or California to hear strong voices for this project. One of our own first citizens, President Calvin Coolidge, recommended it to Congress in 1923, calling it a "capital investment which will be reproductive * * *. Upon these projects depends much future industrial and agricultural progress."

In addition to a long line of Presidents of both parties, other forward-looking, distinguished leaders have espoused and advanced this cause. Secretaries of State Charles Evans Hughes, Frank Kellogg, Henry Stimson, Cordell Hull, and now James Byrnes; Governors of New York Alfred Smith, Franklin Roosevelt, Herbert Lehman, and now Tom Dewey have all given it strong support.

Former Secretary of the Navy and Governor of New Jersey Charles Edison, the son of the famous inventor, and the late Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox were for the project.

The list is long. And the theme of all these proponents has been universally the same—the St. Lawrence project is one of the great projects in the world. It will give this Nation abundant cheap power and an unequaled navigation facility from the Atlantic to the heart of the continent.

The support for this undertaking is not partisan. It is not sectional. Nor is it purely political. Even before there were concrete governmental proposals for its construction, substantial business interests were eager to develop this resource.

In 1921 Col. Hugh L. Cooper, the same eminent engineer who later built the Dnieper Dam for the Soviet Government, laid a proposal before the International Joint Commission to make a gift of the navigation facilities if the governments of the two countries would give his clients a franchise to develop the electricity on the St. Lawrence River between Ogdensburg and Montreal.

And who were his clients? The Aluminum Corp. of America, the General Electric Co., and the du Pont Co., who evidently considered that the power production alone would be worth the cost of the entire development.

These companies, as you know, are not in the habit of engaging in uneconomic undertakings. Let me quote a few passages from the extensive report of Colonel Cooper.

"We believe that the greatest single need for the restoration of the public to normal contentment and happiness is cheap power. The construction of the works here proposed will give to the zone east of Niagara Falls, and for a radius of over 400 miles from the Croil Island site, power advantages at least equal to and probably better than those that now exist, or can be hereafter created at Niagara Falls."

Colonel Cooper's report was equally eulogistic about the advantages of navigation, and I quote briefly from that section of the report:

"It will be seen, therefore, that the zone to be supplied with cheap power will also be aided in its commercial development by the coincident creation of new navigation advantages. These navigation advantages properly coordinated with water power and the vast railway systems now existing in this territory will give to this zone industrial advantages that cannot be otherwise created or found elsewhere on the American continent."

At one time, many railroad interests were supporting the seaway. Almost all of the transcontinental lines west of Chicago favored it. The Great Northern and the Northern Pacific, the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul, the Illinois Central, the Chicago and North Western, the Minneapolis and St. Paul, the Chicago Great Western, the Quincy Lines, all favored this project only 20 years ago.

From the point of view of national interest, and as a business proposition, the overwhelming testimony has been in favor of earliest possible construction of this great project.

You may say, "Very well, but how about us? How will it affect New England?"

Here again, the prevailing opinion and all of the factual analysis available has been favorable. The conclusion of all serious studies has been unanimous that this project would benefit New England.

One of your business leaders, Mr. Henry I. Harriman, made a serious study of this subject and published his findings in 1929 in a book of 152 pages entitled "New England and the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Mr. Harriman was at that time President of the Boston Chamber of Commerce. As you know, he has also been President of the United States Chamber of Commerce for several terms. I need not mention to you that he is one of the most successful businessmen of this community and a leading figure in the public utility field. I shall only read you Mr. Harriman's conclusions which appear on pages 32–33, but commend you to read the whole book.

Mr. Harriman concluded in these words:

"I am convinced that the St. Lawrence seaway is of as great importance to New England as to the Middle West, and that New England should unitedly, heartily, and enthusiastically support the project."

The seaway means to New England:

1. Lower transportation costs on much of its food supply, hence a lower cost of living.

2. Lower freight rates on many of the raw materials required by its industries.

3. Lower freight rates to many markets for its finished products.

4. A supply of export grain and flour at prices as low or lower than can prevail in other North Atlantic ports, hence a revival in the export business of the port of Boston and other New England ports.

5. The removal of the handicap of rail differentials, due to water competition via the St. Lawrence.

6. A reasonable supply of cheap power.

Three years later, when Mr. Harriman was president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, he testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as to the amount of business expected between New England ports and those of the Great Lakes. I quote from his testimony:

"The total annual traffic available on the most conservative basis for a water route between New England and the Great Lakes will be not less than 6,000,00 tons, and very probably it will be twice that amount, and the annual saving to our New England industries will not be less than $16,000,000. What holds true for New England holds equally true for eastern New York and Pennsylvania."

There may be those who will try to discount this weighty opinion by saying that this is only one man's view. But that is not true. At one time or another leaders of New England industry and the Associated Industries of Massachusetts favored this project. Furthermore, this position was taken after careful study.

In 1923, at the time President Coolidge recommended the project to the Congress, a New England committee of 36 industrial and public leaders—6 from each State—was established. They devoted a whole year of study to the subject.

Some of them are still with us and quite prominent in public and business circles—just to mention at random—John G. Winant, former Governor of New Hampshire and our Ambassador to England, and Samuel Ferguson, president of the Hartford Electric Light Co.

Col. Charles Gow was the chairman of the committee. He is here today and can tell you more about this important work. I shall only read you the unanimous conclusion of this group of 36 New England leaders:

"The committee looks upon the proposed expenditure for developing the waterway as in the nature of a capital investment of a national character upon which exceptionally liberal dividends will be returned in the form of reduced transportation costs and the general benefit and prosperity of a large and important section of the country which at the present time is laboring under a most serious and difficult economic handicap. It further believes that the net result of the development of such a waterway will incidentally be of considerable advantage to New England and the surrounding community, both from a broad national standpoint as well as that of purely local self-interest.

"The committee, therefore, places itself definitely on record as favoring the early entrance of this Government into negotiation with the proper officials of the Canadian Government looking toward the prompt consummation of a treaty which will make possible the undertaking of the enterprise and urges upon all New England's local and national representatives the desirability of their full cooperation in every reasonable manner to bring this result about."

This is a far cry from the opposition registered by a representative of the Maritime Association of Boston before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee in 1941. This man, previously a long-time employee of railroads, claimed that cheap power would ruin Massachusetts. One of the Congressmen asked incredulously, "Do you mean that giving the people of New England electricity at reasonable rates, and taking this overcharge of $97,000,000 a year off of them would ruin New England?"

And the witness replied, "Yes; I do."

Apparently this witness and his philosophy have been well accepted here, for the people of New York and New England, except Connecticut, pay the highest electric rates anywhere in the country.

I cannot believe that the voice of Massachusetts will continue to be expressed by such unabashed spokesmen for monopoly and public exploitation. The tradition of liberalism and progress is too well ingrained in New England soil to remain covered for long.

If this project is of great advantage to the Nation in peace and in war; if New England, by the testimony of its citizens, will stand to benefit, then where does this effusion of propaganda against the project come from?

I shall be candid and to the point, for it is time to call a spade a spade. The opposition is engendered by the Eastern Trunk Lines and power companies, both intimately connected with the higher echelons of finance in New York.

I shall not here expose in detail the evidence, for that was done effectively by Senator LA FOLLETTE on the floor of the Senate last December 8. It is available for everyone in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date.

The eastern roads fear competition in their rates, and the power companies fear cheap public power, and this opposition has been consolidated since public development of this project was enunciated by Governor Roosevelt, of New York, in 1931.

These are the sources of opposition and they have succeeded in silencing favorable expressions in the East, as well as in the West. They have initiated hostile and false propaganda throughout the country from coast to coast, and, unfortunately, many well-meaning and public-spirited citizens have fallen for it.

When the western railroads are silenced against their better judgment, when the business voice of New England is made to change its tune within our own generation, when the Southwest is told through the representatives of eastern-controlled railroad and power companies that this project will ruin Texas or Arizona or New Mexico, then it is plain that we are witnessing not only a willful instigation of insidious sectionalism but, what is even more disturbing, we are witnessing a financial colonialism that will ultimately lead this country into an economic straitjacket and commercial strangulation.

I do not believe this will succeed. I do not—I cannot—believe that your representatives in Congress will disregard the national interest and the local interest of the Northeast and turn down this project.

The spirit of liberalism, of progress, and of adventure is stirring throughout the land, and even more so in New England.

The leadership that was New England's the spirit of John Paine and Samuel Adams, of Charles Sumner and Oliver Wendel Holmes and Louis Brandeis is with us again.

I feel confident this spirit will find eloquent expression in the great public servants who represent this State in the United States Senate today.

With such statesmanship and love of public service as our allies, this time we shall win. It is time to return to the first principles of New England prosperity, low-cost power, and low-cost water transportation.

When the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is completed, we will all be proud of it, for it will contribute immeasurably to our economic welfare and to our national safety.

Address by Hon. James M. Tunnell, of Delaware, Before American Slav Congress, Detroit, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 4 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by me before the annual meeting of the American Slav Congress at Detroit, Mich., on December 2, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is an honor and a pleasure to have been invited here to attend this meeting of the American Slav Congress. From listening to what has been said here, I know I am among friends—among men who take a liberal view of the world and speak the same language I do.

To many liberalism is a guiding star, an objective, and a hope for America. To such persons judgment is based on the present and the past. A liberal is one who hopes for something better in the future. In opposition to the liberals are those who have since the foundation of government been advocates of the belief that all wisdom and all power come from above—from the higher walks of life, from the financier rather than the laborer, from the men of wealth rather than from those of lower financial standing. These forces have been as opposite as centripetal and centrifugal tendencies. They are opposite today. The American people have been liberal through their whole history. We have always had a liberal party and a conservative, or reactionary, party. The conservative element in America has always followed the teachings of Alexander Hamilton. The liberal party has followed the teachings of Thomas Jefferson. These parties must follow their respective tendencies. Whenever the conservative party in America turns liberal temporarily, it is met by the opposition of its own supporters. Whenever the liberal party turns conservative, it is met by the opposition of those who would otherwise be its supporters. The conservative party in the United States has but three times in its history reelected its candidate for the Presidency. It has in 156 years had but one man who served two full terms in the Presidency. In the First Continental Congress the natural rights of man were described as being to life, liberty, and property. Thomas Jefferson used a different language—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Right there was the distinction recognized by Thomas Jefferson between the right of property and the right to the pursuit of happiness, the difference between property rights and human rights. Progressives or liberals believe that the fountain of power is in the people themselves. Jefferson believed in the simple government. He was opposed to an alliance between government and business, between the church and the state; his sympathies were with the mortgagor rather than with the mortgagee.

The American Slav Congress has a record to be proud of. It has always stood with the most progressive forces in America. It always supported to the limit the humane and farsighted policies of our late President and Commander in Chief, the greatest liberal of his day, one of the greatest statesmen of all times, our beloved Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The Congress has been equally strong in its support of President Harry S. Truman, another warm-hearted friend of the common man, always a champion of Main Street against Wall Street, another determined foe of special privilege of every kind. Already hailed as one of our ablest Chief Executives, President Truman is loyally dedicated to carrying forward the great work so well begun under his illustrious predecessor, now gone to a well-deserved rest—though certain ghouls, for purposes of their own, are noisily at work with pickaxes on his hallowed grave, hoping to dig up buried treasure and scatter his ashes to be blown away by the winds of vicious rumor and petty gossip.

My phrases are cool and measured when I say that never in our history has there been anything as despicable, so altogether contemptible, as this desperate effort of the bankrupt reactionaries to besmirch the character, impugn the motives, challenge the honesty, and integrity of our late President, who went to his grave mourned by all the world as no man in history before him had been mourned. In their present smear campaign, in their cold-blooded character assassination of the dead, the reactionary high command has reached an all-time low in political tactics, as my colleague Senator SCOTT LUCAS observed a few days back—and there were some of us who were convinced after 1936, 1940, and 1944 that they could not possibly sink any lower. Well, we live and learn, and probably should not be surprised. It was all in the cards. It is just what you might expect of a totally bankrupt opposition trying to make a little cheap political capital at the expense of the country as a whole.

This opposition seems to believe that a time when many hearts are tender from the loss of their dear ones on the fighting fields that petty political capital can be made by attempting to prove that our Nation was led into this war by President Roosevelt and Secreary of State Hull. While the whole Nation is sad from our losses, it was not believed that any person or party would attempt to deceive the American people into a state of mind where they would blame their victorious heroes for the casualty list which was comparatively light considering the great victories won, the tremendous length of our battle fronts, and the preparation of our enemies. Certain of the small type politician is seeking to buy the elections of 1946 and 1948 with the blood of our dead heroes. From being stupid, they have become positively indecent. Abandoning the gutter, they have plunged into the sewer. And I say, let them stay there where they evidently feel at home.

Of one thing, I am quite certain—the American people are not fond of ghouls. Almost all of them, including millions of rank-and-file political opponents who regard themselves as patriotic Americans first and political partisans second, have been pained and revolted by the spectacle put on by the Old Guard leadership, with the grinning approval and loud vocal support of some old stand-bys of publicity specialists and newspaper publishers of the more unscrupulous type. And what is the purpose of this unholy show? What is the theme song of this chorus in brass?—and what brass. The purpose is to put our America Firsters back in business again at the old stand, with the idea of sowing dissension and disunity in all ranks, of pitting nation against nation, employer against employee, group against group. The theme is that our isolationists, Munichmen, and chicken-hearted appeasers of fascism, were right after all. They say we could have done business with Hitler, Hirohito, Mussolini, and company. On what terms, of course, and at the sacrifice of all our democratic liberties—but what did that matter to people who had no use for those liberties anyhow? They are our present day reactionary workers. These people would have hotly denied that they were Quislings or Lavals, but they subscribed to the same basic philosophy that the sensible thing to do was to come to a modus vivendi with the "wave of the future," as it was then known in certain blind and ignorant circles. Let me say, this is not past history. It is in the headlines today, and that is why I am talking about it here. The forces of reaction and disruption are not dead—make no mistake about that. Defeated on the field of battle, they are reorganizing their forces on an ideological plane with the hope of confusing the public mind, and their first concern is to rewrite the history of recent years.

Believe it or not, but the Japanese were not really responsible for the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor. Oh, no. Last Monday, November 26, in the Senate of the United States, as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page 10959, a Senator of the United States was addressed in the following language by Senator MCMAHON, of Connecticut: "It seems to me that the Senator's thesis comes down to trying to prove that the Japanese were not solely to blame for Pearl Harbor." The reply of the Senator was, "Does the Senator have any doubt about that?" This was language used on the floor of the United States Senate during the past week. They are those who would have us believe that the Japanese were not really responsible for the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor. Oh, no. The language of the Sen-

ator implies that the Japanese were not solely responsible for that attack. We are supposed to believe that the peace-loving Japanese militarists were deliberately provoked and trapped into attacking us by those two great warmongers—President Franklin Delano Roosevelt and his Secretary of State, Cordell Hull. It was they and not the unspeakable Tojo who really pulled the trigger, so we were informed the other day by certain Members of Congress. All the administration had to do, it seems, was to sell the Chinese people down the river, abandon all hope of defending the Philippines and Hawaii, sell the Japanese all the steel and oil and munitions of war they wanted on demand, give up all our rights to conduct trade and commerce in the Far East, and everything would have been hotsy-totsy—at least until the Japanese war lords stepped up their demands and handed us another so-called peace proposal, probably suggesting that we draw back from the Pacific coast.

It seems to me I have heard all this before in slightly different terms, and the voice I hear is that of Dr. Goebbels putting to practice his technique of the big lie. Do you remember how the peace-loving Nazis were first menaced by the Czechs, and the Third Reich had to protect itself by smashing Czechoslovakia? Do you remember Herr Hitler screaming about the aggressive designs of the Poles and their responsibility for starting World War II? The Poles were very unreasonable people, it seems. All they had to do was to commit national suicide and Hitler would have been willing to write them off his list. Do you remember the Nazi radio and press on the equally aggressive designs of the Yugoslavs and the Russians—all of whom were thirsting for the blood of those doves of peace, Die Fuehrer and Il Duce? You people of Slavic descent do remember, and I say that none of us should ever forget.

Fascism has received a mortal wound, but it is not yet dead. We have a job to do, and that is to see that its roots are eradicated everywhere. We have a job to do in seeing that we create an international organization which will allow peace-loving people to live in peace, and that we do our best in support of those who are trying to remove rather than increase national jealousies, suspicions, and distrust. Whether they know it or not, our Russian-baiters and British-haters are playing the fascist game of divide and rule. We have a job to do in seeing that the millions of freedom-loving people in Europe who bravely fought as our allies and bore the brunt of the war, do not starve or freeze this winter. We cannot and will not shirk our responsibility here. We have an equally imjortant job to do in seeing that we remove from our midst every last trace of religious intolerance and racial discrimination. Here are the seeds of a native fascism that must be uprooted. This must be a country in which all have equal rights and opportunities, and in which there are no second-class citizens.

The seeds of reaction, as the histories of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy make plain, can only flourish where conditions of economic insecurity prevail. Only when people are jobless and hopeless, only when the orderly processes of government fail in their function of making life more tolerable for the average man, is it possible for the black hand of reaction to gather strength. A people marching steadily toward higher and higher standards of life can never be seduced and persuaded to make the wrong turn by the cheap demogagues of the right. It is no accident that those who now crawl out from under the rocks as unconverted Munich men and spend their days trying to create international discord by open or snide attacks upon each and all of our allies, are the very people who relentlessly attack each and every progressive measure of domestic legislation.

They are the people who fought against social security, minimum wages and hours and collective bargaining. They are the people who were opposed to the Security and Exchange Commission, to the insuring of bank deposits, to giving the small farmer a break for a change. They are the people who are today fighting every proposal in President Truman's 21-point program to take us through the difficult reconversion period and keep us on a high level of prosperity.

Last year, when our boys were fighting in foreign lands, there were those who attempted to prevent their having an opportunity to vote. One man, being an anti-Roosevelt Senator, openly stated on the floor of the Senate when a bill to permit the boys to vote was before the Senate, that if President Roosevelt would announce that he would not be a candidate for reelection, the bill to allow the vote of the soldiers could be passed in 30 minutes. To a very great extent those opposing this vote succeeded in preventing the boys the opportunity which they should have had at that election.

These reactionaries don't like full employment. It is "un-American," it seems, to take steps to insure every able and willing American worker a job so that he can feed his family and keep a roof over his head. They don't like adequate unemployment compensation for the millions of loyal workers now losing their jobs as our war plants close down. The American people are so shiftless, they say, that such compensation would only encourage idleness. Let me say, for myself, that I have never heard a worse libel on the American people, but then, these gentry were always contemptuous of the people anyhow. These reactionaries stated that if unemployment compensation should be allowed generally, it would be only an inducement to people not to work. In other words, those who oppose the people anyway now say that by permitting them to be assured that they will not starve during the period when the Nation is being reconverted from wartime to peacetime pursuits would be a method of inducing them not to work at all. Does any real American believe this? Or was it an excuse to strike at the average man. These are the people who have tied up both adequate unemployment compensation and the full employment bill.

And there are a lot of other things these people don't like—for one thing, the continuance of the Fair Employment Practice Committee to put an end, once and for all, to job discriminations against Negroes, Jews, Catholics, the foreign-born, and all minority groups. This, it seems, is an invasion of our individual liberties.

These people are quite as hostile to public housing for low-income groups, to develcpment of our national resources on a sound regional basis, to the continuance of OPA price ceilings to prevent ruinous inflation and ruthless profiteering, and they almost have apoplexy at the recommendation that the Fair Labor Standards Act be amended to raise the minimum wage level from 40 cents to 65 cents an hour.

And what is the moral of all this? It is quite simple, and I hardly need point it out to you people of the American Slav Congress, for you know it as well as I do. You have always stood squarely against fascism and reaction, both in the foreign and domestic fields. You have always stood for progress at home and the closest kind of cooperation abroad.

The ideas for which we stand are the ideas of the common people everywhere, and they have just won a great triumph throughout the world. Today, with the Nazi beast laid low at last, never to rise again—with the Jap war machine hopelessly smashed—there is good reason for the whole civilized world to rejoice—men, women, and children, of every race, creed, and color, in all the lands where human decency is respected, and human freedom is prized and loved.

All over the world the lights are going on again. At this time we intend to see that they stay on, under a strong world organization designed to keep the peace and stop potential aggressors dead in their tracks.

During the past week in the Senate we have been considering a bill having for its purpose the implementing of the United Nations Organization. This bill has specifically for its objective the permission to our representative on the Security Council to see that our operation of the world force can be used without going to the Congress after trouble has started. We have agreed in our adoption of the United Nations Charter to put up a force for the benefit of humanity in despair, and to prevent war. To this plan there has been no clean-cut opposition, but every attempt in the world to amend or delay the passage of this bill to which we are in honor bound. They want every use of force to be preceded by an appeal to Congress. President Roosevelt once said something to this effect—that to require the United Nations Organization to go back to Congress for authority to use force would be like requiring the policeman on his beat when he saw a burglar entering a house, to go back to the town council before stopping or arresting the intruder. This plan, if successful, would prevent the use of any moral or military force to protect the world, and prevent wars. There were approximately 12 amendments offered to this bill. If these amendments are adopted, or any considerable number of them, the United Nations Organization will be so handicapped that it can never function to prevent wars, as millions of anxious people throughout the world are hoping that it may. The United Nations Organization is young. It is as yet untried. It needs the support and assistance of every peace-loving nation and of every peace-loving individual. However, the United Nations Organization is in existence, and will be given an opportunity to succeed. It represents the best thought of the world. It represents an effort on the part of the best people of the world to stop the bloodshed and wholesale destruction of property which goes with each war. We are progressing.

Yes; we have come a long way since those dark days just 3 years ago, in the fall of 1942, when the Nazis were fighting in the streets of Stalingrad and hammering at the gates of Egypt, and the Japs were running wild in the Pacific, threatening to drench a whole continent in blood. We Americans can be proud of the part we played in that heroic struggle, under as brilliant a political and military leadership as the world has ever seen. With the exception of a few congenitally blind partisans, all mankind recognizes President Franklin D. Roosevelt as the chief architect of the most resounding military triumph of history. But military triumph is not enough. In a sense, it is only the beginning. The larger part of our job remains to be done. We must translate our victory into peace and prosperity for all. This can and will be done, and there is work for all of us to do, each in his own place and function.

I want here and now to give voice to a word of warning with reference to the United Nations Organization. When the League of Nations was proposed, a great majority of the American people favored it. The opposition dared not come out and say specifically that they opposed a League of Nations. What they could say was that it could be amended, and with a deliberate purpose to destroy the League of Nations, its opponents suggested a large number of amendments and alterations. The attempt at that time to destroy the League of Nations was, as you know, successful, and from that time on we were headed for the Second World War. Woodrow Wilson saw this. Millions of other Americans saw it, and there were enough of the opposition in places of power to prevent the consummation of this world plan for peace.

There are many indications in the present mass of proposals and suggestions to cause one to believe that another attempt is being made to destroy the second of our great plans to stop world slaughter. Owing to increased efficiency of weapons of destruction and discoveries of new methods of taking life and destroying property, the next war may be shorter and more destructive than either the First or Second World War. It is possible that this war may terminate differently from our standpoint than did either World War I or World War II.

The necessity for an effective world organization, endorsed and backed by the great nations of the world, has greatly increased. However, the organization needs the support of every man, woman, and child in the world. Those bent on turning to petty, political, partisan advantage and prospective world slaughter should not be permitted to have the voice or the vote in high places to bring the world to a state of complete devastation. Civilization and self-interest combine to demand of us and each of us our greatest effort in the colossal struggle which we shall face in the next generation to prevent the world's worst holocaust. In this, you must be of assistance.

That is part of your job—to provide a public forum for the intelligent discussion and clarification of the great questions at issue. It is likewise part of your job to cooperate as closely as possible with other groups about the country interested in achieving the same ends, so that opinion can be solidified behind a forward-looking program. There can be no slightest doubt that the great majority of the American people want to move ahead to better things. There can also be no slightest doubt that their desire will be frustrated if men of vision and good will now start quarreling among themselves about minor details. Let us all put first things first, and keep our eye on the ball. Peace and prosperity for all is our goal. Let us rededicate ourselves, wholeheartedly and with full vigor, to the achievement of that great aim, and we may be sure of the approval of our conscience and the blessings of our children for generations to come.

Hirohito's Status

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 4 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Star of today entitled "Hirohito's Status." The editorial raises a question which will constantly be discussed respecting the inconsistency of the position of this Government in prosecuting as war criminals all of Hirohito's advisers, even to the *n*th degree, and yet permitting him to remain on the throne.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIROHITO'S STATUS

General MacArthur's newest list of suspected Japanese war criminals again raises the question of what Emperor Hirohito's eventual classification is going to be. The list, which is made up largely of businessmen, militarists, politicians, teachers, editors, and writers, significantly includes the first prince of imperial blood thus to be made subject to arrest. He is Morimasa Nashimoto, and since he is 71 years old and has apparently been little but a figurehead adviser to the throne, logic compels asking why Hirohito himself should not be named.

More important still, the determination of Hirohito's position cannot be divorced from the proceedings now being conducted at Nuernberg. As set forth by Supreme Court Justice Jackson, the chief American prosecutor, one of the key principles governing the trial of the Nazi leaders is that heads of aggressor states must be held personally accountable for the crime of aggressive war, and were Hitler alive and in our hands, he would undoubtedly be sitting in the prisoners' dock today. Accordingly, as far as Hirohito is concerned, the question is not merely whether he should be named if one of his unimportant princely advisers is named, but also whether the Nuernberg principle applies to him, and if not, why not.

Considerations of logic and consistency deeply color this situation. As the man advised, how can Hirohito be immune when one of his lesser advisers is named as a suspect on the ground, apparently, of having advised him? And as the head of an aggressor state which waged an aggressive war, how can he escape the sort of trial called for by the Nuernberg principle? It may be, of course, that he will yet be taken into custody. It may be that expediency—the desire to make the initial phase of occupation as easy and orderly as possible—has dictated the hands-off policy followed up to now. It may be, too, that General MacArthur and his superiors here in Washington have excellent reasons to believe that Hirohito did not want and was powerless to prevent what happened in Asia and the Pacific. Meanwhile, though, the voices of logic and consistency keep asking their persistent questions.

This is not to suggest that Hirohito should be arrested forthwith. It is merely to suggest that as matters stand today there is a kind of delicate and embarrassing discrepancy in the way we are handling him on the one hand and the way we are handling some of his advisers and the Nazi leaders on the other. As long as this situation obtains, as long as it lacks a clear and convincing explanation, the law and morality involved will seem confused, and the Nuernberg principle will look like something quite haphazardly applied, meaning one thing for Germany and another for Japan, so that it may excite little or no respect in the world of tomorrow.

Discharge of Fathers From the Armed Services

REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced in the House two resolutions. One provides for discharge of fathers as rapidly as discharge facilities will permit, and the other provides for the termination of induction upon enactment of the resolution.

After thorough study of the problems involved and a detailed review of the situation since VJ-day, I am convinced that the action proposed by these resolutions is justified and will be to the best interest of the public welfare.

All of us want sufficient military strength to guarantee security, and we shall maintain that. However, I believe you will agree with me that conditions warrant discontinuing the draft.

I would not consider this termination for one moment if it would cause any member of the armed forces who is entitled to discharge under present regulations to remain in the service one extra minute, but I am convinced such will not be the case. Voluntary enlistments are running higher than expected.

In the beginning the President said it was necessary to draft 50,000 per month to prevent any interruption with returning veterans. We agreed with that viewpoint at the time, but now it is reported from reliable sources that 81,094 volunteered during the first half of November, and the number is ever increasing.

In view of these enlistments, it is evident that the draft could be ended without slowing demobilization.

I do not propose a repeal of the selective-service law at this time because it gives certain benefits to the men in the service, but we are happy to observe that the armed forces are rapidly going on a volunteer basis because this is the American way of doing things.

The necessity for the rapid return of fathers is so obvious that I will not take the time of the House to present any argument. I think it will suffice to remind you that the family is the keystone of our spiritual and material life. It is the backbone of this Republic. Let us protect it by the return of these young fathers to their families.

England—Enemy of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 4 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "England—Enemy of Liberty" delivered by me at the Academy of Music in Brooklyn, N. Y., on Thursday, November 29, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When I voted against the new United Nations league, some people said I committed political suicide.

I ought to explain something of that to you. There were only two of us who voted against the United Nations league—Senator HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, of Minnesota, and I. We voted against it because we thought it wasn't any good. There were many other Members of the Congress who felt as we did but at the time it looked to them as if they ought to vote for the League. Some of these men simply felt that it would fall apart anyway—so what was the difference.

However, as far as I was concerned, I couldn't vote for something I didn't believe in or that I thought was bad for the American people. I voted against Dumbarton Oaks and the San Francisco Charter at a

time when it seemed politically dangerous to do so. It wasn't because I didn't want a world organization—I do want a world organization if we can achieve one which is safe for America. But, I don't want a world organization which is simply a paper creation and a British scheme to keep half the world in subjection. I don't want an organization which is a result of British or any other outside influence over the boys of our State Department, instead of being a result of our own considered best interests.

We are new at this game, but the British have been experienced at it for hundreds of years. I knew that we were being taken in by it and that the new league would not and could not work except as a matter of backing up British interests throughout the world. Now we find that this is true. Almost any sensible man admits it.

A few days ago Pat Hurley came back from China. He had the courage to say what all our high officials have thought who actually have been in the Far East, and that is that we are being sucked into a power bloc on the side of colonial imperialism against Communist imperialism.

Now, what do you think Pat Hurley meant? I think I can tell you. He meant that the British who are having a first-class quarrel with the Russians have succeeded in getting us to back their policy throughout the world, particularly in the Orient. He meant that we were being drawn into a new world war in defense of alien interests, a new war which would have nothing whatsoever to do with our own security.

Having committed myself against the league, I am about to commit myself now to another proposition—I want no more war. I think we have had enough war. War means that we are going to have to put our young men in uniform again and have them shot up all over the world. It means many wore widows in my native State of North Dakota. It means a lot more boys with wooden legs and hopelessly hospitalized in institutions. It means more lease-lend. It means final poverty to this Nation.

The only one there is left to fight in the world is Russia. Now, it may be that if the British stop interfering and inciting us on that we can come to some agreement with Russia whereby they will give us what we want to be secure and safe so we won't interfere with each other. If we can do that there will be no war; but if we let ourselves be pushed around because of British interests in Iraq or Iran or anywhere else, then there is certain to be a war.

I dare say there will be some people who will say that this makes me a pro-Russian. I don't know about that. I am not pro-anything but pro-the good people of America who have a right to live and breathe freely again and to ride around in automobiles with real tires on them for a change. I am against tangling with a wild tiger in a cage, too. Maybe some people would say that this makes me pro-tiger..

As far as I am concerned it just means that I have common sense.

Now, I want to tell you this, too, and it takes some courage for a man to say it now: I not only think the British are trying to get us into World War III to defend their world-wide imperialism; I also say they got us into World War II and World War I. I repeat that: They got us into World War II and World War I.

Of course, we had to be anti-Nazi and anti-Japanese; but who built up the Nazis and the Japanese? It was the British who encouraged the Japanese to ravage Asia, just as it is the British who are slaughtering the people of Indochina, just as they are now shooting down the unfortunate people of Java with American lease-lend guns, and murdering the people of India with American ammunition.

The British played the old divide-and-rule game. They didn't care for a free and democratic Germany. They hated what they thought was the Socialist regime put into existence by the decent people of Germany, so, together with the Vickers people, the munitions kings, and people like Sir Henry Detterding, the oil king—all of them British subjects—they conspired to build a real first-class war party in Germany. They never believed that party would turn against them as it did.

It was the British who broke the Versailles treaty in order to give Hitler airplanes and arms; and it was their undercover agents who supported him everywhere in his diplomacy. If the British had supported the democratic leaders of Germany as they later supported Hitler, we would not have had a world war. Europe would not now be in ruins and the world in danger of real collapse.

What do you think these British actions said to the decent Germans? It discredited those who argued for freedom in Germany. It made it clear that Great Britain, then the great power in Europe, was anxious to build up a Fascist state in Germany in order to have it act as a cat's-paw in the war against Russia or even against France, which the British then mistook to be the great military power on the Continent.

The British miscalculation was that the Nazis after suppressing all the good people in Germany turned out to be what hoodlums are everywhere—they refused to obey their masters anymore. It was soon clear that they would challenge the British themselves and that there would be a struggle for the international loot between the pious British Fascists and the out-and-out German Fascists. Therefore, the British had no recourse but to fight, and they did so under the name of democracy.

We had to fight, too, once the enemies of freedom were established in Germany and throughout Europe, but had the British not acted to place them in power there would have been no world war.

What I maintain is that nazism is a world disease. We have just fought a war trying to knock it out of Germany and Japan. Certainly it exists in England, even though England is so self-righteous in its democracy at home.

What do you call it but fascism when you see the British shooting down Indian patriots in their own country and bombarding Javanese towns from the air? What do you call it when the Greeks are unable to run their own government even though they are one of the allies: When you see the Poles sold down the river: when you see British bureaucrats conspire to keep the unfortunate Jews out of their own home in Palestine; when you see the poor Arabs all over the world kept down by the most despotic governments which have been placed and kept in power by British gold; when you see hundreds of millions of people throughout Asia, Indochina, and in almost all of Africa enslaved, and slaughtered when they rebelled against it?

I don't see why one kind of fascism is better than any other kind of fascism. Fascism means the exploitation of other people by force, and here we have a perfect example of it.

At the present moment the British are in conflict with almost half the people of the world. The people of Europe believe they are even trying to turn that continent into a sort of colonial reserve, the same as they have India and Arabia and other countries. They are making every possible effort to bring our financial and military support behind them for a war which they are inviting with Russia.

I am not arguing in behalf of the Russians. I am only arguing in behalf of the United States of America. All I know is that the Soviet Union is not some little country like Ethiopia. It will not be conquered easily. They are not going to lay down their arms and submit, but will fight with everything they have. In short, they are as big as we are, and maybe as tough.

If we go to war with them, we will have to get ready for a tussle far worse than any we have ever been through before. Maybe even our cities will be bombed like the German and Japanese cities.

To my mind, that means we can only go to war with them for cause after all efforts to get together with them have failed.

I don't think we have gotten together yet, of course; but I don't think we can even try as long as the British are interfering.

Our forefathers fought the Revolutionary War to get rid of the rotten system of human exploitation the British introduced here as they have all over the globe. It was they who brought the slaves to this country. Now they are back again, eating us out of our sustenance like the 7-year locusts. What we need is another revolutionary war to regain our independence from Great Britain.

Right at the moment, Britain is in this country asking for a $4,000,000,000 loan. Do you know what this loan means? It means that every man and woman in the country has to work harder and produce more in order to make this gift to the British. Our income tax in the normal year of 1939 was just a little over $2,000,000,000. In order to pay for this so-called loan, it will be exactly the same as if the normal income tax as of 1939 were tripled. Income tax is hard enough on most of us without, in effect, tripling it for the purpose of helping the British keep down half the world. I want you to reflect on that.

Now, this loan, everyone knows, is a frankly disguised gift and is not a loan at all. For the first 5 years it will bear no interest whatsoever. After that it will have some ridiculous interest like three-fourths of 1 percent.

At any rate, it will not be repaid by the British because they cannot pay it. They have not paid any of the loans made before. They didn't pay the loans made after the last war. They owe us an inconceivable sum on lease-lend which they will not be able to pay back and their situation is so bad that they have practically become a third-rate nation.

If we have so much money left after the tremendous costs of this war as to be able to make a $4,000,000,000 loan, let's make it to the poor American farmer who is trying to bring his business up to date again. Let the farmer and the small home owner have a loan at 1-percent interest and give him 45 years to pay. At least we will get our money back and the entire country will benefit by the use of it.

Now, when a third-rate nation suffers from hallucinations and aspires to rule the world there has to be trouble. What actually is happening in our relations with the British is that the tail is wagging the dog.

As far as this Nation is concerned, we would like to help Great Britain, but we would not like to help her put our country at war.

Great Britain is without question the great international danger point. Anyone who has seen her shoot down the helpless peasants of Balbriggan in Ireland, or the students of Indochina and Egypt, knows what she is capable of doing. Now, the same black and tans who used to operate down in Ireland are in Palestine, are shooting down a lot of unfortunate Jews who are asking nothing more than to be allowed to work out their own destiny.

Do you know how the British system works? In the first place, it is necessary for Britain to take cotton goods from India and Egypt and ship it all the way back to England, make it into cotton cloth, and then ship it back to India and Egypt and sell it there. This means that they must suppress these countries and prevent them from manufacturing these goods themselves. And so it goes in still other instances.

This is what the British colonial system means.

This is why you see British soldiers shooting Jews in Palestine, suppressing the natives of Indochina, and jailing the leaders of India, and keeping almost all of Africa in slavery.

It is why you find that even the Caribbean islands at our own back door are complaining bitterly about colonial exploitation which they cannot escape.

In addition to using force Britain practices the old scheme of incitement. She urges on one part of the population of every country against the others. In India she uses the Moslems against the Hindus, in Palestine the Arabs against the Jews, though none of these people had any real quarrels with each other until British self-interest interfered.

In order for Britain to maintain her system throughout the world it is necessary for her to keep in power reactionary governments—the very kind of governments we fought to end. Everywhere they are fighting against the republican form of government. They are supporting a little tin-horn king in Greece against the people. In India they keep the people in poverty and ignorance and support the maharajahs and totalitarian kings.

They even support such murderous and despotic scoundrels as Ibn Saud in Arabia, in whose kingdom no Christian can live.

They even got the late President Roosevelt, who was Mr. Easy Mark to them, to give one of our big C–54 transport planes to Ibn Saud as a gift of the American people. What do you think Ibn Saud did with it? He took this airplane with an American crew and American soldiers and proceeded to use it for the purpose of joy-riding his hundreds of wives around Arabia.

Now, if Ibn Saud wants to have several hundred wives I can't stop it. But, it is against my religious belief and my sentiments as an American to make him a present of an American airplane in order to joy-ride them around the heavens. As far as I am concerned, he can provide several hundred camels for them.

Neither do I see why an American crew has to be humiliated by acting as servants for this type of disgraceful business. Do you know that when Ibn Saud's wives stepped into this big airplane the American soldiers had to stand with their eyes turned away? If they so much as looked at one of Ibn Saud's wives they would have been shot.

Whatever the airplane was worth it was paid for by American money and by American taxpayers. In making the gift and in its subsequent use, America abetted the whole system of human slavery which now exists in Saudi-Arabia, supporting these hundreds of concubines in their jail harems—though these unfortunate women pass under the name of wives.

I am not against Ibn Saud, the British, or anyone. I believe in absolute equality for all people and live and let live.

But I am against any form of racial discrimination here or anywhere else. It only makes for war, and it is anti-Christian and anticommon sense.

And, I cannot agree to slavery in Arabia or to a man handling himself like a billy goat, whether his name be Ibn Saud or whatever it be. I think immorality is immorality whether the British are for it or not.

And another thing, I see no reason why this little British nation, which in today's world is no bigger than a peanut, is entitled to rule almost one billion people. Why are they any more entitled to do so than the Germans—or the Norwegians—or the Swedes?

England in the past has always made good the deficits of all these Arabian kings and others in maintaining their power in those territories. Part of the $4,000,000,000 we are asked to put up is going to go to pay the deficit of Ibn Saud and his 300 wives who must be kept up somehow. I repeat, it will have to pay for British operations in Egypt, in Italy, in Palestine, in Java, and elsewhere, and for the shooting down of democratic elements throughout Europe. All of these people are merely trying to attain their independence and to build a decent life for themselves without interference.

One of the British methods of keeping peoples turned against each other is to force Moslems always to vote as Moslems, Hindus as Hindus, Jews as Jews, and Christians as Christians. None of these people can vote on the issue. In India if a Moslem wants to vote for a Hindu he can't do it. Usually it doesn't make any difference how you vote anyway since the British appoint all the actual rulers.

In India in the leading clubs in a big city like Bombay, no Indian, no matter how distinguished, can join. Now, there are 400,000,000 Indians. What effect do you think this has on them?

On the river boats on the great Yangtze River in China, Chinese dignitaries have to ride second class, simply because the British control the boats. What effect do you think this will have on the Chinese?

The British are desperately trying to keep the Chinese from industrializing in China and the Indians from building industries in India.

What this means is, if we are backing up the British in this despotic practice, we are making enemies of half the world and sooner or later will have to fight them. In an age of atomic bombs where our cities are perfect targets, I think we are taking a long chance.

In addition to this, I can see why the Russians are maneuvering as they are. For generations the British have succeeded in keeping Russia cooped up in an area a little more than three times as large as the United States and without access to the sea. Russia doesn't even have access to the Mediterranean or Atlantic Ocean. In order to get through the Mediterranean she has to go through the straits, through the Dardanelles, and through the Strait of Gibraltar. In both cases the British have acted to close the Russians off and keep them cooped up. This is an old design, and Britain has already fought three wars with Russia over the same thing. Maybe they are getting set to fight another war, but if they are, I don't think we should be in it.

And I do know that the situation is a bad one and that the dead hand of British exploitation lies all over it.

Let me explain the straits proposition to you. These straits owned by the Turks are now governed by an agreement called the Montreux convention which the Russians were forced to accept in the past. It is the British and not the Turks who are the dominating element, just as it is the British and not the Egyptians who actually run the Suez Canal. The quarrel then, seemingly between the Russians and the Turks, is in reality between the British and the Russians. Whatever London demands in this matter, the Turks are compelled to do.

The Russians are seeking a revision of the Montreux convention so that their ships can get to the Mediterranean.

Now, what are the British willing to do for us in return for the support they expect? The answer is exactly nothing.

In Palestine where the Jewish settlers showed a preference for American cars which they consider superior, the British, though they did not have the legal authority to do so, placed a tax on cars which brought the duty on an American car, like an old second-hand Buick, to the fantastic sum of $2,700. This is just for duty alone. They have practically shut off American trade from the Middle East and north Africa. When the Jews tried to get around all this by opening up a car assembly plant for parts, the British put on a duty 50 percent higher for parts than for complete vehicles.

In India, when Britain needed rubber during the World War, they allowed Indian rubber growers to go ahead and develop. Now that they don't need rubber, they are doing their best to stop the Indian rubber growers from raising rubber. One trick way of doing this is to prevent the Indian rubber growers from getting the kind of insecticide they need.

This again places America at the mercy of the big British Malayan rubber cartel, and that is its purpose.

Another example is lend-lease. We gave them these freely. We gave them everything they required, not only to fight a war but to live. For example, we did not charge them tolls for their ships going through the Panama Canal. In return, Britain gave us a small amount of so-called reserve lend-lease—just enough to put on the record. But they even charged us for the use of their ships in the handling of lend-lease material which we were giving to them. They charged us for handling all these goods which we were handing out to them and which represented the labor of the American people. They also charged us for sending it through the Suez Canal, even though it was an out-and-out gift.

There is something ridiculous in all this.

You may believe it or not, but the fact is—and our State Department will be compelled to acknowledge it—that Great Britain has asked us to give up part of our trade in favor of their failing manufacturers. That means the American people seeking work and the American businessmen have to give up part of their sustenance.

We now have about five times as many ships as the British for the transoceanic carrying trade. The British have asked us, and expect us, to give up our preeminence in shipping so that England can once more rule the waves.

I want to repeat to you—when you talk about giving up something you are not talking hot air. You are not talking of something abstract. You are talking about the labor of men in North Dakota and elsewhere who have to work harder and sweat more in order to support some rascally exploitative privilege.

I believe in capitalism to the degree that I believe in fair and free competition, but I don't believe in cartels and repressive capitalism. Particularly I don't believe in the English brand, which keeps everyone from competing with the man who holds the guns. I repeat, Great Britain is holding the gun at the head of democracy all over the world, and we are asked to pay for the ammunition.

In Great Britain there are mountains of tires and other military equipment which Americans have made and paid for. I should like to know where all this is going; also, I should like to know why it is not being brought back. Is it being given to the British as another gift?

What I do know is that American farmers still cannot get tires or overalls or even lumber, and there seems to be no prospect of their getting these things for a long time. This stuff is our property and should be shipped back to let Americans. who desperately need them for postwar reconstruction, utilize them.

I should like to point out to you, my friends, this blanket. Take a good look at it. It was purchased a short time ago in the basement of Selfridge's Department Store in London. It is made of a combination of cotton and wool and sold at approximately $3. That is very cheap for a blanket like this. It should have been worth at least $10 here in America before it was shipped. Let me read the label which is on this blanket, exactly as it was when it was purchased in

Selfridge's Department Store in London. This is what it says:

"Gift of the American people through the American Red Cross."

These blankets and many types of material are all over London and being sold dirt cheap. The poor and freezing people in Europe for whom the American people donated this stuff are still poor and freezing.

What I should like to know is how this stuff got to Selfridge's Department Store in London, by whose authority, and by what right?

Is this same sort of thing to happen to all of the mountains of tires, trucks, overalls, clothes, and other supplies now piled up all over Britain?

Judging from this record, I should say that the American people are getting a pretty shabby deal on this.

I should like to point out, for example, the recent resignation of certain officials of UNRRA, the big relief organization which was supposed to help the starving people of Europe. The reason these men gave for resigning was that UNRRA, whose great expenditures again are being paid for by the sweat and labor of Americans, is being used by the British for purely political purposes in Europe—that is to build up a fight against the democratic elements, in favor of the kings, and to get Europe lined up for another war.

Everything that Pat Hurley said was true in China is also true in Europe, and the people in back of it are the same people.

The object is a war with Russia, and perhaps later with China, if China should get strong.

I again say that we should avoid a war with Russia if we can in good dignity, and I think we can. We have never had a war with Russia.

We may not like the Russian form of government, but, on the other hand, I don't like the British form of government either, and I don't suggest we go to war with Britain over it.

Therefore, all I suggest is that, as it is a struggle between Great Britain and Russia, we should keep out of it. These people have been fighting each other for over three centuries, and if they want to fight another three centuries, it appears to me that it is up to them.

Frankly, I don't even wish to see our soldiers remain in Europe one day longer than they have to remain. I certainly don't want them in Arabia or anywhere else which isn't American territory. Above all, I don't want them backing up British-backed kings and princesses and repressive trusts and cartels. I want a free world in which freemen can live and benefit by their own labor.

One of our major troubles is that our statesmen are no match for the British, who have been at it a long time. The British system of civil servants is the best in the world. From the day these men can go to school as little boys they are taught the best of international intrigue, and they are taught to be independent on the Parliament. You should see the Parliament try to get these officials even to answer questions. The way they parry them is a marvel of ingenuity and insolence.

The British are spending millions of dollars in this country for an out-and-out propaganda campaign to put us squarely behind them in this policy. They control the international communications in their territories, in which they sit as rigidly as the Russians do. If you were in Arabia, Palestine, or India, or any other British place, you couldn't get information out easily. The information the British are willing to let you have is always twisted to suit them.

Talking about "twisted," in America, I am afraid they have most of our head men twisted in Washington. They do it by that system of social mummery. They impress our men with their parties and their titled gentlemen, who are all over Washington. Subjected to this type of influence, our statesmen act like overwhelmed school children.

As far as I am concerned, this British social stuff is just an act. It doesn't impress me at all. No titles impress me. Certainly not anyone that some hypocritical foreign dynasty can confer. The only title I want is that of servant to the people of North Dakota and to the American people.

I am not saying that we ought to reform the British; I simply say we should stop supporting them in any of their schemes which are to our disadvantage or which might put us at war. When I discover that 60 percent of all the food eaten in Great Britain has to be imported from abroad I begin to see how their economic system has to exploit other people in order to exist; when I see the British piously Socialist at home and savagely shooting others abroad in order to prevent them from developing their own nation I throw up my hands in despair. I see no reason whatsoever why the world should be kept in turmoil in order that the road to India should remain British. I think the road to India belongs to the people who live in those territories, just as the right of freedom ought to belong to them also.

I am utterly appalled to find this little Nation of 40,000,000 people not content with over half of Africa, and a great part of Asia, and still other territories, now trying to swallow up still more. They are trying to take over the Dutch territories in the South Sea, the Italian territories in Africa; they have swallowed Ethiopia and French Indochina and Syria. Many Europeans even suspect they are trying to make a colony of Italy itself, Greece, and perhaps Belgium and the Netherlands. That is a terrific appetite for a little bankrupt nation. It indicates to me that its rulers are more than a little mad. It means they are on the way to destruction, and I don't want Uncle Sam to join them in it.

We may be walking into a postwar crisis here in America in which we will find real enough difficulties in securing adequate employment for all our people and maintaining a decent standard of living. Let us stop being bankers to the world unless we have some real American gain in sight. Let us stop being "Uncle Sucker."

As far as the British are concerned, let us tell them flat-footedly that we are not going to back them up in any of their conspiracies, just as we should tell the Russians what it is that we want in order that both our nations can exist harmoniously in the same globe.

Looking around we see that even in our own hemisphere the British are going to be in trouble. Great Britain owns the railroads and the public-utility companies of the Argentine, and if Argentina has any sense they will want to recover them. They certainly will want to recover the strategic Falkland Islands which lie directly off their coast and are also owned by Great Britain, just as we should like to obtain the Caribbeans that are so necessary to our defense, and just as De Valera wants to recover the six northern counties in Ireland. I think it outrageous that Ireland should be kept divided against itself. The Chinese will want Hong Kong and Indochina, and even the Spaniards will want Gibraltar. Arabia will want to be free and the Jews will want Palestine, which they certainly are entitled to under international law. Africa will have to either be free or be handled by an international commission for the benefit of all mankind. India will certainly have to be free, as will Java and the other countries of the Pacific now suffering under British rule.

That is the way the matter goes.

If we want to save ourselves from being involved in these British schemes it will be necessary for us to resist everything which divides Americans from each other. If there are some of you who think that you can play a racial game in this country and be against people because of racial reasons, you are playing the game of the enemies of America, whether they be British Nazis, German Nazis, or whatever Nazis, and you are playing it against the interests of the decent people of America or the hard-working people of England and Germany, too. We are all Americans no matter what our religion is or our racial antecedents, and all are entitled to equal rights and equal opportunity and on this I stand foursquare. I do so not only because it is in the interests of the United States that this be done but also as a convinced Christian. Instead of playing the enemy game by turning our fire against each other in this country, let's all get together and fight world imperialism of any kind. At least we want to fight its influence here in this country. I don't care who is guilty of imperialism—whether it be the British or the Russians or anyone else—we shouldn't abet it and throw the weight of our power behind it.

Let's try to build a free and democratic Europe and let's find some way of getting together with the Russians so that there will be no war and so that whatever our difficulties with them, they can be settled to our mutual satisfaction. Let's throw our weight into a program to build a world in which peoples everywhere can be free. Above all, let's be sure that everyone in the United States, and I mean everyone, has a right to be free and to live free of prejudice and discrimination because of his racial antecedents or his religion. This is the spirit of our Nation, which will continue to be strong so long as this remains its spirit.

Mr. Hull's Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of November 24, 1945.

MR. HULL'S VIEWS

With the death of the late President Roosevelt, no man is better qualified than Cordell Hull to discuss the hopes and the fears which directed the course of this country's foreign policy in the critical years preceding the advent of World War II. Consequently, his statement to the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee deserves the most careful consideration.

Considerable attention has been centered on Mr. Hull's denial that his November 26 note to Japan was an ultimatum which "pushed the button" for the launching of the war. The Star fully agrees that his note was not an ultimatum. But the fact of the matter is—and Mr. Hull's testimony confirms it—that the course of events would not have been altered at that time in any significant respect by anything that Mr. Hull might have said or refrained from saying in his note to the Japanese.

By November 26, 1941, war in the Pacific was inevitable. It is conceivable that a policy of total appeasement might have postponed the war. But it could not have prevented it, for by that time the fatal collision of national interests could not be averted, and the Japanese thought that they were

strong enough, and that we were weak enough, to risk the challenge.

The essence of Mr. Hull's testimony is to be found in this excerpt: "To have accepted the Japanese proposal of November 20 (to which his note of November 26 was a reply) was clearly unthinkable. It would have made the United States an ally of Japan's program of conquest and aggression and of collaboration with Hitler. It would have meant yielding to the Japanese demand that the United States abandon its principles and policies. It would have meant abject surrender of our position under intimidation."

In this situation, and with the war in Europe pressing upon us, it was determined to adopt a firm but cautious policy with respect to Japan. Our military leaders were pleading for time in which to gain strength. They knew that we were weak, and they knew that Japan knew it. Accordingly, in August 1941, the President handed the Japanese a watered-down version of a strong note of warning which had been proposed by Prime Minister Churchill. The fleet was kept based at Pearl Harbor in the hope that its mere presence there would restrain Japan. Mr. Hull persisted in negotiations which he knew to be futile, hoping only to defer the inevitable.

But this effort failed, and it failed primarily for two reasons: First, because we had not the military strength to support the vital foreign policies to which we were necessarily committed, and, second, because the Japanese, in the decade from 1931–41, knew that we were lacking in military strength.

It is easy to say that all of this is water over the dam, and that since we won the war it matters little now. But that, really, is the greatest danger, for if we do not take to heart the lesson implicit in Mr. Hull's statement, the chances are that some future crisis will find us once again trying to support an international political policy which is vital to the preservation of our national interests without the requisite military strength, and the next time we might not have the good fortune and the good allies which contributed so much to our success in World War II.

Negroes in the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, the performance of Negro soldiers in combat during the recent war is one of courage, bravery, and devotion. It is a record second to none.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, there are those within this country and occasionally those within this Congress who have so buried their powers of observation and assimilation of fact beneath their prejudices, that they have ventured from time to time to attack the courageous record of Negroes in this war.

Recently, the War Department has canceled the restriction on a survey which was compiled during May and June 1945 in the European theaters, as to the opinions of white soldiers about their Negro comrades. This survey is deeply revealing not only of the courage and ability of the Negro soldier but of the fact that when white soldiers were given an opportunity to witness the performance and share experiences in the same company with Negroes, their prejudices melted away.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that 64 percent of both white officers and white noncommissioned officers who were surveyed, were relatively unfavorable toward the idea of serving in the same company with Negro troops when they first found themselves in that position.

However, after serving with these Negroes, 77 percent of this number changed their views, felt more respect for the Negro, liked him better.

Had the policy of complete segregation—of isolating Negro and white in the armed services into separate companies—been followed, this experience would never have been given these white soldiers. There are those who tell us that a Fair Employment Practices Commission is not the way to solve the problem of the un-American attitude of certain employers who discriminate against workmen because of the color of their skin or because of their national origin or because of their religious beliefs. I have heard the word education misused a hundred times in such a discussion.

Yet it is true—it must be true—that unless we place white and Negro, Baptist and Catholic, Jew and Gentile, Scandinavian-American and Ukrainian-American together beside each other at the work bench, this educational process will have no chance to work.

It did work in the Army of the United States, where the vast majority of officers and noncommissioned officers who had a chance to serve in the same companies with Negro troops learned that such service was the better way as well as the American way.

Not all the prejudices which block true acceptance of the practice of democracy in America were dissipated by the experience of these soldiers in the European theater. They had not time, nor was the situation ideal for the complete disintegration of all prejudices. But it does point a great lesson for America.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I wish to include at the close of these remarks the now unrestricted survey made in May and June, 1945, by the Research Branch, Information and Education Division, Headquarters, European Theater of Operations under authority of General Eisenhower. It is:

OPINIONS ABOUT NEGRO INFANTRY PLATOONS IN WHITE COMPANIES OF SEVEN DIVISIONS

What do the white company grade officers and the white platoon sergeants in ETO think of the combat performance of Negro rifle platoons which were attached to their companies in March and April and fought side by side with white platoons through VE-day?

This question is answered by a survey, made in late May and early June 1945, by personally interviewing 250 respondents, namely, all available white company-grade officers and a representative sample of platoon sergeants in 24 companies containing Negro platoons in several infantry divisions, namely, the First, Second, Ninth, Sixty-ninth, Seventy-eighth, Ninety-ninth, and One Hundred and Fourth. Standardized questions were used in the survey, which was conducted by five trained interviewers of the Research Branch, I and E Division, ETO.

In all except one of the companies visited, the standard organization of three rifle platoons and one heavy infantry platoon had been augmented by one rifle platoon of colored soldiers. The colored platoons were made up of men from rear echelon units who volunteered for service with the Infantry and were trained for approximately 6 weeks in reinforcement depots, usually by a white officer or noncom who later led them into combat.

In generalizing the opinions here reported, the fact that the Negro infantrymen in these platoons were volunteers must be kept in mind, as must also the fact that not all of the platoons experienced heavy and arduous fighting.

OPINIONS OF WHITE OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN IN COMPANIES WITH NEGRO PLATOONS

Question. How did you feel at first about serving in a company that had white platoons and colored platoons?

	White officers (percent)	*White noncoms (percent)*
Relatively unfavorable ("skeptical," "didn't like it," "thought it'd cause trouble," etc.)	64	64
Relatively favorable ("willing to try it," "made no difference," "didn't mind," etc.)	33	35
No answer	3	1
	100	100

Question. Has your feeling changed since having served in the same unit with colored soldiers?

	White officers (percent)	*White noncoms (percent)*
No, my feeling is still the same	16	21
Yes, have become more favorable toward them[1] ("feel more respect for them," "like them better," etc.)	77	77
No answer	7	2
	100	100

[1] No cases were found in which an individual reported his attitude had become less favorable.

Question. How well did the colored soldiers in this company perform in combat?

	White officers (percent)	*White noncoms (percent)*
Not well at all	0	0
Not so well	0	1
Fairly well	16	17
Very well	84	81
Undecided	0	1
Total	100	100

NOTE.—In commenting on this question, respondents frequently gave detailed accounts of combat performance. Positive qualities stressed were aggressiveness in attack, effective use of firepower, adeptness at close-in fighting, teamwork in battle. Negative qualities reported in a few instances were that at first the men sometimes went forward too rapidly—too far in an attack. Some officers stressed the fact that these colored soldiers, being volunteers, may have had exceptional combat qualities. Others mentioned that in their units there had not been an adequate test under the most severe type of fighting, such as sustained attacks under heavy mortar or artillery fire. It should be noted, however, that the performance of the colored troops was rated just as high, if not higher, by the white officers and noncoms in those companies in which the colored platoons have had severe fighting as by respondents from other units.

Question. With the same Army training and experience, how do you think colored

troops compare with white troops as infantry soldiers?

	White officers (percent)	*White noncoms (percent)*
Not as good as white troops	5	4
Just the same as white troops	69	83
Better than white troops	17	9
No answer	9	4
Total	100	100

Question. How have the white and colored soldiers gotten along together?

	White officers (percent)	*White noncoms (percent)*
Not well	0	0
Not as well in garrison as in combat	14	4
Fairly well	7	36
Very well	73	60
No answer	6	0
	100	100

NOTE.—Replies are somewhat more favorable from white officers and white noncoms with a northern background than from those with a southern background, but differences in opinion are not great. Actual friction between white and colored soldiers is said to have been confined to isolated cases involving white soldiers from "outside" units who did not know the combat record of the colored troops. Evidence indicates that white and colored soldiers have gotten along best together in those units in which they have shared the heaviest combat. While many of the officers in further questioning expressed some doubt as to how well the situation would work out if their unit remains in the Army of Occupation or other semipermanent status, 9 out of 10 said there had been no difficulties as yet.

Question. If colored soldiers are used as Infantry, do you think they should be set up by platoons as they are here, or would some other way be better?

	White officers (percent)	*White noncoms (percent)*
In the same platoon with white soldiers	7	1
In a platoon within the same company	62	89
In separate companies	18	12
In separate battalions or larger organizations	10	2
No answer	3	0
	100	100

NOTE.—Most of those interviewed volunteered one or more reasons for their answer.

Among those who favor the platoon basis, the reasons given, in order of frequency, are:

1. Competition-emulation ("encourages friendly competition"; "each tried to make a good showing"; "gives them something to come up to").

2. Avoidance of friction ("saves any chance of trouble to have them in their own platoon"; "because of the old feeling of boys from the South").

3. Better discipline and control among the colored soldiers ("whites have a steadying influence on them"; "colored boys feel more secure in combat this way").

4. Feeling of participation or nondiscrimination on part of the colored soldiers ("gives them the feeling of being with the white boys"; "avoids that feeling of being set apart and discriminated against").

5. Improved interracial understanding ("work close enough together so they can each get to know the other better and see what they do").

Among the minority who favored separate companies or larger units, the main reasons given were avoidance of friction (especially in garrison situations) and better discipline. A few men gave as their reason their personal feeling of not wishing to be in a company containing colored troops.

INDEPENDENT CHECK IN A CROSS-SECTION SURVEY

In the course of a survey of a representative cross-section of 1,710 white enlisted men in ETO field forces, to ascertain men's information and orientation needs, two questions were asked about the use of Negro troops. This survey was independent of the interviews tabulated above.

The responses to the two questions asked in the cross-section survey were tabulated separately for four sub-groups indicated below. The sample in some groups is small and therefore subject to a larger margin of error than is customary in research branch reports.

Question. Some Army divisions have companies which include Negro and white platoons. How would you feel about it if your outfit was set up something like that?

Percentage of white enlisted men answering would dislike it very much

	Percent
Cross-section of field force units which do not have colored platoons in white companies (1,450 cases)	62
Men in same division, but not in same regiment as colored troops (112 cases)	24
Men in same regiment, but not in same company as colored troops (68 cases)	20
Men in company with a Negro platoon (80 cases)	7

Question. In general, do you think it is a good idea or a poor idea to have the same company in a combat outfit include Negro platoons and white platoons?

Percentage of white enlisted men saying "very good idea" or "fairly good idea"

	Percent
Cross section of field-force units which do not have colored platoons in white companies	18
Men in same division but not in same regiment as colored troops	50
Men in same regiments but not in same company as colored troops	66
Men in company with a Negro platoon	64

NOTE.—These differences in attitude, varying with extent of experience with platoons of colored troops, can hardly be attributed to differences in geographical origin. For example, 31 percent of the white soldiers whose company has a Negro platoon are from the South, as are 34 percent of the soldiers in the cross section of field-force units.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ABOUT COLORED TROOPS IN THOSE INFANTRY PLATOONS

The soldiers in the Negro platoons were somewhat superior to other colored troops in ETO in education and AGCT, but the differences actually are not striking.

Percentage who had graduated from high school:	
Colored in infantry platoons	22
Colored in ETO (cross section)	18
White riflemen (cross section)	41
Percentage with AGCT scores above class IV:	
Colored in infantry platoons	29
Colored in ETO (cross section)	17
White riflemen (cross section)	71
Percentage from the South (including border States):	
Colored in infantry platoons	67
Colored in ETO (cross section)	76

As compared with white riflemen the Negro infantrymen were somewhat younger. Ten percent of the colored were 30 years old or over—as were 20 percent of the white riflemen.

Branches of service from which the transfer to infantry were made were as follows:

	Percent of total Negro volunteers
Corps of Engineers	38
Quartermaster Corps	29
Transportation Corps	26
Signal Corps	3
Ordnance Department	2
All other branches	2

Of all who were converted to riflemen, 63 percent came from the following six military occupation specialties, in order of frequency: Truck driver, light (MOS 345); duty soldier III (590); longshoreman (271); basic (521); foreman construction (059); cargo checker (470).

Our Chinese Policy

REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the recent resignation of General Hurley as Ambassador to China, his forthcoming appearance before committees of both the House and Senate, as well as recent statements by certain Members of Congress have all served to focus the world spotlight on this country's policy toward China. This is a subject of the utmost importance to every citizen of the United States who is entitled to be kept fully informed of our foreign relations policies throughout the entire world. In an effort to clarify the question I wrote Secretary of State Byrnes some time ago asking him to furnish me with a statement of our Chinese policy. Today I have a reply to my inquiry in the form of a communication from Secretary Byrnes which I desire to include with my remarks.

The letter reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 30, 1945.

MY DEAR MR. ANDERSON: I have received your letter of November 17, 1945, requesting information in regard to our policy towards China.

In response to your inquiry, I should like to offer the following brief comment on this subject:

We favor the creation of a strong, united, and democratic China which will contribute to peace and stability in the Far East and which will enable China effectively to support the United Nations Organization.

In line with this policy, we deem it desirable and essential that China solve her internal problems. While we recognize that this is a task which China must carry out largely through her own efforts, we seek by all appropriate and practicable means to pursue such policies and action as will best facilitate China's achievement of internal unity and stability.

Among the means toward this end, we propose, with due regard for the realities of the internal situation in China, to assist China to rehabilitate her devastated economy and to develop a higher standard of living for her masses.

We seek to enhance China's international status, as evidenced by the recognition accorded to China in connection with the San Francisco Conference. We feel that collaboration among China, the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union is essential to

the maintenance of peace and security in the Far East, and that such collaboration among these and other peace-loving nations should extend to all legitimate fields of economic and other endeavor on the basis of equality of opportunity and respect for national sovereignty. We hope that China, for her part, will further such collaboration by instituting and carrying out reasonable policies in the great tasks of unification and reconstruction that lie before her.

During the course of the war it was our policy to assist our Chinese allies to the greatest possible extent in the joint prosecution of hostilities against Japan. Such assistance took the form of credits, the grant of civilian and military lend-lease supplies, the training and equipping of a limited number of Chinese military units, the utilization in China of our Air Forces, and other related activities. Since the capitulation of Japan we have been assisting our Chinese allies in effecting the surrender, disarmament and repatriation of the very substantial Japanese armed forces who are now in China.

I trust that the foregoing brief comment will indicate to you the broad lines of our policy with respect to China and will enable you to reply to inquiries which you may have received from your constituents.

Thank you for your courtesy in writing.

Sincerely yours.

JAMES F. BYRNES,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Secretary for his forthright enunciation of our policy in China. Particular attention should be called to the statement:

We favor the creation of a strong, united, and democratic China which will contribute to peace and stability in the Far East and which will enable China effectively to support the United Nations Organization.

Heavy emphasis should then be placed on the following:

In line with this policy, we deem it desirable and essential that China solve her internal problems.

The Secretary then goes on to say that although this is a task that must be done largely by China herself this Government will "seek by all appropriate and practicable means to pursue such policies and action as will best facilitate China's achievement of internal unity and stability." These are the policies, Mr. Speaker, which must be kept clearly and constantly before the American Congress and the American people. If united support for our country's policies abroad is necessary and desirable, and surely it is, then we must be kept fully informed of all future developments.

Those of us who served in the House of Representatives prior to December 7, 1941, will recall that we were kept very much in the dark on any important international negotiations and commitments that were taking place at that time. We were asked to support our Government's foreign policy without knowing what it was. We were asked to amend the Neutrality Act, to vote for peacetime military training, to support lend-lease, and numerous other important and far-reaching legislative proposals without knowing why. This cannot and must not occur again.

General Hurley's devastating disclosure of a State Department divided against itself at one of the most critical times in the world's history and his appearance before congressional committees will undoubtedly give us most of the information we desire as far as China is concerned. However, we also should have similar information, at regular intervals, with respect to our policies elsewhere in the world. It is my fervent hope that the administration and the State Department will afford us that privilege.

Delaware Day (1944) Address by Hon. James M. Tunnell, of Delaware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, December 4 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, annually in the State of Delaware the date December 7 is proclaimed as Delaware Day by the Governor of Delaware. This anniversary is observed to perpetuate in the minds of the citizens of Delaware the action of their forebears in being the first representatives of any State unanimously to ratify the Federal Constitution. It was ratified by Delaware on December 7, 1787. As in former years, on December 7, 1944, the State of Delaware celebrated the occasion. As a part of the celebration there was held a joint meeting of the Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs of the city of Dover, Del. At this celebration Hon. William J. Storey, secretary of state, extended greetings in behalf of His Excellency Hon. Walter W. Bacon, Governor of Delaware. The principal address, entitled "Ratification of the Federal Constitution by the State of Delaware," was delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL]. The address is very able and inspiring, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RATIFICATION OF THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION BY THE STATE OF DELAWARE

(By Hon. JAMES M. TUNNELL, United States Senator from Delaware)

The Constitutional Convention which was to write the great charter of our liberties was called to meet on the second Monday of May in 1787. The second Monday in May fell on the 14th. However, some of the delegates were not present at that time, and the Convention was organized on the 25th of May in 1787. There were 74 delegates elected to the Convention. Washington was selected as its chairman. In fact Washington was undoubtedly the most influential man in the Convention. However, he spoke but once during the months that the Convention was in session. The Convention did not finally adjourn until September 18. Madison was the floor leader, and it is generally believed that Washington's views followed closely those of Madison. This Convention was one of the most notable in the world's history. It was attempting to prove that democracy could work. This Convention proved that people are capable of ruling themselves. Delaware had five members, George Read, Gunning Bedford, John Dickinson, Richard Bassett, and Jacob Broom. They were all men of ability.

The first great question which divided the delegates was as to whether the Convention was to provide for a national government or a federation. The people of the Colonies and of the Convention had become familiar with a federation. While this organization had not been entirely successful, it had as a matter of fact been around it that the most momentous revolution of the world's history had raged and had been prosecuted to a successful conclusion. However, there was already a good deal of State loyalty at that time. Those who favored a national government did not all hope for the abolition of the governments of the States. But they believed in a strong central government, and one which would overtower any authority and prestige of the State governments. Those who favored a federation believed that the States could join in an organization in which each of the Thirteen States would share its power and prestige. The thought of an improved federation was strong in the minds of many of the delegates. The Articles of Confederation were in the form that many of the delegates believed should be improved and strengthened, but not forgotten. In other words, those who favored a federation believed in an improved or amended draft of the Articles of Confederation. On the other hand there were those, who proved to be a majority of the Convention, who believed that a new Constitution should be written and a new form of government adopted.

This was the first great difference of opinion around which the Convention threatened to divide and possibly dissolve. There were those who believed that the individual independence of the State was entirely irreconcilable with the theory of aggregate sovereignty. There seemed to be no precedent by which the sovereignty of the individual States could be maintained and an over-all sovereignty of a national body recognized. This theory of individual independence interefered with the conduct and the voting of the States in the Constitutional Convention. Maryland was evenly divided on almost every important issue. New York sent Yates and Lansing with Hamilton. Yates and Lansing believed in guarding sovereignty of the State, while Hamilton was in favor of a strong central government, many even saying that he desired a king. Hamilton, because of his beliefs in such a strong government, was not a great factor in the Convention. Patrick Henry was opposed to the proposed new government, but for a different cause. He feared the power of a president. He said, "Your President may easily become king." However, the delegates in the Convention appreciated the solemnity and the magnitude of their task. It was apparent that the new government could be neither a centralized system nor a league, and the question as to just what kind of government could meet the requirements was the first great problem which faced the delegates. If no agreement could be reached on this subject, the whole effort must necessarily fail. The fear of the so-called small States of the power and prestige of the large States seemed to furnish an almost insurmountable difficulty. Strange to say, among the so-called small States were New York and New Jersey, as well as Delaware. Maryland was evenly divided, but was classed as a small State. Connecticut divided its vote sometimes, but was usually on the side of the large States. Madison declared that the division of interests did not in fact lie between the large and small States, but between Northern and Southern States. This is difficult to understand when we find that Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia joined with the three northern States of Massachusetts, Connecticut and Pennsylvania to constitute in many of the votes the so-called large-State class. Many believed that there could be no real

antithesis between the small States as such and their more powerful neighbors. The real danger, if danger there was, arose from differences of economic interests or diversities of attitudes of minds, and not from the wealth or power of the respective States. The national plan was known as the Virginia plan or the Randolph plan. Three of the characteristics of this plan were as follows: (1) The National Legislature should be empowered "to negative all laws passed by the several States, contravening," in its opinion, "the articles of union." (2) It should be empowered "to call forth the force of the Union against any member of the Union failing to fulfill its duty under the articles thereof." (3) That the "legislative, executive, and judiciary powers within the several States ought to be bound by oath to support the articles of union."

The Randolph plan was a design for a strong national government. The Randolph plan attempted to provide for a government built around proportionate representation. The Patterson or New Jersey plan had the following three characteristics: (1) It attempted to bestow upon Congress authority to regulate foreign and interstate commerce, to levy import and stamp duties, and to make rules and regulations for their collection. (2) It contained a declaration that the acts of Congress and treaties should be "the supreme law of the respective States so far as those acts or treaties shall relate to the said States or their citizens, and that the Judiciary of the several States should be bound thereby in their decision." (3) It also provided that if any State, or any body of men in any State shall oppose or prevent the carrying into execution of such acts or treaties, the Federal executive should be authorized to call forth the power of the confederated States, or so much thereof as should be necessary to enforce and compel an obedience to such acts, or an observance of such treaties. Thus it is seen that even the small-State party saw that the Union could not survive if reliance were based entirely on the whims or inclinations of the several States. Both plans contemplated the use of force to maintain the Union. On a vote between the advocates of the two plans, the seven States of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia voted for the Randolph plan. New York, New Jersey, and Delaware voted for the New Jersey plan. Maryland was divided, but Connecticut voted for the Virginia plan. Rhode Island did not participate in the Convention, and the New Hampshire delegates did not arrive at the Convention until July 23, 1787. The national plan, as against the State plan, or the federation, was adopted without a dissolution of the Convention. Bedford, of Delaware, contended that there was no middle way between a perfect consolidation and a mere confederacy of the States. He declared that the large States dare not dissolve the Confederation. He said if they did the small States would find some foreign ally to take them by the hand. This was the boldest threat of the Convention.

The next great question which grew out of the Convention's deliberations was as to the sort of legislative body or bodies the new Government should have. On the question as to whether the first branch of the Legislature should vote according to the Articles of Confederation or in proportion to the number of citizens was decided in favor of proportional representation. Thus we have the House of Representatives to this day elected on that principle. The States of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia voted for proportional representation in the House of Representatives. These 6 large States voted against an unicameral Congressional plan. Delegate Ellsworth of Connecticut moved for equal representation in the second branch of the Congress. A vote on this was taken on the second day of July, 1787. The result was a tie, 5 votes for and 5 against the motion. Georgia was now divided. Baldwin from that State voted for equal representation and Houston against it. The vote of Maryland which had been so often tied was cast for the New Jersey plan by Martin alone because of the tardiness of his colleague, Jenifer, in coming to the meeting. If Jenifer had been prompt in attendance on that morning, or if Baldwin had continued to vote as he had previously voted, the Virginia plan would have been successful. On this narrow margin did the fateful decision depend. However, the small-State men, including those from Delaware, were beyond persuasion. If the Convention decided against them as to the second branch of the Legislature, or the Senate, the Convention would have been a failure. A committee was then appointed after Martin warned the Convention that no modification could reconcile the small States to the least diminution of their equal sovereignty. There was one member of this committee from each State. Those were the days when the success of the Convention was in the balance. The small States were bound to win if there was to be a success of the Convention. However, some of the delegates realized the importance to the separate States and to the world of the success of the Convention. Gouverneur Morris said he came to the Convention as a representative of America, in some degree as a representative of the whole human race. His patriotic stand was undoubtedly potent in the outcome of the Convention. Thus while the actual vote as to proportional representation in the Senate was a tie, the equal representation delegates, among them being the Delaware delegation, won their point, and we today have equal representation in the Senate under their plan, and as a result of the fight made by our delegates. After a time there were those who believed that equal representation was not the sole method of protecting the rights of the small States. The great compromise as to the Legislative branch of the Government was the second and perhaps the most important of the compromises of the Convention.

There were those who realized that by the delegation of specific and well-defined powers to the National Government there could be a specific protection for all of the States of the new Union. It is a peculiar fact that during the first 2 months of the Convention the question of exact distribution of powers between the States on the one hand and the central Government on the other did not receive much consideration. The delegates had been first interested in the establishment of a permanent union. When this question was determined, the next thought was as to the representation in the legislative branch. When this question was adjusted in one of the greatest triumphs in diplomatic maneuvers in the history of the world, the delegates turned to the thought of the specific powers which were delegated to the National Government. The Virginia plan at first advocated coercion to compel obedience by individual States. However, this was soon abandoned by the advocates of the Virginia plan, but was then embodied in the New Jersey plan. Again, one of the points of difference between the delegates was the right of the Federal Government to veto the laws of the States. This problem was amicably adjusted or passed over. The question of the determination of the constitutionality of laws was discussed in the Convention. Martin of Maryland declared as follows, "As to the constitutionality of laws, that point will come before the judges in their proper official character. In this character they have a negative on the laws." However, no specific provision was placed in the Constitution giving the power to the judges to declare any law unconstitutional.

Again, slavery was a problem which for some time threatened to disrupt the Convention. The failure to prohibit slavery was at the demand of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. Connected with the question of the West and its participation in the new Government was the question as to whether slaves should be counted in fixing the basis of representation. In the earlier days it was proposed to enumerate three-fifths of the slaves. This seemed to be acceptable to most of the delegates. However, certain men from the far South declared in favor of enumerating all of the slaves. Some delegates from the North were opposed to counting any of the slaves. Thus slavery, the problem which later divided the Nation into two hostile sections, was even then a dangerous question threatening the solidarity of the Convention and the future of the Government.

Then the question of the Executive caused much discussion. There were those who desired great powers to be placed in the Executive, but the delegates from many States feared the power of the Executive. Again, there were those in the Convention who foresaw the development of the great West, and feared the power that the West might wield on the National Government, particularly because of the slavery question. The manner in which the Executive should be elected resulted in the adoption of the provisions for the Electoral College. At that time it was feared and believed that most of our elections for the Presidency would not be determined by the Electoral College. It was thought that there would be numerous candidates for the Presidency at that election, and that the Electoral College would not be able to elect a President by a majority vote. In the provision for the election of President by the House of Representatives is seen the effect of the determination of the small States to have an equal voice in the election of a President by the House of Representatives, each State being entitled to one vote. The federal state which these men succeeded in formulating had the following salient features: (1) sovereign powers were distributed between the States and the National Government; (2) the National Government had only the powers granted it explicity or by implication; the States individually retained the residue; (3) each government within its sphere of authority operated immediately over the individual citizen; (4) neither government was to be inferior to the other or in ordinary operation to come into contact with the other; (5) the constitutional system was established as law enforceable in courts and was superior to the authority of every State acting either through its government or by convention of its citizens; (6) the National Government recognized and made applicable the principle of the separation of powers with certain modifications.

The question of how this Constitution should be adopted by the various States was finally determined by requiring each State to hold a constitutional convention. Delaware had its constitutional convention in December 1787 and by unanimous vote of its 30 delegates was the first to adopt the Constitution on December 7. The other States ratified in the following order:

Pennsylvania, December 12, 1787, 46–23.
New Jersey, December 18, 1787, unanimous.
Georgia, January 2, 1788, unanimous.
Connecticut, January 9, 1788, 128–40.
Massachusetts, February 6, 1788, 187–168.
Maryland, April 26, 1788, 63–11.
South Carolina, May 23, 1788, 149–73.
New Hampshire, June 21, 1788, 57–47.
Virginia, June 25, 1788, 89–79 (89–78).
New York, July 26, 1788, 30–27.
North Carolina, November 21, 1789; August 2, 1788, refused by a vote of 184–83 to ratify until a bill of rights and other amendments were put forth; ratified November 21, 1789, by a vote of 195–77.
Rhode Island, May 29, 1790, 34–32.

Vermont, whose entry into the Union was contemplated by the Federal Convention, adopted the Constitution January 10, 1791, and was admitted March 4.

Rhode Island did not adopt the Constitution nor become a member of the Union until threatened with a high tariff against its products being exported into the other 12 States.

In the adoption of the Constitution by the various States there were bitter and long-continued arguments. One of the arguments presented by Mr. Smith in the Massachusetts convention is interesting and in the following language:

"Mr. President, I am a plain man, and get my living by the plough. I am not used to speak in public, but I beg your leave to say a few words to my brother ploughjoggers in this house. * * * I had been a member of the convention to form our own State constitution, and had learned something of the checks and balances of power, and I found them all here. I did not go to any lawyer, to ask his opinion; we have no lawyer in our town, and we do well enough without. I formed my own opinion, and was pleased with this Constitution. * * * But I don't think the worse of the Constitution because lawyers, and men of learning, and moneyed men, are fond of it. I don't suspect that they want to get into Congress and abuse their power. * * * I don't know why our constituents have not a good right to be as jealous of us as we seem to be of the Congress; and I think those gentlemen, who are so very suspicious that as soon as a man gets into power he turns rogue, had better look at home."

Delaware may be proud of the fact that it was one of the States which stood firmly for equal representation, and one of those which so impressed their ideas upon the Convention that the United States is still experiencing the benefits of its ideas and activities at that time. In the conventions of the various States every possible argument against the Constitution was advanced. After the adoption of the Constitution, and from that time until the present, every argument has been advanced against the constitutionality of any proposed change or improvement in the Constitution. There were those who at first argued that the Constitution itself was illegal because the delegates to that Convention had not been empowered to go so far in the writing of a constitution. Some of the State delegations had been limited to improvements in the Articles of Confederation. After the formation of the Union, it was contended that a protective tariff was unconstitutional.

It was contended that the Federal Government had no authority to legislate as to slavery in the territories. Some of the most profound lawyers of the Nation contended that the Interstate Commerce Act was unconstitutional. The Labor Relations Act was believed to be unconstitutional. Social security brought down the condemnation of the great legal lights of the Nation. Federal Housing met a battery of legal talent pronouncing it unconstitutional. The wage-and-hour laws of the Nation had to meet the same sort of attack and opposition. However, it stands as a monument to the genius, the natural ability, and the determination of the common man. Gladstone said in referring to the Constitution: "So far as I can see the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." Perhaps it is better that progress should be followed instead of led by learning. It has been said that the Constitution itself being formed by such laymen as Madison, Franklin, and Washington was not a lawyers' contract, but a laymen's charter. At each of the great steps in the progress of the Nation an army of the common people has arisen to protect, preserve, and defend the Constitution. Notwithstanding the protests of constitutional lawyers, the Constitution has stood, and either by interpretation or amendment the demands of the people have been met. The greatest Nation of the world's history has developed around that Constitution. It was founded on the eternal principle of the rights of man. It will continue, and our Nation will survive and prosper, so long as that principle is accepted by mankind. Statesmen live and pass from the stages of government. Governments arise, thrive, and decay. Principles and verities are eternal.

War Food Administration Encourages Soap Monopolies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman, Small Business Committee, House of Representatives:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 5, 1945.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Small Business Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: Permit me to draw your attention, and that of the membership of your committee, to a very deleterious situation that has been developing in the War Food Administration of the Department of Agriculture. The method of setting up quotas by this Administration for the distribution of inedible fats, oils, and grease panders to and strengthens the stranglehold that a few large manufacturers of soap have achieved.

Lever Bros., Colgate-Palmolive-Peet, Procter & Gamble, Armour & Co., Swift & Co., and the Manhattan Soap Co.—six companies in all—apparently control considerably over 90 percent of the manufacture of soap in this country. The first three companies make 82 percent of all American soap. There are about 1,233 soap manufacturers in the country. Approximately 1,217 soap outfits are limited to considerably less than 10 percent of the soap made in our Nation.

The War Food Administration, in its interpretation of Order 42 B, sets up as a base period 1940–41 and limits the quota to whatever civilian soap was manufactured in that base period. It thus freezes the small operator and strengthens the monopoly enjoyed by the so-called Big Three and Big Six of the soap industry. Perhaps during the war there may have been some basis for this method of assigning basic products. The twelve hundred-odd soap manufacturers participated in supplying the huge demand for soap for our armed forces. With demobilization such a supply will not be required. In the absence of compelling exigencies, justice and equity should discourage the use of quotas to foster and support monopolies of this nature. It is nothing short of barbarous for one branch of the Government—the War Food Administration in the Department of Agriculture—to encourage such monopoly whereas another branch of the Government—the Department of Justice—seeks to destroy monopoly.

I have a case in mind—the Kamen Soap Products Co.—with a plant in Brooklyn and a plant in Barberton, Ohio. It has been in business for a number of years, but during the base period it converted its entire plant to the manufacture of soap for military purposes. Its product was mainly a cheap soap, because the American forces preferred a cheap soap. The so-called big shots of the industry were loath to make this cheaper product and concentrated on the more expensive, perfumed soap for civilian use.

Because Kamen Soap Products Co. made little or no soap for civilian use during the so-called base period, it is now given a quota which is negligible to the vanishing point. In other words, because this organization converted its production to almost total military uses, it is now to suffer severest penalties, whereas the largest outfits, which fought to maintain their civilian production and did maintain it during the base period, are given huge quotas because thereof.

The Kamen Soap Products Co. is not a "war baby" and did not come into being because of war orders. If it had known in 1941 that it would be subjected to such restrictions in 1945, it might not have undertaken to devote its entire production to war orders for the various services. With this development in 1945 it might have been wiser to devote its production to civilian soap.

Recently the rationing of edible fats, oils, and grease was discontinued. The gathering of waste fats from butcher shops, hotels, and restaurants has been resumed, but apparently this increased supply has not been taken into consideration in connection with the allotment of these quotas. My constituent, the Kamen Soap Products Co., advises me that carloads of inedible fats, oils, and grease are offered to him for purchase, but because of the quota imposed, it cannot make any purchase from this excessive supply.

This order, 42 B, has the effect of forcing producers of the raw material, such as grease renderers and fat renderers, to sell mainly to the largest outfits. Many of them, and I know many of them, do not desire to sell all or most of their product to Lever Bros., Colgate-Palmolive-Peet, or Procter & Gamble, but under these quota arrangements they cannot sell to anyone other than the so-called Big Three or Big Six. In this way competition is effectively stifled, and very formidable blocs are set up.

Frankly, the War Food Administration is in error in its maintenance of Order 42 B, as well as in its interpretation of this order.

At your next open hearing I shall deem it a privilege to be permitted to testify more in detail concerning this arbitrary discrimination against the smaller soap manufacturers.

Very truly yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Peacetime Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, in the New Yorker there appeared in the Talk of the Town column some interesting comments with respect to conscription of American youth in peacetime. Because this matter is of vital interest to all Americans, and because the observations of the writer in the New Yorker are especially trenchant and provocative, I am including them herewith as part of my remarks:

THE TALK OF THE TOWN

Booth Tarkington, we see, has come out against compulsory military training. He seems to us peculiarly well fitted to speak

on this subject, being the sponsor of a lad named Willie Baxter, who has taken us safely through two major wars without any previous military training whatsoever. Conscripting American youth in peacetime is the most revolutionary domestic idea that has ever been proposed in the United States, and contains the heaviest charge of social dynamite. Big shots in the Army are pushing the idea hard, but they know not what they push. Certainly no one can predict the consequences of taking Willie Baxter away from Lola Pratt, from One-eye Beljus, and from Mr. Parcher and sending him into camp for a year against his wishes. No one can say what it would do to Willie and no one can say what it would do to the society the Pratts, the Beljuses, and the Parchers adorn. Our own mind is still open on this terribly vital matter, but our heart is shut tight, and every instinct hollers that compulsory training is a wrong number. An American conscript army, in peacetime, would be a contradiction in terms: it would advertise a national desperation and it would build into the Nation the thing the Nation has twice taken up arms to lick.

"Look at it," said Mr. Parcher.

"Look at what?" asked his wife.

"That Baxter boy," said Mr. Parcher, as William passed on toward the dancers. "What's he think he's imitating—Henry Irving? Look at his walk."

"He walks that way a good deal lately, I've noticed," said Mrs. Parcher in a tired voice.

Look well, America, as Willie comes walking down the street. Watch out how you change his strange and lordly gait, for he is an extremely delicate mechanism, mysteriously balanced with an escape movement that defies every law of physics. Remove him from his father's evening clothes, put him in compulsory drab, teach him to salute, and you will have something new in this land. And you won't have Willie.

Priority of Transportation for Men Serving in Leyte

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOREST A. HARNESS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 4, 1945.

Gen. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
Chief of Staff, War Department,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL EISENHOWER: An increasing volume of complaints is reaching me regarding the conditions on Leyte Island, the Philippines. These reports coincide so closely in the matter of figures and statistics given that they seem to indicate a really critical condition in that area.

I understand that for the past several weeks there have been approximately 20,000 soldiers with point scores of 80 to 100, or more, awaiting return transportation and the number of embarkations from the area within that time has been only a small fraction of the total number of veterans eligible for return.

I understand, also, that because of the evacuation bottleneck on Leyte several thousand additional soldiers with only slightly lower critical scores are awaiting removal from other islands in the southern Philippines. In the meantime, the rate of returns from other Pacific areas, specifically Luzon, Okinawa, and the Hawaiian Islands, is reported to be comparatively high.

I assume the reports are dependable that conditions in the southern Philippines are about as bad as in any area in which American troops are stationed and are, in effect, much worse than in many areas in which the rate of removal is much higher.

I believe you will agree with me, therefore, that every possible means should be taken immediately to relieve this deplorable situation in the southern Philippines. I hope you will agree, in fact, that the highest priority for troop removals should obtain in such areas where conditions for those troops are worse. A high-point veteran deserves to be returned to the United States, no matter where he may be stationed; but I know you will agree that men in such places as the Hawaiian Islands are practically in Paradise as compared with those in the southern Philippines.

It would appear from these reports that our troops serving on the islands in the southern Philippines have been all but forgotten and that they are living under conditions that seem to be almost intolerable. Authentic information coming to me shows that the climate on those islands is probably the most undesirable of any islands in the Pacific; that our men are surrounded by natives who live in filth and squalor, infested with vermin, where disease is rampant, and that the effect upon the morale of the troops is such that immediate action should be taken to relieve their situation.

I shall greatly appreciate it if you will look into this situation personally and advise me as soon as possible what means can be taken to remove these troops from those island.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

FOREST A. HARNESS.

Discharge Problems Dealing With Forgotten Men in Our Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, one of my great ambitions in life is to be pleasant and agreeable, but the very nature of the duties of my office prevent such equanimity of disposition or attitude all the time. The people of the Eighth Congressional District did not elect me to the Congress of the United States for the purpose of being a "yes" man. While it is a much more difficult task to say "No," I feel better when I do use that word. I am going to use it right now. When I run across some hopeful, happy, and at the same time hopeless, individual who blabbers about the fine work that is being done in demobilizing the armed forces, I find myself out of tune with the summer weather. My answer is an emphatic "No," because there has been and apparently still is a lot of bungling and a lot of mistakes. While the war was going on we overlooked all of those things and the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States could spend money like a drunken sailor—if he felt like it or if his general and admirals felt like it—as long as it went toward the war effort. We were patriotic.

Now that the war is over these boys who have been spending all the money they wanted to spend, whenever they felt like it, wherever they felt like it, just like the proverbial drunken sailor, had better make up their mind that the war is over. We want them to continue spending money on a peacetime basis, but not on a wartime basis. But to get down to the subject matter of this talk: we want the Army and the Navy to demobilize in a businesslike and speedy manner. If, for no other reason, they ought to demobilize because it is costing hundreds of millions of dollars to the taxpayers of this country, just to keep the Army and the Navy going and we certainly do not need all of these men while we are on a peacetime basis.

I have had something to do with this demobilization question and have found it necessary to hire additional help in order to make contacts in connection with numerous cases which come to my office every day. I welcome letters of inquiry and I am glad of the opportunity to be of help to people who have someone in the Army or Navy who can be much more valuable in civilian life, than anywhere else, and who ought to be discharged.

CHINA, BURMA, AND INDIA THEATER OF OPERATIONS

So, some time ago I got a letter from a mother living in my district telling me about her son who was somewhere in China or India or Burma, and that he and thousands of others like him were finding the heat in those lands almost unendurable, that the climatic conditions worked a hardship on them because they were accustomed to our northern climate and asking me to please do something for these men. I promptly told the mother to give me some more information and I told her that her son need have no hesitation in writing me and giving me some facts about what was going on in the China, Burma, and India theater of operations. I had heard from some of the boys in the Pacific and some of the boys in the European theater of war, hundreds of them in fact, but I wanted to complete my study in geography. So I was agreeably and pleasantly surprised to receive a long, interesting, and a splendid letter from a young man whose family I happen to know and with whom I am also somewhat acquainted. He is not a private, but is an officer and is, for the purpose of these remarks, somewhere in the CBI territory. He says:

LETTER FROM SERVICEMAN

In your letter you requested information about what is happening in the China-Burma-India theater of operations. I hope that the information contained in this letter will aid you in some measure to get a fair deal for the men of this command and all servicemen instead of the now proverbial "square deal" that they have been getting.

This paragraph in his letter has the right ring to it. He is not asking that he get special consideration and "the devil take the hindmost." He is interested in seeing to it that we get some first-hand information which will enable

Members of Congress to act intelligently in behalf of the men of our armed forces who are fighting for the four freedoms, maybe, in the four corners of the world.

Then I like another paragraph in his letter, and I am sure that it will interest you, too. He says:

I have very little to gripe about for myself. Although I am over 31 years old, have been married over 4½ years, and have almost 3 years of service in the Army, I have only 6 months overseas and only 35 points toward discharge. It wasn't up to me when and where I'd be sent overseas. I had no voice in that. I only did my job and waited for the inevitable time to come when my name would be on the orders for overseas shipment. Of course, I'm being penalized now for not having been sent overseas right out of basic training or for not having fathered a family in the face of the uncertain conditions of Army service. But about that, I do not complain because I feel that the Army has set up a policy, no matter how unfair it may seem to me. I do complain, however, against the inefficiency and what appears to be downright obstruction of the demobilization plan by both labor, Government, and the services. Because if they are going to foul up the program as set up for the high-point men and the men with 2 years or more overseas, when the devil am I going to get out?

Labor unions that are in a position to tie up ships that are sorely needed for transportation of men back from overseas are striking. I guess they have forgotten about their responsibility to the men who went overseas to save their nice fat pay envelopes in defense industry for them. And the Government that was so quick to grab control of a mercantile concern like Montgomery Ward & Co. now hasn't the spine to step into the breach and see that the ships are kept coming overseas to fulfill the promises of getting men home to their families as quickly as was possible.

The foregoing quotation is just exactly as contained in this letter to me and tells its own story. Right now when it's popular to want to bring the boys back home, everybody wants to get on the band wagon, and I will have more to say about some of these days. But let us continue the story, because this young fellow has a real message. In another paragraph of his letter he says, and he is talking about the United States of America right now, or rather its Government:

That Government even limits the number of men that may be returned on cargo ships to 12 in spite of the fact that some of the ships have passenger space for as many as 25 men. Those same ships didn't have any limitations such as that when they brought the men overseas. Many of the ships brought triple loads of men who had to sleep in shifts on the same bunks. A man could sleep 8 hours, but he couldn't go lie on his bunk at any other time, because there was another fellow in it that had to get some sleep, too. Now the ships are sailing without men to fill the bunks that they do have.

The Army? What is it doing? From where we sit, it doesn't seem that they are doing all that they can. Seems that they have too good a deal in the higher ranks and they are not quite ready to give it up. One nice solution would be to reduce the upper crust in this caste system that is called a democratic Army to their permanent rank before the war instead of nominating and confirming their present rank as their permanent rank. I am sure that they would be quite a bit more eager to speed up demobilization instead of impeding it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to make these remarks too long, but this young man has a lot of other things to say that are important. He encloses some copies of some documents which I hope to use in my remarks on some other occasion. One of these documents calls attention to the fact that certain students in one of these countries who want to come to this country for the purpose of going to our universities can get passage on ships while GI Joe has to wait until some future undetermined time. This is certainly interesting, and I have no doubt that one of our well-known Government departments downtown is responsible for such atrocious procedure. Can you imagine a Government official who gives priority to someone in these three countries so he can come over here and complete his educational work, while thousands and tens of thousands of our young men are over in China, Burma, or India, unable to come back home and complete their school work? What is the present administration going to do about it? I purposely do not identify the author of this letter because something might or might not happen to him, and I do not want to be indiscreet. If you are interested I have his letter on file. I shall transmit a copy of these remarks to the War Department and the Navy Department, because I know they will be interested in really getting some facts which they apparently have greatly overlooked.

The Federal Government and the Aviation Industry—Partnership or Peonage?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Robert H. Wood, editor of the Aviation News:

The subject assigned me takes on renewed importance with the end of the war and return to peace. I was not surprised to learn that the title was phrased by an industry executive. It would tax the imagination to picture a Federal Government official who would worry about the possibility of his being plunged into peonage by an industry.

There are innumerable examples of current disagreement between the aviation industry and our Federal officials, most of them well publicized in our aeronautical magazines.

Industry chafes from a lack of a plant-leasing policy. It feels that failure of CAB to set up a separate cargo aircraft category in the civil air regulations springs mainly from concern over how the Air Line Pilots Association would feel about it. Industry cites the long delay in getting a workable tooling arrangement with Government as a primary reason why our light-plane plants are only now barely getting into production. It feels that policies in surplus aircraft disposal, especially to the air lines, has been a powerful deterrent to production of new and improved transports. It fidgets and worries itself sick because no one in the Federal Government has come up with a national military policy and said, "This is our program." It wonders why the original CAA airport program was not completed many months before it was, and why Government fails to take action on a national air-marking program so even the best pilots, who still get lost, find themselves. It points to the failure of industry and Government to get together on instrument landing equipment so that ultra-modern $750,000 transports need not sit idle on airports in bad weather for days at a time, eating up more depreciation than fuel. All of these disagreements make absorbing reading in the press because of our own personal stake in the outcome.

But to the outsider and the public it must sometimes seem that as far as the Federal Government and the aviation industry are concerned it is not a question of "partnership or peonage" but "partnership or combat."

There is a problem, however, which has not received its share of attention, and which deserves more careful thought from us all. If we do not soon raise some questions we may find a serious threat of peonage to aviation. And by aviation I mean not only the aircraft manufacturers but every facet of aviation activity from that of the individual private pilot or plane owner to the aircraft service operators, the airlines, and our own national defense.

That problem is the future attitude toward aviation of a Federal agency in Washington which we all have ignored for too long a time, primarily because of a striking lack of information and knowledge about it and a fatalistic attitude that nothing could be accomplished if we did know about it.

That agency is the Bureau of the Budget, in the Executive Office of the President. Its prime functions, as far as we in aviation are concerned, are: (1) to assist the President in preparing and administering the Budget; (2) to assist the President by clearing and coordinating advice on proposed legislation and by making recommendations as to Presidential action on legislation. There are other functions, such as to plan improvement, development, coordination, and more economical operation of Federal agencies, and to conduct research into better management.

The power this agency wields is tremendous. It trims and dictates by absolute veto power the budget of every Federal agency. The only appeal the agency has open to it is so complicated that few of them are willing to put up the fight very often. Further, the agency must rearrange its budget to omit any trace of vetoed items before the revised budget is sent to Congress, and no executive of that agency can make any reference whatsoever of an item which has been reduced or eliminated by the Budget Bureau unless he is asked specifically by a member of Congress during appropriations committee hearings. The only hint of the extent of cuts which have been made in an agency's budget is the appearance of the total figure which was originally requested.

The Budget Bureau also has the power to retard and discourage any legislation—proposed, or before Congress—by stating simply that the bill is not in accord with the President's program. Many Congressmen, especially on the majority side, are extremely hesitant to push bills which have been so branded.

An expansion of the Bureau's activities will not be surprising. As a matter of fact it had a hand in formulating our international aviation policy which most of us contend was the mission by established law of the State Department and the Civil Aeronautics Board. The Bureau's rightful function was to see that State and CAB did not work at cross purposes and to act as liaison with the White House.

There is an unhealthful and unnecessary awe of the Bureau of the Budget, and all of its works, traceable probably to its location in the executive office, plus the subordinate fact that its small number of personnel, about 600, are ordered to maintain strict silence on even the most routine activities. Probably no other Federal agency is so free from the public's gaze and the democratic glare of the limelight. Certainly there is no other Federal group with as much power whose ordinary daily workings and organizational set-up are such a mystery, even to high government and industry executives.

Despite the placement of the Bureau in the Executive Office, however, it should be realized that the President cannot consider personally a fraction of the matters he sends to the Bureau. It is also obvious that the Bureau must rely mainly on its own staff. Its personnel are administrative analysts, budget examiners, fiscal analysts, legislative analysts, statisticians, and economists, all reputedly of high professional caliber. Occasionally it may call on outside experts as consultants, but they, likewise, are analysts, examiners, and statisticians. These men are top-flight theorists but with little experience, frequently, in industry, science, or even the world of hard knocks. They are, therefore, lacking in vision and ability to interpret the great transformations going on about them and hesitate to sacrifice perfection for the more realistic job of planning for tomorrow on the basis of the disorganized world which lies before their eyes. They would stop the world for a year until they could start it off again with a better plan.

This was well illustrated a few days ago when an Army general disclosed to a Senate appropriations committee during a hearing that the Budget Bureau, which "acted largely on its own initiative," had cut cut major research items for next year because it felt the Army should pause and take stock of what had been done and what the Army proposed to do. Postponement of research for about a year was actually suggested by the Bureau instead of permitting the Department to consolidate and take advantage of the latest scientific advances.

Perhaps a few other examples of the Bureau's activities in aviation will be enlightening

Despite the recent unanimity of our most respected military and industrial leaders on the absolute necessity of continuing our research, the Bureau cut the Army Air Forces' latest requests for research from $245,000,000 to $115,000,000. The House Appropriations Committee took the Bureau's figures as gospel, passing them without change. The Senate, however, raised the figure to $200,000,000, or an increase of $85,000,000 from the Budget total. This item is now in conference and there is no assurance that the conferees will reject the original Budget Bureau figure, although they have every right to do so.

In the same bill, the first supplemental appropriation rescission, the Navy requested $143,000,000 for aeronautical research. The Budget Bureau slashed this to $61,000,000 before permitting the Budget to be sent to Congress. Again the House accepted the Budget Bureau's action. The Senate, however, restored the full amount for which Navy had originally asked, after it heard the Assistant Secretary for Air, John Sullivan, warn of the seriousness of this reduction. Here again, the final figure is up to the conferees, and Bureau may still have its way.

Many of these funds which the Army and Navy had requested would have been reflected in orders to the aircraft industry.

If these actions by the Budget Bureau are indicative of its attitude on all aviation research and development, then we have still another reason for exerting every effort to wrest from the Government a national research policy. However, Congress can protect us in this interim if it does not hesitate to override the Budget Bureau as often as it deems necessary in the public interest.

Another recent example of the Bureau's myopic tendencies was its flat turn-down a few days ago of a CAA request for civilian-pilot training funds. This followed closely the elimination by the Bureau of a $6,000,000 item from the Navy budget for an aviation training program, to keep the postwar fleet supplied with pilots. The result of this cut was described to Senate members of the Appropriations Committee as "extremely dangerous."

At the time the RFC was struggling to start a surplus-aircraft disposal system the Budget Bureau refused to authorize added personnel to do it. After several months, of course, it was compelled to permit the action, but in the meantime hundreds of additional planes accumulated and the ultimate cost to the Government and the taxpayer was much higher than if RFC's pleas had been met promptly in the first place.

One of the classic examples of Budget Bureau hindsight was the persistent refusal some years ago to permit estimates for the War Training Service to go to Congress in the amounts its sponsors knew were absolutely necessary. WTS then was preparing pilots for our own wartime Army and Navy. Three times the Bureau cut WTS drastically. Finally, after husky support from various aviation groups, and Senator McCarran, the agency was permitted to request the proper amounts.

When CAA finally sent its national airport plan to the President for submission to Congress, it was sent back by the Budget Bureau as ill considered. The plan was rewritten, improved, and returned. Again Budget turned it down. Finally it became sensitive to public demand—a lesson aviation should take to its heart for the future—and relented to the extent of permitting CAA itself to submit the plan to Congress, rather than allowing the President to transmit it with a request for action.

Here again the Bureau had sought perfection because it contended that no airport plan could be drawn up without a Nation-wide survey—money for which, incidentally, CAA did not have. This survey, Budget held, must take into consideration war-built airports which might become surplus. CAA had already tried and failed to get either Army or Navy to give any idea of which, or how many, airports ultimately would be declared surplus.

As in so many other Budget Bureau rejections, its objections were conscientiously arrived at, but impractical and unrealistic. One would have a right to feel that Budget Bureau's analysts should have some conception of the vital need for civil airports and the importance of hundreds and thousands of them in increasing the utility of the airplane to the public.

There is another example which is important because it illustrates the contention being made in this paper that the Budget Bureau takes many actions in the name of the President which the President himself would not agree was in accordance with his policy. One agency, which must remain unnamed, had a vital project which the Budget Bureau disapproved. An appeal to the top Budget Bureau authorities also failed, and the agency was thus unable even to send its request to Congress. One of the agency heads finally went to the President, explained the project and the history of the case, and promptly received a memorandum to the Budget Bureau ordering approval of any budget the agency deemed necessary.

These comments are not made in derision of a hard-working staff in the Budget Bureau, but they are made in an attempt to convince us that we must scrutinize the Bureau critically, as we do our friends at CAA, CAB, State, Commerce, Army, Navy, and Congress, and make known our wishes as freely; and the sooner after the rejection of vital items, the better.

We must remember that Budget Bureau makes many decisions and interpretations, necessarily, without consulting the President, and that, therefore, all Budget action should not be interpreted as having come direct from the President. A political scientist would reject this thesis as a basis for action, but a resident of Washington will accept it as realistic advice, I believe. Let us drop the fatalistic attitude we have had toward projects rejected by the Budget, and campaign for their reinstatement if we are convinced of their necessity.

We must remember that the Budget Bureau is a small agency. It cannot possibly know everything about all things. Certainly, it cannot be an authority in aviation. It has no aviation section or unit or, as far as can be learned, even a single full-time specialist in aviation. It does maintain a continuing study in transportation, in which aviation is considered still as a luxury means of transport, and subsidiary to older modes. Its staff is quoted as favoring the placement of aviation regulation in some single aviation agency such as the ICC or a new consolidated body. It is obvious to you and to me that such action would result in control of not only the air transport industry but perhaps even the nonscheduled operators and private flying by men who are essentially railroad-minded. The threat of a single transportation agency is very real.

With the end of the war, the day is over when the Budget Bureau approves automatically all military requests. Yet we seem convinced, as a Nation, that we must never again be unprepared for war. Furthermore, as the emphasis returns to commercial aviation we must expect to see more and more restrictions attempted by the Budget Bureau. By consistent lack of vision and a negative policy of cost cutting, it can become the No. 1 enemy of an expanded postwar commercial and military aviation demanded by the people. It is lagging far behind public opinion, stressing theories which cannot, in themselves, be criticized, but which are depressing aviation because they are not bound up with realistic appraisal of today's rapidly moving developments and what they will mean tomorrow.

This paper is not an argument for padded pay rolls or pork-barrel legislation. This cannot be overemphasized. But it does seem that too often the Budget is being used, as far as aviation is concerned, more to save money than to spend wisely. Character of public expenditure changes greatly during a country's development. The public demands from its Federal Government maximum benefit from every new service which attains utility and makes possible a better life. Even the Budget Bureau's personnel will concede that economy and efficiency are not synonymous. Mere retrenchment or niggardly increases in Budget, without consideration for the value of the return, never assure better public service, or security.

We have still another reason to demand that Congress, our elected representatives, act independently of the Budget Bureau in aviation matters, whenever necessary. By the law of the land aviation is not merely another activity to be regulated. For our Civil Aeronautics Act is the only law in transportation which orders the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Civil Aeronautics Board not only to regulate, but to foster, encourage, and develop.

This unique dictum we should never forget, nor allow Congress itself or others to forget.

In Opposition to a Proposed Quota of Swiss Watches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the State Department has proposed to the Swiss Government that it set up an export quota for watches coming into this country. This suggestion is the result of a campaign of misrepresentation developed by three American watch manufacturers, the Hamilton Watch Co., the Elgin Watch Co., and the Waltham Watch Co., who are presently under indictment by the Department of Justice for entering into a conspiracy to violate the antitrust laws. It is rather anomalous that the State Department would come to the aid of companies seeking to form a monopoly and who are under such a cloud.

There is herein set forth a communication which I have addressed to Mr. Arthur Paul, Director, Office of International Trade Operations, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C., outlining some of my views on this proposed quota:

DECEMBER 4, 1945.

MR. ARTHUR PAUL,
Director, Office of International Trade Operations, Department of Commerce, Commerce Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PAUL: I invite your attention to a very serious situation that is developing with reference to the importation of Swiss watch parts and Swiss watch movements. On October 26, 1945, a hearing was held before the Committee for Reciprocity Information. This committee is comprised of Mr. Lynn R. Edminster, vice chairman of the United States Tariff Commission (chairman of the committee); Mr. H. Gerald Smith, Department of State; Mr. George B. L. Arner, Department of Agriculture; Mr. H. P. MacGowan, Department of Commerce; Mr. Raymond Mikesell, Treasury Department; Mr. Harold H. Neff, War Department; Lt. Phil Young, Navy Department; Mr. Edward Yardley, executive secretary.

This was an informal hearing at which representatives of the American Watch Assemblers Association were present. As the name implies, this association is composed of members of the American watch importing and assembling industry. This association expressed its vehement opposition to the proposal, apparently emanating from a group of American watch manufacturers, to wit, the Waltham Watch Co., the Hamilton Watch Co., and the Elgin Watch Co., which companies are seeking to establish a quota on the imports into the United States of Swiss parts and movements. Such a quota would fly in the face of the theories advanced by the Democratic administration and its desire to expand international trade and be contrary to the present arrangements existing between the United States and Switzerland. High tariffs, quotas, and restrictions of this character have no place in the program announced, not only by President Truman but Secretary of Commerce Wallace, your immediate superior.

The Administration Seeks To Provide for 60,000,000 Jobs. That is the title of a book so ably written by Secretary Wallace. To insure that full quota of employment, we must maintain exports upward of $10,000,000,000. We cannot export unless we import. International trade is no longer a one-way street. It is difficult to understand how we can with one breath express the desire to increase our international trade by way of increased exports and imports and in the next breath set up a quota system.

During the war we built 56,000,000 tons of ships. We must maintain much of that tonnage for obvious reasons. We cannot maintain it unless we have cargoes to load those ships. We cannot have such cargoes unless we expand our exports and imports. Again, any type of quota such as that proposed by the American watch manufacturers would knock the props out from under an essentially expanded merchant marine.

It is very significant that these three American watch manufacturers are now under indictment at the instigation of the Department of Justice for a violation of the Clayton Act and the antitrust laws, in that they arbitrarily restrict sales and distribution of their products at the wholesale and retail levels and so restrained the sale thereof as to discriminate unjustifiably against certain dealers such as retailers, catalog houses, subjobbers and wholesalers. It is charged that they formed together in a conspiracy in restraint of interstate commerce.

I am informed that the State Department has insisted upon a quota of 3,000,000 watches and watch movements from Switzerland per annum.

It is rather anomalous that one branch of the Government—the Department of Justice—has called these three companies malefactors and law violators, while another branch of the Government, by determining a Swiss quota, would intensify that monopoly and thus bestow an accolade of approbation and good will on violators of the law.

Setting up a quota is monopoly both ways. It creates favoritism and monopoly among the Swiss watch exporters and conversely, the same set of conditions for American watch importers.

Cogent proof was submitted to the Committee for Reciprocity Information that there is a tremendous backlog of demand for watches and that this demand in 1946–47 will run up to about 10,000,000 watches. These watches are not the cheap type but the jeweled movements. The maximum number of these watches that the American manufacturers could provide is approximately 2,000,000 per annum. If the aforesaid quota prevails, it will leave 8,000,000 watches to be supplied. This will permit a demand far greater than the possible supply and allow the American manufacturers to reap a rich harvest by greatly increasing the price of their product. This would be legalized highway robbery, with the State Department as an accomplice, and bring about an inflationary trend in the jewelry business.

The retail jewelers have not been apprised of these facts. They have not been invited to testify and their advice and counsel has been deliberately disregarded.

The American watch manufacturers have sought to advance the erroneous idea that there will not be an excessive demand for watches and that they will be left out in the cold. It is pertinent, in this regard, for me to quote a portion of an advertisement which appeared in all the metropolitan dailies throughout the length and breadth of the land. It was inserted by Estabrook & Co., New York bankers, and used in connection with an offering of the stock of the domestic watch manufacturers. In part, it read as follows:

"A spot check of the retail establishments in New York and the department stores in Chicago indicates that there are at least 2 years of full capacity production ahead for the domestic watch manufacturers."

This advertisement is quite consistent with the surveys that show that for the next few years there will be a considerable increase in the sale of American watches.

Recently in the Wall Street Journal a news item appeared to the effect that the Elgin Watch Co. had recently purchased the plant known as the Elastic Equipment Co. at Lincoln, Nebr., and that Elgin purchased this plant in order to secure greater plant capacity to supply the greater demand for its watches.

Frankly, surveys show that there will be plenty of opportunity for the entire watch industry; there will be an unprecedented demand for watches—those of Swiss origin and those of American manufacturers.

To begin our postwar program by imposing a quota on the importation of watches and watch movements from Switzerland would be quite contrary to the administration's international policy. It would be in direct contradiction to the administration's program for freer international trade, freedom from exorbitant rates of duty and freedom from irritating and vexatious trade restrictions.

The American Watch Assemblers Association constitutes a truly American industry. They employ thousands of people and are as genuinely an American industry as that represented by the Hamilton, Elgin, and Waltham watch companies. The latter companies also import portions of their movements, particularly the jewels. The assemblers of watches and the manufacturers of kindred products for them, such as bracelets and gold and silver watch straps, etc., boxes, etc., involve a completely American productivity. The number of workmen employed in various capacities by the American Watch Assemblers Association compare very favorably to those employed by the domestic companies or American watch manufacturers.

In the year 1940, the import value of watches and watch movements amounted to $10,622,000, of which there was a duty paid of $6,356,000. The sales value of the assembled watches made from these imported movements, taken at the retail price level, was approximately $82,500,000. Of this amount, $10,622,000 was paid to Swiss manufacturers and $6,356,000 was paid as duties to this Government. There remained $65,522,000 in the United States which covered the cost of labor, cases, bracelets, boxes, overhead, advertising, selling expenses, taxes, and profits of both assemblers and retail jewelers. Thus, out of a business in the United States at a retail price level of $82,500,000, only $10,622,000, or approximately 12 percent went abroad.

These figures are typical and conclusively show that the watch assembling is almost exclusively a domestic enterprise.

Very strange to relate, there have been no published hearings so that my colleagues and myself, in the House and in the Senate, could secure information as to the basis for the plea of the American watch manufacturers in their desire to set up a quota. We have not been told the story. Why this matter should be shrouded in mystery is difficult to comprehend. I personally should like to peruse the arguments advanced by the American companies in this connection. I think it is incumbent upon you, in your newly appointed capacity, to uncover these facts.

If a quota is placed on Swiss watches and Swiss movements, it will give a great impetus to smuggling of same into the United States inasmuch as this is the customary reaction to such restrictions. If Switzerland is limited in its sales of watches to us, it must expand its market elsewhere. A quota on the importation of these watches and movements from Switzerland will force that country to reduce her imports of other products from the United States.

I have no doubt, also, that Swiss watches will be "bootlegged" into the United States.

In 1939, for example, the United States imported from Switzerland about 15 percent of the total number of watches made in Switzerland. During the war, because of the

abnormal demand of our armed forces, Switzerland sent into the United States about 50 percent of its total manufacture. That increase was also attributable to the closing to Switzerland of many of its markets in other countries. In the postwar period, these markets will again be available and it is logical to assume that the demand in this country will be less than 50 percent of the total Swiss output.

As I understand it, the State Department has requested the Swiss Government to consent to this quota of 3,000,000 watches per annum. The Swiss Government may refuse. I think it should refuse. In that event, our Government might then declare the trade treaty with Switzerland at an end. Negotiations would then have to be developed for the purpose of effectuating a new treaty. We have just concluded a treaty with Switzerland and I doubt whether there will be a disposition on either side to abrogate a treaty, and undertake the task of implementing a new one.

Of course, Congress could, by enactment, set up a quota but I doubt whether Congress would do this.

It may be possible that the State Department desires to coerce the Swiss Government into an acceptance of this quota restriction.

I am most anxious to discuss this matter with you fully and perhaps arrange a conference with you at which representatives of the American Watch Assemblers Association will be present.

I am sending a copy of this communication to Secretary Wallace.

Thanking you for a prompt reply, I am

Very truly yours.

Pat Hurley for President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to honor my personal friend of many years standing, a former fellow citizen of Tulsa, Okla., by having printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial by Richard Lloyd Jones, appearing in the Tulsa Tribune of November 30, 1945:

Our Tulsa townsman, Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, has given the State Department a sock in the jaw it needs. Its timidities, its confusions, and its intrigues with our diplomats have made a mess with foreign nations.

The American people are forthright. Until Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal outfit began to play politics with diplomats our foreign relations have always been an open book. We used to be a people of our word.

General Hurley shocked Congress into action on the firing line of duty. General Hurley took Congress by the collar and woke it up. He gave Congress courage. Pat Hurley has done more in the last half dozen days to bring our Government back to American principles and practices than has been done by any man since Franklin Roosevelt went into the White House a dozen years ago.

Gen. Patrick J. Hurley is the kind of man the country needs and is looking for. He is a man of positive action. He will condone no doubledealing, no dirty work. And when he finds he is up against the uncurbed, un-American, seditious activities of public officials, he explodes with heroic righteous wrath. The whole country is hungry for just this unmistakable, stalwart honesty. The overwhelming public applause for Hurley's forthright honesty in publicly proclaiming his resignation protest is a demonstration we have not witnessed in years.

Hurley is a man the people have been waiting for. A man who stands right up in meeting and tells the truth.

Hurley would rather resign an office of great importance than to repudiate the principles for which this war was won. He would rather step out of high office than not be free to tell the Secretary of State that he is a timid man, compromising and wrong. Hurley stepped out of high office to bring to the attention of the American people that the subtle intrigues and the timidities of our State Department are laying the fagots for a third world conflagration. Every American wife and mother will thank God for Hurley if he can prevent that.

General Hurley got our of office that the public might know who the little un-American, foreign-minded members of our Congress and the State Department are. He tagged them. And it took a Hurley to tag them.

Oklahoma has produced the man. He has the stuff we need to President this Republic. He is the kind of man we need to return us to the constitutional laws of the land, and to frank and forthright relations with all the nations of the earth.

What a wholesome thing it would be for this Nation to turn General Hurley's righteous indignations on the push-around abuses that the bureaucratic meddlers have made with the people's constitutional rights.

Labor would have a square deal with Pat Hurley. He knows what it is to toil in the mines, and as a day laborer work as teamster. But the labor bosses who run an infamous racket would have a match in General Hurley that would put them in their place. Labor would get a square deal and be protected from its own racketeering bosses.

Pat Hurley would protect business in its rights. This Nation has been made by business enterprises. Business built our churches, our colleges, our hospitals, and our libraries. Business has promoted our arts and endowed our symphonies. Business has multiplied the gadgets that have unbent labor-burdened backs. Freedom of competitive enterprise gave us the sewing machine and the telephone, the chilled plow and the rubber tire, the electric lamp and the cotton gin. Freedom of competitive enterprise, in 100 years, lifted American life above all the human achievements from the surrender of Cornwallis back to the dawn of time.

For a dozen years we have had nothing but nasty, dishonest, and unjust harassments and annoyances, condoned by cowed Congress and sanctioned by courts that contemptuously cast suspicion upon the men who make work for workers, the men who lightened our labors and embellished our lives.

For a dozen years the men who have made the wheels of industry go round have been looked upon with suspicion by a business incompetent in the White House. Gullible citizens have been taught by the small-minded New Deal politicians that anyone is a foe of society who labors to pave the pathway of progress.

Patrick J. Hurley believes in human rights. He believes in justice and fair play to all people. He would gather about him men who would leave no stone unturned to do justice to every citizen of this Republic. There would be no racketeering and there would be no graft, there ould be no taxation to promote the political fortunes of the bureaucratic repudiators of American principles and practices.

Patrick J. Hurley has everything to make a strong candidate for his party to promote for the Presidency. Pat comes out of the life of the frontier. He rose out of the heart of the country. His country fills his heart. He is no fireside crooner, but he is grandly articulate with honesties.

A man arises who has all the fitness to meet the world's imperative needs. Honest and efficient. A forthright fighting American. Pat Hurley for President.

Some Points on President's Proposed Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following analysis of the President's labor message prepared by the legislative representative of the United Clerical Workers of America, CIO:

SOME POINTS ON PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED LABOR LEGISLATION

A. Propcsal has no relation to present situation and is affirmatively misleading.

1. Labor unions in every major current dispute have been "cooling off" for more than 30 days.

(a) In steel, companies broke off negotiations and refused to bargain in October. It is now December and union has been attempting all that time to get companies to resume negotiations.

(b) In auto, union withheld action for more than 60 days while it made offer after offer to company, to negotiate publicly, to present facts publicly, to arbitrate.

2. Companies are today arrogantly refusing cooperation.

(a) In steel, Secretary of Labor has twice invited parties to confer with him. Union has accepted; company has refused even to meet with representatives of Government.

(b) In auto, company has refused public negotiations, arbitration, and has even refused to come to Washington at request of Government representatives.

3. President has pointed out need for wage increases. All available economic data indicate companies can pay wage increases without price increase. Companies have refused to meet these facts on their merits and flatly asserted that their profit position will not be revealed to union, to Government, or even to their stockholders. Administration has even suggested availability of price increases if 6 months of operation show that they will be necessary.

In the light of above, a legislative proposal that unions "cool off" for 30 days is a gratuitous insult to workers and to the intelligence of the American public. It evades the administration's responsibility for dealing with recalcitrant management and is deceptive in that it offers a proposal which would make absolutely no contribution to solving present-day problem.

B. Proposed legislation from long-range view weakens labor in collective bargaining, puts Government on side of management, and is contrary to sound labor relations policy.

1. Denies basic right of labor to strike. This is patently true on the face of the proposal insofar as the 30-day period is concerned. It is further true far beyond the 30-day period since, as indicated below, the denial for the 30-day period may frequently mean in practical effect a total denial.

2. Proposal imposes forcible delay on workers' right to exercise their economic strength. Employer never suffers by delay, since he always has the power to maintain the disputed working conditions. Workers usually, and

in fact almost always, suffer by delay, since it forces them to keep their organization primed and ready for strike if necessary over a prolonged period.

3. The proposal would prevent the workers from adequately marshalling their forces for strike if necessary. The determination as to whether they will be required to endure the 30-day waiting period is in the hands of the Secretary of Labor. If employer stalls during collective bargaining, union cannot safely start marshalling its forces to meet employer's tactics since they have no way of knowing whether at the end of negotiations the Secretary of Labor will or will not demand the 30-day period. Union is then faced with alternative of allowing employer's tactics to disintegrate union morale or of organizing for strike with possibility that they may be told that they will have to keep their strike organization primed but in leash for additional 30 days. This is an extremely, and often impossible, task with hundreds of thousands of workers involved.

4. Because of this weakening of labor's economic strength, the proposed legislation would impede sound collective bargaining. Employers, aware of weakening effects of law on union, would be even less willing to negotiate in good faith or to grant legitimate demands of their employees.

C. Comparison to Railway Labor Act gives no justification for proposal.

1. Facts indicate that even in railroad industry, Railway Labor Act has not operated to best interests of railroad workers. Despite well organized unions, railroad wage scale substantially lower than comparable rates in other industries. Railway Labor Act has actually tied hands of railway unions in efforts to better conditions.

2. Railway Labor Act operates in industry with long history of organization and in which management has abandoned hope of destroying unions. Throughout the rest of American industry management, as indicated by its tactics at present time, still hopes to and is attempting to destroy organizations of their employees. Enactment of President's proposal would simply strengthen that hope.

Terminal Leave for Enlisted Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to grant to enlisted personnel in our armed services the same rights that officers now receive under terminal leave. An officer is allowed 30 days' annual leave and, when he cannot take it, the leave period is allowed to accumulate. Under this system an officer can, under the law passed by Congress, stay on the service pay roll for that period after his discharge and receive his base pay for the amount of time covered under terminal leave. Terminal leave, as such, should be granted to enlisted personnel as well as to the officers.

It is true that enlisted personnel receive mustering-out pay but so do officers up to and including the rank of captain. Terminal leave is not a privilege that only one group should be entitled to but one which should be shared by all enlisted men and women of our armed forces serving during the war. The discrimination between officers and enlisted men, as exemplified under terminal leave, is too rank to be allowed to continue and should be adjusted and corrected at the earliest opportunity.

Peacetime Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include several letters and petitions from outstanding church groups of various denominations opposing military conscription. I also include excerpts from a very brilliant speech recently delivered at Roxbury, Mass., by His Excellency, Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, in which this outstanding churchman and spiritual leader vigorously opposed peacetime conscription:

Speaking at the communion breakfast of St. Patrick's Alumni, Roxbury, and later at a similar event sponsored by St. Joseph's Alumni, Archbishop Cushing repeated his opposition to peacetime military conscription. "There is another matter," he said, "on which I wish to comment briefly. It is a matter which would affect the lives of all. It would affect the futures of individuals and their personal, vocational plans. It would affect the futures of families and their morality. It might even have a serious indirect effect upon the church itself, especially upon the future of its education and the vocations to its priesthood. It would radically change, in many important respects, our whole American way of life.

"I refer to the proposal that we adopt a program of permanent conscription of young men for peacetime military training.

"Judging from the daily papers, many people propose to defeat this program for political and military reasons. There are many good grounds upon which apparently they can do so. I am not concerned with these. I am concerned with moral and social reasons why peacetime conscription would be disastrous for our democracy.

"First of all, let it be remembered that this idea is not a new one. If we adopt it, we will not be the first nation to have done so. Wherever permanent conscription has been tried by any major nation it has a bad history. Since first Napoleon used peacetime conscription and Prussia followed his bad example, the system has invariably led to dictatorship, to militarism, and to those competitive armaments which have been the curse of Europe and the crippling of its culture.

"That is what Cardinal Gasparri meant when he counseled the nations to outlaw this system after the last war. Cardinal Gasparri knew Europe well. He knew its history and the causes of its wars. He knew the things which alone could save Europe; he knew the things which had ruined it. He blamed peacetime conscription for the conditions and the atmosphere in Europe which produced wars in every generation. He said 'Peacetime conscription in Europe has been the true cause of so many and such great evils for more than a century, that the only hope (for the future) lies in its total, simultaneous abolition by the nations.'

"The great cardinal was right, and those who refused to heed his advice on this point were wrong. By tolerating the continuance of peacetime conscription in Europe, they made World War II inevitable. God forbid that we now imitate Europe in her worst systems! God forbid that a program which has been so bloodily discredited in Europe should now become part of our postwar program! It may interest you to know that many of America's greatest peoples came to this country precisely in order to escape the moral and social conditions in the Europe of the last century which conscription caused. One of America's most envied characteristics in the years before the war was her freedom from the regimentation and the moral decay which permanent conscription has always brought with it in Europe.

"Our people have never refused their wholehearted cooperation to any military program made necessary by a real emergency. But, emergencies are by their very nature temporary. If a temporary emergency ever exists which appears to require conscription, then people living in a Democracy have a right to know what that emergency is—what is being done about it—and why military measures are necessary in order to meet it. But no temporary emergency should be made the excuse for a permanent program of militarism, a program spelling the end of our total way of life.

"Religious people have further grounds for reservation with regard to these proposals. We are faced with appalling evidence of the effects on national morality of conscription in Japan, in France, in Germany, and in the other major nations which have established this system. We hear disturbing reports of what the Army policies on morality, especially sex morality, can do and have done to the moral philosophies and practices of even our boys. Even temporary, necessary wartime conscription brings with it serious moral problems. I do not need to elaborate that point. But the proposals to make this permanent and part of our permanent peacetime set-up are frightening. If every American boy in his late teens is going to be exposed to this system and to all that goes with it in the way of "moral" and "hygienic" education, then America and religion have some dark days ahead for them. We are going to be a very different people and the history of Europe and of Asia gives us no reason to believe that we are going to be a better people—or a more prosperous people.

"That same history makes us fear that we will not even have the peace which, we are told, conscription will protect. Germany had peacetime conscription, and Germany did not keep the peace. France had peacetime conscription and France could not keep the peace. Every losing nation in World War II was a nation which relied for its defense on peacetime conscription and which had been bled white in its moral and physical life by the conditions which peacetime conscription makes inevitable. I hope you will not be deceived by emotional arguments in favor of this system; read its actual history elsewhere and meditate on its moral implications before you decide that it is a good idea for America."

MASSACHUSETTS CLERICAL ASSOCIATION,
November 13, 1945.

Mr. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PHILBIN: Enclosed you will find a resolution passed unanimously by the Massachusetts Clerical Association, comprising 240 clergy of the Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts.

Knowing that you will give this resolution your deepest consideration, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Rev. DAVID W. NORTON, Jr.,
Secretary.

Whereas:

1. The use of the atomic bomb marks the discovery of the most destructive force known to mankind;

2. Any attempt to formulate our foreign policy on the basis of temporary superiority

in atomic weapons will force other nations, as well as ourselves, into an atomic armaments race;

3. A domestic policy providing for free scientific investigation and discussion, as well as public surveillance and criticisms, of the application of atomic energy is the best guaranty that peace will be secured and that the public will be given full use of any scientific developments which, furthered under Government sponsorship, belong primarily to the people;

We, the members of the Massachusetts Clerical Association, comprising the clergy of the Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts, resolve:

1. That a system of international control and cooperation be established in order to safeguard world peace; and

We urge that the President of the United States immediately invite the Governments of Great Britain and the Soviet Union to a conference to prevent a competitive armament race, to plan international control of mankind's most devastating weapon, and jointly to utilize international machinery to make available to all people the peacetime benefits of atomic energy.

2. That a domestic policy for the control and development of atomic energy, in harmony with an international system of control and cooperation, be established by the President and the Congress of the United States providing for scientific freedom and a peacetime utilization of atomic energy in the interests of the people as a whole.

THE CHURCH FEDERATION
OF GREATER CHICAGO,
Chicago, November 30, 1945.

The Honorable PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House Military Affairs Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PHILBIN: We are opposed to compulsory military training and approve of Congressman MARTIN'S proposal urging national abandonment of same and reduction of armaments. If scientific, social, and religious efforts for peace are stepped up to equal or exceed the proportions of our recent war effort, peace is possible. It will never be secured by threats of military force.

Hopefully yours,
Rev. W. CARL NUGENT.
PEARL G. NUGENT.

SYRACUSE, N. Y., *November 26, 1945.*

Mr. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House Military Affairs Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PHILBIN: As a citizen and as a member of the Methodist Church Commission on World Peace, I wish to write you personally urging you to consider the action taken by this important commission.

"Further, we strongly oppose the adoption by the United States of compulsory peacetime military training before it has undertaken through international agreement and action to make such training unnecessary."

If the United States with its dominant military power adopts this reactionary, outmoded European philosophy of militarism, there seems to be practically no hope for the United Nations effective organization and thus little chance of peace and world cooperation in years ahead.

Sincerely,
TRACEY K. JONES,
Member of the Commission of World Peace of the Methodist Church, Layman Representative of the Eastern Jurisdictional Conference.

DIOCESE OF MASSACHUSETTS,
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICE,
Boston, November 17, 1945.

Mr. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PHILBIN: Enclosed you will find a resolution passed unanimously by the department of social service of the Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts.

Knowing that you will give this resolution your deepest consideration, I am

Sincerely yours,
Rev. HOWARD P. KELLETT,
Executive Secretary.

Whereas:

1. President Truman's action in placing before Congress a recommendation for universal military training is one which demands the most serious consideration of every American; and

2. This proposal appears to run counter to the fact that our foreign policy is committed to the support of the United Nations' Organization which includes arrangements for military sanctions against possible aggressors and breakers of the peace; and

3. The discovery of the use of atomic energy has led even military experts to question the value of the future of universal military training along the lines suggested by the President; and

4. The future of the world is so obviously dependent upon the work and research of scientists in every field whose skills are attained only through long and persistent training that educators are greatly concerned with the serious loss of young men of college and graduate school age such a program would entail; and

5. Many thoughtful citizens are properly concerned with the inadvisability of instituting such training at this time because of considerations varying from the belief that 18 is too young for the training to the belief that for the Federal Government to enter the States with a program of compulsory education is an invasion of our traditional conception of a free educational system upon which our democracy has always depended for its perpetuation:

Therefore, we the members of the department of social service of the Diocese of Massachusetts resolve:

1. That it would be most ill-advised for Congress to act on any of the present proposals for compulsory military education until a more adequate study be made of their implications in terms both of our foreign and our domestic policies;

2. That Congress establish a civilian commission comprising leaders in education, business, industry, and public life who with the aid of military advisers should make a survey of what, in the light of such considerations as those noted above, would be the best over-all plan for the security not only of the United States, but of all mankind from war in the future.

Montana Again in Vanguard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Billings Gazette:

MONTANA AGAIN IN VANGUARD

The readiness of the overwhelming majority of the people of the country to do everything necessary to win the war was demonstrated repeatedly during the conflict. No call for manpower, blood-bank contributions, material, or money went unheeded.

Aside from cooperating with programs for equitable distribution of scarce commodities, the thing that the vast majority were called upon most often to do was lend money to the Government in the form of war bond purchases.

The success of the seven war bond campaigns was due to a number of factors flowing from war necessity. Highly important was that of campaign organization, of letting the people know what was needed and why, and setting up an efficient system of receiving their money and issuing bonds in exchange. Success in such a venture called for the interplay of many forces, and much work on the part of banking institutions, campaign directors, and solicitors. For this work no remuneration was expected or received. But the test of the success of any such campaign is the will of the people to respond.

All of the seven war bond quotas were oversubscribed, and with a little more time the current Victory loan campaign will be a national success.

Whether the Montana organization that has handled these eight campaigns is more efficient than those of most other States might be questioned outside our borders. Perhaps our people are a little quicker in their reactions. Either, and probably both, may be the case. Certainly, we have reason to feel that this is so. Montanans have reason to be proud that their State was the first to reach its quota in each of the first seven campaigns. North Dakota topped the field in the Victory loan drive, but Montana was soon over the line for second place.

This unique Montana record is one which every campaign worker and every bond buyer is justified in viewing with pride as we shift our major efforts to the problems of another war-produced peace.

Butter Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, Gov. Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota, has written to the Secretary of Agriculture, Clinton P. Anderson, relative to the butter-price situation. The Governor's analysis of the situation is so well brought out that I feel it should be called to the attention of the Members of Congress:

DECEMBER 1, 1945.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: For half a century, the dairy cow has been a major source of income for Minnesota farmers. Many years ago farmers of our State began to band themselves together in cooperative creameries which sought constantly to improve the quality of the butter produced. Encouraged by an increasing demand from other States, our butter production grew steadily until in 1941 it reached a peak of 326,478,066 pounds, valued at $108,535,530, manufactured by 830 creameries, of which fully 621 were cooperative creameries owned by the farmers.

The production of butter continued to grow, here in our State and in many other States, as people came to appreciate the advantages of butter as a food and obtained increasing resources. The industry as a whole continued to prosper until price control and Government regulations made it unprofitable for dairy farmers to continue to sell their cream for manufacture of butter. The action of the Government in establishing and maintaining the ceiling prices it has upon butter,

while allowing cream to be sold for other purposes without ceilings, naturally has shifted great quantities of cream from butter production to the production of other products, including even substitutes for butter.

The point was made that the Government desired to shift a certain proportion of the Nation's cream to other products such as cheese and condensed whole milk, which the officials felt were more readily usable in supplying food for the armed forces. With the war over and this argument no longer tenable, if it ever was, the unreasonable and arbitrary ceilings and regulations discriminating against the production of butter are being maintained. Today creameries can sell their cream all the way from 62 cents to 75 cents per pound of butterfat. Under the present ceiling price on butter, the creameries cannot afford to pay the producer more than 55 cents a pound for butterfat. All during the war, creameries have been restricted on butter production by a low ceiling; whole cream could be sold as a cream mix and used in one form or another without any ceiling whatever.

Result of this policy of discriminating against the production of butter has been to reduce drastically the amount of butter produced. Per capita consumption of butter has dropped from the prewar level of 17 pounds to 10½ pounds, because the ceiling price policies affecting butter, introduced as war measures and being continued now as a peacetime program, have made it impossible for the people to obtain the quantities of butter desired. With a demand for butter that is unprecedented, producers are being prevented by this artificial barrier of a discriminatory ceiling from supplying the desired butter.

If this situation is not corrected, the effect will be a further disastrous reduction in the amount of butter processed. The public will be restricted still more in the opportunity to buy the butter it desires. The effect will be ruinous upon the dairy industry throughout the Nation, and consumers unable to get butter or restricted to substitutes, will be denied the opportunity of purchasing the desired butter because it will not be available on the market. I want to urge upon you and the other men concerned with this problem that steps be taken immediately to correct this situation. If a ceiling is to be maintained upon butter, it is imperative that the Government raise the present ceiling so that producers turning their cream into butter production can get a fair and reasonable price, compared to that received when it is going into other products, so that we can arrest the present serious decline in butter production.

Yours very truly,

EDWARD J. THYE,
Governor.

P.S.—I am writing a similar letter to Chester Bowles, OPA Administrator, feeling that he, too, will want to give this matter attention.

Letter From GI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein copy of a letter by a GI which recently appeared in a periodical:

TRICE UP

EDITOR: Who's kidding who? They tell us that all ships are being used to get us home. Then we learn from the Maritime Union that ships are being diverted to civilian use. Everyone promptly denies this, and now I buy a copy of the Manila Times and find no less than five steamship advertisements and a column called "Commercial vessels due Manila," listing 13 ships.

Just to make sure that there is no mistake, and so that the alibi boys can't wiggle out of this, let's see what these ads say. They are from the Everett Steamship Corp., the Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., the American President Lines, and the American Mail Line. They contain such alluring phrases as: "Freight and passenger service to and from United States Gulf ports and Philippines." "Freight and passengers accepted for New Orleans, Houston, and Galveston." "Freight and passenger space to and from all Philippine Island ports." "Accept freight for Puget Sound."

How about stopping all the baloney about men with such and so many points being eligible to go home, and tell us when we are going home. Our hats are off to the NMU and Mr. Joseph Curran for threatening to strike all ships not used as troop transports by December 1. This is one strike servicemen are in favor of.

LT. GORDON L. SPIELMAN,
Three Thousand Three Hundred and Eighty-Seventh Quartermaster Truck Company, APO 73.

On $46 a Week, Here's What You Can or Can't Buy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my rembarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Press of October 17, 1945:

ON $46 A WEEK, HERE'S WHAT YOU CAN OR CAN'T BUY

(By Ray De Crane)

Last week Robert C. Stafford, a discharged serviceman, returned to his old job at the Press.

To learn the job opportunities for veterans, Mr. Stafford, posing as an unskilled worker, applied for work in Cleveland industrial plants.

He was offered five jobs in 3 hours.

The highest-hourly rate he was offered was 78 cents.

Two other offers were for 70 cents, two employers offered 75 cents.

The total weekly wage at this rate, including the one job that called for 58 hours' work, ranged from $30 to $46.90 a week.

To find out how an average family of four could live on the wages offered Mr. Stafford, the writer asked Miss Sarah J. MacLeod, director of the home economic bureau of the Society for Savings and budget adviser for the Press, to outline five budgets.

Miss MacLeod's budgets showed that:

An automobile could not be operated at even the highest wage.

A telephone in the home was out of the question.

Rent allowance for the highest paying job would be $35 a month.

Highest food allowance (for the $46.90 job) was $17.20 a week.

Only two of the jobs would permit the family to buy a newspaper or magazine.

The relief level food allowance, for two adults and two active children. Miss MacLeod said, is $60.80 a month. For the $30-a-week job, the highest food allowance she could permit was $63, or $14.42 a week.

For the sake of comparison, here is the outlined budget for the $30 and the $46.90 families (figures are on a monthly basis):

	$30 Weekly	*$46.90 Weekly*
Withholding tax	$2.30	$5.60
Savings:		
Social security	1.30	1.94
War bonds	0	7.50
Life insurance	3.00	5.00
Hospitalization	0	1.90
Food	63.00	74.00
Shelter	25.00	35.00
Operating expenses:		
Winter fuel	4.00	5.00
Electricity, gas	4.00	5.00
Telephone	0	0
Household supplies	2.00	3.00
Clothing, dry cleaning	12.00	20.00
Advancement:		
Benevolence	0	2.00
Carfare	5.50	5.50
Medical expense	2.00	5.00
Union dues	1.00	2.00
Education	.25	.50
Furnishings	0	1.00
Gifts	0	0
Recreation	0	3.00
Papers, magazines	0	1.65
Tobacco	0	0
Vacation	0	0
Incidentals	4.25	8.35

Miss MacLeod found the allowance for shelter one of the biggest stumbling blocks. With the highest allowance $35, the home economist expressed doubt as to the type of quarters available for a family of four.

Miss MacLeod said the $20 monthly clothing allowance she suggested for two of the five jobs was "workable," but the "allowances are not adequate," she added, for the other three jobs.

Federal Fair Labor Standards Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement in behalf of H. R. 3914 and S. 1349—amendments to the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act—by the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference:

The social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference wishes to record itself in favor of the proposed amendment to the wage-hour law. The social action department is that section of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the Catholic bishops' organization of the United States, which especially deals with this subject.

The department is the more anxious to speak in favor of the amendment because a guide of its work is the famous bishops' program of social reconstruction which over 27 years ago asked for family living wage laws that would begin with requiring only enough for present normal maintenance but would gradually require enough for protection during sickness, accidents, invalidity, and old age. This amendment is a step toward those standards.

That program also stated that employees have a right to a living wage before an em-

ployer has the moral right to take interest on his investment. That is how seriously we consider the living wage.

The present 40 cents an hour of the law, paid for a full 40 hours of steady work during all 52 weeks of the year, with no holidays, no vacations, and no lay-offs, provides only $16 a week and $800 a year. These amounts are wholly inadequate, and were so when the law was passed.

Neither, for that matter, is the 65-cent minimum proposed by the present amendment a family living wage, nor is the 75 cents which will be mandatory in the third year after the amendment passes, and which can be introduced before then, industry by industry, on recommendation of advisory industry boards.

Seventy-five cents an hour for 40 hours is $30 a week. The approximately 50 weeks of a full year's work reaches only $1,500; and with taxes and social-security deductions, it is much less. Hardly anyone would say that the full $1,500 is enough to meet even a small family's present needs. Yet, prudence dictates the gradual approach to the legal enforcement of the living wage and asks us to be content with a 65 to 75-cent legal minimum now.

The 65-cent rate works out at some $1,300. Five cents an hour more or less means another $100 a year—at full-time work—less or more.

We wish to point out that the amendment does not establish at any of its figures a minimum family living wage. They move toward it, however, and that is so much to the good. We are in favor of the amendment.

Certain further comments on the bill seem in order:

1. The principle of governmental protection of wages is already accepted in law and in American public opinion. No argument needs to be advanced on this matter.

2. The jump from a 40-cent minimum in the law to a 65-cent minimum is a jump in law but not in fact. Very few who are covered by the law will get any increase under the amendment. Those who will get an increase will get very little. The amendment may, however, protect many persons from oppressive wage cuts to far below a decent living.

3. The differentials between the wages of those covered by the Federal law and those not covered will be widened by this law. This is a serious situation. But the Federal Government is not empowered to protect the wage rates of all the people and apparently does not wish to protect all whom it might protect. The plain answer is to go as far as Congress will consent to go within its powers and to work for like State legislation to protect those whom the Federal Government cannot or will not protect. That the Federal and State Governments, in combination, do not protect all is no argument against the Federal Government protecting some; it is instead an argument in favor of both protecting all, in combination.

4. The laws, Federal and State, are not supposed to give full wage justice. They should instead direct themselves toward a minimum living wage and then leave to collective agreements decisions on improvements. Therefore, it is not a valid argument against this amendment to complain that it does not establish the full standard of living which Americans should have. The Government should not try to do everything; that way is the way to totalitarianism.

5. The system of industry boards, which the amendment retains, possesses the great qualities of bringing labor, business, the public, and Government closer together, of making the law more flexible, and of adjusting wage rates to the conditions of particular industries.

6. If a few industries have to increase their prices to meet these wage rates, that is a small thing to pay for the promotion of wholesale justice. If certain individual firms within particular industries cannot meet such wage rates, that is simply proof that labor and the community are subsidizing their inefficiency. There is something radically wrong with an industry or a firm that cannot support its people. I should be overhauled by its employers and labor. If needed, they should call on the counsel of Government. The Government should be forehanded in giving them its counsel and help. Such industries and concerns are diseased.

7. Extension of the law to seamen and to canning and processing of fish, and canceling the ambiguous provision about the area of production seem justified. The people concerned are surely in industry, as the term is commonly used.

8. The committee might well consider an amendment to bring migratory agricultural labor under the law because of the very terrible conditions which that kind of labor meets and because of the special character of their work and the market for the products.

9. We take this opportunity to appeal to the States to pass like laws to protect those under the jurisdiction of the States, including ordinary farm labor.

10. It is sometimes said that the Fair Labor Standards Act is defective since it gives the same minimum wage to both single persons and heads of families. This is, in fact, a defect, if the living wage alone is considered. Yet the wage that is set under the present amendment is barely enough for support of a single individual. Really to correct this defect, the present amendment should be passed so as to pay the 65- to 75-cent minimum to everyone and a further law should be passed to provide more money to a man with a wife and something additional for every child. Failure to introduce that new kind of system makes mandatory a law that covers everyone on the same basis. There are, however, other considerations in this respect, such as the right to equal pay for equal work.

11. The Bishops' Program of Social Reconstruction, referred to above, advocated only State living wage laws. It did so because at that time the Constitution was so interpreted as to forbid Federal laws on general wages. Instead of this limitation of the bishops' program being an argument against Federal laws to cover most of the persons who are now under Federal jurisdiction, it is a further argument for State laws to cover those whom the Federal Government cannot or will not protect.

12. Two other considerations present themselves: People getting enough to live decently can produce better. People getting enough to live decently can buy more goods and services and thus can reduce unemployment. Fuller production and fuller employment will result from this law.

13. We look upon this amendment as a companion piece to and an even more important proposal than the full employment bill. However, that bill, if passed, can help this bill, if passed, by the provision in the Senate full employment bill for mandatory conferences of business, labor, and agriculture to work out the conditions of full employment.

Minimum Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which was published in the Washington Post of November 12, 1945:

ON MINIMUM WAGES—COMMUNICATION CONTRADICTS NAM

May I congratulate you on your fine editorial of November 7 on minimum wage. I am glad that you have not taken seriously the propaganda being issued in opposition to the Pepper-Hock amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The National Association of Manufacturers testified before the House Labor Committee that $15,000,000,000 will be added to the price tags of American merchandise and to individuals' tax bills" by the passage of the amendment. These are "scare" figures intended to enlist opposition to the pending measure. Therefore they need very careful scrutiny. The figures depend on three false assumptions:

First, the minimum wage is confused with general lifting of all wage rates. The former is a matter of law; the latter, of collective bargaining. It is true that raising the minimum would undoubtedly result in higher wages for many of those already receiving the minimum or above it, but the NAM oversimplifies the case by adding 15 cents to the hourly wage of everyone now receiving 65 cents or over. There are a number of industries in which a negligible number of workers receive under 65 cents. Why assume that all of these will get 15 cents extra as a result of the law?

In the second place, it is assumed in the final table that all employees except agricultural and governmental employees will be covered by the minimum wage. "It is quite likely," says the statement, "that eventually coverage in the bill will greatly be extended beyond manufacturing industry alone," but such extended coverage is not proposed in any line of the bill. To say it may happen in the future is a deliberate twisting of the facts.

The third assumption—and the most astounding one—is that the $14,600,000,000, which the NAM estimates will be added to the wage bill when the minimum becomes 75 cents, results, according to their statisticians, in a $15,000,000,000 increase in prices—over 100 percent.

Wages are only one element of cost. The census of manufacturers in its most recent figures (1939) showed that the product of the tobacco industry valued at $1,320,000,000 was produced with a wage bill amounting to $69,000,000—approximately 5½ percent.

The percentage varies among industries. The NAM must know that the effect of wage increases on prices depends, among other factors, upon volume of production and efficiency of management. If American industry had added all its wage increases in the past to prices, we would have been unable to make any advance in living standards; workers would have always been playing a losing game, as each wage increase brought an identical increase in cost of living. This has not been the case in the past, and there is no basis for assuming that it will be the case today.

Robert Johnson, textile manufacturer, testifying the day after the NAM witness, said: "On every side we see proof of the ability of this country to pay higher wages and sell at lower costs * * * this equation needs no proof beyond the record of the last 50 years."

I trust that the public, which is rightly concerned about an inflationary spiral, will think twice before being frightened by the NAM's astronomical predictions.

ELIZABETH S. MAGEE,
General Secretary, National Consumers' League.
CLEVELAND, OHIO, *November 8.*

The Relation of the St. Lawrence Project to the Railroads of This Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, an enormous amount of propaganda has been and is going to be released by the railroads of this country in connection with the proposal to develop the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

It is traditional that the eastern railroads have always felt it necessary to oppose this worthwhile project. At one time something like 15 years ago every western railroad which connected with the Great Lakes was in favor of this project. This means that 40 percent of the railroads of the United States were favorable to it. Then something mysterious happened. It happened at the same time that the Association of American Railroads was formed in the year 1934. After that date, without developing the ramifications, every western railroad kept gloriously silent. They knew 15 years ago, and they know now, that waterway development is beneficial in creating new freight products for the railroads. But I prefer to let an expert tell the story.

I have had my attention called to a remarkable address on this subject of the seaway and the railroads by Julius H. Barnes, LL.D., of Duluth, Minn. In addition to his other attainments, Mr. Barnes is rated as an outstanding businessman and without taking time to enumerate his record, I will say that his opinion measures up with the best. He delivered an address before the Economic Club of Detroit at Detroit, Mich., on Monday, November 26, 1945, and the proceedings on that occasion, including Mr. Barnes' address, are as follows:

ECONOMIC CLUB PROGRAM

The meeting was called to order by President Allen B. Crow.

Mr. DONALD S. KISKADDEN. If our historian, George Stark, was making this introduction, he might say, "First there was the river and that is how Detroit was born." Detroit, the City of the Straits.

It may be in bad taste for me to mention the Buhl Building, but I do so only because on its roof is built the Savoyard Club, named for the Savoyard River, which once ran through our now financial district into the Detroit River. In the lobby of the Savoyard Club are four stained-glass windows bearing emblems recording the national ownerships of the land on which the building stands. First, the Indians, the Huron and Pottawatomie Tribes. Second, France, 1634 to 1760. Third window, England, 1760 to 1796. And, fourth, the United States of America, 1796–1812, 1815–. The British were back in the picture briefly during the War of 1812. It is unthinkable that there should ever be a date placed after the dash following 1815.

Our first subdivider laid out long linear farms running north, but most important having the Detroit River frontage as the southern boundary of the farms. Every settler wanted his place in the sun to be a place on the river.

Those of us born in Detroit, who have lived here many years will recollect that visitors to this city often commented with amazement on the comparative little use Detroiters make of their beautiful waterway, those fine boats and yacht clubs. They place emphasis on the pleasures we are missing.

Many, many years ago, today's speaker thought of the Detroit River, the St. Lawrence River, and the Great Lakes in terms of low-cost water transportation and world commerce. Thirty years ago one of his first articles appeared in the Review of Reviews setting forth the benefits of the St. Lawrence waterway project to the Great Lakes area. Never in all these years during his busy and honored career has he stopped or even faltered in his devotion to this cause. It was his dream and hobby, ever backed up by foresight, vision, and hard work.

Now, with the St. Lawrence navigation and power project being given serious consideration by Congress, he needs our understanding and help to get the job done. Today, as president of the National St. Lawrence Association, he comes to tell us what this project can mean to the people of Detroit.

It is my great honor to present Julius H. Barnes. [Applause.]

MR. BARNES' ADDRESS

Mr. JULIUS H. BARNES. Mr. President and gentlemen, I feel today very fortunate indeed, fortunate in having a forum such as this of men who have played so vigorous and enterprising a part in the whole business fabric of America; and fortunate in having Mr. Kiskadden's introduction, which sketches the historical background for something of what I wish to present to your judgment.

I have been fortunate that while it was 30-odd years ago that I first championed the St. Lawrence, in the days when today's accomplishments were then but vision, anticipation; fortunate in that I have lived to see these factors come into practical play. I have been fortunate in the men associated with me in this cause, men themselves of long years of complete faith and devotion to a cause which we believe is in the whole national interest.

I do wish to speak to you primarily as Americans of a certain philosophy typified by the St. Lawrence project. Detroit, in all the world, is known as a miracle industrial city, and that is what Detroit means in the popular conception all the world over. Here was conceived the automobile, possibly the supreme object of man's desire; probably the culminating contribution to life's social service and to business efficiency.

It seems to be that here in Detroit developed two fundamental philosophies. Its supremacy in industry was achieved by management genius recognizing two typical American philosophies. The economy of standardized production and the reduction of selling price secured by assembly line labor skills was the primary achievement of Detroit's genius, followed since by almost every line of successful industry.

Second, the philosophy of giant merchandizing; the philosophy that costs were reduced by the genius production methods and that that saving should be shared with the cosumers, and, by that very sharing, enlarge the market for itself. These things are typical of Detroit, and Detroit will always stand in advance of other industries which have adopted them, as a pioneer of the two great philosophies which have served the public so well.

Detroit is fortunate at that time that this philosophy came into play with the automobile as its object, probably, as I said, the supreme achievement in human service. It was fortunate also that it was timed, this market philosophy, with the rising buying power of great American sections of people who had the aspiration to own and were achieving the ability to own these things that counted in building giant industries which we denote as Detroit.

Detroit has done much and deserves much. It has new problems for the future if it would maintain its attained leadership. It has a vast vista of possible achievement in the world of rising standards, of new peoples with new earning power, new knowledge, and new skills, informed and guided by such new agencies as the movie, the radio, and the airplane. In all lands, great populations are beginning to earn a buying power that means for Americans industrial leadership.

We believe that the brilliant future of Detroit rests largely in opening this great waterway that passes your door.

I do not presume to be an authority on shipping costs, although I have operated a fleet of ships, small ships, specially designed, on the Great Lakes, Erie Canal, and down the coast of the Atlantic and Gulf ports, and the Indies. I think I know something out of a lifetime of experience as a grain exporter, and out of the direction of the food administration in the last war, and out of 15 years' practical experience in operating ships, and I think I know something of the response which comes with cheap transportation, of which deep water is the very king.

I believe that it is no exaggeration for me to say that in the St. Lawrence opening, with its deep, stable channel, opened to the large ships of our own Great Lakes, and the ocean type as well, that Detroit will deliver the products of its giant industries in far markets, like the Baltic ports of Russia, at a cost not higher than it today is paying to reach New York.

Now, what does that mean to Detroit? Doesn't it give you the security of transportation access for inbound materials and outbound products for which every industry plans and labors? I believe it does.

Here in Detroit two generations of men of management genius, have brought this city to its present prominence. In the two generations, we have had half a century of industrial progress that it would behoove us to survey from time to time. Think of what has happened in this half century in industrial practice.

The wheelbarrow has become the bulldozer; the pickax, the caterpillar; the plow, the great farm combines; the buggy, the closed auto; the horse-drawn streetcar, the motorbus; the mud roads have become concrete highways; the open platform railroad coach, the streamliner; brick and frame cities have grown the skyscrapers; the hand-cranked phone, the instant long-distance, world-wide connection; office work by hand and pen, graduated into the universal typewriter and complex office machines; we daily use products of inventive skill not dreamed of a half century ago. The movie, the radio, the airplane, the auto itself only a crude beginning. Life has moved so swiftly and contributed so much. Human life expectancy in those early days, of 40 years, has almost increased half again. Refrigerated and year-round foods, miracle drugs, highly trained professions—these have flowered also with this industrial revolution. Give this progress human meaning in wider spaced sickness, daily competency, and death itself deferred, and it then has significance which rises above the mere desire of gain.

In those early days on the water corridor past your water front, were still sailing vessels engaged in commerce. Steamships had grown to the then impressive length of 250 feet. Today the 600-foot ship goes by your water front without daily notice. So much has happened in that time between the 250-foot ship with its 2,000 tons and today's ship with its 20,000 tons. At the falls of Sault Ste. Marie the first shallow canal lifted its 20 feet of water access from Lake Huron to Lake Superior, and brought out the first cargo that sailed past Detroit village carrying 100 tons of iron ore. Think of the industrial revolution typified by this growth in three or four

generations, from cargoes of 100 tons of iron ore to those of 20,000 tons feeding your mills and the eastern mills today.

When we review thus the real achievements of Detroit and cities which it typifies, we should understand as well how this leadership developed, not alone on certain natural advantages in America, but on the spirit of confident enterprise which inspired this progress. There is a philosophy here of great interest to us.

Throughout all history, whole peoples have sought the natural waterways of the earth. Before the days of power-driven vehicles water routes offered for centuries the cheapest method of transportation and travel. The rivers thus with fertile valleys and ready transportation centered along their banks for centuries, the world's growth of population.

Review these rivers briefly, and appreciate what use we have made in America of these natural resources of water channels.

The Nile, 4,000 miles in length and 6,000 years in service, cradled its early crude civilization. The Yangtze, 3,000 miles in length and 10,000 years in service. The Volga and the Danube, each 2,000 miles in length and 4,000 years in service. These rivers of the Older World cradled many generations. Yet even today the three oldest valleys with their long history present a civilization barely above the primitive peasant civilization.

Then in that short span of new-world history opened, 300 years ago, three great river valleys of the Western Hemisphere. The Amazon in South America, offering with its tributaries 30,000 miles of waterways serving the vastest drainage area of the world, remains even today almost bare of commerce, serving an almost unpeopled area of unproductive dense forest. The human well, the human skill, the human enterprise has not yet developed there.

In North America the Mississippi and its tributaries, the Missouri and the Ohio, 4,000 miles, aided the rapid development of inland America. It still was handicapped with floods and drought and shifting shoals.

And then the other great waterway bestowed by Nature was the deep stable channel of the St. Lawrence, and its connecting Great Lakes. The Great Lakes contain half the fresh water supply of the entire world. They are free of tides, affected not at all by floods or drought. This deep-water channel reaches from Newfoundland to Duluth and to Chicago with 2,400 miles of the cheapest water transportation in the world.

Almost as if Nature foresaw the power era that would create America's industrial supremacy it planned from Duluth to the Atlantic 600 feet of falling energy, and with the great reservoirs behind them offered the cheapest and most reliable power generation ever known.

Then Nature, as if to test the qualities of this new people, put progressive barriers across that waterway. The 225-foot fall between Lake Ontario and the level St. Lawrence, the 320-foot fall of the great Niagara, the shallow channels of the Detroit and the St. Clair Rivers at your door, the 20-foot drop from Lake Superior to Lake Huron. How have we answered this challenge? American enterprise and engineering skill asserted their mastery of natural obstructions by successive steps. Today, the bypass around Niagara waits with ocean-size locks of 800 feet and ocean depth of 30 feet over the sills, the trade of an expanding world. The shallow channels, almost at your door, have been deepened as commerce grew. They can be deepened again when the great carriers of the ocean are admitted. The Sault has become the symbol of vast transportation achievement. The early portage of the horse and cart has, step by step, developed into the five great locks of today. Off that, single Lake Superior moves in 8 months each year more tonnage than the aggregate of every constructed waterway in the world—Panama, Suez, Welland, Manchester. Nature favored Lake Superior and its shores at the very heart of America with vast deposits of iron, copper, timber of great forests, which built the cities and homes and industries at a speed and economy not conceivably possible without the great waterway on which they based.

And in this development, free America developed the finest example of teamplay between the authority and resources of government, and the stimulant to private enterprise which makes for a people's progress. The frontier line of relation between government and private enterprise has here been remarkably effective.

American invention and American business judgment developed by private enterprise the transportation economies by special ships and special docks, impossible except on a developed waterway requiring the larger authority and larger resources of government itself. That method should be extended to the completion of modernization which has progressed unfailingly everywhere along this great waterway except in the 50-mile stretch of the St. Lawrence. In violation of every concept of American progress, there still wait the locks and channels built for the carrier that has been outgrown. The St. Lawrence Canal authorized in 1882 and completed in 1900—nearly half a century ago—has not been improved or modernized since. It is a sad contrast with the vision and skill and enterprise inspiring the channels above. The 260-foot ships of the early century, carrying on 14-foot draft the modest cargo of 2,000 tons, have passed away. Today's 20,000-ton Lakes cargo ship can travel its 1,500 miles toward the ocean and then stop above the St. Lawrence rapids for expensive transfer. The newly constructed vast fleet of Libertys and Victory ships serving the ocean highways covering five-sixths of the surface of this globe can steam 1,000 miles up the great river and stop short at the foot of the same rapids in the St. Lawrence. Its cargo should instead be delivered 1,500 miles farther inland at Lake ports that nature equipped to be ocean ports as well, with every contribution to industrial growth, enlarged employment, and farm security.

I feel this story with a special emphasis. Pioneers like myself in the grain business of the western ports used this water economy to market the grain of inland America against the cheaper labor competition of Russia, India, and the Argentine, so that the streets of our inland towns became lined with automobiles. In those early days I may qualify through experience for I shipped grain intended for overseas marketing down the Erie Canal on horse-drawn towboats. Today I operate a specially designed motor-driven fleet using the economy of even the 12-foot waterway and paralleled by the great fleets of the oil companies as well.

Where private capital and management skill had free play as in the bulk cargo trades on the Great Lakes, transportation costs are a world marvel. You see the ships go by your docks, on the way up without cargo, earning maintenance and income on the downbound traffic in which the almost one hundred million tons of iron ore each year headed for the furnaces of the East and your own, 1,000 miles of carriage, require a transportation charge per ton less than you would pay to deliver a ton of coal across your sidewalk into your furnace bin.

The modernization of the St. Lawrence proposed in the legislation now in Congress and favored through a quarter-century by men of vision, would give Detroit industries and all Great Lakes ports the cheapest and shortest access to vast new markets for the thousand things which American industry leads in producing.

Do you realize that beside the economy of all-water carriage, without the expense of transfer, the distances to reach these new markets are so much shorter than the present routes via Atlantic ports? It is substantially 500 miles and more shorter from Detroit through the St. Lawrence, to all the north Europe countries—Norway, Sweden, Finland, Russia, Poland, and Denmark, and to the British and the North Sea ports—Liverpool, London, Antwerp, Rotterdam, Bremen and Hamburg. It is a trifle shorter to Gibraltar which typifies trade routes to all the Mediterranean countries, to the Middle East, and via the Suez to India and the Far East. And remember, the whole distance is the economy of water carriage. This means the advantage in delivery cost for which all industry strives by location and method.

Raymond Moley, editor of Newsweek, and Kiplinger, of the Washington Letter, both have recently emphasized that developments in transportation promise stimulated growth in the Middle West and West. The open seaway would deliver imported products needed for our industries, for alloys and special products. The open seaway would be a reassurance against the exhaustion of American reserves of natural resources.

Secretary Ickes recently sounded a sober warning of the drain on our own iron ore, oil, and copper. Lumber and pulpwood will not last forever. The great inland steel plants may need, in not too long, cheap access to imported high-grade ore to mix with our large lower grade deposits, left in our own reserves. Foreign origin alloys may be in demand, and may be needed in even the steel industries of this central Midwest. It is, I believe, mistaken judgment to look on that created movement as mere diversion of existing tonnage. We think all transportation history shows that the economy of transportation always creates new volumes, new business, new employment, and new earnings. Give American industry its access. Its own high skill and energy will do the rest.

What is the world waterway record?

The Panama, opposed in its early years by the railroad industry, opposed today in its intercoastal service, early ridiculed by a great railroad leader, James J. Hill, who described it as a lily pond, nevertheless grew from its 5,000,000 tons in 1914 to 30,000,000 tons in 1940. Even more, we need its vital contribution to national defense. Suppose railroad opposition had defeated its construction even as railroad opposition deferred the St. Lawrence. The Welland Canal, partly dead-end as it is, until America carries out its part with Canada, quadruples its tonnage in the last quarter-century. The Suez doubled its service to commerce.

We believe it is stubborn prejudice that refuses to admit what cheap transportation in and out will do not only to the area immediately affected, but through the overflow of tonnage in a thousand forms, a thousand ways, a thousand places.

We believe historians will wonder at the national lethargy or the powerful influences which held back for half a century the modernization of the half-century-old locks in the St. Lawrence which block the way. They will wonder the more when they compare it with the engineering skill and the business enterprise which developed 1,500 miles of waterway beyond that barrier.

The forces of opposition have been clear. The greatest influence of obstruction centers in the Association of American Railroads and especially since its formation on a national scale in 1934. The dominant influence in that railroad association rests in the three eastern trunk lines from the Atlantic seaboard—the New York Central, the Pennsylvania, and the Baltimore & Ohio.

Since its formation, since the formation of the Association of American Railroads, the western trunk lines, whose terminals rest upon the Great Lakes and whose interest would clearly be an exchange of traffic with the ocean carriers at the ends of their own lines, have been silent. Forty percent of all

railroad mileage rests on the Great Lakes and these lines were not always subservient to eastern trunk-line influence. In the development era following the last war, not a single western line executive failed to approve and endorse the St. Lawrence project. They were railroad executives in a true sense and openly supported the improvement which seems so obviously in their interest. Listen to the list:

President Pennington of the Soo Lines and his successor, Jeffrey; President Ralph Budd of the Great Northern Railway; Howard Eliot, chairman of the Northern Pacific Railway, and his successor, Charles Donnelley; President Byram of the Milwaukee Railway and his successor, Scandrett; President Felton of the Chicago Great Western; President Fred Sargent, of the Northwestern Railroad; President Hale Holden of the Burlington Railroad; President Downs of the Illinois Central. Not a single western railroad failed to recognize the service it would be to the transportation line under their direction.

Why have the western railway executives been silent? Why have they yielded the stage to the eastern trunk lines with their loudly proclaimed fear of tonnage diverted from the lines serving Atlantic ports? Is there financial and transportation colonialism in America to use a phrase of Senator AIKEN? What other explanation is there?

The utility industry formerly so active in opposition, so emphatic in its statement that the water power was not required, has softened as our electric generation has grown in America from 14,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours in the last war to 240,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours in this. Only occasionally today is any voice brash enough to attempt to argue that the power is not needed or that steam plants anywhere, anytime, could hope to equal the cost economy of this great St. Lawrence undeveloped power. And is it fair for the utilities, the utility industries, to oppose a project described by our President as "one of the great projects of the world" on the ground of a utility interest that fears a conflict between public power distribution and private? There is time to solve that character of distribution after the power is first created to distribute. Public opinion which will define that policy in the end can be enlisted behind private distribution more surely by helping to develop the resources of this country and not to suppress a great resource for single private interest. It is encouraging to us that Owen Young, former president of the General Electric Co., and a great figure in the growth of utility service, is a member of our association. There must be others who believe that the development of cheap power means the extension of power service over private lines to a wider range of mills, factories, shops, homes, and farms. Surely that would be in the broad public and national interest.

Then we have the opposition of certain commercial bodies in the Atlantic ports and even in the Gulf and Mississippi Valley which to some minds seems to be competitive.

Some men are opposed to the St. Lawrence for fear that it is a theatre for the development of river authorities. There is no similarity. The St. Lawrence has no problem of flood control or irrigation, such as the river valleys must rest upon. Why do they discredit a great project by an undefined fear of effecting an issue which bears no relation to the character of the St. Lawrence.

Some of the recent acts of business organizations in the great cities of the East have not been clearly based on accuracy of statement and logic of argument. We hope their leaders will determine that at least before their arguments are presented before a congressional committee, they shall be tested for accuracy and truth. They will certainly be challenged.

I cite, for example, the statement made in the last few weeks in the argument for a resolution opposing the St. Lawrence in the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, of which I am a member. Among the reasons for opposition were many inaccuracies not worthy the deliberations of so influential a body. For example, to try to discredit the cost estimate, repeatedly checked and verified by able Army engineers, it stated:

"Actual costs of other canals like the Panama, Suez, Chicago drainage and the Welland were twice or three times the original estimates."

It is time that this statement was nailed as the misstatement it is. Any impartial study would have shown its falsity.

The Department of Commerce in a recent publication on the St. Lawrence commented on the 9 lives of this inaccuracy and quoted officially a letter of January 16, 1934, in which General Markham, Chief of Army Engineers, answered by an inquiry from Senator VANDENBERG by quoting the actual record. He showed that when in 1908 the increased dimensions and widening of the channel through the Culebra Cut was authorized, the estimate approved was $375,201,000. On June 30, 1918, after the canal was opened and in permanent operation, the actual cost was $372,000,000. Let's at least discuss this great project with the dignity and accuracy that it deserves.

The Association of American Railroads is fairly open to question, as to their judgment on national projects and national policies when there is a conflict which seems to threaten their selfish interests.

For example, every transportation act of Congress, I think without exception, declares for the regulatory bodies to preserve the peculiar advantages of every form of transportation. I think it only fair to say and to quote from the public record that the railroad industry has almost generally opposed every act or policy that would help any other industry like water, highway, or air, even when that opposition seemed to be violating the first principles of fair play. If, in 1934, the Senate vote on the then St. Lawrence Treaty had followed the recommendation of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which was just, and had voted two-thirds required approval, instead of 49 in favor and 43 against, we would have had the deep and short water corridor opened for this last great war.

What would that have meant, with 1,000 miles shorter submarine exposure, we would have saved scores of ships, turned all ships faster with more cargoes delivered, quickened our allies war effort with larger and faster deliveries of lend-lease weapons, saved millions of dollars expended on cargoless deliveries of lake-buit ocean ships down the long, shallow route via Chicago and the Mississippi, ships too large for the outgrown St. Lawrence locks. In money, we would have saved many times the $200,000,000 required from us. In war, we would have saved hundreds of lost submarined sailors, and with a shortened war, many, many lives of gallant fighters.

The opposition of 1934 has much to answer for, even if World War II was not foreseen. It came and we have suffered much.

I could illustrate what I mean about railway opposition by a very recent official communication to the Interstate Commerce Commission by Admiral Emory S. Land, Chairman of both the Maritime Commission, building a miracle fleet of merchant ships, and also head of the War Shipping Administration which governed the movement in the war years of practically every fleet in the world. Recently, with the lessened pressure of ships for war, Admiral Land asked the ICC to aid in reinstating the coastal and intercoastal ship services that war had forced the operating lines to suspend for years. The Association of Railroads, in what seems to be an unbroken custom, opposed this reinstatement of service. Admiral Land records officially to the ICC his judgment of the attitude of that Railway Association thus:

"It is a matter of keen regret," he writes, "to me that at the very first opportunity following the close of hostilities, the railroads have adopted a narrow point of view reminiscent of the 'dog-eat-dog' philosophy which so adversely affected their own interests as well as those of the water carriers during the prewar days."

He goes on:

"Objections from the railroads come with bad grace. The rails were not asked to abandon their business to competing transportation. They benefited by the misfortunes of the water carriers. Under our national economy, both forms of transportation are essential. To some extent, the problems of the shipping industry resulted from depressed and noncompensatory freight rates established by the rails in section 4 proceedings."

Any traffic expert will know what section 4 means, the exception of rates to meet so-called water competition.

"I hope that railroad management will see the problem in its proper perspective and adopt a broad-gage view of the solution; that they will see the wisdom and necessity of permitting a privately owned and operated steamship industry to survive and prosper and abandon all lingering hopes of destroying water competition."

We of the Great Lakes hope so, too. This is hardly a heartening instance of supporting national policies in the public interest, and especially when the railroads opposed so sturdy a champion of private operation as Admiral Land has proved himself to be.

The Interstate Commerce Commission, often described as railroad-minded, in its fifty-second annual report, recorded many criticisms of railroad policies and practices. In their comment occurs ICC jugment as "contrary to the public interest" and "in numerous respects unlawful." It does not indicate unlimited confidence, nor tend to create it in the public.

The report comments on the lack of resourcefulness in the railway industries as to laboratory work, experiments, and engineering. It would be hard to make men in the automobile business, like Zeder and Kettering and Ford, sympathize with railroad attitude in respect to constant laboratory work.

We do not desire to disparage railroad performance in this war. It was good. So also was the performance of all American industry—some with conversion problems the railroads did not have to face.

But good war performance cannot hide the questions of public policy which they invite by their activity in opposing a great public improvement.

This brings me to review the hoary old accepted practice of so-called differential line. Admiral Land refers to that in his criticism referring to section 4 proceedings; also, the ICC clearly refer to this practice.

What would you, as businessmen, think of this kind of a policy? As industry operators, you would concentrate production, simplify exceptions, achieve cost economy by such mass concentration. Well, the railroads had other ideas. They established a standard rate of freight between New York and Chicago, say 900 miles. Then they allowed a "differential route" to load freight on a steamer at New York, transport it 300 miles south to Norfolk, stand the extra handling charge on and off the ship, load it in a railroad car headed for Chicago, but farther from Chicago than when it loaded on the steamer in New York. And then because the roundabout delay is not attractive to a shipper, they tried to overcome that by offering a lower rate of freight for the 1,200-mile haul than for the 900-mile haul on the direct line

referred to by the ICC in their fifty-second annual report. And that is not all. Past my office in New York, prior to the war, I saw a steamer leave every night its dock in the North River, headed directly away from New York with freight for Chicago and other points. They went to a Long Island port, transferred again from ship to railroad car, run the car north and through part of Canada, bring it to Georgian Bay, stand another expense of transfer from car to boat, deliver it to Chicago after a total journey of about 1,500 miles instead of 900, and again attract shippers by offering a lower rate for the longer route with all its expenses. Obviously, you can see that this violates every sound principle of American industrial practice. Does that inspire respect for railroad judgment?

I suppose, following that to its natural conclusion, if they could devise a route long enough, say 3,000 miles, they would carry the freight for nothing.

I could tell you with intimate authority my earlier experiences as chairman of Duluth's traffic commission, fighting for its rights before the ICC many years ago. Three big cases before the Commission all won against persistent railroad opposition, and that opposition is still there in other forms.

The railroads publish a weekly, Railroad Data. They have plenty of money for publication, for propaganda work, for conferences, and dinners. They need all these aids to try to disguise the fact that the only substantial argument they present today is their claim of possible diversion of tonnage.

Last week the Railroad Data quoted a president of one of the smaller eastern trunk railroads at a conference in opposition to the St. Lawrence. How is this for a new argument against the St. Lawrence, and I quote—and this was said by one of the minor trunk lines of the East:

"The railroad spokesman opposed the power feature on the ground that atomic energy made questionable the need for further expansion of electric power utilities."

American industry has always faced revolutionary problems raised by perfected invention, mechanics, or chemistry. It will continue to face them and adapt itself to changes as they come. To suspend development by fear of change has never been our way. Nor ever will be. Let's go forward.

I cannot finish this discussion without reference to the most important subject close to all our hearts, the future of our children and our grandchildren. Many of these are just returning from the trials and tests of inhuman warfare in the far corners of the world forced on this peace-loving people. What kind of society, what kind of economic opportunity, what kind of Government are we going to bequeath to them? Shall we forfeit our progress to them by closing new trades, new transportation, or shall we throw open the wide gates of economic progress? This more than any other project is a challenge to the American genius to do big things in a big way. It is within the competence of just such a gathering as this to bring this practical dream into reality. This project, like the Suez and the Panama, is fit work for kings and presidents, for men who rule by ability and purpose.

It explains why every American President in a quarter century has given it first thought and then support. I know it to be true that in the most critical periods of our existence during the months after Pearl Harbor, President Roosevelt took the time from other pressing emergencies to urge the construction of this project. In the hectic days of the San Francisco Conference, the Potsdam Conference, and the Japanese negotiations, President Truman has held many conferences, and, as a result of mature consideration, sent last month a special message to Congress urging its enactment. The State Department emphasizes opening this highway to commerce with the world as an important factor in their program of international collaboration.

Your own Senators, VANDENBERG and FERGUSON, together with Majority Leader BARKLEY, Senators AIKEN, WAGNER, Mr. HILL, LA FOLLETTE, and many others have devoted long and serious study on ways and means of obtaining approval with its international phase. These activities by our national leaders are recognition and a proof of importance of the issue.

This project deserves well of your personal attention and support. Every one of you has influence as a leader of business and public opinion. You owe it to your city, to the Midwest, and to your country to give this practical encouragement which is necessary to fully acquaint the country with its advantages, its importance to national welfare and prosperity, and to apply that analysis to your own self-interest.

Thank you.

[Applause.]

Mr. KISKADDEN. Thank you, Dr. Barnes. Meeting adjourned.

Resolutions of Wapello County, Iowa, Farm Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House will be interested in the resolutions adopted by the Farm Bureau of Wapello County, Iowa, one of the important agriculture counties of the greatest agriculture State. These resolutions were adopted at the recent annual meeting of the Wapello County Farm Bureau.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this set of resolutions:

We, your resolutions committee of the Wapello County Farm Bureau, present the following for consideration of the membership. We dedicate our every effort and resource in full cooperation with the efforts to maintain and expand the principles of world democracy for which our armed forces have so successfully fought. We pledge ourselves to a postwar program to establish jobs and production of such agricultural goods as may be necessary for the prosperity of our Nation and the reestablishment of those from the armed services into civil life. We insist that our representatives at the peace conference continue to take such steps as are necessary to insure a lasting peace and that agriculture have a representative at the peace table.

IMPROVING FAMILY LIVING

To work for better farm family living from the standpoint of social, cultural, spiritual, and physical well being we encourage the rural home as the center of activities for all members of the family. To assume the responsibility of leadership among our own ranks in the community and beyond.

Ever mindful that our spiritual as well as physical needs are of utmost importance in the influence of better family living we pledge our support and cooperation in the activities of our churches.

Realizing that good health makes for a better family life we urge our Farm Bureau give careful consideration to the matter of organizing a health program among rural people. Such a program to encourage a voluntary prepayment health insurance plan for medical aid and hospitalization in case of illness.

To further work for improved family living we shall endeavor to follow the practice of a good nutrition program giving careful consideration to a school-lunch program.

RURAL LIBRARY SERVICE

We urge aggressive action toward the establishment of adequate public library facilities for rural districts. Strong farm organizations, active extension programs, rural study clubs, and the high educational rating of Iowa's farm population, have created a pressing need for library service. Iowa leads the Nation in the proportion of citizens able to read and write. Let us reach a similar position in respect to libraries easily accessible to these same citizens.

SCHOOLS AND EDUCATION

We recognize the need for an improved school program whereby all the children of the State may have an equal opportunity for education. We feel that this can best be accomplished by reorganization of school districts in the interest of economy, efficiency, and equality of educational opportunity. We pledge our support to legislation providing uniform State aid, higher standards for teachers and adequate salaries.

TAXATION

In support of a better school program we feel that ample funds should be collected by taxation to properly maintain an improved system. We favor the collection of the State income tax at the full 100 percent rate and that such funds as are not necessary for the regular cost of government be earmarked for schools.

We favor a simplified Federal income-tax return form. That taxes be levied on ability to pay.

ROADS

We favor a program for the improvement of the secondary road system of the State to the end that every rural home in the State is served by a surfaced road.

We believe that the distribution of State and Federal funds should be made on the basis of need rather than on the area basis. We urge that in this county better road administration is highly desirable and that we should have value received for the money spent.

FOOD PRODUCTION AND SOIL CONSERVATION

We believe that a sound food production program is essential to the well being of agriculture and must be correlated with any enduring prosperity in the fields of labor and industry.

We believe that agricultural prices must be maintained at a level which will allow food production which is adequate to provide high nutritional standards for all peoples. That the present parity formula should be used as the basis for establishing price levels.

That food production should be held at a level which will insure a safe and farsighted soil-conservation policy.

Soil is a national heritage and the Government should take added responsibility in aiding and abetting soil conservation, by making it the predominate consideration in the formulation of all future production-control programs.

We believe that adequate payments should be made direct to farmers for soil-conserving and soil-building practices.

That phosphate, lime, and soil-building fertilizers be made available to farmers on a cost basis.

We believe that the Soil Conservation Service should be authorized and given the responsibility of promoting an aggressive program of informing and educating farmers of the benefits and necessities of soil-conservation and soil-building practices.

LIVESTOCK-DISEASE CONTROL

We believe that since a sound livestock program is the foundation of agricultural

prosperity no efforts should be spared to protect the health and sanitation of livestock.

That strong efforts should be made to prevent the spread of disease. That we should have rigid laws and enforcements regarding the sanitary operation of sale barns. That research be promoted and information be made available regarding the control of new diseases. That a more uniform system of laws regarding the interstate shipment of livestock be promoted.

GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

We believe that a sound-farm program is essential to the well-being of agriculture and that during the postwar reconversion period the combined efforts of the extension service, Soil Conservation Service, and the Agricultural Adjustment agencies will be needed to help rebuild our soil and maintain farm income at a parity with other groups.

We believe that the Extension Service is the agency best fitted to carry out the educational features of all farm programs and should continue in this work as it has in the past.

We believe that the work of the Soil Conservation Service in cooperation with legally organized soils districts in combatting soil erosion and maintaining soil fertility is vitally important, not only to agriculture, but to the Nation as a whole. The type of work performed by these agencies should be expanded. As one means of facilitating this work, we recommend that earth-moving equipment which has been declared surplus, be placed at the disposal of the Soil Conservation Service, to be used in erosion control and drainage work.

We believe that the elected township and county AAA committeemen are the logical men to carry out the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Since the prosperity of the Nation is dependent on the maintenance of the soil, we recommend that the payments for the soils conservation practices under the act be increased.

We are heartily in accord with the plan to take an inventory of the conservation needs for each farm and to give the township committeeman authority to allot the payments on the basis of the need. We recommend that ample funds be allotted for the administration of this program.

We believe that the ever-normal granary should be filled as soon as possible consistent with good soil management, and that the production control feature of the act should be used only as needed to help maintain farm income.

We believe that the over-all crop insurance program should be extended to corn and other basic crops as soon as the necessary data are available.

We recommend that the surplus war property useful to agriculture be made readily available to farmers, and that it be distributed through the township and county AAA committees.

We are in accord with the efforts of the Rural Electrification Administration to bring electricity to farming areas not serviced by the private utilities, and pledge our support to the end that every farm family have access to electric current.

FARM CREDIT

It has been clearly demonstrated that the type of long-term credit extended by the Federal farm-loan associations, which is based on the ability of the land to produce, is particularly suited to the needs of agriculture.

The short-term credit furnished by production credit associations, which takes into account the expected income of the farm, as well as the expense, has proved to be very sound.

We commend these two organizations for their services to agriculture, and we recommend that private lending agencies who have not already done so might well use this system in making loans.

The Farm Security Administration of Iowa has an enviable record in furnishing credit to farmers who have failed to obtain credit from other existing agencies, and deserves our continued support.

INFLATION CONTROL

To assist in preventing another period of inflated prices and a subsequent period of depression, we recommend the following:

1. Retain price and rationing controls as long as scarcities of important commodities unduly influence the price.

2. Postpone permanent improvement until needed materials are readily available.

3. Make investment in land only on the basis of its productive capacity, and encourage the family-sized unit by the use of a taxing system which penalizes large holdings.

4. Keep a large percent of surplus earnings invested in Government bonds.

POSTWAR POLICIES

We realize that service demands for agricultural products will be greatly reduced as discharges are rapidly returning our armed forces to civilian status. Another crop year will see many food needs met by production in devastated countries. With the improvement of farming techniques and a lessening of demand there is a probability that we may find ourselves with burdensome surpluses of food and fiber. We urge that our organization give careful attention to each of the following in an effort to prevent or overcome such a condition:

1. Encourage further research and its application in converting farm crops and agricultural byproducts into industrial material.

2. Provide food for the needy through a two-price system or food-stamp plan, and promoting hot school lunches.

3. Expand our foreign trade on the basis of reciprocal trade agreements.

4. Continue the system of crop loans and ever-normal-granary program until storage stocks have reached an amount considered adequate against a period of short crops.

5. If surpluses continue to grow to a state where they become burdensome, then we urge the addition of a system of crop-acreage controls similar to those so successfully used under the past AAA program.

6. Realizing that demand for agricultural products is closely correlated with industrial employment, we recommend that our organization actively support such postwar programs as will encourage full employment.

7. Our organization should render whatever possible assistance to our returning servicemen in helping them to adjust themselves to normal peacetime occupations, whether on farms, in industry, or among the professions.

CREDIT TO VETERANS

We believe that any returning veteran with the qualifications to become a successful farmer should be given ample credit to establish his operations on a sound basis. Credit loosely extended to all veterans who might apply for farm loans would be disastrous to the veterans as well as to agriculture and the Nation as a whole.

We believe that the Farm Security tenant-purchase program should be expanded as one means of helping veterans to become established as farmers.

ORGANIZATION

Realizing that a unified agricultural front can be maintained only by an organized program, we feel that a much greater effort should be made for a larger membership within the county as well as State and national groups.

We further recognize that the problem of developing an informed membership is as important as obtaining a satisfactory number of members. We believe that the program of work as outlined for 1946 to be a sound approach or means to meet these conditions.

We are now more convinced than ever that the challenge as to success or failure of the intentions and success of the Farm Bureau program rests in a large measure on each individual member and will be measured by the completeness of the cooperation of the entire membership in carrying out the program of work.

ARDEN ROSE, *Chairman.*
REX DECKER.
MORRELL SEEDS.
Mrs. CHARLEY JOHNSON.
Mrs. E. S. HOLLENBECK.

UNRRA Appropriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, as this Congress faces the second large appropriation in a matter of a few weeks for use by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, I am concerned to present to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some fundamental things that have to do with farm production in the United States of America and its relationship to this great agency.

From the standpoint of the American farmer, no problem is more far-reaching and more likely to affect our general trend than the question of markets abroad. It would seem to me that in our consideration of this appropriation, first we must give due consideration to the condition of the United States Treasury. There should be available to us the judgment of experts, and from them we should ascertain whether or not our Treasury can well afford to move farther into the field of relief for the starving peoples of Europe.

If we are convinced that this is possible, then it would seem to me that we should give due concern to the agricultural aspect of the situation. It is food that will keep the distressed people of Europe alive this winter. Food if it is to be had must of necessity come from the farms of America.

UNRRA'S PROGRAM FOR AGRICULTURAL REHABILITATION

Mr. Speaker, if the UNRRA program only included the shipment of food, clothing, and perhaps a few basic medical supplies, the need for relief in Europe and in Asia might continue for years to come. But it now looks as though relief with rehabilitation may be successfully terminated for the European countries by the end of 1946, and in the Far East 3 months after that.

The future program—and the amount of money required to run it for which the United States is asked to allocate its share—is based on that assumption. By that time, so the estimates run, Yugoslavia should be able to feed herself. Poland will probably have surplus food for export. Czechoslovakia has always been a food-importing country but will probably be able to get what she needs from her neighbors. Italy and Greece will be able to raise the usual portion of their own foodstuffs and will have goods

to trade for the others. In Europe, at least, the countries receiving help from UNRRA will be on their own feet again by the end of 1946, provided next year's harvests are good.

This is the important point, gentlemen. We must keep our eye on next year's crops. Given good climatic conditions and one good harvest, it will be possible for people in these liberated countries to look after themselves. It is true that individual farm families, communities, and even nations will not be back where they were. But they should be able to see their way out. After 1946 they will be able to complete their recovery by themselves under their own power.

It is the UNRRA program of rehabilitation coupled with relief that is making this recovery possible. If UNRRA were shipping only wheat and wheat flour for making bread and not the seed for planting and growing wheat this would not be so. If we sent canned milk and powdered dry skimmed milk, as we have been doing, but did not ship dairy cattle to raise the quantity of milk production, we could not expect the rebuilding of war-shattered herds. If we sent only dried peas and beans for emergency relief feeding, and did not supply draft animals and farm machinery to plant, harvest and market fresh fruits and vegetables we would keep these people dependent on us for years to come.

But the UNRRA program is not limited to meeting relief needs. It calls for sending in supplies to make agricultural and industrial recovery possible. UNRRA is watching crop production in Europe and Asia in order to gage the quantity of relief food shipments which must be sent as supplement. But even more important, it is doing everything in its power to back up a program of direct immediate relief by shipping in supplies to assure the success of next year's harvests.

Farm people in the countries receiving the aid of the United Nations through UNRRA are universally asking for draft animals, and other livestock, fertilizers, tractors for power, and the larger farm machinery for plowing, planting, and harvesting. They will make the simpler machines in their own blacksmith shops. They want seed and cleaning machinery to improve the quality of their own seed. Their requirements are modest in comparison to the destruction that has taken place.

Farmers had to plant their crops this spring in mined battlefields, without draft power and with improper fertilizer. To the war-caused difficulties in the way of adequate production, the disastrous effects of severe drought have been added.

It is understandable therefore that the yields this fall are less than the needs of the people. In view of the handicaps it is remarkable that the 1945 harvest was as good as it was. In a good many areas, however, people will be hungry in spite of the fact that each country is doing everything it can to assure harvest of all available crops and their movement and storage for use during the coming winter.

But 1945 must be the last bad winter. The desperate people and their governments have already steeled themselves to accept one more winter of hardship. Let us hope we can put an end to what they are asked to endure—not only for the sake of thousands who may die of hunger, if we do not move swiftly, but for the sake of our own peace and security, if we fail next year to provide a new spring full of hope and promise.

To meet urgent needs for wheat for direct human consumption this winter, UNRRA raised its requirements and shipping schedules. For instance, UNRRA is now planning to send 90,000 tons of wheat per month to Greece instead of 50,000 as originally planned. Wheat for the war devastated countries receiving aid of the United Nations through UNRRA can be obtained principally in the United States and Canada, and possibly from Australia. These countries have more than they need for their own consumption, and there are ships in which to send it. Money, however, is lacking. You may well ask if we appropriate funds now how do we know we shall not be asked over and over again to provide funds for feeding the world. I think all of us are agreed that this country does not want to be a handout country. And from what I know about farmers generally, the European farmer would be quick to resent it if we ever attempted to assume that role, either as an individual nation, or as a member of the United Nations.

After the enemy was driven out from these war-torn countries, the farm people were the one group that knew their job and started doing it. There is no unemployment in the rural areas. People are busy there. They know what to do. They do not wait to be told. They go ahead as best they can.

I think that if we could see them working in their fields the American farmer would have nothing but respect for these European cousins of his. Many of them are actual blood relatives of whom he could very well be proud. He would admire the application of physical energy as they go about their tasks without the tools to which they have ordinarily been accustomed. He might be horrified at some of their methods. He would perhaps be shocked to see the men and the women and sometimes the children working the plows, but he could not help but admire their energy and industry, and when UNRRA supplies come in he would be the first to applaud the way the farm families of these UNRRA countries use the materials and aid we are able to send as a means for helping themselves.

There is a section in Yugoslavia called the Voivodina. It is in the fertile region to the northeast in the Danube Basin. It would remind you of Iowa except that much of it is still crisscrossed with the trenches which were dug when it was a battleground for the contending forces. Some of the corn now ready for harvest was planted before the last battle began. Other lands in the battle zone had to be replanted as soon as the enemy was driven out. There was no time to fill in the trenches, so the corn marches down one side of them and up the other like soldiers in a conquering army.

Helmets are still in evidence along the roadside and occasionally in the fields. It took a tremendous effort on the part of people and the Government to get this land planted again. All available draft animals were used. Men and women hitched themselves to the plows. Children helped. Seed corn was made available from military stocks; it was too late to get in any of the small grains. As an emergency measure during this period, UNRRA actually flew a few tractors into Yugoslavia in airplanes. These tractors were placed in immediate operation on a 24-hour-a-day schedule and made possible the planting of large acreages that otherwise might have gone unsown.

Today this late-planted corn is the doubtful element in the Yugoslavia food supply. It is nearly mature now, and the farmers over there are worrying just like the farmers in Iowa. If the frost stays off until the corn is ripe, there should be nearly enough cereal food in Yugoslavia for the winter. If the frost comes before the late-planted corn is matured, the grain shipments into the country will have to be revised upwards. When the Yugoslav Minister of Agriculture talks to the farmers there he talks in terms that any American farmer would applaud. He tells them if Yugoslavia is going to get on its own feet it is going to be through its own efforts. Neither he nor his people are unmindful of the help that is coming from the West. They know that many of the tractors are Canadian and American machines and that the seed corn they planted, given by UNRRA from military stocks, originally came from the United States.

Livestock especially is a great morale builder. When a boatload come in, word is spread quickly throughout the back country. They see the ships unload and they know that most of the animals they are getting through UNRRA's livestock rehabilitation program were raised in the Western Hemisphere.

The important point here is not the gratitude of these farmers, but their independence. They have a deep sense of appreciation for what UNRRA is able to send, but they are eager to go on from there. The Yugoslavs know how to use materials and equipment from UNRRA as a lever with which to lift themselves from hopeless despondency to a position of self-respecting self-help.

The same feeling prevails in Poland, even though some 40 percent of the land is idle. Where rye has been planted it is only yielding two-thirds of a crop, but the reason for this is not lack of industry. In relatively large areas the farmers put their rye in during the night while still under the German occupation. They were not permitted to plant. All rye was requisitioned by the enemy for food. They had to steal rye from the Germans for seed. They knew the war was going badly for the Nazis, so they planted as much as they could—with no fertilizer and in seedbeds poorly prepared. They planted in the dark of night but in complete faith of an Allied victory, knowing that when the time came to reap their crops they could do so in the full light of day and liberation.

In Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Poland the farmers have done a marvelous job under extremely trying conditions. Their livestock was depleted, draft animals taken by the armies, cattle killed for beef, and in many areas taken out either by the Germans or Russians in their sweep across the areas.

Transport is extremely short everywhere. Near Athens it is usual to see carts and wagons of farm produce coming toward the city. Many of them are pulled by women and children. Some are pulled by cows and donkeys, with the people pushing from behind or helping to pull. You can see any numbers of two-horse wagons with the extra singletree tied back pulled by one thin horse or by a cow with only about a half load. There are also people coming to the city with no transport, plodding along carrying goods on their backs. Although only a few minutes by jeep, it is a day's journey from farm to market on foot.

In many, many places bridges are out. Goods must be transported across streams by boats, picked up again on all sorts of handcarts or on the backs of men and women for further transportation on the other side. Every American farmer who has pioneered in his own community for better farm-to-market roads can understand why the governments of all countries are making earnest efforts to restore the road systems and transport goods to strategic points in anticipation of a winter of suffering.

In this connection I would like to point out that Europe has always depended on animal power to a far greater extent than the United States, not only for cultivating the fields, but for interior transportation. Not in three centuries have rural areas been so completely isolated as they are now. When farmers harvest their grain in one community people 50 miles away go hungry, for there is no way to cover the distance except by walking. Greece was hampered in waging an all-out war against the locusts this summer not only through lack of pesticides, but because of the difficulties of getting the insect-killing materials to the breeding grounds in time to check the locusts as they hatched. These are the conditions which we are asked to vote against, gentlemen, when we cast our votes in favor of living up to our pledged obligations.

Is it small wonder then that in projecting the program for 1946 UNRRA finds that the need for draft power is greater than anticipated? To balance this I am told the needs for pesticides and seeds for next spring are somewhat less. The four countries of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Greece have asked UNRRA for over half a million head of utility horses, mules, cattle, and something over a half a million head of breeding stock. That includes a few swine and sheep. Even with these amounts, which are not likely to be supplied in full, the deficits will still be very great in these countries. The herds can only be brought back by very careful planning of slaughter and the substitution of other foods for meats over a period of several years.

The situation which these countries face today is familiar to every American farmer. We all know of a friend or neighbor whose barn was struck by lightning and destroyed by fire. Or perhaps drought and dust have cleaned him out. Or he may have been first in line when a forest fire swept the country. Though he could not save his own buildings, he fought with his neighbors in ditching and dynamiting to stop the spread of the holocaust. But whatever tragedy struck his farm, some of his best stock were killed. He has to start out again with 2 or 3 dairy cows in place of the 10 or 12 he lost. His purebred bull perished. His draft horse is gone. He has no way to plow his field or to transport his goods to market, or his supplies from town.

After reviewing the extent of damage, his first thought is to get back on his feet. He dips into his bank account, if he has one. He calls on his insurance company. His friends offer to help. It may be impossible at the outset for him to replace his livestock numerically, but he selects new animals with a view to the future. He thinks of the breeding season. While he is picking a few animals to meet his immediate needs he thinks in terms of the qualities he wishes to pass on to the progeny of his present stock. By careful selection he knows that in time he can rebuild the strength and value of his depleted herd.

The help he wants from his neighbor and from his insurance company is help to help himself. He knows that if he can be helped to acquire a few of the right kind of animals he will be on the road to recovery.

Today in Europe hundreds of thousands of farms are depleted, fields are mined, pesticides and fertilizers are lacking, children are without milk, and there is not enough draft power to plow the fields or to carry supplies to and from market. Most of the remaining animals are weak and puny. They show the same unmistakable signs of undernourishment as do many of the people.

Some countries like France, Holland, Belgium, and Denmark are like the farmer who can dip into a bank account. They have bank accounts in the form of foreign exchange. Others like Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Albania, and Greece are in the position that many of our Dust Bowl farmers found themselves in during the thirties. Their banks went broke as a result of the same crop failures which wiped them out. The invaded nations need the helping hands of neighbors and the type of "insurance" that the United Nations have combined to offer through UNRRA. They paid their "premiums" during 1940–44—in blood. And now they need a lift to get back on their feet.

Every breeder knows what happens on an individual farm when a few well-chosen animals are added even though the existing herd may be small and puny. With careful breeding and a controlled slaughtering program, livestock numbers will increase and the quality of animals improve. Just as it would take an individual farmer some 5 to 10 years to recover from a disaster, so will it take the farm economy of Europe 5 or 10 years to completely recover the war losses of livestock. UNRRA will long since have passed from the scene, but the animals we are sending now through UNRRA form the basis of this recovery.

In areas stripped of livestock by the Nazi invaders, UNRRA has already delivered or procured for distribution 12,500 mares and mules and 2,400 milk cows. If we make the money available, UNRRA can continue shipments of animals to Greece and Yugoslavia during the winter and can resume shipments to Poland and Czechoslovakia in the spring.

The Church of the Brethren and several other groups understand the situation very well. Months before the war was over they started a program to raise livestock especially to aid in the rehabilitation of European agriculture. They have turned to UNRRA to deliver the goods for them. Only a few days ago, UNRRA accepted 150 heifers from the Church of the Brethren for Poland. Six very fine blooded bulls were also given by this same organization, through UNRRA, to the farmers in Greece. They, together with six other animals furnished by UNRRA, are being used now in an artificial insemination project to build up the depleted herds of Greece.

There is a gift coming, too, of 30 head of Jerseys, 40 Holsteins, and about 14 Guernseys contributed by the Falls City Milk Producers Association through UNRRA for Athens, Greece.

These gifts of livestock made through UNRRA are over and above the money appropriated by the contributing nations. They are the personal contributions by members of these organizations. The bulk of the livestock for rehabilitation has been, and will be, paid for from UNRRA funds.

We want to keep up this good work, gentlemen. The shuttle service of livestock boats across the Atlantic has got to continue until UNRRA's full quota of animals has been delivered.

In the area around Athens, 9 out of every 10 dairy cows have been destroyed. You can jeep for miles through Poland without setting eyes on a farm animal. In the prewar milkshed of Warsaw and Lodz there is a little milk on the market. The highest ration is at Lodz. There the children are lucky. If they are under 2 they may have 1½ liters. That is less than one-half pint of milk a day for the luckiest kids in Poland.

Now there are two kinds of help needed in that situation. And UNRRA is providing both of them. Canned and powdered milk has gone in and must continue to go in for the mass feeding of starving children. That is relief. And dairy cattle and breeding stock must continue to go forward, to help restore war depleted herds. That is rehabilitation. The equation is a simple one. The more agricultural supplies we can make available, the sooner will we be able to let up on direct relief.

Next to livestock the other major need is for fertilizer. If we are able to send in more fertilizer next year we will not have to send in as much food. Requirements for fertilizer are great, and the yield of the crop will be low unless fertilizer is available. For several years these lands have had no commercial fertilizer. They have been poorly prepared. They are weedy and they show signs of neglect in many ways. Many of you can understand that situation. You know that if you have a field under cultivation for a number of years and have to let it

go maybe one season or two without proper fertilizer or cultivation you may not notice much difference right away. But after the third or fourth year of neglect the yield begins to go down. That is the way it is in most of Europe today. Expressed in terms of standard fertilizers the combined needs of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Greece are 407,000 tons of nitrate of soda, 272,000 tons of raw rock phosphate, 423,000 tons of superphosphate, and 11,200 tons of potash.

UNRRA's search for fertilizer materials has been world wide. There has been a shortage almost everywhere. We know how hard it has been to get adequate quantities here in this country. But our own United States fertilizer plants are going to keep going at 175 percent of prewar capacity for some time to come.

Then, too, some of the ordnance plants used for explosives during the war will continue to make ammonium nitrate, a basic item for mixed fertilizers. Most of their output, which is in addition to our expanded domestic production, has been earmarked for use overseas. UNRRA is able to draw from this source. Chile is one of the United Nations also furnishing nitrates for the liberated countries—some 100,000 tons of it. A small quantity of ammonium sulfate is coming from England.

One hundred thousand five hundred tons of rock phosphate is also expected from north Africa, 50,000 tons of potash from Russia, and 10,000 tons of potash from Palestine. So it looks now as though UNRRA will be able—if granted funds—to supply some 40 percent of the needs of the countries by shipments from the outside.

The actual break-down of the material that UNRRA is seeking to assure the 1946 harvest runs like this: 173,000 tons of nitrate of soda or its equivalent in nitrogen, 187,000 tons of superphosphate, 272,000 tons of raw rock phosphate, and 112,000 tons of potash.

In addition, every effort is being made to stimulate indigenous production. If sufficient coal and raw materials can be had, requirements for outside fertilizer may possibly be reduced. Because of livestock losses there is practically no manure to be had.

UNRRA has several technical men in Europe now working with agricultural ministries finding out what it will take and how long it will take to get local factories in production again. Last year a considerable tonnage of rock phosphate was brought from Russia in an American bottom to Belgium. The idea was that after the manufacturers there had processed enough superphosphate to meet their own needs there will be an exportable surplus for other European countries. This past season a good bit of land was gotten in cultivation under the most trying of circumstances, but because of the lack of fertilizer the yields of these crops were much less than the terrific efforts of the people warranted. The farm people of Europe this fall and next spring are going to exert the same strenuous efforts, and adequate quantities of fertilizer will do much to step up yields that might otherwise be too meagre.

To date a total of $91,400,000 has been committed for agricultural rehabilitation equipment and supplies. Of this amount $69,000,000 was from the United States with the remainder coming from the United Kingdom, Canada, India, Brazil, Chile, French North Africa, Australia, and New Zealand. As shipping possibilities increase, additional goods will be made available from other UNRRA countries. Approximately 76 percent of the total agricultural rehabilitation supplies have come from the United States of America.

"Capital investment" in agricultural supplies in Europe should end by July 1946. By that time the normal crop acreages should be planted, although fertilizers, and better tillage will be required before yields of crops reach normal prewar levels.

Is it enough, gentlemen, to remember the child in Poland who dies for lack of milk, or the farmer who stumbles under his load on the highway to Athens? Or must we remind ourselves that Greece and Italy cannot buy our surplus wheat and other commodities unless they have exportable oil from their olive orchards. As we struggle with our own reconversion problems during the next few years, we shall need desperately the foreign trade that only a recovered agriculture in these liberated countries can provide.

Therefore UNRRA's broad program of relief and rehabilitation is an answer to many of our problems at home as well as abroad. For that reason, if for no other, we must keep UNRRA going to finish its job.

Address on Elks Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an address delivered by me at the special Elks memorial program conducted over Station WLAW, Lawrence, Mass., on Sunday, December 2, 1945, by the Lawrence Lodge, 65, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, in memory of the departed members of the organization who have passed away during the past year.

Memorial service program was in charge of Exalted Ruler John J. Harty, assisted by Esteemed Leading Knight Arthur B. Mahoney, Esteemed Loyal Knight William J. O'Brien, Esteemed Lecturing Knight Raymond E. Kennedy, Secretary Daniel P. Desmond, and Chaplain Bernard F. Donahue. The soloist for this service was State Representative J. Everett Collins, who was accompanied by Raymond E. Wilkinson, organist at the First Calvary Baptist Church of Lawrence, Mass.

The address follows:

This is a memorial service for those members of Lawrence Lodge, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, who are outward bound, journeying to that place from which no traveler returns. It is a time during which we fondly recall the faces and the voices of those who were once with us, nourishing ourselves with the memory of the good they did. Thus strengthened, we go forward to the tasks of this life, with a spiritual kinship that knows not the barriers of death. For they have left us a heritage which we cannot fail.

As we think of our brothers who are gone, we feel regret. Blinded by the speed and the material things of this earthly life, too often we did not see and encourage the quiet virtues of our friends. We wish that we could speak to them once more, to say the words of human fellowship which we were too busy to say while they were walking by our side. "One more chance, one more chance," we cry, as all humanity has cried since the beginning of time, but there is no answer from the beyond. The men we knew have gone, never knowing what they gave to life, not knowing the respect and affection which we meant to speak while they could hear. And, so, through a memorial service such as this, we send out our prayers to eternity, hoping and believing that our loved ones there will understand.

We rise from our prayers, cleansed by humility and fortified by the faith that if we say and do to others what we failed to express to our departed brothers, we shall redeem our mistakes. Through regret and repentance and the renewal of spirit that comes from this communion with the dead, men go on from self to serve the larger needs of family, neighborhood, community, State, Nation, and now the world.

The Lawrence Lodge of Elks has served its community well. For a few moments of memory, we look back to the beginnings of our city. Little more than a hundred years ago, Lawrence was rolling hill and field and meadow, a sylvan paradise, where the creatures of Nature sang and played. The Merrimack teemed with fish, and its waters were as clear and healthful as the fountain of youth. Lawrence had one house, belonging to a farmer who did his daily chores, far removed from the commercial activity of Salem and Boston and Portland.

Then a traveler came this way, filled with the ferment of the industrial revolution. He knew that in Europe the spinning and the weaving were no longer done in the homes. Men had invented machines which could do the work of many men. These machines were housed in large buildings where hundreds worked. In this manner, the production and the profits were great. And when the traveler saw the wide waters of the Merrimack, flowing unused to the sea, he got an inspiration. This flow of water could be harnessed to make cheap power for machines. He hurried back to Boston. Soon many men were coming to this plain in the valley. They built large mills along the banks of the river, and people came to work in the mills, and that is how Lawrence was born.

Then came the war of the brothers—the War Between the States. Men went from Lawrence to fight and die in that 4-year war, and through this sacrifice for something beyond the borders of the town, the people of Lawrence were developing roots of courage and enterprise and cooperation for the common good, in keeping with the American way. After the war, there was much work to be done, and the town had growing pains.

Suddenly, tragedy struck. The Pemberton Mills collapsed, pinning hundreds in the wreckage, and fire broke out. The people of Lawrence rushed to the scene, organized bucket brigades to fight the flames, burned and blinded and exhausted themselves, trying to save the helpless victims. And when it was over there were many dead. But out of this agony and its fearful cost came a deeper awareness of the community and the human dependence of each man on his fellow man.

Production went on and the work was hard as people labored from 6 to 6. In the winter months they went to work in the dark and came home in the dark, never seeing the light of day. When the work was over, many simply crossed the canal to the corporation houses to eat their frugal suppers and fall into an exhausted sleep.

If you look at the stones in the old cemetery, you will read the story of those days. On tablet after tablet you will read the names of four, five, or six in each family who died in infancy. The people wore themselves out in those early slave factories and the mothers could not afford the good food they needed for their children. Production at a profit for the few was the whiplash of this pioneer industrial community. Generations lived and died with no other possible future than these mills.

Then, in 1912, the oppressed workers took matters into their own hands. The long and bitter strike of that year focused world attention on the impossible economic plight of the textile workers. There were bread lines and soup kitchens as the workers suffered together to win some measure of the new freedom, the right to earn a fair share of production's profits for themselves. By their standing together in this common cause they encouraged the development of organized labor which is winning for them better working conditions and better pay.

In 1917, the Nation went to war with an aggressor across the seas and the Nation needed men for the Army and Navy. The people of Lawrence did not hesitate. They did not say: "Let the rich, who got from the country, now give to the country." The mill workers sent their sons by the thousands to fight the world bully on the cold Atlantic and on the shell-swept fields of France. The war was won, and some of the boys who went away never returned. The people, however, did not complain. They shared the burden of their grief and they carried on in the ways of peace. By common sacrifice, they had been brought closer together.

During the 1920's, it seemed that the golden age for which the workers had so long toiled, had at last arrived. There was work for all at decent hours and good pay. The city of Lawrence enjoyed prosperity with all the communities of the Nation. We did not know that it was an artificial prosperity, stimulated by false bookkeeping until the bubble burst in 1929 and the Nation was paralyzed. For 10 years, in a struggle that was, in some respects, more wearing than war or industrial strife, the workers faced fear, despair, and the constant challenge of trying to make both ends meet. In this long and belt-tightening period, families doubled up, individual helped individual, clubs and societies engaged in philanthropic work that taxed every human and material resource. It was a long-drawn-out battle by the community for survival and in the fires of this ordeal were forged even stronger bonds of cooperation.

As our people were slowly though surely winning their fight for economic democracy, the Nation was attacked by aggressors, assaulting us from the east and the west. Undaunted, the Nation rose as one man to beat back the attacks. For 4 years, the people gave labor and skill and faith and life itself to win the most terrible of all wars.

The people of Lawrence stand, on this December of 1945, on the threshold of a new age, beside which the month of July 1945 seems like a point hundreds of years back in time.

Having come so far, they will not falter. Behind them is the record of great obstacles overcome in the forward march of the common man. Foremost among those who have helped them in this pilgrimage is the Lawrence Lodge of Elks. No fair-weather friends are these. They combine the lifting cheerfulness of human fellowship with a day-in-and-day-out devotion to the welfare of the needy and the underprivileged.

The Elks know the meaning of Americanism, which is faith in God and country. They welcome men of all races, all creeds, and all classes in our society, and therefore are truly representative of the communities which they serve. In fire, flood, hurricane, economic distress, and war—at all seasons of the year—the Elks are working with the good will and practical helpfulness which are the roots of American character. These virtues are needed today as they were never needed before.

Peace has come, bringing a great and sobering responsibility. This is the first memorial service to be conducted by the Lawrence Lodge since the coming of peace and the first since the beginning of the atomic age. Today, man is confronted with a power of his own making which can bring unlimited blessings to all, or it can bring complete destruction. Is man ready to meet this responsibility? Has he developed his mind and character to control this power for the general welfare?

To do so, he will need to summon every good that is or was, as we tonight, at this memorial service, recall the exemplary lives of brothers who have gone, that we may be spiritually strengthened to meet the great task which is upon us.

We recall the good which those now dead once did in life, holding it before us as a guide to our own conduct.

As the Elks of Lawrence have worked hand in hand with their fellow Americans, encouraging and helping our community to surmount every trial, so, too, will they work with the communities of State, Nation, and the world, to make the fraternity of mankind, upon which the fate of our civilization depends for survival.

In the name of the departed members of Lawrence Lodge, Benevolent Order of Elks, we pledge that we shall work for this high goal of human brotherhood.

With the inspiration of our dead, and with the help of Almighty God, it will be done.

Full Employment Promise Trapped Workers of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the text of a speech delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System, November 27, on the Congress Speaks program regarding the so-called Murray-Patman full employment bill:

Fellow Americans, as a youngster I used to listen open-mouthed and wide-eyed to the soap-box, patent-medicine doctor who sold that famous magic Indian remedy, rattlesnake oil, absolutely guaranteed to cure all the aches and pains of the human body. I was charmed by the glowing promises of health guaranteed to result from using one bottle costing $1.

The old patent-medicine man is gone, but today his magic appeals are being used everywhere by those who would regiment the people. The health claims for the snake-oil remedy of the gay nineties have been replaced by prosperity claims for cure-all legislation.

The Murray-Patman full employment bill is such a remedy. It uses the propaganda slogan method so successfully used in other lands—lands where the people surrendered their liberty for seductive slogans.

The Communists gained absolute power in Russia by magic promises. Here they are: "Land for the peasants—factories for the workers—bread for the hungry." Let me repeat them—"Land for the peasants—factories for the workers—bread for the hungry." Can you think of a more appealing set of promises to trap a hard-pressed people—unless it would be this slogan used by Hitler "Better wages for the workers"?

These slogans are alluring and tempting, just as the magic promises of the snake-oil doctor were. He took your dollar for his bottle of worthless liquid and disappeared. But the modern political doctors exact a terrible price in exchange for their remedies. In Germany, Italy, and Russia, they promised government full employment and they delivered it—but the price of that slogan was not measured in dollars. The price the people paid was the loss of liberty, justice, and opportunity for their children.

And all these vital rights are a part of the final price of the Murray-Patman full employment bill.

It is this simple. To guarantee your employment, the Government must have the power to force you to live in accordance with its plans—just as the commander of an army, responsible for his troops, must have slavelike obedience from them. If the Government is to have full responsibility for your employment, Government must have the power to regiment you into taking any job it picks for you. This means it will have the power to tell you where you must work, how much you shall be paid, and how you shall spend your wages.

Is this appraisal too critical of this scheme? Listen to the 1944 report of the Social Security Board, which points out that "even full employment could not obviate unemployment in any but a regimented economy." That is the judgment of the United States Social Security Board. And, Sir William Beveridge, author of the Beveridge plan in England, admits:

"Full employment cannot be won and held without a great extension of the responsibilities and powers of the state exercised through organs of the central government. * * * To ask for full employment while objecting to these extensions of state activities is to will the end and refuse the means."

The exact effect of the Murray-Patman full employment bill is "to will the end and refuse the means." It is not reasonable to asume that the authors of this bill mean it to be simply an empty promise—thus you may only conclude that, underneath the bait of the words "full employment," must be the hook of full regimentation, with the same consequences that followed the same promises in Germany, Italy, and Russia.

Well, you may ask, how can we bring about full employment?

Fortunately, today in America, there is a golden and unparalleled opportunity for the Government to encourage full employment. Just two of the regular and normal duties of Government must be done immediately and honestly. Here they are:

1. The administration should set up a genuine plan to balance the budget within 2 years.

2. The administration should prepare an orderly program to wind up the OPA by a definite date.

These two actions would assure workers and industry alike of honest dollars for their production.

Then the unsatisfied needs of the American people, especially our veterans and their families, for housing, automobiles, and other things would create maximum employment and production for many years.

An orderly plan for ending the OPA and the assurance of a balanced budget would end the concealed creeping inflation at the root of most of our strike troubles. For

American industry and labor, like a good football team, must have a set of rules that will not be changed by Washington every few minutes during the game.

Has this administration the ability and the political courage to tackle these duties? For balancing the budget and restoring free production for workers and industry are the vital tasks before the administration and the Congress.

We must not be led by slogans into the dismal European swamp of full employment by enslaved labor. Instead we should take the American four-lane highway of full production by free workers.

Report From Overseas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 27, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the boys in the Army from north Idaho like those from every other section of the country, now that the war has been won, want to get home, as evidenced in a letter just received, signed by a number of Idaho veterans, inserted herewith:

AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR COMPANY,
TWELFTH MOTOR TRANSPORT BAT.,
FMF, PACIFIC, CARE OF FPO,
San Francisco, Calif., November 10, 1945.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Representative, State of Idaho,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Everything in Washington seems to be done on the point plan, so I would like to offer you a point plan from Sasebo, Japan, and we, the enlisted men, would like to have it acted on in whole or part.

1. Straighten out demobilization: When an order comes out, let it be acted on as it is without having it worded in a manner that it can be twisted and distorted into a shape that will suit any situation our leaders choose it to fit.

2. Tell us the truth: We are no longer children and the war is over. Why can't we be told the truth of why we are over here in such great numbers and why can't we be told when we will get home, or don't our great leaders know?

3. Better our conditions: Is it necessary that we should be eating C rations and dehydrated foods for most of our meals when the States are only 20 days from here by ship? I've heard that the Japanese internees in the States ate better than we do, but, of course, I realize that we are of a great democracy and must show these people that we are a shining example to all, except the men who fought from Guadalcanal to their internment in Japan.

4. Get back to democracy: Let our Government again be run by our Congressmen instead of being bulldozed by military men. If an example of what military control of a country can do is needed, then send one of the many congressional committees to Japan and see what it did for these people.

5. Stop strikes: Is the United States Government powerless in stopping these strikes that are holding up shipping facilities and the things we need? If Mr. Lewis and Mr. Green cannot be handled there, send them and their strikers over to us. We would be glad to return to the United States in the ships that they would come in. We, too, have problems but we can't strike.

6. Get us home: Of course, we all realize that there was a war on and with the help of our draft boards we gladly joined the service, but now the war is over and we are very anxious to join our wives, children, and families again. It isn't just exactly a happy family life to be stuck here, thousands of miles from home, in the midst of a group of filthy, stinking, diseased race of people.

Please, sir, put your every effort into helping us fellows get back to the homes that we miss so much.

Sincerely,

W. L. Ellis, Private, USMCR; D. E. Blake, USMC; Carl Schmidt, USMCR; T. M. Myers, USMCR; D. E. Cutting, USMCR; F. W. Rush, USMCR; H. A. Hutchins, USMCR; C. P. Chamberlain, Jr., USMCR; O. A. Colclasure, USMC; L. C. Lee, USMCR.

Address by the Ambassador From Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, December 5 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by His Excellency Dr. Antonio Espinosa de Los Monteros, Ambassador of Mexico, at the dinner in his honor at the New York Board of Trade and the Mexican Chamber of Commerce of the United States, at the Hotel Plaza, New York, November 28, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It afforded me great pleasure to accept the kind invitation from the New York Board of Trade and the Mexican Chamber of Commerce of the United States to be with you tonight, and I count myself particularly fortunate that I am privileged to meet this brilliant company. Although I appreciate very deeply your magnificent reception, permit me to accept it, not as an unmerited personal honor, but rather as a token of your high regard for the Government and the people of my country. From the bottom of my heart I thank you for this tribute to Mexico.

I am especially grateful for the presence of so many ladies who with their charm and loveliness enhance the enjoyment of this gathering. I sincerely hope that the ladies will forgive me for taking this opportunity, graciously offered by their husbands and friends, to discuss matters to which we men—admittedly the weaker half of the species—attach so much importance.

I have been in New York City many times. I have spent here long periods while working on economic and financial matters with Government officials, bankers, and financial executives. I am very happy to see among you so many old friends. Yes, I am still happier because now that I am in Washington, I shall see more of you than heretofore.

Since most of you gentlemen are businessmen, I would rather limit my remarks to the all-important subject of trade between your great country and mine. It was only a few weeks ago that I relinquished a financial post which I held for many years in Mexico. No wonder, then, that I would rather talk shop with you. I want to speak informally and plainly.

My work in Washington will be based on the principle that, while it is of paramount importance to maintain the relations between our two governments on the present high level of friendliness and good will, we must place special emphasis for many years to come on advancing and expanding our common economic interests. I am firmly convinced that the safest way to attain true and lasting peace and friendship among nations lies precisely in a community of business interests, grounded on sincere trust and reciprocal fair dealing.

Mexico, as you all know, has been traditionally a market for consumers' goods of all kinds. We have bought manufactured products from you and from other countries, many of which products we could have easily produced on an economic basis, had we had the necessary machinery and technical skill.

We believe that this situation must undergo substantial changes. Henceforth we shall do everything possible to become, in the main, a market for producer goods and for such consumer goods as we cannot produce on a sound economic basis.

In this respect, if I may remind you, we wish to follow the example of your own country, precisely as advocated more than a century ago by that great American statesman, Alexander Hamilton, to whose prophetic genius and creative ability this country owes much of its fabulous wealth and power.

Let it be known, then, that Mexico is now vitally interested in buying the most modern and efficient types of machinery, tools, and other plant equipment and that the size of our orders shall be limited only by our capacity to pay.

But let not the manufacturers of consumers' goods become unduly alarmed because of this change in our policy. Certain manufacturers may no longer find a market in Mexico, but greater compensation will be found in the unlimited opportunities for new items which the United States is to export to Mexico in increasing quantities, resulting in a larger volume of trade. Experience shows conclusively that the best clients for consumers' goods are the highly industrialized peoples of the world. If Mexico's industrialization program is successful—and we see no reason why it should fail—then our standard of living will improve and consequently we shall soon become ready buyers of consumers' goods of a higher quality and in greater volume than ever before.

It is interesting to note the significant economic and fiscal changes that have taken place in Mexico during the war years.

Since 1942, when the United States practically discontinued production of civilian goods while increasing at the same time its purchases of raw materials, we Mexicans had to tighten our belts in doing away with practically every type of imported consumer goods, while at the same time, our traditionally favorable balance of trade, increased to levels never before attained.

We have as a result accumulated a reserve of gold and foreign exchange without precedent in our financial history. Our currency circulation has expanded many times, and the cost of living has considerably increased in spite of all our efforts.

It is then up to those of us in Mexico who have lived close to these problems during the past 5 years to face them and devise means for accomplishing two things: First, to hold down our inflationary trends with all the means at our disposal; and second, to fulfill a sacred duty, indeed, that is, to make sure that the gold and foreign exchange we have amassed with such great hardships shall not be squandered in an orgy of wild spending in luxury and superfluous goods. We must, absolutely must, see to it that whatever we buy with these funds will guarantee the Mexican people a higher per capita income. We, the people of Mexico, must learn to use our savings both wisely and profitably.

One point of paramount importance arises in connection with these problems:

Since we are to ask our friends in the United States that they sell to us their machinery, equipment, and "know-how" in order to insure the success of our industries, it is only fair that we should also invite them to take, if they so desire, a share in our ventures. This is bound to turn into mutual profit.

I place this thought before the bankers and manufacturers of the United States. We want to work with you and we are willing to risk our money and give our time and effort to reach our goal. We invite the industrialist and the financier to combine their efforts and join us with their capital and techniques as good partners, good friends, and good neighbors.

American banks and bankers have for many years teamed up with American men of vision and courage to build up the greatest industrial empire the world has ever known. The miracle of production which made this country the arsenal of democracy bears witness to the gallant spirit of American businessmen.

We invite and cordially welcome you to join us in our modest but brave effort to industrialize Mexico and thereby lay the foundation for an economy of abundance which will in time bring about an expanded and profitable trade between our nations.

When you invest in Mexico we expect you to bear in mind the same purpose we have of promoting and developing the Mexican economy, as well as of making that development the source of increased profits and other mutual advantages. All we expect of the foreign investor who wishes to go into Mexico is that he abide by the rules of fair play, such as are established by your own legislation for the proper behavior of capital and its management within your own country.

I thoroughly agree with the principles enunciated by your great President Truman. In his Navy Day speech he clearly and forcefully stated the fundamental principles of your Government's foreign policy. One of these principles is that this country believes "that full economic collaboration between all nations, great and small, is essential to the improvement of living conditions all over the world and to the establishment of freedom from fear and freedom from want." We know American businessmen are of the same belief, and that they are willing and ready to translate that belief into action.

In this pioneering effort we have already made some progress. During the past few years many surveys have been completed and we have now the blueprints for several industrial projects. We have built a few plants in association with American industrialists. For instance, we have a new steel mill at Monclova, we are building a plant for aluminum products, we have started production of synthetic yarn and of asbestos products, and soon shall have in operation a can manufacturing plant.

Just recently we completed negotiation with an American firm to build a plant for the manufacture of electrical equipment and household appliances. And it is interesting to note that this plant was made possible by the assistance of one of your largest industrial concerns and by the cooperation of a distinguished group of American private bankers. The American share of this investment, gentlemen, has not come, of course, from American banks; it came from that great source of prosperity the United States has and enjoys, the American investor, who has shown his faith in a greater and more prosperous Mexico.

The Export-Import Bank of Washington, I should add, has been of great assistance to us. We have, for some years, obtained financial aid which has been of paramount importance to us, in meeting some of our most pressing requirements. But I should here place particular stress in pointing out that the Export-Import Bank has studied our plans and analyzed our figures with as cold an eye as any professional private banker could possess. We have been able to borrow money from the Export-Import Bank only when we have shown that the individual project per se is of benefit to Mexico, is self-liquidating and, in general, meets the requirements of sound banking practices.

In closing, allow me to add a few words concerning the future relations between Mexico and the United States of America. The United Nations, with the United States of America as the leading power, have fought and won a costly and terrible war. The Mexican people have had in it their share of "blood, sweat, and tears." After untold anguish and sacrifices without number, mankind has earned the right to live in a world where the settlement of disputes among states shall be left no more to the arbitrament of war. Mexico, as well as every other member of the United Nations, expects to be able to pursue the welfare and happiness of her people under an international system, where social and economic cooperation shall be the rule, rather than the exception.

We want to work hand in hand with all the peace-loving nations of the earth, but more particularly with our closest neighbor—the United States of America. We firmly believe that reciprocal assistance shall be the basis of relations among peoples. Faithful to the glorious tradition of the Americas, may our beloved countries always show respect for each other and dwell in constructive cooperation. Thus, Mexico and the United States of America will always follow the road of justice and good neighborliness to lasting peace and enduring friendship.

Compulsory Military Training—Statement by Donald Du Shane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent of the House, I present for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement on compulsory military training made to the House Committee on Military Affairs on November 28, 1945, by Donald Du Shane, secretary of the National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education, as follows:

STATEMENT AGAINST COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING

(By Donald Du Shane, secretary, the National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education)

The National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education which I represent at this hearing of the House Committee on Military Affairs was appointed and is maintained by the National Education Association, which represents about 900,000 teachers through direct membership and through its State and local affiliated organizations. Since 1943 the commission has given careful consideration to the problems of peacetime compulsory military training. It has come to the following conclusions:

1. That compulsory military training is not at present necessary for the best possible defense of the United States against attack or invasion.

2. That the passage of this measure at this session of Congress would be unwise, wasteful, and injurious to our best interests both at home and abroad.

3. That there are other defense measures of greater importance some of which would be interfered with or prevented by the high cost of compulsory military training.

I. COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING IS NOT AT PRESENT NECESSARY

We have come out of this war with the strongest Navy and the best Air Force in the world and with the world's best equipped and trained but not largest Army. As men are released from our armed forces the Selective Service Act of 1940 provides that they automatically are to be transferred to a reserve component of the land and naval forces of the United States. These men and the large number of volunteers now entering our forces will fully protect us from invasion or surprise attack for the next 5 years or more.

A realistic appraisal of our possible foes during the next five or more years justifies the conclusion that we will not be attacked. Great Britain is a firm ally and a future war with her is inconceivable. There remains only Russia, another of our allies, who is potentially stronger than we are, but war weary and with pressing problems of reconstruction. Her naval and air strength are such that she could not successfully invade us for many years, and there is no indication that she wishes to do so.

Compulsory military training is not only not needed for our defense at the present time, but its adoption might also increase international suspicion of our purposes and encourage armament races which might endanger world peace.

II. THE PASSAGE OF COMPULSORY TRAINING AT THIS TIME WOULD BE UNWISE

Conscription is an un-American institution which is regarded with distrust by large elements of our population. Many believe that its passage will mark the beginning of the militarization of America and of the weakening and ultimate destruction of our democracy. Certainly, the continuance of conscription over a long period of years will have a profound effect upon our political decisions and our dependence upon force in world affairs.

The possibility of the development of a powerful military bloc based on universal conscription should be given careful consideration. While Congress is not fully aware of it, there are plans to be presented later for refresher training and organization of the Reserves into which every class of trainee graduates. The submission to military discipline and indoctrination of our entire young male population, the granting to them of payments and benefits, the catering to them by political elements, will make a military political bloc probable and should be taken into consideration before such a bill is passed. We well may remember George Washington's statement: "This greatest single threat to a republic is an overgrown military establishment."

The use of the atomic bomb in the Japanese war and the intimation that bombs much more powerful can now be produced have raised questions regarding military tactics and defense that cannot as yet be answered. At the moment there seems very little reassurance in the training of millions of men in military drill and the use of pump guns. When the world finds out about atomic bombs, as it inevitably will, the subsequent world war, if it comes, will be much shorter and there will not be time to call up and retrain our compulsory trainees. I understand one of our atomic scientists is about to publish a booklet entitled "The One Minute War." It is possible that Congress will dissolve into thin air before it has time to declare our entrance into the next war. It would seem most unwise to adopt military

conscription, which can be justified, if at all, on experience in past wars, when the entire character of future wars may already have changed without some of our military and naval leaders knowing very much about it.

With the advent of the atomic bomb the United Nations Organization becomes the major means available for controlling atomic energy and preventing the next war. The American people have entered into it with good faith and high hopes and yet some of our military leaders are convinced that another war is inevitable as evidenced by their efforts to pass military conscription immediately. Fortunately, we have an interval of a few years during which we do not need to worry about war and which we will, if we are wise, devote to the utmost efforts to win the confidence of other nations and to convince them of our good faith and our rejection of intimidation in international affairs. The passage of military conscription at this time might injure the chances of improving and vitalizing the United Nations Organization.

III. THERE ARE OTHER DEFENSE MEASURES OF GREATER IMPORTANCE THAN MILITARY CONSCRIPTION

Of more importance to our national defense than compulsory training is the maintenance of a sound economy, large-scale production, and a high national income. Much of our success in the Second War was due to mass production by our trained mechanics, engineers, and managers, and to the drawing into the Army of mechanical experts, technicians, and scientists who were trained by American schools and shops. Whatever it costs in effort and sacrifice, we must maintain a sound economy and a widely distributed high level of national income.

One of the shocking revelations of this war was the rejection of over a third of our young men from service in the Army because of bad health, physical defects, and lack of education. The loss of production in our factories during the war because of strikes was infinitesimal compared with the losses due to sickness and physical defects. Only to a small extent can these conditions be improved during 1 year's military training of selected young men. The major solution must be found in better medical and dental services from the kindergarten through high school and in better medical service to the masses of our people.

Other improvements which are needed for the welfare of our country as well as for our defense in case of another war are the highest possible education and training of the masses of our people, increased training of technicians, engineers, and scientists, the extension of thorough scientific investigation, the elimination of racial and group conflicts, and the development of national unity.

The accomplishment of these objectives equally important from the standpoint of national welfare and defense might be retarded or prevented if marginal public funds were consumed in the payment of the high annual cost of compulsory military training.

The cost of compulsory military training, as estimated by the War Department under the May bill, will be from $1,750,000,000 to $2,000,000,000. It is probable that these estimates are low as they do not include refresher courses and payments to the reserve force of which the military training system is a part. It may well be assumed that the costs when the system is fully in operation will approximate $3,000,000,000 annually.

To Members of the war Congress $3,000,000,000 may not be overwhelming as it is to me, yet I ask your indulgence while I attempt to show some of the social betterments that could be obtained with this sum of money, and which I believe would add much more to our national defense than would military conscription.

With $3,000,000,000 per year it would be possible to:

1. Construct a 10-room modern school building in every county in the United States each year.
2. Construct a $50,000 library in every county in the United States each year.
3. Construct annually a $150,000 hospital in each county.
4. Employ 10 full-time school and public health doctors and 10 full-time school and public health nurses in every county in the country.
5. Purchase 10 new modern school busses in each county in the United States each year.
6. Maintain 1 psychiatric and behavior clinic in every county in the United States.
7. Provide 10 full-time recreation and juvenile guidance workers in every county in the United States.
8. Bring all schools of the country up to a reasonable standard of efficiency.
9. Provide free education for the 3,000,000 children under 18 who are now not attending school.
10. Meet the pay roll of 1 junior college with 10 instructors in every county in the United States.
11. Provide all the expenses of a 3-year postgraduate course for 10,000 selected students each year.
12. Pay the full maintenance and tuition at college or technical school for 1 year of the 900,000 boys who would be conscripted under the May bill.
13. Erect a three-quarter-million-dollar trade and technical school in each congressional district each year.

This would leave an unexpended balance of $15,300,000 annually.

If in the second and subsequent years additional busses, hospitals, and libraries were not needed in each county, and a second technical school were not needed in each congressional district, the cost would be reduced to less than $2,000,000,000 a year.

While there are various possible plans of spending $3,000,000,000 annually for the social improvement of the United States, the above proposals indicate methods by which our national welfare and defense could be tremendously improved for the same amount that would be wasted at the present time on compulsory military training.

We have from 5 to 10 years during which we dare work for peace, during which we must improve our economy, correct bad conditions, solve some of our serious social problems, make democracy work. By then, we will probably know whether the United Nations Organization can give some assurance of world peace, whether the atomic bomb can be controlled, whether some other nation or group of nations is arming and preparing for a war with us. If after this period it should appear that another world war is probable, then would be the time to devise the most effective methods of warfare for the defense of our country, irrespective of expense, which might or might not include peacetime compulsory military training.

They Call It Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 5 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "They Call It Peace," from the Chicago Tribune of December 3, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY CALL IT PEACE

The Senate confessed its disbelief in justice and freedom in rejecting Senator TAFT'S amendment to the measure establishing the powers of the American representative on the United Nations Security Council. The proportions of the vote, 41 to 18, make it virtually certain that a majority of the Senators, as crassly stupid as they are unpatriotic, are prepared to surrender to Mr. Stettinius, the white-haired boy of Wall Street, the congressional power to make war.

It is hard to see how any decent American could object to the adoption of the Taft amendment. It provided that the American member of the Security Council, in voting on any proposal to use American troops against another Nation, be instructed to consider international justice as well as the maintenance of peace. The Senate majority is all for peace, and to hell with justice.

The peace they are going to maintain is the peace of the grave and the concentration camp. It is the peace maintained by strafing Indonesian patriots with lend-lease planes. It is the peace in which the rubber barons of the Netherlands and the colonial capitalists of France will continue to bleed slave labor in Asia and Africa for imperial glory and personal profit. It is the peace being maintained by Russia in Iran, where the Iranian Government is being prevented by armed threat from suppressing a rebel lion fomented and armed by the Russians. It is the peace in which the Red Army is loosed to loot all of eastern Europe, and Polish miners are impressed to dig coal for Russia at a third of its cost.

The utter cynicism of the San Francisco Charter is made apparent to the whole world by the action of the Senators. There is no justice in it, no freedom, only the peace of a status quo, in which the enslavers of half the world are banded together in a new holy alliance to perpetuate that slavery.

There is nothing for America in such a system except the opportunity for more American sons to die—to die this time that the shackles of the oppressed may be made tighter. Men who will consent to such an arrangement, who vote against the proposal to ameliorate it by the consideration of justice, don't belong in the highest council chamber of the Nation. They belong in an insane asylum.

Our National Debt and the British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 5, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, our national debt now is, as reported November 30, 1945, $265,894,473,502.49, almost $266,000,000,000, with a Budget estimate for interest on the national debt for the 1946 fiscal year of $4,600,000,000. Now when our taxes are high and must go higher if the Congress and the administration is ever to raise sufficient revenue to pay the interest and the Government's operating expenses, we learn our Government officials are planning to make a loan of some $4,000,000,000 to Great Britain under conditions that—even if the loan is repaid—will represent

a serious loss to the people of this country.

In considering this transaction, it appears that some of our leading publications are attempting to condition the public mind to accept the arguments being made in support of this loan program. It is intimated that unless we make a liberal donation as to interest and terms, the old cry of Uncle Shylock will be raised against us; that we must open wide the Nation's purse to England or else "the British would cling to closed Empire trade and blocked sterling, thus shutting off a large part of the world—including the United States—from the general flow of commerce"; that the United States Congress and the public did not understand that United States prosperity and hope of peace depended to a significant degree on the British loan.

The following press report is taken from the October 29 issue of the Washington Post:

LOAN OF FOUR BILLIONS TO BRITAIN REPORTED—AGREEMENT AWAITS APPROVAL BY LONDON; TERMS ARE REVEALED

British and United States delegates discussing financial arrangements between the two nations were reported yesterday to have agreed tentatively on an American loan to Great Britain of approximately $4,000,000,000.

The following reportedly were terms of the agreement:

An interest rate of seven-eighths of 1 percent to run for 50 years.

No repayment of principal or interest until 1951, the loan falling due after that year in 50 annual installments.

Suspension of payments on principal or interest in any year in which Great Britain had an unfavorable trade balance.

The agreement was said to have been sent to London recently for a decision by the British Government, and an answer was expected over the week end.

This is followed by a clipping from the November 5 issue of Time magazine:

UNWITTING SHYLOCK

The United States terms sent to London were harsh enough to revive the old Uncle Shylock cry.

Britain could have the $5,000,000,000 loan she needs to reconvert her war economy, and she could have 55 years to pay. But the interest rate would be 2 percent (the United States Treasury, which can borrow for less, would make a profit at this rate); ill-prepared Britain would have to plunge again into fully competitive world trade and cast off her sea anchor, empire preference.

These prohibitive terms were eased a bit by a provision that interest payments need not begin for 5 years, and by an escape clause under which interest could be postponed in years when Britain had an unfavorable balance of trade. Both were logical United States concessions. Without the 5-year grace period Britain would simply pay the United States interest out of United States loaned capital; the escape clause flowed logically from United States assurances to the doubting British that world trade was bound to revive and float British exports up with it.

But to the British, who came to Washington in hopes of an interest-free loan and who looked upon one-half of 1 percent as the maximum interest, the terms were little short of catastrophic.

THE UNSOLD CASE

The United States negotiators had not wanted to turn the screws on the British. Secretary of the Treasury Fred M. Vinson and Assistant Secretary of State Will Clayton sympathetically understood the British case, wanted to give Britain the best deal possible.

What was possible meant what the United States Congress would stand for. And the Congress, appraising the postwar mood of the United States people, was against charity to Britain. Congress was also highly sensitive to the probability that a British loan would encourage other nations, notably Russia, to come knocking on Uncle Sam's door.

The United States Congress and public did not understand (because it had not been told clearly and authoritatively) that United States prosperity and hope of peace depended to a significant degree on the British loan. If Britain, appalled by the terms, refused the loan, these results were probable: (1) Britain would cling of necessity to closed Empire trade and blocked sterling, thus shutting off a large part of the world from the general flow of commerce; (2) Britain could scarcely participate, as the United States hoped she would, in the Bretton Woods plans for freeing currency exchanges and stimulating world trade; (3) currency controls and bilateral trade agreements would restore the dangerous economic warfare of the thirties.

Moreover, the United States Congress and people had never been shown that the loan was a credit for United States food, raw materials, machinery. The United States economy in a critical period would be stimulated by exports to Britain.

Nub of the failure was that the United States negotiators and Britain's persuasive Lords Keynes and Halifax had concentrated on technical points in their 7 weeks' negotiations, instead of taking time out to do a real selling job. Result: Public opinion in both countries was more against the loan after the 7 weeks than before.

BELTS AND MILLSTONES

Britons refused to feel guilty about Empire preference trade restrictions. British negotiators in Washington argued that high American tariffs caused Empire preference in the first place and that it was Britain's only weapon for forcing down United States trade restrictions in the future.

Afraid to lose the meager economic defense afforded by preference, Britons, as unschooled as the United States public in the loan's real meaning, were an easy mark for imperial isolationists. Chubby Tory M. P. Robert John Graham Boothby, who all along had been against the loan, against unblocking sterling, against Bretton Woods, took one look at the United States offer, said it would mean "dismemberment of the British Empire." He asked Britons, whose belts have been tight for 6 years, to tighten them further, and predicted, "We can get through in any circumstances."

Belt tightening might preserve Britain from disaster. But it could never restore her to prosperity, nor substitute for dollar balances, nor could it open up free world trade.

The Labor Government was likely to agree with Tory Spokesman Boothby that the United States terms would be an impossible millstone for Britain to carry. Washington expected the British Cabinet to send back a counterproposal which would not be even close to the present United States proposition.

Then, only statesmanship of the highest order could swing the public of both countries behind the deal, and save a keystone of postwar international economic order and progress.

The American people in considering this loan should take into consideration British resources and the record of our dealings with the British Empire to say nothing of the sacrifices we have made to make good Churchill's proposition that the British Empire is not to be dismembered. This record should be of extreme interest to the American people.

LEASE-LEND

There is inserted here a schedule of lease-lend figures obtained from the State Department:

Total lease-lend aid to British Empire from March, 1941 to June 30, 1945	$29,000,000,000
(This includes value of goods shipped, various services rendered such as boats repaired, also cost of shipping goods to various parts of Empire.)	
Total reverse lease-lend to United States from British Empire	5,295,000,000
(Of this $3,797,000,000 came from United Kingdom, rest from Australia and other British countries.)	
Lease-lend aid from United States to:	
United Kingdom	13,499,000,000
Egypt	1,995,000,000
India	2,021,000,000
Australia	1,154,000,000
New Zealand	209,000,000
South Africa	233,000,000
Bahamas	57,000,000
Canada	618,000,000

(Canada did not receive this aid—went on United Kingdom account for British munitions or reshipments.)

(Figures just above just represent value of goods shipped. Difference between that total and 29,000,000,000 is for services, cost of shipping, etc., and small outside loans.)

In addition to our lease-lend contribution to the British Empire, and the reverse lease-lend payments received at exorbitant prices, we have made many other contributions. The report of another class of these huge outlays is taken from an Associated Press dispatch appearing in the November 6 issue of the Washington Post:

WAR INSTALLATIONS BUILT ABROAD BY UNITED STATES COST $2,413,000,000

Ninety-five percent of the construction abroad consisted of military installations. And more than half the total amount spent in construction—$1,327,000,000—financed the building of bases in the British Commonwealth, the report noted. The break-down:

United Kingdom, $23,000,000; Australia and New Zealand, $238,000,000; Canada, $370,000,000; India, $126,000,000; Bermuda, $77,000,000; British Caribbean possessions, $186,000,000; British Pacific islands, $146,000,000; Newfoundland and Labrador, $123,000,000; other areas, $38,000,000.

Of the grand total spent on construction abroad, including the British Commonwealth expenditures, $192,000,000 was spent on Japanese islands taken in the Pacific; $173,000,000 in the Philippines; $252,000,000 in the American Republics; $73,000,000 in China; $54,000,000 in Greenland; $122,000,000 in France and her possessions; $67,000,000 in Iran; $64,000,000 in Italy; and $89,000,000 in various other sectors.

We know that United States ships carrying British troops were required to pay Suez Canal tolls while British ships during the war passed through the Panama Canal toll free, and that we gave 50 destroyers—before we entered the war—for the privilege, under a leasing arrangement, to construct defense bases in the British possessions.

GOLD RESERVES IN BRITISH MINES

The British have proven up and have yet to mine 446,660,000 ounces of gold valued at $35 per ounce, which amounts to $15,633,100,000, but gold has a much

higher value than $35 per ounce abroad. The table of British unmined gold reserves inserted here was obtained from the Department of the Interior:

[In thousands of fine ounces]

Africa:	
Anglo-Egyptian Sudan	10
Bechuanaland	300
Egypt	50
Gold Coast	12,000
Kenya Colony	1,400
Nigeria	40
Rhodesia	15,000
Sierra Leone	1,400
South West Africa	20
Swaziland	20
Tanganyika	2,500
Uganda	200
Union of South Africa	260,000
Asia:	
British India (including Burma)	5,000
Malay States	700
Sarawak	300
Europe: United Kingdom	-------
North America:	
Canada	100,000
Newfoundland	400
South America:	
British Guiana	700
British Honduras	20
Oceania:	
Australia (including Tasmania)	32,000
Fiji	2,400
New Guinea	8,000
New Zealand	3,500
Papua	700

The estimated grand total is 446,660,000 fine ounces.

The above table is an estimate compiled by the Department of the Interior. We now come to a table limited to the measured unmined gold reserves of the British Empire compiled by the Treasury Department, together with a rough estimate of the total unmined gold reserves of Great Britain amounting to 700,000,000 fine ounces.

MEMORANDUM ON THE GOLD ORE RESERVES OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE

The measured underground gold ore reserves of the British Empire have been estimated by the Bureau of Mines as follows:

Measured gold ore reserves

[In millions of ounces]

Country:	
Union of South Africa	57
Canada	34
Southern Rhodesia	4
Gold Coast	9
Australia	11
British New Guinea and New Zealand	4
Fiji and Tasmania	1
Tanganyika	5
Total	125

Measured ores refer to those ores which have already been surveyed and staked out. Although the bulk of these measured ores are commercially workable, it cannot be assumed for the total, which may include known and measured ores not worth mining at present prices.

The practice of mining companies varies, but many companies measure a sufficient quantity to cover the amount they expect to extract during the next 4 or 5 years.

Total commercial reserves for the British Empire, that is, total ores which are economically workable, are estimated to be in the neighborhood of 700,000,000 fine ounces. This is based on the assumption that South Africa has enough ore to continue its present rate of production of approximately 12,000,000 ounces for 40 years, which would amount to a total of approximately 500,000,000 fine ounces of gold underground. It is estimated that another 200,000,000 fine ounces of gold will cover the other gold-producing areas of the British Empire. These figures are, of course, very rough estimates.

The 700,000,000 appears to be nearer the correct figure when the fact is taken into consideration that an estimate of the gold reserves in South Africa alone, obtained from the Department of the Interior at the time the first lease-lend bill was under consideration, placed the South African unmined gold reserves at well over 400,000,000 ounces.

THE PRESENT VALUE OF GOLD

The following table on gold values in the several nations is taken from the Mining Journal of October 15, 1945:

GOLD AS HIGH AS $89 PER OUNCE

The following is a partial schedule (obtained from the U. S. Treasury) of gold prices prevailing in foreign countries:

Country or city:	*Per ounce*
Chile	$48.00
Argentina	48.00
Bombay	62.40
Greece	80.00
Cairo	88.50
Bagdad	89.00

When foreign countries will accept gold at these prices in payment for their products, shipped to other countries, the United States is going to find itself out on a limb in demanding over twice as much gold for its exports. Trade is going to go to the nations which will accept the least quantity of gold in payment.

The amount of the gold reserves of the Government of England and its dependencies, as well as the dollar holdings of the British family of nations, is a deep dark secret. But we do know that during the war period the British have been permitted to make heavy withdrawals of our monetary gold stocks from the United States Treasury and transfer to British ownership. One reason given by informed sources and off the record is that in making British purchases during the war, United States currency was not acceptable in some quarters of the Empire. United States gold was demanded and given.

The following statement and table of the United States gold withdrawals from the United States Treasury was obtained from the Treasury Department:

CHANGES IN THE MONETARY GOLD STOCK OF THE UNITED STATES, JANUARY 1, 1943, TO OCTOBER 31, 1945

On January 1, 1943, the value of the monetary gold stocks of the United States amounted to $22,726,000,000, as is shown in the attached daily statement of the United States Treasury for that date. On October 31, 1945, the value of the monetary gold stocks of the United States amounted to $20,037,000,000 (daily statement attached). The decrease of $2,689,000,000 in the value of the monetary gold stocks of the United States which occurred between these two dates was due to the sale of gold to foreign governments and central banks. The attached tables show purchases and sales of gold in the United States by foreign countries through June 30, 1945. Later figures are not available.

This decrease in United States monetary gold stocks reflects primarily changes in our balance of international payments on goods and service account which have resulted from developments arising out of the war. Among these changes are the increase in our purchases abroad of strategic and other materials needed in the war effort and the curtailment in our exports of civilian goods not essential to the prosecution of the war.

Withdrawals of gold in the United States, by foreign countries

[In millions of dollars]

Country	1943	1944	First 6 months of 1945	Total
Argentina	219.5	159.6	91.8	470.9
Brazil	131.7	69.8	10.0	211.5
China	20.0	25.0	124.4	169.4
Chile	18.5	29.0	1.0	48.5
Cuba	30.0	65.0	60.0	155.0
Portugal	10.9	62.8	27.9	101.6
Switzerland	38.9	78.8	53.9	171.6
Turkey	39.9	59.8	5.0	104.7
Uruguay	31.4	35.9	18.0	85.3
United Kingdom	50.0	600.3	-------	650.3
Venezuela	21.5	41.0	50.0	112.5
Other countries	173.8	77.0	21.5	272.3
Total	786.1	1,304.0	463.5	2,553.6

It will be noted from the figures presented in the above table that our ally, England, alone withdrew well over a half billion dollars in gold at a time when in many parts of the British Empire the value of gold was much higher than the fixed price of $35 per ounce in the United States.

UNITED STATES SUPPLIES BRITISH SILVER COINAGE WITHOUT COST

In addition to supplying England with half a billion dollars in gold, our Government generously furnished Great Britain 300,000,000 ounces of silver, practically all of which was coined and put into circulation at a higher currency value than the American silver dollar.

The following table has been obtained from the Monetary Research Division of the Treasury:

Silver lend-leased by the United States to foreign governments [1]

Country:	*Millions of ounces*
United Kingdom	88.1
India	226.0
Australia	11.8
Netherlands	56.7
Ethiopia	5.4
Saudi Arabia	18.9
Fiji	.2
Belgium	.7
Total	407.8

[1] All silver lend-leased to foreign governments must be returned to the United States on an ounce-for-ounce basis. The silver lend-leased was used for industrial purposes related to the war, for purposes of price stabilization, and for coinage.

This loan of 325,000,000 ounces of silver is to be melted down and returned to us when the British reestablish their credit control and paper money circulation in their own country and in their dependencies.

Right here, our Government and the American people should take warning from our past experience with British manipulation of silver money after the last war when they extracted and sold 90,000,000 ounces of silver obtained by debasing their subsidiary coinage which was reduced from 0.925 fine to 0.500 fine and then shifted the money of India from a gold exchange basis to a gold bullion

basis. This money manipulation was operated to retire and replace India silver coinage with paper currency and was followed by dumping the melted-down silver bullion on the world market—a scheme that broke the price of silver bullion to lower than 25 cents per ounce, thereby destroying the purchasing power of our oriental customers, which started a price decline and business stagnation that spread across the country with disastrous results to our national economy.

In light of this experience, surely the United States Treasury officials will not stand idly by and let another depression overtake the country by a repetition of British silver manipulation.

BRITISH MONEY TABLE

The money value of silver in the United States silver dollar is $1.2929 per ounce. By consulting the following British money table, we find that the money value of silver in most British countries is in excess of the nominal value of silver in the United States silver dollar:

BRITISH MONEY TABLES

One shilling is equal to approximately 20 cents.

There are 20 shillings to the pound.

There are 12 pence in a shilling.

The value of a penny in our money is equal to 2 cents.

Sixpence equals one-half shilling.

The minor coins of the British are represented by: 2 pence—tuppence; 3 pence—threepence; 4 pence; 6 pence.

Anything above 2 pence is minted from silver.

One-half penny—hapenny—is equal to one of our cents.

Value of ounce of silver in silver currency in the British Empire

Australia	$1.1146
Indian rupee (11/12 fine)	.8728
Indian rupee (0.500 fine)	1.5950
Canada	1.6666
Egypt	1.2797
Ireland	1.4790
New Zealand	2.0688

BRITISH DIAMONDS

The value of diamond jewels measured by carats varies according to quality and size and is variously estimated. Your investigator is unable to obtain any estimate of the unmined British diamond reserves. Investigation discloses that the Government and the operating companies are very close-mouthed as to their diamond resources and mining operation. The figures on the British diamond reserve have been obtained from the Department of Justice, who has had occasion to investigate the diamond industry cartels recently. The Assistant Attorney General's letter is inserted herewith:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
UNITED STATES COURT HOUSE,
New York, N. Y., November 29, 1945.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHITE: Your letter of November 26, addressed to Edward S. Stimson, was received today. Mr. Stimson advises that the diamond reserves of the British Empire, according to an estimate made by Don C. Bliss, of the American Embassy in London, are 43,847,000 carats. The same estimate places the diamond reserves of the Belgian Congo and Portuguese Angola at 116,000,000 carats. The British Empire reserves are largely reserves of gem diamonds, while the Belgian Congo and Portuguese Angola reserves are chiefly of industrial diamonds.

Mr. Bliss has a whole series of mimeographed reports on the diamond industry which can be obtained from the State Department in Washington. The information above is obtained from his report No. 90, American Embassy, London, England, February 17, 1944, the subtitle of which is "VI. Production Trends." The general title of the whole series is "Production and Distribution of Industrial Diamonds."

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

WENDELL BERGE,
Assistant Attorney General.
LAWRENCE S. APSEY,
Chief, New York Office, Antitrust Division.

The value of diamond jewels is variously estimated from $200 to $1,200 per carat. In making a conservative estimate of the British diamond reserve at $200 per carat, it appears the British have a reserve of diamonds amounting to $8,769,400,000.

BRITISH-OWNED SECURITIES

The most recent estimate of British foreign investment including those in this country has been obtained from the British Empire Section of the Department of Commerce which is inserted herewith:

In 1938 British investments were estimated to total approximately £4,100,000,000 according to the computations made by Sir Robert Kindersley and adjusted upward to allow for his acknowledged understatement of British investments in the United States. A later estimate for the same year has placed the total at nearly £4,600,000,000, but this estimate includes some securities which Kindersley evidently omitted as of doubtful value. The distribution of these investments was, roughly, as follows:

Canada	£537,000,000
Australia and New Zealand	667,000,000
South Africa and Rhodesia	254,000,000
India	545,000,000
Other British countries	315,000,000
Total British countries	2,318,000,000
Europe	345,500,000
United States	549,000,000
Argentina	390,000,000
Brazil	160,000,000
All other foreign countries	820,000,000

The magnitude of some of these items is open to question, but the relationships are undoubtedly along the lines indicated.

At the end of 1944 the estimated total of British investments in all countries was between £3,000,000,000 and £3,500,000,000.

British Government had two and one-half billions in bonds and investments in this country in 1942 and have since sold eight hundred million.

They secured an RFC loan of $390,000,000, which they reduced by selling the $800,000,000 mentioned above. The loan is now $260,000,000, covered by pledged assets amounting to $700,000,000.

THE OLD BRITISH DEBT

The British still owe us money from the last war, and it does not appear that they ever intend to pay. As reported by the Treasury, the amount owed to the United States by Great Britain as of January 1, 1945, under the funding moratorium agreement of the last war was $2,452,714,782.58.

The American people are being cautioned concerning the proposed British loans from many high financial sources. Particular importance attaches to an editorial appearing in the home-town paper of the former Federal Loan Administrator, Jesse Jones, which is presented herewith:

[From the Houston Chronicle of October 16, 1945]

CAUTION ON BRITISH LOAN NEEDED

American and British representatives attempting to establish the terms under which the United States may extend financial aid to Great Britain are now reported to be centering their conversations on a $5,000,000,000 loan running for a period of from 50 to 55 years at an interest rate not yet established but described as purely nominal. The discussions are said in addition to contemplate an agreement under which there would be no payment of interest or principal for a period of 5 years.

Any such plan would mean that the American taxpayers would have to pay rather dearly for the privilege of extending aid to Britain. The Government at the present time is paying approximately 2½ percent for its borrowing of long-term money, so that it would have to pay $125,000,000 annually—or a total of $625,000,000—for the $5,000,000,000 loaned Great Britain during the 5-year period during which the borrowers paid us nothing. To this must be added the differences between the interest which the United States receives in subsequent years and what the Treasury pays for the money. It is probable that the differential may increase to $1,000,000,000 what it will cost the taxpayers of the country to give Great Britain the assistance her representatives say she must have. The cost would be greater if Great Britain failed to pay any part of the principal.

The negotiators are, in addition, looking very far into the future when they talk of making a loan with a maturity of from 50 to 55 years. That covers a length of time in world history in which much can happen.

Two world wars have been fought at an interval of only 25 years, and it took Great Britain less than half that time to repudiate the debt she owed the United States after World War I. That is not an encouraging record on which to base a future commitment running for half a century. No ordinary borrower could expect to get a dollar's worth of credit under similar circumstances.

That this may be the view which Congress will take has been indicated by as powerful a figure as Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. Commenting on the reports that the American and British negotiators were about ready to recommend the terms of the loan, Senator GEORGE said: "I don't think this is the time to be pouring out a lot of money to any nation on earth. There are sound reasons why a policy of extreme caution should be followed."

Senator GEORGE is right. A loan to Great Britain should be considered with extreme caution. It should not be made at the expense of the American taxpayer, and only if so secured that by its terms and conditions the United States is assured of repayment.

POPULATION OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE

The following table has been obtained from the Bureau of the Census today:

Most recent estimated population of the British Empire, 539,870,000

England and Wales	41,460,000
Scotland	5,006,700
North Ireland	1,279,745
Eire	2,949,713
Australia	7,229,864
British India	295,810,000
Union of South Africa	9,589,898
South Africa	1,083,121
West Africa	26,191,342
Mandated territory in southwest Africa	347,442
South Rhodesia	1,448,000

North Rhodesia:	
Native	1,366,641
European	18,745
Canada	11,506,655

THE QUESTION

How much must a nation of 130,000,000 people give to an Empire of 540,000,000 people with all the vast land and water resources, the rubber, petroleum, timber, minerals, and precious metals found in an Empire on which the sun never sets?

Peace Needs World Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 4, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, on last Sunday the Indianapolis Star printed a leading editorial which I think all Americans should read. It was entitled "Peace Needs World Conscience."

We face this fundamental fact: World security—and that means our national security—depends upon the establishment of a united world brotherhood. If we miss our opportunity to contribute to the establishment of the brotherhood of man and militarize our country to the *n*th degree through forced military training and thus provide ourselves with a big gun to brandish in the face of the world, we will negative all plans for a united world brotherhood and the individual, to use the expression coined by this editorial, will find himself "the helpless pawn of faltering leadership."

As the editorial so well puts it, "America is the natural leader in the world's crusade for peace." Now is the time for the world's conscience to assert itself. I commend this editorial to all Americans. It is as follows:

PEACE NEEDS WORLD CONSCIENCE

More than the opportunity to utter grateful prayers for peace is involved in widespread attendance of devout folk at church services. The world must rely to a greater degree on the spirit of religious faith if that peace is kept.

Blundering statesmanship, selfish greed, old hatreds made a mockery of the idealism which soared to new heights after World War I. The same elements of militant nationalism so far have ignored the little people of earth as suspicion clouds the bickering over secrets of nuclear energy.

More than ever there is world consciousness, but no world conscience. Leaders talk glibly of the good-neighbor policy, but little progress has been observed toward achieving the brotherhood of man.

Millions are fearful that the world will become a shambles in another war. Every normal individual, wherever he may live, longs for peace, yet seems once more to be nothing but the helpless pawn of faltering leadership.

In this period of confusion man looks beseechingly for some practical application of the Sermon on the Mount to guide despairing humanity from the murk of despondency to the sunlit heights of world friendship.

This does not entrust to religious leaders the responsibility of making a new peace organization of the Nation's work. Few churchmen are equal to that task. But the spiritual conscience of the world must be mobilized to sweep aside the old pattern of suspicious diplomacy by the strong. The small countries have the right to a voice in determining their fate.

America is the natural leader in this world crusade for peace. It covets no territory. It seeks no buffer states bent to its political will. It regrets the compulsion of reasonable preparedness.

The other countries must acknowledge dependence on the Almighty. There can be no other way to reach the distant goal of brotherhood, where echoes the coming Christmas message of "Peace on earth; good will to men."

Tom Turkeys Halved for Shipment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 5, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the raising of turkeys is a big industry in Oregon. When I was in my district recently I visited the plant of the Northwest Poultry and Dairy Products Co., which has recently made extensive improvements in its modern plant for processing and preparing for the market a substantial portion of Oregon's huge turkey crop. Many of these delicious birds make Thanksgiving and Christmas more enjoyable here in the far East. This plant alone has a capacity of 150 carloads of turkeys during a single season by utilizing mass-production methods in a modern plant. Another innovation which has increased its output materially is a method invoked by it of cutting the big birds weighing 25 pounds or more in half by an improved machine and shipping them in refrigerator cars to eastern markets after the fowls are Government inspected, wrapped in cellophane, and packed in attractive boxes. I include as a part of these remarks a descriptive article by Frank Barton, which appeared in the Portland Oregonian December 2, which explains in some detail this Oregon industry:

TOMS HALVED FOR SHIPMENT—PLAN EXPECTED TO IMPROVE MARKET

(By Frank Barton)

An improved market at better prices for the exceptionally large broad-breasted tom turkeys produced by Oregon turkey raisers is expected to be the result of an experiment in marketing these birds now being tried out by the Northwest Poultry & Dairy Products Co., it was announced Saturday.

The Portland concern is cutting these mammoth birds in half and shipping them to the eastern market in refrigerator cars. Each half is sufficiently large for a substantial turkey roast.

The new method does away with the sales resistance caused by the fact that some of Oregon's prize gobblers are too big for many of the present-day small families.

C. W. Norton, president of Northwest Poultry & Dairy Products, pointed out that Oregon gobblers have been selling at 5 cents a pound less than the hens on the New York market in spite of the fact that the meat of the tom is recognized to be superior. He said he expected to cut this differential to not more than 2 cents by developing a market for the halved gobblers.

Not only that, but he forecast that a year-round market could be created for these birds compared with the festive market around Thanksgiving and Christmas for the whole turkeys. A 25-pound turkey gobbler will provide two 12-pound roasts in the halved condition and thus furnish turkey dinners for two families instead of one.

NEW BUILDING BUILT

So far, a quarter of a million pounds of the halved birds have gone east from the Portland plant at 232 Southeast Oak Street, and Norton said he was encouraged by the reception.

The innovation has been carried out in connection with an expansion program which has more than doubled the capacity of the Portland plant to handle and ship turkeys, and at the same time more than doubled the pay roll.

A new two-story addition, 78 by 102 feet, has been erected and new equipment installed at a cost of $65,000. Included is a modern conveyor system which places the operations of picking, dressing, and packaging the turkeys on a mass-production-line basis. Picking is done by machinery as the turkeys move along the conveyor. All fowls are Government inspected, wrapped in cellophane, and packed in boxes for shipment to eastern markets.

The Portland plant, which started its new conveyor system last week, now has a capacity of 150 carloads of turkeys during a single season. The pay roll is 125 to 130 persons.

The Idaho Farmers Speak Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 5, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most wholesome influences in our country today is that of the people engaged in agriculture speaking through their farm organizations.

It is certainly reassuring to attend meetings of the local of the Farmers Union or the local grange and listen to the discussions of those informed people on national policies and national issues.

The members of these farm organizations represent the very backbone of our Nation and the hope of the Nation's future stability. It appears that the membership of the Washington and Idaho Farmers Union have had under consideration some of our national problems and have embodied their opinions and recommendations in a set of resolutions which it is my privilege to place before my colleagues. I earnestly recommend the following resolutions for their thoughtful consideration and appropriate action:

Whereas there are vast surplus war commodities the United States Government has bought for the prosecution of the war; and

Whereas many of these commodities are stored in various Government owned warehouses throughout our region; and

Whereas a vast amount of these commodities are needed on our farms in Washington and Idaho; and

Whereas our farm cooperatives are in a position to buy these commodities on the par with private dealers: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America in Washington-Idaho State convention urge the Surplus Commodities Board make said surplus commodities available to our farm cooperatives the same as to private dealers; and be it

Further resolved, That there be included on the Board establishing policies relative to surplus property a representative of the farm groups.

Whereas the Columbia River Valley has vast undeveloped resources and is the last frontier in this country for a large increase in population, and the natural resources have only just begun to be developed; and

Whereas a Columbia Valley Authority promises the full development of the vast potentialities of the region and promises the coordination of measures for flood control, irrigation, reclamation, navigation, soil conservation, reforestation, watershed management, promotion of wildlife and aquatic life resources under direct management of the respective States, development of mineral and recreation resources, industrial development, and the full utilization of the power potentialities of the Columbia River Basin, with resulting low rates for the people of the region; and

Whereas the establishment of Columbia Valley Authority at present session of Congress offers assurance of an increased economy for the people of the valley, and security to many thousands of returning servicemen and demobilized war workers: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Washington-North Idaho Division of the Farmers Union in convention on October 18, at Spokane, Wash., do hereby urge the immediate establishment of a Columbia Valley Authority, an autonomous board directly responsible to the President and the National Congress.

Copies of this resolution to be sent to our Congressmen and Senators.

Be it resolved by the Ross Point Local, No. 395, of the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, That we oppose the letting of any individual or group of individuals or corporations have any control whatsoever over the atomic energy principle or patents.

That we further favor the use of these discoveries for the benefit of each and every individual of this Nation, that through socialization of such principles and patents the interest of the United States and the people thereof will benefit commercially and be in a position to compete with other nations who may in the course of time make these same discoveries.

In the reconversion period, groups are desperately seeking to obtain special privileges for themselves without regard to others. If we are to avoid disaster in agriculture, it is essential that we maintain a balanced economy, as agriculture is the base of our economy and it must be kept on a parity with the rest of our industries: Be it

Resolved by the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, Washington-Idaho Division, That we demand all necessary programs and action be taken to keep agriculture on a parity with the rest of our industries.

Be it resolved by the Ross Point Local, No. 395, of the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, That we go on record against compulsory military training, because we believe that our youth has certain inherent ability and initiative to cope with situations as they arise and that such an act is contrary to the American system of freedom.

Whereas Army engineers are proposing the building of a huge earth dam by the Government near Springston, Idaho; and

Whereas said dam would flood 31,000 acres of farm land and make it necessary for hundreds of farmers to find homes elsewhere; and

Whereas the benefits of said dam would be practically entirely for the interests of private power companies; and

Whereas a greater threat of flood is added as well as a threat to the mining industry: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we go on record as opposing the building of the Springston dam.

1919, Siberia—1945, China?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 5, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by Marquis Childs from the Washington Post of December 5, 1945. This is an article on China, which I think magnificently states the case:

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

AMERICA'S POSITION

Twenty-five years ago there was great pressure on the Government in Washington to line up in Russia's civil war on the side of the Czarist officers who were fighting the Bolsheviks. American troops were in Siberia, and a few American soldiers fought in trenches with the British outside Archangel, on the other side of Russia's great empire.

That futile effort to put down a mass movement helped to feed the suspicion with which the Russians regarded the rest of the world. It is one of the reasons why it is so hard today to come to any real understanding with the Soviet Union.

There were Americans then who shut their eyes to reality. They ignored the long conflict between Czarist absolutism and the fermenting unrest of the mass of the Russian people. They ignored the terrible hardships and suffering of the Russian people in the war; worse than in any other country, in World War I as in World War II.

They thought that, by sending support to certain adventurous officers of the old regime, they could push back the current of history. In the same way, there are Americans today who believe that a little intervention in China will make it possible for Chiang Kai-shek to master the Communists and unify all of China's vast, strife-torn area.

The danger is that a little intervention will lead to our taking sides in a major way in China's internal war. It will draw us in so that we find ourselves sending more troops and more money and guns. This might not happen, but no one can deny that it is a possibility.

Those who were eager for intervention in Russia's civil war, a quarter of a century ago, and those who today want us to hold the balance in China with men and munitions overlook one all-important fact. The American people are opposed, by their deepest traditions and by all the conditions of life in this country, to that kind of action.

It was only after a direct attack on American territory in 1941 that we roused ourselves to resist what was a carefully planned conspiracy to surround and eventually destroy American democracy. Now that that most terrible of all wars is ended, the clamor of public opinion is to bring Americans home, to get out, to pull back within our continental borders.

So persistent is that clamor that it may prevent us from carrying out responsibilities we owe to the world. How, then, can those who urge intervention in China expect that American opinion will accept a risk which may lead to a considerable commitment in men and machines? We read of the angry mutterings of the American fliers who must fly planes to Chiang over the Hump. This is fact, just as real as the air we breathe, and no amount of lecturing, no talk about leadership, no hysteria is going to change it.

This conflict is an old story. It is partly why we have such a hard time shaping any clear line on foreign policy. You have Americans, often in influential positions, who talk about what America will do. They succeed now and then in fooling both our friends and our enemies, but especially our friends.

They ignore the fact that only under the most extreme prodding, and then only most reluctantly, will Americans take positive action outside the borders of this country.

You can argue that this is wrong, dangerously shortsighted. You can argue that America should now take world leadership. You can argue with considerable logic and force for a Pax Americana—a hundred years of peace enforced by our power around the world, working benevolently through the United Nations, or as a frank imperium.

But that is so contrary to the American temperament that it is impossible. We are left, therefore, with only one choice in our foreign policy. Strong within our own borders, we can be friendly with all peace-loving nations. We can, as Walter Lippmann has so well put it, be a friendly mediator between the nations.

The sooner our interventionists—whether they be imperialists or earnest internationalists who want to carry the benefits of American democracy to the world—learn this, the sooner will we be able to take a reasonable position that accords with American opinion.

We have a chance to become a working partner in a world organization. Quarrels over intervention in China or anywhere else weaken that possibility because such quarrels inevitably stir all the old isolationist prejudices.

Two Trials in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 5, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Memphis Press-Scimitar of December 1, 1945, written by Edward J. Meeman. I commend it to your attention:

The trial at Nuremberg goes well. Evidence, shocking even to a world that thought it had plumbed the depths of Nazi devilishness, steadily unfolds. The trial is being conducted with fairness and dignity. Few doubt that the guilty will be punished and in measure proportioned to their guilt.

There is another trial going on in Germany—the trial of our ability to transform the German nation from a menace into a reliable member of the society of nations. A successful outcome of this other trial depends on our ability to save the innocent—to get Germany to running in such a way that the lives of today's children, and even children yet unborn, will not be warped by

starvation and injustice so that they will be made into Nazis or Communists of tomorrow.

This other trial isn't going well. That we learn from Byron Price, former head of censorship, who was sent into Germany by President Truman to find out conditions and has reported to him that the situation is growing worse hourly.

Germans who live in unheated homes and must walk to work, aren't getting enough food to keep their bodies warm, much less enough to give them enough energy to work.

Mr. Price recommends that additional food be shipped to Germany on credit to provide at least the minimum ration which doctors say is necessary to prevent starvation.

For with starvation would come epidemics and probably riots.

Desperation, he says, might produce a new fuehrer, and embittered Germans would listen to him.

It is right and it is sensible for us to give food and hope to those Germans, however few or many they may be, who will turn to the Western World and its democracy if we give them a chance. Food and hope, too, for the children who, if not molded by our kindness, will be molded by a future fuehrer's cruelty.

For the spirit in which to do this, we may turn to Justice Robert H. Jackson, prosecutor of the Nazis at Nuremberg.

In the great speech with which he opened the trial, at the same time that he was relentlessly indicting the Nazis, he made it clear that the United States was not incriminating the whole German people. He said:

"We know that the Nazi party was not put in power by a majority of the German vote. We know it came to power by an evil alliance between the most extreme of the Nazi revolutionaries, the most unrestrained of the German reactionaries, and the most aggressive of the German militarists."

The German people cannot be absolved from the sin of yielding to this evil minority. But it is unlikely they would have yielded had they not been brought to an economic desperation by the triple disasters of defeat in World War I, a destructive inflation, and a depression.

Let us do what is necessary to prevent a greater economic desperation which would make Germany prey to a new crew of desperadoes.

Let's see that Byron Price's recommendations are carried out.

Let's punish the guilty and rescue the innocent.

Let neither of our great trials in Germany miscarry.

Veterans' Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 5, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, when the deficiency bill was before the House recently, I was glad to have been one who was among the House Members taking the lead in restoring to the bill the $156,000,000 item for veterans' hospitals and veterans' housing. At that time I stated my views on the floor in the brief time allotted to me. I include in these remarks an article appearing in the Washington Times-Herald, December 2, by Lt. Comdr. Tyrrell Krum entitled "Veterans' Affairs," in which he discusses this item:

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

(By Lt. Comdr. Tyrrell Krum, USNR (retired))

If any American war veteran thinks he's going to get anything from the Congress of the United States without wading in and fighting for it, he's got another think coming.

No more glaring example of the attitude which is building up among some Members of Congress toward our returning veterans, now that the drums of war are silenced and peace is assured for the time being, could be found than the spectacle which took place on the floor of the House a few days ago.

Gen. Omar N. Bradley, who left a four-star command in Europe to take over a thankless task as head of the Veterans' Administration, was seeking approval of a $156,000,000 appropriation to be used in expanding the VA's hospital program and providing top-flight medical care for millions of men who marched off and fought and won this war.

The program was then subjected to microscopic inspection by the Federal Board of Hospitalization and the Bureau of the Budget. And, finally, after careful consideration by President Truman, it was approved and sent up to the Hill for inclusion in the first deficiency appropriation bill.

One would naturally feel confident that such a program, so conceived and so approved, would encounter little or no difficulty in being blessed by a legislative body to whom billions of dollars are mere chicken feed.

But this was mere wishful thinking.

The House Appropriations Subcommittee, ruled by Representative CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri Democrat, didn't see it that way. CANNON wanted to know what all the rush was about. Why all the hurry? And, furthermore, why wouldn't the Veterans' Administration, instead of building a lot of new hospitals, be content with utilizing Army and Navy hospitals declared surplus?

The Veterans' Administration gave assurances it was willing to absorb some of the discarded service installations. But, on the other hand, many of them were not fit for the care of veterans.

The VA battled in vain. When the first deficiency appropriation bill was reported out for House approval by CANNON it called for a total expenditure of $1,131,552,312.48 for every conceivable type of project from curbstone sewers to public schools and municipal hospitals.

But not one single red cent for veterans hospitals!

On Wednesday the appropriation bill came before the House sitting as a Committee-of-the-Whole. A small group of willful men, determined to fight to restore the cut from the floor, was on hand, led by Representative JOHN RANKIN, Mississippi Democrat, firebrand chairman of the House World War Veterans Committee.

RANKIN offered an amendment to replace the $156,000,000 item in the same form as it was stricken from the measure by the Cannon subcommittee.

And taking the lead in rallying to his support were Representatives EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts; D. EMMERT BRUMBAUGH, of Pennsylvania; BEN F. JENSEN, of Iowa; WILLIAM A. PITTENGER, of Minnesota; J. LEROY JOHNSON, of California; HOMER D. ANGELL, of Oregon; H. CARL ANDERSEN, of Minnesota; IVOR D. FENTON, of Pennsylvania; all Republicans.

The only Democrat to take the floor in RANKIN'S support was WILLIAM T. BYRNE, of New York.

And thus the day was won. The amendment passed by a vote of 78 to 49. And, thus, the Veterans' Administration Nationwide hospital-medical program squeaked through by a margin of 29 votes.

American Economic Stability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 5, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a thoughtful address by the Honorable O. Max Gardner, Chairman of the Advisory Board, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, and former Governor of North Carolina, before the Economic Club of New York, Thursday evening, November 29, 1945. Governor Gardner has approached the problems of the day with frankness and his convictions deserve consideration.

His address follows:

There is no subject more deeply significant to all of us than that chosen for our discussion here tonight: "American Economic Stability." There is no domestic issue more fundamental to the welfare of our Nation than the question of when, and how soon, and by what means, we are to attain economic stability. If we are to find the answer, we must not rest.

With my background and experience, I must confess that I do not pretend to come to you tonight with any expert knowledge qualifying me to speak with authority or finality as to the plans or policies that are necessary for the creation, maintenance, or continuance of the economic stability of America. I doubt if any of us have a proven formula for the attainment of this utopia.

A subject so vast as national economic stability must, of necessity, in the time allotted be treated in general terms. Many years ago a scholarly divine in my section asked a successful evangelist the secret of his power in the pulpit. He replied by saying, "Well, my brother, I just spread the fodder on the ground so that anybody in the congregation from a jackass to a giraffe can get it." I think, with due apology, that I shall follow his example here tonight.

In fact, ladies and gentlemen, I know more about economic instability than I do about economic stability. I was nursed at the sad and loving breast of instability and for most of my life have been on intimate terms with it. Indeed, I am a magna cum laude graduate with a doctor's degree in the sciences of bankruptcy and political discontent. I experienced these catastrophes as chief executive of North Carolina from 1929 to 1933, when they were marshaled against all governments. Former President Herbert Hoover and I entered and graduated and terminated at the same time, and both of us are well qualified to talk for the remainder of our lives on the subject of economic instability in America during a depression. That was one political agony no one in office at the time will ever quite forget.

The only time except tonight that I ever seriously attempted to raise the veil of our economic future and indulge in economic prognosis occurred on July 22, 1932, when, as Governor of North Carolina, I wrote a letter to the then Governor of the State of New York, in which I used this unmistakable language:

"Public opinion is in a state of flux. There are in it currents of thought moving swiftly and with power, sweeping people and lives before them. New and sudden trends are daily felt. It is a mistake to say that these currents of thought are wholly the creatures of demagogues. Demagogues do not create movements. They merely ride upon them.

We are more than blind if we think the American people will stand hitched to the status quo."

This prediction was made, as you know, in the darkest hours of the depression. I was suffering from mental, financial, and political anguish. I am perfectly willing to leave it to you, in the light of what has happened during the last 13 years, as to whether or not I was guilty of overstatement when, as a minor prophet, I caught a glimpse of the New Deal before the New Deal caught a glimpse of you or me.

As Chairman of the Advisory Board on Reconversion, I have tried to locate the fundamental reasons for our economic and social discontent during the period of physical and mental reconversion. I am sure all of us can agree on one point—that the dislocation of the war is the basic cause of our present disunity. Today the air is filled with criticism and complaint. People who walked together in harmony only a few weeks ago are today openly finding fault with one another. Management and labor which worked together so efficiently in producing weapons for war are now in hostile camps. Why have we become so distrustful of each other? Where is the unity which we had as a Nation? What has happened to our allies? Where are the bonds and ties that were the basis of our great victory?

Since I am to speak to you upon the subject of American economic stability, I think it proper for me to discuss some of the ingredients of discontent that divide and confuse as we move from war to peace. How much of the present upheaval is superficial or natural and incident to transition? How much is ominous and dark and of serious import?

I think it perfectly natural for us to experience instability as we enter the postwar period. The sudden termination of total war—the most destructive in all history—is bound to bring serious shocks to the economic and social system of the Nation. The days through which we have recently passed will mark the watershed of history.

Our vast and unlimited expenditures for munitions have suddenly stopped. Of course, this is right and proper. The peacetime way of spending public money differs radically from wartime. Two billion dollars were spent in producing the atomic bomb. All of this was done in secret. Congress was not consulted. In time of war such a method is defensible, but in time of peace every dollar of Federal funds must be subjected to the white light of publicity and to close public scrutiny, and surely in times of peace we should constructively strive for a balanced budget. I realize that, by reason of national necessity, it will be 1948 before we can hope for a balanced budget.

With the end of the war we are throwing off the stupor and regimentation and beginning to think for ourselves. We no longer have a chief of staff to tell us what to do and not to do. There is no use denying the fact that war is impatient and even inconsistent with the democratic process. Democracy means that others than the General Staff must be consulted. It means that the rank and file of the citizenship are to have a part, either directly or indirectly, in great decisions. We are unlimbering the mental muscles that have been cramped and crowded. We are having full and free discussion of issues again, and only in this way can we justify the great cause for which we fought.

I believe you will agree with me that it would be tragic, both for our Nation and for the world, if in this her greatest hour America should, through dissension and bitterness, fail to resolve her differences.

I have confidence tonight that we will resolve our differences in the light of our traditions—our traditions of restraint, moderation, and tolerance. A wise friend of mine once told me that "The denial of a present satisfaction in order to achieve a future goal is the basis of all economic progress."

We are great in America for what we have accumulated and for what we possess, both in wealth and power. We are still greater for the things we have refused to seize and selfishly appropriate for ourselves. If it were not for the confidence of the little men and the little nations of this earth in the integrity of the good intentions of America today, I do not believe there would be any hope for world stability or world order.

What is this spirit of moderation so necessary to the survival of a democracy? How is it cultivated? How is it to be preserved? How is it sometimes lost? From the pen of your eloquent and wise Judge Learned Hand, we have the following:

"A society so riven that the spirit of moderation is gone, no court can save; a society where that spirit flourishes, no court need save. * * * What is the spirit of moderation? It is the temper which does not press a partisan advantage to its bitter end, which can understand and will respect the other side, which feels a unity between all citizens * * * which recognizes their common fate and their common aspirations—in a word, which has faith in the sacredness of the individual."

If the leaders of the jurisdictional fights within labor, and the stubborn individualists in management, and all leaders of labor and management were compelled to memorize these masterful words of moderation from Judge Hand and then reconcile their differences in the common good, what a blessing it would be to the public welfare and to our economic stability.

What is the grave apprehension haunting our present unrest and threatened instability? What are the words on the lips and in the minds of every thoughtful citizen? What constitutes the real basis of disputes between management and labor, of the quarrel over prices and wages? The answers to all of these questions are found in two great fears—inflation and deflation.

As chairman of the Advisory Board, I recently said to President Truman that I thought a good job had been done in keeping inflation under reasonable control, but that I thought the best hour for America since VJ-day would come when, in the national interest, all economic control fetters and binders could be removed without danger to our national life, and a free America be allowed to move forward into full production under the protective policy of a free competitive economy. Right here I would like to say that as long as controls are necessary, we should strive to find a more expeditious method for wage-price adjustments and do away with current delays and cumbersome processes. I told Director Snyder that, while inflation was a devastating disease, I knew of only one evil more deadly than inflation, and that was the paralysis of deflation.

I believe, therefore, that if we are to have a stabilized economy in America we have got to chart a course that will avert inflation on the one hand, and at the same time move progressively forward towards the goal of a sound equilibrium, steadily rising under the impulse of full production. In order to do this, we have got to keep our eyes constantly on the value of the American dollar, which is today the soundest money in the world. There are two ways to make what we call money. One of these is the printing press, the other, work. I am a disciple of the doctrine of work.

I believe that economic stability will be achieved when the entire population of this Nation has the opportunity and willingness to work—to contribute to the welfare of the whole in a fair manner consistent with the fundamental resources, needs, and greatness of the country. I emphasize willingness to work. I do not believe that we can attain or retain economic stability in America unless our people firmly resolve to rededicate themselves to the dignity of labor and to the national necessity for all of us who are able to work—actually to go to work. In other words, the only complete antidote to inflation or deflation is production and abundant supply, and this means only one thing—work—work for everybody.

It is rather amusing to me to find many people who think they are economically secure who are worried almost to despair about the abundance of money in the pockets of the average man today. Give us time, brother. All we have to do is to be patient with our present prosperity. It will work itself out. It always has. Our memories are short and with all of our educational advance no institution has yet been able to give a degree in common sense. Unfortunately we may rely upon the eventual improvidence of the average American. It may be difficult for the average American to spend 5 years' savings in 1 or 2 years, but the way we are going now we may be able to do it, as the demand of the American people for new and more products during the next few years will exceed anything the country has ever known. When production catches up with and probably exceeds consumption, the economic club will have to meet again.

We must remember that most of us work not for the sheer joy thereof but to make a living. When a bellboy in my hotel asked me the other day how much higher I thought du Pont was going, I knew we were on the way.

There is one thing more to be dreaded than economic instability, and that is economic profligacy, waste, and riotous living. To my mind, one of the worst things about the 1927-29 joy ride was that we all thought we were endowed with perpetual prosperity and many of us unwisely concluded that we would never have to work again—and please remember that most of these suckers were not people who earned their bread in the sweat of their face. One of them is talking to you, and I see some familiar faces in this audience.

To attain economic stability we must, of course, be willing to work. But that in itself is not enough. There are other factors fundamental to the attainment of a stable society for which we must strive. We shall not find these factors by looking backward. The key to economic stability will not be found in the past. It is just 16 years since 1929; but in terms of social and economic progress it is a hundred years. The so-called boom of 1929 looks pitiful to us today. Then we had less than $100,000,000,000 of production as compared with our wartime achievement of $200,000,000,000. And because of the growth of our labor force and our productive efficiency, a mere 1929 rate of production would leave nearly 20,000,000 of our workers unemployed today—far more than the total we had out of work in the worst years of the depression.

It seems to me that this points to the essence of economic stability. Stability is not synonymous with security. We shall not achieve stability if we are permanently satisfied with our present standards. Society stagnates when it becomes smug and complacent. The key to stability is to set our sights ever higher, to strive for higher and higher goals of production. If the motive power of America had not been to come up—come up higher and higher—most of us would not be here tonight.

Many people think of stability as the elimination of boom and depression, of inflation and deflation, of prosperity and poverty—as the elimination of extremes of any kind. Stability is all of these things, but it is something more. To achieve stability, we must reconcile ourselves to temporary instability and controversy as society struggles painfully with new ideas, new methods, and new conditions. If we do otherwise, we will

achieve neither stability nor the will-o'-the-wisp of security.

This concept of stability is not static. It is dynamic. But the very essence of a dynamic stability is that it cannot be achieved by a policy of drift. We have either got to advance or recede. We cannot stand still. I hardly need say that I believe in the American free-enterprise system. I do not believe that the best interests or the stability of the Nation are served by regimentation in peacetime. But a system of free enterprise does not mean that the Government assumes a role of impotence. Planning by government need not be regimentation. It seems to me that planning is just the commonsense approach to a constructive postwar economy. Every well-managed business has a general staff. Businesslike operations of the Government demand the same approach. Our task is simplified and our chances of success are increased by the best planning we can provide. I mean planning by the Government to create a pattern of government and enterprise relationship in which individual industries, individual companies, and individuals will have a feeling of confidence and stability in making their own plans for their own operations. In this direction lies American economic stability.

I have not yet fully explored what seems to me the most crucial factor in our struggle to achieve economic stability. Production and planning will not suffice. In the long run, stability depends in large part upon our state of mind. I mean that there can be no real stability unless we are receptive to change. I repeat—we cannot be stable if we remain static. Change is the law of life. That society will be the most stable that finds a way to maintain its equilibrium in a changing world. Progress is the residuum of a multitude of mistakes. Only through error do men or nations come to know the truth. The progress and stability of a country may be measured by those things once matters of debate which are now accepted as a matter of course.

Those governments that have had the greatest economic stability have been those that have found a way to adjust to changing conditions. Those governments that have been unable to adjust have often been swept away when they thought they were absolutely secure. As the old philosopher says, "Just about the time they think they have the world by the tail, the tail pulls off."

Yes, if our minds and our hearts are open to change, we can achieve stability—both economic and political. For you all know that we can have no economic stability without political stability and no political stability without economic stability. We make a grave mistake if we think we can have economic stability in America with all the rest of the world in turmoil and ruin. I believe that the roots of our economic system will wither and die unless they are firmly planted in the fertile soil of world trade.

The building of a stable world peace upon the ashes and ruins of this war will require all the capacity, patience, and restraint of which the human race is capable. Whether we like it or not, just remember that the stability of this Nation and the whole world depends upon the slender thread of negotiation and renegotiation now being carried on by the representatives of the three great nations of the earth. Here is the ark of the covenant of stability.

And finally, my friends, if we could explore the mind of the average American citizen today, I believe we would find lying side by side two important desires. One is the wish that a world order may be established to prevent war. The other is the natural desire for a job that will bring with it individual well-being and stability to himself and his family.

The two ideas are really different approaches to the same problem. The untutored thinking of the common man has stumbled upon and laid bare the core of the problem facing this Nation and the world. The common man, knowing little and caring less about fine-spun theories of sovereignty, international law and economic stability, shows an intuitive understanding of world problems when he ties up in one bundle the desire for his daily bread and a chance for world peace. It may well be that we cannot long have our daily bread without world peace, and I am equally doubtful that we can long have world stability without our daily bread.

Columbia Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles by Richard L. Neuberger and Robert W. Sawyer from the Sunday Oregonian of November 25, 1945:

COLUMBIA VALLEY AUTHORITY?

(The Oregonian herewith presents both sides of one of the most controversial issues in the history of the Pacific Northwest—the question of whether or not to establish a Columbia Valley Authority similar to the TVA in this region. The affirmative side is presented by Richard L. Neuberger, prominent Portland author, and the negative side by Robert W. Sawyer, publisher of the Bend Bulletin. Mr. Neuberger has been a leader of New Deal groups since he was editor of the University of Oregon campus paper in 1932. Recently discharged from the Army after 3 years' service, Mr. Neuberger is the author of three books and has contributed extensively to Harper's, Collier's, the Reader's Digest, and the Saturday Evening Post. Mr. Sawyer, one of Oregon's most distinguished citizens, is Oregon director of the National Reclamation Association and a nationally known authority on conservation and reclamation. The reclamation association was formed by delegates appointed by governors of the Western States. In addition to his duties as publisher, Mr. Sawyer has served as judge of Deschutes County and as a member of the Oregon State Highway Commission.)

YES

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

As early as 1908 people in the Pacific Northwest began crusading for Federal development of the vast resources of the Columbia River. The crusade was persistent and determined, but nothing happened for nearly 30 years—not until a President entered the White House who had pledged himself to the systematic and orderly improvement of America's great river valleys. The name of this President was Franklin D. Roosevelt.

These facts are important for us to remember. During 3 decades, leading citizens of the Northwest tried to work through such old-line Government agencies as the War Department and the Department of the Interior for the construction of dams at Bonneville and Grand Coulee. But not an ounce of concrete was poured, not a single rivet hammered home. Countless reports were written; they gathered dust in files and drawers. The old-line agencies, competent though they were, failed utterly to put over the projects.

Are we to leave the future development of our region to political caprice? Are we to be solely dependent upon the chance that another President will look with favor on Federal investment in dams, powerhouses, pumping stations and transmission lines along the broad Columbia?

Or will we establish a permanent, continuing regional board with authority and responsibility to develop all the resources of the Columbia River Valley on a coordinated basis?

This issue vitally affects the welfare and destiny of every man, woman, and child in the Northwest. This is particularly true at a time when we need thousands of new jobs to compensate for the war plants which are laying off workers each week.

Before he died, President Roosevelt gave us a pattern for sound development of a major American region. He inaugurated and supported the Tennessee Valley Authority, one of the most successful undertakings in the history of the United States Government.

What about the TVA? Would such an agency benefit the Pacific Northwest? The answer is "yes, most emphatically yes." Ever since a regional authority was first proposed for the Columbia Valley, a campaign of misrepresentation has been carried on against the TVA. One would think, to read these slanders, that the TVA was a tyrannical, mysterious gestapo that destroyed the State's rights and enslaved the people of the Tennessee Valley.

Governors quoted as describing TVA aid to Tennessee

What are the facts?

Last year the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, eminent Pulitzer newspaper, asked the Governors of the seven States in the Tennessee Valley whether the TVA had threatened State's rights or personal liberties. These Governors included Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives, New Dealers and anti-New Dealers. Yet without exception they agreed that the TVA, far from endangering State's rights, had actually strengthened and helped the States of the Tennessee Valley.

"People throughout the Tennessee Valley," said Governor Prentice Cooper, of Tennessee, "are enjoying low electric rates which the private companies used to tell us were 'fantastic and impossible.' The rights of this State and its citizens have been enlarged by TVA through enriched opportunities."

"I am a strong believer in States' rights," said Gov. J. Melville Broughton of North Carolina, "but TVA has done nothing which to my mind embodies any threat to the rights of this State."

Yet despite this expert testimony of the distinguished governors whose States are in the Tennessee Valley, the Oregon State Legislature passed a resolution condemning a Columbia Valley authority as a threat to State's rights. Senator Lew Wallace, of Multnomah County, pointed out that the legislature only debated the resolution for a few minutes, whereas it devoted days and weeks to wrangling with the liquor commission. Who inspired the anti-Columbia Valley memorial? Who was so anxious to hurry it to passage?

William L. Chenery, publisher of Collier's magazine, one of the Nation's foremost periodicals, visited the TVA this year. What did he find out? He discovered that TVA had saved soil, improved public health, cut light rates, helped business, and reduced farm indebtedness.

Chenery asserts Authority brought prosperity

"The Tennessee Valley Authority," concluded Mr. Chenery, "has increased prosperity in hundreds of towns and on thousands of farms in seven States. Most of the doubts that attended its creation have already vanished."

In the Pacific Northwest, however, many chambers of commerce and private power companies are trying to revive those doubts. They are claiming that TVA is a failure, thus

hoping to discredit the Columbia Valley authority. Are these not the same chambers of commerce that originally opposed creation of the Bonneville Power Administration in the Department of the Interior? Is it not one more effort to thwart development of the Columbia River in the interests of all the people?

This fight is far from new. It reaches way back. In 1935, exactly a decade ago this fall, the Portland Chamber of Commerce appeared before the Pacific Northwest Regional Planning Commission and condemned plans for a Columbia Valley Authority. One of the most respected and experienced labor leaders in Oregon's history heard this criticism—the late Ben T. Osborne, secretary of the Oregon State Federation of Labor of the AFL.

After the chamber of commerce was all through, Ben T. Osborne got up. "I am stronger now for a Columbia Valley Authority than when I came here," he said. "There hasn't been an argument that hasn't convinced me of the desirability of the type of organization similar to that of the Tennessee Valley. I am astonished to hear men rise up in fear and dread of the Federal Government as though it was a great octopus. If this region of ours is to be developed to the greatest good of all the people here, there must be some authority and that authority must be the Federal Government."

The future of the Pacific Northwest was close to the heart of Ben T. Osborne. He knew that the welfare of the 75,000 Oregon wage earners whom he led would be well served by a Columbia Valley Authority.

When it opposes a Columbia Valley Authority, the Portland Chamber of Commerce gives one cause to wonder whether it speaks for the great majority of Oregon's merchants or for a few private power companies. How has business fared in the TVA? Mr. Chenery, of Collier's, was told by merchants, bankers, and real-estate men that the TVA had boomed business throughout the entire valley.

President described project as proud success

Smaller wonder that Mr. Chenery heard this praise of the TVA from businessmen. During the immediate prewar years, retail sales for the whole country climbed 54 percent, in the Tennessee Valley 67 percent. The income of the entire country went up 29 percent, in the Tennessee Valley 39 percent. Wages for the whole country increased 46 percent, in the Tennessee Valley 56 percent.

Yet we of the Pacific Northwest now hear the propaganda that an agency like TVA would be a bad thing for the Columbia River Valley.

Harry S. Truman is a wise man. He knows a useful institution when he sees it. On October 10, 1945, the President of the United States said: "By all except a small minority, the TVA is now regarded as a great American accomplishment, of which all of us are proud. We will not listen to the whispers of the timid, that dreams like those of the Tennessee Valley are impossible to accomplish. The valleys of America await their full development. The time has come—now that materials and manpower are more plentiful—to press forward."

TVA embraces seven States of South

Yet, despite this wholehearted approval from Presidents and editors, from farmers and merchants, still we of the Northwest hear that a TVA is not suited to our region.

The TVA touches seven States, including in its area 81,000 square miles and 5,000,000 people. The Columbia Valley Authority, as proposed by Senator MITCHELL and Congressman JACKSON, would also touch seven States, taking in 279,000 square miles and 3,500,000 people. We are told that because of the difference in acreage, we of the Northwest cannot have a regional authority. This is nonsense. It is like saying a doctor who performs satisfactorily as an interne cannot be trusted in the larger field of private practice.

On its course from British Columbia to the sea, the Columbia is one river. Yet a whole galaxy of Government agencies has to do with its management. The Bureau of Reclamation plans and builds irrigation projects. The Fish and Wildlife Service safeguards aquatic life. The Army engineers generate power. The Bonneville Power Administration sells that power. Some of these agencies report to the Secretary of War, others to the Secretary of the Interior. There is no coordinating point. Would you run a hotel with one kitchen for salads, another for soups, still another kitchen for meat orders, and so on? You could be sure no guest would ever be fed. Yet that is the way our most precious regional resource, the Columbia River, is now developed and managed.

Opponents of the Columbia Valley Authority claim that competition among these various agencies is a healthy thing, that no over-all authority is desirable. This rivalry among bureaus, far from being beneficial, is one of the reasons that the Pacific Northwest had to stifle its ambition and wait 30 years for Franklin D. Roosevelt to come along and begin construction of dams on the Columbia.

And if interbureau competition is so worth while, why not apply it elsewhere? When a regiment goes to war, let one Government department supply the rations, let another provide the weapons, let still a third check up on the security precautions, have a fourth issue the proper clothing and bedding. Would you feel confident sending your son or husband off to battle under such circumstances? Yet that is the way the Columbia River is now developed and managed.

Agencies listed as having capable personnel

The Army Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bonneville Power Administration—all these agencies and many more besides have done notable work in the Columbia River Valley. Their contributions have been outstanding. Their engineers and technical men are among the best in the land. The accomplishments of these agencies would not end with the establishment of a Columbia Valley Authority. Indeed, those accomplishments would be greatly enhanced.

Senator MITCHELL and Congressman JACKSON intend explicitly that the valuable personnel of the agencies already in the region shall be absorbed into the Columbia Valley Authority; CVA will make worth-while use of the talents and skill of these men. Lest anyone think this impossible, just consider a recent episode with which we are well acquainted. A few years ago the old United States Biological Survey was consolidated into the Fish and Wildlife Service along with many other agencies. Such illustrious northwestern biologists as Stanley Jewett and Albert W. Moore, formerly with the biological survey, now continue their eminent work in the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Authority generates and sells hydroelectric power

The Tennessee Valley Authority performs many functions to make life better in that region. It generates and sells hydroelectric power; it drains swamps where malaria has festered; it improves navigation; it prevents devastating floods; it distributes fertilizer and restores exhausted soil; it encourages the use of electrical appliances; it makes possible the establishment of new industries, new towns, and new businesses.

A Columbia Valley Authority would undertake most of these tasks, too. In addition, it would develop and reclaim such potentially fertile areas as the Columbia Basin irrigation project in the State of Washington. And it would decide each specific step with an eye on the entire long-range program. It would not lose the forest for the trees. An example will demonstrate the value of such coordination.

Today the Army engineers want to build a new dam at Umatilla Landing, on the Columbia. Up-river communities are in favor of the project. They know it will provide cheap navigation far into the inland empire. But the Fish and Wildlife Service is not so sure of the value of the proposal. Can the Chinook salmon runs survive another dam below the mouth of the Snake? Down-river communities, which rely heavily on the fishing industry, tend to look on the dam with similar skepticism.

This is a vital issue. It involves the livelihood of thousands of people; millions of dollars in annual income are at stake. Yet there is no central point for coordinating the diametrically opposite views. The Army engineers are responsible to the Secretary of War, the Fish and Wildlife Service to the Interior Department. But a Columbia Valley Authority would have on its staff both the engineers proposing the Umatilla Dam and the biologists who fear that the dam will damage the salmon runs. The CVA would study all the evidence on both sides and then reach a decision on the basis of cold, hard facts.

Intelligent men and women in every section of America realize that the model set by TVA is a pattern for such regions as the Columbia Valley to follow. Are we to throw away so opportune a chance? The New York Times, most notable newspaper in the United States, had this to say recently: "The Tennessee Valley experiment has now reached a stage where it has to be regarded as a pattern for other river-valley developments."

The propaganda now being circulated against CVA misleadingly claims that a Columbia Valley Authority would be Federal tyranny. Quite the contrary is true. Today all the Federal agencies associated with the Columbia River must report to Washington for final decisions. No verdict of importance can be reached here in the Northwest. The Army engineers get their orders from the Secretary of War, the Bonneville Administration from the Secretary of the Interior—and many Government departments allow their men in the field scant latitude and independence. All basic policy matters must be referred to Washington, D. C.

Argument advanced for centrally located headquarters

CVA, on the other hand, would have its headquarters, right in the Northwest—at Portland or Seattle or Wenatchee or wherever else the headquarters was located. The three directors of CVA could make a decision at Portland or Wenatchee without having to report to any Cabinet officer. They would be responsible to the President and Congress. No Cabinet officer would stand between CVA and these elected representatives of the people.

The New York Times stated in January: "TVA has shown that Government itself can be decentralized. Its own roots are in the Tennessee Valley, not in Washington. The result is that after 11 years TVA has almost no enemies in its own territory. It is supported by chambers of commerce, by labor organizations, by farmers' organizations, and by men of widely differing political views.

One can only wish that our own chambers of commerce in the Pacific Northwest would show the far-sighted vision demonstrated by these chambers of commerce in the Tennessee Valley. Our region has existed economically for years by exploiting its basic resource—timber. Now the reserves of trees are running out. The United States Forest Service has been warning us that the annual rate of cutting far exceeds the rate of growth. Sawmills are closing down because no more logs are available.

Our principal economic hope rests in sound development of the resources of the Columbia River. Those resources are power for new industries' development, water for irrigation of arid land, deepened channels for low-cost navigation. This development must be cooperative, not competitive. We do not want one Government agency struggling for water for transportation and a rival agency insisting that the water is more essential for irrigation.

Tyranny charges discredited by CVA proponent

The sole chance of coordinating these activities lies in a Columbia Valley Authority.

Do not forget that many of the same individuals now opposing a CVA were also active in the fight to prevent full construction of Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams. (I do not include Judge Robert Sawyer in this group.) Some of these people did not want the lift locks built at Bonneville. Others among them scoffed at the idea of raising Coulee to full height and installing both powerhouses. One power company spokesman called Grand Coulee "this monstrous fraud on the American people."

Should we listen to these men when now they tell us that a Columbia Valley Authority is unwise and tyrannical? Are they interested in the future of the Pacific Northwest, or do they merely want to protect the private utility companies?

Charges of "tyranny," "centralized control," and "superbureaucracy" are being hurled against CVA. These charges have a familiar sound. All of us have been hearing the same noise ever since 1933. Have not identical accusations been made against every policy adopted by President Roosevelt? Were charges of "tyranny" not leveled against the Wagner act, against old-age pensions, against the Farm Security Administration, against the Securities and Exchange Commission, against all the Roosevelt laws which are now an accepted part of our national life?

Government given high praise for achievements

The attacks against the CVA speak alarmingly of "Federal domination." One would think that our Federal Government was an enemy lurking outside the gates. The Federal Government sent Lewis and Clark to explore the Oregon country. It built the greatest army and navy the world has ever seen, and it developed the atomic bomb. If the people of Oregon are not afraid to let the Federal Government come into their homes and send a son or brother off to the Arctic Circle or to the Tropics to fight for his country, then they are willing to let the Federal Government have charge of improving and managing the resources of the Columbia River.

In 1935 the late Ben T. Osborne told the foes of a Columbia Valley Authority: "This Federal Government of ours has furnished the very lifeblood that has kept the Nation alive in the last 2 or 3 years, and I still have a lot of confidence in it." This, of course, is the attitude of the men and women of the Northwest. They know that the Federal Government built Bonneville and Grand Coulee. They know that a regional authority is the one sure way to continue development of the Columbia Valley. Furthermore, they know that those who talk of "State's rights" never talk of "State's responsibilities." Have the so-called State's rights advocates ever generated a kilowatt of power or installed a single pumping station on the Columbia River?

Roosevelt visioned projects throughout Nation

We in the Northwest have before us the outstanding example of the TVA. Will we discard that example in favor of regional anarchy, or will we coordinate the development of the great natural resources of the Columbia Valley in a single integrated agency? The Wall Street Journal, organ of business, can set us right on the subject. "The proposal for TVA's in every important watershed of the country," said the Journal, "has a certain logical foundation. If TVA has been a good thing for the Tennessee River region, it should be a good thing for every other river region."

The future is in our own hands. We can succumb to the propaganda now being circulated against CVA. We can let the money which would finance CVA be spent in some other region. We can let our people stand in bread lines or sell apples. We also can demonstrate vision and insist upon the passage of the Mitchell-Jackson bill for a Columbia Valley Authority.

The late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, four times chosen by the voters of Oregon as the leader of our Nation, knew the right answer. When he established the TVA, President Roosevelt said: "If we are successful here, we can march on, step by step, in a like development of other great natural territory units within our borders."

And shortly before his death the President announced that the time had come to march on in other valleys by the creation of authorities similar to the TVA.

Mr. Roosevelt's message constitutes marching orders for a Columbia Valley Authority. The people of the Pacific Northwest will fall in step to this progressive cadence.

NO

(By Robert W. Sawyer)

("There is before you a major step in the basic reorganization of the Government of the United States as we have known it for the last 150 years," Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes testified on April 18, 1945, before a subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce of the U. S. Senate on the Missouri Valley Authority bill, S. 555.)

In May 1933 President Roosevelt signed the bill for the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The TVA, then, has been in existence and operating for just over 12½ years. It is now claimed that the undertaking has been wholly successful in all of its varied operations and proposals are pending for the creation of other valley authorities. There is a bill in the National House (H. R. 1824) that would divide the Nation into nine authority regions. Senator MURRAY, of Montana, has introduced a bill for an authority in the Missouri Valley (S. 555). There are bills for an Ohio and a Savannah Authority, while a Columbia Valley Authority is proposed in Representative HORAN'S H. R. 2923 and in Senator MITCHELL'S S. 460.

It is the Mitchell bill to which attention has been drawn in the Northwest. It is that bill that is under discussion here.

What form shall the discussion take?

Shall I attempt simply to analyze the Mitchell bill and show point by point what would happen in the Columbia region were the bill to become law?

Mr. Sawyer places authority under microscope

Shall I undertake to compare the Tennessee Valley with the Columbia region (please note those words "valley" and "region") and discuss the bill on the basis of that comparison? Shall I examine the TVA's claims of success to discover if the project actually has been successful and therefore has become an ideal pattern to be copied in the rest of the United States?

Well, perhaps a little of each and to begin with, since it is presented as the reason and the justification for the authority proposals, a short look at the "success" of the TVA.

Few, if any, activities of a Federal agency have enjoyed such vast and well-arranged publicity as has the TVA. It is an accepted fact, I believe, that Ivy Lee publicized John D. Rockefeller, Sr., into favorable acceptance by the American people. Using its own highly competent writing staff, TVA has done the job for itself. Depression born, its spending made work for thousands. The only vocal toes it stepped on, if I may mix the figure, were those of the private utilities and they, by reason of past mistakes of their own and cunning misrepresentation of their enemies, were in the dog house, where their cries were muffled.

All that the TVA produced was either given away or sold below cost. At a time when spending public funds, even at the expense of more debt and continued unbalanced Federal Budget, was popular, there were few to protest. Moreover, TVA pointed toward socialism (I quote from the Socialist Norman Thomas) and while the growing American left winged that way, that, to it, was success.

What about the "success" of the TVA? And first let me touch on one of the Authority's "successes" that it definitely does not publicize. I refer to its practice of doing its work by force account. There have been times when the TVA has had as many as 40,000 employees on its pay roll.

Now, the sound and recognized practice followed by other Government construction agencies—the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Federal Works Agency—is to prepare plans and specifications, to call for bids, and to award contracts to the lowest bidder. Thereby there are assured the safeguards provided by the preliminary preparation of complete blueprint and specification with a definite statement of the standards to be maintained throughout the job. Sound costs are determined. These are the protections ordinarily relied on in the expenditure of public funds. One test of success in such expenditure is whether the taxpayer gets his money's worth—a dollar's value for a dollar—a tax dollar—spent. Who can assert that the TVA has been successful in this regard?

Publisher says flood menace still in existence

TVA gives no publicity to the costs of the work it has done with a force-account pay roll. It does claim success in controlling floods in the valley of the Tennessee River. "Flood damage is at an end in the valley," say the proponents of TVA, "and it has been ended by the operations of the Authority." Certainly, if valley residents have been freed from the menace of floods, if they can go about their affairs no longer apprehensive of what may happen when the waters come down in spate, there is success. But what are the facts? The facts are, indeed, that the lowlanders are no longer subject to flood because they have been moved out—more than 56,000 of them, over 13,400 families—and nearly 600,000 acres of once-fertile land—the most productive in the valley—has been permanently flooded. An annual agricultural production of a value in excess of $13,000,000 has been ended by the immersion of these rich bottom lands. There has been a heavy tax loss. This does not represent success in a flood-control project. This is destruction, definite and final, brought about in the development of a series of power dams. There are, it is true, short sections of the river just below the dams where the possibility of flood damage has been reduced, but it is also true that Chattanooga is still in jeopardy from floods and the Army engineers have been called on to devise protection for that city under the very nose of the TVA.

TVA's largest investment is in facilities for the production of power—dams and generating plants. It is in the production of low-cost power that the greatest success is claimed for the TVA. The power program, it is said, is operating in the black.

Now, as I conceive it, the sale of electric power at low rates is not, in itself, proof or even evidence of success—unless, of course, it is a sale by a private utility that must succeed or go bankrupt—a contingency never faced by a publicly operated utility. Before

the Government sales agency can lay an honest claim to success it must show that its sales price equals or is not less than its cost. That, of course, is what TVA does claim. TVA asserts that its electric power operations show a return on the investment after all costs are met. Very well, what are the TVA costs? Do the users of TVA kilowatts pay in their rates the same charges that are paid by the users of privately produced kilowatts?

The answer is "No, they do not pay the same charges." TVA's rates do not reflect the operating expenses that are paid by a private utility. TVA operates in the black because of that fact. If TVA, like a private utility, paid interest on the money invested in its power plant; if TVA, like a private utility, paid local taxes on an ad valorem basis on its power plant; if TVA, like a private utility, paid income taxes; if TVA and the distributors of its product, like a private utility, paid Federal energy, social security, capital stock, franchise, unemployment insurance, gasoline, car use, motor vehicle, and other taxes—to say nothing of postage—it would not operate in the black unless it charged higher taxes. TVA's low rates reflect not success but subsidy. The taxpayers of the United States are paying a goodly share of the electric power costs in the Tennessee Valley.

Taxes listed as glaring weakness of set-up

That TVA and its defenders all realize the weakness of the Authority position in this matter of taxes is apparent from the way in which they all hasten to assert that TVA does pay taxes. Thus, William L. Chenery, publisher of Collier's, in an article laudatory of TVA, says that though it is an agency of the Government which may not be taxed, nevertheless, it "by a simple provision of the TVA Act, makes contribution in lieu of State and local taxes." On the subject of Federal tax avoidance Mr. Chenery is silent. He does say that "the total tax equivalents and taxes paid by the 83 municipal and 45 cooperative electric systems (that distribute TVA power) amounted to about 5.4 percent of their gross revenue for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944." Mr. Chenery, like so many others who write in defense of the TVA, thinks it important that the agency does pay something in the nature of taxes. None of these writers, however, though they compare TVA electric rates with those charged by the private utilities, goes so far as to mention the taxes that TVA does not and the private utilities do pay. The private utilities of the United States, in the period in which TVA paid 5.4 percent of its gross in lieu of taxes, paid out about 24 percent of their gross to tax collectors, local, State, and Federal.

The TVA record, I repeat, is one of subsidy rather than success.

This author, Chenery, by the way, writes of "the dams and powerhouses at the head (emphasis supplied) of these new (TVA) lakes"—an odd place, certainly, for dams and powerhouses. Chenery, I imagine, rather than TVA, is confused on this point, but his confusion raises doubts as to his powers of observation and understanding and places a question mark against all he has written.

Illiteracy declared high in TVA region

Space is lacking for a discussion of TVA's other lesser activities in which success is claimed. They are varied in an extreme degree. There are few, if any, for which the beneficiaries pay the full cost. In virtually every case, as in the power rates, there is a subsidy contributed by the Federal taxpayer. If, however, TVA has been successful in some of its undertakings that have improved the lot of the residents of the Tennessee Valley, is it indelicate to point to what it was that TVA had to work on—a population with an illiteracy running (1930 census; for some reason the figures were not taken in 1940) from a percentage of 6.6 in Kentucky, through 9.4 in Georgia, 10 in North Carolina, 12.6 in Alabama, to 13.1 in Mississippi—all TVA States).

In contrast note that the percentage of illiteracy in the Columbia region States was Oregon and Washington, 1; Idaho 1.1; and Montana 1.7. There were nearly five times more illiterates in Tennessee alone in 1930 than in these four Northwest States together.

On this whole subject of TVA success, let me quote from an authoritative witness, Representative ANDREW J. MAY, chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives and a Kentuckian living next door to the TVA. Before the committee hearing the Missouri Valley bill last spring Representative MAY said:

May branded Authority indisputable flop

"My purpose in appearing here is to present a factual challenge to the assumption that the Tennessee Valley Authority is, has, or ever will be, a success.

"I shall prove that the TVA is a failure—

"1. As a flood-control project the TVA has created a flood menace.

"2. As a soil-conservation project it has done more harm than it can ever possibly undo.

"3. In both of these activities TVA is wastefully duplicating the functions of two highly efficient existing Federal agencies—the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army and the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture.

"4. The TVA in reality is an antisocial institution, its evil effects far outweighing any social progress and reform it professes to have promoted.

"5. As a power project it is doomed to be a red-ink bureau and forever run a chronic deficit in spite of alleged paper profits.

"6. A clever combination of wishful thinking and fanciful conjecture has been crystallized in the public mind by adroit and tireless TVA propagandists to the effect that by TVA's power resources the Nation was 'bailed out' of its aluminum crisis for the war effort.

"7. Subsidized industrial power rates have proven a disappointment to those supporters of the TVA who believe that so-called cheap power would induce new industry into the TVA area.

"8. And, last but far from least, the authority type of Federal agency is a misbegotten offspring of collectivist thinking by which our constitutional system is by-passed and set aside by an authority with economic and political power beyond, above, and different from that of the individual States and the Federal departments as envisaged in the Constitution.

"The path of authoritarism leads to totalitarianism."

It is unnecessary to go into the details of Representative MAY's proof. The interested reader can find it in the record of the Commerce Committee hearing on the Missouri Valley Authority bill, S. 555. I urge that he do so.

And for a moment "reverting back," as a friend of mine used to say, let us look again at this claim of low rates on the part of the TVA. Let us look through the medium of these two quoted paragraphs:

"Domestic consumers under TVA rates used an average of 1,707 kilowatt-hours during the year (1944) and paid 1.88 cents per kilowatt-hour." (From article on TVA in Brittanica Book of the Year, 1945, p. 690.)

"The average price received per kilowatt-hour for residential service by the company in 1944 dropped from 2.03 cents to the low figure of 1.86 cents. * * * Average annual use of electricity by residential customers (was) 1,978 kilowatts." (From annual report of Pacific Power & Light Co. for 1944, p. 6.)

In connection with those figures please note that TVA's lieu tax payments were only about 5.4 percent of its gross revenue while P. P. & L. Co.'s were 16.5 percent.

George Flagg furnished figures on private power

For the same year, according to figures supplied by George H. Flagg, Oregon Public Utilities Commissioner, Portland General Electric received 1.75 cents per kilowatt-hour from its residential consumers and they used an average of 2,360 kilowatt-hours. PGE paid out in taxes 19.88 percent of its operating revenues.

Now the Mitchell bill for the Columbia Valley Authority has not yet come to a hearing. Those who study the measure, however, have the benefit of the testimony given in April before the Senate subcommittee on the very similar Missouri bill. It was there that Representative MAY made the statement just quoted. It was there that Secretary Ickes made this dramatic statement relating to all the Authority measures:

"This committee should not underestimate the magnitude of the task that is before it. You have before you not merely a question of establishing a single authority, for eventually the Congress will not do less for one watershed than for another. Therefore, there is before you a major step in the basic reorganization of the Government of the United States as we have known it for the last 150 years."

Mr. Ickes followed that statement with an expression of his own willingness to see this reorganization take place—if he could name the terms. What his terms are is unimportant here for his bill is not before us. It is important that he damned the Missouri Valley bill—important because his condemnation applies equally to the Columbia bill. Paraphrasing what he said of the Missouri bill, S. 460, is in essence an endeavor to create in the Columbia region an authority in the direct image of the TVA, although the problems of the Columbia region, the physical aspects of the Columbia region, the resources of the Columbia region, the manner of life in the Columbia region, are quite different from those of the Tennessee Valley. For example, the Columbia region, embracing almost one-tenth of the Nation, is composed entirely of States which entered the Union as public-land States, and some of which still contain large areas of public lands. The whole pattern of land management over wide sections of the region is in large measure a product of the public-land laws enacted by the Congress. On the other hand, the much smaller Tennessee Valley is not, in the main, a public-land area, and to much of it the public-land laws never did apply. The Tennessee Valley is also an area of ample rainfall. What is done to the waters of the Columbia region must be entirely different from what is done to the waters in the Tennessee Valley. The economic development of the two areas is in no way parallel. Rural electrification in the Columbia region, for example, is way ahead of the stage of development that existed in the Tennessee Valley when its Authority was born.

"A solution for one regional problem," Mr. Ickes said, "is not necessarily the exact solution for all others. A remedy for corns is not likely to be an effective cure for thinning hair. The fact that considerable success has been attained through avowedly experimental endeavors in the primarily southern valley does not mean that we should create agencies in the direct image of the Tennessee Valley Authority all over the West."

So much then for the success of the TVA as justifying other valley authorities and so much for the Ickes testimony. What about S. 460, the Mitchell bill itself?

Measure prepared by stranger to West, Sawyer says

S. 460 is a document of 75 pages. It was prepared, not of course by Senator MITCHELL, but by somebody who knew little and cared less for the democracy of the West, the State and Federal economic and legal relationship under which the West has developed and for

the West's background and long established culture and independence. Under section 1 (a) of the bill the region to be included in the authority control would include—not alone the valley of the Columbia and its tributaries as the authority name would indicate—but "that portion of the Columbia River, its tributaries, and watershed which is within the boundaries of the United States, those portions of the States of Oregon and Washington which are not within such watershed, and such additional adjoining territory as may be related to or materially affected by the development consequent to this act."

That clause from the Mitchell bill takes in a lot of territory. In Oregon besides the Columbia, the river valleys that would come under authority control would include the Klamath, the Chetco, the Pistol, the Rogue, the Smith, the Umpqua, the Alsea, the Siuslaw, the Yaquina, the Salmon, the Siletz, and the Wilson, to say nothing of numerous other rivers and creeks emptying into the Pacific Ocean. The Washington list is not as long, but the streams are no less important. The name "Columbia" attached to all these is deceptive. One of wider scope would be more honest. Where California's Smith River belongs in the authority set-up of S. 460 would take a law court to decide.

Let us look beyond this matter of a name, however, and note that in this fact that the valleys of many streams quite independent of the main river are covered by the proposed authority lies one of the initial differences between the proposed CVA and the TVA. Moreover, each stream, including the Columbia, covered by S. 460, finds its outlet in the ocean. Directly or through bay or harbor everyone flows into the Pacific, thereby creating problems unknown and undreamed of in the fresh water Tennessee Valley.

What success has TVA demonstrated in handling these problems of river and ocean? What values have been demonstrated by the TVA that justify substituting authority control in the place of that now held by Oregon's 18 port commissions? Plans for that control are in the bill. Section 20 provides that no "dock, pier, wharf, bridge, float (or) trestle * * * shall be constructed or operated or maintained over, across, along, in, or into any stream or watercourse in the Columbia Valley region, except in accordance with such regulations * * * as may be prescribed by the corporation." Moreover, it is provided that "The requirements of this section shall be in addition to the requirements of all other applicable laws of the United States or of any State. * * *" The authority corporation would overlay the presently sufficient laws with new ones of its own.

I wonder how the State highway commission and the county courts would like the idea of having to go to authority headquarters, possibly in another State, to have their bridge plans approved?

Control draws question from publisher

I wonder how this prospect of authority control, in addition to such regulation as is now effective, is regarded by the many Oregonians, private citizens and business interests, who now own and use recreation and business property such as is covered by that section 20?

Is such authority regulation desired by such men as R. C. Elliott, of Gold Beach; Robert Owens, of Wedderburn; R. T. Meservey, of Illahe; E. J. Oakland and Charles Bulkley, of Waldport; Harry Olsen, of Newport; R. D. Shirmer, of Yaquina; George Calkins, of Otis; E. M. Gerttula, of Kernville; Lee Griner, of Florence; Earl Hill, of Cushman; Earl Madsen, of Lakeside; Earl Hallmark, of Charleston and by such interests as Columbia River Packers, of Astoria, and Al Pierce Co., of Coos Bay, to name but a few of the many along the Oregon coast who would be affected by this proposed legislation?

How would property owners on Lake Oswego like it?

Authority over the region would be exercised by a board of three named by the President for 9-year terms but of no required qualifications other than citizenship and a belief in the wisdom of the act. There are provisions for an advisory board—with no effective power—and a National River Basin Development Board headed by the Secretary of the Interior. Once the plans of the authority are approved he, rather than the Congress, will have control of the organization, thus effecting the "basic reorganization of the Government of the United States" as described by Mr. Ickes.

It would be tedious to outline the provisions of S. 460 clause by clause. Here, however, is a summary of the chief powers given in the bill to the authority board as presented last March in an Oregonian editorial wisely titled, "Columbia Superstate":

"To sell surplus water as well as electric energy; to make and sell fertilizers; to establish, maintain, and operate game farms, wildlife preserves and fish-culture stations; to exercise the same powers as the Interior Secretary, Director of Grazing, Agriculture Secretary, and Chief Forester over grazing and forest practices; to establish, maintain, and operate recreational facilities; to develop mining techniques and sell minerals found or purchased; to construct and operate flood-control projects, including but not limited to dams, locks, reservoirs, fishways, canals, roads, docks, sewage disposal, water purification, sanitation works, powerhouses, steam-generating plants, transmission lines, rural electric lines; to assist and give credit to groups constructing water and electric distribution facilities; to experiment with and demonstrate farming processes, and sell plants, grasses, trees."

Go over that list again, gentle reader, and consider how many of your affairs, if the bill becomes law, would come under the control of the authority board. Do you like the prospect?

You will note that that list begins with the phrase "to sell surplus water." The words connote sovereignty over the waters of the Columbia region and that is a proposition that is resisted by every State-rights man, every stockman, every irrigator west of the Mississippi River. Here, indeed, there develops another of the more important points of difference between the Tennessee and the Columbia region—a basic, a fundamental difference—a difference so extreme that even the Oregon State Grange, otherwise favoring the bill, has demanded of Senator MITCHELL that his measure be changed to give it recognition.

The point is simply that one type of water law prevails in the Tennessee Valley; another and a different one in the Columbia. The TVA has had no experience with this western water law. No claims of success in this regard can be made for the TVA. The Western States, on the other hand, have developed a body of water law that S. 460 would sweep away, substituting for the present intimate, local control the regulation of some new and distant authority. Not one of TVA's glib propagandists, writing to urge a MVA, or a CVA, after the pattern of that eastern experiment, has noted this difference in the water laws of the two regions or proposed protection for the western economy that is based on that different legal status of water.

Look again through that list of powers as set out in that Oregonian editorial. Observe that S. 460 not only puts western water rights in jeopardy. Under the bill those distinctly western activities associated with the public domain such as grazing and mining would cease to be regulated as at present and would fall into authority hands. The Forest Service now operating as a national bureau but fully decentralized would be broken up. So would the Fish and Wildlife Service. So would the Bureau of Mines. So would the Bureau of Reclamation. So would the Corps of Engineers, so far as its river and harbor and flood-control functions are concerned.

Why?

I have said that the Columbia region, as defined in S. 460, takes in a lot of territory. The figure is 279,000 square miles or nearly three and one-half times TVA's 81,000. That TVA size, according to Chairman David Lilienthal, is about right. "Substantial additions to the territorial scope of the TVA," he has written, "would impair its effectiveness and threaten the onset of the evils of remoteness. * * *" "Regions," he says, "should not be so large that they are not, in a management sense, of workable size. The full potentialities of the unified approach to resources and the opportunity to be close to the people and their problems may be fatally impaired if the region itself is a vast one."

How large is "vast" Mr. Lilienthal does not say, but on the strength of his word as to the size of the TVA region it is obvious that the Columbia region of S. 460 is too large.

How much too large the Columbia region is would soon be discovered by its citizens when they had to do business with its office "centrally located in the territory." Do Oregonians want to go to Spokane, say, or to Walla Walla or Boise to attend to such of their business as the authority would control? Do they want to have all legal causes developing in the operation of the law tried in a Federal court as provided in the bill and that in the district where the authority has its principal office? All their procedures with respect to water are now carried out within the boundaries of the State through the State engineer, the local water master, or the circuit court at the county seat. S. 460 would force a change to some new procedure more difficult, slower, and more costly and completely deprive the State courts of the jurisdiction they now enjoy.

The financial provisions of S. 460 are interesting. Today local government agencies share in certain of the income derived from federally owned land. With the enactment of S. 460, that income would be gone. The authority, under the bill, may withhold every penny of income for use in its operations, thus by-passing Congress and ending popular control of the public purse.

Senator Taylor describes authorities as being socialistic

Norman Thomas, Socialist leader, has said that the TVA "exemplifies what Socialists might do, and the technique they would use in the process." Senator GLEN TAYLOR, of Idaho, said on the floor of the Senate in September: "I will admit that these projects (the valley authorities) are socialistic. There is no use beating around the bush about it. They are socialistic, but they will provide abundant cheap power."

Well, the Northwest already had abundant cheap power at less than TVA rates, and more is coming as river development under Army engineer and Reclamation Bureau plans now formulating are executed. No CVA is necessary to bring about Senator TAYLOR'S power goal. Would the Northwest accept this socialistic, totalitarian program outlined in the Mitchell bill even to secure more and cheaper power? Would it willingly see its State rights in water ended, its neighborly relations with present Federal agencies broken, its financial stake in the national forests and the grazing lands taken away, its whole economy placed in the hands of three overlords?

President Truman has given his approval to the valley authority idea. His latest word on the subject was spoken at Gilbertsville, Ky., on October 10, but in the course of the address he made on that day he said, "Let me emphasize that in the last analysis such development is a matter for the people themselves to decide." S. 460 gives the people no

opportunity to decide. It is a bill with the cunning purpose of ending the people's opportunity and right to decide.

In that same address the President said of TVA, "It is an important experiment in democracy." Well, the Constitution of the United States still remains the expression of an important experiment in democracy, and remember that in the valley authority bills "you have before you a major step in the basic reorganization of the Government of the United States as we have known it for the last 150 years."

Has the experiment of the organization set up under the Constitution failed?

If we are to have valley authorities, let everything be put out on the board at once. Let the bill makers get together and draw for the people in one measure the authority control for every river basin in the country. Then let them follow the Truman advice and make it a matter for the people themselves to decide.

Control of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 5, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, on November 23, 1945, I submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

Whereas in the atomic bomb there has been unleashed the most destructive force known to mankind, in the production of which the United States can have no enduring monopoly and against which there is no specific military defense; and

Whereas any effort to pursue a foreign policy based on our temporary superiority in atomic weapons will force other nations as well as ourselves into an atomic armaments race, thereby creating a world of fear and hatred in which nations great and small face sudden destruction; and

Whereas the fundamental aim of United States foreign policy is to have world peace, an aim which cannot be achieved by the United States alone or by any other country by itself, but only through maintaining and strengthening the cooperation and unity of the peace-loving peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the United Nations Organization cannot function successfully unless the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union cooperate on all major issues: Therefore be it

Resolved, That prior to any attempt to set up specific international machinery for dealing with atomic energy the President of the United States immediately invite to a conference the Governments of Great Britain and the Soviet Union, in order to discuss the common danger created by atomic weapons, and to plan for the joint approach by these three nations to the other members of the United Nations Organization for establishing a world-wide system of international cooperation and control of atomic energy to the end of preventing a competitive armaments race and safeguarding peace.

On the evening of November 23 I was invited to appear on the American Broadcasting Co.'s program, Headline Edition, to speak on this resolution. I should like to include here a transcript of that program:

Mr. LEITCH. Mrs. DOUGLAS, will you tell us just why you believe we should invite Russia into a three-power conference on the atomic bomb?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The fact is relations between the Big Three—Great Britain, the United States, and the Soviet Union—have become strained. Read your newspapers, columnists, the radio commentators. Listen to Members of the House and of the Senate. Listen to the people on the street.

No nation alone can keep peace. It was agreed at San Francisco that it was only through the Security Council that we could keep the peace. The Big Three are the core of the Security Council. They are the core because they are the only nations capable today of making war or making peace on a world scale.

If we want peace, we must see to it that neither the atomic bomb of today nor bacteriological warfare of tomorrow or any other problem which may come up weakens the unity and the understanding and the cooperation between the Big Three.

Mr. LEITCH. Going a step further, Mrs. DOUGLAS, would you make available to Russia the secret of the atomic bomb?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. There isn't any secret. There are atoms in every country and there are scientists in every country. The basic discoveries which led up to the making of the bomb were made in foreign laboratories. The information—the discoveries themselves were widely published before 1940. Moreover, some of the most important men who helped us make the bomb were foreigners and some have gone back home. Do you think they are not talking back home?

The only advantage we have at this moment is the mechanical know-how of putting the bomb together and a slight manufacturing advantage. However, it is agreed by the scientists that any industrial nation can catch up with this know-how in from 2 to 5 years.

When Russia knows how to make the bombs, what then? Do we go to war? The boys who are just getting out of the Army and the Navy—will they like that? Do we start all over again in 5 years? What do we do then? We will still have to fight it out or work it out together. We must work out safeguards to see that atomic energy is used for constructive and not destructive purposes internationally. We must work them out together. We must begin with the Big Three.

Mr. LEITCH. Well, Mrs. DOUGLAS, in view of what many people in this country believe is a decided reluctance on the part of Russia to establish any real basis of cooperation with Britain and us, why should we make the first move?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Because we don't want to go to war. And as for Russia's willingness to cooperate, the facts don't bear out the fear that Russia is not as desirous for peace as we are. We are the most powerful nation in the world. We dropped the bomb. If we don't work out a control for this bomb now—if we wait the 2 or 5 or 10 years when Russia has it—it only means that between now and then that much more fear and hate and distrust have been allowed to develop. It will only mean that achieving cooperation will be that much more difficult. We still have to fight it out or live it out together.

This resolution was based upon the scientists' recommendation which had been endorsed by 132 scientists. I am happy to say that my resolution now has the endorsement of the Federation of Atomic Scientists. The telegram which I received is as follows:

Your resolution introduced on November 23 has the approval of Federation of Atomic Scientists representing more than 1,000 scientists at major sites of the atomic bomb projects.

The Federation of Atomic Scientists was formed by representatives of the association of scientists who have worked on the atomic bomb. Six associations make up the federation. They were organized to achieve the following aims:

First. To study the implications to our Nation and to the world of the liberation of nuclear energy.

Second. To create a realization of the dangers that this Nation and all civilization will face if the tremendous destructive potential of nuclear energy is misused.

Third. To help establish an atmosphere of world security in which the beneficial possibilities of nuclear energy may be developed.

Fourth. To study the relation between national legislation and the establishment of an adequate international policy.

And to give all possible publicity to the following convictions:

First. That a continuing monopoly of the atomic bomb by the United States is impossible.

Second. That there can be no specific defenses against the destructive effects of the atomic bomb.

Third. That in view of the existence of the atomic bomb, no nation can, in this new age, feel secure until the problem of the control of atomic power is solved on a world level.

The council of the federation will consist of those delegates of the four component associations who are in Washington at any given time. It is intended that one such member from each association should be present in Washington at all times and two will frequently be present. There will be a central office which will act primarily as headquarters for the association. It will also serve as an information and speakers' bureau and will handle contacts with other groups which hold views similar to those of the federation.

The Washington office shall be made available to all scientists' organizations in America which find it necessary to have the same information that the council is to supply to the four associations. Many of these newly formed groups have the same aims and purposes as this federation.

This federation is composed of representatives from the Association of Oak Ridge Scientists at Clinton Laboratories, the Atomic Scientists of Chicago, the Association of Los Alamos Scientists, the Association of Manhattan Project Scientists, New York City Area; the Atomic Production Scientists, Oak Ridge, and the Atomic Engineers, Oak Ridge.

I also heard from such men as Dr. Irving Langmuir, of the General Electric Co., in Schenectady, N. Y., who wired as follows:

Send my enthusiastic endorsement of your resolution.

Dr. Albert Einstein sent this telegram:

Agree whole-heartedly with text of your resolution and am glad to give permission to quote my endorsing it.

Others who sent me their individual endorsements included such men as Dr. Harold Urey, Nobel prize winner, discoverer of heavy water, professor of chemistry, University of Chicago; P. W. Bridgman, famous for work on properties of materials under high pressure; A. P.

Wigner, professor mathematical physics, Princeton; James Franck, Nobel prize winner, professor of physical chemistry, University of Chicago; Glenn T. Seaborg, who recently announced discovery of two new elements; and W. D. Bonner, head of the Department of Chemistry, University of Utah.

Such organizations as the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions have endorsed the resolution. Also the newspaper the Oregonian, whose editorial of November 20 I quote:

LET'S TALK IT OUT

HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, Democratic Congresswoman from California, has introduced into the House a resolution asking that President Truman call an immediate conference of the Governments of the United States, Russia, and Britain, to consider the problems of atomic energy. The conference would be planned as a preliminary to submitting the whole matter to the United Nations, "to the end of establishing a system of international cooperation and control which will prevent a competitive armaments race, safeguard world peace, and make available to all peoples the peacetime benefits of atomic energy."

The resolution should pass.

Not that we think the United States, Britain, and Canada should immediately present the manufacturing secrets of the atomic bomb to Russia on a silver platter, or any other kind of a platter. But Messrs. Truman, Attlee, and King have made it sufficiently clear that they believe in the world-wide use of atomic knowledge if sufficient safeguards can be imposed. And how can it be determined whether Russia is willing to provide these safeguards if we do not get together with Russia and find out?

Chief among the safeguards, as this page repeatedly has argued, must be freedom of information. We must know what is going on in Russia and the Russian people should know what is going on with us. The Governments of the United States, Britain, and Canada appear to subscribe to this view. But the time to pursue the issue is now. We hope that Mrs. DOUGLAS' fair and well-worded resolution forces a showdown.

Commander Michael A. Musmanno

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 5, 1945

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the story of the public relations section of the Fifth Army in Italy, written for the Fifth Army News at the time of the assignment to Austria of Commander Michael A. Musmanno of the United States Naval Reserve, naval liaison officer.

Pittsburgh and Allegheny County, Pa., are proud of their fellow citizen and judge of the Common Pleas Court of Allegheny County, and I know his many friends and admirers join me in this tribute to his outstanding war record. We await Commander Musmanno's return from the Navy but in the meantime we offer this sincere tribute:

After 20 months of service with the Fifth Army, Commander Michael A. Musmanno, of Pittsburgh, Pa., leaves this famous fighting organization to serve with the United States forces in Austria.

Commander Musmanno, who in civil life is a common-pleas judge in Allegheny County, Pa., has had an adventurous career in the Navy, most of which, however, has been on land. After several months of deck duty in convoy work on the Atlantic and the Caribbean, he was assigned to the Italian theater, where his experiences included such extremes as running the enchanting Sorrentine Peninsula in the capacity of military governor to flying over enemy lines in observation planes.

At Minturno, while engaged in a mission with Fifth Army troops, he was wounded, but he succeeded in carrying out his mission, for which exploit he was awarded the coveted Bronze Star. December 2, 1943, found him in Bari Harbor with a schooner laden with food for the population of Sorrento. In the daring German air attack which sank 17 large ships, Commander Musmanno lost his craft and was thrown into the sea which was ablaze with burning oil. For his efforts in the venture, though it turned out unsuccessfully, the Italian Government awarded him the Medal of Valor. In the front line with the Eighty-fifth Division at Mount Formichi he was wounded in the knee by an aerial-bomb fragment.

While military governor of the Sorrentine Peninsula he earned the good will of the population who in recognition named one of the main piazzas in his honor. He is keenly remembered here for the work he did in the early days of the occupation in repairing bridges blown by the enemy, reactivating public utilities, bringing in food, establishing economic order and system.

During the Vesuvian eruption he had a narrow escape when a storm of volcanic ashes buried the car in which he was riding.

In Florence he served as assistant to Brig. Gen. E. E. Hume, Chief of Allied Military Government in all territory under the jurisdiction of the Fifth Army.

Commander Musmanno also acted as naval liaison officer with army units in the field. During the Bologna campaign he served for 2 months with an Italian Army division attached to the Fifth Army, participating in various actions, including patrol missions at night.

The nature of Musmanno's duties with the United States forces in Austria has not been disclosed.

Report on American-Italian Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 5, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the report of the Council for American-Italian Affairs, Inc., dated December 1, 1945, as follows:

Since the people of Italy joined us in the war against the Axis, they have paid a high price for their freedom.

More than 250,000 Italians lost their lives in action against our common enemy. More than a billion dollars worth of goods and services have been rendered to the cause, $650,000,000 of which were procured with Allied military lire, about $350,000,000 requisitioned or furnished without payment.

These contributions to the victory of the United Nations have been duly recognized. The Allied Commission in Italy stated on October 25, 1944. "The Italian Army has been reorganized out of chaos. It has cooperated loyally with us. * * * The Italian Air Force has considerable results to its credit, and its significant contributions to the Allied war effort should never be forgotten. The Italian Navy has given an enormous contribution to the war effort of the Allies since the day of the armistice."

General Clark thanked the Italian partisans for liberating more than 200 cities, including Milan, Turin, Genoa, and Venice, while General Alexander told the British Parliament that the resistance movement of the Italian partisans was the strongest resistance in all Europe.

Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson stated on September 30, 1945, "Italy turned against the oppressor and Italian troops have fought shoulder to shoulder with the Allies to drive the Nazis from Italian soil. At great risk and sacrifice the people and partisans of northern Italy prepared the way for the collapse of Nazi power and the destruction of the Mussolini government."

With these contributions well in mind, high officials of the United States Government have made frequent statements charting the course of our relations with Italy. Acting Secretary of State Joseph C. Grew stated on May 31, 1945:

"Our policy toward Italy has from the beginning been based on the view that Italy should be given every possible opportunity consonant with the Allied military requirements to regain the respect of the world by proving that she is a democratic, cooperative, constructive element in Europe. * * * In the past 20 months the Italian people have given substantial evidence of their love of freedom, attachment to democratic principles, and ability to rise above the shambles of fascism and ruins of war."

United States officials have not hesitated to state that Italy should be aided in its recovery from war devastation. Said Under Secretary of State Acheson recently, "It is in our own interest to grant such aid. This cannot, however, be economic aid on the simple order of charity. It must be such as at a critical time will enable the Italian people to get back on their own feet; it must be essentially creating the opportunity for them to rebuild their devastated agriculture, industry, and commerce."

Despite these statements, aid to Italy is dwindling. There is acute danger that the supply line will be snapped off completely on December 31, 1945. The supplies will be kept moving only if interested Americans demand that they be kept moving.

It would be difficult to exaggerate the plight of the people of Italy as winter deepens. Official United States Government and UNRRA reports all tell of desperate shortages, widespread poverty, increasing unemployment. War destruction, demolition, and looting by the Nazis, and Fascist corruption have combined to inflict enormous damages upon the Italian economy. There are enormous shortages of food, clothing, shoes, shelter, fuel, raw materials. More than 5,000,000 people are homeless; 350,000 are refugees. The average official daily ration is less than 1,000 calories—only 40 percent of the 2,600 required to provide health.

The need for medical supplies is acute. There are about 1,500,000 cases of malaria in Italy. The incidence of tuberculosis is three timess the prewar rate. The death rate of new-born Italian babies is appalling.

The cost of living has skyrocketed. Present unemployment is around 2,000,000, and by midwinter two of every five Italian workers will be jobless.

Destruction of transportation and industrial facilities has reduced recovery to a snail's pace. Ninety-four percent of the power plants in central Italy alone were put out of commission by the Nazis, and only part of them could be repaired. Rolling

stock on the Italian railways is exceedingly scarce. Most transportation must be done by truck, but there is almost no gasoline. The Italian merchant marine, which totaled 3,500,000 tons before the war, has been almost entirely eliminated.

Even in factories not destroyed, production is practically dead for lack of coal and raw materials. Before the war Italian coal imports averaged about 1,000,000 tons a month at present she obtains less than half that amount. A few days ago a newspaper in Turin carried this headline: "Turin's Industrial has only 60 percent of needed coal supplies and 15 percent of needed gasoline."

Most Italian textile factories are intact, but lack of raw cotton and raw wool, besides lack of coal, has prevented any substantial recovery of this vital industry. In normal times it provided work for hundreds of thousands of men and women, and fed a large export trade.

The rayon industry is virtually at a dead stop for lack of cellulose and coal.

Agriculture has suffered gravely, due to prolonged lack of fertilizer, the drafting of manpower, and the worst drought in 20 years. Mines have added greatly to the damage. So has the flooding of reclaimed soil. The large-scale requisitioning and slaughter of livestock and draft animals during the period of military occupation—in part due to desperate efforts to fight off starvation—has caused the disappearance of several million farm animals. The total damage to agriculture since Italy went to war has amounted to billions of dollars, according to UNRRA.

If the Italian economy is to begin to be able to stand on its own feet by the end of 1946, almost 1,000,000 tons of coal and 250,000 tons of wheat are needed every month until the next crop. Requirements include 200,000 tons of raw textiles, particularly cotton and wool, and enormous quantities of fertilizer, a limited amount of farm machinery, seeds, and other supplies, and a substantial number of farm animals. Also, medical supplies for the ill, fats, oils, meats, fish, dairy products, and sugar for the hungry, and copper, steel, and pig iron for idle industry.

There is no possibility that Italy will receive all these things. Estimates of Italy's bare minimum needs in 1946 range from $1,800,000,000 to $1,200,000,000. Take the latter figure based on the requirements estimated by our own Foreign Economic Administration. How might $1,200,000,000 be supplied?

Italy can count on some immigrant remittances of dollar funds in 1946—but total immigrant remittances since the armistice amount to little over $40,000,000. American War Relief for Italy, a private agency that has done a brilliant job, has sent $30,000,000—mostly in the form of powdered milk, old and new clothing and shoes, and medical supplies. Additional relief has gone to Italy in individual packages sent by Italian-Americans to their relatives and friends. Taking into consideration these and other potential sources of aid, suppose that in 1946 Italy obtains the following:

In immigrant remittances	$25,000,000
From American War Relief	25,000,000
In foreign credits from some revival of Italy's now stagnant foreign trade	100,000,000
In contributions from England and other countries	100,000,000
In long-term credits	500,000,000
From UNRRA	450,000,000
Total	1,200,000,000

The total of $1,200,000,000 would meet Italy's minimum requirement—but all of the above figures are conceived in optimism. Some of them might not materialize.

Obviously, Italy will be condemned to widespread suffering, with dangerous social, economic, and political consequences, if the $450,000,000 UNRRA program is eliminated, curtailed, or even delayed.

There is at least a possibility that the program will be eliminated. There is considerable probability that it will be curtailed. It is already being delayed.

A measure in the United States Congress providing that this country contribute its agreed quota to UNRRA in 1946 by subscribing 1 percent of its estimated national income—a total of $1,350,000,000, with $450,000,000 planned for Italy—is facing serious opposition. The measure is making tragically slow progress through Congress. That it has not been already enacted jeopardizes the supply line to Italy and other nations.

Already, action on the appropriation for $550,000,000 to complete the United States subscription to UNRRA for 1945 (only a negligible part of which goes to Italy) has been delayed in Congress with tragic results. UNRRA has been forced to cancel $50,000,000 orders for medicine, clothing, and other critical supplies, and $50,000,000 worth of United States Army supplies already in Europe are being withheld from starving people until the United States keeps its promise.

Graves are being dug in Europe now for the people who will die there this winter for lack of supplies.

Gov. Herbert Lehman, Director General of UNRRA, testified before Congress:

"I cannot too strongly emphasize that the program for Italy as well as elsewhere will depend on UNRRA being given adequate funds by its member nations. I saw in Italy some of the most pathetic sights I have ever witnessed. I saw houses that were completely destroyed save for one little corner; the people had moved back into that little corner and were trying to eke out a living. I visited refugee camps which were conducted by the Italian Government, but with supplies furnished by UNRRA and under the observation of UNRRA. I will say that the Italian Government has been cooperating splendidly with UNRRA and has been helping the situation there and has been furnishing a great deal of their own money—local currency, of course, because that is all they have got—for the procurement of relief supplies.

"I went over the economic situation; and I am convinced that in Italy, as in other countries, unless aid is given them, and by aid I mean not only food, which, of course, is the most important thing, but other means of supplementing their economic recovery—fuel, which I place at the very top of the list of needs, and raw materials, by which they can begin some work in the manufacture of things of important use by the people of Italy—unless that is done, they are in for a great deal of suffering during the winter, and I am quite convinced that there would result serious social unrest, if not chaos."

The United States actually possesses surpluses of many of the supplies so badly needed in Europe. On November 18, Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson revealed that we have produced a third more food in 1945 than in the average prewar year. He declared, "The United States is one of the relatively few nations that has plenty of food for itself and some to spare for its allies. * * * The United States and its allies made the greatest sacrifice of lives in all history to keep their freedom and to win the opportunity for a lasting peace. America fought, but help to a lot of hungry and homeless can be one of the most powerful forces of the world for clinching that great victory into a lasting peace. That is why we pledged ourselves to help our allies to the limit of our strength."

Congressman JERRY VOORHIS, of California, said recently, "Right now there is in prospect another great glut of eggs; there is the largest citrus fruit crop in history coming along. What are we going to do? Will we see our farmers' prices collapse and what is even worse see people hungry for what we have in superabundance? However peace is to be built, it cannot be done that way. Food for the hungry is, I firmly believe, in accordance with the will of most of the American people in this hour * * *. America, after all, carries the banner of human freedom, constitutional democracy, and the dignity of the individual man or woman. The rest of the world is going to judge those institutions largely by what America does in this crisis."

The House Special Committee on Post War Economic Policy and Planning stated in a recent report, "It has been said, in favor of maintaining our postwar exports at the present level, that the industries supplying most of our present exports are the heavy-goods industries which will suffer most from a reduction in war expenditures. It is the output of these industries which will be most in demand for the reconstruction of devastated areas, and for the industrialization of undeveloped countries. If exports are maintained at the present level, the process of transition from a war economy to a peace economy will therefore be much less difficult; fewer industries will suddenly be deprived of markets, and less painful movements of population will be necessary."

Little of the opposition to UNRRA is open. Opposition takes the form of criticism of the administration of UNRRA. And it takes substance in amendments to the legislation providing for American participation. It is privately admitted that the "free-press amendment" to the UNRRA appropriation, for example, is actually an effort to delay if not to kill the UNRRA appropriation.

Governor Lehman does not hesitate to admit UNRRA errors. "Of course, UNRRA has made mistakes," he told the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. "It tackled a job of a nature and scope never attempted in the world before. It began its task while war was still on and when it had to compete usually with little success with the armed forces for food and other supplies, for shipping with which to send them abroad, and for personnel to handle the relief job."

General Eisenhower told the committee that the ravaged nations are looking to UNRRA for relief and added, "If UNRRA were to fail them, they could not help but feel that not only has the United States failed them, but that the hope of solution of world problems through the United Nations action was an illusory one."

A summation of this critical situation as it affects the relations of the United States with Italy is contained in a statement made to the Council for American-Italian Affairs by E. H. Hunt, Chief of the Italian Division of the Foreign Economic Administration:

"A dangerous situation confronts the Italian supply operation. Since the Sicilian invasion in 1943, the Americans, British, and Canadians have been jointly responsible for civilian supplies to Italy, justifying these supplies in their effect on civilian morale while our armies are in that country. Actual military responsibility for handling civilian supplies was terminated on August 31, and, in the case of the United States, a $100,000,000 appropriation administered by the Italian Division of the Foreign Economic Administration has carried basic civilian supplies to Italy since that date. This money, however, will all be spent by December 31.

"The failure to vote additional funds for UNRRA, which was expected to undertake this responsibility as of January 1, 1946, seems certain to result in an interruption of supplies at the most critical period of the winter. Governor Lehman testified before the House Appropriations Committee that he would not undertake the expanded Italian program without a new authorization. Passage of such an authorization, calling for an additional 1 percent of the national income, or $1,350,000,000, for UNRRA is making slow progress in Congress. At the present rate, it seems impossible to hope that the authorization can be passed by both Houses

of Congress and signed by the President before the 1st of January.

"If such a failure occurs, an alternative method must be found. The obvious thing would be to continue for another 3-month period the present program of civilian supplies through which Italy's basic needs are being met. This would call for an estimated $150,000,000."

A former American foreign correspondent in Italy, Lt. John Atkinson, Army of the United States, returned to this country a few days ago after more than 2 years' service in Italy with Allied Military Government and as United States military aide to Harold MacMillan, British Minister in the Mediterranean and President of the Allied Commission. Shocked by news that the UNRRA appropriation was facing opposition, Lieutenant Atkinson gave this statement to the Council for American-Italian Affairs:

"The worried faces of Italian fathers, the anxious faces of Italian mothers, and the pinched faces of Italian children haunt me now with the memory of American promises that still remain to be filled. The faces look at me out of the remains of thousands of war-ravaged homes and villages and towns and cities, and they all ask the same question: 'Will the American ships with food and clothing keep coming?' 'Yes,' I told them then, and I keep praying that they will.

"America must keep her promise, first for Italian lives, and then for their liberty as well as ours."

The Senate Verdict on UNO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 5, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the New York Times of December 5, 1945:

THE SENATE VERDICT ON UNO

A week of debate on the United Nations participation bill, which the Senate passed last night 65 to 7 and sent to the House, has been enough to measure the strength of isolationist sentiment in the Senate. At no time have the isolationists been able to muster one-sixth of the Senators in support of any amendment which would seriously weaken the Charter.

One of Senator TAFT'S amendments, innocuous in its terms, slightly exceeded this fraction—it received 18 votes. Senator DONNELL'S proposal that agreements to furnish armed contingents to UNO be ratified as a treaty by a two-thirds vote of the Senate was killed by 57 nays to 14 yeas. The principle of majority rule was thus sustained in a chamber in which 33 Members, voting under the treaty-making clause, can defeat the will of the other 63. Senate confirmation of all appointees from this country to the new world organization which was accepted by the majority yesterday, is on a different footing. Certainly it does not weaken our participation. By requiring careful scrutiny of all appointees it will even give added dignity to our representatives.

This debate has stirred up nothing like the interest shown in the League debates of 1919 and 1920. Last Friday the Senate recessed in the middle of it because of an almost empty chamber. The reason for this apathy may be that the conclusion was foregone. The isolationists wished to have their say, and had it. They did not judge it wise to filibuster. Their strategy last July was to vote for the Charter and try to weaken it when the participation bill came up. Their strategy now may be to register their objections and hope for a change of popular sentiment which will let them do some undermining later on. They may count on a growing American disillusionment with our allies, and indeed with practically everything going on in the world beyond our own frontiers.

If full American participation in the United Nations was part of a beautiful dream of heaven on earth they might succeed. There is nothing like the aftermath of battle to make heaven on earth seem impracticable. But Utopia is not in many persons' minds at the moment. UNO is the best instrument in sight, indeed the only one, for preventing hell on earth. The alternative to UNO is not something better, but something far worse. Nor can we give lip service to UNO and put our real faith in armaments. Without UNO the armaments in question will be as fatal to those who use them as those at whom they are aimed.

UNO finds acceptance in the Senate, will find acceptance in the House, and has the support of the American people because we all know the world cannot afford another war. There is really no longer an issue of isolationism versus internationalism. As Americans we want to run our own affairs as independently as we can. We do not love our neighbors better than ourselves. But we have found out by hard experience that for our own sake, if for no nobler reason, we have got to make some sacrifice in order to get on with our neighbors. UNO as it stands is evidence that our neighbors have made the same discovery. This inescapable reasoning seems to be behind the debate in Washington—behind its slow pace and also behind its sure end.

Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 5, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter and resolutions expressing the opinions of some distinguished scientists at the University of Minnesota on the control of atomic energy:

NOVEMBER 9, 1945.

Hon. WALTER JUDD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JUDD: At a recent meeting of some of the scientists of the University of Minnesota, sponsored by the Minnesota Association of Scientific Workers, a set of resolutions concerning the control of atomic energy was adopted. I am enclosing a copy of these resolutions along with a list of the scientists who signed these resolutions with the hope that these resolutions along with others of similar nature, will aid in the formulation of a sound policy in this vitally important question.

Very truly yours,

Prof. WILLEM J. LUYTEN,
President, Minnesota Association Scientific Workers, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

Inasmuch as no steps have as yet been taken for the international control of atomic energy, and whereas the proper solution of how best to use our knowledge of such atomic energy is the most urgent question of the time; be it

Resolved by the undersigned scientists of the University of Minnesota meeting under the auspices of the Minnesota Chapter of the American Association of Scientific Workers, That:

1. The responsibility for control of atomic bombs and of the application of the processes involved to weapons of warfare be vested in the Security Council of the United Nations Organization.

2. We urge the President of the United States to appoint immediately a commission composed of the most competent scientists and statesmen and to urge the formation of similar commissions by the governments of other great powers, in order that these commissions may meet and develop the specific pattern for such control.

Whereas the proposed May-Johnson bill includes serious restrictions on the dissemination of purely scientific information, and whereas such restrictions will inevitably lead to a deterioration in the quality and quantity of fundamental scientific research and whereas such legislation will pit our country against the world in an armament race, and, furthermore, would place our country at a disadvantage in such race: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the undersigned scientists of the University of Minnesota, meeting under the auspices of the Minnesota Chapter of the American Association of Scientific Workers, hereby condemn such legislation; be it further

Resolved, That copies of the above resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the House and Senate Military Affairs Committees, and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *November 1, 1945.*

In view of the increasing importance to human welfare of scientific advances, and because in the past the Government of the United States has ignored scientific opinion—as in the case of the San Francisco Conference of the United Nations Organization, where no representative of science was among the hundreds of advisers: Therefore be it

Resolved by the undersigned scientists of the University of Minnesota, meeting under the auspices of the Minnesota Chapter of the Association of Scientific Workers, That we urge Congress and the President of the United States to make it a definite policy to appoint to every advisory and executive committee dealing with problems involving the use or control of scientific advances at least one scientist competent in the field in question, in order to make certain that the salient facts shall be brought to the fore in the deliberations and recommendations of such committees.

Ernest C. Abbe, W. D. Armstrong, Cyrus P. Barnum, Solvieg M. Bergh, John J. Bittner, E. A. Boyden, J. M. Bryant, J. W. Buchta, George O. Burr, Berry Campbell, F. E. Christensen, William S. Cooper, Samuel A. Corson, H. D. Crawford, A. Orville Dahl, R. W. Dawson, Elva S. Dayton, Hal Downey, Fred Ellis, Haven Emerson, Herbert Feigl, Charles S. French, John J. Gillam, Agnes Hansen, M. Merle Harris, Martin Harvig, E. Francis Hartmann, Austin F. Henschel, Harold B. Hulme, R. G. Huseby, Don L. Jacobs, W. W. Kielley, Arthur Kirschbaum, I. M. Kolthoff, Nora L. Larson, Margaret Clark Lefevre, M. N. Levine, Nathan Lifson, S. C. Lind, Victor Lorber, Willem J. Luyten, J. S. McCartney, Irvivne McQuarrie, Edward E. Mason, George Matsuyama, Hamlin Mattson, E. J. Meehan, T. B. Merner, Shirley P. Miller, Harry W. Mixer, Gerald M. Needham, Alfred O. C. Nier, Rosalind Novick, L. D. Pefliev, S. C.

Peterson, Robert D. Powell, Andrew T. Rasmussen, John M. Reiner, Leo G. Rigler, E. B. Sandall, Carl W. Sharsmith, I. Siminovitch, Karl Sollner, K. Wilhelm Stenstrom, Henry L. Taylor, E. W. Tisdale, R. M. Tryon, Jr., Merton F. Utter, J. Valasek, A. L. Vaughan, Maurice B. Visscher, Clifford N. Wall, Roald K. Wangsness, Herbert S. Wells, L. J. Wells, W. L. Williams, Harland G. Wood, Mildred R. Ziegler.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *November 1, 1945.*

Bring Our Servicemen Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1945

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I have received numerous letters from men in the service and from their relatives at home, complaining of the inefficient manner in which servicemen from all branches of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps are being handled for early transportation to the United States.

The Thirty-first Division was apparently made ready for sailing 3 weeks ago. Yet it is not possible for the parents to secure any definite date when it will leave the Philippines. Letters from servicemen state five times sailing dates have been announced. Each time they have been disappointed.

Letters tell of more than 20,000 high-point men waiting at Guam to return to the United States. Many of the soldiers are anxious to return on cargo ships were used to transport them to the very places where they are now located, even though they would be most uncomfortable and perhaps unfit for such use. Yet the piling up of high-point men overseas due to the failure to furnish some type of transportation is most unfair to these young men who ought to be home with their families for Christmas. They cannot understand why they are forgotten and, through delay, will not be able to compete for employment with men who never went overseas, until most of the available jobs have been filled.

I am sure that other Congressmen are receiving letters like the following which came from the Philippines, as well as articles like the two which I have received with recent letters. The War Department makes known the outfits to be landed at eastern ports from Europe, yet no description of units landing at west coast ports appears in the newspapers. I believe that the War Department and the Navy Department should give more and better publicity to what they are doing to bring the service men and women home, with full explanations of changes in plans and reasons for apparent delays or changes in announced plans:

THE PHILIPPINES, *November 9, 1945.*

Mr. CHARLES R. CLASON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CLASON: This is another note to tell you that I found out the answer to my first letter. If you'll remember my question, "Where are the ships?"

Enclosed is a copy of an item that was not printed. You will understand why it wasn't printed when you read the last paragraph of the item. However, I'd like to add something that did not appear in the article.

1. The editor, R. W. Young, was broken from a technician, fifth grade, to a private.

2. He is now doing garbage and latrine details.

3. The commanding officer of this depot spoke to the casuals in this depot one night (the 6th of November), saying that the article was true and that he had known about it for 3 weeks.

4. He also said that he was doing the best he could to get the men home (this was greeted with jeers and boos).

I'm also enclosing three letters which appeared in the Daily Pacifican. The first, "Splash," is comic relief, but it helps. The second letter, "Advice," is something that Senators and Congressmen, I hope, realize. But the best clipping of all is the one, 400 Ships in Graveyards, NMU Claims.

My father wrote that he hoped I'd be home before Christmas or soon after. I guess there are thousands and thousands of American parents who are hoping the same thing. But the Jap parents won't have to worry, because their sons will be home for the holidays through the courtesy of the United States of America.

Sincerely yours.

HOMEWARD SAILINGS LAG BEHIND GOAL—DEPOTS CROWDED, SHIPPING LIMITED, NO BIG EXODUS BEFORE NOVEMBER

(By Sgt. Dale Kramer)

MANILA.—Analysis of facts and figures gathered from various Army agencies concerned with moving troops home for discharge reveals that:

1. Shipments from Manila for the month of October will total about half the 77,700 called for in the troop movement schedule announced by General MacArthur's headquarters earlier in the month, judging from the number already departed and shipping facilities in sight.

2. No large-scale movement of returnees can be expected before November 1. At best, about one-fourth of the returnees in the four depots which send personnel through the Manila Port—Twenty-first, Twenty-second, Twenty-ninth, and Women's Distribution Center—can hope to embark before November 1.

3. The crowded depots are accepting only a few returnees, mostly over 90-point men, or men over 38 years old.

4. Returnees will leave the depots on a first-in-first-out basis, rather than according to their number of points.

5. As things look now not much help can be expected from cargo ships. Some returning Liberty ships carry a dozen or so returnees in vacant crew or guard spaces, and Transportation Corps is experimenting with a couple of Liberties. The War Department gives a flat no on hasty "camping out" conversion.

6. No help from units of the fleet can be expected immediately. The Navy has been allotted troop transports for its own personnel.

The above conclusions are drawn from information gained in interviews with officials of AFWESPAC Transportation Corps, Replacement Command, and Far Eastern Air Force's 22d Replacement Depot.

Military personnel sent home through the Manila Port between October 1 and October 20 totaled 31,647, according to AFWESPAC Transportation Corps. The Thirty-eighth Division, shipped as a unit, comprised a little more than half of that figure.

If the schedule for shipping as of October 22 holds, places for 7,114 persons will be available during the balance of October, with the only big ship due at the very end of the month. Waiting to fill these places, besides regular returnees, are hospital patients and a few civilians who have been employed by the Army.

Thus if 7,000 Army returnees are given places the total shipped for October will be around 37,000 compared with the 77,700 goal set in the early October schedule.

Check of the four distribution depots which send personnel through the Manila port shows that between 30,000 and 35,000 men and women now occupy them. Exact figure on October 17 was 33,937, divided as follows:

Twenty-first Depot: 1,043 officers, 1,919 enlisted men.

Twenty-second Depot: 1,048 officers, 7,698 enlisted men.

Twenty-ninth Depot: 2,040 officers, 10,969 enlisted men.

Women's Distribution Center: 768 officers (including nurses) and 512 enlisted women.

Not much change has occurred since then.

Length of time returnees have remained in the depots varies from a day or two for new arrivals to a month and a half for Wacs. Average wait before shipment has been running about 3 weeks. Prospects are that the waiting period will increase rather than lessen.

At the two big AFWESPAC ground-personnel depots—the Twenty-first and Twenty-ninth—men with less than 90 points who appear are being sent back to their units until such time as space becomes available. Men with over 90 points or who are over 38 years old are received if they have permission to enter from the replacement command. The Air Corps Twenty-second Depot, overcrowded, is not accepting men.

The depots are shipping personnel on a basis of first in, first out, rather than on a basis of high pointers first and on down. This will mean that many men with points in the seventies will leave before many with over 90. What happened was that some units made low-point men available before high-point men—quick-acting units moved low-point men to the depots faster than others got high-point men in.

Procedure for mustering men out of AFWESPAC depots is this:

Shipment orders are cut in groups (usually of 25) to separation centers in the States, according to the arrival of men in the depots. Replacement command says that in the case of small separation centers it may require a couple or 3 days to fill a list of 25, but that the spread is never more than 3 days. Thus, two men who come into a depot at the same time should leave within not more than 3 days of each other.

Cargo-ship commanders who have berths available are required to report them to troop movement. In this way small lots of a dozen or two returnees have been moved. But the War Department does not permit transportation of troops on unconverted cargo ships.

A few days ago the War Department did, however, grant permission to AFWESPAC Transportation Corps to convert Liberty ships under certain circumstances. But the change-over regulations are strict, with most of the usual transport conditions required—fresh vegetables, hot meals, bunks, refrigeration, and so on. Transportation Corps is now experimenting with a couple of Liberties. Once converted, a Liberty will be able to carry between 500 and 750 men.

OFFER TO BRING GI'S HOME EVADED—EASTHAMPTON MAN SCORES OFFICIALS FOR ATTITUDE

EASTHAMPTON, November 29.—Burned up at the attitude of some officials who evaded the issue when he offered to bring between 600 and 700 servicemen home from the Philippines, Capt. Benjamin Kuta, Easthamp-

ton's only merchant-marine skipper, said his ship, the *Floyd Gibbons*, made the 12,000-mile trip back to the States with an empty bottom.

GOT ONLY EXCUSES

Captain Kuta, the youngest man in the country ever to command a Liberty ship, said there were other ships coming home the same way. He said he could have converted his Liberty ship to accommodate the men in about 2 days, but was given the flimsy excuse that this would tie his ship up. He scoffed at this excuse and said that at the time he made his original offer his ship had already been laid up for 3 days by officials.

He brushed aside other excuses concerning the health of the men and said that this was not given any thought when the men were shipped overseas. He said that many men he talked with would have taken any means of transportation to get home and would not have minded what little hardship they would have encountered on his boat.

The merchant mariner was in his early twenties when he got his first command, and has been in the merchant service for several years. He traveled many difficult runs during the war and has been to ports in all parts of the world.

When he brought his ship into Texas last week, Kuta was returning from a 15-months' voyage in the Pacific. The skipper also lashed out at returning empty ships which should be permitted to carry some of the critical cargo shortages to this country when denied the right to bring home servicemen. He anticipated a strike of ship crews in early December, if conditions are not rectified. Kuta lives on Johnson Avenue and was educated in the local schools and attended the merchant-marine schools.

We Must Aid Unfortunate War Victims in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 5, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has already appropriated over $1,300,000,000 for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. This organization was created by Congress for the purpose of giving aid to the unfortunate people in war-torn countries who were suffering and would suffer from lack of food, clothing, medicine, and other necessities of life. That was UNRRA. We were assured with typical cockeyed New Deal assuredness that nothing else would do, but we just had to have it. It was just going to do the job. This attitude on the part of those in authority in this Government of ours was, of course, typical of everything they have done for years and years. When anything worth while is to be accomplished, instead of using one of the numerous bureaus, boards, and commissions which are already in existence and which are being fed by the taxpayers of America—I said America, and not Europe or Asia—right away one of the glamour boys wants to create a new commission so there can be new jobs—and I think most of them are political—and more red tape, and more money spent. However, Congress yielded to the plea that we must do something for the unfortunate, and we have appropriated over $1,300,000,000 for relief purposes to be administered by UNRRA. Today the House is considering an authorization for an additional $1,000,000,000 for UNRRA. The set-up, like all of these "brain trust" set-ups, is a difficult one to oppose. They tell us that there is suffering in Europe, and we all know that, and I do not believe that there is a Member of the House of Representatives who does not want to help and who does not want his Government to demonstrate its humanitarian ideals.

The second part of the brain-trust philosophy is that UNRRA is indispensable and UNRRA must have the money. Then the third step in this brain-trust logic is that if you vote against UNRRA, then you vote to let people in war-torn Europe starve and die. Of course, these so-called logical steps are false as is usually the case with all brain-trust arguments which disregard sound business principles and believe in chasing butterflies and the rainbow.

Certainly relief ought to be extended, but by the same token the American people ought to be told the truth about UNRRA. From every discussion that I have heard by disinterested people, this outfit known as UNRRA has either done a bad job, or no job at all. It just simply is not accomplishing results. It is political. Its methods are filled with inefficiency and mistakes. It is building up a vast organization with large numbers of people on its pay rolls and to make the story short, people who are in need of food and clothing and other things, are just simply not getting them under the present UNRRA methods. Money that Congress is appropriating for the relief purposes is being wasted. There have been too many charges on the floor of this House to that effect, to permit them to go unnoticed. I am satisfied that they are true. Likewise, I am satisfied that our UNRRA set up in different countries of Europe is a political set-up, favoring one faction or the other in connection with internal troubles of those countries. This is certainly a disgrace.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we have some well established agency to do this relief work. We have the American Red Cross. That is an outstanding group of people. I say this in spite of the mud-throwing contest on the part of some ill advised people just a few days ago. Then we have the Salvation Army. Then we have national church organizations in the United States. We have relief groups formed in the United States for the purposes of soliciting funds for relief work in this country or that country, as the case may be. With typical brain-trust, New Deal purpose of wasting money, by creating a new spending agency, administration officials entirely ignore established agencies which I have just enumerated. If we appropriate money for relief, let us place it in the hands of the Red Cross or these other agencies, with proper safeguards. With a good conscience we can vote funds for that sort of procedure. We will know that the under-fed, under-nourished, and sick people in war-torn countries across the seas are going to get as much care as our Government through its agencies can administer. Let us quit following his UNRRA political set-up and measure the problem and the procedure in terms of business-like and common sense methods.

The time has long since passed when the United States should be considered as the one country to which all other countries could and should turn when they want a hand-out. UNRRA is concerned with their political problems. Its shame is all the greater when it plays politics with human misery.

While I am talking about hand-outs to other countries, I call attention to the item in the newspapers 2 or 3 days ago to the effect that France had just negotiated a $500,000,000 loan. You all know that Great Britain wants $5,000,000,000, Russia $6,000,000,000, and well informed people have said that if we are going to follow that pattern of loaning money, then every other country in Europe has the same right. Incidentally, if we are to finance the rest of the world, we have the same duty toward the small countries of Europe that we have towards those I have just mentioned. I deny, however, Mr. Speaker, that there is any duty whatever. We all know that these so-called loans will never be paid. I challenge the good faith of Great Britain and Russia and France.

I challenge the good judgment of the leaders in our Government who look with favor on this program of hand-outs. It is going to bring to us the ill will of every country in the world, and if continued will wreck this Government of ours.

In this connection let it be noted that the War Department and Navy Department must get the idea out of their systems that all they have to do is come to Congress, get all the money they need, and spend it any way they please. They had better get on a peacetime basis where they can show why they need money and how they are going to spend it, otherwise they will wreck a lot of worth-while defense programs on the foundation of their own foolishness and stupidity. The taxpayers are not going to let them operate on any glorified wartime basis. It takes too much money. These same remarks apply to some other Government agencies. As time goes on, the gigantic task of trying to balance the budget and secure an adequate revenue with which to operate the Government and pay its expenses is going to become more and more important. The only other alternative is to turn the printing presses loose, cheapen the dollar, and invite inflation and the payment of our debts and obligations in worthless Government money. There you have it—the same thing as an outright repudiation of Government obligations. We do not want this.

It is all the more important, Mr. Speaker, that we husband our resources and cut out now trying to be papa, grandpa, mama, and grandma, for such defenseless (?) and well-meaning (?) cousins as Great Britain and Russia. Do not let the sunshine of diplomatic boiled shirts dazzle you. These people

do not want us to be their legal guardians.

I say this is important because there are many worth-while domestic programs which are going to require the expenditure of money. Then we ought to look after our own people a little. We have entirely neglected to develop our domestic programs and we have sadly neglected programs that would be for the betterment of our own people. I get letters every day, for example, from some aged couple who are barely able to buy the necessary food on which to live with the small old-age assistance payments that are made to them by their various relief boards. The cobwebs must be in somebody's brains when they think it a fine thing to loan $500,000,000 to France and then say to John Doe, 68 years of age, and to his wife, Mary Doe, 70 years of age, this Government of yours cannot afford to pay you folks more than thirty or forty dollars a month on which to live by way of old-age assistance. I say such an attitude on the part of leaders of our Government is pure nonsense. This is just one problem—the problem of our old people who have heard during recent years a lot of bombastic platitudes about humanitarianism and about helping the unfortunate. Then these same old folks of ours, who are truly the forgotten man, have had no kindly considerations from their own Government along any proper lines whatever.

Address of Most Rev. Richard J. Cushing, D. D.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. CURLEY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 5, 1945

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address at memorial mass for the One Hundred and First Infantry veterans at the Cathedral of the Holy Cross by Most Rev. Richard J. Cushing D. D.:

This memorial service is a prayerful tribute to your departed comrades. The great poet, Tennyson, beautifully expressed the necessity of this tribute when he wrote:

"Pray for my soul. More things are wrought by prayer
Than this world dreams of. Wherefore, let thy voice
Rise like a mountain for me, night and day
For what are men, better than sheep or goats
That nourish a blind life within the brain
If knowing God, they lift not hands of prayer
Both for themselves and those who call them friends?"

Those for whom you pray this morning worked and played, fought and prayed with you. They helped in their own small or great way to build this country. They believed in America, fought for America, and died for America.

The men who settled America were men of strong religious conviction. Their philosophy of life stemmed from that conviction. What was the result? The original object of American education was to make good Christians. The first result of American legislation was to put God in the center of society. The first foundations of American citizenship were laid in the plain, unvarnished statement that the rights of man come from God. As a consequence of this historic background we have a creed rooted in our Constitution, our history, and our spirit which if followed will preserve our land from evil and help to save the world. Every school boy should be taught that creed. In simple, understandable language it can be summarily expressed as follows:

As an American I believe in God and in the laws of God. I believe in the personal dignity of man, and that this dignity, rooted in his rights, belongs to man's nature as a rational being. The use of these rights may be prevented by force; but they cannot be taken away by the state or any other power. In other words, I believe that men are endowed with natural rights which are born with them and remain as long as life remains. Chief among these natural rights are the rights to life, to personal integrity, to economic opportunity, to property, to a reasonable minimum of education, to a family wage, to the expression of thought and opinion, to the practice of religious worship, and to membership in associations.

Your conferees, my dear men of the One-Hundred and First Infantry, fought and died for this doctrine.

As an American I also believe in the sanctity of the home and that the rock upon which society rests is the family.

I believe that the home is the first and the most important school; that the mother has been constituted by God the first and the most effective teacher. I believe that the home is the house of God—another church; that every family is a sanctuary, a gateway to Heaven, a place of reverence and holiness. A dining room table with children's eager, happy faces around it ceases to be a mere dining room and becomes an altar. The home is a temple of life in which is tabernacled the human soul, made to the image and likeness of God. It is the first of those secular structures which democratic life must quicken with religion if it is to survive. Those whom you remember today also died for this doctrine, for the sanctity of the home.

I believe in the right of private property, that capital has not only rights, but also obligations; that labor has the right to organize in order to secure its economic rights, and also the obligation of working in harmony with capital, of producing honestly, of accepting reasonable agreements. I believe that the ideal way of attaining these end is by union-management cooperation in which the brains of both capital and labor unite in mutual support for the welfare of all.

As an American I also believe that law is a sacred obligation, that all human law flows from the law of God. The prewar world built a way of life based on economic plans, political plans, and social plans—on anything and everything but God's law. That prewar world is dead. It was killed by its own hand and it took your beloved comrades with it. Its hand was held up by rationalism, false liberalism, individualism, unbridled capitalism, unrestrained competition, power politics. All its postulates, all its growth and development led only to the right of might. It has now fallen under an avalanche of blood. We have a sacred obligation to cast aside these Godless systems, to put God back in society, to rebuild the world on the basis of God's law. If we do not fulfill that obligation we fail those whom we honor today.

I believe that democracy is based on the great law of love: it is spiritual, social, and moral, not merely political, and as a result I am my brother's keeper and I am obligated to help him in his need. These are the basic doctrines of the creed that flows from the Constitution and the ideals of America. And for these and all other doctrines emanating from the Bill of Rights and the Constitution, your confreres died.

In accordance with that credo—how can we tolerate the slow starvation of millions of people in Europe and elsewhere—how can we trample on the rights of minorities that had no part in hurling the world into the abyss of war—how can we fail to give sympathy, courage, and hope to whole nations who once befriended us and are now being absorbed by foreign powers—how can we passively observe the moral decay of our own country and expect to supply inspiration for the restoration and resurrection of devastated nations?

My dear men, your presence here this morning is a reminder to your fellowmen and to your departed that you cling to the creed that has made America great. Your way for peace and prosperity is the way of spirituality, the way back to God. Every problem is fundamentaly a religious problem and the solution can always be found in our creed and in the application of the basic truths of that creed to the shop, the office, the market place, and the political arena. In the light of this fact we have need of more men of God and fewer diplomats, more fiery prophets and fewer politicians; more of the Sermon on the Mount and less of the jargon from the modern towers of Babel; more of the spiritual values of our founding fathers and less of the time-serving standards of new-found friends, more family prayers and less family jazz; more teamwork on the part of labor and management and less rivalry and greed.

The whole world looks to us for leadership, for life-giving help. We have survived the greatest tragedy of history. Our American way of life, as bequeathed to us by our forebears, possesses all the basic elements of justice and charity so urgently needed throughout the world. Let us be true to our creed, true to America, true to God and one another and we will not fail. Split the unity that is America, smash the spirit that is America, blast the religious background of America, and we will have more destruction than ever came from the split atom in the atomic bomb.

This is the message our beloved dead have bequeathed to us. We might have broken faith with those who died in World War I, but we must not break faith with the heroes of the late war who sleep on the floor of the deep and beneath the soil of five continents. It is for us to maintain what we have, to hold fast to the creed of America and to the fundamental law of our Constitution, love of God and love of neighbor. Every nation in the world looks to us today for leadership, for hope, for salvation. If we will only be ourselves and refuse to wander from our American creed we can fulfill the greatest mission of charity, mercy, and leadership that Almighty God ever permitted to be entrusted to any nation.

General Bradley's Vital Tasks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 5, 1945

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for December 3, 1945:

GENERAL BRADLEY'S VITAL TASK

With soldiers and sailors coming home at the rate of nearly 1,000,000 every month, the United States faces a national problem of social readjustment unprecedented in history. "Handle this problem improperly," President Conant of Harvard has said, "and we may well sow the seeds of civil war within a decade."

This warning has been soberly stressed by Gen. Omar Bradley, head of the Veterans' Administration, whose far-reaching program for former servicemen is running head-on against serious opposition from certain elements of Congress and from veterans' organizations themselves. The complexities of the undertaking, outlined by Donald Grant in yesterday's Post-Dispatch, are of an order requiring bold thinking and resolute effort both in and out of Government. The evidence, so far, is that we have not yet begun to do the job.

General Bradley's program calls for a strong, independent, decentralized Veterans' Administration, an organization built and operated for one thing, to give efficient service. He wants a medical corps with the best doctors he can get; he wants hospitals where they will do the most good; he wants administrators of courage and energy, unhampered by traditional procedures; he wants community organizations that will offer the veteran more than a runaround.

Against him are alined many and powerful forces of tradition, political privilege, vested interest and public apathy. There are Members of Congress who are thinking more of getting hospitals in their home districts than they are of caring for disabled men. There are leaders of veterans' organizations, most of them soldiers in earlier wars, who are thinking in terms of their own influence, not of the job to be done.

In the Veterans' Administration itself, there are men who have a vested interest in old and inefficient procedures; there are political job-holders comfortable in sinecures and resistant to change. In many communities—St. Louis among them—there is wide unawareness, resulting in apathy, of the critical urgency of the problem.

So far, it is very clear, the country has not yet understood that General Bradley is saying quite simply that on the wise solution of the veteran problem may depend the very future of freedom in America. Let 15,000,000 men come to feel that they have in any measure failed to establish themselves equitably in the life of the country, and there will be a pressure group such as history has not seen.

The Divine Destiny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 5, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and sermon:

WATERVILLE METHODIST CHURCH,
Waterville, Ohio, November 29, 1945.

The Honorable HOMER A. RAMEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE RAMEY: I recall with much pleasure your recent visit to Waterville.

As we drove by our church and you saw the sermon title based on immortality, you asked for a copy of the manuscript. It is here enclosed.

Strange as it may seem, I have no special requests for legislation that I have not previously made known. Is that not a relief to you?

With kindest personal regards for your interest, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS R. WOLTER.

THE DIVINE DESTINY

Life on earth is not a punishment or an existence to be endured in anticipation of that which is above hardship. The divine destiny begins now. Life begins with life. With Peter we ought cry out in joy, "It is good to be here."

To treat life here and now as good in the faith that the best is yet to be is to know immortality. By immortality is meant that which is good and above destruction, and which in the sight of God is eternal. Immortality is not proved; it is lived.

IMMORTALITY OF LIFE

The divine destiny begins with life and begins now. "Life doesn't begin at 40," for it is now in existence.

First of all, there is the immortality of work. No doubt every mother has looked up from the drudgery of a dishpan only to see an inevitable basket of work waiting for laundry and ironing. She has a right to ask, "What is immortal about my work?" In answer we can say there is a good deal of immortality in the work of making a home. If you want to indulge in a moment of pleasant pastime look back at your own days at home when with loving care and fidelity your mother stands at her task of caring for you. When the soldier or sailor comes home, he wants to return to that kind of immortal love and care.

Let no one think the life of a farmer is easy. It is filled with hardship, disappointment, and delay. But the farmer may well discover his work to be immortal. Each day in cooperation with God in nature he seeks to return that which man has taken away. No wonder he looks upon his farm as a landmark. His work has become immortal in building that which endures.

Teachers get tired of grading papers and making assignments. Any routine becomes drudgery. Perhaps students have some opinions about the regularity of examinations and continuous work to do. Both teacher and pupil must have a perspective. The teachers of the men who built the Toledo high-level bridge must sense the immortality of their instruction. The teachers of the statesmen at the San Francisco Conference must sense the immortality of lessons in history and law. The teacher of the doctor is aware of the immortality of work as he sees his life save lives through yet another life.

All of us are scientists in our own fashion. Those who enrich life through discoveries are rewarded for their patient searchings. Madame Curie worked unceasingly in her effort to discover radium. Her work is immortal as we see the lives spared from death because of her discovery.

In the first phase of the economic depression, progress was made in a plan for a work's relief program as opposed to the direct dole. The work's program was criticized for its cost and inefficiency. Much of the criticism was no doubt deserved. What many of us did not then realize was that the program in itself was not at fault. Local administrators thought work, any kind of work, would do. But men do not carry bricks from one side of the road to the other or purposely retard their labors without seeing the futility of their time and energy. The program broke at its weakest link. There was simply no inspiration to the immortality of work. There was no vision, no hope, only the manual inefficient planning of making men move, how, it did not matter. When local administrators set up a goal, men worked, for they had a vision of temples yet undone.

From immortality of work we progress to immortality of thought. Jesus said, "As a man thinketh, so he is." And Jesus was a living example of this truth. His life in word and deed was an audible and visible demonstration of the Sermon on the Mount.

Beside the Bible, we have other great literature recording the immortal thoughts of men. William Wordsworth wrote an Ode—Intimations of Immortality, in which he declares "Heaven lies about us in our infancy." Tennyson's words from In Memoriam are beautiful:

"I hold it truth, with him who sings to one
clear harp in divers tones,
That men may rise on stepping stones of
their dead selves to higher things."

Or, discover the thought of Oliver Wendell Holmes in The Chambered Nautilus as he writes "Build thee more stately mansions, oh, my soul."

A long-time favorite is the Quaker poet Whittier who in Snowbound immortalized:

"Alas for him who never sees
The stars shine through his cypress trees!
Who, hopeless, lays his dead away,
Now locks to see the breaking day
Across the mournful marbles play!
Who hath not learned, in hours of faith
The truth to flesh and sense unknown,
That life is ever lord of death,
And love can never lose its own!"

Immortality begins with life. I have said work and thought are immortal. I now add a third, the immortality of friends. Of the great Biblical friendships, Ruth and Naomi, and Jonathan and David are supreme. These immortal friendships live through the ages.

A chaplain gave his version of Christ's record "He laid down His life for His friend." This story was found in the regiment paper of a western camp. "It was mid-March in the El Guitar sector. They had taken over a position of another battalion and had endured for 2 days the steady artillery barrage from the enemy. At last it was decided to withdraw to the next ridge. The order was given and the withdrawal began. The movement betrayed their positions. As they moved, artillery fire increased in intensity. One company farther out had a most difficult time. The men who could, ran out over the ridge as fast as possible. The aid men helped the wounded. At long last the company commander and his aid men were behind the ridge. They looked out and saw that all men were safely evacuated when they heard a cry. One man still lay in his slit trench. The company commander didn't think it possible to save him. The aid man refused to go away while there was still one in need. Without thought for his safety, he dashed through the withering barrage to the side of the wounded man. He began to administer first aid. The chaplain says that as they looked over the ridge to where the aid man and the wounded soldier were, they saw the cloud of dust that called two men into the Kingdom Triumphant."

Friendships are immortal. The devine destiny begins now in our work, in thoughts, and in friends. May I add now the immortality of possessions? True it is that there are a host of things you can't take with you. If you were to make a list of immortal possessions what would you include? My list is very short. Somehow the possessions which I believe are immortal are memories.

Some of these are memories of more material things. But I am referring now to something of the mind. The memories of our lives are not of suffering or hardship though these may have been present. Who of you do recall in pleasant memory the jaunt through the woods with dad; watching mother prepare the Thanksgiving dinner; listening to the crunch of frosty snow as you made your way to worship; the sound of church bells on a spring Sunday morning; the men who served as ushers at church; the time

you ran home to tell mother about the bird with an injured wing; when you had your first date; the first home; standing by the little crib as you watched your very own asleep; when you saw yourself start down the road to school that first day your youngster made his way alone.

The divine destiny is now. Life begins with life for work, thoughts, friends, and memories are immortal.

IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL

As life flowers forth in all of its beauty, we recognize that good as this life may be, the best is yet to come. Thus comes to reality the immortality of the soul. This is a natural outgrowth or development of our belief in the immortality of life. All these things that have been listed: work, thought, friends, and possessions, lead us to an even greater heritage, the immortality of the soul.

May we rise above the proof concepts of the physical science? In any field we consult experts. If you want to know about the incandescent light, ask Edison. If you want to know about literature ask Wordsworth. If it is music ask Bach. You would not ask Bach about the light bulb or Edison about literature. Therefore do not seek a man out of his field to learn about immortality. Consult an expert. Ask Christ about immortality of the soul. Anyone less will leave you cold. Ask the Master; he knows.

First of all the record tells us immortality of the soul is to be at one with Christ in God. "If we walk in the light as He is in the light, we shall have fellowship one with another." For us this is the assurance of security of loved ones.

Secondly, the immortality of the soul means the fellowship of love. Jesus looked with compassion upon His companion of the cross and to the pleading entreaty of his eyes He said, "Today thou shalt be with Me in Paradise." There are many of us who sense our own imperfections. We long for a fellowship of love.

Then too, some there are who in loneliness recall with Whittier that "love can never lose its own." And they seek a renewal in spirit of those "gone long since and lost awhile." This is the fellowship of love as Jesus promises the reunion of kindred spirits "come ye blessed of My Father and receive the Kingdom of Heaven."

The divine destiny begins now. "He that believeth hath eternal life. * * * And this is life eternal that they should know Thee, the only true God."

Letter From an Officer of Our Air Forces Written From Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 5, 1945

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

This past month and the first 6 days of this month have been our worst on the Continent, as far as accidents are concerned. This has been due to a combination of unfortunate circumstances, the first being bad weather; the second, an almost total lack of good flying control personnel; the third, an almost total lack of experienced maintenance personnel. This is a result of the criminal way in which the people back home have been tearing the guts out of a beautifully working Air Force. One of my leave ships went down with a loss of 25 officers and men. Four escaped with their lives—how, I don't know. This was but one accident in many, finally resulting in all leave planes being canceled, as well as all redeployment by air.

Don't know whether I told you or not, but about a month ago I was elected president of the mess association (officers' club) on this post, which has a membership of about 500. One of the first controversial questions that came up was whether or not German nationals (male or female) would be permitted to attend our functions as guests. When the question was first discussed about 60 percent of the officers favored it and 40 percent opposed. I got our board of governors to vote against Germans entering into our functions, unanimously, then posted signs excluding them. The war then started over again. After about a week of feuding the commanding officer ordered me to hold a general meeting of all officers to vote on the question. From there on I did the slickest piece of political railroading ever seen by the Air Force. I personally shamed the membership into a standing unanimous vote excluding them. Five officers of high rank refused to vote either way, and I further embarrassed them by stating the vote had been carried unanimously with the exception of five officers who didn't see fit to vote either way. As you can guess, no officer wanted to go on record as a German-lover.

Today I found where one of our headquarters sections had employed a German secretary. This set the fire off again. I'm afraid I'm going to be in hot water from now on, for this seems to be just the beginning. One big laugh—we now have Germans guarding our billets and armed, while we aren't supposed to carry arms.

J. Lyle Kinmonth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 5, 1945

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Recently the people of the Third Congressional District of New Jersey lost one of their outstanding citizens in the death of J. Lyle Kinmonth.

Many years ago Mr. Kinmonth purchased a run-down newspaper and went to work to make it a model of sound and progressive newspaper procedure. He felt with all his being that operating a newspaper was a public trust and that true and accurate reporting would reap its reward in securing the approval and respect of the citizens. He was convinced also that a fearless, honest, and frank editorial policy was good business and good citizenship. He practiced both of these principles of honest thinking in his personal life and insisted on them in the operation of his paper. As a result the Asbury Park Press is what it is today—respected by all, including its competitors.

The following editorial from the Freehold Transcript is evidence of this feeling and it expresses eloquently the sentiment of the community at the passing of Mr. Kinmonth:

J. LYLE KINMONTH

Few men leave behind them a memorial, product of their own toil and heartache, as great as J. Lyle Kinmonth created for himself in the Asbury Park Press. But were the Press a monument to Mr. Kinmonth's zeal only, nothing more than a testimonal to his tirelessness, it would be but a momentary tribute to the man whose life was so long identified with it.

No one, particularly the publisher of a newspaper, can build for himself an enterprise, vibrant and successful, without imparting to it some of is own characteristics. In Mr. Kinmonth's case there was more than courage. There was a controlling conviction that independence in presentation of the news was the surest road to publication of an honest newspaper.

The external story is known to us all. The Press prospered. But it was the owner's own decision that paved the way for that success and, though the unthinking may measure it in columns of advertising, the thoughtful will recall that it was Mr. Kinmonth's insistence that his paper's policy be forever divorced from influence by the advertiser or office-holder, that prepared the way for widespread acceptance of the Press in shore homes. That battleground was Mr. Kinmonth's own mind and the problem was resolved early in his career.

The Kinmonth career, embracing faith in our future, is inspirational to all who knew him, particularly in his chosen field. As a practical newspaper man, Mr. Kinmonth was well acquainted with a reporter's problems. The aid and understanding he imparted on such occasions was founded on his own experience and supplied the diligence to get at the truth. That is how the writer, as a former employee of Mr. Kinmonth's, likes to remember him.

Boston Should Be Selected as Site of United Nations Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 5, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include a statement by Dr. Alexander Brin, of Boston, Mass., setting forth reasons why Boston should be selected as the site of the United Nations Organization capital:

A most momentous national and international event in the history of this Nation is the decision of the executive committee of the United Nations, representing the overwhelming majority of the people in the world, to establish the international capital of the new peace organization on the soil of the United States. Today a number of American cities are competing for the great distinction and honor of providing the permanent home of the Organization, which will eventually embrace the 2,000,000,000 people of the world, and covering more of an area than 51,000,000 square miles. The chief contenders for the honor are Boston, San Francisco, Philadelphia, New York, and Chicago.

Through the written and spoken word I have for months been advocating Massachusetts as the outstanding State in the Union preeminently qualified for the world's center of the greatest security organization ever conceived and launched by man.

As far back as last May, while crossing the continent on my way to the United Nations Conference at San Francisco, I utilized my leisure time to brush upon the contributions of early Massachusetts men of letters, internationally minded statesmen and philanthropically minded men whose sympathies were broad and universal, to the sum total

of American and world civilization, whose words and deeds stirred men to action that changed the course of history. As a humble student and lover of American history, I carefully examined some of the historic documents presented to me by my teacher and colleague, the late Prof. Albert Bushnell Hart, of Harvard University, dealing with the American dream of the Massachusetts sons who shaped the earlier destinies of our Nation, to create on this continent a better world to be peopled by nobler individuals.

As I was perusing the aims and dreams of our early Americans expounding their philosophy of government, their love for freedom and justice, their labors for peace and good will among all men, their ideals of statesmanship, their desire to create laws and institutions for the benefit of society, their aim to inculcate spiritual values within the life of the new Republic, their emphasis on the things that make for human betterment, I accidentally stumbled across a letter written by John Adams, the Bostonian who became the second President of the United States, plainly advocating, as early as 139 years ago, the establishment of an International World Court to settle wars and establish enduring peace. President Adams was an ardent exponent of international good will and universal sympathy and understanding. His words were so fresh and sparkling and so modern that the world could study his ideas with profit as a model in achieving a successful society of nations based on fellowship and international friendships. I said to myself, "If the troubled people of the world would but study the sources of our national existence, would understand and apply the fundamental truths pronounced and promulgated by the immortal men who established this Nation, a solution of war and of social, economic, and political problems would be easily attained. It is in the American tradition, basic to self-government, devoid of caste, freedom to work and live and worship in accordance with one's conscience, that the richest life is to be found for all men. No wonder that the United States of America today symbolizes a tremendous hope not only for the 140,000,000 people who are fortunate enough to live on this soil but, in a sense, of all the world. The phrases used by the early Massachusetts settlers not only crystallized the sentiments of the age they lived in but challenged the loyalties of mankind and expressed a hope and prophecy that seems to be the very aim of our present life if our civilization is to survive. The outlawry of war as advocated by President Adams is such a declaration. It is the very essence of the United Nations Charter and should commend the sacrifices and services of all lovers of peace in order to save future generations from the horrible nightmare of two titanic wars in our own generation.

To the everlasting credit of President Adams his advocacy of outlawry of war is being lifted from a phrase to a practical and living and dynamic philosophy. A literal term has been translated into a legal term, backed by 51 nations.

I am convinced that there is no better place on the globe for the capital of the new World Organization than the old Bay State, where the history of America began and where America's No. 1 shrine, dedicated to liberty and democracy is located, where in educational affairs, in the application of the enduring principles of the Golden Rule, we maintain a position of proved supremacy.

The story of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is the story of American civilization. Massachusetts is more than an aggregation of cities, towns, and villages. Massachusetts, which has long borne aloft the torch of progress in the sisterhood of States, is an epic built by some of America's noblest personalities. The most remarkable example of international idealism in practice took place in this part of the globe. The transition of our Nation from isolationism to responsible world citizenship is in line with the dream of the early Massachusetts men. The noble ideals and sentiments which underlie the United Nations Charter are the same ideals and sentiments of the founders of Massachusetts who played such an outstanding part in molding the character of our Nation to appreciate the finest values of civilization. One of the inspiring results of the United Nations Conference at San Francisco was the rediscovery of the American dream and there was ample evidence that the American spirit and the essentials of democracy have conquered the globe.

In Massachusetts lived the master builders of an Americanism which means the welfare of the world through American ideals. Four Presidents went to the White House from New England; others were of New England ancestry. Massachusetts is ideally suited for work, rest, recreation, and study.

President Adams' letter written on December 22, 1806, is worthy of study and attention by all lovers of peace everywhere:

"Differences may arise between nations as well as individuals, but as the latter discuss their rights before tribunals, there is no difficulty, moral or physical, to prevent the former from following a similar procedure. The time will come when the whole world will cover with benedictions the generous nation, which by being the first to pronounce that she renounced the right to conquest, has displayed the stand of universal peace."

Few names of settlements are so fraught (as in Massachusetts) with awe-inspiring significance so filled with abounding memories as that Bay State. What vast episodes of human history have been enacted in this part of the country in the cause of human liberty and progress. Free public education began here. Long before the beginning of our independent existence as a Nation, Massachusetts men laid the foundations of a philosophy of education that has guided our Nation ever since. Massachusetts is today one of the world's foremost cultural and educational centers. Harvard, the oldest American university, is located in this Commonwealth. We have the finest symphony orchestra in the world and Boston is nearer to Europe than any other major American city.

It is in Massachusetts where the history of the United States had its start. Here the foundations of America were laid. Here the seeds of Americanism were planted, the tree of liberty, the majestic oak, proof against all storms, whose branches overspread our whole country, beneath whose enchanting leaves 48,000,000 of the earth's oppressed and downtrodden from every race and creed and from every part of the world have found refreshing shade, secure shelter, inspiration, and encouragement for most useful lives, a scene and center of the world's greatest, most productive, and beneficent activity.

Massachusetts, with her early settlements, her charming villages and towns that later became thriving cities, scattered all over her broad acres in beautiful meadows, by lake, stream, or brooklet, or nestling among her quiet and serene hills, was the veritable cradle and nursery of Americanism, and sent her sons and daughters all over this broad land till they had peopled the whole continent planting everywhere the seeds of a sturdy, a stanch, a loyal, and fearless Americanism. It is from Massachusetts that the American spirit was spread to the glorious galaxy of the indissoluble Union of freedom, justice, and humanity, the world's supreme and universally inspiring democracy.

It was in Massachusetts where lived our greatest heroes and martyrs, where dwelt and struggled and suffered and succeeded the noblest types of American manhood and womanhood—men who formulated the ideals which form the backbone of the United Nations Charter. Where is there in the entire United States such a locale associated with such beautiful memories, traditions, and ideals of liberty for the human race as our own Concord, the literary shrine of America's greatest writers, where America "flowered" so beautifully? What about Walden Pond, of which Thoreau, who made it famous, said so delightfully: "God gave it a commission to be the only Walden Pond in the world." It was here where thought and wrote and spoke such exponents of human liberty as Emerson and Hawthorne, Longfellow and Whittier, Lowell and Holmes, Webster and Sumner, Garrison and Wendell Phillips, and a hundred others of America's immortals, who give life and hope to the people of all races and creeds who came here to establish themselves in a new country.

Here in Massachusetts the first battle of the American Revolution was fought and where the Minute Man now stands guard, as it were, over American liberties, to be defended at a moment's notice as against whatever foe, as in the glorious days of the early America. It is difficult to measure the scope of the tremendous influence of Plymouth, Mass., where the Pilgrims landed, and Provincetown, in whose beautiful harbor the Pilgrims signed, before landing, the famous compact in the *Mayflower*. We have in Massachusetts the Adams Mansion, in Quincy, home of two American Presidents, the second and the sixth, father and son, John and John Quincy, great patriots, immortal Americans; Marshfield, where dwelt the colossal Daniel Webster, eloquent and inspired orator of the ideals of America with his words so internationally timely: "Liberty and union, now and forever."

It is from Massachusetts that influences have gone forth and molded the American Nation and formed its character, shaped the destiny of our people, and affected that of the people of the earth; breasted and conquered tyranny, won our independence, enfranchised the Negro slave, and achieved scores of other blessings that fill the true American heart with pride.

Not only is Massachusetts invested with spiritual benefits of incalculable value, but where is there another part of the world one will find the picturesque and beautiful country which nature endowed with a scenery that varies from the sand dunes of Cape Cod and the rocky north shore of Massachusetts Bay to the forest lakes of our neighboring State of Maine and the New Hampshire White Mountains. It is a pastoral country that has mellowed in the 326 years since the first settlements. It is an ideal place for every conceivable recreation and nourishment of the physical body, in an atmosphere where life is soothing.

Yes, indeed, my enthusiasm about the whole matter has not been exclusively on the basis of spiritual or historic considerations. A detail practical plan based on hard facts has been worked out to indicate the superior advantages Massachusetts has to offer. In addition I have suggested the following:

No one of sound reason can fail to give unqualified support to the need of exchange of visits of the business people as well as the average citizen of all lands, quite as much as a statesman and intellectual leaders. One way to bring it about is to get our business leaders to erect one of the finest structures of its kind in the world to house a permanent international world exhibit to be established in the vicinity of the headquarters of the United Nations Capital. Purpose would be to exhibit under one roof the diversified products manufactured in New England. But more—a section would be devoted to the products of the members of the United Nations family. There might also be a division wherein there would be exhibited evidence of the development and history of industry from the days that the Pilgrim Fathers landed here to the present time.

International peace must rest ultimately upon the mental and moral disarmament which should be an essential part of the

equipment of all human beings, young and old. To bring this about we should establish here an International University for World Citizenship. In such a university would be gathered the best brains of the world for the purpose of studying and developing international law. The language barrier between the nations might be overcome as a result of linguistic advance and questions of economics as affecting the whole world would be considered. The university might truly be the world's center of business, political and intellectual thought and guidance from which might go forth streams of ideals, principles and policies to guide civilization.

As a step to make the children of the world internationally minded, a movement might be inagurated by the children of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to present to each of the 51 nations a replica of the Goddess of Liberty, "enlightening the world, holding aloft the torch of light that everyone may see."

What the world needs is the true spirit of Massachusetts. At a time when the American people are called upon to play the largest part as pioneers of a new and greater world democracy, there is no better place for the capital of the World Nations than Massachusetts, the shrine of our political liberties, as well as of our most exalted national ideals. It is the ideal place for a new birth of freedom for the human race. The spirit of Massachusetts, embracing the creative arts of peace, will help fill the world with immortal beauty and with unending blessing.

Address of Hon. Helen Gahagan Douglas, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. FOLGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 5, 1945

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to commend to every Member of the House, those present and those not present, that they read the broadcast made by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] last night. I give it to you as my opinion that her address is extremely timely and one of the most profound, and one of the grandest utterances made anywhere in this country in the last 10 years or more.

Up in New York State, on a bluff overlooking the wide, majestic sweep of the Hudson River Valley, there is a quiet garden that will forever be a shrine to all who love courage, decency, and fair play.

For in that garden one bright sunny day last spring the American people bade farewell to all that was mortal in their friend—the friend of the little people, the humble, and the oppressed all over this earth. He went to his well-earned rest, mourned by all the world as no man had ever been mourned before—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Not quite 4 months later a bomb was dropped on Hiroshima. A few days later the war with Japan stopped.

The war is over, but peace has not yet come. The world is uneasy. The war is over, but the peace is yet to be won.

To win the peace will take the same kind of imagination, the same daring as it took to build the bomb that ended the war. Halfpenny measures will lose the peace for us.

It was easier to pull down the mighty German and Japanese war machines than it will be to rebuild a more than half-ruined world. It was easier to build 50,000 war planes than it will be to help restore health and confidence to millions of the peoples of this rubble-strewn earth. It was easier to mobilize and train our superb Army than it will be to set our economy in the kind of order that will provide jobs for all who will need them, now that the war is over.

Don't let's fool ourselves. It was easier to keep up the morale of the men on the Ledo Road than it will be to keep our balance, our sense of proportion in this twilight period between war and peace.

We will have to fight to retain our faith and hope in the future. We will have to fight with everything that is in us against deadening discouragement and cynicism.

We must again keep our eye, our mind and our heart on the goals, remembering that, whether we like it or not, we will together share the results of our labor.

Those who think that a planless peace is in the cards are unrealistic. What would have happened if our Commander in Chief and our generals had launched the second front without a plan?

What do we plan for? Where are we going? What are our goals?

World peace. We and the peoples of this earth yearn to settle our difference in the future around a council table, without the persuasion of atomic bombs. And toward this end we have helped to lay the foundation for the United Nations Organization. We must plan now, with everything that is in us, to keep that Organization together, to allow no part of our unity to seep away through friction, misunderstanding, or suspicion. For with it will slip away our very future.

Here at home we have envisioned new goals of human happiness in the economic bill of rights left to us by our friend who sleeps in that quiet garden. And we have the 21-point program given us by President Truman which would make the economic bill of rights a reality. That program demands our action. Lip service never turned a wheel.

What are our assets? What have we got to work with?

A legacy of international good will and friendship, begun and patiently built, stone by stone, in the years before Pearl Harbor and cemented with blood and tears in the heat and flame of battle.

We have inherited for the job ahead a strong and healthy body.

We are rich—rich in industrial capacity, industrial know-how, scientific farming—rich in our reservoir of skilled labor—rich in our men of science and letters—rich in natural resources.

We are intact. We are whole. Our factories, our fields, our cities, and our homes have escaped the scars of war. We have not been driven underground. We have not been bombed.

We are powerful, more powerful than any other nation on the globe today.

Yet we are young—only half grown. We have the assets of youth—vigor and resistance.

But our greatest asset—our most priceless treasure—is our heritage as freemen.

Freemen are unafraid. Freemen have open minds, open hearts that quicken to the yearning of others for freedom, whether they be black, or white, or yellow—whether that freedom is to be won in far-off places or extended here at home.

We have everything to work with—everything to work for. If we can't make a go of it, nobody can.

There is no question that we have the ability to reach our goals. But have we a sense of the urgency of the hour?

Looking back will solve nothing. Yet what seems to be the principal preoccupation here in Washington? What happened at Pearl Harbor 4 years ago—that's the $64 question. It's the hottest topic under discussion. It covers the front pages of our newspapers.

Oh, yes; there is a lesson to be learned from Pearl Harbor. It is the lesson that it is dangerous to fail to read the signposts. There are signposts now, all over the place, but there are some who cannot read them, some who refuse to read them—and some who would even turn them around and have them point the other way.

There are certain groups in this country who thought we could do business with Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito—isolationists then, isolationists now—blind then, before the onslaught of coming war; blind now, stupidly and deliberately blind, before the impact of peace—who choose to spend their time—and ours—scratching around, digging into the files, trying to prove that we wouldn't have been in the war if it hadn't been for Franklin Roosevelt.

These are the people who always hated everything he stood for, because they have always felt contempt for little people. And now they seem to think that by discrediting Roosevelt, by character assassination of the vilest kind, they can do two things: kill his program and justify their own isolationism of yesterday.

The irony of it! That these same people who are trying to prove that President Roosevelt dragged us into this war are by their constant baiting of Russia preparing the ground for an atomic bomb armaments race and for the next war—the last war.

Can it be that anyone is so abysmally ignorant as to think that, had we withdrawn our fleet from Pearl Harbor, abandoned China to her fate, given up all hope of defending the Philippines and Hawaii, sold the Japanese all the steel and oil and munitions of war they demanded, given up all our rights to conduct trade and commerce in the Far East, Japan would not have attacked us eventually?

Can it be that they don't know that Germany, after she finished with Europe, Britain, and Russia, would have turned on us next?

Well, if they don't know it, all they have to do is follow Nuernberg trials, and the German documents will tell them all about it. For they are documenting, step by step, what almost all of us knew—that Germany, years before Pearl Harbor, was bent on world conquest, that Germany and Japan months before Pearl Harbor had formed their Axis. If there are still those who believe that the gentle Japanese war lords were prodded into the Pearl Harbor attack, again the Nuernberg trials have shown that the Germans and the Japanese were discussing the projected attack on the United States many months before December 7, 1941. The rewriters of recent history had better follow the Nuernberg trials and learn a few facts.

Or is this just the cheapest and most cynical political trick that was ever attempted in this land of freedom-loving people? If it is a political trick, the shame falls across the grave of every man, woman, and child who fell in the wake of this terrible war. It is a grinning, obscene mockery in the face of every wounded boy in every hospital in the world.

Even while the Nuernberg trials are going on, before we have liquidated the Nazi party and all its evil works, they would, to satisfy their own political ambitions, do a thing coldly calculated to destroy our unity, to breed mistrust and doubt, at this most dangerous moment in history. Isolationists, not only in the world, but in their own communities.

Whether it is a political trick or not, it is a danger to every fighting man coming home looking for a job. It is a danger to every working man and woman in this country—

and to our whole economy, which is dependent on their earnings. It is a danger because it keeps us looking back instead of forward. It is a danger because, instead of leading, we are allowing events to push us.

Pearl Harbor, do they say? What about the Pearl Harbors of tomorrow? There can be Pearl Harbors of peace, too.

We have a housing Pearl Harbor on our doorstep right now. Look at your daily newspapers, with pictures of veterans living in tents. In my city of Los Angeles homes are needed now for 135,000 families. There is imminent danger that, with the overcrowding, sanitation facilities might break down, resulting in widespread epidemic. This story is repeated in city after city over the face of this land. When all our men in uniform not required for occupation duty have returned home, this country will have a shortage of 3,000,000 homes. We could have been ahead of this emergency. We could have had a housing law months ago.

More than a million of our fighting men are coming home every month. Where is our full employment bill? Unemployment isn't hounding us yet. Are we going to wait and see if it does before we act? After all these months, the bill has just been reported out of committee, completely rewritten so that no one will even recognize it. The words "full employment" are not even mentioned. Those incapable of reading signposts are afraid to set full employment as a national goal. They are afraid of the words "full employment." Well, the American people are not afraid of full employment. They don't think it's un-American to take steps to insure every able and willing American worker a job so that he can feed his family and keep a roof over his head.

Is there danger of a Pearl Harbor in strikes? What has happened to the points in President's Truman's program that would have given confidence and a sense of security to millions of American workers against the day when they might be out of jobs?

Why hasn't the minimum wage been raised from 40 to 65 cents an hour, so that millions of our people could come at least within shouting distance of that high standard of living we're always boasting about?

We hear a great deal about profits, but millions of Americans today are not thinking about profits. They are thinking about enough money to clothe and feed and house their families, pay doctor bills, and meet the increased cost of living on their peacetime, cut-back wages.

Is there danger of a Pearl Harbor in inflation? The Pearl Harbor boys of yesterday don't seem to be worried about that. They're all for going back to the good old law of supply and demand. They're not afraid of high prices. They think a little inflation wouldn't do us any harm.

Is there a possible Pearl Harbor of racial tension? Where is the permanent FEPC, to which both party platforms pledged their support? Where is the permanent FEPC which would put an end to job discrimination against Negroes, Jews, Catholics, the foreign born, and all minority groups?

Remember that April Saturday when Franklin Roosevelt came back to Washington for the last time?

Millions of Americans that day stood with bowed heads—as they had stood through the night along the railroad tracks all the way up from Georgia—as they were to stand again as a train sped through the night from Washington to Hyde Park—and made a solemn vow that the things he stood for, the things he had fought for so valiantly—would be finished.

Well, what are we waiting on?

Let's get started on finishing the job. Let your leaders in Washington know you are ready—that you accept the challenge.

Converting Cargo Ships to Troop Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
Wednesday, December 5, 1945
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I addressed communications to the Secretary of War and to the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration with reference to the desirability and the possibility of converting Liberty ships to troop ships in order to relieve the transportation bottleneck that is preventing the speedy return of high-point men from overseas. Enclosed with my letters were recent news pictures of countless cargo ships swinging idly at anchor in San Francisco Bay as well as a copy of a news article from the Daily Pacifican, the Army newspaper in the western Pacific, which stated that a Colonel Davidson had indicated that Liberty ships could be converted to troop transports in 48 hours.

No reply has yet been received from the War Department, but I have an answer from Admiral E. S. Land which I wish to include with my remarks:

WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, November 30, 1945.

The Honorable JACK Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR JACK: I have your clippings showing cargo ships anchored in San Francisco Bay and describing the belief of Colonel Davidson that Liberty ships can be converted into troops ships in 48 hours. The cargo ships are at anchor because there is no cargo for them to carry. The suggestion of Colonel Davidson is a popular one but has many drawbacks. The so-called "48 hour conversion" of the standard Liberty ship into 750-man troop ships is a temporary expedient which, I understand, the Army has resorted to only in emergency. The War Shipping Administration must, necessarily, in its conversion take into account the need for adequate sleeping, sanitary, medical, and messing facilities and must provide an installation which will be safe for the troops under all conditions of weather. For the purpose of general troop carrying the War Shipping Administration does not feel it either safe or good policy to initiate a program of "48 hour conversions."

Our available ships in the Atlantic are now sufficient to take care of the backlog of men in the European area waiting to come home and within less than a month we will be diverting ships to the Pacific. By the time we could convert these various cargo ships into troop ships the need for them would have disappeared. This problem is one of great urgency and we are doing everything we can to speed up return troop movements. We have checked Army and Navy figures on personnel available for return and find that the presently available ships are all that can be used effectively.

Sincerely yours,

E. S. LAND,
Administrator.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as indicated by Admiral Land, the Army has at various times converted cargo carriers to troop ships in emergency. I firmly believe that as long as high-point servicemen, eligible for discharge, are held overseas because of the lack of sufficient ships to bring them home, an emergency exists. Whatever we can do to expedite the return of these men, without jeopardizing the national safety, must be done.

In this regard it is gratifying to note that the chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee has appointed a special subcommittee to inquire fully into the subject and to report back to the full committee the results of the investigation. As a member of the subcommittee I am looking forward eagerly to this opportunity to obtain all of the facts and information that are available in the various branches of the armed services. I am sure that our committee will be able to recommend steps that will be helpful to those men who have done their duty, who have served their country during a great emergency and who are entitled to a speedy return to their homes and families.

Mr. Speaker, how much more sensible and effective this is than the unwarranted and reckless action just recently taken by various longshoremen's and maritime unions in tying up ships and cargoes at various important ports throughout the United States. In this connection I wish to include with my remarks copies of telegrams recently addressed to Harry Bridges and Ferdinand Smith by the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration. I commend Admiral Land for his forthright language and for his condemnation of the "ill-conceived propaganda" to which he refers.

NOVEMBER 30, 1945.

Mr. HARRY BRIDGES,
International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union,
San Francisco, Calif.

In reply to your telegram of November 28, I repeat what I told you in my previous wire of November 26, namely, that troop transportation from all theaters has proceeded at such a rate that December will see a substantial excess of capacity in the Atlantic. In fact, at least 30 ships with a capacity of more than 76,000 troops will be diverted during that month to the Pacific.

As to your reference to the vessel named *Mormactern*, she was rejected as a troop ship by Army, Navy, and WSA after her last assignment to that service demonstrated her unsuitability.

Second. Your statement that the *Monterey*, the *Matsonia*, and the *Lurline* were returned to the Matson Line for reconversion to passenger service is false. They have not been so returned. There is no intention of reconverting them at this time. Influence which you say maritime unions brought to bear has not dictated any actions taken in connection with these troop ships.

Third. With reference to your remarks about conversion of ships to troopers, that question is decided, as I have told you before, by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and I assume it has occurred quite naturally to them that in view of current excess capacity further conversions cannot be justified.

Fourth. The War Shipping Administration alone is currently operating 551 troop ships, a fleet very substantially larger than the entire foreign-trade fleet of the American merchant marine in 1939.

Fifth. These ships have a collective capacity of nearly 600,000 troops per sailing homeward bound.

Sixth. In addition, both the Army and the Navy operate troop ships.

Seventh. As I have advised your associate, Ferdinand Smith, secretary of the National Maritime Union, all vessels in operation by the War Shipping Administration are providing a variety of essental services to troop transportation, to our allies, and to our own country (and that includes coastwise and intercoastal services), so that any interference by you with the sailing of any ship on December 3 under any such specious pretext as you have advanced would be a disservice to yourselves, to your Government, and to the merchant marine in general.

And finally, as I also advised Mr. Smith, it is my opinion that your ill-conceived propaganda tends primarily toward discouraging, disillusioning, and demoralizing men and women of our armed forces depending upon water transportation homeward.

E. S. LAND,
Administrator, War Shipping Administration.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 5, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

GENERAL COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT,
BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS,
Boston, Mass., November 30, 1945.
The Honorable THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Attached is copy of letter sent to Chester Bowles by the Massachusetts State OPA Labor Advisory Committee, of which I am the chairman.

The representatives of organized labor in this Massachusetts area, CIO, A. F. of L., and railroad brotherhoods, have been cooperating with OPA in an effort to keep down the cost of living. We have recently discussed this situation and are very much disturbed about rumors to the effect that price control might soon be discontinued. We feel that it is for the best interests of organized labor and the workingman that price control continue until supply equals demand.

As a representative of the Locomotive Engineers on the Boston and Maine Railroad, with headquarters here at Boston, I feel that a matter of this importance should be brought to your attention. I have taken this up with my colleagues in organized labor, the CIO and A. F. of L. members, and they have agreed that we, as representatives of organized labor, should bring to your attention our position on this very important subject.

We trust that you will do all in your power to cooperate in the fight against inflation.

Very sincerely yours,
HENRY A. TWICHELL,
General Chairman, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

MASSACHUSETTS STATE OPA LABOR
ADVISORY COMMITTEE,
Boston, Mass., November 27, 1945.
CHESTER BOWLES, *Administrator,*
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: The Massachusetts State OPA Labor Advisory Committee at its meeting on November 14, 1945, held at Boston, discussed the magnificent fight you are waging against pressure from special-interest groups who are attempting, because of selfish reasons, to break the line on price control and rent control.

We, labor advisory committee members, who are leaders representing organized labor in this area, are voluntarily and without compensation giving our time and effort to cooperate with OPA in its efforts to keep down the cost of living. We realize that your fight is a sincere and honest one aimed to benefit the general public and that you do not favor "special favors" to pressure groups. For this, we highly commend you and we stand solidly with you.

Very sincerely yours,
HENRY A. TWICHELL,
Chairman, Massachusetts State OPA Labor Advisory Committee.

Not Unduly Exacting in Indonesia—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 5, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, when Maj. Gen. Patrick Hurley said that "in the Far East we are furnishing lend-lease supplies and using all our reputation to undermine democracy and bolster imperialism and communism," he confirmed the facts of a policy which has been a source of grave concern to many Americans.

General Hurley's statement repeats what has been hinted in less specific terms by the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Grew, last May, when he said "the United States is leaning over backward to avoid offending Russia," and also by the present Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, in October 1945 by the phrase, "we were not unduly exacting in regard to Poland."

Many Americans agree with General Hurley's opinion that, "The weakness of American foreign policy has backed us into two world wars. There is a third world war in the making. In diplomacy today we are permitting ourselves to be sucked into a power bloc on the side of colonial imperialism against Communist imperialism."

Nowhere does the weakness of our foreign policy show up more clearly than in our present bewildered inactivity about the tragic situation in Indonesia. Like General Hurley, most Americans are "opposed to both"—imperialisms—most Americans "still favor democracy and free enterprise." The consequences possibly ensuing from our lack of constructive, positive action are very plainly pointed out by the following editorial in the Christian Century's issue of November 21:

THE BRAVE NEW WORLD REACHES JAVA

Shocking things are happening all over the globe—in China, in Palestine, in Poland and Czechoslovakia, in Germany, and in many parts of South America. But nothing that is going on in any of these spots is quite so shocking as the fighting in Java. There, as we go to press, the half-million inhabitants of the port of Soerabaja are ringed in by a circle of fire from warships, tanks, and bombing planes, while ground troops are systematically overrunning the city street by street, house by house. And the fighting is spreading to Batavia. Italy did nothing worse in Ethiopia. An imperialist power, Britain, which has no right to be in Java, is using Indian mercenaries and American lend-lease equipment to mow down a native population whose offense has been a demand for freedom. The purpose is to force the Indonesians back under an alien rule that the alien imperialism, Holland, is itself not strong enough to restore. A "labor" Britain and a "democratic" United States are thus taking a leading part in refastening the shackles of imperialism on a major portion of the Southwest Pacific. The United States tries to escape its share of the responsibility by asking that the American insignia be painted off the weapons that are killing the Javanese. The British prime minister talks about his nation's "moral responsibility" to the Dutch. What responsibility? And what about British Labor's moral responsibility to the Indonesian hope of liberty? This whole bloody business in Java is almost too terrible to contemplate. Yet it goes on, growing worse day by day. And in this extremity, to whom do the Javanese patriots appeal for understanding and support? To the United States, which likes to think of itself as the beacon light of freedom? Not at all. The Javanese appeal to Russia. Think that over. It may have a lot of future history tied up in it.

From the November 17 issue of the New Leader, the following editorial on this subject of Indonesia and the part required of the United States if we are truly interested in a peaceful world, merits careful consideration:

THE REVOLT IN INDONESIA AND AMERICAN RESPONSIBILITY

The passivity of the United States and its nonintervention in the great conflict in Indonesia is neither sensible nor salutary.

Against British planes, tanks, and guns the rebels have no chance. The insurrection will be suppressed, and the Dutch authorities will be reinstated. For a certain time order and quiet will return to these rich islands which are, with their population of 70,000,000, almost an empire in themselves. But how long will Dutch law and order last, and what is its price?

Criticism regarding the Indonesian uprising is easy but not entirely convincing. It is true that the people of Indonesia endured the Japanese occupation without a revolt; that the weapons they are fighting with at present are of Japanese origin; that they had direct military help on the part of Japanese officers; that the appeal for Russian help is illogical, since popular movements in Russia are suppressed by methods even more cruel than those applied by the British and Dutch in Indonesia.

These considerations do not solve, however, the great problem. What the world sees in the great area between the Indian and the Pacific Oceans today are movements of colonial peoples which have grown and matured in recent decades and have reached a stage in their development when much more self-government is possible and imperative.

Great, popular movements in the colonial spheres, from Egypt and Palestine to French Indochina and Indonesia, have followed the war They are of particular strength in the French and Dutch colonies; this is a symptom and a consequence of the weakening of France and Holland during the war, and the fruit of prewar maladministration. It would be a mistake simply to adhere to the principle of French and Dutch sovereignty and to restore the old colonial status.

The United States has taken a political step of fundamental significance in intervening in the Palestinian problem. Palestine belongs to the British sphere and America has no right to interfere in its internal affairs. With the consent of the people of Palestine as well as of the British Govern-

ment, the United States is going to play a major role in one of the most complicated problems of the Middle East as well as of the whole Arabic world.

America has risen to an outstanding and dominant position in the postwar world. The U. S. A. is not interested in further territorial conquest. The colonial world looks to us with hope. We cannot evade our responsibilities; we cannot return to isolation in any sphere. The U. S. A. alone of all nations is in a position to intervene in Indonesia, in China, in Palestine, on the side of democratic progress. We can stop the senseless bloodshed in the Far East. We can open the road to self-government to the millions of colonial people longing for our political as well as economic aid.

As General Hurley says in his statement on American foreign policy:

A democracy must live on its intelligence, and its integrity, and its courage. To the people of the democracy should be given all the facts to enable them to form correct opinions.

The facts in regard to Indonesia and other parts of the Orient are not simple. To many Americans they seem strange and often bizarre. Yet upon our earnest efforts to understand these facts depends our hope of peace.

Communist Russia Realistic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 5, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, thousands of our men in the military services are having an opportunity to meet Russian soldiers and civilians. The association, in many instances, is quite intimate and this affords these men a chance to judge the Russian, and the social and political system which he symbolizes.

I have just received a letter from a young ensign, who is stationed at Saseba, Japan, and he writes a most vigorous letter about our Russian ally.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I offer for the RECORD this personal opinion of my young friend in the Navy. For obvious reasons, I omit his name in the fear that he might be subjected to discrimination by his superiors:

As far as the current diplomatic policy of the Soviet Union is concerned, I believe it can be expressed briefly and truthfully by the two words: "tactful aggression." The writer has had the opportunity of observing at close hand the policy and conduct of the Russians in that portion of southeast Europe, which they have occupied and has seen them as they really are—not people who can be bought off or bested by a kind of poker-game-trump-card strategy, but tough, fearless, and stubborn men and women who believe unquestionably in the destiny of Russia, in the eventual supremacy of the communistic system throughout the world, and in the infallibility of Josef Stalin. As Stalin commands, so they will do, and with an eager alacrity.

Russians are the world's best-known realists. Force and a firmness of purpose equal to their own they understand, admire, and respect. Ransom and its giver they despise but will take as long as it is forthcoming.

Communism is as serious threat to democracy as the fascism we have just defeated ever was. If we are weak now in the postwar reconstruction, if we play the part of a craven moneybags buying a temporary security with gold, if we do not speak to the world with the mighty voice our armed power entitles us to; then a third, and even far more horrible, world conflict is inevitable.

What has happened to the America which boasted: "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute"?

The Government's Policy Respecting the Aluminum Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 6 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, some time ago I inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD a letter from Mr. L. M. Brile, president, Fairmont Aluminum Co., Fairmont, W. Va., addressed to Mr. W. Stuart Symington, Administrator of Surplus Property. I have received a copy of the reply of Administrator Symington, under date of November 20, 1945, and I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD. The letter gives a very clear statement of the policy of the Government, and I am glad to have the opportunity of placing it in the RECORD. I feel sure that it will be of intense interest to the Senators.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 20, 1945.

MR. L. M. BRILE,
President, Fairmont Aluminum Co.,
Fairmont, W. Va.

DEAR MR. BRILE: Thank you for your comments dated October 22, 1945, on our aluminum report to Congress. We regret that as an independent in the aluminum industry you should construe the program we proposed as contrary to the interests of independent producers. Other independent producers have indicated approval of the proposed program on the basis that it would assist them.

Nothing in our report recommended subsidies for any producers, whether of primary ingot or fabricated products, and we clearly stated on page 53 of the printed copy that if subsidies were to be considered, Congress would make the decision and not the Surplus Property Board (Administration). We, of course, have read the charges made by the Aluminum Co. of America, but those charges are based on that company's own interpretation of our report, and is at variance with our intentions.

You assume that our suggestion that the Government might guarantee losses would constitute a subsidy. We recommended certain precautions that should prevent such an outcome, and we expected that others could operate in good faith under such a guaranty, and show profits as did the Aluminum Co. of America operating under an identical arrangement. You may be interested to know that all bids, involving such a proposal for the lease of aluminum reduction plants, have been withdrawn and that at present such an issue does not exist.

No bauxite subsidy was even mentioned in our report. The proposed assistance is merely of a general nature, with the individual company expected to undertake the normal business investment involved, aided by our Government in international negotiations, if necessary. This is a practice which various businessmen in this country have relied upon from time to time, especially when they suspected discrimination by foreign interests.

I am sure that there is a misunderstanding over the measures we propose, because we are in full accord with your own interest in seeing the aluminum industry operated by fully independent competitive private enterprise.

Sincerely yours,
W. STUART SYMINGTON,
Administrator.

Inflation in the Price of Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have commented on the serious housing problem, particularly as it affects veterans, which confronts us.

Yesterday, Mr. Chester Bowles, OPA Administrator, testified before the Banking and Currency Committee, on the Patman bill to check inflation on housing costs. His remarks are so illuminating that I desire to insert them in the RECORD, as follows:

More than a month ago, before another congressional committee, I urged that legislation be adopted to head off a wild inflation in the prices of homes. And today I am deeply grateful for this opportunity to testify as forcefully as I know how in favor of the bill Congressman PATMAN has introduced.

As Price Administrator, I am concerned, first, because of the direct effect that a wild inflation in home prices can have upon the effectiveness of the OPA's efforts to control rents and prices of building materials. Secondly, I am convinced that the Nation's whole effort to maintain a stable economy during the critical months ahead may easily be exploded by an inflationary fire in the real-estate field. And finally, I have every American citizen's feeling of responsibility about the desperate housing needs of millions of veterans and others who will be homeless or forced to live in cramped or substandard quarters next year unless the housing issue is faced quickly, intelligently, and courageously.

We have come through the war years with a far better record of economic stability than most of us, a few years ago, dared to hope would be possible. We have succeeded in stabilizing the cost of living in the face of inflationary pressures far beyond anything that the country has experienced in its history before. And we can continue to hold the line until the danger is past.

I have been very much disturbed by the dangerous defeatism of some people who have stated publicly their opinion that the line cannot be held, that inflation is inevitable. This is dangerous and irresponsible propaganda. I cannot help but believe that it has been deliberately fostered by certain groups

who feel that a little inflation would serve their selfish interests. These people are either unable or unwilling to recognize that there is no such thing as a controlled inflation.

Once inflation is well started, it is about as easy to control it as to control the chain reaction in an atomic explosion. And the results can be almost as disastrous.

Let me emphasize again that the American people have so far been able to hold back the highest tide of inflationary pressures in history. And we can continue to hold it if we will plug the one hole in the dike that threatens the entire foundation of the stabilization program in the critical months ahead. Uncontrolled prices of homes constitute a danger spot which can and must be repaired quickly.

The inflationary crisis in the real-estate field follows the familiar pattern of tremendous demand for an unavoidably small supply. It was this same war-born condition which prompted a foresighted Congress to act 4 years ago to head off runaway prices on food, clothing, rents, and thousands of other commodities

It is estimated that American families today need a total of about 12,000,000 new homes to make up for building that has not been done during recent years, to replace our more than 7,000,000 substandard dwellings and to meet the needs of the families of more than 3,000,000 newly married veterans and others who have been living doubled up or who want to set up households for the first time.

Surveys indicate clearly that a large part of this need is in the form of immediate demand backed up by more cash than American families have ever had before. Individual savings have increased by $145,000,000,000 since before the war. Checking accounts have increased from twenty-seven to seventy-two billion dollars since 1939. The immediate demand for homes during the next 2 years is estimated at between two and three million units. In addition, the National Housing Agency estimates that the backlog of repair and modernization work which was put off during the war totaled $3,000,000,000 in 1944.

However, the best estimates also indicate that not more than 400,000 to 500,000 homes can even be started during 1946 and probably no more than 350,000 to 400,000 can be completed.

We in the OPA are working constantly with other Government agencies and with industry to break bottlenecks and to clear the way for the largest possible volume of construction. We have watched building-materials prices carefully and have made numerous adjustments wherever it was clear that price was actually standing in the way of production. In addition, we have done everything possible to encourage the construction of new rental property by assuring prospective builders in advance that they will receive rentals high enough to make ample allowance for increased construction costs since 1939.

It is obvious that this particular inflationary bomb will not be rendered completely harmless until we are building homes at the rate of a million or more units a year. In the meantime, while it is still physically impossible to come near closing the gap between supply and demand, the fuze on that bomb must be dampened by effective controls.

The danger signs are already frighteningly clear. Construction costs have increased more than 30 percent since the beginning of the war in 1939. Anybody who has tried to build or buy a home during recent months knows that prices are sweeping higher and higher every day. Evictions of tenants resulting from home sales provide another inflationary danger signal. On the basis of 8 months' experience it is estimated that such evictions in 1945 will total 225,000 as compared with only 73,509 in 1943.

If we fail to plug this dangerous hole in the stabilization dike once and for all, we must be prepared to face the same crippling building boom and collapse which occurred at just about this time after the last war. There was a great accumulated demand for homes after the last armistice too. Early in 1919 a vigorous building boom began. But in 1 year building costs skyrocketed 40 to 50 percent above 1918. And within 1 year the boom collapsed. Runaway prices had dried up the market.

During the "boom and collapse" process, some buyer dug far too deeply into their pockets to pay high prices and lived to regret it later. Thousands of others could not buy at all and thus failed to get the homes they badly needed and would gladly have bought at prices within their reach. The building industry was robbed of its long-range market. It failed to make the contribution it might otherwise have made to a sustained, high-level economy. When the collapse came, thousands of workers lost their jobs. Few people gained and many suffered. There was a long-term aftermath of mortgage foreclosures and economic maladjustment which contributed heavily to the crash of 1929.

There are three reasons why failure to stabilize the prices of homes will also make rent controls increasingly difficult to maintain. In spite of OPA's efforts to allow rents on new construction sufficiently high to bring a generous return, few builders will be inclined to put up dwellings for rent when a big speculative return on the investment can be had so easily by building for sale. Secondly, sales of old houses—and consequently evictions—will increase as more and more owners are persuaded by a speculative profit to sell their properties. And finally, if instead of a healthy long-range building program, we have a quick boom and collapse, the upward pressure on rents for an insufficient supply of existing rental dwellings will continue for many years to come.

Recent surveys certainly give us no reason to believe that we can allow real estate prices to boom merrily upward and yet somehow avoid the inevitable collapse. While there is a ready "flash market" for homes at inflated prices, there is no long-range market at these levels. The surveys show that about half of the people who intend to build or to buy homes are willing to pay no more than $6,000. The Architectural Forum study also indicates that if the people who intend to build or buy are asked to pay even as little as $1,000 more than they now expect to pay, 37 percent of these potential buyers will be out of the market. In recent surveys of soldiers at separation centers, it was found that from 24 to 46 percent (depending on the size of their home towns) said that they can pay no more than $30 a month in rent. Twenty-two to thirty-five percent said they could not afford home-purchase payments of over $30 a month. Only 6 percent think they can pay over $50 a month for a home.

An uncontrolled boom in real estate prices would also weaken OPA's controls over the prices of building materials and services. With prices of finished houses free to soar upward while supplies of building materials continued scarce, the irresponsible speculative builder could easily bid building materials away from those who want to build or repair their own homes. In this setting the black market in materials would be extremely difficult to control, and reputable builders would be unable to hold their own.

Finally, perhaps the greatest cost of an uncontrolled inflation in homes will be the human cost.

According to discharge reports from the armed services and surveys of veterans' housing requirements, approximately 10,000 veterans are coming into the housing market every day. It is estimated that by the end of 1946, 3,500,000 married veterans will have to find homes. Add to this problem the millions of families who have been living in unfit quarters or doubled up under the same roofs with other families and I think you have the biggest reason why America must plan for a healthy, long-range building program which will provide the number of homes our people need at prices they can afford to pay. Our opportunity is all the greater because today, for the first time, thousands of families have the savings and the incomes with which to buy suitable, moderately priced homes of their own.

The Government has already taken some action to head off a crippling inflation in home costs. All parts of the "six-point program" announced by Mr. John Snyder on September 18, 1945, must be pursued vigorously. You can be sure that we in OPA will follow through with our part of that program by seeing to it that the lid is kept on the prices of building materials, construction services, and rents to the very best of our ability. At the same time, we will continue to do everything in our power to help encourage the greatest possible production.

However, I am convinced that the best that all interested Government agencies and industry can do together will not be enough under the present program. And that is why I am glad to be here today to speak in support of the Patman bill.

This bill provides adequate authority to control the prices of new homes and would check speculative demand for existing homes. Control would be limited to those areas and kinds of housing where it was shown to be necessary.

The bill provides that ceiling prices on new construction would be determined on the basis of the actual costs of construction—not in excess of ceiling prices—plus the fair-market value of the land plus the generally prevailing contractors' margin for comparable units in 1941.

This would allow the legitimate builder a generous profit and encourage sound construction. And it would prevent speculative exploitation of the acute housing shortage at the expense of the returning veteran.

I believe, too, that there would be a minimum of red tape in the law's operation. Mr. PATMAN, in his testimony before the committee, pointed out that the builder would be able to determine his own ceiling on the basis of his costs and margin as permitted in the bill. Or the builder could have his ceiling price approved in advance if he wished. Provision is also made for adjustments later to cover any unforeseen circumstances that might develop after building was started. This should set at rest any fears about undue delays.

The provision setting as a ceiling on an existing home the price at which it is first sold after the enactment of the law is certainly generous enough and would help to discourage speculation in existing homes. Obviously this arrangement would place no restriction on the price which the present owner could receive on the first sale.

I am glad that power to allocate scarce building materials to residential construction and especially to low-cost housing is included in the bill. Although this authority is already contained in the Second War Powers Act, the limited period for which it is now proposed to extend that act makes it advisable to have a separate and longer grant in the housing field.

There is increasing evidence that some materials shortages, which it was hoped would be relieved by the first of next year, are growing more serious daily. Lumber, the most important single item in home construction, is more critical than it was 2 months ago. Prospects are that supplies may

easily grow tighter. On the face of these shortages, the home-building industry is increasingly concerned with the diversion of needed materials from home construction to commercial and other nonresidential building.

Positive assistance to residential construction is imperative if we are to come close to realizing our housing goals for the coming year. In view of the obvious needs of returning veterans especially, it seems clearly proper that this assistance should be directed to encouraging construction in the moderate price ranges and in rental housing.

Authority to give preference in the purchase or renting of new residential construction to veterans in areas where there is an acute housing shortage is included in Mr. PATMAN'S bill. Of the millions who will be compelled to double up in the coming year, a major part are veterans. While they have been in their country's service they have been unable to compete on even terms for the homes they now so badly need. They are entitled to ask for something more than the right to scramble for the dregs of an almost exhausted housing supply.

The bill would also authorize subsidizing the construction of new low cost housing accommodations where there is no other practical method for getting adequate housing built in an acute shortage area. I will leave it to the housing experts to decide on the desirability or the necessity for this provision. I am convinced, however, that there is a desperate and immediate need to provide some shelter for the homeless veteran with a family.

As for the administration of the bill, I sympathize with the sense of urgency that prompted the proposal to establish a new agency. However, I do feel that at a time when we are all trying to streamline and simplify the governmental structure, we ought to try to avoid establishing a new agency. It seems preferable to me that the powers contained in the bill should be conferred on the President to be delegated to existing agencies which already have the housing know-how to do the job.

I believe that Mr. PATMAN'S bill is a moderate proposal. I believe that the big majority of thinking people in the real-estate and financial industries will understand the need for it and will help to make it work for their own protection as well as for the protection of the economy in the years ahead. These people know that sound, long-range business cannot be built on runaway costs and inflated prices. Such a plan would clearly strike only at the profiteer and the fly-by-night operator. It places a minimum burden on the majority of responsible people in the industry and provides a foundation for generous and sustained profits.

If we can meet this issue head-on, we have at our fingertips the best possible insurance for a sustained high level of employment and business activity for years to come. We have a ready-made reservoir of demand for homes. If it is not dried up overnight by inflationary prices, it can produce a steady flow of profitable business activity and employment for at least a decade. One and a quarter million houses at an average price of $5,000 would produce consumer expenditures of $6,250,000,000 a year. This is more than a billion dollars larger than consumer expenditures for motor vehicles in 1941. It is estimated that a sound residential boom will make from four to four and one-half million jobs a year, in building and closely related industries. This is nearly one-fifth of our peak wartime industrial employment and about seven times the employment in the automobile industry in its best year.

At this moment we have one of the greatest opportunities in our history to strengthen the social and economic structure of our country at its foundations. But at this same moment, I think the American people and the Congress also face the most dangerous single inflationary threat in our history. That is why I urge with all the conviction I have that the Congress enact this legislation to stop the onrushing inflation of home prices in its tracks before it is too late.

Errors in Government Unemployment Predictions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Wilbur J. Brons from the Chicago Journal of Commerce of November 28, 1945:

ERRORS IN GOVERNMENT UNEMPLOYMENT PREDICTIONS

(By Wilbur J. Brons)

The course of true love is not running smoothly for the ardent advocates of the planned economy, most of whom had pinned their hopes on the full employment legislation now in Congress.

The trouble seems to be that the annual job budget—the device by which the President and his advisers would forecast the state of employment 18 months in advance—has come under a cloud.

As most of us recall, various representatives of government, who were presumed to speak with some knowledge, were rather busy after VJ-day making sober pronouncements as to the number of workers who would soon be idle. On August 15 Stabilization Director Snyder, who probably had at hand more statistics than even the Department of Labor or Commerce, made this statement: "It is expected that there will be 5,500,000 or more unemployed in 3 months."

By spring, Mr. Snyder added, "unemployment may reach about 8,000,000." At about the same time, the War Manpower Commission was predicting 5,000,000 unemployed "in the last quarter of 1945." Meanwhile, the Social Security Board, another Federal agency with access to presumably authoritative information on the number of jobless, thought the figure might go as high as 7,500,000.

About the middle of October, 2 months after these dire predictions were broadcast throughout the land, along came the Bureau of the Census with some data based on actual developments. This agency reported that unemployment in October was only 1,520,000, which represented a decrease of 130,000 from the September total. Almost simultaneously, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor reported that the number of reconversion lay-offs was declining rapidly.

Needless to say, these discrepancies were hardly calculated to promote confidence in the ability of the slide-rule swamis to predict unemployment, which predictions are the heart and soul of the full-employment scheme. The figures showed that the statistical experts of the Government were painfully wrong, and that any program of Federal investment (spending to you) based upon their work would be founded upon shifting sand.

As a matter of probability, the predictions of Mr. Snyder, the War Manpower Commission and the Social Security Board may yet come true—but not for any reason which they took into consideration when they made their forecasts. If we have unemployment running into the five, seven or eight millions, it will be because the big CIO unions have, with Government's assistance, succeeded in tying reconversion into knots by hamstringing the automobile industry.

The full employment bill is undergoing some tailoring in the House. The committee which has it in charge agreed yesterday to drop the budget device altogether. Now if the committee will take the next logical step and report unfavorably on the whole cockeyed program of job predictions and compensatory Federal spending, it will be doing the country a genuine service.

The young men who know more about what is in store for business than business itself were spectacularly wrong in the information they gave their superiors last September. How can anyone assert with a straight face that their data will be reliable in the future?

For Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Manchester Union of December 5, 1945:

FOR MILITARY TRAINING

According to the findings of those organizations that make a business of polling public opinion, three out of every four citizens in the United States favor universal military training. Surface appearances, and the diffidence of Congress regarding this important issue, may seem to contradict these findings. But only until one remembers that organized opposition to any measure is always more fervent and vocal than the large body of public opinion, and that Congress is usually more responsive to that opposition.

If a high percentage of the letters written to Congressmen on this issue are strongly against it, that is only because the bulk of the public does not write letters to Congressmen. Those who favor universal military training are more or less passive. They will express their opinion if it is solicited, but only then. The result is that a noisy minority gives the impression of being far stronger than it is, because it dominates the field of discussion.

One of the soundest sources of opinion in a matter like universal military training is the returning veteran. These men have had knowledge of war at first hand, and of the dangers which the Nation faces. The service which they have just completed is the evidence of their patriotism and their interest in adequate national defense. These men know what the defense of the Nation today involves in training and preparation. It is therefore not surprising to discover the high percentage of returning veterans who believe that universal military training is the only sound guaranty of future national security.

The danger in dealing with any national issue is that minor considerations or prejudices shall dominate the discussion. That this is true in the case of military training is

not surprising. But in facing this issue one consideration must of necessity supersede all others. That is the question of national security in a world where high-powered weapons of war have made continued preparation imperative. With the V-bomb and the atomic missile, instruments of future attack, the time factor becomes the controlling element in national defense. It is the height of folly to disregard this fact. To do so is to play with danger. It is futile to talk about personal rights or personal comfort at a time when a new war may be the total obliteration of life itself at a moment's notice. Obviously, to escape this danger when it comes, we must be prepared to meet it promptly. And when one considers the time required to learn how to operate modern weapons of defense, the argument for universal military training becomes invincible.

Resolutions of Union County, Iowa, Farm Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the Farm Bureau of Union County, Iowa, at the recent annual meeting of members held at Creston, Iowa, on November 6, adopted constructive resolutions, and Members of Congress will be glad to study the proposals from one of the best counties in the greatest agricultural State.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein this set of resolutions:

REPORT OF RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE, UNION COUNTY FARM BUREAU

FOREWORD

Now that the struggle our Nation has been engaged in for the past 3½ years is over and our attention is turned to the immediate problems of reconversion from a wartime basis to a peacetime standard, we should all be thankful and give expression of our appreciation to those people who assisted on the various farm fronts.

Farm people made great sacrifice of life, of time, effort, and material and natural resources. They realize, too, that equal effort, vigilance, and thought must be put forth to prevent the chaos that has always been the aftermath of war.

To that end we again pledge our allegiance to our Government, to the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, and the American Farm Bureau Federation, and reaffirm and endorse those policies that we have previously endorsed that have not as yet been made effective: Therefore, be it

SECONDARY ROADS

Resolved, That we request the allotment of money for secondary roads be on the basis of need of transporting farm products and of school children.

WEEDS

Recommend State and county action on measures to control weeds, one of the most serious farm problems, and further recommend provision be made providing for mowing of weeds on roadsides of all township roads.

INSPECTION

That State supervision be given to private institutions serving farmers, particular reference being made to community sale barns and frozen-food lockers.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Recommend that electric service be made available to every farm home.

REA

Request that Congress appropriate sufficient funds so that adequate finance may at once be made available to the cooperative utilities serving Union County.

Recommend the establishment of adequate electric generating plants so that service may be maintained on all rural lines.

EXTENSION WORK

That the 4-H Club work, home project activities, and work with rural young married people be continued and strengthened in the county.

STATE INCOME TAX

That the State-income tax should be restored to 100 percent, the same to be used as a replacement to be used to better school conditions.

FEDERAL FARM PROGRAMS

We recognize the continuing need for the services rendered by the various Federal farm agencies and express our appreciation for their cooperative effort in meeting farm problems.

APPRECIATION

We wish to express the appreciation and thanks of the membership to the employees of the Farm Bureau for their untiring work in the organization.

ED HANRAHAN,
Chairman.
MRS. FRED HOOD.
L. W. HERRING.
HOMER PORTER.
R. AUSTIN GRIFFIN.
MRS. FLOYD BROWN.

Demobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, it is so seldom these days that we hear a word of commendation for the way in which the armed services are handling demobilization that I am glad to be able to include with my remarks the following letter from a father who has been ill and who needs his boy to help handle his business. The boy has only 43 points, and therefore is not yet eligible for discharge on that basis. The father's report on his visit to a separation center where the son is working deserves reading:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *November 30, 1945.*
Hon. WALTER H. JUDD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JUDD: I have just returned from spending a day at Camp McCoy, Wis. I went down to the camp with the idea there might be some way of persuading the commanding officer that my son William, who is stationed there, might be released. I was very courteously received and shown the regulations that govern these matters. Brigadier General Rice, the commanding officer, took the time to explain why he had ruled against my son's release; gave me a personally conducted tour of the separation center and explained to me the manner in which the returning soldiers are discharged.

While I think the War Department should make a ruling more liberal in such cases as my son, I have no quarrel with General Rice and his decision. I found the separation center working in a very efficient, well-timed manner, with every consideration given to the men being discharged. I had an opportunity to go through every department, including the medical examination, and was present at the ceremony when the men received their medals, if any, and their final discharge papers. The whole procedure is efficient and dignified, and reflects credit on the Army and the officers in charge, particularly General Rice and Major Hammond.

I thought you would be interested in my reaction as not many civilians have an opportunity of seeing how this work is done.

With best regards, I am,
Yours very truly,
MORRIS T. BAKER.

Bulwinkle Bill, H. R. 2536

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, for the consideration of my colleagues, I am transmitting a letter from Mr. W. J. Hynes, a prominent citizen of Boise, Idaho:

BOISE, IDAHO, *December 1, 1945.*
Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I sincerely trust that you may see fit to actively support the Bulwinkle bill (H. R. 2536). The purpose of the bill and its only purpose, as the language clearly shows, is to make it possible to carry out the will of Congress. After many years of steady growth and development in transportation the Congress in 1940 declared the national policy in regard to transportation. That declaration appears at the beginning of the Interstate Commerce Act. No one—not even the opponents of this bill—challenges that policy. Everyone concedes that it is fair and just and sensible. Experience has clearly shown that the observance of that declared policy requires a certain degree of conference and cooperation between the shippers and the carriers who haul their freight and between the carriers themselves. While it is readily agreed that some acts of cooperation are necessary and proper, it has been contended that other acts would be a violation of the antitrust laws. The purpose of the bill is to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to determine, after public hearing, whether or not a specific proposed act or method of cooperative procedure is or would be "in furtherance of the national transportation policy." Upon such a determination the act or procedure would not be in violation of the antitrust laws.

It is a common thing for Congress to enact laws which, under certain conditions, may conflict with each other. There has developed a clear conflict between, on the one hand, the Interstate Commerce Act, as it has been amended from time to time and as late as 1940, and, on the other hand, the Sherman antitrust law as it was enacted in 1890. The only purpose and effect of the bill is to resolve that conflict—to make both laws consistent and proper—and, by so doing, to make them both stronger in their practical application.

This bill would not promote or sanction monopoly. Section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act prevents consolidations, mergers,

pooling of traffic, and other kinds of monopoly. That section has 16 subparagraphs and is complete in its coverage, placing full supervision in the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission. That section would not be changed by this bill.

Furthermore, the bill itself contains all necessary safeguards. By a specific provision of the bill no agreements between carriers of different classes would be permitted. (See section 3.) Thus conference between shippers and railroads and between shippers and truck lines, for example, would be permitted if they were in furtherance of the national transportation policy but no such agreements would be permitted between railroads and truck lines or between any carriers of different classes.

The bill has had the earnest consideration of all parties interested, particularly the shippers who pay the freight. Their complete confidence that the bill would not promote or sanction monopoly is shown by their unanimous support. As you know, the bill has the approval of the following Idaho organizations: Idaho Potato and Onion Shippers; Idaho Woolgrowers; Idaho Cattlemen's Association; Idaho State Grange; Idaho Farm Bureau Federation; Order of Railroad Conductors; Idaho Cooperative Council; Idaho Mining Association; North Idaho Chamber of Commerce, and numerous local chambers of commerce; Idaho Department of Agriculture; Idaho Public Utilities Commission, whose chairman, Mr. Cornell, appeared before the committee to testify in behalf of this measure; Idaho Motor Truckers Association; Idaho Branch, Associated General Contractors of America; and many others.

I sincerely believe that the enactment of this bill is in complete accord with the overwhelming majority of the people of Idaho.

Very truly yours,

W. J. HYNES.

Uniform Divorce Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 5, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Law Student magazine:

UNIFORM DIVORCE LAW

(By Richard Harding Armstrong, Ph. D. LL. B.)

Fast travel between States has necessitated change in many things. Interstate business has done the same. When each of these United States were more or less sovereign, and when a man was born, married, acquired a fortune, and died, all within a radius of 20 miles, there was little need for uniformity of law between the States. The law of a neighboring State was unimportant. It affected only its inhabitants generally. Today, however, we are concerned with the laws of a sister State almost as much as our own in many particulars. Many live in one State and work in another. Many are working in several States. Large business houses do business in all States. Uniformity of law in many ways is very helpful; almost necessary. Uniform business acts have been enacted to fit the demand and need.

All are aware today, that divorce is a necessary evil. Some feel it to be a safety valve and a blessing. Certainly in practice, we have all found it to be the only answer to some domestic difficulties. Different States have entirely varying legislation on the subject. Grounds for divorce range from none in South Carolina to 14 in Kentucky and New Hampshire. Classified in one way there are 36 grounds in the United States and District of Columbia.

The answer is that the wealthy citizen need not be at all concerned with the law of his or her State but may choose any one of the 36 grounds; establish a residence of a varying period in any one of the States and have the bonds of matrimony severed. Some complications arise in the lawyers' mind; in some States a man may be married while in another he is not; he may be a bigamist in one State and not in another; his children may be legitimate in some States and bastards in others and so on through the familiar haze of complications brought about by lack of uniformity in marriage and divorce laws. The only solution is an acceptable uniform act. Strange as it may seem, such an act should not be difficult to arrange. Considering the grounds for divorce, we might safely arrive at that conclusion.

Incapacity or impotency is recognized as a ground for divorce in 34 States. There should be little objection to this as a ground. The same rule applies to adultery recognized in 47 States and the District of Columbia; South Carolina should yield to such an overwhelming majority even though its constitution need be changed. Even constitutions do not always reflect the mind of the times. Desertion or abandonment is a ground in 44 States. The period varies from 1 to 5 years (R. I.). At best the period must be arbitrary. There can be no particular argument in favor of any certain number of years over one. One, two, and three years are most popular. It is difficult to see how any legislature could object to 2 years. Forty States recognize conviction of crime as a ground. One State has a special ground in crime against nature. There would seem to be no special reason for this ground. Certainly courts would consider it a most serious form of cruelty whether committed on the married spouse or another. Intemperance, drunkenness, intoxication, and addiction to drug could all be classified under intemperance in drink or drug. Over 20 States recognize this ground in one form or another. Pregnancy of wife by another man is a ground for divorce in 14 States. Actually it is considered as a valid ground in nearly all States under other provisions of law. Without making it a separate ground, if it happens after marriage it is covered by adultery and if before it should be made a ground for annulment. Twelve States have as a ground insanity or lunacy. There being very good logical argument both for and against mental derangement as a reason for divorce, I shall not list it as a uniform ground for divorce, for the reason that the majority of States have not done so. Further, fortunately such cases are not very frequent, and when they do occur, the sane spouse thinks of things other than divorce usually. Non-support or like neglect is recognized in 25 States. Forty-one States have a cruelty provision. This is probably the most used section in any State recognizing the ground. While 1 State, at least, attempts to distinguish between extreme cruelty and cruel and abusive treatment by statute there seems to be no very good reason for supposing that cruelty is not broad enough to cover both classes of cases.

There are many other offenses for some special local reason which are made grounds for divorce in one or more States. The fact that there might have been some very good reason for enacting such provisions is not denied, but that they are unnecessary or properly covered by some other provision seems to be more apparent. For example, varying periods of absence unheard from are grounds in a few States. These can be properly covered by desertion. Lewd behavior, violent and ungovernable temper, attempt on life of other, public defamation, prostitution or licentiousness prior to marriage, vagrancy, uniting with certain religious societies, venereal disease, imprisonment for life, and so on are each a ground in one or two States. It is quite evident that the particular offense is better covered by a broader ground mentioned above.

Therefore, I shall list what might be wrought into a model uniform statute listing grounds for divorce, broad enough to cover all necessary cases:

1. Incapacity or impotency.
2. Adultery.
3. Desertion or abandonment, 2 years.
4. Conviction of infamous crime.
5. Intemperance in drink or drug.
6. Nonsupport or like neglect.
7. Cruelty.

It is interesting in reading the divorce statutes of different States to note how closely the above table resembles many of the various statutes. No doubt the time will come when something of the sort will be adopted by a majority of the States, together with uniform regulations as to residential requirements, alimony, and the like.

New Year Greetings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, the holiday season is with us and the Christmas bells will soon be ringing out their message. The notes are strangely mixed this year, with love and hate, greed and generosity, grief and joy, and many other contrasts which suggest themselves.

Perhaps one of the most lofty sentiments connected with Christmas and the New Year was written by Alfred Tennyson, who contrasts the old with the hopes of the future in this language:

CHRISTMAS AND THE NEW YEAR

Ring out, wild bells, to the wild sky,
The flying cloud, the frosty light:
The year is dying in the night;
Ring out, wild bells, and let him die.

Ring out the old, ring in the new,
Ring, happy bells, across the snow:
The year is going, let him go;
Ring out the false, ring in the true.

Ring out the grief that saps the mind,
For those that here we see no more;
Ring out the feud of rich and poor,
Ring in redress to all mankind.

Ring out a slowly dying cause,
And ancient forms of party strife;
Ring in the nobler modes of life,
With sweeter manners, purer laws.

Ring out the want, the care, the sin,
The faithless coldness of the times;
Ring out, ring out my mournful rhymes,
But ring the fuller minstrel in.

Ring out false pride in place and blood,
The civic slander and the spite;
Ring in the love of truth and right,
Ring in the common love of good.

Ring out old shapes of foul disease;
Ring out the narrowing lust of gold;
Ring out the thousand wars of old,
Ring in the thousand years of peace.

Ring in the valiant man and free,
The larger heart, the kindlier hand;
Ring out the darkness of the land,
Ring in the Christ that is to be.

And those who love mankind and translate their words into deeds, and their ideas into ideals, will find the whole philosophy of Christmas and the beginning of the New Year encompassed in this lofty and stirring language of Tennyson.

Most of us have listened year after year to a recital of the Christmas story which portrays a visit from that character, Santa Claus, so real to the boys and girls at this time of the year. In the magazine Coronet for December 1945, we are told about the authorship of the classic, A Visit From St. Nicholas. I think the inspiration of this story will be felt by everyone who reads it. The author of the article is Keith Monroe, and the article and the poem are as follows:

A FATHER'S GIFT TO ALL CHILDREN

"Your son is dying," the doctor told the college professor. "Technically, it's a case of shock plus loss of blood. But actually, the boy just doesn't want to live. If you can think of something that will cheer him up, even temporarily, he may rally."

The professor's son was only 7 years old. That day he had been galloping his pony along a winding pathway. The pony had slipped and fallen hard, slamming the little boy to the ground.

When they found the boy, he lay in a pool of blood, with the prostrate pony thrashing feebly beside him. The animal's leg was broken. So they shot the pony and carried the boy home to his father.

The lad had seen his beloved pony die—and he had lost the desire to live.

That was the terrible problem that faced Prof. Clement C. Moore one dark afternoon shortly before Christmas of 1822. Cheer the boy up, the doctor had said. But what did Moore know about cheering up little boys? He had devoted most of his life to producing a monumental work entitled "A Compendious Lexicon of the Hebrew Language: In Two Volumes." As professor of biblical learning and interpretation of scripture at the Diocesan Seminary, his style of writing and speaking was dignified, almost pompous. He had just finished writing an essay expressing his alarm because "more of the well-disposed among my young countrymen do not devote their leisure hours to the attainment of useful learning rather than to frivolous amusement."

But now Professor Moore knew he must devise a frivolous amusement to keep his son alive.

So the father turned away and went to the desk in his own study. He thought a while then began to write desperately, scratch out, and write again. For 2 hours his quill pen raced over sheet after sheet of foolscap. At last he rose and hurried into his son's bedroom.

The boy looked up at him again, his face white and streaked with tears. Dr. Moore began to read—to read in a gay and rollicking voice what he had just written:

" 'Twas the night before Christmas, when all through the house
Not a creature was stirring, not even a mouse."

The long poem was totally unlike anything Clement C. Moore ever wrote before or afterward. But millions of children have been enchanted by it for generations without end. And the one child for whom it was written? He liked it, too—liked it so well that he kept on living for Christmas, and for 60 years thereafter.

"A VISIT FROM ST. NICHOLAS

" 'Twas the night before Christmas, when all through the house
Not a creature was stirring, not even a mouse;
The stockings were hung by the chimney with care,
In hopes that St. Nicholas soon would be there;
The children were nestled all snug in their beds,
While visions of sugarplums danced in their heads;
And mama in her 'kerchief, and I in my cap,
Had just settled our brains for a long winter's nap,
When out on the lawn there arose such a clatter,
I sprang from the bed to see what was the matter.
Away to the window I flew like a flash,
Tore open the shutters and threw up the sash.
The moon on the breast of the new-fallen snow
Gave the lustre of mid-day to objects below;
When what to my wondering eyes should appear,
But a miniature sleigh and eight tiny reindeer,
With a little old driver, so lively and quick
I knew in a moment it must be St. Nick.
More rapid than eagles his coursers they came,
And he whistled and shouted, and called them by name:
'Now, Dasher! now Dancer! now, Prancer! and Vixen!
On, Comet! on, Cupid! on, Donder! and Blitzen,
To the top of the porch, to the top of the wall!
Now dash away, dash away, dash away all!'
As dry leaves that before the wild hurricane fly,
When they meet with an obstacle, mount to the sky,
So up to the house-top the coursers they flew,
With the sleigh full of toys—and St. Nicholas, too.
And then in a twinkling I heard on the roof
The prancing and pawing of each little hoof.
As I drew in my head, and was turning around,
Down the chimney St. Nicholas came with a bound.
He was dressed all in fur, from his head to his foot,
And his clothes were all tarnished with ashes and soot;
A bundle of toys he had flung on his back,
And he looked like a peddler just opening his pack.
His eyes—how they twinkled; his dimples how merry!
His cheeks were like roses, his nose like a cherry!
His droll little mouth was drawn up like a bow,
And the beard of his chin was as white as the snow;
The stump of a pipe he held tight in his teeth,
And the smoke it encircled his head like a wreath;
He had a broad face and a little round belly,
That shook, when he laughed, like a bowlful of jelly.
He was chubby and plump, a right jolly old elf,
And I laughed when I saw him, in spite of myself;
A wink of his eye and a twist of his head,
Soon gave me to know I had nothing to dread;
He spoke not a word, but went straight to his work,
And filled all the stockings then turned with a jerk,
And laying his finger aside of his nose,
And giving a nod, up the chimney he rose;
He sprang to his sleigh, to his team gave a whistle,
And away they all flew like the down of a thistle.
But I heard him exclaim, ere he drove out of sight,
'Happy Christmas to all, and to all a good-night.' "

Peculiarly appropriate at this time of the year, having in mind the close of a global war and the vivid knowledge of our people that the sons of America, many of them, will spend this Christmas and this coming New Year's Day in foreign lands, the following verse written by our own poet, Henry Van Dyke, will strike a responsive chord in every American heart, in every land:

AMERICA FOR ME

'Tis fine to see the Old World, and travel up and down,
Among the famous palaces and cities of renown,
To admire the crumbly castles and the statues of the kings—
But now I think I've had enough of antiquated things.
So it's home again, and home again, America for me!
My heart is turning home again, and there I long to be,
In the land of youth and freedom beyond the ocean bars,
Where the air is full of sunlight and the flag is full of stars.

Oh, London is a man's town, there's power in the air;
And Paris is a woman's town, with flowers in her hair;
And it's sweet to dream in Venice, and it's great to study Rome;
But when it comes to living, there is no place like home.

I like the German fir-woods, in green battalions drilled;
I liked the gardens of Versailles with flashing fountains filled;
But, oh, to take your hand, my dear, and ramble for a day
In the friendly western woodland where Nature has her way!

I know that Europe's wonderful, yet something seems to lack;
The Past is too much with her, and the people looking back,
But the glory of the Present is to make the Future free—
We love our land for what she is and what she is to be.

Oh, it's home again, and home again, America for me!
I want a ship that's westward bound to plough the rolling sea,
To the blessed land of room enough, beyond the ocean bars,
Where the air is full of sunlight and the flag is full of stars.

The song of the angels has become the hope of the world; that hope, which springs unbidden in the human breast, is a sentiment universal at this time: "And on earth peace, good will toward men."

We all hope that the coming year may bring a lasting realization of this wish to our country and to the world.

The President's National Health Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include an editorial from the Journal of the American Medical Association entitled "The President's National Health Program and the New Wagner Bill."

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the President's health program is not only one of socialized medicine, but one of political medicine. If such a program were adopted, it would require an additional 4 to 8 percent pay-roll reduction, a year, from the worker or the employer. It would mean lowering the quality of medical care in this country. This editorial points out many of the fallacies in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell health bill.

THE PRESIDENT'S NATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM AND THE NEW WAGNER BILL

Last week the Journal published the message sent to Congress on November 19 by President Harry S. Truman, submitting a national health program. On the same day Senator WAGNER, of New York, introduced, for himself and Senator MURRAY, Senate bill 1606, and Congressman DINGELL introduced into the House the same version of the new Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. Obviously a number of conferences between those interested must have preceded the coordinated action that occurred. Senator WAGNER accompanied his introduction of the measure with another opening statement, a brief summary of the health provisions and a long series of questions and answers about the prepaid medical care provisions of the National Health Act of 1945. The language of the President in his message to the Congress and of Senator WAGNER in his statement to the Senate and the language of the measure itself are the same trite locutions that the advocates of Federal compulsory sickness insurance have used for these many years in trying to force these proposals on the American people. According to Arthur Sears Henning, "the compulsory health insurance plan is chiefly the brainchild of Isidore S. Falk, research director of the Social Security Board, and Michael M. Davis, a member of the CIO Political Action Committee."

Elsewhere in this issue appears an analysis by the bureau of legal medicine of the American Medical Association of the changes in the latest version of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill from that introduced previously. Mr. WAGNER in his opening statement again informs the Senate that this bill is the result of the constructive suggestions of many outstanding medical authorities and of labor, farm, consumer, and health organizations interested in improving the Nation's health. Neither the President nor Mr. WAGNER nor the Social Security Board made the slightest attempt to consult any representatives of the American Medical Association, which now embraces in its membership more than 125,000 American physicians. Typical of the kind of government that the bureaucrats would force on the American people is this technique of consulting advisers who are known in advance to be in complete agreement with the persons whom they are supposed to advise and of studiously avoiding any one who might offer a contrary opinion. This is government by minority with a vengeance.

The insidious strategy that has been employed in recent years, leading toward culmination by approval of the President of the United States, is clearly apparent to those with an understanding of what has been going on. Since the time when Michael Davis and his associates engineered the formation of the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care down to the present, a gradual enlistment has been secured in behalf of socialized medicine of every agency that could be induced to combine in a movement toward socialization of the American system of government. Around their banner have rallied the members of the so-called Boas' Physicians Forum, certain doctors of philosophy in the field of economics and sociology, the socialistic element in the American Public Health Association and those employed in governmental health agencies who thirst for increased power and expansion of the bureaus that they serve. Let the people of our country realize that the movement for the placing of American medicine under the control of the Federal Government through a system of Federal compulsory sickness insurance is the first step toward a regimentation of utilities, of industries, of finance, and eventually of labor itself. This is the kind of regimentation that led to totalitarianism in Germany and the downfall of that nation. Its prime consideration is deduction from the pay of the worker and taxation of the employer so that the government does for the people most of the things that our people in the United States have been accustomed to do for themselves. The time may yet come when the American worker, as was the case with the German worker, will have more deductions from his wages than "take home" pay.

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE AND FREE CHOICE

In the President's message to the Congress and in the material written for Mr. WAGNER by those whom he employs and consults in the preparation of his proposals, constantly reiterated is the statement that these proposals are not socialized medicine. The first of Mr. WAGNER'S questions and answers is concerned with this question in semantics. Worse than socialized medicine is state medicine. In any system of state medicine the government collects the funds available, manages the service, and distributes the payments. Is not this what the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill would accomplish? True, in the proposed legislation for a Federal system of compulsory sickness insurance, patients are told that they will have free choice of doctors; doctors are told that they will have the right to refuse any patients; but the bill provides that the Surgeon General can limit the number of patients that a physician will see, and that the Surgeon General will provide other physicians when too many patients select one or more of the physicians in a community. The measure mentions free choice of doctor for the patient, but it is free choice within limitations. It is free choice of the doctors who are willing to work under the system. It is free choice if the doctor is willing to work under a fee bill set up by the Government. It is free choice if the doctor is willing to accept a payment of so much per person per year for his services. It is free choice if the doctor is willing to work as a salaried member of a group. It is free choice if the doctor is willing to abide by a majority vote of the doctors licensed to practice in his community. What kind of free choice is that?

Senator WAGNER has always insisted that compulsory health insurance—really sickness insurance—is not socialized medicine. Actually the proposals involve both socialized medicine and state medicine. The American people are entitled to straightforward, honest statements from their representatives as to what such proposed measures would do to them and to their physicians. They have not had such a straightforward statement either from the President in his message or from Senator WAGNER in his statement to the Congress.

THE STATISTICS

In opening his message to the Congress, President Truman referred again to the rejections of registrants under the draft and to the rejections of women who applied to the Women's Army Corps and other women's services. Every fundamental principle of the scientific interpretation of statistics has been violated by the proponents of Federal compulsory sickness insurance in their utilization of these figures as propaganda for the measures they propose. The facts have been provided in several previous editorials in the Journal. One needs only to recognize that the standards of physical fitness for military service changed greatly from the Army of preparedness to the end of the war. Men who were rejected as physically unfit for military service in the first year of war were accepted as quite fit for complete service or for limited service in the later years of the war. Furthermore, none of the proponents of this legislation have ever admitted frankly, as they should if they are interested in an honest scientific statement of the facts, that a tremendous number of those rejected as unfit could not be made more fit by any knowledge available to modern medicine today.

In his questions and answers presented to the Congress, Senator WAGNER again challenges the statement that health conditions and standards of medical service in the United States are higher than in any other large country in the world. Here are more tricks with words. The figures for New Zealand have often appeared better than those of our country, but New Zealand is quite different from the United States and not in any sense of the word comparable. And even if it were comparable, the statistics for New Zealand concern its white European population and carefully avoid citation of its colored and native population. As we go to press New Zealand's system of socialized medicine reportedly faces failure and bankruptcy. Mr. WAGNER challenges the figures for life expectancy in the United States. Let him consult the most recent figures prepared by the leading life insurance companies in this country, which have a financial stake in the life expectancy of the people; he will discover how far ahead the United States really is of any other country in the world with or without a national compulsory system of medical care.

FEDERAL AID FOR HOSPITALS

The President's program includes five features. First is the proposal to grant Federal aid for the building of hospitals and health centers throughout the Nation. Both the American Medical Association and the American Hospital Association have approved the principles of the Hill-Burton bill, which make this proposal effective. Senator WAGNER in his statement to the Congress reminds us that he himself introduced a hospital construction bill in 1940. He has now eliminated from the new Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill the section in the previous draft which concerned hospital construction. This at least is fortunate for the American people because the provisions of the Hill-Burton bill, as modified by the Senate committee which conducted the hearings and which has reported the bill favorably to the Senate, are much more wise and much more scientific than the proposals of WAGNER, MURRAY, and DINGELL. Under the Hill-Burton bill money will not be spent until the need is shown by a survey conducted in the individual State. Furthermore, State organizations will be developed which will have the responsibility for allocation of funds and the control of the expenditure of funds. The place of the Federal Government will be to act as custodian of the funds and to provide the funds when adequate evidence of their need and

proper utilization is supplied. Incidentally, this measure recognizes that some areas of the country may need funds much more than do others, and beyond the ability of the individual State to match any Federal appropriation.

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES

The second recommendation by President Truman is for an expansion of maternal and child health services. Apparently President Truman failed to take into account the pending Pepper bill for maternal and child health, which was analyzed in an editorial published in the Journal on November 10. Senator WAGNER in his statement to the Senate does recognize the existence of other proposals. The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill would make increased grants-in-aid through the Children's Bureau to the individual States for maternal and child health and crippled children, the States developing their own plans, which, of course, would have to have the approval of the chief of the Children's Bureau. Here the grants are made variable according to the established need in the individual States. The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill requires that the chief of the Children's Bureau enter into agreements or cooperative working arrangements with the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to insure coordination in the administration of programs and services in this field. This at least is a recognition of the fact that Federal coordination of health activities is a fundamental need in our Government at this time. The Congress will soon give authority to the Chief Executive to transfer various agencies in order to secure coordinated action and to bring about unified policies. The American Medical Association has recommended again and again and again that the number one step necessary in coordination of health activities is removal of the Children's Bureau from the Department of Labor to the United States Public Health Service in the Federal Security Agency. Previous Presidents have apparently been unable to accomplish this highly desirable objective. The American Medical Association favors the utilization of Federal or State funds for the extension of maternal and child health services where needed.

President Truman also urges an extension of public health services throughout the United States. At present less than half the counties in the United States are provided with full-time public health service. Perhaps some of our counties could never utilize a full-time public health service efficiently; groups of counties could, of course, cooperate. Nevertheless the American Medical Association has been among the leaders of the Nation in urging that adequate public health service be made available in every community in our country.

EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

Confusion again prevails when the proposals of the President's message and of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill are read in connection with the proposals of the various measures for establishing a National Science Foundation. This Mr. WAGNER recognizes in his statement to the Congress; he points out that the Senate Committee on Military Affairs has before it legislation providing for the promotion of medical research and professional education. He indicates that these proposals remain in his revised National Health Act because he wants to help promising individuals without financial means to get a medical education, and he wants to overcome "the restrictions which the medical schools apply particularly to persons of minority groups." For these purposes the sums of $10,000,000 the first year and $15,000,000 the second year are mentioned. Incidentally, the Senator wisely recognizes the necessity for training adequate personnel in the field of public health if progress is to be made in that field. Nevertheless the Congress would do well to place in some single agency all of the various programs allocating funds for training personnel in the field of research, medicine, the public health, the basic medical sciences, and related fields of study.

Scientists throughout the Nation are agreed on the desirability of a National Science Foundation. Physicians favor increased research on cancer and on mental disease and indeed in every medical field in which research could be helpful. They do feel, however, that any National Science Foundation should be directed by a competent board of scientists, who could coordinate research and education. Apparently the present administration seems to prefer a National Science Foundation which would be headed by a politically appointed director. Apparently WAGNER, MURRAY, and DINGELL seem to prefer a system in which the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service would allocate funds to medical schools, research institutions and similar agencies that meet his approval. The movies have a czar who directs and coordinates their activities in certain fields, but they can remove him when they wish to do so and they are free to resign from his support when they wish to do so. Similary baseball has its czar. Now apparently our Government wants a czar for medicine and another czar for research, but there is no way in which those who would be compelled to subscribe for the establishment of the system and for those who would be compelled to work under the system to resign. Their freedom would become a thing of the past.

Incidentally, in his statement on medical research and education, Senator WAGNER has one quite revolutionary paragraph. Under the Constitution of the United States the control of medical practice is within the province of the individual States. Here is the statement of Senator WAGNER:

"State licensure laws are so complex, so lacking in uniformity and so obstructive of interstate mobility of qualified practitioners that some Federal legislation is necessary to bring order out of this chaos. There are no medical schools in some States, and measures to remedy this defect should be considered. Finally, the discrimination which most medical schools practice against student applicants from minority groups requires congressional consideration and appropriate action."

Regardless of whether or not some of the abuses to which the Senator refers exist, the Senator finds only one possible remedy—compulsion by the Federal Government and removal from the individual States of their right to control their own policies. Furthermore, has he made the slightest possible investigation to find out whether or not every State in the United States can support and operate successfully a modern medical school? Has he considered the necessity for teachers, for pupils, for patients? One is reminded of the State which built with Federal funds a hospital for crippled children that exhausted the needs of a hospital for crippled children in that State within 2 years.

COMPENSATION FOR LOSS OF EARNINGS DUE TO SICKNESS

The fifth proposal in the President's program and in Senator WAGNER's measure is compensation for loss of earnings due to sickness. The American Medical Association, through its house of delegates, has consistently favored such insurance. Most strange among the changes in the present measure offered by WAGNER, MURRAY, and DINGELL from their previous promulgation is the failure to indicate anywhere in the proposed measure the taxation to be provided on the worker and on the employer to provide funds for this measure. True, the President in his message mentions 4 percent on the first $3,600 earned by an employee, but the measure itself makes no such mention. Perhaps the mention was avoided deliberately by Senators WAGNER and MURRAY and by Congressman DINGELL so that the bill could be referred to the Senate Committe on Education and Labor, of which Senator MURRAY is chairman, rather than to the Senate Committee on Finance, to which the previous measure was referred. This may serve to secure hearings on the legislation and thus to keep it alive rather than to permit it to sink into the innocuous desuetude that was the fate of the previous measure.

EVILS OF COMPULSORY SICKNESS INSURANCE

Many of the answers included by Senator WAGNER in the questions and answers submitted by him to the Senate are denials of the charges repeatedly made against his proposals by those who wish to see the principles of initiative, democracy, and freedom maintained in American medicine. Thus he categorically denies that his measure "will destroy the private practice of medicine," that it will place the medical profession "under the direction of one man, the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service," that "the National Advisory Medical Policy Council will have no authority," that "the hospitalization provisions in the bill" will "destroy the voluntary hospital system," that "medical education will be controlled by the Surgeon General," that "the bill will plunge the physicians into political slavery," that "people will be obliged to take any doctor the Surgeon General tells them to," that "the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service" will have "the power and authority to designate which doctors can be specialists." The Senator by sophistic argument and smooth phrases categorically denies all of these charges against this measure; the Journal of the American Medical Association now insists that every one of these charges against the measure is valid and that the actual text of the measure itself is the proof of that validity.

No one will ever convince the physicians of the United States that the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill is not socialized medicine. By this measure the medical profession and the sick whom they treat will be directly under political control. By this measure the great system of private hospitals and community hospitals that have grown up in our country will depend for their continued operation on funds paid to them by a Federal Government agency. By this measure the philanthropic efforts for the care of the sick, which have been the pride of our Nation, will be forever deterred. Through this measure competent young men who would enter the medical profession will be forced to seek other fields of action still remaining under our democracy which still permit the exercise of individual initiative and freedom of thought and action. By this measure doctors in America would become clock watchers and slaves of a system. Now, if ever, those who believe in the American democracy must make their belief known to their representatives, so that the attempt to enslave medicine as first among the professions, industries or trades to be socialized will meet the ignominious defeat it deserves.

Practical Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following from an editorial on the financial page of the New York Times, Saturday, December 1, 1945:

PRACTICAL DEMOCRACY

It was stimulating to observers who attended the preliminary meeting of Alien Property Custodian Markham yesterday to establish the conditions of sale of a former enemy property to note the readiness with which the Government official not only welcomed but solicited suggestions from the large number of prospective bidders present. Of the latter, some, bothered by minor details of procedure, others, by broad aspects, discussed back and forth and suggestions were readily adopted with greater dispatch than would have been expected had Mr. Markham been less frank and cordial.

Try It in Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William Philip Simms, from the Washington Daily News of December 5, 1945:

TRY IT IN MOSCOW

(By William Philip Simms)

The Communists are again picketing here in Washington. A little history of this phenomenon, therefore, might be worth while.

Before August 1939 American Communists and fellow travelers, like most of us, were bitterly anti-Nazi. Then came the Stalin-Hitler partnership greenlighting World War II, the Molotov-Ribbentrop deal partitioning Poland and Molotov's speech blaming the war on Britain and France. "The imperialistic character of this war," he said, "is obvious to anybody who wants to face realities and does not close his eyes to facts."

Overnight the party line in America changed to fit Moscow's. President Roosevelt was accused of being a "warmonger." The White House and Congress were picketed. Placards read: "The Yanks are not coming," "No convoys," "No AEF," "Stop wars."

The Communists waged a relentless crusade against national preparedness. They advocated strikes in war industries. Strikes, which the Justice Department said were Communist-fomented, closed down airplane plants for weeks during one of the most critical periods of the war. There was intense opposition to lend-lease.

The anti-Hitler fever in this country was dubbed "war hysteria." Communist rallies sang such songs as this:

"Oh, Franklin Roosevelt told the people how
he felt.
We almost believed him when he said:
'Oh, I hate war, and so does Eleanor!'
But we won't be safe 'til everybody's dead!"

Then came another sudden about-face. That was when Hitler double-crossed Stalin in June 1941 and launched his armies against Russia. Silent for about 48 hours as though the breath had been knocked out of them, American Communists began to call the war "a life or death struggle between democracy and fascism and urged "all measures, military, and otherwise" to defeat Hitler. It now became "a sacred obligation" for American workers to turn out every gun, every plane.

Forgetting the immediate past, they claimed it was "slander" to say the Communists had engaged in conspiracies against the war effort. Instead of saying "The Yanks are not coming," they began to demand a second front in Europe to help Russia—again losing sight of the fact, partly owing to their own efforts, the United States was far from prepared to invade Europe.

Among the organizations which did flip-flops besides the Communist Party, were the Young Communist League, American Peace Mobilization, American Youth Congress, League of American Writers, American League for Peace and Democracy, the Committee to Rebuild the American Labor Party, Greater New York Industrial Council, and others.

Now the war is over and the Communists are picketing the Government again. They are demanding that our marines be brought back from China. Hurley is out, they say, and Secretary Byrnes should go, too. And so on. They have made another complete somersault.

Observers, watching the parade, can hardly help wondering what would happen if Russion picketers suddenly started walking up and down Red Square, in front of the Kremlin, with placards reading: "Get the Red Army out of Poland." "Get our boys home from Rumania and Iran!" "Out with Molotov!"

No Boats, No Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, all of our overseas servicemen who were in action on the different fighting fronts expected to be home this Christmas. They cannot understand what has happened to the boats which were to bring them home. Most of them are willing to return in the same boats which carried them to these foreign countries. They have adopted the slogan "No boats, no votes."

They cannot understand why these boats are available for celebrations. They want to know why they transported horses, dogs, and Chinese troops to America. Many are at a loss to know why their outfit has been given several sailing dates and then had them canceled at the last minute.

Congress has done everything possible to bring these boys home as soon as possible. I made a protest to the Chief of Staff, United States Army, about bringing Chinese to the United States to attend school at a time when American troops are on the waiting list in India for transportation home. It was reported to me from a member of the American armed forces, that the ship *General A. W. Greely* left Calcutta, India, August 28, 1945, and landed in New York City September 26, 1945, with many American troops but among them were several hundred Chinese troops. However, there were many American troops left behind who were eligible to come home. American troops in India and also those on the returning ship resented this incident.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I have received from an American serviceman stationed on Okinawa:

OKINAWA, *November 26, 1945.*

DEAR MR. LANDIS: I have been reading in the papers and magazines quite a bit lately (on my own time) quite a lot of words, just can't realize what is the truth and what is propaganda. Very much of it seems to have a hidden meaning, or rather is a lot of words written uselessly to present a picture to the public, not as it is, but as a few of the people want it presented to all of the people.

Now take the shipping situation, for example: Excluding all of our ships that are in the China seas hauling Chinese soldiers into North China, manned with soldiers and marines of our country, subjecting them to the dangers of a war—your pardon—a revolution of and in which they have no part. I can sit here as I write this and actually see enough ships at anchor to take at least one-third of the soldiers, 100,000, from this coast tomorrow. Of course, I understand that none of these vessels have been converted into the luxury liners that the Army, the Navy, and business agents are demanding that shall be used for the return of troops, but if they were unfit in their present condition and yet we were sent here in them, why can't we have the last say as to whether or not we can be returned in them, as they are now.

Now if you as the people's representative could get the ships back that we have loaned to our gracious and grateful allied countries at cessation of hostilities and put them to a use that they were meant for by the laborers and bond buyers that made them possible, we of the Army would appreciate it very much and be humbly grateful.

Sir, the ships that I have referred to as being within my vision at the present time do not include the ships at anchor at the present time in Buckner Bay and on other beaches along the coast of this island. The ships I have reference to are along Soba Beach and Naga.

Now as to the waste in the Army of all taxpayers' money, yours, sir, and mine, within 6 months after I become a civilian ?? again. I know that our Army or any army that has operated on the large scale that we have, cannot possibly operate without a maximum of waste, but when extravagant waste is so grossly carried on that each and every man shudders at the thought of it, then it is time for someone to take charge and put a stop to such waste. Of course, it is understandable that there should be a reserve of all kinds on this island and every isle under our command at the present time. But when this reserve gets so large that they are taking crates out and piling them by the thousands (unopened) and either covering them over with dozers or else loading them on ships and dumping them into the ocean to get rid of them, and yet still keep shipping the same kind of supplies in that they say it is unprofitable to return to the States. Such equipment as tanks, of course, we know the war is over and all, and they are a lot of iron we will admit, but they were in very good running condition and it wouldn't be too costly to have returned them to the Philippines where even in prewar days they would have been as good as any to have run out on a hill to be made a target of. That is one of the more bulky items. Now take clothing, for instance, the way woolens are packed for shipment in the Army there can be quite a few thousand dollars worth done up in packages and stored in odd corners. That was also one of the scarce articles and so essential that it took the cuff off every pair of trousers in the United States for 3 years, yet in one dump fire on this island

alone there was enough wool clothing (that the bales had never been broken on) burned to put a cuff on every pair of pants made during the same period.

Now I understand that there are quite a large number of representatives—I don't know just exactly what or who they represent—known as the investigating committee out investigating. Well, if they come in with a report on anything with the exception of the officers' clubs, nurses' quarters, and the Red Cross, they should have quite a few interesting topics for discussion.

Now, sir, in regards to the morale of the men in this Army. At the present time it is at a very low ebb, and as for myself, I can't see it improving any in the near future under any circumstances, as they have all done their job and it was a job very well done, and with the one aim left—that was that the quicker it was over, the more quickly they would get home, not only to their family, to their accustomed way of life. Then came the points—leaving some of the mudders in the trenches till the very last.

Oh, yes; I can throw a rock on one now that has spent 26 months in that category till VJ-day—from Bougainville on up through Luzon to here, and with all of that good time he has only 69 points to his credit. Now I know another soldier that never even heard a buzz bomb who has been out for quite awhile now with 87 points to his credit. Which just goes to prove British were right in this instance of one pun they have about our Army—join the American Air Corps and get an invasion ribbon and battle star for every picture you see in the theater.

Then, too, it is impossible to present a picture to the soldiers of anything but slave labor, as they are being driven now, what with the war being over and 42 percent of our officers getting an advancement in grade since VJ-day, and the rest trying to drive their men till they can receive one. This even after the announcement that all construction cease with the exception of recreational projects.

Sir, I will now close—not having enough points to get home—hoping you will use your influence and persuasion to help the boys here that do have points ranging from 115 down to 60 that are now eligible and still here waiting for a ship that as far as they know is still in the very distant future.

S. A. T.

Tito's People's Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. WASIELWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of December 1, 1945:

TITO'S PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

The expected has happened. The delegates recently "elected" in Yugoslavia to a body which was to be simultaneously a constituent and legislative assembly have unanimously approved a proclamation read by Marshal Tito declaring Yugoslavia a "federal people's republic," abolishing the monarchy and decreeing King Peter II, together with the entire Karageorgevitch dynasty, "deprived of all rights vested in him and his dynasty."

From his place of exile in London, King Peter has issued a statement charging that this decision represents "a series of acts by Marshal Tito which have had the effect of removing such a decision from the hands of the people themselves and placing it entirely within his own and those of the 'national front.'" The King then points out that this is a flagrant violation of the Tito Subasitch agreement, "concluded under the auspices and guaranties of the great Allies," providing for a plebiscite on the future constitutional status of Yugoslavia, arrived at by free and democratic elections, as provided for under the Yalta agreement. The King points out that Dr. Subasitch and other members of that original coalition government have resigned in protest, but "the Tito government simply trampled down all their obligations, destroyed the agreement, and organized a totalitarian form of government, in most striking contrast to the ideals of the United Nations, the Yalta resolutions, and the promises they themselves had made." The King's statement ends by saying that he will do his best to "liberate Yugoslavia from tyranny, no matter whence it comes."

There can be no reasonable doubt that King Peter's statement is substantially correct. For the outside world the issue is not whether or not the monarchy should be reestablished, but whether the Yugoslav people as a whole should have the right freely to decide their own destiny. That right has obviously been denied them. Yugoslavia is today in the grip of a totalitarian dictatorship as absolute as any that exists anywhere on earth. The recent "elections," though technically unobstructed, were preceded and accompanied by such intimidation and terrorism that the opposition dared make no campaign or nominate candidates of their own. Furthermore, armed resistance continues in Serbia and Bosnia on a considerable scale, with militant unrest in other sections of the country despite concentration camps and mass executions. Whether or not the western powers decide diplomatically to recognize "accomplished facts," the future of Tito's "people's republic" promises to be a stormy one.

Appropriations for UNRRA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. MURPHY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann from the Washington Post of December 6, 1945:

PLAUSIBLE NONSENSE

(By Walter Lippmann)

A minority, chiefly but not entirely, composed of Republicans, has been holding up the appropriations for UNRRA, alleging that American funds should not be used in any foreign country which does not give American newspaper correspondents full opportunity to report how the funds are used. Any experienced journalist who has worked in foreign countries will tell Congress that this method of promoting freedom of the press is a piece of plausible nonsense. It is one of those proposals which seem sensible enough when first they are looked at, and quite senseless when they are looked into.

For it is a proposal to have American reporters perform the duties of American officials. It supposes that American newspapers have enough foreign correspondents to cover regularly and continuously the distribution of relief in all the cities of Greece, Poland, Yugoslavia, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Italy, the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Korea, Formosa, and China. It supposes that this army of American correspondents—which of course does not exist, which could not be recruited, which American newspapers could not afford to maintain, whose reports our papers would not have space to publish—that this army of newspapermen can make more accurate reports on the operation of relief than our embassies and legations and consulates, our military missions and our intelligence services, not to say the Americans who serve in UNRRA itself.

The proposal, assuming it to be sincere, is plainly the work of men who do not know how correspondents get most of their information in foreign countries where for the most part they do not speak the language, and where there are no free and independent local newspapers. They get it from American officials and the officials of friendly governments, and from persons with whom they make contact largely through American and other officials. The amount of first-hand direct reporting that can be done independently of the regular American official observers is much smaller than most laymen seem to realize. In the countries where UNRRA operates it would be the exception rather than the rule that a foreign correspondent obtained significant news that officials do not already know. He cannot have anything like the same opportunity to find out what is going on.

It is, therefore, quite misleading for Congressmen to tell our people that they must depend on the foreign correspondents to see to it that money given for relief is honestly administered. That is the business of our officials abroad. Where the press comes into it is to report to the people what the officials are reporting, and to watch, which they can do, whether these officials are making competent reports.

It never was, and never could be the function of the press to be inspector, accountant, auditor, detective of a widespread, complicated operation like the administration of relief in some 13 or 14 foreign countries. These gentlemen in Congress may think they are paying a compliment to the press but in fact they are trying to burden the press with a responsibility which is cannot discharge.

The obstruction which the UNRRA appropriations have encountered this autumn has brought this country very near to a moral default on a solemn commitment. UNRRA was created on the initiative of the United States, and in March 1944 the House by a vote of 338 to 54 and the Senate by 47 to 14, passed Public Law 267 offering, without conditions, to give UNRRA an amount equal to 1 percent of our national income in 1943. All the other United Nations, whose territory had not been devastated by the war, made the same pledge of 1 percent of their 1943 national income. Great Britain has fulfilled her pledge; we have not. The necessary authorizations and appropriations have been stalled in Congress on the alleged ground that the destitute must starve, the sick go without medicines, unless our correspondents can be present.

The delay is a scandal and a dishonor. Already, for lack of funds Congress had promised it, UNRRA has had to cancel orders for medicines, clothing, shoes, seeds, plows, and material to provide emergency shelters. That is a cruel punishment to inflict upon suffering humanity in the name of the freedom of the press. It has been a dishonorable thing to do in the name of a government which has justly prided itself that when it makes a pledge, it does not squirm out of it.

Of all the people in this country, newspapermen have the strongest reason for repudiating and resenting this demagoguery about the freedom of the press. Senator WHERRY and his associates need have no fear that American journalists and editors who use

the freedom of the press, who have defended it long before he ever took an interest in the press, who promote it wherever and whenever they can, have ceased to care about this most fundamental of all civil rights. If the best of our editors and correspondents do not want to have helpless and destitute people suffer and die in order that they may get access to the rigidly censored countries, it is not because they need any instruction from Senator WHERRY about the importance of freedom of the press. It is because they do not wish to strike foul blows for their principles, and that they do not think it wise or decent to submerge the principles of liberty, which are meant to give life and hope to mankind, in a morass of misery and disease and death.

Statement of Republican Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a statement of principles, policies, and objectives authorized and approved by the Republicans of the Senate and the House of Representatives after consideration and conference action thereon:

Today's major domestic issue is between radicalism, regimentation, all-powerful bureaucracy, class exploitation, deficit spending, and machine politics, as against our belief in American freedom for the individual under just laws fairly administered for all, preservation of local home rule, efficiency and pay-as-you-go economy in government, and the protection of the American way of life against either fascist or communist trends.

We believe that genuine social and economic progress can be achieved only on these American constitutional principles and it is our purpose to give our citizens this clean-cut choice.

In foreign affairs we shall continue to strive to avoid partisanship. But we shall also seek to avoid secrecy, inefficiency, and drift.

To these purposes we dedicate the following statement:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

We support the United Nations Organization for international peace. We look with particular hope to the General Assembly as the "town meeting of the world" wherein the organized conscience of mankind shall find effective expression in behalf of peace with justice.

We support the indispensable inter-American system as a regional part of the international organization.

We will engage in essential international relief as a humanitarian obligation and to prevent chaos through misery. We demand sound management and protection against exploitation in this connection. We will assist other nations to rehabilitate themselves under arrangements consistent with intelligent American self-interest and over-all limitations that shall not jeopardize our own economic recovery and stability.

We believe in fulfilling to the greatest possible degree our war pledges to small nations that they shall have the right to choose the form of government under which they will live and that sovereign rights and self-government shall be restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them. We deplore any desertion of these principles.

We will seek to find common policies with the other great powers. But we reject great-power domination of the world and the thesis that world peace requires us to endorse alien doctrines or to abandon efforts to seek justice for the weaker peoples of the world.

We advocate ultimate international agreements to stabilize military establishments. We demand open diplomacy, at home and abroad, and free communication throughout the world.

We consider that the maintenance of a strong, solvent, free America is the basis of our greatest contribution to world order.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

We stand for a well-trained and fully equipped Army, Navy, and Air Force adequate to meet any emergency under future conditions of warfare. It must be supported by the most modern scientific research, a strong industrial system, and adequate reserves of trained men with the best weapons and equipment.

DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

Government alone cannot feed the people, nor employ them, nor make the profits from which new enterprises and new jobs are born. Government can help its people to prosperity by lightening the burdens of debt and taxes, laying down the rules of fair play, and protecting those whose own strength and resources are not sufficient to protect themselves.

We believe that equality of opportunity should be available to all, regardless of race, creed, or beginnings. Every individual should be afforded an opportunity to prosper according to his talents, his abilities, and his diligence, subject only to a like right for his neighbor.

We deplore the political tactics which have resulted in class consciousness and strife. We oppose those who would destroy us through the continuation of such strife and struggle.

Our tax burden must be equitably distributed. Taxes must be so imposed as to stimulate creative enterprise, not destroy it, and to afford the individual adequate purchasing power. Tax forms and taxpaying must be simplified. There must be an incentive for business to expand production and employment and for the individual to invest his savings in such expansion. There must be a fair return to both labor and investors if we are to have jobs for the workers, goods for the consumers, and adequate revenue for the Government.

The solvency of our Government must be assured. Outlay must be brought in line with income. The value of the dollar must be maintained.

Economy in Government spending must be achieved. Extravagant Government spending now advocated by the administration in every field can lead only to ruin. Programs involving expenditure of Federal funds should not be undertaken unless the justification therefor is clearly established.

Wartime limitations, restrictions, and controls must be removed. The instant a right or liberty can be returned to the people, it shall be returned. Neither the war nor any other excuse shall be justification for fastening regimentation permanently upon the American people.

Bureaucracy, with its thirst for power and self-perpetuation, must be drastically reduced. The number of Government employees must be cut to an efficient minimum.

We reaffirm our belief in the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively with employers as one of the cornerstones of competitive enterprise. The processes of such bargaining must be protected and strengthened if we are to have real jobs and prosperity for all.

For that purpose we believe that governmental decision must not be substituted for free agreement, but governmental machinery to promote peaceful settlement of disputes should be improved.

Demands by either side must be kept within the bounds of reason and fairness and both sides must recognize the rights of the general public.

The desired end of bargaining between management and men is a contract. Once that contract is made, it should and must be equally binding on both parties as to agreements made.

Free collective bargaining and contracts resulting therefrom must not be nullified or destroyed by resort on either side to willful violence or unlawful destruction of property.

We favor Federal aid to the extent necessary, to States and through States to their subdivisions, to assist them in affording subsistence, shelter, and medical care to their citizens who are unable to provide for themselves. Such aid, including unemployment compensation, must be based on State and local initiative, operation, and responsibility, without Federal bureaucratic interference. It must avoid socialization of the medical profession or of any other activity. Federal aid must be in amounts which do not impose an unreasonable burden of taxation on the rest of the population who pay the bills.

We have pledged stability of farm prices during the reconversion and readjustment periods. We will carry out those pledges. We will support sound, permanent proposals to give farmers expanding markets and their fair share of the national income. We reaffirm our long-standing support of soil and water conservation. We shall support measures designed to better rural living.

A grateful nation demands that those who fought in its defense, their widows and orphans, must never be forgotten. The best of medical care and rehabilitation, education, and training for all desiring it, and efficient assistance in securing homes, farms, businesses, and real jobs, must be provided for the veteran. Nothing in the Federal program should lessen the responsibility of each local community to provide for the return to civilian life of its gallant sons and daughters in a spirit of understanding, helpfulness, and dignity.

Wagner-Ellender Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

MASSACHUSETTS STATE
FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Boston, Mass., November 29, 1945.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
Member, House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LANE: During the recent special victory convention conducted by this organization, October 26–28, 1945, which was called specifically to consider matters affecting trade-unionists and other wage earners in the postwar era, the enclosed resolution was unanimously adopted.

It is sincerely hoped that you will give this matter favorable consideration and assist in whatever way possible in the active support of Senate 1342, commonly known as the Wagner-Ellender bill.

Respectfully,

KENNETH I. TAYLOR,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Whereas this great Nation in concert with its allies has brought to a victorious conclusion its war to make the world and the Nation a better place in which to live; and

Whereas the exigencies of war have proven that the combined resources of Government, labor, and capital can accomplish the well-nigh impossible; and

Whereas the transitional or reconversion period from war to peace is one of paramount importance which may affect the economy of the Nation for many years: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the body in convention assembled reiterate and again record itself in its determination to do all in its power to bring about the ideals for which the youth of the Nation fought, bled, suffered, and died; and be it further

Resolved, That this body act to make possible two of the aims of every veteran and worker in the Nation, the right to a job at a saving wage and the right to a decent house in which to live; surely in this Nation and in this day, not too much to expect; and be it further

Resolved, That this organization petition the next session of the General Court of Massachusetts for appropriate enabling legislation to make effective the terms and conditions of the Wagner-Ellender housing bill (S. 1342); and be it further

Resolved, That this body record itself in active support of a bill now before the Congress of the United States, known as S. 1342, or the so-called Wagner-Ellender bill, which seems destined, if passed, to become a milestone on the road to a good home for every citizen to be supplied by both private industr. and government, and in so doing will create a tremendous value of work in the transition period; and be it further

Resolved, That the officers of this organization be directed to make known the views of this organization and the contents of this resolution to every Member of the Congress in this Commonwealth; to every member of the committees of the Congress concerned with the bill; to the parent body of this organization; to his excellency the Governor of the Commonwealth, and to such other persons, groups, or organizations as may seem desirable.

Loans to Foreign Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the call has gone out to the nations of the earth, "Come one, come all, and get your billions; there is no limit to New Deal generosity." The taxpayers be damned and the devil take the hindmost, under the philosophy of those who spend and spend and tax and tax, is now the order of the day.

These transactions of so-called loans to foreign nations remind me of the experience of Benjamin Franklin with his "poor relation" who persuaded Franklin to lend him $50; then he asked Franklin for a sheet of paper in order to give him a note for the sum.

"What," said Franklin, "do you want to waste my stationery as well as my money?"

The case of an Englishman is also in point: Charles Fox, the English statesman, once received a severe lecture from his father who asked him how it was possible for him to sleep or enjoy any of the comforts of life when he thought about the immense sums he owed.

"Your Lordship need not be in the least surprised," answered Charles, "your astonishment ought to be how my creditors can sleep."

Mr. Speaker, our foreign debtors will not lose any sleep because of what they owe us, but the tax-paying creditors here at home will eventually find it difficult to sleep. Our debtors may have pleasant dreams, but the American creditors will suffer many a hideous nightmare when the grim specter of inflation stands by the bedside to torment and haunt them.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an article by Constantine Brown which appeared in the Washington Star under date of December 5, 1945:

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

Washington officials are expecting a stream of representatives from Europe in the near future. They will all come with the same mission: to obtain loans ranging from millions to billions of dollars.

The British have already made arrangements to obtain a loan of close to $4,000,000,000. The remaining hurdle is Congress, where conditions of the loan are likely to be thoroughly scrutinized.

Conversations between the Russian representatives and State and Treasury Department officials for a reported $6,000,000,000 credit have been carried on for some time, and while no definite arrangements have been made it is expected that they will be completed early next year.

In the meantime, Poland has asked visas for an economic mission seeking to negotiate a loan of between $300,000,000 and $500,000,000.

The negotiations for such sums will be more complicated because of the uncertainty of Poland's economic situation. The American Government, and particularly the Export-Import Bank, is taking the position that it must be satisfied that money advanced will be repaid with interest in the not too distant future.

But while Britain and Russia will be able to meet their obligations, through repayment in kind, or particularly in the case of Russia, in gold, there is little hope that the Poles will be able to meet obligations they intend to assume.

The entire stock of gold Poland possessed before the German invasion is now either at Fort Knox or in Canada. It is subject to lengthy litigation because it did not belong to the Polish government but to the Bank of Poland in which the government had some stock. The owners of the shares of that institution—a majority of whom are outside Poland—are not likely to yield their possessions and will demand that the gold held in America be kept here until their shares have been redeemed in yellow metal.

A mere decree on the part of the Warsaw government that the Bank of Poland has been nationalized will not bring their case before American and Canadian courts.

The repayment of a loan with exports is equally complicated.

As in the case of Hungary and Rumania, the Polish government has placed its entire national economy under the wing of Moscow. The Polish currency, the zloty, has been tied to the Russian rubie and has no gold backing. Poland is not free to promise any payments in kind unless it obtains Moscow's consent. Moreover, it does not possess the necessary machinery to exploit the newly acquired mines in Silesia, a province which was given Poland by Russia in exchange for the agricultural lands east of the Vistula River.

The Potsdam agreement gave Russia the right to 75 percent of the industrial machinery in her zone of occupation in Germany. She has fully availed herself of this agreement, although it meant stripping the factories, mines, and harbors in a territory which had become Polish in accordance with the Moscow-Warsaw agreement.

The Swedes, who have relied on Silesian coal in the past, are shivering this winter. The new owners of the Silesian mines can no longer deliver the coal because of lack of machinery and harbor facilities.

Many members of the board of the Import-Export Bank who are commercially rather than politically minded want to know what guaranty Poland can offer to repay the sums she desires.

The Warsaw government has already indicated it wants only a small amount of dollars in cash for the upkeep of its foreign missions. The balance is needed to purchase industrial machinery and goods in this country. This suggestion may appear appealing provided the Poles can give adequate guaranties that the purchased equipment will remain in the country and will not be transferred to Russia. In other words, the Import-Export Bank feels that America should not be called on to pay for the reparations Russia is taking from the Germans.

As things now stand, the Russians are taking everything that is movable, not only from the former Reich, but also from areas which have been annexed with her consent by certain United Nations. These nations are compelled to appeal to the United States for replacements.

A Finnish delegation also is expected in Washington soon. The reparations that country is compelled to send to Russia have made it impossible for her to have enough exports to purchase abroad the essentials for her population. Washington officials realize that the situation in that little republic—the only European country which has honored its indebtedness to the United States—is desperate.

Finland's credit is good, but there is a suspicion that the machine tools and the manufactured goods we might sell her on credit would find their way to Russia in the shape of reparations. Those who have control over the American purse strings can see no valid reason why the United States should to be a heavy contributor to the payment of Russian reparations.

Claremore, Okla., Bids for Capital of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, Claremore, Okla., is the county seat of Rogers County. The late Will Rogers was born in that county, and called Claremore his home. It is the resting place of both Will Rogers and his wife. A most beautiful shrine and memorial has been erected to his memory at Claremore. This memorial contains a museum of literature, art, and articles possessed by Will Rogers during his lifetime. Thousands of students and admirers of the homely philosophy of Will

Rogers visit his shrine and this museum every month, where they may read his writings and see the things which made life dear to him.

Claremore is a thriving little city, a health resort located in a rich agricultural section. Two trunk-line railroads, one transcontinental highway, and numerous other State highways make it accessible to the outside world. It is situated almost exactly in the center of the United States.

The mayor of Claremore has sent me the following telegram:

GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.:

Claremore seeks the capital of the United Nations. Claremore is the home of the late Will Rogers. At a meeting of the various civic organizations of this city Sunday December 2, it was voted to make a bid for the capital of the United Nations and the following resolution seeking same was adopted:

"Whereas Will Rogers was a world citizen and an ambassador of common-sense humor, promoted peace and friendly relations among all people; and

"Whereas his life exemplified the aim and purposes for which the United Nations Council was created; and

"Whereas it would be a fitting recognition and reward for the service he rendered to relieve the distress and suffering of mankind during the depression years of 1931 and 1932, to establish the United Nations capital of the world at his home town, and site of the magnificent memorial which marks his final resting place."

On behalf of all civic bodies, the chamber of commerce, the American Legion, and the city of Claremore, I have the honor to request that all possible exploration be made to determine the feasibility of selecting Claremore, Okla., as the United Nations capital of the world.

ELMER TANNER,
Mayor, City of Claremore, Okla.

Mr. Speaker, just as Will Rogers was the ambassador of good will from this country to the people of every civilized land, his home folk would like to extend the same spirit of good will to the peoples of the world by having established in their midst the capital of the United Nations. Will Rogers said that he never met a man he did not like. If that spirit could become world dominant, and permeate the lives of the peoples of all races and climes, foreign policies might become a thing of the past and we might truly become a family of nations wherein all men would be brothers. The spirit of Will Rogers would triumphantly hover over assemblies of peoples of the earth at Claremore envisioning such an utopia.

Child Welfare in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include a statement made by Katharine F. Lenroot, Chief of the Children's Bureau, United States Department of Labor, who has just returned from Europe.

While attending the International Labor Conference in Paris, Miss Lenroot visited Germany, saw something of war-torn Europe, and from her experience abroad makes the following observations:

An American who has not before visited war-torn Europe can fully measure the depth of the impression made only on her return, when she sees here the streets full of automobiles, the people well clothed and well fed, the shops and markets full of goods at prices which bear at least some measurable relation to prewar levels, and knows that everywhere in the country homes and buildings are intact, streets brilliantly lighted, and houses warmed.

Europe's population, children and adults alike, face a winter of cold, privation, and hunger that will lead to hundreds of thousands of deaths unless prompt relief is made available. It was commonly reported that all over Europe cemeteries are being enlarged against the winter's toll of human life.

The work of the International Labor Conference, meeting in Paris in its twenty-seventh session, centered upon four main subjects: Maintenance of high levels of employment; protection of children and young workers; minimum standards of social policy in dependent territories; and constitutional questions relating to the structure and functioning of the International Labor Organization and the ways in which it may be brought into relation with the United Nations Organizations.

* * * * *

A very important feature of the conference was the reports presented concerning the suffering of the peoples of Europe and the effects of war and occupation on children and young people. * * *

Cold, hunger, tuberculosis, and separation of families through deportations for forced labor in Germany, and service in the armed forces and in the resistance movement, have had serious effects upon children and young persons in the occupied countries.

* * * * *

The story of the displaced peoples of Europe is stark tragedy. Already millions have been repatriated, but 1,300,000 are still in assembly centers in Germany, including some 800,000 Poles and about 138,000 Baltic peoples. Approximately 100,000 children under the age of 14 years are reported to be in those centers. These displaced people live in barracks, 8 to 12 to a room, adults and children of all ages together. Children without parents or relatives number now nearly 4,000 in the American and British zones, under the care of UNRRA, and more are being located every day, as foreigners are being registered throughout Germany. A central tracing bureau has been set up in Berlin and every effort is made to identify children and locate relatives. Three children's centers have been set up in the American zone and two more are about to be established. Here, as observed in one center, these orphaned and homeless children will receive excellent care. Many are stunted in growth, underdeveloped in muscular coordination, and greatly retarded in school. For instance, 70 percent of the Polish children under the care of UNRRA are in the first and second grades. In one camp, it was reported, there were 990 expectant mothers. In another camp it was expected that 25 babies would be born by Christmas. One of the first concerns of the Poles in the camps has been to regularize family life, as the Germans did not allow the Poles to marry. In one day 16 weddings were performed, and all the brides managed to have white dresses.

In a children's center at Glesterhausen, Germany, maintained by UNRRA, the writer talked with a 16-year-old Lithuanian girl who had been in a hospital when the Germans took her parents for forced labor. She, of course, had never heard of them from that day to this. Later, probably at the age of 13 or 14, she herself had been taken into Germany for forced labor. She had been in two concentration camps, the last one in Belsen. Her number, 14,027 (approximate), was deeply tatooed on her forearm. The horrors that child and her companions had witnessed must have been indescribable. * * *

There are practically no Jewish children between the ages of 6 and 12 years among the displaced persons in Germany. Apparently only those of preschool or adolescent age have survived.

Americans can well be proud of the service being given by American UNRRA staff, working with staff from England, France, Latin-American countries, and other parts of the world. It is a real international enterprise. Many more trained workers are needed, for with the first mass repatriation accomplished, the "hard core" of cases remain. School supplies—paper, pencils, crayon—have been lacking until recently, and are still very scarce, and arrangements for the first books, in Polish, were just being made at the time of the writer's visit. One of the first spontaneous developments in a camp is said to be the school. The displaced population is said to include persons competent to teach from nursery school through university, but most of the teaching has had to be done without supplies or equipment and from memory. Many of the displaced people are superior in every way, and must be given their chance to contribute to the rebuilding of the world.

* * * * *

The first part of the work of the Committee of the ILO on Protection of Children and Young Workers dealt with proposed lists of points for consultation with governments, preparatory to next year's conference when draft conventions will be drawn up for presentation to member governments for ratification. The subjects discussed were medical examinations for fitness for employment and restriction of night work, both relating to children and young persons.

A Letter From Manila

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have before me a letter from Manila which every Member of this House ought to read. I have not the time nor can I get the time to present this letter to the House. UNRRA seems to have the right-of-way because of the deep concern for foreign victims of this war rather than our soldiers who were also victims of the war. It is very evident that the refusal of Congress to take action to help the boys is not deceiving these young men who have fought so nobly and so well. They will not fail to discover who have signed discharge petitions to give them a lift and who have failed to do so. Under leave to extend I am inserting a letter from Manila to which I referred. Again I urge each member to read it:

Who started the rumor that there is a shortage of shipping (there isn't—the ships are not being used for a just purpose) to get the men home? Why should 200 Filipino civilians be allowed shipping space in order

that they may pursue their college educations State-side while we, many of whom have had their college educations (like myself) interrupted, be left here and forgotten except by our wives and loved ones back home?

Why should we be forced to stay over here with nothing to do but follow the whims of our generals, stand reveille, retreat, drink all the liquor we can get to drown our sorrows, and run around with free women, while we hear big lies about how soon we shall be sent home? (Think of the degraded bunch of men that will eventually return to the States if this condition persists.)

Why shouldn't we receive a justified monthly bonus (the Government gives our good money and our articles to other countries or throws it away but we don't reap any of it) for being forced to to remain overseas while the big wigs here and back in the States take all our troubles with a grain of salt? Right now, in our young lives is our earning period for the future or the time to pursue our educations which were interrupted. Some amends in the form of compensation should be made for our waste of time which is definitely not our fault.

We have seen graft. We have seen waste. Yet there is one thing that we haven't seen. That is the ships that are to come and take us home as fast as they brought us over here.

According to the bull sessions I have had with the officers and men over here and what I've seen published in the Mailbag of the Daily Pacifican, an AFWESPAC publication here in Manila, the men over here now do not intend to forget who their Congressmen are who have let them down. Our aim over is to write everyone we know telling them how and why we are being detained and also what should be done in the next elections to see that such injustices are not carried out again. As for me, my legal voting residence is St. Paul, Minn.

I would like to request a copy of your bill and also who the Representatives were that voted for it. It shall be distributed about, and if possible I shall try to have part of it printed in the Mailbag, where it may receive wide publication.

Thanking you in advance, and here's hoping that this grossly unjust situation is brought to someone's immediate attention.

Postwar Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the consent of the House, I submit the following speech which I made before the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation convention, on Tuesday, December 4, 1945, at Chicago, Ill.

All over the world today there is a lack of appreciation of the problems that confront us in the period following the war.

Twice in my lifetime, Germany has had an opportunity to conquer the world by peaceful means and has thrown it overboard by getting into war. She did this because her people worked a little harder than any other peoples in the world. In 1914 she was operating ships all over the world; she had colonized extensively in south Brazil, in Argentina, in Africa, in parts of China, and the East Indies. Her merchant ships were carrying nearer to capacity loads than any other merchant ships in the world. Her factories were humming. Her inventive genius and experimentation was resulting in the development of all sorts of things that were filling the markets with German goods.

At that time she had a monopoly on the world's dye industry and during the First World War it was impossible for us to get any dyes.

Then the military came along and talked the people into war and Germany wound up in an utter collapse. When the First World War was over, she had no navy and very little of merchant marine. Immediately she began to build back her merchant marine. Immediately her industry took over. They organized all sorts of cartels and different kinds of trusts. The most notorious was the I. G. Farben set-up. Her people were down, but they nevertheless were ready to work. They had been brought up to work and they knew how to work. Her merchant marine was rebuilt; her trade was extended all over the world. They were able to unsell other countries because of many reasons:

1. The price.
2. The quality of their merchandise.
3. They sent their people into every nation to develop their trade.
4. They procured enormous loans from other countries which they never intended to pay back.
5. When the airplane development began to come along, they were the most progressive of any nation.

They had their air lines all over South America, all over the Middle and Far East; all over Europe; and by the time 1939 came around their military aircraft were so far superior to anything else in the world and their military equipment was so far superior that they were able to move right in to a point where they were on the verge of victory.

It probably needed a blow like the World War to wake up the people to the situation that Germany presented. If she had not started the World War, her development of her export trade all over the world and her ship-carrying capacity would have allowed her to be in the most favorable position of any nation within a very few years.

England and France slept through that period Doles and hand-outs from the Government were demoralizing their peoples. Those things succeeded in wrecking the French. America, from 1933 on, was subject to the same demoralizing influences. Governmental hand-outs and that sort of thing stood out rather than the development of our trade and our resources; rather than the development of the new methods of doing things that gave the Germans the lead.

Now the world is faced with the same kind of a situation. The Germans, while tremendously hard-hit, are at work cleaning up what they have. The people of Holland, Belgium and Denmark are at work, Sweden and Norway are at work. France and Italy are practically prostrate. They are not going to work. Russia is working and will make considerable headway although her methods of doing things are far behind our own. Britain is not organized. She is demoralized. Her people are not working effectively. They have the philosophy of a radical government which says to the people that they can have nationalization of industry and mines and at the same time have freedom, when history shows that this is absolutely impossible.

Unless we can maintain the private employment of our people and operation of our industry and mines, there is going to be no place for a labor union and collective bargaining and there is going to be no place for liberty in America. Unless our people get to work and get rid of the idea that unemployment insurance is the great goal, we are going to follow the line of France and England after the last war and we are going to be in the same position that they are in. At the present time England, France, Italy, and Greece are in that terrible position. They all want help from the United States. If we can help it we should not let people starve. On the other hand, we should not be handing them the means of livelihood in such a way that we prevent their recovery of initiative.

Here in the United States we are troubled with other things—strikes galore; unrest on the part of the returning servicemen and almost every segment of our population. A good deal of those strikes and a good deal of the unrest has been due to bad labor legislation. There is only one way that the Federal Government can take part in labor relations successfully and that is to act as an arbiter or conciliator between labor and the management. To my mind, that calls for the immediate repeal of the National Labor Relations Board and the establishment of a tribunal similar to the National Mediation Board which has kept peace between the railroad industry and its employees for 20 years. That is the only way that the labor unions can continue to exist in the long run. That is the only way that there can be any opportunity for liberty and freedom.

If we are going to have governmental promotion of demands of one group or another, or governmental suppression of one group or another, we are going to get to the point where we have to have a dictator who fixes the wages and the prices that every manufacturer can charge and that means only one thing—complete and absolute socialism and regimentation of all our people. This means reaction and not progress. This means the end of liberty in America.

Now we have another problem. The expenditures of the Government for this current fiscal year ending June 30 next, are going to run, as near as I can figure, $65,000,000,000. The revenue cannot exceed $35,000,000,000. This leaves a deficit for this fiscal year ending June 30 of $30,000,000,000. Next year the revenue cannot exceed $25,000,000,000. In the years following, the revenues will still further reduce because there will be no hangover of uncollected taxes of substantial amounts.

For the next fiscal year beginning July 1 next, these are some of the demands being made by the administration upon the Government:

Army, peacetime basis	$3,000,000,000
Navy, peacetime basis	3,500,000,000
Compulsory military training	2,000,000,000
Interest upon public debt	5,000,000,000
Departmental expenditures	3,000,000,000
Veterans' Administration	4,000,000,000
Proposed construction projects	2,000,000,000
Proposed UNRRA	1,350,000,000
Proposed loan to Russia	3,000,000,000
Proposed loan to Great Britain	5,000,000,000
Total	36,850,000,000

It is easy enough to see that if we loan all this money and if we spend all this money, we are going to have a deficit in the fiscal year 1947 and a larger deficit in the fiscal year 1948. If our Government is going to survive and we are going to avoid inflation of a very dangerous character to survive, it is absolutely necessary that we cut down on the expenditures which are proposed by the different departments. None of them can be carried on on the basis that they are now being carried and the Army and the Navy even must be cut down below their asking price.

We have to consider when we are making gifts and loans to foreign countries that there is an end to the gratuities that the United States can hand out somewhere and that unless we get to that point, and unless we

get to the point where we ask these other countries to devote themselves to the task of building up their standard of living of their peoples, and do it largely by their own effort toward larger production, we are going to be in a position of serious difficulty.

At the present time we have a national debt of $265,000,000,000 with a prospect of twelve to fourteen billions more before the end of the year. We have paper money outstanding with little behind it, totalling upward of $26,000,000,000—five times what it was before the war. If you add that twenty-six billions to the two hundred and sixty-five billions and add the debts of Government corporations which the Government has guaranteed, you reach a total of $290,000,000,000 of debt already existing.

I beg the American people to wake up and realize the seriousness of the impact of these continued deficit-spending operations upon their own future and to begin to realize an unwillingness to work is going to completely destroy our prosperity. In that way alone can we maintain those ideals of liberty which have been handed down to us by generations of freemen.

Pay of the Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a letter from Mr. Donald W. McKone, judge advocate of the Merchant Marine Veterans Association of the United States, with a comparison of the pay of men in the merchant marine with those in the armed forces.

Mr. McKone's letter and statement follow:

MERCHANT MARINE VETERANS
ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Boston, Mass., December 4, 1945.

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CANFIELD: During the hearing on H. R. 2346, which proposes certain benefits for merchant marine veterans, it was most apparent that considerable confusion exists on rates of pay. These pay scales are a matter of public record as are those of the Army and Navy. However, to make it easier to understand them we have prepared two tables:

1. A comparison of pay of men in the merchant marine with those in the armed forces.

2. Pay rates of five individuals who belong to our Washington (D. C.) Post and represent typical ranks in the merchant marine.

May we urge that you closely examine these tables and we invite your comments.

We speak for the 300,000 men of the merchant marine in thanking you for the sympathetic hearing which you gave us.

Sincerely yours,
DONALD W. MCKONE,
Judge Advocate.

COMPARISON OF MERCHANT SEAMAN PAY RATES AGAINST THOSE IN ARMED SERVICES

NOTE.—Bonus payments apply only while in dangerous waters; normally England to Murmansk, around British Isles, coast of France, and Mediterranean Sea, east of Hawaiian Islands. All bonus figures in this study are prior to VE-day. Bonuses have been drastically reduced or eliminated since then.

Armed services pay per annum

Wife and 2 children, Navy seaman, second class	$1,886.00
Navy petty officer, second class	2,308.68
Navy lieutenant (senior grade) (on duty in Washington)	3,990.00
Army captain, AAF (overseas)	5,400.00
Sergeant, AAF (overseas)	2,976.00

Comparable merchant marine pay with full bonus (tax deducted) per annum

Ordinary seaman	$1,897.70
Able seaman	2,132.28
Second officer (trip to Hawaii)	2,640.00
Second officer	[1] 5,280.00
Boatswain ($1,350 trips to Hawaii and South America)	[1] 2,700.00

[1] While on sea duty from England to Murmansk, Russia—highest bonus payable.

It must be borne in mind that these are pay-roll figures. Merchant seamen do not enjoy armed services emoluments such as uniform allowances, free medical care for self and family, furlough train fare rates, reduced admission to amusement places, etc.

The Navy in its official publication All Hands, September 1945, states "A civilian has to earn $3,600 a year to be as well off as an apprentice seaman; $6,000 to equal a CPO. * * * A CPO (chief petty officer) who entered the Navy at age 20 can retire at 50—on $155.25 a month for life. Few civilians have a future like that."

PAY RECEIVED BY INDIVIDUALS SERVING IN THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE

In view of the interest shown by Congress in the pay of individual seamen we have listed below the pay received by members of our Washington (D. C.) Post who represent every section of the service.

J. R. Hawkins, 2800 Naylor Road S. E., oiler, served 1942 to 1944, wounded and permanently disabled by enemy attacks in Pacific. Average net pay received per year—$1,810.

Forrest H. Morgan, 6316 Brookville Road, Chevy Chase, Md.: Trainee for purser-pharmacist mate license. Trained at Sheepshead Bay Training Station beginning January 1944. Serious illness in training contracted and honorably discharged June 1944. Pay received $50 monthly.

Donald W. McKone, 5332 Forty-second Street NW.: Licensed officer serving at sea, 1943-44. Honorably discharged. Average net pay received $222.07 monthly.

R. Michael Ring, 7819 Stratford Road, Bethesda, Md.: Ensign to lieutenant, United States Maritime Service, administrative duty (also served some sea duty) September 1943 to April 1945. Honorably discharged. Compensated at same pay rate as United States Navy.

Fred Wormcke, 5315 Seventh Street NW.: Age 18. October 1944 to May 1945. Fifty dollars monthly while training. Permanently disabled on first sea duty, April 1945, as a result of enemy torpedoing, total pay received $200.

Price of Crude Oil Should Be Increased

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the membership of the House to the enclosed letter. I, too, feel that the price of crude oil should have been increased many months ago. The small producer, particularly if he produces marginal wells, has had and is having a very difficult time.

INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM
ASSOCIATION OF TEXAS,
Dallas, Tex., November 28, 1945.

Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: The time is past overdue for the OPA to be compelled to surrender its arbitrary and dictatorial power which it used during the war to deprive Texas school children of $15,000,000, the State treasury of $62,000,000, the farmers and ranchers of $217,000,000, and the State's economy as a whole of $1,500,000,000.

These startling figures stem from the OPA's obstinate refusal to permit a normal price for crude oil. All other commodities brought better than normal prices. Crude oil, which is the largest factor in Texas economy, brought a wartime average of less than $1.22 a barrel contrasted with a normal value of $1.85.

If holding down inflation means preventing enormous and unscrupulous profits, then the OPA's efforts in that respect should be backed up 100 percent. It is not inflationary for a commodity to sell for enough to pay for the cost of replacement. As far as holding the line is concerned, the OPA has steadfastly refused to let crude oil come up to the line.

During the war period from December 7, 1941, to August 14, 1945, Texas produced 2,380,542,267 barrels of oil, according to Beauford H. Jester, member of the Railroad Commission of Texas. This oil should have brought an average price of $1.85 a barrel instead of an average of about $1.22—that is, it should have brought 63 cents a barrel more than it actually did.

At 63 cents more, the 2,380,542,267 barrels should have brought Texas almost exactly $1,500,000,000. The failure to receive this just and fair added income means that Texas was penalized by that amount. Is Texas a conquered enemy subject to reparations? Then why should Texas be the victim of expropriations?

The income to Texas from its crude oil benefits every man, woman, and child in the State. Of the 254 counties in Texas, 179 now are in the petroleum-producing column. Farmers, ranchers, and other landowners, including the University of Texas, the public-school system, charitable institutions, and the like, benefit from the royalty payments for oil produced on their lands.

Royalty payments, including overrides, average 14.5 percent of the value of the oil. If Texas oil produced during the war had brought 63 cents a barrel more, the royalty payments would have been about $217,000,000 more than they were.

Petroleum is Texas' largest taxpayer. One of the numerous taxes levied upon it is known as the gross-production tax. This is a State tax. If the oil produced by Texas during the war had brought 63 cents a barrel more than it was permitted to bring, the State would have collected 4⅛ percent of the total amount, or nearly $62,000,000, as its part of the increase. What a backlog this would have been for postwar public works, with attendant jobs for returning servicemen.

By provision of the State constitution, one-fourth of the taxes collected from certain sources go into the public-school fund. The gross-production tax on oil is one of these. You can readily see that if the State had collected nearly $62,000,000 additional via the gross-production tax, the public-school fund's one-fourth share would have been more than $15,000,000.

The war against our two outside enemies could not have been fought, much less won, without Texas oil. Here's the record:

The war period, December 7, 1941, to August 14, 1945, covered 3 years and 250 days. During this period Texas produced 2,380,542,000 barrels of oil against 1,805,161,000 barrels produced in the comparable period immediately before the war—that is, between April 2, 1938, and December 7, 1941—also 3 years and 250 days. Texas' wartime increase was 575,381,000 barrels, or 31.3 percent.

By comparison all other oil-producing States in the Union stepped up from 3,023,936,000 barrels prewar to 3,407,860,000 during the war—a gain of 383,924,000, or 12.7 percent.

Of the total wartime increase—959,305,000 barrels—Texas accounted for 60 percent of it. If Texas had increased its production only by 12.7 percent—the gain registered by the rest of the country—Texas would have produced only 2,034,416,000 barrels instead of 2,380,542,000—a difference of 346,126,000 barrels. In other words, Texas produced 346,126,000 barrels of oil more than its pro rata share.

The last of our outside enemies—Japan—surrendered on August 14. During the 100 days since that time the OPA continues to block the road to normal fair prices for Texas oil. If you have done anything to bring about the surrender of OPA in this sector, I have not heard about it.

What do you think you can do?

Very truly yours,

D. H. BYRD, *President.*

General Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the governing bodies of the two largest industrial cities of my State, Milwaukee and Racine, have passed resolutions urging the prompt passage of the Wagner-Ellender housing bill.

They read as follows:

Whereas the metropolitan area of Milwaukee, Wis., in common with similar urban areas throughout the United States, is presently experiencing a severe housing shortage which has been in large measure caused by justifiable restrictions on the use of building materials during World War II imposed by the Federal Government as war measures; and

Whereas the inconvenience and actual hardship of such housing shortage is becoming more and more acute due to the return in ever-increasing numbers of veterans of the armed forces of the United States and such veterans and their dependents are the persons who will be the first to suffer from such housing shortage; and

Whereas it is the sense of the Joint Committee on Emergency Housing that inasmuch as this problem has in large part been caused by necessary Federal war measures, it is still the responsibility of the Federal Government as a corollary war measure necessary to reestablishment of World War II veterans in civil life, to provide such assistance, financial, by relaxation of restrictive regulations, and by the supply of existing materials, as will make it possible for the Milwaukee metropolitan area together with all other like areas, to relieve such housing shortage; and

Whereas the so-called Wagner-Ellender housing bill is now pending before the Committee on Banking of the United States Senate and is susceptible of amendment: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States Senators from Wisconsin be and they are hereby requested to prepare and submit an amendment to such bill whereby sufficient funds may be appropriated to cover the costs of dismantling existing vacant temporary war housing, transportation of such materials and its erection and rehabilitation in areas of acute housing shortage, and also where advisable to erect new temporary housing all as a necessary war measure and thereafter to do everything possible to secure the enactment of such legislation; and, be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the United States Senators from Wisconsin and to the Representatives in Congress from Milwaukee County.

Be it resolved, That the common council of the city of Racine does hereby go on record as urging the immediate passage of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft general-housing bill now before the Congress of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That the reason for this resolution is the desperate situation that all communities in this area are confronted with a serious housing problem, especially for returning veterans, which demands immediate solution; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the city clerk to each and every Member of Congress from the State of Wisconsin.

UNRRA Chief Quits in Protest at Jews' Plight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it would seem that those supporting UNRRA because of their sympathy for those pitiful victims of war would wish to insist that the money be used for the purpose intended. What good does it do to place funds in the hands of UNRRA to be used for graft and corruption? Surely, there are disclosures of black-market operations, "inhuman treatment of * * * inmates of camps sufficient to put this Government on notice." The facts fully warrant a thorough investigation of the charges made against UNRRA.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article entitled "UNRRA Chief Quits in Protest at Jews' Plight," which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald under date of December 6, 1945:

UNRRA CHIEF QUITS IN PROTEST AT JEWS' PLIGHT

FRANKFURT, December 5.—An American relief worker resigned as welfare director of the Landsberg displaced persons camp today in protest against what he called inhuman treatment accorded Jewish inmates of the camp.

The director, Dr. Lee Srole, a former Hobart College professor, charged that the American Army and the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration were forcing the Jews to live under deplorable conditions "where epidemics threaten hourly."

SMITH DISPUTES SROLE

Lt. Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, chief of staff for American forces in the European theater, disclosed the accusations at a special press conference in his headquarters this afternoon.

Smith disputed the UNRRA worker's charges and invited correspondents to accompany him on an immediate inspection tour of the Landsberg camp, west of Munich.

"The charges are a black eye for the Administration, if true—but the Army does not admit they are true," Smith told the newsmen. "I want you to come with me and then determine the answer."

The UNRRA official said that "thousands" of displaced persons in the Landsberg camp were in danger of death from epidemic, and that he "refused to be an accessory to their deaths."

He charged specifically that two and three people were required to sleep in single beds and that many were being housed in dark shelters which had been condemned as unfit for German prisoners of war.

SPECIAL TRAIN TRIP

He also protested that the displaced persons were receiving a meager 2,000-calorie daily diet. He said it was inadequate for people suffering from the after-effects of 6 years' imprisonment in German concentration camps.

He charged that both the Army and UNRRA headquarters had ignored all reports on the "appalling conditions" at Landsberg.

No Time for Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. O. BURGIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of December 5:

NO TIME FOR POLITICS

Europe's children are unlikely to read the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to learn the loftiness of intent with which some Members of Congress espouse the principle of freedom of the press. But they will know about that espousal all the same. They will know about it, if it should prevail when the House of Representatives acts tomorrow on the UNRRA authorization bill, through the twisting pain of hunger and disease which the great principle will inflict upon their infant bodies. They will know, and we at home will have won the dubious right to read about their agony.

These children of Europe, liberated by our armies and by the armies of our allies, desperately need the $1,350,000,000 contribution from the United States which UNRRA is now asking Congress to authorize. They need this contribution because UNRRA's funds, including even the $550,000,000 appropriation still awaiting final congressional approval, will be exhausted by the end of this year. If UNRRA's flow of supplies to the needy is to continue without interruption, the new contribution must be authorized, and an adequate appropriation of money must be made before the first of the year—indeed, before Congress goes into recess, as it plans, for a Christmas holiday.

UNRRA must have these fresh funds if it is to place orders for food and other supplies to be delivered throughout the hard winter that lies ahead.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee has recommended passage of the UNRRA authorization bill—without the attachment of any shackling amendments. But the bloc of Republican Congressmen who tried to tie their so-called free press rider onto the $550,000,000 appropriation now threaten to do the same in connection with the new authorization. This rider would prohibit the use of American funds in any country which maintained any barriers to free reporting by American newspapermen. It is, as we have said before, a provision which is administratively altogether unworkable. And what is worse, it would impose a special condition upon our participation in an international undertaking—a political condition to which the recipient nations could not in self-respect accede and which would invite the 46 other participating nations to impose all sorts of crippling special conditions of their own.

The effect of this amendment, if it prevailed, let us make no mistake about it, would be to prevent the delivery of relief to the people who need it most. Even an unsuccessful attempt to attach this amendment to the bill could have disastrous consequences. For the amendment must be fought; and if it should delay the granting of funds to UNRRA beyond the first of the year, it would be paid for in suffering and in human life. The Republicans who choose to make a party issue out of this spurious defense of press freedom will be engaged in the ugliest form of politics. Democrats who support them will share in the contempt which Americans cannot fail to feel for so heartless an action. None of us, in or out of Congress, will be able to find much cheer in the Christmas season if we default in our responsibilities to our fellow human beings overseas.

The Labor Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAT ARNOLD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter which I received from Mr. N. M. Brittain of Chillicothe, Mo., concerning the labor situation:

The following I think explains the feeling of most of the people back home in regard to the labor situation.

If both parties would forget the vote that they think they might get by giving labor the right-of-way, then there could be something done that would benefit some one else besides labor.

"Demand of labor's come to be
A hindrance to prosperity
The manufacturer doesn't know
Just when their plants will stop or go.

"They grow more tense with each demand
How much of this can business stand?
It's up to Congress now to do,
And make some laws entirely new.

"Discard all sort of graft and tricks,
Take labor out of politics,
Then hang the leaders one by one,
And keep it up until you're done."

European Veterans Are Angry Over Being Stuck in Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the following letter, telling of 90-point men who are sitting on a Pacific island with nothing to do and waiting in vain to be sent home. This letter, which was written by a Buffalo man on Okinawa, appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Wednesday, November 28, 1945:

My story has been a long roundabout affair from the time I left the good old U. S. A. to now. I spent 10 months with a general hospital in England, then crossed to the Continent, was reassigned to a quartermaster battalion which was directly redeployed to the Pacific and have come to roost here in Okinawa for the last 3 months.

I am going to try to give you a factual picture of the type of treatment the European theater troops who were directly redeployed to the Pacific theater have received and the way the Army discharge plan affects them. I'll try hard not to allow my personal feelings to break forth, because you must know how terribly anxious I am to see my 9-month-old daughter for the first time.

MEN INADEQUATELY FED

I want you to evaluate it yourself, on your own terms and with your own standards, and judge whether we are rightfully discouraged and angry.

Within 2 months of VE-day we were aboard a transport, the *General Butner*, crowded like a herd of cattle, and had a 61-day trip through Panama to Okinawa. During this time I can swear, as a medical officer, that the men were inadequately fed, and I never saw as much skin pathology.

VJ-day arrived as we were anchored in Ulithe Lagoon, on the way to Okinawa. Hopes rose for a quick return home. All other ships on their way from Marseille were sent to New York or San Francisco, but we proceeded. And it was not pleasant to hear the greetings from Pacific troops: "Hello sucker." We had been assigned to the Tenth Army (led by General Stilwell) to be in the first wave of the invasion of Japan. Still the men's spirits held up—surely the War Department would give us a priority, especially since all other troops from ETO were getting furloughs home before direct redeployment.

NOT A SINGLE TASK

Then came the staggering news that no more deployment would occur directly from Europe, no 75-point men would be sent overseas—and yet here we are, with nearly all the men all above that score, and for 3 months in Okinawa we have not had a single task, not even one assignment. Our headquarters is now run by a warrant officer, junior grade, a job that calls for a lieutenant colonel. We have had no commanding officer, no executive officer, no adjutant, no personnel officer.

Now, we hear that all troops in the United States from European theater of operations who were on leave prior to redeployment are being discharged. This really hurts.

As to the medical situation, no more doctors are being commissioned, men who have never even left the States are being discharged, and with 18 months overseas I have only 45 points and must sit here because point credits are frozen and the release score for a medical officer still is 80.

We have no way to express our problems to the War Department, nor to Congress, nor to the people themselves, because in their long way through channels they are always stopped some place.

WANTS STATEMENT OF POLICY

We feel we should be brought home immediately, not 6 to 12 months from now, as it would work out with present plans.

I know you will understand that I merely want to see a good break for the men overseas, especially those who came here from Europe directly. We fully realize that all the pressure now is from the men at home, who have not been overseas.

I thought maybe you would help me to get our troubles before the people, Congress and the War Department, so we can have an honest, simple, straightforward statement of their plans for us, not a lot of buck passing and dead silence.

Surely we should be brought home soon. We feel in our hearts that we have done our part. We just can't understand how men can be let out in the States who have done far less than we have, while we are asked to stay here and wait. It's not right—and all the propaganda about speedy return of veterans is not true. We still have 90-point men here in Okinawa.

Why not sign petition No. 8 on the Speaker's desk and give these men a chance to get home?

Col. Charles A. MacDonald Saved Lindbergh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there has been recent discussion on the floor of the House concerning combat action in which Charles A. Lindbergh engaged while serving in the Pacific theater of operations as a civilian technician.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an Associated Press news release describing how Lindbergh narrowly escaped being shot down in flight. The article names Col. Charles A. MacDonald as the Air Force fighter pilot who came to Lindbergh's rescue.

I am sure that the Members of Congress will be interested to learn that Colonel MacDonald is now the chief of the Army Air Forces branch of the Legislative and Liaison Division in the War Department, and that he is the leading surviving Army Air Forces fighter ace in the Pacific, having 27 enemy aircraft to his credit.

For his gallantry and skill, Colonel MacDonald, who was formerly the commanding officer of the Four Hundred and

Seventy-fifth Fighter Group, has been awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, with Oak Leaf Cluster, signifying that this decoration, the second highest conferred by our Nation, was earned twice. As further evidence of his heroism and expertness, Colonel MacDonald received the Silver Star, with the Oak Leaf Cluster, the Distinguished Flying Cross with 5 Oak Leaf Clusters, and the Air Medal with 10 Oak Leaf Clusters.

The news article to which I referred follows:

LINDBERGH NARROWLY ESCAPED IN FIGHT, FLIER REVEALS

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., December 1.—Charles A. Lindbergh narrowly escaped being shot down when he accompanied a fighter mission over Truk, Capt. Robert De Haven, 23, disclosed yesterday.

Captain De Haven said Mr. Lindbergh, stationed on Biak as a technician, was with three fliers of the Four Hundred and Seventy-fifth Fighter Group when—

"They encountered Zeros and Mr. Lindbergh's guns jammed. Col. Charles A. MacDonald shot down a Nip who was drawing a bead on Mr. Lindbergh's plane. It was after this that Gen. George C. Kenny, far eastern Air Force commander, ordered that Mr. Lindbergh not be permitted to fly combat missions."

Captain De Haven described the incident as occurring a few days after a flight over Halmahera, "during which Lindbergh shot down a Nip." He identified Colonel MacDonald as commanding officer of the Four Hundred and Seventy-fifth.

Military Government in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a recent letter from a young Army officer currently serving with the military government in Germany. He not only has analyzed the problems but he has suggested some solutions:

BAVARIA.

Hon. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. BUCK: Since VE-day I have been assigned to military government in Germany. Through various sources it has been possible to keep moderately well informed of press and public reactions in postwar United States. The reporting of important developments has usually been adequate. It has, I think, tended to lack the depth and perspective that are vital to the long-range evolution of the average American's consciousness as a citizen of a world society. Perhaps it is the hypocritical attitude of the spectator who brings a portable radio to a football game and spends the afternoon at odds with the announcer's report. Since it is obviously quite impossible to be wholly objective, I will limit myself to stating my reaction to some of the major problems that confront those who are in Germany this winter.

Displaced persons: A displaced person is technically defined as an individual from an Allied or liberated country who is in Germany against his will. In all there were a considerable number fewer DP's in Germany than was originally estimated. The problem was further aided by the speed with which the citizens of the eastern countries repatriated themselves on bicycle, foot, cart, or truck. Six weeks after VE-day a large portion of these people were out of Germany. However, somewhat overzealously, perhaps, a tremendous number of western Europeans had been herded into large camps. These camps were often inadequately staffed, unsanitary, and generally miserable places in which to live. The released factory slaves were, perhaps, better off than formerly, but the released farm workers were, in general, worse off. Looting, rape, and murder, though perhaps far less than might reasonably have been expected, were a constant problem.

Since the end of May a superior job of transporting these western Europeans has been accomplished by use of tactical unit transportation and reconstructed railroads. At present there are about 500,000 DP's in the American zone. In most instances, these are adequately, if not comfortably, housed. They are given some medical care, receive better than a subsistence ration and have been issued some clothing. Among these people, however, one finds a condition that may well in the long run be one of the most persistent, most dangerous, and most difficult problems to combat in all Europe. Partially because of unavoidable circumstances, and partially because of a very loose interpretation of those to be classed as DP, the category has given shelter to political malcontents, social undesirables, and outright Fascists in considerable numbers. Perhaps not surprisingly, in many camps these elements have been the most attractive, most cooperative, best educated. In result, often it is these people who get the preferential treatment and in fact supervise the distribution of largesse. To tell you even in generalities who these people are is impossible. They are from no special country although many of them come from the Baltic States. They have migrated in several waves, starting in about 1939. Most of these people came either to escape the wrath of their countrymen or the wrath of the Russians.

Among them is a good sprinkling of Poles, Ukrainians, and Russians who refuse to return to their country. From this segment come frequent and, occasionally, well-documented reports of alleged Russian atrocities. When the wedges between the Allies are evaluated it may well be said that some of the biggest and most effective were hammered home by those whom we now protect. A second difficult problem in this handling of displaced persons is the fact that they cannot be forced to work. I feel that this has been most unfortunate in two respects. First, the harvest in Germany was considerably smaller than it might have been and, second, that people without work, particularly people with no experience in idleness, invariably get into trouble. Most of the displaced persons in the American zone have been afforded a chance to return home and I think I can speak for many of the Americans here in saying that my sympathy is well nigh exhausted. A particularly dangerous piece of reporting was done by Life on this problem when they described as an expert a photographer who made a 7-day, 1,500-mile survey of the problem. In 7 years he might attain such a reputation.

In all fairness, however, the plight of thousands of innocent, indigent, war-shocked humans with no shadow of hope cannot be lightly dismissed. An early and careful screening of these persons would clarify the problem markedly. It would be quite possible to "screen out" most of the unworthy.

Denazification: Here a superior job has been accomplished, especially at the Kreis (county) level. At this point I wouldn't attempt to discuss the short-range effects of the policy as outlined at Potsdam. In Bavaria the policy of denazification is "fait accompli" and in many cases this policy has been extended far down to root out even the apparently nominal party people who were in many cases actually forced under considerable pressure to join the party. Since there is little point in discussing the justification of this policy on a moral or practical basis, I can only say that to date the spirit and letter of the directive have been accomplished unusually well. It is quite probable that we have vetted party people as completely as the Russians and considerably more completely than the British.

The corollary problem of denazification is, of course, replacing those who have been removed and set to work in menial jobs. To try to assess the solution that has been made is quite impossible. The Germans who now govern range from the most staid "Tory" to those "left of left." Efficiency in civil government, highly prized by the Germans in contrast to the Americans, has undoubtedly been sacrificed. This reduction in efficiency is contingent upon both the untried nature of new personnel and the outlawing of the harshly enforced regulations that the Nazi was able and willing to enforce. What the forthcoming election results will be is assuredly anyone's guess. The population, particularly in rural Germany, is decidedly not too party conscious at the moment. There is a general feeling of sympathy for the nominal party members who have had their jobs and security taken from them, their funds frozen, and they themselves forced to work at unskilled labor. On the other hand, many of the present incumbents have suffered heavily at the Nazi hand and are perhaps even more vindictive than we.

Democracy in Germany: There is no reason for any shred of optimism in the thought that the German mentality will be attracted to the philosophy of "liberty, equality, fraternity" in the predictable future. Here and there, through the chaotic haze one can distinguish a flicker of light, but it is pathetically feeble. Twelve years under the guidance of the Hitler gang has beaten out unrelentingly the spark of freedom from all but the most persistent. The approaching winter and the next 5 years in Germany will hardly fan this spark to a blaze. I am quite convinced that true democracy in Germany, or anywhere else in the world, is not attainable on empty stomachs. For the German today the problem is not one of political philosophy but rather that of survival. Concerning the future of men, I am an incurable optimist but for the future of democracy here, the road will be a long, tortuous one, and the foundations will be founded on a people who are largely without hope. In revolting from fascism these spiritless people may well charge blindly to the philosophy of nihilism. In brief, the problems of a constructive peace are far more complex than those of a destructive war. I feel the urge to run physically, as well as mentally, and still there is the inexplicable magnetism of history in the making.

Education: In this field there is much to be done, and so far little accomplished. The youth of Europe can be roughly divided into two general groups. Those who have grown up in the school of fascism and those who have grown up with no school but cruelty and privation. The challenge is so great that it cannot be defined. To date the progress has seemed infinitesimal, but it will take a generation of arduous effort with little perceivable result to even scratch the surface. Perhaps the first "light" to go off in Europe was that of liberal education. Until it is again rekindled, there will be neither lasting peace in Europe nor in the world.

Military government personnel: Much of the adverse comment on military government has, quite understandably, been directed at the personnel. Perhaps I am too close to see the forest, but I feel that the personnel is a very fair sampling of people who were qualified and available. That some of these in every grade are illy adapted to the job is to be

expected. These individuals do not constitute an alarming portion of the officers and men involved. In spite of a wealth of problems that have no solution, in spite of misguided interference from tactical troop commanders with neither skill in, nor appreciation of, governmental problems and techniques, in spite of living in a society where every self-gratification is not only condoned for those in power but actually encouraged, commendable progress has been and is being made.

If these hastily collected thoughts have been of any use or interest, I am pleased. If I can be of any small service as an unofficial source of information, I'll be most happy to help.

My sincere best wishes to you and Mrs. Buck.

Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PEHR G. HOLMES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday afternoon I had the pleasure of hearing our good friend and colleague, Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, address the Massachusetts Federation of Taxpayers' Associations at their annual meeting held at the Statler Hotel, Boston.

In his usual forthright and thoughtful manner Mr. KNUTSON addressed himself to the subject of Government spending, citing billions of dollars that are each year appropriated by Congress to make possible certain projects for which there is no pressing need and which could very easily be postponed until such time as the American people can better afford them.

In analyzing Government spending our colleague showed how cost of Government and taxes go up and down together and that we can look for no substantial reduction in taxes until the administration institutes a rigid policy of retrenchment.

It is needless for me to say that Mr. KNUTSON's remarks were unusually well received and from all sides came expressions of complete approval.

What Mr. KNUTSON said at Boston can very profitably be read by the membership of Congress. His remarks follow:

Fellow Americans, it is a distinct honor and a very real pleasure to be permitted to address the Massachusetts Federation of Taxpayers' Associations in the historic city of Boston. From my earliest childhood have I admired the people of New England for their courage, their industry, their vision, their thrift, and their dependability. No finer race ever lived. Their contribution to the building of America, their part in maintaining the Union intact and independent, also their work in developing the West, are written on the brightest pages of our glorious history.

I dare say your organization came into being to combat the constant rise of Government taxing, and Government spending, and we may take courage from the knowledge that similar organizations are on the alert now in nearly every State in the Union.

Government spending and taxes are, of course, interwoven and inseparable. As spending goes up taxes must of necessity follow. We can only reduce taxes as we reduce the cost of Government, local, State, and Federal. Until recently our watchful eye was directed almost entirely to taxation, and little heed was given to the spending end, but the stern law of necessity now forces us to keep the two in constant focus, with a view to bringing them into alinement.

Some 20 years ago I visited a marine officer friend stationed in the interior of the Republic of Haiti.

A day or two after my arrival we set out on an inspection trip. Before our departure my friend directed the yard boy to fill a galvanized tank in the back yard, which was used as a shower.

The boy evidently took his orders too literally because on our return, after an absence of some hours, we found him pumping away for dear life, the tank overflowing and the yard flooded.

I have often thought of that incident, and how like the yard boy is the average American taxpayer, who pours his money into a bottomless maw that we call the Federal Treasury, and all the time that he is doing so is perfectly oblivious to where the money goes and how it is spent.

That was all very well in the old days when we had no national debt to speak of, and but a nominal income tax. It was only when we awakened to what we thought were our responsibilities to the other peoples of the world and decided to set the world's household in order, that our national debt began to grow by leaps and bounds.

Not to be out-done, taxes followed suit, and they increased, and continued to increase with the speed of a jet-propelled plane. In 12 years we have had 17 tax increases. Think of it!

From a national debt of less than $1,000,000,000, at the time of our entrance into World War I, the debt is now in excess of $250,000,000,000 which, by the way, amounts to about $250 for every minute since the dawn of the Christian era.

Not all of that stupendous sum was spent in "making the world better." Much of it was poured out on a plan to remake America and our economy, in a manner that is as alien to our concepts of government as would be a litter of blooded pups nursed by an alley cat.

Many who watched with apprehension the rapidly mounting debt were lulled by repeated assurances from our leaders that a big debt was a good thing for the country; that the more we owed the greater our wealth; that in the final analysis it was not a debt, because we owed it to ourselves.

A gullible Congress, spurred on by an equally gullible people, embraced that philosophy with all the ardor of a crusading knight in search of the Holy Grail. Not only were we assured that our wealth would increase with the debt, but we were also told that the less we produced the more we would have.

Out of the window went the old, time-tried philosophy that all wealth must come from the soil, from the mines, and from the sea, and that wealth can be created only by labor and by creative toil.

It was not until our taxes had increased about 2,000 percent that the gullible really began to question the soundness and the wisdom of their political soothsayers.

A majority of the American people evidently labored under the impression that the tax burden was being borne by the other fellow, because they continued to go to the polls and register their approval with all the abandon and cheerfulness of a group of children being taken to the country for their first visit.

Time after time they went to the polls and voted their approval of what was being done for them, or, should I say, done to them.

It was only when the little fellow was taken into the tax gatherer's fold that he began to suspect that his leaders had been flimflamming him. It took a long time for the idea to percolate into the minds of the masses that every dollar spent by the Government must be raised through taxation, hidden and visible.

By that time the average chap was too dazed to figure it all out for himself, but slowly the rank and file began to understand that it takes more than WPA rakes, shovels, and hoes to bring us out of a labyrinth of confusion, prodigality, and waste that has stamped the past decade as one of irresponsible governmental spending, and futile planning.

It only takes a pup 9 days to get its eyes open, but the homo sapiens seem to require that many years.

We can only have tax reduction as we have reduction in Government spending. There is no denying that our Government, as it is now operated, and as it has been operated the past 12 years, is costing us at least three times as much as it should, and the reason is not far to seek.

Let us see what certain people have said about this waste. Senator HARRY F. BYRD (Democrat) has said: "Inefficiency and the lack of organization among the very numerous departments of the Government have made the war cost at least twice as much as it should."

On June 29, 1943, a United States Senator stood on the floor of the Senate and said: "I could stand here all afternoon and give example after example showing that tremendous sums of money are simply being thrown away with a scoop shovel." The name of that Senator was Harry S. Truman.

On June 3, 1943, the Comptroller General of the United States, Lindsay Warren, appeared before the House Civil Service Investigating Committee and made statements which were highly significant. They reflected the actual findings of the General Accounting Office, which Warren described as the "strictly nonpolitical" agency responsible to Congress for providing independent audit and settlement of the Government's financial accounts. Said Mr. Warren, in part:

"* * * under the gentle guise of war, the word 'economy' has been deleted from the dictionary."

"Thrift and prudence, ordinary prudence in the expenditure of other people's money, has gone out of the window."

"* * * sometimes the contracting officials for the Government are either nitwits or else."

"* * * some day, some time, I want to see more people in the employ of the Government who are looking out for the Government. It is time some of them are concerned about the people who pay the taxes."

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries every administration that came to power or fell from power in the major European nations either rose or was wrecked upon its fiscal policies. No nation can be indefinitely maintained on a deficit budget. In the end disaster must overtake any nation which fails to pay its way.

Unless we can maintain this Nation on a sound financial basis there is disaster ahead for us and for the world.

The situation is critical, not because we are in a stage of transition from one historic era to another, not because we are entering on a period of extraordinary scientific and industrial development. It was critical before we entered the war, before we dreamed that war was possible. The situation is critical because a decade before the opening of the war we had developed a spending psychology, had entered upon a period of unrestrained and uninhibited spending. We bought what we wanted. Too often we bought what we saw whether we were certain we wanted it or not. We did not stop to count the cost or to consider the source

from which the money was to come to pay for it. The result was a spending spree such as the world has never before seen.

In 10 or 12 runaway years Congress increased the annual appropriations by leaps and bounds. No plan for spending was too fantastic, no amount asked too large. I can find no parallel in the fiscal annals of any nation. Remember, we are not speaking of war expenditures. There is nothing here for war or preparation for war.

If we do not trim the sails of governmental expenditures down to the point where there can be a balancing of the Budget, America is going to take an inflation ride, and the destination will be old-fashioned paper-money inflation that may wipe out all—rich and poor, big and small. We are traveling in that direction pretty fast right now, with upward of $28,000,000,000 of paper money outstanding—nearly six times what it was before the war.

What does that mean? It means that the people of America must wake up. It means that we must stop catering to every whim and trying to provide funds for things that we can do without. It means we must give the people in American an opportunity to live as our fathers lived before us. In short, it means a return to those virtues which in 150 years made America the happiest and most prosperous country on earth.

May I digress a moment to speak briefly on the very serious labor unrest that now afflicts all parts of the country. We are all agreed that wages must be brought into alinement with living costs. However, there is no need for anyone to strike to bring such a balance about. It can be accomplished through friendly negotiation if both sides are disposed to be fair and reasonable. Failing in that the President should use his broad powers to bring about a resumption of production to meet the unprecedented needs for nearly everything, such as automobiles, household necessities and above all, additional housing of which we now have a most serious shortage.

Let production proceed without interruption. The public has some rights that should be respected, but are all too often ignored.

When I came to Congress nearly 30 years ago, it cost the American people about a billion dollars a year to operate the Federal Government. Before Pearl Harbor the cost had increased by 800 percent, or to about eight billion, not counting relief.

The budget estimates submitted by President Truman for the next fiscal year call for sixty-six billions.

We have been operating the Government in the red for 14 years and if we don't bring out a balanced budget pretty soon the sheriff will take us over just as sure as 2 and 2 are 4, and that would be distasteful, even to the most ardent spender and do-gooder.

As a member of Senator BYRD'S Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures, which has already saved the taxpayers over $4,000,000,000 since it was organized 4 years ago, I have had an unusually good opportunity to observe how our Government has grown and expanded until there isn't an activity that mortal mind can conceive of, in which Uncle Sam does not have his finger. Today he operates banks, railroads, busses, trucks, steamship lines, department stores, hotels, printing establishments, and as sale bills have it, other activities too numerous to mention.

As of November 1 a year ago, our committee found that the Government is made up of 1,141 departments, bureaus, and what not. Before the New Deal there were 68 bureaus. Today the Federal telephone directory in Washington alone is almost as big and fat as is the telephone directory of the city of Boston and its suburbs and, like Topsy, it is growing and growing.

Let us take the State Department as an example: It is made up of 69 component parts, and they have divisions that supervise everything from international affairs to pink teas and cocktail parties in the Nation's Capital. Today, we have 26 independent agencies, with a total of 265 components; the Treasury Department is made up of 93 parts. Then we have the emergency war agencies comprising 364 divisions. And so we might go on.

Where we used to get along with about 500,000 on the Federal payrolls there are now in excess of 3,000,000. In most instances when a bureau is discontinued, as a result of too much publicity, the personnel is transferred to another bureau, so there is no reduction in force.

In many of these bureaus there is little or nothing to do. The employees check in in the morning and the first order of business is to read the morning papers. Then as many as can possibly squeeze into the rest rooms retire for a cigarette and a little chin music.

Many of the clerks play the races and are in constant telephonic contact with their bookmaker. It would be interesting to know how many of the girls are now kept busy making presents for Christmas.

Well, may you ask me, who is responsible for this deplorable and indefensible condition. The answer is, Congress is primarily responsible because these extravagances are only made possible through appropriations made by Congress.

Now, don't you folks begin feeling "holier than thou." You are also responsible and I mean it in a much more real sense than the President's contention that you are responsible for Pearl Harbor.

All over the land there are highly organized pressure groups constantly bombarding Congress to appropriate money for this, that, and the other thing. Too many go on the theory that any money jimmied out of the Federal Treasury is just so much gravy.

The late lamented and beloved Speaker, Champ Clark, frequently made the remark that if there is anything more cowardly than a Congressman it is two Congressmen. After all, Members of Congress are but human beings.

When these pressure groups begin bombarding their Congressmen with telegrams, telephone calls, and letters urging them to support this, that, and the other project for spending more money, the average Congressman, with one ear to the ground, and both eyes on the next election, being rather pliable and amenable, as you know, goes along because he thinks the telegrams and letters reflect the majority sentiment in his district.

Let me list some of the projects now pending in committees of Congress which are sponsored by pressure groups and call for huge outlays. And I might say that many of these projects were approved by the President in his September Budget message to Congress. Here are some of them:

	Per year
Federal aid for education	$500,000,000
Vocational education aid	100,000,000
Free food stamp plan	500,000,000
Rural electrification	500,000,000
Federal aid to hospitals	110,000,000
Federal health program	600,000,000
School lunch program	100,000,000
Sewage treatment program	100,000,000
Federal housing program	80,000,000
Increased Federal salaries	500,000,000
Total	3,090,000,000

Then we have bills introduced providing for lump sum appropriations which include:

Veterans' bonus legislation	$13,000,000,000
Additional UNRRA contribution	1,350,000,000
Commodity Credit Corporation	500,000,000
Federal aid for highways	3,000,000,000
Additional river valley authorities	$5,000,000,000
Federal aid for airport construction	1,000,000,000
Total	23,850,000,000
Making a grand total	26,940,000,000

We must not overlook the possible additional item of fifteen billions to other countries.

Every single item that I have enumerated is being backed by one or more pressure groups, so I want to take this occasion to say to the good men and women of America that if they want to prevent wild spending in Washington they had better turn their energies into channels that are directed to economy rather than in high-pressuring Congress for bigger and better appropriations.

REMEMBER, MY FRIENDS, WE CAN'T EAT OUR CAKE AND HAVE IT

The Massachusetts Federation of Taxpayers' Associations has done an outstanding job in awakening the people of New England to the imperative need for reducing the cost of government—Federal, State, and local—and your association is known far and wide for its intelligent and effective work.

Similar associations exist in nearly every State in the Union, and they are all doing a fine work. We know that it is only through such organizations that the desired end can be attained. We also know that these organizations are effective in the degree of their size, therefore every taxpayer in America should join a tax league because that is the only medium through which he can express himself effectively.

The people are going to get economy in government when the demand for economy becomes sufficiently strong and vocal. There is no other agency that I know of through which the people can express themselves for economy so effectively as through an organization such as yours.

Every taxpayer in the State of Massachusetts should join your organization and help promote the great work for economy that you are doing, ever remembering that in numbers there is strength. Alone they can hope to accomplish little. Every dollar invested in such work will return steady and remunerative dividends.

Let me admonish the American people to stop looking to the Government in Washington to do for them the things they should do for themselves.

America was not builded and made great by Washington bureaucrats and Government subsidies. Rather, this great and glorious country is the product of industry, freedom, opportunity, and personal initiative.

The brave men and women of the East, who loaded all their worldly possessions into covered wagons, and turned their faces resolutely and hopefully to the setting sun, braving the hidden dangers of the forests; who in 150 years transformed an empire wilderness into the richest empire on earth—they were the ones who builded America.

Not only did they wrest the empire west of the mountains from the hostile Indians, but they built roads and railroads, opened up farms, established schools and churches, and created thousands of modern and prosperous cities, villages, and hamlets where the standard of living is so high that it is the envy of all the world.

When they set out on that great migration they severed all ties with the old home, and what they did, and what they accomplished was done without Government subsidies, Government controls, or even governmental planning. In short, they also underwent the tribulations and the trials of their forefathers, who had landed on Plymouth Rock two centuries before.

While their worldly possessions were few, they had boundless faith in the future of

America, and a supreme confidence in themselves. That is what America needs today.

They demonstrated to an admiring world what the American people can do if but given a free hand.

Today that area, which we fondly call the bread-and-butter-basket of the world, holds as many opportunities as it ever did. All that we ask is that Uncle Sam remove from our throats the stranglehold of a bold and grasping bureaucracy, and that we be permitted to retain for ourselves a fair share of the wealth that we create.

Fellow Americans, I have boundless confidence in the future and in the destiny of America.

I believe we now stand on the threshold of the most wonderful era in all the history of mankind.

Let us here and now resolve to break the shackles that a bureaucratic octopus has fastened upon us.

Let us also resolve that Washington shall have every dollar that is necessary for the orderly conduct of our Government, and for our national security, but at the same time determine that there shall not be one penny for extravagance and waste.

America no longer has money to throw away. Henceforth, let us think of America first. Then we will again become a happy and prosperous people. Let us ever remember that only a prosperous America can help rebuild a war-devastated world.

Moral Conditions in Yokosuka

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, December 5, 1945.

Hon. JOSEPH P. O'HARA,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Kindly refer to your letter of November 20, 1945, relative to the open letter from Lawrence L. LaCour, Chaplain, USNR, describing conditions of prostitution and sex laxity among naval personnel in the Yokosuka area, Japan.

I am pleased to advise you that, immediately on learning the situation at Yokosuka, an investigation was made and directives were issued ordering strict compliance with the long-established and documented Navy policy for the suppression of prostitution. This compliance has been secured, and all houses of prostitution have now been placed "out of bounds." Parenthetically, it should be noted that the venereal disease rate for the fleet for the month of October was considerably lower than in the continental United States.

The investigation disclosed that an honest effort was made by the commanding officers to control an admittedly difficult situation by means of what at the time appeared most effective. In order to properly meet morale needs, it was imperative that liberty be granted to personnel. Because of the health and recreational problems presented, it was deemed advisable to place many sections of the city "out of bounds." Unfortunately, however, some houses of prostitution existed in the "in bounds" area; and, in order to protect the health of the men, prophylaxis stations were established where they would be most effective; and, in one instance, this was at the entrance to a house of prostitution. While such a procedure may have given the appearance of encouraging the patronage of a house of prostitution, in reality it should have served to remind the men of the hazards to be encountered in such patronage.

The Navy has, for a number of years, made intensive educational efforts to indoctrinate all personnel regarding the dangers of prostitution, not only from a venereal disease standpoint, but also from the standpoint of the moral implications of promiscuous sex behavior. Continence has been urged as the only pattern that will absolutely protect against venereal disease. The Yokosuka and fleet commands involved, at an early date, reindoctrinated their personnel on the hazards they would encounter on liberty.

What Chaplain LaCour observed was the result, in large part, of group pressures, sudden release of inhibitions long pent up by many months of hazardous sea duty, cessation of hostilities and the general let-down in morale stamina of all personnel, all occurring during the confusion incidental to the occupation of Japan by American forces.

While there has been a unanimity of opinion and in directives issued by the policy-making bodies of the Army, Navy, and Public Health Service that prostitution should be vigorously suppressed, there is a wide divergence of opinion of the matter among the rank and file of the services. This reflects the confused thinking of the American public in general on the subject. This confusion exists in spite of the considerable educational efforts that have been carried on in the last several years to enlighten the public as to the moral, social and medical evils of prostitution.

You may be assured that the Navy Department will continue to do its utmost to protect the American ideals of home and family life. In this effort we earnestly urge that the whole citizenry accept their share of the responsibility for the behavior of its individual members.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

OCTOBER 31 1945.

DEAR MR. SCANLAN: The chaplains in the service and the bishops and priests at home have apparently lost round No. 1 in contesting the venereal-disease-control program in the Army. I hope that I am not overreaching myself or exaggerating when I say that we have lost. That is why I add, "round No. 1," because I am hoping that there will be another round. Only this time we had better not be left in the corner. For round No. 2 comes up with compulsory military training and our 18-year-olds.

Round No. 2 must be fought differently than the first round. Instead of it being contested in isolated instances by individual priests and bishops over scattered areas, I think it must be carried on in a well-planned, well-organized, and constructive manner. The present system of venereal-disease control a la Army is pagan, and it can and will be corrected only by arousing public indignation; by shocking parents into realizing what has been and is going on; and by familiarizing them with those things which their sons will face when they are introduced to the Army. The men in the service and the chaplains especially are familiar with the Army's method of presenting its venereal-disease-control program. It is the most immoral and the crudest thing the Army has to offer. For in attempting to curb a disease, the venereal-disease-control program in its present form has succeeded in encouraging immorality.

The following examples are cited in order to clarify and support the thesis that "immorality has been encouraged in the Army."

1. Back in 1941 and again in 1942 there were many objections coming from the soldiers themselves because they were being "forced" to take "pro-kits" with them when they left the post. After much pressure the War Department clarified its regulation that "availability" of pro kits does not mean "compulsion" for the men to carry them. Nevertheless, in 1944 a chaplain's attention was directed to an outfit in an overseas area where the acceptance of a "pro kit" was the condition on which men were allowed passes to town. And again as late as the summer of 1945 another chaplain happened upon the same practice in another outfit in the same area. In each instance the practice was discontinued only after the chaplain quoted the regulation. Was it ignorance on the part of the local commanding officers? No; it was rather their zeal for maintaining a low veneral-disease rate in their outfits.

2. There is no balance in the venereal-disease program as it has been and is now presented to the men. In one or two sentences they are told casually that "sexual relations are not necessary for good health," and that "total abstinence is the best protection against venereal disease." But in six or eight hundred or a thousand sentences the use of prophylaxis is boosted to the skies.

It is true that the chaplain fits into the program. Once every 6 months he is scheduled to give a 15- or 20-minute talk on sex morality. But on the same program a medical officer explains the use of prophylaxis and a film is shown to demonstrate it. To supplement this the men are warned about venereal disease and instructed in the use of prophylaxis sometimes two, three, and four times a month. Prominently displayed in latrines and on the bulletin boards are large posters advocating the use of prophylaxis. Some of these posters are crudely worded, v. g. "There may be a rubber shortage, but there is no shortage of rubbers * * * use prophylaxis," and again, "You can tell when a gun is loaded but you never know when a woman is loaded with venereal disease * * * use prophylaxis." Then in many orderly rooms it is not unusual to see an ample supply of "pro kits" with the invitation "Take one." And all of this in the surroundings where men are supposed to live.

3. The venereal-control program in the Army is reduced to an axiom: "Education in the use of prophylaxis and its easy and ready availability to every man." A program like this considers it in no way evil for a man to expose himself to immorality. The terrible evil is that a man should fail to take a prophylaxis after an exposure.

4. Each commanding officer has the responsibility of keeping the venereal-disease rate down. In order to accomplish this he sees to it that the men are instructed in the use of prophylaxis "ad nauseam." A program like this can give the impression that illicit sex relations are the accepted thing so long as prophylaxis are used.

5. In a Latin-American outpost a commanding officer cooperated with the local civilians by setting up a combined "pro station" and "house of prostitution." It was a fenced-in area with a guard on duty at all times. When a soldier entered he had to give up his pass to the guard. His pass was returned as he left. Before he left, however, it was certain that he had received a prophylaxis. It kept the venereal-disease rate down. But it was an Army-controlled house of prostitution.

6. At another Latin-American outpost the commanding officer confessed that he had closed his eyes to the practice of some of his men bringing native women into the camp area. Although it was against the rules, it was "safe" for the men since they could use the pro station at the camp, whereas there was no such convenience in town.

All of which gives us another axiom: "If men are going to expose themselves, make prophylaxis convenient." And so at every pro station a GI is on duty 24 hours a day to take care of the men who are doing the right (?) thing so long as they take a prophylaxis after an exposure.

7. "You will not be paid for the time you spend in the hospital with a dose of venereal disease" is the argument the line officer used to present to the men as a motive for not becoming infected. Then the medico demonstrated the newest, simplest, safest, and most convenient prophylaxis. (Now a man gets paid for the time he spends in the hospital with venereal disease.)

And so a soldier muses: "The Padre, my parents, and my conscience tell me not to do this thing, while the Army tells me how to do it."

8. The crowning glory (?) of the Army's thorough indoctrination in venereal-disease control was most evident during the days of redeployment of troops from the European to the Pacific theater. The bad houses of Panama were the most popular haunts in the city. They were young kids, most of them, who hadn't a thing to worry about because they were equipped with "pro kits." And the Army told them how to use them.

I am only one priest among thousands and thousands of men giving his and the average man's reaction to the venereal-disease-control program as he has met it. And I believe that it should be blasted sky high. There is no reason why this program cannot be presented in a dignified and constructive manner without undermining morality and encouraging immorality. That venereal-disease control is necessary is a well-established fact, but that it be served to the men in its present form should not be tolerated. The following suggestions are offered to remedy the present Army program.

1. The Government should spend as much money presenting some dignified posters and leaflets (not the "preachy" type) advocating self-control, as it does on advocating the use of prophylaxis.

2. The Government has an obligation to the good, decent, and moral men. These men should be given incentives for remaining that way. Not all of them have religious principles to guide them. But they are familiar with the rules about moral behavior and self-respect, and they should be encouraged to follow them.

3. The Government should draw up carefully prepared outlines on "How to instruct men on the subject of venereal diseases." In their present form these outlines deal with various types of diseases, their cause and the need of prophylaxis. They should be supplemented by some practical motives for moral behavior and the commonly accepted rules for overcoming the venereal desires and avoiding the occasions of sin. Remember that the chaplains have a minority of men coming to church once a week. The Army has all of the men all the rest of the time.

4. The Government should offer a more dignified treatment of the venereal-disease subject by making available to line officers carefully prepared sex-morality lectures which will be read to the men. This will eliminate the stupid efforts of some officers who have no sense of moral values themselves and who have very little constructive advice to offer their men.

5. The Army should exercise its control over houses of prostitution by placing them "off limits." It should also restore the system of penalizing personnel who become infected with venereal disease.

6. It should be an established policy in the Army that, whenever a talk or publicity is given concerning venereal disease and the use of prophylaxis, an equal amount of time and space will be given concerning morality and self-control.

It is my sincere conviction that the Christian people of America are powerful enough and Christian enough to insist that the United States Government will establish a venereal-disease-control program in the Army that will be worthy of their sons.

Please feel free to do with this letter as you see fit. I would request, however, that my name be withheld because of military restrictions.

With best personal wishes, I remain,
Sincerely yours in Christ.

UNRRA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, UNRRA was established at the suggestion of our own country and out of the generous spirit of the American people to bring food and clothing to the destitute families of those men and women who gave all they had, even in many, many cases life itself, to support the joint enterprise in which we were all at the time engaged, that of driving tyranny from the world. They, through the underground, rescued and saved untold thousands of our brave fliers and foot soldiers, who found themselves shot down or cut off in those unhappy lands. To do this, they not only risked their own lives but the lives of their families, as well as the loss of their homes. In order to help us achieve victory with as little expense of lives as possible, they blasted their own bridges; they destroyed their own towns; they fought the common enemy.

Americans are not the kind of people who fail a friend. There may be complaints here and there. And, of course, mistakes are made. Why, even among our own soldiers, boys we love so much and the ones who fought for us, we find black markets. We would not for one single solitary fraction of a second damn and condemn the whole Army for the sins and derelictions of the few. Therefore, we cannot, in fairness, damn and condemn UNRRA simply because within its organization we find those who are unfaithful to their trust and are goaded to wrong by a selfish urge.

A lot of money is asked for here, it is true, but the denial of one package of cigarettes by each of the smoking public of America per week for 1 year would almost pay this bill. Can we afford to jeopardize the integrity of our own pledged word to the Allied Nations, and, of our implied pledge to those who fought for us and with us and are now hungry and cold through no fault of their own?

On the wall in my office is a picture. It shows a young American soldier feeding a starved French child, from his own mess kit, his own rations. He will fight on an empty stomach if necessary, but his heart and his soul are fed. You can see it in his countenance. I think that is the real spirit of America.

We grow by sharing and if America survives the future, it will be because she has the bigness of spirit to know and understand the suffering of others throughout the world and is ready to share.

I am sure that my people in the Ozark Mountains of northwest Arkansas would be ashamed of me if, by my vote, I permitted one orphaned child of any dead soldier of our allies to starve or freeze this winter.

Not Unduly Exacting About Indonesia—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the question of American security is inextricably concerned with the establishment of peaceful administrations in the islands of the Pacific, which shall be acceptable to the populations of the islands. In particular, the vastly overcrowded East Indies group is of vital importance to us—no less than to the titular colonial overlords of those islands.

The United States cannot and should not claim a perfect record of colonial administration, but in the Philippines, at least, the events of the past years have demonstrated that our former wards in that Commonwealth prefer our type of government to any of the other political offerings now current. For this reason it seems remarkable that, so far as we know, our Government has put no moral or other pressure on the British or Dutch Governments to persuade them to a like course in their East Indian insular possessions. Here, again, is an example of what Mr. Secretary Byrnes called our being "not unduly exacting." In plainer-spoken days it might have been termed "moral laziness and moral cowardice."

Some further results of our passivity in the Indonesian crisis can be seen from the following dispatches:

KEY INFLUENCE OF COMMUNISTS IN ASIA CITED—PARTY, OFTEN UNDER ANOTHER NAME, BACKS REVOLTS IN SOUTHEASTERN AREA

(By A. T. Steele)

NEW DELHI, INDIA, December 3.—Communist influences long suppressed or discouraged in the countries of southeastern Asia are playing a growing if not always conspicuous role in the various freedom movements which today are agitating those crowded lands. In general, their immediate announced objective is independent democratic government. In general, they are striving to work through united fronts rather than by taking a lone line, although their policy varies from country to country.

Many observers regard the situation in Indonesia as a portent of what is likely to happen elsewhere in the Orient, particularly if the United States continues its passive policy of leaning over backward to avoid undue exactions.

Constantine Brown give a comprehensive summary in his article of No-

vember 18 published by the Washington Evening Star, of which the following is an excerpt:

The far eastern volcano is not yet in full eruption. But unless the major world powers show more wisdom and a greater desire for sincere cooperation, there is grave danger that before the end of the year one of the most populated areas in the world will be in complete turmoil.

The Indonesian situation affects the United States only indirectly. Because of previous agreements, it is not possible for the American Government to do more than give counsel, which may or may not be followed by the Netherlands and British Governments, the principal beneficiaries of the riches contained in Java and Sumatra.

So far as can be ascertained here there are no political subversive elements behind the revolution of the Indonesian peoples. And although the interested powers may try to put the blame either on "Communist activities" or on subversive propaganda, it is evident that the Indonesian leaders wish only one thing—to run their own people themselves. There is no tendency on their part to divorce themselves entirely from their Dutch masters. Neither are there any indications that they wish to proceed with a policy of nationalization which would be harmful to the large British interests invested in that country.

WOULD BE OWN MASTERS

The Indonesian leaders want to be masters in their own house. Reports from unbiased on-the-spot American observers say they would welcome an economic cooperation from the western world—provided it is more beneficial to the millions of natives who in the past have received only a few meager crumbs from the untold wealth of their country.

The repressive policy of the Netherlands Government supported by the British military and naval forces is considered here as being frankly nearsighted. Use of force against the Far Eastern people might have paid dividends 20 or 30 years ago. But today, after the British and Dutch have been humiliated during the war and forced to surrender to the Japanese, the display of force against poorly armed natives can make little impression on the people of the far Pacific.

The possibility of the Indonesians fighting for self-rule and political and economic autonomy may have serious repercussions in Malaya, Burma, and India itself. In a period of restlessness such as has never been witnessed before, the efforts of the Dutch and British Governments to stick by a policy of force are highly unwelcomed by the American Government and the American people.

WILLING TO MEDIATE

This Government, in keeping with its previous commitments, has adopted a hands-off policy in that area, but the administration, it is said in responsible quarters, would not hesitate to act as a mediator should the governments in London and at The Hague ask for such mediation.

The Indonesian situation has been made unnecessarily explosive. The British and the Dutch must have been fully aware that negotiations could have brought excellent results. The present explosive crisis has been precipitated by an unbelievable lack of comprehension and stubborness on the part of the men who have had the responsibility of dealing with the Indonesians' logical demands.

As George Moorad, the PM correspondent, cabled from Shanghai on November 29:

It is perhaps not thoroughly realized at home that American public opinion is the single most important factor in this oriental tug of war, and the various factions both to left and right have been trying, up to the present rather successfully, to befog the picture of American intents and interest. The struggle of political propaganda from both sides has already reached world-wide proportions.

Practically every informed observer agrees that the greatest danger to world peace at present arises from the lack of a determined policy on the part of the United States. Generally speaking, the American public is still in the dark as to what commitments have been made in its name about our relations to other countries—although those relationships will determine to a great degree the daily life and livelihood of every American for years to come.

As General Hurley has pointed out, the American public has no present part in making or even in learning about our policy, because the cliques and the experts cover all essential issues with secrecy. The purpose of this secrecy is to hide the existence of a vacuum, the empty place where our policy should be. No one has defined or can define our policy in the Pacific, because, the fact is, we have none. There are bits and pieces of policy, limited to specific areas and in some cases conflicting and self-contradictory—just as General Hurley described.

This situation has become more acute in recent years because of administration distrust of a well-informed American people, being openly given the choice between various courses. At no time recently has any executive department of the Government issued a majority and minority report from its advisers. It has issued only unified statements, which leave out every political consideration to which any of the departmental experts may object. Since there are experts of every political correlation, the result is a pronunciamento full of solemn, inane generalizations.

Today in Indonesia, as in many other sections, we are helping to promote war by solemnly refusing to adopt any principle by which both sides may be forced to adopt peace. But in order to do that, the American people must first decide what kind of a world they want to work for, live in, and, if necessary, fight to maintain. Specifically, in Indonesia do we want a return of Dutch-English colonial exploitation? Do we want a native government led by former collaborationists of Japan on a program of racial hatred toward white men? Or do we want, and will we help establish and maintain, a progressive system of education looking toward the full participation of the Indonesian peoples in an unprejudiced world society?

Such choices, with full documentation of background and probabilities of outcome, should be laid before the American people by their Government. It is only in this way, and not by leaning over backward, or by being not unduly exacting, that the United States can properly exert its present paramount influence toward the establishment of peace.

Address of Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Before Shrine Luncheon Meeting, Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 7 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me today before the Shrine luncheon meeting in Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Let me preface my remarks. Four years ago today the news spread throughout America and the world of the attack on Pearl Harbor. In a moment America became united and went to work and performed miracles.

A year later the situation was very dark. Hitler was at the gates of Stalingrad, Rommel at the gates of Alexandria, and the Japanese were knocking at the door of Australia.

What changes have taken place since then.

And so, in this holiday season we lift our voices in gratitude to the Giver of Life that the victory is ours.

It is good to be here with you today. It is good to be in this refreshing atmosphere of joy, to look at smiling faces, cheerful eyes, and jolly hearts.

I am speaking to men who possess the quality of leadership in your make-up. Anyone who has eyes to see with or ears to hear with is aware of the fact that we in America have a job on our hands. While Shrinedom is the playground of Masonry, it is the playground of earnest men who are concerned with meeting head-on the challenges of the present.

Yes; it is good to be in this refreshing atmosphere of brother nobles. It is my privilege to belong to Tripoli in Milwaukee. I always like to get out with good fellows—men who radiate joy and good fellowship, and who are attuned to the worthwhileness of living. Such men know that it is necessary to go apart for refreshment. Appropriate refreshment is found in many channels of human living. We find it in music, we find it in good books, we find it in good conversation, we find it in the playground of Masonry.

But this hour that I shall spend with you will not be taken up with that kind of going apart. Rather we will consider among ourselves some of the present-day challenges (and incidentally some of the joys), because life only comes in meeting challenges effectively and conscientiously—in living in action.

You probably have noticed, as I have, that in the Congress of late there is not so much of what we call name calling. Men are not called standpatters or liberals, Tories or Progressives as much as formerly. Why? Because we are confronted with problems that require the best thinking of liberals and conservatives—in fact, of all segments of our society. The real issue now is whether this country can maintain its republican form of government. In planning for this postwar era one needs to maintain balance and judgment and an open mind so that we do not find ourselves led up a blind alley.

As we all know, since the discovery of atomic energy we are living in a world that

has gone ahead a thousand years. Our tomorrows will be pretty much what we make them. We are grateful for the cessation of war and America's return somewhat to normalcy. All this is cause for gratitude and rejoicing and we are happy that many new discoveries and inventions have been made which will make our physical living more enjoyable.

However, we know that material success and well-being do not by themselves create real happiness. They are but the instruments which, if properly used, will contribute toward happiness and toward peace. Yes; the mere accumulation of things, of money, as many have found out in this period, does not without spiritual values make for peace and joy within. It is well at the start that we have a clear understanding of this, because if we are to go ahead and meet successfully the problems up ahead, we must do so with a spirit of joy in our hearts, with a sense that round about us are the everlasting arms. And with a dedication in our hearts, we will go forward to do right and justice.

The Great Teacher told us to "labor not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life." And in Ecclesiastes we have the idea expressed another way: "Vanity of vanities; all is vanity."

In these war days, America has had cognizance of this idea. You and I know that when loved ones are in jeopardy or when our freedom is in jeopardy, then our money, our income, all become of little value unless they contribute to the safety of loved ones and further the cause of human freedom and justice.

So in this period we must make sure that we do not drift back into complacency, that mentally we do not become apathetic, that we meet our problems with the thought of mastery within, just as we did during the war years. So, with this in mind, may I be privileged to suggest some points that I think we should give consideration to in the program that America must shape. I think we could all challenge each other to do the following things:

1. Substitute faith, industry, thrift, for fear, slothfulness, love of spending, etc. These are not mere words. Our President some years ago said that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself. And those words cut into the very depth of every American and brought courage and strength to America. We cannot afford to loosely spend, to the jeopardy of the Nation's debt, shortly approximating $275,000,000,000. Neither can we let down on the job. We must get to work.

2. Be alert to the fact that we are living in a new world of science which is just around the corner. This new world will bring changes comparable to what the race witnessed during the period of the Renaissance and the discovery of the New World; comparable to the period of industrial revolution; to the period of the political revolution, when America spearheaded the movement that governments derive their power from the consent of the governed.

It is for leaders like you, in your lodges, in your businesses, in your churches, in your homes, in every contact, to demonstrate that you are not simply living by the side of the road and witnessing this great forward movement. Rather, we must all be alert to the privilege and responsibility of living in this age.

3. Get rid of the little foxes in our business relations, in our political relations, in all our affairs—the little foxes that destroy the vines of productivity. Not only world cooperation among nations, but cooperation on every front, in the individual's life, presents a challenge. We cannot be content with a static status. We must watch our own speech and thoughts lest we unwittingly join the ranks of the little foxes, and we must not miss the mote in our own eye while trying to spot the beam that is in our brother's eye. The world needs friendship and understanding—a seeking on everyone's part to see the other fellow's viewpoint. Every individual knows that it is the kind thing, the considerate act, the understanding gesture, that sweetens the daily existence. Businessmen must not engage in rough furor of economic competition. Rather they must engage in healthy, friendly competition—not overreaching. Labor must seek to appreciate the problems of management, and management the problems of labor. This does not mean that we have to always be in the pollyanna mood.

4. Keep our personal and national perspective. What I have to say now applies to individual differences and national differences. We must bear in mind our objective. We must not behave like prima donnas. We must put ourselves into the other fellow's shoes and seek to see the other fellow's viewpoint. We must seek to find common ground, find the things that unite us, and look our differences straight in the eye and seek to iron them out. With poise, not poison, with humility, not bravado, with restraint, not rashness, we must seek the solution.

5. Bear in mind that every age has its problems and remember that we can always get refreshment by going back to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, and recall the historical situation that existed at the time these two great American charters came into being. May I read to you the preamble of the Constitution of the United States.

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

It is significant to note that when the Charter of the United Nations was formed, it started out with these words: "We, the people of the United Nations, determine."

And it further stated: "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and the worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations, large and small,"

And, "to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained,"

And, "to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom."

And then we find these words: "And for these ends to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors and to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security and * * * that armed force shall not be used save in the common interest and to employ international machinery for the promotion of economic and social advancements of all people, have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims."

You will notice that in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Constitution of the United States, "We, the people," have undertaken the job. That means you and me. That means that you and I can't pass the buck to someone else. It is our job to establish justice, to practice tolerance, to promote good will and the general welfare.

All of us know that the mere agreement by 50 nations to the Charter will not of itself accomplish what we hope and pray for. The Charter of the United Nations will have no vitality unless the people make it vital, unless they activate it with their will, intent, purpose, and desire for peace.

6. Relight the flame of a worthwhile living in our homes, our schools, our churches. Clemenceau said some 20 years ago, after Versailles, that the world was sitting on top of a powder barrel. The situation is similar now. Conditions in Asia and in the Near East, in Europe, and our inability to really go places in America, are all indications of the truth of this statement. It has been stated that when God created the world he looked upon it and it was good. We have to recognize that wars, injustice, etc., are man-made. God works through man His wonders to perform, if man will permit Him. This is the way to correct injustices. It is an individual problem. The institutions of the home, the school, and the church are made up of individuals and if those individuals are filled with the flame of divine living, we will have the result, as expressed in these words:

"I took a piece of living clay
And touched it gently, day by day,
And molded with my power and art
A young child's soft and yielding heart."

Hitler molded the youth of Germany his way. Recently I talked with a Senator who had occasion to speak with Reverend Niemoeller after he was released, and he confirmed that experience of the German youth. But Hitler's teaching sowed the wind, and the world reaped the whirlwind. It is for these three institutions—and you and I are a part of each—to get into action so that the youth will give supremacy to the human and spiritual and will daily see the joy of living the Golden Rule.

And we must by word and deed contribute toward creating and maintaining sound public opinion and high idealism, which make possible the increase of righteousness, justice, and good will on the homefront and abroad. This type of leadership is what the world is hungering for. There must be reborn in all of us a leadership that is intelligent, aggressive, and serviceable, that creates friendly understanding among all citizens, that insists on businesslike methods in administrative government, and the living of the highest principles by the individuals in social, business, and professional life.

Documents Bearing on Termination of Anglo-American Financial and Trade Discussions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 7 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have here the statement made in Washington by the President of the United States and in London by the Prime Minister of Great Britain on December 6, 1945, with reference to the American loan to Great Britain; also a joint statement by the United States and the United Kingdom regarding the understanding reached on commercial policy; also a joint statement regarding settlement for lend-lease reciprocal aid, surplus war property, and claims; and also the financial agreement between the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom.

I think it might be well to have these documents printed in the RECORD, and I

ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection the documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Statement made in Washington by the President of the United States and in London by the Prime Minister of Great Britain on December 6, 1945.

2. Joint statement by the United States and the United Kingdom regarding the understanding reached on commercial policy.

3. Joint statement regarding settlement for lend-lease reciprocal aid, surplus war property and claims.

4. Financial agreement between the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom.

STATEMENT MADE IN WASHINGTON BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND IN LONDON BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF GREAT BRITAIN ON DECEMBER 6, 1945

The economic and financial discussions between officials of the United States and United Kingdom Governments meeting in Washington have now been completed.

These discussions have been concerned with the major problems affecting the basic economic and financial relations between the two countries, in the light of the provisions of article VII of the mutual-aid agreement between their governments signed February 23, 1942.

They have covered the questions of financial assistance from the United States to the United Kingdom, the demobilization of wartime trade and monetary restrictions, the settlement of lend-lease, the disposal of surplus war property in the United Kingdom owned by the United States, and, finally, long-range commercial policies in the broad sense, embracing the fields of trade barriers and discriminations, policies in respect of commodities in world surplus, cartels, an international trade organization, and international aspects of domestic measures to maintain employment.

The purpose of the discussions has been to arrive at mutually advantageous solutions of these problems which the two governments would commend to the peoples and legislatures of the two countries and to the world as a whole.

Both sides have been fully conscious of the significance to other countries, as well as their own, of the outcome of these discussions, and they have from the beginning had continuously in view the common interest of their governments in establishing a world trading and monetary system from which the trade of all countries can benefit and within which the trade of all countries can be conducted on a multilateral, nondiscriminatory basis.

The discussions have been successful.

Agreement has been reached, subject to the approval of the legislatures of both countries, for the extension by the United States to the United Kingdom of a line of credit of $3,750,000,000 on the terms stated in the financial agreement signed this day, for the following purposes: to facilitate purchases by the United Kingdom of goods and services from the United States, to assist the United Kingdom to meet transitional postwar deficits in its current balance of payments, to help the United Kingdom to maintain adequate reserves of gold and dollars, and to assist the United Kingdom to assume the obligations of multilateral trade. This credit would make it possible for the United Kingdom to relax import and exchange controls, including exchange arrangements affecting the sterling area, and generally to move forward with the United States and other countries toward the common objective of expanded multilateral trade.

Agreement has been reached for the final settlement of lend-lease and reciprocal aid, the disposal of surplus war property in the United Kingdom owned by the United States, and the final settlement of the claims of each government against the other arising out of the conduct of the war.

Agreement has been reached on the broad principles of commercial policy for which the two governments will seek general international support.

These arrangements, if carried out, will put an end to the fear of an economically divided world; will make possible, throughout the world, the expansion of employment and of the production, exchange, and consumption of goods, and will bring into being, for the first time, a common code of equitable rules for the conduct of international trade policies and relations.

The realization of these proposals will depend upon the support given them by the peoples and legislatures of the United States and the United Kingdom, and where they envisage measures requiring broad international collaboration, the support of other countries.

The following documents resulting from these discussions are being issued by the two governments:

Financial agreement.

Joint statement regarding the understanding reached on commercial policy.

Joint statement regarding settlement for lend-lease and reciprocal aid, surplus war property, and claims.

JOINT STATEMENT BY THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED KINGDOM REGARDING THE UNDERSTANDING REACHED ON COMMERCIAL POLICY

The Secretary of State of the United States has made public today a document setting forth certain "proposals for consideration by an international conference on trade and employment." These proposals have the endorsement of the executive branch of the Government of the United States and have been submitted to other governments as a basis for discussion preliminary to the holding of such a conference.

Equally, the Government of the United Kingdom is in full agreement on all important points in these proposals and accepts them as a basis for international discussion; and it will, in common with the United States Government, use its best endeavors to bring such discussions to a successful conclusion, in the light of the views expressed by other countries.

The two Governments have also agreed upon the procedures for the international negotiation and implementation of these proposals. To this end they have undertaken to begin preliminary negotiations at an early date between themselves and with other countries for the purpose of developing concrete arrangements to carry out these proposals, including definitive measures for the relaxation of trade barriers of all kinds.

These negotiations will relate to tariffs and preferences, quantitative restrictions, subsidies, state trading, cartels, and other types of trade barriers treated in the document published by the United States and referred to above. The negotiations will proceed in accordance with the principles laid down in that document.

JOINT STATEMENT REGARDING SETTLEMENT FOR LEND-LEASE, RECIPROCAL AID, SURPLUS WAR PROPERTY, AND CLAIMS

1. The Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom have reached an understanding for the settlement of lend-lease and reciprocal aid, for the acquisition of United States Army and Navy surplus property, and the United States interest in installations, located in the United Kingdom, and for the final settlement of the financial claims of each government against the other arising out of the conduct of the war. Specific agreements necessary to implement these understandings, setting forth the terms in detail, and consistent herewith, are in the course of preparation and will shortly be completed.

2. This settlement for lend-lease and reciprocal aid will be complete and final. In arriving at this settlement both Governments have taken full cognizance of the benefits already received by them in the defeat of their common enemies. They have also taken full cognizance of the general obligations assumed by them in article VII of the mutual-aid agreement of February 23, 1942, and the understandings agreed upon this day with regard to commercial policy. Pursuant to this settlement, both Governments will continue to discuss arrangements for agreed action for the attainment of the economic objectives referred to in article VII of the mutual-aid agreement. The Governments expect in these discussions to reach specific conclusions at an early date with respect to urgent problems such as those in the field of telecommunications and civil aviation. In the light of all the foregoing, both Governments agree that no further benefits will be sought as consideration for lend-lease and reciprocal aid.

3. The net sum due from the United Kingdom to the United States for the settlement of lend-lease and reciprocal aid, for the acquisition of surplus property, and the United States interest in installations, located in the United Kingdom, and for the settlement of claims shall be $650,000,000 subject to the account adjustment referred to below. This amount consists of (a) a net sum of $118,000,000 representing the difference between the amount of the services and supplies furnished or to be furnished by each Government to the other Government after VJ-day through lend-lease and reciprocal aid channels, less the net sum due to the United Kingdom under the claims settlement, and (b) a net sum of $532,000,000 for all other lend-lease and reciprocal aid items, and for surplus property and the United States interest in installations located in the United Kingdom and owned by the United States Government. The actual amounts due to the respective Governments for items included in (a) above other than claims will, however, be ascertained by accounting in due course, and the total sum of $650,000,000 will be adjusted for any difference between the sum of $118,000,000 mentioned above, and the actual sum found to be due. All new transactions between the two Governments after December 31, 1945, will be settled by cash payment.

4. The total liability found to be due to the Government of the United States will be discharged on the same terms as those specified in the financial agreement concluded this day for the discharge of the credit provided therein.

5. In addition to the financial payments referred to above, the two Governments have agreed upon the following:

(a) Appropriate nondiscriminatory treatment will be extended to United States nationals in the use and disposition of installations in which there is a United States interest;

(b) Appropriate settlements for the lend-lease interest in installations other than in the United Kingdom and the colonial dependencies will be made on disposal of the installations;

(c) The United States reserves its right of recapture of any lend-lease articles held by United Kingdom armed forces, but the United States has indicated that it does not intend to exercise generally this right of recapture;

(d) Disposals for military use to forces other than the United Kingdom armed forces of lend-lease articles held by the United Kingdom armed forces at VJ-day, and disposals for civilian use other than in the United Kingdom and the colonial dependencies of such lend-lease articles, will be made only with the consent of the United States Government and any net proceeds will be paid to the United States Government. The United Kingdom Government agrees that except to a very limited extent it will not release for civilian use in, or export from, the United Kingdom and the colonial dependencies lend-lease articles held by the United Kingdom armed forces.

(e) The Government of the United Kingdom will use its best endeavors to prevent the export to the United States of any surplus property transferred in accordance with this understanding.

6. The Government of the United Kingdom agrees that, when requested by the Government of the United States from time to time prior to December 31, 1951, it will transfer, in cash, pounds sterling to an aggregate dollar value not in excess of $50,000,000, at the exchange rates prevailing at the times of transfer, to be credited against the dollar payments due to the Government of the United States as principal under this settlement. The Government of the United States will use these pounds sterling exclusively to acquire land or to acquire or construct buildings in the United Kingdom and the colonial dependencies for the use of the Government of the United States, and for carrying out educational programs in accordance with agreements to be concluded between the two Governments.

7. The arrangements set out in this statement are without prejudice to any settlements concerning lend-lease and reciprocal aid which may be negotiated between the Government of the United States and the Governments of Australia, New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, and India.

FINANCIAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED KINGDOM

It is hereby agreed between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, as follows:

1. Effective date of the agreement: The effective date of this agreement shall be the date on which the Government of the United States notifies the Government of the United Kingdom that the Congress of the United States has made available the funds necessary to extend to the Government of the United Kingdom the line of credit in accordance with the provisions of this agreement.

2. Line of credit: The Government of the United States will extend to the Government of the United Kingdom a line of credit of $3,750,000,000, which may be drawn upon at any time between the effective date of this agreement and December 31, 1951, inclusive.

3. Purpose of the line of credit: The purpose of the line of credit is to facilitate purchases by the United Kingdom of goods and services in the United States, to assist the United Kingdom to meet transitional postwar deficits in its current balance of payments, to help the United Kingdom to maintain adequate reserves of gold and dollars, and to assist the Government of the United Kingdom to assume the obligations of multilateral trade as defined in this and other agreements.

4. Amortization and interest:

(i) The amount of the line of credit drawn by December 31, 1951, shall be repaid in 50 annual installments beginning on December 31, 1951, with interest at the rate of 2 percent per annum. Interest for the year 1951 shall be computed on the amount outstanding on December 31, 1951, and for each year thereafter, interest shall be computed on the amount outstanding on January 1 of each such year.

Forty-nine annual installments of principal repayments and interest shall be equal, calculated at the rate of $31,823,000 for each $1,000,000,000 of the line of credit drawn by December 31, 1951, and the fiftieth annual installment shall be at the rate of $31,840,736.65 for each such $1,000,000,000. Each installment shall consist of the full amount of the interest due and the remainder of the installment shall be the principal to be repaid in that year. Payments required by this section are subject to the provisions of section 5.

(ii) The Government of the United Kingdom may accelerate repayment of the amount drawn under this line of credit.

5. Waiver of interest payments: In any year in which the Government of the United Kingdom requests the Government of the United States to waive the amount of the interest due in the installment of that year, the Government of the United States will grant the waiver if:

(a) The Government of the United Kingdom finds that a waiver is necessary in view of the present and prospective conditions of international exchange and the level of its gold and foreign exchange reserves and

(b) The International Monetary Fund certifies that the income of the United Kingdom from home-produced exports plus its net income from invisible current transactions in its balance of payments was on the average over the five preceding calendar years less than the average annual amount of United Kingdom imports during 1936–38, fixed at £866,000,000, as such figure may be adjusted for changes in the price level of these imports. Any amount in excess of £43,750,000 released or paid in any year on account of sterling balances accumulated to the credit of overseas governments, monetary authorities and banks before the effective date of this agreement shall be regarded as a capital transaction and therefore shall not be included in the above calculation of the net income from invisible current transactions for that year. If waiver is requested for an interest payment prior to that due in 1955, the average income shall be computed for the calendar years from 1950 through the year preceding that in which the request is made.

6. Relation of this line of credit to other obligations:

(i) It is understood that any amounts required to discharge obligations of the United Kingdom to third countries outstanding on the effective date of this agreement will be found from resources other than this line of credit.

(ii) The Government of the United Kingdom will not arrange any long-term loans from governments within the British Commonwealth after December 6, 1945, and before the end of 1951 on terms more favorable to the lender than the terms of this line of credit.

(iii) Waiver of interest will not be requested or allowed under section 5 in any year unless the aggregate of the releases or payments in that year of sterling balances accumulated to the credit of overseas governments, monetary authorities and banks (except in the case of colonial dependencies) before the effective date of this agreement is reduced proportionately, and unless interest payments due in that year on loans referred to in (ii) above are waived. The proportionate reduction of the releases or payments of sterling balances shall be calculated in relation to the aggregate released and paid in the most recent year in which waiver of interest was not requested.

(iv) The application of the principles set forth in this section shall be the subject of full consultation between the two governments as occasion may arise.

7. Sterling area exchange arrangements:

The Government of the United Kingdom will complete arrangements as early as practicable and in any case not later than 1 year after the effective date of this agreement, unless in exceptional cases a later date is agreed upon after consultation, under which immediately after the completion of such arrangements the sterling receipts from current transactions of all sterling area countries (apart from any receipts arising out of military expenditure by the Government of the United Kingdom prior to December 31, 1948, to the extent to which they are treated by agreement with the countries concerned on the same basis as the balances accumulated during the war) will be freely available for current transactions in any currency area without discrimination; with the result that any discrimination arising from the so-called sterling area dollar pool will be entirely removed and that each member of the sterling area will have its current sterling and dollar receipts at its free disposition for current transactions anywhere.

8. Other exchange arrangements:

(i) The Government of the United Kingdom agrees that after the effective date of this agreement it will not apply exchange controls in such a manner as to restrict (a) payments or transfers in respect to products of the United States permitted to be imported into the United Kingdom or other current transactions between the two countries or (b) the use of sterling balances to the credit of residents of the United States arising out of current transactions. Nothing in this paragraph (i) shall affect the provisions of article VII of the articles of agreement of the International Monetary Fund when those articles have come into force.

(ii) The Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom agree that not later than 1 year after the effective date of this agreement, unless in exceptional cases a later date is agreed upon after consultation, they will impose no restrictions on payments and transfers for current transactions. The obligations of this paragraph (ii) shall not apply:

(a) to balances of third countries and their nationals accumulated before this paragraph (ii) becomes effective; or

(b) to restrictions imposed in conformity with the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund, provided that the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States will not continue to invoke the provisions of article XIV, section 2, of those articles after this paragraph (ii) becomes effective, unless in exceptional cases after consultation they agree otherwise; or

(c) to restrictions imposed in connection with measures designed to uncover and dispose of assets of Germany and Japan.

(iii) This section and section 9, which are in anticipation of more comprehensive arrangements by multilateral agreement, shall operate until December 31, 1951.

9. Import arrangements: If either the Government of the United States or the Government of the United Kingdom imposes or maintains quantitative import restrictions, such restrictions shall be administered on a basis which does not discriminate against imports from the other country in respect of any product; provided that this undertaking shall not apply in cases in which (a) its application would have the effect of preventing the country imposing such restrictions from utilizing, for the purchase of needed imports, inconvertible currencies accumulated up to December 31, 1946, or (b) there may be special necessity for the country imposing such restrictions to assist, by measures not involving a substantial departure from the general rule of nondiscrimination, a country whose economy has been disrupted by war,

or (c) either government imposes quantitative restrictions having equivalent effect to an exchange restriction which that government is authorized to impose in conformity with article VII of the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund. The provisions of this section shall become effective as soon as practicable but not later than December 31, 1946.

10. Accumulated sterling balances:

(i) The Government of the United Kingdom intends to make agreements with the countries concerned, varying according to the circumstances of each case, for an early settlement covering the sterling balances accumulated by sterling area and other countries prior to such settlement (together with any future receipts arising out of military expenditure by the Government of the United Kingdom to the extent to which they are treated on the same basis by agreement with the countries concerned). The settlements with the sterling area countries will be on the basis of dividing these accumulated balances into three categories: (a) balances to be released at once and convertible into any currency for current transactions, (b) balances to be similarly released by installments over a period of years beginning in 1951, and (c) balances to be adjusted as a contribution to the settlement of war and postwar indebtedness and in recognition of the benefits which the countries concerned might be expected to gain from such a settlement. The Government of the United Kingdom will make every endeavor to secure the early completion of these arrangements.

(ii) In consideration of the fact that an important purpose of the present line of credit is to promote the development of multilateral trade and facilitate its early resumption on a nondiscriminatory basis, the Government of the United Kingdom agrees that any sterling balances released or otherwise available for current payments will, not later than 1 year after the effective date of this agreement unless in special cases a later date is agreed upon after consultation, be freely available for current transactions in any currency area without discrimination.

11. Definitions:

For the purposes of this agreement:

(i) The term "current transactions" shall have the meaning prescribed in article XIX (i) of the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund.

(ii) The term "sterling area" means the United Kingdom and the other territories declared by the defense (finance) (definition of sterling area) (No. 2) order, 1944, to be included in the sterling area, namely, the following territories, excluding Canada and Newfoundland—that is to say: (a) any dominion; (b) any other part of His Majesty's dominions; (c) any territory in respect of which a mandate on behalf of the League of Nations has been accepted by His Majesty and is being exercised by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom or in any dominion; (d) any British protectorate or protected state; (e) Egypt, the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan and Iraq; (f) Iceland and the Faroe Islands.

12. Consultation on agreement: Either Government shall be entitled to approach the other for a reconsideration of any of the provisions of this agreement, if in its opinion the prevailing conditions of international exchange justify such reconsideration, with a view to agreeing upon modifications for presentation to their respective legislatures.

Signed in duplicate at Washington, D. C., this 6th day of December 1945.

For the Government of the United States of America:

FRED M. VINSON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and northern Ireland:

HALIFAX,
His Majesty's Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary at Washington.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—150 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 7, 1945

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, last night at the Mayflower Hotel, in Washington, D. C., a dinner in honor of Col. J. Monroe Johnson, Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, and also in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives, was given by the Association of American Railroads. Our genial and able colleague, the Honorable ALFRED L. BULWINKLE, of North Carolina, and a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the House of Representatives, delivered a most interesting and informative speech, which I include under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD:

Chairman LEA, of the commitee, being necessarily absent, the duty and privilege has fallen upon me to take his place on this program.

I deem it both a privilege and a pleasure, on behalf of the committee, to be present and to pay honor to Col. J. Monroe Johnson, the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, at this dinner given by the Association of American Railroads. The Nation is grateful to him for his magnificent efforts to aid in the transportation of materials of war and troops during the critical period through which we have passed.

It is also quite an honor for me to be here and speak to you on this occasion, which I understand is recognized as the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary in the United States Congress of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, although, accurately speaking, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was not established, or created, until Monday, December 14, 1795. At that time in the House of Representatives the Standing Rules and Orders for the first session of the Fourth Congress were adopted, and under the provsions of these rules four committees were named:

1. A Committee on Elections, seven members.
2. A Committee on Claims, seven members.
3. A Committee on Commerce and Manufactures, seven members.
4. A Committee of Revisal and Unfinished Business, three members.

The Rules and Orders of that day further provided that: "It shall be the duty of the said Committee of Commerce and Manufactures to take into consideration all such petitions and matters or things touching the commerce and manufactures of the United States as shall be presented, or shall or may come in question, and be referred to them by the House, and to report, from time to time, their opinion thereon."

Two of these committees had been created in previous Congresses. The Committee on Elections on April 13, 1789, and the Committee on Claims on November 13, 1794. The Committee on Elections was largely a committee on credentials as well as to pass upon the question, if there should be one, as to the election of a Member. Due to the numerous claims, in the nature of petitions, which were filed with the Congress, it was found necessary to create a committee to investigate and pass upon these before the House considered them. Likewise, it developed a year later that the merchants, manufacturers, and shipping and mining interests of that day also had filed numerous petitions in the House relating to their businesses. It must be remembered that prior to this first session of the Fourth Congress that the House consisted of 115 Members, and that all bills, resolutions, petitions, and so forth, were not considered by any committee. When the House convened, if a bill or resolution was drafted it was then referred to the House in Committee of the Whole House. There may have been hearings by some select committee, or, rather, investigations. The whole matter was thrashed out in the Committee of the Whole. When the claims and petitions became too many, the Committee on Claims was established as I have stated, and a Committee of Commerce and Manufactures was likewise established later on.

The Speaker wasted no time in appointing this committee on Monday, the 14th of December 1795. The committee was composed of:

Mr. Benjamin Goodhue, of Massachusetts, chairman.
Mr. Benjamin Bourne, of Rhode Island.
Mr. Edward Livingston, of New York.
Mr. John Swanwick, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Samuel Smith, of Maryland.
Mr. Josiah Parker, of Maryland.
Mr. William Smith, of South Carolina.

The first official act of business of this committee was a petition, or memorial, of John Courts, collector of the revenue for the district of Cedar Point, in the State of Maryland, praying that Enjemoy, in the State of Maryland, be made a port of entry instead of Cedar Point. Up to this time I have been unable to ascertain what action was taken on the memorial of Mr. Courts.

The first written report that I found that the committee filed was on the petition of Samuel Legare, James Theus, and Samuel Prioleau on the 27th day of December 1796. These three gentlemen were owners of the ship, *General Washington,* and it appears from the record that in the year 1794 some of the crew, without the knowledge of the captain, as was alleged in the petition, concealed and secreted amongst the ballast a few kegs of gin, some of which was landed in the United States contrary to the Revenue Act without being reported by the master of the ship. A fine of $500 was placed upon him, and the owners of the ship became surety for the payment of this amount. The captain, or master, left the State of South Carolina for parts unknown and was not expected to return. The Treasury Department was requested by the owners of the ship to relieve them of the payment of this $500. This was refused, so they came to Congress. This committee of 149 years ago made a report in brief and terse language, quote: "That the prayer of the petitioners, Messrs. Legare, Theus, and Prioleau cannot be granted." Nor do I find where the House took any action on this adverse report of the committee.

The coal miners of Virginia petitioned for a higher tariff on coal in order to protect the coal miners from being at the mercy of the foreign shippers of coal of that day.

This brings to my mind the reason for the separation of manufactures from commerce. Numerous conflicts had arisen on the question of jurisdiction on tariff duty between the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Commerce and Manufactures. This tariff fight led to the creation of a Committee on Manufactures, for it was claimed by the protectionists that the purpose of the Committee on Commerce and Manufactures was to foster infant industries. It was claimed that none of the 22 revenue bills from the Committee on Ways and Means had benefited the manufacturers. For this reason, the advocates of protection sought the separation of commerce from manufactures. To the chagrin of the free traders,

the Speaker, Henry Clay, packed the new Committee on Manufactures with friends of protection. This new committee at once became the rival of the Ways and Means Committee and reported out numerous tariff bills up to the year 1832. After this time, it had little influence but did report a bill on wool duty as late as 1864, though it had lost its place among the great committees of the House.

During the years the Committee on Commerce lost some jurisdiction. On December 19, 1883, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors was established and took over the jurisdiction of the rivers and harbors bill. In 1935 it lost jurisdiction when foreign water transportation, coast guard, and other matters were vested in the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The Committee on Commerce continued from 1819 to the year 1892, when its name was changed from the Committee on Commerce to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It was a very interesting event which brought about the change in the title of the committee. In the first session of the Fifty-second Congress there was a contest in the Democratic caucus for Speaker. Charles F. Crisp, of Georgia, Roger Q. Mills, of Texas, and William M. Springer, of Illinois, were the candidates. On the thirtieth ballot Mr. Crisp was nominated. When Mr. Crisp was elected Speaker he appointed Mr. Springer as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, much to the surprise of those who had supported Mr. Mills, because in the Fiftieth Congress he had been chairman of this committee. Evidently the feeling was pretty hot, and in order to placate Mr. Mills the Speaker appointed him chairman of the Committee on Commerce. This did not work, and the Speaker took another try at it, and had the name of the committee changed from Commerce to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

We do not know, of course, whether Mr. Mills would have been placated by the changing of the name or not, because he was elected to the United States Senate and did not have the opportunity of refusing, but it was rumored around that he would not have served as chairman. The Speaker then appointed Mr. George D. Wise, of Virginia, the ranking Democratic member of the committee, as its chairman.

During these 150 years men of ability and integrity have served the committee as its chairman. Men who were active in Congress for years. I shall not recite the names of all of them but will give the names of men like John H. Reagan, of Texas; William P. Hepburn, of Iowa; James R. Mann, of Illinois; William C. Adamson, of Georgia; Thetus W. Sims, of Tennessee; John J. Esch, of Wisconsin; Samuel E. Winslow, of Massachusetts; James S. Parker, of New York; and last but not least, Sam Rayburn, of Texas, and Clarence F. Lea, of California.

It has been my privilege to serve under these last two. Mr. RAYBURN was selected as chairman in 1931. From that time up until 1937, you and each of you know of the amount and quality of the safe, sound, and progressive legislation that was reported from the committee and became law. Likewise, from 1937 much worth-while legislation has been reported from the committee and passed in the House. The Civil Aeronautics Act, the Transportation Act of 1940, the public-health laws, the amendments to the Pure Food and Drug Act, and other meritorious legislation has been placed upon the statute books.

I have given you briefly some of the history of this committee. Members on it carry heavy responsibilities which require much work. Its present jurisdiction is extensive and varied and includes practically all bills relating to the Department of Commerce, including Civil Aeronautics, the Interstate Commerce Committee and all that includes, the Federal Communications Commission and all that includes, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Railroad Retirement Board, the Railway Adjustment Act, Public Health, legislation relating to the Pure Food and Drug Act, petroleum and the Petroleum Administrative Board, natural gas, and many other subjects. So you can see why I am proud of the fact—and I know that every member of this committee is—that it has weathered the storms of the past 150 years and is today the greatest legislative committee in the House of Representatives.

If time would permit, which it does not, it would be interesting to give in detail the many and various bills that have become law during these 150 years. I cannot take that time, but I do want to call to your attention that from this committee nearly 102 years ago was reported out, and finally enacted into law, the bill which made telegraphy possible in the United States. Without this means of communication the railroads could not have been extended over the Nation as they have. Hand in hand these two have brought progress to the country. Without the telephone, without the telegraph, without the radio, transportation would be seriously crippled whether by air, land, or sea. Some day I hope to be able to select the bills reported out of the committee which have had the greatest influence on the trade and commerce of the United States, as well as the other bills which have affected the health and well-being of the individual citizen.

We have touched on the creation and history of the committee during its 150 years. The work of the committee has been touched on. In closing it might be well to remind you that a tomorrow is coming. The future holds very heavy responsibilities and exceedingly hard work for each and every member of the committee. It is true that a great amount of the work deals with regulatory legislation, which is very important to the country. It is also true that some of the work will deal with the individual citizen of the Nation. In times like these, of a necessity these types of legislation must increase; but, be that as it may, it must be remembered that the underlying principle of the legislation that will be reported out of the committee must have as its guide the words "in the public interest."

On behalf of each and every member of the committee, I wish to express our appreciation for the invitation which you extended, and we accepted, to be present and honor a truly great American citizen, Col. Monroe Johnson, and I wish to say to him that he is in every respect well qualified and worthy to be a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Following is a list of the names of the men who served as chairmen of the committee during the 150 years, with the Congresses they served in, and the years:

CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Congress	Year	Name and State
4	1795	Benjamin Goodhue, Massachusetts.
5	1797	John Swanwick, Pennsylvania.
6	1799	Samuel Smith, Maryland.
7	1801	Do.
8	1803	Samuel L. Mitchell, New York.
9	1805	Jacob Crowninshield, Massachusetts.
10	1807	Thomas Newton, Virginia.
11	1809	Do.
12	1811	Do.
13	1813	Do.
14	1815	Do.
15	1817	Do.
16	1819	Do.
17	1821	Do.
18	1823	Do.
19	1825	Do.

CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE—con.

Congress	Year	Name and State
20	1827	C. Churchill Cambreleng, New York.
21	1829	Do.
22	1831	Do.
23	1833	John B. Sutherland, Pennsylvania.
24	1835	Do.
25	1837	Francis O. J. Smith, Maine.
26	1839	Edward Cwetis, New York.
27	1841	John P. Kennedy, Maryland.
28	1843	Izaac C. Holmes, North Carolina.
29	1845	Robert McClelland, Michigan.
30	1847	Washington Hunt, New York.
31	1849	Robert H. McLane, Maryland.
32	1851	David L. Seymour, New York.
33	1853	Thomas J. B. Fuller, Maine.
34	1855	Elihu B. Washburn, Illinois.
35	1857	John Cochrane, New York.
36	1859	Elihu B. Washburn, Illinois.
37	1861	Do.
38	1863	Do.
39	1865	Do.
40	1867	Do.
41	1869	Nathan F. Dixon, Rhode Island.
42	1871	Samuel Shallsbarger, Ohio.
43	1873	William A. Wheeler, New York.
44	1875	Frank Hereford, West Virginia.
45	1877	John H. Reagan, Texas.
46	1879	Do.
47	1881	Horace F. Page, California.
48	1883	John H. Reagan, Texas.
49	1885	Do.
50	1887	Martin L. Clardy, Missouri.
51	1889	Charles S. Baker, New York.

CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

52	1891	Roger Q. Mills, Texas. George D. Wise, Virginia.
53	1893	Do.
54	1895	William P. Hepburn, Iowa.
55	1897	Do.
56	1899	Do.
57	1901	Do.
58	1903	Do.
59	1905	Do.
60	1907	Do.
61	1909	James R. Mann, Illinois.
62	1911	William C. Adamson, Georgia.
63	1913	Do.
64	1915	Do.
65	1917	Thetus W. Sims, Tennessee.
66	1919	John J. Esch, Wisconsin.
67	1921	Samuel E. Winslow, Massachusetts.
68	1923	Do.
69	1925	James S. Parker, New York.
70	1927	Do.
71	1929	Do.
72	1931	Sam Rayburn, Texas.
73	1933	Do.
74	1935	Do.
75	1937	Clarence F. Lea, California.
76	1939	Do.
77	1941	Do.
78	1943	Do.
79	1945	Do.

The Hurley Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 7 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Exit Pat Hurley," by Maxwell S. Stewart, published in the December 8, 1945, issue of the Nation; and I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix the column entitled "On the Other Hand," by Lowell Mellett, in which Mr. Mellett uses the heading "Thinks Hurley might give Chinese benefit of his 1931 Oklahoma plan."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nation of December 8, 1945]

EXIT PAT HURLEY

(By Maxwell S. Stewart)

Ordinarily when a public servant fails in his task, he resigns quietly, and his shortcomings are mercifully forgotten. This has always been true in the diplomatic service, where tradition frowns upon the airing of individual opinions. But Patrick Hurley is not a man who can accept failure gracefully. He showed that repeatedly in his brief but stormy career as Ambassador to China. And when the inevitable consequences of his meddling in Chinese domestic affairs became so apparent that he was denounced in Congress, his inordinate vanity would not permit a peaceful exit. Instead, he issued an angry public statement which only dramatized his unfitness for the responsibilities with which he had been entrusted.

His attempt to shift the blame for his failure to his former subordinates is a reflection of both his vanity and his incompetence. While it is true that his staff, almost to a man, opposed his consistent support of the reactionary elements in the Chungking regime, it must be remembered that Hurley's policies in every case prevailed and that during the past 6 or 8 months he had surrounded himself with men of his own choosing. Nor has the China Division of the State Department exercised a restraining influence. When conflict arose, Hurley was upheld against the judgment of experts who had spent years studying China's complex political problems. Hurley might have argued that civil war would have broken out even if the United States had not encouraged the Kuomintang with promises of American backing, but he certainly has no grounds for blaming our involvement in that war on those who opposed our taking sides in China's domestic dispute. Hurley's charge that some of the career men openly favored the Communists is a deliberate misrepresentation cooked up, apparently, for political effect. The policies advocated by the experts were from the beginning essentially those of Stilwell and Gauss. They sought to prevent American supplies from being diverted from the war against Japan for use in civil conflict and to assist all groups—not merely the Communists—seeking to establish a more democratic political structure in China. In contrast, Hurley's unconditional support of the Kuomintang has encouraged Chungking to resist popular demands for democratic constitutional reform.

The part of General Hurley's statement that most clearly betrayed his unfitness, however, was the self-contradictory charge that these foreign-service officials were siding simultaneously with an imperialist bloc and with Communist imperialism against democracy and free enterprise. It would be impossible in a brief article to untangle the confusion that apparently exists in General Hurley's mind regarding these basic issues. The equating of democracy and free enterprise provides a partial key to the confusion, but even that does not explain how the career men's alleged Communist sympathies were causing us to be sucked into a power bloc against Communist imperialism. Yet this is the one specific charge that would in any way justify his assertion that their policies, in contrast to his own, were laying the basis for World War III.

Confused and uninformed though General Hurley's statement is, it has been seized upon with delight by the anti-British, anti-Russian press. Yet its effect in the long run should be salutary. The American people have a right to know not only the details of our involvement in China but how our policies on crucial foreign issues are formulated. They should be particularly interested in learning why the views of a relative novice should be permitted to override the recommendations of men who have devoted years of study to Chinese affairs. Another relevant question is why, considering his obvious incompetence, General Hurley was kept in his post as long as he was. It is known that a successor—a man with long experience in China—was selected several months ago, even before the general returned from China. But after Chiang Kai-shek sent an urgent letter requesting Hurley's retention, it was announced that he would return to China. The public would doubtless like to know why the views of a Chinese official should take precedence over the interests of the American people. A congressional investigation of these questions would be useful.

After the furor created by Hurley's resignation it was obviously impossible for the President to go back to the original plan of naming a career diplomat to replace him. He had to find a man who enjoyed the confidence of all sections of American opinion and who at the same time would command the highest respect in China. While the selection of a military man with little China experience may be questionable, especially at a time when political issues are paramount, General Marshall is no ordinary military man, and he is not wholly without experience in China. His ability is exceptional, and there is no reason to believe that he shares Hurley's anti-Russian bias. While his task is an unenviable one, he will assume it with as close to united backing as any diplomat could desire.

President Truman has promised that General Marshall will be given specific published instructions before he leaves for Chungking. It is probable that these instructions will follow the general lines of those given Hurley a year ago, making due allowances for changed circumstances. The new Ambassador will undoubtedly be asked to explore the possibility of solving the Kuomintang-Communist controversy and to help formulate a long-range policy on American military and material assistance to China. Whether the President will go further is uncertain. But Marshall's task would be greatly clarified if the President would use this occasion to restate the principles of American foreign policy contained in his Navy Day speech as they apply to China. Such a statement would have a tremendous effect on China's internal situation. The militarists who have gone confidently ahead with preparations for civil war on the assumption that Uncle Sam will provide the arms and pay the bill would lose their trump card if our policy were clearly put; for no responsible American official will pledge the kind of assistance the Kuomintang militarists need if they are to establish control throughout China. If the President were to make it plain that American military and economic support will depend upon the acceptance of basic democratic principles, Chungking might be forced to abandon its stubborn opposition to constitutional reform and so might open the way for a settlement of China's internal difficulties.

[From the Washington Star]

ON THE OTHER HAND—THINKS HURLEY MIGHT GIVE CHINESE BENEFIT OF HIS 1931 OKLAHOMA PLAN

(By Lowell Mellett)

We're funny folks, we Americans. We know how to manage everybody's business. Just now we are undertaking to manage China's business, which is civil war. That's been a large part of China's business for a long time and just now it shows signs of becoming a big business. And there we are, right in the middle of it, prepared to take a hand and show the Chinese how it should be done.

We should know. Didn't we have about the greatest of all civil wars, the greatest in the numbers of killed, wounded, and dead of disease? And didn't we win it; that is, didn't we northerners win it? We certainly did. And look at the results. We've got Bilbos and Rankins and McKellars running the country, or running the Congress, which runs the country.

And so, having demonstrated our capacity, we will now straighten out the little mess into which some 400,000,000 Chinese have got themselves. We will show them the democratic way. Our greatest expert has left the field of actual battle, but he is here with us in Washington and being heard in the halls of Congress. He is telling our lawgivers what should be done for the Chinese—what, indeed, he would be doing this moment himself for the Chinese if an upstart Congress Member hadn't irritated him into resigning; how he would bestow upon the Chinese the blessings of democracy.

WINTER OF 1931 RECALLED

Back in the cold winter of 1931 our hero was, even as now, sacrificing himself on the altar of public duty. He was serving as Secretary of War. The times were troublous. Some millions of Americans were becoming restless. They wanted to eat. The War Secretary—there is no point in concealing his name, it was Patrick J. Hurley—sympathized with this desire and undertook to do something about it. He had a plan. It was embodied in a letter from a fellow Oklahoman, John B. Nichols, of the Oklahoma Gas Utilities Co., of Chickasha, Okla. General Hurley forwarded the letter, with his indorsement, to Col. Arthur Woods, who was in charge of President Hoover's pacification program. The plan, quoting from the letter, provided:

"Sanitary containers of 5 gallons each should be secured in large numbers so that four will always be left in large kitchens where the restaurants are serving a large-volume business. The containers should be labeled 'Meat, Beans, Potatoes, Bread, and Other Items.' Someone from the Salvation Army with a truck should pick up the loaded containers every morning and leave empty ones. The civic clubs, restaurants, the proprietors, and the workers should be asked to cooperate in order to take care of all surplus food in as sanitary a way as possible. In other words, when a man finishes his meal he could not (after lighting his cigarette or cigar) leave ashes on the food which he was unable to consume. * * *"

IT WASN'T FOR CHARITY

"Baskets or sacks must be placed in each store and particularly those operating meat markets. The proprietor of each firm, together with the clerks, will be asked to place whatever food they can spare or cannot sell. Viz, bones, meats of any kind, potatoes, apples, vegetables that might be used for soup or any other items they see fit to place in the baskets and sacks. All bakeries should do likewise."

But this wasn't to be charity. The unemployed, Mr. Nichols explained, were to work for these meals by chopping wood donated by farmers.

"We expect a little trouble now and then," said Mr. Nichols, "from those who are not worthy of the support of the citizens, but we must contend with such cases in order to take care of those who are worthy. God placed them here and it is our duty to see that they are taken care of in a Christian manner."

Well, God placed the Chinese in China, didn't he, and what does General Hurley mean

by letting one little Congress Member interfere with his taking care of them in a Christian manner? He should explain that while he is engaged in telling Congress all.

Tuskahoma, Okla., Proposed as Allied Nations Capital

REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL STEWART
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 7, 1945

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I have just been advised by Hon. Don McBride, chairman of the Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board, that I have been named a member of a committee to be known as the Tuskahoma Advisory Commission. The duties of said committee are to further the proposition that the Tuskahoma area in Pushmataha County, Okla., be considered as a possible site for the new Allied Nations Capital.

In his letter of appointment, Mr. McBride points out:

It is our opinion, notwithstanding the fact that many large cities are bidding for it, that this future world city should be a city in itself and not an appendage to any established metropolis. The area would be internationalized and that would hardly be feasible in an existing city. It is a new idea—this council of the nations of the world—and should, therefore, be housed in a completely new city—rising on virgin soil with no disagreeable past to tarnish it.

Mr. McBride further states:

That Oklahoma could well afford and would be willing to donate the land for this city is of course a definite fact.

In the rest of his letter Mr. McBride gives a very graphic description of the Tuskahoma area as follows:

The site is less than 300 miles from the geographic center of the United States. This fact should be stressed because in any event, the delegates from foreign countries to this capital must of necessity cross one or the other great oceans. That the delegates from the East or West would also have to cross our whole continent if either of the coast-line cities are chosen goes without saying. Therefore, the location of Tuskahoma geographically is perfect.

It is natural to suppose that the future travel—for time, convenience and comfort—will be by air. The great Southwest surrounding the Tuskahoma area has year-around flying weather. The airports and facilities for air travel are unsurpassed by any region in the United States. The temperature range is such as to provide mild winters and pleasant summers.

The water supply is abundant. Dams would impound water for an ample supply for such a city. Their is plentiful material for the construction of multiple buildings. Lumber, granite, limestone, glass sand, and asphalt, as well as an unlimited supply of the raw materials for making brick and tile, are available. Natural gas as a fuel supply is immediately available and abundant and buildings erected where gas is used as a fuel will be as beautiful 10, 20, 50, or 100 years from now and would not be blackened by the smoke-filled air such as would be the case in cities of the north whose invitations the locating committee may be considering.

The proximity of the supply of natural gas would supply the power necessary for this city, as our great fuel-burning power plants could testify.

Scenically, the Kiamichi Valley is a region of great natural beauty.

These are but a few attributes briefly mentioned of the Tuskahoma area as a world capital site.

Subsequent to the appointment of the advisory commission, the Honorable Fred McDuff, of Seminole, Okla., for previous business reasons, could not qualify as chairman of the commission and the Honorable Moss Patterson, Oklahoma City businessman and former resident of McAlester, has accepted the chairmanship. The following citizens were named as members of the Tuskahoma Advisory Commission: Fred McDuff, chairman, Seminole, Okla.; Don McBride, chairman of Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board; Gov. Robert S. Kerr, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Lt. Gov. James E. Berry, Stillwater, Okla.; L. D. (Bill) Melton, Tulsa Chamber of Commerce, Tulsa, Okla.; W. G. Skelly, Skelly Oil Co., Tulsa, Okla.; Hon. James C. Nance, State senator, Purcell, Okla.; Dr. George L. Cross, president, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.; Hon. H. I. Hinds, speaker, house of representatives, Tahlequah, Okla.; Robert J. Bell, attorney, McAlester, Okla.; M. E. Williams, insurance, McAlester, Okla.; Hon. Paul Stewart, Congressman, Washington, D. C.; Hon. Bill Stigler, Congressman, Washington, D. C.; Hon. Ross Rizley, Congressman, Washington, D. C.; Hon. Elmer Thomas, United States Senator, Washington, D. C.; Ben Dwight, Choctaw tribal attorney, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Hon. W. A. Durant, principal chief, Choctaw Nations, Tuskahoma, Okla.; Dr. Henry G. Bennett, president, Oklahoma A. & M. College, Stillwater, Okla.; Hon. Brown Moore, attorney, Stillwater, Okla.; Hon. Homer Paul, State senator, Pauls Valley, Okla.; E. K. Gaylord, president, Oklahoma Publishing Co., Oklahoma City, Okla.; Ken Miller, news editor, Radio Station KVOO, Tulsa, Okla.; Hon. Jack Bradley, State representative, Wilburton, Okla.; Frank Phillips, Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.; Herbert K. Hyde, attorney, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Hon. Frank Carmichael, State representative, Sayre, Okla.; Don Whistler, WNAD Radio Station, Norman, Okla.; Mr. Geo. H. Evans, co-publisher of the Chickasha Daily Express; Dr. Anna Lewis, professor of history, Oklahoma College for Women, Chickasha; Dr. E. E. Dale, head of history department, University of Oklahoma, Norman; Hon. Moss Patterson, transportation, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Is Christianity Her Only Crime?

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 7, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, these attacks now being made on Madame Chiang Kai-shek raise this question in my mind, "Is Christianity her only crime?"

In my opinion she is the greatest Christian leader that China has seen in a thousand years. We saw her stand on that rostrum and plead with the American people to furnish the Chinese fighting forces arms with which to defend themselves against the brutal Japanese.

She made the greatest impression of any foreign visitor I have ever heard address the Congress of the United States.

Now we find the Communists, who have swallowed the atheistic doctrines of Karl Marx, out knifing these Chinese patriots under Chiang Kai-shek who fought to hold the Japs back as best they could, while our boys were dying by the thousands in the Southwest Pacific. Those individuals who are going into the press, on the radio, or on the floor of this House and attacking Madame Chiang Kai-shek are doing an injustice to one of our allies, as well as this little Chinese woman, Madame Chiang Kai-shek, who has done so much to advance the cause of Christianity to suffering people of China.

Mrs. Roosevelt and Chinese Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 7, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I spoke of the somewhat ungracious and inaccurate remarks made by Mrs. Roosevelt in criticism of Madame Chiang Kai-shek and China, remarks to the effect that Madame Chiang, like the Chinese people, talk about democracy but do not know how to live it.

The following editorial from this morning's Washington Post points out to Mrs. Roosevelt the unsoundness of the position which she, one trusts, took thoughtlessly, a circumstance which can always be pardoned in one who talks so much and so often.

Moreover, Mrs. Roosevelt was quick to clarify and, to some extent, apologize for these remarks as will be seen in the article she published this morning.

Mrs. Roosevelt does not comment on the fact that Dr. Sun Fo, a strong and vigorous critic of the Kuomintang Government of Chiang Kai-shek, is allowed, indeed encouraged, to speak and talk freely in China. Surely the granting of free speech in opposition to the government is one of the signs that China is practicing democracy, though it would not be viewed as a sign of unity in Soviet Russia, where freedom of speech is defined as the right of all citizens to say exactly the same thing.

[From the Washington Post]

CHINA LESSON

That a little knowledge is a dangerous thing has never been better illustrated than in the case of Mrs. Roosevelt. It is doubly

dangerous when coupled with an emotional streak such as Mrs. Roosevelt possesses. She used to be one of millions of Americans who looked at China through rose-colored glasses. Now she has joined in criticism of the Chiang Kai-shek government for its undemocratic ways. To be sure, criticism is justified, but not in the comprehensive, unknowing manner that Mrs. Roosevelt puts it. This is how Mrs. Roosevelt expresses her castigation: "Madame Chiang is typical of the Chinese in that she can talk beautifully about democracy, but does not know how to live democracy." A mountain of ignorance is contained in Mrs. Roosevelt's sentence. Actually the Chinese are the people above all others who "live democracy."

Mrs. Roosevelt is confusing representative institutions with democratic living. The value attached to the individual is a Chinese inheritance extending back long before the Christian era. The individual rises superior to the state, even to God. Thus, the Chinese are at the opposite pole from the German and the Japanese, to whom the individual meant nothing and the state everything. It is the dignity felt for the individual that accounts for the civilization of China. Indeed, China is more a civilization than a state, even a nation. No matter where you go in China, whether rule is exercised by a war lord, a Communist, or a Kuomintang general, you will find the same way of life. In China they call it tao, a word the flavor of which can be expressed only by the Biblical way. Along with respect for the individual, the Chinese way of life has no class distinction and no racial prejudice, and is expressed by loyalty to the family and suspicion of the state, no matter who is running it.

Here is the key difficulty about China. Inefficiency is rife because the Chinese have such an abiding respect for the individual. Incompetents are seldom fired, either in the home or in the factory, because the concern would always be about their fate. Far from not living democratically, in other words, the Chinese live too democratically. Bad government is tolerated because government is nobody's concern and therefore is little more than a piratical adventure. It is for these reasons that the governmental unity which Secretary Byrnes, in a letter to Representative ANDERSON, says is the object of our policy toward China will be hard to achieve. We must persevere in pressing Chiang Kai-shek to liberalize his regime in conformity with his promises and the principles of the founder of the Chinese Republic, Sun Yat-sen. But we cannot afford to forget what Secretary Byrnes calls the realities of China, as Mrs. Roosevelt does.

[From the Washington Daily News]

MY DAY—CHINA CANNOT HAVE UNITY WITHOUT ALL PARTS BEING FREE

(By Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt)

NEW YORK, Thursday.—I was reported the other day to have made a criticism of Madame Chiang and that leads me to devote this column today to a few thoughts on the Chinese situation and our own relationship to the situation.

Sensational things have been said of late by people in high places. My few words are aimed at something quite different from criticism. I believe we should make an effort to understand a situation which to most Americans is difficult and confusing.

When Madame Chiang was here she spoke of democracy in words which we all applauded. Anyone living in China, however, knows quite well that there is still a great gulf between those words and the possibility of living in China today in what we would consider a democratic way of life.

We, of all people, should know that democracy requires a literate people. The Chinese people have been divided by different spoken dialects so that a man from one section of the country cannot be understood in another. The educated Chinese are held in high esteem because it takes so long to become educated, and the average Chinese who is for the most part, a peasant or a worker, has only had an opportunity in the very few past years to learn basic Chinese. Only a few million of China's teeming millions can read and write what may some day become a common language and this is the first step in the unification of China.

The Generalissimo's great strength has been his desire to unify China in which Madame Chiang always has helped him. But because this is such a difficult task and those undertaking it, are at times in such precarious positions, there is greater fear of the opposition than there would be, let us say, in our own country of any movement against our country's democratic form of government. We are not seriously afraid of either fascism or communism because we know that as long as through our democratic form of government, we meet the needs of the people, there will be no threat to democracy.

But the needs of the people are far from being met in China today and so the comparatively small group known as Communists, do inspire greater fear in the central government.

The papers have reported of late a movement in China under the Democratic League, whose leader is Mr. Sun Fo, son of Sun Yat-sen. From what one reads it would seem that this might be the middle of the road group which might bridge the gap between the left and the right. One thing seems to me quite certain, according to General Hurley and our State Department, we agreed to support the Generalissimo in his efforts to create a unified government in China, and that is our obligation. But we did not agree to use force against any group in China, and it would be very undemocratic if we tried to settle Chinese internal problems for them.

It is obvious to us as citizens of a democracy that there never can be any unity in any great country unless all parts of that country and all shades of opinion have full expression and representation. That seems to me vital in the solution of Chinese problems today.

[From the Worcester Telegram of December 5, 1945]

CHINA AND DEMOCRACY

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, visiting Lovell General Hospital, took the occasion to speak slightingly of Chinese democracy, and of Madame Chiang, the wife of Chiang Kai-shek, in particular. Madame Chiang, she said, was typical of the Chinese in that she "can talk beautifully about democracy but she does not know how to live democracy." This inability, she said, came about because the Chinese never had an opportunity to see or practice democracy in action.

Mrs. Roosevelt certainly cast no aspersions against Madame Chiang's democracy, or the democracy of the Chinese people, in the dark days of 1942 when she and her late husband were glad enough to entertain her at the White House. Perhaps the political complexion of the present Chinese civil war has now caused Mrs. Roosevelt to side with those parlor pinks who, by some queer process of reasoning, seem to want to back the Chinese Communists against the Chinese Nationalists in spite of the fact that this country has favored Chiang. Certainly, it favored Chiang's government during the Japanese threat.

Certainly China does not have the democracy of the United States, but, after all, it was only in 1911 that the Revolution abolished the imperial office, and it was as recently as 1928 that it adopted the Kuomintang Constitution. Dr. Sun Yat-sen, founder of the People's Party, believed in national emancipation and racial equality; political rights for the people and economic rights for the workers. The Chinese Nationalists, handicapped by a sprawling and undeveloped country, and a virtually illiterate populace, have naturally been unable to achieve the complete democracy which Mrs. Roosevelt believes they should have. Even so, the democratic tendencies shown by Chiang's government have been far ahead of any displayed by the Yenan group of Communists.

Problems of Aluminum Plant Disposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 7 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, today I conferred with President Truman upon the urgent problems of aluminum plant disposal and operation. The President expressed his firm conviction, which he had gained as chairman of the National Defense Investigating Committee, that war plants must be transferred to peacetime work to the maximum extent and in the shortest possible time, for the maintenance of full production and full employment.

I ask leave to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the memorandum which I presented to the President, outlining the problems of aluminum plant disposal.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON ALUMINUM PLANT DISPOSAL

SCOPE OF THE PROBLEM

To meet wartime needs, the Government built, and now owns, about 50 aluminum producing and fabricating plants, plus scrambled facilities, at a total cost approximating $700,000,000. (An allocated share of Government power facilities to service these plants would bring the investment to about $1,000,000,000.) Government-owned plants represent a major position of aluminum capacity. Today these plants are idle, many of their workers unemployed. The Government must transfer these plants quickly to private producers.

BACKGROUND EVENTS

Surplus report

1. In October 1944 Congress passed the Surplus Property Act vesting the Surplus Property Board with property-disposal responsibility and directing that disposals be made in a way to safeguard national security, stimulate full employment, encourage competition and private initiative, discourage monopoly, and so forth. For designated lists of property, including plants costing more than $5,000,000, the Board was to report to Congress within three months after passage of the act, before proceeding to dispose of such properties.

Court attitude

2. In March 1945 the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, sitting as the court of last resort, decided that Alcoa, on the basis of prewar activity, had a monopoly in primary aluminum production. However, the court deferred remedial action pending execution of disposal policies by the Surplus Property Board. The court considered that the Board was striving for the same objective as itself in

attempting to insure competition rather than monopoly. In effect, this was a mandate to the Board to proceed with a plan of disposal which would break the Alcoa monopoly.

COMPANIES FAVOR STOCK PILE

3. In August 1945, 6 months after the due date for the Surplus Property Administrator's report to Congress, nothing had yet happened. Whereupon a subcommittee on light metals and aviation of the Senate Committee to investigate the National Defense Program, with myself as chairman of the subcommittee, held hearings in the Pacific Northwest. This region has a considerable portion of the Government aluminum and power facilities and a serious unemployment problem. We found a number of private producers including Kaiser, Olin Industries, Reynolds and Columbia Metals, interested in leasing some or all of the Northwest plants, as a first step to subsequent purchase, provided they could be assured of an adequate supply of power and raw material, and a market for aluminum. There was general agreement among these witnesses that the best way for the Government to support an interim market was by purchasing aluminum for the stock pile recommended by the Army-Navy Munitions Board. Alcoa offered to buy the plants outright, but advised against hasty disposal of aluminum plants, feeling fortified in its position because the leases it held on the aluminum-producing plants still had 2 or 3 years to run. Goodloe of RFC seemed disposed to think that no move on disposal could be made while these leases were still in effect. The committee was critical of the continuing leases.

Alcoa refuses to operate

4. On August 30, 10 days after our hearing, the RFC suddenly discovered that Alcoa was not maintaining an average of 40 percent production over a 6-month period, as required in the leases, and gave notice of cancellation effective as of October 31. Alcoa refused an alternative offer to operate the plants for a year on 60-day cancellation notice. The leases had to be modified or canceled, to free the Government's hand, but the RFC was obviously reluctant in taking this move, because it invited Alcoa to convince it (the RFC) that this was a wrong action. This invitation appeared in the letter of August 30 giving notice of lease cancellation.

Attorney General's report

5. On September 14 the Attorney General, pursuant to section 205 of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, directing him to report to Congress on factors that tend to foster monopoly, submitted a report on the aluminum industry. The report recommended splitting up Alcoa into a number of competing companies. A letter in the form of a brief against this recommendation was written to Attorney General Tom Clark by Alcoa on December 3.

Board suggest stock-piling

6. On September 21, the Surplus Property Board's report, about 9 months overdue, was submitted to Congress. It proposed to sell or lease plants to competitors of Alcoa, permitting certain facilities to go to Alcoa only upon approval of the Attorney General. The Hurricane Creek, Ark., alumina plant was to be offered to a competitor of Alcoa under terms that would guarantee the sale of alumina to others on a competitive price basis. The report was no optimistic as to success in disposal but foresaw possibility of direct Government operation or Government subsidies to private producers.

Joint hearings

7. On October 19 or thereabouts, joint hearings were held before the subcommittee on surplus property of the Military Affairs Committee, the Small Business Committee, and the industrial reorganization subcommittee of the Postwar Economic Committee. These hearings concerned the reports of Clark and Symington. Since the 30-day review period for Symington's report expired about then, it was decided by joint resolution to extend this period until November 21, another 30 days. This time having expired without further action by Congress, Symington's report is considered approved.

Bill to allow purchase

8. On November 20, I tried to break the log jam in aluminum disposal by introducing for myself, and Senators FULBRIGHT, MORSE, and CORDON, S. 1612. This bill authorizes the RFC to purchase up to one and a half billion pounds of primary aluminum for stock pile, such aluminum to be purchased from Government-constructed plants, at current market prices, and from stocks in excess of current industrial demand. The RFC disclaimed authority to make such purposes under its present act. And pending stock-pile legislation is of a broad, general nature. My bill would fill a gap in existing legislation, and contains a specific instruction for the stock pile to be taken over by any subsequent authority that is set up. A companion bill (H. R. 4841), was introduced into the House on November 28, by Representative COFFEE.

Mitchell committee chairman

9. On November 23, I made a speech on the floor of the Senate, urging prompt consideration of this proposed stock-piling legislation, and pointing out, among things, that a do-nothing policy with reference to disposal was playing into the hands of the Alcoa monopoly. Senator WAGNER, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, has appointed a subcommittee to study this bill (S. 1612) consisting of MITCHELL, chairman; MCFARLAND, FULBRIGHT, BUTLER, and MILLIKIN.

THE PRESENT SITUATION

While the events above indicated were taking place, occasional negotiations were being conducted by the RFC with potential operators of Government plants. At the present time, Reynolds is the most active bidder having submitted a number of proposals. Columbia Metals has also made a proposal. The RFC appears on the verge of concluding a lease agreement with Reynolds with respect to the Hurricane Creek, Ark., alumina plant and the Jones Mills, Ark., reduction plant. In a prior proposal, Reynolds had offered to lease, in addition, the Spokane, Wash., and Troutdale, Oreg., reduction plants. The RFC was unwilling to make a deal on the basis of the earlier proposals. Reynolds is unwilling to take over the northwest plants in the present offer.

The details of all these offers are too numerous to review here. Generally speaking, if the RFC were willing to accept terms which would (1) guarantee the operators against the greater part of their losses, and/or (2) guarantee a market by purchase of excess production for stock-pile purposes, Reynolds, Columbia Metals, and probably other potential operators would agree to take over the bulk of the plants that are economically situated. In terms of present negotiations, these would include the Arkansas alumina and aluminum plants, and the Northwest plants. The RFC is unwilling to accept such terms on the grounds that these amount to Government subsidies. It takes great pride in announcing that the present deal about to be concluded with Reynolds does not include any such subsidies. The present position of the RFC is open to serious criticisms, a few of which I will try to indicate briefly.

Special treatment for Alcoa

1. During the war, in the Alcoa contract, the Government assumed 85 percent of the losses and took 85 percent of the profits. In a memorandum dated August 2, 1945, Husbands proposed to Symington that this Alcoa-type contract was a sensible and practical proposal to get takers for Government aluminum plants, even though the howl of subsidy might be raised in some quarters. Now the howl is being raised (e. g., in a letter of Alcoa to Symington dated October 15), and RFC is no longer interested in applying the Alcoa-type contract. Reynolds made earlier offers, on September 25 and October 23, both of which were inspired by Husbands' original memorandum when our subcommittee publicized it. There were departures in details from the Alcoa-type contract so far as Reynolds' proposals went, but apparently the RFC is not even disposed to negotiate along the lines of its previous recommendations. On subsidies RFC is playing the Alcoa game.

Tie stock pile to operation

2. If the Army-Navy Munitions Board considers aluminum stock piling essential to national security, it seems reasonable to tie in purchases for stock pile with helping aluminum plants get into private, competitive operation. If the Government needs the metal, to call guaranteed purchase for stock pile a subsidy is playing with words. In any event, it is preferable to subsidize competition by action than to subsidize monopoly by inaction. There are paramount objectives in the Surplus Property Act, with respect to stimulating employment, encouraging competition, etc., which override the narrow interpretation of subsidy. If the RFC would accept the stock-pile idea, that would go a long way to disposing of the aluminum plants. But it shies away from stock piling, will undoubtedly oppose my bill, and, in fact, has requested that its comment on the bill be delayed until some other possible negotiations are carried through.

Waste of RFC program

3. The narrow attitude of the RFC on subsidies is part of a penny-pinching approach while dollars are going to waste. It haggles over terms and jockeys around to get a little better deal for the Government, with the result that Reynolds refuses to take over the Northwest plants. The Government owns power as well as plants, and probably a third of the Northwest power is now running over the dams at a yearly loss of $8,000,000, while the plants stay idle. And these idle plants are costly to maintain, not to mention unemployment costs. Already more money has been lost than is involved in the difference between proposals that would work all the plants and those that would work some or none.

Piecemeal approach bad

4. By adopting a piecemeal approach to plant disposal, the RFC successively creates conditions more difficult and less likely to effect the disposal of remaining plants. The technical and financial requirements calls for integrated operation in the aluminum industry. Reynolds and Columbia Metals originally proposed to take over the Northwest plants as well as the Arkansas plants. With the Reynolds deal about to be concluded, excluding the Northwest plants, other takers for those plants will be harder to find if they have to depend on competitors for alumina. It is true that Reynolds will be obliged to furnish alumina from Hurricane Creek to competitors at cost plus 6 percent. Even here the present cost agreement is 2 percent more than Reynolds' earlier proposal of cost plus 4 percent.

CONCLUSION

5. By refusing to relate stock piling to plant disposal, by trying to save Government money in one place and causing it to go to waste in other places, by negotiating disposal on a piecemeal basis instead of on an integrated plan, the RFC is making policy, albeit undesirable policy.

But policy, in plant disposal according to Congress, is really Surplus Property's function, and it is getting nowhere. Under the present set-up, where buck passing and shifting responsibility is at a premium, the Sur-

plus Property Administrator performs no useful function.

Disposal policy which involves so many billions of public moneys, must be taken much more seriously. And policy must be integrated with actual disposal and the economic necessities of a nation in need of permanent jobs. At the present time the RFC is causing Government effort to work at cross purposes, and the Surplus Property Act, good in declared objectives, is a hollow mockery.

The work of these agencies must be given an over-all objective which is in the Nation's interest. This can only be accomplished by assuring administrative responsibility for both policy and disposal.

National Hospital Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 7 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hospital Center," published in today's Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOSPITAL CENTER

Witnesses before the House District Committee have made out a strong case in support of the long-pending bill to create in Washington, with Federal aid, a great national hospital center, embracing several of the larger nongovernmental hospitals in the city. As Senator TYDINGS told his fellow legislators at the hearing, conditions at some of the older of Washington's privately maintained hospitals are deplorable. Staffs and patients are compelled to endure almost unbelievable hardships in antiquated buildings which lack up-to-date sanitary, lighting, ventilation, and clinical equipment, and which, because of their age, are difficult to keep free from dirt and even vermin. Furthermore, Washington's hospitals are congested to the point where it is estimated that more than 1,600 additional beds are needed to meet the nationally recognized hospitalization standard of 5 beds per thousand of population.

Under the National Hospital Center bill, which passed the Senate nearly 8 months ago, the Emergency, Garfield, and Episcopal Eye, Ear, and Throat Hospitals, and possibly several more of the 12 nongovernmental hospitals in the District would be expanded and grouped together in a center which would be financed in part by Federal funds and maintained thereafter by the hospitals composing the center. By using a central heating plant and common laundry, kitchen, and laboratory, operating room, and other facilities, large economies in overhead costs could be effected.

That the Federal Government should defray at least part of the capital investment in such a project, with the hospital paying its own way thereafter, seems but fair when it is considered that surveys reveal that approximately 44 percent of the patients treated consider Washington as their permanent home. There is no Government hospital in the Washington area for general treatment of these employees, although Cabinet members and Members of Congress are able to obtain treatment at the Navy and other service hospitals in and around Washington. The National Hospital Center would provide 1,500 beds and modern equipment to meet the urgent and deserving needs of Federal workers and others. Early passage of the hospital bill is highly desirable.

DAR Negro Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 7 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very wise, timely, and patriotic article by Westbrook Pegler, published in his column, entitled "Fair Enough," in the Washington Times-Herald of October 29, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

NEW YORK, October 28.—The National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution is a private organization of restricted membership, devoted to patriotic and educational works. It has never been accused of allegiance or subservience to any foreign political or national interest, but twice in recent years it has been the victim of savage propaganda, promoted by New Deal ideologists because the rules for the management of its privately owned concert hall in Washington, D. C., provide that it may be leased for performances by "white artists only."

On the first of these occasions Marian Anderson, the Negro singer, came under the ban and Harold Ickes, in the Department of the Interior, took a leading part in agitation which made Miss Anderson famous, whereas, up to that time, she had been comparatively obscure to the public in the United States, although celebrated among artists. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, by way of personal protest and personal political promotion, resigned her honorary membership in the DAR. By contrast with the course of conduct which she urged on American members of the American Newspaper Guild who resigned or thought of resigning in revolt against the domination of the guild by Communists.

Mrs. Roosevelt held in that case that the thing to do was not resign but fight for reform and control within the guild. * * *

Recently another application on behalf of a colored-woman performer for a date at the DAR's Constitution Hall in Washington was denied for the same reason that prevailed in the Anderson case.

The subject was Hazel Scott, who recently married a New York Negro Congressman named POWELL. * * *

The situation now is such that any Negro jug-band or musical-saw virtuoso from any catfish joint or any troupe expressing the degenerate and altogether discreditable jitter and jive themes, given a nimble press agent and the cooperation of any Congressman, may make publicity at the expense of the DAR and its honorable reputation as a patriotic group of American women.

The press, generally, has lent itself to these exploits, failing, almost without exception, to note that the DAR did not originate this separation of the races in Washington or elsewhere but merely followed legal custom in Washington.

In this connection, the DAR has cited a decision of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia which takes "judicial notice of the fact that those accepted practices are not intended to imply the inferiority of either race to the other."

The court observed their existence in public housing and public schools in Washington and that "separate churches are universal and are approved by both races."

In this propaganda, however, the fine patriotic principles of the Daughters are ignored or jeered by persons and groups whose own policies and associations have been responsible for riots, the teaching of dirty doctrines in the schools, in print, and on the air, and the penetration of unmistakable Communists into positions of dangerous power in the Government.

And many among the most active exploiters of these incidents are hypocrites whose personal devotion to the cause of opportunity for the dignified, loyal, and ambitious Negro has never been able to induce them to hire Negroes for any but the most menial jobs.

The impression cannot be escaped, therefore, that among those who have attacked the DAR for its enforcement of a familiar Washington custom, the motive of some is not so much to protest against discrimination or "liberate" art as to discredit an institution which is more purely American than most others of our time because it is purely and serenely American and unashamed of its patriotism.

There are other halls to be had and the fact naturally comes to mind that if artistic freedom were the issue in these disputes those who thirst for such music and abhor discrimination could solve the problem in some edifice owned by any of the many offshoots of the Communist Party.

To mention this possibility is to demolish it, however, because in that case there would be negligible publicity and mediocrity or, worse, vulgarity and mere noise would be assessed at their true value.

None of the agitators of the DAR's difficulties has yet had the effrontery to propose that because, like Constitution Hall, certain religious buildings in Washington are tax exempt and the property of private groups, the congregations which own them should be compelled to lease them for political rallies to be addressed by Congressman POWELL. Yet, consistently, that would follow.

For Constitution Hall and the churches are in the same category as to ownership and tax exemption, and the religious group owning a cathedral would deserve no less abuse than that which the DAR has suffered over these years.

On the record the DAR is incomparably more worthy of popular respect and support than most of those who have attacked it. And Americans who are not descended from Revolutionary soldiers, but patriots nevertheless, could encourage a fine organization by inquiring into their work in their home cities and towns and helping them in aims which call for no apology to the Political Action Committee, Mrs. Roosevelt, Henry Wallace, or the Communist Party.

While the Wounded Wait

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 7, 1945

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein an article

appearing in a recent issue of the Washington Daily News entitled "While the Wounded Wait." The article follows:

WHILE THE WOUNDED WAIT

Maj. Gen. Paul R. Hawley, acting surgeon general of the Veterans' Administration, threatens to resign if Congress insists on treating hospitals for sick and wounded veterans as political pork.

General Hawley is too good a man to lose. We hope he won't have to carry out that threat in order to jolt Congress to its senses.

The logrolling policy of scattering small hospitals among towns in many congressional districts was a mistake, so proved by experience after World War I. Under conditions certain to obtain after this much greater war, the Veterans' Administration will not be able to staff such hospitals with enough thoroughly competent doctors to give the patients thoroughly satisfactory service.

That's why the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Gen. Omar Bradley, and General Hawley proposes to locate major new hospitals near large-established medical schools, where the services of skilled specialists will be available. They are right.

The American people want our war casualties to have the best treatment the country's brains and resources can provide. They won't get it if pork-hungry Congressmen, responding to pressure from business interests in their districts, grab veterans' hospitals as sops to local pride and cupdity.

"I, for one," says General Hawley, "will not experiment with the medical care of the veteran. Either he gets the quality of medical care that he deserves, or I quit—and quit at once."

We wouldn't want to be a Congressman listed as opposing Generals Hawley and Bradley on that issue.

Four Years After Pearl Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 7, 1945

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago today, our country was plunged into a war for which we were utterly unprepared, both physically and spiritually. Just how completely unprepared we were is even yet not fully known to the people, by and large. Every day, the Pearl Harbor investigating committee has been revealing shocking demonstrations of our unpreparedness. We were fortunate that the enemy himself did not realize the extent to which we had been injured on that early Sunday morning, 4 years ago.

If we have learned anything from the horror and misery of these war years, it is difficult to find convincing evidence of that learning in our national policies. The enemy has been beaten. In the process of beating him, we have invented a new weapon whose terrible possibilities frighten even the victors. No enemy can be permanently beaten in a world where a scientist, working in his laboratory, may discover a weapon capable of reversing the result overnight.

Out of this horrible war, there has emerged nothing comparable to the principles we set forth in 1918. Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points were a statement of fundamental beliefs which could be applied to the complex problems of 1918. The right of nations to self-determination furnished a guide to the treaty makers. What guides have we today? What moral doctrines are we relying upon in our treatment of the Indonesians, the Burmese, the Jewish refugees of middle Europe? How can a good world be created unless it is a moral world?

I am not one of those who believes that Great Britain and Soviet Russia are to be condemned while we excuse ourselves for every violation of basic human rights throughout the world. Today, in an almost literal sense, we in America are our brother's keeper. We cannot disclaim responsibility for the treatment of Hindus in India or Malayans in Singapore, because in a very real sense we have made more possible that treatment. The British Government maintains its empire today because Russian and American lives were lost to maintain it, and, having expended those lives, we in America have a right to be heard on the management of affairs everywhere that human beings are involved. The day when we might sit quietly by and say that the treatment of natives in colonial empires was a matter of "purely internal concern" is over. It is over because out of the discontents and hatreds of those millions of human beings there arises a menace to the future security of the entire world.

Here at home in our own country there are problems no less vital to the security of our own people 4 years after Pearl Harbor.

Only a few days ago one of our leading American newspapers asked the question: "Have we a consistent foreign policy?" I ask the question: "Have we a consistent foreign policy at all?" This very week Maj. Gen. Pat Hurley has been testifying before the Congress on the complete contradiction between what we have been saying in Washington about our policy in China and what our representatives on the spot are doing right there. Certainly there are thousands of Americans who would like to know exactly what our soldiers are still doing in India; they want to know just what there is to the story that soldiers returning home were removed from their transports in order to load them with ammunition and equipment for the British in Java.

These general questions are bad enough in themselves. But there is something much more difficult still to understand. To this very day there has been no clear stand taken by the present National Government on the program for the future of Germany. There is not a man in Washington who can tell you what our Government proposes to do with its particular occupation unit of Germany. Certainly you would believe that this one problem—the problem which is most basic to the entire future of Europe—would be a matter of complete agreement by this time. The Allied control machinery in Germany has virtually collapsed; the deindustrialization of the Reich is still in dispute; France is demanding the assurance of military security along the Rhine.

And yet in the face of all these major difficulties our President has recently announced that there is no present need for a conference of the so-called Big Three. He insists that these are matters which can be deferred. Apparently he hopes that the United Nations Organization which is to meet some time right after the 1st of January will seize the initiative and relieve our Government from responsibility for decisions.

I say this is little short of chaos.

This is nothing but abdication in the midst of a major crisis. We, as the most powerful nation in the history of the world economically, physically, and strategically, cannot abandon our role of leadership.

In Washington we have taken on a position of timidity when the hour calls for courage. We have refused to insist upon elementary human justice when the times will not tolerate continued injustice. The policy of appeasement certainly has been amply discredited by this time. Yet we go on playing the game of appeasement indefinitely on the theory that our destiny is somehow tied up with the strength of other groups who are now and always have been in opposition to the expansion of American interests.

For more than 100 years of our history, whenever the British lion roared, our State Department wagged its tail. Only during the Civil War did we recognize that the British Government was definitely hostile to the growing strength of our United States. For the most part, our diplomats took their lead from Downing Street. But it is certainly time for us to recognize the major changes which have taken place in world history since 1776.

Today our country is no longer a small debtor nation, with no important interests throughout the world. Today we are concerned about the Chinese civil war; we are dividing up the responsibilities of government in Korea with the Soviet Union; we run Japan on behalf of the Allies; we have vital interests in many Pacific islands; we are deeply concerned over the future of the Philippines; we are disturbed by the revolt against western rule in the Dutch East Indies; we are bothered by the need for demobilizing troops, including those of Russia, Britain, and our own in the German occupied areas; we are thinking hard about the recent outbreaks in Iran; we are sitting tight on about 50,000,000 barrels of oil in the Middle East, and the oil film is blinding our eyes to the human problems of Palestine; we are trying to figure out some way for Russian ships to get into the Mediterranean area without troubling both Turkey and Britain. These are issues which require an independent and vigorous foreign policy, a policy which is certainly nowhere in sight today.

What about problems at home?

All of us are very much concerned over the serious labor-management disputes that are holding back our reconversion to peacetime industry. I share that concern most deeply. I am certain that all of us are determined upon a course of action which will be fair to all concerned and in keeping with our traditions of free enterprise.

What are the facts behind the disputes? Are the arguments jurisdictional fights between various unions, battling for control, or are they genuine efforts to continue the high American standards of living which have made us a great nation?

It is very simple to lump all the many facts into one mass trial and hand down a blanket verdict. Unfortunately, the issues are not that simple.

Living costs are high today. Veterans returning home to find job offers paying $25 per week are not going to support their families on this kind of pay. Nor are workers laid off from war jobs where they took home $75 to $100 a week going to maintain their homes on $25 a week either. It must be accepted as fundamental that wages must remain at a high level so long as living costs continue on that level. High wages and high profits to industry have gone hand in hand for a long time. It is not possible in our economy today to support any other kind of program.

I believe in the peaceful settlement of industrial disputes. I believe that the methods of collective bargaining must be supplemented by additional resources if they break down. Completely disinterested representatives of the public should be consulted before the final show-down of a strike vote becomes necessary. The decisions of these representatives should be presented to the workers as findings for acceptance or rejection. If they are rejected, they should then be submitted to a final board of arbitration for absolute determination. Such a plan would make possible far more objective consideration of all the many issues involved than the present procedure.

Whatever may be the merits or demerits of my plan, it has this one great advantage over the present method of handling labor-management disputes. This is a plan. What our present national Government is proposing is exactly what it has proposed in foreign affairs.

It shuns all responsibility. It refuses to take a stand because it is trying to be all things to all men.

This is the state of the Nation 4 years after Pearl Harbor. It is not a pleasant picture. But there are elements of strength in it. The Nation is growing alert to its problems. It is becoming increasingly difficult for anyone to "kid" us. We know that all is not well in the world, and that the prospects are that it will become worse before it gets better.

I look hopefully at this side of the portrait. A people who are determined to find out the truth will eventually discover it. A people who are not satisfied with an administration policy amounting to no policy at all will ultimately get an administration ready to take an understandable position on the major issues before us.

Pearl Harbor is 4 years behind us now. We have come out of the valley of the shadow with many saddened hearts. Yet we have also learned that a nation determined to survive can do so. We have watched our factories convert from years of nonproduction to a 3-year effort unparalleled in the history of mankind. We have shown that almost overnight we could build an arsenal of democracy strong enough to preserve freedom throughout our lands. Perhaps in the years ahead we can make it possible from our strength to establish freedom everywhere else. Our strength abroad depends upon our strength at home.

The Republican Party has traditionally been the great party of reconstruction. After the Civil War, after the Spanish-American War, after the First World War we rebuilt our economy. We must join our hands to rebuild our peacetime economy once more. Together we can surmount any obstacle.

The Rehabilitation Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 7, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, early in the debate, a question was raised as to how the efficiency of UNRRA compares with that of the Hoover Relief Committee after World War I. Comparisons are odious, but nevertheless in justice to UNRRA it must be stated that its job is far more difficult and involved. The destruction in this war was far more devastating and the looting more thorough. During the last war there were no blacked-out areas. Our relief agencies were permitted to carry on their work everywhere, unmolested and without military and police supervision. UNRRA's situation is quite different; it was several months after the shooting stopped before its representatives were allowed to bring relief in the Russian dominated areas of Europe and Asia. The starvation and suffering so rampant should have been tended to much earlier, but for the Soviet barriers. Even today, the bars have not been removed. UNRRA is permitted to give relief only in such areas as the Russians will allow.

The principal purpose of UNRRA is, first, to give immediate relief to the suffering, needy people, and, second, give them such equipment and facilities as will permit them to rehabilitate themselves so that further relief will be unnecessary. The second purpose is particularly important if the need for the continuation of UNRRA is ever to cease.

There is no question but that the greatest need for aid and the greatest suffering today is experienced by the peoples whose countries are dominated by Russia.

Let us but briefly review the experience of one of these Soviet-controlled countries and examine its prospects of being able to rehabilitate herself under the existing conditions. Let us look at Poland. The conditions in the other lands are parallel.

Today more than 2,000,000 Russian soldiers and 1,000,000 Russian civilians are policing Poland. Russians, unlike American armed forces, do not have their needs supplied from their homeland. They live right off the people and land they occupy. With the Polish people greatly impoverished and starved, the presence of these 3,000,000 nonproductive parasitic foreigners is like a cancer gnawing at the vitals of the Polish Nation.

Two of our country's leading newspapers recently sent their representatives to Poland to get first-hand information on the situation. Gladwin Hill, of the New York Times, and Edward Kerstein, of the Milwaukee Journal, have given graphic, eyewitness accounts of the tribulations of a proud, courageous people valiantly trying to lift itself out of the ashes of war against great odds.

On November 4, 1945, Mr. Hill wrote in the New York Times that the Polish peasants who made up two-thirds of the country's population and on whom the whole nation depends for food face a grim future despite all that the Government and UNRRA can do to alleviate their distress. About 75 percent of the livestock, about which their farming revolves, providing food, motive power, and fertilizer, was destroyed or carried away by the Germans and Russians. He states that—

> Russians can be seen constantly driving farm animals out of Poland and the general impression is that they have taken considerable, too, but this is hard to prove, since the stock may have come from Germany.

In the new Polish territory, it is estimated that there is an average of only 2 horses to 250 acres of farm land. It is estimated that there are 1,000,000 farms without even a cow. At the rate cattle is now coming into Poland, animals that should be kept for breeding, must be slaughtered for food. One wonders how much of this slaughtering is required to maintain the Russian military and police personnel. It has also been charged that much of the food UNRRA intended for the starving Poles finds its way into Russian stomachs.

The Polish peasant without beasts of burden, machinery, and tools is obliged to work his land with his bare hands. Eighty percent of the crop goes to the Government. In some instances, where a peasant is favored and permitted to retain a head or two of cattle, high quotas of production are set for him. According to an account of Edward Kerstein in the Milwaukee Journal, the quota fixed for a farmer he spoke to was so high that he was obliged to sell his cattle in order to buy the produce needed to meet his quota for fear he might be punished. He told Mr. Kerstein it was physically impossible to get the yield required by the Government.

In an editorial on October 25, 1945, the New York Times had this to say about the new Poland:

> The Polish Nation never ceased fighting. Now it is making an uphill fight for national reconstruction * * * yet the present-day picture of Poland is not a pretty one. A small minority, imposed on the country from outside, hold the Government captive and the people cowed in fear. Man hunts and mass arrests are matched by the retalliatory excesses of the remaining underground, which after having fought for Poland's freedom, now does not dare show itself. To all this is added the immense destruction of the war which is further intensified by the presence of Russian Armies living on the country, armies whose discipline is beginning to give way in some cases.

Mr. Speaker, can a people living under such circumstances, exercise any initiative or freedom? Can a people, under such conditions, ever rehabilitate themselves? The answer is obviously "No." It is, therefore, imperative that all Russians leave Poland, a free election held as promised under the Yalta and Potsdam agreement in order that these valiant people might take their proper place in the society of nations.

October 23, 1945, Gladwin Hill writes, "The Russians stripped the Polish ports of Gdynia and Danzig of most of their cranes and other maritime equipment and have taken at least three of the harbors' four important floating drydocks." The effect of this can only be to paralyze Polish commerce and deter rehabilitation. Gladwin Hill further writes, "This correspondent has visited Polish hospitals that have been stripped of their linens and other essential supplies by the Russians." Meanwhile, 10,000 Poles are dying monthly of tuberculosis because of the lack of adequate hospital facilities.

Mr. Hill writes further about the Russian-Polish trade agreements which extend to the end of 1945, while nominally calling "for an equal exchange of goods on the basis of 'world prices' seems curiously one-sided in some respects."

Under the trade agreements, Russia is to supply 25,000 tons of raw cotton to Poland in exchange for 45,000,000 meters of cotton cloth, although Poland is desperately short of textiles. Poland gives Russia 5,000,000 tons of coal and coke amounting to 75 percent of the total coal production, for about 65 cents per ton whereas it costs $1.75 per ton to mine. Meanwhile, thousands of Poles are going to freeze because of lack of clothes and fuel. The irony of it according to Mr. Hill is that "the Russians are selling a lot of the same coal in southeastern Europe for 10 times that price." Mr. Speaker, can any people reconstruct or rehabilitate itself under such conditions?

It is reported that instead of cash the Russians are transferring to the Polish Government their outmoded submarines and naval vessels of 1916 vintage at greatly inflated values. These vessels, suitable only for junking, can prove to be nothing but a liability and totally useless as instruments of defense.

We read in the press that the present Polish regime is asking the United States for a half-billion-dollar loan. Is this money to be used to meet the deficit created by the existing "trade agreements" it now enjoys with Russia? A continuation of this kind of trade can lead only to depletion of Poland's few remaining natural resources and ultimately bankruptcy.

Mr. Speaker, I supported the request of UNRRA for funds, but I believe it is important that we help these people who are aided by UNRRA to become self-sufficient as quickly as possible. Return these governments to their own people. The surest and most efficient way to do this is to free them from Russian domination. Let us demand that the Russians clear out of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Jugoslavia in order that free elections might be held and governments selected that will work for the benefit of their peoples. Mr. Speaker, we owe that to these people as a result of our oft-repeated pledges. Common decency and the security of lasting peace demands it.

United States Foreign Service Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 7, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a letter that I have received from a former Army officer, who resides in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in support of H. R. 4843, to provide for the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy. I am satisfied that the writer knows whereof he speaks, and judging from his 5 years of experience with the Army service, 1 year of which he was stationed in India and Burma, he has been afforded the opportunity to make his own personal observations.

The letter follows:

IPSWICH, MASS., *December 5, 1945.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: A small item in the Salem News about your bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy prompts this letter.

Congratulations to you on your foresight and fine judgment. I wish you every success. Small as it is, you can count upon my support.

After 5 years of Army service, over a year of it in India and Burma, I have become very conscious of my duty to support deserving public men and to help get rid of the undeserving. I will follow our leaders carefully from now on. I am very happy to say that my wife and friends have told me of your energetic and fine service.

Overseas I had a chance to observe United States foreign policy in action. It is no secret that foreign nations think of us as "Uncle Sap." Even the most ignorant of the Asiatics recognizes our weaknesses—the extravagant wastage of United States money and materials and the lack of qualification of our representatives.

The average ambassador, envoy, and representative from the United States does not know the language of the country in which he is stationed, the customs, traditions, philosophies of those peoples. He is nearly always a very wealthy man, picked as a political award, who entertains and is entertained by the ruling class, the wealthy, and the blocs of the country. His ideas of the country are those gained from those few sources, plus newspapers and pressure groups. As conscientious as he might be, he cannot report to our State Department a true account of conditions. He doesn't know and understand the farmer, laborer, middle class, etc. He doesn't know why the people do and think as they do.

Your bill would accomplish the greatest reform in United States diplomacy. It would furnish qualified, interested men to the service—men who would make it their profession and men who would explain the United States to the people of the country to which assigned; and them to us. It is an urgent need. Good luck.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. JOHN J. KEANE.

Veteran Returns Home To Find Wife and Children Living in Two Unfurnished Rooms Without Cooking Facilities Due to Housing Shortage—Mass Meeting of Veterans Demands Congressional Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to lay before the House a typical example of what is happening in an American city caught in the crisis of our Nation-wide housing shortage.

On November 29 in Fort Worth, Tex., hundreds of veterans, unable to find homes, held a mass meeting. They unanimously adopted a resolution declaring that the veterans' housing problem is "the responsibility of the United States Government," and demanded that the Congress take immediate action to provide the sum necessary to relocate the 50,000 vacant temporary housing units.

Today—

Said these veterans—

the first duty of Congress is to see that we who fought have a place to come home to. Present conditions now existing are beyond the control of the returned veteran and he necessarily must look to the Government for which he fought to fill his present need.

Gentlemen, I wholeheartedly agree with the sentiment expressed by those servicemen. It was our action that sent these boys to battle fronts across the world, and it is our responsibility to see that they have shelter when demobilized.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I should like to include a news story from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of November 30 describing this meeting. I should also like to include the story of the typical plight of a 38-year-old veteran, D. D. Brown.

He came home from Germany with nine battle stars, the Bronze Star, a Good Conduct Metal, and the Purple Heart with three clusters, as the result of shrapnel and bullet wounds in three different battles. He found his wife and two children living in two unfurnished rooms in Fort Worth without cooking facilities. He said of the rooms, "I wouldn't try to raise a dog in them."

In addition, I would like to include a letter from Mr. Drew S. Clifton, one of the outstanding attorneys of Fort Worth, describing the housing situation in that city.

The situation in Fort Worth is not an unusual one. It is typical of the problems that are confronting our cities from Maine to California, and I present it for your consideration:

SEVENTEEN HUNDRED VETERANS NEED PLACES TO LIVE HERE

Most stories "make the papers" because they're unusual. These stories make the

paper because they're all too usual—typical stories of more than 1,700 World War II veterans who need places to live in Fort Worth.

D. D. Brown, 38-year-old former private first class and gunner in the Army Air Corps, was discharged and came home October 29 to find his wife and two children living in two unfurnished rooms—without cooking facilities.

Says Brown of the rooms: "In that I wouldn't try to raise dogs. But what can we do?"

BATTLE WOUNDED

Brown spent 3 years, 1 month, and 17 days in service, almost all of it in the ETO, where he suffered shrapnel and bullet wounds on three occasions and won these awards: Nine battle stars, the Purple Heart with three clusters, Bronze Star, Good Conduct Medal, and American Theater Ribbon with two stars.

The Browns have two children—James Davis, still recovering from a tetanus attack which may leave him a cripple, and Joyce LaValle, 7.

"And when I get home," said Brown, "I not only can't find a place to live; so far I haven't even been able to get a job." Brown's address is 519 Louisiana.

STORY ONE OF DOZENS

Brown's story was but one of dozens told by veterans at the veterans' housing meeting Thursday night. Others were told by:

Bert M. Smith, 21, who served 2 years Atlantic patrol duty and who can find no more space for his wife and two small children than two-room quarters at 3801 Meadowbrook Drive.

"The doctor says our living conditions are retarding my recovery," says Smith. "We're moving out of Fort Worth to find a home."

Robert Degge, 21, who had to move his wife in with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. W. B. Degge, 3801 Rutledge. He was discharged October 3, after 37 months in service, mostly in the Southwest Pacific.

INADEQUATE ROOMS

B. W. Mason, 27, with a service record of 3 years and 4 months, mostly against the Germans, who has three inadequate rooms for his mother and 24-year-old sister, Pearl.

L. M. Hall, Jr., 20, a former gunner's mate, third class, who saw 3 years' Atlantic convoy duty in the Coast Guard, was discharged October 15, to find he had no place to live except with his wife's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Albert Moore, 5700 Calmont.

A. O. Bicknell, 32, former Air Corps technical sergeant with 3 years and 11 months' service, whose duplex quarters at 2615 East Vickery are being sold, forcing the eviction of his wife and 14-month-old daughter, Pamela.

Jimmy Johnson, 21, former marine who had 2½ years' service from Tulagi to Tarawa, was discharged 1½ years ago, but his quarters at 531 Beddell also have been sold and the new owner is awaiting possession.

HOUSELESS VETS CALL FOR ACTION—$150,000,000 DEMANDED FROM CONGRESS TO EASE UNITED STATES HOUSING SHORTAGE

Hundreds of houseless Fort Worth veterans at a mass meeting here Thursday night demanded that Congress appropriate $150,000,000 to relieve the Nation's housing shortage and "give it priority over relief to foreign countries."

The veterans unanimously adopted a resolution declaring that the veterans' housing problem is "the responsibility of the United States Government" and urging Congress "to at once provide the sum necessary to relocate at least 50,000 vacant temporary war housing units."

Asking that the $150,000,000 for temporary housing be appropriated, and given priority over aid to any foreign nation or government, the resolution declared.

SACRIFICES CITED

The sacrifices made by the veterans and their families were for the purpose of freeing peoples of other countries from oppression and dictatorship.

"Today," said the veterans, "the Congress' first duty is to see that we who have fought have a place to come home to."

"Present conditions now existing are beyond the control of the returned veteran and he necessarily must look to the Government for which he fought to fill his present need," the resolution asserted. It also pointed out that as of today there are "approximately 1,700 veterans in dire need of housing facilities here."

Also unanimously adopted was a resolution introduced by James Floyd, commander of the American Legion Bothwell Kane Post, which he termed "an interim emergency resolution."

CITIZENS URGED TO AID

Every Fort Worth citizen was uged to "help out in the housing shortage by making available to veterans and their families any available space in their homes here." A similar resolution was passed earlier in the week by the General Ministers Association.

Drew Clifton, vice commander of the American Legion's twelfth district, was chairman of the veterans' mass meeting, held at Hotel Texas. Heads of all Fort Worth's veterans' organizations took part in the meeting which was jointly sponsored by all the organizations.

Henry Love, past State commander of the American Legion, told the assembly:

"This housing situation is equally bad over most of the Nation. Congress has apparently taken the position that it is a municipal problem. It is not a problem that any city or community can solve. It is the responsibility of the Federal Government because it is part of the cost of winning the war."

Loud cheers revealed that hundreds of veterans agreed with Love.

Said Clifton: "We veterans knew how to fight for democracy. And veterans ought to know how to make it live. For us to enjoy that democracy, we must have housing conditions that mean a veteran doesn't have to live with his mother-in-law."

Floyd, in urging Fort Worth residents to "help the boys until congressional aid gets them houses," pointed out that it will "take many weeks—maybe months—to get the places set up here."

Amvets, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, and Legionnaires were represented en masse at the meeting.

The Thursday night action will be supplemented by a program of every veteran writing Congressmen asking for immediate action. Copies of the resolution specifying a $150,000,000 appropriation also will be sent congressional appropriation committeemen.

Love got a show of more than 40 hands when he asked how many veterans present would be interested in considering possibility of building modern three-room homes if the cost of lot and construction were approximately $2,500 and loans could be obtained under the GI bill of rights.

Love explained that under a plan now being considered by R. J. Newton's chamber of commerce housing committee, such minimum requirement facilities may be developed on lots now owned by the city.

Capt. J. M. O'Brien, of the city fire department, offered a plan under which two veterans may obtain materials and arrange for construction of their own three-room homes at a cost slightly over $1,000 in addition to the lot.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *November 30, 1945.*

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed is news story and pictures which appeared in the morning issue of the Fort Worth Star-Telegram on November 30, 1945, describing our housing problem.

The situation is deplorable and is not one that can be taken lightly; nor is it one that can be solved by an unprepared municipality. We have got to have relief and plenty of it in a hurry. The veteran did not fight for these unbearable conditions. It is not the part of the city government to remedy this situation, but rather the part of the Federal Government. The veteran does not object to this country aiding other countries as long as it does not take away from his family what is rightfully theirs by the veteran, but the trouble is that the liberated peoples are being helped without regard to the men who freed those people. The veteran wants to become a useful citizen to our country in peace as he was in war. For that veteran to be of value to this country he needs a home to call his own, and the Government could, if it would, help him at this time so that he can start his rehabilitation to civilian life on an equal level with other people and not have to overcome the obstacles which now confront him. Yes, you—you and every Congressman could help us. You called on us in war and now we are asking you to meet us half way by answering our plea with action to alleviate the deplorable and oftentimes untenable conditions which we are now forced to live under.

Enlist your service in helping us as unselfishly as we enlisted our services to free the world of tyranny.

Sincerely yours,

DREW S. CLIFTON.

Where the Ships Are Going

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 7, 1945

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a news item that was prepared for publication in a service paper in the Pacific called the "Homeward Herald," published at the Twenty-eighth Replacement Depot, but permission to print the article was denied by the officer in charge, and the story is as follows:

It has been learned authoritatively that the converson program for Liberty ships has resulted in nine ships being converted for transportation of POW's, while only one ship will be used for American troops. Although volunteers are not being used in this work, Army personnel is remodeling the ships.

Present plans call for the conversion of five Liberty ships to be converted by the Army, and four Liberty ships by the Navy. The ships which are to be converted by the Army came from the Port of Manila and one from Batangas. One ship that the Army is converting came from Manila. Ships coming from Manila are shipping under the authorization of base X and AFWESPAC, controlling the movement of troops in this area.

One ship to be converted by the Army is the *Chatten Lyons,* and will be used as a POW ship, according to orders issued for the conversion. The *Horace Lurton* will be converted for the use of transporting American troops State-side. The other ships to be converted by the Army for POW ships are: *Ed Everett, M. Stewart, R. L. Stevenson,* and *Frank Sprague.*

The Navy will convert four POW ships: The *Harry Kirby, Stephen M. White, Keith Palmer,* and the *William H. Allen.*

The dates scheduled for completion of the ships are: *Chatten Lyons,* indefinite; *Horace Lurton,* indefinite; *Ed Everett,* November 6; *M. Stewart,* November 10; *R. L. Stevenson,* November 14; and the *Frank Sprague,* indefinite.

The dates for the completion of the conversion of the Navy ships are all indefinite: *Ed Everett* and *Chatten Lyons* will carry 2,000 POW's each; *Stewart, Stevenson,* and *Sprague* will carry 1,500 POW's each.

At this, November 4, 1945, the *W. L. Gable* is awaiting Navy orders—a ship which has been converted to carry POW's.

The foregoing article recites as to what is being done with ships to bring our boys back home. The item says that four ships are being converted for the use of prisoners of war, while only one ship is being converted to bring our boys back home. Yet the officer in charge denies the publication of this item, even though the facts were taken from the daily status report of the office of the base port command, under base K in the Philippines, covering the period 1200 hours, November 3, 1945, to 1200 hours, November 4, 1945. After the denial, the officer in charge said that something could be printed in connection with one ship—*Horace Lurton*—for the return of our boys to the United States, but nothing could be printed about the conversion of four ships for prisoners of war.

With such conduct on the part of our armed forces, it is no wonder that these boys become bitter overseas awaiting return home.

These boys have fought to free the world from autocracies and they are now subjected by their own Government to the same type of cruelty for which they fought to free others. They are evidently censored and punished for attempting to make known the treatment they receive.

Loans to Foreign Countries

REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 7, 1945

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I was very much concerned upon reading in the morning paper a statement purported to have come from England, to the effect that arrangements had been made for the United States to make a loan to that country of $4,400,000,000 for a period of 50 years, and that for the first 5 years of the loan there would be no interest and thereafter interest would be charged at the rate of 2 percent.

Now in the first place, I would like to know on what authority and by whom such a loan was granted. It seems to me the Congress should know something about such a deal—a deal that involves $4,400,000,000—and yet none of the Members knew anything about it and they get their information that this agreement was made from the London daily papers. There is something wrong when anyone in the Government who is not a representative of the people can make such a deal.

The loss alone in interest rate on that amount for the first 5 years, when no interest is to be charged, will amount to $110,000,000 a year at 2 percent; and for 5 years would amount to $550,000,000. That would be a direct loss to this country of ours, as it costs us about 2½ percent to borrow our money; and we would be losing one-half percent for the balance of the time, or about $2,000,000,000. Therefore our first loss is going to be $2,550,000,000. We can figure on that amount if such a loan is granted and assuming that it will be paid.

Remember the arrangements that were made by the former President under lend-lease. Thank goodness I never voted for the former President or for lend-lease. That piece of legislation was one of the poorest ever enacted. Under it we gave to Great Britain $29,000,000,000 and up to date we have received credit for about $5,295,000,000 from Great Britain. In other words, there is a balance owing us from Great Britain of $23,705,000,000. I ask you, Members of Congress, will this ever be paid to the Treasury of the United States? I say, ask your Uncle Samuel. You know it will not be paid, and I know it will not be paid, and such a scheme as lend-lease is a travesty on American business judgment.

In addition to the money we loaned through lend-lease, our Army during the war built war installations in the United Kingdom amounting to $23,000,000; in Australia and New Zealand they spent $238,000,000 on war installations; in Canada, $370,000,000; in India, $126,000,000; in Bermuda, $77,000,000; in British Caribbean possessions, $186,000,000; in British Pacific islands, $146,000,000; in Newfoundland and Labrador, $123,000,000; and in other British areas, $38,000,000. In other words, we spent a total of $1,327,000,000 in war installations on British possessions. We have been a veritable Santa Claus to Great Britain, and I ask you why should we now loan them $4,400,000,000, at a loss of annual interest? I am fearful that the whole sum principal will be lost if we make the loan.

The American people should also take this fact into consideration, that during the World War we have run up an indebtedness in this country of $265,000,000,000. Great Britain's war debt, notwithstanding the fact she was in the war 1½ years before we got into it, is about $85,000,000,000. After all, who is responsible for winning this war? Certainly if it is financial figures, the answer is the United States of America. When we look at the action in the field of battle. America was always at the front.

In my estimation we do not owe Great Britain $4,400,000,000 additional, and we should not make the loan unless we get a guarantee that the money is going to be returned to the United States Treasury. Certainly we cannot tax the American people for this sum of money to be paid to any ally. Is this money being loaned to Great Britain to carry out the mandates of the party in power under Mr. Attlee, the Socialist Party who have promised to take over the railroads of Great Britain, the coal mines? They have promised the people of Great Britain many of the public utilities. Are we furnishing our money so that the Labor Party may make its promises good in Great Britain? None of it for mine, gentlemen.

After World War I we reduced Great Britain's indebtedness to us in many instances, and then finally came to the conclusion they owed us $2,452,714,782.58. Remember, they have not paid us the principal or any of the interest on that debt. Now I say to the Congress and to the American people, if you are not careful, you will bankrupt America. We will be taken over by the British and then we will be subjects of Britain once more. I shall never betray my ancestors and those who signed the Declaration of Independence. I am going to keep my eyes open, and open wide, to protect America and not give this country away on a silver platter to those statesmen of Great Britain who are too slick for the New Deal, who have and are continuing to give America away. The only way to save America is to get rid of the New Deal before it is too late.

American public wake up, you have been sleeping for 8 years at least, and you could not have been aware of what is going on. I sounded the warning 12 years ago, what to expect from the incompetence of the New Deal and the inefficiency of the party in power in America.

Which way shall we chart our course in America from here on to bankruptcy and ruin or will we turn to solvency? It is up to the voters. It may be possible that the $4,400,000,000 contemplated loan to the British, will be used to put them in the Bretton Woods bank—well, the United States will pay one-third of the capital. So if we pay Great Britain's share with a big loan and then grant a loan to Russia of the same size so they will pay their share, it is just too bad that America has such legislators. I am convinced if we do that that we need a change of administration at once and then we will need enlarged hospitals for the mentally sick, asylums if you please for the New Deal, for that is the best place I could suggest for them.

For goodness sake American voters wake up.

A Promise Made Is a Debt Unpaid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 7, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the responsibility of the Congress and the public to our returning servicemen must be kept in the foreground at all times. We must not forget that it was these boys, now men, many of them with family responsibilities, who met, fought, and defeated our enemies and preserved the honor and dignity of the Nation. Those

fortunate enough to return must be given the consideration they have earned and which they deserve. I believe our debt to them is best expressed in the following editorial from the Veterans Employment News, written by Perry Faulkner. All Members of Congress should read and remember it:

A PROMISE MADE IS A DEBT UNPAID

(By Perry Faulkner)

A unit in the great army of democracy was born here.

He knew the fondness of his Father and the caresses of his Mother. Went off to grade school; stubbed his toe on the uneven streets; learned about life and the value of simple things from his parents, his teacher, and his boy scout master.

On the playing fields of the high school he ran his mile; carried the ball—or batted a long one at a tense and important moment of the ball game.

Grown strong and stalwart he emerged into manhood.

World turmoil came. His nation beckoned. It needed defenders.

He became a living unit in an army engaged in the preservation of freedom.

We promised him some things—and owe him many.

We can partially discharge our obligation by giving him the best possible chance to live a full life according to his capacities for achievement.

A soldier, a sailor, a marine, a coast guardsman, a member of the Air Corps.

A piece of paper called a discharge—a veteran.

Much thinking on the part of the statesman and the citizen.

A great deal of legislation passed bespeaking the mind of Government as it sought to care for the inequalities brought about by time spent in the service of his country.

Plans and preparation in every community.

Organized efforts in every State.

The earnest desire of industry as expressed by costly and elaborate plans to fit once more the veteran into civilian occupations.

Returned to the old job—seeking a new job—that the knowledge gained from technological war could be used to the utmost in civilian pursuits.

The governmental agency charged with the responsibility of giving the veteran a maximum job opportunity in the field of gainful employment is the Veterans' Employment Service.

The vehicle to be used at the actual point of contact in placing the veteran in the job is the United States Employment Service.

If our responsibilities are to be met—if the veteran is to be served—there must be adequate funds to staff and maintain the United States employment offices of America.

The Veterans' Employment Service engaged in job counseling and placements for veterans must be of such size as to give assurance that no veteran shall be neglected.

Coming home from the wars by the thousands now—and ultimately by the hundreds of thousands—we stand upon the threshold of the most enormous task of readjustment in our history.

If there is understanding on the part of everyone—that the problem of the veteran is the most important consideration in our national life—then we can believe with some reasonableness that the proper adjustments can be made.

Failure may mean social dislocations—world shaking in their import.

A promise was made and the debt must be paid.

The same ingenuity that shaped and molded the pliable young flesh of our strongest youth into fighting men must be used in bringing them back to civilian status. proud—decent—dignified.

Wooster, Ohio, Editor Thinks "We Would Better Forget Pearl Harbor A While"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. THOM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 7, 1945

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, if the instigators of the Pearl Harbor investigation feel that their efforts are receiving the applause of the people at large, it would be well for them while on Christmas vacation to test out the sentiments of their constitutents. There is a rising dissatisfaction with the course of the investigation, and a feeling openly expressed much in sympathy with the following editorial from an independent newspaper, the Wooster Record, published at Wooster, Ohio:

MAYBE WE'D BETTER FORGET PEARL HARBOR FOR A WHILE

We read with considerable gratification former Secretary Hull's blistering and contemptuous statement in answer to those who would malign him.

The whole Pearl Harbor investigation is getting to the sickening stage. While some of Hull's critics were trying to blame him for writing the final note which drew Japan into war, Norway awarded him the Nobel Peace Prize.

"A prophet is not without honor except in his own country." It proves itself a true statement over and over again.

What we need is to forget the Pearl Harbor disaster, get right with each other at home and go to work. It was as if Congress were afraid to tackle the real problems ahead and spending its time with trivialities.

"Poor, innocent, peace-loving Tojo," as Hull called him, caught us while we were napping. That seems to be pretty well proven. But nobody could prove to anyone that we drew Japan into the conflict.

Who's To Make the Watches?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 7, 1945

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of December 6, 1945:

WHO'S TO MAKE THE WATCHES?

As odd a scene as history records took place a few days ago in the State Department's press room at Washington.

An indignant gentleman, armed with a copy of a statement soon to be issued by the Department, made a strong protective tariff speech to reporters gathered there.

The State Department, he declared, has cut the tariffs on foreign-made watches—principally Swiss—to the point where the American makers are being put out of business.

The statement to which he objected was to the effect that the Department, instead of taking vigorous action, was politely asking the Swiss manufacturers to forego some of the profits which lowered tariffs made possible and voluntarily cut down on the flood of Swiss-made watches being shipped to this country.

Who was this industrialist? What American company did he represent?

As a matter of fact, he wasn't an industrialist at all, and he didn't represent American watch-making companies.

He was a union man.

His name is Walter W. Cenerazzo, and he is national president of the American Watch Workers Union.

There is where the significance of the incident lies. Labor, at long last, has begun to awake to the harsh fact that importing competitive foreign goods is simply a way of exporting American jobs.

Mr. Cenerazzo had figures to back up his charge that the State Department's attitude is "weasel-worded."

The number of importers of Swiss watches has increased from 50 in 1940 to more than 500 at present.

A total of 28,000,000 Swiss watches have been brought into the United States since the start of the war, he said, representing a total of 14 years of work for 8,000 American watchmakers. Imports in October alone amounted to 2,100,000 watches.

The State of Pennsylvania has a direct stake in this matter. Lancaster used to be one of the three great watchmaking centers of the Nation, the others being Elgin, Ill., and Waltham, Mass.

The future of those centers—and the future jobs of the men and women who might get employment in them—depends almost entirely on whether our American State Department is going to continue to throw the business to Swiss concerns by low-tariff trade agreements, or will give protection to the American industry.

Last summer President Truman asked for and received an extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Acts by which the protective tariffs have been cut more than half.

The State Department at that time promised the congressional hearings and witnesses that under no circumstances would imports be allowed to put American working people out of jobs.

There was a good deal of suspicion at that time that the "global free trade" boys of the Department had their tongues in their cheeks when they made the promise.

Now is a good time to find out.

The protest in this case does not come from a "special interest" or "capitalist" group, but from the representative of skilled workmen who want a chance to get back to work.

The watches they might be making are being made by employees of foreign concerns.

What is the State Department going to do about it?

Nothing, probably.

The cult of "internationalism," what Congresswoman LUCE called "globalony," has led the national administration into some astonishing decisions in its foreign affairs.

President Truman had the opportunity of correcting some of the extremes. Between his good friend Byrnes and other spearheads of bureaucracy, he was coaxed away from the point of view of Congress and persuaded to go to bat for various left-wing schemes fringing on state socialism.

In few of the matters, however, is he likely to reap so quick a harvest of difficulty and disaster as in the free-trade experiments.

The stage is set for a repetition of what happened after the First World War. President Wilson slashed the tariffs before the war began; war-frozen shipping couldn't give foreign producers a chance to take advantage of this ripping down of our protections.

But shortly after the war ended there came one of the sharpest and most needless panics in our economic history. All over the Nation, American firms had to shut down because foreign goods were being dumped on the markets at less than the American costs of production.

The panic stopped as soon as Republicans were able to restore a protective tariff.

Exactly the same sort of depression may now be in the making.

If labor is waking up to the fact that working people's jobs are the real stake in the arguments over protective tariffs, it may be that the President and the State Department can be forced to undo some of the harm their policies threaten.

And Thou, Too, Brutus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 7, 1945

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from The Saratogian of November 29, 1945:

AND THOU, TOO, BRUTUS

The Navy Department's announcement that the aircraft carrier *Saratoga* has outlived its usefulness and will probably meet death under assaults of atomic bombs left Saratoga County, Saratoga Springs, and the town of Saratoga aghast.

So instead of finding a resting place on the banks of the Hudson River or in some historic Valhalla as did *Old Ironsides* and other ships, the *Old Lady, Miss Sara*, as she was known to the Navy, is to meet an ignominious death. While the Navy announcement does not specifically state the *Saratoga* will be A-bombed to death, it does say "the development of the atomic bomb has necessitated an intensive search for countermeasures—and to be of value these tests must be made with ships—and the *Saratoga* falls within this category."

That, in our opinion, is the last word in the lack of appreciation of a great ship; it is as treacherous a blow as that Italian thrust at a prostrate France; it is a double of the Brutus blow.

We wonder if Admiral Bieri, who made the announcement, has ever "fought a ship"; we wonder if he knows how men who fought her, who flew from her decks, feel about the future of the *Old Lady*.

Certainly no sailor, be he captain, executive officer, or enlisted man, who took part in the *Saratoga's* battles in the Pacific will stand silently by while this great exponent of America's sea power dies under attack of our own bombers.

Destruction of the *Saratoga* means destruction of a youngster's belief that she was one of the mighty; death bombing means loss of a great name, yes, a great person who took our men out and brought them back again.

For a ship is a person. Ask the men who fight them.

Philippine Status After Independence—Continued Relations With the United States Through Military Establishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 7, 1945

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an article on the Philippines which appeared in the Washington Post of November 30, 1945, and an editorial in the same paper on the day following.

The article is by Mr. Vincente Villamin, Filipino attorney and economist, of California. It brings up the point that after the Philippines becomes an independent nation on July 4, 1946, a military relationship will subsist between that country and the United States and that, therefore, the economic relationship between the two countries should not be dissolved but, on the contrary, strengthened. The editorial adopts that view. They follow:

PHILIPPINE STATUS—WHAT ITS INDEPENDENCE INVOLVES

(By Vincente Villamin)

On July 4, 1946, the Philippines will be an independent nation. But its independence will be limited. Under a congressional Joint Resolution 93, dated June 29, 1944, the United States, according to plans, will erect a military establishment on Philippine territory that will be much greater than the one she had there before independence. This means that the Philippines will be a part of America's plan of defense and offense and will inevitably be involved in any war which America may wage in that section of the world. Thus the Philippines, under an American law, will not have the first attribute of sovereign independence—the power to desist from or to declare war on her own volition.

For all practical purposes, therefore, there will be what amounts to an unwritten military alliance between the two countries. The Philippines will in effect be an American protectorate and be so regarded by other nations. America's aim, besides protecting the Philippines, is to push her strategic spearhead 5,000 miles beyond Pearl Harbor, so that in the event of war the battleground will be that much farther away from the American mainland.

It is obvious that a strong and friendly Philippines is a vital element in America's military position in that country as well as in her foreign policy in the Pacific and Asia. This basic fact should underlie plans for the Philippines after independence which the United States Congress is now considering.

The Congress has before it two bills: A Senate bill providing partial compensation for damages caused by the war, the restoration of highways, harbors, and the health service, the establishment of interisland air and sea facilities, and the training of Filipinos in certain essential occupations and services, and a House bill defining the trade relations between the two countries.

While the Senate bill promotes the reconstruction of the Philippines, the House bill liquidates its vital trade with the United States, ostensibly in 33 years, but effectively in a few years after the increasing tariff duties are applied. It is clear that the House measure will run counter to the military relations between the two countries, for it will sunder their economic bonds and blast the economic life of the Filipino people.

Once the full meaning of Joint Resolution 93 is recognized, the Philippine-American economic relations might instead be more or less on the following basis:

1. A free trade between them, not for a limited period but indefinitely, coexisting with America's Military Establishment. That will not violate, by reason of their special relations, the most-favored-nation principle nor any commitment to abolish trade preferences.

2. A Philippine program to diversify its production of tropical staples needed but not grown in the United States, to reduce its shipments to this country of commodities considered competitive with American products, and to build a sound producer-consumer economy by expanding domestic economic activities.

3. Congress giving the Philippine government the power to impose import duties on luxury goods coming from the United States, as it does on imports from foreign countries, this to be complemented by a Philippine policy of encouraging the importation of all sorts of agricultural and industrial equipments, tools, fertilizers, chemicals, and the like, supplemented by the employment of American industrial and business managers and technicians.

This three-point plan will build a complementary instead of a conflicting economy, increase the mutual trade appreciably, and develop the Philippines naturally, thereby lessening its disproportionate dependence on markets overseas. A strong and friendly Philippines will be the result.

This is the time to consider such a plan. After independence it will be too late. To implement it there are two assets available in the Philippines which together amount to over three times the dollar value of the country's annual production: (a) The approximately $500,000,000 which the American Government and members of the armed forces spent since the war and which is now mostly in the hands of Filipinos, and (b) the roughly $500,000,000 which the Congress is expected to appropriate for the payment of Philippine war damages.

If there is no plan and things are allowed to move along the line of least resistance, these assets will be dissipated in nonessential purchases and extravagant expenditures instead of being utilized to build that new producer-consumer economy which will create many small industries, businesses, trades, occupations, and services.

To conclude, the liquidation of the Philippine-American economic relations will weaken or wreck the Philippines and possibly throw that nation back as a problem on the United States; and if the economic relations are to continue parallel to the military relations, it is imperative that there be a definite plan to make the Filipino people strong, satisfied, and self-sustaining.

PHILIPPINE FUTURE

One key to the future of the turbulent Far East is certain to be the relationship between the United States and the Philippine Islands. It follows that this relationship ought to be thoughtfully analyzed now that Congress is interesting itself in rehabilitation of the Philippines and readjustment of trade relations between the islands and the United States. We do not believe that either of these problems can be solved satisfactorily without a realistic understanding as to what the basic relation between the two countries will be.

It is well known that the Philippines will become independent next July 4. Some Filipinos and some Americans regret this fact, but it is unlikely that the law will be changed. The Filipinos still cherish the idea of independence. Certainly they have earned the right to manage their own affairs. The United States, for its part, is thoroughly committed to the principle of self-government for all peoples capable of it. That is the key to the policy which we have tried to establish through the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations Organization. The fact remains that the United States and the Philippines have mutual interests which continue to tie them together.

Powerful American bases are to be built in the Philippines for the purpose of keeping enemies more distant from our shores, for protection of the islands and preservation of peace in the Pacific. Use of those bases will necessitate unity of action between the United States and the Philippines in any future war in the Pacific. In fact, the islands will continue to be dependent upon the United States for defense and the United States will be dependent upon them for sup-

port of our foreign policy in the Far East. The relationship might be described as that of associate nations.

We think this overshadowing fact should guide Congress in adjusting our economic relations with the Philippines. The Bell bill before the Ways and Means Committee gives fleeting recognition of this fact by providing that free trade with the Philippines shall continue for 8 years after independence becomes effective. Such trade would then be gradually strangled by applying 4 percent of the normal duty and increasing it 4 percent each year. In short, this measure attempts to encourage the development of Philippine industries that could not be expected to continue operating after the full duties became effective. There would certainly be much confusion, too, from the annual shift in duty rates. If a staggered duty system is to be applied, we think it would be much better to start with a low rate of, say, 5 percent, with increases every 5 or 6 years. But the special relationship between the two countries makes it doubtful whether full duties should ever be applied.

We appreciate the fact that the United States is urging Great Britain and other countries to liberalize their preferential tariff systems. If this movement should succeed on a world-wide basis, the effect would be to ease the trade problem everywhere, including the Philippines. Meanwhile it appears essential to give special consideration to Philippine trade. Overextension of such industries as sugar and coconut oil can be prevented, as contemplated in the Bell bill, through the maintenance of quotas.

The rehabilitation bill, too, can be used to strengthen the islands economically. As reported to the Senate, it calls for $480,000,000 to pay Filipino claims for damages, for public works and training of Filipinos to speed up reconstruction. Actual wartime damages in the Philippines, however, are variously estimated from $800,000,000 up. Why should not compensation be made in full, except to collaborators, with the proviso that funds granted because of industrial destruction be reinvested in Philippine industry? The United States clearly has a powerful interest in restoring the islands to economic health and in retaining the good will of the Filipino people. For we shall not be cutting them loose next July. We shall only be entering upon another type of relationship which must remain intimate and cordial for the sake of both peoples and for the sake of world peace.

Newport, R. I., Is Ideal Site for United Nations Organization Permanent Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 7, 1945

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, indications are that the United Nations Organization will decide to make its permanent home in the United States. A final decision of that question is expected in the near future. In anticipation of that action several American communities have invited the UNO to establish its headquarters within their boundaries.

We of Rhode Island believe we have the ideal location for this great organization. In addition to offering its fine, large estates, we can offer climatic conditions that would make for the health and comfort of the members and employees of the organization that would be at headquarters.

In a study of the main objectives that should be considered in choosing a seat for the United Nations Organization, Ellsworth Huntington, of Yale University, places Newport, R. I., as his first choice.

Because his paper on the subject contains so much interesting information, I include it here as a part of my remarks. It follows:

THE SEAT OF THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

(By Ellsworth Huntington, Yale University)

In choosing a seat for United Nations Organization within the United States the following seem to be the main objectives:

1. The best possible physical conditions for health, work, and recreation.

2. A location as convenient as possible for the greatest number of foreign nations.

3. A location readily accessible to major cultural advantages.

4. A site with well defined boundaries and with sufficient size for a large city.

1. PHYSICAL CONDITIONS

A. Climate

From the standpoint of general health and efficiency at all seasons the best part of the United States seems to be the Atlantic coast from Boston to New York. Other sections which for one reason or another are entitled to consideration in this respect include the southern shores of Lakes Erie and Michigan; a North Central section extending from Minneapolis to Omaha; the Northwest, that is, a strip from Puget Sound southward to Portland; and a narrow coastal strip centering in San Francisco, but not including the actual coast.

The evidence for the preceding conclusion includes extensive studies of the weather and climate in relation to (a) hourly rates of piecework in factories, (b) marks of students, (c) death rates and incidence of disease, (d) the use of libraries, and (e) other conditions such as fatigue. Sound conclusions cannot be drawn from a single criterion, from short periods, or from crude statistics which have not been analyzed as to their accuracy and the degree to which they indicate climatic versus cultural effects. Moreover, no climate is ideal. Several sections of the country can rightly claim superiority in one particular respect, but no section stands first in all. Places which are best from the standpoint of temperature are usually imperfect from that of rainfall, humidity, or variability. Steadily ideal temperatures lead to one set of illnesses, too many storms and changes of temperature to other kinds and too great seasonal extremes to still others. Ideal temperatures lead in the long run to a lessening of mental alertness; too many storms and sudden changes of weather lead to a harmful degree of overactivity both mental and physical.

The difficulties of the climatic problem and the kind of evidence on which final conclusions are based may be illustrated by the death rate, which in the long run provides the best measure of general health. The infant death rate (deaths per 1,000 infants born alive) affords one of the best indexes of general health. When proper allowance is made for under registration in the less progressive sections of the United States the rates range from 31 to 102. The figures for white children during 4 years (1940–1943) in the five sections that may be considered as candidates for first place climatically are as follows:

I. The Boston-New York strip: Connecticut 31, New Jersey 32, New York 33, Massachusetts 35, Rhode Island 39.

II. Lake shores: Wisconsin 35, Illinois 36, Indiana 40, Ohio 40.

III. North Central States: Minnesota 32, South Dakota 35, Nebraska 35, Iowa 37.

IV. Northwest: Oregon 31, Washington 34.

V. California 36.

Perhaps the best of all measures of general health is the "age-specific" death rate, that is, the relative death rate after allowance has been made for the fact that some sections contain a high percentage of children and others of old people. In this respect, as I have explained in Mainsprings of Civilization, we find a significant difference between persons below and above the age of 45 during two thoroughly typical years, 1940 and 1941. The average rate at older ages is given in parentheses:

I. Boston-New York strip: Connecticut 2.9 (33), Rhode Island 2.9 (35), Massachusetts 3.1 (35), New York 3.2 (36), New Jersey 3.3 (36).

II. Lake shores: Illinois 3.4 (35), Ohio 3.6 (34), Indiana 3.7 (34).

III. North Central States: Nebraska 2.7 (29), South Dakota 2.8 (27), Minnesota 2.8 (30), Iowa 2.8 (29).

IV. Northwest: Oregon 3.2 (32), Washington 3.3 (32).

V. California 3.7 (34).

In this table the North Central States make distinctly the best showing, but this cannot properly be ascribed to climate. The scarcity and small size of cities, the absence of the less healthful types of manufacturing, and the dominance of the healthful agricultural mode of life all play a part. Moreover, any region which has been settled comparatively recently has an advantage, because migrants are normally people with better than average health and their children take after them.

If these considerations are borne in mind, a careful study of the two preceding tabulations leads to the conclusion that if the degree of urbanization and industrialization were as low in the strip from Boston to New York as it is in States such as Nebraska and South Dakota, that strip would show decidedly the lowest death rate in the entire United States. Inasmuch as other types of evidence indicate that industrial productivity per hour and mental activity in general seem to be at their best under conditions of climate and weather like those of the Boston-New York strip, we conclude that, other things being equal, the climate there is the best in the United States from the standpoint of general health and activity.

It is not easy to rank the other sections climatically, and I do not speak with confidence. On the whole, the evidence thus far available seems to put the Northwest section next to the Boston-New York strip. That section is more healthful than the parts of Washington and Oregon farther east. Uncertainty as to the magnitude of the ill effects of city life and lack of available statistics that separate either the lake shores from the rest of their States, or the suburban area of San Francisco from the rest of California, make it impossible to say which of the other three stands highest.

B. Recreation

Although the speed and ease of modern transportation make it more feasible than it would ever have been before to base the location of the seat of the United Nations Organization on the most important of all criteria, namely, health and mental alertness, other criteria should not be neglected. Opportunities for recreation are an important factor in health and in making people permanently efficient. From this standpoint the relative positions of the five sections here discussed seem to be as follows: (1) The Northwest with its marvelous combination of island-studded Pudget Sound and great mountains; (2) the San Francisco region with its beautiful bay and its easy access to the coast range and the Sierras; (3) southern New England with a beautiful island-studded coast and the White Mountains, Berkshires, and Adirondacks within an hour or so by plane; (4) the lake shores where land and water

meet, but mountains are far away; and (5) the North Central States with lakes or mountains only at a considerable distance from the sections that are climatically best.

2. LOCATION IN RESPECT TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

In spite of modern facilities for travel the eastern coast of the United States still remains more accessible to Europe and no less accessible to Latin America than either the interior or the west coast. Moreover, although the problems of Japan, China, and the Far East in general are bound to be important, the success of the United Nations Organization depends primarily upon the attitude of Europe. If the seat is located on the west coast or in the interior, European nations are almost certain to feel that it is far away. Their interest will be greater if the seat is placed as conveniently for them as possible. Therefore the order of precedence on this score is the Boston-New York strip, the lake shores, the North Central States, San Francisco, and the Northwest.

3. LOCAL REGIONAL ADVANTAGES

It is highly desirable that the seat of the United Nations should be located within easy reach of great libraries, research institutions, and sources of all sorts of supplies and equipment. In this respect the Boston-New York strip has a great advantage, the lake shores come next, and then the San Francisco region, with the North Central States and the Northwest less favored.

4. GEOGRAPHIC INDIVIDUALITY

Another vital consideration is that the seat should have plenty of room for growth. Large airfields, beautiful parks, and spacious grounds for noble buildings will be needed, as well as space for office buildings and homes surrounded by grass and trees. If the United Nations is even a moderate success, its seat is sure to grow. At first a square mile or two will be enough, but after a generation we may expect a fairly good-sized city and in due time a large city. The growth of Washington and of practically every other capital illustrates the matter. It would be extremely shortsighted to locate the seat in a constricted area of only a square mile or two. It ought to have plenty of room for expansion. Moreover, it would help to promote international harmony if the capital could have the exclusive use of some island, valley, or other well-defined geographical unit with natural boundaries.

A SUGGESTED LOCATION

On the basis of all the preceding considerations the location that seems most appropriate for the seat of the United Nations is the island of Aquidneck with Newport, R. I., at its southern end. Climatically Newport comes close to being the best place on the east coast of the United States, and perhaps in the whole country from the standpoint of steady work and good health at all seasons. Its temperature is ideal in summer, being cooler than that of New York, Boston, or Los Angeles, and a little warmer than that of Seattle or suburbs of San Francisco, such as Petalumna. In winter Newport is about like New York, and considerably colder than any of the west coast locations. The coolness and dampness at this season are draw-backs, but it must be remembered that up to a certain point a cool, stormy winter is a distinct stimulus to both physical and mental activity. It must also be remembered that the monotony of a dry summer with little change in temperature from day to day is distinctly unfavorable in these same respects.

The fame of Newport as a summer resort is well known. That city, to be sure, has nothing to ccmpare with the mountains around Seattle or San Francisco, but nevertheless it ranks as a real beauty spot.

The position of Newport in respect to both Europe and South America speaks for itself. It would be hard to choose any site which is otherwise appropriate and which is also more readily accessible and more acceptable to a large number of countries.

The local regional advantages of Newport include (a) plenty of level space for air fields, (b) many beautiful houses that can readily be purchased, (c) a flourishing little city large enough to supply local needs, but not large enough to overshadow the seat of the United Nations, (d) easy access to New York, Boston, and many other cities, (e) an island which forms a distinct geographical unit that might be taken over as a whole by the United Nations Organization, (f) an area which is large enough for a good sized city, and is not yet densely populated.

Bring the Soldiers Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 7, 1945

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, every Congressman is receiving hundreds of letters from frantic parents and service men and women, all of whom believe that the War and Navy Departments are not properly handling the transportation of overseas personnel to the United States. As a result they feel that thousands of families will be broken up unnecessarily at this Christmas time.

I have on different occasions brought this matter to the attention of the House and have set forth particular letters and newspaper articles which have come to my attention. Today I wish to bring an editorial before you which was published in the Springfield Union on November 23, 1945. It expresses at some length several of the complaints which we Congressmen are receiving piecemeal in numerous letters from home and abroad. I believe that the time for excuses is past. I would like to see divisions like the Thirty-first Division, which has been waiting for weeks for shipping facilities, sent home without further delay. Why have these men been told, time and time again, that their sailing date was immediately before them if the Army and Navy were not prepared to make good on their plans? The editorial is as follows:

BRING THE SOLDIERS HOME

Let's all insist that this great Nation bring the boys home. We're fed up with weak, bumbling excuses from the Army, the Navy, from this and that great man in Washington, from this and that pipsqueak bureaucrat, explaining why the men in all the far corners of the earth, who won the war for us, "can't" get home. We're tired of all the talk—and so are the fighting men sweating it out in many climes.

Bring them home.

We took them over all right. We rushed them over, old and young, big and little, trained and half-trained, loaded with equipment, crowded into huge transports. We sent them everywhere—quickly, efficiently—and they fought like hell, bled, suffered, died. There were no feeble excuses then telling why they "couldn't" be sent to Tarawa, New Guinea, Iwo Jima, France, England, Belgium, Holland, Germany. Not on your life there weren't. Our Navy and our transport service were most efficient, always on the job, and over they went—millions of them. That was war, and this peaceful Nation was 100 percent efficient in fighting that war. But, as we noted in these columns the other day, we are about 23 percent efficient now as we try to get going in peace-ways style again.

What's the matter with Washington, anyhow? Why doesn't it get a move on, a hustle on? If, in time of stress, strain, and emergency we could take men away from home, why can't we, in time of peace, show a little intelligence, a little enterprise, to say nothing of a little decency, and bring them back? Why?

Is it politics? Is it that the brass hats don't want the men brought home and discharged, because when the Army shrinks, it can get along with less brass? Is there something sinister, something the people don't now, that is responsible for the cruel delays and many postponements of the homecoming of so many men?

The men who are being held in far-away places are more than restless—they are bitter, rebellious, and their morale is understandably at an all-time low. They see great ships idle near them; they know that many times ships sail from Europe and from Japan and the islands nearby with empty cargo space which could be used to carry men back to the United States. They know that there are many idle ships in American waters. They are rapidly losing all faith in their Government, and so are many of their relatives here at home.

Members of Congress are besieged daily by their constituents, assailed with the question, "Why aren't the boys coming home?" And Members of Congress go to the various departments in Washington and bring back explanations that aren't really explanations—simply excuses.

This unwarlike nation became warlike overnight and amazed the world with its efficiency as it fought and won the greatest war in all history. But now this unwarlike nation, the greatest and most efficient business nation on earth, cannot line up many of its marvelously great fleets of ships and bring back those men whose job abroad is done, and who by right should be home and out of uniform, and it doesn't make sense.

And the situation may become very serious at any moment, for soldiers far from home, smarting under a sense of injustice, aren't in a pleasant mood. They were willing to fight and die for freedom but they are not willing to sweat and wait and rot for inefficiency and bungling, and you can't blame them.

Bring them home.

American Legion Proposes Real Preparedness System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 7, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, from the Oregon Sunday Journal of December 2, 1945:

AMERICAN LEGION PROPOSES REAL PREPAREDNESS SYSTEM

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—The American Legion, through its national commander, John Stelle, has just come forward with a sensible program for military training that eliminates virtually all the objectionable features of the plan presented by President Truman and General Marshall.

Instead of taking a whole year out of the life of American boys and giving them no further training that could be useful 5 or 10 years later, the American Legion is to present to Congress a bill which requires only 4 months of basic training but provides for integration of the trained youth into some organization which has a continuing relationship to preparedness.

Under the proposed bill by the American Legion, a boy of 18 who is physically qualified would take 4 months of training and then he could return to school or college or join a National Guard unit or a Naval Reserve unit, or, if at college or school, he could join a civilian military training corps unit or an ROTC unit. If he were not going to college, the boy could spend 8 months or the equivalent working in some industrial plant engaged in national defense work of a type set up by the civilian authority.

APPROACH REALISTIC

This is a realistic approach. It recognizes that training in modern times doesn't consist merely of drilling and marching and saluting but of mobilizing young men in mechanical pursuits as well. Training in certain trades is just as essential to a mechanized military service of the future as marching or drilling. Certainly air power needs men in ground crews for repair and maintenance who have had the background of work in factories and plants.

The Legion's proposal is significant because it offers the first important digression from the administration's plan which, incidentally, has no chance of passage anyway. Another interesting proposal is that which comes to the writer from the Regular Veterans Association, an organization founded by but by no means confined to officers who have served in the regular Army and Navy. It says:

"We are convinced that some form of military training is a very real must for this country * * * but we are not agreed upon placing the whole burden upon young men of high school or college age. These boys, for that is all they are, have their lives ahead of them. They are at the place where an education means a great deal to them, especially the ones who are choosing careers in medicine, law, science, and many other professions which require more than the usual 4-year course, and a year from their lives at this time would be a very real loss. Not only that, but they are not yet men with an adult sense of values and to train them fully in the art of killing would be foolhardy indeed."

HITLER PLAN CITED

"Hitler proved what one can do with the younger generation by training them in certain arts. In Germany the youth, not the older folks, were the backbone of his plan of conquest and cruelty. Why then should we teach our youngsters this same science and expect them to return calmly to commonplace things without ever having a chance to practice the lessons thus learned? Taken at a time when their minds are pliable, they may wish to use their knowledge at the slightest provocation.

"We endorse a plan, proved by the Swiss to be workable and which has kept them at peace for many years, whereby the adults, who after all are the ones who should carry the burden of responsibility, comprise the civilian army of defense.

"We ask that all men between the ages decided upon as being physically able to fight be given military training each year until they reach an age when they no longer need be called upon to take the training. By this means no undue hardship is placed upon any one group. Not only that but returning yearly for a few weeks' training, we will have a male population in better physical health than ever before. By spending a few weeks of each year, in this way the men thus taught will not forget the lessons learned nor will they become 'rusty' which is what will happen under a plan whereby a man receives a full year's training, then forgets about it until such time as he may be called upon suddenly and without warning to use what was taught to him maybe 10 years before."

Congress will have before it many plans, but the two foregoing proposals begin to tackle the problem on a practical basis, and out of many ideas may ultimately come some form of training that does not establish a militaristic tradition but accomplishes the main purpose—preparedness for defense.

Compulsory Sickness-Insurance Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 7, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a part of four editorials from the Kansas City Star, the New York Times, the San Francisco Chronicle, and the Milwaukee Journal, on the subject, Compulsory Sickness-Insurance Costs.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that when the people of the United States realize just what may happen under the Truman compulsory health plan, they will have no part of it.

I have, on three different occasions, had the opportunity to visit Europe and investigate, at close range, just the type of medical aid which is given when the medical profession and hospitals of the country are regimented and controlled under Government machinery. I can assure you that the quality of care given to the people in these countries is far inferior to that received in our own country.

The matter referred to follows:

COMPULSORY SICKNESS INSURANCE COSTS

The basic question is whether this expansive and compulsory system is needed in America, to be superimposed on all the medical, hospital, and health prepayment plans now in effect and serving ever-increasing millions of the people. The country's public health showing today is better than it ever has been in the Nation's history—and better than that of European countries which have the Nation-wide health insurance. In the light of these basic facts, it has never been shown that any urgent or real need existed for the compulsory system in America. * * *

Whatever the method, people who did not want this service would have to pay for it just the same, with others getting the benefit of their money. They would be forced to pay into the system, however much they might dislike it and to whatever extent others might cash in on it.

The need must be proved urgent and the program itself the best possible means of supplying it before the country can afford to launch out on such a gigantic and lopsided undertaking. (Kansas City Star.)

What of the cost of the President's program? Here doubts will necessarily arise. We are presented with the familiar argument that with a deduction of 4 percent from salaries up to $3,600 we shall pay little more for medical care than we do now, which is about $2,800,000,000 annually. The argument seems much too cheerful. It overlooks the fact that in normal times 50,000,000 families could not call a doctor except in cases of catastrophic illness. With at least 100,000,000 insured, physicians will be consulted more and more. The cost of insured medical care may therefore well amount to $4,000,000,000 annually. Add the cost of building and operating the proposed hospitals and medical centers at Federal and State expense, and lastly, money allowances when sickness or disability prevents a man from working, and no one knows what the ultimate figure may be. (New York Times.)

We have a profound distrust of remote control by a vast Washington bureaucracy of a concern touching so intimately the lives of the citizens. * * *

The President repeats Wagner in asserting that this plan is not socialized medicine. To us these assurances are nothing more than attempts to soothe persons who do not like the terms "regimentation" and "socialized medicine." They should not fool anyone who can put two and two together.

Similarly unfrank seems the President's assertion that the system must be "highly decentralized in administration" though the fund "should be built up nationally." These two elements are completely incompatible. Whoever holds the purse runs the show, and from the place where the money is held. Nothing run by Washington is ever decentralized. * * * We do not want another national bureaucracy to create another huge pressure group in Government. (San Francisco Chronicle.)

Before we embark on any expansion of social security, we should first figure the costs, as accurately as is possible. If we must have old-age, survivor, unemployment, disability, health, and perhaps still other coverages, we must know the cost of each and the cost of the combination. We must know these things as they bear on pay checks and we must know them as they bear on the national economy.

Incidentally, in deciding on them, we must inquire into their more remote social implications. Security is a desirable thing, but so are the independence and initiative of the individual. In securing aids to the people, we must so operate as not to weaken the people's drive and energy and desire to accomplish things for themselves.

The national interest demands more than a reduction in the financial worries of citizens in the emergencies of illness, unemployment, and old age. (Milwaukee Journal.)

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. MAY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 7, 1945

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Brig. Gen. Luther D. Miller, Chief of Chaplains, on universal military training, before the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, Friday, December 7, 1945:

Gentlemen, my purpose in appearing before your committee is not to argue the necessity for universal military training. Men better prepared than I will speak to that important point. I cannot refrain, however, from expressing my personal conviction as to the necessity for adequate preparedness gained in the hard school of experience.

Those of us who in 1939 saw the frantic haste with which we sought to prepare for inevitable conflict after years of shameful

neglect of our defenses know how close this Nation came to disaster in those crucial days. We watched with apprehension men training with dummy rifles and with trucks for tanks to meet the mechanized might of the best-prepared armies in the world. That experience strengthened our conviction that it is perilous to trust the safety of our country to hasty improvisation in the fatal days of decision.

Those of us who watched from the ramparts of Australia the rising tide of Japanese aggression sweeping all before it in the early months of 1942 while we stood impotently by unable to stem their swift advance, know how possible it is for an essentially second-rate power to defy the might of America successfully when that might is only potential and totally unprepared.

I was with the forces of General MacArthur which slowly and painfully fought their way from one bloody beachhead to another in the long, long road which stretched from Guadalcanal and Buna to Leyte and Luzon. Most of this effort was spent in regaining territory we never should have lost had we been even partially prepared. I cannot forget the graves of brave young men which mark that way. Each one is not only a sacred monument to heroism and sacrifice but each is also a grim reminder of the price we paid in the days of too-little-and-too-late for our former folly of unpreparedness.

I was with the Sixth Army on Luzon which had the honor of liberating from living death the prisoners of Cabanatuan. I saw those men as they emerged out of Japanese bondage into the light of freedom. I see them now, ragged, starved, but with spirits unbroken. These were the men who fought grimly and courageously against overwhelming odds on Bataan and Corregidor waiting vainly for help which never came because we had none to send. They suffered the humiliation of surrender, the agony of the death march, and the long ordeal of imprisonment through no fault of theirs but because the Nation they served so nobly was forced to abandon them, having neither supplies nor men to send to their assistance.

I mention these facts since anyone who has shared in any way the suffering and sacrifice of 4 years of war in the Southwest Pacific knows the price we have paid in the past for our unwillingness to retain the military strength essential to command the confidence of friendly nations and the restraining fear of those who might become our enemies.

All of this I feel very keenly from personal experience but my primary purpose in appearing before your committee today is to testify out of my experience as Chief of Chaplains on the important question of the probable moral and spiritual effects of a year of military training on our youth. No question your committee can consider relative to universal military training is more important than this as I think you gentlemen realize. The parents of America are vitally concerned on this point as they should be. Not even the defense of our Nation should be purchased at the expense of the character of her citizens.

I am here today to state my earnest conviction gained from 26 years of experience ministering as a clergyman to our servicemen that far from being a peril to character a year of military training could become an important adjunct to the constant efforts of the home, the school, the church, and the community to enrich the character of our youth. If I did not believe this, I would not be here.

Frankly, I am a little weary of hearing the repeated libel of those who insist that a year of training would degrade or debauch our sons or transform them into regimented robots or goose-stepping militarists. Upon what evidence do the critics base these assertions? We who have served through training and combat with the men now in the Army know better. You who are receiving these men back into your homes again know better. There are weaklings among them but the vast majority are returning to their homes stronger physically, mentally, and morally than when they went away and far more peace-loving and democratic for their experiences. They have learned discipline and comradeship through service, patience and endurance through suffering, initiative and confidence through achievement. You do not win victories with moral weaklings. It takes character to stand the test of battle and these men had what it takes. They are one and all typical of the kind of men who emerge from either training or service with the American Army.

Much publicity has been given to such evidences as there are of delinquency among our soldiers. We tend to forget that the moral breakdown apparent in our American life is not confined to the Army. Indeed the most pressing social problem facing us today is that of juvenile delinquency among our boys and girls of high-school age. When we consider the perils to youth of separation from their homes and the beneficient influences of church and school, it is well to recall the alarming evidences of moral disintegration among those who never left home.

When you are considering the atmosphere of a military camp with all of its disadvantages, let us remember a few salient facts too often overlooked.

An Army training center is one of the few places in America where there is a planned and supervised program of education and recreation to provide youth with facilities for the worthy use of their leisure time. An Army training center is one of the few places where a strenuous effort is made to drive vice out of the communities adjacent to it or to police these communities for the protection of the soldier when he is off duty. An Army training center is the only place where a religious program for men of all faiths is conducted by the Government with trained clergymen constantly in attendance and chapels provided with equipment and personnel to carry on a comprehensive spiritual ministry among our young men.

Illustrating that final point, I would present to you with a pride, which is not personal, the achievements of the Chaplains Corps. The records in my office show that in the 4 years since Pearl Harbor 8,000 Army chaplains conducted more than 5,000,000 services, with over 300,000,000 men in attendance. These same chaplains with signal devotion made more than 73,000,000 pastoral calls on the sick and the wounded on the battlefields and in the hospitals all over the world. They have held more than 279,000,000 conferences with individual soldiers in which they have brought to lonely, puzzled, fearful, or seeking men the comfort, counsel, and encouragement of a strong and steadfast faith. At no comparable period in our history have so many churches been built, so many services conducted for soldiers, so many Bibles and other sacred literature distributed or a greater program of religious education and inspiration carried on.

I mention these significant figures because they demonstrate conclusively that the moral and spiritual welfare of the men in service has not been neglected in the past and will not be in the future. Indeed it is abundantly evident as many have pointed out that most men were nearer to the church and its ministry in the Army than they ever were in civilian life. Of course, the fact of war accounts in some measure for this unusual concern for spiritual things. Men facing death quite naturally turn to religion. But it would be a mistake to imagine that this is the only or the best reason for the very marked increase in religious interest so evident in the Army. More important, in my opinion, is the fact that the churches through the chaplains brought religion to these men where they were with a vital and practical faith preached and practiced by men who were comrades with the soldiers in a common endeavor.

The chaplain went where your son was. He didn't wait for the boy to come to him. He went to the boy. They were with the men in training and learned to know them on many a long march and lonely bivouac. They sweated it out with your sons in barracks, assault courses, parade grounds and in the field. When the transports sailed for unknown destinations the chaplain stood beside your boy on the deck. And when, in one instance the transport sank, 4 chaplains, Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish, gave their lifebelts to men who had none and went down to their death with those who were forced to stay behind. The chaplain was with your boy in prison camps. I remember on Luzon when we brought the men out of Cabanatuan that some were too ill to make the trip to freedom and one of our chaplains insisted on staying behind because he would not leave them alone. The chaplain was with your boy in combat. As one citation accompanying a minor decoration awarded one of many chaplains so honored, stated: "With a total disregard for his own safety Chaplain ——— remained with the assault troops, bringing spiritual ministration to the living, comfort to the wounded and consolation to the dying. He personally assisted in the evacuation of many wounded men under enemy fire." This is typical of our chaplains. I mention it because soldiers listen to the spiritual message of men like that especially when it is couched in a language they understand. It is that sort of service which gets results and it is that sort of service translated to a peacetime situation that we may expect from the Chaplains Corps in such a training program as you are considering.

I am in no sense suggesting that the universal military training program should be adopted in order that men may receive educational, recreational, or religious benefits. These are incidental to the primary purpose which is military preparedness. I am emphatically stating that past experience demonstrates that the Army is deeply concerned with the welfare of the men committed to its care. I am reminding you that no army in history, not even that of Cromwell or the Crusaders, has ever conceived and carried out so extensive and effective a program of education, recreation and religion. What we were able to do in the demanding days of total war will be done much more successfully in the days of peace.

The responsibility for accomplishing this will not be left to the Army and the Navy, alone, able and willing as they have proved themselves to be. The Secretary of War in his testimony before this committee has strongly recommended the appointment by the President of a civilian board made up of leaders in every movement for the betterment of our national life which would assist the services in the task of planning and administering that portion of universal training not essentially military. On this board would be men and women from the fields of education, social service, recreation, religion and so on who know the needs of youth and how best to serve them. They would be concerned with the conditions in the training centers and adjacent communities which affect the morals of men. They would integrate the program with educational interest whether it be the elementary schooling of illiterates or the advanced study of those who intend to continue to college. They would cooperate with the chaplains in a vital religious effort. In conjunction with the Special Service Division they would provide the finest in recreation. Surely we need not be apprehensive about the moral and spiritual well-being of men served and safeguarded by the most intelligent and interested agencies and individu-

als in our national life cooperating with the Army and Navy which have given ample evidence of their ability and willingness to care for the physical, intellectual, and moral life of the men committed to their care.

I can say for the Chaplains Corps that we would continue, as in the past, to cooperate with churches of all faiths to secure the finest of their ministers for service in the Army. With a universal military training program making unprecedented peacetime demands and offering unprecedented opportunities, we could and would present the challenge of Army service to all of our theological seminaries, seeking thereby to recruit the very best of ministers, priests, and rabbis for this important work. I am confident that the seminaries would assist us in preparing these men.

We will ask for, and I feel certain we will receive, an additional quota of chaplains so that parents may be assured that with every battalion of trainees there would be a minister or priest of their son's faith. These clergymen would be principally Reserve chaplains, serving for a limited period, combining a knowledge of military usage with an intimate understanding of the thinking and habits of civilian communities from which the trainees would come. In conjunction with the civilian board already mentioned the Chaplains Corps would bring to every training center outstanding leaders of religious life to conduct special preaching missions among the men. The splendid cooperation between the various churches and pastors in communities adjacent to the camps and the chaplains so evident in this war would be continued to the spiritual and social benefit of your sons.

It goes without saying that the chaplains would conduct regular religious services and sacraments for the men. These would be held in the fine chapels which already exist on every Army post. They would be enriched by music from the organs with which each chapel is equipped and from choirs composed of trainees and conducted by music masters. When the men are absent from the post on exercises or maneuvers, the chaplains would accompany them and conduct services wherever they might be. While there exists in the Army a fine fellowship between chaplains and men of varied faiths, insofar as it is possible to do so, your sons would be ministered to by men of their own particular denomination and there would be on every post services conducted according to the rites and ritual of whatever faith the men might profess.

Formal religious services, however, are only a part of the program provided by the chaplains. They are concerned with religious education and would conduct classes and study groups as well as young people's societies similar to those at home. They would stimulate an interest in the reading of religious literature and distribute, as in the past, the best available to the men. With the certainty of such a program the Chaplains Corps would plan to cooperate with the religious education agencies of established denominations to develop a well conceived and integrated educational program designed particularly for these men. I know that we can confidently count on the assistance of the churches and with that assistance there is no limit to our possible accomplishment.

Most important of all, perhaps, would be the personal relationship of the chaplain with his men. Remember his whole time would be devoted to them. He has one job and only one and that is to minister to the religious needs of the trainee. Unlike the civilian pastor he does not concern himself with finances. His salary, his church, and his equipment are provided by the Army. Everything possible is done to free him for his all-important ministry. Remember the chaplain lives with the men. He doesn't only see them in his congregation on Sunday, he is with them all the week. Day and night he is available to those who need him and we have evidence to show that he is used. I quoted the figures which show that during the war chaplains held more than 270,000,000 heart-to-heart talks with men. What that kind of ministry means to the lives of men I think you will understand. It means that the lonely and homesick are cheered. It means that the perplexed and bewildered receive counsel. It means that the defeated and discouraged are given the will to try again. It means that those with moral problems and spiritual difficulties receive the guidance which transform lives.

We recognize the peculiar problems incident to young men of 18. We have worked with such men in this war. There are changes in Army usage which are essential to their finest nurture. It is with this in mind that the President has recommended for them a distinctive status as civilians in training and not soldiers in service. It was with this in mind that the Secretary of War urged the Civilian Board to which I have made reference.

This consideration has prompted the plans for the extension of special service providing wholesome recreation and the proposals for an educational program calculated to prepare men for citizenship and for life. It is in deference to the peculiar needs of young men in peacetime that I would recommend the enlargement and extension of the Chaplains Corps. I would go further than that. I would strongly advise that the civilian board should study with care the problem of the moral atmosphere in the communities surrounding the camps where the trainees will live and work. Every safeguard must be given the men when they are absent from the careful supervision of the Army. I would strongly support the decision of the War Department to select the officers for the training program with a thought of choosing men best qualified to live and work with youth.

I would further recommend that insofar as it is possible to do so we should seek to make the atmosphere of the training camps similar to that of college campuses. I see no reason why we cannot. In this connection I believe that it would be wise to adopt the preceptor or counselor system which would place in every barrack where trainees would live a carefully selected leader. He would be a man to command the respect and emulation of young men. He would be one whose character was without question. His presence would help to create an atmosphere which would be clean and wholesome.

Universal military training is something new in American life. It will inevitably become what we choose to make it. There is no good reason why it should differ in any essential from the life at any school or college which has had military training in some form. Few feel that the youths who attend these institutions will return to their homes debauched or degraded by their experience. No intelligent person believes that they will be transformed into jingoistic Prussianized militarists. Indeed, it is the consensus that such training produces the finest type of disciplined, intelligent, manly men useful to civilian life as they are to military forces. This should be true of your boy in training. He should emerge more democratic for the experience he has had with men from all walks of life. He should come home more self-reliant, more disciplined, more intelligent, and better prepared in every way for the certain demands of citizenship in peace as well as for the possible demands of a future war.

From a moral and spiritual standpoint, I am certain that this will be true. I have confidence in the ability of the Chaplain Corps in cooperation with the churches of America to safeguard and foster the character of our sons. I believe with Dr. Dan Poling, a great Christian leader of youth, who stated before a congressional committee considering this subject; "If the Chaplains Corps receives in the peace the recognition, opportunity, and support given it in wartime by the Government and by the commanding officers, and if the churches of our faiths give to the chaplains their loyalty and support, then, gentlemen of the committee, we shall have in universal military training America's greatest moral and religious opportunity since Independence Day 1776." This will certainly be our earnest endeavor. I believe we shall not fail.

Who Is the Coward?

REMARKS
OF
HON. LYLE H. BOREN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 7, 1945

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, the President has recommended to the Congress specific action which he hopes will end the Nation's industrial strife. Having studied his message with earnestness and care, Mr. Speaker, I rise to say it is my deep conviction that the President is right. His recommendation should have immediate and favorable action by the Congress.

The present exigencies demand expeditious action and I hope the gentleman from Georgia will have full cooperation from the Labor Committee in his desire to bring a bill, incorporating the President's suggestion, before the House immediately during the coming week. I hope the Rules Committee and the leadership will give precedence and priority to that bill.

The President's recommendations are positive, plain, and direct, and they are wise and sound. His formula does not go far enough to please some and goes too far to please others, but that fact in itself verifies its wisdom and practicality. It is enough for me that it is a step in the right direction.

Epithet and invective and abuse have been recklessly hurled at the President by the CIO czar and by others amongst the power-hungry rulers of labor. These are ever the weapons of error.

Only a completely irresponsible and unreliable tongue could utter the baseless charge of cowardice against such a frank and straightforward action taken by our unassuming, modest, but courageous leader in the White House.

I do not believe Mr. Phillip Murray was intoxicated when he hurled that hysterical charge. Though I confess his wild irrational allegation might make it seem so. Murray's words were not the result of calm deliberate thought, nor were they the findings of judicious consideration; they were born of fear—stark, real, and unadulterated fear.

The CIO czar is afraid. He is afraid a required cooling-off period will prevent strikes. He is afraid fact-finding will expose him and his puppets in cupidity, in untenable positons and irresponsible actions. He is afraid that if the President and the Congress act to protect the public interest, that that action can only be a direct assault on the citadel of his personal power.

Amongst other statements issued is the vicious, bitter attack on the President by the would-like-to-be dictator of the CIO:

To all this arrogance, the Federal administration yields in abject cowardice. This was Murray's reply to the President's message to Congress calling for legislation which would create fact-finding commissions to inquire into major disputes.

What brought on this vicious attack? The President merely asked the unions to go back to work so that we could finish the job of reconverting from our wartime existence to a normal peaceful life. The President told them that if they would go back to work, he would, since they had failed to resolve their differences in conferences, set up a board of impartial men to investigate the grievances of both labor and industry. That he would appoint an impartial board whose sole duty would be to ascertain the facts.

The CIO czar ranted like a madman against this proposal. He is the coward. He is afraid of the facts because the facts will be against him. He is frightened silly of a fact-finding board. He knows the facts will show that he has threatened ruination to any industry or business that dares resist his demands. He knows that the facts will show that his program denies employment to the individual workingman and the returned veteran, except as such employment is conditioned on the payment of dues and fees in order to get a job to earn a living. He knows the facts will show that vast sums of money taken from the hands of toil have been ruthlessly used to destroy Members of Congress and other elected officials who refuse to be intimidated by him and such as he. He knows that the facts will show that such as he have only one objective—to control, to dominate, and to direct the Government of the United States to their personal gain of power. He knows that the facts will show that such men as he and Petrillo wield dictatorial power over American workingmen who do not have under the dominance of these men an opportunity for democratic action to arrive at decisions that affect them and the public interest.

If he has nothing to hide, why is he afraid of a fact-finding board? He is afraid for those facts to be found and weighed in the light of the public interest and welfare, and he is even afraid for those facts to be found and made fully known to the thousands and thousands of good and honest citizens who hold membership in the unions which he dominates.

Murray says: "The CIO is opposed," but he means that he is the CIO in his opinion. He made that statement without giving the millions of workers that are members of CIO an opportunity to ballot on the issues involved. He presumed to express their opinion for them without permitting them any opportunity to consider the questions and express their own opinion, even to him. The individual worker cannot afford to let the arbitrary will of a single man like Murray direct their thinking for them and speak for them and control their action for them.

Certainly one of the outstanding lessons clearly taught by Hitler's rise to power is to be found in the history of how he arose to power. First, he sold himself as the champion and savior of labor by painting rosy pictures on the canvas of lies and promises which he could not fulfill. Later, of course, he sold labor out and enslaved them.

The czar of CIO is throwing up a smoke screen so the facts cannot find him out and hit their mark. He knows that the sole defense for his arrogant and "contemptuous attitude toward the American people and the Government itself" will be found out by the facts and the facts will destroy him. He knows that "in the wake of his policies will come economic disaster" to the workingman. He knows that the individual union laborer will be able to see that mass unemployment and human distress will follow in the path where Murray leads. He does not want the union laborer or any laborer to know the facts because that knowledge would weaken his power and end his domination of them.

Harry Truman said, "It is the Government's duty to act for the people," and Philip Murray is opposed to that.

Mr. Truman said we must defend our Nation against actions that "cripple our reconversion program," and only those who mean to cripple, hamper, injure, and plunder can be opposed to that.

The President's proposal is a careful, restrained, and temperate program of action. Yet some few who are diseased with the lust for power have answered it with threats. They would browbeat, pressure, and cudgel our Government into submission to their dominance and into surrendering the public interest to their wanton self-interest.

When a "high?" CIO official said, "the President's proposal would alienate all of labor's 14,000,000 members," he uttered a false and contemptible threat. In behalf of the millions of honest, honorable, noble, and patriotic workers of our great country I deny and denounce that lie for them.

Speaking to organized labor in convention in Cincinnati, Ohio, just before Pearl Harbor, I said:

The man who would agitate a strike in a war plant today is the greatest enemy the American worker has.

And I have been sad in seeing irresponsible leadership and minority numbers bring blame and reproach on the great body of American laborers.

The President here demonstrates that he is labor's friend. He wants labor protected against wanton acts that bring severe condemnation and retaliation on the innocent worker, the honorable man of toil, the respected and deserving producer of goods.

Harry Truman is a quiet, unassuming, cautious, patient, anxious, earnest man. If Murray thinks he can browbeat him, he just does not know Truman. I know him. I know he cannot be deterred by the threats or the cudgel of a bully. Truman is trying to do what is right and what ought to be done, and Congress ought to help him.

Mr. Speaker, I stand with the President. I stand opposed to the czar of CIO, and I am proud to say that I entertain no doubt at all but a complete confident certainty that the American people, including the working men and women, will with courage and sincerity stand up and be counted—choosing as I make public choice today to stand by the President and right, and against the CIO czar and wrong.

Proposed Peace Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 7 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there appears in the January 1946 issue of Tomorrow magazine an article by Jack H. Pollack entitled "Do We Need a Peace Department?" This article quotes at length from speeches that I have made on the floor of the Senate relating to my bill, S. 1237, which would establish a Department of Peace, which bill is lying dormant in the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

There are some statements in this article with which I do not agree, but because the article brings to its readers the vital subject about which we are all concerned, namely, how to find the road to peace, and because the article will cause its readers to pause and think about the ideas contained therein, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DO WE NEED A PEACE DEPARTMENT?

(By Jack Pollack)

Traditionally, America has been a creative, pioneering Nation. Whether it was a Yankee whittler perfecting a flying machine or an impassioned Midwesterner heralding one world, we have never lacked for imaginative torchbearers. United States industry has handsomely rewarded its "idea men," and the Government has welcomed them to its inner circles.

Americans are perennially bobbing up with various plans, projects, and programs to solve a given problem, or to bring about a desirable situation. Prominent among these are proposals for creating new Federal departments. Plans to establish departments of education science, public welfare, national defense, fine arts, etc., are continually advanced. For years, well-meaning educators have urged establishment of a peace department to counterbalance our War Department. As early as 1936, Dr. Frederick Kettner, an American ethical-culture leader, recommended at the Inter-American Conference in Buenos Aires, that nations appoint secretaries of peace.

Peace department advocates present a logical, if somewhat familiar, argument. Why spend billions preparing for war, but nothing trying to prevent war, they ask. If a war department is needed to keep abreast of the

best implements of war, why not a peace department to maintain, at all times, the best implements of peace? Pointing out that an affirmative-peace program would cost less than a single battleship, peace department champions hold that the Charter of the United Nations Organization cannot function effectively today, unless nations immediately appoint secretaries of peace.

As an atom-stunned world gropes for a practical peace plan, the idea has now taken legislative shape. Senator ALEXANDER H. WILEY, a Wisconsin Republican, and Representative JENNINGS RANDOLPH, a West Virginia Democrat, have thrown bills (S. 1237 and H. R. 3628) in the hopper to create a Department of Peace headed by a Cabinet officer.

To date, Senator WILEY has taken the lead in thumping for a Secretary of Peace. A consistent noninterventionist prior to Pearl Harbor, reflecting his region's traditional isolationism, 61-year-old Legislator WILEY—like his more renowned colleague, Senator VANDENBERG—has now devoted his energy to promoting the cause of internationalism. An ex-lumberjack, dairy farmer, and small-town lawyer, before reaching the upper Chamber in 1938, his only previously held public office was district attorney in his native Chippewa Falls. Today this white-haired, impressive-looking Wisconsin lawmaker is a member of the influential Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Senator WILEY envisions his proposed Cabinet officer as a peace trouble shooter and right-hand man of the President. Under the Wiley bill, the Secretary of Peace would be appointed by and answerable only to the Chief Executive. Drawing $15,000 a year like other Cabinet officers, he would be the United States representative on the United Nations Security Council, as well as chairman of America's five-man delegation in the General Assembly. To start this project, WILEY suggests as our first Secretary of Peace, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., former Secretary of State. An Under Secretary of Peace would also be Presidentially appointed with the Senate's consent, and receive the customary $10,000 annually.

These two would be assisted by a small group of experts devoting their efforts exclusively to peace. Cooperating closely with other peace-seeking groups, private and governmental, their duties would be:

1. Concentrating and specializing in maintaining world peace;

2. Promoting better understanding of other peoples of the world, and better understanding of fundamental principles of international relations and cooperation among nations;

3. Using the full weight of moral force in encouraging international freedom of the press, in removing international frictions and misunderstandings which make for war.

Senator WILEY believes that passage of his bill would stimulate the cause of world peace. Appointment of a Secretary of Peace, he says, would be the most effective way we could confer prestige upon the United States delegate to the United Nations Security Council, and permit America to take its appropriate position of leadership in the international picture. Moreover, it would remind our neighbors that this time America means business and is determined to insure a warless world—and that we expect other nations to do likewise. Senator WILEY predicts that shortly after we establish a department of peace, other countries will do likewise.

Asked what his peace department would do that a good State Department couldn't do, Senator WILEY replies, "Is maintaining peace the exclusive duty of the State Department now? Our State Department, with its day-to-day diplomatic chores, can hardly be depended upon to give its undivided attention to such a vast job as maintaining peace."

Some of the State Department's daily chores, many unrelated to preserving peace, include working on commercial treaties, handling passports, keeping an eye on citizens' interests abroad, establishing rights for landing of airplanes, etc. Scattered throughout the State Department are the Offices of European Affairs, Far Eastern Affairs, Special Political Affairs; Divisions of River Plate Affairs, Protocol, Cryptography, American Republics Analysis and Liaison. Even the Secretary of State has sundry domestic chores such as custody of the seal of the United States and publishing the laws enacted by Congress.

An administration critic, WILEY denies that he would be creating another bureaucratic agency. "This peace department," he avers, "would not be a vast propaganda headquarters. Rather, it would be staffed by a small group of experts—specialists—who would assist the Secretary in concentrating on maintaining world peace. I would like to see this great Nation be the first on earth to establish a department of peace. And I would like to see the world peace capital on free American soil, not at Geneva, Vienna, or the scene of past failures, hates, fears, intrigues."

Though he insists that creation of a department of peace would be heralded throughout the globe, as war Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations, thus far the Wiley bill has elicited scant Senate support. Introduced in the upper body over 2 years ago, and again in July 1945, it has attracted little attention. Even the atomic bomb's earth-shaking implications—which make mockery of mortal existence—have failed to awaken support for the bill. Other than a sympathetic column by David Lawrence, publisher of the United States News, and an endorsement by such well-meaning but legislatively ineffectual groups as the Biosophy Society and Institute for the Advancement of Cultural and Spiritual Values, the Wiley peace department bill has not received much attention from the Capital press. At present, the bill is pigeonholed in committee, with little likelihood of emerging unless some mass pressure is generated for it.

Not unmindful of this, Senator WILEY on the Senate floor recently challenged, "I only wish that some good Democrat would take hold of it. Perhaps it would then lodge in fertile ground where it might grow."

Behind this inactivity is a bitter legislative truth. Since they lost control of the Senate, Republicans have mainly blocked rather than championed forward-looking legislation. If the Wiley bill is to make any headway on Capitol Hill, some "good Democrat" would have to sponsor it with administration backing. "I only wish one of them would grab it and carry the ball," sighs Republican WILEY.

Democrat Jennings Randolph, a jolly 43-year-old aviation enthusiast from West Virginia, introduced the peace department bill in the House of Representatives, but has done little with it so far. He has, however, requested the House Foreign Relations Committee to hold hearings on his bill which he introduced largely at the suggestion of an influential constituent, R. M. Davis, coal company president, from Morgantown, W. Va. Davis was an observer at San Francisco and is the author of the pamphlet, Constitution for a United Nations Government.

Believing in a broad educational program to keep the peace, Davis urges creation of an office of peace education—which is covered by neither the Wiley bill nor the United Nations Charter. Emphasizing education more than the Wiley bill, the Randolph-Davis measure sees the Secretary of Peace's duties as:

1. Formulating and publicizing educational programs for promoting better understanding of the other peoples of the world, and better understanding of the fundamental principles of international relations and of cooperation among nations.

2. Encouraging the interchange of ideas and persons between colleges, churches, civic organizations, and other institutions, organizations, and groups in the United States, on the one hand, and similar institutions, organizations, and groups in other countries, on the other hand.

3. Assisting educational institutions and religious organizations in the United States in formulating educational programs dealing with international relations, international cooperation, and the problems of peace.

Adherents contend that a department of peace is an insurance policy for peace—with a comparatively small premium. Warning that the United Nations Charter must not suffer the bitter fate of the League of Nations Covenant or the Nine Powers Pact, advocates claim that peace departments would help "rebuild a sad and disillusioned world." They imply that if the nations of the earth had had peace departments, we might have curbed Mussolini, Hitler, and Tojo in time to prevent the recent war.

Cynics consider a department of peace too naive for a brutally realistic world. They contend that it will take more than Secretaries of Peace, no matter how noble, unselfish, and unambitious they might be, to overcome the poisons in national systems. And they seriously doubt whether secretaries of peace could place the cause of international peace above their own national interests.

Obviously, a real department of peace would fearlessly expose any trends toward war. This might, for example, bring it into sharp conflict with another Government agency—one having a dangerous policy toward Spain or Japanese scrap iron. Or it might embarrass a respectable American corporation with cartel connections that put its pocketbook above its patriotism.

A department of peace raises many interesting questions. For instance, isn't it really the job of the State Department to do all the work any peace department could do? Shouldn't those who are popularly portrayed as suave diplomats be as aggressive in preserving peace as in preserving the social traditions of diplomacy?

Yet it is dangerous oversimplification to castigate diplomats for lack of international amity, when their actions only reflect the selfish policies of their respective countries. Witness the recent unsuccessful Big Five London parley.

Consideration of the abstract idea of Governments having departments devoted exclusively to world peace is actually an advance for civilation. However, the real answer may lie far deeper than in creating departments of peace. Norman Cousins reminds us that modern man is obsolete, and says that we had better speedily establish a world government, if we wish to survive. One wonders how immediate this prospect is, in view of the difficulty in achieving even elementary international cooperation in feeding starving Europeans this winter. There are still too many of us who cannot comprehend that a few painless economic sacrifices are a small price to pay for peace.

Perhaps, one day, a permanent peace will be established. Before that occurs, we will have to learn to live without our economic and spiritual fists clenched, and to forsake the creed of "Loot thy neighbor." When that day comes, departments of peace will be unnecessary.

The alternative is returning to the caveman, cliff-dweller stage of civilization. For when the atomic bomb dropped in Hiroshima, it bore the warning that free men and women would have their last chance to sit around a table and talk of peace—or peace departments.

James F. Scanlon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 7, 1945

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle:

(A man that hath friends must show himself friendly; and there is a friend that sticketh closer than a brother. (Prov. 18: 24).)

Upon the first day of December
Was clever James F. Scanlon hired,
And on the last day of November
He's set apart to be retired—
Up to their highest expectations,
He's served efficiently the great
Committee on Appropriations,
For whom he's labored long and late.

He worships at the shrine of duty,
From which life's true successes pour,
Which makes his life a thing of beauty,
Yea, and a joy forevermore.
For thirty years the commendations
And worthy praises of the whole
Committee on Appropriations
Have helped him to attain his goal.

The Capitol's entire connection
Holds him in unreserved esteem—
For James F. Scanlon their affection
Is sweeter than a fairy's dream—
He's been, and is, an inspiration
To his acquaintances and friends,
And has made this a better Nation,
By his unselfish aims and ends.
—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Postwar Policies Affecting Territories and Insular Possessions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH PETERSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 7, 1945

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Territories has for the past several months been making extensive investigations into the various angles of the affairs of the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, both of which occupy strategic positions in world affairs. There is a growing interest in the question of the postwar policies of our Government in dealing with the Territories, insular possessions, and other areas which have been brought under the influence of our Government.

It is most important that our Government formulate definite policies on this vitally important subject.

Among the many suggestions that are being made to our committee from various sources is a most interesting letter which I have just received from Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler setting forth in a clear and forceful manner his views on this question. Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler is recognized as one of the Nation's soundest thinkers and most progressive citizens. I wish to include his letter in my remarks, and I am sure it will be read with great interest throughout the country:

NEW YORK CITY, *November 20, 1945.*
Hon. HUGH PETERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Following some mention in the press as to the possibility of the admission of Alaska to statehood, I beg to submit for your careful consideration the statement which is given below.

The United States of America is now a complete and compact geographic unit. It is bounded on the north from east to west by the Dominion of Canada, on the southwest by the Republic of Mexico, on both east and west and on the southeast by the two great oceans and the Caribbean Sea. It is, therefore, a geographic unit complete in itself.

In my judgment, other territories which are or may become subject to the jurisdiction of the United States—such as Alaska, the Hawaiian Islands, and Puerto Rico—should be set up by our Government as independent, self-governing democracies under the protection but not the control of the Government of the United States. There should be two limitations upon their complete independence—first, their relations to foreign powers should be subject to the approval of the President of the United States; and, second, litigants in these communities should have the right, if they so desire, of final appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. This already exists in the case of Puerto Rico and works exceedingly well. By adopting such a plan as this, the American people would have very substantial influence over these outlying islands and territories, but they would not become part of the United States of America itself. In my judgment, this is vital for our future.

May I say that in 1934 I outlined this plan in speaking to the Legislature of Puerto Rico. That body received the proposal with great applause and apparent approval.

I earnestly commend this matter to your careful attention.

Faithfully yours,
NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER.

Conscience Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 7, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by J. R. Ferren from Signs of the Times for December 4, 1945:

CONSCIENCE HONORED—HEROIC SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST RECEIVES CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR FOR SAVING LIFE ON BATTLEFIELD

(By J. R. Ferren)

Unique among the 15 members of the Army Ground Forces decorated by President Truman on October 12 was Medical Aid Desmond T. Doss, now a corporal, the first conscientious objector ever to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor. His citation was also different in that it featured the saving of life under the most desperate circumstances.

Corporal Doss, after the impressive ceremony held on the White House lawn, told newsmen that he feels himself a "conscientious cooperator" and not an objector. To call a man an objector, he said, groups him with men who are unwilling to wear the uniform, salute the flag, or submit to military authority. When pressed to speak into a microphone for a newsreel story, he gave public thanks to God, declaring that it was only by divine protection that his life had been spared.

What of the background of this young soldier, who since May 12 of this year has been heralded by the press as "the conscientious objector hero," and whose devotion and bravery have won him the highest honor the Nation bestows? The influence of a Christian home, regular attendance at Sabbath school, and the privileges of a church school about tell the story. Doss is a member of the Seventh-day Adventist Church and went through the grades of the church school in his home city, Lynchburg, Va. His attendance at Sabbath school was so habitual that during his Army experience he has kept up his Bible lesson study and observed, though largely alone, the Sabbath school hour and its usual exercises. With this religious background, it has been only natural for Corporal Doss to turn to God for help in every experience on the battle front.

"Prayer is the biggest lifesaver there is," he told his lieutenant one morning on Okinawa as their company was about to climb a cargo rope to attack a Japanese stronghold in the face of almost certain death. "Hadn't we better stop and have a word of prayer?" he urged. The lieutenant gave the word to halt and quietly told the men it was for prayer. Doss was asked to pray. He petitioned the Lord to give them trust, to give the lieutenant wisdom and understanding for the job ahead, as lives were at stake in every order given. "Then I prayed for my men," he said, "and asked that all of us come back alive." They did.

The citation read at the White House ceremony to the high Army, Navy, and Government officials assembled, together with close relatives of the honored men, says this of Private First Class (now Corporal) Doss:

"CITATION FOR MEDAL OF HONOR—CORP. (THEN PRIVATE, FIRST CLASS) DESMOND T. DOSS

"Pfc Desmond T. Doss was a company aid man with the Three Hundred and Seventh Infantry Medical Detachment when the First Battalion of that regiment assaulted a jagged escarpment 400 feet high near Urasoe-Mura, Okinawa, Ryukyu Islands, on April 29, 1945. As our troops gained the summit, a heavy concentration of artillery, mortar, and machine-gun fire crashed into them, inflicting approximately 75 casualties and driving the others back. Private Doss refused to seek cover and remained in the fire-swept area with the many stricken, carrying them one by one to the edge of the escarpment and there lowering them on a rope-supported litter down the face of a cliff to friendly hands. On May 2 he exposed himself to heavy rifle and mortar fire in rescuing a wounded man 200 yards forward of the lines on the same escarpment; and 2 days later he treated four men who had been cut down while assaulting a strongly defended cave, advancing through a shower of grenades to within 8 yards of enemy forces in a cave's mouth, where he dressed his comrades' wounds before making four separate trips under fire to evacuate them to safety. On May 5 he unhesitatingly braved enemy shelling and small-arms fire to assist an artillery officer. He applied bandages, moved his patient to a spot that offered protection from small-arms fire, and, while artillery and mortar shells fell close by, painstakingly administered plasma. Later that day, when an American was severely wounded by fire from a cave, Private Doss crawled to him where he had fallen 25 feet from the enemy position, rendered aid, and carried him 100 yards to safety while continually exposed to enemy fire. On May 21, in a night attack on high ground near Shuri, he remained in exposed territory while the rest of his company took cover, fearlessly risking the chance that he would be mistaken for an infiltrating Japanese and giving aid to the injured until

he was himself seriously wounded in the legs by the explosion of a grenade. Rather than call another aid man from cover, he cared for his own injuries and waited 5 hours before litter bearers reached and started carrying him to the rear. The trio was caught in an enemy tank attack, and Private Doss, seeing a more critically wounded man nearby, crawled off the litter and directed the bearers to give their first attention to the other man. Awaiting the litter bearers' return, he was again struck, this time suffered a compound fracture of one arm. With magnificent fortitude he bound a rifle stock to his shattered arm as a splint and then crawled 300 yards over rough terrain to the aid station. Through his outstanding bravery and unflinching determination in the face of desperately dangerous conditions, Private Doss saved the lives of many soldiers. His name became a symbol throughout the Seventy-seventh Infantry Division for outstanding gallantry far above and beyond the call of duty."

Corporal Doss is returning to the Woodrow Wilson Hospital, Staunton, Va., where he will remain until fully recovered from his injuries. His wife, Dorothy, will continue to teach in the Seventh-day Adventist church school in Richmond, Va.

Doss is one of twelve thousand or more Seventh-day Adventist young men and women who served their country during the war in a similar way. While conscientiously holding to their religious convictions against bearing arms, they made no effort to avoid the fighting fronts. They went into battle without weapons of defense, trusting in the armor of heaven. They ministered to human suffering and need. Hundreds are serving as physicians, some as trained nurses, and thousands in other lines of medical service. Many of them received preinduction training by their church education system, which has especially fitted them for this phase of service.

The noncombatant position taken by Seventh-day Adventists is based on deep religious conviction. No man who sincerely holds it will attempt to evade the patriotic duty and responsibility which is both the obligation and the high privilege of every able-bodied citizen—cooperation for the common welfare of his country. It leads to neither moral nor physical cowardice. On the contrary, it engenders loyalty and courage. It holds men true to duty even at the jeopardy of life, inasmuch as that duty, both to fellow men and government, is at God's call.

A Precedent for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 7, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, every discussion of a lasting peace eventually reaches the question "What about Russia?" My answer is, Russia is no more anxious to fight us than we are to fight Russia. Then how are we to deal with the Soviet Union? Are we simply going to say that they have a different system and that their national policies are incompatible with ours? No, let us quit criticizing Russia and predicting war with Russia. We must try, despite all apparent obstacles, to work out a solution with tact, with patience, and with friendliness, but without appeasement that might be construed as weakness.

A precedent for such a program was established more than a hundred years ago during the administration of President Monroe. The United States, a republic, negotiated a treaty with Great Britain, a monarchy, for an unfortified boundary between the United States and Canada which was just as essentially a part of that "era of good feeling" as the more publicized Monroe Doctrine.

The fact is often overlooked that prior to the negotiation of that peace treaty we had fought two wars with Great Britain, as a result of which there were many in this country who distrusted Great Britain and many in Great Britain who distrusted us. For instance, Henry Clay wrote a private note to President Monroe protesting against the proposal to disarm upon the Lakes on the ground that it would deliver the whole western country up to the mercy of the Indians friendly to Great Britain and hostile to us. When Napoleon escaped from Elba, Madison wrote Monroe: "If Napoleon is restored, England and France will again pillage America." He urged that the United States maintain her ground and fight for her rights. In an article published in 1898 by Johns Hopkins University entitled "Agreement of 1817," it is stated:

Peace had been concluded at Ghent amidst the festivities of Christmas Eve in 1814, and as soon as the slow-sailing craft of that day could traverse the waters of the Atlantic the news was proclaimed in America on each side of the Lakes. But entire peace could not be guaranteed by proclamation. How was the temple of Janus to be kept closed? Manifestly the most apparent danger of future collisions lay in the relations of the two peoples along the northern limits of the United States. While Jefferson was trying to eradicate the war feeling which the newspapers had nourished, and wishing for the two countries to shake hands together, what measures should be adopted to lessen the possible sources of future misunderstandings, as well as to accelerate the return of fraternal feelings, desires, and actions? The development of the Northwest was affected by the presence of British troops in Canada and of British vessels on the Lakes. How should this danger be avoided?

Perhaps no better leaders could have been selected for the hour. They consulted only the interests of the country. They had no ax to grind at the expense of public peace. Their statesmanship did not sink into morbid abuse of some fancied enemy. They and the people for whom they stood, when they looked back and saw that the world had moved, began to look forward for the things that should grow in the new era of quickening activity, when great cities would be erected along the south shores of the limitary Lakes.

The statesmen of that period, sincerely desirous of establishing a lasting peace, applied their minds on both sides to effective arrangements which would render these waters neutral. They saw at once that if peace were merely to lead to a perpetual race in naval construction such a peace would be only temporary and expensive. Building of naval vessels would have gone on ad libitum, possibly ad infinitum, greatly to the emolument of shipbuilders perhaps, but at the risk of strained relations between the United States and Canada.

Reporting on March 30, 1816, to President Monroe, our Ambassador to Great Britain, Mr. Adams, wrote:

In all the late debates in Parliament upon what they call their military and naval peace establishment, the prospect of a new war with the United States has been distinctly held up by the ministers and admitted by the opposition as a solid reason for enormous and unparalleled expenditure and preparation in Canada and Nova Scotia. We hear nothing now about the five fir frigates and the bits of striped bunting. The strain is in a higher mood. Lord Castlereagh talks of the great and growing military power of the United States. The Marquis of Lansdowne, an Opposition leader, and one of the loudest trumpeters for retrenchment and economy, still commends the ministers for having been beaten into the policy of having a naval superiority upon the Lakes. * * * All this is upon the principle of preserving peace by being prepared for war. But it shows to demonstrate what will be the fate of the proposal for disarming.

It is a source of personal pride to me that it was a Representative from Virginia—John George Jackson—who laid the foundation for the wise course subequently followed by President Monroe. Representative Jackson was a grandson of John Jackson, the Scotch-Irish emigrant who was the great-grandfather of the immortal General Stonewall Jackson, whose fame, like that of Lee, rests as much upon his superlative character as upon his military genius. On February 17, 1815, Representative Jackson, of Virginia, offered a resolution that the Naval Committee be instructed to inquire and report to what extent the United States Navy on the Lakes could be reduced consistent with public interest.

Fortunately, those like Jackson, Jefferson, Monroe, and other leaders who had a will for peace prevailed. As a result, for more than 100 years, the relationship between the United States and Canada has been as friendly as that between Virginia and Maryland, and there has been no more occasion for forts on the Canadian border line than there has been for forts on the Potomac River. After the Revolutionary War friction existed between Virginia and Maryland, between New York and New Jersey, and between other States over State tariffs. They did not go to war; they yielded some of their sovereignty and joined a union that provided for free trade between the States.

It is true that the United States and Canada had the same concept of personal freedom and were members of the same continent. But the radio, the airplane, and the atomic bomb have wiped out boundary lines and we are, in the words of Wendell Willkie, living in one world.

We want a lasting peace. The masses throughout the world want a lasting peace. Representatives of the Allies in World War II are discussing the basis of a lasting peace, but as Voltaire once remarked: "The adjective is the enemy of the noun." There is no reason why we cannot reach a world peace as Monroe reached a peace between the United States and Canada by submerging distrust and by refusing to qualify the simple word "peace" with such terms as "national sovereignty" and "trade advantages."

Pleading for a program to support democracies that were resisting Hitler, I said, in a speech delivered in Woodstock, Va., on June 2, 1940:

Last week a well-meaning but misguided woman in Illinois wired Speaker BANKHEAD "Please save America. Let God save the King." Of course, the safety of America, the

protection of our own firesides, will always be our primary concern, but * * * in the new world in which we live we are not an independent, isolated, and self-contained unit. Many years ago it was recorded "None of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself." Those words were spoken in a small world dominated by the Roman legions—in area and population about that of the United States. Science has brought the mighty nations of our modern world jostling together, and man's mastery of the air has given a new significance to the ethical teachings of the first century.

A wide gap separates our ideologies from those of the Russians, but I wonder if it be any wider than the one that separated the Revolutionists in this country in 1776 from czarist Russia of that day, and Russia was our friend and unofficial ally. Again it may be said that in that struggle Russia acted from the standpoint of self-interest, since she, like France, feared the growing military power of Great Britain. But what greater self-interest could any nation have than a lasting peace? Russians are brave, but Russians would rather live than die. Russians are self-sacrificing, but Russians would prefer domestic prosperity to the crushing burden of a huge military establishment.

There is no defense against the atomic bomb. International anarchy must be supplanted by international law or civilization is doomed. "Nations," said Edmund Burke, "do not learn by experience." In this crisis we should not ignore a plan that worked.

Troops Enthuse Over Troop-Ship Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, we hear so many complaints concerning the repatriation and demobilization program that it is gratifying to learn that one part of the job is being performed superlatively. The following letters testify that Mr. Harold J. O'Connell, Director of Food Control for the War Shipping Administration, has been giving the kind and quality of food they want to boys returning home on WSA ships:

S. S. "ANTIOCH VICTORY,"
October 29, 1945.

From: Antioch News.
To: Chief Steward.

Food for a 13-day trip amounts to some 150,000 pounds—including (happy thought) some 54,000 shell eggs. If you have hated the thought of powdered eggs all these months overseas, just concentrate on the thought of 54,000 lovely eggs—probably hard boiled. (How many have we eaten already?)

Sunday, the schedule called for 225 cans of fruit juice—but you fellows actually gulped down between 280 and 290 cans of this delicious fluid.

It was asked whether the call for food varied from day to day—particularly those first few stormy days. Our host says he is unable to notice any great difference in the amount of food eaten by the men—under the weather or not.

In fact, he went so far as to say that he had never seen such a determined group of appetites—cited an instance where a soldier was carelessly throwing his last meal into a convenient corner while holding a full mess kit in his free hand.

The above case will give you a fair idea of the high quality of the food on this ship—the men just enjoy eating it—even if they don't expect to keep it long.

S. S. "A. P. HILL,"
October 22, 1945.

From: Capt. Stuart T. Hynes, Transport Commander.
To: War Shipping Administration.

I wish to comment on the excellent service rendered by the steward's department of the steamship *A. P. Hill* to the troops returning from Europe under my command. The food was well prepared and the quality and variety was excellent.

[Extracts taken from ship's paper Down Hill]

"Such things as we haven't had in the ETO were now ours when we boarded ship on October 6, 1945. We had left Camp Top Hat and Belgium far behind us, and here was ice cream, fresh salads, fresh milk (the first in 2 years for some of us), sugar-cured ham, ice-cold Pepsi-Cola, candy, and more cigarettes than you could smoke in a month of Sundays. Here was a taste of a life that had been long forgotten by many of us, and those are the things which really surprised many. Of course, there were the usual gripes about standing in the chow line, but we're all used to that, and there is not a man aboard that could complain about the chow, for it was always of the highest quality—and better than most of us expected."

S. S. "BRANDON VICTORY,"
October 20, 1945.

From: Maj. Irvin Gold, Commander of Troops.
To Whom It May Concern:

The food that was prepared and served to the officers and enlisted men on board the steamship *Brandon Victory* was excellent, and on behalf of the officers and enlisted men I wish to extend my appreciation to the chief steward, Arnold Sorensen, and his staff, for the good meals and services rendered to the officers and enlisted men aboard the steamship *Brandon Victory*.

[Extracts taken from the ship's paper]

"GI'S UNANIMOUS IN PRAISE OF BV'S CHOW

"They say it's so good it will take the edge off the home cooking they've been looking forward to. Little things we haven't seen in years add to the swell cooking—honest-to-heaven milk, real eggs, celery, cookies, and even olives. Beaucoup bouquets to the ship's galley gang, and beaucoup bouquets to the whole ship's crew. No sign of inedible chicken anywhere. * * * Just dawned on us we're going to get him in time to do a lot of quail hunting. Boy!

"GENERAL HARRIS LAUDS SHIP'S PERSONNEL

"On behalf of the members of the Sixty-third Infantry Division and myself, I wish to express appreciation to the personnel of the *Brandon Victory* for the efforts expended in making this journey a pleasant one. * * * The messing of enlisted men and officers under the supervision of Steward Arnold H. Sorensen and Assistant Steward Charles B. Hilton and Assistant Steward Theodore Velasquez was excellent and an outstanding achievement. The preparation of food was definitely superior in quality. * * * The combined efforts of all concerned in rendering this voyage an enjoyable one have far surpassed the expectations of the passengers. It has indeed been edifying to witness the concerted attempts of the members of the personnel of the *Brandon Victory* to make this homeward journey a brief and hospitable interlude prior to arrival in the United States."

S. S. "CHAPEL HILL VICTORY,"
November 2, 1945.

From: Maj. Marvin J. Hubbard, transport commander.
To Whom It May Concern:

In spite of the fact that the vessel was overloaded 30 percent above normal capacity for the three voyages, and a terrific strain was placed on the Army galley, the chief steward performed his duties in an excellent manner. Nothing but praise was received from the Army officers and men with regard to the preparation and serving of meals aboard the vessel, even under the most trying conditions.

S. S. "CLAYMONT VICTORY,"
October 28, 1945.

From: Capt. Nelson D. Johnson, Transport Commander.
To: Joe Miller, Chief Steward.

Each meal was carefully planned and served and was thoroughly enjoyed by every officer and enlisted man on board, as was attested to by the innumerable reports received in this office.

S. S. "CODY VICTORY,"
September 27, 1945,

From: Capt. Charles P. Mooney, Jr., Transport Commander.
To Whom It May Concern:

The food aboard the *Cody* has been excellent. The GI passengers extend a vote of thanks to Chief Steward Thomas H. Gordon and his able assistant, Horace S. Curry.

S. S. "EDWARD RICHARDSON,"
September 27, 1945.

From: The Richardson Recorder.
To: Orchids to Our Mess.

As far as the kitchen and the food was concerned, it couldn't have been better. There was always plenty of it, and the manner in which it was prepared was very good. Our hats are off to the men who did that wonderful cooking.

S. S. "GEORGE G. MEADE,"
October 30, 1945.

From: Lt. William J. McGrath, transport commander.
To: Weyerhaeuser Steamship Co.

During my two voyages aboard the S. S. *George G. Meade* as transport commander I made frequent observations of the functioning of the steward's department. Daily inspections revealed excellent conditions. Comments from the officers and men were full of praise for the quality and quantity of the food.

S. S. "GEORGE SHIRAS,"
June 1, 1945.

From: Lt. William V. Skillman, transport commander.
To Whom It May Concern:

It is with great pleasure that I heartily recommend Lt. Fred R. Erb, USMS. He has never been found wanting in his untiring efforts to please everyone that he has had dealings with. His operation of the mess for the Army personnel has been above reproach.

"After the Army—What?" Women in Uniform Ask

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 7, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by

Doria Higgins from the Washington News Digest:

"AFTER THE ARMY—WHAT?" WOMEN IN UNIFORM ASK

(By Doria Higgins)

A prediction that by mid-November more than 2,500,000 women will be looking for jobs has been made by Miss Frieda S. Miller, Chief, Women's Bureau, Labor Department. The dearth of postwar employment will be felt first by civilian workers, for the servicewomen will be discharged more gradually. The thought uppermost in the minds of the nearly 100,000 women already in the Women's Army Corps is, When do I get out of the Army and after that—what?

They all are eligible for benefits under the GI bill of rights, and if they wish can complete or further their education at the expense of the Government.

The time has come when the women who left their homes and donned uniforms to travel, who accepted the regimentation and discipline of Army life, the responsibilities of a large organization, will return to a life of personal decisions and responsibilities.

The impression gained from interviews is that they are eager to resume "a regular, normal life," to return to their husbands, or to get married and start a home.

A recent First Air Force questionnaire on the postwar ambitions of the Wacs declares 73 percent want marriage and home-making. That finding is in accord with the opinion of a young infantry lieutenant. "Aw, lady," he drawled, "you know as well as I do a woman's place is in the home."

Although most of the Wacs joined for patriotic reasons, some said restlessness had been a secondary factor and that the restlessness was with them again. They want to travel. One group is planning to buy a car and leisurely tour the United States.

One definite note was struck in the words of a young corporal who said, "I don't feel prepared for the peace. I don't want to get out because I don't know what I want to do."

The question of a regular Wac army is still undecided. At a recent press conference Gen. Stephen C. Henry, assistant chief of staff in charge of personnel, said that it was a legislative matter, and so far Congress has made no moves.

At the other extreme an attractive sergeant, asked if she was glad to get out, cried, "Are you kidding? I bought my first dress in 3 years yesterday—black and slinky."

Regardless of what they do and any temporary bewilderment, they'll take with them not only new and valuable training in different trades, but a sense of independence and a greater tolerance toward people and ideas.

The Capitol's Popular Elevator Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 7, 1945

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle:

There is an elevator man,
As jolly as a jay;
If he can live up to his plan,
On Washington's birthday
He'll reach his threescore, ten, and four,
And yet he thrills with cheer
His many girl friends, more and more,
With every passing year.

The teen-age girls all love to ride
With him from day to day,
And he takes an increasing pride
In them—and what they say
To him, as they ride up and down,
Make him behave, as tho
He were a comic circus clown,
Performing in a show.

The passing years have failed to dim
His fascinating eyes—
The girls all fall in love with him,
Of every age and size—
There's something in him that enshrines
Itself in all their hearts,
Sweet as the song that love designs
When its emotion starts.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Future Policy Affecting the Air Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 10 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article prepared by me entitled "The Same Mistake Again?" published in the December issue of the magazine Flying.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SAME MISTAKE AGAIN?

(By ELBERT D. THOMAS, United States Senator from Utah)

The few weeks left in this year—packed with historic drama through 1945 has been—may well be the most crucial in our national history, if not in the history of the world.

In that brief period the ground work policy concerning the future role of the airplane in our civilization must be determined.

If decision is delayed we are threatened with a chaotic present and a potentially disastrous future. And what we decide to do with aviation inevitably will guide our future economic, social, political, and diplomatic decisions in all aspects of our national and international life.

Five major questions must be faced immediately and policy laid down toward their solution:

1. What are we going to do toward maintaining our air forces?

2. Are the AAF and the Navy air arm going to be separated from our other defense groups, will they be made the controlling factor in our fighting structure, or will they be relegated to their prewar status of military stepchildren?

3. What measures are going to be taken to control the airplane in its relationship to the atomic bomb?

4. What international regulations are going to be laid down concerning the freedom of the air in which planes, both military and commercial, move?

5. Domestically, what measures are going to be taken toward full-throttle aircraft production and the employment that such production implies?

If we answer these questions correctly, we will have the answers to scores of other parallel questions concerning machines, radar, radio, and other developments in the scientific new world upon whose threshold we now stand. Answer them quickly and accurately and we can, for generations to come, enjoy the fruits of that world. Postpone the answers—delay bringing our political, economic, social, and diplomatic thinking abreast of the breath-taking advances of science—and the result may well be anarchy.

It is one of the ironies of modern civilization, and an index to how far our social thinking is behind the scientists, that it is necessary to cite the above alternatives at this late hour. Despite the prophecies of Peary, Douhet, Mitchell, Seversky, and Ziff, to say nothing of the history of the past 10 years, people are still debating the value of air power. It still is necessary, before facing our present dilemma, to review the record, to repeat the predictions that such far-seeing men as Admiral Peary made at the beginning of the century.

Peary's predictions are most clear in my mind because I heard him make them in person, and because they impressed me as strongly as did the unbelievable opposition which arose after he uttered them. His words typify what advocates of aviation are saying today, and his opponents' words typify that benighted opposition which, even now, threatens to block our progress.

My meeting with the admiral occured several years before the Wright brothers flew at Kitty Hawk. I was a student at the University of Utah and he was on a tour of the country lecturing on the Arctic; but in a special forum for students after his regular address he surprised us by speaking, not of the far north, but of aviation.

He spoke dramatically of the coming air age, said that future generations would learn to fly with as much ease as we had learned to swim, and predicted an unlimited future for heavier-than-air craft both in war and peace.

He never changed his views. By 1916, on the eve of our entry into World War I, he was saying, "He who commands the air commands all."

"Our Army and Navy," he declared, "are virtually blind. We have less than 200 trained aviators in the services. These 200 will be busy training other men to fly. We have not a single airplane equipped with a gun."

As early as 1915 he insisted that the best defense of this country would be an aerial coast patrol, and anticipated the use of bombers.

"In no way can we as a nation stand so effectively for forcefulness, for strength, and for world influence as by command of the air. Great and important as is a sufficient Navy for our safety, I speak advisedly when I say that our air service of the near future will be more vital to our safety than our Navy and our Army combined."

He went further, predicting the role of the airplane in a peacetime econmy:

"The work of air preparedness," he said, "is not just for the present (World War I) emergency with Germany. This is only a present incident which should spur us to more immediate readiness. This work of air preparedness is for preparedness on our part for that great realignment of powerful, conflicting, and impoverished interests which is surely to come at the end of this war, and which is a far greater contingency for us than a possible war with Germany under present conditions. This matter is for preparedness even beyond that—preparedeness also for that commercial air power which is coming in the future and in which we should lead."

He went on to visualize a network of air-mail lines around the world, advocated Federal control of pilot licensing, a Secretary for Aeronautics in the Cabinet, civil-aeronautics committees in Congress, and foresaw the need of air laws to fit a three-dimensional world.

He was hailed as a visionary and a crackpot for his pains. "Apparently man was built to stand upon the ground," declared the editor of the North American Review a few months after the admiral had spoken to us in Utah. "Strife against the force of gravity,

therefore, may be regarded as contrary to the intention of the Creating Power." "Winged angels or demons" would have to be used as policemen, he suggested, if the wild dreams of the air enthusiasts were realized. Even scientific men at that time, while admitting that men could fly in heavier-than-air machines said that they would probably never do it because after they once got in the air they could not with safety set down on the ground again. The problem to them was not flying but landing.

Succeeding, although against great odds, in establishing his wartime flying coast patrol, Admiral Peary did not succeed in avoiding ridicule. An article in the Bellman magazine as late as 1917 decried his campaign on the grounds that it "merely tends to create alarm and spread the spirit of panic."

Nor is his career as an advocate of aviation reviewed here in some detail simply for amusement. Down through the years, and even to this day, aviation and its supporters have been subjected to similar opposition. Gen. Billy Mitchell is a classic example. Perhaps more classic still is the exclamation of Admiral William B. Shoemaker on reading the report on Mitchell's bombing experiments on warships off Cape Hatteras in 1923.

"It's true, every bit of it," groaned the admiral, "but, my God, we can't let this get out or it would ruin the Navy."

"If a storm doesn't come up and blow these damn planes away," said another admiral attending the bombing demonstrations, "the Navy will go out of business." And Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels led the opposition by offering to stand on the bridge of a ship while an attempt was made from the air to bomb it, later getting confirmation from Navy Secretary Wilbur in 1924, who said, "I regard the statement that the next war will be in the air as an absurdity, partaking of the Jules Verne type of literature."

On the Army side, Maj. Gen. John L. Hines contributed the startling opinion that "the airplane is never going to take the place of the cavalry."

Yet General Mitchell was court-martialed by a distinguished panel of his peers—including none other than Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Nor did the developments of the thirties and the spectacular advances of the German Luftwaffe drown the protests of those favoring land and sea equipment over airplanes.

"Army aviation," declared Admiral King at the beginning of World War II, "should end at the shore line. I shall do what I can to make it so." As late as 1942 he stated: "It is not fundamentally true that air forces can control either permanently either land or sea."

The same old-line opposition that aviation faced in World War I arose again to dog it in World War II. The difference was that aviation was too strong to play a second fiddle and so effective that it overwhelmed those opposing it.

This is not to say that aviation should be ensconced on a throne and everything else be relegated to a minor role. Teamwork won the war and only teamwork can win the peace. But it does mean that aviation should be assayed at its proper value and the less argument about it the better. Our five major questions should be answered promptly and without qualification.

I believe that it is for the greatest good of the country and of the world at large that they be answered as follows:

1. Our air forces, both Army and Navy, should be maintained, regardless of cost, at the highest possible peak so that pilots may be trainer in large numbers, equipment will be immediately available in large numbers in case of a national crisis, and scientific advancement in the field may go forward unhampered by monetary considerations.

2. The AAF and the naval air arm, not to mention all other national defense groups, should neither be separate units nor controlling factors in our defense plans. All should be combined in a single national defense unit, making teamwork in our military and naval activities an organizational reality as well as a personnel goal. Specifically, the Military and Naval Affairs Committees in the Congress should be abolished immediately and a single Committee on National Defense in each House should replace them. Similar consolidation toward streamlining should be effected in the Army, Navy, and the Cabinet.

3. In considering the control of the airplane in its relationship to the atomic bomb, it should be remembered that the bomb would be of dubious military value without the airplane. Without control of the air—which we must maintain—control of the atomic bomb would be comparatively useless. At the same time, let us not assume that the bomb is the be-all and the end-all of military offensive. The bitter fact is that if we launch a future war on the atomic bomb level we will be forced to sink to biological, chemical, and bacteriological warfare and to face the possible destruction of modern civilization. We must at all cost, therefore, lay immediate and airtight plans for channeling aviation and atomic energy into peacetime activities and design all our planning away from war. So doing, we may look forward to a civilization fostering life more pleasant than ever before in the history of man. The alternative is death.

4. What international regulations are going to be laid down concerning freedom of the air? This may turn out to be the most important question before the world in establishing and maintaining the peace. The airplane can, given the opportunity, contribute as much to lasting peace as it contributed to winning the war. But its contribution will be nil if we hamper it with dog-in-the-manger nationalistic taboos. Of primary importance to world trade and world peace are a set of free-air cities or free-air islands which permit entrance and exit of planes of all nations without trade or immigration restrictions. Air over the poles and over each of the former Axis Powers should also be free, as well as over the Rhine and the Danube and over all mandated territories. Freedom of the air must be more than a phrase, it must be a slogan, the basis for a world program.

5. Domestically, every possible measure should be taken toward full-throttle aircraft production and the employment that such production implies. We must do this or face a depression more severe than any in our history. To cut aviation production back to its prewar level is to court domestic economic disaster. Nor is the problem economic only. If such a cut-back is enforced, it means that some 2,000,000 of America's finest youth trained to perfection in their specialties as airmen, will have their talents and their trained skills thrown on the junk heap. These talents are as valuable—indeed, they should be of more value—to our society in peace than in war. They should be neither junked nor squandered. They should be used at all—or any—cost. To jettison them at this time would be as stupid as it would have been to junk the railroads and railroaders after the Civil War. That talent should be used to the full to develop aircraft that will rival the automobile for utility, will make life in our civilization more livable and pleasant, and keep us at all times equipped with facilities and manpower to meet any challenge from other powers that the future may bring forth.

Aviation history will record 1945 as the year when the AAF smashed the Luftwaffe and, carrying its deadly atomic bomb, blasted the last Fascist stronghold and brought imperial Japan to its knees. It would be tragic indeed if world history does not also record that, as the year came to a close, we who now control the air failed to make it a highway to permanent peace and sustained world prosperity.

The Draft Not Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 10 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "We Don't Need the Draft," prepared by me and published in the American Magazine of the issue of December 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE DON'T NEED THE DRAFT

(By ELBERT D. THOMAS, United States Senator from Utah)

Must we depend on conscription to maintain our occupying forces in Germany, Japan, and other foreign lands? I don't think so. Compulsory military service in peacetime is undemocratic and un-American, and it will not provide the type of police force best suited to handling the sober responsibilities of sustaining peace in the world. Conscription should be abolished as soon as possible.

The Army, however, contends that we cannot achieve our purposes in Europe and the Pacific without indefinitely continuing the draft. Basing its estimates on prewar experience, the Army expects to get no more than 300,000 of the 1,000,000 needed for occupation forces from its present campaign for voluntary enlistments. The rest must be drafted, say Army officials.

But the Army's enlistment campaign is not offering the kind of inducements that will interest a large number of alert, ambitious American boys. The Army is relying on its old prewar system of recruiting, which merely offered a token salary of $20 a month, barracks life, and three meals a day. That system, I admit, will fail to attract enough men.

Furthermore, it will attract the wrong kind of men. It will appeal to the misfits and failures in civilian life who take refuge in the Army because of its security and freedom from responsibility. It will also appeal to the malcontents who learned to like the excitement of war and cannot adjust to the slower pace of normal civilian life—the "foreign legion" boys.

These are not the kind of men who can sell America to suspicious Italians, cynical Germans, and bewildered Japanese. For such men, unable to face the sober responsibilities of maintaining peace, most readily accept un-American notions themselves. Only men who are proud of America and what she stands for and who relish the idea of foreign service to preserve peace will really help in solving the many problems involved in straightening out the world.

How can we obtain such men?

I believe we can induce hundreds of thousands of alert American boys to volunteer if we strive to enlist their enthusiasm by making the service so attractive that they will flock to volunteer. I propose that we take these steps to make overseas service appealing to the right types of boys.

We should confine volunteers to unmarried high-school graduates between 17 and 22. The reason I propose that only high-school-educated boys be accepted is that we should use informed men as our occupation agents. High-school courses during the coming years will cover such subjects as air-age geography, the proposed federation of nations, our own Federal system of Government, and the inter-

dependence of all the national components of this atomic world.

We should guarantee to volunteers for occupation service that they will be in uniform only 2 years, part of which will be spent in Europe and part in Asia. This will offer young men just out of high school a grand opportunity to see the world, without being confined to any one spot long enough to become bored.

Before the volunteers leave America we would give them a brief course in military forms and training similar to that developed for FBI agents. This type training, in itself, may appeal to many youths. The training will be important, because a crucial part of the job of occupation is to see that no underground coalition of Axis financiers shall escape detection. We must not again be outwitted by the Axis powers as we were deceived by Germany after World War I. The caliber of our policing forces will largely determine our success.

While serving with the occupation forces, each volunteer would receive an attractive salary (higher than present Army pay), part of which would be withheld against his return home, to complete his studies or to go into business.

At the end of his foreign service he would be given the option of applying for a commission in the Army Reserve Corps.

I believe that most boys would jump at a chance to take a round-the-world tour at Government expense. By 17 or 18 most boys feel wanderlust. Only a few youngsters of the privileged classes can travel to Europe and the Orient on summer vacations from school, yet my proposal would make such travel possible for any boy.

Some critics may object that this voluntary service abroad would interrupt a boy's education. But certainly it would not interrupt his schooling any more—and probably less—than if he were drafted. As I see it, most boys would volunteer for his service upon completing their high-school education. The bulk of them would not go on to college anyhow, but even if they did plan to, the 2-year intermission for travel abroad would not set them back seriously.

For those boys who do not plan to continue beyond high school, but want to start work upon their return, their occupation in the service will be an asset, not a liability. Talent scouts for Standard Oil, Ford, General Electric—in fact, all the big exporting industries—are always looking for young men whose knowledge of the language and customs of foreign countries qualifies them to represent American business abroad.

The big question, of course, is whether even the inducements I have cited will produce enough volunteers to meet our needs. I think they will. No one knows exactly how many police troops we shall need, once the initial stages of occupation have passed. I think the policing can be done with far fewer men than is generally thought, particularly if we share the policing in Europe and Asia with our allies.

I believe that a fair division of occupation duties among the victors of the past war will accomplish more for the peace of the world than all the propaganda posters put together. You can preach the brotherhood of man until your breath gives out without creating real fellowship. As has been demonstrated in this war, the opportunity for Englishmen, Americans, Russians, Netherlanders, and Greeks to work together, to share their rations, their music, and their off-duty fun is the thing that makes men understand their kinship as men.

I do not propose that we immediately cut off conscription and substitute volunteer methods. Rather, I propose that we give volunteer methods a real chance, and taper off conscription as the number of volunteers rises. But let's make our volunteer methods so successful that conscription will be abolished.

If You Want Peace, Prepare for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 10 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "If You Want Peace, Prepare for Peace" by Austin J. App, Ph. D., which was published in the November 11 issue of Our Sunday Visitor, a popular national Catholic action weekly periodical, published in Huntington, Ind.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IF YOU WANT PEACE PREPARE FOR PEACE

(By Austin J. App, Ph. D.)

This is the time for all good men to write to the President and the Congress, "We don't want peacetime military conscription." On October 23, President Truman told a joint session of Congress, "I recommend to the Congress the adoption of a plan for universal military training."

"Such action," declared Booth Tarkington, best loved of American authors, "will change every American's life even more than the war itself has changed it. * * * No matter what we like to think, this will make the United States a permanently warlike country." (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 79th Cong., 1st sess.).

Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, on May 30, 1945, gave a speech entitled, "Compulsory Military Training in Peacetime Will Destroy Government by the People," in which he remarked, "Whether we become a militaristic and totalitarian country depends more on this measure than any other."

CONTRARY TO BEST AMERICAN TRADITION

Bishop Aloisius J. Muench, member of the Bishops' Peace Committee, writes emphatically:

"Men in responsible positions are advocating peacetime conscription. What our forefathers fled from in Europe is now to be introduced into our country; it is contrary to American traditions of more than sixteen decades. Warlike measures are not a guaranty of peace. (Pitfalls for Peace, 1945, p. 2). Senator TAFT further insists that "militarism has always led to war and not peace." He adds, "Conscription was no insurance of victory in France, in Germany, or in Italy." Booth Tarkington shows that in the two world wars every peacetime-conscription country was defeated once or twice, whereas the only countries which were twice victorious were the nonconscription countries—England and the United States.

Nevertheless many of our generals and admirals are calling for peacetime conscription. Booth Tarkington says that that's natural: "Every dancing teacher thinks everybody ought to learn to dance," and so similarly the generals want a lot of soldiers to drill (ibid, p. 2). Bishop Muench says: "Every war produces a large number of professional army men who, not caring to go back to civilian life, want to hold their jobs."

Even the atomic bomb hasn't discouraged the militarists from thumping for universal military training. When everybody was saying that atomic power made huge conscripted armies ridiculous, the conscriptionists went into a worried huddle and have come out to meet this huddle by simply demanding bigger and better armed forces than ever. With each new invention in the past, says General Marshall, the number of men required was increased.

ATOMIC BOMB CHANGED HIS MIND

But Charles G. Nolte, chairman of the American Veterans' Committee, once a conscriptionist, says the atomic bomb changed his mind. In an article entitled "Post-Atomic National Defense" (the Nation, September 29), he writes:

"In these circumstances, the present squabble over outlying bases will seem childish. A large navy would be an interesting target, although the aggressor might simply choose to ignore it. A conscript army could hardly be assembled, and if assembled would hardly find a place where it could fight to any good purpose—I hasten to withdraw my argument in favor of universal military training, advanced in these columns some months ago."

According to the Chicago Tribune's report of the convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, October 2, "some veterans are skeptical of the military value of a huge reserve because of the bomb's discovery."

But the immensely powerful American Legion organization (of which, incidentally, I am a member in good standing) greatly perplexed that the overwhelming mass of religious and educational leaders should oppose them in this, are the chief lobby force for peacetime conscription. "Universal military training is major objective in Legion's legislative program for this year," was the headline in the National Legionnaire of December 1944. In a speech entitled "The Legion and Labor," at New Orleans, November 22, 1944, the national commander, Edward N. Scheiberling, advocated peacetime conscription as insurance against war, and reminiscent of Cromwell's "Trust in God—and keep your powder dry," added:

"Quite obviously millions of young men being trained in a vast system of citizen-militia will help relieve the pressure of jobs in the immediate years ahead."

IT'LL BE HARD ON THE TAXPAYER

"When the bill to make universal peacetime military training a national policy is introduced in Congress let's all get behind it, and make sure that once it is passed the law is implemented with adequate appropriations." (Legion magazine, December 1944.)

Adequate appropriations for this peacetime conscription which the generals and the Legion want, and the clerygmen and the educators dread, are a sufficiently capacious pie for many to be able to get their finger in. Speaking of it, Representative LOUIS LUDLOW said:

"It is estimated by experts that the cost would be at least $2,500,000,000 and perhaps as high as $3,000,000,000 a year * * * the National Industrial Conference Board estimates * * * the wealth of the United States at $300,750,000,000. If compulsory military training should be made permanent, as the proponents hope it will be, its cost in one century would consume the equivalent of the total wealth of the United States. * * * The annual cost alone of the compulsory military-training program would equal the total wealth of four States—Delaware, Wyoming, Nevada, and New Mexico." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 12, 1945.)

NOW, IS COST OF EDUCATION SO HIGH?

This is a lot of money. Conscriptionists keep trying to suggest that for a rich nation like ours three billions for military training (above the cost of the Regular Army and Navy) is a bagatelle. But when anyone asks for a mere million for a school or a library they bemoan the "high cost of education." A comparison will show how really terrific is the cost of this conscription.

In 1933–34, the year for which I have the figures, endowment for higher education in the United States amounted to $1,539,727,565. That means the total endowment of American colleges and universities is only

half as much as the conscriptionists want to spend every year on civilian militarism.

The stupendous cost of peacetime conscription becomes still more accentuated when compared with the cost of public and parochial school education. In 1934 in all the grade schools and high schools of the land, public and private, there were 29,125,226 pupils. "The average cost per pupil in 1934 was $73.58" (New York Times item dated March 13, 1935). The total cost, therefore, of our whole elementary- and high-school system was $2,133,091,701, or less by about half a billion than the conscriptionists will need for their compulsory military training. Such training, which needs almost as many highly paid officers as inductees, is a moloch compared to which wholesome education is an ascetic.

And this supercostly training may be worse than useless, for, as Robert Maynard Hutchins suggests, "by the time the student comes to use what he has been taught, technological change has produced a situation in which he cannot use it," trained at 18, he may even be "a positive handicap to the Army at the age of 28" (Fellowship, Feb. 1945, p. 25).

SOLDIER ADVANCED, TEACHER RETARDED

That is why a nation which, like France from 1919 to 1939, goes in powerfully for peacetime conscription retrogresses educationally in peace and eventually becomes inefficient in war. Whenever in a nation the soldier steps forward, the teacher is forced back. With the teacher science and invention also slow up. Thus, while the generals of conscription countries prepare for the last war, the teachers and scientists of the nonmilitaristic, the more-money-for-education countries open up the new horizons which both in peace and in war go farthest.

We realized this for a hundred and fifty years. Let's not forget it now. We used to call the peacetime conscription of European countries a brutal, an immoral thing. Even now we speak of educating peacetime conscription out of Germany and Japan. What horrid hypocrites those who call wrong for others what they are busy doing themselves.

Bishop Muench says: "The maxim of militarists, 'Si vos pacem, para bellum—If you want peace prepare for war'—has once more been proved to be untrue," as it has a thousand times in man's bloody, tragic history. Isn't it more than time, after 2,000 years of Christianity, to change the slogan to: "If you want peace, prepare for peace"?

Tribute to George M. Putnam, President, New Hampshire Farm Bureau Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 10 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the editorial which appeared in the Manchester Union, Manchester, N. H., on November 29, 1945, concerning the reelection of George M. Putnam as president of the New Hampshire Farm Bureau Federation.

George M. Putnam's long retention as president of the New Hampshire Farm Bureau Federation is not only a merited recognition of his personal ability, but is indication of the high esteem in which he is held throughout the country, which has benefited much from his long and useful life.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"UNCLE GEORGE"

He was christened George Martin Putnam. Now, at 81, he is "Uncle George" to more people in New Hampshire and throughout the country than he could shake a stick at, as the saying goes. But George Martin Putnam, just reelected president of the New Hampshire Farm Bureau Federation, wouldn't shake that stick even if he could. He knows that there are more persuasive methods; among them well-founded arguments backed up by personal know-how.

It is no accident that Uncle George is now starting his thirty-first year as head of the State farm bureau. Neithe. is it by chance that he has arisen to high position in numerous other fields of responsibility, or that he has received two coveted medals, New Hampshire's own Charles Holmes Pettee medal, by the University of New Hampshire, and the American Farm Bureau award for distinguished service to American agriculture. And, as an insight into his character, it is not surprising to know that he himself has established the Putnam Agriculture Foundation in memory of his wife.

Uncle George Putnam is a busy man. Few at 81—or 61, 51, or 41, for that matter—would care to keep to his busy day-to-day schedule. He learned to work hard as a farm boy in Hopkinton, and never has forgotten that lesson. He is in demand as a speaker, as an expositor, as an arbiter, as a farmer, and as a businessman. In the course of a year there are few of those demands that he doesn't heed.

Uncle George will be 82 years old on the 18th of next January. That is to say, he will be 82 as far as standard measurements of time are concerned. A man is only as old as he feels, and today George Martin Putnam has the zest of youth, but more than that, the benefit of long years of varied experience.

The farm bureau—State-wide and nationally—knows a good man when it sees one.

The Passing of Mrs. Charles Evans Hughes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 10 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, we are grieving today over the death of a very lovable and charming American mother and wife. I refer to Mrs. Charles Evans Hughes. Horace Carlisle has prepared a poem on this fine American woman, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

She openeth her mouth with wisdom, and in her tongue is the law of kindness. (Proverbs 31: 26.)

THE PASSING OF MRS. CHARLES EVANS HUGHES

Death's called the wife of our recognized greatest
Living American, and she is gone—
And now our peace-loving Nation's sedatest
Living exjurist is left all alone—
She was to him what the sweet Martha Custis
Was to George Washington, down till he died—
She largely made the Supreme Court's Chief Justice
All that he was, which he never denied.

She felt his hold on the hearts of the people,
Throughout the length and the breadth of the land—
Her voice, like chimes from a village church steeple,
Echoed approval to all that he planned—
He, in the still hush of silence, will hear it,
Echoing on in the deeps of his heart—
Through the years, will the Chief Justice revere it,
Until the time comes for him to depart.

She has gone on, just to be there to meet him—
When he steps inside the great Pearly Gate,
She, with that same gentle, sweet voice will greet him,
And the reunion will be passing great.
Death is the entrance to God's long tomorrow—
December there is as sweet as is May—
There perfect peace abides, and not a sorrow
Clouds the clear sky of the great perfect day.

—*Horace C. Carlistle.*

The National Grange Legislative Platform

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has, of course, always been conscious of the needs of agriculture. I think it can be said that for decades past both major parties have been very responsive to the needs of the people engaged in agricultural operations. The National Grange at its recent annual convention adopted what, in my opinion, was an important and absolutely constructive set of proposals. It advocates sound legislation. For the information of the public, I include it in the RECORD:

Following are excerpts from the address of National Master Albert S. Goss before the seventy-ninth annual session of the National Grange in Kansas City, November 14 to 23. The address received the endorsement of the delegate body, making the position taken by the national master the policy of the National Grange.

"The farmer and the laborer have much in common. Both must work in order to live. Both face hazards beyond their control which threaten their ability to make a living. The farmer's market price may drop to a level below cost, so that he has no income upon which to live. Wage rates may go down to ruinous levels, or the laborer may lose his job. Both are responsible for producing most of the new wealth upon which civilization exists, and historically for extended periods, neither has enjoyed an equi-

table share of the income which they have been largely instrumental in creating.

"There are also important differences. Farmers, like industry, must furnish capital in order to provide themselves an opportunity to work. Labor has no such responsibility. Farmers risk the capital they have saved, and may not only lose their year's labor, but the savings of former years. Labor has no such problem. Farmers must meet certain overhead expenses before they receive any of the reward of their labor. Labor has no such responsibility. On the other hand, labor may find its income completely terminated without notice while farmers enjoy what might be called temporary security, and frequently are able to continue in possession of their farm with little or no income over long periods. * * *

"Both should realize, however, that this pay must come from what they produce; that there is no other source of income except through production. * * *

"If this could be done on a basis which is fair to labor, to industry, and to agriculture the Nation would enjoy uninterrupted prosperity far beyond anything known in human experience. * * *

"With such cooperation there should be no need of legislation with the inequities and injustice which would inevitably flow from any attempt to standardize rules of procedure. Success depends on the compensation being definitely related to output. * * *

"There has been too much lining up for or against the various proposals for labor legislation without enough effort to cure the defects and strengthen the good features. There have been too many threats by labor pressure groups for reprisals unless Members of Congress accepted all labor proposals as presented. There has been too little recognition on the part of labor that all income must spring from the production of wealth and that higher wages must depend on increased productivity. There have been too many slow-downs and too much "feather bedding." There have been too many hotheaded strikes in violation of labor contracts. In the case of new and inexperienced labor unions, there has frequently been almost a complete lack of responsibility and a total disregard of the welfare of the public. In many instances labor can secure justice and equity only through organization, but labor must grant justice and equity as well as receive it. If a labor union signs a labor agreement, ways must be found to compel compliance with the terms of the agreement. Employers, too, must be expected to live up to their agreements, or expect strikes and labor trouble.

"The whole public is vitally interested in this question. No lasting solution of the labor problem can be attained by force. Any lasting solution must be based on equity. The policies outlined in the three Grange Guide posts are as truly applicable in the field of labor and management as they are in the field of agriculture, and the Grange can play an important part in supporting a program which is fair and equitable to all groups within the meaning of these basic principles. Both labor and industry are shortsighted indeed when they fail to invite agriculture to sit in their councils, for agriculture has a very direct interest in labor relations, and the peculiar position it occupies often enables it to be a sound balance wheel in an unsettled economy.

"The right to quit work is the inalienable right of a free man. The denial of this right is slavery. Because a single individual is at a disadvantage in dealing with a powerful employer, the Congress has exempted both farmers' cooperatives and labor from the provisions of the Sherman antitrust law which prohibits conspiracies in restraint of trade, but such exemptions were granted to make fair play possible, and it was never the intention of the Congress to create monopolies which could impose their will on the rest of the community with no regard for the rights or the welfare of others. The right to strike is the right to quit work collectively. It carries with it no right to engage in violence, nor any right to deny anyone else the right to work * * *."

"It is not our purpose to hold employers blameless in all these strikes, neither is it our purpose to pass upon the merits of the many issues involved in the wave of strikes which threaten our whole reconversion program, and may well lead directly into another economic tailspin if permitted to go uncontrolled. However, when unions without any claimed grievance strike for the announced purpose of demonstrating their strength, it has an ominous appearance. When unions create work stoppages and shortages over jurisdictional disputes in which the employer has no interest, or when unions sign a contract and then deliberately break it, they show a dangerous lack of responsibility. Some means must be found to assure union responsibility, if unions are to enjoy the privileges they now enjoy under Federal law. When the power of organized labor is used to engage in racketeering or to compel employers to pay for labor not needed, they should forfeit these privileges * * *."

"A survey would probably show that most strike abuses have been among new organizations which have suddenly come into being in the enormous expansion of organized labor under Government cultivation. They have suddenly become aware of their power and the lack of Government restraint, and are apt to engage in excesses which will become less frequent with experience. Probably the well-meant Smith-Connally Act providing for strike votes under Government auspices, is being used by agitators to stir up trouble, and should be amended to cure the weaknesses which have developed, or be repealed. However, the present situation is serious and demands action.

"First. The Government should see that the law is promptly and fearlessly enforced.

"Second. The effect of the various Federal labor statutes should be studied and any amendments needed to assure fair play for labor, the employers, and the public should be promptly enacted. Under present law, when a strike threatens, the first effort is usually an attempt to mediate. If this fails, the next effort is to arbitrate. If this fails, it is suggested that the law might provide for a fact-finding commission to make sure that all the facts are clearly understood, both parties being under obligation to continue operation until the facts are developed.

"Third. Recognized leaders of labor and industry should take vigorous steps to eliminate broad causes of disagreement which may exist, and either reach a common understanding, or clearly define their differences so that the Congress can establish a sound policy. Incidentally, agriculture made up of both employers and workers has a very direct interest in this problem and should participate."

The National Grange at its recent seventy-ninth annual session adopted the following items with reference to labor problems:

"The existing unrest on the industrial front and the growing prevalence of strikes is a matter of grave concern to every thinking American.

"We won the war through cooperation and team play, and that is the way we should strive to win the peace.

"Group selfishness and greed for power should be held in abeyance and subordinated to the general welfare.

"As a former President of the United States used to put it, 'In the long run this country is not going to be a good place for any of us to live in unless it is a reasonably good place for all of us to live in.'

"It should be remembered that in every dispute between capital and labor there is a third party that has an interest at stake, and that is the general public. Like the innocent bystander at a riot, the public is often the first to get hurt.

"Without attempting to fix the blame in every instance, it is sufficient to say that the public is rapidly getting fed up on the existing situation.

"Labor and industry should sit down together at the council table in a spirit of mutual helpfulness and cooperation and peaceably adjust their differences, paving the way for the giant task of reconversion.

"If the present situation is allowed to continue much longer, there will be an irresistible demand for a revision of the Wagner Labor Relations Act, so as to make it a two-way act instead of a one-way act, which is at present the case.

"We call for immediate action on the Hobbs antiracketeering bill, which is necessary legislation to correct a legal loophole in existing legislation.

"Any horizontal wage increase over even one industry is certain to contain inequities, and there can be no doubt but that the 30-percent horizontal increase now being demanded is highly inflationary and unsound.

"Within recent months certain groups in large eastern terminal markets have made demands on commission houses and receivers of perishable foods that they abandon their long-established 6-day week and adopt a 5-day program.

"This move, sponsored by labor-union representatives, has cost growers and shippers millions of dollars, and denied consumers hundreds of cars of badly needed foods.

"The 5-day week is forcing growers to change their cropping systems, to modify their marketing operations, and is causing heavy losses of perishable products that must be sold on a daily basis.

"Whereas labor unions are forcing many terminal markets to operate on a 5-day market week by unfair and uneconomic practices; and

"Whereas these practices result in heavy losses to both growers and consumers with no opportunity to meet these added burdens: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the National Grange go on record as being opposed to the 5-day week in perishable food markets and supports legislation that will curb activities of unions in interfering with normal and essential food-marketing services.

"We all have a vital interest in a high level of employment. With a large consumer demand existing today and a productive plant in America capable of providing the essential agricultural and industrial contributions to a high standard of living we must strive for:

"1. Close cooperation of labor and management to secure increased productivity per worker.

"2. A stable general price level.

"3. Slowly rising wage rates based on increased productivity.

"4. A high level of employment of a growing labor force.

"Thus a high level of employment seems axiomatic so long as we do not permit violation of the Grange guide posts.

"First. All prosperity springs from the production of wealth, or consumer goods. Stating it another way, any program which retards the production of wealth is unsound.

"Second. The compensation of each should be based upon what he contributes to the general welfare.

"Third. The prime purpose of government is to protect its citizens from aggression, both physical and economic."

Shortage of Penicillin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, there is a severe shortage of penicillin to an extent that endangers the health and safety of the people in my district and possibly the entire country.

There is widespread grippe in my part of the country of a more severe type. I am advised that there is a great deal of this sickness here in Washington, D. C., and other sections of the Nation.

It has only been through the grace of Almighty God that the citizens of the United States have not been decimated by some kind of epidemic during the war years. With resistance lowered by war work, lack of food, and other items, we have been well-favored in heaven that disease has not swept the country. The policy of the Army and Navy in hoarding to a degree that was and still is fantastic, doctors and nurses could only contribute to the danger. The civilian population was and still is woefully lacking in a sufficient number of doctors and nurses to care for it. And this crisis is not yet passed by any means. Now is the time of the year when the dread scourge of respiratory diseases, in particular, lays low millions of our people.

In my district today there is no supply of penicillin for the public. All pharmaceutical houses say they have none for the public and say they do not know what the reason is. That is a most unsatisfactory answer for me, and I refuse to accept it for the families in my district. The only penicillin being shipped is to hospitals, and even these are cut one-fourth of their requirements. If there is any left the doctors come next—only there is never any left. And none is being sent to the drug stores by the pharmaceutical houses.

People and the doctors are told to send the seriously ill to hospitals—why there is a list of at least 150 applicants waiting to get into the hospitals.

When penicillin was made available to the public a few months ago, the price dropped from $4 to 60 cents per phial. Now, if by chance, you can get a phial, and that is impossible in the area I speak of, it is $1.35 a phial and going up. Who is to blame for this? Certainly not the doctors nor the druggists. Why is there a shortage of penicillin in Luzerne County, Pa.? What answers will the pharmaceutical houses give? These companies should not be allowed to make a racket out of this life-saving drug. Now they make tablets of the drug and sell 12 tablets at $12.60 or $1.05 each. A phial of the drug in liquid form has 27 doses and costs $5 per dose if the price is $1.35 the last I heard per phial. The tablets therefore cost 21 times as much.

There is more than mere convenience to this tablet plan—that is excess profit with a vengeance. Then, too, these big drug companies are scattering a little penicillin here and there in all kinds of ointments, salves, pills, and so forth. And these bring high prices and excessive profits. Could it be that these drug manufacturing companies are sitting back like certain other manufacturing companies and doing nothing in the line of production for the balance of this year because of the excess-profits tax which will be lifted in January 1946? Could it be that they are selling to the English market at a higher price than the domestic market?

In the name of the good people of my district I demand an answer to these questions. But more right now than even that, I want penicillin made available to those in need of it in Wilkes-Barre and the surrounding area—and at once. A reputable physician from Wilkes-Barre was in touch with me by telephone yesterday and protested the circumstances which have produced this penicillin shortage.

If I do not get action in 24 hours, I am going to demand a congressional investigation of the drug-manufacturing companies and the production and distribution of especially these new and miraculous drugs that must be made available to the public.

Legion Says OPA Rules Operate Against Veterans

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, we are facing the Christmas season, millions of people are trying to buy practical Christmas merchandise, including clothing and textile articles, electrical appliances, stoves and washing machines from hundreds of thousands of merchants throughout this land whose stocks, to a large extent, are depleted and the merchants' shelves in many instances, are bare of goods.

Plant machinery is ready to turn out the goods, labor is plentiful, much of which cannot be employed because the OPA insists on holding price levels back to 1942 which, in many instances, prevents the manufacturer from making the goods because of increase in his costs, prevents the distributor and wholesaler from shipping them to the merchants and necessarily deprives the merchants of an opportunity to sell the goods. Worse than this it prevents millions of citizens throughout the Nation from buying possibly a billion dollars worth of goods, ranging from children's wear through the clothing line, and electrical appliances from irons, to washing machines and radios and through the hardware line, from toys to stoves.

During the past 2 months volumes of testimony have been taken before the Banking and Currency Committee on a resolution to correct these abuses which is buried in that committee of the House.

A case has been made out in the interest of the people, yet nothing can be done to give them relief because the proposed legislation cannot be brought to the floor of the House.

As evidence that the people are interested, I hold in my hand petitions which have been signed by the customers of retail merchants in southern Illinois who have sought to buy merchandise but cannot secure it. Over a thousand names have been filed with me from a small territory in Illinois urging the Congress to take such steps in causing a modification of the regulations of OPA so that they may buy the necessities of life ranging from clothing which is seriously needed by them up to furniture and household equipment.

Proof has been given before the Smith committee that reconversion is being held back which is preventing the employment of thousands of workers who are anxious to produce civilian goods but are denied the opportunity because the manufacturer, the wholesaler, and retailer cannot operate on 1942 price levels in a great many instances.

Something must be done to change these conditions and it is apparent that it will not be done unless the Members of Congress get together and force such action.

The matter is so serious that it has been brought to the attention of the national employment committee of the American Legion by Commander Ralph A. Sentman, national director of veterans' affairs.

Commander Sentman pointed out that the prices fixed by the OPA are a handicap to the World War veterans who are returning and are trying to open up small businesses throughout the Nation. He points out that the 1942 prices fixed by the OPA as of 1942 presumes:

1. That the veteran has shared in the abnormal volume of wartime sales, which he has not.

2. That the veteran earned abnormally good wartime profits and as a result has ample cash reserves, which he has not.

He says:

These are the handicaps under which veterans currently go into business. Most young businessmen make up for short resources by giving unusual services. They sell more than merchandise. Under present pricing regulations they will be unable to bear such expense. OPA regulations are based upon the experience of merchants who have not been giving such services.

The serviceman faces another handicap. He is going into business in the face of the tightest supply situation that has existed since war broke out in Europe in 1939. Reconversion is not clicking, and inept, uneconomic price controls largely are responsible. OPA says that goods must come back to the market at 1942 prices. Meanwhile labor and raw materials costs have gone up sharply.

The OPA policy denies the manufacturer a chance to recover his cost of making goods and earn a fair profit in many cases. As a result they simply refuse to make the goods and the economy actually has been drying up since VJ-day instead of expanding as it should. This, unless checked, will result in unusual unemployment conditions and veterans will suffer.

The young veteran will find it hard to get satisfactory goods to sell in the face of this situation. Suppliers naturally may be expected to sell their short stocks largely to their old customers. Meanwhile, the veteran will be approached by the "snow birds" of industry with bootleg goods of questionable quality for sale in black markets at ll the traffic will bear.

The national economy is suffering from overcontrol at the moment. It must remain stabilized until supply begins to reassert itself and competitive conditions return. But trying to hold a fictitious level of 1942 is not stabilization. A sound stabilization policy merely is a process of permitting manufacturers and distributors to recover the full cost of the goods they sell plus a fair profit.

This is not inflationary. Actually, attempts to hold unrealistic price lines that dry up production are a strong inflationary pressure at the moment. Stabilization that insures recovery of cost plus a decent profit will provide sufficient incentive to start goods rolling. Such a policy also is sufficiently tight to protect the consumer against persons who might take speculative or windfall profit.

The interests of veterans who want to go into distributive or service trades best would be served by adoption of the following policies:

1. Manufacturers and producers of all types should be permitted to recover the full cost of making or producing goods with a fair allowance for profit.

2. Distributors should be permitted to recover the full cost of the goods and services they sell plus an allowance for decent profit.

These policies would insure everyone in the economy a fair deal, encourage production, stimulate employment, and return the country to its normal democratic pattern of free enterprise under competitive conditions.

It is apparent to the people and should be apparent to the OPA that its policies are dangerously inflationary. A slight increase in prices which would increase the production and supply of goods might bend the line a bit but it would be better to bend the line with a supply of goods than to break the line by denying the goods to the public which has the money with which to buy. It would be better to bend the line and encourage reconversion and the employment of millions of people rather than to keep them unemployed and prevent a supply of goods equal to the demand.

The OPA should attempt to stimulate production rather than to restrict it as it has been doing. It has insisted on retaining wartime controls of prices that discourage civilian production at a time when it should readjust controls to provide incentives for greater production.

The line has not been held because the quality of the goods has been greatly reduced. It cannot be held unless production is increased. Prices should be readjusted upward in many instances to give impetus to production and distribution. Control at higher levels is not inflationary when it brings a much greater production of civilian goods and a better and more fair income for both the maker, the seller, and the employer. What this country needs now to prevent inflation and against which the Government can tax to carry our enormous governmental expense is more goods, more men employed, and higher incomes for all to prevent inflation and to help carry the current expenses of Government.

What the retailers want is not necessarily elimination of controls now—they want honest, new, peacetime readjustment of controls that recognize economic laws. They want these changes to insure production. If OPA will make these changes production will come forth in such volume that practically all controls can be eliminated in the very near future.

It is indeed unfortunate that in this country of ours with billions of dollars worth of machinery capable of mass production, with men ready to man the machines, that one bureau in Washington can stifle reconversion, deny the people of the goods they want to buy and deny our laboring men and returning soldiers an opportunity for employment and an opportunity to succeed in business.

The Members of Congress should insist that the resolution be reported out promptly from the Smith committee so that we may get on our way toward an economy of abundance by production rather than an economy of scarcity that ultimately may envelop the country in ruinous inflation.

Public Demands Support of Small Business Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a feature article which appeared in the Cassapolis (Mich.) Vigilant, under heading "Personal observations of the Vigilant editor." This is typical of the public demand throughout the country for full support of the House Small Business Committee:

Thousands of small towns like Cassopolis and small cities like Wowagiac, Niles, and Three Rivers depend for their prosperity upon business enterprises that are small in comparison to those in our larger cities, and the future of these small businesses depend largely upon the consideration and treatment they receive at our National Capital. Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, chairman of the House Committee on Small Business, on November 18 said:

"I am definitely of the opinion that big interests of the country are endeavoring to persuade the House of Representatives to scuttle the Committee on Small Business of the House.

"There is a sinister force in this country that is trying to break down any sincere efforts to help small business during the transition period, thereby aiding big business and monopoly.

"Small business has no Washington lobby, and its interests can be protected only if those who sincerely desire to see justice done to small firms are permitted to proceed with their work."

Norman C. Wolfe, president of the American Coach Co., in Cassopolis, in his efforts to procure much needed materials, has had reason to feel the effects of big business procedure. In discussing Congressman PATMAN's statements with the writer of this column, he said:

"I fully subscribe to Congressman PATMAN'S statement. Had it not been for an investigation conducted by the House Committee on Small Business to certify to the urgent need for mobile housing to aid in the war effort, the trailer-coach industry, including our company, would undoubtedly have been delayed another full year in its effort to return to normal conditions. The findings of the committee were so effective that we were permitted by the War Production Board to a full civilian status in April 1944, under a ration plan that required our coaches to be channeled into the hands of war and other essential workers to relieve acute housing conditions. This rationing plan was revoked on May 16, 1945. We are now limited only in our ability to produce coaches by serious material shortages.

"The present outlook," said Mr. Wolfe, "presents an even more uncertain future. Small industrial business and merchants in nearly all lines must face and overcome the tremendous pressure forced at all angles on Washington agencies to gain preferential treatment in getting supplies and raw materials. An eager government can easily 'control or take over' a dozen large companies but the strength of our country, politically and economically, lies in the small businessman and the thousands of small merchants scattered in thousands of communities throughout our Nation. We must fight to keep from being overrun by large industrial and financial interests who seem to be able to reach listening ears in Washington. Small business will be controlled or taken over only to the extent it accepts or rejects the doctrine of defeatism. Defeated, the country may well be expected to take an entirely different course; to win is to guarantee not only the sanctity and right of the small businessman and merchant, but to add immeasurably to the preservation of free government, free enterprise, and democracy itself."

We believe Mr. Wolfe's experience of the past few years enables him to know the situation, and what he told us is worthy of the consideration of all good citizens.

Demobilization of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the old General Hershey formula that it is cheaper to keep our boys in the service both here and overseas than to bring them home and keep them on relief, is still working.

Some of our boys, especially in the Pacific, were told 6, 8 and 10 weeks ago that they had sufficient points and would be home for Christmas. Now they are being told bluntly that their hopes are being blasted. Some are told cruelly that that promise was made only to bolster up their morale, others that they are still needed, others that there are insufficient ships to take them home, and so forth.

Some are discouraged, other depressed, many in despair. Many write home, "I had so expected to be home by Christmas, but it is not to be and I thought I would let you know so you will not make any plans."

I have received hundreds of letters from various families of servicemen

relaying the foregoing and other similar statements.

Our political leaders will be asked a lot of questions when these boys finally do get home. They are aware of the Hershey formula notwithstanding the above-named alibis of their commanding officers. They do not like the labor situation because they believe New Deal politicians are using it as a part of the formula.

Members of Congress could help our servicemen in no better way than to sign discharge petitions at the desk.

1945 Resolutions of Winneshiek County Farm Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions adopted on November 13, 1945, by the Farm Bureau of Winneshiek County, Iowa:

1945 RESOLUTIONS OF WINNESHIEK COUNTY FARM BUREAU

I. DEVELOPMENT OF PERMANENT PEACE PLANS

(a) Because we are interested in every possible means of avoiding the terrific cost of life and property which would result from another World War, we favor the general plan which has been drawn up to maintain world order which was proposed and adopted by the delegates of the 50 nations at the San Francisco Conference.

(b) We continue our support of legislation for world trade which will make for better international relationships through more freedom of exchange of goods between nations.

II. PRODUCTION AND PRICING POLICY

(a) As farmers we favor the continuation of the present parity formula as a guide for agriculture pricing because it still stands as the fairest yardstick which has been so far developed.

(b) Should it be to the general welfare to change the parity formula we favor its adjustment on the basis of securing effective consumption, which, in the long run, determines the price of farm products.

(c) We favor the policy of governmental control in the adjustment of agricultural production and urge that support prices and some form of production control must go hand in hand to be effective over a period of years.

(d) We believe that a pricing program for agricultural commodities should be based on development of foreign markets and a commodity loan program tied to production control if necessary.

(e) Because of the extreme weather risks which all farmers must take in the production of their crops, we favor a simple crop insurance program with emphasis on as much local control as possible for its best operation.

III. EMPLOYMENT AND INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION

(a) We are concerned with the strife which is now going on in industry and labor relationships and believe continued conferences of responsible leaders in labor, industry, and agriculture should continue to be held in order to clarify and work out over-all national policy to the best interests of the three groups.

(b) While the manpower shortage is very much in evidence now, we believe unemployment will be one of the major problems in the Nation in the years ahead. We urge curtailment of monopoly in industry, production of goods as efficiently as possible, fair wages for workers, and Government aid to returning veterans in assuring them of their jobs when they return from service.

(c) We believe that because of development of labor-saving equipment, a fewer number of persons will find jobs on farms in the years ahead, and urge development of more industry as a solution to unemployment rather than a policy of trying to put more persons on the land.

IV. SOIL CONSERVATION

(a) We believe great emphasis should be placed on soil conservation in any general or special farm program which may be developed.

(b) In our opinion, any program of price support or production control should go hand in hand with stress on the conservation of soil resources.

(c) Experience during the past few years has proven it is good national policy to make conservation payments for effective soil-building practices because it will be to the best interests of everyone to maintain a productive soil.

(d) We believe that an effective program in soil conservation depends on continued educational work, and urge that Extension Service give more assistance in educational efforts toward soil conservation.

(e) Because we feel that materials used for commercial fertilizer are natural resources, we support the national fertilizer policy adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation which would assist in making available the right kinds of fertilizer for every farm at a reasonable cost.

V. STATE LEGISLATION

(a) We reaffirm our stand of previous years in supporting the principle of taxation on the basis of ability to pay rather than continuation of the heavy load on property. For this reason we urge our Representatives and Senators to support the full collection of the Iowa net income tax. We favor reasonable tax exemption for World War veterans and continue our stand for exemption of cooperatives as well as religious and educational institutions.

(b) Schools:

1. We commend the last Iowa General Assembly for legislation passed to take Iowa out of forty-eighth place in its State aid for schools program. We believe further legislation is necessary to secure tax equality in support of schools and urge passage of bills as recommended by the Iowa school-code committee, members of which made a thorough, nonpartisan study of the school problems.

2. We commend members of the Winneshiek County school-study committee and school officials for their efforts in getting these facts before the people of Winneshiek County.

(c) Our observations lead us to believe that noxious weeds are at an all-time high in seriousness and because of the potential spread of new noxious weeds such as creeping jonny and horse nettle, we urge serious thought on the part of those responsible, toward organized action and an educational campaign on noxious weeds in Winneshiek County. Study indicates that an effective county weed commissioner system is making more general progress than the township system and we urge the local board of supervisors to consider this plan in 1946. We also urge continuation of AAA payments for weed-control practices.

(d) In order to complete an adequate network of secondary roads in the county, we commend the last legislature in its appropriation in matching Federal funds for this purpose and urge that this fund be expanded to complete this improvement as soon as possible.

VI. ADMINISTRATION AND COORDINATION OF FARM PROGRAM

(a) We commend the recently approved plan by the AAA of allocating of a definite sum of money for soil building, with the determination of these practices to be paid for being decided through local administration.

(b) We commend the conservative policy of the Farm Security Administration in helping to hold down inflation, as well as its plan to assist returned veterans who need credit for farm uses.

(c) We urge continued study of governmental credit agencies in an effort to combine some of the credit activities into one local office because of the confusion on the part of farm people as to where to go and what agency to contact in filling their credit needs. We commend the Farm Credit Administration in its effort to hold down inflation through its conservative appraisal policy.

(d) Because the job of supplying technical assistance is important for a successful soil-conservation program, we approve the work of the Soil Conservation Service as an agency specifically assigned to this job. We appreciate the efforts of the district soil commissioners in administering the district program and pledge our support to an effective and expanding conservation program.

VII. INFLATION CONTROL

(a) As farmers, we believe general inflation control measures have been effective and that in general these measures have been fair to agriculture.

(b) We urge that every effort be made to continue inflation controls into a period sufficiently long in the future to hold down inflation which might easily get out of hand and wipe out many of the gains already made. We see no reason for enactment of legislation to prevent inflation on real estate as the control measures might be worse than the results.

VIII. RURAL HEALTH PROGRAMS

(a) We urge the study by and the organization of, rural groups in order to make better use of the public health facilities which we already have available. When the need arises, we urge that these services be expanded. We commend the local Board of Supervisors for maintaining the county health program which is of much service to the people of Winneshiek County.

(b) In order that farm people enjoy adequate medical care and attention we favor the study and the working out of arrangements whereby farm families may secure voluntary prepayment health insurance. These plans have proven satisfactory and we expect will be more effective and useful in the future. We are opposed to any compulsory governmental health insurance program.

(c) Our studies show that health authorities recommend 40 hospital beds for each 1,000 people. In Iowa there are less than 3 hospital beds per 1,000 people. This is evidence of the lack of adequate facilities for rural families. We urge that hospital authorities study with rural leaders, ways and means of making recommended facilities easily accessible in the years ahead. We favor the passage of the Hill-Burton bill which would provide financial help to health centers to be of more service to rural areas.

IX. IOWA STATE COLLEGE—EXTENSION SERVICE

(a) We express our appreciation for the effective educational program which has been carried on through the leadership of Iowa State College and urge that in order to reach all farm families each county have funds available for a full time 4-H club agent in addition to the county home economist and extension director.

(b) In order to provide experimental information on crops, soils, and other subjects we urge location of an experiment farm in the soil type area most prevalent in Winneshiek County and pledge our cooperation to this type of program.

X. LIVESTOCK, CROPS, AND MARKETING

(a) Under our present marketing system, producers of top-quality livestock receive little reward for their efforts and we urge study toward eventual marketing of livestock on a graded basis.

(b) We urge continuation of the study of marketing facilities in order that cooperatives may use their federated resources in the marketing of products. In the future, quality products will be one of the important goals if good prices are to be received by producers.

XI. IMPORTANCE OF IMPROVING AND MAINTAINING AN EFFECTIVE FARM BUREAU

(a) We commend the House of Delegates in establishing a State membership goal and believe a long-time membership goal should be set for 125,000 members for the State.

(b) We urge further study in regard to ways and means of keeping members informed on national and State legislative proposals and methods of securing their discussion on these issues.

XII. GENERAL

(a) We believe that competent service is the first consideration in the qualifications to handle a county office, and for that reason county officers should be elected on a nonpartisan basis.

(b) We take this means of expressing our sincere appreciation to the newspapers of the county. Their cooperation has meant much in extending information to the farm homes in the county.

(c) Luther College officials have continued their fine cooperation in making radio station KWLC available for weekly radio broadcasts and our appreciation is hereby expressed for this courtesy.

(d) We commend the committees and the individuals whose vision made possible the purchase of the desirable property near the Decorah Post Office and urge the support of all members in attaining the goal toward the worth-while Agricultural Memorial Building. We urge a continued campaign in order that funds may be available to make this building possible as a memorial to World War II veterans and a useful building of which all Winneshiek County would be proud to have had a part in planning.

JOHN AMDAHL, *Chairman,*
Ossian, Iowa,
C. M. LANGLAND,
Spring Grove, Minn.,
A. J. KUHN, *Calmar, Iowa,*
T. E. SELNES, *Mabel, Minn.,*
Mrs. R. M. BJONERUD,
Calmar, Iowa,
Mrs. MELVIN FLASKERUD,
Ridgeway, Iowa,
JOE V. FRANA,
Fort Atkinson, Iowa,
County Resolutions Committee.

Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance

REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am including as a part of my remarks a resolution adopted by the Hennepin Board of County Commissioners, Hennepin County, Minn., in reference to the so-called Townsend bill.

Hennepin County includes half of my district and all of the Fifth District of Minnesota. I have been trying for a long time to see if I could not speed up action and get a vote of the House on the Townsend bill.

The resolution following is an endorsement of H. R. 2229, known as the Townsend bill:

Whereas during the 10 years that the old-age and survivors insurance law has now been in operation it has collected $7,083,000,000 from the citizens of this country. Of this vast sum it has returned only $807,000,000 to the channels of business and employment back home, through benefits to beneficiaries; and

Whereas to extend and broaden this present old-age and survivors insurance law to cover more millions of our citizens, as now proposed by some, would mean an even greater flow of tax dollars to Washington with a correspondingly small return in benefits to recipients back home and, thus to business and employment channels throughout the Nation; and

Whereas greater buying power among our lower income groups in every city, town, and village over the country will be an immediate and vital factor in creating more business, employment and prosperity in our postwar era; and

Whereas the operation of the present old-age and survivors insurance law shows clearly that this law is insufficient and wholly inadequate to provide this buying power or meet the future demands and needs of our people; that plans are now being considered in Washington to revise and improve this law; and

Whereas there is now before the House Ways and Means Committee Congressman CANNON'S Federal insurance bill, H. R. 2229, which provides for adequate social insurance for all unemployable citizens over 18 years old, widows with one child or more to support and voluntary retirement at 60 years; and

Whereas all tax revenue collected under this bill each month (less administration costs) will be prorated among the qualified beneficiaries and returned to the channels of trade, creating more business and employment throughout the Nation, all within 60 days time: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Hennepin Board of County Commissioners in regular session assembled, That we hereby respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to pass the Cannon Federal insurance bill, H. R. 2229, at the earliest possible time, in order to give adequate social insurance to all our citizens and to provide the necessary buying power to insure increased business and employment at home in postwar America; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives; Senators HENRIK SHIPSTEAD and JOSEPH H. BALL; and Congressmen WALTER H. JUDD and WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER.

The St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I started out to make reports to the American people on the state of the Union concerning the St. Lawrence project on November 12, and I have made a report each week since that time. My report today makes the sixth time that I have found it necessary to remind that American people that somewhere in Washington there is a boy named Rip Van Winkle. As I recall it Rip Van Winkle slept for 18 years, but I am rusty on my globaloney, and one of the students tells me that that old New York boy, Rip, slept for 20 years. It begins to look as though the men in charge of the administration program looking toward the development of the are thinking about a 20 years' nap. That is a long time, but the American people have put up with a lot of atrocities on the home front and I suppose a choice of having the St. Lawrence seaway and power project murdered in cold blood, die of starvation and neglect, probably the intelligentsia, speaking in the language of the administration leaders, have just decided to put this old knight known as St. Lawrence to sleep for 20 years. I vigorously and vehemently object to giving him any long period of rest like that. Why? He might not even wake up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on the 2d day of October 1945, with the rattle of drums and blare of trumpets and the noise of the sabers, we were told that the St. Lawrence seaway and power project had the blessing of the administration. I do not believe it. There has not been a thing done from that day to this on the part of responsible administration leaders, except to mark time.

A lot of people are wearing out their shoes drilling around like wooden soldiers, and while we seem to have plenty of shoe leather, I do not like to see the boys wear out their wooden shoes. Let us have some action. Measured in point of days, it has been 69 days as of today, December 10, 1945, since we were assured that everything was all right. Now, on the sixty-ninth day, right here in the city of Washington, the weatherman favors us with a big snow storm. Even the weatherman is laughing at these protestations of speed which appears to be in reverse motion.

Just to get things in chronological order, and by way of repetition, I again call attention to the fact that I introduced a House bill, H. R. 671, which does not differ materially from present pending legislation in the House and Senate. This bill provided for the immediate construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project and was introduced January 4, 1945. That was 11 months and 6 days ago.

But turning aside from ancient history and coming down to date, we note—and I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix page A5258, for December 4, 1945, where this language is used:

This legislation has strong bipartisan sponsorship. In the Senate, Senate Joint Resolution 104 was introduced on October 2, as a joint resolution, by Senator BARKLEY, Democrat, Kentucky, for himself and Senators WAGNER, Democrat, New York; HILL, Democrat, Alabama; TAYLOR, Democrat, Idaho; AIKEN, Republican, Vermont; FERGUSON, Republican, Michigan; LANGER, Republican, North Dakota; VANDENBERG, Republican, Michigan; SHIPSTEAD, Republican, Minnesota; and LA FOLLETTE, Progressive, Wisconsin.

This resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 104, was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, where it now reposes, and, as I have said, 69 days have now elapsed.

October 3, 1945, President Truman sent a message to Congress calling for construction of the St. Lawrence project.

October 4, 1945, I called for immediate action on the Barkley resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 104. See Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A4170.

On November 12, 1945, I called attention to delay, and no action on the Barkley resolution. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 10601; also Appendix, page A4835.

On November 19, 1945, I called attention to delay. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 10810; also Appendix, page A4988; RECORD for November 19.

On November 20, 1945, this matter was discussed in the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives. Appendix, page A5231; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for December 3, 1945.

On November 26, 1945, I called attention to continued delay. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for November 26, page 10985; also CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, same date, Appendix, page A5109.

On December 3, 1945, I again called attention to the unexplained delays. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for December 3, 1945, Appendix, page A5231; also CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for December 3, 1945, Appendix, page A5246.

FARMERS OF THE NATION AND OTHERS WANT TO KNOW WHY THE DELAY

Mr. Speaker, some forty or fifty million people in the midwestern part of the United States want to know the answer to the $64 question, "Why this delay?" Among these people are farmers, businessmen, small manufacturers, and people in every walk of life who want the Midwest to have the advantages of water transportation rates in order to promote their economic welfare. Next year, the politicians will be around in the Midwest looking for votes. We are making the record now for or against the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. The voters will decide next fall who has short-changed them on this great undertaking, unless, of course, Rip Van Winkle wakes up and goes to work. Will we have to say next year that we have a Rip Van Winkle administration?

RIP VAN WINKLE AND THE SEAWAY

While we are waiting for developments on the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, Mr. Speaker, it will do not harm to turn to literary pursuits and I now observe that Washington Irving wrote some documents which are rated as masterpieces. The one which will give him a place among the immortals is the story of Rip Van Winkle. Rip is an imaginary character, and when Washington Irving wrote it he credited the authorship with another imaginary character, Diedrich Knickerbocker. I fortified myself today with the Sketch Book from the Congressional Library, and I refer to the introduction which is in these lines:

RIP VAN WINKLE—A POSTHUMOUS WRITING OF DIEDRICH KNICKERBOCKER

By Woden, God of Saxons,
From whence somes Wensday, that is Wodensday,
Truth is a thing that ever I will keep
Unto thylike day in which I creep into
My sepulcher.

—*Cartwright.*

Then follows an explanatory note to the effect that the story of Rip Van Winkle was found among Diedrich's papers. Then, of course, is the delightful story of the Catskill Mountains and a recital that at the foot of the mountains was a little Dutch village; that Rip lived there for many years; that everybody liked the fellow, and that not a dog would bark at him throughout the neighborhood. However, Rip fell out with work and was one of those boys who liked to live in idleness. There is the story of his wife who tried to reform Rip, but without success, so Rip strolled away into the woods in order to escape work on the farm and the lectures of his good wife. He took his gun, accompanied by his dog Wolf, one fine autumn day and went into the mountains, and he encountered a strange figure and naturally Rip and this fellow struck up an acquaintance and rambled through a ravine, until they met some odd-looking personages. Rip had no trouble adapting himself to the new and strange surroundings, and, as Washington Irving says, he was a thirsty soul and started to take a few drinks with the folks and he fell into a deep sleep. This kept up for 20 years. Finally he awoke and then follows the portrayal of Rip's adventures and the progress the world had made in that period of 20 years. As I have indicated, if you want to read this story while you are waiting for the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, go over to the Congressional Library.

WHERE WILL WE GET THE MONEY?

To get back to business, Mr. Speaker, someone is going to ask where we are going to get the money for the St. Lawrence project. Well, we could get it the same place that this administration is getting $500,000,000 to pour down a rat hole (called a loan to France; the same place they will get $4,000,000,000 for another country that is hard up, Great Britain; and the same place that they will get the money for poverty-stricken Joe Stalin, who only wants $6,000,000,000). When the boys want to waste money they do not have any trouble finding it.

I realize that the American taxpayers are entitled to consideration. However, there is a sharp line of distinction. There are those projects which are worth while and which will benefit the American people. When we spend money on those projects, which is an investment which will pay large dividends in way of increased wealth of our country. Then there are those projects and other methods of spending money, which have no economic value. These loans for example belong to this latter class. So do boondoggling like raking leaves from one side of the street to the other. We need have no hesitation in appropriating money when the investment is going to come back in dividends.

British Duties on Gifts to Needy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include some interesting correspondence regarding duties levied by the British Government on gift packages sent by Americans to needy relatives in England:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *November 6, 1945.*
DR. WALTER JUDD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. JUDD: During the war I have been sending 5-pound parcels of groceries and Christmas gifts to my elderly brother and his family, to help them out in a very needy situation, as I understood Britain was glad for us to do all we could to help our relatives out during such a critical period.

I did not learn until the 1st of October that for every parcel sent they have had to pay duty on them.

My brother, a retired doctor, has been bombed out of three homes. One he occupied, himself and family, the other two he rented. Those he rented were smashed to atoms. The one he lived in was so badly damaged he could not remain in it. So they moved to another part of the county, Surrey by name, just outside of London, and have lived part of the time in an air-raid shelter in the yard. Although an old man, he has contributed to the war effort filling out prescriptions for the doctors in the different dispensaries in their city.

I am much disappointed that they in their position must pay duty on the little help we are allowed to send them. Remember, these gifts are unsolicited.

I hope England, who has urged the United States to send gifts of clothing, etc., will be generous enough to cancel the duty on gifts to some of her people if she wants to be good friends of the United States of America.

Thanking you for any influence you can exert, I am,

Yours sincerely,

MRS. A. G. YOUNG.

NOVEMBER 23, 1945.

MRS. A. G. YOUNG,
Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR MRS. YOUNG: The British Embassy has replied to my inquiry as to why duty is charged on gift packages sent to English citizens. It states that British customs officials report the duty on foodstuffs is so low that the people have not been objecting to paying it. For example:

	Percent
Dry fruit and raisins	10
Hams and bacon	10
Other meats	10
	Cents
Tea, pound	13
Sugar, pound	4
Butter, pound	2

The duty on new clothing made of wool and cotton is 20 percent, plus purchase tax of 16⅔ percent. The purchase tax is levied on the total value plus the 20-percent customs tax—making it about 40 percent in all. A much higher tax is levied on clothing made of silk or fur, which of course is not generally sent by Americans to their needy relatives in England.

No duty is levied on used clothing. If it is declared "worn clothing, no commercial value" and shows definite signs of wear, it will be admitted free of duty and the pur-

chase tax is levied at the discretion of customs officials.

I am having your letter placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope that may help get a change of policy by the British customs officials. It seems to me unjustifiable to charge duty on gift packages from the needy recipients of them.

Incidentally, inquiry from the French Embassy reveals that the French Government levies no duty on such gifts to its citizens, except cigarettes or fur and silk garments.

Very sincerely yours,

WALTER H. JUDD.

Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following appeal for the dissolution of the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

We, the undersigned citizens of Massachusetts, call for the immediate dissolution of the Committee on Un-American Activities (Representatives WOOD and RANKIN). Most of us joined the fight which helped to defeat the Dies committee. It took time to expose the true nature of the Dies committee. No further time is required to expose the Committee on Un-American Activities whose personnel and tactics indicate fidelity to the Dies tradition, which is the Fascist tradition. It attacks progressive action on the ground that it is communistic. It divides the progressive forces. It intimidates liberals, particularly those in Government service. It is a menace to civil liberty.

It gives no promise of investigating the dangerously subversive American Fascist movements. It uses the term "communism" as a name-calling technique directed against progressive movements in an effort to deceive the American people and bring reaction draped in the American flag.

This technique operated by Hitler on an international scale nearly cost us our civilization. Used inside many nations, it laid the ground work for his later conquests. We know the method now, and the failure of the House of Representatives to dissolve this committee will bring discredit on its own head. We urge the House to remember the Dies committee and to dissolve the Committee on Un-American Activities now,

Prof. Gordon D. Allport, Harvard University; Abraham T. Alper, Attorney; Alfred Albert, Attorney; Rhoda Truax Aldrich, Writer; John S. R. Bourne, Attorney; Prof. Bart J. Bok, Harvard University Observatory; Judge Lawrence G. Brooks; Alice Stone Blackwell; Rev. Carl Bihldorff, First Parish (Unitarian); Prof. Edwin G. Boring, Harvard University; Emory S. Bucke, Editor, Zion's Herald; Rabbi Beryl D. Cohon, Temple Sinai; Edward Cooper, Secretary, Boston Urban League; Charles P. Curtis, Jr., Attorney; John S. Codman, Attorney; Edward A. Cahill, Associate Director, Unitarian Service Committee; Angus Cameron, Little, Brown & Co.; Prof. Paul F. Cressey, Wheaton College; Prof. Edward Ely Curtis, Wellesley College; Representative Florence E. Cook; Albert V. Danielsen; Henry W. L. Dana, Writer; Prof. E. Merrick Dodd, Harvard Law School; Bernard De Voto, Author and Critic; Frank E. Dunn, Director of Public Relations, Massachusetts Council of Churches; Rev. Gardiner M. Day, Christ Church, Cambridge; Rev. Joseph F. Fletcher, Episcopal Theological School; Stephen H. Fritchman, Editor, the Christian Register; Dr. Merritt F. Garland; Edwin B. Goodell, Jr., Architect; Sidney Grant, Counsel, CIO; Mrs. Malcolm Green, Education Chairman, Boston City Federation of Organizations; Prof. Harrison Harley, Simmons College; Bishop Lewis O. Hartman, New England Area Methodist Church; Dev. David R. Hunter, Director Religious Education, Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts; Rev. Kenneth Hughes, St. Bartholomew's Church, Cambridge; Prof. S. Ralph Harlow, Smith College, Prof. Howard Mumford Jones, Harvard University; Rabbi Samuel Korff, Kahilleth-Jacob Synagogue; Rev. Herman F. Lion, Second Parish, Marlboro; Norman E. Lockwood, Publisher, Zion's Herald; George E. Lodgen; Florence Luscomb, Vice President, Massachusetts Civil Liberties Union; Representative Louis Lobel; Mrs. W. O. B. Little, Chairman, Massachusetts Committee for World Federation; David E. Lawe, Housing Authority; Seaton Manning; Prof. Kirtley Mather, Harvard University; Rev. Wilburn B. Miller, First Parish, Cambridge; Robert B. Mills, Port Agent, National Maritime Union; Rev. M. J. Minor, President, Ministers Interdenominational Alliance; Ethel P. Moors; John F. Moors; Prof. Kenneth B. Murdock, Harvard University; Prof. A. Howard Myers, Attorney; Malcolm S. Nichols, General Secretary, Family Society; Mrs. Rose Norwood, Women's Trade Union League; Prof. Louise Overacker, Wellesley College; Rabbi Isidore D. Passow, New England Zionist Emergency Council; Rev. William W. Peck; Mrs. Osgood Perkins, formerly director, Boston Stage Door Canteen; Rev. Prentiss L. Pemberton, Minister to Baptist Students in Boston; Rev. Vivian T. Pomeroy, First Parish, Milton; Phelps Putnam, Writer; Martin D. Richardson, Boston Chronicle; Mrs. William Z. Ripley; Joseph Salerno, Chairman, Massachusetts CIO; Mrs. Somers H. Sturgis; Joseph I. Seifert, Vice President American Jewish Congress, New England District; Mrs. Bertha Sperber, Boston Reporter, National Federation for Constitutional Liberties; Mary E. Sanger, Secretary, Massachusetts Civil Liberties Union; Donald Ogden Stewart, Script Writer; Prof. George Sarton, Harvard University; Rev. Carl A. Seaward, Director, Barnard Memorial, Dorchester; Henry R. Silberman, Director, American Jewish Congress, New England District; Edward Spiegel, Attorney; Harry Shumann; Mrs. Arthur Shurcliff; Frank Siegel, New England Director, WOPWA; Benjamin L. Schwalb; Paul Seymour, Executive Director, United Electrical & MRWA; Alan Steinert; Rev. John H. Taylor; Morris R. Taylor; Robert Gould Shaw House; Harry B. Weiner, United Packing House Workers; Katherine Welles, Executive Secretary, Good Neighbor Association; Mrs. Andrew N. Winslow; Rev. Charles P. Wellman, Channing Church, Dorchester; Rolland E. Wolfe, Professor of Old Testament, Tufts College School of Religion.

I would like to commend these people, for the perception and intelligence they have shown in calling on Congress to abolish the un-American committee.

Adequacy in Our Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 10 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Adequacy in Our Time, delivered by me before the Association of the Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia, on the occasion of their eightieth anniversary, on December 7 last, at the Willard Hotel in this city.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Four years ago today, Pearl Harbor came upon us like a thief in the night—and America went to work.

Three years ago Hitler was knocking at Stalingrad, Rommel at the gates of Alexandria, and the Japs were pounding on the door of Australia.

Two years ago the war situation had changed for the better, and 2 years ago I had the privilege of comrading with you, and I want to say I feel distinctly honored to be asked to address you again. It is good to be with you. It is a privilege to break bread with you and a greater privilege to exchange ideas. Old friends surround us. This is like a homecoming—a homecoming of old friends.

On the occasion when I last spoke to you, I said that the people of this District were entitled to representation in the national Congress. I repeat that conviction tonight.

Many of you remember the nineties—the horse and buggy days, when the War, Navy, and State Buildings were the glory of Washington's architecture.

We have traveled a long way since then. Today this city is the finest capital in the world.

In the intervening years, each of you have lived much, witnessed much, and contributed much.

On December 7, 1943, when I was your guest speaker, I said, "On your founding day 2 years ago, Japan struck at Pearl Harbor. It is my heartfelt prayer that on other founding days, the Oldest Inhabitants may serve the District of Columbia blessed with normal and secure living, by perpetuating the American traditions of liberty in a world of peace."

In these brief 2 years since I addressed you the wish that I then expressed has been partially fulfilled. Victory has perched upon our banners. The chief exponents of fascism have succumbed, and over this land the dove of peace hovers. But a new world has been discovered. The advance of man's knowledge and the utilization of atomic energy have swept us ahead a thousand years. New problems, such as we never conceived of 2 years ago, are before us for solution. But I have no fear; America has ever been adequate. The inspiration of builders like you will serve to make sure that this and coming generations will meet head-on the problems that arise and will solve the same.

War always disrupts. It muddies the stream, but time will make the water clear. Our strike situation, our failure to get quick reconversion, the unsettled condition of the world in the Far East and in the Near East, or failure to provide adequate housing facilities for our increase in population and especially for our returning veterans—are all symptoms of the aftermath of war. But we'll settle down and clean up the mess. How?

All problems will have to be solved—by work. Edison said 99 percent of genius was work. It was work that built the political, economic, social, and religious structure of America—work, coupled with the initiative and inventive genius of this great race. Those who would substitute anything else for work are saboteurs fo America's future.

The human mind has the faculty of making solutions complicated. We've been trying complicated methods fer a long time. We've tried to settle economic problems by legislation. It's time to wake up and try industry, work, and common sense. Dooley says that they call it common sense, but, by jimminy, it is the scarcest commodity on the market. But, in my opinion, it is growing in volume. It has lain dormant for some time, but recent years indicate it is no longer asleep. With the tremendous pent-up buying power of a hundred and fifty billion dollars, coupled with the tremendous demand for goods, there is no other way except to settle down to work and produce.

We are facing, however, a labor situation in America that does require that American leadership handle it in the same way that we handled a similar situation, when wealth menaced the individual liberties of our people. Some of you recall that period very well, when strong men became possessed of exceedingly large fortunes and developed the fascist complex. As one such man said, "The public be damned." Then there arose men of vision and courage who say that if this power were not curbed it would lead to the downfall of the Republic. As a result, the Interstate Commerce Act, the Clayton Act, the Elkins Act, the Robinson-Patman Act, and other legislation were passed to protect the public interest and restrain the fascist activities of men who owned and used great wealth.

It has ever been so in the history of the race when political power has been centralized in the hands of a few. Our forefathers saw that, so they established a government of checks and balances.

They saw that in government they could not leave full and complete power in the Executive or in the legislative branches or in the judiciary. Time has proved their wisdom. When men get hold of power (unless they have the character of Jesus, Socrates, Washington, or Lincoln), power gets hold of them, and unless checked, the rights and liberties of their fellowmen are jeopardized. Such were Hitler and Mussolini and other small fry dictators. History's pages are filled with men drunk with the power who have gone berserk.

When the Wagner Act was passed in 1935, it served a useful purpose. It provided an opportunity for labor unions to bargain collectively. But now we see instance after instance where there appears to be no check and balance upon the power of leaders of great groups of men. We see instance after instance where the rights of the public and the rights of private citizens are put in jeopardy because power is exercised arbitrarily without respect to the rights of others.

Of course, if men were shot through with the Golden Rule and it were operating in the hearts and minds of men, restraints would be superfluous. According to a recent poll, some 74 percent of our people have marched up to the definite conclusion that something must be done to protect the public interest in relation to strikes. I have, therefore, suggested that the Wagner Act be reevaluated and that additional legislation be passed that would establish the legal responsibility of unions. The Anglo-Saxon concept of the validity of a contract must not be lost in this age. When individuals break contracts they are held responsible by the courts.

I have also suggested that compulsory arbitration be written into the law of the land and that in order to protect union labor and the public there be full and equitable accounting of union finances; and, too, that union funds shall not be used for political purposes.

In this strike situation, we have a return of the old concept that the king can do no wrong. The President's suggestion last Monday doesn't go far enough. It is a step in the right direction, but it is a meager step. There must be legal responsibility of unions, the same as there is of corporations and individuals. Congress should act without further delay in order that Americans can settle down to work.

The argument that only a fraction of 1 percent of labor stirs up the mess is an argument for taking the steps I've suggested above. Every legislator knows that by and large labor wants law and order, the same as every right-thinking person. But to get rid of this Fascist disease we must pass legislation along the lines I have suggested.

I've spoken to you, my friends, on this serious subject because you are young in the spirit, you love your country, and the capital city of your country. You've lived much and deeply, you've seen the years come and go, and out of your vast experience you've garnered the wisdom that your country needs now. And you have something more—you have the courage to stand up for principle; to speak up, not in hate of personalities, but in righteous indignation against wrong. You believe in the devotion to great causes—love of country. And you want to see preserved for the generations that come after this, the Republic intact. You know that the time to put out a fire is before it starts. One of your oldest inhabitants originated the movement to toll the bell on all river craft passing Mt. Vernon. You are the kind of gentlemen who will always be ready to toll the bell of alarm when danger threatens and who will march out to meet the danger.

In the Senate recently we have been discussing the subject of backing up this Nation's commitments under the San Francisco Charter, whereby we would provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations. The enactment of this bill merely fulfills the commitment we have already made by our signature to the United Nations Charter. By enacting this bill we have demonstrated our good faith as a Nation, preaching again the Anglo-Saxon concept of the inviolability of a contract. But, all of us know, that the mere enactment of any bill will not of itself make for peace any more than the San Francisco Charter of itself makes for peace. Both the bill and the Charter are merely the mechanisms for peace—a mechanism which has no life unless the nations activate it with their will, intent, purpose, and desire for peace.

The American people have measured the consequences of these documents and accepted them—consequences that may mean the expenditure of more blood and treasure in the defense of the peace. The postwar world of today is woefully in need of means for the peaceful settlement of disputes.

We have heard much said about the need for world government. Those who call loudest for that seem totally oblivious of the fact of how unready the world is for such an adventure. We still have to prove our adequacy under the new League, and when I say "our" I mean mostly the other nations of earth. America is ready to go the limit. But are the other nations? We are taking leadership. We will keep the faith. We will not crawfish out of the obligations that are ours. But we must make sure that we do not make a fetish of the mechanism and forget the lesson of Pearl Harbor. Rather, we must make sure that the spirit of cooperation among the nations vitalizes the mechanism. The best way for America to be adequate is for the American people to be made fully aware of our obligations and commitments and also made aware of all facts in the foreign picture.

A look around the world today shows the existence of civil wars, revolutions, riots, famine, and pestilence. Then there is the problem of the atom bomb. We know that wars do not make for peace. If we were to judge from the world picture as it is now, with its prejudices, its hatreds, and its feuds, we would say that the world as as unready for cooperation now as it was 20 years ago. But the present sad state of affairs does not provide a good index of the world's adequacy for peace. The real issue is this: Are the peoples and the nations of the world now ready for the new League? The only way for America to get the answer is for America to take the leadership that is hers, to live up to her obligations under the United Nations Charter, and by reason and judgment, and, if necessary, by using force, make this new instrumentality a thing of vitality. No matter how desperate the situation, no matter how inadequate the nations appear to be, no matter what additional problems are raised by the discovery of atomic energy and the use of the atom bomb, America cannot fail in the slightest degree to approach head-on these international problems.

Recently I had a letter from Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the one man on the court-martial board who stood out against court martialing Billy Mitchell two decades ago. I placed that better in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. General MacArthur would be glad to see Billy Mitchell posthumously elevated to the rank of major general. But it is not of that incident I speak.

On General MacArthur's wall in his office, there is a message that I think has particular application to you, my friends. I give it to you verbatim.

"Youth is not a time of life—it is a state of mind; it is a temper of the will, a quality of the imagination, a vigor of the emotions, a predominance of courage over timidity, of the appetite for adventure over love of ease.

"Nobody grows old by merely living a number of years; people grow old only by deserting their ideals. Years wrinkle the skin, but to give up enthusiasm wrinkles the soul. Worry, doubt, self-distrust, fear and despair—these are the long, long years that bow the head and turn the growing spirit back to dust.

"Whether 70 or 16, there is in every being's heart the love of wonder, the sweet amazement at the stars and the starlike things and thoughts, the undaunted challenge of events, the unfailing childlike appetite for what next, and the joy and the game of life.

"You are as young as your faith, as old as your doubt; as young as your self-confidence, as old as your fear, as young as your hope, as old as your despair.

"So long as your heart receives messages of beauty, cheer, courage, grandeur and power from the earth, from man and from the infinite, so long you are young.

"When the wires are all down and all the central place of your heart is covered with the snows of pessimism and the ice of cynicism then you are grown old indeed, and may God have mercy on your soul."

Yes, this message has special meaning to all of you. You are young in the spirit. You enjoy the pleasure of accomplishing things. You like the responsibility of looking after your own—the maintenance of the traditional American ideas—the American way. You love beauty, good cheer, good deeds. Enthusiasm is yours, and you are undaunted by the challenge of events.

Mr. President, for 80 years your organization has been in being. May it continue for that many centuries.

May I wish for all of you a Yuletide rich with blessings.

The Congressional Viewpoint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 10 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on December 7 the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], before the Golden Anniversary Congress of American Industry of the National Association of Manufacturers in New York City, delivered an address entitled "The Congressional Viewpoint." I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Before anything else, I want to tell you I regard it my privilege, not yours, to be able to address this greatest of industrial forums, because I have eagerly anticipated this occasion.

You manufacturers are a select and influential body. It so happened I was looking for a chance to do a little lobbying of my own at your annual Congress of Industry.

It has always been brought to my attention that you men of industry are good at changing things. As they say in our brainy bureaucratic language known as "gobbledegook," you fellows are good at activating ideas, or maybe it is motivating, or maybe it is implementing ideas.

At any rate, I have read that you are able to take a hunk of coal, a pinch of salt, and stir them up with a breath of fresh air, and behold, you have nylons—and a line of frenzied women from here to Omaha.

You change dreams into realities. The point is, we need some practical changes down at Washington to get a bigger and a better output from the biggest business in the world—our Federal Government.

THE KINSHIP OF FARM AND INDUSTRY

In a slightly different sense, we Nebraskans get most of our income from the processes of change, too. In our case, we mix seeds and soil to produce steak, cheese, flour, ham, and such. Speaking gastronomically and metabolically, or whatever the medical term is, I wouldn't be at all surprised if most of you were at least half Nebraskan.

But I'm sure our relationship is more than being just "belly" cousins. Our farmers talk production, production, and more production. You factory men pound your desks and talk production, production, and more production.

About all I've got to show for this life is my Nebraska ranch. It is really a beef factory, and its output has got to be a carload of fat cattle to market every week or we uncork the red-ink bottle again. Farm and factory talk is the same language, with exactly the same considerations of investment, reserves, depreciation, overhead, hired men, and market risks.

We have the same perplexing dilemma over Government subsidies and hand-outs. We are both concerned about taxes and their effect on our business futures.

THE CORE OF OUR FINANCIAL PROBLEM

One of my duties as Senator is to serve on the Senate Finance Committee, which reviews and recommends taxation bills for passage.

In recent weeks the Congress passed a tax bill which gave business and individuals some measure of tax relief. The Congress went further than the Treasury wanted us to go in granting relief from high wartime rates.

But Congress could approve only a limited reduction. You who had your contracts terminated know how sharply war spending is being curtailed. Nevertheless, the Congress had before it the Budget Bureau's forecast of a $66,000,000,000 Budget for this fiscal year ending next June 30. Of this $66,000,000,000, about $30,000,000,000 will be a deficit.

In short, the 1945 tax amendment was the most tax relief we could offer on a strictly short-range basis.

Real tax relief will not come until the Federal Government curbs its spending. Lowering operation costs is the only way to lower taxes. Otherwise, endless deficits pile up and we are chained to interest charges from which we cannot escape.

And when I say tax relief, I mean all those elements that will free our enterprise and preserve our inventive and productive strength.

I mean the preservation of small business—and that of the whole Nation for that matter—from the dangers of big government. I mean the riddance of excess-profits taxes and the double take on corporate income and dividends.

But we can't cut taxes and escape deficits until appropriations—Government expenditures—are brought into line.

You may ask: Since Congress controls the spending and must authorize all appropriations, why doesn't Congress itself just balance the Budget?

Well, I'm glad you asked. It is a good question.

It is true that Congress does have the power of approving the expenses for ordinary government in its three historic branches—the legislative, judicial, and executive. But in the past 16 years, out of emergency, depression, and war, we have erected a fourth branch—an extraordinary government, if you please, which answers to no audit nor to any conscience save its own.

It is said that the magnitude of this extraordinary Government is now so great as to rival Government proper.

There are 101 of these Government corporations, all financed by taxpayers. Our first step toward sound government was to drive as many of them as we could into a corral, where Congress and the people could keep an eye on them.

Let me tell you about this, briefly.

THE BYRD-BUTLER BILL

In 1943, some of us got interested in the "good neighbor" policy and journeyed down to South America to examine the fruits of this activity.

Possibly some of you may remember the startling disclosures that resulted from this trip. The whole Nation gasped at the size of our spending program in Latin America.

What I want to add to the record now is that in spite of those colossal revelations, the thing that impressed me most was a telephone call to my office from one of the "discovered" corporations. The party on the telephone wanted to know—"where in the world did you get the information about us—we're supposed to be secret."

It was then and there, gentlemen, that I knew big government was getting away from Congress. It was up to Congress to recapture those secrets. In the following months the Byrd-Butler bill was framed. I shared with the distinguished Senator from Virginia, HARRY F. BYRD, the sponsorship of that measure.

Comptroller General Warren says it is the most important piece of legislation of its kind presented in Congress in the past 25 years. I suppose the canny general dates it from women's suffrage.

At any rate, I regard it as Congress' declaration of independence from big government or, perhaps it is only the preamble to the new Magna Carta of free enterprise that will chart our postwar evolution. It is only evolution, thank God.

The Byrd-Butler bill provides that the 101 Government corporations henceforth must come under the scrutiny of Congress in their financial operations. They must toe the same line of budgeting, financing, and auditing that the Constitution draws for the other three branches of Government.

It will, we hope, write the end to Extraordinary Government with its extracurricular activities.

May no other Senator ever again be told that some billion-dollar enterprise of Government is a secret from him and the taxpayers.

THE ROAD AHEAD

But the costly mistakes of the past 16 years of wasteful spending, with their debts, are bygones, after all. Instead of bitter recrimination, let's just make sure they are forever gone, pay the cost, and learn our lesson.

So, where do we go from here?

When I sit and squirm in my Senate seat, thinking about us taxpayers, I am convinced that the Byrd-Butler bill is only a starter.

Now that the war agencies are on their way out, it is going to be far easier to say "no" to them and the rest of government, than for Congress to resist the appeals of pressure groups for new spending.

Depression and war gave us big government and not a few imported ideas for making it bigger. Emergencies, both real and fancied, opened the door for the do-gooders. There was so much reform in the air you couldn't cut it with a corn knife.

Under sweet and noble titles, Congress is still getting these legislative lures to Paradise. But these rosy paths always lead to the pay roll and pay check. The big slice is for big government which is to pay off in the distant future, when the Almighty knows what the value of the dollar will be. Let us recognize these social stunts for what they are—taxes for big government.

Out our way, and I believe out your way, too, the folks want government in the open. Money on the barrel head.

The spending spree is over, and the pendulum is swinging back. The majority party, whichever it be, must take the responsibility for discouraging pressure groups and privilege legislation.

These boys who are coming home from the wars are convinced the American way is best. If they have one hard and fixed opinion, it is that no way of life or kind of government they saw overseas even remotely interested them.

We get a great deal of mail from them in Congress, and you can take it from me most of our veterans will be happy to get away from Government controls.

They want a chance to make money. Plain old profits—enough to send a shudder down the spine of any soap-box Socialist.

They saw first-hand the results of the plundering of thrifty citizens by taxation in Fascist countries, and they saw the fawning, faceless freaks of humanity that it spawns. They saw nations disintegrate, because men's dreams of progress were stifled by the state. They saw big governments that bogged down in debt and moral decadence.

These boys fought to be free.

STREAM-LINED GOVERNMENT

And so it is up to us, citizens, voters, and Congress, to see that this war-swollen bureaucracy of ours is cut down to peacetime size.

It has three times too many employees, with all the attendant evils of duplication and harassment of citizens. Before the war there were less than a million civilian job holders on the Federal pay roll. Now there are more than 3,000,000. Depression and war agencies still honeycomb the regular Government structure. They must be eliminated, along with their orders, edicts, rules, and surveys, deviously tied up with taxpaying and penalties which often have more weight than the laws passed by your Congress.

Much of this big government derives from the war powers of the President. Most of them will continue for 6 months after those war powers are ended either by congressional resolution or by Presidential proclamation.

The President has not indicated when he might proclaim officially that hostilities have ceased. But I wish to point out that the war powers quite likely will run into the next fiscal year.

A $50,000,000,000 BUDGET

The daily press reports a Government spokesman as saying that the forthcoming Budget would total about $50,000,000,000. This compares with estimated revenues of about thirty to thirty-five billion dollars, and indicates a deficit of fifteen to twenty billion dollars to be piled upon our mountain of debt.

A $50,000,000,000 Budget, plus about $10,000,000,000 that State and local governments will spend, will give us a national tax load of about $60,000,000,000, if that spending is to be balanced by tax revenues.

Sixty billion dollars, folks, is 46 percent of the national income which the Treasury estimates for next year.

I submit our Government spending should be brought more in line with our ability to pay.

In Nebraska, our constitution says the State's debt can't exceed $100,000. Our State capital, one of the wonders of the West, was paid for the day it opened. We build our roads the same way, and we have good roads. That is the way Nebraska likes to do business, and I represent Nebraska.

Let me quote to you what the Nebraska Bankers Association wants in Washington. This is from its resolutions of less than a month ago. It puts into words what I've been thinking—

"Now that the war is over * * * we feel that deficit spending should stop and that when existing commitments have been fulfilled, all Government subsidies should be discontinued.

"Consideration should be given to reduction of taxes. Government corporations * * * should ge discontinued unless approved directly by Congress; our National Budget should be brought in balance at the earliest possible date; and all the broad powers granted the executive department, and under which most of these spending agencies exist, should be returned to Congress so that we may have a government by the will of the people through their elected representatives and not by Executive order."

THE DEBT AND THE BUDGET

The stupendous new element of postwar budgeting will be the debt. Next June 30, the end of the current fiscal year, it will have reached $275,000,000,000, or thereabouts.

It defies definition. It is more money than our Government spent in the 150 years prior to 1940. The biggest debt of any nation at any time.

There is currently some fashionable double talk which we Nebraskans fail to understand that this debt may be lightly regarded since we just owe it to ourselves. On such a theory no debt ever should trouble us so long as it is internally held.

By all that's honorable in government, it must be a sound debt. We can't play around with bankruptcy and 85,000,000 bondholders.

Congress must find a way to amortize this great block of credit in a manner as painless as possible to the Nation's welfare. We need the counsel and guidance of statesmen who are financiers and of financiers who are statesmen. We can't pay off with catchwords and slogans and repeated bond issues.

We are not balancing the Budget until we provide for the handling of the debt, and we will never lick inflation until we balance the Budget.

It may take a debt commission or a special committee of Congress, but the problem of our postwar Federal finance will be that of squeezing debt repayment into the National Budget—for the next 50 to 100 years, if necessary.

FOREIGN SPENDING

At such a critical stage of our national finance it does not seem prudent that we should separate our considerations of foreign and domestic spending. They come from the same pocket. Foreign relief, too, must be carefully distinguished from foreign loans. It would be a disservice to any nation to extend loans above its ability to repay, and would win for us again the title of usurer and Shylock.

I hope some of your special-study groups will write me your opinions, particularly about the debt. But there is only one direction that I am prepared to take, and it is my theme henceforth. It is "Balance the Budget."

THE FULL-ACCOUNTING BILL

In the beginning of my talk I told you I came here to plead a special cause, and to lobby your Congress of industry.

Then I have tried to say that free enterprise and tax relief are the Siamese twins of the return to sound government. Let no more fancied crises separate them—and us—from fiscal sanity. Why, a 1-cent change in the corn or cotton market under the touch of big government's propaganda machine, can be made to look as if disaster and chaos will return if big government doesn't take over. Let us dismantle this oppressive machine in a careful and businesslike manner, by the simple means of testing each part for efficiency before we remove it.

I think I know how to do it.

That is why I decided to make your Congress of Industry my pulpit of what I hope will be my next legislative venture. I think it as important as the Byrd-Butler bill. With your indulgence, I shall send up the first trial balloon.

I am proposing a full accounting bill, which would place all Government financial operations on a businesslike basis. Every year at one time and in one specific measure Congress would consider the full operation of Government which would be out in the open for everyone to see.

As soon as I return to Washington I shall introduce a measure asking the responsible fiscal officials of Government—the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Budget, and the Comptroller General—to report their recommendations on this full accounting of Federal spending. I hope that Senator BYRD will join me as a sponsor.

This plan is to provide for suitable legislation to:

1. Include all appropriations in one general appropriation bill. Congress never gets the full financial picture of the Government for which it is financially responsible. It votes appropriations in dribbles; the money can be spent 3 years later, when another Congress is unaware of it and might possibly be appropriating other moneys for the same purpose. Bear in mind, Government finance is Congress' exclusive job.

2. Make each year's budget be a complete operation by discontinuing permanent appropriations.

3. Relate the handling of long-term projects (such as contract authorizations for building ships) to proper annual appropriation.

4. Integrate deficiency and supplemental appropriations into the annual budget.

5. Improve the execution of each Annual Budget and secure a more prompt and efficient annual accounting both by the expending agency and the Comptroller General, to show whether funds were expended properly.

With these improvements, gentlemen, the Congress and the public will know the true state of the Nation's finances.

It will not know the state of the Nation until this, or some other method, provides a way for drawing a complete total on the complicated arithmetic of Government. You do it in business—you've got to.

We have got to do it in Government to save it from consuming itself.

I earnestly solicit your support.

Here is a final thought.

Seventy-five minutes have elapsed since this afternoon session began. During this time the Federal Government has spent over $9,000,000. It has added over $4,000,000 to the debt—your debt.

United States Action To Speed Housing Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Capt. Harold E. Stassen, from the Washington Star of December 9, 1945:

UNITED STATES ACTION TO SPEED HOUSING URGED

(By Harold E. Stassen, captain, USNR)

There are 250,000 homeless heroes in America today. Throughout the Nation these veterans of every battle on every front have returned to their families or have married the sweethearts who were waiting for them; but they are unable to establish homes because of the acute shortage of housing. Obviously, the number of home seekers will rapidly increase as the demobilization continues, so that by next spring there will be between 1,500,000 and 2,000,000 of these veterans looking vainly for a house to call home.

These homeless veterans are, of course, only the more dramatic and appealing portion of the total housing problem in America. There are and will be at least an equal number of others of our fellow citizens who, either because they are moving from a war-plant area to their previous location, or for other reasons, are unsuccessfully searching for a home.

In approaching the situation we should recognize that it is one of our primary domestic problems. The construction of homes to meet the tremendous needs, not only this year but potentially in the next 20 years, can and should be one of the major factors in maintaining a healthy domestic economy and in providing directly and indirectly a good proportion of those millions of jobs we hear discussed in attractive and glowing terms. Furthermore, the lack of good housing has very major social implications. It is reflected promptly in lower standards of health, in social unrest, in crime, juvenile delinquency, and unemployment.

The problem can best be met by the intelligent use of the powers of Government to stimulate and make possible the rapid and

continuing creativeness of our American system with free workmen, individual enterprise and private capital. But to do this means that Government must not hesitate to step in and take the essential action to permit these forces to work.

I specifically suggest the following preliminary measures:

First. That the President immediately appoint a national housing expediter, preferably utilizing one of the members of the Cabinet who is not now very busy. This national housing expediter should be charged with moving promptly to coordinate all elements of Government to meet the present emergency and to plan for the longer-view action of Government in the housing field.

Second. That the shortage of skilled tradesmen in many of the building trades be met by immediately directing the armed forces to release at once all men skilled in these trades, who are not busily engaged in essential high-priority military construction. There should be very little essential military construction now under way, and the people as a whole, including the men in the armed forces, need an intelligent exercise of priorities and release because of the domestic need just as much or more than occupations and types were given consideration in induction into service.

Third. Extensive apprentice programs should be promptly initiated, with the cooperation of management and labor, to train additional men in the skills that are needed. Those few labor unions which engage in narrow restrictive policies as to the numbers that are permitted to qualify in their craft must be required, for the sake of better homes for their own fellow workmen and for the returning veterans, to open their ranks, reduce their initiation fees, and meet the needs of shelter for the people of America.

Fourth. The Army and Navy and all other governmental agencies should be required to report at once all unused space in barracks and other buildings throughout the country and this space should be leased on a short-term basis to individuals who will manage it and make it available for temporary living facilities. The military plans should be so arranged that facilities which they hold, remote from populous centers, are used for military activities to a major degree, while facilities near or in population centers be made available for civilian purposes.

Fifth. There should be an immediate national survey of all unoccupied temporary housing in former war-plant or military areas. These should be made quickly available at hard-pressed population centers.

Sixth. Building materials in military supply depots should be rapidly placed on the market and made available for housing.

Seventh. A national campaign should be started at once to revise and modernize the building ordinances of our metropolitan centers. Many of them were drawn up under entirely different conditions as to construction, materials, sanitation, and fire control. Some of them appear directly to favor monopolies of material or construction, or of labor. A small committee of competent architects, engineers, fire chiefs, builders, and craftsmen might well prepare a model modern building ordinance for metropolitan areas.

Eighth. Plans should immediately be made, and their execution commenced, for clearing out vast areas of the slums of our metropolitan centers and turning the real estate over to private enterprise for rapid and efficient construction and management of thousands of modern housing units.

These are a few suggestions for action on this pressing domestic problem. What I am trying to emphasize is that we must approach this problem with the same kind of imagination and of drive and of scope as that with which we met the terrific challenge of the war we have just won.

We cannot build America by drifting.

Science and the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 10 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech entitled "Science and the Government" delivered by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] before the Science Society of Washington, the Technical Reserve of the Naval Ordnance Laboratory, and the section on social and economic sciences of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, at Washington, D. C., December 5, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A large number of scientists have recently visited the Halls of Congress, and have talked to some of the people's representatives in Washington. I feel, therefore, that I am perhaps only making a return visit when I appear before you this evening. I think it has been a good thing, and a healthy thing, for the scientists and the politicians to get to know each other better. The urgency of the times has forced us together, and I hope that the acquaintance will develop into a lasting and fruitful relationship.

There may be some scientists here this evening who want to know why the Government is concerned with affairs of science. I want to quote you a sentence from the writings of George Washington, who died in 1799. Washington believed, and said, that the "arts and sciences are essential to the prosperity of the state and to the ornament and happiness of human life."

The founding fathers believed that the Government should sponsor scientific research, and they incorporated into the Constitution a clause to the effect that the Congress should provide for the common defense and promote the general welfare. It is under the general-welfare clause that most of our peacetime research has been inaugurated. Expeditions and surveys have been sent out to explore and examine the national domain, and this examination has continued in greater detail as the various sciences developed.

Military necessity early called for Federal support of research. The first Federal research agency was for military ordnance and was established during the War of 1812. Three wartime research agencies were created during the Civil War, 6 during World War I, and 12 during World War II.

Between wars there has been a consistent growth of Government research agencies for the general welfare. The first Federal grant in support of peacetime research as such was made in 1836, when steamboats were constantly blowing up and causing one disaster after another. In an attempt to remedy this situation, the Government made a grant of $10,000 to the Franklin Institute to find out the reasons and try to remedy them for the safety of steamship passengers.

The Department of Agriculture, an agency of research for farmers, was established in 1862. The Weather Bureau was established in 1890, the National Bureau of Standards in 1901, and I could name many other scientific agencies which have helped do the things which common citizens and taxpayers could not carry out alone.

With the increase of industrial activity in the twentieth century, the Government's participation in research was also accelerated, mainly in agriculture, conservation, reclamation, mining, and forestry. Industrial development of the automobile forced the Government into research on roads. The Nation's stake in the development of the airplane led to Government-planned technical advances by the agencies of aeronautical research. Airport engineering developed largely during the depression. A logical development in the use of natural resources in a region is the applied research done by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

As science grew in importance, its recognition in the structure of the Government at a high level has been urged repeatedly. The National Academy of Sciences in 1884 recommended a Department of Science. The Congress, in 1903 and again in 1908, recommended a more "rational correlation" of Government scientific work. President Roosevelt's Science Advisory Board in 1933 and again in 1935 urged a permanent scientific advisory organization.

My own strong interest in Federal scientific activity dates from my early investigations as a member of the Senate War Investigating Committee headed by Senator—now President—Truman. Our studies in 1941 and 1942 of the mobilization of our resources showed weaknesses in the use of scientific data. In the synthetic rubber program, for example, a number of false starts were made because of the lack of adequate data in the hands of responsible Government agencies.

In the fall of 1942 I introduced a science mobilization bill, and the Senate created within the Military Affairs Committee a special subcommittee of which I have had the privilege of serving as chairman, to study the scientific and technological problems of the war effort. Many of the objectives of better organization and enlargement of wartime research which have been set forth by the committee have been achieved, under the War Powers Act, by administrative action.

When the defeat of the Axis was imminent, the committee focused its attention upon the problems of the reconversion of research activity from war to peace, and the maintenance of high levels of scientific research in the postwar years necessary for our national security and welfare. The committee's studies of the Government's research functions, and recommendations for the postwar era, were embodied in the committee reports of January and July of this year. Our major conclusion, which closely paralleled that of Dr. Vannevar Bush's committee studying the problem for the executive branch of the Government, was that the Federal Government should greatly increase support of science, particularly in the basic sciences, in health and medical research, national defense, and other research fields of recognized public interest.

Both the studies made for the legislative and for the executive branches of the Government found that science is playing an ever more important part in the life of the Nation, and that increased funds are needed to finance the Nation's scientific activity. It appeared that for noncommercial-type research, whether for basic science or for such applied science as medical research, the sources upon which we have relied in the past, notably private philanthropy, cannot meet the need in the future. It was accordingly recommended that public funds be used to create a widespread wealth of skills, ideas, and facilities, as an investment in national prosperity and peace.

During October, our subcommittee held public hearings on bills embodying the recommendations for increased peacetime support of science and providing for the creation of a Federal scientific foundation.

Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of Washington, and I jointly heard more than 100 witnesses from all sections of American life, including many eminent specialists who testified on the need for such a foundation and the problems involved in its creation. With a single exception, these witnesses, representatives of industry, agriculture, labor, veterans' groups, governmental agencies, and scientific and educational groups and institutions, urged the creation of a Federal scientific foundation.

During the past 2 weeks I have been analyzing the testimony. The hearings have provided a public record on the basis of which recommendations can be made to Congress, and on which Congress can act with every assurance that it is meeting a vital national need in an effective manner. Let me give you a short summary of the testimony urging Congress to create a Federal science foundation to finance increased scientific activity:

1. The witnesses believed that support of science was an essential of any national defense program.

2. They believed that such support would make manifold contributions to the national welfare, particularly in public health, cultural development, and the technical development of regional resources.

3. A considerable number of witnesses pointed out that the foundation would contribute to international understanding and cooperation, and would help to avert another war.

4. As to the functions of the foundation, those who spoke of it at all were unanimous in their agreement that basic or fundamental research should have Government sponsorship. Widespread support was given to the proposition that the social sciences should be represented, as well as the physical and biological sciences.

5. There was almost unanimous agreement that the foundation should support scientific training through a Federal-aid program of undergraduate scholarships, postgraduate and postdoctoral fellowships.

6. A great many witnesses urged that the Foundation should maintain an up-to-date roster of scientific personnel.

7. All witnesses agreed that the freedom of the individual working scientist must be maintained. Some were afraid of "political control" of science, but were reeassured by other witnesses who pointed to the freedom of scientists working in Government departments and agencies.

8. A majority of witnesses agreed that the Foundation should coordinate research financed by the Government. The best way to do this, they agreed, was through voluntary joint planning and full exchange of information.

9. And, finally, it was generally agreed that the Foundation should promote the widest possible dissemination and utilization of scientific discoveries and techniques.

These are the things that you and your colleagues told me and the other Senators in Washington recently. I am not a scientist and I will not pretend that my approach to this problem is identical with yours. Yet it is my firm belief that the needs of the American scientists and of the American people, part of whom I have the honor to represent in Congress, are identical. I have become convinced, and I think many of my colleagues are convinced, that the free and unrestricted development of basic scientific research is such an important part of our potential national resources that we cannot afford to neglect it. I feel that in order to discharge my responsibility to my constituents and to the people of America I am obliged to do whatever I can to encourage the growth of basic scientific research.

Now what does this mean? Will it be adequate merely to increase the funds available for scientific research? I think not.

There are, of course, many ways in which Federal funds could be used to support American science. During the last 5 years I have given this matter much thought. I have considered many alternatives, and in each case I have abandoned them in favor of a National Science Foundation.

For instance, we could simply appropriate funds to each of the 48 States and tell them that they are to be used to support science. In effect, this would necessitate the establishment of 48 State science foundations.

Or we could make appropriations direct to each of the colleges and universities of the country in proportion to their enrollments. Then, instead of 48 local science foundations, we would have hundreds. I doubt, and believe you doubt, that such schemes would result in equally effective programs of research in national defense, health and medicine, and other fields of national interest.

Or again, we could make appropriations for nonprofit institutions which would, in effect, include private research foundations such as the Rockefeller, Sage, or Carnegie foundations. Although I have the greatest respect for the purposes and practices of those and similar great organizations, I cannot bring myself to believe that the American people would want, or Congress would defend, this manner of expending Government funds.

Finally, we could appropriate Federal funds directly to the National Academy of Sciences or its operating organization, the National Research Council. I assure you that this possibility has received serious consideration. The reason for not following this procedure is that, although these agencies were established by an act of Congress and by Executive order, they are not true Government agencies but have a quasi-public status. I shall discuss this point later.

An entirely new Government agency is needed. It is needed not only to provide the necessary Federal support for science, not only to assure that the funds are spent on programs related to national welfare, but because science itself has now become such an integral part of government. I believe that you scientists want and deserve more than a Government dole for your research.

I do not feel that the Government should tell you what to do or that the proposed Federal agency should exercise scientific judgment and attempt to make decisions which can only be made by the individual investigators. No; I am not proposing that you pay for these funds by giving up that freedom without which true scientific research would soon cease to exist. I think I can best explain what I mean by reference to the urgent scientific problem of the day—atomic energy. This problem is not only a major scientific problem but also the most important political issue of the day. You know better than I what this problem has meant to the scientists who have worked on the atomic bomb. These men received tremendous financial support from the Government. They did their job and they did it well, but it was a one-way affair. They were hired by the Government to do the job, but were given no opportunity to have a voice in what would be done with the new knowledge that they produced and applied. And now these men—and I applaud them for it—are making every effort to find some means of making their voices heard.

Science has reached such a stage of development that we must expect huge and far-reaching developments to come out of our laboratories. If we accentuate this process by increasing the financial support given to scientific research, the scientists will be continually faced with a similar situation. What is the solution? I propose that the Government not only give the scientists more money and better laboratories; I propose, too, that the Government make a place for the scientists in its very structure so that, as scientific knowledge advances, we shall also provide for a voice for the scientists. I think scientists deserve it, and the country needs it.

The need for bringing more scientific men into the Government is a critical part of the problem of the proposed science foundation. The foundation simply cannot be administered by laymen. Its entire operation requires the scientific insight and knowledge which only the trained scientist can contribute.

Now is has been argued that we cannot solve this problem by bringing scientists into the Government to operate this agency. It has been suggested by some that, instead, we shall have to depend on the part-time assistance of a scientific board who will hire administrators to run the Foundation for them. I think, however, that the Government needs more than the part-time services of scientists. I think that we need some of you in Washington all the time, and one of your jobs should be to run the Science Foundation.

I know that this is something of a new departure for scientists. I know that it is a great deal to ask of a man who has spent a lifetime building up a career which is in many ways far removed from matters of public administration. Yet, without the full-time services of men who understand the scientific laboratory from the inside, any scientific foundation is doomed to failure. This issue cannot be avoided. Many scientists have said at our recent hearings that the proposed Scientific Foundation must be under the control of scientists. With this, I heartily agree.

Science must have, and must have now, a full-fledged Government agency run by scientists. I think that this is necessary because, without it, the Government scientific activities cannot be properly guided.

I will not discuss further the major areas of agreement revealed in the testimony. This evening I shall take the opportunity to discuss with you those aspects of the proposed Foundation in regard to which there is a lack of general agreement, or in regard to which misunderstanding exists. These include:

1. The best form of organization for the proposed Foundation—and here the principal discussion concerns the top management.

2. The best way to assure in the legislation creating the Foundation the full publication and free dedication to the public of the results of federally financed research.

3. The best way to deal with the human—the social and economic problems which scientists can help solve.

Before final congressional action can be taken to create the needed foundation, agreement must be reached on these features. I believe that the extensive public record provides an adequate background for intelligent legislative action on these moot points. Before discussing them in detail, let me say a word about the manner and the degree of precision of the results which must be obtained.

Legislators—like scientists—must seek not only yes and no answers but must also make determinations within practicable limits. In the various scientific disciplines, methods have been arrived at for achieving the necessary degrees of precision. Similarly, in Congress, we have an elaborate process for achieving results with the degree of precision appropriate to legislative action.

A bill introduced by a Member of Congress is seldom voted on in its initial form. First through public hearings, then through deliberations of the committee and of the Chamber as a whole, it is shaped toward its final workable form. Even after its enactment, its practicable application is reviewed annually when appropriations are made. Further, Congress can—and often does—modify the original enabling legislation by subsequent amendments based on the year-to-year experience of the agency. It is in the light of this process that we must seek

to create for the new foundation an initial organizational structure so designed that it will have the greatest possibility of successfully accomplishing its purpose.

If we agree, then, that a National Science Foundation is needed and that the financial support of this foundation must come from Federal funds, let us turn to a consideration of the problem of how the foundation should be administered in order that its functions may best be realized. Before attacking this problem directly, permit me to digress into a brief discussion of just what a Government agency is, noting where it differs from a private corporation whether of the industrial or institutional variety.

In order to appreciate the unique characteristics of a Government agency, let me ask each of you to imagine yourself for a moment a Member of the Congress of the United States. As the elected representatives of a segment of our people, I am sure you would feel, as I do, a heightened sense of responsibility to see that all agencies of the Government are operated not only in an efficient manner but in the best interests of the Nation as a whole. From such a vantage point I am sure you would realize how very vigilantly we, as the Members of Congress, seek to protect the rights of all of the people in the enactment of any legislation involving the appropriation of taxpayers' money. Thus, in establishing a Federal agency to which we commit ourselves to make annual appropriations, one of the thoughts uppermost in our minds is that the agency be a true servant of all the people; and that, even under the most unfortunate selection of administrative personnel, we must protect the public from the possibility that the agency may become the instrument of special-interest groups, which, as you may know, are rather plentiful in our democracy. It is for this that the sine qua non of any government agency is that its powers be vested in full-time Government employees whose principal responsibility is their public function, and who have severed all previous connections with private financial interests. From the Government standpoint is is unthinkable that the powers of the proposed National Science Foundation be vested in a board of noncompensated persons, whose principal responsibilities would lie in some other direction, as some scientists have so urgently and so honestly recommended. This is not to say that we, the trustees of the taxpayers' money and interests, impugn the integrity of those scientists who might be appointed to such a board. It is to say that we feel under the highest obligation to assure the people of the United States that under no conditions, at any future time, could the foundation conceivably be regarded as the agency of any special group.

Many scientists testified in the hearings and many have written to me personally that they are convinced of the superiority of the board form of organization. I respect the sincerity of their testimony in this matter and believe I understand why their analysis of the situation leads them to prefer this form of organization. Most scientists have spent their lives in universities and have worked with or under research foundations administered by a board of trustees or directors. In most instances, these groups of men are appointed or elected to serve as trustees of certain funds which private philanthropy has bequeathed. As trustees of these funds, it is their duty to assure that the funds are spent for the purpose or purposes specified in the bequest. In order to utilize the funds, the board of trustees establishes an operating agency, i. e., a university or foundation, and then selects and hires an administrative officer who in turn selects and hires the technical operating staff. But note that it is this highly trained operating staff which carries out the actual work of the organization. The board of trustees simply meets from time to time, reviews policy, and in approving budgets gives its approval or disapproval to the programs proposed by the operating staff of the organization.

A foundation under a single administrator will have a board of trustees, and the board of trustees appropriate for all Government agencies is the Congress of the United States. Congress cannot delegate its constitutional responsibilities or turn them over to any subsidiary board of trustees, no matter how distinguished its members may be.

Let me again emphasize that the success of any operating organization, whether a private industry, a university, or a Government agency, depends primarily on the quality of the technical personnel which makes up its operating staff. It is not the board of directors or the trustees which do the scientific work of a university or a foundation; the same holds for the proposed National Science Foundation. The foundation will succeed only if, after its establishment, we are able to staff it with the very ablest scientists in the United States.

It will be the business of the foundation to administer a large segment of federally sponsored research. Just as the business of the Federal Trade Commission is carried on by full-time Government employees with the training and experience in economics and financial transactions, the National Science Foundation must be administered by a staff composed of first-class scientists devoted to the public service. And unless there are enough able scientists in this country who recognize the importance of this job of administering scientific activities, and unless such men are willing to accept full-time jobs on the staff of the National Science Foundation, it cannot succeed in carrying out the functions which our recent hearings show to be so greatly needed. Now that science has come of age, there must be those among you who are willing to forego the role of the working scientist to accept the challenge of a new career in the administration of scientific research. I do not know how large a staff it will have to be. In the bill S. 1297, we have specified only a full-time administrator, a deputy administrator and a director for each of the separate divisions. Obviously these men will need many assistants in all fields of science. I do know that we cannot expect the business of the foundation to be properly conducted by part-time employees who come to Washington a few days every month and then go back to their regular jobs. The activities of the proposed foundation will be so manifold and so important that they must be administered ably, continually, and efficiently if the foundation is to succeed. I say to you frankly, if I were not convinced that there are those among you who are willing to accept the challenge of these tasks, I would not support the legislation to establish a science foundation.

If we agree that the National Science Foundation must be a Government agency, rather than a quasi-public foundation receiving Government appropriations, and if we agree that the powers of such an agency must be vested in full-time Government employees with no responsibilities other than to science and the Nation, we must still face the problem of the best form of top administration. This problem is not unique to the proposed National Science Foundation; it is a problem which concerns us every time a new agency is established. Many experiments in administration have been tried in an effort to find the best answer to this difficult problem.

There are two general solutions to the problem of top administration. Both are known to be workable solutions, yet both have very real advantages and disadvantages. The first solution is that of having the President appoint, with advice and the consent of the Senate, a single administrator in whom all powers of the agency are vested. This administrator in turn selects and hires other Government employees as his divisional chiefs. These in turn select and hire subordinates, and thus there is created an operating organization with a direct line of responsibility centering in the single administrator. This form of organization works. It is used in all governmental departments and in certain of the bureaus of these departments. It has also been successful in many agencies of the executive branch of the Government.

The advantages of the single administrator form of organization are clear-cut. All responsibility for the success of the agency is immediately identifiable. If the work of the agency is successful, the administrator gets the credit. If the work of the agency is unsatisfactory, the administrator gets the blame, and if the work is too unsatisfactory we get a new administrator. Everyone working in the agency knows the lines of responsibility under which he works. This in general has been found to make for more efficient administration.

The disadvantages of the single administrator form of administration are simply stated. It involves placing tremendous responsibilities in the hands of one man. If he is a good man, that is, if he selects able administrative assistants and accepts their counsel in arriving at decisions, he will run a good agency. On the other hand, if the wrong man is selected and he fails to build up an efficient operating organization, and furthermore if he refuses to seek and accept advice as to the manner in which the agency should be administered, he will fail as the responsible individual. Fortunately, because he is immediately identifiable, he can be removed by the President and a new administrator appointed.

The alternative general solution which has been found successful in the administration of Government agencies is the board or commission form of organization. In this case the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoints several full-time Government employees to constitute the top administrative organization. In some cases, members of the commission elect their own chairman, and in some cases the President designates the chairman. In general, the board or commission form of administration has been found to be successful when it has judicial functions, such as passing on rate questions, determining rights as between individuals or corporations. All the members of these commissions or boards are full-time Government employees.

The advantage of the board or commission form of administration is that it permits combining the wisdom of several at the top level of administration. In establishing the size and characteristics of commissions, the President and Congress attempt to include representatives of all interested groups in the hope that the special biases or predilections of the individuals will be canceled out in the deliberations of the board, thus resulting in decisions more nearly reflecting policies in line with national welfare.

The disadvantages of the board form of administration can also be simply stated. It is somewhat more unwieldly form of administration, and it is more difficult to identify the responsibility for satisfactory or unsatisfactory policies, decisions, and programs. In case the program of the agency becomes too unsatisfactory it is necessary to replace at least a majority of the board before achieving the needed correction. As you can see, this requires considerably more time, and I may say replacement is less likely to happen than in the case of a single administrator.

I assure you that many of us have given a great deal of thought as to which general form of administration will be most satisfactory for the proposed National Science Foundation. As I see it, there are three general alternatives:

A. A single Administrator, appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, in whom will be vested sole authority for operating the Foundation.

B. A Board of three to nine full-time members, appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate; at the time of appointment one of the members of the Board shall be designated by the President to serve as chairman.

C. A single Administrator appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate and a top advisory board of 5 to 15 representative members appointed by the President, to serve in a part-time capacity while continuing their regular professional work with universities, industries, or other organizations.

These three general alternatives seem to be the only feasible forms of top administration for the proposed Foundation. I honestly believe that, with the selection of the proper persons, any one of the three forms of administration would work and work effectively in the best interests of both science and the Nation. I would be willing to join my colleagues in recommending that the bill about to be reported out provide for any one of these three alternatives. In the light of our general discussion of the problems of administering government agencies, however, I wish to explain why I personally believe alternative C represents the best possible setup for the proposed Foundation.

I prefer a single Administrator, not only because it promises to make the administration of the Foundation more efficient, but primarily so that all of us—the President, Congress, scientists, and the public—will know at all times exactly who is responsible for the program of the Foundation. Because of the manifold facets of science, I cannot conceive a Board of even nine men adequately representing all of its interests equally and fairly. A single Administrator, because he would operate under the spotlight of both public and scientific scrutiny, would not dare to omit an essential type of scientific endeavor from the program of the Foundation.

On the other hand, I do not feel that this administrator should be asked to carry on the work of the foundation without the advisory service of the country's ablest scientists. Although I feel that any competent administrator would seek and utilize the advice of such an advisory board, even thought he were not legally required to do so, I believe the law should include this feature and be so written that this advisory board could never become a mere perfunctory body. It is for this reason that we propose to require at least monthly meetings and to give the advisory board the privilege of direct access to the President and Congress. Under this organization, an administrator would not necessarily have to act in accordance with the advice of his advisory board, but, if he failed to do so, he would be obligated to defend to the public any alternative actions. It seems to me that we can depend upon such continuous public surveillance of the activities of the foundation to assure a minimum of unwise administrative action.

I believe that an advisory board, on which it is quite appropriate for citizens to serve on a part-time basis, would enable the foundation to secure the part-time assistance of any of the country's most able working scientists. To my mind the foundation would be more vigorous and would keep more closely in touch with the important problems of all fields of science if this advisory board were composed of men regularly engaged in administering or doing scientific work in the country's academic and industrial laboratories. It is for this same reason that we have recommended part-time advisory committees for each of the divisions. Even though we are able to hire the most able scientists as Government employees to staff the operating organization, they will require the continual stimulation of outside working scientists if they are to continue to serve as effective members of the organization.

The composition of the top advisory board, it seems to me, might reflect the interests of the country as a whole. Of course, this means that scientists should be included on the top board, but, at the same time, it means that industry, agriculture, and labor might also be represented. They are the consumers of the fruits of scientific research. By contrast, at the divisional level, I would conceive the advisory committee to be made up almost exclusively of scientists. It is at the divisional levels that the truly scientific decisions of the foundation will be made. Not only must the Government employees who staff these divisions be competent scientists in their own right—they must have the advice of leading scientists both in and out of the Government laboratories in the planning and administration of the divisional programs.

In brief, I prefer alternative C because I believe it will result in the best administered foundation and provide the best opportunity for scientists to assist in the operation of the foundation both as Government officials and as advisers. And if we provide for limited single terms of office for advisory committee members, the foundation will retain a vitality which cannot be achieved under any other form of administration.

As I have said, the other alternative forms of organization will probably work; and, if in the judgment of those who support the foundation, one of them should be clearly preferred, I should not be adverse to incorporating it in the legislation.

I think that we can all agree that the single administrator without an advisory board (alternative A) is a much less adequate proposal. On the other hand, a full-time board or commission has certain advantages, but, frankly, I think they are outweighed by inherent disadvantages. In the first place, a full-time board would mean that several of the Nation's outstanding scientists would have to give up their present positions to become board members. Furthermore, unless we give such board members unlimited terms of office, it means that scientists appointed to the board would have a difficult time in returning to nongovernmental positions after a term of board service. Over a period of years these board members would, as a group, become so identified with the foundation that they would assume a defensive attitude toward its program. It seems to me far better that we provide the foundation with a proven, efficient operating type of organization, but protect it from becoming bureaucratic by providing for a truly functional advisory board which would continually aid, scrutinize, and criticize the program of the foundation.

Now, a few words on the utilization of research findings. The pure scientist is interested only in the truth, and we are agreed that the foundation should support a very strong program of basic research. But we must not overlook the fact that the group support of science is based on the belief that all knowledge of nature will eventually result in making our existence safer and more satisfying. There may be a few scientists left who are content with the mere discovery of a new fact or law—but I think that most scientists realize that even the most abstract discovery may have a world-shattering impact on civilization and society.

In spite of the fact that applied science has contributed increasingly to the destructiveness of successive wars, I am sure that most scientists are honestly concerned that their work be used for the welfare of mankind—not for its destruction. The problem of assuring the widest and wisest utilization of the fruits of research is indeed a knotty one. Because it is enmeshed with almost every phase of our culture and economy, I shall not pretend to solve it here this evening. I do, however, wish to comment briefly on the so-called patent issue associated with this science legislation.

Let me make one point clear, because it seems to have been misunderstood by some. The proposed legislation is in no sense a patent reform. It is not patent legislation, and it in no way changes the over-all picture with respect to privately developed or privately owned patents. This was stated clearly by Commissioner Ooms of the Patent Office in the course of the hearings on these bills.

My bill to establish the National Science Foundation includes a provision to standardize the handling of all patentable discoveries growing out of all federally financed research. It is no more than an attempt to give the Government a logical and business-like policy which, at the moment, simply does not exist. Your fellow scientists working in governmental laboratories need such a uniform policy. It is not equitable that a scientist working in one bureau receive the commercial rights to inventions which he makes and an equally competent fellow scientist in a different bureau be compelled to dedicate his patents to the public. Yet that is the situation as it exists today.

Granted that a uniform policy is desirable, to be of most value to science and the Nation it must also be equitable and based on sound business principles. After much consideration and discussion with representatives of all interested groups, I am convinced that this basic policy should be one of full publication and free dedication of all findings, including patents, which result from federally financed research. This conclusion is based primarily on two general lines of reasoning:

1. A fair proportion of scientific discoveries are not patentable. Therefore, why should a scientific worker be rewarded because he happens or chooses to work on projects which yield results that can be commercially exploited? Would there not be a danger that good men would be enticed to work in the applied, rather than the fundamental, fields of research? Is there not the further danger that the possibility of patentable results would tend to conflict with free intercourse among scientists and the full publication of research? In other words, is not the policy of free dedication the one which most nearly conforms to the ideals and practices of scientists themselves?

2. What policy with respect to patents represents good practice for the Government? Industrial laboratories require that patents developed by employees be signed over to the industry. This, they argue, is only fair to the stockholders, whose money not only builds the laboratories but also pays the salaries of the employees. It would seem that the policy of public dedication is dictated by the Government's responsibility to its stockholders—the taxpayers. To put the question another way, why should the taxpayer contribute to the cost of a development and then later be forced to pay for it again because of a royalty which the manufacturer pays to the holder of the patent? Or worse yet (and this is not unheard of), would it be fair to the taxpayer if a patent based on Government-sponsored research should become the exclusive property of a company which refused to use it because it would not be to its economic advantage? Or can we defend exclusive patenting of an important medical discovery? So, we have proposed the basic policy of full publication and free dedication.

However, it has been necessary to provide for certain exceptions to this basic policy. Certain types of developmental work needed by the military services can best be carried on in industrial laboratories, which are better equipped for some special kinds of work than nonprofit laboratories. Such industrial laboratories, because they contribute a plant, an experienced staff, and "know how" to the

project, are deserving of at least a portion of the commercial patent rights resulting from the research. Assuming this to be the case, we have made provision for exceptions to the basic policy of public dedication by stipulating that in those instances where the head of a Government agency (including the foundation) finds that a research project cannot be carried out properly except in a private industrial laboratory, he is empowered to include special clauses in the contract to provide for a fair disposition of any resulting patent rights. However, to keep this provision from being unwisely used, it has been provided that each agency be required to publish the details of all such contracts within 30 days after executing them. In this way I believe that we can be sure that special clauses will be used only when they are really in the public interest.

I wish that there were time to speak of the many other aspects of our problem. But there is one point to which my thoughts keep returning: Science is today at a crucial turning point, and we must find the road which will lead to its continuing advancement. If we are to find this road, we cannot define science too narrowly. There are some who sincerely believe that the proposed legislation should exclude research in the social and economic fields. I wonder if this can wisely be done.

If studies of public health are found to involve social factors, should the foundation be prohibited by statute or hampered by lack of duly constituted research personnel and facilities from pursuing investigations in this direction? I am sure you will answer this question as I have answered it—in the negative. If surveys of our resources reveal the need to examine economic problems that are intimately related to their development, is the Foundation to stop short of its goal because Congress failed to make provisions for economic research?

Congress would not meet its responsibilities to the public if it excluded research in those fields which are most directly concerned with human welfare. There is, I may say, reason to believe that a majority of scientists feel this way for one of the scientific organizations represented here tonight testified at the hearings that two-thirds of those members of its governing body who responded to a questionnaire on this point favored inclusion of the social sciences in the Foundation. Probably these activities should be set up in a separate division coordinate with the natural sciences; but they should be there carrying their fair share of the burden of research.

We stand at the threshold of a new era of achievement in scientific research. Almost every field of science has at hand the basis for rapid advance. Even some of the less spectacular byproducts of scientific research can be the starting point of new experimental methods and even of whole new sciences. The production, in significant quantities, of radioactive isotopes opens up a vast new field of research in biology, chemistry, medicine and industrial sciences. I have listened enough to your colleagues to realize that the production of a radioactive isotope of carbon can make possible experiments which will plunge deep into the innermost secrets of physiological processes, and of the behavior of organic chemicals. Yet, as one of the witnesses at our hearings pointed out, the cost of such isotopes is so great, that only Federal support can supply the funds which will make such experiments possible. Here is a clear case where the very progress of science depends on the establishment of Federal support of basic research.

John Quincy Adams, in his first message to Congress in 1825, said: "In assuming her station among the civilized nations of the earth it would seem that our Nation has contracted the engagement to contribute her share of mind, of labor, and of expense to the improvement of those parts of knowledge which lie beyond the reach of individual acquisition." Now, as the boundaries of knowledge are being rapidly pressed back, it is our obligation to provide the means for solving those problems "which lie beyond the reach of individual acquisition." I do not mean that we must find a substitute for the labors of individual scientists, for this is the very essence of scientific research. Rather I believe that the Federal Government must provide whatever the individual scientist needs to make his efforts bear fruit.

I know there are some who say that science has now become such a terrible instrument of destruction that we must now call a halt to its advancement. No scientist can support such an idea, and history has shown that every such attempt to restrain human progress is doomed to failure.

Rather I think that we must face the issue squarely. If we have now learned how to harness the very forces of the sun, if we can now achieve such scientific miracles, then certainly it lies within our power to solve the economic and political problems which threaten to turn our knowledge into destructive channels. This is an obligation which all of us must meet. And you, as scientists, have begun to play an evermore critical role in this great project. I think that you and, indeed, the people of our Nation should be proud of all the men of science who have begun to find the means of explaining to the world that scientific progress and human progress cannot follow separate paths.

It is my firm purpose to do what I can, within the Congress, to provide for all science and for all scientists the support which they need and deserve. The proposed Science Foundation can be a national investment that may yield undreamed of returns in knowledge, in wealth, and in human progress. But its immediate value may be dwarfed if it will also make science a more vital part of our Nation's heritage—if it draws scientists ever deeper into the stream of democratic advance that has made our Nation great.

Soldiers Complain Ships Lying Idle in Okinawa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, military forces have been telling the Congress they were using every available ship to speed the boys home.

From a letter I received this morning from a fine intelligent soldier whose home is in my district, I am satisfied that we are not being given all of the facts by the military leaders and that they are not using every available ship to get the men home.

Some weeks ago it was suggested that a committee be appointed to make an investigation which would call in those of the military service in charge of seeing to it that transportation was increased. I understand that many Members of Congress were assured that every possible ship was being mobilized.

This letter shows conclusively that there is neglect and, in my judgment, something should be done at the earliest possible moment by the military leaders and Congress should insist that it be done.

Promises not kept will not bring any of these men home. The soldier says in his letter, which I insert in the RECORD, that "more than 200 ships are lying at anchor here at Okinawa and have been for some time."

I also have a letter from a lawyer in my district complaining bitterly of the food rations supplied to the men on Okinawa. I am also inserting this letter in the RECORD.

These two letters touch on two points which must be cleared up at the earliest possible moment:

Hon. CHARLES W. VURSELL,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My father forwarded your letter of November 16 on to me along with the article that was contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD entitled "Speed Up Return of Overseas Men." If you knew the jubilation that everyone here felt on reading it you would be amply repaid for your trouble. Even though the effects of your efforts have not been felt here on Okinawa as yet, it is good to know that we have a friend and champion in Washington.

I will try to inform you of conditions as they exist now, so that you will have a clear picture to present.

Here as the facts: As of December 1 men with over 80 points are still on Okinawa. At the rate they are shipping men home the men with 60 points, who were eligible for discharge 1 month ago, will not set foot on American soil before Easter or Mother's Day. More than 200 ships are lying at anchor here and have been for some time. Thousands of bitter and disillusioned men in exile here are condemning those responsible for this outrage. The Nation that once depended upon them to stop a vicious enemy now has forgotten them. Living conditions, not too good before the typhoon, are hardly bearable now.

The GI's here on Okinawa feel that their major problem is to get home. They are not so much concerned with getting out of the Army, once they get home, for they feel that priority will be given them.

We suggest that a survey be made of shipping, including airplanes, to determine if every available means is being utilized to get the boys home, and that the Army be required to get a man home and discharged 2 months after he becomes eligible. Then the Army and War Department could have no excuses for failure and could make no exorbitant promises to pacify the Congress and the people.

I want to thank you for myself and the 150,000 other fellows here for your efforts in our behalf, and for your morale-building article.

Your friend and constituent.

P. S.—I'm sorry to have to correct you on the number of battle stars I have, but I have three and not five. Thank you.

SALEM, ILL., *December 8, 1945.*

Hon. C. W. VURSELL,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You are no doubt besieged by relatives of servicemen seeking special action on their behalf, but I have one here which I think deserves attention.

A friend stationed on Okinawa wrote me a letter today in which he stated that the food situation there is terrible and that the men are forced to dump half of their rations because they are inedible. Shortly after the typhoons the supply of provisions improved but now it is bad again.

The ones most seriously affected are those with low-point scores who will not soon be evacuated, and my friend is only one of thousands there in the same situation.

Such a situation is inexcusable when supplies are adequate elsewhere. They managed to get service during the typhoons and there is no reason why it cannot be done now.

If you can build a fire under the War Department and get these men some decent food you will have their fullest gratitude.

Sincerely yours,

ALFRED S. PFAFF.

The Sunset of Life—Speech of Dr. W. L. Orr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest addresses of its kind I have ever read was delivered by Dr. W. L. Orr, a practicing physician, at Fulton, Itawamba County, Miss., my old home county, before a Sacred Harp Singing Convention in Fulton on October 14, 1945.

Thomas Campbell, one of the greatest of all English-speaking poets, once said:

'Tis the sunset of life gives me mystical lore,
And coming events cast their shadows before.

Dr. Orr is a Christian gentleman. He has carried his Christianity with him through life in practicing his profession, ministering to the sick and injured and inspiring them to better ways of life. His address follows:

I wish to address a few humble remarks today to the elderly people of this audience—we who stand before the sunset, we whose shadows are casting far to the east, we who have completed, or have almost completed, our allotted span of 3 score years and 10.

Our experiences and observations have convinced us that all material things are vanities.

Wealth has a way of eluding those who pursue it and escaping those who possess it. It never has and it never will bring peace of mind and contentment of heart.

Glory fades and vanishes at last, leaving its devotees cloaked in obscurity.

Fame is a gayly colored bubble which when it bursts leaves naught behind save airy nothingness.

The smile of public opinion popularity is as subject to change as the winds which blow from every quarter of the compass. Public opinion defies today and damns tomorrow. Today public opinion makes the welkin ring with its paeans of praise and tomorrow hisses its anathemas to hate. Public opinion today scatters the palm leaves of adulation upon one's pathway and tomorrow weaves for that selfsame brow a cruel crown of thorns and crucifies upon a cross of shame.

Power and pomp perish and pass away.

We have lived long enough to know the profound truth expressed in that famous quotation from William Shakespeare:

"The cloud-capp'd towers, the gorgeous palaces,
The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
Yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve,
And, like this insubstantial pageant faded,
Leave not a rack behind."

We have lived long enough, too, to know that the things which are really worth while, the things which live forever, the things which are enduring as the eternal hills of God, are not the material things of this world—not stocks and bonds, not gold and silver, not the cattle of a thousand hills; but to the contrary they are the invisible and intangible things of the heart and soul—instilled there by the teachings, precepts, and examples of the meek and lowly Man of Galilee.

We who dream of immortality and a better life in some blissful Aidenn beyond the pale where burn the stars, have not found in materialism a firm foundation upon which to build our castle of hope; we have found naught but sands, shifting sands, treacherous sands, sands against which the tempest can and will prevail, but we have found that firm foundation which we sought upon the "Rock of ages cleft for me" which lives in the land where we never grow old.

Here we have grown old. Our step has lost its elasticity and its spring. The passing of the years has dimmed the acuteness of our vision. The flight of hurrying seasons has left its imprint upon our furrowed cheeks and brows.

Our backs are bent and our shoulders are stooped by the burdens, cares, and responsibilities incident to living.

Physically we have declined, but thanks be to God, we have grown in faith, faith in those things which lie behind that veil which no human eye can ever penetrate—faith in the assurance, "Lo, I am with you always even unto the end of the world"; faith in the promise, "In my Father's house are many mansions. If it were not so I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you and if I go to prepare a place for you, I will return again and receive you unto myself that where I am there ye may be also"; and the tired, footsore old pilgrim is cheered by his faith in that ringing invitation, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy ladened, and I will give you rest."

And when the last act in the drama of life has been played and the curtain marked "Finis" falls to close the play sustained by that faith, we shall not move to a realm of darkness, gloom, and despair, but we shall walk, exulting, to greet the glorious burst of a new dawn, the dawn of an eternal and an an unclouded day. Walk to hear a plaudit from the lips of the Master—a plaudit which the world in all its vaunted power cannot remotely approximate and which heaven, itself, can not surpass or transcend—"Well done thou good and faithful servant—thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

God bless you my elderly friends, and you younger ones as well.

How Aid China?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ernest Lindley, from the Washington Post of December 7, 1945:

HOW AID CHINA?

(By Ernest Lindley)

The unity of China is an American objective of long standing—one which the United States has promoted and defended at various times against the opposition of all of the imperial powers. After the First World War, the cornerstone of peace in the Far East was supposed to be the Nine-Power Pact, in which the signatories pledged themselves to respect the territorial and administrative integrity of China.

It was as a result of American leadership and pressure that China was recognized as one of the Big Four—now the Big Five—in World War II.

Roosevelt and Hull knew China was not a great power; that it could become a great power only with help from outside. They considered it important to recognize a great oriental people as a full and equal partner of the great white nations. They looked upon a united and stable China as a bulwark of future peace in the Far East.

The British and Russians were persuaded to follow the American lead. Both not only endorsed Chinese unity but accepted the Central Government as the legitimate instrument for achieving unity. With the agreement of the other major allies that all Chinese territories conquered by Japan, including Manchuria, should be restored to the Central Government, the last major foreign obstacles to the territorial and administrative integrity of China appeared to have been removed—at least temporarily.

WAR POSSIBLE RESULT

But neither the Central Government nor any other group in China is strong enough to unite China and keep it united without foreign aid. It is not enough for other nations to forego imperialist ambitions in China. If they want a united China, they must give positive help.

The United States, therefore, cannot be indifferent to civil struggles within China. The "hands off" policy which some now are advocating would almost certainly leave China in chaos for a long time. Rival groups would fish for foreign support. Other nations—and groups—would be continually tempted to give support to this faction or that to promote their particular group.

Almost unavoidably China would become again the scene and subject of the ambitions of other great powers. And the final result might well be another major war.

The cry "Hands off" is coming, within the United States, principally from two groups: the unreconstructed isolationists and active supporters of the Chinese Communists. This is an odd alliance. The only characteristic which its two elements seem to have in common is indifference to the interests of the United States and to organization of a stable peace.

This observation must carry two qualifications. The first is that some honest American observers who cannot be accused of Comintern connections think the Chinese Communists are the best foundation on which to build a united and democratic China. They were overruled, however, by Roosevelt, who consistently regarded Chiang Kai-shek as the better bet.

NEEDS DEFT HANDLING

The second qualification is, of course, that no one wants American lives expended in a civil conflict within China. It might as well be recognized that prevention of another major conflict will involve the risk of lives—only a tiny fraction, however, of those which would be lost in another great war. At the same time, every effort should be, and is being, made to keep American troops out of the lines of fire in China. Our aid should be confined to weapons and supplies followed by help in developing transportation and manufacturing.

"Hands off" is a complete negation. It is an abandonment of a historic policy at the very time it has been accepted by other major powers, and therefore has its best chance of fruition.

The real question is: Can China best be unified by unconditional support of the central government or by the use of American influence, with the consent of the other great powers, to bring together the Central Government and the Chinese Communists and—

still more important—democratic groups in China which are presently unarmed? The second choice is the better. It may not succeed. But it should be more thoroughly explored and more deftly pursued.

The Sad Muddle of Demobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Stars and Stripes:

THE SAD MUDDLE OF DEMOBILIZATION

In the mind of the Pacific GI the demobilization program is in a sad muddle. He is thoroughly confused by the contradictory pronouncements being handed him, and his morale has suffered accordingly.

The latest bombshell was the announcement that the Army critical point score for discharge would drop only to 55 on December 1.

No explanation has been offered as to why the drop is to be only 5 points instead of 10 as in both October and November. Now every enlisted man with 50 to 55 points must readjust himself to spending a month longer in the Army than he had expected. Those with less than 50 points face even more drastic delays, if future point drops are to be kept to five a month.

This five-point drop has been announced in the face of repeated assurances that the discharge rate would reach a new high in December * * * and in the face of Brig. Gen. Robert W. Berry's indication to the Senate Military Affairs Committee that the critical score would be reduced to 50 on December 1.

Of course, men with 4 years' service and men with three children also become eligible for discharge December 1. But the vast majority of these are either in the States or eligible for discharge on points anyway.

It isn't as though this is the first time the GI has been confused and felt cheated. It's been happening all along.

For instance, more than a month ago, he read that General Marshall told a joint Senate-House session that shipping space was not an urgent problem and that Admiral Nimitz said there would be "ample troop lift." Yet, when he asks his commanding officer why he can't go home, he's told there's no shipping available or "wait until the points drop."

Navy admirals once told him that it would be far too "uneconomical" to use carriers and battleships as troop transports. Now he reads Navy press releases boasting of the thousands of men being ferried home aboard both carriers and battleships.

The pay-off came when Navy's "magic carpet" officials explained the use of the carrier *Hornet* to transport civilian workers from Hawaii to the west coast by saying, "Whereever space is used for the transportation of civilians, it is because it is surplus."

To which Army officials added, "But this will be scheduled so as not to delay military personnel."

Does this mean that demobilization is being delayed primarily by failure to lower points and make more men eligible for return to the States, rather than any shortage of shipping? Or what does it mean?

As a result of all this, GI's are asking, how about all this double-talk? What goes on?

One of the chief troubles seems to be that no one bothers to explain these policies and changes of policy. The GI doesn't know where he stands, or why.

Since VJ-day the only thing he's really wanted is to go home. Occupation of Japan, cleaning up the bypassed islands and other necessary jobs were to be done by low-point men and replacements, he thought.

Every time a general or an admiral so much as breathes a word about points or ships the rock-happy vet practically falls on his face with anticipation and hope.

The tension has been terrific. And it's not getting any less as time goes by. Because the desire to get home and into civilian life has become a highly emotional subject for servicemen, demobilization disappointments and uncertainties are causing mass jitters and threatening to make psychoneurotics out of many. And this includes officers, whose critical score has dropped only two points in the past 2 months.

In a charged situation like this surely the authorities realize the necessity of full and careful explanation of every new announcement.

A good beginning would be to explain this latest point drop to only 55 points on December 1 when everyone was expecting a drop to 50.

Unless the men are given a better accounting than any offered so far they are bound to conclude there is no consistent demobilization policy, or that someone is delaying their return home purposely, for reasons unannounced and unknown.

"Waiting for Ships That Never Come In"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Sun Setter, of Friday, November 16, 1945. As I stated this morning on the floor of the House, this gives a dramatic picture of the mental attitude created by the failure to establish and maintain an accurate schedule for the return of these veterans eligible for release and those with long overseas service.

They should have been home long ago. Certainly bringing them home quickly is the No. 1 postwar job of the Army and Navy. Having a definite schedule and keeping to it strictly would certainly help morale. It is only fair and common sense.

THE LOST SHIP

"I'm waiting for ships that never come in"—these words from a once popular song echo the sentiments of the men in the three class IV units on Palawan, except they are waiting for just one ship. About one-third of these men have been eligible for discharge since VJ-day or before, the other two-thirds became eligible on October 1.

On November 1 a rumor circulated that a ship would dock here on November 5 to take home all the men on the island in class IV units. Later in the day this report was confirmed. The watch began on November 4. Early in the morning until later that night, both officers and enlisted men were on the beach, scanning the sea for a ship that didn't come in that day. The high tide in the morning and the low tide in the evening reflected their spirits; nevertheless, there were celebrations and farewells that night. And when the men went to bed, they were confident that it would be the last night they would sleep on Palawan.

The next morning they were up early and down on the beach again. No ship had come in during the night, and as the day lengthened, more and more did they realize that none would come in. In the afternoon an explanation was made that the arrival date previously given was erroneous. No new date was given at the time, and no explanation was offered for the original mistake.

We know a soldier who used to keep a morale chart. Its range was from poor to very stinkingly poor. In his words, then, the morale of the men here on November 5 dropped to very stinkingly poor. A few nights later, however, it rose sharply again, when the local radio station, WVTS, announced that a telegram had just been received which ordered all the men in class IV units on Palawan to be ready to load on the U. S. S. *General Langfitt* on November 13. Later at least one telegram confirmed this report.

On November 12 a thousand men lined the beaches to watch for the ship. They were like men who had been shipwrecked and who were about to be rescued, and their vigil was as diligent as that of shipwrecked men waiting for the ship which will rescue them. The sun went down in a bank of clouds, but no ship appeared on the sea, only a storm. And the storm that night seemed foreboding, a foreshadowing of disappointment in the morning. And though the watch was resumed again on November 13, the men looked upon the sea with less hopeful eyes than they had gazed upon it the day before. Rumors, some facetious, some serious in their implications, grew as the day wore on. By its close and no ship, morale had dropped to a low which cannot be described even by very stinkingly poor. Officers and men alike had ceased to believe. Optimists had become cynics. Pessimists have become even more convinced that this is the worst of all possible worlds.

It is late in the afternoon of November 15, now, and the ship has not yet docked. For the past 3 days planes have searched the sea in vain for it. As yet no official public explanation has been offered for its failure to arrive here on November 13. As yet, as far as we know, no one in authority has found out why it didn't reach here. No one seems to know where the ship is despite the fact that some 2,300 officers and enlisted men are waiting and daily becoming more and more discouraged.

For these men "when I get home" has become "if I get home." The prospects of another tropical Christmas grow daily, and yet daily these men hear and read reports about men with far fewer points than they have receiving their white-paper goals. They want to know, and they have the right to know, why they weren't sent home before. They want to know, and the whole island of Palawan wants to know, where the ship that failed to reach here on November 5 and again on November 13 is. They wonder now whether there ever was a ship scheduled to take them home on either of these days, and some wonder whether there ever will be.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Tomahawk (Wis.) Leader:

MILITARY TRAINING

President Truman, in a joint session of the House and Senate Tuesday, advocated universal military training for the youth of this Nation. He proposed:

1. A year's military training for all young men when they reach 18 or when they graduate from high school, whichever comes later. In any event, a youth would have to enter training before his twentieth birthday. If a boy finished high school in his seventeenth year, he could enter training with his parents' consent.

2. A continued, small professional armed force.

3. A greatly strengthened National Guard and organized Army, Navy, and Marine Corps Reserves.

4. Establishment of a general reserve of all men who have passed through the universal training system.

On the face of the foregoing four-point proposal the Leader would hesitate to voice approval. Militarism is not at all to be desired. Militarism itself is a dangerous reef which can bring tragic consequences to a ship of state—witness the fates of Germany and Japan as due examples of militarism.

Youth training? Yes; but training in usefulness to peace as well as to war!

In this writer's opinion the redeeming feature of Mr. Truman's proposal lies in his further suggestion, that "the year's period could be used for self-improvement in the way of education and development of skills, raising the literary standards and improving the physical well-being of the Nation's youth." With the accent on the broadest interpretation of those points, and with a softer pedal on militarism, more peaceful use can be made of a year's training period! This we might favor.

Few boys are ready to fully resolve themselves to their futures when they graduate from high school. A year's "cooling off" period, prior to college entrance—with that year spent in becoming more familiar with the firmer realities of existence—would better qualify them to become more serious-minded in college work. It would temper them to a wiser choice of future professions and more earnest application of their abilities. This we know from personal experience!

Imagine—if you will—how much better we might have been prepared for war, had the hundreds of thousands of CCC youths throughout the land been taught even the meagerest details of the military code and manual of arms prior to December 7, 1941! But wait! Do you recall that such training was proposed in Congress prior to the bombing of Pearl Harbor? Yes, indeed, it was proposed prior to the Nation's draft which took effect much later.

And who opposed the training and teaching of military rudiments to the CCC boys? The loudest objector was Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt—look in the record. She said, in effect, that to train the CCC youths in militarisms would be to invite war. And her late husband came into America's highest office in the spring of the same year—1933—that found Adolf Hitler elevated to the highest political office in Germany. Hitler and Roosevelt traveled parallel paths for 8 years—the former with militarism, the latter with pacifism (?)—until the bombing of Pearl Harbor rocked America on its heels. But Mrs. Roosevelt cried the loudest against military training, until a Congress invoked the Selective Service Act and called for 1 year's training.

History is an open book revealing the cycles of man's strength and weakness. And history teaches "again and again and again" that national regimes founded on militarism were and are doomed to suffer when they sought and seek oppression and conquest of peaceful nations.

Yet the more recent pages of history likewise show what tragic suffering befalls the peaceful nation that is not prepared to defend itself—and Poland, Belgium, and China are sufficient examples.

Let us have preparedness, particularly in this modern era of sudden invasion. But let that preparedness be a potential, only to be used to strengthen and enforce peace. Training for youth? Yes; there can never be too much training of youth, but let that training be focused on the building of peaceful and useful men—not aggressors.

The Foster Parents' Plan for War Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the following statement was received by me from the American Headquarters, 55 West Forty-second Street, New York City, of the foster parents' plan for war children. It describes the terrible need of Europe's children and offers one practical suggestion as to what we can do to meet that need in part.

The statement follows:

One million European children will perish this winter unless Americans send food, clothing, and vitamins overseas immediately to France, Belgium, Holland, and Italy, according to the Foster Parents' Plan for War Children.

This information comes to Mrs. Edna Blue, Plan executive chairman, from staff members in these countries who have just completed reports on the conditions of children overseas.

From Eric G. Muggeridge, plan executive secretary in England, who has just returned from a trip through France, Holland, and Italy, comes the following report:

"There is no peace where children are hungry and naked. The war is over but the children in Holland, Belgium, France, and Italy, would never believe you. One million children will die this winter in these countries unless help comes immediately from America. In every country that I have been in, the soldiers who fought to bring this war to its successful end have taken their own rations to feed the children.

"Witness if you can, men who have known battle, scraping their plates in the mess hall to make a stew for the hungry children who gather outside. Lines of hungry children begin to form at least 5 hours before the stew is ready to be given out.

"The only way I can tell you what it is like is to say that swarms of starving, ragged children devour every scrap of food, fit or unfit, that they can get hold of. Perhaps this must be seen first-hand before the world really knows that it must share with these starving children. I entreat you as I have always done—do not fail them, please."

Mrs. Ivy Mason, who is in charge of the work in England, writes:

"It is all very amazing to us to read about the reconversion in America, and how soon there will be more than enough food and clothing to go around—something really to look forward to now that the war is over. For ourselves, the outlook is rather bleak. In some ways the British people seemed happier and braver during the actual dreadful war than they do now. I sometimes wonder how I will be able to stand in line for hours and hours, and how I will be able to get along on such short food rations, to say nothing of clothes. I have long since stopped thinking about them.

"You mentioned in one of your letters that your efforts sometimes seemed very small as you shipped cases of clothing to us. I must certainly tell you right away that one decent item of warm clean clothing is a very big thing to us here. As you know, I have been able to send complete outfits to Belgium for the children and have also used a great deal of clothing for the Dutch children. You also know that clothing was shipped to France, so as you share with us we share with all those that it is possible for us to reach."

Letters from the Channel Islands report that conditions are grave. Although the children have been returned to their homeland, they are still desperately in need of help. Many children have no homes to return to. Many fathers and mothers have died through the long and bitter struggle. Others are missing, and it is hoped that they may be alive and in Germany where they were sent for enforced labor. Only the first step toward the rehabilitation of these children has been taken, and we are anxious to stand by them until they no longer need a helping hand.

Madam Madeline Bogaert reports from Belgium that she is meeting untold difficulties, but worst of all has been a widespread epidemic of infantile paralysis. All work for a while had to be suspended because of this. This was shocking news, and there seemed so little the plan could do about it. We hastened to send blankets and bed clothing which were badly needed. Many of these children will be confined to bed for some time and we are hoping to send toys and games to them in the near future. Not so long ago we were sending children toys and games to keep them occupied and diverted during air raids. The road back to normalcy for these little ones who have suffered the ravages of war does have many unlooked-for bumps which must be overcome.

To help in meeting the situation the foster parents' plan for war children has two suggestions. It appeals to Americans to support one or both.

First, it asks for clean, used clothing of all kinds for men, women, children, and babies. Shoes are needed most of all. Thousands upon thousands of families are trying to start life anew overseas and set up house again.

Have you curtains, towels, clean floor mats, tablecloths, napkins, unbreakable dishes, and children's toys and games? Will you please send your package to the Merchandise Receiving Depot, 991 First Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.?

Second, it asks that public or private schools, other organizations, or individuals, "adopt" children of 14 different nationalities in the 56 children's projects the plan operates in France, Belgium, Malta, Italy, and England. The foster parent receives a picture and case history of the child he is helping, and pays $15 per month. These cash contributions should be sent to the Foster Parents' Plan for War Children, 55 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y.

Thousands of French, Dutch, Italian, Belgian, and British children face the hardest winter of their young lives. America had a vital stake in the war. It is our duty to help the children of devastated Europe now before it is too late.

More than 30,000 children of all nationalities have been helped by the plan since its inception 8 years ago.

Foster parents include Mrs. James Couzens, Representative Clare Boothe Luce, Kate Smith, Dr. John Haynes Holmes, Allan Jones, Tallulah Bankhead, Cornelia Otis Skinner, Jack Benny, Fred Allen, Mark Van Doren, and Clifton Fadiman.

An international committee composed of the Earl of Listowell, the Viscount Cecil of Chelwood, Mrs. Harry S. Truman, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Helen Hayes, and Russell Maguire are sponsoring the work of the Foster Parents' Plan for War Children.

General Motors Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

To Members of All GM Local Unions, UAW-CIO, Greetings:

The national delegates conference of the General Motors department, UAW-CIO, in session in the city of Detroit, December 8, 1945, has received a full report of developments in the strike of General Motors workers recommended by the conference November 20 and begun, by order of the strike strategy committee of the international executive board, at 11 a. m., eastern standard time, November 21.

We have read and considered the telegram of December 3, 1945, from President Truman, addressed to R. J. Thomas, president, and Walter P. Reuther, vice president and director of the General Motors department of the UAW-CIO, in which President Truman proposes to set up a fact-finding board without statutory powers and in which he requests all UAW-CIO workers now on strike against General Motors Corp. to return to work immediately.

We have discussed the President's message to the Congress of the same date, in which certain legislation is proposed which would abridge the constitutional right of workers to withhold their labor.

We have noted, in our discussion of the two items named above, the report of the members of the national citizens committee on the GM UAW-CIO dispute. After reading the 739-page record of the negotiations and seeking all available information on both sides of the controversy, the committee had the following to say under the heading of "Findings and recommendations":

"If President Truman and his advisers had had access to this record (of negotiations), we believe they would have been in a position to insist more firmly on the full use of the collective-bargaining process before suggesting intervention by the Government. We believe that the full possibilities of collective bargaining have not yet been exhausted, and that it is not too late to renew the efforts toward a voluntary settlement."

We believe this recommendation is entitled to great weight, respect, and consideration. The character and independence of the members of the National Citizens Committee on the General Motors UAW-CIO dispute, whose names follow, cannot be impeached: Chairman, Dr. Henry Hitt Crane, Central Methodist Church, Detroit, Mich.; vice chairman, Dr. Harry A. Overstreet, College of the City of New York, New York City; secretary, Mrs. J. Birdsall Calkins, national president, Y. W. C. A., New York City; Prof. Ernest W. Burgess, professor of sociology, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; Rabbi Leon Fram, Temple Israel, Detroit, Mich.; Robert E. Garrigan, assistant director, New Council of American Business, Washington, D. C.; John B. Hanna, church counselor of the council for social action of the Congregational-Christian Churches in the United States of America, New York City; Leon Henderson, Research Institute of America, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Dorothy S. McAllister, National Consumers League, Grand Rapids, Mich.; Frank W. McCulloch, director, James Mullenbach Industrial Institute, Chicago, Ill.; Mrs. Bonaro W. Overstreet, author-lecturer, New York City; Bishop William Scarlett, St. Louis, Mo.; Mrs. M. E. Tilly, secretary, Christian social relations, Woman's Society of Christian Service, southeastern jurisdiction, the Methodist Church, Atlanta, Ga.; Walter White, secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, New York City.

The committee's findings and recommendations are relevant to the conference discussion and are of such importance that we incorporate the full text in our report:

"1. After reading the transcript of the negotiations between General Motors and the UAW-CIO, we believe it would be a contribution to public understanding of the dispute if the transcript were published.

"2. The committee was impressed by the serious and statesmanlike approach of the representatives of the union, as shown in the transcript of the negotiations. If President Truman and his advisers had had access to this record, we believe they would have been in a position to insist more firmly on the full use of the collective bargaining process before suggesting intervention of the Government. We believe that the full possibilities of collective bargaining have not yet been exhausted, and that it is not too late to renew the efforts toward a voluntary settlement. We urge that the two parties immediately resume negotiations.

"3. The union's request to participate in a determination of the wage issue on the basis of full knowledge of the basic wage-price-profit relations is not a "taking over" of management. This request is based on a principle widely approved by responsible leaders of business, labor, and government. Although the setting of actual prices remains a managerial function, at a time when there is a threat of inflation, the level of prices becomes a matter of legitimate public concern.

"4. If collective bargaining fails to result in a settlement, we recommend that any fact-finding commission appointed by the President be authorized and directed to determine what increase in wages can be given on the basis of the corporation's ability to pay without increase in prices. The corporation's ability to meet a wage increase is a sound factor in the determination of wages, both in good times and bad.

"5. From the record it is clear that the union, in its refusal to accept a wage increase that involves price increases, has lifted the whole matter of collective bargaining to a new high level by insisting that the advancement of labor's interest shall not be made at the expense of the public. The union has shown a sense of social responsibility that indicates its growing maturity and is certainly to be commended. The public has a vital interest in holding the line of present prices against inflation.

"6. Because of confusion in the public mind, the committee wishes to emphasize that the record of the proceedings clearly shows that the union's proposition was not "30 percent or else." The transcript repeatedly shows that the union's 30-percent demand was subject to reconsideration if and when management proved the 30-percent wage increase was impossible without a raise in prices.

"7. Considerable data from the General Motors Corp. and the United States Government reports were submitted by the union in support of its contention that the corporation can afford a substantial wage increase without raising prices. Outside of a flat denial supported by figures based upon sources not open to the union, to this committee, or to the public, no convincing evidence has been submitted by the corporation to show that the union's wage proposal cannot be met.

"8. While future profits cannot be computed with absolute certainty, it is common practice to base the prospects of them upon experience and estimated volume and costs. The union is asking that wages be projected in such a forecast as other cost factors and profits are projected. It is the consensus of the committee that the union is making a legitimate claim in asking that wages be negotiated in terms of future expectations.

"9. With regard to the union's 24-hour ultimatum on the acceptance of arbitration, the public should be reminded that the ultimatum was on the question of the willingness of the corporation to arbitrate and not on the basic wage demands, which would have required longer consideration.

"10. The committee reviewed carefully the union's supporting argument for the maintenance of take-home pay. It was based on the thesis that purchasing power must be commensurate with production. The committee agrees with this principle of wages since without adequate purchasing power to buy the products of industry there can be neither full employment nor general prosperity.

We note that General Motors management, after taking 4 days to make up its mind, on November 23 replied to our November 19 proposal of arbitration with a refusal of arbitration not only in the form proposed by the union, but in principle as well.

We note that on November 25, 1 day after receipt of the corporation's reply to our offer of arbitration, Walter P. Reuther, UAW-CIO vice president and director of the GM department, wired the corporation, proposing that negotiations be resumed at the earliest possible date.

We note that on November 26 the corporation again violated the National Labor Relations Act in an even more flagrant manner than theretofore by refusing even to go through the motions of collective bargaining. In refusing to resume negotiations the corporation further violated the Wagner Act by setting up conditions to resumption of negotiations, namely, that:

1. We modify our unreasonable demands. (We have offered throughout the negotiations to reduce our demand for a 30-percent increase in wage rates if and when the corporation could show that it could not be paid without increasing prices.)

2. We abandon the attempt to negotiate wages on the basis of our (the corporation's) past profits, assumed future profits, and our selling prices. (We have contended that wages cannot be negotiated in an economic vacuum, but must be arrived at in relation to prices, profits, costs, and volume of production.)

3. We are now prepared to discuss wage demands on their merits. (What merits? The corporation gives no clue. What is the corporation's definition of "merits"? Is it the so-called going wage? With unemployment expected to increase, such a wage would be likely to become a going, going, gone proposition.)

We note that on November 27 the union filed with the National Labor Relations Board a supplemental charge that the corporation management was in violation of the National Labor Relations Act in refusing to resume even the pretense of collective bargaining and in setting arbitrary conditions for resumption at some later date.

This supplemental charge followed the original charge filed November 8, on which the National Labor Relations Board has taken no action. The Board remains silent on our charge that the corporation, by first advancing inability to pay and then refusing to supply factual support for that contention, is violating the Labor Relations Act in that it refuses to bargain collectively in good faith. It is a basic principle of law that justice delayed is justice denied. Every day that the Board's silence continues, in the face of the corporation's refusal to bargain in good faith (renewed as late as 5 p. m. yesterday, December 7) is a new denial of justice to 300,000 General Motors workers and their families.

We note that on November 27 the United States Director of Conciliation invited corporation and union representatives to meet

with him in Washington; that the union representatives accepted at once and did meet with him and the Secretary of Labor, at considerable expense to the union; that the corporation president not only refused to have corporation representatives attend, but we are informed that he subsequently played a record, taken from a tapped wire, of a conversation between himself and the United States Director of Conciliation, in an attempt to prove that the official was wrong in stating that the General Motors president had agreed to attend a conference with him. We suggest that the President or an appropriate committee of Congress may wish to ask the General Motors president for a play-back of records of any other conversations between himself and the United States Director of Conciliation, or to obtain the words or substance of such conversations in some other way.

We note that the General Motors president made his arrogant and contemptuous defiance of the President's agent more unmistakable by adding that he did not plan to go to Washington at any time in the future.

By November 29, the GM snub to the Federal Government had aroused so much public attention that the General Motors president held a public press conference, at which he said (quoting from page 33 of the GM transcript):

"If President Truman asked me to come down to Washington to see him, I would certainly go. If Mr. Warren (the chief conciliator) asked me to come down to see him, well, I have quite a few things to do too, see?

"QUESTION. Well, let's put Schwellenbach in the middle now.

"Mr. WILSON. All right.

"QUESTION. If he asked you——

"Mr. WILSON (interposing). He is gradually getting used to that."

We see that, while the president of the would-be sovereign state of General Motors consents to meet and listen to, if not to treat with, the President of the United States, he contemptuously brushes aside the officials appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate to conciliate and mediate in industrial disputes affecting interstate commerce and the national welfare.

Significantly, at the same press conference (pp. 34–35 of the transcript) the following colloquy took place:

"QUESTION. Mr. Wilson, what would be your position on a fact-finding board here, to hear the arguments and make recommendations, without any power to carry them out or order the carrying out?

"Mr. WILSON. I discussed that a little bit over the phone with Mr. Warren. I pointed out to him that the trouble wasn't over the facts, because the facts of the past could readily be ascertained. The trouble was over what you did with the facts, and the uncertainty of the future.

"So that this so-called fact-finding idea, while it might be quite useful in something like examining into the question of, we will say, wages and rates for a utility, where you are just talking about a rather simple kind of thing, that might be helpful. But I doubted if it applied very well in a business like ours. * * * The best facts we have are the past operating reports of the corporation. They are clearly facts, and they are gotten up in good shape. But it is an awfully big kind of thing."

To us, this means that the General Motors management is against fact finding and advances the excuse that the corporation is just too big to handle in a fact-finding inquiry.

On November 29 President Truman supported the unanimous recommendation of the OWMR advisory board that negotiations be resumed.

Thereupon the General Motors president immediately announced that the corporation would not resume negotiations on the wage dispute.

On Monday, December 3, President Truman announced a proposal to Congress that the right of American workers to withhold their labor as the ultimate step in collective bargaining be abridged. At the same time he telegraphed to our union officials the proposal and request to which we have referred. The President had not consulted with our union officers, but on October 19 he had conferred with the president of General Motors, while the union was attempting to persuade the corporation to negotiate on our demands.

It is proposed that those who comply with Federal law and policy shall surrender unconditionally in this test of economic strength to which we have been forced and that the corporation management, which has treated Federal statutes, policies, and officials with scorn, contempt, and open violations, shall be declared the victor.

We are asked to retreat from economic democracy as furthered under the courageous leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

We cite and endorse the words of CIO President Philip Murray, speaking of President Truman's legislative proposal for which General Motors and steel workers were to be the human guinea pigs:

"Does the Federal administration condemn the sit-down strike of American industry and put an end to the public financing of these outrageous practices?

"The sole answer of the Federal administration is to seek legislation directed against labor.

"Industry has refused to engage in collective bargaining. Industry has refused to meet with the union in the steel industry though specifically requested by the Federal Government. Industry has refused to accept voluntary arbitration in the automobile dispute.

"To all this arrogance the Federal administration yields in abject cowardice.

"Its rancor is confined to labor."

Examining the President's proposal and request, we find that:

1. The proposed fact-finding body, if it were able to get the relevant facts, would promote public understanding and support for our contention that the corporation can pay 30-percent higher wage rates without increasing prices.

2. If the General Motors workers were to return to work now, as requested by President Truman, General Motors management would, in all probability, treat the fact-finding board with the same scant courtesy it has extended to the President and would fail to furnish that body with any relevant facts worthy of the name.

3. If General Motors workers were to return to work at any time prior to the acceptance of the board's recommendations by the corporation and the union, they would be receiving less assurance of a wage-rate increase from President Truman's fact-finding board than they can get now from General Motors, namely, 13.5 cents an hour, or $1.08 more per 8-hour day, and without any assurance that the board's recommendations would be applied retroactively.

4. In view of the foregoing, we believe that this national conference of elected delegates of the General Motors workers would be acting in disregard of the interests of the workers, the union, and the national welfare, if it were to recommend acceptance of the President's proposal and compliance with his request.

We conclude:

A proposal to go back to work with no settlement of our demands, with no commitment that they would ever be settled, with no undertaking by the corporation to adopt any of the recommendations that might be made, would be unacceptable under any circumstances.

But in the circumstances which now exist, the President's proposal is ill-advised and undeserved, coming as it does after months of conscientious effort by the union to settle the wage dispute with General Motors on the basis of the economic facts and in strict conformity with the Government's wage, price, and collective-bargaining policies as promulgated by Congress, President Truman, Secretary of the Treasury Vinson, Secretary of Commerce Wallace, Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach, OWMR Director Snyder, and OPA Administrator Bowles.

President Truman's December 3 telegram to President Thomas and Vice President Reuther concluded with the words: "I hope very much that it will be possible for you to comply with this request of the President of the United States."

We regret that the facts and circumstances compel us to the conclusion that it is not possible for us to recommend to GM workers that they accept the President's request.

We recommend that you vote "No" on this request that you return to work. We further recommend that President Truman read the verbatim transcript of the negotiations and that he persuade General Motors to begin to bargain collectively in good faith. If that is done, we believe that a fair settlement based on General Motors' ability to pay 30 percent higher wage rates without higher prices can be reached and GM workers will then return to work as freemen.

Hold the picket line.

To the above, we must add a brief comment:

Unfortunately and unfairly, in our opinion, President Truman based his back-to-work request upon an appeal to the patriotism of General Motors workers. The patriotism of freemen enduring sacrifice in defense of their rights needs no defense. The thousands of veterans in our picket lines wearing the battle stars and ribbons of every theater of war answer the implied impeachment of our patriotism. These veterans by their presence prove that the peace will not be won until military victory is followed by victory in the economic field here at home. The American press and radio have fully and fairly informed the American public of our purpose to set a pattern for full production, full consumption, and full employment.

We endorse and repeat the statement of President Thomas and Vice President Reuther in their acknowledgment of President Truman's telegram:

"The American people know the contribution to the war effort made by the GM workers who were forced into the strike. They lost, according to Government figures, only six ten-thousandths of 1 percent of the man-hours worked. Mr. C. E. Wilson, who now defies their justified demands and who defies the law of the land which says he is compelled to negotiate with his workers, admitted at a recent press conference that the wartime record of GM employees was 14 times better than the average for the industry."

That is the wartime record of General Motors workers. It will stand. In the winning of the peace General Motors workers will continue to meet their patriotic responsibility as they see it.

Adopted unanimously by the national delegates conference of General Motors workers, UAW-CIO, in the city of Detroit, December 8, 1945:

Elwin J. Corbin, Chairman, National GM Negotiating Committee; Charles K. Beckman, Secretary, National GM Negotiating Committee; L. H. Adkins; Alfred Frederico; Edward Gurske; Edgar L. Crago; Harold McDougald; Fred Ascough; Charles Oswald; R. J. Thomas, President, International Union, UAW-CIO; Walter P. Reuther, Vice President, UAW-CIO, and Director GM Department; George F. Addes, Secretary-Treasurer, International Union, UAW-CIO.

The Need for an Experimental Forest in Northern Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

THE NEED FOR AN EXPERIMENTAL FOREST IN NORTHERN WISCONSIN

The unfolding of military secrets at the end of Warld War II has focused attention on the basic value of scientific research in helping to solve problems affecting the well-being of this Nation.

It is common sense to conclude that research can play as important a role in our peacetime way of life as during the emergency of a total war.

MANY BENEFITS

There are 10,000,000 acres of second-growth forest land in northern Wisconsin that can be rebuilt into a tremendous natural resource. Intensive research on a scale not approached today will help recreate this resource in a minimum amount of time. In terms of greater employment, a larger tax base, assurance of cover for wildlife, and a permanent background of green timber for recreation, it is a factor of immense concern to all of the State. Nearly 30,000 workers owe their livelihood to forest industries. With good forestry supplying raw materials, this number could be doubled.

This folder is published by Trees for Tomorrow, Inc., as a result of meetings and contacts with representatives of public and private agencies, farmers, industries, and individual citizens interested in the establishment of a center for forest research in northern Wisconsin.

The need for such a forest is only too apparent. We have agricultural experiment stations in the State that have proved their worth in the development of field crops and our great dairy industry. We do not have a large scale forest research center where studies, tests, and developments could be made for landowners who have soil suitable only for growing tree crops.

LOCALIZED RESEARCH

An experimental forest for northern Wisconsin will supply a focal point where forestry problems pertaining to our particular kind of trees and our kind of soil can be solved. It will establish a nearby outdoor laboratory where the results of experiments can be studied first hand, where experiments in the process of development can be watched and where questions on the over-all practice of good forestry can be answered.

There is widespread demand for more economic information in relation to the growing and harvesting of tree crops. An experimental forest provides such information. Because it is to everyone's interest, you are urged to investigate the need of an experimental forest and support a program to acquire it. Minnesota and Michigan have such forests. It is practical that all of Wisconsin look to the expansion of research facilities to help advance this State's important forestry program.

HOW A NEW RESEARCH FOREST CAN BE ESTABLISHED

Wisconsin has a huge investment in forest land. State forests, national forests, county forests, industrial forests, farm forests, and timberland owned by individuals represent an outlay of capital that runs into millions and millions of dollars. And Wisconsin is not without a well-rounded basic forestry program. However, foresters and forest technicians are the first to admit that additional research is vitally necessary if we are going to approach the task of reforesting the North in a manner comparable to the size of the job.

THE COST

An experimental forest for northern Wisconsin will cost $50,000 per year. No part of this sum need be spent in the purchase of land. We have thousands of acres of public-owned land that can serve this purpose. The $50,000 will be spent to secure a staff who would work under the direction of the Lake States Forest Experiment Station. This forest can be established through action of Congress. It is recommended that $50,000 be incorporated in the United States Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for 1947 under the heading "Forest Service—Forest management research."

The cost is small, about 0.02 of 1 percent when measured in terms of Wisconsin's $300,000,000 a year forest and wood utilization industry. It is insignificant in comparison to the $13 per $1,000 of investment industry spends on research.

All interested in the rebuilding of a more prosperous and well-developed North are urged to review the need for an experimental forest in northern Wisconsin and support this cooperative plan for acquiring it.

It has been suggested that this new forest be called the Bong Experimental Forest, as a memorial to Maj. Richard Bong—this Nation's ace of aces and northern Wisconsin's own native son—who gave his life in aeronautical research.

An Amendment to H. R. 2742

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a new bill identical with the original act H. R. 2742, except for the addition of a proviso. In view of the fact that H. R. 2742 passed the House by unanimous consent on April 17 last, having been reported out of the committee unanimously, I am hopeful that the new measure will also pass the House with the same ease and dispatch, as no controversial issue has been added by the additonal proviso.

It may seem a bit strange and calling for an explanation that I have introduced this new bill with an amendment, identical with a measure which has already passed the House, but which has not been acted upon by the Senate. Of course, another way to handle the matter would be for the Senate to amend the former bill to the same effect. That, however, might require a conference and would probably cause a greater delay than for the other body to act upon the latest version of this bill directly.

My reason for proposing this further proviso to the original bill is that the original bill, according to the rulings of the Department of the Interior, does not cover lands in Arizona under the Boulder Canyon Project Act, as I had originally supposed it did. In order to make sure and definite that the preferential rights of veterans shall apply both to lands in Arizona, watered by the Gila Canal, and the lands in California, watered by the All-American Canal, it seems necessary that this proviso be written into the measure either in the House or in the Senate. As a matter of saving time, I have moved to provide for it in the House bill.

What Should Chiang Kai-shek Do With the Communists?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, last week it was stated in this House that I wanted the United States to support a one-man dictatorship in China. That statement was made with reference to my repeated urging that the United States support the National Government of China in continuation of the policy followed by the late President Roosevelt, President Truman, and three successive Secretaries of State, Messrs. Hull, Stettinius, and Byrnes, as well as the various acting Secretaries of State during these administrations.

The present Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, reiterated the need for continuing this policy when he said on December 7, that "we believe, as we have long believed and consistently demonstrated, that the government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek affords the most satisfactory base for a developing democracy in China." Mr. Byrnes also told the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations that the long-range policy of the United States in China "is the development of a strong, united, and democratic" nation.

There can be little doubt but that this policy has the overwhelming support of the American public, which has little sympathy for one-man dictatorships wherever they may be. In order that there may be no further misunderstanding by anyone as to my exact position in regard to the place which the Chinese Communist Party should be given in the Chinese Government, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a speech made by me at Trenton, N. J., on October 9, 1945, 2 months before the present controversy on this subject arose in the House. The occasion of this address was the celebration of the anniversary of China's independence from foreign imperial rulers, and the establishment of the Chinese Republic:

CHINA'S CHALLENGE

Tonight on this great Double Tenth many eloquent tributes have been paid to our valiant ally, China. Her long resistance to Japan before we entered the war is our historical debt to her, for it saved us immeasurable costs in blood and materials. But that service to us, tremendous as it was, is only one great episode in the history of mutual aid between China and America. It is that mutuality of aid and obligations between our two great nations that we must all try to emphasize tonight.

For over 80 years America has played a notable part in helping China to be and stay a free nation. Back in 1861, when the freedom and unity of our own Nation was in grave jeopardy, we had still the strength and wisdom to strike shrewd diplomatic blows for China's freedom. Anson Burlingame, whom Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Seward had sent as Minister to China, found that nation weakened by opium wars and by corruption in high imperial places, and almost defenseless before internal dissension and the truculent trade and territorial demands of European powers. Western diplomats suggested that the outright partition of China would be the wisest, as well as to them the most profitable, solution.

But Burlingame, with a courage and vision worthy of Mr. Lincoln, wrought a miracle of diplomacy over the more cynical and experienced diplomats of other greater powers. His views of justice and good will prevailed. He stated and Seward, John Hay, and Elihu Root in time established, the great principles of the "open door" for China; noninterference in its internal affairs by foreign nations, guaranties of Chinese sovereignty and territorial integrity, and equality of interest, obligation, and cultural and economic exchange between China and western powers.

After 80 years Burlingame's policy endures, not only as a great doctrine, but a great challenge to America. Have Americans the vision, the good will, the intelligence to walk with China in united friendship and respect toward the great common goals of progress and freedom? There is no time in history when America's answer to that challenge, that question, is more crucial to the future of both nations than in this very year.

For the first time since China became a Republic she has an even chance of becoming a great modern nation. That will not be easy. Her postwar problems are vast. Eight years of war have intensified the poverty of a nation which was, even before those years, terribly poor compared to our western democracies. Uncounted millions of Chinese have been killed and maimed; perhaps 30 million more are homeless. China's railways, mines, industries, roads, factories, dams, power plants, communications and agriculture are all in chaos. To gain the most elementary economic stability, she still needs much help from us, and this we owe her, for at last she has a chance. That chance must of course be predicated on the assumption that China and Soviet Russia will stay at peace with one another—that the present pact between Soviet Russia and China will be honorably observed to the letter by both parties. Surely, after the lessons of the past decade any other assumption is incomprehensible.

But China has notable assets too. She has a government and a leader which have surmounted every hazard ever offered to a struggling nation: revolution, civil war and foreign war, domestic and foreign intrigue, inflation, disease, and famine. China's leader, Chiang Kai-shek, has remained longer at the helm of the ship of state under incomparably greater difficulties than any other world statesman. He has stood the greatest test of statesmanship by bringing peace to his people and guarantees from Soviet Russia and the other great Allies of territorial and domestic sovereignty.

And this Chinese leader has presented his nation and the world with another great challenge—greater than any voiced by any other world leader. On VJ-day, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek delivered this message to the Chinese people:

"I am (said the Generalissimo) deeply moved when I think of the teachings of Jesus Christ that we should do unto others as we would have them do unto us and love our enemies. My fellow countrymen know that to 'remember not evil against others' and 'do good to all men' are the highest virtues taught by our own sages. We have always said that the violent militarism of Japan is our enemy, not the people of Japan. Although the armed forces of the enemy have been defeated and must be made to observe strictly all the terms of surrender, yet we should not for a moment think of revenge upon the innocent people of Japan. Permanent world peace can be established only upon the basis of democratic freedom and equality and the brotherly cooperation of all races and nations."

We westerners have talked much in times past of our spiritual superiority to the Chinese—without reflecting whether such superiority existed. Yet it remained for a Chinese leader—among all the leaders of the world on VJ-day, unmistakably to strike the most clear and profound Christian note.

No nation has fought so long, nor endured a tenth so much as China at the hands of the Japanese. Perhaps no other people, except the Jews of Europe, have suffered individually so terribly, and could be less criticized for overlooking the Christian doctrine of forgiveness. Under these circumstances, surely all men who believe that the truest expression of religion is the love of one's fellowman must thrill to these words of Chiang. Surely, if he means it, as he must, he ranks with the Lincoln who could say "with malice toward none and charity toward all." Let us accept his text and examine how Chiang may be expected to apply it not only to his foreign enemies, the Japanese, but to his domestic enemies, the Chinese Communists.

It is certainly not for us to direct any nation as to its forms of government or the solutions of its internal problems—certainly not that of China, the longest standing of all our global allies, the oldest and most sophisticated people in the world.

And yet as Americans we have a duty to the world to set forth our opinion on those forms of government which we have found in the past serve best to meet the demands of a common peace and prosperity. We can justifiably place our own experience at the disposal of China, which, like America, claims to love democracy.

Democracy to us in America means many things. But basically I think it means the civil rights of man—his right to say what he thinks, to think what he chooses, to worship as his conscience dictates, to assemble with like-minded people peaceably wherever and whenever he wishes. It means, as Lincoln said, that the government is the instrument of the people and can be changed by the people at their will through the free exercise of their ballot. It means, furthermore, that majority rule carries with it no right forcibly to liquidate the rights or convictions of the minority, which are always to be safeguarded within the framework of government.

With its blood and its aid and its share in victory, America has surely won the right to speak frankly to her friends. Are we not justified in admitting that these basic civil rights and freedoms have never existed throughout China, and particularly not during the terrible decade of the war for national existence? Is not America justified in believing that China has postponed the realization of democratic freedoms only because war made postponement necessary, and that with the blossoming of peace these basic rights will speedily be granted to the people of China? "Do good to all men" can have no other meaning in a true democracy.

Today, we and our great Chinese allies are no longer bound together by the flaming bonds of war. Our bond now and always must be a still stronger one—the ideals and principles that we both have declared to be our national aims.

Now, and not a year ago, comes the crucial test of China and America and their friendship. If either betrays these ideals, then the bonds of friendship will weaken and fall away.

China, during the war, was a house politically divided. The problems of political unity in China today stands before all others, even the tremendous economic ones which face her. I believe that lasting unity and true peace in China can come only through the basic precepts of democratic freedom.

It goes without question that no nation can exist if two independent governments share its sovereignty, or if two independent political armies stand marshaled face to face along the line of a shaky truce. There must be a basic solution. A China part Communist, part Kuomintang, and both parts armed, cannot endure. From that truth other truths follow: China is too vast and numerous a nation, its communications too inadequate, its local customs too varied to permit, short of tyranny, of one enormously centralized government organ controlling every detail of national life down to the remotest village. We Americans learned that lesson 170 years ago; we wanted unity, and yet our regional variety made impossible that integration of every State and every conviction into one rigid, central framework. We sought and found a solution that has endured to this day, a Federal union.

Within our Federal Union, the most diverse elements live at peace. The customs and laws of South Carolina or Nevada are different from those of Connecticut or Maryland, yet there is no doubt that we are one united people. Our Federal Union has been granted certain basic powers—national defense, foreign affairs, finance, interstate commerce—but other powers are reserved to the States, and sometimes futher subdivided from States to municipality and county. Each State chooses its own governors, makes its own criminal and civil laws, creates its own educational system, permits and regulates the political franchise to individuals, as it sees fit. By this system of unity in variety we have become a great nation.

China is even greater in numbers than America, and far behind us in communications and unity. It cannot wisely be controlled in toto from Chungking, or Nanking, or Peking by one man or even a group of men, however patriotic. Its customs are too disparate, its distances too great for governors of provinces to be selected by one central government, for universities in each province to be the creation of one central government, for its local tax laws and police administration to be the creation of one central government. It needs a central government to provide for its national defense, to direct its foreign affairs, to lay the foundations of national industrial reconstruction, to regulate its commerce, to collect taxes for these projects, and to do all those things without which no sovereign power can exist. But by attempting to do all, it will turn the clock of democracy backward, either to communism or fascism, but in any case to dictatorship.

There are certain areas in China which we all know are now dominated by the Communist Party. There are certain areas—much, much larger—controlled by the Central Government of Chiang Kai-shek; others where Moslem militarists are in control; still others where the people are ethnically and racially non-Chinese. All of these areas must make of their political armies one single force subordinated to a central government. But none of these armies will lay down their arms if they feel that their political convictions and beliefs, indeed, their very lives, are at the mercy of other revengeful political parties—if they believe that all they have gained in local reforms or local self-government during the war is to be wiped out by dictatorial edicts from far away.

It is the opinion of many thoughtful Chinese and Americans that only federal union offers a real solution for China's problems. A federal union, in which each political party should be allowed to organize and govern provinces they now clearly possess and hold, and the citizens of which are loyal to it. Each party must participate in one central government on a basis of representation; and to that one government, all armies in China must be subordinate. Further than that; the federal government should, as it

does in America, guarantee that every province should have a republican or democratic form of government as soon as it is politically possible. And the federal government should guarantee to every person—no matter what his political creed—the right to speak his mind and think his thoughts wherever he may be. Kuomintang papers must be allowed to publish in Communist areas, and Communist papers in Kuomintang areas. The federal government should allow no terrorist policy of any party to operate anywhere in any province. And out of all this, the world might soon see how truly great and noble a code is democracy, in our sense of the word, when practiced in China. If Chiang Kai-shek does unto the common men of China, who honestly believe in Chinese communism, exactly what he would have them do unto the common men of his political party, we need have small fear for the democratic future of China.

I say incalculable forces for peace and happiness have been tapped if 450,000,000 Chinese even partially follow this advice of their leader, if he follows it himself, and if we will follow it too: "Do unto others." There is no other course for China to follow, or America either.

And follow it we must, Americans, Chinese, everybody. The atomic bomb alone has made any other course impossible. The splitting of the atom, which has found the ultimate secret of material destruction, has also destroyed the supremacy of all material values. What remains, in an atomic age, alone indestructible, is mind and spirit. The Golden Rule of all religion, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you," has become the political law of survival for government, for nations, for all mankind. To follow that law is what we and the Chinese, who owe one another so much in the past, owe the world in the future.

Low Wages Will Destroy American Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, there must be no drop in purchasing power. Our children and our servicemen must eat no less, simply because the war is over.

The Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion has reported that by the spring of 1946, wages and salaries will have declined thirty to thirty-five billion dollars from April 1945. By that time, weekly wages will be cut 28 percent below April 1945. Prices continue to rise.

As a result, it is estimated that take-home pay of the average worker will be about 10 percent below 1941. This means less food, less clothing, less medical care, in virtually every American home. The effects of such a sharp drop in purchasing power will be felt by the entire community.

These are the facts which confront the Nation in planning for a peaceful, prosperous, postwar America, an America in which our farmers, veterans, workers, businessmen, and others can live free of want and fear.

American labor has demonstrated its patriotism during the war, by its magnificent production record, its service in the armed forces, and its no-strike pledge.

Repressive labor legislation will not solve the basic economic problems which confront us, and will intensify the differences which exist among us at a time when unity is needed more than ever.

National Benefits From Transportation Advantages of St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the great frontiers as yet undeveloped, which will contribute to the wealth and welfare of every section of America is the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. It is not a sectional project. True, something like 20 States in the land-locked empire in the midwestern part of this country will be benefited by the St. Lawrence seaway, but so will every other section of the country.

COMPARABLE TO PANAMA CANAL

Some people will recall rather clearly what took place when the Panama Canal was dug and joined the Atlantic and Pacific oceans across the Isthmus of Panama. It was a tremendous undertaking and nothing like it has ever happened that has contributed so much to the progress of transportation not only on the North American Continent but in world-wide directions as well. I pass by the interesting history of that project; the objections to it—and these objections sound like those raised today against the St. Lawrence seaway—or the arguments for the project and other features. No one has ever advocated filling up the Panama Canal on the theory that it hindered human progress. World War II has been finished and the story of moving our Navy from the east coast to the west coast and the fact that such a procedure was almost indispensable, requires no elaboration. The St. Lawrence project is needed to supplement the Panama Canal project.

I quote, Mr. Speaker, from a pamphlet issued March 23, 1933, by Charles P. Craig, executive director of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Association, in support of the ratification of the treaty signed on July 18, 1932, by representatives of the United States and Canada, for the development of this project. Mr. Craig packs page after page with his striking and challenging sentences, which, in part, are as follows:

I. THE RISE OF THE SEAWAY DEMAND

The civilization of the midcontinental area of North America expanded under conditions that enabled agriculture and industry to meet on a competitive equality with like producing areas in this and other lands. In this picture of opportunity the Great Lakes, one great commercial body of water reaching from within a short distance of the Atlantic to the midcontinent was a prime factor. Rail transportation leading down to these lakes; relatively low rates on bulk commodities moving eastward and ex-continent; low overhead costs of production, were among the remaining prime factors that gave the midcontinent its day of opportunity.

CAUSES OF THE MIDWEST'S DEMOTION

Today this region is demoted in its ability to compete in coastal, intercoastal, and foreign trade. The reasons are obvious:

1. The opening of the Panama Canal changed the transcontinental trade routes from land to water. The Pacific, Gulf, and Atlantic coasts were drawn close together in cost nearness. The interior of the continent, relatively speaking, was pushed far away. Because of this factor alone it became difficult if not impossible for the midcontinent to compete for either Pacific or Atlantic coastal trade, with producing or manufacturing areas favored by ocean transportation. The continental marketing zone of the Middle West was circumscribed. The limitation of its agriculture and its industries began.

2. Costs of rail transportation, increased during the perid of the World War, have remained far above the pre-World War level and the effect upon rates and traffic moving has been immediate and devastating. The midcontinental farmer or manufacturer, competing in overseas markets, finds himself faced by transportation costs that even in normal times place him beyond the zone of profitable prouction, and compel him to direct his production along lines that seemingly promise better returns, with the inevitable result that new congestions are created, new surpluses built up, and chaos, both agricultural and industrial, has resulted.

3. The effect of increased rail transportation costs, falling upon the farmer and manufacturer alike, is still further intensified by the fact that costs of ocean transportation have remained essentially unchanged. Together these two factors are producing a natural, a logical result. Industries of the midcontinental area dependent upon coastal or foreign markets cannot compete with the same industries located on the seaboard. The inevitable result is a continued trek of industries to the coast, carrying with such movement the workers necessary to their operation or leaving them behind to increase the problems of unemployment and lessened consumer demand. Agriculture, being unable to move, sustains the full brunt of this blow to its basic ability to exist.

The agricultural problem of today is fundamentally transportation. The problems surrounding the stagnation of midcontinental industry are fundamentally those of transportation. The restoration to the interior of the North American Continent of that status which it held before the events above-mentioned took place is basic to any and all forms of permanent relief. Extending the ocean 1,000 and 1,400 miles inland is the longest single step which can be taken in the direction of solving, naturally and permanently, the agricultural and the industrial problems of the midcontinental area and of the Nation as a whole. Bringing the Atlantic to all the shores of the Great Lakes restores the transportation equilibrium upset by the opening of the Panama Canal and places the midcontinent upon a competitive basis with relation to coastal and world markets. Such restoration is vital to the retention of the industries of the Middle West within the area in which they developed and from which they are now being driven, and it is absolutely vital to the future of agriculture.

The disadvantage under which the continental interior was laboring became apparent immediately after the World War. Industry and agriculture alike centered upon a possible remedy. The Great Lakes had been improved to the status of an inland ocean. The St. Lawrence River, except for limited

reaches, had every requirement necessary to ocean navigation. Around the rapids in the St. Lawrence were 14-foot canals that afforded insufficient outlet from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic.

MR. CRAIG'S ARGUMENTS CANNOT BE REFUTED

In the foregoing brief discussion by Mr. Craig of the needs of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, you will get some idea of the intricacies of the transportation question and the way that progress has been stifled in the Midwest. In other parts of Mr. Craig's pamphlet, facts are set forth showing the advantages of the St. Lawrence project to other sections of the United States. Of course, what benefits one section of the country is bound to work to the advantage of other sections of the country. Mr. Craig shows the handicaps of the Midwest in 1933 and now, 12 years later, those handicaps still exist and still work to the detriment of our people out that way, as well as to all of the people of the United States.

When hearings were held by the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives here in Washington in June and July of 1941, a great deal of interesting testimony was developed and Mr. Craig's argument was expanded and fortified by another man from the Midwest. This man was John C. Beukema, of Muskegon, Mich., who represented the National Seaway Council and other groups at the hearings. Mr. Beukema was urging the ratification of the agreement between the United States and Canada for the construction of this project, which agreement had been entered into on March 19, 1941, and Mr. Beukema was urging the passage of H. R. 4927, which had been introduced in Congress for that purpose. He testified on Monday, July 7, and his statement in part was as follows:

MR. BEUKEMA TESTIFIES

The question we propose to discuss is the long-range usefulness of the project. What does this project mean to the United States in terms of increased production, and volume of trade; and in the opportunities afforded residents of one section of the country to purchase the products of other sections at less cost and at lower transportation charges?

It must be remembered that our coastwise trade in the United States exceeds in volume our foreign trade three to four times. It must be further remembered that the cost of transporting bulky commodities in a deep-draft vessel on a continuous water haul is about one-eighth to one-tenth of the corresponding rail charge.

Hence, the seaway has a vital significance to the citrus fruit growers in Florida, the canned-food processor in California, the lumber-mill operator in Oregon, as well as the Detroit automobile manufacturer and every coastwise resident who drives an automobile.

Summarizing, gentlemen, the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is primarily one of those great national investments that bind the people of every section of the country closer together by enabling them to exchange the products of their labor at less cost and inconvenience, thereby increasing the consumption of these products.

1. Growth of foreign commerce of the Great Lakes: This is not a new project. We are not asking the Governments of the United States and Canada to create a new facility, a currently nonexistent waterway. The seaway is operative today. It is carrying the substantial volume of tonnage, aggregating 9,236,318 tons the last postwar year.

Up to the outbreak of the war ships of well-known and established lines made regular sailings during the navigation season between Great Lakes ports and north European ports. The businessmen of Detroit and Muskegon are as accustomed to looking out of the windows of their offices and seeing Dutch and Norwegian flags flying from ships loading and unloading the port as the businessmen of lower Manhattan are to seeing those same flags flying from the masts of vessels in New York Harbor.

The one difference is that the ships which serve the lake ports are small vessels, with limited carrying capacity, usually not to exceed 1,500 tons, capable of navigating the present 14-foot canals in the St. Lawrence River. Most of them were specially built for this trade in Scandinavian yards. This commerce has developed since 1933, or since the previous treaty was defeated. It grew out of it.

IN CONCLUSION

It is submitted, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Beukema not only brings up to date the arguments of Mr. Charles P. Craig but he develops the advantages of this project to all sections of the United States. In other parts of his testimony, which we do not here quote, he shows how the development of trade will follow, in immense proportions, the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. One of the familiar arguments against this project is the fact that it is not used now, and therefore is not necessary. This argument, of course, puts the cart before the horse. When the facilities are available, it has been the history of transportation that people will take advantage thereof, and this is especially true in connection with all waterway development in the United States. As Mr. Beukema points out in other parts of his testimony, the Atlantic seaboard will trade with the Midwest; so will the Pacific coastal cities. Vast trade possibilities, which are not now possible because of prohibitive transportation costs, will be opened up and America will be better off when the hopes of the friends of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project are realized.

We Shall Need Professional Men and Women and Scientists If We Are To Keep in Step With the Progress of the Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a letter which I received from my district written by a highly cultured, patriotic woman, whose views are worthy of serious consideration of those who are interested in the education of our youth. I, for one, believe that every young man now in the service who desires to enter college and has the qualifications to do so should be demobilized and permitted to return to his country and complete his education.

The letter reads as follows:

One night last week we who were listening to our radios, heard the announcement of the new directive to draft boards, instructing them to cease the drafting of students of science. This policy will react so unfairly on a group of men, now in the service, that I am moved to make an appeal in their behalf. My son typifies this group. At 16 years of age he had completed high school at Fredonia, N. Y., and a term's study at Fredonia State Teachers College—in a period of 3½ years. He maintained the highest average in Fredonia High School and in Fredonia State Teachers College and the highest regents average in Chautauqua County. He was awarded a State regents scholarship.

At 17, he enrolled at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N. Y., majoring in mathematical physics. While in attendance there he maintained the highest average in his class of 300 in physics, chemistry, and mathematics—led the school in his last semester—was awarded a school scholarship. He became a special student, taking graduate seminars, and assisted in the laboratory. In an interclass thesis competition, his was judged best in all classes, was printed by the college and placed in the library. Incidentally, the subject matter of his thesis dealt with the potentialities of the atom—and this was in April of 1943. While in school, he took the Navy V-12 test, was called up for a physical examination but was rejected for poor vision. At 18 he had completed 2 years of study at RPI. He immeditely volunteered for the draft and was accepted by the Army in July of 1944. He was given 3 months of basic training at Camp Croft, S. C., and was then assigned to ASTP. He was sent to North Carolina State College at Raleigh and enrolled in the fifth form in an electrical engineering group. While there, he received a designation for scholastic excellence and was awarded the good conduct medal. He remained at NCSC for 9 months or until graduation. His next assignment was to a Signal Corps Battalion at Fort Monmouth, N. J., where he anticipated the opportunity to enroll for OCS. However, the entire ASTP graduating class was sent to Camp Crowder, Mo., for a course of instruction in Morse Code. It is interesting to note that at each of the several camps where my son has been stationed the personnel officer has confidentially told him that his AGCT score or rating is among the highest on record.

Then came VJ-day. On the morning of the day he was to have left for Fort Monmouth, all assignments to that point were canceled. In October he received his orders: "T. S. U. Alaskan Communical System, Seattle, Wash., for subsequent shipment overseas." During a year and a half in the Army, he has received no practical experience in preparation for this assignment, with the exception of 8 weeks' training in Morse code. It now develops that he is to become a radio receiver's attendant, whatever that is.

And today, the 5th of December, my son is leaving Seattle for Fairbanks, Alaska. If this follows the established pattern of Alaskan assignments, it means 2 years of isolation, 2 years of stagnation. In 2 months he will be 20, and under the present point system he faces the prospect of several years in the Army. What, except uncertainty does the future hold for him? His talents are being wasted and at the only time in his life when capacity for study is greatest, education is withheld from him.

Yes, I endorse nondrafting of students of science—though I do think it will result in a large crop of would-be scientists out of proportion to the number enrolling for other professions. As you know, I live in a rural community and observed how many healthy young men, heretofore not agriculturally inclined, turned their hands to the plow when proffered farm deferment. I maintain that any national policy that puts its faith for

future scientific development in its unknowns and restrains the education of its potential scientist—students who have already displayed scholastic superiority in this field—is short-sighted and unsound. Are those students who, in time of war, put service to country above every other consideration to be penalized in time of peace? What price patriotism! Extension of privilege in peace is as grave aproblem as division of burden in war—but is this evidence that this problem is being met with the same degree of intelligent foresight that characterized the war effort?

I have been particularly interested and impressed by the news stories carried in our press, telling of the courageous battle you are waging in behalf of the servicemen—your efforts to correct injustices, inequalities, and prejudices now confronting those seeking discharge. Your efforts are to be commended.

The Bulwinkle Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Arne C. Wiprud, former special assistant to the Attorney General in charge of the Transportation Section of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, recently made a speech which all Members of Congress should read. It gives some of the reasons for my opposition to the so-called Bulwinkle bill. We should exercise greater care and diligence in protecting the public from domination in transportation matters by the Association of American Railroads.

The speech follows:

PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AND THE ANTITRUST LAWS

(By Arne C. Wiprud)

A truly great opportunity lies ahead for the transportation industry, greater than ever before. The widespread distribution of war industries now being converted to peacetime use should increase greatly the national production and income and distribute more equitably the Nation's wealth. This means larger tonnages to be transported and increased demands for travel. The exigencies of war have also developed new technologies that can be applied to all modes of transport. These can bring about enormous improvements in transportation facilities and services, and reduce costs, which means further increases in traffic. Whether the transportation industry can rise to its great opportunity depends upon the practices it pursues and the policies of government.

History records that the practices fostered by private groups in the industry have restricted the development of public transportation. They have suppressed technological advancement; they have supported high rates; they have increased the cost of transportation; and they have protected inefficiencies. These restrictive practices have had consequences disastrous to the industry and the Nation.

The question naturally arises, Why should any industry, especially an industry that depends upon and therefore should encourage public support, pursue practices productive of destructive results? The answer leads first to a consideration of railroad finance.

The investigations of congressional committees, notably the Pujo committee, the Pecora committee, and the Wheeler committee have laid bare the methods by which such banking houses as J. P. Morgan & Co. and Kuhn, Loeb & Co. have exploited railroad after railroad in all parts of our land. Their ruthless exploitations—from the Morgan-created New Haven-Boston & Maine railroad monopoly to the recent financial wrecking of the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway Co. by Kuhn, Loeb & Co.—have touched and blighted every major railroad company and every community. In cynical disregard of law, particularly the Federal antitrust laws, these railroad banking houses went about their business of sacking the railroads. Their victims—large and small investors who often lost their all, farmers, small businessmen, and the public, which pays the transportation bill—have protested in vain. No force, not even Government itself, has yet been strong enough to stop their destructive rule.

There are those who say that this is an old story—that it is "rattling the ancient bones of antiquity." But the record shows that it is an old story ever new, for the baneful influence of these banking houses is still with us, like the Old Man of the Sea.

The scheme of railroad financing which these banking houses have saddled on the railroads, with few exceptions, lingers on. It is the source and center of the railroads' difficulties and the real cause of the restrictive practices in the industry. Bonded to 60 percent of their capitalization, with generally no sinking fund provisions to reduce this top-heavy debt, railroads have been hard-pressed to pay interest charges. When the bonded obligations matured, they were promptly refunded or extended, and usually increased, and the refunding or extension bonds sold to the public—at handsome profits to the bankers in the form of commissions and fees.

This scheme of financing, which always increases but never reduces the aggregate of railroad debts, forced railroad managements to suppress improvements, curtail services, and to seek higher and higher rates all to the end of preserving this unsound scheme of financing, thereby insuring a continuous and profitable income to the bankers. If rate increases prove insufficient to pay interest on the bonded debt, the railroad goes into bankruptcy, and the investor pays through the loss of his investment.

On May 8, 1944, the Interstate Commerce Commission required competitive bidding for railroad bonds. Independent railroad managements and independent banking houses long fought for this opportunity, supported by such outstanding national leaders as President Truman, then Senator; Senator Wheeler; Senator Shipstead; Mr. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; and Mr. Johnston, chief grand engineer of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. This should prove a great step toward breaking the control of J. P. Morgan & Co. (more recently Morgan, Stanley & Co.) and Kuhn, Loeb & Co. over the marketing of railroad securities, provided they do not find some way to circumvent it.

Progressive railroad managements, independing of Morgan or Kuhn-Loeb influence, have brought about revisions of their capital structures in accordance with sound financial principles and drastically reduced their bonded debt. Though some were on the brink of bankruptcy, their rehabilitation was accomplished without the outrageous destruction of security values characteristic of financial reorganizations shaped under the guiding hands of railroad bankers. Thus these independent managements have restored the integrity of the railroad dollar. This is reflected in the fact that the market value of the securities of such reorganized railroads are today in excess of Interstate Commerce Commission valuations.

The scheme of collusive railroad rate making established under banker rule to support unsound railroad capitalizations also lingers on. Following the repeal in 1933 of the mandatory provisions of the Transportation Act of 1920, which sought to insure by Commission action a fair return on the value of railroad properties as a whole, the railroads' own private rate-making machinery was brought into full play. Control was obtained through private rate-making conferences of carriers organized regionally and integrated into a Nation-wide set-up closely controlled at the top. The over-all organization is the Association of American Railroads. For the western United States a special set-up was established, called the western commissioner plan. Thirty-five railroads operating in that vast territory signed an agreement to insure monopolistic control over transportation rates in the West. They not only agreed to eliminate all competition in the making of rates but vested ultimate authority in a committee of bankers and businessmen of related interests that held their meetings at 40 Wall Street. Prominent members of the committee included representatives of J. P. Morgan & Co. and Kuhn, Loeb & Co. This situation prompted the chairman of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, Senator WHEELER, to state that "it evidences quite clearly the control the powerful nonrailroad interests in the East have over transportation rates in the West." The Federal Government has instituted a suit charging, among others, that this rate-making combination violates the Sherman Antitrust Act. And the State of Georgia has filed an original suit in the Supreme Court of the United States charging that a combination of railroads in the East to fix rates in the South violates the Sherman Act.

Private rate-making conferences, patterned after those in the railroad field, have been established by motor and water carriers. Agreements have been entered into by the organized rail carriers and the organized motor carriers. Thereby motor-carrier rates have been forced upward to the level of rail rates, and water-carrier rates arbitrarily related to rail rates. And an agreement between the Railway Express Agency and the domestic air lines provided that air-express rates should be at least twice rail-express rates.

Thus, rates by all modes of transportation were illegally raised to an artificially high level without regard to the actual cost of transportation.

This colossal rate-fixing scheme is without parallel in the American industrial and business world. But it works—in the interests of Morgan, and Kuhn, Loeb.

The efforts of the banker-ruled railroads to suppress the development of competing forms of transportation has also been a subject of Senate investigation. Busy with suppressing competition, they overlooked opportunities to improve their own facilities and services. The same manufacturers build the same cars, locomotives, and other equipment year after year, with little change in design, efficiency, or price. The whole technology of railroad signaling and communication is an anachronism. Trainmen still go down the track with lantern and flare to protect trains at emergency stops. The Federal Government has to date instituted at least one suit to break up an alleged illegal combination in the railroad equipment field. The monopolistic practices which enabled the Pullman interests to prevent the construction and use of modern lightweight sleeping cars is a matter of court record. By the terms of the western agreement, 35 railroads operating west of the Mississippi River agreed to delay improvements in railroad equipment, curtail new services, and suppress proposals to speed up freight and passenger schedules. Through such collusive practices, the equipment of railroads has become deficient in quantity and quality.

The whole public-transportation program of the banker-ruled railroads is one of planned scarcity and high price. Their monopolistic controls have drained carriers' revenues through financial exploitation, restricted the development and use of modern transportation equipment, retarded air-freight transport, hindered the operations of motor carriers, obstructed the building of pipe lines, and fixed rates in all fields of transportation. Government policies have contributed to some of these results. The Government has supported private group rate making through extensive application of its minimum-rate power and otherwise; and it has discouraged the full use of inland waterways.

What does this history of public transportation mean to you and I who have given thought to the future? The conclusion is inescapable that the continuance of monopoly controls and practices in transportation will destroy the last vestige of private enterprise in public transportation and with it private ownership and operation of our public transportation systems. Only through the restoration of competition can this industry be preserved as a legitimate field for private enterprise. Competition, which is basic in our economic philosophy, is not alone essential to the maintenance of private enterprise in transportation, but to development of truly modern transportation systems to serve the needs of an expanding national economy.

But monopolists, with their profitable monopolistic practices, die hard. Those who dominate "a monopoly toll bridge and collect easy fees" will tenaciously fight for that profitable advantage and ever seek to enlarge it. And this is true in public transportation. Witness the efforts of the so-called Transportation Association of America, in collaboration with its sponsor, the Association of American Railroads, to seize monopoly power over the public domain through the establishment of "competitive (sic) integrated transportation systems." Their plan contemplates the creation of corporations which would control and operate all rail, motor, water, and air transport facilities throughout large geographic areas. The idea seems fantastic even from the standpoint of managerial competence. Yet, to save their monopoly positions and to avoid the competitive challenge of newer forms of transportation, this program is vigorously advocated by these organizations which represent the greatest concentration of financial and economic power in this country. If they succeed all the benefits from past and future public expenditures for highways, airways, and waterways would accrue solely to these monopoly groups. It is encouraging that President Truman, then Senator, publicly condemned this scheme, characterizing the proposed "competitive integrated systems" as "cartel-monopolies."

Another source of danger to the national well-being is the so-called Bulwinkle bill now pending in Congress. This adroitly drawn bill would legalize agreements among competing carriers within and between all forms of transportation subject to the Interstate Commerce Act. Thus agreements relating to transportation rates, technology, and services would be exempt from the prohibitions of the Sherman Act. The Bulwinkle bill would thereby not only perpetuate monopolistic rate making by each form of transportation but would authorize the integration of virtually all forms of transportation insofar as private rate fixing is concerned. In short, rail-, motor-, water-, and pipe-line-carrier representatives would be authorized, if this bill becomes law, to sit around the table for the purpose of fixing the transportation rates of the country. If automobile manufacturers, the steel industry, the processors of food sought such authority the people of the Nation would be shocked. But the Association of American Railroads and its Transportation Association of America assure us that public transportation companies constitute a regulated industry and therefore abuse of such tremendous power is not possible. Of course, they recognize that any attempt to so fix rates without congressional sanction would run afoul of the Sherman Antitrust Act. This was reaffirmed in the now famous case of *The State of Georgia* v. *The Pennsylvania Railroad Company et al.*, decided March 26, 1945, which I recommend every member of this organization read with care. So they propose through the Bulwinkle bill to repeal the Sherman Act as applied to all combinations for the purpose of fixing rates.

Mention should be here made of the effect of the passage of the Bulwinkle bill upon the Government's suit against the western railroads, the Association of American Railroads, J. P. Morgan & Co., Kuhn, Loeb & Co., and others, and upon the original suit of the State of Georgia against the eastern railroads, and others. The Government's suit charges a combination and conspiracy to restrain trade and commerce in the western part of the United States and to monopolize. The State of Georgia case charges a conspiracy among defendants in restraint of trade and commerce among the States so as to discriminate against Georgia. Have any of you read the complaints in these cases? If you have not, you should, and then ask yourself (1) whether the practices therein charged should be continued in the public interest, (2) whether the practices therein charged are necessary to the proper and efficient functioning of the transportation industry, and (3) whether you, as advocates of sound transportation policies, would want the practices therein charged, if proved by the Government, perpetuated. But if the Bulwinkle bill becomes law the Government and the State of Georgia may never get an opportunity to prove them. If you have any doubt on this score read the printed hearings of the House subcommittee on the Bulwinkle bill. Yet, the chairman of that committee did not want to hear testimony on the serious charges by the Government and by the State of Georgia of conspiracy and collusion by carriers, their bankers, and others, which the bill would legalize.

I predict that if the Bulwinkle bill becomes law the private companies operating public services in all fields of transportation covered thereby will raise rates to still higher levels, with greater abuses than existed in the past. This will be so because no public regulatory agency, no matter how competently staffed, could possible police such a gigantic combination to fix the prices that the public must pay for the privilege of using any form of public transportation. Indeed, the power of such a monopolistic combination to resist control would certainly lead to a break-down of regulation, if it did not result in the regulatory agency becoming the subservient captive of the regulated price-fixing monopoly. The Bulwinkle bill is truly the legislative road to economic serfdom.

Can it be that managers of transportation companies take the position that they cannot function as private enterprises unless they can conspire against the people of the United States? I think not. My belief is that all such schemes (including that embodied in the Bulwinkle bill) emanate from the same banker-controlled groups which seek to perpetuate financial exploitation of public transportation. Certainly these schemes are no more essential to the proper functioning of transportation services than in any other industry. There is a legitimate area of collaboration among railroads in the making of joint rates (as provided by Congress in the Interstate Commerce Act) which the Supreme Court clearly recognizes in the Georgia case. But this will not serve the purpose of the bankers. They boldly seek to fasten permanently on the Nation their vast Nation-wide private rate-fixing machinery, with all its coercive appellate machinery, headed by the Association of American Railroads, which has eliminated virtually all competition in the making of rates within and between all forms of public transportation.

Thus it appears that the Nation is at the crossroads with respect to its transportation policies. Which shall it be, monopoly and stagnation or competition and progress in an expanding national economy? In making the choice, it must be recognized that public transportation can and should be more than an instrument of carriage. It can tie industries into an organic economy; it can enlarge market areas; it can help to develop regions and resources; and, finally, it can be a strategic aid in the maintenance of free competition—the very basis of our private-enterprise system. The people, through Congress, should demand that private companies performing public transportation services rise to their great opportunity to perform these functions in the new era that lies ahead.

An Example of Statesmanlike Long-Range Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I include therein an address given by Harry M. Bashore, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, Sacramento, Calif. I want to say, prefacing the Commissioner's address, that I wish to furnish it thus for public information not only because of the interesting facts contained therein but as an example of advance thinking on great reclamation projects.

When we see a finished job of construction covering many decades, or possibly centuries, which is a result of long-range planning our admiration is excited almost as much by the planning thereof as by the execution of the plan. This goes for any physical building, whether it be a medieval cathedral or even our beautiful old Capitol Building of the United States in which our sessions are held, but it goes also for other types of building in statescraft or of the things of the mind or of the spirit as well as the works of man's hands.

The reclamation work of our Government in the semiarid western portion of our country has been one of brilliant success during its 43 years of service. It has laid the basis of new communities and has given rise to new wealth, but its earlier achievements are but small as compared with the great tasks ahead. To fulfill those tasks requires long-range planning on a much bigger scale than heretofore. The great Central Valley in California is one of several areas in the West where coordinated planning to achieve maximum results is necessary. I think Commissioner Bashore, in this address, illustrates such long-range coordinated planning. The designer of a medieval cathedral never lived to see the completion of the structure. It will take a long time to complete the greater western projects, so long that few, if any, now

engaged in this reclamation planning will live to see their completion, but in any case those who have a part in the foundational work can envision what they will be on completion.

The Commissioner's address is as follows:

I am grateful to your distinguished Governor for the opportunity to appear before the California Water Resources Council today. As a representative of the Secretary of the Interior and also in my own capacity as Commissioner of Reclamation, I want to speak to you about the plan evolved in the Department of the Interior, in cooperation with many Californians, designed to promote the best interests of your State—one which favors no special interest or locality.

The plan proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation is the only plan for the full coordinated development of the Central Valley resources which California has ever received. It is the only comprehensive plan for the conservation and use of water now before the State.

A few figures will help to make clear its magnitude.

The initial stage of development, which is now under construction and involves the completion of the Shasta Reservoir and power plant, the Keswick afterbay, Friant Reservoir, the Delta cross channel, the Contra Costa Canal and distribution system, the Friant-Kern Canal, the Madera Canal, the Delta steam power plant and part of an electric transmission grid, is estimated to cost between $350,000,000 and $400,000,000 of which more than $160,000,000 already has been expended.

The second stage of construction, which is recommended for authorization in the present basin-wide plan, and is being considered by Governor Warren, will require about 15 years to complete. It involves 30 major projects totaling in cost about $527,000,000.

The third stage of construction which will be undertaken when the projects are needed and funds become available, will involve 36 additional projects at a total cost of some $900,000,000.

These three stages add up to an investment in California of about $1,800,000,000. This is two and one-half times as great as all the money that has been spent by the Tennessee Valley Authority, and almost twice what has been invested by the Bureau of Reclamation in all of our 17 Western States in its 43 years of successful operation. I am sure that your imaginations need little stimulation to visualize what this would mean to California while construction is underway.

But the immediate benefits while this project is under construction are insignificant when compared with the long-time benefits to California for many, many years after the work has been completed.

There is no problem here as to whether the people of California will lose or profit by this enterprise. Some few seem to think there is a question whether they will profit more if their Federal Government undertakes this development for them, or if it is constructed and operated by the State. There is also the question of how the resulting additional income to the people of California is to be distributed, whether the benefits will be widely spread among all of the people of your State, or whether they will accrue mainly to specially favored groups. The plan offered by the Bureau of Reclamation is designed to effect the widest and most equitable distribution of benefits.

Now let is take a look at what some of the benefits of this development can be. When the plan is completed about twice as much farm land in the Central Valley will be irrigated as in the past. During the period 1928 through 1934, irrigation in the valley consumed on the average 7,450,000 acre-feet of water for irrigating 2,970,000 acres. The ultimate plan calls for the use of 16,600,000 acre-feet on 6,580,000 acres. In passing I would like to point out that another plan of development provides water supply for new irrigation of only 1,034,000 acres of land as against water supply and transfer canal facilities for more than 3,000,000 additional acres by the Bureau of Reclamation.

About one-third of the hydroelectric power generated will be used for pumping irrigation water. It is clear, therefore, that there is a direct connection between the cost of water delivered on the land and the cost of electric current. Unless there is low-cost power there cannot be low-cost irrigation water for most of the valley, although a few especially favored areas might benefit by local conditions. The comprehensive plan includes 28 power plants at multiple-purpose reservoirs and afterbays which would increase the capacity of hydroelectric plants in the basin by 1,697,000 kilowatts. These, together with 750,000 kilowatts in supplementary steam plants needed ultimately to firm the hydroelectric output in dry years, would aggregate 8,100,000,000 kilowatt-hours of firm power annually.

Navigation of the Sacramento River also would be improved and many new recreational opportunities afforded. River conditions for fish life would be improved, although reservoirs on some streams might have a detrimental effect by cutting off spawning areas. Most, if not all, of the fish values can be saved only by arranging the proper sequence of construction.

Translating these benefits into dollars and cents we get something like the following: On 2,000,000 acres of land now under irrigation supplemental water would produce an annual increase of about $30,220,000 in crop values. New irrigation water on 3,040,000 acres would produce some $198,000,000 in additional crop revenue each year. These sums can be multiplied several times if one wishes to estimate income produced by transportation, storage, processing and packing, wholesaling and retailing of the products produced, although much of this beneficial income would be to the Nation as a whole.

An annual income of approximately $28,000,000 would be received in revenue from the disposal of power. Flood control benefits measured by reduction of flood damages and by increase in land values would average around $8,000,000 a year as would also benefits from municipal and miscellaneous water supply developments. Benefits from navigation improvement would be about $1,314,000.

This places the annual direct benefits of full development of Central Valley resources at about $275,000,000 yearly on an investment of about $1,800,000,000—a return of more than 15 percent per annum. And this does not include the income and profit taxes that would flow back in hard cash to the Treasury as a result of its outlay on wealth creating properties. When all of this is taken into consideration the Bureau's proposal looms up as just about the most profitable disposal of funds the Government could possibly make, if it were concerned with nothing else than increasing national income and resulting Treasury receipts. If there were no other reason for this investment, retirement of substantial portions of the national debt would be enough to justify it.

Figuring the benefits to agriculture in terms of numbers of farms, the increase would be from about 59,000 farms in the Valley in 1939 to some 110,000 farms when the project reached completion. Farm income would have been increased in the same period from about $220,000,000 annually to $420,000,000—a boost of more than 90 percent. An increase of 90 percent in income for California farms is worth considering.

Agricultural expansion cannot take place on such a scale, of course, without a corresponding growth in industry, service occupations and trade. It is estimated, for instance, that as a result of new irrigation developments alone the number of manufacturing establishments would increase from 1,600 in 1939 to about 2,200 when the project is completed, together with an increase in the number of workers from 44,000 to about 60,000 and a jump in the value of products manufactured from $625,000,000 to $850,000,000—a jump of 36 percent—something for California manufacturers to think about.

The number of proprietors of service establishments, it is estimated, would increase from 7,400 to 11,100, with an increase in the number of workers from 9,700 to 14,500, while the dollar value of sales would go up from $37,200,000 to $55,800,000. This would be a 50-percent increase in sales for service establishments.

The number of retail and wholesale trade establishments would jump from 23,000 to 31,000, with an increase in the number of wage-earners engaged in them from 63,000 to 86,000, and the value of sales up from $900,000,000 to $1,215,000,000, or one and one-fifth billion dollars—a gain in trade of 35 percent.

The first two stages of the program would provide about 550,000,000 man-hours of employment at the construction sites and in manufacturing plants throughout the Nation. Translated into men at work, this means the employment of some 18,000 men for 15 years.

Others wil describe to you, or already have described the details of the Department of the Interior plan. I shall, however, ask you to remember this—that the operation of the system of reservoirs and canals required to develop completely irrigation and power and to provide for control and use of flood waters in the Central Valley is so complex that unless its control is centered in a single agency, and carried out under a systematic plan, full utilization of the basin's water resources cannot be attained. Full use of available water supplies calls for facilities designed to conserve water in surplus areas and to conduct it long distances to deficiency areas and to new lands. This the Department of the Interior proposes to accomplish by a system of 38 major reservoirs intricately interconnected by hundreds of miles of main canals. The entire system was designed to permit fluidity and efficient operation in the transfer of water from key reservoirs to a multitude of different places to meet the ever-changing requirements of supply and demand.

The relation of the Folsom Reservoir to the operation of the comprehensive conservation plan provides a typical illustration. Water stored in the reservoir could be delivered directly by any one of three main routes into the interconnected system of canals traversing the valley and be routed for irrigation use to almost any area in the basin floor west or south of the reservoir. In addition, reservoir releases would be controlled for power generation and for regulation of flows to maintain fish life along the American River, both of which are conservation uses of the stored water. The disposition of stored water at any given time would depend upon a number of variable factors intimately related to the operation of the basin project as a whole, including storage in other reservoirs, snow storage, location and amount of water demand, existing flows in alternate-transfer canals, power generation requirements, flood protection, and the releases required to maintain favorable flows for fish life.

In any plan that looks to the comprehensive control and conservation of the basin's water resources it is inconceivable that the Folsom Reservoir, or any one of a number of key units, could be operated separately. To permit anything resembling efficient operation, it would be imperative that such key units be managed in close coordination with all other units. Unified control must be achieved.

Unified repayment policy is almost as important as unified operation. If water rates are negligible in one area, and set at a figure designed to effect repayment in another, you have an unbalancing force at work that will almost certainly play havoc with land values, and create dissention, instead of the unity required if Californians are to obtain congressional support.

You will remember that the State of California at one time attempted to finance this development itself, but because the sums of money involved were so large—too large for either the State or private capital to finance—it turned to the Government in Washington. Now the Federal Government to perform its functions justly must consider the interests of all of the people, despite the fact that it is sometimes regarded as a greedy monster feeding upon the people through taxation. Congress represents the humid East as well as the West, and to obtain the necessary funds with which to finance so vast a program as that proposed for the Central Valley of California it will be necessary to persuade the Senators and Representatives who come from the East that the Central Valley project is for their benefit as well as yours. This means that the people of California must assume a reasonable attitude in asking Congress to grant funds for their benefit, and they must show that the development of their western part of the country will reflect prosperity to every other area.

May I also remind you that in considering the problems of any river basin that the Bureau of Reclamation must take into consideration the welfare of all of the people of that basin, rather than the interest of one group or another seeking special benefits. This must be done if we are to keep this Government of, for and by the people. It is often some special interest group, which, forgetting that all of the people must be considered, causes most of the outcry against their Government in Washington. A case that at once comes to mind is the demand which has been raised by a special interest group for complete abolition of the 160-acre limitation in Reclamation Law, which prohibits the Bureau of Reclamation from delivering water to more than 160 acres in one ownership. Your community property law in California makes 320 acres the effective maximum. Not only does the maintenance of this principle of size limitation mean the protection of trade, but it means protection of community life as Americans have known it.

Let me remind you also that following any great war in which there have been enormous expenditures of public funds, that it is essential to economize. Congress today feels strongly such a need, and it is indeed true that there should be no unnecessary expenditures.

But if we are to provide opportunities for the men returning from the battle fronts, and if we are to continue to maintain a high-velocity economy and a high standard of living, we must continue to develop the resources which nature has given us. The impact which the construction of such projets as the Central Valley project will have upon the national economy in the years immediately ahead will help to spell the difference between prosperity and depression.

When we take a long-range viewpoint, we must realize that the entire world has become resource conscious, and that if we are to maintain our place of leadership among the family of nations that we must use our heritage to the best possible advantage, improving it through wise cultivation rather than wasting it.

In addition, there is also this important point to remember—reclamation development is sound business. Multiple-purpose projects are self-liquidating when wisely constructed and operated and revenue from water charges and disposal of electricity will return to the Treasury virtually all that is expended. In this connection it should not be overlooked that the power development within the Central Valley is the key to success in the economic problem.

While almost nine-tenths of the direct benefits of the ultimate development will be derived from irrigation, it appears now that irrigation interests will be required to repay only about 40 percent of the construction costs. Revenue from the disposal of power, and allocations to flood control and other purposes, will account for the remaining 60 percent of construction costs. Without the large returns from low-cost power, and the consequent self-liquidation of the project, it seems to me very probable that the Congress may be quite reluctant to undertake the project—at least at this time.

In the face of these facts it is important that all California interests unite upon a single plan that will produce maximum results for the people of California and for the Nation. If the interests of the Nation as a whole are overlooked by the people of this State, I believe I can say without qualification that you will make little progress with Congress in obtaining the funds which you so urgently need. This will be true, also, if you place the interests of any special group within your State above the interests of the people of California as a whole. You must assume a broad, unselfish point of view which is statesmanlike—you must look into the future and plan wisely for the years ahead, both for yourselves and your children—if you are to succeed in inducing Congress to adopt a plan of sufficient scope to do the job for your State that you consider necessary.

If you will adopt such a program, if business, labor, farmers, consumers are united on one plan that is comprehensive and well conceived, I believe that you will get the necessary financial support from Congress.

You may not be aware of the fact that every other far Western State has given strong support to the Bureau of Reclamation. Your neighbor States are in the habit of going to Congress with a united voice in demanding funds for their irrigation development, and generally get what they seek when their plans are well conceived.

I wish to stress that your future is in your own hands. Only remember that the day is not so very distant when the population of your State will be greater than your resources can sustain if you do not take wise action now. As population increases wise husbanding of resources is necessary if you wish to escape the ultimate fate of almost every civilization the world has ever known. Rome, Byzantium, Egypt, India, and China once attained great civilizations, but their populations grew beyond the ability of their people to provide sufficient food to sustain decent standards of living, and their civilizations fell into decay.

Likewise the population of California will increase beyond your ability to support them and your own prosperity will decay unless you give heed in time to developing your resources to their maximum long-term capacity. Piecemeal development, project by project, will not accomplish this. Only an over-all plan which is sound and just to all of your people will serve this end.

Just one more thing I wish to say. This plan for full development of the Central Valley is identical in many respects with the plan developed by the State of California itself. The initial project development is virtually the same as that proposed by the State. The Bureau of Reclamation must, by law, respect the water rights of individuals, and the State laws under which the rights of individuals are protected. We have no desire to override the wishes of the people of California, and have offered the service of the Federal Government with but one purpose in view—to assist the people of California.

In conclusion, permit me to say that the rate of accomplishment on the comprehensive plan will be governed by the availability of funds and the economic condition of the country as a whole. Accordingly, I make no attempt to predict how many years will elapse before the construction necessary to carry out the plan is completed. However, I believe that each unit undertaken will be a necessary component of the plan in its entirety.

We appreciate this opportunity of discussing our proposals with you.

Doctors Seek Substitute for United States Health Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Sunday Star of December 9, 1945:

DOCTORS SEEK SUBSTITUTE FOR UNITED STATES HEALTH PROGRAM—AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION STUDIES PLAN FOR NONGOVERNMENTAL INSURANCE TO SAFEGUARD DISCRETION OF INDIVIDUAL

(By Thomas R. Henry)

The American Medical Association has just met squarely what many of its members believe to be the greatest challenge yet offered to independent medical practice in the United States—the far-reaching Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, introduced following President Truman's message to Congress on national health on November 19.

This legislation in effect would set up a system of compulsory health insurance met by deductions from pay envelopes. It seeks to improve the national health by making medical service available to all the people—to spread over the population the inestimable values of medical progress over the past generation.

The organized medical profession of the United States has itself made great advances in this direction and it is aware of the hurdles and pitfalls better than any other group—for it is constantly coming in contact with them.

The association, following instructions from its house of delegates meeting in Chicago last week, is hard at work on a prepayment sickness-insurance plan which, its members feel, will confer every real benefit likely to come from the national legislation now proposed, will be more practical and will keep the profession free of lay—and they fear, political—direction and interference.

FATHERED BY DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SOCIETY

This decision by the medical association is largely due to the efforts of the Medical Society of the District of Columbia, one of the most progressive groups in organized medicine, which essentially framed the resolution adopted at Chicago. It is difficult to predict the lines the national plan will follow. Proposed set-ups have been submitted by several State societies.

There are certain elements in the broad picture of medical care which are responsible for the greatest hardships to the individual—such as hospital bills, surgical bills, and obstetrical bills. There are already efficient schemes of hospital insurance, largely under private auspices. Memberships are growing as the benefits are better appreciated, and there appears to be little room for change except for improvements in details. Need for major surgery is clearly a catastrophe, like a fire. Presumably, reasonably accurate statistical tables can be framed on which to base insurance costs. With those taken care of, the physicians believe, perhaps the biggest element of the problem will be solved.

There still remains a vast, uncovered field in which, it is presumed, the men at work on the national plan will proceed cautiously, by a system of trial and error, rather than by a broad application of untested ideas such as is indicated by the bill now before Congress.

DOCTOR WANTS TO BE FREE

The American doctor wants to remain free. He believes that his freedom in the past has been one of the greatest factors in building up the finest medical service anywhere in the world. He believes that no discipline imposed from outside will approach in effectiveness the discipline of its own members, by organized medicine and the self-discipline of the members themselves. But also he is thoroughly devoted to the extension of the best medical service to all the people in the most effective way possible.

Both the physicians and the Government face one of the most complicated social questions imaginable. Compared to sickness insurance such a complex problem as unemployment insurance is simple. No other field in the past has been less susceptible to socialization. It has seemed somewhat like socializing music, art, or poetry. As one physician remarked: Insurance against sickness is like a newspaper insuring itself against ever being scooped.

Like every large body, the American Medical Association has its right, left, and center. These are expected to work out their differences in the numerous conferences which will be necessary before a workable plan is adopted to take the place of that proposed by the Government.

TREND TOWARD SOCIALIZING

The fight is not against "socialized medicine." This is a complete misnomer, says Dr. Roger I. Lee, of Boston, newly elected president of the American Medical Association. Medicine has grown more and more "socialized" for the past century—largely through the efforts of the physicians themselves. Every public health department, every public school clinic, every State or municipal hospital, is a manifestation of "socialized medicine."

Instead, the battle is against "political medicine." There is an infinite difference between the two, Dr. Lee says. There are certain medical and public health services which can be rendered almost mechanically by any conscientious, qualified individual. Such, for examples, are general inoculations in the face of an epidemic, X-raying of the chests of school children, fortifying deficient foods with essential vitamins. Medical societies everywhere have fought for these things. They have played, perhaps, the principal part in making the American people the healthiest in the world. There could be no finer case for such work than the experience of the Army and Navy in the war. The sickness rate from communicable diseases was reduced to a point where it was almost inconsequential, although it has been one of the major problems in all past wars.

The doctors have no quarrel with the creation by society of an environment conducive to health, and both national and local societies constantly are advocating new activities. In this field medicine is an exact science. Individuals can be dealt with en masse, for one does not vary one iota from another.

EACH INDIVIDUAL A PROBLEM

But the chief activity of the medical profession lies in quite a different field, where sickness is a matter of reaction between the environment and the individual—where the patient is something unique in the universe. The physical and mental difficulties of such a person cannot be dealt with on any sweeping basis. Each case presents its own peculiar problem and medicine becomes both a science and an art.

There can be no question but that the cost of medical care is high. This is inherent in the practice of a combined exact science and fine art. The burden falls heaviest on persons of moderate incomes. It is an old truism that the best in medicine is shared by the very poor and the very rich. For the former, communities have provided free hospitals and the medical profession, in accordance with its ancient tradition of service, gives its best efforts for nothing. The rich, of course, can afford to pay. It has been to some extent the practice of doctors to "soak the rich to carry on their work for the poor." This has not been very satisfactory, either to the wealthy patients or the physicians. But the family whose income just about meets ordinary living expenses often gets a terrific economic blow from unpredictable illness.

Sometimes the members struggle for years to meet the bills and seriously reduce their standards of living. Sometimes they simply do not pay. It is generally supposed by doctors that their bills are the last to be met. That is one of the reasons for the high cost of medicine. Those who do pay must make up for those who do not, and the physician who was able to collect all his bills could cut down his charges by a big margin.

SICKNESS UNPREDICTABLE

Now, the family with a modern income can insure against other unpredictable expenses, such as fire, death of a breadwinner, and so forth. Why can they not insure against catastrophic sickness? One reason is that the former type of catastrophies can be predicted by exact actuarial statistics. It is a pretty safe bet that a certain number of dwelling houses in Washington will catch fire in the next 6 months. There is little element of guess work in predicting how many Washingtonians in the 60-year-age group will die in 1946.

Medical practice is different. One cannot predict sickness, because there is such a large subjective element about it. Every person differs from every other person. Some demand medical services for complaints which would be regarded as inconsequential by others. Doctors sometimes make the cynical comment that the best way to cut down the sickness rate of a community is to raise prices for medical services.

Insurance against sickness costs in general, doctors say, would be unpredictably and prohibitively expensive.

Various schemes of political medicine have been tried. Perhaps the best known is the British panel system, which is not far removed in principle from that proposed in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, although the latter would give a larger leeway for personal choice. A group of British physicians constitute a panel. Each panel has a certain number of patients, who make their own free choice of the doctors on the panel. Only within this group does the patient select his own physician. Each constituent of a panel pays a stated fee each year.

DODGE RESPONSIBILITY

There are various claims as to how well this has worked. The conclusion of most American observers is that it is quite inefficient. The panel physicians are inclined to treat only the simplest of ailments. They are not held responsible for specialist service and this gives them an opportunity to avoid responsibility.

From his own observations, Dr. Lee says, the higher type of independent British physician is as good as any in the world, but the panel doctors fall far below the average American practitioners. They are much more inclined to sell medical care over the counter, like potatoes or cheese. They reach the point where the peculiarities of the individual mean nothing.

One of the greatest political medicine experiments was that of the Veterans' Administration after the last war, when a corps of physicians was set up to care for veterans with war-connected disabilities. Over a course of years it proved a dismal failure and veterans' hospitals were a byword everywhere for inefficiency.

The present administration, under Maj. Gen. Paul R. Hawley, proposes to do away with this system to a very large extent and rely on the American private physician, freely chosen by the patient himself, to treat the 20,000,000 veterans of the Second World War.

HEALTHIEST IN WORLD

These 20,000,000, by the way, go a long way toward nullifying the value of any compulsory health scheme—constituting, as they do, such a considerable element of the American population. They have already the best sort of sickness insurance, for nothing. True, it is supposed to extend only to war-connected disabilities, but in actual practice the dividing line is hard to draw.

A good deal has been made of the poor health of the American people under the present system—as revealed by the numbers rejected by the draft for physical and mental defects. This is all bunk, say the doctors. The American people are the healthiest in the world. No sort of medical service ever could have remedied a good many of the defects for which men were rejected by the Army. Doctors cannot repair constitutional weaknesses. They cannot raise subnormal intelligence. A good many of these rejected by the draft boards would have had the same defects if physicians had danced attendance on them every instant since they were born. They could thank medical men, as it were, for the fact that they were alive, instead of having perished as subnormal babies.

Furthermore, Army standards were very strict. The British Army—and also the German Army—was filled with men who never could have gotten through the gate of an American military post and many of them made very good soldiers.

Fate of the Small Business Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of November 27, 1945, entitled "Fate of the Small Business Committee":

FATE OF THE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

The possible death of the House Select Committee on Small Business around January 1 is foreshadowed in the rejection by the House Committee on Accounts of a request for $135,000 to continue the work through 1946. The Small Business Committee will be out of funds in a week and the accounts group is reported willing to offer it only $20,000 to liquidate the program.

A difficult floor decision, then, faces the House: Does the committee's work justify its being made an exception to the undeniable need for cutting Federal spending and reducing expensive special wartime committees?

Enjoying little public acclaim, the Small Business Committee nevertheless for the last year has functioned as an effective court of appeal for the little fellow who felt he was being neglected or injured in the Government reconversion program. It lent a sympathetic ear to those multitudinous small firms whose voice could neither compete with the lobbies of big business nor get a foot in the door of the Federal agencies abusing them.

In its months of hearings concerning little businessmen in textiles, coal, oil, logging, stoves, bottling, construction, tires, repair shops, slaughtering, manufacturing, retailing, food packing—to mention only a few—and in taxation, price, financing, and surplus goods problems, the committee with big-brother fervor frequently has slugged OPA, SPA, WPB, OWMR, and the armed services into changing their ways or policies.

Meanwhile, it has built and offered to Congress a comprehensive plan on how to avoid injuring the little man when it draws its long-term tax program. Much constructive legislation already has stemmed from its recommendations.

The committee's cost is relatively small; its decisions, investigations, and reports already have involved some $30,000,000,000 of the Nation's economy; handling 60 cases a week, it is a refuge in time of hardship for unorganized enterprises which are without industry representation in Washington; it is an accurate source of congressional information from a segment which provides more than half the Nation's jobs and comprises 96 percent of its enterprises.

In the light of these facts, it would seem desirable to make an exception and continue the committee, if not for a year, at least until most Federal wartime controls are off and little business' reconversion problems are more nearly over.

H. R. 4717, to Establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 7, 1945

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to compliment the Veterans' Committee on bringing to the floor of the House this legislation. This legislation has been needed for the past 25 years and will, in my opinion, improve the medical service not only for veterans of this war but for veterans of all wars.

We are very fortunate in securing as head of the Veterans' Administration Gen. Omar Bradley whose service has been outstanding in World War II.

The Veterans' Administration has been fortunate in securing the service of so able a soldier and doctor as Maj. Gen. Paul R. Hawley, Acting Surgeon General of the Veterans' Administration. A subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee, of which I was chairman, had the privilege of visiting many of the hospitals and field stations in England, France, Belgium, Holland, Germany, and Austria, last summer. We also had the privilege of visiting the redeployment camp Lucky Strike through which a larger percentage of all prisoners of war were redeployed. We were there at the heighth of the redeployment of the prisoners of war and observed the treatment given these boys by the medical service when they entered the station. Medical services in this entire theater were handled, in my opinion and in the opinion of the committee, in a very efficient manner. The men—wherever we talked to them—were highly complimentary as to the medical service rendered under the command of General Hawley. The hospitals throughout the theater were clean, and the medical service was of the highest order. I also had the privilege, at the request of General Hawley, of returning to this country on the hospital ship *Acadia*, which brought back more than 800 patients who were principally ambulatory cases. I lived with these men daily for over 8 days. The medical service and the care of these men were on the highest professional level. I reviewed daily the complaints as each man was given the opportunity to make any complaint in regard to the service. The only complaint during the entire trip was that there was either too much air or not enough air in the wards of the hospital ship, and this was a minor complaint.

H. R. 4717 enables General Hawley to offer commensurate compensation to doctors, nurses, dentists, pharmacists, dietitians, and all personnel required to carry out the best medical service obtainable because of the fact that it offers pay for service rendered in line with civilian pay. It is our duty to see that the disabled veterans shall have the best of medical treatment, and I believe that under this act we will be able to do so.

Resolution of Davis County (Iowa) Farm Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, in the State of Iowa we have very active and progressive Farm Bureau organizations and at the recent annual meeting of the Davis County Farm Bureau resolutions were adopted on the subjects of agriculture, world peace, health, military, and economic matters.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to bring these resolutions to the attention of the Members of the House since they express the progressive spirit of farm members of one of Iowa's fine agriculture counties:

We the members of the resolutions committee, offer to the Davis County Farm Bureau the following policy deciding principles that we trust will meet with the approval of this farm bureau group and those that combine with us to make this great organization. Great because it is made up of voluntary group of farmers with broad and open-minded views and in a free and unfettered farm organization working for the interest of each farmer in America.

In offering the following principles we request the members present to offer suggestions for improvement or addition which they so desire to be included.

1. World peace: We favor the general plan for maintaining world order adopted by the delegates at San Francisco Conference: We believe reciprocal trade agreements will further the development of this plan.

2. Military training: We do not favor compulsory military training for youth, but do favor a larger military force than our pre-war forces with emphasis upon more military research and added inducement for voluntary enlistments. We feel that a strong, high trained * * * voluntary army would be more valuable than a large, slightly trained compulsory army.

3. Agriculture program: In order to establish a balance between agriculture and industry we favor continuation of parity prices for agriculture production. We recommend partial Government control of production to meet demands; favor commodity loans with normal granary. We feel crop insurance program should be continued and expanded.

4. Soil conservation: We favor continuance and expanded soil-conservation program supplemented with strong educational program and a reasonable Federal compensation as an added inducement. We pledge our continued support to the Extension Service, AAA, FSA, and Soil Conservation Service in efforts to conserve our soils, for we feel that a sound soil-conservation program is our first line of defense and that the Farm Bureau make every effort to help carry on the work of the soils district that has been established in Davis County. We favor continued emphasis upon a liming and phosphating program for Davis County.

5. In order to pay off our Government debt we favor taxation at near present level. We feel income tax and sales tax are the fairest, as they are based on ability to pay.

6. Schools: We suggest that Farm Bureau endorse and back the school code, and we favor a more equalized school-taxation plan.

7. Sale barn: We favor State legislation to govern sale barns that help eliminate spread of disease and parasites.

8. Hospital: We favor the Davis County hospital plan.

9. Inflation: We commend the OPA for their work done in inflation control and feel that price controls should be continued until scarcities disappear.

10. We feel the extension program has done an effective piece of work and should be continued and expanded.

11. We resolve that the returning servicemen be given an opportunity to purchase farm homes under a long-time-loan program to protect them against foreclosure and loss of homes. Every effort should be made to encourage veterans to return to the farm and to help them get started on a sound basis.

12. We recommend that the Farm Bureau continue to support farm-to-market road program.

13. We feel the strength of our organization lies in the work and support we obtain from our membership. We wish to commend the following for their faithful and untiring efforts in carrying on the program: Our women's chairman, Mrs. Glenn Huffman; Girl's 4-H Club chairman, Mrs. Z. Willard Hubbartt; Boy's 4-H chairman, E. S. Baughman; organization director, Z. Willard Hubbartt; insurance agent, A. R. Barnett; county extension director, Don P. Carter; county extension home economist, Norma Feigenspan; the officers and directors of the Farm Bureau, 4-H leaders, office assistants, and all others who have contributed time and effort to our program. We especially want to thank Sherm Rene and family for donating the use of the new sale barn for our 4-H achievement show.

14. We wish to commend the business and professional men of Bloomfield, for their support of our farm bureau organization and its activities during the year. It is recognized that the great work carried on by the farm bureau in the many fields in which it affects the general welfare of farmers is possible only because of the cooperation of all.

15. We pause here momentarily to recall the passing during the past year of long-time friends of the farm bureau: H. W. Tarrence, Gene Runkle, J. W. Lanman.

16. We also take this opportunity to express our sincere appreciation to those who served in the armed forces and have brought peace again to our Nation. We pledge ourselves to support the Victory war loan to bring them home and to make America worth fighting for.

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE:
E. S. BAUGMAN, *Chairman.*
LOWELL CRUIKSHANK.
E. R. KINCART.
H. O. AUGSPURGER.
DWIGHT DOWNING.

Japanese Cruelty—Don't Forget How They Starved Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Saturday Evening Post of December 8, 1945:

DON'T FORGET HOW THEY STARVED US

As one of the two American medical officers who experienced conditions in both the military and the civilian prison camps on Luzon, I am anxious to have the American people understand, and never forget, that the Japanese applied a premeditated and systematic program of starving American prisoners to death. During 34 ghastly months I saw every manifestation of dietary deficiency merely by looking at people around me—the terrible pain and toe-dragging gait of beriberi, the hemorrhages from scurvy, the mental stupor and hardened skin of pellagra, the barrel-leg bloat and withered muscles of hypoproteinemia.

The first application of mass extermination began with the death march after the fall of Bataan in April 1942, and continued with horrible results until December of that year, when the Nips increased our rations a little and let Red Cross packages through, having decided to fatten us up to use as prison labor in work projects. For 14 months after witnessing this bald admission that our diet was inadequate to keep us alive for long, I served on a Bataan labor detail, in Bilibid Prison hospital and at Cabanatuan. Afterward I spent the last 11 months in the Santo Tomas internment camp, where I saw a new system of starvation applied.

At first, malaria and dysentery plagues slaughtered our people. Quinine would have prevented the malaria deaths; sanitation alone, if we had been permitted to enfore it, would have wiped out the dysentery. With dietary deficiencies and beatings contributing, 1,475 Americans and 23,000 Filipinos died in 51 days in Camp O'Donnel, where we were herded after the death march.

Then the starvation program began its awful execution with the diseases of prolonged food deficiency. There was dry beriberi, bringing its burning, stinging, and crawling sensations of the skin on legs and feet, its terribly painful neuritis, its paralysis of the muscles, which lifts the foot and made it necessary for those walking skeletons in our camp to take high steps to keep their toes from dragging. Also prevalent was the wet type of beriberi, bringing its dropsy, which waterlogs bulging legs, balloons abdomens and faces, and, before death, effects a bloating of the entire body—excruciating penalties for lack of vitamin B_1, or thiamine chloride.

SICKNESS AND DEATH, AND NOT EVEN A DECENT BURIAL

In due course, pellagra and aribofiavinosis set in. The symptoms were dermatitis, a coloring and thickening of the skin, swelling of the tongue, diarrhea, mental confusion and, at the end, usually severe dementia. Riboflavin, or vitamin B_2, deficiency, commonly accompanied pellagra—cracking lips, sores of the nose, burning eyes, ulcers of the legs as large as half dollars.

Vitamin C deficiency caught up with us. Scurvy, with its breaking blood vessels in the skin, muscles, and bones. The men's gums bled and their teeth loosened and fell out. Vitamin A deficiency, too—ulcering and scarring of the eyes; in some of the cases total blindness. And in the early days at Camp O'Donnell there was always the lack of water, resulting in severe cystitis, or inflammation of the bladder. One day I stood in line at a faucet for 9 hours, only to see it turned off for the night when I was four men away.

In Cabanatuan alone, 2,300 Americans had died by the end of 1942. One day 60 died. The emaciated cadavers were borne to the cemetery by prisoners almost equally cadaverous. The living lined the road, saluting the dead, dully contemplating when their turns would come. Out where the bodies were deposited en masse in graves that filled with water before they could be completely dug, gaunt arms, legs, and torsos habitually protruded from the mud.

Of course we complained to our jailers. A typical result was the time I tried to requisition vitamin B for the Bataan labor detail. I was given four bottles of Lydia E. Pinkham's compound, which, according to the label, includes "1 milligram of crystalline thiamine chloride"—the daily requirement of a child. Also I was given a supply of Dr. Williams' Pink Pills for Pale People. At Santo Tomas Prison truckloads of food donated by neutral agencies were turned away at the gate. Meanwhile, inside, we dragged about on bloated legs, shriveling away to skin, bones, and hair. We ate the cats, dogs, pigeons, and the vegetation—hibiscus, canna lilies, and banana trees.

These stark facts about Japanese mass murder I have set down because I've noticed a tendency here at home to forget, even almost to forgive, the enormity of Japan's war crimes. I do not want the American people to forget.

Maj. LIVINGSTON P. NOELL, Jr.,
Medical Corps, Army Air Forces.

General Hurley Is Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, bearing directly on information which I have presented to the House on three or four occasions I offer for the RECORD, a statement appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of today.

John Service who was arrested by the FBI in connection with the stealing of secret and highly confidential documents from the State Department appears to be the power behind the scene which caused General Stilwell's removal by our late President, and has influenced the resignation of Ambassador Hurley from the Chungking Government.

It could hardly be said that the "Cardinal Mercier of China"—Bishop Paul Yu-pin—would make the statement attributed to him without foundation in fact.

Whitewashing of radicals and Communists is not unknown in Washington.

The Times-Herald article follows:

YU-PIN ACCUSES STATE DEPARTMENT AIDE OF RED INTRIGUE IN CHINA—SERVICE PERSUADED STILWELL TO DEMAND ARMING OF COMMUNISTS, SAYS BISHOP

(By Tina Marranzano)

Inside details of State Department behind-the-scenes intrigue in China which resulted first in the recall of General Stilwell and more recently in the resignation of Ambassador Hurley, were disclosed to the Times-Herald last June in an exclusive interview with Bishop Paul Yu-pin, vicar apostolic of Nanking and internationally known prelate, sometimes referred to as the Cardinal Mercier, of China.

The Times-Herald refrained from printing it at the time because it felt it might adversely affect diplomatic efforts to coordinate the two rival armed factions in China.

KNOWS MANY OFFICIALS

The Chinese prelate, who numbers among his friends many high-ranking Government officials in this country, told the following story on the day that John S. Service, career diplomat, State Department appointed political adviser to Gen. "Vinegar Joe" Stilwell, was arraigned before Commissioner Needham C. Turnage following his arrest in June on espionage charges involving the alleged mishandling of confidential State Department documents.

Service was later cleared by a grand jury and was reassigned in August to duty by Secretary of State Byrnes for important work in connection with far-eastern affairs.

SERVICE INFLUENCED STILWELL

At the same time, Bishop Yu-pin, a close friend of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, disclosed why the Chinese leader had asked for the recall of General Stilwell even though they were known to be the best of friends.

Bishop Yu-pin had just returned from the San Francisco Conference where he had served as unofficial adviser to the Chinese delegation. Previously arriving in this country on Easter Monday, 1943, he remained here until November 1944, and return to the United States in April to attend the Conference.

The prelate said there was every indication that Service was working in the interests of the Communist Party and that it was upon his advice that General Stilwell approached Chiang Kai-shek in person no less than three times to ask that the Chinese Communists be armed with American lend-lease supplies.

UNITED STATES REDS START CLAMOR

Stilwell did this, the prelate said, even though the Generalissimo had warned him that his insistence in this demand left no recourse but that President Roosevelt be asked to recall him from China.

The prelate disclosed that when Service was appointed political adviser to General Stilwell, the American Communists immediately began howling for this Government to demand that the Chinese National Government arm the Chinese Communist soldiers.

Meanwhile Service was doing a pretty job of finagling with the Chinese Communists, Bishop Yu-pin said, and kept urging Stilwell to send a representative to provinces in which they were active to investigate the part they were playing in the war against the Japanese.

PLAYED INTO HIS HANDS

"Vinegar Joe," playing into Service's hands, the bishop continued, appointed Service himself to the job. The report Service submitted to Stilwell, the prelate said, "lauded the Communist soldiers in glowing terms."

But, the bishop emphasized, Communist guerrilla warfare actually was but a minor part in the battle against the enemy.

Following his report to Stilwell, Service kept urging him to go to the Chinese generalissimo with the demand that the Communists be armed. Cognizant of the situation in China, Vinegar Joe hesitated to do so, the bishop said, but finally consented when his political adviser insisted.

STILWELL SHOCKS CHIANG

Bishop Yu-pin said that Chiang Kai-shek was astounded at the American general's velvet-gloved demands because the latter knew that to arm the rival faction could result in but one thing—an immediate outbreak of civil war and the possible destruction of the National Government of China.

Although Stilwell's first Service-inspired visit failed, Service did not lose heart, the bishop said, but allowed some time to go by before he again urged a second visit by Stilwell to the generalissimo. Again the Chinese leader refused, and it was then, the prelate said, that Stilwell was informed that if the demand was repeated, there was no other alternative but to ask that President Roosevelt recall him from China.

STILWELL TRIES THREE TIMES

Undismayed, Service kept hammering at Stilwell that the Chinese Communists were getting a raw deal, and again insisted that the demand be resubmitted for the generalissimo's reconsideration.

And it was on this third visit to his good friend, with whom he had broken bread on many an occasion, that Stilwell was informed by the generalissimo he was asking Roosevelt to relieve him of his duties in China.

Service, the bishop said, was a definite detrimental influence during his assignment in China.

WARNS OF RED IMPERIALISM

On various other occasions during his 18-month stay here, the prelate warned of Communist imperialism in the Far East. It was 2 monthe before the Teheran Conference that he said in an interview published in the Times-Herald, that "unconditional surrender of Japan must include unconditional return of Manchuria." Familiar by reason of birth there with Manchuria's vast reserves of raw material, mineral resources, forests, and fishing, the prelate asserted that World War II actually started with the invasion of the northern province and can well be the start of World War III.

Amending the Soldier Ballot Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from St. Globe Democrat of Friday, December 7, 1945:

AMENDING THE SOLDIER BALLOT LAW

Representative C. W. VURSELL, of Illinois, has made a commendable move to amend the soldier vote law which was bitterly controverted in the last Congress prior to the general election. It will be recalled that the administration attempted to force the adoption of the short Federal ballot which permitted overseas service men and women to vote only for President, Vice President, and Members of Congress. This was the Green-Lucas bill which was rejected, but a compromise was voted which provided that with certain limitations those State governments which would authorize the Federal ballot as being legal in their States, could give the soldiers the option of voting either the Federal or the State ballot.

Only 20 States offered both ballots to the service men and women, and the governors of 28 States held that the Federal ballot in most cases was illegal. Only 2 percent of the 4,900,000 soldiers of voting age used the Federal ballot, which is potent argument that it was a failure.

In urging Congress to strike out the short form entirely, Representative VURSELL pointed out that former Secretary of War Stimson, chairman of the War Ballot Commission and one of the original sponsors of the Federal ballot, admitted after the election that there was serious question whether this short form "is of sufficient utility to justify its continuance as a voting procedure in time of war."

Although the war is over, the same limitations apply in peace to the men and women in service. Mr. VURSELL is not only correct in asking for elimination of the Federal ballot but his suggestion should be followed by Congress now in order to clear the skies before the congressional elections are held next year.

Elusive Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio talk delivered by me over radio station WIND, Chicago, on December 8, 1945:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, we live in a turbulent world. At the conclusion of a war more intense than any in history, we had assumed, and had a right to, that some measure of sanity and good will would result after victory. Perhaps we are all guilty of wishful thinking, for we know that freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom from want and fear do not prevail in the world today. One of my colleagues recently returned from Europe said, "There is less peace today than before the war." This is a sobering statement, but it is true. I said we live in a world of chaos because we are apparently in search of something which is not present in the world. Men and nations are seeking for security, security against the deadly power of the atomic bomb, a weapon more terrible than man has ever conceived.

As a nation we try to prevent other nations from securing the secret and the know-how of this indescribable force. We seek security against unemployment, security against the lowering of our standards of living, security in our right to protect ourselves against aggressors, security and with the hope that our democratic institutions may be preserved. As individuals, we seek security in our business ventures. We seek security for our families and we look ahead to security in old age when we will be willing to pass on our responsibilities to younger people. We seek security in all phases of life, and yet, we know that today, it is an elusive concept, perhaps an elusive ideal. We are now in the midst of a serious economic upheaval. Witness the labor turmoil today, and yet these men, and we have no reason to doubt them, believe their cause is just and righteous, a desire for security for those who labor with their hands and minds. These are indeed challenging days calling for the best in you and me, for it goes to the very basis of our civilization, and the question is: "Have we the courage, the fortitude and foresight to meet this great responsibility?" We are but the trustees for future generations. We inherited the blessings of liberty and freedom from our forefathers. We pass on to our children, and their children, these same ideals for which, in the past few years, we have given with lives and treasure.

I have already alluded to this problem of world peace and to the threat which comes through that new discovery—atomic power. The time has come, ladies and gentlemen, for us to consider the full implications facing this world, for we are part of it. We have been hearing and reading much in the past few weeks about the secret of atomic energy.

It was my privilege a few days ago to have sat in at a meeting or conference of Congressmen, who had as their guest, one of the scientists who worked on the atomic bomb. He very frankly stated that we should not be fooled into believing that there is any secrecy about atomic power. The only secret lies, at the moment, in the mechanical knowledge which went into producing the weapon itself. He stated that the power of atomic energy has been known to scientists for hundreds of years, but only until now has a process been devised by scientists and engineers which permits us some control of this energy. He further stated that the Germans had a plant in operation in eastern Bavaria, and immediately, when the Russian Army took over that area, they seized the plant, and that plant is in operation today. What I am trying to say is this, that we may endeavor to lock up the know-how of atomic power and the mechanical phases of it, but it cannot remain a secret very long. From this, there is but one conclusion: that competition in the field of atomic power by the nations of the world will ultimately result in the total destruction of mankind as we know it today. Thus we are faced with the stark reality that men and nations must learn to live together. We must be about the business of creating understanding. Yes; there is a lack of peace and understanding and it is so important that we, as ordinary individuals, should give time, thought, and expression to our views. The United States is called to world leadership. We have the opportunity if we will continue that leadership on a sound, constructive basis, for we have no desire for territorial aggrandizement. We are not imperialistic; we are concerned solely with the question of maintaining our national integrity and the establishment of as high a standard of living for our people as we can possibly secure.

Those of us who have the privilege and honor to serve in Washington at the seat of our National Government, cannot help but feel a great deal of concern about our economic situation. As I see it, the one great domestic issue is that of free enterprise versus state socialism. During the war we have gladly submitted to regimentation in the war effort. We have tossed liberty and freedom overboard in the interest of a united effort to win the war. During the period of war, we have seen a steady trend toward the establishment of a strong centralized government, a government of men and not of law. We are face to face in this country today with the question as to whether or not our society shall be organized on the

basis of private ownership of the means of production, or on the basis of public control of the means of production. The idea I am expressing deals with the question of a planned economy. Free enterprise is the opposite and means the sovereignty of the consumer in economic affairs for the right to conduct his business on the basis of a fair return to him on his invested capital. I know of no group in this country more vitally interested in that question than those of you who are listening to this broadcast. Many of you have felt the lash of bureaucratic orders, but you have said nothing. I am sure that deep down in your hearts, you have longed for the day when those orders would no longer be in effect and you could run your business and your homes as you knew they should be run, on sound, economic principles with a full realization of the public's interest in your affairs.

We must know that socialism, which breeds bureaucracy, means full government control of every sphere of the individual's life and the unrestricted supremacy of the government in its capacity as a central board of production management. The result is obvious, namely, a full control of our economic life. We are told today that there may be a middle ground of approach between free enterprise and government control or state socialism. I do not believe it. I am convinced that you are going to have one or the other. It is a matter of choice, and the American people must face this issue in the very immediate days ahead.

I have said, and I know you agree, that everybody went along during the war with the Government in its desire to win this war, and we yielded our rights and freedoms. Yet, in Washington, there is a desire expressed openly that many of these controls must be continued upon some pretext or other. A short time ago, certain representatives of government made a plea for a continuance of the War Powers Acts which vested in the Chief Executive unheard of powers. Yet, with the war over and the reconversion period in full swing, we are asked to continue controls. We are asked to reendorse, if you please, a continuance of a planned economy. The issue is up to you. You are getting the kind of government you tolerate. There is no force like that of intelligent public opinion. I have seen it demonstrated on the floor of the House time and again, and it behooves us, and I would suggest that you give vent to your feelings in these matters for if we permit a continuance of these wartime powers in this country, we will have moved too far in that direction to retrace our steps. The die will have been cast, and we will become the victims of our own inertia.

Might I, ladies and gentlemen, for the sake of emphasis, call your attention to the true meaning of socialism or totalitarianism, or communism, or whatever you have a mind to call it? All these "isms" are in the same category. Socialism, as such, means the subordination of every individual's whole life work and leisure to the orders, the whims and fancies of those who are in political power. It is the reduction of man to a cog in an awe-impressing machine of compulsion and coercion which forces the individual to remove any activity which government might not approve. It tolerates no real expression of dissent. It is in fact the transformation of society into a strictly disciplined and regimented civilization.

Someone has said that it cannot happen here, but I call your attention to the fact that there is evidence of it today. It is in action. It is on the move. It is so close that some of us cannot observe it. To the individual businessman, to the farmer, to the artisans in any wealth-producing activity, government will have the final say as to his movements. It is, in effect, totalitarianism to the highest degree. Under circumstances such as this we, the people, are the wards of government. It is our guardian. It controls our lives. If I judge rightly, the American people do not want this sort of thing to predominate in the life of this Nation. This is not what our boys have fought and died for. This is not the purpose which motivated our entry into this war. Eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty.

We have been thinking in terms of world security and considering also the problems of our own economic society, yet there is a problem which constitutes the most serious threat of inflation, which can wipe out everything that has been near and dear to us at home and abroad. These other problems are insignificant when we consider the full import of the situation that confronts not only this Nation, but the world. Every nation is faced with the same problem.

A short time ago my daughter returned after 18 months of service overseas with the American Red Cross. Part of her service was in China. She tells a most interesting story about going out for dinner which consisted of curried chicken, tea, and hot rolls and a little wine. For that she paid $4,353. Of course, in Chinese money, but I cite it merely as an example of what is going on in China. We know that identical situation prevails in most of Europe and Asia today. Not on such an outlandish scale, but a pronounced inflation exists in France, Spain, Portugal, Italy, and the occupied countries.

Some very interesting figures came to my attention just a few days ago, and I was amazed to learn that in 1939, which I believe was considered one of our prosperous years, there were $7,000,000,000 in circulation. In July of 1945 that amount had been increased to $27,000,000,000 at a time when civilian goods in this country were at a premium. We know that this great increase in total dollars comes as a result of the war and unlimited Government spending. We know that it is a condition which threatens our very existence, for should inflation really take hold in this country, all that we treasure would be wiped out, including our form of government.

The Government has a responsibility and a tremendous one in this connection, and the time has come for those in responsible positions to face the facts and chart a course taking us away from this situation. The time has come to think in terms of economy, perhaps an old-fashioned term, but a true economic law, nevertheless. Government must stop its prolific spending. It must strive to balance the budget. Once the floodgates of inflation are broken we will never stem the tide. Government will have to stop advocating spending of money to satisfy this group or that. It will soon have to eliminate subsidies as an economic factor. It will have to curtail its own expenditures, which means a reduction in governmental personnel. It will mean a smaller Army and a smaller Navy. It will mean the application of sound business practices in the operation of our Government. That can and will become a fact when, as, and if you, as citizens, insist upon it and elect men to office who stand for those principles.

In conclusion, I want to read to you a statement by John Stuart Mill, who, about 1870, said this:

"A people may prefer a free government, but if from indolence, or carelessness, or cowardice, or want of public spirit, they are unequal to the exertions necessary for preserving it; if they will not fight for it when it is directly attacked; if they can be deluded by the artifices used to cheat them out of it; if by momentary discouragement, or temporary panic, or a fit of enthusiasm for an individual, they can be induced to lay their liberties at the feet even of a great man, or trust him with powers which enable him to subvert their institutions; in all these cases they are more or less unfit for liberty; and though it may be for their good to have it even for a short time, they are unlikely long to enjoy it."

Comments on My Trip Through China, India, and Other Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the annual banquet of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the State of Michigan on December 8, 1945:

The War Department subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee consists of eight members, five Democrats and three Republicans. I am ranking minority member. This subcommittee drafts, holds hearings on, passes upon, and steers through the House and through conference with the Senate all War Department appropriation bills. These bills have aggregated $214,000,000,000 in the past 5 years, which is one and one-half times the assessed valuation of every piece of property in the United States as it was before the war.

This committee is absolutely dependent upon the information given us by the War Department justifying these appropriations, unless it goes out into the field and sees for itself just what becomes of the money. This $214,000,000,000 was spent and scattered all over the world. It was with the appropriation in mind that this committee took a 36,000-mile trip and actually saw what became of the money and how it was expended. It was, in my judgment, one of the most profitable trips from a taxpayers' point of view that any congressional committee ever made. It has already paid, as far as I am concerned, large dividends. It enabled me to advocate and help to bring about increases in the $52,000,000,000 rescission bill that I never could have justified had I not made the trip. This bill, you will recall, cancels and returns to the Treasury war appropriations heretofore made to various bureaus and departments and will save the taxpayers an amount that is more than twice the amount our World War I national debt reached at its peak. The information that the committee gathered will be valuable as long as its members have the responsibility of determining War Department appropriations.

CHINA

While it is impossible to give a review of China in a few minutes, to me it was one of the most interesting countries in the world. Everybody works. The Chinese coolie, in my judgment, is one of the most remarkable individuals I ever saw. No individual ever worked harder in the world for less. Every man, woman, and child works. That coolie may be breaking stones with a hammer, work we give our convicts at hard labor; he may be pulling with hundreds of others a large cement-filled roller, rolling down an airstrip; he may have a yoke around his shoulder like an ox and carry dirt in baskets for half a mile, or he may be doing a hundred other kinds of similar work for 10 or 12 hours a day, his only compensation, a cup of rice and a cup of tea—but he works. If this tremendous energy can ever be directed toward modern methods of production, China will be the most wealthy country in the world.

KUNMING, CHINA

Kunming, China, is in Yunan Province. Yunan Province is the first Chinese province through which the Burma Road runs, the

road that brought supplies from India. Everything that came to China over the Burma Road had to go through Yunan Province. At the time I was there the Governor was Lung Ying. We had a buffet luncheon at Major General Aurand's home which the Governor attended. Dr. Mao, a University of Minnesota graduate, in charge of the large tin works in China, acted as interpreter as five of us, including the Governor, sat at a table and ate our dinner.

Strangely the thing he was most interested in was taxation. He impressed me as a typical war lord. You will recall he is the Governor whom Chiang Kai-shek captured while his troops were on the Burma side of the province.

The Governor, I was told, had 200,000 of the finest troops in China. Every street in Kunming was filled with Chinese troops marching in columns of four the night we were there. They were fully equipped with tommy guns, rifles, and a show was put on without a doubt to impress us. These 200,000 Chinese troops never shot at a Jap during the entire war. I was further informed that only such equipment got through Yunan Province as the old Governor permitted to go through. There is no other explanation that I could find for the equipment that these troops had. The son of Governor Lung had 50 American jeeps which were stolen from the American Army. The Army admits they had them. I asked General Aurand why he didn't get them, and I was informed that they could not go to the Governor's palace to get them. There was a thieves' market selling American supplies and equipment within a few hundred feet of where we slept that night. I was told by Army officials that there were hundreds of these thieves' markets in China. I asked them why they didn't go into these markets and take the American equipment that was there, as it had the American mark on it. The reply was that American soldiers had sold it. I replied, in turn, that if the Army took this equipment wherever they found it, the thieves' markets would cease to exist because they would not buy the equipment unless they were permitted to retain it. I was confidentially informed that the same Governor got a rake-off on the supplies. At 4 o'clock in the morning, I met a male Red Cross worker and talked to numerous military police from then on until 7 o'clock and got a great deal of interesting information.

A certain type of water buffalo carts in Kunming are all equipped with automobile wheels with rubber tires. I went into that matter and here is a story. When the Burma Road was closed by the Japs, a great many French and British motor vehicles were left on the China side in Yunan Province. This same son of the Governor stripped these vehicles of the wheels including the rubber, expecting to sell the wheels separately to anyone who bought the vehicles. It was the same old racket that they pull off over there. For instance you rented a building for a certain amount per year, then you had to pay another huge amount for the key to get into the building. Nobody bought the vehicles and they were left there to rust. So the son of the Governor had the wheels on his hands. The old Governor came to the rescue and issued an order that a certain type of vehicle in Kunming could not travel on the streets unless it had rubber tires, so his son could sell these wheels and tires. The result is that if you were on the street of Kunming, China, tonight you would see hundreds of vehicles drawn by water buffaloes equipped with American automobile wheels and tires.

The military police told me that the thieves are apparently organized and the city authorities would do nothing to them when we caught them. The result was that the military police who brought in anybody caught stealing, beat them up and kicked them out because they knew that if they turned them over to the authorities they would not be punished.

In going through China I was told that an attempt would be made to retain 25 American divisions in China. I was alarmed at this story and when we had a conference with Army officials at Kunming I brought up the question of getting out of China. I was told at that meeting that they could and would get out of China by December 15. After the meeting I was in the Red Cross building and some of the GI's recognized me and wanted to talk to me. I sat down in the lobby and as usual in a few minutes 75 or 100 GI's were there. The question came up as to when they could go home. I told them I didn't know, all I knew was that I was told by Army officials a little while before that they were going to get the troops out of China by December 15; that they were going to fly troops across the hump to Karachi, India, and from there on home. The China Lantern, a paper published over there, headlined the statement, "The next issue of the China Lantern had a statement by General Wedemeyer to the effect that this was all wrong; that somebody had misinformed me and that the troops had to stay there to repatriate 2,000,000 Jap troops. I received perhaps 50 copies of this China Lantern from boys after I got back.

I wrote a letter to the Secretary of War asking for a complete statement, taking the position that the people of the United States would not tolerate our entering another war in China. I asked the Secretary whether General Wedemeyer was right or whether those people were right who told me that they would get these troops out of China by December 15. I placed the correspondence in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Secretary of War's letter reads in part as follows:

"The information given you at Kunming apparently was intended to apply only to western China."

No such reservation was made. The fact of the matter is that after the secretary wrote me, an Associated Press story appeared that they were retaining troops in northern China "because of a promise made to the Japanse last August to help in the surrender and repatriate Japanese troops there.

You have Lung Yin generals in the Yunan Province with 200,000 well-equipped Chinese troops. You have so-called Communists in the north with another big army and Chiang Kai-shek somewhere in between. The Chinese war may last for years. There never was a time to my recollection when there wasn't some kind of a civil war in China. A million American troops would not handle the situation there. We cannot win in China and I believe we ought to bring our troops home at once. It is not a question of repatriating Japanese troops. It is a question of whose Chinese troops are going to get the arms, ammunition, and equipment which those Japanese have. Whoever gets those arms, ammunition, and equipment is going to win the China war.

CHIANG KAI-SHEK

We had dinner with Chiang Kai-shek. I sat across the table from him with his interpreter at my side. I was in his palace before we went into the large dining hall later and was with him until nearly 11:30 o'clock. He is a very clever individual, selects words carefully, a typical Oriental with a wonderful personality. He is perhaps the strongest individual in China today. This does not mean that a majority of the Chinese people are behind him. He was strong for Hurley and Wedemeyer and just as strong against Stilwell, although he didn't mention Stilwell's name. There is no doubt but what he is a typical war lord, with the Soong family of which Madame Chiang Kai-shek is a member as his strongest backer. The question as to whether China is coming back depends upon the stabilization of Chinese currency. The Chinese dollar is greatly inflated. It took anywhere from 750 to 3,400 Chinese dollars to buy an American dollar. I was informed, whether correctly or not, but I think correctly, that nothing could be done about it because Chinese banks and the Soong family were back in the inflation. It is my candid opinion that we are being taken for a merry ride by all of them.

MAO TZE TUNG

Mao Tze Tung is the so-called Communist leader we hear so much about. Pat Hurley had brought him for a conference with Chiang Kai-shek. I attended a luncheon at the embassy. Only three members of our committee were at this luncheon. I had a long talk with Mao Tze Tung through an interpreter. He impressed me as being very earnest, sincere, and honest in his endeavor to help the poor people of China. I was with him perhaps an hour and a half either talking to him direct or listening to the conversation between himself, Pat Hurley, and others. He and his generals wore plain blue denim overalls and jackets which might have come out of any country store in America. Each had a blue handkerchief around the neck. The most surprising thing I learned about this so-called Communist leader was that he was not a Communist at all. Joe Stilwell said he isn't; Pat Hurley says he isn't, and Joe Stalin called him an "ersatz" Communist.

I was further informed that while they broke up the big war lord estates, they divided these estates on an individual property ownership basis. If a person going into China gives his honest opinions and conclusions, he should not be criticized because those conclusions may not be the same as the conclusions arrived at by reading the press, listening to the radio and from other sources.

In China you are either master or slave. My heart went out to these millions upon millions of poor people in China who work, toil, and sweat day after day for a mere existence—people who work so hard and have so little. People who love the soil or as they call it the good earth, because it is the good earth which gives them their rice and the things, not to live, but to exist upon. I don't believe we can have a strong, unified China unless these millions of coolies who are now in effect slaves are free. The war lords will never free them. They thrive on slavery. That is true whether the war lord is Chiang Kai-shek or Lung Ying.

I know I may be criticized for what I say here but it is my opinion that the only man in China to whom these poor people can look is Mao Tze Tung, so-called Communist leader, who is not a Communist at all. He is the only man I met whom I believe has the honest-to-God welfare of these poor people at heart. Call him what you will, but this policy of his is going to spread. No one is going to stop him. The coolie is going to say, "Over there is that northern province where Mao Tze Tung is, they give us land, they give us a little of the good earth where we can raise rice, and tea, and a few vegetables."

Over there we can dig in the soil that will belong to us. Over there we need not slave any longer. We will get two cups of rice instead of one and two cups of tea instead of one for a day's work. Therein lies the hope for a new China. Not communistic but capitalistic because individual property ownership is capitalistic whether it be under Mao Tze Tung in China or under President Harry Truman in the good old U. S. A. It probably will not be in my time but some day a real China is going to rise from the ruins of the old—a free China; a China in which every Chinese individual down to the lowest coolie will have the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This means the right to eat three times a day, having a decent place to live, just as much in a free China as in a free America. Amer-

ica, a country which won its liberty and freedom by revolution—America, which boasts of being a free country where each citizen is guaranteed the right of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" cannot consistently support any war lord in China, whether he be Chiang Kai-shek, Lung Ying, or some other who denies to the masses of Chinese people the very right which we enjoy and boast of. No plea of a unified China which continues slavery for these masses can justify such support.

THE SENATE SHOULD CALL GEN. JOSEPH W. STILWELL IN THEIR HEARINGS ON CHINA

We have apparently two views as to what our policy in China should be. Both, in my judgment, are based upon sincere convictions. The first is represented by my good friend, Maj. Gen. Patrick Hurley, Ambassador to China. He undoubtedly represents the administration policy. Another view is held by many people who are just as sincere and just as honest as the first group. These people should be permitted to testify before the Senate committee so the American people may have the benefit of their view.

On August 30 our subcommittee had a conference in Okinawa which was attended by Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell, commanding general of the Tenth Army. General Stilwell addressed us briefly but said nothing about China. He was about to close, when I said, "General Stilwell, this subcommittee is going into China. You could not pick seven men in the United States who know less about China than our subcommittee. On the other hand, you, General Stilwell, know more about China, the real China, than anyone else I know of. You can be of real help to this committee, if you will. You can give us information which will be of real assistance to us in the work we are trying to do. Won't you please give us your honest opinion on or off the record, as to what you think of the situation in China?"

General Stilwell turned to the committee and talked and answered questions on China for perhaps 30 minutes. I shall consider everything that General Stilwell said as being off the record. I do feel, however, that until General Stilwell has testified and given his views on the China question, the Senate committee and the American people will not have had both sides of that question. His remarks will contain some "vinegar" and perhaps a little "acid," but he will give you interesting facts. No one is going to accuse Joe Stilwell of being a Communist or not having the best interest of his country at heart.

General Hurley has given his side and General Stilwell and others should give theirs. Both of these men are friends of mine, and I admire them greatly. General Hurley has given us the benefit of his views. The hearing will not be complete until Joe Stilwell gives us his views.

It is my conviction that a strong China, a China which will take her place in the world politically, commercially, and, if necessary, in a military way, cannot be based upon the suppression of the masses of the Chinese people.

KARACHI, INDIA

We were supposed to stop and have two conferences—one with junior officers and one with enlisted men—at Karachi, India. To my amazement and surprise, we spent 2½ days at New Delhi and then Army officers made every effort to get us out of Karachi without seeing the enlisted men and junior officers. We stopped off there for lunch and were told to get back on the plane at 1:15 to start for Abadan. In going through the officer's club on my way to the officers' mess a number of young Air Corps officers who had been flying transport planes "over the hump" and all over that area stopped me and wanted to know why they could not talk to us. While talking to them, Major General Richards, budget officer for the Army, who was an officer on our plane, called me saying that we would have to eat and start at 1:15. I got a cup of coffee and a sandwich, came back, and talked to the junior officers while the rest were eating. They again complained that they were not given a chance to tell their story, and I stated then and there that I was going to remain and hear their story, regardless of anything else. I just got going with a pencil and pad when the group came out and General Richards tried to hurry me to the plane, the other committee members having gone ahead. I informed Major General Richards that I was going to stay there and get the facts. He came back again and told me the plane was going to leave. I told him to take the plane and go. I was going to get the story if it took me until Christmas and if he wanted to leave he could. He then turned to a second lieutenant who had been talking to me and ordered this second lieutenant to report to his commanding officer everything he had said to me. Here we had the anomalous situation of a congressional committee trying to get information being blocked by the chief budget officer of the War Department. What I said at that time just is not printable. When I got through saying it the Army officers left. While I was talking, some of the other committee members came back, with the result that we remained and heard the story of these men, and the officers, other than those present, including Major General Richards, left at my insistence. I was then able to get a little information unhampered.

I had perhaps seventy-five to one hundred lieutenants and captains there, all flying officers who had been on duty bearing the brunt of the flying across the Hump and elsewhere. I took penciled notes. I took information only from men who saw what they told me. I have their names with this result:

1. We flew 750 tons (1,500,000 pounds) of Indian cotton across the Hump by air for the British who sold it to the Chinese. The cotton was worth about 15 cents a pound or $225,000 which the British got. I was told it cost us from $1 to $2 a pound to haul this cotton across the Hump or from a million and a half to three million dollars which they undoubtedly charged against lend-lease, if it was charged against anything. I saw a part of the cotton in the air warehouse waiting to be shipped at Chabuam, India, and 371 tons had already been shipped according to their records.

2. They transported cargo after cargo of springs, mattresses, commodes, bedsteads, dressers, etc., for officers by air. This material was shipped by air from Khaurtaum, Egypt, to Karachi, India, 2,000 miles, and from Cairo, Egypt, to Karachi, 3,000 miles. One group told me they carried by air 570 Simmons mattresses, 270 spring, 240 bedsteads, chairs, commodes, dressers, a quantity of barbed wire, and other things. This was only a part. I examined the records and found a great deal more of this type of property had been shipped by air. An officer, and I have his name, had shipped to him an Austin car from Karachi to New Delhi, India, and shipped it to Karachi because he did not like the paint on the car. A quantity of tile was shipped by air from Bombay to Karachi to build a patio for the officers' club at that place. The patio was built after VJ-day.

3. A great deal of equipment was hauled from Africa to India thousands of miles only to be burned after it got there. I have the name of the officer who said he saw them burn probably a gross of flying gloves worth $2 apiece, 75 parachutes, and a great many new A-2 flying jackets. He saw them smash aircraft parts and instruments with an ax. A Lieutenant Renshow, I was told, did the smashing acting on orders. A Major Griffith from Calcutta, an Air Corps shipping supply officer, was sent to Karachi from headquarters to get rid of the supplies within a week. I have the name of the lieutenant who heard him say that. I was informed that the same type of flying jackets and equipment they were destroying had been taken from the men going back to the States and which they were taking back with them. A load of empty Coca-Cola bottles was shipped out. A printing press weighing 8,000 pounds was shipped from Karachi to Agra and from there to Gaya where it was left unused. I was informed that the officer at Gaya made the statement it was the only way he knew to get rid of it.

Another officer informed me that they destroyed and dumped tools and instruments in the original packages; that an enlisted man showed him welding tools that he had taken from the packages before destruction. Among the things that were destroyed, I was informed, were 10 beacon lights worth $3,800 apiece; 20 Pratt & Whitney engine cylinders worth $700 apiece; 10 magnetos for airplane engines. Incidentally the Austin car was shipped on June 28, 1945, weighing 2,760 pounds shipping weight. All this information was obtained in spite of every attempt made by the budget officer of the War Department to prevent my obtaining it. The information was furnished by officers and men who actually did the flying.

The Bar and the Bench

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by Dr. Jay P. Taggart, president of the Ohio State Bar Association, before the junior bar section at the fall association meeting in Cleveland on November 30, 1945.

Dr. Taggart was for years dean of the law school at Ohio Northern University, and at the present time is a member of the board of trustees of that most distinguished institution of advanced learning. Dr. Taggart is also an alumnus of Ohio Northern University, and while a law student at that institution received the highest grades in the State of Ohio of any participant in the Ohio State bar examination.

He is also a distinguished lawyer and author, being one of the compilers and master of his work in the compilation of the Ohio annotated code. In spite of his active life, he gives a great deal of his time and fortune to the advancement of his old alma mater, Ohio Northern University.

OHIO BAR ASSOCIATION REPORT
(Vol. 18, No. 35, December 10, 1945)

THE BAR AND THE BENCH

The occasion for this address is at least twofold: First, I have believed for some years that the former practice, of the making of a presidential address by the president of the association, should be revived, because I think he owes it a duty to communicate to it whatever ideas or suggestions he may have about its work, or about the administration of justice; second, as I have talked with lawyers, rather widely distributed over the State, during the year since my election to the presidency, it has seemed more and more apparent to me that both the bar and the bench are in need of a revival of interest in the fundamentals of our judicial system and our method of administering justice.

Perhaps the president's annual address ought to contain some review of the work of the association during the period immediately preceding it, but the limitations of this program do not permit that, and I do not think you would be interested in hearing it—particularly since monthly notes of the proceedings of the exective committee are now published in the Ohio Bar, and the principal committee reports are printed, there is no very great need for such a review. Any member of the association who reads the Ohio Bar and the committee reports knows more about the work of the association, from those sources than I could possibly tell him in any address. This is true also of statutory changes, even though the association, through its committees and officers, has given careful attention to many legislative proposals during the past year and has some substantial accomplishments to its credit, especially the creation by the last legislature of a permanent code-revision commission.

I take up, therefore, without further preface, certain subjects which I think are presently of most vital importance, both to the bar and to the bench; the present condition of our judicial system, our methods of administering justice, and the trend of business away from the courts and our profession.

I am neither at the moment, nor fundamentally, so concerned about the loss of business to our profession as I am about the decreasing volume of the business of the courts. We have complained for a long time, and still complain, about the inroads, upon our practice, of practitioners of other callings. I have said before, and I repeat, that I think we ourselves are very largely, although, of course, not solely, to blame for those inroads, and that, if they are to be corrected, we must correct them ourselves, by impressing upon the public our ability, willingness, and fitness to do the work which other people are doing, and we think we ought to do. If we have lost business to other callings it is, I believe, very largely because we have not taken advantage of our opportunities, have not fitted ourselves to do promptly, efficiently, and ably the work which members of these other callings or professions are doing for the public, and to a certain extent because of lack of confidence of the public in the integrity and trustworthiness of a few members of our profession. The correction of these situations depends, I repeat, upon our equipping ourselves to do this work, and letting the public know in proper ways that we are equipped, able, and willing to do it, and that we maintain, and intend to maintain, in the practice of our profession, the highest standards of integrity and honesty. This latter factor, in particular, requires, and will require in the future, much closer attention to the enforcement upon the negligent fringe of our profession of the high standards set up, and professedly adhered to, by us, in our canons of ethics. If lawyers and courts are willing to continue to wink at infractions of our own ethical rules, because of personal friendship or sympathy for the offending lawyer, or because of the feeling that in some way he has a right to make a living, which is a higher right than that of the public to be dealt with honesty and fairly by every member of our profession, we shall simply have to take the consequences. The great majority of the members of our profession intend to, and do, adhere honestly and carefully to our standards of ethics, but we are entirely too considerate, at the public expense and at our own expense, of the occasional lawyer who is not concerned about ethical matters, and thereby injures the whole profession. At this point, too, the courts have a very grave responsibility, to which I shall recur.

I am not, however, as I have said, so deeply concerned about possible loss of business by us as members of the bar. I think there will always be business for lawyers who are honest, able, and industrious. It may not be business in the courts to so great an extent as formerly, but by whatever name we may be called, the community will always need us, or some profession which does what we hold ourselves out as equipped to do.

It is not so clear that the public is always going to consider that it needs a judicial system of the kind with which we now supply it. You are all familiar with the phenomenon of the decreasing volume of business in the courts. I know quite well that much of that has arisen during the war emergency, as a result of that emergency.

To whatever extent this decrease of litigation results from a more peaceable disposition of our citizens, it is, of course, a salutary thing. Litigation is not a thing to be encouraged, for the selfish benefit of judges or lawyers. The condition of which I speak is the transfer to other agencies of business which exists in any event, but which ought to be handled by courts of law. I know, too, that many of you believe that the volume of litigation will materially increase when conditions return to what we are pleased to speak of as normal. To some extent that will undoubtedly be true. I seriously doubt whether it will be true in so great a degree as you think. The phenomenon to which I refer is not a new thing. For many years there has been an increasing trend toward the taking away from the courts of jurisdiction which, at least in principle, had formerly belonged to them, and the lodging of it in commissions, boards, bureaus, agencies, of many and diverse kinds, which we are accustomed to speak of as administrative agencies. Making due allowance for the conditions of the war emergency, it seems to me probable that that trend will increase, rather than diminish, unless both the bench and the bar exert themselves, much more energetically than they have in the past, to stem the tide. If this meant merely a loss of livelihood to some individuals, because fewer judges may be needed, there would be no justification for my addressing you about it.

The matter is one which is fundamental to our system of government and our way of life. I know that problems of international organization, the control of the atomic bomb, labor disputes, threats of inflation, and many other questions, both international and domestic, seem superficially of much greater importance, and that we talk much too lightly and tritely, of the tremendous importance, in our constitutional system, of an independent judiciary, but it is, nevertheless, of fundamental importance, if what we have become accustomed to call—also too lightly—the American way of life, is to be preserved, that an independent judicial system, uncontrolled by any other branch of Government, open as freely and as cheaply as possible to all citizens, administering justice as expeditiously as is consistent with substantial justice, and staffed by able, well equipped, mentally alert, ethically sensitive, and absolutely independent and fearless judges, who respect the person neither of the poor nor of the rich, as the Mosaic code has it, be maintained, and that to it shall be committed the decision of all justiciable matters. If and when we cease to maintain such a judicial system in this State, or in the United States, we shall have lost one of the principal foundations, if not the most important foundation, of our political and economic systems, and just insofar as we cease to use such a system, in proper cases, we weaken that foundation.

But you will say, I suppose, "We have such a system in this State." I submit that I doubt if the public believes that, and I say so because of the apparent public disposition to remove matters from the jurisdiction of the courts, because of the disposition of businessmen, with which every lawyer is familiar, to settle matters rather than to try them in court, and to provide in contracts for arbitration, instead of relying upon judicial determination, and because of the disposition of the public generally to complain, and in many cases with sound reason, about courts and lawyers, and the law's delays. So that I present to you for serious consideration the question whether the growth of administrative agencies is not in large part due to a real, but unformulated, and largely unexpressed, dissatisfaction with the workings of our judicial system, and to a public feeling that, after all, such agencies operate expeditiously, and with perhaps little more arbitrariness than many courts, and I remind you that the history of the English-speaking peoples is not without its examples of the substitution, partially or wholly, of one system of tribunals for another, when the public came to believe that a need for change existed.

Some of you may say that, since I am not now a trial lawyer, I have no right thus to speak of the courts, but I think that a lawyer who does not practice actively in the courts, but who has some opportunity to know what other lawyers say about them, and to know something of what the business community thinks about them, may be in a better position to make suggestions than those of you who are, day in and day out, before the courts. And so I suggest to you, first, that the business community, at any rate, is not satisfied that our present method of administering justice, particularly in civil causes, is an efficient, economical, or expeditious tway of determining disputes, and, second, that a large element of the public is not convinced, as to some of our courts, that they are entirely free from outside influence of one kind or another, whether that be due to politics, to the personal necessities of the judge, to the need for his campaigning for reelection, to indolence, inattention to business, or whatever other cause.

We need fairly and squarely to face some existing facts and not to solace ourselves, as so many of us—and I am afraid too many judges—apparently do, with the belief that as things have been, they will always be, and that our present method of administering justice will always be permitted to continue, whether or not it is thoroughly satisfactory to the community. There seems to me to be a certain laissez faire attitude, an apparent acceptance, albeit a dissatisfied acceptance, of things as they are, a certain spiritlessness, among the rank and file of lawyers and judges.

Consider first for a moment the actual efficiency of our present method of disposing of litigated matters, particularly civil causes. Is it not possible that the time consumed in making up the issues and getting cases ready for trial could be materially shortened without prejudice to justice? May we not, at some points, have concerned ourselves too much with making justice pay for itself, rather than with making it open, efficient and expeditious? Is the present method of arriving at the facts of a case, particularly our traditional method of examining witnesses, the most efficient that could be devised without sacrifice of the necessary safeguards of truth? It seems to one who looks at the actual trial of cases in a more or less detached way that there are many elements of waste of time, effort, and money involved in the average trial and appeal. There is also a marked disinclination on the part of both bar and bench, but again, particularly, I fear, upon the part of many judges, to try to put into operatio: newer and more efficient methods. Pretrial procedure is one outstanding example of that. In many courts, its possibilities have not been thoroughly tested, and even when it is honored by lip service, it is too often used perfunctorily, without realization of its possibilities, or as a mere method of compelling settlements. It is true that lawyers are very much to blame for delays in trials, but it is

also true that judges have it in their power to prevent very many of those delays, and to compel much more speedy and more efficient procedure on the part of the bar, and in my judgment no judge who does that will in the long run suffer by it.

Next, let us consider briefly the actual disposition, toward the matters which I am discussing, of some members of the bench. I would not be misunderstood. I intend no indiscriminate condemnation of either bench or bar. I am satisfied, as you are, of the fundamental integrity and good intentions of the vast majority of the members of our profession and of the occupants of the bench, but, just as there is at the bar what I have spoken of as a negligent fringe, who either openly flout, or are passively uninterested in, our standards of ethics, so it, unfortunately, must be said that there are occasional occupants of the bench who do not seem to be concerned about its improvement, about the practical application of the standards of judicial ethics, or perhaps about anything except routine performance of business, continuance in office, possible increases in salary, and other perquisites. Judicial indolence is, it must regretfully be said, a disease not entirely unknown; the disposition of occasional judges to delay unconscionably the decision of matters submitted to them is a matter about which we talk more than we act; neither is an inclination upon the part of sitting judges to opppose the abolition of unnecessary judgeships, or the imposition of some additional work upon their courts, a thing unknown. Almost every questionnaire submitted by a bar association to its membership discloses that there are a few judges who a substantial number of members of the bar believe permit themselves to be influenced, in the disposition of cases, by considerations other than those of justice, and I have already spoken of what seems to me an indisposition on the part of many members of the bench to try new methods and to compel members of the bar who practice before them to conduct their cases with reasonable speed and efficiency. To put it in another way, the machinery which we already have, which would conduce to more efficient operation of the courts, is not thoroughly used, but much more efficient machinery might be devised if we were sufficiently alert.

I have said that I would recur to the responsibility of courts for the maintenance of the ethical standards of our profession. Many lawyers who have served on grievance committees of bar associations know perfectly well that one of the greatest obstacles to the enforcement of our ethical standards is the unwillingness of some judges to treat seriously, when presented to them, infractions of our canons of ethics, so that, in practical operation, grievance committees hesitate to submit to courts, for discipline, cases other than those of the most flagrant kind. I submit that this should not be so. Bar associations and individual lawyers should be encouraged by the courts to bring to their attention disciplinary matters, even if not so flagrant as to require disbarment, not so that it may be known that there are lawyers who are negligent in such matters, but rather so that the public may know that the bar and the bench cooperate in attempting to protect the public against such offenses. Too frequently, as you all know, it happens that when lawyers have been disbarred for flagrant misconduct, they are reinstated, without publicity, without adequate evidence of reformation, and of fitness to enjoy the public confidence, and very frequently over the protest of the same bar association at whose instance they were disbarred. At this point I digress to express, so far as I have a right officially to do so, the appreciation of this association of the attention and cooperation of the supreme court of this State in regard to the matter of reinstatements, evidenced by its recent amendment of its rule XXVII, in response to an application made by the committee on legal ethics and professional conduct of this association.

I make no apology for laying so much stress as I have upon the matter of ethics, either of the bar or of the bench. The upholding of integrity and honor in our profession is one of the declared purposes of this association. We are not tradesmen; we are not merely craftsmen; we are not even solely practitioners of a very high art; we are members of a profession, and, trite as it may be to say so, both bar and bench must, like Pompeia, be beyond suspicion, and we shall enjoy the public confidence only to the degree that we thus keep ourselves beyond suspicion, not merely beyond actual misconduct.

But, you may say, what remedies do I suggest? I think that what Ohio needs is a unified court, containing no more judges than are actually needed for the discharge of the judicial business of the State, divided into trial and appellate divisions, and with small claims divisions for the handling of minor litigation. If the public continues to desire elected judges, the judges of such a court might be elected by appropriate political subdivisions, with proper provision for periodical adjustment of the number of judges to the demands of judicial business, but be subject to assignment from place to place as they are needed, so that they will be kept busy, and so that the public will not bear the expense of unnecessary judges. Such a court should be free to make, and freely change, the rules of pleading, evidence, and procedure, in the interest of as free, untrammeled, and expeditious justice as may be found reasonably possible, and it could and should be alert and astute to protect and promote, by well-considered changes, without long legislative delays, the efficiency of the judicial process.

This may be a counsel of unattainable perfection, but we must always aim at ideals beyond what we can accomplish at a given time. But if that is unattainable or too visionary, then we need, within the framework of our present judicial system, such a rearrangement, and such a reduction of number of judges in places in which there are too many, as that courts will be kept busy, and so that it will be demonstrated to the public that it has a body of judges who are busy, industrious, alert, and careful of the public interest, and then the bench may, with confidence, appeal to the public and to the bar for that reasonably increased compensation which, in many parts of our judicial system, is needed, and for some reasonable system of retirement pay for judges who have spent long years in the public service, and who, because of that long service, and of age, would be unable, upon retirement from the bench, to earn a competency in the practice of law.

I think, too, that the time has come when lawyers must make up their minds that, far from simply choosing between two or more comparatively undesirable candidates for a particular judgeship, they shall see to it that in such a case a suitable candidate is persuaded to run and is elected, and that it is the duty of the bar, further, to see to it that judges who do not measure up to the standards in which the bar itself believes, and who are unwilling in good faith to cooperate with the bar in its efforts to enforce our standards of ethics, shall in no case be supported by the bar for election, and this without regard to questions of personal popularity, personal sympathy in particular situations, or long service in a particular office

I am not a prophet of doom; I am not, I trust, a wild-eyed reformer; particularly I am not a candidate for anything. I am, however, and I think we all ought to be, deeply concerned about the fundamental matters which I have attempted to lay before you; that is, the continued existence of our judicial system upon its present basis as an independent branch of government, and the restoration to its jurisdiction of great bodies of matters with which it ought to deal, and which ought never to have been allowed to escape from the jurisdiction of the courts; but I am firmly convinced that the trend is not likely to be reversed, unless and until both bench and bar are willing to give serious, continuous, attention to these matters. The mills of the public dissatisfaction, like the mills of God, which in truth they are, are slowly set in motion, but when they grind they grind surely, and exceeding small. And so, if, in your opinion, there be in our scheme of the administration of justice, and in its continuance, any virtue, if in them there be any praise, then I ask you seriously to think on these things.

New York State Ought To Pay Back Premiums for Veterans' Retirement Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Joseph Leib, national legislative director, American Veterans of World War II:

NEW YORK STATE OUGHT TO PAY BACK PREMIUMS FOR VETERANS' RETIREMENT FUNDS

(By Joseph Leib, national legislative director, AMVETS)

Discharged soldiers now returning to their jobs in police and fire departments throughout the State of New York are finding it necessary to dig down in their empty pockets in an attempt to catch up with their premiums to the State retirement fund.

This is an unfortunate predicament that warrants immediate study. Many of these premiums are averaging as high as $100 per year. This is staggering enough to some veterans but then take into consideration that most of these men served in the armed forces from 2 to 4 years. Therefore, repayment of these premiums would completely eat up, if not exceed, whatever mustering-out pay these veterans collected when they returned to civilian life.

It is obvious that the present requirements are causing a great hardship on many battle-scarred veterans and it is the opinion of AMVETS that the legislature should take under consideration possible legislation in order to correct this injustice.

An article regarding this condition follows:

"[From the Army Times of December 8, 1945]

"AMVETS PROTEST PAYMENT OF OVERDUE PENSION PREMIUMS

"BUFFALO.—Officials of both the police and fire departments have asserted that servicemen returning to their jobs in these two departments should not have to pay back premiums into the New York State retirement fund for their pensions, but that either the State or city should shoulder the responsibility.

" 'Under the existing regulations, veterans must pay back premiums averaging around $100 for each year they were absent from their jobs while serving with the armed forces.

" 'According to Patrolman James Francis, commander of the newly formed Thomas V.

Brennan Post, affiliated wth the AMVETS, 70 veteran members of the post employed by the police department are now discussing the situation.'

" ' "The returning servicemen feel very bitter about paying the back premiums," asserted Francis. "Most of these men have been in the military service for 3 or more years, and it certainly is going to hurt their pocketbooks, especially those with families. The powers that be certainly should not let them down."

" 'The AMVETS' State convention, said Francis, will be held in Buffalo December 14 and 15. At that time it is expected that resolutions asking the State to pay the back premiums will be drawn up.' "

Address by J. Edgar Hoover Before the International Association of Chiefs of Police

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 11 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday the renowned Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, made a Nation-wide radio address before the fifty-second annual conference of the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

The chief G-man gave the facts on the postwar crime wave which we are now experiencing. He told of the expanded roles which the home, the church, and the school must play if we are to be adequate to cope with the lawless tendencies that always follow in the wake of war.

Mr. Hoover pointed up, too, the fact that the returning serviceman, instead of being a problem, is actually a potent patriotic stalwart in the drive against hoodlumism.

Finally, Mr. Hoover warned us to be on our guard against the wiles of the collectivists within our midst. In particular, he told us to be vigilant against the insidious work of the Communists operating behind a thousand guises within the ranks of labor, within the church, the home, the schools themselves, to undermine the Republic.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this important address be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RECONVERSION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT

There is a marked similarity between our meeting 6 years ago, as war was spreading in Europe, and our first peacetime meeting today. The firing has stopped on the battle fronts, but it is being resumed on the home front. We had a big job to do then, but a bigger one faces us today.

At our last peacetime meeting, it was my duty to convey to you the President's directive calling upon all law enforcement to protect our internal security, and to call upon you for assistance. The manner in which you answered your country's call to duty is a tribute to your love for America. Never in our national history have brighter pages been written by men working together for a common purpose.

Already, I have expressed my gratitude to many of you and today I want publicly to extend to all of law enforcement my heartfelt appreciation for your assistance in keeping our home front secure. It is also my privilege to extend to you the personal greetings and commendation of the Attorney General of the United States, Hon. Tom C. Clark. As the chief law enforcement officer of the Nation, he has asked me to convey his congratulations for a job well done.

The ability of all branches of law enforcement to cooperate and to pool their facilities proves once and for all that we needed no unified agency to insure the discharge of our responsibilities. I have said before, and I say again, that there is no place in our American way of life for a national police. Our first line of defence in peace or war is the local police agency. It is on the scene and can strike at lawlessness at its source. The role of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall continue to be that of a service agency to augment and bolster your efforts and to handle those matters which are Nation-wide in scope and beyond the reach of hometown protectors.

As we look to the future, we should also consolidate our gains. At the very inception of hostilities, we were all apprehensive of what might happen. That these fears did not materialize is a tribute to the forces assigned to maintain the peace at home.

In every period of national emergency, it is normal and natural for human beings to become panicky and hysterical. There is not an experienced law enforcement administrator in the land who was not criticized for seeming inaction. We could not pubicly proclaim what we were doing and why. But in no civilized land in time of war were civil rights and personal liberties abridged less than here in the United States. The civil rights which we preserved then must be preserved in the future. The dragnets of World War I were unheard of in this war. The slacker raids did not recur. The lynchings and character assassins of World War I were checked. On the other hand, the sabotage which everyone said would occur did not take place.

Early in the war, skeptics proclaimed that we were wide open to espionage. They held that nothing was secure and nothing was being done. The record is exactly to the contrary. We knew from the very outbreak of the war that espionage was under control. I do not mean that the enemy was not active. He was. Foreign powers tried to steal not only the atomic bomb, but other military secrets. For years, Nazi Germany had built an espionage machine and an army of fifth columnists, which proved to be the downfall of once proud nations. They spent money with reckless abandon and were constantly on the alert to train, develop, and unleash spies and saboteurs, not only in the United States, but throughout the entire Western Hemisphere. The counterespionage program which we developed did more than encircle spies and render them harmless. It enabled us to learn of their weaknesses and their aims.

There is a universality to law enforcement in democratic countries. I am happy to report that the integrity and devotion to duty of peace officers in the United States has been matched by our neighbors in the north, in the south, and by our British allies. It was our happy privilege to be closely associated with the security and intelligence authorities in the British Isles, with that sterling organization in Canada which has captured the imagination of all Americans—the Royal Canadian Mounted Police—and with similar agencies in all of the countries in the south from Mexico to Chile.

There were few espionage cases which came to our attention which did not have worldwide ramifications; and FBI liaison agents, stationed from Canada to the tip of South America, received the highest degree of aggressive cooperation.

It can truly be said that so far as subversion is concerned there is no such thing as a domestic field. It is international. Japanism manifested in this country had its origin in Japan. Nazism in Germany, and Fascism in Italy, and without the wholehearted spirit of mutual assistance of all law enforcement agencies, domestic and foreign, the FBI could not point to the proud record we have today. Let me illustrate. Germany, lacking an ever-necessary supply of platinum, turned to the black market of South America. One arch platinum smuggler was arrested in California. His trail led through several South American countries. In each, the facts were communicated by the FBI to the established law enforcement agencies in those countries and the holes were plugged. In one espionage case which centered in New York, shipping information was getting out of the country. Contacts of the enemy were spotted in faraway Brazil and Chile. There, the authorities quickly moved into action. Twenty-four clandestine radio stations were put out of business, 30 short-wave transmitters were seized, and in all, 335 espionage agents were arrested in South America alone through the fine cooperation of the countries of that continent.

More than 23,000 enemy aliens throughout the Western Hemisphere were identified, interned, deported, or moved from strategic areas through the joint efforts of local law enforcement agencies and the FBI. We not only thwarted enemy sabotage at home—none occurred in the entire Western Hemisphere throughout the entire period of World War II. We of law enforcement can be very proud of this record.

The wartime associations of law enforcement officers of the different countries have brought about a spirit of understanding and friendship which will inure to our mutual advantage in the peacetime years which lie ahead. I cannot commend too highly all of the officers with whom we have been privileged to work, and I sincerely hope that the spirit of mutual assistance and understanding will continue.

We have faced many problems, burdened as we are with added duties, untrained personnel, and acute manpower shortages. The salaries paid to law-enforcement officers are scandalously low. Community leaders should hang their heads in shame when they condemn their local police without first facing the fact that the average officer could command a much higher salary in the industries he protects.

In replenishing our ranks, we should enlist the aid of the public in improving conditions, in providing better facilities, and in securing the modern implements of law enforcement. A community can have no better investment than in an alert, well-trained police department. It is false economy and a flagrant disregard of society's rightful protection to reduce essential enforcement services.

Our gretest advances have come through concentrated training programs. But we have scarcely begun to scratch the surface. Like every other popular movement, leeches and parasites have already tried to attach themselves to the field of police training. Here is a job that belongs in the hands of law enforcement. It is no place for professional promoters with quack nostrums to sell nor for stratosphere thinkers disseminating mists of error and confusion. Yet, I know of in-

stances where ex-convicts with glib tongues have actually succeeded in taking part in training police and in surveying police needs. The International Association of Chiefs of Police can embark on no more important program in the postwar years than a widespread campaign to lift police standards through well-established training activities conducted by professional men of law enforcement who have dealt in the realities of the problem.

The need for increased effectiveness and the marshaling of whole communities on the crime-prevention front becomes more important each day. Lawlessness has taken on such proportions as to even startle the imagination. The crime waves proclaimed in the daily press are not imaginary. They are real. They are bloody. If anything, the press is guilty of understatement rather than overstatement. Let me be specific. In October of this year serious crime increased 19 percent over the same month last year. Of the more serious crimes, the increases reflect 32 percent more murders, 38 percent more auto thefts, 38 percent more robberies, 11 percent more larcenies, and 26 percent more burglaries. Crime rates are continuing to rise rapidly throughout the entire Nation.

The fingerprint files of the FBI reveal a criminal army of 6,000,000 individuals who have been arrested and fingerprinted—1 out of every 23 inhabitants in the United States. You know only too well the constant recurrence of arrests.

After every great war or period of acute national emergency there has been a rescission of moral fortitude. This one will be no exception. I hope as you do that the racketeers, the overlords, the desperadoes, and the criminal scum who characterized the roaring twenties will not come back to the American scene. I fear, however, that this is wishful thinking. Once they get a start and find they can succeed, we shall face very serious trouble.

Crime springs not alone from a state of mind. There are many factors that must be considered in discussing crime causation, such as the matter of economics, moral standards, and social conditions. To combat the rising tide of serious criminality which is sweeping the country, we need a revival of old-fashioned discipline and courage.

The abuses and maladministration of our penal systems which release murderers, sex-crazed degenerates, outlaws, and bandits on parole or on "leave of absence" from our correctional institutions to commit serious crimes against our citizens is constituting again a national disgrace. A large percentage of the fugitives being sought by law enforcement officers throughout the country have been the recipients of ill-advised clemency.

The inefficient and careless manner in which convicted criminals are guarded in our jails and penal institutions is shocking and in many cases represents criminal malfeasance upon the part of those charged with the proper safekeeping of these enemies of society. Almost daily we note hardened criminals escaping from confinement to endanger the lives of our citizens. The taxpayer has every right to demand that convicted criminals be guarded by men of high character, integrity, and intelligence. Law enforcement agencies exist for but one purpose, namely, the protection of society. We of law enforcement must be alert to take advantage of every opportunity to focus the spotlight of public opinion upon the evil conditions which presently exist. In this, we must enlist the aid of a sympathetic press and a civic-spirited screen and radio.

The responsibilities of law enforcement are ever broadening. Not only must we marshal our forces on the front of crime detection and apprehension, but there is an ever-broadening front dominated by the subverter and purveyor of alien isms who seek to transform the America we know and love to a land of class struggle. The fight against fascism continues. The hooting war has stopped, but these espousers of dictatorships still exist, and they have been too well entrenched to become converts to democracy overnight. The evidences of Fascist survival are too plain to ignore.

To the Fascist foe must be added another, the American Communist. These panderers of diabolic distrust already are concentrating their efforts to confuse and divide by applying the Fascist smear to progressive police departments, the FBI, and other American institutions to conceal their own sinister purposes.

The godless, truthless way of life that American Communists would force on America can mean only tyranny and oppression if they succeed. They are against the liberty which is America; they are for the license of their own. When they raise their false cry of unity, remember there can be no unity with the enemies of our way of life, who are attempting to undermine our democratic institutions. The Fascist-minded tyrant whom we conquered on the battlefields is no different from the American communistic corruptionist who now uses the tricks of th confidence man until his forces are sufficiently strong to rise with arms in revolt.

America cannot exist half democratic and half Communist or Fascist. If we want to improve upon our American form of government we will do it in our own way, in our own time, and with our own blueprint. Therefore, it behooves us to be on guard for an enemy that brazenly and openly has advocated the corruption of America, that spends sleepless nights working one propaganda line after another, that poses behind a dozen fronts, that squirms and twists his way into those great American forces such as the church, schools, and the ranks of labor.

As I speak to you today, the big guns of the Communist Party in the United States are aimed at returning veterans, openly boasting that here is a new front behind which they can hide. They have selected a worthy foe, for the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars are too experienced in fighting America's enemies to be hoodwinked by these Communist swindlers.

Lest I be misunderstood, I do not for one minute detract from the heroic fight Russia waged against the invading Nazi hordes, to emerge as one of the great powers of the world. We must not let the antics of the American Communist prejudice us against this great Nation which has the right to any form of government she desires, nor must we judge the great Russian people by the lunatic fringe which represents the great majority of American Communists.

Yes; we have a right and a duty to know what is going on in America. Law enforcement in the peacetime era must determine to do its best to prevent home-grown or imported Fascists and Nazis from reorganizing or regrouping under some other high-sounding, misleading name.

The rising trend in crime once again directs its attention to the home and the youth problem. More and more, I am convinced that the fault lies directly in the home. Parental responsibility is no longer in style. This causes me to suggest that a new approach is necessary. In the past when a youngster committed crime, he alone was held responsible and went to reform school, a foster home, or was put on probation. The time has come when parents should be held responsible not only to their own conscience but to society. Juvenile delinquency does not occur until adults first become delinquent. Law enforcement must find a way to do more to alleviate this problem. A widespread return of officers to the beat, concentrated efforts through crime prevention bureaus, and a closer contact with community facilities will make it a more potent force for social betterment.

There is a need for more realism in meeting the crime problem. It is not pleasant, but the fact remains that it is the delinquent youngster of the war years who is now graduating into the ranks of seasoned criminals. The most recent figures reveal that 21 percent of all arrests are of persons under 21. More persons aged 17 are arrested than in any other age group. Those under 21 years of age represent 15 percent of all murderers, 36 percent of all robbers, 51 percent of all burglars, 34 percent of all thieves, 26 percent of all arsonists, 62 percent of all car thieves, and 30 percent of all rapists.

The whole problem becomes more serious when we observe the shocking spectacle of the rise in youth offenders during the war years. They are the ones who are now becoming the postgraduates of crime and are committing the more despicable offenses. The arrests of girls under 18 years of age have increased 198 percent since the last peacetime year of 1939, while arrests of boys under 18 years of age have increased 48 percent for homicide, 70 percent for rape, 39 percent for robbery, 72 percent for assault, 55 percent for auto thefts, and 101 percent for drunkenness and driving while intoxicated.

These figures do not mean that all youth has failed; on the other hand, the generation ahead of them has failed. The best we can do to correct our mistakes is to aid the youngsters who have never had a chance in recapturing their rightful places and removing those forces which have contributed to their delinquency. The home, the church, and the school must be united in a common purpose. We need new altitudes of respect, both for the parent and for law. We need a rebuilding of the foundations which made this Nation the greatest in all history, bulwarks formed of more staple materials than those of apathy, selfishness, or indulgence. Our boys and our girls are the foundation of America, to grow as their parents and their surroundings direct.

We have a potent ally in the returning veteran. Fathers, older brothers, and even mothers and sisters freed from defense plants can do much to restore the home to its rightful place.

The average veteran will come home a better citizen. He knows what America means. He has fought and sacrificed the best years of his life in order that democracy might survive.

I resent the libel that has been placed on the returning veteran by those who would lay the postwar crime waves at his doorstep. This misapprehension regarding servicemen stems from the fact that many weapons used in crimes of violence are either service pistols or other souvenir weapons the returning soldiers were allowed to bring home because of lax regulations. Many of these inevitably find their way into the hands of unscrupulous black marketeers who resell them to hoodlums and criminals.

Hundreds of thousands of such souvenirs have been brought into the country by returning war veterans. Consequently every community and all civic groups should start a campaign to keep dangerous souvenir war weapons out of the reach of killers and bandits. Nationally the Federal firearms statute should be strengthened so as to serve more adequately to protect society and make more difficult armed depredations upon law-abiding citizens by thugs.

At the very outbreak of war, in addressing you, I pointed out that oppression would crystallize a fifth column. We singled out

the guilty then and protected the innocent. Here was a practical lesson in Americanism which worked. The same principle should be applied to the veteran. Give him the understanding, friendship, and help he deserves while he faces a period of adjustment. Those few who take the law in their own hands must be treated firmly and be made to understand that neither they nor anyone else can be immune when they do as they please and fail to respect the rights of others.

As we face the new era that lies ahead, let us do so with the determination that the people we serve shall have our best efforts and the utmost of our protection. Let us realize our responsibilities to those who have fought and died that democracy might live, by dedicating every fiber of our being to the preservation of the America we love. Let us forever pledge that we shall keep here in America a way of life that is wholesomely democratic, where citizens walk consciously and fearlessly as free men.

I know of no great cause; I know of no cause more entitled to receive the enthusiastic support of every American interested in the preservation of our country's institutions.

Stateless Persons

REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 11, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a concurrent resolution, the purpose of which is to reestablish the civil rights of the many thousands of refugees now in internment camps and scattered throughout Europe and Asia. A similar resolution is being introduced in the Senate by Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, of Michigan. There is nothing particularly new to students of the refugee situation in World War I in the purposes of this resolution. After World War I the terrible and pressing problem of refugees and stateless persons was met by the creation of "Nansen passports" under the League of Nations. Today, there is no similar passport or card of identity for stateless persons. My resolution seeks to request the State Department to create such passports for a need that is even more pressing than after World War I.

Less than a month ago General Eisenhower told the House Foreign Affairs Committee that the problem of displaced, that is, stateless persons is still far from being solved, although at that time some 3,000,000 displaced persons had been returned to their former residence-areas from the American occupied zones.

Since then the forcible evacuation of persons from Czechoslovakia and Hungary has added a new caravan of over a million other men, women, and children who must be located somewhere and given some kind of shelter, food, and opportunity to earn a livelihood. In the Europe of today this cannot be done without ration cards, work cards, and papers of identification, none of which are available to exiles so long as they are classed as "stateless." The situation is greatly complicated by the fact that many of these newly displaced families have been uprooted from areas where their ancestors have lived for hundreds of years, and they are ignorant of any other region or customs.

Aside from purely humanitarian consideration is the social effect this resentful horde may have within another generation. As Fridtjof Nansen told the League of Nations in 1928, asking for aid in settling the much smaller number of refugees then displaced in Europe:

If intelligent human beings are forced to brood over a situation so much against their wishes and efforts that they come to regard it as an injustice, and if they are denied the most elementary forms of protection, there is the danger that their physical and intellectual energies, instead of being turned into constructive channels, may be exploited in other ways which will exact a heavy reckoning out of all proportion to the slight sacrifice they now ask.

Today, General Eisenhower calls attention to a similar situation magnified by the greater number of these unhappy refugees. Testifying recently before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on UNRRA, General Eisenhower said:

I class anyone as stateless who does not want to go back to his former area through certainty of persecution. Unless that man can be shown to be a real criminal, where he is arrested and turned over to the authorities, he is a stateless person. We have thousands of those men, and we have to feed them all. They have no possibility of getting their food from anyone except from our stocks of food, and such indigenous stocks of food as we have been able to sequester for them.

Our great relief job to date has been, on the whole, satisfactorily done, but there is more needed than the Army can give those people. Future education certainly is needed. They must go somewhere sometime. They should have education now and proper nutrition rather than just shotgun types of nutrition of, say, so many calories a day. There are children, there are old people, and there are women. There is a very vast job to be done.

Among all the "stateless" problems the cases of political refugees from areas now held as parts of the Soviet Russian Empire are particularly tragic as they are claimed by the Soviet Government to be its subjects, and this claim was accepted by United States authorities until last September and, even now, is only in temporary abeyance. Deportations under the Soviet claim may be resumed at any time under the authority of the American commander of the zone of occupation, or by a directive from the President at the instance of the State Department.

Mr. Speaker, here is the resolution introduced by me and by Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, of Michigan, in the Senate:

Concurrent Resolution on Stateless Persons

Concurrent resolution favoring prompt inquiry by the United States State Department into the question of affording stateless persons immediate relief by legitimatizing their civil status and their right to become self-sustaining citizens

Whereas there are now in the areas occupied by Allied military forces many thousands of refugees, including persons who have been uprooted from their native areas to which they fear to return because of the probability of persecution for their political beliefs; and

Whereas following World War I so-called Nansen passports were provided under the auspices of the League of Nations to meet the needs of such persons, and did meet those needs: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the State Department be requested to explore and promptly report on the subject of such refugees with a view to relieving immediately their present intolerable situation, either by means of appropriate international machinery within the existing framework of the United Nations Organization to legitimatize and register the civil status of, and provide cards of identity for, all stateless persons who are now in any area occupied by any armed forces of a constituent member nation of the United Nations Organization, or by giving sufficient and proper authority for the above purposes to the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugee Problems now existing with headquarters in London.

For the purpose of this resolution, a stateless person shall be understood to mean "any individual, free of criminal charges against him, who does not want to return to his former area because of the probability of persecution."

Speech of Hon. H. Struve Hensel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 11, 1945

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Assistant Secretary of the Navy H. Struve Hensel before the convention of New Jersey Real Estate Appraisers at Atlantic City, N. J., December 7, 1945:

The aftermath of war is generally characterized by deep emotional upsets which often threaten reason and balance. An atmosphere of unsteadiness is frequently generated. After the First World War, several nations suffered violent internal revolts. In this country, emotion overpowered reason to such an extent that an eminent group of congressional investigators solemnly characterized defense munitions makers as "merchants of death" and announced that the cause of war lay solely in the aspirations of such munitions makers. Our consequent weakness at the start of this war was the price we paid for that emotional spasm.

On this fourth anniversary of Pearl Harbor Day and less than 4 months after complete victory over our enemies, this country is again on an emotional spree. Reconversion is delayed by a myriad of strikes. There is a wild rush to demobilization. Our people seem determined to exclude all things military from their private lives. The atomic era appears to some to promise terror and devastation. Others are relaxed to the point of limpness because of a belief that we will, always and without effort, be preeminent in the atomic field.

There is also what may be called the magic formula group which is convinced that the merger of our armed forces will be the complete panacea for permanent safety. Such group resists all suggestions of care and study. Their watchword is "Haste." Their plans are vague and conflicting. Their claims are extravagant—so extravagant, in fact, that many of you must wonder how

we ever managed to win this war, if our Military Establishment was as sick as they claim.

The emotional heat thus generated is rather terrifying. Witnesses have appeared claiming that the Army Air Forces won the war practically single-handed. It is charged that the weapons of sea power were obsolete or obsolescent at the time of their greatest successes. Many battle-starred naval veterans wonder if they were ever in the war. The guess is often repeated that we could have saved billions of dollars if we had fought this war with a single military department instead of two. It is also guessed that 75 percent of our war expenditures would have made us militarily stronger if we had only had a single department of some kind. There is also the unprovable statement that we would have won the war earlier if the departments had been combined. Proof of such claims is frankly admitted to be impossible. Yet on such unsupported opinions—as to which I am a most doubting Thomas—we are asked not only to risk our national safety but we are urged to take that step without investigation, reflection, or study. It is hard to believe that mature people could be so carried away.

There is admittedly an important and complex problem before us. We must establish an organizational pattern which will best preserve our national security for all time. National security in its broadest aspects—in defense against total war—is our objective. Our plan must be comprehensive, not a series of disjointed and fragmentary approaches. Yet so far we seem absorbed with only the military phase of the problem. I can assure you that, while military operations are most important, they are but a part of total war. Military successes are completely dependent on basic steps in research, invention, production, transport, and other activities quite unrelated to the military departments. In limiting our discussion to the military departments, we are not even approaching consideration of our real national problem.

I have the deepest regard for the sincerity and industry of the Senate Military Affairs Committee. Yet, the hearings before that committee do not faintly resemble a careful study of our national security. The committee has no staff to make a detailed analysis of the over-all problems. Its members are not legislatively familiar with the Navy and naval affairs. There is no group available to the committee painstakingly to investigate our present organizations and their operational advantages or disadvantages. The committee members have many other duties. Some of them are members of four or five other important committees. The hearings are seldom attended by more than 5 of the 18 committee members. Down to this evening only 1 of the 18 members had attended all of the hearings. None of the Senators can devote their entire attention to this problem for even a day much less for a week or a month. Although the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee has most experienced counsel to organize and present a case, this Military Committee has none. Consequently, the witnesses appearing before the committee are not subjected to searching cross-examination. No matter how extravagant the claim or how unsupported the guess, there has never to date been any demand for substantiation or proof. We have been entertained with the most general opinion testimony, completely unsupported by real evidence and forever defying critical analysis. The pattern is one of debate not study. It is conducted along the lines of claim and counterclaim—not analysis and reflection. That is certainly not the atmosphere or the manner in which to compose a comprehensive plan to preserve national security.

It is time that we attacked our real problem calmly, coldly, and in a manner commensurate with our intellectual maturity and with the importance of the subject. The selected solution must be able to stand the test of peace and war. We cannot afford to make any mistake.

We civilians have had some experience with war. We ought to be able to agree on some important facts. We know, whether or not it is admitted by the military, that there was much more to this war than field operations. We often emphasized the scope of our mobilization of manpower and material resources by calling it total war. We know that the next war, if there should be one, will be even more total than this one. Everyone will then be in the service of his country. The front will be everywhere. I doubt whether any material resource will be left untapped. Organizations which might have been successful in this war may be wholly unsuited for the atomic era. It is for a possible future war—not the past one—that we must prepare. We know what happened to France when she followed a majority of her military opinion and prepared for the last war instead of the coming one.

A comprehensive plan for national security must include provision for marshaling the entire resources of our Nation. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say: for mobilizing every person, every material, every tool, and every skill. Our analysis of the elements of security must be started far back of the field efficiency of the armed services. The fighting forces are but the apex of the pyramid. The shape, form, and strength of the apex must be determined by the base. The testimony and hearings to date are conceived in the opposite theory.

We should start with plans for the mobilization of our material and manpower resources. A thorough catalog must be carefully prepared. Plans must be made for the conservation and improvement of those resources. Organizationally such work involves the functions performed by our War Production Board, the War Manpower Commission, and also by the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, Labor, and the Interior. There were also auxiliary agencies, such as the Solid Fuels Administrator, the Petroleum Coordination, the War Food Administration, and other similar agencies. The foundation of security is built on such activities. Yet they have not been mentioned in the War Department claims.

Stock piles of critical materials not possessed by this country must be planned, accumulated, and kept current. This must be done to support the people in the factories and on the farms as well as on the field of combat. Such activities are in the realm of the Metals Reserve Corporation, Rubber Reserve Corporation, and the Army-Navy Munitions Board. Furthermore, we cannot neglect a catalog of all foreign sources of critical materials. For that we must turn to the State Department. And I have left out of my discussion the important war functions performed by the Office of Defense Transportation, War Shipping Administration, the Office of Price Administration, and Selective Service.

I have deliberately refrained until this point from discussing the role of the scientist in this war. I can hardly imagine his role in the future. Under the direction of civilian scientists—not military leaders—the independent Office of Scientific Research and Development fought the war through radar, sonar, the proximity fuse, and nuclear physics. In the release of atomic energy, they may have harnessed some of the basic natural forces. Others may guess as they want, but it is not a bad guess that all military men—and the military departments—may in the future be replaced by scientific groups—nuclear physicists and even biologists.

Such are and will be the real basic elements of our national strength. Agencies to supervise and direct such matters were hastily devised in this war. Successful mobilization of those resources and the coordination of those activities made possible the victorious campaigns of the Army and the Navy. You will recall that late in the war the Office of War Mobilization was devised as a supreme authority over the military departments and the War Production Board, which had already been placed over the military departments in the procurement field. If we are really studying national security, there is the field of study. Obviously a unification or other reorganization of the armed services would contribute little to the coordination of those activities or the mobilization of basic resources.

It was also in such fundamental endeavors that we made our most serious mistakes. The coordination of civilian and military research was not the most perfect. Our many material shortages—rubber, tin, copper, steel, food, and many other items—were the result of bad planning. The determination of contests for such materials by the armed services together against the general mass of civilians was much more perplexing than the settlement of the contests between the armed services. The continuous struggle of our fighting forces to tear men away from the farms and the factories affected our national security just as much as the Battle of the Bulge. Our failure to train industrial personnel and our drafting of essential workers was much more threatening to the Army than the Navy's recruiting of volunteers. It is also now apparent that the existence of two Departments was not even a remote cause of our disaster 4 years ago today at Pearl Harbor.

The role of the State Department in preserving national security likewise cannot be underestimated. In that Department wars are avoided and sometimes made. There friendships are developed in peace to mature into alliances in time of war. The Army and the Navy are in reality but instrumentalities of the State Department. That is becoming clearer to all as the Pearl Harbor investigation continues. The functions of our armed services can hardly be satisfactorily determined until the State Department has specified the foreign policies to be supported. The establishment of the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee was one of the great steps in the direction of real integration of our national security agencies. That is not even mentioned by the War Department witnesses.

Admittedly there were many deficiencies in our prosecution of this war which cannot be risked again. We fought in an atmosphere of superabundance. The next may be fought in an economy of scarcity. Now is the time to prepare fully—not partially. Can it really be that some people would have us study only the military departments?

We can proceed from the catalog of the basic elements of security to a review of some of our major mistakes. Our matériel requirements were not estimated with precision. We entered the war with inadequate knowledge as to the country's productive capabilities. Food shortages surprised us frequently. Our allocation of critical materials was most imperfect for a long time. We never attained a firm grasp on the manpower problem. The recruiting and training of personnel for industrial as well as military purposes was far from scientific. Men with higher skills were often used in less skilled jobs. The education and training of research men for the invention and development of weapons and counter measures were seriously neglected.

As such major deficiencies are enumerated, it should be noted that responsibility of the armed service departments for overwhelming victory dwindles. The possibility of preserving security solely by reorganizing those departments dwindles even faster. It is time to turn from emotionalism to realism. Reorganization of the armed services, no matter how successful, would be but a fragmentary accomplishment. An effort to reorganize

that fragment alone, as insisted upon by the War Department, not only neglects national security—it is really dangerous. Concentration on the unification of the armed services as the one "magic formula" may well lead us to a partial solution which will hamper and obstruct a satisfactory settlement of the entire problem. We may also—and this fear is supported by many of the claims made before the Senate Military Affairs Committee—we may also come to believe that in solving a fragment of the problem, we have automatically solved the whole.

There you have the fundamental issue between the War and Navy Departments today. Both seek national security. The War Department believes that security can be attained solely by merging the military departments. The Navy believes that national security requires a much more comprehensive governmental reorganization and that to attain real security in total war, the armed services play only a part.

It is surprising that Army commanders find security completely encompassed in the military departments. In directing its inquiry solely toward the advisability of unifying the armed services and encouraging field commanders to give unsupported opinion testimony, the Senate Military Affairs Committee has done worse than put the cart before the horse. The basic elements of strength are being passed over. The atomic era is being forgotten and passed by. Our usually sane national thinking is being led astray.

It is time for us to act our national age. There is no reason for us to develop the galloping jitters. We have just won a war. There is no war on the horizon in the next week or month. We have adequate time for careful study and critical analysis. Delay carries no penalty. Error may involve the loss of our national life. When a leading Senate proponent of unification opposes a careful study on the ground that it will kill unification—when the Army members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff can urge a civilian commission to study the effect of guided-atomic missiles on our national security but can reject such a study with respect to our governmental-security organization—when military field commanders can urge that we unify first and find out how later on—it is time for the people to call a halt.

There is no one man who, short of a long period of careful study, has acquired sufficient experience in all phases of this war to speak with authority on the complete cycle. We cannot reason carelessly from the field of combat to the domestic front or vice versa. The problems of each phase were radically different. The field commanders know the combat angle. They know little, if anything, about the problems encountered in producing the materials and training the men which made their exploits possible. The men who worked in the service departments here and in the War Production Board and the other agencies of mobilization know little of the problems of the field. I must emphasize again and again that this is an enormous and complex problem. No one phase should be permitted to dictate the solution. It cannot be solved piecemeal. Any solution which does not embrace all elements of national security should be doubly suspect. All conflicting War Department plans fall into that unsatisfactory category.

To date there has been only one study which even purports to consider all facets of national security. Such study was made by Ferdinand Eberstadt at the request of the Secretary of the Navy. You will remember Mr. Eberstadt as the Chairman of the Army-Navy Munitions Board and inventor of the controlled-materials plan, which solved our problems of material allocation. He undertook his study without any bias except that of a citizen. As a matter of fact, he started with some leanings toward a single military department. He catalogued all the elements of national security and checked the errors made in this war. Analyzing such studies, he evolved a comprehensive plan for national security. A single military department was rejected. Three departments—sea, ground, and air—were recommended. Decisions as to policy and coordination of those purely administrative organizations were lifted from the departments to a higher level. The military administrative organizations were to be kept compact and single-minded for efficient operation. Here only do I find it recognized that preservation of our full national security does not lie in the consolidation of any of our existing governmental departments, but rather in the creation of modern coordinating and directing agencies. This is the pattern for the future.

The existing State-War-Navy coordinating committee is to be replaced by a National Security Council with the President or Vice President as Chairman, and with the Secretaries of State, War, Navy, Air, and the Chairman of a National Resources Board as members. Such council will have a permanent secretariat. It will be responsible for foreign and military affairs and will maintain active, close, and continuous coordination between the departments and agencies of government responsible for foreign and military policies and their execution. It is the improvement of an existing instrumentality and, except for the proposed addition of the Secretary of the Treasury, it is almost identical with the recommendation recently made by Walter Lippmann as a more satisfactory instrumentality for determining our foreign policy. Such National Security Council would have under it the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a central intelligence agency, and a central research and development agency. The three service departments would execute and carry out the policies determined in this permanent body. Unity is directed by the Security Council.

On the domestic and economic side, the present War Production Board would be replaced by a National Security Resources Board consisting of a permanent chairman, the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Air, the heads of other concerned departments, and the chairman of a Military Munitions Board. This permanent organization would establish and keep up to date, in times of peace as well as war, integrated programs for the maximum use of all of the Nation's natural and industrial resources in the support of national security. This Board would be assisted by a Military Munitions Board which would determine the policy and planning of procurement, production, and distribution of military materials. Again, unity is directed by the Resources Board and the three separate service departments are utilized as the administrative organizations through which the domestic and economic policies determined by these boards are carried out.

Such proposal really deals with national security in its broadest aspects. Instead of trying to rely for our security upon a single Secretary restricted to military matters, it establishes instrumentalities able to deal comprehensively with foreign and military matters as well as domestic and economic matters. The service organizations will be prominently represented in such councils. They will not be convulsed with attempted merger. Autonomy and vitality in each administrative branch wil be supplied by a split of the War Department into two parts. Efficiency will be preserved by seeking the maximum in compactness. Everyone knows that enormous size breeds inefficiency. Such a comprehensive organization is directed toward real national security.

In conclusion, and as aid to further investigation, I should like to state briefly the conclusions I have thus far reached on this perplexing subject. Some of you may find them equally acceptable.

First, the problem before us involves all elements of our national security. It is broader than the existing War and Navy Departments. The true solution must be equally broad.

Second, I am not in favor of, nor opposed to, merger in the abstract. Merger is not susceptible of discussion in abstract terms. A merger is a detailed plan. It can only be discussed in such terms. Could any of you discuss a merger of General Electric and Westinghouse in the generality of a single president?

Third, I am opposed to the many vague and conflicting plans proposed to date by War Department spokesmen. I am particularly opposed to the plan of merger last presented by Lieutenant General Collins. It has as its central purpose the isolation and restriction of civilian control of the armed services and it is bad organizationally. It will bring about no economies. It will not foster national security. That position I would submit at any time to any impartial jury. The proposal is superficial and dangerous.

Fourth, as a citizen, I am deeply concerned with the present emotional approach to this important problem. If the delay inherent in critical analysis and study will kill the program of merger as was insisted by some of the proponents of the War Department plans, it is clear to me that the project should be killed. There is too much at stake to justify a headlong plunge until we know just where we are going. The present discussions and hearings must be returned to the fields of analysis, sobriety, and calm reflection. You as citizens can and must lead the way.

House Resolution 407

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. FOLGER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 11, 1945

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution purports to make in order, immediately upon the adoption of the resolution, consideration of H. R. 3937.

The bill was considered by the Committee on Military Affairs of the House, and the resolution recites that the purpose of the bill is to repeal the War Labor Disputes Act and to abolish the National War Labor Board. It was stated, however, by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, that, even if this rule were adopted, consideration of the bill would not be had and that he, as chairman of the committee having the bill in charge, would not bring it before the House until after the Committee on Labor, under the direction of Mr. ROBERT RAMSPECK, acting chairman, had had an opportunity to consider legislation proposed by President Truman in a communication to Congress about a week ago.

It does not only seem but it is a fact that this is a procedure not heretofore adopted or indulged in by the House: the consideration of a rule to make in order action upon a bill which it is not contemplated will be brought up except at some indefinite period of time. It may not have been designed, but it certainly has the effect that this rule would circumvent and stymie consideration of the President's recommendations as to

labor legislation which he positively requested of the Congress. It is quite unfortunate that this resolution should be brought up without the expectation of action on the bill, pending consideration of the President's recommendations.

This resolution, moreover, states that all points of order shall be waived against any provisions of the bill or to amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Military Affairs. This would have the effect of giving to the Committee on Military Affairs jurisdiction of labor legislation and with it the substitution of any legislation that the committee might decide to bring to the floor of the House just as the bill was being considered by the membership. No one but a member of the Committee on Military Affairs would likely know what substitution or amendment this committee has in mind to offer to the House for consideration.

This sort of procedure does not commend itself to the thoughtfulness of one who desires to know what he is legislating about or is called upon to vote on. What a substitute bill or the provisions of a substitute bill or denominated amendments would be, no one outside of the Committee on Military Affairs could know. Moreover, it is not contemplated that the bill at all shall be considered except that the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, addressing himself to the resolution, had said that he would not bring up the bill immediately, and expressing the thought that he did not know when he would allow the bill to come to the House. Later a member of the Committee on Rules stated that he had the promise of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs that if this resolution were adopted the bill itself would be considered not later than next Tuesday, just 1 week from today. It was not indicated, however, what that bill would contain, as the committee has authority, or would have under the resolution, to offer the House anything it desired, without such amendment or substitution even being printed. Furthermore, it seems to me that inasmuch as the bill in question lay in the Committee on Military Affairs for a long time and was not brought to the House until after the President had made his recommendations, it would be almost an affront to the President to go back and dig up a bill and offer it under such a resolution as this one is, and which would have the substantial effect of disregarding any of the recommendations made by the President.

So that it makes no difference what this bill contains as to whether the rule should be adopted, as we are put on notice that the Committee on Military Affairs has reserved the right to substitute anything it please.

The President has made recommendations and really a request for legislation along lines pointed out in his message to the Congress. I think consideration of his recommendations should be given a fair opportunity for action by the House of Representatives, and not be circumvented or stymied by the use of some long-pending measure, not pending before the House but before a committee, and not brought out until after the President had made his recommendations and request.

Inasmuch as it is not contemplated to follow the resolution, which calls for immediate action on the bill, and in view of the recitals heretofore made as to the conditions and circumstances, I see no point in adopting this rule. To my mind, it is next to playing with a subject, and in the face of what I deem required action on the part of the House to consider recommendations of the President on important subjects.

The Atomic Bomb—Address by Walter Myers, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, December 2, Mr. Walter Myers, Jr., of Indianapolis, a brilliant and capable attorney and student of public affairs, delivered a broadcast under auspices of the Indiana Committee for Victory in which he discussed the potentialities and future of the atomic bomb. I have requested and have obtained the unanimous consent of the House of Representatives to have Mr. Myers' address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a notable and worth-while contribution to the discussion of this important matter. His address follows:

The atomic bomb has done more than to fuse the sands of New Mexico or to obliterate the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The effects of its stupendous explosions have rocked the world to a far greater extent than the physical damage which it created. It has become a universal topic of discussion throughout all the nations, from coffee-table conversation to the stilted language of diplomats in lordly conference assembled. Editorials, articles, lectures, sermons, publications, and vast quantities of learned diatribes on the subject have flooded radios, newspapers, and magazines. Most of these reflect little knowledge but great imagination.

Throughout all this mass of literary and oratorical effort we can trace certain persistent themes, however. One of them is an overwhelming fear of the bomb. As we know, it has turned out to be the most destructive force ever devised by man. Experts have stated that one small atomic bomb aid raid, if undertaken by surprise over this country, could devastate practically all the important cities and kill over 40,000,000 persons. Thus a little neighboring country harboring unfriendly desires, with 120 atomic bombs and an equal number of long-range bombing planes, could conceivably cause such a catastrophe if it executed a sneak attack such as the Japs brought about in Pearl Harbor. Other scientific experts have theorized that solar energy can be harnessed. They have pointed out that in theory if the rare uranium atom can be split, thus releasing the terrific energy resulting in the atomic-bomb explosion, there is no reason to believe that the very common atom of nitrogen cannot be similarly split. If so, the resulting explosion might set off a chain reaction which might destroy all matter on the world. It is no wonder that such thoughts have curdled the blood of not only political leaders and diplomats, but of businessmen, Army commanders, and labor leaders of the world.

A second persistent theme which can be traced throughout the voluminous material about the bomb concerns the problem of how to control its use. While people are in agreement about its deadly potentialities, and are united in their fear of it, the question of its control has caused far-reaching differences of opinion. Many believe that it should be kept within the realm of the United States in a tightly locked safety deposit box. Others believe that an international committee should protect it. Still others feel that its so-called secrets should be revealed to all nations of the world for the future advancement of science. The great amount of energy spent trying to solve a far greater problem has been wasted and of no avail unless the peoples of the world solve a far greater problem. To make an issue of whether Russia or any other nation should be taught its secrets, or whether the United States should preserve them in silence forever, is to put the cart before the horse.

The greatest problem facing the world today is how to govern the passions and warlike tendencies of man so as to prevent any future wars wherein the atomic bomb could be employed. To date the ingredients of the bomb have been used for purely destructive purposes. With further development it could conceivably destroy civilization as we know it. However, it is under the domination and control of human beings, who can use it or not use it, in accordance with their desires. In order to abandon it completely for destructive purposes, man must once more try to form a world community in which all peoples may live in peace. The effects of the atomic bomb should permanently dissipate nationalism and isolationism and banish them forever from the thoughts of man.

This Nation, as well as the countries of the world, can best protect itself from the bomb by sincerely and quickly promoting such a world community as has been suggested. Whether it can be created by a reorganized League of Nations, or a world-wide super government, or the existing United Nations Organization is not as important as recognition of the fact that some form of international union is absolutely necessary. If we devote our energies in creating such a union which will be dedicated to serving the peaceful interest of the world, we shall never have to fear the consequences of the atomic bomb.

Address by Hon. Henrik Shipstead, of Minnesota, Before Lutheran Men's Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, December 11 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered on October 28, 1945, at the Civic Opera House, Chicago, Ill., at a meeting held under the auspices of the Lutheran Men's Council.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The greetings I bring are sincere and friendly, even though the shadows around us will lend a note of grimness to what I venture to say this afternoon. Christian character is still the hope of mankind, and its only substantial, practical hope. When I look back

over my years of observation, at first-hand, of what the Lutheran Church has stood for I am sincerely happy to come here from Washington and give testimony to the profound esteem and respect in which I hold this great exemplar of dauntless courage and integrity of character.

Viewing the future, I see the Lutheran Church faced with a tremendous challenge—a challenge that will spell the difference between national and individual weal or woe. Aside from the spiritual mission of the church, her obligation of awakening a greater active interest in good government among her membership is more pressing than ever before. The crying need of the times to offset the forces that are undermining the cause of truth, righteousness, and justice in government and international relationships is a wider application of the tenets of the church.

Once again the leaders of men, out of ignorance or out of a malicious indifference to the causes and consequences of war, have visited a calamitous repetition of history upon a terrified world. Once again men caught in the mad chaos of their own folly are crying "Peace, peace," when there is no peace. Power politics is still in the saddle riding mankind to destruction.

A reminder of past history will help us better to understand this present conspiracy of silence and better to appraise the future.

In the year 1785 Dr. Samuel Johnson observed:

"Among the calamities of war may be justly numbered the diminution of the love of truth by the falsehoods which interest dictates and credulity encourages. I know not whether more is to be dreaded from streets filled with soldiers accustomed to plunder, or from garrets filled with scribes accustomed to lie."

In 1848 Abraham Lincoln said of President Polk, whose complicity in the Mexican War he suspected:

"He is a confounded, confused and miserably perplexed man. God grant there is not something about his conscience more painful than all his mental perplexities."

During the latter part of the nineteenth century, Disraeli, for many years Prime Minister of England, wrote:

"All great events have been distorted, most of the important causes concealed, some of the principal characters never appear, and all who figure are so misunderstood and misrepresented that the result is a complete mystification. If the history of England be ever written by one who has the knowledge and the courage, the world would be astonished."

I venture to say that this quotation will apply to all the great world powers engaged in this war.

Secretary of State Robert Lansing wrote of President Wilson's part in drafting the Treaty of Versailles:

"He has put himself on a level with politicians experienced in intrigue, whom he will find a difficult lot. He will sink in the estimation of the delegates who are not of the inner circle, and what will be more disastrous will be the loss of confidence among the peoples of the nations represented here."

Even more recently the brilliant English man of letters, Aldous Huxley, wrote:

"At no period of the world's history has lying been practiced so shamelessly or, thanks to modern technological progress, so efficiently or on so vast a scale as by the political and economic dictators of the twentieth century."

Already events are proving that this war has been a tragic repetition of the causes and results of these ancient afflictions. Yet we are still being told that the only thing we must fear is fear itself.

History teaches us it is knowledge that is power and not courage. It is ignorance that makes cowards of men. It is the prostitution of truth that breeds human corruption and human slavery. Why is it then that in the midst of the present disaster we are not being warned against these things?

During the past 30 years men highly skilled in the arts of mastery have strutted onto the international stage. One by one these masters have abused the confidence of the people, usurped their liberties, and corrupted their minds and morals. Always for allegedly fair and noble ends, and always under the guise of a benevolent tyranny, these masters have succeeded in committing two international crimes in one generation.

Certainly these things have not just happened. There are too many of the same strange threads running through the pattern of recent years for us to continue to believe our highest policy-making circles are either ignorant or innocent of what they are doing.

Again we are admonished not to be perfectionists or starry-eyed idealists, and not to expect too much from all the grandiose promises and schemes with which our statesmen inspired our sacrifice and suffering. Again, as was the case following the last war, we are told there has been a slight misunderstanding among the victor powers.

If I read history aright, this Nation was born in the bloody travail of just such a historic epoch of world revolt against the then-existing social and political tyranny as the one in which we now find ourselves. The founders of our Government knew the historic background of this revolt. They were carefully conscious of its cause. Faithful to the lessons they had learned from history, they built the foundations for a new nation under God. Our Constitution was framed in the light of that knowledge.

What was even more important is that our respect for the dignity and rights of human personality was directly derived from a Christian heritage and incorporated into the very heart of our constitutional representative Government.

There was not the slightest misunderstanding of these principles and and ideals in the minds of our freedom-loving fathers. There cannot possibly be any misunderstanding of the challenge of these historic truths now. The American people still know instinctively wherein lies their greatest treasure and their greatest strength. We have not yet lost our faith that the essential genius of a free society lies in its power of self-criticism and self-correction. We have not become such moral ingrates as to expect Almighty God to save us from the consequences of acts which he has given us the wits to avoid, yet, if these further catastrophies are not to befall us, we must now demand a day of reckoning.

Remember the Atlantic Charter, which was promised to every nation—the great and small, the weak and the strong, the victor and the vanquished—and, individually, to the black, to the brown, to the red, to the yellow, and to the white alike? It has become the "Atlantic barter."

When the wraps of propaganda are taken from off the "four freedoms," we shall find the "four horsemen" again charging down the corridors of time.

When our liberation of the tragic peoples of Europe and Asia is exposed, we shall find them transferred from the hands of one dictator into the bloody and tyrannical hands of another.

Our "justice" has become a masterpiece of mockery in which we have taken over the purge techniques of our enemies and, at the same time, revived and extended to the white race the savagery of slave labor.

The "peace" about which our self-styled international authorities are shouting from the housetops, is merely the extension of brutal war techniques to millions of helpless and innocent men, women, and children.

The "interim agreements," under which the victors are attempting to hold the mad chaos of Europe and Asia together, have become brutal, immoral, and uneconomic political absurdities.

If our financial books were balanced, we would find that America, as the world spendthrift and chief advocates of international pump-priming, is the first great nation in history to have fought two wars in order to finance a bankrupt imperialism. Even the London Economist, one of the greatest interpreters of international affairs in the British Empire, has the grace to admit that England now needs $6,000,000,000, not for food, clothing, and shelter but to finance her armies of occupation all around the world. Russia is asking more billions, so she can continue her imperialistic program and her enslavement and purge of eastern Furope, the Near, the Middle, and the Far East.

International law has degenerated into international anarchy, in which there is not a single international law, principle, agreement, covenant, or purpose held in common among or binding upon even the Big Three.

Even while I speak, our one world is being carved up by three powers behind closed doors without the advice or cooperation or consent of the suffering millions involved.

Then what do these men mean when they cry "Peace"? We need only to read between the lines of the foregoing statements of the present ugly international facts of life for the answer.

"Give us more power," our statesmen cry. Again the state supreme, whose greed for the products of man's toil and suffering can never be gratified, rears its ugly head.

"We shall enforce the peace," our statesmen shout. Yes, they are enforcing peace upon the millions of their economic slaves in Africa and Asia, and they are doing it with American lend-lease tanks, guns, and ammunition. The people of the British, French, and Dutch East Indies have been working in slavery over a century for the sisal and rubber monopolies on these plantations. Their wages have been from 40 cents to $1.25 a week. They want to be free. They were promised independence at the outbreak of the war. They are now fighting to achieve that freedom. The British, the Dutch, and the French Governments are fighting these people with American lend-lease tanks and guns, and our State Department has requested these governments to remove the words "Made in the United States" from these instruments of warfare that American workingmen and American taxpayers produced to be used for freedom.

It was in 1918 that Ernst Troelsch, the great German historian, sadly lamented to a friend:

"What have we witnessed since Hegel's time but the gradual draining away of our native belief in the power of the spirit to rule history?"

Was it not St. Paul who said of the evils of his time:

"We wrestle not against flesh and blood but against principalities and powers; against the rulers of the darkness of this world; against spiritual wickedness in high places."

It was the eminent theologian, Emil Brunner, who so forcefully stated the dilemma and the challenge men of every age confront, when he said:

"If it were truly possible for the State to make men out of wild animals, would it be necessary for the State to make wild beasts out of men?"

America can never discharge her aspiration to world leadership by proposing haphazard, face-saving doctrines and policies of government, either at home or abroad, which the pages of history reveal have repeatedly wrecked governments and civilizations since the beginning of time.

The challenge that is ours can neither be declined nor ignored; the forfeit is freedom, collective and personal alike.

Should we fail, inevitably our "brave new world" becomes a miserable hovel.

It was to save us from these calamities that the mothers of America gave millions of their sons to the war. We had over a million casualties and over a quarter of a million dead. If the history of diplomacy and power politics repeats itself, these boys will have died in vain.

"Mourn not for the dead,
Who in the soft earth lie,
Dust to dust as will you and I.
But mourn, rather, for the silent meek
Who know the world's wrongs
But dare not speak."

Official Inhumanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 11 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Official Inhumanity," by the editor of the Lutheran Outlook, published in the November issue of that magazine. The editor is Rev. E. E. Ryden. I ask that the article be printed in the Appendix following the address which I have asked to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICIAL INHUMANITY

Peace has come to the world, but as yet there is no peace. The spirit of hatred aroused by the passions of war continue to persist despite the fact that war drums have ceased to beat, and there are numerous evidences that the flames of animosity are being fanned by sinister forces. Inhumanity and even brutality are being practiced in a manner that is shocking to the Christian conscience. Millions of human beings are on the verge of starvation, and yet, in America at least, there appears to be no official cognizance of the fact. And the American people are being kept strangely in ignorance of the awful catastrophe that has befallen a large part of the world's population.

We are referring primarily to the appalling tragedy that has come to the German people. We have no plea for the despicable despotism which for six long years brought untold misery to mankind. It has been brought down to the perdition which it richly deserved. But we do raise a voice in solemn protest against the inhumanity which today is being practiced by the victor nations against the German people, many of whom have suffered from their tyrannical leaders longer than the peoples of other countries. And we do plead for pity and mercy for the millions of innocent children who in no way could be held responsible for the crimes of their war lords, but who now are become the chief victims of the judgment which has fallen.

Tens of thousands of these children are already dead from exposure and starvation. Other tens of thousands will perish for want of food, clothing, medicine, and shelter during the bitter months of winter that lie ahead. They roam the highways, these children, some with parents and others alone. But their parents are often as helpless and destitute as they.

Where did they come from? They came from the territories taken over by the Russians, Poles, and Czechs in eastern Europe. The minority problem in many parts of eastern Europe has always been a troublesome one. The minorities have been a source of irritation to the ruling majority peoples. The Russians, Poles, and Czechs, however, have evidently found a simple solution for the minority problem. They have determined that there shall be no minority. And that is why some 16,000,000 to 18,000,000 people of East Prussia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Pomerania, the Baltic States, and Silesia are now wandering the highways of eastern and central Europe, driven from their homes, dispossessed of all they owned in the world, and compelled to beg, to steal, or to die.

British Foreign Secretary Bevin recently told Parliament that the refugee scenes he had witnessed in Berlin beggared description. "As I watched," he said, "I felt, 'my God, that is the price of man's stupidity and war.' It was the most awful sight you could possibly see." And most of the refugees, he added, were women and children. Although he did not say it, the implication was clear that the Russians had taken the husbands and fathers as slave laborers.

And in this revolting slave business, the United States also stands with guilty hands. During the month of July the communications zone of the United States forces in Europe turned over 320,000 German prisoners to the French and 278,000 to the British, for reconstruction work. These figures did not take into account other thousands of German prisoners already turned over by the Sixth and Twelfth American Armies. However, after the International Red Cross reported that the slave laborers turned over to the French were receiving inhuman treatment, further transfers were halted by General Eisenhower.

The other week, some 2,474 of these slave laborers were returned to the Americans by the French. Correspondents described them as "a beggar army of pale, thin men clad in vermin infested tatters." All were pronounced unfit to work—three-fourths of them because of malnutrition. Nineteen percent were severe cases requiring infirmary treatment. Said Associate Press photographer Henry Griffin, who took pictures of the piled corpses in every German concentration camp from Buchenwald to Dachau:

"The only difference I can see between these men and those corpses is that here they're still breathing."

It is not without reason that some of the leading churchmen of Germany, men who suffered persecution at the hands of their Nazi oppressors because they would not subscribe to their pagan philosophy, are beginning to wonder if they helped to betray their country into the hands of enemies who are even more pagan and inhuman than their former political tyrants. Bishop Theophilus Wurm, provisional head of the newly organized Evangelical Church of Germany, in a recent letter to Dr. G. K. A. Bell, Anglican Bishop of Chichester, asks bitterly if it was necessary that once again in history the victorious powers should "come to be infested by the spirit of those they have vanquished."

"Was it not possible," he asks, "to take preventive measures in order to save innocent women and children from ghastly misery? Was it really necessary to proceed in such a manner that the war propaganda of Goebbels seemed to be vindicated?"

Bishop Wurm recalls the pledge of the Allied statesmen at Tehran in which it was stated that "we will not rest until we have won the victory over tyranny for freedom and tolerance," and then he adds:

"How we long to see this pledge redeemed. The future destiny of the human race will be determined by the outcome of the struggle between the heathen spirit of revenge and the Christian spirit of mercy and forgiveness. Which will prevail?

"The spirit of forgiveness won the day in 1815, after Europe had been freed from enslavement endured for 20 years under Napoleon. A peace was made which respected the integrity of France proper. The spirit of forgiveness did not prevail in 1918–19. Today whole German populations are subjected to the harshest retribution."

Strangely enough, it is England—the country that suffered perhaps more than any other from the destructive fury of the Nazi war machine—that has shown the first evidences of an awakened conscience regarding the vindictive measures pursued by the Allies in Germany. The recent discussion in the British Parliament regarding the miseries of the German people was led by Foreign Secretary Bevin himself and brought on one of the most remarkable emotional outbursts witnessed in many years. One lawmaker who ventured to remark that he was indifferent to the fate of the German people was silenced with cries of "shame" from his colleagues. Another denounced in bitter terms what he called the lunatic policy of the United States.

What is this "lunatic policy" of our Nation? Is it a form of appeasement by which we have given free rein to Russia, Poland, France, and other of our allies to carry on in any fashion they desire, just in order to avoid friction with them and to keep them cooperating with us?

From the lips of one of our returned chaplains who was an eyewitness of the scene, we have heard how hungry German children digging in the garbage cans of a certain American outfit in the hope of finding food during the early days of the occupation of Germany, were driven away by American soldiers. This does not sound like the deed of American men. Our fighters do not ordinarily act that way. They would rather share their candy, gum, and food with hungry youngsters. But even American soldiers were helpless in the face of grim official orders that not only prohibited them from fraternizing with the conquered enemy peoples but also denied them the right to reveal any human kindness. Was this also a part of the lunatic policy of our country?

And what about UNRRA? Is it a fact that this agency, which has billions of dollars at its disposal for relief work, is prevented from giving any aid to former enemy peoples? If so, who is responsible for this situation? Is it a part of a coldly calculated official inhumanity by which the Allied nations hope to reduce the German people to a state of helplessness?

In contrast with the strange cloak of silence which Washington has thrown over the desperate plight of Germany's dispossessed millions, warning voices are beginning to be raised in various parts of the United States. "The peace is being lost at the present moment as fast as it is possible for five nations to lose it," declared John Nevin Sayre, cosecretary of the national Fellowship of Reconciliation, in a midwestern address, as he told of the brutal deportations in eastern Europe. "The age that is coming in must be marked by nonviolent spiritual force. Unless that force is characteristic of the age to come, there won't be any age or culture worth talking about or making an effort to save for our children."

Dr. John A. Mackay, president of Princeton Theological Seminary, echoed the same sentiment when he said, "If the world displays interest exclusively in punishment of war guilt, it will create a diabolical situation with dangerous reactions."

And former President Hoover is even more deeply concerned. In an address at Wilson College, Pennsylvania, emphasizing the need of a reconversion of the intellectual, moral, and spiritual life of mankind from the shock of war to the life of peace, he spoke soberly about our dulled sense of truth, our damaged sense of justice, our loss of sensitiveness to brutality, and at least the partial

loss of our ideals of freedom. If the Allies persist in their present policy of visiting on the children of millions of Germans and Japanese the sins of their fathers and seek to reduce the economic life of coming generations to the low levels of an agricultural state, warned Mr. Hoover, they will "create gigantic cesspools of hate, poverty, and conspiracy against the world."

These are solemn words, and America and the rest of the world will do well to ponder them earnestly. The time has evidently come when the church must raise its voice in protest, and in no uncertain words, against the vindictive and brutal spirit of revenge which appears at the present time to animate the victorious nations. The world is in utter chaos, morally, spiritually, economically, and politically, and it is drifting rapidly closer to the abyss of complete disaster. Millions are in the grip of despair. Revolutions everywhere are in the making. It is already late, very late, if mankind is to be saved from another appalling catastrophe.

Instead of discussing the probability of a third world war and the horrors which the atomic bomb will bring to such a struggle, let the nations be summoned for a peace conference. And let it truly be a peace conference and not the breeding ground for another war. The devils of hate have already ruled long enough, and a sorry mess they have made of God's fair world. It is time to let the Prince of Peace begin His reign in the councils of the nations and in the hearts of men.

Slave Labor in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, December 11 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, earlier in the day I placed in the RECORD some remarks made by me in Chicago on the 28th of October. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks earlier in the day an editorial entitled "Slave Labor in Europe," from the October 4, 1945, issue of the Wanderer, a very excellently edited Catholic newspaper published in the city of St. Paul, Minn.

SLAVE LABOR IN EUROPE

Commenting on the inhumanity of the use of German slave labor by the Russians to rebuild the devastated areas of the Soviet, Fr. Edward J. Whelan, S. J., says in a letter to America:

While it is true that Great Britain and the United States have not descended to the depth of using slave labor, one wonders why there has been no outcry against this return to barbarism from our Government or from the American press. One almost would infer that the use of slave labor by the Russians meets with our approval.

A few weeks ago I received a personal letter from one of our ablest and most experienced war correspondents now in Europe. He writes: "A diplomat from Moscow told me that it was generally accepted there that around 8,000,000 are in the slave-worker camps of Russia and Siberia. A high Polish diplomat told me the other day that of 1,700,000 Poles forcibly deported by the Reds to the interior of Russia, incomplete returns indicated than 400,000 men, women, and children had perished. Attention at home in the States, it seems has been focused only on the concentration camps in Germany. God knows they were bad enough. But do they justify slavery or the conditions in Poland, Hungary, Rumania, eastern Germany, Austria, etc.?"

The reestablishment of human slavery in the form of compulsory slave workers to rebuild devastated areas of Russia is a crime that cries to Heaven. The dignity of man is ignored and insulted, families are broken up, and such treatment of men made after God's own image will result in savagery unbelievable, spiritual collapse, and moral disintegration. What a terrible precedent to establish.

Also terrifying is the thought that our country and Great Britain seem to have given their consent, at least tacitly, and to our shame. Granted that slavery of German prisoners was already in operation in Russia and Siberia before the Potsdam Conference, that does not justify our complacence. There should have been a strong protest by us.

It may not be too late even now to stir up our people and the world against the barbarous institution of slavery in our so-called twentieth-century civilization.

Sheepshead Bay Maritime Training Station

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 11, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle Supplement of Sunday, December 9, 1945:

SHEEPSHEAD BAY MARITIME TRAINING STATION

The Sheepshead Bay Maritime Training Station was rushed to completion during the summer and fall of 1942. This was the period of crisis for the United Nations. The Russians were desperately defending Stalingrad and the British were digging in at El Alamein. Our allies fought as only those with their backs to the wall can fight but they needed supplies. And men were needed to man the supply ships.

This Nation answered their call. When the first section of trainees entered the gates of the station on September 1, 1942, the property was still a mire of muddy paths and partly constructed buildings. The first graduate was shipped out December 5 before the station was even dedicated. Six days later the full complement of 10,000 was reached and the next day the dedication took place. Its first superintendent was Commander George M. Wauchope, United States Naval Reserve, and he was succeeded in May 1943 by Capt. John L. Beebe, United States Naval Reserve.

LARGEST IN THE WORLD

The Sheepshead Bay station is the largest merchant marine training school in the world. Sprawling over 76 acres, the gigantic station contains barracks, a mammoth auditorium and gymnasium, administration center, canteen, hospital and dental clinics, carpenter shops, the largest enclosed swimming pool in the world, mess halls, machine shops, 5 piers and more than 200 whaleboats, sail and motorboats, 27 outdoor steering trainers, classrooms, parade ground, and the reproduction of a complete deck of a typical freighter.

Between December 1942 and VJ-day the station turned out 115,000 trained seamen, all volunteers. Many of them saw the sea for the first time when they stepped within the station's boundaries. But they were turned into mariners with dispatch and precision. Two men out of every three trained by the War Shipping Administration came from its Sheepshead Bay training camp. This means that more than half of the entire personnel of the American merchant marine are Sheepshead graduates.

COURSES OF STUDY

These men who manned the United Nations supply lines and spread the name of Sheepshead Bay into every war port on the globe averaged a 13-week course at the station. From here they were sent to a graduate school for further training. Sheepshead's shortest course was a 6-week schedule for messmen. The longest was a 6-month curriculum for a new-type warrant rating which combined the functions of junior assistant purser and pharmacist's mate. This was to assure merchant crews a trained medic on their many dangerous convoy runs.

The courses were elastic, however, depending on the need of the moment. When available ships had full crews the call for men was hushed and the 13-week course for deck and engine ratings was extended to 18. Such was the case during February 1944. On the other hand, many men anxious to get in the fight volunteered and were shipped out after 10 weeks.

During the 1943 emergency periods when crew shortages were acute, hundreds were speeded to ships after 6 weeks. Since the station accepted 16-year-olds with their parents' consent (a total of 10,000), many fuzzy-cheeked youngsters were thrown into the dangers of submarine-menaced sea lanes, where wolf packs bared their fangs without warning. Although these short-course personnel held only messmen's ratings, once they set foot on deck they were subject to the skipper's orders and the discipline of the high seas. Since Nazis torpedoes did not distinguish between the experienced and non-experienced, men barely getting their sea legs were called upon to perform the tasks of the sea-wise and hard-bitten.

LOUDEST GRIPE

One of the loudest and most perennial gripes of the American merchant mariner during World War II was that, unlike his British equivalent, he was not considered a part of his nation's armed forces. The percentage of dead and missing of those who sailed into the teeth of the enemy as civilians was greater than that of the Army and Navy. Approximately 6,000, or 3 percent, of the 200,000 American merchant seamen are dead or missing, compared with the 2-percent figure of the armed forces. No statistics were kept on wounded or prisoners of war. The Sheepshead Bay honor roll lists 250 men who went down with their ships.

The Sheepshead Bay Maritime Training Station has the neat look of a naval post, the firm discipline of a military unit, the solid traditions of a university—and the fresh tang of the sea. The green apprentice seaman, whose deep-seated romantic notions pictured a sailor as a casual swaggering character making constant rounds of water front bars or plotting mutinies in the forecastle with a knife in his teeth, is shocked at his first view of the station. He sees trim lines of men marching with the geometrical precision of West Point graduates. He sees streets as clean as a hospital floor. He sees freshly painted white barracks lined up as trim as the men they house. It is enough to make him take a deep breath of salt air and look again.

The new seaman is sucked into the life of the station as soon as he enters it. First, a barrage of questionnaires is thrown at him.

He is fingerprinted and photographed for identification purposes and given a thorough medical examination, including inoculations. Then, he is supplied with $80 worth of clothing which consists of work dungarees, dress blues, raincoat, underwear, peacoat, and shoes. Seabags full, he is assigned to one of seven two-story barracks, each housing 1,400 men and containing four recreation rooms.

SPIRIT OF THE SEA

The new man quickly becomes familiar with the names of famous American ships, for the barracks are named after them—*Glory of the Seas, Westward Ho, Savannah, Clermont, Lightning, Ocean Monarch,* and *Flying Cloud.* The three big classrooms are named *Saratoga, St. Mary's,* and *Enterprise.* The gunnery building is *Constitution.* The buildings do not have names merely to give the new seaman a lesson in United States sea history but to imbue him with the spirit of the sea from the beginning. The buildings are "ships," the floors are "decks," windows are "portholes."

Besides the big jobs of housing, feeding, and training thousands, the station makes sure that everything is done for the safety, happiness, and comfort of every man. Doctors and pharmacist's mates are always ready in case of accidents or sickness. The tailor shop helps keep clothes spruced up. In the ship's service store he can buy anything from jewelry for his girl friend to tobacco for himself. There are Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish chaplains to give advice on personal and religious problems. The Red Cross has a field office at the station. There are two giant mess hall buildings, in which each barracks has its own immaculate compartment, where 700 men are served cafeteria-style in one sitting. Organized athletic competition is aimed at supplying a healthful sport for every taste.

The 6 weeks of preliminary training lay heavy emphasis on lifeboat skill. The new man may grin as he learns to manipulate an oar in a boat embedded in solid ground, but this elementary instruction is important. It is not long, however, before 11-man crews are handling the boats in Sheepshead Bay and Rockaway Inlet.

SINK OR SWIM

Since their very lives depend upon it the men are taught five swimming strokes, not including the crawl because the head is submerged part of the time. It was discovered that about 20 percent of the men entering training did not know how to swim.

The men are toughened by boxing, wrestling, a 565-yard obstacle course, and gymnasium training. It is essential they have strong, well-coordinated bodies to enable them to face emergencies. They are familiarized with guns, gas masks, oxygen-breathing apparatus, and fire-fighting equipment. They must learn the 32 points of the compass backward and forward.

At the end of 3 weeks of quarantine the trainee rates his first week-end liberty in the most exciting city in the world. He returns to another week of classes and then goes into workweek. This means swabbing the deck, painting, washing windows, and clerical work. Preliminary training is finished off by mess week, which enables every man to be certified as a steward's mate, third class.

In advanced training the man learns the heart of his job. In 99 cases out of 100 it is a field of work he himself has chosen. There are 17 courses in deck training plus 3 weeks of practical work aboard one of the USMS training ships operating on Long Island Sound and Chesapeake Bay.

The student seaman learns about every piece of deck equipment, the principles of deck cargo rigging, how to load cargo, marlinspike seamanship (the use of rope), and signaling. On cleverly designed steering trainers, which consist of a steel platform of pontoon design pivoting in water, he gets the feel of the wheel.

Some men, who can't resist the thrill of working with engines, join the "black gang." Engine training revolves about the Liberty ship and its equipment. A wealth of instruction devices and actual operating equipment gives the student thorough knowledge of the machinery he must care for and repair. Like deck seamen they get 3 weeks aboard a training ship.

MESS

Good food is the key to a happy ship. And to make sure there are as many happy ships as possible in the American merchant marine a 10-week intensive course is devoted to turning out skilled second cooks and bakers. There is nothing haphazard in the menus turned out by these trainees. They provide balanced meals based on their study of nutritional values. Their preparation of meat, fish, and poultry is sure and swift and they are as wary of dirt as a physician. In addition to this there is an 8-week chief steward's course open to men with at least 9 months of sea duty as chief cooks.

The 6-month course for junior assistant purser-pharmacist's mate is usually given to the older men, for theirs is a responsible job. They must treat wounded seamen calmly and expertly at the height of an emergency. They must keep pay roll and cargo records accurately and know a mind-staggering list of intricate regulations.

A man with ability gets a chance to show his worth at the school. He may compete for entry into radio school or the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, "the Annapolis of the Maritime Service." He may apply for transfer to the Army Transport Corps. Engine trainees may go to turbo-electric or pumpman schools.

After the student takes his oath in accordance with shipping regulation he is ready to ship out. For his first trip the Maritime Service assigns him to a ship. After that he is a free agent.

PLANS FOR THE FUTURE

Unlike many other wartime installations which sprouted up all over the country only to be wiped off the map with equal celerity, the Sheepshead Bay station is destined for an important role in the postwar years. Under the terms of a national policy designed to provide 100,000 trained men for a peacetime merchant fleet, the school will give 1-month refresher and upgrading courses to unlicensed personnel. Present plans look to a school able to hold 6,000 men at one time, 60 percent of the present capacity. Courses will be given for deck, engineer, and steward nonofficer ratings, and classrooms will be enlarged for the purpose. In charge of these activities will be Capt. J. von Sneidern, U. S. M. S., who succeeded Captain Beebe October 15, 1945.

Centralization and Coordination of Federal Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 11, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there are functions of government, State and National, and of essential businesses of many kinds, which cannot be efficiently conducted without accurate statistical information, reasonably current and approximately dependable.

The Congress has recognized this need from the beginning of our Government by authorizing the collection, compilation, and dissemination of statistical data. The number of governmental agencies exercising such authority has steadily increased—especially in recent years—until there are now said to be as many as 65. Whatever the number, the feeling is widespread and frequently voiced that there are too many agencies engaged in statistical activities and that economy and efficiency would be effected by centering such work in a single agency.

The idea of centralization of governmental functions is not new. It has been the subject of careful study and investigation in the formulation of the supply bills in every Congress. The Congress, in the Federal Reports Act of 1942—Public Law 831, Seventy-seventh Congress—undertook to eliminate duplication and establish an economical and efficient procedure by vesting over-all administrative control in the Bureau of the Budget. Much has been accomplished in pursuance of that law, and the Bureau of the Budget, it will be generally agreed, is in position to bring about orderly, sensible, and economical administrative processes.

I have received from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget a report of a recent study the Bureau has made, at the instance of the Committee on Appropriations, with regard to the establishment of a single statistical agency. It is an illuminating paper and I am presenting it for the information of any who may have an interest in the subject. It is my impression that the committee is inclined to believe that the Bureau should be given every opportunity and encouragement to effect compliance within a reasonable time with the spirit of the Federal Reports Act, to which reference is made.

The report follows:

DECEMBER 4, 1945.

MY DEAR MR. CANNON: I am transmitting herewith a report to the House Committee on Appropriations on "Centralization and coordination of Federal statistics." This report has been prepared by the Bureau of the Budget in response to the committee's suggestion, in its report on the first supplemental appropriation rescission bill, 1946, that the Bureau of the Budget study the problem of duplication in our present centralized system of Federal statistics, and take appropriate measures toward the establishment of a single statistical agency.

We have set forth in the report a brief account of the study of Federal statistical programs made in 1938 and ensuing measures taken by the Congress and by the Bureau to provide for increased coordination, a summary of some of the reasons which indicate that complete centralization is not desirable, an indication of some of the legislative obstacles to statistical centralization, and a résumé of the Bureau's present methods for coordination of Federal statistics.

The reasons why complete centralization is impractical do not imply that existing arrangements for Federal statistical activities in several areas are satisfactory. There is need of improvement. Any attempt to improve these arrangements, however, must take into account many administrative, legislative, and technical considerations such as those dealt with in this report.

We shall be glad to supply you with any additional materials you may wish, whether in written reports or in consultation.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director.

CENTRALIZATION AND COORDINATION OF FEDERAL STATISTICS—REPORT TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The great variety and complexity of information needed to administer the Government of the United States and to meet the legitimate needs of its citizens for facts call for strong control over the statistical programs of Federal agencies. The best means of obtaining this control have been discussed from time to time for more than three generations. The particular device of creating a single statistical agency has been examined thoroughly at intervals during the last 25 years.

The conclusion each time has been that it is impracticable to delegate to one agency the responsibility for the gathering, compilation, and publication of the many diverse kinds of numerical facts that must be obtained by the Federal Government. The alternative conclusion has been drawn from each of these examinations that there must be centralized responsibility for the coordination of fact-gathering programs; but that the programs themselves should be executed by various administrative and other specialized agencies.

We believe that these conclusions still hold. The objectives sought by proposals to centralize statistical activities within a single agency are the elimination of unnecessary duplication and overhead expenses. In our judgment these objectives can be met much more satisfactorily by leaving statistical programs within separate agencies and providing for coordination in the many different fields.

It should be understood that the considerations weighing against complete centralization of statistical work do not indicate that great improvements in Federal statistical work are not needed. Although many improvements have been made in recent years, much still remains to be done to increase the efficiency of present statistical activities. Such improvements, however, cannot be made without full consideration of the many administrative, legislative, and technical problems involved.

The present report explains what considerations have led to the continuation of a decentralized statistical system and why coordination seems to be a better means than centralization for eliminating duplication in Federal reports. It also explains why, in view of the many legislative provisions under which Federal agencies operate, it is not feasible, in a literal sense, to centralize all statistical work of the Government in a single statistical agency. The report further describes the measures the Bureau of the Budget is taking to eliminate statistical duplication and to centralize the collection of information within limited fields.

RECENT STUDIES AND DEVELOPMENT OF STATISTICAL COORDINATION

Adequate provision for statistical coordination within the Federal Government is of fairly recent development. With the exception of a few short-lived organizations, established in time of emergency, there was no central authority charged with responsibility for statistical coordination until 1933, when President Roosevelt established the Central Statistical Board. Even then, the functions and authority of the Board were limited.

In 1938, at the request of the President, the Central Statistical Board made a thorough study of alternative methods of bringing about increased efficiency in the collection of Government statistics. The results of this study, with the Board's recommendations, were printed in January 1939 as Report of the Central Statistical Board on the Returns Made by the Public to the Federal Government (H. Doc. No. 27, 76th Cong., 1st sess.).

While the report was being prepared, the secretary to the President asked the agencies most concerned to submit memoranda on the best means of eliminating duplication in Government statistical and reporting services. They were asked specifically to comment on the feasibility of establishing a single statistical agency. Analysis of these replies and study of the problems presented led the Central Statistical Board to recommend against the centralization of Federal statistics into one agency. The Board reached this conclusion because of the impossibility of separating many statistical processes from administrative operations and because it was convinced that the possible advantages of a single statistical agency would be more than offset by disadvantages. The Board recommended that there be a statistical coordinating agency with adequate powers to eliminate duplication in agency programs and to relate the needs of different agencies for similar information.

The Central Statistical Board was incorporated into the Executive Office of the President, as the Division of Statistical Standards of the Bureau of the Budget, under the Reorganization Act of 1939. As part of the Budget Bureau, its authority for statistical coordination was greatly increased. Enactment of the Federal Reports Act of 1942 further strengthened the Bureau's authority in this field. The objectives, methods, and achievements of the Budget Bureau in coordination of statistical programs are described in the final section of the present report.

Copies of the Central Statistical Board's report to the President, of the agency replies to the letter from the secretary to the President (which have not heretofore been submitted in full to the Congress), and of the Federal Reports Act of 1942 are attached as exhibits 1, 2, and 3.

IMPRACTICABILITY OF COMPLETE STATISTICAL CENTRALIZATION

As a result of its continuous work and years of experience in working with Federal statistics, the Bureau of the Budget is convinced that it is impracticable to centralize the collection, compilation, and publication of statistics in one agency. Reasons against such centralization are presented here in summary form.

1. Statistical activities are an integral part of the programs to which they relate: Statistics collected by the Government are of two general kinds: those which are collected as a result of administrative operations, and those which are collected primarily for the information they yield. The distinction between these two types is not always sharp. Frequently the two purposes may be combined in one collection, and where this is possible better statistics may be obtained at lower cost.

Most Government statistical collections are of the first type. They are by-products of the regular activities prescribed by law for the various administrative agencies, and cannot be separated from the programs to which they relate. Examples of statistical collections of this type are tax returns; reports required by regulatory agencies, such as the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission; and applications on forms such as those used by the Social Security Board, the Federal Housing Administration, or the Veterans' Administration. It would be impossible, for instance, to divorce the collection of statistics from the regular operations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in collecting taxes. Numerous statistical activities of the Government would therefore have to be exempted from the operations of a single statistical agency, and problems involved in coordinating these statistics would still remain.

Statistics of the second type are those which are collected primarily to determine facts and relationships useful to the Government and to the public as guides for making decisions or taking action. Much information of this type is also derived from operating reports of the first type. Both sources provide information needed by the legislative and executive branches of the Government as well as by business, agricultural, and labor groups. Examples of statistics of the second, or informational, type are crop and livestock reports, population and vital statistics, current data on employment and unemployment, statistics on production and distribution.

Informational statistics are collected by most agencies of the Government in direct connection with their programs and operations. During the war, for instance, the War and Navy Departments collected great quantities of statistical data in connection with administering contracts, expediting deliveries, and maintaining records of progress on contract completion. This information was collected primarily not by questionnaires sent out from Washington, but by administrative officers stationed in the field. Reports of these officers were usually sent to regional or district offices for information and action, and then to Washington for summarization. Thus the flow of information followed administrative channels.

So long as there is a central coordinating procedure by means of which duplication can be avoided, it is more efficient and economical for the responsible operating or administrative staff to collect information pertaining to its general area of responsibility. The collection of such information may be incidental to operating reports received automatically. The same staff may be utilized. In many cases the ready availability and understanding of data in a particular area makes it possible for an operating agency to demand less information than it would need if the data were collected by a separate agency.

There are a few bureaus in the Government which are primarily statistical, with limited operating duties, such as the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of the Census in the Department of Commerce, the statistical units of the Bureau of Mines or the Fish and Wildlife Service in the Department of the Interior, or the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor. Most of these bureaus, however, are more than statistical agencies. They are also research staffs of the operations of their respective departments and serve the needs of Cabinet officers having a great range of responsibility over economic activity. Even in the limited area represented by this type of bureau, consolidation in a single agency would not be desirable because it would separate statistical work from the departments and the officials having policy and operating responsibilities for particular functions. Informational statistics needed by the public or by a number of Government agencies are generally assigned to one of these bureaus for collection and tabulation.

The problem of rationalizing the Federal statistical system involves centralizing collection where economy will result without impairing the purposes served by the data. In these circumstances centralization is practicable and is now being applied in many instances. Centralization by subject matter or by groups of respondents is discussed below, under "Present Methods of Coordination" in the section on single-collecting agencies. Determination of which bureau should be responsible for any given collection is based upon the nature of the inquiry and upon a consideration of which bureau is best equipped to obtain the data needed at lowest cost. Naturally in this situation there are occasional cases where no clear-cut advantage exists for the selection of one bureau over another; but these cases are exceptions in the general statistical picture

Present costs for statistical activities would not be reduced by centralizing them in one agency. Transfer of statistical responsibility to such an agency would involve transfer of the entire staff working in each area, including professional and supervisory staff to direct the clerical staff. The largest expense in statistical work is clerical help, which is now fully occupied and which would have to be either transferred or replaced. Statistical equipment is now so fully utilized that there is no slack. Overhead costs for statistical activities are now part of the general administrative requirements of the different departments and agencies. If the statistical activities were removed the agencies would still need to maintain close association with the statistical staff, wherever it was located; and additional supervisory staff would be required for liaison with remote operations of a large central statistical agency.

2. The collection and interpretation of statistical data are not separate mechanical processes but require special knowledge of a given field: Statistical data, to be useful and realistic, should be obtained, analyzed, and interpreted by those who have knowledge and experience in the particular field. It is not possible in a centralized agency to have the requisite specialized knowledge of many unrelated subjects without duplicating the personnel already required by specialized agencies in the performance of their regular duties. At present statistical activities within many agencies are carried on not as separate activities but in connection with other staff responsibilities. If the statistical programs were removed to a central agency, maintenance of liaison between the operating and the statistical agency would not only necessitate duplication but would require expansion of professional staff. Both time and money would be wasted if it were necessary for the technical personnel of an administrative agency to participate continuously in an advisory or supervisory role over the personnel of a central statistical agency.

3. Centralization of statistics would tend to decrease the accuracy and timeliness of the data: Statistics are not ends in themselves. To be useful, either to Government agencies or to private organizations, they must be accurate, timely, and applicable to the problem at hand. Those fundamental criteria for good statistics would be much more difficult to meet in a mammoth centralized agency than in small units attached to operating agencies, each familiar with problems in its particular area and concerned with solving those problems. Furthermore, under present arrangement, many agencies have the great advantage of continuing contacts with business advisory committees or other groups affected by their programs. These contacts have been established primarily to aid in operational problems, but they also serve very substantially to improve the Government's statistics in a given field by making the respondents more fully aware of the need for the information and the Government more alert to the reporting difficulties involved. The advantages now gained from contacts of this kind would be lost if the collection of information were transferred from the operating to a statistical agency.

The economic system is so complex that general-purpose statistics need to be very elaborate. In some fields such statistics are necessary and justifiable. For many purposes, however, they would be almost prohibitively expensive as compared with most of the specialized statistical work now being done.

Even within departments, where the Secretary usually had the authority to shift responsibilities of the different bureaus in any manner needed to increase the efficiency of the department as a whole, statistical responsibility has not been centralized. Maintaining a close relationship between statistical and administrative activities has proved to be a more efficient and economical means of producing the specific kinds of statistical information needed. Experience has shown that beyond a certain point centralization of statistical activities results in an unwieldy organization which lacks the flexibility necessary to adapt statistical programs to changing needs. Without such flexibility the costs of statistical services inevitably increase.

In brief, the 1938 study and continuous experimentation since then indicate that centralization of statistical activities would be an inefficient method of eliminating duplication in Government statistical and reporting services. Collection of relevant statistics is an integral part of an agency's operations, like answering correspondence, or supplying information or legal advice, or preparing a budget. Such functions cannot be separated from the regular operations of an agency without substantially impairing their usefulness and validity.

Centralization of most statistical responsibility in one agency has appeared practicable in some other countries, such as Soviet Russia, Italy, and most of the South American Republics, where the amount of statistics supplied to the public by the Government is relatively limited. We believe that the volume and usefulness of statistical materials supplied by our Government to its citizens are a matter for pride. They are envied by other peoples. In no other country are business, agricultural, and labor groups given so much of the basic information on which a system of free enterprise must depend.

In general, the efficiency of a centralized statistical system decreases as the organization of a government becomes more complex and as the variety and quantity of information supplied to the public increase. In Canada, for instance, where a single statistical agency was established some years ago by law, the system was found ill-adapted to wartime requirements and the new statistical activities were carried on by administrative agencies and not by the central bureau. In Great Britain, the only other country with an amount of statistical activity comparable to ours, each ministry collects and compiles its own statistics. During the war the need for correlation of the separate informational programs resulted in the establishment of the Central Statistical Office to coordinate the statistical activities of the various ministries. The Office has proved so useful that its peacetime continuation, with increased responsibilities, was recently announced by the Prime Minister.

EXISTING LEGISLATION PERTAINING TO STATISTICS

It has been stated that 65 separate agencies engage in the gathering, compilation, and publication of statistics of one kind or another. Actually, the number may be greater or smaller, depending on how "agency" is defined; whether, for instance, the Department of Commerce is considered as one, or whether each of its major operating divisions—such as the Census Bureau, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Civil Aeronautics Board, Weather Bureau, Patent Office, National Bureau of Standards—is counted separately. Almost every establishment in the Government collects some statistical material as an essential part of its operations. Most of these statistics, however, are used in operating specific programs and are not published.

Questions of statistical needs and responsibilities have been carefully considered by the Congress in the enactment of the basic statutes of administrative agencies. In these statutes the provision of information with which to administer a program has been regarded as an essential part of an agency's operations, and in many cases the agency is specifically directed to collect, compile, and publish statistics relating to various phases of its activities.

Sometimes the collection of statistics is an incidental byproduct of the program which the agency was established to operate. The Social Security Board, for instance, automatically obtains information on employment and pay rolls in covered industries through administration of its unemployment compensation and old-age insurance programs. Similarly the Securities and Exchange Commission necessarily obtains financial reports from corporations listed on the stock exchanges in connection with its supervisory and regulatory functions.

A few examples of existing statutory requirements for the collection and publication of statistics are presented below. The list could be extended to include most agencies of the Government. Many agencies are given not only general authority to collect statistics relevant to their programs, but in addition are required to collect detailed data on specific subjects. The following list presents some examples of both types:

Department of Agriculture

"There shall be at the seat of Government a Department of Agriculture, the general design and duties of which shall be to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture, in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word" (5 U. S. C. 511).

"The Secretary of Agriculture shall procure and preserve all information concerning agriculture which he can obtain by means of books and correspondence * * * by the collection of statistics, and by any other appropriate means within his power" (5 U. S. C. 514).

"The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to collect and publish annually, on dates to be announced by him, statistics or estimates concerning the grades and staple length of stocks of cotton, known as the carry-over, on hand on the 1st of August of each year in warehouses and other establishments of every character in the continental United States; and following such publication each year, to publish, at intervals in his discretion, his estimate of the grades and staple length of cotton of the then current crop" (7 U. S. C. 471).

"The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to collect and publish statistics of the quantity of leaf tobacco in all forms in the United States and Puerto Rico, owned by or in the possession of dealers, manufacturers, quasi-manufacturers, growers' cooperative associations, warehousemen, brokers, holders, or owners, other than the original growers of tobacco. The statistics shall show the quantity of tobacco in such detail as to types, groups of grades, and such other subdivisions as to quality, color, and/or grade for particular types, as the Secretary of Agriculture shall deem to be practical and necessary for the purposes of this section and sections 502 to 508 of this title, shall be summarized as of January 1, April 1, July 1, and October 1 of each year and an annual report on tobacco statistics shall be issued" (7 U. S. C. 501).

Bureau of the Census

"A census of population, agriculture, irrigation, drainage, distribution, unemployment, and mines shall be taken by the Director of the Census in the year 1930 and every 10 years thereafter" (13 U. S. C. 201).

"The Director of the Census is authorized and directed to collect and publish, for every second year after 1927, statistics of manufacturing industries; and the Director is hereby authorized to prepare such schedules as in his judgment may be necessary" (13 U. S. C. 217).

"The Director of the Census is authorized and directed to collect and publish statistics

concerning the number of squares of red-cedar shingles produced in shingle-manufacturing establishments in the United States; the shipments of red-cedar shingles by producers; the withdrawals from warehouses of red-cedar shingles which have been imported into the United States from Canada; and the imports of red-cedar shingles from Canada. * * * The statistics as to the number of squares of shingles * * * shall relate to each calendar month and shall be published as soon as possible after the close of the month" (13 U. S. C. 94, 95).

"The Director of the Census is authorized and directed to collect and publish statistics concerning the amount of cotton ginned; the quantity of raw cotton consumed in manufacturing establishments of every character; the quantity of baled cotton on hand; the number of active consuming cotton spindles; the numbers of active spindle-hours; and the quantity of cotton imported and exported, with the country of origin and destination" (13 U. S. C. 71).

Civil Aeronautics Administration

"The Administrator of Civil Aeronautics is empowered and directed to collect and disseminate information relative to civil aeronautics (other than information collected and disseminated by the Board under subchapters IV and VI of this chapter); to study the possibilities of the development of air commerce and the aeronautical industry; and to exchange with foreign governments, through appropriate governmental channels, information pertaining to civil aeronautics" (49 U. S. C. 456).

Civil Aeronautics Board

"The Board is empowered to require annual, monthly, periodical, and special reports from any air carrier; to prescribe the manner and form in which such reports shall be made; and to require from any air carrier specific answers to all questions upon which the Board may deem information to be necessary" (49 U. S. C. 487 (a)).

Bureau of Labor Statistics

"The general design and duties of the Bureau of Labor Statistics shall be to acquire and diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with labor, in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word, and especially upon its relation to capital, the hours of labor, the earnings of laboring men and women, and the means of promoting their material, social, intellectual, and moral prosperity" (29 U. S. C. 1).

"The Bureau of Labor Statistics * * * shall collect, collate, and report at least once each year, or oftener if necessary, full and complete statistics of the conditions of labor and the products and distribution of the products of the same. * * * The Bureau of Labor Statistics shall also collect, collate, report, and publish at least once each month full and complete statistics of the volume of and the changes in employment, as indicated by the number of persons employed, the total wages paid, and the total hours of employment, in the service of the Federal Government, the States, and the political subdivisions thereof, and in the following industries and their principal branches: (1) Manufacturing; (2) mining, quarrying, and crude petroleum production; (3) building construction; (4) agriculture and lumbering; (5) transportation, communication, and other public utilities; (6) the retail and wholesale trades; and such other industries as the Secretary of Labor may deem it in the public interest to include. Such statistics shall be reported for all such industries and their principal branches throughout the United States, and also by States and/or Federal Reserve districts and by such smaller geographical subdivisions as the said Secretary may from time to time prescribe" (29 U. S. C. 2).

"The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor is authorized and directed to make continuing studies of productivity and labor costs in the manufacturing, mining, transportation, distribution, and other industries.

"The Secretary of Labor is directed to submit annually to the Congress a report of the findings of the Bureau of Labor Statistics in complying with this section" (29 U. S. C. 2b).

Office of Education

"There shall be under the Federal Security Agency a bureau called the Office of Education, the purpose and duties of which shall be to collect statistics and facts showing the condition and program of education in the several States and Territories and to diffuse such information respecting the organization and management of schools and school systems and methods of teaching as shall aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems and otherwise promote the cause of education throughout the country" (20 U. S. C. 1).

Department of the Treasury

Section 54 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code requires certain organizations exempt from taxation under section 101 of the I. R. C. to file annual returns which shall state the items of gross income, receipts, and disbursements, and such other information as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may by regulations prescribe.

Section 63 of the Internal Revenue Code provides that the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, shall prepare and publish annually statistics reasonably available with respect to the operation of the income, war-profits, and excess-profits tax laws, including classifications of taxpayers and of income, the amounts allowed as deductions, exemptions, and credits, and any other facts deemed pertinent and valuable.

Section 2555 of the Internal Revenue Code requires dealers in narcotic drugs to render to the collector of the district a statement setting forth the quantity of narcotic drugs received by them during certain prescribed periods of time, the names of the persons from whom the said drugs were received, the quantity in each instance received from each of such persons, and the date received.

The Alcohol Tax Unit administers a number of statutes which require dealers in industrial alcohol, liquor, wines, etc., to make reports relating to the business in which they are engaged. Among these statutes are the following: Internal Revenue Code, sections 2811, 2844, 2845, 2855, 2857, 2859, 2871, 2904, 2915, 3032, 3033, 3155, 3171.

The Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency administers a number of statutes which require national banks to report various types of information to the Comptroller of the Currency. Among these statutes are Twelfth United States Code, page 161, which requires national banks and affiliates of national banks to make reports at least three times annually, setting forth the resources and liabilities of the said banks; Twelfth United States Code, page 163, which requires national banks to report to the Comptroller of the Currency the amount of dividends declared and the amount of net earnings in excess of such dividends; and Twelfth United States Code, page 602, which requires national banks operating foreign branches to furnish information concerning the condition of such branches to the Comptroller of the Currency upon demand.

Interstate Commerce Commission

Railroads and pipe lines: "The Commission shall have authority, in order to perform the duties and carry out the objects for which it was created, to inquire into and report on the management of the business of all common carriers subject to the provisions of this chapter, and to inquire into and report on the management of the business of persons controlling, controlled by, or under a common control with such carriers, to the extent that the business of such persons is related to the management of the business of one or more such carriers, and the Commission shall keep itself informed as to the manner and method in which the same are conducted. The Commission may obtain from such carriers and persons such information as the Commission deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this chapter; and may transmit to Congress from time to time such recommendations (including recommendations as to additional legislation) as the Commission may deem necessary" (49 U. S. C. 12 (1)).

"The Commission is hereby authorized to require annual, periodical, or special reports from carriers * * * and from lessors * * * to prescribe the manner and form in which such reports shall be made, and to require from such carriers and lessors specific and full, true, and correct answers to all questions upon which the Commission may deem information to be necessary. * * * Such annual reports shall give an account of the affairs of the carrier or lessor in such form and detail as may be prescribed by the Commission" (49 U. S. C. 20 (1)).

The Commission has similar authority to collect reports from motor carriers (49 U. S. C. 304 (7) and 320), water carriers (49 U. S. C. 904 (b) and 913 (a)), and freight forwarders (49 U. S. C. 1003 (e) and 1012 (a)).

The Commission is also empowered to require reports concerning the issue of securities and concerning safety appliances, methods and systems, and the authority to prescribe the form in which reports shall be made.

Federal Trade Commission

"The Commission shall also have power—

"(a) To gather and compile information concerning, and to investigate from time to time the organization, business, conduct, practices, and management of any corporation engaged in commerce, excepting banks and common carriers subject to the act to regulate commerce. * * *

"(b) To require, by general or special orders, corporations engaged in commerce, excepting banks and common carriers subject to the act to regulate commerce, or any class of them, or any of them, respectively, to file with the Commission in such form as the Commission may prescribe, annual or special, or both annual and special, reports or answers in writing to specific questions, furnishing to the Commission such information as it may require as to the organization, business, conduct, practices, management, and relation to other corporations, partnerships, and individuals of the respective corporations filing such reports or answers in writing. * * *

"(h) To investigate, from time to time, trade conditions in and with foreign countries where associations, combinations, or practices of manufacturers, merchants, or traders, or other conditions, may affect the foreign trade of the United States" (15 U. S. C. 46).

PRESENT METHODS OF COORDINATION

The independent operation of scores of separate statistical programs would lead to bewildering confusion unless there were a central coordinating agency to group related needs of different agencies and to develop procedures for an integrated system of Federal statistics. Administrative responsibilities of many agencies necessarily overlap, in general terms at least, and in such areas it is especially necessary to take steps to prevent duplication and unnecessary work.

The Federal Reports Act established a mechanism for statistical coordination by directing the Bureau of the Budget "to coordinate Federal reporting services, to eliminate duplication and reduce the cost of such services, and to minimize the burden of furnishing information to Federal agencies." This act was not passed until the end of 1942.

During the war years it was necessary for the Bureau to concentrate the activities of its statistical coordinating staff almost entirely on the review of forms in order to keep to a minimum the vast numbers of reports required by wartime controls. Even during this period the Bureau was able to make some notable advances in arrangements for more efficient integration of Federal statistics. With the end of the war it is devoting an increasing proportion of its time to the development of further measures to avoid duplication and increase comparability among Federal data and statistical programs.

The Budget Bureau achieves coordination through its review of forms, its establishment of single collecting agencies, and its development of uniform standards for use by all agencies. Its thorough budgetary review of agency proposals also strengthens its statistical control. The following paragraphs contain brief descriptions of the way in which each of these devices operates.

1. Review of forms

Statistics are obtained from administrative, operating, or informational report forms or applications received from groups of respondents. The Federal Reports Act provides that every agency (with a few specified exceptions) must obtain Budget Bureau approval for any report form or questionnaire to be sent to 10 or more respondents. This means, in fact, that no statistics may be collected without thorough examination and approval by the Bureau of the Budget. The purposes of this examination are to prevent unnecessary duplication and unwarranted cost and to improve the quality and general usefulness of the statistics obtained.

The Budget Bureau maintains a file of all forms in use by the agencies. Every new questionnaire proposed is examined to see that the data it would obtain are necessary and relevant to the program of the agency, and are not already available from reports collected by the same or any other agency. The Budget Bureau also makes sure in its review that a form is as simple as possible and conforms to business practices, that it is sent to the smallest possible number of respondents, and that it is collected no more frequently than necessary. Expiration dates are assigned to all forms, and before that date each form must be resubmitted for Budget Bureau examination as to its continued necessity and for any further simplification possible.

A full description of the methods used in reviewing forms is presented in Two Years of Progress Under the Federal Reports Act, published in March 1945 by the Senate Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business (Rept. No. 47, p. 2). A copy of this report is attached as exhibit 4.

2. Establishment of single-collecting agencies

Although the Bureau of the Budget does not believe it would be practicable or desirable to centralize all Federal statistical activities within one agency, it has long advocated a more limited and selective centralization of statistics within particular areas of subject matter, or, where subject matter considerations are not determining, a limited type of centralization based on considerations of efficiency and economy. As early as 1934, in its First Annual Report, the Central Statistical Board proposed the development of what is called focal agencies to be responsible for all statistical activity in particular fields. The focal agency would not necessarily collect all or even part of the information for which it had responsibility, but would be concerned with putting together currently into a rounded picture all available information pertaining to its field. This proposal was modified in the 1938 report of the Board to the President, which called for the gradual development where practicable of single-collecting agencies. These agencies would be responsible for centralized collection of information in given fields of interest or from given groups of respondents. The Federal Reports Act of 1942 called for the development of single collecting agencies to serve the needs of two or more Federal agencies.

This kind of limited centralization by subject-matter fields or respondent groups has the advantage of being flexible enough to permit adaptation of collecting arrangements to changing administrative responsibilities and needs. The kinds of arrangements which the Budget Bureau makes for joint collection and use of data necessarily depend on the kinds of problems involved. In some cases these arrangements are broad enough to cover a very large segment of Federal statistics. In other cases they may be confined to two agencies and one report form. The following instances are illustrative of many arrangements worked out by the Budget Bureau since the passage of the Federal Reports Act:

"Late in 1943 the Bureau established an interagency committee to appraise the needs of Federal agencies for financial information and to determine what agencies should carry out specified parts of the program. The committee, representing seven agencies, investigated and made recommendations on the allocation of responsibility for various parts of the program. As a result, the Bureau completed arrangements for an integrated collection program which would supply the needs of all the agencies without duplication and at minimum cost.

"The Bureau has designated one agency as responsible for the collection and processing of data on exports and imports needed by five administrative agencies, thus avoiding the necessity of independent and overlapping activities in the field. The program has proved effective and useful—it has provided the data needed promptly and has proved flexible enough for special needs. For example, one agency needed information on each shipment of each of 120 commodities to each of 70 countries from each of 3,000 exporters during a 3-year period. The Budget Bureau arranged that the agency obtain the information from special tabulations of data in the possession of the single collecting agency, rather than from an independent and very burdensome survey.

"The Bureau arranged that one agency be the collecting and compiling agent for all information from gas utility companies needed by itself and three other agencies.

"The Bureau eliminated 3,500 forms a month by arranging for one agency to provide another with information it had been collecting independently on its construction contracts.

"The Bureau arranged for one agency to use annual tabulations of industrial injury reports supplied by another agency required to collect such information in one industry, thereby eliminating duplicate reporting."

Opportunities for additional arrangements of this type arise continuously in the operations of the Budget Bureau. Its task of coordinating and rationalizing the statistical program of the Federal Government as a whole involves constant examination of the areas of responsibility of each agency and bringing together all agencies, whether statistical or operating, which have a common or related interest in a particular problem. In designating single collecting agencies or arranging for joint collection or use of statistical data the Bureau of the Budget is guided particularly by considerations of overhead cost and ultimate use of the information sought. We believe that through continuous and increasing efforts in this direction it is possible to bring about an integration of Federal statistics which is realistic, practicable, and economical.

3. Development of uniform standards

Lack of uniformity in definitions, techniques, and procedures frequently makes it difficult for one agency to make use of statistics collected by another. The lack of uniformity wastes time and costs money. The Budget Bureau has therefore taken the leadership in developing uniform standards for use by all agencies. Only through general application of standard techniques, definitions, and classifications can data collected by different agencies be made comparable and consistent and be fitted together to yield reliable and meaningful totals.

Among the uniform standards already developed by the Bureau and adopted by the agencies concerned are the standard pay-roll reporting period and standard definitions for categories of employees in manufacturing industries. Adoption of these standards involved considerable changes in some reporting systems, but makes valid comparison and integration possible.

The Budget Bureau has participated actively in the development of standard techniques whereby in any instance the minimum essential information may be obtained without asking more detail or collecting more reports than necessary.

It has developed a standard industrial classification which not only improves the usefulness and comparability of data obtained by different agencies but also makes it unnecessary for various agencies to spend money on specialized staffs to develop and maintain independent classifications for their own purposes. The Bureau has also completed some parts of a commodity classification now in use by all agencies of the Government in describing, recording, and reporting property.

The use of a single classification system in complicated recording and reporting systems tremendously simplifies operations and reduces total costs by making it unnecessary to convert from one classification to another every time commodity information crosses agency lines.

The Budget Bureau has developed standard forms for use when two or more agencies carry on similar activities, such as procurement, contract renegotiation, or contract termination and settlement. Standardization of these forms not only relieves the respondent of the necessity of keeping duplicate records but facilitates summarization of reports from different agencies.

4. Budgetary review of agency programs

The Bureau of the Budget is responsible for reviewing the annual appropriation requests of all agencies, and for recommending to the Congress what funds should be granted. This basic function of the Bureau gives it unique opportunities for knowing in detail the functions and present and proposed activities of each agency. In its review of appropriation requests the Bureau makes a thorough study of the program of the agency, both in its entirety and in detail. Appropriation requests for statistical programs are studied in relation to the functions and authorities of the agency making the request, and in relation to similar programs in other agencies. The Bureau's responsibilities in the budgetary process supplement and greatly strengthen its authority for statistical coordination.

Bad Bargain With Britain

REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Associated Press reports this morning that the United States has proposed commercial use of airfields leased to us by England in Newfoundland, Bermuda, and the Caribbean for military purposes. That request is rather belated. The request should have been made, indeed, and made most forcibly before the loan had been negotiated with England. There is an old story but a true one that when the feast is over the guest departs. The London negotiators have departed. We have shot our bolt. We have no longer the power of bargaining with Great Britain. You can jolly well know that that request for the commercial use of those air bases will be denied.

Address by Governor Green, of Illinois, Before Meeting of Republican National Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 11 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, at a recent meeting of the Republican National Committee in the city of Chicago, Governor Green, of Illinois, made a very able address. I ask that the article which appeared concerning it, written by Mr. Robert Howard, of the Chicago Tribune, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Governor Green called upon the Republican Party yesterday to return to the "straight thinking and plain speaking" necessary to save America from the chaotic failures of the Truman New Deal.

Republican Presidents again can be elected and America can be returned to prosperity and sound progress, the Governor said in his welcoming speech as the party's national committee opened a 2-day session in the Stevens Hotel.

The Governor was introduced by National Chairman Herbert Brownell, Jr., as "one of the greatest Republicans in the country." Green was interrupted frequently by applause and was given a standing ovation when he finished.

SOUND PROGRAM DEMANDED

He said Republican failures have been caused by weak compromises designed to ape New Dealism. He called for the National Committee to adopt and to stick to "a sound declaration of principles" at the start of the 1946 campaign.

"Let us Republicans be true to ourselves and our honest beliefs," Governor Green said. "I predict that if we do that we shall gain 10 votes for every 1 we lose."

Stressing his constructive program, the Illinois leader also warned that America's world position is being wrecked in the aftermath of victory by ineptness of President Truman's administration.

FOUR FREEDOMS VIOLATED

Governor Green said:

"We propose a complete about-face from the weak and vacillating Truman New Deal diplomacy, which has suffered the most humiliating defeat in American history.

"With the greatest military force in the world, it has lost every skirmish on the diplomatic front. The 'four freedoms' and the Atlantic Charter have not only been disregarded, but specifically violated.

"American diplomacy under Truman, instead of standing as a fortress for the freedom of peoples and the integrity of national existence of small nations, has become the abject servant of British, French, and Communist imperialism."

HYBRID ADMINISTRATION FLAYED

"Truman-Democratic-New Deal diplomacy is losing the peace 6 months after American armies and navies won the war. Power politics again rules the world, and the Truman administration has stood helplessly by. We warn that appeasement now can be as dangerous as at Munich, especially when it means compromise with the conscience of America."

Courage must be substituted for compromises at home and abroad, he continued, adding:

"We know that our country is today by long odds the strongest of all nations, more than a match for any combination that might be brought against us, but we have too often given lip service to a foreign policy founded upon fear."

PEOPLE TIRED OF DOUBLE TALK

"We have been told that we must not raise our voice against the rape of Java by the British and Dutch for fear of offending some voters, and we have been told we must not even protest against the shameful betrayal of Poland for fear of offending Russia's following over here.

"We say we don't want Communist votes—and whether we do or not, we can never expect to get them—but we act as if they were about to fall into our lap if only we behave with circumspection."

The people are tired of double talk, at which Republicans should not attempt to duplicate New Dealers, he continued.

NEW DEAL FALSEHOODS CITED

"By this time, the country knows that the New Dealers cannot be trusted. They promised Palestine to the Arabs and to the Jews at the same time. They gave Poland to the Poles and to the Russians. They told us that lend-lease would keep the Nation out of war when they knew it would not. They told the fathers and mothers of America that their sons would not be called upon to fight on foreign soil. They promised peace when they knew war was upon us."

The party leaders were told that they had been deluded by local victories during 14 years of failure in national leadership.

"The Republican Party was founded to elect, not sheriffs, but Presidents," Green admonished. "It was born as a national party, has always been a national party, and, if it cannot win national elections, has lost its main reason for existence.

"Our party has failed nationally, chiefly because it has not been true to the faith that is in us," he went on. "We believe in private enterprise, but we have offered only feeble protests as private enterprise has been hemmed in and restricted by Federal taxation, regulation, and regimentation, until it cries for help."

UNITED STATES DEFENSE A CORNERSTONE

"The cornerstone of our program must be the vigorous protection of the people of America from future attack," Governor Green said. "This is the first duty of our Government.

"We do not agree that the American people were to blame for Pearl Harbor. We are determined that there shall never be another Pearl Harbor. We demand that the superiority of our Army and Navy and their air arms in numbers and in scientific weapons of modern warfare shall be rigidly maintained.

"Republicans must insist that the Government promptly and unequivocably act to insure the permanent retention of air and sea bases vital for the defense of America," he continued.

"WE STAND FOR WORLD LIBERTY

"We favor the fullest cooperation with other nations to insure peace, but we insist that the makers of our foreign policy cling to our American ideals of justice and liberty," said the Illinois Governor. "We must never condone the suppression of liberty in Poland, in the Baltic states, in the Balkans, or in any nation in Europe, Asia, or elsewhere. It must be our vigorous policy to use the leverage afforded by the discussion of forgiveness of lend-lease, or of requests for new loans, and every other peaceful means to speed liberation of the people of these nations.

"Just as vigorously we must support in our dealings with all nations concerned the right of free Jewish immigration into Palestine. May we not hope that American influence, properly used, can achieve that long cherished goal of world Jewry, with due protection of the rights of all?"

HUMAN SLAVERY CONDEMNED

"The Republicans of the Middle West will never approve the administration's indifference to the extension of human slavery, whether the victims be the peoples of the nations we have defeated in war or the unfortunate natives of Malaya and southeastern Asia."

To the national committeemen, Green sketched a Republican program to put the national economy on a sound basis.

"We believe that the time has come to bring national expenditures down to the tax receipts of our National Government," he said. "We must live within our income, and basic thinking should govern our consideration of loans and gifts to other nations."

WOULD GUARD AGAINST FRAUD

"We insist upon rigid honesty throughout the national administration, and that there be a prompt end to the use of public power for personal gain. Particularly, we urge Congress immediately to enact legislation requiring full publicity to all deals for disposal of surplus war goods or alien property.

"We face the fact that the present and future prosperity of America depends on the prompt reconversion of American business to a sound peacetime economy. Increased production of sorely needed materials, tools, and consumer goods is our paramount need today. Without increased production, we cannot check the current trend of inflation or achieve the full employment which is our hope to avoid the equally serious perils of deflation.

"We believe that such increased production can be accomplished only by the fullest cooperation of American industry, American agriculture, and American labor under the profit motives of our system of free enterprise. We believe that system has demonstrated its superiority to any system in the world, both in the miracle of our production for war and in the long-range record of American industrial expansion which has produced for the American people the highest standard of living the world has ever known.

"We charge that our production has now bogged down mainly because the Truman New Deal administration has failed to clear away obstacles to reconversion created by oppressive Federal tax policies and a maze of Federal bureaucratic regulation. * * *

REGIMENTATION MUST BE ENDED

"We believe that the regimentation of American business, American agriculture, and

American labor must be speedily terminated; that special war controls shall be ended as quickly as possible, and that powers of Congress and the State governments, delegated to the President in the war emergency, should be speedily restored to Congress and the States. Freedom from regimentation is the objective of a liberty-loving people; governmental controls should be limited to the prevention of abuses and dishonesty and the correction of gross inequalities."

Prosperity for both capital and labor has been made almost impossible by New Deal tinkering that has complicated labor disputes, Governor Green said.

"The basis of virtually every labor dispute today is the natural desire of the workers to receive under peacetime conditions a take-home pay at least equal to the amount they received while working overtime hours during the war emergency," he continued. "They are supported by those who argue that the levels of workers' incomes must be maintained to provide the buying power required to support the full-employment program for our country."

CHALLENGES NEED OF MORE BUREAUS

"However desirable this may be, from the employers' point of view, it means an increase in his unit cost of production, and, if he proposes to meet this cost by increased prices, he runs into the ukase of another group of New Dealers which says: 'You must not increase prices.' In this situation, the American businessman is chanting the familiar words of a late leader of the Democratic Party who could not stomach the New Deal: 'You can't have it both ways.' The President of the United States has been unable to show us how we can have it both ways, and I do not believe it can be accomplished by law or by the creation of any additional bureaus or so-called fact-finding bodies.

"We endorse collective bargaining. The right to bargain implies the right to refuse terms offered—the right of labor to strike and the right of management to shut down if satisfactory agreements on wages and conditions cannot be reached. Strikes and shutdowns are expensive to the public, but they are more expensive to the employers and employees involved."

CLEAR LABOR PROGRAM

"We believe that most of our labor conflicts could be settled promptly if management and labor were free to negotiate in their own interests. I see no effective solution to this problem until free and unfettered collective bargaining is restored. I trust that the position you take here on labor will be clear and forthright, and that we shall not promise what we cannot perform."

Governor Green reaffirmed Republican belief in the Bill of Rights, said that social security must be placed on a sound basis actuarially, and pledged full aid to returning war veterans.

VETERANS' NEEDS PARAMOUNT

"The Republican Party must pledge to the American people the fulfillment of our Nation's obligation to provide a sound and happy future for the veterans of this war. That obligation transcends any supposed obligation to our allies or to the world."

He called for speedy discharge of soldiers "not absolutely essential to our national interests," and blamed New Deal bungling for the housing shortage.

"Finally, we believe the time has come to speak out for America; that the efforts of our Government should be turned to benefit Americans; that the greatest service we can do for mankind is to keep America strong," he said.

"I believe that the people of America today will listen to straight thinking and plain speaking. I am convinced that here and now is the opportunity for the Republican Party to put our country on the road to prosperity and sound progress."

Labor Developments Support Mr. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, December 11 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Labor Developments Support Mr. Truman," published in the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle of December 7, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR DEVELOPMENTS SUPPORT MR. TRUMAN

Developments following President Truman's message to Congress urging the enactment of legislation for fact-finding in industrial disputes have served to substantiate the correctness of Mr. Truman's position.

The United Automobile Workers have rejected a 10-percent increase offered by General Motors. The union leaders insist that they must have 30 percent. Here is a case where fact-finding would be of value. The employer acknowledges his ability to pay increased wages. The employees take the position that the amount offered is not sufficient. There must, therefore, be some common ground upon which the two parties to the controversy could meet, and how could the point of compromise be better established than through an outside examination of the facts presented by the disputes.

The intemperate language of many labor leaders who have commented on the President's proposal also demonstrates the necessity of applying more impartial minds to the controversies between labor and management which are retarding reconversion.

An outstanding example of labor's intemperance was the charges made by Philip Murray, president of the CIO, that the Truman administration had yielded in "abject cowardice" to industry's refusal "to engage in collective bargaining" and that the President's action was responsible for laying the ground work of a legislative design "to weaken and ultimately to destroy labor union organizations."

Mr. Murray further charged that the administration had ignored human rights and "appeased" industry "with ever greater opportunities for increased profits at the expense of the American public."

These statements lack all reason. There is collective bargaining. Possibly not in the sense that Mr. Murray interprets the term, for he seems to feel that it should result always in the granting of labor's demands. President Truman has not appeased industry any more than his predecessor did over a period of 12 years. Any appeasement there may have been, has been in favor of labor. The President's action was not designed "to weaken and ultimately to destroy labor-union organization," since it did not take from them a single one of the many rights they have acquired in the last decade.

No one either in labor or management has as yet advanced a sound or valid reason why there should not be a fact-finding examination of labor disputes affecting the public interests, which the principals are unable to settle. The President's proposal presents no new and untried methods. What he suggests has been employed in railway mediation over a long period of time. The procedure has prevented any crippling work stoppages in railroad transportation. It has not held railroad wages down. There are, as a matter of fact, those who criticize the President's fact-finding proposal on the ground that railway labor has benefited unduly by the use of such machinery.

It cannot be denied, however, that fact-finding as it has been employed in the United States for the examination of industrial disputes has served the public interest and prevented strikes. At the present time there are numerous conflicts in the industrial field where the public interest has been given no consideration, and there are strikes and threatened strikes highly disruptive to peacetime production. The President has taken action designed to protect the public interest and to bring an end to work stoppages. So far the course of events has served to substantiate the soundness of what he has proposed.

JESSE H. JONES.

Financing Dead-Beat Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 11, 1945

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, December 6, there appeared in the Times-Herald, of Washington, D. C., an editorial by John O'Donnell that I feel should be read at this time by every citizen in the United States.

Now that our State Department has kindly consented to give Great Britain another gift of $4,500,000,000, I do not care about Great Britain's promises to repay this. Her promises are not worth the paper they are written on. She owes us over $5,000,000,000 from World War I that she promised to pay, and then refused to pay. She owes us $29,000,000,000 from lend-lease which she has not and will not promise to repay.

Our first duty now is to our returning veterans. That $34,000,000,000 that Great Britain already owes us would go a long way to put the veteran back into civilian life, from which he was taken. It would go a long way in setting him up in business for himself in place of looking for jobs that will not and do not exist.

The editorial quotes the gentleman from Nebraska, Representative STEFAN. I am in full accord with the gentleman from Nebraska, Representative STEFAN, when he quotes a famous quotation: "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute." I would add, "Billions for the veterans, but not one cent for dead-beat nations that accept our money and goods and then call us 'Uncle Shylock.'"

The editorial follows:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

At this moment, up on Capitol Hill, the battle lines are being sharply drawn for the most important issue that ever faced the citizens of the Republic.

At stake is control of Congress in next year's election; at stake are the political fortunes of President Harry Truman. Pivot of the battle is whether President Truman wants to go down the line and fight for White House victory on the firm line that he once stood for, and still stands—for the ideas and practices of his predecessor, the late Franklin D. Roosevelt.

For the first 3 months after the death of Roosevelt, last April, the politically shrewd Truman went down the political line for

Roosevelt's policies. Now, something new has been added. The Roosevelt background of the entrance of this Nation into the war—the revelations of Pearl Harbor—have changed the magic name of Franklin Roosevelt from a political asset to a definite liability.

Never before in our Nation's history has a President who died in office lost his political prestige and authority with such appalling swiftness.

After all, the words of Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Cleveland, and the great T. R. Roosevelt spoke from the grave and had their influence after death. So, for a bewildered era, did the mouthings of the sainted Woodrow Wilson.

The Hyde Park grave has silenced the political injunctions of F. D. R.—hence, the immediate worry of the Truman administration. After all, the boys want to win in the next Presidential campaign. They figured on playing the Roosevelt line, and now they have to reverse their field—a dangerous and audacious shift in any game, particularly in that of politics. And it looks as if the boys may be tossed for a loss.

Boiling hot at the moment is the proposal that American taxpayers loan a few billions to Great Britain and the Communists of Moscow and then top this off with some odd millions to our so-called beloved and united allies.

Now this proposition is strictly down the old lend-lease alley deviously charted by F. D. R. at the very time when he was piously proclaiming to the Nation from the White House that this Nation was 100-percent neutral, that "I hate war." Interesting point is that the proposed loan to Britain, which might have gone through with a bang and a whoop under the high-pressure days of Roosevelt, probably will be booted out the window when it reaches the House of Representatives.

After all, every Member of the House has to fight for his political life before the voters next November. The idea has been percolating through their brains that the returning veterans would like to see taxpayers' dough spent for such things as housing, jobs, etc., for Americans. And Brother Truman and his advisers are getting the same idea.

For about a month now, the British have been putting the diplomatic arm on our Santa Claus branch of the Government. The Communists, Poles, etc., have been stretching out the clutching hand for the Uncle Sam handout. Truman, Secretary of State Byrnes, and all our so-called Treasury and United States loan experts (by the way, does anybody remember when any of the foreign boys gave us a small hand-out from their public funds?) have been figuring out how we can part with our cash.

What we would like to know is whether the Income Tax Division of the Internal Revenue Bureau would certify the loan as a bad debt if we don't collect? And we don't think we ever will. Can we deduct it from our taxes, as individual taxpayers?

How much will Brothers Truman, Byrnes, and Vinson personally be clipped—and the Members of the House of Representatives? After all, they got us into this sucker trap.

There were sounded some very intelligent observations on this subject by the veteran and respected Representative KARL STEFAN, dean of Nebraska's delegation in Congress.

At a moment when all the boys were cupping a meditative ear to the reports that President Truman, the State Department, and some of the New Deal hang-overs were discussing with British mendicants the amount of dough we should hand out to them Representative STEFAN stood up and told the House an ancient truth. It was this:

"We are vested with the responsibility under section 7, article I, of the Constitution of the United States of America, namely: 'All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.'

"The present situation which this House must meet is: Foreign nations have demanded that the United States Government loan them or give them billions of American dollars, which the House must take from our people through tax legislation."

The Nebraska Congressman awakened the memory of his colleagues to the historical fact that once upon a time an American naval officer retorted to the cash demands of trans-Atlantic pirates with the words, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute."

We give Representative STEFAN credit for sinking the knife in gently, but deeply and thoughtfully, when he observed:

"Let us forget for the moment that their (ex-allies) attitude in this matter is unparalleled in all financial history.

"They do not come, hat in hand, begging. They do not come as equals, asking openly for loans to bear honest rates of interest and to be honestly repaid. Rather, they come in arrogance, asking outright gifts. Above all, let us not forget that the members of these foreign missions are perfectly aware of the source of these gifts which they so avidly seek from the American people."

Navy Department and United States Foreign Policy

REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 11, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Naval Affairs Committee, for prompt investigation, some facts which have been brought to my notice.

Since the policy of the United States Government, expressed by President Truman is: Not to interfere in other nations' internal affairs, and the upholding of all peoples' right of self-determination, I am amazed that our Navy Department helped arm, train, and equip Dutch troops who are now fighting the Indonesian peoples in the Netherlands East Indies.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, in September of this year, approached the Foreign Economic Administration, through the Netherlands Purchasing Commission, with an inquiry regarding the possibility of their getting equipment for a detachment of Royal Netherlands Marine Corps men. Their request was denied by the Foreign Economic Administration, who informed the Dutch that since the war was over, they were no longer eligible for supplies for military operations. The Dutch then went to the Navy Department, and asked for the same types of equipment that had been denied them by the Foreign Economic Administration. The United States Navy granted the request for these war materials, to be sent to the Netherlands East Indies. The Navy accepted the bid on a cash reimbursement lend-lease basis. The Navy requisitions for these supplies amounted to around $16,000,000. Aside from the defiance of United States foreign policy by the Navy Department in this instance, I do not have any evidence showing that we were ever paid the $16,000,000 by the Dutch.

On every requisition, the delivery instructions read "Royal Netherlands Marine Corps, for overseas duty shortly. Fastest delivery is requested."

From the Naval Bureau of Medical and Surgical Supply, standard kits for medical companies, infantry battalions, surgery, dental, and miscellaneous surgical supplies were given to the Dutch for the repression of the will of their colonial subjects.

From the Naval Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, 450,000 gallons of 80-octane nonaviation gasoline and 25,000 gallons of lubricating oil, for overseas field activity in the Netherlands Indies, were sent to serve on a 6-months' self-maintenance basis. Other items mentioned on this requisition were: B-type rations for 30 replenishments for 5,000 men; and A-type rations for 90 replenishments for 5,000 men; Army-type special menus for hospitals, and so forth, were also included.

Yards and dock material for advance base functional components for naval construction companies, such as pontoon bridge construction materials, were given and sent.

Post-exchange supplies for overseas activities, enough for 5,000 men for 3 months, were also given by our Navy to a foreign government for use in subjugating native peoples.

As if this were not enough, it appears on some of the requisitions that supplies were to be delivered to the Quartermaster of the Royal Netherlands Marine Corps at our United States Marine base, Camp Davis, N. C. The 5,000 men used our materials and were trained in American camps.

It is obvious that the departments of our Government knew quite well where these men and supplies were to be used. In the light of this fact, in complete violation of the policies laid down by the President and his foreign office, the State Department, I want to know who was responsible, and demand that the individuals be called before the proper authorities to relieve them of the responsible positions they now hold.

We are having enough difficulties ironing out our foreign policy today, without complicating it by the irresponsible actions of some unknown American policy-maker, who has the blood of another Allied Nation's subjects on his hands.

If anyone doubts that such transactions took place, let him call on the Navy Department to show him their requisition Nos. NEN–10,000 through 10,005.

All dealings in lend-lease by the Navy Department are under the Chief of Naval Operations. I believe that this division should certainly look into the matter with congressional aid, to see whom within it has taken this unheard-of responsibility and placed the United States Government in the position of actually, literally participating in the repression of Dutch colonial peoples in their own lands.

I hope that the Naval Affairs Committee will take prompt action in investigating this situation, and see that the person or persons responsible for this act be immediately replaced by those

who will not drag this Nation into affairs outside its jurisdiction.

Our expressed policy is to foster democracy and to encourage nations to have the right of their own self-determination. Such irresponsible acts as I have outlined here will not help us obtain the friendship and cooperation of our world neighbors.

We must avoid any subsequent acts of intervention, whether it be in Indonesia, China, or anywhere else. If these supplies have not gone forward to the Pacific as yet, they should be stopped.

This democracy must continue its policy of working in harmony with all peace-loving nations. Our own interests come first, and our best bet for world peace is in United Nations cooperation. A firm expression of this policy must be known to the world through our own democratic actions.

I regret that I have felt it necessary to reveal the foregoing information about the Navy Department's misguided action. I feel it in the best interests of the Nation to prevent a recurrence of such action, by bringing this to light now.

Pfc Jack MacNider, USMCR

REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 11, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, on November 30 I spoke on the floor protesting the release of Pfc Jack MacNider, USMCR. I read into the RECORD a letter to General Vandegrift, Commandant of the Marine Corps, in which I raised certain questions concerning the incident. I have today received a reply from the general which I wish to place in the RECORD. You will note General Vandegrift states frankly that the discharge took place "in deference to a request by General MacArthur and in consideration of the outstanding record of General MacNider in two world wars." I repeat my previous charge that this discharge smacks of rank favoritism and should never have taken place. Neither General MacArthur nor General MacNider should make such requests. There are tens of thousands of lads in the armed services who want to resume their education as much as does young MacNider. There are Members of this House who have sons in a comparable position but they would not dream of making such a request.

General Vandegrift assures me there will be no more such discharges. I sincerely hope this policy will prevail. The one case has been too many.

COPY OF LETTER FROM GEN. A. A. VANDEGRIFT TO REPRESENTATIVE ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

MY DEAR MR. BIEMILLER: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of November 30, relative to the discharge of Pfc Jack MacNider, USMCR.

My approval of the return home and discharge of Private First Class MacNider was in deference to a request by General MacArthur and in consideration of the outstanding record of General MacNider in two world wars. It was not an act of friendship, for I barely know General MacNider, and I can assure you that the case bore no political significance whatsoever.

Insofar as I know, the MacNider case is the first and only deviation made from the Marine Corps' established policy governing discharge. Had I realized the possible result of my acquiescence in this particular request, you can rest assured such decision by me would never have been made.

In view of the reaction resulting from the MacNider case, I can assure you that henceforth not the slightest deviation from the Marine Corps system of discharge credits may be expected by anyone.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

A. A. VANDEGRIFT,
General, USMC, Commandant of the Marine Corps.

The Hobbs Bill, H. R. 32, Antiracketeering or Antilabor?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 11, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, some proponents of this bill have referred to it as an antiracketeering bill. It is important in any objective analysis of the bill to understand that it simply is not an antiracketeering bill at all. We already have an antiracketeering law. The Hobbs bill simply removes certain sections from the present antiracketeering law.

Responsible labor organizations condemn the practices which constitute racketeering. Labor has taken vigorous steps, frequently with the aid of government prosecutors, to cleanse its ranks of racketeering elements. Labor opposes the bill, not because labor opposes antiracketeering legislation, but the Hobbs bill is not in any respect an antiracketeering measure.

Supporters of the Hobbs bill in all public discussions seek to convey the impression that it outlaws the use of force or violence or prohibits something which the bill calls robbery and extortion. The proponents of the bill thus seek to convey the impression that those who oppose the Hobbs bill are in some way protecting force or violence or robbery or extortion.

The fact is that the prohibition of force or violence or the prohibition of what the Hobbs bill chooses to call robbery or extortion are not at all the changes which the Hobbs bill makes in the law. The Hobbs bill would not for the first time introduce into Federal legislation a prohibition on force or violence or robbery or corruption as those are defined in the bill. All of these are already today prohibited by Federal law. The language in the Hobbs bill in most respects is merely a repetition of the language which already appears in the present Antiracketeering Act. The significance of the Hobbs bill lies in the changes which it would make in the present act.

Before proceeding to an analysis of these changes it is interesting to note the extent to which the new bill, while purporting to replace completely the existing Antiracketeering Act, simply repeals the language of the original act and recasts it in terms of labels such as robbery or extortion. Thus the term "extortion" is defined in H. R. 32—section 1c—as "the obtaining of property from another, with his consent, induced by wrongful use of actual or threatened force, violence, or fear, or under color of official right."

The present law already declares a felony the activities of a person who "obtains the property of another, with his consent, induced by wrongful use of force or fear, or under color of official right."

H. R. 32 declares felonious the activities of any person who "commits or threatens physical violence to any person or property in furtherance of a plan or purpose to do anything in violation of section 2."

The present law already on the books declares felonious the activities of any person who "commits or threatens to commit an act of physical violence or physical injury to a person or property in furtherance of a plan or purpose to violate section (a) or (b)."

H. R. 32 declares to be felonious the activities of any person who "conspires with another or with others, or acts in concert with another or with others, to do anything in violation of section 2."

The present law declares to be felonious the activities of any person who "conspires or acts concertedly with any other person or persons to commit any of the foregoing acts."

H. R. 32 applies the term "robbery" to the "unlawful taking or obtaining of personal property" against the will of another person "by means of actual or threatened force or violence or fear of injury"—section 1 (b).

The present law makes felonious the activities of any person who obtains or attempts to obtain money or other valuable considerations "by the use of or attempt to use or threat to use force, violence, or coercion."

In general, therefore, when we discuss the Hobbs bill we are not discussing the question of whether or not we are to have an antiracketeering law. We already have one which contains all of the substantial protections against racketeering which are needed, or, indeed, which the Hobbs bill offers. When we discuss the Hobbs bill, what we are discussing is what changes should be made in the present antiracketeering law.

What are the changes which the Hobbs bill really offers in the present antiracketeering law? Basically they come down to just one single change—but very significant from the point of view of the direction in which the antiracketeering law of 1934 might be turned. The present law specifically prohibits any attempt to direct its application against situations involving simply "the payment of wages by a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee"—section 2a. The present law specifically declares that:

No court of the United States shall construe or apply any of the provisions of this act in such a manner as to impair, diminish, or in any manner affect the rights of bona fide labor organizations in lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof as such rights

are expressed in existing statutes of the United States (sec. 6).

These are the two provisions which the Hobbs bill would delete from the present antiracketeering act. The deletion of these two provisions would constitute the full extent of the change which the Hobbs law would make in the existing antiracketeering law. Indeed, there is no pretense either on the part of the author of the bill nor in the report of the Committee of the Judiciary that anything else is contemplated or desired by the proponents of the Hobbs bill.

Thus all that the Hobbs bill does is to remove from the present law the two provisions inserted to prevent any warped application of the law in derogation of the rights of labor. All that the Hobbs law does is to remove first the provision which prevents application of the antiracketeering act to the payment of wages by a bonafide employer to a bona fide employee and second the provision which prevents application of the law to impair the "right of bona fide labor organizations in lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof."

The mere statement of this fact should be enough to demonstrate why organized labor is opposed to the Hobbs bill. The mere statement of this fact should be enough to demonstrate why the Hobbs bill should be defeated.

On the other side of the picture we may point out what would be the results flowing from the removal of the protective clauses which are now contained in the present law. This question may be answered by answering at the same time another question. Why were the provisions placed into the present law when it was enacted in 1934?

The provisions now appearing in the law were inserted by the representatives of the very agency of the Government entrusted with the duty of enforcing the legislation—the Department of Justice. At that time the Attorney General wrote to the House Judiciary Committee on May 19, 1934, pointing out that the protective provisions had been inserted into the bill and explaining that:

> The original bill was susceptible to the objection that it might include within the prohibition the legitimate and bona fide activities of employers and employees. As the purpose of the legislation is not to interfere with such legitimate activities but rather to set up severe penalties for racketeering by violence, extortion, or coercion, which affects interstate commerce, it seems advisable to definitely exclude such legitimate activities. (See H. Rept. No. 1833, 73d Cong., 2d sess.)

What are some of the means by which the language of the Hobbs bill, in the absence of the protective provisions which are elements of the present antiracketeering law, may be directed against the legitimate and bona fide activities of employers and employees as the Attorney General noted? The law makes it a felony for anyone to obtain the property of another by "actual or threatened force, violence, or fear of injury" to persons or property. Lawyers who have had occasion to familiarize themselves with the decisions of the courts on labor problems, particularly the courts operating in the heyday of the labor injunction, are aware of the kind of interpretation that has been given to words of this type in connection with labor disputes.

There are courts which have held that whenever workers seek to bring about a wage increase or other adjustment of their working conditions by a strike, however peacefully conducted, they are attempting to "force" their employer to grant the wage increase or the requested adjustment of their working conditions.

There are courts which would hold that since a union's sole method of inducing an unwilling employer to grant wage increases is the economic weapon of the strike, then the very posing of the demand by a union to the employer is a threat of force.

Attorneys familiar with the decisions of the courts on questions of picketing will recall that there are courts which have held that picketing, however peacefully conducted, is by its very nature an attempt to "force" the employer into action which he is not willing to take. It is on this basis that many courts have in years past granted sweeping injunctions against concededly peaceful labor activity.

Attorneys familiar with the decisions of the courts on charges of violence in labor relations can tell of the implications to labor in a statute worded as is the Hobbs bill. There are courts which, in injunction cases and in disorderly conduct cases, have held name-calling or use of such terms as "scab" to constitute force or violence. Whatever may be your feelings as to whether such name-calling should properly be considered disorderly conduct under local ordinances or statutes, it should be kept in mind that the Hobbs bill is defining conduct which would become a felony, punishable by imprisonment up to 20 years, or by a fine of up to $10,000 or both.

This problem has another aspect. It is generally recognized that some, if not all, labor disputes are unfortunately marked by heated tempers on both sides. It is unfortunately true that in some instances in the heat of labor disputes there will be minor altercations on the picket line. There will be occasional scuffles between partisans. Any truly criminal conduct which may occur in the course of these altercations and scuffles is, of course, punishable by local disorderly conduct statutes or ordinances or other local laws. Under the Hobbs bill every such altercation is automatically raised to the level of a Federal offense—a Federal felony the punishment for which may be as high as 20 years in jail or $10,000 in fine.

Nor is that all. These dangers are not even limited to the persons who may take part in the strike or in the picket line and certainly not to the persons who may be actually involved in the altercations or in the name-calling or other incidents which under this bill would become felonious.

Section 3 of the Hobbs bill makes equally felonious the conduct of those who conspire with or act in concert with others to commit the acts which are prohibited by the bill. Now, if a strike is force, within the meaning of the other sections of the bill, then obviously not only the strikers are guilty of felony but all those who voted for the strike at the union meeting. Indeed all those who are members of the union may be involved, since by their membership in the organization they may be found either to have conspired or to have acted in concert with strikers. By the same token, all of the workers on the picket line, and indeed all of the members of the union, may be found to have conspired or to have acted in concert with the individual or individuals who may have become engaged in an altercation found to constitute a felony under the bill.

All of these are not merely hypothetical dangers. They are not speculation. These are dangers which are found in the kind of construction which courts have in the past given to certain words in connection with their application to labor-relations problems.

True, we have come a very long way from the kind of approach which is reflected in such interpretations. We may assume that there are very few today who would side with the courts of the first two decades of the nineteenth century which found the mere existence of a labor organization to constitute an unlawful conspiracy. The fact is, however, that applied to specific strike situations and other specific labor-relations problems brought to the courts, there are many decisions now on the books and there are many judges now on the bench whose outlook may quite definitely be expected to result in holdings of the kind that have been outlined above.

It is reasonable to assume our national legislators do not believe that legislation directed against racketeering should be directed against a strike for higher wages or a picket line in support of such a strike. Certainly that was not the intent of the Congress which enacted the 1934 Antiracketeering Act. We doubt that the supporters of the Hobbs bill would be willing to assert that this is their intention today.

How then are the dangers of such constructions of the antiracketeering laws to be avoided? The 1934 statute provided the answer in the form of the two very simple provisions previously cited:

First. That the act was not to apply to the payment of wages by a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee.

Second. That no court was to construe the act "in such manner as to impair, endanger, or in any manner affect the rights of bona fide labor organizations in lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof."

The supporters of the Hobbs bill offer no substitute assurance against these dangers. They offer only the elimination of the protections contained in the present act. Under the circumstances labor must be excused for arriving at the conclusion that the supporters of the Hobbs bill seek the very antilabor ends which these protections in the present law sought to prevent.

In connection with this bill, as with any other piece of proposed legislation, it is significant to consider the purposes of

the sponsors and the circumstances in which the proposal is made. Is the bill now being offered in the light of a sudden and special need exposing a defect in the laws now on the books? Is the bill brought before the House because of a sudden outbreak of robberies and extortion within the meaning of these terms under the antiracketeering law now in effect?

On the contrary, the Rules Committee sent this, along with another measure of similar objective, to the House openly and avowedly because of the occurrence of a number of strikes. There is no doubt that those American workers now on strike are exercising legal and constitutional rights rightfully theirs under our American form of government. In bringing this bill before the House at this time the sponsors of the measure are in effect making clear their hope and intention that if enacted the bill may be used as a means of repressing American workers and labor organizations in the exercise of their lawful rights.

Moreover, the record of the author of the bill is relevant and significant. He has a long and consistent background of opposition to every measure for the benefit of American working men and women and of support for every measure designated to weaken the position of American workers. He opposed the National Labor Relations Act in its original enactment, he has supported every proposed amendment since then to weaken the act; he opposed the Wage and Hour law in its original enactment and he has supported every amendment to that law since that time which would in any way weaken it. He opposed the Social Security Act in its original enactment.

The antilabor record of the bill's author is reflected equally in the persistence with which a bill of the present type has been introduced and reintroduced over the past years. There can be no pretense that it is offered as a new measure dictated by any special justification at the present time. On the contrary, before the war it was introduced in almost identical terms for a number of years. During the war it was recast in the appearance of a war measure—Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, H. R. 653, introduced January 6, 1943. Today, with hostilities at an end, it still bears in title II, section 201, a reference to the war in which the United States is now engaged. Today, the bill takes on new significance in the eyes of its sponsors because it comes at a time when the most powerfully entrenched monopoly portions of American industry are greedily seeking to prevent the maintenance of American consumers purchasing power and to expand to unheard of levels their already swollen profits. We know that the truthful presentation of the facts to the Nation as well as to the majority Members of Congress will do much toward stifling maneuvers so thoroughly opposed to the welfare of the American people. We urge that the Members of Congress make every effort to assure the kind of objective analysis and understanding of measures like the Hobbs bill, which must mean the quickest defeat of such measures.

When Oil "Joined" the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 11, 1945

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Orange Disc, volume 7, for September-October 1945, entitled "When Oil 'Joined' the Navy." The author is Dr. Paul H. Giddens, of Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.:

MODERN SEA POWER WAS BORN WHEN OIL "JOINED" THE NAVY

(By Dr. Paul H. Giddens)

That the world's most powerful navy, the United States Fleet, uses oil for fuel is taken as a matter of course. It was not so long ago, however, that coal was the sole source of power for propelling our fighting ships and the transition from coal to oil was, as history is reckoned, a comparatively recent development. This is an account of the events and investigations that led to the decision to change to oil and create an oil-burning fleet. It was a momentous decision and, in view of the part our Navy was called upon to play in World War II, it was also a fortunate one.

In 1864, 5 years after Col. Edwin L. Drake drilled his famous oil well near Titusville in northwestern Pennsylvania, the United States Navy began an experiment with petroleum as a substitute for coal on naval steamers. This was the first in a long series of experiments which culminated in 1913 in the Navy's decision to burn oil exclusively in all fighting ships. While the results in 1864 were reported upon favorably, further development of petroleum as fuel was thwarted by the fact that when exposed to the air of a confined space at summer temperatures, petroleum gave off a gas which, when mixed with atmospheric air, became explosive and detonated with the force of gunpowder. Until a practical remedy for this could be found, naval engineers believed that it was useless to experiment upon the best form of apparatus for burning oil.

Three years later the Navy resumed its investigation. Numerous trials made on three experimental boilers at the Brooklyn Navy Yard demonstrated that the method invented by First Assistant Clark Fisher was a complete success. The engineering problem involved in burning oil appeared to be satisfactorily solved, but there were important disadvantages to the use of petroleum on a ship. B. F. Isherwood, Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering, solemnly concluded his report upon the experiment by writing that "it appears that the use of petroleum as a fuel for steamers is hopeless; convenience is against it, comfort is against it, health is against it, economy is against it, and safety is against it." Twenty years were to elapse before the Navy made any further experiments and reported its findings.

The appointment of George W. Melville, engineer in chief of the Navy, as Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering in 1887 was a turning point in the development of petroleum as a source of power for the Navy. In fact, it marked the beginning of an epoch-making period in the construction of a new United States Navy. For the next 16½ years Melville served as Chief of the Bureau and, often in opposition to conservative opinion, he was responsible for the introduction of the water-tube boiler, the triple screw system, vertical engines, the repair ship, and the "distilling ship." "The naval power," Melville long contended, "that can successfully install a liquid-fuel plant in a warship will possess a great military advantage." Although he retired in January 1903, some years before the introduction of oil as fuel for battleships, the constant experimentation carried on under his supervision laid the foundations for this revolutionary change.

Within a year after his appointment as chief of the Bureau, Melville appointed a Board of Navy Engineers to test the value of crude oil for fuel in a patented device of the Petroleum Fuel & Motor Co., of Washington, D. C. The apparatus, applied to a locomotive belonging to the company, was placed at the disposal of the Board. The trial lasted for 6 hours; several factors impressed the engineers: burning oil was smokeless and noiseless; the facility of manipulating the fire was "very decidedly in its favor"; a smaller force in the fire room was required than for coal; and the evaporative results were "the best on record." While the Board was not certain about the safety of storing and handling oil, it believed that this problem could be solved. If so, oil might be used advantageously on torpedo boats and coast-defense vessels.

The experimental use of oil as fuel for torpedo boats abroad, especially in Italy, had attracted considerable attention in the United States. Discussion in naval circles led the torpedo board in 1892 under the supervision of Commander George A. Converse to make inquiries regarding the use of petroleum as fuel for steam boilers. It found that oil was being successfully employed in a large number of manufacturing establishments. Consequently, the board expressed the belief that oil could be used in torpedo boats. In 1897 the Navy Department contracted for two new torpedo boats—exactly alike except that one was to be fitted for burning oil and the other for burning coal, so that a comparison of the two fuels might be made. The outbreak of the war with Spain, however, thwarted this project. During the winter the Chief of Ordnance lent the small torpedo boat *Stileto* to the Bureau of Steam Engineering for several months. The fuel-oil apparatus of the Consolidated Gas Fuel Co. was installed, not to determine the economic value of oil as that had been pretty thoroughly investigated, but to give the system a thorough trial under conditions of regular daily service. All of the tests were satisfactory and the crew enthusiastic. Experimentation with different types of burners continued through 1899 and 1900 at the Navy Yard in New York and on the torpedo boat *Talbot*.

The number of experiments made during the 40 years prior to 1900 by various foreign navies, as well as our own, to utilize oil for naval purposes, shows how important military experts regarded the question. The United States Navy, however, had not introduced oil as a fuel for a number of influential reasons. Ignorance concerning the economic value of petroleum had not been eliminated. Some people were still afraid that the supply of oil might become exhausted. The cost, at 7 cents per gallon in 1897, was considered excessive. Oil could not be purchased away from our own coasts, and this was a distinct hindrance to naval operations. The oil from Pennsylvania and Ohio, the largest producing States in the eighties and nineties, did not seem particularly suitable for use as fuel. There had never been any thorough, systematic, and independent study of oil fuel by the Navy Department. Finally, in all of the experimentation of the past, too much effort had been made to burn oil in the same way as coal without success; oil had simply been thrown into a furnace by an injector, and no recognition had been given to the importance of atomizing oil.

In 1902 Melville reported: "The use of crude oil as a combustible for marine purposes has

probably increased to a greater extent during the past 2 years than during the previous century." A number of factors had contributed to this sensational development and change in the general picture. The production of huge quantities of crude oil in Texas and California had dispelled the idea that the oil supply would soon be exhausted. Moreover, the oil found in these States proved to be particularly suitable as oil fuel. The military value of petroleum had been greatly enhanced by the fact that the new fields were located near the water and the product could be delivered to naval vessels at comparatively slight cost. The increased use of oil in locomotives, power plants, and especially in ships plying from New York to San Francisco and San Francisco to Honolulu had served to heighten interest in oil. Finally, previous experimentation had now demonstrated that oil should be atomized before ignition and that the length of furnace, volume of combustion chamber, and the calorimetric area were all factors which must be considered in burning oil.

In view of these circumstances and the fact that a trifling amount of data was extant, Melville believed that the time had arrived for the Navy to commence an extended series of experiments to determine how petroleum could be adapted for naval uses, and he urgently requested an appropriation of $20,000 to conduct an investigation. The Navy had found it exceedingly difficult to secure reliable data about using oil as fuel; shipowners, manufacturers, and inventors were not inclined to tell of disappointments, reverses, or failures, those who were successful did not feel called upon to give the world information obtained at considerable cost and trouble. The results of the proposed Navy investigation, therefore, would be of value not only to the Navy but to all interested in liquid fuel. The Secretary of the Navy, John D. Long, supported Melville's recommendation, and the Fifty-seventh Congress authorized the appropriation on July 3, 1902.

For several months prior to the passage of this law, a naval board composed of Lt. Comdrs. John R. Edwards, Wythe M. Parks, and Frank H. Bailey, had been working under Melville's direction making a series of tests on coal. Through the generosity of the Oil City Boiler Works, which had been desirous of entering the field of marine boiler construction, a thoroughly equipped experimental plant with a Hohenstein water-tube marine boiler had been completed and placed at the disposal of the Navy without cost. In completeness and character the experimental plant had never been surpassed. With the passage of the law July 3, 1902, and the completion of the tests on coal, the boiler was carefully cleaned, put into condition, and the board prepared to test oil as fuel.

Many companies offered oil to the Navy free of charge at the wells, yet there was no certainty as to when the oil could be delivered. In order to run the tests the Navy needed a steady supply, so the oil was purchased from the Standard Oil Co., and most of it came from the Beaumont, Tex., field. Experts from the oil-fuel department of Standard were consulted from time to time and gave valuable advice.

The official tests began in August 1902 and ran through June 1903. At the outset the Board thought it desirable to make an endurance test of the plant and conducted a test of this nature for a concentrated period of 116 hours. After the completion of the endurance test the Board proceeded to test different types of burners. The Board then turned its attention to the study of the mechanics of combustion in using oil, mechanical burners, furnace construction, smoke nuisances, crude-oil prices, world production of crude oil, and a host of other pertinent subjects.

In October 1902 the Board made a preliminary report. It declared that the results already secured warranted without delay the installation of oil-burning equipment in at least one-third of the torpedo boats and destroyers. In regard to the larger vessels, especially battleships, the installation of oil-burning equipment presented serious difficulties; the safe and convenient storage of oil beneath the protective decks and the question of replenishing the supply in the case of vessels being sent without warning to unfrequented harbors were grave matters. The preliminary report of the Board served a useful purpose—it stimulated individuals to make special experiments and, in many cases, the general results were submitted to the Bureau of Steam Engineering for consideration .

In attempting to determine the value of liquid fuel for naval purposes, the Board drew heavily upon the experiences of the industrial and maritime world. It sent Lt. Com. Ward P. Winchell on a round-trip voyage from San Francisco to Tahiti on the steamship *Mariposa* to observe and report upon the burning of oil in that ship. Particular attention was given by the Board to the use of oil in the *Navadan* and the *Nebraskan* of the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., and in the locomotives of the Santa Fe and the Boston and Maine Railroads. It made a special visit to the Hoosac Tunnel, where oil was used in four locomotives of the Boston and Maine to keep the tunnel free from smoke. The Board also made a critical inspection of the oil-fuel installation of the Standard Oil Co.'s whaleback steamer *City of Everett* on a trip down the Delaware River. Moreover, hundreds of letters were received from technical experts throughout the country who were directly or indirectly interested in oil as a combustible. As a result of these efforts, the Board could "unhesitatingly state that both upon the part of the engineering profession and of skilled labor there is a general desire to have oil supplant coal as fuel for practically every purpose. * * * The desire to use liquid fuel thus practically exists everywhere."

The Board submitted its voluminous report to Rear Admiral Melville, and it was approved by his successor, on August 1, 1903. One year later it was published under the title, "Report of the United States Naval 'Liquid Fuel' Board." No effort had been spared by the Board in its desire to test petroleum. The cost of the investigation, including the installation and operation of the experimental boiler plant and the direct and indirect expenditures by individuals and the Navy, totaled more than $200,000. The Board's work represented the largest outlay ever heretofore incurred by either private, corporate, or official interests in the thorough investigation of the important problem of determining the possible future field for the use of crude petroleum as a fuel.

Many significant conclusions were presented by the Board on the technical and military aspects of the subject. Special attention is called here to the following because they had a bearing upon the question of whether or not the United States Navy should abandon coal for oil fuel:

1. By reason of our acquisition of the Philippines and the Hawaiian Islands and our responsibility for defending the projected isthmian canal, the scene of our probable future naval operations would be more distant from the supply of coal than in past wars. "It may be in the Pacific rather than on the Atlantic," the report prophetically declared, "where our greatest naval battles of the future will be fought." The defense of these places, therefore, would be greatly dependent upon our ability to use California oil as fuel in our ships of war. In view of these considerations, the Board recommended that at least one vessel cruising on the Pacific coast should burn liquid fuel exclusively, and this vessel should be assigned to special experimental work for an extended period.

2. It was highly probable, unless greater importance was attached to the value of the factors of evaporative efficiency, boiler capacity, steaming radius, and character of supply, that the successful and exclusive use of oil on board an armored cruiser or battleship could not be brought about for some years.

3. The information and data warranted the immediate use of oil on several torpedo boats and torpedo-boat destroyers.

4. Naval demands of the future made it compulsory to begin immediately the training of engineering specialists on oil and oil appliances.

5. The engineering or mechanical feature of the liquid-fuel problem was considered as having been practically and satisfactorily solved. Hindrances to the use of crude petroleum as a standard fuel for the Navy were cost, expense of transportation, and the lack of a safe and satisfactory structural arrangement for carrying an adequate bunker supply.

In spite of Melville's efforts and the Board's report, 5 years elapsed before the Navy made any progress in converting its ships to burn oil. Once it started, however, the pace was relatively fast. During 1909 the installation for burning oil fuel instead of coal under the main boilers of the *Cheyenne* was completed. A year later the Secretary of the Navy made this important announcement: "All new destroyers and submarines are now designed to use oil exclusively for fuel, while battleships and other large vessels were being fitted to carry oil as an auxiliary fuel." In the same year the Navy placed oil installations in the battleships *Delaware* and *North Dakota;* in these ships, oil was used only in maintaining power on long pulls, or when the fire became dirty, or when the trimming of the coal in the fire-room bunkers became difficult. Owing to the increased use of the oil fuel by the Navy, it became necessary to build storage depots at Key West, Charleston, Norfolk, and Narragansett Bay. The Secretary of the Navy pointed out that it would be necessary to build additional depots at outlying strategic points. Plans were also being made at the Philadelphia Navy Yard to instruct firemen and water tenders in the methods of burning oil. "The lack of such a place of instruction," wrote the Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering, "had greatly hindered the development of the art of oil burning in the Navy." When the *Wyoming* and *Arkansas*, the fastest and largest battleships in the world, were completed in 1912, their boilers were fitted to burn both oil and coal. With only a portion of our fleet equipped to burn oil, the Navy was now using over 30,000,000 gallons a year.

Congress authorized in 1911 the construction of two dreadnaughts, the *Nevada* and the *Oklahoma*. The question now arose: Should these battleships burn oil exclusively? The Navy recognized the superiority of oil-burning battleships and desired to build them, but it was afraid of the failure of the supply of oil. In Congress and in naval circles the question was vigorously debated. Before making any decision, Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels sent a letter in 1913 to the Department of Interior asking for expert advice regarding the fuel-oil situation. Receiving assurances from Secretary Franklin K. Lane that the Navy might rely upon the reserves already existing for a supply of oil greater than the life of any battleship, the order was given to make the *Nevada* "the first oil burner in any Navy." "Henceforth," declared Secretary Daniels, "all fighting ships which are added to the fleet will use oil." Thus, after almost a half century of experimentation, the Navy had made a decision which was to revolutionize naval warfare—to build an oil-burning fleet and to depend solely upon petroleum for power. At last, Melville's hopes and ambitions had become a reality.

In commenting upon this momentous decision Secretary Daniels in his annual report for 1914 wrote that "the transition from coal to oil will mark an era in our naval develop-

ment almost comparable with the change from black power to smokeless powder for our guns. The ease with which oil can be handled, its superior steam-producing properties, the reduced number of men required for handling it, and the decreased exertion required from the firemen, to say nothing of the ease with which cleanliness of the ship can be maintained, all combine to make oil the ideal fuel for naval use."

Control of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am asking to reprint herewith the speech made by Mr. Chester Bowles, head of the Office of Price Administration, before the National Association of Manufacturers in New York, December 6.

Mr. Bowles' speech follows:

I am very glad of an opportunity to appear before the annual meeting of the National Association of Manufacturers. I have always found here a friendly atmosphere and a willingness to discuss any public policy in a constructive atmosphere of give and take.

The whole country is deeply concerned in the program of inflation control, about which you have asked me to speak today. Businessmen are concerned. Farmers are concerned. The workers in our factories are concerned. And so are the great mass of our people which cannot readily be fitted into any group.

There are many audiences before which I appear where the support of our program is heartfelt and vigorous. Last night I spoke before several hundred businessmen at a dinner given by the business council. Next week I will appear at the annual dinner of the Ohio Grange, an organization representing thousands of farmers which has also pledged its all-out support to the OPA's price-control program.

Here in this meeting of the NAM I am face to face with a group whose leaders have gone on record during the last 18 months in vigorous opposition to what we have done and to what we are now doing.

Only the leaders of the National Retail Dry Goods Association and the leaders of the Association of Real Estate Boards have equalled the vigor with which the National Manufacturers Association heads are opposing the stabilization-control program through which inflation thus far has been kept in check.

I must point out that this opposition to effective price control is a departure from the original NAM stand when wartime price controls were first proposed.

In 1941 when price- and rent-control legislation was under discussion the stand of the NAM was clear-cut. Mr. Noel Sargent, who was then your secretary, testified before a congressional committee that firm controls on prices was an absolute essential to meet the inflationary circumstances created by war. In many respects his recommendations went beyond the actual program which your Government has put into effect.

I am told that Mr. Sargent's testimony was a major factor in securing the passage of the original Price Control Act.

But more recently your position has changed. To some degree in 1943, and increasingly in 1944 and 1945, you have swung into sharp opposition to effective price control.

Obviously, today we are in disagreement. Obviously, we cannot both be right. One of us must be wrong.

Let me emphasize my own feeling of deep humility with which I approach the problems which confront us. I have been wrong on occasion in the past and, like most human beings, I shall probably be wrong on occasion in the future. I do not want to appear dogmatic or, above all, I do not want to create the impression that I think I have all the answers.

In that spirit I should like to analyze the stand of your association on this question of price and rent control. At the outset I believe it is a proper question to ask what would have happened if the Nation had followed the advice of the NAM leaders in 1944 and 1945.

Before Congress 18 months ago and again last spring NAM officials advocated amendments to the act which in my opinion would have made effective price control absolutely impossible.

But for the sake of clarifying the point, let's accept the view of those who claimed these changes would have increased prices only 10 percent each year. Even though we accept this viewpoint, the result would have been a $30,000,000,000 increase in the cost of fighting the war—a sum only two billion less than the cost of the entire World War I. At the same time Mr. and Mrs. Long-Suffering American Consumer would have found $36,000,000,000 added to their cost of living. In other words, even relying on the most optimistic estimates put forward by the proponents of the NAM-sponsored amendments, the Nation has already saved $66,000,000,000 by not taking your leaders' advice.

But those figures are, in my opinion, only a portion of what your official proposal would have actually cost our Nation.

Those of us who have been entrusted with the task of wartime price control have long recognized the fact that controlled inflation is an idle dream. One man's price may be the cost of a thousand other firms.

There is no organization big enough or smart enough or efficient enough to handle the vast deluge of price adjustments which would result from any such concept. There could be only one result and that is higher and still higher prices, each feeding on itself with the beginning of an inflationary spiral which would soon be out of control.

As I analyze the NAM's position on price control, it seems clear that the opposition of your leaders stems from a conviction that these controls tend to hold down production. Certainly there was no indication of this during the war years. This is perfectly clear from the record.

Both industrial and farm production during the years of effective price control have risen to record levels. They have gone far beyond even our most ardent hopes. American management and American labor in their all-out war effort have hurried the day of victory and have amazed our enemies as well as our allies.

Today it is generally recognized that inflationary pressures are at record levels. Liquid assets are at an all-time high. Savings have increased from prewar levels by $145,000,000,000. Currency in circulation is almost five times as great as before the war.

The stock market has been booming merrily upward. As in 1929 taxi drivers, barbers, and elevator boys are providing inside information on just what selections are apt to rise the fastest. The dope sheets coming from Wall Street anticipate higher and still higher prices. The real estate market is starting to skyrocket.

What, under such circumstances, would happen to prices if the Nation now accepted the advice which Mr. Robert R. Wason, chairman of the NAM reconversion council, and Mr. John Airey, chairman of the NAM War Controls Temination Committee, offered to Congress on November 7. This NAM recommendation called for the elimination of all price control by the 15th day of February. What, for instance, would happen to food prices?

Those of you who are in the candy business know that coconut, which OPA decontrolled some 30 days ago, has quadrupled in price. Many grades of furs, from which price controls were removed during the fall months, have more than doubled. Your wife will tell you that some grades of oranges, lemons, and grapefruit moved up 50 to 100 percent in the first few days following the action of OPA in removing the price restrictions.

If this occurred on food products which seemed to be in adequate supply, what would happen to meat, vegetables, milk, cereals, and all the other dozens of food products which are in more scarce supply?

If the Nation accepted the advice of your leaders to drop price control 60 days from now, what would happen to clothing prices? Right now the apparel situation is tighter than it has been since the beginning of the war.

Our veterans in search of their first outfit of "civvies" are forced to walk from store to store and even then often fail to secure the clothing to fit their needs. All authorities agree that this shortage is likely to continue for a great many months to come.

If we accepted your official recommendation of the early removal of all price control, what would the public be asked to pay for automobiles, refrigerators, washing machines and vacuum cleaners? Some say that competition would take care of all that. I can only say that this expectance is not in line with the facts.

The original requests of OPA by reconverting manufacturers were for price increases ranging from 25 percent to 55 percent. On October 26 and 27 orders were taken for 300,000 Ford cars, one-third of the entire 1941 production, with no questions asked on prices or trade-ins.

If the Nation accepted the official NAM recommendation, what would happen to the price of building materials? During the period of the First World War the cost of lumber, soil pipe, brick, and other essential building materials tripled. Today the housing shortage is infinitely greater. Under the best of circumstances I am told that only 500,000 homes can be built in 1946.

This will be meager relief to the 3,401,000 families, a major portion of them young married veterans, who will be forced to live with relatives, or otherwise double up during the coming year. If we removed price controls, is there any limit to the heights to which building materials would move in 1946? Certainly not, judging from what occurred 25 years ago.

If we accepted the official advice of the NAM what would happen to rents? We could not remove price controls without removing rent controls. We know that in the period of the last war 90 percent of the entire increase in rents occurred not during the war itself but after the armistice. In view of the critical housing shortage, could we expect any greater restraint on the part of our landlords today?

Finally, if we accepted the advice of your leaders, what would happen to wages? Today most of you gentlemen feel that the demands of the labor groups are excessive. If controls were ripped off as you propose, if rents were allowed to shoot upward, if food and apparel prices were allowed to boom, labor would very properly intensify its demands for higher and still higher pay checks.

History has proven that in a race between prices and wages, prices invariably go up faster. Under such circumstances, however, our workers would have but one defense and that would be to get what they could as fast as they could get it in the hope of keeping their incomes within speaking distance of the rising cost of living.

Organized labor could at least make an effort to keep its earnings in line with increasing living costs. But how about the

millions of workers, farmers, and people living on fixed incomes who have no strong unions to protect them? What would happen to them as prices and rents shot upward?

Finally, how about the businessmen if the Nation accepted the official advice of the NAM? Prices that skyrocket invariably collapse. How would our businessmen, particularly our small businessmen, fare as inventories were thrown on the market for any price they would buy and as the inevitable drop in purchasing power dried up their sales?

We had 106,000 bankruptcies following the collapse after the inflationary rise in 1919 and 1920. If we ripped off our inflation controls today, could we expect anything less in 1947?

Your leaders say they fear inflation as much as I do. They agree with me that production, production, and still more production is the only final cure for the inflationary danger.

But it is their claim that price control interferes with production, and that if price controls were removed the whole situation would take care of itself. The record has proven them emphatically wrong in the past. The record indicates that their claim is equally wrong today.

Last week the President's report stated reconversion has been achieved at record speed. Manufacturers of automobiles, washing machines, electric refrigerators, and other reconversion products, reporting to the Civilian Production Administration estimated their volume of sales by June 1946 at from 75 percent to 300 percent above 1939 levels—all under OPA price controls.

Retail sales today, again under the very price controls which your leaders claim make all-out production impossible, are breaking every record.

Admittedly, price control has never been painless. Admittedly, it can never be painless. Obviously, there have been some delays, some fumbling, some outright mistakes. Everyday we are moving to correct these mistakes and to eliminate hardship to the fullest extent of our ability.

Business is restless. Business has had its fill of wartime regimentation and red tape. Very properly, business is anxious to get back to a free economy with Government interference reduced to a minimum.

Believe me, there is no one in America as anxious to get rid of price controls as I. I cordially dislike the job I have. I would like nothing better than to drop it tomorrow.

Price control should and must be removed as rapidly as supply conditions permit. Barring continued labor-management difficulties, the production estimates for 1946 indicate that in industry after industry during the next 12 months, we will find supply and demand coming into balance. As that occurs, I assure you that your Government will move promptly to eliminate the last vestige of price restrictions in those industries. But to remove them before competitive conditions are again established is to invite inflationary chaos.

Gentlemen, the recommendation of your leaders for the removal of price control in 60 days is reckless in the extreme. Just how high prices would go I do not know. But at the best, it is a risky, reckless, gambling policy which in all likelihood would produce a national disaster.

The everyday people of America are looking forward eagerly to good jobs, steady jobs at higher wages—to a high sustained level of farm income—to good profits for our businessmen—to the development of a land of peace and abundance where every man may raise his family in an atmosphere of economic security and with steadily increasing standard of living.

Today the entire country, with very few exceptions, believes that our capitalistic free enterprise system continues to be our best hope of achieving this future. But we must face the fact that this deep-seated confidence and belief in our free enterprise system is largely confined to America. In practically every European country, capitalism has ceased to be even a source of controversy. In country after country we find the left wingers advocating communism while the right wingers advocate various forms of a socialistic state.

I have great faith in our ability to make our free enterprise system work here in America. But would this system, in spite of its great achievements, and its deep-seated roots in the traditions and thinking of our country, survive the bitter disillusionment which would surely develop if the inflationary forces are allowed to take hold? Frankly, gentlemen, I am very skeptical.

Let us make no mistake about it. The everyday people in this country are wholeheartedly behind this program of inflation control. Our farmers are behind it. Our workers are behind it. The consuming public is behind it. And tens of thousands of businessmen, large and small, many of them members of the NAM, are also behind it.

The urge to strip off price controls now (or, let us say on February 15), and to let the devil take the hindmost, comes with relatively few exceptions from business and business association leaders. As I have pointed out the leaders of the NAM have been among the most outspoken.

The dizzy inflation which could so readily develop in the absence of OPA controls on prices and rents would, I repeat, not be accepted lying down by the great masses of our people. It is for this reason that I firmly believe that the stand which your leaders have taken represents a most dangerous threat to the future health and success of our entire free-enterprise system.

Gentlemen, I might have come to you today and made a pleasant and easy speech about the inflationary dangers and our efforts to combat them. But such a speech would have failed dismally to meet the basic issue.

These are critical times and I believe we are all entitled to frank statements and blunt opinions. Your leaders are on record in favor of a course of action which I believe to be utterly foolhardy and dangerous. I would have failed to meet my public responsibilities if I did not state to you my own sharp disagreement with them.

Let me emphasize that I accept the great sincerity and patriotism with which Mr. Mosher, and other leaders of your organization, have stated their views. I hope you will accept with equal readiness the sincerity with which I have tried to state the facts as I see them.

Let me take this occasion to ask your organization to reexamine its position. You supported price control in 1941. If you will but look at the facts of the present inflationary situation, it seems to me you must support price control now.

In spite of whatever disagreement there may be between some of us, let us never forget that we are all working wholeheartedly and humbly for the same goal—a country of peace, abundance, and prosperity—for all of our people of all races, of all groups—whoever they may be, wherever they may live.

Some Problems Before Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 11, 1945

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks, I include an address, Some Problems Now Before Congress, which was delivered by me on Friday, October 12, 1945, before the Executives' Club of Chicago, an organization of approximately 1,200 of the most prominent businessmen in our second largest American city:

[From the Executives' Club News]

SOME PROBLEMS NOW BEFORE CONGRESS

(By Hon. DEWEY SHORT, Republican Member of Congress from Missouri, Friday, October 12, 1945)

Mr. President, members of the Executives' Club of Chicago, since last I addressed you gentlemen much water has gone under the bridge and over the dam. At that time we were deeply involved and busily engaged in fighting the most terrible and devastating war in all history. While there was no doubt in any of our minds as to the ultimate outcome and of eventual victory, we knew that we were engaged in a gigantic task that called for the supreme combined efforts of all Americans, regardless of race, color, or creed. Fortunately in every time of great crisis the American people, regardless of minor political or religious differences, have been big enough and patriotic enough to lay aside these minor differences and to join heads and hearts and hands in fighting to preserve the liberties bequeathed to them as free men.

It was a long, hard, and devastating war, and no one here today or anywhere else in the world can, at this moment, accurately estimate the total cost in blood and treasure, the millions upon millions of the flower of young manhood in all the belligerent countries involved in that savage struggle, or the billions upon billions of dollars in national wealth of each participating power that was spent in that global conflict.

It doesn't require a very intelligent person or very much knowledge of the world's history to know that following in the wake of every war, and particularly in one such as the one that just ended that engulfed the whole world, you naturally and inescapably must face political upheaval, social chaos, and serious economic dislocation.

DEMOBILIZATION

War pulls nations and peoples up by the roots and disorganizes all of our lives. We find ourselves in a much more serious predicament at this tragic hour than we found ourselves following the First World War and in the wake of a decade of depression. The backwash of war presents as many and as baffling complex problems as war itself. I do not exaggerate, gentlemen, when I give it to you as my honest and humble opinion that the next few months are going to be most critical period in the history of this beloved Republic, more critical than at the darkest hour at any moment of the whole war—or, I should say, wars—which has just ended. We fought two, one in Europe and one in Asia; one in the Atlantic, and one in the Pacific.

It took us 5 long years to build up the mightiest war machine that the world has ever known, 12,000,000 men and women from every nook and corner of this great Nation, fighting on every continent and on every sea, in every field of battle, and in the skies all over this universe.

I told Ward Castle when he cordially invited me to come back here to inflict myself for the fourth time upon you—which proves that you are very patient people and capable of enormous endurance—that I would discuss just some of the problems now confronting the Congress of the United States and naturally confronting you people.

The first thing after victory, of course, is the uppermost and foremost problem confronting us all, in which an overwhelming majority of the people are tremendously interested, the problem of demobilizaton. I get telephone calls and telegrams and bushels of letters every day from dear friends of ours,

intelligent people, good patriotic Americans, saying "Now my boy is no better than John Brown's. I don't want any special consideration, but I need him so badly."

Sometimes it is on the farm; sometimes it is in some branch of industry. Maybe he is a professionally or technically trained man. Perhaps he is married and has some kids at home and can claim some dependency. All these special classes can find some good reason why their loved ones should be immediatly discharged and come home. We have witnessed since VE- and particularly since VJ-day an emotional upheaval in this country that has knocked the people off their trollies, a hysterical haste to discharge everybody from all branches of the service. If we did that, where in the name of God would we be?

This problem of demobilization that I am discussing very briefly and altogether too inadequately in the limited time I have at my disposal is not as simple, gentlemen, as it might first appear to be. I repeat, it took us 5 years to build up this machine and to get ten or twelve million men and women scattered all over the world, and you cannot get them home overnight, and it wouldn't be desirable if it were possible in the state of thoughts and confusion and uncertainty that you find throughout the world today. The problem is a very difficult and complex one. No Army or Navy, not even Congress or any other governmental agency, could possibly lay down a hard and fast rule, an inflexible formula, without doing somebody an injustice because of the very complex, difficult nature of the problem. It is inescapable that we will have cases of individual injustices. I regret there are so many. We should do everything in our power to correct as many as possible. I can understand how anxious fathers and mothers and wives and sweethearts are to get their loved ones back.

I have a brother who has been in the Air Corps over 3 years, and 18 months of the time in England. He is down in Dallas now. I have a nephew 36 years old with two little girls, 10 and 12, in Tokyo, who has gone through the stinking, steaming jungles of the Southwest Pacific. I would like to see him come home to his wife and two little girls. I have another nephew down in that equatorial region of South America which is about the jumping-off place comparable to New Guinea. He would like to come home. I have another one in Germany, barely 19. His mother would like to see him.

There is not a family that hasn't been affected, and let me say this: I don't like to see any soldier cutting grass with bayonets or wasting his time picking up cigarette butts. I am just as anxious, I think, as any American to see that they are brought home as quickly as possible. I even built a fire under some of the generals, and told them that we were going to put a burr under their tail, and if they didn't get these boys home quickly and speed up this demobilization, Congress would take it over themselves, and we have speeded up that program.

We discharged 600,000 men last month from the Army alone. We will discharge 800,000 during the month of October. [Applause.] Yesterday our committee had lunch with General Arnold, General Spaatz, General Eaker, General Doolittle, and the high-ranking officers of the Air Corps who are having to try to plan their program upon certain suppositions. I am not free to tell you what was told us, but you will read about it Monday when it is released.

They are going to furnish us with a copy of it tomorrow. I hope they don't dare go below the estimate that is in their minds at this moment—not for awhile. We should move cautiously and carefully, exercise the greatest discretion during this troublesome period of postwar reconversion, especially during the time we are trying to write a peace which we hope will have some justice in it and that will last a little longer than the last one, to prevent a recurrence of a world tragedy a quarter of a century hence. We are discharging 10,000 men a day from our Air Corps, 300,000 men will be let out next month, and I imagine, if exigencies demanded it, and we were called upon to call our air force today into operation, that our commanders would find themselves very much embarrassed, and we might find ourselves in danger.

LET'S BE A LITTLE PATIENT

We want to be just a little tolerant and a little patient. Everybody today seems to want to let George take care of the country. "As a dog returneth to his vomit, so the fool returneth to his folly." Is it possible—after spending the huge sums of money that we have, and after suffering over 1,000,000 casualties, a quarter of a million men killed, and others maimed and wounded for life—that we are now going to let the sands of victory run through our fingers because we are so darned impatient to get everybody out of the service?

George Washington said, you know, "If you want to avoid an insult, you had better be prepared to repel it." I still believe in God, but I think we should keep our powder dry. Speak softly, but we had better carry a big stick because there are some brigands still on the loose throughout the world who understand only one language, and that is force.

America is the apple of their eye, and with modern weapons and particularly with the atomic bomb, they are not going to sail around the world; that is too great a distance. They won't follow the line of the Equator. They will fly over the top of the Hump. Did you ever imagine what it would be like to get a few rocket bombs with a little atomic energy in them? If you drew a line around the world at the Equator, you would find that there is no one south of the Equator who is a potential enemy of this country, except the country of Brazil, with which we are on good terms, but north of the Equator reside all of our potential enemies.

The next war will be fought with rockets and with atomic bombs, which spell the end of civilization itself, and the thing that we have to keep in mind is that this demobilization should be carried on in a gradual, orderly manner, and I am happy to say that thousands of our troops are being landed every day in every port in this country that is available; in Boston, in New York, at Newport News, at Norfolk, down at New Orleans and Seattle, and San Francisco. They are returning by the thousands, and we are bringing them home just as quickly as shipping facilities and these service separation centers permit, so I hope that the Members of Congress, who have been deluged and covered up with an avalanche of mail, everybody wanting "out" of the service—not tomorrow, but today—will be just a little patient, a little tolerant, and try to understand the enormous difficulty and complexity of the task.

If we ever needed the advice of Shakespeare, we need now the admonition that Hamlet's mother gave her son when she said, "Oh, gentle son, upon the heat and flame of thy distemper sprinkle cool patience." Let's be a little patient.

I am not wanting to see these ex-servicemen, or men now in the service becoming ex-servicemen too rapidly. Many of my buddies in the last war were so anxious to get home that they didn't take time to get physical examinations or have disabilities written on their discharge, and for a quarter of a century they have been trying to establish service connection and cannot do it. They are suffering hardships today.

I am glad to see we are doing a much better job in this war by seeing to it that when a soldier or a sailor goes to a separation center, he talks to the finance officer and gets all of his papers in order. He gets a thorough physical examination. All notations are written on his discharge. He is consulted about reemployment. We are doing an infinitely better job in this war than we did in the last one. I wish every single one of you gentlemen here would take time to buy, beg, borrow, or even steal, if necessary, the report of Gen. George C. Marshall, the biannual report that he released the other day. I want you to read it and study it because I know you are great Americans out here, and it is too bad Members of Congress can't come out and speak to this club, which is an inexhaustible fountain of inspiration and patriotism, to get away from mad Washington. But so much for demobilization.

URGES BOMB SECRET BE KEPT

I can report to you gentlemen that for this week we have been holding hearings on the atomic bomb. On Monday morning Secretary Patterson and General Groves testified. Tuesday we had Dr. Vannevar Bush, head of scientific development and research and also Dr. Conant, of Harvard. We have listened to the chemists and the physicists. I know so little about atomic energy, I feel more ignorant now than I did when they began their testimony because they spoke a language that I could not comprehend. I confess that I possess abysmal ignorance, but when a man realizes he is ignorant, he is pretty smart. It keeps him from becoming indispensable. [Laughter.] And there are no indispensable men in this world. There never have been—not now, and I hope and pray there never will be.

Of course we have had men who thought they were, but then they pass on and the world goes on.

This atomic bomb is the most terrifying, devastating force that has ever been let loose. I don't know how secret it is. I asked that question; I thought it was pertinent. I have always thought that science was international and universal; that no country and no people have a monopoly upon the discovery of truth. We all know that certain experimentations have been carried on for the past half century in atomistics. It was only because of the high pressure of a savage war, of course, that it was quickly developed.

I am convinced in my own mind that there are no secrets so far as the ingredients or materials or component parts of the atom bomb are concerned, because it is the product of too many minds from too many countries. However, I do think the method of its manufacture, the managerial genius, the American "know how," the skill and industry of our own workers—I mean the mechanics of the production of this deadly thing that threatens, not only national suicide for nations, but the destruction of civilization everywhere—I know that that is more or less an American secret.

We are 14 jumps ahead of the rest of the world, and let's hope and pray to God that we stay ahead and keep the secrets of its manufacture. [Applause.]

We know what it is and what it will do, but it took many people in many places to assemble all of the data and all of the knowledge and all of the mechanics in order to produce it. That is America's secret, and if America has a thimbleful of brains, she will hold onto it. [Applause.]

UNITED STATES FEEDS COW—EUROPE MILKS IT

We are going to share all good things with other people. We have shared so much we don't have much left. [Laughter.] The British and the Russians are our allies and are still our allies, and we love them, but this lend-lease is supposed to be a two-way road. Pipe lines should come back as well as go over, but the old cow has had her head here in America. We have been feeding her and taking care of her. Her other end has been in Europe, and she has been milked dry. [Laughter and applause.]

They have all but carried the dome of the Capitol away. And let me say this, gentlemen, I think we have arrived by this time to when we should talk plainly. We won't

lose anything by that, not after the London Conference, the great fiasco that ended not only in a stalemate—a deadlock, but where we have been inclined to give and give, and thank God Jimmy Byrnes has finally spoken out and said, "We are not going to compromise or surrender any more principles." I hope he sticks to it. [Applause.]

UNCLE SAM AGAIN IN ROLE OF "UNCLE SAP"

I remember back in the World War you boys went to Chateau Thierry and Belleau Woods and the Meuse-Argonne. The French were so discouraged they were throwing their rifles away and going back home. We came in at the eleventh hour, and we saved the day. I remember how we were branded "Shylock" afterward. I know the billions of dollars that we loaned which we have never collected. History has a queer and naughty way of repeating itself. We painfully are going through now what we went through in the last one. Uncle Sam becomes a bigger Uncle Sap as the years go on.

PEARL HARBOR CARDS STACKED

We came into this global conflict at a very dark hour. We are going to try to find out just how we got in it, and I did introduce the four resolutions to continue investigations of Pearl Harbor. The committee has been set up. I hope we can get to the bottom of it, though I am afraid the cards are a little stacked in advance. It is hard to go up against a marked deck or loaded dice, and you don't want to fix the jury before you go to trial. That is a method that has been employed in this country in the past twelve years in every branch of government, until at this hour America has reached a new low moral tone. The Presidency has been prostituted and commercialized and exploited until the stench in Washington will remain in the nostrils of decent patriotic citizens for decades to come. [Applause.] I am not angry today, but I am filled with righteous indignation and holy wrath. [Applause.]

WHO WON THE WAR

Now how in the world was Germany licked and crushed? Everybody here knows that three-fourths of the troops we had in the Mediterranean and the western front were American troops. Where in the name of God would we have been without Eisenhower and Bradley and Devers, Simpson and Hodges, Patton and Patch, and the three and a half-million men that we got to Europe in this war. We got only two millions in the last one. All the time that Patton was racing through France, and when he broke through Germany and down into Czechoslovakia, every newspaper I could get hold of in London would tell how Monte had begun a new offensive.

Do you think there would have been no capitulation at Stalingrad? Do you think the Red Army could ever have gotten to Berlin without the enormous assistance we gave them in lend-lease—planes and tanks and ammunition and food? America's industrial capacity, American workers in our factories and on our farms and in our mines, America's managerial genius, as well as the men who fought in the air and on the sea and on the land, won this war.

I have no quarrel with any form of government that exists abroad. If the Russians want communism, God! let them have it. I should, by all rules of the game, be a Communist myself because I have nothing, and I want to share it with everybody. [Laughter and applause.]

My mother's people all came from England, and I spent a happy year at Oxford, and you are going to hear a representative of the British Government next week, and you should all be here and listen very attentively to hear him tell about the great victory of the labor party over there. If England wants state socialism, she is welcome to it, but we don't want in the United States either Russian communism or English state socialism. [Applause.]

If their form of government is so superior, so superb, so far better than capitalism, why is it that during the war and now after the war the Russians and the Britishers come with hat in hand to Washington, one asking for six billion, and the other hoping that they will get that much, or even more, if we are gullible enough to give it to them? They are not satisfied with lend-lease during the war, though it was specifically written into the act of Congress that it was a war measure and was to be continued only so long as we were actually in war and that it would automatically end when the war ended, but now the Russians and the British tell us that lend-lease must go on. They have to have hundreds of millions of dollars more voted to them now. Not by my vote.

There are a lot of crown jewels that I have seen over there that would bring a pretty neat sum, even here on the market in Chicago. I know that they could get enough for the crown jewels, either the Czar's or the King's, to run a country for a little while, and so help me God, I am not going to take butter and bacon, corn pone and sowbelly out of the mouths of my constituents down in the Ozarks in Missouri as long as they wear emeralds and ermine in Moscow and London. [Applause.]

NEED OF PROTECTION

Perhaps some think I am a nationalist and isolationist. I am not. I am more broad-minded than they are. I have been farther back under the barn hunting for eggs than a lot of those Britishers and Russians have ever been away from home. I have been over to see them many times. Most of them have never been out of their own bailiwick.

Why of course the war has left us supreme. We have to assume and shoulder our responsibilities and meet this great opportunity, but we don't have to be maudlin. We don't have to be mollycoddles. We don't have to be weaklings to prove our friendship for the world. Sometimes the only way you can make some folks like you is to talk very straight to them or let them feel the impact of your power. Then you get along much better with your neighbor. That is the reason I don't want to get demobilized too fast too much. If they took the fire department and the police force out of Chicago, half the people in this city wouldn't be here a month from now because the hoodlums would take it over tomorrow—and if it were New York, they would take it over this afternoon! [Laughter.] If it were in Kansas City, they would take it over now! [Laughter.]

You have to have protection. It is going to cost you money, an army and a navy and an air force, but we had better have a superior air force and the largest and best navy; not necessarily a large standing army, but a highly trained, well equipped, well-disciplined army capable of expanding itself so that we can back up the moral law and our ethical ideals with physical force if necessary, because that is the only language that some people can understand. I am sorry to say that, but it is just true. I wish it were otherwise, but it ain't. [Laughter.]

I don't know whether Britain and Russia want lend-lease, whether they want a loan. If they do, it is over a long period of time at a very small or no rate of interest. By the time it would come due, everyone would have forgotten about it because Americans have short memories. Our consciences soon grow callous. We are not going to quarrel with them about the form of government they have. We want to give them to understand that we have a government of our own—what a marvelous government it is. We intend to keep it.

Four hundred and fifty-three years ago Columbus—and this is Columbus Day—discovered a new world and in that brief time, because there was planted on this continent, in this new world, Christian religion and eventually a representative form of constitutional government, and because we established an economic system of individual initiative and private enterprise where man could stand on his own feet and walk the earth his own king—though we are not as large as other countries, either in area or in population—we have grown to be the greatest Nation on the face of God's earth. We don't want to change it. [Applause.]

UNITED STATES SYSTEM PERILED WITHIN

We don't want to change it, but it is being undermined, attacked, and assaulted. There are things going on right now in this country I don't like it. I believe in the right of labor to organize. I believe in the right of collective bargaining. I believe every laborer is worthy of his hire. I hold no brief for the sins of industry in the past, but the pendulum has swung altogether to the other extreme until now a few, just a little handful, a coterie of high-powered labor racketeers, many of them from the Old World who lived in poverty and who are living better now than they could ever have lived had they stayed where they were born, are over here shaking down Americans to pay exorbitant fees and stir up trouble, having jurisdictional fights. A few hundred men going out of a plant here will throw several thousand innocent men out of employment other places. Congress has to do something about it. [Applause.] The President of the United States has to do something about it. [Applause.] If we don't, when another million or two of these soldiers get back home they will do something about it. [Applause.]

We will discharge more than 6,000,000 men from our Army alone by the 1st of next July. That is just about as fast as you can bring them back home by plane and by ship and through our ports and separation centers, gentlemen. In the meantime, we have to keep a cool head, calm nerves, warm feet, resolute will, and an inflexible determination to see that this Nation is not wrecked from within. Years ago Edwin Markham wrote:

"I fear the vermin that shall undermine Senate and school and citadel and shrine.

"I fear the worm of fraud, the fatted worm of ease and all the crawling progency of these.

"I fear the vermin that shall honeycomb the walls and towers of state in unsuspecting hours."

I am not fearing this country being invaded or attacked from the outside by any country on earth for a little while. If we have sense enough to keep ourselves strong, we never will be, but I do fear the vermin, the rats who are boring from within, who are undermining the Senate and school and citadel and shrine. I fear men with alien ideas and foreign philosophies contrary to the spirit and genius of the founders of this republic who would undermine and destroy the very foundations upon which this great Government rests. I am not easily scared, either.

I have seen too darned much of it. We have had too many coming into Washington on special trains from the east side and from the back alleys. They don't look any too good to me. They don't talk my language, and God knows, I don't like their smell. [Laughter and applause.]

FIRST TAX CUT SINCE 1933

Well, we granted you a little relief yesterday. Ten voted against the tax bill. It will give you a cut of from 10 to 40 percent, and I am sure that your able Senator BROOKS here will go forward in the Senate, maybe making it a little more. The significance of that bill is that it is the first time since the advent of the New Deal—I think someone called it steal—I don't know—New Deal or steal—it is the first time since 1933 that you have gotten any reduction at all, so it is significant in that it shows we have about faced, and we are now headed in the right direction. [Applause.]

Even with the reduction that we have incorporated in the pending bill we are going

to worm and corkscrew $25,000,000,000 out of the taxpayers of this country next year, and that isn't peanuts to an Ozark hillbilly. [Laughter.]

Our annual budget before the war was seven billion a year, but we are going to collect more than three times that in order to carry on this top-heavy, bungling, cumbersome, and costly bureaucracy. Let's hope and pray we won't have to carry it on too long, that there can be some more reductions, but I don't think there is much possibility of it until we have a little housecleaning in Washington. [Applause.]

We are going to have to get a good stiff new broom, maybe a pitchfork and a scoop shovel—[Laughter]—on election day to elect men to the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives who still believe in the Constitution and who will vote to uphold it and who have a little respect for the high office of the Presidency and who still think a little of God, home, and mother. That is all.

BUILDING TWO WORLDS

There are so many other issues I would like to discuss, but there is not time. We have been building two worlds here in America for the past 453 years, and particularly since the Pilgrims landed on the Plymouth Rock, and the Cavaliers down at Jamestown. We have been building two worlds during your generation and mine. One of them is a material world with its physical comforts. It is a world of skyscrapers and transcontinental railways and airplanes and radios and frigidaires. It is a world of physics and of chemistry and of mathematics. It is a world of engineering. It is a marvelous world that has given the people of this great Nation, 139,000,000 of us now, more of the good things of life, so far as physical comforts are concerned, than any country has ever known. It has been built up, yes, under this constitutional form of government, under this free economic system. Call it capitalist or whatever you will. It has been built up here in a land where men have known God and where we trust many of us will return to the faith of our fathers. It is a wonderful world. We have built it at a terrific rate of speed; the world of atomic energy, the world of electricity, the world of steam. It is a marvelous world of accomplishment.

There is another world we are building in America. It is the world, not of suspicion and distrust and of hate, but of faith and hope and love and of human brotherhood. It is the world of tolerance and forbearance. It is the world of patriotism. It is a world where men and women love this country and who are just as willing as their forefathers to go out today, as the boys did yesterday, to give the last full measure of devotion to protect and preserve it. It is a world of moral law, a world of ethical ideals and of religious principles, and, unless we build this spiritual world with the same rapidity and substantiality with which we have built a material world, then in spite of huge armies and large navies and superior air forces, in spite of all our accomplishments of years gone by, we will crash and go to pieces on the rocks of a sordid and a crass materialism.

It has been good to again see you. [Applause.]

British Loan Proposal Is Unbusinesslike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 11, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I include in my remarks an editorial published in the Houston Chronicle on December 7, 1945:

United States negotiators have proposed that we make a loan to the United Kingdom of $3,750,000,000, to be repaid in 50 annual installments from 5 to 55 years, largely at the convenience of the British. No interest is to be charged on the loan for 5 years, and thereafter the rate will be 2 percent per annum. Allowing 5 years interest free, the average interest rate on the loan will be 1.62 percent, assuming that the interest will be paid continuously after 5 years. There is, however, a provision in the loan agreement that no interest will be charged in any year where the United Kingdom has an unfavorable international exchange position. If this should happen every year, we would get no interest whatsoever. If it happened in one-half of the years our average interest rate would amount to less than 1 percent.

During the past few years the United States Treasury has been borrowing money from its citizens at an average interest rate of 1.92 percent, so that on the interest alone, assuming that we make the loan and that the British pay it, and pay the interest in full, we will have a very substantial loss in the difference between the interest we collect from the British and the interest we pay our own citizens for the borrowed money.

In addition to the loan of $3,750,000,000, the terms and conditions of which bear little if any relationship to business principles, our negotiators have agreed to accept Britain's notes for $650,000,000 in full settlement of our unpaid $25,000,000,000 lend-lease account and all our investments, materials and surpluses in England. Obviously, this is tantamount to a gift.

In consideration of our making this very large loan at a great sacrifice to our own taxpayers, the British agree that—manana—within 1 year after the loan has been ratified by our Congress and approved by the British Parliament they will eliminate the dollar pool which they now control, thereby enabling countries of the British Empire to use their current dollar receipts without restriction. In other words, if Australia or India, or some other member of the Empire should sell us something and get dollars for it, such country could then use the dollars any way it wished. With the dollar pool in effect such countries can only use those dollars at the pleasure of Britain. They must give Britain the dollars and accept sterling.

There is nothing in the agreement to indicate that the United States will receive anything in the nature of foreign bases, raw materials, communications, or other concessions.

In connection with the loan agreement Secretary of State Byrnes has issued a beautifully written white paper containing many laudable and desirable aspirations with respect to world trade. While recognition of this white paper is made by the British, they are not signatories to it. They agree to undertake to help us work out world-wide multilateral agreements governing such things as tariffs, cartels, quotas, and production, to be administrated by an international trade organization. But these are only promises to try to help work out agreements with the other 48 countries of the United Nations. Bluntly stated, the British will only cooperate in working out world trade agreements if we lend them $3,750,000,000 and settle our lend-lease account, and give them title to our hundreds of millions of investments and materials in Britain on a 55-year note. If it costs this much to get the cooperation of Britain in world trade, what will it cost to get the cooperation of the other 48 countries of the United Nations?

If we must continue to help the British temporarily, let's do it by selling them our agricultural prdoucts—cotton, grain, meat, tobacco, etc.—on easy credit until the world gets more settled, and we can see our own way a little better, and let's see what we are to get in return. Fifty-five years is much too long.

Resolution on Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 11, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following resolution which was adopted on December 5 by the national executive council of the Textile Workers Union of America—CIO—at its quarterly meeting held in Boston, Mass.

The Textile Workers Union of America represents some 400,000 workers engaged in the several branches of the textile industry and has substantial membership in virtually all of the textile-producing States in the Union and especially in the New England region.

Resolution on housing

Whereas this country faces a Nation-wide housing crisis of record-breaking proportions; and

Whereas the shortage of all types of housing falls with the greatest severity at this moment on the returning war veterans and low-income workers; and

Whereas failure of Congress and the Federal Government to control real estate sales has brought about widespread speculation and flagrant profiteering which has caused a marked inflationary movement of menacing proportions; and

Whereas quite apart from the cruel and needless human suffering and unfair exploitation which the housing crisis causes, the shortage of housing accommodations is delaying full reconversion of many industries which are unable to get into full production due to the impossibility of recruiting sufficient labor; and

Whereas this housing shortage applies with real severity in several textile communities; and

Whereas drastic rent increase have been imposed on textile workers in several places which have not up until now been included in OPA rent control areas: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President send a message to Congress and resolutely press for its adoption, urging a comprehensive legislative program calculated to meet both a long and short range need of the situation; that this program include the following steps:

1. That the President by Executive order at once place all building materials under control so that the use and allocation of essential materials may be devoted and concentrated on house building rather than on industrial construction wherever human needs so require;

2. That the President by Executive order make available wherever needed and justified, all surplus military or naval establishments for conversion as temporary shelter for returning veterans or other citizens in critical need of emergency accommodations;

3. That legislation along the lines of the Patman bill now before the Congress be enacted into law at once which would give the President power to regulate sale prices of all real estate until the housing shortage shall have been mitigated;

4. That the scope of the Patman bill be enlarged to give the President power to take needed steps to increase the supply of building materials either by raising wages or prices or by other means;

5. That the administration give the most vigorous support to the Wagner-Ellender-Taft omnibus housing bill, hearings on which have now commenced in the United States Senate;

6. That this executive council calls upon the membership of the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, to do all in their power to develop mass support and pressure for the speedy enactment of the Patman and Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bills.

Why Export American Jobs and Pauperize American Labor by Importing Competitive Goods?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, most of our watch industries have been ruined by foreign imports. Even the free-trade internationalists in the State Department now recognize the fallacy of free trade in watches. It is a hard pill for some of these internationalists to swallow because of their investment in foreign watch establishments.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial from the Herald Tribune of New York City, under date of November 17, 1945:

FOREIGN TRADE FALLACIES

America's best assurance of a prosperous foreign commerce, points out Stuart Chase in a study, "Tomorrow's Trade," just published by the Twentieth Century Fund, "is to build prosperity at home."

This newspaper is glad to welcome the support of the articulate Mr. Chase in debunking some of the more widely held fallacies concerning foreign trade, and in particular (1) the theory that the big obstacle to our foreign trade is the high level of our tariff and (2) the belief that we can achieve continuous prosperity and full employment at home by floating a huge volume of exports on a correspondingly huge volume of foreign loans. As Mr. Chase notes, it is not necessary to defend the general level of the tariff structure, much less some of the more conspicuously excessive schedules to explain the pattern of American foreign trade. Indeed, as he points out, it is absurd to generalize about tariff, for the word is "a meaningless noise until one gets down to cases." There is no mystery about the existence of a limit on our imports. It derives from the fact that most of the things we need we can obtain within our own borders, the biggest free trade area in the world. As Mr. Case says, 70 percent of imports from other countries consist of materials needed for our own manufacturing industries, and the way to keep such imports at a high level is to keep domestic production at a high level.

From the standpoint of practical importance, Mr. Chase's attack on proposals to "blow up" exports by a huge program of foreign loans is much more timely because a heavy barrage of propaganda along these lines is emerging from Washington at this very moment. The danger of such subsidized exports has been repeatedly stressed here and in other quarters where it has been given anything more than the most cursory study. It is a program which, as the London economist has shown with merciless logic, comes down, in the end, to a policy of "exporting American unemployment."

An unfortunate aspect of this argument at the present time is that it is being employed as justification for the proposed credit to the British Government. No one has urged the extension of such a credit more vigorously than this newspaper, but to base that policy on representations that "we must maintain a huge and continuing foreign loan policy" is not only utterly unsound, it is to assume that the proposal can be sold to the American public only by advancing the sordid argument that the transaction is one that will yield us a handsome financial return.

Atomic Warfare—Can It Be Averted?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 11, 1945

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. Paul F. Fratessa, prominent attorney of San Francisco, with which he has enclosed a copy of an open letter addressed to the Congress of the United States, outlining a plan which he believes might avert necessity for use of atomic bombs in the future.

Mr. Fratessa for many years has taken an active interest in the problems of government, and during the administration of the late Gov. Friend W. Richardson he was attorney for the California State Highway Commission.

In order that his thoughtful thesis may be brought to the attention of the Members of Congress, I have asked permission to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The thesis follows:

Necessity for the use of atomic bombs can only be eliminated by removing the causes of war and of communism.

Greed of the few for profits and power cause poverty and want in the "midst of plenty." Great concentration of wealth and power warps the minds of too many in high places, thereby forcing the people to follow leaders who promise relief and hope for a better world. We have seen the results under our present system owing to its defects.

DEFECT I

Theoretically, our profit system is supposed to redistribute all profits added by industry to the cost of production and distribution. In practice this rarely happens. Low income groups seldom receive dividends. Investments requiring labor are always far below the total profits added to the costs of production and distribution, which creates a great vacuum, resulting in unemployment and thereby depriving the consumers of purchasing power who are all entitled to a livable income.

DEFECT II

Our profit system fights for foreign trade in an effort to maintain full employment, endeavoring to sell goods which cannot be paid for unless we accept goods in exchange. This course leads all nations into economic warfare followed by military conflict. Every nation is entitled to needed raw materials. No nation should be forced to accept finished goods while it has the manpower to produce them itself. Every nation can and must have purchasing power to consume its own production without foreign trade.

DEFECT III

Excessive profits, salaries, wages, and incomes of every nature received by anyone who cannot use them within a reasonable time, prevent others from earning or receiving a livable income, when these same excessive incomes were derived from the toil of the worker, because of their greed for excessive income.

All defects can be cured by congressional action.

1. Amend the Federal Reserve Act, by requiring the Federal Reserve Board to maintain a stable dollar or be removed from office by a majority vote of the House of Representatives and

2. Subsidize all low-income groups or subsidize industry—which means all employers of labor—with payments from the United States Treasury which will insure a reasonable profit to industry and farmer, with credit created without interest as provided in Congressman VOORHIS' H. R. 1 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, thereby wiping out profiteering—commonly called inflation—for all time, as consumers would pay actual cost for all items; or

3. Abolish private profit as Russia has done; or

4. Create a new system whereby we, the people, through Congress—

(a) Guarantee unconditionally all public deposits—which are just simple figures entered on the books of our bankers and other depositories;

(b) Call in all our present currency and Federal Reserve notes and destroy same, after giving full credit to the owners;

(c) Substitute "prosperity" currency, which shall be self-liquidating, as legal tender for all purposes, in various denominations and same size as now in use, with 50 spaces on the reverse side dated for machine cancellation by the banks, or by stamps to be affixed by the holder, weekly on a day certain, at the rate of 2 cents per dollar, represented by each item of currency, or amount on deposit in every prosperity account opened at any bank or depository with prosperity money, or prosperity checks, which shall be charged at the same rate and shall be paid to the United States Treasury, together with the funds received for the sale of stamps issued for this purpose. Prosperity checks and currency shall be legal tender for all purposes, except for deposit in security accounts hereafter described;

(d) Ten dollars is the limit anyone can possess of coins without a special permit from a bank and permittee shall be charged weekly at the rate of 2 cents for every dollar so possessed in excess of the $10 exemption as though the excess dollars were in a prosperity account;

(e) Prosperity accounts shall be supervised by the Treasury Department, who will furnish every bank with sufficient cancellation machines which will automatically record the daily cancellations of prosperity money, showing the amount due the United States Treasury at the expiration of 50 weeks from the date of issue the prosperity money shall be fully canceled and returned to the United States Treasury for destruction;

(f) On the effective date of the act, all banks, firms, or persons receiving public deposits shall earmark every deposit shown on their books as a security account and shall for 1 year thereafter accept currency, old coins, and Federal Reserve notes for deposit in security accounts. Prosperity coins shall be issued every year thereafter, which must be exchanged for new yearly coins during the month of January, or suffer a penalty equal to 2 cents per dollar for each week of delay;

(g) Security accounts may be converted into prosperity accounts or currency and may be transferred to other security accounts, but may not be used for the payment of interest, dividends, wages, and salaries. Any security account checks which may be cashed with prosperity money shall be credited to the United States Treasury. All banks shall be fully compensated for their services with prosperity currency, or checks drawn on the United States Treasury;

(h) All taxation of every kind and nature shall be suspended, including social security, unemployment, etc., thereby reducing the cost of living to half its present cost—because of the elimination of hidden taxes;

(i) The Federal Government shall pay all of its obligations by check drawn on the United States Treasury, which shall be deposited in prosperity accounts only, or cashed with prosperity currency within 5 days, or suffer the weekly reduction of 2 cents for every dollar represented by the check during the delay in cashing or depositing same. This rule will apply to all prosperity checks when issued;

(j) All States, cities, and political subdivisions existing by taxation must submit proper budgets to a bank of their own choosing, where the United States Treasury must make available weekly the amount required to meet the obligations payable in prosperity checks;

(k) Bankruptcy laws must be repealed. Instead, prosperity money shall be made available by the banks to all industry and farmers when they have exhausted their security accounts for the payment of wages, salaries, repairs, or renewals only, or for deficits arising therefrom;

(l) The Federal Reserve banks shall operate as agents for the Government in handling the new issues of prosperity money and foreign exchange.

Books shall be kept showing the true and accurate amount of credit due from every nation in the world. The Treasury Department shall enter into mutual agreements with all nations, fixing a permanent basis for the transfer of credits, for any purpose whatever. No transfer of gold or any other security will ever be necessary or permitted. Every nation indebted to the United States shall agree to honor any demand when presented for use within the nation on whom the demand is made. This arrangement will enable Americans to purchase foreign credits through their banks from the United States Treasury without any risk of fluctuation.

It will enable us to send travelers to foreign countries and consume these credits.

As an additional incentive, we could reward deserving and faithful American workers with expense-free trips for producing quantity and quality for a given period;

(m) Every nation must agree to make available to every other nation raw materials or other products essential to its well being, either on credit or exchange for goods without demand for gold or silver;

(n) Security accounts, when loaned for any purpose, shall be repayable only in prosperity money;

All dividends, bond interest, pensions of every kind, and anuities shall be paid only in prosperity money;

(o) Our Social Security Act must be extended to all alike. Payments must be the same to all, which must be a livable income for everyone, if they cannot work through no fault of their own;

(p) After several years of operation Congress shall provide the necessary machinery to hold an election by mail, whereby the owners of security accounts and of all public bond issues shall decide by majority vote, the method to be adopted in disposing of all public debts, by either converting the bonds into security bank accounts, or by requiring Congress to levy a tax on security accounts to pay the bonds;

(q) Every State must create an economic security board with authority to fix and determine, at all times, the exact amount which constitutes a livable income, settle labor disputes, fix prices and profits, if necessary to maintain a stable dollar, make rules for the banks to advance prosperity money to all persons who are unable to pay for necessities, medical and hospital expenses until the Social Security Act is amended to this extent; also recommend to the legislature regulations for further safeguarding society from those who refuse to work, drunkards, and dope addicts.

This presentation of the greatest problem now facing the world serves to illustrate one improvement over our present system, which has lead us into two world wars within 25 years.

If a better method can be evolved, we should all be glad to cooperate. We are all entitled to live decently, provided we are willing to work in producing the items we all need.

Therefore, Congress must study this suggestion and find a better way to provide for the general welfare of all Americans. Over 1,000,000 Californians have voted at three consecutive elections for better pensions because they know it can be paid by simple bookkeeping.

I find it hard to part with our established methods and customs, but prefer it only in order to avoid this continual strife between capital and labor which finally leads nations into war.

If we fail to improve our methods we are headed for war with the Communists.

They have a plan. You cannot fight their plan by merely opposing it. Our people cannot eat the Constitution or Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. We must have a real good plan for beating the coming depression or the Communists will win.

Respectfully,

PAUL F. FRATESSA.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Party Responsibility in a Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 11, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at the annual dinner and victor banquet of the Bronx County Bar Association at the Hotel Commodore on December 8, 1945:

You have extended to me a very great compliment in asking me to address this distinguished gathering of lawyers. I am not a lawyer and I have a layman's respect and apprehension in the face of a lawyer's learning and skill. I have never yet won an argument with a lawyer, and I don't propose, for one moment, to start an argument here tonight. And, may I say, I never, in my early days, could have conceived of a day when lawyers would actually want to sit and listen to me.

But of one thing I am certain. I am not here to talk about the law. I am not going to carry coals to Newcastle or law to the Bronx Bar Association. I want to speak on a subject which has been a major concern in my life—that is, party responsibility in a democracy.

Since I am speaking to lawyers, permit me to say, however, that I know enough about the administration of the law in Bronx County to feel an added sense of respect for this particular group. There is no county in the State of New York or, in fact, the Nation, where so little criticism can be leveled at the administration of the law—particularly in the office of the district attorney. It is a great tradition you have here, that of selecting the ablest available man for district attorney, of backing him up and permitting him to administer his office without fear, favor, or politics. The quality of that service over the years has been shown by the great jurists who have been elevated from the office of district attorney here to the higher courts of the State. They have a worthy successor in the present incumbent, Samuel J. Foley, and I think we can all assume that the end of his distinguished service in the district attorney's office will be but the beginning of a still more distinguished service on the supreme court bench of the State of New York.

It is a profoundly important thing to keep the administration of the law, especially the administration of criminal law, on a nonpolitical plane. We have all been distressed in the past when, in some other countries that I need not mention, it has been found that policital influences have prevented the enforcement of the law.

There are two ways in which politics can obstruct and impair the administration of criminal justice. The first is when the scales of justice are weighted with personal favor, and guilty men go free. The second is when men entrusted with the enforcement of the law use their great official power to seek votes by bringing charges, no matter how false or unfounded, against their political opponents. The grand jury, for example, is an honored institution, and justly so. District attorneys have a sacred responsibility to use the grand jury only as tradition dictates that it shall be used. To use it in the midst of a political campaign to bring forth, not indictments, but vague charges is a shameful and reprehensible misuse of official power. Such base actions befoul the purity of justice and bring the law and the courts into disrepute. We must not let the guilty escape. But we must not callously accuse or smear the innocent. In this, I am not talking theory. I have in mind, as I am sure you must have, some events in another county in the not too distant past.

The high tradition in Bronx County, which justly holds the district attorney's office in high respect, derives more definitely from a sense of party responsibility. For party responsibility means the capacity of an organization to establish and build traditions and to sustain them through the years. A party is something more than a mere dispenser of patronage; it is the means through which a free people control their government in a republic.

As an illustration of what I mean, my own party in New York City has, this year, been challenged by a vote of overwhelming confidence in its candidates for city office—General O'Dwyer, Senator Joseph, and Mr. Impellitteri. The party in these five boroughs owes a great obligation to the voters of the city of New York, which it can pay only in terms of good government at the least possible cost and with the greatest efficiency. If it fails in that responsibility, it will be cast out into exterior darkness, as it has been in the past, and fittingly so, and there will be weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth among the selfish and shortsighted ones. But if a party in the metropolis builds its principles on a sound foundation—if it serves the people well—it will be rewarded with a continued opportunity to serve the public.

The United States is a Federal Union. Not only in its Government but in its political organizations, it consists of 48 units and a single national unit. The duty alike of a State party and a city party, in a national campaign, is to support loyally the choices of the national convention. But between the quadrennial elections, the governments, as well as the political organizations of the States and the cities, carry on their own individual existences. I served long enough as chairman of one of the great national parties to realize how much national political organizations depend on State and city organizations. And that is as it should be, for it would be an inversion of the proper order of things, if ever the State and city

organizations should become dependent upon the national organizations. State and city organizations must select candidates for State and city offices on their own responsibility. They have to live with them and they have to stand or fall on the record their candidates make. They not only have to select candidates and conduct elections, but State and city organizations must have a definite philosophy of government. They must have principles which they create and maintain and which are appropriate to their own special needs and, naturally, in harmony, whenever possible, with the national organization. And I have seen enough of politics to know that no party can long endure and be successful unless it has such principles.

My Republican friends here tonight will not be surprised if I say, very seriously, that for many years the Democratic Party of the State of New York has not only had such principles, but in a very definite sense has helped to bring our State among the States of the Nation in promoting wise policies of government dedicated to efficiency and humanity. New York has, in a brilliantly constructive way, given to the Nation an example of a State that is leading its people to the light of freedom, order and truth. May the State and city of New York bear this responsibility seriously in the months and years to come. A party cannot merely wait for its opposition to make mistakes and fall from public favor. It must consistently, not only in the light of the past but in the light of obvious present needs, lead public opinion. I have said in the past, and I say again, that Government must seek to contribute to those broad social needs which an advanced civilization places upon Government. It must not only be efficient, but it must be humane. It must be administered by one with a head and a heart.

It is only fitting and proper to point out that the leader in this State who first most nearly achieved these two ideals of government was Alfred E. Smith. We shall never forget, not only those who worked with him, but those who saw him at a distance, that in his appointments he required inflexible honesty and sound qualifications. He fought for a simplified government in order that government might perform its services to the public at a minimum cost and with maximum effectiveness. With government thus established on a sound, business-like basis, he extended the activities of that government to meet new and developing human needs in the commonwealth. That great record stands. It is an inspiration and a challenge to those who succeed him.

I cannot say too earnestly that no party can long succeed in the State of New York whose leader or leaders take only one page from the book of Al Smith. They may speak in ringing and inspiring terms of what they have achieved. They may exhibit an administration that is honest and efficient, but if that administration is a mere machine seeking to perform in a routine manner functions of government, without realizing that the true end of government is to serve humanity, then that administration cannot long hold the interest and the imagination of the people. It will only have done half of its job, if it turns government into an impersonal machine.

In the State of New York a great beginning was made in the administrations of Alfred E. Smith, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Herbert H. Lehman. Over many years a confident people supported these great Governors. There was built up, in the Governor's office and in the legislature, the broadest program of social and economic justice that any State has seen. Year after year New York lighted the way to progressive ends. As a member of the party which these great men represented, I hope this service may continue, that new goals may be reached and that the governmental instruments created in the past may be perfected. For only by fostering such progress can any party play its great role in a democracy.

I said a little earlier that only by fixing party responsibility can a democracy retain the benefits of freedom and, at the same time, provide the people with what they legitimately expect from government. When, as in some countries of the world, there is substituted for responsible parties a multitude of bitter factions, liberty is endangered. It was Washington himself who warned his people, in his Farewell Address, of the dangers of factions in a republic. Washington did not mean that he opposed the formation of responsible political parties. His fear was that the experience of other countries, in which parties had degenerated into factions, might be repeated here. And only in the past decade have we seen, in the fate of France, the danger in breaking down the responsibility of parties. For a country which depends on many parties will, in the long run, have no parties at all, but rather endless civil strife between selfish fragments of the population. We have witnessed in this war that only the United States and Great Britain, true democracies built on the two-party system, have most extensively retained freedom for the individual.

In a two-party system it is always possible for a victorious party to be the legitimate and really representative majority of all the people. There is strength and permanence and responsibility in such a party control.

Moreover, with a two-party system, the party out of power can be sufficiently large to extend its influences on a broad basis. It can be, in truth, an effective critic and corrective of the actions of the party in power. Without strong and intelligent opposition, a party in power grows careless, inefficient, indifferent to public sentiment and, all too soon, dishonest. Conceive, if you can, a Nation or a State in which one party is large enough to be a majority, and the opposition is broken into five or six small groups. The majority party can safely ignore the splinter parties of an unorganized, discordant opposition, no one of which is strong enough to challenge the ruling party at the polls. Ultimately, such a one-sided party system loses all of the characteristics of a free government, and from a one-party system there is developed a one-man system. Today, every schoolboy knows that dictatorships rise on such unstable foundations.

Moreover, the best government is usually found in those nations and states in which the parties are fairly equal in size. That, it seems to me, has been the great virtue of our party system in New York. State elections have never been cut-and-dried affairs. There has always been a real contest, and the control of government has passed, from time to time, from one party to another. Much of the progress that this State has made in the affairs of government has been due to this close race for public favor by two strong parties.

The relations between a sound and healthy party organization in the State and the national organizations is also a matter which deserves careful consideration. The Democratic Party in New York State has repeatedly provided the national ticket with substantial majorities. It has invariably recognized the great authority of the national Government in matters of foreign affairs and, ordinarily, loyally supported the foreign policy of the President, regardless of his party affiliation. It has recognized as a great principle that politics stops at the water's edge.

In the last analysis, a party depends upon the vision, the honesty and the character of its officers. Men who hold high places in a party organization for a long time develop, in the main, these qualities in an even greater degree than in most callings and professions. For the public is a hard and exacting task master.

I grow a little impatient with those who seek to discredit the political leaders because some leadership has failed in its responsibility. I have the same feeling for those who seek to discredit the profession of politics that I have when I hear the profession of the law condemned because there are some dishonest lawyers, or the medical profession because some doctors do not do their duty. By and large, the politician is as honest as any man. In the work of political organizations, as in other human activities, good character justifies itself; energy and loyalty pay dividends and intelligence and education open the road to high honor. The parties owe it to the Nation to seek by every legitimate means to induce able and honest young men and women to join the party, to work with it, to exert what influence they can, and to seek, through the party, to improve the state of the Nation and the condition of everyone in the Nation.

To attain their proper role in a democracy, the political parties must do much more than merely get out the vote and win elections. They must, through research and consultation, develop beneficial and wise policies to be embodied in their appeal to the voters. Furthermore, they must carry on a twofold educational program. They must provide instruction for voters and prospective voters. And they must intelligently train party workers. A political party must, if it is to be useful and successful, operate on a schedule of 6 days a week, 12 months in the year. It is not a diversion, a sport, or a hobby. It is a serious undertaking for earnest and intelligent people.

Its ideal is justice and its end is human freedom.

If a man is a political animal, as a great philosopher has said, then it is his sense of justice which distinguishes him from the brute. Without this ideal of justice, men would be baser in character, poorer in soul. He would find no companionship in such virtues as truth, mercy, honor, courage, and wisdom. But when he seeks to bring the reality of these virtues into political life, he is too often confused by his energy, blinded by expediency and betrayed by ambition.

For justice is not the stepping-stone to power. It is a vibrant, living ideal. It is not a dusty collection of laws and precedents fanned by quibbling arguments in tired courts. Rather, it is a warm and human restraint on power. For power without justice is tyranny, and tyranny is foreign to this republic.

The highest ideal of party government is like the great objective of our Constitution—to establish justice. The political party is the collective expression of the aspiration of many men and women.

The changing conditions of society create, year by year, new stresses and strains among the people, new injustices that need correction, new needs for government service, and new solutions for old problems. The political part is the link between these conditions and the government.

Governments without the living force of political parties would be cold and unresponsive mechanisms. When parties fail in their duties and ideals governments fail. When parties seek only power tyranny grows in public offices. When parties fail to educate the public governments betray the people's interests.

"Justice," said Edmund Burke, "is the great standing policy of civil society, and any eminent departure from it, under any circumstances, lies under the suspicion of being no policy at all."

Our political parties must meet this high test.

Individual Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 11, 1945

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include a short note from a soldier's mother and a letter from her soldier son to me.

The hope of this soldier is, I am sure, typical of what is in the minds of every American service man and woman today.

Mr. Speaker, it is the duty and responsibility of us all to see to it that we live up to the expectations of our Nation's brave defenders in every way, shape, and form. To do less will not be enough.

COUNCIL BLUFFS, IOWA, *November 28, 1945.*
Representative BEN F. JENSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JENSEN: The attached letter was enclosed with a letter which I received today from my son, requesting me to forward it to you correctly addressed. I believe it merits your serious consideration.

Mrs. FRANCES J. MCNEIL.

FUKUOKA, JAPAN, *November 18, 1945.*
Mr. BEN JENSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JENSEN: Now that hostilities have ceased, we out here are looking forward to coming home soon. The members of the armed forces do not, as you know, have a very large degree of personal freedom. Now that our discharges are actually in sight, we are looking forward to a new personal freedom, not only the freedoms of speech, religion, fear of aggression, and want, but a complete freedom of pursuit of happiness. This includes, I believe, pursuit of vocation. If our vocational pursuits are to be controlled by governmental agencies and labor unions we will see little change from our service in the armed forces.

We out here are grateful to have been of service in the protection of our country and its liberties. Nothing could be more discouraging than to come back to the States and find some of our liberties in a state of decay. I am sure you are aware of the fact that almost all soldiers, sailors, and marines are opposed to the dictatorship of labor unions. We can't help but feel that the power they have had has been allied with our enemies in fighting against us. Is their purpose really to protect the workers? It appears that now their aim is to destroy the personal freedom of the common man.

Why cannot our Government, elected and supported by the citizens of our democracy, control the ever-rising and revolutionary powers of labor management? Is it afraid to oppose the political powers already gained by labor management? Even though these powers are apparently subversive to the constitutional rights? Is it going to betray the men and women who have fought for its preservation these past 4 years?

I hope not. All servicemen hope not. And I feel that you also hope not; hope not enough to use your respected influence among your colleagues to bring about a Nation of individual liberties that all members of the armed forces will be glad to return to and call their own.

Sincerely yours,

L. W. MCNEIL.

The Bible in a World Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. EATON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 11, 1945

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over the National Broadcasting Co., at Washington, D. C., on December 9, 1945:

Since its founding 129 years ago, the American Bible Society has distributed nearly 350,000,000 copies of the Bible, or portions of the Bible. During the Second World War the society was responsible for the distribution among our armed forces, at home and abroad, of more than eight and one-half million copies of the Bible in whole or in portions.

Either as a complete volume or in selected portions the Bible is now being printed and read in 1,068 languages. And the publishing of the Bible has become far and away the greatest publishing business in the world.

Viewed against the menacing background of postwar world conditions, these statistics are of profound significance. If reading the Bible becomes a daily habit among the peoples of the world, common moral ideals and spiritual energies will be liberated, which may, and probably will, determine the common destiny of mankind.

We are accustomed to think of the Bible as primarily a ministry or message addressed to the individual alone. It does give consolation to the sorrowing; comfort to those who suffer; courage to the fearful; strength to the weak. It enthrones faith. It inspires love. It kindles and illumines the mind. It stills the storms of passion and hate. It reveals the meaning and purpose of human existence. It fortifies the spirit to meet the mystery and might of death.

So long as the individual is compelled, by the laws of nature, to defend his personal existence and identity against the stark mass of the physical universe, in which he functions as an infinitesimal atom—so long will the truths of the Bible strengthen and sustain him in his unequal struggle.

All this is gloriously true. But the world today finds itself in the clutch, and under the curse of circumstances never before experienced. Emphasis has been shifted from the individual to the mass. The rights, the duties, the very; identity of the individual are in danger of being absorbed by, and lost in the mass. For more than a generation the civilized world has been living in a climate of continuous conflict—class against class, nation against nation, race against race. Two world wars, the most costly and destructive in all history, have shaken every political, economic, social, and spiritual institution to its foundations.

These appalling conflicts are like the cosmic convulsions between geologic ages. We are left to grope our uncertain way through a no man's land of universal confusion, lying between two ages. One carried on the sombre wings of frustration and failure toward final extinction. The other, as yet shadowed by uncertainty and fear, challening mankind to set foot upon unknown and untried pathways which lead we know not wither.

In this troubled time of transition and change, one fact stands out like a fixed star in a midnight sky. We have come at last to a world age, the duties and difficulties and dangers of which can only be met by the creation of a world civilization. It is self-evident that no world civilization can successfully function unless it is foundationed upon, and governed by universal moral law, universally accepted. Such a moral law capable of universal acceptance and observance is set forth in the Ten Commandments of the old Testament and the Golden Rule of the New Testament. It is equally self-evident that if universal acceptance of this universal moral law is to be achieved, illiteracy must be abolished everywhere; the Bible must be translated into all languages, and Bible reading must become a common practice among all peoples.

Groups of individuals, great societies, and even races of men are held together by a variety of common motives, interests, and ideals. These change with the passing of time and the vicissitudes of progress or decay. But the ultimate social binder which makes a cohesive human society possible is spiritual, operating in the realm of human affairs, just as the law of gravitation rules in the physical universe. When this spiritual unifying force is weakened or ceases to function societies fall apart and confusion reigns until a new constructive spiritual force is liberated.

We have a disquieting example of this in our own country at the present time. Hitherto we have achieved a unique national unity by the practically universal acceptance of a common moral standard which had its origin in the teachings of the Bible. But this common sense of moral obligation—and moral standard of personal conduct has become obscured and, in countless cases, repudiated and abandoned. In its place there is in process of adoption the antisocial and anti-Biblical delusion of every man for himself—every group, every interest, every class for itself.

This condition of spiritual chaos will find its cure in a return to and a renewed acceptance of the teachings of the Bible.

On June 26 in San Francisco the delegates of 51 nations signed what is known as the Charter of the United Nations Organization. After 8 weeks of continuous conference and frank discussion these representatives of 51 nations, representing every conceivable variety of social, economic, and spiritual ideas and ideals, reached a completely unanimous agreement. The ultimate basis of this agreement was the acceptance by all of a common moral judgment as to the folly and wickedness of war—and of a common moral obligation to foundation our new world civilization upon law, justice, freedom, and cooperation rather than upon brute force.

What we did in San Francisco was of course only the beginning of a world policy which may take a hundred years of trial and error to fully implement. But our great fundamental achievement was the formulation and acceptance of a common moral standard for the governance of world-wide international relations. By our united determination to prevent the outbreak of war anywhere in the world we accepted the principles that injury by war inflicted upon any one nation means injury to all nations.

This enthronement of a common moral standard by and for the world will lead, as time passes, to acceptance and more complete understanding of those deathless spiritual impulses which are common to all men everywhere regardless of breed, creed, or condition.

First of these impulses is the universal urge in all ages and under all conditions, for men to seek a conscious relationship with their Creator. This is the impulse, to satisfy which the great religions of the world have been developed; not to mention a multitude of superstitions and cults.

The history of man is a record of alternating periods of progress and reaction, growth and decay. In this it follows the pattern of nature with its periods of light and darkness; its changing tides and seasons. Four hundred years ago the old world was lifted out of the Dark Ages by an intellectual return

to the great Mediterranean culture and by a renewed spiritual response to the message of the Bible as the word of God. This revival of learning and widespread interest in and loyalty to the teachings of the Bible, coupled with the discovery of new worlds, liberated great progressive and constructive spiritual forces which gave us four centuries of unparalleled progress.

In this hour of world-wide stress and trial we find ourselves once more under the shadow of a new dark age. We have created a material civilization which by its very magnitude and complexity threatens to destroy its creators. We have built what we proudly acclaim the most wonderful machine ever devised; but no individual and no government seems to have brains and character enough to run it without wrecking the very institution it was intended to serve. The work of our hands has outgrown our power of mental and moral control.

We may take comfort and courage in one historic reality. Just as Nature abhors a vacuum so in the history of man whenever there has occurred a spiritual vacuum, such as now seems to have overtaken us, there has always flowed in from the infinite spiritual resources of the Divine Creator a new energy to fill the vacuum and start men once more toward the light.

We have come at last to a world age. A universal age. This universal age must have as its foundation a universal moral law, universally accepted if the world is to escape being returned to primal chaos. The Bible contains the one supreme universal philosophy known to man. It begins with God the Creator of the heavens and the earth and the Father of the race of man. It ends with the same universal fatherhood. It proclaims a common moral and spiritual code for all men. I believe it contains the key to a future of cooperation and brotherhood for all men in a world age activated by a word civilization, based upon a common moral code.

These are great days—days that try men's souls. But in the Bible we find a source of hope and faith—which, if we can accept it and make it our own, will bring us once more to that great moment when with the entire brotherhood of man we can proclaim—

"We have seen the powers of darkness take
their flight,
We have seen the morning break."

Cum Laude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 11, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, when, after a long and distinguished service, a member of the official staff of the House retires from public service to enjoy a well-earned vacation, we release him with mingled pleasure and regret—pleasure that his service is crowned with so richly a merited recognition of duty well performed—and regret that we are to lose a man whose long training and experience makes him well nigh indispensable.

But perhaps the uppermost consideration at the time is our sense of personal loss in the departure of a man whose intimate personal association has endeared him to all who have come in contact with him in social and official capacities.

That is particularly true of the retirement of one of the most valued men on the staff of the Committee on Appropriations, our friend, the friend of every Member of the House, James F. Scanlon.

Service on the staff of the Committee on Appropriations is particularly strenuous and exacting. It is especially true of the arduous duties so successfully handled by Jim Scanlon, in which not only a high degree of technical skill but rare tact and diplomacy are essential. His oversight and supervision relieved the members of the committee of a great deal of administrative work which otherwise would have devolved on the chairmen and members of the subcommittees. Knowing that all details would have to pass his critical scrutiny, they could leave to him many matters of routine which otherwise would have added materially to the burden of their already heavy committee work.

But if we must lose him, it is a matter of gratification that he is retiring while he yet has before him many years in which to devote his time and attention to matters and interests in which he is particularly gifted.

Mr. Scanlon has served with the committee for more than a quarter of a century. In that time he has helped to write important chapters in the history of the fiscal affairs of the Nation. He has made a record to which both he and the committee can always look back with pride and gratification. As he takes leave of his life's work, our warmest regard and affection go with him. We wish for him and Mrs. Scanlon good luck, good health, the continued happiness of achievement, and Godspeed.

Free and Unfettered Elections in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 11, 1945

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, recently the Marshal Joseph Pilsudski Society, of Chicopee, Mass., has communicated with me relative to the plight of the people of Poland and their present government. The members of the society feel that if President Truman's Navy Day pledges are fulfilled, America will regain its world leadership and Poland and other valiant allies in the present war will have received just treatment which may otherwise be denied them. They ask that our State Department demand withdrawal of allied controlling forces from Poland in order that this unhappy country might have a chance for true freedom and democracy.

I am sure that all persons who are interested in the welfare of the people in stricken Poland will be interested in the reply of Secretary of State James F. Byrnes to my letter requesting a statement from him of information now available to the State Department. His reply brings information which is not generally known and which I hope indicates that before many months have elapsed the people of Poland will be given a free and unfettered opportunity to express without coercion the type of government which they wish to set up and to establish a constitution under which they would like to live.

The letter of the Secretary of State is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 10, 1945.

The Honorable CHARLES R. CLASON,
House of Representatives

MY DEAR MR. CLASON: I have received your letter of November 27, 1945, forwarding a communication from one of your constituents regarding conditions in Poland.

It is understood that the number of Soviet troops in Poland has been substantially reduced and that a considerable proportion of these forces, stationed in Poland on the basis of an arrangement with the Polish Government, remain in connection with the two lines of communication between the Soviet Union and the Soviet zone in Germany.

The policy of the United States Government in regard to Poland has been, and now is, steadfastly guided by understanding sympathy for the interests of the Polish people. This attitude, which envisages the existence of a strong, free and independent Polish state, motivated the recognition by this Government on July 5, 1945, of the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity, which was formed as a result of consultations between democratic leaders from within Poland and from abroad and which, at the time of recognition, accepted in their entirety the decisions of the Crimea Conference on the Polish question. The Polish Provisional Government thereby affirmed its intention of holding free elections, pursuant to the formation of a Polish Government.

In order to ensure conditions whereby Poland may establish a government of its own choice, this Government will continue to press for free and unfettered elections.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BYRNES.

Address of Hon. Meier Steinbrink

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 11, 1945

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Meier Steinbrink, justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, at the memorial services of Brooklyn Lodge, No. 22, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, on December 7, 1945, at Brooklyn, N. Y.:

It is exactly 4 years ago this very day that the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor occurred, and, as a result, our Nation found itself thrust into World War II. That war has now ended, but in the course of it hundreds of thousands of lives have been sacrificed and many of our own brethren and the sons and brothers of members have made the supreme sacrifice.

Tonight we gather in this meeting place made sacred by the very purpose for which we have assembled to pay tribute in an atmosphere of solemnity and patriotic devotion to those of our fellow members who have gone to that land from which no traveler has yet returned and where—our faith leads us to believe—the best of life is yet to come.

We have come together to memorialize those who have gone to their eternal rest. Nothing that anyone can say to their beloved could possibly beguile them from their loss, and yet, in the words of the immortal Lincoln, "Theirs must be a solemn pride for having laid so costly a sacrifice on God's altar."

A life well spent is a life worth remembering, and it has been a beautiful custom in our fraternity to gather annually as a mark of respect to those whom we count as faithful brethren and as faithful friends. So far as it relates to them, this meeting affords the opportunity for acknowledgment of the debt of gratitude that is due from us to those who have preceded us.

Sorrow for the dead is the only sorrow from which we refuse to be divorced. In our efforts to assuage grief for the loss of some loved one opportunities are constantly sought to extol the character, to enumerate the virtues, and to recount the achievements of those whose memory is held in affectionate remembrance.

Those whom we memorialize tonight were part of this fraternal order, and as such their affiliation testified to their good character and their faith. But faith without works is dead. Honest belief leads to worthy action. Faith in an all-wise and all-loving God should move toward excellencies of conduct that make God real in everyday affairs.

Religion through ritual alone is utterly worthless unless a desire for service and self-sacrifice follows. If we are to live up to the full measure of our opportunities, then no worthy cause should escape our attention and no religion should invite our scorn. The full man is not the perfect man, is not compressed into a mold. He sees beyond the horizon of denominationalism. He can see beauty in the blessed sacraments of the Roman Catholic Church; he can see the glories in all branches of the Protestant faith; and he can feel the throb of prophecy in the atmosphere of the synagogue.

A true Elk deplores divisions while sensing their values. Religious labels alone we should detest. What we want is what is best beneath the labels, and whatever involves human well-being should command our strength, our support, and our compassion.

Death is always a most unwelcome visitor, and yet we recognize it as inevitable. It was not my privilege to have known all these brothers whom we memorialize on this day, but this I am certain of: Each in his sphere was loved and was revered.

Had they lived 100 years earlier, I should have thought that Owen Meredith, frequently referred to as Lord Lytton, had them in mind when he penned these beautiful lines:

"I wish I could get you at least to agree
To take life as it is, and consider with me
If it be not all smiles that it is not all sneers,
It admits honest laughter and needs honest tears.

God means every man to be happy, be sure;
He sends us no sorrows that have not some cure.
Our duty down here is to do, not to know,
Live as though life were earnest, and life will be so.

Let each moment like time's last ambassador come,
It will wait to deliver its message, and some
Sort of answer it merits. It is not the deed
A man does but the way that he does it should plead
For the man's compensation in doing it."

It was, I am sure, in this spirit that they lived; it was in this spirit that they died. A smile that lingers in memory is a manifestation of immortality. When man writes "ended," God writes "begin."

Today we are living and moving in a world of chaos. Our Nation has just emerged from the throes of conflict. Compared with the war we have just ended the First World War was but a prelude to action. In World War II the battlefront was thousands of miles away. Now the battlefront is here and everywhere.

Today it is not a war to make the world safe for democracy; it is a war to save democracy, to keep the light of freedom burning as a light in the dark, to keep the law of justice as a pillar of flame leading men together on to an abiding place of peace.

Forgive me if for a moment I seem to digress. And yet what more appropriate occasion can there be for expression of patriotism than when we are sober and serious minded during a memorial hour.

The Allied Nations have fought the powers of darkness. Those of the Axis would have turned the clock back to the Dark Ages. The Nazi way of death was the spread of an ideology which preached the domination of any one group, be it a group of class, race, religion, or nationality over all other groups.

We have learned through past and bitter experience that the only way to combat the gangster individual or a gangster nation is by drastic action, by routing out the gangs, lock, stock, and barrel, and an extirpation of the gang rule idea by a strict allegiance to law and order and to a belief of all men in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

It is for this American ideal that many, many thousands have been sacrificed while hundreds of thousands of others stood ready to pay the price, if the need were there, that our Government and our institutions might continue to live.

Being an American is not a matter of common race, common nationality, or common religion but of a common belief in an ideal of equal treatment and equal opportunity for all. The Bill of Rights applies to all within our borders. We are a law-abiding nation, not a law-fearing nation, and our laws are for all of us—Americans by birth, Americans by choice, or even the stranger within our gates. That is the democracy of the living just as death is the democracy of the dead.

Many years ago at the time of the outbreak of the Civil War, America's foremost orator wrote these words. They might have been spoken after Pearl Harbor. Said he:

"The past rises before me like a dream. Again we are in the great struggle for national life. We hear the sounds of preparation, the music of boisterous drums, the silver voices of heroic bugles. We see thousands of assemblages and hear the appeals of orators. We see the pale cheeks of women and the flushed faces of men, and in those assemblages we see all the dead whose dust we have covered with flowers. We lose sight of them no more. We are with them when they enlist in the great army of freedom. We see them part with those they love. Some are walking for the last time in quiet, woody places with the maidens they adore. We hear the whisperings and the sweet vows of eternal love as they lingeringly part forever. Others are bending over cradles, kissing babes that are asleep. Some are receiving the blessings of old men. Some are parting with mothers who hold them and press them to their hearts again and again and say nothing. Kisses and tears; tears and kisses, divine mingling of agony and joy. And some are talking with wives and endeavoring with brave words, spoken in the old tone, to drive from their hearts the awful fear. We see them part. We see the wife standing in the door with the babe in her arms, standing in the sunlight sobbing. At the turn in the road a hand waves. She answers by holding high in her loving arms the child. He is gone and gone forever. We see them all as they march proudly away under the floating flag, keeping time to the grand, wild music of war, marching down the streets of the great cities through the towns and across the prairies, down to the fields of glory to do and to die for eternal right."

But now the war is over, and now you and I must see a vision. It is a vision of the future. We see our country eventually filled with happy homes, with firesides of content foremost of all the earth. We see a world where thrones have crumbled and kings and dictators are dust. The aristocracy of idleness has perished from the earth. We see a world without a slave. Men are at last free.

We see a world at peace, adorned with every form of art, with music's myriad voices thrilled, a world in which no ill exists, a world on which the gibbet's shadow does not fall nor is the guillotine called into play, a world where labor reaps its full reward, a world without the beggar's outstretched arm, a race without disease of flesh or brain.

And as we look, life lengthens, joy deepens, love canopies the earth, and over all there shines the star of human hope. How much of that vision or dream shall yet come true remains for those of this generation to say.

In the world today there is an insurrection without parallel. It stands unique among all the reported revolts against civilization. It is a point of difference which has never in my lifetime received the emphasis which it now has. It is perhaps best exemplified in the words of him who was the dictator of the German Nation which are to be found in his book Mein Kampf, in which he said, "We are not against the hundred and one different kinds of Christianity; we are against Christianity itself."

No nation has ever lived which has been Godless, and the conflict just ended has brought men of all faiths back to a recognition of the fundamentals of their faiths. The biblical doctrine, "Have we not all one father?" is basic with Catholic, Protestant, and Jew. It is the teaching of all the great faiths of the world, and it is in the light of this faith that tonight especially we stand with bowed heads and say:

"Is there beyond the silent night an endless day?
Is death a door that leads to light? We cannot say.
The tongueless secret locked in fate?
We do not know, we watch and wait."

It may be that there are still dark days ahead, but as always the sun shines in all its splendor after a night of storm. The storm has broken, it has subsided, but let us vow by the memory of those who have fallen that we shall face with courage and determination everything that may come in order that our children, our children's children and the generations yet unborn may live here in peace and harmony under the blessings of the finest form of government that was ever conceived by the brain of man.

May these thoughts, out of the ageless wisdom of man reaching across the centuries, have their message for us in this hour of our questioning and of memorial, and help us in the shadows to find light and, above all, the realization that it is only dust that surrenders unto dust; that love is stronger than the grave, and that through the majesty and genius of our love we shall have life abide with life.

Prayerfully we ask of the Heavenly Father of us all that we be given the will, the determination, the persistence to finish the task while we are here, and when our time comes to pass on, to hand the lighted lamp to those who are younger than we and who are to follow us in the race of lighted lamps.

May the souls of our departed brethren and of our own be quickened and may our children's and our own courage be renewed by the blessed example of those who have passed beyond. May we continue to perform faithfully God's work until the task is done. Then we shall find it in our hearts and upon our lips to repeat in graciousness, in submission and in faith the words of the ancient prophets, "The Lord has given; the Lord has taken. Blessed be the name of the Lord."

President Truman's Health Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 11, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the professional medical politicians, headed by Dr. Morris Fishbein, have been hollering "socialism," "communism," "totalitarianism," and similar epithets at President Truman's health plan. Anyone who reads this message carefully realizes how ridiculous those who mouth these phrases make themselves.

But the crowning blow to these wild and irresponsible charges came recently when a group of distinguished Americans ran as a paid ad in the Washington Star and Washington Post a statement endorsing the President's plan. This statement was signed by such well-known "Socialists," "Communists," and "totalitarians" as Gerard Swope, of the General Electric Co.; David Sarnoff, president of the Radio Corp. of America; Lessing Rosenwald, of Sears, Roebuck & Co.; Bernard Gimbel, president of Gimbel Bros.; Gardner Cowles, publisher, of Des Moines; Barry Bingham, publisher, of Louisville; and Bartley Crum, attorney, of San Francisco. The complete statement and list of signers are as follows:

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S HEALTH PLAN WOULD INCREASE PRODUCTIVITY, REDUCE DISEASE, SAVE LIVES

We have read his message to Congress. We endorse it.

A NATIONAL HEALTH PLAN

We have read and strongly approve President Truman's message proposing a national health program. Many messages have been sent by Presidents on the state of the Nation, but this is a message on the state of the people of this Nation, the first full-length Presidential message on health ever submitted to Congress.

TO BE ADMINISTERED LOCALLY

We commend this plan for national health insurance to be administered locally, with free choice of doctor and hospitals for the people and professional freedom for physicians. This is a thoroughly American plan, consistent with our tradition of using government to aid the people in doing things for themselves. We agree with the President that voluntary health insurance will not "meet more than a fraction of our people's needs."

NOT "SOCIALIZED" MEDICINE

We agree also with his statement that "the American people are the most insurance-minded people in the world. They will not be frightened off from health insurance because opponents have misnamed it 'socialized' medicine."

FEDERAL AID THROUGH STATES

We support his recommendations for Federal aid through the States, for the construction of hospitals, for medical research and education, for the care of the needy, and for the extension of needed preventive, maternal and child-health services to every part of the country.

LEGISLATION BY CONGRESS

We would like to see the recommendations of the message promptly carried out by Congress through legislation. This program will increase productivity, reduce disease, and save lives. The income and the professional facilities of the average physician will be improved. The benefits to the health of the American people will far outweigh the costs; in fact, most of the costs are merely the regularization of existing expenditures.

We are glad that many groups, including organized labor, have already approved the principles supported by the President. We sign this endorsement as individuals.

We urge Congress to prompt action.

Signers of the endorsement:

Gerard Swope, General Electric Co., New York.
David Sarnoff, president, Radio Corp. of America, New York.
Lessing J. Rosenwald, Sears, Roebuck & Co., Philadelphia.
Bernard Gimbel, president, Gimbel Bros., New York.
James Roosevelt, Los Angeles.
Gardner Cowles, publisher, Des Moines.
Barry Bingham, publisher, Louisville.
Raymond Swing, radio commentator, New York.
Norman Cousins, editor, New York.
Cecil Brown, radio commentator, New York.
Albert D. Lasker, New York.
F. O. Watt, banker, St. Louis.
Guy Emerson, banker, New York.
Anna M. Rosenberg, labor public relations consultant, New York.
Mrs. Sidney Borg, New York.
Edwin R. Embree, president, Julius Rosenwald Fund, Chicago.
George C. Hatch, general manager, Intermountain Network, Ogden, Utah.
David Heyman, financier, New York.
Fred M. Stein, banker, New York.
Evans Clark, director, Twentieth Century Fund, New York.
Howard L. Tiger, vice president, the Permutit Co., New York.
Elizabeth S. Magee, National Consumers League, Cleveland.
Ted Patrick, advertising, New York.
Henry L. McCarthy, Council of American Business, Washington.
Sidney Hollander, Baltimore.
Samuel Rubin, president, Faberge, Inc., New York.
W. H. Weintraub, advertising, New York.
William K. Sherwood, president, North American Trade Consultants, New York.
V. Henry Rothschild, 2d, attorney, New York.
Morris S. Rosenthal, executive vice president, Stein Hall Co., New York.
Chester Rowell, editor, San Francisco.
Judge Francis E. Rivers, New York.
Frank Jaros, vice president, Compolite, Inc., Brooklyn.
Gerald Morgan, Hyde Park, N. Y.
Paul L. Ross, formerly regional director, OPA, New York.
Victor Roudin, International Theatrical & Television Corp., New York.
Helen Hall, Henry Street Settlement, New York.
Meyer Parodneck, president, Consumer-Farmer Milk Cooperative, Inc., New York.
Paul Kellogg, editor, New York.
Percy S. Brown, Good Will Fund, Boston.
William Morris, theatrical agent, New York.
Mady Christians, actress, Connecticut.
Victor Trascff, artist, New York.
Irving Caesar, author-composer, New York.
John Cromwell, film director, Beverly Hills, Calif.
Thomas Craven, art critic, New York.
Agnes Smedley, writer, Saratoga Springs, N. Y.
Alexi Maieff, composer, Saratoga Springs, N. Y.
Fiorello H. LaGuardia, mayor, New York City.
James M. Patton, National Farmers Union, Denver.
Caroline Dudley Morgan Smith White, Cranbury, N. J.
Alma Clayburgh, singer, New York.
Artur Schnabel, pianist, New York.
Edward Chodorov, playwright, New York.
Eliott Nugent, actor, New York.
Fredric March, actor, New York.
Rex Stout, writer, New York.
Carl Van Doren, author, New York.
Hans Rademacher, educator, Swarthmore College.
John A. Kingsbury, Woodstock, N. Y.
Leonard Bernstein, composer and conductor, New York.
Lee Brody, actress, New York.
Leopold Mannes, musician, New York.
Norman Corwin, writer and producer, New York.
Dorothy Norman, columnist, New York.
Thomas Mann, writer, Santa Monica, Calif.
Morris Llewellyn Cooke, consulting engineer, Washington.
Adele Rosenwald Levy, New York.
Wallace Clark, consulting engineer, New York.
John D. Black, economist, Harvard University.
Max Radin, professor of law, University of California.
Charles E. Merriam, political scientist, University of Chicago.
Bartley Crum, attorney, San Francisco.
Leo J. Linder, attorney, New York.
Martin Popper, National Lawyers Guild, Washington.
William H. Roever, mathematician, Washington University, St. Louis.
C Fayette Taylor, engineer, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Meyer Bernstein, under sheriff of New York.
Rev. William O. Easton, Council of Christian Education, Philadelphia.
Robert W. Kenny, attorney general of Sacramento, Calif.
Hunter Delatour, president, Brooklyn Bar Association.
Paul A. Dodd, economist, University of California, Los Angeles.
Michael M. Davis, medical economist, New York.
Samuel C. May, political scientist, University of California.
Stephen P. Duggan, educator, New York.
Aaron Copland, composer, New York.
Leonard Erlich, writer, Saratoga Springs, New York.
Roger N. Baldwin, American Civil Liberties Union, New York.
Neil Lieblich, State war ballot commission, New York.
Ernest A. Hauser, chemist, Harvard University.
John Eric Hill, Museum of Natural History, New York.
F. D. Patterson, president, Tuskegee Institute, Alabama.
Roswell G. Ham, president, Mount Holyoke College, Massachusetts.
William O'Dwyer, mayor-elect, New York City.
Jo Davidson, sculptor, New York.
John Dewey, educator, New York.
Vilhjalmur Stefansson, employer, New York.
Channing Frothingham, M. D., Boston.
Alice Hamilton, M. D., Hadlyme, Conn.
Harry A. Millis, economist, University of Chicago.
J. Douglas Brown, economist, Princeton University.
Charles S. Johnson, sociologist, Fisk University, Nashville.
Edwin E. Witte, economist, Madison, Wis.
Justice Hubert Delaney, New York.
Nedwin Smokler, attorney, Detroit.
Robert S. Lynd, sociologist, Columbia University.
William F. Ogburn, sociologist, University of Chicago.
John P. Peters, M. D., New Haven.
Allan M. Butler, M. D., Boston.
Ernst P. Boas, M. D., New York.
R. M. Walls, D. D. S., Bethlehem, Pa.
John Oppie McCall, D. D. S., New York.
Thomas G. Addis, M. D., San Francisco.
Frank Goldmann, M. D., New Haven.
Mary Dublin Keyserling, Washington.

Kingsley Roberts, M. D., New York.
Harold M. Phillips, attorney, New York.
N. Kobrin, D. D. S., New York.
Alfred Walker, D. D. S., Miami Beach.
Marvin C. Harrison, attorney, Cleveland.
Benjamin Algase, attorney, New York.
Alfred J. Asgis, D. D. S., New York.
Rev. Stephen H. Fritchman, Boston.
Basil G. Bibby, D. D. S., dean, Tufts Dental School, Boston.
John A. Slade, attorney, Saratoga Springs, N Y.
Justice Arthur P. McNulty, New York.
Abel Wolman, doctor, public health, Baltimore.
Bertram M. Bernheim, medical doctor, Baltimore.
C.-E. A. Winslow, doctor, public health, New Haven.
Russell Davenport, author, New Haven.
Ray Stannard Baker, historian, Amherst, Mass.
Stuart Chase, author, Connecticut.
Ulric Bell, writer, New York.
Robert Ardrey, playwright, California.
Henry Billings, artist, New York.
Louis Adamic, writer, New Jersey.
William Zorach, sculptor, New York.
Lowell Mellett, columnist, Washington.
Louis S. Weiss, attorney, New York.
Louis F. McCabe, attorney, Philadelphia.
Agnes H. Schroeder, medical social worker, Cleveland.
Theron Bamberger, theatrical producer, New York.
Kermit Bloomgarden, producer and manager, New York.
Hope S. Bagger, teacher-writer, New York.
Jules J. Justin, public member, War Labor Board, New York.
Bertha C. Reynolds, social worker, New York.
Ethel H. Wise, New York.
Kurt Adler, opera conductor, New York.
Henry Seidel Canby, literary critic, New York.
Ilka Chase, writer, New York.
Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, New York.
William Rose Benet, editor and writer, New York.
Ralph Barton Perry, educator, Harvard University.
Mary K. Simkhovitch, Greenwich House, New York.
Gertrude F. Zimand, National Child Labor Committee, New York.
Ruth Emerson, medical social worker, Chicago.
Johannes Steel, radio commentator, New York.
Ben Grauer, radio announcer, New York.
Sigmund Spaeth, musician, New York.
Marc Connelly, playwright, New York.
Leland Stowe, radio commentator, New York.
Quincy Howe, radio commentator, New York.
William S. Gailmor, radio commentator, New York.
Barbara N. Armstrong, professor of law, University of California.
Donald Dushane, educator, Washington.
Mary McLeod Bethune, president, National Council of Negro Women, Washington.
Fanny Hurst, writer, New York.
Charles H. Colvin, engineer, New York.
Bart J. Bok, astronomer, Harvard University.
Michael Heidelberger, biochemist, Columbia University.
Carolyn Slade, novelist, Saratoga Springs, New York.
Bernard Hart, theatrical producer, New York.
Harvey Harris, attorney, New York.
Alex B. Novikoff, biologist, Brooklyn College.
Magistrate Anna Kross, New York.
Howard Vermilyea, actor, New York.
E. H. Greibach, physicist, White Plains, N. Y.
Peter Blume, artist, Connecticut.
Louis B. Boudin, attorney, New York.
Philip Evergood, artist, New York.
Rudolph Ganz, conductor, Chicago.
Martin Gabel, theatrical producer, New York.
Oscar K. Rice, educator, University of North Carolina.
Philip R. White, Rockefeller Institute, Princeton.
Judge Nathan R. Sobel, New York.
Robert Chambers, biologist, New York University.
William Standard, attorney, New York.
Victor D'Amico, educator, New York.
Alonzo F. Myers, educator, New York University.
Carol King, attorney, New York.
Milton Paulson, attorney, New York.
Hazel Scott, pianist, New York.
George Zukor, producer, Hollywood.
Ordway Tead, educator, New York.
Kenenth S. M. Davidson, physicist, Stevens Institute of Technology, New Jersey.
Benjamin E. Youngdahl, dean, School of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis.
Herbert E. Phillips, D. D. S., Chicago.
Struthers Burt, author, California.

The Tire Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 11, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a constant barrage, telegrams and letters, from the State which I represent, protesting the shipment of all tires to Europe until such time as the people of this country have been reasonably well taken care of with replacements. There is particular distress expressed in farm regions where farming has been put on a mechanized basis and the need is very great for truck tires for tractors and other heavy machinery.

Months ago we were advised that when the gigantic plants produced by the Government for the production of synthetic tires were in operation, there would be an abundance of tires. Strangely, this situation has never come to full realization. Always, each month there is a continual explanation for not having tires. Certainly with the general character of brains we have in this country to make tires, together with the plant facilities, at this date there can no longer prevail a condition which prevents the use of tires by the domestic population.

I am sometimes concerned as to whether or not the Government has given the go-ahead sign to make synthetic tires in this country in full production. At the same time that the country cries out for tires, we find certain amounts being shipped to Europe, although the departments advise us that the number going to Europe is only about 1 percent.

While I recognize that in all probability the Government must send tires to Europe for use in the occupied zones, I fully recognize as well that the commercial cars of Europe perhaps feel the need of tires also.

The problem that confronts America is not factory ingenuity or capacity. Something has held up tire production from the very inception of synthetic tires. We should build in the United States a great tire industry, making it possible to make synthetic tires. The industry should be supported by adequate tariff protection, and this should be done at once. It is inconceivable that with the capacity we possess, that anyone in the United States, and especially farmers now so badly in need of them, should struggle along, driving to market with their livestock and other products on tires now many years old. The United States is a country of transportation, whether it be in the rural sections or the urban sections. A survey of the tire situation in the United States is already overdue.

Yanks Sleep on Deck in Rain While India Students Get Cabins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 11, 1945

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a news item by the International News Service and appearing in a local newspaper last week.

I quote the item:

YANKS SLEEP ON DECK IN RAIN WHILE INDIA STUDENTS GET CABINS

NEW YORK, December 8.—Newly arrived American troops from India complained today that 58 soldiers had to sleep on rain-washed decks of the motorship *Torrens*, so cabins could be provided for 50 Indian students from Karachi.

The troops assailed Army brass hats and the State Department for permitting the sale of tickets for the foreign civilians' passage aboard the *Torrens*, which arrived yesterday.

Another arrival was the Greek vessel *Koundouriotic* out of Antwerp, with 28 United States troops aboard, which had to be towed to New York after drifting propellerless for 60 hours.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to me this is inexcusable and unthinkable. Here we have American soldiers who have fought through hard Asiatic and European campaigns to victory—victory that was achieved not only by the bloodshed and death of battle, but victory that was fraught with every hardship known to man—jungles, mountains, and monsoons; tropical sun, disease, and pestilence; fatigue and hunger—and now the American Government, acting through the United States Army, puts these American heroes out on the decks of a ship in more weather and cold and rain while 50 Indian students sleep in the luxury of staterooms. Mr. Speaker, it is a damnable disgrace.

In the first place, I would like to know why these students, or any civilians for that matter, are allowed space on troop ships when the Army and the Navy both tell us that the real bottleneck in

returning our boys home is the lack of shipping space? The good-neighbor policy is fine enough, but I believe that real charity and benevolence begins at home with our own people. Do not we know that instead of being thankful to the people of the United States for the consideration and gifts of food and clothing we have given to them most foreign countries are sorely cussing and condemning us because we do not give them more. And yet we put our own boys, one of them might be your son or mine, for all we know, out in the rain while these so-called students, spreaders of alien doctrines and theories, are given steamship cabins. Why should they have this preference over our own boys? I say keep all aliens at home until every last one of our own American GI's is back in his native land, the good old U. S. A.

Secretary of Navy Replies to Inquiry As To Suppression of Prostitution; Orders Compliance With Navy Policy—Japan Situation Cleaned Up — Letter Is Prompt Reply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 11, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I incorporate in my remarks a letter to me from the Secretary of the United States Navy under date of December 7, 1945. I do so because I heretofore referred in this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the letter from Chaplain Lacour, and I also set forth my letter of November 19, 1945, to the Secretary of the United States Navy.

The number of communications I have received since my remarks and letter on this subject clearly show that the people of America are hearing what is said here in Congress or placed in the RECORD and also, that they are concerned with the morality of their sons in the armed forces.

Since my letter to the Secretary of the Navy became public, I feel it due the Secretary and also our great Navy that his prompt answer to my letter also be given to the public for its guidance.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that paragraph 2 of this letter clearly and positively states what was done and that the long-established policy of the Navy is for the suppression of prostitution. I am very happy to have received this prompt and clear-cut reply by our Secretary. In closing my remarks I include the same:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, December 7, 1945.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOYLE: Kindly refer to your letter of November 19 relative to the open letter from Lawrence L. Lacour, chaplain, USNR, describing conditions of prostitution and sex laxity amongst naval personnel in the Yokosuka area, Japan.

I am pleased to advise you that, immediately on learning the situation at Yokosuka, an investigation was made and directives were issued ordering strict compliance with the long-established and documented Navy policy for the suppression of prostitution. This compliance has been secured, and all houses of prostitution have now been placed out of bounds. Parenthetically, it should be noted that the venereal disease rate for the fleet for the month of October was considerably lower than in the continental United States.

The investigation disclosed that an honest effort was made by the commanding officers to control an admittedly difficult situation by means of what at the time appeared most effective. In order to properly meet morale needs, it was imperative that liberty be granted to personnel. Because of the health and recreational problems presented, it was deemed advisable to place many sections of the city "out of bounds." Unfortunately, however, some houses of prostitution existed in the "in bounds" area; and, in order to protect the health of the men, prophylaxis stations were established where they would be most effective; and, in one instance, this was at the entrance to a house of prostitution. While such a procedure may have given the appearance of encouraging the patronage of a house of prostitution, in reality it should have served to remind the men of the hazards to be encountered in such patronage.

The Navy, has, for a number of years, made intensive educational efforts to indoctrinate all personnel regarding the dangers of prostitution, not only from a venereal disease standpoint, but also from the standpoint of the moral implications of promiscuous sex behavior. Continence has been urged as the only pattern that will absolutely protect against venereal disease. The Yokosuka and fleet commands involved, at an early date, reindoctrinated their personnel on the hazards they would encounter on liberty. What Chaplain Lacour observed was the result, in large part, of group pressures, sudden release of inhibitions long pent up by many months of hazardous sea duty, cessation of hostilities and the general let-down in morale stamina of all personnel, all occurring during the confusion incidental to the occupation of Japan by American forces.

While there has been a unanimity of opinion and in directives issued by the policy-making bodies of the Army, Navy, and Public Health Service that prostitution should be vigorously suppressed, there is a wide divergence of opinion on the matter among the rank and file of the services. This reflects the confused thinking of the American public in general on the subject. This confusion exists in spite of the considerable educational efforts that have been carried on in the last several years to enlighten the public as to the moral, social, and medical evils of prostitution.

You may be assured that the Navy Department will continue to do its utmost to protect the American ideals of home and family life. In this effort we earnestly urge that the whole citizenry accept their share of the responsibility for the behavior of its individual members.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

The Stilled Unknown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 11, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and poem:

UNION, N. J., *December 9, 1945.*

The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: In a recent issue of my copy of the National Legionnaire, I read where both you and the Honorable Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, of Colorado (whom I also addressed a copy of the enclosed), introduced a resolution in Congress, fostering an American Legion plan to have the bodies of two unknown of our Nation's heroes sent home from overseas and entombed in Arlington Cemetery.

The short poem enclosed expresses my sentiment of those brave men. It has never been published, so if in your opinion it is worthy of same, you are entitled to its use in whatever capacity you deem fit.

Trusting this poem will be of some value to you. Your comments on its worthiness will be most welcomed by me.

May I wish you success in your fight to perpetuate the memory of our Nation's heroes.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES A. SMITH.

THE STILLED UNKNOWN

Knew not the color of his skin,
His relatives or next of kin;
Never traced his family tree,
A product of the slums, or perhaps an F. F. V.
Matters little if of Puritan stock,
Or African slaves from the auction block;
His only claim to fame—that He'd been slain
So foes of freedom could never reign.

Question not while he does slumber
The name, address, or serial number.
Was he destined to be a future President?
From the State wherein a resident?
Matters little his religious creed—
The death was caused by men of greed.
His identity known to God alone,
Installed on throne—the stilled unknown.

Once more marching Mars caused human pain,
When thinkers plot, for their ravaged gain,
Lay they foreign fields with waste and strife
As brave youths are slain—by madmen's knife.
So once again they'll move that stone
And stilled unknown, you'll not be alone;
But joined by buddies of another war,
So rest with them in peace—O warrior of yore.

—*Charles A. Smith.*

Headquarters of United Nations Should Be Centrally Located at St. Louis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 11, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to print, I am inserting a letter from George C. Smith, president of the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce, relative to the location of the headquarters of the United Nations at Weldon Springs, adjacent to the city of St. Louis, as follows:

DECEMBER 10, 1945.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On November 5 I wrote you that we had written to Hon. E. R. Stettinius, United States representative, Preparatory Commission, United Nations, inviting his serious consideration of the Weldon Spring Ordnance Plant property near St.

Louis, and setting forth several reasons why we believed this site was particularly suitable as a location for the headquarters of the United Nations. I also stated that we were preparing a booklet for transmission to the members of the Preparatory Commission. It has just come from the printer and I am forwarding a copy to you under separate cover.

We believe that this property is particularly desirable as a United Nations Organization headquarters site because of the existence of the public utilities on the property. The water system, capable of taking care of a community of approximately a quarter of a million population, the steam-boiler plants with combined capacity of 720,000 pounds of steam per hour at 325 pounds per square-inch pressure, and the high-tension electric system, complete with fan-cooled transformers of 20,000-26,000 kilovolt-ampere capacity, are all installed and ready to operate. These utilities alone cost the United States Government approximately $15,000,000 and to reproduce them in the present material and labor situation might occasion a delay in the construction of headquarters at another location of 18 months or longer.

I would be very happy to have the benefit of any suggestions or comments you might care to make concerning our presentation to the United Nations.

Very truly yours,

GEO. C. SMITH,
President.

I trust the convincing statement of the president of the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce will have every consideration.

Soldier Lt. Joseph L. Lockard, of Pearl Harbor Fame, Says Congressional Investigation Asinine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. BUELL SNYDER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 11, 1945

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under privilege to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include some sentences taken from the Evening Star of December 6 on investigation of Pearl Harbor. The article follows:

PEARL HARBOR PROBE "ASININE" SAYS YANK WHO GAVE WARNING

NEW YORK, December 6.—The Herald Tribune said today that Joseph L. Lockard, has termed the congressional investigation of the Pearl Harbor attack "asinine."

Lockard, recently given an honorable discharge as a first lieutenant, was reached by telephone at his home in Williamsport, Pa., and the Herald Tribune quoted him as saying:

"I've been wanting to say this for years. Responsibility can't be pinned on any American. We have lost sight of one important fact—the Japanese were responsible for Pearl Harbor.

"I don't think the investigation is doing our country any good. I don't think it's doing our foreign relations any good either. We're in a very critical period now. The country is far from straightened out. Yet they'll take up the time of dozens of Senators investigating something of which the true perspective won't be apparent for at least 50 years.

"I don't see how or why you could blame America."

Be It Ever So Humble, There's No Place Like Home!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 11, 1945

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, a great poet has said:

A man's chimney is the golden milestone from which he measures every distance in the great world about him.

The soldier is returning from the battlefield; the sailor is returning from the sea. Each has been in far-away places. Each has measured distances from the golden milestone—his own chimney, his own home, or the home he dreamed of buying or building on his return from the battlefield or from the sea.

But, Mr. Speaker, this soldier and this sailor are not having much luck. If that be true now, what of the soldier and sailor who will return months from now? Certainly it is time that something constructive be done about this urgent matter. The hour is already tragically late, and everybody knows it.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, this is what the lumber trade stated a few days ago:

Last week the sawmills on the west coast sold 66,000,000 feet of American lumber to foreign countries. This is just 1 week's sales. This lumber would build 6,600 average-size homes here in the United States. There is no ceiling price enforced by the OPA on sales of American lumber to foreign buyers. The sawmills need higher prices to pay higher costs, so they are selling the lumber we need so desperately here at home to foreigners.

In the meantime the "little gray home in the West," or the East, or the North, or the South, which the soldier or sailor dreamed about, remains but an empty dream.

That is not all, Mr. Speaker. The lumber trade says further:

The Federal bureaucrats have had, since the end of the war, tied up in red tape at one base (Port Hueneme) on the west coast, 80,000,000 feet of lumber which they will not release. This lumber would build 8,000 homes for you people that need a roof over your head.

So, the Federal Government itself is doing its part in keeping the soldier's and the sailor's chimney just—a dream.

Mr. Speaker, let us now turn to what the National Retail Lumber Dealers Association with offices in Washington, D. C., has to say about this matter:

NATIONAL RETAIL LUMBER DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., December 7, 1945.
To Members of Congress:

Every Member of Congress wants to do something for housing, for construction, and for the returning veteran.

Every Member of Congress should know that the main problems of the building industry are, first, lack of materials and, second, manpower to do the construction jobs.

Every Member of Congress knows of the frantic legislation being proposed to allocate materials and to put further controls back on the building industry.

Let's be practical. If Congress wants to do something to help the building industry and the returning veteran to get a home and to help the construction industry, let it see to it that the export of lumber, one of our shortest building items, is stopped.

The attached letter to John W. Snyder points out that in 1945 approximately 750,000,000 board feet of lumber were exported to many foreign countries, much of it for the purpose of "maintaining export relations." This is in addition to lumber that was exported to our military establishments for the purpose of winning the war.

Seven hundred and fifty million board feet of lumber would have built between 75,000 and 100,000 badly needed dwelling units.

Congress should see to it that no more lumber is exported to any country for any purpose during the period of the construction emergency in our own country.

Very truly yours,

H. R. NORTHUP,
Secretary-Manager.

NATIONAL RETAIL LUMBER DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., December 6, 1945.

Mr. JOHN W. SNYDER,
Director, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, East Wing, White House, Washington, D. C.

Subject: Exports of lumber.

DEAR MR. SNYDER: Your office is engaged in investigations and in actions aimed toward a solution of the present problems of the construction industry, and as you have yourself indicated, you realize that probably the primary problem confronting the construction industry today is a shortage of materials necessary to enable the construction jobs to start.

You and your staff also are aware of the fact that one of the construction bottlenecks is the inability of the industry to secure the necessary construction items of lumber to even start the houses that are badly needed by people in every section of the country. In the absence of any assurance that the lumber production situation will be improved in any major degree before another 60 or 90 days, it becomes highly important to the retail lumber industry and the entire construction industry that whatever lumber is produced by the manufacturers be conserved to fill the critical domestic lumber needs of this country.

We, therefore, recommend that the exportation of lumber to foreign countries be immediately stopped.

Previous retail lumber industry objections to the continued export of lumber products have met with the statement by the War Production Board, and later by the Civilian Production Administration, that the amount of lumber being exported is a negligible amount considering the over-all lumber-production picture. This may be true. We are told that, in 1945, approximately 3 percent of the 1945 lumber production was for export; but expressed in board footage, this 3 percent will probably run in the neighborhood of 750,000,000 board-feet of lumber. This board-footage of lumber—were it available today or had it been available to the construction industry in 1945—would have provided enough lumber to have erected between 75,000 and 100,000 badly-needed dwelling units. We, therefore, say that regardless of the percentage of lumber being exported in relation to our over-all production, any lumber going for export is lumber that could be used by the construction industry to provide for emergencies that exist in the field of housing in the United States.

We are informed that throughout the war licenses to export lumber to certain Latin-American countries have been issued at the rate of about 15,000,000 feet of lumber per month to "maintain export relations." Again, regardless of the amount, we can see no need to maintain such relations at a time when we cannot take care of critical housing needs in the United States.

If and when we have in the United States a normal lumber production and a normal situation in relation to supply and demand, then we believe consideration should again be given to the matter of lumber for export.

The constructon industry is "taking it on the chin" from agencies of Government. and from the public to some extent, because of its inability to provide under present conditions a large volume of badly needed construction. If your office, plus the Civilian Production Administration and all other agencies of Government concerned with export and foreign relations, will see to it that in 1946 we do not ship another 750,000,000 board feet of a badly needed building material to nations outside this country. the construction industry will guarantee to you and to the American public the production of needed construction with every board foot of this lumber that you channel to domestic uses.

It is our understanding that authority for lumber export stems from the Second War Powers Act, and through your office to the Civilian Production Administration and the Department of Commerce, with the old Foreign Economic Administration functions of licensing shipments now being handled by the latter agency.

We are also informed that some time next week a joint meeting will be held by these agencies at which time the subject of allocations of lumber for export for the first quarter of 1946 will undoubtedly be discussed. We respectfully request that no allocations and no licenses for the export of lumber be issued for either the first or second quarter of 1946, and that after that time you again give consideration to export permits if conditions in the United States warrant.

Your office will be told that the items of lumber being exported cannot be used by the construction industry. The lumber manufacturers can readily manufacture a great proportion of the lumber now being exported into lumber items that the construction industry badly needs.

The primary job of the retail lumber industry is to build and to supply building materials to the home builders and the construction contractors of the United States. When our dealers attempt to procure for construction as much of the present production of lumber as they possibly can and are told by sellers of lumber that their needs cannot be met because those sellers have a more profitable export market, we believe that there is something definitely wrong with the picture.

One of the reasons retail lumber yard buyers are told this—one of the usual reasons why we have difficulty in procuring lumber—is namely, regulations of the Office of Price Administration. The Office of Price Administration makes it possible for export buyers of lumber to pay premiums to the manufacturers of lumber over and above the price which retail lumber yards can pay for the lumber and offer it to badly needed construction jobs. In our opinion, your Office should investigate the terms of OPA's export price regulations and that you should not accept the statement that OPA is simply allowing exporters their traditional markups, but you should dig into the fact that, regardless of their statements, premium prices are being paid to lumber manufacturers by representatives of foreign governments for items that we need here to do the building job.

We would very much appreciate an early indication that your Office will take steps to prohibit the further exportation of lumber until such time as our critical domestic housing situation shows signs of being alleviated.

Very truly yours,

H. R. NORTHUP,
Secretary-Manager.

Mr. Speaker, I beg and implore the Congress to deal with this most urgent and serious problem in a constructive manner. H. R. 4761, on which the Committee on Banking and Currency has held hearings for several days, is not the answer. Homes cannot be built without building materials and people who know how to build. These two factors—materials and labor—are basic. To rely on controls and allocations without paying first attention to increasing the supply of materials and trained labor is to fan the flames of runaway inflation. Those flames are already so hot that they threaten to destroy our economy. No economic disaster could be worse than runaway inflation. If there is anyone in the Congress or in the world who doubts that, he should turn the pages of at least one of the numerous tragic accounts that have been written by persons who have learned the truth from firsthand experience. May the Almighty save the American people from this monster.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I have said so often for so long a time—the solution to shortages is increased production, such greatly increased production as will make controls unnecessary. The soldier and the sailor are waiting for that sunrise. And so is many another American who did his best to sustain the soldier and the sailor while they fought to protect your home and mine, be it a palace or a cottage.

H. R. 4931, a Bill To Facilitate Purchases of Surplus Properties by Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to the bill I filed December 10. It is referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. An outline of the provisions is as follows:

First, Purchase at any Veterans' Surplus Property Center by any one veteran up to 5,000 in aggregate.

Second. This priority shall take priority over all other dispositions of surplus property, except dispositions under sections 12 and 13, and shall also take priority over dispositions to or by the Smaller War Plants Corporation under section 18.

Third. The prices shall not exceed the average cost of the property to the Government. Proper adjustment being made for wear and tear, condition, age, obsolescence.

Fourth. Immediate delivery of items purchased shall be made, if the items are in stock.

Fifth. At least once every 30 days notice of stock on hand, quantity, price, location, shall be given by the head of each veterans' surplus center—first, by newspapers of general circulation; second, posting in each post office in each judicial district; third, notifying each town or city clerk.

Sixth. At least one veterans' surplus property center shall be established in each judicial district in each State.

Seventh. At each of these veterans' surplus property centers shall be assembled and displayed items of serviceable surplus property, the items to be representative of all available surplus property available for sale and immediate delivery.

Eighth. This act to be administered by the Administrator.

The clear advantages of this bill are briefly stated as follows:

(a) It will give legitimate and sound opportunity for investment of cash had by the veterans with reasonable reward in terms of profit on resale; if he desires so to do, I have no objection to a veteran making a good money profit on his investment. For this profit will help him get into business or education or other opportunity "on his own" that much sooner.

(b) It will give the veterans themselves a definite, systematic available ways and means to learn what and where surplus property is to be offered and the prices thereof.

(c) It will give him a definite, specific priority—without any "ifs or ands." It is next immediately after priorities to governmental units; it is ahead of smaller war plants so the boys will have a chance to buy without competing with combinations having loads of money or pull or anything else which can get in ahead of the veterans themselves.

(d) It does not set up a new or different bureau or department. It accomplishes the desired results within the framework of already set-up administrative agencies.

(e) The sample display and sale in each judicial district in each State puts the stock pile and information and inspection and purchase within geographical reach of the veterans themselves. After all, the priorities are only as good for the veterans as is their opportunity to go and make a sound purchase. They are presently foreclosed in most cases, for they are located too far from the stock pile of surplus to go to the sale. So the dealers and buyers buy up in large quantities and then turn around and resell to the veterans themselves. Direct purchases by the veterans means more help to them and I am for it. These boys fought for us. I have every hope American businessmen will help the veterans reestablish themselves by helping the veterans to have every sound and sensible American opportunity to help themselves get reestablished. The veterans do not want charity nor sympathy.

For your fuller information I set forth the text of the bill itself:

H. R. 4931

A bill to facilitate purchases of surplus property by veterans

Be it enacted, etc., That section 16 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (relating to sales to veterans) is amended by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 16" and by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"(b) The Administrator is directed to provide by regulations for sales of surplus property to veterans under a program as follows:

"(1) In each Federal judicial district there shall be established at least one veterans' surplus property center (A) at which there shall be assembled, in sufficient quantities for sales for immediate delivery, and at which there shall be displayed, items of serviceable surplus property, the number of different

kinds of items to be reasonably representative of all the surplus property which is available for sale and is of a kind which can be sold for immediate delivery, and (B) from which sales by catalog or by sample of other kinds of surplus property will be made to veterans.

"(2) At least once every 30 days, the head of each veterans' surplus property center shall, by advertisement in newspapers of general circulation in the judicial district, by notice sent to each post office therein (such notice to be posted on the bulletin board of such post office), and by notice to the city clerk and the town clerk of each city and town in the district (such notice to be suitably posted by such clerk), inform veterans of representative items of surplus property available for sale at the center, and the prices thereof.

"(3) At each veterans' surplus property center, immediate delivery of items purchased by the veteran shall, at the option of the veteran (if such items are in stock at the center), be made.

"(4) The price to be charged for any item of surplus property sold to veterans shall not exceed the average cost of such property to the Government, proper adjustment being made for wear and tear, condition, age, and obsolescence.

"(5) The purchases which may be made at any veterans' surplus property center by any one veteran may not exceed $5,000 in the aggregate.

"(c) The requirements for surplus property of the veterans' surplus property centers shall take priority over all other dispositions of surplus property, except dispositions under sections 12 and 13, and shall also take priority over dispositions to or by the Smaller War Plants Corporation under section 18."

SEC. 2. The last sentence of section 18 (e) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 is amended by striking out "The" at the beginning of such sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as provided in section (c), the."

Postwar Programs of Democratic and Republican Parties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 12 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of the postwar programs of the Democratic and Republican Parties, delivered by Hon. Robert E. Hannegan, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, at a dinner held in Denver, Colo., on December 11, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I had intended to talk to you this evening about a program for America—about two programs, in fact; that of the Democratic Party and that of the Republican Party.

I had hoped to set these two programs, one against the other; to compare them so that voters in the important congressional elections which are now less than a year off might now begin thinking seriously about the issues between the two parties, basing their judgments directly on the stated positions of the parties themselves.

I am sorry that I cannot do so.

The Democratic Party's postwar program, as set forth in President Truman's recent messages to Congress and in his public statements, takes up the main problems confronting the country and deals with them specifically, point for point, in terms of action. And that is language that Americans like and understand.

Now, as you know, the leaders of the Republican Party met last Friday and Saturday in Chicago, and at that gathering a long-awaited statement of their party's policy was brought forth.

I have studied that announcement carefully. In the expectation that Republican voters were at last to know what they were voting for, straight from their own party leaders, I have read every line of it and tried to read between the lines.

I regret that the information remains, in Republican councils, a top secret.

I am unable to discover, anywhere in the announcement, a program for America.

In this difficulty, it appears that I am not alone. The editorial writers of the newspapers—Republican papers included—share it with me. They have reacted by calling this statement of policy—and I quote the words of one of them—"a masterpiece of evasion."

The rank and file of Republicans themselves—those outside the councils of the old guard—were quick to show their disappointment with it. Frank O. Horton, for example, Republican national committeeman from Wyoming, accused the congressional leaders of producing the same kind of statement that had contributed to Republican defeats through the past 15 years.

"At least," he said, "we should have a statement that people will read and understand."

The Chicago gathering also had the benefit of expert opinion when Clarence Buddington Kelland pronounced the platform—again I quote—"a meaningless conglomeration of ambiguous words." Mr. Kelland ought to know. He is a professional writer.

But whether the Republicans are satisfied with this political brain child or not, they have legally adopted it. And the electorate of America must judge it at face value.

What is that value? If the statement says nothing, as the Republicans themselves point out, then the only inference we can draw is that the party does not choose to make its stand clear to the people.

Well, we Democrats take our party obligation seriously. We are engaged in an important election contest, not a guessing game. If the Republicans refuse to come out with the truth of their position, it becomes our job and our responsibility to the electorate to do it for them. And I propose here and now to sweep aside the empty verbiage of Chicago and get down to realities, using the evidence that we have.

Individually, the Republican leaders in Congress have spoken their minds. We know where many of them stand. And now that the party has evaded its responsibility, we are correct in reading its intent not in what it says, because it says nothing, but in the statements and actions of its acknowledged leaders.

Individually, Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, one of the most influential members of the Republican leadership, exactly 7 days ago cast his vote in the United States Senate against American participation in the United Nations Organization.

Individually, Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY, Republican whip, another recognized party leader, also voted against American participation in the United Nations.

Individually, Congressman CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana, chairman of the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee, declared last September that in this congressional campaign of 1946 his party must go back—I quote—"to old-fashioned conservatism."

Now, those are actions, straightforward speaking, which the American people can understand.

The people know what Congressman HALLECK's "old-fashioned conservatism" means. They remember the last time they had it, under Republican government, and what happened to them as a result of it.

They remember the old-fashioned conservatism that killed the hope of world peace after the First World War; that invited and sanctioned a reckless inflationary boom; that proved incapable of coping with the crash that followed; that brought ruin to our farmers and unemployment to our factory workers; and that turned the jobless veterans of World War I out of the Nation's Capital with guns.

We have a wholesome habit in America of judging a political party less on its promises for the future than on its performance of the past. But if a party's leaders were to admit error in the past and tell us they wished to abandon the old policies responsible for such error and do better in times ahead, we Americans would likely lend a charitable ear—especially if they were to tell us just how, specifically, they hoped to do better. We would not be convinced, but we are usually willing to give honest intentions the benefit of a doubt.

But when we have a record of the past before us, and the pages of that record are black with tragedy and disaster to the people, and a party leadership tells us it wants to go back to the ways of that past, then there is no question, there remains no benefit of doubt to be given. We know exactly where such a party stands.

That is the position of the Republican Party today, and the fake platform brought out at Chicago does not change it. Perhaps the rank and file of Republican membership was overoptimistic when it looked to Chicago for a sign, at least for some forthright word. Perhaps, considering the record, that was expecting too much.

But they had been given the solemn word of Congressman JOE MARTIN, House minority leader, that he and his Republican colleagues in Congress would draw up a "positive"—that was his word—a positive program for America.

And a fine, ringing promise it was that JOE MARTIN made to his party last September. I remember it well—all these months.

"We plan," he said, "to set before the country a definite and concise statement of the aims and objectives of the Republican Party as represented by Republican Members of Congress. We plan to do this in such manner as will leave no room for questioning as to where the Republican Members stand on the issues before the country."

The issues before our country are real. They are vital. Some of them are crucial. And they concern each one of us in our daily lives. They touch our homes and the future of our country.

This being so, they cannot be treated lightly. To make the claim of solving the problems that confront America in 1945, and at the same time to evade those problems deliberately, is to play with other people's lives.

There are times, there are levels of human experience, in which irresponsibility may be set down to ignorance and overlooked or forgiven.

But we are not on that ground now. Where it jeopardizes the integrity of our Nation and the safety of our children, such irresponsibility is immoral.

When the question arises of our national defense, for example, a political party is irresponsible when it makes a pretense of answering, as the Republican leaders have done, by stating that it "stands for a well-trained Army, Navy, and Air Force, adequate to meet any emergency."

Anybody stands for that. But where are we going to get the army? How are we to raise and maintain it? Let these Republicans in Congress answer that, as President Truman has already answered it, and they will have

met squarely and forthrightly the problem that confronts our country.

But they have deliberately chosen not to answer it; and in doing so, they are dealing as irresponsibly with the safety of our country in 1945 as they did when they voted against its defense in 1940.

Of course, the Republican platform does not tell us that armies grow on trees. But if there is any suggestion in this document as to how and where our Army is to be maintained in adequate strength, I would like to have it pointed out to me. I cannot find it.

So, again, with the problem of improving and maintaining the health of our people, President Truman, in a special message on November 19, told Congress of the vital need for a national-health program. He outlined the specific requirements of the people and asked for action on a five-point program of preventive and curative medical aid to meet those requirements.

Now, according to their congressional platform, the Republicans are in favor of health.

They go so far as to specify good health.

Yet you may read through that statement many times, as I have, and you will discover not one action that they propose to take for preventing and curing bad health.

And that irresponsibility, that willingness to play with the lives of our people and the safety of our Nation, runs through the entire document.

Here, then, is the "positive program for America" which Republican Leader JOE MARTIN promised 3 months ago. Here is the statement that would leave no room for questioning as to where the Republicans in Congress stand.

But I am concerned tonight with one aspect of this imitation platform which is of deeper significance to me than its text.

I am concerned with what has gone on behind the scenes while that text was written, particularly while the plank on foreign policy was written; and I shall be concerned with what goes on behind the scenes while that plank, in the months ahead, is held before the people.

That plank begins with the words:

"We support the United Nations Organization for international peace."

I am concerned tonight because I have just returned from overseas, and I have looked upon the shambles that was Europe, and I have asked myself the question that must spring into the thoughts of every American who surveys that panorama of death and then comes back to contemplate the unbroken walls of our homes here in America, the streets of our proud cities, the peace and plenty of our tree-lined fields.

"Is America," we ask, "is this fair land that we love, to remain unscarred and beautiful in our eyes, forever exempt from the scourge that has run its terrible course all about us, to east and west and around the world? Or have we but come to the second intermission in some vast three-act tragedy which must, a few years hence, play out its deadly plot here?

"Is America living on borrowed time?"

A little while ago that question would have been fantastic. Today it is not. Today it is the scientist who turns to the statesman, and dropping the cold, dispassionate language of his calling, shaken by what he himself has created, asks:

"Can you protect our people from the thing that we have made? You, your work, that principle of statesmanship which must bring the powers of the world into accord for the common security—there in that principle of international cooperation lies the only known defense. How good is the promise of peace? How much can we hope for?"

That defense against the atom bomb and the carrier rocket and the dread assortment of other weapons that are certain to emerge from scientific laboratories was given to us by a man whom the historians of all countries will some day call the Father of the United Nations—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

That defense has been brought closer to realization and completion by a great leader who believes in it and who has remained true to his pledge to carry on—President Harry S. Truman.

One week ago today, the legislation to give the United States full, active participation in the United Nations Organization was passed in the Senate by the overwhelming vote of 65 to 7.

That was good news. It was news to make the hearts of all of us rejoice.

It was not news that gave us the right to be complacent. It was not news guaranteeing us that the long struggle for international cooperation has been fully won, that we need do nothing more. And it is my purpose here tonight to sound a warning to the Nation.

We are now in the eleventh hour of the long struggle to overcome old hatreds and to exterminate, once and for all, the war-breeding virus of isolationist thinking.

Yet there remain among us men who, for the sake of those old hatreds and that thread-bare philosophy of isolationism, would prevent America even now from joining the United Nations Organization, men who voted, only a week ago, to keep America out of it.

There were others who attempted last week in the Senate to apply crippling amendments to the legislation for world peace. Seventeen Republican Senators voted "aye" on one such amendment. It was only after they were shown the overwhelming strength against them that some of these 17 turned about and voted for the bill itself.

Now, those are men who hold positions of power in the Republican Party. Were they insurgents or lone hands outside the councils of the Republican Old Guard we could account for them as such and disassociate them in our minds from Republican Party policy.

But I have pointed out that these men, men like Senators TAFT and WHERRY, are leaders of their party, accepted as such, recognized as such.

Every Republican voter in the United States, as he considers the safety of his country and the future of his children, may well ponder this fact, may well ask himself:

"How much faith can I place in a party leadership which avows support of the United Nations in its pledge to the people and votes against the United Nations in Congress?"

Before we let ourselves become complacent in the Senate vote of last week let us remember that it was 11 o'clock when the enemies of world peace struck 25 years ago—struck and succeeded in wrecking the peace of Woodrow Wilson.

Before we let ourselves become complacent let us heed the warning given in a recent editorial in the New York Times. Discussing the isolationists in Congress, the paper says:

"Their strategy last July was to vote for the (United Nations) Charter and try to weaken it when the participation bill came up. Their strategy now may be to register their objections and hope for a change of popular sentiment which will let them do some undermining later on."

Today while the guns are silent, while all over the world the lights are lit again and men once more are in danger of being lulled into the complacency of truce on earth, let us remember that the making of peace on earth is a long process; that the task of completing this peace will be carried over to the Congress that we are to elect in 1946; and that whether the enemies of world peace can undermine it, whether it is to be killed once more by the old Republican formula of amendment and revision or whether it lives to guard America from the hell of atomic warfare, will depend upon the kind of men we elect next November. The Republican leadership has shown us, by its own acts, that America's only safe guaranty of living at peace with the world lies in the retention of a Democratic Congress.

When I decided to make it my purpose in Denver to sound this warning, some well-meaning friends—a few—cautioned me against it.

It would be a mistake, they said, to choose international cooperation as my subject here. They reminded me of the traditional isolationism, as they called it, of the West. No; when you go out to Denver, they said, talk about mining or sugar beets or the tourist trade. Don't talk about foreign policy and remote matters of that kind.

Well, I have talked to you about the way to keep atom bombs out of the skies over your homes here in this beautiful city which lies inland by many hundreds of miles from either shore, and I am as earnest and I believe I have as good reason to speak of it here as I would have in Massachusetts or California.

I believe the people of Denver and the people throughout our great West are as far from isolationism in their thinking, as alive to the direct menace that modern warfare would mean to them, as the people of Seattle or Cape Cod or any other part of the land.

And so I am glad of the opportunity that has been given to me to sound my warning to America from this high ground. I see it as an opportunity to demonstrate to your fellow Americans all the way out to both coasts that the menace of isolationism is not at home in the West.

We Democrats stand firm on the statement we made in our platform of 1944:

"World peace," we said then, "is of transcendant importance. Our gallant sons are dying on land, on sea, and in the air. * * * We pledge that their blood shall not have been shed in vain. America has the opportunity to lead the world in this great service to mankind. The United States must meet the challenge. Under Divine Providence, she must move forward to her high destiny."

This we have not forgotten.

This we shall not forget.

Tires for Veterans

REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, above all other considerations in the allotment of tires, OPA should take care reasonably the needs of the returning veterans. This has not been done. I have just recently received a wire from the chairman of the civilian OPA ration board at Shreveport, La., informing me that the December quota of tires allotted for the needs of Barksdale Field Separation Center at Shreveport, La., amounted to 39 passenger tires, while the Army post asked for 1,000 tires for soldiers being discharged at this post. I set forth the wire in detail:

Separation center, Barksdale Field, tire quota for December reduced to 39 passenger tires, which is grossly inadequate in view of increased rate of discharges. Minimum need 1,000 tires. Regional and district office OPA refuse any relief. Understand Jefferson Bar-

racks, Mo., December quota 608. Caddo Parish unable to render assistance in view December quota lower than any month prior to opening of separation center. We appeal for your immediate assistance.

J. H. PABODY,
Chairman, Caddo Parish Transportation Committee.

Upon receipt of this telegram from the local OPA board chairman, I appealed to the office of Chester Bowles, OPA Administrator, urging the dire necessity of giving to the returning veterans being discharged a liberal supply of tires that they may immediately reestablish themselves in civic and community life. This appeal by me direct to the office of Mr. Bowles resulted in an additional allotment of 200 passenger tires, leaving the veterans being discharged at this separation point in north Louisiana shortchanged some 661 passenger tires.

This morning, Mr. Speaker, I received an additional appeal from the chairman of Caddo Parish Transportation Committee, who is also chairman of the local OPA tire-rationing committee, urging the immediate increase in the December allotment to meet the needs of the returning veterans. I set forth this telegram in full:

Thanks your wire Barksdale tire quota. My original telegram said minimum need 1,000 tires which was true if all applicants were supplied with their request. However, with cutting down all requests and limiting any one applicant to 2 tires they can get by with total of 600, which means 335 additional quota. Administrator Bowles' letter received this morning. His statement in error relative Caddo Parish quota total November quota 2,860, December 2,340. Caddo Parish needs 2,500 additional quota to cover increased request from transient soldiers and conditionally approved applications for October and November and increased requests from public. Sincerely hope it is true that tire rationing to end January 1.

J. H. PABODY,
Chairman, Caddo Parish Transportation Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the veteran returning to our midst is entitled to first consideration by the OPA in meeting his needs for passenger tires. When he is released, he often finds the tires to his old car, if he has retained it, rotted and useless. If he has previously sold his car, he purchased a used one and is immediately faced with the necessity of obtaining tires. These he must have, in many cases, if he is to get into active business and if he is to move freely to and from his own home. These he must have if OPA is to keep faith with those who fought for this Nation and its people. It is indeed a shabby situation which requires that these returning heroes beg for one or two tires for the old car that they may be able to enjoy those comforts and necessities which you and I have obtained during their absence.

This is not the only case where OPA has failed to meet the needs of the returning veterans for tires. Other appeals have been received and other claims filed with OPA with varying success. It is apparent, however, that our fighting men must bow to the almighty OPA and humbly beg for tires before the ink on their discharge certificates becomes dry.

Antiracketeering Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the so-called antiracketeering bill before the House is designed to protect trade and commerce moving between States against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation.

The hearings conducted by the Committee on Judiciary of the House during April and May of 1942 left no doubt in the mind of any fair-minded person that in different places in the Nation illegal and unconscionable practices were being pursued that prevented farmers from bringing their produce into large cities unless and until they met demands of certain members of local teamsters unions for the payment of tribute.

These practices were in clear violation of State laws. Likewise these unlawful practices were denounced by every representative of organized labor who appeared before the committee. They left no doubt that they considered these practices unlawful, against good morals, and harmful to the cause of organized labor.

These representatives of organized labor, while leaving no doubt that they condemned all such extortion practices, nevertheless expressed the fear that the bill contained language that would destroy certain acknowledged and recognized rights of labor in its attempt to deal with the conditions complained of. There was no objection upon their part to deal with acts of extortion, or acts of violence, in connection therewith. They also felt that present existing State laws were sufficient to deal with the situation.

My vote against the bill at that time was based upon the fear above expressed, and, secondly, because there was sufficient law in each of our States to prosecute acts of extortion and, therefore, no need of additional Federal law to accomplish the purpose.

The situation that now exists with reference to the bill (H. R. 32), now before the House, is considerably different than when such legislation was previously before the House. In the first place the present bill does not contain any language that in my opinion would in any way adversely affect present existing rights of labor, and, furthermore, the Supreme Court in its opinion in the case that arose under the previous bill leaves no basis for the contention that the enactment of this bill would destroy any legitimate right of labor. In this connection I also draw attention to the fact that the bill as drawn cannot be considered as antilabor. It refers to any person guilty of extortion. It makes no difference whether such individual is a member of a labor union or not. It refers only to individuals who practice acts of extortion and violence. Of course, this general language would include a member of a labor union as well as anyone else who violated the law.

Certainly no law-abiding citizen would countenance for even a moment the acts of extortion that have been shown to be practiced against farmers in their honest endeavor to take their produce into legitimate markets for the benefit of the consuming public.

I have known intimately officers and members of labor organizations in the First Congressional District for many years. There has never been one of them who, by word, act, or conduct approved of the acts of certain individuals in the labor movement that has given rise to the necessity for this law. I owe it to the good name of these law-abiding men, whom I have learned over a period of years to honor and respect in their endeavor to advance the welfare of workers, to vote for a measure that makes unlawful extortion committed in the name of organized labor, or otherwise, by those who do not recognize their duty as citizens or respect their obligations as members of labor unions. And certainly I owe a duty to the farmers who seek to do nothing more than carry on legitimate trade in supplying consumers with the necessities of life.

I had hoped that local and State law enforcement officers in our large cities, where the violations usually occur, would measure up to a complete fulfillment of their duties as such officers and enforce the laws against extortion and violence in cases affecting our farmers. But unfortunately in many instances they have not done so. This failure makes it reasonable and necessary for the Federal Government to step in and do this all-important job of protecting law-abiding citizens from acts of extortion and violence.

For the above reasons I shall vote for the pending bill.

Demobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 12 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a group of American soldiers on Mindanao have sent me a letter relating to demobilization. The letter is addressed to the Congress, and it is most thought-provoking and indicates what American soldiers in far-away places are thinking. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINDANAO, *November 1945.*

The Congress of the United States, Washington, D. C.:

WHAT IS THE SCORE?

We who are stationed here on Mindanao, without a single exception, have been taught

that our Government is democratic in spirit and, therefore looks out for the welfare and protection of its citizens—in short the recognition of the dignity of man to the effect that he is not imposed upon by any department, pressure group or clique. We have been further taught that we were sent to this remote and desolate island in the Pacific to insure freedoms—freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom of the press, and freedom from want—to all of its inhabitants. We have been propagandized to the effect that we must give these "four freedoms" to the entire world of which a failure to do so would means chaos and slavery to ourselves and to our posterity. This is the score that brought us to this island and sent millions of our budies to all parts of the world and thousands to unknown islands from which they shall never depart.

We appeal to you gentlemen of Congress because we have that constitutional right; because you are delegated the power by the people to be used in guaranteeing our freedom and welfare; because it is you gentlemen of Congress that the dictatorial and military-caste conscious Departments of War and Navy, can be forced to treat the men in their services as competent individuals with a mind of their own, and a definite life to live, a home to establish, and maintain, all of which cannot be realized in the services, and because you are the only hope for the solution of our problems, your failure to solve them or to give satisfactory answers to them leaves their ultimate solution in the hands of us who are now here on Mindanao and throughout the world, upon our return to civilian life.

We want to know upon what basis the European theater was considered practically 95 percent of the world's victory and lay in the defeat of Germany. Why was all entertainment of any value sent to the European theater, while a few reprobates were sent to the Pacific theater; why was the best food, equipment, and greater number of personnel sent to European theater while the Pacific theater received left-overs? We want to know further why the war in Europe was considered as the battlefield so large and important that the Pacific war against Japan was considered merely as a skirmish of little importance?

Could the great importance given to the defeat of Germany be related to the growth of great industrial establishments, scientific developments, and military efficiency? Could this importance have related to the fact that these progressive and aggressive strides threatened to end economic domination of the world by a few ruling families of the Allied nations? Could this importance be attached to the abolishment of the last vestige of the definite and common-sense policy of prohibiting, for all time, marriage outside of the white race, thereby justifying, encouraging, paving the way and sanctioning intermarriage of Negroes and whites in the United States and all European countries?

This entire Pacific theater of war has never been considered as a major objective. The newspapers gave and are giving little publicity to all that the men have done and are doing here. The radio is filled with the grand job that was done and is being done in Germany; the picture-production companies have filled and are continuing to fill every theater at home and throughout the world including all GI movies, with anti-German propaganda of which we are fed up while on the other hand there has been practically no distribution by theater or publications, or by lecture, any propaganda to build a will to utterly annihilate the "Sons of Heaven" whose greatest glory was killing Americans and sabotaging America from coast to coast, on the farm land, in the cities, in the schools, especially University of California, University of Oregon, and the University of Washington. Yes, gentlemen of Congress, our Government and our fine War and Navy Departments have been and are so busy shoving German propaganda down our throats by way of orientation of Information and Education Division by lectures given by those men elevated to position of gentlemen, in name only, by your congressional acts; by way of the press; by way of radio; by way of the pulpit; that the Pacific, Asiatic war with its far-flung battlefields became in the eyes of that part of the world not involved directly in its prosecution only a minor skirmish.

We have been propagandized to believe our gentlemen by act of Congress who are in charge of demobilization have evolved a democratic policy which is fair to all. Yes, they worked out the infamous and notorious point system. They justify this greatest display of incompetence in the history of all War Departments, upon the basis that the men in the service requested it, which is a downright lie because only a very small number of enlisted men were given an opportunity to voice their wishes. Following true to form it seems rather definite that the wishes of European theater troops were followed; also those of State-side members of our armed defense.

How can the War Department with any degree of sanity attempt to propagandize us to believe that any person in the armed forces of the United States with 2½ to 3 years active service should have a priority discharge over the person with from 3 to 5 years active service? Why does the War Department and the military display their stupidity by attempting to make us believe that the young man, the unmarried man, the childless couples are all the cream of a military machine and are so deserving as to be the first called to military dictatorial rule and the last to be relieved from it? And what is more we want to know why enough of you gentlemen of Congress stood by, thereby sanctioning their stupidity?

We are not so childish in our thinking, gentlemen of Congres, that we cannot detect the appreciation of our services rendered in this theater of war, by you and the military. You have definitely shown it by your undivided attention to evacuation of troops from Europe and a snail's pace evacuation for troops of Asiatic Pacific theater.

Gentlemen of Congress our intelligence has been taken so lightly that the War Department and the military with your O. K. have with flowery phrases and pitiful and stupid moaning attempted to make us believe that men from 40 years down to 35 have more responsibility, more to live for than young unmarried men, young married men with no children and, therefore, shall get priority in returning to civilian life. Such policy is being carried out and none of those aged gentlemen whom you call the backbone of the Nation are at home now while the young men who slushed through the mud, blood, and grime to destroy the enemy are still isolated here on Mindanao because they happened to be young with nothing to live for except the hardships and tragedy of the battlefield.

As we stated before, gentlemen of Congress, we are not so childish as to miss the correct interpretation of the War Department and the military's action which has to date been sanctioned by enough of you to be put into operation. Yes; action that returned physically fit men for military duty to their homes after the long and strenuous term of 2 months in disease-infected Philippines while there are those here now who had over 36 months of this grand and glorious jungle paradise of the Pacific with no assurance as to when they will follow those who are so much more important to their country—the 40-year-olds, the "38'ers," and "35'ers" who are alleged by the War Department, the military, and sanctioned by you, to be the greatest contributors to the progress, growth, and welfare of our United States of America.

We do not at this time, gentlemen of Congress, wish to cover the War Department's and military's action which you have so freely sanctioned, however, we do want you to know some objectives which we have seen in their action, which are as follows:

1. Security of positions,
2. Political entrenchment, and
3. Military caste crazy.

Gentlemen of Congress, we are aware of the problems of far-reaching consequences created by the War and Navy Departments and which you were so united with them that you failed to halt their growth. Where are the great Pacific and Atlantic United States Navies? Where is our mighty merchant fleet? You know as well as we that when Japan and Germany were threatening domination of our possessions every kind of oceangoing craft was used in rushing troops for their defense. Comfort of troops was secondary. Troops and supplies were moving in a continuous stream to all parts of the world. The War and Navy Departments handled the great and burdening problem of logistics swiftly and efficiently. Which clearly proves that logistics involved in demobilization can be handled much faster because of use of ships which in time of war transported supplies and equipment to all parts of the world, can now be used in transporting troops and if the same initiative were used by the War Department and military against the Japanese as against the people of Germany there would be several Japanese craft transporting American troops to the homeland today, but the Japanese are favored by being "Sons of Heaven" and are getting priority on American ships engaged in returning them to their home, while we Americans continue to wait. All in the name of economy, a good one, overshadowing Dr. Goebbels' propaganda.

It is said by some that there must be conveniences added to converted troop ships for men waiting transportation home. We unanimously say the hell with that line and bring on any craft that will carry a soldier to the United States.

We, who are here on this island, heard of your great Navy Day. Did it ever occur to you that there are troops waiting for those very ships and have been for over 4 months while the brass and braid put on the eyewash and guzzle liquor? Could this great day have been the cause of postponing our sailing date and even today has delayed announcing a definite date?

Gentlemen of Congress, we know the answers to these questions which are shown by the gratitude of our War and Navy Departments in their inaction to get us home and leaving us all the great advantages of gazing day after day toward an empty harbor, our tent city, dusty highway, and desolate hills.

Not realizing their folly, the brass in the War Department, sent to this island the famous Ninety-third Division. They strengthened their folly to the degree of the intelligence of jackasses when they brought them into contact with all troops (white) on this island and especially with those of the Thirty-first Division and attached units.

We know of the Ninety-thirds inefficiency. We know their record for unreliability in battle. We do not hold their incompetence against them but when they come here crowding us off highways into canyons, abusing their authority as MP's and acting in general that they won the "dam" war and the Thirty-first Division, attached units and other white personnel should "hell" them, then we, as one, object to their "dam" overbearing attitude and as a result lives have been lost. No amount of propagandizing will erase the differences that exist between the two classes of troops. This situation grows worse with each passing day while our transports lie idle.

Not only do these famous troops of the Ninety-third show their true color in their every activity, here they have openly made their boast that they were in this war and upon return the white girls will be available and subject to their will. Such statements

forewarn that when they attempt to exercise such attitude they will melt as snowballs in hell.

Yes, gentlemen of Congress, we leave it to you to decide if there are problems to be solved and we inquire as one man why you stand by and uncheck the dictatorial policy rammed down our throats by the brass and braid.

After being subjected to dictatorial brass and braid policy from 3 to 5 years we, gentlemen of Congress, as one man are searching for the reason we fought this war and with each passing day on inaction in returning us to the United States of America we find it more difficult to locate.

We believe, gentlemen of Congress, that an executed wrong cannot be righted, but with vision, determination, and the courage to act, the original wrong can be eliminated, thus ending all chances for a repeat. We mean that by promptly executing the discharge plan you will accomplish the end of a subwrong—incompetence and inefficiency in returning troops to their homes even though the imprint shall always remain.

Gentlemen of Congress, we are agreed to the man that you are faced with a challenge which has many problems that must be solved. We are also agreed to the man that the objectives for which we were involved in this war are so remote that they are invisible.

We are further agreed as one man, gentlemen of Congress, that part of the so-called objectives of this World War II may be retrieved if you act with wisdom, speed, and efficiency in getting down to realities which must result in getting us home without delay.

Hemispheric Cooperation for World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 12 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by His Excellency Pedro G. Beltran, Ambassador of Peru, at a meeting of the Pan American Society of Massachusetts and Northern New England, Inc., on Wednesday, November 14, 1945, at Boston, Mass. In his address appears a statement which I wish to read at this time. Let me observe that it characterizes the quality and very great interest which we should have in the address. In speaking of the American Republics, Ambassador Beltran said:

We have to draw together for our very safety. Our governments have realized it. The resolutions passed at the Inter-American Conference in Mexico City bear witness to it. The proposed Inter-American Treaty that will soon be negotiated and which is to implement the Mexican resolutions is another proof of it. This is all in the right direction. Yet can we claim that it is enough? I say that it is not because we need something more. It is not only the governments that should get together. It is the peoples of our different countries that should become alive to the need for getting closer to each other. Then we shall be on firmer ground. When public opinion becomes insistent there is nothing else left for governments to do than to fall in line. On the other hand, official action when not duly backed by a general consensus of opinion is ephemeral. What is done one day may be reversed the next. This great country became what it is today when the inhabitants of the Thirteen Colonies realized that it was a question of life or death to stand together. We need to rouse the same feeling all over the hemisphere. There is no reason why our determination to remain sovereign and independent nations should be in the way. Rather it should make us realize that to defend that very sovereignty and independence we are in need of each other's support.

Mr. President, I have caused an estimate to be made by the Public Printer of the cost of printing the address in the Appendix of the RECORD. The estimate, which is submitted with the copy of the address, indicates the cost will be $130.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Now that the war has come to an end at last it seems appropriate to take stock before its lessons are forgotten. President Truman, in his Navy Day speech, said: "We have learned the bitter lesson that the weakness of this great Republic invites men of ill will to shake the very foundations of civilization all over the world." I do not think anybody will be inclined to question this for if Hitler had only known what this country was capable of, he never would have been so crazy as to start the struggle. This is something to bear in mind forever in the future. It is true that the enemy is now prostrate. But so it was in 1918 and yet it has been our lot to witness how conditions can be made to change in a tragic way in the matter of only a few years.

Let us remember also that the war was not won easily. Referring to the days between Pearl Harbor and Stalingrad and El Alamein, General Marshall has this to say in his recent report: "In those hours Germany and Japan came so close to complete domination of the world that we do not yet realize how thin the thread of Allied survival had been stretched." For this great democracy was caught unprepared. Fortunately it had time to get ready before it was too late. But this was solely due to the fact that the stage of scientific development reached at the time did not make it possible for the enemy to attack America as long as the British were holding them in Europe, at first alone and later on together with the Russians.

But, will it be so in the future? Can you afford ever to run the same risk again? The present strength of this great Nation, unequaled in history, must not delude anyone into complacency. In the future there will be no time to get ready; one will have to be ready from the start. A few weeks, perhaps a few days, might make all the difference, even though the enemy may have to strike from far away. Let me refer again to General Marshall's report. He quotes the concluding paragraph from the estimate he asked General Arnold to prepare on the capability of modern weapons in his own field of action. It reads as follows: "All of these weapons and their possible combinations make the air approaches of a country the points of extreme danger." "Many Americans do not yet understand the full implication of the formless rubble of Berlin and of the cities of Japan. With the continued development of weapons and techniques now known to us, the cities of New York, Pittsburgh, Detroit, Chicago, or San Francisco may be subject to annihilation from other continents in a matter of hours."

This is not a warning to the United States alone; it is a warning to all the countries of this hemisphere. We are all in the same danger. These weapons know no frontiers and distances mean very little. The enemy does not have to reach Panama to destroy the Canal. A base almost anywhere along the Pacific seaboard, from Mexico to Peru, might be sufficient for that. The same can be said of the Caribbean coast of Central America, Colombia, and Venezuela. The Brazilian bulge, so far away from this country, is of vital importance for its defense. During the war it was the convenient jumping-off place for planes flying across to Africa. One can well imagine the far greater importance it would have in any future struggle. An enemy beachhead in any of our countries would be a threat to all the others. You cannot think any longer of the piecemeal defense of the hemisphere. No country can be safe unless it can rely on effective support from the others. In future, it is no exaggeration to say that we will stand or fall together. Paradoxical as it may seem today, when you have reached the zenith of your power, your security is much more tied up with that of the hemisphere than in the past.

We have thus become more interdependent than ever before; in fact, we have reached a degree of interdependence that nobody could foresee before the latest scientific progress that made possible new weapons of tremendous power that can be directed to their targets by remote control from unbelievable distances to carry out their mission of destruction. Nor is there anything to complain of in this greater interdependence between our countries if we take due account of it and act accordingly drawing our ranks closer together. We shall then be all the stronger as the resources of the whole hemisphere are so much greater than those of any of its component parts. We have to draw together for our very safety. Our governments have realized it. The resolutions passed at the Inter-American Conference in Mexico City bear witness of it. The proposed Inter-American Treaty that will soon be negotiated and which is to implement the Mexico resolutions, is another proof of it. This is all in the right direction. Yet can we claim that it is enough? I say that it is not because we need something more. It is not only the governments that should get together. It is the peoples of our different countries that should become alive to the need for getting closer to each other. Then we shall be on firmer ground.

When public opinion becomes insistent there is nothing else left for governments to do than to fall in line. On the other hand, official action when not duly backed by a general consensus of opinion is ephemeral. What is done one day may be reversed the next. This great country became what it is today when the inhabitants of the Thirteen Colonies realized that it was a question of life or death to stand together. We need to rouse the same feeling all over the hemisphere. There is no reason why our determination to remain sovereign and independent nations should be in the way. Rather it should make us realize that to defend that very sovereignty and independence we are in need of each other's support.

Can we say, however, that everything has been done in the past or is being done at present to rouse public opinion in our countries to this need for greater cooperation and more intimate understanding among Americans, in whichever country they may happen to live? In any case, we must admit that we are yet very far from that goal. The people in one nation are not familiar with the problems of the others. They feel strangers when they venture in this hemisphere outside their own country. This we cannot allow to continue. The greatest contribution that we can make to the future security of each of our countries is to dedicate ourselves to this great task of bringing our peoples closer together, of making them trust each other, of bringing about real understanding; in short, of developing that genuine friendship which makes one feel at home in somebody else's land.

I think that this is the proper time to set to work. There is no longer any reason for that mistrust of the colossus of the north so prevalent south of the Rio Grande in the past. Facts speak louder than words and nobody can question today that the foreign policy of the United States is based on these two basic principles: first, respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the other countries, however small or weak they may be; and, second, noninterference in their internal affairs. Because it was not always so in the past, untold harm was done. The Monroe Doctrine has been a cornerstone of the independence of the Americas. Yet it could never bring us together as long as there was reason to fear that under its guise the most powerful member of the community could impose on the weak. For it is only human to sense more the immediate danger than the potential one from afar. In fact, pro-Nazi elements in the other American countries still thought they could play on this fear to stir anti-American feeling during the war.

And so the time has come when we should ask ourselves what is the best approach to the problem. To get people to trust and understand each other, to feel friendly toward each other, you must try and get them together. They must have dealings among themselves and see as much as possible of each other. This is the proper human approach to what is nothing but a human problem. It is most unfortunate, for this reason, that neither you in this country nor we in the South have been in the habit of visiting this hemisphere whenever we traveled abroad. Both here and in Latin America a very large proportion of people is found familiar with European countries, yet who know hardly anything of other American countries. Perhaps this was bound to be so in the past. However, it is not only in our traveling habits that we were drawn more to other lands. With our trade it was just the same, and here is a point to which I think should be given a great deal of consideration because so far, rather than shaping our fiscal policies so as to develop the maximum commercial intercourse between our countries, we have gone in the opposite direction. Governments may be thinking of new treaties to bind our nations together yet their policies have tended to make it progressively harder for us to trade among ourselves. They have thus been driving our peoples apart. A typical example is to be found in the tariff policy of this country. Let me give you some figures. According to the United States Tariff Commission, in 1932, 33½ percent of American imports from all countries had to pay duties, whereas less than 29 percent of imports from Latin America were subject to the tariff. But in 1937, only less than 41½ percent of imports from all sources were dutiable, whereas over 48 percent of imports from Latin America came under the tariff. Furthermore, the duties charged represented less than 37 percent of the value of the goods brought into this country from nonhemispheric sources, whereas it was equal to 47½ percent in the case of imports from Latin America.

Now, I ask you, how can we expect a real feeling of solidarity to develop among the peoples of this hemisphere as long as such a policy prevails? Do you not think this may make it a little hard at times for the people south to understand your sincerity when you talk of the good-neighbor policy? It is true that things are not quite is bad today, due to the trade agreements negotiated since 1937. But what I am driving at is the fact that instead of tending to bring our peoples together governments have been acting as if they wanted to prevent them from having any dealings. They proclaim loudly that our nations should get closer yet they make it as hard as possible for our nationals to trade. They want solidarity in the political field, but they oppose it in the economic one. I ask you: Do you think these two policies are consistent? Do you think you can ever be successful in the first if you persist in the second? And yet, the figures mentioned do not tell the whole story as, on top of the tariff, you have quota restrictions which rigidly limit imports into this country. In some cases, quotas are so small that they amount practically to prohibition.

The British, in trying to bring the different countries of the Empire closer and more firmly together, went in the opposite direction, setting up a system of imperial preferences which made it easier to trade within the Empire than with the outside world. They knew that they were doing this at the risk of antagonizing other countries and provoking retaliatory measures, yet they thought it was worth while taking these risks in the belief that nothing brings countries together more than commercial intercourse, because it makes people know and understand each other and each other's problems. There used to be an old British saying that "trade follows the flag." Realistically, they have been using trade to cement the foundations of the flagstaff.

By what I have just said I do not mean to advocate any inter-American preferential tariff arrangements because the world should move away from any sort of discrimination. The same merchandise should pay the same duty regardless of the country of origin. Yet the tariff can be drawn up so that only the lightest duties be levied on such goods as can be imported from other American countries. In other words, the policy should be reversed. In this way you will be helping the development of inter-American trade without any discrimination against the outside world because if other countries can ship the same goods they will not have to pay a higher rate. Instead of driving our peoples apart we would be creating conditions under which they would tend to get together.

Trade relations, particularly so nowadays, do not stop at the letter-writing stage. Soon after commercial relations are established the export and import managers visit the countries with which they are doing business. They are followed by the principals and by other members of the organization until this becomes a regular routine affair. We know that from our own experience because that is precisely what happened to Latin Americans with Europe, with which they have always carried the bulk of their trade. In fact, relations went even further because the children were often sent to be educated in those European countries with which the parents traded. Should we be surprised that so much of Latin America has looked in the past to the outside world when we know that they had to go to other continents to find an outlet for their products? Events in the Old World have been of concern to us because our economy was dependent on conditions in the countries with whom we traded. Anything happening there affected us. On the other hand, economic developments in this country were only of interest to us insofar as they affected our European customers.

The war has made it necessary to import large amounts of strategic materials into the United States. The application of the tariff has been suspended in most cases and a large inter-American trade has developed. The effect of this in drawing us closer together has been remarkable. Are we going to go back now to prewar conditions? Are we going to lose any of the ground gained? The trade policy of this country has been inconsistent with all the pronouncements and lofty declarations that we hear every day about inter-American solidarity. People are much more impressed by deeds than by words. If we go back once more to a system where we can only buy from you but not sell to you as in the past, I think that untold harm will be done to the cause of hemisphere solidarity. It is hard to realize the full extent of the change brought about by these closer commercial relations in both directions in the few years of the war. It would be a tragedy if by reason of the fiscal policy of this country the other members of the American family were to be obliged, once again, to look outside the hemisphere for markets for their goods. We can undo in a very short time what the necessities of war achieved.

In the past our trade relations with this country have been, as I have just mentioned, mostly one way. At least I can say that of Peru. We used to ship our products largely to Europe and also, to a certain extent, to the Orient. Hardly anything came here. But we used to buy a great deal from you. We will continue to need your wares after the war because American skill and technical knowledge are so far ahead that we shall always require them. In the past we used to pay for what we bought here by transferring funds from other countries to which we sold. Will this be possible after the war when so many of those countries may not be able to afford to buy from us unless we buy also from them? Unless the fiscal policy of this country is changed we are running the risk of not even being able to go on buying from you as much as in the past. Our trade intercourse may become even less than before. Trade, in the long run, is nothing but barter carried on a money basis, for we pay for what we buy abroad with the goods that we sell to other countries. If we are unable to sell to you, and our customers are not in a position to allow us to buy dollars with the proceeds of our sales to them, then we will be unable also to buy in this market.

In many cases your import barriers may have been justified in the past when you had ample natural resources and before you had reached your present stage of economic development. But, at present, there is no sound economic reason for preventing so many of our materials from coming in. Your resources or some of them are being quickly exhausted. Mr. Bernard Baruch, only 10 days ago, in a letter to Representative GORE, had this to say on the subject: "We cannot go on depleting our soil and mineral resources as we have in the past 7 years without tragic results to our whole economy and national life." Secretary Ickes has publicly called attention to the same problem listing 21 minerals of which the United States has now less than a 35-year supply. It looks as if nobody could question the fact that in many cases you have consumed at least what was easier to produce and therefore your present domestic sources of supply necessarily imply a very high cost of production. Would it not be much more profitable and wiser, from the point of view of conserving your resources, for the United States to allow those imports to come in, making available to us, in this way, at the same time, the necessary exchange to buy your manufactured articles? Mr. Ickes says that the United States should have access to the minerals in foreign lands, but it is this Government, through its fiscal policy, that has prevented such materials from becoming available to American users in the past.

It is commonly acknowledged today that prosperity cannot be achieved in any one country by itself. It is also generally agreed that you cannot rely entirely on your domestic trade to maintain a reasonable amount of activity and employment. Exports are a necessary requisite and the export business cannot develop unless other countries have the means to buy from you. A more liberal fiscal policy would not there-

fore be harmful to your economy. You would then be selling more abroad for the very reason that you would be buying more. Your own economists say so. This is today the generally accepted doctrine. Now, if at the same time that this is economically sound it also helps bring our peoples together, then the sooner it is done the better. There is no gainsaying that one of the greatest contributions to the cause of pan-American solidarity would be the development of larger commercial intercourse between the American countries which would result in their becoming as interdependent economically as they are interdependent already from the point of view of their defense and security.

I can only think of one other way in which we can contribute as much, if not even more, to bring about genuine friendship and good will between our peoples. Before I finish tonight I would like to say something on that. When a boy gets his higher education in another country he becomes familiar with its problems. He gets to understand why things are done in a different way than he was accustomed to at home. He comes to see other peoples' points of view. There is no room for misunderstandings then for beneath superficial differences we are all as human and very much the same. It is the casual observer who goes back home with mistaken ideas of the people because he is more impressed by peculiarities in habits and customs, in dress and even in expressions, than by the real human factor behind our outward actions and appearance. This does not happen when you are young and live long enough in a foreign country. I do not favor a short postgraduate course because a boy does not have time enough then to acquaint himself properly with conditions in the other country. He leaves when the ice is barely broken, when he has not yet had an opportunity to know individuals because he has not had time to develop close friendships. Boys should rather be sent for the whole of their higher education. Then they are likely to be younger when it is easier to become adapted to different conditions. They would be staying longer and, when they went back home, they would be the best apostles, the stanchest advocates of more intimate relations between the two countries.

They would continue to owe allegiance to their country of birth, yet they would have at heart the development of closer ties with their alma mater with what in a way could be described as their second spiritual home.

Now, how can we get a large number of boys to go to other American countries? As I have said before, in the past they have usually gone to Europe because their parents' connections were in Europe. But, in any case, if we let things alone it will be only the children of the well-to-do who will get a foreign education. This is wrong. This opportunity should be open to promising boys regardless of their parents' means. To this end governments should step in and provide scholarships. Although your Government can help more than any other one because it has greater resources and because you have so many first-class colleges in the United States, it should be easy to work out reciprocal governmental arrangements so that the flow would not be one way only. That would not do either. Just as the boys from Latin America should come here, so also yours should go south. It is not enough for us to know you, for you cannot establish one-sided friendship. You should also get to know us. And just as our boys should learn English, so yours should learn Spanish.

I think the eventual results of an interchange of students would surpass the most optimistic expectations. But we must realize that, here again, no time should be wasted because it will take many years for these results to materialize. First of all, one cannot expect the flow of students to be very great from the start, regardless of what may be done about it. It will take time to get parents used to parting with their boys and to allow them to go abroad. Then it will be years before the returning boys become leaders of public opinion in their own countries. But, however long it may take, no more solid foundation can be found to make the peoples of this great hemisphere genuinely friendly; friendly through mutual understanding, through respect for each other, and through personal contacts. We had an example of that during the war in those of our boys who had been brought up here and in England and France who from the beginning grasped the full implications of the struggle and went about fighting pro-Nazi activities. They provided a strong barrier to enemy propaganda. They openly opposed totalitarian tendencies in the most outspoken way and they did a lot of good.

The understanding, good-will, and friendship that would bind our peoples together if we were to follow the two courses that I have advocated tonight will ever be the only firm foundation of hemisphere solidarity. Nothing should be left undone to attain this end. But unless the peoples really have it at heart the governments by themselves will not be able to achieve much. Let us bear in mind that a united Western Hemisphere will be, at the same time, our best contribution to the peace of the world, for no group of nations will fit better within the framework of the United Nations Organization, none will have more at heart the fulfillment of its high mission in the world, and none will be more in agreement with the very spirit of the Charter than this group of American countries who hate war, who cannot be lured by any thoughts of conquest or by dreams of victory, who respect the right of others to work out their own salvation and their own happiness in their own way just as much as they claim that right for themselves, who believe that all nations should be equal and free, even the smallest and weakest, and whose peoples only want to be allowed to pursue their peaceful occupations under their own freely elected governments. We are firm believers in international collaboration. We fail to see why it should not prove to be the key to the solution of world problems just as it is in our own American affairs. Nobody need be afraid of a strong Western Hemisphere, for we do not want to be strong to abuse our power. We want to be strong to help make it impossible for anyone to think again of conquest and of imposing on the weak. None of us likes fighting. But so as not to shirk our responsibility to the community of nations let us make ourselves ready to provide our full contribution to the new international organization if ever the peace of the world is again endangered. It is for this reason that to dedicate ourselves to bind ever closer together the nations of this hemisphere is to dedicate ourselves to the cause of peace in the world at large.

Mrs. Truman's Right to Privacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER F. GEORGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 12 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Indianapolis Commercial of December the 1st regarding the holding of press conferences by the President's wife and her right to privacy.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mrs. Truman and the female section of the Washington press do not seem to be getting along too well together. We are for Mrs. Truman and if editors in general still possess good taste, they will see to it that some of their correspondents are instructed to respect her privacy. The President's wife makes no pretense at being a public figure. She happens to be the "first lady," but she seems to put little stress on that title. First, she seems to want to be a good wife, a good mother, and a good homemaker, and that is all the American public has a right to expect of her. She is entitled to privacy, even if fate has thrust her into the White House. She is not a public figure and she seems to prefer not to be one. And if that is her wish—and we think she exercises good taste because it is her wish—we think her wish should be respected—and respected in more ways than one. If the American people desire Mrs. Truman to become a public figure, they might elect her to public office. We predict that if such a thing could happen, it would be against her will.

Mrs. Roosevelt was a public figure by choice. She was more in the public eye than any other woman who ever occupied the White House. But that is no reason why Mrs. Truman should be so considered, if she does not choose to play that role. And we think a majority of the people will enjoy for a while, at least, a modest and unassuming wife of the President of the United States.

We do not believe that a hardboiled female press contingent has a right to try to make Mrs. Truman a public figure against her will and we resent their attempts to "pan" her simply because she has the good taste to refuse to hold "press conferences" and to discuss public issues which are none of her business except for the interest that might be shown such issues by the ordinary citizen.

The American people are unkind and almost barbaric, when public opinion will permit the wife of the President to be shoved around by a group of women feature writers, who seem to believe it is their right to make a show out of the Chief Executive's wife. If Washington comment is to be taken at its face value, Mrs. Truman seems to have been forced to make some concessions for the sake of her husband's public relations. If the Washington newspaper women have no better taste, their editors and publishers should have. These men, who must secretly admire Mrs. Truman for her stand almost to a man, should see to it that their "girls" are not rude, pushy and revengeful simply because Mrs. Truman wants to play her role quietly. Unless the privileges of the press are abused, a newspaper writer has no right to try to make a public figure out of any person if he or she wants only to be left alone.

And as for the President's daughter, we have boiled inwardly because of occasional references that have been made concerning her.

If Mr. and Mrs. Truman want their daughter to grow up as an average American girl that is not only their right but we believe it shows that they have good taste. Being the daughter of a President can be quite a handicap, if she is spied upon constantly by writers who make comments about her clothes, her behavior and her every act in public. It is cruel to place a young girl in a goldfish bowl simply because she happens to be the President's daughter, especially when the young lady seems to want nothing so much as to simply be left alone.

Moral of Pearl Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, December 12 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Moral of Pearl Harbor," from the New York Times of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MORAL OF PEARL HARBOR

Testifying before the Congressional Pearl Harbor Committee yesterday, General Marshall said that President Roosevelt had personally ordered that all warnings of imminent war sent to field commanders in the Pacific should also include an instruction to them not to precipitate hostilities, but to wait for an overt act by the Japanese before hitting back. That our field commanders did so, at Pearl Harbor and in the Philippines, is evident from the result. If anything had still been needed to knock into a cocked hat the suggestion insinuated by some of the probers and voiced openly by their publicity claque that President Roosevelt "plotted" Pearl Harbor in order to drag the country into war, this statement of the American Chief of Staff at the time should complete the job.

But General Marshall's testimony likewise points another lesson which is of the utmost importance, not to the clarification of history, but to our future security. And that is the lesson of the vulnerability of the democracies. Because democracies do not go to war, and do not even prepare for war, until the overwhelming majority of the people is convinced of imminent peril by overt acts on the part of an aggressor, the aggressor will always have the advantage of them. That applies not only to the surprise attacks with which aggressors have learned to begin their wars, but to the whole preparation and planning of war, in which the initiative is a priceless advantage.

The Japanese had demonstrated the advantage of the sneak attack nearly 40 years before Pearl Harbor, when they crippled the Russian Fleet at Port Arthur. Hitler had improved on their technique, in both the military and diplomatic fields, a fact which enabled him to placate the democracies while he prepared for war, and then to attack them individually for the purpose of eliminating them one by one. The revelations at the Nuremberg trial and the admissions of the Japanese leaders themselves have demonstrated how both the Nazis and the Japanese plotted to wage war against the United States; how Goering called for planes able to bomb New York as early as 1938; how Hitler was preparing to seize islands in the Atlantic as stepping stones to the Americas; how Hitler and Matsuoka, the Japanese Foreign Minister, concerted their plans early in 1941; how the Japanese war lords obtained an undated war declaration from their Emperor and prepared to put it into effect at a time strategically most convenient for them, which turned out to be December 8, 1941, their time. We did not know these details then, but only the politically blind could mistake the purposes which they had loudly proclaimed by their past actions. It is to the credit of President Roosevelt and his associates that they realized the danger and did what they could—through such measures as lend-lease—to prepare for it.

Despite this, Pearl Harbor happened. How far military negligence or misjudgment was responsible for it, or at least for the extent of the disaster, should be revealed when all the evidence is in. But it is already clear that there were two main factors in the situation. The first was the misjudgment of the spirit of this country, which tempted both Hitler and Japan to attack us in the confident expectation of victory. The second was the determination of the American Government, well known to our enemies, not to strike the first blow, which enabled them to plan at leisure and to strike at a time and place of their own choosing.

In short, we deliberately surrendered to our enemies the element of surprise, against which there can be no absolute protection, even in the midst of war. We did so because American public opinion would not permit the Government to take the initiative in the face of even known danger without so splitting the country as to impair its effectiveness for war. That is the price we pay for liberty and democracy. If the price was high in this war, it is bound to be much higher in any future war fought with atomic weapons. For liberty and democracy we shall continue to run whatever risk they bring. We would not have it otherwise. But unless we do our utmost to banish war from this world, and unless, pending this achievement, we prepare sufficiently not only to stop tempting powerful aggressors to attack us but also to meet them with superior force able to survive all surprises, we may yet hear history pronounce the verdict that we deserve whatever fate befalls us.

Weaknesses of Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent of the House, I present for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a radio address I delivered last night over the Columbia Broadcasting national network, entitled "Weaknesses of Our Foreign Policy," as follows:

Our foreign policy, if it can be said that we have one, is lamentably defective. It may be expressed in one word, "drifting." We are drifting, drifting, drifting, apparently without chart or compass. No one knows whither we are bound or in what port we are likely to land, or whether we shall remain forever at sea. We have altruistic purposes, but they are singularly lacking in strength and direction. "Without vision the people perish." We seem to have no clear vision. We have no plan for future action. Our foreign policy is improvised from day to day. All is confusion.

Let us face the naked facts courageously, in a spirit of camaraderie and helpfulness, for through constructive criticism and friendly cooperation we may ultimately hope to find the right path.

THE APPALLING WORLD PICTURE

Four months after VJ-day what is the world picture? It is an appalling picture. We have our fighting men in China and for all I know they may be killing Chinese Communists in the civil war that is going on there. We are told by the Associated Press that American Air Force pilots are "debating angrily" their postwar assignment to the perilous job of flying airplanes wholesale over the "hump" from India and Burma for delivery to Chiang Kai-shek's forces. The International News Service reports that at least 11 American planes have crashed in this operation, with untold loss of American lives. What business have we interfering in the internal affairs of another country? The world is fast sinking into the old groove of power politics where wars are spawned and I very much fear that by our fumbling we may be contributing to the making of another war. We hear it said that the race for armaments is on and that another world war is looming on the horizon. Our two most powerful allies—Russia and Britain—are carrying on unilateral activities wholly inharmonious with the spirit and purpose of the United Nations Charter. There are indications that every nation on earth that has any means of doing so is feverishly attempting to develop its own atomic bomb, so that it may get the drop on all other nations and wipe them out of existence. The world appears to be moving toward another atomic war and the atomic fever has risen several degrees since November 20 when the announcement was made that the United States is still manufacturing atom bombs, "for experimental purposes". If the United States, the leader among nations, sees fit to continue the manufacture of atom bombs it gives an excuse to all nations to manufacture them and stack them up pending developments. And what kind of a "one world" will we be living in if every nation has its stack of atom bombs ready to use on other nations whenever a hair-trigger situation develops? The first thing to be done with the atomic bomb is not to manufacture more of them but to outlaw the use of the bomb in war by as tight an international agreement as can be made.

MAC ARTHUR'S SUGGESTION NEGLECTED

Nearly 4 months have elapsed since VJ-day and we have not taken one single step to implement the wise suggestion made by Gen. Douglas MacArthur when, in accepting the surrender of Japan, he spoke of the futility of war and said:

"We have had our last chance. If we do not now devise some greater and more equitable system Armageddon will be at our door. The problem basically is theological and involves a spiritual recrudescence and improvement of human character that will synchronize with our almost matchless advance in science, art, literature, and all material and cultural developments of the last 2,000 years. It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh."

TIME TO MAKE A NEW DECLARATION OF FOREIGN POLICY

For four long years in the storms of war, we have made world leadership our business. We cannot, we must not shrink from that leadership now. It is time to make a new and ringing declaration of our foreign policy and in that declaration we should make crystal clear that, God helping us, we of the United States of America intend in good faith and with all of the earnestness and sincerity we can command to help establish His rule on earth.

Long ago, I proposed the creation of a religious advisory council to aid in the peace settlement, this council to be composed of eminent religious leaders who could speak in one voice—Protestant, Catholic, and Jew—for moral ethics and Christian-Judaic spiritual principles in the making of peace and in ordering the future of the world. The great religious organizations stood by ready to present their nominations for this council but the State Department would have none of it.

There is a responsibility resting on the United States for leadership in world peace that rests on no other nation on earth. Are we living up to that responsibility? No. If we were we would not have our fighting men taking part in a civil war in China and we would not be manufacturing atomic bombs for experimental purposes or for any other purpose. We voluntarily assumed lead-

ership in World War II. We grabbed the ball and we, more than any other nation, won the war which was to establish permanent peace and brotherhood on earth, yet when our great commander, General MacArthur, tells us how that permanent peace may be established and how civilization may be saved, we proceed to pay no attention to him. We have done nothing to encourage a great moral and spiritual resurgence which alone can bring about the salvation of the world. We must not forget that we are in a new era now, and that our duty henceforth will be to do our very best to establish peace on earth and to saving, instead of destroying, priceless human values.

WE CANNOT ESCAPE OUR RESPONSIBILITY

Having led in the military leadership that brought about a successful conclusion of the war, we cannot now, if we are true to our faith and loyal to our promises, refuse to accept the moral leadership of the world that must be relied on to convert the fruits of military victory into permanent and lasting peace. The world is looking to us for such leadership. How are we going to justify the dropping of atom bombs on great cities and the killing of hundreds of thousands of civilians, including women and children, unless we make good on our promise to lead in redeeming the world forever from war and hate and establishing it on a permanent basis of peace and understanding? Hiroshima and Nagasaki are not attractive pages in our national history. Those colossal tragedies can be justified only by a good-faith redemption of our pledge to do everything we can to make a better world. The finger of history is on us and we had better buck up and do something.

SITUATION NOT HOPELESS

What can we do? Fortunately, I believe, the situation is not hopeless if we retrace our steps in the right direction. America, first of all, must face the fact, so well stated by General MacArthur, that only a great moral and spiritual leadership can save the world in this age of the perfection of the lethal instruments of war. America, having led the world in war, must not now back away from that moral and spiritual leadership in peace. We cannot escape our responsibility.

FIRST STEP IS TO OUTLAW THE BOMB

I propose two things: First, I propose that we exercise our leadership a little in connection with the atomic bomb. Immediately after VJ-day I introduced in the House the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the personal representative of the President on the United Nations Organization, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., be, and hereby are, urged to exert their utmost efforts to secure a definite postwar agreement by the United Nations to ban the atomic bomb forever as an instrument of war."

The preparatory commission of the United Nations Organization is meeting this month and the General Assembly will meet in January. I sincerely hope that the President and Mr. Stettinius, our representative on the United Nations Organization, will do their best to secure an agreement by the United Nations at these meetings whereby all of the United Nations will join in binding themselves not to use the atomic bomb in warfare. With that agreement made, we can very well join all the other nations in developing atomic energy to serve the arts of peace, thus conferring incalculable blessings on mankind.

We can say to the nations of the world, "If you will join us in outlawing the atomic bomb as an instrument of war we will never manufacture another bomb. We will seal the doors of our atomic bomb plants and will never open them again."

That would be one forward concrete demonstration of the kind of postwar leadership we promised mankind when we were marshaling the forces to victory on the battlefronts, and I cannot imagine any action we could take that would have a more immediate or dynamic effect in composing the fears of the world and in substituting peace and a patient outlook in place of hectic preparations for war. As long as we make announcements that we are continuing to manufacture atomic bombs without undertaking to secure an agreement of the United Nations to ban the atomic bomb as an instrument of war we are applying irritants, instead of emollients, to the troubled international situation and we should be careful not to do that.

DEPARTMENT OF PEACE AND GOOD WILL

The other suggestion I have to make by way of improving our foreign policy and fulfilling our mission of moral and spiritual leadership on which the hopes of mankind now rest, is that Congress should proceed to pass and the President to sign a bill I have introduced (H. R. 4648) which is proposed as a measure to implement the advice of General MacArthur when he warned that war has become so destructive that unless nations turn from war and find a common denominator of peace "Armageddon will be at our door." The text of H. R. 4648 is as follows:

"Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established a new department of the Government of the United States to be known as the Department of Peace and Good Will, which shall have for its purpose the activating of the forces of good will and mutual understanding throughout the world and the fostering of amity among nations."

One way to help in winning the peace is to dramatize our purpose by the establishment of a department of peace and good will. Why not? With our Nation professedly committed to the creation by earnest efforts of a new world of peaceful relations between man and man all around the earth, we have no governmental agency to implement that endeavor—not one. Let us examine the scroll of governmental establishments and see what we have:

First. A War Department—function to destroy and kill.

Second. A Navy Department—function to destroy and kill.

Third. An Office of Scientific Research and Development—function to invent the instruments that destroy and kill.

And so on.

I would not eliminate or depreciate any one of these. In the present posture of world affairs we must have, and must continue to have until peace is secure, an adequate Army and Navy. But after we have committed our leadership, as we have in a thousand solemn ways, toward bringing about a new and better world, patterned even though imperfectly on the plan of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, is it unreasonable to expect that we shall inaugurate this new era of peaceful endeavors and make our Government responsive to our professions by adding to the roster of our governmental activities a new department of peace and good will to protect and conserve the great human values?

WE NEED A FIGHTING DEPARTMENT TO WIN PEACE

If we want peace, and I am sure that all American do, we must be ready to fight for it.

We need a fighting department that can bring more activity to the solution of the problem than the State Department can under its traditions and authority. We need a department that can and will reach out around the earth and propagandize for peace; a department that can and will get in touch with the moral and spiritual forces of the world; a department that can and will contact and activate and unify the forces in all lands, which alone by common purpose and united action can make the permanent peace of the world a blessed reality. It is a tremendous fight we are up against, but we must win it—or else Armageddon. The brotherhood of man, once a beautiful vision, has become a necessity if the world is to escape destruction.

The passage of this bill by the United States Congress would be notice to the world that when we said we wanted to be a good neighbor in the family of nations we meant it. Other nations are reported to be much confused by our militaristic preparations and are finding it difficult to reconcile our plans for forced military training and regimentation with our protestations for peace. To those doubting Thomases in the family of nations the passage of this bill and the creation of this Department of Peace and Good Will would mean that we are going all-out for peace and that we are not for peace with our tongues in our cheeks. I say again that in the recent war we voluntarily assumed leadership among nations in emancipating enslaved people from tyranny and oppression, and I ask again, Are we now going to fail humanity by refusing to accept the moral leadership that is necessary to translate the fruits of victory into a peaceful world of the future?

LET US REMEMBER OUR HEROIC DEAD

Before long the hearts of our people will be wrung by the saddest of all spectacles in the aftermath of war—the mournful procession that will bring our beloved dead from their temporary graves in foreign countries to their final resting places in American soil. Two hundred and seventy-four thousand seven hundred and sixty-six Americans, the flower of our manhood, gave the last full measure of devotion fighting for our flag in foreign theaters of war, and the bodies of these men will be brought back and committed to the home soil of the communities from which they sprang—earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust. Funeral corteges will soon wend their sorrowing way to almost every locality in the United States, and all of the pent-up grief of fathers, mothers, wives, and sweethearts will break forth in a new deluge. The millions of our people who will be touched by the poignant grief of this panorama are going to say to the statesmen of our time, "We serve notice on you now that this must not happen again. We expect you to build firm foundations of enduring world peace and we will hold you responsible if you do not."

It is time the people should express themselves on these vital issues. I hope that every person in America who wishes to do his part in ushering in a peaceful world will write to the Foreign Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., and request a favorable report on this bill, H. R. 4648, and at the same time send letters expressing interest in the bill to the Representative in Congress from his district and the United States Senators from his State.

The War and Our Vanishing Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include therein an article written by Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, entitled "The War and Our Vanishing Resources,"

which appeared in the December issue of the American magazine.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H. R. 4955 to establish a national resources policy, to create a natural resources council, and, amongst other important provisions, to provide for a natural resources inventory. The following article written by the Honorable Secretary of the Interior states the case clearly on behalf of this legislation.

THE WAR AND OUR VANISHING RESOURCES

(By Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior)

We may have peacetime conscription. We may retain a tremendous peacetime Navy. But the plain fact is that we cannot afford another prolonged war in 20 or 30 years.

Not that we haven't the men, not that we haven't the will to fight again if we have to, not that we haven't the cash—we just haven't got the oil, the copper, the zinc, and the mercury, which are so vital to the machines and munitions of modern warfare.

The prodigal harvest of minerals that we have reaped to win this war has bankrupted some of our most vital mineral resources. We no longer deserve to be listed with Russia and the British Empire as one of the "have" nations of the world. We should be listed with the "have nots," such as Germany and Japan.

The overwhelming significance of this change from a "have" to a "have not" nation lies in these facts: Without mineral resources, the United States could never have built the ships, the planes, and the guns which have made us the greatest military power in the world. We could never have been more than an agricultural country. We could never have been able to support, at a standard of living that is the envy of the world, the 135,000,000 people now living within our borders.

Does this change in status mean that we are about to become a pushover for other countries, that our standard of living will be greatly reduced, that we shall all become farmers, and horse-and-buggy farmers, at that? This, in fact, is the future that we are now carving out for our grandchildren and our great-grandchildren by our do-nothing policy.

It should be burned into our consciousness that we do not have an inexhaustible supply of minerals—the sinew that makes this country mighty. Our minerals are not inexhaustible and irreplaceable. Unlike wheat and corn, new crops of minerals do not appear from year to year. Further, the faster we grow in industrial strength and military potency, the more rapidly we dissipate our mineral resources—the very basis of our military and industrial power.

To prevent the decline of the United States as a major military and industrial power, and to maintain our high standard of living, we must take immediate positive action to increase our known mineral resources. We must begin at once—

To stock-pile minerals.

To explore our country more extensively than ever before.

To hunt for better methods of recovering metals from scrap.

To have access, in common with other peacefully disposed nations, to minerals in the lands that have been conquered in the recent war, for from now on we shall be increasingly dependent upon imports for our minerals.

The bountiful heritage of minerals and oil with which the United States was originally endowed has tended, unfortunately, to make most of us complacent about these resources, and our time has been spent in patting ourselves on the back for mining such great quantities of them. This puts us in the position of the man who was so happy about the speed at which he was sawing off the limb that he forgot that he was sitting on the limb.

How close we are to cutting off the limb that supports us can be seen by casting up our accounts to ascertain the cost of this war to our mineral resources, and inventorying how much we have left.

Between January 1, 1940, and January 1, 1945, we tore from the earth some 5,000,000,000 tons of minerals. Included in this total are 516,158,500 tons of domestic iron ore, the most astonishing amount ever produced by this or any other nation in a similar period. During this period we mined 3,061,060,000 tons of coal, or enough to cover the whole city of New York with a blanket of coal 12 feet thick.

Here are some figures which will give an idea of the variety and quantity of our mineral resources that have been sacrificed on the altar of the god of war. In the 5-year period from New Year's Day, 1940, we mined 3,061,060,000 tons of coal, 516,158,500 tons of iron ore, 2,278,000 tons of lead, 3,642,000 tons of zinc, 5,000,000 tons of copper, 14,169,000 tons of bauxite, 20,750 tons of tungsten, 112,000 tons of molybdenum, 17,118,000 tons of sulfur, 68,000,000 tons of salt, 3,155,000 tons of potassium, and 1,000,000,000 tons of petroleum.

Into the war machine and domestic economy also went 15,700,000,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas. The tonnage of petroleum mentioned above equals 7,325,000,000 barrels. Some idea of the demands upon our petroleum resources may be measured by the fact that the United States has 36 percent of the known oil reserves of the world, but has been furnishing approximately 60 percent of the petroleum used in the war.

These figures do not encompass our total mineral production during the war; we have also mined large amounts of other minerals, but they do show how great has been our dependence upon our minerals and what great quantities of these limited resources we have used.

If we are to continue as a dominant industrial and military power, the big question is not so much what we have used but what have we left.

The fact is that some of our "blue chip" minerals have been depleted to the critical point. On the basis of known usable reserves, we have in this country only nine major minerals which, at the 1935–39 rate of use, may be expected to last 100 years or more—nitrogen, magnesium, salt, bituminous coal and lignite, phosphate rock, molybdenum, anthracite, potash, and iron ore. And a hundred years is nothing in the life of a nation.

We have less than a 35-year peacetime commercial supply of 21 minerals. The significance of this is that 35 years are but little more than the usual interval between wars, and among these 21 minerals are: Petroleum, copper, lead, and zinc, in the production of which we have led the world for many years. The others are: Sulfur, natural gas, fluorspar, cadmium, gold, lead, silver, bauxite, vanadium, antimony, tungsten, platinum, asbestos, manganese, chromite, nickel, and tin. Our automobile and electrical industries, to mention only two, would not have made the advances that they have made had they been hampered by shortages in any of these minerals.

So far, I have mentioned coal, iron ore, and petroleum only briefly. Their prime importance—imagine the United States trying to get along without the products made possible by coal and iron and petroleum—merits special consideration, however. Coal is the Nation's No. 1 mineral asset. Iron ore ranks second, and petroleum third.

Just how important coal is to a nation's economy is shown by the facts that the five great centers of industrial and military power—the United States, England, Russia, Japan, and western Europe—have developed on the basis of large coal resources.

Coal is the stuff that spins the wheels of most of our industry. It would appear that we have plenty of coal, but already our reserves of high-grade coking coals, without which it is difficult to make steel, are none too plentiful, and their lack may compel us to seek different and perhaps more expensive ways of making steel, within a comparatively few years.

Despite their fundamental importance, we don't know enough about coking coal reserves. In mining almost any bed of coal, a third or more of the coal in that bed is irretrievably lost. Some of this loss is unavoidable, but much could be prevented if the cutthroat competition in the industry did not force the mine owners to take the easy pickings and move on to new coal beds, instead of getting all of the coal that there is out of any particular seam. Further, there is no wisdom, from a national viewpoint, in consuming our limited reserves of high-grade coking coals to generate steam for power plants, when these coals are so vital to the making of steel. Steam plants can use lower grade coals. We have plenty of them.

Iron ore is an outstanding resource in four of the five great centers of industrial power. Much to her regret, Japan is notably deficient in iron ore, and attempted to overcome this weakness through aggression. Our reserves of iron ore do not match those of coal by a wide margin. Originally, some 6,000,000,000 tons of usable ore were to be found in the good earth of this country. About two-thirds of the original cache remains, but, in true American style we have already licked the icing off the cake, and much of the ore that is left will be harder and more expensive to get.

The high-quality ores which are found in the Mesabi Range in Minnesota will soon be only a rusty memory. This ore is the cream of our resources, because it can be mined cheaply and because it is so free of other minerals that it can be used directly in the blast furnace, without prior treatment. These high-quality ores account for 50 percent of the total iron production of the country. At the prewar rate of extraction, the remaining tonnage will be exhausted in 22 years.

We must develop our lower-scale ores, and we shall have to build large plants to treat them. Such plants will limit production capacity and will be costly. But to maintain our position of self-sufficiency would justify some extra cost to the public, although the consumer cannot be expected to assume an unreasonable burden, such as paying $10 for an iron frying pan.

As to oil, the daily newspapers give evidence that supplies are far from ample to meet all demands. The American Petroleum Institute estimates known or proved reserves of oil at 20,000,000,000 barrels. Last year we produced 1,700,000,000 barrels of crude oil.

Thus, if future discoveries fail to bring in enough oil, we shall shortly—in 15 to 20 years—be faced with the need for developing sources of oil supply outside of the continental boundaries of the United States. Under peacetime conditions, substantial quantities of oil could be obtained from the Caribbean area and, if necessary, from more distant sources, such as Saudi Arabia and Bahrein. This would seem to be the cheapest solution.

Secondary recovery of domestic supply from apparently depleted oil fields has begun already, and could be increased considerably at higher prices

Synthetic liquid fuels also offer a feasible, though more costly, solution. Synthetic motor fuel can probably be made from coal at 18 cents a gallon in large plants. The Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior is experimenting in the production of synthetic gasoline in commercial-sized plants. Costs of from 12 to 15 cents are possible, after the techniques have been fully developed. The costs of producing

gasoline from crude petroleum are approximately 5 cents a gallon.

If we exhaust our readily available domestic reserves of minerals—what experts call our "commercial reserves"—the car owner, manufacturer, or housewife is directly affected. The consumer's automobile, his electric iron, and his refrigerator will cost more, because we shall be forced to pay the extra cost of shipping these minerals in from abroad, and it will cost more to extract what we call our submarginal resources.

Our submarginal resources of today may be, and frequently are, our commercial reserves of tomorrow, because almost all of the earth which covers the United States contains minerals which could be used if we were willing to pay the price for extracting them. This, of course, could be tremendously expensive and might run the cost of some minerals up to several hundred dollars a pound.

Already technological advances indicate that this possibility is not too remote in some fields. Before the war the aluminum industry, for instance, would not attempt to use bauxite which contained more than 8 percent silica. Bauxite deposits found to have more silica than this were rejected as unfit for use, and this constituted our submarginal supply. Now processes have been developed whereby bauxite containing 20 percent silica is being used, and bauxite containing a greater proportion of silica constitutes our submarginal supply. Tomorrow, with improved technology, bauxite containing even more silica may be used.

Because most commercial companies hesitate to spend money in this field, federally financed research along this line would pay big dividends. In inventorying the Nation's mineral resources, I have, however, discounted the possible enlargement of our sources of supply by the discovery of new methods of extraction for two reasons: first, these methods have not yet been found or perfected; and, second, in some cases we just haven't the minerals in submarginal supply.

But, if we are willing to pay the price for them, our potential reserves of iron ore, phosphate rock, molybdenum, potash, and all forms of sulfur are ample for many years to come. Resources of nitrogen, magnesium, and salt, for practical purposes, may be regarded as limitless as the sea and the sky from which they are drawn. There are large submarginal resources of bauxite, manganese, and vanadium. How our submarginal resources of uranium stand will have to await further exploration.

But of such vitally necessary minerals as copper, lead, zinc, tin, nickel, and chromite little is left. We shall have to import these minerals in larger and larger quantities. Otherwise, we shall be faced with the prospect of a civilization without all of the necessities (batteries, paints, washtubs, plumbing supplies, tin cans, shiny automobile radiators) with which these minerals now provide us.

Even more alarming than the fact that we are coming to the end of some of our known resources is the fact that we are uncovering few, if any, unknown deposits of minerals.

The failure of petroleum discoveries to keep pace with the rapid rate of depletion has received much attention during the war. Discovery of other mineral deposits has declined alarmingly for half a century. No major metal-producing district comparable to Butte, Bisbee, Homestake, or Coeur d'Alene has been brought into production in the United States since 1916. There have been few important copper discoveries in this country during the twentieth century. Most of the large producing deposits were known before 1900. The largest discovery since then has been the United Verde Extension mine at Jerome, Ariz.

New discoveries now depend upon the development of effective and economical means of finding deposits not recognizable from surface indications alone. Large quantities of ore hidden deep in the earth have been found by underground exploration conducted in active mining areas. Geophysical methods have been very successful in locating petroleum deposits. New findings of concealed resources by a combination of these methods are looked for, but we have come to the end of the good old days when digging for water might produce an oil gusher or a gold mine.

In view of our impending have-not position, should we shut down our mines and preserve the scarce resources remaining in the ground for future emergencies? No. The cost would be too great. It would be wasteful, because much of the unmined portions of developed deposits probably could never be recovered after prolonged shutdowns. The abrupt shut-down would strand thousands of miners and their families in isolated mining areas. Huge capital losses would be incurred. For these reasons, the proposal does not seem to merit serious consideration.

Then what can we do?

Stock piles should be built up, for this is one of the surest ways of assuring our basic security in minerals in time of need.

A large-scale stock-piling program would provide a reservoir into which domestic materials might be placed in times of depression. This would mean that the Nation would benefit from low costs and the miners would have employment. Such a stock-piling program during the last depression would have given us a substantial inventory that would have eased greatly the job of producing minerals during war years.

Such minerals as we lack entirely, or whose supply here is insignificant, should be imported and added to our stock piles.

Our second line of defense is our marginal and submarginal resources. Exploration for new deposits should be carried on vigorously, and plans made for emergency production.

Private industry alone cannot be expected to carry this burden. Since the defense of the Nation is involved, the work of private industry should be aided by Government research and by Government-sponsored explorations. Such a program might lead to the development of new peacetime industries. Interesting possibilities in this direction are offered by our large deposits of manganese-vanadium, and aluminum-bearing materials.

We should never again be so prodigal as we have been in the past in bestowing our precious scrap upon nations that may send it back in the form of bullets and bombs. Further, we should spend time and money in seeking new and better ways to recover metals from scrap.

As our mineral resources grow smaller and as we are compelled more and more to seek raw materials outside of our borders, we must keep our military forces—our Army, Navy, and air arm—strong enough to do our share in maintaining the peace of the world—a peace that is necessary if we are to bring in what we require for our own economy. Without a strong military force, we would be laying open the life lines of raw materials to the first aggressor who could gather a sizable military force about him.

We must encourage and support, morally and financially, the investigations of our research workers and scientists.

If followed, the program that I suggest would prevent or postpone for many years the loss by the United States of its dominant position and its high standard of living.

Such a program would cost money, and, as a nation, we have been willing to talk a great deal about conservation but unwilling to put up much cash for it. We have preferred to see millions of cubic feet of an irreplaceable resource—natural gas—flared off—burned up—rather than spend money to store it. We have preferred to waste millions of tons of coal rather than halt cheap but wasteful methods of mining.

The time has come to face the fact that we can no longer afford to keep our present nonconservation policy. The need in war for modern weapons made from metal and propelled by mineral fuels, mineral shortages that have at times threatened serious repercussions on the battle front, the scarcity of the modern conveniences to which we have become accustomed, and fuel and gasoline rationing ought to have brought home to us the tremendous importance of minerals in modern life. The situation calls for positive action on a long-range program that will guarantee the Nation's future mineral supply.

A Letter to President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following open letter to President Truman, which appeared originally in the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Tablet:

A LETTER TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Man to man, may I intrude on your precious time for a few moments of serious talk?

Accumulating evidence seems to indicate that your State Department is joining willing hands with the loud alien, semialien or alien-minded Soviet agents and fellow-travelers who are now shouting in this country for a break with Spain and implicitly for another civil war in Spain.

Unfortunately, you yourself, Mr. President, could not have let us down with a more sickening thud than when you came home from Potsdam uttering your unprovoked attack on Spain to the dismay, disheartenment, and even real heart-scald of your well-wishers and friends.

As a false step I, for one, hoped you would soon retrieve it.

You have so far done nothing of the kind. Almost willingly, though I sincerely hope not, you have been and are now being pushed into the position of the bully with regard to a nation of some 25,000,000 persons who have just recently gone through a terrible civil war that cost it 1,000,000 dead.

Suppose the United States in the late war had suffered in proportion to Spain during her civil war, Mr. President. That would mean more than five million dead. Assuredly this is no small matter.

Yet now the big, brave, chivalrous United States of America, fresh with its Atlantic Charter and its pledge to the "four freedoms," is going to tell tiny Christian Spain that Franco can no longer rule that country. Why? Because the Soviets say so: there's no other visible reason.

Oh, yes, you will be told that Germany and Italy helped the Spanish Nationalists. Are you quite unaware that Russia and France helped the Spanish "reds"? Were the American colonists blameworthy for accepting help from the absolute monarch Louis XVI's Lafayette and Rochambeau?

Spain has not attacked us. Spain is not aggressive in politics in the United States. She is not running even a propaganda campaign here, though many another foreign country is. Spain is not threatening our lifeline. She is not fomenting revolution here. Spain is not even backing a Republican for our Presidency. Why, then, all the

excitement? Is it because she is trying to mind her own business?

Surely, Mr. President, your common sense is going to put a stop to all this criminal nonsense before it goes any further. Those yelping for civil war—at the recent New York meeting, was there a single bone fide veteran present?—like to yell and so to be heard. I prefer to keep silence. But I can do so no longer.

That peace-promoting Pontiff Pius XI praised, not the totalitarian government of Spain as such, but the people of Spain who rallied around some leader to put a stop to the murderous and tyrannical attack on traditional religion all over that country under such worthies as many of those now calling for more civil war in Spain. Our founding fathers did no less.

Are you prepared to push this assault against the conscience of Catholics throughout our land, some 25,000,000 of them, too, for the sake of an allegedly liberal crowd who are so really liberal that they supported poor Russia against aggressive little Finland? These are many of the same who backed the Russo-German pact of 1939, you will recall.

If you will scan the heaviest casualty lists as printed in the papers of New York City for months during the awful European conflict, you will be able to judge for yourself what a price Catholic boys paid in the war.

Yet, Mr. Laski and Mr. Novikov attack their spiritual guide under the mask of democracy, or what not. People are asking, "Does Mr. Truman give silent consent even to that?"

Now your administration appears on the verge of trampling down the very Christian faith of these men to satisfy a pressure group whose patriotism is certainly centered elsewhere than before Washington's shrine at Mount Vernon. Will it be Nikolai Lenin or George Washington?

If you persist in thus disregarding and impliedly insulting the conscience of American Catholics who were so loyal during the war, you are in time going to be a very sorry man for that fact—the loss of intelligent Catholic sympathy from coast to coast for one thing, and for another, your own eventual awareness of the further fact that you have pulled out a major prop for Christianity in Europe and that you have substantially helped to install in its place "red" atheism.

Recently the Primate of Spain, the Archbishop of Toledo, pointed out that some 300 out of his 600 own diocesan priests were killed by the reds during the trouble in Spain. These clergymen carried no arms. Their hands were anointed to bless. But they were killed nonetheless. And they are by no means the whole story even in the single archdiocese of Toledo.

Suppose half of your congressional and senatorial friends were tortured and shot. Do you think you would so soon extend the right hand of fellowship to their torturers and murderers? You are far too loyal a man for that, I am convinced. Yet the danger of your mind being poisoned, if not overwhelmed and swamped, by all the shouting and the rigged-up machinery of the vociferous agencies of Red propaganda in our midst seems indeed very real today.

Why not seek other and saner counsel? In Washington itself you might easily take sound advice from such high-principled and competent men as Rt. Rev. Msgr. John K. Cartright; Rev. David A. Rubie, O. S. A.; and Mr. Constantine Maguire.

Why don't you talk to the Spanish Ambassador, Senor Cardenas? It can hardly be that he is beyond personal contact or impervious to straight and sincere conversation. Why don't you use that horse sense that has become proverbial with Missourians? To the criers for civil war in Spain, you might make the perfectly natural and very effective everyday demand: "I'm from Missouri; show me."

Mr. President, they can't show you; nor anyone else. They know it. That's why they are screeching so loud.

Preferring to keep quite silent, I still feel constrained to appeal to your fundamentally Christian conscience and your sense of abstract and practical justice. In that conscience and sense I am trying to maintain confidence. You are not going to let us down, are you, Mr. President?

Respectfully and sincerely yours,

JOHN L. BAZINET, S. S.

(Father Bazinet is vice rector of St. Mary's Seminary, Roland Park, Baltimore, Md.)

Is This the Pattern of America's Future?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the December issue of a magazine called Common Sense, is an article written by Victor G. Reuther, whom I understand to be a brother of Walter Reuther, the UAW leader in Detroit, which bears the title "Look Forward, Labor."

In this article Mr. Reuther makes this very interesting observation:

For this reason a new American progressive party must propose a pattern of social ownership that will serve to break the controls of monopoly capitalism. And the forms of social ownership it does propose to institute must, in the fashion of the cooperatives and the TVA, be absolutely democratic in character. Such an economic approach—involving the substitution of democratic social ownership for private monopoly ownership and the retention of useful and efficient small business under private controls—can win the support and participation of important groups whose contributions are essential to the operation of a modern economic system.

Here then is an economic pattern which follows very closely that which is being evolved in certain other areas in the world, namely, the ultimate destruction of the free enterprise system of the United States. I am sure the membership of the House will be interested in this new economic philosophy since it comes from a very authoritative source. The article follows:

LOOK FORWARD LABOR

(By Victor G. Reuther)

Within the next decade, labor organizations in this country will face a critical and continuing challenge to their capacity to lead the fight for full employment and full production under democracy. The manner in which labor meets this challenge will in large measure determine whether or not the democratic forces in the world can build the economic basis for an enduring peace.

In facing up to this challenge, American labor must, I think, give serious consideration to the three following basic facts:

First, we have succeeded in smashing the military vanguard of world reaction as represented by the armed forces of the Axis Nations; but, in order to win this victory, the workers had to be substantially convinced that a victory over foreign fascism would result in fulfillment of the "four freedoms."

Second, in winning the military phase of World War II, we have only done a portion of the job of winning the "four freedoms," because we have not even begun to clean up the economic and political conditions out of which fascism grows—and we have not educated our people to understand that realization of the "four freedoms" is fundamentally incompatible with the economic and political devices that were employed to win the military war against foreign forms of fascism.

Third, upon the assumption of the validity of the foregoing two propositions, it is clear that we cannot attain the "four freedoms" by a return to "normalcy," free enterprise, "the American way," or any of the other verbal dodges of the status quo—and so we face the task of making up our minds that labor has the responsibility to design, propose, initiate and carry through a program of social action that will abolish the conditions from which fascism draws its strength.

In the short time that has passed since VJ-day, the need for a labor program has been expressed with unusual prominence in the public press. Unfortunately, the initiative has been seized by the partisans of the status quo—like Senator VANDENBERG—who have called for a conference of labor, industry, and government to iron out the industrial problems arising out of conversion to peacetime production.

This initiative from the right for formulation of a labor program is unfortunate because it proceeds on the antiquated theory that government can persuade labor and capital to join hands and work like brothers for the common good. It is unfortunate that some labor spokesmen have agreed to the theory that labor must depend upon the free enterprise system to provide the bulk of the 60,000,000 jobs that everybody is talking about.

The recent strikes and threats of strikes for necessary wage increases reveal the real danger in this supposed get-together program of labor, industry, and government. The danger is that under any such get-together program as may occur today, a two-thirds majority of the conferees—namely, industry and government—will gang up on labor in an effort to compel it to accept a labor program designed to maintain the status quo.

It appears that this drive for increased government supervision and regulation of industrial relations is motivated by the desire of the employers and their political partisans to cushion themselves against the impact of an expected period of labor militancy. So far, no major employer of industrial labor has shown any inclination to agree to raise wages, to hold or reduce prices, or to take any other essential steps toward full employment under free enterprise.

Most large employers have, on the contrary, exhibited a marked determination to fight to the last ditch all endeavors of labor to achieve full employment and full production. The only conclusion to draw from this behavior of the major employing groups is that they are girding up their loins for an all-out battle to retain their privileges, prestige, and profit-making powers under the "normal" system of "free enterprise," to which they insist the Nation must return.

There is every indication that American monopoly capitalism intends to wage a bitter fight to perpetuate its controls over the lives and destinies of the majority of the American people. Congress has already reflected the temper of the American business community by the manner in which it has handled conversion.

The full employment bill, which was inadequate to begin with, has been emasculated with amendments which destroy even its original inadequate intent.

Unemployment compensation, for example, has been handled in a completely shameless fashion, for after providing the employers with tax rebates, profit insurance, contract termination awards (not to mention the fabulous boosts in net worth built up out of war profits) Congress then bluntly refused to give unemployed war workers a pittance of $25 a week for 26 weeks.

Price-control authorities, instead of protecting the public against postwar inflation, have fallen over themselves in their eagerness to meet business demands for higher prices.

And there has been no manifestation of interest whatsoever, on the part of either business or Government in any sensible plan to harness the vast network of publicly financed, Government-owned plants to a full employment program.

All in all, labor seems to be caught in a sort of domestic pincers movement; on the economic front the employers are standing firm against trade union demands for necessary upward adjustments of wages, and at the same time they are calling loudly for Government regulation of collective bargaining procedures. On the political and legislative front Congress bows to every whim of business, yet refuses stubbornly to enact any legislation favorable to labor.

While the workers are thus squeezed between the economic power of the employers on the one hand and the political pressure of an unfriendly Congress on the other, labor is called upon by both business and Government to join in a program to work out solutions for our industrial problems. Labor leaders should certainly attend such a conference, or conferences, but not for the purpose of helping industry and Government to preserve the "free enterprise," monopoly capitalism, scarcity system.

It is time to debunk the notion that labor can meet in parleys with Government and management, and, by some miracle, fashion a compromise that will keep all parties happy and contented. So long as such conferences are based on the premise that monopolistic industries are going to be permitted to maintain their powers, privileges, and profits, their only achievements will be more devious devices for dividing up scarcity.

Participate in the conferences, yes—but let labor's spokesmen declare in these conferences their determination to fight with every ounce of their power for a democratic economy pledged to attain full employment and abundance; an economy in which public welfare will take precedence over private profit.

In short, labor today should proclaim a declaration of independence. Our best labor economists and our most far-sighted labor leaders should, regardless of their union affiliations, pool their talents in a plan looking toward the formulation of a realistic program for economic democracy. To declare its independence of business and government, however, does not mean that labor should isolate itself from other important functional groups in our economy. The kind of program we need today will fail in its inception if it does not include the ideas and techniques that farm organizations, progressive businessmen, and consumer groups have to offer.

To achieve a labor declaration of independence means to divorce progressive trade unions from the restrictive concept of "unionism as usual," under which the major function of labor organizations has been to wrestle with business and government for larger shares of scarcity under a system of "free enterprise." It involves recognition, and public proclamation, of the fact that the profit-taking power of monopolistic "free enterprise" is the bottleneck that is barring our path to full production and full employment. (In 1944 the profits of about 2,000 large industrial corporations were nearly five times more than they were in the prewar years of 1936–39. Figures, before taxes, showed a profit of $9,900,000,000 in 1944.)

It involves the summoning of sufficient courage by labor to state bluntly that punitive legal regulation cannot break the monopolistic bottleneck of unearned income. Finally, it involves realization of the fact that—if the industrially employed workers are to have the income essential to full employment—private ownership of monopolistic industries must be replaced by forms of social ownership, such as the TVA and cooperatives, all fundamentally democratic in character.

A program of this nature will prevent America from drifting into some form of totalitarianism in which big business will combine its economic power with the power of government to compel the people to obey its decrees.

Of course, such a program is political dynamite, but the task of social engineering that we face is of such scope that nothing short of political dynamite can blast away the obstructions to economic abundance and insure the expansion of political democracy.

I will be the first to admit that with the present political set-up there is small hope of placing this basic program before the people in such a fashion that they can intelligently act upon it. Figuring out political stratagems for persuading either the Republican or Democratic Parties to wage a campaign upon a basic issue like the social ownership of monopolistic industries seems hopeless at present.

It is my opinion that the time is now ripe for labor to divorce itself from the two old parties and resolve to build the base for an independent, indigenous, new national political party—a party designed to mobilize the American people for democratic abundance at home and enduring peace in the world. We face that decision now.

In the first place, it is clear that the majority of the American people sincerely desire full employment, full production, expansion of political democracy and international security based on justice and equity, but they do not possess a national vehicle through which to express and act upon these desires. There is no national implement of power, not even in the Federal Government, that has the democratic will to attack and break the dominance of the monopolies which stand in our way. Instead, the Nation is torn by sectional skirmishes and incited by factional groupings concerned mainly with their own self-interests.

The present Federal Government has demonstrated its inability to cope democratically or realistically with the urgent economic problems confronting the Nation. The legislative, executive, and administrative instruments of Federal power have failed tragically in this hour of national need.

On the domestic front, as I have already said, Federal authorities have indulged every whim of the monopolists, industrialists, and financiers, while shamefully neglecting the basic needs of the returning veterans and unemployed war workers. Internationally, American diplomacy likewise reflects the interests of the cartelists. The tendency in our foreign policy seems to be toward peace negotiations founded on power politics and imperialistic expansion of American big business.

Because of the apparent unwillingness of the Federal powers to act, except in the interests of the monopolists who today dominate our economy, aggressive pressure groups are taking the initiative and exerting force to attain their particular ends. Even labor—divided as it is, and lacking a national implement with which to work for legitimate and democratic goals—is compelled through expediency to employ the tactics of these big pressure groups.

In this atmosphere capital stands out as the giant among the warring pressure groups, and Government largely reflects its policies. Should this situation continue into a period of widespread unemployment and unrest, as seems dangerously possible under current economic trends, there is no power on the American scene that can prevent a further coalescence of monopoly capitalism and Government, and the emergence of a home-bred variety of fascism.

Moreover it is tragic to observe that in spite of our victory over foreign forms of fascism there are many Americans who seem more than willing to adopt Fascist techniques at home as an alternative to democratic reconstruction of our economic-political system.

I see no hope of staving off this catastrophe except in the unification around a common economic program, and within the framework of a national political organization, of trade unions, farm organizations, cooperatives, independent and progressive business groups, and such other democratic institutions as are willing to break with the past. Alone, no one of these groups can either formulate or implement the necessary program of social change. United, they can formulate a program containing the basic requirements of all participating groups.

Organized labor is obviously the one functional group that has the initiative and the organizational resources to start such a move for dynamic democratic action. I realize, naturally, that we cannot expect all sections of the American labor movement immediately to throw their resources into this proposal. There will be hesitancy, reluctance, and even outright opposition to the idea of creating in this country a counterpart of the British Labor Party.

But I am confident that there are enough leaders of vision and courage in the CIO, the A. F. of L., the Railroad Brotherhoods, and the genuine independent unions to form a block of opinion and initiative whose force would be weighty, if not decisive, in American labor politics. Moreover, it is not in the least far-fetched to speculate that the creation of such a block would serve most effectively to implement the badly needed solidification of the American labor movement.

In any event, the promotion of this idea would provide a rallying point for the more youthful and militant minor labor leaders who are today frustrated by the artificial barriers dividing American labor. It would, in addition, serve as a most valuable educational device for teaching our millions of inarticulate card-carriers that "unionism as usual" cannot solve the national economic problems against which labor is dissipating its strength.

I realize fully that the course of action I am here suggesting is fraught with perils and pitfalls. The gravest of these, I am certain, is the difficult task of persuading broad sections of the nonunion public that the American labor movement is not an aggregation of goons, racketeers, and wild-eyed Bolsheviks. We must uneducate great masses of Americans who have been convinced that the trade unions are un-American cliques of self-seekers. But I can think of no more effective tool for this task than a national political organization which will offer to these nonunion and largely unorganized masses of ordinary folk a weapon with which to express and pursue their goals and desires.

These unattached and misinformed legions are the potential shock troops of American fascism; and, if we of labor do not have the foresight to invite them to join with us in the formulation of a common program, they will one day attack us from the right with all the fury that social frustration kindles in the breasts of its victims.

Secondly, a new national progressive party cannot succeed in America unless it overcomes the danger to democracy inherent in any over-all program of economic planning under political controls. It is a matter of historic fact in the world of our time that a government manned by a minority cannot force the democratization of a machine-age economic system without curtailing those very rights and liberties that are the substance of democracy itself. Universal state ownership of the means of production, as traditionally envisioned by leftist planners

of the ideal social order, or even excessive government intervention in economic processes, can be just as destructive of democratic freedom as any rightist dictatorship.

For this reason a new American progressive party must propose a pattern of social ownership that will serve to break the controls of monopoly capitalism. And the forms of social ownership it does propose to institute must, in the fashion of the cooperatives and the TVA, be absolutely democratic in character. Such an economic approach—involving the substitution of democratic social ownership for private monopoly ownership and the retention of useful and efficient small businesses under private controls—can win the support and participation of important groups whose contributions are essential to the operation of a modern economic system.

These groups, including farmers, professionals, technicians, small businessmen, and so forth, must be persuaded to take their place beside labor in the planning and building of a more democratic America. If they share in the formulation and implementation of a program of democratic abundance, these non-labor groups will have faith in its future; and their presence in the progressive camp will help to insure against too great a concentration of both economic and political power within the Government.

American labor is today well on the way to understanding the urgent need for political action. The limited success of the Political Action Committee (PAC) has demonstrated that the workers can be aroused to act politically and that they can unite with other groups for common objectives.

But PAC is only a good beginning. Unless we act soon to channel its energy into a national political organization that will offer to the American people basic and democratic solutions of our national economic problems, the militance and the awareness it has generated may be dissipated in futile demonstrations of pressure.

This is the eleventh hour for American labor. The chips are down and the stakes are democracy itself and global peace founded on justice and brotherhood. A new progressive American political party may not win power tomorrow, but it can certainly begin the long over-due job of educating our people to understand that they must organize, act collectively, and win political power—in order to secure the four freedoms that were promised to them as a reward for their contributions to the winning of World War II.

American Ballyhoo in Support of English Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the effectiveness of molding public opinion.

We are about to witness another great drive to condition our way of thinking in favor of piling $3,750,000,000 on the unbearable load of our national debt in making the British loan. Already many of our leading columnists by subtle reasoning have come out with their arguments in support of the British plan.

The mechanics to be used and the technique to be followed is presented by the Wall Street Journal, November 13, 1945, issue, in an article entitled "Ballyhoo for Britain," which I submit here for the consideration of the Members of Congress:

WASHINGTON.—The American public is expected to drop its opposition to a loan for Britain between now and the turn of the year.

It won't happen by accident.

Five top Government agencies are mobilizing their opinion-manufacturing machinery for a campaign which will start soon and which officials say will be running at full tilt by December, when Members of Congress will be home listening to constituents. The pay-off will be legislative action in January.

Between now and then the pressure will pile up. Some maneuvering will be in public view, carefully timed. Speeches will be made by Cabinet members, for instance. Some of it will be a bit more obscure; the Government aims to help in preparation of many a magazine article, Sunday newspaper feature, and privately sponsored radio programs plugging the loan.

MANY "OFF-THE-RECORD" SESSIONS

A great deal of the activity will be entirely behind the scenes. Plans are afoot for "off-the-record" sessions in Washington and other cities from coast to coast, in which officials will indoctrinate businessmen, clubwomen, labor and farm leaders, and representatives of literally hundreds of miscellaneous organizations—all carefully chosen for maximum influence on public thinking.

Religious leaders, both ministers and laymen, will be among those welcomed to Washington for education, officials say, much as during the campaign to sell the Bretton Woods monetary plan.

Meanwhile, representatives of Britain in the United States have been specifically instructed to keep quiet about the projected loan.

The American strategy is all drawn up. It is incorporated in a State Department document bulking 100 pages or so which has been distributed to key officials in the Treasury Department, Commerce Department, Federal Reserve Board, and Agriculture Department.

STUDY SHOWS 70 PERCENT OPPOSE CREDIT

This includes a section entitled, "Special Report on Public Attitudes on Foreign Policy," based upon unpublicized governmental polls of public opinion. This study, which also includes analyses of press and radio comment, is understood to show that about 70 percent of the American people are presently against a large credit for Britain.

The present tactics were decided upon after a battle which for a time rocked the State Department. A group of top officials outside that agency demanded that a high-powered publicity expert be hired to run the campaign for popularization of the British loan. But after a tussle it was decided "at a high level" that this could backfire, so the job of planning and directing was left to a little-known division of the State Department which has proved its mettle in previous drives.

This is the Office of Public Affairs, whose acting head is Francis H. Russell, a Boston lawyer who came to the State Department in 1941 and first worked on economic warfare and the blacklisting of foreign firms tainted by Axis influence.

OTHER CAMPAIGNS GO ON

Mr. Russell contends—doubtless quite correctly—that the British loan campaign will not dwarf other drives on public opinion which his division has carried on with little uproar. These include popularization of the food and agriculture organization, the International Aviation Conference, some inter-American pow-wows, the big hullabaloo for the Dumbarton Oaks plan, and minor campaigns like one for the St. Lawrence waterway.

This work goes on constantly. A few days ago a group of industrialists were invited to Washington for the correct "background" on UNRRA. Off-the-record meetings were held recently in Washington, New York, Chicago, Denver, and San Francisco to further the cause of a projected global Educational and Cultural Organization. Late last week an influential group of Washington representatives of national organizations was lectured privately on preparations going on in London for the start of the United Nations Security Organization.

At least one governmental memorandum has referred to such activities as propaganda. Members of Mr. Russell's staff never use this word themselves, they contend. They wince even when the word "selling" pops up. "We like to think we're meeting a demand for information," they explain.

S. Shepard Jones is in charge of Mr. Russell's Public Attitudes Section which, with funds not appropriated for that purpose by Congress, is engaged in polling public opinion, analyzing the returns together with press and radio comment, and compounding his reports in documents which are stamped "confidential."

Chester Williams is in charge of group relations, among other things, arranging an average of one speech each day by some State Department official somewhere in the country. He also fixes up the "background" conferences. For instance, 120 organizations will be in Washington November 26 under auspices of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, to hear private talks by Under Secretary Acheson, Assistant Secretary Clayton, and others on the British loan and other matters, officials say.

HELPS ON DATA FOR ARTICLES

Mrs. Margaret Carter is in charge of a section to which folk are shuttled when they come to the State Department in search of information for magazine stories, radio scripts, or what not. She gives them the proper angle, and arranges interviews with Department dignitaries.

Mrs. Delia Kuhn is in command of Public Views and Inquiries, a special writing service which helps publish governmental pamphlets and which answers letters that pour into the agency from the populace. These average 400 daily, but in times of excitement, as during the San Francisco Conference, they hit a rate of 5,500 a day.

Though the State Department occupies a central position in the British loan campaign, it is flanked by strong supporters. Mr. Russell says that liaison is maintained at a high level by conferences between top State Department officials and Treasury Secretary Vinson, Commerce Secretary Wallace, and Federal Reserve Board Chairman Eccles. He did not mention any ranking official at the Agriculture Department, which is also participating.

Interdepartmental ballyhoo is supported even more effectively at a lower working level by mobilization of the public relations experts of all five departments. A representative of each goes to Mr. Russell's office for briefing on the campaign.

OTHER ORGANS AVAILABLE

The resources of these agencies can be rather staggering when fully mobilized. For example, the Agriculture Department, if it wishes to pull all the stops, can use these organs among others:

A Nation-wide extension service, with an editor in each State who can supply rural papers with stories about the markets for farm products which might result from foreign lending.

County agents, and 4-H Club organizations, where information can be passed by word of mouth.

The AAA organization, including State and local committees empowered to adopt resolutions and hold meetings on the basis of material prepared in Washington if they choose.

Services supplied direct to farm papers, journals, and radio stations.

Agricultural councils in all States and counties, able to reach local facilities of publicity.

The Commerce Department has numerous publications, and doubtless can play on its close connections with trade organizations. The Federal Reserve Board has its own publication, and its representatives, like those of the Treasury, can be influential in speech-making and private word-of-mouth contact with opinion.

Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, the basic issue that has emerged from the debate so far over full employment in this country, reduced to its fundamentals, is jobs versus relief. For some time the debate has centered on almost everything else but the subject of jobs and relief, and that after all is the accepted strategy of attempts to block the legislation—to talk about everything else except what is really bothering one. One thing the argument is not about is whether there could be full employment even without the bill. Everyone is agreed that unemployment is unavoidable if we do not take a positive position to prevent it. To be sure the opponents of the bill place more faith than its sponsors in the length of time for which immediate boom factors may stave off that depression. Both sides, however, are equally alert to the reality of severe demobilization readjustments in the months that are ahead, and to the danger of a serious collapse after the boom has spent itself. In fact, the opposition has revealed itself as completely defeatist on this score. Again and again it has stressed the inevitability of business cycles and the inability of the Government to do anything about it.

Likewise the disagreement does not relate to freedom as is sometimes claimed. All are agreed that freedom is more important than employment. But it cannot be demonstrated that there would be a conflict of the two under the operation of the bill. On the contrary, we all know that opportunity to earn a living is prerequisite to individual freedom to enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—that a man on relief is not free to develop his personality and to make the most of his potentialities. And we know that without the markets provided by employed consumer, there can be no freedom of enterprise and business initiative and competition.

If there is any kind of freedom that is threatened by the promise of full employment, it is the freedom to profit from misfortune, to squeeze out one's competitors, to reap the windfall rewards of inflation and the bargain prices of deflation.

Another spurious issue has to do with public spending under the bill. A great deal of noise has been made about the tremendous sums that would have to be spent to close the gap in private activity, and about how this would mean constant growth in a public debt that is already enormous.

This is most interesting in its implication that private enterprise is completely impotent to respond to Government encouragement, and that it will fall far short of providing enough jobs. Again the opposition admits that unless action is taken we will have mass unemployment—but they prefer to do nothing about it.

Even more pertinent is the fact that these same people are themselves advocating huge public expenditures. They readily admit that in the event of depression—that depression which they would do nothing to prevent—the Government will be liable for emergency relief expenditures. No one, they say, will be allowed to starve. They will feed the people. They will provide clothing and housing and medical care. They will give them doles and work relief. But they will not give them work.

The only difference is that they do not favor the kind of constructive, carefully planned expenditures designed to increase the productivity of the economy, raise the national income and stave off depression. Instead they propose unproductive emergency expenditures, incurred after the crisis has hit, for wasteful and hastily improvised make-work projects, or for outright doles.

In the light of these facts, the clamor about the importance of balancing the Budget stands clearly forth in its absurdity. They know as well as we that deficits occur during depression—as a result of rising emergency expenditures and a shrinking tax base—and never during prosperity. They know that if we really want to balance the Budget and reduce the public debt we must sustain a full-employment level of national income.

This leaves as the real issue the fear of Government intervention. The opponents of the full-employment bill do not want to commit the Government to a full-employment pledge. They are afraid of a guaranty of the right to work, and they are not willing to assure that right. They oppose positive collective action to prevent unemployment, and they want to circumscribe Government responsibility.

There has been a great deal of sparring all around this issue. Sometimes they claim that we cannot bind a future Congress. But they know full well that in a democracy if the people are behind a piece of legislation they will enforce it. Why, then, do they oppose the measure if they are convinced that it has no binding or legal effect?

Sometimes they claim that since the bill does not offer individual redress in the courts in the event of unemployment, it is a misleading and fraudulent promise, not a genuine guaranty. But they know full well that a pledge of all the resources of the world's richest and most efficient nation is all the guaranty that the people need or desire. I am sure that if the people are convinced that the Government will do all in its power to achieve full employment, they will not ask for more.

Sometimes they claim that there is nothing new in this legislation—that nothing can be accomplished under it that cannot now be done without it. Again it may be asked, if they are sincere in this conviction, why do they oppose the measure so strenuously?

The answer, of course, is that they are not sincere. It is true that the Government has always collected statistics, taxed and borrowed and regulated, subsidized and underwritten private enterprise, controlled, and supervised, and spent. And it is true that under the operation of the bill the Government would still be doing these things.

The difference, however, is that all of these tools of Government would become part of a single integrated program—they would have a common purpose, and their total effect would add up to full employment. This is the essence of a national budget—that it should balance all of the various flows of public and private consumption and investment at a particular level, namely, the full employment level of activity. It would budget for enough jobs for all who are able and willing to work, and for nothing short of that.

The opponents of the bill grant the usefulness of statistics, and proclaim their readiness to estimate and forecast. But they do not propose to use the figures as a guide to action. If their budget should reveal a deficiency in private activity, they would let the slack be taken up through unemployment. They would close the gap with human misery, rather than constructive Government action.

And why are they afraid of such action? Because they know that if Congress were guided by the full-employment goal, it might have to do these various things differently—it would take action in the same fields as before, but not necessarily in the same direction. A full-employment program might step on some privileged toes, because it might call for more progressive taxation, or more aggressive action against monopoly, or more assistance to new and small firms, or more adequate development of our natural resources at the wealthier taxpayer's expense, or expanded social security, or opening up of new industrial regions to compete with established centers of activity, or more tangible support to the traditional formula of higher wages, larger output, and lower prices. There might be occasions on which the collective will of the majority would override the interests of the minority.

What do the people, those who will really be affected by the enactment of such legislation, say about full employment. In an effort to ascertain the viewpoints of the average man and woman, a very comprehensive and most unusual method of sampling opinion was employed in the Second Congressional District of Illinois, which I have the honor to represent in this Congress. Nearly a year ago the Independent Voters of Illinois undertook to ascertain the opinion of the people in the Second Congressional District of Illinois. The poll was decided upon at a meeting of this league. Sixty citizens volunteered to make a very complete canvass of the district under

the direction of Mr. John H. Millar, secretary of the Independent Voters of Illinois. The volunteers set out to develop a new technique of political information and action. A detailed block-by-block study of the district was made, so that it was possible to pick for interviewing a "sample" that, in miniature, would have the same characteristics as the district as a whole. Persons within this "sample" were interviewed by a corps of specially trained volunteer interviewers in the period shortly before VJ-day.

The Second Congressional District of Illinois is the fourth largest district in the United States, with a population of 612,641 in 1940. It has a cross section of varied economic, racial, and nationality groups. It includes the University of Chicago community and the south Chicago steel mill area. Consequently, although I would not vouch that the results of this particular study are 100-percent typical of the Nation as a whole, I cannot see why there should be any great divergence.

In the first place, it was learned that the people are worried. Canvassers asked them whether they thought job conditions would be the same, better, or worse after victory over Japan? The result? Forty-nine percent, practically half of them, expressed their conviction that things would be worse. Only 19 percent, or one-fifth, thought they would be better; and 13 percent thought they would remain the same. The more optimistic estimates were based upon such abnormal, temporary factors as large reconversion demands at home and abroad, and—this is significant—their confidence in a Government program to help stimulate activity. The more pessimistic reasons, on the other hand, related to cutbacks in war industries, return of servicemen, and the record of depressions in the past.

Having established the fact that the people have no real confidence in the future, poll takers then asked, "If there are not enough jobs for everyone after the war, do you think anything can be done about it?" And here the overwhelming response—83 percent, to be exact—was "Yes." Only 8 percent said "No," while 9 percent just did not have an opinion.

The next question obviously was what should be done; and to this over half of those interviewed spontaneously proposed some sort of Government program. Forty-eight percent supported Government action to stimulate business, build public works, give direct relief, or provide social security. Twenty-three percent recommended spreading work or shortening hours, presumably through Government control.

This much is certain, the people of Illinois are not opposed to working together to help one another through Government action.

It might be added for the benefit of those who see the demand for Government action as the radical and desperate plea of the underprivileged, that all income groups responded equally in favor of the positive Government policy. Just as many of those earning over $100 a week recommended such action as among those earning up to $43 a week.

Now, let us quickly summarize the results of the $64 question—before someone jumps to his feet to protest, "Yes, but how do you know they would favor the full-employment bill?"

Without naming the full-employment bill, this question was asked, "What would you think of a bill like this? First, the President would find out each year how many jobs there are going to be for the coming year. Then, if there were not enough jobs for everyone, Congress would give financial help to private business so that it could provide more jobs. Then, if there were still too few jobs, the Government would give contracts to private business to build public works to make up the balance of jobs needed."

The results? Eighty-three percent indicated they would favor such a proposal. This is more than just a majority, it is an overwhelming majority. Not only does it represent more than four-fifths, but 5 percent just could not decide, so that only 12 percent were actually opposed.

Note that according to the phrasing of the question, the first step would be financial assistance to private business, and the second step would be private contracts for public works. This, of course, is much narrower than the original full-employment bil, which, as a first and primary requirement, calls upon the Government to exercise the whole range of responsibility to which I have referred earlier and not merely financial assistance. Similarly the last resort would be Federal investment and expenditures in any one of a number of possible forms, not just for public works.

As a matter of fact, the divergence of this question from H. R. 2202 accounts for most of the unfavorable responses. Further questioning revealed that opposition to such a measure was related primarily to reluctance to subsidize private enterprise, which should stand on its own feet, and to fear of increased taxation. Hence, these people should find it reassuring that real full-employment legislation proposes to take steps to enable business to stand on its own feet—not merely to subsidize it, but by underwriting its markets, and combating monopoly, and encouraging consumption and in a good many other ways than direct expenditures. Then perhaps they would realize that the kind of full employment which is the objective of this bill would not increase tax rates but would improve the ability of people to pay taxes.

Retirement of Brig. Gen. Robert L. Denig, United States Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I want to pay tribute to the greatest military family in my district.

Last week one of the grand old "young" men of the Marine Corps, Brig. Gen. Robert L. Denig, 61, retired from active duty Saturday, December 1, 1945, after more than 40 years in the corps.

The general, who was Director of the Division of Public Relations since its inception in mid-1941, was highly honored in Washington's Statler Hotel on the night before his retirement by members of his immediate staff at headquarters.

Attending were the Marine Corps Commandant, Gen. A. A. Vandegrift, Maj. Gens. Pedro A. del Valle, Allen H. Turnage, and Field Harris and numerous other high-ranking Marine officers as well as many of the over 200 enlisted combat correspondents and "exes," the majority of whom are back at work on newspapers throughout the country. Attending, also, were many well-known civilian newsmen and photographers, news-reel editors and cameramen.

General Denig, who was wounded in action while commanding an Army battalion in France as a major, is generally credited with being the father of the combat correspondent idea in the American armed forces.

Certainly, he was the impelling force which prevailed on a theretofore tradition-bound Marine Corps to loosen its restrictions and permit enlistments of qualified newspapermen for reporting of action on all the Marines' front lines.

Throughout a war that saw the general send his 2 sons into the Pacific in active roles as tank commanders, 1 never to return, also saw the general at the helm of a program that sent out into action over 200 of the Nation's most active and aggressive newsmen to report the war.

These men were present in small numbers when the marines jumped off the landing barges at Guadalcanal in the first offensive action of any of the American forces in World War II. They were present also at all subsequent Marine landings up to and including final Okinawa. Seven of General Denig's own—his combat correspondents—were killed in action. In addition, over 40 were wounded.

Son of a naval officer, Brigadier General Denig was born September 20, 1884, in Clinton, N. Y. As the son of a naval officer, General Denig became acquainted with the naval service early in life, and went to grade school for several years in Japan, while his father was at sea in the United States Asiatic Fleet.

General Denig attended high school in Sandusky, Ohio, where in 1900 he was a private in Company B, Sixth Ohio Regiment, National Guard. He left Sandusky to attend Manlius Preparatory School, and upon graduation entered the University of Pennsylvania.

On September 29, 1905, General Denig was appointed from Sandusky, Ohio, as a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps. One year later, following a period of training at the School of Application, Annapolis, Md., he was attached to an expeditionary force organized for service in Cuba where he served until November 1907. After his service in the Cuban pacification campaign Lieutenant Denig was assigned to sea duty and served

in the Marine Detachment, U. S. S. *Missouri*, until December 1909.

While at sea in August 1908, he was promoted from second to first lieutenant, and in December went ashore to duty at the marine barracks, Annapolis. Duty as post quartermaster at Annapolis occupied Lieutenant Denig until October 1911, when he was transferred to recruiting duty, and after a short period of instruction at Philadelphia in the duties of a recruiting officer, he took charge of recruiting district of Minnesota, No. 12, Central Recruiting Division, St. Paul.

In May 1913 Lieutenant Denig was again transferred to foreign duty and served in the Philippines until January 1916. The Marine Barracks, Philadelphia, was Lieutenant Denig's next station, and it was while serving in Philadelphia that he was promoted to captain in September 1916.

March 1917 saw Captain Denig having his first contact with Germans, when with a platoon of men he arrested the crew of the German auxiliary cruiser *Crown Prinz William* interned along with the *Prinz Eitel Frederick*, and conducted them from Philadelphia to Fort Oglethorpe, Ga. July 1917 saw the Fifth Regiment of Marines assembling at Quantico for duty overseas, and on August 5 Captain Denig, in command of the Seventeenth Company, Fifth Marines, sailed for France. After several months at the various combat schools in France, during which time he received a temporary promotion to major, Major Denig was given command on May 1, 1918, of the First Battalion, Thirtieth Infantry, Third Division. As commander of the Army battalion, he participated in the Aisne-Marne defensive, east of Chateau-Thiery from June 1 to July 7, and on July 8 he joined the Second Battalion, Sixth Marines, Second Division. At the battle of Soissons Major Denig stayed with the Sixth Marines, but on July 30 the Army again needed experienced field officers, and Major Denig commanded a battalion of the famous Ninth Infantry. He commanded the Third Battalion of the Ninth until October 3, when a serious wound took him out of the fight, and on November 27 he was evacuated to the naval hospital at New York.

Duty in New York, Philadelphia, and Marine Barracks, Portsmouth, occupied the major until 1922, and in March 1921 he received his permanent majority.

Major Denig sailed in March 1922 for foreign service in Santa Domingo where he was attached to the Second Marine Brigade until the spring of 1924.

From 1924 until 1929 he spent a tour of duty at the Marine Corps schools and Marine Barracks, Quantico, first as a student and then as an instructor.

November 1929 marked the beginning of another Caribbean period of service, this time in Nicaragua, and from December 1929 until the following December he commanded the northern area at Ocotal, Nicaragua. In April 1931 after a few months duty at Managua, Nicaragua, as chief of staff of the Guardia Nacional, Major Denig returned to the United States for duty at Headquarters, Marine Corps, and was promoted to lieutenant colonel in October 1931.

In May 1933 Lieutenant Colonel Denig was again assigned to duty at Quantico where he served first as assistant chief of staff of the Fleet Marine Force and then as chief of staff until the early spring of 1936. While at Quantico, in 1934, he was promoted to the rank of colonel.

Command of the marine barracks, naval prison, Portsmouth, N. H., was Colonel Denig's next tour of duty at which he continued until his transfer in July 1939, to marine barracks, Navy Yard, Pearl Harbor, T. H. There he served as commander of the marine post, district marine officer, and district commander, Nineteenth Reserve District, until June 1940. He then took command of the post at Puget Sound, Bremerton, Wash., and served as district marine officer and comandant of the Thirteenth Reserve District.

On June 1, Colonel Denig was ordered to Headquarters, Marine Corps, and advanced to the rank of brigadier general. He continued on active duty and upon the establishment of a Marine Corps Division of Public Relations, General Denig was appointed Director of the Division, in which capacity he is now serving.

General Denig holds the following decorations: Navy Cross; Distinguished Service Cross; Purple Heart; Cuban Pacification Medal; Victory Medal with Aisne, Aisne-Marne, St. Mihiel, Meuse-Argonne and Defensive Sector clasps; Expeditionary Medal; Second Nicaraguan Campaign Medal; American Defense Service Medal with Bronze Star; French Legion of Honor; French Croix de Guerre with bronze star; French Croix de Guerre with palm; French Fourragere; Presidential—Nicaraguan—Medal of Merit.

General Denig is married and has one son, Lt. Col. Robert L. Denig, Jr., USMC, who is in command of the Tank Battalion, Training Center, Camp Elliott, San Diego, Calif. Another son, Capt. James L. Denig, USMC, who commanded Company B, Fourth Tank Battalion, Fourth Division, was killed in action on Namur Island, Kwajalein Atoll, Marshall Islands, on February 1, 1944. In addition, there is one grandson, Robert L. Denig III, the son of Lieutenant Colonel Denig.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting the record of his famous father, the late Commodore Robert Gracey Denig, as well as the record of his distinguished son, Capt. James L. Denig, USMC, who was killed in the Marshall invasion in the Pacific area:

COMMODORE ROBERT GRACY DENIG, UNITED STATES NAVY

Robert Gracey Denig, who rose from cadet engineer to commodore in the United States Navy, was born on May 22, 1851, in Columbus, Ohio.

After attending college in Kenyon, Ohio, and the Ohio and Jefferson College in Philadelphia, Pa., he entered the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis as a cadet engineer. He was graduated in 1873.

Commodore Denig's early tours of duty took him to Panama, Honolulu, and South America. He was one of 29 persons who were rescued when the U. S. S. *Trenton*, on November 24, 1877, was wrecked off the coast of North Carolina. During the Spanish-American war, Commodore Denig, then a lieutenant commander aboard the U. S. S. *Niagara*, took part in the bombardment of San Juan and the Battle of Nipe Bay.

For several years thereafter, Commodore Denig served on flagships which went on world tours and special trips to Africa and South America. He was made a commander in 1903, a captain in 1907, and in 1908 was placed on the retired list with the rank of commodore.

When the First World War broke out, Commodore Denig and his family were living in Sandusky, Ohio. In April 1917 he was recalled to active duty as chief inspector of navy engineering material in Pittsburgh, Pa., where he served until the end of the war.

During this period, Commodore Denig was active in stimulating war production in this vital manufacturing area. He designed a war-worker medal for persons employed in war plants. At his instance streetcar service for war workers was immeasurably improved.

This job completed in October 1919, Commodore Denig returned to Sandusky, where he helped organize the Perry Post, No. 83, of the American Legion. He died suddenly on April 10, 1924, in that city. Three years later, the name of Perry Post was officially changed to Commodore Denig Post.

Commodore Denig was married on April 11, 1878, to Jeannie Livingston Hubbard, of Sandusky. They had three children, one of whom is Brig. Gen. Robert L. Denig, the recent director of the Marine Corps Division of Public Relations, in World War II.

CAPT. JAMES L. DENIG, USMC, SON OF BRIG. GEN. ROBERT L. DENIG, USMC, KILLED IN MARSHALLS

Marine Capt. James L. Denig, son of Brig. Gen. Robert L. Denig, Director of the Division of Public Relations of the United States Marine Corps, has been killed in the Marshall Islands invasion.

Captain Denig was in command of a tank company in the Fourth Marine Division, which made the initial landing in the Roi Island area of the Marshalls. No details have been received on his death.

Word of his death was received today by his father in Marine Corps Headquarters, Washington, D. C.

Captain Denig's address was 2122 California Street, NW., Washington, D. C., the home of Brigadier General Denig.

Only 24 years old last December 25, Captain Denig was determined to follow in his father's footsteps. He was graduated from the Manlius School, Manlius, N. Y., where he completed a course in the reserve officers' training course, junior division of the Infantry.

On April 20, 1939, he was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps Reserve. Part of his training in the inactive Reserve was received at Pearl Harbor, T. H.

Meanwhile, he continued his schooling at the University of New Hampshire. In June 1941, he received a bachelor of science degree in economics, cum laude.

On September 13, 1941, he was called to active duty. He reported to Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va., where he received basic training.

In February 1942 he was assigned to the Navy Department as an intelligence officer. In that capacity he was transferred to Ensenada, B. C., Mexico, as assistant liaison officer on the staff of Gen. Lazaro Cardenas, then supreme commander of the western defense area in Mexico, and former President of the Mexican Republic.

In June of that year young Denig was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Regular Marine Corps. He then was transferred to Port of Spain, Trinidad, British West Indies, as naval liaison officer.

In August, he was transferred to Dunedin, Fla., to the Amphibian Tractor School. A promotion to first lieutenant followed on September 30, 1942. In April 1943 he was advanced to captain.

In May 1943 Captain Denig was transferred to the Fourth Division, then being organized at Camp Joseph H. Pendleton, Oceanside, Calif.

His enthusiasm for marine tanks was handed down to him by his brother, Marine Lt. Col. Robert L. Denig, Jr., a veteran of Guadalcanal and currently executive officer of the Marine Tank Training School near San Diego, Calif.

Captain Denig was a member of the Phi Lambda Phi Fraternity, a scholastic honor society. He was unmarried.

Clayton Act Should Be Amended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which recently appeared in the Nashville Tennessean in support of H. R. 4810, a bill to amend the Clayton Antitrust Act:

UNDER OUR OWN CARPET

General MacArthur's crack-down on monopoly in Japan is a reminder that our own antitrust program, suspended for the most part during the war, is being resumed under more unfavorable conditions than in 1942, largely because of a reduced staff, a reduced budget, and the failure of Congress to take any action on the various proposals to strengthen the laws enforcing competition.

Thurman Arnold put the fear of God in the hearts of monopolists with the most vigorous antitrust policy in the history of the Nation before his retirement in 1943. He considered the nearly 300 suits which he brought only the beginning of an effort to restore free competition to America.

To carry on the brilliant and aggressive program, Arnold's able successor, Mr. Berge, needs an expanded budget and a bigger staff for the war-shrunken antitrust division of the Justice Department. The war and the closed season on trusts have given monopoly one of the greatest lifts in history. A campaign even more vigorous than that launched by Mr. Arnold in 1938 is needed to roll back the tide on behalf of the consumer, the wage earner, and the small-business man.

The antitrust division needs more than a bigger budget, however. Its antitrust weapons—the Sherman, Clayton, and Robinson-Patman Acts—are inadequate. The Temporary National Economic Committee's recommendations for strengthening them deserve something better than the small consideration given thus far by Congress.

The Federal Trade Commission should be raised from its present low stature as a referee between businesses and a collector of statistics to be a real agency of the people. This could be done by adopting the TNEC proposal to give it the power to grant or refuse to grant Federal licenses for interstate commerce and to withhold approval of any business merger. Such a measure would make it possible to head off monopoly before it could form.

Other bills based on the TNEC recommendations, such as the O'Mahoney-Kefauver bill and Senator LANGER'S proposal to raise the criminal and civil penalties for violating antitrust laws from mere taps on the wrist to punishment severe enough to deter, deserve early consideration.

One of the reasons why the Clayton Act his been practically a dead letter for a quarter of a century is found in its weak original construction, which failed to outlaw the acquisition by a corporation of a competitor's assets in addition to stock in cases in which it would lessen competition. If holding companies during the twenties failed to reach the size of the gargantuan Japanese "big four," it was not due to the restraints imposed by the Clayton Act. The O'Mahoney-Kefauver bill would correct the serious weakness of the 1914 law and also make up for some of the inroads on the act by judicial review.

Hope for full employment and expanded production in America is closely tied in with the question of monopoly control. Experience has clearly shown that if left alone monopoly power will raise prices, narrow consumption, reduce production, lower wages, and head the Nation into depression. Congress cannot afford at this time to be indifferent to the question of preventing restraint of trade through industrial concentration, if a free capitalist America is to evolve.

"We Must Unify Our Armed Forces" Is Theme of Excellent Magazine Article by John Cowles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I have just read one of the most splendid and convincing articles which has been published on the subject of the unification of the War and Navy Departments. It was written by John Cowles, chairman of the board of Look magazine. The author possesses first-hand knowledge of the theaters of war. He was on Okinawa at the time of the Jap surrender. He was also in north Africa and Alaska, and he visited installations in the Pacific.

As a vigorous advocate of unification, I present for the information of my colleagues, the following:

WE MUST UNIFY OUR ARMED FORCES
(By John Cowles)

If the American people realized the extent of the ineffectiveness, friction, and waste that results from our having separate, independent War and Navy Departments, they would overwhelmingly demand that Congress immediately integrate them into a single unified Department of National Defense.

Not only would the war have been won sooner had the two services been unified 10 years ago, but fewer American boys would have lost their lives. Hundreds of thousands fewer men would have bee n:eded in uniform. Tens of billions of dollars would have been saved.

Saying this implies no criticism of the superb valor and achievements of either the Army or the Navy. In the victory that our forces won, there is ample glory for all.

THE SYSTEM IS WRONG

Our double-headed system of separate War and Navy Departments, each completely independent of the other, each getting its own separate appropriations from Congress, is basically wrong. Our system of having both the War and Navy Departments perform many of the same functions inevitably results in staggering duplication and waste. Our system of emphasizing the separation of the services is wrong. Our system of separate Army and Navy intelligence services is wrong. Our system whereby no one but the President—who is too busy with other matters—has command authority over the two services is wrong.

Because of our double-headed set-up, General Marshall and Admiral King had to devote large proportions of their time not to planning affirmative strategy to defeat our enemies but to composing disputes between the War and Navy Departments. As a result, many phases of the war had to be conducted on a basis of compromise, with necessarily reduced effectiveness.

Everyone who has testified either for or against Senator HILL'S proposal to integrate the two services now concedes the need for unity of command in each combat theater of war. Unity of command in Washington is even more important.

People who believe that we did have real unity of command even in all of the war theaters are mistaken. Right up to the day of the Japanese surrender, control of American forces occupying Okinawa, our closest territory to the Japanese homeland, was under divided command. Some were under General MacArthur, a thousand miles to the south in the Philippines; some were under Admiral Nimitz, more than a thousand miles to the east on Guam; while those in the strategic air force were under General Spaatz, also a thousand miles away. MacArthur reported to General Marshall, Nimitz reported to Admiral King, Spaatz reported to General Arnold, all of them in Washington, and even in Washington no one except the President had the power of command over the separate services.

DOOLITTLE WAS APPALLED

When Lt. Gen. Jimmy Doolittle arrived to take command of B–29 operations on Okinawa, he was apparently so appalled by the situation that he did an amazing thing for a top-ranking military man to do; he publicly pleaded for unification of command.

The so-called island commander of Okinawa actually lacked the authority even to discipline traffic violators, except for that relatively small proportion of the total forces directly under him, even though he had responsibility for seeing that the thousands of motor vehicles engaged in the construction of roads and air strips were not delayed by traffic jams.

Handling the 325,000 natives on Okinawa—enemy nationals—was no small problem. Yet the successive conflicting orders as to whether the Navy or the Army were to exercise control of military government finally became an open joke.

There was even question as to the degree of coordination of air attacks on the Japanese by our three separate Air Forces, the Fleet Air Arm under Nimitz, the far eastern Air Force under MacArthur, and the United States Strategic Air Force under Spaatz.

When war correspondents of the highest professional standing attempted to send dispatches hinting at the lack of unification that so obviously existed, censorship stopped them.

The procurement services of the War Department and Navy Department at home bid against each other for supplies and equipment. Qualified ordnance experts have even expressed the view that some standardization suggestions were purposely vetoed so that munitions and weapons would not be interchangeable between the Army and the Navy.

Manufacturers of various items used by both the Army and Navy were required to package their products completely differently, 12 in a box for the Army, 25 for the Navy, at increased expense and production delay, for no apparent reason except that the War and Navy Departments had separate procurement set-ups.

Service rivalries between the War and Navy Departments produced duplicating airfields,

hospitals, and even officers' clubs in many places.

Both the Army (ATC) and the Navy (NATS) operated on air-line service across the Pacific. Even on a tiny island like Johnston, an island only large enough for a single air strip, the Army and Navy each maintained its own exclusive personnel to put gasoline into its planes. The Army took the position that only soldiers should service Army planes, and the Navy that only sailors should service Navy planes, so we had double-headed administration and personnel.

Such wastes of manpower and money were multiplied a hundredfold by duplicate Army and Navy headquarters with all of their supporting service troops, duplicate intelligence services, duplicate supply depots, duplicate facilities and installations throughout the globe.

The Army specified one color and weight of underwear for its men in Iceland and Alaska, and the Navy another. Consequently, both forces couldn't be outfitted from a single store of supplies.

Although most people assume that the Navy handles all ocean shipping, the War Department actually has an enormous shipping section, duplicating functions that the Navy should be better qualified to perform.

If a college football squad were divided into two separate groups, one of linemen and the other of backs, and they were coached entirely separately, using different signals, we wouldn't expect them to function effectively if they were put together for the first time as a team only at the opening whistle of a game. Yet that is precisely the situation we have in our defense set-up with separate War and Navy Departments. That is at least a partial explanation of the disaster that occurred on December 7, 1941, at Pearl Harbor.

If—God forbid—another war comes, and the simultaneous dropping of atomic bombs on a score of American cities signals the start of hostilities, do we want two groups of uncoordinated players, even if they are individual stars, or do we want a trained team where each member knows exactly what he must do to help the team as a whole?

Unification of the Army and Navy into one department does not necessarily mean making either service subordinate to the other. Scientific progress may reduce the relative importance of one branch as new discoveries are made, but that is no reason for opposing integration.

Some opponents of unification argue that combining the services would necessarily "shatter the morale" or "destroy the traditions" of this specialized service or that. But no one would suggest that the Marine Corps does not have superb morale, and yet it is only one small part of the over-all Navy Department.

Today war is "total." It is an indivisible mixture not only of land and sea and air fighting, but of construction and logistics, of production and scientific research.

Recent scientific developments in atomic fission, in radar and the whole field of electronics, in jet propulsion and rocket projectiles, multiply the imperative reasons why the War and Navy Departments should be unified. The hundreds of millions of dollars a year that would be saved by eliminating duplication would provide funds for more research work on new weapons than we have trained scientists available to handle.

All Army, Navy, and Air Force uniforms, except clothing designed for some specific operational function, should be identical. Military titles for commissioned and noncommissioned officers should be identical. Pay should be the same in all branches for men of the same rank performing tasks of comparable danger or difficulty. Morale can be safeguarded through collar insignia indicating the specialized service in which the individual is engaged.

Our whole system of military and naval education should be overhauled. Instead of allowing admission to West Point and Annapolis to be controlled even in part by political patronage, competitive examinations should be given those who, after completing two or more years of college with ROTC training or service in the National Guard, want to make a career of military service. Possibly every boy so selected should have a year of training at West Point in the ground forces, a year at Annapolis in the naval service, and year of aviation at Randolph Field, before deciding in what branch he prefers to specialize. Other promising students should be sent to scientific institutions, so that we will have trained physicists and chemists working constantly on the scientific problems of national defense.

If war comes again, it will probably be all over, won or lost, in a far shorter time than any past war has been. It will be too late then to unify for maximum effectiveness. A second-best system of national defense, like a second-best hand in a poker game, is a poor bet.

With the discovery of the atomic bomb and the rocket, war has been revolutionized. Our national-defense system must be revolutionized, too.

Housing for Middle-Income Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 12 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by Msgr. John O'Grady, secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on December 6, 1945, on the subject of housing for middle-income families. The committee had under consideration Senate bill 1592. Monsignor O'Grady's statement was comprehensive and pointed. As such it should be given wide circulation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Recently I held a meeting of our clergy in an industrial area of a certain city as a preliminary step to setting up a community organization that would include all groups. The clergymen that I brought together for a discussion of their neighborhood problems represented 12 different nationalities. One thing about which they spoke with a good deal of feeling was the lack of decent housing in the area. They stated that the families in that area wanted to own their own homes but that there was a scarcity of homes for sale; that when such homes as were available were purchased it was difficult for families to keep up their payments because of the high costs.

PUBLIC HOUSING A PREPARATION FOR HOME OWNERSHIP

What I found in this community is typical of what one finds all over the United States. When I have talked to local leaders in industrial areas about the low-cost public-housing program they have told me that while it is most essential and should be continued, that it is really a transitional program; that one of the best gains from public housing is the preparation of people for the ownership of their own homes. They have pointed out that while a number of their people who have been renters in the public-housing projects have purchased their own homes this number would be much larger if homes were available at a price they could afford to pay.

VALUE OF HOME OWNERSHIP

It is not easy for one to appreciate what the ownership of a small home in the ordinary American community means in the conservation and upbuilding of family life. The home is something that families cherish. It is a bond of union between the members of the family. It gives the head of the family a sense of achievement that can hardly be acquired in any other way.

In the conservation and upbuilding of American family life it is not only the home itself that matters but also the neighborhood. Everyone is aware of the process of deterioration that has been going on close to the heart of American cities in recent years. We know how the so-called slum areas have been breeding places of ill-health and of juvenile and adult delinquency. We know how difficult family life is in those areas. In the building of homes for American families we have to consider not merely the physical home itself but also the environment in which it is located. Our present slum areas are not suitable places therefore for the building of homes. The present slums must be cleared away in order to make the areas on which they are built suitable places for home building.

MINIMUM STANDARD OF LIFE INCLUDES HOUSING

During the past 50 years in the United States much has been said and written about the right of the citizen to a certain standard of life. People have talked and written about the right of the worker to a living wage not only for himself but also for his family. One of the basic purposes of the American labor movement has been the securing of a living wage for its members. In recent years the principle of the living wage has found expression in American statutory and constitutional law. The American people have also come to recognize the right of workers, in fact the right of all citizens, to protection against the hazards of life, such as, age, unemployment, and industrial accidents. This minimum standard of life includes not only a living wage and protection against the major hazards of life but also decent housing with proper sanitation, sufficient space to insure that privacy which is an essential part of family life, and adequate bathing and toilet facilities.

For more than 50 years there has been considerable discussion in the United States about the part that housing plays in a standard of life. As early as 1888 the Bureau of Labor made a study of workers' housing in this country. The same Bureau made a still more comprehensive study in 1902.

Beginning about 1917 we had much discussion about municipally owned and operated homes. About this time a few model home projects were established here and there throughout the country. During the twenties there was a wide interest in limited dividend corporations as a means of bringing homes within the reach of the people at a price that they could afford to pay. In 1932 the Federal Government entered the field of housing on the credit side. The mortgage market had become very shaky. It was necessary to have an institution similar to the Federal Reserve System to help home loan agencies make their credit more flexible. For this purpose the Federal Home Loan Bank System was set up in 1932. The Federal Housing Administration was set up in 1934 in order to secure a new flow of capital into the housing field and also to protect existing capital investments through a large insurance program. In 1937 the United

States Housing Act was passed to aid local housing authorities in building low-rent homes for families who could not pay the rent that private capital was compelled to charge.

AN ALL-INCLUSIVE HOUSING PROGRAM

During the past 2 years the Senate of the United States, through its Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Redevelopment of the Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, has made a complete study of the whole place of housing in the economy of the Nation. Now this Committee on Banking and Currency has before it the bill based on the committee's report. In this bill we have an all-inclusive housing program. Those who are interested in the purely fiscal side of housing are no longer separated from those who regard it as basically a social problem. Public as well as private housing are parts of one program and side by side with them we have a comprehensive program for urban redevelopment. Over the entire program there is to be a general planning agency which is to insure that housing will no longer be dealt with in separate watertight compartments. Without this over-all agency there is no possibility for a housing program that will meet the needs of the American people.

A CHALLENGE TO PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

It is no exaggeration to say that housing plans for middle-income families under this bill present one of the most serious challenges that has ever been presented to American private enterprise. They challenge American business to meet one of the greatest needs of the Nation. They challenge it to provide decent homes at a price within the reach of 9,000,000 nonfarm families earning in peacetime between $1,000 and $2,000 a year. In 10 years there will be 11,500,000 families in this middle-income group, assuming relative prosperity and high national income. Private enterprise is not only challenged to meet the needs of this very large number of families but it is offered a variety of inducements to do so. Once the American people understand the far-reaching provisions of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill for middle-income families there will be no question about their attitude toward it. The United States is still a country of middle-class people. It still has a middle-class mentality. Its families cherish home ownership. They want to have a stake in the soil. Think of what this legislation will mean for millions of families who heretofore have never had an opportunity of owning their own homes. Think of what it means for those who have purchased homes at a price they could ill afford to pay. Think of what it means for the families who have lost their homes because they were unable to pay the relatively excessive service charges.

MIDDLE-INCOME FAMILIES FORGOTTEN

The middle-income families of the United States are not unemployed people. They are an important section of the wage-earning people of this country. They are the backbone of American democracy. At the same time they are the families that are most likely to be forgotten in housing, in health measures, and in other services. The upper income groups are able to take care of themselves. Most of our public efforts so far have been concentrated on the lowest third of the population. Families in the middle-income group, particularly families of four or more, cannot afford to pay more than one-fifth of their entire income for housing. If these families spend more than this amount they must skimp on their allowances for food, for clothing, for recreation and for religious activities. Broadly speaking, this means that the middle-income families, with incomes from $1,000 to $2,000 a year, can afford to spend for their housing at most $20 to $40 a month. This may be for rent or it may be applied toward the cost of owning a home. It follows, therefore, that the middle-income families can obtain good housing only if such housing is available in adequate supply at costs ranging from $20 to $40 a month.

According to the 1940 census, middle-income families in great numbers were not getting good housing in 1939; they were not getting even decent, safe and sanitary housing. Of the nonfarm families paying between $20 and $40 a month for their housing, almost 875,000 lived in houses in the worst classification—those needing major repair. Another 265,000 of these middle-income families lived in houses without running water or plumbing—although not needing major repair. Still another 960,000 of these families lived in houses lacking basic sanitary facilities, such as private baths or flush toilets. Thus, more than 2,000,000 middle-income nonfarm families were deprived of housing coming up to what could be called an American standard. On the farms, the situation was relatively worse. In the years since 1939 there has not been much home building because of the war. Housing today is relatively much older. The housing prices have gone much higher than incomes—the total situation is far worse now than in 1939.

PLANS FOR HOME OWNERSHIP FOR MIDDLE-INCOME FAMILIES

How does the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill enable private enterprise to build for middle-income families? First, and most important, there is a plan for home ownership. This plan uses the Federal Housing Administration system to insure 95-percent loans on individual homes, thus reducing the down payment required of the home purchaser to 5 percent, contrasted with from 10 percent to 20 percent under the present FHA plan. It extends the term of repayment of the loan to 32 years, contrasted with 20 or 25 years under the present FHA plan. It reduces the maximum statutory interest rate on these loans to 4 percent, contrasted with a maximum statutory interest rate of 5 percent under the present FHA plan. It is contemplated that, with experience, the actual interest rate under the new plan might average around 3½ percent. (This would be apart from the one-half of 1-percent charge for FHA insurance.)

The plans for bringing decent housing within reach of millions of middle income families in the United States have been clearly thought out. The program has a large nonpartisan support in the Congress. Those who are opposing it are undertaking a very serious responsibility. If they want to adopt a do-nothing policy, this ought to be made clear to the American people. A critical review of their objections is certainly in order at the present time.

OBJECTIONS TO NEW HOUSING BILL

The objections of Raymond M. Foley, Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration, before this committee may be regarded as fairly typical. Commissioner Foley opposes the plans for middle-income housing because he feels the problem has been in large measure solved. In his testimony he said, "Since its inception and progressively thereafter, the great bulk of FHA operations has been in the middle market." Now, the figures presented by Commissioner Foley are a complete refutation of this assertion. According to the figures, 95 percent of all the home buyers in 1940 under the FHA small-homes plan had family incomes above $1,500 a year. Seventy-one and one-half percent of these home buyers had incomes above $2,000 a year. In other words, only 5 percent of this FHA housing was produced for families with incomes under $1,500 a year, and only 23½ percent of the FHA housing was produced for families with incomes between $1,500 and $2,000 a year.

Even assuming higher postwar incomes and a better standard of life than ever before, about 32 percent of American families in 1935 will have incomes between $1,000 and $2,000 a year—and this 32 percent is the middle-income third (which is all the middle market can mean, if it means anything)—then we see in cold figures the utter unreality of the claim that the great bulk of FHA operations has been in the middle market.

Incidentally, upon questioning, Commissioner Foley said that all he meant by the middle market was the middle of what FHA was actually doing. This would mean that if FHA were producing homes mainly for those with incomes of $2,000 to $8,000 then the $5,000 a year income would be the middle marked by Commissioner Foley's definition. Of course, less than 10 percent of the families in the country have incomes of $5,000 a year and above.

POSSIBLE RESULTS OF POSTPONEMENT OF A HOUSING PROGRAM

As part of his second objection Commissioner Foley tells about the scarcity of materials and of labor during the next year. He claims that without any new plans we can use up all our materials and employ all the available labor in building 500,000 houses. Commissioner Foley therefore concludes that we should postpone all these plans for the time being. This argument shows a lack of proper appreciation of the present housing situation in the United States. Will we secure the most effective results in meeting the needs of the American people by using up our materials and our labor in the next year in building $6,000 to $10,000 homes? Should we not rather try to lay more stress on the building of homes for families who need it the most, namely, the middle-income families. The principal result of a "do nothing policy" will in all probability be a speculative boom in the building of houses for the high-income groups to be accompanied by deprivation and overcrowding for ordinary wage earners and returning servicemen.

For a number of years this great lack of a housing program to meet the needs of the middle-income groups has been quite apparent. The proposed program should be an important element in stabilizing the housing market. It should provide us with a pattern designed to meet the needs of the ordinary people instead of the lopsided developments we have had in the past leading to speculative booms, to be followed by depressions of increasing severity.

CLAIMS OF ECONOMIC UNSOUNDNESS

A third objection to the middle-income plan for home owners is that it is "economically unsound" and would jeopardize the FHA system. It is difficult to understand what Commissioner Foley means by "economically unsound." He refers to a certain period in the life of the mortgage during which the still outstanding principal of the loan will be slightly less than the value of the house. During this stage he contends that the loan will be in a condition of "economic unsoundness." Now the depreciation schedule used by Commissioner Foley to place the value of the house below the value of the outstanding loan in the early years is an arbitrary schedule of depreciation, which adopts a higher depreciation rate in the early years of the house than in the later years. This may be sound from the standpoint of the speculative seller but it is hardly sound from the viewpoint of the economics of home ownership. It is a well-known fact that it is during the latter years that wear and tear begin to tell most heavily on the house. Under this plan if the majority of the houses were to be foreclosed and sold in a speculative market within a few years then there might be some merit in Commissioner Foley's arbitrary depreciation schedule but our experience indicates that most of the homes purchased will not be purchased for speculation but rather will be retained in the hands of their owners.

But even if Commissioner Foley's depreciation schedules are right, they merely mean that there would be some losses on those houses foreclosed during the period when the depreciated house is worth less than the outstanding loan. But all this means that there would be some losses in some cases. In any insurance system there are some losses in some cases. Commissioner Foley does not give us any facts which take account of the premiums collected to cover these losses. He takes no account of the fact that on most of the houses under this plan there would be no foreclosures and no losses. In fact, the premiums collected on the houses that were not foreclosed would be greater than under the present FHA system because the collection of premium at the same premium rate would continue for 32 years instead of 20 or 25 years.

PRIDE IN HOME OWNERSHIP MAINTAINS STANDARDS

The Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration clearly underestimates the interest of the lower middle-class American families in home ownership. Their interest is far wider and deeper than any purely financial interest. For them the buying of a home is one of the great achievements of their lives. It is the pride that they have in maintaining their homes that keeps these homes up to good standards and that also maintains good standards in the neighborhood. Commissioner Foley has issued a great challenge to all who want to maintain good standards of home life in the United States. He has issued a challenge to those who would build better neighborhoods with a better neighborly spirit—neighborhoods in which there is more genuine democratic discussion of their neighborhood problems and the problems of American life.

EXTENSION OF LOAN MATURITY

The fourth objection made by Commissioner Foley is directed toward the 32-year loan. He considers this economically unsound. But the extension of the life of the mortgage proposed in the new bill is necessary to bring the monthly charge for home ownership down to the level of the family with an income of $1,000 to $2,000 a year. Now Commissioner Foley tells us that this is economically unsound. Families, therefore, must keep on paying the $40 to $50 a month which is most of what FHA offers to the middle-income groups. We know that this is beyond the means of the ordinary family earning even $2,000 a year. It would require at least a $2,500 yearly income under the present FHA plan to support a $5,000 house, or a $3,000 income in the case of large families. We must remember that FHA generally quotes monthly charges that cover debt service and taxes, but leave out maintenance. Most of the FHA-quoted figures are about $8 below the actual monthly shelter cost.

We are asked to accept on faith this statement in regard to economic unsoundness. What is there that is economically unsound about a 32-year mortgage? Most of the private industry groups have been recommending a 30- to 35-year mortgage for years. We have not been given any figures which show that the premiums charged are not adequate to meet the losses. On the basis of available information I contend that the extending of the period of mortgage maturity would minimize rather than increase the risks of payment. I understand that this has been the experience of the Home Owners Loan Corporation. I understand also that it has been the experience of the Farm Credit Administration. It has been the experience of many reputable lending agencies. In all probability the middle-income home purchaser would be a better risk on a 32-year mortgage than he is under the present FHA provisions, because the charges would be better adjusted to his capacity to meet them.

But suppose for the moment that FHA assumes some additional risks. Was not this the original purpose of FHA to carry part of the risk that was too much for private capital. Now if FHA is not willing to take additional risks, and should it continue in its present field in which it is insuring one-third of the loans on home building in the United States, what will be the future of housing under FHA?

It is interesting to note that while the opponents of the middle-income plan object to it on the ground that it involves greater risks, on the other hand they object to the compensatory insurance features that have been written into the bill to cover the greater risks. They say that these additional insurance features are unnecessary to accomplish the desired results.

PROVISIONS FOR RENTAL HOUSING

The second plan designed to provide adequate housing for middle-income families has to do with rental housing. This plan provides for FHA insurance of loans for 95 percent of the value of large scale rental projects, contrasted with the present FHA law which permits insurance of loans only up to 80 percent of the value. It enables these loans to be made for a period of 40 years, contrasted with the present FHA practice of making such loans on rental housing only for a 26- to 31-year period. It fixes the maximum statutory interest rate on these loans at 3½ percent, and it is anticipated that an average interest rate closer to 3 percent will be attained in practice.

Under this plan the owners or developers of large-scale rental projects—those to whom these loans of private funds insured by FHA would be made—might be cooperatives, limited dividend companies regulated by State law, public instrumentalities such as city corporations, housing authorities, and public educational institutions. Private educational institutions could get a 90-percent loan. It is estimated that these more liberal terms would provide rental housing in great quantity for middle-income families, resulting in many cases in rents as low as $30 a month.

The objections against the 40-year, 3½-percent, 95-percent insured loans for mutual and rental housing for middle-income families are the same in substance as the objections to the 32-year home-ownership plan. The answers to these objections apply with even greater force to the mutual or rental housing than to the home-ownership plan. There are no individual risks but only group risks in this mutual or rental plan. The need for this type of housing is so great, and the rents would be so far below those ordinarily charged for the same type of housing that the vacancy rate would be extremely low. Loans for such housing represent one of the soundest types of investment, and FHA insurance on such loans with a premium charge would certainly not involve losses to the Government.

LAPSED PAYMENTS PROVISION

The fifth objection to the plans for middle-income housing under the bill relates to the provision for lapsed payments. This provision does not prevent the FHA from drawing up appropriate rules and regulations in terms of operating necessities. It merely requires that in a form approved by the FHA a provision for lapsed payments should be inserted in each mortgage contract, so that in the case of economic hardship or other adversity the mortgage term may be extended at 1-year intervals up to a maximum of 3 years.

The objectors to this lapsed payment provision would substitute an amendment requiring the FHA to draw up such regulations, but not requiring any mortgagee to make use of the lapsed payment provision unless he so desired. In other words, after Congress had declared by policy in favor of a lapsed payment provision the mortgagee would be able to nullify this policy completely by refusing to use it.

From the point of view of the home owner there can be no question about the benefit of the lapsed payment provision to him. But the objectors do not talk about the interest of the home owner. They talk only about the interest of the lender and of the secondary-mortgage market. But even from the viewpoint of the lender it has been demonstrated both by HOLC experience and by the practices of the more progressive lending institutions that a lapsed payment provision enlarges rather than reduces the opportunity for the full recovery of loans made. Flexibility of terms is an advantage to the lender. Foreclosure and default is not the road to full recovery.

WARRANTY PROVISION

The sixth objection raised by Commissioner Foley and others is directed toward the warranty provision of the bill, which they contend will drive lenders away from the FHA system. Now, this argument overlooks the place that the homeowner occupies in the whole system. Will he not come in time to associate the warranty with good building practices? Will not therefore the warranty make the FHA system more, rather than less, attractive?

It may well be that much of the opposition to the warranty as well as to the 32-year period of mortgage maturity may come from those who would build homes with poor materials and thereby do a grave injustice not only to the homeowner but to the community. Has it not come to the time when the citizens as a whole must be ready to strike out for better standards in housing construction? Why should not the FHA assume the leadership in this movement? Once the people recognize the value of the warranty, once they come to associate it with better standards of housing construction, then instead of driving them away from the FHA system should it not rather attract them toward it?

At the present time FHA processes each individual house for plans and specifications. It makes an appraisal in connection with each house. It is supposed to inspect each house three times. If the FHA can perform so many services for the lending institutions, why can it not perform one service on behalf of the home owner?

INSURANCE OF CONSTRUCTION LOANS

The seventh objection raised by Commissioner Foley against the middle-market plans of S. 1592 is that the 85 percent firm commitment in connection with the 32-year plan for home ownership is unsound. Under the present FHA law an 80 percent firm commitment may be made. This means a loan is insured up to 80 percent of the value of the house before a purchaser is found and a down payment made. This really means insurance of a construction loan on behalf of the builder. The bill would permit this insurance on behalf of the builder, or "firm commitment" to be made up to 85 percent of the value of the house. It is called a "firm commitment" because technically what really happens is that the builder gets a firm commitment that the FHA insurance will be put into effect when the ultimate purchaser is found. The great advantage of this firm commitment is that it enables the builder to escape the risk of not being able to find a purchaser immediately. Thus, he can undertake large-scale operations, knowing that if purchasers are not found for all the houses at once, he may rent them for a while or sell them on a lease-option plan without a down payment. This large-scale operation, and assurance to the builder, makes for better planning and economies in cost of construction, consistent with good standards.

The objection is raised that the 85 percent firm commitment is too high because it would permit the builder to undertake construction with practically no capital, especially if there

were an initial overvaluation of the ultimate cost of the job through overvaluation of the land. The argument is made that allowing the builder to proceed without capital of his own would make for irresponsibility. There are a number of valid answers to this argument. In the first place, during the war a 90 percent firm commitment was permitted on small houses in order to get large volume. This 90 percent firm commitment worked well. There is no indication that it was detrimental to the FHA. On the contrary the FHA has frequently reported that despite the risks of building houses during the war when populations were unstable, the agency is coming out ahead on its war operations. For these reasons, Senator TAFT has pointed out that he can see no basis for the FHA objection to the 85 percent firm commitment.

In the second place, the 85 percent firm commitment could not result in a commitment equal to the value of the house unless the FHA was faulty in its own appraisals. The FHA has to appraise each job. Senator TAFT has made this same point.

DEVELOPING RESPONSIBLE BUILDERS

In the third place, the whole concept that a builder is responsible only if he has an equity involved is fallacious in its basic assumptions. In this country we must try to develop builders who have a professional pride in their work, who build good houses because that is their job, and because the FHA would not permit their use again if they built poor houses. The loss which the builder would suffer if he did not do a good job would be the loss of his reputation as a builder and his failure to be used again in connection with FHA insurance. The FHA should endeavor to exert this kind of pressure on builders instead of using the indirect method of getting good builders through the banker idea of a builder's equity in the job. The FHA argument is a slur upon the builder.

The FHA objection to the higher firm commitment on the ground that it would create irresponsibility on the part of the builder ties in with its objection to the warranty provision. The warranty provision is aimed directly toward getting good building by making the builder responsible for good building. If we have a warranty provision we do not need to be afraid of the 85 percent firm commitment.

REDUCING THE COST OF HOUSING

The eighth objection made against the middle income plans of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill is that we should reach the middle income groups by reducing the cost of housing rather than by tampering with the credit machinery. It is contended that if we could reduce the cost of building by 10 percent we would accomplish more than by the credit improvements in the middle income plans provided by the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill. Now the bill contemplates stimulating every type of cost reduction, including the cost of the house, the cost of the land, and the cost of money. All of them must be reduced.

The very people who say that we should reduce the cost of the house instead of the cost of money, at the same time say that we should not try the middle income plans now because we are in an inflationary situation in which the cost of housing is sure to be higher. In one sentence they claim that it is extremely unlikely that the cost of building a house will be reduced, and in the second they claim this is the only way to reach the middle income groups.

It is true statistically that reductions in the cost of building a house, taken alone, cannot meet the needs of middle income groups. In most urban communities today it is impossible to build a good house for much less than $6,000. Even if this cost were reduced 50 percent, which is a naively optimistic assumption, the result would be a $4,000 house. A $4,000 house under present methods of financing serves a $2,000 a year income family. The middle income groups, on a Nation-wide average, have incomes between $1,000 and $2,000 a year. Thus it is obvious that while we must reduce the cost of building the house we must also lengthen the life of the mortgage and lower the interest rates in order to meet the needs of the nine to twelve million middle income families for whom no adequate provision can be made with our present methods.

INTERPRETATION OF NEW HOUSING LEGISLATION

In interpreting the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill to the American people the basic emphasis of all the organizations sponsoring it will be on its plans for the middle-income groups. They will emphasize its value to the American wage earner and his family, to the American farmer, and to the agricultural worker. They will point to its contribution in maintaining the great middle clas traditions of the United States. They will stress the contribution of this bill to the development of better families and better neighborhoods. They will point to what its provisions for redevelopment will do toward the clearing of the slums and the rebuilding of the blighted areas of American cities, thus removing one of the greatest sore spots in the life of the Nation.

All the organizations sponsoring this bill are interested also in its provision for expansion of the low-cost public-housing program. They know that this program has become a part of the accepted pattern of American family life. If private enterprise is not able to meet the needs of the middle-income groups it certainly cannot reach those who cannot pay the rents that private enterprise must charge even with the new implements provided by the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill.

The new housing bill will provide untold benefits for American wage-earners and their families. In view of its contribution to their welfare it is most important in carrying out the vast plans envisaged under this legislation that proper cognizance be taken of the rights of American wage-earners. The requirement to pay not less than the wages prevailing in the locality should be made a condition of all aid extended by the Federal Government in the form of FHA insurance. To accomplish this, the prevailing wage amendment should be embodied in title III. The accepted standards, including the wage standards that have been secured through years of struggle, should be applied in the administration of each and every section of the bill.

Hon. Clarence Cannon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article from Printer's Ink of November 23, 1945, concerning the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Chairman CANNON is one of the ablest and most effective men in the Congress. Not only his district, which he so ably represents, but the State of Missouri and the Nation are proud of his untiring efforts, his fine judgment, and his unerring knowledge of this country, and its needs.

The article follows:

MORAL: DON'T TRY TO INSTRUCT CLARENCE CANNON'S APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Alfred Schlindler, Under Secretary of Commerce, had the best intentions in the world when he appeared before the House Appropriations Committee in a laudable effort to pry out a little extra money for the Department. But he made the mistake of pontificating—of explaining things the committee knows better than anybody. The chairman, CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat of Missouri, has been in Congress since 1923 and during most of that time has been a member of Appropriations. He knows the story backward, as do other veteran members, Republicans and Democrats. Naturally enough, therefore, when anybody from a department attempts to instruct them, as Mr. Schindler innocently did, they are likely to take him for a ride—which is just what Mr. Schindler had. The Under Secretary found, as has been discovered by many before him, that hard-bitten Congressmen are much smarter than you would think, and that one underestimates them at his peril.

Full Employment and the OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, as coauthor of a full employment bill, which is prefaced on knowledge for the need of full employment in the highly industrialized Bridgeport section of the district I represent, I have been deeply concerned with the results of a survey made by the Bridgeport Chamber of Commerce as to the effects of OPA policy on employment and production.

During the past 6 weeks this survey has been carried out to determine what answers should be given a letter written by Mr. Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration. On November 9 Mr. Bowles sent out a general inquiry as to what businessmen and the general public out in the country are really thinking about the effect of OPA on our national economy. The Bridgeport Chamber of Commerce engaged the firm of Thompson & Lichtner, management engineers of Boston, Mass., to get a factual answer.

They turned in a remarkably comprehensive report on the effect of OPA policy on employment and production in the Bridgeport area. I quote the following brief facts from that report:

PERTINENT BASIC FACTS AND FIGURES

There are, according to the USES, 220 industrial plants in the Bridgeport area (Bridgeport, Fairfield, Stratford). One hundred and thirteen of the above, however, have from only 4 to 25 employees. Eighty percent of the sampling was obtained from locally owned and managed plants having from 50 to 1,000 employees. There are 107 plants of such a character in the Bridgeport area. According to the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics sampling procedure, a 10-percent sampling of the number of plants quoted above is adequate to secure facts characteristic of the whole. Moreover, the plants employing labor from 50 to 1,000 produce more than 90 percent of all that is

manufactured in the area, according to United States Bureau of Census figures.

SAMPLE THREE TIMES MORE ADEQUATE THAN NECESSARY

It devolves, therefore, that this survey embraces, in number of samples taken, more than three times that which is necessary to warrant the assertion that the statements and figures elicited from the respondents apply to the entire Bridgeport industrial area.

HIGH LIGHTS OF THIS REPORT

Ten outstanding statements gathered from top-ranking plant executives

1. OPA price ceilings, squeezes, and regulations, unless adequate relief be afforded before February 15, 1946, will render 8,700 jobless in the Bridgeport area. This is 14.8 percent of the current total employment in industrial plants of 59,000.

2. OPA price ceilings, squeezes, and regulations, despite a present lack of help in many industrial plants, has currently caused "unemployment" in 34 percent of all manufacturing plants in the same area. But for the OPA plants would be offering jobs today to 3,400 more men or women or 5.7 percent of current industrial employment.

3. More than half of the responding executives state that a 30-percent wage increase without proportionate price relief would put them immediately out of business, practically all the remaining executives state they would face a bankruptcy within a short period.

4. If a 30-percent wage increase is granted with no corresponding price relief, 63 percent of manufacturers state that they will immediately dismiss their entire labor force; 22 percent (or a total of 90 percent) state that they will reduce personnel by 50 to 90 percent.

5. Total manufacturing costs in the Bridgeport area since price-freezing began in 1943 have risen variously from 10 to 100 percent. The average is 29.4 percent.

6. To operate at a fair margin of profit at current wage level, price relief on products sold, ranging from 0 (8 percent of respondents only) to 75 percent, is demanded. The average is 19.1 percent.

7. Fifty-eight percent of the Bridgeport area industrial plants report manufacture of one or more items which they are forced, to maintain trade position, to sell at less than cost; 72 percent at break-even prices, and 88 percent at unreasonably small profit.

8. Fifty-eight percent of the same type of plants, because of the OPA, have discarded, or will shortly discard (unless adequate relief is granted), one or more fair-profit pre-OPA items

9. OPA inequities, inconsistencies, difficulties, or hardships, affect 64 percent of Bridgeport's industrial plants.

10. Forty-six percent of responding top-ranking executives offered further remarks, facts, or opinions deemed pertinent to the material at hand. There was a strong undercurrent of thought generally that "the OPA was acceptable in principle and should continue to function, but"—

The entire report, which will shortly be made public, deserves careful consideration by legislators and by the public as a contribution to factual understanding of the present situation both of labor and management, and the effect the continuance of ceiling prices at their present levels may have upon full employment, as well as the effect such ceilings may have in continuing the present shortage of consumer goods which might encourage growth of a black market in somewhat the same way as prohibition led to bootlegging.

These problems cannot be solved with slogans. They demand careful, documented and audited inquiry. The survey made by Bridgeport is, in my opinion, a very important contribution to such an inquiry and deserves to be followed by like surveys elsewhere as well as to be studied for its own sake and value.

Stabilization of Shipbuilding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article published by the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, CIO, entitled "Stabilization of Shipbuilding":

STABILIZATION OF SHIPBUILDING—SHIPYARDS NOT JUNKYARDS

After World War I our combat ships were junked, our merchant marine left to barnacles and rust. So the Axis counted us out on December 7, 1941—and let us have it below the belt.

But America answered, and ships that had been only ideas in designers' heads—or plans on drawing boards—slid down the ways in a steady mounting stream.

It was the "bridge of ships" that ended two bitter years of defeat and turned the tide for ourselves and our allies. America's productive capacity had done the impossible.

The shipbuilding stabilization program, a joint agreement of labor, management, and the Government, blueprinted the production miracle.

Shipbuilding stabilization meant ships for the United Nations in war. The CIO Shipworkers' Union wants it to mean ships for America in peace.

Crucial test for the stabilization program will come on December 4 when a National Shipbuilding Conference convenes in Colorado Springs to review wages in the industry. This, the first of the annual reviews in peacetime will determine whether we will have—

Shipyards to build vessels needed for national defense and postwar prosperity; or—

Junk yards that invite a future Hitler to start World War III.

STABILIZATION—SHIPS FOR VICTORY

In 1938 the CIO Shipworkers' Union submitted a shipbuilding production plan to the Government.

In 1940 the union's plan was accepted by the National Defense Advisory Commission. A joint agency of Government, labor, and management was set up—the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee.

Since 1940 a stabilization program has set the framework for collective bargaining in the industry. It embodies four shipbuilding zone standards agreements: Atlantic, Great Lakes, Gulf, and Pacific.

Within these zones, labor, management, and Government representatives agreed on:

1. A uniform skilled mechanics rate.
2. Uninterrupted production.
3. Arbitration of all disputes.
4. Cost of living wage increases.
5. A training program for new workers.

In 1942 a national shipbuilding conference set the ground rules which geared the entire industry to all-out production during the war and provided for an annual wage review by the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee after labor had agreed to waive the wage-escalator clause in the old zone standards agreements.

The CIO Shipworkers' Union and the AFL metal trades department represent labor on the committee. Twelve industrialists represent management. The Navy, the War Department, and the Maritime Commission represent the Government's interest in shipbuilding.

THE WHEELS WENT 'ROUND

Everybody is in on it. The wheels have gone 'round in the shops and the keels have slid from the ways.

Everybody agrees stabilization did the trick.

Stabilization was the big war factor in the shipbuilding industry.

Stabilization worked—we won the war.

And in addition to the production record, stabilization saved money.

Navy and Maritime Commission officials say that shipbuilding cost the Government less in World War II than in World War I. Though workers' earnings were higher, they produced more per hour. And profits were so generous for the industry in World War II that contracts were often renegotiated and refunds made to the Government.

The saving to the Government was accomplished by an industry on an even keel—an industry stabilized—an industry that paid its workers, its management, its stockholders and produced for victory.

The industry can continue to do this in peacetime—if stabilization continues.

FIGURES ARE FACTS

Just one detail of savings goes into the billions.

In 1942 the national shipbuilding conference planned 'round the clock, seven-day operations. Automatic overtime on Saturdays and Sundays was abolished. Absenteeism took it on the chin. Remember—this was voluntary, long before the administration ordered the very same thing for the whole Nation.

This elimination of calendar premium days saved the Government $1,800,000,000 from 1942 through 1945.

The employee's suggestion program in the shipbuilding industry saved, according to United States Department of Labor statistics, $44,000,000.

From January 1943, through June 1944, idleness due to strikes amounted to only 0.06 percent of available working time, and absenteeism dropped in the shipyards, adding millions of man-hours to production.

That's the play-by-play record of stabilization.

But there's something more.

STABILIZATION AND WAGES

The national shipbuilding conference in 1942 committed the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee to conduct a wage review each year. A wage review, in plain language, means a look at wages to determine whether they need adjustment.

In 1943 and again in 1944 the National War Labor Board which handled the wage review at the request of the stabilization committee flatly refused a blanket cost-of-living raise.

Now the NWLB is quitting. The war is over. The CIO Shipworkers' Union says the wages must rise in the 1945 review.

At the December 4 national shipbuilding conference the union will lay the figures on the table. It will exhaust every recourse of collective bargaining to reach an agreement that will cement stabilization.

WHAT ABOUT STABILIZATION?

The Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee, as set up in 1940, is to last until the President of the United States declares the end of the national emergency.

Then what?

If the shipbuilding industry is to continue—and it must continue for the sake of national security—then stabilization must

stay. It must be permanent. It must become a part of American industrial life in peace, as well as in war. It must become a part of America's life in order to insure the life of America.

STABILIZATION—SHIPS FOR PEACE

The shadow of Pearl Harbor will be cast upon the national shipbuilding conference December 4. Its decision on the 1945 wage review will vitally affect America's ships for peace.

The CIO Shipworkers' Union says that the American shipbuilding industry must be maintained in business on an efficient and functioning basis.

Officials of the Navy and the Maritime Commission, prominent Members of both Houses of Congress, and leaders of industry say it also.

The Graduate School of Business Administration of Harvard University made a report for the Navy Department. It found that with respect to ships and shipyards the country could and should have been more realistically prepared than it was for World War II. The war would have been shortened. Lives would have been saved. The final cost would have been less.

Admiral Ernest J. King, in the March 1944 report Our Navy at War, said: "Our armed forces and production were not adequately expanded and developed to permit our taking the over-all offensive in any theater. The Army Ground and Air Forces and our shipping were not yet prepared to move overseas in sufficient strength for an offensive, and the Navy, even without the losses sustained at Pearl Harbor, could not alone carry the war to the enemy."

WE NEED SHIPS FOR PEACE

For preparedness against attack the United States needs ships in peace.

We also need ships in peace to make possible a prosperous, expanding peacetime economy.

Ships and shipbuilding contribute to national prosperity by—

Furnishing a transportation system, internal and external, prevent interruption of service and tend to improve the service available to importers and exporters of the United States.

Providing 10 percent of our national employment.

Creating business opportunities among companies which will invest in shipping, and industries which will supply shipbuilding material.

Stimulating international trade to the benefit of our own expanding economy. There is almost a direct ratio between the volume of foreign trade and our national income.

MUST CONSERVE OUR ASSETS

To maintain an effective and functioning shipbuilding industry, a substantial portion of present production facilities and managerial know-how and the painfully acquired skills of the shipbuilding workers must be retained. Shipbuilding of tomorrow will be a long-range program, whose needs must be anticipated in advance.

The workers for whose skills there may be urgent needs next year or in future years must be kept in the industry.

Already an alarming decline is noticeable in the shipbuilding industry, greater in proportion than the cut-backs in production. Workers are quitting shipyards because of uncertain job security and sharply reduced earnings.

To retain these skilled workers, the CIO Shipworkers' Union says that the forthcoming national shipbuilding conference must provide wage adjustments which will make their difficult, unpleasant, often hazardous employment attractive.

Continuation of the shipbuilding industry is also a matter of national policy. Congress must act soon.

STABILIZATION—WAGE EQUALIZATION

Peacetime stabilization requires that America keep its shipbuilding workers employed in shipbuilding. This can be done only by returning to the shipyard workers the loss in wages which they voluntarily accepted under the wartime stabilization program and by maintaining present take-home pay.

Here are some facts

Shipyard workers were promised a roll-back in the cost of living in 1942. In return, they relinquished their rights to full-wage increases to which they were entitled under the wage-escalator clauses in the four-zone-standards agreements.

This promise was not kept.

American shipyard workers have lost 32.2 percent of 1 year's pay. It would take a 38.6 cents per hour increase to restore this loss. The CIO Shipworkers' Union is asking only a 17½-cent per hour increase—less than half of what it is entitled to.

One and one-fourth billion dollars loss in pay

An additional 30 percent wage increase is essential to compensate for the loss in pay resulting from a return to the 40-hour week. Over $1,250,000,000 is being taken from the annual income of shipyard workers by this reduction in work. This is dangerous. It will encourage deflation and a vicious cycle of depression.

The wage increases for which the union is asking will result in no increase in the cost of shipbuilding production. The industry can absorb the cost of these increases.

Here is the balance sheet

Given to Industry

1. Increased productivity per man—during the war it rose 30% to 50%.

2. Elimination of wasteful practices necessitated by the wartime demand for ships, such as labor hoarding, inefficient supervision, and so forth.

3. Elimination of excess profits tax and reduction of the corporate income tax.

4. Huge reserves resulting from wartime profits.

The ability of the shipbuilding employers to pay wage increase sought by the IUMSWA–CIO out of their profits is indicated by the financial reports of a number of typical corporations in the industry. Their average profits after dividends, taxes, and reserves for the years 1941 through 1944, as contrasted with their average over the 1936 to 1939 period, are as follows:

	Percent increase
Bath Iron Works	642.85
Electric Boat Co	541.62
Los Angeles Shipbuilding Co	224.80
Maryland Drydock Co	1,366.27
Newport News Shipbuilding Co	201.87
New York Shipbuilding Corp	2,313.48
Todd Shipyards Corp	1,378.27

Owed to Labor

1. Correction of the inequities created when wages were frozen during the war.

2. A bulwark against constantly shrinking real income.

3. Compensation for still rising living costs.

4. Protection against relaxation of price controls, which appears likely for the future.

5. Minimum lay-offs to make up for the lack of savings that can tide workers over reconversion unemployment.

FACTS FOR AMERICA'S FUTURE

Pearl Harbor has become a symbol of unpreparedness.

Final victory was won only because of a gigantic production feat in the shipbuilding industry, an accomplishment which would have been impossible without the shipbuilding stabilization program and the resultant cooperation of Government, labor, and management. Thus the shipbuilding stabilization program was a major contributing factor to victory.

Our Nation cannot afford another Pearl Harbor. The shipbuilding stabilization program must be continued in the interest of our national security and peacetime economic prosperity.

The Shipbuilding Workers of America—CIO request your consideration of the facts. They are facts which concern America's future.

Machinery Improvement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and editorial:

OCTOBER 9, 1945.

Hon. WILL CLAYTON,
Assistant Secretary,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a part of the presentation which your Department made to the Ways and Means Committee, seeking authorization for the extension of the reciprocal trade treaty policy, your representative, Hon. Charles P. Taft, as shown on page 051, volume 19, of the hearings, stated:

"If I may take the textile industry, in this country again, the development of textile machines in this country has slowed down. As a matter of fact, the Japanese, who are generally accused of being only imitative, and developed considerable improvements in textile machinery which, in part at least, explains why their competition was very serious for our cotton textile industry."

This representation, above quoted, has been seriously challenged by an editorial which recently appeared in the July 19, 1945, issue of the American Wool and Cotton Reporter, a trade publication, from which I quote the following:

"MACHINERY IMPROVEMENT

"The textile industry has always been replete in enthusiastic research. We will give some instances. The textile industry of the United States leads the world in automatic looms. No other country in the world approaches us in that matter. The Draper Corp., its successor, the Draper Co., or the original George Draper & Sons, invented and perfected the first automatic loom and today the textile industries of the whole wide world appreciate and acknowledge the wonderful productive, low-cost properties of the Draper loom and admire the cotton textile industry of the United States and the rayon weaving industry because of the accomplishments of that equipment.

"The Crompton & Knowles W 3 automatic magazine looms and the newest S 5 silk loom are similarly powerful and potent in the woolen and worsted and fancy rayon industries. No other textile country in the world approaches us on low cost, high quality, high productive weaving. But even after the Draper loom had become a fact, improvements and research on weaving did not cease. The Drapers themselves have maintained powerful interest and accomplishments in improving their looms and in weaving in general. The same thing for Crompton & Knowles. But that isn't all of it. Other people have made efforts, as typified by the Stafford loom, which was taken over by Drapers, and the Hopedale loom, with a similar experience. And Crompton & Thayer Loom Works. And

still research and expenditure on weaving problems continue.

"Some years ago a man named Lucas invented a loom and he was financed by a very wealthy New York Stock Exchange and sugar broker concern, Lamborn, and the Lucas-Lamborn loom was worked out. After Lucas and Lamborn thought they had the loom perfected they asked us to go down to see it. We went with Mr. Lamborn over to a hidden little shop in Elizabeth, N. J., where Lucas himself was stationed with the loom and operating it. We were told all about the loom before we saw it, the framework of it was all steel, perhaps pressed steel, the gears were all cut steel gears. The filling package of about 3 pounds was passed through a very wide open shed, and that 3-pound filling package would, theoretically, keep the loom in operation for hours and hours and hours without needing any replenishment.

"The loom would, theoretically, be running 300 picks a minute. We went over to see it. Lucas himself operated it; we stood and watched it for about 3 hours, and finally we said to Lamborn: 'Mr. Lamborn, you haven't got anything. The Draper loom will beat the life out of it. Your 3-pound filling package is interesting but what good is it when the Draper loom, with all of its automatic attachments, has the big battery where the filling supply is replenished automatically; one boy, a battery hand, can tend 100 looms or 120 looms. You say you can run 300 picks a minute, but we have stood here for 3 or 4 hours and you haven't been able to do 100 picks a minute. You haven't got anything.' Lucas said: 'Are you a practical loom man?' And we said: 'No.' Then he asked us to send a practical loom man to him. So we hired the head loom fixer, an old, experienced expert weaver, from one of the finest cotton mills in New England and sent him down to Elizabethport to operate the loom and to report on it. Incidentally, we got an expert's fee of $150 a day and expenses for that loom fixer. He ran the loom, he was impressed with it, or perhaps he was talked into it, and he wrote a quite glowing report on it. But there isn't any Lucas-Lamborn loom today.

"Weaving equipment, looms made in this country and used by our domestic textile industry, are so far ahead of any weaving equipment in the world. Of course, loom improvement has not ceased; the Drapers will see to that, Crompton & Knowles will see to that, every intelligent weaver in the country, every loom fixer, every overseer of weaving, is thinking about it all the time. We have a tremendous amount of practical—not theoretical—research working all the time for the advancement of the industry.

"And then at another time, a few years ago, the late Frank C. Hopewell, who was treasurer of the Sanford Mills and head of the L. C. Chase & Co., the great commission house, he had a loom. Some professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology invented a loom. Hopewell financed it. They had the loom set up in a secret shop out in Watertown, Mass., and after they had worked on it for several years and thought they had it perfected, Mr. Hopewell asked us to go out and see the loom. We went out to Watertown, to the shop, with Hopewell, and there was the loom, and there was the inventor, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology professor, operating it. As we went into the shop Mr. Hopewell introduced us to a young man whom he called Erhart. We didn't recognize Erhart.

"This was an electrically operated loom. Instead of having a regular picking motion, with a picker stick, and a picker, and a picker arm, and a picker ball, and a shaft and shoes, it was operated by electric rheostats. On each side of the loom in the shuttle box was the electric rheostat arrangement, and it theoretically so operated that the rheostats coming into action threw the shuttle to the other side into the other shuttle box, and rheostats there checked it, slowed it down, and then reversed the operation and threw the shuttle back to the other side, etc. We watched that loom for a couple of hours. Erhart expatiated on it and Mr. Hopewell became quite enthusiastic. Finally we said to Hopewell: 'You haven't got anything'—and his face fell. Erhart bragged about the loom because he was afraid not to. He was afraid of displeasing Mr. Hopewell.

"But there was the loom with all the electric riggings on it, something way beyond the powers of the average loom fixer, they would have to have electricians all through the weave shop to take care of the looms, to keep the electric rheostats in operation, they would be adversely affected by lint and by the humidification; instead of being simplified the loom was made tremendously more intricate, it couldn't begin to compete on woolen and worsted production with the Draper loom on piece dyes or warp fancies, or with the Crompton & Knowles looms on woolen and worsted fabrics in general. And that loom is gone out of the picture. But it did represent—along with the Lucas-Lamborn loom, also—something of the always occurring effort of men within the industry and men allied with the industry in efforts to improve machinery, to keep down costs, all part of the very practical research effort that is, and always has been, present in this industry of ours.

"The yarn-producing equipment of the American textile industry leads the world. We invented spinning frames for cotton-yarn production that replaced the old mules and that made our cotton-yarn-producing industry the leader of the world. We invented the woolen spinning frame which is working out similarly. And Whitin, and Saco-Lowell, and H. & B., and Davis & Furber, and Johnson & Bassett and others, are all of the time experimenting, researching, improving and keeping our yarn producing industry way out front in leadership.

"We had an experience on new spinning equipment a few years ago. Somebody, or a group of people, had invented some new kind of a spinning ring and traveler and had it on exhibition with the machinery running in a shop up on Water Street in Boston. They were selling stock in the company that owned the patents and that was going to build the new spinning equipment so naturally we were a little leery of it. We went up to see it. As we remember it, it was some kind of a floating ring and some kind of a floating traveler and the claims for it included a claim that the whole thing was going to operate much more economically and much more efficiently and very much faster and produce yarns at very much lower cost. The man who was running it and in charge of everything up at the shop on Water Street was a fellow named Fobes. We watched it for an hour or two and then we told Fobes that he didn't have anything. His claims included a speed revolutions per minute for the front rolls that were wholly outside of possibilities. The cotton stock wouldn't stand any such speeds.

"Fobes asked us, 'Are you a practical spinner?' and we said 'No.' He asked us to send a practical spinner to see the equipment, so we got hold of Martin, who had been superintendent of yarn production in the Lancaster Mills, and had held similar important jobs in other mills, and sent him up to see it, to watch it, and to report on it to us. Martin made a very favorable report, but we told him he was wrong, we knew he was wrong. And that spinning equipment is wholly out of the picture. The fact that the expert weaver and loom fixer reported favorably on the Lucas-Lamborn loom and the fact that Erhart, who had been a loom builder himself in a minor capacity, reported favorably on Frank Hopewell's electric loom and the fact that Martin reported favorably on the new spinning method is not derogatory of them. They were mill men, they were all the time looking for improvements—in fact, the whole industry is all the time looking for better equipment, better methods, better processing, and will give everything a fair chance, and that was the attitude of the three men referred to.

"The fact is that this American textile industry of ours is pretty well equipped, way ahead of the rest of the world. There is no lack of continued, speculative experimentation by the textile machine builders themselves. They actually do spend a vast amount of money every single year and in every succeeding year on practical and theoretical research. So when anybody tells us that the textile industry has been deficient on research it grieves us a little. We know a darned sight better. And the facts of the American textile industry prove it."

I will greatly appreciate receiving from you such statement or explanation as you believe advisable to indicate that the presentation on the part of the Department of State to the Ways and Means Committee, as related above, was warranted by the facts easily obtainable.

With all good wishes, I am yours sincerely.

Basic Reasons for Credits to Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 11, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I include an excellent article by Arthur Krock which appeared in the New York Times, December 7, 1945:

THE BASIC REASONS FOR THE CREDITS TO BRITAIN

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, December 6.—The administration is braced for protests in Congress against the terms of the proposed credits to the United Kingdom, and the British expect difficulties in the Empire when they undertake to carry out some of the commitments they made as a quid pro quo. Both obstacles, however, may prove easier to surmount than was envisaged in the preparations being made for that purpose.

The administration, of course, wishes it did not have to go to Congress for specific authority on the details of this loan and could have arranged them through the Export-Import Bank, after getting a commensurate increase in its loaning capital. But in all the circumstances the alternative was an impossible idea, and so the administration is ready publicly to meet and answer all criticisms, item by item.

The chief questions and objections, which are probable, and the responses administration spokesmen will make, can be summarized as follows:

Question. The United States already has a huge internal deficit, and there is no guaranty in the terms of the credit that this arrangement will not increase it. Where is the money coming from?

Answer. The total amount involved represents the cost of waging the recent war for about 15 days. That money was all shot away. This is to construct a free and productive world economy and reduce to the lowest possible minimum the number of economic blocs in the postwar world, and through the lend-lease settlement we shall not have the issue that afflicted our international relations between the two World Wars. The money is coming out of the Treasury. We have it, and also there is no

present prospect that it will be requisitioned rapidly.

Question. The interest rate is stated as 2 percent. But with the 5 years of grace it works out at 1.62 percent and can go lower if the British omit any annual interest payments, as they can on their own finding that conditions warrant it, and the Treasury pays an average of 1.92 percent on its obligations.

Answer. That is quite true. But the British cannot undertake higher terms. And it should not be forgotten that they must make their annual payments on the principal with no waiver privilege. Also it should be remembered that the conditions we have imposed oblige the British to change their national economy, which is no simple assignment.

Question. Why did the British ever adopt an economy which requires fundamental change to participate in the kind of world we want?

Answer. Do not forget that the Ottawa agreements and other aspects of the British bilateral trade and preference system were their measures of protection after we raised the wall of the Fordney-McCumber Act and adopted other repressive trade policies. Also do not forget that, if we do not come to fair credit terms, the British economy will be intensified, and they can do that for quite a while anyhow.

Question. Aren't the terms of the credit a bad precedent? Won't other nations expect the same treatment, notably Russia, where Stalin (according to Senator PEPPER) is thinking of a request for billions of dollars? And how many times are you coming here to ask for appropriations for other national credits?

Answer. The United Kingdom's case is a special case. We recognize no other like it and do not expect to, so no precedent is being set. Also we do not plan to take up with you the credit or loan requests of other nations. These will be handled through the Export-Import Bank.

Question. Britain has more assets, dollars included, than seem to have been taken into account in these terms. Aren't we being credulous and easy?

Answer. The British came here to get a grant, or gift, and the sum they had in mind was $5,000,000,000, though at times they mentioned $6,000,000,000. From their own viewpoint, and their own war books, they had a tenable claim. But we declined to consider this at all. We insisted on a business deal, and that is what we have made, subject to approval of Congress. In their acceptance of the proposals for the expansion of world trade and employment, prepared by our technicians, the British also have made concessions of vast importance to the cause of enduring peace.

Question. Aren't we assisting them to nationalize their industries, which will put our private industries at a disadvantage in the world market?

Answer. No. And if this plan fails the world's turn to nationalization will increase and force a hateful decision on us.

Question. Recently B. M. Baruch said that the Government should compile a careful and complete list of its assets and liabilities and its own domestic commitments and needs before deciding what gifts, loans, and credits it can extend abroad, and to whom. Has the administration such a list, or anything resembling it? If so, does it sustain this credit? If not, should we make it now?

What the answer to such a question, if asked, would be this correspondent has no idea, but not improbably the response would be general—to the effect that, of course, the Government knows what obligations it can assume and that the problem of the United Kingdom is of such immediacy that it must be dealt with at once in our own ultimate interest.

But whatever this particular reply, the other answers above are reasonably accurate paraphrases of the arguments in favor of the credit plan as they have been stated to this correspondent by some of its negotiators who will appear before the committees of Congress.

American Jeweled-Watch Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. ROLAND KINZER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter received by me yesterday from Walter W. Cenerazzo, national president of the American Watch Workers Union:

THE AMERICAN WATCH WORKERS UNION,
Boston, Mass., December 10, 1945.

Congressman ROLAND KINZER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KINZER: On last Tuesday, December 4, 1945, Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, took the floor of the House of Representatives and assailed the three American jeweled-watch manufacturers—the Elgin National Watch Co., the Hamilton Watch Co., and the Waltham Watch Co.—and criticized the State Department for coming to the aid of the American jeweled-watch industry.

Congressman CELLER's actions are understandable. He represent the Benrus Watch Co., one of the largest Swiss watch importers in America; he represents the Lazaruses, of which family S. Ralph Lazarus is the president of the Swiss watch importers group, which masquerades under the name "American Watch Assemblers Association." Congressman CELLER simply forgot his identity as a Congressman on Tuesday, December 4, and he thought he was representing his client, the Benrus Watch Co. As to the contents of the letter which Congressman CELLER sent to Mr. Arthur Paul, Director of the International Trade Operations, United States Department of Commerce; it is apparent that Mr. CELLER in his anxiety to please his clients, has failed to look at the record and to investigate the facts.

Had Congressman CELLER cared to read the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate's Finance Committee of 1943 and 1945, he would have found the case of the American jeweled-watch industry and its employees versus the Swiss watch importers and the Swiss cartel (the Swiss Superholding Co.). For four long years, the employees of the American jeweled-watch industry have been crying as a voice in the wilderness protesting the fact that a foreign country which was supplying Germany and the Axis with military timing mechanisms was being allowed to build a Frankenstein in the United States through Swiss dumping of civilian watches. We have knocked at the door of Congress many times as have we appealed to the State Department and the Committee on Reciprocity.

We have had a hearing on October 23 before the Committee on Reciprocity and that hearing was declared confidential by this committee and they gave a hearing to the Swiss Watch Importers on October 26, 1945 which was confidential also. We requested of Mr. Edward Yardley, executive secretary of the Committee on Reciprocity, that these hearings be made public, and that we be given the opportunity to see what was said by the Swiss Watch Importers, and that they be allowed to see our case. This request was denied. We appealed to the State Department through Winthrop Brown, chief of the commercial policy of the State Department, to open up the records. We were again refused. After both cases were heard by the Committee on Reciprocity on October 23 and October 26 of this year, the Committee on Reciprocity delayed action for 5 weeks waiting for a brief from the Swiss Watch Importers which it granted them the right to file. To this date, such a brief has not been filed from the best information available.

Congressman CELLER's arguments in behalf of his client are fallacies and are the handiwork of a group groping in the dark to protect a group which was allowed to expand in the United States during wartime to the detriment of the national defense of the United States. We agreed with Congressman CELLER that international trade should no longer be a one-way street. It's time that American interests were protected and the job opportunities of American workers were protected. Mr. Wallace's 60,000,000 jobs will never be a reality in America if we eliminate the opportunity for employment from the many basic industries which are subject to foreign competition. However, we can appreciate Mr. CELLER calling Mr. Paul's attention to his superior, Mr. Wallace, because Mr. CELLER knows that Henry Wallace, Secretary of Commerce, is a brother-in-law of Henry Bruggman, Swiss Minister to the United States. We don't know whether Mr. Wallace is interested in the Swiss interests or the American interests in this case as he has never yet expressed himself. As for the effect limitations of Swiss watch imports on the merchant marine, Congress CELLER had better discuss with his client, the Benrus Watch Co., the amount of shipping space watches take, for he will find out if you can put 20,000 watches in a suitcase and accordingly all of the Swiss watch imports into the United States in any one year can be put in the hold of one boat. How the merchant marine would starve to death if they had to depend on only Swiss watches for employment and trade.

As for the employment aspect, not one bit of employment is given by the Swiss watch importers that would not be given by the American jeweled industry if all watch movements were manufactured here—as a matter of fact, more employment would be given to the workers of our country if all watch movements were manufactured here, because many Swiss watches come here already cased and the American watch companies buy all their cases in the United States. Such items as bracelets, golden and silver watch straps, boxes, etc. that Mr. CELLER mentions—all that employment and domestic sales of such products would be given by the American jeweled watch industry to Americans. The only one that would be hurt by the elimination of such imports would be the Swiss watch importers who have much room from 50 prewar to 500 now and who have waxed fat from the profits on the 28,000,000 watches they have imported during the war. They are in the same position as the gambler who is allowed to prosper during an unscrupulous municipal administration and made to abide by the laws in the best interests of the community. The gambler protests because he has been allowed to operate over a long period of time and thinks he has a vested interest in his business, even though it is illegal. So it is with the Swiss watch importers—a wartime condition has allowed them to become large traders in war and they believe that they now have the right to exclude the American jeweled-watch industry from a fair place in the market of the United States.

Eighty-five percent of the unit cost of a watch movement is labor cost. American workers receive three times the pay of Swiss workers. Comparable watch movements—Swiss and American—retail at the same price.

even though the Swiss watch movement is imported into the United States from one-fourth to one-third of the cost to the manufacturer in the United States, but the consumer doesn't benefit; nor does the retailer. The Swiss watch importer picks up the difference as his profits, to the detriment of the national defense of the United States. Congressman CELLER should know that there are only two sources of supply for timing mechanisms in the world—the United States and Switzerland. He should be deeply interested in the fact that the Swiss watch industry supplies the machinery and timing mechanisms for Germany and the Axis and that they did not supply the Allies with any military equipment. Congressman CELLER should be deeply interested to know that American boys were killed and maimed by the products of the Swiss watch industry. Congressman CELLER should be deeply interested to know that there are 90 war plants in existence today in Germany, all of which are equipped with machinery made in Switzerland. Congressman CELLER should be deeply interested in the fact that if the program that he advocated last Tuesday on the floor of Congress were adopted that it would mean the elimination of the American jeweled-watch industry and that the country that controls Switzerland would control the timing mechanisms of the world in future wars.

As for his analysis that the demand in 1946 and 1947 will total 10,000,000 watches—all we can go by on the subject is the record. The average sales of watches in the United States from 1926 to 1940 were 3,475,000 watches per year. These include domestic production and Swiss watch imports, combined. The figures for this period are as follows: 1926, 4,464,000; 1927, 4,834,000; 1928, 4,279,000; 1929, 5,139,000; 1930, 3,475,000; 1931, 1,779,000; 1932, 898,000; 1933, 1,001,000; 1934, 1,646,000; 1935, 2,183,000; 1936, 3,527,000; 1937, 4,451,000; 1938, 3,100,000; 1939, 3,990,000; 1940, 4,751,000.

These figures are the totals of watch sales in the United States from 1926 to 1940. During this period Swiss watch imports averaged 2,100,000 watches per year. During the war, these imports increased tremendously. In one month—October 1945—2,100,000 watches alone were dumped into the United States from Switzerland. Since Pearl Harbor 28,000,000 watches were dumped into the United States by these Swiss watch importers who now cry that it is un-American for Americans to demand that their jobs be protected. We note that Congressman CELLER recommends that the Swiss Government refuse to accept the limitation of 3,000,000 watches as suggested by the State Department. We pray to God they do; for we believe that 3,000,000 watches is excessive and that no more than 2,000,000 per year should be allowed into the United States. We believe that the American people once they are acquainted with the facts in this case will rise in wrath and demand that Congress enact legislation to protect industries such as our's that are essential to national defense. How can any Congressman representing the people of the United States have the gall that Congressman CELLER has to stand up on the floor of Congress and advocate the destruction of an industry essential to national defense.

As for smuggling of Swiss watches—who better than the Swiss Government can police this? But again, the Swiss were never fussy who they did business with—for anyone who would do business with Hitler during wartime would do business with anyone. Senator KILGORE, of West Virginia, chairman of the Subcommittee on Elimination of German Resources for War, said that correspondence in his hand makes it clear that the principal concern of the Swiss was the prospect for future business dealings with a postwar Germany, irrespective of its political character and its relationship to the peace- and freedom-loving nations of the world. Need we say any more?

As for Congressman CELLER's reasoning on his statement that of retail sales of $82,500,000 only $10,622,000 went abroad, doesn't this statement speak for itself? The Swiss watch worker who works for two-thirds less than the American watch worker and the Swiss watch manufacturers dominated by the Swiss cartel sell their watches cheaper, or cost them less to produce. But the Swiss watch importer, when he sells these same watches, charges as much for them as does the American jeweled-watch manufacturer for the product which costs the American manufacturer so much more to produce. Let Congressman CELLER investigate the profits of the American jeweled-watch industry for the past 20 years, and he will find that the net profit for the American watch manufacturers has been less than $1 per watch over this period and let him contrast this $1 per watch with the profits made by the Swiss watch importers on Swiss watches, and he will find that the average profit for the Swiss watch importer to average between $7 and $10 per watch.

As for employment, the Swiss watch importers supply—other than the big three Swiss watch importers: Bulova, Gruen, and Benrus—the rest, or 90 percent of the rest, if they have an office, a telephone, and a sales room, they are doing well—and some of them even use their bedroom as a place of business.

If it were not for the important position which Congressman CELLER holds, as a Congressman and a member of the all-important Judiciary Committee, we would not have dignified him with a reply when we found out his affiliations with the Swiss watch importers as an attorney for the Benrus group. However, in view of his position, we deemed it mandatory to reply.

If democracy is to survive in America, if the Republic of the United States is to be maintained, integrity in our public officials must be of high standard, and every United States Senator and every Representative in Congress must consider the national good and must keep our country at all times prepared against the bullies that arise in international affairs. The best insurance for peace in the world is a prepared America. That is all we are pleading for in asking for the survival of the American jeweled-watch industry. We plead with Americans for America so that a national defense industry will be maintained and that America shall not be dependent upon any foreign country for timing mechanisms.

We respectfully request you, as the Congressman representing one of three localities in which an American jeweled-watch factory is located, to place this reply to Congressman CELLER in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thanking you in behalf of the membership of the American Watch Workers Union, I remain

Very truly yours,

WALTER W. CENERAZZO,
National President, American Watch Workers Union.

Demobilization of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, our boys overseas and those who are in this country are fully aware of the failure of Congress to act in behalf of their release. They know that petition 8 is on the Speaker's desk awaiting the signature of the Congressmen. They are fully aware that had the Members of Congress signed petition No. 8, thousands of the boys now marooned and idle on desolate islands could now be on their way home. These fighting men scattered all over the globe cannot understand why their respective Members of Congress refuse to sign petition No. 8 in an effort to hasten their release.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting letters I have received from soldiers on the subject of their demobilization.

From Manila comes this letter dated November 15:

DEAR SIR: Having nothing else to do only write letters and wait, I thought I would write you a line to let you know what we are thinking about over here.

I am wondering why all these men must stay over here, away from their loved ones, etc., when there is nothing useful for us to do. My opinion is that we are merely here to take care of the unemployment problem back there. They can't make me believe there is a shortage of shipping as our company supervises the loading and unloading of ships at one pier here, and no one is of the opinion there is any ships lacking.

I suppose our higher officers are letting on what a wonderful thing is being done here, etc. Why shouldn't they want to stay here where they can make their fortune in short order? They have the best of everything and, I dare say, live better than they did in civilian life. If they want a jeep to take a Wac for a ride, they manage that, and altogether they should enjoy their Army life. To keep us busy the officers have inspections to make sure our mosquito nets are a certain distance from the floor, shoes in a certain spot under our cots. They don't mind inspecting the food, which is rotten. Chicken half picked isn't very appetizing even on Sunday.

I have a wife and two children at home and neither of the children will know me when I do get home. If we were doing anything useful, I would be willing to do my part, but as near as I can figure we are here so those draft dodgers and IV-F's can strike and still keep their jobs.

I was brought up on a farm near Falconer, N. Y., and your reputation among the farmers is very high. I thought you might be interested to hear some "beefing" from a GI and no doubt help influence your ideas.

Respectfully yours.

A serviceman writes me the following letter from Dutch New Guinea:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE REED: We read in our news bulletin several days ago that you along with Representative HAVENNER and others are sponsoring a move to speed the return home of armed forces veterans.

This is certainly a very fertile field for such a move and one very close to the heart of every serviceman. Now that we have made many sacrifices to win these two wars (Europe and Pacific) the least that the War Department can do is to get us back to our broken-up homes and families quickly, which they certainly aren't doing at this base. The last ships returning men to the States pulled out of here on August 4, so you can easily figure up until today how many days that has been. Prior to our coming here the longest wait for a ship had been 31 days, but the present stay beats all previous records for waiting here. Yet that was while the war was still going on. Now that it is over one would think they would give us more transportation but just the reverse is true. We see moving pictures of the *Queen Mary* docking in New York bring back 15,000

men in less than 5 days, hear of a ship leaving Australia with 500 GI wives for the States, yet we men waiting for discharges have to stay here and sweat it out.

Hollandia is the only embarkation port between Manila in the Philippines and Australia. All the men from the other bases in between have to come in here from both north and south. They are piling in here daily, forcing the erection of more tents, yet none but a few emergency furloughs have left, and these left by plane.

It wouldn't be quite so bad, but this camp is in a most out-of-the-way place on this base. I spent 11 months on this base, and it is the dampest, coldest-toward-morning place that I have lived here. We are living eight men in six-man tents, most of which leak very freely. Ours looks like it was fired into with a 12-gage shotgun.

Water is turned on only for 1½ hours in the morning and 1½ hours in the afternoon. This has to suffice for shaving, washing, showering, and washing our clothes. The day I was on KP we ran out of coffee for breakfast, and we didn't have even water to offer the men to drink as it wasn't turned on until 8:30 a. m. and of course we couldn't start cleaning up until then.

At night the only lights we have are candles, just like our forefathers used. Needless to say the chow is lousy, dehydrated eggs every morning for breakfast, most of which go into the garbage cans. The other day one 30-gallon trash can was the only thing 1,400 of us men had to wash our mess gear in.

Still on this base are standing barracks with wooden floors built up off the ground, that have never been lived in, with plenty of lights and water available and a nice sandy ocean beach nearby where the waiting troops could go swimming. Yet they stick us back in the jungles in a place like this away from everything. I know from seeing with my own eyes the Jap prisoner-of-war camp on this base had better accommodations than we have here. They had tents that didn't leak, wooden floors up off the damp ground and water turned on 24 hours per day, for I was there several times and I know. This is part of the thanks we get for serving our country and its people in their time of dire need.

It's not myself so much that I'm thinking of, but the other thousands of service sons who will follow me through this camp on their way home for age and point discharges and for temporary duty. Thought you would be interested in getting the facts first-hand as we find them on the long way back home. Just because we are on the way back, we are still human beings and United States citizens which some of the higher-ups seem to forget.

The War Department was given a free hand to do as they saw fit during the war, but now that it is over, it is up to Congress to step in and take a hand, otherwise they will be 20 years in demobilizing the armed forces at their present speed. The men aren't worried about finding work, they are more than willing to take their chances. Just an opportunity to be with their loved ones and try to restore their broken-up homes and families.

You may show this letter to all interested, yet I want my name withheld, until such time as I can walk out of the separation center a free man. For I know the Army still holds a noose around your neck until 24 hours after you leave the separation center, and I don't want to get into any trouble this late in the game, with a clean record so far.

Remember the ex-servicemen are going to be a strong influence in the future of the United States. They still have faith in their Congressmen but not for long, unless things change fast.

Saturday and Saturday night it rained so hard here that some of the men's personal belongings and clothes were washed for yards out of their tents. Some of the tent areas are low and water was standing ankle deep inside the tents.

Regardless of what newspapers and radios say back home, no action has been taken on this base toward releasing 35-year-olds with 2 years' service or 80-point men. And no action probably will be taken until a good portion of the men already here have been moved out, whenever that is.

Today they are issuing us overcoats, woolen blouses, and long heavy underwear so they must be expecting it to be very cold weather when we finally do reach the States.

We also read that the large luxury liners, *Queen Mary, Queen Elizabeth,* and *Aquitania* are very soon going back to civilian service. If Congress and the American people permit this, they are certainly giving their country's defenders a good knifing in the back.

Just 7 weeks ago today our group of men came into this place, and we haven't caught a ship out yet. And General Marshall can stand up and tell you, the Congress, that shipping is not a problem. Don't know what the hell you would call these 7 weeks, it certainly is far from a night's stop-over.

Another thing we soldiers don't like to hear and read about is this wave of strikes sweeping across our Nation that we fought to defend. They are certainly very quick to let us down, adding much more to our delay in getting back. A lot of fellows have expressed opinions they would like to have their rifles given back to them so that they could use them to clean out these sort of things on the home front upon returning. They will be wanting jobs, not excuses that reconversion was held up because of strikes.

Are you in Congress going to still sit idly by and let these conditions continue, or will someone take immediate action to correct them? Time will tell very shortly.

Yours for speedy action in our behalf.

A private, first class, stationed at Camp Crowder, Mo., wrote me the following letter:

DEAR SIR: I am just one of several thousand men who are sitting around in Army camps, twiddling our thumbs. There are thousands of men who haven't done a day's work for 2 months or more, just being retained in service because the War Department is being deliberately slow in releasing men.

The War Department must think they are pulling the wool over the public's eyes by issuing the order for December 1, "All men with 4 years' service will be released beginning December 1." Everyone in the Army knows very well that there are very few men with 4 years' service who haven't already been discharged, as there are only a few men with that length of service who haven't been overseas. And this business of releasing men who are surplus is just another "snow job" for the public. It is a good "cover up" for the discharge of men like Mickey Rooney and others with the necessary "pull" who have been released without sufficient points as the points stand now. But try and be declared "surplus." I can assure you that the men in the Army who realize this situation as it really is are completely fed up and won't take much more.

I returned from 1½ years' overseas service, had my "temporary duty" recuperation furlough at home, and after sitting around 4 weeks was assigned as a company clerk in a medical training battalion which has no trainees. All I do is type a morning report and perhaps a couple other pieces of work, and sit around the rest of the day. Everyone is just sitting around, doing practically nothing. I have never seen such a waste of manpower. Mine is just one case in a few thousand.

The whole reason that the War Department is slowing discharges is because a few top-ranking men in Washington are afraid of their skins. They do not give a damn about how fast men are discharged. Their only concern is to retain their jobs at all costs. And this waste of manpower is the taxpayers' burden for many years to come.

As a representative of the people, I implore you to have another investigation made of the situation which exists. The blindfolds which the War Department are working on the general public are completely uncalled for and should be immediately stopped.

I thank you for your attention in this matter, and so do thousands of other fellows in my predicament.

Very sincerely yours.

This next letter I am going to read is from a sergeant who sent copies of this letter to many of you. Because it may not have received careful attention, I am going to read it to you:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REED: Yesterday: Yesterday we were patriotic and consecrated to doing the best job possible to preserve democracy and the "four freedoms" and rid the world of despots like Hitler, Mussolini, Tojo and company. With total victory came the glowing promises of rapid demobilization, a point system that would be strictly adhered to and an early return of overseas veterans—Congressmen proposed this and that, but War Department assured the men and their families that everything possible would be done to bring about Christmas reconciliations. Wives, mothers, and sweethearts pinned their hopes on promises like "MTO," Europe and Austria to be cleared of all but occupation forces by December 1945."

Today: Today, December 1, 1945, and all 55–59 pointers are eligible for discharge. But, we are far from the homeland where men of almost any score are getting released daily because they are stars in sports or movies, or the son of a general, or just plain surplus.

Plenty of shipping was allotted to clear this theater as promised, but diverting of shipping that began in November was culminated by transfer of 11,000 spaces on the carriers *Wasp* and *Champlain* as announced today—and no reasons are given for the change.

Today the overseas veteran is the helpless pawn of Regular Army militarists who have the unholy authority to act the same as in the midst of the holocaust of war.

Tomorrow: Christmas is not far off on the calendar of tomorrows—in fact, it's much too close for any of us to continue nurturing that hope of enjoying it at home with our families. The man overseas must resign himself to writing off another Christmas away from home as his little contribution to the peace of the world.

Tomorrow does little to brighten our outlook with meaningless statements and promises like "all personnel not needed for occupation purposes will leave Europe by late January," or "critical point score will be reduced to 50 by January 1, 1946," or "no enlisted man is essential and none will be held when his discharge score is reached."

But some time in the future tomorrows we overseas veterans will be men again, with equal rights and privileges, and able to level our sights on the former almighty brass hats who were able to interrupt their important tasks to fly home for ceremonies or in time for Christmas.

Here is a letter a serviceman on Okinawa wrote to his father in New York:

OKINAWA, *November 17, 1945.*

DEAR DAD: Up to this new development in the discharge system, I didn't have too much to gripe about. Of course, I want to get home. There is nothing I want more. I know that there are a lot of others who deserve to get out first, but when they start pulling what they are doing now, it changes my attitude quite a bit.

The Army won't give you a break. There are just no two ways about it * * *. They don't want to release the men any faster than they have to; only fast enough to keep public pressure and opinion from them. The way it is presented to the public and the way it actually works out are two different stories. I realize there are difficulties involved, but still it's not the way it should be.

The system for December helps barely anyone, especially a man overseas. A fellow who has been in the Army 4 years up to September 2 and is overseas most likely has 60 points or more and is already eligible to leave under the 60-point score for November. There are exceptions, I admit. For men in the United States it is fine. If they have 4 years they have 48 points and will be released. But most men in that category in the United States are already out. All it takes back there to get out is 2 years. They declare you surplus and that's all there is to it. Most men, with 3 children, overseas also have 60 points or more. There again, it is the guys in the United States who benefit. The 35-year-olds with 2 years of service and the 38-year-olds is nothing new. So actually what do you have: the exceptions and the men in the United States are the ones who gain by it.

The Army figures claim that with this move 783,000 more men will become eligible for discharge. I don't believe it, even with the men with scores from 55–60 being included. What does the man overseas get—nothing. Actually we are being penalized one point per month by not having them add up. It places us on an equal basis with a man in the States, and that is decidedly unfair. He can live fairly decently, and I don't mean by that that we are suffering, but there is a lot of difference being here and in the States. He can get passes, go out, get a furlough, and just having the feeling of being on United States soil is plenty in itself. My complaint is that the men overseas are not being treated fairly. Add up the scores for us in any way, just so we get credit for the time since September 2 that we have spent 10,000 miles from home.

Here are some figures which were published in a paper that we get. I have 38 points and 29 months of service up to September 2, so you can see where I stand in the group. It won't be too long before I'll have 3 years in, but still all that time isn't going to count. If you have been in the Army that long or anywhere near it, you surely deserve to get out and without any waste of time or mincing of words.

These figures are as of October 15:

Points	Pacific	Elsewhere overseas	United States	Total
85 and over	75,000	135,000	200,000	410,000
80 to 84	50,000	135,000	100,000	285,000
70 to 79	170,000	454,000	176,000	800,000
60 to 69	245,000	450,000	205,000	900,000
50 to 59	227,000	468,000	255,000	950,000
40 to 49	125,000	332,000	393,000	850,000
0 to 39	402,000	311,000	1,197,000	1,910,000
Total	1,294,000	2,285,000	2,526,000	6,150,000

On the shipping situation. Cargo ships which could house troops go back empty because they claim they don't have feeding facilities. There is not a man here who wouldn't eat K rations and sleep on a cot or anywhere to get back home. The Army won't do that, though. They say they are thinking of the comfort of the men. When they brought them over double loaded, there was no thought of comfort. You spent 12 hours on deck (regardless of weather) and 12 hours below.

I heard on a news report that 11,000 men came in from the Pacific on 21 ships, or on the average of about 520 men per ship. There were 5,000 on the one I came over on. And to top that off, we have heard, and we know it to be true, that Japanese prisoners of war are being returned to their country on our ships. They claim a shortage of ships, but still they have enough to use for those no-good yellow so and so's. There is a ship off the coast here that has been there close to a month. That helps, too.

So, altogether from our point of view, the system is no good, and they aren't doing what they claim they are. Don't be fooled by all the promises they feed the people. There is just one thing to do, exert pressure on Congress so that they will either get control of the discharge system, or else watch the Army so closely that they can't pull any fast ones.

I hope this gives you and idea of what actually is going on.

Your loving son.

This letter was signed by a GI of 1 year's overseas service:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE REED: I don't know exactly how to begin this letter, but I'll be quick and to the point. This letter not only speaks my sentiment but also that of many others still overseas.

We read in the paper of men in the United States with 21 months of service which exempts them from overseas duty. If you're on this side of the pond with 44 points or less, you're stuck for army of occupation, and mind you, most of us have been overseas a year or better. To prove my point I myself have 2 years' service—8 months in the United States and 16 months overseas, saw 2 months of actual combat in the infantry, for which I received one battle star. I have 41 points.

Here's another thing that is undermining our morale over here. Next month GI brides will be shipped to the United States to join their loved ones. Hell, aren't we who fought for our country human also; have we not families? In most cases these brides have seen their husbands last since we've seen our loved ones.

In conclusion I say why not at least get us back to God's country, the United States of America?

A Navy man writes to me as follows:

DEAR MR. REED: I especially desire to add my protest against the unwarranted and malicious discrimination against yeomen in the Navy's present application of the point-discharge system. Because I have no relatives affected by this discrimination, I feel I am fairly objective about it.

I know a chief yeoman on Guam who had more than enough points for release on November 1. Because yeomen are arbitrarily required to amass additional points, however, he will be held in service there at least another couple of months. And yet this man is a Navy volunteer who enlisted before Pearl Harbor. He writes me that he averages only about 3 hours' work a day, which demolishes the theory that he is really needed in his present assignment. He has already volunteered to stay in the Navy until next June, if he can be brought to the States to assist in the demobilization process (which is ostensibly the Navy's excuse for keeping yeomen in service); but this offer was summarily rejected.

I sincerely hope you can do something for this man, and for others like him. If the Navy Department expects the public and Congress to support its desperate struggle to remain an autonomous branch of the Government don't you think it had better stop acting as though it still thought of its citizen sailors as the chattel they largely are in wartime?

From the Philippines comes this next letter from a captain:

DEAR MR. REED: On tonight's news broadcast from radio station WVTM in Manila, we learned that "Representative DANIEL REED, of New York, instituted proceedings to determine why a certain general's son, a private first class of the Marine Corps, should have been discharged from service before his turn under the discharge system for his service." The announcer went on to say that his father requested through MacArthur that his son be discharged so that he might continue his premedical education.

Mr. REED, if you were listening tonight, I am sure you would have heard the resounding cheer you received from both officers and enlisted men, most of whom have seen service in the British Solomon Islands and Philippine campaign, and, speaking for the enlisted men, many have given up their premedical or predental education due to the war. Now due to their training they are the laboratory, X-ray, and dental mechanics who were recently declared essential. As things now stand, all they need for discharge is to be adopted by some "name" general.

The officer situation here is equally as bad. I am a dentist and formerly practiced in Cattaraugus County at Salamanca before entering the war early in 1942.

Now I am assigned to a field hospital. Due to excess number of dentists, I volunteered to take over the anesthetic service in the department of surgery here, as there are not enough dental patients for all the dentists to remain busy. Personally, I appreciate my duties as it makes my time pass faster, and it is much better than being an excess officer at one of the many general hospitals or sitting around a replacement depot waiting for my 68 points to make me eligible for discharge.

A fellow dental officer, in a visit with the AFWESPAC dental surgeon learned that on Luzon alone there are over 1,400 dental officers at present. Consider, as we did in combat, that one dentist attends 2,000 soldiers, then it looks as though there are about 3,000,000 men on this island.

I am sure that your available figures will give you the actual number of men on Luzon, so that you and I know the dentist-patient ratio here is a mere fraction of what it is back in western New York, if I am to believe the reports my old patients in Salamanca write to me, as they have to wait for weeks for an appointment with one of the four remaining, overworked aged dentists there.

As for the physicians and surgeons, the condition here is even worse, as there are over three times as many medical officers according to the usual Army proportion.

Naturally every medical and dental officer in the armed forces has given, and will continue to give and do his best for every patient available, but when it comes to only working 1 or 2 hours daily, as compared to the 8, 10, and 12 hours worked by civilian dentists and doctors, it makes us wonder if we are not defrauding the taxpayers back home by accepting our monthly payments for what little service we are needed to give over here.

Your action as described by the radio tonight has certainly championed the cause of all of us, both officers and enlisted men, and speaking for all of the Army personnel here on Luzon, I wish to thank you for what you have done, and I am sure will continue to do, to rapidly lower the discharge scores for all dental and medical personnel so we can return to civilian practice where we will have work to do and where it seems we are needed.

H. R. 32

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a

letter from Lewis G. Hines, national legislative representative of American Federation of Labor, and one from Joseph A. Padway, general counsel, American Federation of Labor in reference to H. R. 32:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C. November 14, 1945.

Hon. HUGH DE LACY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As per our telephone conversation, I am attaching hereto a copy of a letter received in this office from Judge Padway, which is self-explanatory. I am informed also that a similar letter has gone to Chairman SABATH.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS G. HINES,
National Legislative Representative,
American Federation of Labor.

NOVEMBER 9, 1945.

Mr. WM. C. HUSHING,
Chairman, National Legislative Committee, American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HUSHING: I am advised that Representative HOBBS informed the Rules Committee that after consultation with Mr. Tuttle and myself he tore up his 1943 bill and brought in a new bill identical with the present bill (H. R. 32), and that this bill had the approval of Mr. Tuttle and myself.

I think Mr. HOBBS is in error respecting any conference he had with me and Mr. Tuttle. I do not know what Mr. HOBBS and Mr. Tuttle may have discussed, but in any conversations I had with Mr. HOBBS I certainly did not give my approval to the old bill nor to the new one. Perhaps Mr. HOBBS assumes that because we vigorously opposed his first bill and criticized it, that his new bill removes our criticism. Also, Representative CELLER proposed some amendments which I, as counsel for the American Federation of Labor, deemed imperative in any bill dealing with the subjects of the bill.

It has been the position of the American Federation of Labor, and it is my position with respect to the first bill and subsequent bills proposed by Mr. HOBBS, and the present bill (H. R. 32) that they are destructive of labor's fundamental rights. I cannot conceive of anyone approving of a bill which embraces within its definition of crime what constitutes mere minor misdemeanors and defining them now as major felonies with penalties for violation of 20 years imprisonment and a fine as high as $10,000.

But it is not the penalties alone that are objectionable. It is possible under this bill to convict a person who, in his official position, informed an employer that if demands for increased wages or improved working conditions were not met a stoppage of work would take place. Under section 1, paragraphs (b) and (c), "robbery" and "extortion" are so defined that placing one in fear of injury (which under the definition includes fear of loss of property) constitutes a crime.

There are other fundamental objections to this bill which the American Federation of Labor has voiced from time to time and which I have made at different times. Certainly there is no need for the bill because crimes such as robbery and extortion are defined by the statutes of every State. These definitions, whether new or borrowed from the statutes of some other State, are exceedingly dangerous to the fundamental rights of organized labor because of broad concept and the tendency of some judges to give a still broader interpretation to them so that what would ordinarily be lawful conduct, or might copstitute a minor offense, becomes an aggravated felony. In fairness and justice, the bill should not be enacted into law.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH A. PADWAY,
General Counsel, American Federation of Labor.

Leather Flight Jackets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith a letter dated December 12, 1945, from Rear Adm. W. J. Carter, Chief, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, Navy Department, concerning an article by Columnist Drew Pearson which appeared a few days ago. Mr. Pearson stated that information had come to him that around 12 cars of leather flight jackets valued at $42 each, are being slashed so they may be condemned and then burned. The Navy Department informs me that such is not the case.

Admiral Carter has had a thorough investigation made and the enclosed letter from him speaks for itself. I want the Congress to know what the Navy has to say concerning this alleged destruction of the taxpayers' property. I have known Admiral Carter for a great number of years. The whole Congress knows he would have no patience with any subordinate official under his command who was a party to the commission of the act referred to in Mr. Pearson's article.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS,
Washington, D. C., December 12, 1945.

Hon. L. M. RIVERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RIVERS: In further connection with our telephone conversation, the following data are submitted for your information concerning the statement of Mr. Drew Pearson that 12 cars of leather flight jackets, valued at $42 each, ar being slashed so that they may be condemned and then burned.

The Naval Aviation Supply Depot, Philadelphia, is the central procurement and distribution center for flight jackets. The depot also serves as a clearing center for all jackets returned as unfit for use. When used jackets reach the depot they are carefully inspected. If they can possibly be repaired, the jackets are renovated and are reissued. If the jackets are damaged beyond repair, they are shipped to the salvage and disposal section of the Philadelphia Navy Yard. The salvage and disposal section again inspects the jackets. Those fit for use by naval personnel performing work which necessitates the protection afforded by jackets, and which by its nature is apt to ruin new clothing, are issued on custody receipts. Those jackets determined suitable for sale or disposal by N. M. R. & D. A. are segregated. Those which are so badly damaged that they are without value are stripped of their linings and zippers and are sold as scrap leather.

The flight jackets received to date by the Salvage and Disposal Section approximate 6,100—less than two carloads. The value of these jackets when new ranged from $13.35 for the intermediate weights to $29.42 for the heavy jackets. Of this 6,100, 400 were determined as suitable for sale or disposal by N. M. R. & D. A.; 4,200 were issued on custody receipts to naval personnel, the majority going to submariners; 1,500 were declared unfit for any use, were stripped of their zippers and linings, and were sold as scrap leather.

In summary:

1. Less than two cars of jackets, valued at from $13.35 to $29.42 when new, have been declared as unfit for renovation.

2. Of these jackets, only 1,500 have been sold as scrap leather. This was done in accordance with current Navy Department instructions.

Sincerely,

W. J. CARTER,
Rear Admiral (SC), U. S. Navy, Chief of Bureau.

Santa Claus Rides Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Jesse H. Jones, of Texas, one of the outstanding financial authorities of this country and for years one of the few sound Cabinet officers under the New Deal, is opposed to the Truman loan of American taxpayers' and war bond buyers' money to Great Britain. As part of my remarks I include an editorial which appeared December 7, 1945, in Mr. Jones' newspaper, the Houston Chronicle and Herald.

This loan is indeed a fine Christmas gift to Great Britain. A gift is what it is. The other day a responsible member of Parliament expressed the views of his country when he said, "We fought earliest, hardest, and longest. It is we who are the creditors." He opposed our advancing these funds as a loan and undertaking to collect any interest. He wanted a gift. Like lend-lease, the loan is a gift. It will never be repaid. The interest will never be paid in full. We went through this same wringer after the last war.

With a national debt bigger than that of any of our allies, with heavy taxes, with interest being charged our veterans on GI loans at 4 percent, I cannot support loans to foreign nations at 2 percent. About the only way I could support this loan is for it to be raised by British bonds voluntarily bought by our individual citizens who would be willing to take the risk of the usual British default. Or, it might be raised by a special tax called the Truman-British tax, so the people would know they were being trimmed.

It is said this loan is necessary to promote world trade. The truth of the matter is that we will lose both our money and our goods. Business will be good while impecunious peoples raid our markets with our money but the shelves will soon be bare and we will be holding some I O U's against a debtor who is execution-proof.

Where are we going to get the money to continue these global spending sprees? We would do well to heed the advice in

the fifteenth chapter of Luke, twenty-eighth to thirtieth verses, wherein it is asked:

For which of you intending to build a tower sitteth not down first and counteth the cost whether he have sufficient to finish it? Lest haply after he hath laid the foundation and is not able to finish it, all that behold it begin to mock him, saying this man began to build and was not able to finish.

The editorial follows:

BRITISH LOAN PROPOSAL IS UNBUSINESSLIKE

United States negotiators have proposed that we make a loan to the United Kingdom of $3,750,000,000, to be repaid in 50 annual installments from 5 to 55 years, largely at the convenience of the British. No interest is to be charged on the loan for 5 years, and thereafter the rate will be 2 percent per annum. Allowing 5 years' interest free, the average interest rate on the loan will be 1.62 percent, assuming that the interest will be paid continuously after 5 years. There is, however, a provision in the loan agreement that no interest will be charged in any year where the United Kingdom has an unfavorable international exchange position. If this should happen every year, we would get no interest whatsoever. If it happened in one-half of the years our average interest rate would amount to less than 1 percent.

During the past few years the United States Treasury has been borrowing money from its citizens at an average interest rate of 1.92 percent, so that on the interest alone, assuming that we make the loan and that the British pay it, and pay the interest in full, we will have a very substantial loss in the difference between the interest we collect from the British and the interest we pay our own citizens for the borrowed money.

In addition to the loan of $3,750,000,000, the terms and conditions of which bear little if any relationship to business principles, our negotiators have agreed to accept Britain's notes for $650,000,000 in full settlement of our unpaid $25,000,000,000 lend-lease account and all our investments, materials, and surpluses in England. Obviously, this is tantamount to a gift.

In consideration of our making this very large loan at a great sacrifice to our own taxpayers, the British agree that—manana—within 1 year after the loan has been ratified by our Congress and approved by the British Parliament, they will eliminate the dollar pool which they now control, thereby enabling countries of the British Empire to use their current dollar receipts without restriction. In other words, if Australia or India, or some other member of the Empire should sell us something and get dollars for it, such country could then use the dollars any way it wished. With the dollar pool in effect such countries can only use those dollars at the pleasure of Britain. They must give Britain the dollars and accept sterling.

There is nothing in the agreement to indicate that the United States will receive anything in the nature of foreign bases, raw materials, communications, or other concessions.

In connection with the loan agreement Secretary of State Byrnes has issued a beautifully written white paper containing many laudable and desirable aspirations with respect to world trade. While recognition of this white paper is made by the British, they are not signatories to it. They agree to undertake to help us work out world-wide multilateral agreements governing such things as tariffs, cartels, quotas, and production, to be administrated by an international trade organization. But these are only promises to try to help work out agreements with the other 48 countries of the United Nations. Bluntly stated, the British will only cooperate in working out world trade agreements if we lend them $3,750,000,000 and settle our lend-lease account, and give them title to our hundreds of millions of investments and materials in Britain on a 55-year note. If it costs this much to get the cooperation of Britain in world trade, what will it cost to get the cooperation of the other 48 countries of the United Nations?

If we must continue to help the British temporarily, let's do it by selling them our agricultural products—cotton, grain, meat, tobacco, etc.—on easy credit until the world gets more settled, and we can see our own way a little better, and let's see what we are to get in return. Fifty-five years is much too long.

Indianapolis Doesn't Want Federal Money for Slum Clearance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of December, 7, 1945:

INDIANAPOLIS DOES NOT WANT FEDERAL MONEY FOR SLUM CLEARANCE—HAS OWN PLAN BASED ON SPECIAL TAXES AND ADVISES OTHER CITIES TO FOLLOW SUIT

WASHINGTON.—Indianapolis does not want any Federal financial handout to help with its slum clearance.

In fact, a representative of that city Wednesday suggested to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that it is time all cities stood on their feet. He was Paul L. McCord, president of the Indianapolis Redevelopment Commission, which is charged with remaking Indianapolis' slum areas with money raised by local taxes.

Mr. McCord testified against the Wagner-Ellender Federal housing bill, which would give subsidies to local communities for slum clearance and urban redevelopment. He declared: "We are convinced that the majority of taxpayers want their local communities and their States to assume their rightful obligations of government and quit calling upon the Federal Government to transfer these obligations to Washington."

While the people of Indianapolis are confident that the city can take care of its own problems, Mr. McCord said they would "feel a little foolish if we proceed to do so with our own resources and then wake up to find the Federal Government pressing subsidies on other cities, which we shall have helped pay for.

"The answer to that suggestion, however," he continued, "is not in our accepting Federal aid but in all communities awakening to their own responsibilities and the threat to our national existence of further deficit spending and determining to meet the problem, themselves, without Federal aid."

Detailing for the benefit of the committee just how it works, Mr. McCord said that under a bill passed by the Indiana General Assembly last March by a large majority in both houses, a redevelopment department of the city government was established. It was made a special taxing district, with power to levy taxes but not to issue bonds, and placed under the management of a board of five citizen commissioners, appointed without regard to political affiliations. This board was given authority to designate blighted areas, acquire them, clear them, plan for their redevelopment and offer them for sale to private enterprise.

"In order to erect safeguards to prevent any possible misuse of such authority," he continued, "notices must be given both to owners of property declared blighted and proposed to be purchased and to the taxpayers of the whole community. Hearings must be held and taxpayers may remonstrate against any project, in which case the whole proceeding must be heard by the full panel of our superior court of five judges, whose decision as to the designation of the blighted area and the authority to purchase them is final.

"In acquiring blighted areas, the commission must follow specified provisions for appraisal and determination of price but the commission also is given the right of eminent domain, if it cannot agree with the owner as to price."

The commission has already levied the first tax for its work and next year approximately $550,000 will be collected for slum clearance and redevelopment projects, Mr. McCord stated. He added that some of this money, after being spent to acquire blighted areas, would be recouped from the sale of land either to private capital or to other public agencies.

The amount of money which the commission may levy next year will add 10 cents per $100 to the city's tax rate, which over-all, for city, school, county, and State purposes, totals $3.45 per $100, Mr. McCord said.

Indianapolis is confronted with the same problem which is facing most other urban centers—demand for extension of public services without proportionate increase in assessed valuation plus a top-heavy dependence on real-estate taxes.

"But," he declared, "we are convinced that the answer to this is not more Federal aid but more economical spending of what we raise, plus withdrawals by Federal and State governments from some of the taxation fields which they are now so completely exhausting."

Management-Labor Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me Monday, December 10, 1943:

In the field of management-labor relations our country faces a fundamental choice. On the one hand we can choose to have decisions made in this field by governmental bodies such as the War Labor Board has been during the war or such as we would have under compulsory arbitration proceedings. Theoretically we could say that there could be no strikes or stoppages at all and we could substitute impartial decision by a governmental body for collective bargaining. This, of course, would take away from labor the right of striking and from management the right to make decisions about many of the things connected with its industry. On the other hand we can choose to continue with a system of freedom depending upon collective bargaining for the settlement of disputes. But if we choose this method, it must be recognized that collective bargaining will not always succeed and that from time to time we will have shut-downs of industry on the part of management and strikes on the part of labor. We have to choose between collective bargaining and all its consequences or else a pretty full degree of control by a governmental body. In the field of essential

public utilities like water, electric service, gas, and the like, it is probable that to protect the public against most serious consequences something in the nature of compulsory arbitration will have to come, but I do not believe that America really wants to choose this method in preference to collective bargaining in the great field of industry generally.

If this be true, then we must recognize that the right to strike is exactly equivalent to the right of a company to cut down production or shut its plant when it feels it is not getting a sufficient price for full production. And we must also recognize that to force one man or group of men to work for the profit of somebody else is so contrary to American principles as to be unthinkable in this country.

Having said all this, it nonetheless remains true, that the interest of the general public must be paramount. It must come ahead of all the interest of all special groups including labor and management combined. And so all responsible government officials will say that the price of freedom for labor and management is that they agree reasonably well together and that strikes by labor or shut-downs by management shall only occur when it is actually true that there is absolutely no other way to solve an irreconcilable problem.

The Labor-Management Conference resulted in substantial failure. It accomplished something but it was marked by an arrogance on the part of management and a stubbornness on the part of labor which rendered the development of agreement on important issues impossible. I am afraid that there was an attitude in that conference to the effect that the problems of labor and management are none of the people's business. Such an attitude is decidedly not one upon which we can build the future of America. Under these conditions it was squarely up to Government to decide whether it would leave matters in the situation where the Labor-Management Conference left them or whether it would take action to assert the paramount interest of the general public. The decision had to be that the Government would take such action. Why? Not because the United States is in grave economic danger but because in the case of both management and labor the people of the country confront concentrations of very great power. Whereas this has not been nearly so true in the past, millions of people are worried and concerned about this power. They must believe—they must be shown that the Nation as a whole is stronger than, and superior to, any special interest in it. The primary duty of the Government is to demonstrate that this is so.

Therefore, the President of the United States did act—he acted, I believe, with courage, promptness, and foresight. That in itself is a great big point for the President, but, more than that, the proposal which he made is exactly in line with the principles I have just set forth. He did not propose that freedom be taken from management or labor. Indeed, he warned the Congress against the passage of punitive or coercive legislation, some of which has already been proposed and is likely to come before the House at any moment. What he asked was that the facts be laid before the American people for their judgment. He asked Congress to pass legislation so that the people could know the right and wrong of disputes between management and labor and so that they could intelligently pass upon the issues. The President simply asked that through the appointment of fact-finding bodies of impartial citizens the Nation be enabled to know whether either management or labor is abusing the priceless freedom which America affords. Apparently the President believes as I do, that the moral power of an informed public opinion of a free people is one of the most powerful forces on earth. He has asked for that moral power to be mobilized as a factor in settling industrial disputes and avoiding strikes and conflict. In my opinion, he is not only on strong ground but on high ground as well. Congress certainly should consider the President's proposal from every angle and should bear in mind in any legislation which it passes that its primary purpose is to strengthen and improve the machinery of collective bargaining. But, basically, I believe Congress should, and I believe it will, support the President regardless of what the immediate political consequences to individual Members of Congress may be.

House of Representatives Should Participate in Treaty-Making

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article written by me which appeared in the December 1945 issue of the Tennessee Law Review on the subject of the desirability of having the Members of the House of Representatives participate in treaty-making and of consideration of treaties as other legislation. The article is as follows:

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SHOULD PARTICIPATE IN TREATY-MAKING

(By ESTES KEFAUVER, Representative, Third Tennessee Congressional District)

The two-thirds rule in the Constitution for the approval of treaties should be amended.[1] The recent confirmation of the United Nations Charter by the Senate with only two dissenting votes does not alter the necessity of modifying this outworn provision of our Constitution. The approval of the United Nations Charter merely marks the beginning of our full-fledged participation in international affairs. In the years to come treaties and international agreements in which this Nation will be called upon to participate will be presented to the Congress in increasing numbers. Treaties and Executive agreements growing out of the United Nations Charter will be more controversial than the Charter itself. Many worth-while agreements with foreign powers will be disapproved if their confirmation is required by two-thirds of the Senate.

The Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, on February 13, 1945, favorably reported House Joint Resolution No. 60 which provided that an amendment should be submitted to the States to change the two-thirds Senate provision for the making of treaties. The resolution, sponsored by the Honorable Hatton W. Sumners, chairman of the committee, provides simply that "Hereafter treaties shall be made by the President by and with the advice of both Houses of Congress." This is the constitutional method of acting upon general legislation.

In view of the fact that this country is going to deal more and more in the field of international affairs, it is timely that the public, and especially the lawyers of America, should again examine the merit and workability of the two-thirds provision in the light of conditions and problems confronting the Nation in this advanced era. The House of Representatives, on May 9, 1945, with less than 90 dissenting votes, passed the Sumners resolution. It is now pending in the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate. The Senate could perform no act which would so increase the faith of the people in representative government as to give the State legislatures a chance to consider this amendment.

THE TWO-THIRDS RULE REPRESENTS NO FUNDAMENTAL PHILOSOPHY

When an amendment to the Constitution is proposed, it is important to differentiate between provisions which were adopted as a result of the deliberately thought-out theories of political government and provisions which were included in the basic law as a compromise to meet local or domestic differences. As for the latter class, it is important to determine whether the particular condition which gave rise to the provision still persists.

The motive that caused the insertion of the two-thirds rule in the Constitution was not to insure that treaties should be considered on their merits, considering the welfare of the country as a whole, but to appease a demand arising out of the suspicions, differences, and jealousies of the original States.

The two-thirds clause was the culmination of a long and heated struggle between the colonies which had been going on since the signing of the Declaration of Independence, which found expression in the Articles of Confederation, and which, in fact, almost prevented the union of the States. "There can be little doubt, historically," writes John W. Davis, "that the two-thirds rule was dictated in the Constitutional Convention, not only by prevailing jealousy of executive power, but also by recollection of the requirements under the Articles of Confederation that 9 of the 13 States voting as units should assent to any treaties entered into by the 'United States in Congress assembled,' a provision which in its turn derived directly from the mutual jealousy of the colonies."[2]

This heated struggle was between the northern and southern States to preserve what each group regarded as its special interests. The four southern States were interested in navigation on the Mississippi and the future of New Orleans as a port.[3] The four New England States were interested in protecting their fishery rights. Either group of four, if they could get one other State to vote with them, would be able to block any treaty affecting their local interest. The dispute between the sections become so dan-

[1] United States Constitution, art. II, sec. 2.

[2] Davis, Present Day Problems (1923) 9 A. B. A. J. 553, 556.

[3] Warren, The Mississippi River and the Treaty Clause of the Constitution (1934), 2 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 271, 278. In this article it is said: "Gov. Patrick Henry, so wrote John Marshall to Arthur Lee (March 5, 1787), 'has been heard to say that he would rather part with the Confederation than relinquish the navigation of the Mississippi'." It is also said: "The two-thirds provision was inserted (as a North Carolina delegate, Hugh Williamson, later wrote), 'for the express purpose of preventing a majority of the Senate or of the States * * * from giving up the Mississippi'." Quoting further: "The New England States, while having little real interest in the West, feared that France was opposed to their essentially necessary rights in the fisheries, and hence they combined with the South in opposing the influence of the French Minister."

The Southern States, fearing that even the two-thirds rule did not give them sufficient protection over what was then only a theoretical right of navigation on the Mississippi River, had difficulty in securing approval of the Federal Constitution on this ground. Virginia and North Carolina in the first Congress sponsored drastically more difficult treaty-making machinery (id. at 299).

gerous and violent that James Monroe, of Virginia, feared, and, in fact, came very near advocating, that the United States should be divided into three confederacies: a southern, a middle, and a northern confederacy. The differences between the States, the fear of the smaller States that the larger ones might unduly dominate them, was the underlying cause for the inclusion of the two-thirds rule in the Constitution.

The clause is a striking example of the class of provisions which was inserted to take care of a burning political issue of the times. One may search the debates on the Constitution in vain to find any fundamental political theory on which the two-thirds rule was founded. The provision, therefore, was used as a compromise to unite 13 States into a union. The Union has long since been created and firmly cemented. We must now examine the provision, not with reference to the problem of creating the Union, but with reference to the problem of this country of dealing in foreign affairs in an advanced era, never visualized by the founding fathers.

The founding fathers held no firm philosophy to the effect that treaties with foreign nations should be ratified by two-thirds of the Senate. This is shown by the fact that on September 7, 1787, a motion of James Madison to exclude "treaties of peace" from the two-thirds provision was adopted without dissent. The following day the provision was eliminated without much discussion.

REASONS FOR EXCLUDING THE HOUSE

First, it was contemplated that the President would actually advise and consult with the Senators (26 in number at the time of the adoption of the Constitution), and that the Senators would be an expert body which would participate with him in the formation of treaties. In accordance with the anticipated procedure, President Washington attempted personally to advise and consult with the Senate during the First Congress. The subject was a treaty with the Creek Indians. History records that he was treated coolly on this occasion. He vowed he would never return. Since that time, treaties have been handled by the Senate as other legislation. The "advice" provision of the treaty clause is obsolete. The Senate has never entered into the active negotiation of treaties as was contemplated by the founders.[4]

Second, it was anticipated that treaties would be made in executive or secret sessions of the Senate and the President. Secrecy no longer plays a part in treaty making. The present Senate has more Members than the House had at the time of the first Congress.

Third, under the Constitution as originally written, Senators being elected by the legislatures of the States, it was thought that they would have greatly superior knowledge on foreign affairs as compared with the Members of the House, and that they would have much longer terms of service than the Members of the House. Since the adoption of the seventeenth amendment, the first of these reasons has ceased to be valid. Furthermore, history demonstrates that the tenure argument is no longer logical or sustainable.

Hamilton, in the Federalist, expressed the prevailing idea that "the fluctuating and multitudinous composition" of the House would unfit it for a share in treaty making.[5] But even Hamilton failed to foresee that the negotiation of treaties would be taken over by the Executive, leaving to the Senate only the duty of passing judgment on treaties already signed.

Several members of the Constitutional Convention were dissatisfied with the two-thirds provision. James Wilson made this point at the time the Convention was considering the rule: "If two-thirds are necessary to make peace, the minority may perpetuate war, against the sense of the majority."[6]

THE TWO-THIRDS RULE IMPEDES FOREIGN AFFAIRS

When our international relations were few and simple, when the oceans really protected us, the emasculation and rejection of our treaties by a minority of the Senate could be tolerated. Today modern science and invention have made the frontiers of all nations almost contiguous. Events in any part of the world directly or indirectly affect the economy and welfare of the United States. In these days, the very life and death of the Nation depend on smooth-working machinery for regulating our international relations.

The record of the Senate in handling treaties of peace is long and it is disturbingly bad.[7] From the moment the United States became a world power as a result of the Spanish-American War the Senate has frustrated every significant move to make it possible for the country to participate in settling international disputes. It rejected the Olney-Pauncefote Arbitration Treaty of 1897. It emasculated the Hay Arbitration Treaties of 1904. It retained a stranglehold on the innocuous Root Arbitration Treaties of 1908–10. It impeded the effort of President Taft in connection with the Taft Arbitration Treaties of 1911. Then, of course, the history of what happened to the Treaty of Versailles, the League of Nations, and the World Court following World War I is well known to all. It should also be pointed out that the two-thirds provision prevented the annexation of Hawaii and Texas by treaty. A circumvention of the Constitution called executive agreements had to be resorted to for their annexation.

In the modern world negotiations must be conducted with foreign countries. The two-thirds provision ties the hands of our negotiators. This Nation, the most powerful and influential in the world, cannot exert its great strength for the cause of better international relations and world peace because of this anachronism in our Constitution.

TWO-THIRDS RULE AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Government must function in the international field. This necessity has forced Chief Executives, particularly during the past 50 years, with the support of the public, to enter into executive agreements and to resort to the use of concurrent resolutions in order to accomplish the desires of the people. These devices are, of course, used because of fear, which was a reality in most instances, of not being able to secure approval by two-thirds of the Senate to the particular matter under consideration. Thus, the two-thirds provision has an increased tendency of placing the important foreign affairs of the Nation more and more in the hands of the Executive to the exclusion of Congress.[8]

Prior to 1939 the United States entered into nearly 2,000 international instruments. Of this number 1,182 were executive agreements. Seven hundred and ninety-nine were treaties. We do not condemn the agreements as illegal. They were for the most part necessary for the welfare of the country and have subsequently been approved by Congress, but most of them should have been submitted as treaties. This would have been done if they could have been considered as other legislation.

This is an unhealthy tendency. It has far-reaching and ugly possibilities. The maintenance of the two-thirds rule, instead of working to maintain a great power in the Senate, is actually taking that power away from the Senate. Congress should act as a check upon the treaty-making powers of the President, but by maintaining a rule that prevents negotiations which the people desire, the Congress is in the process of eliminating itself from this important function of government. The proposed change will diminish the use of Executive agreements. It will stop driving American diplomacy underground.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SHOULD PARTICIPATE

Since the old reasons of secrecy, longer tenure, and intention to advise no longer exist, and since navigation on the Mississippi and New England fishery rights are no longer imperiled, the House of Representatives, for good and affirmative reasons, should participate with the Senate in shaping our foreign policy. The Members of the House are closer to the people, and the viewpoint of the direct representatives of the people should be heard in helping to shape our foreign policy.[9]

In our complex society, most of the important domestic laws are necessarily closely interwoven with our foreign policy—laws affecting the merchant marine, the size of the Navy, money stabilization funds, air bases, tariffs, etc., which require the concurrence of both Houses of Congress, directly pertain to foreign affairs. It is impossible to draw the line between purely local problems and problems dealing with foreign policies. Therefore, both types of problems should be treated as regular legislation.

In the years to come, treaties and agreements relating to foreign affairs will increase greatly in number. If this Nation is to maintain its world position, these matters must be handled expeditiously. Few treaties can long be sustained without implementing

---

[4] In early history, on rare occasions, the Senate proffered its advice to the President, but the Senate has never entered into active negotiations of a treaty. See 2 Haynes, the Senate of the United States, 276.

[5] The Federalist, No. 75. "In the North Carolina convention it was urged that, since treaties were to be the supreme law of the land, the House of Representatives ought to have a voice in making them. The objection also was made that the President and 10 Senators might make treaties of alliance and dispose of the country in such manner as they might please. To these objections William R. Davis, who had been a member of the Federal Convention, replied: 'The power of making treaties has, in all countries and governments, been placed in the executive departments. This has not only been grounded on the necessity and reason arising from that degree of secrecy, design, and dispatch, which is always necessary in negotiations between nations, but to prevent their being impeded, or carried into effect, by the violence, animosity, and heat of parties, which too often infect numerous bodies. Both of these reasons preponderated in the foundation of this part of the system'." See Crandall, Treaties, Their Making and Enforcement, 61.

[6] Farrand, Records of the Federal Convention (1913), 548.

[7] Important treaties defeated in the Senate by lack of two-thirds majority:

Date of vote	Country	Vote	Subject
June 27, 1860	Spain	26:17	Cuban Claims Convention.
June 1, 1870	Hawaii	20:19	Reciprocity.
Jan. 5, 1883	Mexico	33:20	Convention for retrying claim.
Apr. 17, 1884	Zollverein	26:18	Reciprocity.
Apr. 20, 1886	Mexico	32:26	Convention for retrying claim.
May 5, 1897	Great Britain	43:26	Arbitration.
Mar. 19, 1920	Mulitlateral	49:35	Versailles Treaty
Jan. 18, 1927	Turkey	50:34	Amity and commerce.
Mar. 14, 1934	Canada	46:42	St. Lawrence Waterway.
Jan. 29, 1935	Multilateral	52:36	Adhesion to the World Court.

[8] Perry, The Treaty Making Power (1922) 216; North American Review 40.

[9] Fleming, The Treaty Veto of the American Senate, pp. 14, 15.

legislation which requires the concurrence of both Houses of Congress. Appropriations and legislation to work out details will be necessary. Few important treaties can be completely self-executing. There is no present valid reason why one type of legislation should be considered only by the Senate and a two-thirds approval required, when that legislation must sooner or later receive the sanction of the other House of Congress. No foreign policy agreed upon by the Senate can long endure unless it has the support of the people. If it secures the sanction of a majority of both Houses of Congress, it is undeniably the foreign policy of the Nation. Having been thus sanctioned, it will receive better and more enlightened support from the people.[10]

Under our Constitution, treaties are declared to be a part of the supreme law of the land, along with the Constitution itself and laws passed in pursuance thereof. This legislative status is an important reason for associating both Houses in the treaty-making process. It is an important reason for permitting them to act by the same majority which suffices for other legislative acts. At present it is possible for a bare majority in Congress to abrogate a treaty by passing conflicting legislation or by failing to pass subsidiary legislation necessary to carry out its provisions. Such action leaves the treaty in existence as an international obligation, but, as the law of the land, the treaty is overruled and of no effect.[11] In view of this undeniable fact, it would be better to have both houses of Congress act upon the treaty by a majority in the first instance. The other method has, and will, lead to international obligations which cannot be fulfilled because of subsequent congressional action. This creates bad relationships with other countries. It impedes the ability of our negotiators to deal with foreign powers.

During its early history the United States, as a remote young nation, could indulge in a negative foreign policy of withdrawal from world affairs. Today, as a great nation, the responsibility for leadership in the organization of world peace is thrust upon us. Two world wars in one generation demonstrates that this country cannot shrink from its responsibility to provide for peace and still survive as a free nation.

International leadership demands capacity for positive and constructive national action in the forging of a just and enduring world order. To cooperate in this imperative undertaking, there is a very valid reason why the power of the United States Government to make peace should be as broad as its power to make war. Yet the Constitution requires only a majority of both Houses of Congress to declare war, while a small minority in the Senate may prevent the United States from ratifying treaties providing for international organization. The desire of the people as reflected by a majority of both Houses of Congress should be the guiding influence in settling war, just as it is in making war.

[10] Henry Hazlitt, in A New Constitution Now, has this to say: "The requirement for ratification of treaties by a two-thirds vote places the power of indefinitely prolonged obstruction in the hands of a minority. It was largely responsible for America's refusal to enter the League of Nations or to adhere to the World Court. 'The irreparable mistake of our Constitution,' wrote John Hay in a letter in 1899, when he was Secretary of State, 'puts it into the power of one-third plus one of the Senate to meet with a categorical veto any treaty negotiated by the President, even though it may have the approval of nine-tenths of the people of the Nation'."

[11] *Cook* v. *United States* (288 U. S. 102 (1933)): "A treaty may supersede a prior act of Congress, and an act of Congress may supersede a prior treaty." *United States* v. *Ferreira* (13 How. 40 (U. S. 1851)): "A tribunal created by an act of Congress in conformity to a treaty derives its whole authority from the statute creating it and not from the treaty."

Marine Corps Maj. Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois, Heads a Splendid New Organization, Appreciate America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following syndicated article, which appeared in the magazine section of the Sunday Star of Washington, D. C., on December 9, 1945, describing an interesting activity of Maj. Paul H. Douglas, husband of our colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois:

APPRECIATE AMERICA

Even in the darkest days the Army had a stock remedy for gripers: "Take your TS card to the chaplain and let him punch it." TS meant, approximately, "Tough Stuff." Of course, there weren't any "Tough Stuff Cards." It was just a gag, but it provided the Army with a great safety valve. During the worst days in Normandy I saw soldiers forget gripes and laugh when someone said, "Take your TS card to the chaplain, Joe."

Sometimes, and particularly now, all America needs a TS card. You'll find one in Chicago—an organization with a title that is so simple it almost makes you jump—"Appreciate America."

In the pains of war and the aches of reconversion, this organization says to every griper in the land, "Take your TS card to the chaplain, Joe."

BUILD AND LOOK FORWARD

But Appreciate America is a great deal more than a safety valve. It has set itself a positive job: to build, not to break; to look forward, not backward; to give hope, not despair. Its honorary chairman is Marine Corps Maj. Paul H. Douglas, wounded at Peleliu and Okinawa, who continued appreciating America from a bed at the Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md. Its chairman is Brig. Gen. A. F. Lorenzen (retired), the man who smashed Von Papen's spy ring in World War I and smoked out Caribbean U-boat bases in World War II.

Serving under these two are dozens of men of good will—businessmen, labor men, educators, clergymen, entertainers—who differ on many subjects but agree about America. "Appreciate America" is a "for" organization. It accentuates the positive. General Lorenzen states the platform in this capsule: "We are for everything that is good for America. We are against everything that is harmful to America."

FIGHTS DESTRUCTIVE DRAGONS

To implement this aim, Appreciate America has plunged into the arena of public opinion where, unfortunately, there are still the unslain dragons of the malicious lie, hate-mongering, minority-baiting. Appreciate America has assailed these dragons with a bombardment of constructive Americanism in printed form: booklets, cartoons, placards, pamphlets, posters, stickers.

One series of booklets, in which "Joe Doakes" answers the breaker-downers and the haters, became so popular that business firms all over the country requested copies to put in pay envelopes. The Inland Steel Co. distributed 50,000. The Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corp. filled its pay envelopes with 150,000. Gimbel Bros. placed Joe Doakes booklets on its counters as give-aways and the YWCA distributed 500,000 more. In all, Joe Doakes had a circulation of 12,000,000.

In 1941, when Appreciate America printed a condensed version of Douglas Miller's You Can't Do Business With Hitler, the Sixth Army Corps Area requested 6,000 copies for its morale division.

Aided by James Montgomery Flagg and a dozen other top artists, Appreciate America has turned out more than 60,000 posters for the walls of schools, factories, offices, and stores. Its poster on religious freedom was chosen by the Encyclopaedia Britannica as the best patriotic poster of the year. Its free-press poster was used as the emblem of Newspaper Week by the National Editorial Association. The American Federation of Labor chose its poster on unity as the official placard for a meeting in Chicago.

Ham Fisher has put his Joe Palooka to work, appreciating America on red, white, and blue posters from coast to coast. Other comic strip artists have followed suit. Harold Gray, in the last days of isolationism, had his Orphan Annie looking across to the flaming shores of Europe and saying, "Leapin' lizards! It's later than I thought! But we'll not let it be too late for America! Eh, Sandy?" Sandy, of course, said, "Arf!" And so did Eisenhower.

When war hardships brought an epidemic of gripes, "Appreciate America" produced its "griper series." For the businessman who griped because he couldn't get a seat on a train, there was an autographed picture of Hirohito saying: "Whether you know it or not, you're my friend." For the griper about rationing, there was a German iron cross awarded with Hitler's compliments for "distinguished service." For the tax griper there was a 50-yen note with the legend, "Beefers belong on Hirohito's pay roll."

Hollywood stars added their voices. Bob Hope, Bette Davis, Bing Crosby, Frances Langford, Humphrey Bogart and others turned in signed messages for "Appreciate America's" hungry presses. Bing Crosby's message contained one line that seemed to say it all: "Americans can live as friends."

DREW CARTOON SERIES

Recently Vaughn Shoemaker, cartoonist for the Chicago Daily News, undertook a series of cartoons for "Appreciate America." All of them stress the constructive factors in Americanism. But the one which has drawn the warmest comment is a little picture of four boys in a baseball game. Defending the right of one of them to play, a lovable toothless kid with a mit in one hand and a catcher's mask in the other says, "What's the difference what nationality he is—he can pitch!"

Some 1,800 publications, with a total readership of more than 25,000,000, are being supplied with Shoemaker's cartoons. More than 18,000 schools, as well as veterans and service groups, have displaced "Appreciate America" placards and posters.

One large university refused the material. A spokesman said, "We must view things from all sides."

"Very well," "Appreciate America" replied. "We'll be glad to give you the American side."

"You have me there," the spokesman said. "Send us your material."

Much of "Appreciate America's" prodigious output is distributed free. In some cases there is a charge to cover expenses. The organization is nonprofit, depends upon contributions. Douglas, Lorenzen, and their col-

leagues work without pay, as does everyone in "Appreciate America," except one full-time girl secretary at the Chicago headquarters.

"Joe Doakes" is the organization's most valuable spokesman. Here's what he has to say:

About the gripers: "When someone keeps criticizing the way things are going, I tell him I never saw a ball game won by the noisy fellow in the bleachers who's yelling at the umpire and razzing the players. Games are won by the men in the field."

About unity: "When somebody knocks a neighbor of mine because he is a Protestant, a Catholic, or a Jew, I tell him he may not know it, but he is falling for Hitler's stuff. Hitler started knocking the Jews and ended by knocking religion, the Masons, labor unions, business, and everything that makes for a free world. When you begin to hate you can't tell where it will stop."

Paul Douglas was a professor at the University of Chicago when "Appreciate America" was founded in 1940. He taught economics and he also served in Chicago's city government as alderman from the Hyde Park ward. Chicagoans were shocked when he refused the swanky car provided for aldermen and instead rode around town on the "El" and streetcar.

He shocked them again by publishing a full accounting of how he had spent his salary and a tabulation of his campaign expenses, which were less than $5,000 while others had spent $100,000.

Then the Nation went to war—and so did he. At 50 he enlisted as a private in the Marine Corps.

He served for 2½ years in the Pacific, rising to the rank of major, and returning with a pair of Purple Hearts. He caught Jap steel in his cheek at Peleliu and later had his left arm ripped to ribbons by mortar fire on Okinawa. Douglas, at the Bethesda hospital, insisted that I not make him out a hero. So remember—he wasn't a hero. He came back 65 pounds lighter, his brown hair turned snow white—but he wasn't a hero.

MUST WORK AT UNITY

When the doctors get through with him, Douglas, a Lincolnesque character who stands 6 feet 4, will be back in Chicago fighting the Battle of America. "The greatest thing we can do for America is to build unity," he told me. "We've got to work everlastingly at unity."

General Lorenzen, like Douglas, entered the armed forces as a buck private. But that was in 1891, and he has since served in the Spanish-American War, and World Wars I and II. Looking at his warm, ruddy face, you'd never guess that Lorenzen could be a menace. But he is—to America's enemies. As an intelligence officer in World War II, President Roosevelt sent him to find the U-boats' refueling bases. He found them.

Back in civies just a few days when I saw him, General Lorenzen was in a different kind of intelligence business. He wanted to spread the intelligence that will give America unity.

Lorenzen suggested a three-point program:

"Our schools must teach young Americans to live together under the only real definition of 100 percent Americanism—tolerance, equality, and freedom to live and let live.

"Our war veterans must pitch in to insist upon the free, unified America for which they fought.

"Our molders of opinion must be constructive. Let those who get a crude delight out of destructive criticism offer a better solution to our problems, or it would be healthier for America if they kept their mouths shut."

It was an onslaught of destructive criticism from the mouth of Herr Goebbels which brought Appreciate America into being in 1940. The first thing that burned them up was the Nazi lie about labor's utopia under Hitler and the companion insults to labor here. Appreciate America crammed the truth back into Goebbels' maw: 90 percent of Hitler's workers averaged $10 a week; 22 percent of this was deducted for taxes and "voluntary" contributions. The workweek was 72 hours.

To nail down the facts, Appreciate America obtained and published the pay slip of a skilled German worker showing a monthly salary of $74, with $16 deducted for dues and taxes.

HURLED BACK HITLER'S WORDS

When Goebbels preached anti-Semitism, Douglas and his crew hurled back the words of Hitler in Mein Kampf: "We are not out against the hundred and one different kinds of Christianity itself—even those Christians who really want to serve the people will have to be opposed." And the words of Storm Troop Leader Ammerlahn: "Roman Catholics are the black vultures of German nationalism. We will not stop until we have scratched them out of the German people."

For contrast, Appreciate America submitted the words of Franklin D. Roosevelt: "There can be no peace if humble men and women are not free to think their own thoughts, to express their own feelings, to worship God."

Douglas says it all adds up to this:

"We want to aid in the indestructible unification of Americans by promoting a love for our country through an appreciation of its advantages, to the end that Americans may cherish their liberties and the countless assets which distinguish America as a blessed land."

The Alaska Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a statement made by Mr. A. J. Breitenstein, secretary of the Great Falls Chamber of Commerce, Great Falls, Mont., before the Mountain States Association annual convention held on November 13 at Denver, Colo.:

This report is to cover generally the present status and the future development of the Alaska Highway; how it can be reached by the people of the United States; its prospect as a tourist highway and a commercial road; its role in developing the natural resources of Canada, the Yukon, and Alaska; its importance as an established interregional connection from the Mountain States territory through Montana to Alberta.

Right now the only all year-round hook-up is by way of United States 91 at Sweet Grass and entering Alberta at Coutts to Lethbridge, Macleod, Calgary, and Edmonton over improved roads, thence approximately 456 miles over ordinary country roads, of which 353 miles is graveled, in a northerly and westerly direction to Dawson Creek where the Alaska Highway officially starts.

At present the situation is something like this: The Alaska Highway proper of 1,422 miles is completed. The southern terminus is Dawson Creek, British Columbia. The northern terminus is Big Delta, Alaska. Big Delta to Fairbanks over the Richardson Highway, approximately 90 miles more. Less than 3 months ago Thomas H. MacDonald, Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads, and Congressman J. W. ROBINSON, of Utah, chairman of the House Committee on Roads, drove over this highway. Mr. MacDonald in a visit at Great Falls on his return from that trip, stated:

"The Alaska highway is a better road than the early Montana graveled roads were. Not yet a tourist's road, oil finished, but a road which can be used in all seasons, well engineered, wide, and well graveled. Chambers of commerce should use caution about encouraging tourist travel until the highway is under permanent management and has tourist facilities. What will be done about the future of the Alaska highway is entirely in the hands of Congress."

Mr. MacDonald prevailed upon Mr. O. S. Warden, the publisher of the Great Falls Tribune, to send a staff correspondent over the highway to get a true story of its future, not alone for the present but from a long-range standpoint. Four representatives of the Great Falls Chamber of Commerce accompanied the special writer. The entire trip was made by automobile the first 2 weeks of last September.

Thereafter 12 articles on successive days were printed in the Great Falls Tribune. These were based on official reports and conversations with military and civilian engineers, civic leaders, and men on the street. They contain substantial and well-thought-out reasons, all indicating that the Alaska Highway can and will be a well-traveled road in the years to come. The subject covered included Future of Alaska Highway, An Implement to Airway Travel, This Route Will Build Northwest, Expense Great but Has Value of Tourist Route, Development Would Justify Upkeep, Engineers Coping With Economic Problems, Should Be Important Trucking and Commercial Route, Telephone and Telegraph Lines Require Well-Kept Road, Many Tales Untrue Concerning Alaska Highway, This Road Will Attract Prospective Tourists, West Coast Admits Need for Inland Highway, and Prompt Decisions Essential on Upkeep.

The Great Falls Chamber of Commerce is republishing these articles and tney will be ready for distribution in the next few days. After reading them and analyzing the report of the committee who accompanied this staff correspondent, we are of the belief that the Alaska Highway is important enough to both Canada and the United States to warrant its becoming a permanent, all-weather, well-maintained road.

A properly equipped and controlled air route to Alaska is indispensable to the defense of the American continent. Toward this end, Canada has purchased from the United States the airports now located at frequent intervals along the Alaska Highway. In order to service this most feasible air route there must be a land route. The present road serves as a guide to flying as well as being an essential part of the service of supplies. Its maintenance will determine the permanent value of the air route.

The Alaska Highway is in good shape today according to Thomas MacDonald, Chief of the United States Bureau of Public Roads, and from first-hand reports of folks who have traveled the road recently, including Luke Wright, the writer of the Tribune articles. Bridges along the road are all of permanent construction.

The direct and indirect values to be obtained from permanent maintenance and upkeep of the Alaska Highway are:

1. It will provide an indispensable part for the maintenance of an air route to Alaska which all agree is essential to our military defense;

2. It will make possible the maintenance of present telephone and telegraph communications between the States and Alaska, already constructed by the Army;

3. It will open up a whole new area for tourist travel. Development and indications from tourist, travel, and other sources show

that interest in this highway and region is very extensive in the United States.

To accomplish these ends, we believe:

1. That a permanent Alaska Highway Commission of five members should be established and that at least one of these members be appointed from the Mountain States; and

2. That possible consideration should be given to request the Congress of the United States to extend financial aid to Alaska and Canada in the maintenance of this highway.

These two recommendations are cited because from official sources and through the press all indications point that on April 1, 1946, this highway will be turned over to Canada for future maintenance and upkeep. This is quite a challenge to Canada. The finances involved will run into substantial figures. Some Canadian citizens claim there is no disposition to furnish any definite information to their public on this subject but that generally speaking most of them advocate making the Alaska Highway a main artery in the road system on this continent and a dare to American business ingenuity.

An Alberta magazine, published at Edmonton, says in part editorially:

"The Alaska Highway is worth millions to the future of Canada's industrial revenues, both internal and external. It is worth still more as a lure for the tourist of future years. It is up to Canada to see that this great asset does not return to the wilderness stage. A great gift like this from our friendly neighbors is one that all Canadians will appreciate.

"As to upkeep, it is true, the bill will be fairly heavy, but the road is in good condition and should not cost more than $400 a mile to maintain for many years to come, as a graveled road, but it will be cheaper in the long run to surface it, using Alberta bituminous sands for that purpose."

Very few of the fellows in the Mountain States Association membership group responded to our query as to the future value of this highway. One outstanding reply came from Gus Backman, secretary, Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce, who stated:

"I would say that the future value of the Alaska Highway to us fellows in the intermountain area, is the development of the finest scenic and tourist highway that can possibly be on the American continent. The construction of that highway will unquestionably call for the development of highways leading out of the Alaska Highway to all points of tourist interest in Canada and Alaska. In addition, it will open up new territory for colonies and industrial development, particularly mining, which in turn is very closely related to the activities in our area. Of necessity, it will develop a route that will provide transportation between Alaska and the main line that will be of tremendous worth to all of us."

INTERREGIONAL HIGHWAY CONNECTIONS

We now refer to the report dated January 1944 of the National Interregional Highway Committee outlining and recommending a national system of such highways. It includes the primary routes of the Federal-aid system with certain improved highways totaling 33,920 miles recommended as interregional routes.

There will be additional mileage added, bringing the grand total to 40,000 miles. Recommendations for this extra mileage are to be made by the State highway commissions by joint petitions. It is expected that such announcement will be made before July 1, 1946.

Reports from the eight States, members of this organization, indicate Wyoming and Montana are left out in the cold on northward interregional connections. Here is the picture:

Montana: In February 1944 the Governor of Montana learned that no such interregional route connected Montana and this intermountain country with Canada. Grand Forks-Winnipeg was the nearest eastern connection and Coeur D'Alene-Eastport, Idaho, on the west, leaving a 2,000-mile void. The governor's protest was immediately backed up by various Montana chambers to continue US 91 from Butte to Helena, Great Falls, Shelby, and connect at Sweet Grass-Coutts. The official designation is from Los Angeles, Salt Lake, Pocatello, to Butte, thence westerly to Missoula, Wallace, Coeur D'Alene-Eastport.

Wyoming was pretty much the same as Montana. The interregional highway from El Paso, Albuquerque, and Denver runs out at Cheyenne. Montana communities along US 87 joined Wyoming in trying to have this continued on to Casper, Sheridan, Billings, Lewistown, and Great Falls, thence on 91 to Sweet Grass.

Colorado from Mexico, El Paso, Albuquerque, and Denver, thence to Cheyenne, where it stops.

New Mexico: Same as Colorado.

Arizona: Starting at Las Cruces, N. Mex., going westward, thence northward to Phoenix, Wickenburg, and Ash Fork, where it stops but joins in with east-west U. S. No. 66.

Nevada's designation is more east-west than north starting at San Francisco to Reno and Salt Lake City.

Utah: From San Diego, Los Angeles, Barstow, to Salt Lake City.

Idaho really has two such designations. One, Salt Lake to Butte, and the other northwesterly from Salt Lake, Boise, to Portland.

TOURIST TRAVEL TO THE ALASKA HIGHWAY

Several years ago conservative tourist organizations and other groups interested in motor travel were really condemning this particular route as one impossible to be traveled by tourists and setting it up as a bugaboo with no merit whatsoever. Lately, however, the thought has been different. This was brought about by declarations of those high in authority that the prospects for travel over the Alaska Highway is most promising before another half decade is over.

The American Automobile Association in a recent survey on postwar travel trends brought to light some very interesting findings. It says that 43 percent of the people who plan their vacations in the United States expect to tour the Rocky Mountain States, the Northwest, California, and Southwestern States. In expected travel to 13 foreign countries listed, Canada is second with 20 percent, Alaska third with 16 percent. Mexico is first with 25 percent. Transportation preferences: Automobile, 84.5 percent; airplane, 8.5 percent; railroad, 6.5 percent; steamship, 6.5 percent. The AAA this year published a special pamphlet on Alaska containing several interesting chapters devoted to the history and future use of the Alaska Highway.

Thomas MacDonald very recently said: "It seems to me that Great Falls, Lethbridge, Calgary, and Edmonton can form a very strong combination to obtain proper recognition of the Alaska Highway, its maintenance and further improvement. I think there will be immediately no great rush of traffic overland to Alaska. However, when a bus can be driven from the center of the United States through to Fairbanks in 9 days, it definitely puts Alaska within reasonable reach of the automobile. Our people go far afield for recreation. We should approach the future of the highway not from the standpoint along of the present, but for a period of say 25 years."

He further said—"From the first connection that I have had with this road I have believed in the soundness of the location and its continuing importance. This inland route is the most reliable for travel between the major part of the United States and the interior of Alaska, say Fairbanks. The road now is in splendid condition and the bridges over the major streams are exceptionally fine, permanent structures."

ALBERTA

Alberta has taken a significant part in the future of the Alaska Highway. The civic leaders of Lethbridge, Calgary, and Edmonton, together with provincial officials, have always realized, I believe, the potential development of this highway as a tourist possibility. Groups from the Great Falls chamber have visited these 3 principal cities, at their invitation, at least 10 times the last 3 years to assist in a cooperative way the course by which we in the States can urge development.

Unfortunately, Alberta does not have the highway-building set-up that we in the United States do. There is a 7-cent gas tax for the Province and 3 cents additional to the Government. But this is not earmarked for road building. It all goes in the general fund. They have a tough problem on their hands. Yet they are fighting valiantly to tie in with us to work out something and in some way establish plans to maintain this highway and also to build a first-class connection from Edmonton.

The versatile Dan Campbell, Alberta director of publicity and travel at Edmonton, has these opinions:

"The road is already an important commercial artery. It is even now internationally important because it is the only line of transportation for vital supplies and materials with which the airports must be maintained.

"Governments do have an important duty to perform in the maintenance of the Alaska Highway and other newly built transportation systems in the north. If this generation is to benefit, if the north is to be brought into alinement with other efforts at man's disposal to alleviate unemployment, to provide homes and livelihood for multitudes of bewildered human being now, the road must be maintained as a modern highway and the necessary maintenance work becomes an urgent necessity."

"The fundamental fact of the need for immediate action cannot be stressed too strongly. Virtually no effort short of violence can be too powerful to insure immediate action. Every thought and agency at the disposal of wise and energetic men should be thrown unreservedly into the struggle for immediate action, because the need is now, not 10 years from now. This does not alter the fact that if we do not get immediate action now, no power on earth can restrain progress in the North in the future."

In the final summary in venturing some opinions and beliefs in the development of the now famous and alluring Alaska Highway as a tourist road, it would seem that the development of the fertile expanses of the North holds many potent benefits for commerce and society. The immediate benefits go to Alberta primarily and to the tier of mountain States. This depends upon the energy of putting our visions into effect; they must be tremendous in scope and overwhelming in magnitude.

In conclusion, can the delegates to this Mountain States Association convention as an organization, put forth these proper and continuous efforts to help bring about the development and maintenance of the Alaska Highway, so that it will really assume its proper place as a tourist highway. Are some of the suggestions outlined here worthy of presenting to our congressional delegations, national and State highway leaders, public relation experts, and our own chambers of commerce to ascertain if they can help in such an achievement.

I believe we can.

Letter From American Watch Workers Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PEHR G. HOLMES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE AMERICAN WATCH WORKERS UNION,
Boston, Mass., December 10, 1945.

Congressman PEHR HOLMES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOLMES: On last Tuesday, December 4, 1945, Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, took the floor of the House of Representatives and assailed the three American jeweled watch manufacturers—the Elgin National Watch Co., the Hamilton Watch Co., and the Waltham Watch Co., and criticised the State Department for coming to the aid of the American jeweled watch industry.

Congressman CELLER's actions are understandable. He represents the Benrus Watch Co.—one of the largest Swiss watch importers in America; he represents the Lazarus' of which family S. Ralph Lazarus is the president of the Swiss watch importers group, which masquerades under the name "American Watch Assemblers Association." Congressman CELLER simply forgot his identity as a Congressman on Tuesday, December 4 and thought he was representing his client—the Benrus Watch Co. As to the contents of the letter which Congressman CELLER sent to Mr. Arthur Paul, Director of the International Trade Operations, United States Department of Commerce; it is apparent that Mr. CELLER in his anxiety to please his clients, has failed to look at the record and to investigate the facts.

Had Congressman CELLER cared to read the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate's Finance Committee of 1943 and 1945, he would have found the case of the American jeweled watch industry and its employees versus the Swiss watch importers and the Swiss cartel (the Swiss Superholding Co.). For four long years, the employees of the American jeweled watch industry have been crying as a voice in the wilderness protesting the fact that a foreign country which was supplying Germany and the Axis with military timing mechanisms was being allowed to build a Frankenstein in the United States through Swiss dumping of civilian watches. We have knocked at the door of Congress many times as have we appealed to the State Department and the Committee on Reciprocity.

We have had a hearing on October 23 before the Committee on Reciprocity and that hearing was declared confidential by this committee, and they gave a hearing to the Swiss watch importers on October 26, 1945, which was confidential also. We requested of Mr. Edward Yardley, executive secretary of the Committee on Reciprocity, that these hearings be made public, and that we be given the opportunity to see what was said by the Swiss watch importers, and that they be allowed to see our case. This request was denied. We appealed to the State Department, through Winthrop Brown, chief of the commercial policy of the State Department, to open up the records. We were again refused. After both cases were heard by the Committee on Reciprocity on October 23 and October 26 of this year, the Committee on Reciprocity delayed action for 5 weeks waiting for a brief from the Swiss watch importers which it granted them the right to file. To this date such a brief has not been filed from the best information available.

Congressman CELLER's arguments in behalf of his client are fallacies and are the handiwork of a group groping in the dark to protect a group which was allowed to expand in the United States during the war to the detriment of the national defense of the United States. We agreed with Congressman CELLER that international trade should no longer be a one-way street. It's time that American interests were protected and the job opportunities of American workers were protected. Mr. Wallace's 60,000,000 jobs will never be a reality in America if we eliminate the opportunity for employment from the many basic industries which are subject to foreign competition. However, we can appreciate Mr. CELLER calling Mr. Paul's attention to his superior, Mr. Wallace, because Mr. CELLER knows that Henry Wallace, Secretary of Commerce, is a brother-in-law of Henry Bruggman, Swiss Minister to the United States. We don't know whether Mr. Wallace is interested in the Swiss interests or the American interests in this case, as he has never yet expressed himself. As for the effect limitations of Swiss watch imports on the merchant marine, Congressman CELLER had better discuss with his client, the Benrus Watch Co., the amount of shipping space watches take, for he will find out you can put 2,000 watches in a suitcase, and accordingly all of the Swiss watch imports into the United States in any 1 year can be put in the hold of one boat. How the merchant marine would starve to death if they had to depend on only Swiss watches for employment and trade.

As for the employment aspect, not one bit of employment is given by the Swiss watch importers that would not be given by the American jeweled watch industry if all watch movements were manufactured here; as a matter of fact, more employment would be given to the workers of our country if all watch movements were manufactured here, because many Swiss watches come here already cased and the American watch companies buy all their cases in the United States. Such items as bracelets, golden and silver watch straps, boxes, etc., that Mr. CELLER mentions, all that employment and domestic sales of such products would be given by the American jeweled watch industry to Americans. The only one that would be hurt by the elimination of such imports, would be the Swiss watch importers who have much room from 50 prewar to 500 now and who have waxed fat from the profits on the 28,000,000 watches they have imported during the war. They are in the same position as the gambler who is allowed to prosper during an unscrupulous municipal administration who is called to task by the honest successor to this unscrupulous administration and made to abide by the laws in the best interests of the community. The gambler protests because he has been allowed to operate over a long period of time and thinks he has a vested interest in his business, even though it is illegal. So it is with the Swiss watch importers. A wartime condition has allowed them to become large traders in wartime and they believe that they now have the right to exclude the American jeweled watch industry from a fair place in the market of the United States.

Eight-five percent of the unit cost of a watch movement is labor cost. American workers receive three times the pay of Swiss workers. Comparable watch movements—Swiss and American—retail at the same price, even though the Swiss watch movement is imported into the United States from one-fourth to one-third of the cost to the manufacturer in the United States, but, the consumer doesn't benefit; nor does the retailer. The Swiss watch importer picks up the difference as his profits, to the detriment of the national defense of the United States. Congressman CELLER should know that there are only two sources of supply for timing mechanisms in the world—the United States and Switzerland. He should be deeply interested in the fact that the Swiss watch industry supplies the machinery and timing mechanisms for Germany and the Axis and that they did not supply the Allies with any military equipment. Congressman CELLER should be deeply interested to know that American boys were killed and maimed by the products of the Swiss watch industry. Congressman CELLER should be deeply interested to know that there are 90 war plants in existence today in Germany, all of which are equipped with machinery made in Switzerland. Congressman CELLER should be deeply interested in the fact that if the program that he advocated last Tuesday on the floor of Congress were adopted that it would mean the elimination of the American jeweled watch industry and that the country that controls Switzerland would control the timing mechanisms of the world in future wars.

As for his analysis that the demand in 1946 and 1947 will total 10,000,000 watches—all we can go by on the subject is the record. The average sales of watches in the United States from 1926 to 1940 were 3,475,000 watches per year. These include domestic production and Swiss watch imports, combined. The figures for this period are as follows: 1926, 4,464,000; 1927, 4,834,000; 1928, 4,279,000; 1929, 5,139,000; 1930, 3,475,000; 1931, 1,779,000; 1932, 898,000; 1933, 1,001,000; 1934, 1,646,000; 1935, 2,188,000; 1936, 3,527,000; 1937, 4,451,000; 1938, 3,100,000; 1939, 3,990,000; 1940, 4,751,000.

These figures are the totals of watch sales in the United States from 1926 to 1940. During this period Swiss watch imports averaged 2,100,000 watches per year. During the war these imports increased tremendously. In 1 month—October 1945—2,100,000 watches alone were dumped into the United States from Switzerland. Since Pearl Harbor 28,000,000 watches were dumped into the United States by these Swiss watch importers who now cry that it is un-American for Americans to demand that their jobs be protected.

We note that Congressman CELLER recommends that the Swiss Government refuse to accept the limitation of 3,000,000 watches, as suggested by the State Department. We pray to God they do, for we believe that 3,000,000 watches is excessive and that no more than 2,000,000 per year should be allowed into the United States. We believe that the American people, once they are acquainted with the facts in this case, will rise in wrath and demand that Congress enact legislation to protect industries such as ours that are essential to national defense. How can any Congressman representing the peoples of the United States have the gall that Congressman CELLER has to stand up on the floor of Congress and advocate the destruction of an industry essential to national defense?

As for smuggling of Swiss watches—who better than the Swiss Government can police this? But again, the Swiss were never fussy who they did business with—for anyone who woul do business with Hitler during wartime, would do business with anyone. Senator KILGORE, of West Virginia, chairman of the Subcommittee on Elimination of German Resources for War said that correspondence in his hand that makes it clear that the principal concern of the Swiss was the prospect for future business dealings with a post-war Germany, irrespective of its political character and its relationship to the peace- and freedom-loving nations of the world. Need we say any more?

As for Congressman CELLER's reasoning on his statement that of retail sales of $82,500,000 only $10,622,000 went abroad. Doesn't this statement speak for itself? The Swiss

watch worker who works for two-thirds less than the American watch worker and the Swiss watch manufacturers dominated by the Swiss cartel sell their watches cheaper, or cost them less to produce? But, the Swiss watch importer, when he sells these same watches charges as much for them as does the American jeweled watch manufacturer for the product which costs the American manufacturer so much more to produce. Let Congressman Celler investigate the profits of the American jeweled watch industry for the past 20 years, and he will find that the net profit for the American watch manufacturers has been less than $1 per watch over this period and let him contrast this $1 per watch with the profits made by the Swiss watch importers on Swiss watches, and he will find that the average profit for the Swiss watch importer to average between $7 and $10 per watch.

As for employment: the Swiss watch importers supply—other than the big three Swiss watch importers: Bulova, Gruen, and Benrus, the rest or 90 percent of the rest—if they have an office, a telephone, and a salesroom, they are doing well—and some of them even use their bedroom as a place of business.

If it were not for the important position which Congressman CELLER holds as a Congressman and a member of the all-important Judiciary Committee, we would not have dignified him with a reply when we found out his affiliations with the Swiss watch importers as an attorney for the Benrus group; however, in view of his position, we deemed it mandatory to reply.

If democracy is to survive in America, if the Republic of the United States is to be maintained, integrity in our public officials must be of high standard, and every United States Senator and every Representative in Congress must consider the national good and must keep our country at all times prepared against the bullies that arise in international affairs. The best insurance for peace in the world is a prepared America—that is all we are pleading for in asking for the survival of the American jeweled watch industry. We plead with Americans for America so that a national defense industry will be maintained and that America not be dependent upon any foreign country for timing mechanisms.

We respectfully request you, as the Congressman representing one of three localities in which an American jeweled watch factory is located, to place this reply to Congressman CELLER in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thanking you in behalf of the membership of the American Watch Workers' Union, I remain

Very truly yours,

WALTER W. CENERAZZO,
National President, American Watch Workers Union.

War Cost in Materials One Trillion, One Hundred Fifty-four Billion Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. James H. Brady, of the American University, has devoted considerable time to research concerning the cost of World War II. I am inserting herewith a recent statement relative to his studies:

World War II cost the world $1,154,000,000,000 for armaments and war materials alone, James H. Brady announced yesterday after completing a cost study. The researcher also expressed belief that total property damage, not counting loss of life, amounts to about one-fifth the direct cost, or $230,900,000,000.

The study took 3 months. Brady assisted American University in the preparation of a war-cost study last May before the war was over.

The direct cost of armaments and war materials was arrived at by exhausting all available sources, Brady said. This included embassies, records of Government agencies, information services, and official reports.

Brady's study did not include the money spent and large damage resulting from 10 years of war in China. There was almost no data available on China's expenditures, Brady said.

The Oswego Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 6, 1945

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I had the occasion to speak on the radio with reference to the problem of solving the situation now existing at the Government camp maintained at Oswego, N. Y., to shelter a number of refugees from countries at war.

The committee of which I am chairman held hearings at Fort Ontario in order to get first-hand information about the group and to formulate a just and humane policy with respect to the situation.

Some 60 persons appeared before my committee as witnesses and some of the witnesses were members of the refugee group itself.

Among the outsiders who spoke was General O'Dwyer, now mayor-elect of New York, and John Pehle, who was the executive director of the War Refugee Board.

After a thorough discussion of the situation, the matter was thoroughly gone into and definite policies were recommended by the committee to the Government of the United States.

Unfortunately, up to the present time, the recommendations of the committee have not been commented upon by the Government and I am obliged to speak to the public of the United States in order to bring this problem to the direct attention of the people.

The refugee camp at Ontario was one of many camps which were opened in various countries in order to save from immediate death a number of refugees who were threatened with extinction. This country took care of the smallest number of refugees who were able to enter camps in the various countries established for that purpose. Little Switzerland, Sweden, Portugal, and other countries received into their midst many more persons than we did in the United States. The total number of those received at Oswego was less than 1,000. The exact number was 982. The refugees arrived in New York on August 3, 1944, and from there proceeded to Fort Ontario, Oswego. Ten of these unfortunates died before the time the hearings of our Committee on Immigration had begun, but 11 infants were born and these deaths were offset by the births.

Some 60 or more persons, particularly of Yugoslavian nationality, left the camp and returned to their homelands since the hearings began.

The number of refugees is therefore diminishing steadily and by the time some action is taken by our Government there may not be more than 900 who will require attention. These 900 unfortunates are entitled to the care and protection of our Government.

There is no reason why the camp should continue to be maintained at a great expense to the Government, when these persons could be easily let out and permitted to come in as legal immigrants under our immigration laws.

These refugees are of many religious persuasions and we have among them Roman Catholics, Greek Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. Everyone who has come in contact with them has been impressed by their high cultural level and the high proportion of talented and gifted people among that group.

The children have been attending the local schools and have been among the brightest and most responsive pupils. The occupations of these persons are varied. There are people who were professionals, managers, salesmen, people engaged in agriculture, fishery, forestry, butchers, farmers, and others.

Many of their refugees have relatives in our armed forces. Twenty-one of the refugees are either the sons of or the parents of people in the armed forces. Most of them have relatives in the United States who would be able to and are willing to take care of them if these refugees should be allowed to enter the United States for permanent residence.

It would be almost impossible for these refugees to go back to Europe. The conditions are such that so-called displaced persons would find it exceedingly hard if not impossible to resume life in those places from which they were driven out.

One of the members of a committee which was organized in the vicinity to help these refugees said that it would be almost criminal to keep them enclosed in the fort, because, while they have tentative security there, they are more or less in the position of people in concentration camps who cannot move out of their quarters and who are enclosed in an area where they can be of no use either to themselves or to the community.

These refugees have been trained by our welfare organizations for eventual admission to the United States and to become a part of our country. We organized for them classes in English, as well as recreational facilities, such as movies, musical entertainment, and the like.

I am sure that if these persons are allowed to enter the United States for permanent residence they will make a valuable addition to our population.

The committee of which I am the chairman has therefore recommended that steps be taken to close the camp and permit these refugees to enter the

United States for permanent residence under our existing immigration laws.

A few days ago we were informed that the Canadian Government allowed 3,500 refugees, who were admitted in the same manner in which our refugees were admitted to Fort Ontario, to become citizens of Canada without any further ado. Our committee did not recommend anything as drastic as all that, although it would not have been amiss to allow these persons to apply for citizenship at once.

Nevertheless, mindful of the difficulties of our immigration laws, our committee simply wishes to facilitate the admission of these persons for permanent residence under our existing immigration laws.

I feel that this is the least we can do for these unfortunate persons, and I feel that this method of solution will be satisfactory to everybody.

As a gesture to other countries it will be up to us to devise a satisfactory plan for the solution of this problem. It is intolerable that the United States, which is now engaged in the task of closing up concentration camps throughout the world and setting their inmates at liberty should maintain a concentration camp in its very midst. The refugees should be freed at once. There is no palliative that will do. It would be futile to give the inmates a sort of a leave of absence or a sponsored leave or any other temporary liberty as distinguished from full freedom.

If we should resort to have measures from time to time, it will mean that the problem will be with us again later and later and instead of one debate on the subject we shall have many debates much more futile than the preceding one.

It is desirable that a uniform policy be adopted, so that there will be no delay in the reorganization of all of the Oswego refugees, and I believe that all of these refugees should be treated alike.

The refugees should be given the status of visitors who have overstayed their temporary admission. Those that can qualify for regular immigration visas should be given the opportunity to apply for such visas and be readmitted for permanent residence. Those who do not so qualify should be weeded out as undesirable. In this way, the refugees who came as guests of the Government and who can easily qualify for immigration visas should obtain the proper status as such.

The contention could be made and in fact voices have been uttered to the effect that these refugees should be sent back to Europe where they belong.

If conditions were normal and if Europe were in a position to resume its ordinary life, the story would have been different. Such, however, is not the fact. Europe is not in a position to welcome back anyone who has left its borders. In fact, the great problem of Europe today is the resettlement of many displaced persons who cannot go back to the land of their birth.

President Truman has just appointed a committee to cooperate with a British committee appointed for this same purpose, to find ways and means how to resettle many displaced persons in Palestine.

The refugees at Fort Ontario will not be welcomed by any European country. In fact there is no European country today which welcomes any of its former citizens.

There remains, therefore, one way by which this relocation of human beings can be effective.

We must find a place for them in the United States and it is not up to Congress to find a place for these unfortunate persons, but for the executive branch of the Government.

Congress did not authorize their coming to the United States and the executive authority acted on its own responsibility and the cause of humanity to permit the admission of these 900 persons or so to the Oswego shelter.

Since the executive branch of the Government has created the problem, it is up to the executive branch of the Government to solve it.

I therefore believe, and in this I am supported by all of my colleagues, that relief can be given to these refugees by executive action under our immigration laws. Only in this way can these harassed human being finally find a haven of refuge.

Resolutions of Decatur County, Iowa, Farm Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I desire to include therein a set of resolutions adopted by the Decatur County (Iowa) Farm Bureau at its annual meeting on November 9.

Farmers of Decatur County are interested in progressive agriculture and have made great strides in soil improvement and development of livestock and crops. They have produced great quantities of foodstuffs during the war years in spite of being seriously handicapped by lack of labor and machinery. With such farmers as we have in this progressive county the United States has been able to feed its own people and materially aid in supplying foodstuffs for the rest of the world.

DECATUR COUNTY FARM BUREAU RESOLUTIONS, 1946

We believe that the support of township meetings, our county organization, and board of directors, and to stand solidly behind our State and national organization is our only hope of securing for farm families our fair share of the national income and educational and social improvement.

I. ROADS

Resolved, That counties which so desire should be permitted to use State and Federal funds to surface secondary roads on a drainage grade, rather than being forced to build a percentage grade.

II. FARM PROGRAM

Resolved, That any farm program should be a balanced program that will give grass land and livestock producers the same proportionate protection that was formerly limited to the seven so-called basic commodities.

III. PARITY

We firmly believe in the principle of parity as the basis for farm prices, and, if and when the price of any major farm product drops below parity, we urge our organization to use every means at their command to keep such product off the market till parity prices can be obtained. If farmers are to secure the necessary labor to continue operating in an efficient manner, we will have to compete with industrial hours and wages for labor, and we believe parity prices must be computed on that basis.

IV. SOIL CONSERVATION

Resolved, That soil conservation is imperative, and we recommend the continuation of conservation payments for approved practices.

V. TAXES

Resolved, That the State income tax should be restored to 100 percent as originally passed.

VI. MILITARY TRAINING

Resolved, That peacetime military training should not be made compulsory.

AUBREY REDMAN,
ERALD SCOTT,
E. B. SAYLOR,
Committee.

Letter From a Small Businessman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from one of the small businessmen of Rockford, Ill., presents such an excellent and concise picture of what the average American small businessman thinks and desires that, under the unanimous-consent request already granted to me, I insert it for the benefit of my colleagues, and particularly for the benefit of the Washington bureaucrats who insist upon war controls of all kinds being retained because they claim the American people and the American businessman cannot get along without such controls:

HILL MACHINE CO.,
Rockford, Ill., November 30, 1945.

The Hon. NOAH M. MASON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am what is known as a small businessman. I operate a small manufacturing establishment employing less than 100 people. I hope that it will grow to employ 500 or 1,000 or more.

I am writing to tell you as my Representative in Congress that I do not want any help from the Government. I am quite willing to take my chances on competing with the big fellows. I don't want any special breaks as I think I am smart enough to make and distribute my products cheaply enough to sell them competitively. If I can't, I'll quit and work at something else.

However, while I don't want help, neither do I want interference or hindrances from my Government. I want to be free to apply the special technical talent and ability which I

think I possess to produce and distribute my merchandise more efficiently and cheaply. I can't do that and read OPA regulations, talk to labor organizers, WLB, NLRB, Wages' and Hours' men, conciliators, and what have you at the same time. My big competitors can keep a high-priced staff of lawyers, so-called labor-relations men, and nonproducing specialists to contend with these, but my little company can't support them.

I think I can offer to buy the component parts and manufacturing operations for my products for high enough prices in the form of wages so that enough people will want to work in my plant to produce the full capacity of the plant and tools.

I want to be free to buy or not to buy from these people either individually or collectively and I acknowledge the right (and claim it has existed since 1776) of these people to sell or not to sell to me either collectively or individually as they choose. I don't want any antistrike legislation and on the other hand, I don't want the Government to force me to deal with people against my own free will.

What I do expect from my Government is impartial police protection for myself and other citizens from unsocial individuals who threaten or commit assault and battery, mayhem, defamation, libel arson, and riotous or other heretofore unlawful acts to prevent me from freely dealing with other individuals and to compel me to deal only with the particular group they sponsor and whose membership is dependent upon their ability to so coerce me. I expect that protection from my local government, but if it isn't provided, I expect it from my State or Federal Government.

I have read and understand the Constitution of the United States. I have read the Wagner Act and many of the Government decisions under it. I insist that it is unconstitutional, court decisions to the contrary notwithstanding. Its application is an encroachment on the freedom of all individuals. I refuse to recognize the existence of a separate class or caste called labor entitled to special rights.

Collective bargaining in its true sense is a privilege or right which has always been available to any group, but under the Wagner Act the words mean coercion of individual employers and employees.

The right to picket, that is, the right of individuals to walk peaceably on a public thoroughfare and express their ideas unmolested, needs no new law to uphold it. But under the Wagner Act picketing has come to mean legalized violence and disorder and the abrogation of the individual's right to walk unmolested on a public thoroughfare to his work.

I urge that you work for the repeal of the Wagner Act, and the repeal of all other laws upon which is built the present bureaucratic interference with the freedom of individual citizens to engage in enterprises individually or collectively for the purpose of bettering themselves.

Very truly yours,

F. LEROY HILL.

United States Marines in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of loose talk lately concerning the status and utilization of United States Marines in China. In my opinion it is the duty of the Congress to see that the entire country is kept currently, and what is even more important, accurately informed on a subject of this kind. Accordingly, and in an effort to obtain the true facts, I recently addressed a communication to General Vandegrift, Commandant of the Marine Corps, requesting that he advise me of the progress that is being made by our marines in disarming the Japanese forces in China. Under date of December 10, 1945, I received a communication from General Vandegrift which reads in part, as follows:

United States forces were ordered into China to discharge a commitment to our Chinese Allies to bring the war with Japan to a conclusion by assisting in disarming the Japanese troops in China. Execution of this assigned mission is in progress. Retention of United States forces in China after completion of this mission is not expected. The Marine Corps, in employing its forces, is carrying out the directives received from higher authority which were issued in implementation of the commitment outlined above.

Marines overseas who are eligible for discharge or who have had long periods of service overseas on their current tours of duty are being returned to the United States as rapidly as practicable, regardless of the employment of their units. As far as is possible, men who have the highest number of points are being returned to the United States first.

Particular attention should be directed to the general's statement that "Retention of United States forces in China after completion of this mission" (disarming the Japanese troops) "is not expected." This pronouncement, Mr. Speaker, confirms a similar statement which was issued to the press by the Secretary of War on November 12, 1945. Mr. Patterson's release at that time reads:

The military problem in China at the present time, insofar as the United States is concerned, is the completion of the surrender, disarmament, and evacuation of the Japanese forces. There are still more than a million armed Japanese in the China theater.

Our limited force on the continent of Asia is making every practicable effort to assist the forces of the Central Government of China in the accomplishment of this mission.

The Central Government of China under Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek has been deeply and helpfully involved both inside and outside China in our common war against Japan.

The government of Chiang Kai-shek is formally recognized by the Soviet Republics, by Great Britain, and by the United States. All three of these powers are now cooperating with the generalissimo in accomplishing the disarmament and evacuation of Japanese troops from China.

The United States troops in China will not be used for the suppression of civil strife but will protect American lives and property.

Points in China that have been liberated by the United States forces will be turned over to representatives of the recognized Central Government of China.

There is no danger of our troops becoming involved in civil strife in China unless they are attacked, in which event we may expect the American troops to react with vigor and success.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if additional confirmation is needed to emphasize the reasons for our Marines being in China, we can turn to the State Department and refer to a speech delivered at the Foreign Policy Association Forum by John Carter Vincent, director of the Office of Far Eastern Affairs, in New York City, on October 18, 1945. One paragraph from this speech is particularly significant. Mr. Vincent said:

Some questions may have arisen in your mind with regard to the dispatch of American marines to north China. They have been sent there pursuant to military directives to serve a specific purpose; that is, to assist Chiang Kai-shek in demobilizing and repatriating Japanese troops in the area. Their stay is temporary. They will be withdrawn when they are no longer required for the purpose for which they were sent. Generalissimo Chiang has announced that the marines would leave north China as soon as they can be relieved by Chinese Government forces. The process of relief is now in progress.

The three statements I have quoted above, if read in reverse order, would seem to indicate clearly that it is not the policy of the United States Government to utilize our armed forces in quelling civil strife in China. If this assumption is not correct, we are being sadly misled. If it is correct then there should be an end to baseless rumors and irresponsible statements that lack foundation in fact.

Remarks on Complaints of a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include two letters.

We must, of course, agree that it is much easier to get consent of this Congress to help others than to help ourselves. That is the way with the unselfish United States of America.

As has been stated, the United States of America means Christianity in action. In fact we have gone so far that a man who speaks of America has been called unpatriotic.

It seems to me that the time has arrived when it is both unwise and unsound to put our own country at the foot of the list. Too many want to throw over our own country under the subterfuge of "Building the Peace" talk. They use this slogan to substitute the "red" flag for the American flag, and substitute the Communist manifesto for the Sermon on the Mount.

Let us have an unbiased and well-balanced judgment and realize that no pressure group can respect a person they can control or influence by chain mail or threat.

TOLEDO, OHIO, *December 6, 1945.*
Congressman HOMER A. RAMEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Well, sir, Santa Clause certainly went on a wholesale rampage accord-

ing to the news just reaching the ears of a great many surprised and belittled Americans—surprised and belittled by whom? That's the answer we are waiting for. Santa Claus, always pictured such a square shooter, probably does not fit the name of the giver, as he surely would not let his own starve, and go naked, and play big shot to an outsider—four billion to Britain—disgusting to say the least.

Haven't we done enough for them already. The government of the people has taken and given at their own pleasure whatever and whenever they wished to help—always to help the British. What makes anyone think they are superior to any other nation? In most respects I think they are inferior. What is the scarry story they tell to make our representatives turn over more than they would to their own families? Whatever the story it works wonders. Well fairy tales used to be told to make one have a good imagination, some of them surely would sound preposterous, when I was a child, but after reading these headlines in the morning paper, the most fantastic fairy tale, can be made a reality and make more sense.

Four billion to this high-hat aggressor nation—simply adding insult to injury. The only nation that has done these thing to us—first.

I was brought up to believe charity is a virtue, but I was also taught in my early school days, it was "not good to take from the mouths of children and feed to the dogs." In other words, why take from the hungry mouths of our own American children and give to anyone out of all those we have been supposed to help. The whole world is human and in need.

I do not feel from reading past history that I have in the least no, not the smallest atom if the average can figure so small an amount, debt toward these hungry aggressors—they have never been called on to give us any assistance, but have well been practiced in the cry of "wolf," and I think this a big injustice to those of us who have lived in these wonderful United States and have claim to it as their beloved country.

I should think they would be satisfied that we saved their necks and forget about their vacant bank rolls. If we are going to make a people more comfortable and give them the benefits of additional financial help (I didn't know there was a surplus), as we have been taxed to the utmost, because I thought—our Government needed the help—well let's take weekly trips around some of the districts in even a city the size of Toledo, you can get rid of a lot of money just giving some of the poor little children the mere necessities of life. Shame on all of us, and doubly shame on those who make these unfair, un-American decisions.

Where is our patriotism?

All the dates one cannot remember, but one date I do remember and so do you, July 4, 1776. Something worthy to remember, Declaration of Independence. This war fought against whom? The very country who has in the past caused us untold misery and heartache. Refresh your minds, read it again. If you have been too busy to give this memorable day a thought, take a little time out, walk over the premises where you have the privilege of habitating these days, due to the votes of the American people, and then examine your conscience. We want proper representation and when things are of no small consequence, we want a voice as is our birthright.

The one-sided mustering-out allotment, $700 to their boys, $300 to ours who went into the mess to help them, and the American soldier who won the war and saved at least what they still have left, and stopped the guns from firing over the very heads, how thankful they should be, without asking for more. Certainly, evenly divided would be griping enough, but to be more than doubled, who does these terrible things to the American people? Someone is to fault.

Well, for the future that lies ahead, for those who will live after we have paid our call, and for the marvelous heritage which our forefathers left us, do something about this loan, or gift, while there is still time left, granting them so much for the mere asking; they may decide it would be better to live here in some not too long a time; they may demand this gift, who knows; asking gives them $4,000,000,000—what if they should demand?

Take action, immediately.

Yours very truly,

BLANCHE V. VALIQUETTE.

STOP THAT LOAN TO ENGLAND

Congressman HOMER A. RAMEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Stop that loan and fast. I have never heard anything like it. Never. Till my dying day anyone that has anything to do with promoting or signing a $4,000,000,000 loan to Great (?) Britain will be on my blacklist forever, and I will work and connive to oppose him in everything he does, so help me God, and I do love my God.

I pick up the paper this morning and there staring me in the face, "The United States To Loan Great [nuts] Britain $4,000,000,000." My only comment was "Suckers again," and all the people in the car that I ride to work with felt the same way, so it's not just me. Why should we do that? We only paid for the war for them; they never paid the debt from the last war; in fact, they didn't even try. Words that ran through my brain were those of Winston Churchill: "I have succeeded. The United States is in the war." We should help that. No; we should not.

Should I pay a high income tax so we can give them a loan? No; I will not. I'll quit my job and let the Government support me for awhile. I'm as good and better than they are. Besides, there are too many people in my own country that need help; what about the people in the South, who can't read or write? The hill-billies, as they are called, and why, who have been left alone to live in poverty, with no schools for miles around, living in shacks. Why, because they haven't been taught to live decent—we don't have the money to launch such a big project. Well, let's start there, Mr. RAMEY, the British are smart enough when they can get a $4,000,000,000 loan from people who haven't got the money to help our own. Speaking of the last large sum of money we lent Britain in the last war (World War I), what are we doing to help Finland?

Something else that crossed my mind: What about the general conditions of the colored people in my country. Have we treated them right? We have not, and we are the ones who brought them away from their homes in chains. Yes; I said in chains. I protest that loan and it better be stopped (there are millions like me, too), and to a practical mind that is a lot of votes in any man's language.

Another thing that made my American blood boil (the loan made it overflow) was an article in the paper the other night with the list of "mustering out" pay for our soldiers as compared with our allies. And our soldiers are the ones who won the war, too, and not the bloomin' "limes." Guess who was at the bottom? The United States of America, the land of wealth and enterprise. I bowed my head in shame. But wait, this is even better. Guess who was at the top. Poor, poor England. Yes; the people who are asking and getting (over my dead body) for a $4,000,000,000 loan. They are giving their soldiers $700 compared to our $300. That is not right. Do you think so?

I am not going to buy a "hot dog" and pay for a steak so I can help give our soldiers $300 and they can pay theirs $700. I think too much of our GI's.

I love my country and I think it is wonderful to live here, but the things the servants of the people are trying to put over on us is making me sick to my stomach.

Let us stop that $4,000,000,000 loan to Britain.

Sincerely,

MARY A. CURRAN.

TOLEDO, OHIO.

Address of Hon. Oren Harris, of Arkansas, on Transportation Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include here the text of an address delivered this morning by my colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

The address, delivered before the New York State Fruit and Vegetable Shippers and Receivers Association in Schenectady, N. Y., follows:

I am pleased with the opportunity you have afforded me to lay before such a representative body of users of transportation some of the considerations that have influenced the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to undertake an investigation of transportation problems, for we in Congress know that shippers and transportation agencies must face these problems in the long and difficult period of readjustment tto an economy of peace. And we have already found that, in more ways than one, settling down to peace is a harder job than setting up for war.

I am not, in any sense, representing the committee. Any opinions that I may express are my own and are not, necessarily, the opinions of any other member of our committee.

Our committee is composed of some of the ablest men in Congress. They think for themselves. They differ widely on many questions but there is unanimity of opinion among them on one point. We believe that transportation, from the over-all viewpoint—rail, highways, water, air—has only one mission and that is service to the public. It is not an end in itself. It is an instrument. If it becomes inefficient through its own errors or through mistakes of regulatory bodies, or fails through neglect in Congress, the whole public suffers.

And we should never forget who the real owners of transportation are. Among those who suffer through financial default due to break down in our transportation machinery are the policyholders in hundreds of life-insurance companies, depositors in thousands of savings banks and other holders of transportation securities.

The approach then of our committee to the solution of these perplexing problems stems from solicitude for the users and the real owners of transportation facilities. And when we have said that, we have said practically the whole American public.

THE DECLARED POLICY OF CONGRESS

These considerations influenced Congress when it wrote the following declaration of policy as the preamble to the Transportation Act of 1940, as we sought to pass an act that would, and I quote:

"Provide for fair and impartial regulation of all modes of transportation subject to the provisions of this act, so administered as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each; to promote safe, adequate, economical, and efficient service and foster sound economic conditions in transportation and among the several carriers; to encourage the establishment and maintenance of reasonable charges for transportation services, without unjust discriminations, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices; to cooperate with the several States and the duly authorized officials thereof; and to encourage fair wages and equitable working conditions."

It is perhaps a little presumptuous for an Arkansawyer to come up here into the great Empire State and talk to you about transportation. But I see from the nature of this organization that I am not entirely out of my element. As a boy I started out as an Arkansas farmer. I was a real farmer and did not become one when I sought to run for office. I remember well, in the spring of 1923, when I helped to plant a melon patch in which I was to have an important financial interest. The first two carloads of those sun-kissed Arkansas melons that went to market from that patch were mine. They were, of course, the finest melons that ever grew. They netted me $833.67 and with that profit I was off that fall to the Arkansas State Teachers College.

Some of my political adversaries have been mean enough to say that a melon patch was responsible for the loss to agriculture of a darn good farmer and for the creation of a mediocre politician. But enough of my good friends and neighbors, I am glad to say, think otherwise and have sent me three times to Washington as their Representative. It is apparent then that I slid into this meeting by way of Washington on a couple of carloads of melon rinds.

Another circumstance gives me a certain right to talk to your group. You are engaged in the shipping and marketing of the farm products that your hillsides and valleys yield so bountifully. Our hills and valleys in Arkansas also yield a bountiful produce. If the sun of your beautiful Finger Lake section enhances the sweetness, glamor, and potency of your grapes, we can also claim for our corn a certain enhancement of desirability due to our moonlight. What our moonshine does to our corn in Arkansas produces a result which can be compared favorably with what the sunshine does for your grapes. I have heard it said that our Arkansas white mule, which feeds upon our corn, packs a healthy kick.

TRANSPORTATION IS A TOOL

It is not about the products that the members of your association convey and market to the people but about the mechanism through which that conveyance is made that I would speak to you today. That mechanism is in many forms. Grouping it all together we call its transportation. From the standpoint of the user, transportation is a single implement. It is a tool. It is created not for itself but for the use of others. It must, of course, under our system of free enterprise not only pay for its keep but pay a profit to those who supply the capital to create it and keep it running.

But transportation must serve the public first and its own interests second. It is that public service and not the self-interest of the agencies of transport that influences Congress in its approach to transportation. It is from the standpoint of predominant public interest that we must expect the agencies of transport and the users of transport to approach their problems. Unless we jointly—the Congress and the people—seek every possible means of adjusting self-interest to public needs, and succeed in doing so, we will get nowhere. Legislation enacted in the vacuum created by selfish pressure groups without strict regard to the needs of the people is merely empty phrases and meaningless words.

When the Honorable CLARENCE F. LEA, chairman of our committee, introduced last July a resolution calling for a thoroughgoing survey of postwar transportation, he made a comment before the House that so brilliantly pictures the situation that I can do no better than to quote him here.

"This problem," said Mr. LEA, "is vital because transportation is the connecting link between our producing machine and the consuming public. Without adequate economical transportation our whole economy can bog down, no matter how much energy, wisdom, and capital industrial executives may put into the other phases of reconversion from a war economy to an economy of peace."

He pointed out further that failure to provide a legislative remedy to meet the needs of our transportation system, or failure to focus the thought of leaders in the transportation field upon their own responsibility, apart from legislation, can prolong for many years this Nation's period of reconversion. And he truly said that it might even throw our whole economy into chaos.

As one member of the subcommittee that will conduct this inquiry, I can assure you that we will devote all the time and all the energy that is necessary to the prosecution of our study. We hope and expect to find the answers to some of the problems that are perplexing to you as users and providers of transportation. These same problems have likewise perplexed the users and providers of transportation throughout the Nation but we do not know what all of those problems are. We do not know how they measure up in your job of meeting the demands of the public you serve. We can only find out what those problems are from you and we want to know how you look upon them and from what angles you approach them.

NOT TO REWRITE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Let it be understood, however, that we do not expect to rewrite the whole Interstate Commerce Act. We believe that we can do a pretty thorough job within the statutory framework that has been created over the many years that law has been on our statute books.

You will agree, I am sure, that the expansion of the services of the newer forms of transportation and the vast changes that have taken place recently in our economy have made much of this framework obsolete. Indeed, obsolescence set in many years before the war but just as that catastrophe has opened up new vistas in manufacturing; it has also opened new vistas in transportation and has multiplied and magnified its problems.

The Congress, in view of the significance of transportation to all of our people, will endeavor to apply itself in a statesmanlike, objective fashion to finding the right answers.

In dealing with a matter of this kind we should be statesmen and forget local and regional interests and hope the people who appear before us with their recommendations will do likewise.

If we are to be representatives of all of the people we must expect the people whom we serve to forget self-interest when they approach common problems. We grow the finest melons and corn and cotton in the world in Arkansas, but if you here in New York can't get them, due to a break-down in transportation, we both suffer. What we need from you I wouldn't know, but there are other States that are less independent than we are, and I am sure my people will wish me, as their representative, to act also as your representative in my approach to this inquiry.

I hope and believe that I have an open mind. Personally I am prepared to find that some of the views I held a few years ago on transportation may be quite erroneous when I have examined all of the facts inherent in the new conditions that surround our present transportation problems.

We frequently hear our transportation facilities in this country described as a transportation system. Magnificent as these facilities are, however, and tremendous as may be their achievements, it is not true to describe them as a system.

What we have, in fact, is a far-flung conglomeration of transportation systems and independent agencies. This is due largely to the enormous variety of needs, geographically and economically, which these systems have been created to meet. It is also due in part to the fact that each system and each mode of transportation has grown up under our system of free competitive enterprise largely through the inspiration of competition. This competition has been not alone that of the enterprisers who have created our transport agencies. In many cases a mushrooming and sporadic growth has been stimulated by intense competition among geographic and economic areas.

THE PROBLEM

Let me devote a few moments to the task of laying before you some of the factors that give this transportation problem of ours such compelling interest to both the people and the Congress.

The history of the economic progress of the world is, in a very large sense, the history of the development of transportation—cheap and efficient. You men know that the thing which determines your ability to do business profitably is the extent of your market. To all business enterprise the business of the transportation has an importance exceeded by no other. It is transportation, and only transportation, that determines the extent of the market of any business.

Now what have we at this time in the way of facilities? We have 30,500 miles of navigable inland waterways served in peacetime by more than 11,000 vessels. At the beginning of the war there were more than 8,000 miles of coastal and intercoastal water routes competing with rail and highway users.

There are 1,302 railroad companies, of which 136 are class I roads operating 230,000 miles of privately owned tracks and thousands of terminals, freight depots, repair shops, and other supplementary and maintenance facilities.

While in 1919 this country had less than 10,000 miles of hard-surface highways, we now have nearly one and one-half million miles of such roads, 230,000 miles of which have been built with Federal aid. Operating over these highways, at the beginning of the war, were 26,200 trucking companies and more than 1,500 motor-bus companies, together operating 5,000,000 vehicles.

Also, there are 3,000 airports in the United States and the Civil Aeronautics Authority has plans for 3,000 more. There are nearly 35,000 miles of lighted airways.

Then, too, there is an extensive network of pipe lines, expanded greatly during the war. It, too, is a factor to be reckoned with.

Going back to the highways, we have to consider, as a most important competitive force, millions of motor vehicles, privately owned and operated, trucks and passenger cars.

All of these facilities have demonstrated beyond question their ability to serve our people. They must continue to do this and perform even more satisfactorily than in the past. Our only hope is that our regulatory system and our statutory framework may be perfected to aid them in this effort. Our aim shall be to prevent unbridled competition between private carriers and common carriers and among common carriers themselves, from destroying the value of this fine instrument.

PEOPLE'S HUGE BILL FOR TRANSPORTATION

The people have a huge investment in their transportation instrument and they pay a

huge bill for its use and maintenance. They are paying not only through direct charges but also through taxation. They have paid this bill in the past without serious complaint because they know they must have the service. From farm and from factory a stream of produce flows through the channels provided by transport and this stream must never stop or we would starve and freeze and disappear as a nation.

The size of the transportation bill that the people of this country are paying is suggested by our appropriations for roads. Since the passage of the Federal Highway Act of 1916, approximately three and three-quarter billions of dollars have been authorized by Congress for expenditure on Federal highways. This includes one and one-half billions authorized last fall for expenditure during the first postwar years. The over-all cost of our highway system has never been ascertained but the figure is very large. Add to the three and three-quarter billions authorized for Federal aid, the State, county, and city funds that have been expended on streets and highway and the figure will run up into almost astronomical proportions. But whatever it costs I am certain that highway users consider the investment well worth while for they are still asking for more.

I will not burden you with further statistics. I have dwelt on the road situation because I assume that is your predominant interest, but I will ask you to think of the billions of private capital that have gone into the construction of the roadbeds, terminals, and other basic facilities of our rail lines and the other billions that have gone into the rolling stock of these lines. I will also ask you to think of the millions that have been spent by Federal and local governments for air-line development and the billions of expenditure that are in immediate prospect.

You will see, if you think clearly through these staggering figures, what our greatest problem is. We must make the services provided by private capital continue to be available to the users of transportation when they must compete with the billions of tax-free, interest-free, Government capital in other facilities. If we cannot solve this problem, we must face the alternative. That alternative is not pleasant.

Transportation must and will continue as a service to the people. You will never see a sign plastered on the door of a railroad station on any of our trunk lines, "This road has been closed down by its owners." A warehouse can go out of business whenever it finds it unprofitable to continue. A factory making hoe handles can close up any time it wishes. The stream of commerce through our transportation system cannot stop. It must continue as private enterprise or become a Government activity.

THE ROAD TO SOCIALISM

I can hear some who do not think through this problem say "and so what?" This view is very narrow. It holds that so long as trucks and railroads, bus lines and air lines, roll and fly, we don't care what happens to other elements of our business fabric. But there is much more to this picture than meets the eye blinded by self-interest.

If you examine the history of countries that have gone over to socialism, you will see what I mean. The first step is the socialization of transportation and communication. We see in England today that almost first on the program of the new socialistic government is the nationalization of transport. A few days after the government took over the banks, it took over domestic air lines. I warn you that what is happening in England can happen and will happen here if privately financed transportation goes bankrupt in its unequal competitive race with Government-aided transport.

Let's assume that the Government can operate the business of transportation as efficiently as private enterprise. Let's assume that your trucks will roll as effectively for you if directed by a bureau in Washington as when directed from your office. I doubt this but it is possible.

But what are you going to say about turning over to politicians the largest single unit of purchasing power to be distributed by men who hold their jobs at the pleasure of a political party? This obviously could lead to totalitarianism.

What are you going to say about adding 3,000,000 transport employees to the Federal pay roll? They will vote. They will want new pension schemes. They will be in the driver's cab. They will run your business because they will run the Government.

How long can industry and agriculture exist as free enterprises with such a set-up? There is the answer to those who brush off this problem with a "So what."

AFTER WORLD WAR I

Some 25 years ago we came out of World War I with a transportation problem quite different from that facing us today. Then, we merely had to consider the railroads. Air lines did not exist. Motor vehicles were not serious competitors. All that we had to do was to rehabilitate our rail facilities after 26 months of Government operation which had been characterized by the worst service in transportation that this country has ever seen, either before or since. I seriously doubt if anyone who had any experience during those dreary 26 months would ever contemplate the prospect of Government operation with anything but a shiver of horror and disgust.

Fortunately, our repair job at this time is much simpler. Except for a brief period of threatened labor trouble there has never been any suggestion of Government operation during the war which has just ended.

Everyone will agree that in meeting the demands of war, transportation did a magnificent job. When we approach the problems of peace, however, we cannot reasonably expect it to work miracles and continue to exist as a part of our free-enterprise system if we permit it to starve itself by unreasoning competition or impose upon it, through regulation, impossible restraints. The performance of highway, rail, water, air, and pipe-line transportation was beyond anything that the American people had any right to expect. This should be the best answer that can possibly be made to those who would force transportation into Government ownership and operation.

But this fine record will amount to nothing as an argument against Government operation if we do not compose the potentially destructive elements of transportation into a serviceable tool. The job will not be an easy one for part of this implement will be supported by private capital which must earn a return. Part of it will be supported by Government capital that does not have to earn a return to investors; the taxpayers provide this capital. It is a problem similar to that which faced this Nation when half of it was slave and half of it free. I am optimistic enough to believe that we can find the answer without going through the throes of a socialistic revolution.

Search for this answer we will. Searching for it we are.

PROGRESS OF INQUIRY

Our subcommittee on transportation has made much progress in its inquiry. This has been due in large measure to the fine cooperation that we have received from many hundreds of users of transportation facilities, the operators of transportation agencies, investors in transportation securities, and economists—students of and experts in transportation. We have received a great volume of statements, opinions, and comments in response to the request which Chairman LEA sent out. This request went to thousands of individuals and companies throughout the country. Much of the material which we have received is highly significant and practical. It all shows how alive our people are to the importance of this problem. It indicates to me that Congress is on the right track.

These statements are now being digested and analyzed. We expect to publish them for the use of the committee, the Congress and the public generally. This publication, however, will not supply the only basis for action by our committee. Hearings will be held on any proposed legislation before it is reported to the Congress for enactment.

I want you to know that we are making this study in your behalf. If you have received the list of suggested topics and have not replied, it is important to us, as your servants, that you do so at the earliest possible date. We want to have before us all the pertinent comment in time for it to appear in our preliminary publication. If any of you wish to have copies of the topics sent to you, a request to the committee addressed to the House Office Building will bring an immediate reply.

INQUIRY TOPICS SUMMARIZED

A brief summarization of these topics will serve to indicate to you the thorough nature of our inquiry. They are grouped under nine main headings. The first heading is "National transportation policy." Under this we seek to find what criticism can reasonably be directed against the statement of policy in the Transportation Act of 1940.

The second heading is "Regulation." Under this we seek comment on:

(a) Advantages and disadvantages of separate regulatory agencies for each mode of transportation.

(b) Advantages and disadvantages of a single regulatory body for all forms of common carriers, reporting directly to Congress.

(c) Should the Interstate Commerce Commission be reorganized in the light of present-day conditions and postwar transportation problems?

1. If so, how? by changing its powers, its procedures, or the mechanics of its set-up?

2. What would be the objects to be sought by such reorganizations?

(d) The extent, if at all, to which any or all forms of common carriers should be exempt from the application of the anti-trust statutes where the activities in question are under the supervision of the regulatory agency.

(e) To what extent should Federal Government agencies be given powers to promote activities of common carriers?

(f) To what extent and under what circumstances are differentials in rates as between different types of carriers warranted or desirable; or necessary in fairness to the carrier; or necessary to give the public the inherent advantage of each?

(g) What do you suggest to coordinate further our transportation agencies, both within the same types and as between different types?

Time does not permit me to go into further detail. I think you will see that we have overlooked very little. We have dealt with the subjects of finance, common ownership, taxation, Federal aid, interstate barriers to commerce, and the submarginal carrier.

These suggested topics are not to be construed as just another questionnaire. We are quite sure that you and every other businessman in the country has seen quite enough of these. We have offered topics for discussion. They are subjects for comment. If anyone has anything to say on any subject not covered in our document, he may let himself go in any direction that he chooses and be sure that his opinions, if

they are germane to the inquiry, will receive our careful considerations.

COMPETITION A MATTER OF GREAT CONCERN

From what I have said you can rightly judge that the matter of competition gives us the greatest concern. Our committee will give much thought to this. We have the job of regulating competition not only between agencies of the same type but also between different types. We realize that each mode of transportation performs a special and valuable service. Each has its advantages and disadvantages. Furthermore, each excels to some extent all of its competitors.

These considerations make regulation in the field of transportation an absolutely necessary Government function. The job of the Government, however, is not that of either punitive control or encroachment on the field of management. Its job is to try to assign to each mode of transport the type of service for which it is most useful. We must endeavor to set up a legal structure which will preserve the inherent values of each.

Regulation, of course, must impose restraints on carriers. Sincerely carried out, with recognition on the part of Government agencies of their power for evil as well as good, regulation has in it substantial benefits for the regulated agencies.

A brief consideration of one of the important aspects of competition will serve to illustrate the nature of the whole problem.

From 1900 to 1920, except for the tonnage carried on the Great Lakes and by inland and coastwise water services, the railroads handled substantially all commercial freight and passenger traffic. Today, however, both the older and newer forms of transport provide far more efficient facilities and promise to be of added competitive importance. Especially is this the case with waterways, highways, and pipe lines in the handling of freight and busses and airplanes in the handling of passenger traffic.

Just before the last war began the railroads handled only 63 percent of the total freight tonnage, contrasted with practically all of it during the early 1900's.

Beginning with the advent of steam, transportation was almost entirely the function of the common carrier. Today vast tonnage is transported by farmers and manufacturers for their own account.

OBLIGATION OF HIGHWAY USERS

Those who use the vast facilities that have been provided by the taxpayers through our system of roads, which is the finest in the world, owe to the public the best possible service that can be given. The same responsibility rests with all other forms of transportation. I did not come here to lecture you on the conduct of your business. I think it might be useful, however, to point out that some 85 to 90 percent of the highway haulage of freight is by private and contract carriers and that only 10 to 15 percent is carried by the common-carrier trucker. The private carrier is immune from all regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The contract carrier has almost none. This is as it should be.

I personally do not wish to see further regulation of either the private or contract carrier, and the situation is entirely in the hands of such carriers. So long as they operate strictly within the meaning of the law they should be treated exactly the same as any other private business. They should be free from snooping by Government agencies and free from bureaucratic meddling in their management.

But when either the private or contract carrier steps out of character and seeks or accepts, for instance, those innocent-appearing return loads, he must realize that he has become, under the law, a common carriers. There is no more place in our economy for a black-market carrier than there is for any other black-market dealing.

Abuse of privileges by a few can lead to the imposition of unwanted and undesirable restraints upon the many.

The members of your association are performing a fine service to this Nation. You are delivering food to our great cities. I want you to know that we of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives are your servants in aiding you in the performance of your job. We do not seek to become your masters. Furthermore, we will do everything in our power to prevent those who seek to become your masters from accomplishing their purpose. We shall endeavor to reduce regulation to a minimum and to maintain it as a benign service rather than as a force for the regimentation of your business.

We ask you on the other hand to realize that you are a part of what can be a great transportation system. If you and the other parts of that system realize this fact, we may see a real transportation system in this country and not a mere conglomeration of transport facilities.

The serving of self-interest, failure to recognize that interest as merely a part and not the whole of any problem, cannot be tolerated in this complicated economy of ours. The alternative is just around the corner—Government ownership, Government operation, state sccialism. In England there was no legitimate fault to be found with the service that transportation has rendered to the nation. It did a job under terrible conditions that compares favorably with what transportation did for us. Yet, we find the Government taking over transportation in a program for industrial socialization which reaches down even to the land itself.

That is a thing which we do not want to happen here. That is a thing which you as the operators and users of transport can help us prevent. The means are primarily in your hands, not in ours as your lawmakers. We can go just so far. You have the major task. You must make the law work.

America, Russia, and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of the foremost labor leaders in this country, Mr. George Meany, of the American Federation of Labor calls attention to a most important matter. Writing in the current issue of the American Federationist fearlessly states that the world picture is discouraging and there is serious doubt that our soldiers, sailors and workers are going to have the kind of world they envisioned, even after victory.

Mr. Speaker, this outstanding leader says:

By force, or unilateral action, Soviet Russia is exercising the prerogatives of a dictator in Poland, eastern Germany, Czechoslovakia and the Balkan nations and in addition, assuming a dominant antidemocratic position in eastern Asia. While screaming loudly against an imaginary western bloc this same nation has set up a chain of dominated states from the North Sea to the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. Meany places the American Federation on record against that kind of international manipulation and says forthrightly, "Will never submit to gag rule," so they intend to speak out against it.

Mr. Speaker, every Member should read this article, which I incorporate as a part of my remarks:

AMERICA, RUSSIA, AND PEACE

(By George Meany)

The people of America fought and worked for victory in the recent war against Germany and Japan in the hope of establishing a world of peace based on the principles so clearly enunciated in the Atlantic Charter. They worked and fought, hoped and prayed for a world in which men would be able to live and work toward a better day for all mankind without the eternal curse of war.

The soldiers, sailors and workers of our country hoped that, by defeating those who openly and frankly made a virtue of barbaric injustice they would be able to build a world of peace on the firm foundation of international fair dealing for all peoples.

WORLD PICTURE DISCOURAGING

But today, just a few short months after the end of the war, we find it difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile what we see about us with that which we had in mind when we fought and worked for military success. The world picture offers little promise for the peace that mankind ardently prayed for during 6 years of worldwide conflict.

We see definite indications in the Old World of a return to the philosophy that only the strong are fit to rule. This time we won't call it nazism or facism, but the victims will recognize the same old methods of oppression and tyranny for what they are—no matter what name is applied to the system.

By force, or unilateral action, Soviet Russia is exercising the prerogatives of a dictator in Poland, eastern Germany, Czechoslovakia, and the Balkan nations and, in addition, assuming a dominant antidemocratic position in eastern Asia. While screaming loudly against an imaginary western bloc, this same nation has set up a chain of dominated states from the North Sea to the Pacific Ocean.

Square this sort of thing, if you can, with the principles of freedom and self-determination for all peoples so forcefully expressed by the late President Roosevelt during all the years he was leading an inspired people to final and conclusive victory. Reconcile, if you can, the present situation in Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Rumania—where millions of people are suffering and starving under Soviet-imposed dictatorships—with America's promise that the right of self-government would be accorded to all nations liberated from Hitler's domination.

The American Federation of Labor has raised its voice in protest against these oppressions for the same fundamental ideals of liberty and justice on which it protested against the aggressions of Hitler and Mussolini for years prior to the start of World War II. We shall continue to raise our voices in protest. We shall continue to fight for a world system of justice in which right, not might, will govern relations between the peoples of the world. No one need try to tell us, as certain people are telling American leaders of political life and thought, that we must not speak out frankly against the evils we see in the recent actions of Soviet Russia, lest such utterances "worsen relations" between our two countries. That is ridiculous nonsense.

WE'LL NEVER SUBMIT TO GAG RULE

American labor, as represented by the American Federation of Labor, has never accepted and will never accept the gag rule. We have never and we do not now recognize that silence in the face of manifest evil is a virtue. We know that all history shows the utter futility of trying to correct wrong by refusing to expose it.

We of the American Federation of Labor will continue to speak out—bluntly and clearly—regarding undemocratic, unilateral actions by Russia in the conviction that there is more chance of securing change by criticizing what we don't like than by remaining mum.

We of labor also recognize that conditions which Americans cannot approve exist in countries other than Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and the other lands now under Communist domination.

We firmly believe that all peoples without exception—whatever their color and whatever the part of the earth in which their homes may happen to be located—are entitled to the opportunity to develop, to govern themselves and to strive for better economic conditions. Future peace depends upon fair treatment during the years ahead for all peoples who up to now have been ruled and exploited by other nations.

The philosophy that might makes right has never brought permanent peace. History tells us that power politics cannot bring peace. Our own capacity to remember, even for a short time back, tells us that peace cannot be purchased by appeasement.

The time has come for a real effort to achieve permanent world peace on the basis—the only possible basis—of international morality and justice. The entire world looks to the United States of America for moral leadership in this effort. Our representatives in Washington must accept this challenge.

TYRANNY IN EASTERN EUROPE

To pretend that we do not know that millions of people in eastern Europe are today victims of a dictatorial tyranny with all the old familiar trappings used by Hitler and his mob would be an act of national hypocrisy. We have nothing to gain by refusing to acknowledge the facts in regard to the lone-wolf foreign policy of Soviet Russia.

Our Government must resist firmly all attempts to set up spheres of influence which ignore the democratic rights of the people affected. Only in this way can the United States make its full contribution to future world peace as a major factor in the new United Nations Organization.

The American Federation of Labor wants the United Nations to be united nations and not just a jealous aggregation of powerful rivals. We are convinced that our country will gladly help to establish a United Nations of the world in which democratic liberties are assured and the free will of the people of each nation is given free opportunity for expression.

A great many Americans are puzzled today about our country's relations with Russia and our attitude toward the Communists. The great majority are frankly unable to decide what the aims of the Soviets are and what our American program should be. There are many earnest citizens who believe that Russia is bent on the traditional aim of world revolution for communism or on a frankly imperialistic nationalism. Another and far smaller group assert that "everyone is out of step but Russia," and that any opposition to any Soviet aim is prima facie evidence of fascism.

Within the 15,000,000 members of organized labor there are some of the latter. There are some actual and mental foreigners among those millions, and as a rule they make more noise than those in the majority. Even in those few notorious unions which are Communist-dominated, the actual number of Communists is very small in proportion to the total membership. But the "Commies" do not indulge in the luxury of differences among themselves. They have their orders to carry out and they organize their forces with firm discipline to vote "yes" or "no" and sometimes even "yes" and "no".

They spawn front organizations in great profusion. They have paper outfits for every one of the scores of campaigns upon which they are engaged at any time. Back in early June 1941, they had one called The Yanks Art Not Coming. After the Nazis broke the Hitler-Stalin Pact by invading Russia, they became military experts and demanded the immediate opening of a second front. What a few days before had been an imperialistic war which we should stay out of suddenly became a people's war against fascist imperialism into which we should enter at once.

The Communist Party front organizations would be useless, however, if there were no dupes. This country has thousands of good people whose hearts burn at injustice and whose minds seldom are bothered by checking up on facts. They are persuaded to sign resolutions, write their Congressmen, join organizations, and raise funds for the Communists to spend.

Even in labor unions they use stooges. They bring in resolutions denouncing oppression of labor in X Y Z land and, since everyone in a labor union is against oppression, the resolution usually slides through. Then the Daily Worker and perhaps Pravda and the Russian radio are apt to announce that another American labor union has denounced the reactionary imperialist program which Mr. Red-Baiting So-and-So, is trying to develop in fascist style.

That's the way they operate.

REDS HIT TRUMAN AND BYRNES

Right now there is a Communist compaign to extol Franklin D. Roosevelt and, by subtle inference, to criticize President Truman and denounce Secretary of State Byrnes. Such a resolution was introduced at Paris by the Russian-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions. It called on the United Nations' leaders to follow President Roosevelt's objectives in order to guarantee the continued unity among nations as the sole guaranty to the peoples of the world of their freedom, peace, and prosperity.

That seems harmless enough. But is it? Read it in the light of the recent London conference. That conference ran into a deadlock. Secretary Byrnes had to come home and tell the American people that there was a fundamental difference with Russian Foreign Commissar Molotov as to the meaning of the word "democracy." Everyone, it seemed, was out of step on this question except Molotov.

The Communists have an easy answer for that one. They say Foreign Secretary Bevin and Secretary Byrnes are reactionaries. They allege that President Roosevelt's personal choice as unofficial Assistant President was not carrying out his program. They imply that President Truman is being pushed by reactionary forces to a position contrary to that of his predecessor.

That brings forth more Communist resolutions and denunciations. They claim that atom-bomb politics are being played, that the capitalist countries are trying to gang up on the Soviet. Even though Britain is now under a Labor Government, the Communists allege that Attlee and Bevin are becoming Tories. Only the other day the British Communist Party came out in the open denouncing Bevin and demanding his removal. When we look over Bevin's record as a trade-unionist and his position against dictatorships of any kind, it must be clear to all that there can be no compromise between real trade-unionism and a political party which takes its orders from Moscow.

It is time that our Government talked matters over plainly with the Russians and made it clear that we do not want to push them around or let them push us around. We want peace, but we don't want peace at the price of having commissars giving orders at the White House. If the Russians are sincere in their asserted desire for peace and world cooperation, they ought to welcome frank and sincere talk along these lines.

The greatest contribution that our Government can make at this time to the cause of world peace would be to lay our cards on the table and ask Russia to do likewise.

Here at home the organized-labor movement also can make a contribution to world peace by seeing to it that Americans remain free. The people of all nations are looking hopefully to America for leadership—and not because we have more material wealth than some other nations, not because we proved in the recent war that we could produce and fight at least on a par with some other nations, not because we have a higher standard of living than most nations.

The people of this globe are looking to America—they have confidence in America—not because our country has more miles of railroads, or better highways, or more beautiful buildings, or greater natural resources, but because they know, as we do, that here in America there dwells—in full glory—that almost intangible something that is called freedom.

When the architects of the structure on which this Nation stands based that structure on the principle that all men are equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights they brought into being, for the first time in history, a government that gave substance to the inherent love of freedom that lies deep in the human heart. The civilization which we see all about us in America today is the work of men and women who came to these shores from all parts of the earth because, above all else, they desired to be free.

We must maintain our freedom here at home. Unless we do, there will not be much that we will be able to do for those in other parts of the world who are today crying out against the oppression of dictatorial control.

Economic and Production Goals of Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 13 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject of economic and production goals of farmers, delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] at a farmers' conference held at Altoona, Pa., on December 12, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and fellow farmers, probably you have never thought of me as a farmer, in spite of my interest in the family farm at Slippery Rock. But my job in Washington is a kind of farming. I've been plowing a legislative furrow there for nearly 12 years, and I think that in that time I've managed to reap quite a little benefit for our State—farmers, workers, merchants, and all classes of our people. In any event, I've done my utmost to plow a straight furrow, and by that I mean that the policies I advocate back home are the policies I advocate in Washington. That may not seem unusual, but you'd be surprised how many legislators get a change of heart after they get to Washington.

I have always felt that there was only one proper goal for any legislator—the greatest good for the greatest number. That may seem like an outworn maxim, but I submit

that in this conference on goals it is well worthy of your consideration. I suggest it because it illuminates one side of the farmer's problem which is all too frequently forgotten, namely, that the farmer does not prosper unless his customers prosper.

I say this because I have observed an inclination among farmers to look with suspicion, distrust, and even downright hostility, upon the efforts of industrial workers to better their standard of living through labor organization and collective bargaining.

You farmers, and the thousands of farmers you represent, are businessmen. You produce goods which you sell in the market. What is that market? It is the millions who live and work in our great industrial centers, our cities and towns. Some of them are rich, others are moderately prosperous, many are poor.

You cannot gain anything by trying to sell more food to the rich. They are already eating all they want, or all their doctors will let them eat. The moderately prosperous, who are able to buy all that their families require, are in the same situation. If you want to expand the market for your products, you have only one place to go. The poor do not have enough to eat because they cannot afford to buy enough. When I speak of the poor I am not referring to persons on public charity; I am referring to the worker who is struggling to raise a family, one who has to watch his budget so carefully that after he pays the rent he does not have enough left to feed his children properly.

It may be hard to believe that in this great land of plenty there should be a substantial portion of our population that doesn't get enough to eat. Yet the plain fact is that when the call to arms went out for the war just ended, 26 percent of our young men were physically disqualified for military service. That could never happen in a well-fed nation. It is is the price we paid for long years of undernourishment, particularly through the depression of the early thirties.

The idea has long been fostered among farmers, by those having axes to grind, that the farmer prospered when wages in the cities were low. It was argued that when wages were low the prices of manufactured articles the farmer had to buy were also low. The argument omitted the essential fact that when wages were low the worker couldn't buy enough to eat, with the result that the farmer had no market for his goods. We all remember, or should remember, how quickly unemployment in the cities was reflected in the collapse of farm prices.

The relation of a living wage for the worker to the farmer's prosperity has been brought out very clearly in all the studies that have been made on the subject. One of these, by the Brookings Institute, showed that families with $800 annual income spent $400 for food, that those with $1,300 spent $500, those with $1,800 spent $700, and those with $2,700 spent $900. There is now pending before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor a bill which, if enacted into law, will set a 65 cent per hour minimum wage. I am heartily in favor of the legislation and am supporting it. I point out to you that, if that legislation is enacted into law and a 65 cents per hour minimum wage made mandatory there will be no $800 income families. Those who are in that class today will through the carrying out of that act get up into the higher income brackets. They, of course, will be benefited by this. In turn, you farmers will be benefited in that the increased pay received by them will permit them to consume more of the foods which you produce.

There's nothing surprising about the figures I have given you. They are just what we would expect, namely, that as people earn more money they are going to keep on spending more of it for food until they are able to buy all the food they want.

The so-called conservative interests, which are in fact conserving their own profits at the expense of both farmer and worker, have been telling the farmer for years that labor was a bugaboo, a monster that would destroy him. And many farmers have come to think that labor is some kind of an imaginary monster. It's nothing of the kind. Labor is the boy down the street who fills your gasoline tank; it's the friend you have in the city, who has a job in a mill and has a hard time making ends meet. The millions of just such hard-working citizens, taken together, constitute labor. When they go hungry, the farmer goes bankrupt. When they prosper, through fair wages and working conditions, the farmer prospers. Moreover, when they are able to buy encugh to eat we will have a Nation that will not have to reject more than a quarter of its sons because they are physically incapable of defending their country.

I have pointed out the close relationship between the farmer and the worker, or laborer, in order to emphasize the fact that their interests are identical. They rise or fall together. I do so because I wish to suggest an important goal for your conference, namely, an earnest effort to enlist the farmer's sympathy in and support for the efforts labor is making to better its economic status through proper and just demands.

I am not doing this on the basis of sympathy, or with any hope of having the average farmer join the picket lines in his spare time, but simply because as a cold cash dollars-and-cents proposition, the farmer is cutting his own economic throat when he permits conservatives to persuade him that labor is his enemy. The point is that they're both in the same boat, and the sooner the farmer realizes it, and acts upon that realization, the better it is going to be for the farmer.

Just the other day the Committee on Economic Development, at Chicago, reported that American agriculture faces a "slackening in the rate of increase of demand." It went on to say that "food demand does not keep pace with rises in family incomes; except for the very low income group, people spend proportionately less on food as their earnings increase."

Note that exception. The report makes it clear that the way to increase consumption, and thereby keep the farmer prosperous, is to increase the earnings of the very low income group. The low income group is labor. Labor is fighting to increase those earnings. If it succeeds, the farmer will benefit. If it fails, the farmer will suffer. What more logical goal for the farmer, then, than to help labor to prosper?

The farmer's problem is not one of production. He knows how to produce. The magnificent record of war food production speaks for itself. Year after year the farmer is producing more food, and producing it more efficiently. His real problem is markets. If enough people buy enough of the food he raises, his annual cash income will rise. But they won't buy if they don't have the money. They're trying to get it, those customers of the farmers. They're trying to get it through union organization, through collective bargaining. If they fail, both they and the farmer go hungry, and the Nation itself suffers through undernourishment.

The farmer can help to provide the greatest good for the greatest number, himself included, by giving his support to the battle his customers are making for a fairer share of the wealth they produce. He must identify himself with the interest of his customers, and do his share in helping them to win their battle. That's a big goal, one that overshadows all other goals today. Regardless of how he may arrange his production schedules, regardless of legislation he may advocate relative to farm prices, he isn't facing his basic problem until he raises his sights much higher and concentrates on the ultimate goal—prosperity for his customers, the men and women of labor, so that he in return may prosper.

Paradox in Aluminum Plant Disposal Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FADJO CRAVENS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Harold Fleming, from the Christian Science Monitor of November 26, 1945:

PARADOX IN ALUMINUM PLANT DISPOSAL POLICIES

(By Harold Fleming)

NEW YORK.—Anent the story of surplus war plant disposal, encountered by the "flying reporters" on their recent Nation-wide trip and discussed on this page Friday, the oddest and biggest story of all concerns the Government's war-built aluminum plants and what shall be done with them.

The reporters talked with aluminum officials at Pittsburgh, home of the Mellon interests, and here is the way the story works out—a sad or a comical one, depending on the viewpoint, involving a paradox of conflicting policies, the inevitable result of fuzzy national thinking on the subject of monopoly.

Present status of the case is that the Department of Justice has ruled that the huge new Government-owned aluminum plants cannot be sold to Alcoa (Aluminum Corp. of America). But there are no other bidders. Hence the SPA has recommended subsidies to other buyers. But President Truman has said that the thing ought to be settled without subsidies. And while subsidies are being discussed, naturally no new bidders are likely to come forward. So the Government is simply boxed in on all sides as to what to do about the plants.

The present chapter of absurdities started a few years ago when Thurman Arnold, the then head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, threw the book at Aluminum Corp. with a suit charging 143 kinds of violation of the antitrust law.

LEGAL DECISION AWAITS PLANTS' DISPOSAL

But Alcoa's people, in addition to being smart merchandisers and smart manufacturers, also are smart lawyers. Having learned their lesson back in 1912 in a consent decree promising not to violate the Sherman Act, they proceeded to make the antitrust law their bible, together with all subsequent revised versions, free translations, and higher criticisms. And the court, after millions of words of testimony had been taken, threw out the antitrust case on 143 out of 143 counts.

The Government then appealed the case to a special court set up because a Supreme Court quorum could not be obtained on it. This special court of review sustained the lower court on all but one count—though an important one. It found that Alcoa had no monopoly of bauxite, of alumina, or of anything except—an important exception—of aluminum ingot production, of which it had in 1940 over 90 percent.

But the court's decision was made in 1944, and in the meantime the aluminum picture had changed radically, with the country's

aluminum capacity multiplied several times, most of the new capacity being Government owned.

The court therefore sensibly announced that it would make no final order until final disposition should be made of these Government plants.

In this connection it opined that if Alcoa ended up with a third of the country's postwar aluminum capacity, that would definitely be no monopoly; and if it ended up with two-thirds, that would not necessarily constitute a monopoly—but might.

MISREPRESENTATION OF COURT

The scene then shifts to Washington and the surplus disposal law. Under that law the Department of Justice can veto the sale of any plant over $1,000,000 as threatening a violation of the antitrust law, and Congress can veto any sale over $5,000,000 for any reason it chooses. All the aluminum plants come under these vetoes, because aluminum cannot be produced cheaply except on an enormous scale.

The Attorney General then reported to the Surplus Property Board (since changed to the Surplus Property Administration) that it could not legally sell any of the plants to Alcoa—citing the court's decision. This was a misrepresentation of the court, however, since the court had not even said that 67 percent of postwar capacity would necessarily give Alcoa a monopoly.

Thereupon SPA Administrator W. Stuart Symington and RFC Director Sam Husbands, who had been making mild efforts since February to find other buyers, sent telegrams to 224 companies encouraging bids. But they got only three bites. Two of these, from Reynolds Metals, which had been in the field during the war, and from Columbia Metals, newly formed to make aluminum on the west coast, asked for direct or indirect subsidies. Reynolds asked for a 5-year lease under which the Government would buy at 15 cents (the present price) any ingots not sold to the market, and the RFC would stand all losses for the first year and 85 percent of losses for the second and third years.

SUBSIDIES RECOMMENDED EXCEPT FOR ALCOA

The Surplus Property Board thereupon, on September 21, recommended to Congress direct or indirect subsidies all the way down the line, from bauxite to ingots, for any bidder except Alcoa. It recommended that the Government get the bauxite from abroad for these hoped-for other buyers, and subsidize the intermediate or alumina process for them. Then it recommended 5-year leases, with subsidies and Government loss guaranties, after which the lessees should get options to buy the plants at prices to be based on their costs during the 5-year lease.

As the baffled Alcoa people, who had actually built the plants at no profit and run them for the Government, and who stood ready to buy some of them without subsidy, direct or indirect, pointed out, this lease-with-option plan would be an open invitation to extravagance.

As they put the consequences: "What would a calculating lessee * * * do who wanted to buy as cheaply as possible? * * * He would spend money with abandon to capture customers and markets and to create a sales organization * * * useful * * * when he purchased the plant. Sell below cost, drive Alcoa and his other competitors to the wall, and capture customers for later use. The more he spent during the * * * lease, the better. The RFC would pay the bills. * * * Extravagant management on Government money would kill two birds with one stone. * * * The more he earns as lessee, the more it will cost him to buy the plant under the purchase option; the more he loses under the lease, the cheaper the purchase price."

Competitive Skill Seen Key to Alcoa's Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FADJO CRAVENS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Harold Fleming, from the Christian Science Monitor of November 28, 1945:

COMPETITIVE SKILL SEEN KEY TO ALCOA'S POSITION

(By Harold Fleming)

NEW YORK.—Previous article pointed out that in the present impasse in the disposition of the Government's aluminum plants Washington officials apparently reflect a feeling on the part of the United States public that it is cheaper to pay a high price (including subsidies) for aluminum than to let one corporation dominate the aluminum market by producing and selling aluminum cheaper than anybody else feels able to do.

At this point it is important to look into how Alcoa got its 90 percent of the prewar aluminum market. And, on the subject, the district court's findings of evidence (on the basis of a houseful of documents submitted by, among others, the highly vocal Thurman Arnold) are significant.

The court found that "anyone possessing the four cardinal tangible elements of intelligence, industry, courage, and money or credit is and has been able with confidence to go into the production of virgin aluminum * * * [and] is now free * * * since the expiration of the Bradley patent in 1909 * * * to produce virgin aluminum * * * no one stands in his way or so far as has been shown, unless armed with a patent, has ever stood in his way, of obtaining either bauxite or water power or of his producing aluminum therefrom."

DEPENDED ON NO MONOPOLY OF RAW MATERIALS

Muscle Shoals has been cited by enemies of Alcoa as "something that we do not want repeated"—but Muscle Shoals is an instance of why Alcoa held 90 percent of the aluminum ingot output up to the war. Ford wanted to go into Muscle Shoals in order to make aluminum. He finally withdrew because his engineers told him that, even if he had Muscle Shoals power, he could buy aluminum ingots cheaper from Alcoa than he could make them himself.

Alcoa, the courts found, depended on no monopoly or control of raw materials. As Alcoa said in its recent answer to the SPB report to Congress, "Raw materials are available in unlimited quantities at competitive prices. The manufacture of aluminum is not controlled either by patents or by secret processes.

"Government-owned facilities represent the last word in efficient equipment. Government-owned plants form the largest single aluminum enterprise in the world. They are admittedly in good balance and capable of operation on a competitive basis. The fact that Alcoa offered to buy several of these properties without benefit of subsidy or other favor, and operate them in competition with * * * whoever might obtain other Government plants, is a convincing demonstration that subsidies are not needed."

BENEFITS OF RESEARCH AVAILABLE TO ALL

And, as the district court said, "The astonishing thing is the great number of witnesses who appeared * * * competitors as well as customers * * * who have completely exculpated Alcoa from blame and * * * praised its fairness as well as its helpfulness to the aluminum industry * * * its consistent policy of helpfulness to competitors and customers alike. The benefits of its research * * * its engineering * * * have been made available generally to competitors and customers * * * without cost. * * * Alcoa has followed the practice of exhibiting and explaining to competitors and customers its equipment and manufacturing technique and has passed on to such persons the benefits of its experience, all without charge to them."

Long and short of the matter appears to be the fact that Alcoa, with Telephone, seem to be the only outfits which started 40, 50, or 60 years ago with virtual monopoly of a market, due to patents and the like, and have held them by the simple process of keeping ahead of everybody else competitively no matter what happened.

As the appeals court put it, "It was not inevitable that it [Alcoa] should always anticipate increases in the demand * * * and be prepared to supply them. * * * Nothing compelled it to keep doubling and redoubling capacity before others entered the field. It insists that it never excluded competitors; but we can think of no more effective exclusion than progressively to embrace each new opportunity as it opened, and to face every newcomer with new capacity already geared into a great organization, having the advantage of experience, trade connections, and the elite of personnel."

MONOPOLY GAINED BY OUTSPACING COMPETITORS

In other words, the gist of the matter seems to be that Alcoa gained its 1940 monopoly by keeping ahead of potential competitors. In this it has differed from great hopes like the United States Steel Corp., which was put together by the Morgan firm in 1903 with 60 percent of the country's steel-making capacity, only to lose its position until it was rescued from oblivion around 1935 by Myron Taylor's management; and the United States Rubber and American Woolen, which from a dominant position in their respective industries descended through the process of managerial stagnation into the bankruptcy courts in the 1930's. Alcoa appears to be in this respect a sociological fluke or exception.

This, however, may be a result of the fact that the aluminum business is only in the narrow-minded view of left-wing critics a business where monopoly can flourish. Actually, aluminum competes with virtually every other metal. Alcoa has not obtained a pound of aluminum ingot sales in 50 years except in competition with either magnesium on the one hand or, on the other hand, with copper, or other nonferrous metals, or with various kinds of steel. Aluminum markets in the past 50 years have been gained from beginning to end in direct price competition with other metals.

The housewife knows the competition between aluminum utensils and steel-and-enamel pots and pans, determined by price; but this competition extends from the kitchen to the railroad tracks, in which latter market aluminum competes directly with stainless steel. Every aluminum market today has been carved out, in straight-out price competition, of the former market of some other metal or material.

ALUMINUM HIGHLY COMPETITIVE PRODUCT

And this is obviously due to be even more true in the postwar than in the prewar era—that aluminum is a highly competitive product whose market can be expanded almost entirely on a price basis.

Aluminum competes with copper for high-tension power lines; with magnesium for fast-moving machinery parts; with needle steels for railroad-car bodies; with zinc-plated and galvanized steels for farm consumption; and with enameled steels for kitchen use.

There would, it appears, have been no aluminum business but for Alcoa; but, more fundamentally, there would have been no Alcoa and no 90-percent monopoly of the aluminum business but for the fact that Alcoa happens to be run by people whose answer to competition is to keep ahead of it.

This would seem an anomaly and an exception to the rule that monopoly breeds corporate sloth if it were not for the fact that even a 100-percent monopoly of the aluminum business would be, in the nature of the competition between metals and materials, no monopoly at all, but merely a challenge.

Subsidy Talk Held Bar to Cheaper Aluminum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FADJO CRAVENS
OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Harold Fleming, from the Christian Science Monitor of November 27, 1945:

SUBSIDY TALK HELD BAR TO CHEAPER ALUMINUM

(By Harold Fleming)

NEW YORK.—Previous article pointed out how Washington officials have arrived at a total stalemate on how to dispose of the country's war-built aluminum plants because, on the one hand, the Department of Justice has ruled that the Aluminum Co. of America, which built and ran most of the plants, must not get them, and, on the other hand, there are no other bidders now except for operation with subsidies—and President Truman has said there must be no subsidies.

The situation is further complicated by the fact that once the word "subsidies" was spoken, any hope that nonsubsidy bidders for the plant would show up has, of course, evaporated. No company in its right mind would bid for one of these plants without subsidy with the prospect that other similar plants would go to subsidized operators. It would then be in the same position behind the eight-ball as Alcoa. It seems that some competent metal companies, like American Smelting & Refining, might have taken their courage in hand and offered to compete with Alcoa on an equal basis, but that is out now that subsidies are talked of.

EFFECT ON GOVERNMENT-SUBSIDIZED POWER PRACTICES

One of the interesting types of subsidies proposed by the late Surplus Property Board consisted of sales of power from the TVA and the Government-owned Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams at trick low rates from which Alcoa would be barred. The accounting on these projects has always been suspect, having been exempted from the accounting requirements imposed on private power companies by the Utility Act of 1935.

The new proposal would, in a furtive way, make them still lower, for the SPB's proposal is that buyers of aluminum plants—other than Alcoa—be allowed to have firm power on an "only when you want it" basis, so that the Government-subsidized power-authority seller, not the buyer, would take the loss involved in "water over the dam," as Alcoa has to do both with its own plants and when it buys from the Government.

The official figures on the present aluminum ingot capacity are as follows:

Ownership of aluminum smelting facilities

	Pounds	Percent
Government	1,360,752,000	57.9
Alcoa	828,127,000	35.2
Reynolds Metals Co.	161,730,000	6.9
Total	2,350,609,000	100.0

FUNDAMENTALS OF SURPLUS DISPOSAL

These figures, however, represent total capacity and not total competitive capacity. As pointed out on this page a few days ago, there are a good many war-built plants in the United States which, though beautifully constructed to jewel precision and Rolls-Royce efficiency, are in the wrong place or for other reasons could not stand the gaff of open competition in peacetime. Cutting these out of the table, the figures are as follows, showing a somewhat higher Alcoa percentage of holdings:

Ownership of aluminum smelting facilities capable of fully competitive operation

	Pounds	Percent
Alcoa	650,000,000	47.7
Government	552,000,000	40.4
Reynolds Metals Co.	162,000,000	11.9
Total	1,364,000,000	100.0

Alcoa could buy at least one or two more large plants and still not come within what the circuit court said might constitute a monopoly.

From here on, obviously, the discussion must get down to the fundamentals of what surplus disposal should be, and what actually constitutes monopoly.

Obviously, the original major purposes of surplus disposal have been lost to view as the fear of alleged monopoly has flashed in the eyes of Washington officials and of the American public. The originally declared congressional objectives of the Surplus Property Act—there were many more, all told, and, in fact, so many that the law was practically unworkable—were (1) to promote production, (2) to employ labor, and (3) to secure for the Government the fair value of the property sold. And a fourth was to produce "a peacetime economy of free, independent, private enterprise." In the case of the aluminum plants, these have all had to be sidetracked to keep the big, bad wolf Alcoa from using its seemingly inexplicable power of making money on 15-cent aluminum from doing so.

IRONY AS WELL AS PARADOX IN SITUATION

There is irony as well as paradox in this situation. For, on the natural assumption that Washington opinion reflects public opinion, it appears that the American public is prepared to pay through the nose for its aluminum in the next 5 years at least, and probably for many years beyond that, so as to protect itself against the imagined risk that it will become a victim of a corporation which in some years far over the horizon might use its power to hold up the American people for an economically unjustifiably high price for aluminum.

In other words, the philosophy of the present moves in Washington is that a present very large risk (or through-the-ceiling subsidized costs for aluminum) will be gladly accepted in order to avoid a conjectured later risk, far over the horizon of years, of an ultimately excessive and unfair price for this highly competitive metal.

To put the most charitable interpretation on this view, it is that the American public, through its Washington representatives, would rather have freedom from monopoly than a mess of pottage in the form of cheaper aluminum today, and that it would rather have its birthright of such freedom than to get aluminum cheaper for the next 5 or 10 years.

But there can be another guess. And the other possible guess is that the hand is the hand of Esau, but the voice is the voice of Isaac. It cannot be very wide of the mark to say that subsidized competition has bid for its place on false pretenses.

How Danzig Was Liberated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article that appeared in the December 5, 1945, edition of the Lutheran Companion. The article is as follows:

HOW DANZIG WAS "LIBERATED"

(Until its annexation by Hitler-Germany, the city of Danzig was a free state. According to the Lutheran World Almanac (1937) this city had a population of 421,000 people, of which 200,000 were Lutherans. Prof. Otto Piper of Princeton Theological Seminary has obtained the following eyewitness report on the fate of the Christians in Danzig. It was written by a 50-year-old teacher and describes her experiences during the occupation of Danzig by the Red Army.)

I saw the Russians march into Oliva on March 24, 1945. All women were in their cellars. The Russians first plundered everything, permitting us to remain in our cellars. The following day my two nieces, aged 15 and 22, were raped, the one 7, the other 15 times. The following day a Russian officer advised we move to the cathedral, since he could not guarantee the conduct of the drunken soldiers. But even there Russian soldiers entered and raped all women, some upwards of 30 times, while crazed men played the organ and rang the bells. The cathedral, apart from the raping of the women there, was terribly soiled and the vestments stolen. Driven from the cathedral, I then found refuge in the air-raid shelter of the parish house. There we were safe for 2 days, but when found by Russian and Polish civilians, all the women were raped again. Among them were Protestant and Catholic nurses.

On Good Friday we returned to our house, where 40 people stayed in 3 attic rooms. I kept the death register in the parish of Oliva. The death rate rose rapidly, there were suicides daily.

LOADED INTO CATTLE CARS

Not only persons of German descent, but also Poles whose families had lived in Danzig for generations, were evacuated. People were loaded into cattle cars, 120 to a car. We got no food during the 10 days' travel from Oliva to Guestrow, Mecklenburg. Polish militia offered us loaves of bread at prices up to 200 zlotys ($38.00). Anyone who reached the Mecklenburg frontier with more than 20 zlotys was shot. Seventy persons in our transport died between Oliva and Guestrow, another 10 after arrival.

A Protestant pastor makes the following statement: "My 18-year-old daughter was raped in the first days of the occupation of Danzig an average of 15 times a day, usually by Mongols, who threatened her with machine pistols. Mothers of 4 and more children were treated bestially. Nurses in hospitals, threatening to collapse from exhaustion, were raped. Many of them chose suicide. Only women employed by the Russians

in offices or in kitchens escaped rape. Watches and jewelry were stolen everywhere, even by Russian officers, who did not, however, participate in the raping of women."

RAPED GIRLS, KILLED BOYS

Dr. O., a Catholic priest from Danzig, reports as follows: "Almost everyone who did not belong to the Nazi Party, i. e., 80 percent of the total population, disregarded the Nazi order to evacuate captured Danzig. What remained of the city the Red Army burned. They raped girls as young as 8, and shot down boys who tried to protect their mothers. This was due largely to the intoxication of the Red Army. When sober, they showed greater human understanding and even tried to defend the population against the excesses of the Poles, who, on their arrival, plundered everything.

"The initial Russian attitude toward Catholic and Protestant pastors was correct. Later many pastors were arrested, several died from ill treatment and lack of food, either in prison or immediately after release. A Polish administration was established at the end of April. Evacuation of the population by the Polish militia started early in July. Whole blocks of houses were surrounded. Occupants were driven into the streets, herded to the railway station, and loaded into freight cars. In Langfuhr two vicars and their pastor resisted evacuation. All three were beaten with rifles, were forced to clean cattle cars.

"I left on August 1, 1945. At every station we were plundered by the Polish militia. Many died on the way.

"Between April and June (before the evacuation) we buried 500 people in our cemetery, while for the entire year 1944 our deaths were only 104. The Protestant churches of Danzig were occupied by the Poles in June and used for various nonreligious purposes."

THE SITUATION IN HUNGARY

The official organ of the Hungarian Reformed Church, Elet es Jovo, reports the following facts concerning the situation of the Protestant church in Hungary:

"All the churches in Budapest were damaged in the course of the fighting. Four of its 17 Protestant churches are damaged beyond use. Throughout Hungary (where there are more than 500,000 Lutherans) church-building damage ranges from 5 percent to 80 percent."

Of special interest to United States Lutherans are the following reports from the same source:

"Dr. Sander Raffay, the Lutheran-Evangelical Bishop of Budapest, has resigned and is ill. Dr. Zoltan Thuroczy, bishop of the Evangelical-Lutheran Church in Nyiregyhaza, was arrested on a charge of 'supporting the war and anti-Soviet propaganda.' He was sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment.

"The Reformed Bishop of Siebenburgen, Dr. Sandor Makkay, has also been brought to trial because his new book, Arte of Marte, was declared out of sympathy with the present authorities."

Air-Mail Postage

REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced two bills which now are before the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

These are H. R. 4734 and H. R. 4735. The first bill would reduce the present 8 cents per ounce or any part thereof on air-mail-letter postage to 5 cents per ounce. The second would set up an average man's air mail by providing 3-cent air-mail postal and post cards and authorize such a rate for use on souvenir and other cards. Many Members of the House have assured me they favor both of these bills.

Air-mail rates since the inception of the domestic air-mail system by the Post Office Department in 1918 have varied widely. They have been as high as 24 cents per ounce or fraction thereof, including special-delivery fee. Zoning systems also have been used, with a charge of 8 cents per ounce for each zone. It is interesting to note that in August 1928, 18 months after air-mail zoning was abolished and the rate was dropped from 10 cents per ounce or fraction thereof to 5 cents, there was a 95-percent increase in air-mail traffic.

The only recent change in air-mail rates, which had been set at 6 cents for each ounce or fraction thereof in July 1932, came on April 2, 1944, when Congress established the present rate of 8 cents for each ounce or fraction thereof with overseas air mail for servicemen still carried at 6 cents. The 2 cents increase per ounce was made for the purpose of raising revenues, just as certain luxury taxes were instituted. Now is the time to drop not only the 2-cent tax but an additional 1 cent, so as to make sure air mail will continue to be used in great quantities.

The bill calling for a reduction in air-mail rates to 5 cents an ounce would make possible a cut which has been ardently advocated by the Hon. Robert E. Hannegan, Postmaster General of the United States.

Speaking at a luncheon in New York on September 7, this year, in celebration of the silver anniversary of the first transcontinental coast-to-coast all-air route on which mail was carried, the Postmaster General, in championing air mail, said:

> From now on I want to encourage the use of air transportation for first-class mail in every way possible.

The honorable gentleman then went on to say:

> Now, under our present economic system, our business people know that one of the best and quickest ways to get the American people to buy a good product or use a good service is to lower the cost. There is no public education like the good old American method of offering the people a good bargain.
>
> I believe this principle applies to the postal service as well as any other, and I take this occasion to announce to you that I am going to ask that legislation be initiated in Congress to lower the cost of air mail.
>
> At present the rate on domestic air mail is 8 cents an ounce. This is a wartime rate, which automatically drops back to the peacetime rate of 6 cents an ounce, 6 months after the end of the war.
>
> But I am going to ask for a further reduction, a reduction of the peacetime rate to 5 cents an ounce. And I am going to start pressing for this reduction now.
>
> I believe many more people would use air mail if it were cheaper, and I also believe that if many more people did use it, the resulting increased volume would bring down the unit cost of delivery, and, within a reasonably short time, would justify the cost.
>
> That is a tried and true principle, you know, in the peacetime business of our comtry. It is this way we have been able to raise the standard of living of our working people above that of any other people in the world—by bringing the products of our industry and our services down to prices which they can afford to pay. And I want to remind the businessmen of America that they themselves, and their fathers before them, have proved, again and again, the soundness of this principle of American business. Every time it is tried it works. It works in bringing more and better things to our people. It works in creating more jobs. And in the long run it works in assuring better, steadier profits to the owners themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most of us will agree with the Postmaster General in the soundness of this principle of American business and in his plan of reducing the air-mail rates. The reduction is not a great one in reality, for as the honorable gentleman pointed out, the air-mail rate is soon due to return to 6 cents by the act of Congress that raised it to 8 cents, therefore, the cut is but 1 cent.

I believe, and I know many Members of the House feel the same way, that this move should be made now for it would encourage, as the honorable gentleman has said, a greatly increased use of air mail and this encouragement will be needed, for we all know that a goodly portion of the large increase in air mail during the war was caused by the large number of letters that were exchanged between the boys and girls in the service and their families. With the boys returning home at an ever-increasing pace, it is going to be necessary to encourage the use of air mail by individuals and business houses—by following that fine old American custom of encouraging the use of a good service by lowering the cost.

And from the standpoint of national defense it is important that we keep our commercial air lines growing. Gen. H. H. Arnold, commander in chief of the Army Air Forces pointed out in a recent talk before the National Press Club here in Washington:

> The air lines today are as much a part of air power as is the bomber and fighter. We must have enough transport planes, civilian and military, so that we can transport an airborne corps of 30,000 men on short notice.

One of the ways to have such an air fleet, in as economical manner as possible, is by encouraging expansion of the air lines, and what better method could there be to do this than by following the good old American custom of encouraging the use of a good service by lowering the cost?

My second bill would also aid in this direction, for the adoption of an air-mail postal and post-card rate would bring a new force into the picture. The 3-cent post card, in inaugurating a poor man's air mail, will tend to give the public

additional benefits of air transportation—in fact it does not seem right to me—for so thoroughly an established service as is our air mail, not to provide the convenience of the postal card and post card.

There is nothing novel about the idea of an air-mail post card. In 1939 Great Britain, a majority of the British Dominions and colonies, Ireland, Denmark, Estonia, Iceland, Colombia, and Venezuela all had lower postage rates for post cards than for letters sent by air mail to certain destinations.

The United States Post Office Department is an agency that belongs to all the people of the United States—the most widespread and all-pervasive agency in the land—an agency seeking the speediest form of transportation. Under such conditions I believe it should allow many more of its owners an opportunity to use its speediest form of transportation by the adoption of a 3-cent postcard rate.

I feel that the post card is but another step in the direction of giving the public a lower air-mail rate of postage. And with business fighting the battle of reconversion, the post card will be used by many firms for daily quotations and short routine reports not of a confidential nature such as stock and grain and other quotations requiring speed for national distribution. Prior to the war it is my belief that regular air mail was used by some businesses for this purpose to a limited degree.

In addition, a 3-cent air-mail postal-card rate would open a new market for picture postal cards so favored by vacation travelers and we all know that the travel industry is going to be big business with a vengeance. Starting next June the travel interests of this country are pushing a "victory vacation year" and some authorities are estimating that the travel industry which was a $6,000,000,000 business before the war will be a $15,000,000,000 industry annually for the five following years. This would be a real aid in boosting the use of air-mail postal cards.

Both of the air-mail bills I have introduced would aid in increasing employment for they would aid in keeping air mail at somewhere near the tremendous volume which it attained during the war when everyone was writing to their sons and daughters and wives and husbands in the service and they were answering via air mail. The amazing growth in the volume of air mail is clearly shown by the fact that the air-mail pound-miles performed grew from 22,294,962,738 in 1941 to 85,802,866,010 in 1944 and during this period the payments to the air lines, made by the post office, dropped from 0.93 mill per pound-mile to 0.33 mill per pound-mile.

It is interesting to note that the percentage of total postal revenues credited to domestic air mail by the Post Office Department increased from 2.09 in 1938 to 7.02 in the fiscal year ending June 1944, a gain of 226 percent. In the same comparable period the percentage of total expenditures credited to the domestic air mail jumped from 2.81 to 4.41, an increase of 57 percent, thus reflecting a healthy balance in gains between expenditure and revenues—an indication that the drop of 1 cent in air-mail-letter rates would still leave a profit for air mail.

Looking at it another way, it has always been the policy of Congress since 1851 to recognize the post office as a vital important public service with the policy of "service first." There has been the feeling that the Post Office Department should not make huge sums from its services, although the profits from some forms of mail are used to subsidize others that are transported at a loss. However, it has not been the feeling that this should be carried too far. In the fiscal year ending June 1944, profit on domestic air mail after all costs had been charged against it was reported by the cost ascertainment service as $29,530,917. This was on a business that totaled $79,412,510.

With air-mail pound-miles showing an increase of more than 45 percent for the fiscal year ending June 1945 according to the Civil Aeronautics Board reports, there seems little doubt that a much greater profit will accrue to air mail when the final report appears for this fiscal year. If the 6-cent rate be left in effect, the profit from air mail will still show a substantial profit. So in theory we should increase the payments to the air carriers or reduce the rate to the people.

Of the two alternatives there does not seem to be any question as to which is advisable and the Honorable Postmaster General has pointed out that he believes that the rate of 5 cents within a short time would justify the cut.

I believe both of these bills deserve the support of every Congressman for they are but a continuation of the congressional policy of utilizing the fastest methods of moving mail for the benefit of all people in all walks of life. They would not only aid our vastly expanding air transport system, which is now growing at a tremendous rate, but they would certainly force the expansion of air mail and thus make for closer human and business relations and in turn for national welfare and unity.

An example of the support given the air-mail post-card and postal-card measure is a letter I received this morning from the National Council on Business Mail. The letter follows:

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON
BUSINESS MAIL, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., December 11, 1945.

Hon. HAROLD C. HAGEN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAGEN: We were very much pleased to receive from our Washington representative a copy of your bill, H. R. 4735, providing for air-mail postal cards and private mailing cards, at the rate of 3 cents postage.

We believe this to be a definite step forward to a greater use of air-mail service, and that the air-mail card will prove to be a great convenience to the public, and prove also to be remunerative to the Department.

We are calling the proposed service to the attention of the members of our organization and feel certain that it will meet with their hearty approval.

Sincerely yours,

S. F. KIRBY.

The Atomic Bomb and Its Implications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it was my distinct privilege to hear recently a most remarkable address delivered by Dr. Marshall Wingfield, pastor, First Congregational Church of Memphis, Tenn., on the subject of the atomic bomb and its implications. Dr. Wingfield delivered the speech before the Crittenden County Chapter, United Daughters of the Confederacy, at West Memphis, Ark., on December 3.

The speech reflects a most thorough knowledge of an intricate subject. It is truly a masterpiece.

Dr. Wingfield is a world-famed religious leader, scholar, historian, author, and lecturer. He has traveled extensively here and abroad.

Because of the far-reaching significance of this most learned address on a timely subject I include the full text:

Our Bible opens with the story of creation in which man came comparatively late. When man was created and placed in a garden which lay "eastward in Eden," he was told that he might eat of the tree of life, and all others except the tree of knowledge. The great scholars tell us that the high point of the story is the warning to man against eating of the tree of knowledge prematurely. Failure to heed this warning was the great transgression. It was here that our first parents fell, and here have fallen all their children. Through the ages man has always acquired knowledge before he has acquired the morality to restrain him in its use. Man learned the secrets of chemistry before he grew tall enough spiritually to refuse to use his chemistry to make poisonous gases to destroy his fellowman. Man invented a boat which would plow under the sea, long before he had a spirit great enough to restrain him from using the boat as a murderous weapon. The airplane was invented before man was ready to use it benevolently. All of these were forms of eating of the tree of knowledge before eating of the tree of life.

Man brought in his machine age before he brought in a moral age to manage his machines. He invented the radio which enabled him to say everything everywhere, and then had to admit the truth of G. K. Chesterton's jibe that it was a very remarkable thing that the most perfect means of communication should appear at a period in human history when man had so little to say.

Man made the world smaller before he learned how to live in a smaller world. He has learned how to produce goods in great abundance, but he has not had the willingness of heart to distribute his goods for the general welfare of his fellows. The result is the world has had want in the midst of plenty. It has not been very long since citrus-fruit growers were piling up their fruit and spraying it with kerosene to reduce the market's edible supply. Pigs and calves were destroyed by the thousands in carrying out this economy of scarcity. Every third row of cotton was plowed under while thousands were sewing patch upon patch to cover their nakedness.

If one wants a memorable picture of this crazy economy of destruction which was substituted for a decent economy of distribution,

let him read Carl Sandburg's poem about the wind-bitten vagabond who came to a crazy country where shoemakers were barefoot because they had made too many shoes, and carpenters were living outdoors because they had built too many houses, and farmers were in debt because they had grown too much food.

At every garden where man has paused ón his long road, he has gone to the tree of knowledge before he has gone to the tree of life. And now man has plucked the knowledge of how to release the power of the atom. Compared with that knowledge, the invention of gunpowder, the harnessing of steam and electricity, and the invention of the gasoline engine, may come to seem like very small matters.

Harnessing the atom will enable physicists and engineers to enter vast new realms of power research and development. The scientists confidently tell us that this amazing discovery will make man independent of the sun for food production. Man will be enabled to live underground as healthily as above ground, and more comfortably. Any country, with any climate, at any time of the year, on a small indoor acreage can grow all it needs to feed, clothe, and provide shelter for its citizens. The citizens will need only to contribute services according to their talents—administrative, manipulative, or technical—and for only a small fraction of their time.

It is believed by scientists that the economy of uranium may soon displace the economy of coal. A pellet of this energy the size of a vitamin pill will run an automobile for a year. The same pellet will heat one's house in winter. Atomic power will provide artificial suns to drive away fog and melt the ice on city streets. It has even been claimed that this energy may be used to break up hurricanes and tornadoes. It will enable men to make iron, copper, tin, gold, and other metals from sea water and in unlimited quantity.

This atomic power can easily be managed, the scientists say. It can be turned on and off like an electric light. It can be used to incubate eggs or to give off a white-hot candescence. It can be stored indefinitely without deterioration. It can be used so cheaply to drive vehicles that its energy can make transportation a public utility. According to scientists, there are many other ways in which the atomic energy can be used to bring in the age foretold by the poets and prophets.

But there is little cause for rejoicing in any of this information. And the reason why there is little room for rejoicing is simply this: Once more man's mentality has run too far ahead of his spirituality. Intellectually, he has jumped ahead into the twenty-first century suggested by the pictures of Buck Rogers and Flash Gordon. Spiritually, man is lagging back in the Stone Age.

The late Professor Soddy, of Oxford, used to say that "if it ever becomes possible to release the great store of energy in the atom, the first use that man will make of it will be to construct a bomb." And Professor Soddy has proved to be among the prophets.

The Archbishop of Canterbury recently said that with the nations in a war-weary mood and sobered by the discovery of the possibility of the suicide of the race, he has no doubt that man will control the atomic bomb against ill use for a long time to come. Against this word of the archbishop I set the word of the great military philosopher, Von Clausewitz: "War is an act of violence pushed to its utmost bounds. To introduce into a philosophy of war a principle of moderation would be an absurdity. Force unrestrained by any law save that of expediency is the true nature of war."

The archbishop is indeed an optimist. He would still be an optimist if he believed that man will be morally strong enough at the end of another century to be entrusted with this primal force. Wise men have been saying for a century that the universe is a vast tinderbox from which God hides the matches. Now man has found the matches and, after striking two of them, stands awed by the thought that he has found the stuff from which is wrought the wrath of God.

The energy of the atom can be exploded with a violence beyond anything known on earth. The British "grand slam," mentioned by President Truman, is an earth shaker so powerful that when one of them was dropped on a granite islet in the English Channel for experimental purposes the islet disappeared. The "vial of wrath" in each of the two atomic bombs dropped on Japan was no larger than an orange, but it was 20,000 times more powerful than the "grand slam" and contained a quarter of all the explosive power of all the bombs sent against England during the whole course of World War II. Dr. Leslie W. Bell, one of the scientists who helped invent it says, "An atomic bomb dropped in the ocean would create a tidal wave which would destroy the Nation's Capital. A bomb dropped a half mile from a warship would melt it."

We are being told that the unleashing of this basic power of the universe will end war. Nations will have to keep the peace now, or the whole race will perish. The same thing was said when gunpowder and dynamite were invented. But war continued in more terrible forms than before. Nobel, the inventor of high explosives, declared that he had ended war, but he lived long enough to bemoan his invention. The $9,000,000 fund which he set aside for peace and other prizes was a gesture of atonement.

Professional military men will remind us that each new weapon calls out a counter weapon, just as the bomber plane called out the fighter plane. That might have been true once, when man was dealing with derivatives, but it cannot hold true now, when man leaves derivatives behind and comes down to the original and primal force. When the final physical force has been employed, how can there be any other physical force to counteract it?

There is only one power in the universe which can counter the destructiveness of atomic power, and that is moral power, or spiritual power, or religious power, as you may choose to call it. And it is not likely that enough moral force will be called into play to safeguard this atomic force, the Archbishop of Canterbury to the contrary notwithstanding. The temptation for posterity will likely prove greater than its moral strength and the power will be unleashed for evil.

Leonardo da Vinci invented a submarine, but he destroyed his plans because he feared man would use his invention to bring about the utter destruction of civilization.

Havelock Eilis writes that he stood by Hiram S. Maxim one day as Maxim explained his new gun. After hearing him relate how many lives this gun could snuff out in a minute, Mr. Ellis said to Mr. Maxim, "That gun will make war very terrible." And the inventor replied: "No, Mr. Ellis, it will not make war terrible: It will make war impossible." Mr. Ellis wrote this reminiscence a few days after Maxim died, and added: "I suppose the man who first elongated the 2-inch knife-blade into the 3-foot sword blade thought he had made war impossible."

The discoverers of more effective killing instruments have not feared, as da Vinci did, to make their death-dealers available. They have thought, as Maxim did, that their inventions would end war. But in every instance the weapons which they thought would end war have been used to make wars more ghastly.

Under the pressure of passion and the urging of ambition, men have put into use the most efficient killing instruments at hand. There is no reason to believe that posterity will act differently when it comes to using atomic energy. This energy may not completely destroy the world, but one with imagination can easily see the remnant of humanity, deep in some cavern of the earth, pronouncing bitter curses on the scientists for unleashing the power which has wrecked the world. If you would see a preview of that picture look at the picture of the London woman whose three little children had been killed by German bombs, as she stands where her house had stood, and calls upon God to damn eternally the man who invented the airplane.

We are told that fear will restrain man in the use of this atomic power. But where in history has fear ever been a deterrent when hate had been whipped up to white heat? In the conquest of the atom at this particular stage in history, there is little ground for any sort of feeling save a feeling of deep anxiety. We have intelligence enough to know that we cannot confine the secret of the atom to America. What we know today, everybody will know tomorrow. What we have today, everybody will have tomorrow. If the atomic bomb can destroy Japan today, it can destroy America tomorrow. And the enemy will not have to cross the ocean to loose it against us; he can send his atomic bomb by a manless rocket which has been launched from the ocean's other side.

The danger of atomic war is too great and too threatening to permit neglect of any means to lessen or delay it. We must study and support all possible forms of social control, realizing, of course, that no social controls by themselves can save us. Nothing less than the inward controls of the spirit can save us now. The best that the outward social controls can do is to keep the threat of atomic war from overwhelming us.

In the hands of competing nations, atomic bombs would precipitate total war, because of the mutual fears of aggression which now spells annihilation. Unless a single world control of atomic power can be achieved while the United States alone has the secret, it is not likely that such control will ever be achieved. We should, therefore, urge our Government to state now its purpose to place the secret under a single world control, and to press for the perfection of such a control.

It should not be difficult to make a beginning in this direction since the General Assembly and the Security Council of the United Nations Organization both have authority to deal with threats to peace. Certainly the atomic bomb uncontrolled is the direst of all threats to peace. It would naturally seem that the United States Government should make the control of atomic energy, through the Assembly and Council of the United Nations Organization, its first order of business. It is not too much to say that the United States should determine now to establish world sovereignty over atomic power for the mutual protection of all. There are no political or technical obstacles which could overcome the effort.

The choice today is between world control and world catastrophe. America's choice in the matter will have a tremendous influence on other nations as they make their choices. In this, our day of visitation, America needs the help of God. Our knowledge of atomic power would not be dangerous if we knew God. Our pride and self-will are what make atomic energy dangerous. Only through repentance and inward renewal, can we overcome the peril we have created. We must practice the faith that men are brothers. We must live as children of God or we shall not live at all.

We Will Have Plenty of Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to refer to an article which was yesterday placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD written by the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Harold L. Ickes, and which was published in the December issue of the American magazine. Mr. Speaker, it so happens that in the January issue of the same magazine, which is just out, there is an article prepared by Hon. Eugene Holman, president of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, which takes decidedly an opposite view from that expressed by Secretary Ickes.

When Mr. Holman prepared his article he had no information that Mr. Ickes was writing on the same subject, and, I am told, as soon as the Ickes article appeared Mr. Holman wrote to Mr. Ickes explaining that.

Mr. Ickes predicted a potential shortage in the petroleum supply for this country, but Mr. Holman is very much more optimistic, as he indicates that the known resources in the United States now will take care of the demand for hundreds of years.

This article written by Mr. Holman clearly sets forth his views and is entitled "We Will Have Plenty of Oil."

WE WILL HAVE PLENTY OF OIL

(By Eugene Holman, president, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey)

(A world-traveled geologist, Mr. Holman has visited every oil-producing region in the world except the Far East. As a young man he took part in the development of the great Texas, Louisiana, and Arkansas oil fields. For more than 23 years he has been associated with the producing activities of his company.)

Anybody who imagines that our oil supply will perish in the next decade, or even the next 100 decades, is all wrong. I can't blame them for their belief, because for several years or prophets of national impoverishment have been publishing and broadcasting the prediction that we shall have no more oil in 12 to 14 years. This is utter nonsense. People who make such statements simply do not know the facts.

Geologists, the scientists of the petroleum industry, generally agree that more than 150,000,000,000 barrels of oil will be found in the Western Hemisphere, enough to last us over 100 years at present rate of consumption. About 50,000,000,000 barrels of this they place in the United States alone. These are conservative figures.

But a 100-year potential is not enough. It is a shortage. If it represented our only hope, it would mean that our grandchildrens' airplanes might be grounded and their motorcars stalled for good—certainly that we should one day have to import all our oil from far abroad. But it is not the only gasoline potential. We have enough coal in this country to produce an additional 2,000 years of gasoline. Researchers now estimate that gasoline may, when the need arises, be produced from coal at a refinery cost of only 10 cents a gallon, not too much higher than the present cost of gasoline from petroleum—around 5 cents per gallon. If taxes on gas were reduced, the cost of gasoline from coal thus would not be prohibitive to mass consumption.

In addition to coal, we have trillions of cubic feet of natural gas, which can be converted into billions of barrels of gasoline. And we have not yet touched the vast quantities of gasoline-producing oil shale and tar shale with which our continent abounds.

But these ample reserve sources of liquid fuels probably will not be extensively tapped for a long time—as long as our general welfare can better be served by lower-cost natural petroleum available in ample supply.

And natural petroleum will continue to be available. Large favorable areas of our country remain to be explored for oil. Further, all the oil is not under dry land. Some of it, we have discovered, lies under lake and sea. Perhaps the largest potential source of supply is under the shore waters of the Gulf of Mexico, where already some successful drilling has been done. Also, as this article goes to press, drilling will have begun in a huge sandbar off Cape Hatteras, in the belief that oil may lie under the Atlantic coast. Underwater drilling is in its infancy—merely, of course, because it has not been necessary, since we are still not short of oil in spite of alarmists.

The largest and most significant underwater oil project, which presages what may come eventually on the Atlantic, Gulf, and California coasts, is at Lake Maracaibo, Venezuela. Here a 50-mile shore strip is one of the world's great sources of oil. An affiliate of our company drills there in an area extending 10 miles offshore and in water 100 feet deep.

To accomplish it, engineers had to invent every step of the way. Drill deck footings were established on giant concrete piles up to 150 feet in length. For greater lengths, hollow metal piles encased with concrete were used. When the time comes to drill in deep water off the coast of the United States, the industry will know how.

However, the life expectancy of our gasoline supply cannot be gaged alone by the volume of petroleum available in the next 100 years, nor even by petroleum substitutes. Other factors may stretch the gasoline supply over a far greater time than we can now calculate. For example, it is even possible to produce more than one barrel of gasoline from a barrel of petroleum by adding hydrogen to petroleum. This operation, using a process called hydrogenation, is not economically feasible or necessary at the present time, but it can be used to increase our supply of gasoline. Indeed, you can dig up asphalt from the street and convert it into gasoline by adding hydrogen.

The gasoline yield of petroleum, through improved cracking processes, is today about 40 percent. The remainder of the petroleum is used for numerous products, including fuel oil, solvents for paints and cleaner, butadiene for synthetic rubber, and so on. But we can increase the 40-percent yield to 80- or 100-percent yield if it is necessary to increase the gasoline supply. As the consumption of gasoline increases in the Nation—and we believe it will increase—we can easily step up the gasoline yield of petroleum from 40 percent to 50 percent or 60 percent, in this way cutting down the yield of fuel oil.

And we can continue to import fuel oil and heavier crude oil from nearby sources, such as Venezuela, not to compete with our domestic resources, but to supplement our own supply while maintaining a healthy and vigorous domestic industry. Our petroleum is light compared with much of Venezuela's. Heavy petroleum lends itself particularly well to the manufacture of fuel oil, whereas lighter crude, such as ours, is more adaptable to gasoline manufacture.

Still another factor which may stretch our gasoline supply is quality improvement, such as higher-octane gasoline. Ten years ago 100-octane gasoline cost $2 a gallon to produce. Now it can be available to the consumer at only a matter of cents more a gallon than regular gas. The important thing is that higher-octane can give the motorist 50 percent more power and 50 percent more mileage in a car designed to use it. The ordinary automobile engine of today will not use 100-octane gasoline efficiently, but engines designed for it are on the way.

The fear expressed by some people of an impending gasoline famine has been heightened by two factors: First, the shortage that developed at home during the war as a result of our having supplied our allies with 80 percent of their petroleum; and, second, the announcement of the oil industry that our present petroleum reserve amounts to about 20,000,000,000 barrels.

As for the first, obviously there is no shortage now, because motorists, since the removal of rationing, have all the gas they want at a refinery cost of about 6 cents a gallon, less than the cost of a gallon of distilled water. The balance that you pay at the filling station, on the average 15 or 16 cents, is made up of taxes and the cost of distribution.

The second catch lies in our announced reserve. If it represented all the oil available in the United States, there would, indeed, be cause for worry. It is on this figure, 20,000,000,000 barrels, that our alarmists have based their prediction that our gasoline motors will die of thirst in the next 14 years or so. They should have made their prediction at the beginning of the war. They would be on the spot today, because we started the war with a reserve of only 19,000,000,000 and, paradoxically, have ended it with 20,000,000,000. This increase was accomplished in spite of serious wartime shortages of manpower and tools.

Without pedantry it would be well to explain the meaning of this word "reserves." The announced reserve of the petroleum industry represents only a conservative estimate of the known quantity of oil in present oil fields. Each year there is prepared a new estimate, to include new discoveries, oil found by new drilling, and revised estimates of oil in previous discoveries. These revisions are important. When the great east Texas oil field was discovered 15 years ago its reserves were estimated in the millions. Today its reserves are in the billions of barrels, and it has become the largest producing oil field in the world.

The reason for such revisions is that the extent of an oil field cannot accurately be estimated from one drilling or a dozen. In the course of several years outpost wells are sunk for miles around the original find, and estimates of the reserve of the field are revised as the yield of the outposts indicate. While we started the war with a reserve of 19,000,000,000 barrels and ended it with 20,000,000,000, this increase did not represent just new discoveries. It represented the development and revised yield of the oil fields. New discoveries actually declined for the first few years of the war period, because we had neither the material nor the manpower for searching effectively.

And there is another heartening consideration when it comes to our reserve. The petroleum industry makes its estimates of our known oil supply on the basis of past methods of extracting the oil from the ground. This is the conservative thing to do. Only a few years ago we expected to get only 20 or 30 percent of the oil from the ground—that is, out of a known 100,000,000,000 barrels under our fields, we estimated we could get only 20,000,000,000 or 30,000,000,000 barrels.

Year by year our techniques have so improved that today experts generally agree that at least 50 percent of the oil can be recovered—about twice as much as we could formerly obtain. And this is still a conservative estimate. Actually, some modern, efficiently operated fields are yielding as much as 80 percent of their oil. In the oil business we must be conservative because, while we are estimating on sound engineering theory backed by experience, the thing we are estimating, like the neutrons in the atom bomb, cannot be seen.

In many oil fields in which recovery was low we can go back with new techniques for increasing the yield. We can get a "second crop." We can flush out remote "lost" deposits of oil sand by repressuring with gas or flooding with water.

We often make the mistake of thinking of oil fields in terms of square miles. Actually, we should think of them in cubic miles. This three-dimensional situation is due to the simple fact that different layers of oil often exist in one field, sometimes separated by many thousands of feet. And the presence of the deeper oil may not become known until many years after the shallower sand has been tapped. It is found by drilling deeper—vertical exploration.

Examples of this are legion, but a typical illustration is found in the field at Elk Basin, Wyo. This field was discovered some 30 years ago and wells were drilled 1,000 feet deep. The sand at this level produced for many years and the field neared exhaustion. Then, in 1942, a test well was drilled several thousand feet deeper and encountered a new oil pool, several times larger than the original one. Oil pools thus often lie one below another, like stories of a building. And we are far from having fully tested this vertical frontier, for the average depth of United States oil wells in recent years has been less than 5,000 feet, whereas we actually have found oil as deep as some 13,000 feet.

How do geologists presume to predict that there are at least 50,000,000,000 barrels of oil yet to be found in the United States? The answer is simple in principle, though, of course, complicated in detail. In the United States there is an area of approximately 2,500,000 square miles of sedimentary rock—the geological name for the kind of rock in which oil is found. Of this area, 1,500,000 square miles are favorable for the accumulation of petroleum, and scarcely half this territory has been thoroughly explored for oil. Studies of oil discoveries in the past show that, when thoroughly explored, from 1 to 3 percent of favorable territory produces oil.

Using only the lowest expectancy—1 percent—the geologists' calculations yield the 50,000,000,000-barrel figure. But there still is a chance—and a good one—that 3 percent or even more of some of the land will produce oil. In this case the potential of 50,000,000,000 may be increased.

Probably a good many readers live in States favorable for oil production, but not now producing. It may be that some of our future oil supply will come from their back yards or farms. These hopeful but nonproducing States are Arizona, Delaware, Georgia, Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, New Jersey, Oregon, North Carolina, South Carolina, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Virginia, and Washington. When the time comes that we need this oil, the petroleum industry will find it. There are hundreds of oil companies, large and small, that will be in on the search. Oil discovery and production today is engineered from top to bottom and every branch of science called upon, yet the smallest wildcatter has at his command the same geological techniques for discovery employed by the biggest companies.

But it must be remembered that while we are the largest oil-producing Nation of the world, we have only 15 percent of the world's favorable oil territory. We have produced already almost twice as much oil as the rest of the world combined, and we have gone more than twice as far, too, in progress.

Oil resources abroad are now very great—collectively, they far exceed our own. Can we expect a fair share if we need it to supplement our resources at home? The answer must be "yes." Our engineers, for the most part, discovered the world's oil. There is more vitality in the American petroleum industry than in any in the world. The average motorist probably does not realize that through our zeal to discover and negotiate, Americans today operate nearly one-half of the oil reserves of the world outside the United States. There is every reason to believe, in spite of some of our unfortunate experiences with expropriation in the past, that we shall continue to operate them. Trends toward peace and world amity are most impressive today; it is to be hoped that there will be a growing sense of security as time goes on.

Indeed, on purely business grounds the oil industry has less concern over the failure of the oil supply than of the development of atomic power. For if we ever do have the latter, we shall have it long before we "run out of oil." When we begin to run engines economically on atomic energy, oil will become a secondary, rather than a prime, source of power. By that time, however, it is likely that oil will have created a new industry for itself as a source of chemicals and special products; it will change its outlet, not lose it.

When you, as a motorcar buyer or driver, prick up a terrified ear to the prophets of oil-doom, remember that 63 years ago, 15 years after the completion of America's first oil well, the State geologist of Pennsylvania warned that oil wouldn't last long. Shortage predictions have come regularly since then. For example, some three decades ago the chief geologist of the United States Geological Survey issued this portentous warning: "Petroleum in the United States is a wasting asset. It is so far depleted as no longer to afford a secure foundation for the obligations based upon its continued adequacy."

Those were mighty words, but they weren't true. Oil continued to flow 30 years later in the period of its greatest trial—the recent war—despite such warnings. It licked the Nazis and the Japs. The industry fought to keep it flowing, even though costs rose in the face of fixed prices and its share of tools and men was not enough to maintain new discoveries. Yet we came out with greater reserves than we had to begin with. Now a new age of discovery begins. We can look to the future with confidence. There will be plenty of oil.

Hands Across the Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of December 11, 1945:

HANDS ACROSS THE SEA

Is the British loan good or bad? Are its terms satisfactory? Does it finance socialism? Does the United States get a reasonable return for the large extension of credit involved?

A good many people will be asking themselves these questions during coming months—and perhaps years.

The answers are not easy. Very few persons will take the trouble to read through the long and extremely dry official statements. Those sufficiently interested will be largely partisan—they will be looking for evidence to back up a political point of view.

Scores of others will express vigorous opinions pro or con without knowing or caring what the exact facts are.

For those who are sincerely interested, there is one quite simple yardstick to measure comments and tell whether the author is dealing with truth or propaganda.

That yardstick is whatever statement may be made concerning the interest which the British Government is required to pay for the use of American credit.

Every New Deal propagandist is stating the interest to be 2 percent.

Unqualifiedly, that statement is false.

Whenever it is seen in print, or heard on the air, Americans ought to be on guard. Either the person who prepared the statement is too ignorant of his subject to make his opinions worth consideration or he is deliberately misrepresenting the facts.

The rate would be 2 percent if it were paid every year. But it is not going to be paid every year.

Deducting the years for which the plan specifically provides that no interest is to be paid, and figuring the interest on the same basis that interest is figured on long-term bonds sold at a premium or discount, the interest rate is 1.62 percent.

The distinction is very important. On current conditions, it costs the United States $1.92 a year to borrow every $100.

Loaning this borrowed money at $2 would give a profit of 8 cents on every $100 so loaned. Loaning it at a yearly rate of $1.62 means a clear loss every year of 30 cents to the United States Government.

But even the 1.62-percent rate is by no means guaranteed. Whenever the British Government decides to skip a year, it can do so with very little more formality than merely getting in touch with the President of the United States.

The terms of the clause providing for the waiver of interest are remarkable. They commit the United States in effect to waive the payment whenever the British insist.

"The Government of the United States," the document says, "will grant the waiver if the Government of the United Kingdom finds that a waiver is necessary," subject to reports and forecasts on internal economic conditions in the British Empire which would be impossible for the United States to either confirm or contradict.

But still more significant is the interest which the British labor government, now in process of nationalizing Great Britain, is asked to pay. This government will run for 5 years, unless sooner dissolved as a result of parliamentary revolt.

How much is the labor government promising to pay the American people for the use of $4,400,000,000 during those critical 5 years when dollar loans are so urgently needed to allow the buying up of underlying ownership of banks and industries to be nationalized?

Not one red cent.

The interest charges under the Truman plan are fixed to start December 31, 1951—after the end of the term to which the present labor government was elected.

This is a point which every American citizen ought to understand clearly.

The money concerned is his money. The brash New Deal remark that "they" had the money and it is on hand in the United States Treasury is the "bunk." Wherever it is, the

American people own it—not President Truman and his friends.

The proposed loan figures out to approximately $31.50 apiece for every man, woman, and child in America—$157.50 for every family of five.

That brings us to the $64 question: Do you, as an individual, want the Truman administration to hand over to the British labor government, which is openly antagonistic to the economic system under which you operate, $31.50 of your money to do as it pleases with for the next 5 years?

So far as the labor government is concerned, this would be a Christmas present. Future generations, and not those now in office in England, would have to worry about both repayment and interest.

"Hands across the sea" is a wonderful idea. So is the expression, "forgiving and forgetting."

But there is good reason to suspect that in the present case the American hands are for giving and the British hands extended only for getting.

Administration of the Surplus Property Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROGER C. SLAUGHTER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Kansas City, Mo., November 27, 1945.
Hon. ROGER C. SLAUGHTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SLAUGHTER: The record of the administration of the provisions of the surplus property law is a record of constant discrimination against local governmental agencies. The law contains specific provisions of priorities in the disposal of war surplus materials.

Last June, 8 months after the enactment of the law, the Surplus Property Board promulgated regulation No. 2. This regulation required the local governments to file a statement of needs, SPB 7, with the disposal agencies. These statements were filed with the regional office of the disposal agency but have been constantly ignored ever since.

Where disposal agencies sent out lists of available materials as required by SPB 2, the lists have consisted mostly of materials that were not desirable or were unusable by local governments. A minimum quantity of usable materials have appeared in these so-called notices of available property. In most cases it is impossible to identify and appraise the goods as crated.

On November 6, 1945, the War Surplus Board issued Administration Regulation No. 14, which provides an allowance to local governments of 40 percent discount off of original cost prices, which were highly inflated due to time-and-a-half and double time paid for labor costs. It also provides that Federal surplus is sold where is and as is. It further provides that the purchaser must assume all handling and transportation charges. When you consider that the 40-percent discount was based on highly inflated costs on merchandise of questionable condition such as is offered as Federal surplus, it could not be termed an advantageous offer except for the seller.

So far as local governments are concerned, surplus property disposal in this country simply does not exist today. The original regulation may have been a scrap of paper, as most of us believe, but at least it provided a method by which local governments were supposed to obtain surplus properties. It fixed responsibility for notification upon the disposal agencies in unmistakable terms.

I feel confident that the Members of Congress are eager to know what happened under the legislation which they adopted and will take immediate steps to have this law properly administered.

Respectfully yours,
JOHN B. GAGE, *Mayor.*

Suggestions for a Larger National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the remarks of Gen. Milton A. Reckord, adjutant general of Maryland, printed in the Baltimore Sun of December 13, 1945, on military training:

GENERAL RECKORD REVEALS PLANS FOR NEW, LARGER NATIONAL GUARD

(By Howard M. Norton)

Plans for a National Guard three times larger than the prewar guard, with four times as many air units and heavy emphasis on mechanization, were revealed in detail for the first time yesterday by Maj. Gen. Milton A. Reckord, adjutant general of Maryland, who was chairman of the committee of fifteen generals which drafted the plans.

Maryland's famous Twenty-ninth Division will be reorganized as part of the new National Guard, General Reckord said.

The postwar guard will have a strength of 500,000 men, consisting of 24 divisions, he revealed.

TO HAVE 72 AIR UNITS

There are to be 72 air units—both transport and fighter—under the new plan, as compared with only 19 before the war.

Armored equipment and armored units will replace the old cavalry organizations; there will be no mounted or horse-drawn units in the National Guard of the future.

Motorized and self-propelled guns will replace the old horse-drawn artillery and the War Department pledges that the guard units will actually have this equipment, not mocked-up imitations.

AGE-IN-GRADE RULE

Younger and more efficient officers are to be secured, and the corps will be kept young and efficient by enforcement of a strict "age-in-grade" rule and extensive schooling.

The over-all aim, says General Reckord, is to have a well-rounded organization distributed over the country in such a way that the guard units in each industrial area will be constantly ready to defend their home areas.

The new plan, the general declares, assumes that there will be some sort of permanent conscription plan.

CONSCRIPTION ASSUMED

"If Congress fails to vote conscription, then it will have to make membership in the National Guard a lot more attractive in order to keep the new guard at full strength," he said.

The committee which drafted the plan for the postwar guard comprised five regular generals, five reserve generals, and five from the National Guard. Under General Reckord's leadership they approved the plan unanimously, and secured the unanimous approval of all sections of the War Department.

Here in the general's own words, is a digest of the officially approved plan:

"The strength of the National Guard of the future will be approximately 500,000 enlisted men together with the necessary officers, and will be the maximum within each State that can be recruited and maintained at a satisfactory standard.

NO HORSE-DRAWN UNITS

"The organizations and units allotted to the several States will be those which are required for the accomplishment of the mission of the National Guard and, when taken together with the units of the Regular Army and the Organized Reserve Corps, will insure an over-all balance force within the Army of the United States.

"Within the total allotment, organizations of the proper type will be allotted to each State and territory to enable it to accomplish the State mission.

"It will be interesting to note that there will be no mounted or horse-drawn units in the National Guard of the future. Armored equipment and armored units will replace old cavalry organizations; and motorized and self-propelled guns will replace the old horse-drawn artillery. Notwithstanding this fact, however, in the reorganization of the postwar National Guard the pride and traditions of old organizations will be utilized to the full."

FINE, BATTLE-SCARRED TWENTY-NINTH

"The 18 National Guard divisions which have performed in such a marvelous manner in north Africa, in Italy, in Europe, and in the Pacific will be reorganized and as far as practicable will be reallocated to the States from which they originally came.

"The old Twenty-ninth Division is 1 of the 18. The units of this organization entered Federal service on February 3, 1941, and the division is still in active service. It was one of the three divisions of the American Army which constituted the assault wave on the Normandy beaches on D-day. Men of Maryland, Virginia, the District of Columbia, and western Pennsylvania furnished the framework upon which this fine, battle-scarred organization was built.

"Air units of an appropriate type, antiaircraft artillery and signal aircraft warning units will have a high priority in the reorganization of the National Guard.

"Maryland will again be called upon to maintain a National Guard air unit as she has done since 1920. Air will form a very important part of the National Guard of the future."

THE BEST ARMY EQUIPMENT

"Prior to World War II the National Guard of the country supported only 19 air units, but in a postwar planning the National Guard will be called upon to support 72 air units. This will enable the larger States to maintain a number of units and, taken in connection with the antiaircraft, is designed to give to every industrial community throughout the Nation protection against enemy aircraft.

"All units of the National Guard are to be organized and equipped in a manner identical with that of similar Regular Army units. The National Guard of the future will not be asked to train with make-believe antiaircraft guns, with trucks representing tanks, with bags of flour representing grenades.

"The words, 'as far as practicable,' will have no place in the postwar National Guard. The equipment to be furnished them will be the best the Army has; it will be identical with that of the Regular Army.

QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

"It is anticipated that the National Guard of the future will be tied in with universal military training and that the young men who completed basic military training will enlist in the National Guard in such numbers as to keep the guard at approximately war strength. Technically trained organizations in the guard will be allocated to those States having such qualified personnel available. This principle will be carefully followed in order that all organizations may maintain a nigh state of efficiency.

"Qualification requirements for officers in the future National Guard will be standardized in order that all officers grade for grade within all reserve components will be identical and the officers will be interchangeable.

"An 'age-in-grade' policy will guarantee that officers will not remain in grade too long. This principle will be so administered as to keep a continuous flow in motion, guaranteeing that each officer remain in a certain grade a definite period of years, after which he will be either promoted or step aside."

SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Waivers for physical defects will be on an identical basis with that provided for the Regular Army.

"In the initial reorganization appointments will be limited to those wartime officers who have clearly demonstrated their qualifications by actual performance in the grade or position contemplated, or who, through the satisfactory discharge of duties of corresponding and equal responsibility, have qualified for such appointments.

"Second lieutenants will be procured from among qualified enlisted men who satisfactorily complete courses at officer candidates school, or from among recent graduates of the Reserve Officers Training Corps.

"In order to maintain efficiency in all organizations, a mandatory age-in-grade provision will be adopted, and annual physical examinations will be given all officers. Examining boards will be composed of an equal number of Regular Army and National Guard officers."

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

"Officers of the National Guard will be afforded maximum opportunity for extending their professional education. This may be accomplished in several ways; by accepting temporary active duty with the Regular Army, by attendance at service schools and, for senior officers, attendance at Command and General Staff schools. Efficiency reports will be rendered on each officer.

"It is hoped that greater incentive than heretofore will be provided for men to enlist and serve in the National Guard. For those who have served 1 year in military training camp, a 2-year enlistment is provided—for all others, 3 years. The physical and educational standards for enlistment in the National Guard will be those prescribed for the Regular Army.

"Maintenance of efficiency and promotion among enlisted men will be afforded by attendance at service schools and detailed temporary duty with training forces. Selected enlisted men will be detailed to attend officer-candidate schools and, upon satisfactory completion of the prescribed course, will be appointed second lieutenants."

TRAINING SUPERVISION

"The training objective for the individual will be designed to develop and qualify personnel in all grades to perform all duties which reasonably may be assigned to them both in peace and for mobilization, and to maintain such standards of mental and physical fitness as are necessary for active field service. The unit training will insure that all units will be capable of immediate mobilization and field service.

"The training of the National Guard will be conducted by the officers of the Guard under the supervision of the commanding generals of the appropriate major forces.

"This is a definite change from the past procedure. Prior to World War II the Corps Area Commander was charged with the supervision of training, but in the future the Corps Area Command—now the Service Command—will be charged with supply; and the major forces—that is, Army Air, Army Ground, and Army Service Forces—will be charged with training. It is believed this change will guarantee much better supervision and will insure a better trained Guard."

SYSTEM OF ROTATION

"Regular Army instructors will be assigned to duty within the States in a manner similar to that which obtained in the past, but they will be responsible to the commanding general of the major force concerned rather than the Service Command.

"Normally, Regular Army officers assigned to duty as instructors will remain on duty for a period of 3 years and they will not be eligible for an extension of this period of duty. This will enable rotation and will guarantee that the National Guard will receive adequate and up-to-date instruction; and it will also benefit the officer who at the end of a 3-year tour will be required to serve with his own branch for a period of time before becoming eligible to again act as an instructor."

Address of the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, at the Communion Breakfast of the St. Vincent De Paul Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a splendid, powerful, and timely address made on Sunday, December 9, 1945, at the communion breakfast of the St. Vincent De Paul Society in Cathedral Hall, Boston, Mass., by the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D., archbishop of Boston, on the importance of UNRRA in the saving of human beings who are suffering acute distress throughout the world, and the vital necessity of additional appropriations by the Congress before Christmas to assure the undisturbed continuance of UNRRA in its mission of human relief:

At the beginning of recorded history Cain killed his brother Abel. Almighty God asked him, "Where is thy brother?" Cain answered, "Am I my brother's keeper?" Centuries whirled away into space, and one day the Christ, the new Abel, came down to this earth because He was His brother's keeper. Ever since He is the ideal of Christian charity.

The scope of charity embraces everything we do for our fellow beings out of the love of God without any hope of material reward. The challenge to charity is thus a challenge of Christianity. If we love God, then love of neighbor is the necessary corollary of love of God. "A new commandment I give unto you, that you love one another as I have loved you."

In our day countless tongues from bombed homes, prison camps, and roofless sanctuaries are pleading, "Will you be my keeper, as Christ has been yours?" What will be our answer? Suppose that conditions in America and Europe were reversed. Suppose one section of the United States was as hungry as Greece; suppose husbands and fathers in another section were deported to a foreign land and all children exiled or left to starvation; suppose an enemy took the produce from our farms as they overran our country.

On the other hand, suppose that Europe was blessed with the same abundance with which we are blessed. In that case, would we not expect the people of Europe to assist us, and would we not consider them remiss in human kindness, if they refused to do so? Apply then, the Golden Rule of the Saviour: "All things whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you also to them."

Now that for all practical purposes is the aim of what is known as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

We agreed to contribute 1 percent of our national income for 1943 to that organization. Many other nations did the same. Everybody recognized that immediate relief for starving people in devasted countries was the first concern of a war-relief program. To the present time we of the United States have failed to make good our promise. Our Congress has been discussing the matter for months. In the meantime disease and death are rampant. "Am I my brother's keeper?"

We are told that a free press should be contingent upon the giving of relief to any country. All of us are in favor of opening the channels of news to every land, but Christian charity compels us to feed, clothe, and house the starving and the naked wherever they are. We attached no rider to our lend-lease shipments of war materials. Should we now attach one to charity? If we do, and if the UNRRA should fail for lack of funds, then the Good Samaritan has been waylaid.

The conditions in war-ridden lands beggar description. How can we comprehend the appalling situation in Poland, where 800,000 people are living in dugouts and holes in the ground, and where 10,000 die monthly from tuberculosis. "Am I my brother's keeper?"

How can we estimate the sufferings in Greece where the population must try to survive this winter on about one-third of the American consumption of food calories or in Yugoslavia where 75 percent of the adults, and 90 percent of the children, are barefooted; where 66,000 war casualties are limbless, and the year's crop will be half of the normal supply? "Am I my brother's keeper?"

How can we describe the plight of Austria when in Vienna alone, 5,000 people are dying each month from tuberculosis and all indications point to an increase during the coming months?

The desperate conditions and desperate need in the world today defy the comprehension of the secure, the well-fed, the warm and well-housed. It has been estimated that over 90,000,000 of our European allies, already weakened by semistarvation, will need shipments of 9,000,000 tons of food this winter if they are to be saved. The peoples of Greece, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Italy, China, and several other countries which have no credit resources will not eat without UNRRA.

Almost 25,000,000 people are milling back and forth in Europe—displaced, homeless, completely destitute. The destruction of housing facilities in Europe and China is tremendous, and the cruel expulsion of long-established populations of German origin from eastern Europe increases the horror of the world's uprooted, cruelly begun in the early days of the war. "Am I my brother's keeper?"

This litany of misery can be increased until it embraces every war-stricken land of Europe and elsewhere. In all human history there was never such sorrow, suffering, and starvation.

We may differ in great or small measure from these afflicted nations in matters pertaining to politics and human rights, but is it not a beautiful thing, despite our differences, to help our neighbor in his misery? And is it not a beautiful thing to contemplate many nations blessed with an abundance uniting, despite their own differences, in a work of brotherly love resulting from the pooling of resources to bring relief to the victims of heartless war?

The work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration must not fail. Thank God, Congress has taken the necessary first steps toward meeting our inescapable obligations. Friday morning the hearts and the consciences of all the American people must have been eased when they read in the newspapers that the House of Representatives had approved the appropriation needed in order to clear the good name of the United States, not so much in the eyes of our allies, as in the eyes of millions of people in Europe whose morale in resistance and in survival was kept alive by the promises we made to UNRRA. Last week there appeared to be a shocking danger that our Nation might default. Thursday's vote in the Congress indicates that it intends to abide by its promises.

However, there is still urgent need for alert, insistent, uncompromising public opinion on this matter. Every person who loves the fair name of the United States and who is anxious to alleviate the appalling situation of innocent millions all over the world will demand immediate further action in Congress so that before the end of this year food and other absolutely vital supplies can be bought and shipped to the destitute in liberated Europe. Last week's vote is in the right direction; but the problem is not solved. Delay can still mean death. The appropriation which the Congress has now agreed to provide should be passed by both Houses before they recess December 20. Otherwise the winter will be gone, and with it hundreds of thousands of lives, before funds are put to work in critically needed relief and in proving our national good faith.

We have a moral duty to make known our opinion on this matter and to watch very carefully the vote and the action in its regard of our elected representatives in Congress. This is not a political question and it should not be permitted to be turned into one. This is a question of keeping pledges we, as a people, made; it is a question of saving millions of lives; it is a question of averting conditions which might easily lead to another war; it is the age-old question: "Am I my brother's keeper?" Write immediately, my dear men, to your representatives in Congress to the effect that we are our brother's keeper regardless of his politics, his economics, his race, or his color. We have the great opportunity of laying the roadway of future peace on the rockbed of charity and justice, for the prospects of future peace depend in great measure on our ability to give renewed life and strength to the sick and dying people of the war-ridden nations. If we do not measure up to the task, the basis for an enduring peace will not be laid in this generation.

American Watch Manufacturing Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PEHR G. HOLMES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum of facts by the committee of the American Watch Manufacturing Industry regarding the American Watch Manufacturing Industry's position in connection with the State Department's representations to Switzerland concerning exports of watches to the United States:

1. The American watch-manufacturing industry, consisting of Bulova, Elgin, General Time Instruments, Hamilton, Ingraham, New Haven, U. S. Time (formerly Waterbury), and Waltham have been out of the civilian market since June of 1942, at which time their facilities were completely converted to the manufacture of war goods. Some interference with civilian watch manufacture occasioned by the early acceptance of war orders had already begun by 1941.

2. The war has demonstrated that the American watch manufacturing industry is absolutely essential to the defense of this Nation.

3. All during the war years Switzerland has had unrestricted access to the American market and no competition therein from any source whatsoever. For 10 years (1931–40) prior to the war, imports of Swiss watches into this country averaged less than 2,000,000 units annually, with no single year's importations exceeding 3,000,000 units until 1940. Beginning in 1941, as shown by the following table, importations of Swiss watches increased substantially:

	Number	*Value*
1941	4,300,513	$13,778,248
1942	5,292,712	19,211,681
1943	7,996,589	34,984,113
1944	6,912,332	37,200,843
1945 (first 10 months)	7,474,754	----------

These have been practically all jeweled watches. Note the disproportionate increase in value between the year 1942 and subsequent years. The demand for watches during the war years has been currently satisfied by these importations, leaving the American industry without a pent-up demand for its peacetime product; a situation which is unique, so far as we know, in the category of war-converted industries.

4. The American industry called this situation to the attention of the Committee for Reciprocity Information. Hearings have been held at which representatives of both the American industry and the importers have presented their views. Action was taken only after both sides had been heard.

5. No quota on watch imports has been imposed by the State Department. It merely has suggested to Switzerland that it, Switzerland, voluntarily limit its watch exports to this country from December 1, 1945, to December 31, 1946, in order to give the American industry a chance to reestablish itself in the American market. As we understand it, the limitation suggested is 3,000,000 units for this 13-month period.

6. This action by the State Department on behalf of an essential American industry has been seized upon by the importers to launch a smear campaign against the American watch-manufacturing industry, and in particular against Elgin, Hamilton, and Waltham, jeweled-watch manufacturers.

(a) A two-page telegram was dispatched by the Watch Assemblers Association on December 5 to jewelers and department stores all over the country, followed by a supplementary letter the next day, asking the recipients to wire their Congressmen, Senators, and the Secretary of State in protest. We also understand that two of the largest importers, namely, Gruen and Longines, have since sent out similar telegrams. Therefore, any protests which may be received will have been inspired by this action of the importers.

(b) The anticipated demand for watches has been exaggerated in an effort to frighten retailers into thinking that the State Department's suggestion, if agreed to by the Swiss, would result in a shortage of watches. No allowance is made for the fact that the American industry is returning to the manufacture of civilian watches.

(c) A congressional spokesman for the importers alleges that the Department of Justice has charged the Elgin, Hamilton, and Waltham Cos. with having "formed together in a conspiracy in restraint of interstate commerce." This is absolutely false, there being no case pending against these companies jointly. The fact is that before Pearl Harbor indictments were returned against these three companies individually (not jointly) dealing with their arrangements with wholesalers. At the request of the Army and Navy, in view of the importance of the production of these companies to the American war effort, these cases were deferred for the duration of the war. They are still pending and the companies are contesting the Government's charges. Nothing has been said about the multitudinous prosecutions which have been brought against the watch importers for violations of OPA price ceilings, actions which resulted from the profiteering efforts of these importers.

(d) This same congressional spokesman has alleged that the American companies seek to establish a monopoly. This is ridiculous; the American manufacturers have never supplied more than 50 percent of the American jeweled watch market under the most favorable tariff treatment, and under the reduced rates of the 1936 trade agreement with Switzerland had their share reduced to less than 40 percent. The Swiss on the other hand were enabled by the treaty to increase their share to over 60 percent prewar, and during the war, and as of today, have not only complete control of the American market, but the world market as well. The latter they have always completely dominated. The Swiss industry is, in fact, a government controlled and dominated trust. They fix prices, they control the exportation of machines used in watch making and, during the war and since, have refused to sell such machinery to watch manufacturers in this country. During the war they refused to permit sales of watches to American manufacturers who were desirous of keeping their trade names before the public while they were engaged in the fabrication of war goods, although the Swiss increased their sales and supplied new accounts in this country after such refusal.

(e) It is also claimed that the American industry would be allowed to reap a rich harvest by greatly increasing the price of their product. We observe that there still are price ceilings on watches and that the American industry has adhered to those ceilings. As a matter of fact the importers have been permitted by the OPA to increase their prices despite swollen profits not subject to renegotiation, whereas the American industry has not been permitted to increase theirs at all, not even an equivalent amount.

7. On the alleged factual side of the data that has been made public by the importers, there are certain misconceptions which should be clarified.

(a) It is said that the suggestion of the State Department is contrary to the administration's international trade policy. If that policy is to encourage the destruction of

American job-producing industry, the assertion is correct. However, every time the reciprocal-trade-agreements program has come before the Congress for approval, it has come with the assurance that the authority sought would not be used to injure, let alone destroy, American business. The last extension bill came with President Truman's expressed assurance to that effect. The State Department's mere suggestion that the Swiss voluntarily do some reciprocating certainly is, therefore, within the announced intentions, at least, of the administration.

(b) By failing to comment thereon, the implication is left that there is no limit to the duration of the recommended self-imposed restriction. The fact is, as we understand it, that the State Department has suggested only a 13-month period.

(c) It has also been said that proof was submitted to the Committee for Reciprocity Information "that there is a tremendous backlog of demand for watches and that this demand in 1946–47 will run up to about 10,000,000 watches." If by that statement is meant 10,000,000 over the 2 years, it is approximately correct, and the importers' fair share of a 5,000,000 annual market in each of the years 1946 and 1947 would, based on historical percentages, run not over the 3,000,000 units suggested by the State Department as a quota to be self-imposed on the Swiss during the 13 months beginning December 1, 1945. If 10,000,000 annually was intended, the figures have been grossly exaggerated, since we know of no surveys, including those made by the War Production Board, which mention watches among the immediate desires of the purchasing public. As a matter of fact, the War Production Board survey did not show any demand whatsoever for watches. It is only common sense to conclude that with imports during the war ranging three and four times their prewar average that the market has already been oversold. Obviously, the things which the consumer's dollar will be spent for are those things which have been off the market entirely during the war years. Watches are one of a very few commodities that could be had during the war, and, with other things not available, considerable anticipated buying occurred. It is significant the surveys mentioned are not identified. Another significant thing which has occurred recently is that the retail prices being advertised for certain types of watches are much lower than they used to be—a development inconsistent with the claim of shortage.

8. Much emphasis has been placed on the thousands of people employed in and as a result of the importing business. No figures are given. The American manufacturers employ, normally, approximately 20,000 workers in their movement-manufacturing operations alone. Furthermore, they support exactly the same types of related industries as do the importers, and others in addition thereto, because they require supplies of the materials which go into the movements and into the processes of manufacturing the movements; these the importers do not support, except in Switzerland.

9. The rather ludicrous assertion is made that we need this expanded import trade to keep our merchant marine busy. We had supposed it was common knowledge that one small cabin on almost any type of seagoing vessel would more than accommodate the 10,000,000 units over which so much concern has been expressed.

10. Even the old argument about smuggling has been resurrected from the moth balls. The Swiss have undertaken to control this, and it is assumed that, as a matter of good faith, they will continue to do so.

11. One thing has been carefully overlooked. Now that the war is over many uncontested markets closed to Switzerland during the war will be opening up again. This will be occurring while the American industry is getting back into production. Switzerland can now better afford to reduce her exports to America than after she has geared her production to holding more than her fair share here, plus the markets now reopening to her. It is now, also, that the American industry needs assistance to get back into the market after a long time out of it in the service of its country. Is it too much to expect some semblance of reciprocity from one of the nations saved by the participation of this country in the war, particularly when it is remembered that that same nation not only had an unrestricted wartime outlet for its civilian products here, but was also supplying war materials to an enemy of all mankind?

ELGIN NATIONAL WATCH CO.
GENERAL TIME INSTRUMENTS CORP.
HAMILTON WATCH CO.
NEW HAVEN CLOCK CO.
THE E. INGRAHAM CO.
UNITED STATES TIME CORP.
WALTHAM WATCH CO.

Bonds for Loans to Britain and Other Nations Should Be Sold to Individual Americans, Not to Banks, for the Specific Purpose of Foreign Loans; Try It and See What Happens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, again I wish to call attention to a proposed gift—deceptively called a loan—of $3,750,000,000 to be made by the New Deal administration to Great Britain. The interest rate—another piece of hypocrisy—was set at 2 percent; but if and when the interest is ever paid, the effective rate will be about 1.63. It should be mentioned also that in granting the $3,750,000,000 checking account to Britain, the United States also writes off some $25,000,000,000 of lend-lease material used during the war.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that I shall not be called a carping critic for calling attention to this proposed gift of $3,750,000,000 to Britain. On yesterday, December 12, 1945, I pointed out that if the administration makes this stupendous gift to Great Britain, it will furnish a precedent for similar gifts to other nations. There are other persons alarmed at the consequences which will follow these hand-outs of billions to foreign nations. I quote verbatim excerpts from an article by Henry J. Taylor which appeared in the Washington Daily News, December 10, 1945:

OTHER NATIONS SEEK LOANS LIKE BRITAIN'S

(By Henry J. Taylor)

A loan to the British Government is only the first on our loan list. What we do about this we must be ready to do for many other nations.

France came in for a $550,000,000 loan last week. Russia, China, Italy, Belgium, Poland, and a dozen other nations also are waiting to see what rule book we write for the billions for Britain.

Each nation expects equal treatment. We are setting a foreign-loan pattern, many times larger than after the last war.

We expected to be repaid last time. But after every country, except Finland, defaulted (the countries borrowing now, including England, still are in default) the idea grew up that we should not have expected to be paid back in the first place.

Everyone knows that we cannot give away our money and our resources forever; there is a bottom to our barrel, and, in many ways, we are starting at the bottom now.

We shall have to be careful what we do. The money itself is important. We all pay it. The over-all sum for which loan applications probably will be made is estimated at $20,000,000,000.

Our duty is to lend aid, according to our ability.

Any gain our foreign friends might make now is temporary if it violates the American people's idea of sound judgment. Anything but a program for the most business-like loans will hurt the world in the long run more than the loans will help today.

Unless our loan affairs are wisely handled the boomerang from the results could increase the already too good possibility that America will wash her hands of everything outside the 12-mile limit. In this way the cause for world collaboration would receive such a setback as to play directly into the hands of the isolationists. The issue is even more broad for the future than for the present.

The principles are the things to grasp now.

First, we should put a limit on our total postwar loans, both in time and in dollars.

It is the total which affects us more than the individual amount to any nation. Until this total is at least estimated, and formal congressional action taken to limit our aggregate loans, no intelligent action can be taken on Britain's request for $4,000,000,000.

Any individual loan must be made in proportion to the total sum.

Second, we should restrict our postwar loans to whatever nations took elementary steps in their own and our behalf before applying for any loan. Many of the most flagrant discriminations against America's interest, such as the black-out on information about Russia can be corrected by prospective borrowers before they negotiate at all.

Third, any nation should be required to utilize its own assets to whatever degree it can, for funds or as collateral, before we supply additional funds.

As a Senator, Mr. Truman wrote in a report to the Senate, November 5, 1943: "Before authorizing lend-lease the Congress expressly requested and received assurances that lend-lease assistance would be extended only where the recipient was fully utilizing all his own resources."

Yet Great Britain actually increased her assets here by $1,500,000,000 during the war and she has an estimated $3,600,000,000 in gold, cash, and securities here today.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more essential to the ultimate welfare of this country and to the world than to make the United States a solvent nation. The solvency of the United States is a condition precedent to the peace of the world and to our ability to be of service to suffering humanity.

Mr. Speaker, how solvent is the United States? I wish to invite attention of the membership to the financial status of the United States Government.

When the Members of the House shall have examined the debt to which the present generation and our posterity are committed, I offer a suggestion with reference to any gift or loan to a foreign nation. The suggestion is this: That the dollars for the British gift or loan of $3,750,000,000 and all other loans to foreign nations, if and when made, shall come only from funds raised by the sale

of long-term bonds to individual investors for the specific purpose of the foreign gift or loan.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I am inserting a summary of the financial status of the United States Government:

Summary of financial status

Direct public debt (as of Dec. 31, 1944)	$230, 630, 233, 709. 36
Contingent liabilities of the United States (as of Dec. 31, 1944)	24, 548, 752, 812. 62
Unliquidated obligations incurred against appropriations and contract authorizations	[1] 67, 057, 064, 000. 00
Total guaranteed loans	6, 545, 526, 493. 00
Insurance in force	308, 116, 643, 131. 00
Total gross debt and contingent liabilities	636, 898, 220, 145. 98

[1] As of Nov. 30-Dec. 31, 1944, not available.

Owing to the United States by foreign countries as of July 1, 1945

Principal amount	$11, 435, 365, 215. 21
Interest postponed and payable under moratorium agreements	184, 696, 634. 30
Interest accrued and unpaid under funding and moratorium agreements	3, 171, 278, 458. 02
Total principal and interest owing the United States	14, 791, 340, 307. 53

Proposed loan to Great Britain

Cash	$3, 750, 000, 000. 00
Lend-lease materials and surplus property goods	650, 000, 000. 00
Total	4, 400, 000, 000. 00
Great Britain presently owes us from previous war, World War I or subsequently but prior to World War II a principal amount of	$4, 368, 000, 000. 00
paid interest	2, 047, 664, 782. 58
Total owing the United States from prior to World War II transactions	6, 415, 664, 782. 58
If present proposed loan and advances are made they will owe the United States	10, 815, 000, 000. 00

Will we be called upon to loan them the money to pay back this debt to us? Or will it again be charged off to the poor business ability of Uncle Shylock?

Financial picture of the United States at present

(1) Direct public debt (as of Dec. 31, 1944):	
Interest-bearing debt	$228, 891, 263, 312. 84
Matured debt on which interest has ceased	185, 900, 520. 26
Debt bearing no interest	1, 553, 069, 876. 26
Total gross debt	230, 630, 233, 709. 36
(2) Contingent liabilities of the United States (as of Dec. 31, 1944):	
Obligations guaranteed by the United States	$1, 513, 997, 139. 36
Obligations issued on credit of United States:	
Tennessee Valley Authority bonds	6, 300, 000. 00
Funds due depositors, Postal Savings system	2, 206, 694, 367. 00
Federal Reserve notes (face amount)	20, 821, 761, 306. 26
Total	24, 548, 752, 812. 62
(3) Unliquidated obligations incurred against appropriations and contract authorizations	[1] 67, 057, 064, 000. 00
(4) Data supplied later not available at time of above.	
Data furnished in Treasury letter of Mar. 23, 1945, and not included in independent offices hearings (p. 1298):	
Total guaranteed loans	6, 545, 526, 493. 00
Insurance in force	308, 116, 643, 131. 00
Total gross debt and contingent and other liabilities	636, 538, 220, 145. 98

[1] As of Nov. 30, 1944, not available as of Dec. 31, 1944.

Statement showing total indebtedness of foreign governments to the United States, July 1, 1945

Country	Total indebtedness	Principal unpaid [1]	Interest postponed and payable under moratorium agreements	Interest accrued and unpaid under funding and moratorium agreements
Funded debts:				
Belgium	$503, 579, 077. 60	$400, 680, 000. 00	$3, 750, 000. 00	$99, 149, 077. 60
Czechoslovakia	175, 072, 336. 13	165, 241, 108. 90		9, 831, 227. 23
Estonia	24, 491, 700. 81	16, 466, 012. 87	492, 360. 20	7, 533, 327. 74
Finland	8, 574, 063. 24	7, 842, 131. 29	[4] 731, 740. 93	191. 02
France	4, 606, 635, 664. 40	3, 863, 650, 000. 00	38, 636, 500. 00	704, 349, 164. 40
Germany (Austria)	[2] 26, 024, 539. 59	25, 980, 480. 66		44, 058. 93
Great Britain	6, 415, 664, 782. 58	4, 368, 000, 000. 00	131, 520, 000. 00	1, 916, 144, 782. 58
Greece	36, 873, 535. 10	31, 516, 000. 00	449, 080. 00	4, 908, 455. 00
Hungary	2, 740, 938. 07	1, 908, 560. 00	57, 072. 75	775, 305. 32
Italy	2, 052, 213, 409. 34	2, 004, 900, 000. 00	2, 506, 125. 00	44, 807, 284. 34
Latvia	10, 114, 980. 04	6, 879, 464. 20	205, 989. 96	3, 029, 525. 88
Lithuania	9, 064, 140. 62	6, 197, 682. 00	185, 930. 46	2, 680, 528. 16
Poland	206, 497, 824. 20	206, 057, 000. 00	6, 161, 835. 00	94, 278, 989. 20
Rumania	74, 926, 279. 75	63, 860, 560. 43		11, 065, 719. 32
Yugoslavia [3]	63, 396, 718. 78	61, 625, 000. 00		1, 771, 718. 78
Total	14, 315, 869, 990. 25	11, 230, 804, 000. 35	184, 696, 634. 30	2, 900, 369, 355. 60
Unfunded debts:				
Armenia	27, 391, 079. 33	11, 959, 917. 49		15, 431, 161. 84
Russia	448, 079, 237. 95	192, 601, 297. 37		255, 477, 940. 58
Total	475, 470, 317. 28	204, 561, 214. 86		270, 909, 102. 42
Grand total	14, 791, 340, 307. 53	11, 435, 365, 215. 21	184, 696, 634. 30	3, 171, 278, 458. 02

[1] Includes principal postponed under moratorium agreements and principal amounts not paid according to contract terms.
[2] The German Government has been notified that the Government of the United States will look to the German Government for the discharge of the indebtedness of the Government of Austria to the Government of the United States.
[3] This Government has not accepted the provisions of the moratorium.
[4] Also includes interest postponed and payable under agreements of May 1, 1941, and Oct. 14, 1943.

Some of the British Government holdings in United States industry

	Shares
General Motors Corp	434, 000
Radio Corp. of America	177, 000
Amerada Petrol	133, 000
Chrysler Corp	36, 000
Standard Oil of New Jersey	198, 000
Standard Oil of Indiana	315, 000
Socony-Vacuum Oil Co	130, 000
American Telephone & Telegraph Co	70, 000
United States Steel (preferred)	21, 000

Would it not be good business to have the British Government liquidate these holdings into cash and use that in reducing their debt rather than to continue drawing earnings from that source while at the same time trying to negotiate further loans from the United States taxpayers?

Have we again reverted to the status of colonial days when we were crying "taxation without representation"?

Are the American taxpayers to uphold the British Empire forever?

Certainly good business sense demands that we draw a line somewhere. The ability of the American taxpayers is not without limits.

Present loans will beyond doubt be followed by others to other countries, and so on without end. Where is the money coming from?

Shortage of Penicillin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, since my remarks of December 10 having to do with the temporary shortage of penicillin in my district, I have been in touch with Mr. Eugene J. Earley and Mr. Roy S. Koch of the Civilian Production Administration. These gentlemen have been most cooperative in presenting to me the facts surrounding the sarcity of penicillin, and have assured me to my satisfaction that the reasons for the shortage were uncontrollable. They have assured me, as well, that the situation in Wilkes-Barre had been corrected and that ample supplies will soon be available for my district and the Nation at large.

I am presenting, further, a letter on this subject received by me today from the Civilian Production Administration:

This will confirm our discussion yesterday with Mr. E. J. Earley regarding your statement on the shortage of penicillin which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 10, 1945.

Attached is a copy of direction 4 to CPA Order M-300, effective November 23, 1945. This order provides that 40 percent of the penicillin produced each month must be used to fill hospital orders since hospitals have the most urgent requirements for the drug. Considerable more penicillin is being made available for hospitals in December than in any previous month.

Allocation of penicillin was discontinued August 31, 1945, in accordance with WPB's policy of revoking controls when no longer necessary. Unfortunately production dropped approximately 10 percent in September, probably, because of the poor quality of corn-steep liquor available for use in the nutrient media for culturing penicillium notatum. At the same time, export licensing of penicillin was discontinued and the export demand increased for UNRRA, Latin America, European and other countries, except for the United Kingdom which is self-sufficient with regard to penicillin. In September, also, the Food and Drug Administration permitted the initial distribution of certified lots of penicillin tablets, ointments, and other dosage forms which are convenient for patient and physician alike. This increased the over-all demand for penicillin to such a point that Direction 4 to M-300 became necessary to protect hospital supplies.

In the last several weeks the quality of corn-steep liquor has improved and is result-

ing in increased production of penicillin in December. The export licensing of penicillin was reinstated December 1, 1945, by the Office of International Trade Operations of the Department of Commerce at the request of Civilian Production Administration. By agreement between CPA and OITO, an export quota of 170,000,000,000 units was established for December, or a reduction of 15 percent from the quota established for July and August, respectively.

Physicians and pharmacists may obtain their supplies of penicillin from the portion of production not reserved for hospitals. As production increases this month additional penicillin should be available to these distribution channels.

We have taken steps to insure that areas in short supply receive prompt shipment of penicillin. Should you have any further information regarding inability to obtain penicillin, we would be pleased to have you refer such cases to our attention. We assure you prompt steps will be taken to alleviate any hardship within the limits of available supply. The CPA is watching the penicillin situation carefully and will place penicillin under complete allocation, if necessary, in order to insure equitable distribution.

Your interest in penicillin distribution is appreciated and if we can be of any further service please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Very truly yours,

ROY S. KOCH,
Civilian Production Administration.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am more than ever convinced that the time has arrived for immediate congressional action with reference to Palestine. The action of President Truman in naming representatives of the United States to the International Commission that is to inquire into conditions in Palestine has emphasized the need to us to affirmatively declare the urgency of restoring immigrating into that country and to establish it as a Jewish commonwealth. It is vitally necessary that the Commission and the nations of the world understand fully the position of the United States with regard to Zionist aims in Palestine. I am advised that the Senate will take action on an identical resolution to the one I am introducing in the House today, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reporting out Senator WAGNER'S resolution favorably 17 to 1.

The facts with regard to the tragic conditions of the displaced Jews in Europe are established. To abandon the Jewish victims of Nazi crime would destroy the confidence of common people in the ability of Allied statesmen and the Members of this honorable body to honor their high professions.

Under all of the facts and all of the law, the law of God as well as of men, the rescue of these unfortunate people can brook no further delay. That is true as well to assure that Palestine, the historic motherland of the Jewish people, become, as soon as possible, a Jewish democratic state.

The Moral of Pearl Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of December 12, 1945:

THE MORAL OF PEARL HARBOR

Testifying before the Congressional Pearl Harbor Committee yesterday, General Marshall said that President Roosevelt had personally ordered that all warnings of imminent war sent to field commanders in the Pacific should also include an instruction to them not to precipitate hostilities, but to wait for an overt act by the Japanese before hitting back. That our field commanders did so, at Pearl Harbor and in the Philippines, is evident from the result. If anything had still been needed to knock into a cocked hat the suggestion insinuated by some of the probers and voiced openly by their publicity claque that President Roosevelt "plotted" Pearl Harbor in order to drag the country into war, this statement of the American Chief of Staff at the time should complete the job.

But General Marshall's testimony likewise points another lesson which is of the utmost importance, not to the clarification of history, but to our future security. And that is the lesson of the vulnerability of the democracies. Because democracies do not go to war, and do not even prepare for war, until the overwhelming majority of the people is convinced of imminent peril by overt acts on the part of an aggressor, the aggressor will always have the advantage of them. That applies not only to the surprise attacks with which aggressors have learned to begin their wars, but to the whole preparation and planning of war, in which the initiative is a priceless advantage.

The Japanese had demonstrated the advantage of the sneak attack nearly 40 years before Pearl Harbor, when they crippled the Russian Fleet at Port Arthur. Hitler had improved on their technique, in both the military and diplomatic fields, a fact which enabled him to placate the democracies while he prepared for war, and then to attack them individually for the purpose of eliminating them one by one. The revelations at the Nuremberg trial and the admissions of the Japanese leaders themselves have demonstrated how both the Nazis and the Japanese plotted to wage war against the United States; how Goering called for planes able to bomb New York as early as 1938; how Hitler was preparing to seize islands in the Atlantic as stepping-stones to the Americas; how Hitler and Matsuoka, the Japanese foreign minister, concerted their plans early in 1941; how the Japanese war lords obtained an undated war declaration from their Emperor and prepared to put it into effect at a time strategically most convenient for them, which turned out to be December 8, 1941, their time. We did not know these details then, but only the politically blind could mistake the purposes which they had loudly proclaimed by their past actions. It is to the credit of President Roosevelt and his associates that they realized the danger and did what they could—through such measures as lend-lease—to prepare for it.

Despite this, Pearl Harbor happened. How far military negligence or misjudgment was responsible for it, or at least for the extent of the disaster, should be revealed when all the evidence is in. But it is already clear that there were two main factors in the situation. The first was the misjudgment of the spirit of this country, which tempted both Hitler and Japan to attack us in the confident expectation of victory. The second was the determination of the American Government, well known to our enemies, not to strike the first blow, which enabled them to plan at leisure and to strike at a time and place of their own choosing.

In short, we deliberately surrendered to our enemies the element of surprise, against which there can be no absolute protection, even in the midst of war. We did so because Amercan public opinion would not permit the Government to take the initiative in the face of even known danger without so splitting the country as to impair its effectiveness for war. That is the price we pay for liberty and democracy. If the price was high in this war, it is bound to be much higher in any future war.

Department of State Waits

REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Department of State, speaking for the President, does not even give lip service to recalling 600 ships from foreigners to carry our boys home.

On November 20, 1945, I introduced H. R. 4760 to get back our 600 ships now used by foreigners.

The State Department wants to wait for information from the War Shipping Administration, even after the War Shipping Administration and the Maritime Commission have failed, neglected, and refused to tell about 7,500 Government-owned and chartered ships now under their control and operation.

Yet, the Department of State, the War Shipping Administration, and the Maritime Commission are under the absolute control of the President.

As to the recalling of the ships with foreigners, the State Department says:

DECEMBER 10, 1945.

The Honorable S. O. BLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BLAND: By your letter of November 24, 1945, which I acknowledged on November 28, you requested a report for your committee on the bill (H. R. 4760) to provide for the securing of our ships from foreign nations and the return of the armed forces overseas, and for other purposes.

The bill proposes the immediate recall of merchant vessels owned by this Government and now operated by foreign countries, in order to expedite the return of our overseas forces. You are doubtless obtaining from the War Shipping Administration and other agencies responsible for the transport of our armed forces from overseas information as to whether the return of our overseas forces is in fact being delayed by insufficiency

of troop transport capacity and as to whether the ships referred to in the bill could be used as troop transports to expedite this movement.

Accordingly, I would prefer to reserve comment on the bill until the facts in this connection are reported.

The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this letter.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BYRNES.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pity that our overseas men must suffer such rot after waiting more than 6 months to be brought home.

When Did War End?

REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have a resolution in the Judiciary Committee which has for its purpose the declaring of hostilities at an end as of September 2, 1945. This resolution had a short hearing, but to date has not been reported out of the committee. I realize that there are many acts and directives directly connected to the ending of hostilities. One of the most important is that of permitting men, who enlisted for the duration, an opportunity to have a discharge from the armed forces. This Congress should not by a legal trick continue this part of the wartime regimentation on the ground that neither the President nor the Congress has proclaimed the end of the war. The myth that there is still a war on should be exploded by prompt action of this Congress.

I include the following letter from a young man in the Navy who is now serving in Shanghai, China:

NOVEMBER 11, 1945.

Representative MILLER of Nebraska,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C

DEAR SIR: I have read lately that you are one of those who are trying to get us released from the service, as we feel we should be. I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart for standing by us, and I certainly hope that you will be able to get some good results soon. I believe my own case is fairly typical of those you are trying to help.

While I was still 17 years old I voluntarily enlisted in the Navy with the understanding that I would be released within 6 months after the duration of war. At the time I enlisted, I was naturally interested in the contracts I signed and therefore had the entire matter explained to me by the recruiting officer in charge of my home office. We discussed the matter quite thoroughly and I was definitely led to believe that I would be required to service only for as long as the war lasted plus 6 months. That 6 months, I was told, was the maximum length of time I would have to service once the war ended.

As I now look back over 2 years to that time when I enlisted it all seems like a mockery and a farce. I feel that I have lived up to my part in the bargain and now I simply ask that my Government live up to its part.

Little did I think at the time I enlisted that the Nation for which I volunteered to fight would double-cross me, when the war ended, with some technicality. And a technicality it is, when we fail to recognize a cessation of hostilities now that the war has obviously ended and a formal peace signed by us in the presence of the world.

I and all the others who volunteered are naturally very resentful of the Government's actions, and we won't be quick to forget and forgive as people might think we will be. All we are asking for is a square deal which the United States should be willing to give to us after what we have given to it during these last few years.

By a square deal I mean for the war to be declared officially ended as of September 2, 1945, when the formal signing of the peace took place. That done, the Government should be conscientious in seeing to it that volunteers be released according to the contracts which they signed.

It is quite obvious that this square deal of which I speak is being fought and blocked by certain powerful forces which are high in our National Government. It is obvious that the Navy is reluctant to release its men any faster than they absolutely have to. The Navy point system is evidence of that. It was designed to free as few men as possible without arousing too much indignation. It was designed to keep the young, independent men in the service till the very last minute. The Navy's system of release, compared to the Army's, is ridiculous, and yet they are getting away with it without much trouble. Why can't the Navy be honest with its men and with the people of the United States by telling just exactly what it has in mind for its young men? The Army has at least told its men that if they have 2 years or more service they can plan on being released by March. Why can't the Navy do the same? I believe we both know the reasons, and they should be corrected at once.

No doubt, you have received a number of letters of this type, and I certainly hope that you will soon be successful in helping us fellows out who are stuck because we have no dependents and because our Government is reluctant to admit that the war has ended, regardless of the fact that it obviously has.

To me, dependents are not the only important obligations a man can have. Those of us who are still young have obligations to ourselves. We must be allowed to continue where we left off in school, for one thing. That alone is an important obligation both to ourselves and to society.

I am glad, as I said before, that you understand all these problems of ours and all your efforts are most gratefully received and deeply appreciated by those of us who have served.

Sincerely yours,

MEMBER, UNITED STATES NAVY NOW SERVING IN SHANGHAI.

Lithuanian-American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in introducing a series of resolutions today I bring to the attention of Congress and the Nation and the world at large these expressions of free Americans concerning the fate of the beloved lands of their ancestors. These expressions amount to a declaration of policy with special reference to Lithuania and are on a par with like expressions of freedom-loving people down through the centuries. Seldom do the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD resound with words such as these sounding a clarion call to breathe life into the words of "the four freedoms" and declaring the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as the inalienable rights of the oppressed people of Lithuania and the brave citizens of the little nations all the world-wide over. With a sublime faith in Almighty God and trust and confidence that justice will prevail, Mr. Speaker, I present to the Congress the following remarks and resolutions made at the American-Lithuanian Congress in Chicago:

ADDRESS OF ARCHBISHOP SAMUEL A. STRITCH OF CHICAGO

Mr. Chairman, the Congressman, reverend fathers, and my dear friends, I want to thank you for the good wishes you gave me today as I celebrate the ending of the twenty-fourth year of my consecration as bishop. In these good wishes I sense the spirit of this gathering and the fine things that brought you together.

If there was not something fine in you, if there was not in your a love most real and binding for freedom you would not be here.

All of us who have an interest in taking part in this session today place Lithuania as a symbol in this modern troubled world, the world of Christian civilization.

It took a great many centuries to build this civilization. And in it are a few ideas which are fundamental. First is that all men have a cast, a personality of their own, and certain innate rights. The second is that all men came together in the great family and brotherhood of men left by Him who died for us on the cross. We took these two concepts and built upon them. There have been mistakes made in the history of the west. Grave mistakes. But never before have we seen in history an attempt made to destroy the rights of man. There have been tyrants but they have kept up a respect of human nature and of its rights.

We Americans are troubled, for we see a renewal of struggles which have tortured Lithuania throughout its history.

Lithuania decided long centuries ago to become a part of the West and not a part of the East. And in its literature and in its art it is that of the West and not that of the East.

Just a few years ago, it seems, it had achieved the struggle it had been carrying on for centuries and had set itself up as a sovereign state. It was not big, as there were not a great many people. It was not a rich state. It was a state in which the Lithuanian people had a personality.

And they have developed that personality. Anyone familiar with their contributions to art and the things they have done for European and western history, has the knowledge that Lithuania has its own personality and the right for sovereignty and independence.

Our late President voiced this conviction when he planned the peace program. Clearly he said, "You have no right to destroy the personality of man and no right to destroy the personality of a people." We have seen time and time again in history that the work of tyrants might have succeeded but never succeeded in crushing the personality of a people.

The Lithuanian people have contributed to the variety of our culture.

When we look on what they have done in their own and other languages, we must admit that we would be poorer in our culture if there had not been this contribution of the Lithuanian people.

There are smaller countries than Lithuania. Who of us thinks of going down and destroying Puerto Rico?

Who thinks of robbing Cuba of its independence because it happens to be off our shores?

Lithuania took its place as a free state in a family of nations in the belief that all nations should live in unity. Its own political make-up was democracy. It wanted to respect the dignity of its citizens. It called upon its citizens to unite in the family of nations for its own common good and for the good of the world. It had reason in history to feel aggrieved. In its history there had been injustices done, but it had resolved to throw off all violence and to show that though their nation was small, the Lithuanians could do mighty things.

In 1920 Lithuania entered into a treaty with Russia, and Russia acknowledged Lithuania's independence. Again in 1926 it entered into a nonaggression pact with Russia wherein Russia assured the independence of Lithuania. When the Russians first came into Lithuania they voiced such assurances, but they enforced slavery on the people. When they came again, again they enforced their tyranny.

They did not keep the heritage of the Lithuanian people. They set up a puppet government and made that puppet voice Russian sympathies but not the sympathies of the Lithuanian people. And so we have before our eyes today a very queer situation.

Our country recognizes Lithuania. Lithuanian, Estonian, and Latvian representatives are still functioning. But, on the other hand, there has been an aggression made and, in fact, Lithuania is occupied by the Russians who are claiming it to be a part of their territory.

This claim is not based on any just right. There is no reason which can justify the deprivation of this country of its independence and its government.

We are here today to revive in our resolutions the hope that in some marvelous way the chain of enslavement will be broken and Lithuania will regain her full freedom. But if in chains she must endure hardships for a while, she will endure it with a heart that loves freedom, and she will never surrender her rights. And she will be glorious in her chains.

No; all of us have reached the same conclusion: we want Lithuania to be free and the Baltic states to be free. We have cast aside unworthy intentions which were manipulated by the Communist group in Lithuania.

These Lithuanian people are Christian Catholics and contributed much in sanctity to the church. In their days of trouble they showed that they never tried to sever religion from their culture and they are brothers of the human race as well as brothers in the house of the church.

My mind is troubled by the sufferings which have come to the Lithuanians. I know perhaps better than most about how many members of Lithuania were forced out into exile and how many found their way in the countries of Europe. They are in these countries today and there is a power proclaiming that they should return to their homes. For what? These refugees have a right to demand our protection, and should not be forced to return to suffering and danger and death. One of the instant things which demands the attention of the champions of democracy today is to declare a rightful haven for the homeless exiles in Europe and Asia who are being forced to return to their homes.

Fortunately at this time we bring relief to these depressed Lithuanians in Europe and in parts of Asia. We are allowed to protect many of them. We are allowed to do what we can for them and I want to assure you that the bishops' council and war relief of the National Catholic Council is doing its utmost to serve in every way these suffering people. Just recently they made a very generous grant.

It has watched this work. And while, of course, it realizes its own direct responsibility in doing what it can do, it rejoices that you are joining with them in trying to bring relief to those suffering whose hearts are crushed by the tribulations heaped upon them.

If we could only get a hand of relief into Lithuania. There is a black-out which obscures assistance. We cannot enter to relieve this suffering. So we are praying—praying not only that we may have funds, but that we can take care of those whom we are not permitted to take care of, and be permitted to enter and aid these suffering peoples of Europe.

Whatever be the political situations, the immediate thing to be done is to try to take care of the suffering and try to see if we can protect human rights of little children.

I am very glad that you gathered here in Chicago for this convention. These days will go down in the history of Chicago. You who love freedom came here to find a way to help Lithuania, and the Baltic states. And you came here with sympathy for Poland, for in both countries things have happened and are still happening. You have sympathy for all who are oppressed. You love this land under the Stars and Stripes because it stands for freedom and for the vow that no government may put it upon itself to infringe upon the freedom of another. Because it is a great democracy and democracy is Christian—you love this country. I pray that your resolves come true. May Lithuania be out of its difficulties and sufferings soon. Lithuania is true to its God, it has proved true to its ideas and believes in freedom. The great God in heaven will aid it.

ADDRESS OF HON. DWIGHT H. GREEN, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

I am indeed happy to be here tonight to welcome to Illinois the visiting delegates to the Lithuanian-American congress and to congratulate the Lithuanian-Americans of Chicago on their devotion to the land of their fathers and their definite contribution to the progress of our own city, State, and Nation.

It is fitting that this congress should be held in Chicago because for a generation Chicago has been the center of activity in America for the advancement of Lithuanian culture, Lithuanian freedom, and the welfare of our American citizens of Lithuanian origin. It is significant that the president of the Lithuanian American Council, Inc., under whose auspices this congress is held, Mr. Leonard Simutis, and its secretary, Dr. Pius Grigaitis, are Chicagoans. The fact that they are editors of competing newspapers, and that they represent different points of view, indicates the solidarity of your people in working for the common good, and demonstrates that you have truly caught the spirit of tolerance and cooperation which always has been the strength of our America.

I am familiar with the long and aggressive campaign which the Lithuanian-Americans of Chicago have waged to call the attention of all Americans to the struggle for liberty in their homeland.

I have no sympathy with the attitude of some Americans, who have enjoyed the blessings of our freedom so long that they have forgotten that the ancestors of all of us once were immigrants, who sometimes doubt if a man can be loyal both to the land of his birth or his fathers and to the country of his adoption. To me it is as simple as for a man to be loyal to his father and mother and still be a good husband and father at his own fireside.

Nor am I impressed by the statement we hear often these days that since the United States has proclaimed and enforced the Monroe Doctrine in this hemisphere for more than a century, we must permit the powerful neighbors of the Baltic States to control the destinies of those peoples. No man can read history, or even the current newspapers, without appreciating the difference between the protective interest we have taken in all the American Republics and the predatory interest of the European powers in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. While we have guaranteed for our neighbors the opportunity for the full development of their free governments, their natural resources, and their culture, "protection" in Europe has meant the suppression of free institutions, of national cultures, customs, and languages, the exploitation and confiscation of economic resources, and wave after wave of invasions marked by murder, rape, and destruction.

Against that sort of protection the conscience of America always will protest. And America will be false to the ideals of liberty of the founders of this Nation, if we silently condone the crimes being perpetrated today against the peoples of the small nations of Europe and against the subject peoples of Asia.

America does not wish to dictate to the nations of the world. Certainly, we do not intend to use our tremendous military power to enforce any American meddling in the affairs of large or small nations. Yet the tremendous victory we have won in this war has placed us in a position of great influence throughout the world—an influence which we can and should use to advance justice and liberty everywhere. The American people expect the leaders of their Government and their diplomatic representatives to be guided by these high principles in their consideration of the forgiveness of lend-lease, the making of future loans, and in all our foreign relations.

From the record of events both before and since the end of hostilities, it is clear that we are not doing so. The fine words of the Atlantic Charter, of two Presidents and their Secretaries of State, are mocked by the meek subservience with which we have yielded to the imperial ambitions of our various allies.

This is particularly true in the case of Lithuania. The influence of American opinion was largely responsible for the world's recognition after the First World War of the independence of Lithuania which had been proclaimed on February 16, 1918, and which Lithuania had successfully defended on the field of battle. The American recognition of the Government established under that declaration in July 1922 has never been withdrawn. The sovereign rights of a free Lithuania were repeatedly recognized in solemn treaties executed by the Soviet Government.

The United States Government still recognizes the Lithuanian Minister to the United States. It has never approved the puppet government set up by force by the Soviet Union. Yet it has failed to make any effective protest against the crushing of liberty, the mass executions, the exiles to Siberia, the interference with Lithuanian churchmen, and the manifold indignities and sufferings inflicted upon the men and women of Lithuania. It is small wonder that a Senator from Indiana and a Congressman from Illinois each have introduced resolutions in Congress calling upon our State Department to force a consideration of the plight of Lithuania by the Council of Foreign Ministers in London. If the Congress truly represents the spirit and will of the American people, I am confident those resolutions will be speedily and overwhelmingly adopted.

Time does not permit me to review in detail the long struggle for freedom of the Lithuanian people. The spark of freedom kept alive through centuries of oppression will not be destroyed by the setbacks of these days. Their current tragedies have taught the peoples of all the Baltic states the necessity of composing their own differences and

cooperation for their common liberation. They have learned the lesson which Benjamin Franklin taught the people of the new American States when he told them in the Continental Congress, "We must hang together, or we shall be all hanged separately."

With such cooperation, both in their own lands and among their friends in America, and with truth and justice on your side, I am confident that Lithuania again will be free. In recent years it has been my privilege to proclaim the anniversary of the Lithuanian declaration of independence, February 16, as Lithuanian Independence Day. I trust that before the next observance of that occasion there will be new hope for the land that you love, new proof that the force of America is behind your prayers and your hopes.

Meanwhile all of us should be reminded from the fate of Lithuania and every other country where freedom has suffered in our day that we must vigorously defend our own country and its free institutions. We in America must be prepared to defend our liberties from attack from within or without our borders. We must maintain the military and naval supremacy, both in numbers and in our scientific weapons of modern warfare, which now renders us impregnable.

The godless philosophies which flourished on the continent of Europe and brought so much suffering to your kinsmen have spread through the world. In one form or another there are manifestations of them in our own United States. They will not flourish here if we are alert to the perils which they present to our freedom of religion, our system of individual opportunity, our sound American prosperity.

I know that the Lithuanian-Americans, with their deep devotion to their churches, their appreciation of their opportunity here by their own efforts to advance themselves and their children, their loyalty to their community and their country, will be a strong bulwark in the defense of our liberties. They will stand firm with all good Americans for the preservation of the American system under which they have prospered and under which they hope their sons, who have made such a glorious contribution to our country's victory, will achieve new progress and greater happiness. They will keep America tomorrow as it was yesterday and is today—the last great hope of freemen everywhere.

POLICY DECLARATIONS AND RESOLUTIONS

I. RECONSTITUTION OF LITHUANIA

To Foreign Relations Committees of the United States Congress:

The Lithuanian-American Congress, representing by duly elected delegates the preponderant majority of Americans of Lithuanian extraction or descent, jointly and severally, reiterates its membership's unequivocal belief in the inalienable rights of men and nations, in the principle of equality of men and races, in the right of peoples to pursue individual happiness and to develop their creative talents in freedom under a representative democratic form of government, for all nations capable of self-government, and in the war aims proclaimed by our country, based on the Wilsonian principle of national self-determination, the Rooseveltian Atlantic Charter and "four freedoms," and President Truman's "12 points."

Being particularly concerned with the destiny of Lithuania, the country of our ancestors, and realizing that the people of Lithuania desire nothing that is not rightfully theirs, this congress takes cognizance of—

(a) The ethnic, cultural, and linguistic individuality and the political traditions of the Lithuanian people.

(b) The ancient Lithuanian statehood dating back to the year 1200 A. D., its splendid historical record of tolerance; of individual, racial, linguistic, and cultural liberty; its progressive jurisprudence and ways of administration perpetuated in historical reminiscences of the liberal Lithuanian rule among the Latvian, White Ruthene, Ukrainian, Jewish, and Tatar nationalties.

(c) The most progressive and beneficial Lithuanian leadership in the educational and political reforms of the last quarter of the eighteenth century, just before the final partition of the Commonwealth of Poland and Lithuania in 1795.

(d) The long, unceasing, and determined struggle of the Lithuanian people against the foreign—Muscovite and German—domination and oppression; the heroic sacrifices of each succeeding generation of the Lithuanian people in the great mass insurrections of 1794–95, 1812, 1863–64, 1905, 1918–20, and the epic Lithuanian fight for basic human rights, for human dignity, for the freedom of the press and of the printed Lithuanian word during the 40-year suppression of all Lithuanian literary activities, 1864–1904.

(e) The proclamation of independence by the people of Lithuania on February 16, 1918; the unequal heroic struggle against several rapacious neighbors of Lithuania; the victory of the people in the general, direct, untrammeled elections by secret ballot in April 1920 to a constituent assembly based on proportionate representation; and the democratic constitution framed by the Lithuanian people's representatives for a progressive democratic nation of western Christian outlook and of liberal populist traditions in administration.

(f) The admirable progress in democratic self-government, economic and cultural advancement; the consistent adherence to the rule of reason, of justice, and of law in international relations; cooperation in the peace machinery devised by the League of Nations; and of the scrupulous performance of all international obligations by the Republic of Lithuanian in the years 1918–40.

(g) The imposition by the Soviet Union—by threat of superior force and in connivance with Nazi German war criminals now being tried by an international tribunal at Nuremberg—of a "mutual assistance pact" on October 10, 1939, whereby Lithuania granted and leased to the Soviet Union military bases in the strategic centers of Lithuania in exchange for a solemn Russian guaranty of the independence of Lithuanian and of Russian noninterference in the domestic, political, social, and economic order of the country.

(h) The subsequent violation by the Soviet Union of all treaties—the peace pact, the nonaggression pact, and the mutual assistance pact with a guaranty of the political independence and noninterference in domestic affairs—then and now in force between the Soviet Union and the sovereign Republic of Lithuania.

(i) The Soviet policy of lawlessness, terror, intimidation, economic impoverishment, nationalization, sovietization, oppression, persecution, mass arrests, mass executions, and mass deportations which caused, within 1 year of the Soviet occupation, immeasurable losses in manpower and of economic and cultural wealth in Lithuania.

(j) The condemnation by the Government of the United States in a statement by the Department of State on July 23, 1940, of the deliberate attempt by the Soviet Union to annihilate by devious processes and predatory activities the political independence and territorial integrity of the Republic of Lithuania and the northern Baltic States—Latvia and Estonia.

(k) The universal insurrection of the people of Lithuania against all foreign domination and enslavement in June 1941; the restitution of the political independence of Luthuania under a provisional coalition government, and its dissolution by Nazi Germany in August 1941.

(l) The Atlantic Charter declaration of August 1941 by the President of the United States and Prime Minister of Great Britain, holding out a promise of the restoration of sovereignty to the peoples forcibly deprived of same, and the subsequent embodiment of the Atlantic Charter as a part of the declaration by the United Nations, including the Soviet Union, on January 1, 1942.

(m) The effective Lithuanian underground liberation struggle during the 3 years of German occupation and continuing to this date, directed against Nazi and Soviet attempts to annihilate Lithuania as a sovereign nation and for a restoration of fundamental human rights and political independence, under a unified supreme Lithuanian committee of liberation which, since August 1941, proclaimed to the people that its fight for the Allied cause and the liberation of Lithuania and its good Baltic neighbors is being waged in full confidence in fulfillment of the Atlantic Charter.

(n) The present second occupation of Lithuania by the armed forces of the Soviet Union and the imposition of a puppet Soviet regime maintained solely and exclusively by the bayonets of the Red Army and NKVD troops; a continuing Soviet rapacity, imperialism, and refusal to honor its peace, nonaggression, and friendship pacts with Lithuania in spite of the solemn Russian underwriting of the Atlantic Charter, the Moscow Declaration, and the Yalta Declaration to liberated European peoples.

(o) The reiteration of the American policy of nonrecognition of the Soviet attempt to annihilate the independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, voiced by the Department of State in March 1945.

(p) President Harry S. Truman's 12-point policy enunciated in his recent Navy Day speech.

(r) The equally excellent record in democratic self-government; cultural and economic advancement, scrupulous cooperation in the League of Nations peace machinery, the strict observance of all international treaty obligations, and the good neighborhood policies of the peoples of the Republics of Latvia and Estonia.

(s) The continuing guerilla fight and underground resistance of the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia striving for their liberation and for fulfillment of the many promises made in behalf of the United Nations and Big Three powers; and finally

(t) The unsurpassed American contribution to the victory over fascism, achieved at high cost in human lives and suffering, in great material destruction, and the decisive American lend-lease aid to the fighting United Nations.

Wherefore the Lithuanian American Congress pledges its full moral support to the people of Lithuania striving for a liberation from enslavement by any foreign power and for a restoration of the full political independence and democratic self-government of their country, in a free world promised by the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations Organization.

The Lithuanian-American Congress calls upon the Government of the United States to implement its wartime policy declarations by the active exercise of its good offices in initiating immediate measures to induce Russia to honor the Soviet Government's endorsement of the Atlantic Charter, the Moscow Declaration, and the Yalta Declaration to liberated European peoples, and to withdraw the Soviet armed forces, police, administrative, and Communist Party apparatus from the territories of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

The Lithuanian-American Congress calls upon the great powers that had subscribed the Yalta declaration to liberated European peoples to fulfill all of their jointly made promises to liberated European peoples, certainly including among them the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; to create conditions enabling the formation of broadly representative interim governments of Lith-

uania, Latvia, and Estonia; to repatriate Baltic deportees from their Siberian and northern Russian exile, under the supervision of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration; to provide for an orderly, noncompulsory repatriation of displaced Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians from western Europe, after the evacuation of the Russian troops, police, and Communist Party apparatus from the territories of the Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; thereafter to hold free and untrammeled general elections, under impartial United Nations supervision, with the effective full participation of the United States, and under conditions of complete uncensored freedom of the radio, press, campaigning, assembly, speech, and reporting, thus helping the sovereign peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia to restore their democratic self-governments after the harrowing experiences of three successive hostile occupations.

The Lithuanian-American Congress also calls upon the Government of the United States to initiate the move for an immediate admission of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, still full-fledged members of the League of Nations, into the United Nations Organization.

Finally, the Lithuanian-American Congress requests the Government to arrange immediately, prior to resumption of actual self-government, for admission, directly into the Baltic states, of the American press, the Red Cross, welfare organizations, and the American staff of UNRRA.

The membership of the organizations affiliated in the Lithuanian-American Congress will spare no effort until the above-stated objectives shall have been fulfilled, and the honor and spirit of the United Nations shall have been preserved by effecting the promises made to American men and women of the armed forces, to the American people, and the world at large.

II. TRIBUTE TO HUMANITARIANS

To the Foreign Relations Committees of the United States Congress:

The Lithuanian-American Congress was deeply moved by the wave of humanitarian response to the desperate call for help from 167 Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian internees, who, having been forcibly inducted in the German armed forces in violation of international law governing the conduct of a military occupant, used the first opportunity to flee to neutral Sweden to seek a haven from oppression and subjugation.

When it became known that the Swedish Government, inclined to treat these Baltic political refugees as ordinary interned prisoners of war of a belligerent country, accepted a Russian demand to surrender the Baltic citizens along with the German internees on conclusion of the hostilities of war—the Swedish people were the first to demand that the Baltic internees be treated as political refugees rather than face an almost certain death at the hands of the Soviet oppressors of the home countries of the internees. The spontaneous wave of sympathy for these victims of war and aggression spread throughout Sweden and thence to other democratic countries. In consequence of this great pressure of domestic and international public opinion, the Government of Sweden is reconsidering its former decision.

The Lithuanian-American Congress pays greatest respect and gratitude to His Holiness Pope Pius XII, His Majesty Gustav V King of Sweden, the Protestant bishops and delegates of the Evangelical Church of Sweden, Archbishop of Canterbury of England, the great liberty-loving Swedish masses and their free press for their humanitarian intervention.

Lithuanian-Americans are also grateful to the great American press agencies and newspapers, United States Senators and Representatives, and to the many churchmen, organizations, and individuals for their spontaneous response and action for the preservation of the right of asylum for political refugees.

Respect for the inalienable rights of man survives in the western democracies, as is shown by the humanitarian intervention in Sweden, the United States, England, Vatican City and Switzerland in this instance of saving the 167 human beings whose lives were jeopardized in consequence of Nazi lawlessness.

III. PRESERVATION OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

To Committee on Un-American Activities:

The Lithuanian-American Congress joins other patriotic Americans in a solemn warning against the systematic infiltration of subversive elements, under deceptive labels of promotion of pseudo "democratic" causes, into Government offices, in institutions of learning, in forums of discussion of domestic and international problems, in the motion-picture industry, and into labor organizations.

The insidious propaganda, actively sponsored and directed by an extensive network of disguised agents, is slowly making inroads into all phases of American political, social, economic, and cultural life. It is undermining the very foundations of the American way of life and is turning many individuals, otherwise fair minded, into blind tools of foreign propaganda, foreign imperialism, and un-Amercan ideas. This evil influence encroaches even upon our educational system, ostensibly under a disguise of "learning to know our friends"—who refuse and have no reciprocal opportunity to learn anything of our democratic ways of life.

The Lithuanian-American Congress calls on the fellow citizens of the great American democracy to be watchful and alert, to nip in the bud the vast plot of poisoning American public opinion, and to safeguard American standards of education and ways of life, particularly the freedom of the radio, press, school teaching, and motion pictures from a slanted and falsified communistic propaganda. Typical of such un-American activities was the recent example of a handful of Communist-minded individuals staging a convention of "democratic" Lithuanian-Americans in Pittsburgh and demanding an abandonment of the Chinese democracy to a foreign domination.

IV. UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

To Foreign Relations Committees of the United States Congress:

The Lithuanian-American Congress welcomes American initiative in forming the United Nations Organization to safeguard world peace.

Nevertheless, it is our considered opinion that the Government of the United States, in cooperation with the Governments of Great Britain and British Dominions, should immediately initiate an amendment to the United Nations Organization Charter to abolish the veto power of any one of the great states and to return to the principle of sovereign equality of all nations, large and small, by applying the majority rule in the Assembly.

The veto power, particularly when reserved by an imperialistic state isolating itself from all outside intelligence and control, and building up a set of satellite states completely dominated by a single political party, controlled by such state, would only tend to promote lawlessness and aggression and to perpetuate the fruits of aggression by such state at the cost of subjugation of its weaker neighbors. The malignity of such veto power is particularly illustrated by the failure and refusal of the Soviet Union to conform to its many international commitments, to evacuate its armed forces from eastern European and Middle East countries, and to create conditions enabling free and unfettered elections there.

This congress is confident that the American people are prepared to modify the old concepts of sovereignty in order to preserve civilization in this age of atomic energy. For the sake of survival of our civilization, there should be no way open for sabotage of the United Nations Organization by any veto-minded power.

V. MILITARY PREPAREDNESS

To Committee on Military Affairs:

In the present stage of world affairs, the United States must retain its full armed might to carry out our country's commitments to liberated peoples and in behalf of the world order for which our sons had fought.

Firmly trusting the expert opinion of our military and naval leaders, the Lithuanian-American Congress urges the people's representatives in both Houses of Congress of the United States to enact legislation for military preparedness, in accordance with the program promulgated by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower and other experts entrusted with planning our country's defense programs.

VI. TRIBUTE TO AMERICAN PRESS

The Lithuanian-American Congress gratefully acknowledges the fairness of the preponderant majority of the American press in reporting world events, the plight and aspirations of the subjugated freemen of the world, the conduct of the various occupying forces, and the situation of displaced persons and political refugees in liberated western European and far-eastern countries.

The fair attitude of the American press and its foreign correspondents enabled the American people to form intelligent and unbiased opinions on world events and on the problems of peace settlement on the basis of the solemn wartime promises repeatedly made by our Government and by the United Nations—in a free world, under a rule of reason, of justice, and of law in international relations.

The freedom of the press and fairness in reporting salient news in an uncontrolled press are two basic promises fortunately blessing the American people in a half-free, half-slave world. The Lithuanian-American Congress voices its firm faith in the American free press and in the continuation of liberal press traditions that bring a ray of hope to subjugated peoples.

VII. DISPLACED PERSONS AND POLITICAL REFUGEES

To Foreign Relations Committees of the United States Congress:

The Lithuanian-American Congress heard with great sympathy and commiseration the reports on the present situation of displaced persons and political refugees in Europe. Several phases of their treatment were closely studied and a considerable improvement in the condition of the unrepatriable Baltic and other political refugees is noted with satisfaction.

This Congress voices its gratitude to Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower and his staff at Frankfurt, to State and War Department officials promulgating the humane policies concerning the treatment of displaced Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Jews, and other political refugees, and to the Honorable Herbert H. Lehman and his staff for their untiring efforts, in behalf of UNRRA, on the policy-making level and in many instances on the field operational level, to improve the hard lot of these victims of war, aggression and racial prejudice.

The Lithuanian-American Congress expresses its firm confidence that the Department of State, that Army authorities and the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation

Administration will solve the pressing problems of refugee life and will improve postal and other communications facilities for the unrepatriable Baltic and other political refugees.

Liberation of their home countries, remains however, the paramount problem demanding United Nations Organization's action.

VIII. A TRIBUTE TO FRIENDS OF LITHUANIA

To Foreign Relations Committees of the United States Congress:

The Lithuanian-American Congress pays its tribute to the governments and peoples of the countries continuing to recognize the de jure independence of the sovereign Republic of Lithuania, to wit: The United States of America, the Vatican, the United Kingdom, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, El Salvador, Spain, Syria, Turkey, the Union of South Africa, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

In full realization that all of the sovereign states of the free world, with the sole exception of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, are in fact friends of the Baltic States, the Lithuanian-American Congress pays its special tribute of appreciation to the Governments and peoples of the above-named countries for their active or moral support of the aspirations of the temporarily subjugated freemen of Lithuania.

The executive officers of the Lithuanian-American Congress are hereby delegated to transmit this resolution to the accredited representatives of the said countries at Washington, D. C.

IX. BALTIC ENTENTE

Recalling the long historical record of friendly coexistence, side by side, of the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and the common plight and aspirations of the three Baltic peoples, the Lithuanian-American Congress pledges its full moral support of the common struggle for freedom and independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Lithuanian Americans are proud of the exemplary record of good neighborliness of the Baltic Entente interrupted so abruptly by World War II. Mutual ties of friendship have been strengthened in fact by the experience of foreign occupation common to all three good Baltic neighbors and by their underground fight for a common cause of freedom.

The Lithuanian-American Congress is confident that the United Nations Organization, under the moral leadership and initiative of the Anglo-American democracies, shall soon re-create conditions enabling the Baltic peoples to resume their places as sovereign democratic states in a world community of freemen.

X. GERMAN WAR CRIMINALS

To Foreign Relations Committees and Judiciary Committees of the United States Congress:

The Lithuanian-American Congress notes with satisfaction that some of the war criminals are brought to trial for their crimes.

Nevertheless, the Lithuanian-American Congress finds it necessary to call the Government's attention to the fact that the indictment against top Nazi criminals now being tried at Nuremberg omits the crimes committed by them against the independence, security, and territorial integrity of the Republic of Lithuania.

In 1935 the Government of Lithuania had prosecuted Dr. Neumann, Von Sass, and other Nazis of the Klaiped-Memel district for terroristic acts and plotting to separate the Klaipeda territory from Lithuania. The trial brought into the open the fact that these acts were directed from Berlin by Nazi Party officials and the German Government.

Furthermore, in March 1939 the German Government, acting through Joachim Ribbentrop, its Foreign Affairs Minister, forced the Government of Lithuania, by threats of use of superior forces amassed on the German-Lithuanian frontier, to cede the Klaipeda district to Germany. Simultaneously, Germany signed a guaranty of territorial security of Lithuania minus the forcibly seized district of Klaipeda.

Finally, in August and September 1939, Germany violated this guaranty by signing two pacts with the Government of the Soviet Union, whereby the Baltic states and Poland were divided into Russian and German spheres of influence, in effect attempting to annihilate the political independence of these countries.

Wherefore, the Lithuanian American Congress requests the Government of the United States to move that the indictment against Ribbentrop and other German war criminals be supplemented with three additional charges of acts of aggression, to wit:

1. Plotting against the orderly Government and territorial integrity of Lithuania in 1935;

2. Forcible seizure of the Klaipeda district from Lithuania in March 1939; and

3. Violation of the sovereignty of the Baltic states in August and September 1939 in a bilateral plot to annihilate the political independence of Lithuania and other Baltic states.

XI. INTERNATIONAL TRIAL OF NON-AXIS WAR CRIMINALS

To Foreign Relations Committees of the United States Congress:

The Lithuanian-American Congress expresses satisfaction that one set of war criminals of World War II is brought before the bar of international justice, wherein the representatives of the Russian people are sitting in judgment on German war criminals for the crimes committed against non-German countries and peoples, including the Russian people.

The charter of the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg defines certain crimes: conspiracy and crimes against peace, war crimes, and crimes against humanity.

However, the Lithuanian-American Congress calls the attention of the American people to the fact that no provision has been made thus far to bring to justice non-Axis war criminals for their multitude of crimes committed against world peace and civilian populations of the occupied countries.

It is a generally known fact that the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics acting through Vyacheslav Molotov, Premier and Foreign Affairs Commissar, plotted with the German Government represented by Joachim Ribbentrop and other German officials to commit crimes against peace in violation of international treaties, agreements, or assurances in the development and course of the common plan or conspiracy against many eastern European countries including Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, in August and September 1939. Thereafter, in the course of the German-Russian conspiracy, the Government of the Soviet Union invaded by armed forces the territories of Poland and by threatening the use of Soviet armed might, forced the governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia to accept in October 1939 the so-called mutual assistance pacts investing Russian armed forces into the Baltic States, under a "solemn Russian guaranty" of respect for the sovereignty of those countries and their domestic, political, social, and economic systems. This step was thereafter followed by a war of aggression by the Soviet Union against Finland and installation of a puppet regime of Otto Kuusinen to replace the legitimate Government of Finland. These actions of the Soviet Government clearly fall within the definition of count 1, of the crimes against peace of the Nuermberg tribunal.

In June 1940, when the British evacuated Dunkerque and the Germans already had overrun the lowlands and France, the Government of the Soviet Union acting through Foreign Affairs Commissar Vyacheslav Molotov, served ultimata on the Governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and by investing the masses of Russian armies and naval forces, forcibly seized the Baltic States, destroyed the legitimate Governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and imposed puppet regimes not representative of the peoples concerned in violation of international treaties and the domestic laws of said countries.

Thereafter, in pursuing the policy of conspiracy against the political independence and territorial integrity, and in violation of the existing treaties, agreements and assurances, the Russian conspirators initiated and carried out farcical elections. The conspirators greatly enlarged existing Communist Party organizations, established a network of new state and party organizations and "coordinated" the state agencies with the result that the life of the Baltic peoples was dominated by Communist doctrine and practice, such as that the leadership of the Communist Party, as the sole bearer of the Soviet doctrines, was entitled to shape the structure, policies, and practices of the Baltic states and all related institutions, to direct and supervise the activities of all individuals within the state and to destroy all opponents. The conspirators established and extended a system of terror against opponents and supposed suspected opponents of the alien regime. They imprisoned such persons without judicial process and subjected them to persecution, degradation, despoilment, enslavement, torture, and murder. The conspirators destroyed the free trade unions by confiscating their funds and properties, persecuting their leaders, prohibiting their activities and supplanting them by an affiliated party organization. The conspirators promoted beliefs and practices incompatible with Christian teaching, sought to subvert the influence of the churches over the people, expelled the teaching of religion from all schools, and reshaped the educational system and particularly the education and training of Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian youths, on a progressively militarized footing and for the object of maintaining a dictatorship of one single Communist Party. They deprived labor and all populations of their rights of free industrial and political association.

Thereafter, the Russian conspirators reduced the diets of the Baltic States to bodies of their own nominees and curtailed the freedom of popular elections throughout the occupied territories of the Baltic States and Poland. The conspirators methodically and pursuant to plan endeavored to assimilate the occupied Baltic territories politically, culturally, socially, and economically into the Soviet Union and endeavored to obliterate the former national character of these territories. In pursuance of these plans and endeavors, the Russian conspirators forcibly deported inhabitants who were predominantly non-Russian and introduced thousands of Russian colonists. This plan included economic domination, physical conquest, installation of puppet governments, purported de jure annexation, and enforced conscription into the Soviet armed forces. In November 1940, the People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs of the Soviet Union issued, at Moscow, an executive order, No. 001223, directing the listing of all "anti-Soviet elements in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia." Thereafter, when the lists were compiled, one Serov, Deputy People's Commissar of Public Security (NKGB) of the U. S. S. R., issued detailed instructions regarding the manner of deportation of "the anti-Soviet elements from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia."

In consequence of these orders from Moscow, in execution of a common plan and conspiracy to commit crimes against humanity, hundreds of thousands of innocent people were detained, tortured, murdered, particularly in June 1941, or deported into the interior of the U. S. S. R. from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Masses of people were massacred, as in example at Proveniskis and Telsiai in Lithuania. Murders and ill treatment were carried out by divers means, including shooting, bayoneting, clubbing, hanging, starvation, gross overcrowding, systematic undernutrition, systematic imposition of labor tasks beyond the strength of those ordered to carry them out, inadequate provision of surgical and medical services, kickings, beatings, brutality, and torture of all kinds, systematic verbal abuse, denial of the right to correspond with relatives, and isolation from all contacts with families and relief organizations. In some cases, the victims were American citizens whose citizenship was arbitrarily denied by the Soviet authorities.

All these crimes are clearly within the definition of crimes against peace and humanity as defined by the charter of the International Military Tribunal for the trial and punishment of the major criminals of the European Axis countries.

The armed forces of the Soviet Union once more occupied the Baltic States in the summer and fall of 1944, and in the spring of 1945. Ignoring the obligations of the Atlantic Charter and declaration to liberated European peoples, subscribed to by the Government of the Soviet Union, the Soviet authorities again imposed a terroristic puppet regime maintained exclusively by the armed might of Russia. All freedoms, all basic human rights are once more suppressed. The policy of mass terror, mass executions, and mass deportations is once more instituted. Baltic men and women have been and continue to be forcibly drafted into the Red Army, Red Fleet, and labor battalions, and shipped outside of their home countries. Atrocities have been and are being committed by the Red Army and NKVD troops with exceptional brutality in disregard of all humane standards. Russification and communization of the Baltic countries is proceeding apace, including the bringing in of the masses of non-Baltic peoples from Russia, to settle in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Postal services, railroads, radio facilities, and all economic organizations are taken over and exploited by Russia and by Russian officials. No American reporters and no American or United Nations relief officials are admitted into the Baltic States. Baltic citizens forcibly inducted, in violation of international law, into the German armed forces, are being treated by the Russian authorities as traitors and peremptorily executed on their surrender. Eight months after the conclusion of hostilities in Europe the Soviet Government maintains a state of siege in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. The countries are ruined economically in consequence of organized plundering of public and private property, expropriations, requisitions, and nationalization by Russian officials. These multiple crimes are being perpetrated by the occupational Russian regime in peace time.

Taking these generally known facts into consideration, the Lithuanian-American Congress petitions the people's representatives in both Houses of Congress of the United States to direct the executive branch of the Government to initiate the measures providing the machinery and uniform standards for trial of all international criminals, regardless of their nationality and regardless of the commission of such crimes in wartime or peacetime, in order to bring to justice Russian and other criminals guilty of crimes against peace, war crimes, and crimes against humanity, either by supplementing and extending the competence of the International Military Tribunal or by enlarging the scope of jurisdiction and venue of the International Court of Justice.

In particular, the Lithuanian-American Congress petitions for additional definition of international crimes by enacting the provisions embracing—

(a) Seizure, by force or by the threat of force, of a territory of another state; and

(b) Initiation and carrying out, under the conditions of a military occupation, of political elections for the purpose of effecting either the change of sovereignty for the benefit of the occupying power and/or imposing a party dictatorship subservient to such occupying power.

LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN COUNCIL,
LEONARD SIMUTIS, *President.*
WILLIAM F. LAUKATIS,
Vice President.
PIUS GRIGAITIS, *Secretary.*
MICHAEL VAIDYLA, *Treasurer.*
RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE,
Rev. JOSEPH VASKAS, *Chairman.*
CONSTANTINE R. JURGELA,
Secretary.

Soil Conservation

REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL STEWART
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, Oklahoma has taken the lead in forming a soil-conservation committee through our Governor by inviting all of the governors of the 48 States to participate in a move for larger representation groups of farmers and the governors to come to Washington on the 10th of January in an effort to convince Congress that the surplus machinery of the Army and the Navy should be turned over to the soil-conservation districts of the various States as a grant. I trust that each Member will give of his time and read the letter I received from Mr. Deering, editor of the Farmer Stockman, bearing on this subject, and a news item appearing in last Sunday's Daily Oklahoman, Farmers Plan Capital March January 10 To Demand Relief.

The farmers of the Nation cannot understand why foreign countries can acquire the much-needed machinery in soil conservation without consideration and the failure of Congress to favorably act upon the Poage bill which passed out of the Agricultural Committee several months ago—which is still before the Rules Committee.

This is not our first appearance or effort upon this subject and we favor before a recess for the holidays the Poage bill be reported out and brought to the floor for final passage.

The greatest investment this country can make, is saving what soil we have left.

The letter for Mr. Deering and the article in the Daily Oklahoman are as follows:

FARMERS COMING TO WASHINGTON

THE FARMER-STOCKMAN,
Oklahoma City, Okla., December 10, 1945.

Hon. PAUL STEWART,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STEWART: No doubt you are familiar with the efforts now being made by the Oklahoma State Soil Conservation Board to organize and generate support for the transfer of surplus machinery and equipment to soil-conservation districts for soil-conservation work. I am informed that the Oklahoma congressional delegation has adopted unanimously a resolution supporting this type of legislation, and because of your previously expressed attitude, I am sure that you are willing to do all you can to further the cause of soil conservation.

At the meeting of the board here on last Saturday it was determined that on January 10 a committee headed by the governors of the various States will be asked to assemble in Washington to urge Congress to pass this legislation.

The Oklahoma State Soil Conservation Board, with the assistance of Gov. Robert S. Kerr, has undertaken the job of organizing and enlisting this support in all 48 States. They have had favorable replies from a dozen or so governors already, indicating their willingness to help.

I wonder if there is any possible way of speeding up the legislation on this matter so that it might not be necessary to make this proposed "march on Washington." I know that accommodations are difficult to find and I think no farmer would be disappointed to miss the trip, but farmers are determined to press every opportunity that may assist them in obtaining this machinery.

I would appreciate having suggestions you may have to make which will facilitate our efforts at this end of the road in support of this program.

Very truly yours,
FERDIE DEERING, *Editor.*

[From the Daily Oklahoman of December 9, 1945]

FARMERS PLAN CAPITAL MARCH JANUARY 10 TO DEMAND RELIEF

A farmers' march on Washington January 10 to demand grants of surplus Army and Navy equipment to the soil conservation districts was sought Saturday by the State soil conservation board.

Governor Kerr was asked to take the lead in enlisting governors of the 48 States to head delegations of farmers from their respective States in demanding that Congress make the equipment available for carrying out soil-conservation work, A. F. Houston, Grove, chairman of the board, said.

Houston said the board already has the support of the Governor in its plan for obtaining grants of the surplus equipment suitable for conservation work, and that preliminary letters sent out to States in the southern region have brought favorable replies from 20 States, including Tennessee, Florida, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, West Virginia, Virginia, Arkansas, Louisiana, and North Carolina.

The board will urge the other States to act promptly to prevent the surplus equipment from being disposed of through other channels, Houston said.

C. A. Ramming, executive secretary of the board, said letters supporting the plan to make suitable surplus equipment available to the soil conservation districts have been received from all members of the Oklahoma congressional delegation, and that the Oklahoma delegation met recently in Washington to adopt a resolution in support of the plan.

A committee composed of D. H. Brown, a member of the board; Ramming; Ferdie Deering, editor of the Farmer-Stockman; and

E. B. Smith, in charge of soil-conservation matters for the Oklahoma State Highway Commission, was named Saturday by Houston to organize the march.

The plan is to urge governors of the various States to head delegations of four or five farmers from their respective States with the entire group assembling in Washington to present the appeal for the equipment.

At least three bills making the surplus equipment available for soil-conservation work are now pending in Congress.

Ramming and T. C. Richardson, representing the Farmer-Stockman, attended a meeting of about 50 Texas farmers last week in Waco, Tex., with Congressman W. R. POAGE, of Texas, author of one of the bills, and Ramming said POAGE assured them he will support any of the measures so long as it makes the equipment available to the farmers.

Similar bills also have been introduced by Representative LYLE BOREN, Oklahoma, Democrat, and Senator MCKELLAR, Democrat, Tennessee.

Houston said that the preliminary letters were sent out to States in the southern region only, but he believed the response indicated that most of the States would be represented among the delegation going to Washington in January.

A large amount of surplus Army and Navy equipment suitable for soil-conservation work is now available, Houston said. It should be made directly available to the districts now prepared to make use of it, he asserted.

Proposed Loan to Great Britain

REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the debate yesterday on an appropriation of $75,000 for the Small Business Committee. And I cannot understand why we in the Congress quibble over an appropriation of $75,000 to help small business in America when shortly there will be brought before us a proposal to grant a loan to Britain of $4,400,000,000 to build up and maintain British industry and trade.

I understand from the press reports that the House of Commons opened debate yesterday to determine whether or not they will accept the $4,400,000,000, 50-year, 2-percent loan. Now isn't that something? We may have to send a couple of ambassadors or career men to the British Isles to persuade them to take this money on a long-term credit; but do not worry, they will take it.

Now, I cannot understand why they opened debate as to whether or not they will accept this money when this proposal has never been presented to the Congress to debate whether or not we approve giving this $4,400,000,000 under the terms suggested.

As far as I am concerned, I think that it would be better to take the $4,400,000,000 we are going to give Britain, and that is exactly what we are going to do, and the $6,000,000,000 talked of for Russia and set up the $10,000,000,000 to pay a bonus to the veterans of this war.

Certainly we who represent the American taxpayer are entitled to an opportunity to approve or disapprove of this loan to Britain before the House of Commons should determine whether or not they are going to accept it. I cannot understand why the duly elected representatives of the people are by-passed in the determination of matters of this nature.

We have a $300,000,000,000 debt and to saddle another four to ten billion dollars on the already overburdened backs of the American taxpayers is a matter that we should at least be given an opportunity to pass on. However, the economic and industrial supremacy and trade of the British Isles must be maintained, regardless of the hardships it works on the American people.

In view of the fact there seems to be a question as to whether or not Britain wants to accept this loan under the terms which have been suggested, why not call the whole thing off, and we will not have to get into any world-trade agreements or any other agreement that may eventually cause us trouble. It is about time we started to develop plans to reduce our $300,000,000,000 debt rather than increase it by many billions of dollars.

Everyone thinks Uncle Sam is a rich uncle, whose pockets are inexhaustible. Spend, spend, spend! But mind you, the day is not far distant when the American people will awaken to the complete realization that they will have to, by hard work, produce the money to pay the taxes to pay this bill, and let no one tell you otherwise.

If we keep on spending as we are now doing, ultimately we will go into bankruptcy.

Facing Winter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I include an article, Facing Winter, by Barnet Nover, which appeared in this morning's Washington Post:

FACING WINTER
(By Barnet Nover)
UNRRA AND THE FOUR HORSEMEN

There is a race going on between America's legislative machinery and the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse; and the fate of millions of hungry, homeless, disease-menaced and despairing people in Europe and Asia depends on the outcome.

Congress has just appropriated the final $550,000,000 of this country's original $1,350,000,000 commitment to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. This action is to be commended, particularly since, in its final form, the appropriations bill had no injurious conditions tied to it.

We must recognize, however, that this money is being made available to UNRRA only in the very nick of time. Without these absolutely indispensable funds the machinery of UNRRA would have had to come to an almost complete standstill at a time when, with winter just around the corner, the demands on UNRRA are greater and more pressing than ever.

We must also recognize that the current appropriations while adequate for UNRRA's immediate needs provide no margin for that agency's future operations. In fact, by the end of December, every last dollar of the $550,000,000 just voted to UNRRA by Congress will have been committed.

For that reason it is not only essential that an additional sum of $1,350,000,000 be appropriated but that this appropriation be made available to UNRRA before Congress adjourns for its Christmas recess.

Postponement of such action until after the House and Senate reconvene in January will inevitably lead to a break in UNRRA's supply line. This could have extremely serious consequences for a great many suffering individuals in Europe and Asia.

The point is that between the time an order is placed by UNRRA and the time the supplies thus ordered are placed on board ship an average of 7 weeks elapses.

There is a further and inevitable delay between the loading of such ships and their arrival on the other side. And after those ships have docked at Marseilles or Piraeus or Stettin or Shanghai further time is bound to elapse before the supplies can reach the individuals to whom they may mean all the difference between starvation and at least a minimum of subsistence, between health and disease, between hope and despair, even between life and death.

During recent months UNRRA's shipments have steadily gone up.

In October of this year shipments totaled 520,000 tons. The total went up to 750,000 tons last month, may reach a million tons this month, and go well beyond that figure in January.

But by the middle of February the last of the supplies will be at dockside that are being ordered out of UNRRA's current funds. This means that if, by mid-February there is to be no break in the movement of essential supplies on UNRRA account, orders must be placed now. But UNRRA can place no orders unless and until it has the money to pay for them.

That is why it is so imperative for Congress to act on the second $1,350,000,000 UNRRA appropriation before it recesses. By mid-January or early February it will be too late to undo the damage that will be done by leaving UNRRA's treasury bare during the early weeks of winter.

Since it first began to operate a little more than a year ago the operations of UNRRA have steadily grown in scope as they have increased in efficiency.

UNRRA has more than its share of growing pains. With the military in control in many areas of Europe, UNRRA was forced to operate, at the outset, on a very limited scale.

Furthermore certain political difficulties and differences had to be overcome before UNRRA was invited in to take over the relief efforts needed in countries, such as Poland and Yugoslavia, where the needs were greatest. And to make matters worse, great difficulties stood in the way of UNRRA's recruitment of personnel at a time when so many of the people vest trained for the tasks UNRRA had to do were still in uniform.

Most of these difficulties have since been overcome. More and more of the relief job which the Allied armies themselves did at one time and still do in some areas have been turned over to UNRRA. The organization is now faced with the request that it take over in Austria and Italy.

But all this means that UNRRA's efforts cannot be subject to any interruption such

as would occur in the event of any postponement of the $1,350,000,000 appropriation bill now up before Congress. The House has passed the authorization. The Senate still has that job to do. And both Houses have as yet to act on the actual appropriation bill.

If we are not to be remiss in our obligations, this money must be made available, and promptly. Speed is of the essence.

Henry Morgenthau, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the Honorable Henry Morgenthau, Jr., former Secretary of the Treasury, before the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio, December 8, 1945:

I am sure all of you must be as greatly disturbed as I have been by the fearsomely slow development of our national policy in dealing with Germany. Five months have passed since the Potsdam Declaration gave us the blueprint to be followed. The real, solid accomplishments in building from that blueprint have been pitifully small. In the most important fields, nothing has happened.

Yet, if we cannot carry out this relatively simple program, there is little chance that we can go on to build a permanent peace. Our course in Germany has been more thoroughly considered than some of the other problems of peace. We have agreement, signed and sealed, on all the vital aspects of the program except Germany's western border and the future of the Ruhr. On that basis, it only remains for the Allies to sit down and do business with each other. If the occupying authorities cannot agree, the foreign ministers should roll up their sleeves and grapple with any disputed point. If the foreign ministers fail to reach a prompt settlement, the heads of states must iron out the difficulty.

I myself have by no means given up hope that we will carry out the principles of Potsdam. But we must do more than put words on paper. Europe today faces the danger of chaos because for 4 months the Potsdam Declaration has remained little more than a blueprint. Hundreds of thousands of Europeans will die this winter unnecessarily because of our failure to act. The very existence of democratic governments on the Continent is threatened because we have not moved fast enough.

The administration has not been thinking hard enough, has not been working consistently on this job.

Four months is more than long enough, even in Washington, even in international dealings, to have moved forward. Since August 2, when the Potsdam agreement was signed, nothing has been done, so far as the public knows, to fix Germany's western boundaries. Why not? Since August 2 nothing has been done, so far as the public knows, to establish a permanent regime for the Ruhr industrial area, to break up the menacing German cartels, to settle just what industries Germany may keep, and, in our zone at least, to redistribute land so that Germans can grow their own food.

The whole framework of the peace is at stake. Failure to act is our greater danger at present. For with every delay, rumors, and suspicions multiply. We cannot turn our backs on the problem and hope that if we just forget about it, all will be well.

From the very beginning, our policy toward Germany has been the very foundation stone of peace. Success in Germany is the first essential step toward permanent world organization, toward lasting United Nations cooperation. The first test of postwar policy, the first test of the ability of free peoples to win the peace as they won the war, is our handling of the German situation.

Today Germany remains our problem. We have still to meet the test. We have still to take that first essential step toward real peace. Seven months after the final collapse of the Third Reich, the purpose and the manner of our occupation are still in the realm of debate.

Of course, no one should expect to have all the problems settled in 7 months. That is a little too brief a time to undo the damage of generations of German belligerence. I am not one of those who despair because the millenium does not come rushing upon the heels of Armageddon. At the same time, the unnecessary delays have brought us to the brink of a major crisis.

Let us review briefly what the 7 months of our control over Germany have accomplished or failed to accomplish. Our information on these vital points has not been altogether satisfactory. We have suffered from hold-overs of censorship and restrictions on the free flow of news. Surely there can be no valid reason why correspondents of all the United Nations should not have untrammeled access to all the zones of occupation, no matter which power happens to be exercising authority.

We know that the immediate disarming and substantial demobilization of the German armies have been achieved. Only a few remnants of the once mighty Wehrmacht remain in military formations.

The program of denazification and trial of war criminals has gained headway after a slow start. In finance and government service, the removal of Nazis has been fairly complete.

Unfortunately, the record in industrial life is not as good. This is a danger spot to be watched, and it may be hoped that the recent arrest of a group of German industrialists by the British foreshadows improvement. The great trial at Nuremberg has served the eminently useful purpose of reminding the world what we fought to destroy. As an example of mankind's new determination to hold its betrayers to strict accountability, the trial may have even more wholesome results.

When we come to industrial disarmament of the Reich, I, for one, am deeply concerned. Here is the key to our success in converting Germany to peace, and we are still only talking, still planning, at a time which cries for action. Even such actions as we do take are noisy but not vigorous. Only a very few factories have been selected as available for reparations. Yet official reports show that in spite of bomb damage, Germany's industrial capacity remains largely intact. The plants that have actually been destroyed typify the loud futility of the program to date. Ammunition and explosives factories have been blown up with a great deal of satisfactory noise. But these plants, by their very nature, are in small scattered buildings, easily replaced and unimportant in the general calculation of German industrial strength. Yet the heavy industry of any nation is the real measure of its military potential. With the advent of the atomic bomb, this becomes more important than ever before, if that is possible.

Linked closely to Germany's one-time dominance of European industry were the German business combines and cartels. So far our determination to abolish these cartels exists in word only. Deeds are lacking. Even the investigation of the cartel system is not being pressed strongly.

The program of reparations, also tied closely to the future of Germany's heavy industry, is in the hands of a committee. That committee has hardly advanced to the planning stage.

From such a long record of talk, it is pleasant to turn to a field in which we can discern some prompt and effective action. Europe's displaced persons—at least some 6,000,000 who have desired to return to their native lands—have been sent back in spite of difficult transport problems. The displaced persons who remain are those who will not or cannot go home. While these pitiful wanderers are suffering enough to keep any humane person awake nights, their more fortunate companions in misery have been saved by efforts that are worthy of all praise.

The long, slow task of creating an atmosphere in which the German people can reeducate themselves has been begun, and if the results so far are disappointing, that should be blamed mostly on the difficulty of uprooting the poisonous growth of centuries. German elementary schools and a few other institutions are open. The reorganization of local and provincial life to allow communities to take part in the handling of their own affairs is under way. Health and sanitation have been taken care of more efficiently than many observers had dared to hope.

The German people are eating. Food is being brought in for them, and I am glad that we are carrying out our responsibilities in this respect. True, millions of Germans are getting no more than 1,550 calories a day. But this is as much as some of our liberated allies can get, and if we give more to Germans it can only be by taking it away from Germany's victims.

Out of this summary of the situation, I think, one fact emerges clearly. The whole administration of Germany has been conducted on a hand-to-hand, largely uncoordinated basis. That means bad administration. Immediate problems have occupied the administrators and the policy makers to the exclusion of real objectives. Yet only when the real objectives are formulated can the immediate problems be solved.

Our paramount objective, in the long run our sole objective, is peace. Let us not lose sight of it.

My own program for using Germany as a stepping stone to peace has been set forth in my book, Germany Is Our Problem. The fact that more Germans may have to earn their livelihood in a smaller territory than I used as an illustration in my book does not affect the basic principle. But before it can be carried out, the Germans must be given a chart of their future. They must know that hope of aggression is dead. They must also know that hope of a decent peaceful life is before them.

The failure of the occupying powers to carry out the program envisaged in the Potsdam Agreement is our greatest blunder to date. It is a blunder for which I can find no real excuse. By putting that agreement into effect, we can give the German people a blueprint from which to build their country into a peaceful member of international society. But until we do that, we can do no more than act as guards. The elements of our policy are simple. They are:

First, the decision as to just what industries Germany may keep. There should be confined to consumer goods, to the so-called light industries which can never be a basis for modern war. These could then get into production as rapidly as physical circumstances permit. The Germans themselves could plan, knowing that 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 of them might eventually find jobs in these factories.

Second, the intensification of German agriculture on a family-farm basis should be

encouraged. This means breaking up the big landed estates. It means cutting down forests to build homes and then bringing the cleared land under the plow. It means helping Germany to establish rural financing akin to our own farm-security program. The new farmers must be helped with credit, seed, advice, essential tools. Only in that way can Germans be self-supporting without being also a menace to peace.

Now such a program needs the cooperative action of ourselves and our allies. In this it resembles all the other problems of peace. All of them need cooperation. And that cooperation requires frequent discussions. For this reason I feel that President Truman will soon revise his estimate of the necessity for Big Three conferences—or anyway, Big Four conferences. I hope that Secretary Byrnes has correctly interpreted the real meaning of the President's statement on this point. There are some things that can only be done by the heads of States.

For instance, general agreement on German administrative problems has been impossible because the French have felt that certain other problems must be settled first. The cooperative way of getting things done internationally is to examine the case on its merits, not attempt to bludgeon the dissenting member of a group into acquiescence. Abolition of the rule of unanimity is no substitute for real accord. It is the accord that is important, not the rule. The situation is this:

At Potsdam, the Big Three laid the basis for a settlement of Germany's eastern border. That was essential to administration of occupied Germany. But nothing was said about the western border, or that equally important point, internationalization of the Ruhr. One must remember that the French, who have been overrun by the Germans three times in three generations, have every reason to feel insecure until these two vital questions have been settled. I feel certain that only a conference between the United States, Britain, France, and Russia to iron out this point can give us the basis for further collaboration in achieving our common ends in Germany. Furthermore, a prompt settlement here will help give stability to the French Government, and in turn to the whole fabric of Europe. It should also add wisdom and strength to the allied councils.

This is not a problem that can be fobbed off on the United Nation Organization. A world organization is not a peace conference. It cannot settle the problems arising from the war. UNO will have its hands full with the problems arising from the peace.

Joint action at a conference of the four major powers concerned will go a long way toward establishing the basis for our objective of peace. It will put the lid on the ambitions of Germans who still cherish a dream of a rearmed Reich. Their only hope is disagreement among the Allies.

The revival of German heavy industry as the first step toward that rearmament already has its advocates, although they do not put it quite that way. Some of them see Germany—as they saw Germany before the war—becoming a buffer against Russia. That curiously short-sighted view—to put it more kindly than it deserves—is highly pernicious. For its only possible result is antagonism and suspicion between Russia and ourselves. Nothing could be more dangerous. The only hope of peace is in a solid understanding between the United States and Russia. The greatest menace to peace is the campaign to sow discord between us.

Here, too, Germany is our testing ground. Upon the actions now to be taken rest the stability of Europe, the success of the United Nations Organization, and the strengthening of our friendly relations with Russia.

Tuskahoma World Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL STEWART
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by Ken Miller:

Four years ago tonight this Nation was shocked into the realization we were officially at war. Official proclamations had been made and the declarations of war resounded around the world.

The rude awakening and the first shock of Pearl Harbor day had not even worn off, but quickly a dazed nation was staggering to its knees after the first blow and attempting to gain its feet to strike back at the foul blow which had been struck.

The next three and a half years saw the fastest recovery a nation had ever made. Volunteers swarmed to the recruiting places. Draft machinery was beginning to turn over on greased wheels to fill the ranks of our Army. Factories turned on the night lights and extra crews were summoned back to the red glow of steel furnaces to put the plants into 24-hour production.

Homes saw loved ones go off to war and the remaining members took up their lunch pails and went to the factories. Even the children returned from their schoolrooms and canvassed the neighborhoods for scrap paper, rubber, iron, and steel—all to be molded into bombs, bullets, and guns to strike back at America's attackers.

And now the oppressors have been heartily spanked and the leaders are either dead, condemned, or awaiting their retribution. Heroes are returning to their homes, some battle-scarred and some maimed for life. Others are missing from their homes and will not return. Others are coming back to again take up their lives in peace.

All over the world the machinery of peace is being geared as world diplomats and leaders striving to set up the machinery which will forever outlaw war and oppression. Conferences are going far into the midnight hours as they strive to assure a weary and saddened world that never again will ambitious dictators attempt to further their realms of conquest—and to assure a world that never again will peace-loving citizens be dragged away from their homes, families broken up—just to reassert our rights to peaceful living and enterprise.

Today a new world of nations is in the making—a world dedicated to peace. World leaders even visualize the creation of a new world capital, which will be dedicated to the prevention of war and the maintenance of peaceful living among all nations of the world.

These world leaders are striving to locate a suitable place where a world capital may be built—a symbol of peaceful intentions, a place where the representatives of peaceful nations may meet, and a place where the machinery for maintaining this peace can be set up and kept in operation.

As a result, during recent weeks we have seen a half dozen ambitious groups come forward with the request that this proposed new world capital to be set up by the United Nations Organization be located in their respective areas. Philadelphia has officially made a bid for the new capital. Boston has submitted a proposal. San Francisco is requesting the capital be located there. Claremore, home of our own Will Rogers, has made its bid.

Some diplomats who are in close touch with the United Nations Organization say they believe the body will select a place in the United States which will be far from a metropolitan center—a huge expanse which is not littered with too modern structures and an area which can be built as a cosmopolitan center for the diplomats of the world.

Just a few days ago I was formally appointed to a state-wide commission in Oklahoma, to aid in the presenting of the suggestion that the town of Tuskahoma be selected as the world capital.

During my many years of residence in Oklahoma, I can safely say that there are few towns and cities in the State I have not visited at least once. There were few areas that I was not thoroughly familiar with. But Tuskahoma—where was Tuskahoma?

I found a map, and finally located the town, off the beaten trails, far down in the southeast corner of Oklahoma, and situated in the Kiamichi Mountains. I feel quite sure my consternation about Tuskahoma is shared by the majority of the citizens of Oklahoma, for it is a safe prediction that only a very slight percentage of the residents of this State have ever visited Tuskahoma.

This week I started out to find Tuskahoma—to visit the little-known town—to see personally the area which was being advocated as a location for the world capital. Quite frankly, I was a little skeptical when I started out, and even doubted the sincerity of those who were taking up this cause.

Last Monday morning I boarded the airplane of the Aerial Photo Service, and this company's genial manager, Delmer Curtis, was my pilot. Despite the bitter cold of that morning, he turned his plane in the direction of the Kiamichi Mountains in southeast Oklahoma.

Forty-seven minutes later we landed on the airport at McAlester, and there had a brief talk with Ben Choate, of Indianola, Okla., a member of the State legislature, who is the father of this move to locate the world capital at Tuskahoma. We heard Choate's story in brief, and he told us of certain areas in the vicinity of Tuskahoma which he especially wanted us to visit.

In the below-freezing weather, we again took off from the McAlester Airport and headed toward the hills which we could see in the distance.

Gradually we gained altitude until we finally were cruising at an altitude of more than 3,000 feet. Soon I saw the reason, for it was necessary to gain this altitude to clear the Kiamichi Mountains which were directly in our path. True, there are not mountains in Oklahoma equal to Mt. Everest or Pikes Peak, but what I saw certainly did equal the beauty of many sections of the Rockies. They were huge mountains in miniature. The Kiamichis were brown with the fall leaves of sleeping trees. A few still retained a bright red color as nature painted its colors on the Kiamichi canvas. And on top of the mountains we saw the bright green of the pine trees and the evergreens.

So engrossed were we in the beautiful scenery from the air, that we did not realize the mountains were gradually dropping away from us. Curtis suddenly nosed his plane downward, and the sight ahead of us was amazing. I had traveled by automobile on both sides of the Kiamichi Mountains, and had crossed them at several points, but here, directly in front of us, was a huge broad valley, almost as level as a floor.

Scattered above the valley were small farms, a few small farm houses, and cattle were grazing in the pastures. The beautiful Kiamichi River wound through the valley, the cold green water standing out in the scenery more vividly than the bright green of the evergreens and pines on the top of the mountains.

It was the first time I had ever realized that such a large valley, and such a beautiful expanse of land even existed over inside those rugged mountains.

My pilot, Curtis, nudged me and then waved his hand.

"There it is—this is the Tuskahoma Valley," he said.

I nodded, still much taken aback by the sudden realization that I had lived in Oklahoma these many years and had failed to see one of the most beautiful spots in the entire State.

We continued downward, until we were flying at an altitude of less than 500 feet. We passed over a farm house, and a farm wife was hanging clothes on a line. The clothes were hanging straight, not a sign of wind as the mountains on either side deflected the cold winds, furnishing an efficient windbreak for the entire valley.

We speeded over the land at 100 miles per hour, until directly in front of us was a small cluster of buildings. Small and a typical wayside town. There were no paved roads, and no railroads to this town.

Curtis informed me that this was Tuskahoma. We circled the town a couple of times, and several residents stood in the street and waved. It seems that my flying trip had been well publicized. I learned later in the day, and they were aware that a newsman was surveying their little town from the air that morning.

We headed north from the town, and only a mile away we saw a large red-brick building. Somewhat amazed at the sight of this building, I queried Curtis, who had flown over this area the day before, taking pictures of the entire valley, which the State commission is sending to the United Nations Organization in London.

This was the old capitol building of the Choctaw Nation. Only a few yards away was a small house, and Curtis informed me that this was the home of Chief W. A. Durant, principal chief of the Choctaw Tribe.

We flew from one end of the valley to the other, a distance of nearly 35 miles. And then we crossed it at several points, finding the valley 12 miles wide.

Here was a large valley, in which you could visualize the location for a large modern city of nations.

Here could be constructed a city, laid out by architects' plans, and world leaders' dreams—a city of beauty and a city of practicality.

Our plane turned homeward, and during the next hour I attempted to visualize this city of peace—the city of tomorrow. I knew well that mine was only a dream, and yet I realized too that Washington, D. C., was a city of planning. I realized that Geneva was virtually built from the ground up. Why not the new world capital?

Its location was ideal on the American Continent—the very center of the United States. The climate was temperate the year around.

Railroads were only a few miles away, and highways could easily be joined across the mountains to this haven of beauty. Wild deer and wild turkey roamed the hills nearby, and wildlife was abundant. Fish were abundant in the clear river which drained down from the little mountain streams forming rivulets over the mountains.

It was not difficult to envision a dream of fine broad highways being constructed by Oklahomans, highways made from gravel taken from the potato hills of the Kiamichis, and covered with asphalt refined in Oklahoma plants.

And then there were railways being constructed from their present locations across the mountains into this modern city of the twentieth century.

Huge planes were landing on a broad airport at one end of the valley, one bore the markings of a Russian airline to the United States. It taxied to the loading strip and stood beside a plane from Britain, and another air liner from China.

The diplomats, some in sport clothes, carrying guns and fishing rods, ready for a brief respite in the wildness of the Kiamichi Mountains, boarded taxis, and hastened to the nearby world capital.

Downtown all was a-glitter. Beautiful buildings, all constructed from granite—quarried from huge stocks of granite available in Oklahoma—rose from the valley floor. Atop each of the buildings were a few helicopters, parked by the diplomats, the envoys, and their aides. The windows glistened with shiny new glass, made in Oklahoma plants, and made from Oklahoma sand. The windows were held in place with lead trimmings taken from the lead mines of northeast Oklahoma. Building cornices sparkled under the sun, as the northeast Oklahoma zinc reflected the light.

It was a smokeless city, for all heating was done by natural gas taken from Oklahoma wells. The city was brilliant with light at night, produced from huge reservoirs and dams throughout Oklahoma. Cars hurried up and down the streets, carrying the world's great and near-great to conferences and places of entertainment. These cars were new models, powered by Oklahoma oil and Oklahoma gasoline.

The houses near the heart of the city were built of native lumber taken from the Kiamichi Mountains, and were painted with paints made from Oklahoma resources. Newsboys were on the streets calling the late headlines, and selling papers made from wood pulp taken from the nearby mountains.

And then—by that time we were back over the Tulsa municipal airport, and our dream was over.

Yes, I know, it may sound like a lot of nonsense, and a dream—but it still isn't beyond the realms of possibility. Such things have been done. Columbus had to dream. The builders of Washington had to dream. And look at the city they built. Look at Geneva today, the capital of the League of Nations.

Now, the dream of Tuskahoma may be a dream, but it isn't a dream to those people down in the valley. They are sincere, and they have convinced many prominent and influential citizens of the Southwest that this is not just a dream, but a distinct possibility. To get their viewpoint, may we suggest you listen to a special Main Street Speaks program from Tuskahoma at 11:30 tomorrow morning.

Ben Choate, a Choctaw Indian who had a vision of a beautiful city of tomorrow constructed in the valley of his birth, at the home of the world's only nation of people, the Choctaws, who are on record for having voted out their own national existence many years ago, to accept advancement, peace, and progress—the Government of the United States—is to be commended highly on his foresight. It may never become a reality—but more and more it is gaining in favor, until today Choate has received offers of assistance from scores of civic bodies throughout the Southwest. He has received praise from hundreds of individuals, and other scores of cities have pledged help in the plan to make a portion of Oklahoma the world capital of peace.

A Secretary of Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Enquirer of Monday, October 29, 1945, entitled "A Secretary of Transportation":

In view of the vital role taken by all forms of transportation in the life of the Nation, the suggestion by Basil Harris, president of the United States Lines, that a Cabinet post of Secretary of Transportation be created should receive warm support.

As Mr. Harris pointed out in his address at the dinner of the American Merchant Marine Conference the other night, we all are dependent on transportation. He said:

"The truck, the train, the plane, and the ship play such an important part in our daily life and are such an integral part of our economic structure as to merit primary attention by the Cabinet of the President. Every man, woman, and child in this great Nation—whether it be the food we eat, the places we go, or the work we do—is directly dependent on transportation in one form or another, and much of this transportation is competitive so regulation is essential.

"Therefore, we need a spokesman who can sit in the seats of the mighty and speak for all forms of transportation with the dignity and authority of a Cabinet minister. It is a self-evident fact and needs no defense."

In the postwar world when competition for international trade will be very keen it is obvious that quick, efficient transportation of goods and passengers may often be a determining factor in the placing of orders. And since, as Mr. Harris also said, 1 job in every 10 is dependent on export trade, the very prosperity of our country will necessitate the correlation of our transportation facilities and the development of proper public support. To this end the appointment of a Secretary of Transportation is an essential step that should be taken without delay.

And the President need look no further for a man who is so eminently qualified for this post as Basil Harris.

Use Every Ship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to say that according to a press release War Shipping Administrator Land says there are enough ships available for the return of overseas men, yet he has not come before the Merchant Marine Committee. More than 3 weeks ago I called for public hearings before the Committee on Merchant Marine covering the deplorable ship situation and failure to return our men because of lack of ships, and asked that public hearings and examination of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration be held.

Since the cessation of hostilities in Europe last spring every schoolboy has known of the cry that there are not sufficient ships to bring the boys home, and that the Army has told these overseas men that there are not sufficient ships. Every letter from these boys says they are being held because of no ships.

Pictures in the newspapers show large fleets of unused ships lying at anchor in various harbors throughout the world. One of the most recent was taken by the

Chicago Tribune showing 125 idle ships lying at anchor in one American harbor.

In addition, there has been the incident of 1,000 men being ordered to go into the hold of a smelly warship for transportation. They refused, some going a. w. o. l. The port health officer said that it was not a fit place to carry 1,000 men, that the space was not sufficient, and that the sanitary conditions were foul. Yet the love for home forced 500 to ride in this ship.

Further, the War Shipping Administration has over 425 ships with the British, more than 125 ships with the Russians, and even during the war and now, spent millions of dollars to make ships into crab canneries for the Russians.

On the recent three disabled troop ships in the South Atlantic with our returning troops, one is of Greek registry. Why are we hiring foreign ships if the War Shipping Administration has made our ships available. I introduced a resolution to recover back our 600 ships from foreigners for their use in returning our boys. But the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration have not come forward for hearing and examination.

Since the cessation of hostilities in Europe the Maritime Commission, the War Shipping Administration and the Administrator have evaded and refused public hearings before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries as to what has become of $22,000,000,000 spent by the Maritime Commission for ships, as to what has become of more than 5,000 American ships, as to why hundreds of American ships are in the hands of foreigners for their own private use, as to why these ships and the remaining 5,000 have not been immediately turned over for the return of our troops.

For nearly 6 months the public and parents of these boys have been refused public hearings on the use of more than 7,500 ships owned and chartered by our Government, as to why they have not been fully used to bring back our overseas men.

The President, through the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration, has absolute control of the use and operation of more than 7,500 Government owned and chartered ships, but has failed and neglected to order these ships to return our overseas men. I have introduced the following resolution that the President, the Maritime Commission, and the War Shipping Administration make available immediately these 7,500 ships for the exclusive return of our soldiers overseas:

A bill to provide for the immediate use of all ships owned and controlled by the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration to return our overseas men

Whereas the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration have expended more than $22,000,000,000 for the building and operation of ships; and

Whereas our soldiers in foreign countries are told that there are not enough ships to bring them home; and

Whereas there are millions of the armed forces overseas awaiting to be returned home; and

Whereas the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration have nearly 7,500 ships under their control; and

Whereas the Martime Commission and War Shipping Administration have failed to use these 7,500 ships to return our soldiers from overseas: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States, the Maritime Commission, and the War Shipping Administration immediately make available 7,500 ships for the exclusive return of our soldiers to the United States and that the members of the Maritime Commission, members of the War Shipping Administration, the Administrator of the Maritime Commission, and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, be forced to attend public hearings for examination as to their failure to make available and use these ships for the return of our soldiers overseas.

Truman's Labor Proposals Similar to Minnesota Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Star-Journal of Thursday, December 6 1945:

TRUMAN'S LABOR PROPOSALS SIMILAR TO MINNESOTA ACT

The procedure for settling labor disputes which President Truman asked Congress to enact differs only slightly from that provided in the Minnesota Labor Relations Act. Here are the main steps the President outlined in his message Monday:

"1. If collective bargaining and conciliation fail and a strike vitally affecting the national public interest is called or threatened, the Secretary of Labor would so certify to the President.

"2. The President then would appoint a fact-finding board. It would report its findings and recommendations within 20 days.

"3. From the time the dispute is certified until 5 days after the board reports, it would be unlawful to call a strike or lock-out or make changes in pay or working conditions except by agreement. The parties to the dispute would not be bound to accept recommendations of the fact-finding board."

The Minnesota act sets up the following procedure:

"1. A union or employer can file with the State conciliator a strike notice or request for assistance in settling a dispute.

"2. Ten days must elapse after receipt of strike notice before a walk-out follows. However, in disputes affecting a substantial number of people, and therefore the public interest, the conciliator so certifies to the Governor, and then an additional 30 days must elapse before a strike is legal.

"3. The Governor appoints a fact-finding commission, which must report within 25 days.

"4. The conciliator calls in both parties and tries to effect a settlement on the basis of the fact-finding report. If agreement is not reached, a strike becomes legal at the end of the 30-day waiting period."

No police powers are vested in the State conciliator. The most he may do is to deny benefits of the act to unions or employers who act contrary to the law. Such benefit for a union is chiefly that of certification as bargaining agent.

What the Minnesota act does—and what Truman proposes to do—is designate a cooling-off period and provide for gathering the facts on a dispute.

While it is true that principles rather than facts are the points at issue in much industrial strife, responsible people on both sides must be willing to face the facts squarely. Perhaps even more important than obtaining the facts for the parties to a dispute is obtaining them for the public. Public opinion can be the most powerful determinant in labor troubles.

Since January 1, 1945, the Minnesota conciliator's office has taken part, on request, in 427 disputes. Some of these were applications for certification of unions as bargaining agents, but in more than two-thirds of the cases strike notices were filed or the commissioner was asked to assist in settling disputes. During the war, strikes in the State averaged about 10 a year. There has been a slight increase in the rate since the war ended. That was to be expected. Hardly anyone would deny that industrial relations have been much better since passage of the law.

Labor does not lose the right to strike under either the Minnesota act or the Truman proposal. Compulsory arbitration is not provided.

It is difficult then to understand the reason for opposition of national labor leaders to the Truman plan. Perhaps they realize that sentiment against unions grew up in some quarters during the war. Perhaps they realize the General Motors strike put them in an unstable position and they fear reprisals. Perhaps they feel that once labor legislation comes to the floor of Congress, much more sweeping action may be taken than the President suggests.

There is the latter danger. A number of antilabor Congressmen would like the opportunity to hamstring unions. It is to be hoped that the majority of Congress will not accede to such demands. The interest of unions also is bound up at many points with the public interest.

But fact-finding and waiting periods have not operated to the detriment of organized labor in Minnesota. They should not impair the best interests of labor nationally, if voted by Congress.

The Utility Industry's Record in Peace and in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an address delivered by B. C. Forbes, president of the Investors Fairplay League, before the league's forum at the La Salle Hotel, in Chicago, on November 29, 1945:

Ironically, the most hounded industry in America, the arch target of governmental prosecution, invasion, usurpation, is the one which has achieved a perfect record throughout the war, never has been guilty of "too little nor too late," to quote Chairman J. A. Krug, of the War Production Board, never resorted to rationing, never bred black markets, actually lowered prices.

Ironically, also, the first concern in this industry to fall down on the war job was

the Government's prize project, TVA, which had to be bailed out by investor-owned companies.

When the supreme emergency overtook America, the colossal requirements for power to energize the Nation's war-producing facilities was furnished to the extent of more than four-fifths by privately owned and operated plants which governmental bodies have been so persistently attacking and dismembering, to the ruination of myriads of modest individuals and families who invested their savings in utility stock issues invariably approved by governmental regulatory bodies.

This fact should cause every American taxpayer to stop, look, and listen. The electric power and light industry pays taxes to the tune of $2,000,000 each and every day of the year. But each and every time a taxpaying utility is swallowed up by a Federal, State, county, or municipal body, the taxes formerly paid by the privately owned properties are laden upon the shoulders of other taxpayers.

Lincoln declared that no nation could exist half slave, half free. No industry can exist half governmental owned, half investor owned.

All indications, at least until recently, have been that Washington's dominating objective has been to obliterate the utility industry, owned by millions of small investors and to engulf the whole industry in state socialism.

Again ironically, the Federal instrument which is dismembering the Nation's foremost utility enterprises was established by Congress for the protection of consumers and investors.

The Securities and Exchange Commission was brought into being after millions of investors, and especially speculators, had their fingers badly burned in the financial catastrophe of 1929. Admittedly, during the 1920's utility leaders, in common with innumerable leaders in finance and industry, indulged in unconscionable promotions and exploitations. Congress, spurred by the very natural Nation-wide indignation against utility and other over-reaching Napoleons, passed the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935.

Chairman Joseph P. Kennedy, of the SEC, warned Congress that the Holding Company Act contained "no effective standard to guide the Commission in the momentous decisions it must make"; that it was "not a wise policy to vest in any one group of men the tremendous responsibility involved in this great power"; also that "I do not believe it is fair or practical to expect any five men to shoulder the responsibility of deciding which of these utility systems are to be reorganized and into what size or character the ultimate groupings should evolve."

What prophetic words. The SEC Commissioners have flopped and floundered. Instructed by Congress to draw up a plan to bring about the economic and geographic integration of the utility industry, the SEC has consistently side-stepped that—perhaps impossible—task.

Notwithstanding the immeasurable responsibilities devolved upon the SEC Commissioners—responsibilities calling for vast experience—the composition of the Commission has undergone kaleidoscopic changes. No fewer than 15 men have served as members of this 5-man Commission in 10 years. The shocking fact is that membership in this Commission has flagrantly been taken advantage of as a stepping stone to more remunerative public office.

Although few Federal legislative measures have cried louder for amendment, the law has not been amended since its inception a decade ago, although many less faulty and less vital measures have been improved during this period.

The utility industry deserves better treatment than it has received—than it is still receiving.

How has it met the crucial test of war? Consider these phenomenal tributes:

Secretary of War Robbert H. Patterson: "The Nation's electric light and power industry has never fallen down on its job. The Army rates its performance as that of 'a good soldier.'"

Vice Adm. Emory S. Land, Chairman, United States Maritime Commission: "We owe a debt of gratitude to the men and women of the electric power industry. They delivered the power we needed to build the ships. Our thanks for a job well done."

Lt. Gen. E. Reybold, Chief of Engineers, United States Army: "We, of the Army engineers, know of your work at first hand—know it and appreciate it. I am both privileged and honored to salute you."

Vice Adm. W. R. Monroe: "You delivered, each and every one of you, from executives in the front offices to the men who climbed the poles. When we asked for power we got power, and not—thank God—alibis!"

Under Secretary of the Navy Artemus L. Gates: "The wartime achievements of the electric industry well deserve the Nation's approval."

What of the industry's achievements before the war? In the 10 years preceding 1928 no fewer than 15,000,000 new customers were added—incidentally, largely due to the creation of holding companies, which made possible the raising of billions of capital to expand light and power facilities, often in rural areas, to take over and modernize and expand numerous small concerns.

In the half-dozen years ending in 1930 no fewer than 9,000,000 new customers were given the benefit of electric service.

Last year power output was double that of 1939, although generating capacity had been increased only 27 percent—a notable example of increasing efficiency.

Other and perhaps even more impressive instances of the industry's never-ceasing progressive achievements:

By January 1, 1945, war's needs had drawn from our farms more than 5,000,000 men and women, reducing our farm population to the lowest in 35 years. Yet farm production was increased 35 percent over a period of 5 years. This was made possible in no small degree by the increased use of electric power—for milking cows, pumping water, grinding feed, lifting loads, and, in all, for the performance of about 200 farm jobs.

Whereas nearly 3½ pounds of coal were required to produce a kilowatt-hour of electricity during the First World War, last year only 1½ pounds were consumed.

The average cost of electricity in homes has been more than cut in half since 1914. Even during the last 5 years, despite the very sharp rise in the cost of living, the average price per kilowatt-hour has been reduced—not increased—12 percent, to less than 3½ cents, a level never before reached.

A World's Fair exhibit illustrated these fantastic things 1-cent's worth of electricity would do: Wash 2 tubfuls of clothes; afford 6¾ hours of food protection; supply music for an entire evening; scramble eggs for 8 people; toast 30 slices of bread; make 7 cups of coffee.

Today electricity rivals the daily newspaper in being the cheapest thing, the greatest value for the money, any people, anywhere, ever enjoyed. As Peter O. Knight, Tampa utility executive, once observed to me: "The taxes on cigarettes alone amount to more per annum than the total cost of the domestic consumption of electrical energy in the United States."

Utility wage earners have always been among the best paid—even in depression times their average weekly pay exceeded that of 90 percent of the Nation's industries.

The world knows and acknowledges that American industry played a foremost, even miraculous part in winning the war, saving civilization. Its record, by and large, was phenomenal.

Somewhat less perfect, to say the least, has been the record of some of our multitudinous Washington authorities. Blunders galore have been perpetrated, particularly in the realm of bossing civilian activities. Bluntly, mismanagement has been flagrant. Interminable numbers of alphabetical agencies have been created, have overlapped, worked at cross purposes, been abolished, only to be supplanted by a new and equally ineffective brood.

A very prominent American, in 1930, publicly proclaimed:

"The doctrine of regulation and legislation by master minds in whose judgment and will all the people may gladly and quietly acquiesce has been too glaringly apparent at Washington during these last 10 years. Were it possible to find master minds so unselfish, so willing to decide unhesitatingly against their own personal interests or private prejudices, men almost Godlike in their ability to hold the scales of justice with an even hand, such a government might be to the interest of the country. But there are none such on our political horizon and we cannot expect a complete reversal of all the teachings of history."

That, gentlemen, was Candidate Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The philosophy, the truth, he then enunciated is as sound today as it was then.

Yet the trend ever since, under the New Deal, has been ceaselessly toward more and more governmental domination of our historic American economy, toward further and further encroachment upon investor-owned enterprise, toward multiplication of Federal regulators, toward the arrogating of still greater and greater overlordism by Washington.

This has been notoriously true in the field of power and light. It certainly was so during President Roosevelt's regime. And now President Truman plumps for multiplication of TVA's.

Has not the time come to call a halt?

The postwar responsibilities facing the electric power industry are, if that were possible, greater than it was confronted with during the war. A new era is dawning. A thousand-and-one new things to enrich life in America are promised. Almost without exception, every last one of them will call for the utilization of electric current.

Gigantic though the capital expenditures of the utility industry have been in the past—it is now a $13,000,000,000 industry—still vaster expenditures loom. The necessary capital will not be, cannot be, provided by the Nation's savers unless the Government's whole attitude toward the industry becomes less antagonistic, less hostile, less injurious.

Voters throughout the length and breadth of the land should voice their endorsement of the Boren bill for thoroughgoing investigation of the effect of the Public Utility Holding Company Act, with a view to enacting legislation designed to preserve our free enterprise system, to arrest the drift toward state socialism in the utility world, to prevent the further wiping out of innocent utility stockholders.

The constitutionality of the "death sentence" which, as administered by the SEC, has wrought so much havoc, is now before the United States Supreme Court. Profoundly it is to be hoped that the Court will take an enlightened, broad-minded, constructive view of this parlous situation, this menace.

Let me repeat, is it not ironic that the industry whose achievements have not been surpassed by any in this country or in any other country, is the one which for a decade has been subjected, and is still being subjected, to governmental blasting?

One of the very first recorded divine decrees was "Let there be light." American utility managements have fulfilled that decress infinitely more superbly than the men

of any other land on the face of the earth. They, and those who provided the wherewithal to accomplish this, richly deserve new, greater consideration.

Northwest Development—An Opportunity for Returning Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, there is submitted herewith for printing in the RECORD the resolutions adopted by the Inland Empire Waterways Association in the Northwest in favor of the comprehensive program for the development of arterial highways and river transportation in the three great Northwest States—Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.

We know that the eyes of this country are turned to the vast undeveloped resources of the Northwest and that the development of our water resources in the way of transportation, land reclamation, together with our highways, will open large areas and present exceptional opportunities for our returning veterans for the establishment of new homes and business opportunity.

The resolutions follow:

Resolution 1

Whereas this association was organized in February 1934 to prosecute a definite constructive river navigation development program, and

Whereas the McNary Dam and Snake River improvements as recommended in House Document No. 704 has now been authorized by Public Law No. 14, Seventy-ninth Congress, and

Whereas it is to the advantage of the overall comprehensive program to have all of the projects as recommended in House Document No. 704 authorized by the Congress at the earliest possible moment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Inland Empire Waterways Association in regular meeting held in Lewiston, Idaho, this 20th day of November 1945, does hereby reaffirm a program embracing House Document No. 704 and urges the authorization of the remaining portion of the program as contained in that document, namely, The Dalles Dam, providing a navigable channel 300 feet wide with a depth of 10 feet between the eastern end of the pool caused by the construction of The Dallas Dam and the McNary Dam, the John Day Dam, and the Arlington Dam.

Resolution 3

Be it resolved on this 20th day of November 1945, during the twelfth annual meeting of the Inland Empire Waterways Association, That the officers of this association continue their efforts in support of the legislation now pending in Congress leading towards the acquisition of the Hood River and Cascade locks (Wauna Toll Bridge Co.) bridges by the Federal Government for toll-free operations and all structures of a like kind hereafter constructed shall be with the cooperation of the Federal Government and the highway departments of the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, and all such structures shall be free bridges.

Resolution 5

Whereas this association has long been appreciative of the splendid public service rendered to this Nation by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, in the promotion, prosecution, and development of our harbors and inland waterways, and

Whereas we feel that in the interest of economy, efficient and expeditious development of our inland waterways, the administration of this all-important natural resource should not be disturbed, and

Whereas millions of dollars of taxpayers' money have been expended and approximately 150 years of training and compilation of valuable statistical information by the Corps of Engineers is a matter of record: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Inland Empire Waterways Association in regular meeting held in Lewiston, Idaho, this 20th day of November 1945, does hereby reaffirm its position that the comprehensive development of the Columbia and Snake Rivers for navigation remain undisturbed in the department of the Corps of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, United States Army.

Resolution 8

Resolved, That the completion of the Lewis-Clark Highway across the State of Idaho will extend the beneficial effect of the open-river development into western Montana and create and stimulate trade and commerce between that vast area and the head of the navigation at Lewiston, Idaho.

Resolved, That the completion of said highway project will be of major benefit to the agriculture, horticulture, and business interests of all the inhabitants of the territory tributary to the Snake, Clearwater, and Salmon Rivers, in the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana.

Resolution 10

Whereas the congressional delegation of Idaho, Oregon, and Washington have worked diligently and cooperatively with this association in the prosecution of its comprehensive program; and

Whereas we are cognizant and appreciative of the efforts of the congressional delegations of the Northwest States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Inland Empire Waterways Association in regular meeting held in Lewiston, Idaho, this 20th day of November 1945, does hereby extend its most sincere and cordial appreciation to each and every Senator and Congressman from Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, individually and collectively for their hearty cooperation and active support in behalf of our program to date and urge their continued active, loyal support for the future.

Resolution 14

Whereas Senate bill No. 35, an act authorizing the preservation and repair of certain rivers and harbors; and

Whereas said act contained the authorization for the McNary Dam and the dams on the Snake River from its mouth to Lewiston, Idaho: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Inland Empire Waterways Association in regular meeting held in Lewiston, Idaho, this 20th day of November 1945, does hereby petition the congressional delegation from the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho to exercise all its powers and influence to secure early appropriations for these projects so as to insure early construction thereof.

Resolution 15

Whereas this association was organized in February 1934 to prosecute a definite, constructive river-development program; and

Whereas the executive committee recommends the adoption of a specific program as outlined in House Document No. 704, which is: Four locks and dams on the Columbia River from The Dalles to the mouth of the Snake River, 10 locks and dams and channel-improvement work from the mouth of the Snake River to Lewiston, Idaho, as recommended and approved by the Corps of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors as outlined in House Document No. 704;

Provided, however, That pending the authorization of the comprehensive program by Congress, the officers of this association and directors are instructed to vigorously and aggressively prosecute a program designed to provide navigation to Lewiston, Idaho, by open-channel improvements or such other methods as may be determined as practicable and feasible: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Inland Empire Waterways Association in regular meeting held in Lewiston, Idaho this 20th day of November 1945, does hereby reaffirm and accept as the program of this association the engineering plan approved and recommended by the Corps of Engineers as contained in House Document No. 704, with the added provision that we should seek extension of open-channel improvements pending the authorization and completion of the comprehensive plan.

Proposed Loan to Great Britain

REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we will always have a U. S. A. if we do not give it away. I want to add my little word again about the great loan that is contemplated for Britain. As was said a few moments ago, Britain is very seriously considering whether she will accept the $4,400,000,000 our State Department offered her. In the first place, I do not know why the State Department offered her a loan on such terms. It is such terms and conditions as concluded by the State Department that would wreck this U. S. A.

Any loan that is not on a sound basis for our Government to make is not a good loan for the U. S. A. It it's a loan, I am afraid it's like the other loans to Great Britain, it will be a repudiated loan. Just bear this in mind, that they still owe us over $6,500,000,000 from the World War I.

I am willing to loan Great Britain money if we can find that money to loan. But I want to loan it to them on terms that constitute good sound business and on terms that will look after the American people's interests. Just remember that that comes to about $35 for every man, woman, and child in America. And if for any reason Great Britain does not pay it back, then the taxpayers of this country in future generations are going to have to pay it. So remember that the loan is a bad one.

The agreement forgives $35,000,000,000 of lend-lease; that is bad. It forgives interest payments for 5 years; that is bad. It forgives interest payments for any of the other years of the

50 of the time of the loan, providing Great Britain does not have a balanced budget; that may be many of the remaining years; that is bad. It may be used to purchase the coal mines of Great Britain; that is bad. It may be used to buy Great Britain's railroads; that's bad. It could be used to socialize Great Britain and I am opposed to that. I do not want to socialize any country, and especially this country. We will always have a free U. S. A. if we do not give it away.

Tools Are the Fruit of Frugality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks which was granted on December 13, I am including an informal address which I made to the Chicago Forum of the Investors Fairplay League on November 29, 1945, as follows:

Mr. Forbes, fellow Americans, it is good to be here today. It is good to enjoy the fellowship of the forgotten man—the investor in America.

I could make you a great speech on power today. I am not going to do so. Some years ago I introduced a bill to consolidate all the power agencies in the Federal Government, including the loan functions of RFC, the regulatory functions of the FPC, and the SEC; the functions of Bonneville and the administrations of Fort Peck and Grand Coulee and TVA and all the rest in a single agency, that our lawmakers whose time is so scant may be able to see in better perspective where we are and whither we are going in this whole field of power. Those who are charged with the destiny of administration and who are the lords of our destiny in Washington have not seen fit to take that bill into their bosoms and to give it the right-of-way in the Congress. But I say to you advisedly (and I must be so careful as to what goes down on this record) that there is not a man in public life today who in my judgment has a complete concept and a perspective concept of this whole field of power.

So, Mr. Forbes, I could make you quite a speech on that subject today, but I am not going to do so. I want to talk a little about free enterprise—and we will forget about the title until, like in the proper sermon, we get to the last paragraph.

I wish it were possible to simplify some of the problems in America today that disturb people. There is so much ferment in the world, both on the international and on the domestic horizon, and I often wish that it were possible to somehow whittle it down into some kind of an individual cosmos where one could see and understand a great deal better. In proportion as you take this huge, complex, and bewildering economic structure, the working of our own country, and whittle it down to a few fundamentals that are somehow germane to your own life, you understand it so much better.

I think Lincoln was adept in that field. You remember when the negotiators of the Confederacy came to Washington for the purpose of negotiating a peace—even before it happened—he brought them into the White House, welcomed them with the utmost of grace, and finally said, "Now, gentlemen, I am only interested in two very simple propositions, so I will write them on paper, and you can write anything else you want and I will sign it." So he sent one of the lackeys to bring a huge piece of paper, and at the top Abraham Lincoln wrote: Number One: The Union must be preserved. Number Two: Slavery must be abolished." And then he handed this piece of paper to the negotiators and said, "Write anything you want by way of peace terms, and I won't even bother to read it. I will sign it."

What an amazing thing. But they were the fundamentals, simply delineated, as it were; and if we could do that today, how easy it would be to solve the bewildering problems with which we are confronted today.

Now, it is a tragedy that the investors have so little representation. You hear about every other group, but how little about the investors. I think the only time I came in contact with them was in 1934 when I served on a special committee of the House which was known as the Select Committee on Bondholders Protective Reorganization. It dealt with those people who, with the utmost of confidence and a certain degree of naïveté, took the fruit of their frugality and their thrift and dumped it into bonds and one thing and another and after the debacle were pretty well wiped out. We went into all sections of the country to hold hearings, and held many hearings in Chicago. Nothing distressed me quite so much as the thousands of people who gathered over here in the Federal Building, for there was something haggard and frantic and agonizing about them as they stood there waiting upon six or seven Members of the Congress to sort of probe and explore this whole matter in the hope that perhaps those values would come up and that these humble investors, the rank and file in the country who, through thrift over a long period of time, had made it possible for the country to go forward, might retrieve some of that investment that was lost.

But today we hear about everything else—we hear about wages, we hear about prices, we hear about every economic facet on the horizon of the country—but how little about investment. There is an OPA—the Office of Price Administration. There was a WLB—the War Labor Board. There is an NLRB—the National Labor Relations Board. There is a CCC—the Commodity Credit Corporation. Mention almost any activity in our economy today, and I will show you a Federal agency that devotes itself to that particular interest. And I have often thought, maybe there ought to be an OIA—the Office of Investigators Administration—to give the forgotten man a little place in the horizon.

Now that all is said and done, of course, the investor is, after all, the motive power of human progress. When I was a college student, I used to dip into things like Progress and Poverty, written by Henry George. You remember that. And I remember isolating that great truth, that cooperation is the law of human progress. But as a matter of fact, there has to be something with which to cooperate.

Now, you can get management and labor and everybody else together, but still, there must be an instrumentality for cooperation. And what is it? It is the very thing that accounts for the standard of living and for the progress that was made in America, and generically, you call it "tools." Land is a a tool of production. Factory buildings are tools of production. Machinery of all kinds are tools of production. And they spell the difference between the civilization in this our blessed Republic and what you see elsewhere in the world.

For 90 days in the spring of this year I bounced around the world by the grace and generosity of the constituents of the Sixteenth Congressional District of Illinois. When I was candidate for national honors, they made up a fund, and I wouldn't spend it, so they made it available for a world trip.

What a fruitful thing it was, and what an immense adventure. But one of the things I saw as I got around was the difference between our own civilization and what you find in Egypt or India or Syria or Lebanon or Turkey; or France or Great Britain or Belgium or Germany; or any other place. The difference in their civilization and ours is essentially this. You can recite it in one word. It is the difference of tools.

You go into the bazaars of the Middle East or the Orient, and what do you see? Old people sledging on metal, whether they are coppersmiths or silversmiths. There you see the handweavers, there you see the handicraft guilds of 2,000 years ago. It is the difference between that and the assembly line and the machine technique of America that accounts for the difference in the standard of living.

Four hundred million people in India—a country that is two-thirds the size of our own country—and the wage there in many instances is 3, 4, 5 cents a day. They live on a handful of rice and a little piece of fish. But there you have a throw-back to an ancient age. Also you come back to the difference between our own country and their country. It is in this thing which is the motive power of progress. It is the instrumentality of production. It is tools.

There is that difference, and it has been that way in peace and in war. I think one of the most engaging experiences I had was to go through the V2 plant in Nordhausen, Germany. I spent some days up there, going to all the prison camps, and there was a prison camp located close to this series of underground passages, 30 miles long, where V2's were manufactured—these instrumentalities of death and destruction that would start from some loading platform on the Continent and travel 40, 50, 60 miles, and then find a target and wipe out life and eliminate buildings and construction, perhaps, in London or Southampton or elsewhere. But the thing that impressed me most was not the 30 miles of tunnels. The thing that impressed me most was the machinery that was there, the tools. That is the reason Hitler had perfected the Stuka and the tank. That is the reason he moved as fast and as far as he did. It was because of the tools that were available.

As I went along with a torch through those passageways, imagine, for instance, seeing machinery that was manufactured in Rockford, Ill., by Barber-Coleman Co., and machinery manufactured by the Cleveland Machine Tool, and Cincinanti Twist Drill, and the factories in Buffalo and Jersey City and Chicago. There they were. They had been gathered up from other countries over a long period of time. Here were 30 miles of machines, some of which had never been used, that were the real instrumentalities for the swift-moving events that took place way back in 1939 and almost cost the world a victory. Some of them were still in grease and had never been used. Here were milling machines and shapers; here were lathes and punchpresses and stamping machines—everything gathered from all over the world. And there you had the real motive power behind the force with which the Nazis struck, nearly 6 years ago.

What is true, of course, in war, is equally true in peace. You come back to this whole question of tools, and behind it is what? When all is said and done, what is it? What are all these machines and tools that are

scattered all over the United States that account for the high standard of living? They are the length and shadow of the frugality and the thrift of humble people everywhere who had been following an old adage that each generation must retool itself. That, gentlemen, is one of the most fundamental things with which we have got to contend today.

But now this grim and terrible war is over. It's been finished. I often think of it in terms of the sixth word of the Galilean as they hanged Him on the cross. At Eastertime every minister devotes himself to the last seven words of the Master. What did He say when He hung on the cross and they cast lots for His robe and they applied to His lips the sponge soaked with vinegar? When He was ready to give up the ghost, and the agony of the flesh has been expended, He said, "It is finished." And so this horrible and grim and brutal business is finished, and now we address ourselves to the question of postwar prosperity.

I am just like a shopper about it. I read the advertisements in the Saturday Evening Post, in Collier's, and Fortune, and there are glass houses and plastic gadgets and we are lifted way up into a kind of strange exultation as we think of life in terms of the postwar period. But no matter how far we move forward from where we are now and no matter how much life is enriched and ennobled, behind it must be the machines for this and the next generation, and behind the machine must be the thrift and the frugality and the savings of the average fellow who makes a great contribution to his own generation in the form of tools, which spell a finer and a larger and a more expanded life.

Must there be some incentive to save? Think of the ferment and the uncertainty in the United States today. Think of the unrest. Think of the people who are constantly writing their Members of Congress. I said a moment ago to Mr. Smith, there are congressional offices today that have as many as four and five thousand unanswered letters. Congressmen get quite beside themselves when they can't catch up with their mail. And what do those letters represent? They are a reflection, after all, of the uncertainty about the future. They are a reflection of the ferment that is in the hearts and the consciences of the people from one end of the country to the other—one of those tragic things.

So we say, all right, if the investors of this and succeeding generations are going to still devote themselves to frugality and thrift, that we, our generation, might retool ourselves and carry out a great social responsibility for better living in the country, and for this elusive thing that they call the abundant life, then there must be incentives—and what are they? Of course, there is the incentive of reduced taxation. But, folks, there is something infinitely more important than that. I sometimes wonder whether we went too far in this last transitional tax bill in Washington, because reduction in taxes is not going to mean too much until there is a corresponding reduction in expenditure. [Applause.] We see it exemplified this very afternoon. Do you know what would happen if I were in Washington on the floor of the House this afternoon? Since it is half past 2 now—that means half past 3 there—many Members have girded their loins for battle, and the battle, of course, will be to get a little more money out of the Treasury of the United States.

All day Monday, the Appropriations Committee of the House, of which I am a member, had the longest session it has had since I have been a member of that committee—and I have been there quite a long time. The real fight, of course, centered around the fact that they wanted additional money for all the congressional districts in the United States, for flood control and rivers and harbors. Here was money to be expended for the Veterans' Administration, for hospital additions and new hospitals. So all afternoon, in the full committee, the battle raged. The committee finally won. It held that deficiency bill down to a billion, one hundred million. It originally came to us from the President and the Budget Bureau with $576,000,000 more than the amendment suggested by the White House itself. So after long, arduous hearings lasting for weeks, we got it pared down; we took out five hundred and seventy-six million.

Now it goes to the floor. They called me from my office early this morning. I said, "What happened?" They said they have already written some amendments into the bill, and it looks as if they are going to write more amendments this afternoon.

An illustration: When General Bradley came to us for $158,000,000 dollars for new and additional hospitals for the Veterans' Administration, the thought occurred to me and to some other members of the committee that we have about 119 Army and Navy hospitals in the country. General Somerville came before us just a few weeks ago and said, "In December of 1945"—which is next month—"I am going to turn back 40 hospitals, and before June 30, 1946, I will probably turn back 40 or 50 more." Where are they? What kind of hospitals are they? Would they be useful for veterans' affairs and for those cases that must be rehabilitated over a long period of time? Wouldn't it be possible, therefore, to transfer some of these serviceable hospitals to the Veterans' Administration and save so many millions of dollars for the people of this country? But there are folks on the floor of Congress this very afternoon who have other ideas, and since General Bradley has asked for it, since the President has implemented that request, there is a move now to put back $158,000,000. Every citizen is more than anxious to make the very best provision for our veterans but tax reduction means nothing if you are going to continue to siphon money out of the Federal Treasury and add to the inflationary force that will blow the lid off even though Chester Bowles sits upon it. [Applause.] No one man, no ten men, no hundred men, no thousand men can cope with the inflationary force if the economic condition and the flow of money out of the Federal Treasury is such as to generate an irresistible force underneath. You can't get a weight strong enough or heavy enough to keep the lid on when that force gets to brewing.

So one of the real responsibilities before us is in this whole field of public expenditure. Those are some of the incentives, then, to disturb or to somehow dissipate the ferment, the uncertainty that is in the minds of people today who are clutching a few savings that they would like to put somewhere, to be invested in plants and machines and tools which becomes the motive power of human progress.

Oh, there are so many things that must be done: The revitalization, I think, of competition in the country; the setting out of some definite area for social-security benefit. All those things are necessary, and then there is one that we often forget—and what is it? Oddly enough, it is in the field of statistics. The other day, before I left Washington, we had the Under Secretary of Labor before us—and since that time he has resigned. He was a former Member of the House by the name of Carl Moran, of Maine—a courageous man and a very able man. While he was testifying, I was listening because they wanted a few hundred thousand dollars more for the Bureau of Labor Statistics. I said, in substance, "Mr. Secretary, what difference does it make whether we give you the money or not because the figures you finally contrive don't beget any confidence from anybody?" I said, "Management doesn't agree with your figures because, for instance, they say your cost-of-living index is too high. The CIO doesn't agree because they say repeatedly that the figures are too low. Why gather up so many facts and figures and embed them in tables and hurl them in great chunks at the country when nobody believes them?" So I thought one of the things that can be done to help bring about a sense of sanity and confidence in the country is, first, to develop some agency in Government that is nonpartisan, nonpolitical, unslanted in its viewpoint, that will take figures, good and bad, and say, "Here they are," and finally generate a measure of confidence on the part of investors, management, labor, and everybody else in this whole Republic, and then start setting up a foundation. It is just part and parcel of the whole field of incentives that are necessary if investment capital is to flow.

I can say, Mr. Forbes, with respect to SEC, that for years I have served on the subcommittee on independent offices appropriations and had opportunity to pass upon the budget requests of Mr. Ganson Purcell, the Chairman of SEC, and his staff, who come before us. We have had so many figures that I insisted he insert in the record from time to time, to show that the course that we are pursuing in this country is, as indicated by the amount of new capital as distinguished from refinancing over a decade of time—is the best indication I know of that funds have been tied up at the source; that there hasn't been that requisite confidence and requisite incentive for this motive power of human progress to articulate itself in the industrial field and carry it forward to something finer and nobler and better.

There are two things that I want to emphasize today—and then I will get around to the subject of the speech. [Laughter.] In addition to all these incentives, folks, it seems to me that one of the first jobs in America today, as we think in terms of this word that jumps from tongue to tongue, namely, "reconversion," is that there must be a kind of moral reconversion in America, and by "moral reconversion," I mean essentially the demobilization of defeatism. Oh, you know what a tragic thing it is today, after we have emerged from this conflict with our land intact, our cities intact, our buildings undestroyed, our people in good shape, wage rates reasonably high, with all the facilities intact that spell out a great and fine and promising prosperity, that you find people high in public life and elsewhere who go about with long, lugubrious faces, who think hopelessly about the future. You can hear speeches on the floor of the House and Senate any time in which they talk about the apple sellers.

You know, it reminds me of the fellow who went into a restaurant, got the napkin up around his neck, and when the waiter came, said, "What kind of soup have you?" The waiter said, "Oxtail." He said, "Why go back that far?" I often have wondered about that—to think that we dip back into the dim and dismal past when there are so many prospects before us, and all we need to do is to demobilize the defeatism in our own hearts and consciences and souls and then we shall resolutely move forward. That's a part of this whole incentive picture for the free and undiminished flow of capital to be translated in terms of machines and land and buildings, to send this country forward to something better.

We ought to be ashamed of ourselves for the attitude that we express when defeatism

is involved. I have seen a lot of soldiers. I have talked to GI's all over the world. I remember being at the airport at Calcutta early one morning, at 6 o'clock—way down in India. The planes were lined up and the boys were getting ready to fly over the "hump." As they were standing around there in the semidarkness I said, "Sergeant, what's your name?"

"My name is Joe Doak."

"Where are you from?"

"I'm from Chicago."

"Where are you going to go?"

"I'm going to fly over the 'hump'—and then the business."

You see, they were then on the threshold of this brutal business so recently come to an end. I said, "What do you think about it all?" Almost invariably the answer was something very expressive and definitive. "Well, we're going over and give them a shellacking and wind this business up in a hurry."

Never did you see any confession of defeatism, never any belief that victory was not in our grasp, never any faltering of courage. You know, every time you look at the pilot of a B–29 and you feel that old, sinking feeling about the future, just think that there is a boy who probably started out in one of those B–29's and took 1,800 miles of water with no landing place and dropped his destructive eggs and came back to base, and probably sat down to play a hand of gin rummy with his associates in the barracks. There's a lesson in encouragement and hope.

If we need anything more by way of a lesson, of course, we could get it out of the Chinese. I marvel at these Chinese folks. When the going got tough, you know they had to move all their tools (you see, that's their instrument for doing business) from everywhere in south China way back to Chungking. That was 1,500 miles. They moved 150,000 tons of machinery 1,500 miles. How? Like we do it, with tractors and heavy-duty trucks? No. They had no tractors, and they had no trucks. They took the machines apart; they loaded them on their bare backs, and Chinese coolies trudged over mountains and through valleys for 1,500 miles, to set that machinery down upon the terrain and quickly start manufacturing small-arms ammunition and other weapons, that the war might go on and that the "V" for victory might be written in the sky.

There is the answer to defeatism. But we have too many folks who sort of lock up hope before trouble even starts. You remember that story about Houdini. (Mr. Forbes, you ought to appreciate this, because it happened in Scotland.) Mr. Houdini was still an amateur in the legerdemain business when he went up to Scotland to give a demonstration, and the frugal, thrifty city fathers said, "We'll take your wager. We'll lock you in the jail and put you in a strait-jacket, and we'll bet you a hundred pounds you can't get out"—and that's really some wager for a Scotsman. He got out of the strait-jacket all right, and began to pick the lock on the jail door, and after an hour and a half he fell against the door, and it opened. They hadn't locked it. We are like that. Mentally we lock the door of hope and courage when actually it is not locked. I know of no better way to demobilize defeatism and get some sense of confidence into the country, as a great incentive for the free flow of investment capital, than to religiously devote ourselves to exterminating defeatism wherever we find it in the country.

No, folks, with all the incentives that you can recite—the revitalization of our whole competitive system, reducing taxes, reducing expenditures, better statistics, more stability, all that sort of thing that is so desirable and so necessary if we are going to put our country back on a foundation where it will really move forward as it did in days of old—there is still one thing lacking, and it is the indispensable ingredient. I don't care what you do in the field of incentives—it still has to be done in the right atmosphere. That's important. And the right atmosphere is the atmosphere of freedom. Free enterprise is just a facet in this whole structure of freedom—and you will never know how much it means until you see lack of freedom in other corners of the earth.

Last night I talked to six or seven hundred farmers at the Sherman Hotel. I said, "The first specific conclusion I want to give you from this trip that I took so recently is that communism is definitely on the march in every area of the world." I said, "Let's quit being sentimental about it. Let's quit being emotional. Let's quit thinking about a Cossack behind every gooseberry bush. Let's be objective and real and think of this as a form of government which will have a very definite effect upon the trade, the commerce, the business of our own country. Let's translate it in terms of its effect upon the daily human welfare for our own people, and then we shall readily understand what this menace is like if that virus gets too strong within our own country."

The trouble is we go off half-cocked and in such a cloud of nebulous emotionalism. The pay-off last night was when a man who is high in the councils of agriculture came to me and said, "Congressman, could you recommend to me a good book on communism?" I couldn't. I said, "Lee, I know of no book on the subject that you would want to read. They are all written by either a lot of long-haired professors or people with slanted inclinations and dispositions, and they give you one side and not the other."

So out of that thinking I think I got an idea. I thought last night before I went to bed that when I get back to Washington tomorrow I ought to drop a little bill into the hopper to set up a joint committee of 5 Senators and House Members who should be charged with the responsibility of picking a dozen or 15 or 20 people in the United States, of all shades of opinion, to prepare a short treatise on the economic aspects of communism, and then print it free of charge and scatter it by the millions through the country, and let our people really know what this business is all about.

If the free-enterprise system and freedom are going to be saved against the viruses that are moving through the world, folks, it can be done in one simple way. It is a question of getting the facts to the people—first isolating the facts and then disseminating them.

I often think of the chap they had on the witness stand who was called to testify about an auto accident. The attorney said, "Did you see the accident?" He said, "Yes."

"How far were you away when it happened?"

Without any hesitation, the witness said, "Twenty-two feet nine and one-half inches."

The attorney looked at that judge, then he looked at the jury, then at the witness, with some contempt. "Now," he said, "Mr. Smart Alec, how do you know it was 22 feet 9½ inches?"

He said, "You know, when this accident happened, I reached into my hip pocket and pulled out a tape measure and quickly measured from where I was to the point of impact of the collision, because I knew that some fool lawyer was going to ask me that question." [Laughter.]

Well, as a matter of fact, people are asking questions today, and in proportion as the answers are made simple and the facts are gotten to the people everywhere, so the problems that are before us are nearly half solved.

That gets around to the thing that I ought to say to you today. What price free enterprise? The answer is very simple: Enough people armed with the facts, who, through an organized and determined effort, will outmatch the efforts of those who would destroy the free-enterprise system.

Remember that great speech that Daniel Webster made on the Constitution. He said, "There are those who would uphold and those who would destroy." But the story in brief is simply this, that when you have enough people who are interested in preserving it to offset those who would destroy it, modify it, change it, and import some new ideology or some new system into the country, then we can feel reasonably sure that freedom and free enterprise will remain secure.

It's a case of facts. It's a case of information. But you have got to get it to the people. Take, for instance, the Library of Congress. It is probably one of the greatest repositories of the fruit of human thinking anywhere in the world. Last year I tried to get an additional hundred thousand dollars for the legislative research section over at the Library of Congress, simply to make it possible for Members of the House and the Senate to enjoy all this wisdom that is there, and to have it analyzed and presented in terms that will be helpful. If that Library were 10 times as large, it would be of limited value unless the information there is made available to meet current problems.

You may not know it—I still get letters from people who ask for free garden seed—and there has been no free garden seed in 24 years. Isn't it marvelous? I get letters from people who say, "We bet a hundred dollars that General So-and-so isn't entitled to wear five stars." All sorts of questions that indicate that somewhere along the line we have failed to get out information to the people.

It is not surprising, then, that Opinion Research only very recently came out with a story, after polling the people in all sections of the country, that 40 out of every 100 adult people in the United States do not know the names of the two United States Senators from their State.

What is the answer? What is the answer to this question of a free flow of investment representing the frugality of our people that provides the tools that enhances and expands and carries forward the standard of living in this country and preserves the free enterprise system? The price is simply an organized, implemented, determined effort on the part of people high and low, rich and poor, humble people everywhere, that that system shall not fail.

I heard a little incident the other day that I think is good for a conclusion—because when you talk about freedom and free enterprise, oddly enough, you must come up with this conclusion, that you do not get something for nothing, here or elsewhere, and if it is doled out freely on one side, somebody has got to pay somewhere in our social and economic structure. The whole thing, I suppose, can be summarized in a phrase that we can all understand—there is no such thing as a free lunch.

An ancient king summoned all his wise men and economists—they were 300 strong—and said, "Now, look! distress is on the land; there is grievous economic dislocation. I want you to come up with some kind of an answer."

They puzzled for a year, and they came up with 600 volumes filled with charts and graphs and explanatory data, and they said, "Here, O King, is the answer." He took one look at that solution, and he shot 150 of them and sent the other 150 back and said, "I will give you just a little while to come up with the answer." They came back with a hundred volumes, and he shot another half. Finally he got down to one man—just one old-time economist with a long beard—who stood in the presence of the king. The king said, "Have you got the answer?" He said, "Yes, O King." He said, "You know, your life depends upon the answer."

He said, "O King, I have got the answer, and it is in one phrase." He said, "King,

relief will be found if we simply carry out that old adage, 'There is no free lunch.'"

In proportion, folks, as we do that, and just think simply and get those simple facts to people everywhere in the United States of America, demobilize defeatism and then set up incentives for investment, which creates the tools of progress, then I have no doubt as to whether or not this blessed thing of free-enterprise system will prevail or not.

One other thing, and then I am through. In 1940 I sat with one of the state ministers down in Buenos Aires, in the Argentine. He said, "Congressman, you are not going anywhere in your country. If you get into a war with Hitler, you will never lick Hitler."

I said, "Is that so? You know, Your Excellency—have you ever been to the United States?"

He said, "No."

I said, "If you come as far as Washington, I will not only pay your expenses up to Detroit, but I will even go with you to show you what tools, labor, direction, and a free atmosphere can do in carrying forward the pursuits of peace, and also in developing the instrumentalities of victory." I said, "If you are going to build a B–29, you get a hundred thousand people out in a 640-acre field, and they will be carrying monkey wrenches and bolts and screws and pieces of aluminum, and you will labor a long time, and maybe you will fashion an airplane. Maybe it will fly, and maybe it won't. But if it does fly, you will call it a day, and you will have festal occasion that will last 6 weeks, and you will start in on B–29 No. 2.

"We don't do it that way in the United States," I said. "First management gives direction to fashioning the blueprints; the investors come forward with money for the tools; those tools are operated under skilled direction by the labor of the country; and then tanks and planes begin to drop off the line with all the facility of so much stick candy."

I said, "Your Excellency, that is the difference between the Argentine and the United States of America. There is cooperation through the use of tools—in what? In the thing that you lack here—the climate of freedom and free enterprise."

One must go into the corners of the earth to appreciate to the full the blessings of freedom. Its retention, its safeguarding, its perpetuity, lies in an organized effort to offset the efforts of those who would destroy. Simple? Also hard. For the answer lies within our own keeping.

It is good to fellowship with the forgotten folks in our country—the forgotten man—the investor.

Thanks so much. [Applause.]

United Nations Organization Capital

REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 10, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman from South Dakota that I hope when the House considers his concurrent resolution that it will also consider having the United Nations Capital in the Lexington-Concord area, in my district, in that historic community where the first blow for liberty was struck. Many other towns in my district are associated with that great fight for liberty. It is a very beautiful country, and I think the nations who have been fighting for freedom will appreciate very much having the capital in that locality. It is also an extremely healthful place. It is next door to one of the finest airports in the world. It is a part of metropolitan Boston, with its live port, its fine seaplane landing base, and its fine airport also. It has great railroad facilities; great colleges with magnificent libraries, the great Institute of Technology is in Boston with its availabillity for research. Boston is a great medical center. Fine churches are throughout the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and persons of every nationality live within its border. Fine newspapers and radio stations are numerous in the Commonwealth. In no other place can we find a better working of democracy with freedom of speech and action and religion than in other Commonwealths. The Concord-Lexington area is an ideal capital for the United Nations. I have received a cable from England that it is being considered.

Un-American Elements Want To Abolish Committee on Un-American Activities

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on December 10, the gentleman from California [Mr. PATTERSON] inserted in the RECORD a petition asking for the abolition of the Committee on Un-American Activities. That petition was signed by a group of individuals, the leaders of whom would have signed a petition for the crucifixion of Jesus Christ.

To read that list reminds one of a petition coming from a bootleggers' convention asking for the abolition of the local grand jury. Some deluded individuals were evidently misled into signing that petition by the subversive leaders of this drive to get rid of the Committee on Un-American Activities that is trying to protect this country against their treasonable designs.

If they perpetrated such conduct in any other country in the world, the chances are they would be stood against a brick wall and shot.

Practically every Communist front organization, as well as every other subversive movement in America is represented in the list of names on that petition, as is shown by the records of the Dies committee, and also by the records of the FBI.

Of course, these un-American elements want to get rid of the Committee on Un-American Activities. They would like to get rid of the FBI also. Then they could practice their treasonable activities without fear of exposure.

But they know that as long as the FBI and the Committee on Un-American Activities are on their loathsome trails their alien noses are rubbing against the bars of the penitentiary, or facing that deportation they so richly deserve.

Letter From a Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I just received what appears to me is a very informative and important letter dated November 29 from a private in the ranks of our armed forces. I submit the letter to your attention from this GI friend of mine. I think his explanation is so clear that no word of mine can be added advantageously:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 29, 1945.*

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE:

Up until the time of my induction into the United States Army on July 29, 1945, I had handled all of the family's expenses and affairs, with my modest income. Since my induction my wife has had to undertake the task of trying to be a good mother to our two children, and at the same time assuming all of the responsibility of managing the house on considerably less money. This undue strain has shown its effects upon her as well as upon our children.

The fact that my wife has become very nervous and irritable has caused the children to become less respectful of her. Her discipline has had to, of course, become more severe, and the children have become less obedient.

A child needs the guidance of a sympathetic and patient mother and the discipline and guiding hand of an understanding father. To remove either parent from the home causes a very unbalanced condition within the home, which will later have its effects upon the children's lives. The results, of course, being a declination in school grades and later adolescent troubles and lastly, but far from being the least, it will eventually have a very marked effect on the children in later years as a citizen.

The prevailing circumstances at my home has caused the situation to get almost completely out of my wife's hands, and it is most certainly out of my hands as long as I remain in the Army.

My wife is in need of an operation, which we have sincerely tried to avoid for the past 2 years, through the use of medicines and drugs and intermittent doctoring. My wife has lost nearly 20 pounds since last August; she now weighs 93 pounds and the present strain and uncertainty of her future home life certainly does nothing toward improving her unhealthful condition. I certainly would not adhere to the operation she needs so badly, as long as she is alone and with no one to take full charge of the children.

I did not hesitate to take up arms against our enemies when my time to be called upon came. I do not intend to cast off those arms for my own personal gain or comfort, but rather for the health and safety and welfare of my family.

We have proven to be in a very healthful position here in the United States, where we can cut production, discharge servicemen, and at the same time have overpowered our enemies. Why then, cannot we very well afford to maintain our high standard of home life, rather than see it crushed by the absence and continued inductions of fathers, who are the sole supporters of families, such as myself.

Pray, our Nation has not bled itself of all of its younger generation, who are full of pep and vigor and anxiety for adventure and travel. Does the Congress of the United States want to see the high standards of home life in America and the morale of its people go back into the dark ages? Surely not, for we are a progressive and wonderful nation and we shall not see it recede into a state of chaos, but will diligently press its future progress, so that it will be second to none in its high standards of public morale and home life.

A married man usually is not efficient away from his family, especially since hostilities have ceased and he feels there is no longer any need for him anywhere but in his home. He is most assuredly not efficient in the Army. I can truthfully say as a married man of almost 11 years that my mind is constantly on the health and welfare of my family. With my wife's health failing and my children being forced to live under the present unpleasant conditions, I cannot, therefore, maintain the effective morale needed to become the good soldier I should be.

During the time when our Nation was waging a gallant war against our oppressors, I felt it within my heart, that it was my duty and obligation to my country and family to take my place in the armed forces to defend our precious democracy and to protect my Nation and home from threatened destruction. I truthfully felt proud that I was in such good mental and physical condition to do my small part of relieving some of our courageous men who had been away from home several years. However, since the cessation of hostilities and with many young unmarried men in uniform and out of uniform, just itching for travel and adventure who could be utilized to this extent, I therefore believe that every married man that has children should be sent back to their families, for sake of national health, safety, and preservation of the true high standard of America's once proud home life.

At the camp I just left a few days ago, there were at least a dozen young unmarried men between the ages of 18 and 21 who were nearly on the verge of tears, because they were not being shipped overseas, with our group, which incidentally numbers about 44 men, 95 percent of whom are married and have children.

Why is the War Department still sending married family men overseas and yet sending men who are single and between the ages of 18 and 25 to work in separation centers here in the States? I am speaking of the Finance Department of the Army only now, as this is the department to which I'm attached. Surely, Mr. DOYLE, there must be a definite reason, or is there?

You may think I'm being selfish, by the tone of this letter, but I most sincerely am not, and I can truthfully say this letter represents the sentiments of the thousands of fathers in our armed forces. If you think not, then you should personally interview some of them and get their opinions. I can truthfully say this letter represents all of the fathers assigned to my outfit.

We all feel that our first duty and obligation to our Nation has been fulfilled, with ending of the war and feel further that our second duty and obligation is calling us back to homes and families.

Then too, Mr. DOYLE, we have to consider the taxpayers' point of view, especially from the point of security. We know the national debt is so large now that it is almost beyond comprehension and that as a previous taxpayer and am hoping to be a future one, that if I should live to be 200 years of age, with no more wars, I would still be paying my share of expenses and costs of this war. My children and their children's children will be paying for this war as long as they live.

It costs the taxpayers of the United States approximately $150 per month to maintain a married man with two children in the armed forces. Of my outfit there are some 50 percent or more that come within this category. It costs the taxpayers of our Nation $50 per month to maintain a single man with no dependents in the armed forces. Therefore, would it not be more beneficial to the taxpayers in the United States, if all fathers were released from active duty, as the armed forces would then be able to maintain three single men for what it is costing to maintain a married man with two children? So out of 44 men, there are 22 of them married and having at least 2 children, the cost to the taxpayers is at the rate of $3,300 per month, whereas, 66 single men could be maintained for the same amount.

During the past month it has been my privilege to talk with at least 150 married men with at least 2 children. One hundred and fifty married men in this category costs the taxpayers at the rate of $22,500 per month. Four hundred and fifty single men with no dependents could be maintained for the same price. Of course, with many married fathers going overseas at this time, the cost is of course $10 extra per man, per month.

With the war over and our Nation looking ahead to a prosperous postwar era, I must truthfully say, we are not doing much to lessen the great burden that lies on the shoulders of our citizens.

Surely the Congressmen of our great Nation, who are supposed to be the greatest body of intellectual wizards in the world, can clearly see that if it costs as much to keep one married man in service now, with two children, as it does to keep three single men, that this great body of men would do something about it. The strength of our armed forces could be more than doubled and the burden on the taxpayers would not be any greater and at the same time our high standards of American home life would still remain secure.

Gen. Joseph T. McNarney stated in his first press conference since his appointment to the new post of successor to General Eisenhower, that United States military occupation of Germany would last for more than 10 years, and that he strongly favored the plan for the families of occupation troops to join them as soon as possible. As for myself and family, if I had liked Germany or any other foreign country so well as to have my family live there, I would have done so years ago. What is wrong with the good old United States of America as a place for a man to raise a family, or don't the great leaders of our democracy wants its citizens to marry and raise families here any more? The United States was plenty good enough for our forefathers, and it is most certainly good enough for me, and by all that's sacred, I'll never take my family out of this Nation to reside. Even though I have never made as much money as some people, I at least have been happy and content living in the United States of America.

I sincerely think it is outrageous for any honest-thinking true American to even harbor such thoughts as asking United States citizens to take up residence in any foreign country against the citizen's will. What is our freedom and the pursuit of happiness coming to anyway?

At the present time we are undertaking the task of raising funds by means of a Victory Loan drive or bond sales drive. This drive will fall very, very short of its goal. It is supposed to be for the furtherment of rest homes, convalescent hospitals and rehabilitation resorts, etc., for our gallant men and women who were wounded, or had their health injured by being interned in prisoner-of-war camps. This assumption may, however, be true, but the average GI Joe, and I am one of them, that I have had the pleasure to talk with, knows very well it takes lots of money to maintain a large Army and Navy and they feel that as long as the taxpayers would be gullible enough to spend money buying Victory bonds, that many high-ranking military men, probably no longer needed, will continue to hold their high-paying jobs and that as long as there is being such a large waste of their money now, that it would only be throwing good money after bad.

I personally think as a citizen of the United States, that instead of our great diplomats trying to appease and be a good-time "Charley" to every nation in the world, they should take a peek at their own country and do a little appeasing here at home. Because, mark my words, that there is a day coming and it may not be too far away, when they may wish to God they had.

Mr. DOYLE, this lengthy letter may sound like an editorial of some kind, but truthfully, I'm writing you as an admirer, supporter, and as a free-speaking citizen and taxpayer.

You may not remember me and again you may. My name is * * *, address as of December 3, will be somewhere in the Brooklyn Army Base (P. O. E.). I am a former resident of Long Beach, Calif., Eighteenth Congressional District of California. I was formerly president of the Cabrillo Homes Resident Interproject Council and owner and general manager of the little newspaper of the west side of Long Beach, known as the West Side Monitor (formerly the Interproject News of Cabrillo Homes and Navy Housing).

I know, Mr. DOYLE, that the voters and taxpayers of the Eighteenth Congressional District have the utmost confidence in you as their Representative to the Congress of the United States, in that you will do everything in your power to lessen the burden of high taxation that now rests on their shoulders and the shoulders of every other tax-paying citizen of America, and that you will do your part by insisting that the unnecessary spending of money by all departments of the Government cease, and point out how the maintenance of a sufficiently large Army and Navy for the protection of our loved homeland and as a weapon for the insurance of future peace could be obtained at a much lesser cost than at the present. This would not jeopardize our famous way of good American home life and high standards of living in any way, else what is the use of an Army and Navy at all?

Mr. DOYLE, any consideration you may render to me in this matter shall be very dearly remembered and deeply appreciated by both myself and my family, as I am making application for my discharge from the Army of the United States on the grounds of dependency and hardship. It will also be an encouragement for GI's who are in the same category as myself. If anything were to happen to my wife or my children due to present conditions, I guess I wouldn't have much else to live for.

I am forwarding certain extracts from this letter to the Los Angeles Examiner and the Long Beach Independent as a means to show the people of the Eighteenth District that no matter where a citizen and taxpayer may be, he can always feel free to call upon his Congressman and tell him his troubles, and that he will be heard with open ears and bend every effort to assist him if at all humanly possible; and, by all means, that he has the taxpayers' interest purely at heart

and that it will remain uppermost in his mind and guide his every action and decision at all times.

Respectfully,

From your friend and supporter,

Pvt. ——— ———.

P. S.—Surely, Mr. DOYLE, the preservation of professional football is not as important to our Congressmen as is the preservation of the American home. I certainly hope not.

The Full Employment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. STARKEY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. STARKEY. Mr. Speaker, in ancient times it was said that the mountain labored and brought forth a mouse, and many of us who doubted that such an event could occur have received a startling example recently how great labors could produce extremely small results.

Unquestionably the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments labored long and hard on H. R. 2202, the so-called full-employment bill. It held public hearings in September, throughout October, and for the first week in November. The testimony printed is voluminous and no more confusing or convincing than the ordinary committee testimony on controversial subjects.

But I have been under the impression that full employment was neither a controversial nor a partisan subject. The underlying ideal is so obviously in accordance with all American ambitions, aspirations, and hopes that it would seem that the only persons opposing full employment would be those who actually do not want to work and are so lazy that they do not want to see others working. Both political parties agreed to the full-employment principle in 1944. The Democratic Party platform practically begins with a statement on full employment, and Governor Dewey, in his acceptance speech, declared:

> We Republicans are agreed that full employment should be the first objective of the national policy.

Apparently the two parties then saw eye to eye on what everybody admits is to be the great postwar domestic problem—or is it barely possible that the Republicans were just making political speeches in 1944?

Others who testified for the original bill were not making political speeches. Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, president of the Federal Council of Churches, was not making a political speech when he declared that this bill was of great interest to religious bodies, since it translated ethical and democratic ideals into concrete forms meaningful to the common man. Pointing out that a man who cannot get a job is not free, the bishop asserted that this bill "will take its place in history among the significant legislative acts of our time."

Certainly the Most Reverend Robert E. Lucy, S. T. D., archbishop of San Antonio, was not making a political speech when he testified:

> By the law of nature and of nature's God, man has a right to labor for himself or for another to the extent to which some income is necessary to support himself and his family in decent and frugal comfort and to save something for the uncertain future. * * * Under the full employment bill, Congress will know beforehand the probable number of unemployed in a given period. The representatives of the people must then decide whether to accord these laboring people the liberty of the sons of God to work and live or the liberty to starve. * * * It is imperative that the full employment bill be passed. It is equally imperative that it be not amended to death. Strangely enough, those who most heartily fear and hate socialism are the very ones who, by the injustices of their reactionary policies, drive the people to the desperation of an all-powerful state.

The members of the committee, it is true, took to heart at least one admonition of the good Catholic archbishop of Texas. They did not amend the bill to death. They killed it and produced in its stead an entirely new bill—the Employment Production Act of 1945.

Not even its most optimistic supporter expected the original bill to provide full employment for everybody everywhere at his or her particular trade or occupation. But we did feel that it was an important step in the right direction. It was first a declaration of policy—the statement of an ideal. And let me say that a declaration may be very important. If there had not been any Declaration of Independence, there would never have been any independence for the Colonies, and the United States of America might never have come into being.

And so we made the declaration in the original bill that "all Americans able to work and seeking work are entitled to an opportunity for useful remunerative, regular and full-time employment." To implement this declaration we set up a certain program designed to stimulate trade, to encourage private enterprise, to strengthen small business, to coordinate the activities of business and Government to the end that we would attempt to foresee and predict trends in employment, in the production and consumption of goods, in the volume of investment during a given year.

Now the idea of prediction is not especially new. Estimates of national income, of Government expenditures, of volume of business are made almost every day by somebody—Government bureaus, market analysts, newspaper financial editors, and every businessman must know his particular market. In many fields now there is substantial agreement on certain estimates, and in some fields the Government bureau estimates are so accurate as to be accepted by all in that field as the best possible estimates.

The last important phase of the original bill was that when the Government, in the person of the President of the United States according to procedures approved by Congress, estimated that there was to be a shortage of jobs, Congress was to be informed of it, and inferentially we were expected to do something about it—if necessary by approving additional public works.

In some fashion, which I am unable to comprehend, this last portion of the bill seems to have angered the opponents of full employment more than any other feature. Apparently, the fact that the Government of the United States might use its collective intelligence to forestall economic catastrophe, might attempt to cure a disease before it got complete hold of the body politic, maddened many persons. They felt that we should leave economic affairs strictly alone, in the hope that they would right themselves, although all the history of the past indicates they never have righted themselves. Under the original provision of the full employment bill, Congress was going to be warned of a thief before the horse was stolen; Congress was going to be warned of a flood before the fields were already inundated, and the opponents of the full employment bill did not feel that this was right. Apparently, they believed that we should wait until the lightning strikes before putting up any lightning rods, and wait until a fire starts before installing fire hydrants and fire engines.

The new Employment-Production Act of 1945 completely abandons the idea of full employment even as a national ideal. Its declared purpose is not to assure full employment but a continuing national policy to promote high levels of employment, production, and purchasing power in a free competitive economy. It will accomplish this purpose, evidently, by asking the President to submit an economic report to Congress within 60 days after the beginning of each session on current economic conditions and any suggestions for legislation required to remedy or improve them. To assist the President in the preparation of this report a council of economic advisers is created, and to assist the council in its advice to the President a joint committee of House and Senate members to be known as the joint committee on the economic report is created. The council of economic advisers to the President is to gather authoritative and timely information on economic trends, to analyze and interpret them for the President, to assist the President in the preparation of the annual report, and make interim reports on a quarterly basis. Whenever the council determines that widespread unemployment exists it is to report to the President the causes of such unemployment and it may recommend legislation to alleviate such unemployment.

I admit that this is a very small residue of what began as promising to be a great bill. We have in this new bill little more than the establishment of a national department or division of economics for the executive and legislative branches which will coordinate the effects of all the existing economic analyses of the various bureaus and departments, adding to them information from private sources and perhaps obtaining through original investigation some new additional information. But the mere fact that the Government takes cognizance of economic matters on the highest level, that it accepts as its duty the necessity of keeping the Members of Congress and the public informed, that it further accepts the duty of rec-

ommending legislation to alleviate unemployment when found all are steps in the right direction. The bill does not go far enough, but it does point the administration toward a coordinated program of economic investigation and upon this basis we may in the future expect progress.

Although I admit keen disappointment that the original bill was not recommended by the committee I intend to vote for this bill as the best available at the present time. I do not propose to stop working for the principles of full employment, but I feel that if we only get an official economic report once a year on conditions that will serve as the basis for legislation we will have got something worth while.

The Price the Farmer Receives and the Consumer Pays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the New York State Fruit and Vegetable Shippers and Receivers Association, Schenectady, N. Y., December 12, 1945:

I am very pleased to have this opportunity to participate on the program of the New York State Fruit and Vegetable Shippers and Receivers Association, at Schenectady, N. Y., today, December 12. When your secretary invited me to address this meeting he very thoughtfully assigned me the subject, The Price the Farmer Receives and the Amount the Consumer Pays, or Price Spreads Between Producers and Consumers. He probably could not have selected a subject about which so much has been said in the last quarter century, but concerning which so little actually has been done, although, apparently, much effort and ability have been directed toward the problem.

I am grateful to my chairman, Hon. JOHN FLANNAGAN, Jr., for selecting me to make this talk after he received the invitation from your able secretary, Earle H. Bogardus. I am indebted to J. O. Parker, who is in charge of our marketing investigating committee, for his assistance in securing some of the facts used as a basis of my address.

I am neither a short-time crystal gazer nor a long-time prophet, so I shall merely attempt to review here today some of the work that has been done on this problem in the past and give you any personal observations I may have concerning it.

Perhaps for purposes of the record, we should all remember that the investigation presently being conducted by the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives into the marketing of farm products makes the third time in approximately 25 years that the attention of Congress has been directed to this very important problem. Just after World War I, the Congress created what was known as the Joint Commission of Agricultural Inquiry, and one of its important duties was to investigate marketing. Again in 1935, the Congress, by joint resolution, directed the Federal Trade Commission to ascertain the proportion of the consumer's dollar going to farmers and distributors, respectively. During all the intervening years the Department of Agriculture through its various agencies has been gathering vast amounts of statistical information and publishing reports of its studies. All of these various investigations and studies have shown one thing very clearly: that is that the producers of farm food products receive a smaller share of the consumer's dollar than that received by the people who make their livelihood by distributing such products. Only twice since 1913 have producers on the average received as much as 50 percent of the consumer's dollar—that was in the year 1918 and the present war years. It may be that there is a proper and adequate explanation for that result, but in all the studies heretofore made, various criticisms have been leveled at the distributive processes and various recommendations made from time to time for their improvement. Whether the marketing margins are excessive, I am frank to admit that I do not know, but it behooves all of us to seek the answer to that problem and to explore the possibilities of improving the marketing system, for we all know that the hue and cry continues that distribution costs are too high and that the spread between the farm and the table is too great. It is better to inquire into such problems now while there is a fairly steady economic level rather than wait until a deflationary period comes and farm prices begin to fall. For then we are likely to be besieged to take action without knowing what, if anything, should be done.

How much does it cost to market fruits and vegetables? How does the Nation's bill for marketing fruits and vegetables compare with the amount received by the farmers who raise the commodities? According to information compiled by the Department of Agriculture, the total marketing charges for fruits and vegetables exceeded those of any other commodity group. In 1939, the last normal prewar year, the farmers' share of the retail cost of all fruits and vegetables, fresh and processed, was 31 percent. Producers received 35 percent of the consumers' dollar expended for fresh fruits and vegetables. In other words, it costs about twice as much to get fruits and vegetables from the farm to the consumer as the farmer is paid for growing them. The fruit and vegetable food bill of consumers in 1939 was about $2,800,000,000. Of this amount producers received about a billion dollars, and the difference of $1,800,000,000, or 65 percent, represents marketing margins.

Production and consumption of fruits and vegetables have increased considerably since 1920, and today approximately 20 percent of the average family food budget is spent for these products. The amount of the consumers' food dollar expended for fruits and vegetables ranks second only to meats. The value of these protective foods from a nutritive standpoint is becoming increasingly recognized. Every effort should, therefore, be made to assure that our system of marketing provides for the widest possible distribution of these products. We need only to look back to the thirties to see important failures in our distribution system, when vast amounts of fruits and vegetables were dumped and when producers were able to receive greater returns by marketing only a portion of their crops. Failures in distribution that we witnessed then must not be repeated.

If the producer of fresh fruits and vegetables received only 35 percent of the consumers' dollar in 1939, where did the other 65 percent go? Assemblers at shipping point accounted for about 6 percent, transportation about 19 percent, wholesaling and terminal brokers about 9 percent, and retailing about 31 percent. Merely to cite the marketing margins and the distribution of such margins among the various functions is not to say, however, that these margins per se are too high or that any of the functions are unnecessary. The figures which I have just recited merely show where the margins are and serve to enable us to see how the various functional groups fared in comparison with the farmers who produced the commodities.

I should like to give you some facts from the committee report in connection with the Pace bill, H. R. 754, for inclusion of farm wages in determining parity price of agricultural commodities:

"This bill, in identical language, was twice before reported unanimously by this committee and has been approved twice by the House of Representatives, once by unanimous vote of the Seventy-seventh Congress and again by voice vote during the Seventy-eighth Congress, at which time only one vote was heard against it. It was reported to the Senate by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry during the Seventy-eighth Congress. * * *

"Soon after his election in 1932 the late President Roosevelt called to a conference in Washington the outstanding farm leaders and agricultural experts of the Nation. At that time the farmers, those who provided the food and fiber to feed and clothe the people, were facing bankruptcy. Farm prices had gone down, down, down. * * * The President called on these leaders and experts to confer and submit recommendations for both quick relief and long-term remedies. * * *

"The period, 1909–14, was adopted as the base period. This was to be the base or standard by which future farm prices would be determined. If the cost of the farmers' necessities should go up, then these prices should rise proportionately in order to keep the two in balance—at parity.

"This conference of farm leaders and experts submitted their report. The President made his recommendations to the Congress, and on March 20, 1933, the House Committee on Agriculture reported a bill to the Congress (H. R. 3835) containing the following declaration of policy:

"'It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to establish and maintain such balance between the production and consumption of agricultural commodities, and such marketing conditions therefor, as will reestablish prices to farmers at a level that will give agricultural commodities a purchasing power with respect to articles that farmers buy, equivalent to the purchasing power of agricultural commodities in the base period. The base period in the case of all agricultural commodities except tobacco shall be the prewar period, August 1909–July 1914. In the case of tobacco the base period shall be the postwar period, August 1919–July 1929.'

"That bill, with that declaration of policy, became law on May 12, 1933 (Public Law 10, 73d Cong.).

"Then, in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 parity was defined, as follows:

"'Parity, as applied to prices for any agricultural commodity, shall be that price for the commodity which will give to the commodity a purchasing power with respect to articles that farmers buy equivalent to the purchasing power of such commodity in the base period.'

"PURPOSE OF THE BILL

"Probably one of the clearest and most understandable statements of the purpose of this bill is that of the late President Roosevelt, in his message to Congress on September 7, 1942, as follows:

"'Parity is a fair relationship between the prices of the things farmers sell and the things they buy. Calculations of parity must include all costs of production, including the cost of labor. As a result, parity prices may shift every time wage rates shift.'

"At the present time that 'fair relationship' does not exist. * * * And, certainly, if a farmer must now pay three or

four times as much for his labor as he paid during the base period, his crops cannot have that equivalent purchasing power unless this increase in labor cost is taken into account in determining parity prices.

* * * * *

"LABOR COST NOT INCLUDED

"But it will be observed that labor cost is not included in these parity calculations, although it is the biggest single item entering into the cost of producing a crop—32 percent, according to BAE.

"Then, if the parity principle is fair, and it is generally recognized as the fairest system that can be set up, it must be admitted that all the labor engaged in production should be included in the cost of production. That is all this bill seeks to do.

"Three things should be clearly understood and kept constantly in mind—

"1. This bill does not seek to add, and will not add, to parity prices the total amount paid to or allowed for those working on the farm. It merely adds, as a part of the cost of production, the difference or increase in the farm-wage rates since the base period (1909–14).

"2. That labor is the largest single item entering into production. It represents a greater percentage in producing some commodities than in others, of course, but the Bureau of Agricultural Economics reports that on the whole it represents 31.7 percent of the cost of production. Therefore, it can be easily understood what a rank injustice is being visited upon producers when the increase in labor cost is not included in the calculation of parity prices.

"3. That the passage of this bill, and the adjustment of the parity index and parity prices as provided by this bill, does not mean that the producers will necessarily receive the new parity prices for their commodities or that the consumers will be required to pay such a proportionate rise in the cost of such commodities. In the first place, parity prices are not actual prices paid to the producer; they are the prices the producer should receive in order for his commodities to have a "fair relationship" and an "equivalent purchasing power" with the things he must buy to live and make a crop, as promised by the Congress. In the second place, the trend of farm prices is now downward; already the prices of many commodities are below present parity prices and the producers have been assured protection or supports of only 90 percent of parity prices. The present parity prices, not including this increase in farm labor cost as provided in this bill, are only about 70 percent of true parity, and when producer prices are protected at only 90 percent of this, that is 90 percent of 70 percent, the producer realizes protection or support of only 63 percent of parity prices.

"The producers are entitled to receive parity prices for their commodities, 100 percent, and certainly while their prices are supported at only 90 percent of parity it should be 90 percent of the full and true parity authorized by this bill.

"PROVISIONS OF BILL

"This bill provides that, in addition to the present items considered in calculating parity, such prices shall also 'reflect the cost of all farm labor, including hired workers, farm operators, and members of the families of farm operators engaged in work on the farm, as contrasted with such costs of all farm labor during the base period.'

"The committee calls special attention to the fact that this bill includes only those workers who are actually engaged on the farm. There are three groups included.

"First, the hired worker. * * *

"Second, the operators.

"This term is intended to cover the small farm operator, the tenant and the share cropper; the men who actually live on the farm, manage the farm, work on the farm, and in most cases work in the fields, planting, plowing, cultivating, and harvesting the crops. Upon them rests the responsibility of producing the crops to feed the Nation, without regard to hours, weather, or seasons. * * *

"Third, the family worker. * * * There are now over 25,000,000 persons living on the 6,000,000 farms of the Nation. * * * Not included, the committee regrets to say, is the hardest worker of all, the farm wife. While she may not spend her time in the fields, she is the one who must be the first to get up in the morning and the last to retire at night. Breakfast must be prepared, the family cow must be milked, the house must be cleaned, the children must be prepared for school, the sick must be nursed, the sewing must be done, the old must be cared for, the vegetables must be gathered, the chickens must be fed, the washing must be done, the canning must be done, and on and on through the day. Finally evening comes, and after all have been put to bed and plans have been made for another dawn, a tired body lies down to rest. No; be it said to our shame, BAE doesn't include her among the farm workers and for the price of the crops grown on the farm no allowance can be included for her labor.

"BAE estimated that on January 1, 1945, the farm population was 25,190,000. It will thus be seen that if this bill had been in effect in 1944 it would have covered the wages, at the hired wage rate, of—

"Hired workers	1,880,000
Farm operators	5,140,000
Family workers	1,250,000
Total	8,270,000

* * * * *

"Yes, there are some—the committee can't believe there are many—who claim the right to buy their food at the same price they paid in 1909–14, although their own income in many cases has doubled and trebled since that time and notwithstanding the fact the farm wage-rate index is now 345 as compared with 100 in 1909–14. While they cheer other workers for asking a 30-percent increase in wages, they would deny the farmer the privilege of asking that the increase in farm-labor cost be included in figuring fair prices for his crops. While they approve others laying down their tools in support of their demands for 52 hours' pay for 40 hours of work, they expect the farmer to stay on the job, to work from daylight to dark, and to sell his crops at a price which reflects for him the same wage he received and paid over 30 years ago.

"No; the farmers don't strike, and they won't strike. * * *

"First, here is how the gross income is made up, as announced by BAE:

"Cash farm income, value of products consumed on farms, and gross farm income, 1944

"Cash receipts from farm marketings	$19,790,000,000
Government payments	804,000,000
Total cash income	20,594,000,000
Value of products retained for home consumption	2,040,000,000
Rental value of dwellings	812,000,000
Gross farm income	23,446,000,000
Adjustments for changes in inventory	−415,000,000
Gross farm income, including adjustments for change in inventory	23,031,000,000

"In the first place, it will be observed that the total cash receipts were only $20,594,000,000.

"Then, as the following analysis will show, after deducting the costs of production, after allowing a wage of $935 per year (the same average wage allowed for the hired workers) to the 5,140,000 full-time farm operators and the 1,250,000 family workers, and a return of only 3 percent on the value of unencumbered farm property, there is a net cash return of only $2,812,150,000. For the 25,190,000 people on the farms of the Nation this means only $111 per annum each. From this $2,812,150,000 some provision must be made for the farm wife, the hardest worker of all, for clothing for the children, schoolbooks, lights for the house, doctors, dentists, undertakers, etc. Here are the figures:

"Amount of cash left in hands of the farmers

"Total cash receipts from marketings	$20,594,000,000
Expenses of production:	
Feed purchased	2,078,000,000
Livestock purchased	647,000,000
Fertilizer and lime	476,000,000
Cost of operating motor vehicles	831,000,000
Miscellaneous operating expenses, including horses and mules, seed, insecticides, containers, electricity for production, twine, ginning, operating gas and steam engines, irrigation, grazing, insurance, dairy supplies, blacksmith and miscellaneous hardware supplies, miscellaneous greenhouse and nursery expenses, veterinary bills and medicine, sugar tolls, and total short-term interest	1,218,000,000
Total operating expenses	5,250,000,000
Buildings	743,000,000
Motor vehicles	460,000,000
Machinery and equipment	421,000,000
Hired labor (cash wages)	1,760,000,000
Taxes	460,000,000
Farm mortgage interest	255,000,000
Land rent	1,100,000,000
Total production expenses	10,449,000,000
Excess, receipts over production expenses	10,145,000,000
Government payments to nonfarmers; that is, owners not living on or operating farm	89,000,000
Balance	10,056,000,000
Allowance for 3 percent on $42,307,000,000 value of unencumbered farm property	1,269,200,000
Allowance to 5,140,000 full-time farm operators for work on the farm, care of stock, repairs of machinery, milking cows, planting, cultivating and harvesting crops, and general management of farm, at $935 per year, same rate as paid hired workers	4,805,900,000

Allowance to 1,250,000 family farm workers (only one-fourth person per farm) at $935 per year, same rate as paid hired workers	$1,168,750,000
Total allowance	7,243,850,000
Net cash returns for all purposes for the 25,190,000 people on the farm, including something for the farm wife, hardest worker of all, and including clothing for children, schoolbooks, lights for the house, gas for the family car, paying the preacher, doctors, dentists, undertakers, etc., or the grand amount of $111 per year per person	2,812,150,000

"(All figures for expense of production supplied by Bureau of Agricultural Economics.)

"This $2,812,150,000 is a long way from the published gross income figure of $23,446,000,000, which latter amount is what millions of people think is the farmers' pocket money.

"THE OTHER FELLOW

"In this connection it is interesting to note—

"1. The Department of Commerce has reported the total national income for 1944 at $160,700,000,000;

"2. The Department of Labor reports that there were 38,000,000 employees in nonagricultural establishments in January 1945, not including personnel of the armed forces, domestic servants, and self-employed persons;

"3. The Department of Commerce reports that, of the total national income, the sum of $111,000,000,000 was for wages and salaries, excluding farm wages.

"Does the farmer even start to begin to receive his fair portion of the national income? Figure it out yourself and draw your own conclusions. Such a situation hardly requires comment.

"UNENCUMBERED FARM PROPERTY

"The values of unencumbered farm property and farm indebtedness used in the foregoing analysis were supplied by BAE, as follows:

"Value of farm property Jan. 1, 1945:	
Real estate	$45,592,000,000
Other property	15,367,000,000
Total	60,959,000,000
Indebtedness against farm property:	
Real-estate mortgages	5,635,000,000
Average volume short-term credit	2,089,000,000
Total	7,724,000,000
Values of property free from debt	53,235,000,000
Adjusted to exclude owners not living on farms	42,307,000,000

"DEMANDS OF LABOR

"Let it be said first that, insofar as this committee can interpret the attitude of the farmers of the Nation, they favor good wages, both for their own hired helpers and for all of those who work in the industrial plants, manufacturing establishments, mines, shops, stores, utilities, transportation systems, and other places. They recognize the need of such workers having strong purchasing power in order for them to buy all they need of the products of the farms. They want such workers to have, as they want for themselves, not only a living wage, but a wage sufficient to provide some of the comforts and pleasures of life and some protection against the uncertainties of the future and old age.

"But the farmers do ask equal treatment. They feel they have the right to insist—in fact, to demand—that (1) when industrial wages go up, and thereby result in an increase in the wages of the farm worker, that such increase in his labor cost should be promptly reflected in the price he receives for his commodities, and (2) that a similar increase in price should be allowed for his own work on the farm or in the dairy or elsewhere. The enactment of this bill is necessary to bring about such equal treatment.

"While the producers fully realize the benefits they derive from high consumer purchasing power for farm commodities, they are just as sure that a high purchasing power among the 25,000,000 people now living on farms can be of equal benefit to those who work in the industrial plants, manufacturing establishments, mines, etc.

"In fact, one of the greatest markets in the world today is the American farmer. They would like to enjoy modern improvements and modern conveniences just the same as those who live in urban communities. There are those who contend that national prosperity depends entirely upon high industrial wages and high purchasing power in the hands of industrial workers. On the contrary the economic history of this Nation demonstrates that the economic condition of the Nation as a whole follows the economic condition on the farms. Without exception, when the farmer is prosperous the Nation is prosperous. The farmers produce the raw commodities which industry and commerce must have for doing business and just as surely as industry must depend upon the farm for its raw commodities it must depend upon the farmer to bring about favorable economic conditions.

"The fear has been expressed by some that if this bill becomes a law it will justify demands by industrial workers for increase in their wage scale. The committee submits that this bill cannot justify any such demands.

"1. As shown above, the salaried workers are already receiving $111,000,000,000 of a total national income of $161,000,000,000. Surely they don't want it all.

"2. Since the base period (1909–14) the average hourly earnings of the factory worker have increased from the rate of 21 cents per hour paid during that period to the present rate of $1.02 per hour, an increase of nearly 400 percent. Here are the official figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor:

Year	Average hourly earnings, in cents	Index of hourly earnings of factory workers
1910–14	21	100
1915	23	108
1916	26	123
1917	31	147
1918	41	193
1919	48	226
1920	58	273
1921	51	239
1922	46	219
1923	52	246
1924	55	258
1925	54	257
1926	55	259
1927	55	261
1928	56	265
1929	57	267
1930	55	261
1931	52	244
1932	46	216
1933	46	215
1934	54	255
1935	56	264
1936	56	266
1937	63	299
1938	64	302
1939	63	299
1940	66	312
1941	73	344
1942	85	403
1943	96	454
1944	102	481

NOTE.—Figures from Bureau of Labor Statistics of Department of Labor.

"3. The consumer is today buying his food for a less percentage of his income than at any time in the history of the Nation. During the 5-year period 1935–39 the consumer spent 23 cents of his or her dollar for food, while for the same kind and quantities of food today he or she is paying only 15 cents of the dollar. And, after taking into account the greatly increased quantity of food the consumer is buying today, he or she is still spending at this time only 20 cents of the dollar. Much more food bought and consumed in 1945 than during 1935–39, and yet the increased quantity is costing a less percent of the consumer's dollars, 20 percent as against 23 percent."

Time will not permit discussion and analysis today of all the various marketing functions, but I do want to touch momentarily upon the wholesaler function, since I assume that some of you are engaged in wholesaling. When I stated a moment ago that approximately 9 percent of the consumers' dollar went to wholesalers, the group that I was referring to includes terminal brokers, terminal auctions, wholesale receivers and jobbers, commission receivers, and chain-store warehouses. Although this group accounts for only approximately 9 percent of the consumers' dollar, it is a very important cog in the distribution machine, and apparently its importance has been recognized in view of the fact that in all the investigations heretofore made this group has received considerable attention.

The conclusion has been pretty generally reached that there are definite possibilities for not only reducing marketing costs but eliminating waste and reducing deterioration by the reorganization and improvement of many of the principal wholesale and jobbing markets. Many of the wholesalers themselves have recognized this but have admitted that they are powerless to bring about what they were ready to admit were needed improvements.

In many cities the wholesale markets for fruits and vegetables are very old. For example, the Faneuil Hall Market, of Boston, is about 200 years old, yet it is still the principal market in that city.

Many changes have taken place since most of the terminal markets have been constructed. Methods of transportation have changed. Produce from distant producing areas has become available. Consumption has increased. Yet with all these changes the markets themselves have undergone little change, with the result that many of these markets are inadequate.

Buildings are old, were not designed for handling fruits and vegetables, and are not suitable for the efficient handling of produce.

Most of these markets do not have proper facilities for handling motortruck receipts. Streets are too narrow for many of the larger over-the-road trucks to enter, and the produce must be reloaded on a smaller truck for a haul of a block or two to reach the market.

In some markets literally hours are required for a truck to get into the market and unload. When it finally gets through it usually cannot reach the particular wholesaler's store

and the produce must be unloaded and carried by porters to the wholesaler's store.

When members of our committee visited the West Washington Market, in New York, the truck congestion was so bad that it required more than 1 hour for a truck to turn from one street to another.

Another evil is that few cities have a common place to receive rail and truck shipments. Thus, there is much expense involved in moving commodities from the rail terminal to the truck market and in buyers having to go from one place to another to obtain their supplies.

I could go on and give additional examples, but it takes no expert to know that conditions like these mean time wasted, high operating costs, unnecessary handling, large losses from spoilage, and other cost-occasioning factors.

These conditions make real efficiency in marketing perishable products very difficult, if not almost impossible to attain.

Studies of the several principal markets have been made from time to time by the Department of Agriculture, and it has been estimated that savings of millions of dollars could be made through the improvement of the physical facilities for handling the commodities alone.

One might properly ask, if this is true, why have these improvements not been made? The answer is that some of them have. In other cities plans are now being made for bringing about certain improvements. In the main, the smaller markets and smaller cities can lead the way, since they are not confronted with all the obstacles that lie in the path of market improvement in large cities. Probably the greatest single obstacle to market improvement, especially in the larger cities, is the divergent interests within the marketing groups. Unless a very substantial portion of the wholesalers within a market are agreeable to the construction of new facilities, a different location, and so forth, little can be done by only a part of the market interests because of the costs and risks involved.

It has been proposed by various groups from time to time that Federal moneys should be made available through loans or grants, or both, for the construction of new market facilities in connection with public-works programs. In fact at the present time the Federal Works Agency is authorized to make loans to States, cities, and municipalities for the purpose of planning public improvements, and it is my understanding that some cities seeking to improve marketing facilities have obtained loans for such purposes. In that connection, I would like to make this observation—we should carefully consider establishing some method or means whereby the plans of such markets can be carefully examined and integrated into a unified national marketing system before making large sums of Federal moneys available for the erection of marketing facilities. Otherwise we might actually burden rather than improve the marketing system through the construction of improper facilities which would require the industry to meet high fixed costs.

At the outset I told you that I was neither a crystal gazer nor a long-term prophet, but I do want to make one phophecy. Whether we have improved marketing facilities at terminal markets and the savings which it is estimated would flow therefrom depends largely upon the willingness of those engaged in marketing to work and act together as a united group for the benefit of the industry as a whole. In my opinion, the failure of these marketing interests to take the action which is admittedly needed does not mean that improvements in the marketing processes will not be forthcoming. I do not want you to misconstrue that statement or infer it as a threat of legislation. For that is not the case. What I have in mind is simply this: we have seen the growth and establishment of two methods of marketing today which make little or no use of the so-called terminal markets. I refer to what is known as the chain-store-warehouse method and the service-wholesaler method. The former is the more familiar of the two and provides for the integration of the assembling, distribution, and retailing of fruits and vegetables, and whether we like chain stores or not, the inovations and improvements which they inaugurated are certain to continue. In this connection it should be observed that the Department of Agriculture estimated that for 1939 the average margin for retail fresh fruits and vegetables for chain stores was 25 percent as compared to 32.5 percent for the independents, and that the chain-store warehouses took a margin of 8 percent as compared to 12.5 percent for wholesale receivers and jobbers. Those figures are estimates and probably are subject to many adjustments. Nevertheless, it is the popular conception that the method employed by chain stores has brought about a reduction in marketing margins. The service-wholesaler method which is being utilized at certain points in the Midwest combines the receiver-wholesaler-jobber functions and uses chain-store-warehouse methods to receive, handle, and distribute from a single warehouse the supplies needed by retail outlets. In each instance the terminal market is almost completely circumvented. In other words, its the old story—if old ways of doing things are not improved, new methods will be found. Terminal markets, I believe, will be compelled to modernize or go into competitive oblivion.

I am convinced that any group can maintain its rightful position in the marketing system if it is continually trying to improve its services and does not rest upon its laurels. The fruit and vegetable industry is your industry, therefore, its problems are your problems. The decision as to whether there is anything to be gained by exploring the possibilities of improving the marketing system is yours as well as mine. The improvement of our system for distributing farm products is a matter which rises above local or selfish considerations or partisan politics. We must not confess our inability to grapple with this problem which in the evolution of time has come to challenge our genius.

Citation To Accompany the Award of the Medal for Merit to Ralph K. Davies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 14 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the citation to accompany the award of the Medal for Merit to Ralph K. Davies.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION TO ACCOMPANY THE AWARD OF THE MEDAL FOR MERIT TO RALPH K. DAVIES

Ralph K. Davies, for exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services to the United States. As Deputy Petroleum Administrator, Mr. Davies organized and directed the unique Government-industry combination that achieved one of the outstanding victories of the war—the assurance of petroleum for every military and essential civilian need of the United Nations. Under his guidance, this unprecedented partnership furnished the United Nations with their most vital and most used munition. As a member of the President's Committee on Oil, Mr. Davies played a leading part in formulating and negotiating an international oil agreement, executed by officials of the United States and Great Britain. To these high duties Mr. Davies brought profound oil knowledge, an incisive intellect, rare vision, the quiet power of a gifted organizer and executive, the courageous devotion of a man characterized by unflinching determination, and a deep sense of public service.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Resignation of Gen. Patrick J. Hurley and the Sabotage of Our Foreign Policy in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 14, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to whom was referred the resolution (H. Res. 443) requesting the Secretary of State to give information regarding the resignation of Gen. Patrick J. Hurley and the sabotage of our foreign policy in China, having considered the same, report adversely thereon without amendment and recommend that the resolution do not pass.

For the information of the House, there is included in this report the following communication from the Department of State:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 8, 1945.

The Honorable SOL BLOOM,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BLOOM: I have received your letter of December 1 enclosing House Resolution 443, which has been introduced by Representative ROGERS of Massachusetts and referred to your committee.

I have no information relative to sabotage of our foreign policy in China. I enclose a copy of my statement made yesterday before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations upon that subject. That statement also refers to the resignation of Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, as Ambassador to China, referred to in the resolution. I enclose also, as bearing upon that matter, a copy of the statement made by the Department at the time of his resignation, a copy of General Hurley's letter of resignation, and a copy of the President's reply thereto.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BYRNES.

STATEMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, DECEMBER 7, 1945

During the war the immediate goal of the United States in China was to promote a military union of the several political factions in order to bring their combined power to bear upon our common enemy—Japan. Our longer-range goal, then as now, and a goal of at least equal importance, is the development of a strong, united, and democratic China.

To achieve this longer-range goal, it is essential that the Central Government of China, as well as the various dissident elements, approach the settlement of their differences with a genuine willingness to compromise. We believe, as we have long believed and consistently demonstrated, that the government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek affords the most satisfactory base for a developing democracy. But we also believe that it must be broadened to include the representatives of those large and well-organized groups who are now without any voice in the government of China.

This problem is not an easy one. It requires tact and discretion, patience and restraint. It will not be solved by slogans. Its solution depends primarily upon the good will of the Chinese leaders themselves. To the extent that our influence is a factor, success will depend upon our capacity to exercise that influence in the light of shifting conditions in such a way as to encourage concessions by the Central Government, by the so-called Communists, and by the other factions.

If I understand correctly what Ambassador Hurley has stated to me, and subsequently to the press and to this committee, he entertains no disagreement with this conception of our policy. Moreover, he has indicated to me and to this committee that he has been unfailingly supported by two Presidents and three Secretaries of State in his efforts to execute this policy.

He does object, however, to what he asserts has been a failure or refusal to make this policy public.

I wish to make it clear now, because of its bearing upon this point and upon other matters which I shall come to in a moment, that I am not familiar with every speech and press release and letter of my immediate predecessors as Secretary of State, nor with every incident that has occurred in recent years among officers of the State Department in China or elsewhere. I have not had the opportunity to examine these records, nor am I likely to have it in the near future.

Nevertheless, I submit that the broad outlines of our policy in China have never been hidden or difficult to recognize. The phase of that policy upon which Ambassador Hurley has placed the greatest emphasis is our support of the National Government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek.

Of all the phases of our policy in the Far East, this seems to have been the clearest and most obvious. We formally recognize only the National Government. Our Ambassador is an ambassador to the National Government. Our war supplies and financial assistance have been delivered only to the National Government. At the Cairo Conference it was Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek who represented China. At San Francisco it was the Foreign Minister of the National Government who signed the Charter of the United Nations. It was the National Government which ratified the Charter. It is the Foreign Minister of the National Government who sits in the Council of Foreign Ministers.

In recent weeks, the necessary presence of our troops in China has been a source of understandable concern to the American people. As a result, the subject has been raised frequently at my meetings with the press. I have made it very clear that our troops are in China for the sole purpose of facilitating the surrender of large numbers of Japanese troops to the armies of the National Government in compliance with the order of the Supreme Allied Commander.

These are a few among many public evidences of our recognition of the government of Chiang Kai-shek as the legitimate Government of China. In the face of them, and in the light of the admittedly consistent support of this policy by Presidents Roosevelt and Truman and Secretaries Hull, Stettinius, and myself, it is difficult to understand Ambassador Hurley's intimation that his failure to achieve a satisfactory settlement of China's internal division resulted from the absence of a public expression of our policy.

General Hurley's statements before this committee require me to add a few words concerning what he has indicated to be a refusal by me and by the President to grant his request for such a public statement. The pressure of time has been so great that I am unable to make a categorical statement at the moment, but I can tell you that I have not been informed of any written document in the possession of the Department of State in which the Ambassador has made such a request.

I can state categorically that he has never made such a request in conversation with me. Moreover, I was present at one of the two conversations he has had with the President since his return in September. I did not hear him make such a request at that time. Since the Ambassador's testimony here, I have asked the President whether, in his recollection, Ambassador Hurley has ever requested him, orally or in writing, to issue a public statement of our policy in China. He does not recall such a request.

My recent letter to Representative ANDERSON of California, to which Ambassador Hurley has referred with approval, was in response to a letter of inquiry from the Congressman. When a Member of Congress requests an explanation of some aspect of our foreign policy, I take it as a matter, of course, that the request should be answered. But in the absence of such specific inquiries, I have thought it necessary to give public expression to our foreign policy only as occasion may demand.

As I have indicated, it is not my intention to attempt to interpret and explain every event of large or small importance in the administration of our foreign policy in China and other parts of the world in recent years.

I feel, however, that in fairness to the loyal, intelligent, and hard-working men of our foreign service, and in fairness to the employees of the Department of State, generally, I am compelled to discuss briefly certain charges which Ambassador Hurley has made.

The foreign-service officers are nonpolitical Government employees, selected through competitive examinations. They have long labored earnestly and with too little public recognition to uphold abroad our national interests. My own experience with them has given me a high regard for their ability, integrity, and loyalty.

I do not know George Atcheson or John Service. But because of the special criticism to which they have been subjected by the Ambassador, I have obtained and read Mr. Atcheson's telegram of February 28, 1945, and Mr. Service's memorandum of October 10, 1944. These are the documents upon which the Ambassador appears to rely most strongly for support of his charge that these two officers sought to prevent the accomplishment of the objectives of United States policy in China.

The propriety of Mr. Atcheson's telegram can be determined only against the background of the events in China which preceded it. Like Ambassador Gauss before him, Ambassador Hurley had been making strenuous efforts to achieve unity, not only between the Central Government and the so-called Communists, but between the Central Government and the other dissident elements in China as well. At the time Ambassador Hurley left Chungking for a visit to Washington on February 19, 1945, I am advised that the negotiations between the Central Government and the Communists appeared to have broken down.

When Ambassador Hurley departed from the Embassy at Chungking, Mr. Atcheson, as counselor, automatically assumed charge of the Embassy's affiairs. On February 28, 9 days after the Ambassador's departure from Chungking and 3 days before his arrival in Washington, according to the records of the Department, Mr. Atcheson sent his telegram. It contained a broad and thoughtful analysis of the situation in China as it appeared to him in the light of the shifting circumstances of the moment. It concluded with the recommendation that these shifting circumstances required a readjustment of our immediate strategy.

In his telegram, Mr. Atcheson distinctly stated that "a favorable opportunity for discussion of this subject should be given by the presence of General Wedemeyer as well as General Hurley in Washington."

The officer in charge of an American mission in a foreign country bears the responsibility for full and accurate reporting of the factors and events which are necessary to the intelligent formulation and execution of United States foreign policy. He is further responsible for the submission from time to time of recommendations with respect to this policy. If his reports and recommendations are to be useful, it is clear that they must reflect his free and honest judgment.

In the case of an ambassador, these considerations have always been taken for granted. They have been taken equally for granted in the case of the officer who assumes charge during the absence of the Ambassador from the Embassy. Since September, for example, we have relied upon the reports of the ranking official of the Embassy in China.

It is difficult to understand how Mr. Atcheson failed in any way to observe the letter or the spirit of these rules and traditions. His telegram of February 28 was a full and free report of the current situation in China as he saw it. His recommendation was an honest effort to assist the Department of State in the formulation of its future policy in China. There is nothing to indicate that he sought to circumvent his superior in making this report and recommendation. On the contrary the telegram expressly suggested that this was a matter upon which the views of Ambassador Hurley should be sought by the Department in Washington.

The specific action of John Service to which Ambassador Hurley referred in his conversation with me was the preparation of a memorandum on October 10, 1944. I have also read this memorandum with care.

Before I turn to its contents, I wish to call attention to a few facts, as they have been presented to me. At the time this memorandum was prepared by Mr. Service, he was not attached to the Embassy at Chungking. Although he retained his status as a foreign-service officer, he was attached to the staff of General Stilwell, as a political observer in Yunan. He was at the time administratively responsible to General Stilwell and not to the Embassy.

Ambassador Hurley, as of that date, was in China as the personal representative of the President, with the rank of ambassador; but he was not the United States Ambassador to China. He was not in charge of the United States Embassy in Chungking.

Under these circumstances, it cannot be said that anything Mr. Service wrote constituted insubordination to Ambassador Hurley.

The memorandum itself embodied recommendations for a basic change in United States policy toward the Central Government of China. It was written in forceful language and the conclusions which it drew were rather drastic.

It was addressed to General Stilwell. It was also routed to the Embassy in Chungking. The Embassy forwarded it to the Department without endorsing its conclusions, but with a noncommittal covering memorandum indicating that it represented the views of a single political observer.

When the memorandum reached the Department of State it was sent to the Division of Chinese Affairs. Before it was circulated

further, the Division of Chinese Affairs attached another covering memorandum stating decisively that although its contents were informative, many of its conclusions, which were specifically enumerated, were regarded as incorrect.

It is not my purpose to dwell at greater length upon the two documents. In my opinion, based upon the information which has thus far been presented to me, there is nothing in them to support the charge that either Mr. Atcheson or Mr. Service was guilty of the slightest disloyalty to his superior officers.

What it amounts to is that within proper channels they expressed to those under whom they served certain views which differed to a greater or less degree from the policies of the Government as then defined. Of course, it is the duty of every officer of the United States to abide by and to administer the declared policy of his Government. But conditions change, and often change quickly in the affairs of governments. Whenever an official honestly believes that changed conditions require it, he should not hesitate to express his views to his superior officers.

The other complaint of Ambassador Hurley is that some official or employee did not merely express a different view to his superior officer but advised someone associated with the Communist forces that the Ambassador did not accurately represent United States policy. For such action there would be no excuse. I would be the first to condemn it and to dismiss the person guilty of it. But Ambassador Hurley has not furnished : .e, nor do I understand that he has furnished this committee, any specific evidence to prove that any employee was guilty of such conduct. Men who have rendered loyal service to the Government cannot be dismissed and their reputations ought not to be destroyed on the basis of suspicions entertained by any individual. I should be profoundly unhappy to learn that any officer of the Department of State, within or without the foreign service, might feel bound to refrain from submitting through proper channels an honest report or recommendation for fear of offending me or anyone else in the Department. If that day should arrive, I will have lost the very essence of the assistance and guidance I require for the successful discharge of the heavy responsibilities of my office.

HURLEY'S RESIGNATION

The Secretary was surprised at the news release by Ambassador Hurley that he had submitted a letter of resignation.

When the Ambassador returned from China he told the Secretary that because of his health he wished to resign, but later advised the President and the Secretary that he would return to China after taking a rest. That was on October 9.

Monday morning Ambassador Hurley called to see the Secretary and presented a letter of resignation, addressed to the President, setting forth the statements contained in the news release. The Secretary advised him of the serious situation existing in China and urged him, instead of resigning, to promptly return to China.

The Ambassador returned in the afternoon and, after again discussing the situation in China, agreed to return to his post. He said, however, that he had an engagement on Wednesday to make a speech before the National Press Club and would prefer not to leave before that time. The Secretary told the Ambassador that would be entirely satisfactory. The Secretary then advised the President that the Ambassador would promptly return to his post.

NOVEMBER 26, 1945.

The Honorable the PRESIDENT
OF THE UNITED STATES

(Through the Secretary of State).

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I hereby resign as Ambassador to China.

In tendering my resignation, I wish you to know that I am in agreement with the foreign policy outlined by you in your recent Navy Day address.

I am grateful to both you and the Secretary of State for the support you have given me, and for your kind offer in requesting me to return to China as Ambassador.

In one capacity or another I have been on the perimeter of America's influence since the beginning of the war. During the war I have served in Java, Australia, New Zealand, and generally in the southwest Pacific; in Egypt, Palestine, the Lebanon, Syria, Trans-Jordan, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Russia, Afghanistan, India, Ceylon, Burma, and China. Of all of the assignments China was the most intricate and the most difficult. It is a source of gratification to me that in all my missions I had the support of President Roosevelt, Secretary Hull, Secretary Stettinius, yourself, Mr. President, and Secretary Byrnes.

In the higher echelon of our policy-making officials American objectives were nearly always clearly defined. The astonishing feature of our foreign policy is the wide discrepancy between our announced policies and our conduct of international relations. For instances, we began the war with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and democracy as our goal. Our associates in the war at that time gave eloquent lip service to the principles of democracy. We finished the war in the Far East furnishing lend-lease supplies and using all our reputation to undermine democracy and bolster imperialism and communism. Inasmuch as I am in agreement with you and the Secretary of State on our foreign policy I think I owe it to you as well as to the country to point out the reasons for the failure of the American foreign policy in reaching the objectives for which we said we were fighting the war. I will confine my remarks in this letter to Asia, although I wish to assure you that I will be at your service in discussing frankly other phases of our international relations.

I was assigned to China at a time when statesmen were openly predicting the collapse of the National Government of the Republic of China and the disintegration of the Chinese Army. I was directed by President Roosevelt to prevent the collapse of the Government and to keep the Chinese Army in the war. From both a strategical and diplomatic viewpoint the foregoing constituted our chief objective. The next in importance was the directive to harmonize the relations between the Chinese and American military establishments and between the American Embassy in Chungking and the Chinese Government. It will readily appear that the former objective could not be accomplished without the accomplishment of the secondary objective as a condition precedent. Both of these objectives were accomplished. While these objectives had the support of the President and the Secretary of State it is no secret that the American policy in China did not have the support of all the career men in the State Department. The professional foreign-service men sided with the Chinese Communist armed party and the imperialist bloc of nations whose policy it was to keep China divided against herself. Our professional diplomats continuously advised the Communists that my efforts in preventing the collapse of the National Government did not represent the policy of the United States. These same professionals openly advised the Communist armed party to decline unification of the Chinese Communist Army with the National Army unless the Chinese Communists were given control.

Despite these handicaps we did make progress toward unification of the armed forces of China. We did prevent civil war between the rival factions, at least until after I had left China. We did bring the leaders of the rival parties together for peaceful discussions. Throughout this period the chief opposition to the accomplishment of our mission came from the American career diplomats in the Embassy at Chungking and in the Chinese and Far Eastern Divisions of the State Department.

I requested the relief of the career men who were opposing the American policy in the Chinese theater of war. These professional diplomats were returned to Washington and placed in the Chinese and Far Eastern Divisions of the State Department as my supervisors. Some of these same career men whom I relieved have been assigned as advisers to the supreme commander in Asia. In such positions most of them have continued to side with the Communist armed party and at times with the imperialist bloc against American policy. This, Mr. President, is an outline of one of the reasons why American foreign policy announced by the highest authority is rendered ineffective by another section of diplomatic officials.

The weakness of American foreign policy has backed us into two World Wars. We had no part in shaping the conditions that brought about these two wars. There is a third world war in the making. In diplomacy today we are permitting ourselves to be sucked into a power bloc on the side of colonial imperialism against Communist imperialism. I am opposed to both. I still favor democracy and free enterprise.

Our announced policy in the First World War was to make the world safe for democracy. That slogan was elaborated for the Second World War by a definite statement of principles in the Atlantic Charter and the Iran Declaration. We won both wars, but in both instances we failed to establish the principles for which we alleged we were fighting. America's foreign-policy officials have always been divided against themselves. Consequently we have always been a prey to the nations that give lip service to our ideals and principles in order to obtain our material support. The war that is now in the making is not even intended to defend or establish democratic ideals. Instead of putting our weight behind the Charter of the United Nations we have been definitely supporting the imperialist bloc. At the same time a considerable section of our State Department is endeavoring to support communism generally as well as specifically in China.

The hydra-headed direction and confusion of our foreign policy in Washington during the late war is chargeable to the weakness of our foreign service. If our foreign service had been capable of understanding and sympathetic effectuation of our announced war aims, it would not have failed so completely to couple our logistical strength with our foreign policy to obtain commitments to the principles for which we claimed to be fighting from the nations to which we gave the strength of our productivity and manpower.

I am purposely omitting from this short paper a discussion of my negotiations with Britain and Russia for the recognition of the territorial integrity and independent sovereignty of China and the procurement from both of these nations of an agreement to support the aspirations of the Chinese people to establish for themselves a free, united, democratic government. These negotiations, as you know, were successful and, so far as Russia is concerned, was solemnized in a treaty and exchange of letters.

A democracy must live on its intelligence and its integrity and its courage. The people of a democracy should be given all the facts to enable them to form correct opinions. The discrepancy between American foreign policy as announced in the Atlantic Charter and the Iran Declaration and in your recent Navy Day address, and as carried into effect may be attributed in large measure to the secrecy which has shrouded the actions of the State Department. All too frequently information concerning the conduct of our foreign relations leaks out to the public in distorted, garbled, or partial form. The re-

sult is that the American people have too little basic information to judge the extent to which their State Department correctly interprets and administers the foreign policies of the Nation.

During the war we had to maintain secrecy to prevent giving aid to the enemy. I grant that sometimes during the war we had to be expedient. Now we should endeavor to be right. I raise this issue because I am firmly convinced that at this particular juncture in our history an informed public opinion would do much to give intelligent direction and implementation to our international objectives.

With special reference to China and the other nations where I have served in the last 4 years, the blessings of factual publicity would be manifold. Now that the war is over I am willing that all my reports be made public, together with the reports made by those officials in the foreign service who have differed with the promulgated American policy.

Our true position in China is misunderstood abroad because of this confusion of policy within our own Government. This situation suggests the need for a complete reorganization of our policy-making machinery, beginning at the lower official levels. No international policy can succeed without loyal and intelligent implementation. Because of the confusion in our own international policy, make no mistake, Mr. President, America has been excluded economically from every part of the world controlled by colonial imperialism and Communist imperialism. America's economic strength has been used all over the world to defeat American policies and interests. This is chargeable to a weak American foreign service.

I wish to absolve from this general indictment some of our career men. Some of them are very admirable and well-equipped public servants who have fought in the State Department and in other countries against overwhelming odds to advance American ideals and interests.

America's economic and diplomatic policies should be coordinated. America's strength should not be allied with any predatory ideology.

America should support the amendment or revision of the San Francisco United Nations Charter to make it democratic. Our strength should be used to uphold the decisions of the United Nations rather than to support conflicting ideologies or war-making power blocs.

Respectfully,

PATRICK J. HURLEY.

The Honorable PATRICK J. HURLEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: I have your letter of November 26, tendering your resignation as Ambassador to China, which you forwarded to me through the Secretary of State. I am grateful to you for the service which you have rendered in this important and difficult post.

I regret that you feel unable to continue, and, therefore, in accordance with your desires, accept your resignation.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Forgotten Men?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Evening Item of Lynn, Mass.:

FORGOTTEN MEN?

A few brief months ago, newspaper writers, commentators and public officials were proudly proclaiming that Okinawa would live in the grateful memory of the American people as long as this Republic endures.

Today, hundreds of cynical American troops who survived that bitter, historic campaign, including some of our own greater Lynn boys, are wondering if they and Okinawa already have been forgotten.

Some of the men now stationed on that bleak island have been in the service from 2 to 5 years. They have been told the war is over. They have read about hysterical rejoicing at home on VJ-day. They read of reconversion problems, of labor troubles—all the externals of a nation returned to peacetime living.

But to them, the end of the war has meant little. They and their comrades—the heroes of yesterday—are isolated on Okinawa and innumerable other islands dotting the lonely Pacific. The few men who have been shipped home came back away behind the schedule prepared under the War Department plan for rotation. When those remaining ask their officers about getting home, they are told: "Transportation isn't available." What happened to our thousands of Liberty ships? Our transports? Our endless supply ships? Our fleets of planes? Our great Navy?

Men with more than 80 points are still on Okinawa, although 60 points are supposed to be sufficient for discharge. More than 200 ships were lying at anchor off the island November 1. Living conditions, none too good before the typhoon, are intolerable now. Taxes, reconversion, voting, and readjustments all pale into nothingness when compared with these men's shining dream of return. The least a grateful Nation can do is to help them realize that dream.

Not Unduly Exacting About Java

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 14, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, after his return from the London Conference Secretary of State Byrnes characterized American foreign policy, in the matter of Poland as being "not unduly exacting" toward Soviet Russia. The following article which appeared in the weekly news analysis, Human Events, shows that, in the matter of Java, we are being "not unduly exacting" of Great Britain. In our failure to be duly exacting toward Russia, in the matter of Poland, and toward Britain, in the matter of Java, we are betraying not only the Atlantic Charter, but we are failing to use the UNO for the high purposes of international peace and justice to which it was supposedly dedicated, and for which this Nation joined it. Yes; we are failing, before we have hardly begun, in our task of world cooperation for liberty, justice, and peace:

JAVA: A TEST OF THE CHARTER

(By Felix Morley)

It is reported from Batavia that the British intend to use a stronger hand to put down the independence movement in Java, and consequently will soon greatly reinforce their army of occupation in that Netherlands colony. Up to the present there has been no official expression of American opinion on this disagreeable subject. But, as former Governor Stassen has just pointed out, it is definitely our business.

The Charter of the United Nations has been binding on its signatories, including the United States, since conclusion of the ratification process on October 24. The wording of several articles of the Charter is difficult to reconcile with the policy of the British Socialist Government in Java. The wording of other articles strongly suggests that it is the duty of the United States to call attention to the subject. It would not be a promising inaugural for the United Nations Organization if Americans should close their eyes to what looks very much like clear-cut transgression of its principles by a prominent member.

Moreover, this is a matter in which all Americans as individuals have a responsibility to speak out. The Charter, signed by our representatives at San Francisco on June 26, ratified by the Senate on July 28, is unqualified on this point. It says that: "We the peoples of the United Nations [are] determined * * * to insure * * * that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest."

There is no doubt that the British Government is using armed force, strongly and ruthlessly, against the Javanese, a people over whom Great Britain has no claim to sovereignty whatsoever. There is a great deal of doubt that this use of force can be called in the common interest of most of the members of the United Nations.

II

The Charter of the United Nations is a long and complicated constitution of international government. Some Americans may not as yet fully understand all the obligations involved in our membership. So it is not superfluous to quote applicable sections.

Under article 73 of the Charter—

"Members of the United Nations which have or assume responsibilities for the administration of territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government recognize the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount, and accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost * * * the well-being of the inhabitants of these territories."

Great Britain is a member of the United Nations which has assumed administrative responsibilities in Java, whose native people under Netherlands rule "have not yet attained a full measure of self-government." It may be questioned whether the Netherlands, as a member of the United Nations, has fulfilled its "sacred trust" by inviting British troops to crush an independence movement with which the Dutch themselves are evidently unable to cope. Still more questionable is the British observance of "sacred trust" in accepting this assignment.

In the old days this example of imperialism would have been no concern of the American people. We might not have liked it, but under isolationist practice we would have had no legal obligation to intervene. Isolationism, however, is now discarded, and as a permanent member of the Security Council of the United Nations we have taken a solemn commitment to "determine the existence of any threat to the peace," in the words of article 39 of the Charter. The fighting in Java, now threatening to spread to Sumatra and other parts of Indonesia, is all too obviously a "threat to the peace."

Under other circumstances it might have been argued that American responsibility is lessened by article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, which says:

"Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state."

That provision, however, is inapplicable to the case at issue. When the British started to repress the Javanese rebellion it was demonstrated that this matter is not essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the Netherlands.

III

It should be emphasized that the major question involved is whether the Charter is to be treated as a scrap of paper, even before it is fully operative. That issue is fundamentally more disturbing than official acquiescence in the use of lend-lease tanks (with USA markings removed) to crush a native people for whose liberation those tanks were built.

Moreover, there is no issue, so far as our responsibility as a member of the United Nations is concerned, over current British policy in Siam. It is somewhat extraordinary—shocking is the word used editorially by the Washington Post—to witness the abasement of this once independent nation to colonial status. But Siam was undeniably an Axis ally during the war and, under article 107 of the Charter:

"Nothing in the present Charter shall invalidate or preclude action, in relation to any state which during the Second World War has been an enemy of any signatory to the present Charter, taken or authorized as a result of that war by the governments having responsibility for such action."

In the case of Indonesian territory, no such justification for British military occupation exists. The ostensible reason for the landing of an Anglo-Indian army was to disarm the Japanese forces left stranded in Java and adjacent islands when Tokyo surrendered. That argument can no longer be regarded as anything more than a pretext.

While the Javanese republican forces undoubtedly have obtained some Japanese arms there is no pretense that the independence movement has any more external incitement than was the case with the American colonials in 1776. Indeed, the British admit that they have been employing captured Japanese troops, as well as Indian mercenaries, against the natives.

IV

The part played by Japan was to provide the occasion, not the incitement or the backing, for the proclamation of independence made by Dr. Achmed Soekarno as soon as the Japanese lost control last August. Dr. Soekarno, after appealing to Russia to intervene, has now given way to the more conciliatory Premier Sutan Sjahrir of the unrecognized Indonesian Republic. His efforts to work out some satisfactory compromise with the Netherlands and British authorities have so far proved unavailing. After nearly 3 months of bloodshed the situation is still deteriorating.

In view of the pledges made at San Francisco, and duly ratified, this tragic situation cannot honorably be allowed indefinitely to impede the reestablishment of peace in the Far East. The first meeting of the United Nations Assembly is scheduled for January 8. It will be in order then for some national delegation to invoke that section of article 11 of the Charter which says:

"The General Assembly may call the attention of the Security Council to situations which are likely to endanger international peace and security."

It will be unfortunate if the Charter of the United Nations is first invoked to question the policies of a wartime ally. But the United Nations claims to be something much more than a self-protective alliance of the victorious powers. The very first article of its Charter sets forth, as a primary purpose of the Organization, "respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples."

Americans cannot be utterly indifferent to the moving appeal of President Truman, on the day of the signing of the Charter:

"The world must now use it. If we fail to use it, we shall betray all those who have died in order that we might meet here in freedom and safety to create it. If we seek to use it selfishly—for the advantage of any one nation or any small group of nations—we shall be equally guilty of that betrayal."

Will Russia Play Ball?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following significant editorial from American Aviation for December 1, 1945:

WILL RUSSIA PLAY BALL?

Berlin—bomb-wrecked Berlin is the most important aviation center in the world today. Montreal is not. Washington and London are not. But the fallen capital of Berlin very definitely is.

The future of the world depends upon the future of American and Russian relationships.

Aviation is one of the most, if not the most important, keys to American-Russian relationships.

Today Berlin is the laboratory, the testing machinery, the creative center, for working out future American-Russian relationships in civil aviation. History is being made here, history that directly affects every aircraft and accessory manufacturer, every air line, and every aviation development in the United States.

Before coming to Berlin, one hears just about everything conceivable about the Russian attitude toward civil aviation. In Vienna, Rome, Paris, Copenhagen, Stockholm, and points en route, one hears that the Russians are blocking every move the United States makes in civil aviation, that they confiscate our aircraft, that they are shooting at our transport planes in the Berlin area, that they push us around, that we never will obtain permission to fly into Russia, that we might as well start the war over again, and so on and so forth deep into the night at every gathering.

The average American is immature when it comes to international relationships. He is an amateur. He overlooks differences in languages, in concepts, customs, thinking, backgrounds, and history. He is impatient. He wants things to happen now. And he is guilty of a tremendous amount of loose talk, hasty conclusions, and petty quibbling when it comes to discussing our civil aviation problems with Russia.

Thus, it is that in this historical laboratory of Berlin, where patterns of far-reaching significance are possible of establishment, that the utmost care and the utmost thinking must be exercised. And it is a genuine pleasure to report that progress is being made.

The over-all United States military picture in Germany is a shameful mess. It is bumbling, complex to a fantastic extreme, unworkable, and a disgrace to the country which exerted such tremendous production and fighting effort to win the war.

But the United States can be grateful that the top aviation policy man is Maj. Gen. Robert W. Harper, Director of the Armed Forces Division (formerly the Air Division) of the Group Control Council. While irresponsible Americans in uniform spend time beefing (to use a mild expression) about the Russians, Bob Harper is using brains and tact in working out practical and important civil aviation relationships with the Russians and the French and the British.

It is easy to sit in Paris and cuss out the Russians for interning American aircraft forced down in Russian-controlled territory, or to raise Cain because the Russians shot up red flares at American aircraft a few miles off the Magdeburg-Berlin airway corridor, or to hangar-fly the Russians for requiring 2 weeks' advance clearance of transport planes flying to Budapest.

It isn't so easy, but it's a lot smarter, to try to understand the complex Russian methods of doing business and to reason out the many "whys" of what is going on in eastern Europe today. Confidence breeds confidence. The Russians are peculiar—to our way of thinking—but basically there is reason to be optimistic in reaching a sane, practical agreement on civil aviation problems.

This agreement will not be reached in PICAO in Montreal, but in the practical testing laboratory of Berlin. And as is appearing in Berlin today, our major problems may be more concerned with reaching agreements with the British than with the Russians.

The first successful test passed by the four-power Group Control Council is the establishment of an air-traffic control center for Greater Berlin, regulating the air traffic of Russian, American, British, and French aircraft. But one doesn't call it a traffic-control center, for the word "control" has a much more severe meaning in Russian than it does in the English language. When a traffic-control center was proposed, the Russians balked sharply. When the whole idea was finally explained in detail, that traffic regulation is necessary for safety, the Russians agreed to the entire principle. The name adopted is Aircraft Safety Center. As this is written technical committees of the four powers are at work drafting details of the new aircraft safety machinery and the Russians have asked that a teletype tie-in be made between the American Tempelhof Airport and the Russian Adlershof Airport for exchange of weather information.

Thus history is in the making. Aviation relationships begin with simple things. A jointly operated traffic center, a teletype link, exchange of weather information, the exchange of technical views—all this is basic groundwork toward a much greater understanding.

One handicap of the Russian aviation officials should sound familiar to our own military aviation, and it is important that this handicap be understood. Russian aviation has been under the stern wing of the Russian ground forces. And this, more than anything else, has accounted for the large number of "incidents" which arouse the ire of American airmen.

Hollywood Victory Committee Did Wartime Job That Only Hollywood Knows How To Do

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, many a soldier had a chance to laugh or to dream a little or perhaps be lifted mentally out of the mud and muck of the Pacific islands or the homesickness of Europe, by the talents of the artists sent around the world by the Hollywood Vic-

tory Committee. Many of these boys were made happy and made to feel glad they were alive perhaps only a few hours before they had to fly into combat with the enemy or meet him in combat on land or at sea by these actors.

These real troupers, all headliners, who traveled to the four corners of the earth to bring them cheer and fun and keep up their morale and to let them know they were not forgotten wherever they were.

The Hollywood Victory Committee is concluding its work on December 31, 1945. Here is an account of what they have done in 4 years as reported by Variety:

FIFTY-FIVE THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED AND NINETEEN APPEARANCES ARRANGED BY H. V. C. IN FOUR YEARS

A total of 55,619 free patriotic appearances of entertainers has been arranged by the Hollywood Victory Committee, it was announced by Kenneth Thomson, as committee prepared to celebrate its fourth birthday today.

The H. V. C. was formed 3 days after the Pearl Harbor attack, with 22 organizations representing screen, stage, and radio talent guilds, production associations and film studios. Since that date the committee has assigned 4,11[illegible] performers to entertain the armed forces, sell war bonds, and aid Government and war relief agencies. Individuals have taken part in 7,634 events, including 122 overseas tours, 151 hospital tours, 254 camp tours, and 41 bond tours.

The committee will conclude its activities December 31, Thomas said, after setting up a method for continuing entertainment in military hospitals.

Hon. Ralph K. Davies Awarded Medal for Merit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE F. LEA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Ralph K. Davies, as Deputy Petroleum Administrator during the war, performed a magnificent service for our country. He brought to that position experience, understanding, and executive ability of a rare quality. In the performance of his duties he exercised an impartiality and fairness that no one questions.

As chairman of the Petroleum Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House, I take particular pleasure in the high recognition accorded Mr. Davies by President Truman for his services as Deputy Petroleum Administrator for War.

"For special and meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services to the United States," the President on Wednesday, December 12, 1945, awarded to Mr. Davies the Medal for Merit.

The citation of Mr. Davies is as follows:

CITATION TO ACCOMPANY THE AWARD OF THE MEDAL FOR MERIT TO RALPH K. DAVIES

Ralph K. Davies, for exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services to the United States. As Deputy Petroleum Administrator, Mr. Davies organized and directed the unique Government-industry combination that achieved one of the outstanding victories of the war, the assurance of petroleum for every military and essential civilian need of the United Nations. Under his guidance, this unprecedented partnership furnished the United Nations with their most vital and most used munition. As a member of the President's Committee on Oil, Mr. Davies played a leading part in formulating and negotiating an international oil agreement, executed by officials of the United States and Great Britain. To these high duties Mr. Davies brought profound oil knowledge, an incisive intellect, rare vision, the quiet power of a gifted organizer and executive, the courageous devotion of a man characterized by unflinching determination, and a deep sense of public service.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Have You Read the Smyth Report on Atomic Energy? Better Get a Copy and Read It Before Voting on the May-Johnson Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the May-Johnson bill may be a reflection of the amazing story recently reported in the Washington Daily News which stated that most of the members of the Military Affairs Committee had not read the Smyth report on atomic energy which has been available at the Government Printing Office for several months. Reading the Smyth report should have been a "must" for each member of the committee before the May-Johnson bill was ever considered. When it became available, I obtained 150 copies of the report and sent them to various people so that they could become familiar with atomic energy. Every Member of Congress should obtain a copy and read it before the May-Johnson bill is reported to the House for debate.

A subject as technical and as vital to the people of the Nation as atomic energy should be thoroughly studied by all Members of the House before acting on the May-Johnson bill. I have read and re-read it, and made a study of it. Here is what the Chemical and Engineering News of the American Chemical Society says about the members of the Military Affairs Committee concerning the Smyth report:

ATOMIC IGNORANCE

Recently the Washington Daily News ran an interesting story giving the results of an informal survey on how many public officials in Washington have read the Smyth report on atomic energy.

This report is the most comprehensive official account of the development that has been published to date. It was amazing to find that some of the people on Capitol Hill who have given the most opinionated speeches and statements on what do do about the situation have not even read the report.

We can't help thinking that if a similar survey were made among other groups who are equally vocal we might find that the atomic sculptors on Capitol Hill are not the only ones who have neglected to get as complete an understanding of the subject as possible.

Better get a copy of the Smyth report right away and read it thoroughly.

Veterans' Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Wilmington Morning News, Wilmington, Del., Friday, December 14, 1945:

TRAYNOR DEMANDS HOUSING FOR VETS—HE INSISTS EASTLAKE SHOULD TAKE FORMER GI'S EVEN IF PAY IS MORE THAN $30

United States Representative, PHILIP A. TRAYNOR, yesterday demanded that recognition be given veterans seeking dwelling units at the Eastlake development of the Wilmington Housing Authority, where, he said, there are 14 vacancies, denied to veterans because they are making more than $30 a week.

In a letter to the Commissioner of the Federal Public Housing Authority in Washington, Dr. TRAYNOR stated that he had been advised by Arthur Scotten, executive director of the authority, that Eastlake, being a slum-clearance project, is not available to veterans making more than $30 a week.

"Yet, I am told by good authority that there are housed there, policemen and firemen of the city of Wilmington, who are making over $2,100 per year," he stated in his letter. "There are also migratory workers from all over the United States, all making on an average of $100 per week during the war, housed in this development, and I understand they are still there," Dr. TRAYNOR said.

"It seems to me that it would be a good policy to house 14 veterans rather than deny them the houses on a technical ruling. Thirty dollars per week in the city of Wilmington is a subnormal wage. Wilmington is one of the cities that prospered during the war and like Washington, D. C., the rents are high," he added in his letter.

Dr. TRAYNOR cited a case of one veteran, his wife, and three children living in 2 rooms because they cannot find adequate housing facilities. Declaring that a school boy makes $30 a week today, Dr. TRAYNOR demanded that the salary stipulation be waived in the cases of veterans seeking homes in Federal housing projects.

In his letter to Philip M. Klutznick, Commissioner of the Housing Authority in Washington, Dr. TRAYNOR said, "If you have no authority in the matter, kindly advise me who has. I desire prompt action."

The letter added: "* * * pertaining to the disposal of Federal Housing in Delaware, I beg to advise that I am mostly concerned in the disposition of 14 houses in the Eastlake project that are now vacant. I have been trying for 3 weeks now, since I spoke to you in the office of Congressman LANHAM, concerning housing of returning World War II veterans. I am not so much interested in the surplus property to be sold as I am in putting the properties there in proper livable condition to enable the veterans to have homes. As least they deserve this much consideration."

May-Johnson Bill Should Be Defeated—200 Members of the National Academy of Sciences Oppose It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, when more than 200 members of the National Academy of Sciences are opposed to the passage of the May-Johnson bill as written, there must be something wrong with it. The National Academy of Sciences is one of, if not the oldest and most respected scientific organizations in the United States. They are not politicians and their recommendations are not made for political purposes. They are sincerely interested in the development of atomic energy for the good of the Nation. Their recommendations should be taken seriously into consideration by all Members of the House.

Here is the resolution which has been adopted and signed by more than 200 members of the National Academy of Sciences:

RESOLUTION ON ATOMIC-ENERGY CONTROL

I

The Johnson-May bill for the regulation of atomic energy, now before Congress, does not protect the vital interests of the United States. This bill should be withdrawn.

Amendments have not corrected the essential defects of the bill. They retain the objectionable features of the original bill. The bill, if enacted, would:

1. Weaken the national defense.
2. Jeopardize the democratic institutions of the American people.
3. Frustrate fundamental research necessary to the maintenance of American leadership in the development of atomic energy.
4. Set up an authority within the United States responsible to no one—not even to the President or the Congress.
5. Take atomic energy away from the American people, where the President says it belongs, with the danger that it may become the exclusive property of the military.
6. Make it more difficult, perhaps impossible, to stop the present drift toward an atomic-armaments race.
7. Block the normal negotiation of international agreements in the field of atomic energy, and interfere with attempts to set up vitally necessary international controls.

The bill, as now amended, creates a commission with autonomous powers not only in the area of atomic military research, but in scientific, medical, and industrial fields. The new amendments do not require the Commission to license independent research or to make materials available to independent laboratories under proper safeguards. Nor are standards set up under the bill for atomic research privileges. The Commission would have power to grant exclusive rights in atomic energy development to certain private companies, or to withhold these rights from other companies at its own discretion.

II

In our judgment, any legislation in this field should, as a minimum, provide the following:

First. The Commission and its Administrator should be responsible to the President and to Congress. They should be removable by the President in the same manner as Cabinet officers.

Second. Any secrecy regulations should be applicable only to the disclosure of the design features and laboratory tests pertaining to the plant and to details of the atomic bomb itself; that is, only to such matters as are normally kept secret when the manufacture of munitions or weapons of war is involved. We note that the President of the United States has distinguished between the scientific knowledge and the design features, tests, plants, and details of the bomb itself. Other regulations should be limited to removing hazards to safety.

Third. Prior to promulgation all secrecy regulations should be reviewed by a special Cabinet committee to make sure that the public interest in full disclosure is protected whenever possible.

Fourth. To protect individual research, the Commission should be required to provide sufficient materials, under proper safeguards, to make independent research possible. It should be made perfectly clear that the Commission has no power to control research.

Fifth. The Commission should be required, after an appropriate interval, to recommend to the Congress a program setting forth the standards which should apply to the Government regulation of the industrial use of atomic energy. Until such a program has been recommended and enacted by the Congress, the Commission should not have any power to permit the use of atomic power for industrial purposes. Such a program should deal specifically with such problems as patents, exclusive rights, and those steps to be taken to encourage private enterprise to assist in this development. Research and experiments looking toward the industrial use of atomic power should be permitted prior to the submission of the industrial program.

Sixth. We believe that the free exchange of scientific information with the United Nations as proposed by the President is of the utmost importance, and is not entirely separate from the development of a domestic program. Atomic power has been made possible only by the work of scientists all over the world. Many of the most eminent of these scientists are not in the United States and are citizens of foreign countries. Legislation must be framed by the Congress so as to take advantage of such international agreements as may be achieved and to permit the free exchange of scientific information, not only within our own country, but with foreign scientists.

III

President Truman has said: "Never in history has society been confronted with a power so full of potential danger and at the same time so full of promise." Surely, any legislation on a subject so momentous deserves the gravest consideration by Congress. We welcome the creation of the special committee of the United States Senate to deal exhaustively with these matters. Equal consideration must be given by the House of Representatives. To forestall the dangers and realize the promises of atomic energy, Congress owes the American people the best legislation which its combined wisdom can draft.

Respectfully submitted by members of the National Academy of Sciences.

Westward Bound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's New York Times:

WESTWARD BOUND

After 26 hours of testimony and cross-examination, Gen. George C. Marshall was permitted yesterday by the congressional committee investigating Pearl Harbor to step down from the witness stand and prepare to embark on the important mission to China which the President has given him. It was perfectly proper that General Marshall should have been called to testify, and that he should have been questioned closely on the role he played in the preparations preceding Japan's attack at Pearl Harbor. His testimony was an essential part of the story. But it is no credit to the committee that for hours on end he was compelled to go over and over the same points in a tedious and often petty examination which at times resembled nothing so much as it did an effort by a smart lawyer in a police court to catch an unwary witness in an inconsistency.

The time to assess whatever responsibility General Marshall may have had, if any, for the failure of our armed forces to take more adequate protective measures at Pearl Harbor will come when all the evidence is in. Meanwhile, George Marshall will be westward bound over the course of the armies which went on from the catastrophe of Pearl Harbor to complete victory under the leadership of a Chief of Staff whose personal contribution to that result was nothing less than magnificent.

Army Chaplain Calls Jews Worse Off Than Germans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article by Virginia Reid:

ARMY CHAPLAIN CALLS JEWS WORSE OFF THAN GERMANS

(By Virginia Reid)

WASHINGTON, December 12.—"It is better to be a conquered German than a liberated Jew."

That statement was made today by a United States Army chaplain, Capt. Robert Marcus, at a press conference arranged by the World Jewish Congress.

Captain Marcus charged incompetent and disinterested military government officers are ignoring Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower's order calling for improved conditions in European internment camps.

One military government man said frankly that "Hitler had something there" in his attempt to annihilate the Jews, Captain Marcus said.

NO HOUSES REQUISITIONED

Not one German house has been requisitioned to provide living space for Jews crowded into displaced persons' camps, he asserted, although Eisenhower specifically ordered dwellings taken over for that purpose.

He said that between 25,000 and 30,000 Jews have died in the camps from malnutrition or lack of clothing and shelter since their liberation.

Some inmates told him it was better under the SS, he reported.

Captain Marcus said 100 percent of the 100,000 Jews now in internment camps want

to go to Palestine. He accused the British of deliberately mistreating the Jews in their zone in order to force them back to Poland and stop their agitation to go to Palestine.

FLEE POGROMS IN POLAND

He said these homeless Jews refuse to go to Poland because five or six thousand of their fellows have come back to the camps to escape pogroms sweeping Poland.

Captain Marcus said Eisenhower is the most beloved man on the continent because he is sincerely interested in a complete denazification of Germany. Gen. Sir Bernard L. Montgomery, the British commander, is only interested in normalization of Germany, he charged, regardless of the consequences to displaced persons.

America and the Philippines — After Their Political Separation They Will Have Military Relations and the American Flag Will Continue To Fly Over the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a timely statement on the Philippines by a Filipino lawyer and economist in private life, Mr. Vicente Villamin, who lives in my district in Los Angeles, Calif.

The statement appeared in the Washington Diplomatic Letter of the Weekly Review of International Affairs.

By virtue of our geographical position, we of the Pacific coast are profoundly interested in the Philippines and other countries in the Orient. We want their good will and their trade. With the Philippines, a rich tropical country, I believe we can develop a mutually beneficial trade in the immediate future that is greater than in the past.

As Mr. Villamin states, after the Philippines become an independent nation on July 4, 1946, her relations with the United States will continue on the basis of their military relations. The Resident Commissioner from the Philippines [Mr. CARLOS P. ROMULO] has also stated that fact in commenting on an editorial in the Washington Post which was obviously inspired by an article by Mr. Villamin which appeared in that paper the day before the editorial was published.

The Congress will soon consider bills concerning the Philippines and it is, therefore, timely for Members to study the basic facts of the problems, and for that purpose the reading of Mr. Villamin's statement is strongly recommended.

The statement follows:

AMERICA AND THE PHILIPPINES

After 47 years the American flag will come down on July 4, 1946, in the government buildings in the Philippines, heralding the birth of a nation. But it will go up again at the naval and air bases as soon as they can be built in that country by the United States. That is the provision of Joint Resolution 93 of Congress, approved June 29, 1944.

With those bases on her territory, the Philippines will become an integral element in the American Pacific strategy, which seeks to locate its apex 5,000 miles beyond Pearl Harbor, thus pushing the future battlefields that much farther away from the United States.

To the Philippines the fundamental fact is that, by provision of an American law distinguished from a treaty, that country, regardless of its wishes in the matter, will become a part of the war in which the United States is a belligerent in roughly the same way that it got involved in the last war, because America was politically supreme and sovereign there.

The Filipinos are overwhelmingly for a continued association with America, and after receiving their international independence that association will be supported by their military relations.

The bill pending in Congress rearranging the economic relations between the two countries after Philippine independence utterly disregards their future military relations and their profound political implications, for it seeks to dissolve their economic bonds ostensibly in 33 years, but actually in 2 to 5 years after the application of the progressive tariff duties. An American military establishment surrounded by an impoverished and disappointed people will hardly serve its purpose effectively.

The projected bases in the Philippines will cost around a billion dollars, which was the cost of the war to the United States for 3½ days. If their presence in that country deters, as it undoubtedly will, any potential enemy, the United States is supported by formidable reasons in strengthening, rather than weakening, the Philippines economically and otherwise.

It is, therefore, but logical to expect Congress, after resurveying the Philippine situation, to continue the free trade between the United States and the Philippines, its virtual protectorate, coterminously with the existence of the American military establishments on Philippine territory, for that free trade is enormously helpful to the Filipino people.

However, this time the Filipinos must not depend too much on too few industries and on markets overseas. They must build a new domestic economy that will create many small industries, businesses, trades, occupations, and services. And, too, they must blunt the competitive points that touch on American economy by retrenchment in certain industries, while they exert new efforts in the development of a long catalog of tropical staples which are needed but not grown in the United States.

With the vast amounts of money that the United States has left in the Philippines during the war and will pay for the war's devastations there, aggregating over $1,000,000,000, the coming Philippine nation has a golden opportunity to become a really strong and self-sustaining nation—the one bright spot in the Orient where the American flag flies alongside the Filipino flag.

Whose Musicians?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following short editorial from the Lynchburg News of Lynchburg, Va.:

WHOSE MUSICIANS?

The Fredericksburg post of the American Legion, planning Armistice Day memorial services, desired an orchestra to play sacred music and made request for members of the Marine Band at Quantico. The request was denied by Local 123, American Federation of Musicians, Richmond.

Rocked back on their heels by this denial, and confident there was some misunderstanding, the sponsors called President Frank Cowardin of the union at Richmond. Graciously he consented to refer the request to his headquarters in New York. Again came denial, and the marine musicians didn't play.

Who has charge of United States Marine musicians at Quantico? Are they part of the Marines and so subject to orders, or are they under Local 123, American Federation of Musicians? Do they belong to Uncle Sam or to Caesar Petrillo? If to the latter, they are not marine musicians; if to the former, throw Petrillo out.

Send Doctors Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Stars and Stripes, issue of November 28, 1945:

DOCS GOT THE MISERY

The waste of Army doctors has been freely discussed in the States in various articles appearing in the press. Senator REED has charged that the Army was holding 10,000 unneeded doctors and dentists in what he termed a "disgraceful situation." Apparently nothing is being done with regard to the hoarding of surplus doctors and dentists in the ETO.

Since VE-day, thousands of doctors have been idle in this theater. General hospitals with bed capacities up to 1,500 have been kept fully staffed, with a daily patient census of only 300. One general hospital now has 20 patients and still has not been authorized to close. Many doctors have been detailed to nonmedical duties.

An alarming situation faces those of us who seem to be stuck indefinitely in the ETO. The only vehicle, at present, for sending doctors home is on the basis of pre-Pearl Harbor service, 80 points, or being over 48 years of age.

We note War Department policy that medical officers in the States having 30 months' service will not be sent overseas. We find no provisions for those of us in the ETO with many more months of service, much of it overseas, to be returned to the States. Morale among doctors is very low, and this precludes the keeping of medical care on a high professional level.

We are told that there is a shortage of doctors and no relief is forthcoming until replacements are available. Doctors were trained at the Government's expense under ASTP. Now, we are told that they lack sufficient training to assume responsibility of overseas duty. And yet, most of the ETO patients have minor complaints and disorders not requiring the attention of highly trained specialists.

We request an immediate investigation into the problem of redeployment of medical officers in the ETO and a definite answer to the following questions:

How many doctors will be needed in Europe for the Army after January 1, 1946? Does the Army plan to use the same ratio of doctors to men in the service as was needed under actual combat conditions? How many patients are there in the ETO and what percentage of these require skilled specialists for their treatment? How many doctors and specialists are now in the ETO? Why are not replacements of low-point officers made available from the States on a just rotation basis immediately?

What is the status of the thousands of doctors educated at the Government's expense during the last 2 years? How many doctors have been sent home under the redeployment program during the last 60 days? How many will be sent home in the next 60 days? Why has not a definite policy been forthcoming with regard to medical officers?

(Signed by 165 medical officers from 23 medical units.—Editor.)

Wants Republican Party To Go Republican—for a Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as the New Deal takes America farther and farther into Hitler's national socialism—the latest steps being the demands for conscription and socialized medicine—simultaneously, cunning efforts continue to destroy the Republican Party.

With charming sharpness, the Omaha World-Herald on December 11 outlines this campaign to eliminate the Republican Party—and thus automatically bring about the despotism and tyranny of Germany and Russia.

The editorial follows:

A LOVELY CAMPAIGN

If the Republican Party is to go forward in vast confusion it won't be for lack of plenty—just oodles—of advice.

Interestingly enough, most of the advice comes from solicitous friends of today who, come election time, will fight tooth and nail to tear the party to shreds.

In Indiana a Congressman, himself a Republican, declares that to win, the Republican Party must be the radical party in America, and not the conservative.

And that proposed program meets with whoops of delight—from the radical camp and its editorial, commentator, and radio spokesmen.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch (democratic, of course) summons the Republican rank and file to stage a real revolt for radicalism. Let them rally again, as they did when they nominated Willkie and made a liberal out of Dewey. Then, and then only, the two-party system may come into its own again.

The Post-Dispatch, naturally enough, disdains to comment on what happened to the Republican Party in its various attempts to equal, if not outdo, the New Deal. Why bring that up? Best forget it.

Nor does the Post-Dispatch attempt to furnish a blueprint for a two-party system in which both parties are radical and conservatism is left without representation, without leadership, no place to go but to the tall timber.

With both parties hell-bent for radicalism in a hurry and to the limit, with our politics all engine and no brakes, what a merry race to Gehenna that would be.

Obviously the only contest would be as to which party could outdo and outdistance the other in carrying the New Deal forward to the goal of socialism—or something even more pronounced.

In Soviet Russia they are more straightforward. They call it one party only—none other permitted. What is proposed here, sleazily, is one party but sailing under two names. Let 'em fight! No matter which wins.

We like the candor of the Soviet bosses better.

The proposed campaign would be a curious one

Did the "Democrats" spend much? We "Republicans" pledge we shall spend more! We "Republicans" will lend more! We will tax more heavily! We will increase the national debt more rapidly! We will more completely control prices and wages, regiment more thoroughly, build a larger and more powerful bureaucracy!

Come to us, all you citizens who are weary and heavily laden, and we promise to double your load!

A lovely campaign. A glittering prospect for our distracted Republic.

Maybe that program will appeal to the Republican Party. Maybe. If so, it will shortly be closing up its affairs, bankrupt in fact as well as in seeming. And all the rest of us can be preparing to close up, too. Except, of course, those who actually prefer the system Russia has adopted and that the rest of Europe is headed for.

For ourselves—a small voice in the wilderness—we would prefer to see the Republican Party go Republican—for a change.

If the Republican Party went Republican, could it win? No one knows. Perhaps we are already so far into the one-party system of Hitler's national socialism that we cannot regain our liberty.

But if the Republican Party would go Republican, the courageous people who believe in the American way of freedom could rally their forces and would deserve to win.

The Republican Party will not and does not deserve to win on a "me, too; but I can do it better" appeal. Those singing this tune, if they are sincere, should get out of the Republican Party and join the New Deal. Let them collaborate in reforming the New Deal from within its ranks, and not by posing as Republican Messiahs. In the case of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, they supported Willkie for the Republican nomination and then supported Roosevelt for election.

Meteorological Observation Stations in the Arctic Region

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 14, 1945

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, on November 7 I introduced a bill calling for the establishment of meteorological observation stations in the Arctic region of the Western Hemisphere for the purpose of improving the weather forecasting service within the United States and on the international air transport routes from the United States. This bill, H. R. 4611, is pending before the House Committee on Agriculture.

This proposal is identical to S. 765, introduced by Senator OWEN BREWSTER, of Maine, reported out of the Senate Commerce Committee and passed by the Senate October 29.

Arctic expeditions have been sponsored for over 300 years, largely for the purpose of new discoveries, but the importance of scientific research was not overlooked. Results have not been great in comparison to the efforts made because of hazards and expense of early Arctic exploration.

It has been found in recent years, as ably demonstrated by the Russians, that maintenance of stations in remote Arctic areas is neither unusually dangerous nor unreasonably expensive. We have benefited from that early effort in recent years, and learned at the same time how essential Arctic scientific research is to us.

We have heard more about meteorology during the recent war and find that with the progress of aviation the Arctic, a more isolated portion of the globe and a vital spot in the future, will be more easily penetrated.

Gen. Henry H. Arnold, the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, recently explained to the Press Club that the polar regions have been conquered by aviation, and cited distances, speeds, new weapons, and new planes to show that attacks will travel this course if there is another war.

A Tribute to General Romulo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am today inserting a resolution passed unanimously by the National Assembly of the Philippines, to which it is my pleasant duty to call the attention of my colleagues in this House. It is a resolution which pays tribute to the present Resident Commissioner of the Philippines to the United States, Brig. Gen. CARLOS P. ROMULO, and I feel that it should be known by all of us, because it is important that we have the assurance that he who speaks here for the Filipino people has the united support of that people.

I need not say here what we in this House think of General ROMULO. We have shown it by the standing ovations that we have repeatedly given him whenever he uses the privilege of the floor. We showed it when we unanimously passed the Filipino Naturalization bill

after his powerful speech advocating its passage. We showed it when we took him at his word and without discussion passed the bill releasing $71,000,000 to the Philippine Commonwealth. We showed it also when we passed the bill authorizing the Export and Import Bank to extend its operations to the Philippines, at his behest. We showed it when we passed the amendment suggested by him to the recission bill allotting $200,000,000 to the Army of the Philippines. We are showing it to him now as we cooperate with him in his efforts to get Congressional action for Philippine rehabilitation.

It is but proper that General ROMULO should have our esteem and admiration. In his writings and utterances he has expressed such an unwavering faith in America that is inspiring and no American can be more loyal to the American flag than this Filipino who fought for us in Bataan, Corregidor, and Leyte, was wounded in action, and was several times decorated by General Wainwright and General MacArthur.

Because we know him and admire him in the United States for what he is I am happy to be able to inform this House of how highly he is also thought of in his native country by the legitimate representatives of his people by inserting today the following resolution passed by the loyal Philippine National Assembly at its last session:

[First Congress of the Philippines, second special session, House of Representatives]

House Concurrent Resolution 25

Concurrent resolution making of record the appreciation of the Congress of the Philippines for the invaluable services of Brig. Gen. CARLOS P. ROMULO to his country.

Whereas Brig. Gen. CARLOS P. ROMULO for more than 3 years worked indefatigably in the United States to tell the American people the great epic of Bataan and of the unswerving loyalty of the Filipino people to America and to the ideals of freedom and democracy;

Whereas by his writings and speeches, he has succeeded in presenting the Filipino people in a favorable light before the American Nation and has thereby brought about a closer understanding between the American and Filipino people; and

Whereas on the floor of the United States Congress, as Resident Commissioner of the Philippines, he has ably espoused the Filipino cause and has proven himself to be a worthy spokesman of the Filipino people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That they express, as they do hereby express, their appreciation for the invaluable services of Brig. Gen. CARLOS P. ROMULO to his country.

Pattern of Surplus Sales

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing the original letter from the Howard Zink Corp., of Fremont, Ohio, and a copy of the letter from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation covering the sale of surplus duck material. I have had numerous complaints concerning the sale of surplus property and this shows the usual pattern after a person has actually purchased the property. Weeks and months later he is advised that it has been sold to someone else. This is the method and it seems that there are always some specially preferred persons.

THE HOWARD ZINK CORP.,
Fremont, Ohio, November 20, 1945.

Hon. ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We would like to have you know of our experiences trying to buy some surplus property from the hereinafter named Department.

On or about September 23, we received a duck material list put out by the Office of Surplus Property, Department of Commerce, 704 Race Street, Cincinnati, Ohio, dated September 21, which reads as follows:

"Available millions of yards of surplus cotton duck."

Our purchasing agent called Mr. Cliff Hall, of the Treasury Department Office, Cincinnati, in regard to this list. He advised us that the lot of material we were interested in was open stock and no doubt the Government had a very large quantity of this particular lot. On October 2, we mailed our purchase order No. 0264 for 100,000 yards of the duck material, and enclosed with our purchase order a certified check for $27,000, made out to the Treasurer of the United States, Office of Surplus Property, Department of Commerce, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Our purchasing department called the Department of Commerce at Cincinnati at least twice each week since the order has been placed, trying to find out if and when the Government would ship the duck on our order. We were also interested in two or three hundred thousand yards more of the same lot, which we were willing to purchase and take into our Passaic, N. J., and Fremont, Ohio, plants. We were unable to get any information from the Cincinnati office as to when the 100,000 yards would be shipped. Our purchasing agent talked to the following persons at the Cincinnati office: Mr. Cliff Hall, J. F. Rule, and a Mr. McDaniels, sales manager, trying to find out if the Government was going to ship our order. The last time we talked to Mr. McDaniels over the phone was on November 14. At that time we were advised our order should be shipped from the Quartermaster Depot, Charlotte, N. C., within 5 days.

We received a letter dated November 15, signed by James F. Rule for Rowland D. Shell, Regional Director, Region 4, Consumer Goods Division, advising that our check in the amount of $27,000 would be returned to us because the duck had been sold out in small lots. The largest quantity going to any one buyer was 75,000 yards.

We really counted on getting not only the above lot of material, but an additional quantity to help us keep our help busy during the reconversion period, but it appears as if we were not given very much consideration.

We are enclosing a copy of the letter dated November 15 received from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Consumer Goods Division. We do not know if there is anything you can do about this, but we would like to know what we have to do in order to be able to buy any of the surplus goods offered by the Treasury Department. We will appreciate hearing from you at your convenience.

Respectfully yours,

THE HOWARD ZINK CORP.
H. E. ZINK, *President.*

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
OFFICE OF SURPLUS PROPERTY,
CONSUMER GOODS DIVISION,
Cincinnati, Ohio, November 15, 1945.

The HOWARD ZINK CORP.,
Fremont, Ohio
(Attention Mr. C. L. Cole.)

GENTLEMEN: With reference to your purchase order for 100,000 yards of duck, lot No. 218, located at Charlotte, N. C., same was presented to our Central Office in Washington, together with orders from this office and all other regions for allocation. We regret to advise, that due to such a number of requests for this item, you were not awarded any of this item.

The awards were made as authorized in the following quoted paragraphs in letter received from Mr. William C. Lehman, Assistant Director in Charge of Sales, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C., and trust that this explanation is satisfactory.

"Therefore, in order to carry out the aim of the Surplus Property Act to secure wide distribution, the following methods were used:

On those items of less than 5,000 yards that had to be sold as one lot, where there was more than one bidder, the lots were drawn for the successful bidder.

Wherever the yardage ordered was many times the yardage available, awards were made in full to those ordering the minimum quantity of 2500 yards and if the balance of yardage available was sufficient, it was prorated to the balance of the offerings. Where the balance of yardage was not sufficient to make an award to all of the offers made, of a reasonable amount that a bidder would be interested in having, the yardage was then prorated to all bidders of 10,000 yards or less, (in one instance on one 20,000 and one 30,000 yard order, and in one instance on one 75,000 yards and lesser amounts, where the balance of the orders on larger amounts totaled 3,500,000 yards with 250,000 yards to allocate). All of the larger items offered on such lots received no award."

Very truly yours,

JAMES S. RULE,
(For) ROWLAND D. SCHELL,
Regional Director, Region IV,
Consumer Goods Division.

Their Right To Howl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Fort Wayne (Ind.) Journal-Gazette should receive the attention of all Members of Congress. It seems that again a high Army officer is trying to prevent servicemen from writing to their Congressmen and to the newspapers by threatening them with disciplinary action. I believe this to be a dangerous, totalitarian, un-American attempt to take away constitutionally guaranteed rights and believe it should be thoroughly investigated by the Congress.

Members of Congress have received thousands of letters from men in service and their families, and, as the editorial points out, the chief complaint is the delay in getting home. If the Army wants to prevent servicemen from writing to their Congressmen, their best bet would

be to remove the main cause of their complaints and get them home. I do not believe that such communications violate in any way Army regulations drawn up to prevent men in the armed forces from interfering with military procedure or from seeking to "procure personal favor through legislation." For the most part the men who have served their country so well are asking no more than they deserve and have earned. They have won the war; they have served long and arduously; they have given up their families and loved ones; and now, very naturally and humanly, they want to come home. They want what the military authorities have promised them—to be brought home as speedily as possible. After the sacrifices they have made, they deserve that and more.

If disciplinary action should be the result of their writing to their Congressmen or to newspapers, it should be taken against the brass hats who try to gag them, not against the GI's who have fought a war to protect a right which is now threatened. We are not a totalitarian nation; our Government does not endure because we keep people gagged and afraid to speak out when they believe injustices are being committed. The people of this country—including the men in the armed forces—have long cherished "their right to howl" and it is one of our duties as Members of Congress to help them keep that right.

The American people have too much faith in their Army heads to believe the military needs to hide anything, and unless the military authorities do have something to hide, they have nothing to fear from the exercise of free speech now.

Members of Congress are just as patriotic as the brass hats. They have no desire to interfere with necessary military discipline. But they do have a desire and a right to secure equitable treatment for all people—including men in the Army.

THEIR RIGHT TO HOWL

Since the end of the war letters from disgruntled, impatient servicemen have been pouring in to newspapers and to Congressmen. From the men overseas the chief complaint, of course, is the delay in getting home. From men stationed in this country the big gripe is the apparent reluctance to give discharges to eligible servicemen.

This newspaper has not always agreed with the writers of these letters, but we never have doubted their right to write them. Not so, however, with Brigadier General Hornsby, of the Army Air Forces Technical Training Command, who last week caused to be published in the Lowry Field Rev-Meter a letter designed to end the GI pastime of writing letters to their Congressmen. General Hornsby cites two paragraphs of Army regulations on which he bases his order. The first order forbids any person in military service to "procure or oppose in any manner or influence legislation affecting the Army to procure personal favor through legislation." The other paragraph of the regulations cited warns that extreme care should be used by men in service in making "public pronouncements on political or diplomatic or on legislative or administrative measures and matters, the treatment of which tends to prejudice discipline, to involve superior officers in controversy, to interpret official publications, or define military procedure."

General Hornsby calls attention to one of his previous orders which said anyone with a complaint should communicate by direct correspondence to the air inspector of his command. He closes his communication with a warning that violators will be subject to disciplinary action.

It is apparent that the sections cited by the general were written by the War Department for the purpose of preventing string pulling—not to keep the lowly GI from writing a letter to his home-town newspaper editor or to his Congressman. Certainly a personal letter to a Congressman could not be construed as a public utterance. The letter a soldier writes his Congressman may hold forth on any subject from food, length of service, or the color of the top sergeant's eyeballs on Monday morning, but we believe the Constitution guarantees something like that. The letters may, as the general says, "place an undue burden" on the legislation, but it must be remembered that they asked for the job.

Many servicemen are doing little else than thinking of their personal problems these days. If they can let off some of their steam and spleen by writing letters, we believe they should be encouraged to do it. Certainly, they should not be intimidated by officers who place a too-broad construction upon certain regulations.

Peacetime Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony by an outstanding businessman and publicist, J. Henry Scattergood, before the House Committee on Military Affairs on November 30, 1945, opposing the peacetime draft and calling for energetic moral and political leadership now on the part of the United States toward strengthening the United Nations and other agencies of peaceful international cooperation:

I am here to speak for the Friends' Committee on National Legislation, but I feel that I speak for great numbers of people of all faiths everywhere who still believe in the nonmilitary pattern of American life that has prevailed for 160 years of our history and who are opposed to peacetime conscription and a permanently enlarged military establishment for such reasons as these:

1. Because they want our country to have real security through the prevention of war, not the false security of an armament race headed straight for a third World War.

2. Because they are not convinced that from a military viewpoint conscription is a sound policy.

3. Because they feel that the enormous annual cost of a great permanent military establishment will threaten our whole American economic and financial system.

4. Because they do not want to have the military services become a predominant influence in our Government and political life.

5. Because they want our boys and young men trained to be upstanding citizens who think for themselves in terms of democracy, self-discipline, liberty, peace, and world brotherhood, not trained to be units in a military machine who think in terms of authoritarian discipline, war, fears, and distrust of other nations.

6. Because they believe real security can be attained by a positive, courageous policy of developing the United Nations Organization and world-wide reduction of national armaments by international agreement.

7. Because they believe that the way of cooperation and mutual service between nations will pay better dividends in security and welfare than great national competitive armaments and perpetuation of a system of power based on suspicion.

I need not review for this committee the well-known views of the Society of Friends—that war is utterly incompatible with the character and teachings of Christ. All Christians are against war; the Friends and other pacifist denominations have carried their opposition further. Their love of our country is as great, and their desire to serve is as strong, but it has taken the direction of relief of suffering caused by the war, health, and other civilian projects. Congress has recognied the law of conscience and generously provided ways of service other than in the armed forces.

While I represent the Friends committee, nevertheless, instead of stressing the Friends' view alone I would like to speak as a businessman and representative of typical citizens who are deeply interested in the trend of world events.

PREVENTION OF WAR IS MAIN ISSUE

We are not unmindful that General Marshall, General Eisenhower, Admiral King, and our other great military and naval leaders are vigorously urging conscription as necessary for our security, and we recognize that they are entitled to be heard with the greatest respect They are doing their duty as men responsible for military policy, and they know much more about this than any of the rest of us. But that does not mean that their conclusions about conscription are necessarily right when all aspects of national interest and policy are taken into account. These gentlemen speak as military experts, but primarily as military experts. It is their duty to look forward to the possibility of war, and to tell you and all of us how to be prepared for war if war comes. It has become clear, however, that this is not the main issue—that if war comes there is not going to be any real security for anyone. The main issue is what President Truman and Prime Ministers Attlee and Mackenzie King recently said it was—the prevention of war. This is a problem beyond the field or our military leaders. This is a problem which you gentlemen of Congress have to deal with and solve—not as military experts, but as statesmen.

The atomic bomb has awakened us to an awareness of an unparalleled crisis in the world. There is a new kind of fear throughout the nations. The most awful war of history has just been fought and won; the aggressor nations of Germany and Japan have been laid low; and yet we are passing through a trough of cynicism and of doubt in human nature and human destiny, intensified by the unknown terrors of atomic energy. There seem to be many who think that the best the world can hope for is a precarious peace based on overwhelming force—lasting perhaps 15 or 20 years. What everybody wants, of course, is lasting security.

There are two alternative proposals to obtain this: (1) the old preparedness way; (2) the new world organization with its planned collective security. Both ways are in side-by-side existence today, and the policy must actually be settled as to which is to prevail. The United States is the strongest nation of all, and is in the responsible position of having to lead the world. It has the responsibility, too, of the knowledge of the bomb. The course our Nation follows is altogether likely to fix the future of mankind.

PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION WOULD STIMULATE ARMAMENT RACE

The old military preparedness way is based on the theory that each nation must be stronger than any other, either in its own

strength alone or with others to give it the advantage in the balance of power. We know by bitter experience of the two world wars that this theory has not worked. We know that through the centuries it has started more wars than it has stopped; we know that it leads again, as in the past, to a new armament race, and that it is based on a psychology of war, that instead of there being safety in this policy of military preparedness, there is almost certain danger of a third world war. Yet, here we are today, already proposing various steps again in the military race. As Senator FULBRIGHT said the other day, "We propose large armed forces by conscription; we demand exclusive bases in the Pacific, we insist upon our right to participate in the affairs of eastern Europe, and we keep the atomic bomb to ourselves under the guise of a self-appointed sacred trusteeship. At the same time we deplore militarism; we object to Russia's demand for bases in the Mediterranean and the Dardanelles, we refuse her request to participate on an equal basis in the affairs of Japan. We complain of her actions in the Balkans, and we would oppose any mention of the Panama Canal. This situation seems to point to a lack of guiding principles and convictions on the part of the United States." All these steps, both of ourselves and of Russia, however, are based on individual national preparedness.

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION MUST BE MADE TO WORK

The second alternative to obtain security is the newly formed United Nations Organization. We can rejoice that all the great allies in the war joined in its formation and are members. In opening the San Francisco Conference President Truman said, "We stand in the midst of the vast ruins of the most terrible war in history. We must prevent—if human mind, heart, and hope can prevent it—the repetition of the disaster from which the entire world will suffer for years to come. But here and now, at San Francisco, the work must begin with the setting of the essential organization which is to keep the peace when it is won. Our sole task is to create the structure. We must provide the machinery which will make future peace not only possible but certain. We hold a powerful mandate from the people." This international organization—the UNO—must make effective a system of law and justice between nations. We must work toward the transfer of military power of individual nations to the international organization, so that the power may be used collectively in support of law and justice. Through it, also, must be developed economic policies for the well-being of all peoples. Standards and attitudes must be built up to form the foundation of an ordered and peaceful international community. This way is based on the psychology of peace.

These are long-range goals, but they give us our directions. The international organization set up at San Francisco is admittedly only a beginning. Improvements are already being suggested in England and in the United States as to limiting the veto power of the council nations. But imperfect as it is, the UNO offers the nations the possibility of developing it into an instrument of progress along these lines, if they have the will and the wisdom to do it. There is no other practical possibility in sight. So the choice lies between taking the San Francisco organization and gradually developing it into an instrument for law, justice, security, and economic well-being, or sinking back into the old struggle for national power, and its apparently inevitable consequence—war.

This making the UNO a success should be the preponderant purpose of humanity. If there ever was a "must," this is it. And all the more so now with the revelations of atomic energy.

I was at the recent meetings in Philadelphia of the American Philosophical Society, of which I am privileged to be a member. We were addressed by some of the scientists who had worked on the atomic bomb. They all said there is no defense except in strengthening the world organization for peace; that if the atomic bombs are used again in war, the soldier in the army will be safer than the wives and children in the city. They said that every sane person must be concerned with this fate; that we simply cannot afford to be without world government. One of them, in the realm of pure physics, likened the discovery of atomic physics already made to the discovery of America by Columbus, that a whole new continent of discoveries lies ahead leading in all probability to the solving of the universe and of creation itself.

Now what has all this to do with conscription? Just this: We are in an intervening period now. We are all sick and tired of war but fear leads the world to continue the old attempts at safety through old-fashioned military preparedness, while at the same time creating the new world organization. As I said before, both exist side by side, and all the great nations participate in both. But the world hopes for the UNO development from stage to stage. The first step will probably be supervision and regulation of the armaments retained. This received approval by Russia, France, and United States in the last disarmament conference. Perhaps later will come the pari passu reduction of individual nations' armaments and the transfer of parts to the UNO; then may follow the international law to hold liable the individual lawbreakers as criminals, like the criminal trials against the Nazi and Japanese leaders today; perhaps some day the world government can be attained, now so eloquently urged by Justice Roberts.

Now in this intervening period, while the UNO is being brought to more and more development, why introduce conscription in peacetime—new and un-American as it is—as an addition to our forces as they are? We have already a Navy as large as all the other navies in the world put together; we have the largest Army in peacetime we ever had. Why introduce conscription now? What's the hurry? We have no present threatening enemy; Germany and Japan are finished as aggressors; it is unthinkable that the United States and Great Britain will go to war against each other; General Eisenhower said the other day about Russia, that Russia wants peace with the United States more than anything else. And the United States certainly wants peace with Russia.

Other nations would interpret American adoption of peacetime conscription as proof that we don't trust them and that we expect another war; that we refuse to replace competing conscript armies by democratic world cooperation; that really we don't expect the UNO to be successful.

WE CAN'T MOVE IN TWO DIRECTIONS AT ONCE

If, on the other hand, we really do believe in the UNO and are sincere in our resolve to make it work, let us move in that direction, and not backward to the Old World futile policy of conscription, which we have never had in our history, and this just at the time when all efforts should be made in the other direction. If you want to go in one direction, you don't make a start in another, as this would be doing.

Furthermore, many people have come to believe that in an age of the atomic bomb military training would be obsolete and futile; that the training of a relatively few scientists would offer more real security today than the military training of a million boys a year.

ARGUMENT THAT CONSCRIPTION IS NEEDED TO SUPPORT THE UNITED NATIONS IS SPECIOUS

It is sometimes argued that conscription is needed because we are in the UNO and must support it by military force. A moment's thought makes it clear that under present circumstances the argument is wholly specious. Under existing conditions there is no expectation or possibility that the UNO will be used against any one of the Big Five. The veto provisions preclude that. Yet it is only for measures against one of these great powers that conscription could be needed.

Let us note in passing, that if millions of trained men should ever again count in the future, we should be fully cognizant of population trends. Astonishing information on birth rates, death rates, and careful calculations on manpower in future years were given by the experts in population studies of Princeton at a meeting of the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia 18 months ago. These studies were based on the population, male and female, in 1940 and showed the trends of birth and death rates to the year 1970. These showed that Germany, France, England, and the United States would have fewer men of military age in 1970 than in 1940, so that they could not carry on a world war like the one just finished based on manpower. Spain, Italy, and the Balkans will have about the same numbers in 1970 as in 1940; but Russia will have 12,000,000 more men of military age than in 1940.

Let us also look further to the Far East. China has 400,000,000 population; India has 375,000,000. If these nations follow our Western examples in becoming military powers, what will happen? I remember 20 years ago hearing Dr. Henry Hodgkin, an English missionary to West China, say how short-sighted, to say the least, we Westerners have been in teaching the Chinese, that greatest naturally pacifist state, that the only way that they could gain a place in the sun would be to be able to fight for it. The Chinese didn't want to change—there the soldier occupied the lowest place in the social scale, but Dr. Hodgkin said the Chinese would learn the lesson if they found they had to, that they could pull triggers as well as a white man; that they could live on rice where our soldiers want beefsteak, that they are fatalists and death means little to them. Where in the long run will we Westerners come out if we head into a military clash with these eastern peoples? We already have had one lesson with one of them—the Japanese, who copied the worst part of our civilization. To prevent such a clash ever occurring with Russia or with these eastern peoples, it is only intelligent self-interest on our part to make a real working success of the world organization of nations while we have time. This will provide other means of solving world problems than by force, and will set up machinery for settling disputes by peaceful methods.

WHERE WILL THE MONEY COME FROM?

I have not mentioned costs of conscription. Congress knows only too well the pressure it is under to cut taxes and reduce Government expenditures. The cost of conscription is estimated at two and one-half to three billions annually. Secretary Patterson testified before this committee that the Army wants 500,000 men in peacetime, costing several billions; Admiral King wants a Navy of 500,000 and 58,000 officers; General Arnold wants 400,000 for the air. On top of these demands for almost a million and a half men with their huge peacetime costs, there will also be vast demands for veterans, social security, medical care, unemployment insurance, and all the civilian departments of the Government, as well as the huge debt service. The country will ask where is the money to come from for all these, and if conscription, which certainly is not needed now and which will cost three billions new expenditure, is added it would seem $20,000,000,000 to $25,000,000,000 wil have to be raised. Businessmen can well ask what chance there will be for balancing the budget, for reduction of the largest debt ever incurred by an nation in

history. Many will even fear that the preservation of private initiative will be threatened. It will be altogether likely that the unsound practice of deficit financing will have to be continued and that some forms of repudiation will have to be adopted such as again lowering the value of our money standard. I well remember being in Berlin and paying a million marks for a newspaper. I am in a business with a subsidiary company in France, and we have seen the French franc go from 19.3 cents down to 2 cents. We need not in this country go all the way, but we will go part way down this route with sad results to us all, if we do not set our financial house in order.

LET AMERICA ADOPT A PROGRAM OF RELIEF AND GOOD WILL

Friends have been strong believers in the power of good will and good deeds in international affairs. The relief work done in many countries by the American Friends Service Committee bears testimony to this. It was my great privilege to have been the first Quaker emissary to France in 1916, and to have been on the first American Red Cross Commission to France. I was the first chief in France of this Quaker reconstruction and relief unit; also later I was a special Quaker Commissioner to the Ruhr at the time of the French occupation. I can bear personal testimony to the power of the child-feeding work in Germany. The Friends were the distributors in Germany of food for children from the Hoover relief organization. A million and a half children were fed daily in all German cities of 50,000 population and upward. The effect was unprecedented. The hardest-hearted German father was melted when his undernourished child came back from school one day and told him that America had brought the children food, which they themselves had no way of providing. "If thine enemy hunger, feed him." It works as nothing else works, if we only have the faith to try it.

Let America today go on with the great work of UNRRA, the Red Cross, the Quaker relief committees, and it will be much more efficacious toward our safety than the institution of conscription.

Conscription is not the American way to educate youth for democratic citizenship and world responsibility. Discipline is needed, but discipline in a democracy must rest fundamentally on self-discipline and not coercion. Training from childhood up in American ideals and privileges and duties is the only way to produce character and a sense of democratic responsibility. This is the task of the homes, schools, and churches, and cannot be done by the Army in 1 year with 18-year-old boys.

Furthermore, as we look at Germany, Japan, and other dictatorships that have used military conscription to indoctrinate their young men, we see what it has done to them. It has made them consider the state, not God, as supreme; it has taught them that the individual exists for the good of the state, not the state for the individual. We look today in the Axis countries for those who have stood out against this philosophy, and upon them we hope to rebuild democracy and freedon on the ruins of dictatorship. Why, then, should we think we can preserve our own democracy by indoctrinating our boys with the principles of dictatorship—for an army must always be a dictatorship?

We respectfully submit that the safety of our country lies not in any great military establishment such as peacetime military conscription would be. George Washington, in his Farewell Address, warned us not against a large standing Army as some would have us believe, but against "overgrown military establishments," which, to use his words, "under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty."

SECURITY LIES IN MORE FREEDOM, NOT LESS

Rather does our security lie in more democracy, not less; in more freedom of speech; more freedom from want; more freedom from fear; more freedom of religion, which will make our essential Christianity the very life not only in our own country but throughout the world. To accomplish this requires self-discipline, not the discipline of the Army camp; the rekindling of individual conscience, not the submergence of it; complete loyalty to God, even above loyalty to the state. These virtues are not taught in Army camps.

We are convinced that only as our Nation turns from the treacherous path of military power and walks firmly in this path of freedom can we do our part to create in the world that mutual trust and confidence which are essential if the foundations of democracy are to be securely laid in other lands, and if the World Organization launched at San Francisco is to maintain peace. Our prayer is that you and all those in public office may seek and find wisdom from God, and, in the words of Lincoln, "that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Priorities for Veterans' Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 14, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, on November 18 I introduced H. R. 4742, a bill to give war veterans priority in securing farms, homes, and building materials for those homes. Since that time the situation which faces our war veterans in trying to find homes for their families has become a great national scandal. The House and Senate are being flooded with bills to relieve the whole housing situation, and the administration has finally addressed itself to this national crisis. The following editorials are pertinent to the urgent need for rapid action in the housing situation which must be taken by both Congress and the administration:

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post]

HOMES FOR EVERYBODY

The housing shortage is getting to be a sore point all over the Nation. It is especially resented because returning GI's coming back to the country they saved can't get a roof over their heads. They feel resentful about this and everyone else feels ashamed—or ought to.

But in a situation like this we have the usual cockeyed remedies proposed. The first impulse of all of our politicians is to rush into public housing. It isn't necessary, it isn't the solution, and most of the GI's don't want it. They want homes of their own.

It isn't a shortage of public housing which is bothering us but just a shortage of houses, or rather of homes. And the reason for the shortage is not hard to find. We haven't been building any homes to speak of for the duration of the war. Furthermore, building materials are still scarce and building labor is likewise scarce.

The solution to the problem is not to go into a lot of expensive public housing projects, or to treat veterans as wards of the city or the State or the Nation. The real remedy is to find out the bottlenecks in building materials and remedy these bottlenecks, just as we remedied the bottlenecks which were holding up the production of planes and artilleries and ships and so on. In every case this was successfully accomplished.

We might have all the houses the country could use if all the people who want to build houses at the present time had the ability to get the materials, the contractors, the labor to build them. Therefore the most that the Government can do to be permanently helpful in this case is to smash any bottlenecks that exist and give the go-ahead signal to private construction. Literally hundreds of thousands of homes are planned and hundreds of thousands of prospective home owners are eager to build, but they want to build with materials that are good, not shoddy or substitute; with labor that is competent, not green or unskilled, and at prices that are within reach of the average family. To solve this problem requires the same kind of business brains and executive leadership that solved the problem of airplane production, of artillery production, and of ship production in the war.

We do not need ill-advised, hastily constructed, unduly expensive public housing. We need a great number of new private homes.

As a practical aid to returning servicemen Congress should immediately pass the bill introduced by Representative CLARE LUCE, giving top priorities on building materials to servicemen. That would enable them to get the earliest start during the shortage of materials. As bottlenecks were broken and more materials became available, the civilian demand could be met.

[From the Washington Post of December 14, 1945]

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

EFFECTS OF HOUSING SHORTAGE

When Members of Congress went home on holiday last summer, they heard a never-ending clamor from fathers and mothers about bringing the boys home. It was so insistent that some Congressmen sought refuge back in Washington or in remote vacation retreats.

This time when they go home for the brief Christmas recess, they will hear from the returned veterans themselves. The question of a place for fighting men and their families to live is the hottest issue in the country and it is still only in the warming-up stage.

It explains why the Truman administration has hastily back-tracked to apply controls on building materials again. These and other controls were taken off too heedlessly in response to pressure lobbies.

It explains the Senate's hasty action in voting $160,000,000 to be used to adapt emergency wartime housing for the veterans in cities and college towns. Made-over barracks will not be ideal by any means, but some such makeshift is necessary for the months ahead.

Reports reaching OPA show that in almost every city and town across the entire country the situation is the same. They show, too, that the talk of self-discipline put out by the building industry to justify removal of controls was largely nonsense.

A study of OPA reports make plain what a grim story it is. Thousands of families have been evicted. Hundreds of thousands are living in cellars and garages which are damp and insanitary.

The headlines from city to city are monotonously repetitious. They tell human-interest stories of veterans returned from 2, 3, and 4 years of service to find that they must live separately from their wives and children or doubled up with in-laws who are already crowded.

In each community they are casting about desperately for some expedient. At Great Lake ports they have sought lake steamers for use at dockside during the winter months.

Veterans seeking shelter for wives and children often grow desperate. One former officer in an Illinois city after 12 days of futile search, worked himself into a frenzy and began to smash the furniture in the local veterans' dvisory office. Yet, withal, they are remarkably patient.

The vacancy rate on rented dwellings, perhaps the best barometer of the housing shortage, has moved downward in most cities almost to zero. The contrast with 1940 when the crowding had just begun is striking.

In San Francisco the gross vacancy rate 5 years ago was nearly 7 percent. In May of this year it was 1 percent and it is probably less than that today. In Detroit it was 3.3 in 1940 and less than 1 percent in July of this year. The percentages for 1945 are deceptive in that the vacancies which do exist are largely substandard dwellings.

VJ-day released a small building boom. But it is not in houses or apartments. Lansing, Mich., for example, reported $1,000,000 of new construction and exactly three $6,000 houses going up. The construction was industrial and commercial. That is fairly typical of what is happening around the country.

One consequence is that the price of houses has been soaring. Confidential reports to OPA show that in many areas a speculative boom is in full swing. Modest dwellings that once sold for $4,500 are bringing up to $9,500.

In one community housing units built during the last war years for sale purposes were sold under order L-41, limiting the cost of new houses, at a fair price. They are now bringing half again as much in a speculative market.

Some veterans who can find the down payment are buying this inflated property. It is a measure of their desperation.

But the possibilities of loss and bitter disillusion are plentiful, especially when the veteran makes the discovery that loan privileges under the GI bill of rights are worthless in the face of such inflation. Multiplied many times over, this disillusion can have serious political consequences.

These grim facts of life are certain to intrude on the holiday cheer of many a Congressman. The idea of going back into a barrack again even though it has been reassembled into family type units will not appeal to GI Joe and if he can find somebody from Washington to tell his troubles to, he'll do it.

But he will take that barrack if it comes down to a choice of that or more separation from the family he returned to with the war's end.

Forgotten Point Men in Okinawa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter received from one of my constituents:

OKINAWA, *October 9, 1945.*

Hon. WILLIAM A. ROWAN,
Congressional District Office,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am writing this letter to you in hope that you will use your influence to help the men of the Thirty-fifth Station Hospital. We are being taken to Japan to serve as occupation troops with the Sixth Army after 32 months of continuous service overseas. During those long months there were no furloughs, no rotation, no, not even a decent break for those men whose loved ones at home fell sick and died. We were sent direct from the ETO to the Pacific when other units stationed near us, and who had less time overseas, were being sent to the United States.

At the present time we have 190 men eligible for discharge under the War Department's directive which states that men of 70 points and above will be released from their present assignments and will return to the United States.

Yesterday, the 8th of October, an order releasing 129 men with point scores of 80 and above, was read to us by our personnel officer. The men were told to pack and be ready to leave at 1300 hours for the POA center as their first step homeward. At 1300 hours the commanding officer of the unit rescinded the order—none of the men left. He, the commanding officer, admitted that it was up to him whether the men could leave or not. Sir, is that fair to American men who have given so much of their time toward winning the war?

We ask you to intercede for us; help us to return to our loved ones and don't let us become forgotten men.

Respectfully.

A National Housing Policy: S. 1592

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is quite probable that S. 1592, a bill to establish a national housing policy and to provide for its execution, may not be reported out of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, now holding hearings thereon, prior to recess or adjournment. However, Mr. Speaker, it is quite will understood that such a measure will eventually reach the House of Representatives in some form or other, in which event the membership will be well advised to read the statement made before the Senate committee by L. Douglas Meredith, vice president and chairman of the committee on finance of the National Life Insurance Co., of Montpelier, Vt., which statement under consent heretofore granted I am including, with my endorsement, as an extension of my remarks.

I think the sponsors of this measure were wise to recognize that their bill not only provides for the birth and administration but also for the execution of a national housing policy under Federal control, if you know what I mean.

If the Federal Government takes over all business to operate and to execute, there certainly will be effectuated an execution of free enterprise and individual initiative. There are already too many small business corpses hanging on the gallows due to Government interference to suit me or to ensure anything but the eventual socialization and federalization of the United States of America, always the land of the brave but day by day becoming less and less the home of the free!

Mr. Meredith's statement follows:

Gentlemen, my name is L. Douglas Meredith, and I appear before you at this time as a representative of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, by virtue of membership on the Chamber's construction and civic development department committee. It also is my privilege to be affiliated with the National Life Insurance Co., Montpelier, Vt., as vice president, and chairman of the committee on finance. This company, incidentally, is a very active investor in home loans, and particularly Federal Housing Administration insured-mortgage loans, in which we have invested more than $210,000,000 since 1935.

The general views which I present here today are those of the Chamber, as reflected by a poll of all members on this and other vital subjects taken earlier this year.

We fully recognize the careful thought, diligent efforts, and the motives which have prompted the preparation and introduction of S. 1592. It is easy for us, too, to recognize that an acute housing shortage exists in the United States at the present time, that there always has been, and always will be, room for improvement in the housing facilities of our Nation, and that housing activities represent a very important factor in the economic structure of our country. At the same time, we are unable to agree with many of the principles and methods proposed by S. 1592 for remedying unsatisfactory housing conditions of the present, and for improving the housing standards of the Nation over the next generation.

PRESENT HOUSING STANDARDS ARE HIGH

Whenever a situation such as the current housing shortage develops, it becomes very easy for each of us to focus our attention upon acute current conditions, and to overlook or to minimize the fact that the American people enjoy the highest standard of living in the world. And housing is an important factor in that standard of living.

A recent survey of the United States Bureau of Census indicated that well over four-fifths of the occupied dwellings in the United States have ample room space as measured by the high standard of one person per room.

Well over four-fifths also have electricity or gas lighting.

Four-fifths of the urban dwellings have private bathtubs, or showers, for the exclusive use of their occupants, and 65 percent of all occupied dwellings have such facilities.

The four-fifths of the population who are well housed are the energetic, self-supporting families who have led the way in the past, and can be relied upon to improve the standards of the future.

This recent housing survey reveals there has been a decided improvement in housing for the country as a whole during the war years from 1940 to 1944. More dwellings are better equipped today than they were 5 years ago, despite wartime shortages. In addition, there has been a marked increase in home ownership during these years. In October 1944 there were 18,573,000 dwelling units occupied by owners, which represented an increase of 22 percent over April 1940.

It is significant, too, that not all of these housing accommodations are high-priced residences. More than half of the one and one-half million home owners purchasing single-family houses insured by FHA are now paying for them in installments of less than $40 a month. In 1941, the last normal building year, 40 out of 100 owners were paying for their homes and meeting all fixed charges with monthly payments of $30 to $40, while 28 out of every 100 were paying less than $30.

The American family's will to improve its housing standards and to own its own home is a demonstrated fact. So also is the ability

of the private home-building industry to meet these widespread and persistent demands for better housing.

WHAT IS THE HOUSING PROBLEM?

Review of the facts just stated properly leads us to consideration of the question: What is the American housing problem?

An acute housing shortage in practically every city in the country results from necessary restrictions on construction during the war period, from a rapid increase in marriages, and the fact that reconversion has not yet reached the stage at which houses can be produced in volume. Then there is, as always, the group of individuals with very low income whose housing conditions greatly could be improved. Yet it is difficult for many of us to see anything in the so-called housing problem which cannot be cared for by private enterprise and private production.

A widespread fallacy of much current thinking about housing arises from the mistaken conception that new accommodations must be provided for particular groups, such as low-income persons. New houses should be provided for all families who are willing and able to pay for them. When new housing is constructed, the occupants vacate less expensive quarters which in turn are available to another group, and thus the process of shifting occupancy extends throughout the income scale until only the poorest housing remains unoccupied. The quickest and most economical way to meet housing needs is to leave private enterprise free to build for the demand whenever it may appear.

The critical problem which faces the building industry now and will for some years to come is a problem of production and costs.

The problem cannot be solved by legislation directed primarily at affecting the supply of credit, as is contemplated by S. 1592. It can be solved only by industry and by community action designed to speed up the production of building materials and houses and to lower costs.

The home building industry is an outstanding example of small business in action. It is comprised of hundreds of thousands of contractors, builders, suppliers, professional firms and lending institutions. They have their roots deep in the community life of this country, and they have done a good job. For example, figures of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics show that the average cost of one-family dwellings has declined almost steadily during the last 18 years, falling from $4,593 in 1925, to $4,228 in 1935, and to $2,876 in 1943.

The Federal Government can play its most-effective role by encouraging and clearing the way for this decentralized industry and community action.

GOVERNMENT ACTIVITY IN THE FIELD OF MORTGAGE CREDIT

Congress should be especially careful now not to undo, as a result of pressure of the readjustment period, what has been built up through the effective teamwork of the Federal Government and the private lending institutions.

The Federal Government, prior to the war, initiated several far-reaching activities of a permanent nature, the purpose of which was to improve the home-financing or mortgage-credit facilities of the country. These activities were undertaken primarily in the interest of those millions of private individuals who are home owners, or want to purchase a home, and those millions of private individuals who have placed their savings in lending institutions which in turn used them to help finance home ownership. Never in the history of this country has the credit supply for the purchase of homes been more ample or available on more favorable terms than today.

These activities of the Federal Government which have been highly successful may be described briefly as follows:

1. The Federal Home Loan Bank System consisting of 12 regional banks from which the members of this System—for the most part savings and loan associations, although other types of mortgage-lending institutions are eligible for membership and are members—may borrow on the security of eligible home mortgages, or of obligations issued or guaranteed by the Government. The System and the Corporation to date have been self-supporting.

2. The Federal Housing Administration which provides for the mutual insurance of private loans of high ratio up to 80 percent and in some cases to 90 percent of the value of the property. The insuring function of this Administration is available to, and used by, practically all types of mortgage lenders, and to date has been self-supporting.

3. The mortgage companies of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which buy and sell mortgages on income properties, and also mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration.

In addition to these new agencies, established facilities in the field of mortgage finance have been enlarged and modernized, including the liberalization of previous restrictions in national banks.

Prior to the war, these three major innovations in the field of mortgage finance—the Federal Home Loan Bank System, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Federal mortgage companies were grouped together along with the RFC in the Federal Loan Administration.

This satisfactory arrangement was disrupted during the war through the setting up by Executive order of a temporary war agency, the National Housing Agency, which brought the Federal Home Loan Bank System and the Federal Housing Administration under its jurisdiction. The United States Housing Authority, now the FHA, also was placed under it.

BILL WOULD CONTINUE MODIFIED WARTIME CONTROLS

S. 1592 proposes to continue in a modified form the wartime supervision and direction of the activities of these agencies. Under the terms of title I of this bill, the wartime National Housing Agency becomes permanent. The National Housing Administration is made responsible for the general supervision and for the coordination of the functions, activities, and programs of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, for the Federal Housing Administration, and for the Federal Public Housing Authority which succeeds to all the functions of the United States Housing Authority and all the wartime Federal public housing activities. The Administrator is directed by title X to estimate the housing needs of all communities throughout the country and of all rural areas, and to recommend to Congress such governmental action as he feels necessary to see to it that the needs which he estimates are taken care of. This in effect continues in peacetime the wartime control or so-called programing activities of the National Housing Agency.

The adverse effects upon the private home financing and building industries of using the wartime National Housing Agency as a model for the peacetime organization of the Federal Government's housing activities are patent.

During wartime all new residential building was channeled through the National Housing Agency due to the necessity for distributing building materials so as to meet emergency housing needs in specific numbers in certain areas at a given time. This was controlled by programing.

What harm did this programing do the private home-financing and home-building industries?

The answer is, no harm in wartime, any more than the War Production Board's regimentation of all industry harmed the manufacturers of the country. The injury many individuals suffered is more than compensated by the good which came from victory.

However, if programing in any form is to be continued after the war when materials and labor are in plentiful supply, it will mean increasing control from Washington of the real-estate and mortgage markets and of the home-building industry. This in turn will mean restraints on manufacturers of building materials and equipment and their dealers. Also, it would mean the determination of community-housing needs by a far-removed governmental bureau, rather than by the people of the community well acquainted with local requirements.

PREWAR COORDINATION OF CREDIT ACTIVITIES SHOULD BE RESTORED

It is highly important to the prompt recovery of home building that this wartime supervision and direction of the activities of these agencies of proven value should be terminated. There is no reason why this should not be done at once. The war work of the National Housing Agency is completed.

It also should be borne in mind that the basic functions of each of the agencies under the NHA are different. The Federal home-loan banks are banks for making advances to their members. The Federal Housing Administration is an agency which insures mortgage loans, while the Federal Public Housing Authority in the final analysis is a relief agency. It does not seem to us that governmental agencies with interests as varied as these are should be continued under one administrative head.

Congress should restore at once the Federal Housing Administration and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to their previous positions of influence, leadership, and responsibility in the Federal Loan Agency. We know of no action which would be more encouraging at this time to the progressive forces in the home building and home-financing industry.

Proposals to improve the operations of the Federal Housing Administration and of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board should be considered by Congress on their merits. They should be considered entirely apart from the attempted objectives of S. 1592 to use both private and public lending agencies, and also Government subsidies for the purpose of providing new homes for families of all income groups.

OVER-ALL HOUSING POLICIES AND PROGRAM ARE IMPRACTICAL

The proponents of this bill are apparently of the opinion that the housing problem of the country is a total problem, that its solution calls for adoption of an over-all housing policy, to be carried out by a single Federal bureau.

But the plain fact is that Congress never has been able to adopt an over-all housing policy. It has been impractical to do so. A striking recent example is the failure to bring within the scope of this bill either the activities of the Veterans' Administration or the Public Roads Administration.

Yet in the next 10 years the home-loan provisions for veterans may directly affect up to one-half the entire housing market. Likewise, in connection with public roads, Congress has earmarked $125,000,000 to be spent annually for 3 years on a 50–50 matching basis to build modern thoroughfares within cities, and there is probably no single factor that is more influential upon urban housing than transportation.

Again, the bill divides responsibility for rural housing between the Department of Agriculture and the NHA.

The basic obstacle to an over-all treatment of housing is the decentralized character of the construction industry and the extremely variegated economic interests concerned with housing: construction, material supply, building labor, local government, finance, and property management, to name but a few. Congress would be well advised to deal with each of these constituent elements in-

dividually through such activities as housing research, labor relations, and mortgage insurance and discount as it is now doing, rather than to undertake a forced coordination of diverse and dissimilar organizations.

Two details involving application of the bill to FHA loans deserve special consideration.

Sections 309 (b) and 404 (c) of S. 1592 require that certain FHA loans shall include a proviso "for the extension of the period of amortization at any time the mortgagor, because of unemployment, economic conditions, or misfortune beyond his control, is unable to make a principal or interest payment due under or provided to be paid by the terms of the mortgage: * * *."

The intent of these provisions is commendable, but a stipulation so generally stated might well make FHA loans much less attractive to investors. The company with which I am affiliated includes in its uninsured loans a proviso which gives the borrower a deferment privilege under certain circumstances, but this privilege is expressed in language so specific that there can be little, if any, dispute as to what it means.

Section 312, of S. 1592, amends section 203 of the National Housing Act to provide in effect that upon new construction to be insured under this section by the FHA, the general contractor must give a warranty against structural defects and any failure to comply with the construction contract.

Builders in some cities now furnish such a guaranty, and no one doubts or questions its desirability. At the same time, in a market such as the present when there is an acute shortage of housing and when there is a plethora of funds available for purchases, it is my opinion that this provision would cause builders to shy away from FHA loans, and to encourage their borrowers to finance without them. I believe further that it would have very serious adverse consequences on the splendid work of the Federal Housing Administration.

PROVISION FOR RESEARCH

Congress should make suitable provision for existing Federal agencies, in cooperation with educational, research institutions and the construction industry, to correlate and to encourage research on construction materials and methods. This might be done by setting up a Committee on Construction Research which would be composed of men from Government agencies directly concerned with research in this field, and men from private life who have an outstanding reputation for their interest and achievements in the field of research as it relates to the construction industry. Such a committee should not carry on research activities, but should coordinate and encourage the research work which is presently being carried on by several Government agencies, by private business concerns, and by foundations and educational institutions.

It should be noted that the Department of Commerce through its Bureau of Standards and the Department of Agriculture through its Forest Products Laboratory are already deeply concerned with many phases of technical research in the building and construction field.

Action already has been taken by the Department of Commerce with the approval of Congress for setting up a Construction Division in its Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce to assemble in one place and to make available to the construction industry all pertinent statistical and other data bearing on its operations.

I submit for your consideration that the building industry needs a Henry Ford in every city who will produce houses for a small family at $1,500, $1,800, or $2,000, but this will require extensive research as to materials and methods of production.

Herein rests the great undeveloped opportunity for cooperation by Government and private industry. Government should encourage research which will make lower cost houses possible. Industry certainly can provide them.

CLEARING THE WAY FOR URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Another fundamental objective which must be accomplished to bring about a permanent improvement of housing is to clear the way for a resumption of community initiative and responsibility for urban redevelopment.

This objective cannot be attained through action in Washington. It is the States and not the Federal Government which are in a position to give cities the necessary powers to plan for and to carry out the redevelopment necessary to make them attractive places in which to live and work.

Definite progress is being made along two lines. For the first time cities are working with the highway departments in their States in planning improvements in their major thoroughfare systems. Funds for carrying these plans into effect are available through the Federal-aid highway appropriations, as previously noted.

For the first time, also, cities are being given adequate power and funds to reclaim their rundown areas.

Urban redevelopment laws have been enacted by a number of States to provide a legal basis for assembly by condemnation of land within cities for redevelopment. Outstanding among these laws is the measure enacted this year by the Indiana Legislature which authorizes the establishment of a redevelopment commission in Indianapolis with power and funds to clear and replace slums and blighted areas, and then under proper safeguards to sell or lease them to private individuals for redevelopment. There is also encouragement in the appropriation made this year by the Illinois Legislature to assist municipalities in that State to finance urban redevelopment programs.

The States and cities are in better financial position than they have been in years to assume the costs of local improvements. They should be encouraged by Congress to take the initiative and to assume the costs of financing these new, important, but as yet untried and experimental programs for reclaiming slum and blighted areas. Congress should see to it that its fiscal policies are such as will not unduly hamper the ability of the State and local governments to carry out their responsibilities in this and in other fields which are properly in their jurisdiction, or to tempt them by Federal grants to evade such responsibilities.

BILL CONTEMPLATES LARGE EXPENDITURES

S. 1592 contemplates an expenditure by the Federal Government for housing and for urban redevelopment of several billion dollars over a period of years. These expenditures will be financed by issuing obligations, largely tax exempt, which will be repaid by what might be called a sinking-fund arrangement, which in the bill goes under the name of annual Federal contributions.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES WOULD BE UNTIMELY AND INFLATIONARY

Much of this expenditure of Government funds would occur during the next 5 years, at a time when the private building industry will be straining every resource to take care of accumulated housing and other building requirements which can and will be financed by private funds. It would occur at a time when the States and cities are in a better financial position than they have been in years to assume the costs of programs for reclaiming slums and blighted areas. It would occur at a time when Congress itself faces the extraordinarily difficult fiscal problems created by a debt approaching $300,000,000,000. It would be an untimely and inflationary expenditure of Government funds.

Most of the Federal expenditures contemplated in S. 1592 are for public housing and related slum clearance with the objective of providing housing for low-income groups at prices they can afford to pay. This objective is accomplished not by the production of improved housing at lower cost, but by subsidies in the form of low interest costs, by long amortization periods, by contributions from a Government agency, and by local tax concessions. Thus housing becomes a social goal, regardless of the ability of a project to sustain itself economically, and the occupants become quasi-wards of Government. Builders, landlords, home owners, and investors naturally wonder whether housing has entered an era in which its otherwise bright future is to be obscured by the threat of Government competition and the threat of ultimate Government ownership and control of all housing.

SIGNIFICANCE OF INTEREST RATES

S. 1592 is conspicuous because of its stipulations throughout of very low interest rates and, therefore, no discussion of the bill would be complete without some comment on this subject. Earlier this year, able testimony was presented before the Taft subcommittee by Elbert S. Brigham, president of the National Life Insurance Co., and Paul Bestor, vice president of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, who emphasized that any consideration of the future of housing and mortgage financing requires giving attention to interest rates and their relation to mortgage activity.

During recent years, money rates, including mortgage rates have been the lowest in history for reasons which are well known. From various quarters, the suggestion is advanced that rates should be still lower, and that the Federal Government should establish and maintain them at incredibly low levels by governmental action.

The intentions of these persons undoubtedly are of the best, but we should not overlook probable consequences of such rates or the rights of lenders who represent the savers of the country, as well as the rights of borrowers, and the fact that most savers are dependent upon the income from their savings to support them when incapacitated for work.

A substantial and satisfactory spread must exist at all times between the rate on mortgage loans and other investments or mortgages cease to be appealing investments. Let us take, for example, loans with a 4½-percent interest rate. Recently at the American Life convention annual meeting held in Chicago, consideration was given during a panel discussion to the net interest return on mortgage loans. Figures as to the interest rate and cost of administration were presented by representatives of four different companies. These figures were averaged and it was demonstrated that, assuming a 4½-percent interest rate on mortgage loans, the net return is 3.04 percent after deducting costs as follows:

Service fee	0.55
Originating commissions	.43
Principal losses	.15
Home-office expenses	.33

Had the gross interest rate on these loans been 4 percent, and other costs the same, the return to the investor would have been 2.54 percent.

Instead of buying FHA loans or uninsured mortgage loans, an investor can purchase long-term Government bonds at 2½ percent with no risk of loss or corporate obligations. Bonds can be registered and the check for interest is mailed to the investor on each interest-payment date. With bonds, the lender encounters no difficulties in servicing loans, problems in personnel, foreclosure, liquidation of acquired real estate, or any other problems inherent in mortgage lending. It is imperative that the net return on mortgage loans must be attractive to investors

in order to induce them to make loans. Prospective mortgagers are in constant competition with other borrowers, including railroads, industrial organizations, and all other seekers of credit.

This subject of interest rate is part and parcel of the still larger problem of inflated construction costs and abnormal real-estate values. It is idle to devise more governmental machinery for housing, while ignoring the obvious fact that today costs and values are the great hurdle in the path of speedy correction of housing shortages. As a result of governmental deficit financing during the war and in prospect for some time to come, a huge money supply has been built up far in excess of any reasonable need of the economy. It operates as a continuing inflationary threat on all prices, real estate and other. In addition, it operates to increase the supply of investment funds and to force interest rates downward.

As previously pointed out, a certain spread is necessary between mortgage interest rates and the rates on Government and corporate bonds, which means that when Government bonds are available at 2½ percent, the mortgage rates cannot fall much, if any, below 4 percent without funds flowing into governments in preference to mortgages. However, if the supply of funds is large enough, it will force both rates lower while maintaining the differential, as is happening now in the markets for Treasury bonds and mortgages.

At the same time, the pressure of an unwieldy money supply is a potent factor in pushing prices upward. In real estate where control measures are extremely difficult to apply, it operates both directly in stimulating the bidding up process, and indirectly in facilitating financing.

If we are to control inflation, we must attack the root causes, among them an excessive and expanding supply of money. In my view this will involve, first, balancing the Federal Budget with restraint upon new spending and maintenance of high tax revenue, and second, reduction of the money supply.

The money supply is now largely in the form of bank deposits owned by the general public. It can be reduced by refunding the maturing bank-owned short-term securities into long-time holdings by the public. In other words, we should seek to induce the public to exchange their deposits for Government bonds.

I submit to you that the most effective way to accomplish this is to raise rather than lower the interest rate. If the Treasury were to offer a long-term bond at a rate somewhat higher than the prevailing rate, designed to take up the liquid savings of the public, both directly and through savings institutions, it would in my judgment have the following effects:

1. It would encourage saving rather than spending at a time when there is an excess of demand in the commodity and real estate markets. There is little reason to save when interest rates are extremely low and the currency is depreciating;

2. It would check the inflationary boom in real estate. Money which is now seeking investment in mortgages would be drawn toward Government bonds;

3. It would check the flow of equity capital into the stock market and the real estate market by serving notice on persons hedging against inflation that the Government's easy money policy was not perpetual.

It frequently is argued that low money rates are necessary in order to keep at a minimum the costs of carrying our huge Federal debt. And yet, if a policy of low interest rates produces higher prices, the real cost of carrying the Federal debt may be greatly increased and the burden may become extremely onerous to every citizen of our country. Higher prices resulting from Government fiscal policies are a vicious and hidden tax just as burdensome, and possibly more so than any direct tax.

In conclusion, it is our opinion that while S. 1592 contains numerous points of merit, the housing situation in America is not so grave that it calls for omnibus treatment with Government entering the housing field on a basis and to an extent it has never entered this field before.

Cordell Hull Awarded Nobel Peace Prize in Oslo, Norway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, December 10, the banquet hall of the Nobel Institute in Oslo, Norway, was the scene of festivities marking the formal presentation of the 1944–45 Nobel Peace Prize to former United States Secretary of State Cordell Hull. The presentation address was delivered by Gunnar Jahn, former Norwegian Minister of Finance and chairman of the Norwegian Storting's Nobel Committee. United States Ambassador Lithgow Osborne accepted the award on behalf of Mr. Hull whose ill health prevented him from personally accepting the plaudits of the Nobel Committee.

Mr. Jahn paid high tribute to the father of the good-neighbor policy with the following remarks:

Throughout a long life, Cordell Hull has labored to strengthen relations between the States. Best known to the public are his tireless efforts in the field of foreign trade policy, the goal of which was to break down the autocratic tendencies at home and abroad which to a great extent had characterized the nations' policies since the late 1920's. That is the background for his battle against isolationism at home, for his efforts to shape a peace bloc among the states of the American continents, and for his labors to organize the United Nations.

Several observations, which were a part of his first speech in Congress, shed a forecasting gleam to indicate his general course of action. He appears before us as the bearer of the best of liberalism's ideas; a man with a strong social consciousness. But at that time he had not yet given expression to his international point of view. That does not make its appearance until the time of the First World War. As early as 1917 he is setting forth his observations on an international agreement covering the weapons of trade policy. The task of easing trade restrictions was taken up by the League of Nations and with the great world conference held in Geneva in 1927 a foundation was laid for the work of the ensuing years. Final efforts to erect this structure found expression in the World Economic Conference in London in 1933. As we now know, the conference led to no results, but Hull did not give up. In 1934 he succeeded in pushing through a law which gave the President power to reduce tariff rates and to ease import restrictions for those nations which were willing to extend like concessions to the United States.

On the basis of this law he succeeded in concluding 14 different trade agreements in all. This marked a complete revision of the United States' foreign trade policy. It was partially in recognition of the United States position as a creditor nation that the reversal came about, but for Hull it was something more; it was his indefatigable belief that in this way one might smooth the way for a better understanding between nations and remove one of the causes of war. This is typical of him. When he does not accomplish his goal in the great onset, he turns to other paths. He bows before defeat, but never gives in. His belief in the cause is too firmly grounded for that. He is realistic enough to recognize that which is politically possible at a given moment, and to accept that rather than to wait for something which will possibly come eventually.

The reason I have dwelt so long on Hull's work in the field of trade policy is because it illustrates the trait which is characteristic of his labors. Not until Roosevelt's election in 1932, however, did Hull get an opportunity to give full expression to his ideas. It will not be possible in this survey to go into Hull's activities during the years from 1932 on. That would mean analyzing the foreign policy of the United States during those years. It may be said, however, that probably no foreign minister has ever had a more difficult period in which to serve. Year after year brings new incidents which could drive anyone to despair, and which gradually culminate in the Second World War. But Hull never gives up, despite opposition both from at home and abroad. When he fails to reach his objective via one approach, he attempts to push his ideas through to victory along another route.

Nothing better illustrates his procedure than his pan-American policy and his stand in regard to the neutrality law. Both the point of departure and the intent may be found in Roosevelt's description of the good-neighbor policy as a program which is aimed, first and last, at creating peace and good neighborliness on the American continents at a time when it is impossible to secure world-wide participation. It was also possible to bring about a convention where rules of guidance governing a state's rights and duties are set forth. The most vital decision is perhaps that which contends that no state has the right to intervene in any other state's internal or external affairs. This conference was followed by the Buenos Aires meeting in 1936 and by the Lima Conference in 1938. In Lima, Hull did not succeed in reaching the goal which he had set for himself. It nevertheless signifies a victory for the ideas of peace, even though it represents no extension of the achievements reached at the Montevideo and Buenos Aires Conferences. In Europe these pan-American departures have many times been regarded as a sort of expanded isolationism, but they must not be construed as such. They are large-scale attempts to realize the ideas of peace through international cooperation in those areas where it seems possible to succeed in forming, as Cordell Hull says, a pattern which could have an inspiring effect on the whole world.

The struggle over the neutrality laws and against isolationism concerns us so intimately that we remember it well. By and large, the original neutrality law can be said to serve the interests of peace. Neither can it be denied that the standpoint of isolationism is pacifistic. But the isolationists regard peace, first and last, as the United States peace, while Hull calls for a more elastic neutrality arrangement through which the United States can cooperate with other nations to maintain that peace; for, as Hull expresses it, the United States cannot unilaterally declare peace for itself alone. Peace, to him, means a peace between peoples. But he is realistic enough to see that it is something which must be fought for in order to be realized. As has already been mentioned, Hull turns to decisive language when he touches upon relations with the totalitarian states in Europe, and as the war draws nearer his speeches become sharper and more intense. All that is with-

in him, his sense of justice, his deep humanitarianism, rises against that which he sees of the encroachment and the violation of everything which represents the ideas of justice.

But with the coming of the war, his voice is overshadowed by that of Roosevelt himself who emerges more strongly than ever before as the leader of United States Foreign Policy.

It was necessary that this be the case, and it is not easy for one who has not had an opportunity to become personally acquainted with the circumstances, to show to what extent the happenings of these years are due to Cordell Hull. One can only draw conclusions according to the little which is known. He has done everything within his power to strengthen that which could beat back the aggressor powers, but he has also struggled intensively with the problems which were destined to appear with the coming of peace. This is already apparent in the draft of the six points which established the future policy of the four great powers at the Moscow Conference in 1943; and according to what we now know he has, during the last years of the war, labored tirelessly with the problems associated with the new United Nations Organization.

The principles of justice, which in the United States have possibly been to a greater extent than in any other land the possession of the individual man from his school days on, have been the guiding stars for his life and his work; where life and doctrine have been one. It is therefore a great pleasure for the Norwegian Storting's Nobel committee to be able to give the peace prize to this great American, in recognition of his long and tireless labor for understanding between nations.

The Housing Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from today's issue of the Toledo (Ohio) Times, penned by the distinguished journalist, Harold Hartley:

TRUMAN DIDN'T SOLVE THE HOUSING PROBLEM

President Truman's long-awaited building controls came yesterday. Three of his suggestions seem workable and should bring some improvement. One of them, however, is impractical and probably impossible.

First the President appointed an expediter for housing materials. Such a move has been suggested in this column several times. During the war, expediters were employed to keep war materials moving to the war plants. There is good reason to believe the same principle should work with housing materials. With this in mind, Mr. Truman appointed Wilson W. Wyatt, former Louisville mayor, as chief housing expediter. He should have an organization reaching every materials producer and contractor, and serving every community which has a housing problem.

Another proposal adopted was also a wartime practice. It called for the use of a priority system governing housing materials. The complaint today is that too many materials are going into commercial building, and too few into dwellings. The priority system would help to put the materials into the distressed field. The priority system works hand-in-hand with the expediters.

A third suggestion called for the release of surplus housing units and building materials of the Army and Navy for housing of veterans. Such a move should have been made long ago. Someone has been alseep at the switch.

The fourth and last suggestion sounded well, but until some reasonable way is found in which to work it out, it will remain purely in the suggestion stage. It called for the fixing of ceilings on old and new housing. Of the two classes, it would be much easier to find an appropriate ceiling on new housing because the prices of building materials can be regulated. But who knows how to fix ceilings on old houses?

Our greatest inflation has come in the sale of old dwellings and farm property. In housing it has been a case of an extremely high demand in the presence of an acute shortage. With no controls, it is easy to see where such a situation would lead. Housing prices have skyrocketed. The real answer is to build more houses, and until building materials begin to flow in the right direction, there is no sign of housing relief.

About the only way in which a ceiling can be put on old dwellings is to limit the profit in the sale of a house. But if this is done, what is there to prevent the limitation in the profit in the sale of an industrial security? Both represents capital gains, which are recognized by the Government, and, of course, covered by taxes.

Mr. Truman's housing control program cannot become 100 percent effective unless someone finds a method by which to control the ever-rising prices of old dwellings. When Mr. Truman, or his advisers, figure that out, they will have a pretty good program.

China in Its Proper Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me, I desire to call attention to an article which appeared in the Contra Costa County Labor Journal and 12 other labor papers throughout the States of California. Our action in China in intervening a civil war in that nation on the side of those who are oppressing the very democratic rights and reforms for which we struggled in our own Revolution so many years ago, are compared to those of the Hessians in our own early fight for freedom. I believe the article, demonstrating the clarity with which labor sees the present role into which we have been lead by Gen. Patrick J. Hurley in the Far East, is worth the attention of every Member of the House. It follows:

OUR HESSIAN STUNT IN FAR EAST, BUTTRESSING REACTION, LIKELY TO GENERATE MASS HATRED TOWARD UNITED STATES

(By Observer)

During the American Revolution against Britain in 1776 the British hired troops from Hesse-Cassel, Germany, to fight the troops of George Washington. They were hated and despised. When captured they were treated like dogs. For many years Hessian was a term applied to those who opposed liberty and self-government.

What may we expect the Asiatic peoples to think of hired Americans who fight the slave peoples of Asia who are fighting for freedom and who believe us when we announced our belief in and adherence to the Atlantic Charter?

Chiang Kai-shek's (Kuomintang) China is ruled by the war lords with their private armies, and money lenders who often extract 100 percent interest, the landlords who get from a half to three-quarters of the crop from their tenants. Two-thirds of the arable land is owned by 2 percent of the population and this concentration of land ownership is increasing rapidly. Nine-five percent of the people are illiterate, live in degrading poverty and die by the millions every year of starvation.

In the northern partisan areas (miscalled Communist), the leaders have not dispossessed the landowners, but they have compelled fair rentals, low interest rates, introduced a large measure of self-rule, and begun universal education. Their plan may be compared to the American Revolution in many ways. These are facts, and don't let anybody tell you otherwise. If the partisans maintain their present trend toward democracy they will win and China will become a great free country.

What, then, will these peoples struggling for freedom think of the United States? Will "American" then be a term of derision and hatred? What will all the billion slaves of Asia call us?

Regardless of what Hurley, Wedemeyer, or anybody else says, the United States military forces have been acting like Hessians in northeastern China. Whether directly or indirectly, they have been supporting the war-lord government of the Kuomintang in suppressing the revolutionists. The fight in China is an internal fight. As such, the outcome is just as important to the progress, freedom, and future development of China as the French Revolution was to France, the revolt against Britain was to the United States, the upsurge of Simon Bolivar was to the peoples of Latin America.

United States Army Air Forces and ships transported tens of thousands of Chinese Nationalist soldiers to areas claimed by the partisans as part of their domain, and these soldiers were American-trained and supplied with American weapons of combat. United States Marines guarded the ports for the Nationalists. United States Army liaison teams accompanied the Nationalists. The claim that our forces had to do all this to effect Japanese surrender in northern areas to Chinese is cover-up stuff. The fact remains that we have directly interfered in an internal situation on the side of reaction and forced sincere American lads to play a Hessian role that our patriotic history books taught them to hate.

A Suggestion on the Housing Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bee and Herald, of Jefferson, Iowa:

A SUGGESTION ON THE HOUSING SHORTAGE

Every community is facing a terrible housing shortage and, although many different plans are being attempted to solve it, nothing even approaching a solution has been found. Our guess is that we will be a long time muddling through unless it is attacked sensibly on the Federal level.

A local businessman this week came close to what might be the answer. He proposed

that nonessential building and remodeling be halted by law until the housing shortage is eliminated.

We wouldn't exactly go that far. We would propose, however, that building materials be put on a priority basis with top priority to the persons who are using them to create housing for additional family units.

As family income has risen in recent years there has been a lot of remodeling and nonessential repairing—the jobs which home owners have wanted to do for a long time but never before felt they could afford. In most cases there isn't anything about them that couldn't wait another year or two if thereby some family could be furnished with a decent place to live.

The housing shortage is not local and it's not State-wide. It is national. With strikes in the lumbering camps and factories producing building materials and with a dearth of carpenters, plumbers, electricians, etc., America faces an acute housing problem which is apt to be many years in solution. That is, unless it is immediately attacked on the Federal level.

Poor Start for UNO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from yesterday's Boston Herald. The logic contained therein seems to me to be inescapable, and I believe it deserves to be read by everyone who wants to see UNO work. The editorial follows:

POOR START FOR UNO

The interest of Americans in world affairs has been of an off-again-on-again-gone-again character. A dramatic episode arouses them for a whole, but routine foreign affairs receive little attention. This lack of concern did little damage in the days when the United States was a nation unto itself and the two oceans seemed impregnable first lines of defense. Now that a plane can cross the Atlantic in 5 or 6 hours and rocket bombs a great deal faster, and a United Nations Organization has been charted, a continuance of the attitude would be harmful.

The UNO can succeed only if the people of the world are determined that it shall. The mood of Americans as a whole may make the difference between complete success and the sort of failure which dogged the old League of Nations. The Foreign Policy Association and similar groups have done a great deal to expand the horizon of Americans, but its programs have been of limited circulation. Millions still regard the UNO as something rather remote from them.

If the world capital is set up in the United States this lukewarmness will become a glowing thing. Reading daily detailed reports of activities there, the people will better understand what the UNO is, what it is trying to do, and how vitally its efficiency affects the welfare of the United States. Americans would become international minded, as most of the European peoples are now. The ordinary American citizen would ultimately understand world problems about as well as home issues. Congress and the President would feel the impact of a better-informed, continuous public opinion.

The old notion to which Governor Dewey referred scathingly in his campaign, the notion that this country has never won an international conference and that such gatherings should be regarded with misgivings or avoided, would quickly vanish. The result would be a far more active participation by the American people as well as the American Government in earnest discussions of global problems.

Located in Europe, as a minority of the members of the UNO now desire, the organization would seem less closely related to the United States. The trickle of news would not stimulate the thinking of Americans. They would still surmise that international cross-currents of politics were as influential as they used to be in Geneva. Ardor for the UNO would be less pronounced, and isolationism would probably be strengthened. An aroma of futility would cling to a European site, as the Russians, who will probably vote in favor of an American site, continue to argue. A large majority of Central and South Americans would be as deeply disappointed and resentful as citizens of the United States.

A new organization, carrying the hopes of humanity for an indefinite reign of peace, would be initiated under more auspicious omens if it began to function in a new environment and in a nation which has a more passionate longing than any other for a peaceful planet. In short, the UNO would be off to a limping start in Europe and to a flying one in the United States.

Need for Veterans' Building at Boston, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a letter I have received from Thomas Dorgan, clerk of the superior court, Boston, Mass., concerning the need for a veterans' building at Boston:

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
SUPERIOR COURT,
CLERK'S OFFICE, SUFFOLK COUNTY,
Boston, December 12, 1945.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Some time ago I wrote to you on the urgency of having erected in the city of Boston a centrally located administrative building to care for the needs of the returning veterans. The forecast made at that time in relation to the number of veterans who would be future applicants for compensation and other services is now found to be much too modest. The rapidly mounting number of veterans requiring assistance makes it imperative that the governmental agencies whose duty it is to serve them be assembled in one building which will be adequate and convenient.

Now that the Veterans' Administration is divided into 13 regional districts, one of which is Boston, why is it not constructive planning to erect in each of these regional districts a new Veterans' Administration building. The whole criticism through the years since World War I has been that there has never been proper space to intelligently transact the problems of the veterans. The Government has been penny-wise and pound-foolish in this particular matter and has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars for big rents instead of facing the realization that the work of the Veterans' Administration will be constantly increasing through the years and that a new building to house all the facilities under one roof in each of the regional districts would be of tremendous advantage in the efficient functioning of veterans' affairs.

With traditional generosity, the American people are sending, not millions—but billions—of American dollars to the people of Europe to help them rehabilitate themselves and, for good measure, are giving them a breathing space of 5 years on interest payments. If we can afford to do this, can we not take care of our veterans' interests adequately?

In Boston, the veterans' facilities are all over town: In the Federal Building, the Houghton & Dutton Building, at 17 Court Street, and in the hospital at the Dedham line of West Roxbury. This is still the situation after 2 years of constant friction and repeated promises to house all the facilities under one roof after 20,000 Massachusetts citizens had signed petitions to have a new Veterans' Administration building erected in Boston. These petitions, some months ago, were sent to Gen. Omar N. Bradley.

It is time for some intelligent action on this problem and I earnestly ask your support.

Sincerely yours,
THOMAS DORGAN,
Clerk.

Consumer Credit Controls Should Be Modified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, President Truman has before him a request for immediate termination of Government controls on consumer credit. As Members of the House know, people of the country are denied the right to buy most consumers' durable goods except for cash or when they make large down payments and pay up the balance very quickly.

The request for termination of these curbs was made by the Retail Credit Institute of America following the annual meeting of the membership in New York City in November. The institute represents retail merchants in 44 States. It is a reputable and outstanding trade association, and its views on the complicated subject of credit are worthy of consideration. I wish to state publicly that I am 100 percent in accord with the institute's position, and I join with the merchants in requesting the President to take immediate steps to lift these credit controls.

As a wartime measure, the clamping down of these credit controls seemed necessary. No one can gainsay that argument. But to assert that they are a continuing necessity is sheer nonsense. In fact, there is no vital argument in support of the continuation of these controls and plenty of arguments against them. Let me expand on one argument

alone, an argument against these restrictions that struck me very forcibly. Am I, as an American citizen, protected by the Constitution and clothed with rights written into our laws and in our national traditions allowed, to make my private contracts on terms that suit me and my neighbor? That is the gist of the argument.

Clearly I have such a right. It is inherent in the concept of the word American. I can go to a merchant in my town and agree to pay him $1 down or $50 down on a $100 article. This is a matter for him and me to settle. The contract is between us and we, as Americans, can make our own terms. For the life of me I cannot see how such a contract is the concern of the Government. It is a legal contract between me and the merchant and freely entered into by both parties, and it is not the concern of the Federal Government. Mr. Speaker, such a contract does not constitute interstate commerce. How then can the Federal Government, in time of peace have any jurisdiction over it? Yet, there are those in Washington who believe such a contract should have the approval of the Government. Here again crops up that paternalistic attitude of Government, some of whose officials feel that they should dictate to me what is socially sound and morally good for me.

Some of the high-minded thinkers in Washington, the self-appointed guardians of the public morals, feel that these credit curbs should become permanent law. Obviously such a law would give them more authority, more jobs, and more opportunities to inject into our social structure more of their pet ideas on what is good for the workingman. I should like to call attention of the House to this danger. You will be hearing more about this subject when officials of the executive departments make their first new moves in this direction. For they will come to us. There is no other alternative for them.

Personal credit controls strike at the very root of rights guaranteed by the Constitution. If followed to its logical conclusion I see no reason why the Government at a later date cannot tell me what to say, what to write, and where to work. It is the dangerous implications in the continuance of these controls that disturbs me. It is the entering wedge for those who would destroy all rights of the individual and make him subservient to the state.

If, as I say, we were still waging war and needed controls the continuance of these restrictions would make some sense. No true American in time of war is opposed to a temporary suspension of some of his individual rights. But now that the war is over there is no possible justification for these restrictions.

On the contrary, these restrictions are holding up the reconversion program. What is the sense in manufacturing millions of articles if they cannot be sold? Articles are produced for sale and not for dusty shelves. If cash or heavy down payments are required it is a certainty that retailers' markets will be frozen. People simply do not have the necessary cash to make heavy purchases. President Truman himself admitted this in his October 30 speech when, speaking of the need for increased wages, he said:

If nothing is done to help the workers in this situation, millions of families will have to tighten their belts—and by several notches.

Returning veterans obviously do not have the cash with which to start life anew. Many of them are postponing marriage because of the absolute impossibility of attempting to rent and furnish a home. Many of them are disillusioned. They fought and bled for such American ideals as the right of private contract and now they find that right denied them. This is outrageous treatment for those who gave up everything for the defense of their country.

These credit restrictions—known as regulation W—are a breach of the American's rights, an insult to the returning veteran, an outrage on the American people, and one of the major hurdles blocking the reconversion program. President Truman can lift these restrictions by an Executive order. He does not have to seek the authority of Congress. The President should attempt to learn what the American people are thinking on this subject and not just take his advice from bureaucrats who wish to extend their authority.

In their petition for termination of these controls, the Retail Credit Institute of America lists 11 arguments. Each argument is a sound piece of irresistible logic and I do not know how they can be controverted. I do hope the Members of the House will find time to read these arguments, which are:

1. Will force millions of middle and lower income families to cash their Government bonds and savings, to enable them to buy the things they need, the very thing the Administration at Washington must at all cost prevent, to preserve proper balance in national finances, and to encourage the people to keep their savings, to do their purchasing out of current income without drawing upon what they have accumulated from labor in past years.

2. Will work great and needless hardship on millions of returning veterans and their families. These Americans lack adequate cash to re-equip their homes even on the simplest plan and to rehabilitate themselves for civilian life. They are entitled to reasonable and flexible credit and merchants are ready to offer it on the basis of their character and individual credit-worthiness.

3. Will prevent millions of displaced war workers from purchasing the products they need to equip themselves and their homes when reemployed by American business after migration to new environment.

4. Will deprive millions of people who have never enjoyed so-called wartime income of the opportunity to maintain a progressive standard of living. These millions include salaried employees, the so-called white collar workers, newspaper men and women, professional people, those employed in our hospitals, teachers, and many other groups upon whom regulation W has worked hardship throughout the war.

5. Will restrict the vast output of American factories dependent upon consumer credit for the effective distribution of the things they make. Regulation W will militate against the Nation's gigantic program to provide from fifty-five to sixty million jobs for our people. By its very restrictive nature it must reduce employment. It must result in fewer jobs for returning veterans and displaced workers, at a time when almost every economist, Government and private, insists that our prosperity depends on a 50-percent increase in the production and distribution of consumers' durable and semidurable goods. Regulation W is a direct obstacle in the path of the accomplishment of this objective.

6. Will give great economic advantage to those with considerable ready cash against the family with a small pay envelope.

7. Will destroy the democratic privilege of every American citizen to have equal access to available supplies of the Nation's products; will continue the undemocratic, antisocial and uneconomic wartime practice of rationing by the size of the pocketbook.

8. Will dampen the morale of the American worker; will divide our people into classes, those able to buy as they please and those artificially restricted from the markets, creating a situation contrary to every fundamental upon which modern marketing and mass production have been built up, dangerous to the continued growth of the American system of production and distribution that made possible America's gigantic war production.

9. Will monopolize consumer credit into the channels of big business and banking and destroy thousands of little merchants throughout the Nation, who, for a generation or generations, have served their customers' credit needs on a flexible, personal basis. The business survival of countless little stores has rested upon their individual credit and other service arrangements with customers. Until regulation W, their larger competitors have been unable to meet this credit service with equal satisfaction. The inflexible application of Federal regulation, its necessary disregard for local conditions of prosperity or difficulty, its prohibiting of the very essence of proper credit granting, consideration of the individual need and merit in each transaction, will make business success hazardous and proper service to consumers impossible.

10. Will deprive countless citizens of their sense of personal dignity by preventing their enjoyment and use of the credit standing of which their character and credit worthiness has made them entitled.

11. Will confer upon a Government agency power to determine upon what terms millions of people must make their contracts of purchase for intimate family needs—treated as masses, not individuals, whether in city or country, whatever their condition and need.

The Most American Thing in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the Cincinnati Times-Star of Tuesday, December 11, 1945, entitled "The Most American Thing in Washington":

THE MOST AMERICAN THING IN WASHINGTON

A strange feature of public life in America during the past 7 or 8 years has been the persistent and venomous attempt to discredit Congress in the eyes of the American people.

Of course Congress has its weaknesses and its faults. Its great strength is that when all is said and done it is honestly and naturally representative of the people back home.

That is the reason why individuals and groups who are pushing pet schemes which

Americans back home do not want become exasperated so easily at Congressmen and Senators. They picture them as stupid, opinionated, venal. Thousands of newspaper and magazine articles and even a few books have been printed to show how contemptible Congress is.

Senator LA FOLLETTE has an interesting article in the December 3 issue of the Progressive. The Wisconsin Senator is chairman of the special congressional committee now preparing a program for the reorganization of Congress. LA FOLLETTE thinks that a number of improvements are in order. For one thing, in a period when the executive branch of the Government is in general overstaffed, Congress is still getting along with about the number of assistants it had decades ago. If the executive department has its own corps of experts to give it advice on public questions and if Congress is without such assistance, it is evident that Congress must rely more and more on the Executive. Obviously, that is not in line with the underlying American theory of a government of equal and coordinate powers.

"The executive branch of the Government," says LA FOLLETTE, "has expanded and reorganized several times to meet the new conditions. A bill which has passed the House is now pending in the Senate to grant the President sweeping powers for another reorganization of the executive branch of the Federal Government. The Congress has been struggling along, working harder than ever, with an organization and appropriations entirely inadequate to enable it to discharge its responsibilities in the complex economic environment of this age."

The La Follette article includes a comparison between Congress in our time and the first Congresses of the United States, by the very distinguished historian, Charles A. Beard. "As a more than casual student of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD," says Beard, "I venture this opinion: It is possible to pick out of the RECORD for the past 10 years addresses (not orations) which, for breadth of knowledge, technical skill, analytical acumen, close reasoning, and dignified presentation, compare favorably with similar utterances, made in the preceding century by the so-called great orators.

"Considering the complexity of problems before Congress today, and taking account of the distractions which now beset Senators and Representatives, the quality of serious speeches in both Houses is amazingly high. There is, to be sure, more trash—bad poetry, demagogic claptrap, and clotted nonsense—in the RECORD of the past 10 years than there was in the annals of the Congress from 1789 to 1799. Yet after studying the operations of the first Congresses of the United States and the operations of the Seventy-sixth Congress, I am convinced that for disinterestedness, absence of corruption and concern with the public good, the present body is of higher order."

Of course, there are weaklings and men without ideals in the present Congress. There are men who cower before threats of reprisal at the polls. But it is surprising when you consider Congress as a whole how many men it includes who put patriotism above votes and who on matters of basic principle will not surrender under any political pressure whatsoever.

If you hear somebody engaging in one of these sweeping tirades against Congress, you are fairly safe in concluding that he is either a gullible follower of somebody else or that he deliberately places the interest of some foreign country or some minority group in this country above the interests of the American people. Congress is at heart American—which would excuse its faults even if they were very much weightier than they are.

Use of Indian Troops in Indochina and Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the eighth annual meeting of the India League of America was held at Steinway Hall, New York N. Y., on Wednesday, December 12, 1945, at 8:30 p. m.

Pearl S. Buck, Nobel prize winner and honorary president of the India League of America; Sirdar J. J. Singh, president of the India League; and Mr. Sidney Hertzberg, journalist and member of the executive committee of the India League, addressed the meeting. Richard J. Walsh, editor of Asia magazine and chairman of the India League executive committee, presided.

The following resolutions which were adopted at this meeting should be of great interest and encouragement to the freedom-loving citizens of the United States:

Resolution on the use of Indian troops in Indochina and Indonesia

Resolved:

(a) That this meeting expresses its deep resentment and disappointment that notwithstanding the repeated demands of all parties in India, the British Government still persists in the use of Indian troops in squelching the independence movements now blossoming in Indochina and Indonesia.

(b) That it is the firm opinion of this meeting that as stated in the India League of America's cable of October 22, 1945, to the British Prime Minister, Clement R. Attlee, it is indecent to use Indian troops to suppress the Nationalist movements in Indochina and Indonesia, when India herself is fighting for her independence.

(c) That it is the belief of this meeting that Indian troops are being used in this despicable effort to entrench and foster colonialism, to give India and Indians a bad name not only in the eyes of their fellow Asiatics, but among all the progressive and liberal peoples of the world.

(d) That this meeting lodges an emphatic protest with the British Prime Minister, and forceful requests that Indian troops be withdrawn immediately from all areas where they are being used to suppress and destroy independence movements.

Resolution on the freedom of India

Resolved:

(a) That though, upon the overwhelming defeat of the Conservative Party in the British elections and the coming into power of a labor government, high hopes were entertained that the labor government would take some bold and decisive action to hasten the independence of India, this meeting wishes to record, with great regrets, its utter disappointment in the labor government's attitude so far toward the freedom of India.

(b) That this meeting is of the opinion that though some useful purpose may be served by the proposed parliamentary delegation which is to visit India in the near future to meet the Indian political leaders and to learn their views at first hand, the time is past for such missions and deputation to accomplish anything worth while.

(c) That India is in no mood to tolerate further delaying tactics in granting her complete independence, on the repeated pretext of lack of unanimity among all Indian groups.

(d) That unless steps are taken to transfer all power to the chosen representatives of the people of India, as soon as the present elections are over, the people of India will lose their faith not only in the present British Government but also in the British Labor Party.

(e) That from all advices, private and otherwise, that have reached here, we are of the opinion that unless a constitution for a free India is framed soon after the elections, and complete independence is granted to India, there will be violence and chaos of the magnitude which will put in shade the first armed revolution of India of 1857.

(f) That we request the members of the labor party, both in the House of Parliament and outside, to bring their pressure upon their government to avoid such a catastrophe, which would be tragic both for India and for England. And help those Indians who believe in democratic evolution by making a political settlement, acceptable to the elected representatives of the people of India.

(g) That a free, democratic, united India will be a great bulwark against the expansion of any ideologies other than those that guarantee the freedom of man.

Resolution on Indonesia and Indochina

Resolved:

(a) That this meeting extends its deep sympathy to the people of Indochina and Indonesia in their heroic struggle against imperialist powers and fervently hopes that they will succeed in achieving their ultimate goal of complete independence.

(b) That we most strongly condemn the use of Japanese troops against the Indochinese and Indonesian nationalists and request the British, the French, and the Dutch Government to make a public declaration that henceforth no Japanese will be used in those areas either in defensive or offensive capacity.

(c) That in accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter which under the head of "Purposes and principles," article 1, clause 2, says:

"To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace."

And again under chapter XI under the heading of "Declaration regarding non-self-government territories," article 73, says:

"Members of the United Nations which have or assume responsibilities for the administration of territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government recognize the principle that the interest of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount, and accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost, within the system of international peace and security established by the present Charter, the well-being of the inhabitants of these territories, and, to this end:

"(a) To ensure, with due respect for the culture of the peoples concerned, their political, economic, social, and educational advancement, their just treatment, and their protection against abuses;

"(b) To develop self-government to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, according to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and their varying stages of advancement."

And to avoid further bloodshed, chaos, and loss of life of men, women, and children in Indochina and Indonesia, we hereby request the President of the United States to instruct the members of the United States delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization, which is sched-

uled to meet in January 1946 in London, to take the initiative in appointing an inquiry commission of the United Nations, to proceed to Indochina and Indonesia immediately, and to report its findings to the United Nations Organization at as early a date as possible.

(d) That we believe that the Nationalist leaders of Indochina and Indonesia, as publicly announced by them, will welcome an arbitration by the United Nations.

Full Employment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to a number of requests, I am herewith presenting excerpts from a report on the full employment bill, made by the independent voters of Illinois, Inc.:

Prior to the field interviewing a complete block by block analysis of the entire district was made in order to pick a "sample" that would reflect in miniature the total characteristics of the district as to economic status, race, political leanings, occupations, etc.

All persons interviewed were asked the same series of 19 questions, designed to reveal not only the state of public information on the full employment proposals but also how, and to what extent, the citizenry of the district informs itself about what goes on in Congress.

A question: "Have you heard of any bill before Congress that will plan for enough jobs for everyone after the war?" brought replies as follows:

	Percent
No; have not heard	69
Have heard, but have no idea what it is	19
Have heard, but have wrong idea what it is	4
Have heard, and have right idea	8

Following this question, the essentials of the Murray full employment bill were set forth as follows, but without naming the bill:

"What would you think of a bill like this? First, the President would find out each year how many jobs there are going to be for the coming year. Then, if there were not enough jobs for every one, Congress would give financial help to private business so that it could provide more jobs. Then if there were still too few jobs, the Government would give contracts to private business to build public works to make up the balance of jobs needed."

Response to this proposal was:

	Percent
For	83
Against	12
Doubtful	5

The next question asked named the bill: "Have you heard of the Murray Full Employment bill?" The replies were:

	Percent
Yes	17
No	81
Doubtful	2

These contrasting replies indicate a large, but uninformed, majority generally favorable to the measure. This majority is larger in some groups than in others, but is found in all groups.

Thus, by types of employment, the percentages for the proposal are:

	Percent
Business and professional	74
Other white collar	84
Shop and manual workers	91

Persons with college education, and those with incomes of more than $100 per week, like the business and professional group, indicate relatively more skepticism than persons with less education and lower incomes.

By race and nationality, those for the proposal are:

	Percent
Native-born white of native parents	79
Native-born of foreign parentage	83
Foreign-born white	86
Negroes	94

In the Second Congressional District 22 percent of the population is Negro, as compared with 8 percent for all of Chicago. Half of the city's Negroes live in this district. The fact that they are for the full employment proposal so strongly makes the total percent for the proposal slightly higher than it would be if Negro population were substantially less.

The principal reason cited by those favoring the proposal is that it would provide jobs and so help avoid unemployment. Nine percent observed specifically that it would be better than direct or work relief. Following are some typical comments:

"It opens up opportunities. Places the responsibility on the Government, where it belongs. It is fair.

"It would create more buying power for everyone, which would create more business.

"Help private industry to keep going and give jobs to people without actually taking over private industry.

"A bill of this sort would enable many people to be employed who want to work.

"It would give people work. They would not be idle and could support themselves. It would do away with WPA.

"I think it is good. A man would rather work than be given something. We Negroes want a chance to work for what we get.

"Would not want my husband to sell apples when he gets out of the Army.

"Won't mind the taxes if it gives the jobs.

"It would give everybody a chance to work.

"Would help avoid a depression.

"A bill of this type would give work to everybody. As a matter of fact, the Government should do this."

The 12 percent who oppose the full-employment proposal, as presented in this survey, give three principal reasons: (1) Opposition to Government interference with, or subsidies to, business; (2) increased taxation; (3) the difficulties of making the plan work. Some of their comments are:

"Don't believe in subsidies for private business. Taxpayers pay for subsidies.

"It would involve a lot of red tape, I'm afraid. It's a beautiful thought, but I just don't think it would work out.

"There have been too many bureaucracies. The taxpayer has to pay the bill.

"Don't think Government belongs in business.

"Would be a pork barrel for private capital. Capital would take advantage by asking Government for money even if they didn't need it.

"Not a proper economic measure. Industry should stand on its own feet.

"No particular advantage. It would be paid for by taxation. A case of getting a check and handing part of it back to the Government."

One question was designed to find out whether the term "full employment" as defined by the proponents of the bill—jobs for all—is understood in that sense by the general public.

All respondents were asked, first, if they had heard the expression "full employment," and second to define it. Fifty-one percent of the definitions given by those who had not heard the expression are of the "jobs for all" type. Seventy percent of those persons who had heard the expression are "jobs for all" definitions. In both cases the remainder give a variety of answers other than jobs for all, such as steady work, work 8 hours a day, full-time work, etc.

(The number of definitions on which this analysis is based is 13 percent in excess of the number of respondents, since some give more than one definition.)

From this it appears that a spontaneous definition of the term "full employment" by those who hear it for the first time is significantly more vague and general than by those who have heard it before. Apparently, the term takes on more of a "jobs for all" meaning after it has been heard more than once. This may be in part due to current publicity which uses the term "full employment" in the "jobs for all" sense.

Eleven percent of the responses of those who had never heard the term give a spontaneous definition of full-time work for the respondent—the opposite of a part-time job. One woman, for example, says it means a "full-time job for my husband." Only 3 percent of the responses of those who had previously heard the term give it such a personal, rather than a public, meaning.

This analysis indicates that, whether or not "full employment" is as good a slogan as "jobs for all," the majority of persons tend to associate the two. Some 30 percent, however, need further clarification of the term "full employment."

If it had been possible to test the slogan "full employment" by an opinion poll before it came into general use, it is quite possible that something better might have been found. Perhaps it would have been simply "jobs for all." In Part V of this report is further comment on the importance of testing in advance the public reaction to proposed slogans.

PART II. JOB PROSPECTS

Citizens of the Second Congressional District, just before VJ-day, were definitely more hopeful about their individual prospects after VJ-day than about job conditions in general.

A pair of questions brought this fact out. Asked if they think job conditions will be the same, better, or worse after the victory over Japan, those interviewed replied:

	Percent
Same	13
Better	19
Worse	49
Others (including combinations of above)	19

But when the group sampled were asked about "job conditions for yourself and your family" their replies were:

	Percent
Same	54
Better	19
Worse	20
Others	7

This difference is explained by the response to the further question, "Why do you think that?" Sixty-four percent of the explanations for a same or better response said that the responden is in a job not dependent on war activities for its continuance, such as producing civilian goods, working in a hotel, civil service, or teaching. They feel safe despite the possibility of a downswing.

Those who expect general conditions to be the same or better base such expectations primarily on their estimate of the large civilian demand following reconversion. Some mention also foreign demand for American goods. Others indicate that they have confidence in a Government program to help stimulate activity.

Forty-nine percent of the responses which are pessimistic about general conditions following VJ-day cite as their reasons: Civilian demand will not balance cut-backs; reconverted industries will require fewer employees; returning servicemen will increase competition for jobs, etc. Nine percent of the pessimistic responses are based simply on

the idea that history will repeat itself—other wars have been followed by depressions—therefore this one will be.

In the racial grouping, the proportion of optimistic answers on the general job situation is highest among the foreign-born, 28 percent, and native-born of foreign parentage, 22 percent. The proportion of pessimistic replies to this question is highest among the native whites, 59 percent, and the Negroes, 57 percent. Respondents who are foreign-born and second generation yield a considerably lower proportion of pessimistic answers, 37 percent in both cases.

Young people gave pessimistic responses about general conditions more often than older persons—72 percent of the responses from young women of 21 to 29 years, and 61 percent of those of young men, had a gloomy outlook. It is interesting to note that the young women were more pessimistic than the young men.

The question was asked: "Do you think government, business, and labor should have an equal share in handling unemployment?" The phrasing of this question was deliberate, since a careful pretest in the field indicated it would get respondents to express themselves as to interrelationships between the three groups. Even small qualifications were probed in order to make sure respondents had a chance to show preference for any one of the three.

Results on this question were:

	Percent
Yes	59
No	27
Undecided	10
Others	4

Women supported this proposal in greater strength than men—65 percent of all the women as contrasted with 51 percent of all the men. However, women over 45 were in closer agreement with the men—56 percent—than the women under 45, of whom 69 percent were in favor. In both sex groups the youngest members—men and women 21–29—were slightly more in favor of cooperation on an equal basis.

The 27 percent who did not agree that Government, business, and labor should share the handling of unemployment on an equal basis had the following opinions:

	Percent
Government should have greater share	28
Business should have greater share	28
Labor and management should work together with Government as referee	13
Labor should handle unemployment alone	10
Opposed to business, with no reference to the other two	6
Opposed to labor, with no reference to the other two	4
Other and "don't know" answers	11

A break-down was not made to learn what percent of each of the above groups of responses also gave a "yes" to the digest of the full-employment bill. However, it would seem from a rough inspection of the above figures that it is likely that the bill has attracted to its support not only those who favor equal sharing of the responsibility but also some from the various groups favoring other alternatives.

In other words, no matter what preference the respondents have, either for cooperation on an equal basis or for a particular controlling group, the majority still is for the digest of the bill.

A further question asked: "If there are not enough jobs for everyone after the war, do you think anything can be done about it?" Replies are positive:

	Percent
Yes	83
No	8
Doubtful	9

Ask what can be done, 48 percent of the responses indicate some sort of a Government program to stimulate business, build public works, give direct relief or provide social security. Twenty-three percent recommend spreading work, or shortening hours. Nine percent suggest returning women from jobs to place in the home.

The fact that only 48 percent of the answers spontaneously named the Government as the controlling factor in a given program obviously does not mean that the balance are opposed to Government control, given the fact that the great majority support the full-employment proposal as given in this survey. We may assume that in the balance of the responses if the spontaneous suggestions were probed to find out what agency should be used to implement the program (e. g., spreading work or shortening hours), a considerable number would probably name the Government alone, or Government and business.

Break-down by income reveals only minor differences as to the percentages of answers which spontaneously mention some Government-controlled measure to relieve unemployment:

	Percent
Up to $43 a week	45
$43 to $65 a week	50
$66 to $100 a week	44
Over $100 a week	45

It is interesting to note that the lower and upper income groups show no difference at all in this respect.

Using the same break-down for the answers saying private industry can prevent or remedy unemployment, we find that in the three lower income groups only a negligible percentage of the answers are in this category, while 10 percent of the responses from the top income group are in that category.

Using the age-sex break-down on those answers which say the unemployment situation would be relieved if women left their jobs we find that none of the suggestions from the young men under 30 and only 4 percent of the responses from men over 30 are against women working. This is a contrast to the women's opinion on this subject, where we find the following percentages against women working:

Age:	Percent
21 to 29	12
30 to 44	16
45 and over	9

The percent of all female responses on this point is 12 percent. When only the responses of nonworking housewives are considered the percentage is slightly higher: 16 percent.

For this particular break-down a further analysis was made as to how each age-sex group reporting this answer stands in regard to the full-employment proposal. It is found that only one person (a female 30–44) out of the whole group is against the proposal. While this question was not especially designed for this purpose, this analysis gives some weight to the assumption that while women generally resent other women as competition for their current or prospective breadwinners, they would be less opposed if there were greater job security generally. It is interesting that in the defining of full employment only one response specified that it meant jobs for everybody but married women.

PART III. POSTSCRIPT: RESEARCH IN PARTICIPATION

(By John H. Millar, director, Citizens Research Bureau)

The project reported here is a double-barreled research experiment: (1) In opinion polling; (2) in citizen participation.

Sixty citizen volunteers, under paid professional guidance, did most of the work. Thus, costs were less than would be the case if clerks, interviewers, and analysts were paid as well as supervisors. Quality of work done by these volunteers is high. Mrs. Ruth Shils, professional consultant on the project, was particularly impressed by how favorably the work of volunteers compares with that of paid workers on other opinion polls.

Deliberate effort was made to provide in the project a wide variety of jobs for the volunteers: Clerks, interviews, analysts, computers, etc. With a larger variety of tasks to be done, it becomes possible to involve a larger number of persons of various talents and interests.

Experimental work to improve effectiveness of volunteer political activity has particular interest to organizations such as Independent Voters of Illinois, principal backer of this project.

Political action organizations, such as IVI, stress doorbell ringing just before elections. But it is a long time between elections. It would strengthen such organizations and hold together their corps of workers if there were doorbell ringing between elections also. This project points to one way of accomplishing this.

Research in participation has wide significance. Improved methods are needed, and if developed will be used not only to increase citizen participation in government, but also in other fields: Worker participation in industry, parent participation in education, member participation in labor unions and cooperatives, citizen participation in all sorts of organized activity in a free society.

As this is written Independent Voters of Illinois is setting up a committee on research for further experimental activity of this double-barreled sort.

1. Opinion polling focused on single Congressmen and their districts will be extended, improved, and greatly speeded up. This means streamlining relationships between Congressmen and constituents. Congressman ROWAN, following private conversations with other Members of Congress, hopes that use of the method may extend to many other congressional districts.

2. Information secured through such polls will make more effective the educational activity of citizen organizations working on behalf of public issues. At the same time the accurate methods of statistical control that are used will improve the administrative effectiveness of the work.

The net result of this twofold experimental work might be described as applying management-engineering techniques to volunteer citizen action.

Methods that develop, however, will be different from the standard methods of business and industry. They will be more democratic, less authoritarian. The problems are different. Situations are different. The supervision of large numbers of part-time volunteers, who work for short periods only, is quite different from standard management of full-time paid workers.

Research in participation is research in democracy. That's what democracy is: Voluntary citizen participation in the Government.

St. Louis Invites the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a résumé of the advantage of the Weldon Springs area, located at the crossroads of the Nation, and suggested by the city of St. Louis as the site of the permanent headquarters of the United Nations:

1. SECURITY

The property was originally purchased by the United States Government for reasons of security and protection from attack. It lies not far from the exact geographical center of the country. In this position it is almost at the center of the defense zones of the North American Continent, being protected by the coastal zones, the inner mountain zones, and the air zones of the central plains. While distance no longer affords complete protection, the central areas of the Middle West are among the few which sheer distance rendered invulnerable in the recent war. In this respect any location in this geographical region would afford greater security than one near either coast or border. The bastion of space—not to mention the armed defenses of the United States—still guarantees a large measure of immunity from attack to the central valley of the Mississippi.

2. CENTRAL LOCATION

"The site," said the report to the preparatory commission, "should offer easy accessibility from and to the world at large," and ready communication "with any area where immediate action might appear to be necessary." A glance at the map opposite indicates the totally central position of the Weldon Spring area. Plenipotentiaries from every nation in the world follow routes of travel that converge toward the center of the United States, and the commercial air lines have regular schedules east and west and north and south of this section of the country. St. Louis, the neighboring city, is "the most modern telegraph relay point in the world. Telegrams are relayed through it more swiftly than through any other large telegraph center." It is presumed that the headquarters of the United Nations will erect and control its own radio station, independent of commercial stations now operating, but, in an emergency, the services of local radio stations could be made available until the Assembly and the Councils have their own equipment set up.

3. ISOLATION

The recommendation of a site to the United Nations is both a privilege and a responsibility. The burden of responsibility will consist of turning aside any "local influences" that could be construed as affecting the impartiality of the Assembly's judgments. In this respect St. Louis has a marked advantage over most of the cities of the country. Though it is the largest city of Missouri, it is not the political capital. While its trade is active and flourishing, the routes of trade travel are not congregated in one direction as are those of the coastal cities. While it is the center of a Federal Reserve area and is itself an important banking city, few people could ever imagine that it might exercise a financial or commercial domination over the deliberations of the United Nations. St. Louis and the immediate surrounding districts of Missouri and Illinois have welcomed settlers from all over the world—from every nation in Europe and from many of the Asiatic peoples. Thoroughly American, it is, at the same time, a cosmopolitan city, having assimilated most of the world's racial and national strains. Alongside such a city the headquarters of the Assembly need fear no pressure except that of welcome.

4. PHYSICAL DETAILS

Size

The Weldon Spring property, entirely fenced and free of private holdings, comprises 27.7 square miles, nearly 18,000 acres, or slightly less than one-third the area of the city of St. Louis. Since none of the property of the international establishment will be occupied by industrial or manufacturing buildings, an area of the size mentioned will provide ample accommodations (residential, official, recreational, and storage) for a population of half a million people.

Facilities

Water: A complete, duplicate water system is already installed, with a daily capacity of 40,000,000 gallons of treated potable water. Such a supply is large enough to serve 200,000 people, and will provide, in addition, for complete air-conditioning in residential and assembly buildings.

Power: The area is supplied with electric power by the Union Electric Co. of Missouri from two high tension lines through two fan-cooled transformers of 10,000 to 13,000 kilovolt ampere capacity each. These lines and transformers are in place and available for immediate service. There are two steam power plants equipped with six boilers, each boiler with a capacity of 120,000 pounds of steam per hour at 325 pounds pressure per square inch. Each steam plant has installed and ready for use, power generating plants of 1,250 kilowatts. These extensive facilities are of substantial importance for lighting, heating, and for other steam purposes and are a permanent asset to the Weldon Spring site. With the water plant they cost the United States Government about $15,000,000. Their immediate availability can hasten the construction of the United Nations headquarters by many months.

Communications: St. Louis and its adjacent territory are served by the most modern telegraph system in the world. A further expansion of these unequaled facilities has been authorized—"beam transmission"—whereby as many as 1,080 messages can be sent simultaneously. The Weldon Spring area is directly connected to and served by these St. Louis facilities. A telephone cable forms direct connection with the Southwestern Bell Telephone headquarters at St. Louis. This Bell System is prepared and willing to supply any local and long-distance telephone facilities required by the United Nations Organization.

Transportation: Within the property are 104 miles of good motor roads and 22 miles of new standard-gage railroad track, the latter connecting with the main line of the Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad. The main line of the Wabash Railroad is in close proximity. United States Highway 61, the eastern boundary of the property, goes directly to St. Louis, which is less than 20 miles distant. This city is America's second largest rail center, and has 19 trunk-line railroads which control over half the country's rail mileage. The St. Louis Terminal Railroad Association is the largest system of unified freight and passenger terminals in the world. The world-famous Lambert-St. Louis Municipal Airport, its development based on first-hand study of the finest European airports, is 16 miles east. Five important air lines operate scheduled flights daily, and applications for extension of these services, both nationally and internationally, as well as for the entry of several new lines, are expected to have prompt and favorable decisions from the Civil Aeronautics Board. Space for the construction of a headquarters airport is available on the Weldon Spring site or in the immediate vicinity.

Buildings: Several industrial buildings and 30 modern residences, erected for the explosives plant and its staff, are available for use as temporary offices and homes of surveying and construction units. An abundance of building stone can be quarried right on the site. The United States Government opened and operated large quarries along the river front.

Climate

The climate of the St. Louis area is characterized by mild winters, with abundant sunshine and moderate snowfall. The summers are warm, and there are exceptionally long frost-free periods. Temperatures range from an average of 38.6° in winter to 77.1° in summer. St. Louis has a relatively low humidity, the average for mornings being 76 percent, for noons 56 percent, and for nights 62 percent. Precipitation averages 37 inches annually.

Atmospheric conditions

There is sunshine in St. Louis during 59 percent of the hours in which sunshine is possible, and on an average, 314 days of the year have some sunshine. More than a third of the days of the year are clear. Dense fog is normally recorded on only 10 days a year, so that it is rarely a hazard in aerial navigation.

Opposed to Peacetime Military Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter opposing peacetime military conscription from Hon. Harry M. Reed, of Waterloo, Iowa, formerly United States district attorney for the northern district of Iowa and veteran of both World Wars. Mr. Reed is the father of a soldier son who gave his life in the advance of the United States Army across Europe.

The letter follows:

DEAR SIR: I notice that the Army is now promoting another campaign for the drafting of 18-year-olds. I also notice that the Army has eliminated most of the hokum of its earlier campaign and now states that the sole reason for the draft is protection. I also notice that its reenlistment program is resulting in many master sergeants reenlisting but few privates.

If the drafting of 18-year-olds is the best way or the only way that America can be protected, certainly, they must be drafted. I am wondering whether such a draft would do anything other than save the rank of some of the brass.

Everybody I have talked to who has been home on furlough has complained of the fact that he has had nothing to do in the Army. Every parent that I have talked to who has a boy in the Army has said that the boy has written home complaining of his utter boredom. I talked to a chap who was drafted about 4 months ago who was home on leave and who told me that neither he nor any of his group had done a lick of work since they completed basic training, except a little KP and to police up the premises.

Obviously, everybody who is now in the United States Army does not know everything that he should know about war. Where are the Army schools that they want to send the 18-year-olds to? Why shouldn't the boys who are now in service go to school now? The better prepared those boys are for an eventual war, the safer this country will be.

I suppose the answer to the question is that the Army has no schools that are in shape to take care of these boys.

Has anybody made a personal inspection of the situation? Taking the 18-year-old boys off the high-school steps is a very serious matter both to the boys and to their parents and to this country. It would certainly seem to me that two or three Senators or Congressmen with a little ambition and the welfare of their country at heart

could spend a week making an unadvertised trip around the camps where these boys are loafing. It would seem to me that they could very profitably do several things: (1) Find out what the Army is doing with the boys that it now has in this country. (2) Does the Army have any schools to send boys to, and, if so, do these schools compare favorably with our high schools and colleges? (3) What are the moral conditions around the camps, and have provisions been made in advance for adequate supervision of the 18-year-olds? (4) Are the men in the Army who are handling the 18-year-olds competent and fit to work with the boys? (5) Has the Army aroused to the fact that an 18-year-old boy just out of high school must and should be treated very differently than the same boy in time of war or than the average prewar soldier? (6) Does the Army seem to be making efficient use of its personnel, or is it merely killing time with them?

If on that trip a couple of competent schoolmen were taken, it would seem very helpful to me. As you well know, the Army plan is to assemble a large body of men and then start talking about what it will do with them. That makes for discontent and tends to teach the boys to be loafers.

Specifically, what does the Army expect to teach a boy other than basic training that he could not be better taught by professional instructors in the public schools and colleges?

Does the Army have a definite plan for the training of the boys that is now in operation and that will keep them busy in the same way that they are now kept busy in the public schools and colleges? It would seem to me that it should produce that plan and have a plan that would meet the approbation of men who are skilled in the handling of youngsters. In other words, I would not think the Army ought to be trusted with these boys until it had a camp that would meet the approbation of trained peacetime Y. M. C. A. men and that would have the approval of trained public-school men.

In time of war, there is nothing to do but give your boys to the Army and trust in the Lord. With no disrespect to the Army, we all know that it is operated on the "hurry and wait" plan, and that there have been tremendous numbers of boys who have sat around for indefinite periods. Boys always get in trouble when they sit around. To my way of thinking, there is now no excuse for such a system.

No sane man would send his boy to a college that was going to be organized after the boy got there and merely on the promise of the college president that he knew all about training boys. No sane man would send his boy to a college that was not interested in the moral phases of that boy's education. No one who was very bright would send his boy to a place where their conception of social relaxation was a "beer bust" nor where the faculty had had no training in the teaching of boys. If the Army now has an adequate program to keep a boy busy, it certainly has kept it top secret.

This letter is too long, but it seems to me that the time is past when one must take the Army on faith. I can see no reason for being awed by many stars. It would seem to me that the Army program should be subjected to the same detailed scrutiny that one would give to any other institution holding out as being competent to train boys.

Does the Army know yet what it wants to train them for, specifically? Does it know how many boys it wants as auto mechanics; how many boys it wants for radio; how many boys it wants to run a telephone exchange? Can it give a specific reason why it believes it can make a better engineer out of a boy than Ames?

In short, can the Army now prove that at the end of a year, an 18-year-old will be more skilled in a particular job if he is in the Army than if he attended a vocational training school?

I recognize that the Army says that it will teach discipline. In view of the conduct of a great many of the boys who have just been discharged, I gather that by the word discipline, the Army does not mean personal discipline. It seems to me that that has some importance in view of the fact that the 18-year-olds may some day be soldiers but certainly will be citizens.

As usual I apologize for the length of my outburst, and I am not trying to tell a United States Congress how to run its business. I just keep wondering, however, whether anybody has ever gone out and personally investigated the situation or whether you are all relying on the testimony of some general who has no personal knowledge either. You as an experienced cross-examiner ought to really have some fun deflating some of these chaps who testify from compiled records and not from knowledge.

Sincerely,

HARRY M. REED.

Idaho Legion Joins Fight To Eliminate Pauper Oath for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement by Joseph Leib, service officer of Vincent B. Costello Post, No. 15, the American Legion:

IDAHO LEGION JOINS FIGHT TO ELIMINATE PAUPER OATH FOR VETERANS

(By Joseph Leib)

It is gratifying to learn that among the first veterans' group in the United States to join in the fight to eliminate the obnoxious and un-American pauper oath for veterans was the Department of Idaho of the American Legion.

Idaho was one of the States that submitted a resolution to the national convention of the American Legion recently held in Chicago, Ill., urging the discontinuance of the oath which appears on the Veterans' Hospitalization Form P–10. The bureaucratic procedure has been the subject of a great deal of criticism by Members of Congress and former servicemen.

To date there are six bills pending in the Congress, as follows:

H. R. 599, by Representative SPRINGER.
H. R. 1923, by Representative MORRISON.
H. R. 2413, by Representative WICKERSHAM.
H. R. 2587, by Representative MARTIN of Massachusetts.
H. R. 2717, by Representative SASSCER.
H. R. 3332, by Representative BARRY.

Here is a copy of the resolution adopted by the Department of Idaho:

"Be it hereby firmly resolved by the Twenty-seventh Annual Convention of the American Legion, Department of Idaho, That the portion of the Form P–10 (application for hospitalization or domiciliary care), which deals with the applicant's financial ability to defray costs of either transportation or treatment, be stricken out.

"Whereas the allowance or disallowance of a service-connected disability is not contingent upon the financial status of the claimant, this convention wishes to go on record as being of the opinion that such a statement is impertinent and is not necessary for such admittance: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That until such time as the form can be revised deleting this entire question, service officers and Veterans' Administration facility representatives be instructed to execute the form P–10 ignoring completely the pauper statement, which at the present time is required to be answered in the affirmative."

Problems Before the Ways and Means Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of a speech that I was supposed to deliver before the Ohio State Chamber of Commerce at Columbus, Ohio, today, December 14, 1945. When those sponsoring the Columbus meeting realized the importance of legislation that was being considered in the House today they graciously excused me.

In my somewhat extended service in this House I have never missed an important vote. I have missed a few unimportant votes. I felt that the votes today were important.

The remarks which I had intended to make at Columbus today would have been, in substance, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Ohio State Chamber of Commerce, and friends, I appreciate your invitation to meet with you. You have a right to feel proud of the fact that yours is the largest State chamber of commerce in the country.

I have had many pleasant relationships with the officials and members of your great organization. You are fortunate in having at the head of your organization Mr. A. Graves Williams, who has given you so much of his time and genius. Likewise you are to be congratulated on having such a capable and efficient executive force. These men have made a most favorable impression upon Congress and upon those with whom they have come in contact.

From my work as a Member of Congress, I have long since been convinced that the great industrial and business organizations and the labor organizations should equip themselves so that they might be able to bring their problems clearly and promptly to the attention of those in authority in the Government.

Our forefathers recognized this fact because the first amendment to the Constitution provides that Congress should have no right to pass any law that would abridge the right of the people to "petition the Government for a redress of grievance."

The first amendment to the Constitution is also the first section of the Bill of Rights about which we hear so much in these modern days. The Bill of Rights did not give the people the right of free speech nor the right of free press nor the right of petition. It simply preserved to the people the right which they already had and protected them in these rights by providing that Congress should pass no law infringing on these rights. There is no doubt that the freedom of speech and the freedom of the press and the right to petition are sometimes greatly abused. Pressure groups of various kinds are much more numerous and powerful in these days than they ever have been.

The activities of some of these groups are becoming increasingly pernicious and I predict that in the future some drastic action will have to be taken to restrain those who abuse these privileges. Liberty is sometimes lost by those who enjoy it.

The Members of Congress and all others in official capacity should not be so weak as to yield principle to expediency. Taken as a whole, fair play is still one of the greatest natural sentiments of a free people.

Whether these pressure groups be laborers, distributors, or farmers, they are more and more bound to be brought to the realization that the public has a tremendous interest in their activities. One of the greatest present needs in our country is some plan whereby the right of the public will be given proper consideration at all times.

I am expected to discuss some of the problems coming before the Ways and Means Committee. I shall do so and in doing so I shall discuss the Ways and Means Committee itself.

We are much inclined to look upon the Constitution as something sacred and hallowed, and we should. But the Constitution was drawn at a very critical time in the history of our country and by very practical men. In writing this great document, their first concern was for a national legislature that would at all times represent both the people and the States. Having created such a legislative body the framers of the Constitution proceeded immediately to prescribe and distribute the powers which they intended the new legislature to exercise. In this way they created our republican form of government.

In a republic the right of sovereignty—the right to rule, is vested forever in the people themselves who act through their chosen representatives. No king, no dictator has any right to govern superior to the right of the people's chosen representatives. In our Republic there are two outstanding principles which the people must hold to themselves as closely as possible if their republican form of government is to endure. One of these is the control over the purse strings. The other is the control over the power to declare war. One means financial security and the other means personal security.

The first section of the Constitution immediately following those sections which created and set up the legislative departments of the Government, reads as follows:

"SEC. 7. All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills."

The action of the framers of the Constitution in making this section its first declaration of principle indicates that they felt that this section expressed a most important principle and that it would guarantee to the people the control of the purse strings.

The First Congress that met under the Constitution assembled on March 4, 1789. It was nearly a month before a quorum could be counted but on April 1 sufficient Members had arrived at the Capital in New York to transact business. It is significant that the very first piece of legislation considered was a bill to raise revenue by imposition of certain import duties. So important was the subject of revenue in the minds of the founders of the country that within 4 months from the day Congress first met, action was taken to implement section 7 of article 1 of the Constitution by the appointment, on July 24, 1789, of a committee in the House, known as the Committee on Ways and Means. It was the first legislative committee appointed in the House and it has continued to function from that day to this, zealously defending its constitutional prerogatives and resisting every attempted encroachment by the executive branch of the Government on its exclusive right to initiate revenue legislation.

This committee is unique in that it was the first congressional committee to be set up by Congress and was set up to exercise and fulfill a constitutional mandate.

Many of the great men of the Nation have achieved their distinction by reason of their work on this committee. Our own William McKinley was a member of this committee and for years was its chairman. While he achieved distinction as governor and as President, yet the real foundation of his distinction was his work as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Until 1865 the Ways and Means Committee not only had the responsibility of raising revenue but it was also the Appropriations Committee of Congress. There are many who still believe that the levying of the revenue and the spending of the money should be controlled by the same committee. The principal reason for the division of the activities of this committee was that the work was too heavy for one committee. Accordingly there was created in 1865 the Committee on Appropriations in the House and a similar committee in the Senate. It is not likely that these two committees will again be merged. It is likely, however, that a closer relationship will be established and maintained between these two great committees so that Uncle Sam's left hand may always know what his right hand is doing.

While it is generally considered that from the importance of its functions and duties, the Ways and Means Committee is the most important committee of Congress, and while the actions of this committee are practically always approved by the House, yet there has been a tendency in these latter years by the Executive to usurp the powers of Congress over financial matters. Most of the money that the Government has been spending in the last few years was not money collected from the people through the regular channels of taxation. It is money borrowed from the people through the sale of bonds dated ahead to be paid by future generations.

Just a few days ago you noticed by the papers that two members of the President's Cabinet had taken upon themselves the responsibility of tentatively settling $35,000,000,000 of lease-lend obligations owing to the United States from Great Britain for less than $1,000,000,000 and at the same time they tentatively obligated our country to loan to Great Britain $4,400,000,000 which probably will never be repaid. Such an important transaction as this should not be even tentatively agreed upon by two men. Congress should have been consulted. Of course, the loan cannot be made without congressional approval, but these tentative agreements usually establish a moral obligation. From this it is easy to argue that a moral obligation must be carried out.

FINANCIAL PROBLEMS

This brings us logically to a discussion of some of the financial problems that face our country and which must be directly or indirectly considered by the Ways and Means Committee in the near future. These problems divide themselves into two categories.

First. The problems of taxation and fiscal policy.

Second. The problems of social security.

The financial situation of the Government is now in worse shape than it has ever been. There seems to be absolutely no financial program. Soon after Mr. Morgenthau was inducted into office as Secretary of the Treasury, he made a statement before the Ways and Means Committee that the financial policy of the Nation was largely a day-to-day policy. Subsequent events have shown that he told the truth. We evidently are still on a day-to-day policy.

Assuming that our national debt is $266,000,000,000, it will stagger you to know that this means that the share of the city of Columbus in this colossal obligation is $655,000,000. The interest on this debt now is approximately $4,500,000,000 per year or nearly $1,000,000,000 more than all Federal expenditures in 1933. Nearly twice as much money was spent from January 1, 1941 to July 1, 1945, as was spent by the Government during all of the time from 1789 down to the first of January, 1941. The total expenditures of the Government from 1789 to January 1, 1941, was $173,000,000,000. The amount spent between January 1, 1941, and July 1, 1945, was $315,200,000,000.

PROBLEMS OF TAXATION AND FISCAL POLICY

It is not an easy matter to be able to establish just what our fixed obligations are and consequently it is a difficult matter to estimate what our running expenses will be. With the executive department making moral commitments on every hand, which commitments sometimes run into millions; with the Government agencies, such as the Import-Export Bank and UNRRA operating with wide limitations which can involve billions; with RFC and the Commodity Credit Corporation and other domestic agencies operating almost as wild; and with the OPA still paying billions out in subsidies, nobody is able to say with any degree of accuracy what our national debt is at this time. I maintain that with our outstanding moral obligations and with our overlapping spending, our national debt at this time is well over $300,000,000,000.

Every year since 1930 our Government has been running a big deficit. The following list shows the amount of these terrific deficits:

1931	$800,000,000
1932	2,900,000,000
1933	2,200,000,000
1934	3,300,000,000
1935	3,800,000,000
1936	5,000,000,000
1937	3,300,000,000
1938	1,500,000,000
1939	3,500,000,000
1940	3,600,000,000
1941	5,100,000,000
1942	19,600,000,000
1943	55,900,000,000
1944	49,600,000,000
1945	53,900,000,000

You will note that 12 out of the 15 years above referred to were peacetime years. In other words, we failed during all the 12 years of peace to pay the running expenses of our Government which averaged about $4,500,000,000 per year. We are, we hope, entering a long era of peace. How can we possibly pay our running expenses when the interest alone, on the debt we have incurred, will equal, if not exceed, the annual total running expenses in the years preceding the war?

Our necessary expenditures for the year ending June 30, 1946, may reasonably be expected to total $67,300,000,000. We will have spent by June 30, 1946, about $30,000,000,000 more than we collect from taxes and other income sources in that year.

Looking ahead to the fiscal year of 1947, which begins July 1, 1946, the best available estimates now place our receipts at approximately $26,000,000,000, our expenditures at something under $50,000,000,000, and our resulting deficit at about twenty to twenty-four billion, provided, of course, no drastic tax reductions occur, and, provided further, that general business conditions are good.

These constantly recurring deficits have resulted in a staggering debt—a debt of such proportions that it threatens our very security. Let me ask you in all seriousness, what do you think? Can we pay this debt, and if so, how would you suggest we pay it? Most of you, I am sure, have given serious thought to this problem and know that there are only about three ways in which we can meet this terrific obligation. One is by inflation. Another is by repudiation or cancellation, and one is by taxation.

If we attempt to settle our debt by inflation we run the risk of lighting the torch that has consumed many another nation.

We surely will not burn our country up in the scorching conflagration of inflation.

Obviously, we cannot repudiate the national debt or any part of it. We surely will not enter upon a program of repudiation. That would be so dishonest and so contrary to the very genius of our Republic that we must not even contemplate it. Repudiation would mean that this Government or any other government so conceived and so dedicated would perish from the earth.

Therefore, if this debt is to be paid, we must pay it by taxation. Can it be done? It must be done.

Ours is now the greatest nation in the world. No one challenges our position in this respect. We have won this position in the crucible of the most vicious war that ever scourged the earth. It has cost us so much in manpower that there is now an American cemetery in virtually every country of the world. It has blasted our home life to such an extent that I am sure our people everywhere feel like saying as they did after the Civil War:

"No more shall the war cry sever
Or the winding river be red."

Although we have won this great war and now are the recognized leading nation of the world, we cannot get away from that immutable rule of life—that with great opportunity comes great responsibility. Our nation must not go down. The indomitable courage and the great ability and capacity of our people will meet this test.

Again I say, will we solve our financial problems by taxation? We can do so if we can settle our own domestic troubles. We are like the man who had seven sons who were continually quarreling. After providing himself with seven sticks he called his sons around him and said, "Now, boys, you can see that I can break each of these seven sticks if I break them one at a time. If I bind them together I cannot break any of them."

When we combine all our energies and all our resources and pull together to meet this tremendous financial obligation, we can do so.

We cannot pay a debt except with something that is worth something. In other words, this debt represents wasted wealth. It must be paid by new wealth. All wealth comes from a combination of three sources—from nature, plus the acumen of the human mind, plus the dexterity of the human fingers.

In other words, nature is still rich and the American people must remember that no excellence is achieved without great labor. Work was the magic word in the magnificent development of our great Republic. When the American people get over fighting with each other and when they all go to work as they should and will do, I think we can again pay our way into financial liberty and freedom.

If we cannot do this and if we assume to pay our taxes by increased rates and by taking a greater percentage of the earnings and savings of our people, we cannot pay out. We must create more wealth to tax and not look for more taxes on the wealth we have.

We must again review the whole tax and revenue situation so as to encourage industrial expansion and encourage wide and steady employment. The fallacious doctrine of scarcity must give way to the doctrine of full and free production of all classes of commodities, for it is by production that wealth is created. A part of something is worth more than all of nothing.

Our tax structure is wholly unsuited to our prospective peacetime requirements. Aside from being geared to wartime economy, it has long been in need of a thoroughgoing overhauling, including a return to sound tax principles and especially to simplification of the law and its administration. It is notoriously lacking in these respects.

An ideal tax system demands that due consideration be given to ability to pay. It must be broad and general in its application. It should be reasonably stable, and yet sufficiently elastic to be adaptable to changing economic conditions. Furthermore, a sound tax system cannot be built around one source of revenue to the exclusion of all others, and it must finally satisfy the requirement of justice and administrative feasibility.

I shall review in a general way some of the important changes made in the present tax laws by the Revenue Act of 1945 which becomes effective on June 1, 1946.

Individual income taxes

1. The present surtax exemptions are made applicable to the normal tax, effective January 1, 1946, thus providing exemptions of $500 each for the taxpayer, his spouse, and each of his dependents for the normal tax as well as for the surtax.

2. The surtax rate is reduced 3 percentage points in each bracket, effective January 1, 1946.

3. The combined normal tax and surtax is further reduced by 5 percent of the tax, effective January 1, 1946. Thus the combined normal tax and surtax rates in effect have a starting rate of 19 percent and reach a top rate of 86.45 percent on incomes over $200,000. However, the present combined limit on normal tax and surtax of 90 percent of net income is reduced to 85.5 percent.

4 About 12,000,000 low-income taxpayers were taken from the tax rolls as a result of these changes.

Partnerships

The changes in individual income taxes also affect partnerships as well as individuals since the income of a partnership is taxable to the partners under the individual income tax.

Application of individual income taxes to members of the armed forces

1. All service pay received by enlisted personnel after December 31, 1940, and before the termination of the war is excluded from taxable income.

2. The time for paying taxes attributable to service pay of commissioned officers is extended and the tax is to be paid, without interest, in 12 quarterly installments over a 3-year period.

3. A similar extension of time for payment is provided for taxes attributable to preservice earned income for 1940 or 1941 if the tax became due after the taxpayer's entry into the service.

Corporate taxes

1. The excess-profits tax is repealed, effective January 1, 1946.

2. The 2-year carry-back of unused excess-profits credits is retained for 1946 in spite of the repeal of the excess-profits tax at the first of that year.

3. Corporate surtax rates are reduced to 38 percent from the present 40 percent for corporations with income over $50,000. For corporations with income under $50,000 the rates are reduced 4 percentage points on the first $25,000 of income and for income between $25,000 and $50,000 the effective rates are reduced from two to four percentage points. The new schedule of combined corporate normal and surtax rates provided in the Revenue Act of 1945 and as compared with the old law is as follows:

Combined normal tax and surtax rate on income in bracket

Income:	*Revenue Act of 1945 (percent)*	*Old law (percent)*
Net over $5,000	21	25
Over $5,000 but not over $20,000	23	27
Over $20,000 but not over $25,000	25	29
Over $25,000 but not over $50,000	53	53
Tax rate on all incomes of corporations with income over $50,000	38	40

4. The capital-stock tax is repealed with respect to the capital-stock tax year ending June 30, 1946, and the declared-value excess-profits tax with respect to the related taxable year.

Excise taxes

1. The automobile-use tax is repealed, effective July 1, 1946.

2. With respect to the excise war tax rates imposed by the Revenue Act of 1943, no change is made in the existing law which provides that such rates will be reduced to the 1942 levels approximately 6 months after the termination of hostilities. However, when these excises are thus reduced, this bill provides that tax refunds to the extent of the tax-rate reductions are to be made on floor stocks of alcoholic beverages and electric-light bulbs.

Employment taxes

Employment taxes for the old-age and survivors' insurance program under this bill are frozen at the present rate of 1 percent on wages paid by employers and 1 percent on wages received by employees instead of being allowed to increase in 1946, as provided by present law, to rates of 2½ percent on each of these groups.

Revenue effect of changes made by Revenue Act of 1945

The reduction in tax liabilities arising from the tax bill as it finally passed the House has been estimated at $5,920,000,000 for 1946. Reductions in the individual income taxes are expected to account for $2,644,000,000 of this total, and reduction in corporate taxes to account for $3,136,000,000. The remaining $140,000,000 represents the estimated reduction resulting from the repeal of the automobile-use tax.

Taxes are an inevitable part of government. To reduce taxes, we must increase our wealth. We must widen the tax base and last, but not least, we must remember that thrift is yet a virtue. We must also remember that extravagant public spending does not reduce taxes.

PROBLEMS ARISING FROM ECONOMIC SOURCES, SUCH AS SOCIAL SECURITY

I think that the most comprehensive and far-reaching piece of domestic legislation ever passed by the Congress was the Social Security Act of 1935. As you know, that act dealt with many subjects, among them old-age pensions, blind pensions, old-age assistance, unemployment compensation, aid to dependent children, etc. You would wonder why legislation of that kind would come before the Ways and Means Committee. The reason is that each of these programs cost the Government a lot of money and it was necessary to include in the same legislation provisions for raising funds with which to carry on these additional activities. It is only natural that such a far-reaching new piece of legislation would in its operation develop some imperfections that would call for amendments and modifications. In 1939 it was amended in several respects, but it has had no general overhauling since that time. It is now again due for some necessary amendments. It is likely that when the subject is opened for these necessary amendments there will be a great number of other amendments of all kinds presented for consideration.

Those who think that the coverage should be widened so that many other people could be included have also been pressing their claims. Then there are those who think that the program should be widened so as to include universal hospitalization and universal medical care. Just what will happen in these respects, I do not know. In fact nobody knows. I think I can safely say, however, that the chances are that the Ways and Means Committee will some time between the 1st of January and the 1st of July give thorough consideration to amendments to the Social Security Act. Just what

will be considered and what will be adopted it would be idle for me to speculate further.

As you know, amendments to one title of the Social Security Act have been before Congress for consideration for some time. I refer to the amendments pertaining to unemployment compensation. The Senate, in this session of Congress, passed a bill providing for amendments to the unemployment compensation laws. The Ways and Means Committee of the House refused by a vote of 14 to 10 to recommend any changes in the present law. When the bill which the Senate passed came to the House for consideration, it was referred to the Ways and Means Committee, which committee proceeded to put it in cold storage where it still reposes. The President thereupon castigated the committee for its refusal to reconsider its action, but so far this committee has shown that it is still tough and still hard to scare.

The money spenders in Washington apparently appreciate the difficulty in getting the approval of the Ways and Means Committee for legislation calling for great expenditures. For that reason they have arranged to have the proposed national health program legislation referred to another congressional committee. This health program with its socialization of medicine, if adopted as it has been written, will cost the Government many billions. The authors and those supporting this legislation have craftily omitted any reference to taxes in the bill and in that way have succeeded in having the bill relieved from the ordeal of being considered through the Ways and Means Committee. Apparently, they expect to pass the bill authorizing these countless millions and then expect the Appropriations Committee to appropriate the money.

The bill makes no reference as to how the money is to be raised. All other legislative measures referring to social security have provided for the levying of a tax from which the expenses of such legislation would be made heretofore considered. All such measures have been referred to the Ways and Means Committee.

This effort to by-pass the Ways and Means Committee is proof of how free these spenders are with the people's money and how lightly they consider the national debt and the financial burdens they place on the people.

Returning, therefore, to my theme as to what the Ways and Means Committee will probably consider during the next session of Congress, no doubt it will take up the subject of taxation with the idea in mind of doing the best that can be done under these very stressful and discouraging circumstances. The revenue laws will be amended.

Second, it will give thorough consideration to social-security legislation. With what result I will make no prophecy.

Please remember that the country is in a critical financial condition. The duties and responsibilities of Congress are heavy. The average Congressman fully appreciates his obligation to faithfully advance the general welfare of the people.

A Communication From a Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a letter I received from a young marine that I have known a good many years, together with a newspaper clipping from the Stars and Stripes:

SIXTH BASE DEPOT GENERAL SUPPLY,
CARE FPO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
November 29, 1945.

DEAR SIR: The enclosed article from the Stars and Stripes newspaper is further evidence of a poorly managed discharge system.

I also fought on Iwo Jima from D-day until the operation was completed. I am writing to you not in an attempt to have you intervene in securing my release from the Marine Corps. I do, however, insist that you make every effort to amend the discharge system. As a suggestion I propose a committee of the legislative body, who will have full control of the administration of a fair discharge system. The War Department would be answerable to this committee.

Any fair discharge system should secure the immediate release of men who have served at least 18 months overseas regardless of points. In all fairness, if a 38-pointer who fought on Iwo Jima was discharged, any man who has a minimum of 18 months overseas and fought in the campaign should be promptly released.

I strongly urge you to use these facts and direct it to any committee working on this discharge controversy.

Your prompt reply is requested.

Respectfully yours,

RAY F. BRIGHTMAN, Jr.

P. S.—The following men fought on Iwo Jima and now have 18 months overseas:

Charles J. Bowden (546687), Tewksbury, Mass.; Paul R. Bonar (853664), Fort Wayne, Ind.; Ray F. Brightman, Jr. (546623), Methuen, Mass.; Alfred C. Botel (553946), Amsterdam, N. Y.; Francis W. Brown (829414), Washington, D. C.; Adam Boruta (538994), New Bedford, Mass. (12 months); Virgil Bouknight (993524), Newberry, S. C. (12 months); George G. Greco (541044), Newark, N. J. (17 months); Oscar W. Bowers (993521), Prosperity, S. C. (13 months); Albert E. Burslem (925443), Paterson, N. J.; Leo F. Pion (976590), North Grafton, Mass.; John "S." Shrewsbury (963747), Nevada, Mo.; Floyd W. Bramlett (987170), Decatur, Ga. (12 months); Edward H. Bohemin (80223), Springfield, Mass. (12 months); Frank B. Lane (825744), Golden Pond, Ky. (17 months); Charles Kensil (966688), Philadelphia, Pa.; Charles W. Harmon (931384), Elgin, Ill.

The following-named men have 24 months overseas now and are ineligible for discharge:

Stephen Sandella (538968), Wakefield, Mass.; Donald G. Glaze (913779), El Campo, Tex.; W. J. Hopson (916326), Cadiz, Ky.; Keith C. Grant (523645), Topeka, Kans.; Thomas Alderman, Jr. (543670), Oak Hill, W. Va.; Leo J. Mausser (897261), Cleveland, Ohio; William R. Henson (875926), Santa Paula, Calif.; Edward F. Leitz (558305), Milwaukee, Wis.; Clarence Brock (873789), Fariston, Ky.; Ralph L. Arle (534306), Shreveport, La.; Clarence N. Corwin (548895), Los Angeles, Calif.; Al Cesione (855238), New Jersey.

[From the Stars and Stripes of November 28, 1945]

THE EASY WAY OUT

GREAT LAKES, ILL.—Pfc Jack MacNider, 18, son of Brig. Gen. Hanford MacNider, was discharged Tuesday from the Marine Corps, the Navy public relations office has revealed.

Young MacNider said he had a total of 38 points for his service in Iwo Jima and other Pacific battles. The Marine point requirement is 50, but MacNider said he received a special order discharge.

In Washington the Marine Corps said young MacNider was discharged at the request of General MacArthur.

A statement issued from the office of Marine Corps Commandant Gen. A. A. Vandegrift said:

"Pfc Jack MacNider, United States Marine Corps Reserve, was returned to the United States and discharged from the Marine Corps in accordance with a radio request of General MacArthur, supreme commander in the Far East."

General MacArthur relayed to Marine Corps headquarters the request that General MacNider's son be permitted to return home from Tokyo, but MacArthur has no knowledge of young MacNider's discharge, a headquarters spokesman said in Tokyo Wednesday.

The spokesman made public an exchange of radio messages involving Private First Class MacNider.

To General VANDERGRIFT:

"MacNider very anxious bring son, Pfc Jack MacNider, Fifth Marine Division, now on furlough, back with him to United States to continue his medical schooling. If you can authorize such procedure, be glad arrange air transportation for return with his father to United States where he will report any station you may designate."

The reply:

"Procedure outlined is authorized. Please direct Pfc Jack MacNider report marine barracks, Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill. duty and grant him 30 days delay en route if he so desires."

The youth's father, former National Commander of the American Legion, commanded the One Hundred and Fifty-eighth Regimental Combat Team in the invasions of New Guinea and the Philippines.

General MacNider said in Mason City, Iowa, that Jack had enlisted on his seventeenth birthday and "I asked permission to bring him back (from Japan) with me so he might continue his pre-medic studies."

The general has two other sons who enlisted on their seventeenth birthdays and now are out of service—Tom, 19, was an Air Force cadet given an option to leave the service and did; Angus, 17, received a medical discharge from the Navy.

There Always Will Be a U. S. A. If We Do Not Give It Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of this day's RECORD on the subject There Always Will Be a U. S. A. If We Do Not Give It Away.

To the American people I am only trying to inform you of just what this administration is trying now to do with the balances of your resources, the resources that belong to the people of this country. Do you citizens know that we have a national debt of over $265,000,000,000, the largest in our history before this administration came into power, by about 1,000 percent or 10 times more than it was at the end of World War I.

A dreadful position to be in. Well, as bad as it is if we buckle our belts and go

to work we could in years and years take care of the debt and remain under our Constitution and still have our freedom and liberty. Providing, providing, providing we get a balanced budget and go to work, everybody go to work and get on to the job, that is vitally necessary. Now let us see what you are doing in Government as I see it, still spending more and more instead of less and less. Now you must be frugal and do those things that are necessary and leave undone a lot of crackpot schemes that do not have to be done at this time.

Many things can be put off till some future date, and thus not muddy the waters. Now suppose that someone owed you $50 on a promise to pay by a certain time. If he refused to pay the $50 when due would you loan him $50 additional? I believe not. If a party bought merchandise from you for $100 and refused to pay the bill would you sell him $50 more merchandise? I do not believe you would.

Now let us review our loans to Great Britain who the State Department wants us to loan $4,400,000,000 of your money that you will be held responsible for if they do not pay it. In the first place Great Britain owes us in principal and interest over $6,400,000,000 from the First World War. She owes us over $32,000,000,000 under the lend-lease agreement. The understanding is that in granting the loan of $4,400,000,000 of your money you are to cancel their obligation to you of $32,000,000,000 of lend-lease money. Is not that the most ridiculous thing that you have ever heard of? I have never heard anything so foolish, so unsensible, so ridiculous.

The recommendation for the loan is that it be made for 5 years without interest that alone is a gift to Great Britain of $500,000,000. Have you $500,000,000 to give away with a debt of $265,000,000,000? The loan also is at 2-percent interest, providing that Great Britain has a balanced budget, then she pays the interest. If she does not, she does not pay us interest. Whoever heard of such a poor deal for America as that? Why she may never pay any interest. In fact, she has not paid her debts to us, and I frankly must confess I do not think she will ever pay this loan if it is made. And it will not be made under the terms and conditions as is recommended by the State Department by my vote. I will not obligate all the people in my district for this additional debt without their consent. Our people in the Fifteenth District of Pennsylvania have enough debt, enough taxes to pay, and I shall not obligate them for any more debt in this manner without their consent. I am for America first, last, and all the time. We will always be a United States of America if we do not give it away. Let me ask you, What did Great Britain ever do for the United States of America? I ask you this in good faith. Name it. Tell me or write to me about it. I am not for giving them money to buy their railroads, their coal mines, or their public utilities as promised by the party in power. I will never socialize any country.

Report on the Quebec Conference of United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, December 15 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report I have received from Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, on the Quebec Conference of the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization, held on October 16 to November 1, 1945. The purpose of this conference was to develop a program dedicated to the aims of more adequate food and clothing for all the people of the world and at better levels of living for the world's food and agriculture producers. I think this program is of great benefit to agriculture.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, November 26, 1945.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In accordance with your request of November 3, I am enclosing a report on the Quebec Conference of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

THE FAO CONFERENCE AT QUEBEC

The first session of the Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations was held in Quebec City, Canada, from October 16 to November 1, 1945. The purpose of the Conference was to create, organize, and give general direction to the first year's program of FAO, a body dedicated to the aims of more adequate food and clothing for all the people of the world and of better levels of living for the world's food and agricultural producers—that is, the farmers, forest workers, and fishermen.

The Conference accomplished its purposes in a manner highly satisfactory to the delegation of the United States.

As President Truman pointed out in his message to the Conference, the one vital interest of this country was to get FAO off to a good start. "The task of repairing the ravages of war and building for a saner future," the President said in part, "are tremendous. Each day it becomes clearer that in many ways we must work harder to win the peace than we did to win the war. But we know that the peace can be won. One of the major victories can be won at Quebec.

"The United States is eager and proud to take its full part in your efforts. The success of this all-important first step in the life of the food and agriculture organization is the primary aim of my country's delegation. Its members come to this Conference prepared to work together with the delegations of other nations for the good of all, and to bear their full share of the responsibility for a successful outcome."

I am glad to report that the President's hopes were realized at Quebec. Members of the United States delegation did take a leading part in the work of the Conference. They worked in close accord with the representatives of other countries, and found an equally sincere desire on their part for understanding and cooperation.

As a result of the Quebec Conference, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations now is a going concern—the first of the permanent international bodies to grow out of the wartime cooperation of the United Nations. It has a truly great director general—Sir John Boyd Orr of Scotland. It has a strong and well-balanced Executive Committee, a workable constitution, and a forward-looking but practical budget of early projects.

Before any more detailed report on how the Conference went about its work and what it accomplished, a brief review of the nature and idea of the FAO may be helpful.

For all practical purposes the Food and Agriculture Organization is an outgrowth of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture held at Hot Springs, Va., May 18 to June 3, 1943; although for years previous to that, world interest in the problems of food and agriculture had been growing.

The Hot Springs Conference was convened by the United States Government upon the initiative of President Roosevelt. In a letter to members of that Conference, President Roosevelt said in part:

"This is the first United Nations Conference. Together, we are fighting a common enemy. Together, also, we are working to build a world in which men shall be free to live out their lives in peace, prosperity, and security. * * *

"We know that in the world for which we are fighting and working, the 'four freedoms' must be won for all men. We know, too, that each freedom is dependent upon the others; that freedom from fear, for example, cannot be secured without freedom from want. If we are to succeed, each nation individually, and all nations collectively, must undertake these responsibilities: They must take all necessary steps to develop world food production so that it will be adequate to meet the essential nutritional needs of the world population. And they must see to it that no hindrances, whether of international trade, of transportation or of internal distribution, be allowed to prevent any nation or group of citizens within a nation from obtaining food necessary for health. Society must meet in full its obligation to make available to all its members at least the minimum adequate nutrition. The problems with which this Conference will concern itself are the most fundamental of all human problems—for without food and clothing life itself is impossible."

Forty-four countries, either members of the United Nations or associated with them, attended the Hot Springs Conference. They were: The Governments of Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Columbia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia; the French representatives; the Governments of Great Britain, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Luxemburg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippine Commonwealth, Poland, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Yugoslavia.

In addition, Henrik de Kauffmann, the Danish Minister at Washington, attended the sessions in a personal capacity in response to an invitation from the United States Government.

As a result of the discussions at Hot Springs, members to the Conference reached a clear agreement on such basic points as these:

The world has never had enough to eat. At least two-thirds of its people are ill-nourished; many face periodic starvation; and this in spite of the fact that two-thirds of the world's people are farmers.

The modern science of nutrition proves beyond doubt that if all people could get enough of the right kinds of foods, the average level of health and well-being could be raised much higher than it is now.

The modern science of production shows how to produce enough of the right kinds of foods. To do it, farmers everywhere must have the opportunity to use modern production methods.

But production alone is not enough. Foods must be so distributed that the levels of consumption of those who do not have enough are progressively raised.

This implies an expanding world economy, in which each nation will play its own part, but all will act together. Only by acting together can nations, in the close-knit modern world, achieve peace, prosperity, and rising standards of living.

The Conference recommended establishment of the United Nations Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture and specified that the field should be construed broadly enough to include forestry and fisheries. The Interim Commission was directed to make plans for a permanent organization. L. B. Pearson, of Canada, was elected chairman. The United States member of the Interim Commission was Paul Appleby, Assistant Director of the Budget. About a year later ne was succeeded as United States member by H. R. Tolley, Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

The Commission worked hard and carefully at two major tasks—preparation of a constitution for the permanent Food and Agriculture Organization, and a series of technical reports which would serve as a starting point for the work of the first FAO Conference.

The first draft of the constitution was completed by January 1944 and sent to the several governments for comment and suggestions. The final draft was ready for submission by July 1944. Within the next year more than 20 nations (the number required to bring FAO into existence) had formally or informally indicated their acceptance of the constitution. The acceptance of the United States took the form of a resolution approved by both the House and Senate.

In the meantime, the Interim Commission had been making studies and recommendations as to the structure and functions of the new organization and had published the reports of technical committees on nutrition and food management, agriculture, forestry, fisheries, and statistics.

The call for the Quebec Conference was issued August 14, 1945—the day of Japan's capitulation. All of the nations represented at Hot Springs were invited, as was Denmark, which had had personal rather than official representation at the earlier meeting. A few other countries were invited to send observers. Under the constitution only the 45 Hot Springs participants were eligible to be charter members of FAO.

As a result of the work of the Interim Commission, much spadework already had been done before the Quebec Conference opened. Through the reports of the technical committes and through other studies, the work of committees at Quebec was largely a matter of selecting, amending, and approving.

The fact that the proposed constitution had received prior approval from most of the participating governments still further narrowed the field in which the first FAO conference worked; that is, there already was agreement as to the Organization's chief aims and general method. The aims are set forth in the preamble to the constitution:

"The nations accepting this constitution, being determined to promote the common welfare by furthering separate and collective action on their part for the purposes of raising levels of nutrition and standards of living of the peoples under their respective jurisdictions, securing improvements in the efficiency of the production of all food and agricultural products, bettering the condition of rural populations, and thus contributing toward an expanding world economy, hereby establish the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations."

The general nature of FAO's functions were outlined in article I of the constitution as follows:

"1. The Organization shall collect, analyze, interpret, and disseminate information relating to nutrition, food, and agriculture.

"2. The Organization shall promote and, where appropriate, shall recommend national and international action with respect to (a) scientific, technological, social, and economic research relating to nutrition, food, and agriculture; (b) the improvement of education and administration relating to nutrition, food, and agriculture, and the spread of public knowledge of nutritional and agricultural science and practice; (c) the conservation of natural resources and the adoption of improved methods of agricultural production; (d) the improvement of the processing, marketing, and distribution of food and agricultural products; (e) the adoption of policies for the provision of adequate agricultural credit, national and international; (f) the adoption of international policies with respect to agricultural commodity arrangements.

"3. It shall also be the function of the Organization (a) to furnish such technical assistance as governments may request; (b) to organize, in cooperation with the governments concerned, such missions as may be needed to assist them to fulfill the obligations arising from their acceptance of the recommendations of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture; and (c) generally to take all necessary and appropriate action to implement the purposes of the Organization as set forth in the preamble."

Thus the chief tasks of the Quebec Conference were those of formally creating FAO, of perfecting and approving the interim commission's suggestions as to organization and programs, and of choosing a director general and an executive committee.

The Conference opened at 4 p. m. October 16 at the Chateau Frontenac, where all of the plenary and committee sessions were held and where most of the delegates stayed. The United States delegation had arrived the preceding afternoon. Make-up of the delegation, as announced October 3 by President Truman, was:

United States member: Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture.

Deputy United States member: Hon. William L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State.

Alternate United States member: Howard R. Tolley, United States representative on the United Nations Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture.

Congressional advisers: Hon. ELMER THOMAS, United States Senate, chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; Hon. RAYMOND E. WILLIS, United States Senate, member, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr., United State House of Representatives, chairman, Committee on Agriculture; Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE, United States House of Representatives, member, Committee on Agriculture.

Advisers: Andrew W. Anderson, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; Paul Appleby, Assistant Director, Bureau of the Budget; H. G. Bennett, president, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Hugh Bennett, Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture; Homer L. Brinkley, president, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives; R. E. Buchanan, Director, Agricultural Experiment Station, Ames, Iowa; Edward G. Cale, Acting Associate Chief, Commodities Division, Department of State; P. V. Cardon, Agricultural Research Administration, Department of Agriculture; A. L. Deering, dean, College of Agriculture, University of Maine; Mordecai Ezekiel, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture; Albert S. Goss, Master, the National Grange; Henry S. Graves, college of forestry, Yale University; L. Wendell Hayes, Divisional Assistant, Division of International Organization Affairs, Department of State; Edward I. Kotck, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; Edward A. O'Neal, president, American Farm Bureau Federation; Thomas Parran, Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service; James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union; Hazel K. Stiebeling, Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, Department of Agriculture; Leroy D. Stinebower, Deputy Director, Office of International Trade Policy, Department of State; Anna Lord Strauss, president, National League of Women Voters; Clifford C. Taylor, agricultural attaché, American Embassy, Ottawa, Canada; Lyle F. Watts, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; L. A. Wheeler, Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, Department of Agriculture; M. L. Wilson, Extension Service, Department of Agriculture.

Press relations officer: Henry Jarrett, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture.

Secretaries of delegation: James G. Maddox, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture; Clarke L. Willard, Assistant Chief, Division of International Conferences, Department of State.

Other official duties prevented Assistant Secretary Clayton and Mr. Appleby from attending. Two additional advisers, however, joined the delegation during the conference. They were Harry Carlson, assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, and Samuel Jackson, former United States Senator.

The Food and Agriculture Organization officially came into existence the first afternoon of the Conference when representatives of 30 nations, including the United States, signed the constitution. By the end of the conference 42 nations had become members. The following member nations were represented at Quebec:

Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iraq, Liberia, Luxemburg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Peru, Philippine Commonwealth, Poland, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Syria, and Lebanon. The two list-named countries had started out as observers at the Conference and subsequently had applied for membership and had been admitted unanimously.

Five other member nations—Bolivia, Chile, Ecuador, Paraguay, and Uruguay—were not represented at the conference.

Accredited observers were present from the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, the Byelo-Russian and Ukranian Socialist Soviet Republics, and Argentina.

The U. S. S. R., which had been represented at Hot Springs and on the interim commission, sent a good-sized and able delegation of two dozen or so to Quebec and participated actively in the work of the plenary session and the commitees. Announcement that the U. S. S. R. was not ready to accept

full FAO membership at the present time occasioned general regret. L. B. Pearson, conference chairman, made the following statement in reporting the Russian decision to the Conference:

"This morning I had a conversation with the head of the Soviet delegation. He assured me that his Government has the same objectives and sets for itself the same tasks as FAO, that it endorses the idea of international cooperation for the improvement of agricultural production and the bettering of the food situation of the United Nations.

"The Government of the U. S. S. R. feels, however, that the organizational forms of FAO still require study. It has also become necessary for the Soviet Union to consult those of its republics which are large producers of agricultural products and agricultural raw materials.

"For these reasons the U. S. S. R. is abstaining from becoming a member of FAO at this time, and its representatives will continue to attend the first session of FAO only as observers.

"I know that I am speaking for every member of the Conference when I say that it is our earnest hope that the Government of the U. S. S. R. will soon be able to accept the constitution of FAO, which is the first of the specialized Organizations to be set up by the United Nations. The U. S. S. R., as an indispensable member of the United Nations and as one of the nations which has already ratified the UNO Charter, will be greatly interested and concerned in the work of FAO. We hope, therefore, that it will not be long before it expresses that interest by accepting all the rights and obligations of full membership of our Organization."

In the field of organization, the Conference set FAO on its feet as a functioning international body. Much of this work naturally took the form of detailed arrangements and procedures too numerous to be included in this report. The complete details can be found in the report of Commission B of the Conference.

A few points are worth special mention. The permanent headquarters of FAO is to be the same place as that ultimately selected as the seat of the United Nations Organization. This decision was reached on the understanding that the seat of the UNO will also be that of its Social and Economic Council. The temporary seat of FAO is to be Washington.

The question of permanent regional offices was reserved for action by next year's FAO Conference on recommendation of the director general and executive committee. The committee and the director general have the authority, however, to establish provisional regional offices in the meantime.

Provision was made for the closest possible working relations between FAO and other United Nations organizations, especially those that along with FAO will be associated with the Social Economic Council. To avoid duplication and confusion, it was recommended that the affairs of the International Institute of Agriculture and the Comite International du Bois be wound up, and their functions and equipment taken over FAO. To accomplish this in an orderly and legal manner, the member countries of FAO who also are members of the other two organizations (in each case they constitute a decided majority) were requested to take steps looking to prompt liquidation of IIA and CIB.

As for finances, the total budget for the first fiscal year which will run for 8½ months, until June 30, 1946, was set at $2,500,000, and the budget for the next fiscal year—the full 12-month period starting July 1, 1946—was set at $5,000,000. The United States share for the first fiscal year is $625,000, and for the second, $1,250,000. It is provided that no country's contribution can exceed 25 percent of the total budget. Because of unusual conditions in many member countries, that were ravaged by war, no attempt has as yet been made to work out any permanent methods for establishing the contributions of member nations. The apportionment for the second fiscal year represents some modifications in the form used for the first year, but it was recognized that conditions will have to be more settled before a formula taking into consideration such factors as population, national wealth, and national income can be devised.

The staff of FAO is to be appointed by the director general and, in keeping with the constitution, selection and compensation are to be made without regard to race, nationality, creed, or sex. Appointment of deputy directors general, of which there are to be no more than three, will be subject to confirmation by the Executive Committee.

Actual selection of a director general and the Executive Committee constituted the second major phase of the organizational work done as Quebec. Sir John Boyd Orr, who had come to the conference as an adviser to the United Kingdom member, was unanimously chosen director general for a term expiring December 31, 1947. The salary for the position was set at $18,000 a year plus a $10,000 representation allowance.

It is almost needless to mention Sir John's world-wide reputation as a nutritionist and agricultural scientist. His attainments as a farmer and as an administrator of a research organization are perhaps not so widely known. He was born in 1880 in Ayreshire, Scotland, and holds Glasgow University degrees in the arts, sciences, and in medicine. He founded the Rowett Institute for Research in animal nutrition at Aberdeen, Scotland, and has been its director until his election to Parliament this year as representative of the Scottish universities. In addition to being interested in the operation by the institute of the 1,000-acre farm, Sir John owns and operates a large general farm in Scotland.

In his acceptance speech Sir John said, in part:

"I think most of you will agree that we are now passing through the greatest crisis in the history of our civilization That crisis has been brought about by the advance of science. In the last 40 years science has advanced more than it did in the previous 2,000 years. Physical science has let loose tremendous new forces into the world. Those forces cannot be bottled up; they must either be harnessed to serve the ends of mankind, or they will break loose in a riot of destruction.

"How those forces are used will affect all nations equally. The world is now so small that any war will be a world war; any prosperity must be a world prosperity. Governments realize this, and they are, therefore, attempting to set up world organizations which will enable those powers of science to be applied on a world scale. It is very fitting that FAO should be the first of these organizations. It deals with the primary products of land and sea; it deals with food—the primary necessity of life.

"Let me say a word about what FAO must accomplish. Each nation has accepted the responsibility, which indeed must be the responsibility of any government, to provide, as far as possible, food and a health standard for all the peoples it governs. But something new has arisen. All the governments have agreed to cooperate in a great world food scheme, which will bring freedom from want of food to all men, irrespective of race or color.

"I ask you for a moment to consider what the great results will be. In the first place, disease and misery and premature death, which afflict the majority of the people of this planet, will, to a large extent, be replaced by health, by happiness, and by life.

"But other results will follow. If the nations of the world are going to get together to feed the people of the world, they must increase the production of the most important foods. In many cases that production must be more than doubled. This will bring prosperity to agriculture. There should be no slump in agriculture after this war, such as after the last war, and prosperity in agriculture must overflow into other businesses and into world trade.

"But we do these things not because they will bring prosperity but because they are right. We have now reached the stage, I hope, when we realize that if we put first things first, and do the things which we know to be right, a great many social, economic, and political difficulties will disappear. * * *

"I hope that upon their return to their own countries, all delegates will report to their governments that this Organization has been launched in a spirit of great good will, and that it has been set on its course to make its great contribution to the promotion of human welfare and to the unity of the nations of the world. I also hope that all delegates will inspire their governments with the enthusiasm which has been generated at this Conference, so that all the nations will put their resources of men and materials at the service of this great Organization, which will have the great honor of laying the first stone in the foundation of that great new world which modern science has made possible."

The executive committee, which is to exercise the power of full conference in the periods between the annual meetings of that body, consists of 15 members chosen by the conference for their personal qualifications rather than as formal representatives of their governments. Eventually, each committee member will be chosen for a 3-year term. It is also provided that one-third of the membership shall be chosen each year. Therefore, it was necessary that one-third of the first group of committeemen chosen should serve for 1 year, one-third for 2 years, and one-third for 3 years. When the 15 nominations to the executive committee had been approved unanimously by the conference, the length of term for each was decided by lot. Executive committee members, with their terms of service, are: Sir Girja Bajpai (India), 2; Edouard Baker (Haiti), 1; G. S. H. Barton (Canada), 1; Newton Castro Belleza (Brazil), 3; R. R. Enfield (United Kingdom), 1; E. J. Fawcett (New Zealand), 1; Anders Fjelstad (Norway), 2; Alfonso Gonsales Gallardo (Mexico), 1; Darwish Haidari (Iraq), 2; Andre Mayer (France), 2; Stanislaw Mikolajczyk (Poland), 2; Howard R. Tolley (United States); 3; P. W. Tsou (China), 3; P. R. Viljoen (Union of South Africa), 3; and Arthur Wauters (Belgium), 3.

Subsequently, the committee elected Andre Mayer as its chairman and H. R. Tolley as vice chairman.

Establishment of general policy with particular emphasis on recommendations for the first year was the third major function of the Quebec Conference. Six committees were established to submit reports to the Conference in their respective fields. There were committees on nutrition and food management, agriculture, forestry and forest products, fisheries, marketing, and statistics. Several of these committees were subdivided into panels designed to give detailed study to certain phases of the broader committee subject.

Full reports of the six committees are grouped together in the report of Commission A of the FAO Conference.

Although the United States had a deep interest in the work of all six of the committees, its interest in marketing was perhaps the keenest and most immediate.

"Marketing," the introduction to the report of that committee states, "is the crux of the whole food and agriculture problem. It would be useless to increase the output of food, it would be equally futile to set up optimum standards of nutrition, unless means could be found to move the food from the producer to the consumer at a price which represents a fair remuneration to the producer and is within the consumer's ability to pay. Similar considerations apply to other agricultural products and to fish and forest products.

"It should be the responsibility of the Food and Agriculture Organization to collect all relevant facts regarding both the supply and demand situation. The collection of the facts alone will not be sufficient. The Food and Agriculture Organization must advise the governments which comprise it, and the other international bodies whose activities effect supply and demand, as to the action which should be taken to maintain and increase consumption."

The marketing committee, in addition to recommending that FAO promptly make world-wide studies of the needs and marketing possibilities for food and agricultural products, and to stressing the need for interchange of information on marketing and transportation techniques, brought out strongly that FAO should make specific and detailed recommendations to member nations, to any international trade organization which may be formed, and to any special groups formulating or administering international commodity agreements.

The recommendations on programs and policy, all of which were adopted unanimously by the conference, make it clear that although FAO will not be an action agency in the sense of buying or selling products or of laying down any binding rules, the member nations of FAO are determined that it shall be an active agency, not content merely to gather and publish information.

Two paragraphs from the report of Commission A reflect the spirit and character of the six committee reports adopted by the conference. "What stands out most from all these six reports? It is this. The peoples straightway, if they so wish, can take a great step forward along the road towards freedom from want. They need not wait for research, important though it be that scientists continue to make discoveries which augment man's control over his environment. They need not wait for surveys, though investigators must continue to study human needs and lay bare the earth's resources. They need only to act on what is known, for every country, no matter how advanced, can achieve substantial immediate improvements in production, nutrition, and rural welfare by the more energetic application of existing knowledge.

"To move forward rapidly, however, governments must work together. Although each has important programs of a domestic character there are other problems they cannot resolve by acting independently of one another as interwar experience has shown. Many countries need outside help in improving farm practices; others need to cooperate together in expanding and ordering their foreign markets. The list of FAO work projects in this report measures the extent of the peoples' interdependence."

Like other large-scale international gatherings of its general type, the conference found it necessary to divide and subdivide into commissions, committees, and panels. All final decisions were made in plenary session at which each member nation had one voting representative. Each member nation also had a representative on the two commissions—commission A on policy and program and commission B on organization and administration. Senator ELMER THOMAS was the United States member of commission A and Representative CLIFFORD HOPE the United States member of commission B.

The participating nations were represented by their leading men in the field. Besides the United States Secretary of Agriculture, Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, Poland's Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Agriculture, was present, together with M. C. Tanguy-Prigent of France, S. L. Mansholt of the Netherlands, J. G. Gardiner of Canada, all ministers of agriculture in their respective countries. P. J. Noel Baker, Minister of State in the British cabinet, was among the many other top-rank officials present.

Advisers and associates on the delegations of the various countries included dozens of the world's leading economists and scientists in the fields of food and agriculture, although a few countries sent one-man delegations. Several, like the United States, sent groups numbering two or three dozen. Altogether, not counting clerical and administrative staff members, the national delegations at Quebec totaled about 250 persons. In addition, there was a large and able secretariat whose membership was drawn from many of the participating nations, including a number of physical and social scientists from the United States.

It is impossible to comment even briefly on the way the conference was conducted, without mentioning the outstanding work of L. B. Pearson, Canadian Ambassador to the United States, who was first temporary and then permanent chairman of the conference. No small part of the success of the conference was due to the chairman's tact, vision, energy, and good nature.

The delegation from the United States was a well-balanced and effective working group. I should like to make special mention of the great contribution made by the four Congressional advisers—Senators THOMAS and WILLIS, and Representatives FLANNAGAN and HOPE. Their work in the commission and committee sessions was as valuable as their counsel in the daily meetings of the United States delegation. A list of the committee assignments of members of the United States delegation follows:

COMMISSION A. POLICY AND PROGRAM

I. Nutrition and food management: Dr. Thomas Parran, Dr. Hazel K. Stiebeling, Miss Anna Lord Strauss, Dr. M. L. Wilson.

II. Agriculture: Mr. P. V. Cardon, the Honorable Elmer Thomas, the Honorable Clifford R. Hope, Dr. H. G. Bennett, Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, Dr. A. L. Deering, Dr. Mordecai Ezekiel, Mr. Albert S. Goss, Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, Mr. James G. Patton.

III. Forestry and forest products: Mr. Lyle F. Watts, the Honorable Raymond E. Willis, Mr. Edward I. Kotok.

IV. Fisheries: Mr. Andrew W. Anderson, Mr. Edward G. Cale.

V. Marketing: Mr. L. A. Wheeler; the Honorable John W. Flannagan, Jr.; Mr. Homer L. Brinkley; Mr. Harry Carlson; Mr. Leroy D. Stinebower.

VI. Statistics: Dr. R. E. Buchanan, Mr. L. Wendell Hayes, Mr. Clifford C. Taylor.

COMMISSION B. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

I. Rules and procedure: Mr. L. Wendell Hayes, the Honorable Elmer Thomas, Miss Anna Lord Strauss, Mr. L. A. Wheeler.

II. Finance: Mr. Edward G. Cale; the Honorable John W. Flannagan, Jr.; Mr. Leroy D. Stinebower.

III. Administrative arrangements: Miss Anna Lord Strauss, the Honorable Raymond E. Willis, Mr. L. Wendell Hayes.

IV. Constitutional and diplomatic questions: Mr. Leroy D. Stinebower, the Honorable Clifford R. Hope, Mr. Albert S. Goss, Miss Anna Lord Strauss.

Dean Graves was chairman of the conference committee on forestry and forest products and Mr. Cardon was vice chairman of the committee on agriculture.

After approving the committee reports of the two commissions, the conference closed. The general feeling at the end was one of optimism. The conference had accomplished all its three objectives. It had created FAO. It had organized it and picked an outstanding director general and an able executive committee. It had charted a course for the first year. Beyond that no one yet can do more than hazard a guess.

From the standpoint of the United States, FAO holds great promise, especially in the field of marketing. Naturally, we also can learn much from other nations about the science of nutrition and agricultural production. We have even more to learn about fisheries and forestry. But, all things considered, we probably will give more than we receive in the exchange of technical information. Our great problem is to find markets for all we can produce efficiently, and that applies to industry as well as agriculture. The FAO, through efforts to improve distribution and to increase productivity and raise living levels all over the world and to generally contribute to an expanding economy, can help supply the outlets we must have if we are to enjoy continued prosperity based on full production; also, FAO is of great importance to the United States as the first of the United Nations organizations designed to establish prosperity and maintain world peace. As Sir John Orr said, "FAO is the world's answer to the atomic bomb. If the nations cannot agree on food, they can agree on nothing."

At Quebec, FAO got off to a good start. Where it will go from there depends on how much sincerity and effort member nations put into it and how well they work together. As the richest and most powerful member nation, much of the answer is up to us.

Problems of Lumber Dealers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, December 15 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement filed by Mr. Edwin W. Elmer, executive secretary, Independent Retail Lumber Dealers' Association for North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, and two other of the adjoining States, which he made before the Senate Small Business Committee on December 12, 1942.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Independent Retail Lumber Dealers Association, with offices in the Baker Building, Minneapolis, Minn., represents some 500 independent retail lumber dealers in the States of Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, North Dakota, and South Dakota. To our knowledge, our organization is the only one in the

country representing exclusively the interests of the small or independent lumber retailer. Other lumber associations have combined memberships of independent and line yard or chain lumberyards. The reason that membership in our group is confined to small dealers is that frequent conflict of interests develop between the independent and large chain-yard groups. One such conflict of interests is present in the current lumber-distribution problem.

It is estimated that there are from 25,000 to 30,000 retail lumberyards in the United States. The majority of these yards are independently owned and operated.

The problem that today confronts our small lumber dealers in the Northwest is equally as serious for the many thousands of independent lumbermen throughout our Nation.

To fully understand and fairly consider this distribution problem some background information will be necessary.

Some lumber is produced in nearly every State in the Union. In the construction of a home, for instance, the lumber used often comes from widely separated areas. There may be fir from the west coast and hardwood from the South. No one mill, regardless of size, can supply everything the buyer requires. Very few concerns, except those with extensive operations in widely separated timber areas, have found it profitable to maintain a salaried sales organization of sufficient size to merchandise their product direct to the retailer. As a consequence, aproximately two-thirds of our prewar lumber production was sold through lumber wholesalers. These wholesalers, with years of experience in the distribution of lumber produced, perform a genuine service to manufacturers and retailers alike. They supply the retailer with valuable market information, advice on industry problems, extension of credit, and act as referees in occasional misunderstandings and complaints that develop in any business. The properly financed wholesaler eliminates the credit risk for the manufacturer. Further, he makes it possible for the manufacturer to take only that portion of large requirements that the latter can properly and profitably handle.

The functions of the commission lumber merchant are in many ways similar to that of the lumber wholesaler.

Thus, to a great extent, the independent retail lumber dealer has been dependent upon the lumber wholesaler and commissionman for his source of supply. When the lumber dealer is in need, for instance, of a car of west-coast fir, he contacts his wholesaler, giving him the specifications for the material, which might be used in the construction of a home, store building, creamery, food-processing plant, or some other building in his community. The wholesaler fills this order, if he can, calling upon the various mills that he represents.

When the Office of Price Administration established mill ceiling prices, they announced that the customary commission allowed wholesalers and commissionmen, had been computed and was included therein. During the war, when our armed forces needed and took lumber to the near exclusion of all civilian uses, wholesalers, for the most part, did a fine job aiding where they could, and accepted with a minimum of complaint, the direct sale by the mill to the Government as the most satisfactory method of meeting our wartime requirements.

Government buying of lumber has now almost ceased. With the ending of hostilities, we find a tremendous pent-up demand for lumber for civilian use. There are several classifications of buyers, all striving to buy present lumber stocks and contract for future lumber production for their particular clients. Included among such buyers are those representing large chain lumberyards, large wholesale distribution yards and large industrial users. These buyers are compensated on a salary-and-expense-account basis. Equally desirous of placing lumber orders are the lumber wholesalers and commissionmen.

All during the war, most of our Government's lumber requirements were purchased direct from the mills at full ceiling prices. Because of customary Government payment practices, not even the usual 2-percent cash discount was taken. When civilian buyers replaced Government buyers, most of the mills continued to ask and have received full ceiling prices.

In fairness to the mills, it must be stated that since price controls went into effect, production costs have increased substantially. We doubt if any of the mills could continue to pay wholesale commissions, and stay in business, on today's production costs, if they wanted to.

Inasmuch as wholesalers today cannot place business at less than full ceiling prices, and inasmuch as they are prohibited from adding any "mark-up" or buying charge under all present OPA price regulations covering lumber, except Revised MPR 19, covering southern pine, these buyers are effectively eliminated from the field.

Under present OPA price regulations, the small lumber retailer cannot compensate his wholesaler for locating and buying lumber for him, even though his large competitor is permitted to absorb limitless expense for this same buying service through his employee buyer. Further, OPA refuses to permit two or more small dealers to share the expense of a joint buyer.

It is true that OPA does not prohibit the small dealer from likewise hiring individual buyers in the many markets from which his lumber comes. Neither does OPA prohibit the small dealer from traveling the length and breadth of the land, trying to serve as his own buyer. Many factors make it impossible and impractical for him to do this, however. A few would include (1) his inability to leave his business for long periods of time; (2) the staggering expense of such buying practices; and (3) lack of contacts among the many mills.

The only other alternative is to use black-market tactics. It is a sorry state of affairs when legitimate businessmen are driven into illegal practices in order to stay in business. This is true even though the regulations to be violated appear to be unconstitutional, arbitrary, and discriminatory.

We do know that the major portion of lumber production available for civilian use since Government buying has ceased has been taken by the three large groups of buyers enumerated above, and further, that they have contracted for considerable of the mills future production. Unless immediate relief in buying is granted the smaller lumber retailers, they will be unable to place orders for their spring lumber requirements. There is no logical reason to believe that such dealers could expect to place orders for any appreciable amount of suitable yard stock for several years to come, even with peak production, under present buying inequities.

The majority of the 25,000 to 30,000 retail lumberyards in the country, the more than 1,000 wholesale lumber concerns, and the hundreds of commission lumber merchants are a formidable segment of our Nation's industry to needlessly force out of business. Once again, the poor, long-suffering general public will reap the fruits of maldistribution. There are many sections of our United States that have very few chain lumberyards or wholesale distribution yards. In many States there are few if any of such lumberyards. In those States the consumer is dependent upon his independent or small lumberyard for his lumber requirements.

President Truman has recently stated that priorities would be issued, if necessary, to assure the flow of building materials into small homes. Our continued attempts during the past 2 months to budge OPA on this very serious distribution problem would make us very wary of placing further Government controls in that or any other Government agency. If some of the controls and unreasonable provisions of regulations now in effect were amended or corrected, as the need arose, it would be a far more effective solution and a real boon to reconversion.

The lumber and building industry itself is capable of meeting its full reconversion responsibilities if only given a fair chance to do so.

During the past several months the Independent Retail Lumber Dealers Association has repeated often, in letter, bulletin, and news articles, that our paramount problem is to secure our just share of present mill stocks, and future mill production. The plan we suggest is simple, and will be effective. It can be accomplished by OPA almost overnight. All that need be done is to extend the "mark-up" provisions of Rev. MPR 19, covering southern pine, to all species of lumber. Our small retail yards could then secure their lumber requirements through their wholesalers, as usual. This amendment to present lumber regulations would insure the flow of material into the average independent retail lumberyard. It would mean less material for the large wholesale distribution yards and industrial users, and more for home construction.

There are other minor, but nevertheless important factors which need correction in the retail lumber industry. OPA again holds the power for correction of these. They include:

1. The $5 per thousand handling plus 10 percent mark-up given large wholesale distribution yards. The retail dealer must absorb this, in addition to his expense of hauling the material, over regular mill ceiling prices, with no chance to pass on to the consumer any portion thereof.

2. Excessive prices paid for remanufactured lumber. This has resulted mainly because mills' ceiling prices have been too low on desirable yard stock items.

3. Absorption of unreasonable freight costs on green lumber.

The field secretary of our association, Mr. Deward G. Schultz, recently returned from a 3-week inspection trip of the western lumber-producing areas. His report of December 3, 1945, reads as follows:

"Since November 10 I have personally conducted an investigation of conditions in western lumber-producing areas, and have found that with the elimination of WPB controls and OPA's refusal to recognize and protect the position of the wholesaler and commissionman, prospects for securing a fair share of the Nation's lumber production have become extremely critical for the small buyer. Yes; even more serious than we had thought."

Since November 10 I have had the opportunity to personally analyze conditions at the scene of operation, remaining in each production area long enough to contact the leading mills, western wholesalers, and prominent observers. These conclusions result from general discussions and studies of accurate report sheets on mill production costs.

Much depends on the Nation's future lumber production. One thing seems certain. Lumber and other west coast building materials will not be available in quantities sufficient to supply huge pent-up consumer demands for several years to come. I am irked by propaganda coming from prominent sources within the lumber industry which attempts to convey the impression that "there will be plenty of lumber for everybody shortly after the first of the year." I didn't run across anyone on the west coast engaged in such wishful thinking. Retail dealers who permit the application of such soothing salve and contemplate an easy road to lumber procurement will find themselves without lumber stocks in 1946. Large buyers on the coast today are fully aware of the circumstances. They are representatives of

large industrial users, catalog houses, wholesale distribution yards, and chain lumberyard systems. Reports to their associates show much concern about securing a minimum of 1946 requirements. Just why a large retail lumber association, supposedly representing the best interests of small dealers, apparently fosters a program of false, misleading propaganda, is beyond my understanding. Unless wholesalers, commission men, and independents are willing to take matters into their own hands the larger buyers truly will hog it all if they can.

At this writing it would seem that the strike situation, indeed unfortunate at this particular time, is improved and that some of the many mills idle for more than 2 months, will soon be in operation. A considerable number in the Inland Empire are now so disorganized, their programs having been so disrupted that they cannot produce until spring. The strikes for some came at a time in which preparations for winter logging should have been made. Seasons of the year have no respect for strikes. Some CIO mills were not down on strike. They continued to operate with the understanding that wage adjustments were to be retroactive to November 1. The question yet unsolved is "Who will pay the increase of 12½ or 15 cents per hour?" A satisfactory settlement with labor unions doesn't mean that production will promptly go forward in the Inland Empire, or elsewhere for that matter. Accurate reports on production costs on the basis of 12½ cents per hour wage increase, retroactive to November 1, show that mills are "running in the red" now that they are producing yard stock. If OPA doesn't act quickly (and they have shown that they can in the case of southern pine) many of the mills will be forced to shut down. This is what they intend to do. Under present price ceilings most Inland Empire mills will be idle before or at least by January 1. This is not a pleasant picture. It appears that the mill cost of lumber will have to experience an average raise of approximately $5 per thousand to sustain and increase production.

It is said on the coast that Mr. Peter A. Stone (Lumber Branch, OPA) expects mills to operate for 6 months and then prove to him that they have lost money. Do your own thinking. The war is over, and now it is not a matter of saving lives. It is claimed by some of the mills that only about 5 years of good production remain in the Inland Empire. Mr. Stone will find the going plenty tough. Producers in the area can hardly be blamed for holding out for a reasonable return as their natural resources become depleted.

The situation is similar in Douglas fir, although in the past the "fancy paragraphs" which even most of the producers themselves do not understand have made it possible for them to operate at a profit. However, they, too, are feeling the squeeze now, since they no longer sell a major portion of their production to the Government at mill ceiling prices, with the benefit of "fancy paragraphs." Ceiling prices on some yard items must be raised to secure production. The industry as a whole wants to get back to the shipping of dry stock, but their present ceiling prices do not appear adequate to cover drying and additional handling costs. This again calls for action by Mr. Stone.

At best very little dry lumber will be shipped in 1946 and 1947. Demands are great and the lumber is still in the tree. By midsummer of 1946 retailers in the Northwest area will receive some dry stock, but there will not be enough dry stock (kiln dried) to anywhere near meet requirements.

Redwood inventories on the west coast are depleted, but are gradually being built up. Much of the lumber from the redwood tree must be air dried for 6 or 8 months before it can be kiln dried. Very little redwood siding and finish will be available for distribution in the Northwest prior to June 1946.

It has not been the purpose of this report to be at all pessimistic. These are facts and there is no reason for anyone to be misled. The independent retail lumber dealer is in a precarious position. He can help himself considerably if he will cooperate with his wholesaler or commissionman to the extent that in this emergency he demand from OPA the right to compensate him for his buying service. Mill representatives are frank to state that everything being equal, they would much rather do business through old, reliable, trusted channels. It is imperative for the survival of small lumber dealers that the "mark-up" provisions of the southern pine regulation be extended to all species of lumber immediately.

Yours very truly,

INDEPENDENT RETAIL LUMBER DEALERS' ASSOCIATION,
By EDWIN W. ELMER,
Executive Secretary.

Conditions in Lumber-Manufacturing Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, December 15 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter sent to Mr. Chester W. Bowles, Administrator of OPA, by the Retail Lumber Dealers' Association. The letter is dated October 22, 1945, and signed by Deward G. Schultz, acting executive secretary of the Independent Retail Lumber Dealers' Association.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDEPENDENT RETAIL LUMBER DEALERS' ASSOCIATION,
Minneapolis, Minn., October 22, 1945.

Mr. CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: Changing conditions in the lumber manufacturing industry on the west coast, from one where Government agencies requisitioned most of the mills' output to one where lumber in large quantities will be available for civilian consumption, has posed a problem of tremendous import to independent retail lumber dealers of the United States. This results from the failure of OPA to amend existing maximum price regulations as dictated by present conditions.

A position equally as serious has arisen and confronts the lumber wholesalers and commission merchants.

Congress fully recognized the importance of maintaining established methods of distribution, and clearly stated its intent in this respect in the Emergency Price Control Act, in the following language: "The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry." The section in question covered prices, rents, and market and renting practices.

OPA announced at the time regulations establishing mill ceiling prices went into effect, that the customary commission due wholesalers and commission merchants had been included in the mill prices. However a mandatory discount provision was refused by that agency. Retail lumber dealers and wholesalers and commissionmen alike complained very little and accepted their position gracefully, as long as the lumber which was sold by the mills direct to Government agencies was considered essential to the war effort. Businessmen in both the retail and wholesale fields simply tightened their belts and awaited the reconversion period which is now here.

What do the independent retail lumber dealers and the lumber wholesalers and commission merchants find, now that reconversion is here? The mills, which have been selling direct during all of the war period, and which have, except in rare cases, retained the discount computed and included in mill ceiling prices for wholesalers and commission men have shown that they intend to continue selling for the full ceiling prices during the postwar period. They can easily do this, as buyers for large chain lumberyards and wholesale distribution yards will take their entire output on this basis for some time to come.

The independent or single-yard operator could not possibly afford to hire a buyer to purchase stocks for him, in the many markets from which he must obtain his varied stocks. His volume in each market could not possibly justify such an overhead. This is a function which has always been handled by his lumber wholesaler or commission man.

Early in 1945 there were 537 lumberyards in the State of Minnesota classified as small or independent retail yards, and who depended upon the wholesaler or commission man as a source of supply of his lumber requirements. There were 392 line or chain lumberyards at this time, who would be represented by buyers on the coast and in the several lumber markets.

Unless OPA acts immediately to amend the present northern softwoods, western softwoods, and hardwood maximum price regulations the independent retail lumber dealers, wholesalers, and commission men will have to make a choice. They can obey and submit to these OPA regulations, which are arbitrary, discriminatory, and indefensible, and be driven out of business. They can stand up for their constitutional rights and save their businesses by following a procedure which OPA has sanctioned in MPR 19, covering southern pine lumber.

There are from 30,000 to 40,000 retail lumberyards in the United States which would be affected in the above manner, and hundreds of wholesalers and commission men. They have played a vital role in the lumber industry during its entire history.

The amazing thing about OPA's failure to act in this matter, and their apparent disregard of the fact that these thousands of lumber retailers, wholesalers and commission men will be driven out of business is that this reticence does not have the slightest pretext of being of any benefit to the public in general, and has no bearing whatsoever on the price that the general public pays for their lumber. It would seem that OPA, by their refusal to grant relief, has determined to deliberately drive independent retail lumber dealers, wholesalers and commission men out of business.

OPA's failure to act in this matter will further seriously impair the rights of farmers, businessmen, and home owners in many communities where there are no chain lumberyards to get lumber for needed repairs, improvements, additions and new construction. Our citizens living in such communities will be unfairly and unjustly discriminated against. If the independent retail lumberman cannot get lumber, neither can the people in the area that he serves, in many cases.

Independent retail lumber dealers, wholesalers and commission men will not be driven out of business. They will fight for their

constitutional rights. They will not be deprived of their property without due process of law. They will not desert the customers and trade who have come to depend upon them, at a time when they are vitally needed. The retail lumber dealers will pay commissions to the wholesalers and commission men for buying lumber for them, and will absorb such commissions out of their own margin of profit. It should be carefully noted that the retail lumber dealer will not pass this cost on to the public, but will absorb the increased cost himself.

There can be nothing illegal or wrong with such a course of procedure, because OPA has sanctioned this procedure in its own MPR 19, covering southern pine lumber. Why OPA consistently denies similar rights to the industry dealing in other species of lumber is difficult to comprehend.

The thousands of persons whose businesses, incomes, and livelihoods are at stake believe that under conditions as they now exist OPA's MPR 94, covering western pine and associated species of lumber, as well as the regulations covering northern softwoods, in their present form, are unconstitutional and invalid, on the following grounds:

1. It violates the fifth amendment to the Constitution because it deprives independent retail lumber dealers, wholesalers, and commission merchants of their property without due process of law.

(a) The effect of the regulations in their present form is to drive these groups out of business, to deprive them of their income and profits, and to drastically reduce the value of their capital investments, and all without any practical or reasonable means of hearing or appeal.

2. The regulations in question are discriminatory.

(a) The MPR 19, covering southern pine lumber, grants to the segment of the lumber industry dealing in this species the very benefits that OPA is denying businessmen dealing in northern softwoods, western pine, and associated species of lumber.

(b) The latter OPA regulations create a monopoly for the large chain or line lumberyards and wholesale distribution yards in that they bottle up a major portion of the production of the lumber mills. The small retail lumberyards are effectively prevented from securing appreciable amounts of lumber.

3. These maximum price regulations of OPA are arbitrary.

(a) Although OPA has been fully informed of the hardships and inequities resulting from the northern softwood, western pine and associated species of lumber regulations in their present form, and the imperative need for immediate relief, as well as the incongruity of the southern pine regulation and those covering northern softwood, western pine and associated species, they have consistently refused to make any effort to remedy the situation.

It would also appear that OPA maximum price regulations covering northern softwoods, western pine and associated species are invalid under conditions as they have now developed, as contrary to the following provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act itself:

"The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, or changes in established rental practices, except where such action is affirmatively found by the Administrator to be necessary to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act." (U. S. C. A. title 50, Appendix, art. 902, par. (n).)

The northern softwoods, western pine and associated species, Maximum Price Regulations of OPA in their present form are compelling not only changes, but radical departures in the "means of distribution established in the industry." The present effect of these regulations is to completely remove independent retail lumber dealers, lumber wholesalers and commission merchants from the lumber industry. There can be no claim that such action is necessary to prevent evasion or circumvention of the act.

In the case of *Philadelphia Coke Co.* v. *Bowles* (1943) (139 Fed. 2d, 349), the Court, speaking of business practices, stated:

"The purpose of inserting in this section the provision that powers granted should not be used or made to operate to compel changes in business practices, etc., was to make sure that the Administrator would not go beyond his price regulating function and engage in an effort to reform business practices which were not directly related to prices."

It is no argument for OPA to say that payment of commissions to wholesalers and commissionmen by retail lumber dealers itself compels changes in the business practices established in the lumber industry. First, the industry is still subject to wartime restrictions; these conditions have resulted in many regulations which have not worked out in practice in the manner contemplated in theory. The war emergency gave birth to OPA and is the only excuse for its present existence. If conditions were back to normal OPA would have been liquidated, and there would not now be the need for the circuitous method that the affected groups must employ to seek relief from an untenable position. In fact, the present problem would not be with us. The present predicament of the affected groups is due entirely to wartime conditions and their immediate aftermath. OPA has a solemn and continuing duty to keep abreast of the times, and to act to prohibit the use of their regulations as vehicles of monopoly and discrimination.

Neither can OPA's failure to act expeditiously in this emergency be excused by blaming the laws of supply and demand. We reiterate that OPA's continued existence is proof that conditions are not yet normal. An Administrator's philosophy that all problems will eventually run their course and iron themselves out in time is no solace to businessmen who are being driven out of business in the meantime. The relief for the independent retail lumber dealers, wholesalers, and commissionmen must be immediate.

We trust that immediate consideration of this matter and prompt remedial action will be forthcoming.

Yours very truly,

INDEPENDENT RETAIL LUMBER DEALERS' ASSOCIATION,
By DEWARD G. SCHULTZ,
Acting Executive Secretary.

Feeding Our Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, December 15 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Feeding Our Allies" published in the Washington Post of December 15, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEEDING OUR ALLIES
A COMMUNICATION

"Join the Allies and starve! Join the Axis and be fed by the Yanks!" Posters emblazoned with this slogan should have been plastered all over China, France, Norway, and the Netherlands, because it is the truth. The United States statement on German policy, released by Secretary Byrnes yesterday, indicates clearly that these countries would be far better off this coming year if they had fought against us rather than with us.

The United States Government is going to guarantee at least 1,550 calories per day for the normal German consumer. How easy would be the minds of the French and Dutch and Belgians if they could get such generous largesse, and could spend their pitifully small stock of United States dollars to purchase the industrial materials they sorely need.

Mr. Byrnes says, "In terms of world supply and of food shipments from the United States, liberated areas must enjoy a higher priority than Germany throughout this first postwar winter." Doesn't Mr. Byrnes consider China a liberated area? Because if he does, and if we should enable China and the other liberated areas to raise their consumption to 1,550 calories a day, there would not only be no food for the Germans but the generous diet of the United States would be considerably reduced.

The State Department policy has been variously elaborated in terms such as these: "The liberated areas will get the foods to satisfy their needs, and then whatever foods are left over will go to Germany—in other words, the Germans will get only the surpluses over and above the liberated areas' needs."

Officials familiar with the total food situation have repeatedly pointed out that there are no such surpluses, if the word "needs" is taken to mean human needs to prevent starvation. If any reasonable calorie figure is used as a criterion of human needs, there just isn't enough food in the world to satisfy the needs of all the liberated allies; every attempt we could possibly make, even continuing tight food rationing, would serve merely to alleviate somewhat a tremendous problem of limited supply versus human need.

The joker is found in Mr. Byrnes' definition of "need." According to the formula under which United States allocations of food are made, no food is provided for any claimant unless that claimant guarantees his claim with cash on the line, and our food prices are high. Regardless of true human needs, the "needs," which Mr. Byrnes has stated have first priority before the Army feeds the Germans, will be much smaller quantities, resulting from a painful calculation by the claimant government as to the amount of their very limited United States dollars which they can afford to spend o. food.

But the United States Army is claimant for Germany; the 1,550 calories per German will become a firm requirement, with financial backing, submitted by the Army. And the food will be allocated to them. Mr. Byrnes' pious expression that the liberated areas would enjoy a higher priority than the Germans is just a plain untruth—the Germans stand a much better chance of eating this winter than the peoples the Axis has oppressed for the past several years.

President Roosevelt committed the country to fighting the war most efficiently regardless of the limitations of the dollar sign—the country reluctantly accepted his judgment in the matter, without being completely convinced. Do we not need someone now with

the courage to commit this country of ours to the battle against hunger and poverty with the same wisdom, that the peoples of the earth who fought side by side with us should be permitted to eat at least as much as our erstwhile enemies, regardless of the limitations of their state of finances?

More and more during the coming year the little people of the world will have occasion to mourn again the passing of Franklin D. Roosevelt—apparently the only force that could make this selfish little Nation of ours see beyond the end of its balance sheets.

CHARLES MILLER.

WASHINGTON, *December 12.*

The Cause of India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, December 15 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star in the form of an advertisement, signed by the National Committee for India's Freedom.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. ATTLEE, WHAT ABOUT THE WORLD OF TODAY?

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE BRITISH PRIME MINISTER

To the Right Honorable CLEMENT R. ATTLEE.

SIR: I gather you are here in Washington, among other things, to help build the world of tomorrow. All power to you in this laudable and lofty undertaking.

I desire, however, on behalf of the National Committee for India's Freedom, which represents the vast majority of Indian nationals resident in this country, to submit a few observations for your consideration, which pertain to the world of today, in which your Government is deeply implicated.

When the British Labor Party, of which you are the head, came to power in a decisive and sweeping victory, there was widespread hope that the more flagrant abuses and venalities of British imperialism would, at any rate, be mitigated, and a departure made from the traditional toryism of your predecessor in office, Mr. Churchill, and his kind. This expectation was all the more natural since, for a generation, your party had made ardent protestations of liberal internationalism, and now you had secured undisputed parliamentary power to carry your professions and principles into practice.

On examining the record of the Labor government since it came to power, we find that, whatever you and your colleagues may have done, or attempted, on the home front, there is not a ray of light to illumine the dark and dismal domain of British imperialism and colonialism.

There is no evidence today of any heart-searching on the part of the British Government, of which you are the head—no chastening of the spirit, no sign of moral regeneration, not even an honest and intelligent reorientation to the changed aspects of the world. You and your colleagues appear to be impervious alike to the hopes and the sufferings of a broken world.

What other conclusion is to be drawn from the operations of British policy in Asia today? What Churchill did in Greece you are doing on a more outrageous scale in Indonesia and elsewhere. And as representing Indian sentiment, we have a stake in these British imperial activities. Both Churchill and you have used Indian soldiers, respectively, to crush Greek and Indonesian and Indo-Chinese patriots. Why? We suggest that if this sort of dirty work must be done it should be undertaken by your own soldiery and not by Indians. You cannot be unaware of the fact that there is a vast and deep revulsion in Indian against this sordid and cynical policy of the British Imperial Government.

Indian volunteers enlisted to fight against the Axis, and in behalf of what they were told was to be a war of human liberation. They are now being employed, under virtual military coercion, to act as mercenaries, and to destroy their Indonesian and other kinsmen who seek independence, and to whom they are bound by innumerable ties of history, culture, and sentiment. Being a slave himself, the Indian must needs labor to enslave others! And you are a party to that degradation.

And why has the world been confronted with this ghastly spectacle? Mr. Churchill, very understandably, did not want to liquidate the British Empire. You appear to be bent upon a more ambitious project: To resuscitate and reestablish the moribund empires of France and Holland in Asia—as satellites in the British solar system! And this is sought to be done, primarily, with American equipment and Indian manpower.

Since you are in Washington and have just proclaimed your concern for a foreign policy that should be "conceived in the interest of all the people of the world," may I recall to you certain words of a great American that appears to be pertinent; Abraham Lincoln said:

"If any nation robs another nation of its freedom, it does not deserve freedom for itself, and under a just God will not long retain it."

Lincoln's words proved to be a prophecy, and not merely a warning, in the case both of France and Holland. Britain herself, at Dunkerque, had a close shave with destiny.

By the grace of God, and help of the United States, you have all been rescued—and given a new lease of national life and freedom. Yet, you and the French and Dutch imperialists, with unregenerate souls, are apparently trying to revive again in Asia the suicidal old business of imperial enslavement and colonial exploitation.

India is the pivot and exhibit A of world imperialism. So long as India is not free, the world will not be free. It is presumably in order to bolster your own empire, and the imperial system in general, that your government is so frantically trying to put back their respective colonies into the palsied hands of the French and the Dutch.

I suggest that you cannot reverse the processes of history. There will be no peace in Asia—and in the world—so long as such policies are pursued.

You have just affirmed as "the supreme need of today * * * the lifting of the bonds of fear from the human spirit, and the setting free of the human spirit." How can you reconcile your own diagnosis with the policies of your Government? Your exalted concept of the freedom of the human spirit with the blood and terror let loose by your agents and hirelings on hapless men, women, and children who, after generations of bondage, want nothing more than their own long-usurped birthright of freedom?

Furthermore, is the system of British rule in India conducive to "the lifting of the bonds of fear from the human spirit?" Many of your party leaders, and experts, well know the facts. (I would refer you in particular to Sir Stafford Cripps, and to Francis Williams, the author of that excellent and completely honest book Democracy's Battle, who, I understand, is here with you in Washington as your press secretary.)

You, too, should have some cognizance of the inner realities of the Indian situation since, as I recall, you went out to India as a member of the Simon Commission. What your precise part, if any, was in the compilation of the commission's report, I do not know. I can only hope you were not one of its architects. For that pretentious structure perished from the weight of its bogus fame and real futility.

However, having gone out to India in such a responsible capacity, you must have seen and heard enough to discover this central truth: From the days of the mutiny until today, India has been ruled by fear—a disarmed and devitalized population at the mercy of organized militarism. Should this cycle of Indo-British relations not now be ended—the cycle whose reciprocal segments are force and fear?

There has been no appreciable advance upon the policy or the tactics of the previous British Governments which you succeeded. We are being treated in India to the same eternal procrastination, the same moth-eaten alibis, the same demands for an impossible national unity which exists nowhere on this earth, the same playing up of minorities and secretarians to defeat the demand and goal of constitutional freedom for the nation as a whole.

You and your Government have it in your power to redeem the honor of England's name in Asia, and to help forward the cause of human freedom by breaking the fetters of 400,000,000 of the people of India. Only freedom can dissolve the bonds of fear anywhere.

I trust you may be yet enabled to live up to your professions and aspirations.

I remain, sir,

Faithfully yours,

SYUD HOSSAIN,
Chairman, National Committee for India's Freedom.

The Need for Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, December 15 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief, informative statement on the need for health insurance.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEED FOR HEALTH INSURANCE

HOW HEALTHY ARE WE?

Because the United States is the richest of the nations and is known throughout the world for its natural advantages and its progress in education, sanitary controls, and scientific achievement, it is often declared that Americans, as a people, stand first in health. Statistics do not bear out this claim. Despite past progress in preventing sickness and prolonging life, the United States has not yet achieved for all its people—and in particular for those in the working ages—the level of security of life which has been attained in some other nations with much smaller economic resources.

In the years before the war, 7 countries had lower infant mortality rates than the United States. From 7 to 11 countries—the number differing for various age groups—had lower death rates among children and adolescents, and 20 or more countries had lower rates among persons aged 35–64. Death rates among white persons in the United States are typically lower than those of the Negro population; yet even if the international comparison is restricted to the white population, our death rate is by no means the lowest. In the expectation of life for white boys at birth, the United States ranked fifth among the prewar nations; for white men at age 20, it ranked ninth; at age 40, twelfth; and at age 60, thirteenth.

Selective Service reveals the serious health situation in this country. Of the first 3,000,000 men examined for Selective Service (average age 26), one-half were rejected because of physical or mental defects. Notwithstanding the lowered standards of physical and mental requirements and the fact that a certain number of men with a serious disease or handicap are inducted into the armed forces and given needed rehabilitation, the rejection rates still approximate 40 percent. At the end of 1944 we had 4,500,000 IV–F's. To this number must be added 1,000,000 men initially inducted and later discharged because of unfitness for military service.

Testifying before the Senate Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education, Col. Leonard G. Rowntree, medical director of the Selective Service System, said that Selective Service physical examiners had expected to find "a rough, virile, manhood." They had been disappointed. Colonel Rowntree called the situation "appalling," and said, "We can no longer regard ourselves as a sturdy, healthy Nation; the country is ailing."

THE DAILY TOLL

On an average day 1 person in 20 is unable to carry on his normal routine because of illness or disability. Studies of the Social Security Board based on the national health survey (1936) and other data indicate that on an average day at least 7,000,000 people are disabled. This is the number of persons who, because of illness, accidents, or defects, are unable, temporarily or permanently, to go to work, to attend school, or to follow other normal pursuits. About one-half of these 7,000,000 persons are incapacitated by disabilities of less than 6 months' duration; about one-half of longer duration. These figures do not include the thousands of persons who go to work or school or continue their usual activities in spite of permanent physical defects or chronic illness.

COULD MEDICAL CARE CUT DOWN ILLNESS AND PREVENT DEFECTS

The national health survey found that nearly 18 persons in every 100 suffer from chronic disease, lameness or other crippling defect, or serious impairment of sight or hearing. Many of these chronic conditions could have been prevented by medical attention at the first sign of illness or injury.

The illness and injury, unfortunately, even when discovered early, frequently continues uncorrected. This is borne out by a study of physical rejectees in Hagerstown, Md., made by the United States Public Health Service. The Public Health Service compared Army health records and school health records made 15 years back when the boys were in elementary school. Comparison brought out the realization that 15 years ago physicians could have predicted which boys might fail to pass Army examinations—15 years ago they had defects in vision and teeth but little was done to correct them—15 years ago physicians could have predicted from their growth and posture, their general state of nutrition, which of these boys were likely to grow up into physically handicapped adults. "It is particularly disturbing," the Public Health report says, "to find that, in spite of knowing * * * which children in a community would grow up into physically handicapped adulthood, the health professions, the lay professions, and especially society as a whole, has to date apparently failed to take full advantage of the knowledge."

WHY DON'T AMERICANS GET ENOUGH MEDICAL CARE?

One reason is that social progress has not kept pace with medical progress; the benefits of medical progress have not become available to all the people. There are many regions in our country today where the chance of survival is no greater than it was 60 years ago. There are places—and this is especially true of our rural area, where average income is low—where people are almost without access to modern facilities to prevent and cure sickness. The selective-service examinations sharply brought out the medical deficiencies in our rural areas. Whereas among a large group of 18- and 19-year-old registrants about 25 percent were rejected on physical or mental grounds, among boys classified as farmers the rate of rejection was 40 percent.

The United States as a whole has in peacetime nearly enough doctors. In January, 1940, there were about 141,000 active physicians or about 1 physician to 935 people. But this country-wide ratio conceals the fact that physicians are concentrated in wealthy areas. There is wide variation from region to region, from State to State, and among counties within States. The following table shows some of the State-to-State variations.

New York State	1 to 597
Massachusetts	1 to 696
California	1 to 747
Illinois	1 to 789
South Carolina	1 to 1,565
South Dakota	1 to 1,657
Alabama	1 to 1,684
Mississippi	1 to 1,784

Furthermore, medical facilities are concentrated in the large cities and some medical services scarcely exist outside them. Physicians, too, are concentrated there. In large cities the national ratio was probably about 1 general practitioner for 750 to 800 people. In rural, low-income and sparsely populated areas, only 1 general practitioner might be available to serve 2,000, 3,000, or an even larger number of people. These rural physicians are often elderly, and as they die, younger physicians are not coming in to take their places. The result is that the situation in regard to doctors in rural areas is becoming progressively worse. There are throughout the country dozens of counties without a single doctor in them. Maldistribution of specialists and dentists is much greater. Maldistribution of other health personnel parallels the picture indicated for physicians.

Another reason Americans don't get adequate medical and hospital care is that large numbers of people cannot pay for them. "Most of the remediable defects found in the draftee," says Dr. Hugh Cabot, a leading Boston physician, "spring from inability to pay the bills which are often beyond the peoples' means." Many people who are within reach of facilities today cannot take advantage of them because they cannot surmount the barrier of costs that stands between them and the doctor, the laboratory, or the hospital. Thus a considerable part of the capacity of hospitals and the time of skilled practitioners goes unused in ordinary years, though in the same places there are sick people badly in need of services. Reluctant to undertake financial burdens, many hesitate to consult a doctor and find out in the early stages of a disease, when it may be checked or cured, what is wrong with them. Today, except for accidents, the leading causes of death are the slowly crippling diseases of middle and old age—diseases of the heart and arteries, cancer, and other chronic ailments. To prevent and curb such diseases takes skilled individual medical care—and skilled individual medical care over a period of years is beyond the purchasing power of millions.

Studies of the medical services received by Americans as compared with those needed by Americans indicate great insufficiencies. According to the final report of the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care, the services received among low-income groups constitute one-third or less of requirements. The well-to-do receive three times as much medical attention as those with lowest incomes. Moreover, because of the higher cost of specialist services and laboratory services, the medical care received by the low-income groups is likely to be more limited than that received by groups with higher incomes.

With regard to hospital services, statistics show that families with high or very low incomes receive almost twice as much care as families with moderate incomes. Some very low-income families obtain free hospitalization. High-income families can pay for needed care. Most self-supporting families are in between and are unable to purchase all the care they need.

SICKNESS AND POVERTY

No one has yet proved whether sickness causes poverty or poverty sickness. But it is a fact that they go together; sickness comes oftener and lasts longer in the homes of the poor than of the well-to-do. The National Health Survey found that persons in families on relief had nearly three times as much disabling illness lasting 7 days or more as those in families with incomes of three thousand to five thousand a year. Low-income groups have twice as much sickness as high-income groups, and the impact of the costs of medical and hospital care on low-income groups is very heavy. More than one-fifth of our urban families of low incomes spend for medical and related costs more than $100 every year, and many have sickness bills of one-fourth, and even one-half, of their entire family income.

MORTALITY RATES AND POVERTY

All mortality studies indicate markedly higher infant mortality, mortality from tuberculosis, and from most other causes among the low-income groups in comparison with those with higher incomes. In recent years we have greatly improved our ability to save lives, but this improvement is spotty, and rates are still high in some States, in some areas within States, and among Negroes and other characteristically low-income groups. The death rates reported for low-income areas and low-income groups are often as high as those which prevailed in the country as a whole a generation or two ago.

INFANT MORTALITY RATES SPOTTY

How much chance infants have to survive depends on where they were born. The infant mortality rate for the United States as a whole in 1942 was 40 deaths per 1,000 live births. In 3 States with the best record the rate was 30 or less per 1,000. But in the State with the best record, a baby's chance to survive the first year of life was nearly 3 times as good as it was in the State where the infant mortality rate was highest. As with general mortality, infant mortality is high in low-income areas.

THE COSTS OF MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE ARE UNEVEN AND UNPREDICTABLE

On the average, American families spend about 4 or 5 percent of family income for medical care. Averages, however, conceal wide differences in the expenditures of individual families. Some spend little or nothing in a year if they escape serious illness or can postpone preventive medical or dental services. Other families pile up bills which represent more than they could hope to save in many years. Only about one family in five uses hospital service in the course of a year, but this one-fifth spends more than half of all the money spent for medical and hospital services. The annual medical ex-

penses of families with hospital care average more than $300, while medical bills of other families with medical care average about $70 a year. Hospitalized illness is a large and unpredictable drain on family resources. Nor are medical costs in general predictable; no family can tell in advance what medical expenses will be necessary in the coming weeks or months. Medical and hospital costs cannot be budgeted on an individual basis like rent, or food, or clothing because, unlike these other necessities of life, medical needs are uncertain, unpredictable, and uncontrollable.

The Wool Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABE MURDOCK
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, December 15 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, the special Senate committee created for the purpose of studying and investigating the wool industry in this country has recently held and concluded extensive hearings on this very important subject. The hearings were well attended by sheep men from all sections of the country, fabricators, processors, brokers, public officials, and educators. The hearings were presided over by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who has rendered invaluable service to this great industry for many years.

Recently a publication concerning the hearings was issued by Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Beane. I ask unanimous consent that the publication be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR PRESSING PROBLEM IN WOOL AND PROPOSALS TOWARD A SOLUTION

Under the able chairmanship of Senator O'MAHONEY, a special Senate committee has been holding hearings, from November 19 to 27, in search of a constructive wool policy.

The problem has been defined as follows:

1. Stocks overhanging the market:

(a) CCC inventory of domestic wool 421,000,000 pounds as of October 27; estimated at 525,000,000 pounds by end of year.

(b) British stock pile in United States 286,000,000 pounds foreign wool.

(c) World stocks of foreign wool exceeding 4,000,000,000 pounds.

2. Domestic wool prices above world prices:

(a) The CCC buying program, while protecting the producer during the war, has resulted in the accumulation of a stock at such prices as to cost the taxpayer a currently estimated loss of approximately $65,000,000.

(b) The selling price, as decided upon previously, has been some 20 percent above foreign duty-paid prices and, after the November 27 price reduction of 15 to 16 cents per clean pound, is still estimated at 5 to 7 cents above foreign duty-paid prices.

Result is that, apart from Government contracts specifying domestic wool, the latter can be used only to supplement shortages of particular grades of foreign wools, instead of the normal vice versa.

(c) Despite the wartime rise in foreign growers' costs, even so high a tariff as 34 cents per clean pound is claimed to be insufficient to keep the domestic grower in business.

3. British wool control: British Empire producing countries have formed a joint control with Great Britain for the purpose of liquidating their surpluses. Since this liquidation is estimated to require perhaps 13 years, the strain on market absorption will be severe and extended. Machinery in other consuming countries will take years to rebuild, thus the United States market will be sought intensely. Meanwhile the wool tariff and high labor costs make wool-textile exports difficult or impossible.

4. Other considerations:

(a) The interruption of shipping lanes during this war has revealed the domestic wool growing industry to be a strategic necessity.

(b) A parity price to the grower is considered inadequate inasmuch as the base period (1910–14) was a period of low wool prices.

(c) Wool is a world commodity, with worldwide consumption and relatively few large producers. Among the latter is a large degree of State control, principally as a direct consequence of the war.

(d) Wool growing is incapable of appreciable cost reduction by mechanization, and reduction in labor costs, estimated to have risen 100 percent since 1940, is not in sight.

(e) The fear of repercussion on the manufacturing trade, already worried about the adequacy of current tariff protection, of any change in the raw material price structure.

5. Decline in numbers of breeding sheep in United States, approximately 25 percent since 1942. As a result of rising production costs and fear of surpluses, liquidation has been in progress, and domestic wool growing is admitted to be a sick industry.

REMEDIES SUGGESTED AT THE HEARINGS

1. Upward revision of the tariff looked upon in many quarters as the simplest solution.

Obstacles are:

(a) Opposition by the State Department as contrary to basic policy.

(b) Would enlarge the umbrella for synthetic competition, and tend to reduce consumption.

(c) Objected to by subsidy advocates as an unnecessary additional burden on the consumer-taxpayer.

2. Producer subsidy advocated by the State Department as being least objectionable; opposed by the Department of Agriculture as being against its general policy. Producers only lukewarm—consider stopgap only; feel more comfortable with a satisfactory price in the market place, however induced.

3. Import quotas favored by many growers and some manufacturers; opposed by the State Department. Logic behind them is that no more wool should be available than domestic production plus necessary supplementary imports for adequate consumption. Proponents suggest imposition either on estimated total needs, or on a per capita consumption standard, similar to the sugar plan (see Fortune article, condensed in November Reader's Digest, Why You Can't Have Enough Sugar, for sugar plan defects); some suggest quotas be based on the degree to which living standards are raised in the exporting country.

Objections:

(a) Difficulty of equitable administration among both United States importers and exporting countries.

(b) Quantities and types required may change from year to year.

(c) Manufacturers' necessary freedom of selection of foreign wools would be reduced.

(d) Licensing of importers and an import quota plan for textiles would be necessary.

(e) Restricted imports mean higher consumer costs.

4. Hill plan:

This advocates purchase by the Government of all wools, both domestic and foreign, and its sale at a price which would be an average between the controlled prices of the two.

Variants include a floor price on domestic wool, Government control on purchase of foreign wools, or free purchase of foreign, with supported prices for domestic wool.

Objections to the basic plan are:

(a) Inimical to the system of free enterprise.

(b) Insufficiently flexible. Government buying methods cannot equal those of the trade in efficiency of making complicated selections of foreign wool. Government selling methods, as instanced by CCC with domestic wool, considered too slow and cumbersome compared with either British disposal methods or those of the trade. Unwanted types might accumulate.

(c) Assuming wool imports subject to quota, some of the quota difficulties abovementioned arise.

5. National Wool Marketing Corp. plan:

CCC buying program to be continued during the readjustment period, or as long as the joint Empire control is in process of its surplus liquidation.

Domestic wool prices would be maintained at present ceiling levels, or cost plus reasonable profit.

Each year's clip would be sold through trade channels at prices competitive with British control prices, CCC losses to be reimbursed from wool import duties.

Advantages:

(a) Assuming no wool tariff change, readjustment of textile duties might be unnecessary.

(b) CCC dependence on congressional appropriations reduced or eliminated.

(c) Consumers would have the benefit of world prices plus tariff, estimated to be about twice the cost of the reconversion differential. Latter would not be pyramided in manufacturing and retailing processes.

Objections:

(a) The reconversion differential payment contained within the buying price is a disguised subsidy, though perhaps no more so than a tariff.

(b) Present ceiling levels claimed by growers to be inadequate. Cost plus reasonable profit difficult to determine, and might establish undesirable precedent to other groups.

COMMENT

The fifth plan appears to contain the elements of the most practical approach to the purely domestic problem, provided the eventual objective is a level of domestic prices competitive with c. i. f. world prices, plus a tariff no higher than present rates. An adequate readjustment period, and adequate guaranteed prices in such period, seem essential, but with the inauguration thereafter of a gradual reduction of domestic buying prices upon periodic reexamination. The long-term policy should be clearly announced so that the readjustment period shall be fully used, in efforts toward production cost reduction from a wartime level. Specific and immediate measures are suggested as follows:

(A) Domestic field:

1. The establishment of a minimum domestic production total, adequate for national security under immediately foreseeable conditions.

2. The establishment of a buying price for a fixed reconversion period, sufficient to maintain profitably such production, but not—as in the case of cotton—to increase it.

3. Thereafter reconsideration of the domestic production goal, and the establishment of a buying price at the beginning of each season, set in accordance with the then existing and prospective conditions, but with the basic objective clearly in view. The consequences of such a program, i. e., surpluses in Government hands, lead to the question as to whether they are not part of a world surplus problem, only possible of permanent solution through international agreement. While the British joint control, controlling 70 percent of production in the main exporting countries may have little need for merging with a relatively small United States production, it may be that the reverse is true.

(B) International field:

1. Study of the operation and experience of BAWRA (British-Australian Wool Realization Association) in the liquidation of Empire surpluses following World War I. A big job was done, and government stock piles were liquidated.

2. Study of the present joint control, with the object of determining common ground on which a working agreement might be based. (If you can't lick 'em, join 'em.) Should it become evident that the world wool problem is too big for permanent settlement except through the United Nations Organization, such study will have clarified the issues.

3. Study of the practicability of joint auctions of domestic and suitable foreign wool in the United States, with reserve limits jointly set according to relative values, losses to be apportioned according to pool contributions.

Objections (mostly psychological):

(a) Resistance to international agreement.

(b) Auctions still looked upon in some domestic quarters as "fire sales."

(c) Auction marketing methods feared by small dealers as being too direct, and as favoring the large topmaker or manufacturer.

Advantages:

(a) Practical experience on a large scale has shown the auction method to be the least cumbersome and most direct method of surplus wool disposal. Quantities offered and reserve limits can be adjusted to market conditions, but the net effect is liquidation of surpluses as fast as the markets can absorb them.

(b) Prices to the consumer tending to stimulate wool consumption and competitive with synthetics, the consumer-taxpayer thus having an offset to Government losses.

(c) Government in business is ended as rapidly as possible, and the free enterprise system is encouraged.

(d) A further step, however small, is taken in the slow growth of international collaboration on common world problems—found vitally necessary in war, but still in its infancy in the problems of peace.

HERBERT J. HOLLAND.

DECEMBER 3, 1945.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, December 15 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an editorial from the Detroit News of November 29, 1945, dealing with the St. Lawrence waterway and favoring that project.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEAWAY'S OPPONENTS GRADUALLY FADE AWAY

The Economic Club listened this week to an address by Julius H. Barnes on the St. Lawrence seaway, of which he has been an active, persistent, and never-discouraged supporter for 30 years.

The role and experience of the News in relation to the seaway has paralleled that of Mr. Barnes. We have a special bond of sympathy with him. Like him, we never doubted for a minute that some day the seaway would be built and operating to justify, not just our faith in it, but our certain reasoned knowledge of the great blessings it will confer on the landlocked interior of the continent.

Men of the News who had a part in the launching of this project, so many years ago, long since have passed to whatever reward is reserved in heaven for those who dream such big dreams and work to make them come true. Those who came after them have caught their enthusiasm and gone on working.

Mr. Barnes, it seems to us, goes on forever. He was a young grain shipper from Duluth when he came to see what would be done for the great grain-growing area west, north, and south of there, if only 30 miles of St. Lawrence rapids were flooded out and Duluth thus made a seaport.

He is an old grain shipper from Duluth now, but his vision of the seaway's meaning to the landlocked interior is as clear and his enthusiasm as fresh as ever.

Here in Detroit, because it was Detroit, he talked this week of what the seaway means to Detroit's industrial future. But the meaning is much the same for Duluth, for every lake port, which will become a seaport, and to the whole vast interior region now many hundreds of miles from low-cost ocean transportation.

We, like Mr. Barnes, never have doubted that a time would come when this dream would be fulfilled. Of late, we have begun to hope more actively than in a long while that he and we, on the News, yet may live to see it fulfilled.

The old provincialism and the old gullibility toward the special-pleading arguments on the rail and power interests seem to be passing. Those interests, which for the best part of 30 years have generated and fomented the opposition to the seaway, have not relaxed their vigilance. But New England and New York, long in the forefront of the opposition, have come over to support of the seaway and it appears that other regions will follow.

A factor has been the huge sums of Government money profitably spent on improvement of the Tennessee River Valley and the further sums now proposed to be spent on the Missouri and other valleys.

Such projects demonstrably add to national wealth, efficiency, and well being; yet no project for regional development offers such prospects of profitable returns—as to cheap electric power alone, for example—as does the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Valley project, which Congress has been kicking around for over a generation.

The moral claim of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin but even more the national necessity of the project are coming to be recognized. The seaway bill now before Congress well may be enacted, as President Truman, the eighth President to do so, has asked. Hasten the day. We want to live to see it.

The Way to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, as a citizen and a Member of Congress, with a deep and abiding devotion to our principles of government, I fully subscribe to objectives of the democracies in waging the war to a successful conclusion—that the world might be freed of dictators and militarism.

Now that the war has been won and the way has been cleared to establish fair dealing among men and permanent peace among nations, it is time to turn our efforts to bringing peace and not militarism and future wars to humanity. Surely the democracies did not sacrifice the lives of their sons and pile up mountains of debt for their children to pay so that the nations of the world would enter an armament race to vie with each other to build up huge armies and mighty navies.

The world will agree that this is not the end of our present-day civilization. We have progressed far since the days when might made right. Our States have their courts and policing authority and we have lived in peace and amity with our neighbors on this continent for over 100 years.

If civilization is to advance, we must go forward in a plan to establish peace and amity among all the nations of the world. The way is not by building bigger and stronger armies and mightier navies but by using our influence to get all the world to accept permanent peace as its main objective.

Under permission of the House, there is inserted herewith a statement of a great labor movement on peacetime military conscription:

STATEMENT OF HARVEY W. BROWN, PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS, BEFORE THE HOUSE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE ON PEACETIME MILITARY POLICY

I am Harvey W. Brown, president of the International Association of Machinists, with offices at Ninth and Mount Vernon Place NW., Washington, D. C.

The International Association of Machinists represents over 700,000 American workers as their agency for collective bargaining with their employers. The citizen-workers who make up the membership of our association are drawn from every industrial section of our Nation and are for the greater part skilled craftsmen, helpers, apprentices, and production workers in the metal industries.

My purpose in appearing before your committee today is to convey to you the considered position of our association relative to the important question of peacetime compulsory military training.

First, we would like to point out that we agree with those who advocate the necessary matériel and military personnel to maintain our freedom, and the dignity and security of our American way of life. We differ with some who have testified before your committee when we face the question of the best methods to pursue in acquiring the military force found to be necessary, and the wisdom of maintaining a peacetime military force of such huge proportions as favored by some who have testified before your committee and as proposed in the May bill, H. R. 515.

We submit that an Army and Navy made up of the youth of America, trained by compulsion in peacetime, without consideration to their mental attitude toward military life or whether or not they are emotionally suited or desirous of such training, will not be possessed of the qualities needed to meet military requirements. Certainly the compulsory training of the young men of Italy, Germany, and Japan in the past 20 years and the defeated state of those nations today is a living example of the delusion of such thinking.

To make America strong in the years ahead, we do not need compulsory military training; we do not need to resort to undemocratic methods of holding our Nation's youth in a reserve army whether or not they are capable of being of service from a military

standpoint; we do not need to raise our male children with the understanding that they must reach the age of 25 years before they can declare themselves free men; we do not need to bear the tremendous cost of maintaining a vast armed force in peacetime when there is no unfriendly nation on the face of the earth with the potential power to attack us on land, sea, or in the air.

We reason that our Nation, with its great and successful heritage as a democracy, with its wealth and natural resourcefulness, can best afford to make voluntary enlistments in our needed military forces sufficiently interesting to attract and win the attention of the best suited of our Nation's youth without the element of compulsion and force as found in House Resolution 515, which is before your committee for consideration. The recently released figures of the War Department reveal the success of voluntary methods to keep our armed forces at the required strength. Enlistments in the Army alone are proceeding at the rate of 175,000 monthly, more than tripling the 50,000 figure given by President Truman as the monthly requirement.

The purpose of the May bill is—to quote from the measure—"that the reservoir of trained manpower built up at such enormous expense during the present war should not be permitted to become empty again as after World War I, but should be perpetuated for the peace and security of future generations." We do not agree with the illogical reasoning of such an expression of purpose.

The implication that compulsory peacetime conscription would soften or lighten the enormous expense spoken of in this bill is not a convincing argument in favor of youth conscription. The cost of maintaining a citizen army by compulsion, with its high percentage of misfits for duty, if they are ever actually needed and the Government's financial responsibility for the injury and sickness of conscripts brought on through training, would not permit any reduction in expense from a taxpayer's standpoint.

With the enactment into law of compulsory military training there would be no convincing point in attempting to maintain that our victory over the Axis nations had resulted in the preservation of our traditional American freedom. If our youth are to be forced into military training in time of peace against their own decisions and are placed in reserves for 6 years thereafter, it is logical to assume that marriage and the building of homes and raising of children will be delayed, and that such delay will virtually destroy the prospects of normal family life at an early age, which is a cherished goal of most Americans.

The sponsors of military conscription and those who endorse such proposed legislation have failed to tell us which nations endanger our peace or security. Germany and Italy are completely defeated and Japan is in a state where her philosophy of conquest is eradicated for all time.

The citizens of America have a right to ask and be told the truth regarding the danger that threatens our security to such an extent that compulsory military training is necessary. If we are to militarize our 18-year-olds at the rate of 1,000,000 per year for an indefinite period, it is our right to know just who our dreaded enemy might be. Is it Great Britain or Russia or China? Those great nations were our effective allies in destroying German nazism, Italian fascism, and the imperialism of Japan, and the facts as we know them indicate that they are as anxious as we in America to settle differences that may arise, through peaceful means. Where else can be found nations that would have potentialities of successful aggression?

Certainly, the weapons of war that have been developed during the conflict that is just over should show us the absolute necessity of a future of peace if our civilization is to continue. To this we all agree whether or not we can see eye to eye on the wisdom of compulsory military training as a national peacetime need. If it is a true and intelligent analysis of present-day weapons development, to expect that any possible future war would be fought with rocket bombs, atomic missiles of destruction and other highly technical air and sea weapons, and that any possible attacks would be so timed as to cause widespread destruction before the attacked nation could organize its equally devastating weapons; then we question the effective value of a force of soldiers and civilian reserve with only a slight knowledge of the requirements that would arise in an era of technological warfare of such magnitude.

The International Association of Machinists is deeply interested and sincerely concerned with the causes and prevention of wars, believing that the beginning of wars of aggression can be traced to the poverty, insecurity, and desperation of the people, resulting in their readiness to accept the destructive leadership of warmongers. Hitler's leadership over the German people was successfully attained because of mass unemployment and starvation which destroyed the thinking of the people to a point where they readily followed his organized plan of destruction, and his ruthless program of annihilation of Jews and others, finally resulting in the humiliating defeat of the German Nation, notwithstanding the fact that the numerical strength of Hitler's conscripted army was enormous. Had there been no mass unemployment and hunger in Italy, Mussolini, with his distorted ideas of national superiority, would not have been successful in his program to become dictator. These are two present-day examples of the effect of large-scale insecurity upon nations. We contend that America should profit by the lessons which we have learned from the tragic mistakes of these nations and provide the necessary machinery so that this situation will not occur in our own country. Instead of considering the passage of laws to conscript our Nation's youth by compulsion in time of peace, we maintain that Congress should be giving more attention to the passage of legislation which would provide full employment, higher standards of education, better standards of living for our people, and the development of an adequate and highly skilled military force made up of those who voluntarily wish to follow a military career.

President Truman says that the objective is not to train professional soldiers, but to train citizens. If the training is not to get competent soldiers, then, we ask, why are they to be trained?

We contend that the churches, homes, schools, and colleges of America are proper sources of good citizenship development, and we seriously believe that compulsory military training would have the opposite effect upon many who would view peacetime training as a sentence that they must serve, against their will and judgment.

Certainly good citizenship in a democracy does not depend on military training, and can best be gained through civilian channels.

Our association together with other responsible unions, have fully endorsed the Federal apprenticeship training program and have cooperated in the development of joint labor-management apprenticeship committees in many industrial plants. By this means, thousands of America's young men are being systematically trained for skilled trades, that will certainly be of great value in the days of technological advancement ahead. This is the kind of training we need to keep America strong, and those who enter such training should be assured that their work will not be interrupted by military training. In this connection, we would like to point out that the members of our association built the famous B–29 bombers in the past war, and we know the tremendous amount of time and skill required to perfect such equipment. The press has carried, within the past few days, the story of the new 28-cylinder Major airplane motor. This engine, only now going into production, was in the blueprint stage long before we entered the war and like all other airplane engines has taken years of work from design to production. Instead of a massive military force in peacetime, we sincerely recommend that more attention be given to the encouragement of young men to become apprentices and junior engineers to the skilled trades in modern industry.

The American people know that better educational programs in our schools will best serve the interest of the Nation and its future security.

The National Opinion Research Center of the University of Denver—whose noncommercial Nation wide polls are considered by many social scientists to be more accurate than Gallup—reported on June 23, 1945, the result of a Nation-wide poll on the subject of conscription legislation. Question: "If this Government had $2,000,000,000 a year to spend, would you rather have it spent on a program of better regular education in the schools, or on a program of compulsory military training in the Army or Navy?"

	Percent
Regular education	56
Compulsory military training	25
Neither or both	11
Undecided	8

On November 3, 1945, the Denver organization reported a poll. All were asked: "If the United States had to do one of these two things after the war, which one do you think would give us the best chance of helping to keep peace in the world?"

	Percent
1. By trying to build a bigger army than any other country?	31
2. By trying to get the world organization to build a police force that would be bigger than the army of any country in the world, including the United States?	56
Neither	2
Undecided	11

If the war has taught us anything, it is that it wasn't lack of military training that caused our difficulties when we were attacked, but lack of general and technical education, lack of public health, lack of facilities, installations, munitions, ships, planes, and supplies. Military training in peacetime by compulsion will not cure these shortcomings.

A strong bulwark of our democratic heritage will not be produced by military conscription, but by widely extended education; proper medical examinations and corrective physical programs made available at reasonable cost to all people; healthful housing and full employment. By these means we shall prepare the way for a healthy and properly equipped America ready for any eventuality.

We can see nothing sound in the argument that military life in itself can be credited as the best method of improving the health of our Nation, for one of the basic requirements upon entering the armed services has always been sound health before induction.

We sharply disagree with the testimony of Mr. William S. Knudsen, who recently appeared before your committee and spoke in favor of peacetime military training. It is certain that his contention, that a year of military training for our youth will "make them more democratic," "they will learn each other's ways, they will be more patriotic," is a prediction entirely without foundation. In all the years of our history of devotion to the principles of democracy and fair play, we have never before had to force our 18-year-olds into military camps in order to "make them more democratic."

We question whether this leader of industry whose contribution to democratic society is respected, but who, according to his testimony, came to free America 1 year before he would have been inducted in the army of his native country, can be accepted as an authority on whether or not peacetime compulsory military training is a builder of patriotism and democracy. We challenge the implication that patriotism and love for democracy is weak in our land, or would be strengthened by compulsory military training.

The International Association of Machinists is opposed to compulsory military training for the reasons stated and also because we have seen many evidences where deferred American workers needed during the war were suddenly drafted and their deferments canceled because of their registered opposition to injustices imposed by their employers. We can see nothing in the present proposals for peacetime military conscription to assure labor that these industry-dominated pressure practices will not be continued in time of peace, if conscription is to be a national policy.

President Truman's message to Congress, in which he recommended compulsory training, clearly sets forth the objective when he says, "Some would be trained for combat, others would be trained for whatever war service they are physically and mentally qualified to perform." In our considered opinion, this would mean nothing short of military direction of labor, in addition to control over the fighting forces. Such a plan is against the ideals of our democratic freedom, and in the light of the splendid record of American labor in the past war we sharply disagree that legislation should be enacted supporting such a program, which would destroy the workers' opportunity to exercise their freedom of occupational choice.

In closing, I would like to say that we believe the bills presently being considered by your committee which deal with the conscription of our youth in peacetime should, in all fairness to those who sacrificed so much on the fighting fronts, be held in abeyance at least until they are back on their own soil, thus permitting them to have a voice in those measures that if enacted into law will seriously affect the lives of all American veterans and their children.

DECEMBER 10, 1945.

Need for Expansion of Georgia's Health Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, December 15 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the Georgia rural-health conference showing the need for expanding and improving Georgia's health services.

Similar studies of other States show that every State in the Union is in need of some expansion and improvement in its health services.

The chairman of the Education and Labor Committee and I have introduced a bill—S. 1606—which provides a comprehensive health program designed to improve health services in every community in the United States. Representative DINGELL has introduced a companion bill in the House of Representatives—H. R. 4730.

Our bill provides for a four-point health program:

First. Existing Federal grants to the States for public-health service are broadened and increased to speed up the progress of preventive health services.

Second. Existing Federal grants to the States for maternal and child-health and welfare services are broadened and strengthened.

Third. Health insurance is made available.

Fourth. Grants-in-aid are provided from social-insurance funds to nonprofit institutions engaging in medical education or research.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS GEORGIA ONLY HALF WAY TO HEALTH?

This is true so far as public-health nurses and health officers are concerned. Georgia needs twice as many as its present health program provides; it needs three times as many public sanitarians. Hospital facilities are even further below par compared with the Nation as a whole.

WHAT IT MEANS

Compare Georgia's vital statistics record with the Nation's to see what this means in wasted human resources—sickness and death. The table here contrasts the records for 1940. (Rates are per 100,000 population except where noted.)

	Maternal death-rate[1]	Infant death rate[1]	Typhoid death rate	Malaria death rate	Diphtheria death rate	Tuberculosis death rate	Syphilis death rate
Georgia	5.3	57.8	2.2	2.8	1.9	49.1	18.8
United States	3.8	47.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	45.8	14.4
Difference	1.5	10.8	1.1	1.7	.8	3.3	4.4

[1] Per 1,000 live births.

RURAL HEALTH IS THE KEY

Georgia's health problem is largely a problem of medical care and facilities for its predominantly rural population. There are not enough doctors, nurses, health officers, and hospitals in the rural areas.

For instance, although the population of the State is 65.6 percent rural (in 1940) most of the doctors and dentists and hospital facilities are concentrated in city areas. A report of the health panel of the State agricultural and industrial development board says that what medical facilities we have are badly distributed in relation to population.

Doctors and dentists: Georgia has 1 doctor for every 2,000 people. That is accepted by health experts as an adequate ratio. However, 1 doctor for every 1,000 to 1,500 people is considered a better standard. And although we have an adequate number of doctors, they are not spread over the State in the right proportion to take care of our rural population. Only 20 counties have the adequate ratio of 1 doctor for every 2,000 people. In 75 counties 1 doctor has to care for 3,000 or more people. In 61 counties 1 doctor has to serve from 2,000 to 3,000 people. Two counties have no doctor at all. The problem of dental care is much the same. Forty-five percent of the dentists of the State are concentrated in the Atlanta area.

Hospitals: Georgia does not have enough hospitals. The State's hospital facilities add up to an average of 1.4 beds for every 1,000 people. The national average is 6 beds per 1,000. What hospital facilities we have are badly distributed. Half of the hospital beds of the State are concentrated in the Atlanta area, where there is only 24 percent of the population. Only 6 counties have 5 or more beds per 1,000 population. Eighty-five counties have no general hospital beds at all.

Personnel: The health panel report says Georgia's present expenditure of 80 cents per capita (made up of local, State, and Federal funds) provides only half the number of public health nurses and health officers and only one-third of the number of sanitarians needed for an effective health program. One nurse for every 5,000 people is called an adequate minimum, 1 for every 2,500 the ideal ratio. Georgia has only 1 public health nurse for every 10,000 people. One health officer for every 30,000 people is considered adequate. Georgia has 1 for every 65,000 people. One sanitarian for every 20,000 people is considered the minimum ratio. Georgia has 1 for every 60,000 people.

THE ANSWER?

The health panel report says Georgia vital statistics show that diseases which can be controlled by immunization—such as typhoid and diphtheria—"are rapidly approaching the irreducible minimum," but that diseases not controllable by immunization have not decreased at anything like a comparable rate. The reason, says the panel, "constitutes the gravest problem * * * facing Georgia in the field of health—lack of physicians and medical facilities. * * *"

The only answer seems to be more doctors and dentists, more hospitals, more public-health services for Georgia's rural population. Statistics show that the death rate for most diseases is higher in rural areas than in urban areas. Rural people are ill more often and for longer periods of time than city people. The selective-service rejection was higher among farm youth than any other occupational group. Obviously, our rural health program needs considerable expansion.

PROPOSALS

The health panel report sets out a detailed plan for expanding and improving Georgia's health services. It proposes a State-wide program to attain by long-range planning the following goals:

Three beds per 1,000 persons for acute general hospital facilities.

A general hospital within 35 miles of every patient.

Acute general hospital to be of not less than 100-bed size.

Maternity shelter and emergency facilities in each county.

A well-developed medical center at each of the State's two medical schools,

Modern out-patient health center facilities, including dental, in all towns of more than 500 population.

Tuberculosis hospitals in each of the nine health areas into which the State would be divided, each large enough to furnish two beds per annual tuberculosis death.

Why State-wide? The alternative to an integrated State-wide health and hospital program is for each county or municipality to establish its own facilities. On this basis, 90 of Georgia's 159 counties would have to spend more than 10 percent of their local revenue to pay for one public health nurse. If each county had to operate a separate hospital for its citizens only the hard fact is that only 16 counties in Georgia have populations large enough to justify a 100-bed hospital. Since it is generally accepted that hospitals of less than 75-bed size cannot provide the best of medical care and at the same time be operated economically, the sparsely settled rural areas would still suffer from insufficient facilities.

Low cost care: Any program designed to raise the standards of Georgia health must reach all citizens. Low cost or free medical care must be provided for part of the popu-

lation. This is made obvious when we consider that 30 percent of the people of Georgia have incomes under $1,000 a year, and 53 percent live on incomes ranging from $1,000 to $2,000. In these facts lies the proof that poverty and poor health go hand in hand.

HOW TO DO IT?

Such a full program of health education and medical care as Georgia needs obviously costs money. Yet the waste of human resources caused by disease is even more costly. The need for a program cannot be denied. Rural people themselves certainly realize this need and want something done about it. A recent bulletin of the United States Department of Agriculture said surveys reveal that more than four-fifths of farmers interviewed favor an increase in public-health clinics for rural areas.

GEORGIA RURAL HEALTH CONFERENCE,
Academy of Medicine, Atlanta, Ga.

Sponsored by the following organizations: American Cancer Society, Georgia division; American Legion; Committee for Georgia, Southern Conference for Human Welfare; Georgia Conference on Social Welfare; Georgia Congress of Parents and Teachers; Georgia Congress of Colored Parents and Teachers; Georgia Council of Church Women; Georgia Council of Negro Women; Georgia Educational Association; Georgia Federation of Labor; Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs; Georgia Home Demonstration Council; Georgia League of Women Voters; Georgia State Industrial Union Council (CIO); Georgia Teachers Association; Georgia Tuberculosis Association; National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, Georgia chapter; Southern Regional Council; Woman's Christian Temperance Union; Young Women's Christian Association; Youth Division, Georgia Citizens Council.

SEPTEMBER 13, 1945.

Loan to Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, December 15 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article headed "Mallon derides British loan," written by Paul Mallon and published in the Fargo (N. Dak.) Forum of December 12, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MALLON DERIDES BRITISH LOAN
(By Paul Mallon)

WASHINGTON.—A few of the bravest administration Congressmen said God loves everyone and the British loan agreement is a good one immediately after it was announced.

The suspicious or knowing Congressmen roundly denounced it.

But the bulk ducked and ran when they saw newsmen coming to seek comment. These detected a high aroma of unpopularity about the whole affair wafted in the first puff of the news from the State Department. They did not know much of its vast unfathomable ramifications.

What they knew, they did not like. And the deeper they went into it, the less they liked it. It was so bad few wanted to be connected with it one way or another.

Indeed its sponsors, in the sacred halls of the Department, were not eager to champion the success of their negotiations in Congress. They rather made plain they would welcome a delay at least until Parliament has acted on the Bretton Woods agreement, and would not press for approval until after the Christmas holidays.

If Britain turns down Bretton Woods, our sensationally modest official enthusiasm for this thing will be revised downward.

The first superficial examination of the proposition by the Congressmen was enough for most.

We are to lend Britain far more than her whole canceled First World War debt. The amount to be advanced is $3,750,000,000 while the old war debt still owed is $2,331,000,000, less than two-thirds as much.

The only way we can raise this money is by borrowing from our people. The interest charge to us is not less than 2⅜ percent. The loan to the British carries only 2 percent. But we must pay our people interest from the date of the loan.

For the British, interest will not start until 5 years, at least so the publicity said. Actually her interest payments will not start until 5 years after December 31, 1946—more than 6 years hence.

The British permanent under chancelor of exchequer, Sir Edmond Bridges, succeeded in slipping the extra year in at the last moment.

Britain can use this money any way she chooses. The publicity put stress upon her likelihood of buying American products. This is but one purpose among many specified. The others are so broad as to permit her to spend the sums through her treasury any way she wishes.

Simultaneous announcement was made by Mr. Attlee to Parliament that, of course, he was going ahead with the socialization of Britain. To buy coal mines, utilities, and other businesses, he will issue bonds to his people, but not delayed action bonds. No one can give offhand the cost of British socialization but it will be certainly $3,750,000,000 added to British exchequer obligations.

The use of our money to protect the British financial position permits the socialist experiment. Otherwise that added debt could not be carried, judging from the official British statements of her financial plight.

But on our loan, we get nothing for 5 years (what will happen in this atomic age by then?) while Britain can draw the money as she wants it.

This is, strangely enough, the best feature of the deal. It gets worse from here on. The lend-lease deal is almost unbelievable. Britain owes us about $25,000,000,000 under what Mr. Roosevelt deceptively called lend-lease.

Now it is officially said this money and goods were neither loaned nor leased. Mr. Roosevelt had a provision for repayment in kind, so we could at least get some of our equipment back for use or scrap. That is forgotten in the current arrangement.

Britain gets the title to everything we have given her for what the agreement calls a payment of $50,000,000 to $700,000,000.

This is not a "payment." We merely add it on to the loan which is to start becoming a loan 6 years after the money is paid. Actually Britain pays nothing unless or until she pays the new loan 56 years hence. In short we throw away $25,000,000,000 of debt for a new debt of "$50,000,000 to $700,000,000" to begin in 6 years.

What do we get? We get promises. Nothing definite about anything. No time limit or signed specific plan of immediate action. We get a hope of negotiating the abandonment of the various gypping arrangements by which Britain has maintained her trade—Empire preferences, antidollar pools, sterling blocs, and cartels.

They do not promise to abandon all these immediately or at any time. They promise to negotiate about abandoning them, which, of course, means nothing. Whether they do abandon these practices or not is left to future negotiation—and a world trade conference next year.

Note well Mr. Truman's careful words about the credit "making it possible" for the United Kingdom to expand multilateral trade; and Mr. Vinson's claim that it opened "the likelihood" of a less competitive trade world.

We got "possibilities" and "likelihoods"; and they got the $25,000,000,000 we have already supplied, plus $3,750,000,000 more at less interest that it will cost our Treasury to raise the money for any purpose she chooses.

The Threat of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an editorial taken from the Veterans of Foreign Wars publication, Foreign Service, December 1945 issue.

The veterans are very much concerned about the threat of inflation. It is going to take the cooperative efforts of all groups to prevent the kind of inflation that is now threatening us.

The editorial is as follows:

THE THREAT OF INFLATION

The danger that cost-of-living prices will zoom upward to calamitous levels is today's most serious threat to the welfare of the Nation's returning veterans. Unless positive, cooperative action is taken to ward off inflation, the returning veteran is destined to be the No. 1 victim of conditions that will destroy his faith in America—and his every chance to build anew for the future.

Following World War I in 1917 everybody expected living costs would drop. Government controls against inflation were promptly liquidated. For a few months following World War I, living costs actually did sag but there soon followed a scramble for raw materials and goods that sent prices up faster than during the war.

The records show that more than 40 percent of the increase in living costs during the World War I era, took place between March 1919 and June 1920. Then the American people reached the point where they could no longer buy the things that they needed at prevailing prices. Deflation swept the country nearly overnight. Factory pay rolls shrank 44 percent. Employment fell off more than five million. Business profits turned to losses. Between 1919 and 1921, farmers' incomes dropped more than 60 percent. In the next 5 years more than 450,000 lost their farms.

We have been told that production is the only effective antidote against both inflation and deflation. This means there is only one way to prevent economic chaos. When goods and commodities are scarce, the people who have money to spend will readily pay more for the things they want to buy. Thus they will give the green light to spiraling prices. However, when people can easily purchase the commodities they need, the tendency to demand the most that they can get for their money will keep prices in reach of all.

As long as the consumer has the necessary purchasing power the wheels of industry will

keep turning, our farmers will find a market for their products and returning veterans will find profitable employment.

The temptation to cut loose from the shackles of Government controls is sweet but let's not make the same mistake we did after the First World War. There must be no complete relaxation of Government controls until the danger of inflation is over—and when all the men who are due to leave the armed forces will have the chance to speed their readjustment to civilian life as quickly as possible.

Without question, America is faced with a situation which demands nearly perfect teamwork between Government, business, labor, farmers, and all other elements of our national life.

If we invite a repetition of the tragic consequences of the early twenties, then the men who won the victory over the Axis Powers will have every right to question the gratitude of the American people.

Protest Against Enemy Alien Testimony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Evalyn Walsh McLean and also a letter written by Dr. Carruthers, a former Navy chaplain, to the Times-Herald:

MRS. M'LEAN PROTESTS JAP AS COURT-MARTIAL WITNESS

The following telegram was sent last night to Secretary of the Navy Forrestal by Mrs. Evalyn Walsh McLean:

"DEAR MR. SECRETARY: When I first read and heard the rumors that the Navy Department was going to call a Japanese captain of a submarine to testify against one of our own American boys, I simply did not believe it.

"When I read the paper this evening I was shocked and horrified to think that you, as the Secretary of the Navy, or anybody connected with you in your office, would allow such a farce and travesty to be perpetrated against our American democracy.

"Knowing what these wretched perverts have done to our people and to the other peoples of the world who they have had in their power, knowing full well that their oath and their word of honor is less than a scrap of paper—yet men like you still have faith in their word and their honesty to allow them to testify against one of our own.

"I just hope, Mr. Secretary, that you and the people under you who are responsible for allowing this to happen will never realize how bitterly the soldiers and sailors feel about it tonight.

"It is one of the most disgraceful actions that our democracy has suffered up to date under the theory we must have justice for all.

"Remember, Mr. Secretary, there is no such word as "justice" when you deal with liars, with perverts, and with human scum that is lower than any animal.

"If the perverted Jap testified that our boy was wrong, and our American boy—who I have the greatest faith in—said the Jap was lying, who would you believe?

"I personally would believe our own boy, but apparently the Navy is ready to at least give consideration to the testimony of a lying little Japanese handy man, who, thanks to the credulity of the Navy, has been made an important poor fool for a few days.

"Mr. Secretary, is the United States of America being asked to choose between the testimony of a Japanese or the testimony and word of one of our American boys?

"I know how I would decide this matter. What about the rest of the United States of America?

"EVALYN WALSH MCLEAN."

COSMOS CLUB,
Washington, D. C., December 15, 1945.
EDITOR, THE TIMES HERALD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The surrender instrument which the Japanese signed on the U. S. S. *Missouri* occasioned a notable historic statement by the supreme commander of the Allied forces in the Pacific war zone, which should be noted and most closely studied.

General MacArthur in effect stated in one clear sentence a point of view that all chaplains of all faiths accept. I think we may include scholars of all religions and discerning statesmen scientifically versed in legal history, philosophy, and jurisprudence. Clergymen, citizens, and professors with real understanding and patriotic appreciation confirm his view that the basic question was theological in the peace settlement.

The Japanese were told that their surrender was not so much a military victory as a finale for Japanese theology now defeated after conflict with an American theology which produced a Christian civilization of law, ethics, freedom, mercy, justice, and right.

What he meant was that the phrase "God and country" which the veterans of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars of War I and II accept as the ideal of war service cannot be in any ethical sense theologically the same as the Japanese banzai to Emperor Hirohito because he is nothing more than the puppet god of the world, whatever his pseudo claim is.

With a lieutenant commander son in the Navy and a seaman first class daughter in the WAVES, I am compelled as a former chaplain of the United States Navy myself and as the first appointed chief chaplain of morale, education of the Navy and Marine Corps, representing the Secretary of the Navy, to say that the MacArthur statement is the most profound, acceptable, and simple reduction of the war issue between Japan and the United States to be found in one sentence in current history.

What others may think is their affair in this free country. But I find myself unable to view without grave national concern the highly improper precedent of admitting the testimony of a Japanese enemy alien (?) into the court-martial history of the United States Navy, especially because this enemy allegedly torpedoed the vessel of the defendant in the case. My observation would be that such a course is unwise, unsuitable, legally dangerous, un-American, and damaging to the Christian traditions.

How did this enemy alien Japanese officer enter this case over the protest of Captain Cady, attorney for the defense? It seems rather incredible that this could happen while a state of war still exists between Japan and the Allied Powers. Still more astounding is the fact that this Japanese officer apparently sank the vessel of the defendant and now his word takes on face both here and doubtless in Japan, where much can be made of it.

As a sometime chaplain of the Navy, I find I must dissent from the apparent assumption of the court that the oath this Japanese officer takes is in any comparable legal sense sacred alongside the oath of an American officer educated in the honorable tradition of Annapolis and commissioned to serve God and country in line with his forebears in the military forces of the Nation.

As a private citizen, born in the bible belt of Kansas, and resident for 20 years in Pasadena, where the Japanese component of population was rather large during these 20 years, it would be my impression that the President of the United States and the Congress might well undertake to see to it that this shintoistically-sworn oath and testimony, whether it serves or hinders the legal situation, be expunged on the record as incompetent and an improper military precedent dangerous and unbecoming to a Nation that respects the Christian and legal traditions of America.

In this decidedly unique instance of what seems to me to be an error in procedure, it would be my feeling that it is time for light and not heat to be turned onto this question. With that in mind I would welcome a research into the Army and Navy archives which would probably take some time to find out whether or not it would be wise to change the general philosophy of military urisprudence. So far I have been unable to find any precedent in the Army and Navy archives that in the slightest degree approach this instance identically. Research may show that I am wrong. With sincere conviction.

Dr. JOHN F. B. CARRUTHERS,
Former Chaplain, U. S. S. Oklahoma, Overseas World War I. Former American Legion Post Chaplain, Pennsylvania. Member, Veterans of Foreign Wars, California.

TELEPHONE CALL FROM CHAPLAIN DR. F. B. CARRUTHERS AT THE COSMOS CLUB

My opposition to the admissibility to an enemy alien Japanese officer into a United States Navy court martial rests upon moral grounds because I was a former chaplain of the battleship *Oklahoma*, sunk at Pearl Harbor, and I am the father of a daughter and son in the United States Navy now. I do not pretend to be an authority on naval law nor to criticize the fair-play intent of the Navy Department.

As a graduate of Princeton University, Princeton Seminary, Princeton Graduate School, I feel competent to say that the honor and truth are something that a Japanese alien officer cannot understand as a chaplain understands those words. It is more than a problem of semantics. It is a problem of Christian America versus Japanese Shintoism. That is why General MacArthur called the issue between Japan and America a theological one in nature.

Loans to Foreign Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Rothwell Brown from the New York Journal-American of November 21, 1945:

LOANS TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

(By George Rothwell Brown)

WASHINGTON, November 21.—If Prime Minister Attlee's chief errand in Washington was in connection with the proposed British "loan"—rather than with the secret of the atomic bomb, as many believe—he has not aided his cause in Congress.

Congress may not have the last say with regard to splitting the atom, but when it comes to splitting our Treasury deficit it cannot be ignored.

As pointed out in this place some time ago, Washington is jittery over the application of atomic energy to military purposes. Notwithstanding the United Nations Organization, there are freely expressed fears of a third world war.

So what many realists in Congress are asking is "In that event and if Europe cannot prevent another war, why should we finance it?"

It isn't a foolish question at all for that is precisely what we did after World War I.

On the eve of World War II, 16 European countries owed to the United States Government $11,433,857,402.72, on a total indebtedness of nearly thirteen billions.

All but little Finland had defaulted on interest and principal. The argument was that they could not afford to repay sums which had been borrowed from Uncle Shylock to save them from conquest.

In 1937 in a speech in the House, Representative ROY WOODRUFF, of Michigan, a Republican Member of the Ways and Means Committee, made certain statements about these debts which are being recalled today, as Europe again turns to the United States for financial assistance in fabulous amounts. He said:

"It was officially announced recently that the British Government is to spend for war materials and supplies during the next 5 years the enormous sum of seven and one-half billion dollars.

"His Majesty's Government now owes us the sum of $5,107,000,000. Of this amount $739,446,980.97 in principal and interest is past due.

"Their total debt to us constitutes approximately two-thirds the sum they propose to spend within the next 5 years for their Navy and other war equipment—and yet they would have us believe they are financially unable to pay us, their saviors, the comparatively modest sum they formerly agreed to pay."

Mr. WOODRUFF then went on to discuss the debt of $4,081,227,249 which France then owed the United States—and which France still owes. He thus referred to France:

"And what have they been doing since the day they declined to make further payments on their debt to us? They have been spending more and more each year preparing for war. A small part of the money they are spending each year for this purpose would meet their pledged payments to us, and we would have some assurance that the American people are going to be taxed eventually to discharge this obligation."

Turning then to Russia—which is again seeking an American loan—Mr. WOODRUFF said:

"The Government of Soviet Russia has been recognized officially by the United States. The people of that country owe the people of this country $366,688,455.88. Payment of this debt constitutes a sacred obligation upon the existing (Russian) Government, regardless of its character."

Germany, in 1937, owed the United States, as Mr. WOODRUFF pointed out, $1,200,000,000. And Germany, he added, was rebuilding her military machine.

How escape the conclusion that it was with money owed to the American people that Europe after World War I armed for World War II?

National Intelligence Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, this summer a committee of 11 Members of Congress made a study of conditions in several countries, and upon our return we made certain recommendations, one of which was a recommendation that our intelligence forces be combined into a superintelligence force.

The State Department has about completed its master plan to blanket the world with a superintelligence system, it was disclosed last night. As chairman of the group, consisting of Congressmen WICKERSHAM, DONDERO, WEISS, FEIGHAN, MERROW, RAMEY, CHELF, CARNAHAN, HORAN, FULTON, and HUBER, I wish to compliment the President and the State Department upon their decision to inaugurate this plan. I feel sure I speak the sentiments of each member of the group which composed the committee.

The United States has never had such a system in peacetime. Perhaps the lack of one permitted Japan to plot world conquest virtually undetected and allowed Hitler to move into many countries before he was checked. Soon after President Truman took office he took action to correct the situation.

The plan will definitely strengthen the foreign policy of the United States of America and provide sources of valuable information for the policy makers. It will be presented to the President for final approval soon.

This plan calls for establishment of a National Intelligence Authority. It would be composed of the Secretaries of State, War, and Navy, with Secretary of State Byrnes as chairman. In security matters the heads of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Treasury would join those previously mentioned.

In the past, especially during wartime, the intelligence units of the United States of America have been somewhat disjoined. Principal aim of the new program is to coordinate them through the State Department. This would rightfully provide a cohesive espionage service throughout the world.

The intelligence agents will be required to keep an active and thorough check on everything in foreign countries from the development of atom energy to conditions of unrest which might lead to another war.

The proposed system would be an outgrowth of the Office of Strategic Services which is credited with giving the United States excellent and worth-while intelligence protection during the war.

It is expected that Col. Alfred McCormack, an able director of Army intelligence, is likely to hold the key assignment in the new system. He will likely be appointed executive secretary to coordinate interdepartmental operations. He would be supported by two advisory groups, one for intelligence and the other for security. The latter would include FBI and Treasury officials.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the adoption of our recommendations in this instance and in other instances since our report was made proves the value of such studies and substantiates our trip which we made in the national interest.

Oil, Blood, and Sand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me, I wish to call attention to a forceful article by Inge Kaiser, published in the December 17 issue of the New Republic. The article is a brilliant analysis of the role which oil plays in the Near East and of the inspired opposition to a democratic Jewish commonwealth in Palestine. It bears out many of the points I made when I spoke on the House floor in favor of a free government in Palestine that would offer a real homeland to oppressed Jewish people and rest upon the solid support of Arab and Jew alike.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I desire to include Miss Kaiser's article in the RECORD. It follows:

OIL, BLOOD, AND SAND

(By Inge Kaiser)

(King Ibn Saud, according to a recent news dispatch, is said to have stated his satisfaction with American oil companies and to have labeled rumors of cancellation of concessions as "a big wind." In answer to an inquiry by the Arabian American Oil Co., he repeated his deep concern about Palestine, but said he differentiates between American companies and government, which makes policy. His present revenue in royalties is estimated at $6,000,000 annually. It is possible that he has found during the last month that he could not follow through on his earlier threat, or he might want to hold that strategy until later. We believe the following considerations are still relevant to the situation in the Middle East.—I. K.)

In the eastern section of the Arabian peninsula the monotony of endless sand dunes is interrupted by the slim derricks of the Arabian American Oil Co. Out of these wells flows oil—and trouble. On the west side of the peninsula lies Palestine. Here the stranded Jews of Europe are trying to find refuge from persecution. No railroad or pipe line connects the two areas. Yet the request for unlimited immigration into Palestine has had strange repercussions: Ibn Saud, King of Saudi Arabia, has threatened that if this request is granted he will stop the flow of oil from Saudi-Arabian wells.

Until the arrival of the atomic age, the present is an oil age. In the words of Senator O'MAHONEY, "There is nothing that men and nations will not do to gain control of it [petroleum]. They have been known to bribe kings and potentates, to foment revolutions, to overthrow governments. Purely individual rights and interests have frequently been of very little moment in the struggle for petroleum." On the other hand, when questioned about the Palestine situation, Foreign Secretary Bevin declared, "The

British will not be affected by considerations of oil. This is a human problem."

What makes up this human problem? According to the Harrison report on conditions in Germany, there is a dire need and a great desire on the part of Jews to go to Palestine. The oft-stated obstacle of animosity between Arab and Jew doesn't jibe with recent reports on the ease and friendliness of relations between these two groups. The argument of Palestine's inability to support an increasing population has been boldly answered by one of the best reclamation experts of this country. The vast difference between the standard of living in present-day Palestine and that of surrounding Arab countries affords a glimpse of the agricultural and industrial potential.

Yet the Palestine question is being used as a political issue in Arab countries. The immediate demand all over the Western World for a settlement in Palestine has made the question acute. Ibn Saud, without reference to the human problem, threatens to cut off the oil. He is taking this stand because he fears the introduction of western ideas by Palestine-educated Arabs and the example of an industrialized Palestine to his feudal rule.

Ibn Saud must know full well that he could not operate the oil fields himself. Although Arabian American, the operating company (it is owned jointly by Standard Oil Co. of California and the Texas Co.), employs thousands of Arabs, for more complex jobs it imported Italian prisoners from Ethiopia and Eritrea, and repeated advertisements here beckon American workers to come to Saudi Arabia to perform the skilled tasks for the company. Of course, all administrative work is done by Americans. Actually to disown Arabian American would be to kill the goose that lays the golden eggs, unless His Highness has other plans in mind. Ibn Saud's treasury is too dependent upon outside contributions.

There are two explanations for Ibn Saud's bluff. He is either counting on Standard to put up a stiff fight for a continued State Department policy of appeasement, or on the economic rivalry among the Allied Powers with interests in the Middle East.

When, last May, the five berobed Arabian princes came to the San Francisco Conference, they were whisked about in Standard of California cars, their bills were paid by Standard. On their way up, they had been shown through some of the Texas oil fields and refineries by Standard Oil and Texas Co. officials, and in the Galveston area it had been arranged for them to be guests of the Navy.

Ibn Saud's relationship with Standard dates back to 1933. In 1930 Standard had acquired a concession on the Island of Bahrein, a sheikdom in the Persian Gulf. In order to gain marketing facilities, Standard sold a half interest to the Texas Co. Production had followed initial exploration so rapidly that Ibn Saud was deeply impressed with American methods. (English interests earlier had prospected and given up in that area.) Besides, the United States was not an imperialist power and would not be likely to interfere in his internal affairs. The Palestine question was not then acute. He granted Arabian American a large concession in 1933. Apparently, Ibn Saud was so well pleased with the way this relationship worked out that in 1939, in preference to much higher bids from the German and Japanese Governments, he awarded an additional concession over the remainder of his territory to this company. The payment was $1,500,000 in gold coin and a yearly rental of hundreds of thousand of dollars. In addition, Arabian American came to Ibn Saud's rescue financially with loans on advance royalties of about $10,000,000 between 1939 and 1941 alone. The annual royalty was about $1,500,000.

The Jews are still living in concentration camps in Europe. That is the human aspect. Ibn Saud knows that the combined investment of Standard and Texas in Saudi Adabia and Bahrein amounts to $100,000,000 already, and he appeals to Standard's interest in oil. Ibn Saud also knows that Standard is in a good position to take strong steps to protect its investment. Standard's people hold high jobs in many American Government departments.

Standard of California's vice president, Ralph K. Davies, is the Deputy Petroleum Administrator for War. In that capacity he had tremendous powers to direct the activities of the oil industry at home and abroad. He aided Secretary Ickes in negotiating the Anglo-American oil agreement. (Secretary Ickes himself stated that this agreement was designed to deal primarily with the Middle East oil problem.) James Terry Duce, vice president of Arabian American, was head of the Foreign Division of the PAW for 2 years. Under PAW's directive 70, he had almost plenipotentiary powers over foreign oil operations. The assistant director of the Theater Division of the Army-Navy Petroleum Board was Lt. Col. Eugene T. Kavanaugh, former Washington representative of the Bahrein Petroleum Co. (Standard of California and Texas' other Middle East subsidiary). Max W. Thornburg, vice president of Bahrein, was petroleum adviser in the State Department. And Arabian American's liaison man with the court of Ibn Saud was a main source of information on economic conditions in Saudi Arabia for the Cairo Embassy. It is no reflection on the honesty or patriotism of these individuals to point out that obviously, they could not be expected to follow governmental policies inimical to the interests of the companies from which they had come and to which they naturally expected to return.

When the trans-Arabian pipe line was first publicly proposed in February 1944, a project to be financed by the United States, there was such protest that it seemed as if Standard had overplayed its hand. Secretary Ickes, by the way, was not only concerned with oil problems; he was also interested in solving the human problem. Later in the same year he declared, "I * * * hope that the world's statesmen who gather to write the terms of an enduring peace will keep before them the tremendous possibilities for good which are inherent in the development of Palestine as a homeland for Jews, particularly for those unforunates who were the victims of the Germanic madness." Based on security considerations, the pipe-line plan was quite sound. The terms were so favorable, however, to the oil companies in the Middle East, and so unfavorable to the American people, that public opinion was aroused. And so was the envy of the nonparticipating oil companies, who clothed their objections in an outcry against Government entry into the oil industry. The strategic value of the pipe line to a powerful role of the United States in world politics remains. And Standard can be assured that diplomatic protection will be afforded this project if it is built privately by Arabian American, as now contemplated.

If United States security can be used by Standard as a tool to protect its interests in the Middle East, then Ibn Saud will be able to get away with playing his fifth ace. His bluff can be called only if United States foreign policy is based on the broad principles now established, integrating the supply of petroleum requirements with a democratic solution for Palestine.

Ibn Saud's other plan would also foil the hopes of homeless European Jews. Since companies of American nationals are by no means the only ones in the Middle East, he could try to play various national interests against each other.

As early as 1901 the British Government obtained a concession covering five-sixths of Iran. Iran is estimated to contain 25 percent of proved Middle East oil reserves: 4,000,000,000 barrels. In 1944, the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., whose majority stock is held by the British Government, was producing 100,000,000 barrels of oil, more than twice as much as the other Persian Gulf fields combined.

This Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. is one of four groups, each owning 23.75 percent of the stock of the Iraq Petroleum Co., the only concessionary in Iraq. The other groups are Royal Dutch Shell, Compagnie Nationale des Pétroles, and Near East Development Co., which, in turn, is owned by Standard of New Jersey and Socony. Iraq's reserves are estimated at 4,000,000,000 barrels. Production in 1944 was 28,000,000 barrels. In 8 years, from 1934 to 1942, more than $90,000,000 was paid to the Iraq Government.

The French, in addition to their share in Iraq Petroleum Co., hold the League mandates over Syria and Lebanon, although officially these countries were given their independence in 1943. Preliminary surveys promise large reserves in southern Syria. Iraq Petroleum's pipe line traverses both countries, with its terminal in Tripoli, Lebanon.

Russia obtained a large concession in northern Iran in 1907. In 1921, renouncing all imperialist objectives, she gave this right back to the Iranian Government, with the provision that no other concession be granted in that area without Russia's consent.

Ibn Saud might seek an agreement to operate his oil properties with one of these three governments. In 1938 the British were importing only 25 percent of their petroleum requirements from Iraq and Iran. Most of the remainder came from the Western Hemisphere. If forced to remain within their sterling bloc, the British might welcome an offer of the Saudi Arabian wells. France, too, might want to add to her economic and political strength by taking them over. Russia was recently trying to obtain an oil concession in Azerbaijan. She might find it opportune to spread her influence along her southern flank. Ibn Saud would probably fear this influence more than he would welcome the economic assistance. Yet he might approach any one of these powers for aid. If successful, he might gain support in his threat to immigration into Palestine.

The Anglo-American oil agreement, concluded in October, was designed to prevent schemes of this sort. Perhaps Secretary Ickes, in pushing it through, was concerned simultaneously for the solution of the Palestine problem. The agreement provides that concessions already granted shall be respected. But it is not yet binding. Moreover, only England and the United States are parties to it. The oil industry had been so aghast, at the first draft in 1944, at this new "Government interference" that it forced the elimination of the more constructive articles. Only immediate negotiation among all four powers concerned of a strong and binding treaty based on the principles of the Atlantic Charter can effectively call Ibn Saud's bluff.

The discussion of Ibn Saud's possible plans shows up the irresponsibility of past policy in respect to the exploitation of oil-bearing countries. Although their rulers grow rich on royalties, almost no improvement is made in the lot of the people, either by the producing company or by the potentate. Arabs are still dismally poor, diseased, and largely dependent upon the charity dispensed by their feudal lord. This situation is the source of Ibn Saud's strength.

If the living standards of the people themselves were improved—as a condition of oil production—by the introduction of irrigation and of modern agricultural methods, by the establishment of schools, hospitals, and other sanitary facilities, not only would some human problems be solved but a better relation between foreign nationals and Arabs would result. Markets would be created for oil and for American exports—and, incidentally, this method would more closely correspond to announced principles of

foreign policy. This program would also further weaken the present threat of a holy war, which even now is mere saber rattling. There are no organized troops at Ibn Saud's command. Nor is there the hatred of Jews depicted by some Arab leaders. Whatever there is of animosity seems chiefly inspired.

If American security depends upon access to Middle East oil, the suggestions made above could contribute to a solution of the oil problem and they could aid in solving the human problem of the Jews—and of the Arabs. A firm policy for Palestine combined with a firm policy for oil, carried out not by Standard's agents, but by responsible top executives, is the only method of proving Ibn Saud wrong. Otherwise, he will be justified in his faith in Standard's omnipotence, and in the inability of the Allies to resolve their economic conflicts.

United States Policy Toward China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by President Truman:

[From the Washington Sunday Star of December 16, 1945]

The Government of the United States holds that peace and prosperity of the world in this new and unexplored era ahead depend upon the ability of the sovereign nations to combine for collective security in the United Nations Organization.

It is the firm belief of this Government that a strong, united, and democratic China is of the utmost importance to the success of this United Nations Organization and for world peace. A China disorganized and divided either by foreign aggression, such as that undertaken by the Japanese, or by violent internal strife, is an undermining influence to world stability and peace, now and in the future.

The United States Government has long subscribed to the principle that the management of internal affairs is the responsibility of the peoples of the sovereign nations. Events of this century, however, would indicate that a breach of peace anywhere in the world threatens the peace of the entire world. It is thus in the most vital interest of the United States and all the United Nations that the people of China overlook no opportunity to adjust their internal differences promptly by methods of peaceful negotiation.

END OF HOSTILITIES URGED

The Government of the United States believes it essential:

1. That a cessation of hostilities be arranged between the armies of the National Government and the Chinese Communists and other dissident Chinese armed forces for the purpose of completing the return of all China to effective Chinese control, including the immediate evacuation of the Japanese forces.

2. That a national conference of representatives of major political elements be arranged to develop an early solution to the present internal strife—a solution which will bring about the unification of China.

The United States and the other United Nations have recognized the present National Government of the Republic of China as the only legal government in China. It is the proper instrument to achieve the objective of a unified China.

PACTS WITH CHINA RECALLED

The United States and the United Kingdom by the Cairo declaration in 1943 and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics by adhering to the Potsdam Declaration of last July and by the Sino-Soviet treaty and agreements of August 1945 are all committed to the liberation of China, including the return of Manchuria to Chinese control. These agreements were made with the National Government of the Republic of China.

In continuation of the constant and close collaboration with the National Government of the Republic of China in the prosecution of this war, in consonance with the Potsdam Declaration, and to remove possibility of Japanese influence remaining in China, the United States has assumed a definite obligation in the disarmament and evacuation of the Japanese troops. Accordingly, the United States has been assisting and will continue to assist the National Government of the Republic of China in effecting the disarmament and evacuation of Japanese troops in the liberated areas. The United States marines are in north China for that purpose.

The United States recognizes and will continue to recognize the National Government of China and cooperate with it in international affairs and specifically in eliminating Japanese influence from China. The United States is convinced that a prompt arrangement for a cessation of hostilities is essential to the effective achievement of this end. United States support will not extend to United States military intervention to influence the course of any Chinese internal strife.

REMOVAL OF JAPANESE INFLUENCE

The United States has already been compelled to pay a great price to restore the peace which was first broken by Japanese aggression in Manchuria. The maintenance of peace in the Pacific may be jeopardized, if not frustrated, unless Japanese influence in China is wholly removed and unless China takes her place as a unified, democratic, and peaceful nation. This is the purpose of the maintenance for the time being of United States military and naval forces in China.

The United States is cognizant that the present National Government of China is a one-party government and believes that peace, unity, and democratic reform in China will be furthered if the basis of this government is broadened to include other political elements in the country. Hence, the United States strongly advocates that the national conference of representatives of major political elements in the country agree upon arrangements which would give those elements a fair and effective representation in the Chinese National Government. It is recognized that this would require modification of the one-party political tutelage established as an interim arrangement in the progress of the nation toward democracy by the father of the Chinese Republic, Dr. Sun Yat-sen.

PROMISE OF AID HELD OUT

The existence of autonomous armies such as that of the Communist Army is inconsistent with, and actually makes impossible, political unity in China. With the institution of a broadly representative government, autonomous armies should be eliminated as such and all armed forces in China integrated effectively into the Chinese National Army.

In line with its often expressed views regarding self-determination, the United States Government considers that the detailed steps necessary to the achievement of political unity in China must be worked out by the Chinese themselves and that intervention by any foreign government in these matters would be inappropriate. The United States Government feels, however, that China has a clear responsibility to the other United Nations to eliminate armed conflict within its territory as constituting a threat to world stability and peace—a responsibility which is shared by the National Government and all Chinese political and military groups.

As China moves toward peace and unity along the lines described above, the United States would be prepared to assist the National Government in every reasonable way to rehabilitate the country, improve the agrarian and industrial economy, and establish a military organization capable of discharging China's national and international responsibilities for the maintenance of peace and order.

In furtherance of such assistance, it would be prepared to give favorable consideration to Chinese requests for credits and loans under reasonable conditions for projects which would contribute toward the development of a healthy economy throughout China and healthy trade relations between China and the United States.

American Policy in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles of William Philip Simms and Ernest Lindley from the Washington Post of December 17, 1945:

TWO-EDGED SWORD

(By William Philip Simms)

President Truman's statement on China policy, old China hands say, is a two-edged sword which can cut the ground from under either the Chinese Communists or the national government, depending on a number of "ifs."

If the Communists agree to merge their army with the national forces, and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek then refuses to broaden his government to include other political groups, he will find himself on the spot. Clearly he could no longer expect aid from the United States.

If, on the other hand, the Communists ignore the President's polite plea to cease hostilities and amalgamate their armies with the Chinese regulars, national unity will remain impossible. Blame would be laid on their doorstep.

There is still another "if." If the United States refused aid to China because unification had been prevented by the Communists' insistence on an army of their own, such refusal almost certainly would doom the generalissimo. Without American aid, China would face chaos and that would play into the hands of the Reds—especially if they retain their army, now strengthenced by recently acquired Jap equipment.

Thus, it is pointed out, the President's policy can hardly be as inflexible as some seem to think. True, he indicated that future American loans and credits to China would depend on unification and the "broadening" of the Chungking regime to include the Communists. But should unity fail as the result, say, of the Communists' refusal to give up their army, it would hardly be fair to blame the National Government and so deny it assistance.

This is regarded as important because, hitherto, efforts at unity have always failed on the issue of a single national army. As President Truman stated, "the existence of autonomous armies such as that of the Communist army is inconsistent with, and actually makes impossible, political unity in China." The generalissimo has always said

the same thing. But while he has more than once offered to take Communists into his government, grant a considerable degree of local autonomy in Red districts, and so on, agreement has consistently failed on the army issue at the last minute.

Chinese circles say the generalissimo will go along with President Truman. In fact, they observe, he made this clear as long ago as last September. Shortly after VJ-day he announced a three-point program: (1) Amelioration of the lot of farm and factory workers; exemption from land tax and a 25-percent reduction in land rent. (2) Inauguration of constitutional democracy; early convocation of a peoples' assembly; freedom of speech and association. (3) National unification and nationalization of all armed forces in the country.

The President's statement, therefore, would now seem to put it squarely up to the Communists. At the same time he has put a powerful weapon in their hands.

Some Chinese dissidents do not want help from the United States—if the help goes to the National Government. For more than a decade they have maintained an army in the field to overthrow that Government. Without help, the plight of the Chinese will rapidly become such that the Government may find itself so unpopular that a little push might send it toppling.

But, even now, General Marshall is on his way to Chungking. In his new Ambassador, the President will have a top-notch diplomat to carry out American policy in China and advise him on future interpretation.

GENERAL MARSHALL'S JOB—AMERICAN POLICY IN CHINA

(By Ernest Lindley)

President Truman's statement on American policy toward China is based squarely on our commitments and our interests—not only our narrower national interest but our broader interest in the preservation of world peace.

We continue to recognize the National Government of China as the legitimate government of China and the central instrument for achieving Chinese unity. We will continue to cooperate with it internationally and give it military assistance in disarming and evacuating Japanese troops. But we will not back it unconditionally in a civil war. We urge, instead, that Chiang Kai-shek abandon one-party rule and immediately convene a national conference of all political elements to organize a broadly representative government. We are prepared to give economic aid to a broadly representative regime.

The President's statement will not entirely please those who hold that we have no interest in what happens in China—that we should withdraw completely and let Nature and civil war take their course. It will not entirely please those who, for one reason or another, think that the Chinese Communists, or some other groups in China, provide a better vehicle than the central government for promoting democracy and eventual unity in China. Nor will it please those who think that we should back Chiang unconditionally.

The first two groups forget our commitments to a wartime ally, and our historical interests in the unity of China. They overlook the danger that a prolonged civil war would revive open rivalry among the other great powers in China.

Under the leadership of the United States all the other great powers have come to recognize the National Government of China not only as the legitimate government of all China but as one of the Big Five of the UNO. All of them have agreed that the Chinese territory wrested from Japan shall be placed under the jurisdiction of the National Government. The Russians appear to be fulfilling this commitment faithfully in Manchuria.

Thus, finally, after decades, the last international obstacles to historical American objectives—the territorial and administrative integrity of China—appear to have been removed. To pull out now and let Chinese internal strife take its own course would be unimaginably short-sighted.

We do not want to impose upon China an unpopular or unrepresentative government. We are interested in promoting democracy as well as unity within China. We recognize that the Chinese have the right to choose their own government. We therefore call on Chiang to abandon one-party rule and broaden his government, giving representation to other groups—including, of course, those which are unarmed, as well as the Chinese Communists. We recognize that with the broadening of the government, autonomous armies such as those controlled by the Communists must be eliminated and all armed forces integrated into the Chinese National Army.

We are not asking of Chiang anything which he himself has not offered to do. He has promised political and economic reforms. There have been previous efforts to unite the Chinese Communists and the Central Government and there has been disagreement among American observers as to whether the failure was due chiefly to the Central Government or chiefly to the Communists. Some of them felt that former Ambassador Hurley would have succeeded if he had put more pressure on the Central Government. Others felt, with Hurley, that his efforts were frustrated by the encouragement given to the Chinese Communists by some American representatives.

President Truman did not try to specify what, in his opinion, would be fair terms for the inclusion of the Chinese Communists in the Central Government, or what representation should be given to other groups now outside the Central Government. He said, in effect, that it is up to the Chinese to work this out for themselves. Yet, the United States probably will not be able to avoid judgment on the terms proposed by the various Chinese groups. For if the negotiations bog down, we will have to decide what to do next and we cannot very well decide that without deciding who is responsible for their bogging down.

The task before General Marshall is delicate: More of a diplomat's task than a soldier's. His objectives have been clearly stated by the President. But the means of furthering them will have to be determined very largely by General Marshall himself. Fortunately there should be no doubt, either in China or in this country, that he speaks and acts with authority.

Thanks to OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a news item emanating from Greenville, Tex., praising the OPA. It is as follows:

BELATED THANKS TO THE OPA

With the end of meat rationing, a recent news item had this to say in regard to a statement by OPA: "We can't help but feel hurt. After all we've done for the public, not one single letter of appreciation has been received." The Messenger hastens to send a belated message of thanks to the OPA for a job well done, a job that in itself was a thankless task, but we are supposed to grow wiser with the years. World War I should have taught us the folly of not being organized into a compact rationing system. OPA tried to organize so that a fair distribution of all available goods and products would be issued to the public. Because the heads of OPA were human beings, they were susceptible to mistakes, just as even the President or any human is susceptible. We were, indeed, fortunate in that most of us got a balanced diet, perhaps better for us physically, than most diets we have been accustomed to. We came out of the war a better Nation as a whole than we entered it. Some of us missed the big steaks, the bacon, hams, etc., that we used to enjoy, but our soldiers fared better, were in a better frame of mind, and were more physically fit. We were supposed to sacrifice. Most of us did. Most of us played fair, else the whole rationing program would have broken down. So our thanks go out to the OPA, its officials, clerks, and all others connected with it. We are sure that most people really are appreciative of the good work done by the OPA, but most of us looked upon it in the same sense that a child looks upon its parents—we just took everything for granted, without the thanks. Another thing, OPA, you had been telling us that this, that, and the other would soon be off the ration list, and again we just took it for graned. We just forgot. Because we are truly grateful.

Dear Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include the column Dear Washington by Helen Essary, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of December 16, 1945:

DEAR WASHINGTON

(By Helen Essary)

The general had been invited for cocktails. But on his way to the living room he passed the open library door and the staring keys of a typewriter.

"Excuse me," he said gruffly. "This is where I stop. This is my chance." Hastily turning "squads right," he marched to the desk, pulled out a chair, sat him down, and started to peck away at the keys. "I simply must do this. I've got to the point where I have to explode about the way this damnfool country of ours is committing suicide. How about giving me a couple of paragraphs to tell what I think? I've got to blow off steam. I'm not exactly a columnist. But if in any kind of a way I can make people—can make as many as two people—see that instead of holding the position we had in June 1945, when we were the most important nation on earth, we are running down to about a fifth-rate power. A fifth-rate power, I tell you! Why, of all the idiots, we Americans are the worst. We, we * * *"

With an ease that surprised me, inspired by indignation, no doubt, the general went to work. The typewriter table shook with the pounding of his fingers. His words, as I read them later, actually were milder than his manner. This is what he wrote:

"The United States is willfully, wickedly squandering its great power. We are break-

ing up our Army. Our Navy. Our air power. We are giving away money. We are destroying billions of dollars worth of ships and planes. Throwing away munitions. Food. Leaving supplies of all kinds to rot in foreign dumps.

"Our only thought is: We don't want to hear any more about war. We're sick of war. Get rid of the things of war. Melt down the guns. Scrap the ships and planes. Get the men out of uniform. Scrap everything. If I could write a national theme song I'd make it, 'Scrap it! Scrap it!'

"And I'm ashamed to confess," he added, "but 'Scrap it' would be a more popular note today than 'The Star-Spangled Banner.'

"The tragedy is that while we're saying, 'Scrap it!' out of one side of the mouth, we're whispering out of the other side about the next world war. We are saying that the Russians, the Argentinians, and Fiji Islanders and most of the other peoples of the world are itching to fight us. Does this make sense? I ask you—does this even begin to make sense?

"How in the name of the god of war do we expect to combat these enemies we insist are at our doorstep, if we disband our Army, blow up our Navy, sink our merchant ships, and give away our money?

"I'm convinced we are the most inconsistent human beings ever put on this earth. Many of us didn't want the United States to get into into this World War. We thought this country should mind its own affairs. Stop making excursions into the devious rabbit warrens of European politics.

"In many ways this kind of thinking was right. We Americans are not successful meddlers. However, once we began to meddle, we should have been prepared to see the thing through. You can't see the thing through abroad now without an Army and a Navy to back up your tall words. Yet when some disgruntled soldier appears before Congress and says that the Pentagon "Boy Scouts" are keeping men in service because thereby the officers hope to hold their wartime rank, the uproar starts again 'Get the boys home!'

"It wouldn't hurt to keep some of those new draftees away from mamma and the girls for a year longer. But we aren't doing that. We are leaving our gains unprotected at the mercy of any marauder.

"Six months ago we were the world authority on peace and war. We could go where we wanted to go. Create what we wanted to create. Our voice was respected. Our favor sought. Soon we shall have no air force, no Army, no Navy to prove we mean a single demand. We'll be where France is, I tell you. Nobody seems to mind, but Washington is slipping on more than the ice which covers her streets."

"Hurrah, General," I said. "Three cheers and a columnist's citation for you! You've said what thousands of people are thinking. We won this war at a fearful price. And now we are pouring our gains straight down the sewer. We sometimes have no more sense than jack rabbits."

"Let's change the subject," ordered the general, handing me his two typewritten pages. "The new year is almost here. Let's be gay if we can."

"Speaking of the new year and something gay," remarked a just-arrived caller, "look what I found in the classified ads of a Washington newspaper.

"Have you a furnished house to rent from December 31, 1945, to January 1, 1946? Must be within hour's run of Washington."

"H'm'm'm," grinned the General, suddenly cheery, "looks like a big night ahead. I've got some ads myself to contribute to the occasion since saving classifieds is now a Washington pastime. How are these two:

"'Temporary woman, white, wanted for partial care of householder and two small children.' And this: 'Cultured lady wants to ride to Palm Beach December 28 with small quiet dog?'"

Washington is indeed a funny place. For our proper indignation over the country's "scrap it" program now vanished. We soon were laughing over our amusing ways and thanking heaven that since all human beings were idiots, we had the good luck to be the American kind.

Not Unduly Exacting About the Laws—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Secretary Byrnes said that the United States was "not unduly exacting" in its relations to the Soviet Government he expressed, perhaps unconsciously, the extent to which we have abandoned our basic concept of law as a principle governing our actions to each other and our national acts toward other nations. For it is the nature of law to be both exigent and upright. It cannot "lean over backward."

In his book, The Anatomy of Peace, Mr. Emery Reves writes:

Throughout known history only one method has ever succeeded in creating a social order within which man had security from murder, larceny, and other crimes, and had freedom to think, to speak, and to worship.

That method is law.

And integrated social relations regulated by law—which is peace—have been possible only within social units with one single source of law, irrespective of the size, territory, population, race, and religion of such social units.

For the past 2,000 years over an increasingly large area of the globe there has been such a single basic source of law. From time to time, and in various places, its enforcement has varied, and its liberality to individuals has been steadily strengthened. But the concept of individual responsibility to the law, and of individual protection under the law has not been questioned, though it has often been violated.

Today, however, legislators must ask themselves upon what basis the laws they pass will be respected and supported by the courts and by the public. This is, quite possibly, the fundamental question of our time. Every control we seek to set up, whether for the safeguarding of atomic knowledge or against the spreading of disease and crime, depends upon the public attitude toward law.

This attitude, even within the boundaries of the United States, is now being profoundly, rapidly, and almost imperceptibly affected by two influences heretofore unknown or relatively weak.

The first, and most immediately powerful of these influences, is the new doctrine of "mass guilt" accepted by Mr. Justice Jackson, of the Supreme Court of the United States, in his opening statement to the trial court for German war criminals at Nuernberg. How this doctrine violates our historic concept of law is defined in the following article by Dr. Rustem Vambery, former dean of the law school in the University of Budapest, which was published in the December 1 issue of The Nation:

LAW AND LEGALISM

(By Rustem Vambery, professor of criminal law and former dean of the law school at the University of Budapest)

Jurists may still be wrangling over their concept of law, as Immanuel Kant accused them of doing nearly two centuries ago. There are, nevertheless, some established principles governing these allegedly indefinable rules of conduct. "Blut ist ein ganz besonderer Saft," wrote Goethe: and law, which circulates in the veins of the body politic, is a particular kind of precept. It is not merely a variety of prose divided into articles and sections. No lawmaker can afford to disregard the fundamental principles of law and jurisprudence. If he does, the enforced rules will be law only in name, as were the so-called laws issued by Mussolini and Hitler. Civilized nations have evolved these principles at the cost of millions of human lives, sacrificed in the struggle against tyranny, and no change in the substance of law should ignore them, for they are constituent parts of man's bill of rights and of our western civilization.

There can be no difference of opinion about the necessity of exterminating the monsters who were responsible for the unspeakable horrors in Europe and Japan. That the Nazi and Fascist leaders should be shot or hanged by the military or political power goes without saying, but has nothing to do with law. The selection of the culprits is the business of the political or military machinery. Application of a legal procedure in dealing with an unsuccessful revolution is not adequate, for, as a familiar couplet puts it:

"Treason can never prosper—What's the reason?
"If it does prosper none dare call it treason."

If an attempt is made to apply the law of a stable society to the atrocities of revolution and war in a world turned topsy-turvy, the narrow frame of law will burst without restoring the desirable order.

However, it was in defense of law and justice that the Allied forces fought and died—unless we use these terms as a euphemism cloaking imperialist interests. The law was not Polish or Dutch or French or Czechoslovak law, but the fundamental principles which are common to all civilization and which the authoritarian revolutions had flouted. Judges guided by sound popular feeling, introduction of the principle of retroactivity, the presumption of future guilt, the collective responsibility of a racial or political group, the denial of protection to the individual against the arbitrariness of the state, the revival of tribal revenge, and the most atrocious cruelty were salient features of what Hitler's Germany understood by law. Anyone familiar with the history of criminal law knows how many centuries or rather millennia it took before the exact opposite of this Nazi theory and practice became generally recognized as an integral part of law and justice.

This historical development should not be ignored by the Allies in their endeavor to restore pre-Nazi law. Thus far the trial of war criminals in France and elsewhere has revealed little respect for prewar legal principles. Unfortunately, the indictment of the leading war criminals filed with the International Military Tribunal also exhibits characteristics reminiscent of Hitlerian jurisprudence. Of course the United Nations War Crimes Commission would not confess to the application of such homeopathic methods, but the fact seems clear. The indictment is partly a succinct account of the events of World War II, partly a summary of the horrors perpetrated by Germans in occupied areas and in Germany itself. However, when it declares without any supporting evidence that about 4,000,000 persons were exterminated in Auschwitz and

one million tortured in Rovno and does not say who committed these unprecedented crimes, it must be regarded as an explanation of why the Allies waged the war rather than as a legal document.

In his report to the President, Justice Jackson warned against the danger that the trials would become enmeshed in "doctrinal disputes, which are part of a lawyer's paraphernalia." It appears from the indictment itself, which repeatedly refers (sections VIII and X) to "the general principles of criminal law as derived from the criminal law of civilized nations," that the fundamental principles of jurisprudence are not merely whimsies of pettifogging lawyers or, as Lord Wright has put it, "pseudo-legal or legalistic rules having no basis in the common conscience of mankind." Observance of these principles is not merely the craft of the legal guild; the doctrine of law is not a professional artifice but the guaranty of the freedom of all the citizens.

It is regrettable that the indictment, which conforms neither to the principles of law in general nor to the principles of international or criminal law in particular, as these are "derived from the criminal law of all civilized nations," should not be in accordance with the first principle of all justice—impartiality and disinterestedness. Prior to Hugo Grotius the victors had the right to punish the vanquished, but in our age it seems strange that an international court composed exclusively of the victor powers should pass judgment on the war criminals of the vanquished. It is true, however, that one of the judges, Prof. Donnedieu de Vabres, may be considered impartial, since he insisted in one of his books that the democratic states should accept the criminal policy of the authoritarian governments.

Moreover, it is the charter establishing this International Military Tribunal which defines the crimes for which the war criminals are going to be tried—if the words "other inhuman acts committed against any civilian population, before (how long before?) or during the war" can be termed a definition at all. According to the late Elihu Root, "If the law of nations is to be respected, the theory upon which the criminal law is founded must be adopted in respect to offenses against international law."

Thus far no authoritative attempt has been made, in custom or in general practice, to extend the precepts of international law—the sources of which are listed in article 38 of the Statutes of the Permanent Court of International Justice—to cover the condemned and forbidden conduct of individuals. After the assassinations at Marseilles the French Government suggested that the League of Nations set up an international criminal court, but to no avail; and as one of the greatest American authorities, Manley O. Hudson, has said (International Tribunals, 1944, p. 136), "The time is hardly ripe for the extension of international law to include judicial process for condemning and punishing acts either of states or individuals." The jurisdiction of the International Military Tribunal can therefore scarcely be said to rest on a firm basis, since its charter, like all rules of international law, requires acceptance by the customs of all civilized nations. Even if we agree with Viscount Simon, former Lord Chancellor of England, who said on March 20 last in the House of Lords, that a "properly constituted military court has jurisdiction in an occupied country to deal with war crimes," the competence of such a court with regard to "crimes against peace and humanity" is doubtful. There is no reason whatever why a German who murdered or enslaved anyone in Germany should not be tried by a German court. Lord Wright, one of the judges at Nuernberg, wrote: "We are proud that we live under the rule of law and of the legal machinery for enforcing it." I wonder whether we should be proud of the rules of procedure which the prosecutors appointed by the victor powers have agreed upon.

Even more contrary to the principles of criminal law and as unprecedented in the nonauthoritarian part of the world is the determination of what should be considered "crime" by the victors, that is, by the prosecutors, as it appears from the report of Justice Jackson to the President and the definition of the "crimes" in the charter. A liberal German scholar, Franz von Liszt, termed the penal code the magna carta of the criminal; certainly it is the magna carta of the honest citizen, whom it protects against the arbitrariness of the authorities. A fundamental principle of law is that the law should decide the punishment and define as precisely as possible the acts constituting the punishable crime. But the charter not only leaves to the tribunal, as Viscount Simon expressed it, "the prodigious responsibility to select the punishment" but defines the crimes in a legally inexact, indeed in an appallingly vague, manner. Article 6, point C, of the charter speaks of "crimes against humanity," namely, murder, extermination, enslavement, etc. Murder, which by the law is no crime against humanity but against human life, is defined very differently in the English common law and in the French Penal Code. Who is going to decide what was an "inhumane act" 20 years before the war? If the International Military Tribunal does so, what differentiates it from Hitler's law courts, where the judge passed sentence according to the "sound sense of the people"?

Count I of the indictment is a "common plan or conspiracy to commit crimes against peace, war crimes, and crimes against humanity." Leaders and accomplices are "individually responsible for their own acts and for all acts committed by any persons in the execution of such plan or conspiracy." In plain language, the collective responsibility that prevailed in the tribal age of mankind is restored, in spite of the principle, recognized even by Roman law, that "a society cannot commit crimes." It took a long time for the recognition of responsibility for criminal guilt to become "the basic principle of the judicial and legal system of Western civilization in the last century" (Sutherland, Principles of Criminology, 1939, p. 352). In violation of this fundamental principle all participants of the conspiracy are being indicted not only for their own acts but for those of other conspirators, no matter whether they knew of them or not. This is all the more reprehensible as the crime termed "common plan or conspiracy" embraces also all crimes against peace, all war crimes, and crimes against humanity.

This means, for example, that Gustav Krupp van Bohlen—or perhaps his son, who has become a criminal according to the rules of the Pentateuch, which visit the sins of the fathers upon their sons—having helped the Nazis to power and used labor for the conduct of an aggressive war, is supposed to be responsible for all murders and other horrors perpetrated by any Gestapo or S. A. man, even if he is unaware where, when, and by whom these crimes were committed.

Collective responsibility hinges on the crime against peace, which is "defined" as planning, preparing, or waging a war of aggression or participating in the planning of such war. We are not told exactly what constitutes an "aggressive war," but the facts substantiating this crime are all political and military events that occurred after the foundation of the Nazi Party in 1920. We may take it for granted that the outrageous deeds of the Nazi regime, as a report to the President assumed, offended the conscience of the American people, who "viewed the Nazis as a band of brigands." However, the United States maintained diplomatic relations with this "band of brigands" up to Pearl Harbor without, apparently, preventing the execution of "the Nazi master plan."

We are told that only acts should be punished "which have been regarded as criminal since the time of Cain." Many despots, tyrants, and dictators have indeed committed atrocities which from time immemorial have been considered crimes. But in no country has the planning or waging of aggressive war ever been tried by a law court.

Autant pis, some people may say. If aggressive war thus far has been no crime, it is certainly desirable that it should be made punishable. Whether the charter has the authority to fill this lacuna is doubtful. But such legislation cannot be made retroactive anyway—not only because article 9 of the Constitution of the United States interdicts ex post facto laws but because all tyrants from Nero to Hitler have used retroactivity, as Professor Lauterpacht puts it, "for cloaking arbitrariness in the garb of law." But this is exactly what the indictment is doing. One of its authors, Justice Jackson, asserts the contrary and as evidence refers to the Briand-Kellogg Pact of 1928, which outlawed war, and to the Geneva protocol of 1924 and the resolution of the Pan-American Conference of 1928, both of which declared that war of aggression is an international crime. This argument, however, is fallacious in two ways. The Nazi Party and its subsidiary organizations, founded in 1920, became "the instrument of cohesion among the defendants and their coconspirators" (Indictment, count I, 4, A). In other words, the accusation refers in part to action predating the above-quoted international conventions, which declared aggressive war to be an "international crime."

Assuming, however, that the conspiracy to wage an aggressive war continued after such a war had been declared a crime. It still cannot be ignored that "a conspiracy to commit a crime is a different offense from the crime that is the object of conspiracy" (W. Mack-W. B. Hale: "Corpus Juris," vol. XII, p. 542). Now, crime is "a wrong directly or indirectly affecting the public to which the state has annexed certain punishments" ("Corpus Juris," vol. XVI, p. 51), and the "guilty knowledge of the act done by the conspirators is a necessary element without proof of which there can be no conviction" ("Corpus Juris," vol. XII, p. 552). Moreover, it is generally accepted that "a law providing punishment for an act which was criminal when done but for which no punishment was provided is ex post facto as to that act" ("Corpus Juris Secundum," W. Mack and D. J. Kiser, vol. XVI, p. 8892). Can it be sanely assumed that all members of the Nazi Party "with knowledge of its aims and purposes became an accessory," to the murder of all the 4,000,000 persons exterminated in Maidanek? After all, no crime can exist without the combination of a criminal act and criminal intent ("Judicial and Statutory Definition of Words and Phrases," 3d ser., II, p. 694). To be made responsible for all the war crimes and crimes against humanity specified in counts III and IV, the knowledge of the aims and ends of the party, the Gestapo, and the SA or SS is scarcely sufficient, since to be an accomplice, an accessory, or an abettor the knowledge in each and every case of when, where, and by whom the crime was committed is an irremissible element unless we accept the Hitlerian principle of presuming a future guilt.

There are other principles of law and jurisprudence with which the indictment is at variance, but the violation of nonretroactivity sets the most dangerous example. Patrick Gordon Walker, speaking over the BBC, acknowledged that the acts which the defendants are accused of were not deemed crimes, but he thought the indictment contained not an infringement but the establishment of a rule of law. However, no law

can be established by violating the elementary principles on which both law and human civilization rest. It is not a lawyer's crotchet to insist on these principles. Recklessly to disregard them is to threaten the very foundation of our social life. Maintenance of law is of permanent interest; revolutions are transitory episodes in the history of human society. In liquidating revolutions legal means are unfit instruments unless they help to restore prerevolutionary law and order. Observing legal formalities while ignoring the essence of legal principles necessarily results in atrocities against justice itself.

In Kipling's poem, Norman and Saxon, A. D. 1100, we have been told:

"The Saxon is not like us Normans.
His manners are not so polite.
But he never means anything serious
Till he talks about justice and right."

Is the Nürnberg trial going to dispute this statement?

Address of OPA Administrator Bowles Before the New Council of American Business, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 17 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a speech which was delivered in New York City by Hon. Chester Bowles, OPA Administrator, on Wednesday evening, December 5.

Mr. Bowles' speech is, I believe, of unusual importance. It is a fine expression of the danger which this country faces from uncontrolled inflation. I believe the Members of the Senate will find it to be of great interest.

Mr. Bowles spoke before the New York Chapter of the New Council of American Business, a national organization of businessmen. His address was squarely against the lifting of price controls because he believes that such controls will continue to be necessary until more normal competitive factors in trade and industry come into play. The alternative, he feels, would lead straight to uncontrolled inflation and a deep business depression.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great pleasure to take part in this opening banquet of the New Council of American Business. You are a young organization with a fresh point of view, and I notice that most of your members are young men—men with enthusiasm and ideals, men who are not ashamed to be called crusaders.

The country needs your crusading point of view. American business needs it. You have undertaken to reverse the pressure group slogan of a certain section of business—the slogan which says that whatever is good for business simply must be good for the country. As businessmen, you believe that only what is obviously good for the country as a whole can bring lasting benefit to business.

The old hackneyed pressure group slogan, that what is good for business must be good for the country, flatters some businessmen into believing that he is the center around which the economic universe turns. You are out to urge the more sobering truth that business moves with the rest of the economy, and that there cannot be any abiding business prosperity except when the entire Nation is economically prosperous and sound.

Back in the late twenties this country ran its economy into the ditch when it accepted the false notion that the pulse of the stock market ticker is a measure of the country's economic health. In the ensuing crash, not only did the country take a terrific beating, but Wall Street took a beating and business, great and small took a beating. The business leaders who had championed the false notion of new era prosperity took a moral beating from which it required 10 years to recover.

I was also a businessman before I took my wartime assignment in Washington. It is as a former businessman and as a friend of business, that I feel an obligation to sound a note of warning. If we as a nation decide to follow the lead of the small minority of business pressure groups seeking purely selfish advantages, we shall sooner or later have a repetition of the 1929 disaster, and a repetition this time on a far larger and even more dangerous scale.

The possibility of such a crash, as I say, is not immediately around the corner and for that reason we still have time to stop, look, and listen and to take action to straighten things out. But if our action is to be really effective we have to think and talk frankly and we have to be ready to face some unpleasant facts.

During the war we had to deal with the danger of inflation as an impersonal economic phenomenon. The Government was taking half of our production for war, and the resulting scarcity of goods in relation to available purchasing power was creating a terrific pressure on prices.

There was a grave question in many minds whether the inflationary situation, created not by anybody's will but as a result of the war emergency, could be controlled. Never before in our history had we successfully prevented wartime inflation. But this time we pitched in together and did it. Notwithstanding that the war expenditures in this conflict were 10 times the scale of World War I, we demonstrated that as a nation we possessed the means and the know-how to keep under lock and key the greatest inflationary pressures that this country has ever seen.

What is the situation today? The inflationary forces have not subsided and they are unlikely to subside for many months to come. We know we can continue to control those forces. The only question is, have we the courage and above all the will to do so.

But here is our greatest dangers—the will to control inflation seems to have disappeared from some business groups. During the war, when the physical survival of the Nation was at stake, all business groups, and in fact all economic groups in the Nation, loyally supported price control. Today, however, we find some business leaders who are demanding the crippling or elimination of price or rent control. They seem to feel that since the actual fighting has ceased there is no more need of restraint and self-discipline. Although most businessmen are sincerely convinced of the need for continued controls until danger to the whole economy is over, there is a powerful minority that seems determined to make a killing on uncontrolled rising prices and rents. And they have rationalized their position by telling everybody that what seems good for them simply must be good for the country.

I am confident that is not what most businessmen think. Hundreds of businessmen have urged us privately to stand firm. They have told us that they are with us, and that we must not be misled by the voice of the minority. But the American people can only believe what they hear. And they hear only from the vocal minority.

It is this vocal minority which has spread the propaganda that the way to solve the reconversion problem is to increase prices and increase profits. Profits, they tell us, are the minspring of our economy, therefore, profits can never be too high for the economy's good—even in the face of inflationary pressures which threaten to overwhelm us.

Again and again they have told us "take the lid off prices—or we can't produce." In the housing field where prices are already dangerously high, they have called for the elimination of price controls on building materials and they oppose any proposal to hold the price of finished houses within the reach of the 2,000,000 married veterans who are coming back from the war with no place to lay their heads.

Others are letting it be whispered that they are holding their goods for a while—that price controls will go soon and that prices will be higher. A crop of identical rumors recently broke out in a few department stores that went like this: "Better buy now, lady," the clerk said, "prices are going up."

These people are betting on inflation. Their dangerous activities have given rise to a flood of contracts with escalator clauses and with prices and deliveries stipulated on a when-as-and-if basis. Their activities have also given rise to a crop of predictions in the tip-sheets and even in the business press that inflation will be here soon. Their activities also unquestionably play a part in explaining the spurting stock market in Wall Street where some stocks have even reached 1929 highs.

Some of these people are counting on the prospect that OPA will yield under this kind of pressure. I can clear up that point right now. OPA has no intention of yielding.

Since the hold-the-line order was issued in April 1943, the level of prices has been held under control except in two major areas—finished houses and the stock market. Only in these two cases may it be said that inflation is under way. In every other field the American people, working with their Government, have done a job which the skeptics said couldn't be done.

I am confident that as a result of the courageous legislation recently introduced by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN ceilings may soon be established on the price of completed houses so that in this field also the American people can prevent the blind forces of inflation from turning the American dream home into a nightmare.

But the danger is far from past. It is hard to believe that responsible leaders of business would knowingly light a fuse to the explosive economic mixture around us. Most of those, who oppose continued price controls undoubtedly are sincerely persuaded that the danger of inflation is now definitely past and that the time has come to return to the conditions of a free market.

It is all too clear, however, that this is not true. Commodities all across the board—with rare exceptions—are pressing hard against OPA price ceilings. In a few cases, where we have counted on supply-and-demand factors being more or less in balance, we experimented with the suspension of ceilings. The response of prices in most instances was terrific.

The plain fact of the matter is that the inflationary danger today cannot be appraised solely by rational calculations of supply and demand—great though the purely economic pressures may be. What we are up against is a far more dangerous menace—the apparent will for inflation on the part of some minor but powerful groups.

Most of them do not, of course, appreciate fully the explosive forces with which they are toying. They feel, very likely in full sincerity, that the inflation that would result from their action would be relatively

minor—even healthy. But that's the same old "didn't know it was loaded" theory with which disasters have been explained in the past.

Let's make no mistake about it. Unless we can win the fight against what might properly be called this "pressure group urge to inflation"—and we have to win it in the next few weeks, in the next few months—we shall condemn America—all America, consumers, agriculture, labor, and business—to a brief period of false boom followed by a shattering smash-up that will shake our economy to its foundations.

Statisticians may dispute as to the exact length of the boom—whether it will last into 1947 or end in 1946. People argued that way in the twenties as to the length of the bull market. But everybody knows that if we go through an inflationary boom, we shall suffer a deflationary crash whose consequence nobody can foretell.

We still have time to think and contemplate the possibilities. Price levels under OPA controls are still holding steady. Wholesale prices are still less than 2 percent above the levels of 2½ years ago. Only in the uncontrolled real estate and stock market areas is inflation actually under way.

Let us stop then and consider what a broad inflationary advance would mean for the various economic groups in the economy. What would it mean to the veteran? To labor? To the farmer? To the small and independent businessmen? And even to big business?

Nobody escaped the consequences of the crash of 1920 or the crash of 1929. That is why today, while reckless groups are optimistically talking up inflation, our farmers, our workers, and the great majority of our businessmen are swept by a sense of foreboding.

You don't see the veterans welcoming the Wall Street talk of inflation. You don't see labor or the consumers asking for the lifting of price and rent controls. You don't see the farmers cheering the bull market, and you don't see the great majority of businessmen doing any cheering either.

I think the people of this country are entitled to have their present fears set at rest. I think they are entitled to have the specter of willful inflation banished from our midst once and for all. The way to do it, it seems to me, is for the country to agree firmly, courageously, and beyond question or doubt upon its determination to see the job through. Then and only then will the speculative, inflationeers, and those sincere but misguided advocates of a free market under present inflationary conditions, be kept from selling price control short.

We need, I believe, to do three things:

First. As I testified to the House Banking and Currency Committee this morning, we need to establish controls over the prices of completed houses to put an end to the all-too-obvious inflation already underway in this field.

Second. We need to maintain firm price controls on all commodities, and ceilings on all rentals until the dangers of inflation in each commodity field and each rental area is over. In determining the time at which controls should be removed, there are no magic dates. It depends entirely upon the speed with which supply comes into balance with demand.

Third. We should remove controls as promptly as possible, in one commodity field and rental areas after another as soon as it is safe to do so.

A firm decision to control prices and rents is an indispensable preliminary to any satisfactory transition from war and peace. Without it we can kiss good-by the brave new postwar world of security and prosperity, full employment and opportunity which we promised to build once the Nazi threat to our civilization was removed.

I would be the last to claim that price control in and by itself would be sufficient to call that brave new world into existence. That world must be built by the hard work and cooperative thinking and planning of all groups in the community—business, labor, agriculture, and government.

There has been a lot of talk of cooperation. Some of it has sounded hollow because it has come from people intent on advancing their own private interests, regardless of the general welfare. Cooperation under such conditions becomes an empty farce. The only time cooperation between groups becomes fruitful is when each group makes an honest effort to put the national interest ahead of its particular private interests.

That is why I like your businessman's platform. It not only urges all business to take the stand that what is good for the country is good for business, but it is an invitation to labor and to other groups to approach their problems from the same point of view.

To be sure, each group is not expected to neglect its own special State in the total national picture. We don't expect business to put forward a program which leaves out business enterprise and business profits, and we don't expect labor to put forward a program which leaves out the protection of good wages and steady jobs. But the particular planks which the various groups put forward for themselves must fit into an honest program calculated to advance the welfare of all groups.

That is exactly the kind of program you have put forward. You are back of the full employment bill. You are back of the bill to set a 65-cent-an-hour floor under wages. You are for liberalized unemployment compensation. You oppose the weakening of collective bargaining. You are for a permanent FEPC, so that no man—whatever his race, color, or creed—is denied the benefits of American opportunity.

You are for a program to protect the farmer—to protect his prices and protect his income. You support the broadening and deepening of the social security program to cover everyone in the entire working population, and to raise benefits to a level of decency. You are for a medical care and health insurance program to bring the blessings of medical science into every home.

You are for the development of our natural resources, the application of the TVA idea to the Missouri River, to the Columbia River, and to the other river valleys. You are for all these good things and many others—last but not least of which is world cooperation and world trade.

This is a program in the national interest. This is a program for all the people. This is a program behind which men of good will everywhere may rally.

Your program shows us the way at home. But more than that it shows us the way to international peace as well.

In recent months the eyes of the world have been focused with a new anxiety on international problems, seeking to find an escape from war in the atomic age. Thinking men recognize that if mankind is to escape destruction, the nations of the world must build a new international society, a society built not upon greed and selfishness and irresponsible power, but one in which there is freedom and abundance and security for all. But thinking men recognize that we cannot have these things abroad if we do not have them at home. We cannot have security, freedom, opportunity, and abundance abroad while we have insecurity, fear, and economic disorder at home. We cannot have peace with other nations while we wage undisguised economic war at home.

The hopes of the world rest on us to provide leadership in the present crisis. Ours are unparalleled resources and productive power. Ours is the tradition of freedom—freedom not for the few but for all. If freemen here in America should fail, where can freemen anywhere succeed?

The world is looking to us to build a society in which there are jobs and opportunity for all who seek them, a society whose abundance is not denied to anyone whatever his race, color, creed, or economic status. It is only a society dedicated internally to the principle of live and help live that can take the lead in establishing the same principle of live and help live in international affairs.

Gentlemen, ours is a great and urgent responsibility. Time is running short. At home and abroad the forces of misunderstanding, of ignorant greed, of fear and conflict are mounting swiftly. These forces must be checked and reversed before it is too late.

The Nation needs men of unselfishness and of vision. The Nation needs crusaders.

That is why I salute your organization. More power to all of you.

There Is No Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include the enlightening and timely article There Is No Peace, by Morris H. Rubin, editor of the Progressive, which appeared in the Progressive of December 17, 1945:

THERE IS NO PEACE

(By Morris H. Rubin)

They are calling the approaching holiday season the world's first peacetime Christmas in 7 years, but there is no peace on earth, no good-will among men or nations.

In one-half of the world, from Palestine and Iran to India, Indochina, Indonesia, and China, where live half the people of the earth, the war goes on, in one form or another.

In the other half of the world, where the guns are stilled at last, there is a paralysis of the spirit, a numbness of mind and morals, a haunting fear that the fruits of victory are rotting even before we pick and taste them.

Everywhere, whether it be where they are fighting or only brooding, there is a bitter sadness among the people as they watch the four horsemen of war—imperialism, competitive armaments, power politics, and revenge—crush all their hopes that the end of the bloodiest war in all history would usher in an era of peace and international cooperation.

The political and economic instruments of cooperation were forged months ago at San Francisco and Bretton Woods. Weak as they may be on paper—and that they are—they have yet to be used and tested. Instead of a meeting of the United Nations Organization on the functioning of the economic agencies agreed upon at Bretton Woods, there has been a revival of naked imperialism, the launching of a new armament race, and a unilateral lunger for power and spoils.

The grim situation in the Orient is best illustrated by the bloody warfare in the Netherland East Indies, where impotent Dutch coupon clippers have refused the Indonesian demand for self-government, and shaking their fists from their safe perch in Holland, have succeeded in mobilizing British imperial troops and American money and materials for a brutal subjection of the independence forces.

In Europe, Asia, and Africa British imperialism and Soviet imperialism are jockeying for position in the old game of power politics while America drifts somewhere in the middle. In the Western Hemisphere the United States is brandishing the "big stick" while talking piously of the good-neighbor policy.

Nor is this all. In Europe, spawning ground of world conflict for three centuries, our policy of revenge is turning sour even more rapidly than the Progressive warned it would. The collapse of the Potsdam settlement, which was based on blind vengeance and dismemberment, is now so complete that during the past week President Truman, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, and Byron Price, the President's special envoy in Europe, joined in calling for a modification of those harsh and unenforceable terms.

Every report from Germany and Austria, whether from newspaper correspondents, Army officials, or civilian observers, tells the same melancholy story of how our monstrous policy of revenge is operating against our own self-interest and against the maintenance of peace. Despair is turning to desperation as hunger, cold, disease, and hopelessness grip the non-Nazis as well as the Nazis and paralyze incipient liberal and democratic movements while strengthening the position of the Fascists who feed and flourish on discontent and despair.

More than 6 months after the unconditional surrender of Germany, it is still impossible for the rest of the world to write to German friends or relatives, or send them food or clothing—no matter how anti-Nazi they may have been or how desperate may be their need.

This sordid pursuit of a policy of revenge for its own sake, of planned prostration and calculated misery for a whole people, has extended so far as to ban the shipping of Christmas packages of any kind in this holiday season when the formulators of, and apologists for, that policy are talking with pious hypocrisy of the glory of Jesus and the Sermon on the Mount.

Just as disheartening as the facts of the world situation is the attitude of too many Americans. Gone is the moral indignation over the collapse of principles and the flouting of wartime pledges. Absent is a driving desire to buckle down to the breath-taking problems we face at home and abroad. And present is a sort of dejected apathy, a callous acceptance of the very doctrines of hate and intolerance and force that we thought we were fighting to overthrow, a weariness of body and spirit, and a fitful brooding over the atomic bomb.

From the press, the radio, and the public platforms comes an endless stream of cure-alls, most of them, like the pink pills of the quack, easy to take and less than half the price of good medicine. People everywhere, and among the intellectuals especially, find it so easy to skip over the nasty-tasting problems of imperialism and power politics and competitive armaments, and, instead, find a welcome jag in the thought that if we could only have world government tonight or tomorrow morning sure, all our problems would be automatically solved.

World government may well be the ultimate answer to many of the world's political problems, but the most naive bystander knows that even if the American people could be sold, world government won't be attained in the immediate future.

Would Soviet Russia, which insists on the right to veto every action of the United Nations Organization, and torpedoes conferences which fail to do her bidding, consent to surrender her sovereignty to a world government she could not control?

Would Great Britain, selfishly determined to continue milking her colonies, regardless of the price the world must pay in blood and tears, permit a world government to end her imperial rule?

To ask the questions, it seems to me, is to answer them. Only last week Pravda, the Red daily which speaks for the Soviet Government, lashed out at proposals for strengthening the United Nations Organization and abolishing the power of each of the big five to veto the decisions of the rest of the world.

Pravda made sense, it seems to me, when it scorned the notion that the world could skip over all its immediate problems and find peace in world government.

"Today the press is full of a new panacea that will secure the world from both the atomic bomb and war," it said sarcastically. "The panacea is a world assembly elected by the nations that would be either a world parliament or a world government. This parliament or government, for the sake of which nations are to renounce their sovereignty to a certain extent, will guaranty complete confidence between the nations and will magically create laws that will exclude the possibility of wars."

The cozy theory that you can solve the world's problems by erecting a global tent over them has bewitched too many tired liberals who don't like to face up to the concrete problems of India, Indonesia, Indochina, China, Palestine, Iran, Egypt, Greece, Spain, Italy, the Balkans, and Latin America.

It seems to me a readily apparent fact that no matter how many international organizations we have, or how perfectly they may be drawn, they are not worth the paper they are written on unless the world at the same time gets at the basic causes of war—which are imperialism, power politics, spheres of influence, competitive armaments, policies of vengeance, social and economic dislocations, and racial and religious intolerance.

Looking back over the months that have slipped away since the end of the war, one is struck by the fact that all our attention, all our energies, and all our planning have been centered on the forms of organization to enforce the peace, rather than on the substance of the peace settlement itself. If the United Nations Organization is an international agency to enforce the peace, what peace settlement will it have to enforce when it finally meets? There has been no peace conference, no meeting of the minds, no basic pattern of settlement; rather there has been a unilateral grab of power and spoils by the victorious nations.

Some of the same editorial writers, radio commentators, and politicians who talk so nobly out of one side of their mouths about world government and international cooperation, are just as glib when they use the other side in arguing for conscript armies, buffer states, and spheres of influence for individual nations bent on maintaining their individual security.

Is the situation then hopeless?

Far from it. The fight for a just and lasting peace has only just begun, but it will take a new vision, a courageous willingness to stand up and be counted, and unceasing struggle by progressive-minded people everywhere if we are to reverse the present trend.

What shall our program be?

The course, it seems to me, is clearly indicated:

1. Summoning of a peace conference of all nations at the earliest possible moment to draw up a basic settlement of outstanding issues—the settlement then to be turned over to the United Nations Organization for enforcement. Our present policy of building enforcement machinery even before we have anything to enforce is bound to fail.

2. An organized effort to secure international agreement to prohibit peacetime conscription, provide for orderly, uniform disarmament by all nations, and international control of the atomic bomb. Can't we, without benefit of all the diplomatic hocus-pocus, sit down with the Russians, the British, the French, and the others, and say: "We'll drop our plan for universal conscription. We'll reduce our military establishments—if you'll do precisely the same thing?"

3. Work for the abandonment of imperialism and colonialism and give subject peoples every opportunity to govern themselves—as we have sought to do in the Philippines. The achievement of this vital goal is, of course, far more difficult than it sounds, but we shall never be able to deal with this basic cause of war if we keep running away from it.

4. Reverse our present policy of revenge and dismemberment in the conquered countries of Europe and launch an enlightened program of encouraging democratic forces while weeding out and turning over to the non-Nazis the job of trying and punishing the Nazi gangsters responsible for the plight of Germany and the world.

5. Encourage and transplant to Europe the soundly conceived, Lincolnlike policy Gen. Douglas MacArthur is pursuing in Japan—a policy of encouraging democratic groups to prepare for self-government while uprooting and destroying every possible source of feudal, imperial, militaristic, aggressive action. Our policy in Japan has been the reverse of the course we have pursued in Germany, and has, of course, produced a totally opposite result thus far.

6. Guarantee the political boundaries and integrity of small nations, but strike at their basic, economic problem by encouraging federation and the development of free trade areas, as, for instance, through a United States of Europe.

7. Establish new machinery for the immediate relief of the destitute of all countries and encourage the peoples of the world to help themselves by providing long-time credits for long-range economic rehabilitation for nations prepared to underwrite a just and democratic peace.

8. Draft an international bill of rights setting world standards for freedom of religion, the press, speech, and political action.

9. Democratize the machinery of the United Nations Organization by giving smaller nations a greater voice in its deliberations and by providing for amendment of the Charter by democratic means.

It sounds tough, doesn't it? Well, it is—a lot tougher than drawing diagrams of the perfect world organization. But it must be done—and it can be done—if we have the patience, the vision, the courage, and the energy to fight it out, regardless of the obstacles, the name-calling, and the sneering attacks of the short-cut crowd in the cocktail lounges.

There is only one alternative to such a program—an America armed to the teeth, a world of armed and suspicious camps, and war—an atomic war.

The democratic, anti-imperialist alternative is our only hope—the only hope of a world hungering for peace but saddled by suspicion and power politics with a crushing new burden of armaments and saddened by the selfish maneuvering of the Great Powers with the fear of a new and ghastlier war.

America has a magnificent opportunity to lead the way—not by force of arms or unilateral compulsions but by putting our own house in order and breathing new life into democracy—economic and political—and by using our "reservoir of good will" to tip the scales against imperialism wherever our voice is listened to or our aid is needed.

Every nation has made its share of mistakes and has been guilty of crimes against the peace. This is the time to make a fresh start, to tear up the sordid pages of the past and present, and to begin anew, in a spirit of candor and cooperation, to write a peace based on justice for all. It isn't an impossible ideal. In fact, we have tried everything

but idealism up to now. Many sacrifices will be necessary, of course; but the price of peace, however great, is just a tiny, almost invisible, fraction of the cost of World War III.

Capt. Sue S. Dauser, Nurse Corps, United States Navy, Retired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 17, 1945

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, on December 14 Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal presented to Capt. Sue S. Dauser, Nurse Corps, United States Navy, retired, the Distinguished Service Medal at ceremonies in the Navy Department.

A few days ago the Secretary of the Navy pinned the Distinguished Service Medal upon the blouse of a gracious, modest woman and, in so doing, he gave well deserved recognition not only to this individual but to a branch of our military services whose contribution to victory in World War II is but little known.

The text of the citation for the Distinguished Service Medal reads as follows:

For exceptionally meritorious service to the Government of the United States in a duty of great responsibility as Superintendent of the Navy Nurse Corps during the prewar period of the national emergency and during World War II. Discharging with keen foresight and superb professional ability the heavy responsibilities of this vital assignment, Captain Dauser rendered distinguished service in establishing a post-graduate training program for Navy nurses and for the Navy's participation in the cadet nurse training program. By her sound judgment and careful planning, she was directly responsible for expanding the Navy Nurse Corps from 600 in the prewar period to 11,500, the number essential to provide adequate nursing care for the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard personnel as the war progressed. Loyal to the ideals established as a standard for her profession, Captain Dauser maintained a high morale and splendid efficiency in the Navy Nurse Corps, and her constant devotion to duty throughout reflects the highest credit upon herself, her command, and the United States naval service.

With Miss Dauser's inherent humility, a characteristic that made her respected and beloved by the thousands of women who served under her, the captain accepted the coveted medal as a tribute to these women rather than as a personal honor. And while it is true that the ceremony cannot but be viewed as an honor to the entire Navy Nurse Corps as well as to the individual who served as its superintendent throughout the prewar and war periods, I should like for the personal element not to be submerged.

An overseas veteran of the First World War, Miss Dauser had less than 500 nurses at her disposal when, in 1939, she came to Washington from duty in her native California to become head of the Navy Nurse Corps. Only a few weeks earlier, Vice Adm. Ross T McIntire had assumed the position of Surgeon General of the United States Navy. It was a happy coincidence that they commenced at the same time their administrative tasks—tasks that grew successively in importance and responsibility as war broke out in Europe, the President declared the existence of a national emergency, and, then, climactically, Pearl Harbor. The integration of the nursing phase, posing its complex problems of recruitment, training, assignment, and advancement, with the over-all aspect of Medical Department services was a model of efficiency. True there were bottlenecks that developed but, under the general supervision of the Surgeon General and the immediate direction of Captain Dauser, the strength of the Nurse Corps grew from 436 to 11,500 with a minimum of wasted effort or resources.

In the meantime, the Navy as a whole was undergoing vast expansion and with it the Medical Department, faced with meeting unprecedented needs in supplying doctors for warships and for the Marines; in constructing and staffing hospitals both at home and abroad; in undertaking research along multitudinous lines, yet all having the common objective of conserving the health and lives of our fighting men; in rehabilitating a legion of wounded and sick whose numbers grew steadily until they ran into the scores of thousands. Save for warship duty, nurses were required in the fulfillment of all these aims. And, with regard to that lone exception, the influence of the Navy's women in white was felt in battleships and submarines, too, for the hospital corpsmen entrusted with nursing duties in our men-of-war had received their training in hospitals and schools "on the beach" from the nurses. It was, indeed, fortunate that with such a tremendous task to be performed by the Nurse Corps alone, Admiral McIntire had the services of a superintendent whose initiative and judgment permitted him to be freed of all unnecessary details so that he could devote himself to the medical program as a whole.

With pride and satisfaction, Captain Dauser viewed the achievements of her little, humane band as weeks passed into months and months into years. It was a Navy nurse who was chosen to be the first person in the Navy to receive the Legion of Merit. A program for the training of flight nurses was started and dividends came high at Iwo Jima and Okinawa. Eleven Navy nurses were decorated by the Army and the Navy for heroic devotion to duty in the Philippines. Nostalgically, Captain Dauser remembered what an Army colonel had written a quarter century earlier of the nursing complement of a troop transport.

The troops on board this ship—

He wrote—

are about to complete a journey which was fraught with many dangers, not the least of which was a very serious epidemic of what appears to be Spanish influenza. The sick report of the troops on board jumped from 6 to 160 inside of 48 hours. The chief nurse and her coworkers did not need any request, but, seeing the danger, came forward and volunteered their services, with the result that what was chaos—there being practically no accommodations or facilities on board to care for such members—was handled in what I consider a most admirable manner under the circumstances. They have worked night and day in the cold and damp, on decks that were being washed by seas, without any lights whatever, exposed to the dangers of contagion with a deadly malady, and they have rendered these services most cheerfully. The troops of the command can never forget the great assistance and the self-sacrifice which this noble body of women has rendered.

Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz gave the Navy's "well done" to the nurses a year ago when he was Commander in Chief of the United States Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean Areas:

These nurses bring to the hospital organizations in the Pacific war theater the high standard of nursing service provided in naval hospitals in the United States—

He said—

Their specialized knowledge and training and their devotion to duty are invaluable in providing the excellent hospital care given our sick and wounded. To these nurses who have volunteered their services wherever they may be required we give our heartfelt thanks for duty well done.

After 28 years of selfless service to the United States, the woman who led the Navy Nurse Corps through the most trying, the most momentous, period in its history, is going into retirement. Only memories now are her duties in Scotland and France in 1918–19; at sea in the hospital ship *Relief*, in the Transport Service, and on the Alaskan trip of the late President Warren G. Harding, whom she nursed in his last illness; in Guam and the Philippines, and, finally, in the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery—the most exacting job of her career. Fortunately, the Navy has designated a splendidly qualified woman to take up the work Captain Dauser is relinquishing. She is Commander Nellie Jane DeWitt, who, like her predecessor, entered the Navy Nurse Corps shortly after graduation from nursing school. Too, her duties have been so varied that she brings a wealth of experience and understanding to the position.

I join Admiral McIntire in bidding welcome to Commander DeWitt and saying "Farewell, good luck, and well done" to Captain Dauser.

Return of Members of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of great satisfaction to the Members of Congress when members of the armed forces are aware and express appreciation for what most of us are trying to do in their behalf daily.

I thought the members would like to read a letter I have received from a personal friend, a former medical officer in

the Army, who has served with fine distinction:

NOVEMBER 20, 1945.

Hon. WALTER C. PLOESER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WALTER: I wish to express the gratitude of the medical officers in my group for the assistance of our Congressmen in facilitating our return to the States and civilian life.

For several months our only hope was reading in the Stars and Stripes about congressional pressure for our return—then all of a sudden the "Green project"—I was returned from Paris in 1 day and within exactly 1 week had cleared the separation center—many of my fellow officers had a similar experience and all are very happy about it.

I was fortunate in receiving one of the 1946 Fords sold to veterans here in St. Louis—have obtained space with several other doctors in the Missouri Theater Building and now only hoping and looking for a place to live. That too is quite a problem here as you probably well know. We were warmly received by the South Side Lions and hope to see you at one of the meetings in the not too distant future.

Sincerely,

PIERCE POWERS.

CLAYTON, MO.

The Centennial of Texas Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, Texas became a State in the American Union 100 years ago this month. In Texas, the Texas Centennial of Statehood Commission created by the Texas Legislature is directing the observance there in a proper manner.

Here in Washington, the Centennial of Texas Statehood is also being observed. In the Library of Congress there is an extensive exhibit on the first and second floors of the Library, consisting of pictures, significant books, and old manuscripts bearing upon the history of the State, and its admission into the Union.

Last Saturday, in Whittall Pavilion of the Congressional Library, exercises were held commemorating the historic event of Texas admission into the Union.

Under leave granted, I am submitting herewith the introductory remarks by Dr. Luther H. Evans, Librarian of Congress, and also the address delivered by me on that occasion:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY LUTHER H. EVANS, LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

Congressman JOHNSON, ladies and gentlemen, the Library of Congress is just what its name implies, for it serves Congress in a very practical way, but it is also the national library. It is the largest single depository of our national record as it has been accumulated in books and pamphlets, in printed documents and maps, in periodicals and newspapers, in prints and photographs, and in the manuscript records of significant individuals and societies. There are specialized libraries in various parts of the country which cover some limited portion of that record more minutely and completely than does the Library of Congress, but there is none which covers the whole record so comprehensively. This national record we strive to make available to the whole people of this country as effectively as we are able, and in a multitude of ways. The Library of Congress is thus peculiarly well fitted to take account of anniversaries of national significance, landmarks upon the path along which our people have come in the four centuries and a half since these western continents have been known. On these occasions the Library regularly places in its exhibit cases the books and maps and prints most worth seeing which bear upon and illustrate the events which we are remembering. Of these aninversaries, there are few which can give us greater pleasure than those which mark the centenary of a new State into the Union. In celebrating such an event we invite some distinguished citizen of the State concerned to deliver an address within our walls to mark the opening of the exhibit. This we did last March for Florida, and so we shall do a year from this month for Iowa, and in 1948, if it is safe nowadays to look so far ahead, for Wisconsin. But today's occasion is one which necessarily gives me a particular pleasure and pride, for I am by birth a Texan. One hundred years ago this month my State, and Congressman JOHNSON's State, became an equal member of this American Union. Our exhibition places on view fascinating materials for the history of Texas, from the first printed narrative of white men in Texas, printed in 1555, to photographs taken only yesterday. I am very glad indeed to have persuaded my good friend Representative LUTHER A. JOHNSON of Corsicana to come and talk to us on the significance of the Texan story. Mr. JOHNSON.

ADDRESS OF HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

My colleagues of the Texas delegation, ladies, and gentlemen, *"Resolved, etc.,* That the State of Texas shall be one, and is hereby declared to be one, of the United States of America, and admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever."

By this joint resolution, approved by President James K. Polk on December 29, 1845, Texas on that date become the twenty-eighth State of the American Union. This month we are celebrating the centennial of the statehood of Texas, in honor of which the Library of Congress has brought together this exhibition of rare and significant books and manuscripts bearing upon the history of the State. I should like to point out that what happened 100 years ago was an event quite unique in the history of the United States. For the first and last time in its history, our Union absorbed an independent nation, and a sovereign republic transformed itself into one of the United States. The Lone Star flag gave way to the Stars and Stripes, and Texas came under the fifth of the six flags which have waved against her skies. These flags conveniently and dramatically summarize the eventful history of the region which is now Texas, and so illustrate the making of the Republic which joined our Union a century ago.

The first flag was the fleur-de-lis of Bourbon France. It is of course true that Texas was included in the vast regions for which the discoveries of Columbus and his followers had staked out a Spanish claim, that Pineda charted the coast as early as 1519, that Cabeza de Vaca wandered there after his shipwreck, and that Coronado and Moscoso marched through in search of fabulous kingdoms. But the first attempt to plant a flag in actual settlement was made in the reign of the Grand Monarque, by a mighty builder of the French empire, the Sieur de La Salle. Pathetically transient as was his post on Matagorda Bay, it shocked the rulers of the waning Spanish Empire into their first attempt to establish missions among the Texas Indians in 1693. These soon withered away, and it was two more decades before renewed French activity provoked the authorities of New Spain into an occupation of Texas which proved permanent. Old Nacogdoches was first set up in 1716, but the first Texas settlement with an unbroken occupation was San Antonio, where the mission afterward to be known as the Alamo, was established as a way station 2 years later.

France was eliminated as a neighbor by the Peace of Paris in 1763, which advanced the Spanish frontier eastward to the Mississippi. After nearly four decades of comparative tranquillity, and very slow growth of the Texas settlements, Napoleon compelled the Spanish Crown to restore the old province of Louisiana weste of the great river, only to sell it to the United States within 3 years. From 1811 on Texas was troubled by revolutionary outbreaks and by filibustering expeditions from American soil, and in 1821 came under its third flag, the banner of Mexico, at last independent of the crumbling Spanish Empire. At almost the same time preparation was made for the fourth, for it was in the last days of 1820 that Moses Austin made his fateful journey to San Antonio and entered into the contract whereby his son as empresario brought the first body of colonists from the United States to settle in Texas. The tide that Stephen Austin set flowing ran for nearly a decade before the Mexican Government took steps to halt it, and in those years same 20,000 people, colonists and their slaves, came in to give the Texas land a wholly new population, for they quite outnumbered the 3,000 Mexicans who were the only possessors after a whole century of Spanish settlement.

Eventually the Mexican Government repented of its liberality, brought the current of immigration to a stop, sought in various ways to curtail the autonomy of the Texans and to impose its way of life upon them, and sent an army among them to forestall opposition. The first crisis was weathered, but within a few years Mexico passed under the dictatorship of Santa Anna, and no rights seemed to be beyond the reach of an arbitrary military regime. Just as the American colonists of 1774 had appealed to the British Constitution and to their rights as Englishmen, so the Texan colonists of 1834 appealed to the liberalism of the Mexicon Revolution and to the suppressed Mexican Constitution. But the hand of power was not stayed, and in September of the following year, just as General Gage had sent out to seize the stores at Concord in 1775, so Colonel Ugartechea sent out to seize the brass cannon at Gonzales. The first skirmishes took place and, like the Continental Congress, the Texan Consultation issued its declaration of causes for taking up arms. Santa Anna brought his army to San Antonio and besieged the little force in the Alamo, and the delegates of the Texan Convention at Washington-on-the-Brazos put their signatures to a document which began:

"When a government has ceased to protect the lives, liberty, and property of its people, from whom its legitimate powers are derived."

It was a declaration of independence, and Texas has its fourth flag—its own flag. For some weeks longer Santa Anna continued to advance and seemed on the way to drive the Texans out of Texas, when Sam Houston's bold stroke at San Jacinto destroyed his army and saved the Republic.

For 10 years, then, the Republic of Texas enjoyed the "independent attitude among the nations of the earth," which it had assumed on March 2, 1836, and lived under the constitution which the convention had drawn up into the 2 weeks following the adoption of the declaration. During this decade the Republic was governed, according to that constitution, by a President elected every 3 years and by the heads of executive departments whom he appointed, by a congress consisting of a senate and a house of representatives chosen annually, and by a supreme

court and inferior courts whose judges were elected by the joint ballot of the congress. This Republic of Texas entered into diplomatic relations with the United States of America, and sent a minister to represent it at Washington, while, after recognition, a chargé d'affaires from the United States appeared at the Texan capital. Two treaties were negotiated between the two nations in 1838 one at Houston settling claims of citizens of the United States against Texas, and one at Washington for marking the boundary between them. Texas sent diplomatic representatives to Europe, and was recognized by four European nations; European representatives came to Texas, and the French built an embassy on Robertson Hill in Austin. Among the six members of the President's cabinet was a secretary of the navy, and he actually had a navy to administer during the whole existence of the Republic; some of its vessels were later incorporated in the Navy of the United States.

Although Texas was a full-fledged republic with all the attributes of sovereignty, it was not altogether satisfied with its status. The same plebiscite which ratified the Constitution of the Republic in September 1836 voted on the question of annexation to the United States; only 93 votes opposed, while the overwhelming majority, some 6,000, were in favor of that measure. But in the United States to which they desired to adhere, the Texas question almost at once became all but inextricably entangled in politics, in diplomacy, and in the poisonous issue of slavery. The United States Senate refused to ratify the treaty of annexation which required a two-thirds vote. It was first submitted in this form rather than by joint resolution which merely required a majority vote of both Houses by which latter method annexation was accomplished some years later. When Texas' first overtures were rebuffed, her pride was hurt; she withdrew her solicitations, and some public men in Texas looked toward a policy which would consolidate Texan independence. But this policy would not work; the Mexicans were irreconcilable, and desultory warfare went on. Under these conditions a sparsely settled rural country could not afford sovereignty; the Republic of Texas, as the national debt multiplied, was a business that did not pay expenses. Furthermore, the sentiments of the Texan people toward the land from which they came did not change. Early in 1845 there was at last a significant change in the conjunctions of American politics. A majority of both Houses of Congress adopted a joint resolution (the vote in the Senate was so close that a change of one vote would have defeated the resolution), which consented that the territory included within the Republic of Texas should be erected into a new State and admitted as one of the States of this Union, and President Tyler approved this resolution as one of his last official acts, on March 1, 1845. Very cheerfully the Republic of Texas set about the task of reducing itself from a nation to a State: the president summoned a convention; the congress passed a joint resolution expressing its consent; the convention adopted an ordinance of acceptance and then drew up a new constitution fit for a State of the Union; the people of Texas went to the polls on October 13 and ratified this new constitution and on December 29, 1845, when President Polk approved the joint resolution, the Supreme Court holds that was the day on which Texas became a State. In the following February the Legislature of the State of Texas met in place of the congress of the Republic, and Gov. J. Pinckney Henderson took over the reins of government from President Anson Jones. Once more the Federal Republic devised by our founding fathers had justified itself; with no loss of liberty to the individual Texan, and no loss of self-government, and no breach of continuity, independent Texas had become one of the United States.

Who were these Texans who had won their independence as a sovereign republic, sustained it for 10 years, and now voluntarily surrendered it? The answer is simple: They were Americans, who had come to Texas from all parts of the American Union, and so were simply resuming the old political relationship with their former fellow citizens. When Texas passed under her fifth flag, her citizens got their old flag back. Southern Americans and frontier Americans predominated, but there was at all times a substantial admixture of Americans from the older parts of the country and from the more northerly States. Their revolution- and constitution-making reproduced, as I think my examples have shown, the American national tradition. The largest single element in Texas came from Kentucky and Tennessee; but the men who settled these States were simply the spearhead of the advancing American frontier. Some of these tall men with long rifles who pressed on turned north, like the Lincolns, and settled the States beyond the Ohio, others moved westward into Missouri, and yet others pushed southwestward through Arkansas into Texas. A contemporary list gives the places of birth and of last residence for 57 members of the convention which declared independence in 1836. Three were of Mexican and four of European birth. Twenty-eight were born in the Old South, and eleven of these in Virginia. Fifteen were born in the Southwest, and a majority of these, or nine, in Tennessee. But seven were born in northern seaboard States, including three in Pennsylvania and two in New York. When we come to the place of last residence, there is a considerable westward shift; the Southwest, from Kentucky to Louisiana, leads with 37 members and Illinois and Missouri are represented with 5. Eight came directly from the Old South, and four from the Old North. It is easy to call the roll of men from Northern or Middle States who became prominent in public life in early Texas. The President under the provisional government was David G. Burnet, of New Jersey; the last President of the Republic, Anson Jones, from Massachusetts. Stephen Austin was born in Virginia, but his father, Moses Austin, came from Connecticut, as did Ashbel Smith, who represented Texas in Europe. The first Secretary of the Navy of the Republic was S. Rhoads Fisher of Pennsylvania; the second was Louis P, Cook, from New York.

The first generation of Texans were noted, not only for the diversity of States from whence they came, which is likely responsible for the cosmopolitan population of our State today, but their experience in the life of the American frontier caused them to acquire self-reliance, endure hardship, and ability to carry on in spite of dangers, instilling in them an intense degree of patriotism and a willingness to fight for what they believed to be right, and these traits of the forefathers have been handed down, in part at least, to the Texas people of this generation. The heroic part Texans have played in World Wars I and II is evidence of the truth of this statement. Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, now Chief of Staff, and Admiral Chester Nimitz, now Chief of Naval Operations, are both native Texans, and many heroes of the war, both officers and GI's, were from Texas. Texas A. & M. College furnished more officers than West Point.

Texas became the twenty-eighth State of the Union, but 20 more were to be admitted before the roll of the continental United States would be filled up in 1912, and, yet, one of the Senators opposing the admission of Texas said, "The United States already had territory enough for all useful purposes."

When Congress passed its joint resolution of March 1, 1845, it made provision for the formation of four additional States out of the Territory of Texas, should Texas consent to such division. But Texas has not consented, or at least only in a minor degree. In 1850 Texas did consent to the alienation of its territorial claims to the extreme Northwest, in exchange for a sum which sufficed to liquidate the debts of the Republic, and the lands thus relinquished have become portions of Wyoming, Kansas, and Oklahoma, a good slice of Colorado, and the better part of New Mexico. Propositions to divide the homeland into two or three States met with no encouragement, and Texas has retained a truly imperial domain, the basis of its subsequent expansion, productivity, and prosperity.

The first complete census of Texans came with the national enumeration of 1850. In that year there were 212,000 Texans while United States population was 23,190,000, and Texas was the twenty-fifth in rank among the States. She had already quadrupled the estimated 50,000 who carried out the Texas Revolution, but she was still a comparatively insignificant part of the American Union. The 1850's saw Texas almost triple her population, which reached 604,000, and rise to twenty-third rank. The decade of Civil War and reconstruction, during which Texas obtained and lost her sixth flag naturally saw a retardation of growth, but Texas nevertheless added over 200,000 souls and rose to nineteenth place among the States. During the 1870's the rate of increase shot up with complete economic and political recovery, and Texas nearly doubled her population, arriving at a million and a half and the eleventh rank in the Nation. By the end of the century she had passed the 3,000,000 mark, and at the following census, in 1910, stood fifth in the Nation. She maintained this position for three decades, but at the last census went to sixth rank, having at last been passed by California. In 1940, the population of the United States was 131,670,000 or a little over six times what it was in 1850; while the number of Texans stood at 6,414,000, or more than thirty times what it was in 1850, and about a hundred and twenty times what it was in the year of San Jacinto.

As it has been with population, so has it been with wealth and production. The natural resources of Texas have contributed to the wealth of the Nation, and they have grown in volume and value with the passing of the years, leading in livestock and agriculture, and cotton having always been the chief agricultural product. The census of 1850 reported that in the previous year Texas had made 58,000 bales out of a national crop of nearly 2,000,000 bales. But by 1860 Texas cotton had risen to 431,000 bales, just 10 percent of the national crop of 4,310,000 bales. The vast areas available for expansion to Texas farmers insure in the years after the Civil War a position of supremacy in cotton growing. In 1878 the million-bale mark was passed, with the State producing about a fifth of the Nation's cotton.

Expansion went steadily on in the twentieth century. The record crop was achieved in 1926, when the staggering figure of 5,628,000 bales, nearly a third of the American crop and about a fifth of the world's production, was reached. Since then a diminishing world market for cotton has been a deterrent, but in 1937 Texas produced 5,154,000 bales on a considerably reduced acreage. In 1944 Texas, with 2,640,000 bales, was still turning out about a fifth of America's cotton crop. Cotton, however, although the premier crop of the State, does not represent a great deal more than a fourth of the total value of the products of Texas farms. Wheat, dairy products, onions, tomatoes, pecans, peanuts, black-eyed peas, watermelons, and pink grapefruit must not be overlooked. These products make Texas the greatest farming State in the Union.

Beside this great agricultural expansion of the last century, we have to notice the appearance of other forms of wealth, in each

of which Texas has achieved a position of eminence. From the earliest times Texas has been recognized as an ideal land for grazing, and considerable herds were kept there even before the Americans came. But their expansion was strictly limited by the absence of an available market. Not until after the Civil War were the great cattle drives organized on a scale which enabled the Texas plains to furnish the markets of the North and East. The open range was fenced in in the course of the 1880's, but meanwhile the railroads had come and the Texas ranches had no difficulty in marketing their expanding product and maintaining the position which the State had won. In 1943 there were 7,518,000 cattle of all kinds in Texas, about a tenth of the Nation's total and 2,000,000 more than in the next State on the list. With nearly ten and a half million sheep, Texas has more than a fifth of the national flock, and completely outdistanced all competitors by the production of 75,000,000 pounds of raw wool.

Toward the close of the nineteenth century there was developed a new source of wealth which the men of 1836 and 1845 could hardly have dreamed of. I have some right to speak of Texas oil, since it was the accidental bringing in of the well at Corsicana, my home town, in 1895, that first gave economic importance to the industry. In 1901 came the sensational discovery at Spindletop, and the beginning of a tremendous expansion which has gone steadily on until the present. Texas, fifth in oil production in 1925, skyrocketed to first in 1928, and by 1940 had doubled its 1928 production. The monstrous wartime production, swollen to 748,000,000 barrels, has approximated half of the national total, which, together with sulfur in which Texas excels all others and helium of which Texas has a virtual monopoly of the helium supply in the world, has spelled the doom of Berlin and Tokyo. This development of the extractive industries in oil, natural gas, and other minerals has made Texas first in the Nation in the annual value of its minerals, ahead even of Pennsylvania. I shall conclude this brief review of a century's growth in wealth by noting that in the most recent period Texas has made a very serious entry into the realm of manufactures. She is no longer content to export her resources in their raw state, but now stands eleventh among the manufacturing States of this Union, with a product valued at just over a billion and a half dollars. And in this realm, we are probably only at the beginning of her development.

This development of wealth could hardly have taken place if there had not gone with it a parallel development of transportation. Texas in 1845 was not precisely isolated from the rest of the Union, but getting there was a long and tedious journey. The easiest access was by sea, by sail or steamboat to the tiny ports or landings at the mouths of the rivers which flow into the Gulf. The cotton crop had, of course, to be marketed by sea, or a little later, by the steamboats which came up the Red River beyond Shreveport in favorable seasons. Early in the 1850's Texas began to build her own railroads, but as late as 1870 there were only 700 miles of track, and these ran entirely within her own boundaries and gave no connection with the rest of the Union.

In the latter 1850's came the first rapid and dependable means of travel by land, when the transcontinental stage-coach lines included northern Texas in their routes. The 1870's and 1880's were the era of building during which the Texas railroads came into their own; by 1890 there were 8,600 miles of track within the State, and Texas was at last bound to every other part of the Nation by a mode of transport which could accommodate unlimited quantities of both passengers and freight. Today 10 large systems operate within the State, and Texas, with its 16,600 miles of operated road, is easily first among the States of the Union. Beside the railroads are 24,700 miles of designated and maintained highways, on which operate the gasoline engine vehicles; there were over 119,000,000 motorbus-miles operated in 1943, and 292,000,000 motortruck-miles. Of late Texas has made the fullest use of the facilities of aviation; 9 commercial air lines cover the State with a network of air routes, and, with 294 airports and 1,815 civilian aircraft.

There are many other respects in which I could survey the progress of the hundred years since the Republic became the State, but time forbids. I have merely chosen a few of the most conspicuous landmarks by which the rate of advance can be checked. If those in Congress who opposed the admission of Texas were living now and could see Texas after 100 years of statehood, with all of her growth and development and the contribution in men and material that she has made to the Nation, they would doubtless regret having voted to prevent Texas from becoming one of the galaxy of States.

And looking to the future, let us hope that when the next centennial of Texas statehood is observed, 100 years hence, that no atomic bomb and no enemy from within or without will have destroyed this Nation, and that our children's children can then, as we do now, celebrate the greatness and glory of both Texas and the Nation, and indulge the hope that the Lone Star State may continue to be a conspicuous part of this Republic.

A Thanksgiving Message From the Pacific Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, the following letter, which is entitled "A Thanksgiving Message From Pacific Veterans," certainly is entitled to our hearty "Amen." I put in the RECORD for the President, War and Navy Departments, to read. Congressional action is almost futile. It is the administrative action which is necessary to correct all the evils so sarcastically recited.

I have been in the Pacific theater of war twice before VJ-day. These men have experienced the toughest ordeal. Add to that the monotony of idleness and long waiting and you know how these veterans feel.

The administration has the power to correct every evil and injustice recited. When can we expect action?

The letter follows:

A THANKSGIVING MESSAGE FROM THE PACIFIC VETERANS

On this Thanksgiving holiday of 1945, I wish to send a Thanksgiving message from the veterans of the Pacific, especially of the southern Philippines. We have much to be thankful for this season. We can be thankful that we have not been overseas more than 2 years, and some of us more than 3 years—yet.

We are thankful for the efforts being made in our behalf. In this theater, Liberty ships are being converted for our use in returning home. A pitiful few, true, but at least a token effort is being made. The faster, larger cargo ships that could have carried twice as many of us, and twice as comfortably, are needed for commercial purposes at home. We are thankful that our Nation is thinking of commercial interests rather than the interests of a few million veterans who have the unreasonable wish to get home in the immediate future. After all, what does a few more months or years mean in our young lives.

We are thankful that the Atlantic Charter is not entirely forgotten now that the war is over. Naturally, it is up to us to decide who will control the government the people of the oppressed countries choose. We are thankful that our naval power is being used to transport men and matériel for the Chinese Nationalist Armies under Chiang Kai-shek. He needs help. After all, while we were fighting the Japanese invaders of China, Chiang could not control them with the troops diverted from his war with the Japs. General Stilwell had the unreasonable idea that first consideration should be the Japs rather than fratricidal strife. He was replaced. The Japs could not put down the Chinese Communist Party with their armed might while in power in northern China. Naturally we must now throw in our aid in this "worthy" cause.

We are thankful that the war-weary ships of the line, as well as the cargo ships which have performed valiantly during our time of need, are being retired from active service. One-fifth of the ships of the line, and several hundred of the cargo ships are to be retired, we are told.

We are thankful that other interests are not allowed to be interfered with in order to get our overseas veterans home a little sooner. For many of us it has been three Christmas seasons away from our families, and another one more or less matters little. If a ship is needed to transport arms and munitions to the Dutch for use against the Indonesians, the mere fact that this selfsame ship is loaded with troops bound for the United States need not interfere with that. The troops can be unloaded to make the ship available, as the Liberty ship loaded with 350 home-bound GI's was unloaded at Hollandia, New Guinea, in order that it could proceed to Finchhaven to pick up arms and munitions for the Dutch.

We are thankful that the poor members of the K-Nine Corps are not forgotten. These poor pups have been overseas for a long time, too. Why should they be slighted in favor of the GI?

We have many things to be thankful for this Thanksgiving season. But will someone please tell me precisely what? Americans, give us something to be thankful for next Thanksgiving. Public opinion and pressure can force a general speed-up of the demobilization from the Pacific, and end the immense differentiation between the difference areas of the Pacific theater. Many areas have shipped home men with 60 points while in the southern Philippines we have men with 70, 80, 90, and even 100 points still sweating out transportation. Just because we happen to be the ones who are the greatest distance from home is no reason we should be passed by. We want a general speed-up of demobilization from the Pacific, and on a more equitable basis. Then and only then will we have something to be thankful for this Thanksgiving season.

Housing Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith two articles relative to

the housing situation. They are self-explanatory:

SERVICEMEN'S WIVES DISGUSTED WITH HOUSING SITUATION

Salt Lake City Tribune published feature story on interviews with servicemen's wives who are disgusted with housing situation there. Says one wife, "If I don't have a nice house or apartment with a wreath on the door for Ernie when he gets in at Christmas, somebody's going to hear from me. I'd like to know who fought this war for landlords, anyway." Other wife reports that "if you find a place to live, as you probably won't, they won't give you a lease, and you know what that means—as soon as OPA melts away rent will be doubled. We can't pay it, and it's awful cold in wintertime out on the curb." Another woman reported that a landlord told her as soon as OPA moved out, he'd up rent from $67.50 to $87.50.

FOUR MILLION FAMILIES WANT TO BUILD OR BUY

Chester Bowles, in an article in the New York Times magazine, says that it is expected that not more than 475,000 homes will be built within the next year—only an eighth as many as people would like to build or buy. The OPA, in trying to keep the prices of homes down, has established tight controls on building materials and is maintaining rent controls on rented homes and apartments. Now the OPA is proposing that the prices for completed homes be controlled through the National Housing Administration. Although there are some who oppose this plan, builders stand to benefit from these price-control measures.

Bill H. R. 5012 Proposes To Eliminate Pauper's Oath for Veterans Hospitalization and Domiciliary Care in Veterans' Administration—Follows Resolution Content of National American Legion Convention, 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, many months ago I spoke out against the pauper's oath now used in veterans' matters. I then declared that it was not only unnecessary and undignified, but that it was injurious to morale and unworthy of us as a Nation to demand an oath of these lads as to their financial ability before we would allow them to enter and receive care in Veterans' Administration facilities.

My conception of our duty as a Nation to these veterans is to try, in every way, to promptly and cordially continue to extend to the needy and worthy their every reasonable medical care—and do it without running them through a lot of unnecessary red tape and embarrassing questions. I would favor the great mass of those who will not impose upon their Nation. These boys fought a good fight for us. They went the limit for us. Now let us go the limit for them.

While there are several worthy bills on file by distinguished Members of this House, I know of none of them which provides for the deletion, fully and entirely, the way H. R. 5012 does, in accordance with the resolutions of the American Legion study and conclusions. This group of distinguished veterans is close enough to the heart and mind and needs of the veterans, to speak to us sincerely and soundly. Unless it can be shown that their reasoning is unsound, I believe it should be translated into action—and promptly—for the veterans.

For your information I set forth with my remarks the full text of the Doyle bill, H. R. 5012, filed December 17, 1945, and referred to the World War Veterans' Committee of this House:

A bill to dispense with the requirement that a veteran be unable to pay hospital expenses, in non-service-connected cases, as a condition to hospitalization and domiciliary care in Veterans' Administration facilities, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6, as amended, of title I of the act of March 30, 1933, entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government" (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 38, sec. 706) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and is unable to defray the necessary expenses therefor (including transportation to and from the Veterans' Administration facility)", and by inserting after "shall be furnished necessary hospitalization or domiciliary care (including transportation" the following: "to and from the Veterans' Administration facility in case payment of such transportation by the veteran would cause undue hardship"; and

(2) by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The statement under oath of the applicant on such form as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall be accepted as sufficient evidence that payment of transportation by the applicant would cause undue hardship."

Voluntarism Versus Compulsion in Labor Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, December 17 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Voluntarism Versus Compulsion in Labor Relations, delivered by me before the American Trade Executive Association in Chicago on November 17, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a pleasure for me to participate in this open forum discussion meeting with you on the general subject of labor relations. If I were to give my speech a title I think I would call it Voluntarism Against Compulsion in Labor Relations. However, I do not intend to confine myself too closely to the limitations of any subject because there are several important issues confronting our country today upon which I wish to comment in spite of the fact that not all of them are directly related to the general topic of the type of procedure which should be adopted in settling labor disputes.

I would like to talk quite informally with you about the general problem of the right and responsibilities of industry in the field of labor relations today, and then you may subject me to cross-examination when I close. I don't expect you to agree with all of my viewpoints any more than labor organizations with whom I discuss these problems agree with me, because we are dealing here with a subject so controversial that reasonable men, if they are intellectually honest, are bound to disagree. I don't think anyone, however, should discuss any domestic issue these days without relating to it the all important international issues.

I think that I would fail in my obligations to any audience if, as a Member of the United States Senate, I did not point out that the success or failure of the program and objectives encompassed by the San Francisco Charter will determine our domestic well-being. The international crisis which will confront us for the next few years, and an intelligent handling of that crisis by this country will determine in the last analysis the economy of America.

By nature I am inclined to be optimistic, but I am certainly pessimistic about the trends of America's foreign policies today. When you think that in July 1945 we rose to great heights in America, insofar as reorganizing our international obligations are concerned when we became a subscribing party to the San Francisco Charter, and then when you think of the toboggan ride down the slide of nationalism that we have taken since July 1945, I think I am justified in asking you to ponder the ultimate consequences of reversion to nationalism. I think we need to keep in mind the fact that if we give the world the impression that there is an alinement between the British Commonwealth of Nations and the United States on all international issues, and that decisions are reached by that alinement before an opportunity is given to all nations of the world, through the United Nations Organization, to reach decisions, it ultimately will be to the disadvantage of this country.

I think good progress has been made as the result of the conference between Prime Minister Attlee of Britain and the President of the United States on the atomic-bomb issue. However, we must not ignore this issue. Can you think of an issue which, over the long range of years, is more important to our economic interests? This is an issue which is going to have to be settled on a world-wide basis, and not upon a basis of an alinement between Great Britain and the United States. I hope—although there has been a considerable modification of the attitude of the President of the United States in regard to the atomic-bomb issue from what he held prior to the conference with Prime Minister Attlee, nevertheless, I hope that those two world statesmen will take the next step, and that is to see to it that the atomic-bomb issue is put on the conference table of the United Nations Organization for final policy formulation.

We must realize that it is only a matter of time before the atomic-bomb secrets will be the possession of the world. We can't stop that development. As I said on the floor of the United States Senate recently, the so-called secrets of atomic energy do not belong to the people of the United States. I say now that the bomb does not belong to the people of the United States and to the people of the British Commonwealth of Nations. It belongs to mankind. We cannot nationalize it because we cannot nationalize science. We cannot close the minds of scientists or block the researches of scientists in countries which were not parties to the Attlee, King, Truman communique. The time has come, I think, to heed the teachings of the scientists of America in regard to the policies which must ultimately be followed in connection with atomic energy. Unless they are heeded, then your immediate economic interests will be of only temporary value. Don't delude yourself about it.

There is no room in America for a supernation complex. Read the pages of history and recognize, ladies and gentlemen, that we are dealing today with international problems that call upon us to act as statesmen with vision, with recognition of the fact that in the immediate future—and by the immediate future, I mean the next 2 or 3 years—we are going to have to decide issues through a world organization that will determine the destiny of this Nation for the next century. That destiny will never be determined in the interests of peace, if we adopt a nationalistic attitude toward world problems. An alinement based upon atomic diplomacy will not be conducive to peace unless all nations are included within the alinement.

With that preface, I come to this domestic issue of labor relations. I am confused about it. You are confused about it. I know of no intellectually honest people who aren't confused about it because here, too, we are facing a crisis. I had hoped—I want to continue to hope—that the management-labor conference will bring forth some statesmanlike solutions to labor problems that are impinging upon the economy of this country. On the basis of such releases from the conference as I have read to date, I am discouraged, because I think the conference has given little indication to the American people that it really has come to grips with the basic problems that confront industry and labor in this reconversion period.

I think there are three or four premises which, for purposes of this discussion, we ought to consider basic. One is that a revolution is taking place in the minds of men the world around. Why ignore it? You aren't going to be able to get away from it. We are entering into an era now of the greatest enlightenment in the history of man. We have developed in America the most enlightened workers of any peoples of the world. It is a direct result of 150 years of free education. This enlightment which is a direct product of the great publicity forces, educational forces, and advertising forces, has been wrought over the years upon the consumers of America. Free education and trade advertising have produced a great deal of wishing and desiring on the part of workers and consumers for a better standard of living. Unless you want to stamp out the forces of education, unless you want to try to stop the common men and women of America from thinking, you are going to find it impossible to prevent their ever pressing demand for an increasing share of the products of their labor. That is basic economic-labor fact and industrial statesmen who do not recognize it, I think, will pull a Sampson act in the house of private industry.

Now, I happen to be one who intends to fight for the preservation of a capitalistic system of economy in America if for no other reason than for the reason that I am satisfied, as a student of history, that common men and women will enjoy a better standard of living under such a system than under any state economy that can possibly be devised by politicians. But that does not make me blind to some of the mistakes of employers in the field of labor relations. As I have appeared before labor groups—sometimes in the midst of their "boos"—and pointed out to them that they have a great interest in the profit system, I now point out also to you that there is no other economy that really develops and protects to the same degree as our American system the dignity of the individual.

We should do what we can to get the people of this country to become fully conscious of the fact that political democracy and a profit system economy are inseparable. Destroy the profit system economy and you destroy political democracy for the very simple reason that you have to substitute then for a private enterprise economy a state economy. That means Government dictation not only over business but over workers and employers alike. We have national socialists in America who want to see our private enterprise system destroyed, and they are not looking with disfavor upon the widespread labor struggles of today. I say to labor groups, "Whether you know it or not, unless you work out more peaceful procedures for the settlement of your disputes, you are playing right into the hands of those who seek to destroy the private enterprise system, which you allege you want to maintain, and you are helping along the cause of the regimenters who want to impose upon us a state economy." There is no freedom for labor under such a system. The state becomes the workers' master, not its servant, under any breed of fascism, communism, or national socialism.

But, ladies and gentlemen, if you are going to make the private-enterprise system work, then I tell you, employers as well as labor are going to have to make the voluntary system of collective bargaining work. They are going to have to make some concessions and sacrifice some prejudices if they are going to make it work.

I want to talk now in terms of some specific suggestions that I think American industry is going to have to accept if it is going to make the principles of voluntarism work in the field of labor relations. Needless to say, I am very much opposed to that segment of industry today that is arguing for and trying to have adopted various forms of compulsory arbitration. They will lose their shirts, so to speak, under compulsory arbitration because they seek to substitute for independent action on the part of industry and labor, governmental decrees as to how industry shall function. Although a plausible case can be made for compulsory arbitration on paper, the major objection to it is that it won't work. It won't work because, as long as employers insist upon being free men, and as long as workers insist upon being free labor, they are not going to accept a compulsory arbitration decree, once they are convinced that it is rooted in injustice.

The labor movement is basically a social movement. Let me make clear that I do not mean a socialistic movement, but rather a social movement. Or to put it another way, it is a great human movement with so many factors that it cannot be put in a legislative strait-jacket. It is one thing to legislate against specific abuses of the labor movement. Such legislation is not only necessary from time to time in order to protect the public's interest, but such legislation will receive the support of labor, businessmen, farmers, and consumers generally.

However, on the other hand, such legislation as compulsory arbitration legislation, which has the effect in the last analysis of substituting governmental decree for free collective bargaining, voluntary arbitration, and economic action on the part of industry and labor, is bound to have the opposition, in the long run, of all economic groups, particularly industry and labor. Thus, you will find most industrial leaders and most labor leaders opposed to compulsory arbitration because they see in it an attempt on the part of government to regiment the economic life of the country, and, further, they are realistic enough to know that the spirit of independence, the love of liberty, and freedom of economic action are so basic in our American way of life that any legislation which seeks to stifle them is bound to break down. Volumes of legislation and hundreds of prisons will not prevent free labor and free employers from striking and locking out because in the field of labor relations we are dealing in a very real sense with freedom itself. Both labor and industry fear—and I think rightly so—governmental dictation of labor relations. Such governmental controls as compulsory arbitration are characteristic of totalitarian states, be they communistic or Fascist, and there are forces within our Government today in this country which are unwilling to pay some of the prices of freedom, and hence would like to see a governmentally regimented economy.

Labor and industry oppose compulsory arbitration because they well know that the social and human facets and implications of the labor movement cannot be directed or controlled successfully by the adoption of legal analogies. I doubt if anyone has pleaded more than I have for a judicial approach to the final settlement of labor disputes, but I have always been careful to make the reservation that the judicial approach must be upon a voluntary basis and not a compulsory one. Under a compulsory arbitration approach the arbitration tribunal inevitably becomes the dictator of economic policy, with the result that if its decisions are enforced inherent managerial rights of industry and free collective-bargaining rights of labor are destroyed. Under such a system we would find a constant challenge to government in a field in which, in my opinion, government is least qualified to judge with finality.

I do not think we should ever lose sight of the fact that freedom of economic action on the part of both employers and labor is a very precious right, high on the list of American liberties. In my judgment it is so basic in the psychology of our people that any attempt to destroy it by legislative compulsion will result in so many various types of resistance that any such legislation is doomed before it is even written on the statute books. Free labor and free industry will see in it the danger of loss of economic liberties which, over the long years, have been more beneficia' to the development of the American standard of living than could possibly have been the case if such freedom had not existed. After all, the right of free men to organize and bargain collectively and to strike or lock-out, if necessary, has been a great check against exploitation. Don't forget that Government can be an exploiter, too, but usually it takes a very long time to remedy the exploitations of Government.

It is very fallacious to argue that compulsory arbitration promotes Government by law. We should not assume that every proposal which seeks to control human and economic activity by way of legislation is consistent with the ideal of Government by law. It is frequently too difficult to get the layman to see the limits and confines of proper governmental regulations of the affairs of free men. Usually the point can be made clear only when the Government sees to transgress our liberties to such a degree that we can see in bold relief the danger of governmental tyranny. However, when Government seeks to control the economic lives of industry and labor in the field of labor relations by way of compulsory arbitration, we can be sure that a spirit of noncompliance will manifest itself time and time again, and to such a degree that such legislation will weaken rather than strengthen government by law. In my judgment, a movement for compulsory arbitration in this country would result in a serious set-back to the very dramatic advancement of procedures for the peaceful settlement of labor disputes which is going on throughout the country today. For instance, there is a great increase in the use of voluntary arbitration mediation and conciliation. Good-faith collective bargaining and the settlement of labor disputes in direct negotiations between employers and labor are advancing with such strides that all students of the labor movement are thrilled with the advance. For the Government to step in, however, and substitute

itself as a compulsory arbitrator of labor disputes would change the very nature of the type of peaceful procedures which the parties are now using to an ever-increasing extent in the voluntary settlement of labor disputes.

One of the many objections to the Burton-Ball-Hatch bill is that it is designed to develop compulsory arbitration. If I were an employer, and I wanted to buy for myself the maximum amount of labor trouble, I would invest my money in lobbying for some compulsory arbitration proposal or support some such proposed legislation as the Burton-Ball-Hatch bill. I think that bill would give me the best assurance that I would have constant labor turmoil in my plant. My plea to you is that, if you want to keep the private enterprise system—and we must keep it if we are going to keep our form of government—then veer away from these proposals that are being made in the present crisis which would seek to put labor relations of this country in a legislative straitjacket.

If we are not going to use compulsory measures then what hope is there through voluntary methods? May I say next that in my thinking on these problems I insist on drawing a line between two types of labor controversy: A controversy which involves the social and economic implications of the labor movement, as those implications relate to hours, wages, and conditions of employment; and issues which involve the legal rights of innocent parties and third parties. As to that latter great group, as I said in my foreword to Teller's new book about to come off the press, in the field of legal rights—and I will give you some specific examples of what I mean in a moment—I think it is the obligation of government to maintain government by law, and pass such legislation as is necessary to protect those legal rights. But over in the field of wages, hours, and conditions of employment I want to see a Government hands-off policy to the maximum extent possible. I want to see labor statesmen and industrial statesmen sit down around a truly free, collective bargaining table and, on a basis of voluntarism, come to agreement as to what conditions will prevail between them.

Labor and employers must keep in mind the fact that there are significant differences between the legal rights of parties to labor disputes and the legitimate social and economic objectives of such disputants. As to the former, such as the right to protection of property and person from unfair labor practices engaged in either by employer or union the public's interest is paramount. The protecting of such recognized and publicly accepted legal rights in the field of labor relations as in other spheres of human relations fits into a pattern of legislative and legal sanctions. It is in this phase of labor relations that judicial processes enforced by government are most effective. This is true because once there is universal public acceptance of and demand for certain patterns of conduct between disputants in relation to their property and persons, legal sanctions through legislation for the protection of such obligations of conduct become feasible and usually necessary.

However, most of the operative facts of labor controversies do not relate to legal rights but rather to social and economic objectives in regard to which the parties should be allowed the maximum of voluntary action and freedom of choice compatible with the public's interests. Legislative bodies usually create more serious labor trouble than they seek to solve whenever they attempt to place legislative restrictions upon social and economic objectives of a labor program which are consonent with our system of government and the legal rights of persons affected by those objectives even though they may be affected to their economic detriment.

It is in connection with the economic and social objectives of the labor movement, as they manifest themselves in specific industrial disputes, that the area of conflict between the principles of voluntarism and freedom of individual and group choice as contrasted with governmental compulsion and legislative restrictions, exists. Both labor and industry are constantly confronted with legislative attempts to destroy their freedom of action within the area of legitimate economic and social aims. The public's concern is to be found in its Government maintaining a proper balance between freedom of action on the part of labor and employers to settle their differences and advance their interests by means of free collective bargaining and all it implies in respect to voluntarism, and attempts on the part of labor and employers to abuse their freedom of action by infringing upon well-recognized legal rights of each other and of third parties. In addition the public rightly looks to its legislators to provide for fair and decent labor standards and for administrative and judicial machinery which will protect those standards. During the war great strides were made by industry and labor in developing procedures of quasi-judicial wartime tribunals set up for the peaceful settlement of disputes. Many procedural, as well as substantive labor law precedents, were established by wartime labor tribunals, notably the National War Labor Board. It is to be expected that out of this experience industry and labor will look to Government to make available to them on a voluntary basis administrative machinery and quasi-judicial tribunals as aids to them in collective bargaining and in the peaceful settlement of their disputes.

When I speak about the obligation of government to protect the legal and property rights of innocent parties and of third parties in labor controversies, I think of such examples as these: The jurisdictional dispute. I say to this audience, as I have for years to other audiences, that I, for one, believe that the jurisdictional strike is absolutely unjustified in our country, and I have yet to hear a labor leader who has been able to advance a single sound argument that justifies going out on strike because his union is in a jurisdictional dispute with another union. My record on this issue was made long before I went into politics. I have said in decision after decision, as an arbitrator under a contract, that I would not support a stoppage of work under the contract on the basis of a jurisdictional dispute. I have held that I would not support a union, as far as a picket line is concerned, whenever the picket line is a collusive one resulting from a jurisdictional dispute. A third party—the employer as well as an innocent public—is damaged in his legal rights by jurisdictional strikes. The Government has an obligation in such cases to see to it that property rights of innocent parties are protected by whatever force of law is necessary to protect them in such cases. I consider such strikes a challenge to government by law, and I have said so many, many times. Thus on the floor of the Senate the other day I said:

"I particularly wish to commend the statement the President made with respect to jurisdictional disputes, because I happen to share the view that unless labor, by voluntary agreement, comes forward with a procedure whereby jurisdictional disputes can be settled without strikes, it is the public duty and obligation of the Congress of the United States to establish whatever court procedures may be necessary to settle jurisdictional disputes by legal sanctions and determinations. I say that because jurisdictional disputes impinge upon the legal rights of people not parties to an economic struggle. I hope that this conference will keep constantly in mind the very important line of demarcation between the legal rights of parties to labor disputes and the social and economic rights of such parties. In the latter category I do not believe that straitjacket legislation can provide us with any permanent solution to the problem. However, government does have the responsibility to see to it that parties in an economic struggle which impinges upon the legal rights of groups or individuals, be they labor or employers, must be prevented from the transgressions against the legal rights of others. I believe that the President made that very clear by implication, if not by exact language yesterday, when he told the conference in effect that some procedure must be found for settling jurisdictional disputes."

It has been my hope that labor and industry leaders, as to this particular issue, would work out a peaceful procedure without governmental action. I have hoped that something would come out of the present industry-labor conference on the point. Maybe it will. I have seen no public indication of it.

I remember the first week that I served on the War Labor Board. We had a jurisdictional strike in a midwestern plant. One union was objecting because another union was maintaining machinery that the striking union had installed. The striking union insisted on the right to also maintain the machinery. The dispute came to us about 5 o'clock in the afternoon and it involved a vital war plant. I made what in my judgment was just a formal routine motion. I said, "I move that the men be ordered to return to work at the next shift, and that Mr. Green and Mr. Murray be requested to settle the dispute without further stoppage."

I was figuratively lifted out of my seat, because one gentleman on the labor side of the table, hit his fist on the table and shouted, "We dare you to call for a vote on that motion. We serve notice that this Board is not going to tell us when our men have to work."

There I was, under the law of national necessity, sitting as a member of a compulsory arbitration tribunal for the war period. That is what the War Labor Board was during the war, and I am perfectly willing to justify it as such in a war crisis but I want none of its compulsory powers in peacetime. I think we had to have a supreme court of labor during the war and those of us on the War Labor Board tried to so function. Hence the challenge thrown down in this case challenged our jurisdiction over such disputes.

Don't forget that the Defense Mediation Board had just recently been broken up because one segment of labor didn't like one of its decisions, and I recognized at once that if we were going to be confronted with that challenge constantly, with one side or the other walking out because they didn't like some decision, we had better get that issue behind us, so I said, "Mr. Chairman, I move the previous question." And then that great public servant, Frank Graham, seconded my motion. Then I said, "I want to get this issue behind us. I want to know whether or not war production is going to be stopped in this country by jurisdictional strikes. If you labor members are going to take the position you are suggesting the sooner this board folds up the better. I am willing to take the issue to the country."

The labor side—and I am speaking of all factions because they were as one on this jurisdictional matter—ask for a 10-minute recess. They came back after 10 minutes and said, "You won't have to put that motion, because we have ordered the men back to work."

I said, "Ah, that is not good enough. That doesn't settle the issue. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move that the following resolution be the policy of this Board," and I then introduced the resolution which provided that in the case of jurisdictional disputes, Mr. Green and Mr. Murray, or whatever labor

leaders were involved, would be notified of the dispute by the Board, and unless they had it settled within 24 hours, we would appoint an arbitrator whose decision would be final and binding." The vote was 8 to 4, with labor dissenting, but it became the policy of the War Labor Board for the period of the war.

Privately some of those labor leaders said, "You gave us an awful beating, but we asked for it. We recognize that certainly during wartime we shouldn't have jurisdictional strikes." I say we cannot justify them in peacetime, either.

Because of the limits of time, I will mention just one other point on labor's side of the line. I am a firm believer that when a labor organization signs a contract, its signature should be cherished as its bond. Hence, in all my arbitration work I have taken the position that the contract must speak for itself. I didn't write it. I didn't sign it, but the parties did. If they signed a poor one, that is too bad, but they cannot have orderly peaceful procedure in labor relations unless both parties live up to their contracts. Hence, when either an employer or a union violates a contract provision I think they should be held responsible. I think they should settle disputes arising under a contract by voluntary arbitration. If they don't I think the contract obligations must be enforced by government. If labor and management don't want to come forward with such proeedure as will permit of contract enforcement voluntarily, then I happen to share the view that it is an obligation of government to insist upon it.

Now let me say a word or two about your obligations as employers in labor disputes. I think yu need to do some rethinking. I think you need to throw away some of your escape mechanisms which you use to avoid giving up to the full obligations of voluntary arbitration. Personally, I do not think any American employer can justify taking a position before the people of the United States of refusing to be willing to submit to voluntary arbitration all issues that have created an impasse between himself and his workers. If you can't settle the dispute in collective bargaining, if you can't work it out in conciliation and mediation, then I do not think you have a right, or should be permitted by the public, to exercise the right of saying, "I will not put the merits of my case on top of an arbitration table for the full consideration of the public, and let the decision rest upon the merits."

I know there are a lot of employers who are dragging their feet on this issue. Predictions are dangerous, but I think you are going to be forced in the next decade to stop hiding behind the worn-out alibi, "inherent rights of management." Not immediately, because right now the employers of America—because of some mistakes that labor leaders have made—are in a very favorable position with public opinion. But don't forget the pendulum of public opinion swings. Hence, I would like to see American employers grasp the great opportunity they have now, and come forward with a program which shows that they really mean to practice these principles of voluntarism for which I have been pleading. I say to American labor and employers, as I said to a group of employers in my office yesterday morning about a strike of great importance to a large section of this country, "Why don't you offer to arbitrate all the issues which have been raised between you?" They said, "Oh, first, we don't know what kind of an arbitrator we would get, and second, we feel that the issues impinge upon some of our inherent rights of management."

Now, you won't like this one, but I want to tell you what I said to them: "You should stop talking about determining the jurisdiction of arbitration for yourselves by taking the position that every time you think you may be weak on some certain issue, you won't arbitrate it because it interferes with some inherent rights of management." Employers generally hide behind that fiction when the fact is that many of the labor disputes in this country arise over the question of whether or not the demand of labor does interfere with the inherent rights of management. Now, if you had a compulsory arbitration system, that would go to arbitration whether you wanted it or not, and if you have got confidence in the merits of your case, you ought to be willing, if that is what is causing the major trouble in the case, to submit that issue to voluntary arbitration and let the facts speak for themselves. So I say, ladies and gentlemen, that I am not at all impressed with the contention of industry in some great cases that they can't submit the issues to arbitration because they involve the inherent rights of management.

If you are going to use voluntary arbitration in good faith, let me very quickly suggest a few procedural safeguards that I think are vital: Keep the affidavit of prejudice to be used against an unqualified arbitrator. When you accept an arbitrator, do not bind yourselves to accepting him beyond that particular case. I say that for two main reasons: First, I don't like the system of so-called industry impartial umpires appointed as standing arbitrators. An industry impartial umpire sooner or later becomes a substitute for collective bargaining. The parties pass the buck to him, and he is soon doing the things in your labor-relations work that you should be doing for yourselves in negotiations with the labor group. Further, I don't like the impartial umpire set-up, because I have noticed that those umpires don't remain impartial very long. At least, they are suspected of not being impartial after they have rendered a few decisions. I am at a loss to understand why some of them seem to want to keep their jobs after they have lost the confidence of one or both sides of the parties to the contract.

Further, I suggest keep the affidavit of prejudice, because it not only is a good check upon the arbitrator but, psychologically, it is a great reassurance to yourself. I have always taken the position in my arbitration work that at the beginning of a case either side should be allowed to stand up and say, "Mr. Arbitrator, we prefer not to have you handle this case." I don't want to hear a reason. Maybe a party doesn't like the color of my necktie, or my last decision, but he should be privileged, in my judgment, to object to my further services. Interestingly enough, as far as my own experience is concerned, guaranteeing the affidavit to the parties has resulted in its not being exercised in a single case. I think the very fact that the parties were guaranteed the right to use it built up their confidence in the arbitrator.

Second, if you are going to use voluntary arbitration, do not forget to include in your contract procedures that guarantee a full consideration of the case by the arbitrator. I happen to be one who believes firmly in reasonable judicial procedures for arbitration. Let me take the wage issue. Incidentally, let me say that if you want an example of the abuse of proper arbitration procedure, you only need to look to the conditions of reference which the Secretary of Labor attempted to impose upon the oil industry in this country when he said, in his proposal, "Give them 15 percent and then arbitrate whether they should have any more." In my judgment, that did violence to a fair judicial process for voluntary arbitration.

If you are going to use voluntary arbitration as a judicial process, then on the wage issue let the arbitrator have access to all the facts. A judicially minded arbitrator will say in reply to your argument, "We cannot pay higher wages," "I want to go into your books." Every time that issue has come before me, as a private arbitrator, it has been interesting to note how frequently the employer withdrew his objection on ability to pay and permitted me to go ahead with the wage issue without a consideration of his books. On the other hand, I have had many instances in which the books have been submitted, and I think you would be surprised to discover how easy it is to develop confidence in honest arbitrators by letting them go into your books and render a decision on the wage issue in accordance with what the facts of the business show. Too many employers use the claim that they can't pay higher wages as a red herring argument, and they should be required to submit proof and not mere allegation on that point.

The constant drive of labor for a greater share of the product of its labor is a natural drive. It is going to continue, because free men and women in this country are going to constantly try to improve their standards of living. It is well that they should. However, reason and facts under this voluntary system should prevail. Hence we must try to inject into the picture an honest exchange of facts between the employer, the arbitrator, and labor so that the arbitrator's decision can rest on facts and not on suppositions or economic threats.

I have talked already longer than the program committee suggested. Therefore, I shall close with one last point, but still a vital one. I think that temporarily American industry in the present labor chaos is going to be in a stronger position with the public than will be labor. But you are going to make a mistake if you do not recognize, as industrialists, the importance of maintaining the high purchasing power of American workers. Unless you maintain that power, you are going to deflate the value of the American dollar. After the immediate splurge of buying that is ahead for the next 4 or 5 years based largely on spending present savings, a low-wage structure will throw us into a depression which will prove to be very costly to American industry.

So I say to that segment of American industry that still thinks labor is a commodity, that still believes it is essential, under a private enterprise system, to maintain a large pool of unemployed out of which they can pull their labor to meet their labor needs as labor conditions change—you are selling industry short if you fight for low wages now. You cannot treat labor as a commodity any longer and get by with it in this country. Labor will not tolerate and should not tolerate low wages and a low standard of living. We must make these voluntary procedures of free collective bargaining work if we are going to keep labor free, if we are going to keep employers free, if we are going to keep America free from some form of state socialism.

Feed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include: First, a letter; second, some recommendations; and, third, an analysis which the Department of Agriculture furnished me in reply to certain questions with reference to the feed situation which I directed to that agency of the Federal Government, as follows:

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION, GRAIN BRANCH,
December 14, 1945.

Hon. HENRY O. TALLE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. TALLE: This will acknowledge your letter of November 27, addressed to Mr. Walter C. Berger, Chief, Feeds Division, concerning a possible order to limit the amount of protein ingredients being used in mixed feeds for livestock and poultry. We have also noted your request for a general summary of the feed situation at present and the outlook for next year.

The protein meal situation had become so critical that the Department proposed the issuance of an order designed to limit the amount of protein used in mixed feeds for livestock and poultry at the present time to the amount which was used during the same months of last year. When this proposal was presented to the feed industry, representatives of the industry took the view that the inequities in the distribution of protein feed ingredients could be corrected on a voluntary basis. The Department is giving the feed industry this opportunity.

In order that the necessary adjustments be brought about by the industry itself, we have asked the feed manufacturers to adopt a program designed to adjust their production schedules to last year's operations and eliminate a number of undesirable trade practices which have developed because of the critical supply situation. We are enclosing a copy of the recommendations which have been submitted to the feed industry.

These recommendations are to effect a reduction in the amount of protein ingredients currently being used in mixed feed for both livestock and poultry. Our records on the quantities of proteins being produced at the present time indicate that we have only enough protein ingredients to produce the same amount of mixed feed for all classes of livestock and poultry that was being produced at this time last year.

In compliance with your request for a statement on the general feed situation, we are enclosing a summary which, we believe, should meet your needs.

Very truly yours,

JAMES W. BROWNING,
Assistant Chief, Feeds Division.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EFFECTING A MORE EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF PROTEIN FEED INGREDIENTS

(By Walter C. Berger, Chief, Feeds Division)

Numerous and increasingly insistent complaints on the part of the feed industry about its inability to obtain enough oilseed meals for current requirements have given rise to the consideration of an order restricting the use of protein meal for feed. An order limiting the quantity of protein meal used in mixed feeds during the period December 1945–February 1946 to the amounts used during the same months of the preceding year was discussed with representatives of the industry. The order also proposed to limit the production of poultry feeds during this period to the same amounts produced in the corresponding months of the preceding year in order to effect an equitable distribution of protein meal among the various classes of users.

Although the institution of such an order would bring about a more normal distribution and use of protein meals, we are very hesitant to recommend issuance of an order at a time when our efforts are directed toward the lifting of wartime governmental controls. We want to give the industry every opportunity to solve their problem on a voluntary basis.

In order to correct the protein-meal distribution difficulties on the basis of voluntary action, the industry itself must make adjustments such as the following:

1. Any feed manufacturer having materials on hand or bought, that will enable him to produce more mixed feed than he produced in the corresponding month a year ago should reduce his production schedule accordingly. The manufacturer should then release to the market at least part of the materials, which, if the order were in force, he would not be allowed to use in making mixed feeds.

2. The industry as a whole should take particular note of its production of poultry feeds and adjust its output for the month of December to the same level as a year ago.

3. Commission merchants and terminal elevators who formerly were not in the feed distribution business should immediately discontinue the practice of demanding oilseed meals for oilseeds. Such a practice is not part of their normal business and only aggravates the distribution difficulties.

4. Country elevators should discontinue requiring that processors supply them with oil meals for the oilseeds that they are selling to the processors in excess of their immediate needs.

The small amount of meal that is being demanded by the seed growers who supply the country elevators is justifiable. The country elevators should refrain from taking more meal than they need for their retail sales to their former customers in their own territory. The practice of accepting meal for the purpose of reselling to other feed dealers and feed manufacturers should be discontinued.

The total supply of protein feeds available in 1945–46 is sufficient to maintain production of meat, dairy, and poultry products to meet all peacetime requirements. The difficulties some users are having in securing their equitable share of protein feed ingredients can be attributed only to maldistribution. It is hoped that cooperation of the industry will make it unnecessary to issue the proposed order.

THE FEED SITUATION

A total supply of 160,000,000 tons of feed concentrates is available in the 1945–46 feeding year, including carryover, production, and imports. This total includes feed grains, byproduct feeds, and wheat and rye for feeding. It compares with a total supply of 161,500,000 tons a year ago and a 1937–41 average of 137,000,000 tons. In terms of units of grain-consuming animals, the supply of concentrates per unit of livestock estimated to be on farms on January 1, 1946, will be 1.09 tons compared with 1.10 tons a year previous and an average of 1.06 tons in 1937–41. In addition to this supply of concentrates, there is a near-record supply of hay in relation to cattle numbers, with the geographical distribution unusually favorable.

The total supply of concentrate feeds fed to livestock has included in recent years from eighteen to twenty million tons of byproduct feeds which constitute roughly 15 percent of the total feed concentrates fed. Mill byproducts contribute nearly one-half, oilseed cake and meal about one-third, and animal proteins the remainder. The total amount of byproduct feeds available in 1945–46 will be smaller than the record supply of 19,500,000 tons in 1944–45. Mill feeds will be about the same, with the indicated sharp decrease in brewers' and distillers' dried grains offset by increases in wheat mill feeds and beet pulp. The supply of oilseed cake and meal will be significantly smaller, with the estimated 25 percent decrease in cottonseed cake and meal only partly offset by increases in the production of linseed and peanut cake and meal. Estimates of the supply of cottonseed meal available in 1945–46 had to be repeatedly scaled down, reflecting continued deterioration of the cotton crop. Cottonseed production from the 1945 crop, as indicated on December 1, is estimated to be 24 percent less than produced in 1944 and 28 percent below the 10-year average. The supply of animal proteins is expected to be somewhat larger than a year ago, reflecting increased slaughter operations and larger production of dried buttermilk and skim milk for feed.

Estimates of livestock and poultry production on the basis of current livestock numbers and indicated supplies of feed concentrates suggest that total livestock production in 1946 could be maintained at the 1945 level without a significant reduction in carry-over stocks of feed grains. The available feed supply, however, cannot sustain an expansion in poultry production such as is indicated from current statistics on hatchery operations. The readjustments which must be made from the wartime level of agricultural production are greater in the case of eggs than for other livestock products. Production of eggs and poultry during the war increased to a volume sufficient to meet all military and export requirements and, at the same time, permitting a substantial increase in civilian consumption. This has not been possible for other livestock products. Civilian per capita consumption of livestock and poultry products in 1945 compares with the 1935–39 average about as follows:

Eggs and chickens, 25- to 35-percent increase.

Turkeys, 50-percent increase.

Meats (other than poultry), unchanged.

Dairy products, unchanged.

If livestock production in 1946 is maintained at the 1945 level, it represents a substantial readjustment to peacetime requirements. Since the wartime peak was reached in 1943, total cattle numbers have decreased each year; milk cow numbers in 1946 will be at least 2 or 3 percent below the wartime peak of 1944; and hog production in 1946 is expected to be nearly 30-percent down, leaving little for export after meeting civilian needs. This decline in livestock-dairy production has taken place in spite of the fact that civilian demand calls for an increased output of these products. While these readjustments to decreasing feed supplies have taken place in livestock production, output of poultry and poultry products continued at record levels. Although the number of hens has declined, egg production in 1945 was only 5 percent below 1944, and new peaks have been set this year in broiler and turkey production.

Substantial reduction in poultry and egg production will be imperative not only to adjust our agricultural production pattern to peacetime needs, but to preserve our extremely limited feed supplies, of which an uncalled-for large proportion continues to go into poultry products at the expense of output of meat and dairy products. The greater flexibility of poultry production and its increased production efficiency resulting from expanded commercial operations have enabled the poultry and egg industry to compete more effectively with other livestock enterprises for our available protein feed resources. This has been possible largely because of the ceiling prices imposed upon feeds which suspended the operation of supply and demand factors in the distribution of feed supplies. If prices were allowed to fluctuate freely, our feed supplies would be automatically allocated among the different uses and the distribution would be in the best interest of agricultural producers and the consuming public alike. Price controls cannot be terminated until our over-all agricultural output has increased sufficiently in relation to demand to effectively check inflation. While these controls must eventually go, their premature removal may not only bring inflation, but would greatly aggravate the problem of fair distribution.

The restrictive effect of a continued wartime level of poultry and egg production upon other livestock enterprises is demonstrated by the following facts:

(a) Of our total supply of high-protein feeds, 65 percent is used in the manufacture of mixed feeds.

(b) Approximately 60 percent of our total production of mixed feeds consists of poultry feed. This indicates that over 50 percent of our high-protein feeds goes into the production of poultry and eggs.

As a result of the decreased supplies of high-protein feed ingredients as compared with a year ago and the continued heavy demands on protein feeds from poultry producers, the tight feed situation, which had been anticipated to ease considerably by this time, shows no signs of relaxation. The situation for poultry feeds is much less favorable than for livestock feed in general. The large amount of the corn crop which is soft this year is sure to make for a tight corn situation in poultry areas. Soft corn can be fed to advantage to cattle and hogs but not to poultry, especially when it must move through commercial channels.

With no improvement in the supply situation in sight, the adjustments needed to restore balance to our feed-food picture will have to be in the form of reduced livestock operations. Poultry and egg producers, so far, have made little, if any, adjustment to the loss of wartime demands, because poultry and egg prices have been holding generally at satisfactory levels. Poultry producers should be urged to bring about the necessary adjustments before prices much lower than those now prevailing will force producers to fall in line. Not only will prices reach a much lower level if adjustments are postponed, but the total adjustment that will need to be made will be more drastic if action is delayed. The coming year gives every indication of being one in which efficiency in operations rather than volume of production merits principal consideration.

Destiny in Our Hands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me, I would like to include in the RECORD, an article entitled "Destiny in Our Hands" by Dr. Walter H. Barkas of the University of Washington in Seattle, Wash. Dr. Barkas, an outstanding scholar and scientist, prepared his paper on behalf of himself and several score other scientists at the University. While some may not agree with his conclusions, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Barkas offers to this Congress and to the American people much to occupy our thought and to challenge our ancient conceptions. The article follows:

DESTINY IN OUR HANDS

(By Dr. Walter H. Barkas)

This Nation has enormous production facilities and a virile people. We have great but demobilizing armed forces, immense military supplies, and a most devastating weapon in the atomic bomb. Now for the first time in history we, with our potential allies, could cause our will to prevail throughout the world. We are not exercising overtly this aggressive power; yet, ultimately, a security for everyone can come only by the establishment of a real world authority. The power and prestige of this country are greater than have been enjoyed by any nation in modern times, and there still remains a considerable store of genuine good will toward us in many corners of the globe. Why must we subscribe only to timid, unimaginative policies when we ought to be outstanding in world leadership?

Our present dominant situation is, nevertheless, transient. Soon we shall have demobilized, others may have closed the gap in the superiority of weapons, new political line-ups will have shifted the balance of power elsewhere, and the opportunity which now presents itself for decisive steps in organization will have passed.

Wealth and vulnerability invite attack, although aggression may also come from fear or desperation. The new and more dreadful character which warfare has assumed demands that the leaders of this country face the facts squarely.

Suppose any nation were in possession of a supply of atomic explosive sufficient for perhaps a hundred bombs. Such a small quantity of material might be transported into this country in embassy luggage or by numerous other means. Well organized smuggling by a foreign power would be very difficult to stop or even detect. One must postulate that in peacetime there are no great practical obstacles to bringing atomic bombs secretly into this country.

The agents of the nation in possession of the bombs could acquire private quarters located in the central areas of each of our large cities, and particularly in Washington. A suitable plan might be to mine such buildings with atomic bombs set to be detonated at a given time which could be arranged, by simple means, to be synchronized in all the cities.

The complete devastation of the governmental and industrial centers of the country with the loss of the key personnel should be quite sufficient to render us incapable of organized resistance.

Certain steps are possible which might aid in preventing such a calamity, but it is believed that military defenses against a carefully prepared undeclared attack of this sort are really not feasible, and a defensive force is powerless to protect the Nation. The dependence on such forces for protection would be an example of the old fallacy of the Maginot Line, and might induce a false sense of security.

We require a basic re-evaluation of our position in the world and a dynamic concept of organization for our own protection and for the welfare of all peoples.

A PROPOSED COURSE OF ACTION FOR THE UNITED STATES LEADING TO AN EFFECTIVE WORLD STATE

In its early history, this Nation brought into practical realization a union of sovereign States. The Constitution of the United States was written amid strife and suffering and the Nation was welded together with wisdom, diplomacy, and compromise. In the War Between the States, a great issue was settled, and the Union thereby strengthened. In United States history, sovereign States have been persuaded or have themselves requested to join the Union and relinquish their sovereignty to the Federal Government.

As in the beginning of this Nation, now is the time for bold and decisive action. The United States in its maturity can lead other nations in establishing a world authority providing constitutional guarantees for the elementary freedoms of men, and freedom from fear for all peoples.

Such an enterprise will require leaders of great stature, but freemen have risen to the occasion and grown in stature when there were great deeds to be done. Witness the response of this Nation to the Pearl Harbor attack of only 4 years ago.

Within the organization of our Government, as it exists, we have the means for establishing a world authority. The following steps are contemplated:

1. A draft of a definite world constitution should be prepared. No better model exists than the Constitution of the United States of America. This document has stood the test of time, providing a government which is stable and which on the whole has protected the freedoms of the citizens very well. It is very important that there be bipartisan agreement on the text of the constitution and on the proposed program for putting it into effect. While there may be necessary amendments and alterations to the existing constitution, a union as strong as that between the present States must be envisaged, and the Executive must be provided with authority to exercise force up to the full strength of the component States when necessary. Only police-like militia may be permitted the individual States.

In putting into black and white definite constitutional guarantees, informal sounding out of foreign opinion doubtless will be necessary to aid in making realistic provisions.

One possible means for gaining the helpful cooperation of the Soviet Union is for representatives of the United States Government to approach the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic and inform them of the course of action to be taken by the United States of America. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republic would then invite and prepare a world constitution acceptable to the United States of America. Such a move must be undertaken only at the highest levels by men of good will. A similar direct means for obtaining the cooperation of the Soviet Union has been suggested by Professor Einstein.

Alternatively, the preparation of the constitution might be carried out by experts in our Department of State in consultation with the statesmen of both political parties. The bringing in of representatives of more than one country in the actual preparation of the document probably would be unwise and fruitless wrangling might result.

Whoever writes the constitution, we must insist on the preservation of the basic freedoms as understood in this country and in England. It is believed that neither an economic system nor a religion should be forced on any people. To show that organization is possible with individual differences, we may cite Canada. Some provinces are socialist, some capitalist; some Catholic, some Protestant; some speak English, some French.

Legislative representation of individual states in the federation could properly be made equally between the states in one legislative body and proportional to the literate population in a second body.

2. The next step after the preparation of a plan of world organization meeting the approval of the nation's leaders would be to publicize it, using all the skill and know-how which American publicists possess. A program of conditioning all the accessible people of the world, including our own, should be the sole task of a major agency comparable to the Office of War Information. This office should be established for the purpose, and provided with large resources. The executives in the agency ought to be of the highest caliber available in the country.

Every channel for publicity should be utilized fully in selling the proposed organization so thoroughly to all peoples that even the most adamant leaders will be forced to cooperate.

In carrying out the publicity campaign books and booklets in all languages should be prepared and distributed by every means possible. Articles and editorials should appear in all available newspapers and periodicals. The proposition that "the pen is mightier than the sword" must be exploited to the limit. The moving pictures ought to be used aggressively, and a world network of radio stations put into operation pushing the idea. The services of the greatest orators in

the various languages must be obtained. Support can be built up in the great world religious organizations which may be very powerful. Clubs should be formed dedicated to the idea and the organization of these clubs should be international insofar as possible. In addition representatives of our Government provided with large funds should be sent abroad to develop the idea; and to gain support and commitments from influential individuals within the governments of the various nations.

The greatest inducement for entering the federation, of course, would be in the security provided. By joining the federation any people could acquire the protection of the joint resources and manpower of the signatories. Every individual would thereby acquire all the rights and privileges of citizenship. During the campaign the various provisions of the constitution should be elaborated, and the truly utopian possibilities of the world order developed.

It is reasonable to ask what expenditure we can afford for such permanent security. By camparison, what did we buy for $300,000,000,000 in the past war? If even a fair fraction of this amount were spent intelligently to develop the proposed world organization success would be assured. It would be a grave mistake to undertake such a program without providing plenty of margin. If carried out boldly and overwhelmingly no risks of any sort are incurred.

3. The technique of sampling public opinion should be employed continuously so as to gage accurately the progress of the campaigns in the various countries.

As soon as measurement of sentiment both here and abroad indicates that the time is ripe for action, the United States of America should proceed with the organization.

A Federal territory not subject to the jurisdiction of any present sovereign nation should be established. Representatives of countries responding to our invitation to assemble would bring into being the Federation, operating under the previously prepared constitution and having complete sovereignty over the external affairs, and the internal affairs as necessary, of the signatory states. If the campaign will have been handled astutely, a large number of states would rush to participate. The remainder must be handled with patience and given very persuasive treatment. Probably no single nation would be strong enough to stay out. The great danger at this point is the formation of a rival organization of greater vitality. Obviously, the Federation must be brought to completion before the present great advantages of the United States of America have deteriorated. In carrying out the proposed confederation, every shred of United States bargaining power, military, moral, and economic, must be made available to insure its success.

It is virtually certain that the atomic bomb and other weapons under development render sovereign nations things too fragile to exist long in the world. Men of Hitler's type are not uncommon, and where he miscalculated, the next conqueror may well map a campaign reckoned to lead with certainty to success. If we do not take the initiative in world organization, others will, and, after so doing, little of civilization may remain.

ADDENDUM

Since the above was written public attention has been called by American scientists to the vulnerability of our cities to atomic mines. In the meantime, also, the Prime Minister of Great Britain has proposed to pool the secret weapons of all countries in the custody of the United Nations Organization. Even if this is feasible there remains a fear that the degree of sovereignty remaining to the nations making up this Organization so weakens its authority that it may not be effective. Nevertheless, this move on the part of Great Britain shows how far others are willing to go to implement a world organization.

If a sufficiently strong United Nations Organization moves rapidly into the position of authority it must occupy, it may not be necessary for the United States of America to undertake a unilateral course of action. However, if the UNO degenerates into a modern Tower of Babel, then the program outlined above remains open—provided that the United States of America still possesses sufficient bargaining power to carry it through.

Anglo-American Loan Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, because I believe it goes to the very root of the reasons for the recent loan agreement between the United States and Great Britain, I am asking consent to include with my remarks a recent column written by Mr. Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

ANGLO-AMERICAN LOAN AGREEMENT

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Prompt ratification of the American loan to Britain is an urgent necessity. Ratification with a minimum of debate. Without too much penny pinching. With complete disregard for the Sam-the-Sap and global Santa Claus jeers that will be left around like bird droppings by discredited American crows, frantically seeking revalorization.

For the new agreement, reached after such painful negotiations, is principally a political act. If—which is impossible—every nickel of the three and three-quarter billion loan were to be ultimately lost, it would still be as much a paying investment as winning the war.

Obviously the agreement is, at the same time, an economic measure and a most important one. If it works out as planned, it will help to stabilize the business world. It will go some distance toward restoring multilateral world trade. It should eliminate the exclusive "sterling bloc" of countries restricted to trading in British pounds.

It should free consumers from losses due to international cartels, those footpads of modern commerce. It should end the mischievous German-invented practice of currency manipulation. And it should put Great Britain solidly back on its base as financial pillar.

All these things are well worth doing. But the real stake behind the Anglo-American agreement is something else, something greater—namely, the preservation of a society based on individual freedom rather than on protected unfreedom. For this the existence of an independent and powerful Britain is almost as essential as that of an independent and powerful U. S. A.

We do not have to worry about Britons keeping their independence with or without American assistance, they will keep control over their affairs. They did not challenge the Nazis single-handed in 1940 in order to submit to anybody's dictation in 1945. It is to maintain their essential independence that even now—after the war has ended and the worst is over—they go on heroically submitting to material restrictions the hint of which would throw Americans impatient of OPA regulations into hysterics.

But without temporary American aid, Britain cannot quickly recover its power. And this power is—as I said—essential to the preservation of a society, in the main, based on freedom.

Here the interruptions begin. "What about the Labor government's attack on free enterprise?" shouted the indignant capitalist.

"What about British imperialism?" insist the hypnotized Liberals.

Precisely. What about them?

It is time Americans learned that under mass production methods, civil liberties are no longer a byproduct of declining private initiative.

The late Frank Knox, Republican newspaper publisher, sat one morning in the sunny courtyard of the Byzantine Museum of Athens, Greece. He had just visited Mussolini's Italy and around him once-free Greeks were writhing under the Metaxas dictatorship. Suddenly, the experience began to work. To this writer, he announced:

"It isn't property that's important, it's liberty. Am I right?"

In the last years the same revelation has come to many.

British socialism, so far from choking off, may prove to be the forcing bed of greater liberty. As Britain goes, so—I believe—goes western Europe.

What about British imperialism? Once it was a real danger. The present spectacle of the British Labor Party clubbing Jews in Palestine and bombing Javanese is repugnant enough. But actually, British imperialism is a dying duck and none know it better than the British. Their problem is how to end it without thereby providing fuel for another, more dangerous imperialism.

One way or another, the long subjugated peoples of Asia—and ultimately of Africa—are going to cast off the old yokes. The question is, Who is going to guide their first uncertain steps toward self-government? Will they move toward individual freedom or toward protected unfreedom? Certainly, from the American viewpoint—ignored by too many Americans—it is far better that they should remain associated with Europe. This can happen only if Britain and western Europe remain both strong and free.

We should try to realize that in a world balance between two systems, the intellectual power of western Europe, the weight of Asia's numbers, will ultimately turn the scales.

This is why American politicians more conscious of their country's real interests would long since have gone to work building up France instead of allowing sympathy with Germans to obscure their view. This is why, in aiding Great Britain to recover its economic and political health, Americans are really aiding themselves.

The real stake behind the Anglo-American loan agreement is what is best in the American way of life.

Our Future Lies in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me, I wish to include an article from the Machinists Monthly Journal, official publication of the International Association of Machinists, of which I am proud to be a member.

The article, by Albert H. Jenkins, is a brief and trenchant appraisal of what

is happening in China. It should be read by every Member of this House, and particularly by those who have doubted the wisdom of pursuing the policy first established by our late great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt. That policy was for a united coalition government in China, and, as this article says, such an achievement would be good news, indeed, not alone for China but for the United States and the world.

The article follows:

[From A. F. of L. Machinists Monthly Journal of November 1945]

(By Albert H. Jenkins)

The future of the United States may be decided in China.

That may seem unlikely now, when America has proved itself the strongest nation in the world and expects to remain so, but let's look at some facts which show it makes a big difference to us what happens in China, the "sleeping giant" which is awakening.

First, facts on the fundamental sources of power, China has about a half billion people, nearly four times as many as the United States. China is about one-third bigger than the United States in land area. It has more coal than any other country in the world, vast amounts of iron ore, and practically all other natural resources which make a nation powerful.

The Chinese people are intelligent and courageous, make as good soldiers as any in the world. They have proved their fighting qualities even when they had almost no weapons and equipment, and were abused and badly led by crooked war lords.

Now the United States and other countries are sending military and industrial experts to China, to help develop its enormous potential power. Once well started on that road, there is no reason why China cannot become the strongest nation in the world.

Moreover, China is next door to India, Burma, Siam, Indochina, and other Asiatic countries which want to throw off the white man's rule. They will follow a strong China, and add to its power.

WHAT KIND OF CHINA?

Th Asiatic nations should have freedom, and we should not object to China's becoming strong; but what kind of China?

America still has in its power to determine whether China will be a democratic nation, a safe good neighbor in the future, or a tyrannical dictatorship which will continue to enslave its own people and will be a dangerous threat to the United States. It all depends on whom we support in China.

China may seem far away, but this war proved the world is getting smaller. The broad Pacific can be crossed in days or hours, instead of the months is used to take. Around the Pacific are developing the great powers of the future, as once mighty Europe loses its grip on the teeming peoples of the earth.

Far-seeing Americans know that our future largely lies in the Pacific, that China will have a big say in that future, and that during the next few years we have a last chance to turn China toward democracy or dictatorship.

To understand this problem it is necessary to know a little about the history of China.

For centuries that country was ruled by conquerors from the north, from Mongolia, the Manchu dynasty. There was nothing democratic about that rule, but by lopping off the heads of grafters it enforced some honest government.

A GREAT LEADER

Then a great leader arose. He was Sun Yat-sen, a real democrat with an enlightened program for China. He demanded that China become a republic, that the war lords, landlords, and money lenders who impoverished and cruelly mistreated the people be put down.

In 1912, China became a republic, and there was bright hope for better days. The war lords, landlords, money lenders, and crooked politicians proved too powerful, however, to be overthrown at once.

THE RISE OF CHIANG

Sun Yat-sen died and the situation changed again in 1926 and 1927, when Chiang Kai-shek, one of Sun Yat-sen's bright young men and now ruler of China, came to the front.

Chiang was in south China. Around him gathered the best of the young Chinese, who believed in democracy and were willing to make a fight for it. Borodin and several hundred other Russians were sent from Moscow to give Chiang advice and help.

Chiang's army, accompanied and preceded by propagandists for Sun Yat-sen's ideas, marched north and were welcomed by the downtrodden peasants. They won a tremendous victory and the land was bright with hope.

As soon as Chiang was in power, however, he struck a bargain with Chinese and foreign bankers and industrialists. He married a daughter of the richest banking family in China, the Soongs, and turned on the people who put him in power.

CHIANG AND DEMOCRATS

Chiang tortured and killed thousands of the best young Chinese democrats. Even the wife of the great Sun Yat-sen had to flee for her life from China when she opposed Chiang's actions. Some of the Russians were killed, while Borodin and others escaped.

Some of the Chinese who still believe in Sun Yat-sen's program formed the so-called Chinese Communists Army in south China. Chiang's army chased them thousands of miles into barren areas of north China. The ragged and hungry Chinese Reds suffered terribly, but fought their way through, and continued to exist until the Japs invaded China in 1932.

Since then the Chinese Red armies fought the Japs by guerilla warfare and expanded until they claim to govern 100,000,000 Chinese in northern provinces.

Throughout the war Chiang continued to use some of his best armies against the Chinese "Reds" instead of against the Japs. General Stilwell, who commanded the American troops in China, protested against the use of American weapons and supplies to kill Chinese instead of Japs. As a result, Chiang had Stilwell fired from China.

CHINESE COMMUNISTS

What kind of people are the Chinese Communists, and what do they want? Those questions are important, because the answers throw light on the chances for democracy in China.

An article by Capt. William A. Mikkola, an officer who spent some time in north China, was recently published in a conservative Washington newspaper. The article begins with a description of Mao Tse Tung, leader of the Chinese Communists.

"A quiet, soft-spoken man, Mao moves freely among the people," Captain Mikkola says. "He is really a chosen leader, since, in Communist China, elections are even more democratic than our own.

"Each community elects its own leaders. These elect a representative, and representatives elect the central governing body. This central body then elects the head of the Government.

"This is in contrast with Chungking (Chiang's) policy, under which no coolie has power to cast a vote.

"The coolie class has been eliminated in Communist China. Each person is equal.

"When the Communists first went to Yenan it was barren. Now hillsides and valleys are cultivated successfully. The Communists produce enough food and materials for enough clothes in 2 years to supply everyone in plenty for 3.

YENAN'S PROGRAM

"Chinese Communists are intensely interested in American methods of education. Any American book or magazine which arrives is eagerly read.

"They also are interested in American industrial and mechanical developments. While at present they have only the most primitive methods, they are educated and will be ready when modern equipment will be available.

"Much speculation has been caused on whether or not Communist China is dominated by Russian interests. As far as it was possible for me to ascertain, there is no contact with Russia. There are no Russian representatives at all in Yenan, nor have there been.

"Most persons coming from a visit to Yenan agree that the Chinese Communists might have called themselves a new democracy, rather than having a title which the world continually confuses with Russia.

"More and more Chinese turn to the government they regard as a haven for a man who has been despised and ignored, who has been given no relief when he is starving. They regard Yenan as the place where they can work, be educated, get clothes and food and security, and take part in their own government.

"Nobody can look out and not see that here is a real challenge to the old order of misery in Asia."

CHANCE FOR UNITY

American Government representatives in China recently brought leaders of Chiang's Kuomintang government and the Chinese Communists together to discuss the possibility of uniting in a new Chinese government.

Chiang is demanding that the Chinese Communists greatly reduce their armed forces, and permit him to appoint governors for the northern provinces in which the Communists have elected their own governors.

Those concessions might put the Chinese Communists at Chiang's mercy, and they know what that mercy means by long experience.

On the other hand, Chiang appears to be making some concessions. It would be wonderful news from China if a united government is formed on terms which permit all parties—Chiang's, the Communists, and several democratic parties which are small but still alive—to exist and compete with each other in promoting democracy.

The only alternative is a continued dictatorship under Chiang, with China becoming immensely powerful and dangerous to democracy everywhere.

Halt the New Attack on Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Chicago Sun, Tuesday, December 11, 1945. It is entitled

"Halt the New Attack on Price Control":

HALT THE NEW ATTACK ON PRICE CONTROL

Chicago consumers are rallying this week to let Congress and the administration know they still want price control. The demonstration is timely. As OPA Administrator Chester Bowles said last week, the battle against inflation may be won or lost in the next few months.

Tremendous pressure against price controls has developed among misguided special interest groups. The National Association of Manufacturers has demanded abolition of all ceilings by February 15. Real estate and retail dry goods interests are waging steady warfare against control in their fields. Some manufacturers, according to Reconversion Director John Snyder, are holding their goods off the market until the excess profits tax expires on January 1. Evidently they hope to be rewarded for this strike against the public not only by tax savings but by higher prices as well.

Nothing is clearer than the need for continued control if a disastrous inflation is to be avoided. When subsidies were withdrawn the price of butter shot up overnight. Oranges and grapefruit increased 50 to 100 percent when ceilings were removed. If this was the case with commodities which were thought to be in sufficient supply, what would happen in those fields where shortages will be likely for some time to come?

Wartime experience has blasted the contention that business must have higher prices to produce. Vast reserves of purchasing power are waiting to be tapped. The production will be forthcoming if it is made perfectly clear that the price line is not going to be abandoned.

Not only should existing controls be maintained, but new ones should be added where necessary—for example, in the real estate and stock markets, where inflation is already under way. Above all, Congress must make clear its intention to keep all controls as long as they are needed.

An immediate statement of policy, favoring extension of the Price Control Act beyond its June expiration date, together with new legislation establishing price ceilings on newly completed homes and checking the stock market boom, would be the best possible warning that the people do not intend to go through the wringer of postwar inflation as they did in 1920.

Christmas Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I sent to my constituents:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 25, 1945.

MY DEAR FRIEND: As Christmastime approaches, I cannot let that season go by without at least a word passing between us.

There are two things of great significance about this particular Christmas. The first, of course, is our thankfulness for the coming of peace, our hope that the day of reunion, too long delayed already in many instances between the fighting men of America and their loved ones, will come very soon. The second significance of this Christmas, however, lies in the absolute necessity, if humanity itself is to be spared a terrible fate, of the rededication of men and nations to the principles of the Sermon on the Mount. I have honestly tried throughout my career in Congress, as I know millions of other people in their particular walks of life have done, to apply these principles to my work. All too often, I know, I have in part at least failed to do this. But today we have but two alternatives: either we will apply to our relations both at home and internationally the teachings which come down to us from the first Christmastime, or else we shall, in all human probability, face at some terrible future the devastation of an atomic war. Other questions, of course, are important, but in comparison to this one, they pale into insignificance. For, through the scientists of America, man has dared to bring to earth the basic cosmic power of God's universe. Upon our shoulders, therefore, rests a responsibility greater than that of any generation that has gone before us. We must find the law of God and follow it and we must know that its very basis lies in dedicating this, his last and greatest gift to man, to the welfare of mankind and to the building of a structure of peace which this time will actually be strong enough to prevent a future war.

There is enclosed herewith a speech delivered in the House in which I have tried to give expression to some of the ideas briefly outlined in this letter.

May God be with you and with our Nation in the year that lies ahead.

Sincerely yours,

JERRY VOORHIS.

Radio Address of Hon. Fred Bradley, of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED BRADLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my radio broadcast of this week which went on the air over the three stations in my district, WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie; WDBC, Escanaba; and WMAM, Marinette-Menominee:

The big noise in the House last week was the question of strikes and labor-management relations. As I previously predicted to you, the House refused to even consider the question by a margin of 18 votes. Without burdening you with the details the reason it refused to do so was by the clever resort to legislative procedure and legislative tactics under the rules of the House. Before we can consider any measure in the House we have to have a rule of procedure granted by the Rules Committee, and if that rule of procedure is voted up, the committee having the bill in question can call it up at any time. If the House votes down the rule the bill is dead. While the rule to consider the so-called antistrike bill was under consideration, the chairman of the committee having the proposal to repeal the Smith-Connally Act in his control, let it be known on the floor that he would not call that bill up for consideration until the Labor Committee had had ample opportunity to consider legislation embodying the President's proposal to clear up the present labor-management mess through the establishment of fact-finding boards, etc. Many Members of the House found themselves on the well-known spot politically with their constituents back home. We were all swamped with messages from the ranks of labor demanding that we take no action on the bill, and yet those of us who read the daily papers, and especially those who had been home recently, realized that the American public is fed up on this present labor-management controversy and wants it settled and settled promptly. The American public doesn't care a hoot about legislative procedure, with which it is not familiar. What they are asking us today is: "Why doesn't Congress do something to clean up this present industrial unrest? We had a chance to do it, but we failed our responsibility by 18 votes. Those who voted against even considering the question, in my opinion, clearly evaded the issue, and believe me, there were many of them circulating around the floor last Wednesday making excuses for refusing to consider the so-called antistrike bill on Tuesday. The point of the matter is that in the 7 years I have represented you down here in Congress, our Labor Committee—to which the President's proposal has been submitted—has not yet, and I predict, will not in this instance report out to us any bill designed to cure the labor unrest in this country.

The chairman of that committee was once reported by the newspapers to have said that her committee would never be permitted to report out any legislation of that nature except over her dead body. In my opinion, regardless of excuses offered to the contrary, any Member who voted not to consider the pending legislation will be generally regarded by the public as giving encouragement to the continuation of strikes in this country. Those who voted as I did to consider the matter and to offer needed amendments to the pending bill were at least discharging their responsibility to the public and voting as their conscience dictated to consider and adopt suitable legislation designed to continue without further interruption a logical, sound reconversion program.

The following day, on Wednesday, the House again passed for the fourth time what has been known as the Hobbs anti-racketeering bill. This bill is designed primarily to permit farmers to get their produce to market without having to pay tribute to some racketeer or labor union or failing to do so be beaten up by some so-called goons. This situation originally developed around New York City but the practice has spread to numerous other large cities including our metropolitan areas in Michigan. In New York City, for instance, farmers have for many years been trucking their produce to the local markets. They naturally pick their vegetables, fruits, and other produce off the farms, load them into their trucks late in the afternoon or in the wee small hours of the morning and then start to town. The A. F. of L. Teamsters Union had by coercion and threats of violence forced many of the New York markets, who are the customers of these farmers, to enter into a closed-shop agreement providing that only trucks driven by Mr. Dan Tobin's union could deliver produce to such markets. The result was that when the poor farmers from New Jersey, Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, and on south sought to truck their produce to the New York markets, they were stopped at the New York State line by Dan Tobin's union goons and were assessed a set fee to have one of those men ride on the farmer's own truck, which the farmer himself continued to drive to market and himself unload his produce. Now Dan Tobin's man did not do one blessed thing but ride on the truck and collect the fee for the union—the poor farmer continued to do the whole job himself. If he failed to comply with their demands, he was hauled out of his truck, given a good going over with a lead pipe or piece of rubber hose or a pair

of brass knuckles and his truck and his produce, grown by his own sweat and blood, dumped overboard and his truck smashed. In my humble opinion this is racketeering of the lowest order. It is coercion. It is un-American. I was proud to be in the usual 2-to-1 majority in the House which passed this bill and once again we, who voted for it, can only hope that the Senate will not again turn a deaf ear to the overwhelming sentiment thus expressed by the House. At least, again, we have done our part.

Well, so much for the labor situation insofar as the House is concerned. Now, I want to go back into the Pearl Harbor matter. I want to point out to you folks a propaganda campaign going on around the country that I don't like. I think it is un-American and I think it is unfair to the American people to be thus misled by name speakers.

We all know that we suffered the greatest military defeat in our history at Pearl Harbor. The American people ever since have been wanting to know why we suffered that defeat. No less than six different investigations have heretofore been held on the Pearl Harbor matter. A seventh, which is the joint congressional investigation by both Houses, is now under way unearthing and disclosing for the first time to the public the real facts and I have been talking to you about it each week.

Immediately after Pearl Harbor you will recall that Gen. Walter Short and Admiral Husband E. Kimmel were removed from their commands following the so-called Roberts committee investigation. That committee was appointed by the President and headed by Supreme Court Justice Roberts. It was followed by an investigation by both the Army and the Navy. That made three. In the present congressional investigation it has been developed that the Army later sent a Colonel Clausen on a secret reinvestigation and from present testimony it appears that he was instructed to, and did, suggest that previous testimony be changed. Then the Navy conducted two additional one-man inquiries by then Admiral, now United States Senator, THOMAS HART, and Admiral Hewitt.

One thing is certain that in each of the several investigations heretofore conducted, when the reports were made public after submission to the White House, considerable portions of them were deleted. These deleted portions are belatedly coming to light in the congressional Pearl Harbor investigation. Very frankly it is also now clear that the reason some of these previous reports had been deleted in part was due to the fact that the war was still in progress and we dared not disclose to the Jap enemy that prior to Pearl Harbor we had succeeded in cracking their code messages and all through the war our commanders were thus able to know in advance just what the Japs' intentions were, where they were going to strike next, where their weakest points were, etc. To this extent these deletions can, of course, be honorably excused.

But one thing I personally cannot excuse is this fact. That when I have been in attendance as I have at many of these Pearl Harbor congressional hearings, I have been amazed at the seeming lack of memory on the part of some of these generals who have testified in the present investigation. After all they had all been subjected to questioning in one or more of these investigations heretofore and certainly they should have kept a diary or kept their memory alive on various incidents which even to the ordinary layman, like myself, pointed to the fact that something was about to happen at Pearl Harbor or certainly that something was going to happen somewhere about December 7, 1941. And yet, just last Thursday afternoon, I frankly was amazed to hear Gen. Sherman Myles, then Chief of our Army Intelligence, repeatedly answer that he could not remember—he could not remember.

But now before I close, I want to go back to this propaganda about which I am concerned, and you should be also. Some time ago President Truman sought to lay the blame for Pearl Harbor on the American people and now it has come to light and I have personally heard some of our outstanding military men state to the public that the American people were responsible for Pearl Harbor because they did not put enough pressure on their Congressmen and Senators to see to it that the armed forces had enough money to get ready for this last war. That is the lowest, rottenest, dirtiest propaganda, in my opinion, that has ever emanated from the White House, and I don't care who hears me say it, because the figures prove otherwise. I am not blaming some of our outstanding generals, some of our outstanding admirals, and other heroes of this war, who are being sought after and carried all over the country night after night and day after day speaking their piece, but always spreading some propaganda. It is hard to argue with those men who are our Nation's heroes today because of what the boys under them have accomplished in winning this last war. It is hard for a Member of Congress to offset their arguments to a listening anguished mother or father whose son may have perished at Pearl Harbor.

Certainly we were not ready for this war. There is no argument about that, but why should these men possibly now from hindsight, but I fear with orders from someone who has malice aforethought, seek to condemn the American people or their Representatives in Congress? As that great American and great Democrat the late Al Smith used to say: " Let's look at the record." Let me give you some figures, my friends, which Representative FRANK KEEFE, Republican of Wisconsin, a member of the committee, put into the record of the Pearl Harbor hearings. Figures which reveal what had been asked for, what the President recommended and what the Congress did with the various requests for funds from the Army and Navy between the years 1934—when Mr. Roosevelt really began to function as President of these United States—and up through Pearl Harbor. For the sake of brevity over this microphone, I will give you round figures only but this broadcast which will appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will give the complete figures and reprints will be available in my office if you wish to know what the exact figures read:

Between 1934 and 1941, the Army asked for roughly, $17,185,894,377. The Bureau of the Budget, to which all requests for appropriations are first submitted and which is directly responsible to the President, and for which in turn he must assume the responsibility, cut the Army's request to $16,390,079,707, or a cut of roughly $800,000,000. The Congress appropriated almost $17,000,000,000, or in other words upped the President's own figures about $440,000,000.

Now with respect to the Navy. And in this connection remember three things. First of all, that prior to Pearl Harbor and more especially in the third-term campaign of 1940, the President frequently repeated the statement that your boys will not be sent into any foreign war; secondly, remember this, that in all our deliberations in the Congress on the repeal of the arms embargo, aid to Britain, merchant-ship arming, etc., we were always told these were steps short of war, and the administration told us this was the surest program to keep out of war; and thirdly, the President once made the public statement that anyone who advocated a two-ocean Navy "was just plain dumb" and yet 3 weeks later the Congress of the United States—your Congress—forced him to sign the two-ocean Navy bill—which originated in your Congress—and approve the appropriation therefor. So here are the Navy figures from 1934 to 1941, inclusive:

The Navy asked for $9,434,271,533. The President's Budget Director cut that to $7,428,240,190, or, in other words, he cut it slightly over $2,000,000,000. But the Congress appropriated $8,285,934,388. Or, in other words, the Congress restored $857,694,198.

And so, my friends, in conclusion, the next time you hear any high-ranking admiral or general going around the country, indubitably under instructions from the White House to place the blame for our unpreparedness on you, the American people, politely suggest to him that he go back and look at the record. It is becoming increasingly clear from the Pearl Harbor hearings, conducted by your Congress, that the fault—and the entire blame—for Pearl Harbor is right straight in the laps of the "brass hats" in the War Department and in the Navy Department, who were out-guessed and out-maneuvered in the initial phase of Pearl Harbor by the little men from Japan.

That's Telling 'Em—"Private" Hargrove Talks to the National Association of Manufacturers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, there is inserted herewith a talk by "Private" Hargrove to the NAM:

WHAT (SEE HERE, PRIVATE) HARGROVE THINKS OF NAM—"YOU'RE PREJUDICED, BEHIND TIMES, AND MORE THAN A SHADE HYPOCRITICAL"

(This is the text of the talk, See Here, Private Enterprise, given to the NAM by ex-Sgt. Marion Hargrove, author of See Here, Private Hargrove.)

After spending 3¼ years in the Army in the enlisted, or "speak when you're spoken to," branch, it is a genuine pleasure to find myself standing here with some high brass listening to me for a change. I must confess that I feel like a cross between Daniel addressing the lions and St. Francis preaching to the birds, but I feel, in a larger sense, that today I am a man.

As I understand this assignment, I'm here as a spokesman for all the veterans, and you're here to represent all of American industry, and I'm supposed to lay on the line what it is that we all are expecting from you all. There are a number of flaws in this arrangement.

In the first place I have no credentials as voice of the veteran, and I don't know anyone else who has. I'm authorized to speak for only one veteran—myself—and I don't think that I can be called—to use the term employed by the Hollywood columnists and women's page editors—the typical GI Joe.

In the second place, the topic is largely political and I'm not. What you need for this sort of work is the straight-ticket type of firebrand who can see that all right and all justice is on one particular side of any particular question. The sap who will tell you either that you're a gang of Fascists, or that labor, in which group you've apparently classed the veterans, is a bunch of Red Russians out to run the country. In the current style of politics, in which everybody is either a Fascist or a Communist, I look upon myself as God's lonely man; and as an authority on industry and economics, I am only a simple young man who thinks there's a lot wrong with both management and labor. The only thing I can give you is one veteran's opinion and you have to decide for yourselves what it's worth.

I find it a little difficult to speak to you as an organization since I've never been able to figure out your purpose as an organization. I've been reading about the NAM almost ever since I learned to read, and it seemed to me that you were always against whatever was up for discussion. I can't remember offhand a single thing you've been for. I know that any number of your individual members are alert, thinking, progressive men, but I can't remember offhand a single contribution the organization itself has made or a single constructive thing it's done in the time I've been reading or hearing about it.

Possibly the organization is a victim of poor public relations. Possibly it needs a definite well-planned program to show the public that it isn't as bad as the public thinks it is. Maybe it has done constructive things, but if it has, you don't hear much about them. The NAM has such a bad name, a lot of which may be a carry-over from its worst days, that even when it's right about something it can't draw public support to it. Even when a man gets mad at the unions he doesn't side with the NAM.

NAM, to the average thinking person, I would say, means something stubborn and reactionary, and obstructionist. Even when it's right, it always seems to be right for the wrong reason. In an argument in which the National Association of Manufacturers claims itself on the right side, the opposition uses facts and logic even if it's bad logic, and your NAM spokesman gets up and begins to talk about bolshevism, the American way and the evil forces that are out to ruin the country; and all of the old-style "gentleman from Mississippi" hog-wash goes out with the imprint of the NAM and the apparent sanction of American industry as a whole but through public relations.

Mind you, I'm not saying that I think this is an association of righteous and upstanding idealists who've been sinned against in thought and word by the public. I don't think that at all. I think that if you put the association on a take-one, take-all basis—who are prejudiced and behind the times and more than a shade hypocritical, who talk a lot about free enterprise and the profit system—that we still have monopolists and cartels, whether or not a member of the brotherhood is constantly being prosecuted for violations of the laws governing free competition.

You are opposed to raising the minimum wage and you are opposed to compensation for all these people who are going to be unemployed. Maybe you have reasons for your opposition besides the ones that come naturally to hand, but I haven't heard any and I can't think of any.

Industry has been allowed to build up reserves for reconversion and it has what looks to me like a very good minimum profit insurance in this business of refunds on excess-profit taxes.

Industry has its own brand of unemployment compensation and its own brand of minimum wage handed to it by the Government, and if the NAM has good reasons why labor should not be taken care of too, I think it only fair to you that the public hear them. It seems to me that as an organization, you have very definite and very great responsibilities when you refuse to meet them.

I am not denying that you show good instincts. I think that inviting me here for the sole purpose of abusing you was a very nice, ingratiating sort of thing, but even your good instincts go astray at times.

I went over to your place on Forty-ninth Street the other day to have my picture taken with Mr. Wisenbuger, and one of the fellows in the office there was telling me about the awful problem you are anticipating with the shipping clerks and such like who were drafted into the Army and are coming back now as lieutenant colonels and brigadier generals. According to the fellow I was talking to, industry is going to have a tough time fitting these exalted office boys and shipping clerks into jobs as industrial lieutenant colonels and brigadier generals.

Well, this is a sad sort of thinking and it isn't the sort of thing to endear you to the great masses of returning veterans—most of whom have not even made corporal. It's a little silly to think that because your shipping clerk made $450 a month in the Army, he has to get $450 a month in civilian life. There were a great number of unmitigated jerks in the war holding a major's rank while their work was being done by privates first class, and the fact that they were in the gravy in the Army doesn't entitle them to the gravy in civilian life.

Any number of men, I will admit, were given a chance to prove themselves in the Army, and actually earned their pay. This should be taken into consideration and they should be tested to see what worth they have for better jobs, but it would be a bad mistake to promote them automatically on the basis of their Army ranks. Too often in the Army you find that the relationship between a man's rank and his ability is purely accidental.

The average American soldier underwent financial hardships in the war and he took a lot of abuse from these incompetent office boys who were drawing plump salaries and seniority promotions. He was pushed around a lot in the Army and he's come out determined to take a minimum of pushing around in civilian life.

I would advise you as individual employers gradually to forget what a man was in the Army. The Army is past now and only the man is left. The American veteran does not think of himself primarily as an American veteran. He thinks of himself as a civilian who has been out of the running for 3 or 4 or 5 years and who needs a decent job now and a chance to settle himself in at least as good a civilian job as he gave up when he went into the Army or the Navy.

This is the way you should feel—considering what he was when he went away, what he missed in the way of enlarged experience and chance for advancement while he was in the service and what he learned in the service, and you'll find some vastly broadened men outside of the officers registered.

Treat your veterans as individual problems. Try to strike a balance between what they want to do and what they can do, and I think you'll find the problem of the veteran isn't nearly so staggering as you thought it is.

Merger of Army, Air Corps, and Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, this Congress will have presented before it in a few weeks for consideration a bill for the unification of the Army, Air Corps, Coast Guard, Marine Corps, and the Navy, and I desire to include in my remarks a copy of an editorial which appears in Collier's magazine of date December 22, 1945, as follows:

SINGLE COMMAND FOR TOTAL WAR

So far as we can see, the case is just about completed for bringing all the fighting services—Army, Navy, Air Forces, Marine Corps, wartime Coast Guard—under one Department of Defense, or Department of War, or whatever we may choose to call it.

Modern war is total war, as we've been hearing ever since the Germans demonstrated the fact in Poland in 1939. It can be won only by the highest attainable cooperation among all services, plus superiority in quantity and quality of weapons and supplies.

Lack of Army-Navy cooperation was one factor in the Pearl Harbor disaster, and in our melancholy experiences of the first few weeks after the invasion of Guadalcanal. When MacArthur and Nimitz achieved a reasonable degree of Army-Navy cooperation, things began to look up.

Since VJ-day, a number of wartime secrets have been coming out on this subject. The most alarming of these thus far unveiled were contained in a special report drawn up last April, before the German war was over, by a committee of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The report was withheld from the public until a considerable time after Japan quit.

In that report, it is stated that "true integration of the effort of the forces has not been achieved in any theater"; also, that "the armed forces will not reach their maximum of effectiveness at the point of contact with the enemy until these handicaps are overcome." In down-to-earth English, that means we paid more in lives for victory than we need have paid.

As we understand the plan to unify the services, it would not destroy any service's individuality or merge them all in one colorless, clique-ridden military bureaucracy. Under the single Secretary of War would be assistant secretaries for Army, Navy, and air. Pride of service, differences in uniforms, esprit de corps—all these would survive. Procurement and equipment duplications and overlappings would go, to the great benefit of the taxpayers. As for interservice envy and rivalries and backbiting, the unified command would have power to root them out as the petty-minded and childish but grave dangers that they are.

Not that this reform is a cure-all. It couldn't be. But it does look like the logical next step in the evolution of our defense machinery, and it is favored by a preponderance of our best military minds. We'd like to see Congress put the services under one command without further delay, and we cannot see what further arguments can be brought forward. The essentials of the debate are now on the record, pro and con; and it looks as if the pros have it, by at least a nautical mile.

Mr. Speaker, I am gathering factual and statistical data on this subject, and beginning in January it would be proper to present this information each day.

Jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today filed a joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to sign on behalf of the United States the declaration under paragraph 2 of article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, recognizing as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement the jurisdiction of that Court in certain types of legal disputes. This resolution is

somewhat similar in form to the one submitted in the Senate—Senate Resolution No. 196—by Senator MORSE, of Oregon, on behalf of himself and Senators TAFT, GREEN, FULBRIGHT, SMITH, FERGUSON, AIKEN, BALL, CORDON, WILEY, TOBEY, MAGNUSON, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, MYERS, and MCMAHON.

There is, however, an essential and very important difference between the two resolutions. The Morse resolution is in the form of giving advice and consent to the President and requires an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Senators present at the time the vote is taken.

My resolution is a joint resolution of the two branches, requiring a majority vote in each.

I shall not at this time attempt to discuss the merits of accepting compulsory jurisdiction for certain types of disputes by the Court of Justice. That has been done with extraordinary thoroughness and skill by Senator MORSE and is recorded in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, November 28, 1945, beginning on page 11088 and carrying through to page 11109.

I do, however, wish to comment briefly on my reasons for desiring to see the House of Representatives take a part, which I believe to be an entirely proper part, in authorizing the President to take the step indicated. No international lawyer can say with certainty where the power lies in the United States Government to authorize the President to accept the compulsory provision in the statute of the International Court of Justice. That statute is in the form of a treaty which has been approved by the Senate of the United States by a two-thirds vote. Paragraph 2 of article 36 allows a nation the option to accept compulsory jurisdiction in certain legal disputes or to retain the right to agree voluntarily that any dispute as it arises may come under the jurisdiction of the International Court. It is my personal belief that a joint resolution can confer this power on the President inasmuch as I do not believe that any question of ratifying a new treaty is involved in this grant of power.

I further believe that it is important that the House of Representatives should take an increasing measure of responsibility with respect to the conduct of our foreign relations and that it is most important that there be established at the earliest moment a definite precedent for determining where the ultimate power lies in the making of decisions of the type contemplated.

It is my hope that the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House will grant an early hearing on this matter, as I feel strongly that it should be speedily resolved.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

Joint resolution authorizing the President, on behalf of the United States, to accept and recognize the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in certain categories of international legal disputes involving the United States

Whereas article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations, to which the United States is a party, declares the purpose "to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace"; and

Whereas the people of the United States desire to encourage the functioning of the United Nations Organization, so far as possible, within the framework of justice and international law; and

Whereas article 38 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, to which the United States is a party, declares it to be the function of that court "to decide in accordance with international law such disputes as are submitted to it"; and

Whereas the role of the International Court of Justice in the international administration of justice will be enhanced by states conferring on it jurisdiction in advance; and

Whereas article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice provides that states "may at any time declare that they recognize as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court" in defined categories of legal disputes; and

Whereas such declarations have been made by a number of states and are now in force, conferring on the International Court of Justice compulsory jurisdiction over legal disputes; and

Whereas the people of the United States desire the largest possible extension of such jurisdiction in the interest of justice according to international law: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That (a) it is the policy of the United States to adjust its international disputes by pacific means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law. Accordingly, the President of the United States is authorized and requested to deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations a declaration under paragraph 2 of article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice recognizing as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes hereafter arising concerning—

(1) the interpretation of a treaty;

(2) any question of international law;

(3) the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;

(4) the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not authorize the President to deposit a declaration which does not exclude from its application—

(1) disputes the solution of which the parties shall entrust to other tribunals by virtue of agreements already in existence or which may be concluded in the future (article 95 of the Charter); and

(2) disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States (art. 2, par. 7, of the Charter);

or to deposit a declaration which does not provide that it is to remain in force for a period of 5 years and thereafter until the expiration of 6 months after notice may be given to terminate the declaration.

Do Not Write Your Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include herewith a tear sheet from page 28 of a Navy booklet entitled "Do Not" and from which you will note there is stated "Do not write letters concerning your duty to Navy Department or Congressman."

The excerpt from the Navy Department publication is as follows:

TIMELY ADVICE

Do not—
Disobey orders or instructions.
Borrow money or effects.
Lend money or effects.
Buy on credit (always pay cash).
Have anything in your possession not your own.
Leave anything adrift.
Smoke in unauthorized places.
Hesitate to ask questions.
Be friendly with strangers who promise you a good time.
Hitch hike.
Buy nonregulation uniforms.
Try to be funny on duty.
Discuss movements of men or ships with civilians.
Write letters concerning your duty to Navy Department or Congressmen.
Drop cigarette butts, papers, orange peels, or other trash on deck or walks.
Use another man's drinking cup, tooth brush, or towel.
Wear another man's clothes or sleep in his hammock.

Mr. Speaker, if an enlisted man is in trouble, or has some problem and cannot obtain any consideration from his commanding officer, who in the Sam Hill can he write to unless he writes to his Congressman for help?

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to also include in these remarks the letter from one of my constituents, the father of a boy in the Navy, as follows:

EUNICE, LA., *September 8, 1945.*

Hon. HENRY D. LARCADE,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR HENRY: My son was at Navy recruiting station at Lafayette, La., July 30 and they gave him a little book about the Navy. I tore out a page, which I am sending you, just for you or other Members of Congress to see for yourself that the Navy brass hats don't want to be under any restraint from our elected Government officials.

I want to predict that unless we stop this peacetime draft and cut the size of the Army and Navy in 15 years the United States Congress and civil authorities will be subordinates to Army and Navy brass hats.

We will have a bigger and better military machine than Germany or Japan ever dreamed of having—and that will be the end of democracy.

Can't our elected representatives see what happened to Japan and Germany under military rule? What makes them believe we will not end up the same way?

Your friend,

GEORGE STAGG.

Labor Supply and Demand in Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am submitting a survey made by

the Utah Manufacturers Association relative to the supply and demand for labor in Utah, not only to what the situation is today, but what might be contemplated in the immediate future.

The letter, I think, is self-explanatory and indicates a rather hopeful picture for industry and labor. So far as I know, this is the first time in Utah where management, on its own account, is endeavoring to gather its own information whereby it can gage its activities accordingly:

UTAH MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,
Salt Lake City, Utah, November 19, 1945.
Hon. W. K. GRANGER, M. C.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GRANGER: Because of our great interest in the problem of providing job opportunities in productive enterprises we are watching closely the unfolding pattern of labor supply and demand in Utah, and undertaking frequent checks of industrial employers to keep constantly informed on the developing employment picture. Our most recent inquiry directed to a representative group of manufacturers demonstrates a dynamic condition in Utah industry that should provide jobs for all who will give honest service.

We inquired, (a) How many male employees could your organization now put to work, and (b) how many additional employees over and above the current employment potential could your organization place in 1946? The replies reveal that 14 firms currently employing approximately 3,600 could provide immediate jobs for 521 more employees and 542 additional jobs early in 1946, or an immediate increase in jobs of 14 percent and a combined increase in employment of almost 30 percent.

It would be hasty generalization to conclude that the same percentages would apply to the 25,000 Utahans currently employed in manufacturing and kindred enterprises, but strong supporting evidence of continuing steady Utah labor demand is presented by concurrent figures provided us by the Utah Metal Mine Operators Association. With 6,900 on October pay roll, current labor demand for a balanced operation in Utah nonferrous mines, mills, and smelters is 3,025, with an additional 1,500 job potential for 1946 operations. These figures apply to daily wage earners alone and increased employment of roughly 10 percent, or 450, can be anticipated for salaried workers employed in this industrial field.

Although there are in Utah a considerable number who are voluntarily idle while waiting for a "soft" job, we believe there is an increasing tendency for workers to make the readjustments in work and pay which are necessary during this reconversion period. Workers are beginning to realize that it is of the utmost importance to better living and increased security that people work and produce. They understand more and more that it is a necessary part of the reconversion process for some workers to shift from one type of work to another, from specialized work to less skilled and less technical operations. As the local manager of the USES stated in a recent press release, "Men who will accept a bottom-rung job with a future are wiser than a worker who looks only to current pay. Many of our best employment opportunities exist in overalls," and he cited the example of a veteran hired in February as a warehouse laborer now earning $250 a month as salesman of the parts he handled as warehouseman. Employers often prefer to select men for top positions who have thoroughly learned and produced through work as warehousemen, truck drivers, laborers, or other non-white-collared jobs.

We believe that the physical job of reconversion has proceeded faster than expected. As a result, the anticipated shock of unemployment is not developing. Veterans and war workers are finding and taking peacetime jobs. If labor disturbances are avoided and deterrents to production lifted, a rapidly mounting production of goods and services will supply workmen with satisfactory wages and industry with sufficient employment in an expanding industrial economy.

Very truly yours,
UTAH MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION
L. K. NICHOLSON, *President.*

Secretary Byrnes Keeps Feet on the Ground

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor:

WASHINGTON.—The American Department of State has never been precisely what one would call a big, happy family. But it can be reported that it is a little more, not less, of a family unit for the onslaughts upon it of Maj. Gen. Patrick Jay Hurley.

What made the difference was the manner in which Secretary Byrnes reacted to the Hurley charges. He went warmly to the defense of his berated subordinates, more warmly than some of them had anticipated. It has been good for morale in the organization. It was a test of the Secretary's loyalty to his staff.

They had been fairly confident of how Mr. Byrnes would react to attacks from the left. No one ever accused Mr. Byrnes of being on the radical side, even remotely. He would be certain to defend vigorously against pressure from that side. But there was not the same confidence that he would defend against attacks from the right.

It could be charged that the Hurley attacks did not put a very severe strain on Mr. Byrnes. They were noted for their warmth rather for their detailed documentation. They were marked by apparent inconsistency.

And the manner in which Mr. Hurley resigned his Ambassadorship was not such as to endear him to Mr. Byrnes, who was taken completely by surprise. But still, they were attacks from the right, and there were in the State Department men who had doubted Mr. Byrnes' willingness to defend his Department when the pressure came from that direction. He has done so, and done it generously and firmly. The result is a marked feeling of improved solidarity in the organization.

And the mere fact that attacks have been made from the right have in themselves improved the position of the Department. It is a very long time since it has been under attack from that direction. For some 10 years it has been consistently and almost exclusively under fire from the left. Any organization which takes punishment only from one side tends to acquire something of an unbalance in its views about itself. It was beginning to wonder if perhaps it did partake of all the reaction of which it had been accused. Now it finds itself pilloried as being just the contrary. Therefore, the outside pressure is more nearly in balance than it has been for years.

So the net effect on the State Department organization itself is to improve confidence and loyalty.

As for the effect on American foreign policy—

So far as China is concerned, the real issue which the Hurley blasts have brought to a head is: Who controls policy? The career men of the Department never differed with Mr. Hurley himself nearly as much as they differed with the Army. China policy was a particularly acute case of policy being made by the Army as distinct from the diplomats.

Field officers of the armed forces have made policy during the war. They have been making it in China to a considerable extent without benefit of State Department advice. But the State Department has the legal responsibility for the conduct of our foreign policy. It has been trying to regain control over, or at least obtain a voice in, the conduct of Chinese policy.

The Department itself never for one moment wanted to throw American weight to the Chinese Communists and try to make them into the controlling factor in Chinese politics. But it has doubted that a policy of complete and full support for Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek would ever produce either a truly united China or the kind of China which would best serve American interest in the Far East.

So long as Mr. Hurley worked for a unification of China, he enjoyed the fullest support of the diplomatic service career men. They broke with him only where and when he seemed to abandon efforts to reconcile Chinese factions and to put his whole weight behind a single faction.

What can be expected now is renewed pressure toward inner reconciliation of the factions in China and less wholehearted American support behind the single Chungking faction. You can also expect greater emphasis on avoiding involvement of American troops in Chinese civil war and also on getting American troops out as soon as possible.

Not much change is to be expected from the Hurley charges about Iran. The tenor of that charge was that American policy had abandoned American commercial interests in Iran to the British. But the threat to such interests comes so very much more from Russia than from Britain that concern about the British seems rather unrealistic.

Farmers Do Not Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. EARTHMAN
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. EARTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in the recent past about the patriotic services rendered by the brave lads who have won the world's greatest conflict, and certainly too much credit cannot be given them. My only fear is that we Americans, in our effort to establish normal conditions, may have a tendency to forget their extreme sacrifice and heroism. God forbid that this become a fact, for but for them we would be today ruled and dominated by terrorism and tyranny.

There is another group that deserves our commendation and to whom we should give great credit, for throughout the war it would have been an impossibility for the Allied forces to have succeeded

had it not been for the great army of American agriculture.

We may have a fighting army well equipped in every respect and with the latest implements of war at their command, but, as was seen on Corregidor, no army can survive without food. The American farmer, under great hardships and handicaps, supplied the greatest number of sons proportionately and the largest amount of food on the fewest acres in the history of our Nation, and today, when all types of labor, whether justifiable or not, are striking on every hand and thousands of potential producers of much-needed products are nonproductive as a result. This is happening when the economic structure of our Nation hangs in the balance and when the great monster, inflation, can most successfully be defeated by means of great production, they continue to strike. This is not true of the American farmer. He does not confine his labor to a certain number of hours each day under the very best of working conditions but day in and day out, winter and summer, you will find the men and women, the boys and girls that composed 32,000,000 farm people in the United States, working diligently and patriotically to produce all that is possible and in some cases when due to Government regulations the cost of production is greater than their remuneration.

The above facts are so well expressed in the following editorial which has been contributed by the Franklin County Progress, which is published monthly by the Franklin County Farm Bureau at Winchester, Tenn., in their November issue:

FARMERS DO NOT STRIKE

During the war years when a tremendous effort was being made by everyone to achieve an early and complete victory some of us thought that when peace did finally come we would be so thankful that we would settle down to rebuilding our peacetime economy, generally content with our wages. When peace came the very opposite to this occurred. Strikes flared up on every hand, endangering the security of the Nation, causing us to lose face with our allies, undermining the chance for the world to have a lasting peace under the leadership of America. All this is happening as the planes and ships are unloading our young men and women on the shores of their native land for which so many have given so much. It is a slap in their faces as they come home and see those who made big wages during the war refusing to go ahead, and work for wages almost as large as those received in wartime. Surely labor and management can find a basis for working agreements without wholesale strikes at this time. Yes, it is a sorry sight to behold.

Farmers never have staged a walk-out or been a party to a sit-down strike. They have always produced an abundance of food and raw materials, often at very little profit to themselves. If they were not satisfied with the returns from their labors they went to the halls of Congress for help. They did not quit. During the war just ended American farmers increased their production 50 percent over prewar levels. This was done with less labor, very little new equipment, costly delays in getting repairs and obtaining supplies. Even now they are working early and late feeding and clothing the Nation, including the strikers, and sending supplies to starving people in other lands. Farm people make their mistakes, have their shortcomings, but as a group they never quit.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation Supplies Evidence To Show How Murray-Patman Act Saved Small Dealers in Rationed and Frozen Commodities During Wartime—Measure One of Several Sponsored by House Small Business Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday a number of Members of the House expressed themselves in reference to the need for the continued operation of the Small Business Committee and the over-all action of the House in this respect was indeed gratifying.

During the remarks on past achievements of the committee, mention was made of the assistance rendered the automobile dealers of our Nation in financing frozen stocks of automobiles.

This particular measure went beyond the automobile dealer—the legislation sponsored by the Small Business Committee and which was subsequently enacted into law by the Congress was a measure to provide relief to all dealers in certain rationed articles or commodities. This law was designed to aid small businessmen who had on their hands inventories frozen by action of the War Production Board and who were financially distressed because they could not therefore dispose of such stocks or because they could not obtain loans against such stocks. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was authorized either to purchase such frozen stocks directly or to make loans against them on a fair basis of valuation.

In this connection, I think it might be of interest to the Members to note a letter and a report which was sent me the other day by the Honorable Charles B. Henderson, Chairman of the Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. These are as follows:

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, December 14, 1945.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Select Committee on Small Business,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PATMAN: I am enclosing herewith a copy of a report sent to me by W. E. Willett, Assistant Chief of our Examining Division, relative to our handling of loans and purchases under the Murray-Patman Act.

I thought you would be interested in the assistance this act has been to dealers, particularly automobile dealers.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely,

CHARLES B. HENDERSON.

[Enclosure]

REPORT ON THE RATIONED ARTICLE AND COMMODITY SECTION OF RFC—THIS SECTION WAS ORGANIZED TO HANDLE LOANS AND PURCHASES UNDER THE MURRAY-PATMAN ACT

On June 5, 1942, or 25 days after the Murray-Patman Act (sec. 5 (h) of RFC Act) became law, the Directors of RFC issued general instructions to RFC's 31 loan agencies with respect to the procedure for handling loans and purchases thereunder.

We entered into this program with a most liberal but sound point of view. Our approach was to accomplish the desire of the Congress, to prevent and relieve distress among dealers, and our interpretation of the act was based on that premise. Every question that has arisen during the 3 years that the program has been functioning was considered on that basis. The Directors of RFC felt that under this act they had an opportunity to do a most constructive piece of work by keeping the various trade dealers operating during the critical period before them, particularly the automobile dealers, whose repair shops were so vitally needed in the country's transportation problems.

Our principal concern after the enactment of the law was to assist automobile dealers in stabilizing what appeared to be a panicky automobile retail market. So within 3 days after our general instructions were prepared, or on June 8, 1942, we authorized our loan agencies to make loans to authorized automobile dealers on rationed automobiles and commercial vehicles. These loans were made for an amount representing the net cost of the vehicle to the dealer, plus transportation charges, and plus a monthly increment allowed by the OPA, or, in other words, for an amount representing the dealers' full investment in the vehicle.

Automobile purchase instructions were issued to our loan agencies soon thereafter. Vehicles were purchased on the same basis that loans were made. We were able to assist dealers wishing to sell, rather than to borrow, by finding other dealers who were willing to purchase. In most of these latter cases we loaned the purchasing dealers funds with which to complete the sales. We did this principally to keep vehicles in their normal sales channels.

In addition to making direct loans to automobile dealers, we also entered into agreements with banks and finance companies interested in cooperating with us in our program to aid automobile dealers under this act. A total of 142 banks and finance companies signed such agreements, and through such agreements these private financing institutions were able to assist over 18,000 automobile dealers in financing about 200,000 vehicles in amounts aggregating approximately $213,000,000. These agreements were take-outs (in effect, guaranties) of all vehicles which the banks or finance companies might have to take over under such financing.

Loan and purchase instructions were given our loan agencies also on oil-burning and gas-burning equipment, liquefied petroleum gas equipment, typewriters, tires and tubes, electric ranges, commercial and industrial refrigerating equipment, bakery equipment, fluorescent lighting fixtures and tractors.

In determining which rationed articles were to be declared eligible under this program, we endeavored to base our decision on the anticipated number of dealers that would be affected by the rationed-article order under consideration because the act (sec. 5h (a) (1)) specifies that "such loans and purchases are to be made only in the case of rationed articles under circumstances resulting in a substantial number of dealers being affected." Our views on this particular subject in the early part of this program were undoubtedly too liberal in scope as the

following table of the total number of loans and purchases authorized will indicate. However, our intent was to help as many dealers as possible consistent with the act.

Loans and purchases authorized by RFC

Articles	Loans			Purchases		
	Number of loans	Number of articles	Amount	Number of purchases	Number of articles	Purchase price
Automobiles	2,639	59,460	$63,363,587	189	2,282	$3,579,592
Oil burners	110	7,540	478,067	442	25,632	1,349,547
Typewriters	35	2,268	120,353	1	153	5,139
Tires and tubes	42	31,149	262,327	1	212	612
Liquefied petroleum gas equipment	10	383	47,683	1	85	9,710
Electric ranges				5	135	11,358
Gas burners	34	2,990	148,556	99	2,756	242,180
Commercial and industrial refrigerating units	12	848	112,193	9	131	71,684
Bakery equipment	1	37	4,106			
Fluorescent fixtures				7	1,502	19,452
Tractors	1	5	8,504			
Total	2,884		64,545,376	754		5,289,274

In summarizing, the RFC has, under the Murray-Patman Act, assisted directly 3,638 dealers to the extent of $69,834,650, and indirectly, 18,021 automobile dealers to the extent of $213,209,302. Developments show that the greatest assistance has been given to automobile dealers.

The act provided thousands of dealers with a means of remaining in business, through loans, to carry on under rationing, with monthly increments to cover all carrying charges on the rationed articles concerned. And those dealers who desired to discontinue business were able to liquidate their rationed articles without loss.

W. E. WILLETT,
Assistant Chief, Examining Division.
NOVEMBER 15, 1945.

Suggestion of Navy Island as Site of United Nations Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, December 17 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by LeRoy E. Fess in support of the selection of Navy Island as the seat of the United Nations Organization.

It is my hope that one of the many attractive places or sites on the continent, such as Navy Island, which is in close proximity to Buffalo and Niagara Falls, N. Y., will be considered and selected as the site for the permanent seat of the United Nations Organization.

There are many splendid sites in this country, and in my State in particular. I trust that within a short time a suitable one will be selected. Hyde Park and Saratoga, in New York, would also make exceptionally fine locations for the seat of the United Nations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Navy island, that little chunk of wilderness which splits the Niagara River at the northwest tip of Grand Island, is having its day in the sun after more than 100 years. If efforts of the joint United States-Canadian committee now in London are successful, it will become the permanent seat of the United Nations Organization.

Such a peace role would be entirely new for the island whose history is one of war, rebellion, and rum-running. When the French had it, back in the 1700's, they built a navy yard there and named it Isle de Marine, from which it undoubtedly takes its present name. The British acquired it during the French and Indian War. The spot of woodland was a buffer and jumping-off place for troops in both the American Revolution and the War of 1812.

CEDED TO CANADA IN 1825

The tiny island officially was ceded to Canada in 1825 by an international survey commission which functioned under mandate of the Treaty of Ghent, which terminated the War of 1812. At the same time, Grand Island was given to the United States to offset Canada's acquisition of Grand or Long Island in the St. Lawrence.

Navy Island had its first taste of world fame a dozen years later, during the Canadian Rebellion of 1837, when William Lyon Mackenzie, leader of the insurgents and grandfather of William Lyon Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada, made it the headquarters for his handful of troops. For a few hectic weeks, the island was an independent republic.

A memorable incident of this fracas was the burning of the steamer *Caroline*, a 46-ton Buffalo vessel which was used for communication and supplies between the island and the American mainland. On the night of December 29, 1837, volunteer Canadian troops hunted out the *Caroline's* pier at Schlosser, set her afire and adrift. The blazing vessel plunged over Niagara Falls.

Mackenzie, who previously had been driven out of Canada, soon found Navy Island untenable and abandoned it on January 14, 1838. He spent the next 10 years as an exile in the United States. When King George VI visited Canada just before World War II, the Prime Minister showed him the picture of his grandfather, which he has on his desk together with a framed notice from Her Majesty's Government offering £1,000 reward for Mackenzie dead or alive.

"The King seemed interested," the Dominion's Prime Minister commented.

Save for these few red-letter days, Navy Island has been mostly uninhabited. For a few years, a government caretaker lived there and operated a small farm in a clearing. William Bennett, a former Niagara Falls City engineer, at one time leased tillable acres on the island. Old-timers in the Falls and La-Salle recall that 30 or 40 years ago a sizable hotel flourished there, supported by gay river party trade. This hostelry boasted "the longest bar in the country."

Recent visitors say a few ruins of buildings and remnants of old wharves may be seen near the water's edge.

The few clearings carved out of the forest for farm land look bare from the air, but are covered with waist-deep underbrush. All the rest of the land, an estimated 25 of the total 315 acres, is woods, some of it probably virgin timber. Wildlife is said to abound, including some deer.

There is a popular legend that the island also harbors wild boar, a reverted type of domestic pig which escaped from early settlers. A theory also has been advanced that the wolves recently shot on Grand Island used Navy Island as a stepping stone in their trek down from the Canadian north.

FAVORABLE POINTS STRESSED

The advocates of the spot as United Nations headquarters hold out the lure that, with a minimum of face-lifting, Navy Island could be transformed into the New World's capital within a few short months, if not weeks.

A small army of woodsmen equipped with modern machinery could clear the land quickly, while a fleet of bulldozers would follow in their wake to do the uprooting and leveling. Only a portion of the trees would need to be removed, it is pointed out, the rest being left in landscaped arrangement to provide natural parks.

Being almost level, the land would lend itself to quick transformation, the committee making the offer to the UNO points out. Other obvious advantages include the location in an international river, the fact that only fractions of a mile of water separate it from the mainland of Canada and Grand Island, making bridges inexpensive to build, and its central position in the Niagara frontier, a metropolitan area with 900,000 population and easy of access to the principal cities of Canada and the eastern seaboard of the United States.

TRULY PEACEFUL SETTING

Perhaps the biggest selling point for the proposed world capital is that the tiny island is on the border of two of the United Nations which boast the longest unfortified border in the world—longest in distance, shortest in years. Since the Rush-Bagot Agreement of 1817, no hostile shot has been fired across its 3,500-mile expanse.

The invitation to the UNO to consider Navy Island as its permanent home has been presented in the form of an elaborate brochure, beautifully illustrated and setting forth all the reasons why this location would be an ideal site.

Should the UNO look favorably upon the offer, it is proposed that Canada and the United States enter into an agreement whereby half of the island will be ceded to the United States so the new world capital may be considered a joint gift of these two leading members of the United Nations.

Crain Resigns as District of Columbia Navy League Head

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article captioned "Crain resigns as District of Columbia Navy League head," which appeared in the Washington Post of date December 16, 1945, as follows:

CRAIN RESIGNS AS DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NAVY LEAGUE HEAD

Bennett Crain, Washington lawyer, yesterday resigned as president of District of Columbia Chapter of the Navy League of

America in protest against the league's and the Navy's methods in opposing unification of the armed services.

His resignation was contained in a blistering open letter to Ralph A. Bard, president of the Navy League of America, which also included his resignation as a director of the national association.

Crain stated that he joined the Navy League in 1942, and is a charter member of the District chapter. "I joined in the hope that I might thereby serve in a small way the war effort and interests of our country. In view of recent developments I find myself apparently participating, by implication, in statements and policies which I by no means approve.

"Officials and certain members of the board have seen fit to speak on behalf of the league without consulting the membership on a vital question affecting our national security."

SHELDON CLARK'S LETTER

The immediate cause of his resignation, however, was a letter, dated November 2, from the former president of the league, Sheldon Clark, of Chicago, to Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Democrat, Colorado, of the Military Affairs Committee, and a telegram from the same source dated December 1 to President Truman. Of these messages Crain wrote:

"I would under no circumstances approve the imputations of bad faith * * * contained in the letter of Mr. Clark to Senator JOHNSON, and his telegram to President Truman.

"I do not propose to be a party, even by implication, to assertions that a proposal, openly and earnestly advocated by such citizens and patriots as Secretary of War Patterson, former Secretary of the Navy Daniels, Assistant Secretary of War McCloy, General Marshall, General Arnold, General Eisenhower, and outstanding Members of both Houses of Congress, represents an 'undercover movement,' a 'grab for power with a disguised purpose,' an attempt to 'establish rule by a military clique' or a 'military coup by stealth of political interests.'"

ADMIRAL'S "EFFRONTERY"

Later in his letter Crain decries efforts of the Navy to use the league as a mouthpiece. "I cannot overlook," he said, "the recent action of an admiral commanding one naval district who, after employing naval personnel to assist in expansion of the league membership, had the effrontery to advise the league that unless it carried out a program suggested by him the Navy would cease to look to the league for public support.

"I cannot support a policy which permits, as at the December 7 national board meeting, attendance of active naval officers for the purpose of influencing league action."

Crain has his law office at 815 Fifteenth Street NW., which is also the offices of the District chapter of the Navy League. His Washington home is 1304 Thirtieth Street NW., and he also has a home at Mount Victoria, Md.

GI Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from one of my constituents in regard to obtaining GI loans, which is as follows:

VILLE PLATTE, LA., *December 12, 1945.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you very much for your help while I was in the Army.

Now I am out and am trying to get information on how to go about borrowing money with the Government to go into business of my own.

It looks like there is nobody here that knows anything about the same.

If you know anything about that matter, would you kindly advise me?

Truly yours,

LANDRY SOILEAU.

Mr. Speaker, many of the banks and financial institutions are unable to obtain help to handle these loans. The constituent writing the above quoted letter lives about 15 miles from my home town where the bank there has been trying to have the Navy separate an officer of the bank who lacks about 2 or 3 points in order that the bank may handle these loans, but without success. The officer is not suffering as he is a golfer and there is a golf course where he is stationed, but the bank and the GI's are suffering because there is no one to handle GI loans.

Our No. 1 Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the No. 1 critical problem facing our Nation today is the housing problem. There are approximately 25,000 retail lumber dealers in the United States, of which I am one. Judging from my own contacts with many of these gentlemen, I know they are just as opposed to runaway prices as the general public. Most of them can recall the last building boom and the sad results many of them experienced with the building collapse. I have hesitated a long time in coming out against price controls, as I feel that price controls should be maintained until supply and demand were in reasonable balance. I had hoped that OPA might take a realistic attitude, and by working with other governmental agencies they might aid the production of lumber and building materials adequately and promptly. However, as time goes on, there seems to be little hope that the fundamental thinking of the OPA authorities can possibly be directed along realistic lines.

As a lumber dealer, I am acquainted with the excessive prices paid by retail dealers for nonstandard items, for remanufacturing in transit, for unusual and abnormal purchases through distribution yards, and the alleged black-market operations. It seems to me it is only a matter of time until either legally or illegally economic forces will burst the bounds of legal control. Therefore, will it be possible for OPA to maintain an unrealistic control policy before the whole structure breaks down under its own weight?

I hope I am wrong, but we cannot ignore some of the factors in the situation. The lumber dealers have complied with the various regulations during the war. Generally speaking, I believe they recognize the attitude of the OPA has been generally constructive. All worked to help accomplish the difficult task the industry faced. Now that the war is over, that spirit of compliance is past. Every lumber dealer knows there is a job to be done. Houses must be built to take care of the veterans who need houses. The lumber dealer knows that if the regulations and red tape surrounding the manufacturers and distributors are dropped, production will get underway and the consumer will be benefited through normal market procedure.

If controls are dropped legally, it is my humble opinion that prices will go up, but this condition will adjust itself by the increase in production. The public may pay a little more for their houses, but not much more than they would through an uncontrolled black market. In getting production increased the hardship period will be greatly reduced and more houses constructed.

The longer we wait in bringing this matter to a head, the more confusing the picture looks. Steps to control the prices of both old houses and new houses are just impracticable. Bills such as the Patman bill and the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill definitely tend to federalize the housing industry and do not guarantee any increase in production or decrease in cost.

It is my understanding that here in the East, the Connecticut, the New Hampshire, the Massachusetts, and New York State Retail Lumber Dealers Associations have passed resolutions that Congress take the necessary steps to bring about increased production, and if it becomes necessary to attain this end, to abolish price controls. I am including in my remarks the opinion expressed by our Northeastern Retail Lumberman's Association adopted November 26, 1945.

Personally, I have a lot of faith in the judgment of the American retail lumber dealers. These men, along with the cooperation of other businessmen, bankers, and local citizens, can control the inflation problem better than a national agency. It is up to the President to use his present powers to see that lumber allocations are channeled to the dealers serving communities where housing is critical. We hear about the millions of feet that are being shipped to foreign countries. Possibly under ordinary conditions these export relations should be maintained. However, with over 100,000 veterans needing houses, our relations with these gentlemen must come first.

This is an expression of the considered opinion of the Northeastern Retail Lumbermen's Association:

We believe that the only real source of wealth for the Nation and its citizens is from production.

We believe that whatever retards production is against the public interest and whatever increases the Nation's productivity raises the standard of living.

We believe that the paramount duty of every agency authorized by the Congress is the attainment of this end.

We believe that it is the special duty of the construction industry to fill quickly the great need for more and better housing.

We believe that the discharge of this duty is being seriously impeded by the unrealistic policy of some Government agencies.

We believe that the policy of OPA in particular is one of the factors which is retarding production in the following respects:

1. It fails to act promptly to correct obvious inequities.

2. It has failed to set price ceilings adequate to encourage the production of building materials, especially lumber, required to build homes, such as flooring, ceiling, siding, and small sizes of framing, while continuing relatively high ceiling prices on the types of lumber required for the prosecution of war.

3. It has become involved in the technicalities of the hold-the-line order to the point where production has been so retarded as to cause rather than prevent inflation.

4. Its present policies, if continued, will make it impossible for OPA or any other agency, to prevent a black market which will build up the cost of new homes to a point which will defeat the purposes of price control.

Therefore, we respectfully ask that the Congress take appropriate measures to the end that every other objective be subordinated to the fundamental goal of increased production, even if in order to attain this production, it becomes necessary to abolish price controls over construction materials.

Adopted November 26, 1945.

United Automobile Workers of Detroit Contact Prime Minister Attlee of Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the proposed recess of the House and Senate over the holiday season, it is interesting to note a news item in yesterday's Times-Herald, of Washington, D. C., Sunday, December 16, 1945. This news item indicates how far the trend toward internationalism has developed in the United States. It also shows just how far the interests of foreign countries in the affairs of the United States may be extended. These facts are very significant and challenge the consideration of everyone. The news item reads as follows:

CIO ASKS BRITAIN AID IN GM STRIKE—CITE 434,000 SHARES OWNED BY BRITONS

DETROIT, December 15.—The CIO United Auto Workers, in a dramatic appeal to Prime Minister Attlee of Great Britain, tonight called on Britain's labor government to support the union's strike-enforced bid for a 30-percent wage boost from General Motors Corp.

R. J. Thomas, UAW-CIO international president, made the request in a letter to Attlee.

Thomas based his appeal to the Prime Minister on "reliable" information that the British Government owned 434,000 shares of GM common stock.

(If the British Government holds control over any stock in the strike-bound General Motors Corp., it would not dream of interfering in an American domestic problem, authorities in London declared.)

UAW officials, meanwhile, prepared for resumption of negotiations Monday both with General Motors and Ford Motor Co., and also with a newcomer to the savagely competitive automotive field—the Kaiser-Frazer Corp.

Both sides were organizing for appearances in Washington Wednesday when President Truman's first fact-finding board organizes to examine the GM dispute.

These facts, Mr. Speaker, are very significant and point out much better than any language I might use the necessity for the American people to examine carefully all legislative proposals in this country relating to foreign countries. This episode shows clearly the interest another country might have in the passage or the defeat of any pending legislative proposal.

"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

LOANS TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

This story of the Congress of Industrial Organizations—CIO—asking Prime Minister Attlee of Great Britain to interfere in the dispute now being carried on between the United Automobile Workers, on the one hand, and the company which employs them, on the other hand, naturally associates itself with the question of the pending $4,000,000,000 loan to Great Britain.

One American columnist has just recently indicated that the loan was proper, and he has written at some length to explain just why a loan should be made. I do not want to dignify his nonsense by even mentioning his name.

It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the American people agree with another columnist, who has pointed out rather clearly that this pending loan is just a plain hand-out.

It is estimated that this country has spent $250,000,000,000 in the winning of World War II, and presumably this additional $4,000,000,000 does not make any difference to these intellectuals in the United States who want to be good fellows and give away everything we have to foreign countries, as long as it is done at the expense of the American taxpayers. It is time that we cut out this foolishness, because this idea of loaning France $500,000,000, Great Britain about $4,000,000,000, and Russia some five or six billion dollars can't be justified on any sensible basis. I am opposed to such a program of loans or hand-outs.

THE PROBLEMS OF UNRRA

In this connection, it should be noted that, up to date, the United States has already agreed to contribute to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration the sum of $1,300,000,000. This outfit is commonly called UNRRA, and the money is to be contributed to the set-up, along with funds from other foreign countries—small in amount—for the purpose of aiding people in Europe who have to have food, clothing, and medicine. Otherwise, we are told they would starve.

When this thing started, the sensible argument was made that the quicker these people were rehabilitated, and they are war victims, just that much quicker would things return to normal.

Recently there has been powerful propaganda, stressing the needs to help these suffering people by overlooking the misdeeds, mistakes, and politics which UNRRA has played with human misery. Congress has been asked to authorize another and an additional $1,000,000,000 for UNRRA. In my opinion, the American people are opposed to giving any further funds to UNRRA. I think they are opposed to this additional $1,000,000,000. They would not be opposed to having Congress appropriate money to be used by the American Red Cross, the Salvation Army, or relief agencies, such as the churches. The American people know that those groups would not play politics with human misery, but would really help people in need of food, medicine, and clothing. Those people ought to have our help. But we have had enough experience with UNRRA to know that it is unfit to meet the situation.

According to the newspapers for yesterday, the deficiency bill, which passed the House recently, has been amended in the Senate to add an additional $750,000,000 for UNRRA. In my opinion, the House of Representatives ought to defeat that amendment. It has no place in a deficiency bill. There ought to be further hearings in the appropriate committee to determine the need for this additional $750,000,000. UNRRA ought not to get that sum of money until we have definite assurances how the money is to be spent and that it will go to relieve people who are hungry, people who are sick, and people who need clothing. As I said, I am in favor of having the United States help out these unfortunate people. On the other hand, we have a duty to our own people.

WE NEGLECT OUR OWN CITIZENS

I pointed out in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, on December 5, 1945, in dealing with the question of aid for unfortunate war victims, that we have money to spend on everything that is international, and at the same time we are asked to shut our eyes to the fact that there is plenty of rehabilitation work to be done in America. In spite of the boast of New Dealers and brain-trusters that they have been good to the American people, it was not so long ago that they bodly proclaimed that in this country we had plenty of ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed. As I recall, that was uttered during a campaign year, and naturally was intended to get votes. However, it had a large element of truth. But it was simply an idle gesture, and everything that has happened since that historic declaration simply proves that those in control of our Government did not intend to do anything about the unfortunate people in this country. They have done nothing about it. They are not going to do anything about it.

Here we are, with a housing shortage, and it is going to get worse. In all fairness, let the record show that the building of homes had to stop while this World War was going on. But I want to ask you to tell me just what the administration has done to meet the crisis we now face—a shortage of homes. The answer, of course, is that nothing has been done, and many of our people are going to live in conditions worse than what used to be described as "slum areas." In other

words, they are going to have a live wherever they can get shelter, and no questions asked.

Then think of this: "We export lumber, though homes are needed." That statement is no political oratory. It is the headlines in an article in the Washington Daily News for Friday, December 14, and this article points out that enough lumber to build 75,000 to 100,000 much-needed houses has been shipped abroad this year. The item then goes on to say that this lumber went to England, France, and a number of other countries. Such a procedure demands that the administration explain.

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

In my remarks when UNRRA was under discussion on December 5 I referred to a letter that I had received from a man who was 68 years of age and his wife was 70 years of age, and they were lucky to get $40 a month for living expenses. The recital of these facts carried its own conclusion, namely, that this alleged humanitarian administration of ours has just made a lot of empty promises and has sadly neglected these pioneer citizens.

In yesterday's mail I received a letter from a neighboring State. The writer pleads for a national old-age pension law which will let him and his wife live the balance of their years on this earth without leading a pauper's existence. He calls attention to the fact, and I quote:

> This old-age assistance is no good. I am 75 years old. I get $30 per month. I am not able to do any work. I have no other income.

This writer, in some verse that he enclosed, appeals to the present generation to remember their mothers who have now grown old and who are entitled to national old-age pension legislation so that they may spend their declining years with a little comfort and homelike necessities, rather than the present program, which treats them little better than a lazy bum who refuses to work.

And so, Mr. Speaker, as we approach this holiday season, when good thoughts crowd out evil from the minds of men and generosity and a helping hand go out toward others not so fortunate, let us think about our own people and their needs while giving so much effort to the problems of others.

Occupational Material

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LANSDALE G. SASSCER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in the Gravel Agitator, published by the Three Hundred and Nineteenth Infantry in Czechoslovakia. This article is such a fair and constructive outline of the well-warranted feeling of the men now in occupational duty who have seen active battle service that I thought it should be called to the attention of the Congress. The article follows:

OCCUPATIONAL MATERIAL

In Stars and Stripes we read that the "hate Germany" educational program, with all its courses designed to combat fraternization involving orientation classes, moving pictures, statistics, and photographic evidence on Nazi atrocities meets with a general indifference and a "what the hell" attitude. Another part of the article tells of the jeers accorded one GI when he ventured the opinion that Germany should be occupied for 20 years, and the question was hurled at him, "How many points have you got, bub?"

It is no wonder that antifraternization publicity is accepted so lightly. Most of the men who are here have been in the ET from 8 to 20 months, and the possibility is that they will have to remain here for some time yet. Most all of these realize the value of occupation, and also realize the subtlety of the German civilian. However, most of the GI's here feel their duty done and can't see occupation if it must take their own efforts to perform this task. Most of us were snatched out of civilian lives and shoved bodily overseas, which so abruptly severed all family relations and ties very cruelly. Married, single, or family men all have suffered. All this tends to make tempers short here about the subject of going home or occupational duties when this subject is brought up.

What is being done to relieve this situation both by the Army or Congress. We read on the front page of the Stars and Stripes, as follows: "Congressmen today demand suspension of the draft." So many words, and do they add up. How does this affect the soldier already overseas? Who will relieve the unfortunate nes overseas if the draft is suspended? Due to lack of men, will the occupational army fold up? All these questions and many more are running through the minds of all concerned. In the occupational army are now many men who have not enough points for shipment home and, due to lack of replacements, cannot look forward to starting soon. Yet these men are the ones who served in combat—some in Luxemburg, some in the Siegfried line—the hell holes that the regiment and division participated in overcoming.

From a GI outlook over here, we see 6 months overseas as enough for any man. Increase the draft, train men in Europe and Japan—but only 6 months' service overseas. Have training occupational areas that have large-scale educational facilities available and hire efficient teachers, civilian if necessary, to maintain them. Each day could be regulated for so much vocational study. Have recreational facilities galore. Keep the men so busy in things they like to do that they would have no time for fraternizing.

Wake up, America—don't be fooled. Occupation is necessary, and if handled properly would be beneficial for all concerned. This article defends no one, but when Congress attacks the Army for its alleged high-pressure reenlistment practices, it should be considered that men for occupational forces have to be procured somehow, particularly if Congress refuses to draft sufficient men to meet the demands. All these accusations may be justified, but the question remains, "Will the right steps be taken if the draft is suspended?" Will the draft, if suspended, be altogether done away with? Let's not make the same mistake we made after the last war and forget the matter entirely. Occupy for 5 or 10 years and observe what develops. No chance can be taken this time, because another world conflagration with the use of the new and horrible weapons may be almost racial suicide on our part unless proper preventatives are taken.

What about the men overseas—yes, you GI's? It is true many of you have by far done your duty well and deserve everything that civilian life has to offer, but is that the end of your duties? You, the GI still overseas, are yet soldiers it is true, but your word will carry much weight and a world of influence.

Farmers Support St. Lawrence Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, just so that my colleagues will know that I have lots of company in efforts to promote the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, I want to call attention to how the farmers feel about this matter. Agriculture is basic and if we do not have the farmers to feed us, serious consequences will happen to people engaged in the operation of railroads and utilities and the ports of New York and other great cities. So anything you do to help the farmer get his products to market is a constructive step toward promoting his prosperity and well-being. The farmers of America have consistently supported the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

NATIONAL GRANGE ENDORSES ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT

One of the outstanding groups in this country representing the agriculture interests is the National Grange. Its membership is composed of leaders in the agriculture world and these people have made a careful study as to the needs, the feasibility, and the results that will follow the completion of the seaway and power project. It is, therefore, interesting to note their action taken on November 23, 1945, when this outstanding group of farmers held their annual session at Kansas City, Mo. Their resolutions which were unanimously adopted are as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL GRANGE AT ITS SEVENTY-NINTH ANNUAL SESSION AT KANSAS CITY, MO., NOVEMBER 23, 1945

Whereas the National Grange has for many years gone on record as favoring the development of the St. Lawrence River for navigation and power: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Grange reaffirms its support of the St. Lawrence waterway and power project and urges that Congress appropriate funds to complete this project at the earliest possible date.

ACTION TAKEN AT THE SEVENTY-SEVENTH AND SEVENTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL SESSIONS OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE

At its seventy-eighth annual session, at Winston-Salem, N. C., November 23, 1944, the National Grange reaffirmed resolutions adopted at its seventy-seventh annual session at Grand Rapids, Mich., November 18, 1943, as follows:

"Whereas the National Grange has for years advocated the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway, nearly 90 percent of which is already completed, and opening this wonderful artery of commerce to carry the products of the interior of our country to the markets of the world at reduced costs; and

"Whereas the completion of this project would permit the development of vast electrical energy, now going to waste in the onrushing waters of this mighty river, resulting in cheaper electric power to all our people; and

"Whereas there is legislation now pending in Congress to bring this project to completion as soon as material and labor are available: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Grange reaffirms its position favoring completion of this project for navigation and power purposes."

Action taken by the National Grange at its recent seventy-ninth annual session at Kansas City, Mo., November 23, in support of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, is consistent with the program favored by the Grange over a period of many years.

The Grange supported the St. Lawrence Seaway Treaty of 1932 and the Federal-State Accord of 1933 on the power development submitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Senate, 1932–34. When the United States and Canada signed the pending agreement of March 19, 1941, to complete the development, the Grange recommended legislation to authorize the project—H. R. 4927, Seventy-seventh Congress—at public hearings before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in 1941. Legislation to implement the 1941 agreement and the 1933 accord was reintroduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress—H. R. 2280 and S. 1385—and in the Seventy-ninth Congress—H. R. 671, Senate Joint Resolution 104, and companion bills.

Mr. Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange, has been an outstanding supporter of the development of water resources throughout the Nation for navigation, power, and other beneficial public purposes. On many occasions Mr. Goss has advocated the St. Lawrence project, and on November 29, 1944, declared that "had it been developed prior to the present war its value to the Nation would have paid the total cost several times over."

At the last congressional hearings on the St. Lawrence project, Mr. Louis J. Taber, master of the National Grange, 1923–41, testified before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, July 17, 1941:

The pending bill authorizes the modernization of an existing waterway, not the undertaking of an entirely new development. * * * By spending less than $200,000,000 in Federal funds, we shall thus greatly enhance the value of the investments already made by the United States and Canada on the upper lake channels, the Welland Canal, and the other great improvements now in use. In addition, we shall make available 2,200,000 horsepower of the cheapest hydroelectricity in the world, to be divided equally and distributed by public agencies of the State of New York and the Province of Ontario. * * * The use of all of our transportation facilities, including the St. Lawrence, to reduce the cost of shipping our products to market, will obviously help our entire country, not hinder it, in meeting competition in the postwar period.

In a statement presented at the congressional hearings, August 6, 1941, Mr. Fred J. Freestone, master of the New York State Grange, 1928–36, and chairman of the executive committee of the National Grange, 1933–41, said:

The St. Lawrence development authorized by the pending bill will be of advantage to producers and consumers in every section of our country. Any project that helps to create low-cost transportation and low-cost power will bring benefits that are general in character and not confined to any one section.

IN CONCLUSION

Many Members of Congress are familiar with the records of some of the men who were in attendance at this annual meeting: Mr. Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange; Mr. Louis J. Taber, one of its former national officers; and Mr. Fred J. Freestone, one of its leading members, and they are all recognized as outstanding men. They are unselfish in their devotion to America and to the support of those matters which will make our country happier and a better place in which to live. I cite these men as examples of the type of people who are found almost everywhere in this country and who are supporting the St. Lawrence project. It is too bad that the administration does not give the American people and the National Grange a Christmas present this year in the shape of the St. Lawrence project.

General Marshall Blows Up Pearl Harbor Smear Plot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Philadelphia Record for the week of December 2–8, 1945:

GENERAL MARSHALL BLOWS UP PEARL HARBOR SMEAR PLOT—F. D. R. HATERS ONLY BOOST HIS STATURE

Gen. George C. Marshall, then Chief of Staff, made a grievous error in the critical days preceding the disaster of Pearl Harbor.

He underestimated the daring—or the foolhardiness—of the Japanese, he told the Congressional Pearl Harbor Committee.

The Nation's top and most responsible man thought an attack on Hawaii was virtually impossible. He had so informed the late President Roosevelt.

LAND INVASION

Marshall's testimony showed that whatever thinking he had done on Hawaii was in terms of a land invasion by the Japs. Apparently it had not occurred to him that the Jap intention would be a hit-run blow to break the back of the United States Navy.

But General Marshall's place in history must be judged by his over-all record. Every general makes mistakes.

Nobody makes a hit every time he comes to bat.

Marshall redeemed himself by subsequent brilliant direction of our victorious war effort.

Marshall informed President Roosevelt on May 5, 1941, that the island of Oahu was "the strongest fortress in the world," and that an attack was highly improbable.

F. D. R. HAD MEMO

Roosevelt had that memo during the war years when those who hated him so viciously charged that he had neglected the defenses of Pearl Harbor to invite a Jap attack and thus plunge this country into war.

Yes, F. D. R. had that note. He could have made it public and silenced the tongues of all his enemies.

GOP Candidate Dewey was reported to have information which "would destroy Roosevelt's chances in the 1944 election."

Dewey knew that we had cracked the Japanese code before Pearl Harbor and that Roosevelt was aware the Japs probably would attack somewhere.

Dewey did not divulge his knowledge—a gesture of patriotism according to the conservative press. Actually, Dewey had no choice. To reveal his information would have been unpatriotic and meant political suicide.

President Roosevelt showed his towering stature by refusing to defend himself against calumny.

He could have disclosed the Marshall note. But it might have impaired public confidence in the Chief of Staff and it would have injured an able officer. Roosevelt, devoted to winning the war, refused to do that.

The more the Roosevelt haters, in and out of the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee, try to smear Roosevelt, the more they reveal him as a man for the ages.

Presidential Yacht Club Takes a Look at St. Lawrence Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of those readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD who have not followed the line of progress, let me say that I have inaugurated the practice of making a weekly report to the people on the state of the Union. This report is wholly occupied with the progress being made in the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. My report today makes the seventh successive Monday that I have discussed this proposition with my colleagues in Congress and also with the people of the United States.

As we have approached the holiday season, when the era of good tidings is with us and people expect the bearer of good gifts, I had fondly hoped and fervently desired to say that something had been done, aside from just mere babble and serious talk as well, to assure the construction of the St. Lawrence project. However, it is with deepest regret that I have to report no tidings, either good or bad, and no gifts from those givers of all good things in Washington to the American people. In other words, 76 days have now gone by since that historic day on October 2 when a note of good cheer was sounded in this troubled world.

Just so that you may keep the facts correct in mind, here is the record:

October 2, 1945, Senate Joint Resolution 104. This provided for construc-

tion of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project and was introduced by Senator BARKLEY of the great State of Kentucky and others. I quote correctly from the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A5258, where this language is used:

This legislation has strong bipartisan sponsorship. In the Senate, Senate Joint Resolution 104 was introduced on October 2, as a joint resolution, by Senator BARKLEY, Democrat, Kentucky, for himself and Senators WAGNER, Democrat, New York; HILL, Democrat, Alabama; TAYLOR, Democrat, Idaho; AIKEN, Republican, Vermont; FERGUSON, Republican, Michigan; LANGER, Republican, North Dakota; VANDENBERG, Republican, Michigan; SHIPSTEAD, Republican, Minnesota; and LA FOLLETTE, Progressive, Wisconsin.

This resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 104, was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, where it now reposes, and, as I have said, 76 days have now elapsed.

October 3, 1945, President Truman sent a message to Congress calling for construction of the St. Lawrence project.

October 4, 1945, I called for immediate action on the Barkley resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 104. See the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A4170.

On November 12, 1945, I called attention to delay, and no action on the Barkley resolution. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 10601; also Appendix, page A4835.

On November 19, 1945, I called attention to delay. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 10811; also Appendix, page A4988.

On November 20, 1945, this matter was discussed in the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives. Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A5230.

On November 26, 1945, I called attention to continued delay. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for November 26, page 10985; also Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A5109.

On December 3, 1945, I again called attention to the unexplained delays. See Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A5230; also Appendix, page A5246.

On December 10, 1945, I again called attention to the unexplained delays. See Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A5377; also Appendix, page A5395.

PRESIDENTIAL YACHT CLUB

Now, Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested as a Christmas present for the American people, something new be tried in efforts to break the log jam which has occurred on the St. Lawrence River. We may have to call on the old lumberjacks of the northwest for help, but before that we want to give nature a chance. So, in anticipation of the promise of the future we are going to suggest the organization of a new and powerful group or society for the promotion of the St. Lawrence project. Let us call it the Presidential Yacht Club.

THOMAS E. DEWEY

No better Christmas present can be conceived than this plan to present to the American people some navigators, tried and untried who are interested in water transportation. We are going to aim high.

One aspirant for membership in the Presidential Yacht Club is the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey. He thinks he knows a lot about navigation. He has a fine background and most of you will recall that it was Tom Dewey who sent a few racketeers to the penitentiary, and the people were so delighted in discovering him that they made him Governor of New York. They called him "Silent Tom."

Governor Dewey has long been interested in navigation as well as power. On many occasions he has been outspoken in his endorsement of this project. Witness his message to the New York State Legislature on January 3, 1945, wherein he said in part, as follows:

For years I have advocated the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. During the past decade the means have been found and billions in Federal funds have been appropriated to develop great rivers in other sections of the country, for power, navigation, flood control, irrigation, and like purposes. The incomparable resources of the St. Lawrence River should no longer be wasted. If the Federal administration is unable or unwilling to proceed, then the State of New York itself should undertake to complete the project on a self-liquidating basis, in cooperation with the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Ontario.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, that Governor Dewey thoroughly believes that yachts, as well as other boats, should travel the inland seas of this Republic unhindered by channel depths and other obstacles.

GOV. HAROLD E. STASSEN

Another man who has aspirations for the Presidential Yacht Club is that modest former Governor of Minnesota, Harold E. Stassen—late a captain in the United States Navy. Stassen is on the natural in claiming to know something about navigation, because he has sailed the Atlantic Ocean and the Pacific Ocean in the uniform of his country. He takes to water like a duck.

Some people call him "loquacious Harold," because he does and can talk on any subject—the atomic bomb, peace, labor disputes, and the UNO.

In 1941, when hearings were in progress on the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin, Governor Stassen testified before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives. His testimony appears in printed hearings for June 17 to July 9, 1941, on page 915, and I quote from the committee hearings verbatim the following forthright statement:

STATEMENT OF HON. HAROLD E. STASSEN, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Mr. PITTENGER (acting chairman). I now take pleasure in presenting Governor Stassen, of Minnesota.

Governor STASSEN. Congressman PITTENGER, Chairman MANSFIELD, and gentlemen, I am appearing before this committee this afternoon on behalf of the people of Minnesota to support the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and the project as it is now before this committee.

I support it not only from the standpoint of the local historical background of support for the project from the people of my State, going back for many years, but also in a very deep sense at this time in the recognition of the propect as the type of development of our resources that will add to our strenth from both an economic and a military or defense standpoint. We feel development of resources of this nature, adding a very excellent means of transportation and at the same time developing very considerable amounts of electrical power, is the type of a thing that is basically sound. We feel that this great country of ours can better afford to have a surplus of methods of transportation and a surplus of power, than it can afford to be caught short in either respect; whether it be a matter of defense needs in these future years, or the future development of this Nation and this continent in an economical sense and in its relationship to the rest of the world.

The foregoing comment, Mr. Speaker, requires no elaboration. It is a plain recital of fact and entitled the Governor to a whole fleet of oceangoing steamboats.

THE HONORABLE FIORELLO H. LAGUARDIA

But. Mr. Speaker, candidates for the Presidential Yacht Club are not limited to men who have been are now are governors of great States. Friends of the former colorful mayor of New York City, the Honorable Fiorello H. LaGuardia, sometimes speak of him as Presidential timber. While it is thought he would like to operate a Presidential yacht, he will have to have some training. His experience is that of an aviator in World War I. Presently he may achieve his efforts for undying fame because announcement has just been made that he will write for PM, a New York City magazine, which publishes its Sunday edition in two sections. The mayor will write without strings and restrictions. This sort of "four freedoms" is right down his alley, as many of his former colleagues in the House of Representatives can testify.

However, he joined the Presidential Yacht Club in 1941, and listen to this verbatim quotation from the printed hearings of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House, June 17 to July 9, 1941:

STATEMENT OF HON. FIORELLO H. LAGUARDIA, MAYOR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Mayor LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I appear on behalf of and in support of H. R. 4927. I want to make it clear that my city is divided on this subject, and I assume full responsibility for appearing here today in support of the St. Lawrence River development. My own business advisory committee, known as the mayor's business advisory committee of the city of New York, is on record in opposition to this project. I want the record to show that.

The subject is not new. Many of us have been giving a great deal of thought and study to it for many years, and, like every other great project, it meets with opposition from those who know too much about it and those who know too little about it.

My city has the greatest port——

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Mayor, would you allow me to disturb you for a moment? I understand there is about to be a vote on a rule on the May bill. I am afraid our Members will want to be on the floor.

Mayor LAGUARDIA. That is all right; I used to answer roll calls myself.

(The committee thereupon took a recess for the purpose of answering a roll call.)

The CHAIRMAN. Are you ready to proceed, Mr. Mayor?

Mayor LAGUARDIA. As I was saying, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my city has the greatest port in the entire world. It is a typical port city. Surely I would not be endorsing this project if I had the slightest fear that it would injure my city as a port.

I have not come to this conclusion in the last few minutes. Some of us, as I said before, have been with this project for a great many years. It is natural that people might have a fear of competition. We are constantly confronted with that. At one time New York City was the only port on the Atlantic seaboard. Seventy-five years ago all of the ocean traffic, practically all, came into the port of New York. Since that time other great ports have developed on the Atlantic—Baltimore, Philadelphia, Boston, Charleston——

The CHAIRMAN. Norfolk.

Mayor LAGUARDIA. Norfolk. There was a time when all the cotton came up north. Within the last 30 years I would say your great Gulf ports have developed, and we are still in business as a port in New York City.

The CHAIRMAN. And you have continued to expand and grow.

Like Governor Stassen, Mayor LaGuardia has a habit of talking so that his language can be easily understood, and you will have no doubt after reading the foregoing excerpt of his testimony that he is wholeheartedly in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

RESTRICTIONS PREVENT FRANK DISCUSSIONS OF OTHER CANDIDATES

From now on, Mr. Speaker, my style is cramped and my language contaminated by Jefferson's Manual. If I express myself fully, I might find myself out of order. I do not want that to happen at Christmas time.

I call attention at this time to section 370 and section 371 of Jefferson's Manual, which constitutes the "ten commandments" of the House of Representatives. They read:

SEC. 370. In Parliament, to speak irreverently or seditiously against the King, is against order (Smyth's Comw., L. 2, ch. 3; 2 Hats., 170).

Then section 371 reads as follows:

It is a breach of order in debate to notice what has been said on the same subject in the other House, or the particular votes or majorities on it there; because the opinion of each House should be left to its own independency, not to be influenced by the proceedings of the other; and the quoting them might beget reflections leading to a misunderstanding between the two Houses (8 Grey, 22).

I therefore call attention to others who are reported as aspirants for the Presidential Yacht Club. If I were not bound by Jefferson's Manual, my discourse might be entirely different.

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

A man who is recognized as one of the leading possibilities for the Presidential Yacht Club is the Honorable ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Grand Rapids, Mich. It is reported that he is an ardent champion of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Like Governor Stassen, he has taken a leading role in the affairs of the Nation. Like Governor Stassen, he is one who shares in the parenthood of the United Nations Organization at San Francisco, Calif., where the idea was developed that we should have an international organization to look after the affairs of the world from the womb to the tomb.

HON. ROBERT TAFT

Another man who deserves honorable mention in the field of those who could operate a Presidential Yacht with credit and distinction is the Honorable ROBERT TAFT, of Cincinnati, Ohio. He is a man of tireless energy, solid integrity and comes to the deck of the ship with the memories of one of our great Americans, William Howard Taft. Mr. TAFT will probably need some intensive study in connection with the problems of commerce, if he is to become a specialist on navigation matters. The research department in the Congressional Library tells me that since 1940 he has uttered no language which could be construed one way or the other in connection with any discussion of the St. Lawrence project.

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

Another Ohio man and former Governor of the great State of Ohio is the Honorable John W. Bricker. It is reported that he will come to the Senate of the United States next year and thereafter take a postgraduate course in the arts of navigation. He will need it, because the Congressional Library Reference Bureau lists him as having maintained official silence in connection with the subject matter of this speech. However, this former candidate for Vice President of the United States does have unbounding possibilities.

IN CONCLUSION

We just note these matters for consideration, Mr. Speaker, as the old year draws to a close. President Truman does have a fine White House Presidential yacht. He cannot blame these other boys for looking with eager eyes upon that new acquisition.

It is too bad that somebody does not help the President get things moving. Progress just before this Christmas is on a dead level. Somebody in high Government circles needs a Presidential hair cut. You know the story about Samson, his hair was long and his hair was strong. So was he. Then they got one of the girls to take a pair of shears and cut his hair. He lost his strength until his hair grew long again. It just occurs to me that if a haircut would do any good in the way of breaking the present strong deadlock which is preventing action on the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, then the President ought to get the barber shop in operation at once.

Navy Ribbons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein excerpt from the article Merry Go-Round, which appeared in the Washington Post, of date December 16, 1945, as follows:

Vice Adm. Louis E. Denfield, Chief of Naval Personnel, had a tough time the other day trying to defend brass-hat discrimination against Naval Reserve officers in awarding decorations for bravery.

Appearing before the House Naval Affairs Committee, the admiral admitted that, while there were about 275,000 Naval Reserve officers to 25,000 Annapolis men—or a ratio of 11 to 1—the total of awards was 34,225 to Reservists and 15,799 to Regulars—or a ratio slightly over 2 to 1.

ANNAPOLIS CLIQUE

Of course, Annapolis men dominate the board which hands out the awards. Here was their ratio of handing out the Navy's chief decorations:

Medal of Honor, Reservists 10, Regulars 8; Navy Cross, Reservists 1,091, Regulars 1,012; Silver Star, Reservists 1,877, Regulars 1,789; Distinguished Flying Cross, Reservists 4,945, Regulars 1,163; Bronze Star, Reservists 4,150, Regulars 3,314; Legion of Merit, Reservists 367, Regulars 1,273; Navy and Marine Corps Medal, Reservists 1,551, Regulars 601; Commendation Ribbon, Reservists 4,721, Regulars 3,342.

Representative W. STERLING COLE, of Bath, N. Y., grew inquisitive about the heavy favoritism for Annapolis grads.

HOLD HIGHER POSITIONS

"I recognize that you cannot give out ribbons on the basis of percentage ratios," declared COLE, "but when you have a military establishment of eight Regulars as against 92 Reservists, and yet your recognition of the work they have done is approximately 2 to 1 in favor of the Reservists, though their over-all representation is about 11 to 1, then there should be an explanation."

"The only thing I can say is that there are a great many more Regulars in responsible positions than Reservists," replied Admiral Denfeld. "The higher awards would naturally go to the Regulars for that reason. In other words, if a destroyer does outstanding work in battle the captain will probably be awarded the Navy Cross. He will award lesser decorations to members of his personnel."

"Is that the only explanation you have?" demanded COLE.

"That is the only one I know of," responded Denfeld.

NOTE.—Admiral Denfeld was not responsible for the above situation, which is a hangover from the days when Admiral King's friends were running the Navy. Admiral Denfeld, new head of the Bureau of Personnel, is bringing in a new group of officers to work with him.

VESSELS KEPT IDLE

Although the shipping bottleneck has been broken in the Atlantic, much still remains to be done before the GI's of the Pacific begin to return at a resonably rapid pace. One big reason for delay is the incredible bungling of "brass hats" who keep vessels idle for months.

The case of the Liberty ship *John Martin Miller* is a good example. It left Baltimore April 14, 1945, carrying 7,111 tons of bombs, proceeded to Lynhaven Roads, England, from whence it left April 28, without unloading, for the Mediterranean.

However, the end of the German war, May 8, caused a change in plans. The *John Martin Miller* anchored in the Azores, then went back to Charleston, S. C., arriving May 20. Then she set sail for the Pacific, arriving in Eniwetok July 11. However, there was still no resting place for her bombs. So, on July 13, she pushed on to Saipan. Then for the next 2 months the *John Martin Miller* wandered back and forth between Saipan and Tinian.

On September 5, orders came to take the 7,111 tons of bombs to Okinawa. The ship arrived September 26 and there she sat, through three typhoons, awaiting orders. One day the first mate met a friend who said he was surprised to see the *John Martin Miller* still in port inasmuch as orders had come for her to leave 5 days before.

VOYAGE COSTS $500,000

The captain then discovered belatedly that orders had arrived to proceed to Batangas in the Philippines. At last report the *John Martin Miller* was still at Batangas, after more than 7 months of trying to unload her useless bombs. The entire voyage cost more than $500,000.

Unfortunately the *Martin* is not the only ship inefficiently handled. The steamship *Vladex*, a Liberty ship, moved out to the Pacific last April 23 with a cargo of bombs and propaganda leaflets. The leaflets were printed in German though the ship was sailing for Japan. The Liberty ship *Henry Austin* lay in the Bay of Batangas for 48 days before it was unloaded. Finally it was converted for carrying troops, then waited five more days to sail. The *Elisha Mitchell*, a Liberty ship, reached Batangas on August 6 and was still in the bay November 21, awaiting orders, 108 days later.

The *Juan Pablo Duarte* arrived in Batangas on September 15, and was still there 67 days later. The *John B. Kendrick* was in Batangas Bay for 100 days after it arrived on August 17. The *George H. Williams* was in the same bay for more than 102 days.

Statement by Montgomery Ostrander in Support of Senate Bill 1592

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 18 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this week several important veterans' organizations have appeared before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in active support of the housing bill of which I am one of the sponsors, along with the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

A few weeks ago I made a Nation-wide radio address stating why I believe that this bill will be of tremendous help to veterans and their families in securing decent housing at costs within their means.

I am happy to note that the veterans' organizations to which I have referred are so fully in agreement with my views.

I first ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Montgomery Ostrander, Washington representative of the American Veterans' Committee.

I have obtained from the Public Printer an estimate of the cost of printing the statement on behalf of the American Veterans' Committee. The estimated cost is $121.40.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Montgomery Ostrander. As the Washington representative of the American Veterans' Committee, I am presenting this statement on behalf of the chairman of our national planning committee, Charles G. Bolte.

At present I am on terminal leave from the United States Marine Corps, having last week completed 3 years of service, about half of which was spent overseas. Prior to the time I entered the Marine Corps, I was engaged in industrial-relations work, having been for several years personnel manager of a manufacturing plant located in Baltimore, Md.

Although the American Veterans' Committee appeared before this committee last summer in support of the full employment bill, it may be appropriate for me to say at this time a few words about the organization which I am representing. The American Veterans' Committee is an organization of World War II. Honorably discharged veterans and members of all branches of the armed forces of the United States, including members of the Merchant Marine who served during the war, are eligible for membership without regard to race, creed, or color. We have chapters throughout the United States as well as overseas chapters in such locations as Manila, Paris, Honolulu, Tinian Island, and others. The overseas chapters are composed of members still in active service. In fact, a substantial proportion of our current membership is still in service.

Rather than seeking to set the veterans off as a class, the American Veterans' Committee has set its course toward the welfare of the country as a whole. This has seemed to us the soundest policy, since the real interests of the veteran are identical with the real interests of any other American citizen—or any group of them. The protection and furtherance of these interests require full and vigorous cooperative action by private enterprise and by Government to assure that every American, veteran and nonveteran alike, shall have—as the minimum consistent with our American standard of living—the opportunity to obtain:

1. A good education, which, limited solely by his own abilities, will enable him to make his full contribution to the democratic society in which he lives;

2. Steady employment with adequate wages at a job which utilizes his training or his skills;

3. A decent home and a suitable environment in which to live and raise his family;

4. Security from want when, because of disability, ill health, age, or other condition, he is no longer able to work; and

5. Freedom from the threat of another war through the active participation of the United States in the United Nations Organization.

The American Veterans' Committee believes that these real interests of the veteran will be most affected—to either his ultimate benefit or disadvantage—by what we, as a nation, are willing to do toward the realization of a most important goal. That goal is the stabilization of our national economy at levels of production and employment which will utilize, as fully in peace as in war, the productive capacity and manpower resources which are ours—and which, together, far surpass those of any nation on the face of the earth. What we have done in the last 4 years demonstrates what we, as a nation, are able to achieve in these respects—even when the end products of the full utilization of our productive capacity and manpower resources were death and destruction. Surely, when the end products thereof are the goods and services required to meet the needs of a world at peace, we cannot accept a lesser goal.

To achieve this desirable goal, which is essential to the future welfare of all our people we must attain in our postwar economy levels of production and employment considerably higher than those which obtained in the prewar years. Like other segments of our economy, house production must accept its responsibility for making its appropriate contribution to that necessary expansion. Moreover, consumer needs for housing are so great and so urgent that they require a much higher and more sustained volume of house production than ever obtained over a long period of the prewar years. In these years, it varied from a high of some 900,000 units to a low of some 90,000 units. Over the 20-year period before the war it averaged just under 500,000 units a year. During the 10 years preceding the war the annual average dropped to about 275,000, and annual production seldom was large enough to meet even the needs of newly formed families to say nothing of that required to replace our slum and other substandard housing.

By either test, there exists an urgent need for a greater and more sustained volume of house production than we have ever achieved before. However, it seems very clear we shall never achieve the required volume of house production unless we are prepared to adopt now a balanced program of long-term national housing policy and action.

Because of the special importance which so obviously attaches to housing, the National Planning Board of the American Veterans' Committee some time ago adopted a program of housing recommendations. Some of these recommendations were directed to emergency action which we felt should be taken at once to at least minimize some of the more painful aspects of the housing shortage which exists today. Most of these recommendations have been embodied in the temporary program of emergency housing action recently announced by the President. While this committee is not now considering that program, we would like to point out that, in our judgment, the proposed maximum-price limitation of $10,000 on priority-assisted housing is too high, and is likely to become a minimum price. We believe that building materials should be allocated among several price ranges; for example, 25 percent to houses selling for less than $4,000; 25 percent to houses selling between $4,000 and $6,000, etc. In this way the very real danger that the maximum price established would become the minimum price would be reduced.

More importantly, however, the balance of the housing recommendations adopted by our Board were addressed to the long-term action and program required. These recommendations included the following:

"A comprehensive long-term program for increasing private and public housing construction should be adopted by Congress.

"A balanced construction program should be established to avoid concentration of construction in the highest price brackets and to insure a supply of dwellings for both purchase and rental, at all price levels by means of the following:

"A. To meet the needs of low income renters, Congress should take immediate steps to help local housing authorities to build at least 500,000 low-rent houses in the next 2 years.

"B. To meet the needs of middle-income renters, Congress should authorize the Federal Housing Administration to insure a return of 2¾ to 3½ percent on private investments in rental housing, when the rents are such as families of moderate income can afford.

"C. To hold down the cost to purchasers of homes, the Federal Housing Administration should be empowered to insure mortgages where repayment is spread over 32 years and the interest is no more than 3½ percent.

"Any Government housing program should not permit the existence of restrictions

which are prejudicial to individuals for racial or religious reasons."

Our main area of interest, therefore, is centered upon the adoption now of a well-rounded program of long-term national housing policy and action along the lines embodied in the bill now before you. It is only through such a program that the current housing shortage can be remedied. The situation, which calls for this kind of action to be taken now, was never better stated than in the following excerpts from the editorial in the current issue of Life:

"By now it is clear that the housing shortage is not a temporary or war-born dislocation. Scarcely a city or town in the United States has as many dwellings as it really needs * * * our homeless veterans are merely the most dramatic victims of a shortage whose ultimate victims are the American family and the American standard of living.

"Never was there an industry * * * so unready to rise to the occasion. * * * If the housing industry had done even a passable job in 1910-40 we would not be in this jam today.

"It has shamefully neglected its biggest market—the small house."

Strictly speaking, it is not the "small house" which has been so neglected by the house-building industry. It is as unfortunate as it is true that such housing cost "reductions" as may have been achieved generally were obtained through the reduction in the size of the house. Through this device the consumer does not get a better house for his housing dollar; he merely gets less house. The small house is being produced—and it still costs too much. It is the good house in the moderate price class where it is within the financial reach of the great bulk of our American families which has been so shamefully neglected. We believe that one of the most commendable features of the bill which you have under consideration is that it not only recognizes this fact, but also embodies specific features designed to meet this most important aspect of our housing problem.

The bill recognizes that there now exists a proven and workable system for meeting the housing needs of our lower-income families. Title VII of the bill appropriately perfects and provides for a continuation of this program of aid to the local communities for low-rent public housing. While the program provided for by this title of the bill is similar in many ways to the applicable recommendations adopted by our committee, the proposed goal of 500,000 houses to be built within the next 4 years is only half of what the National Housing Administrator reported would be a minimum requirement in this field. We would, therefore, like to see this goal increased to 1,000,000 houses. Title VII also provides for a 20-percent gap between the upper rental limits for admission to public-housing projects and the lowest rents at which private enterprise is providing a decent supply of new construction. We can see no useful purpose that will be served by this gap. The bill also recognizes that the housing needs of our families of substantial and fairly moderate income are being met through private-enterprise operations supplemented through the systems of home-mortgage credit and insurance carried out through the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration and the Federal Housing Administration. Title III of the bill therefore seeks to perfect these systems, through various amendments which experience has indicated would enable them to serve the housing needs of these groups more broadly and more effectively than they can under the present provisions of the statutes under which they operate. While these amendments of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration and Federal Housing Administration statutes may also serve to broaden somewhat the area of housing needs which can be served adequately by private-housing enterprise supplemented with these aids, there is a clear recognition that there nonetheless remains the vast housing market represented by the great bulk of American families of what may be termed "moderate incomes"—incomes too high to be served by public housing and too low to be served through the existing systems of aid to private housing enterprise operations, even when perfected and extended by the amendments contained in title III.

As to both home ownership and rental housing the bill provides in titles IV and V for supplementary and additional systems of insurance of home mortgage loans and direct investments in rental housing for those families who, if they are to have good housing, require more favorable terms than are obtainable under existing systems. It is the housing market represented by these families which must be reached in volume if, in the postwar years, we are to build better America by meeting the consumer needs of all groups for decent housing, while at the same time securing the high and sustained volume of house production which, we believe, is necessary if we are to achieve the high levels of production and employment required.

We are particularly in favor of the plan embodied in title IV for 95 percent insurance of a mortgage loan of not more than $5,000 with a 32-year amortization period and a maximum interest rate of 4 percent. We call attention to the fact, however, that the recommendations adopted by our board anticipated a maximum interest rate of 3½ percent, and we hope that the committee will give full consideration to amending the bill to provide for this lower maximum rate. This type of insurance would cover the financing of a house costing not more than $5,300. The property securing the loan is therefore squarely in the broadest and most stable housing market. The loan is 100 percent insured throughout its entire life. Moreover, the provisions of section 403, as we understand them, would protect the lender against the possibility of incurring any loss on the loan as a result of default in interest or from foreclosure expenses. It is a better loan for the lender—and from the standpoint of the borrower also—than a loan which is guaranteed under the GI Act only up to 50 percent, or a lesser amount, with the liability under the guaranty decreasing pro rata with the decrease in the loan as it is paid off. Yet the maximum interest rate on loans guaranteed under the GI Act is 4 percent.

Also there has been a good deal of testimony before this committee that home mortgage funds will be available in quantity, so that we might hope for a healthy competition as these funds actively seek new outlets. Under such circumstances, we would hope that a maximum rate of 3½ percent would assure a sufficient flow of mortgage funds into the financing of this most desirable type of home.

We are strongly in favor of the provisions of the bill permitting a lapse and extension of the fixed monthly payments when the home buyer is temporarily unable to meet them because of ill health, unemployment, and the like, and also the warranty provisions. We believe that they represent improvements in our home financing and home-building practices which are long overdue.

We also endorse the plan embodied in title IV for the insurance of mutual ownership and rental housing and the plan embodied in title V for the insurance of direct investments in rental housing, both of which are limited to meeting needs of families of moderate income which are not being adequately met without such insurance. These provisions, along with titles III and VII, are needed to assure a well-rounded program and provide good housing for purchase and rental in all price classes. This also is consistent with the recommendations adopted by our Board.

The special provisions of titles IV and V for supplying good housing for our families of middle income, who constitute the largest and most neglected area of the entire housing market, are further supplemented by the provisions of title II relating to technical housing research and matching aid to local communities for studies of their own housing needs and markets. These bear most importantly upon improving our existing means and developing new techniques for reaching in adequate volume the neglected portion of the housing market represented by the needs of the great bulk of our families of modest incomes. This is especially true on the side of technical housing research. While that portion of the house-building industry represented by the manufacturers of various components which are incorporated into finished houses unquestionably do a good deal of technical research, it is concentrated almost entirely upon the improvement or development of their special products. What is most needed, however, is technical housing research directed to the whole house—toward improving the techniques and methods of house building and assembly. Some of this type of research, which is so greatly needed if housing costs are to be effectively reduced is being done in the laboratories of a handful of universities today. The Government could do much to stimulate this type of technical research and to pull the results together. A relatively small expenditure in this area may be productive of enormous benefits through lowered house-construction costs.

We also endorse and support the provisions of title VI which would establish a system whereby the Federal Government would share with the local communities the cost of acquiring and clearing the slums and blighted areas and preparing the land for redevelopment in accordance with its most suitable use. This system, as we understand it, is based on the fact that the revenues which could be derived from the most appropriate re-use of the land in these areas are not sufficient to support the cost of acquiring and clearing them.

We also endorse and support the provisions of title VI which would establish a system whereby the Federal Government would share with the local communities the cost of acquiring and clearing the slums and blighted areas and preparing the land for which will eliminate them. This title should also prove effective as a further supplement to private housing enterprise operations by making land in the more central city areas available for the development of good housing. Operations under this title should also tend to stabilize municipal tax revenues and expenditures.

Specifically on those features of the bill designed to afford special preference to veterans, particularly title IX, relating to the disposition of permanent war housing owned by the Federal Government, we should like to indicate that, in our judgment, they seem to be reasonable and appropriate. Unquestionably, today, it is the veteran who has returned and who is seeking a place to live who is most directly affected by the current housing shortage. To the extent that it is feasible to do so, we think he ought to be assured of a reasonable preference in getting a place to live. It is noted that with respect to the low-rent public-housing program the preference is provided for a 4-year period. Since the contributions supporting that program become available over a 4-year period and the bulk of the dwellings to be provided may not be available of occupancy for perhaps 2 years, it is really only a 2-year preference. We, therefore, suggest that the committee give consideration to extending the period during which this preference should be accorded to veterans to 6 or 7 years.

We also desire to commend the sponsors of the bill for the provisions of section 311,

which would permit the FHA to consent to the extension of the maturity of insured mortgages made by veterans to cover a period equal to the period of military service. This would permit the veteran to obtain by voluntary agreement with the mortgagee and the FHA the same relief which he is entitled to obtain by court action under the Soldier's and Sailor's Civil Relief Act and thus avoid expense and delay. It is noted, however, that there are no provisions which would accord to veterans a preference in obtaining FHA insured rental housing or in that built for sale. We recommend that the committee consider the feasibility of including appropriate provisions in this respect.

We also recommend that there be included in the bill a nondiscrimination clause which would be applicable to the entire housing program.

We regard as appropriate and desirable those provisions of the bill which seek to make good housing available to farm families on terms consistent with their capacity to pay, and as especially important those provisions requiring a periodic report to the Congress by the National Housing Administrator concerning estimates of housing needs and the progress made in meeting them, along with an evaluation of the housebuilding industry's contribution to production and employment.

Although they appear in the first title of the bill, we have deferred until this point our recommendations as to those provisions relating to the consolidation of these related housing functions and activities in a single national housing agency. We have done so because we believe that the essential relationship of the varied functions and activities must be apparent from our consideration of the merits of the proposals embodied in this bill. These functions are interrelated; some are supplementary to others. But if we are to have a national housing policy and program capable of meeting the housing needs of all our people, all of these functions must be appropriately concentrated upon those needs through the application of that policy. Our only recommendation as to this point at variance with the provisions of title I of the bill, would be that, in view of the special importance of housing in terms of both the needs of the people and the national economy, consideration should be given to changing the status of the agency from an independent agency to an executive department represented in the Cabinet.

The American Veterans' Committee, it is thus seen, finds itself in agreement with almost all of the provisions of this bill and feels that its passage would be an important step in providing the housing necessary for this country. Two omissions from the bill, however, both recently referred to by the President, threaten to reduce its effectiveness. There is nothing in the bill which would insure that building materials—now scarcer than ever before—will be available for the construction of houses selling in the lower-price brackets. Some method for allocating these materials is vitally necessary and one possible method is that proposed during a previous section of this statement. The absence of any restriction on excessive pricing may also go a long way in defeating the excellent goals of this bill.

The American Veterans' Committee hopes that action will be taken to incorporate both of these features in the bill.

There is one other matter which I desire to place before this committee before I close. I refer particularly to two types of statements which have been made by some of the organizations who have appeared before this committee and opposed the enactment of this bill.

I think it may be fairly stated that the first of these two types of statements, while generally hedged and qualified to assure a wide avenue for later retreat, is quite apparently intended to convey the impression that the home-building industry—unfettered and unaided—has always produced and is now ready, willing, and able to produce a substantial volume of good housing in the moderate-price class where unquestionably it is most needed.

For example, the statement made by the president of the National Association of Home Builders before this committee on December 6 states: "I find that a surprisingly large number of these builders are pressing to meet the demand for housing in the lower-priced classes. They have learned that it is the best kind of business in that it is by far the largest market for their product. In the South and West particularly many operators who built $5,400 and $5,800 war housing are redesigning such housing for a lower price." In addition, the policy statement released at the time when this same organization was demanding that L–41 be lifted pledged that they would concentrate upon constructing dwellings for modest-income groups.

Now I think some light on the merits of this matter may be found in the statement released by the Home Builders just 4 days before the announcement of President Truman's temporary emergency program restoring the priorities system with a $10,000 price limitation on priority assisted housing. In discussing the plan then under consideration by the President, the release of the Home Builders organization states: "Priority plan penalizes present construction." Prepared hastily without industry consultation the original plan would have drained off critical materials for new construction under $8,000 from all housing presently under construction above that figure. * * * It is hoped that our vigorous recommendations will be accepted that all housing under construction be given the same preferential treatment and that the $8,000 ceiling be raised to $10,000."

I think that many will agree with our conviction that, certainly under present conditions and to the extent that past experience is indicative of what we may expect in the future, a maximum price limitation of $10,000 will result in a minimum price of $10,000 in actual practice.

Now as to the second of these two types of statements It has been made in varied forms, but they all seem calculated to raise the same inference. In effect, these organizations say this bill would make home ownership available, on reasonable terms, to a large number of American families who otherwise would be denied that opportunity. In any fair appraisal of the merits of such a statement, let us remember first of all that there are veterans too, and large numbers of them, who would fall into this classification and any measure which meets this type of housing need is therefore bound to help the veteran. Perhaps most of us would admit that today the largest burden of housing harships fall upon the veteran who has returned and is seeking a place for himself and his family to live.

Most of us would probably agree that, to the extent that it is feasible to do so, the veteran in need of housing ought to have a reasonable preference. The policy statement released by the National Association of Home Builders, and which was given widespread publicity at the time they were seeking the removal of L–41, pledged that they would give preference to veterans in all housing which they built. So far as I know, there is nothing which would prevent these builders from giving a preference to veterans in the housing they build—including the "lower cost housing produced" with the supplemental aids provided by this bill.

Well, anyway, they say this bill would present more competition to the veteran seeking a home. For example, the same statement made by the president of the Association of Home Builders before this committee on December 6 says: "It purports to provide a preferential treatment for veterans but actually sets up unprecedented competition for the veterans. * * * This bill through higher mortgage loans would bring a great number of nonveterans into direct competition with him for the lower cost housing produced."

Let me state to the members of this committee, with all the sincerity at my command, that for this very reason alone (and entirely apart from the many other admirable features of this bill) the American Veterans' Committee would enthusiastically support and endorse the bill—because it will bring to great numbers of our people, who otherwise would not have it, the self-respect, the satisfaction, and the pride in their community which so universally is identified with the secure ownership of a good home. No greater tribute could be paid to the sponsors of this bill than the above-quoted statement made by those who so vigorously oppose the enactment of the bill.

Testimony of American Veterans of World War II in Support of Senate Bill 1592

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 18 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the testimony before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on the housing bill given by the American veterans of World War II.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The American veterans of World War II, Amvets, through its national commander, Jack W. Hardy, recently recommended to the President a program of action addressed to the current critical housing emergency. A program of action similar to that recommended came a few days ago when the President announced that there would shortly be issued an Executive order reestablishing a priority system under which building materials would be channeled into the production of moderate priced housing with reasonable preference for veterans.

Supplementary to these recommendations made by its national commander, Amvets has made a study of all pending legislation. This study was made in order to arrive at a program which would provide not only immediate and at least temporary relief, in terms of the current housing emergency, but also a permanent and more lasting solution to the long-term aspects of our national housing problem. To this end, the American Veterans of World War II, Amvets, which is the largest exclusive World War II organization in the country with over 250 posts already established in 38 States, recommend the following program of housing action.

As a preface to our remarks on the matter of housing, we wish to state that our program was prepared a few days ago prior to the conference committee's recommendations which include the deletion of the word "normal" in the description of "reasonable, normal value."

Such action on the committee's part substantially officially approves our statement that "veterans seeking to purchase have generally been permitted to follow the market."

Also, our program has not properly endorsed the means by which those desiring housing at levels above the $5,000 mark are provided with means to obtain such housing on a reasonable equitable basis. We wish this interpolated as we recognize the fact that in many communities the $5,000 level would not produce adequate facilities.

We cannot stress too strongly our feeling of the need for some means of preventing the sale at, say, $10,000, of homes whose worth is only $7,500 or $8,000.

AMVETS' PROGRAM OF HOUSING ACTION

The housing shortage with which the country is now faced becomes increasingly critical. It is a cumulative housing shortage. While it had its beginnings in the decline of home building in the middle twenties it is daily being subjected to further pressures of war-born shortages and the additional demands resulting from our military demobilization. It affects the entire civilian economy. But today it operates mainly to the disadvantage of our returning veterans, who are seeking a place to live while they make their adjustment to civilian life.

In its long-term aspects—and today as in the past, it is essentially a long-term problem—it can never be dealt with effectively by temporary legislation. In that aspect it requires long-term legislation.

The immediate problem today—now—is becoming so critical, however, that emergency measures must be taken at once to alleviate the situation so far as possible, pending the Nation's conversion from a war-time economy to a peacetime economy and the resumption of permanent house construction at a rate never before achieved.

Toward the more immediate aspects of this problem, we have recommended before, and again endorse, a program similar to that announced by the President on December 12, which would immediately restore a priority system under which our scarce supply of house-building materials will be channeled into new house construction.

We believe that any system for the allocation of such materials to new house construction should assure that the houses produced under this system should be available to the vast group of moderate income Americans who need them most, and at prices within their capacity to pay. We therefore believe that the proposed price limitation of $10,000 per unit is too high, and that the maximum limit should tend more toward the $7,500-price class.

Likewise, we believe that perhaps the greatest singe unanswered problem in the country today is our housing problem. Accordingly, we believe that the proposal embodied in the President's program to allocate about 50 percent of all building materials into new house construction is too low. In spite of all of our industrial genius and productivity, no business and no industry can resume peacetime production unless the workers who are required to carry out that business or industry can find adequate housing. Housing needs in the moderate-price class must therefore have a fair preference over the competing demands of industrial, commercial, and business structures and higher-priced dwellings. We urge that the allocation system established to effectuate the program announced by the President be geared to channeling 80 percent of building materials into the construction of housing for people of moderate income.

We heartily endorse and strongly recommend the proposal of the President that any system under which materials are allocated for new housing construction shall contain adequate provisions assuring that veterans in need of housing will be given a special preference in obtaining that housing.

No program which seeks to make housing available on reasonable terms to veterans and the general American public can be effective if the present inflationary trend in our housing supply is permitted to continue. The program announced by the President will afford a price limitation only upon new housing constructed under the priority system. At best, it can therefore touch only the smallest portion of our total housing supply. It leaves free from all controls all of our existing urban housing supply today, which consists of some 29,500,000 nonrural dwellings. Moreover, it is predicated entirely upon the authority contained in the Second War Powers Act, which by the recent action of the Congress has been extended only to July 1, 1946. Even today, Mr. Snyder, the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, has stated that this is not long enough and recommended that these powers be extended through the calendar year 1946.

Therefore, in addition to the immediate program proposed by the President, and which can be carried out only for a relatively short period under legislation now existing, we favor the immediate enactment by the Congress of legislation along the lines of the bill introduced by Congressman Patman. This would permit the continuation, so long as Congress determines the need therefor to exist, of the temporary program now proposed by the President. In addition, it would permit the establishment of maximum prices on existing as well as new housing, and it is on existing housing where the continuing increase in prices is exerting perhaps the most serious threat of inflation. In addition, we believe that it is clear that this should be accompanied by a continuation of the authority now existing for control of rents for such period of time as the Congress determines that need therefore exists.

As a further and immediate step in alleviating the current housing hardship of returning veterans, we urge that the necessary legislation to permit and assure the fullest utilization of all temporary housing and other facilities under the control of the Federal Government in meeting the emergency housing needs of veterans be speedily enacted. We urge the House of Representatives to adopt Senate Joint Resolution 122, which has already been adopted by the Senate, so that the necessary appropriation for this purpose can be made available immediately. We urge that the Senate increase to the requested $191,000,000 the smaller amount which would have been made available under the House version of the current deficiency appropriations bill. This sum would permit the provision of 100,000 temporary family dwelling units for veterans urgently in need of housing, by making possible the removal of war housing and other facilities from isolated areas where they are now located and are no longer needed to urban areas where the housing demands of veterans are acute. While this may appear to be a relatively large sum, these demands are most urgent, a substantial part of the cost of moving and reerecting these units is expected to be shared by the States and local communities themselves, and it is hoped that a reasonable amount of these funds may be reimbursed from the rentals derived from the projects.

The home-loan guaranty provisions of the present GI bill of rights have been held out to the veteran as an easy means of achieving home ownership, while at the same time protecting the veteran against the loss of his home and his life savings. Neither in their technical features nor in their administration have these provisions achieved either objective and in the long run we do not believe they can.

As originally written, these provisions purported to offer some degree of protection to the veteran who is up against the spiralling inflation of the real estate market by prohibiting the guarantee of any home loans if the purchase price exceeded "the reasonable, normal value" of the property. It is common knowledge that appraisals on homes which veterans are seeking to purchase have generally been permitted "to follow the market" to the obvious detriment of the veteran. But even beyond this, various proposals to take more money out of the veteran's pocket under the guise of protecting him have been advanced; for example, various national organizations representing lenders, builders, and realtors have supported proposals to change the law so that the guaranty could be made in any case where the loan did not exceed the reasonable normal value of the property—although the purchase price could exceed reasonable normal value without limit. This is sound business practice in the judgment of some groups because the lender would be fully protected. As to this proposal, few voices were heard as to how the veteran was thereby protected. On the other hand, a great deal of talk was heard that the veteran was a rugged individualist who could take care of himself and in all likelihood would not pay more than a reasonable normal value of the property he sought for his home—this notwithstanding the fact that the veteran was then without a home and under the present short supply of housing had the doubtful choice of remaining in that condition or paying the asking price. The theory was also advanced that the veteran ought to be required to put a little money of his own into the deal. In other words, if the reasonable normal value of a house was $10,000 and the asking price was $15,000, the veteran would be all right under this proposed amendment to the GI bill, if he were able to get a guaranteed loan in the sum of $10,000 (which is improbable) and put up the balance of the purchase price—$5,000 or more—in his own cash.

It might be anticipated that with this kind of amendment to the GI bill, the Congress would soon have before it proposals to provide the adjusted compensation in order that the veteran might be assured of a means of securing additional ready cash, readily convertible into inflated real estate.

In our judgment, the veteran specifically and the country generally would be far better served if the inflationary trend of residential real estate was effectively curbed immediately so that there might be more general resort to the system of home-mortgage financing under the Federal Housing Administration of the National Housing Agency. Under this system, the protection offered to the prospective home buyer through high construction standards, sound neighborhood planning, realistic appraisals and a fairly liberal financing plan has always been and continues to be far in excess of the many supposed advantages theoretically available under the GI bill. The President's temporary program, modified in those repects which we deem advisable, and accompanied by permanent statutory authority for the continuation and perfection of that program while the need continues would do much toward making available to far greater numbers of veterans and other home buyers or renters the benefits of the FHA insured mortgage system.

In the main we have dealt thus far with the immediate and emergency aspects of the current housing situation. That, however, is the smaller part of this problem. Its effective solution, with its resulting benefits to the country as a whole, require permanent housing legislation and a long-term housing program, calculated to meet the housing needs of all groups. This seems clear, by any test, whether it be in terms of housing needs, employment needs, or investment needs.

We believe that the bill to establish a national housing policy and provide for its execution, recently introduced in the Senate under the joint sponsorship of Senators

WAGNER, ELLENDER, and TAFT, represents the most honest and realistic effort thus far put forward to meet this problem.

While we endorse the bill as a whole and while we wish to state specifically that we believe that the various special preferences accorded to veterans by several sections of the bill are reasonable and proper, we are nevertheless especially interested in, and desire to single out for particular commendation, certain features of the bill. Although these features of the bill are not cast in terms of special preference to veterans, in our judgment they will be most suitable and helpful to our veterans who, in large numbers, are again becoming a part of our civilian peacetime economy.

One of the most important of these features of the bill is the plan, designed to produce a larger volume of moderate priced homes available on financial terms which offer the prospect of home ownership to a sizeable portion of our population who otherwise might well be denied the privilege of home ownership. It seems to us that the plan whereby 95 percent FHA insurance or up to $5,000 for a 32-year 4-percent home mortgage loan, coupled with the 85 percent firm commitment to builders, is sound in all respects. We believe it is capable of producing a substantial volume of good housing in the moderate price class, which, without this system and the special inducements it offers, would not otherwise be available. It seems clear to us that this system offers far greater potential possibilities of realistic service to the veterans, who most need it, than any advantages, theoretical or real, obtainable under the home-loan guaranty provisions of the GI Bill of Rights.

It seems to us that, at the present time, the establishment of the maximum rate of interest for this plan at 4 percent per annum is satisfactory and should attract an adequate flow of mortgage money into this desirable type of home loans. In fact, since the principal obligation of the mortgage is completely insured, with the insurance also protecting the lender against the possibility of loss resulting from default of interest or from foreclosure expenses (and we think this proposed amendment extremely desirable) we may hope that under present conditions, adequate funds might be available at less than the current maximum rate. We would not attempt, at this time, to predict what conditions may obtain in the future which may affect the availability of mortgage money at this rate, but we assume that, if necessary, the maximum rate can be adjusted by amendment to meet the then existing conditions.

Under the GI Act, the aggregate amount of the guaranty for the veteran—on business loans, home loans, or farm loans—may not exceed 50 percent of the loan, or $2,000, whichever is the lesser. Moreover, the act specifically provides that the liability under the guaranty must decrease or increase prorata with any decrease or increase of the amount of the unpaid portion of the loan. Entirely apart from the advantages inherent in the FHA system, with regard to high construction standards, good neighborhood planning and realistic appraisals, a guaranty of 50 percent or a lesser amount of an original loan—which guaranty decreases as the loan is paid off—obviously cannot be as advantageous either to the lender who makes the money available or to the prospective home owner who needs the money, as a loan which is 100-percent insured.

The GI Act presently requires that the loan must be paid off in 20 years, and, even under the most liberal amendment thus far proposed, it would only extend it to 25 years—as contrasted with the 32-year maturity permitted under this small-home financing plan. Again, in terms of the advantages which would be offered under the FHA system with the amendments proposed by this bill, both the home owner and the lender would be offered additional protection through those provisions which would permit the postponement of monthly payments by the mortgagor with continuation of FHA insurance in cases where the inability to pay was due to unemployment, ill health, or other conditions beyond the control of the mortgagor. Beyond this, American home buyers would, for the first time, be offered the facilities of a system which, through the warranty provisions embodied in this bill, would provide protection against defects in construction, faulty materials or workmanship, and violation by the building contractor of his contract obligations. Thus, it seems to us that the plan embodied in title IV of this bill offers the opportunity of home ownership to an unhappy and unprovided-for part of our population who could not otherwise enjoy it. More importantly, it is offered under terms consistent with the financial abilities of the great bulk of our moderate-income families and on terms which offer real protection to these people against the loss of their homes and the savings invested in them.

Time does not permit us to state, in the same detail, our reasons for favoring the other titles and provisions of this essentially sound and comprehensive housing measure. Many of these other titles and provisions seem particularly in line with the needs of veterans as they are assimilated into the stream of our peacetime economy. More specifically, these would include those provisions which, by a variety of devices, seek to achieve the production of substantial amounts of good housing for rent as well as sale for the vast bulk of our Nation's families. They include the provisions which would establish a system of aid to local communities for the assembly and clearance of slums and blighted areas and their preparation for redevelopment for suitable uses consistent with the desires of the local communities; they include the provisions for the continuation and expansion of the existing system of aid to the localities for the provision of decent housing for our families of very low income, who cannot otherwise obtain decent housing, as well as the extension of this system to cover similar families in rural areas.

Also on the rural side, we believe the amendment contained in section 801, which would extend the usefulness of the FHA system of insurance by eliminating the requirement that farm loans may be insured only where there is involved construction or repairs calling for the expenditure of at least 15 percent of the mortgage proceeds for materials and labor is sound.

We also regard those provisions which would enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans for farm housing, on terms similar to those under which loans for purchase of farms may be made under the Bankhead-Jones Act, represent a feasible device for making good farm housing available as an essential part of an over-all program designed in its totality to effect a more efficient and adequate farm economy.

Finally and specifically, in terms of the needs of veterans, we endorse those provisions of the bill which, with regard to disposition of permanent war housing now owned by the Government, establish the principle that it shall be disposed of consistently with the postwar needs, with preference to veterans. In similar terms we endorse those provisions of title IV, which would make FHA insurance available on liberal terms to educational institutions requiring additional housing facilities for veterans.

Finally, we believe that it is most essential that all of these housing measures be subjected to the cohesive influence of common policy. No single one of our recommendations is unrelated to our other recommendations. They are part and parcel of a single bundle, and no one alone could do effectively the job that must be done in housing. They must be focused upon the sound objective stated in the preamble of the bill of realizing, as soon as feasible, the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family Surely America, with its genius for getting things done, could not set its sights on any lesser goal. Therefore, the proposal, embodied in the bill, which continues and perfects the present organization under which all of the principal urban housing functions and programs of the Federal Government would continued to be vested, in a single National Housing Agency, is sound and should be enacted. Moreover, we believe very strongly that this principle should be strictly adhered to in the case of any other housing legislation which may hereafter be enacted, including that which we have here recommended as essential to meet the current emergency needs, that is, the Patman bill, the continuation of emergency housing powers as proposed for the President's emergency program, and Senate Joint Resolution 122. Any housing functions or activities encompassed by such legislation should, we believe, be placed within that single National Housing Agency, and should not be scattered among various agencies with a consequent division of responsibility and lack of decisive housing policy and action which is so obviously necessary to achieve the admirable goal which has been established.

Statement of Omar B. Ketchum in Support of Senate Bill 1592

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 18 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement by Omar B. Ketchum, national legislative representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, on Senate bill 1592.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My name is Omar B. Ketchum and I am national legislative representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. The membership of this organization is now in excess of 1,250,000 men who have served, or are serving, on foreign soil or in hostile waters during some war, campaign, or expedition in which this Nation has participated. Nearly 1,000,000 servicemen of World War II are members.

The existing housing situation is a source of concern and anxiety to the officers of this organization, especially as it relates to the needs of those veterans now discharged and the great numbers soon to be returned to civilian life.

During the week of December 3, 1945, at Kansas City, Mo., a conference of national officers, department commanders, adjutants, and quartermasters from every State in the Union was held, where reports were received from the grass roots, coupled with reports from other sources coming to our offices, on the need for and lack of housing facilities.

From the nature of these reports we are alarmed at what might be the result if some drastic action is not taken, i. e., (1) immediately to relieve the emergency housing need for returned and returning veterans, (2) to provide a long-range housing construction program to assure adequate and satisfactory

housing facilities for all our citizens, veteran and others, at costs to meet the needs and abilities of all.

The National Council of Administration was so concerned and alarmed respecting the existing and growing housing emergency that they passed the following resolution:

"Whereas the shortage of housing is recognized as one of the most critical problems confronting the Nation; and

"Whereas the National Housing Administration estimates that 2,000,000 veterans are, or will become, homeless in this shortage; and

"Whereas there is indisputable evidence that many veterans are temporarily sheltered in municipal or county jails or camping in public parks; and

"Whereas less than 40 percent of the armed forces have been discharged and that continued demobilization under these conditions will further add to this shameful treatment of veterans and lead to bitter resentment and render them susceptible to Communist influences: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the National Council of Administration, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, assembled in Kansas City, Mo., December 3-4, 1945, go on record requesting the President of the United States to declare the housing shortage to be a national emergency and to direct appropriate Government agencies to take the necessary steps to allocate and divert building materials and surplus housing to alleviate the housing shortage and to call on the construction industry to cooperate to the fullest extent, and that priority in rentals, construction, and sale of homes be given to veterans; and be it further

"Resolved, That until permanent housing can be constructed vacant and useful structures, temporary or permanent, under the control of any governmental agency, be immediately made available for temporary housing facilities for our returning veterans and their families."

To that end, we have envisioned the provisions of Senate bill No. 1592 as providing the legal means by which such objectives may be attained, and in line therewith the national legislative committee authorized the national legislative representative to appear before your committee to express to you this organization's support and recommendation of Senate bill 1592 with several suggested amendments thereto.

The housing problem as presently existing involves great consequences to our Nation and its people, especially returning veterans, and if not solved will be the cause of many unfortunate and not-wished-for results.

Low-cost family housing in the $5,000 or $6,000 value bracket is the crying need, and priority and allocation of material to this type of construction must absolutely be provided, until materials become fully available, so as to provide the minimum housing for veterans' requirements, during the intervening emergency period between scarcity of materials and the reaching of an adequate production supply for all purposes.

The current disclosure in a local newspaper of the recent export to other countries of sufficient lumber to build over 100,000 housing units, when we here are in distress, certainly makes it impossible to give any excuse or reasonable explanation to our veterans as to any justifiable reason for the existing situation.

We appreciate that bill 1592 is one of general purpose as it relates to housing, and contemplates a long-term housing program, and as contemplated in this light and view, do we bring to it our recommendation and support, both as to its potential prospects of bringing decent housing to our fellow citizens and making available in the near future and economically possible too, a character of housing duly deserved and earned by veterans and their families, in cities, villages, and on farms, and in every economic bracket.

We appreciate the committee's inclusion in the bill of a preference for veterans and servicemen. However, to satisfactorily effect such indicated preference, we respectfully suggest several amendments to the bill, as follows:

1. On page 57, after line 23, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 503. The National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end of title I thereof the following new section:

" 'SEC. 8. For a period of 6 years after the date of the approval of this act, the Administrator shall not insure, or make any commitment to insure, (i) any direct investment in rental housing pursuant to title VII hereof, (ii) any mortgage pursuant to section 203 hereof if such mortgage involves a principal obligation of $7,500 or less (except in the case where the mortgagor is the owner and occupant of the property), or (iii) any mortgage pursuant to section 207 hereof (except in the case of a mortgage with respect to a project of a nonprofit mutual housing corporation), unless the investor, the mortgagor, or the builder, as the case may be, shall agree to give preference in the rental or sale thereof to persons who have served in the active military or naval forces of the United States on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of hostilities in World War II, and who have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable.' "

2. On page 78, line 9, change "4 years" to "6 years."

3. On page 79, in line 9, strike out "equally"; in line 10, strike out "and at the rent involved"; and in line 13, change "4 years" to "6 years."

4. On page 109, after line 4, insert the following new subsection:

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the contract or other instrument under which any permanent war housing under the jurisdiction or control of the National Housing Agency is disposed of for other than low-rent housing in accordance with the provisions of this title shall require the person acquiring such housing to give preference in the rental or sale thereof to persons who have served in the active military or naval forces of the United States on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of hostilities in World War II, and who have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable."

We respectfully submit to this committee as a recommendation our observation of veterans' preference over a period of 25 years.

The Congress always has been considerate in the past in enacting into laws passed by it sections which authorized veterans' preference whenever requested, but the veteran has met with sorry results in the administrative field whenever he sought the full benefits to which he was entitled. By subterfuge, evasion, the run-around, and by methods and actions too devious and lengthy to burden this committee with, the purpose and intent of Congress in respect to veterans' preference was thwarted and set at naught.

We feel that the time is now at hand that whenever veterans' preference is granted by Congress in any act, that same must be implemented, by provisions which will attach penalties for the violation of such provision, so that those who in the administration of any act of Congress granting veterans' preference, fails to comply with such requirement, he or they will be subject to such penalties. We have found that this is necessary to effect such preference and the intent of Congress.

In conclusion, may we impress upon the committee that the lack of immediate housing for returned and returning veterans is bordering on a national tragedy; that much suffering, disappointment, heartache, and dissatisfaction is bound to result, before existing conditions improve, but we place full reliance upon our elected representatives, that they will leave no stone unturned to come up with answer solving the emergency in the most satisfactory manner and establishing the basis for the future improvement of the housing problem of all our citizens needing same.

Home Building Calls for Supreme Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting an editorial written by H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary Post-Tribune, outlining the critical housing shortage in the city of Gary, Ind. Mr. Snyder has some valuable suggestions on the housing crisis in the following editorial:

HOME BUILDING CALLS FOR SUPREME EFFORT

Something exceptional must be done to build several millions of housing units with the greatest possible speed. Not only must we make up the shortage resulting from the lack of construction during the war but the unprecedented shortage during the decade of the thirties.

Several thousand additional homes are needed in Gary alone and a similar situation exists throughout the country. The situation was bad enough during the war when people submitted to being crowded together because of the emergency.

But the emergency is over and millions of soldiers are back and on the way back, nearly all of them prospective renters or buyers of homes. We must do everything we can to give them the homes they need and deserve.

Unfortunately that is easier said than done. The problem looks almost unsolvable, but, like all other problems, a good deal can be done about it if it is attacked in the proper way. A Nation-wide program is called for, and the best one we have seen has been suggested by Harold E. Stassen.

His plan calls for the appointment of a national expediter by the President, which was done yesterday, and then a gathering up of all the loose ends of the construction industry. Skilled workers would be released from the Army and schools for apprentices started. Unused governmental space everywhere would be inquired into, particularly that of the Army and Navy, including their unused materials. Then there should be a national campaign to modernize building codes so that all speed possible could be used in getting homes built.

But with everything possible being done one factor is certain to hold back any program, that is the production of lumber and many other building supplies. There just isn't enough to meet the need and there probably won't be for several years.

That means that most of the supplies we do have must be channeled into building homes rather than into other projects we can better afford to wait for. Fortunately there is an appreciation of this need in Washington and plans for its proper handling are being made.

We doubt that much will be accomplished by placing a ceiling on prices. What we can do to prevent unnecessary price rises should be done but too much of the talk today shows little understanding of economic factors. Supplies cannot be sold for less than their cost.

Old houses will not be sold for less than the owners think they are worth and new ones will not be built unless the builders can make a fair profit at least. Price ceilings do not help unless they permit action underneath them. If they press down too far activity is stifled and it would be better to do nothing.

What we want is houses. Army and Navy building supplies may be found to be vastly greater than is believed but whatever they are they should be put to use now. And that goes for everything else that will expedite this job. This is a national, State, and local job and it ought to be hitting on all cylinders everywhere.

The Holding Company Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at a forum on public utilities sponsored by Investors League at Chicago, Ill., November 29, 1945:

Today on LaSalle Street in Chicago the times are a far cry from the LaSalle Street of the old board of trade in the era of "Old Hutch," "Dapper Billy," and the picturesque Ed Partridge, and Everingham.

The abuses of the days of laissez faire are not entirely gone. Under restriction and regulation many of the old abuses remain simply wearing new raiment. The wrong and scandal are with us still, but the old swindles are out of style and modern up-to-date ones have succeeded them. They differ no more than milady's gown of 1882 differs from her beach suit of 1945.

In the old days it was crédit mobilier and Teapot Dome. Today it is Swindle, Inc., and the nonprofit corporation.

America has approached its problems always with a realization that there is heart and brain enough in America to meet and solve them.

When first we founded a government in this then new world, we recognized and announced the simple and evident truth that all just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed.

The first three words of the Charter that constitutes the American philosophy were—"We the people"—and the public interest has ever been the yardstick that both defines and limits each area and boundary of every act of government.

Out of the particular problems of the public as investors have grown many acts of government. Acts that have been altered to meet the tide of circumstances, the flight of progress, and the decrepitude of obsolescence.

It is to one of these, one of the great reform bills of the decade of the thirties, that I address myself. I speak of the Holding Company Act. It was, and is a sound and wholesome law. Experience has proven it to be one of the most salutary of the reform era.

While I claim it to be in its fundamental aspects wise and sound, I do not hold it to be a perfect instrument. A product of times and circumstances that ever change and alter, experience of necessity tests and tries it and discovers some elements of weakness and perhaps some elements of error.

To hold that any product of human minds, however great those minds might be, has attained a permanent perfection, free of fault or frailty, is an untenable position. I am sure the Securities and Exchange Commission would not hold itself, like Caesar's wife, in every act above reproach, nor make a finding of perfection for itself in all of its interpretations—if so, I herewith file a formal disclaimer to such a finding.

The Congress in the form of the Securities and Exchange Commission subcommittee of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has decided to review the Holding Company Act—to study it in the light of its operations—to examine it in the light of the realities of experience. We are examining it carefully, judiciously, without preconception or prejudice.

We are not on a hunt for faults to be found with the act, and may even be better satisfied with the act after this study. We are making a studious review of the act.

It is fitting and our proper responsibility to do this.

The Holding Company Act has not been reviewed nor revised in the 10 years of its existence. The Interstate Commerce Act was reviewed and revised 17 times in its first 10 years.

All the major acts of Congress are properly and frequently revised in the light of experience and to meet the public interest. Thus, and only thus, can we find the path of justice through all the winding ways of error, malfeasance, or deceit.

We have undertaken a task that is a hard task and perhaps a thankless one.

We feel we have a right to expect a spirit of cooperation from the Securities and Exchange Commission that will bring to us unbiased, impartial, and judicial analysis of suggestions offered and constructive recommendations for implementing, clarifying, and improving the act to better serve sound public policy.

We feel we have the right to expect a spirit of cooperation from the industry that will bring to us the facts in their simple realities, clearly delineating between any advocacy of self-interest and recommendations for the common good.

We feel that sound law and good administration should build faith and trust in each other as between industry and the Government's agencies.

I decry the feeling that the Securities and Exchange Commission and industry have in common a mutual mistrust of each other.

Let there be an end to chaos and doubt and punitive and defensive acts, or need for punitive or defensive action.

Rochefoucauld says, "Hypocrisy is homage that falsehood pays to truth." Our committee wants the truth and we have no welcome either for falsehood or hypocrisy.

We cannot look with favor on either fantastic theories or ruthless practices.

If I may divert at this point to a personal view, it is my personal opinion that competition should be equalized between public and private enterprise.

I have seen in widespread areas of our national economy tax exemption tipping the scales against private enterprise in favor of public or collective ownership.

I believe that collectivism or communism can stand only on the strength of its propaganda. I know its claim to equality in the sharing of the benefits of production is a myth.

Economics are made of facts, not fancies.

If we are realists and both examine our own national experience and go abroad for the experience of others, we can only be convinced that the American system of private enterprise and individual opportunity is the world's best system of national economy. No other system, by comparative factual analysis, can enter even the realm of competition with the American system. Those conclusions are the inevitables based only on the facts and figures—on the mathematics of economics apart from the added weight of value in the individual's personal liberty. The American system of private enterprise has worked well. It never should be abandoned.

Collective ownership is growing in America in almost every phase of our economy. Tax exemption for collective ownership is an illusory concession creating real inequities and unjust burdens on all of us who are not the direct beneficiaries of the specific project. In the field of public ownership of utilities the people are victimized by devices for financial manipulation and are persuaded by dishonest accounting.

The American taxpayer is beset with a million snares for the unwary. He is not awake to the realities. He is a somnambulist, sleep walking now but soon to be rudely awakened by the hurt of these hazards. He is whipsawed coming and going in these expansions of collectivism, but he does not know it yet.

Many people join the march of collectivism with hand-me-down or ready-made preconceptions and never stop to check whether they are true or false.

Equalization of competition between public or collective ownership and operation of enterprises and private ownership and operation of enterprises will bring out the facts and test truly the values. Then the claims will be fairly tested and the people will find with Jerome Frank that "We have been cocksure of many things that simply are not so."

Psychological waves of irrationalism and "functicism" have swept the world in many periods of history. The mania of witch-burning, the madness of nazism, the fallacy of communism, all have a cousinship with any sweeping fad or craze or mania whether it be miniature golf or Ku-Klux-Klanism. Wishful thinking dominates mass behavior, and add to it the moving power of sentiment and human psychology will invent a justifying theory for behavior however irrational.

The wishful thinking of those who are honest advocates of public ownership has invented theories that justify tax exemption, or tax evasion; that justify almost any device or expediency. The credulity of the unsuspecting and sincere advocate of collective ownership of public utilities is played upon not only by the demagog who covers up great and long range benefit with enticement to prompt the petty advantage but also by the shrewd promoter and the wizard manipulator.

On this stage absurd performances occur. The unsuspecting public is made stooge to the financial prestidigitator. The lamb of the rural district lies down to bed with the wolf of Wall Street. The black leg and the puritan are wed, and wishful thinking invents a theory to justify it.

In Omaha and in Puget Sound the buyer went to market to buy some wool and laid down his money for a fresh shorn lamb.

The wily opportunist ever searching for the easy plum to pick has found a new crop for his harvesting.

The wolf of Wall Street is huffing and puffing again and this time he has a new disguise that I have, I think, properly labeled—Swindle, Inc.

Believing that Government is under oath to serve the public interest, I hold that we cannot ostrich-ize our vision against a seeing-eye knowledge of such performance. If the Holding Company Act can be implemented to bar such doors, then it should be so. The Federal Power Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, and Internal Revenue, should be marshaled to combat that wrong. And these agencies of Government should have an arm long enough and a sword sharp enough to cut down such crime where'er it raises its serpent head.

And now speaking again of the committee's work, I might say, and so it is that these special cases involving questionable transactions have been brought also in the forum of our deliberations.

We have in the forum of our committee a scale on which to weigh public burdens. We trust the scale is correctly balanced to register the full weight of public interest. We trust that our eyes are focused to truth, our minds attuned to justice, and our processes considerate and fair.

We know that our acts will be cautious and restrained by judicious care. We feel that the results of our study will justify the arduous labors of our task and that what is finally done by the committee will be done well, as it will be done faithfully. We hope in the end results we can have the unreserved approval of our critics as well as those more favorably inclined. On the Holding Company Act we contemplate no sweeping change, no wide nor radical departure, but we do contemplate constructive improvement and an implementation to the full extent, but only to the extent that deliberate care, studious research, caution, and wisdom clearly dictate.

I Am My Brother's Keeper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article which appeared in the Pilot, Boston, Mass., on Saturday, December 15, 1945:

I AM MY BROTHER'S KEEPER

There are times when Christians must think and act like Christians—or forever renounce their right to the name. A typical crisis of this kind confronts us now. Strongly, eloquently, and with a manifest depth of feeling, Archbishop Cushing, in his address to the St. Vincent de Paul Society Sunday, insisted that the United States is morally bound immediately and completely to fulfill its pledged word to support UNRRA (the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration).

People are shivering, starving, and dying. Children, denied even minimum subsistence, are already marred for life. Unless succor comes quickly, many of them will never see even a stunted maturity.

The address of His Excellency is magnificent in its fidelity to the authentic Christian tradition. If we understand this superb text correctly, the archbishop is demanding that we quit playing politics with starvation, disease, and exposure.

It would be laudable in the extreme if Europe would establish democratic governments, unhobble the press, show evidence that the lessons taught by the ordeal of the world's worst war have been learned. But "Christian charity compels us to feed, clothe, and house the starving and naked wherever they are. We attached no rider to our lend-lease shipments of war materials. Should we attach one now to charity? If we do, and if UNRRA should fail for lack of funds, then the good Samaritan has been waylaid."

At a time when priests in Russia were being murdered simply because they were priests, at a time when public walls were festooned with blasphemies so revolting as to turn one's stomach, Pope Pius XI continued to pour food and clothing into this famine-stricken country. Neither then nor afterward did Soviet Russia express a syllable of gratitude. But the people were hungry and suffering. That's all the shepherd's heart of Pope Pius XI cared to know. He would warmly endorse Archbishop Cushing's moving appeal to help all who need help for the solitary, sufficient reason that they are hungry and cold. As heartily as his illustrious predecessor, Pope Pius XII would approve. And so, we may feel very certain, would Jesus Christ.

Abroad people are in torment. They are suffering a veritable agony. European mothers are listening to wails of the infants in their arms and they can only wait in dry-eyed despair until death heals the pain of their babies and their own. How—in the name of a compassionate Christ—can we continue to debate when every moment's delay means unpaintable anguish to beings made like ourselves, in God's image, and again like ourselves, redeemed by His precious blood?

Thoughts and Wishes of the Man in the Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, December 18 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, on Friday, November 23, 1945, I obtained unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address by Mr. Robert E. Hannegan, chairman, of the Democratic National Committee, at a dinner of the Indiana Democratic Editorial Association held at French Lick, Ind., November 17, 1945.

Two pages were inadvertently left out of this address in the printing and I ask unanimous consent that the address in full be printed in today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have always considered it an important part of my business to keep posted as thoroughly as I can on the thoughts and wishes of that anonymous individual whom we in America are in the habit of calling the Man in the Street.

To me, that man is important—the most important figure in the whole United States.

Having no name, he may be a big industrialist or a small businessman or a farmer or a factory-hand. He may be a Democrat or a Republican or an independent. But as the Man in the Street he is all of them. He is bigger than any of them. His interests come first.

Now, for those of us who are in politics, this man without a name, without a stated occupation, is a very sound consultant. His thinking, you know, is usually pretty clear. He is a pretty level-headed fellow.

That is why it is always smart politics to find out, between elections, what he is saying, what he is thinking about, what he wants. Ignore him, minimize his importance, put your own objectives above his, and—well, look what has happened to the Republican Party.

But if it is a general rule of good politics to go to the Man in the Street and try to get his responses and discover his thinking, if this is important any time, then it is even more important now.

We are at this time in a period of transition, of change from war to peace. With that far-reaching shift, most of us realize and expect an atmosphere charged with new political and economic currents, a change in the approach of our people toward many issues and controversies that affect us all. It is natural and logical that this should happen. If anyone is surprised by it, I say such a person does not know the American people very well. He hasn't been talking very much with the man in the street.

While war lasted we preserved a national unity in the defense of our country against a foreign aggressor. Even under the stress of this great conflict we were not forced to give up our right of free expression.

We held a national election in the very midst of war. But we subordinated all our interests to the winning of that war. We not only placed restraints on ourselves by law, but we voluntarily refrained from trying to advance private causes that would have imperiled the great cause of our country. I say "we" and I mean most of us—all but a small minority.

Then, overnight, came an end to war, and an end to the extreme calls and exactions it had imposed upon us. This means, in a free country, the moral right to speak out again on any subject or for any cause, public or private, within the limits of legality, and certainly it includes the right of any faction, any organization, and individual, when he thinks he is being hurt, to say so.

Inevitably, when this happens, our national unity is put to a test. But we have stood countless such tests in the past, and we shall go through many more in the future.

If anyone tries to tell me that it is unnatural for an American who has a grievance, or thinks he has one, to speak out about it, I say that person does not know his Americans.

And if anyone tries to tell me that our country cannot stand up under the strain of this free give-and-take, I say that person underestimates the tensile strength of our democracy.

We are just now hearing a good many of these alarms. They are coming from people who seem to think that America cannot pass this test of our national unity, people who fail to see the difference between controversy and catastrophe. They are people who think America "can't take it."

Well, when I hear of these fits of self-induced hysteria, I set aside my copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where most of the outbursts first see print. I throw away the editorial and columnists' page of the newspaper, where they are echoed. And I go out and have a talk with my level-headed friend, the man in the street.

I think some of his reactions are worth passing along.

You recall that back in 1940 and 1941, when war threatened us, there were people who said the many groups and factions in America with diverse viewpoints would be unable or unwilling to set aside their differences in defending the Nation against an outside aggressor. That was supposed to be democracy's fatal weakness. There were certain people in Europe saying that, and there were certain people over here, echoing them word for word.

Today the people in Europe who were most vitally interested in spreading that kind of talk are silent. Some of them have poisoned themselves. Some, for the same purpose, use a rope, others a revolver. Still others are on trial and will be taken care of in due course.

But what about the people in America—those who interested themselves in spreading the same doubt of our democracy over here?

Those people are not silent today. As leaders in the Republican Party, they used their membership in Congress 5 years ago as

a sounding board. And they are using that same sounding board now.

They are still voicing defeatism—as loudly in peace as they did in war. Yesterday they were trying to break down the faith of the American people in their gallant Commander in Chief, the late Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Today they are trying to shake America's faith in the man who has quickly and ably shouldered the responsibility of leading this Nation to peace and postwar prosperity, President Harry S. Truman.

It is these opposition leaders who are now howling calamity and who are hoping that a great show of dissent will break the confidence of the people in Harry Truman—and who are doing their best to create and aggravate that dissent.

Well, they are wrong both ways. And do not be deceived, the man in the street knows it. He knows that the people who failed to realize the seriousness of this country's situation in 1940 are the same people who are voicing hysterical fears for the Nation in 1945.

When America stood in real danger for her very life, when complete national unity was vital and every disruptive word might have meant the death of a soldier on the battlefield, these were the people who complained of rationing and the OPA, who grumbled about the WPB, who shouted their pet grievances recklessly.

Now, with the crisis of war behind us, at a time when Americans have once more earned the right to assert themselves and to contend for that which they believe is their due, now these same people are suddenly alarmed for the survival of the nation.

Well, the man in the street knows this. He does not like disputes, international, industrial, or domestic. About the only thing he likes to argue is politics.

Certainly he does not approve of strikes. He is both employer and employee. He is producer and consumer. He is labor, management, and the public. And he knows that industrial shut-down hurt him, that he is the fellow who pays, any way he looks at it.

But when a Member of the United States Senate gets up, and in his great fears for the safety of America, launches a bitter attack on President Truman for his effort to bring labor and management together in conference so that a way may be sought to resolve their differences, that Senator may be speaking for the Republican Party—of which he is a prominent member—but he is not speaking for my friend, the man in the street. He is not speaking for the employee nor the employer. He is not speaking for labor nor for management. And he is not speaking for the American public.

Yet only a few days ago such a speech was made on the floor of the United States Senate by Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin. And that speech, which was made in direct criticism of President Truman, was a very revealing one.

It revealed exactly what is behind all this sudden patriotic fervor on the part of the Republicans in Congress, these pious fears for America which they began voicing after America had won the war, but which they had never expressed while America's enemies were still on the march.

Now, what does this Republican Senator want? What has he been leading up to? What does he think President Truman ought to do so that his own fears will be quieted?

Only this: Throw overboard the principles of the Democratic Party. Cancel out the social gains that have been made in recent years. Raise the tariff, and abandon the principle of collective bargaining.

"I know," he says, "that these realistic views will invite upon all those who voice them the accusations of labor baiting and union busting. I, for one, deny both charges with all the vigor at my command."

And in the same breath—with all the vigor at his command—he demands that President Truman outlaw the principle of collective bargaining—a principle to which both management and labor in all our big industries have long subscribed, a principle which they reaffirmed only the other day at the conference called by the President.

But this same Republican leader was not nearly so concerned for the safety of America a few years ago when war threatened us. Back in February of 1941, less than a year before Pearl Harbor, he told the people he did not believe Japan would be foolish enough to attack American interests.

From the record of his voting, one would not judge that the Senator was very greatly impressed with America's danger then. I think the time has come to cite the various items of that record having to do with the strengthening of this Nation to meet the greatest war crisis that ever threatened its existence. Here is the way Senator WILEY voted:

Against revision of the Neutrality Act.

Against military conscription.

Against offering effective aid to Allied countries.

Against lend-lease.

Against lend-lease appropriation.

Against transfer of Axis ships to Britain.

Against extension of the draft.

Against belligerent zone restrictions to make possible the delivery of lend-lease shipments to nations fighting Nazi Germany and her allies.

Against the armed ship bill, to protect American vessels from submarine attacks.

Against the ship seizure bill enabling us to take over ships belonging to countries occupied by German forces.

Against the second lend-lease bill.

And so on—all down the line of preparedness against the most dangerous enemy America has ever had, this Republican leader voted against every one of the measures of the Roosevelt administration to safeguard and strengthen America while there was still time—measures which, as later events proved, saved the lives of thousands of American boys.

Yes, Senator WILEY, the man in the street of today, who was also the man on the battlefield and the high seas of yesterday, remembers you and your Republican colleagues in Congress. He remembers you well.

And now he is the man, Senator, who has come home alive and safe, to a Nation that has been saved, because a Democratic majority in Congress backed up a Democratic President in an American program of preparedness against the aggressor.

That is why this man is coming home alive and safe today, Senator. And in a matter of life or death—his life or his death—don't you think it is natural, Senator, that he and his family should remember you?

And don't you think it is natural that now, when this man is home again, wanting to go to work, and wanting protection in his job—isn't it natural, Senator, that he should be a little puzzled by your sudden fears for America unless his protection is sacrificed?

My fellow Democrats, I do not expect this Senator or any of those of his party who voted with him in 1940 and 1941 to answer these questions. I expect, rather, that they will go on with their determined effort to smear the memory of one of the greatest Americans who ever lived—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I expect these Republican leaders to continue turning their faces away from the post-war problems of our country, problems of reconversion and the maintenance of employment—the whole field that has been covered in the 21-point program set forth by President Truman.

I expect them, in their bitterness and their complete lack of a program of their own, to carry on this desperate search for a political smudgepot, a muck rake, and some way of making their accusations and innuendoes stick where they are trying to plaster them—on our country's great and honored dead.

In the beginning, you know, the Man in the Street—and I am talking now of the fellow who may be a Democrat or a Republican or an independent—welcomed the investigation of Pearl Harbor.

He thought the purpose was to get facts. He assumed that there would be a proper investigation of those facts. He expected the facts would be pertinent to the case.

That is what we all want. And what we did not want was a smear. What we did not want was to create the opportunity for an embittered political clique to use this investigation for indiscriminate muckraking, or as a soundingboard for broadcasting unrelated findings which it may dig up and distort at will in a prejudiced resolve to destroy the name of the unanswering dead.

We have relied on the Senators of our own party who are on that Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee to prevent it from becoming just such a soundingboard, and our confidence was well placed. They are going to see that this investigation is a clean job.

The Republican Senators were told that the committee would have access to any and all necessary sources of information through its legally constituted committee counsel.

In other words, the information was to be supplied to the committee as a committee, for committee purposes. Files of the Roosevelt administration were to be opened and documents made available in this manner.

As a safeguard against the threat of political abuse of the investigation, the files were not to be made accessible to individual members of the committee, as individuals, for their individual purposes, whatever these might be.

But was this what those Republican members of the committee wanted?

They demanded, instead, that they be allowed to go themselves, as individuals, direct to the Roosevelt files and search through them for anything they wished, whether it was relevant or not, and to do anything they wished with whatever they might find.

Now, what do you think these Republican Senators could have had in mind when they made that demand? And from the fury they showed when the demand was not granted, what do you suppose they could have been hoping for from this investigation? What plans have been thwarted?

One of them has since lamented that because he was not allowed this privilege, the investigation has been crippled. Crippled as what, Senator? As a congressional investigation with a proper and legitimate purpose, or as a political fishing expedition?

But what is behind this desperate effort to smear Roosevelt? What is the political significance, now, in 1945, of an attempt to turn and twist the history of 1941 so that it might discredit the memory of a man who is no longer President?

If you want the answer to that question, the man in the street can give it to you.

He will tell you that the Republican Party has not once offered a positive, constructive program for America in the past 20 years.

When a political party lacks a program of its own, there is not much else for it to do than attempt to discredit the opposition. When that doesn't work—and it hasn't worked in four national elections—the party is left in a pretty desperate plight.

Clearly, the attempt to smear Roosevelt is a tactic of desperation by a party without a program.

From election day of last year up to the time when President Truman offered his postwar economic program in his message to Congress last month the American people had been given no sign of what the Republican leadership might have had in mind as a policy for the future of this country.

But at that time a brief but revealing expression of Republican sentiment was given us. It came from Congressman CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana. And we can accept it as authoritative, because Congressman HALLECK is not only chairman of the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee but he is also head of a seven-man group named by the party especially to draft a new program of its objectives.

HALLECK and his clique of Republican leaders didn't like the Truman program. And this is what he said:

"This (the President's message) is the kick-off. This begins the campaign of 1946. * * * And in waging the Republican congressional campaign we will go back to old-fashioned conservatism."

That is all he could offer. "Back to old-fashioned conservatism"—the kind which the Republican Party gave us when it was last in power. With it, you remember, they gave us corruption in government, depredation in Wall Street, depression in Main Street, foreclosure on the farm, ineptitude in foreign policy, and consistency and purpose in only one direction—the further aggrandizement of a favored, powerful, wealthy minority.

But a return to those ruinous practices which led to the crash of 1929 would never be accepted by the majority of the people as a program for the America of 1945. And the Republican leaders know it and admit it.

Accordingly they have once more set out in search of a program which they can offer the electorate.

More than 9 weeks ago Congressman MARTIN, the House minority leader, made it known that the perennial quest was on again. He and his colleagues in Congress held a 2-hour caucus, which they announced as the first step toward drafting what they described as a positive program for America. A committee of seven Republican Congressmen was appointed to do the actual drafting. MARTIN said:

"We plan to set before the country a definite and concise statement of the aims and objectives of the Republican Party as represented by Republican Members of Congress. We plan to do this in such manner as will leave no room for questioning as to where the Republican Members stand on the issues before the country."

Well, that was very fine; but it was more than 9 weeks ago and the country is still waiting. To date there has been no definite and concise statement, no program, nothing that might bring to an end the questioning as to where these Republican Members of Congress stand.

A couple of weeks ago I remarked on this at a Democratic dinner in Philadelphia. At that time 7 weeks had passed, and no Republican program. I remembered it because I had marked my calendar on the day of JOE MARTIN'S fine promise, and I had crossed off every day that passed since then. I had at that time 51 crosses on my calendar.

But the very next day JOE MARTIN'S Republican steering committee made an announcement. It was great news. We learned in the newspaper—I quote:

"The Republican committee met for what they said was an attempt to bring closer to realization their 'statement of principles,' which will be the GOP platform yardstick for the 1946 congressional election.

"Foreign affairs, labor and unemployment, soldiers, and the returning veteran were among the subjects discussed, but the conferees said no definite conclusions had been reached."

That story was accurate as far as it went. These members of the Republican steering committee failed to reach any conclusion because they failed to reach any agreement.

You see, they were split by the question whether to come out with Congressman HALLECK'S "old-fashioned conservatism"—which means no solution to any of the problems of the country—or to endorse in principle the program which the Democratic Party has already set forth.

They have been warned by members of their own party to drop the "me too" tactic. They have been told that you have to have something better than "me too" to win an election, and the last two Presidential elections have proved this.

On the other hand, they have also been warned against the consequences of having no program of their own—warned by men prominent in their own party.

A few of the more thoughtful and self-analytical Republicans have come out and stated this publicly. John D. M. Hamilton, for example, who was the party's campaign manager in 1936, recently contributed an article to Liberty magazine entitled, "What the GOP needs."

He writes:

"Over the last few years there has been a growing restlessness within the rank and file of the Republican Party which does not bode well for its future. Too many Republicans, after years of loyalty, find themselves wondering where their party is going and, worse, whether they will be obliged to go along with it as a matter of party regularity rather than through conviction. * * * Possibly our party will win even though it adheres to a negative program based on the other fellow's mistakes. If so, the victory will be neither creditable nor permanent, and the party will have destroyed its usefulness to the Nation and forsaken its destiny."

Well, such are the difficulties of a party without a program. That was the trouble when the Republican steering committee met. The result was, no agreement, no conclusions.

Now, this report of progress was made public last November 2. But since then I have had to go on crossing the days off my calendar, because there is still no program, the Republican leaders continue reaching no definite conclusions. I now have 67 crosses.

But I do not want to predict that nothing will ever come from this Republican committee. What I do predict is this alternative:

These Republican leaders will either have to eat their words of criticism of Harry Truman's program for postwar America and go back to the tactic of crying "me too"—a tactic which they have already tried without success—or go even further back to the old familiar negatives, the do-nothing, offer-nothing kind of government which they practiced with such disaster to the country in three administrations.

To the people of America, to the man in the street, it is a matter of small concern which horn of this dilemma the Republican leadership decides to hang on. What he wants is settlement of our labor troubles without sacrifice of the right of collective bargaining.

What he wants is protection of American workers and American soldiers coming back to their jobs without leaving the matter of their future to chance or charity.

What he wants is maintenance of public purchasing power without price inflation.

What he wants is the continued flow of risk capital and reasonable profits in industry.

The man in the street knows that every one of these objectives is possible in America, and he also knows that something is being done to attain them.

He knows that the administration of President Truman has pointed the way to labor, to management, to Congress, and to the public to make the possibility a reality.

And the man in the street is learning that Harry Truman is not only pointing the way. He is ready to fight for his program, if need be, to fight for every inch of the way until those objectives are reached.

Ever since Harry Truman became President, we have heard references to the honeymoon, as some have called it, between the Truman administration and Congress.

That term was used because the majority of the membership of Congress like other people who have worked with him for any length of time, had come to like and admire Harry Truman regardless of party affiliations. Through his years as a Senator he had earned the reputation of a leader who was easy to get along with.

With his coming into the Presidency, people naturally expected a cordial relationship to spring up between the Executive and the legislative branches of government, and in this they were not disappointed. That cordiality existed, and it exists today. If anything, the relationships with Congress that Harry Truman values most highly are stronger today than on the day when he moved into the White House.

There were some members of the opposition, however, who thought they saw a chance to play on this relationship to further their own political purpose, and that purpose was to force America back into the ways of reaction, to nullify the very principles for which Harry Truman has always stood and on which he was elected to high office in 1944.

When these people failed to get what they were after, they began declaring that "the honeymoon is over."

Well, I take this opportunity to point out that no honeymoon can be over between Harry Truman and the Republican element that has been trying to smear Franklin D. Roosevelt and destroy the social gains made by the American people under a Democratic administration.

That honeymoon is not over because it never existed. On Harry Truman's part, there never was even a proposal.

And there never will be. There is not now, and there never will be, any appeasement of reaction in the form of sacrifice of those basic principles on which the people of America elected this administration.

Rather, our party will go to the people in 1946 and ask them to rid Congress of that type of would-be honeymooner who smiles and beams out of one side of his mouth but out of the other demands political and economic reaction as his price.

I believe the people of America recognize that kind of legislative blackmail for what it is. I believe they will show what they think of it when they go to the polls in 1946. I believe the Democratic Party will not only retain its majority, but will expand that majority in a Congress ready to go forward with America.

On Feeding the Germans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 18 (legislative day of Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter under the heading "On Feeding the Germans."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON FEEDING THE GERMANS

JOHN D. MCCUTCHEON & CO., INC.,
St. Louis, Mo., December 5, 1945.

LETTERS FROM THE PEOPLE,
St. Louis Post-Dispatch, St. Louis, Mo.

GENTLEMEN: The Germans have sown to the winds, and now that they are reaping the

whirlwinds, a great many honest and well-intentioned Americans, including Dorothy Thompson, persuade themselves that we should immediately send relief and food supplies to help get Germany back on its feet economically, even though the rest of Europe is not yet on its feet.

A few whirlwinds are not too great a price to pay, and, indeed, definitely entered into the calculations of a people bent on the establishment of the supremacy of the Herrenvolk and Deutschland uber Alles. Of course, they wanted to win the war, but their primary concern was that the war leave Germany stronger than before in relation to the rest of Europe. This accounts for their ruthless policy of extermination of intellectuals, teachers, scientists, and all groups from which leadership might develop.

After all, in these days of high industrial technology, any industrial nation can physically prepare for war in less than 10 years (it took Hitler from 1933 to 1939), but it takes a generation or two to prepare biologically.

It is not by accident that the Germans came to be the kind of people they are, but the result of a hundred years of biological selection of population, plus a long period of indoctrination. As a result of these two influences, the so-called good or peace-loving people in Germany have suffered a steady attrition in numbers and their percentage to the total population has been growing ever smaller.

During the period from 1840 to 1860, with the steady encroachment of Prussian militarism into the rest of Germany and the defeat of the liberal movement, the peace-loving people flocked out of the country to escape the warlike atmosphere and military conscription. Over 1,000,000 came to the United States alone in the 13-year period between 1847 and 1860. This migration of the good or peace-loving segment of the population has been going on ever since, so that the residue of people left in Germany were increasingly authoritarian and militarily aggressive. They were thus conditioned for the Herrenvolk and the fuehrer complex.

Five wars of aggression within a period of 75 pears have fanned the flames of extreme nationalism among this residue population to the point where there was no public conscience to oppose Hitler in the final liquidation of the remaining peace-loving elements in the population. It is not illogical, therefore, that today the Germans blame the Hitler regime for losing the war but not for planning and initiating the most horrible and barbaric total war in history. They have no sense of guilt over the liquidation of the peaceful elements of their own population by the hundreds of thousands; no moral revulsion over a diplomacy whose cardinal precept was duplicity and treaty-breaking; no horror over a well-considered, carefully planned national policy of race destruction of their neighbors; no mercy for the labor slaves they illegally impressed into a servitude worse than death; and no pity for the millions of Europe's children starved, dead of disease, or orphaned because of their aggression; only pity for themselves and their low state as losers of the war.

Good American citizens of German extraction do themselves a great disservice when they permit themselves to be identified with these residue dregs of a hundred years because of a nostalgic loyalty to a fatherland they would no longer recognize. Their families were the cream that rose to the top and left this land of brutish hatred and arrogance.

Most historians realize now that Germany was left much too strong in relation to the rest of Europe following World War I, and as of today the Germans have won World War II biologically. This is just as the German general staff planned it, and now if they whine loud and long enough, we are again to help them back on their feet as we did after World War I.

If we don't feed them we are told they might not like us, nor believe in democracy, and they might even ambush and murder some of the members of our army of occupation. Of course, the Greeks, the Yugoslavs, the Poles, and even the French, who are all in a much more pitiable state of undernourishment and disorganization, will starve and freeze, too, this winter, but we have no army of occupation in those countries and are not, therefore, responsible for maintaining order there. So disorder does not worry us too much. They can starve in private, but our Army sees the Germans if they starve.

The fundamental problem of Germany is that, occupying a central geographic position in Europe as she does, she is relatively too strong and too large populationwise. Their population has continued to grow in spite of an enormous emigration of people, because of a national policy since the time of Bismarck of special favors and state premiums on large families and more children. The state needed more cannon fodder. This policy reached its apogee when Hitler offered special premiums for universal illegitimacy. If I must support an illegitimate child, I at least want the parents to renounce illegitimacy as a policy.

They complain that our occupation policies offer them no hope, when the only worthwhile hope to a German is world dominance. It should be made plain to them in the only language they can understand or respect that there can be no hope for a Germany of eighty to ninety million people; but that if they will reverse their policy of state premiums on large families and more children, a population of forty to fifty million can live very comfortably and well in Germany.

First, we should feed our allies for whose misery the Germans are responsible—the Greeks, the Yugoslavs, the Poles, the French, the Belgians, the Dutch, the Czechoslovakians, the Norwegians, the Danes, the Russians, and the Chinese. Then, we should feed the indirect victims of German connivance—the Bulgarians, the Hungarians, the Rumanians, the Finns, and the Italians. After we have raised the nutritional standards of these countries to the minimum subsistence level, if we are then still in a giving mood, it would be a fine humanitarian thing to feed Germans, but let us prevent starvation in these other lands first.

Yours very truly.

A General Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial entitled "A General Failure," which appeared in the Lawrence Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., Friday evening, December 14, 1945:

A GENERAL FAILURE

From the mounting testimony going into the record of the congressional Pearl Harbor investigation it is becoming more and more evident that no one in authority in the Government could fully conceive in the late fall of 1941 that the United States was in imminent danger of being attacked. There was a general failure, in the White House and on down, to take the true measure of the Japanese.

A message from the late President Roosevelt to the American High Commissioner in the Philippines on November 26, 1941, put before the committee, offers an illuminating commentary on the state of mind prevalent in Washington during those critical days. In it the President said that "the next Japanese aggression might cause an outbreak of hostilities between the United States and Japan." He observed also that while there were no clear indications of where the Japanese might strike, an "advance against Thailand seems most probable."

Other evidence adduced by the committee has shown that President Roosevelt was under no illusions about what would come if the Japanese continued on their aggressive course. Yet apparently, at the very moment when the negotiations at Washington had all but broken down, he thought that the next Japanese blow would be aimed not directly at this country but somewhere else. What he expected, apparently, was a Japanese move that might compel joint American-British-Dutch action, but not the daring one that was actually taken.

There were good grounds for this appraisal in Japan's previous step-by-step policy and also in the consideration that it would be a mistake for Japan to strike at this Nation—as it was. But the fact remains that the President, though he had the fullest information, underestimated the Japanese. No wonder many of the Nation's military men shared that error.

This does not excuse those who were responsible for defending Pearl Harbor. Their contention is that they did not get the facts they needed to take the right decisions—nor did they get all the information available to General MacArthur whose command was alerted. But they had enough warning to act properly if they had not been misled by the general atmosphere of Washington.

The Immediate Problems of Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the other evening, in the United Nations Forum, more than 2,000 people sat enthralled in Constitution Hall, as they listened to an address by Brig. Gen. CARLOS P. ROMULO, Resident Commissioner of the Philippines to the United States, which under leave to extend my remarks today, it is my pleasure to insert in the RECORD. There is a message for every American in General ROMULO's speech, and I wish to second his appeal that action be taken now on the Philippine rehabilitation bill pending action of this House. I hope every man and woman in the United States will read what General ROMULO has to say on the Asiatic problems that now confront the world.

The address follows:

The immediate problems of Asia today are the immediate problems of the whole world. They are the urgent, dangerous problems of peace or war, progress or reaction, human happiness or human misery.

It seems difficult for many people in the western world to understand the ever-increasing importance of the Far East in world affairs. During the past 3 years, most of which I have spent in the United States, I

have witnessed the development of a subtle yet undeniable tug-of-war between those people who are Europe-minded and those who are Asia-minded.

INTER-RELATION OF EAST AND WEST

But actually there is no reason for this conflict in orientation. Asia and Europe—and America—share the same planet. Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Wendell Willkie gave their lives in the effort to make us realize that this is, indeed, one world. The atomic bomb punctuated their statements with an explosion that will be heard round the world for eons to come.

After all, the inter-relation of East and West is plain for all of us to see. The aggressions of the Axis began in 1931 when Japan raped Manchuria. They came to their peak with Hitler's aggressions in Europe. They swung back to the Pacific with the attack on Pearl Harbor and the Philippines. There is no real dividing line, no Sunday-Monday line in world affairs. We know now that if a full-scale war were to start on one continent it would rapidly spread to all continents and become World War III. And once again the Filipino tao, the Belgian factory worker, the African tribesman, and the American lecture-goer, would find themselves horribly involved. How many would survive? I do not know. Neither do the scientists who worked on the Manhattan project.

All over the world, there are certain present or potential local problems which are in reality world problems. In Asia, to my view, there are four such problems.

THE PROBLEM OF CHINA

The first of Asia's problems is China.

Let us try to stick to the simple facts as we discuss the problem of China. What are they, these simple facts? Foremost, I suppose, would be the very size of the country, both in area and in population. China is a huge land, and its population is so great that nobody knows exactly how many millions of Chinese there really are. In our own time, these hundreds of millions of human beings living in this vast land have suffered misery upon misery. Never have they known a strong, democratic, progressive government that could protect them, promote their welfare, improve their lot. Never have they been free from the specter of outside aggression, of periodic famine and suffering, of unceasing civil war. The people of China are impoverished, and for the most part illiterate. They cannot be blamed for these things. They have been the victims of their own situation—of their ancient history, of the richness of their land, of alien greed, of their own numbers.

In the past generation, China was reborn. In the spirit of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, the people regained their self-respect, their pride, their aspirations, their hope for a decent future. Through the 8 years of unceasing warfare with Japan, it was this spirit that kept the Chinese going. There were times when they seemed to be fighting alone, when they seemed to have lost the friendship or at least the support of the outside world, when the mountain trails that linked them with the rest of the world were blocked by the greedy forces of Japan. But China had been reborn, and she was spiritually strong enough to fight on. Through all time to come, the world must pay tribute to the courage of China.

INTERNAL DISSENSIONS IN CHINA

Part of the penalty of war making is the fact that nations must, as a matter of policy, delude themselves. We of the United Nations deluded ourselves into believing that the war and the ultimate victory might solve the problems of internal dissension in China—that a people who had gone through so much together might somehow be able to unite in the easier stresses of victory and peace.

We know now that this was a wartime illusion. China today is more clearly split than it has ever been.

The Kuomintang, the Nationalist Party of China, is the legal, recognized Government of China. Its leader is the President of China. Chiang Kai-shek has indeed stood for years as the symbol of a China that could never be defeated. His government has consistently fought the Japanese, and in the process it has been forced to relegate domestic problems to a secondary role. It has not yet faced up to the economic and social problems that plague the land. It has taken the first faltering steps toward democratization of China's political life. But it is moving very slowly—too slowly.

To the north in Yenan, are the Communists. They have adopted a program of land and tax reforms, and they, too, have waged war against the Japanese. But they are adherents of an authoritarian system of government which does not gibe with the freedoms which we of the democratic nations have come to take for granted.

These two factions must be brought together Perhaps that is an impossibility. Perhaps the differences are so great that they cannot be bridged. Perhaps the moment of conciliation and compromise has passed. If that is true, then civil war in China will continue and expand, and it may in the end engulf us all.

We must make one last try.

GENERAL MARSHALL'S IMPORTANT MISSION

We must attempt to encourage the Kuomintang to carry out the sweeping reforms which will bring it halfway to the Communist position—and which will, more important still, benefit the people of China. For there is pressing need for land and tax reform in China, for an overhauling of the archaic social and economic system, for the program of universal education which alone can establish a literate, well-informed electorate.

We must, at the same time, attempt to encourage the Chinese Communists to meet the Kuomintang at least halfway. For there is also a pressing need in China for political democracy and personal freedom, and for a recognition of the rights of all classes in the society.

We must make the one, final effort to avert chaos in China. That is why General Marshall's mission to Chungking is in a sense as important as his wartime role of Chief of Staff. That is why every sensible person in the world hopes that he will be as successful an ambassador as he was a Chief of Staff.

On him—the representative in China of the most influential democracy—falls a great task. He will have the job of helping China to help herself, of helping China to become democratic, united, and strong. I mention the word "strong" last, for China's strength will inevitably follow if, she is both democratic and united.

THE PROBLEM OF JAPAN

The second immediate problem of Asia is Japan.

We have defeated her in war. We must consolidate our victory in peace.

In the Potsdam Declaration, the people of Japan were told how far the United Nations were prepared to go in the regeneration of their country. "There must be eliminated for all time," reads the Potsdam Declaration, "there must be eliminated for all time the authority and influence of those who have deceived and misled the people of Japan into embarking on world conquest, for we insist that a new order of peace, security, and justice will be impossible until irresponsible militarism is driven from the world."

I take these words to mean exactly what they say. Our purpose in Japan today is to make sure that she will never again break the peace. This means that Japan must never again be permitted military power. It also means that, whatever economic and political and social system emerges in Japan, she must never again be permitted to hold a high place in the realm of economic power.

Japan itself is a country poor in natural resources. Perhaps the greatest of these is the mountainous terrain, and the rushing streams fed by heavy rainfalls. Japan is an ideal country for the development of hydroelecric power; before the war the country was second only to the United States and Sweden in Nation-wide electrification. In this electronic age of atomic energy, this is a vitally important resource. It must be controlled sternly and intolerantly.

THE EVIL CONCEPTS REMAIN

But hydroelectric power is not Japan's most valuable resource. That resource is sheer manpower—not a few million farmers and a few million laborers, but 70,000,000 industrious, energetic men and women and little children, all of whom are trained to spend long hours at hard work for little pay. That is Japan's greatest strength today, and it must never be overlooked.

Indeed, the question of Japan is not much more than the question of keeping its manpower powerless. We do not want to starve the people of Japan as they starved their victims in the Philippines. We do not even want to cut Japan entirely away from participation in world trade as she cut away the lands unfortunate enough to have fallen for a time into the orbit of the so-called Greater East-Asia Coprosperity Sphere. But we certainly do not want to allow Japan to become strong again.

We must remember that in the Far East material destruction can never outweigh spiritual strength. Tokio may be rubble and Hiroshima a ghastly cavity. But the people remain, and they carry within their brains the evil concepts that have been taught to them for generations. They are not repentant. Today America's occupation forces hold sway in Japan. The fuse has been removed from the dynamite. But the dynamite is still there. It can still explode.

THE PROBLEM OF COLONIAL AREAS

The third immediate problem of Asia is the problem of the colonial areas.

All over colonial Asia there is unrest. In India, riots. In Indochina, a revolutionary government and the prospect of more fighting. In Indonesia, an all-out struggle between the Indonesians and the British and the Dutch. In Burma and Malaya, ill-concealed dissatisfaction.

Two nations are responsible for this tremendous upsurge of nationalist feeling. Two nations are responsible for the flame of revolt that has swept over southeast Asia. Two nations are responsible for the revolutionary realization that all human beings—no matter what the color of their skins—do have a right to control their own destiny. These two nations have been bitter enemies. One has stood for freedom, the other for slavery. One is the United States of America. The other is Japan.

With all her evil ambitions, with all her brutality and her arrogance, Japan unwittingly touched a spark of pride in many embittered, rebellious hearts in Southeast Asia. During the first 6 months of the war, when Japan's armies were sweeping almost unchecked—except on Bataan—southward over the colonial areas, a new realization came to these subjugated peoples. They understood, perhaps for the first time, that the white man was only human, that he was neither invincible nor infallible, that he did not rule by divine right but rather by the force of his arms, his wealth and his ability.

THE RESIDUE OF JAPAN'S INITIAL VICTORIES

When the Tokyo propagandists spoke, during the war, of "Asia for the Asiatics," they really meant "Asia for the Japanese." Their aim was to substitute their own brand of vicious imperialism for western colonialism. But the residue of their attempt is quite

different. By their early victories, by the implications of their propaganda, they have left in southeast Asia—not a pro-Japanese cancer—but the seeds of self-respecting nationalism, the kernel of desire for liberty and self-government.

Do not misunderstand me. I am not giving the Japanese credit for anything. I am merely saying that this development, which was never really intended by the Japanese, was an inevitable result of their early victories, their propaganda, and in fact of the very length of the Pacific War.

At the same time the yeast of American influence has been rising steadily throughout colonial Asia. Perhaps most Americans do not realize how great an influence their own country has exerted in that part of the world. The simple truth is that the United States has opened the eyes of the peoples of Asia by her policies in the Philippines.

ADVENTURE IN COOPERATIVE STATESMANSHIP

Forty-five years ago the United States launched an experiment in colonialism without parallel in the history of the world. Her goal was not subjugation, not exploitation, but liberation. Rapidly, through the years, with American help, we of the Philippines learned the ways of self-government, of democracy, of national development, and of national pride. The Philippines became a breath-taking adventure in cooperative statesmanship. Literacy in the Philippines soared. Participation in government became universal. Trade prospered, industry and agriculture thrived, until our standard of living was the highest in the Orient. All over the Orient the people watched this new experiment with undisguised fascination. When war came they saw that we willingly and wholeheartedly resisted the Japanese—and they know that they themselves did not have so much to fight for as we Filipinos did.

America's policy in the Philippines lies behind the events in Indonesia, in Indochina, in Burma and Malaya, and India. And the question that now faces you in America is a simple one: "You say that freedom is good for you Americans. You say it is good for the Filipinos. Can you say that it is not good for the Indonesians, the Burmese, the Indochinese, and all the rest of us?" A billion pairs of eyes look to the United States for the answer to this question that your own policy has encouraged them to ask.

AMERICAN PATTERN IS SOLUTION

For myself, I believe that the solution to the problem of colonial Asia today is a solution involving all of the United Nations, but along American lines. It may be that some of these rebellious peoples are not yet fully prepared for immediate independence. If that is the case, it is because the powers controlling their homelands have not assisted them in the way that America assisted the Filipinos. It is because they have not afforded these people access to that prime requisite of democratic self-government, universal and free education. It is because they have not raised the level of public health. It is because they have not permitted these people to take part in the trade and industry of their own homelands. It is because they have not consistently increased the local participation in local government.

UNITED NATIONS GUARDIANSHIP

In all honesty, I do not believe that the colonial powers of Europe can be expected to remold their policies along American lines. There is no evidence that they have any such intention. It is, on the other hand, quite possible that by force of arms they may—for a time—put down the insurrections that have broken out in colonial Asia. But those insurrections will thunder again and again. During the 350 years of Spanish rule in the Philippines, my own people averaged one revolt every 2 years. Not until the end of the last century did we begin to succeed against Spain, at the very moment when Dewey was sailing into Manila Bay.

Last spring, in San Francisco, there was intense interest in the trusteeship provisions that were finally written into the Charter of the United Nations. Those provisions express the civilized world's intention that subject peoples shall be encouraged toward ever greater self-government and ultimate independence.

For those peoples of colonial Asia who are not fully prepared for immediate independence, the time has come to carry out the intentions of the United Nations. Let these peoples be placed under the generous guardianship of the United Nations Organization. Let the conscience of the world take responsibility for their education, their economic development, their political development. Let a definite date be set for their assumption of full sovereignty, their unconditional membership in the family of free nations. And let the promise be kept.

THE PROBLEM OF PHILIPPINES REHABILITATION

The fourth immediate problem of Asia is the problem of Philippine rehabilitation.

I shall not retell the story of the Philippine war record. The simple fact is that the American flag was flying over our islands when Japan attacked in December 1941. Of our own free will, our people rose in defense of our country and of your flag. Americans and Filipinos fought side by side, and for months the Japanese timetable of conquest was heroically delayed. Even when the Japanese were in nominal control of the Philippines, the underground and the wide-sweeping guerrilla forces of the Philippines carried on the fight. Throughout the war, there were spots in the Philippines which remained free soil. The story of the Filipino guerrilla has been recounted often. But it has not yet been fully told. When it is, the world will thrill with pride at a moral courage that belongs, not only to the Filipino people, but to all mankind.

Elsewhere in Asia, all of the other brown peoples were watching to see what would happen to their kinfolk in the Philippines They were anxious to know what would be the reward of the Filipinos—whether we would be cast off as stepchildren once the need for us was ended, or whether we would receive the assistance we need in order to rebuild our ravaged land, whether America would keep her plighted word contained in the pledge of President Roosevelt: "I give to the people of the Philippines my solemn pledge that their freedom will be redeemed and their independence established and protected." To us, liberation has meant utter destruction. Manila is no more. Our country is in ruins. We have suffered more devastation, perhaps, than any other United Nation in the world.

AMERICAN PRESTIGE INVOLVED

American prestige throughout Asia is involved in Philippine rehabilitation. We need American help, in the form of understanding and patience, in the form of technical advice and assistance, in the form of trade and commerce, in the form of compensation for the war damages suffered by our people under your sovereignty, in the form of physical relief and physical reconstruction. Last month, our President, Sergio Osmeña, was here in Washington to discuss the problems of mutual help between the Philippines and the United States during this postwar period of rebuilding and rehabilitating. There are before the Congress of the United States two bills covering this matter. I hope they will be acted upon immediately. Not only is our own future bound up in these bills, but also the very prestige of the United States and perhaps the very peace of the Orient and of the world.

These, then, are the four great problems of Asia—China, Japan, colonial Asia, and Philippine rehabilitation. They have in common something more than their geographical locality.

AMERICA'S NEW STATUS AS WORLD LEADER

In every single case, the strength, the moral power, the prestige, and the safety of the United States is deeply involved. The future of China hangs upon the actions of your new Ambassador. The future of defeated Japan depends upon the policy of the commander of your occupation forces. The future of colonial Asia is bound up with your national conscience. The future of the Philippines hinges on the fulfillment of the commitments you made to us before and during the war.

It is not for me to tell you what American foreign policy should be. I have only the right to tell you what your involvement is in the part of the world with which I am personally familiar.

I can say to you now that your new status as a world leader has thrust upon you responsibilities which you cannot shirk. Even if you had no policy, that in itself would be a policy, and it would have very definite and predictable consequences.

For myself, I have known my brother Americans too long to have any doubts about where the United States will stand in dealing with these problems. You will do your best to make China democratic, united and strong. You will do your best to prevent Japan from ever again disturbing the peace. You will do your best to help the cause of freedom in colonial Asia. You will do your best to fulfill your responsibilities in the Philippines.

More than that, no man anywhere has a right to ask of you.

Congress Beware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the Lawrence Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., on Saturday, December 15, 1945:

CONGRESS BEWARE

The proposed merger of all the armed forces of the United States into one War Department is too drastic and revolutionary to be passed upon impulsively or with undue haste.

The Congress of the United States might best serve all interests by setting aside this important and highly controversial proposal at least until such time as they officially terminate the war just won.

The heat of war has not yet subsided, our men in all branches of the armed services are not yet all back from the scenes of their triumphs, and the Nation is facing postwar and economic problems that are far more pressing than that of the proposed merger. Rushing such a merger as that proposed into reality could have serious and far-reaching consequences that might be avoided by giving it the careful consideration that it demands at a time when there are less diverting influences than just now.

The Army, the Navy, the Air Corps, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, and any other agencies or branches of the armed forces that might be affected have too much at stake, as well as the Nation itself, to

allow any wave of hysteria to prevail and rush such a potentially dangerous merger into being without the most complete study and consideration and the coolest deliberation and final action.

Hearings upon this proposed merger now being held are greatly overshadowed and cast into the background because of the more sensational hearings in connection with the Pearl Harbor investigation. The most brilliant leaders of all branches of the armed forces are expressing themselves in the interest of national security. It is true, however, that many of those heroic leaders have hardly had time to rest their weary brains and tired bodies from the ravages of war when called upon to express their convictions and beliefs relative to the better plan for national security in the future.

The outstanding World War II heroes are magnanimous in their reviewals of the greatest military activity and strategy of all time. All seem to agree that no one branch of the armed forces could rightfully claim a preponderance of credit for victory. It is generally agreed that more than ever before the ultimate success was due more to the cooperation of forces than anything else. There were some mistakes and they, as well as the brilliant successes, must be taken into consideration in shaping any changes in national security policy and operations.

The records and traditions of all branches of service should be carefully weighed before any definite action is taken. The brilliant men who guide the policies of the Army, Navy, Air Corps, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard must not ruthlessly be cast into a common military leadership pool. Any reorganization of the world's victorious and most powerful war machine should be done slowly and surely. Let things cool off a bit, allow the men who know to get rested and refreshed, hear the whole story calmly and without hysteria, and then the best plan for future national security will result.

The Members of Congress must not allow themselves to be stampeded into taking action that could result in a concentration of military authority into a dangerous dictatorship. There is no imperative rush to this proposed change in a most vital agency of our democratic government. Other matters of greater immediate importance need not be neglected by the Congress to give attention to the merger proposal.

The rushing through of such a major and drastic program is definitely not in keeping with the highest principles of democracy.

British Loan Proposal Is Unbusinesslike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial of December 7, 1945, from the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle. Jesse H. Jones is the president of the company publishing this daily paper of the great Lone Star State. The editorial sets forth a viewpoint on the British loan proposal which is informative and practical. It follows:

BRITISH LOAN PROPOSAL IS UNBUSINESSLIKE

United States negotiators have proposed that we make a loan to the United Kingdom of $3,750,000,000, to be repaid in 50 annual installments from 5 to 55 years, largely at the convenience of the British. No interest is to be charged on the loan for 5 years, and thereafter the rate will be 2 percent per annum. Allowing 5 years interest free, the average interest rate on the loan will be 1.62 percent, assuming that the interest will be paid continuously after 5 years. There is, however, a provision in the loan agreement that no interest will be charged in any year where the United Kingdom has an unfavorable international exchange position. If this should happen every year, we would get no interest whatsoever. If it happened in one-half of the years our average interest rate would amount to less than 1 percent.

During the past few years the United States Treasury has been borrowing money from its citizens at an average interest rate of 1.92 percent, so that on the interest alone, assuming that we make the loan and that the British pay it, and pay the interest in full, we will have a very substantial loss in the difference between the interest we collect from the British and the interest we pay our own citizens for the borrowed money.

In addition to the loan of $3,750,000,000, the terms and conditions of which bear little, if any, relationship to business principles, our negotiators have agreed to accept Britain's notes for $650,000,000 in full settlement of our unpaid $25,000,000,000 lend-lease account and all our investments, materials, and surpluses in England. Obviously this is tantamount to a gift.

In consideration of our making this very large loan at a great sacrifice to our own taxpayers, the British agree that—manana—within 1 year after the loan has been ratified by our Congress and approved by the British Parliament they will eliminate the dollar pool which they now control, thereby enabling countries of the British Empire to use their current dollar receipts without restriction. In other words, if Australia or India, or some other member of the Empire, should sell us something and get dollars for it, such country could then use the dollars any way it wished. With the dollar pool in effect such countries can only use those dollars at the pleasure of Britain. They must give Britain the dollars and accept sterling.

There is nothing in the agreement to indicate that the United States will receive anything in the nature of foreign bases, raw materials, communications, or other concessions.

In connection with the loan agreement Secretary of State Byrnes has issued a beautifully written white paper containing many laudable and desirable aspirations with respect to world trade. While recognition of this white paper is made by the British, they are not signatories to it. They agree to undertake to help us work out world-wide multilateral agreements governing such things as tariffs, cartels, qoutas, and production, to be administered by an international trade organization. But these are only promises to "try" to help work out agreements with the other 48 countries of the United Nations. Bluntly stated, the British will only cooperate in working out world trade agreements if we lend them $3,750,000,000 and settle our lend-lease account, and give them title to our hundreds of millions of investments and materials in Britain on a 55-year note. If it costs this much to get the cooperation of Britain in world trade, what will it cost to get the cooperation of the other 48 countries of the United Nations?

If we must continue to help the British temporarily, let's do it by selling them our agricultural products—cotton, grain, meat, tobacco, etc.—on easy credit until the world gets more settled, and we can see our own way a little better, and let's see what we are to get in return. Fifty-five years is much too long.

Disposition of Surplus Property

REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, on November 26 I introduced a bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944—H. R. 4793. Its sole purpose was to give to veterans an undiluted priority on surplus commodities that they want to purchase.

My remarks on the floor of the House in connection with this legislation called attention to the fact that time was of the essence. Delay will nullify our pledge to our fighting men that they shall have a real and not a fictional right to purchase surplus war materials. Mr. Stuart Symington, the Surplus Property Administrator, in testifying Wednesday before the Surplus Property Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, endorsed this legislation.

H. R. 4793 is not revolutionary legislation. It is not even a comprehensive overhauling of the Surplus Property Act. It simply proposed to eradicate an obvious error in law. Rectification of that error cannot wait. A democracy to be effective must be responsive to the will of the people—not yesterday or tomorrow, but today. I respectfully urge your help today.

Mr. Symington's statement, in part, follows:

Are there any changes that could be made in the provisions of section 16 that would help get goods into the hands of the veterans? Two changes have been suggested.

As we have pointed out, under the present statute the veterans' preference is subordinate to the priority claims of Federal agencies, and State and local governments. It has been suggested that the veterans should be given a priority that comes ahead of all claims except those of Federal agencies. Representative LYNDON JOHNSON has introduced a bill to make this change.

In the case of property which will always be in short supply and for which there will be large demands by both veterans and the present priority claimants—for example, trucks, jeeps, and passenger cars—this change would help the veterans. For that reason we favor it. It should be understood, however, that this change would not solve the most important problem—that of outlets. An A-1 priority will help the veteran but it will still leave him with the basic problem of finding the kind of property he wants, in usable condition, and in a location where he can inspect before buying. If this change is made in the statute, therefore, it should be recognized that most of the present problems will still remain to vex us.

The present statute also restricts the veteran's right in another way. The veteran can buy only to establish and maintain his own small business, agricultural, or professional enterprise. We have construed this provision liberally. We have held that a veteran can buy property to use in this business or profession even though he is employed by others, provided, of course, that the property is of a kind that the veteran might reasonably be expected to furnish when he is employed by others. Even so, the veteran cannot buy for his personal use. He can buy office furniture, but not dining-room

furniture. He can buy a car if he is a salesman, but he cannot buy one merely for his personal use.

There does not seem to be a great deal of sense in this distinction. Representative LYNDON JOHNSON'S bill would abolish the distinction and let the veteran buy for his own use. We are in favor of this change provided, of course, it is understood that the Surplus Property Administration must have some authority to limit the amount of property any one veteran can buy. This is necessary because of the limited amounts of some kinds of property that will be available. Here again, however, it should be understood that this change in the statute will not solve our basic problem of getting goods into the hands of the veterans.

In conclusion we should remember this: All of us agree that the veteran should have a preference. But goods are not distributed by statements of principle or by statutes no matter in what detail or with what precision they are drawn. The problem of distribution is a problem of administration and operation. In our private economy goods are distributed through an elaborate and intricate series of relationships—relationships that are the result of years of experience and that involve the services of millions of people. The system of private distribution is not so arranged that it can easily give a priority or a preference to one group of ultimate buyers as against another. In the intermediate stages of distribution it is true there are different prices to different levels of trade—but these practices are not designed to give one group of ultimate consumers a preference against another. By our new wholesalers' plan we are trying to make use of these recognized differences in levels of trade. Whether we shall succeed remains to be seen.

If the new wholesalers' plan is not successful, then in our judgment there will be only one way left for the Government to attempt to carry out section 16: it will have to try to distribute property directly to millions of veterans on a Nation-wide basis. To do this the Government must undertake to duplicate in a small way the private distribution system which as we have said, is the result of years of experience and involves the services of millions of people.

It is not surprising that our attempts so far to deal with this problem have not been successful. We must try to solve it—but the public interest will be served if all of us admit the difficulties, so that neither people generally nor the veterans in particular, will believe that the task is easy or that our failures have been intentional.

Guam Soldiers Need Additional Food

REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, evidently our boys on the island of Guam are not getting enough to eat, according to recent letters received; and I would suggest that both the Chief of Naval Operations and the War Department investigate the situation and see that these boys are well fed.

It is bad enough that they should be isolated on the island of Guam. Certainly, there is no reason why they should not be fed a good and a sufficient amount of food—all they can eat.

One of the letters, signed "The Forgotten Men," is as follows:

If possible I would ask you to take pity on we poor enlisted men who are stuck in the One Hundred and Thirty-fourth C. B. on Guam and find out why they are torturing us with such lousy chow for the last 4 weeks. I wish somebody would find out what chow the officials are using up and why the enlisted man isn't entitled to the same portion. They have a bunch of kids on the chow line with instructions not to give us an extra helping if we ask for it. I walk away from chow every day hungry.

You probably saw in the movies and in the different literature that the Navy puts out about the wonderful Navy chow. There is no evidence of it in the One Hundred and Thirty-fourth C. B. on Guam. I can't understand why, now that the war is over, the Navy is giving us such bad treatment during our last remaining days in the service.

Another letter was forwarded to me by the parents of a boy on Guam, and I quote excerpts from it:

I got in the chow line tonight at 5:30 and it was 7:30 before I got into the chow hall. So you can see there are a lot of men here. Of course, this is a receiving station, but there are still more men over here than they know what do do with. They are trying to find a place to put us now, and they can't do it. I was talking to a kid today who just left the States and he said they went to Pearl Harbor, Okinawa, and Japan, and no one would take them, so they came here to Guam and are now waiting for some place to go.

Evidently something has gone wrong at Guam. They either have too many men on the island and not sufficient food or somebody is getting careless about the situation in not seeing that these boys are given the proper amount of food.

We certainly get ourselves worked up and concerned about feeding the rest of the world and appropriate millions and millions of dollars. Therefore, I can see no reason in the world why we should not be looking after our own boys in the South Pacific and seeing that they are well fed.

A Plea for Action on Philippine Island Rehabilitation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARLOS P. ROMULO
RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that some time ago the Senate unanimously passed the Philippine rehabilitation bill, which appropriates funds for compensation of Philippine war damages, and for restoration of public works destroyed by the war. The bill also provides for the transfer to the Philippine Government of surplus properties now in the islands, and for the training of a number of Filipinos in various technical fields.

This bill has not yet been voted on by the House of Representatives. Every day I receive frantic messages from Manila, asking about its status. For the truth is that we cannot begin to rebuild and rehabilitate in the Philippines unless this help is given to us.

I am, therefore, presuming to appeal to the Members of the House of Representatives, and to the American people, for speedy action on this legislation.

By now every Congressman must know the basic facts behind this legislation. Compensation for war damages suffered in the Philippines is not a matter of a gift from the United States but rather a matter of simple justice to those who suffered because the Japanese attacked our country when it was under American sovereignty.

The surplus war materials which would be transferred to us are in the Philippines now. They cannot be used by the American forces, for they no longer have any need for these materials. They cannot be shipped back to the United States right away because of the expense and because all available shipping space must be used to bring high-point troops home for discharge. They are in the Philippines now, and day after day, in our tropical climate, these materials are rusting, spoiling, or rotting. They could aid immeasurably in the rehabilitation of the Philippines.

Eighteen million Filipinos look to the United States for the immediate help that was promised to them during the war and since the war. Unless this legislation is adopted, we will not be able to start our program of reconstruction. Unless it adopted quickly, thousands will suffer and even die, while delay after delay stifles the help that everyone agrees we should receive.

I do not believe that, after the war record we have written with our blood and tears, we need argue the justice of our case. We know that the United States has every intention of accepting its responsibility to the Filipino people. Already the Senate has voiced half of the will of the United States. Now it is up to the House of Representatives. I cannot believe that trifling reasons will postpone the full expression of America's conscience.

We ask that the Members of the House act now to fulfill America's commitment, prevent further human suffering, and start the Philippines along the road of reconstruction. A single month, even a single week, of further unnecessary delay will cause untold havoc in our precarious economy.

We are not alone in this plea. The Washington Post yesterday morning published the following editorial:

RESUSCITATION

Recently we urged Congress to make a more generous settlement of war damage claims in the Philippine Islands than is provided in the Tydings bill That measure authorizes the expenditure of $450,000,000 to aid the Filipinos in getting back on their feet. War damage in the islands is estimated at $800,000,000. Since the Philippines are still part of the United States and their people fought valiantly to expel the Japanese foe, we can see no reason why full restoration should not be made, except to collaborators, with the proviso that the funds be reinvested in Philippine enterprise.

We recognize, however, that speed in getting this work of rehabilitation under way may be even more important at this time than the specific amount of the claims recognized. The Senate passed the Tydings rehabilitation bill on December 5 by unanimous consent. Unless the House acts before the beginning of the congressional recess this week the year in which the war ended will pass without anything tangible being done toward Philippine rehabilitation. That would be a tragic set-back for American policy in the islands. Consequently, we urge the Insular Affairs Committee and the House itself to speed the enactment of this humanitarian measure before the Christmas holiday.

In part, this proposed aid to the Filipinos represents turning over to them surplus war materials which cannot be returned to this country without heavy expense. A large part of the cash outlay will be covered by the $220,000,000 collected by the Government in war-damage insurance premiums. It is quite reasonable that the insurance fund be used for this purpose, since most of the war damage in American territory was sustained in the islands. Senator TYDINGS pointed out, moreover, that General MacArthur ordered the Filipinos to destroy their bridges, machinery, and other property in order to cripple the Japs while the war was on. Certainly we have a clear obligation to make good these losses.

Senator TAFT expressed confidence that "throughout the Far East we shall receive from our contribution, because of our accomplishment in finishing the great job we have done in the Philippine Islands, a credit which will amount to far more than any money which we are called upon to spend under this bill." Part of that credit will be lost, however, if the House haggles over the bill or permits it to drag over into next year. The war is over; the work of reconstruction ought to be under way. Don't let it be said that we have weakened the faith and determination of the Filipino people and their neighbors by either indecision or inaction at the right moment. The Filipinos have years of hard reconstruction work ahead of them and only 6 months to go before their independence will come into effect. For their sake and our own, we ought to crowd into each of those 6 months a maximum of cooperative effort.

Mr. Speaker, the American organs of public opinion have expressed themselves vigorously in favor of quick action on the Philippine legislation now pending before us. Two American newspapers, one the Oregonian, representing the viewpoint of the Pacific coast, and another the Rochester Times-Union, voicing the opinion of the east coast, published as their leading editorials a few days ago the following articles:

[From the Oregonian, of Portland, Oreg., of December 7, 1945]

OUR DEBT TO THE FILIPINOS

There is one debt which the people of the United States will pay gladly and gratefully, and that is a bill for war damages to the Philippines. The Senate has passed and sent to the House a measure authorizing $450,000,000 for that purpose. The Senate's Territories Committee scarcely needed an eloquent appeal from Gen. CARLOS P. ROMULO, Filipino war hero and Resident Commissioner, to increase the original figure of $100,000,000.

Money will never repay our obligation to the Filipino people, who were our wards and whom we left defenseless to suffer the brutal occupation of the Japanese. Our brave allies never lost faith in the United States, nor we in them. In battle beside American soldiers on Bataan, in guerrilla bands raiding from the hills, by assistance and protection of American prisoners of the Japs, and by the intelligence they provided to prepare for the return of General MacArthur, the Filipinos have forged unbreakable bonds between their nation and ours.

With our help the Philippine Commonwealth will restore its economy and become one of the great small nations of the world. In the world history of empires, colonies, and protectorates, the relations of the United States and the Philippines stand out as a beacon.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union of December 11, 1945]

LIBERATING PHILIPPINES IS ONLY HALF OUR DUTY

The lecture visit of Brig. Gen. CARLOS P. ROMULO, Resident Commissioner of the Philippines, reminds us of how often the course of history has been changed by inaction. A case could be made out that neglect, indifference, and unconcern have changed relations between peoples more profoundly than more dramatic actions.

There should be no indifference or unconcern about the Philippines. Nowhere under the American flag at any time have all the horrors of war been written in the people's blood as in the Philippines. Their men fought at our side, their women and children were bayoneted, their cities ravaged.

Okinawa was bad. But if the Filipinos had not been the loyal people that they are, the Okinawa campaign, so costly in American lives, would have been repeated 10 times over.

So next July 4 the Philippines will be free, not as a reward, but as the logical culmination of a long-time policy.

That by no means ends our responsibility. The independent Philippines will still occupy as close a relation to the United States as any State in the Union.

Under the joint resolution of June 29, 1944, the United States will construct and maintain in the Philippines great sea and air bases which will push the spearhead of our defense 5,000 miles west.

These bases limit the independence of the Philippines in foreign policy and in the power to declare war or even to remain neutral. And they impose on us the duty of keeping our bases operating in an economically strong and loyal area.

Two island measures are before Congress. A Senate bill proposes payment of about a half billion in claims for war damage. Actual war damage is believed to be about twice that total. Except for claims of collaborators the total bill should be paid.

A House bill is open to dispute. It recognizes that the Filipino's standard of living is the highest in the Orient because of American tariffs. It seeks to soften the jar of independence upon Philippine economy by gradually imposing our tariffs after 8 years of free trade.

We do not believe that Congress can say that 8 years from July 4, 1946 or at any other given time, the Philippines can stand alone against the competition of the whole Orient.

Their special position in our defense scheme suggests an integrated economy, too, with free trade between us indefinitely. Meanwhile close economic cooperation should develop a division of labor between us so that products of each would supplement the other, rather than compete.

That will not be easy, for the dairy farmer doesn't want the competition of coconut oil and the beet sugar farmer doesn't want duty-free cane sugar competition.

But there are tropical staples needed here which the Philippines can produce. Patient development of complementary rather than competing trade is the only way we can fulfill our obligation and protect our bases.

Only White Woman Taken Prisoner on American Soil During World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM R. THOM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the following press release from the United States Department of the Interior:

Mrs. Etta Jones, the only white woman to be taken prisoner on American soil during World War II, has received from Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes a check for $7,374.21, representing back salary as Indian Office teacher on the island of Attu, where she and her late husband, C. Foster Jones, were captured in 1942 when the Japs seized that Aleutian outpost.

Included in Mrs. Jones' check was a salary increase which was awarded her last year upon the recommendation of the Interior Suggestions Committee when she and Mr. Jones won the Award of Excellence in absentia for outstanding valor in the face of danger. From the day that Attu was captured, their fate was never known until Mrs. Jones was found alive and well last August at Totsuka, a village near Yokohama, when General MacArthur's forces roared through after the Japanese surrender.

Mrs. Jones, now at the end of her 3½ years of wanderings as a prisoner of war, including many harrowing experiences during the few hectic days following the capture of Attu, confirmed to Secretary Ickes that her husband lost his life at the hands of his captors, although the details were never vouchsafed to her.

In her story to the Secretary and to other associates of the Department of the Interior she emphatically corrected an earlier hearsay account to the effect that her husband had trained a small band of Attu natives to resist the Japanese landing. "Of my own personal knowledge," she said, "there was never any resistance of any kind. There was nothing to resist with. My husband and one native had a shotgun apiece for game shooting, but I know that neither of them ever fired a shot at the Japs."

While Mrs. Jones' memory as to dates during her long and complete isolation from the outside world is frequently somewhat hazy, the details on the capture of Attu are indelibly stamped in her mind.

"When a Jap ship was sighted in the outer harbor on that Sunday morning, June 7, 1942," she narrated, "we were not in the least disturbed. We had been warned some weeks previously by the Navy at Dutch Harbor that Attu was a danger spot and were told to be ready for an American naval vessel to pick us up for evacuation. Naturally, everybody thought that what we saw was the long-awaited American ship.

"Pretty soon, however," she continued, "some native fishermen came in and said they had seen a lot of little ships surrounding the big ship. These, we learned later, were landing barges and had not been visible at first. Also about the same time, some natives spotted a reconnaissance plane with red circles under its wings. Then we began to suspect that something was amiss, but still we had nothing definite that invasion was near.

"About 11 o'clock we suddenly saw Jap soldiers swarming down the mountainside coming from all directions, shooting wildly as they ran. In a twinkling they were upon

us. Some shots rang through the windows of our little house, shattering the window panes. One or two natives were wounded, but there was absolutely no resistance.

"My husband at the time was at the radio sending the weather report to Dutch Harbor, as was his daily habit as operator of the radio weather station. I rushed to him and cried:

" 'The Japs are here!'

"He repeated that cryptic remark on the radio, but we never knew whether it was received, since weather conditions were bad for sending radio messages and he was broadcasting the weather report 'blind.'

"A moment later a young Jap officer entered our house, just as I was going out to give myself up. The first thing he did was storm to the radio and put it out of commission. Then he shouted to both my husband and me:

" 'Come outside, and bring nothing with you!' I did manage to pick up my glasses on the way out.

"After a complete search of our house, as well as those of the natives, we were all herded into the schoolhouse for a talk by the commanding officer. The officer gave quite a suave talk about their having 'come to release the Aleuts from American tyranny' and that they would be allowed to carry on their 'normal life'—provided—and this was repeatedly emphasized—that they obeyed orders. The Japs started right in teaching us how to bow low three times each time we met an officer.

"Late that first day the Aleut natives were allowed to return to their homes, which they found stripped of everything valuable. But my husband and I were not permitted to return to our house. We were told to go to an empty house, because, ours being the best house on the island, the Jap officers wanted it for themselves.

"I was permitted to have my own bed, but was forced to carry it myself. My husband was cuffed to one side when he tried to carry it for me. As I was lugging it along in the dark a Jap guard constantly prodded me in the back with the butt of his rifle. Once I fell down in the slippery mud (it had been raining), and then the guard kicked me in the stomach until I thought I would faint. During that trip I saw them knock my husband down three times—for no reason at all.

"That night my husband and I spent together in this barren house, with no lights or other comforts. Neither of us mentioned to the other about how we had been treated. It was simply a subject that we didn't talk about.

"Next morning the commanding officer sent for my husband to come to headquarters. I never saw him alive again. From then on my temporary abode was strictly guarded every minute, and the natives had been instructed not to talk to me.

"A day or two later, however, some of them managed to get near enough to me to whisper:

" 'We buried Mr. Jones near the church.'

"I whispered:

" 'Did you have a box?'

" 'No,' they whispered, 'we were not allowed to have a box.'

"Each day thereafter, as was his daily custom, my Jap guard would say:

" 'Your husband is well. He sends his love. We've got him where it's warmer.' "

One week later—on June 14—Mrs. Jones, still not having been told by the Japs the true fate of her husband, was taken away to Japan on a Jap ship, which evidently had been converted to war service from a tourist vessel. Mrs. Jones, in contrast with the brutal treatment on Attu, was given every consideration, even to having a well-appointed cabin to herself.

During the first few months of her captivity she was lodged at the Bund Hotel in Yokohama, and thereafter at a yacht club until she was transferred about a year ago to Totsuka.

She had been evacuated from Yokohama, she said, because the Japs had correctly suspected that Yokohama would be bombed.

During her whole time as a prisoner, Mrs. Jones said, she was never once permitted to write or receive any private messages of any sort. She and the others interned with her were never even allowed to have a radio. They were permitted to buy the Nippon Times, an English-language newspaper published in Tokyo. Naturally, all the news they got was to the effect that Japan was winning the war on all fronts.

"When the Americans retook the Philippines," said Mrs. Jones, "the Nippon Times saved face by saying the Japs had retreated from the Philippines, since they no longer had any strategic importance. Our capture of Okinawa was given similar news treatment."

Mrs. Jones and her fellow-internees used to spend considerable time at night trying to count the number of American bombers over Tokyo, where the huge incendiary fires were plainly visible.

"In the morning," she continued, "when we would ask the guards what that was lighting up the Tokyo sky last night, they would invariably reply:

" 'Oh, that was American planes burning after being shot down by Japanese antiaircraft guns."

"We would just smile. Of course, we knew better."

In spite of being constantly fed with Jap-victory propaganda, Mrs. Jones said she never had a moment's despair over the final outcome or of her eventual rescue. Only at Attu did she ever suffer any brutality or indignity at the hands of her captors.

National Service Insurance Benefits

REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, almost all servicemen are concerned these days about their national service insurance. A number of plans have been proposed to correct the present situation in regard to the national service insurance benefits. I understand a subcommittee of the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation is now making a study of this problem. I have here a statement submitted to me by a man who is in close touch with servicemen of this war. He recommends a number of changes in the national service benefits. For the benefit of the Congress and particularly the committee now studying the problem, I include this statement, together with the accompanying table:

PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE PAYMENT OF NATIONAL SERVICE INSURANCE BENEFITS

Question. Should the provisions of national service insurance, which now provides for the payment of benefits on a monthly installment basis only be changed?

Reason for suggested change: A change permitting the insured to elect whether benefits under his policy are to be paid out to his beneficiary in installments or in a lump sum should be immediately made.

To understand fully the reason for this let us look at the original motive which caused the present provision for the payment of benefits in monthly installments only to be put in force. During the First World War Government insurance provided for payment to beneficiaries in a lump sum only. It was later found that in all too many cases, where benefits were so paid, the money was either squandered or lost through unwise investment in a short period of time thus defeating the basic purpose of the Government in providing such insurance. Therefore, in order to protect the veteran's dependents and to assure them of assistance over a long period of time the present plan was set up whereby benefits are paid only in monthly installments.

During the war this was a wise and sound policy. The sale of national service insurance was universal throughout the armed forces. Virtually every man carried the full $10,000 maximum policy allowed him. The average serviceman was pleased and satisfied with the arrangement for he knew that if he was killed his widow would receive a monthly pension—entirely separate from his insurance—of $50 per month with additional allowances for his children, and this amount plus the monthly benefits from his $10,000 insurance policy would help materially to provide a permanent livelihood for his family. At that time he had no worry over his death causing an immediate expense of doctor's bills, hospital bills, and funeral expenses.

Now the situation is entirely changed. In the first place no pension is now provided for widows of war veterans who die of non-service-connected causes. Her immediate needs for ready cash with which to pay bills and funeral expenses can only be met from whatever cash—if any—and old-line insurance her husband leaves her. Her national service insurance is of no value here. From it she can expect only small monthly payments depending in amount on her age at the death of her husband and the size of the policy he was financially able to keep in force.

Obviously, even if the husband was able to keep the full $10,000 policy in force and to pay the premiums upon it the benefits his wife would receive from it would not support her or even come close to it. If his income prevented his carrying the full amount of insurance and he was forced to reduce the amount to less than $5,000 (as most veterans will have to), the monthly payments his widow would receive would be a mere pittance.

In other words, the situation that exists now and the one which existed during the war are entirely different in these respects:

1. During the war nearly every serviceman carried the full $10,000 policy and was in a financial position to do so. After conversion, with the higher premiums involved, a majority of veterans will be able to pay for only $2,000 or $3,000 policies.

2. During the war benefits were supplemented by pension payments which together would provide the serviceman's family with the bare necessities of life. There is now no such pension provision.

3. During the war the death of the serviceman did not create additional expense for his family to pay.

It is clearly apparent that the function the veteran's insurance is now called upon to perform is entirely different than it was during the war. In the first place, the average GI cannot carry more than $2,000 or $3,000 of this insurance. He needs every penny of this protection and would like to get it from National Service Insurance, but he needs to have it payable immediately upon

his death, in a lump sum, so that the bills accumulated while he was unable to work—the doctor bills, the hospital bills, and his funeral expenses—can be paid. Perhaps, if there is anything left over it will help pay the mortgage on his little home or at least provide his widow and family with a few dollars during the period of readjustment when it is most needed. That is what he needs and wants—not a pittance of a few dollars a month strung out over a lifetime.

Certainly it cannot be urged that the monthly benefits, even under a $10,000 policy, would provide reasonable support for a veteran's dependents. A mere glance at the table of benefit payments will refute this. Furthermore, it cannot be fairly said that if servicemen were satisfied with the method of payment during the war they should be now as well. The insurance benefits alone never were sufficient to support the veteran's dependants but, supplemented with the pension the total amount was reasonable. Now his widow will not only have no assistance from a pension but economic necessity will, in most instances, force him to reduce the amount of insurance he carries as well.

Summing up the whole matter I would say that the average GI was satisfied with the insurance program as set up during the war. Furthermore, most of the boys would like to carry as much of their national service life as they can afford. However, they do not feel that the method of payment meets their present need for protection and they are not interested in converting any of their insurance unless this is changed. In fact many of the boys feel that the continuation of the present policy is part of an organized plan, sponsored by insurance companies, to force them to drop national service insurance and turn to private companies for their protection. If this is the case a continuation of the present policy should certainly accomplish that result.

I cannot feel that this is the case, and if the individual veteran was permitted to elect whether his beneficiary was to receive a lump sum or monthly payments upon his death the greatest single dissatisfaction with the postwar insurance program would be eliminated.

This should be done now. Thousands of boys have already dropped their insurance. Most of them for this one reason alone. Every day that the situation goes unremedied thousands more will continue to do so. Furthermore, when such a change is effected it should be adequately publicized and every opportunity given those who have already dropped their insurance to obtain its new benefits. The insurance program during the war was satisfactory and reasonable. There is no reason why it cannot be changed to meet the requirements of peace.

Respectfully submitted:

FRED LOUIS, Jr.

HARLAN, IOWA.

Cost of national service insurance under conversion plan

Age of insured	Ordinary life	20-payment life	30-payment life
20 years	$14.56	$23.20	$18.23
25 years	16.22	25.10	19.77
30 years	18.47	27.35	21.67
35 years	21.31	29.95	24.03
40 years	25.10	33.39	27.23

Monthly benefit payments to beneficiary

Age of beneficiary at death of insured:	*Benefits per $1,000*
20 years	$3.48
25 years	3.62
30 years	3.78
35 years	3.99
40 years	4.26
50 years	5.04
60 years	6.34

Builders of the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered in May 1939, by Mr. Philip C. Ebeling, then president of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, at Valley City, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Every once in a while it is important that we return to fundamentals. Tonight I shall do just that—discuss with you the underlying philosophy of the junior chamber movement. I shall answer your question, "What is it all about?"

No doubt everyone in this room has at some time been asked the questions, "What is the junior chamber of commerce?" "Is it like a chamber of commerce, a service club, a social club?" "Just what is it?"

It is not a chamber of commerce. While we are interested generally in business and business affairs, our primary concern is not business protection, promotion, or stimulation. We are interested in many other things of a civic, educational, philanthropic, or cultural nature. A chamber of commerce is concerned with the civic as it affects business. We are concerned fundamentally with civic service.

It is not a service club. Our definition of the word "service" is broader than that of "welfare," and includes generally a man's duties and responsibilities as a citizen—the true definition of "civic." Therefore, you will find us in the forefront of programs or projects that will improve the community, State, or Nation, even though they might involve governmental action—something a service club never does.

It is not a social club, a lodge, or a fraternity. While we encourage fellowship and fraternalism among our members, we use them merely as means to an end—to get effective action by young men in worthy projects.

Therefore, when people ask you what a junior chamber of commerce is, the only answer you can give is that it is a junior chamber of commerce. It is an organization with a personality all its own.

Listen carefully, as this is the first time you have heard a comprehensive definition of a junior chamber in one sentence: "A junior chamber of commerce is a supplementary educational organization wherein the young men of Valley City may join together in a friendly spirit to inculcate civic consciousness in its membership by means of active participation in constructive projects which will improve the community, State, and Nation."

That is a junior chamber of commerce as the concept has finally crystallized. You will notice there are seven ideas expressed in it.

The first idea expressed is that it is "a supplementary educational organization." An intelligent man's education does not stop when he has completed his formal education in school or college. It is a life-long process. Until this organization was founded a young man had no organized group wherein he could broaden his knowledge or develop his skills in the company of his contemporaries. He either was forced to hopelessly compete in groups with men many years his senior or spend his leisure hours in lonely solitude or "stepping out" in pleasure haunts. In the junior chamber he can supplement his formal education in practical ways and "step in" to his full share of civic responsibility.

It has been said that education consists of three processes: (1) Acquiring information; (2) developing skills; (3) creating attitudes. Here he can acquire first-hand information on the pressing problems of community, State, and Nation. He can develop quickly his skills in leadership cooperation, working with other people, persuasiveness, tact, and all those traits and personal characteristics which will make him a man among men. He can create correct attitudes of fairness, tolerance, patience, faith. This supplementary educational process can work more efficiently, with greater speed, and with practical effect in this company of friendly contemporaries, free from artificial barriers.

The best definition of education I have heard is: "It is a preparation which enables a man to better understand his environment so that he might live in it happily and usefully." Certainly the junior chamber of commerce meets this test and can justly be called a supplementary educational organization.

The second idea expressed in the definition is that it is "a young man's organization." It is the only truly national young men's organization in this country. In 1931, we had 81 member organizations. We now have over 550 organizations with a basic membership of 110,000 young men. These exist in 44 States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, and Hawaii. We have associate members in Canada, Australia, and China. The idea has been so worth while that it has spread to 16 foreign countries. We can now proudly say, just like the British Empire, that "the sun never sets" on a junior chamber of commerce. And even more proudly we can point out that this has been builded by the voluntary effort of young men without a dime being paid to organizers.

It is strictly a young man's organization with its membership composed of, its policies determined by, and financed by young business and professional men between the ages of 21 and 35 years of age. It must always remain a young man's group, as by this age limit new leadership, membership, and activity are assured. It is a veritable fountain of youth.

It is a representative group wherein worthy young men can find a place. In it Jew and gentile, Catholic and Protestant, Democrat and Republican, rich and poor will be found working shoulder to shoulder for a common goal.

Why shouldn't young men have an organization of their own? There is too much of a tendency to underestimate the abilities of young men. The pages of history chronicle the achievements of young men. Washington was a colonel in the Virginia army when he was 19; William Pitt was Prime Minister of Great Britain when he was 24; Napoleon was Emperor of France when he was 33; McCormick had invented the reaper and Westinghouse the air brake when they were 23; Shakespeare had written ten of his greatest plays when he was 32; Sir Isaac Newton discovered the law of gravitation when he was 24; Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence when he was 34; Alexander Hamilton was Secretary of the Treasury when he was 32, and the average age of the Continental Congress, the men who conducted the Revolutionary War, was slightly below 34 years of age. Energy, enthusiasm, and willingness to try—those attributes of virile young manhood can accomplish much.

They can accomplish more by being banded together in their own organization where

those attributes are allowed free play. This idea is not new. A short time ago I was in Independence Hall in Philadelphia, the birthplace of this Nation. There I was told that Benjamin Franklin, whose name is synonymous with wisdom, when he was slightly over 21 years old, joined together with other young men of Philadelphia into a civic-service organization called the Junto Club. History records that many of the fine things Philadelphia enjoys today were started by the young men's organization—a forerunner of the junior chamber of commerce.

The third idea expressed is "in a friendly spirit." We do not operate as a cold business type of organization. We endeavor through luncheons, dinners, and social events to bring about a spirit of fellowship. The junior chamber makes acquaintances, develops friends, and keeps friendships in repair. Need I say more of the importance of this? We all recognize that friendship is "life's sweetest influence." It is desired by king and peasant alike.

The fourth idea expressed in the definition is "to inculcate civic consciousness." Here we have the fundamental purpose of every junior chamber. Personally, I can think of no more important purpose for which an organization can stand.

What can be more important than impressing people with their duties of citizenship? Too often we prate about the privileges of citizenship and overlook the duties. Too many think that they fulfill their obligations of citizenship if they pay their taxes, contribute to some worthy causes, vote and vote for the best man—or the least bad. Civic consciousness involves far more than that.

It means that we must think in terms of the general welfare and not individual welfare. An alarming tendency in this country has been the growth of class groups and blocs of all kind. We almost have government by pressure groups. Pressure groups have their proper place, but when they think in terms of their selfish end only they become a threat to democracy.

It means that we must actually put the needs of others above our own selfish interests. The outstanding thing about George Washington to me is the fact that as the richest man in the colonies, with everything material to lose and little to gain, he nevertheless, put the welfare of his countrymen above his own interests and chose Valley Forge.

It means having faith in your fellowmen, in your leaders, and in the eventual triumph of right. It means tolerance, patience, and "striving unceasingly to quicken the public sense of civic duty, that we may transmit this country not less, but greater, better, and more beautiful than it was transmitted to us," as the last sentence of the Athenian oath of citizenship from ancient Greece tells us.

"High-minded," you say. Yes, high-minded. And there will never be any permanent solution of the problems that bedevil and befuddle us until more and more individuals become high-minded. Intelligence is not enough. Knowledge is not enough. Industry is not enough. We may have any or all of these, and yet the direction in which we go may be wrong.

Laws will not solve our problems. You can't legislate goodness. James Whitcomb Riley said, "the meanest man I ever knew operated within the law." It will ever be thus with laws.

Gold will not solve our problems. The poet reminds us:

"Not gold, but only men can make
A people great and strong.
Men who for truth and honor's sake,
Stand fast and suffer long.
Brave men, who work while others sleep,
Who die while others fly—
They build a nation's pillars deep
And lift them to the sky."

It is only as more and more men accept the philosophy of life consistent with good citizenship that selfishness, greed, and thoughtlessness—those enemies of progress—will give way. Only four philosophies tug at man for his acceptance. "Know thyself," said Socrates, the Greek father of philosophy—knowledge is the highest good. "Be thyself," said Marcus Aurelius, the Roman stoic—personal virtue—as long as I am personally good—that is the highest good. "Exalt thyself," said Nietzsche, the German realist—power—the power that comes from position and money—that is the highest good. But the philosophy of citizenship and the most important one was uttered by a young man 33 years of age. "Give thyself," said Christ—service for your neighbor—if you give your life for him, you will not lose it. You know that philosophy of life. I submit until more and more individuals accept that last philosophy of civic consciousness very little else is of lasting importance.

Fellow Jaycees, you are therefore engaged in very important work. How important is well illustrated by this little story. A man was trying to read the newspaper one night. His small son was playing and making a terrible racket, as children often do. Finally, in desperation, the father tossed down on the floor a picture puzzle of the world cut out from a magazine and told the little boy to put it together. In just a few minutes the son reported that it was completed. The father asked him how he had managed to do it so quickly. The son replied, "Oh, that was easy. There was a picture of a man on the reverse side of the puzzle, and just as soon as I put the man together right the world came out right."

You are engaged in putting young men together right.

The fifth idea expressed is by means of active participation in projects. This is an important point—an unique contribution particularly appropriate for a group of energetic, enthusiastic young men. A junior chamber of commerce is not composed of joiners, but rather of doers. It is not another bunch of resoluters. It is not another one of these organizations that meet, eat, belch, and adjourn. It has always been, and may it always be, a project organization. Every since Henry Giessenbier conceived this idea in St. Louis in 1915, it has been dedicated to action. With the energy, enthusiasm, and willingness to try anything once, so characteristic of young men, it is proper that it should have as its motto, "It will be done." We inculcate civic consciousness by doing, not by talking about it.

In this country we seem to have a fetish for committee meetings and conferences. Too many times that meeting is the last thing ever heard of a worthy project. A familiar way of solving a problem is to appoint a committee, have a meeting, draft a report, file it away. Next year you do the same thing all over again.

Clarence Day has written an interesting little book called This Simian World. It is a soliloquizing or philosophizing on what would have happened if some other animal than the monkey had been selected as the base of the evolutionary process. He takes up these animals one by one. It might have been the tiger. Then we would have been slinky, terrifying kind of people, preying on each other, and having a great time. It might have been the cow. Then we would have been ruminative, phlegmatic, Carnation milk contented kind of people. Interesting, however, is the fact that the monkey was selected, and the outstanding characteristic of the monkey is chatter.

Lots of chatter oftentimes but very little action.

The greatest pleasure I get from traveling around the country this year is to see the many concrete evidences of the up and doingness of these young men—in Oklahoma City, to drive in the warm Oklahoma night to the beautiful Taft Stadium to hear the fine symphony orchestra, both junior chamber projects, and hear there that night the first rendition of the new Oklahoma State song, In Old Oklahoma, a State Jaycee project—in Mobile, to be driven along the beautiful Azalea Trail, a junior-chamber project that has brought a personality of its own to Mobile and thousands of tourists every year—in San Francisco to look out into San Francisco Bay, see beautiful Treasure Island rising from the bottom of the bay, and realize that it would not be there with the gorgeous Pacific Exposition thereon, except for the ingenuity, intelligence, and industry of the San Francisco Jaycees. These, and the many others I have seen in many places, are living proof of the worth whileness of this young man's organization with its inexhaustible leg power.

If I had to define a junior chamber in a phrase, the best I know is, "Young manpower at work"—emphasis on work.

The sixth idea expressed is "in a constructive manner." It isn't enough to be doing. It must be constructive and not destructive. It is hard to be constructive—easy to be destructive—hard to be for something—easy to be against things. This city is full of people who can get excited against civic improvements, but I will wager there are not many who will fight the good, long, hard fight for a thing for the public good. I often wish everybody had this little poem emblazoned on their hearts.

"I saw them tearing a building down,
A gang of men in a busy town.
With a ho-heave-ho and a lusty yell,
They swung a beam and the side wall fell.

"I asked the foreman, 'Are these men skilled,
As the men you would hire if you had to build?'
He laughed and said, 'No, indeed;
Just common labor is all I need.
I can easily wreck in a day or two,
What builders have taken a year to do.'

"I asked myself as I went my way,
Which of these roles have I tried to play?
Am I a builder who works with care,
Measuring life by the rule and square,
Or am I a wrecker who walks the town,
Content with the labor of tearing down?"

Builders—not wreckers! That is part of our "doing."

The seventh and last idea expressed in the definition is "for community, State, and Nation." Of course, the community or city is important. I heard George Verity, chairman of the American Rolling Mills Co., say that he liked to think of a junior chamber as a "philoptimists' club." Philoptimists—not optimists—meaning "lovers of cities." We desire to make our home cities "alabaster cities undimmed by human tears," as the last line of that great song America the Beautiful says. We do want to make our communities happy places where we can live, own property, and raise families.

I pity, however, the young man whose vision is circumscribed by the city limits. The problems which baffle us now, and whose solution are wrapped up intimately with our future as young men, are State and National questions. We must be concerned with them. We can't avoid them.

That is one of the reasons why your State and National organizations exist—to express the young man's viewpoint in State and National affairs and to interest you in these questions. We primarily are concerned, and do a splendid job, in giving parentage, prestige, purpose, and inspiration to member bodies. With just a fraction of the dues that comparable national organizations receive, we enable you to do a good job locally by unloosing a veritable flood of ideas and accumulated experience for you. But part of our function is to make your voice heard

beyond the confines of Valley City by joining it with the voices from hundreds of other cities in a nonpartisan, nonsectarian manner toward the solution of State and National affairs.

That is the reason why last year your national organization was one of the sponsoring groups behind the McCarran-Lea bill. That bill is called oftentimes the "bill of rights of commercial aviation." That bill, now law, resulted in the Civil Aeronautics Authority being established with powers to forward commercial aviation.

We also were one of the original sponsors behind the Pittman-Robertson bill, which was designed to force the use of conservation tax moneys for conservation purposes. The heads of the United States Biological Survey recently expressed to me their debt to us for the splendid help we gave.

That is the reason why within the past few weeks we have vigorously made known to the public officials of Arkansas, Maryland, and other States our stand for the furtherance and improvement of civil service in the public personnel.

That is the reason why this year and last year we have joined health associations in urging the passage of and proper financing of the Venereal Disease Control Act—commonly called the La Follette Act.

That is why we, as sponsors, have arranged to have introduced in the present Congress two bills. One of these would enable the Post Office Department to put a safety message on every letter as part of the stamp cancellation. The other would authorize the creation of a national defense committee, composed of the ranking members of each of the five committees of the House and Senate that would otherwise dabble piecemeal in this important question. This committee would hold public hearings in order to define just what we are trying to defend, and then operate as a unit in its solution.

That is the reason why we are now undertaking a national survey of the long-term financing needs of small- and intermediate-size businesses through our member organizations, which when completed will be turned over to the Securities and Exchange Commission and Congress as a basis for legislation in this important field.

Notice two things about these things that I have mentioned. First, that we are not a pressure group seeking to further the aims of young men only. All the things mentioned are concerned with the general welfare. We don't want any subsidy for young men. We want those things that will make this country a happier and better place for all groups. Secondly, that we, as young men, had better be interested in these significant problems. Consider the last one mentioned, for example—defense. The reason is obvious—27 to 35—we are first-class cannon fodder.

It is important that you be heard. Goethe said, "The destiny of any nation at any particular time depends upon the opinions of its men below twenty and five." Since medical science has advanced man's span of life 10 years, we may now say that the destiny of the nation will be determined by the opinions of its young men under thirty and five.

I have given you a definition of a junior chamber of commerce and its philosophy in these seven thoughts. However, I must say more about its educational value. I said before that education involves the creation of attitudes. This is the most vital of the three because it gives direction to the information acquired and the skills developed, and further because attitudes remain after the other two have departed.

It is, therefore, encouraging to discover that young men have an attitude of fairness.

Fairness will solve nearly any of the problems that bother us. If you had to boil down into one word what Americanism is, you couldn't find a better word than fairness. "Fairness is the one indispensable feature of the American tradition," recently said the Supreme Court. Just being fair about matters seems to be the crying need of the time. If businessmen want protective tariffs, if they are fair, they will consider subsidies for others. If farmers want crop control, in fairness, they will want to consider the interests of consumers. If labor insists in certain demands, in fairness, the employers' interests must be considered. Fairness implies thinking of the other fellow. It does not lend itself to supreme confidence in one side of the story. Fairness would not result in thinking of America as a grab bag, but rather as a treasure chest in which we place everything we hold dear. It would exalt the spirit of compromise, remembering that this Nation was founded in compromise.

This is not a true democracy in which we live. Democracies have always failed. It is a democracy in a republic with a limit set beyond which even the majority may not go. Every citizen has certain rights. In this type of government we must have a spirit of fairness developed to the highest degree. Isn't it encouraging to know that an attitude of fairness is being instilled successfully in the young men of America?

Young men also have an attitude of optimism. They have faith and confidence in the future. Skeptics often say to us when they look at some of our committees, "You young fellows are crazy. You can't do anything about that problem, or that problem, or that one." They look at our public personnel standards committee, for example, and say, "Look at that one. You can't do anything about that. The spoils system is literally steeped in people's nature." It is a long, hard fight—but we have faith and confidence. Young men's faith insures progress.

Yes. We have faith and confidence even when the world is in the terrible state of affairs it is in now. And, gentlemen, it is in a bad way. Let me read to you this quotation from a well-known magazine:

"It is a gloomy moment in history. Not for many years; not in the lifetime of most men who read this—has there been so much grave and deep apprehension; never has the future seemed so incalculable as at this time. In our own country there is universal commercial prostration and panic, and thousands of our poorest fellow citizens are turned out against the approaching winter without employment and without prospect of it."

Consider this excerpt from a speech in Congress.

"We all know that the people were oppressed and borne down by an enormous load of debt; that the value of property was at the lowest point of depression; that ruinous sales and sacrifices were everywhere made of real estate; that relief laws were adopted to save the people from impending destruction; that deficit in the public revenue existed; and that our commerce and navigation were threatened with complete paralysis."

Do those sound familiar to you? You would swear they had been spoken or written within the past 5 or 6 years by some Jeremiah. As a matter of fact, the statement from the magazine is from Harpers of the year 1857—82 years ago, and the speech in Congress was by Henry Clay in the year 1832—107 years ago.

Why shouldn't these young men have faith and confidence? Certainly they recognize history does make carbon copies of itself, and that the bitterest controversies of today will be mere footnotes in the history books of tomorrow. They are a part of a movement that is trying to create attitudes of faith, reverence, self-reliance, tolerance, good will, persistent striving—those pioneer qualities that will solve any problem, regardless of how imponderable the solution may seem.

I address my concluding remarks primarily to the older men present. When I say "older," I refer to those over 35 years of age. We know that a man may be 75 years of age and yet have the spirit of 25. Probably I should say "more experienced young men." We refer in junior chamber circles jokingly and fondly to those who pass beyond their thirty-sixth birthday as "exhausted roosters." May I say then to you "exhausted roosters" that we have no quarrel with you. We are proud of your accomplishments. We solicit your advice, your interest, your friendship. These young men are not callow youth. We trust you receive them not in the "father and son" attitude, but rather in the "older brother and younger brother" spirit. As brothers we can cooperatively do much.

I have mentioned "young men" many times tonight and stressed their virtues. Here is what Sir Francis Bacon has to say on the subject in his essays:

"Young men, in the conduct and management of actions, embrace more than they can hold; stir more than they can quiet; fly to the end without consideration of the means and degrees; pursue some few principles which they chanced upon absurdly; are reckless in innovating; use extreme remedies at first; and that which doubleth all errors, will not acknowledge or retract any. Like a badly trained horse they will neither stop nor turn."

(That should take us young fellows down a bit.) But Sir Francis continues:

"Men of age object too much; consult too long; adventure too little; repent too soon; and seldom drive things to a full completion, but content themselves with a mediocrity of success."

Then to prove the point I made of marching along together, he makes it all right by concluding:

"Certain it is good to compound employments of both because the virtues of either may correct the faults of both."

The Bible says, "Old men shall see visions; and young men shall dream dreams." We fully realize that we need your visions if our dreams are to come true. We know that you know that these dreams of energetic, enthusiastic young manhood are needed if your visions are to be immortalized.

These young men are engaged in a very serious business. From them will come the builders of the future. While all the fine young men in this community are not members of this group, certainly from ones with attitudes like these will come those who will immortalize your visions of a better world.

Back in the days of Mohammed, the prophet, people had great respect for horses with intelligence. The most intelligent ones were selected for war purposes. These war horses were trained to follow the bugle in battle. The great prophet himself had occasion to have some of these horses and went to a famous farm to make personal selections. The horses were pastured in a pasture next to the river. The prophet gave orders that the horses were to be fenced off from the river and left unwatered for 3 days. At the end of 3 days, the bars were taken down, and, of course, the horses rushed in a mad body to the water to quench their thirst. Just as they were about to plunge into the water, the bugle was sounded, and of that great number of horses only 10 answered the call of duty despite their physical needs. Those 10 constituted the beginning of the famous "prophet breed" of Arabian horses.

My point is—we seek to breed such a passion for civic service and a desire to sublimate the individual welfare for the general welfare—that from this kind of young men, this "prophet breed" kind of young men, will come the builders of the future.

Yes. Builders of the future. Builders perhaps not of material wealth achieved oftentimes by devious means and by the sacrifices of others. Builders not of a reputation attained by the cheers of the crowd and the huzzas of the thoughtless. Builders, rather, of a type of character that will seek with a hungry heart for a larger and richer life:

"Isn't it strange that princes and kings,
And clowns that caper in sawdust rings,
And common folk like you and me
Are builders for eternity?
To each is given a bag of tools,
A shapeless mass, a book of rules,
And each must build e'er life has flown,
A stumbling block or stepping stone."

Builders of stepping-stone kind of people because they are the ones who not only hold the secret of personal triumphant living, but likewise will be the builders of the future.

Doesn't it make your heart leap with joy to be able to say, "The young men of Russia are marching under the red banners of communism; the young men of Italy are wearing the black shirts of fascism; the young men of Germany are wearing the brown shirts of nazism—but, thank God, the young men of America are wearing the white shirts of constructive effort and peace in this civic service organization of and by young men, but for a better, finer, and greater America"?

The Army and Veterans' Administration Hospital Experiences of Tony J. Sloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following affidavit of Tony J. Sloss, a veteran of World Wars I and II. Nothing I might say could add or detract from it. The affidavit is as follows:

GLENDALE, CALIF., *November 25, 1945.*

To Whom It May Concern:

Statement of hospital experiences of Tony J. Sloss, Serial No. 5603187, Fifty-seventh Battery, Fifteenth Antiaircraft Sector, W. W. 1; Serial No. R-5603187, Regular Army, Company C, Eighth Infantry; Serial No. 39547358, W. W. 2:

While in training at Camp Joseph T. Robinson, with the Company A, One Hundred and First Medical Detachment, in February of 1943, I was knocked down off an 8-foot wall of the obstacle course, injuring my right shoulder. I went on sick call the next morning and was told that I had sprained my shoulder and that it would be all right in a couple of months. I received no treatment for this injury, and when I went back on sick call, as my arm pained a great deal, I was given an ounce of rubbing alcohol and instructed to massage my arm with it. This is all that was done for me.

When I complained again of pain in the shoulder the doctor, without even examining me, said, "All you want is to get out of that long hike which is scheduled for tomorrow." I made the hike—suffering great pain, as it was a very cold day—raining and sleeting. I never returned for treatment, as I knew nothing would be done for me.

Upon completion of our basic training we were transferred to the One Hundred and Sixty-second Station Hospital at Sheppard Field, Tex. I was put in the kitchen as a cook, and as my right arm kept giving me trouble I had to use the left arm for all heavy lifting.

One day one of the company doctors saw me and asked what was wrong with my right arm. I explained, and after examining me he said I had a clavicle out of place and he ordered some X-rays taken. He said that as it had been 2 months since I was injured it was too late to put the arm back in place without surgery. This was never done.

In May 1943 while preparing a meal in the mess kitchen, I moved a 20-gallon pot of potatoes with my left arm. As I did so, I injured my back so that I was unable to straighten up. My mess officer, Lt. Henry L. Douglas, and my company commander, Lt. Henry J. Guidry, Jr., had me carried to my quarters as I was unable to walk. As they were unable to get an ambulance to come for me, they ordered two other soldiers to help me to the hospital which was across the street from our barracks. Since they were unable to do anything for me at the first aid station there, they walked me to another part of the hospital to find another doctor. When we found the doctor he looked at me and without as much as touching my back ordered me to go to the therapy department for treatments. He said I had a torn ligament in my back.

I was confined to my quarters for a while and when I was able to straighten up, I returned to my work. They were very short of cooks, as the boys were taking their furloughs before going overseas and so they asked me if I could come back to help them out. I did, but continued with the therapy treatments every other day. Soon I was transferred to the Reserve Corps as I was overage and my unit was going overseas. I did not make a request to leave the service but was ordered to do so by my company commander as he felt I was too old for overseas service.

When arrangements were completed for my transfer to the Reserve Corps, June 19, 1943, I was sent to Detroit to take a position with the Ford Motor Co. They sent me to the B-24 bomber plant at Ypsilanti, Mich., where I was given a job operating a large punch press. This work proved too much for me because of the soreness in my arm and back. They sent me to their hospital for X-rays. They told me that because the injury happened before I came to work in their plant they could do nothing for me. They did, however, transfer me to another department where the work was of a lighter nature.

As the soreness and pain continued, I went to a private doctor. He, too, said that I had a dislocated clavicle, torn ligaments, and a dislocated back. He told me that it would take months of rest and a lot of sunshine to improve the condition. He suggested that I return to California as the cold climate there might cause arthritis to set in as it had been so long since I was injured and since nothing was done for me at the time of injury.

I returned to California in March 1944, and after a couple of months rest went back to work. My back and arm continued to give me trouble and in January of 1945 my back pained me so that I again went to a doctor, Dr. E. T. Remmen, of Glendale. In his opinion there was a rupture disk in my spine, and he advised me to go to the Veterans' hospital at Sawtelle.

In March 1945 I was admitted to the Sawtelle Veterans' Hospital. The first 4 weeks there were spent in taking X-rays and making diagnosis. Physiotherapy treatments, consisting of cabinet heat treatments, showers, and massage were given for several weeks. During one of these treatments, I was given a cold shower following a heat treatment. This caused my blood pressure to rise so quickly that I suffered a severe hemorrhage almost instantly. After the hemorrhage I suffered with severe headaches. The doctor ordered X-rays of my head. He then ordered me to continue with the physiotherapy treatments. When I told him the treatments seemed to make my head ache more, he told me they had been ordered for a certain length of time and that I must continue with them whether they hurt or not.

A few days later, while I was taking a treatment, the nursing office sent for me. Upon arrival at the office I was asked to sit down in a wheel chair. I did so, and was given a hypo and a pill. When I asked what all this meant I was advised that I was going down to X-ray for an examination. Without obtaining my consent or without an explanation as to what was to be done, they proceeded to remove 7 cubic centimeters of spinal fluid and inject 7 cubic centimeters of dye into my spine. From 2 to 4:30 p. m. I was X-rayed and examined. During the entire time I suffered excruciating pain.

When they put me to bed the doctor told me I was to remain there for 48 hours. The next morning another doctor came in to see me and ordered me out of bed. I got up, but it made me so sick that I was unable to get up again for a week. I was there 7 weeks when they decided to remove a small, fatty tumor from my back in the hope it might help to relieve the pain. This operation did not help at all. The doctor who ordered the removal of the tumor suggested further X-rays and study of my case. However, 2 weeks after the operation I was told there was nothing more they could do for me. Nothing at all was done for my arm during the entire 9 weeks I was there.

They released me on May 9, 1945, and suggested that I go home and rest for 3 months. If I did not improve in that time I was to return to the hospital.

The Government pension, for which I made application while I was in the hospital, was denied me. Also, I have been making payments on my life insurance during my entire period of illness, and it is my understanding that when a veteran is disabled his premium payments shall be suspended during such period of disability.

After leaving the hospital I went to a private doctor. He treated me with diathermy, massage, and the electric vibrator. After several weeks of treatments, two each week, I began to show some improvement.

On September 4 I was hit by a bus while waiting at the intersection for another car to cross in front of me. I was taken by the city ambulance to the Physicians and Surgeons Hospital in Glendale. My attending physician, Dr. F. E. Poole, ordered X-rays. There were no bones broken, but he said I was suffering from a brain concussion, injuries to my back, and possible internal injuries, and that I should remain in the hospital from 4 to 6 weeks, as I would need heat and massage treatments to my back as soon as the head injury would permit.

As I have been unable to work since the first of the year, I was not in a position financially to remain in a private hospital that long so my doctor had me moved by ambulance to the veterans' hospital at Sawtelle.

While under Dr. Poole's care I was getting hypos to keep me quiet. I was kept on a liquid or soft diet. The first meal I received after being transferred to Sawtelle consisted of a hamburger, potato salad, and a raw peach. They refused me anything to relieve the pain in my head or back, except aspirin. I was there for 5 days before they would give me a laxative. At the end of the week I was released. The doctors there said it was "an old-fashioned idea to keep patients in bed after a head injury," and that I must "get up and walk." This I did.

A week later I suffered a relapse and was unconscious for 8 hours, so Dr. Poole ordered me back to the hospital. I did not want to go back because of the treatment I had received there the other times. However, Dr. Poole said I must return to a hospital and I could not afford to go to a private one. He called Dr. Long at Sawtelle and Dr. Long assured him that if I would return I would not be placed in the admitting ward again but would be admitted directly to the neurological ward. He also promised that they

would have Dr. R. B. Raney, a neurologist, see me at once. I was taken back again by private ambulance, and instead of taking me to the neurological ward as they had promised, I was put in the admitting ward and kept there for 3 days. The second day I was there I suffered so severely with the pain in my head that it was almost unbearable. Four or five times between 10 a. m. and 1 p. m. the attendant in our ward, Mrs. Katherine Stratton, 3214 Broadway, Santa Monica, went to the nurse to ask her to give me something to relieve my pain and each time she promised but did nothing about it.

When my wife arrived at 1:30 p. m., I still had not been given anything to relieve my pain so she called the officer of the day. He immediately came in to see me and ordered a hypo which the nurse gave. They finally transferred me to the neurological ward on the fourth day. There I again asked for something to relieve my pain and was given a sterile hypo and an aspirin tablet. This, of course, gave me no relief It just so happened that when the nurse came in to give the hypo, she left a slip of paper with the names of several men in our ward, and the medication she was giving them, on my bedside table. My wife, who has spent several years working in a hospital office, picked up the slip of paper and read it. I had told her the hypos were giving me no relief at all but she could not believe it until she read it herself.

When she returned home she contacted Dr. Poole and he advised her to take me out of Sawtelle and put me in the care of a good neurologist. As soon as they found out I wanted to go home they began giving me codeine and told me they could not release me as long as I was under a narcotic. Finally at the end of two weeks after I refused the codeine, they discharged me. I had to lie to them and tell them the pain in my head was better in order to get out to seek relief from a private doctor.

Dr. Poole then referred me to Dr. J. M. Nielsen, a neurologist, who gave me a thorough examination. He then referred me to Dr. R. B. Raney, a neuro-surgeon, for further examination as he felt that I had a ruptured disk in my spine which would necessitate surgery. This is the condition for which I was first sent to the veterans' hospital by Dr. E. T. Remmen last March. Dr. Raney is of the opinion that I will have to have a spinal fusion He wishes to hold a consultation with a surgeon, who at this time is still in the service, but who expects to be released in a week or two. If they decide the surgery is necessary, it will cost me somewhere in the neighborhood of $2,000. This, of course, makes the operation impossible as I have not worked since the first of the year and have been refused my pension.

I am writing this as I feel something should be done to improve conditions existing in our veterans' hospitals. They are, we are told, the best equipped hospitals in the United States. Unfortunately, however, the patients are not allowed the advantages of this equipment as it seems the doctors are too indifferent to care whether they are taken care of or not. One of them made the remark to me the first time I was there that he hated this damn uniform and would be glad when he could get out of it. That is the attitude which seems to prevail and as long as it does, there will be little real interest in the patients' well-being. They are merely there to fill their place and draw their pay.

This is my story and there are many other boys who could tell stories just like it but who refuse to complain until the very end when they feel it is too late so what's the use. Or they take their lives in their own hands and commit suicide rather than complain.

I am writing this for the sake of the thousands of boys in our veterans' hospitals for whom I hope you may be able to use your influence to better these existing conditions.

Thanking you in advance for your kindness, I am

Sincerely,

TONY J. SLOSS,
Veteran, World Wars I and II.

Before me a notary public in and for the county of Los Angeles appeared one, Tony J. Sloss, known by me to be the person whose signature appears above, who upon being duly sworn according to law, states that the above statement is true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

R. MCCARTY,
Notary Public.

My commission expires November 16, 1946.

UNO—A Great Step Toward World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the question we are debating today is one of the most important that has ever been before the American Congress. It is true that the debate in the Senate last week, and in the House today, has not been excitihg or very controversial. Nonetheless, by the passage of the legislation, Congress is taking a great step forward on behalf of the American people in preparing to work in peaceful cooperation with the other nations of the world.

The Charter of the United Nations became operative on October 24, 1945, after it had been ratified by the other four permanent members of the Security Council. Thus the Organization which was chartered at San Francisco is becoming a living reality The next step so far as the United States is concerned is to proceed with the implementing legislation necessary to bring about our effective participation in this great work. Today we are showing that we are prepared to take a mighty step to effectuate our membership in the United Nations. Unless we do this and follow through with the other parts we are to play, we would be merely deceiving the hopes of the people of this country. The people and the Members of Congress understand clearly the consequences of the requirements of our membership in UNO. They are prepared to take the responsibilities of membership. They are willing to do whatever is necessary in order to enjoy the privileges which that membership may bring in the form of world security.

The legislation we are discussing today is one of the most important steps to be taken toward this end, namely, world security. It prescribes the internal and domestic arrangements within our own Government for giving effect to our participation. It enables our national authorities to take certain steps and to make commitments on the part of the United States. It provides for the representation of the United States in the various agencies and organs of the United Nations. It sets up the method of making appointments and the duties and responsibilities of those persons who are appointed.

When the question of the United States joining the United Nations Organization became a matter of immediate legislative concern some months ago, the unreconstructed isolationists in the Senate saw that there was no way for them to repeat in 1945 what their predecessors had done in 1919.

It was clear that American sentiment for participation was too strong to be blocked either by a frontal assault on the Charter or through crippling reservations tacked on the act of ratification.

The strategy then decided on by the opposition was to accept the Charter but to restrict the authority of the American delegate on the Security Council as, in effect, to make our participation in the United Nations Organization meaningless. In this they have failed.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the people will not think that because this issue is not hotly contested that it is not an important commitment we are making. Indeed, I regret that other news of the day might limit the importance that will be given to the action of Congress in passing this legislation. Let us remember, however, that this is only the first implementation of the San Francisco Charter. Others of a more controversial nature are likely to follow. If we are to really play our part in bringing security to the world, it is necessary that we keep in close touch with the activities of the Security Council and of the United Nations Organization. It is necessary that we be ever willing to exert the force and influence of this great Nation in backing up the efforts of the UNO in trying to maintain a stable and peaceful world.

I am very happy, Mr. Speaker, that there is such unanimity on the part of Members of Congress in taking this great step. I think the unanimity is reflective of the will and hopes of our people. Let us ever be constant in making this Organization the great and effective agency for maintaining a stable world which we have prayed for it to be.

Reductions of the Wine Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolutions of the Wine Institute of California in the interests of grape farmers and wine producers. The internal revenue must be protected against law violators, but the law should not be so interpreted as to punish the innocent.

The rules applicable to whisky distillation should not necessarily be applicable to wine making. Wine making is an agricultural pursuit whereas whisky making is not. Wine has always been looked upon as the juice of the grape.

Recently the Alcohol Tax Unit of the Internal Revenue Bureau, with more zeal

than caution, pounced upon innocent stockholders of a winery company and sought to hold those stockholders, far distant from the winery, liable for the alleged derelictions of some employees and/or officers of the winery. Although those stockholders participated in no wrong if any, and had no knowledge whatsoever of such wrong, if any.

It were barbarous if our laws were so stretched as to siphon into payment of penalties those wholly unrelated to, and noncognizant of the misdeeds of others, and innocent of moral turpitude.

If the internal revenue laws can be so construed it is high time they were revised in the light of twentieth century enlightenment. The particular offending statutes hark back to the whisky buccaneer and the days of the Whisky Rebellion.

I hope the Alcohol Tax Unit revises its judgment and substitutes sounder sense for a misguided enthusiasm. I shall study this situation and suitably offer bills to revise the entire code referring to grape growing and wine making.

Herewith are the resolutions:

Whereas under the provisions of section 2800 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code every proprietor or possessor of, and every person in any manner interested in the use of, any still, distillery, or distilling apparatus is jointly and severally liable for taxes imposed by law on the distilled spirits produced therefrom; and

Whereas said provision was enacted to protect the revenues due primarily from beverage distilled spirits and upon which the excise tax is to be paid upon such spirits; and

Whereas said provision has been interpreted by various courts to impose liability upon stockholders of corporations and other persons who neither exercise nor have within their power the authority to exercise control over the operations of the business; or have any knowledge of the acts of those operations of the business; and

Whereas said section 2800 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code thus penalizes persons who may be wholly innocent of any wrong or wholly without any knowledge or control of the operations of the distillery and is therefore unjust and inequitable; and

Whereas said section likewise permits an undue proportion of any liability to be assessed against a particular individual solely by reason of his ability to pay; and

Whereas under the provisions of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (June 25, 1938) (C. 675, sec. 1, 52 Stat. 1040) and more particularly under section 333 thereof, penalties, including imprisonment, are provided for in the event of any violation; and

Whereas under the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States (320 U. S. 277, 64 S. Ct. Reporter 134), corporate officers and managers may be subject to imprisonment for violations of which they have no knowledge and in which any intent to commit wrong was lacking; and

Whereas under our present corporate system officers cannot possibly be aware of the manifold transactions of a widely scattered business operation; and

Whereas the Supreme Court itself stated "hardship there doubtless may be under a statute which thus penalizes the transaction though consciousness of wrongdoing be totally wanting." And Justice Murphy, in his dissenting opinion, stated, in part, "It is a fundamental principle of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence that guilt is personal and that it ought not lightly be imputed to a citizen who, like the respondent, has no evil intention or consciousness of wrongdoing": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, the board of directors of Wine Institute in meeting assembled this 14th day of December 1945, That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully petitioned as follows:

(1) To repeal section 2800 (d) of the Revenue Code.

(2) That if said section be not repealed that it be amended to strike therefrom the following words: "and every person in any manner interested in the use of."

(3) That said section 2800 (d) be further amended to provide some equitable limitation of the liability upon any one of several persons jointly and severally liable thereunder.

(4) That section 333 of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, as herein above cited, be amended to provide that no person be subject to imprisonment for a violation of the provisions of said act unless there be a personal guilt on the part of the person charged or that he have knowledge of said violation from which a guilt might be imputed; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of the Congressmen and Senators representing the State of California in the Congress of the United States.

Preview of World Plans To Be Implemented by the Bretton Woods Monetary Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker to anyone conversant with the record of British money manipulation and trade restrictions, it should not be difficult to foresee restrictions on free play of international trade that can, and doubtless will, be imposed by Great Britain, a policy in direct opposition to the assurances given in the Atlantic Charter when the United States and Great Britain stated, in article IV:

They will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and other raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.

The plight of Canada is reported in the December 10, 1945, issue of Times:

Great Britain's single-minded struggle for recovery was shaking Canada's hopes of prosperity.

Since September 2, when the end of the Pacific war closed out mutual aid (Canadian lend-lease), London had piled more and more restrictions on imports from Canada. Almost the whole range of processed articles, from such job-producing industries as farm machinery, rolled oats, newsprint, office machines, and household appliances were barred from the British market.

Some manufacturers, concluding that they would have to build new plants in Britain, prepared to do so. Wheat and lumber were shipped only to tightly budgeted Government buyers. And then Canadian exporters began meeting similar restrictions in India, Egypt, Australia, other countries in the British-money (sterling) circuit.

Businessmen last week yelled for somebody to do something—and quick. They well knew that the Dominion's traditionally best customer, Britain, would have to be the best customer again if Canada's plans for a 33-percent increase in her prewar exports were not to go glimmering.

UNDERSTANDING AND DOUBTS

At Ottawa, trade officials knew the urgency of keeping British shelves open to Canadian goods. They were fighting against British embargoes without hope of across-the-board success until the United Kingdom and the United States came to terms in their Washington deal for an American loan. But the Canadians, historically the third partner in the North Atlantic trade triangle, believed that the United States loan would not be "big enough to let Britain spend dollars freely." The painful symbols of British economic austerity, they figured, might be reduced but hardly eliminated.

Canadian economists did not carp at the British. It was true that Britain did not have enough dollars for all her needs, logical that she should refuse to borrow more than she had a prayer of repaying. But Canada had not been niggardly in meeting Britain's needs in the war. Why should Britain now doubt that Canada would put up the money, somehow, to keep trade going?

Canada's reconstruction loans to Britain would be quickly settled, once the Washington deal was concluded. Meanwhile, two facts stood out: First, the pace of trans-Atlantic trading would be set by the British-United States agreement; second, if Canada could not sell enough to Britain, she would have to sell more to the United States, to Latin America, and to other customers outside the sterling areas.

The Housing Problem and Plans to Overcome It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert in the RECORD a copy of my radio speech via WDRC, Hartford, Conn., last Sunday, on the housing problem and plans to overcome it:

My subject today deals with the problem of housing and the plans to overcome it.

We were warned we would have a housing shortage—and yet we permitted ourselves to be led over the brink so that today, suddenly, local communities, the National Government, and Congress have put aside other pressing problems to concentrate on how we are going to meet this one. A national conference of the housing industry is being held this week to develop ways and means to break this housing bottleneck.

Legislation will be acted on in the House this week to use 50 percent of housing material in the construction of homes that will cost $10,000 and less. Price ceilings will be established on existing homes. Price ceilings will not be lifted on building materials.

There are many reasons for the situation in which we find ourselves. For one thing we must remember that there was never enough housing. There was no construction to speak of during the depression years. Some 10 years ago the Government set out to encourage the building and ownership of low-priced homes along with its program of slum clearance and low-cost public-housing projects. Before that, most families in the two-to-five-thousand-dollar-a-year income class had to be content with living in tenements or flats.

By the time the war broke out, throughout the Nation there was a sweep toward home ownership well under way. In addition many public-housing projects had been built. The war interrupted all that sort of construction, and construction was permitted only for essential building needed for the prosecution of the war.

Came the war's end and the construction industry claimed it was ready to resume normal building, provided that war restrictions were lifted.

For weeks that was the big question. Should wartime controls be continued? Should we continue to permit only the construction of homes for the modest income family, or should we remove the lid entirely and permit construction to satisfy any market demands? Should price ceilings for building materials be lifted?

During the early years of the war, home construction was limited to an over-all cost of $6,000. As prices for construction material and labor rose, the building industry demanded an increase in the limit price of the home—and won. The limit cost was raised to $8,000. But even so, thousands of homes for which construction priority was granted were not built because the builders demanded an even higher price limit. That higher limit was refused and the builders instead turned their efforts to other types of construction that brought them more profits.

After VJ-day the demand from the building industry that ceilings be entirely removed became more insistent. The OPA, together with a number of Members of Congress and housing officials, opposed this demand on the ground that removing controls would not insure the home owner fair value for the price he would be required to pay. We lost on one count. The cost limit was removed. But the demand that the ceiling price on building materials be also removed was rightly, and as we now see, fortunately, refused.

Then ensued the tug of war. As the old Chinese laundryman once said, "No tickee, no washee," so now it was "No removal of price ceilings, no low-cost homes."

It is estimated that by the end of 1946, three and a half million families will be in need of housing—almost three million of them will be veterans' families.

The GI bill of rights grants the veteran a loan in order to buy a home—but the administration of the law properly requires that the purchase price be fair.

OPA officials pleaded for a ceiling on real estate during the war but the committees of Congress turned a deaf ear. Consequently the price of real estate soared and desperate people had no recourse but to pay the price asked when they had it.

But the GI couldn't purchase such homes even if he wished to because the Government appraiser would not okay use of a GI loan for inflated real estate. Now at long last ceilings will be placed on real estate. It's too bad we didn't close the barn door before the horse ran away.

All these conditions are partly responsible for the very serious housing shortage. Temporary war housing, which was supposed to be torn down after the war, now must be retained. But there is a curious situation around Hartford. The housing shortage is so serious that the city and State officials have been putting their heads together with the construction industry to solve the problem. Yet, in the South Quaker Terrace project in West Hartford there are 159 units. Only 49 were occupied. At Oakwood Acres there are 335 units; only 77 are occupied. Yet every day I receive letters from veterans complaining that they cannot find homes for their families and ask my help with the housing authorities.

Veterans, to be sure, have preference in public projects, but few people are moving out of the others and there are long waiting lists of veterans. I have suggested to the veterans who have written me that they apply for quarters in these West Hartford temporary projects. It may be a bit inconvenient for them to move out there. The apartments aren't the last word in modern improvements. They were built as a temporary expedient to meet a wartime emergency. But they do offer warmth and comfort, and will enable a veteran and his family to live together.

I have asked the Washington authorities to hold the South Quaker Terrace project in a standby status for a while to see whether there will be sufficient veterans availing themselves of quarters there, for the plan was to ship the building to some other community which has been asking for it.

The authorities in Washington, who last October too hastily granted the removal of the cost limitation, have now conceded their mistake and are supporting the President's recommendation that a price limit of $10,000 be set. Still, there is the big question—whether the home owner will receive fair value for his investment. A new $5,000 house with a $10,000 price tag is not going to be a good bargain for anyone. It is obvious, therefore, that price ceilings on construction materials must be maintained.

Yet right now we are resisting the clamorous demand from members of the building industry that price ceilings of construction materials be removed.

Yet it was revealed the other day that enough lumber to provide for 75,000 to 100,000 houses in the low-cost bracket had been shipped abroad this year because overseas lumber prices are higher than those permitted by OPA. So a bill has been introduced in Congress to halt the exportation of lumber. I certainly shall vote for it if the problem isn't met otherwise. It is just too bad if American veterans and workers cannot provide homes for their families because the lumber industry gets a bigger profit out of selling its goods abroad.

On the other hand, two contractors testified at hearings last week that they were making an adequate profit out of building low-cost homes.

And just before I started my talk this afternoon I received a letter from the New Council of American Business urging my support of President Truman's reconversion housing program, with the retention of the controls he recommended, and claiming that business in the housing field has been grossly misrepresented by the lobbies in Washington.

And today, also, I received a letter from Mrs. John Lee, president of the Connecticut League of Women Voters, an organization which has been quick to champion the protection of the consumer at all times, urging housing controls.

I hope our Government stands firm in its insistence that we do not repeat the tragedy of the years following the last war. Then the real inflation hit us after the war, when the pent-up demand for the goods, with no price control, gave vent to a disastrous inflation with the depression following shortly thereafter, which most of us haven't forgotten.

In conclusion I want to list the outstanding steps the administration so far has taken to combat the housing shortage. A National Housing Coordinator has been appointed, an appropriation has been obtained from Congress to continue the use of the temporary housing projects until adequate housing facilities are again available, an appropriation of $195,000,000 is in its final congressional stages for housing to meet immediate veterans' needs, a $10,000 over-all price limit on housing has been reinstituted. Legislation will be acted on in the House this week to channel 50 percent of housing materials into low- and medium-cost homes, and price ceilings will be placed on real estate.

The facilities of the Government are being geared to overcome the housing shortage in the shortest space of time. And action is moving on the long range housing program embodied in the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, aimed at banishing overcrowding and slums and rebuilding our cities with good housing and good neighborhoods.

We are late on the job—but we are not too late.

Gold in Idaho Primitive Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 14, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Hovey Hill entitled "Gold in Idaho Primitive Area":

GOLD IN IDAHO PRIMITIVE AREA

There is a river in Idaho, known as the River of No Return because one can boat down its 400-mile course, through the mountains of Idaho, but cannot return up by boat, due to the fall of the stream, making it impossible to navigate the swift current, that in places assumes the character of rapids and cataracts. The stream is Salmon River, a major tributary of Snake River which heads where the southerly end of the Sawtooth Mountains rear their granite heads 4,000 to 5,000 feet above the normal valley floor.

From its main source at 8,700 feet above sea level it runs northerly to Stanley basin 25 miles, where it turns easterly and northeasterly to Salmon 118 miles, thence north 22 miles to the North Fork, where it turns westerly with many meanderings northerly and southerly to Riggins, in Idaho County, about 150 miles almost across the State of Idaho, where United States Highway No. 95 follows the stream to White Bird Creek, 30 miles in a generally northerly direction and where the highway leaves it and where it again turns northwesterly and westerly until it joins the Snake River 260 miles from Salmon and 394 miles from its source, falling 7,800 feet in a total drop into Snake River. With its major and small tributaries it drains an empire of about 13,600 square miles, in the area about White Bird Creek, a country as large as Massachusetts and Connecticut combined.

Geologically this vast area that is the Salmon River drainage is made up of old sediments from pre-Cambrian to the Tertiary that have been broken up, tilted and left by continential movements of intrusive granite masses known as the Idaho batholith. Parts of the western area have been covered by outpourings of lava contemporaneous with the Tertiary Columbia River lavas.

Gold and some other minerals have been detached from the enclosing original matrix and deposited in stratas as fine gold in the upper stratas and coarse nuggets on the bed rock of the adjacent bars.

This gold ranges from 860 fine in the fine gold to 960 fine in the nuggets that sometimes weigh as much as 5 ounces.

All this process, covering millions of years of geologic time, has constituted a great nature's hydraulic operation into the Salmon River sluice box. Gold was first discovered on Salmon River in 1862, soon after the discovery of the rich diggings at Florence.

There is hardly a yard of the banks of Salmon River that has not been skimmed or worked by hydraulic methods since 1862; most of this work was superficial, as but few

of the high bars were so situated that water could be brought on under pressure, or that the bedrock was high enough above the river level to allow a dump for disposal of tailings. After the white men skimmed the area for a few years, hordes of Chinese came in and worked the ground over largely by hand methods. Millions in gold were taken out by these methods, and during depression years in 1893 and again in 1929–31, hundreds of men were rewashing the low bars by hand methods and making wages of $1.50 per day. Since the days of successful dredge mining in California, Australia, and other countries, this great sluice box has been an object of interest to many engineers as to how the undoubtedly rich deposits of both fine and coarse gold that lie in the bed of the river itself and in the adjacent low bars that as yet are virgin gravel, except for the few inches of skim with fine gold on the surfaces, could be worked.

If sufficiently large dredges with digging depth to reach bedrock, having ample power for handling hard and heavy gravels, are designed, the Salmon River sluice box will be a source of gold production for many years to come.

WALTER HOVEY HILL.

Col. Ruth Cheney Streeter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, on December 7 Col. Ruth Cheney Streeter resigned as Director of the Marine Corps Women's Reserve, terminating nearly 2 years of outstanding service during this country's crisis. Colonel Streeter typified the unswerving spirit of the women marines in a way that drew the greatest admiration from their fellow brother marines.

The selection of Ruth Cheney Streeter to head the Marine Corps Women's Reserve was widely applauded because of her record in civic and professional activities. It was, however, her superb leadership as the head of the Women's Marine Corps Reserve that proved the wisdom of her selection.

Colonel Streeter, before her selection as head of the women marines, was active in health and welfare work, serving as a member of the New Jersey State Relief Council, New Jersey Commission on Interstate Cooperation, and New Jersey Board of Children's Guardians. Holder of a commercial pilot's license, the colonel was also the first woman member of the Committee on Aviation of the New Jersey Defense Council, a position to which she was appointed in May 1941.

She is the wife of Thomas W. Streeter, retired lawyer and banker of Morristown. They have four children, Lt. Frank S. Streeter, USNR, Lt. Henry S. Streeter, USNR, Sgt. Thomas W. Streeter, Jr., AUS, and Lilian Streeter, a freshman at Bryn Mawr College.

Commissioned a major when she entered the Marine Corps, Colonel Streeter was subsequently promoted to lieutenant colonel, and has held her present rank since February 1, 1944.

The colonel was eligible for discharge under the credit as soon as it went into operation in September of this year, but she remained at her post until the initial problems of demobilization were solved.

Under her guidance the women marines reached a top strength of 18,838. Besides filling thousands of office jobs they served in such varied departments as motor transport, post exchange, photography, and communications. Nearly 40 percent served in aviation, including the highly specialized fields of aerology, synthetic training, and parachute packing. Nine hundred and ninety-seven served in Hawaii.

When requesting a discharge Colonel Streeter said:

My reason for asking to be released at this time is because my sons—who have themselves been in service 3 and 4 years—are on their way back, and I am needed at home. * * * Colonel Towle is excellently qualified to serve as Director and I turn over to her the supervision of the destinies of the Marine Corps Women's Reserve with full confidence in her ability to guide them well.

During the brief ceremony held just before Colonel Streeter left, Gen. A. A. Vandegrift, Commandant of the Marine Corps, said:

It is with deep regret that I contemplate your leaving, and I cannot let the occasion pass without conveying to you some expression of my admiration and appreciation of your outstanding service as Director of the Marine Corps Women's Reserve from its inception in January 1943 until the present time.

Over that period the Marine Corps Women's Reserve grew in size to a maximum strength of 831 officers and 17,714 enlisted. It set a standard of excellence which, in my opinion, could not have been excelled and would be difficult to equal. The ability and qualifications of its personnel, thanks to careful selection and splendid training, made possible theri replacement of thousands of male officers and men and the badly needed release of the latter for combat service during the war. That the Women's Reserve functioned so splendidly and effectively and fulfilled in every way the purposes for which it was organized; and that it established and maintained such high repute for character, conduct, and efficiency, were all due in great measure to your own exceptional administrative and executive ability, your wise judgment, your sound and farsighted planning, and to your complete devotion to duty.

The Marine Corps Women's Reserve, under your outstanding leadership, met fully those high standards of dependability, efficiency, and devotion to duty which are traditional in the Marine Corps. It is an organization in which the Marine Corps takes great and justifiable pride. You take, on leaving, my earnest assurance of the grateful appreciation of the Marine Corps, and the sure knowledge of a difficult task splendidly accomplished.

Both personally, and as Commandant of the Marine Corps, I want you to know that I deeply appreciate your services, that I view your separation with very real regret, and that I wish for you every happiness in the years to come.

With Colonel Streeter's resignation the Marine Corps has lost a leader but this loss is greatly compensated in the succession of Col. Katherine A. Towle, of Berkeley, Calif., to the position of Director. She was the right hand of Colonel Streeter and her appointment guarantees the continuity of the efficient administration under Colonel Streeter.

The performance of Colonel Streeter and all of her women Marines can be summed up in the Marine motto, Semper Fidelis—they are always faithful in the fulfillment of their tasks.

Address of President John Green, of Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, at the National Shipbuilding Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention to a memorable address delivered by John Green, president of Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, on December 4, 1945, at the national shipbuilding conference, being held at Colorado Springs, Colo. It is composed of representatives of both management and men, with representatives of the Government also sitting in.

The speech delivered by Mr. Green is entitled to careful and serious consideration by all who are interested in the stabilization of a great industry, because it represents the studied thought and views of an experienced leader of labor and an organization that through all the years of its existence has sought to improve working conditions of workers.

During the war period, when production of ships was so necessary to an Allied victory, the shipworkers not only distinguished themselves by reaching the highest level of production that had ever been attained in the history of shipbuilding, but accomplished it without any disturbing labor strife. Their record in this respect has been so commendable as to entitle the views of their organization as expressed through its officers to the greatest respect and confidence.

In accordance with the unanimous consent granted by the House, I include as part of my remarks the entire speech of Mr. Green. It reads as follows:

The convening of this conference marks a milestone in the history of shipbuilding labor relations. We are now met to discuss our industry in preparation for peace—and no longer in preparation for war. Yet, our long experience during this last war has shown and taught us many things—the most important perhaps is the fact that when we want to do something badly enough, some means can be found to do it which will be acceptable to all concerned. We've learned cooperation—give and take. We've learned from our own and others' mistakes as well as our victories.

The basic problem before this conference, as I see it, is, will we have shipyards and a shipbuilding industry, or will we have junkyards and perhaps another Pearl Harbor? We must keep ourselves on an even keel throughout this reconversion period—or we will sink after we have seen our first action. We sank—after the First World War—and I tell you now that it can't happen again, or we sink for good.

You may ask—what has the problem of wages to do with the continuance of a sound,

stable industry? We can't have a sound and stable industry—we can't have any industry at all—if we can't put our own internal affairs in order. What is the sense of fooling ourselves? Can we paint our house without cleaning it first?

CITES LONG UNION FIGHT

The Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America has had the foresight to fight for stabilization long before it started. Since 1933, when it was first formed, our union fought and fought hard for the revitalization of the industry to prepare our country for the dark times ahead.

In 1939 we asked and asked again—until in 1941 it was accomplished—for the stabilization of working conditions in our industry. We knew the job we would have to do—sooner or later; we saw the war coming and we knew that the only way we could do this job was by a three-way partnership of Government, industry, and labor. No one can dare to say that we failed in doing this job.

Look at our record. I am not going to repeat our production totals here—we all know these. But, let us survey the other record of labor—the little known record of productivity, know-how, that record of keeping our promises.

When we first started our program we had to build the Liberty ship—and I would like to point out that the only reason we had to build these ships was that we had no industry, we had too few skilled men, we had been junking our yards, and we had to build ships for war that must be junked in peace—we cut the man-hours required for these ships down from 1,300,000 to 400,000.

Finally, we had enough skilled workmen to build the Victory. Here we reduced the man-hours over 30 percent from keel laying to delivery.

It is true that these are mass-production ships—let's look at the custom-built Navy. Our own Secretary of the Navy has admitted that the costs of ships in this war have been much less than the costs in the First World War. Those of you who build naval ships will know what it means when I ask you to try to estimate the man-hours and money savings of carbon arc burning alone.

SET UP JOINT GROUPS

We wanted so much production that we even set up labor-management production committees. Since the summer of 1942 the employees' suggestion program resulted in savings of over 31,000,000 man-hours and over $44,000,000, for Maritime Commission contracts alone.

Even before the actual outbreak of war—you asked us for a no-strike pledge. We can honestly stand here and say to all America—we kept that pledge. From the beginning of 1943 through June of 1944, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has estimated that strikes in our industry were less than six hundredths of 1 percent of available working time.

If you figure this on the basis of $1.00 an hour—we lost less than two-thirds of a tenth of a cent an hour through strikes.

We built an industry during this war. We all built it. Management felt the building of this industry in its profits a little more than we did in our wages. The four war years of 1941 through 1944, as compared to the four pre-war years of 1936 through 1939, increased shipyard profits in the hundreds and thousands of percent.

The income, before taxes, for all companies wholly or partially engaged in shipbuilding—60 percent of the industry—increased by over 425 percent. For those companies only engaged in shipbuilding it increased by over 1460 percent.

Even after all taxes, reserves—and even after paying out dividends to their stockholders—management's income increased by over 320 percent for all companies and by over 810 percent for those companies solely engaged in shipbuilding.

Even including night shift premiums, piecework and incentive payments, shift credit and so on, average straight time hourly earnings for shipyard workers only increased 34 percent during the four war years of 1941 through 1944, as opposed to the four pre-war years of 1936 to 1939.

This increase has, to all intents and purposes, been wiped out by the increasing cost of living during the war years.

ANALYZES WAGE FREEZE

What circumstances made possible this virtual freeze of our real wages since the beginning of the war?

When stabilization of this industry was first begun—Government, management, and labor all realized that workers' base rates had to be protected against hidden decreases, because of a rising cost of living. Therefore, all four of the original zone standards agreements had escalator clauses—linking base rates with the cost of living.

By the spring of 1942, it became evident that the cost of living was rapidly increasing while wage scales were fixed, and consequently, a national conference was called for April 27, 1942, in Chicago to consider the problem of wage adjustments as provided for in each of the four zone stabilization meetings.

TWO IMPORTANT EVENTS

Prior to this meeting, two important events occurred. On January 30, 1942, the Emergency Price Control Act was passed. Thus, there were initialed the beginnings of a national economic stabilization program.

In addition, on the very day that the members of the National Shipbuilding Conference were meeting in Chicago (April 27, 1942), President Roosevelt set forth in a message to Congress a seven-point program to stabilize the cost of living.

The labor members of this conference were in an advantageous position for several reasons.

1. By agreement, signed by labor, industry, and Government, wage scales (and not earnings of any sort or kind) were tied to changes in the cost of living where such changes equaled or exceeded 5 percent at periodic intervals. This meant that industry and Government were committed to increasing the wage scale—the basic wage rates—by the percentage increase in the cost of living from the base periods of each of the zone standards to April 15 or May 15, 1942.

2. None of the zone standards were due to expire in 1942. The Atlantic coast zone standards were due to expire on June 23, 1943. The Gulf coast zone standards were due to expire on August 1, 1943; the Great Lakes zone standards were due to expire on June 2, 1943, and the Pacific coast zone standards were due to expire at the end of the national emergency, as proclaimed by the President, and/or at the end of 2 years (from April 1, 1941) whichever was the longer.

The union, therefore, was under no obligation to assent to any changes in the zone standards, and particularly to changes which would eliminate the wage scale-cost of living escalator relationship.

3. Without assent from the union, the zone standards could not have been amended, and no changes could have been possible until 1943.

4. In 1943, no shipbuilding stabilization program could have been administered without the inclusion of labor representatives, and labor representatives were in a position to refuse to agree to such stabilization, if they had wanted to think only of the interests of the shipyard workers, and of no one else.

5. The union would have been within its rights had it demanded that the signatories of the zone standards abide by the provisions for adjusting wage scales to changes in the cost of living. This was recognized by both Mr. Paul R. Porter (then chairman of the Stabilization Committee) and President Roosevelt.

CONSIDERATION OF LABOR

Three considerations determined the union's choice of foregoing full wage rate increases in the interests of national economic stabilization.

1. The union turned its eyes to England where the trade unions in 1942 were faced with a similar dilemma. There, too, a national economic stabilization policy, similar to President Roosevelt's seven-point program of April 27, 1942, was in effect, and its operation was actually stabilizing the relationships between wages, cost of living, earnings, and profits. What England could do, we could also, or so the union thought.

2. The union leaders felt that man's ultimate responsibility was to his country and to the welfare of all the people residing therein, even if this meant the sacrifice of interests and principles for which they not only stood but upon which their fellow workers had chosen them as their representatives and leaders. The war had made such extreme demands upon the productive and distributive capacities of our national economy that national economic stabilization alone could prevent economic disaster at home. The union felt that the other elements of our society—industry and agriculture—would likewise see the close interdependence of their interests with the interests of the national welfare, and that they would sacrifice their interests to that of the national welfare where necessary. Sadly, to the union's regret, this was not to be realized.

3. Finally, the union felt that sufficient public promises were made by responsible Government officials to warrant a trust and faith in the Nation's leaders' abilities to stabilize living costs, profits, and earnings as well as wages; and that the Congress would see that complete, over-all economic stabilization, and not a partial stabilization of wages alone, was the only possible equitable method of stabilization.

The union would again wish to stress two points:

1. The union was under no obligation, except that to the national welfare, to eliminate references to wage adjustments with changes in the cost of living. Had it not assented to their deletion, these wage adjustments would have had to remain in force until the spring of 1943, and this would have necessitated wage increases in the spring of 1943 since the cost of living increased.

2. Had the union not eliminated the reference to wage adjustments with changes in the cost of living, during the Chicago conference, it would not, in view of the consequent failure to stabilize the cost of living, profits and earnings, have done so in 1943. Since no shipbuilding stabilization program could have (or could ever) succeed without the participation of labor, and since no changes in zone standards could take place without the acquiescence of labor, the clause providing for wage adjustments commensurate with changes in cost of living would have continued in full force and effect, or there would have been no shipbuilding stabilization program.

MONEY SAVED GOVERNMENT

The money saved for the United States Government was estimated, for the year of 1942 alone, by the union as follows:

Voluntary acceptance of the abolition of premium calendar days, $70,000,000.

Acceptance of compromise of the change in basic dates due under the cost of living formulas of the four zone agreements, $135,000,000.

Acceptance of less than the cost of living wage adjustments, $400,000,000.

Total saved, $605,000,000.

The sum represented the actual equity of the shipyard workers in the success of the

eventual stabilization of the cost of living. This sum represented what the workers were deprived of in 1942, by reason of the failure of the attempts to stabilize the cost of living. By this time we have saved the Government well over one and one-half billion dollars.

PROMISE BY PRESIDENT

When we agreed not to retain the escalator clauses in the four zone standards agreements, this was done upon a promise of the United States that the cost of living would be stabilized. The President said:

"You have my assurance that all the Executive power I have will be used to carry out all the essential steps of the policy (stabilization) laid down."

The President promised a roll back in the cost of living to March 1942. Therefore, the shipbuilding workers accepted an 8-cent increase instead of abiding by the escalator clauses of the four zone standards agreements. To date, through December of 1945, the shipyard workers will have lost almost 4 months' salary because of the failure of the promise to roll back the cost of living. This is 32.2 percent of 1 year's pay, or a 38.6-cent per hour general wage increase to stabilize the workers' income according to the escalator clauses of the original zone standards as of December 15, 1945.

The shipyard workers of this country have an equity in a wage increase. They have an equity based upon a promise of the late President of the United States. They have an equity based upon their increased productivity. They have an equity based upon the fact they kept their pledged word.

Therefore, without any if's, and's, or but's, I am privileged herewith to submit the program of the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America for:

1. A 17½-cent wage increase across the board, and—

2. A percentage increase of 30 percent in wage payments upon reduction in hours of work so that weekly take-home will be equal to the take-home for a 48-hour week.

Investigation of the Spanish Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY, OF QUEENS COUNTY, N. Y., REQUESTING INVESTIGATION OF THE SITUATION IN SPAIN BY A JOINT MEETING OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, BASED ON THE BOOK RECENTLY PUBLISHED BY OUR WARTIME AMBASSADOR TO SPAIN, CARLTON J. H. HAYES

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the French Government, two-thirds of which consists of Socialists and Communists, has requested our Department of State to meet and discuss with them the proposition of breaking off diplomatic relations with Spain for the purpose of bringing about a revolution to overthrow the existing Spanish Government.

Ever since the end of the Spanish Civil War, Communists, fellow travelers, and Spanish exiles have been trying to involve us in restoring the Red-Pink Spanish Government, consisting mainly of anarchists, Socialists, Syndicalists, and Communists back into power.

I do not like Franco's military dictatorship and that is what the present Spanish Government is. The Falangists or Spanish Fascists are only a small minority group in Spain and are losing ground all the time. I do not like the military dictatorships which exist among some of our American neighbors south of the Rio Grande, and which have existed since these nations broke away from Spain; neither do I like the Russian dictatorship under Stalin. However, I am strongly opposed to United States breaking off diplomatic relations or going to war with any one of these countries in order to enforce upon them our type of democracy.

I have read and want to call to the attention of every Member of Congress the book entitled "Wartime Mission in Spain," recently published by Macmillan Co., and written by our wartime Ambassador to Spain, March 1942 to January 1945, the distinguished historian, scholar, and teacher, Prof. Carlton J. H. Hayes.

It is my conviction that the majority of the Members of Congress, after reading this book, would feel as I do that Professor Hayes should be called before a joint session of the House and Senate Foreign Affairs Committees to tell us his experiences in Spain and its attitude toward the United States during the recent war.

This hearing, in my opinion, should be held before our State Department takes any action on the French request. The book, I am frank to say, was a revelation to me, and I am sure it would be to most Members of Congress who have been subject to a constant barrage of anti-Spanish propaganda inspired by Communists, Spanish exiles, and their ilk whose only interest is the success of their own ideologies and not the welfare of the United States of America.

If you do not have time to read Wartime Mission in Spain, I urge you to read the following paragraphs taken from the book summarizing some of ex-Ambassador Hayes' conclusions:

Let me now set forth certain conclusions from my wartime experience and reflection in Spain.

Throughout my entire residence there, from May 1942 to January 1945, I had constant evidence that the large majority of the Spanish people greatly desired (1) to stay out of the international struggle, (2) to avoid recurrence of civil war, and (3) to be friendly with the English-speaking democracies, especially with the United States. These desires have been common, not only to the mass of Leftists (Republicans and Socialists), but also to most of the Rightist groups which supported General Franco in the Spanish Civil War (Liberal Monarchists, Traditionalists, and the Conservative following of Gil Robles) and consequently to members of these groups who held office in the existing government (which was essentially a coalitior rather than a single-party government).

General Franco is in a curious position. He is a cautious politician with strong military backing, and, though doubtless the large majority of Spaniards, Rightist as well as Leftist, would ideally prefer another chief of state (if it could be arranged in an orderly fashion), many of them recognize, with varying degrees of gratitude, that by virtue of his cautious policy he succeeded in keeping Spain free from foreign and domestic war during an extraordinarily trying period.

So long as Axis victory seemed to him inevitable, so long as almost the whole continent of Europe was at the mercy of Germany, with German armies massed near the Pyrenees and German submarines infesting the seas adjacent to Spain, General Franco let Hitler and indeed the world believe that he was pro-Axis. Nevertheless, whatever may have been his inmost thoughts and personal fears in the matter, the fact remains that at least from the date of his dismissal of Serrano Suñer from the foreign office and the leadership of the Falange, in September, 1942, General Franco guided or backed the responsible officials of his Government in approximating Spain's official position to the pro-Allied position of the large majority of the Spanish people.

From September 1942 to June 1943, while the Spanish Government was still ostensibly "non-belligerent" and hence technically "unneutral," it not only placed no obstacle in the way of our landings and military operations in north Africa and southern Italy but gave us significant facilities, such as de facto recognition of the French Committee of National Liberation at Algiers and of its official representatives in Spain; free transit through Spain of over 25,000 volunteers (chiefly French) for active service with our armed forces in north Africa; noninternment of several hundreds of our forced-landed military airmen and their evacuation through Gibraltar; immediate delivery to us, quite uncompromised, of secret equipment on forced-landed planes; and freedom and full opportunity to carry on economic warfare with the Axis on Spanish territory by means of preemptive buying of wolfram, mercury, fluorspar, skins, woolen goods, etc., and blacklisting of Spanish firms doing business with the Axis.

From July 1943 to May 1944, the Spanish Government shifted its declared position from nonbelligerency to neutrality, and gradually increased the facilities it was according us to the detriment of the Axis. It not only curbed the discrimination against us in the Falangist-controlled press of the country, withdrew the Blue Division and Blue Air Squadron from the eastern front, and replaced pro-Axis with pro-Allied diplomatic representatives in countries of Europe and Latin America, but it permitted the commercial sale of American propaganda magazines, granted us control of all passenger traffic, by Spanish airplanes as well as ships, between Spain and Spanish Morocco, and withheld recognition of Mussolini's social republican government in north Italy.

Moreover, it speeded up the evacuation of Allied refugees and forced-landed airmen, arranged for the escape to Spain of a considerable number of Jews from Hungary, Germany, and the Low Countries, and tolerated, even to the point of abetting, the very important clandestine activities of our secret espionage services directed toward obtaining from across the Pyrennees invaluable military information about German troop movements and dispositions in France. Finally, as the result of a series of negotiations, pressed by us and vehemently opposed by Germany, Spain embargoed all exports of wolfram to the Axis from February to May and agreed to allow thereafter only token shipments (which stopped altogether after our landing in France in June 1944). Simultaneously, the Spanish Government agreed to submit to arbitration the question of the internment of Italian warships which had been held for several months in the Balearic Islands, to close the German consulate at Tangier, and to expel its staff and other Axis agents suspected of espionage or sabotage against us.

From July 1944, the Spanish Government repeatedly indicated, by word and likewise by deed, that its policy toward us was one of benevolent neutrality. It authorized our use of Barcelona as a free port of entry for supplies for France and other liberated areas. It expelled or interned several hundred German agents. It assured us it would not harbor persons adjudged by competent Allied tribunals to be war criminals. It rescinded practically all censorship restrictions

on American journalists in Spain and arranged with the United Press to utilize this American news service for the Spanish press.

It was the first foreign government to make a general air agreement with ours; and, under this, we obtained transit and landing rights in Spain for three different American air lines and also for our Army planes. It finally put into effect between Madrid and New York the direct radio-telegraphic circuit, which had been the object of protracted and fruitless negotiations by us with the Spanish monarchy prior to 1931 and with the Spanish Republic prior to their civil war. On the eve of my departure from Spain, in January, the Foreign Minister notified me that his Government had released the interned Italian warships. Already the outstanding, and long-standing, difficulties between the Spanish Government and the American-owne telephone company were the subject of amicable negotiations which issued, just after I left, in a mutually satisfactory agreement. Moreover, the Foreign Minister had already agreed to stop the carrying of any merchandise by the German air line between Barcelona and Stuttgart (the only means left to Germany of getting goods from or to Spain), and had expressed a desire to discontinue this German line altogether if only we would consent to the maintenance of some sort of communication between Spain and Switzerland. This also was accomplished shortly after I left Spain. Furthermore, both the Foreign Minister and General Franco himself repeatedly made clear, not only in conversation with me, but by inspired articles in the Spanish press, their hostility to Japan and their intention, in due course, of breaking diplomatic relations with it. This, too, they did soon after I left.

In trying to assess the reasons for Spain's swing toward us and the increasing facilities it granted us from 1942 to 1945—in other words, the reasons for whatever success my wartime mission had—I arrive at four basic considerations. First and foremost, Spain acted, as any nation would act, in what it conceived to be its own interest. In its own interest, Spain needed and desired to stay out of the war. To have joined the Axis in 1940 would sooner or later have brought it into the war. To have shown any partiality for the Allies prior to the end of 1942 would have brought the Germans into Spain, and consequently Spain into the war. To have flouted reasonable requests of the Allies from 1943 onward might have well have led to hostile action on their part and thus brought Spain into the war. In any of these cases Spain would have lacked foresight and failed to serve its own greatest interest. The tactic of our diplomacy was to establish and enlarge a common area of Spanish interest and of our own. For we were not in Spain to oppose Spaniards or their Government, but to get them to help us oppose the Axis.

Second, I must emphasize the economic weapon which we and the British possessed. Spain simply had to have certain commodities from us, most notably petroleum, which it could not obtain in satisfactory quantities elsewhere. These we were able and ready to furnish or to withhold. With what telling effect we wielded this weapon, even before we had any military victories to our credit, must already be sufficiently clear. It should be borne in mind, however, that the mere withholding of a commodity like petroleum was in itself no weapon at all. Only when it was associated with a willingness to furnish the commodity, under conditions reasonably satisfactory to us, did it constitute an effective weapon.

Third, we owed no little of our success in Spain to Axis, and particularly German, misjudgment of Spanish character. The Nazis were at first too sure they had Spain in their pocket, and afterward they overworked their propaganda and threatened too much. They neither invaded Spain, when they could, nor ceased trying to dictate to it, when they should. Moreover, their regimentation, their superior airs and patronizing attitude, and their deadly seriousness were repulsive, when not merely ridiculous, to the large majority of a nation notoriously individualistic, proud and stubborn. The tactic which certain of our journalistic critics in America urged us to adopt toward Spain was essentially the German tactic. It is fortunate we didn't follow it, and I sincerely hope, in our own national interest, it never will be followed.

Fourth, and by no means least, we were immeasurably aided by our moral ascendancy over the Axis. Spain came to recognize that when we made pledges, as, for example, to respect its territorial integrity or to furnish it with some commodity, we meant to keep our pledges, whereas the Axis relied on brute force and made promises only to break them. To maintain our moral position intact is vitally necessary to our prestige in any foreign country and hence to the successful conduct of all our international relations. When we have requests to make of another country, we must support them with reasons that are fair and honorable. If we had acted otherwise in Spain, we should have gravely weakened our moral position and thereby greatly handicapped ourselves.

My mission in Spain was rendered peculiarly difficult by reason of prevailing popular sentiment in the United States against the Spanish Government of the time, that of General Franco. And contemporary and future Spanish-American relations are likely to be troubled for similar if not the same reasons.

Our American Government, being democratic, is naturally and necessarily responsive to public opinion. And public opinion in the United States, as crystallized or reflected by our journalists and publicists, has been, and still is, predominantly hostile to the existing regime in Spain, expectant of its speedy collapse, and opposed to any measure or indication of a collaboration with it which might conceivably serve to strengthen or prolong it. This opinion is reenforced, moreover, by a somewhat similar attitude prevalent in England, by the partisan propaganda of exiled refugees from the Spanish civil war residing abroad, and by the interested and denunciatory propaganda emanating from Soviet Russia and its inspired press and radio.

The central and most widespread popular notions in the United States about the Franco regime have been that it was forced upon Spain by Hitler and Mussolini, that it has been thoroughly Fascist, and pro-Axis, and that, as one of our newspapers has recently said, "if diplomatic and economic support were withdrawn from Franco by all the United Nations, his Government would fall through spontaneous action by the masses of the Spanish people whom he has exploited and tortured for nearly a decade." I, of course, hold no brief for General Franco's Government. I am an American and a Democrat, and I most certainly would not wish to see his type of government installed or copied in the United States, or indefinitely continue in Spain or anywhere else. Yet I have had to face the fact, just as our own Government still has to face it, that if one wishes to deal with Spain one must deal with the existing Spanish Government, whatever it is, and that in order to deal with it wisely and advantageously one must be realistic about it and not the victim of wishful thinking or of fables.

Actually the Franco regime owes its origin only in part to military aid it received from Italy and Germany during the civil war. This aid has been much exaggerated, as that of Russia and France to the Loyalists has been minimized. The civil war was primarily a Spanish affair, in which a half of the Spanish Nation and more than half of the Spanish Army supported General Franco.

Actually, too, as the historical record in this book reveals and as Mr. Churchill stated in the House of Commons in May 1944, the Spanish Government of General Franco has not been thoroughly pro-Axis, but, rather, has long accorded a large number of important facilities to the Allied war effort. Spain's contributions to us in this respect compare favorably with those of any other neutral—Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, or Portugal. Nor, as I have previously explained, has General Franco's dictatorship been inspired by Nazi ideology or directed solely by Fascists; it has been more in the nature of a military dictatorship traditional to Spanish-speaking peoples.

Actually, also, it is difficult to understand why "the exploited and tortured masses of the Spanish people" must await the withdrawal of foreign diplomatic support from their government before they spontaneously rise up and overthrow that government. Surely they don't fear that France and Russia, and England, and China, and the United States would interfere to prevent them from overthrowing Franco. No, there must be a sizable number of Spaniards who don't regard themselves as "exploited" or "tortured," or who prefer a quiet evolution of the Franco regime to revolution and the uncertainty of succeeding alternatives.

There has been a curiously recurrent expectation in America of an automatic collapse of the Franco regime. It was loudly voiced by journalists and publicists in the spring of 1943, just after our military successes in north Africa; more loudly in September 1943, when Mussolini was ousted and Italy signed the armistice with us; and still more loudly in the spring of 1944, when we entered Rome and landed in Normandy. Thenceforth, in continuous chorus it has been affirmed that the triumph of Allied arms must mean the speedy abdication and disappearance of General Franco and his supporters.

The curious feature of all this is that what actually happened in Spain did not correspond at all to the expectations abroad. Instead of weakening his position within the country, the external events in the spring of 1943, in September 1943, and in the spring of 1944 served rather, at least for the time being, to strengthen it. By now, it should be evident that one is seriously misinformed and unrealistic if one takes for granted that the Spanish Government's collapse is inevitable and imminent—unless, of course, we are ready to employ Allied pressure to collapse it. It is not likely to collapse through voluntary abdication, or, so far as I can see, through any general mass revolt of the Spanish people. The domestic opposition to it is too divided, too broken into quarrelsome groups of Monarchists, Republicans, Socialists, Syndicalists, Anarchists, Communists, and Basque and Catalan nationalists, and too lacking in experienced and respected leadership. The memory of the horrors of the late Spanish Civil War is still much too vivid, and the fear of doing anything to precipitate its recurrence is, with the exception of the Communist minority, almost a national obsession.

After all, the existing regime represents that part of the Spanish nation which finally won a 3-year civil war; and it would indeed be quite a novelty in human history if the victors in such a war should say to the vanquished only 5 or 6 years afterward: "We are sorry; we shouldn't have won; we have made a mess of things; we will now restore you to power and welcome back your former leaders and let them do to us what they will." Imagine General Grant saying anything like that to the leaders of the Southern Confederacy in the midst of our own post-Civil War reconstruction!

Of course, the United Nations could almost certainly exert sufficient joint pressure, through rupture of diplomatic relations and

more especially through economic boycotts, to bring about the disintegration of General Franco's Government. It might be, moreover, that in such an event the half of the Spanish nation which was on the Loyalist side during the civil war would temporarily overlook its factional differences and unitedly acclaim the return to Spanish soil of the government-in-exile constructed at Mexico City. But it would be extremely dubious whether the initial acclaim and unity could be long maintained, whether the acquiescence of the other half of the Spanish nation, including the Army, could be secured, and whether the United Nations could show the same harmony in continuously supporting a new regime as in getting rid of the present one.

Every major nation, I suppose, would like to see every other nation fashioned in its own image and likeness. Most Americans would doubtless like to see Spain a democratic republic functioning under a constitution and bill of rights akin to ours; and some Americans may hope that sooner or later our Government will employ its economic power, and, if necessary, its military force to replace the existing political regime in Spain with just such a democratic republic. But, on the other hand, Soviet Russia and Communists elsewhere in the world hope that Spain will be transformed into a Soviet state, into a dictatorship of the proletariat, with Dr. Negrin, or someone like him, forcibly substituted for General Franco, while the statesman who served as British Ambassador at Madrid from 1940 to 1944 has repeatedly expressed the hope that constitutional monarchy of the English type might be restored in Spain.

From my experience and observation in Spain, I am extremely dubious about an early, happy realization of such hopes. The masses of the Spanish people are largely indifferent, if not hostile, to the Bourbon monarchy, and if it were restored by some military coup it would lack needful popular support and could be maintained in the long run only with foreign—presumably British—assistance. On the other hand, large numbers of Republican and Socialist leftists blame the Communist minority, no less than the rightists, for the tragedy of the Spanish civil war, and at least some of them would make common cause with the entrenched and not inconsiderable strength of the right against any Communist regime, with the result that this would have to be forced upon Spain with foreign—presumably Russian—aid.

It might be that a democratic republic could be established with a large measure of popular support. But we should be under no illusions about the difficulties which would beset it and which would militate against its orderly functioning according to American traditions and ideals. Spaniards have no such political tradition as ours. Their two experiences with republican governments—the one in 1870 and the other in the 1930's—were not fortunate and have not made all of them enthusiastic about seeking a third experience. Moreover, any majority of Spaniards who might support a republic would not consist of two big and moderate parties, like the Republican and the Democratic in our own country, but would comprise a variety of factions so disparate as to render extremely difficult the maintenance of a united and really democratic front against Communist advocates of a proletarian dictatorship on one side and rightist champions of monarchy or a military dictatorship on the other. Dictatorship, in one form or another, is no novelty, but an old habit, in Spanish political life, and historically it has been exercised from the left as well as from the right.

Some Americans seem to think that the United States should follow up the Allied defeat of Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany by engaging in a kind of world-wide crusade against any and every government which we don't like or which someone dubs Fascist or totalitarian. Now, if it is an aim of ours to overthrow all dictatorships throughout the world, we should intervene in Spanish affairs and use all possible means to overthrow General Franco's dictatorship. For this purpose, I imagine, we could count on the cooperation of the Soviet Union, possibly on that of France, and barely possibly on that of Great Britain. But would there be continuing agreement among the Allies as to who or what should take General Franco's place?

And if we are going to intervene in Spanish affairs and use all possible means to overthrow General Franco's dictatorship, why should we stop there? A goodly number of other countries in the contemporary world, including some of the United Nations, are subject to dictatorships, military, or even totalitarian. What about Portugal? What about Turkey? What about Brazil? What about a half-dozen or more Spanish-American countries? What about China? What about the Soviet Union itself? Marshal Stalin was not notably helpful to the democracies from 1939 to 1941.

In the circumstances it would seem statesmanlike, at least from the standpoint of the United States, to ensure a peaceful resolution of current political difficulties and conflicts among peoples recently liberated from Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany before interfering in Spain or in any other neutral or Allied country. My own conviction is that we should not concern ourselves with the internal affairs or form of government of any foreign country, unless that country becomes, or clearly threatens to become, a menace to the peace and independence of its neighbors and hence of the world and of ourselves. I never liked the Nazi regime in Germany or the Fascist regime in Italy, or, for that matter, the Communist dictatorship in Russia. These have all seemed to me fundamentally of the same ilk and quite antithetical to the democracy I know and like in America. Yet, so long as they kept the peace and did not go on the warpath, or threaten our security, I believe our Government acted wisely in having diplomatic relations with them and in leaving to their own peoples any question of their internal affairs and form of government. When Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy did become menacing and aggressive against their neighbors, we had reason to break with them and to oppose them; we finally did so when they joined Japan in an attack upon us.

Noninterference in the internal affairs of foreign countries is not merely personal counsel of mine. It is a long standing, and at least used to be a generally accepted, American public policy. One of its classic expressions was President James Monroe's in 1823, which I quoted at the beginning of this book and which, for emphasis, I here quote again: "Our policy in regard to Europe * * * remains the same, which is not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the government de facto as the legitimate government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it, and to preserve those relations by a frank, firm, and manly policy, meeting, in all instances, the just claims of every power; submitting to injuries from none." This was the policy which President Franklin Roosevelt reaffirmed in specific pledges to Spain, and the policy in accordance with which our wartime mission in Spain was discharged. I don't believe it should lightly be changed.

Frankly, I would leave Spain to the Spaniards. Left to themselves, they are no menace to their neighbors or to the peace of the world, and they are a people whose tradition and temperament are inflexibly opposed alike to domestic regimentation and to interference from abroad. The existing regime is regarded by the mass of Spaniards, rightist as well as leftist, and is admitted by General Franco himself to be but temporary. Eventually there is sure to be a change in it. But change is more likely to be impeded than expedited by foreign intervention or interference, which would probably involve additional suffering for the Spanish people and lead to serious divisions among the major Allied Powers.

Meanwhile, with the existing Spanish Government, as with any Spanish government which, through evolution or internal revolution, may succeed it, the United States would do well, in my opinion, to pursue a policy of friendly relations. Spain and the Spanish people can be, regardless of their form of government, very serviceable to American interests at the present and in the future.

There remains, of course, a public opinion in the United States, besides other public opinions in Great Britain and Russia, hostile to the pursuit of such a policy. But the most hostile of this public opinion is, I am sure, a peculiarly ill-informed, or a most selfishly interested and propagandist-directed, public opinion. There can be no doubt of the need and importance of public opinion in a democracy. But if a democracy is to act wisely, especially in the domain of foreign policy, and at the same time to reflect, as it should, the major public opinion of its people, it is of supreme importance that democratic public opinion be well informed and truthful and honest. Public opinion which is fashioned and propagated otherwise must of necessity lead a democracy like the United States into the most foolish and dangerous paths.

As the United States projects its worldwide leadership into post-war reconstruction and the organization and maintenance of international peace and security, it becomes all the more desirable that our Government, particularly our Department of State, should greatly strengthen and make much more effective its liaison with the American press and other fashioners of American public opinion and thereby contribute actively toward making and keeping that opinion well and wisely informed. This, I hope, would apply to our relations with Spain as with other countries.

Spain desires to cultivate especially friendly relations with the United States. I firmly believe that for the future, regardless of what its Government may be, whether one evolved from General Franco's, or restored monarchy or a republic, we should reciprocate and should cultivate especially friendly relations with Spain.

In support of such a policy on our part I would advance some five basic considerations:

1. Spain (with Portugal) occupies a most important geographical position in respect of commercial aviation of the present and future, particularly between the American Continents and Europe. There is no need of laboring the generally recognized significance of the airplane for postwar communication and transport between nations and continents, or the rivalry which most probably will develop among great industrial nations for primacy in the construction of planes and the proliferation of air routes throughout the world. For the United States it would appear that one of its first objectives in the development of any world program of aviation should be the Iberian Peninsula. Spain perceives advantages to herself in this and is quite prepared to cooperate closely with the United States in aviation matters if she can count upon fair and considerate treatment in return.

2. Spain (with Portugal) also occupies, as the present war has amply demonstrated, a peculiarly strategic position in relation to any major threat to the peace of Europe and hence of the world. If Spain had joined Germany in 1940 or could have been relied upon to offer no resistance to German invasion and

occupation, it is reasonable to suppose that the German war machine would have reduced Gibraltar, closed the Strait, and thereby dealt a mortal blow at Britain in the Mediterranean and north Africa before we could have sent any effective aid or been in any position to undertake a counteroffensive against the "soft underbelly" of Europe. In that case the war might have been gravely prolonged and the final outcome far more dubious.

It should by now be clear to Americans that any power, whether Napoleonic France or Hitlerian Germany or some other madly ambitious power of the future, which goes on the warpath in Europe and attempts to dominate that Continent, automatically endangers the peace and security of the rest of the world and is sure, sooner or later, to involve the United States in a horribly costly overseas conflict. It behooves us, therefore, to cultivate and maintain especially friendly relations with nations which of themselves are not likely to provoke such a conflict, but which can provide, in case of emergency, a convenient European bridgehead for our armed forces. Spain is just such a nation, and especially friendly future relations with her should not undermine, but rather buttress, any policy or program of collective world security. But to make a friend of Spain requires being a friend to Spain.

3. Many ills in Spain derive from economic backwardness. This is fully recognized by the Spanish Government and by thoughtful Spanish businessmen and farmers, who look particularly to the United States to supply machinery, materials, and technicians for the industrial and agricultural betterment of their country. Most Spaniards are industrious and hard working, and economic assistance from the United States would prove profitable to both countries. In the immediate future Spain could be utilized as an important supplier of textiles, tires, and foodstuffs to our armed forces and the liberated areas in Europe, if only she could get from us the requisite raw cotton, rubber, and fertilizers. She has the factories and the workmen. Instead of trying to force on Spain exports from the United States which are deemed luxuries by her Government and which eat up her dollar balances, we might, much more helpfully to ourselves and to the well-being of the Spanish people, remove some of our restrictions on the export of materials vitally needful to the domestic and foreign economy of Spain, and at the same time lower our tariff on the imports with which Spain must pay us.

Spain particularly wants a large number of motortrucks, a large amount of hydroelectric equipment, a large miscellany of agricultural implements, and machine tools and spare parts. She wishes to import them from the United States, and if we meet her halfway, we shall have in her a good customer as well as a good neighbor.

4. Some ills in Spain derive from lack of sufficient popular and technical education. Here, too, thoughtful Spaniards, regardless of political affiliation, look to the United States for aid and example. They want to know what is being done by Americans, both scientifically and practically, in agriculture, in medicine, in chemistry, in vocational guidance, in the industrial arts. In turn, Spain has arts and literary and historical scholarship from which Americans should increasingly profit. A sympathetically developed program of cultural relations between Spain and the United States, on the scale of that between the United States and Hispanic America, would be mutually beneficial.

5. I do not believe that we can successfully pursue one policy in Hispanic America and another in Spain. If we continue to convey the impression that we are a bad neighbor to Spain, we shall increase the difficulties and hazards of remaining a good neighbor to the other American Republics. Contemporary Spain, I am sure, has absolutely no political objectives on the American Continents, but she does have a huge cultural empire there. Her history and enterprise, for four and a half centuries now, have been more fruitfully associated with America than with Europe. She faces westward rather than northward or eastward. She has given to 18 of the 21 American republics her language, her religion, her art, her men and mentality, her virtues, and vices. I have yet to encounter a family in Spain, whether of nobility or peasantry, of professional or artisan class, which does not have relatives and interests in Spanish America. There are hundreds of thousands of first-generation Spaniards actually living in such cities as Buenos Aires, Montevideo, Lima, and Habana, and, for good or ill, exerting influence upon the social, economic, cultural, and political life of American Republics to the south of us.

Nor is the traffic one way. Indeed, I have been astounded by the Spanish-American numbers and influences in Spain. Along with France, Spain has been, and is most likely to remain, the main magnet for tourists and students, artists and athletes and journalists, from Latin America. Almost every well-to-do Spaniard has a wife or mother or at least an aunt who hails from Cuba or Peru or Mexico or Argentina; and in every important Spanish city the "colony" of nationals of each major Spanish-American country outnumbers any other "foreign" colony, German, French, or British.

There are many differences, of course, between Spain and her daughter nations in the New World—differences between an old long-settled country, of monarchical tradition and relatively homogeneous population, and a group of pioneering "frontier" countries with republican and separatist traditions and with very heterogeneous populations. But such differences are, I think, less than those obtaining between England and the United States, and they should not be exaggerated. Throughout both Spain and Hispanic America there are strikingly similar political and social, as well as cultural, characteristics. The social structure is similar, and so, too, are the political currents: The complexity and individualism of party politics; the endless conflicts between "rightists" and "leftists," between "clericalism" and "anticlericalism," between federalism and centralization; the recurrent revolutionary movements and the equally recurrent resorts to military dictatorship. Such currents in one Spanish-speaking country are reflected, sooner or later, to greater or lesser degree, in the others. Here, again, by reason of close cultural and personal contacts, Spain cannot be unaffected by developments in Spanish America, or vice versa.

I assure that the "good-neighbor" policy of the United States toward the countries of Spanish America involves our securing the utmost cooperation with and from them for mutual defense and commercial advantage, without impairing their independence or interfering in their internal affairs. If they tend toward "right" or toward "left," that is their concern and not ours, so long as they are friendly and cooperative and do not endanger the basic purposes of the good neighbor policy. If this policy is to produce the most salutary and enduring effects, then I would conclude from the foregoing that it should be extended to embrace not only the Spanish-American countries and Brazil but also Portugal and Spain.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to break off diplomatic relations with Spain because the Spanish Government pretended to be or was pro-Axis before the United States entered the war, what about Soviet Russia which not only collaborated with Hitler in starting the war, but took half of Poland as a pay-off and then attacked and seized a part of tiny Finland? Are we going to establish one principle for Spain because she is weak and the Communists do not like her, and another principle for Russia because she is strong? Furthermore, in evaluating the French request, it should be borne in mind that the Falangists, or Spanish Fascists, are only a small minority in Spain and that more than one-third of France is communistic. Let us have the entire Spanish situation brought out into the open and reviewed completely. If necessary, let us have every American attaché at our Embassy in Spain during the war give his views along with those of ex-Ambassador J. H. Hayes.

Let Us Not Knife Mr. Secretary Byrnes Behind His Back While He Is Trying To Bring About Better Relations Between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the so-called Un-American Activities Committee recently requested the financial and membership records of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

All of us here, at one time or another, have noted the work of this organization, whose purpose is to bring the peoples of the two great Allied Nations, the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, into closer intellectual and cultural harmony. The National Council's work has been open and aboveboard, and their sponsors are many of America's leading figures.

In the light of this, I cannot see how this House committee can insinuate, simply through the request by a committee of its name, that the persons and contributors of this fine organization are engaged in subversive activities.

The established policy of this Government is to deal in cooperation with the Russian Government. Only through such cooperation, as with all other nations, can we hope to practice peace. I believe that in attempting to disrupt the activities of an organization, which is promoting the most harmonious relations between the two Republics, is a direct threat by the Un-American Activities Committee at our foreign policy and relations with the Soviet Union.

This is further proof to me that the continuance of the committee is inimical to the welfare of this Nation. It stops at nothing to voice its injudicial practices, and daily lowers the prestige and dignity of the United States Congress by its acts.

Corliss Lamont, the chairman of the National Council, has addressed me the

following communications, which I believe should be reread by every one of our colleagues here:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICAN-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP,
New York, N. Y., December 9, 1945.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: We enclose herewith a copy of a letter this day sent by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship to Representative JOHN S. WOOD, chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities. In this letter the National Council states its decision not to open its books and records to investigators of the above committee, which has been requested by that committee since November 12, 1945, and which has been the subject of an exchange of correspondence between the National Council and the committee. The enclosed letter states the reasons for the refusal to allow the requested investigation. These reasons are substantially based on the obvious fact that by no interpretation consonant with the facts does the National Council fall within the scope of the committee's authorized powers of inquiry, either as being engaged in un-American propaganda, as being subversive, or as seeking the overthrow of the principles of our form of government.

The National Council has been fully aware of the activities and conduct of the present Committee on Un-American Activities and of its predecessor, the Dies Committee. As you know, this conduct has merited widespread public condemnation and sharp criticism on the floor of Congress which has led to a move to amend the House rules to abolish the committee as a standing committee of the House.

The National Council is aware, too, of the fact that the present Committee on Un-American Activities was established on the opening day of Congress without full consideration having been given thereto and under circumstances which caused Representative JOHN MCCORMACK, then majority leader, to say that the action was without precedent in the entire history of Congress and to express his hope that the House would not accept the offered amendment.

The activities and methods of the Committee on Un-American Activities have made it plain that its present move to "investigate" the council is not a move to discover things un-American or subversive but rather is a move designed to injure American-Soviet relations upon which, as our letter to Representative WOOD indicates, the peace of the world depends. The committee's action can have no other effect.

We call this matter to your urgent attention because we believe it important to the dignity of Congress and to our national well-being that the activities of this committee to date and its motivations should be given the closest scrutiny by Congress itself to the end that there will be no further abuse of the power of Congress through smear campaigns against the truly democratic forces in American life.

Sincerely yours,
CORLISS LAMONT,
Chairman.

Copies to all Congressmen.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICAN-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP,
New York, N. Y., December 9, 1945.

The Honorable JOHN S. WOOD,
Chairman, Committee on
Un-American Activities,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOOD: The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, by unanimous vote of its board of directors, has decided not to accede to the surprising request of the House Committee on Un-American Activities that it be permitted to send in investigators to examine the organization's books and records. We reiterate that in our opinion the National Council is not a proper subject of interest for your committee; and we are unable to comprehend how our important work for American-Soviet cooperation and understanding could possibly be considered an un-American activity.

A brief statement on the work of our national council may serve to clarify the matter. The council is an educational organization in the broad sense, financed entirely by Americans and trying to present the people of the United States with reliable information about Soviet Russia and American Soviet relations. Among our more than 200 directors and sponsors are some of the most eminent citizens of the United States of America, including several Members of Congress.

Since the founding of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship in 1943, we have done our best to further the ends of our Government for American-Soviet cooperation in war and in peace. And in this patriotic effort we have had on numerous occasions the collaboration of the United States Army, the United States State Department, and other Government agencies. Both President Roosevelt and President Truman have shown sympathy with our work.

On November 14 last President Truman, General Eisenhower, and Admiral King all sent messages to our great Madison Square Garden meeting, at which England's noted Dean of Canterbury was one of the chief speakers. The Dean of Canterbury, as the special guest of the National Council, likewise addressed large rallies in other cities besides New York and was later received by President Truman at the White House.

Other speakers at our Madison Square Garden meetings have been Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Acting Secretary of State; Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board; the Earl of Halifax, British Ambassador to the United States; Andrei A. Gromyko, the Soviet Ambassador; Joseph E. Davies, former United States Ambassador to the Soviet Union; and Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell.

The day-to-day work of our organization includes a speakers bureau which tries to meet the constant demand for lectures on the Soviet Union; an exhibits department, which supplies photographs on various phases of Soviet life to schools and colleges, libraries, and museums throughout the United States; an educational committee, which initiates teachers' conferences and exchange of students between America and Soviet Russia; an architects committee, a music committee, a religious committee, and a science committee, which stimulate cultural programs on Soviet Russia and cultural interchange with that country.

The activities of the National Council have been open and Nation-wide and reported constantly in the public press. Our organization has nothing to conceal. Your committee has failed to indicate in what manner the activities of the council bring it within the scope of the investigation that the House of Representatives has authorized your committee to make. Nor has your committee given any reason for its demands upon us, though we have repeatedly asked for one.

The National Council does not, to quote the House resolution on this matter, engage in "un-American propaganda activities." It is not "subversive" in any way; and it does not attack "the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution."

Your committee must be aware that inherent in its request is the inference that helping the American people to understand our Soviet ally and promoting American-Soviet amity are un-American and subversive. For us to yield to a request based on this erroneous inference would not merely cause wanton injury to the work of the National Council, but would also have a deleterious effect upon America's foreign relations and thus be of disservice to our country. In fact, the request of your committee, if pursued, would in itself contribute to the present reckless campaign to undermine those friendly relations between America and Russia upon which the peace of the world depends.

Accordingly, we must assert our legal and constitutional rights to be free from unwarranted and improper interference by the agents of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Because of the importance of the issues involved in this matter, I am making this letter public.

Sincerely yours,
CORLISS LAMONT,
Chairman.

Import Quota on Watches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PEHR G. HOLMES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on November 21, 1945, I introduced a bill in the House of Representatives, H. R. 4770, creating an import quota on watches and watch movements:

Be it enacted, etc., That after January 1, 1946, an import quota on watches and watch movements is hereby established.

The import quota on watches and watch movements shall be determined by establishing an annual import quota that is not more than 25 percent of the total production of watches manufactured in the United States of America in the year 1940.

My reason for this action was due to the fact that I had received information that during the first 9 months of this year the Swiss watch interests shipped into the United States an average of 600,000 watches and watch movements a month. Then in October they dumped into this country 2,000,000, and in November about one and a quarter million; that about eight and three quarters million in 11 months, and I suppose that the December imports will come in for good measure. During the war over 28,000,000 watches and watch movements were imported into this country. What chance will the American watch manufacturers have against that kind of competition?

What is going to become of the eight or ten thousand men and women engaged in gainful employment in these industries? Are they going to be turned out to become part of the army of unemployment? Is that what we mean by full employment? No; the right thing to do is to stop this wholesale dumping of watches in the United States. I can assure the Members of this House that after our recess I am going to ask the Ways and Means Committee for a hearing on my bill.

Last Friday, December 14, in the well of this House the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] made a statement:

That the gentleman who went to the White House represents a company union—a company controlled union.

I suppose he had reference to one of my constituents, Walter W. Cenerazzo, national president of the American Watch Workers Union. Now in order to keep the record straight, let me inform the membership of this House that the American Watch Workers Union is a national union. It is composed of employees of all the American jewelled watch industries. The local unions affiliated are the Elgin Watch Workers Union, the Hamilton Watch Workers Union, and the Waltham Watch Workers Union, located in my congressional district. Each of these unions have been certified by the National Labor Relations Board.

Now, let me further state to the Members of this House that Walter Cenerazzo has been a tireless worker not only in the interest of the employees he represents but also the industries where these men and women are gainfully employed. He realizes that this dumping must be stopped, otherwise the last three remaining American watch manufacturing companies in the United States will have to go out of business, and that would be a calamity. What would happen in case of another war? Would Switzerland furnish the timing devices our Army and Navy would need? That is a question for us to keep in mind.

We have a choice of keeping eight or ten thousand people employed. Yes; with proper protection we could increase that employment to 20,000 or 25,000. Which will it be? It is up to Congress to take action. For my part, I am 100 percent back of Walter W. Cenerazzo and the employees he represents, and I am equally determined to do everything I can to see to it that the Waltham, Hamilton, and Elgin Watch Cos. shall continue in business.

Let me ask this question: When has it become un-American to ask protection for American citizens and American industry?

Loans to Russia and Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Press of St. Marys, Pa.:

OPPOSING LOAN

A couple of papers in Texas the other day conducted a poll among their readers asking whether or not they favored credit loans to Russia and Great Britain.

Now Texas is about as far removed from contact with Europe as any portion of the United States could be, and one would naturally expect a pretty accurate poll of public opinion from residents of that area.

The newspaper readers by an overwhelming majority opposed loans to either country.

We believe the same sentiment exists elsewhere in this country.

Americans in general can see no sense in extending credit to England, already in "hock" to us from the First World War, and a nation that once referred to Uncle Sam as "Uncle Shylock" when he asked if England could not pay at least some interest on her financial obligation.

Great Britain at the present time is conducting an experiment in changing her form of government, and many Americans are skeptical that part of the loan sought from United States is to further that change.

We entertain no illusions that Great Britain will not compete with us in world markets even if she is granted the loan she is now in market for.

We ran across this competition after the last war and there have been some instances told where England has been competing with us for trade even during World War II in the matter of lend-lease material.

We don't fall for high-powered propaganda that England will be financially sunk if she does not get $4,000,000,000 from Uncle Sam.

Her colonial possessions are ranked among the richest in the world. She controls gold and silver mines, untold wealth in agricultural countries, to say nothing of her precious diamond mines in Africa.

We might say the same of Russia. She has in Siberia some of the world's most valuable mining resources, principally gold.

The loan we are in the process of making to England will be interest free the first 5 years, then bear the rate of 2 percent annually after that.

Wouldn't you like to negotiate a loan with your home-town banker on the same basis?

Address of Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, on December 6, last, Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., spoke at the convention of Tennessee Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, which was being held in my home city of Memphis.

General Farley has a host of friends all through the South and especially in my city. His speech was so thoroughly and genuinely accepted, and his whole theme so much like him, that I requested permission to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all of us may have the pleasure of reading it:

It is a truism that wars leave their impress upon men and things. But no war approached in magnitude the one we have just fought to a successful finish, and no other war of which history has a record has done so many things to men and to their institutions, whether these institutions be political, educational, commercial, or what not. These inanimate creations of man often reflect the character of their makers. And we have seen men and their enterprises alike affected by the great trial they have so recently undergone. Some men met the test imposed by war and triumphed. Others couldn't meet the test and failed. I am speaking now, of course, of men and enterprises on the home front. We have seen enterprises that failed to meet the test go under completely. We have seen small concerns grow into gigantic undertakings and we have seen some of our large enterprises closed down.

Not alone enterprises and their makers have been affected by the war. It has also altered attitudes and trends, hopes and desires. Nothing human or of human creation escaped the impact of this war. These changes were not unexpected.

History shows us that when great cataclysms occur, the normal trends, which ordinarily move so slowly as to be almost unnoticeable, take on a great head of steam and move with extraordinary momentum, a momentum that leaves most men dazed and wondering. All of us have witnessed a cataclysm hitherto undreamed of. It is the duty of all of us to understand the changed conditions, to meet them, and to master them.

Many commercial enterprises follow these normal trends, and because of the very nature of their capital investment, the wide area they cover, the thousands they employ, they must, even of necessity, because of their massiveness, move slowly. Such enterprises even in war, because of this retarding factor we have described, are apt to move slowly.

This is true of all the heavy industries, of all transportation and communication, of such basic industries such as steel, iron, coal, lumber, railroads, telephone, and telegraph, to mention some. The industries that manufacture goods for consumer consumption, which we designate as consumer goods, where merchandising is a major part of the success, must of necessity deal in both the latest things and the latest improvements. These invariably involve either an element of style, or an element of invention, and the managers of such enterprises must be ever prepared to have ready at the proper time the suitable things to fill the demands. The public, in times like these, must ride on an obsolete pullman or a run-down railroad coach; but the public does not have to buy, nor will it buy, an obsolete model of a home appliance, such as a washing machine, a refrigerator, and the like.

Now, it so happens that this particular industry in which you and I are engaged, is not wholly of the heavy industry, or wholly a consumer-woods industry. While we partake of both and are dependent on them, we occupy a somewhat middle-of-the-road position, and this circumstance is fortuitous. While the aggregate of the investment in our industry is comparable to the largest of the industries, it is broken up into units and an individual, or a group of individuals, can hold a separate part. This makes for sound dispersement of capital and sound dispersement of labor. Consequently, if we handle ourselves intelligently, we escape the many irritating penalties and confusions so frequently involved in concentration of labor and capital. And because we are also geographically scattered, we escape the inevitable and burdensome problems that come from piled-up resources and labor in single communities. And here again we have much to be thankful for in the fortunate nature of our organization.

Some people are inclined to accord respect to high-priced articles. It is just human nature to look behind the highly priced tag and contemplate the effort, skill, energy, research, and ingenuity required to put that kind of product on the market. The very product itself is of a nature that commands recognition for itself and its maker. A locomotive, a turbine, an automobile, looms large in the public's consciousness and fills so much space actually, and in the mind, that it demands notice. The small, inexpensive casual product does not have within itself this dominant factor of cost and size. It, therefore, must stand or fall on other factors. In this group we find ourselves.

Throughout the years we have seen our products accepted by the public in ever-increasing quantities. Many erroneously assumed that these products were accepted purely as a diversion, or as a thirst-quench-

er. They had forgotten that there is a social implication inherent in our product, that people like to be together while sipping a harmless beverage to while away the time, and that this very fact contributed largely to the growth of our sales. All of us in our industry know this. But I am confident that there were many of us who did not realize that our beverages had become part of the American way of life. It took this global war to bring out this truth, a truth apparent on every battlefield where our men fought gallantly and where our women aided nobly. Our fighting forces, even at the uttermost ends of the earth, asked, aye, demanded, as part and parcel of their daily life, the beverages they had learned to drink at home.

Those that see the extent to which we have grown, the high place we have earned in public consciousness, are fully aware that our reciprocal obligations toward our public are greater than ever. We, as never before, must practice every virtue known to the business world. Character and integrity must be respected among us. In any modern industry in these highly competitive times, there is no place for the fly-by-night, the chiseler, the trickster. These types can ruin their honorable colleagues by their shortsightedness and unprincipled conduct.

Our industry must be synonymous with everything that is best so that the public must get its money's worth in intangibles of taste, of bouquet, of flavor, or relaxation. That our products must be trustworthy, goes without saying. But the public must know and must never have reason to question the inherent integrity and the wholesomeness behind every one of our products. The careless fellow, the indifferent fellow, can do great harm to all of us. We cannot have any red flags, or any other kind of danger signals in this business. All products must be safe.

Now a word about techniques. The future problem of business will largely lie in increased costs. Sanitation can best be preserved by the elimination of human contact with the beverages. So we must continue to improve our equipment and machinery, our methods and our processes, until we approximate the ideal in automatic manufacture and handling. Nothing could be more important at this time. And we will have problems enough in the distribution area of our business, which is and must be so largely human.

So, I will close by saying that the ideal for us is to practice the virtues of sound business, to put out products of unquestionable quality, and to be worthy everywhere and at all times of the confidence reposed in us by the public.

Resolution of Buena Vista County, Iowa, Rural Electric Cooperative Relative to Extension of REA Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a resolution recently adopted by the Buena Vista County, Iowa, Rural Electric Cooperative relative to extension of REA service:

Whereas the Buena Vista County Rural Electric Cooperative is now in position to extend electrical service to many additional farms as soon as the funds are available; and

Whereas the farms now requesting such electrical service are in an area where the grain and livestock production is unusually large; and

Whereas the need for such additional electrical service is greater than ever before: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this cooperative request that the Federal Government make an additional appropriation for the extension of electrical service; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States amend Senate file No. 3483 of the Seventy-fourth Congress being an act to provide for rural electrification and other purposes by changing subparagraph (c) of section 3 of the said act by eliminating therefrom the provision that the available funds shall be allotted to cooperatives in the proportion which the number of their farms not then receiving central station electric service bears to the total number of farms of the United States not then receiving such service. In other words, that there be stricken from the said section (c) all after the words "several States" down to and including "receiving such service."

That this cooperative believes that this provision of the law is not the best policy because the production of farms should govern the availability of electric service and not the number of the farms, and the effect of this provision of the law is really to penalize the cooperatives most actively promoting the extension of rural electric service; be it further

Resolved, That sufficient copies of this resolution be sent to Representative CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Washington, D. C., so that he can place a copy in the hands of each of the Iowa Congressmen and that copies of this resolution be sent to Senator GEORGE A. WILSON and Senator BERT B. HICKENLOOPER.

On this 11th day of December 1945 in a regular meeting of the board of directors of the Buena Vista County Rural Electric Cooperative, the foregoing resolution was adopted by unanimous vote of the directors, all of the directors being present at such meeting.

The Chinese Foreign Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a resolution from the North Platte Valley Central Labor Union of Scottsbluff, Nebr.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have grave misgivings about keeping our troops on foreign soil. The recent incident, when a Chinese town was shelled because a soldier, who was out hunting rabbits, was killed, is evidence enough that all is not well in countries where our troops are located.

If we continue on a policy of power politics and attempts to police the entire world, we will find the American people becoming very critical of our foreign policy.

Whereas at the present time American equipment, American ships, and American troops are being used in the Far East, both in helping the Dutch and French imperialists retain their colonies on the old basis in French Indochina and Indonesia and in aiding the Chiang Kai-shek government pursue its civil war against the overwhelming majority of the Chinese people who are trying to establish a democratic and free China; and

Whereas such American interference in the affairs of the far eastern countries is not in the benefit of the "four freedoms" for which World War II was fought, but is only in the interests of big monopoly capital which is out to gain maximum domination over the Far East; and

Whereas unless such interference is brought to an immediate and complete halt, the inevitable outcome will be America's involvement in a huge new sacrifice of mankind in World War III: Therefore be it

Resolved, That all American troops, ships, and equipment be immediately withdrawn from China, Indonesia, and the Far East except for that used to complete the destruction of the feudal Fascist regime in Japan; and be it further

Resolved, That more and speedier efforts be made to get the men and women in the armed services back home.

Passed at regular meeting, December 13, of the North Platte Valley Central Labor Union.

J. H. THOMPSON, *President.*
GEORGE C. EWALD, *Secretary.*

Is the OPA Policy "Rule or Ruin"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call the attention of the Members of Congress to an outrageous condition which exists in one of the emergency war agencies we created. Instead of following the philosophy of trying to preserve our economy and our system of free enterprise, we discover these agencies are wrecking the very foundation of business upon which our great economic system was built.

When did we empower the Office of Price Administration with the power of life and death over our business concerns? When did we delegate its administrative officials arbitrary and dictatorial authority to indiscriminately hand down decisions contrary to the best interests of our economic way of life?

I am presenting for the consideration of the Members a letter I received from a small businessman in my district. It clearly presents the ruthless and inhuman policies which exist in this Frankenstein we helped create. If such practices continue on the part of the OPA in the face of our efforts to reconvert to a peacetime economy, I greatly fear for our future.

The backbone of our economic structure is the small business firms of this Nation. I believe we can safely estimate on the basis of previous surveys that 80 percent of our people are employed by the so-called small businesses. It is these people who are the customers of the big industries.

Where are we headed, if we permit the OPA to close them out? Can it be there is a sinister motive behind the OPA's attitude? Is it motivated by a desire to wipe out all small business firms, so that

the Government can step in and take over our economic system? Are we to continue to let conditions arise like the one my constituent cites where the OPA finds itself convicted of an injustice, but instead of correcting its mistake reverses itself rather than lose face with its other offices? Are we going to tolerate an attitude from one of our public servants who intentionally spiked a justified rate adjustment because of his personal feelings?

If we permit the continuation of such policies, I gravely fear the consequences. I believe it is time for the Members of Congress to see that the Office of Price Administration performs a public service, rather than follows a policy of rule or ruin over our economic life.

The letter follows:

No doubt Mr. Bowles is a very busy man and does not remember remote cases such as ours, but we were the one parking-lot company in the United States that staged a lone fight trying to get permission to get a 3-cent increase on our first-hour parking rate and a 1-cent increase on the daily rate. This was granted us by local offices in Columbus, Ohio, which gave their permission to make these changes in rates in both Columbus and Cincinnati. We also had a like permission granted in Kentucky. Then we applied in Indiana and it was denied. When we produced the findings in our favor by the price attorney for the OPA in the Columbus office, as well as the findings of the attorney for the OPA in the Louisville office, the price attorney in Indiana became very angry—said he would spike that at once as he was going to make a special trip to Cleveland, Ohio, and have those rates canceled and we would have to go back to our old rate. After operating the new rate about 5 days, we got telegrams from Cleveland demanding that we go back to the rates as they were before we were granted permission to raise and in the telegram we were advised that if this was not immediately done, we would be subject to court action by the OPA.

The one thing that has stuck in my craw is the remark that has been made by several members of the OPA boards and that is that the Government didn't care how quickly I went broke, as we fully believed we would go broke if we were not given the right to get these few pennies more on each transaction. I didn't think that that should be the attitude of our Government or anybody connected with our Government. At the time the remark was made to me personally by two men who were holding well-paid Government jobs in the OPA, I was devoting, and had been for months, anywhere from 60 to 90 hours per week on Government work without one penny of remuneration. That was a new angle for me, as I had always thought in the past that our Government wanted to see businessmen succeed rather than have failures chalked up, and being of a rather tenacious temperament, I decided to see this thing through. We contacted the OPA office in Washington and after cooling our heels in the outer chambers, we finally got to one of the many assistants of the OPA who, after reviewing very carefully our case, said we were entitled without a doubt to this rate, but he would have to uphold the decision of their regional board at Cleveland. Whether we are right or wrong, we must uphold them. And on asking what our next move would be, said there was only one move left and that is to take this before the Federal Court of Appeals, which we did and which was a very costly procedure. We employed a Washington attorney who was licensed to go before this court. Then a very comprehensible brief was drawn and printed and a day set for hearing. Well, on the day before this case was to be heard, I received a telegram asking that I grant the OPA a 20-day extension due to the fact that they had not prepared their brief and were unprepared to go before the court. I granted this extension. Then again the day before the postponed date for hearing, I received another telegram asking for a 30-day extension, as the OPA was still unprepared and which I granted.

When the case was finally heard, my attorney wrote me saying that no doubt we would win our case, as the brief that had been prepared had been so poorly gotten up that they would have absolutely no legs to stand on before a legal-minded court. We were to know in 30 days the findings of this august body, but it took about 90 days. Well, it seems as though the cards were stacked against us as the findings were that if we were permitted to make this increased rate effective, that we would undoubtedly cause runaway inflation in the United States. I think if Mr. Bowles will ask for the file, if they keep files, that he will have a very comprehensive coverage on the entire case.

As I stated in previous letters, that had it not been that our landlords had given us relief we would have been out of business in 1943, which in our minds more or less goes to prove that the Government didn't care how soon or who goes broke. In a small company like ours, we have lost a great amount of money and we have rent indebtedness to make up, that for a small outfit like ours, is a staggering figure. We have been unable to get help due to the fact that we were only allowed to employ people who the USES would give us, and were held to October 1942 wages. In one instance we were told by the USES that we could use a man who was subject to epileptic fits and sometimes would have as many as three in 1 day. Think of the hazard this man would create driving high-powered automobiles on public parking lots. We naturally did not hire this man. And that was about the type of help the USES would permit us to use. We were allowed to have some old men who were not able to get in factories and in most cases were not able to drive cars, but simply permitted the customers to park their own automobiles. This is strictly against the rules of our insurers.

Even if business is at normal, it will take us 4 or 5 years to make up the back rents that we owe. Now we are not only compelled to go back to the rent as set up in our leases but we are compelled each month to start paying on the amount owing due to the rent reductions we had during 1943 and 1944 and 10 months of 1945.

When you price different commodities in stores, the prices are so much higher than they were before the war that it almost leads one to believe there is a distinction in who may and who may not raise the price of their merchandise. Our merchandise is strictly service—therefore, a luxury.

Lumber Policies of OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, due to methods of applying ceilings on lumber mills, the OPA is choking off production. Government agencies never admit their mistake. They feel that the lumber industry is at fault and now, with their meddlesome interference, they have set up a new housing agency, which attempts to put ceilings on old and new houses. In my opinion, the plan is doomed to failure. The administration has been busy trying to make the public feel that the lumber and building industry is incapable of doing its job and that they need more Government supervision. I do not believe this to be true. What the lumber industry and every other industry needs is less Government regimentation and less whipping of the cow around the proverbial stump. Business just cannot go ahead when the Government is clubbing it from every side.

In 1945, 750,000,000 board-feet of lumber was exported. This would build 100,000 new homes. We are exporting 15,000,000 board-feet of lumber to South America each month. All of this is in addition to lumber taken by the various military units. At Port Heunene, on the west coast, some 80,000,000 board-feet of lumber is tied up by the Army and the Federal bureaucrats. I am reliably informed that both the Army and Navy has an enormous surplus of lumber scattered all over the world. This lumber should be released at once and made available for housing in this country. We should stop all exports of lumber until our own needs have been met. One reason we do have exports is due to the OPA ceiling prices in this country. The sawmills need higher costs and ceiling prices have not been enforced by OPA on sales of American lumber to foreign buyers.

I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the appropriate committee in the House, at once, investigate and report, to Congress, the amount of lumber being held by the military forces and the amount of lumber we continue to export to foreign countries. Steps should be taken to make the proper adjustments on ceiling prices in order to keep this lumber in the United States. There is a tremendous demand for new houses. They cannot be built by Government regulations or OPA directives, nor by lumber which is shipped out of the country.

On Behalf of Pvt. Jeremiah L. O'Donovan-Rossa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I herewith offer a letter which I have sent to Secretary of War Patterson on behalf of Pvt. Jeremiah L. O'Donovan-Rossa, grandson and namesake of a famous Irish patriot. This soldier, I believe, was unfairly court-martialed during the operations in north Africa and sentenced to death, which sentence was later commuted to 20 years' imprisonment, with dishonorable discharge, and then again reduced to 5, again with dishonorable discharge.

This sentence is entirely unjust, and I shall continue my fight to get this lad completely exonerated. I shall continue my fight to get an honorable medical

discharge for him or a reassignment to duty under a new number, whereby the lad can eventually get an honorable discharge.

The letter to Secretary of War Patterson, which follows, reveals all the facts. In view of what is hereinafter stated, it is utterly wrong that the stigma of dishonorable discharge should attach itself to the lad for the rest of his life. Any further imprisonment is cruel and inhuman. This wrong must be righted.

DECEMBER 18, 1945.

Hon. ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: May I direct your attention to the matter of the court martial of Pvt. Jeremiah L. O'Donovan-Rossa, 20250618, who had been with Battery D, Four Hundred and Fifty-sixth Parachute Field Artillery Battalion.

I believe a grave injustice has been done the lad, and I am communicating with you in the hope that the wrong can be righted.

The lad had volunteered for duty, and for 3 full years in the Army had maintained an unblemished record. He was recommended by his commanding officer for officers' candidate school. He served in Alaska and then volunteered for paratroop training. He successfully passed all the tests. He and other trainees were assured by the Army authorities that at the end of the course of training it would be their right to obtain an assignment to whatever branch of service within the Airborne Command they might care to choose. The lad's choice was the Infantry. He was, however, directed to the Field Artillery. He protested and was given k. p. duty for 14 days. At the end of this period of punishment, he was given a further similar term for no reason within his knowledge. He protested to the corporal who gave the order and was then confined to his quarters. He went to the Army post exchange and for this infringement of the confinement order, he was sentenced to 6 months' imprisonment.

This sentence was suspended so that he might be sent overseas. Shortly after his arrival in Africa, he was again placed under guard without explanation. He repeatedly inquired regarding the reason, but no information was given him. He was taken the following morning with other prisoners and ordered to dig a latrine ditch. He protested to the sergeant in charge that since he had not been told the reason for his confinement, he did not feel that he should do the work which had been assigned to him.

This could have been termed disobedience of an order of a noncommissioned officer, an offense punishable by a maximum penalty of 6 months. This course, however, was not adopted. A lieutenant was notified, who promptly gathered some witnesses and proceeded to meet him and then repeated the same order which the sergeant had previously given.

The lad again inquired as to the reason for his being held a prisoner. He still was not informed of the reason. The lieutenant, unmindful of his own misconduct, laid the groundwork for a charge that would result in the execution of the accused. The refusal to obey the unwarranted order of a noncommissioned officer had now changed to a refusal to obey a lieutenant, carrying with it the possibility of death before a firing squad.

It was not until 2 days after this incident that he was told that the suspension of the prior sentence had, for some unexplained reason, been withdrawn. I cannot understand, of course, why the lad should be sent overseas to serve a 6-month sentence. If his services were not to be utilized, I fail to see what purpose was gained in shipping him.

When the lad finally was given the reason for his confinement he stated that he was ready to obey the order. He was told it was too late. The charges were being prepared. It is worth noting that the soldier and the lawyer assigned to defend him on such a serious charge met only for the briefest period immediately before the trial. The defense counsel attempted to raise the point that the purpose of the lieutenant giving the order was to increase the punishment from 6 months' imprisonment to death before a firing squad. Such action is prohibited by the Articles of War. This obvious point was brushed aside by the court-martial officers and the sentence of death was imposed.

The records will show that the reviewing officer returned the case to the original tribunal for further consideration, intimating that the sentence had been too severe. That sentence, however, was confirmed by the original tribunal. The lad then wrote to General Eisenhower, a copy of which letter is enclosed. The general replied, stating in part, "No person in the military service can defy orders with impunity. In this respect you were at fault. However, you should have been informed of the reason for your confinement and because the officers were at fault in not so informing you, I have approved a sentence under which you will be entitled to be restored to duty within a reasonable time."

However, somewhere along the line was a definite laxity in carrying out the order of General Eisenhower. The treatment of the lad became much worse after General Eisenhower had written. He had been sent to the hospital, yet before his treatment had been completed, he was removed from the hospital and placed on a bread and water diet for 14 days without charges or explanation. His mind had been affected by the previous treatment and this latest abuse broke it completely. The lad attempted suicide.

It must be noted that at the end of his paratroop training in the United States, he had shown signs of fatigue and was examined by an Army psychiatrist who believed there was something unusual in his mental condition. This factor was entirely ignored by the tribunal.

When General Eisenhower commuted the sentence, he likewise arranged for the suspension of the dishonorable discharge. Without reason, the dishonorable discharge portion of the sentence was reinstated. After the attempted suicide, the psychiatrist ordered the lad returned to the United States under restraint.

The lad's case was reviewed again. The sentence has now been reduced to 5 years.

The latest report from Fort Leavenworth indicates that the lad is somewhat improved physically and mentally.

I am certain that your sense of justice will be outraged, as was mine, in reading the facts in the case. The lad, eager and patriotic, enlisted with the highest hopes of serving his country. Instead of being given every opportunity to do so, he finds himself now shattered in health and spirit, and withal, compelled to carry the stigma of a dishonorable discharge for the rest of his life.

It is my thought that one of two procedures can be followed in his case to permit the lad to go on with his life in a decent, ordered fashion. I respectfully request that the lad be given a discharge of honor based on medical grounds or reassigned to duty under a new number. I believe sincerely that only in this way can the ends of justice be served.

May I hear from you thereon.

With assurances of highest esteem, I am,

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

FIFTH ARMY GUARDHOUSE, APO No. 464,
April 16, 1943.

Gen. DWIGHT EISENHOWER,
Commander in Chief, American Expeditionary Forces, North Africa.

SIR: The writer is Pvt. Jeremiah L. O'Donovan-Rossa, A. S. N. 20250618, Battery D, Four Hundred and Fifty-sixth Field Artillery Battalion, Eighty-second Airborne Division, at present confined at this station, having been sentenced by general court-martial of June 14, found guilty of violation of Article of War 64, insubordination to a commissioned officer, and sentenced to be shot dead by musketry.

This offense was committed by the prisoner on June 3 while in confinement in his battalion guardhouse. The prisoner had been placed there without knowledge of his offense and asked several times to the officers and noncommissioned officers in charge of him what the nature of the offense was. He was not informed and when ordered to work refused to do so, as a form of protest. Later in the day the Officer of the Day gave the same order in the presence of witnesses and the prisoner again refused saying he did not know why he was in the guardhouse.

Sir, I am not a criminal. My anger at the treatment I was receiving blinded my vision and destroyed my judgment so that I ventured into deeper water than I realized. I never intended to do anything that would deprive my country of my services. It has always been my endeavor to lead an upright life and this object has not changed. I want to stay here and take part in the coming invasion of Europe. I am no coward. What I want is a chance to prove myself to my superiors, my countrymen, my family, and myself. I don't want to run away now. I'm not asking for my life but for something more precious, my good name. If you were to lower the sentence to a life sentence I would still be sent away from battle and to the penitentiary. This would be a terrible thing for my family and myself and a tremendous waste when you could use me as a soldier. I am a parachutist and machine gunner by qualification, and I beg of you to put my life to good use, not ruin me and disgrace my father and mother who bore me into this world.

I was in the Army for 2½ years without getting into trouble and I ask a chance to show you that I can still be a good soldier and fight for my country.

There are people at home who believe in me and there are the officers and men in my own battery who believe in me. Give me a chance to prove that I am worthy of that faith.

Respectfully,
Pvt. JEREMIAH O'DONOVAN-ROSSA.

Charity Should Begin at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES L. GERLACH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. Gerlach. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter:

CORNWELLS HEIGHTS,
BUCKS COUNTY, PA.,
December 10, 1945.

Hon. CHARLES L. GERLACH,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

MR. GERLACH: Allow me to respectfully protest the continue draining of American resources, in an attempt to build up an ideal utopia for all the flea-bitten nations of Europe and Asia.

I believe that Congress will be asked to approve another so-called loan to England amounting to about $4,000,000,000. France and China also have their hand out for another billion or so. Russia has some kind of a claim in for another couple billion. And you are in a position to know about how

many more moochers are already lined up for a grab at American "sucker money."

I am a veteran of the First World War, having served every day of that war, including service in the Philippines, and in France and Germany as a member of the American Expeditionary Forces and army of occupation in Germany. My son is a veteran of this war, with service in France and Germany.

My contact with European and Asiatic countries has given me plenty of first-hand information regarding the habits, politics, economics, and general conditions of these countries. I do not rely on the propaganda and sob-sister stuff being so generously spread out for American consumption.

And I am absolutely opposed to the squandering of another cent of American money anywhere, anytime, and any place in Europe, Asia, Africa, or Australia.

It was disgusting in the recent Victory Loan campaign to see and hear the heart appeals of wounded veterans for bonds to help bring the boys home, pay for wounded vets, etc., while very little or nothing was said about the billions of dollars that would be poured out to European and Asiatic parasites. Even while these vets were appealing for bond sales the vultures of Europe and Asia were already planted in Washington with their hands out, waiting to get the money as it came in.

Frankly, after my experience in the First World War I have no sympathy with the rotten political and social systems in either Europe or Asia. With a history of almost 2,000 years of continuous wars, bickerings, and petty jealousies behind them it is almost laughable to hear some of our social experimenters and high-minded "nitwits" explain how we are going to change their line of thought.

We have been told that if we don't give to Europe there will be mass starvation and Europe will go Communist. Well, what's so bad about that—for Europe? Both things are about the best thing that could happen—for Europe.

If they were allowed to do some starving they wouldn't be so d—— quick to start another war.

And if the land that is cultivated to the growth of grain for beer and whisky, and for grapes for the high-hat vinegar that goes for wine in Europe—if this land was devoted to the growth of foodstuffs in Europe maybe they could begin to feed themselves. Hundreds of strong-back-and-weak-mind natives are weaned on a wine bottle, matured on alcohol, and never even use the word "water"—let alone use it, either for drinking or washing. Is it any wonder that these alcoholic clog-hoppers are easy pickings for a few of the bright boys who suddenly decide to become dictators, fuehrers, duces, kings, emperors, lords, dukes, counts, no accounts, and the many other titles which have cropped up in Europe during the last 2,000 years, and which all amount to the same thing—a boss for the "dumb guys."

About the best thing that could happen to Europe would be just what we are afraid will happen—communism. Somebody to boss them. They certainly are not capable of governing themselves; even in our own time since 1914 ample evidence has been given of this fact. And Russia is proof enough that communism is an ideal form of government for any bunch of "hunkies" who are too d—— dumb to think for themselves. England has given recent notice that she subscribes to this doctrine, and even has the gall to ask America to finance the scheme.

The U. S. A. is too good a country to be brought down to the level of European peasantry, and to have its wealth of manpower, resources, and culture dissipated, wasted, and squandered among swine who cannot and will not attempt to help themselves.

They start those wars in Europe, let them take the consequences of their own actions. The theory that we are in some remote and mystic way responsible for the welfare of a continent which has twice dragged us into their own jealous quarrels, is typical European dogma, loudly proclaimed by immigrants and their progeny of recent generations who have had nothing to do with the building of America, and care less about its future.

While billions of dollars of American money are being squandered over the world, we have the spectacle of thousands of Americans unemployed at home, appeals from various agencies for help for the sick, blind, and disabled.

If we have a superabundance of money, wealth, and national resources, let Congress see to it that home needs are met entirely before one cent is given abroad. And I mean "give," because experience has shown that every loan turns into a gift, to be repaid by abuse and vituperation compounded annually on foreign shores.

It is the duty of Congress to see that American needs are met first. And there is plenty of need in America right now. Robbing the pay envelopes of American workers to fatten foreign shirkers is not the answer to this problem.

Allow me to thank you for past work on behalf of us in Bucks County, and hope that you will give this letter your consideration.

JOHN F. THOMPSON.

Tax Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said respecting the tax relief extended to the people under the law recently passed. Many people have either misconstrued this law, or have been misinformed regarding its provisions. An article appeared recently, written by Alexander R. George, which was published throughout the country which, in a measure, clarifies the provisions of that tax relief extended to the people of this nation.

Mr. Speaker, that all may have the benefit of this clarifying article, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therewith this clarifying article respecting the tax relief extended to the people of this Nation.

The article follows:

MILLIONS TO GET TAX RELIEF

(By Alexander R. George)

Wage earners all over the country soon will get their first sweet taste of new lower income taxes.

Tax cuts under the new law apply to 1946 income and, therefore, will go into effect January 1. That means smaller amounts will be withheld from pay received on and after that date, even if the pay is for work done before the new year.

About 12,000,000 low-income persons who have paid tax on 1945 income will pay no tax on 1946 income.

The remaining 35,000,000 will carry a lighter tax load. For many who support families of two or more dependents, the tax saving will mean additional money for food, clothing, and other necessities. The tax cut amounts to 52 percent for a married man with two dependent children and an income of $2,500. If he has four dependent children and an income of $4,980, the saving is 32 percent.

Take a man with a wife, two dependents, and a weekly wage of $45. The weekly withholding will be 50 cents, compared with $1.40 in 1945. For a married man with four children and a weekly salary of $65, the weekly withholding will be 20 cents, compared with $1.50. In the case of a single person with no dependents and a weekly wage of $25, the weekly withholding will be $2.50, compared with $3.10.

The amount of income tax withheld from wages depends upon the number of exemptions the taxpayer can claim as well as the wages he earns. A taxpayer gets an exemption of $500 each for himself, his wife, and his dependents. These exemptions are included in the Government tax table used by an employer in finding the amount to be taken from a worker's pay.

Exemptions are listed on certificates filed by employees with their employers. New exemption certificates are not required unless there has been a change in the number of an employee's exemptions. However, some business concerns which have had numerous changes in personnel are requesting all employees to make out new certificates to assure that all exemptions are listed.

Exemptions change when a taxpayer marries, when a child is born, when a divorce occurs, when someone for whom the taxpayer has claimed an exemption dies, or when the taxpayer begins or stops supporting a dependent.

An important thing to remember is that the reduced taxes have nothing to do with your 1945 income. They apply to income received in 1946.

For 1945 income, every civilian who received $500 or more in 1945 must file a return on it before midnight of March 15, 1946. That includes persons who do not owe any tax for 1945 and also those who pay up their tax in full during 1945. Some taxpayers will get refunds on 1945 tax. Others will still owe some tax.

The Government requires employers to furnish employees on or before January 31 with withholding receipts (Form W-2) for 1945. These receipts list your gross pay and the amount of tax withheld from that pay. Most wage earners are allowed to use their withholding receipts as 1945 income-tax returns.

The receipt is an "extra-simplified" return, so it will pay most taxpayers not to lose or mislay it. Otherwise they will have to get another receipt from their employer or make out a more complicated return on Form 1040.

If your wages in 1945 amount to $5,000 or more, or if your income other than wages totals more than $100, you can't use the withholding receipt as a return. You must use the long form 1040 if your income was $5,000 or more, or if you claim deductions, (taxes, interest, large medical expenses, etc.) amounting to more than 10 percent of your income.

You may use the short form 1040 if your income was less than $5,000, regardless of source. If the return is made on the short form 1040 or on a withholding receipt, the tax is figured from a table which automatically allows about 10 percent of the total income for deductions. Taxpayers with allowable amounting to more than 10 percent can save money using the long form 1040.

Man and woman veterans of the United States military and naval forces below the grade of a commissioned officer have no tax liability for services pay. The new law says they do not even have to file returns with respect to service pay.

The law also extends the time for paying taxes on the service pay of commissioned officers. The tax so deferred is payable over a period of 3 years in equal quarterly installments without interest. There is a similar

extension of time for payment of taxes on preservice earned income for 1940's or 1941 which became due after the taxpayer entered the service.

Commissioned officers get a special tax exemption of $1,500 of service pay. This is in addition to the regular $50 exemption each, allowed every person (civilian or military) for himself, wife and dependents.

Demobilizing the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on October 23, 1945, I wrote the War and Navy Departments that, in my opinion, they would have more than 5,000,000 men under arms at Christmas time. These Departments vigorously defended their position and indicated that the figures were entirely too high.

On December 12, 1945, a letter from the Bureau of Naval Personnel to all Members of Congress contains the report, and I quote:

> There remains about 900,000 American military personnel in Europe who are either eligible for discharge or will be by the time transportation is available for them. Nearly all of these are in the Army. In the same category, in the Pacific, there are about 1,000,000 Army men and slightly less than 1,200,000 Navy men; 135,000 Army men remain in India.

From these figures, it is easy to determine that there is something like 3,235,000 military personnel outside of the United States, in Europe and the Pacific area. This would undoubtedly be greatly increased, if we were to take into consideration the men now in the Aleutians, Alaska, Panama Canal Zone, South America, and northern Africa. I do not believe it includes the military personnel in the Far East. It is estimated that there are nearly 3,000,000 men in the military personnel, either in the United States or on the way to the United States. This would place some 6,000,000 men in the various units of the armed forces at Christmas time. These figures do not take into consideration the number of men who are voluntarily enlisting in the Army. They are reenlisting at the rate of seventy-five or more thousand each month. In addition to this, the selective service has been taking about 50,000 men a month.

The report of the Bureau of Naval Personnel indicates that—

> By December 1, more than three and one-half million personnel of the various branches of the armed forces have been returned from overseas. Of this number, 2,300,000 have been brought across the Atlantic, 1,204,000 across the Pacific, and 173,000 from India. The report continues there are now available 920 troop and converted combatant ships, with a total simultaneous lift of 1,400,000 men.

It is interesting to note that under the prodding of this Congress, the various branches of the armed forces have been trying to speed up the return of men from the various theaters of war. I am convinced, however, that they can still do a better job. It will be remembered that the Navy saw fit to tie up hundreds of ships, capable of carrying soldiers, for the Navy Day parade. To me, this was inexcusable.

It seems to me that every man and woman who is now in the United States forces and for whom there is no useful employment, should be given an immediate furlough home and left there with his family, his community and his business, until it is time to effect and complete his discharge.

The armed forces are now getting sufficient men under the voluntary enlistment method to meet all of their needs. It should no longer be necessary to take 50,000 teen-age young men a month and place them in military service.

The Members of this Congress, as they go home for their Christmas recess, may well find some pointed questions being asked by their constituents on why their sons and daughters are not being brought home faster. This Congress has neglected to bring out bills or sign petitions which would make, in order, legislation designed to speed up the demobilization program. In my humble opinion, there are entirely too many generals who want to keep the Army large and intact. It is the duty of this Congress to act.

Treatment of the Jewish People in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to call to the attention of the Members of Congress the following telegram concerning the treatment of the Jewish people in Palestine:

FORT WAYNE, IND., *December 13, 1945.*
Congressman GEORGE W. GILLIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The Fort Wayne Jewish community is shocked at British military action in killing and wounding scores of Jews in undefended Jewish settlements in Palestine. The reports relative to the treatment of displaced persons in British controlled Bergen Belsen camp in an effort to intimidate the few surviving victims of Nazi persecution to an acceptance of British policy in regard to Palestine is unthinkable. It is apparent that the British Labor Government is trying to force Jews into fear and silence in anticipation of the inquiry about to be made by the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry. We urge and implore you to take note of the widespread anger such tactics have aroused in this country. We hope that you will insist that the hounded Jews of Europe find that peace and sanctity in Palestine to which they are entitled and that the British be requested to cease these activities.

THE FORT WAYNE JEWISH COMMUNITY.

Grand Coulee Power for Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Richard L. Neuberger, from the Signalman's Journal for November 1945:

GRAND COULEE POWER FOR RAILROADS—GREATEST CONSTRUCTION PROJECT SINCE TRANSCONTINENTAL LINES WERE BUILT BEING CONSIDERED IN WESTERN STATES

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

The most spectacular railroading in America is that which conquers the lofty wall of the Continental Divide. Seven lines cross the great hump of the Rockies and roll down to the seaports of the Pacific Coast. These ascents of the country's highest mountain range require sharp switchbacks, twisting curves and grades that reach 3.3 percent. Locomotives cough and spit and bellow, as the commerce of the Nation is hauled over the granite and lava barrier that forms the spinal column of the United States.

Today, one of the principal postwar issues along the Pacific seaboard is how our mountain-going freight and passenger trains shall be pulled across the Rockies and the other two ranges which lie beyond, the Sierras of California and the Cascades of Oregon and Washington.

The Bonneville Power Administration believes that all the railroads in the 11 States of the far West should be electrified. This proposal is now being hotly discussed throughout those 11 States, the States of the vast American outdoors— Washington, Idaho, California, Oregon, Montana, Wyoming, Nevada, Colorado, Utah, New Mexico and Arizona.

Bonneville engineers, commissioned with the task of selling the huge power output of Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams, base their proposal on three current problems:

1. The need to provide jobs for thousands of workers employed during the war in shipyards, airplane plants, and aluminum factories.

2. The need to conserve the dwindling oil reserves still left in the United States.

3. The importance of finding new markets for the immense hydroelectric production of Federal projects on the Sacramento, Columbia, and Colorado Rivers.

The Bonneville idea involves virtually all main-line track from the Rocky Mountains on westward. Eighty-five hundred miles of roadbed would be put under the trolley, making the project the most ambitious railway undertaking since the transcontinentals were originally thrust to the Pacific. It also would be the greatest electrification network anywhere in the world. Seven major systems would be involved—the Great Northern, Union Pacific, Southern Pacific, Santa Fe, Northern Pacific, Denver & Rio Grande, and Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific.

Key structure in the project would be Grand Coulee Dam, which spans the upper Columbia River like a concrete fortress. This is the principal unit in the Government's river-control program. It also is the biggest power plant on earth. Energy from Grand Coulee would move trains on nearly all the lines of the West. Boulder Dam on the Colorado, Bonneville on the Columbia, the Big Thompson project in Colorado and other Federal generating centers would also put juice in the maize of trolley wires.

The cost of the scheme would be nearly half a billion dollars. This is big by peacetime standards, infinitesimal when compared to the toll for the war. The cost would be divided as follows:

Trolley system	$160,000,000
Wayside substations	120,000,000
Electric locomotives	160,000,000
Total	440,000,000

Sharp division splits the West on the idea, Senator HUGH MITCHELL, of the State of Washington, a 38-year-old New Dealer, believes that electrification of western railroads is inevitable. "Electricity," says Senator MITCHELL, "secures greater traffic volume at higher speeds and lower costs. The advantages are so marked and the needs so great that railroad electrification in the Northwest is bound to come into its own, like it has in the mountainous countries of Europe. Future conservation of oil and coal will require moving trains with power from falling water."

On the other hand, a former Republican governor of the State of Oregon, Charles A. Sprague, believes that Diesel engines are far more practical than those coupled to trolley wires. He also contends that electrification would saddle the railroads of the West with so heavy a debt that funds would not be available for new cars, better ballast on roadbeds and other necessary improvements. Sprague maintains that centralized traffic control is more essential to the lines than electric locomotives.

Yet the issue remains a critical one all along the Pacific seaboard. Why?

The answer is found in the West's peculiar postwar problem. After Pearl Harbor great industries burgeoned beyond the Rockies—industries building ships, assembling planes, fabricating light metals. But these were new industries; they were not plants which had been making typewriters, sewing machines, stoves, and other products of peace. Now the war is over. The coast's factories have no peacetime production to which they can return. In the West, it is not reconversion, it is elimination. This means that employment must be found for thousands of workers.

The Bonneville electrification proposal is ready and waiting. In fact, Dr. Paul Raver, the Bonneville administrator, claims that the plan will help provide opportunities for the full employment of labor. Yet he puts another reason even ahead of this. He declares that during the war the United States seriously depleted its remaining petroleum reserves. All western railroads except the Northern Pacific rely on oil for fuel. Putting all trains west of the Rockies under trolley wires would save 200,000,000 gallons of oil annually, according to Raver and his associates.

Benjamin T. Brooks, noted petroleum technologist, warns that the United States is in danger of changing from an oil-exporting nation to an oil-importing nation. How can oil be saved? Bonneville engineers declare that trains are the only transportation units which can be coupled to hydroelectric plants. Obviously, automobiles cannot be put under trolley wires; it is even more impossible for ships and airplanes. Water power is inexhaustible, however. Its use depletes no resources. The late J. D. Ross, first Bonneville Administrator, once told Franklin D. Roosevelt that Grand Coulee Dam was "an oil well that will never run dry, a coal mine that will never thin out."

Electric locomotives perform best on mountainous lines. Practically all the railroads in Switzerland are electrified. Electricity accelerates swiftly; it leaves no smoke in long tunnels; it pulls smoothly on steep grades. T. M. C. Martin, the Bonneville Dam railroad expert insists that an electric engine can pull 47 loaded freight cars uphill at 23 miles an hour, whereas a steam locomotive with the same load will make 19 miles an hour and a Diesel only 16.

Perhaps these reasons have impelled the Denver & Rio Grande to be the Western railroad most seriously interested in the Bonneville idea. The Rio Grande has the steepest grades on the continent. Its Tennessee Pass ascent of the Continental Divide, at 10,239 feet, is the highest crossing of the Rocky Mountains. It has the six-mile-long Moffat Tunnel above Denver. Already, the Rio Grande has had its line from Denver to Salt Lake studied and analyzed by engineers of Westinghouse, General Electric, the United States Bureau of Reclamation and the Bonneville Power agency.

T. M. C. Martin believes that 10,000 workers could be kept busy for nearly five years stringing trolley wires above the 8,500 miles on main-line tracks in the West. He adds the important note that many of these men could be veterans of World War II. The United States Army Signal Corps string vast networks of line during the war. For example, several regiments erected a telephone system along the 1,600 frozen miles of the Alcan Highway. Men with this type of experience, points out Martin would be ideally qualified to construct the world's greatest trolley project. Employment might be stimulated in other industries, as well. More than 500,000 poles would be required, thus giving impetus to sawmill orders. These could be second-growth trees, so that virgin forests would not have to be invaded.

All in all, the railroad electrification undertaking will be a major issue on the Pacific slope during the years directly ahead. Manufacturers of Diesel engines are sure to resist the proposal. They claim that the Diesel locomotive is the most practical hauling power yet developed. It requires no costly trolley system. It is self-contained and does not depend upon wires. It generally operates in four units. If one unit breaks down the train still can reach the next station under its own power.

So the issue is joined. The time-honored steam locomotive even has its proponents. Union Pacific engineers claim the huge, new Big Boy 4-8-8-4 freight locomotives are unexcelled. Yet on the arid uplands steam runs into the problem of water. Rivers are far apart. Much of the moisture is unsuited even for locomotive boilers. This shortage is becoming increasingly acute in the desert of Arizona and New Mexico. Diesel engines burn much oil but they do not have massive boilers which lap up water like a herd of elephants.

Much American railroading is mundane and tame. The color has gone from it. Mechanization has pushed back the frontier. But in the mountains of the West, where the electrification issue will be decided, the drama and the color remain. This is the most spectacular rail transportation in the land.

In the Montana Rockies the long trains roll through canyons where crystal-clear rivers lap at the walls. Trout and salmon inhabit those icy reaches. Off to the south, on the gaunt uplands near the Mexican line, the freights and passengers thread across sagebrush plateaus where the only water is a mirage. Yet these dry uplands have beauty, too—the beauty of serried mesas and rocks as brightly hued as Joseph's coat.

In the tiny division points "helper" locomotives are coupled to the trains, and the roar of two engines echoes among the mountain walls. Passengers look from their coaches and diners on what is left of the American frontier. They see, too, where our frontiersmen suffered and died. Capt. J. W. Gunnison, of the Army engineers, and his survey party were massacred by Ute Indians while exploring the Sherman Hill Pass now followed by the Union Pacific. Great Northern travelers wind through Marias Pass, discovered by no less a frontiersman than Capt. Meriwether Lewis, of Lewis and Clark.

And so, in this vivid setting, the controversy over railroad electrification will be decided.

With Japan finally laid low, the question will confront Senate committees and boards of directors before many more barrels of bunker "C" fuel oil have been reduced to smoke. In the meanwhile, trains clatter down from the high summits and the sonorous sound of the locomotive whistle fills granite gorges. Across innumerable trestles the proud steams and lordly Diesels roll, and below the decks of the bridges the white water of the mountain rivers foams and surges.

These flecked streams in which trout lurk and salmon spawn may yet revolutionize transportation west of the Continental Divide. Where the rivers rush around the piers of railroad bridges, the glacial water lifts in snapping arcs—like the loops of a thousand question marks.

Country Against Prohibition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I include as part of my remarks an article from the Washington Post. It follows:

PUBLIC 2 TO 1 AGAINST PROHIBITION DESPITE MANY LOCAL DRY LAWS

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

Although a considerable portion of the United States has voted "dry" under local-option laws since national prohibition was repealed more than 10 years ago, public sentiment today remains 2 to 1 against return to Nation-wide prohibition.

Sentiment on the question has been periodically tested since 1936 by the Institute.

The question, asked of a cross section of voters:

"If the question of national prohibition should come up again, would you vote wet or dry?"

	Percent
Wet	67
Dry	33

About five in every hundred had no opinion.

In other words, if a Nation-wide referendum were to be held today on the issue, the vote would be approximately 2 to 1 against a return to national prohibition.

It will be remembered that in 1933 the official referenda showed 30 percent of all voters voting dry, 70 percent wet.

The table below charts the trend of public thinking on the question of national prohibition since 1936:

	Percent dry	*Percent wet*
1933 official referenda	30	70
1936	33	67
1938	36	64
1940	32	68
1942	36	64
1943	34	66
1944	37	63
Today	33	67

People also were asked:

"Do you ever have occasion to use any alcoholic beverages such as liquor, wine, or beer, or are you a total abstainer?"

Highlights of results on this question reveal these facts:

One out of every three (33 percent) are total abstainers; 15 in every 100 (15 percent) drink only wine or beer; 51 percent—5 out of 10, on occasion drink any alcoholic beverage, including wine, beer, or liquor.

Drinking falls off sharply among men when they reach 50. Only 2 of 10 are nondrinkers up to 50. After that about 1 out of 3 is a total abstainer.

More women than men are nondrinkers, with 25 percent among men nondrinkers, compared to 41 percent among women. Fifty-seven percent among women over 50 are nondrinkers.

Demobilization of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, in a recent publication of the Adakian, published at Adak, Alaska, by United States troops, an article appears which exemplifies the feeling of our boys, still in the service, respecting their releases and discharges and their return to their homes. The use of our ships for transporting prisoners of war is severely condemned by our troops, and they are justified in their condemnation of that practice and policy. Since VE-day many Congressmen, of which I was one of that number, have tried to cause the speeding up of releases and discharges and the return home of our boys. Many of them are very disappointed and despondent over the slowness of the Army and Navy in doing its job. Especially do these boys, in the service, almost despair of ever reaching home when they learn that prisoners of war have a priority over our own soldiers—and many of them really wonder "who won this war." The article is very enlightening upon the subject of the general feeling of our troops upon this policy.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my own remarks, I include herewith the article published in the Adakian by our troops, which is as follows:

WHO GOES HOME FIRST?

Last week we picked up a report on a commercial news broadcast that about 500 Nazi prisoners of war were being returned to the United States, for return to Germany, on the steamship *William Thompson*.

Reluctant to believe that the War Department would use for such a purpose a ship which could take, as it has in the past, United States servicemen home from Alaska and the Aleutians, we wired a Seattle newspaper for confirmation. Last night we got our answer:

"Five hundred and forty-one of over 700 Nazis returned on steamship *William Thompson* with 57-man guard from United States engineers demolition project, Excursion Inlet. Ship capacity, 600."

(Excursion Inlet is on the Alaskan coast, on the inland waterway, about 1,000 miles above Seattle.)

GERMANS HOME BY MAY

Two other dispatches received in the past few days cast some illumination on this situation:

Headquarters, Alaskan Department Public Relations Office released this story last week:

"All German and Italian PW's will be shipped out of the country by the end of April 1946, Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson announced today.

"Mr. Patterson said that he made this statement after conferring with Members of Congress and representatives of agriculture interests, who asked for a War Department statement of policy in order that farmers might plan for their 1946 farm operations. * * *

"It is estimated that 326,000 Germans and 24,300 Italian prisoners of war will be returned to Europe during the period from December 1945 to April 1946."

Yesterday ANS carried this story, datelined Camp Shanks, N. Y.: "Three European-bound transports Saturday carried 1,975 German PW's as the War Department stepped up plans to return by early spring the 306,000 German captives still in the United States."

WHO'S GOT PRIORITY?

The story of the *Thompson* raises a couple of burning questions:

1. In view of the present need for ocean-going vessels to carry United States servicemen home, and in view of the present railroad jam on the Pacific coast, why weren't the Germans at Excursion Inlet taken down the Inland Waterway in smaller vessels and transferred to the Canadian Railway for shipment to New York?

2. If reasons unknown to us made this impossible, why weren't they left where they were until every United States serviceman who is eventually due for discharge is shipped home from the Pacific?

The men in the Alaskan department have a right to answers from the War Department to these questions.

We have no uncharitable desire to keep former members of the glorious Wehrmacht away from their homes any longer than is necessary. Our point is simply that United States soldiers and sailors have first call on ships. As long as men with 55 or more points, or men with 2 years in the Alaskan department, sit on Adak today, they have prior rights to ships like the *Thompson*.

General Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee:

Whereas there exists an extreme shortage of housing accommodations throughout the Nation, which will be intensified as additional of our veterans return to civil life; and

Whereas there has been introduced in the Senate of the United States bill S. 1592, known as the Wagner-Taft-Ellender general housing bill, which if passed will tend to provide ways and means by which the housing shortage can be alleviated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That it hereby endorses and supports the general provisions of the Wagner-Taft-Ellender general housing bill, S. 1592; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk is hereby directed to send certified copies of this resolution to the chairmen of the appropriate Senate and House of Representatives committees, Senators LA FOLLETTE, WILEY, WAGNER, ELLENDER, and TAFT, and to Congressmen BIEMILLER and WASIELEWSKI.

WALTER A. KLEIN,
City Clerk.

A Veteran and Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I am in full agreement with Hon. Stuart Symington, Administrator of Surplus Property, that the act should be given the attention of the Congress immediately with a view to enacting amendments that will make it more workable, especially in reference to the preference that was extended to veterans.

I have had considerable correspondence with veterans and also the disposal agencies that are handling surplus property in regard to the general subject. Even though I signed the conference report as one of the House conferees I stated at the time that the bill in its form was a monstrosity but that we were told it was absolutely necessary that some legislation be passed. I opposed the Board that set up and later I participated in having the amendment that provided for an administrator adopted.

Under this legislation the Administrator lays down the policy, promulgates the rules and regulations, and names the disposal agency that is to handle various types of surplus property. Originally, the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department was assigned as a disposal agency to handle consumers' goods. Later, this authority was granted to the Department of Commerce and finally placed in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Mr. Symington has nothing to do with the actual disposal of the property, and it is practically out of his hands as soon as he notifies the disposal agency what the various Government departments have declared surplus and where it is located.

Regional offices have been set up to handle consumers' goods. The regional office for my section is in Kansas City, Mo. They have a branch office in St. Louis, but, aside from giving information, the branch office in St. Louis has no authority to dispose of any surplus property of any kind. Veterans have complained bitterly that they have been pushed around. Although they have secured a priority to purchase a car or a truck, they cannot secure one.

I have an outstanding example of the experience of a veteran who is trying to purchase a car. He has the necessary priority. I received a letter from him the other day, and as a part of my remarks I quote from that letter. It follows:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *December 11, 1945.*
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR JACK: I want to let you know what has been done regarding my getting an auto.

First, I haven't got one yet, and as things stand now, I have no prospects of such. I just came from the St. Louis Office of Surplus Property, Mr. Jack Swink, and he informed me there is nothing more he can do as his hands are tied and the Kansas City office has all the say-so. Mr. Swink located a case and called me to go to Jefferson City to look at it and see if I wanted it. Well, I went to Jefferson City yesterday and after a lot of trouble I saw the car. It was a 1939 Chevrolet, no battery, no tires whatever, and in poor condition as it had been used by the Department of Agriculture for 6 years and was really worn down with 160,000 miles. Well, Jack, the price they wanted for it was ridiculous. They wanted $585.50. I saw the records on the car and the Government paid $581.93 for it in May 1939. If things weren't such as now, they would ordinarily sell this car for junk, yet they want $4 more for it than it cost 6 years ago after getting full value out of it for 6 years in the Agriculture Department. I don't understand that, Jack, and neither do a lot of other people.

While in Jefferson City I also located a 1940 Chevrolet which has been declared surplus by the Agriculture Department there. I asked Mr. Swink if he could get that car for me, and he says he doesn't know anything about it, that I would have to go to Kansas City to see Mr. H. Rope Bishop, who is in charge of this district, about getting this car. Well, Jack, here are the details about this car I located myself.

It is now stored in a private garage in Jefferson City, and has been sitting there since July of this year, which was told to me by an employee of the office of Animal Industry, room 202, United States post office, Jefferson City, Mo. I inspected this car and the tires are completely worn down, no good, and the motor is usable. It has 110,000 miles on it and was used by the Agriculture Department for 5½ years. The Government paid $604.68 for it as records show, which I saw on file. Here are complete details: 1940, passenger, 2-door sedan, Chevrolet Master 85, engine No. 3033148, declared surplus by Agriculture Department, Jefferson City Animal Industry Office, 202 United States Post Office Building.

Jack, I would like to have this car, as a car is a necessity, and not a luxury to me. I need one badly in my work as I have told them before. I have my priority veteran certificate and am sending it to Mr. H. Roper Bishop, Chief of Government Requirements Division, Consumer Goods Office of RFC, 2605 Walnut Street, Kansas City, Mo. But I am afraid I will get no action from Kansas City unless you get on them. Jack, this 1940 car is worth about $550, but I will give the Government $600 for it, as I need it in work. They will probably want about $700 for it, and that is an outrage as you can buy from a used-car dealer for that.

Trusting you will look into this, as I know you have always been fair about everything, and that you set up the surplus office to help veterans, and not make profits out of used cars which are of no value to the Government.

Thanking you a million times and waiting to hear from you and what to do.

Mr. Speaker, just as soon as Congress reconvenes I sincerely hope that the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures will call the committee to hold hearings with a view to enacting amendments that will clarify this situation. Why a city with a metropolitan area population of a million five hundred thousand people like the city of St. Louis should not have a representative of the agency disposing of consumers' goods to actually sell surplus property rather than only give information, I cannot understand.

Hobbs Bill Presents Test for Liberals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star:

HOBBS BILL PRESENTS TEST FOR "LIBERALS"—ATTEMPT TO KILL MEASURE IN COMMITTEE RAISES ISSUE

(By John H. Cline)

A few months ago American liberals—those of the genuine as well as the strictly synthetic variety—were striving mightily to braing the fair-employment practices bill to a vote in the House. The obstacle was the House Rules Committee, which had refused to clear the measure, and this was roundly condemned as a frustration of our democratic processes in that a small band of southern tories and kindred reactionaries were attempting to impose their prejudices on the membership of the House by an improper exercise of the peculiar power which they enjoyed as members of the Rules Committee.

So far as the principle involved was concerned, these complainants were right. But now the shoe is on the other foot, and it remains to be seen whether those who denounced the pigeonholing of the FEPC bill, which they wanted to see passed, will manifest the same concern for the proper functioning of our democratic processes in the case of a bill which many of them do not want to see passed.

This is the so-called Hobbs bill, which is really an amendment of the 1934 Antiracketeering Act—an amendment made necessary by the refusal of the Supreme Court in 1942 to apply the law to union racketeers. The Hobbs bill has passed the House and has been referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee, where an attempt will be made to kill it either openly or via the pigeonhole method.

The possibility that this attempt will succeed cannot be brushed aside, for the misguided "friends of labor" succeeded in bottling up a similar bill in 1943 in a Senate committee, just as they have succeeded in killing in Senate committees virtually all of the major labor legislation passed by overwhelming votes in the House in recent years. In none of these instances was there a protest from those who were so articulate in their complaints against the treatment accorded the FEPC bill, and it remains to be seen whether they will speak up now. Representative MARCANTONIO of New York, who was among the loudest in denouncing the Rules Committee for holding up the FEPC bill, has been quoted as saying of the Hobbs bill that "there isn't any question that we can stop it in the Senate," meaning, presumbably, the Senate committee. And the Daily Worker, Communist Party paper, with whose views Mr. MARCANTONIO generally is in accord, has called upon "the folks back home" to let their Senators know how they feel about this "vicious" bill which is described as a threat "to the very principle of organized labor." This sort of nonsense will not prevail if the Hobbs bill ever gets to a vote in the Senate. The danger is that it will be used as an excuse for letting the measure die in the Senate committee.

The Hobbs bill is neither vicious nor antilabor. On the contrary, it is designed to stamp out a vicious racket, flourishing in the guise of legitimate union activity, which is a real threat to labor in that it is capable of arousing public feeling to a point where legitimate as well as illegitimate union activities will be in serious jeopardy.

This particular racket is practiced by some elements in the AFL Teamsters' Union and is confined in its application to trucks moving into New York and other cities. Some of these trucks are owned and driven by farmers moving their produce to market. Others are driven by members of the union from other sections of the country. But no distinction is made on this score. In the case of New York City—and the technique is much the same in other places—members of Teamsters' Local 807 for years have been waylaying trucks coming into the Holland Tunnel. They stop the trucks, and by beating or threatening to beat the drivers extort payments from the drivers or owners of sums of money equivalent to the union scale for a day's work. In some instances the union racketeers, although their services were not needed, have helped or offered to help in driving or unloading the trucks; in others they have simply taken the money and disappeared. Some trucks have been overturned and burned. Sometimes farmer drivers have been compelled to pay a union "initiation fee" ranging from $30 to $56 without being given opportunity to join the union. Nor is this a matter of an occasional holdup here and there, testimony taken by the House committee which considered the bill indicating that approximately 1,000 truck drivers or operators are compelled to pay tribute to these union racketeers each day.

In 1942 a case involving the conviction of a group of these racketeers came before the Supreme Court, and that tribunal, on the fantastic theory that Congress had intended to sanction such activities by the holders of union cards, reversed the conviction. The Hobbs bill which died in 1943, and the bill now before the Senate committee, were designed to overcome the evil effects of that decision, and to squelch any notion that Congress looks with an approving eye on the teamsters' racket.

At the same time, however, the bill has been drawn with care to safeguard all legitimate union activities, and that this has been done successfully is well evidenced by the fact that among the supporters of the Hobbs bill are such individuals as Representative VOORHIS, of California, who is a proved "friend of labor" in the best meaning of that term.

All that this bill would do would be to wipe out a court-made distinction between union and nonunion racketeers. It makes an eminently desirable law apply equally to everyone, including extortionists who happen to hold union cards, and it should be approved without delay in the Senate. It will be so approved if the intelligent friends of labor, realizing that this racket is giving the whole labor movement a black eye, will get behind the bill and see that it is reported out by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Insidious Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Press of St. Marys, Pa.:

INSIDIOUS PROPAGANDA

Gullible Americans and they number into the millions, in the next few days will be fed high-powered propaganda that United

States should loan Great Britain $4,000,000,000 as a matter of economic gain for this country and bring into more harmonious relations trade dealings with the country and the British Empire.

It is hard to say at this time how far the proposed loan will go in Congress, although some observers at the Capital think it will pass.

If such a thing should happen that Congress approves this loan, we might as well kiss the $4,000,000,000 good-by.

England never made any attempt after the last war to repay her obligations to United States and financially she was better off then than now.

Not even one cent of interest was paid on her World War I obligations even after United States had "forgiven" her a considerable share of her debt.

How differently we treat our English allies and own men who fought the war.

A GI coming home from war has to wade through mountains of red tape to get a $2,000 loan to apply on the purchase of a home, or to go into business.

There is no interest waiving on this money. Interest must be paid at full legal rates.

But England will not be called upon to pay one penny interest on her contemplated loan for 5 years, and even then there are loopholes that will permit further extension of the interest-free agreement.

Such a loan is not even sound business. A banker who would make a loan in this country to an individual would be classified as "nuts" and the bank examiners would yank him out of his job quicker than you can read this editorial.

But to give England such easy terms is O. K. so it seems in Washington unless Congress rears up on its hind feet and tells Great Britain to paddle her own canoe as we have been doing in this country since the first white man set foot on American soil.

Our Marines in China Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, since I spoke to the House on the situation in China, I have received over 3,000 letters and petitions signed by more than 5,000 persons in my own congressional district, urging that our troops be withdrawn from that unhappy land.

Since then, too, the President of the United States has defined our policy toward China in a welcome announcement which assuredly is sound in its basic recognition of the need for achieving unity and democracy in China through a representative government that will encourage necessary economic and social progress.

I know the President's statement on China will be welcomed, too, by most of those who have taken the time to write me on the subject. Ordinarily, Mr. Speaker, I would not ask permission to include any of these communications in the RECORD. However, several of them come from our own marines in China.

The Members of this House will be as interested as I was in reading the opinions of the heroes of Guadalcanal, of Peleliu, and of Okinawa on their present mission in north China, where they feel themselves no longer the advance guard of liberty and freedom, but instead, the participants in a Chinese civil war.

It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that under the privilege granted me, I wish to include a letter sent me by 15 enlisted marines in China, and a leaflet which other marines inform me has been circulating among their buddies in north China.

In calling attention to the letter, I hope the House notes the fact that 25 transports which carried Chiang Kai-shek's forces to north China where they have come in direct military conflict with other Chinese troops, returned empty to the States. Not a single marine from the hundreds of high-point men in north China was brought home on those transports. I trust, too, that the Members note the reference to World War III in the leaflet which other marines have forwarded from north China. These heroes of this war do not look forward to a new war. They fought for peace and democracy and they want no part of any enterprise which now endangers the goal for which many of them gave their lives.

The letter follows:

TSINGTAO, CHINA, *November 30, 1945.*

DEAR SIR: The Army newspaper, Stars and Stripes, on November 28, 1945, published an article on yours and five other Congressmen's resolutions asking President Truman to order the immediate recall of all United States troops, transports, and supplies from China. We can assure you that you have the support of thousands of Marines here in this theater.

Not only are we reluctant to unwantonly be placed in circumstances that may well involve us in participation in a war between rival Chinese political forces and possibly eventually another World War, but we don't believe we are getting a fair break in demobilization.

On October 9, 1945, all men, except those enlisted as regulars having a critical discharge score of 60 or more, became eligible for discharge. That was almost 7 weeks ago, and still at least 90 percent of those men are here, waiting to be relieved of their duties and furnished transportation home. On November 1, 1945, all men with a critical discharge score of 50 or more became eligible for discharge and are also waiting to be sent home. The old excuse that there is no transportation available is not true here.

On November 14 approximately 25 United States transport ships unloaded troops of the Chinese Eighth Army here at Tsingtao. Those ships would have been more than enough to have taken the entire Sixth Marine Division back to the States. Last week we watched these ships weigh anchor and sail for home—empty.

Most of us here in the Sixth Marine Division served in the last great land battle of the war, Okinawa, and have also served overseas anywhere from 12 to 24 months. We're not asking any special favors but we do want to have the same privilege of being discharged when we become eligible, as those who were fortunate enough to not have had to do occupation duty. We have been hearing from time to time how many men the Army has discharged, which at the last report was expected to reach 55 percent, or over 4,000,000 men, by January 1, 1946. The Marine Corps is a small organization, never having had a total of more than 500,000 men enlisted at one time. A small organization such as this should have been able to discharge men as fast in proportion as the Army. Still we have heard no figures quoted and we are wondering if a percentage of men anywhere equal to that of the Army has been discharged.

When we see empty ships leaving for the States we feel that we're not getting a fair deal. During this war 90 percent of the men serving in the Marine Corps served overseas (this figure was taken from the October 29, 1945, issue of the Time magazine) and Marines participated in practically every major land and sea battle fought in the Pacific.

We're asking at this time if we have not earned the right to be sent home and discharged when we become eligible and transportation is available.

Mr. Speaker, the leaflet, which marines themselves are circulating in north China, calling attention to their own position there and urging that they return home, reads:

THE TIENTSIN ADDRESS—IN TRIBUTE TO THE MEN OF THE FIRST MARINE DIVISION

No score and well over 3 years ago our continent thrust us out into a great world war dedicated to the proposition that an American could call himself a human and free being.

Now we are actively engaged in an internal strife, testing whether our Nation or any other nation so conceived and so dedicated can continually meddle in foreign entanglements and come out whole.

We are met on a great battlefield of World War III. It is for us, the living, to here dedicate our spared lives and to retract our advance from that field or those who have perished will have done so in vain.

The survivors must stand and crush into submission the weaklings who remain only to prophecy that the birthright of freedom is death and destruction.

Guadalcanal! Finchaven! Cape Gloucester! Peleliu! Okinawa! North China?

The Committee on Un-American Activities

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Un-American Activities has now committed its most outrageous blunder. It has begun an investigation of the Friends of Democracy and subpenaed or requested the books and records of this honorable and patriotic organization which for 10 years has been leading the fight against communism and fascism.

Up to this time the principal accomplishment of the committee as far as anyone could see was to furnish a forum for the Communist Party in the United States. Its leaders were brought down to Washington for a public hearing. From this vantage point they gained the opportunity to belittle the committee and Congress and to expound the doctrines of communism.

The newspapers have revealed that the American Military Government in Germany is in possession of a list of thousands of names of people in America whom the Nazis considered as their friends and supporters. Here is a matter of the gravest concern, but has the committee made any effort to obtain that list and to check upon those individuals?

The Scripps-Howard newspapers have been carrying a series of articles over the past few weeks exposing subversive and racketeering activities of a large number of individuals and organizations. The Philadelphia Record of December 16 carries on its front page a story exposing Fascist control of 12 new veterans' organizations. Why does not the committee call some of these to Washington?

There is nothing to indicate that the committee has shown the slightest interest in following up any of these important leads.

Since it was created almost a year ago this committee has failed to justify either its existence or the expenditure of the $75,000 appropriated to it. The protection of our internal security is the job of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in the executive branch of our government, and not of a legislative committee. If we feel that the country is not being properly safeguarded from un-American elements then it is up to us to let the FBI know it, not to give free rein to a committee that is devoting its efforts to hounding, harassing, and smearing liberal groups and bringing contempt and ridicule upon this House which created it.

FASCISTS BACK 12 OF 47 GROUPS SET UP FOR VETS—MCWILLIAMS AND GERALD L. K. SMITH HEAD OWN ORGANIZATIONS

The peddlers of racial hatred, intolerance, and disunity are back in business again—this time in the guise of veterans' organizations.

Of the 47 new organizations bidding for the membership of 13,000,000 veterans of World War II, 12 are sponsored by native Fascists. They have the familiar odor of the American Firsters, the Christian Fronters, the Coughlinites, and the rest of the lunatic fringe attached to them.

LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS

1. The Christian Veterans of America, organized by Frederick Kister, former America Firster, and associate editor of the pro-Fascist Scribner's Commentator.

2. The Nationalist Veterans of World War II, promoted by the Reverend Gerald L. K. Smith, head of the America First Party.

3. The Protestant War Veterans, of which Edward J. Smythe, one of the defendants in the sedition trials of 1944, is organizer and chairman.

4. The St. Sebastian Brigade, headed by Father Charles E. Coughlin, of Royal Oak, Mich., former publisher of Social Justice.

5. The Servicemen's Reconstruction Plan, sponsored by Joseph McWilliams, another of the sedition trial defendants and self-styled pro-Nazi "fuehrer of Yorkville."

6. The United Sons of America, headed by Harvey Hanson and operated from the prewar Ku Klux Klan headquarters in Detroit.

7. The Christian War Veterans of America (not to be confused with the Christian Veterans of America), which subscribes to the beliefs of the Reverend Gerald L. K. Smith.

8. The George Washington Bodyguard, a Chicago "cultural" group which has been associated with George Deatherage's American Nationalist Confederation.

9. Military Order of the Liberty Bell, a national order for veterans of all wars, which is strongly anti-Negro and antiforeign and which operates out of Washington, D. C.

10. The Fight for Free Enterprise, Inc., led by William Walker, a trainee of pro-Nazi Joseph P. Kamp. The organization, while not a veterans' group, is much interested in controlling veterans' thought in its Free Enterprise News Bulletin.

11. The Nationalist Party, a political organization formed by ex-Senator Robert Rice Reynolds.

12. The United Veterans Political Party, organized by ex-Congressman John H. Hoeppel, of California, who was impeached for selling appointments to West Point. This organization, through its publication, is disseminating anti-Semitic propaganda.

START DRIVE HERE

Thus far, only one of these groups—Kister's Christian Veterans of America—is known to have launched openly an organization drive in Philadelphia.

During the last 8 weeks the Christian Veterans has distributed reams of printed propaganda beseeching Philadelphia's "Christian veterans to awake." Much of this material is filled with anti-Semitic tirades and is put out under Kister's name. In it Kister frankly admits his former ties with America First. He asks veterans to respond to his "call for action" by sending in membership applications and contributions to the organization's headquarters in Chicago.

He also urges "Christian veterans to develop leadership in the affairs of government" and to oppose all "subversive forces which seek to destroy Christianity."

PLEDGES $2,500 BONUS

Kister promises the veterans a $2,500 bonus and full employment. He expresses himself wholeheartedly in favor of free enterprise, labor unions, and agriculture. In addition, he advocates the stopping of immigration for 10 years and the deportation of aliens who apparently do not agree with his personal concept of liberty.

Associated with Kister in the Christian Veterans of America is at least one other known America First sympathizer—George Vose. Vose is national secretary.

The literature names Paul Meinhart, of Lester, Delaware County, as assistant national secretary.

It is less difficult to understand Vose's connection with the organization than that of Meinhart.

PRAISED BY SMITH

Rev. Gerald L. K. Smith, for whom Vose also works (as does Kister) through the Nationalist Veterans of World War II, recently said of him: "He has always been an America Firster and now he is mad at the Army, and that's the way I like my people to be—angry."

Perhaps Vose is "mad at the Army" because of the following facts:

On April 27, 1943, Vose was court-martialed at Fort Sheridan, Ill. He was charged with having sold Army matériel and with having sold passes to enlisted men for $5 and $10 each. He was found guilty on March 3, 1943, and sentenced to 6 months at hard labor. He was permitted to rejoin his company after serving his sentence, but shortly afterward suffered a leg injury and was given a medical discharge.

DISCHARGED BY ARMY

Meinhart is a 22-year-old discharged veteran who lives with his parents in a modest, neatly furnished bungalow at 312 Seneca Avenue, Lester. He was discharged from the Army last December after having been shot accidentally through the jaw while on maneuvers in the South.

Under what circumstances he joined the Christian Veterans of America, or when, is not known. However, some time earlier this year he went to Chicago to go to work. It is presumed that while he was there he became affiliated with Kister and Vose, who selected him as their stooge for the organizing job in the Philadelphia area and elsewhere in Pennsylvania.

SURPRISED BY ACTION

In Lester, Meinhart is known generally as a "nice, mild-mannered boy—not the kind that is arrogant or belligerent."

"I was frankly surprised to hear he had tied up with an organization of that type," said a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars there. "I doubt if he knows the kind of people he is affiliated with."

In any event, Meinhart now regularly attends meetings of the Philadelphia Chapter of the Blue Star Mothers, a prewar extremist group, which is assisting him in his organization drive. It is from members of the Blue Star Mothers that he obtains his leads on possible members. And it was the Blue Star Mothers who recently contributed the funds to pay for a newspaper advertisement to promote the Christian Veterans of America membership drive—an advertisement no newspaper in Philadelphia has seen fit to print.

RESULTS UNKNOWN

How many members the organization drive has produced in Philadelphia is not known.

But Meinhart has been heard to say the drive is not progressing favorably.

At least one other of these organizations is believed to have some Philadelphians on its rolls. That is Father Coughlin's St. Sebastian Brigade, which in the strict sense of the word is not a veterans' organization. The brigade was organized early in 1942. By November of last year it is said to have had the names of 400,000 veterans on its lists. They were enrolled by their wives, mothers, and sweethearts.

PLANS 100 ORGANIZERS

A novel plan for extending the influence of the National Veterans of World War II has been conceived by Rev. Gerald L. K. Smith. It is fashioned after the plan followed by Hitler before his ascension to power.

Smith promises each veteran a bonus of $1,000 to involve them in his hate campaign against organized labor, Jews, Negroes, and other minorities. He plans to train 100 organizers. Each of these organizers will go to one of the 100 principal cities. There they will organize a group of 10 veterans, who in turn will organize 10 more, and so on, until the organization's desired strength is gained.

Smythe describes his Protestant War Veterans as a voluntary association of white gentiles of the Protestant faith who served in any war of the Republic. He has set his membership goal at 25,000,000 veterans and members of their families. He is still far from that goal.

M'WILLIAMS OFFERS MORE

Joseph McWilliams, the man who would be fuehrer, and who has a special technique for dodging draft boards and prisons, is more ambitious in what he offers the veterans. He proposes a $7,800 bonus. He adds that veterans, "thus fairly treated, will smash all efforts to a dictatorship (presumably by anyone but McWilliams), and will devotedly protect the Christian culture which nurtured them."

How far the peddlers of hate will get with their scheme to indoctrinate American servicemen with the principles of fascism remains to be seen.

ONE MILLION FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND JOIN UP

Thus far the 6,000,000 men who have already returned from World War II have shown no haste to join any organization. Only about 1,500,000 have joined any veterans' organization. Most have selected the old-line conservative groups—the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled War Veterans.

Another 30,000 are claimed as members in the recently organized American Veterans of World War II, better known as the AMVETS. Another 11,000 have affiliated themselves with the liberal-minded American Veterans' Committee, organized by Charles Bolte, New York writer. This organization boasts as members Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.; Philip Willkie,

son of the late Wendell Willkie; and Owen Root, youthful organizer of the Willkie clubs; and Col. Evans F. Carlson, of the famous marine battalion, Carlson's Raiders.

LOOK FOR MALCONTENTS

But the peddlers of hate, by their own confession, are not interested in the type of veterans who join the Legion, the VFW, DAV, AMVETS, or AVC.

They are looking for the men who, coming back from the wars, are unable to bridge the gap from military to civilian life with ease. They are seeking the malcontents, the jobless, the homeless, and those who figure the Government owes them more than it is giving.

They do not need many members to serve their purposes—neither a majority or a large minority.

They believe that 50,000 or 100,000 men, organized in well-knit units across the country, would give them an effective organization of storm troopers to fight for fascism.

Saboteurs in Two Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, insufficient recognition for outstanding service rendered has been given to J. Edgar Hoover and his fine staff of men of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I especially call attention to records of our committee which disclose the important fact that during World War II the United States experienced not one successful foreign-directed act of sabotage. This is the result of the great work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and to the great directorship of J. Edgar Hoover. Recognition of this great service to our country in time of war is given in a timely editorial by Ben McKelway, associate editor of the Washington Evening Star. By leave granted me, I am happy to include this editorial with my remarks:

In reporting to the International Association of Chiefs of Police that not one foreign-directed act of sabotage was completed successfully in this country during World War II, Director J. Edgar Hoover of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has stated a fact that contrasts sharply with the sabotage record of the First World War. Prior to America's entry in the other war and for some time subsequent thereto, German agents had a veritable field day. With no American counterespionage service worthy of the name in operation prior to 1917, German and Austrian spies and saboteurs ranged far and wide almost unmolested, leaving a wake of fires, explosions, and damaged war machines that seriously impaired this country's preparations for war. Best remembered of these acts of sabotage were the Black Tom and Kingsland disasters, which destroyed millions of dollars' worth of munitions and other supplies and cost the lives of a number of workers. Investigation of the Black Tom and Kingsland cases revealed that these and many similar fires and explosions were the work of trained saboteurs and spies, operating under a system directed by the German and Austrian Embassies prior to the outbreak of hostilities and thereafter by German diplomats in Mexico.

All of this occurred in the days when there was no FBI and when counterespionage in any form, even by military and naval intelligence agencies, was frowned upon in official quarters. It is significant that the total appropriation for G–2, the Army's intelligence service, in 1916, was $11,000. After April 1917, G–2 was permitted to expand rapidly, but its counterespionage agents were for the most part lacking in experience and training, whereas Germany's spies were veterans at the game.

Fortunately, the United States benefited from the lessons of the dark days of 1916–17. Long before war came again to America, a well-organized, efficient spy-catching campaign had been launched, with the FBI as the nucleus and coordinator of counterespionage activities. As early as 1936 and 1939, the FBI began unearthing and breaking up German and Japanese spy rings. The Bureau's staff grew from a prewar strength of 2,000 special agents to more than 15,000 as the war reached its height. Every suspicious person was placed under surveillance, every suspicious act, message or document investigated. Hundreds of known and suspected agents were arrested and many were tried and convicted. Yet all of this was done without "witch hunts," without transgressing the rights of loyal citizens. It is a record of which the FBI and its many cooperating groups, from Army and Navy intelligence to local sheriffs, may well be proud.

Resolution of Schenectady Veterans of World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the board of governors of Schenectady Veterans of World War II, Inc., Schenectady, N. Y.:

Whereas the United States Government has proposed a loan to England in the amount of $4,400,000,000 without interest for the first 5 years and at a rate of interest of 2 percent thereafter; and

Whereas any returning veteran of the United States armed forces who borrows money from his Government, under the provision of Public Law 346, commonly known as the GI bill of rights, is compelled to pay interest of 4 percent on the Government-guaranteed portion of said loan, with only a 1-year moratorium granted on the interest charge on said portion; and

Whereas the tangible and intangible collateral offered by the veteran to guarantee the repayment of any loan made to him by his Government is equal to or greater than that which may be offered by foreign countries as history has proven; and

Whereas it appears that the Federal Government is discriminating against the veteran by charging him double the amount of interest charged foreign countries for money borrowed from the same source: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of governors of this organization respectfully ask that immediate steps be taken to amend that portion of Public Law 346 covering loans to veterans by increasing the moratorium period on interest charges as now prescribed and by lowering the rate of interest charged on said loans to a figure which will be comparable to that charged foreign countries for borrowing; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this board is instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Honorable United States Senators from New York State and to the Honorable B. W. KEARNEY, Member of Congress, Representative of the Thirty-first Congressional District of this State.

Seventh Louisiana District Has National 4–H Club Health Champion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, the Seventh Congressional District of Louisiana, which I have the honor to represent, has furnished from the Parish of Cameron, bordering on the Gulf of Mexico, John Harold Savoy, the Nation's healthiest 4–H member, chosen at the national congress held in Chicago, Ill., recently, and I am proud of this distinction for my district. Mr. Speaker, with your permission I should like to include with these remarks a newspaper account of this event, to wit:

[From the Eunice (La.) New Era of December 12, 1945]

J. H. SAVOY, OF CAMERON, IS NAMED NATIONAL 4–H CLUB HEALTH CHAMPION—ACHIEVES HIGHEST DISTINCTION POSSIBLE AS CLUBSTER AT CHICAGO CONFERENCE

A 17-year-old boy from Cameron Parish achieved one of the highest distinctions possible in 4–H activities when he was named the Nation's healthiest 4–H member at the national congress in Chicago. He is John Harold Savoy, a student at Creole High School in his native parish. He attended the congress following his selection as the healthiest 4–H boy in Louisiana at final tests in the State contest held on the university campus last November. He shared honors in the latter event with Georgia Faye, Middleton, of Natchitoches Parish, Louisiana's healthiest 4–H girl, who received honorable mention in the contest at Chicago.

The choice of John Harold Savoy as the Nation's healthiest 4–H boy is especially noteworthy, since he is a product of a definitely rural section of the State, where coastal marshlands abound and 4–H activities are limited. He has been a club member for 7 years, and has followed good health practices from the beginning of his membership. The honors accorded him, both in the State and in the national competition, reflect the highest credit of his zeal and devotion in a project highly important in its implications of the worthiness of the 4–H program.

Significance of the achievement lies in the fact that a boy from an isolated rural section of this State was able to develop practices and procedures permitting him to enter competition with other boys and girls from every State of the Nation. The health championship is one of the most coveted honors awarded at the national congress. Young Savoy was one of 1,298 Louisiana 4–H'ers who took part in the State health contest this year. There were others, of course, who followed the health program as a project. In all, 10,137 club members enrolled in health study during the year. It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of a program which enlists the interest and activity of so many young people in the rural

areas of the State—especially a program involving the physical well-being of boys and girls who are to be citizens and leaders of the future.

Warmest congratulations are due Miss Hazel Bratley, extension nutritionist of L. S. U., who has direct supervision of the 4–H health program, and the county and home demonstration agents of Cameron Parish, who had immediate direction of the work in which the new national champion excelled, for the signal demonstration of success which has marked their efforts.

Marriage Data by the Bureau of the Census

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to print, I include a letter from J. C. Capt, Director of the Bureau of the Census, which is self-explanatory:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,
December 5, 1945.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have read with some concern comments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, November 29, on the recent release by the Bureau of the Census of data on the marriage prospects of men and women, by age. In particular, I was concerned by the evident misunderstanding of the value and the uses made of the information on marriages and marital trends related to age of individuals.

The basic information on marriages and marriage rates is used by the Census Bureau in compiling estimates on the number of new family units annually. This information is important to the manufacturer and the retailer who are concerned with the number of family units as potential customers for their goods. It is important to the construction industry as a measure of the future demand for building. It is important to school authorities in weighing the factors which provide estimates for future school needs as the new family units become parents and their growing children enter the school system.

Often the Census Bureau receives requests for information on the number of each sex who marry at given ages, other correspondents request information on the age or ages at which the largest number of the population marry, and still other requests are variations of the theme. Manufacturers of jewelry have written in to request the data to measure the future market for engagement and wedding rings, and the data have even entered into studies upon which future legislation is based.

An immediate concrete example of the usefulness of the marriage data is a request early this month from the research and drafting committee of the Kentucky State Bar Association engaged in preparing a revision of the Kentucky Statutes of Descent and Distribution. One of the inquiries from this committee was for data on the average age of marriage for males in the United States. By means of the tabulations which were included in the release you discussed the Census Bureau was able to supply the answer.

Another recent request came from the New England Council for Economic Development and Regional Cooperation. This request was for "the ratio of marriages to the construction of new dwelling units." A letter from the department of economics and sociology of Colorado College requesting the marriage and marriage rates data states that this information is useful in courses in sociology. From the editor of the National Almanac, published at Northwestern University, came a request for the number of marriages per 1,000 women (15–44 years of age) each year. Similar requests have been received from the Interstate Department Stores, Inc., of New York; the department of economics and sociology of Connecticut College; the Circuit Court, Third Judicial Circuit of Michigan; the research department, Esquire Magazine; the National Conference on Family Relations, Chicago, Ill.; the department of sociology, University of Kansas; the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina; and the department of rural sociology, University of Missouri.

The release discussed was prepared primarily for the information of newspaper correspondents in Washington from whom the Census Bureau has received numerous requests for this type of information. Stories based upon this particular report were distributed by all three of the national press wire services and "made the front page" of newspapers throughout the country, which is evidence of the universal interest in the subject.

Sincerely,

J. C. CAPT, *Director.*

China Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, among the American columnists, who attempt frequently to analyze and interpret events and conditions in China, their significance for our own country and policy with relation to them, none has to my knowledge more consistently shown good understanding and balanced judgment than Mr. Barnet Nover. Under permission to extend my remarks, I include his column from the Washington Post of December 18, 1945, which gives a penetrating and, I think, accurate evaluation of the new restatement by President Truman of our historic policy of working for a strong, independent, and friendly China, under the domination of no outside power as the best guaranty of America's long-term security in the Pacific:

CHINA POLICY

(By Barnet Nover)

GENERAL MARSHALL'S MISSION

It is not surprising that President Truman's statement on China has, on the whole, aroused much more enthusiasm in Chungking than it has in Yenan.

It is true that the Chinese Communists find some passages in that statement very much to their liking.

They are delighted, for instance, with the President's critical reference to "one-party government" in China, meaning the government headed by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and controlled by the Kuomintang, the only party that has legal status in the area under Chungking's control.

The Communists are wholly in favor of the proposal that the Chinese Government be "broadened to include other political elements in the country." And they applaud Mr. Truman's pledge that there will be no "United States military intervention to influence the course of any internal Chinese strife."

All this, from the Chinese Communist point of view, belongs on the credit side of the ledger. But their joy over the Truman statement is very much tempered by the President's recommendation that once a broadly representative government has been established in China "autonomous armies should be eliminated as such and all armed forces in China integrated effectively into the Chinese National Army."

In taking this position President Truman was, of course, expounding no new policy. All previous efforts made by the United States to get the rival elements in China to unite have had as their corollary the unification of all Chinese armed forces. But each time a prime reason for the failure to achieve political unity was the inability to reach a satisfactory agreement regarding the integration of the Chinese Communist armies in the military forces under the control of the Central Government.

We Americans think of an army purely as a military instrument. In China during these last decades the principal role played by armies has not been as much military as political.

That was true when more or less independent war lords controlled most of China's provinces. It is still true today.

The number of men a war lord had under arms determined how much "face" he had. It determined the amount of revenues and supplies he received from the Central Government in return for fealty to that regime. Last, but not least, the size of the army a war lord had under his command determined whether he was to remain in power or be overthrown by somebody more powerful than he.

To the extent that the Chinese Communists fear that by disbanding their armies or allowing them to be incorporated in the national forces they will lose political power, to that extent are they certain to resist the President's proposal.

Nor are they likely to regard as an adequate quid pro quo the inclusion of individual Communists in the government. Such an offer has been made to them repeatedly. But they have never been satisfied that they stand to gain as much by going inside the government and giving up their arms as by remaining outside and keeping them.

By the same token it is not difficult to see why the Chinese Nationalists are very much pleased with the President's proposals.

The fact is that every one of these proposals is and for a long time has been on Chiang Kai-shek's own agenda. He favors a cessation of hostilities between the rival elements. All Chinese do. They have had more than enough of strife. He is not opposed to "a national conference of representatives of major political elements" as Mr. Truman recommends. Precisely that kind of a conference was called by the Chungking government some time ago. Bearing the name of the People's Consultative Conference, it is to convene at Chungking in a few days and will include delegates from the Kuomintang, the Communist Party, the Democratic League, the Young China Party, and Independents.

As for the democratization of the Chinese Government, Chiang Kai-shek could not oppose such a move without going contrary to the program laid down by the late Dr. Sun Yat-sen, father of the Chinese Republic and founder of the Kuomintang. Actually, Chiang is on record not once but many times in favor of doing away with the one-party political tutelage system once the war had ended.

President Truman's statement of policy should help bring about that strong, united, democratic China which this Nation has always wanted to see come into being.

The fact must be recognized, however, that this goal will not be easy of achievement.

The Chinese people certainly want it. The world situation and China's own desperate plight demand it. But the obstacles are great and are deeply imbedded in China's political soil and her economic situation.

So in carrying out the President's directive, Gen. George C. Marshall will have no easy time of it. Yet no task needs doing more than the one with which he has been entrusted. It is not too much to say, in fact, that not only the future of China but the peace of the world may depend on the success or failure of his mission.

Release of Doctors From the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in this country regarding the early discharge of doctors who are still in the service in order that they may take their places in their respective communities where they are badly needed. And, may I say, that the doctors are greatly disturbed over the slowness in granting releases and discharges to them. Many of them are sitting on foreign soil, doing nothing, yet they are not released and discharged. This is a most glaring example of the bungling of the discharge system following the close of this war, and this must be corrected and the discharge of all doctors available for discharge accomplished at the very earliest moment. They are needed in their home communities, and the people are demanding that these doctors be released and discharged as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an article appearing in the Stars and Stripes, which follows :

The waste of Army doctors has been freely discussed in the States in various articles appearing in the press. Senator REED has charged that the Army was holding 10,000 unneeded doctors and dentists in what he termed a "disgraceful situation." Apparently nothing is being done with regard to the hoarding of surplus doctors and dentists in the ETO.

Since VE-day thousands of doctors have been idle in this theater. General hospitals with bed capacities up to 1,500 have been kept fully staffed, with a daily patient census of only 300. One general hospital now has 20 patients and still has not been authorized to close. Many doctors have been detailed to nonmedical duties.

An alarming situation faces those of us who seem to be stuck indefinitely in the ETO. The only vehicle at present for sending doctors home is on the basis of pre-Pearl Harbor service, 80 points, or being over 48 years of age.

We note War Department policy that medical officers in the States having 30 months' service will not be sent overseas. We find no provisions for those of us in the ETO with many more months of service, much of it overseas, to be returned to the States. Morale among doctors is very low, and this precludes the keeping of medical care on a high professional level.

We are told there is a shortage of doctors and no relief is forthcoming until replacements are available. Doctors were trained at the Government's expense under ASTP. Now, we are told that they lack sufficient training to assume responsibility of overseas duty. And yet, most of the ETO patients have minor complaints and disorders not requiring the attention of highly trained specialists.

We request an immediate investigation into the problem of redeployment of medical officers in the ETO and a definite answer to the following questions:

"How many doctors will be needed in Europe for the Army after January 1, 1946? Does the Army plan to use the same ratio of doctors to men in the service as was needed under actual combat conditions? How many patients are there in the ETO and what percentage of these require skilled specialists for their treatment? How many doctors and specialists are now in the ETO? Why are not replacements of low-point officers made available from the States on a just rotation basis immediately?

"What is the status of the thousands of doctors educated at the Government's expense during the last 2 years? How many doctors have been sent home under the redeployment program during the last 60 days? How many will be sent home in the next 60 days? Why has not a definite policy been forthcoming with regard to medical officers?" (Signed by 165 medical officers from 23 medical units.)

Construction or Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following self-explanatory communication from one of my valued constituents in California. Is it not about time we changed some of the rules and regulations to which he refers?

LOS ALTOS, CALIF., *December 13, 1945.*
Hon. JACK Z. ANDERSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I see controls are going back on building materials. Did I ever tell you of my experience?

I got most of the materials to build a house before Pearl Harbor. Then 2 years ago I was discharged from the Army. I asked in New York, Philadelphia, and Washington (where it's hard to crash the doors of the bureaucrats) about building and filled out forms and got the run-around, generally things like this:

Bureaucrat. "And even if we gave you material to build you couldn't use the bathtub you have in your back yard."

Me. "Why not?"

Bureaucrat: "Because rule number so and so prohibits bathtubs in new houses."

Me: "Then what am I supposed to do?"

Bureaucrat: "Go out and buy a stall shower."

Me: "And what is the reason for the rule?"

Bureaucrat: "To save material."

Mine.

Even asked in San Francisco when I returned home and was told that that was the rule of the Medes and Persians.

So I still have the material.

I have been digging a nice hole.

I have lined up some lumber. I might have to help cut it.

If fool rules would hold off I'd have a nice house to live in, or for someone else to live in, in 6 or 8 months. Then as I have two 40,000-B. t. u. floor furnaces (one is more than enough in California), 1,400 pounds of nails (600 to 800 equals 1 house), several hundred feet of copper pipe, plenty of copper screen, down spouts, bronze door knobs, and so forth, I could build a second house if the bureaucrats would let me.

Of course, if we must have regulations to send bathtubs to Britain I can fill out forms until I am fed up.

But if we want housing for veterans, then America should come first. Russia could send us some of her surplus lumber (and pulpwood) if she really wanted to pay off a little lend-lease (I doubt if she does).

Sincerely,

MARVIN O. ADAMS.

Stop This Thievery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel concerning the so-called loan of $4,400,000,000 to the British:

STOP THIS THIEVERY

In addition to several other things, the Christmas season is an occasion for Senators and Representatives to run back to their home bailiwicks for a little combination recreation and fence repairing.

This makes them fairly accessible to their constituents, and makes the Christmas season this year an excellent time for the people at home to let their Congressmen know we are tired of playing Santa Claus to the whole cock-eyed world.

It is a good time to let them know that particularly we are turning thumbs down on the proposed gift of $4,400,000,000 to Great Britain.

After all, this is the American people's money. It is the American people's right to say for what it shall be spent, and to whom it will go. Neither the Congress nor the President has any legal or moral right to throw billions of dollars of our tax money around unless we say it's all right.

Not very many American people think it's all right to put another $4,400,000,000 in John Bull's stocking.

And please let us not fool ourselves into thinking that this money is a loan. It is not a loan. The British have said they didn't want a loan, because they couldn't pay back a loan.

The London Daily Mail said editorially, the other day:

"There is a limit beyond which Britain will not go. The British people are determined not to enter the postwar world with a millstone of foreign debt around their necks.

"That could mean only one of two things. Either we should become a dependency of the United States, or we should have to incur the odium of repudiating a debt which we should be unable to carry."

That is plain, blunt language. It says they don't want to borrow money because they don't want to incur a debt which they would have to repudiate. (Of course, we might say here, parenthetically, that we didn't know the British had any scruples against repudiating a debt.)

But anyhow, the Daily Mail went on to say, in a very impatient and scolding tone: "The United States should propose some means of assisting Britain which would not confront us with such a dilemma."

Such as what, for instance? Well, if they can't and won't borrow from us, and still insist they have to have nearly five billion, what else can be done except to give it to them?

Meanwhile, our own Government has been spending our money to finance one of the most extensive propaganda campaigns in history to sell us on the idea that we should hand this gratuity to Great Britain.

The propaganda has run the gamut of all the Keynes-Attlee nonsense, and it has been disseminated over the radio and through the signed columns of the syndicated globalists in newspapers, and through every other means imaginable.

If the people swallow the bait, the average American is a great deal more stupid than we think. But thinking about it won't help. The pressure on Congressmen is terrific, to put the scheme over.

The legislative action to steal nearly $5,000,000,000 from American taxpayers is due to come up in January.

Between now and that time, let your Congressman know that you expect him to vote against this thievery.

Scrapping of War Tools at Tank Plant Explained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an article appearing in the Flint News-Advertiser of November 23, 1945, entitled "Scrapping of War Tools at Tank Plant Explained," written by George H. Maines, News-Advertiser staff writer. This article contains information of interest to the general public.

SCRAPPING OF WAR TOOLS AT TANK PLANT EXPLAINED—PROCESSES OF RECONVERSION PUZZLE THE PUBLIC, RUMORS FLY—SO HERE'S THE DOPE

(By George H. Maines)

War tools are being disposed of here by Army ordnance men and Fisher tank officials, but, they have served their purpose in the war effort. They have no further useful value, according to an investigation made by the Flint News-Advertiser.

Industry, as one official stated, probably takes into consideration also the souvenirs taken home to help build a Christmas present for GI Joe's new brother, and industry takes it in stride.

But no useful tool, jig, die, small or large part, or material in any form of assembly is ever scrapped until the Government or the contracting industrial firm has had an opportunity to purchase.

PUBLIC GETS WHAT'S LEFT

When the requirements of Government and industry are fulfilled with regard to the purchase or storage for future use of any material used on war contracts, the public is offered what is left, a Government official stated. And this could include everything from a bolt and nut, screws, pliers, drills, lumber, storage batteries, gears, files, to assembled machines.

Reconversion proceeds in this order:

1. Termination, or the time when a tool, part, assembly, or machine can no longer be gainfully used due to completion or cancellation of a Government contract.

2. Disposition, which is the order to keep or salvage something.

3. Salvage, which is the step to sell or scrap something.

DISPOSAL FOLLOWS A PLAN

The process of disposing of material, when the useful life has been terminated, consists of the following steps:

1. The Government has first choice to take back parts usable now or later in a Federal arsenal or replacement depot.

2. Industry has next priority to distribute its own useful durable tools to its subsidiaries or branch factories.

3. Prime salvage bidders take the bulk of what's left for resale to smaller industries or through used-tool supply houses.

4. The general public has access to the balance, after which the unsold materials are scrapped as junk and sold to dealers for disassembly and shipping only as remelted metal.

UNCLE SAM COMES FIRST

On war contracts, the Government has priority on anything it can use or might use later. These parts, tools, or assemblies which Government keeps are packed and shipped to arsenals, storage warehouse, or lot after being properly covered or packed. Some machines are painted with a heavy protective substance that will withstand years of storage.

Property owned by the corporation or contractor is disposed of by its own officials. Any of their units have first choice of any salvage.

Material on hand is listed and the lists are sent to dealers and firms known to be in the market for such items. Bids are asked for. Generally speaking these are buyers who make a business of watching for sales to the public, and have early knowledge of where the salvage is; just like specialists in the real estate business watch for tax title sales when the State or county offers real estate. Salvage specialists follow all of these industrial salvage sales. The high bidder obtains the listed lot.

ANYBODY CAN BUY IT

Now that the Government and the industrial contractor and salvage specialist have bought everything considered to be of value, or usable, the balance is offered as scrap to go to the highest bidder. Again the bids are, in general, watched for by those in the business of buying scrap. But anybody has the right to bid for and buy it.

This scrap may be in the form of cutting tools, jigs, special tools, patterns, dies, and equipment that originally might have cost thousands of dollars. But it has no further useful purpose except as metal to be remelted. It already has been paid for in the cost of production.

In this scrap there could be storage batteries, durable tools, gears, wrenches, saws, files, pipe—anything. It is here, aften, that confusion occurs in the mind of the public when a good part or piece of material is scrapped.

CANNOT BE SOLD AS TOOLS

Occasionally tools, small parts, and accessories do get into the scrap pile and find their way to the junk yards. These unmutilated pieces may have value, but they cannot be sold as parts or tools in the ordinary sense. The junk dealer in whose yard the scrap eventually lands has the laborious task of sorting all pieces and shipping separately the copper, brass, zinc, cast iron, wrought iron, different kinds of steel, and other metals.

This scrap must be mutilated and shipped as such for remelting, as the Interstate Commerce Commission sets the freight rate for scrap which is much lower than for a similar part not mutilated.

Now and then a good piece or a new or usable part gets into the scrap pile or junk yard. With millions of pieces being scrapped and mutilated the human element enters. One official pointed out that hotels daily lose towels, linens, silverware, and supplies; and merchants and shopkeepers charge off annually a percentage of what they know will disappear from their counters. But very few whole parts reach the scrap pile.

PERISHABLE VERSUS DURABLE

It might be of interest to the reader to know the difference of types of tools so often referred to by the layman.

Tools in industry, called durable tools, are not the ordinary variety of the household type such as hammers, saws, files, chisels, and pliers which are perishable tools. Durable tools are especially made for forming the shape of a part or a complete product. Such a product could be a tank hull, an automobile body, a washing machine, or dish washer. This tool is a special piece of equipment, has little or no value any more, United States officials say, and cannot be converted to any other use.

The word "tool," as ordinarily used by the housewife, describes a hammer or saw, socket wrench, or commonly known pieces that are perishable. Industry distinguishes the difference between classifications of tools, one durable and one perishable. The industrial tool is built by a skilled toolmaker for a specific job and is worthless outside of that job.

The perishable tool is an article that can be used on several jobs or until broken or worn out.

RUMORS SET AT REST

Durable tools at Fisher tank plant today have no value. They are being scrapped. Perishable tools are salvaged and used by industry or sold.

The tarpaulins are en route to the Rock Island Arsenal for storage, a Government official reported. They were not burned nor destroyed.

Many high-priced gears were shipped to the Chrysler plant, and were not destroyed nor mutilated.

Prestone was poured in the ground in storage tanks, not on the ground, as rumored.

There were no rubber boots burned, but some synthetic material that looked like rubber that nobody would even cart away for nothing was burned under supervision.

The officials at Army Ordnance here and the General Motors men in charge of reconversion, termination, and salvage are without question doing a splendid job.

Naval Commander, With 17 Years of Service, Advocates Single Department of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article favoring a single department of defense. It was written by a naval commander, with 17 years of service and sent to his mother early in 1943. I trust my colleagues will

read the 1-minute speech I have made in today's RECORD. In those remarks I quoted from the letter from this Navy commander. His words are challenging. The article he wrote, from the Pacific theaters of war, follows:

LET'S START A SINGLE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Late in October 1941, I was walking through the tunnels and over the cliffs of Corrigedor. An Army officer was describing to a group of us naval officers the points of interest, the keys to the defense system, the strong and weak points. The language was English and the discourse professional, but time and again our guide had to be interrupted to explain what he meant by a certain term, phrase, or abbreviation. The United States Army and Navy have different languages, and the need for an interpreter is sometimes nearly as great as between a Russian and an Italian.

Herein lies the real reason behind Pearl Harbor. Short and Kimmel were but the names that represented two systems of thought that have little or nothing in common with each other. From the day a boy enters the Naval Academy he is taught to compete against the Army and not one single word about cooperation with that Army. The same is true at West Point. Consequently, ever since that day in July, 1926, when I entered Annapolis, I have looked mentally down my nose at anything Army. I even pitied the Army. I was not alone. There were many thousand others. There still are.

In 1938 I attended the Army's Chemical Warfare School at Edgewood Arsenal. Here was my first real professional contact with the Army. I learned little except that the Army had no money, so could actually do little training. My antipathy for the Army increased. So did that of my Navy contemporaries who attended the same school.

For nearly 3 years preceeding Pearl Harbor I was stationed on a ship in the Orient. Here were Americans away from home and here, for the first time, the Army and the Navy seemed to meet on somewhat even terms. There was some discussion of mutual affairs, some interest in the problems of the other service. This may have been caused mostly by the evident nearness of approaching calamity. Once in a while an Army officer would come on board ship and, mostly out of curiosity, take a ride. Once in a blue moon a naval officer would go on Army maneuvers. But these few contacts were personal, arranged by the individual for his own information. Even out there, where we were a few Americans in a sea of orientals, not once was there, to my knowledge, an official coordinated activity involving the Army and the Navy that was not social. Certainly there were meetings between the heads of the services, but here, as at Pearl Harbor, there was no head of the combined services who had the authority to initiate combined activity. If there is no boss, there is no one to start any joint training of the two services and no one to delineate where the activities of one service starts and the other stops.

In 1942, I attended the Naval War College at Newport, R. I.; there were several Army officers in the class. This is the one attempt by the armed forces to coordinate thought. Army officers attended the Naval War College and naval officers attended the Army War College. But even here there is no attempt to coordinate the activity and thought of the two branches. An Army officer at the Naval War College learns only how the Navy will do it. A naval officer at the Army War College learns only how the Army will do it. Where are they to learn how they are both to do it together? The entire education system of our armed forces presupposes that either the Army or the Navy will fight the war, never both. How can this system be corrected without too greatly upsetting the present organization?

First the enmity that exists between the Army and the Navy must be eliminated. This can best be done by destroying the competitive traditions between West Point and Annapolis. The courses at the two schools for the first two and a half years are practically the same. Let's combine the schools for this period. Let the boy who is going in the Army room with the boy who is going into the Navy or Air Force. (For a separate Air Force is later proposed, aside from the Army and Navy Air Forces.) Then let them specialize during the summers and the last year and a half as they do now, but keep them rooming together. Great friendships will be fostered. The basis of thinking and training will be the same. Tradition will become our tradition, American tradition, rather than Army versus Navy tradition.

The Naval War College is at Newport. The Army War College is in Washington. Where is the War College? There isn't any. These two colleges should be combined under one command. Somewhere we must learn how to fight together before a war starts.

Coordinated commands? In peacetime there aren't any. When war comes there is a great hustle and bustle to appoint supreme commanders that have to direct and coordinate Army and Navy and Air activity, who have never had one day of practice at it in time of peace. Why shouldn't it have been Short or Kimmel rather than Short and Kimmel? Had it been either, instead of both, Pearl Harbor may well have resulted in a Jap fiasco. If we have to have supreme commanders in war, we should have them in peace, schooled at an Army and Navy Academy and a combined War College that have given them a background for the job of directing combined military functions.

To carry the plan of coordination directly to the top, would it not certainly be best to have but one department in the Government charged with the defense of the country? This we will call the War Department. Under Secretaries would be Army, Navy, and Air. It is that simple.

What benefit will accrue besides the elimination of possible future Pearl Harbors and a more intelligent conduct of future wars? A great saving of public funds. Army and Navy men wear the same underwear, eat the same food, have the same bodies, similar teeth; in many cases fly the same kinds of planes, fire the same guns, and require similar construction projects. Thus War Department contracts could, in many cases, be let for equipment required for the entire armed force of the country, rather than separate Army and Navy contracts. The Supply, Medical, Construction, and Dental Corps could do for both services, making another link between the two services to bind them together.

Sooner or later the Army and the Navy must learn and put into use an efficient communication system, for now the Army cannot communicate with the Navy except through an interpreter. The system of neither is used by the other service. The time lost due to this calamitous situation is probably the greatest weakness in our defense system. And it is easy to correct. Again—one system.

It is believed that most interested people are now convinced that Army and Navy Air Forces are what we want, each with the function of cooperating with its own forces. But it is also felt that, when the big bombardment missions come, such as the RAF raids on Germany, that these are best carried out by a separate air arm. It is proposed, therefore, to have an Under Secretary for Air, charged with directing the functions of this separate Air Force, but who will have no hand in the Army and Navy air arms. The functions of the Army and Navy air arms will continue to be to work with ground forces and ships at sea, respectively.

When should we make the change? Why not now? We are trying to make the same changes in a much more difficult manner anyhow. Certainly the next classes to enter West Point and Annapolis could be combined only too easily. Nothing in this plan changes the interior organization of any department as now set up, except the coordination of supply, medical, construction, and communications. Those could be left until after the war. But it must be done before the next war, or Pearl Harbor may become a pleasant memory compared to what might happen should our armed forces grow too far apart in the next interval of peace.

Or do we prefer to retain the dash and color of the Army-Navy game?

AUTHOR'S NOTE.—Nothing in this article is intended to cast a reflection on either the Army or the Navy, each of which is an efficient, hard-fighting outfit within itself. It is not within the power of either the Army or the Navy to correct the inherent weakness indicated in this article. Rather, it is political, and can only be corrected by congressional action.

The opinions and assertions contained therein are the private ones of the writer and are not to be construed as official or reflecting the views of the Navy Department or the naval service at large.

Loans to Foreign Governments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Special House Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, I addressed a letter to its chairman, Hon. WILLIAM M. COLMER, on some phases of the committee's work which I now wish to give the House for the information of the Members:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POSTWAR
ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING,
Washington, D. C., November 28, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM M. COLMER,
Chairman, Special House Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: Since such a large part of the discussions, suggestions, and criticisms of the reports, especially Report 7, of the Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning have taken place in executive sessions where no record of them was made, I felt it my duty to write you relative to some of my suggestions and impressions.

Report seven recommends various conditions which should be met by foreign nations, particularly Britain and Russia, before the United States should extend loans to them, and impliedly recommends such loans be made when such conditions have been fulfilled.

I was in accord with the background discussions and conditions outlined but, as you recall, I repeatedly and with force advanced the view that before we recommended any loans for foreign nations that our committee should make a study of the economic and financial condition of our own Nation and

its various levels of government for the purpose of ascertaining, insofar as possible, how far we could go in advancing extensive loans to other nations without impairing or endangering our own financial structure or imposing an undue burden upon our own people. There is some point beyond which this Nation cannot go with impunity in creating a national debt which we must remember is always underlaid by the public debts of our various States, counties, and municipalities in addition to the indebtedness of public utility districts and quasi-Government corporations. It is manifest there is an astonishingly large per capita public debt of all types here. It might well be the responsibility of our committee with its able director of studies to try to find this point.

It has been my view that, in addition to making such a study of our own country, we should make, insofar as possible, a comparable study of other nations which have requested loans or contemplate doing so, for the purpose of determining relative strength and needs before asking our own people to extend such loans.

Likewise, before our committee assumes the responsibility of recommending such loans to Congress we should ascertain, insofar as possible, the purposes to which our money so loaned is to be put by the different borrowing nations. No doubt, there are many purposes for which our people would not wish us to loan their money to other nations, even if the financial position of our country was found to justify it.

If our committee assumes responsibility for recommending that foreign loans be made, it would seem that we also should accept the responsibility of seeing if any acceptable plans for repayment are possible. If we should feel our national interests require us to extend financial assistance to a nation which holds no reasonable hope of repayment, or if we feel such assistance should be granted for world humanitarian reasons, I should think we should consider making grants rather than loans in such cases and thus avoid complications resulting from failure to repay.

I had hoped such studies might have been made before our report dealing with these questions was presented, but since it was not feasible I want to urge that our committee undertake the study as early as practicable, that it might be in a position to furnish the House with this information before such matters come on the floor for consideration, and I feel we will be remiss in our duty if we should fail to do so. I hope it may be convenient to call a meeting of the committee without too much delay to consider these matters.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

CARROLL REECE.

Sussex County (Del.) Farm Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following article from Wilmington Morning News, Wilmington, Del., of December 17, 1945:

SUSSEX FARM INCOME THIRD HIGHEST IN EAST—$60,000,000 REPRESENTS 76 PERCENT OF TOTAL FOR DELAWARE

Sussex County's 1944 farm income of $60,000,000 is believed to be the third highest county farm income east of the Mississippi, according to Dr. R. O. Bausman, professor of Agricultural Economics at the University of Delaware.

About 76 percent of Delaware's entire farm income of the State was from Sussex County. And of the $60,000,000 Sussex income, nearly $46,000,000 or 77 percent came from the sale of commercial broilers. Other farm income in the county included $4,000,000 from truck crops, $2,000,000 from poultry and eggs, and $1,000,000 for the dairy industry.

The eastern counties having a higher farm income for the year than Sussex are Aroostook County, Maine, and Lancaster County, Pa. There are also 11 counties in the west with higher incomes.

Portland a Major Lumber Port

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mr. H. J. Cox on the subject of lumber production and lumber freight rates which appeared in a recent issue of Random Lengths, a publication of the Willamette Valley Lumbermen's Association. The article follows:

Leading businessmen of Portland are advocating port terminal facilities to accommodate a current lumber storage of at least 50,000,000 feet, board measure, the bulk of which will move by rail from inland points of origin in Washington and Oregon.

Portland can maintain its prestige and importance as a leading lumber port, regardless of the fact that most of its local sawmills are, of necessity, approaching the end of a useful and well-spent life.

There is ample timber resources and production capacity in the Willamette Valley to maintain past volume of lumber tonnage through the port of Portland, but, to reach such objective, transportation costs must be provided which will enable lumber tonnage to move from Willamette Valley points to Portland, for transshipment by water to our coastwise, intercoastal, and offshore markets in competition with cargo mills.

In the eight counties comprising the Willamette River Basin the annual lumber production is running around 2,000,000,000 feet annually. Around 38 percent of this 2,000,000,000 feet is produced in five counties—Clackamas, Washington, Yamhill, Polk, Marion—with a railroad-transportation rate to Portland of 5½ cents per hundredweight for water reshipment, or around $1.65 per thousand feet.

Around 20 percent of this 2,000,000,000 feet is produced in two counties (Benton, Linn) with a railroad transportation rate to Portland of 7½ cents per hundredweight for water shipment; or around $2.15 per thousand feet.

Around 42 percent of this 2,000,000,000 feet is produced in Lane County, with a railroad transportation rate to Portland of 9 and 10 cents per hundredweight for water reshipment; or around $2.70 per thousand feet.

In addition, Lincoln County produces around 200,000,000 feet annually with a railroad transportation rate to Portland of 9 and 10 cents per hundredweight for water reshipment; or around $2.70 per thousand feet. Douglas County is producing around 500,000,000 feet annually, with a railroad transportation rate to Portland of 16 cents per hundredweight for water reshipment; or around $4.50 per thousand feet.

In the above-mentioned group of five northern Willamette Valley counties, as well as Benton and Linn, the timber resources are limited and lumber production is not only headed for the decline, but already decreasing in the 5-county group. The port of Portland will be largely dependent on Lane and Douglas Counties where timber resources will permanently maintain a total annual lumber production of around 1¼ billion feet.

Civic, commercial, and public agency bodies throughout the Willamette Valley are vitally concerned over such management of our timber resources as will insure a permanent timber supply, thereby contributing to the protection of local communities, industries, and employment. This cannot be accomplished if our timber is logged for manufacture outside the local area or outside our State. Some timber owners do not appreciate or heed this fact. On the other hand, the owners whose timber is intermingled with O. & C. (Government ownership) will, under the law, so operate. Likewise, it is evident the policy of the United States Forest Service will not only require a sustained-yield operation but the manufacture of such timber in the local community.

The railroad is now hauling logs from points in Polk and Marion Counties to Oswego and Menefee at a rate of around 3 cents per hundredweight, as compared with a rate of 5½ cents for lumber to Portland. From points in Linn County for around 5 cents per hundredweight, as compared to 7½ cents for lumber. From points in Lane County at around 5 cents per hundredweight for logs, as compared with 9 to 10 cents for lumber.

For years the railroads have "land-locked" the upper Willamette Valley, particularly Douglas County, and have forced our original California markets far inland—due to rail shippers being unable to compete with cargo shippers at California ports of delivery, or the cargo shippers combination water shipment and rail and/or truck backhaul to inland California markets.

If Portland is to be a leading lumber port it will require a blanket of not to exceed a maximum rate of around 5 cents per hundredweight south of Portland to Myrtle Creek, Oreg. On the other hand, if the railroad company wants to increase its rail lumber tonnage to California it will have to decrease its present rate from Willamette Valley points to at least on par with the cargo rate to port of delivery and on par with the combination cargo and rail-truck backhaul to market destinations. This statement is predicated on what our future competitive rate will be, not on the rate existing during the war period. In the prewar days, the water rate, or the combination water and backhaul rate to California points was less than the all-rail rate from Willamette Valley points. Seemingly, it is safe to assume that in the days to come this situation will again exist. On the other hand we have reasonable rail-freight rates to California provided such rates remain competitive with future water, and water-backhaul rates to California points.

Housing Conditions in Los Angeles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of this

House the intolerable housing situation facing the returning veterans and the population in Los Angeles. We need immediate relief now, and it can only be gained by the fastest possible demounting of all unused barracks and Government housing from every section of the Nation, and transporting it to emergency areas such as Los Angeles.

People are literally sleeping in the streets in this western city. Veterans there are asking us, "Is this what we have been fighting for?" We here cannot wait another minute. The Congress will adjourn before Christmas, and it is imperative that we take care of this desperate problem before we leave.

Contractors have already given testimony that it is impossible for normal construction facilities to meet the immediate requirements. They say it would take 6 years at a normal rate of progress to met present-day needs in Los Angeles alone.

We must stop all lumber from being shipped to any part of the world today. We must see that a high minimum wage is set, on a national basis, so that workers who have shunned the lumber and construction industries will find these jobs attractive, and thus create an adequate labor supply in that industry. We must give every encouragement to the industry to develop new methods of building, such as those which have been produced through the exigencies of war.

This legislative body must act to help the people of this Nation. The returning war veteran, the displaced war worker, and Mr. Average Home Owner must be assisted in finding even temporary homes for the winter. Then we must go on to enact legislation for a long-range, truly American high-level home-building program, such as outlined in the Wagner-Ellender measure, which I have had the honor to introduce in the House.

Only through such careful planning for the future of our homes, may we hope to avoid such emergencies as presently beset us in the major industrial areas of our Nation.

Gas Rebates, Detroit Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a letter I addressed to Hon. Thomas C. Clark, the Attorney General, on December 10 relative to the gas rebates in the Detroit area, and his reply thereto dated December 14, 1945, with exhibits:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 10, 1945.
Hon. TOM C. CLARK,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: An unfortunate situation is arising in Detroit, in which a member of the corporation counsel's staff, acting as utility rate adviser to the city of Detroit, is opposing effort by the United States Government to assure equitable participation by local manufacturers in a pending rebate of approximately $10,000,000 of impounded funds, accumulated by order of a Federal court as overcharges for natural gas used by customers of the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. in the Detroit area since November 1, 1942. This opposition has been expressly based upon a contention that local industrial consumers of gas have passed on such overcharges in the sale of their product, and thus have recouped their excess rates.

Whether such opposition is by direction of the mayor and common council I cannot say, but when this discrimination against Detroit industries was first advocated by the municipal representative at a hearing before the Michigan Public Service Commission last May, I addressed an inquiry to the Secretary of the Treasury, under date of last June 6. It is worth observing that the $10,000,000 fund has accumulated principally due to the increased use of natural gas by local industries during the war, and that the national taxpayers were the buyers of their products. Accordingly, the Treasury Department referred my letter to Mr. Rawlings Ragland, Acting Head, Claims Division, Department of Justice, who notified me under date of August 7 that the Government's interest would be clarified and asserted.

With the above as background, I transmit herewith an excerpt of the transcript of proceedings before the Michigan Public Service Commission, session of Tuesday, November 20, 1945, evidencing the direct conflict of views on the rebate question which persists between the Federal Government and the spokesman of the city of Detroit. I quote from the statement of Mr. J. Francis Hayden, representing the Department of Justice:

"Mr. J. FRANCIS HAYDEN. May I be heard at this time?

"Chairman MCBREARTY. Yes; we would like to hear from anyone who has any thought on the subject. We have heard from Mr. Lee and Mr. Goodman that the domestic customer is the only one entitled to the refund.

"Mr. HAYDEN. I am appearing here, specially and not generally, on behalf of the United States of America, for the purpose of bringing to the attention of this Commission the interest which the United States has in the refund to be made on account of purchases made in the Detroit area * * * the United States has become one of the largest direct and indirect consumers of natural gas * * *. The Government has been running a lot of these plants around here, paying the bills for them, and these plants have been buying, I presume, at industrial or commercial rates. Now, to the extent that the Government has paid the bill on that type of a rate, you cannot exactly say that the Government has passed it along, because we do not have customers, we only have taxpayers and investors, and that involves practically all of us, I am sure everybody in this room, all the people in Michigan and every other State in the country * * *.

"Another peculiar type of interest which the United States has in the refund will arise in connection with the national housing program. As you all know, there are certain Government-owned housing projects in and around Detroit, and there are also a number of locally owned but federally subsidized housing projects. In general, the Federal Government has been paying the bill for the national-housing program and to the extent that any moneys may be recovered by way of refund, it is felt to be equitable and proper that the refund should be returned to the appropriations allocated to the entire program. * * * I feel that this Commission cannot be lauded too highly for its prompt action in seeking the views of all classes of consumers, and for its apparent intention to see that a prompt and proper refund is made to whatever extent is proper through proceedings of this Commission * * * we feel that the United States is ultimately entitled to receive its full pro rata share of the refund based on its purchases in all appropriate classes."

In a further statement, Mr. HAYDEN informed the Commission that "It is difficult to gather together all our claims. They are widespread. We are working to gather them together, and we expect to present them in complete form as soon as possible."

With respect to the Government's collection of its claims for rebate, I submit the following queries on behalf of manufacturers of the Detroit area:

1. Is the Government's method of computing claims so simplified that the requisite information can be obtained from the gas company, without causing loss of time and expense to local manufacturers?

2. Is it necessary to compute the amount of natural-gas overcharge accruing to each separate contract?

3. Cannot the proportionate rebate due any manufacturer be computed simply on the basis of the degree to which his total output was dedicated to war manufacture, starting with November 1, 1942?

4. Will the Department of Justice also assist the manufacturers to obtain their equitable share of the impounded funds for such gas used in manufacture not under Government contract?

5. In seeking its equitable share of refunds, based on gas purchased for public-housing programs, will the Government assist other consumers of gas for like purposes obtain also their fair portion of such refunds?

For reasons which I shall bring shortly to the Department's attention, the manufacturers of the Detroit area are without effective representation in the proceedings before the Michigan Public Service Commission and before the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth District. Accordingly, may I request an early decision on the questions submitted above, so that manufacturers in my district may be kept fully informed?

In sincere appreciation of the effective manner in which the Department of Justice is safeguarding the rights of the Nation's taxpayers in this proceeding, as well as those of the industries of the Detroit area, I am

Very cordially yours,

JOHN LESINSKI,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., December 14, 1945.
Hon. JOHN LESINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your letter to the Attorney General, dated December 10, 1945, in reference to the Detroit developments in the Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co. refund proceedings, has been referred to me for reply.

In accordance with previous correspondence, the Claims Division, Department of Justice, has been taking active steps to ascertain and protect the Government's interest in the impounded excess charges as a direct and indirect consumer of Panhandle gas during the period of litigation, in connection with which the funds were impounded.

In that connection it was necessary to take action in the Colorado Interstate Gas Co. case, a similar case, in the tenth circuit, which came to a hearing on November 8 and 9, 1945. In that case the court made a decision in principle directing a distribution to domestic and commercial consumers (excluding special and industrial consumers) in proportion to their payments. The decision is subject to clearing the distributing companies of tax liability, and is without prejudice to the claims of the United States as a

direct and indirect consumer. The decision is part of exhibit III of the enclosure hereinafter mentioned.

On November 20, 1945, this office noted a special appearance in the Michigan Public Service Commission hearing in order to point out the Government's interest, and our claim that the commission had no jurisdiction to make any adjudication affecting that claim. This office had no standing to speak at that hearing on the merits of the claims of any class of private consumers. It is interesting to note that while two spokesmen appeared for local commercial consumers, none appeared to assert the private claims of any industrial purchasers. The hearing was concerned only with the Detroit area.

I have just learned that another hearing is scheduled before the commission at Lansing, Mich., on December 20, 1945, to take up the same problem with regard to the balance of the State of Michigan. It has been agreed that the Government's statement of special appearance and objection as made at Detroit will be spread on the record of the Lansing hearing.

After investigation at Detroit, it was learned that the tax problems arising from the refund was delaying distribution of the money because the distributing companies were reluctant to disclaim an interest in the fund unless assured that they were not incurring tax liability. This problem is now removed by a blanket tax ruling obtained by this office on December 6, 1945. That ruling and our request for it are exhibits III and IV of the enclosure.

On December 11, 1945, I applied for, and obtained an order to show cause bringing up the whole matter of rights and distribution before a special session of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit, at Kansas City, Mo., on December 28, 1945. A copy of the order and the supporting papers is enclosed for your information.

If any of your constituents desire to assert personal claims to a refund, that is, refunds to a particular class of consumers, they would do well to appear at Kansas City on December 28, 1945, and obtain leave to be heard. The same observation may be made with respect to the hearing at Lansing insofar as that hearing may be held to be binding upon particular Michigan consumers.

The Attorney General cannot speak for the interest of particular consumers but only for the Government's interest as a consumer.

Answering your specific queries numbered 1 to 5:

1. The Government is now trying to ascertain from gas company records all billings to Government contractors in the refunding period. When this is completed each contractor will be asked to execute an assignment to the Government.

2. It will not be necessary to segregate the charges between contracts unless the contractor claims a right to some part of the refund.

3. If a proportionate share of the refund allocable to a contractor based on proportion of war effort can be agreed upon, a partial assignment should be acceptable.

4. The Department of Justice has no authority to assist in the collection of private claims. Private manufacturers will, therefore, have to assert their own interests.

5. In asserting a claim to a refund for Federal housing projects and for federally subsidized housing projects, the Attorney General is asserting the Government's interest. While this activity may coincide with some private interest, he cannot speak for the private interest.

Your interest in these matters is appreciated.

Respectfully,

JOHN F. SONNETT,
Acting Attorney General.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT—"PANHANDLE EASTERN PIPE LINE COMPANY, ILLINOIS NATURAL GAS COMPANY, AND MICHIGAN GAS TRANSMISSION CORPORATION, PETITIONERS, V. FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION, CITY OF DETROIT, COUNTY OF WAYNE, MICH., ET AL., RESPONDENTS"—NO. 12,466—ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

Upon the annexed petition of the United States of America verified the 11th day of December 1945, and upon all the proceedings heretofore had herein, and sufficient reason appearing therefore, it is

Ordered, That the original parties to this cause, the intervenors and the distributing companies named in exhibit II of said petition show cause before this court at a session to be held in the courtroom of the circuit court of appeals, United States Courthouse in Kansas City, Mo., on December 28, 1945, at 10 o'clock in the forenoon of that day or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why an order should not be made distributing the impounded funds in this cause and any additional amounts deposited with the court to the ultimate consumers of said distributing companies, and why the original petitioners herein should not be directed to make final and complete compliance with the provisions of the stay order entered herein on December 7, 1942, by making additional deposits as may be directed by the court, and why the court should not adjudge the rights of the original petitioners, the intervenors, the distributors, and the ultimate consumers in the impounded funds and any additional deposits, and why a method of distribution should not be determined and directed, and why provision should not be made for the protection and determination of the interest of the United States of America in the impounded fund and any additional deposits, and why the court should not grant such other and further relief as should be just and proper; and it is further

Ordered, That said distributing companies file with the court at that place on or before the time of the hearing on this order to show cause, separate verified statements setting forth the claim, if any, which each company filing it asserts to a distributive share in the impounded funds and any additional deposits which may be required by the court, or declaring, if that be the case, that such company has not and does not claim any interest in said fund and any additional deposits; and it is further

Ordered, That service of a copy of this order to show cause and of the papers upon which it is granted, if made personally, or by mail on counsel for the parties who have appeared in this cause and upon the distributing companies on or before December 17, 1945, shall be sufficient.

By the court:

JOHN B. SANBORN,
United States Circuit Judge, Presiding.
DECEMBER 12, 1945.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT—"PANHANDLE EASTERN PIPE LINE COMPANY, ILLINOIS NATURAL GAS COMPANY, AND MICHIGAN GAS TRANSMISSION CORPORATION, PETITIONERS, V. FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION, CITY OF DETROIT, COUNTY OF WAYNE, MICHIGAN, ET AL., RESPONDENTS"—NO. 12,466—PETITION

To the Honorable the Judges of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit:

The United States of America for its petition respectfully shows:

1. Under date of September 23, 1942, Federal Power Commission duly made an order requiring the original petitioners abovenamed to reduce their rates and charges for or in connection with their transportation and sale of natural gas in interstate commerce for resale for ultimate public consumption effective as to all bills regularly rendered on or after November 1, 1942. On December 7, 1942, on application of said petitioners this court duly made and entered an order staying the aforementioned order of Federal Power Commission upon the condition among others that said petitioners deposit in the custody of the court amounts equal to the ordered reduction of rates pending a review of the order of the Federal Power Commission. A copy of said order is annexed hereto and marked "Exhibit I" of this petition.

2. On June 6, 1944, this court affirmed said order of Federal Power Commission. Thereafter the original petitioners sought and obtained a review of this court's judgment by certiorari in the United States Supreme Court. On April 2, 1945, the Supreme Court affirmed the judgment of this court, and the mandate of the Supreme Court has been duly filed in this court. The original litigation has thus been finally determined.

3. On November 2, 1945, Federal Power Commission duly approved a new schedule of rates filed by Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co. pursuant to the original rate reduction order. Between November 8 and 10, 1945, said order was duly served upon all parties to the proceeding before Federal Power Commission. No petition for a rehearing has been filed with Federal Power Commission, and the time to do so expired on December 10, 1945. The order approving the new rates is now final and not subject to review.

4. Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co. has filed statements with Federal Power Commission indicating (subject to verification) that its excess charges for gas during the effective period of the court's stay order and down to the effective date to the new rates amounts to approximately $24,857,363.42. The payments made into court pursuant to the stay order amount to $24,307,476.49 (subject to verification by the clerk) leaving a difference of $549,886.93 to be deposited by the original petitioners in order fully to comply with the terms of the stay order with respect to deposits on account of gas charges.

5. The fund now in the custody of the court together with such additional amounts as the court may require to be deposited by the original petitioners was intended either to be returned to the original petitioners in the event that they were successful in the litigation, or to be distributed for the benefit of the ultimate consumers of the original petitioners' distributors in the event the petitioners were unsuccessful.

6. A list of the original petitioners' distributors and a tabulation of the approximate excessive rates allocable to their purchases as recently reported to Federal Power Commission by Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co. is annexed hereto and marked "Exhibit II." The interest of such distributors, if any be claimed, is nominal only in that any distribution made to them would be impressed with a trust for the payment of appropriate refunds to their customers, the ultimate consumers whose rates would have been correspondingly reduced but for the stay order granted by this court.

7. The United States of America has a substantial interest in the impounded fund and any additional deposits both as a direct consumer of natural gas sold by the original petitioners, and also as an indirect consumer through its war contracts. During the period involved and throughout the area concerned, various Federal agencies have purchased and used petitioners' gas for cooking, heating and other uses for institutions and installations. War contractors have likewise used such gas for contract purposes, and have obtained payment of charges therefor from the United States. Many of the contracts contain provisions that refunds, rebates and returns on original

cost shall be pursued and accounted for to the United States in reduction of its original cost. In cases of contracts containing no such provision, the United States is nevertheless equitably entitled to the benefit of any refund allocable to the performance of its contract.

8. The complete details of the interest of the United States in the fund cannot be accurately and completely stated at this time because of complexity of war activities during the period involved but investigations are now being made so that the full extent of such interest may be brought to the attention of this Court in appropriate form at the earliest opportunity.

9. The afore-mentioned distributing companies have not yet been called upon to indicate formally whether they claim or disclaim any interest in the impounded fund in this case. Upon information and belief, some of the distributing companies are willing to make formal disclaimers of any interest in the fund provided that they obtain the execution of formal tax closing agreements clearing them of all income and excess-profits-tax liability in connection with the impounded fund.

10. On November 28, 1945 a formal request was made by the Attorney General to the Treasury Department for a ruling which would apply to the present case and all similar cases on the question whether a distributing company which makes a formal disclaimer permitting this Court to make a direct distribution of the fund to ultimate consumers would be subect to any tax liability. A ruling that a distributing company would not be subject to tax in such case was made on December 6, 1945. A copy of the Attorney General's request to the Treasury Department to which is attached as an enclosure a copy of the findings and decree of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit in a similar case, and the reply of the Treasury Department are annexed hereto and marked "Exhibits III and IV," respectively.

11. In order to protect the rights and financial interest of the ultimate consumers in this case, including the United States, and to give the distributing companies a timely opportunity to have the benefit of the aforesaid tax ruling during the calendar year 1945 the distributing companies should be required to assert their claim, if any, in the impounded funds forthwith or immediately to note their disclaimer in the records of this court.

12. No previous application has been made for the relief requested herein or any similar relief. Application for order to show cause is made because of the shortness of time remaining before the end of the present calendar year and the impossibility of obtaining a hearing on this application by regular notice of motion.

Wherefore petitioner prays:

1. That an order be issued directing the distributing companies to show cause in open court why the impounded funds in this cause and any additional amounts deposited with the court should not be distributed to the ultimate consumers of said distributing companies, and directing that said companies file on or before the hearing on the order to show cause verified statements setting forth either their claims to a distributed share of the impounded fund and any additional deposit, or their disclaimer of any interest in the fund.

2. That the original petitioners be directed to make final and complete compliance with the provisions of the stay order entered on December 7, 1942, including the deposit of the entire expense of impounding, protecting, investing, and distributing the entire fund and any interest which may be charged by the court.

3. That the Court adjudge the rights of the original petitioners, the intervenors, the distributors and the ultimate consumers in the impounded fund and any additional deposits.

4. That a method of distribution be determined and directed.

5. That provision be made for the protection and determination of the interest of the United States of America in the fund as a direct and indirect consumer of gas sold by the original petitioners and their distributors.

6. That the Court grant such other and different relief in the premises as may be just and proper.

JOHN F. SONNETT,
Assistant Attorney General.
VICTOR E. ANDERSON,
United States Attorney for the District of Minnesota,
Attorneys for the Petitioner.

Of counsel:

J. FRANCIS HAYDEN,
Special Assistant to the Attorney General.

District of Columbia,
City of Washington, ss:

John F. Sonnett, being duly sworn deposes and says that he is Assistant Attorney General of the United States of America in charge of the Claims Division, Department of Justice; that he has read the foregoing petition and knows the contents thereof; that the same is true of his own knowledge except as to the matters therein stated on information and belief, and as to those matters he believes it to be true; that the source of his information and the grounds of his belief are communications received by the Claims Division, Department of Justice from various Government agencies and investigations being made under his direction.

JOHN F. SONNETT.

Sworn before me this 11th day of December 1945.

[SEAL] GLADYS E. MCGAFFEY,
Notary Public.

EXHIBIT I

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, EIGHTH CIRCUIT — NO. 12,466 — NOVEMBER TERM, 1942—PANHANDLE EASTERN PIPE LINE COMPANY, A CORPORATION, ET AL., PETITIONERS, V. FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION ET AL., RESPONDENTS—STAY ORDER

This matter comes before the court upon the petition of petitioners for an order of stay of the order of the Federal Power Commission, dated September 23, 1942, requiring reduction in rates and charges for gas furnished by petitioners; the pleadings filed thereto; the reply of the petitioners; various memoranda presented by the parties; and oral presentation by Mr. Glenn W. Clark and Mr. D. H. Culton for petitioners, Mr. Harry S. Littman for the Commission, Mr. Harold Goodman for Wayne County, Mr. James H. Lee for the city of Detroit, and Mr. Park Chamberlain for Michigan Consolidated Gas Company.

Until further order of this court, the above order of the Federal Power Commission is stayed upon the conditions following.

1. The monthly difference between payments to petitioners under existing rates or arrangements and those required under the order of the Commission shall be promptly paid over to John C. Hughes, of Kansas City, Mo., as the custodian of this court, not later than the twenty-fifth of the succeeding month, to be held by him for the benefit of the ultimate consumers or of petitioners as in this litigation may be determined entitled thereto. Such payments for months prior to this order shall be made by December 15, 1942. Triplicate receipts for each of such payments shall be given petitioners by the custodian, one of which shall be promptly filed, by petitioners, with the clerk of this court and one with the Federal Power Commission.

2. The entire expenses of impounding (including, among other things, protecting, investing and distributing to petitioners or to ultimate consumers) of these funds shall be borne by petitioners. Whether any earnings on such funds (while so impounded) may be applied upon such expenses is reserved for future determination. When and as required by orders of this court, petitioners shall pay to the custodian such expense money, upon triplicate receipts, which shall be filed as above.

3. No interest shall be charged petitioners upon such impounded funds unless allowed upon application hereafter made by respondents or any of them. Such future applications may be made only (a) if and when petitioners fail to be ready to present this review upon the merits on May 14, 1943 (as set for hearing by a separate order entered as of this date), or (b) if and when this court shall enter its decree or order sustaining the above order of the commission and shall deny any petition for rehearing which may be filed thereto. Any interest allowed hereafter shall be at the rate of four percentum annually from the date of such allowance or thereafter as required by any orders of allowance.

4. Full power and jurisdiction is reserved to cancel or modify this order and to enter any other orders (with or without application of the parties) to protect or to promote the rights and interests of the parties to this litigation and of the ultimate consumers financially interested in the impounded funds.

It is further ordered that the clerk of this court is directed to transmit a copy of this order to each of the parties to this proceeding or to their above counsel.

Approved for the court: December 7, 1942.

JOHN B. SANBORN,
Presiding Judge.

EXHIBIT II

DOCKET G-200 AND G-207— PANHANDLE EASTERN PIPE LINE CO.

Summary of company's calculated reduction resulting from application of reduced rates filed Oct. 22, 1945, and accepted by order dated Nov. 2, 1945

Purchasing company	Total per original billing	Bills based on new rates	Reduction
Albion Gas Light Co	$27,626.61	$17,720.67	$9,905.94
American Gas Co	12,640.76	7,053.24	5,587.52
Battle Creek Gas Co	365,574.44	232,050.98	133,523.46
Bowling Green Gas Co	60,223.49	36,694.48	23,529.01
Central Distributing Co.:			
Kansas	46,013.31	28,987.40	17,025.91
Missouri	135,173.41	87,001.85	48,171.56
Central Illinois Electric & Gas Co	250,004.45	176,809.24	73,195.21
Central Illinois Light Co	4,426,805.22	2,988,506.49	1,438,298.73
Central Illinois Public Service Co	940,284.98	585,653.44	354,631.54
Central Indiana Gas Co	7,297,033.23	5,462,411.31	1,834,621.92
Central States Natural Gas Co., Inc	22,107.24	14,178.21	7,929.03
Central West Utility Co	220,972.08	138,615.54	82,356.54
Cities Service Gas Co	27,242.80	21,778.98	5,463.82
Citizens Gas Co. of Hannibal	285,739.40	180,887.54	104,851.86
Citizens Gas Co	119,361.67	74,871.96	44,489.71

Summary of company's calculated reduction filed Oct. 22, 1945, and accepted by resulting from application of reduced rates order dated Nov. 2, 1945—Continued

Purchasing company	Total per original billing	Bills based on new rates	Reduction
Citizens Gas Fuel Co	$383,468.95	$236,906.05	$146,562.90
Consumers Power Co	3,163,432.81	2,269,531.07	893,901.74
The East Ohio Gas Co	9,047,422.66	6,245,400.88	2,802,021.78
City of Fulton	69,006.18	41,654.51	27,351.67
The Gas Service Co	188,919.70	170,786.01	18,133.69
Greenfield Gas Co., Inc	56,202.01	35,915.57	20,286.44
Illinois Power Co	2,362,423.99	1,468,171.47	894,252.52
Indiana Gas Distributing Corp	131,169.46	84,002.27	47,167.19
Indiana Gas & Water Co., Inc	31,630.99	19,341.20	12,289.79
Indiana-Ohio Public Service Co	153,045.45	97,078.96	55,966.49
Interstate Gas Co.:			
Kansas	110,631.06	69,550.19	41,080.87
Missouri	403,377.80	256,766.59	146,611.21
Kentucky Natural Gas Corp	2,835,023.36	2,447,422.05	387,601.31
Kokomo Gas & Fuel Co	602,784.38	397,231.11	205,553.27
Town of Lapel	9,180.11	5,785.16	3,394.95
Lee's Summit Gas Co	6,289.51	4,048.37	2,241.14
Louisburg Gas Co	14,244.25	11,949.17	2,295.08
Lynn Natural Gas Co	13,164.07	8,371.00	4,793.07
Michigan Consolidated Gas Co.:			
Ann Arbor	447,293.06	281,945.74	165,347.32
Detroit	30,576,593.55	19,622,084.03	10,954,509.52
Missouri Edison Co	100,601.49	62,603.93	37,997.56
Missouri Power & Light Co	1,809,909.73	1,214,066.47	595,843.26
Missouri Utilities Co	369,490.52	226,831.12	142,659.40
Missouri Western Gas Co	43,780.85	23,348.91	20,431.94
Town of Montezuma	3,588.50	2,257.30	1,331.20
Morton Municipal Gas Co	47,659.52	28,841.89	18,817.63
National Utilities Co. of Michigan	332,823.78	208,235.41	124,588.37
Northern Indiana Public Service Co	2,411,748.05	1,525,534.12	886,213.93
Ohio Fuel Gas Co.:			
Rural	1,685.00	1,081.32	603.68
Main line	2,857,471.55	5,226,515.80	628,955.75
Ohio Gas Light & Coke Co	238,714.00	152,555.99	86,158.01
Pendleton Natural Gas Co	31,567.82	20,371.98	11,195.84
Town of Pittsboro	4,694.34	3,009.40	1,684.94
City of Pittsfield	40,828.09	24,916.04	15,912.05
Prairie Pipe Line Co	725.75	585.90	139.85
Public Service Co. of Indiana	2,945,437.92	1,845,215.41	1,100,222.51
Richmond Gas Corp	345,733.21	217,290.53	128,442.68
Town of Roachdale	3,094.64	1,983.71	1,110.93
City of Roadhouse	21,629.40	13,186.80	8,442.60
Southwestern Public Service Co	13,074.80	7,552.85	5,521.95
Toledo Edison Co	53,349.45	33,363.81	19,985.64
Western Ohio Public Service Co	12,550.76	8,031.65	4,519.11
City of White Hall	17,759.18	11,118.30	6,640.88
Total	79,550,024.79	54,687,661.37	24,862,363.42

EXHIBIT III

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., November 28, 1945.

JOSEPH D. NUNAN, Jr., Esq.,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Washington, D. C.

Attention: Frank T. Eddingfield, Esq.

SIR: This office is taking steps to protect the rights of the United States as a direct and indirect consumer of natural gas to obtain refunds on account of payments from 1942 to 1945 at rates finally held to have been excessive in decisions handed down by the United States Supreme Court on April 2, 1945, in the Colorado Interstate Gas Co. case and in the Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Co. case.

In a recent proceeding before the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, the court took up the matter of the distribution of an impounded fund representing excess charges of $8,524,143.08 in the Colorado Interstate Gas Co. case, and after a hearing the court made findings and an order, a true copy of which is enclosed.

As appears from the enclosure, some of the distributing utility companies disclamed any interest in the fund, and the court thereupon assumed jurisdiction to direct distribution to certain classes of ultimate consumers of such companies on the basis of the ratio that their dollar payments bear to the aggregate of the total payments of all eligible customers of their respective utility company during the refunding period. You will note, however, that no distribution is to be made unless and until closing agreements are executed with Federal and State tax authorities clearing the companies of tax claims in connection with the fund.

We are informed that no closing agreements have yet been executed with the Colorado companies although negotiations therefor are pending.

A similar situation is expected to arise with regard to a much larger fund impounded in the Panhandle case where no hearing has yet been called by the court. Various parties are desirous of moving that case for a hearing and early action but it is anticipated that the same tax question will arise and have a bearing on both the position taken by the utility companies and the action of the court.

It is requested that you advise this office of your opinion on the following question:

If the distributing companies in the Panhandle case, or any similar case, take an identical position as that of the disclaiming companies in the Colorado case, as set forth in paragraphs 9 and 10 of the enclosure, and the court makes findings similar to those contained in paragraphs 1 to 12, inclusive, and an order similar to the one enclosed (pars. 1 to 4, 6, 7, and 9 to 11), and such order becomes final and is performed, will any part of the fund be taxable to the distributing companies under the Federal tax laws?

If your answer is in the negative, it is contemplated that it may be used in seeking early disclaimers from the distributing companies, and in asking the courts to take early action in proceeding with a distribution to ultimate consumers, including the Government. It is understood that your opinion will have no bearing on the case of any company which refuses to make a disclaimer. It is further understood that any company proceeding to make a disclaimer will have to apply to your office for an individual closing agreement clearing it of all tax claims in connection with a refund ordered by the court on the basis of such disclaimer.

Respectfully,

JOHN F. SONNETT,
Assistant Attorney General.

ENCLOSURE OF EXHIBIT III

IN THE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, SITTING AT WICHITA, KANS.—FIFTH DAY, NOVEMBER TERM, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 1945

Present: Hon. Sam G. Bratton, circuit judge; Hon. Walter A. Huxman, circuit judge; Hon. Alfred P. Murrah, circuit judge; and other officers as noted on the 5th day of November 1945.

Before Hon. Sam G. Bratton, Hon. Walter A. Huxman, and Hon. Alfred P. Murrah, circuit judges.

COLORADO INTERSTATE GAS COMPANY, A CORPORATION, PETITIONER, V. FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION ET AL., RESPONDENTS—ON PETITION TO REVIEW AN ORDER OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

This matter coming on for further hearing, pursuant to notice to all parties of record, and all interested parties now being before the court, and the court having examined the record and files herein, including the written statements and evidence submitted to this court, and having heard the argument of counsel, and being now sufficiently advised in the premises, the court does now hereby find:

1. Colorado Interstate Gas Co., pursuant to the Federal Power Commission's Opinion No. 73 and orders, which opinion and orders were heretofore affirmed by this court and by the Supreme Court of the United States, did file, on or about October 1, 1945, new schedules of rates and charges with the Federal Power Commission which are made effective as to all bills regularly rendered on and after May 20, 1942; and on October 3, 1945, the Federal Power Commission by its order, a certified copy of which has been filed herein, accepted said schedules for filing in compliance with the Commission's said opinion and orders and allowed said rate schedules to take effect.

2. The total amount collected from the purchasers of natural gas by the Colorado Interstate Gas Co. under bills rendered on and after May 20, 1942, and prior to the 20th day of October 1945, in excess of the lawful rates provided in the new schedules of rates and charges referred to above, is the sum of $8,524,143.08 (subject to verification or correction).

3. Pursuant to the stay order of this court, entered herein on May 16, 1942, Colorado Interstate Gas Co. has heretofore deposited with the First National Bank of Denver, Colo., the aggregate sum of $7,001,280.07, and Colorado Interstate Gas Co. has in open court offered to deposit in said fund the amount additionally due, totaling $1,512,863.01 (subject to verification or correction), in full payment and satisfaction of all of its obligations under said opinion and orders of the Federal Power Commission and said stay order of May 16, 1942, of this court relating thereto.

4. Colorado Interstate Gas Co. should now be required to deposit with said First National Bank of Denver the further sum of money equal to the difference between the amount heretofore deposited by it with said bank, as stated in paragraph 3 of these findings, and the total excess collections made by said Colorado Interstate Gas Co., as stated in paragraph 2 of these findings, which said additional sum of $1,512,863.01, when so deposited, shall be held by said bank along with the sums heretofore deposited therein by said Colorado Interstate Gas Co., subject to the further orders of this court.

5. The court should take control of said sum heretofore deposited and the sum hereafter to be deposited, for the purpose of distribution thereof to the persons lawfully entitled thereto.

6. The deposits of the sums heretofore made together with the deposit of the said additional sum with said First National Bank of Denver will constitute full payment of all

sums due from Colorado Interstate Gas Co. and full compliance with all of its obligations under said orders of the Federal Power Commission and orders of this court in relation thereto, in respect of all natural gas billed prior to October 20, 1945, and by making said additional deposit Colorado Interstate Gas Co. will have fully satisfied and discharged all obligations on account of said excess charges for natural gas billed prior to October 20, 1945.

7. It further appears to the court, and the court therefore finds that with respect to natural gas sold during the refunding period herein involved at the Pueblo, Colorado Springs, Denver, and Arapahoe gates, the court now should enter orders defining the refund rights and general methods and procedures of distribution of the impounded funds as they relate to such sales at the gates specified above only.

8. That the moneys impounded in connection with said gate sales belong to the eligible consumers (as hereinafter defined) of Public Service Co. of Colorado, and its said subsidiaries, the Pueblo Gas & Fuel Co., and Cheyenne Light, Fuel & Power Co., as well as the city of Colorado Springs, and should be so distributed, subject to any charges thereon imposed by the court; that neither the said Public Service Co. of Colorado, nor its said subsidiaries, nor said city of Colorado Springs except as a consumer, is entitled to such refunds or any part thereof.

9. No part of said impounded fund has been paid or delivered to said Public Service Co. of Colorado or its said subsidiaries, and said fund and no part thereof has been in the possession of said Public Service Co. of Colorado or its said subsidiaries.

10. Said Public Service Co. of Colorado and its said subsidiaries do not claim and never have claimed any part of said fund. It has been and now is the position of said companies that said fund belongs, subject to any charges thereon imposed by the court, to and is the property of their eligible gas consumers, who during the period covered by the accumulation of the fund, have paid their bills upon the schedules of rates then in effect.

11. The basis upon which the said impounded funds should be paid to the eligible consumers served through said Pueblo, Colorado Springs, Denver, and Arapahoe gates is as follows: All regular domestic and commercial customers (excluding special and industrial customers) of each of the foregoing utilities, who received gas service during all or any portion of the billing period of Colorado Interstate Gas Co. from May 20, 1942, to September 25, 1945, inclusive, hereinafter referred to as the "refund period," shall be eligible for refunds. Every such customer is hereinafter designated as the "eligible customer." A refund shall be payable to every "eligible customer" on the basis of the total amount paid by such customer for the "refund period." The foregoing total amount of payments is the customer's "refund base." The aggregate of the refund bases of all eligible customers of each of the utilities above referred to shall be divided into the net aggregate amount available to said eligible customers of such utility; and the refund payable to each such customer thereupon shall be ascertained by multiplying the "refund base" of each customer by the quotient so above obtained.

12. The master hereafter to be appointed by order of this court to make distribution of said impounded fund shall be permitted and authorized to receive for distribution State of Colorado and State of Wyoming sales taxes on such excess collections aforesaid.

13. It further appears that no finding or order should be made at this time as to who is or who shall be entitled to receive, or the disposition that is to be made of that part of said impounded fund derived from or accumulated by virtue of sales by Colorado Interstate Gas Co. of natural gas at the gates of sale to Natural Gas Pipeline Co. of America and Citizens Utilities Co.

It is now, therefore, hereby ordered, adjudged, and decreed:

1. That within 5 days from the date hereof the petitioner, Colorado Interstate Gas Co., shall deposit with the First National Bank of Denver, Colo., the additional sum of $1,512,863.01, and file with the clerk of this court the receipt of said bank showing such additional deposit.

2. That the court always has had, and hereby continues to retain, control of all sums heretofore deposited, all interest or other earnings thereon, and all securities purchased from said deposits and hereby continues in control thereof, together with the additional sum of $1,512,863.01 now ordered to be deposited, for the purpose of distribution thereof to the persons lawfully entitled thereto, pursuant to the further orders of this court.

3. That the deposits of the sums heretofore and herein ordered to be made do constitute full payment of all sums due from Colorado Interstate Gas Co. and full compliance with all of its obligations under said orders of the Federal Power Commission and the orders of this Court relating thereto in respect of all natural gas billed prior to October 20, 1945, subject to verification or correction, and do constitute full satisfaction and discharge of all liabilities and obligations arising out of the collection of said excess charges for natural gas billed prior to October 20, 1945.

4. That that part of the impounded fund to be allocated to the customers of Public Service Co. of Colorado and its said subsidiaries as well as the city of Colorado Springs, belongs to and is the property of the eligible customers of Public Service Co. of Colorado, the Pueblo Gas & Fuel Co. and the Cheyenne Light, Fuel & Power Co. and of the city of Colorado Springs, subject to any charges thereon imposed by the Court.

5. It is further ordered that there shall be no distribution of said impounded fund or any part thereof to the eligible consumers of the Public Service Co. of Colorado and its said subsidiaries, unless and until appropriate closing agreements shall have been made and entered into by and between said companies and the Treasury Department of the United States and the department of revenue of the State of Colorado.

6. The said master shall be permitted and he is hereby authorized to receive for distribution as a part of said impounded fund, State of Colorado and State of Wyoming sales taxes on such excess collections aforesaid.

7. The refunds to be made to eligible customers upon excess charges paid and collected as aforesaid at the Pueblo, Colorado Springs, Denver, and Arapahoe gates, shall be made under the direction of a master, hereafter to be appointed by this Court, upon the basis and in conformity with the method and formula of distribution set forth in finding No. 11 of this order.

8. It is further ordered that no determination is herein made of who is or who shall be entitled to receive, or of the disposition that is to be made of that part of said impounded fund derived from or accumulated by virtue of sales by Colorado Interstate Gas Co. of natural gas at the gates of sale to Natural Gas Pipeline Co. of America and Citizens Utilities Co.

9. This order is made without prejudice to the rights of the United States as a direct or indirect consumer of natural gas.

10. This order shall not be construed to cover or relate to any matter or thing not expressly disposed of herein.

11. The questions of liability for costs of distribution of the impounded funds and the liabilities, if any, for interest thereon, are reserved for future determination of the court.

12. The court reserves and retains jurisdiction of this cause, the parties hereto, and the impounded funds for the purpose of such other and further orders and decrees herein as may be necessary, suitable, or appropriate in the premises.

Made and entered in open court this 9th day of November 1945.

A true copy as of record.

Teste:

[SEAL] ROBERT B. CARTWRIGHT.
Clerk.

EXHIBIT IV

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 6, 1945.

Hon. JOHN F. SONNETT,
Assistant Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SONNETT: Reference is made to your letter dated November 28, 1945, with enclosure, requesting an opinion as to the tax consequences arising out of the disposition of impounded funds in certain cases where the wholesale rates for natural gas charged distributing companies have been ordered reduced by the Federal Power Commission, or other regulatory bodies having jurisdiction, and the reductions ordered are subsequently upheld by the courts; and which impounded funds, based upon disclaimers filed by the distributing companies, are found by the court to belong to the ultimate consumers of natural gas and are ordered paid under the court's direction direct to such ultimate consumers, the customers of the distributing gas companies.

You cite two recent cases, the *Colorado Interstate Gas Co.* v. *Federal Power Commission* (65 S. Ct. 829) and the *Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co.* v. *Federal Power Commission* (65 S. Ct. 821), both decided by the Supreme Court on April 2, 1945, upholding reductions in wholesale gas rates charged distributing companies, which rate reductions had been ordered by the Federal Power Commission in 1942. You call attention to the fact that in the Colorado Interstate Gas Co. case an impounded fund of $8,524,143.08, representing the disputed rate reduction accumulated during the litigation period, was, upon petition being filed by the distributing companies with the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit disclaiming any right to the impounded fund, found by the court to belong to the customers of the distributing companies and was ordered by the court to be paid, under the direction of the court, direct to the eligible customers of the distributing companies. (A copy of the court's order entered November 9, 1945, is enclosed with your letter.)

You state that a similar situation is expected to arise with regard to the distribution of a much larger fund impounded in the Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line case, and with the view to protecting the interest of the Government in that case as a direct and indirect consumer of natural gas, you request an opinion on the following question:

"If the distributing companies in the Panhandle case, or any similar case, take an identical position as that of the disclaiming companies in the Colorado case as set forth in paragraphs 9 and 10 of the enclosure and the Court makes findings similar to those contained in paragraphs 1 to 12, inclusive, and an order similar to the one enclosed (pars. 1 to 4, 6, 7, and 9 to 11), and such order becomes final and is performed, will any part of the fund be taxable to the distributing companies under the Federal tax laws?"

While rulings in specific cases are made by the Bureau only at the request of the taxpayer, or its authorized representative, it

may be stated for your information that in cases of this kind where the distributing company disclaims any right in the impounded fund representing the reduction in rates and the court, or State regulatory body, having jurisdiction in the matter finds that such impounded fund belongs to the customers of the distributing company, the ultimate consumers of the natural gas, and orders the fund paid to them, and such order becomes final and is performed, the Bureau has taken the position that the impounded fund does not constitute taxable income to the distributing company and that no Federal income and excess-profits tax liability wil be incurred by the distributing company with respect to the distribution of the impounded fund to its customers. Further, the full amounts paid for natural gas by the distributing company, including the excessive charges impounded and paid to its customers, will constitute allowable deductions in computing the distributing company's taxable net income during the period involved, provided such excessive charges have been included in gross income of the distributing company.

Very truly yours,

WM. T. SHERWOOD,
Acting Commissioner.

Primitive Mining in Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, Chinese geologists played an important part in the early mining of Idaho with their crude "hard-rock" mining in the extraction of gold and silver from the ores of mines near the headwaters of the west fork of Jack Creek about 20 miles east of Silver City, then a flourishing mining town in Owyhee County in the late sixties and early seventies, but now one of the many old ghost towns of the Gem State. This was one of the recent statements of Gov. Arnold Williams in reviewing some of the early history of Idaho. He based his observation upon the report that recently came to his attention concerning the discovery of the old rustic retorts found a few years ago in the Owyhee mountains.

Four of the old retorts, or furnaces, were constructed by the miners, from the celestial kingdom, who came to the United States and helped in the early mining and railroad building. These furnaces were about 5 feet high and 6 feet wide. An opening at the top held about 1,500 pounds of rock from nearby quartz-bearing ledges. This ore was piled on top of the fire and hot ashes made from the roots and limbs of the mountain mahogany. Then the ashes of the silver sulfide and oxidized gold ores were panned for values. The heat of the ashes was fanned with a huge bellows made with deer hides. With this forced draft the crushed rock yielded the ores for melting. The gold and silver was sent to San Francisco.

It was from Silver City that Idaho's first telegraph line to the San Francisco stock market was constructed in the year 1865. Much of the wealth from the mines in Owyhee County was shipped by stages to the west coast. The road to Winnemucca joined the original overland trail to the coast and was one of the outlets from southwestern Idaho to the coast and was the foundation of the present transcontinental highways.

Hospitalization Facilities for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, when General Hines was Administrator of Veterans' Affairs I conferred with him on several occasions regarding the lack of hospitalization facilities for the thousands of veterans in the thickly populated industrial Calumet region, and other areas of northern Indiana.

General Hines, before his departure, recommended a veterans' hospital for this section of our State.

I have taken this matter up with General Bradley several times since he has assumed his responsible office as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. This morning I received a letter from General Bradley stating that the Hines Hospital, adjacent to Chicago, should be able to take care of the thickly populated Gary area in addition to the thickly populated Chicago and northern Illinois area which it now serves.

In the last 2 years I have received hundreds of complaints from my district stating that disabled veterans had been turned down at Hines Hospital on account of the overcrowded condition.

The number of critical cases in the Calumet area have vastly increased on account of the hundreds of casualties returning from World War II, and this number will further increase as the years pass.

Hines Hospital is now, and will continue to be, overburdened serving the millions of people in Chicago and surrounding Illinois territory.

Unless a hospital is provideed in this area for northwestern Indiana, we will continue to be the victim of our close proximity to Hines Veterans' Hospital, already overcrowded and without adequate room space for the disabled war heroes from northwest Indiana.

I am herewith submitting an item from the Gary Post-Tribune of December 15, which further elaborates on this critical hospital situation:

ASK HOSPITAL AID HERE FOR ILL VETERANS

Recommendations that the Government contact with Gary hospitals for emergency care of local veterans will be made to the United States Veterans' Administration by the executive board of the Community Information and Counseling Center, it was announced today by Willard A. Pipher, chairman.

A number of cases of discharged servicemen who are suffering from service-connected disabilities were cited to the board of the counseling center last night by Daniel J. Redding, counselor-manager.

SERVICES NEEDED

Several men who served in the Pacific where they contracted malaria have suffered attacks since their return home and needed hospital treatment, Redding said. The Government hospital at Hines, Ill., was full to overflowing and unable to receive them and local hospitals could not accept them except at their own expense.

When a person goes into the armed services he is presumed to be physically fit, Redding said. Therefore, if he comes out with any disability, the Government says he is entitled to hospital treatment.

Somebody has been asleep on the need for hospital facilities, Redding declared. All over the country a similar condition exists because the Army and Navy hospitals are inadequate, he pointed out. What is true of medical care is also true of dental care, he said.

NEED DENTAL CENTER

Men have been discharged from the Army with defective teeth who were told to have them treated by their home-town dentists, Redding told the board, but local dentists already too busy with their own patients have been hesitant to undertake work for veterans at Government expense when they are not acquainted with the procedure for getting paid for it. He proposed the establishment of a center for dental care of veterans.

There have been a number of cases of veterans with nervous conditions caused by the war who have "cracked" since they came home. Difficulty has been experienced in getting them hospitalized, Redding said, and a great need exists for local arrangements to give them temporary care.

When the Veterans' Administration establishes a regional office in Gary, there will be medical men on the staff who will facilitate the entrance of men from this area into hospitals, Redding believes. Meanwhile, it is imperative to make temporary provisions, he said.

St. Louis Newspaper Demands Action in the Housing Emergency—Charges Hugh Potter Was Tool of Real Estate Lobby—Endorses Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, for weeks the leading newspapers of our country have been echoing the pleading of the people for relief from skyrocketing home prices and their demand that the Government cease its puttering and take swift and drastic action to meet the housing crisis.

On December 13 the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, one of the very best newspapers in America, devoted three-fourths of its editorial page to a statement of the housing problem in a demand for action by the Government. The clear-thinking editors of the Post-Dispatch have put an unerring finger on the propaganda efforts of the speculative real estate lobby to lull the Nation into a sense of false security regarding the danger of the housing shortage.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like

to include that fine message for the benefit of the Members:

FOR CONTROL OF HOME PRICES

In asking Congress for price controls on all residential property, President Truman moves to correct a tragic omission antedating his own Presidency. Realty price controls, as we argued in support of a proposal by Chester Bowles many months ago, should have come with rent controls. Because they didn't, prices have soared fantastically; many dwellings even stand vacant in wait of buyers, while the homeless sink to new depths of indignity and despair. And the end, unless the Government acts, is far from yet.

But for the one circumstance that Congress has still to act, there would be no useful end in reciting the record of delay on this measure up to now. That circumstance is important. The same realty-builders' lobby that delayed Administration decision will undoubtedly wheel up its heaviest artillery to kill or delay action in Congress.

The lobby was smart enough to get Hugh Potter, past president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, appointed for a time as construction co-ordinator under Reconversion Director John W. Snyder. So priorities on building materials were dropped prematurely—an error now happily corrected—and Mr. Snyder spoke coolly of finished-dwelling price controls so recently as last month. Unless the American people now outdo the lobby with a stronger chorus of superior arguments, it may win once again. A foretaste of the opposition is found in objections by St. Louis real estate men; builders and speculators reported elsewhere in this newspaper.

The lobby says soothingly that the industry will restrain prices voluntarily. That's silly. No agent can keep the owner from charging all he can get, and few agents, since their commissions increase with the price, would dream of trying. The industry is not restraining prices. What the lobby means by voluntary restraint is what Herbert U. Nelson, NAREB vice president, means when he says there has been no realty inflation.

Furthermore, so the propaganda runs, no operative builder would dare erect new houses if prices were controlled. This threat of a sit-down strike, and also the voluntary-restraint plea, has been exposed within the industry itself. For instance, Lewis & Lamberth, a large home-building firm in Dallas that can see its own long-run interest, says this:

"The claim that the building industry will police its own members to keep prices in line, and that competition among builders will keep prices down, is sheer nonsense. The argument that ceilings and controls will prevent construction can be quickly exploded by examining the title VI housing program, in which private builders constructed a record number of housing units under most rigid controls.

"With adequate materials and labor and an unprecedented demand, the houses will be built. The only question is whether they will be sold at reasonable prices with fair profit or at inflationary and profiteering prices. We plan to start 50 houses in the next few weeks and to build 300 next year, and we will welcome the placing of ceiling prices thereon. We are members of the National Home Builders' Association."

A third contention is that controls of home prices would be class legislation. That's silly, too. The exact opposite is the truth. When nearly every other important cost of living is controlled, it is gross favoritism to exempt the price of houses—and it has been going on more than 3 years. A control imposed now would diminish discrimination, not begin it.

Unfortunately, no control imposed now could entirely eliminate such disparity; no control could roll back the already-inflated price level. In fact, the formula of the Patman bill would allow one more uncontrolled-price sale of an old house. But it would prevent increases after that. The proposed cost-plus formula for new construction presents administrative difficulties. But they are not insuperable. Granting their imperfection, these rules should go into effect unless OPA is all ready with better ones.

Meanwhile, prices fly upward, causing still greater unhappiness among the homeless now and building up to a tidal wave of owners' losses when the boom busts, stagnation in a construction industry that has skimmed the cream and priced itself out of the market and, yes, another spell of doldrums for the same realty agents who so doggedly work today against their own interests in the tomorrows.

Before this tragedy runs still further, let the administration exert the greatest pressure it can for immediate legislation, and above all, let Congress bow to the realities of the situation. Against those realities, Congress feels all the force of a pressure group whose deadly efficiency is amply proved. It would seem to be a moment when Members of Congress should also be hearing in no uncertain terms from someone beside real estate agents, get-rich-quick builders and people with houses to unload on the people's ill-fortune.

Letter From Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter from a resident of my district:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *December 12, 1945.*
HON. WALTER H. JUDD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR DR. JUDD: As I'm not sure of "Uncle's" correct address, would you be kind enough to forward the enclosed letter in my behalf?

"DEAR UNCLE SAM: I am writing to ask you for the loan of $1,000,000. It's a very small matter compared with other calls on your generosity, but there are several reasons why this request deserves immediate and favorable attention.

"In the first place, I'm one of your own family—or should I say 'our' family. I have been doing my small part in business for over 25 years to help our family run more smoothly. You call on me each year for my financial contribution (and lately it's been a substantial one). In the last 5 years of peril you have even called on my three sons to help prevent our enemies from mowing us all down in cold blood. Through this period your various emergency agencies have thrown every conceivable obstacle in my way to prevent me making my best contribution to our mutual welfare. Don't you think a little loan now might be in order?

"Furthermore, Uncle, my credit is good. Your annual assessments have been met on time. I have never defaulted on any contract with you. In our daily paper I have just seen a picture of a Mr. Byrnes (he must be one of our family, probably a fifth cousin twice removed) purportedly signing away $4,400,000,000 of our family fortune in the form of a loan to one who not only isn't in the family but whose credit is questionable. Have you or he asked the family about this? I just want a million.

"Finally, Uncle, I'll use this money to start a business and create jobs. If you let me have this I'll be glad to pay you 3 or 4 or 5 percent every year—not just 2 percent after 5 years if I feel like it. And I'll let your privately owned airplanes land in my backyard even though they do reduce the fares so everybody can ride.

"So, you see, I'm one of the family, my credit is good, I'll use the money constructively right here, I'll pay (and you'll get it) better interest, and I'll even be friendly after I get it. How about a million, Uncle? What do you say?

"Hopefully,

"N. S. MITCHELL."

Is Congress Itself on a Sit-Down Strike?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I wish to call to the attention of Members the interesting findings about congressional attendance printed by that gadfly of the press, George Seldes, editor of In Fact.

I hope the figures he reveals will help us all next year to be in our seats and push forward action on the great issues which receive our attention:

On September 5 Congress reconvened at the request of President Truman to enact reconversion legislation. In the 2 months that followed the official roll calls reveal that absenteeism has ranged from 16 to 42 percent in the House and from 9 to 35 percent in the Senate.

SENATE LOW: 38 PERCENT ABSENT

The House has never convened with less than 70 Members absent, while in the Senate daily absentees have totaled at least 9.

The official roll calls—of which there have been 65 in the Senate and 47 in the House in the 2 months after Congress returned—indicate that the Senate reconvened on September 5 with more than 33 percent of its Members absent. In the House better than 38 percent were not in their seats when the first gavel fell.

The low point in House attendance was reached on September 24 when 181 or 42 percent of the 431 members were absent. The House has 4 vacancies.

The Senate's worst attendance was reached November 2 when 34 or 38 percent of the 95 Senators (there was one vacant seat at the time) were absent.

The best attendance of the House was on October 18 when 360 or 84 percent of the 431 Members were recorded. In the Senate, the highest attendance was noted on September 27 when 87 or 91 percent of the 96 Senators were present.

LARGE NUMBER SKIP IMPORTANT BILLS

A high degree of absenteeism was also recorded in votes on important legislation in both Houses. Thus, when the vote was taken after the spirited fight over the confirmation of Dean Acheson as Under Secretary of State on September 24, better than 27 percent of the Senators were recorded as not having voted.

In the House September 11 on the vote to authorize a Pearl Harbor investigation by Congress, 28 percent of the members were recorded as not having voted.

Here is the absenteeism (as shown by the official roll calls of the House and Senate) on other important votes on legislation:

Senate—to return the United States Employment Service to the States, 17 percent; full employment bill, 15 percent; confirmation of Raymond S. McKeough, former CIO-PAC official, as a member of the United States Maritime Commission, 20 percent.

House—new Army recruitment bill, 20 percent; reorganization of executive departments, 16 percent; naturalization and immigration of India natives, 32 percent; $5,000,000,000, tax reduction bill, 18 percent; Federal airport construction bill, 16 percent; size of the postwar Navy, 19 percent; "free press" rider on UNRRA appropriation, 17 percent; and $550,000,000 for United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, 17 percent.

A corporation which attempted to conduct its affairs on such a basis would quickly be forced out of business, unable to operate.

Many Congressmen cry that labor is hampering reconversion, but there is precious little that Congress itself has done on the President's reconversion program.

Iran's Rights Plain—Fait Accompli in Iran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include for the RECORD an editorial and an article from the Washington Star of December 18, 1945:

IRAN'S RIGHTS PLAN

(By Maj. George Fielding Eliot)

Small countries—such as Iran—maintain armed forces largely for the preservation of domestic order. They do not expect to be able to resist invasion by a powerful neighbor. For security against such a danger, should it occur, their reliance must be on the United Nations Organization and on the general conscience of the world. Their hope must be that the world will remember Ethiopia, Manchuria, and Czechoslovakia—and the consequences of permitting these nations to be violated.

But the world, and the neighbors of such small countries in particular, may properly expect they will maintain within their borders decent order, conditions in which there shall be in all parts of the country a responsible authority to which travelers, merchants and resident aliens can look for the protection of their legal rights.

In ordinary circumstances, such conditions can be assured by the normal agencies of Government—that is, local civil officials, courts, and police.

Where circumstances are not normal—as, for example, under the conditions of war or war's immediate aftermath—it may be necessary for a great power to maintain forces in the territory of a weaker neighbor, with which it is at peace, to prevent an enemy from gaining a dangerous advantage there. But the law of nations as well as long custom alike dictate that these conditions must be regarded as extraordinary, and must be brought to an end as soon as the justification ceases to exist.

There can be no justification whatever for a policy which, while offering disorderly conditions as a pretext for occupation or continuance of occupation, forcibly prevents a legally constituted government from using its forces to abate the disorderly conditions complained of. To say—as the Soviet Government has said of conditions in the Iranian province of Azerbaijan—that the reinforcement of the Iranian garrison in that province would only make conditions worse, is to assume a right of sovereign judgment as to Iranian affairs which is wholly outside the proper sphere of Soviet considerations.

All discussion of the political nature of the uprising in the province of Azerbaijan is beside the point. The facts are that there has been an uprising of some sort, that the legally appointed Iranian Governor has been expelled from the province, that the Iranian Government desires to restore its authority, that to this end it desires to send additional military and police forces into the province, and that it has been prevented forcibly from doing so by Soviet forces.

It is also beside the point for David Zaslavsky to ask in Pravda why the presence of Soviet troops in Iran is being "challenged" by American and Britain when American and/or British troops are in Java, Egypt, Greece, Palestine, and China, Mr. Zaslavsky should know, or should be informed, that neither the American nor the British Government have "questioned" the presence of Soviet troops in Iran. It is well understood that these troops are on Iranian territory pursuant to treaty arrangements and collateral understandings to which all three nations, and Iran, are parties.

The Soviet Government has a legal right to keep its troops in Iran until March 2, 1946, though mutual withdrawal at an earlier date has been proposed by the United States, urged by Iran, and would have been accepted by Britain if it had been possible to obtain Soviet agreement, which it was not.

There is a feeling in Washington and London that the Soviet purpose may be to leave behind its withdrawing forces in March, these Azerbaijan rebels so firmly entrenched in power that they cannot be overthrown—as they might have been had the Iranian Government been enabled to take timely action. There is the further feeling that this condition of affairs may be subject to further political exploitation by Moscow along lines which are becoming painfully familiar.

It is to be hoped that Secretary of State Byrnes and Britain's Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin may find means to convince the Soviet's Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov that this sort of shenanigan cannot serve in the long run either the legitimate interests of the Soviet Union or the cause of world peace, to which the Soviet Union is devoted and upon which its future security depends.

FAIT ACCOMPLI IN IRAN

The diplomatic crisis over Iran seems to have about reached the showdown stage. Radio Moscow's announcement that a new "national government" had been established in Iranian Azerbaijan, timed as it was to coincide with the arrivals of Secretary Byrnes and Foreign Minister Bevin in the Russian capital, is generally interpreted as a virtual shutout move by Soviet diplomacy to present American and Britain with what the French call a "fait accompli"—in plain English, an accomplished fact which is not to be undone or interfered with.

This uncompromising Russian gesture is the logical culmination of an aggressively unilateral policy by which, under cover of pretexts which were obviously specious, Moscow has fomented a separatist movement in Azerbaijan, the Iranian border province adjacent to Russian Transcaucasia, forbidding the central government of Iran to do anything to restore its authority. The character of the new "national government" of Azerbaijan is revealed by the fact that it is headed by a veteran Russian agent who fled his native Iran a quarter century ago for pro-Russian intrigues and has lived ever since in the Soviet Union. The new regime is obviously a mere front for the Russian military occupational authorities and will do whatever Moscow dictates.

All this has occurred despite strong and repeated diplomatic protests from both Washington and London. It is not a happy sign that the Foreign Ministers' Conference in Moscow opens on so inauspicious a note as a virtual Soviet defiance of its western associates and a flagrant violation of the sovereign rights of Iran, a charter member of the United Nations, to say nothing of an equally flagrant violation of pledges to respect Iran's independence and integrity made jointly by the executive heads of America, Britain, and the Soviet Union at their conference 2 years ago in Tehran, the Iranian capital.

The gravity of the situation is enhanced by its wider implications. Moscow has been putting Turkey under similar aggressive diplomatic pressure, demanding, among other things, the cession of border disticts of Asiatic Turkey just west of Azerbaijan. Iran is militarily helpless, but Turkey is not, and avows an intention to resist any Russian aggression by force. The consequences of an unprovoked Russian aggression on Turkey, likewise a charter member of the United Nations, might be catastrophic. Lastly, Azerbaijan flanks northern Iraq, with its immensely rich Mosul-Kirkuk oil fields, which lie near the Azerbaijan border.

In the light of all this, Washington and London may well consider whether it is not better to make a determined stand on this first test of basic principles rather than compromise them as part of an appeasement policy which would have no moral foundation and no limits save those imposed by naked force.

A Message to Congress From Okinawa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, during the past 3 months I have received hundreds of letters from men in the armed forces stationed in all parts of the world. I am quoting below extracts from a letter received from a friend of mine who is now "sweating it out" in Okinawa, waiting for a ship to take him home. I am not giving his name, as I do not want to subject him to court-martial proceedings. He tells the story which is typical of justified complaints made by thousands of GI's who have done their part to win the war. I insist that every available ship should be used to bring these men back to the United States.

Congress should not adjourn for the holidays until we have passed legislation to expedite the release of men from the service and to force the use of every possible ship to bring them back home. I urge the Democratic leadership, which is in control of legislation, to permit a vote of my bill, H. R. 4467, or other similar bills to discharge men from the service.

In addition to the message from my friend in Okinawa, I am also inserting as a part of my remarks an Associated Press news item which appeared in the newspapers of the country on November 28, 1945:

A SOLDIER WRITES FROM OKINAWA

To say the least is putting it mildly. The situation seems more hopeless each day. I never dreamed the United States would let us down as it has. The people could do us a lot of good if they would only wake up. But now that the war is over, they have just turned their backs to us. They don't need us anymore so to h— with us. Everyone here just don't give a damn for anything any more. The big shots realize the situation is getting pretty desperate for they have put out orders that no one except guards and MP's are to have any arms or ammunition and no one is to have a knife with a blade longer than 3 inches. They're not kidding any more.

Those men in the States who are so damn comfortable where they are and are responsible for these circumstances would soon give us consideration if they were here only a short time under our circumstances.

They keep kidding you people, telling you they are going to do this and they are going to do that. Figure it out yourself. We still have 80-point men here. Still back in the States you can get out on 50 points or 2 years' service. Twenty-six-year old men are too old for the Army now if they are not in already. However, if they are already in, that's different. Our unit is about to break up near the first of next month. The way things are going now the low-point men below 55 are to be transferred to other units for God only knows how much more service. This whole outfit has been out here 17 months. That's an awful long time out here where there is no civilization. No comforts, poor food, no recreation other than shows, which are damn poor, and it ain't much fun to sit in a rain and see one. The only thing that is plentiful is work. In my estimation every man in this unit has earned his right to freedom and happiness as a civilian. I'll never forget the time that we heard Tokyo Rose on the radio while we were on Anguar. She said that the Americans who had landed there had been counter-attacked and were wiped out. We got a laugh out of it. The people of Japan believed it. Now Uncle Sam is trying the same stunt. I wonder how long the people are going to go on believing these stories.

ANDRESEN URGES ARMY TO SPEED UP DISCHARGES

(By Richard Powers)

WASHINGTON.—Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN (Republican, of Minnesota) said today he believed the Army and Navy are "falling down on the job" of getting servicemen home quickly.

"There are untold thousands of men waiting at stations all over the world—and with the required points for discharge," ANDRESEN told a reporter.

"High Army and Navy officials tell me that they are bringing them home as fast as they can. Actually, they are not."

ANDRESEN said "they used every type of ship, including Liberty ships and other slow vessels, to send the boys to the war zones" and "it seems to me they can use the same kind of ships to bring them back home."

MORE SPEED URGED

The Minnesotan said Army and Navy officials say Liberty ships and some cargo ships are too slow, only making 9 to 10 knots an hour, and faster ships must be used for demobilization purposes.

"It seems to me that it would be better to be on the way home at 9 or 10 knots an hour than to sit on some island in an obscure part of the world—maybe months—waiting for slightly faster transportation," ANDRESEN said.

"It also appears that the Army and Navy have absolutely no regard for the cost of keeping men in the service. From that angle alone they should hurry the discharges."

ANDRESEN has a bill before the House Military Affairs Committee which would speed discharges, including a provision for discharge after 18 months' duty.

ANDRESEN produced letters from servicemen which, he said, supported his assertion that ships are not being fully utilized.

One sailor on Saipan sent ANDRESEN a list of the names of 100 ships of all types which he said were tied up there.

A soldier in the Philippines wrote the Congressman saying he had counted more than 100 ships tied up there "doing nothing."

Another in Korea wrote that more than 2,000 servicemen with more than 75 points "have been waiting a long time to go home, while men with a lot less points in other places are being shipped home."

A Plea for UNRRA Help for Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a memorandum entitled "A Plea for UNRRA Help for Hungary."

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PLEA FOR UNRRA HELP FOR HUNGARY

The members of the undersigned organizations respectfully urge that the assistance of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration be extended to the people of Hungary.

We urge this, first, as a matter of humanity.

The retreating Nazi armies destroyed a large part of Hungary; left Budapest, its once beautiful capital, a mass of ruins; and robbed the people of as much of the grain, livestock, clothing, and medical supplies as they could carry away. The results of the Nazi domination of the country are appalling. There are 200,000 orphans to be cared for; as a result of malnutrition, 400,000 children are suffering from rickets; 17,000 of the children suffering from tuberculosis are without hospitalization or convalescent care, without medical supplies, and without proper nourishment, clothes, or bedding; there is not adequate food for nursing mothers, and no food or clothing for newborn babies; surgeons are operating without anesthetics—because there are no anesthetics; thousands of persons are dying as a result of the lack of insulin, penicillin, digitalis, sulfa drugs, and other medicines; there are no surgical dressings, iodine, X-ray films, nor plaster of paris for those with broken bones; with no supplies to repair the damaged homes, there are no warm clothes for the winter, and not enough fuel.

Americans of Hungarian descent, through American Hungarian Relief, Inc., have contributed several hundred thousand dollars in cash and in clothing, but the quantities of medical supplies needed, as reported from Hungary through official channels to the President's War Relief Control Board, clearly indicate that any substantial improvement in conditions is beyond the financial ability of Hungarian-Americans. The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration is the only hope.

Secondly, we urge assistance to Hungary through UNRRA as a step toward the preservation of peace in a democratic world.

The people of Hungary greeted with joy the liberating Russian armies, and immediately set out to establish a stable and democratic government. The last of Germany's former satellites to be liberated, Hungary was the first to earn diplomatic recognition by both the United States and the Russian Governments. And the people of Hungary were the first to hold a free and democratic election, on November 4. The reaction of public opinion in the United States and in other democratic countries was expressed in an editorial of the New York Times of November 7, which, after giving due credit to the Russian Army and to the Provisional Hungarian Government for making these elections possible, continued:

"But the main credit must go to the Hungarian people themselves, who displayed both courage and love of liberty under the most trying circumstances. They not only demonstrated that their government is entitled to recognition by the United Nations but also set a fine example for all their neighbors who must still hold elections to decide their future course and government."

And as to the policy of the Small Landholders Party which obtained a clear majority at that election, the same editorial said:

"And that policy can be endorsed by all democracies. It calls for close relations with Hungary's mighty neighbor, Russia, but not to the exclusion of free economic, diplomatic and cultural relations with the western world.

"Finally, the policy pledges the punishment of war criminals and collaborators, but it also demands a chance for all true Hungarians, including Jews, to return home under guaranties of safety and liberty. If the small landholders are allowed to put these policies into practice, they will erect in Europe's most troubled area a citadel of democracy which should be an inspiration to all those who are fighting for democracy in adjacent lands."

We are convinced that nothing can shake that citadel of democracy—except cold, hunger, and disease. We, both as sons and daughters of Hungary and as loyal Americans, are anxious to see that the faith of the Hungarian people in their new and democratic way of life will not be undermined by extreme suffering. We are convinced that this is to the best interest of the one world, the happier world, which we are trying to make a reality.

This memorandum is presented by the following organizations of American citizens:

New York Council of Hungarian-Americans for Victory, chairman, Louis Toth, certified public accountant, member of the faculty of Cornell University, New York City.

American Federation of Democratic Hungarians, chairman, Dr. Oscar Jaszi, Cabinet Minister in the Government of Hungarian Republic of 1918–19, member of the faculty of Clark University, Worcester, Mass.

Hungarian American Council for Democracy, chairman, Bela Lugosi, New York City.

National Committee for Hungarian-American Trade Unionists, chairman, James Lustig, trade union official, and by the following organization of Hungarian citizens living in the United States: Committee for a New Democratic Hungary, chairman, Prof. Rustem Vambery, member of the new National Assembly of Hungary.

FHA Loans for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a news release under today's date relative to FHA loans for veterans:

Congressman JOHN LESINSKI, Democrat, of Michigan, chairman of the Michigan Democratic delegation, announced today that there had been a meeting of his State delegation at which were present Congressmen RABAUT, SADOWSKI, O'BRIEN, DINGELL, AND HOOK.

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the unfortunate situation which has arisen in Michigan, and particularly in the Detroit area, in securing FHA loans for veterans. The Federal Housing Administration has very stringent regulations with reference to approving loans where a veteran cannot establish credit antecedents.

Many of the veterans applying for these loans were not employed prior to their entry into the service and while in the service were married or have married since their discharge, and as a result cannot get FHA approval to purchase homes. The recent strikes in Michigan are also a bar to veterans securing FHA approval, because the FHA will not approve loans for the purchase of homes where the veterans are now on strike, even though the condition is temporary and one over which they have no control.

Immediately after the meeting of the delegation Congressman LESINSKI contacted Hon. Raymond M. Foley, Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration, and Director Foley informed him that he was now engaged in the processing of new regulations to be issued to all field offices which will eliminate the difficulty veterans are now having in securing approval of FHA loans for the purchase of homes.

Capital of the World?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the December 13, 1945, edition of the Larchmont (N. Y.) Times entitled "Capital of the World."

"CAPITAL OF THE WORLD"

Supervisor Francis T. Leonard, of New Rochelle, a Democrat, has suggested that Westchester interest the United Nations Organization headquarters site committee in Westchester as an ideal location for what might be called "the capital of the world."

We do not know how seriously the UNO headquarters site selection committee would consider this offer. After all, larger communities have sent representatives to London with motion picture films, with financial pledges, and with Chamber of Commerce boosts. It may be that the suggestion of Westchester has been advanced too late. We do not know and we have no means of finding out what would be the committee's attitude.

But we do know that Mr. Leonard is absolutely right when he points to the unequaled advantages of location which Westchester offers.

A large percentage of the delegates to UNO must, of travel necessity, utilize New York harbor or airports in vicinity of the metropolis, since they will come either from Europe or South America. Westchester is close enough to New York City for travel convenience and yet sufficiently distant from the noise and excitement of a large city to allow quietude and serenity for the delegates' deliberations. Our own airport, which can be reached from almost any section of the county in 20 minutes, is adequate for any air-borne passenger or commodity transportation. And our fine system of parkways would provide quick transit to the metropolis for those desiring cultural or entertainment facilities.

We question seriously the advisability of locating UNO headquarters in any large city, such as New York or San Francisco. It seems to us that better results and less envy will be reached through selection of a site where the UNO will not be overshadowed. While the failure of the League of Nations does not strengthen the attitude, it should be noted that the capital of that organization was wisely placed in Geneva, relatively a small city.

The UNO quite likely will desire privacy for its deliberations and the opportunity to work without outside interference. That could be attained much more easily in some such suburban area as Westchester than in the hurly burly of a large American city. And yet Westchester is in sufficiently close proximity to New York City to give all its advantages of travel and entertainment.

So, Mr. Leonard's idea is not at all fantastic. It is, in our opinion, well worth the consideration of county officials, who should not too carelessly assume that it is too late to obtain favorable action. Indeed, the very circumstance of lateness in making the offer might be an advantage in a highly competitive situation.

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States—Information Concerning Authorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in connection with House Joint Resolution 180, giving official recognition to the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD certain interesting information which I have received from Dennis A. Dooley, librarian of the State library at Boston, Mass. This information was collected at my request in order to determine whether the author of the pledge of allegiance to the flag was a Massachusetts resident. I find that there was a difference of opinion as to whether one Francis M. Bellamy or James Upham was the author. The material to which I refer seems to affirm the fact that James Upham was the real author.

I may also say that the first recorded raising of the flag over a school took place on Catamount Hill, Colrain, Mass., in May 1812.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE YOUTH'S COMPANION,
Boston, Mass., May 7, 1923.

LIBRARIAN,
State Library, Statehouse,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: Perhaps you will be interested to place on file a copy of the enclosed leaflet which we have prepared in response to the demand for information concerning the origin and history of the well-known pledge of allegiance to the flag.

This demand has been very urgent of late on account of the fact that we broadcast from radio-telephone station WGI, at Medford Hillside, an offer of a prize to all who were able to answer this question correctly: Who wrote the pledge of allegiance: "I pledge allegiance to my flag and to the Republic for which it stands: one Nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all," or with whom did it originate?

The activity of the Boston Traveler in urging people to learn this pledge and to repeat it at noon on Memorial Day has also served to increase popular interest in the subject at the present time.

Should you care for additional copies of the leaflet, I shall be glad to supply them to you without charge.

Very truly yours,
THE DEPARTMENT EDITOR.

THE YOUTH'S COMPANION FLAG PLEDGE

"I pledge allegiance to my flag and to the Republic for which it stands: one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

The above pledge of allegiance to the Stars and Stripes, which is variously known as the pledge of allegiance, the pledge to the flag, the salute to the flag, the national salute, and the Youth's Companion flag pledge, was written in tentative form by the late James B. Upham, of Malden, Mass., a member of the Perry Mason Co., then and now the publishers of the Youth's Companion. It was molded into its present and final form by the members of the firm and the editorial staff of the Youth's Companion. The pledge is, therefore, correctly known as the Youth's Companion flag pledge.

It was first given wide publicity through the official program of the national public school celebration of Columbus Day, which was printed in the Youth's Companion of September 8, 1892, and about the same time sent out in leaflet form to schools throughout the country by the executive committee appointed in February 1892, by a national convention of the State Superintendents of Education, held in Brooklyn, N. Y. It was first used officially during the national public school celebration of October 21, 1892, which took place simultaneously with the opening of the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago. On that occasion it was repeated by more than 12,000,000 public school pupils throughout the country. The whole movement of the national public school celebration was instituted by the Youth's Companion as a part of the broader program that, under the direction of Mr. Upham, the Companion had been pursuing since 1888, a program for advancing patriotism by improving school grounds and putting the Stars and Stripes over every schoolhouse. The executive committee that prepared the program for the celebration at which the Youth's Companion flag pledge was to be used made the Youth's Companion office its headquarters. On that committee the Youth's Companion had one representative, and he was appointed chairman.

When the flag pledge first appeared the second "to"—the one immediately preceding "the Republic"—was accidentally left out. The error, which of course was immaterial,

was soon corrected. From time to time since then versions of the pledge have appeared with the word "country" substituted for "Republic" or with the word "American" inserted before "flag," but the alterations never have gained widespread popularity or have long survived. Neither change substantially alters the form of the Youth's Companion flag pledge.

A few facts will be found of interest in clearing up some of the popular misconceptions about the flag pledge. The Stars and Stripes was first saluted by a foreign naval power on February 14, 1778, when the French Admiral La Motte-Picquet returned the salute of John Paul Jones, of the U. S. S. *Ranger*, with an admiral's salute of nine guns. Charles Sumner uttered two widely known sentiments about the flag that are sometimes mistaken for the pledge, but that on examination will be found to be entirely dissimilar. One, which begins "There is the national flag!" which ends "Upheld by all our hands," and which gives Sumner's own idea of the symbolism of the colors of the flag, is found in his address, Are We a Nation? that he delivered on November 19, 1867; the other beginning "Our national flag" and ending "had its origin!" was proposed in a letter dated July 2, 1852. Daniel Webster, Henry Ward Beecher, Abraham Lincoln, Edward Everett, and Oliver Wendell Holmes all uttered widely quoted thoughts about the flag, but none of them in any way parallels the pledge. The American's Creed, first made public on May 30, 1918, which begins "I believe in the United States of America" and ends "against all enemies," was written by Mr. William Tyler Page, of Maryland, in 1917. Its phraseology in no way resembles that of the pledge.

The name of Mr. Francis Bellamy, of Massachusetts, is sometimes associated with the pledge by reason of the fact that Mr. Bellamy, then a member of the Youth's Companion staff, represented the Youth's Companion on the executive committee that had charge of the preparations for the National Public School Celebration. Mr. Bellamy, however, was not the author of the pledge. The name of the late Frank E. Bellamy, a Kansas schoolboy, has also occasionally been connected with the pledge, for the reason that in the school year of 1895–96—4 years after the pledge first appeared—he submitted it as his own in a school contest. As the pledge was apparently not well known in his community at that time its appearance made a considerable stir, but since the facts concerning its origin have become widely known Bellamy's claim to being the author of it has been dropped. Complete and trustworthy surveys of the entire Frank E. Bellamy controversy have been prepared by both the Kansas State Historical Society and the Woman's Relief Corps and are on file at the respective headquarters of those organizations.

Various patriotic men with whom Mr. Upham talked over the pledge—especially a group identified with the New York schools—have been mentioned as the authors but there is no evidence to show that they did more than discuss and approve a rough draft, prepared by Mr. Upham and afterwards condensed and perfected by him and his associates of the Companion force.

The Woman's Relief Corps, which is the woman's auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, the American Flag Association, which was organized in 1898—6 years after the pledge first appeared—and many other patriotic organizations have done much in disseminating the pledge to every quarter of the land.

The patriotic salute "We give our heads! and our hearts! to our country! one country! one language! one flag!" which is often used in the primary grade of schools, was written by Mr. George T. Balch. It does not replace the flag pledge, and the flag pledge does not replace it. The two are not related except through the ties of a common purpose, the purpose of keeping alive the spirit of patriotism and devotion to our country.

[From the Boston Herald of November 27, 1905]

JAMES B. UPHAM

He was born December 27, 1845, in New Hampton, N. H. He was a son of the Reverend James Upham, D. D. He was educated in New Hampton Literary Institute at Fairfax, Vt., and went to Detroit in 1866, where he was employed in the book and publishing company of E. B. Smith & Co. He came to Boston in 1872 and entered the employ of Perry Mason & Co., publishers of the Youth's Companion, becoming a member of the firm in 1886. He was a deacon in the First Baptist Church, of Malden, member of the Converse Lodge of Masons, Tabernacle Chapter and Beauseant Commandery, K. T.

He was a stanch Republican, although he never held any public office.

He removed to Malden 24 years ago. He was married in 1876 to Mary A. Hartshorne, of Milford, N. H., who survives him, besides one son and one daughter. The funeral will take place on Tuesday afternoon.

Died November 25, 1905.

Suggestions of Enlisted Men for Improvement of the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief editorial from Yank, the Army weekly, giving the views of some of the Army enlisted men regarding certain matters which now are before the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YANK RECOMMENDS

AN ATTEMPT TO PUT TOGETHER SOME OF THE BASIC SUGGESTIONS ENLISTED MEN HAVE FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY

There is a sharpening of ears and a stirring of activity in the advertising business these days, and the reason is a strong rumor that the United States Army is getting ready to spend $3,000,000 a year on advertising and publicity. Naturally, the various advertising agencies are interested in securing the Army account. Fifteen percent, the usual advertising agency fee, of $3,000,000 comes to almost half a million bucks.

The purpose of the proposed advertising campaign, as we understand it, would be twofold—it would help boom recruiting for the peacetime Army we need by making service in that Army look attractive, and it would keep the general, taxpaying public informed as to the desirability of having an Army and as to what improvements were being made in training that Army.

Yank has been serving as the magazine of the enlisted man for some 3½ years now, and we feel that we know pretty much about the Army. We are even willing to give the Army—for free, without even a 15 percent commission—some advice on how to make itself more appealing to recruits, how to keep the voting public happy about it, and how to save a few millions of dollars in advertising. You see, this peacetime Army will, fortunately or unfortunately, have to be made up of a great many more enlisted men than officers. Our idea is to make it more attractive to these enlisted men—and, incidentally, a better Army all around.

The ideas we suggest are offered sincerely. They are a composite of what the enlisted man has been thinking about all along, a gathering of material which has been piling up in Yank's mail bag and of observations made by Yank enlisted-men correspondents in all theaters of the war and at home.

First, let's have more promotion from the ranks. By this we mean that every possible position requiring a commissioned officer should be filled by a man who has had some service as a GI. Let every West Pointer, either just before entering or just after leaving the Academy, put in a year as a noncommissioned soldier. Knock out political appointments of officers, and, in those cases where some officers have to be directly commissioned to do a certain job, make public their qualifications for the job and let them be passed upon by a board of officers who have had experience in the ranks before granting their commissions.

Such a system would give enlisted men an incentive to work toward eventual officership and would attract a smarter type of soldier to recruiting offices. It would also deal a blow to the "officer-caste" type of thinking which is already in danger of permeating our entire Army. Something like this "officer-caste" came into power in Germany and the German General Staff, and a 130-year cycle of wars—two of them world wars—was the result.

Yank believes that a man should not be eligible for officership because of an accident of birth or education or political connection. An officer should be given the opportunity to prove himself first in the ranks. Perhaps there should be no dividing line between commissioned and noncommissioned—just a promotion ladder going straight on up from private to general.

For our second improvement, let's have all promotions—both noncommissioned and commissioned—on a basis of competitive examination without overdue attention to seniority. Between two equally qualified candidates, personal preference of the officer in charge will necessarily be the deciding factor. But let's have a few less sergeants made sergeants simply because they're good guys, and let's put an end to the ridiculous sight of capable young junior officers prancing around their CO like so many newly rich women around a reigning dowager, trying by this favor and that attention to buck their way a grade higher. As to seniority, there is no evidence that hardening of the arteries, even in colonels, is an infallible index of brain power.

And let's do something about making officers as liable under military law for their errors and faults as GI's already are. Every enlisted man knows that an officer can, and sometimes does, get away with a hell of a lot without any more serious bother than a reprimand and a change of station. If an officer is unfit, don't just ease him into a clerical job or hold up his next promotion a month or two. Bust him, as you'd bust a corporal in the same position. If the officer's good, he can climb up again. That seems to be Army reasoning in the case of GI malfeasances; why not apply it to officers?

Let's also do something about keeping distinctions of rank in their proper place. Rank, and the respect due to it, are necessary for the organization of the Army. There must be men to give orders and other men to obey them, but there is no need to differentiate between officers and men off post or off duty. This differentiation has been made in this war, and it has had uniformly bad results. Let's get rid of it.

As a first step here, let's abolish differences in uniform (except for insignia), in messing

facilities, in equipment, in quarters. Perhaps in this last instance there might be fewer men assigned to a room as rank increased, but there should be no difference in type or quality of housing.

All ranks should have the same type of quarters for the same reason that they have the same type of food. And for the additional reason that there has been no single cause of GI hatred for officers—and we use the word "hatred" advisedly—greater than the hatred stirred by looking out of a match-box barracks or a dust-ridden tent to see your platoon commander breezing off to a soft bed in officers' quarters or a quick one before dinner at the chrome and plastic bar of a movie-type officers' club.

There should be no social difference because of rank, because there are no social differences in the human beings involved, except as individuals. You'll find many a bore, and even a boor or three, with stars on his collar, and there are some charming and amusing people with only one stripe or less on their sleeves. There is no reason why the captain can't come to the movie early enough to get a good seat and no reason why a GI can't cut in for a dance with the prettiest girl in town—she being willing, of course.

The most depressing spectacle of this war, and the most disgusting for some soldiers who had a slight pride in the fact that they were said to belong to a "democratic" Army, was the sign "Off limits to EM." The idea that the technical artificiality of rank, a label useful only to clarify the chain of command, could entitle one man to eat in a good hotel and banish another to a fly-specked zinc counter has no part in any Army that represents the United States.

We on Yank believe the Army can benefit by studying these suggestions. We believe that improvement within the Army is just 3,000,000 times as important as publicity outside the Army. We believe that ours can be as fine an Army as its potentials promise, only by hard work from within on the part of every GI and every officer, and by sharp observation from without by every civilian.

The Challenge to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Charles A. Lindbergh at the forty-second aviation anniversary dinner of the Aero Club of Washington at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., on December 17, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We meet on this 17th day of December in honor of Orville and Wilbur Wright. Most of us here tonight have followed aviation as a profession for many years, and yet it is difficult even for us to realize the advance our art has made since that first power-driven flight.

It is only 42 years since they catapulted their plane into the air at Kitty Hawk. It has often seemed to me that it must have been centuries ago. Watching bombs falling on some South Pacific jungle or standing amid the ruined walls of a European city, I have had to tell myself over and over again that all this has happened within a lifetime. There is something incongruous in picturing that fragile and harmless craft in the same frame with the terrific detonation of bombs and millions of tons of rubble.

Why picture the Wright brothers with war and ruined cities? The very question emphasizes the difference between the inheritance they gave us and the use to which it has been put. It shows the road that mankind might have taken. That plane at Kitty Hawk, like the Chinese firecracker, held the magic of great construction in peace or great destruction in war. That we have used this inheritance primarily for war is a responsibility which rests squarely on our own shoulders. When I say our own shoulders, I speak of civilized man. The greatest tribute we can pay to the Wright brothers is to consecrate our effort to the end that aircraft will be used to build civilization in the future, and not to destroy that part which still remains.

The technical aspects of aviation appear unlimited. Certainly there was never a time when it was more interesting to speculate on the future of aircraft. When I received your invitation to address this meeting, my mind first turned to such subjects as turbo jet transports and high altitude rocket flights. How soon will we be crossing oceans at greater speed than the sun? Why can't we land on a planet now that the atom has been split? What speed might an atomic rocket attain in interstellar space? But as I sat down to write this paper, such questions became dwarfed by the basic problem of how to keep aircraft from destroying the civilization which creates them.

There is little satisfaction in spending one's life developing machines which are likely to bring ruin to one's own people. Our minds are harassed by the damage that has already been done; by the realization that western man has not justified his trust; that he has misused his inheritance from the early pioneers.

The ghost of Lilienthal must glide uneasily over German cities. The devastation that the Nazis brought to Europe, carried on the wings he loved, is a warning to us all. The developments of science, improperly guided, can result in more evil than they bring good. What peaceful men take a thousand years to build, fools can now destroy in fewer seconds. Experience has shown that we cannot depend on political specialists to turn the inventions of science to the benefit of mankind. We can no longer blind ourselves to the future uses of aircraft while we concentrate on their mechanical perfection. It has become more important to control our products than to produce them.

Let us survey our present position. It is obvious that all of our ideas must be reconsidered in the revolutionary light of an atomic era. This applies especially to aviation since it provides the carrier for the latest and most deadly of all man's weapons. We know that one airplane, carrying one atomic bomb, can wipe out a city. We know that transoceanic rockets, using fuels already developed, can be built in the near future. The cost of a transoceanic rocket carrying an atomic bomb would be a small franction of the value of a city. The oceans, therefore, which proved effective barriers to bombing aircraft of World War II, will not protect this country from atomic rockets of World War III, if such a war begins.

In the past, we have developed methods of defense against attacking aircraft. The fighter and the proximity fused antiaircraft projectile have made the sky a dangerous place for bombers. The guided missile may rid it entirely of military aircraft of our present types. But against rockets carrying atomic bombs, traveling faster than a cannon's shell, we see no adequate defense. Counter attack might win an atomic war; but it could not replace our cities or bring back our dead.

Life would be intolerable here in America if we knew that an irresponsible foreign government could, without warning, send an atomic rocket hurtling toward every city in our country. If we permit the world to continue uncontrolled, an enemy could have such rockets aimed at our vital areas waiting only for the pressure of a button to send them off. Then, our institutions, our homes, our families, would be at the mercy of some fanatic's finger thousands of miles away. It would be like living with a rifle pointed always at your head. And it would be only a matter of time before the trigger would be pulled, for where man has had power at his fingertips, sooner or later he has found causes for its trial. From primeval club to atomic bomb, he never invented a weapon so terrible that he failed to use it in war.

If we are able to prevent the misuse of power based on aircraft and atomic energy in the future, that will mark a greater epoch in human relationships than their invention marked in science. Yet if we fail, the penalty is staggering. We can succeed only by organizing all nations toward this end. For we must face the fact that aircraft and the atomic bomb have brought us to a time when we will either live in an organized world or in constant insecurity.

To me, it is no longer a question of whether or not we should have world organization, but of what form it should take. Now that such an organization is in its infancy—now is the time to consider seriously its implications. Too few people stop to realize that a world organization may vary between the arbitrary power of a Roman state and government based on the complete equality of man.

I do not believe it would be wise even if it were possible for this country to dominate the world by force. Certainly such a policy would be contrary to the ideals we have held. On the other hand, it is obvious that a world state based on the complete equality of man would be controlled by the nations of largest population. In such a state, our country would have less than half the influence of either India or China. We would have less influence than Russia. There is not much indication, either in our wars or our peace conferences, that the nations which have controlled on the basis of ability are willing to turn over their leadership to the nations which would control on the basis of counting heads. That would be contrary to the record of our forefathers and to the history of human progress.

Whatever compromise is made between these extremes of Roman state and mass control, it must contain an element of power to be effective—power to prevent the preparation for an atomic war, power which cannot be blocked by the veto of any single nation. Power, because experience has shown only too clearly that we cannot depend on promises alone. In this age of split seconds and splitting atoms, a world organization must have immediate and overwhelming strength at its disposal. To disarm too quickly, to fail to maintain the quality of our weapons, to underestimate the revolutionary changes the atomic age has brought, would be fatal. A successful military movement must prevent rather than win an atomic war, for one can hardly call a victory in war successful when it is won at the price of a destroyed civilization.

I have advocated tonight a world organization backed by military power, an organization led by the western peoples who developed modern science with its aviation and its atomic bomb. But I must confess to you that I am fearful of the use of power. I plead for strong military forces only because I believe the alternative is worse. We have seen what happens to a people too weak to maintain its rights. We need only think of France in 1940, of Poland, of the Baltic countries, of the Mayan civilization here in America, the Hindu in India, the late Roman. Power is essential to survival; it is essential to freedom; it is essential even to justice.

But power alone has limited life. History is full of its misuse. There is no better example than Nazi Germany. Power without a moral force to guide it invariably ends in the destruction of the people who wield it. Power, to be ultimately successful, must be backed by morality, just as morality must be backed by power. A world organization, to have permanent influence, must wield a power that is guided not by the desire for revenge, not by the intent to exploit or enslave, but by the qualities represented in Christian ideals. To those who say that such ideals are impractical, let us point out the failure of the Hitlerian regime. The philosophy of Christ may have been too intangible for the Nazi government to understand, but the rubble of Berlin is a sufficiently tangible result of their failure.

Can we learn from that failure? I believe we can maintain the necessary power. But can we do what no people has ever done before; can we pass the test of the Christian code? That requires integrity, humility, and compassion that are lacking all over this postwar world. One finds no trace of these qualities in the complacency with which we greeted the inverted hanging of Mussolini's body. There is little indication of them in the court trials of our conquered enemies. There is an appalling lack of them in our attitude toward the famine-stricken peoples we have defeated. But without these qualities, there can be no security, as the Germans learned. Without them, we simply sow the wind with our aircraft and our bombs.

Christian ideals may in one sense seem a far cry from the subject of aviation on which you invited me to speak. But in a deeper sense, they affect every industry and every action. They cannot be left alone to church and clergy. They must live in the philosophy of a nation, in the policies of a world organization, in the use of science and its great inventions. They enter into the pressure of the red button that drops a bomb. They are as essential to the foundations of New York and Washington as they were to those of Berlin and Nuremberg.

We in America already have the most powerful air force in the world. We have the greatest Navy and the best equipped Army. We have demonstrated that we can outbuild any other nation. We have the atomic bomb. We are a Christian people. The ideals we profess are high. We have all the necessary elements to lead the world through this period of crisis. But can we combine these elements in our daily policies and lives? Whether our western civilization is facing new heights of human accomplishment or whether it is doomed to extinction depends not as much on technical progress as on the answer we make to this question.

Trucks for Canadians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, our newspapers have recited the difficulties and failures of war veterans in getting trucks.

Yet, thousands stand outside in New York and other places, while additional thousands are sold cheaply to foreigners all over the world. In the South Pacific we are selling motor equipment for junk at $10 a ton and hauling it halfway around the world for the Dutch and others.

Here is a picture in a Canadian newspaper showing a field of trucks, and the advertisement recites:

UNITED STATES ARMY TRUCKS FOR SALE—SMALL DEALER CLOSES BIG DEAL—ALL LATE MODELS IN GMC, DODGE, MACK, CHEVROLET, AND DIAMOND T

Sixty percent of these vehicles are in excellent all-around condition having been reconditioned by the Army. There is surprisingly low mileage on the majority of them. A few select units have been stored for almost 2 years.

The above trucks purchased from the United States Army. The cost of these units to the United States Army duty free amounted to approximately seventy-five thousand dollars.

Yet, the poor GI who fought and who must give taxes to pay for them finds it very difficult to get a truck at home.

Lithuania in Eclipse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID I. WALSH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Worcester Telegram on Monday, December 10, 1945, dealing with the Lithuanian situation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITHUANIA IN ECLIPSE

(By Dr. W. Elmer Ekblaw, Clark University)

There will always be a Lithuania. Though at present in eclipse, like Estonia and Latvia, Lithuania cannot be, and will not be, destroyed. The glory that has been Lithuania's throughout the centuries cannot be darkened, nor for long even dimmed. It will shine again, the sunlight of a people who have in the past played a prominent role in the progress of Europe toward culture and a higher level of art and science and philosophy. It will shine again, when justice and peace and brotherhood shall prevail among men, a jewel in the constellation of peoples who contribute toward that glorious day.

The travail in which Lithuania has endured throughout the whole written history of Europe so many vicissitudes of conquest, oppression, and tyrannical despotism, has never been so desperate, so painful as now, under the ruthless domination of Russian imperialism and territorial aggrandizement. Her leaders, whatever their virtues or their powers, have been liquidated or exiled. Her farmers have one and all been snatched from their lands and deported for labor unto death in the wastes of Siberia. Her folk have been cruelly wrested from their homes, broken in body and spirit, and reduced to vassalage worse than bondage. No apologist for Russia can justify or condone her treatment of Lithuania and the Lithuanian peoples. No darker drama of tyranny, treachery, and lust has ever been shown upon the screen of civilization than the present tragedy of Lithuania.

In that isthmian fracture-zone of states and peoples that stretches from the Baltic Sea to the Black, between the peninsula that nourished the civilization of western Europe and the Asiatic mainland that harbored throughout the centuries the barbarism and despotism of Muscovy and its Mongoloid coherents, the Baltic States, particularly Lithuania, have formed the most vulnerable bloc. Sharing with Poland and Czechoslovakia and the nations southward, the precarious position of buffer zone between two widely separated stages of human progress, between two equally widely separated economies and systems of government, between two just as widely separated philosophies of life and social institutions, Lithuania has always faced the problems of retaining her autonomy, preserving her distinctive cultural institutions, and maintaining her right to independence, and existence as a free and equal member of the family of nations.

The sympathy of the American people goes out to the Lithuanians, as it does to the Finns, the Esths, and the Letts, and the other persecuted peoples of that fracture-zone, that buffer belt, in this terrible time of trial and test. Had the Atlantic Charter but been established and its principles defended, the tragedy of those peoples and states between the Baltic and the Black might have been averted, and the freedom won for them by the Treaty of Versailles might have been preserved in this crucial and critical period of history. The only consolation the freedom-loving, freedom-seeking peoples of the world who view with such profound dread and pain the sordid subjugation of all the peoples of central Europe so freed, is that the day of reckoning will surely come.

There will always be a Lithuania; and the glory that was Lithuania will certainly shine again.

That Loan to Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "That Loan to Britain," published in the Arkansas Democrat, of Little Rock, Ark., on December 16, 1945. The editorial is one of the best on the subject which I have seen.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THAT LOAN TO BRITAIN

You'll be hearing agonized yelps about our $4,400,000,000 loan to Britain. It must be approved by Congress and all the vote-seeking foes of the administration will have a noble chance to sound off.

You know the tune they'll hit. The administration is squandering our substance. It's flinging the taxpayers' hard-earned money to a foreign nation. We'll never get it back. The unpaid loans of World War I will be reviewed with tremolo vocal effects and oratorical antics. There'll be touching references to the needs of our own people. The flag will be waved and resounding statements made about home and mother and the iniquity of plastering a mortgage on tots in the cradles.

Well, that's politics. Free government everywhere has its circusy aspects, and most healthy people like it. Life must be a dreary business in countries where government is just a dull routine of power doing as it likes, with no political plays and counter-plays, no rousing appeals to the people.

Apparently, the British House of Commons had its grandstand act in the course of approving the loan provisions. There were 2

days of debate, with the Conservative minority heckling the Laborites who are responsible for the terms of the loan. And Commons wasn't deciding on lending money—only on accepting it.

But this is one case where the borrower had much of the trading advantage on his side. The loan is vital to Britain, true enough. Yet it is also important to us that we make it.

For without this credit, Britain would have to embark on a fight for world trade by every device she could invent. Only so could she live. She would have to tighten relations with all parts of her empire and with her neighbor countries in northwest Europe, building up a trade bloc with preferential tariffs and quotas and any other means available.

We would be virtually shut out of that large market. We would have to battle that set-up, with its wealth of raw materials and its manufacturing skills, for trade in South America and every outlying corner of the world.

It would be sheer stupidity to force such a course on Britain. The cost to us in trade would eventually be far greater than the amount of the loan, even if it's never repaid.

More than that, Britain must be strong if there is to be a balanced world, with any prospect for peace. She is our natural ally, and a feeble, impoverished Britain during the years it would take her to recover unaided, would weaken our own position.

This loan isn't an act of charity. It's just good sense.

Return and Demobilization of Troops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, December 12, 1945

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a War Department release of December 17 stating the number of troops en route to the United States from overseas theaters, and also giving the latest demobilization figures.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEVEN HUNDRED AND ELEVEN THOUSAND AND SIXTY-SEVEN TROOPS EN ROUTE TO UNITED STATES FROM OVERSEAS THEATERS

On December 11, 711,067 soldiers were en route back to the United States from overseas theaters, the War Department reported today in emphasizing again that serious congestion in passenger traffic out of west-coast ports will cause delay in debarkation of troops arriving there for discharge.

With 306,577 troops en route to the United States from the Middle Pacific and Western Pacific areas, the possibility of further congestion at west-coast ports is heightened.

Latest demobilization figures, released by the War Department today, are—

Returns to civil life:	
Released during week ending Dec. 14, 1945	287,000
Total released Dec. 1 through Dec. 14, 1945	597,000
Total released VJ-day (Sept. 2, 1945) through Dec. 14, 1945	3,639,000
Total released during the period May 12, 1945, through Dec. 14, 1945	4,231,000

Since VE-day, 17,444 doctors, 4,070 dentists, and 26,223 nurses have been returned to civil life by the Army.

Peace Is No Game for Hit-Run Players

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of December 16, 1945:

PEACE IS NO GAME FOR HIT-RUN PLAYERS

It required over a year to bring back to the United States the 1,933,156 members of the armed forces we had overseas at the end of World War I. Most of those men had to be transported only about 3,000 miles. In 1919 few other Allied troops required seagoing vessels for redeployment.

At the close of this war 3,000,000 Americans were in Europe and another 2,500,000 were elsewhere overseas. Many of our armed forces are more than 6,000 miles from the continental United States. Being better fed, equipped, and cared for than any other army in the world, they require the services of many ships to supply them pending repatriation. There are large numbers of English, Canadian, Australian, and other troops also remote from their homes and requiring many ships to supply and repatriate them.

In the light of those demands and by comparison with what was done in 1919, the rate of redeployment reported elsewhere on this page is phenomenal.

When fighting ceased in August the Army thought it would have 2,500,000 men in service July 1, 1946. On September 25 it reduced the estimate to 1,950,000. Later it was reduced still more.

Nevertheless, servicemen and their relatives and friends are high-pressuring the Government to get the armed forces home faster.

MOTIVES ARE UNDERSTANDABLE

The desire to get home, now that the fighting is over, is understandable, as is the desire of kin to have their loved ones back. No foreign spot is as attractive as the United States to one privileged to live here. Many of the places in which our troops are stationed are desolate, comfortless, boring.

But even miracle worker Uncle Sam can't stretch a magic carpet round the globe on which millions of men can be transported home overnight. The existing facilities are being stretched to the utmost. It does no good to berate Congress to provide transportation which does not exist. All that can fairly be demanded is that no favoritism be shown in redeployment.

Precipitate and panicky redeployment, on the other hand, may cheat us of our dearly bought victory.

Three hundred thousand young Americans died that the rest of their countrymen could enjoy peace and security. Thousands of others suffered wounds or imprisonment. Millions of their comrades in all the Allied forces underwent terrible ordeals to crush German, Japanese, and Italian militarism and make the world safe for peace-loving peoples.

Their sacrifices have made possible, but by no means assured, the fulfillment of this lofty ideal. Axis militarism has been defeated but it could revive again—undoubtedly will revive again—if the free peoples do not organize the postwar world in such a way that aggression becomes both unattractive and impossible.

Military victory is not an end but a means. The victors must hold the vanquished under control until the war makers are thoroughly discredited in the eyes of their own countrymen, until decent Germans and Japanese have learned how to govern themselves and live amicably with the rest of us.

If the United States fails to participate in this pacification and reconstruction job it will doom the sons, possibly even the younger brothers, of the men who fought this war to fight a third world war. The idea of aggressive war has not yet been banished from many enemy minds. The Second World War has not yet been won.

Reports from dependable American observers with no political or military axes to grind show that redeployment, as now being conducted under unbridled political pressure, has gotten badly out of hand. They show that the United States is rapidly dissipating the great influence it should be exercising for continued peace with justice.

The situation calls for sober second thoughts by servicemen and their relatives. It calls for more discerning and courageous leadership by the President and Congress. The men who now threaten to punish at the polls those who fail to bring them home immediately will join with the rest of mankind in decrying the folly of 1945–46 if, a decade or two hence, they find the world back in the mess from which they fought to retrieve it for four awful years.

While bringing home the men who won the war as fast as they can be relieved without jeopardizing the peace, the Government should be creating a permanent organization—partly military, partly civilian—for carrying out our postwar overseas obligations for as long as may be necessary. Peace is no game for hit-and-run participants. It must be striven for in season and out.

Refusal of General Vaughan To Use Government Car

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to observe that many of us in the Congress have commented upon, from time to time, and have even criticized certain officials in other departments of government for having Government automobiles and Government chauffeurs furnished for their use. Such criticisms have occurred of minor officials and even of employees, and sometimes of major officials. I realize that if I were to say that one official in another branch of government had accepted the use of a Government car, to be driven by a Government chauffeur at Government expense, it would excite no comment and would not be news. But it happened to be called to my attention just recently, by an item in the column entitled "Inside Washington," written by Jim H. Brady, that the military aide to the President of the United States, Brigadier General Vaughan, has actually refused the use of a Government car or a Government driver, and is operating his own car at his own expense. Mr.

President, I think that is a matter of news, and is entitled to be published in the RECORD. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the column written by Mr. Brady be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Brig. Gen. Harry W. Vaughan, military aide to President Truman, doesn't believe in accepting special considerations from the Government. As military aide to the President the general is due a car and driver, but he didn't think it was proper to accept this special service.

The Missouri Democrat walked down the street and bought him a Hudson coupe with his own money. "Now I don't have to worry about waiting for a driver and when I go some place I spend my own money," the general said. "Probably the only trouble is in finding a place to park around the White House."

General Vaughan is a regular fellow. He does an excellent job taking the place of Gen. "Pap" Watson, beloved aide to the late President Roosevelt. The general's wife is a nice person, too. She likes to stay home and care for her children. She is a Cub Scout Mother and has a lot of fun with the troop.

General Vaughan went to the Potsdam Conference, and the Mrs. told him to be sure and bring each scout back a present. He found each boy an Iron Cross, German medal. The troop was tickled pink. So was I, because the general brought me one, too. This was also at the suggestion of Mrs. Vaughan. She's swell.

Address of Hon. Robert F. Jones, of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. JONES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Ohio Chamber of Commerce at Columbus, Ohio, on Friday, December 14, 1945:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests and members of the Ohio Chamber of Commerce, somebody handed me a tough assignment when they suggested I talk on the subject of future costs of Government. If I am a good guesser you will have a good speech! If I am a poor guesser, I am a bum. This, however, does not detract from the importance and vital consideration that must be given to the subject.

The gentleman from Missouri, Mr. CANNON, chairman of my committee, the Committee on Appropriations, said:

"In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, every administration that came into power or fell from power in the Old World either rose or was wrecked upon its fiscal policies."

That statement intrigues me. It is a statement of fundamental truth. It is elemental that no nation can indefinitely maintain itself on deficit financing. In the end, disaster overtakes any nation which fails to grasp this simple truth, and so we must look at the subject of future costs of government in the final analysis from the standpoint of the ability of the people to pay for the service they demand of government.

We shall very shortly have a $300,000,000,000 debt, most of which came from the World War II expenditure of $416,628,032,000, roughly, worth of appropriations for the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission, Executive Office of the President and other agencies. Now the war is over. We have collected some large sums of money from regular taxation, the surtax, and excess-profits tax, so that the $416,000,000,000 of war is not all national debt. With every cent that we could collect, and the highest annual tax bills in the Nation's history, the debt will be $300,000,000,000. And it is with this burden on our backs that we must pause and look at the historical tracks from whence we came over 156 years of our Nation's history. We must look over the road that leads from the beginning of our Government down to date and stretches ahead into the far distant future.

The nature of decisions we make today, to a very large degree will determine the destination and the road we take as a Nation, not only next year but for 100 years to come. The size and strength of America as a fighting force and perhaps a builder of the peaceful world, ties up the destiny of all the peoples of the world. Therefore, unless we can maintain the United States of America on a sound financial basis, there is disaster for the entire world.

The situation is critical and is all the more critical because the people of America have not reached a crisis in their thinking. They are not aware of the tremendous responsibility that accompanies the $300,000,000,000 debt upon the backs of 140,000,000 people.

Now, let us take a look back over the road. The Federal Government was a very inexpensive organization in the early days of the Republic. We all know this and it demands no proof. We never reached a billion dollar appropriation until the fiscal year 1909.

Right here may I pause and tell you how much a billion dollars is. A billion dollars would pay 1,000 men $2,000 a year for 500 years.

Now I repeat, we never reached a billion dollar Federal appropriation until the fiscal year 1909, and we stayed within the one-billion limit until we entered the First World War, and then our expenditures were the largest in the history of the Nation at that time. In the fiscal year 1918 we appropriated nearly $19,000,000,000 and in the fiscal year 1919 we appropriated $27,000,000,000. This initial expense of $46,000,000,000 was the initial cost of World War I.

I was alarmed and shocked when I looked at the record of appropriations of the Federal Government after World War I and learned that for any single year after the First World War appropriations never got down below 350 percent of the last pre-World War I normal peacetime year. The lowest Federal appropriation after World War I was in 1922 when the appropriation was roughly $90,000 less than $4,000,000,000.

In the 1920's the highest postwar appropriation was five and three-fourths times the last full peacetime normal year expenditure.

Now the 1930's mark the beginning of an era when we started on our spending psychology in the Federal Government. Some folks attribute it to a period of unrestrained and uninhibited personal expenditure of the people in the twenties. As a people we bought what we wanted. Too often we bought what we saw whether we were certain we needed it or not. We did not stop to count the cost nor to consider whether we would ever pay out. The result was a spending spree among people which the world had never seen nor enjoyed before. When the crash came in 1929, there was some encouragement from politicians and even statesmen that Uncle Sam bridge the gap and take the place of the individual of the Nation as the great spender who does not count the cost or ask whether there is ever going to be money to pay for it. We are still on a spending psychology and I think a few concrete instances will show us exactly what I mean.

I will quote from the chairman of the great Appropriations Committee who talked to the Members of the House on November 27, 1945. He said:

"Let us take a few concrete instances. For example, let us check the astounding growth of the agricultural appropriation bill. For the fiscal year 1933 the agricultural appropriation bill totaled $175,000,000, to be exact, $175,671,665. That was a large sum.

"Under the chairmanship of Congressman James W. Wadsworth, of New York, the father of our distinguished colleague, JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Jr., the agricultural appropriation bill carried a total of $3,232,995. But coming back to modern history. In 1940, the agricultural appropriation bill was $1,194,498,633. In 7 years the bill had jumped 700 percent.

"Let us check the Interior Department appropriation bill. In 1933 it was $45,533,672.33. At the beginning of the war it had reached $188,325,923. Likewise, the State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor bill for the fiscal year of 1933 was $112,291,970.89. In 1941 the combined bills representing the same departments aggregated $1,130,431,691.

* * * * *

"It might be added, however, that the civil functions bill, reported out by the Subcommittee on War Department Appropriations, but which carries only civil appropriations, increased from $106,578,489 in 1933 to $305,188,514 in 1940."

Let us summarize. In 1933 the entire appropriation for running our Federal Government in that peacetime year was $5,750,000,000. But for the fiscal year 1940, which, by the way, is the last 6 months of the calendar year 1940 and the first 6 months of 1941, the ordinary expenditures of Government amounted to $13,333,000,000. This is a 230-percent increase over 1933 fiscal year, and I quote again the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, when he says:

"Now these bill were typical of practically all Government expenditures. In those 7 or 8 run-away years we increased the supply bills, the annual appropriations, by leaps and bounds. There is no parallel in the fiscal annals of any nation. Remember these are not war expenditures. There is nothing here for war or preparation for war. All the figures cited are peacetime expenditures for the annual housekeeping expenses of the Nation."

John Q. Public in the twenties was a dollar-down-and-a-dollar-a-month victim. Uncle Sam took his habit and became a billion-dollar-down-and-a-billion-dollar-a-month good time Sammy. We approached World War II with this kind of an appropriation attitude, without any regard whatsoever for the condition of the Treasury. We are apparently approaching the peace after World War II with the same attitude we had before we felt that any mad dogs at large in the world were a threat or danger to us.

Now, with this background of attitude on the part of the people and the Congress toward the Treasury of the Federal Government, we have the proper background now to make a survey of the future costs of government. I think the best way to get at the cost of government is to take a look at the regular peacetime establishments of the Government, see how much they cost, eliminate the War and Navy Departments and other war items from them, and substitute the best peacetime estimates at this time that can be made in place of these war appropriations.

In the calendar year 1945, we have appropriated in the regular supply bills as of June 30, $66,900,297,000, roughly. Since that time we have appropriated $2,938,401,030.98, bringing the total to $69,838,598,000.

Now, I shall give you a statement of the first peacetime annual cost of government on the assumption that the departments and regular agencies of the Government will not ask for any more money for raises in salary, that there will be no new programs, and that the War and Navy Departments will ask for the peacetime sums the best estimates of which I can get to date. I will call them fixed charges.

The first fixed charge will be interest on the national debt. It is already between $5,000,000,000 and $6,000,000,000 annually. That one item alone is larger than the entire expenditure of the Federal Government for all purposes prior to 1934. This expenditure for the national debt each year will have to be paid before we can start to begin to commence to figure on running the government. This interest charge of $6,000,000,000 is a very conservative figure because, comparatively speaking, all of the bonds are sold on short-term issues and the bonds and certificates of indebtedness or what have you will have to be renewed and refunded at the end of their maturity date. Everyone knows and everyone will admit that Uncle Sam is not going to pay these bonds on the due date. At the present time Uncle Sam is borrowing money at the lowest rate of interest ever paid by any government, 2 percent annually on the Government debt, which is a very small item. But we can take a look back and see what happens on refunding World War I obligations of the Government, and it is reasonable to assume that Uncle Sam probably cannot purchase the use of money for anything near this rate of interest. I may be fooled, but it is very likely that when we refund this enormous $300,000,000,000 public debt it will bring a $12,000,000,000 fixed charge annually. It may be that annual interest on the public debt will never be this high, but if we use the same percentage of rise and interest rate on refunding bonds issued by Uncle Sam for the World War I war debt, we shall have a fixed charge at least of $10,000,000,000 annually.

The second fixed charges that everyone is agreed we shall have is for the War Department establishment. The best estimate that I can get from the War Department as to their hopes is $8,000,000,000 a year for the War Department.

If you talk to the average man on the street he will say that we ought to remain strong as a nation, we ought to have the best Army in the world. We don't want any war. President Truman says we don't want any territorial aggrandizement, but the people of America, if I can judge them correctly, want us to be prepared. There is only one conflict in the argument and that is the manner and means of raising the actual manpower. At the present time everybody connected with the administration—and the administration has the votes in Congress—is insisting that a large War Department appropriation will be requested, and $8,000,000,000 is the figure that keeps rattling around in Washington like Caesar's ghost. This figure for the Army has never been set down in writing in any formal request to Congressmen, but if I can judge the public relations maneuvering, I say the figure of $8,000,000,000 is what they hope for.

The next fixed charge which is for the Navy Department. The annual Navy cost is definitely a part of legislative history. The Congress has already authorized a number of components of ships and auxiliary craft which will require an expenditure of three and one-half bilion dollars a year.

Tied to these two items is compulsory military training expenditure of two and one-half billion dollars a year, one and one-seven tenth billion dollars of which is for the Army and the balance for the Navy.

I add another fixed charge and this is one that no Member of Congress or citizen will want to escape. It represents the greatest debt of honor America owes today. I predict that the initial start will be an extra billion dollars in the immediate future. It is three and one-half billion dollars now and I estimate in the immediate future it will run another one and one-half billion dollars. It is our obligation to the veterans. We must pay the veterans' allotments, pensions to his widow and children and orphans, the expense of his education, the hospitalization, his loans to become businessmen or farmers; we must pay for all of these things we have promised and guaranteed the men who bared their breasts for the Nation in its time of need, in the GI bill, in legislation already passed, and in other legislation which will be passed in the future. And, however much we pay, it will be only a part of what we owe them.

Testimony before the committee indicates that the peak of hospitalization of veterans of the war will not be reached until 1975.

We are today paying pensions for every war the United States has fought except the Revolutionary War. We are still paying pensions for the War of 1812, for the Mexican War, the Indian War, and the Civil War, and we will be paying pensions on this war for 100 years to come. From this time on we must set aside at the beginning, before we pay anything else, billions of dollars to redeem our obligations to the veterans. That is a fixed charge that cannot be avoided and one which no one desires to avoid. And its cost will run into the billions.

We have already appropriated $1,350,000,000 for UNRRA and we have authorized an additional $1,350,000,000 this fiscal year. That appropriation, I estimate, will be forthcoming in the spring. I have put this charge of $1,350,000,000 as a fixed charge of government. You may find some argument with it. Everyone today says that UNRRA is a temporary organization to which the United States makes 70 percent of the entire world contribution so that the peoples of the devasted countries may get on their feet, or at least get by the first harvest period. May I point out to you, that the $1,350,000,000 grant, appropriation, gift or loan is not far from the permanent subsidy, WPA, commercial endorsement, or investment which will be given to foreign countries each and every year of the Republic, if America continues its present dream world of international thinking. Corporations that start making outright gifts or cooperative contributions to South American countries, European countries, Asiatic countries, and island continents have developed techniques and contracts which, if they continue at the present rate of growth, we shall easily be making this expenditure of $1,350,000,000 each year. The UNRRA may go out of existence, but a new agency will be created to take its place. At the present time, there are 35 separate agencies making loans, money grants, and contributions to other countries and I predict that this is the minimum of the load Uncle Sam will carry.

Now, for the next fixed charge, I turn to the independent offices hearings before the Appropriations Committee last spring to get some idea of the public works that may be expected so that you will see that I am not talking through my hat when I say that expenditures for public works are estimated to be $5,000,000,000 a year.

Mr. Field, who made the representations to the committee on the witness stand for General Fleming, said:

"I am including everything. We feel that in the postwar period we will have a national income of around $150,000,000,000 if we are going to keep our economy going with relatively full employment. If we are going to have from 50,000,000 to 60,000,000 people working, we are going to have to have a total volume of new construction of at least $15,000,000,000 per year. Our estimates are not based solely on our own feeling about it. The American Society of Civil Engineers has been working on this a great deal, trying to stimulate interest in planning and construction, and it has come up with the same figures—$10,000,000,000 worth of private construction and $5,000,000,000 worth of public construction, or a total of $15,000,000,000 per year.

* * * * *

"We think the construction industry should be prepared to do an average of $15,000,000,000 of all types of construction each year in the postwar period. We think at least $10,000,000,000 of that should be private construction of homes, commercial buildings, improvements and additions to industrial plants, and that type of activity. We think there is a very good chance it can get up to that point—which leaves $5,000,000,000 for public works of all kinds."

Now I am ready to correct my statement for future costs of government for the immediate fiscal year of 1946, as a base for the peacetime fiscal year of 1946. I take the $66,900,000,000 that we appropriated as of June 30 this year, I subtract the Military and Naval Establishments' appropriations passed during the war, amounting to $45,000,000,000, and substitute in their place the Army and Navy $8,000,000,000 and $3,500,000,000, respectively, leaving a base for peacetime operations of $33,302,000,000, roughly. I add the first deficiency and UNRRA deficiency, which we have already passed, amounting to $2,938,698,000; an UNRRA appropriation of $1,350,000,000; $5,000,000,000 for public works; $1,500,000,000 extra for the veterans; conscription, $2,500,000,000; and get $46,590,598,103. This is the base of operations, apparently, for 1946 and future years.

As I told you earlier, after the First World War you know what the percentage was in the increase in cost of Federal appropriations. Human nature of bureaucracy is no different in this postwar period than it was in the 1920's, and I am advised by the members of the Independent Offices Subcommittee on Appropriations, who are holding hearings on requests for the independent establishments of the Government before the entire President's budget is submitted, that each one of these agencies is asking for substantial increases in their appropriations, increases in salaries, personnel, and functions because of the great emergency which exists at the present time.

This $56,000,000,000 peacetime figure for 1946 I contend is a conservative estimate of the future cost of government. Don't get the idea in your head now, that if the same administrative governmental point of view or the people's point of view is continued that you will get any governmental annual cost below this $56,000,000,000 base. I have cut these estimates down to the rock bottom and believe me, an internal bureaucracy of 2,500,000 civil servants in continental United States and 850,000 civil servants in foreign countries wil be spending one-half their time finding ways and means of continuing and extending their own personal importance on the governmental pay roll, and indispensable importance of the agency for whom they work.

There are now 850,500 civil employees working in foreign countries. This is practically the same number of civil servants employed on the entire Federal pay roll of the United States and its outlying possessions on June 30, 1938, to be exact, the entire 1938 civil employee pay roll was 851,926, and if you think anybody having charge of presenting estimates to the Budget to Congress has in mind removing any of them from the pay roll, you are badly mistaken. So $46,500,000,000 is the base of the thinking in the present trend of government.

There is nothing here for the health program proposed by the President. There is nothing here for the huge speed-up or expansion program for reclamation construction which will be proposed by the Reclamation Bureau of the Interior Department. There is no increase for the ambitious program of the War Department civil functions adminis-

tration for the construction of huge multiple-purpose dams for the generation of cheap electricity. There is nothing here yet for the program of $770,000,000 for the construction of an airport on every pasture land adjacent to an unincorporated village. These estimates do not contemplate $880,000,000 construction program of the Post Office Department for every city and hamlet in the land that has not already received a new post office in the 20's and 30's. It does not contemplate the huge expenditures that the Department of Agriculture might anticipate to pay farmers for raising nothing and for contouring their farms. There is nothing here for the increase in international obligations caused by the United Nations Organization and other commitments and obligations in the international field resulting from World War II. And it does not comprehend the cost of proposals of the full employment commission which the administration hopes to establish to make recommendations to the President and to Congress for keeping 60,000,000 people employed forever in the United States. There is another item that is tangible and is as sure to come as the night follows the day but as yet there are no estimates from the Budget Bureau so that I can make the slightest guess, and that is for promotions in the various agencies of the executive branch of the Government. I refer again to the independent offices hearings where it was developed that some men who started at $3,600 in 1933 are drawing $9,600 a year. The only psychology or unwritten law which limits executive department salaries is the congressional salaries of $10,000. Once congressional salaries are raised, there will be a virtual army of employees' salaries in the excutive branch to jump from the unwritten limit now of $10,000 to $12,000, $15,000, or $20,000 or whatever Congressmen might vote for themselves in salaries.

I am going to post some o- these items and some projects that have approval by the President in his September 1945 message to Congress or are legal authorizations now and indicate to you the size of the bills that have been or are about to be introduced by Congress to make these projects law:

	Per year
Federal aid for education	$500,000,000
Vocational education aid	100,000,000
Free food stamp plan	500,000,000
Rural electrification (additional)	420,000,000
Federal aid to hospitals	110,000,000
Federal health program	600,000,000
Sewage treatment program	100,000,000
Federal housing program	80,000,000
Increased Federal salaries	500,000,000
LUMP-SUM PLAN	
$880,000,000 post office construction	100,000,000
$770,000,000 airport construction program	77,000,000
$500,000,000 Commodity Credit Corporation	500,000,000
$3,000,000,000 Federal aid for highways	500,000,000
$5,000,000,000 new river valley authorities	500,000,000
Total	4,587,000,000

I will not charge that these bills will be annually appropriated, but I will make a safe bet on them or increases in established programs to win, place, or show to the extent of $3,000,000,000 annually, if the President, the Congress, and the people continue the present spending attitude.

There is now pending before Congress a bill for $4,500,000,000 for loans to Britain. If this bill passes and we loan money to Britain, it is only reasonable to assume that a loan to Russia will be forthcoming immediately. You know that when Russia sends her delegates here for a loan and we have already gone on record that because of Britain's sacrifices in this war we have made a loan of $4,400,000,000, Russia will say: "Well, what do you think of our sacrifices in the war? Look at the men we saved. Look at the American lives we saved." And Russia will go away with a $4,000,000,000 loan.

Bretton Woods commitment authorized is $5,850,000,000. That is law today. I shall only change the estimated original commitment of $3,300,000,000 for the capital fund of the bank.

Gentlemen, we are at the cross roads in America because bureaucracy is unrestrained. The Appropriations Committee and Members of Congress are not able to restrain the people or themselves from making these huge demands on the $300,000,000,000 burdened Federal Government, as the congressional record of debate on the last Deficiency Appropriation bill shows.

There was one item of particular significance in that bill which illustrates the fact that Congress is like the girl that can't say no. The Committee on Appropriations deferred consideration of $128,000,000 for the projects of the civil functions of the War Department. Twenty-five million dollars was for rivers and harbors; I shall not discuss that item. But the flood-control item was mainly for hydroelectric multiple-purpose dams for the generation of cheap power. The Appropriations Committee was soundly pummeled, sadly defeated, and the entire appropriation for the generation of electricity projects were added to the bill on the floor of the House. I think this $87,000,000 was added with reckless abandon. There is no provision in the flood-control basic law that people who get this cheap electric power at the taxpayer's expense shall ever pay back a dime of principal for the cost of installation.

There is no provision in the flood-control law that they will ever get back a cent of interest, and yet these are capital investments to benefit citizens of the United States who are unwilling to make an investment to recompense the Federal Government for even a part of the cost of the advantages they get.

I have figured out the probable tangible costs with a base of $46,500,000,000. I add the probable additions which are made tangible because the President has mentioned them in his message to Congress in September 1945. I add $14,700,000,000 to my base figure of $46,590,698,103 and come up to a probable cost of government in the near future of $61,290,698,103.

Each month, each week, and almost daily somebody comes forward with a huge program that will cost Uncle Sam another billion dollars.

If I were an aviator trying to describe the weather on future costs of Government I would say, "Ceiling unlimited—visibility zero."

WHAT SHALL WE DO ABOUT IT?

The first thing you can do is send word down the line to the local secretaries of chambers of commerce urging them not to sponsor programs that demand Federal contributions. The argument is advanced by these local chambers of commerce that if the local people will bond the local subdivision for $250,000 the Federal Government will make a contribution of $500,000; and the argument is advanced by the chambers of commerce "if our city doesn't get the $500,000 from the Federal Government, another city of the same size will get the money." Now, if chambers of commerce are going to sponsor this kind of propaganda as representatives of businessmen who are most vitally affected by deficit financing, confiscation of private property by a $300,000,000,000 plus public debt, then truly Uncle Sam is headed for the rocks financially and can never recover.

I have a 1939 Dodge automobile. I would like very much to have a 16-cylinder 1942 model Lincoln. If I buy it, I will have to mortgage my house, and I suppose, once I made the purchase, I would enjoy driving behind 16 cylinders of power and would look very prosperous in this millionaires' limousine and could create quite a good impression until the mortgage came due. Now, from my family's standpoint, my investment of $4,500 ought to be kept in my home so that they and I are never tossed in the street. By this same token, public spending debts must be paid. If I default on the loan, I would lose my home and a receiver or the sheriff would sell it; when a government goes into bankruptcy a dictator takes possession of the government. There are no present advantages, no will-o'-the-wisp prosperity, for any local community that offsets the danger of dictatorship.

I go back now to that group of men who bared their breasts for our country. We owe them the first consideration to pay the debt of honor we owe to them for giving us our security today. I hope that chambers of commerce will not be a party to raiding the Treasury for foolish expenditures at home and unsecured, unsound loans to foreign governments abroad so that the war veterans come to an empty till for the GI benefits, and may God curse us if we put him on the streets selling apples because we have helped empty the till.

I have visualized the foreign loans at $8,400,000,000. With all my heart, I urge that the United States do not make the loan. If there are citizens of the United States that want to make the investment in the socialism of Britain and communism of Russia, I suggest that Congress authorize the sale of British and Russian bonds to those that want to buy them in America.

Secondly, if the majority in Congress now determine that the loan should be made by Uncle Sam, I suggest that a separate bond issue be made. I don't propose that Uncle Sam pay 2 percent regardless to the people that buy these bonds. I propose that under the terms of the loan to Britain and Russia, when the British Government and the Russian Government are not required to pay interest, then the bonds issued for this purpose do not bear interest. Then, if Uncle Sam has made a bad deal, those that wanted him to make the bad deal and have faith in the investment may be the only ones to suffer the lesser return on their investment.

Thirdly, I suggest before Congress transfers the assets of the United States of America the President should present a genuine plan to balance the Budget of the United States within 2 years.

Democracy on the Diamond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAT ARNOLD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of December 12, 1945, being a reprint from the Saturday Review of Literature, Democracy on the Diamond, by John T. Winterich:

DEMOCRACY ON THE DIAMOND

(Jackie Robinson, a Negro ballplayer signed for a Brooklyn farm, is the first athlete of his race in modern organized baseball, writer says; tolerance in the ball park is seen as significant for America; issue is not color of his skin, but simply: "Can Robinson play ball?")

(By John T. Winterich in the Saturday Review of Literature)

A Negro named Jackie Robinson may well become one of the stouter bulwarks of a tolerant and understanding America along about next April. Robinson has just signed up with the Montreal team of the International League.

Montreal, in baseball parlance, is a Brooklyn farm—if a player makes good in Montreal, the gates of Flatbush are likely to be flung wide for him, and garlands of ailanthus leaves showered at his feet.

There is no present indication that such attention, if he ever comes to merit it, will go to Robinson's head. There is every indication that it will not. Robinson knows what he is up against, or put it a little more accurately, what is up against him.

NOT A CRUSADER

Robinson will be the first Negro player in modern organized baseball, according to Al Laney of the New York Herald Tribune sports staff, who interviewed him the other day. Robinson opened his heart to Mr. Laney. Said he:

"I know that I will take a tongue beating. That I can take. At least I think I can take it. And I am due for a terrible riding from the bench jockeys all around the International League circuit if I am good enough really to play with Montreal all summer. I know about the riding white players give one another and I am sure it will be much worse for me."

Robinson makes it clear that he is going into class AA ball as a ballplayer and not as a crusader. Rather, he will crusade by not crusading. He has seen tolerance breed tolerance before.

He played football for U. C. L. A., and has confronted the brawniest that Southern Methodist, Texas Christian, and Texas A. and M. had to offer. No individual among his opponents screamed to the white man's God about "white supremacy" or made any lustier passes at Robinson than the tactics of the game demanded. Robinson ought to know.

"They played hard football," he says, "and really gave me a smacking at times, but I can say with perfect honesty that there never was the slightest thing to indicate that they were giving me the business because I was a Negro."

INVITED BY SOUTHERNERS

Later he played in the All-Star game in Chicago with a team that included half a dozen southern boys. Of this experience he says:

"The first few days in camp there was a slight tension. I noticed it and kept to myself. When the other boys would play poker I would sit around by myself reading a magazine. On about the fourth day these southern boys came to me in a group and asked me to join their game. After that we were friends, everything was entirely natural, and there was no restraint. And I want to say that, in the game, these southern boys gave me the best blocking I ever had."

Laney, exploring all sides of the issue as a good reporter should, asked Robinson "what this proved with regard to his coming baseball career." Robinson said, "It proves, or at least it indicates to me, that once the ice is broken and the idea accepted, the thing is entirely possible."

Of course, the thing is entirely possible. It is absolutely inevitable if America is going to live up to its high protestations of democracy. And there is no better place to begin it than on a baseball diamond.

WHAT TWO-BAGGER WOULD DO

Ten thousand ball-park customers roaring their approbation of a slashing two-bagger from Jackie Robinson's bat will mean more for American democracy than 10,000 other Americans applauding Hazel Scott's piano playing (not in "Constitution" Hall) or Paul Robeson's acting—and Hazel Scott and Robeson would be the first to admit it.

Last winter Robeson made an eloquent plea for the admission of Negro players into big-time baseball. A committee of 10 appointed by Mayor LaGuardia of New York City recently reported that "sheer prejudice and tradition" have heretofore motivated the exclusion of Negroes from organized baseball.

Of those 10,000 ball-park spectators, probably only a small proportion will be familiar with Native Son or Black Boy or If He Hollers Let Him Go. A higher percentage, thanks to a golden platterful of publicity from Boston, will know something about Strange Fruit.

"There is no possible chance that I will flunk it or quit before the end for any other reason than that I am not a good enough ball player. That is the only thing I could be mistaken about. The other things I know." So concludes Jackie Robinson.

Whether Jackie Robinson is or is not a good ballplayer is the only question at issue.

Mr. Speaker, those well-meaning Congressmen who are trying to make a permanent bureau of the Fair Employment Practice Commission, which was established as a war-emergency measure, should take warning from the above article.

The small businessman, and there are many of them, cannot afford a legal staff; so, when the dissatisfied employee or the applicant for a job thinks he has not had due consideration, he can, under FEPC, if it becomes a law, bring suit against the employer and, even though the employer wins the lawsuit, it has cost him more than he can afford, in court costs and attorney fees, to clear his business of the charges.

Such permanent legislation would result in a field day for the lawyer, make added expense for the small businessman, and he would have another bureau in Washington telling him who to hire.

Good performance, good citizenship, and character, as in this Negro's case, will take care of any possible discrimination on account of race, creed, or color.

Joe Israelite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial that appeared in the column of the Chelsea Evening Record, of Chelsea, Mass., on Thursday, December 13, 1945, which is an eulogy on the passing of one of the most active citizens of that city. Attorney Joseph Israelite, a lifelong resident of that city, graduated from Harvard College and Boston University Law School with honor and distinction. He had served the municipality as an alderman and city solicitor. Up until the time of his death, Joe Israelite was loved, honored, and respected by the people of his city and by others, like myself, who had occasion to have business dealings with him. For the past few years he had worked unceasingly and untiringly for the city of Chelsea to protect the interest of his home city in the famous Green tax case. In the passing of Attorney Joseph Israelite, his city has lost a faithful public servant and his family has lost a sincere, honest, and conscientious son and brother. To them we all extend our deepest sympathy with the hope that they may be strong enough to bear the burden of their grief in this hour of sorrow.

JOE ISRAELITE

The untimely death of Joseph Israelite, former alderman, former city solicitor, and special counsel for the city in the Green case, is a definite loss to this community.

No man gave more sincere service to this city in the past generation than did Joe Israelite. It may well be said that he gave his life in the service of Chelsea, for it was his appearance and vigorous protest against the current oil petition which caused his most recent and fatal collapse at the city hall, last week.

Strong in his convictions, aggressive in matters in which he believed he was right, Joe Israelite often was referred to as "the ideal alderman" when he was serving the community in that capacity. He was a fighter for his cause to the end.

He was city solicitor when the Green case came up. He tackled it with characteristic vigor. He studied the complex situations from every angle. He literally lived with the Green case and he won every skirmish in every court. Judges and opponents admired his presentation of this case. He suffered a collapse while working on it, and then another later, but of these only a very few intimate friends knew. He was advised by physicians and friends to "take it easy," but it was not his nature. He continued to throw everything he had into his work.

A clean, upright, honest, outstanding citizen, who fought long and hard for what he believed was for the city's best interests; a devoted son and an efficient public servant, he will long be sorely missed and his place not easily filled.

Antistrike Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGER C. SLAUGHTER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Kansas City, Mo., December 12, 1945.

ROGER C. SLAUGHTER,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I observed in the Kansas City Times this morning that you were one of the leaders in the House battle yesterday to obtain immediate action on a more drastic antistrike bill than the plan recommended by the President, and I am not in the least surprised at your action.

When such matters as the FEPC, 65-cent minimum wage, $25 unemployment compensation, and other bills were recommended by the President of the United States for

the good of the public, you were one of the first to take an opposing position to these measures. It seems that your position is more pronounced every day insofar as legislation affecting labor is concerned. Your actions are certainly branding you as antilabor.

The type of legislation which is being proposed today and which you seem to favor is the same type of legislation which was enacted by the Nazis in Germany during their rise to power, in which they wiped out labor unions in that country. The same was true in Italy during the rise of fascism.

As soon as a group of workers try to better their economic conditions, the cry for antistrike legislation and measures necessary to protect the public are raised by the reactionaries who are present in our Government today. Nothing is done to big business when it decides to strike against the Government—and such a strike is going on today because of the excess-profits tax. Many employers do not care whether they produce anything or not until after the first of the year because if they do not produce they save money because of legislation enacted by yourself and other Congressmen.

Labor willingly sacrificed during the war, but they are not willing to continue to sacrifice anything now that the war is won for the benefit of the millionaires of this country. They are only willing to sacrifice when it benefits the entire country as a whole. Labor is entitled to a decent, living wage and it is about time that we put into effect the four freedoms proclaimed by our late departed President Roosevelt, instead of hanging them on the wall and talking about them, but doing nothing about them.

I tell you, sir, that if this type of legislation is enacted or the type proposed by President Truman in his recent message that the greatest injustice to the workers of this country will be done because you cannot take away the liberty of the people without something happening as a result of that deed. If Congress is interested in doing something for the welfare of the country, it had better enact legislation providing for full and real collective bargaining by industry so that our whole economic structure does not collapse.

I can assure you, sir, that your action is resented by the CIO workers in your area and by all of the liberty-loving people of the great State of Missouri. I do not believe that your actions should be guided by your hysteria and that this is the time when clear thinking and analyzing of all problems will be to the best interest of all the people of our Nation.

I aso note that your opposition was upheld by Representative BELL from this area, and I would appreciate it if you would convey this message to him, so that he, too, can understand what is in the minds of the workers in the State of Missouri.

Very truly yours,

IRWIN L. DESHETLER,
Regional Director.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 17, 1945.

Mr. IRWIN L. DESHETLER,
Regional Director, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Kansas City, Mo.

MY DEAR MR. DESHETLER: I have just received your letter of December 12 in which you denounce the action of the President and the Congress in attempting to curb the unbridled strike wave which is paralyzing the country.

I was particularly interested in your statement that any such action is the same type of legislation enacted by the Nazis in Germany and the Fascists in Italy, and which, as you say, wiped out labor unions in those countries. Perhaps through inadvertence you neglected to mention and comment on Communist Russia where workers have no voice at all.

It is to be assumed that your letter refers to two pieces of legislation which were before the House of Representatives last week. The first is the Hobbs bill, which seeks to prevent robbery and extortion with respect to interstate shipments. It is designed to punish individuals who indulge in these practices, and if you think they are customs that should be defended I am sure your reasons therefor would be of considerable interest to the people of Kansas City.

The primary purpose of the May bill is to provide penalties for a labor union that calls a strike in disregard of a no-strike clause in its contract. As a labor leader, I wonder if you would care to go on record as stating that there is less obligation upon a union to keep its contract than there is upon an employer?

You are mistaken when you call the May bill antilabor. It is antistrike in its concept and it is based upon the fundamental proposition that the public interest is superior to the interest of either labor or management. There is a growing feeling that unless something can be done to bring about industrial peace, there will be six and a half to seven million people unemployed by the middle of the year, which means that millions of returning servicemen and servicewomen will be without jobs. The President and the Congress do not propose to let that condition come about without an attempt on their part to prevent this unnecessary calamity.

Many are also convinced that the rank and file of union members are entitled to some sort of protection against the rash and ill-advised acts of leaders like Mr. Reuther, who has taken his men into a strike at a time when his union is in the worst possible position for a costly strike and the giant General Motors Corp. in the strongest possible position for a long conflict. Mr. Reuther has dragged his followers into a long strike with less than $4,000,000 in the union treasury, with the result that to date General Motors employees have lost $28,000,000 in wages, no strike benefits are available, and many of the strikers are without the necessities of life, not to speak of a little extra spending money that would provide some measure of cheer and happiness at Christmas for their children and their families.

You mention democracy at great length in your letter. Certainly there is no place where democracy should operate more firmly than in a labor union. Members of the union should be free to choose their own leaders with free and open elections and with a certainty that their ballot will be counted, and when strike votes are taken, the same safeguard should be thrown around the individual union member to protect him from outside coercion. There is substantial evidence that a great many union leaders, particularly in the CIO, have not been chosen by the members but rather have been chosen by small cliques, for if this were not the case, the question inevitably arises as to why these leaders are unwilling to rely upon the loyalty of their members rather than insisting upon the enforced and hated check-off system in order to make sure that the dues come in.

Neither management nor labor can succeed in this country without popular support. Organized labor has made great strides in the past 10 years, and it is proper that it should. However, with increased recognition comes increased responsibility and irresponsible leaders must be curbed for the protection of the dues-paying members of the unions as well as for the general public.

Very truly yours,

ROGER C. SLAUGHTER.

Great Cooperative Leader Writes on the Consumer Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the article which I ask consent to have included herewith is written by Dr. M. M. Coady, a priest of the Catholic Church and member of the faculty of St. Francis Xavier University at Antigonish, Nova Scotia. Along with Dr. James M. Tompkins, Father Coady inspired the development of the great cooperative movement of Nova Scotia and the other Canadian maritime provinces. That movement has raised from poverty the fishermen and miners, and many other people of that area. It has grown to include the bulk of the farmers. The credit unions of the area provide safekeeping for the savings and a source of credit out of their own savings for the people.

Thousands of groups of people in the United States meet in neighborhood homes at regular times to study and discuss their problems and decide upon action to solve them. These groups represent democracy at its best. They have grown out of the cooperative movement, and they have found a large part of their inspiration in similar groups which for a long time have been meeting in the Canadian maritime provinces. Here Protestants and Catholics alike have found an approach to everyday human problems which embodies the fundamental precepts of their faith.

Dr. Coady's article follows:

CONSUMER APPROACH—GREEN LIGHT ON THE HIGHWAY

(By Dr. M. M. Coady)

I think I can best illustrate the necessity of the consumer approach in our cooperative ventures by portraying to you the difficulties that cooperative marketing will run into when it gets under way.

Let us make it very simple. We shall take the farmers, for example. They hear, we will suppose, for the first time about this new technique of cooperation. It is, they are convinced, the green light on the economic highway of life. It beckons them to follow. They decide to form a marketing cooperative. When they begin to bring in their commodities, wheat, meat, or anything else, they are suddenly stopped on the first intersection on the road by the green light; a traffic cop rushes out, blows a golden whistle, holds up a threatening left hand and stops the traffic.

Who is this man with the golden whistle? He is the representative of the first hierarchy of business. He is the merchant, the dealer, the wholesaler, or the representative of the market.

He promptly tells the farmers that they cannot cross this golden line, they must stay back on their farms. These men are everywhere and our would-be cooperators are going to experience great difficulties in the beginning if all the people are not thoroughly indoctrinated with the cooperative philosophy. He can smash the farmers' ranks. He can do this because his economic position gives him influence. He stands high in the political and social life of the community.

He is thus a potential danger to any movement of the people to invade, even in this simple way, the field of business.

The reason for this power is to be found in the fact that he owns economic institutions in the consumer field. He owns stores, wholesales or credit institutions. Were he and his kind out of the way, then the road would be easy. Thus, what so many people here in Canada consider the first step in cooperation is encountering an obstacle that can be solved only by the consumer approach.

We can come to the same conclusion from another angle. The farmers, and all primary products for that matter, should not be satisfied with selling their raw material. You western wheat growers could manufacture your wheat into flour. The green-lighted highway that leads east to the Atlantic Ocean is thronged with people who would love to join with you and own cojointly these milling plants.

But you would look down that long way in vain for a chance to do this as long as your fellow countrymen are not organized on the consumer end. Even if you milled your wheat you would still have to give it to your fellow Canadians through old-line profit business and that would not make it much better for you or for them.

In the Maritime Provinces we have 120 cooperative stores—we do about $8,500,000 retail business a year. We have three wholesales which do $5,000,000 business. Now, suppose that we had, in our part of the country, at least one cooperative store in every community and the wholesales set up in all the region, we could go in with you in joint ownership of flour mills and thus give an easy outlet for this manufactured commodity.

And let us remember this does not apply just to the rural areas of Canada, it applies with greater force to the urban communities. The only way that you can carry on cooperative business with the city dwellers of this country is to have them organized in cooperative consumer societies of all kinds.

City people want the farmers' flour, bacon, and other processed commodities, but you can't get them to them cooperatively unless they have consumer societies. But the population in an urban center should not be looked upon as mere consumers—they, too, are producers. If cooperation is to become universal in this country, I might say if it is to survive in this country, then the city dweller must come into the picture. If we are to sell to him, we must buy from him.

This could be done not by separate organizations of city people against rural people but by cooperative associations in which all are members. We feel proud of the fact that in eastern Canada, on account of our insistence on this universal philosophy from the very beginning of our movement, there is a complete understanding between coal miners, steel workers, industrial workers generally, and the fishermen and farmers.

They are not antagonistic. They sit on the same boards of wholesalers and federations of other consumer cooperative societies. They are moving on all fronts together and are looking forward to the day when they will conjointly own manufacturing plants to supply their needs. This should be the ideal of all cooperators in Canada.

But there is still a greater reason why the primary producers need the industrial workers in the cooperative movement. When through the industrial revolution the domestic system was swept away and manufacturing was concentrated in factories located in industrial centers, the masses of the world's people lost control of their economic lives. Consumer cooperation is the instrument which will give us back this control.

The consumer institutions were not swept away from the local communities. Men will always need stores, wholesales, banks, and service institutions. These must and always will be located where people live.

When the people own, cooperatively, enough of these institutions and when the volume of demand grows they can federate into wholesales and either build or take over the manufacturing plants in the distant industrial centers. Here is where the city man is needed most. We need the volume of his business. We will need him as a worker. But he will be something more than a worker and wage earner in the net set-up. He will be joint owner with the primary producers of the manufacturing plants that cater to the needs of all the people. He can become joint owner of a business whose greatness is only limited by the will of the people.

Here we have the key to the new control and ownership of the productive processes in modern society. This is a clever technique. Nothing can stand up against it. Let the people of North America control their consumer institutions and they own America. That is the road back for the masses of the world's people. That is the road that will lift the people from being mere primary producers who do the world's dirty and hard work to full-fledged citizenship.

We are dead men if we cannot see that our manifest destiny here in Canada is to be a great people; we have the country. We should be as broad as Canada—4,000 miles broad; we should be as virile as the North Wind, realistic as the rocks of Ontario, as serene as the waters of the Great Lakes, secure in our stride as the lordly flow of the St. Lawrence, energetic and active as the infinitely turbulent Atlantic, artistic as the island fringes and green slopes of British Columbia, imperturbable as the everlasting, majestic Rockies. If we don't build here a great civilization we will contradict all human history.

Connecticut Republican Resolution on Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the following is a resolution on Palestine adopted by the Republican State Central Committee at a meeting on Thursday December 13, 1945, in New Haven, Conn.:

Resolution favoring action to enforce and accelerate continued development of a Jewish national home in Palestine

Whereas the ruthless persecution of the Jewish people in Europe, which brought death and suffering to millions and has resulted in continued privations for large numbers of survivors, who have become homeless, demonstrating the urgent need for speedy action; and

Whereas on April 21, 1943, the republican legislature passed a joint resolution favoring "absorption in Palestine of as many Jews as may be required" by the plight of the Jewish people in Europe; and

Whereas on June 30, 1922, the Sixty-seventh Congress of the United States unanimously resolved that the "United States of America favors a national home for the Jewish people"; and

Whereas on October 29, 1945, Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Republican leader of the House of Representatives, introduced a joint resolution urging that the United States use its influence "to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country": Therefore be it

Resolved by the Republican State Central Committee of Connecticut, That every effort be made to achieve a speedy solution to this grave problem and that Congress be urged to force immediate action to end dilatory practices of the Federal administration, so as to provide full opportunities for colonization by the homeless Jewish people in Europe; be it further

Resolved, That our Government initiate steps looking to an agreement among nations that Palestine be reconstituted as a free and democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall enjoy the equal rights of freemen; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator THOMAS C. HART, Representative JOSEPH E. TALBOT, and Representative CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, Republican Members from Connecticut, of the Congress of the United States, to indicate the wholehearted support of this committee of their efforts to win for the tragic victims of oppression the chance to live under the principles of liberty and opportunity which are an integral part of the American way of life.

Navy Demobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the Navy Department:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL,
Washington, D. C., December 12, 1945.

To All Members of Congress:

Subject: Progress report on Navy demobilization.

During the Christmas holidays you may be asked by constituents for the latest information concerning Navy demobilization and the return of veterans from overseas, and it occurs to me that the following facts may be of use to you.

By December 1, more than 3,500,000 personnel of the various branches of the armed forces had been returned from overseas. Of this number, 2,300,000 had been brought across the Atlantic, 1,204,000 across the Pacific, and 73,000 from India.

After World War I it took more than 10 months to transport 1,900,000 men across the Atlantic. During last month alone, 930,000 men were returned to this country, including many who had to be transported distances exceeding 6,000 miles.

In less than 3 months after Japan's surrender the Navy discharged more men than it did in the 10 months following the 1918 armistice. The Navy discharged a total of 351,497 people during November. On December 9, 17,932 naval personnel were separated, the largest total for a single day.

To return veterans there are now available 920 troop and converted combatant ships with a total simultaneous "lift" of 1,400,000 men. We are, at the moment, using more than 350 large passenger liners and converted freighters in the Atlantic, 170 in the Pacific, and 30 to and from the India theater. We are also utilizing 350 passenger-carrying war vessels, including large and small carriers, attack transports, cruisers, battleships, and hospital vessels.

At present, there remain about 900,000 American military personnel in Europe who are either eligible for discharge or who will be eligible by the time transportation is available for them. Nearly all of these are

in the Army. In the same category in the Pacific, there are about a million Army men and slightly less than 1,200,000 Navy men. About 135,000 Army men remain in India.

By early January space will have been made available to return from Europe all personnel except those necessary for clean-up forces and garrison duty. It is expected that sufficient transport accommodations will be available to take all the men out of India by April 1, and all out of the Pacific by early summer. This, of course, excludes occupation forces and service troops.

As for the Navy's problems, we have three major obligations. We must maintain enough ships at full fighting efficiency to meet the Nation's commitments on the high seas and overseas. We must lay up ships, decommission bases, and preserve or dispose of surplus material so that installations and stocks of supplies will not be simply abandoned or destroyed. Lastly, we have a large share of the job of returning to the United States Army and Navy personnel now outside the continental limits.

We have reduced, insofar as possible, the complements of ships. We have discharged, under the point system, or have assigned to other duties, thousands of persons whose services were no longer needed in their particular specialties. But, so long as ships remain in operation they have to be maintained. Machinist's mates and watertenders, among others, are no less busy. With thousands of passengers aboard, the work of cooks, bakers, steward's mates, and supply personnel is more difficult than under normal circumstances.

The number of points normally required for the discharge, under the demobilization program, of enlisted men has dropped from 44 on September 1 to 38 on December 1, and by January 1 the score will be down to 36. The score for officers, which on September 1 was 49, is now 44 and by January 1 will be 43. By the first of the year we expect that approximately one-third of the 3,000,000 naval personnel to be demobilized will be back in civil life; by the end of January, one-half; by April, two-thirds; and by September 1 demobilization is scheduled to be completed.

At the present time we are not assigning to foreign duty any enlisted man who is within 6 months of discharge, nor are we assigning enlisted men who are within 45 days of discharge to vessels making transport trips. Enlisted personnel, who are 38 years of age or over and who have a state of dependency which existed on August 15, 1945, may now be discharged, upon their request, regardless of their point scores, rates, or classifications.

Likewise, any enlisted man with three or more children is considered to have a prima facie case of hardship, and is discharged regardless of points upon his own application. Furthermore, on January 1 enlisted personnel hitherto ineligible for demobilization under the point formula because of the need for their services will become eligible for discharge on the basis of point scores.

In order that as many naval personnel as possible may spend Christmas at home with their families, those Navy men and women ashore and on ships within the continental limits of the United States who will be eligible for discharge on or before December 31 will be separated immediately, wherever they can be spared, so that they may reach home by the holidays.

I have said before, and I repeat, that the Navy is determined to get the men home just as fast as our requirements and transportation will permit. To that end we pledge our best efforts, and the same ingenuity and spirit which were applied to the problems of the war.

Respectfully,

LOUIS E. DENFELD,
Vice Admiral, USN,
Chief of Naval Personnel.

Communism in Public Schools of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I insert the following letter in the RECORD which was received by the Committee on Un-American Activities on December 18, 1945, from a New York City school teacher:

I am sure that in the large issues confronting you, you have had no opportunity to examine the very serious problem confronting New York City's teachers.

We are forced to take in-service courses approved by the board of education. Of late these have been given by an ever-increasing number of private organizations of very questionable sponsorship. Such a one is a course given by the Institute of Pacific Relations at 1 East Fifty-fourth Street, New York City, where Communist propaganda is the subject of every single discussion on Pacific problems. The merits of the Communist Party, its way of improving life for the masses, and its acceptance as the only way of saving the peoples of the world becomes the center of every Tuesday's meeting.

How are American teachers to protect themselves? Who is providing the loophole for the entrance of these courses into the required work of the New York teachers? You are the only hope we have of bringing this into the open. Individually we can only bring recriminations and loss of license on ourselves if we protest. We want your help.

Coffee-Cup Tempest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein an editorial from the Boston Herald of December 18, 1945:

COFFEE-CUP TEMPEST

Sugar is short, cream is short, and, unless Washington comes across with a new subsidy or a lifting of controls, coffee is going to be short next spring. We do have the cup still.

For 2 years the OPA has kept coffee prices below the cost of production. This stabilized a cost-of-living item, but it flooded the country with low-grade coffee. When the squeeze began to get so great that even this quality threatened to dry up, the Government came across on November 19 with a 3-cent subsidy on 6,000,000 bags through March 31, representing a $24,000,000 adjustment to the producers.

The result has been a moderate improvement in the coffee now arriving. One large Boston dealer states that the quality is now better than we have had for 2 years, though the choice varieties from Colombia, Mexico, Guatemala, and Venezuela are still going elsewhere than to the United States. It would take a 5-cent subsidy to get them here.

What is to be done after the subsidy expires on March 31? The administration is committed to a policy of abandoning these price evasions on food. But it cannot let go without raising or removing the ceilings, and this it is reluctant to do at a time when labor is protesting at the cost of living.

Now, a second-grade cup of coffee is too much to pay for the appeasement of labor. Americans do not drink the stuff for calories or vitamins, and this includes the rank and file of the United Automobile Workers, too. Nor would the removal of controls result in skyrocketing prices, not with 14 growing countries competing for our market. There is something to be said, too, for the soothing effect on American nerves of a smoother cup of coffee. Certainly there is a lot to be said for the alleviation of Latin-American jitters by an ending of these harassing restrictions.

Back to Solvency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD W. LANDIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, America now demands leadership which will bring us back to solvency. Our people are opposed to deficit spending. We need a thorough house cleaning in the departments and agencies of the Government. We must reduce materially the number of Federal employees and weed out those New Dealers who favor perpetual deficit spending.

We must not bankrupt America in order to finance the world. America must not play the role of Santa Claus to foreign nations. The American people should not be required to keep their "nose to the grindstone," to aid foreign nations, when we have a reconversion job to do in the United States.

To risk the taxpayers' money to promote lending and investment to foreign countries may not be a wise investment, particularly if the volume is too large. There is a certain inherent risk which is not present in domestic investment. There is no legal way in which debts can be collected from a foreign country, particularly from that country's government. If payments are suspended, the investor is helpless.

Our own experience in foreign investment has not been very promising. History shows that it will not make for peace. After the last World War we were criticized severely because we made an attempt to recover our war debts. Most of the countries did not even pay the interest on these loans. Then why should we make this large loan to Great Britain? We do not want to bankrupt Great Britain by making such a loan. During a recent debate in Parliament Winston Churchill and the Conservatives opposed the loan on the grounds that it might bankrupt their country.

We want to support the United Nations Organization for international peace. We will aid the starving nations abroad with our surplus food. We have agreed to the Bretton Woods proposal for international financing. However,

any additional foreign loans must be protected with contracts for air bases and strategic and critical materials.

The proponents of the British loan contend that money will come back to America in wider markets, if the plan works. They will use this money to purchase materials and goods in the United States.

However, if this money were distributed to our citizens in wages, farm prices, and old-age pensions both the money and the goods would remain in the United States. It is high time that we do something for Americans first before we try to finance the world.

The New Deal administration now proposes to loan Great Britain a total of $4,400,000,000. The money will be repayable over a 50-year period at 2 percent interest, but repayments will not start until 1951. Under the proposed loan Britain would not pay interest for the first 5 years. Where are we going to get the money? Of course, it will come from the American taxpayers. The idea of loaning Great Britain money at 2 percent and charging our veterans and farmers 3 to 4 percent is ridiculous. Great Britain already owes us $6,400,000,000 from the last World War.

British assets were listed by the United States Bureau of Mines, unmined gold reserves, $24,500,000,000; unmined diamond reserves, $8,800,000,000, and foreign investments of $14,000,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, I was not elected to give America away. I do not believe in making these loans to foreign countries to make socialism work in England and commuhism work in Russia.

Exorbitant salaries and allowances paid to certain kings and rulers is another reason why American taxpayers might be opposed to foreign loans.

Great Britain: Provision is made for the support of the royal household by the settlement of the civil list soon after the commencement of each reign. The civil list of the present king, established in 1937, after the usual surrender of hereditary revenues, was fixed at 410,000 pounds—$1,656,400—of which 110,000 pounds—$444,400—is appropriated to the privy purse of the king, 134,000 pounds—$541,360—for salaries for the royal household and retired allowances, 152,800 pounds—$617,312—for household expenses and 13,200 pounds—$53,328—for alms and bounty. The civil list also provides for an annuity of 70,000 pounds—$282,800—to Queen Mary. The provisions for other members of the royal family are as follows: The Princess Elizabeth, 6,000 pounds—$24,240; the Duke of Gloucester, 35,000 pounds—$141,400; the Princess Royal, 6,000 pounds—$24,240. No provision is made for the Duke of Windsor.

Belgium: The king has a civil list of 12,000,000 francs—$405,120—and the Queen-Mother of 2,000,000 francs—$67,520.

Egypt: According to law 50 of 1938, the king's civil list is fixed at $413,800, and the royal family's allowance at $413,800.

Italy: The civil list has been settled—1919—at 11,250 000 lire—$570,409; by a law of 1925 an allowance of 3,000,000 lire—$152,109—was settled on the Prince of Piedmont, heir apparent, Duke of Aosta, and the Duke of Genoa receive an allowance of 1,000,000 lire—$50,703—each.

Japan: The civil list is fixed at 4,500,000 yen—$1,054,755.

Sweden: The royal family of Sweden have a civil list of 1,896,900 kroner—$452,012. The sovereign, besides, has an annuity of 300,000 kroner—$71,487—voted to King Carl XIV Johan and his successors on the throne of Sweden.

Switzerland: The president of the federal council has an annual salary of 1,720 pounds—$6,949.

Bulgaria: The civil list is fixed—1938—at 4,791,705 leva—$58,032—besides 27,289,900 leva—$330,508—for the maintenance of palaces, and so forth.

Denmark: The king has a civil list of 1,000,000 kroner—$193,080. Annuities to other members of the royal house amount to 151,200 kroner—$29,194.

Greece: The king's civil list is fixed at 24,000,000 drachmai—$161,160—and of the Diadoch at 4,000,000 drachmai—$26,860.

Netherlands: The sovereign has a civil list of 1,200,000 guilders—$637,536. There is also a large revenue from domains, and in addition an allowance of 100,000 guilders—$53,128—for the maintenance of the royal palaces. The family of Orange is, besides, in the possession of a private fortune, acquired in greater part by King Willem I in the prosecution of vast enterprises tending to raise the commerce of the Netherlands.

Norway: The king has a civil list of 700,000 kroner—$158,963, the crown prince 150,000 kroner—$34,064.

Yugoslavia: The king's civil list amounts to 24,000,000 dinars—$537,528, plus 24,886,328 dinars—$557,379, as difference for payment in foreign exchange.

France: The head of the French Government receives 15,000 francs per month or 180,000 francs per year—equals about $36,000 plus additional allowances for expenses—prewar figures.

It was impossible to get the figures for Russia and China ruler from the State Department or the Congressional Library. They may be secret.

I am opposed to the $4,400,000,000 loan to Great Britain or any other similar loan to foreign countries unless these loans have proper safeguards to protect the American taxpayers. However, I would not object to a specific bond issue where the purchaser of these bonds assumed the risk. This would remove these transactions from the Treasury's general fund operations.

This $4,400,000,000 could be spent advantageously in America in aiding the GI bill of rights, securing decent pensions for the elders of America, care for our Nation's citizens who are undernourished, ill-clad and ill-housed, and carry on an educational campaign to reduce juvenile delinquency to a minimum.

If Great Britain gets this loan then Russia is expected to request a loan of $6,000,000,000, France and China will want to borrow five hundred to six hundred million and other nations will ask for loans.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to call a halt on these foreign hand-outs. Let us beware of the kind of a leader who is "a steady patriot of the world alone, the friend of every country but his own." The Republican Party would be wise to select the following slogans: "Back to Solvency" and "There Will Always Be an America Unless the New Deal Gives It Away."

The Greatest Menace in America Today Is Organized Propaganda. The OPA Is the Greatest Offender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the greatest menace in America today is organized propaganda. This menace has been growing rapidly for years, especially for the past 15 years. Private individuals, corporate interests, labor organizations, and political factions have indulged in it. Even the Government itself has engaged in it.

Should the Government engage in propaganda? No. Absolutely no! It is the duty of the Government to keep the people informed by reporting facts to them. Reporting anything but facts would be a distinct disservice. Likewise, it is the duty of Government to prevent organized propaganda by any of its agencies when it has the effect of misrepresenting or distorting facts.

Is the Government carrying out its responsibility in this respect? Mr. Speaker, let me answer that by asking this question: Is there any Member of this House who has not on many occasions had serious doubts as to the factual accuracy of statements issued by many Government agencies?

One of the greatest offenders in this regard has been the Office of Price Administration. The OPA could yet do some good within the scope of its authority. Its organized propaganda is becoming so revolting to the American people and to Members of Congress, however, that I predict they will soon decide they would rather do without the good it might do than to risk the harm it will be sure to do through the propaganda efforts of a small group in that agency to perpetuate their power and bring about permanent Federal control of prices in this country.

OPA has indulged in organized propaganda of the most shameless kind. It has gone o far as to have millions of its misleading publicity statements mailed out with monthly allotment checks to dependents of men in the armed services. It has organized pressure groups of one kind and another to descend en masse on congressional hearings and stridently demand perpetuation of OPA.

Within the last few weeks it has organized community propaganda campaigns throughout the country in the form of a special week devoted to praise of OPA. These special observances were first to be called Anti-inflation Week. But

after the ground work was well laid, the signals were changed and word went out from Washington that they were to be called Price Control for Prosperity Week. Under that name, this OPA propaganda is now going on in small communities in every part of this country.

Newspapers in those communities are being pressured by OPA representatives to print long prepared statements extolling the virtues of OPA and of permanent price control. City officials have been induced under the plea of patriotism to give special public recognition to OPA activities.

I would like for the Members to think for a moment on the name they have chosen, Mr. Speaker—Price Control for Prosperity. All of us want prosperity. We expect to have it. And now Mr. Bowles is starting to sell us on the idea that we must have price control if we are to have prosperity. By implication, we must have price control as long as we have prosperity.

Between now and next June 30 the American people are going to witness one of the greatest Government propaganda campaigns of all times, based upon this theme of Price Control for Prosperity. The purpose of that campaign will be to perpetuate OPA. Under the guise of controlling inflation the OPA seeks to make price control permanent. From this it would be an easy step to state socialism.

The strategy by which permanent price control is to be achieved is to find one reason after another why price controls cannot be lifted at the moment—always accompanied by the pious hope that it can be removed in the near future. Like the end of the rainbow, however, that happy day will be constantly retreating. We will move from one "emergency" to another as we have done for the past 13 years—each "emergency" requiring the continuation of Federal control over the private lives and activities of American citizens.

Last summer, when the war with Japan ended, we were assured by Mr. Bowles that our economy would be "decontrolled" as speedily as possible. Dates were set for the removal of price controls and we were told that nearly all controls would be lifted soon after the first of the year. Most of these dates have come and gone and the controls have not been lifted. The "emergency" is still with us and Mr. Bowles now says that we do not dare remove the controls after the first of the year, as he had promised, and that they must be continued past next June 30.

The campaign to accomplish that purpose has already started and it is partly to point out the utter ruthlessness and cynicism of that propaganda drive that I take the floor today.

Mr. Bowles has used as his shining example of the horrors of price control removal the case of the price of citrus fruits, on which price controls were removed by OPA on November 19. This example has been used by Mr. Bowles before a Senate committee, in speeches throughout the country, and on Monday of last week in a press conference here in Washington which Mr. Bowles called for the purpose of giving further publicity to his citrus fruit exhibit. OPA representatives have been instructed to make it the keynote of their arguments and press releases in promoting Nation-wide observance of "Price Control for Prosperity" week.

Here is an example of the kind of statement Mr. Bowles makes on this subject. Speaking before the National Association of Manufacturers in New York on December 6, Mr. Bowles said:

> What, for instance, would happen to food prices (if price controls were removed)? * * * Your wife will tell you that some grades of oranges, lemons, and grapefruit moved up 50 to 100 percent in the first few days following the action of OPA in removing the price restrictions. If this occurred on food products which seemed to be in adequate supply, what would happen to meat, vegetables, milk, cereals, and all the other dozens of food products which are in more scarce supply?

Analysis of that statement will demonstrate that it is made with the usual Bowles' technique—a collection of half-truths and inferences made for the deliberate purpose of misleading the listener. But I am not so much concerned now with the fact that the statement is intentionally misleading as I am with the fact that Mr. Bowles is using continuously as his chief argument for the necessity of retaining price control a hand-tailored example—citrus fruit—which was carefully planned and put into effect for the express purpose of giving OPA just this kind of a propaganda medium.

I am convinced that in removing the ceiling price on citrus fruits, the OPA did so with the deliberate purpose of creating a sudden increase in prices which they would be able to use as exhibit No. 1 in their campaign to perpetuate OPA controls, and for the immediate exploiting of which they had made careful preparations.

Here is the story of the citrus-fruit propaganda theme:

Producers of fresh fruits and vegetables have long contended that there is no need for ceiling prices on fresh fruit or vegetables which are in adequate supply. In fact, they point out, ceiling prices on such products tend to peg retail prices at the ceiling and retard consumer purchasing, even though there may actually be an oversupply of that particular fruit or vegetable. This contention has proved to be correct. As most of you know, there have been no ceiling prices on potatoes for the past several months and potatoes are no higher today than they were when ceilings were lifted and are, in fact, lower than they were a year ago when price ceilings were in effect.

There have been similar results from removing ceilings on other fruits and vegetables in adequate supply. When there is plenty of a commodity, competition is a more effective ceiling on prices than OPA can ever maintain. OPA chooses to ignore these experiences, however, and talks only of citrus fruits.

For a long time the growers of citrus fruits had an agreement with OPA that when the price of their product reached a certain low level, indicating an essential balance between supply and demand, ceiling prices would be removed in order to stimulate consumption. That price level, at which ceilings were to be removed, was reached late last July. But OPA—in spite of its agreement to do so—would not remove ceiling prices. Although the Department of Agriculture reported that we would have one of the largest citrus fruit crops in our history, OPA continued throughout the summer and early fall in its refusal to remove ceiling prices. Then, on November 19, just 3 days before Thanksgiving, OPA suddenly removed the ceiling prices on citrus fruits. Mr. Bowles and his economic manipulators had calculated their time carefully.

November 19 was the Monday before Thanksgiving, when fresh fruits are in heavy demand for the holiday table. November 19 is also near the end of one of the big orange seasons of the year and just before another large orange season starts. It is in the period when there is always a relatively short supply of oranges because the Valencia season is nearing its end and the navel orange season is not yet in full swing. This situation was so well recognized by the citrus fruit trade that, when informed of the action, many of them begged OPA to leave the ceilings on for another two or three weeks, until navel oranges were moving to market in quantity. November 19, it might also be noted, was just before community observances of Price Control for Prosperity Week in which OPA planned to use the citrus fruit example.

The result of removing citrus fruit ceilings at this particular time was exactly what any intelligent person would have predicted from the conditions I have just described. It was the result which OPA strategists knew would occur when they planned this action for November 19. Supplies for the Thanksgiving season were already shipped. There was no possibility of moving additional supplies from producing areas to consuming areas in the 3 days between November 19 and November 22. The demand for choice fruit is higher those 3 days than it is at any other time of the year except just before Christmas and New Year's. Shoppers, eager to get choice fruit for their holiday meals, and retailers, eager to provide this fruit if they could, naturally bid up the price of choice citrus fruits. Top grades shot up well above previous ceilings. It is significant, however, that the poorer grades of fruit not only did not double in price, as OPA has intimated, but actually "went sour," as the produce dealers say, so that the average increase in citrus fruit prices throughout the country—even under the conditions OPA had planned—was only a few cents a crate.

This fact was ignored by OPA as it put its publicity machine in motion. OPA press offices throughout the country were ready on the day ceilings were lifted to issue their scarehead stories ignoring the small average increase in price and citing only the jump in the price of choice holiday fruit, to draw the obvious moral that this is what happens when any ceiling price is removed.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that OPA publicity offices throughout the country came out with similar statements at the

same time, all tending to show the results of removing ceiling prices, was not accidental. It was carefully planned here in Washington by the OPA. Almost identical releases appeared simultaneously in papers from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

I have not had time to go through all the newspapers of the country for November 19 and 20, but here are some typical examples of the manner in which OPA publicity offices went to work to capitalize on the situation which OPA price manipulators had created.

In San Francisco, the Associated Press quoted the district OPA director on November 20 as urging restoration of ceiling prices on citrus fruits "because the price of oranges has jumped approximately 70 percent practically overnight." The San Francisco Chronicle quoted the regional OPA administrator as saying he would make an immediate investigation to determine whether ceilings should be replaced. He apparently had heard his master's voice.

In Detroit, OPA press agents again rushed to the Associated Press with the news that "removal of Government controls sent the price of citrus fruits skyrocketing today in Detroit markets." He forgot to mention that the average price did not advance.

In Chicago, OPA press agents rushed into print with the news that some oranges had jumped from $5.50 to $9.95 on the Chicago market. These, of course, were the choice fruits in high demand for Thanksgiving. They did not give the average price of oranges. This story, too, was widely used by other newspapers and the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, after using this story editorially added: "In Pittsburgh there seems to have been little appreciable change." It is not recorded that any OPA agent in Pittsburgh pointed out that failure of prices to skyrocket there vindicated the soundness of removing price controls.

In Minneapolis, the Star Journal, like all the other newspapers, quoted the OPA district director. He made the absurd prediction that grapefruit, oranges, and lemons would disappear from restaurant and cafe menus. He, too, had heard his master's voice.

Thus it went throughout the country. Within 1 day after the removal of price controls on citrus fruits OPA press agents in district and regional offices everywhere laid down their barrage of publicity, distorting facts to prove their argument that removal of ceiling prices on any commodity is a mistake.

The most truthful story appeared in the Denver Post. The prices quoted there, as elsewhere, were the most alarming which could be found and not representative of the market as a whole, but an OPA food specialist in the district office spilled the beans. Ceilings were removed, he told the Post, because of "a surplus supply due to an exceptionally large crop and as a test of the effect of the removal of price ceilings on wholesale and consumer markets." That, of course, was the real reason for the removal of citrus price ceilings on November 19—so that it could be held out to the country "as a test of the removal of price ceilings on wholesale and consumer markets." The OPA spokesman in every community had to have this story in order to make his propaganda sound convincing, but the Denver man slipped in passing it on to the general public.

After the original flurry in prices which OPA manufactured, the price of citrus fruits settled back within a few days so that many grades and varieties are now selling well below previous ceiling prices. Mr. Bowles well knows this fact and yet he continues to use this one misleading example, which OPA prepared so carefully, as an argument for such an important decision as that on indefinite continuation of all ceiling prices.

On Monday of last week Mr. Bowles called a press conference in which he again used the deliberately misleading example of citrus-fruit prices. Here is the way he was quoted by the Associated Press reporter:

> In saying OPA will have to move more slowly in the future in eliminating price controls, Mr. Bowles said that what happened on citrus fruits illustrated this. Price ceilings on fresh citrus were removed last month and prices immediately shot up, doubling in some cases, Mr. Bowles said.

When asked to substantiate this figure of increased prices Mr. Bowles called on an OPA economist who was sitting at his elbow and this economist reported that oranges were then selling from one-half cent to 1 cent a pound above ceiling prices on the wholesale market. This would be 35 to 80 cents a box above previous ceiling prices. This was either a deliberate misrepresentation or an evidence of ignorance. The ceiling prices of Valencia oranges in New York was $5.38 a box. On the day on which Mr. Bowles held his press conference—Monday, December 10—Valencia oranges sold in New York at an average of $4.29 a box—exactly $1.09 a box below the previous ceiling prices.

The ceiling price of navel oranges was also $5.38 a box and even this choice fruit, which was not yet moving in adequate supply to meet demands, sold in New York December 10 for $5.57 a box, only 19 cents above the previous ceiling, and a normal reflection of the market situation at this time of year. Florida brucebox oranges with a ceiling of $4.55, sold in New York that day for $4.31—24 cents below ceiling. Florida Indian River oranges, with a ceiling of $4.99, sold for $4.71 a box on December 10—28 cents lower than the previous ceiling.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, in laying the groundwork for his propaganda campaign to perpetuate OPA, Mr. Bowles has not only deliberately manipulated the controls of citrus fruits so that prices would go up, he has consistently misrepresented and misinterpreted the results of that action and continues to do so in the face of overwhelming evidence that even the very figures he uses are erroneous.

This kind of propaganda is now appearing in the small newspapers of the country. Local OPA representatives, obviously on direct orders from Washington, are using the excuse of "price control for prosperity" week to persuade editors of smaller papers to print their arguments for OPA perpetuation, in which the manipulated citrus fruit price plays a prominent part.

I press this on the attention of the House as a sample of what we may expect in the next several months as this great propaganda campaign swings into high gear.

Precampaign Platform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago the Republicans in Congress set forth in a forward-looking document its aims and objectives. This was not in any sense intended to be a party platform. Obviously, a platform could be framed only by delegates to a national convention.

It was desired the people should know the political creed which would guide Republicans in Congress in the determination of the specific problems as they arose. Those aims were later endorsed unanimously by the Republican National Committee and steps taken for the purpose of a closer coordination with Members of Congress as new problems arose.

The Republican aims and objectives will undoubtedly serve to bring about greater unity of action on the part of all Republicans. The Harrisburg Telegraph, in an editorial printed on Monday, December 10, really shows a complete comprehension of the purposes and the wisdom of the Republican action. Under permission to extend my remarks, I include the editorial:

PRECAMPAIGN PLATFORM

Voters will not have an opportunity to exercise their franchise in State-wide elections before the first Tuesday after the first Monday, 1946. All States will elect Members to the National House of Representatives, one-third will elect United States Senators, while others will elect governors and members of State legislatures.

Evidently with an eye on those elections, and proceeding on the paraphrased theory that "in time of calm prepare for storm" is a good policy, Republican Members of Congress have drafted and submitted "aims and purposes" to the national committee. They have whipped up ideas gleaned from correspondence, talks with constituents, and sifted from "bull" sessions which are a daily routine in the Capitol cloakrooms. In reducing their thoughts to type they have started the jelling process of a 1946 platform.

The handiwork of the legislators was endorsed unanimously in Chicago Saturday by the national committee as a basis for party policy. That the middle and far west committeemen should have criticized some of the paragraphs is a healthy sign, and Chairman Brownell quite properly announced he would appoint a committee of seven to receive, clarify, amplify, and broaden existing principles and receive new suggestions.

It is apparent that the authors did not intend to write a rigid platform. Their chief aim was to spark an interest in the party and what the party should support and advocate in legislation. They framed an outline that should start Republicans on a round of examination and polling of sentiment of voters.

It is hoped that these original or preliminary principles of a Republican platform will be widely distributed. State and county committees would do well to provide copies to members and to citizens of all political alinements and request frank, honest comment. Discussion and debate of current and anticipated political issues will excite a healthy interest in the party's desire to increase congressional representation and gain control of more State administrations and legislatures.

Let the missionary work get under way.

Demobilization of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, in the terrible war that ended only a few months ago America assembled the greatest fighting force the world has ever known. Land forces, naval forces, and air forces combined to bring victory over the Axis Nations. The victory was won on every battlefield and in every department. Our forces were led by brilliant commanders, but we must not overlook the character and performance of the men who make up the rank and the file. They sacrificed everything. They suffered, bled, and died over land and sea, in the air, and under the water and never asked for any favors until the victory was ours.

Now the same men and women are asking for release from service in order to return to civilian life and take up where they left off when they took up arms.

Parents want their boys back. The older men are carrying and have carried the load on the farms and in the factories until they are breaking down. Wives and children are begging to have their husbands and fathers back. Many men have little children at home. The responsibility of the Government now is to get every boy home as quickly as possible. Transportation and shipping must not be allowed to slow down the demobilization program.

Several months ago I introduced a simple bill providing for the prompt discharge of remaining sons in a family where one son has lost his life in the armed services. Grief-stricken mothers and fathers have lost one boy—they want the other returned to the family circle. Can we not have action on a simple bill of this kind?

While the War and Navy Departments both report that demobilization is going forward with full speed yet there appear to be innumerable inequalities. The point system does not always appear to be exactly fair. Moreover there are thousands of cases in which men are held as essential when they have a sufficient number of points. How about this situation? Washington is overflowing with high-ranking officers yet men in the ranks such as mail clerks, storekeepers, yoemen, and so forth, are held as essential regardless of points.

Maj. C. L. Lambert, an outstanding lawyer and citizen of Sigourney, Iowa, who served with honor and distinction in World War I and again for a long period in this war and during the intervening years as a National Guard officer, brought to my attention a letter from a soldier stationed in Japan. He describes conditions for the American servicemen as being worse since the war was over than when the fighting was on. Situations such as he describes should be investigated and I am taking the liberty to include in my remarks excerpts both from Major Lambert's letter and from the one received from the soldier, whose name is withheld for obvious reasons:

Hon. KARL M. LECOMPTE,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR KARL: I am sure you will be very much interested in knowing how some of our fighting men are being treated that are still in the service and you might have an opportunity to take it up with the right place in the War Department where it will do some good.

I am inclosing herewith a letter from a soldier who has been in the service for over 2 years and who has a Purple Heart with an Oak Leaf Cluster indicating he was twice wounded in battle. The mere fact that he has gone from a recruit to a staff sergeant in the Infantry in 2 years will indicate that he is a high-class young man. He is not quite 21 years of age.

His mother and father are very much exercised over the letter. He is a member of the Twenty-seventh Division, now in Japan. He received his wounds on Okinawa.

I am satisfied that perhaps this is an isolated case and that many of the soldiers are being much better treated. However, I am not so sure that there are not many other instances fully as bad or worse.

I believe if this letter of this soldier is properly placed in the War Department it will bring forth an immediate investigation and probably result in the elimination of conditions complained of.

It would seem to me that a soldier twice wounded and not fully recovered should be commended rather than censored for complaining about such treatment, both for himself and his fellow soldiers.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,
Yours very truly,

C. J. LAMBERT.

FUKUSHIMA, JAPAN,
October 14, 1945.

DEAR FOLKS: Just thought I'd drop a few lines to let you know that I am all right. We are still in the same place here. We are really catching it now. They work the men night and day here and they are forcing them to wade mud and water up to their knees to do common work that Japs can do. It is worse now than when there is a war. The USO commando "brass hats" we have now are really making it miserable for the men. If it was combat it would be different. Then they are good to the men because they are afraid of the men. The "brass hats" we have now never saw a battle and are just out of the States and think they won the war. They take all the souvenirs such as rifles, sabers, pistols, and so forth, and leave us who fought the war without anything. All the men who have been in battle with this outfit have been wounded once or twice and can't get anything and get all the dirty work. Seems like there is no more democracy in this country. If things get much worse I think I'll turn in my stripes and go to the guard house. Especially if I don't go home soon. I am completely fed up with the way it is run now.

The division goes to the States in December but one needs 60 points to go with it. I have but 54. It's pretty darn poor friends and neighbors one has and Congressmen when they can't get combat men home. I have been wounded twice over here and it has ruined my physical condition and left me with two bad legs and they can't even get us home.

I read in a paper from the States that stated 70 pointers would be out by October 1 and 60 pointers by November 1. At present, they still have men in the company with 84 points. Looks like they are pulling the wool over your eyes back there. All of us over here are completely fed up with the situation. Seems like they forgot us or just don't care.

ROBERT.

The boys are not getting home as fast as they should. Men with long service are being held in Germany, Japan, China and in the islands and at stations everywhere, men who have richly earned a discharge. Men are held too long in the Aleutians. Often the food is poor and inadequate. Some men have been "advised" that they better not write to their Congressmen and doubtless many boys do not write us, out of fear of consequences. In the following case a wife sent to me a letter from her husband in which he told her of the destruction of Government property on one of the Pacific islands. I quote from this letter but withhold the writer's name:

Sergeant ——— has been telling of seeing natives at work (while driving with his friend), digging huge pits about 20 feet by 30 feet by 15 feet. His friend said, "Just wait till we drive a bit farther and you'll see what they're for." And sure enough. There we saw how rifles, clothing, equipment of all sorts were being buried just to get rid of it. It really hurts to think that that may be the fate of my carbine that I've babied all these months and of my clothes all freshly laundered and mended. Especially when our allies just across the China Sea will probably go underclothed this winter. Think of all the wonderful things that could be made of all that cloth.

The morale of the Army and Navy is at a low ebb. One high-ranking officer told me recently in a frank conversation that there are more men a. w. o. l. now than at any time in the Army's history; the number now goes into the thousands and men are a. w. o. l. in every theater of operation.

Another matter that is causing much dissatisfaction is the food handed out to boys in some islands of the Pacific. Let me quote one paragraph from a letter written by a young friend whose statement speaks for itself:

Well I just came back from dinner. The food around here is a damn shame. After every meal I'm still hungry and I'm not the only one. They don't feed us anything. We had stew for dinner but it just consisted of water and gravy and two or three pieces of meat in it for each man. That is all. No potatoes, nothing filling. Bread, no butter. They've been giving us one piece of bread per meal. If they can't feed us they haven't any right to keep us here. I've had plenty of bad food in the Army, but I've never been starved before. You can't get seconds on any of it—except water. I don't care about the quality, I'd like some quantity for a change. One of the boys in my room told a colonel the other day that we'd starve if it wasn't for the bread. The meals got better then for a couple of days, but now they are just like they were before. What a life—may all brass hats responsible burn in hell. I'm hungry, how are you?

The slowness in discharging men, the delays in getting them home, the failure to grant discharges where men are needed at home—all combine to militate against any program for universal military training. If the leaders in Congress and in the Army and Navy really want a universal training law it might be advisable to speed up demobilization and see to it that all men with 2 years' service and men with battle wounds are given the privilege of being discharged by March 1, 1946.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley at the fifty-second annual fall luncheon meeting, Bronx Board of Trade, October 18, 1945:

It was with particular pleasure that I accepted the invitation of the Bronx Board of Trade to speak at this meeting. I do not know of any association which has shown a greater interest in getting the facts as to its postwar problems with greater intelligence than has been demonstrated by Mr. Adolph J. Chesley, your president; Mr. W. E. Matthews, executive secretary, and members of the Bronx Board of Trade. There seems to be in your membership and among your officials an awareness of the significance of attaining and maintaining high levels of production and employment through bold plans made by the Bronx businessmen.

Our memories are short, indeed, if we do not remember that 5 years ago America enjoyed its best peacetime year. With 46,000,000 people gainfully employed we produced roughly $100,000,000,000 in goods and services. That was after 7 years of experimentation by a government that was feeling its way and by businessmen who were not at all times in possession of the solution to many of our problems. It was truly the "age of experiment."

It was in this situation that we were confronted with war. War broke out and raised our economy to new high levels.

We have had four enemies from the beginning of this war: Germany, Italy, and Japan; and the fourth one, unemployment. That enemy has still to be licked. The only way to defeat that enemy lies in expansion, and when we speak reconversion, I would like to emphasize that we must reconvert and expand, because it will do us little good to reconvert to 1940 standards. If we were to open up tomorrow morning where we left off in mid-year 1940, we would have millions of unemployed, a cut-back of almost 60 percent, and an excess of $100,000,000,000 worth of left-over war goods scattered over six continents.

We are in possession of the key to the greatest era America has ever seen, based on a backlog of demands which must be fulfilled to provide us with the same types of equipment at the level of living that we were enjoying in 1940.

Let us examine what they are. In 1940, Americans drove 28,000,000 automobiles. By the end of last year, we were down to 23,000,000 cars. With the completion of reconversion, and if Americans act as they always have, we shall then want to drive in America 33,000,000 automobiles, so that the industry is short 10,000,000 cars right now.

We should have to build 554,000 new homes every year to take care of expansion in families. There has been no building since 1941, so that we are short 2,000,000 dwelling units of one kind or another. That will require a 4-year construction operation.

Since Pearl Harbor we have had more than 7,000,000 marriages. Imagine the gigantic production necessary to give those couples the many things that they will need to set up housekeeping.

What about the electrical-appliance industry? We are short 70,000,000 electrical appliances. Many are putting ice in electric refrigerators, because they cannot get parts and equipment.

What about the railroads in America? What about new hotels, new buses, new transportation, telephone companies, your utilities? All require replacements. That will require primary sources of labor right across the board.

Truly, we have never had an era of opportunity like this one. In America, with the highest living standard in the world, over 80 percent of our farm homes do not have central bath rooms and heating plants. Think of the possibilities in electrifying farm homes and supplying electrical tools and equipment.

However, most of the planning for a sustained high level of employment and high national income, will terminate abruptly after our accumulated wants are filled, unless we learn to sell more goods to more people than ever has been thought possible. There are no previous sales records to which we can return. A glance at our war-production record shows that there could never again be any doubt of the ability of American industry to produce anything in any desired quantities. However, there is still doubt about the ability of our distribution channels to carry away mass production into the hands of the consumer.

If industry is going to produce 41.6 percent more goods than were produced in 1940, our distribution must certainly increase the volume of sales in order to meet this great increase in production. What are the reasons to believe that we have a great potential market for this increased production? Let us look at the record. Have people saved during the war? Yes; they have saved more money since Pearl Harbor than they saved in the previous 170 years of the existence of the American Republic.

During the war, people have paid off their debts, their mortgages, and cleaned up their time payments on refrigerators, automobiles, and other installment purchases. Therefore, I am inclined to feel that these people feel more secure and confident, and will want to make the purchases that they have been thinking of during the war. Adding up all savings of unincorporated businesses and so forth, our total savings are more than $100,000,000,000.

Recent surveys of a true cross section representing the mass market of America, show that most people plan new purchases. Eighty-five percent intend to replace major articles that have worn out. This includes automobiles, refrigerators, home furnishings and new homes. These are planned purchases by people who have money.

At this point, if I may, I would like to present the results of a research project by the marketing committee of the Committee for Economic Development, called American Industry Looks Ahead, and a supplement, Postwar Views of American Manufacturers. This research project endavored to answer the following question: Will business be good in America when our industrial machine has been reconverted for peacetime pursuits? To us in this country, there is today no question more challenging than that, and I suppose there is no question to which more Americans everywhere are more anxiously seeking an answer.

And at the same time that we ask whether business will be good after reconversion, there are other questions that spring to our minds.

How many people will have jobs in the United States? How good will business be—and how large will employment be in the manufacturing industries? How will things be in your industry—and in mine? If we are to have a high peacetime level of production, sales, and employment, when will that materialize?

This report is the first forecast yet produced in any such detail giving the estimates of industry leaders and trades associations as to early peacetime market prospects. It covers no fewer than 290 classifications of processed and finished goods. I repeat, it is a forecast made by American businessmen themselves—1,564 manufacturers and trade associations.

Now, what do the leading manufacturers and trade associations foresee as the volume of goods which they will be able to make and sell in the first full year after reconversion—a year which might begin in September 1946? It is this: 41.6 percent more than in 1939. In some minds the increase is as high as 75 percent. Let me emphasize this figure—41.6 percent more goods and services produced in America in 1947 than in 1939. That is what manufacturers themselves are counting on, given an economic climate which will encourage risk taking. We have learned to produce abundantly for war. We have it in our power—and our manufacturers know it—to produce abundantly for peace.

To accomplish a task of this size we must recognize a new concept of the importance of selling. And this new concept must be based on a scientific analysis of our markets. We must rely less on hunches and intuition in the field of marketing and depend more on testing and measurement.

Walter D. Fuller, chairman of the CED Development Division, under whose auspices the CED marketing committee undertook its marketing survey, explains its scope as follows:

"The marketing committee's job was not to do the forecasting but to put together and interpret the result. The market appraisal is thus a composite view of postwar markets for manufactured goods by American manufacturers themselves. The opinions as to the significance of this view, so far as the level of postwar employment is concerned, are those of the marketing committee.

"The importance of the study is obvious. As a forecast of markets, it should be directly useful to the manufacturing industry, to the wholesale and retail trade, and to other business interests. Beyond this, it has much value as an interim check on the level of the manufacturing industry's postwar anticipating and planning.

"Its broader implications have significance for industry itself, for Government, and for all who are concerned with the economic future of our country."

But, this is only part of the picture. The other part is that it is of no use to produce this immense volume of goods—and, in fact, they will not be produced—unless they can be sold.

Those of you who are specialists in distribution, it is you and the selling staffs under you to whom industry turns in these first postwar years. Forty-two percent more production means the need for 42 percent more sales.

Is this too lofty an ambition? Can Americans effectively absorb 42 percent more of the goods of life than they ever did before the war? Permit me to repeat myself; CED believes they can and want to, and will, if they have the purchasing power. Sumner Slichter of Harvard, chairman of the CED

advisory board, has made an impressive estimate of the huge volume of "catching-up demand" for consumer goods which would sustain the national market for years, and of the unprecedented volume of liquid individual savings that will be available to support the demand.

But the "catching-up demand" can be only the beginning of the story of America's future prosperity. Sales must be maintained after deferred wartime needs are satisfied, so that the later period will be a sustained high level of employment.

The challenge to Bronx business lies in preparing first, to produce this increased volume of production and then, and more important, to sell these goods.

New kinds of goods, the results of startling inventions, will be produced. Improvements have been made in familiar goods. These will stir up demand.

More customers for the stores will result from population increases. Already, at the end of February 1944, it was estimated that population had reached nearly 138,000,000.

The yearly income of the people of the Bronx—the per capita income, all translated into the buying power of the dollar as it was in 1926—increased four times between 1850 and 1937. Because this tremendous expansion has taken place there is good reason to believe it can take place again.

How did the people of this Nation climb up the ladder to higher standards of living? The answer is, by continually using more goods, thus creating more factory production and more employment. The retailers, wholesalers, salesmen, and advertisers of America persuaded them to own and use these goods.

More than any other people in the world, Americans demand more and better goods. They seek improvements, and they expect manufacturers to satisfy them. They feel themselves to be free individuals, not held down by caste or creed, and they expect to get ahead.

One major reason for expecting people to buy is that we have people who know how to sell. Our system of getting goods to the people, of distributing, or marketing them, has no equal in the world. Every family is within reach of a store, every store is reached by wholesalers, every wholesaler is reached by manufacturers. These families speak one language, want similar goods, have high standards of living, and are not divided by tariff barriers such as are found in Europe.

Nowhere else in the world does there exist such a gigantic market. It has made possible our methods of organized distribution, which in turn have made possible our methods of mass production. Every retailer in America shares these benefits.

As I said a moment ago, a recent survey of a true cross section representing the mass market of America shows that most people plan new purchases. No survey is needed to tell any retailer that if the public was asked, "Do you want to dress better and eat better after the war?" they would answer "Yes."

Bronx retailers and wholesalers also intend to replace worn-out equipment. Manufacturing establishments need to make substantial purchases of equipment and machinery.

While employment can be expected to remain high, and the total wage income of the country large, the truly anxious question is whether the people as a whole will wait to see how things turn out before buying. If the whole Nation hesitates, a depression with serious unemployment can result.

Retailers of the Bronx and all those who sell goods can help overcome this hesitation by well-planned sales and advertising programs, ready to launch at the proper time.

It is hard to believe that if the present restrictions are relaxed and more goods make their appearance, the people will not spend at least some part of their great savings. If they should spend too freely while goods are still scarce, the results would be dangerous, sending prices up and causing inflation. Moderate spending is to be hoped for, rather than a scramble for scarce merchandise.

Great changes may be looked for, following the two greatest wars and the greatest depression in history. No retailer can expect conditions to stand still. The growth of the department store followed the depression of the early 1900's, and the growth of the chain store followed World War I and the depression of the early 1920's.

New kinds of retailing are now being planned in some quarters, and new methods of distribution from manufacturer to retailer. Retailers who are alive to changes and who lay their own plans will be better able to meet changes as they come.

Without committing themselves completely to an optimistic forecast, retailers may well decide to take all the steps necessary for estimating their future volume of business, and for laying out the programs they would need to follow in order to handle that volume when it develops.

Retailers and wholesalers will always be needed to get goods to the people. They are as necessary as factories. Here is the reason:

America's famous mass production is made possible by a production line on which each worker performs one specialized job instead of several jobs. The division of labor turns out more goods.

Likewise, on the consumption line, as we may name it, stretching from the factory to the family, each specialized worker, whether retailer, wholesaler, agent or broker, salesman or advertising man, performs a separate job. This division of labor is as efficient as necessary and deserves as much credit as that of the production line.

In fact, the Nation's consumption line has moved faster than the production line. It is always calling for more goods. That is one of the ways we have climbed to new levels of national wealth.

The goods that will be made in factories must also be sold. That is to a great degree the responsibility of retailers. Even production goods, steel, machinery, chemicals in the end produce goods for ultimate consumers. All manufacture ends in the retail sale.

In one of our best peacetime years—1939—more than 17,000 Bronx businessmen were engaged in retail trade. They provided employment for more than 26,300 individual employees who indirectly contributed to the maintenance of almost 100,000 people. These employees were paid over $32,000,000 in wages, while their employers maintained an investment of $31,000,000 in stocks of goods on hand.

By turning over their combined stocks more than 10 times, our retailers contributed almost $349,000,000 to the Nation's total volume of retail sales.

The war has exacted its toll of proprietors of retail establishments and clerks for the armed services and for war work. Many opportunities will therefore exist in the coming months for reestablishment of retail business by former proprietors as well as for new enterprisers who I hope will come from the ranks of boys who were once clerks.

Our citizens have borne without complaint the shortages of civilian goods and the special services to which they were accustomed in the prewar years. However, it is quite clear, that with the war's end, business will remain only with progressive retailers who plan to return quickly to prompt, courteous, customer treatment, with accommodations, goods, and services greatly enlarged over what was considered to be excellent retail service prewar.

A retailer who thinks he can slip easily into the postwar period by merely letting more customers come in his door and ordering more goods as he needs them, may be due for a rude awakening. Changes will not come as suddenly as an earthquake, but come they will.

New kinds of stores are now being planned and when they are set up they will be vigorous 1947 models. The pull from new buying power in the public, and the push from wholesalers and manufacturers, will demand aggressive selling.

Reconversion, in retailing, begins with the retailer. It affects men rather than machines, though the changes in their ideas may change their stores, too.

In the field of construction there are thousands of job opportunities for the city's carpenters, painters, plasterers, masons, bricklayers, electricians, plumbers, and similar occupations. The construction of new commercial, industrial, and residential structures will revive local construction activity and bring it back in step with the recurring 18-year building cycle; a major upturn in construction is overdue. The revamping and adequate servicing of our loft and office buildings alone will provide jobs for many.

In the residential field at least 200,000 family dwelling units will be required to provide housing for the natural population increase up to the present time.

This urgent market may total $1,000,000,000. In addition, there is the need for replacement of 470,000 old-law tenements representing another $2,000,000,000 in the not too distant future. The trend in commercial construction is well illustrated by the recently announced $15,000,000 trade center, planned for the four-block St. John's Park terminal site in downtown Manhattan.

I know that the Bronx retailers, wholesalers, service trades people and construction people here in the Bronx in cooperation with CED and the Bronx Board of Trade have done a splendid job of planning for the sale of this increased volume of production, and it is only through an understanding of his responsibility to sell this increased volume, on the part of every wholesaler, retailer and service trade person, that we are going to be able to maintain a high level of production and employment right here in the Bronx.

Things don't happen; they are planned and brought about. I am convinced that if your organization and other organizations of a like character in the Bronx work together in the cooperative way you have in the past, our reconversion goal will be obtained.

Britain Poisons Minds of People of India Against the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I herewith submit an interesting letter from a returned official of an important branch of the service. It is self-explanatory. It underscores the attempt of Britain to hurt us in India.

DECEMBER 16, 1945.

Congressman E. CELLER,
New York State.

DEAR SIR: In response to your request I am preparing this account of my observations in India during 1945. I hope that you will find material here that will aid you in furthering the just and legitimate interests of the United States of America and of continuing world peace.

It came as something of a surprise to me, upon arriving in the India-Burma theater, to learn that American officers and officials are unofficially but clearly discouraged from attempting close contacts with Indians. An attempt is made to segregate the American in India and to prevent him from getting to

know India or Indians well. I was informally instructed by my superiors to stay away from Indian politics and political figures. I was not to show any interest in things Indian and I discovered that it was considered bad form to show such interest.

Furthermore, we were informed that we were in India by the kindness of the British and that we should at all times be careful to keep them happy. Unfortunately most of the British there were more or less frank to show their dislike and distrust of America and Americans. I traveled a great deal and largely with British officers. This gave me plenty of opportunity to discover their sentiments.

It came as a distinct shock to discover that the main sources of news about America for India, such as Reuters Agency, were careful to slant their news about America in such ways as to tend to breed ill will and misunderstanding about our country. Leading British papers in India usually took an unhelpful attitude toward the U. S. A. in editorials, etc.

During the year I was there I felt a distinct deterioration of our position and prestige taking place. I feel certain that our status in India and the Far East has materially declined during the war. Perhaps this is an understatement.

Frequently the Reuters dispatches, prominently featured in leading papers there, carried stories about our race riots and ill-treatment of Negroes. Shortly after the Phillips letter had been published in America, and apparently to counteract its good effect in India, several such stories of race problems in America appeared in such papers as the British-owned Statesman. It had the desired ill effect.

An example of other types of anti-American news in India was the anonymous letter published by the Statesman late in 1944 purporting to be from an Anglo-Indian girl who had been "seduced" and abandoned with a child by an unnamed American officer. The girl threatened suicide. Several months later a member of the Central Legislative Assembly asked the government if the letter had ever been proved to be authentic and the government admitted that it appeared that the story was not true. Nothing was ever done publicly, however, to deny the letter. In a country such as India a letter of that type was destined to cause considerable criticism of Americans.

A more recent and most far-reaching example of news stories slanted for anti-American sentiments occurred shortly after the recent monetary-loan talks began between Britain and the United States. One morning most of the English-language newspapers of India carried headlines stating that America demanded that Britain reduce or cancel her debt to India in return for a loan. The Indians were naturally greatly put out by this seemingly unreasonable demand and were instantly greatly irritated with America. We had only the stories there to go by (the account was carried to India by Reuters) and we also couldn't understand why our Government had made such a demand. Upon returning to the States I asked why our Government had demanded that the Indian debt be canceled and discovered that the stories which had appeared in India were quite distorted and that actually our loan negotiations had contained requests concerning the dissolution of the dollar pool which would have met with high approval in Indian circles; unfortunately the story wasn't carried that way. It is hard to understand why our foreign service in India made no statement to clarify the distorted version of the facts which appeared in India and which did us so much harm there.

In the realm of business, too, attempts were made to cause Indians to look with disfavor on opportunities for doing business with America. India represents a tremendous market which could be of great value to America and, also, India would benefit by importing plants, machinery, and consumers' goods from us. Britain can't fill that market for some time to come but won't let us enter it if possible. India was promised about $40,000,000 worth of dollar credit from the dollar pool for the period 1944–46; but, getting such credits to buy with proves very difficult. So far only $5,000,000 of credit has been released out of the $40,000,000 promised and actually India needs and wants much more than $40,000,000 in credits. Red tape and delay are used extensively to avoid granting such credit. It is common knowledge that bribery is actually the only practical method of getting credits.

The Government of India has announced plans to send students to America for studies—always carefully avoided in the past—but it is not generally known that most of those students are to be trusted Government employees who will not pick up ideas of freedom over here. Bona fide students who have their own funds and want to come here to study are regularly turned down. A visa is usually granted them but the Reserve bank refuses or delays forever in granting them dollars for their rupees. Many students I knew had been trying for a year or more to get to come to America to study. Many were frankly told it would be much better for them to go to England.

Indian booksellers were everywhere most anxious to get books about America from here but all experienced utmost difficulty if not complete impossibility in getting permission to buy books from America. As a result, we could not buy books about our own country which we wanted to read and which Indians also wanted to read.

Besides all of these matters, there was the inescapable fact that the people of India and of southeast Asia expected American leadership in their progress toward greater freedom and opportunity and looked too long in vain for such leadership. They are everywhere disillusioned with us and are counting us as tacit supporters of the reestablishment of empire. It was widely pointed out in India, often by British agencies, that the words "freedom" and "justice" do not appear in the United Nations Charter and that we supported Britain against Russia in the matter of the Russian demand for a clearcut statement about colonies. It is hard to believe that America has gone so far down the road from the ideals of its founders. The colonial world expected a great deal from us and the way the news gets out there it seems as though we have not only done nothing constructive but have actually alined ourselves with the reestablishment of colonial domination. During the war our agents carried statements about the "four freedoms" into the Jap-held countries of southeast Asia, now those people are trying to realize those freedoms and are met with American equipment used by British troops against them.

Wendell Willkie warned some time ago that we were losing our fund of good will out there. I think we have lost it and that it has been in good part due to slanted propaganda against us and to the failure of our foreign service, many of whom seem more concerned with Britain's estate than with our own, to speak up to counteract such slanted items.

After all, foreign peoples do not look upon us as we look upon ourselves. We think we are good and have good motives. We take that for granted. Apparently we think our opinion of ourselves is shared by other people; but unfortunately it is not. A conscious effort is needed to assure the world of our real motives and interests. Propaganda against us only makes it more imperative that we know our minds and that we let other people know what we stand for.

I trust this gives you some idea of what has happened to our status in the eastern part of the world during this war. I know I am not the only American who was there who feels as I do about these matters.

Resolution on Atomic Energy Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a resolution on atomic-energy control, supported by more than 200 members of the National Academy of Sciences, which was submitted to me by Robert S. Mulligan, professor of physics, University of Chicago:

RESOLUTION ON ATOMIC-ENERGY CONTROL

I

The Johnson-May bill for the regulation of atomic energy, now before Congress, does not protect the vital interests of the United States. This bill should be withdrawn.

Amendments have not corrected the essential defects of the bill. They retain the objectionable features of the original bill. The bill, if enacted, would—

1. Weaken the national defense.
2. Jeopardize the democratic institutions of the American people.
3. Frustrate fundamental research necessary to the maintenance of American leadership in the development of atomic energy.
4. Set up an authority within the United States responsible to no one—not even to the President or the Congress.
5. Take atomic energy away from the American people, where the President says it belongs, with the danger that it may become the exclusive property of the military.
6. Make it more difficult, perhaps impossible, to stop the present drift toward an atomic armaments race.
7. Block the normal negotiation of international agreements in the field of atomic energy, and interfere with attempts to set up vitally necessary international controls.

The bill, as now amended, creates a commission with autonomous powers not only in the area of atomic military research but in scientific, medical, and industrial fields. The new amendments do not require the Commission to license independent research or to make materials available to independent laboratories under proper safeguards. Nor are standards set up under the bill for atomic research privileges. The Commisison would have power to grant exclusive rights in atomic energy development to certain private companies, or to withhold these rights from other companies at its own discretion.

II

In our judgment, any legislation in this field should, as a minimum, provide the following:

First. The Commission and its administrator should be responsible to the President and to Congress. They should be removable by the President in the same manner as Cabinet officers.

Second. Any secrecy regulations should be applicable only to the disclosure of the design features and laboratory tests pertaining to the plant and to details of the atomic bomb itself; that is, only to such matters as are normally kept secret when the manufacture of munitions or weapons of war is involved. We note that the President of the United States has distinguished between the scientific knowledge and the design features, tests, plants, and details of the bomb itself. Other regulations should be limited to removing hazards to safety.

Third. Prior to promulgation, all secrecy regulations should be reviewed by a special Cabinet committee to make sure that the public interest in full disclosure is protected whenever possible.

Fourth. To protect individual research, the Commission should be required to provide sufficient materials, under proper safeguards, to make independent research possible. It should be made perfectly clear that the Commission has no power to control research.

Fifth. The Commission should be required, after an appropriate interval, to recommend to the Congress a program setting forth the standards which should apply to the Government regulation of the industrial use of atomic energy. Until such a program has been recommended and enacted by the Congress, the Commission should not have any power to permit the use of atomic power for industrial purposes. Such a program should deal specifically with such problems as patents, exclusive rights, and those steps to be taken to encourage private enterprise to assist in this development. Research and experiments looking toward the industrial use of atomic power should be permitted prior to the submission of the industrial program.

Sixth. We believe that the free exchange of scientific information with the United Nations as proposed by the President is of the utmost importance, and is not entirely separate from the development of a domestic program. Atomic power has been made possible only by the work of scientists all over the world. Many of the most eminent of these scientists are not in the United States and are citizens of foreign countries. Legislation must be framed by the Congress so as to take advantage of such international agreements as may be achieved, and to permit the free exchange of scientific information, not only within our own country, but with foreign scientists.

III

President Truman has said: "Never in history has society been confronted with a power so full of potential danger and at the same time so full of promise." Surely, any legislation on a subject so momentous deserves the gravest consideration by Congress. We welcome the creation of the special committee of the United States Senate to deal exhaustively with these matters. Equal consideration must be given by the House of Representatives. To forestall the dangers and realize the promises of atomic energy, Congress owes the American people the best legislation which its combined wisdom can draft.

Respectfully submitted by the undersigned members of the National Academy of Sciences:

Charles Greeley Abbot, director, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.; Comfort Avery Adams, Edward G. Budd Manufacturing Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; Thomas Addis, professor of medicine, Stanford University; Robert Grant Aitken, emeritus director, Lick Observatory; Abraham Adrian Albert, professor of mathematics, University of Chicago; James Waddell Alexander, Institute of Advanced Study, Princeton University; Charles Elmer Allen, professor of botany, University of Wisconsin; John August Anderson, Mount Wilson Solar Observatory, Pasadena, Calif.; James Rowland Angell, president emeritus, Yale University; Charles Armstrong, medical director, United States Public Health Service, Washington, D. C.; Harold Delos Babcock, Mount Wilson Observatory, Pasadena, Calif.; Irving Widmer Bailey, biological laboratories, Harvard University; Wilder Dwight Bancroft, emeritus professor of physical chemistry, Cornell University; Philip Bard, professor, school of medicine, Johns Hopkins University; Gregory Paul Baxter, professor of chemistry, Harvard University; George Wells Beadle, professor of biology, Stanford University; Charles P. Berkey, emeritus professor of geology, Columbia University; Henry Bryant Bigelow, museum of comparative zoology, Harvard University; Raymond Thayer Birge, chairman, department of physics, University of California; Eliot Blackwelder, head of department of geology, Stanford University; Alfred Blalock, surgeon in chief, Johns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore, Md.; Hans Frederik Blichfeldt, research laboratory, General Electric Co., Schenectady, N. Y.; Gilbert Ames Bliss, emeritus professor of mathematics, University of Chicago; Marston Taylor Bogert, emeritus professor of chemistry, Columbia University; Edwin G. Boring, professor of psychology, Harvard University; Norman L. Bowen, professor of geology, University of Chicago; Gregory Breit, ballistic research laboratory, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.; Percy Williams Bridgman, professor of mathematics and natural philosophy, Harvard University.

Arthur Francis Buddington, professor of geology, Princeton University; Douglas Houghton Campbell, professor of botany, Stanford University; Anton Julius Carlson, emeritus professor of physiology, University of Chicago; William Bosworth Castle, professor of medicine, Harvard Medical School; William Ernest Castle, research consultant, University of California; Rollin Thomas Chamberlin, professor of geology, University of Chicago; Charles Manning Child, emeritus professor of zoology, Stanford University; Hans Thacher Clarke, professor of chemistry, College of Physicians and Surgeons, New York City; Ralph Erskine Cleland, professor of botany and bacteriology, Indiana University; Arthur Byron Coble, professor of mathematics, University of Illinois; William W. Coblentz, physicist, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D. C.; Carl Ferdinand Cori, professor of pharmacology, and biochemistry, Washington University, School of Medicine; John N. Couch, professor of botany, University of North Carolina; Henry Crew, professor of physics, Northwestern University; Reginald A. Daly, emeritus professor of geology, Harvard University; Bergen Davis, emeritus professor of physics, Columbia University; Clinton J. Davisson, Bell Telephone Laboratories, New York, N. Y., Nobel prize 1937, physics; Arthur L. Day, director (retired), geophysical laboratory, Carnegie Institution, Bethesda, Md.; A. J. Dempster, professor of physics, University of Chicago; John Dewey, emeritus professor of philosophy, Columbia University; L. E. Dickson, emeritus professor of mathematics, University of Chicago; Th. Dobzhansky, professor of zoology, Columbia University; E. A. Doisy, director of department of physiology and biochemistry, St. Louis University School of Medicine; Hugh L. Dryden, Chief, Mechanics and Sound Division, Bureau of Standards, Washington, D. C.; Carl O. Dunbar, director, Peabody Museum, Yale University; L. C. Dunn, executive officer, department of zoology, Columbia University.

C. A. Elvehjem, professor of biochemistry, University of Wisconsin; R. A. Emerson, professor of plant breeding, Cornell University; Joseph Erlanger, professor of physiology, Washington University School of Medicine; Henry Eyring, professor of physical chemistry, Princeton University; Wallace O. Fenn, professor, School of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Rochester; M. L. Fernald, Fisher professor of natural history, Harvard University; John A. Fleming, director, department of terrestrial magnetism, Carnegie Institution of Washington, D. C.; Paul D. Foote, director of research, Gulf Research & Development Co.; J. Franck, professor of chemistry, University of Chicago, Nobel prize, 1925, physics; R. C. Fuson, professor of chemistry, University of Illinois; Henry Gilman, professor of chemistry, Iowa State College; William K. Gregory, American Museum of Natural History, New York City, N. Y.; William D. Harkins, professor of chemistry, University of Chicago; R. A. Harper, emeritus professor of botany, Columbia University; Ross G. Harrison, emeritus professor of biology, Yale University; E. B. Hart, professor of agricultural chemistry, University of Wisconsin; Carl G. Hartman, professor of zoology and physiology, University of Illinois; Selig Hecht, professor of biophysics, Columbia University; Michael Heidelberger, College of Physicians and Surgeons, New York, N. Y.; Ludvig Hektoen, Chicago Tumor Institute, Chicago, Ill.; C. Judson Herrick, emeritus professor of comparative neurology, University of Chicago; Joel H. Hildebrand, chairman, department of chemistry, dean, College of Letters and Science, University of California; William Hovgaard, emeritus professor of naval construction, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Edwin P. Hubble, ballistic research laboratory, Aberdeen Proving Ground; Claude S. Hudson, Director of Division of Chemistry, National Institute of Public Health, United States Public Health Service; George A. Hulett, emeritus professor of physical chemistry, Princeton University.

Albert W. Hull, assistant director, research laboratory, General Electric Co., Schenectady, N. Y.; Clark L. Hull, Institute of Human Relations, Yale University; Walter S. Hunter, professor of psychology and director of laboratory, Brown University; Vladimir Ipatieff, professor of chemistry, Northwestern University; Herbert E. Ives, physicist, Bell Telephone Laboratories, New York, N. Y.; M. H. Jacobs, school of medicine, University of Pennsylvania; D. F. Jones, department of genetics, Connecticut Agricultural Experimental Station; Edward Kasner, Adrian professor of mathematics, Columbia University; Edwin C. Kemble, professor of physics, Harvard University; A. V. Kidder, chairman, division historical research, Carnegie Institution, Cambridge, Mass.; John G. Kirkwood, professor of physical chemistry, Cornell University; Adolph Knopf, director of graduate studies, department of geology, Yale University; Charles A. Kraus, professor of chemistry, director of chemical research, Brown University; L. O. Kunkel, Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, Princeton, N. J.; Irving Langmuir, associate director research laboratory, General Electric Co., Schenectady, N. Y.; K. S. Lashley, director, Yerkes Laboratories of Primate Biology, Orange Park, Fla.; W. M. Latimer, dean, college of chemistry, University of California; Armin O. Leuschner, emeritus professor of astronomy, University of California; Warren H. Lewis, Wistar Institute of Anatomy and Biology, Philadelphia, Pa.; S. C. Lind, dean, institute of technology, University of Minnesota; Ralph Linton, professor of anthropolgy, Columbia University; C. C. Little, director, Jackson Memorial Laboratory, Bar Harbor, Maine; Leo Loeb, emeritus professor of pathology, Washington University; Warfield T. Longcope, physician in chief, Johns Hopkins Hospital; Chester R. Longwell, chairman, department of geology, Yale University; Theodore Lyman, director, Jefferson Physical Laboratory, Harvard University; J. B. Macelwane, director, institute of geophysics, St. Louis University.

Duncan A. MacInnes, Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, New York, N. Y.; Wm. deB. MacNider, Kenan research professor of pharmacology, University of North Carolina; Barbara McClintock, department of genetics, Carnegie Institution, Cold Spring Harbor, Long Island, N. Y.; E. V. McCollum, head of department, School of Hygiene and Public Health, Baltimore, Md.; L. A. Maynard, director, School of Nutrition, Cornell University; E. D. Merrill, director, Arnold Arboretum, Jamaica Plain, Mass.; Ernest Merritt, emeritus professor of physics, Cornell University; K. F. Meyer, Hooper Foundation, University of California medical center; Leonor Michaelis, emeritus member, Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, New York, N. Y.; George R. Minot, director, Thorndike Memorial Laboratory, Boston City Hospital; S. A. Mitchell, director, McCormick Observatory, University of Virginia; Carl R. Moore, chairman, department of zoology, University of Chicago; Joseph H. Moore, Lick Observatory, Mount

Hamilton, Calif.; Marston Morse, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N. J.; F. R. Moulton, secretary, American Association for Advancement of Science, Washington, D. C.; R. S. Mulliken, professor of physics, University of Chicago; John H. Northrop, Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, Princeton, N. J.; F. G. Novy, emeritus dean, Medical School, University of Michigan; Theophilus S. Painter, research professor of zoology, University of Texas; Charles Palache, emeritus professor of mineralogy, Harvard University; J. T. Patterson, director of zoological research, University of Texas; John R. Paul, professor of preventive medicine, Yale University; Linus Pauling, head of division of chemistry, California Institute of Technology; G. W. Pierce, emeritus professor of physics, Harvard University; W. B. Pillsbury, emeritus professor of psychology, University of Michigan; Alfred N. Richards, professor of pharmacology, University of Pennsylvania; J. F. Ritt, professor of mathematics, Columbia University.

O. H. Robertson, head of department of medicine, University of Chicago; W. H. Rodebush, professor of chemistry, University of Illinois; Alfred S. Romer, Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University; William C. Rose, acting head of department of chemistry, University of Illinois; Frank E. Ross, Mount Wilson Observatory, Pasadena, Calif.; William W. Rubey, principal geologist, United States Geological Survey, Washington, D. C.; Florence R. Sabin, emeritus member, Rockefeller Institute, Denver, Colo.; Frederick A. Saunders, emeritus professor of physics, Harvard University; Karl Sax, professor of botany, Harvard University; Adolph H. Schultz, associate professor physical anthropology, Johns Hopkins Medical School; W. B. Scott, emeritus professor of paleontology, Princeton University; Carl E. Seashore, dean pro tempore, department of psychology, State University of Iowa; Philip A. Shaffer, dean of medical school, Washington, University; Harlow Shapley, director of observatory, Harvard University; John C. Slater, head of department of physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Joseph Slepian, associate director of research laboratories, Westinghouse Electric Corp., East Pittsburgh, Pa.; Louis B. Slichter, professor of geophysics, California Institute of Technology; V. M. Slipher, director, Lowell Observatory, Flagstaff, Ariz.; Lyndon F. Small, head chemist, National Institute of Health, United States Public Health Service, Bethesda, Md.; Lee Irvin Smith, chief of division of organic chemistry, University of Minnesota; Philip E. Smith, professor, college of physicians and surgeons, Columbia University; William C. Stadie, professor of medicine, University of Pennsylvania; L. J. Stadler, professor of botany, University of Missouri; W. M. Stanley, member, Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, Princeton, N. J.; Joel Stebbins, Washburn Observatory, Madison, Wis.; Otto Stern, research professor, physics department, Carnegie Institute of Technology; G. W. Stewart, professor and head, department of physics, State University of Iowa.

Calvin P. Stone, professor of psychology, Stanford University; Marshall H. Stone, professor of mathematics, Harvard University; George M. Stratton, emeritus professor of psychology, University of California; George L. Streeter, Johns Hopkins Medical School, Baltimore, Md.; Otto Struve, Yerkes Observatory, University of Chicago; H. U. Sverdrup, professor, Scripps Institute of Oceanography, La Jolla, Calif.; John R. Swanton, ethnologist, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.; William H. Taliaferro, dean, division of biological science, University of Chicago; C. V. Taylor, dean, school of biological science, Standford University; Charles Thom, United States Department of Agriculture (retired), Port Jefferson, N. Y.; T. Y. Thomas, professor of mathematics, Indiana University; Edward L. Thorndike, emeritus professor of psychology, Teachers College, Columbia University; Edward C. Tolman, professor of psychology, University of California; A. M. Tozzer, curator, Peabody Museum, Harvard University; Robert J. Trumpler, professor of astronomy, University of California; Harold C. Urey, professor of chemistry, University of Chicago, Nobel prize for chemistry; H. S. Vandiver, professor of mathematics, University of Texas; C. B. Van Niel, professor of microbiology, Hopkins Marine Station, Stanford University; Donald D. Van Slyke, member, Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, New York, N. Y.; J. H. Van Vleck, professor of physics, Harvard University; T. Wayland Vaughan, emeritus professor and emeritus director, Scripps Institution, Washington, D. C.; Oswald Veblen, professor, school of mathematics, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N. J.; H. B. Vickery, biochemist in charge of laboratories, Connecticut Agricultural Experimental Station, New Haven, Conn.; Selman A. Waksman, professor of soil microbiology, New Jersey State Agricultural Experimental Station, New Brunswick, N. J.; J. C. Walker, professor of plant pathology, University of Wisconsin; Hermann Weyl, professor, school of mathematics, Institute for Advanced Study.

John B. Whitehead, emeritus professor of applied electricity, Johns Hopkins University; Willis R. Whitney, honorary vice president, General Electric Co., Schenectady, N. Y.; E. P. Wigner, Jones professor of mathematical physics, Princeton University; R. R. Williams, chemical division, Bell Telephone Laboratories, New York, N. Y.; B. H. Willier, chairman, department of biology, Johns Hopkins University; George B. Wislocki, Stillman professor of comparative anatomy, Harvard Medical School; Clark Wissler, emeritus curator, American Museum of Natural History, New York, N. Y.; S. B. Wohlbach, School of Medicine, Harvard University; R. W. Wood, research professor of experimental physics, Johns Hopkins University; L. L. Woodruff, director, Osborn Zoological Laboratory, Yale University; Robert S. Woodworth, emeritus professor of psychology, Columbia University; Sewall Wright Burton distinguished service professor of zoology, University of Chicago; W. H. Wright, Lick Observatory, Mount Hamilton, Calif.; Robert M. Yerkes, professor of psychobiology, Yale University School of Medicine; V. K. Zworykin, associate director, R. C. A. Research Laboratories, Princeton, N. J.

Seven Steps by Congressman To Help Make UNO Succeed—It Depends Upon You and Me To Be Builders of World Peace; Do Not Stir Up Misunderstanding, Ill-Will, Suspicion, With Other Members of UNO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, when I yesterday voted to put life blood into the United Nations Organization, I voted to give life to the hopes, aspirations, prayers of the great mass of the American people. Yes; we all hope and we must all work and pray that this time there shall be an enduring world peace. The first chance we now have to set up international peace and security, machinery to enable international accord and collaboration for this enduring world plan is through this very United Nations Organization which we yesterday voted to implement by authorizing the appointment of the United States representatives thereto.

And since so much able and clear explanation has already been made by committee members of just what this bill will do, I wish to take a few minutes to make some observations which I believe are pertinent in this debate. Then I may, on the assumption that every Member of this House wants enduring world peace more than anything else for the world. I want just this very enduring world peace, that none of my neighbors shall lose their sons in another world war as I did mine in this one, and that this world shall live as a world neighborhood instead of a world at each other's economic and social throats.

I make seven suggestions as to our own attitude and conduct in this House with reference to this UNO to wit:

First. Let us mentally make it a must. That is, because we know that another world war, with the atomic power used therein, will result in the destruction of the civilization of man. We know we must have success with the UNO. It is either success through UNO or world chaos. Therefore the UNO must succeed.

Second. Because the choice is either a successful UNO or chaos, because of the atomic power which scientists tell us will now be available to all nations, we must not only conclude mentally that UNO must succeed, but we must all do our dead level best to make it successful. "Lip" service and voting authorization and money is not enough for us to do, or render.

Third. Talk not of its possibility of failure, but rather speak only that it must succeed. Speak at all times of it in terms of something must succeed and about which there can be no room for failures.

Fourth. Do not talk on this floor in terms of ill will, prejudices, hatred, suspicion of the other members of the Organization of which we have become a component part. Whenever we speak of any of them, let us first make sure that what we are impelled to say is not mere gossip or false exaggerated report or hearsay. Let us speak of the other members as we would be ourselves spoken of. Let us not stir up ill will, suspicion, and misunderstanding toward our motives by reason of ill-chosen words or hasty conclusions or unfounded conclusions.

Fifth. Let us consider that we here in Congress are an integral part of this new world instrument for world security. Therefore we must consider ourselves as in a particularly high place to be builders of peace, by reason of only saying the things and doing the acts which are designed to definitely build for an enduring world peace.

Sixth. Be possessed of a mind that the UNO can succeed in a war-torn world. Stop our doubting. Stop our doubting. Stop repeating to one another doubts as to its becoming a success. Stop spreading fear. Be positive for its success instead of negative and doubtful.

Seventh. Keep the UNO in a nonpolitical position in our minds and hearts. By that I mean to say that the peace of the world is more important to me than is the calling of a person by his party affiliation. Counting the cost of the recent war in terms of money and human lives and destinies; adding thereto the waste, heartaches, fears, hates, the chaos both past and future which will result in the world as sure as gospel from this war, it behooves us here and now to dedicate our every material and spiritual resource to the high purpose and the necessity of doing our dead level best as a Congress to make the United Nations Organization a success.

To me this need of enduring world peace is ever present. It is a dominating factor in my attitude toward many things. Upon it depends decisions of destiny by this Congress in your lifetime and mine. There must be no sense of scoffing at the possibility of achieving world peace. Rather, gentlemen, there must be no act, no deed, no word by us—or any of us—which is designed to or which will postpone that day.

It depends upon you and upon me—today, tomorrow—each day to be builders of an enduring world peace—mentally, morally, spiritually, and by what we say and by what we do.

Resolution on Poland

REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is most appropriate on the eve of the birthday of the Prince of Peace that Congress should give its attention to pending great questions affecting world peace.

I am therefore introducing today a resolution in behalf of the Polish people, expressing sympathy with their aspirations for a completely free status and pledging the assistance of this Congress to their aims for a democratic government of their own choice. It seems particularly fitting, at this time when our Secretary of State is engaged in conferences with leading ministers of the United Nations, that this Congress should express the hope that he will be able to bring into the agenda of these conferences the problems of Poland, Lithuania, and other Baltic and Balkan Nations.

It may also be appropriate at this time to hope that at these conferences our Secretary of State may move successfully to fix an early date for the negotiation of permanent treaties of peace and thus end the dangerous policy of international drifting which appears to be generating feelings of distrust and suspicion that may well sow the seeds of future war.

Our able and distinguished Secretary of State is about to confer with the foreign ministers of our principal allies in Moscow. This is the appropriate occasion, therefore, to consider pending great questions which involve on almost a world-wide scale the freedom of millions of worthy democratic-minded peoples. Above all, this is also the time to move for and arrange the early negotiation of final treaties of peace which will determine just, durable, and effective settlements and thus put an end to patchwork, piecemeal diplomacy and the policy of drifting and equivocation on vital international issues before this drifting leads us to the threshold of another great war. I have already urged our Department of State to bring up these questions for discussion at Moscow and earnestly hope that they may be considered.

In connection with the discussion of freedom and self-determination, it is most appropriate for me once again to bring to the attention of the Congress the unfortunate continuing plight of the gallant Polish people, the Lithuanian Nation, and other Baltic and Balkan States which are now suffering from, or threatened with oppression and unwarranted denial of freedom.

It would seem very clear that there is in some places here and abroad, the belief, desire, and hope that previous settlements of the Polish question and other related Baltic and Balkan questions heretofore arrived at by unilateral action or in informal conferences between some of the leaders of the United Nations would, after original protest, be ultimately accepted and approved by the people of the United States. The theory underlying this view is that, if long enough continued, our Nation will forget or overlook these gross and indefensible violations of the Atlantic Charter and our own cherished principles of freedom and justice. And I am not confining my remarks to the areas mentioned above because they are pertinent to informal arrangements heretofore made which affect many other nations and areas. They are equally pertinent to the brutal encroachments of imperialism whereever it reappears in ugly form throughout the world as to the brutalities and violations of totalitarianism.

Be that as it may, so far as I am concerned as a member of Congress, I am not prepared and will not be prepared at any time to forget or overlook these injustices. I endorse as a step in the right direction the principle stated not long ago in substance by our State Department that this government would not accord diplomatic recognition to autonomy over any nation that was based on force, conquest or aggression.

Some of the Allied Nations, including our own, have protested the political systems prevailing in central Europe. The Secretary of State has sharply criticized the situation in formerly hostile Bulgaria in particular, because he regards it as permitting a puppet dictatorial government in that country contrary to the interests and wishes of the people. In logic, the same protest is even more applicable to our faithful ally, Poland, where a puppet government, a ruthless dictatorship based on force, is established by our acquiesence and compliance which, if we can believe reports, is proceeding to throttle freedom and perpetrate outrage after outrage against the God-fearing, liberty-loving, peace-seeking Polish people. This is certainly a great inconsistency and glaring paradox of our current international policy.

If anyone is under the impression and is proceeding on the theory that this situation is going to "blow over," that the delivery of gallant Poland, heroic Lithuania and other brave Baltic and Balkan Nations into the special sphere of Russian influence is going to "blow over" and be forgotten by the American people or by the American Congress merely through inertia and the lapse of time, he is making a great mistake.

The irregular and ill-advised action on Poland by our Government and our allies has provoked the deepest resentment and bitterness among millions of decent, liberty-loving American citizens and this resentment and bitterness is not confined to those of Polish blood but is burning in the heart of every American citizen who loves liberty and believes in and stands for the principles of self-determination and the Atlantic Charter for which precious American blood has been so lavishly spilled all over the world.

What could be more destructive of our professed war aims than for this great, free, and powerful Nation to join with the other nations in turning over the Polish people to an undemocratic and ruthless regime against their will, and without their consent and without action by the United States Senate whose approval of foreign treaties is required by the Constitution. Could we believe for one moment that the United States Senate would ever sanction this outrage?

I am conscious that some Allied statesmen have talked about the political mistakes of the Polish, have advocated the so-called Curzon line as the solution to Poland's territorial problems and have made accusations against the good faith and fair dealing of the Polish people that are most unwarranted. No one should know better than some of these statesmen themselves that the Polish people not only do not accept the Curzon line, but have no voice whatever in present policy or acts of the present puppet masters of Poland.

Those who participate in, recognize, and condone this outrageous violation of the God-given right of the Polish people to maintain and conduct a free government of their own choice must bear due guilt for the evil consequences of their acts and weak excuses and patent subterfuges will never delude the fair-minded, democratic-minded peoples of the earth, here or elsewhere.

It is even more outrageous and indefensible to accuse the Polish people of the terrible inhuman crimes that have been and are being committed in eastern Europe, especially the slaughter and exile of the religious, when it is a known fact that all means of self-defense as well as self-expression have long since been taken away from the impoverished and defenseless Polish people by the oppressive puppet regime in Poland.

These poor people cannot speak and protest let alone procure or use the arms with which to defend their lives, families and possessions. It has become fashionable in some supposedly enlightened and liberal circles to make scapegoats of the Polish people in order to district attention from those responsible for their horrible plight.

But there is not a Member of this House, and there is not a freedom-loving American citizen in the Nation, who does not recognize that this situation now obtaining in Poland, to which I regret to say our Government apparently has consented, is an affront to all conceptions of honesty and justice. It is a repudiation of the basic principles of freedom and self-determination. It is a cruel betrayal of one of our most loyal allies in the war. It is a calloused unpardonable abandonment of the so-called "four freedoms" which were alleged, as we were so often and so positively assured when our boys were being sent off to slaughter and death in all corners of the earth, to be the aims for which they were fighting, bleeding, and dying—our hope for a brave new world of peace and plenty.

It is pertinent now, and it will be pertinent until this question is finally settled under principles of international justice, amity, and decency, to ask whether or not it is the intention of our State Department and Government to consent to the perpetuation of this violation of the fundamental rights of the Polish people. To abandon them and leave them helpless before the powerful ruthless tyrants who are now holding them by the throat and stifling their last free breath is an unconscionable offense against the law of nations and the law of God which the decent opinion of this great free American nation will never condone or sanction.

No, Mr. Speaker, this episode of betrayal of gallant Poland will not blow over. It will not be forgotten. It lives in the minds and hearts of all our countrymen who love freedom and it will live in our minds and hearts until Poland is restored to its honored and rightful place among two free nations of the earth.

Some officials of this Government may glibly argue that compromise is a necessary part of world statesmanship but that is a principle that never has been and never will be accepted by the American people. The principle of compromise with terrorism, compromise with injustice is not an American principle; it is offensive to the very spirit of free America. Like every other nation in this world which has fought and struggled and sacrificed for self-government throughout the ages as gallantly and bravely as Poland has done, Poland is entitled to her freedom, Poland is entitled to reestablish and maintain her own government, Poland is entitled to her own territories and her own possessions, and Poland is entitled to her birthright as a free nation. Nothing less than that will ever satisfy the spirit of fearless devotion to liberty that animates the Polish people, and nothing less than full political, social, economic, and ideological protection for Poland as an independent and sovereign nation can or will be recognized by the American people.

Mr. Speaker, as an American, I object to small peoples and small nations being kicked around by the strong and the powerful because I do not like injustice or bruite force, and, moreover, because I understood that this war was to end that sort of thing for all time. I am out of patience with those who pursue the principle of compromise through appeasement and supine submission to the will of radicalism and imperialism. The time has come for our Nation to declare a strong, forceful foreign policy. We seek no selfish gains; we pursue no greedy aims; we ask not for territories or possessions of other people; we demand only that the principles on which our own Nation is based and for which we entered the war and for which so many of our loyal sons have offered up their lives shall be respected throughout the world; we demand this in the name of those who died that human liberty and American liberty might live.

It is time to let other nations understand—and I care not how strong or powerful they are—that we do not intend to sit idly by and watch cynical forces of totalitarianism or imperialism just as evil in their purposes and as ruthless in their methods as Hitler ever was employ brutal force and unwelcome infiltration to sweep across Europe—sweep across the Orient—threatening to destroy or throttle every spark of freedom and justice wherever the withering hand of tyranny is laid.

Mr. Speaker, in our own self-interest as well as for justice it is time for us to act and I urge that our State Department declare a strong affirmative position in this matter and serve notice on every nation to which it may be applicable that we will no longer tolerate oppression and betrayal of the Polish people or any other people desiring freedom, that we will regard continued domination of such peoples against their will and in violation of international morality to be acts of bad faith toward the principles and aims of the United States of America and the United Nations Organization.

Sincere and whole-hearted international cooperation may well bring peace through justice but further appeasement of nations who through aggression and conquest insist upon making a mockery of our war aims and the accepted principles of human decency can only lead to another world war. Let us correct this threatening situation before we bring ruin upon the whole world, before we drift or are drawn into the vortex of another war that will decimate not only ourselves, but all of civilization. Now is the time for a show-down.

Billion Dollar Loans for Whom?

REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, while Members are home during their 2-week Christmas recess, they will hear many questions about the proposed loan of over $4,000,000,000 to Great Britain, with its net interest rate of substantially less than 2 percent.

Some of these questions will challenge the wisdom of loaning money to foreign nations at interest rates so low that our taxpayers must pay higher taxes to supply the differential between the interest rate our Government must pay to borrow the money it loans abroad and the interest rate it proposes to charge the lucky foreign borrowers. Others will inquire about the logic and justice of charging American veterans an interest rate over twice as high as that charged to veterans of foreign countries who are members of the constituency of nations fortunate enough to be given bargain interest rates.

However, Mr. Speaker, it would seem that none could question the wisdom and businesslike methods of Congress if we were to insist to President Truman that before pressing for approval of his proposed loan to Great Britain action be deferred until at least March 31 with the understanding that by that time the President submit to Congress a breakdown and summary of all the foreign loans it is proposed that this Government make to foreign countries during 1946.

Russia wants six billion or more; the Arab countries want several hundred millions at least; Norway, Yugoslovia, Italy, Poland, and other foreign nations, it is understood, are planning to approach us with fervent pleas and persuasive appeals for substantial loans. America will make few lasting friends by loaning its substance lavishly throughout the world but we can make some lasting and embittered enemies if we grant consideration to some and deny it to others. Even President Truman must realize that there is a limit somewhere to what this country can do in the matter of loaning billions which it does not have. The logical approach therefore is to list all the requests for foreign loans before acting on any so that Congress can scale them down, grant them all, or refuse their approval as the facts and figures then available might best indicate.

Lack of Transportation for Our Servicemen

REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, we all read in the press yesterday of the great numbers of returning servicemen on the east and west coasts, stranded for the lack of transportation. We note on every train, bus, and plane countless thousands of civilians running all over the country on pleasure jaunts and taking up space and utilizing equipment that could well be used to carry home the men who have given us the first peaceful Christmas we have had in 4 years. We see stranded aboard ship, on our very shores, our flesh and blood, unable to see those whose faces have carried them through the filth and hell of the world's most savage conflict. How their hearts must burn. How their spirits must sink on such a

reception. What will be their feelings because we have not even noted their great and immeasurable sacrifices and contributions to the comfort and safety the American people have enjoyed at their expense? Have we ever thought where we would have been had they faltered or hesitated? Have we forgotten how they fought for us in the dim days, with inadequate arms, planes, and tanks? Have we failed to recall their death march on Bataan and on Guam?

There was no bottleneck in transportation, or a lack of priority, when we were rushing these same man to the far-flung battle fronts to protect this Nation. Why should there now be any bottleneck or lack of priority for their transportation home, when they have so gloriously finished the greatest job ever assigned to the men of this country?

On yesterday, I requested the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation to cancel all civilian travel—plane, train, and bus—not connected with the reconversion effort, in order to get these boys home for Christmas. I hope that every Member of the House will do the same. Get in touch with the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation today. Think of the gratitude that will live in the hearts of our returning servicemen for such a yuletide thought. And think of the appreciation of their loved ones if you help to make their return for Christmas possible. These veterans are entitled, as a matter of right, to have every possible effort made to get them home without delay.

Mr. Speaker, these warriors, these heroes, homesick and tired, have lived to see and to feel what was written in Holy Script: "A prophet is not without honor, save in his own country."

Loans to Foreign Governments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker before we take from the pockets of the taxpayers of the United States the almost innumerable millions of dollars and turn them over to foreign governments, it might be well to review the amounts now owed to us by foreign countries. These defaulted debts make a sorry picture when it is recalled these billions will have to be redeemed by our people by the hardest kind of work and privation. I am inserting at this point the reputed debts of World War I owed to the United States, as of July 1, 1944:

World War I debt owed the United States, as of July 1, 1944

(Source: U. S. Treasury Department)

Country	Total indebtedness	Principal unpaid [1]	Interest postponed and payable under moratorium agreements	Interest accrued and unpaid under funding and moratorium agreements
Funded debts:				
Belgium	$495,263,077.60	$400,680,000.00	$3,750,000.00	$90,833,077.60
Czechoslovakia	170,484,850.31	165,241,108.90		5,243,741.41
Estonia	23,919,170.81	16,466,012.87	492,360.20	6,960,797.74
Finland	8,704,800.15	7,941,403.92	[4] 763,396.23	
France	4,529,589,934.38	[2] 3,863,650,000.00	38,636,500.00	
Germany (Austrian indebtedness) [2]	26,024,539.59	25,980,480.66		627,303,434.38 44,058.93
Great Britain	6,263,764,782.58	4,368,000,000.00	131,520,000.00	1,764,244,782.58
Greece	36,437,695.10	31,516,000.00	449,080.00	4,472,615.10
Hungary	2,674,567.89	1,908,560.00	57,072.75	708,935.14
Italy	2,047,231,659.34	2,004,900,000.00	2,506,125.00	39,825,534.34
Latvia	9,875,762.05	6,879,464.20	205,989.96	2,790,307.89
Lithuania	8,848,573.28	6,197,682.00	185,930.46	2,464,960.82
Poland	299,332,204.20	206,057,000.00	6,161,835.00	87,113,369.20
Rumania	73,111,160.13	63,860,560.43		9,250,599.70
Yugoslavia [3]	63,088,593.78	61,625,000.00		1,463,593.78
Total	14,058,351,371.19	11,230,903,272.98	184,728,289.60	2,642,719,808.61
Unfunded debts:				
Armenia	26,793,083.46	11,959,917.49		14,833,165.97
Russia	438,449,173.08	192,601,297.37		245,847,875.71
Total	465,242,256.54	204,561,214.86		260,681,041.68
Grand total	14,523,593,627.73	11,435,464,487.84	184,728,289.60	2,903,400,850.29

[1] Includes principal postponed under moratorium agreement and principal amounts not paid according to contract terms.

[2] The German Government has been notified that the Government of the United States will look to the German Government for the discharge of the indebtedness of the Government of Austria to the Government of the United States.

[3] This Government has not accepted the provisions of the moratorium.

[4] Also includes interest postponed and payable under agreement of May 1, 1941, and the joint resolution approved June 12, 1941 (Public Law No. 110, 77th Cong.).

I think most Americans will agree with the statements of Upton Close whose views are expressed in an article entitled "Close Ups." Under leave to extend, I am inserting the article:

CLOSE UPS

(By Upton Close)

Perhaps it is the mystical dreaminess of the Christmas season, but I am politically nostalgic this week. In the dying embers, which are always usual in a picture like this, I see the United States Senate of other years, a great and noble body led by a band of wondrous prosecutors—instead of a group of sniveling defense attorneys.

Through the curling smoke wisps of my imaginary fireplace comes the stern and gaunt face of Jim Reed of Missouri. I can hear the bellowing periods of this great American echoing through the Senate chamber as he condemns with snarling contempt a British loan of $4,400,000,000. I think he would speak like this:

"These miserable minions of Karl Marx, the Maynard Keynes, the Harold Laskis, and the rest of them, come crawling to us here begging us to hand out to them $4,000,000,000 with which to spread a Sovietized imperialism throughout half the world. They want it without interest, without promissory notes, without proper formality. Gentlemen, they want it without a thought of repayment just as they wanted and got lend-lease.

"And they got the four billion four hundred millions from a weak and milksop administration during the very same fortnight that their government in London prohibited our own Pan-American Airways from landing more than twice a week in England. I heard no objection to the landing of American transport planes in England during 4 years of war—planes bearing American troops to save the British Isles from German invasion."

As the embers in my imaginary grate become dimmer, up from the gloom arises the countenance of Hiram Johnson. As if from the tomb I can hear the great rolling voice pouring out the opinions of a real American on the nebulous question of world government.

"By what right do these emissaries come from foreign shores, infiltrate our State Department, our press, our universities, our schools, and even our churches with the thought that the people of the great United States must now surrender a part or all of their sovereignty to some dreamy world organization?

"We have been drawn into their wars and have lost and suffered through all of them. When the fighting is over and our blood has soaked hundreds of foreign battlefields they have told us to get out and not to meddle in their international political affairs."

Yes, what we need in our Senate and House today are more Walshs and Johnsons and Reeds who will drive with whiplashes of scorn and ridicule the dangerous and subversive termites from our governmental institutions—and less defending attorneys of the Barkley type who seek to shield their clients from responsibility for their acts before the great court of public opinion.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, Bishop Charles Wesley Flint, of the Methodist Church for the Washington area, has recently given a letter explaining his views on military training. Believing that all will find it of interest I am including it as follows:

THE METHODIST CHURCH,
WASHINGTON AREA,
Washington, D. C., December 11, 1945.

To the Members of the Military Affairs Committees of the House of Representatives and of the Senate:

You have recently received a communication from the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church opposing the pending bills for universal military training.

Of the 24 or 25 bishops present when this was voted, I was the only one who did not vote for the resolution. I could not subscribe to several of the statements included, though in harmony with my colleagues on the intent and objective.

1. We, bishops, are unanimous in the conviction that the only sure basis for peace and security are international understanding and agreement, cooperation, and good will.

Also that this objective should be constantly motivating and controling—nothing should be done which militates against it and everything possible done to promote it.

As, by the UNO and other agencies, we press on toward this ideal, there must be interim arrangements. On the nature of these, good men will differ in judgment.

2. We, bishops, are unanimous in protesting against a full year, segregated from normal life and education, for exclusive military training under military regime.

(In my humble judgment, however valuable the training, a year of basic military training for youth in the most active, ambitious and acquisitive year of life, without a preponderant measure of educational or vocational content, would be intolerable boredom and react against the very purpose.)

Speaking only for myself, I am surprised that the various polls indicate such a majority of citizens generally, of servicemen and students favoring military training when the only bills pending call for a full year. (In my judgment, the opinion of our Methodist laymen would not differ materially from the general poll.)

Some measure of universal military training is certainly regarded with favor by American people generally.

May I, speaking only for myself, urge the following considerations:

1. The provision for universal military training should be regarded as temporary, to be reduced as rapidly as, and eliminated as soon as, progress in international relations permits.

2. Meanwhile the period for such training should be only the minimum essential for basic training. Surely a whole year is not needed for such purpose.

3. Some program be devised by which, for senior high school and college youth, such training be integrated with the regular educational program.

4. In the case of youth who do not have opportunity in high school or college, the period of special military training include either a large educational element, vocational or foundational, or supervised training in industry.

5. Courses with educational content to be formulated by, or jointly with, educational authorities.

6. The educational curriculum to include a course of instruction in international relations, including study of the causes of war and means of promoting peace.

7. Ample provision to be made for the social, moral, and spiritual welfare of the trainees; the moral and cultural qualifications of officer-instructors to be of a high order.

Yours respectfully,

CHARLES W. FLINT,
Bishop, Washington Area, the Methodist Church.

Mr. Speaker, there have been various polls on military training. One of the most interesting was made by the Motive magazine published by the student department of the board of education of the Methodist Church. This poll and the statement covering it are as follows:

THE AMERICAN CAMPUS THINKS ABOUT PEACETIME COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING

The following is the report on the first of a series of student opinion polls conducted on campuses over the Nation by the Motive student editorial board. Because of the overwhelming importance of peacetime conscription, there was no quandary over the subject for this first Motive poll. During the first week of October, students stuck blanks, bearing the four questions printed below, in the faces of other students. The answers given to these four questions give us a revealing cross section of the opinions held by students on peacetime conscription. The poll has for the most part been taken on coed, liberal arts, average-sized campuses. A few of the polls were taken in women's colleges and men's colleges. Several were made in theological seminaries. Some of the polls were taken on the campuses of colleges with church affiliations; others were taken at State and privately endowed universities and colleges. A cross section of all four college classes is represented; in coeducation institutions, opinion blanks were distributed to men and women in accordance with their percentage number in the school. An effort was made to include students from a variety of backgrounds and environments; city and rural students as well as those economically wealthy and of moderate means are included. It would be most interesting to present a comparison of campuses by name; it would also be interesting to give the views of a few of the nationally known participants. But it has been agreed that such information will not be divulged. It is vital that we know and evaluate what students of this country think of peacetime compulsory military training, so read on.

1. Do you favor 1 year of peacetime compulsory military training for all physically able men?

Percentage of total number answering "Yes"	66
Percentage of total number answering "No"	34
Percentage in church-affiliated schools answering "Yes"	59
Percentage in church-affiliated schools answering "No"	41
Percentage in non-church-affiliated schools answering "Yes"	71
Percentage in non-church-affiliated schools answering "No"	29
Percentage of all women voting answering "Yes"	69
Percentage of all women voting answering "No"	31
Percentage of all men voting answering "Yes"	59
Percentage of all men voting answering "No"	41

2. If you favor this training, when should it be given? At what age? Or upon graduation from high school?

Percentage of those favoring training at age of 17	5
Percentage of those favoring training at age of 18	10
Percentage of those favoring training at age of 19	1
Percentage of those favoring training at age of 20	1
Percentage of those favoring training at age of 21	3
Percentage favoring age of 17 or end of high school	34
Percentage favoring age of 18 or end of high school	41
Percentage favoring training upon completion of college	5

3. If a law for compulsory military training is favored, do you favor allowing men who are conscientiously opposed to this service to spend 1 year in alternate service of some sort?

Percentage of total number answering "Yes"	74
Percentage of total number answering "No"	26
Those in church-affiliated schools answering "Yes"	74
Those in church-affiliated schools answering "No"	26
Those in non-church-affiliated schools answering "Yes"	75
Those in non-church-affiliated schools answering "No"	25

4. Do you favor a year of equivalent training for women?

Percentage of total number answering "Yes"	13
Percentage of total number answering "No"	87
Percentage of all women answering "Yes"	15
Percentage of all women answering "No"	85
Percentage of all men answering "Yes"	10
Percentage of all men answering "No"	90

Veterans' Rights Under the Amended GI Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, the enactment of the conference report on H. R. 3947 will provide a sound, modest, constructive plan for dealing with the entire veterans' problem. It will substitute order and system for the chaos and confusion now existing as a dozen different Government agencies are quarreling over the control of certain functions for veterans. It will centralize responsibility, reduce red tape, eliminate overlapping services, and, most of all, assure the veterans of a decent break.

This measure, H. R. 3749, contains some very important changes in the so-called GI bill of rights, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, including changes in Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, pertaining to the rehabilitation of persons disabled in service since September 16, 1940.

Briefly, the important changes are:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The act makes permanent the authority of the Administrator to procure necessary space for administrative, clinical, medical, and out-patient treatment purposes, by lease, purchase, or construction of buildings, or by condemnation or declaration of taking. Under existing law this authority is limited to the present war and 6 months thereafter.

ARTIFICIAL LIMBS, OTHER APPLIANCES, AND RELATED SERVICES

Provision is made to insure ample authority governing the procurement of prosthetic appliances and services in connection therewith to disabled veterans, including travel expenses.

SPACE FOR SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

The Administrator is authorized, at his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to furnish, if available, necessary space and suitable office facilities for the use of paid, full-time representatives of veterans' organizations specified in section 200, Public Law 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, June 29, 1936, and such other national organizations recognized by the Administrator thereunder, in the presentation of claims

under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

DISABILITY RETIREMENT

The present provision permits review of findings and decisions of retiring boards of the War or Navy Departments. The new act clarifies the intent by including findings and decisions of boards of medical survey and disposition boards.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Extension of time: The act extends the time from 2 to 4 years after either the date of his discharge or the termination of the war, whichever is the later, to initiate a course; and extends the time within which education or training may be afforded from 7 to 9 years after the termination of the war.

Requirement of showing of interruption of education by service removed: The new act eliminates the requirement in the law that veterans show that education was interrupted by service, and because of such change, it strikes out the 25-year age limitation on presumption of interruption of education.

Reference to refresher or retraining course removed: There are stricken from the present law the references to a refresher or retraining course, and in effect the new act provides that the veteran will be afforded approved education or training for a period of 1 year plus the time he was in the active service, not to exceed a total of 4 years.

Short intensive courses: There are authorized short intensive courses under contracts with approved institutions, with pro rata acceleration, or foreshortening, of period of eligibility, but the cost of any such course may not exceed $500.

Correspondence courses: Provision is made for instruction by correspondence courses, without subsistence allowances, subject to contracts as to rates, charging one-fourth of the elapsed time used in following such courses against the veteran's period of eligibility. The total amount payable for a correspondence course or courses is limited to $500.

Adjustment of fees to public institutions: The Administrator is authorized to make an adjustment of fees in the case of public institutions, if he finds upon application by the institution that customary charges are insufficient to permit the furnishing of education or training to eligible veterans or inadequate compensation therefor, on an over-all plan and based on showing of need of assistance to meet the educational demands under the Federal program. The estimated cost may be fixed—by regulation if desirable—instead of the actual cost—only by agreement—and the veteran may elect to foreshorten his period of eligibility by having all customary charges in excess of $500 paid. Since section 1505 is repealed there is thereby removed the chief obstacle to the proper operation of these provisions.

Subsistence allowances increased: The monthly subsistence allowances are increased from $50 to $65 in the cases of veterans without dependents, and from $75 to $90 in the cases of veterans with dependents.

Combination of courses: Provision is made for approved combination of courses under part VIII—education and training—and part VII—vocational rehabilitation—of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, except that the total period of combined courses must not exceed the maximum period or limitations under the part affording the greater period of eligibility.

Return of books, supplies, or equipment: There is authorized the release of returned books, supplies, or equipment, to educational or training institutions for credit, or the disposition thereof otherwise, without regard to limitations on disposition of surplus property generally.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION, PUBLIC LAW 16, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

Extension of time: The Administrator is permitted to approve courses under Public Law 16, relating to vocational rehabilitation of service disabled, beyond the 4-year period fixed in existing law and there is also extended from 6 to 9 years after the end of the war the time within which training may be furnished, to conform to the amendments made in part VIII.

Monthly rates under Public Law 16 increased: The new act provides that the disabled veteran, while pursuing training and for 2 months after his employability is determined, will be paid the amount of subsistence allowance specified in paragraph 6 of part VIII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended—the education and training provisions, title II, supra. It establishes a minimum rate of $105 for a veteran without dependents, $115 with a dependent, and $10 per month additional for a child, $7 for each additional child and $15 for a dependent parent. Under existing law, while a veteran may receive additional pension while pursuing a course of training, the amount payable cannot exceed the rates for total temporary disability—such rate for a veteran without dependents being $92.50 per month. The effect of the amendment is to permit the disabled veteran to receive subsistence allowances at the sums payable under part VIII relating to education and training plus whatever pension he is entitled to under existing law, but with a prescribed minimum, to protect the disabled veterans with low rate of pension.

GUARANTY OF LOANS FOR HOMES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PURPOSES

This title of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act is revised materially, the most important changes being as follows:

First. Any loan made by any of the prescribed lending agencies to an eligible veteran within 10 years after the end of the war in compliance with the terms and conditions of the title is automatically guaranteed in an amount not in excess of 50 percent of the loan. In place of the present predetermination of the Veterans' Administration that a proposed loan may be guaranteed it provides that a loan is automatically guaranteed by virtue of the lender and the veteran having consummated a loan in full compliance with the specific provisions of the title, one of which is that the purchase price or cost does not exceed the reasonable value as determined by proper appraisal made by an appraiser designated by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The terms of the loan may be as agreed upon by the lender and the veteran subject to the provisions of the law and regulations adopted pursuant to law. The Veterans' Administration upon determining that a loan has been automatically guaranteed is authorized to issue a certificate of guaranty. Loans to be made by lenders other than those supervised by State or Federal agencies must be approved in advance by the Veterans' Administration in order to be guaranteed.

Second. The aggregate amount of the guaranty in the case of a non-real-estate loan may not exceed $2,000 and in the case of a real-estate loan, $4,000, or in a proportionate amount in combination loans or in two loans of either type.

Third. The interest may not exceed 4 percent.

Fourth. The Administrator is authorized to pay an amount equivalent to 4 percent on the amount originally guaranteed rather than payment of interest for the first year.

Fifth. The maturity on amortized loans on real estate may not exceed 25 years, or in case of farm realty 40 years, and the maturity on non-real-estate loans shall not exceed 10 years.

Sixth. Makes clear that the veteran may purchase a lot out of the proceeds of a loan designed to finance the construction of a home on that lot.

Seventh. Omits the word "normal" from the phrase "reasonable normal value" in connection with appraisals.

Eighth. Broadens the act so that loans can be made for every ordinary farming purpose.

Ninth. Broadens the business-loan provisions to permit any normal business enterprise to be financed initially.

Tenth. Broadens the refinancing of existing indebtedness to cover all types of loans, with restrictions.

Eleventh. Extends and declares the powers of the Administrator to perform functions under the loan provisions, principally with respect to suits payment of claims, compromises, property administration, and the like.

Twelfth. Adds a plan permitting the Administrator to insure any loan made by supervised lending agencies which otherwise might be made under title III, as amended. Such insurance will be issued in lieu of a guaranty, to be issued direct to the lending institutions under procedure giving them not to exceed a 15-percent coverage and to be issued only to supervised lending institutions or financial institutions purchasing such loans from the original lending institution. The Administrator is authorized to prescribe, by regulation, terms and conditions and to establish the interest rate not to exceed 3 percent discount or a flat equivalent rate.

Thirteenth. The guaranteed loans may be made by any ordinary lending agency which is subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or of any State or Territory, including the District of Columbia.

Restrictions of Federal laws are removed as to certain institutions subject to Federal supervision with respect to the following—as to any loan at least 20 percent of which is guaranteed under the title, and, of course, limited to such governmental loans: (a) Ratio of amount of loan to the value of the property; (b) maturity of loan; (c) requirement for mortgage or other security; (d) dignity of lien; and (e) percentage of assets which may be invested in real-estate loans.

Fourteenth. Lenders not of one of the specified classes may make guaranteed loans only in the event the loan is approved in advance by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Fifteenth. The provisions pertaining to secondary loans, section 505, are modified to conform to new procedure, and the provision that the rate of interest on the second loan shall not exceed that on the principal loan by more than 1 percent is omitted.

Sixteenth. Provision is made to protect contractural rights under loan guaranties issued under the original act, and to authorize the approval of applications filed at any time within 90 days after the effective date of the new act, in order to permit the continued processing of loan applications pending the issuance of necessary instructions and regulations under the amendatory legislation.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Section 1505, relating to deductions from any future adjusted compensation repealed: Section 1505 of the law relating to charges and deductions of benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act against benefits under any adjusted compensation law is repealed.

Citizens of United States who performed active military or naval service with Allied governments: The new act extends to persons who served in the active military or naval service of Allied governments and who were citizens of the United States at the time of entrance into such service, the benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act as well as the vocational rehabilitation provisions of Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, to the same extent as in the case of persons who served in our own armed forces. It is provided, however, that these benefits will be extended only to persons who are residents of the United States at the time of filing claim and who are not receiving similar benefits from the government of the Allied nation concerned.

Persons on terminal leave or hospitalized pending final discharge: There are extended the benefits of education and training and guaranty of loans, and vocational rehabilitation under Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, to persons while on terminal leave or while hospitalized pending final discharge, with provision that no subsistence allowance would be paid in such cases under title II of the act or Public Law 16. This section is made effective as of June 22, 1944, the date of enactment of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

The acceptance of this conference report will prevent a repetition of the tragic mistakes under which World War I veterans suffered and will guarantee just treatment to our veterans, who were taken away from their schools, colleges, and jobs. Their home life has been broken up.

We must face this tremendous problem. It will be a problem of returning all these men and women back to normal channels of civilian life. This is a most important problem, because it affects 10 percent of our entire populations. It is the most vigorous 10 percent of the Nation—the young men and women upon whom the future welfare of this country will depend.

Every effort must be made that nothing will interfere with the physical and economic development of this segment of our people. It is a problem that must be solved with understanding and sympathy, because it is first of all, a human problem.

They are coming back at a time when our country's national economy is under a terrific strain. Millions of men and women returning from the war front and camps will need jobs, money, training, hospitalization, housing, and other assistance, and they will expect stability and security, so that they can start rebuilding their private lives.

We must give them all that. It is the least we can do for them, because they have given us continued freedom and liberty.

The Use of Knowledge in Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 23, 1945

Mr. CRAWFORD. Charity, Mr. Speaker, belongs in unorganized, individual, human relations, such as the paternal care of the family; it is not a proper function of government. The Government's business is that of arranging for full and free, and yet peaceable, competition; and unless it fills that bill wisely and well we will not have, first, full—or nearly full—employment; nor, second, will we have production with ample goods in the consumer's hand.

It is particularly untrue, therefore, that any attempt on the part of government to foster or furnish employment directly, to compensate for that which private business fails to supply, can be reassuring to business or give that confidence to private enterprise which will promote employment of either capital or labor. If there are any investments which the Government should make, these must be considered, in timing as well as other factors, on their own merits, for they not only must not but they cannot be made to constitute a satisfactory and in the long run a make-work program.

It is particularly inept to attempt to assemble a statistical chart of the needs of both government and business as if they were a single field of operation in which a single, so-called national budget could be projected out of the past and into the future with an assurance that can be dignified as anything more than guesswork. Business itself is essentially a thing of many budgets, each of them with its own uncertainties; and nothing government can do will remove the speculative element and afford security to each, or to all, of these competitors so that they can proceed with a so-called confidence born of the absence of risk. Government interference cannot assuage, it can on the contrary only aggravate, these risks into a deadly burden on business, especially the little businesses that have plenty to do without having to fit themselves into Government regulations and that have to take up most of the slack in unemployment.

Among the really careful and objective thinkers on this subject who have attained the status of the "best sellers" with the reading public is Prof. F. A. Hayek, author of The Road to Serfdom. Recognition of his talent has been renewed in the current number of the American Economic Review, published by the American Economic Association, in an article entitled "The Use of Knowledge in Society." Here Dr. Hayek asks, and answers, the question, "What is the problem we wish to solve when we try to construct a rational economic order?" That there can be no rational statistical basis for procedure such as is set forth in the so-called full employment bill is made too clear for further dispute. The pertinent part—greater part—of this essay is therefore offered for the RECORD as a conclusive negative in the debate on this legislation:

I

What is the problem we wish to solve when we try to construct a rational economic order?

On certain familiar assumptions the answer is simple enough. If we possess all the relevant information, if we can start out from a given system of preferences, and if we command complete knowledge of available means, the problem which remains is purely one of logic. That is, the answer to the question of what is the best use of the available means is implicit in our assumptions. The conditions which the solution of this optimum problem must satisfy have been fully worked out and can be stated best in mathematical form; put at their briefest, they are that the marginal rates of substitution between any two commodities or factors must be the same in all their different uses.

This, however, is emphatically not the economic problem which society faces. And the economic calculus which we have developed to solve this logical problem, though an important step toward the solution of the economic problem of society, does not yet provide an answer to it. The reason for this is that the data from which the economic calculus starts are never for the whole society given to a single mind which could work out the implications, and can never be so given.

The peculiar character of the problem of a rational economic order is determined precisely by the fact that the knowledge of the circumstances of which we must make use never exists in concentrated or integrated form, but solely as the dispersed bits of incomplete and frequently contradictory knowledge which all the separate individuals possess. The economic problem of society is thus not merely a problem of how to allocate given resources—if given is taken to mean given to a single mind which deliberately solves the problem set by these data. It is rather a problem of how to secure the best

use of resources known to any of the members of society, for ends whose relative importance only these individuals know. Or, to put it briefly, it is a problem of the utilization of knowledge not given to anyone in its totality.

This character of the fundamental problem has, I am afraid, been rather obscured than illuminated by many of the recent refinements of economic theory, particularly by many of the uses made of mathematics. Though the problem with which I want primarily to deal in this paper is the problem of a rational economic organization, I shall in its course be led again and again to point to its close connections with certain methodological questions. Many of the points I wish to make are indeed conclusions toward which diverse paths of reasoning have unexpectedly converged. But as I now see these problems, this is no accident. It seems to me that many of the current disputes with regard to both economic theory and economic policy have their common origin in a misconception about the nature of the economic problem of society. This misconception in turn is due to an erroneous transfer to social phenomena of the habits of thought we have developed in dealing with the phenomena of nature.

II

In ordinary language we describe by the word "planning" the complex of interrelated decisions about the allocation of our available resources. All economic activity is in this sense planning; and in any society in which many people collaborate, this planning, whoever does it, will in some measure have to be based on knowledge which, in the first instance, is not given to the planner but to somebody else, which somehow will have to be conveyed to the planner. The various ways in which the knowledge on which people base their plans is communicated to them is the crucial problem for any theory explaining the economic process. And the problem of what is the best way of utilizing knowledge initially dispersed among all the people is at least one of the main problems of economic policy—or of designing an efficient economic system.

The answer to this question is closely connected with that other question which arises here, that of who is to do the planning. It is about this question that all the dispute about "economic planning" centers. This is not a dispute about whether planning is to be done or not. It is a dispute as to whether planning is to be done centrally, by one authority for the whole economic system, or is to be divided among many individuals. Planning in the specific sense in which the term is used in contemporary controversy necessarily means central planning—direction of the whole economic system according to one unified plan. Competition, on the other hand, means decentralized planning by many separate persons. The halfway house between the two, about which many people talk but which few like when they see it, is the delegation of planning to organized industries, or, in other words, monopoly.

Which of these systems is likely to be more efficient depends mainly on the question under which of them we can expect that fuller use will be made of the existing knowledge. And this, in turn, depends on whether we are more likely to succeed in putting at the disposal of a single central authority all the knowledge which ought to be used but which is initially dispersed among many different individuals, or in conveying to the individuals such additional knowledge as they need in order to enable them to fit their plans in with those of others.

III

It will at once be evident that on this point the position will be different with respect to different kinds of knowledge; and the answer to our question will therefore largely turn on the relative importance of the different kinds of knowledge; those more likely to be at the disposal of particular individuals and those which we should with greater confidence expect to find in the possession of an authority made up of suitably chosen experts. If it is today so widely assumed that the latter will be in a better position, this is because one kind of knowledge, namely, scientific knowledge, occupies now so prominent a place in public imagination that we tend to forget that it is not the only kind that is relevant. It may be admitted that, so far as scientific knowledge is concerned, a body of suitably chosen experts may be in the best position to command all the best knowledge available—though this is of course merely shifting the difficulty to the problem of selecting the experts. What I wish to point out is that, even assuming that this problem can be readily solved, it is only a small part of the wider problem.

Today it is almost heresy to suggest that scientific knowledge is not the sum of all knowledge. But a little reflection will show that there is beyond question a body of very important but unorganized knowledge which cannot possibly be called scientific in the sense of knowledge of general rules: The knowledge of the particular circumstances of time and place. It is with respect to this that practically every individual has some advantage over all others in that he possesses unique information of which beneficial use might be made, but of which use can be made only if the decisions depending on it are left to him or are made with his active cooperation. We need to remember only how much we have to learn in any occupation after we have completed our theoretical training, how big a part of our working life we spend learning particular jobs, and how valuable an asset in all walks of life is knowledge of people, of local conditions, and special circumstances. To know of and put to use a machine not fully employed, or somebody's skill which could be better utilized, or to be aware of a surplus stock which can be drawn upon during an interruption of supplies, is socially quite as useful as the knowledge of better alternative techniques. And the shipper who earns his living from using otherwise empty or half-filled journeys of tramp steamers, or the estate agent whose whole knowledge is almost exclusively one of temporary opportunities, or the arbitrageur who gains from local differences of commodity prices, are all performing eminently useful functions based on special knowledge of circumstances of the fleeting moment not known to others.

IV

If it is fashionable today to minimize the importance of the knowledge of the particular circumstances of time and place, this is closely connected with the smaller importance which is now attached to change as such. Indeed, there are few points on which the assumptions made (usually only implicity) by the "planners" differ from those of their opponents as much as with regard to the significance and frequency of changes which will make substantial alterations of production plans necessary. Of course, if detailed economic plans could be laid down for fairly long periods in advance and then closely adhered to, so that no further economic decisions of importance would be required, the task of drawing up a comprehensive plan governing all economic activity would appear much less formidable.

In a competitive industry at any rate—and such an industry alone can serve as a test—the task of keeping cost from rising requires constant struggle, absorbing a great part of the energy of the manager. How easy it is for an inefficient manager to dissipate the differentials on which profitability rests, and that it is possible, with the same technical facilities, to produce with a great variety of costs, are among the commonplaces of business experience which do not seem to be equally familiar in the study of the economist. The very strength of the desire, constantly voiced by producers and engineers, to be able to proceed untrammeled by considerations of money costs, is eloquent testimony to the extent to which these factors enter into their daily work.

On reason why economists are increasingly apt to forget about the constant small changes which make up the whole economic picture is probably their growing preoccupation with statistical aggregates, which show a very much greater stability than the movements of the detail. The comparative stability of the aggregates cannot, however, be accounted for—as the statisticians seem occasionally to be inclinde to do—by the "law of large numbers" or the mutual compensation of random changes. The number of elements with which we have to deal is not large enough for such accidental forces to produce stability. The continuous flow of goods and services is maintained by constant deliberate adjustments, by new dispositions made every day in the light of circumstances not known the day before, by *B* stepping in at once when *A* fails to deliver. Even the large and highly mechanized plant keeps going largely because of an environment upon which it can draw for all sorts of unexpected needs; tiles for its roof, stationery for its forms, and all the thousand and one kinds of equipment in which it cannot be self-contained and which the plans for the operation of the plant require to be readily available in the market.

V

If we can agree that the economic problem of society is mainly one of rapid adaptation to changes in the particular circumstances of time and place, it would seem to follow that the ultimate decisions must be left to the people who are familiar with these circumstances, who know directly of the relevant changes and of the resources immediately available to meet them. We cannot expect that this problem will be solved by first communicating all this knowledge to a central board which, after integrating all knowledge, issues its orders. We must solve it by some form of decentralization. But this answers only part of our problem. We need decentralization because only thus can we insure that the knowledge of the particular circumstances of time and place will be promptly used. But the "man on the spot" cannot decide solely on the basis of his limited but intimate knowledge of the facts of his immediate surroundings. There still remains the problem of communicating to him such further information as he needs to fit his decisions into the whole pattern of changes of the larger economic system.

How much knowledge does he need to do so successfully? Which of the events which happen beyond the horizon of his immediate knowledge are of relevance to his immediate decision, and how much of them need he know?

There is hardly anything that happens anywhere in the world that might not have an effect on the decision he ought to make. But he need not know of these events as such, nor of all their effects. It does not matter for him why at the particular moment more screws of one size than of another are wanted, why paper bags are more readily available than canvas bags, or why skilled labor, or particular machine tools, have for the moment become more difficult to acquire. All that is significant for him is how much more or less difficult to procure they have become compared with other things with which he is also concerned, or how much more or less urgently wanted are the alternative things he produces or uses. It is always a question of the relative importance of the

particular things with which he is concerned, and the causes which alter their relative importance are of no interest to him beyond the effect on those concrete things of his own environment.

It is in this connection that what I have called the economic calculus proper helps us, at least by analogy, to see how this problem can be solved, and in fact is being solved, by the price system. Even the single controlling mind, in possession of all the data for some small, self-contained economic system, would not—every time some small adjustment in the allocation of resources had to be made—go explicitly through all the relations between ends and means which might possibly be affected. It is, indeed, the great contribution of the pure logic of choice that it has demonstrated conclusively that even such a single mind could solve this kind of problem only by constructing and constantly using rates of equivalence (or values, or marginal rates of substitution), i. e., by attaching to each kind of scarce resource a numerical index which cannot be derived from any property possessed by that particular thing, but which reflects, or in which is condensed, its significance in view of the whole means-end structure. In any small change he will have to consider only these quantitative indices (or values) in which all the relevant information is concentrated; and by adjusting the quantities one by one, he can appropriately rearrange his dispositions without having to solve the whole puzzle ab initio, or without needing at any stage to survey it at once in all its ramifications.

Fundamentally, in a system where the knowledge of the relevant facts is dispersed among many people, prices can act to coordinate the separate actions of different people in the same way as subjective values help the individual to coordinate the parts of his plan. It is worth contemplating for a moment a very simple and commonplace instance of the action of the price system to see what precisely it accomplishes. Assume that somewhere in the world a new opportunity for the use of some raw material, say tin, has arisen, or that one of the sources of supply of tin has been eliminated. It does not matter for our purpose—and it is very significant that it does not matter—which of these two causes has made the tin more scarce. All that the users of tin need to know is that some of the tin they used to consume is now more profitably employed elsewhere, and that in consequence they must economize tin. There is no need for the great majority of them even to know where the more urgent need has arisen, or in favor of what other needs they ought to husband the supply. * * *

VI

We must look at the price system as such a mechanism for communicating information if we want to understand its real function—a function which, of course, it fulfills less perfectly as prices grow more rigid. (Even when quoted prices have become quite rigid, however, the forces which would operate through changes in price still operate to a considerable extent through changes in the other terms of the contract.) The most significant fact about this system is the economy of knowledge with which it operates, or how little the individual participants need to know in order to be able to take the right action. In abbreviated form, by a kind of symbol, only the most essential information is passed on, and passed on only to those concerned. It is more than a metaphor to describe the price system as a kind of machinery for registering change, or a system of telecommunications which enables individual producers to watch merely the movement of a few pointers, as an engineer might watch the hands of a few dials, in order to adjust their activities to changes of which they may never know more than is reflected in the price movement.

Of course, these adjustments are probably never "perfect" in the sense in which the economist conceives of them in his equilibrium analysis. But I fear that our theoretical habits of approaching the problem with the assumption of more or less perfect knowledge on the part of almost everyone has made us somewhat blind to the true function of the price mechanism and led us to apply rather misleading standards in judging its efficiency. The marvel is that in a case like that of a scarcity of one raw material, without an order being issued, without more than perhaps a handful of people knowing the cause, tens of thousands of people whose identity could not be ascertained by months of investigation, are made to use the material or its products more sparingly; i. e., they move in the right direction. This is enough of a marvel even if, in a constantly changing world, not all will hit it off so perfectly that their profit rates will always be maintained at the same constant or "normal" level.

I have deliberately used the word "marvel" to shock the reader out of the complacency with which we often take the working of this mechanism for granted. I am convinced that if it were the result of deliberate human design, and if the people, guided by the price changes, understood that their decisions have significance far beyond their immediate aim, this mechanism would have been acclaimed as one of the greatest triumphs of the human mind. Its misfortune is the double one that it is not the product of human design and that the people guided by it usually do not know why they are made to do what they do. But those who clamor for "conscious direction"—and who cannot believe that anything which has evolved without design (and even without our understanding it) should solve problems which we should not be able to solve consciously—should remember this: The problem is precisely how to extend the span of our utilization of resources beyond the span of the control of any one mind; and, therefore, how to dispense with the need of conscious control and how to provide inducements which will make the individuals do the desirable things without anyone having to tell them what to do.

The price system is just one of those formations which man has learned to use (though he is still very far from having learned to make the best use of it) after he had stumbled upon it without understanding it. Through it not only a division of labor but also a coordinated utilization of resources based on an equally divided knowledge has become possible. The people who like to deride any suggestion that this may be so usually distort the argument by insinuating that it asserts that by some miracle just that sort of system has spontaneously grown up which is best suited to modern civilization. It is the other way round: Man has been able to develop that division of labor on which our civilization is based because he happened to stumble upon a method which made it possible. Had he not done so he might still have developed some other, altogether different, type of civilization, something like the state of the termite ants, or some other altogether unimaginable type. All that we can say is that nobody has yet succeeded in designing an alternative system in which certain features of the existing one can be preserved which are dear even to those who most violently assail it—such as particularly the extent to which the individual can choose his pursuits and consequently freely use his own knowledge and skill.

The Al Smith Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald:

THE AL SMITH DRIVE

As there is a much larger quota for Massachusetts than for New York State in the drive for funds to build an Al Smith Memorial Hospital in New York City, the managers of the enterprise must have assumed that he is better appreciated here than in his home territory, and that residents of Massachusetts will therefore respond more liberally to the appeal. That is probably correct. This State did better by him politically than New York. It whooped things up for him spontaneously and more unroariously than other sections. Persons of the Charles E. Hughes and Elihu Root type shared the attitude toward him of the man who earned his living with his muscles.

Did New Yorkers see so much of al that familiarity bred disregard and he became a prophet not honored adequately in his own country and among his own people? Are the enthusiasm and affection for him in Massachusetts and Boston due in part to the fact that the memorable nominating speech in the Democratic national convention of 1932 came from a Bay Stater, Joseph B. Ely?

The personnel of the committee which Mr. Ely heads intimates the extent of affection for Al. The group includes outstanding Protestants and Jews as well as Catholics, business, professional, and military men, among them Brig. Gen. Henry Parkman, Jr., the prominent and the inconspicuous. The chances are that the $150,000 desired from Massachusetts will be raised and that some of the largest contributions will come from persons who didn't vote for him and who spoke against him angrily at the time. They, and the more modest givers, will chip in because they saw in Mr. Smith those qualities which transcend political considerations and bind all decent men together irrespective of party, race, creed, and color.

Potato Support Prices for 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following announcement is of interest to the potato growers of America and also to the Members of Congress who voted for the Steagall amendment to the Price Control Act:

The United States Department of Agriculture today announced the support program that would be in effect for the 1946 crop of Irish potatoes, together with the schedule of base prices. The operations outlined and base prices are designed to permit growers a return of not less than 90 percent of parity.

Although the program for next year's potato crop is similar in general to the price support program in effect for the past few years, it differs in two major details.

Under the program announced today for the 1946 crop, there is to be no advance announncement of support prices for grades below U. S. No. 1 at fixed amounts or at fixed percenages of the applicable prices for U. S. No. 1 grade. Instead, the Department will support prices of lower grades, exclusive of culls, at such times, in such areas, by such means, and at such prices as will be necessary to carry out the USDA's price support obligations. In this connection it is pointed out that the Department may prescribe conditions governing disposition of grades lower than U. S. No. 1 which would need to be met before U. S. No. 1 grade potatoes would be eligible for support.

The second difference is that the announced support prices are base prices, effective at a stage of distribution described as "in bulk, loaded on truck at farmer's gate." Formerly support prices were at the f. o. b. level. The actual price to be received by any grower participating in the price support operation, therefore, will be the applicable base price, adjusted for the value of the marketing services actually performed as prescribed by the USDA. Specific allowances for marketing services will be announced before the support operations are undertaken.

Prices of early and intermediate crop potatoes will be supported by direct purchases, and if necessary, by diversion to other than normal trade channels, including exports, industrial, and food outlets. Late crop potato prices will be supported by loans, supplemented where necessary and practicable by diversion to export, industrial, and feed outlets.

Provisions of specific purchase and diversion programs will be announced when operations begin. In the case of the loan program, however, a full announcement will be made as soon as all details have been worked out.

Schedule of basic support prices on 1946-crop Irish potatoes

PART I: EARLY AND INTERMEDIATE POTATOES

[In dollars per hundredweight, U. S. No. 1 quality, bulk loaded at grower's gate]

State and area	From beginning of season through—				
	Apr. 30 (1)	May 31 (2)	June 30 (3)	July 31 (4)	Aug. 31 (5)
Early:					
Alabama	-----	-----	$1.70	-----	-----
Arizona	-----	-----	-----	-----	$1.65
Arkansas	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.60
California, southern [1]	$1.50	$1.35	1.35	$1.25	-----
Florida:					
Southern [2]	2.60	-----	-----	-----	-----
Northern [3]	-----	2.20	1.70	-----	-----
Other	-----	-----	1.70	-----	-----
Georgia	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.70
Louisiana	-----	-----	-----	1.70	-----
Mississippi	-----	-----	1.70	-----	-----
New Mexico	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.60
North Carolina	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.60
Oklahoma	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.60
South Carolina	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.70
Tennessee	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.60
Texas:					
Lower Valley [4]	2.60	2.25	-----	-----	-----
Northeastern [5]	-----	-----	1.60	-----	-----
Western [6]	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.60
Other	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.70
Intermediate:					
Delaware	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.65
Kansas	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.40
Kentucky	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.70
Maryland	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.65
Missouri	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.40
New Jersey	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.50
Virginia	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.65

Footnotes at end of table.

PART II: LATE POTATOES

[In dollars per hundredweight, U. S. No. 1 quality bulk loaded at grower's gate]

State and area	July (1)	Aug. (2)	Sept. (3)	Oct. (4)	Nov. (5)	Dec. (6)
California:						
Modoc and Siskiyou	-----	-----	$1.35	$1.40	$1.50	$1.60
Stockton [7]	$1.45	$1.45	1.50	1.55	1.65	1.75
Colorado:						
Greeley [8]	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.25	1.35	1.45
San Luis Valley [9]	-----	-----	1.20	1.25	1.35	1.45
Western Slope [10]	-----	1.10	1.15	1.20	1.30	1.40
Connecticut	-----	1.50	1.60	1.65	1.70	1.80
Idaho:						
Northern [11]	-----	-----	1.10	1.15	1.25	1.35
Other	1.05	1.05	1.15	1.20	1.30	1.40
Illinois	-----	-----	1.50	1.55	1.65	1.75
Indiana	-----	-----	1.50	1.55	1.65	1.75
Iowa	-----	-----	1.40	1.45	1.55	1.65
Maine:						
Aroostook	-----	-----	1.20	1.25	1.35	1.45
Other	-----	-----	1.30	1.35	1.45	1.55
Massachusetts	-----	1.50	1.60	1.65	1.70	1.80
Michigan	-----	-----	1.40	1.45	1.55	1.65
Minnesota:						
Northern [12]	-----	-----	1.10	1.15	1.25	1.35
Other	-----	-----	1.25	1.30	1.40	1.50
Montana	-----	-----	1.15	1.20	1.30	1.40
Nebraska	1.40	1.30	1.25	1.30	1.40	1.50
Nevada	-----	-----	1.30	1.35	1.45	1.55
North Dakota	-----	-----	1.10	1.15	1.25	1.35
New Hampshire	-----	-----	1.60	1.65	1.70	1.80
New Jersey	1.50	1.50	1.60	1.65	1.70	1.80
New York:						
Long Island	1.50	1.50	1.60	1.65	1.70	1.80
Other	-----	1.50	1.50	1.55	1.65	1.75
Ohio	-----	1.50	1.50	1.55	1.65	1.75
Oregon:						
Eastern [13]	1.05	1.05	1.15	1.20	1.30	1.40
Other	-----	-----	1.35	1.40	1.50	1.60
Pennsylvania	-----	1.50	1.50	1.55	1.65	1.75
Rhode Island	-----	1.50	1.60	1.65	1.70	1.80
South Dakota	-----	-----	1.20	1.25	1.35	1.45
Utah	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.10	1.20	1.30
Vermont	-----	-----	1.60	1.65	1.70	1.80
Washington	1.15	1.15	1.25	1.30	1.40	1.50
West Virginia	-----	-----	1.55	1.60	1.70	1.80
Wisconsin	-----	-----	1.25	1.30	1.40	1.50
Wyoming	-----	-----	1.25	1.30	1.40	1.50
Other States [14]	-----	-----	1.50	1.55	1.65	1.75

[1] Counties of Monterey, San Benito, Madera, Fresno, Inyo, and all counties south thereof.

[2] Counties of Charlotte, Glades, Martin, and all counties south thereof.

[3] All counties lying north of the counties of Charlotte, Glades, and Martin, and south and east of the Suwannee River.

[4] Counties of Zapata, Jim Hogg, Brooks Kenedy, and all counties south thereof.

[5] The counties of Hardeman, Foard, Knox, Haskell, Jones, and Taylor, and all counties east thereof; the counties of Callahan, Eastland, Erath, Hood, Johnson, and Ellis, and all counties north thereof; and all counties east of the Trinity River except the counties of Walker, Liberty, and Chambers, which are considered as lying wholly west of the Trinity River.

[6] All counties north of a line formed by connecting the southern boundaries of the counties of Yoakum and Stonewall; and the counties of Childress, Cottle, King, and Stonewall, and all counties west thereof.

[7] Counties of Solano, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Merced, Santa Clara, Alameda, and Contra Costa.

[8] All counties in Colorado not included in the San Luis Valley and the western slope.

[9] Counties of Saguache, Huerfano, Las Animas, Costilla, Alamosa, Rio Grande, Conejos, Mineral, and Archuleta.

[10] Counties of Routt, Eagle, Pitkin, Gunnison, Hinsdale, La Plata, and all counties west thereof in the State of Colorado.

[11] Idaho County and all counties north thereof in the State of Idaho.

[12] Counties of Wilkin, Otter Tail, Wadena, Cass, Crow Wing, Aitkin, and Carlton, and all counties north thereof.

[13] Counties of Malheur, Baker, Union, and Wallowa.

[14] All States and areas not provided for in this schedule.

I do not care to discuss this problem until a later date. You will note that Utah, for example, is to be provided a $1.05 per hundredweight, or 63 cents per bushel floor or support price for 1946. Northern Minnesota and North Dakota a 66-cent per bushel support, Wisconsin a 75-cent per bushel support price as of September 1946.

Can you give any reason why the support price for early potatoes in California in May of 1946 should be 81 cents per bushel and $1.35 per bushel in Texas, and $1.32 per bushel in Florida?

There are many situations that must be considered in connection with this announcement, and after the recess I am expecting to present them to Congress and show exactly what is taking place in the minds of the price jugglers of this administration.

Federal Contribution to States for Old-Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 19), 1945

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter received by me from the Chairman of the Social Security Board, relating to a bill I recently introduced—S. 1653—to provide for computation of amounts of grants to States for old-age assistance on the basis of the financial resources of the several States, together with an introductory statement prepared by me on the subject.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On December 4, I introduced S. 1653, a bill to require that Federal contributions to States for old-age assistance shall be in accordance with the ability of the separate States to pay their proportionate part, based on the per capita income in each State in proportion to the per capita income of the continental United States.

Under present laws, with the Federal Government contributing an amount equal to that appropriated or authorized by the State in which a claimant happens to live without regard to the cost of living or what the pensioner needs for a minimum standard of living, persons residing in the poorer States are denied the essentials of life. For the entire Nation, the average monthly payment to needy old people is nearly $30 per month, but in 9 of the 12 lowest income States the average, in spite of substantial increases in recent years which has cost the local taxpayers a far greater percentage of their income than in the wealthier States, the average is less than $20; and in five of those nine States it is less than $15.

Cost-of-living studies do not show large or clearly defined differences among the States and regions in the costs of identical essential needs in food, clothing, and housing. Yet, when the need is as great and the fiscal ability is low, local officials have no recourse but to reduce the payment of old-age assistance below the actual minimum cost of living. Because the welfare of each section of the country is of concern to all sections, it is believed that in meeting the actual welfare needs of our aged needy, no matter where they happen to live, the general public welfare of all the people will be improved. In the 12 States with the lowest average income, with 21 percent of the population of the country, only 14 percent of the total Federal amount is granted for public assistance.

This bill is designed to bring about reasonably adequate assistance to needy folk in every State, no matter where they live and regardless of the financial resources of the area. This principle has been endorsed by the Council of State Governments, the American Public Welfare Association, and other interested and informed groups. The Social Security Board has recommended to Congress that the Federal Government provide special aid for public assistance to States with low economic capacity on an objective basis. The principle of granting more State aid to poorer localities has already been well established in education; certainly essential needs are more necessary for our aged poor, and the obligation falls on each of us individually, no matter where we live, and upon all of us as a Nation.

LETTER FROM MR. ALTMEYER

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD,
Washington, D. C., December 18, 1945.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: Thank you for sending me a copy of the bill on old-age assistance, S. 1653, which you introduced in the Senate. Your bill is in essential agreement with recommendations made by the Social Security Board for amendment of the Federal matching provisions of the Social Security Act, not only for old-age assistance but also for aid to dependent children and aid to the blind.

The Ninth Annual Report of the Social Security Board for the fiscal year 1943-44 included the following statement regarding the basis of Federal grants to States. We believe this statement may be useful to you in presenting the need for amending matching provisions:

"Under the Social Security Act, the Federal Government matches, dollar for dollar up to a given amount a month, the assistance payment made to a needy old or blind person or a dependent child under a State plan approved by the Social Security Board. Within the limits on Federal matching, the amount of the Federal grant to the State for any of these assistance programs, therefore, is fixed by the amount provided by the State, or the State and its localities. States differ greatly in income and therefore in potential capacity to finance adequate assistance programs. In 1943 per capita income ranged from $1,452 in the high State to $484 in the State where average income was least. Average income increased in 1943 in all but one State, where it already was high, but the range and ranking remained about the same as in 1943. States with a high level of income can make relatively large appropriations for public assistance and thus qualify for relatively large Federal grants, though the extent of need among their people may be less than it is in States which can afford only small amounts and get only small Federal grants.

"Studies of the Board have led to the conclusion that differences in the economic and fiscal capacity of States are the greatest single clause of the even wider variations in levels of assistance. Among States administering public assistance under the Social Security Act, average payments for each of the three special types of assistance in June 1944 were about four times as much in the highest State as in the State where the average was lowest. In general assistance, financed wholly from State and local funds, differences were even greater, and the average in the highest State was more than six times that in the lowest.

"The average assistance payment in each State is made up, of course, of differing individual amounts, since the payment to a recipient supplements what resources he himself may have. Individual assistance payments under these four programs range from a few dollars a month to—in a very few States—more than $100 for an occasional recipient in exceptional circumstances. A low average for a State might be due to the fact that the recipients on the rolls needed only small amounts to supplement what they themselves had. Actually, however, the low averages occur almost without exception in States where per capita income and fiscal resources are low. The low averages result, in general, from the meagerness of payments to persons who have little or nothing but their payment. In such States, moreover, some needy persons eligible under the State law may get no aid whatever because funds are lacking.

"The Social Security Board reaffirms a recommendation made in earlier reports that special Federal aid for public assistance be provided on an objective basis to States with low economic and fiscal capacity. Such provision is essential if standards of assistance are to be equitable and more nearly adequate in all States. Just as the Board believes that the Federal share should vary with economic capacity of the States, it believes that Federal and State funds should be distributed to localities in relation to their needs and, where the localities participate in financing, also in relation to their financial ability."

We are enclosing copies of two tables showing the variation among the States in expenditures for old-age assistance under present matching provisions. Table 1 shows total expenditures per inhabitant from Federal, State, and local funds in the fiscal year 1944-45. Table 2 shows the percent which each State received of total Federal funds expended for old-age assistance compared with the percent of total United States aged population in the State.

I hope this information will prove useful to you and that you will let me know if we can be of further assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. ALTMEYER, *Chairman.*

McVay Court Martial

REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, the Navy court marshal of Capt. Charles B. McVay 3d, held here in Washington, in my opinion, leaves a blot on the Navy that will never be erased. Reports indicate that the court found the accused "not guilty" of all charges save and except one—not zigzagging his ship, and the most reprehensible fact of the trial was that this officer, the scion of an illustrious Navy family, was convicted of that charge upon the testimony of an enemy officer, Commander Iko Hashimoto, a despicable Japanese commander of the submarine which sent his ship to the bottom.

Mr. Speaker, I am advised that never before in the annals of our country has a court martial called an enemy to testify against a brother officer, and in view of the brilliant record of Captain McVay, it is difficult to understand the action of the men who constituted this naval court martial.

Mr. Speaker, I have followed this case from the beginning of the court martial, and it seems to me that instead of Captain McVay being brought to trial that, those responsible for the loss of the 860 men of a complement of 1,160 for not sending rescue craft until 5 days after the disaster, should have been the ones to summon for court martial.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Secretary of the Navy or the President will reverse the findings of this scandalous and undeserved action of the court-martial court in this instance; however, even this action will never remove the stain from the court martial and Navy in summoning a prejudiced enemy officer to testify against a brother officer with a record such as that of Captain McVay.

Port of Galveston Leads the Country in Export of Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news clipping from the Galveston Daily News, December 11, 1945, in regard to the shipment of cotton through the port of Galveston. For many years before the late depression Galveston was one of the leading ports in the export of cotton, generally in first position. During the war, of course, such shipments were limited to war and lend-lease purposes. From this clipping it will be seen that Galveston has again gone to the front with cotton receipts greater than in any other port in the United States. The report is as follows:

PORT NOW HOLDS FIRST PLACE IN COTTON RECEIPTS

The port of Galveston is bidding again for its former distinction as the world's greatest cotton port. Figures released yesterday showed that the local port is leading its two chief competitors, Houston and New Orleans, by a comfortable margin in cotton receipts.

Gross receipts for the 1945-46 season to date were 609,099 bales yesterday, the Galveston Cotton Exchange and Board of Trade said. In comparison, Houston's total is 496,995 bales and that of New Orleans 483,005 bales.

Foreign exports from Galveston total 162,372 bales, and 260,936 bales have been shipped out by rail. Export figures of the ports of New Orleans and Houston were not available yesterday.

While at this time last year Galveston was leading all ports in the Nation in gross cotton receipts, a marked increase is notable this year. Last year at this time the total of gross receipts was 478,954 bales. At the same time, Houston's gross receipts were 344,197 bales, and New Orleans' 362,175 bales.

Foreign exports have shown a tremendous gain since the end of the war. Last year's exports at this time totaled 47,516 bales, as compared with this year's 162,372 bales. Rail movement of cotton was higher last year than this, with a total of 266,308 bales going out by rail as compared with 260,936 bales this year.

Statement of Philip H. Hill Before Senate Committee on Banking and Currency Regarding Senate Bill 1592

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 19), 1945

Mr. TAFT. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Philip H. Hill in behalf of the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency in regard to Senate bill 1592.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Philip H. Hill. For 7 years prior to my entering the Navy in October of 1942, I was city solicitor for the city of Charleston, W. Va. For several years during this period, I also served as chairman of the committee on housing of the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, on whose behalf I am privileged to present this statement on the general housing bill which this committee now has under consideration.

For the information of the members of the committee, I may say that the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers was formed some 10 years ago to serve as a central clearing house for information and assistance required by city attorneys in the performance of their official duties. It is now serving 416 member municipalities, with a total population of more than 60,000,000 of our citizens located in 48 States and Hawaii. More than 2,000 municipal law officers of these member municipalities are represented through the institute.

At the outset, let me say also that the interest of municipal law officers in housing legislation is not remote—as some may be disposed to believe. On the contrary, it is very direct and very active, for it is at the municipal level that housing cuts across the whole pattern of the administration of the modern community. City attorneys and municipal law departments increasingly are being called upon to participate and assist in working out various phases of the housing problems of their own communities. This has been generally reflected in the wide variety of problems dealt with in the reports of our committee on housing and committee on eradiction of blighted areas.

A resolution endorsing the provisions of S. 1592 and recommending its enactment by the Congress was adopted this week by the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers assembled in annual conference. I would appreciate it if a copy of this resolution, along with an excerpt from the report of our housing committee on S. 1592, might be inserted in the record at the end of my remarks.

Because the problems resulting from the continuing spread of slums and blighted areas have been of such long standing and serious concern to all municipal officers, perhaps a disproportionate part of my comments are directed to that title of the bill which deals with aid to localities for the assembly and clearance of slums and blighted areas and their preparation for redevelopment. However, this should not be construed as indicating in any way that we feel that the other titles of the bill are less workable or less essential. It is our firm and sincere belief that each of the several titles of the bill are required to meet specific needs. Because of this fact and because of the essential relationship of its several titles, we are convinced that S. 1592 represents the most sensible and honest effort which has been put forth to provide a realistic solution to our housing problem. And today, nonetheless as in the past, our housing problem, while it is intensified by the pressures of war-born shortages and our military demobilization, is essentially a long-term problem. Clearly it cannot be met either through short-sighted expediency which demands no action now, or by temporary, emergency, or piecemeal legislation.

While the housing problem is common to all communities and is therefore national in scope, effective and appropriate remedies necessarily are tied to the local market. Basically, therefore, the housing problem is essentially a community problem and the degree of success achieved by any national program which seeks to deal with such a problem must depend in a large measure upon the degree of responsibility accorded to and assumed by the local communities. We believe that the bill properly places in the local communities the clear responsibility, and initiative, for determining their own housing needs, and for working out their own programs to meet these needs, with supplemental assistance from the Federal Government where necessary. Likewise, we feel that this basic concept is properly supplemented by the provisions of title II of the bill which provide for aid to the local communities, on a matching basis, for the preparation of analyses of their local housing markets and needs. We believe that these provisions are essential to help the communities in meeting most effectively those responsibilities which, under the bill, are theirs.

We are also strongly in favor of those provisions of title II of the bill which would authorize funds to be made available to the National Housing Agency to carry out a program of technical housing research. Through such a program, we believe it is possible to make continuing progress in the reduction of the construction cost of homes. More important, perhaps, from the standpoint of the municipal law officer, such a program seems to offer a feasible means of securing the factual bases upon which outmoded building codes may be revitalized to permit and encourage the use of new and improved building techniques and materials. Clearly this would benefit all those who have a stake in house production—the consumer, the builder, the banker, the laborer, and the local community.

The provisions of titles III and IV of the bill seek to perfect and expand the various aids to private housing enterprise currently extended through the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration and the Federal Housing Administration. These provisions seem sound and should do much toward enabling these units to assist in meeting, more effectively than they can under the present statutes, the housing needs of our returning veterans and of families of more moderate income. Throughout titles III and IV there is an appropriate concentration on the encouragement and protection of home ownership. At the same time there is a clear recognition that, by reason of preference or need, many families will continue to require rental housing. The rental housing provisions of titles III and IV, along with the provisions of title V which seek to attract into moderately priced rental housing large aggregates of investment capital now actively seeking new outlets, should provide a reasonable balance of sales and rental housing.

We are strongly in favor of the provisions of title IV which seek to secure the production of a substantial volume of moderately priced homes available for purchase under advantageous terms which, at the same time, offer additional protection to the home owner against the loss of his home and his life savings. The sponsors of this bill are to be commended for working out a combination of firm commitments to builders, up to 85 percent of the appraised value of a moderately priced home, with provision for its purchase by the home owner under a 95-percent, 32-year, 4 percent mortgage. It would be our hope that such a plan would be sufficiently attractive to cause builders who otherwise would in all likelihood be much more interested in producing housing in the 7-, 8-, 9-, and 10-thousand-dollar price class, to produce a substantial volume of good homes in the moderate-price class where the need is clearly the greatest.

As I have indicated before, the problems resulting from the continuing spread of slums and blighted areas have been of long standing and serious concern to all municipal officers. It is our sincere conviction that no substantial volume of new housing construction may now be undertaken without reference to this problem which is common to all urban areas.

A pronounced trend of tax delinquency exists in these areas, and investments therein have become highly speculative risks. The migration of population, investment capital, and taxpaying capacity continues at an accelerated rate as blight progresses. The cost of public services which the local government must continue to supply to these areas, nevertheless, continues at a constant figure. At the same time additional municipal expenditures are required to provide and maintain essential public services to the newly developed outlying sections and to make them more accessible to the central business areas, and, as has been very appropriately stated, "Taxes go up, rents go up, and the residents continue to go away."

The march of population, investment capital, and taxpaying capacity from the central areas to the suburban areas will continue unless effective action is taken to make these blighted central areas available for appropriate redevelopment at prices which are consistent with the reuse of the land. This has now become increasingly apparent to a wide variety of individuals and groups, responding to an equally wide variety of motives and interests. The implications of this trend to municipalities which already are hard pressed to find new sources of revenue to meet new and progressive municipal needs—particularly in view of the continuing trend on the part of the Federal Government to preempt the sources of new local tax revenues—is plain. Accordingly, there is an increasing demand not only from farsighted realtors and public officials, but also from a diversity of groups never before particularly interested in housing, that positive, constructive action be taken now to remedy the basic conditions which nourish and encourage the spread of urban blight.

We recognize that the program of aid to localities for the assembly and clearance of these blighted areas and their preparation for redevelopment is considered to be an experimental program. We recognize that it is a new program, but we believe that it may well prove to be as important as any single feature in the general housing bill.

The committee well knows that this problem has been of sufficient concern to cause some 20 States to enact legislation which seeks to make it feasible, by a combination of private enterprise and local public endeavor, to assemble the land in these blighted areas and make it available for suitable redevelopment at a price consistent with the most appropriate reuse of the land. Some of these laws have been on the books since 1941. But apart from the project being developed by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., under the New York law, none of them have been productive of the clearance and redevelopment of blighted areas. We are convinced

that, under these State laws alone and without supplemental assistance from the Federal Government, real progress in the clearance of these blighted areas and their redevelopment for appropriate uses will not be achieved. In part, this is due to the fact that the necessary write-down of the land values in these areas cannot be accomplished through State and local action alone because they do not themselves possess the financial resources to undertake that job. Moreover, the complications resulting from constitutional limitations upon the incurring of debt or upon the levying of taxes to support new municipal undertakings would make it impossible to get any such type of program under way in any substantial number of States.

We believe that the provisions of title VI offer the first real hope of substantial accomplishment in this extremely important field. Because the potential accomplishments which may be realized from this title could do so much to revitalize the sound development of our municipalities and the stabilization of their revenues, we wish to emphasize the importance which we attach to it. Given this type of assistance for the assembly and clearance of land in slum and blighted areas, additional incentives would be created for all types of housing development. New opportunities would be opened for large-scale direct investment under the yield insurance provisions of the bill. The types of housing most likely to be produced with yield insurance seem particularly appropriate for the relatively intensive use for which many central areas are most suited. Mutual ownership and rental housing seeking land suitable for large-scale development should find particular advantages in making use of the areas which this plan would make available. Housing for upper-income families under present FHA operations should be safeguarded by the protection of the type of neighborhood development possible under this plan. Incentives for the retention of existing, and the attraction of new, commercial developments may be provided. Public housing should have an important role to play in rehousing low-income families displaced by clearance and redevelopment operations involving reuse of the land for commercial use or housing for middle or upper-income groups.

In the past the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers has consistently favored the program of aid to localities for low-rent housing for families in the lowest income group. We recognize, of course, that there are some groups who today, as in the past, contend that all forms of public-housing activity must be stopped and they are extremely vocal in their contention. We do not believe that this type of opposition is based upon any realistic or honest approach to the problem. It would certainly seem that today there is a clear recognition, on the part of all reasonable and informed groups, of the importance and necessity for the continuation of the public low-rent housing and slum-clearance program to serve those families whose incomes are so low that, even with the improvements and additional aids to private enterprise provided in the bill now before you, they cannot be served by private enterprise.

At the Federal level, a special congressional subcommittee which studied the problem for more than a year and a half have stated its conviction that remedial measures must be provided which will permit the more rapid removal of substandard housing and the rehousing of low-income families than can reasonably be expected to take place through private initiative and finance alone. Likewise, the system established under the United States Housing Act for meeting these needs has, by the test of actual experience, proven to be the most effective and economical means of doing this essential part of the housing job. Title VII, as we see it, provides the necessary basis for the continuation of the low-rent-housing program under the United States Housing Act. Also, it perfects that system so that the cost of the program may be materially reduced through complete private financing of the loans at lowered interest rates. This would permit a reduction in the annual contributions from 60 to 45 years, and offers substantial possibilities of further economies.

At the State and municipal level the need for such a program has received complete recognition. Forty States, along with the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, have enacted legislation to permit the creation of local public bodies with adequate powers to participate in that program. More than 400 cities and more than 350 counties have established local housing agencies. This seems to be an overwhelming confirmation of the need for this program.

The National Institute of Municipal Law Officers strongly endorses those provisions of the bill which place the major urban housing functions of the Federal Government in a single agency. Like all other Federal housing legislation, this bill has as its central objective the provision of good housing for our people. It seeks to stimulate the provision of that housing through varied fiscal devices and systems of aid. Thus it seems to be a matter of plain, common sense that these interrelated programs and activities must be centered upon that objective through a unity of activity and purpose, and a clear delineation of responsibility for housing policy, which can only be achieved at the Federal level through the establishment of a single housing agency. This is borne out by our experience with the scattered housing agencies and programs in earlier years, and our experience with the National Housing Agency under the most trying wartime conditions.

We should also like to indicate that we note with approval and consider appropriate the various special provisions of the bill relating to veterans and their families and to the families of men still in the armed services.

We believe that this bill offers a realistic approach to the housing problem and affords the best possibilities of attaining a sustained and high annual volume of new home construction. It does not attempt to segment or deal separately with various phases of the problem, without regard to their obvious interrelation. We endorse the bill because it seeks to provide the means for a program to stimulate the production of good housing at reasonable cost for those who did not have it before; to provide an effective means for arresting urban blight and aiding sound community growth; to protect sound property values and to establish new outlets for investment funds, building materials, and labor.

Veterans and Labor—The Victory Team

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the closest ties forged at the anvil in the heat of war were established by the joint efforts of the laboring men and women, and the service men and women of our beloved America.

The husbands, sons, brothers, sisters, and other relatives of the makers of the implements of war and the preparers of food, serviced and manned our weapons of destruction in their joint devotion for victory.

Theirs was a mutual sacrifice, even to the accidents in factory and the bloodshed of the battlefield. The distinction of the uniform is fading to civilian attire, and the reconversion, so to speak, is reestablishing that mutual interest that should exist for a prosperous America, emerging as the fruit of victory. Such a victory demands, and rightfully so, work for all at a fair wage level, comfortable living standards, and a productive economy for family needs.

Let no worker or returning serviceman permit anyone to sever this unified, wholesome position, for in unity there is strength. The deepest interests of the country are involved in that unity purchased at a tremendous price in the sacrifices of the war. Here is a comradeship born in the sweat and blood of devotion to the ideals that in the serious days of conflict captivated the imagination of the world. In the tranquil hours of peace, it should be cherished and preserved.

Parity in Health and Education for Farm People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 19), 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Parity in Health and Education for Farm People, which I delivered to the Associated Women of the American Farm Bureau Federation, at Chicago, on December 17 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The farm women, the women whom you represent here today, constitute 2 out of 10 of all American women. Three out of every ten children in America are being reared in farm homes. But the farm income is only one dollar out of every ten of the Nation's income.

Two out of every ten women, then, are farm women.

Three out of every ten children are being raised in farm homes.

Yet only $1 out of every ten goes to provide for these farm homes.

We are determined not to be satisfied with the progress that has been made toward a parity of income for farmers. We still have a long way to go.

I come to Chicago to talk with you and the representatives of the American Farm Bureau organization about three fundamental things: The soil, the health of the Nation, the Nation's children.

All three of these things are related directly to achieving what amounts to a parity of opportunity for farm people. The scientists tell that we are taking plant food out of our soil at twice the rate we are putting it back in the form of fertilizer and soil-building crops. This means that we are facing soil bankruptcy.

When your family sits down to the table for a meal, it's not the amount of vegetables,

milk, and meat which alone determines the food value of the meal. It's the phosphorus, nitrogen, and other minerals that determine whether meals build strong, healthy bodies. And in turn, the amount of these elements is determined by the plant food that was available in the soil from which the vegetables, meat, and milk came.

The people of Deaf Smith County, Tex., have practically no tooth decay, and few dental bills. That's because the soil of that section is rich in minerals. Science today associates many disabilities and diseases, such as goiter, night blindness, anemia, thyroid troubles, tonsillitis, dental caries, and heart disease with deficiencies of minerals in our soil.

What is true of people is true of livestock. Missouri didn't just happen to be a mule-raising section. They're able to raise big, tough mules in Missouri because of the soil there. In certain areas of Tennessee a high phosphorus soil produces crops and grazing which fatten and grow livestock faster than other sections of the State.

The key to the American Farm Bureau soil plan is the national fertilizer policy bill, which Senator BANKHEAD and I are sponsoring in the Senate, and Representative FLANNAGAN in the House. Tomorrow I have the good fortune to have an opportunity to discuss in detail with the American Farm Bureau the progress of this measure. I have taken the liberty to mention it here because it is related to your own interest in increased income for farm people, in a healthier diet for the Nation, and in the preservation of our basic national resource, the soil.

No matter how we approach the necessity of providing medical care, we find that it relates directly to income. It is income that builds hospitals, pays doctors' bills, and provides public health services.

Four out of every ten counties in the United States do not have a recognized hospital. Practically all these counties are rural counties.

You need no statistics to remind you that throughout the rural areas of America the number of doctors is far below that necessary to provide needed service to farm people. The war years have made it even worse. Year by year the number of doctors in our rural areas has been dropping.

Doctors are now concentrated where hospitals are available. Having spent thousands of dollars to educate and train themselves, doctors are unwilling to practice where they do not have hospital facilities, where they do not have the tools with which to do their work.

I remember when I was a boy in knee pants, my father could carry most of the equipment a doctor of those days needed in one of those small, black handbags. Today, with the marvelous progress in medicine, the doctor must have access to X-ray equipment, laboratory equipment, sterilizing equipment, anaesthetic equipment. They're not gadgets to him. They are to the doctor what a tractor, a cultivator, an electric pump are to the farmer. They make it possible for the doctor to increase the services he can provide society.

During the war we learned an expensive and impressive lesson about how the health of individual people is related directly to the strength of the Nation in time of emergency. One man out of every three called up for military service was found unfit to serve because of physical or mental disability. The same percentage—one out of every three—applied to women who sought to serve with the Women's Army Corps.

If half of the men who were rejected for service for these disabilities had been qualified to serve, it would never have been necessary to call up fathers, or men over 35.

Those who are handicapped for service during war are also handicapped for service during peace. Physical or mental defects take their toll in lowered production, and early death.

How can the Nation remain unconcerned about the toll that poor health is taking from our human resources?

Let me ask how many of you come from counties which today have adequate hospital facilities and public health facilities.

Suppose you have to depend on your local resources; that is, private organizations, church groups, county and State governments, and private charity. Do you think that in the next 5 years you could get adequate hospital facilities without Federal aid?

Based on the conviction that it would be impossible for areas which need them most to provide adequate hospital services without some help from the Federal Government, Senator Burton, now Justice Burton, and I joined in sponsoring the hospital construction bill. Under this bill direct grants would be made to assist States, counties, and communities to provide needed public and private nonprofit hospitals and medical centers. The amount of money for any particular State would depend on that State's present income. I am happy to report to you that we were able to pass the bill in the Senate last Tuesday. It is now in the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the House of Representatives. This legislation has the backing of the American Hospital Association, the Catholic Hospital Association, the Protestant Hospital Association, and the Council on Medical Education and Hospitals of the American Medical Association. Only if it is favorably reported by the committee and passed by the House of Representatives is there any hope for adequate hospitals in the areas which most need them.

The health and lives of the farm people of the Nation demand the passage of the legislation. The health and lives of all the people of the Nation demand the passage of the legislation.

We also have had a dramatic example of how essential education is in the modern war. We were able to develop the atomic bomb because of the level of education in America. You have undoubtedly been impressed with the fact that atomic energy had its beginnings in the laboratories of our colleges. Dr. Albert Einstein, a professor of mathematics, laid the groundwork for atomic energy a quarter of a century ago. Mathematicians, physicists, chemists—those who teach and those who have been exploring the frontiers of science—made it possible to take those formulas and to devise this machine of destruction—a machine which we now believe can also be an engine for construction.

But education does not begin in the laboratories of our great institutions of higher learning. It is based on the whole structure. The foundation is in thousands of grammar schools and high schools.

If the whole structure is to be sound, there is much to be done.

It is already late. Education takes time. The investment in the first grade of grammar school today does not pay dividends in citizenship until the boy or girl reaches maturity—14 or 15 years from now. We must have a greater urgency in our determination to provide adequate, universal public education.

We have a desperate need in many sections for more and better education, for more and better school buildings, for more and better paid school teachers.

The average salary of rural school teachers is not even half the average salary of city teachers. I can show you charwomen and janitors cleaning public buildings who receive more pay than the average salaries of the Nation's rural school teachers.

In some places we find good school buildings but the children are being taught by poorly paid and untrained teachers. A child has no choice over where he or she is born. Yet this often determines the opportunity he or she will have in life.

California pays her school teachers an average annual salary of $2,497.

Indiana pays her school teachers an average annual salary of $1,606.

Alabama pays her school teachers an average annual salary of $925.

The low pay of Alabama teachers is not due to lack of interest in education in Alabama. Alabama's problem, like that of many other States, especially farming States, is low income.

Yet the Nation during the war depended upon men and women who were raised in our rural areas. Likewise, the Nation is dependent for its future upon boys and girls who are in America's rural schoolrooms today. The intelligence of these boys and girls in peacetime jobs for the future, and in defense for the future will determine the strength and well-being of the Nation.

The farmers send millions of their dollars out of the rural sections each normal, peacetime year into other sections for the purchase of automobiles, farm machinery, fertilizer, clothing, and manufactured goods and commodities of all kinds. The rural sections cannot tax the profits from these millions of their farmers' dollars. The only way the rural sections can get back some of these farmers' dollars so badly needed for schools and the education of the farmers' children is by the Federal Government collecting some of these farmers' dollars in taxes and sending the dollars back to the farm sections through Federal aid for education.

Considering America's income and what we are capable of providing, how many of you feel that in your communities or counties you have adequate school plants, adequate salaries for teachers, and adequate school terms?

Suppose your community or county has to depend on local or State resources, do you think that within 5 years from this date you can have adequate educational facilities?

How many of you here believe that there is any reason why a rural child in America should not have an educational opportunity equal to a city child?

Knowing it will not be possible to provide for better educational opportunity in the areas which need it most without Federal grants, Senator THOMAS of Utah and I are sponsoring a bill which would make such grants directly to the States. The amounts to go to each State are based on their present per capita incomes and the effort they are now making to provide educational opportunity for their children.

This bill offers the one hope to speed up rural education—the one opportunity to make it possible for farm boys and girls to have an educational opportunity more nearly equal to that of city boys and girls. Without Federal aid there can be no such opportunity.

Many war veterans are returning home more determined than ever to complete their education. Their experiences with learning rapidly to do jobs in the Army and Navy mean that they have high standards in what they expect. The Federal Government has made it possible for these men and women, as individuals, to continue their education. But this is of little value if the high schools, trade schools, and colleges open to them are low in quality. Either these veterans will become discouraged and drop out of school or they will move off to other schools where the standards are higher.

It is simple justice that children should not be handicapped because of something over which they have no control. The three out of ten children who live on America's farms must not be handicapped because their families receive only one dollar out of ten of America's income.

I would like to remind you that Federal aid for education is not a new thing. There is Federal aid provided for our land-grant colleges and other institutions. There is

Federal aid for the agricultural extension service, and its farm educational services. There is Federal aid for agricultural and home economics courses in our high schools.

Those who raise the cry that Federal aid means Federal control forget that we have had experience with Federal aid for education over a period of half a century.

These programs I have outlined to you are a parity program. A parity of educational and health opportunities for rural people. Such parity is essential, not only in the interest of farm people but in the interest of the Nation.

The United States now is in a position of world leadership. It is a responsibility that we cannot escape or hide from. It is an opportunity that no other people in history have had.

But that responsibility and that opportunity have made education a national necessity. We cannot build a new world unless it is based on knowledge and understanding. The way of peace is not easy. The United States, along with other peace-loving nations, is committed to a bold, new attempt at international security and peace through the United Nations Organization. How many people understand fully what this means? How many will be alert to give our representatives to the United Nations Organization the support and confidence they need?

I have heard those who say, "It's too much for me to understand. Let our leaders in Washington decide those things."

Your leaders in Washington to make wise decisions must know what you and millions of Americans think and believe.

Americans of the future must be educated and prepared to think clearly. They must have the capacity to understand other peoples and other nations. As others look to us for leadership, so we must look to them for cooperation at every step.

Now that all the world is at our own backyard, American education must become a dynamic force—a force that helps us look inward as well as outward. A force that will make it possible for us to avoid staring at the mote in our brother's eye while we cannot see the beam in our own eye.

We have at this moment our opportunity to lead mankind forward and upward over a new frontier and into a new era. We failed to grasp such an opportunity at the end of the last World War. Destiny has now blessed us by giving us a second chance. It may be the last. We cannot count on a third.

Low-Cost Housing: A Challenge to the Building Industry—Under Secretary of Commerce Delivers Constructive Address to Builders of New York on Problem of Great Current Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted to me, I beg leave to include in the RECORD a copy of an address made by the Honorable Alfred Schindler, Under Secretary of Commerce, before the Building Industry Employers of New York State at the golden jubilee dinner of that organization at the De Witt Clinton Hotel in Albany, N. Y., on December 12, 1945.

Mr. Schindler's address is on the subject Low-Cost Housing: A Challenge to the Building Industry. The full text of his address is as follows:

I appreciate the opportunity of addressing you this evening. There is an important reason for this. As one of the public administrators of the Department of Commerce I'm deeply concerned with the progress of the building industry in these critical days of reconversion. I also am deeply concerned with what I believe your industry can do and must do in helping shape the prosperity of the country in the years ahead.

We are all aware of a great, Nation-wide deferred demand for construction of all kinds. Our farmers are in need of construction; industry is in need of construction; trade and service businesses are in need of construction; all branches of Government, down to the smallest township, are in need of construction. But the most critical part of this deferred demand for construction is in housing. This demand is growing more acute with each passing day. It is being constantly swelled by the number of veterans who are returning to civilian life. These veterans need living quarters. War-industry centers are bulging with people who apparently intend to stay put and who therefore need decent living quarters—not trailers and makeshift barracks.

Now all of this construction demand, especially the demand for housing, is geared into almost every industry in the country. These feeder industries are the whole run of consumer durable goods. Together, they add up to employment for some four and a half million workers. Next to agriculture, construction is the largest industry in the country. In a 40-hour week the construction industry, together with its feeder industries, can produce better than 10 percent of our total national production.

Thus, the health and well-being of your industry is of the greatest concern to the Nation as a whole. Should your industry be afflicted by a fatal disease—and I make no bones about it when I tell you that the disease I have in mind is inflation—and I am talking to you as one businessman to another—should your industry become bedridden with inflation through blind greed for only fat or swollen profits, then it will have succeeded in sickening our entire economy. If people cannot buy what you build because of high or inflated costs, then the boom now before the building industry will collapse after a brief period just as sure as fate.

The building industry historically has always been able to market houses to that one-fifth of our population which can afford to pay high prices. But it has not served adequately or wisely the other four-fifths of our population. Three-fifths could pay just reasonable prices for dwellings. The remaining one-fifth are in dire need of subsidized housing. But together, these four-fifths of our population represent a tremendous, untapped, and continuing market.

It is to this market that the building industry must turn. Not only to meet the urgent housing needs of this overwhelming portion of our population, but because if their demands for housing are not met—if they are neglected—then the prosperity which should so richly grace our land will evaporate. The four and a half million jobs which the building industry could supply toward our national goal of "maximum gainful" employment will not materialize. And the building industry, every phase and facet of it, will be in a terrible mess.

As a businessman I know that you builders want to build houses that people can afford to buy. It makes good business sense, because you sell more houses that way. But the reason you haven't been able to make houses cheaper and sell them cheaper is because you have tangled with and become surrounded by a lot of obstacles—some of them of your own choosing. These obstacles can correctly be labeled "cost obstacles." And while they stand high in the path of your industry's progress—high in the path of full profitable production and full gainful employment for the American people, they are not immovable. They must not be immovable. They are obstacles that can be cleared away only by the most honest thinking, the clearest understanding, and the boldest action that can be collectively given to the task. I say "collectively" because they involve realtors, the building industry, labor, and government down to the smallest town council.

These obstacles, as we in the Department of Commerce see them after careful study, can be enumerated as follows:

1. The lack of effective price control on land values, on construction, and on finished houses.

2. The lack of year-round work and an assured basic annual wage for the workers in the industry.

3. The oppressive and restrictive practices now being carried on by some construction industry suppliers, and the restrictive agreements between management and labor in the construction field.

4. The continuance by most of our municipalities of antiquated building codes, which restrict the use of new and cheaper materials and in many other ways add to the cost of construction.

The removal of these obstacles is the No. 1 job facing the industry today. For we are going to have houses built that more of our people can afford to buy, despite the selfish interests of those who have chained their present mental attitudes to unrealistic past performances. The public will not wait impatiently forever.

I want to discuss one by one the points I've enumerated. The first is price control. You gentlemen know what happens when inflation hits the housing industry. You saw it happen after the First World War, and again in the late 1920's. You know what symptoms identify this disease. The prices of land and of new and old structures rise rapidly. This encourages the fly-by-night speculator to dabble in the building game. He jumps in, puts up a few cheap structures, and takes out a fancy profit. In so doing he further bids up land values and the cost of materials. This makes it just so much tougher for the legitimate builder to operate. Banks and other credit sources see the bubble grow, and knowing that it has to burst, they withdraw from the building field—and the industry is soon in a serious and costly depression.

The responsible and legitimate businessmen in the building industry should champion and support needed price-control legislation. Legislation which should remain in effect until the dangers necessitating it have safely passed.

They should likewise support such additional legislation as has already been introduced and as may be contemplated, designed to avoid serious immediate pitfalls—to establish stability in the industry and to assure its continued growth and progress and needed contribution to the general welfare and soundness of the economy as a whole.

Legislation such as has been suggested in the bill introduced by Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, which authorizes the President to appoint a housing coordinator who would be in a position to mobilize the whole economy behind the housing industry. He could expedite the production of building materials and he could channel them into that type of construction and housing where the need and the market is greatest. He could set ceilings on new houses. These ceilings would take into consideration present material costs, labor costs, and an ample margin of profit.

He would also have the authority to apply ceilings to future sales of existing houses. He could take strong action to see that speculative excesses in land did not hinder construction activity.

He could put his weight behind the drive for new homes in the areas where the situation was most urgent. He would have the over-all power necessary to cut red tape and get things done.

This is a direct and forthright approach to help lick the housing shortage—to make the volume of production of houses possible and to help assure the production of houses that more of our people can afford to buy.

Quite obviously, such a coordinator would have to work most closely with all elements involved and secure their best help and cooperation in developing a proper plan of procedure and support in its full and successful implementation. Thus, a most serious cost obstacle to the wholesome progress of the industry can be removed.

Now I come to the second point I previously made—the lack of year-round work and an assured basic annual wage for the workers in the industry. This cost obstacle is not an artificial one. Unlike booming land values and speculative profits, this problem cannot be solved by legislation. But it can be solved by wisely appreciating the demand for housing as well as by the application of some good hard thinking—ingenuity, and sound, common, business sense. In an industry which must now strive to give more consumers housing they can afford to buy, the present high hourly wages paid to the mechanics and laborers of the building trades are helping hamstring this goal.

Labor is not at fault in demanding this high hourly rate of pay. The fault lies with the industry itself. When you consider that the building trades workers are employed on an average of only 32 weeks out of the year, then whatever they demand for hourly pay must include remuneration for the 20 other weeks the industry cannot give them work.

I want to take this occasion to correct a mistaken impression that many people have about the wages of building trades workers. There is widespread belief that these workers make big money because of the high hourly rate of pay they receive. On the contrary, a building trades worker's income is less than that which his fellow-worker makes in a manufacturing plant. The average annual income received by the building trades worker prior to the war was less than $1,400. During the war it crept up to over $2,000. But this increase was largely the result of overtime paid during the rush to get munitions plants built and other needed construction built in the speediest possible time.

Now nobody can argue against the fact that "a laborer is worthy of his hire." Building trades workers are skilled mechanics and should be paid well for their work. I believe they would be willing to take less pay per hour if they had better assurance of year round work and an annual basic wage permitting the decent standard of living to which they are entitled.

A true measure of income is not a man's hourly wage but his annual income and it's this annual income that determines his standard of living.

An assured basic annual wage would go far toward bringing down building costs and helping stabilize the industry. There are many ways this objective can be reached. One method is by combining as cooperatives, so that facilities can be exchanged and sheds built where prefabrication of some parts of a structure can be carried on at all times. Another method is by making year-round work possible by "tenting" the job, when weather necessitates. In this age of tremendous scientific advancement there should be no reason why construction of all kinds, especially that of houses, cannot be carried on in all kinds of weather. During cold weather these tents can be heated. In this manner, shoring and concrete work could be carried on. The original carpenter or bricklaying work can be carried on under this kind of tenting. And when the roof is completed the tent can be taken down. Windows can then be boarded up and in cold weather the interior of the house can be heated so that the plaster work, the plumbing, the electrical work or the rest of the carpenter work can be carried on without stoppage.

Paradoxically, an assured annual wage in the building industry not only would mean lower construction costs, and thus more sales of houses, but at the same time it would mean more jobs and higher annual wages for the workers. Thus, the cost obstacle of seasonal high hourly wages is a challenge to the growth and prosperity of the building industry. It is a challenge to the industry's ingenuity and engineering ability. It is a challenge that can and must be met. It is a cost obstacle that can and must be removed if we are to build houses whose costs are within the means of more of our people.

Yes, there are many who say this cannot be done. There are many who say some time in the future we may find a way to do it. Leaders, aggressive and wise, however, will find a way to do it now and thus reap for themselves the fruits of their leadership.

The third cost obstacle I made reference to earlier is the oppressive and restrictive practices now being carried on by industry, management, and labor in the construction field. These practices are illegal in many respects, and harmful to the industry in the over-all. They are also militating against the years of full profitable production and full gainful employment that can lie ahead for us.

One of the worst practices—a practice that has been under the scrutiny of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission—is the retailer-enforced agreement against building manufacturers. In this type of agreement, some building supplies retailers boycott a building materials manufacturer if he should sell supplies to a volume builder or contractor direct. Thus, where a volume builder or contractor could lower the cost of construction by a considerable amount of money, he is blocked in his efforts. Although the Federal Trade Commission has leveled several cease-and-desist orders on such retailer groups, reports indicate that this practice is still being carried on sub rosa. Plumbers also make agreements whereby they refuse to install the plumbing unless the plumber is permitted to furnish his own material. The same is true of electricians and other contractors or subcontractors. All these practices are in restraint of trade. Restraint of trade means restraint of employment—not free enterprise.

Freedom of individual enterprise means freedom of competition—not license to destroy competition or to establish monopoly. All these practices are helping to keep the cost of housing beyond the reach of the average American family. They can be stopped at once through the cooperation of builders' associations like yours with the Federal Government.

With regard to the restrictive agreements between management and labor and suppliers in the construction industry—these restrictive agreements exist in most large cities. They usually exist between building associations and local labor unions. Sometimes they exist between local unions themselves. These agreements cause more hours of labor to be spent upon a particular installation than are necessary by the furthest stretch of the imagination. Since these agreements are city-wide, every builder has relatively the same additional costs that his competitor has—costs that are usually passed on to the purchase price of a house, or to the building owner.

These make-work affairs, these outgrowths of the depression years when construction labor was in large part walking the streets and very understandably sought to protect itself by limitation of work agreements, have no right to existence in these days. They are no more productive of full employment than are the restrictive provisions of cartels and other monopolistic understandings. During the war these agreements were waived because there was plenty of work. There is more than plenty of work in the years of full production that lie ahead. If these agreements are not abrogated at once they will do more harm to building labor than good. If they are not discarded it will be because of unfortunate short-sightedness.

Let me cite some examples of these agreements. In some cities, glass put in a window sash by a manufacturer must be taken out by a builder and the window reglazed by a member of a local glazing union. The same treatment is usually accorded factory-wired electrical fixtures. The wires must be taken out and then put back by a member of the local electrical union. Paint spray guns and similar labor-saving devices are a favorite taboo with unions. In some instances, where a 5- or 6-inch paint brush is practical, no wider than a 4-inch brush is permitted. Jurisdictional disputes are all too frequently settled by dividing work. A member of one union sets the beam while the rival attends the setting. There is no end to a list of this kind.

Now, no single restrictive agreement such as I have drawn your attention to, exists on a Nation-wide scale, and no single employer-union agreement amounts to much in a specific instance. But when these restrictions are all added up, the aggregate is very costly. Both industry and labor must take immediate steps to cancel out these agreements, these cost obstacles to lower-cost housing. The solution should be found in the assurance of plenty of work, in full production and full employment.

The last cost obstacle I want to expound on is building codes—codes which restrict the use of new and less costly materials, new methods of construction, and which deny the development of technological progress in the building field. It must be recognized that building codes by their very nature are restrictive, and that their purpose is to protect the public from dangerous practices. But it must also be recognized that many codes, through long usage, have acquired a kind of sanctity although they are out-of-date, and, in a good many instances, just plain ridiculous. Take the example, of the code of one of our large Midwest cities. In this instance the code is so worded as to prohibit the use of a certain type of fireproof wallboard. Yet this product, manufactured in about 30 plants throughout the United States, is of standard quality, and has wide acceptance. It has been tested and approved by our National Bureau of Standards. The quantity used per million dollars' worth of construction has more than trebled in the last decade. Hundreds of million feet were used by our armed forces. But the home owners and builders of this large city are deprived of its use and of the economy of its use.

In another city the code requires the thickness of brick walls to be 12 inches for dwellings, when 8-inch walls are generally accepted in most other cities. Thus, an unnecessary cost is added to the purchase price of new homes in that city.

In still another city the code is written so that there is a dependence on minimum dimensions, rather than on safe working stresses. For example, this code requires 2 x 4 studs without permitting construction of equivalent strength but of different dimensions, such as in glued panels.

Then there is the code in another large city which requires that the first floor of a dwelling be constructed to withstand a live load of 50 pounds per square foot, when most other cities have found 40 pounds per square foot to be more than reasonably safe.

These are not isolated examples. But they all add up to the reason why the skeletal structure of a house is so unduly costly. What is needed is a national building code which every city and community can adopt, perhaps with minor local variations. Starting with the wartime experience with a national building code for defense housing, the Department of Commerce is exploring the possibilities of further action in this direction.

The mechanics of change in codes are unduly cumbersome. But the area of technical dispute in most codes is relatively small. There is no need for the codes of certain cities to go beyond the safe standards established by the National Bureau of Standards, or beyond the limits established in the codes of comparable cities. This does not imply the building of "jerry" structures. The standards established by the National Bureau of Standards is a guaranty against that. The correction and modernization of codes is a "must." Horse-and-buggy-day codes represent an entirely unnecessary and burdensome cost obstacle in the path of low-cost housing.

The building industry will not find itself alone in fighting for the removal of any cost obstacle. The Department of Commerce now has a new construction division which was organized for the sole purpose of assisting any and every phase of your business. This division will concern itself with the promotion of year-round construction, the removal of restrictive clauses in the building codes, and the removal of costly management-labor restrictive agreements. In short, it will concern itself with helping the building industry to achieve the fullest production possible.

Our construction division will also furnish you with statistical and research information, as well as information on material production. The free-enterprise system can work best when business has knowledge of the facts and is able to make its plans on the basis of facts.

Incidentally, our figures show that the production of materials is on the upswing, and even taking into account a normal amount of work stoppages due to strikes and bad weather, we should just about skim through the early spring. We think that by summer the present scarce materials such as lumber, brick, gypsum lathe, sheet steel, and soil pipe will be in reasonably fair supply, although inventories and a completely rounded line of these materials may not be available until fall. We must recognize that this coming spring will be for the building industry a rather trying period. But no builder should be gloomy or discouraged. By early fall materials should be available to meet all building demands.

When the materials picture is normal again the building industry should be all set to go. Beginning now, every day should be used to prepare for what is coming. Never before has the building industry had so great and challenging an opportunity of fitting our mass-production skill and techniques toward the problem of satisfying the housing needs of all our people. As businessmen you must consider the full extent of your market. The vast majority of our citizens have low annual incomes. They are the backbone of our country. They are the greatest potential mass market in this country for housing, and their housing need is the most pressing problem facing the country today.

There is neither magic nor mystery in the production of low-cost housing. No builder can afford to sit back and wait for some startling new mechanical invention to reduce the cost of construction. You cannot cure a chronic disease with a headache powder. The problem must be tackled at its source. Fight to get rid of the obstacles in the way of lower construction costs. That must be the first objective, to which everything else is secondary.

The building industry should take the initiative in lowering construction costs. As businessmen, any other role would be a costly error. Now is the time for the industry to take a page out of the history of other industries—and build in the interest of the consumer at a price the consumer can afford to pay. This not only makes good business sense, but it is the only method by which our country will achieve full profitable production and full gainful employment. This is a challenge the building industry must face with boldness and vision, with considered action and with concerted action. In this direction lies the progress that can be ours if we will it so.

The Snow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle:

Hast thou entered into the treasures of the snow?—Job 38: 22.

THE SNOW

From the sunless scenes above,
Gentle as the voice of love,
To the earth below—
Like a crystalline veneer—
Through the silent atmosphere,
Comes the quiet snow,
Hiding e'en earth's humbler things
'Neath the whiteness of her wings.

And, as comes the quiet snow—
Fresh from heaven's overflow—
Silently and odd,
To us throughout all our days,
In a million mindful ways,
Comes the care of God—
Comes His tender, loving care
For His creatures everywhere.

When the sunshine comes again,
Over mountain, glade, and glen,
Noiselessly the snow
Melts her silent self to tears
As she, weeping, disappears
From the earth below;
But the love the Father sends
Never melts, and never ends.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Labor Protects Veterans' Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include a letter from an enlisted man in the United States Navy which was published in the magazine of the United Automobile Workers, Ammunition.

I insert this letter to call to the attention of Members of Congress that there is a strong feeling among the men in service that their rights as workers when they return to civilian life are being protected by organized labor. The thinking veteran wants to return to a United States in which he will find a spirit of cooperation among all groups that go to make up our great citizenry.

This is not the first letter of this kind that I have seen. Within the past 2 weeks I had a very interesting letter from one of our fighting men in Japan. Let me quote what this American soldier, Sgt. Frank R. Reidelberger, of Venice, Ill., who fought his way with the Eighty-first Infantry Division through the bloody island hopping in the Pacific to the very shores of Japan, had to say:

We had quite a discussion last evening about labor and capital, and I assure you that most of us know that labor is going to be our friend when we return.

The letter which appeared in Ammunition follows:

SIR: Enclosed you will find $1 for a subscription to Ammunition.

I would like to add my voice to that of many other liberal friends of labor. I appreciate the great fight the CIO is putting up not only on behalf of labor itself but also for the common man in every walk of life.

In the future I not only intend to back labor but also to join veterans' organizations and let my voice be heard. An alliance between organized labor and the veterans is a necessity if we are to continue a liberal advance.

WILLIAM THUMMA,
AOM 3/c, Ordnance Department,
Box 11, NAAS, Chincoteague, Va.

Men and Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, unless certain things are changed one of the strongest bodies of opinion against conscription or compulsory military service in peacetime will come from those men who have served during the present war and particularly those who have served since the end of the fighting. The reason for their attitude is simple and single—the undemocratic character of both the Army and Navy and the tremendous gulf that separates officers from men.

There are, of course, many, many cases where officers have displayed that rare ability to secure discipline by means of true qualities of leadership and have caused the men to want to follow them and to feel that in so doing they were acting as free self-respecting men. But the vast majority of expressions of opinion from servicemen—especially since the war ended—has been in forthright denunciation of officers' privileges and what they term some officers' arrogance. There is far too much smoke not to indicate a very substantial fire. Universally the men recognize that in time of active warfare there has to be

authority and discipline and that it must be exercised by officers. But their complaints refer not to orders given in battle but to the relationship between officers and men at other times, such as the present.

Now one argument advanced for peacetime military conscription of all young men has been that we had to do it on account of America's international commitments. This is an argument that I am quite unable to follow. For surely no one is suggesting that we are going to send these 18-year-old boys that would be drafted under such a system off to Africa or the Middle East or the Far East or anywhere else. Therefore all the problems of fulfilling international commitments must be met by members of the Regular Military Establishments. And men for such service must be obtained by the traditional volunteer method of our country.

Therefore the real danger to enabling the United States to carry out its international commitments is to be found in anything which blocks or discourages voluntary enlistments. And the main thing that does so is the failure of this Nation so far to accord to a noncommissioned man in the armed services the honor and dignity which is his due. Congress is partly at fault. The pay, in my opinion, is still not what it should be. The enlisted man who, naturally enough, wants to marry and have a family is, in peacetime, most inadequately provided for. There is the immediate patent injustice whereby officers receive pay at the time of discharge for accumulated leave not taken whereas the men do not. Bills to correct this have been introduced. They ought to be passed. In fact all these things ought to be corrected by legislation and at once.

But such measures will not be enough. There has to be a new truly democratic spirit in the armed forces and the barrier of distinction between officers and men, though it cannot be completely broken down of course, has got to be in certain important respects removed.

There are many reports about this matter, with which others will be as familiar as I. Some of them outrage a man's sense of fair play. There is the one about the general who forbade any of his men flying a particularly dangerous course to have parachutes though his own plane was well equipped with them. There is the letter which I received from an enlisted man anxious to come home who wrote that all the officers at a camp on Leyte had long since departed for home while the men still waited for transportation. Again I quote from a letter recently received from a man serving in the Army in Japan:

> Another thing: Many of us have souvenirs captured from the Japs. When we arrived in Korea we were told to turn them in so that they could be fairly apportioned to the men as they went home. Well that was not so bad although some of us had risked high points to get those souvenirs. But the next day a general came by to inspect them and generously gave some of them to his friends and took some more for other friends. Apparently the general had over 50 friends. Just to make sure that we could not slip them away from him our mailing privilege was restricted. We are not allowed to mail packages until they have been inspected by a special officer. War trophies are among the many things which are confiscated.

Enlisted men, especially in the Navy, tell about the tremendous amount of time that they must spend running errands and performing personal services for officers in matters which at best have no connection whatsoever with the running of the Navy and at worst are destructive of self-respect and sometimes even degrading. Somehow or other the standards observed by the best officers (most of whom the men report are Regular officers) have got to be made the standards of the rest. And the key to it is that a sailor or a soldier in the United States Navy or Army is a man and an American citizen and according to every standard set up by this Nation exactly as good, as a man, as any officer above him.

One incident was brought to my attention concerning an enlisted man in the United States Navy stationed on one of the islands in the Pacific.

In the case of this particular serviceman who was doing plumbing work in the Navy, he had written a letter to his family stating that he had been at his present location for only a short time and was then completing hot showers for the use of officers while the enlisted men on the same island were still in pup tents and bathing in their helmets. The man who censored this letter brought it to the executive officer of the battalion who thereupon called the writer of the letter to his desk. The officer proceeded to explain to the enlisted man that he was not allowed to write to people in the States and explain the type of work he was doing and added also that "officers come from better families than enlisted men and are entitled to such things." This in reference to the hot showers which were provided for the officers and not for the enlisted men.

Unfortunately this is no isolated instance. And it illustrates the very point of the existing caste system which breeds resentment in the rank and file of the men of the armed services.

An editorial in the Washington Post on November 13 raises far more serious issues than any yet spoken of. No one will be so naive as to expect that there will be universal restraint among servicemen. But it is another matter to try to contemplate with equanimity the sort of moral and health conditions apparently existing among naval personnel in Japan. The Post editorial is based on a letter from a Navy chaplain, now in service in Japan and in position to know whereof he speaks. I shall not repeat the details related in the Post editorial nor its direct quotations from Lieutenant Lacour. But along with its attack on the Navy's policy of permitting sailors free access to houses of prostitution in Japan the Post states that for officers special places are provided. "Even in vice," remarks the Post "the sacred naval caste system is preserved."

I am not suggesting a break-down of discipline. I am suggesting a building up of morale. In any military organization men have to obey the commands of officers. But I have found no objection to that on the part of the men so long as the commands have something to do with the efficiency of the service or the welfare of the personnel, or the welfare of the Nation. The objections come when the orders given have only the purpose of serving the personal convenience or even indulgence of an officer.

Moreover, I see no reason for any difference in quality or quantity of food between officers' and men's messes .I can see no reason for differences in the quality of uniforms. And I am certain that along the line of creating a fairer, more democratic spirit in our armed forces lies the greatest hope of encouraging the voluntary enlistments in the Regular Army and Navy which is the only means of discharging international commitments by the United States of America.

Commodore John Barry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I offer for the RECORD a fitting tribute, in verse, to the memory of Commodore John Barry, one of the outstanding heroes of the American Revolution and of the early history of the United States, the bicentennial of whose birth year is now being observed throughout the Nation. The author of these lines is James Patrick McGovern, a captain in our Army during World War I, whose widely read Poems of World War II were published last spring by Bethesda-Chevy Chase Post, No. 105, of the American Legion, Department of Maryland, of which he is a member.

BICENTENNIAL

Gallant Barry's immemorial name
Lives in his feats and needs not such acclaim
As "Father of the Navy." Washington,
Barry, Jones, Morris, Nicholson,
And others fought in ship or planned in hall
For our first naval glory. The later call
Against the pride of Algiers and of France
Saw Barry's post from seventh to first advance.
This captain, when new frigates hoisted sail—
Senior to Captains Barney, Truxtun, Dale,—
So ably trod his quarterdeck at sea
His ships emblazoned his famed mastery.
His *Lexington* drove Britons from their lair
Along blockaded shores of the Delaware;
His *Raleigh* with her shattered masts fought on
And won the beach when other hope was gone.
In the *Alliance* shone his forthright art.
His brillant seamanship, his dauntless heart;
Last, the *United States* as his command
Stamped him one of our Navy's foremost band.

—*James Patrick McGovern.*

Our Soil and the National Fertilizer Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 19), 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on Tuesday last, December 18, at Chicago, Ill., I addressed the annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation on the subject Our Soil and the National Fertilizer Bill. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am grateful for this opportunity to be here with you at your annual convention where you are planning your programs for the coming year and exchanging with each other the benefits of your experience as leaders of farmers.

Yesterday I had an opportunity to talk to the Associated Women of the American Farm Bureau Federation. I told them that I welcomed the opportunity to talk about three fundamental things:

The Nation's health.

The education of the Nation's children.

The preservation of the Nation's soil.

These are fundamentals. They are resources with which we cannot afford to gamble.

In respect to medical care, the Associated Women are aware, as I know you are, of the crisis which the rural areas of the Nation face as the number of doctors for each 1,000 people continues to drop. Four out of ten counties in the Nation, most of them rural counties, have no recognized hospital whatever. Among the remainder, most of the rural counties especially do not have anything like adequate health facilities.

In war, we know that physical and mental defects eliminated one-third of all the men called up for service. These same handicaps lower peacetime efficiency, result in hardship for millions of families, and lead to unnecessary sorrow and misery. With the support of the American Hospital Association, the Protestant Hospital Association, the Catholic Hospital Association, and the Council on Medical Education and Hospitals of the American Medical Association, Senator Burton, now Justice Burton of the Supreme Court, joined with me in sponsoring the hospital construction bill. I am glad to tell you that we passed the bill in the Senate last Tuesday. It is now under consideration in the House. Its passage is the only hope for speeding the day when the rural families of the Nation can enjoy parity in hospital and public health facilities.

We know also that whatever the opportunities or the dangers that may face the American people in the future they can best be met by an enlightened, educated people. But 3 out of every 10 school children are being raised in farm homes which have only 1 out of every 10 dollars of the Nation's income. In short, as it has been put, "America's children are where the dollars ain't."

How long must we wait before children in farm areas have a parity of educational opportunity with city children? Children do not decide where they will be born, or the income of their parents. Yet where they are born, and the income of their parents, determine in large measure the opportunity they will have in life.

More than 150 years ago Thomas Jefferson laid down the principle that universal, public education of a high standard was essential in a democracy. We have made much progress in that direction, but anyone who stops to consider the low standard of teacher salaries, the short length of school terms, the overcrowded schoolrooms, and the lack of school equipment—especially in the Nation's rural areas—knows how much remains to be done.

For more than 70 years the Nation has recognized some responsibility for Federal aid to education. You know what Federal aid has meant to agriculture through our land-grant colleges, through the extension services, through grants for vocational and home-economics classes in high schools. This experience, together with the urgent need for a higher standard of education in grammar and high schools, led to the writing of the Federal aid for education bill. Senator THOMAS of Utah and I are joint sponsors of this bill. There is hope for its passage in the increasing awareness of America's educational needs.

The Nation's health and the Nation's children—these represent investments that cannot be neglected if America is to be able to make the most of its opportunities and to shoulder its responsibilities.

But it is of another fundamental resource that I want to speak to you today—America's soil.

Shortly those of you in this audience will be placing your orders for fertilizer during the coming year. Let's consider for a moment what happens.

You'll select a formula such as 3–12–12, or perhaps 6–8–4. It's a formula based on the same knowledge available 20, or perhaps 25 years ago. That is, it's like buying a 1925 model automobile.

In each 100-pound sack you order there will be some 80 pounds of inert matter. Inert matter is a fancy name for something your soil doesn't really need. Apt as not this inert matter is sand, or dirt; part of it is chemical byproducts that have not plant food value. The formula also includes some elements which may be needed on some soils, but not yours.

In short, if you bought your groceries in this same way, a loaf of bread would be mostly sawdust, such as Mussolini used to provide for the people of Italy.

Who pays the bill for this sand, sulfates, chlorides, fillers of various sorts, and other elements you don't need?

Certainly the manufacturer who mixed the fertilizer doesn't give you the sand and other elements which have no plant food value. Certainly the railroads and trucking companies do not haul this inert matter free. They charge the same rate for hauling sand in fertilizer sacks as they charge for hauling the potash, phosphorous, and nitrates.

Maybe you do not mind paying the estimated $4.80 for each 600 pounds which you have to pay for sand and other elements you don't need. Maybe you're unusual for a farmer and can afford this extra money. But what about the labor it takes to handle and spread it?

If today's fertilizers were mixed on formulas based on present scientific knowledge, at least one-half of the inert matter would be eliminated. That is, you would get the same plant food, which is after all the only reason for fertilizing, with half the inert matter you're now buying. We have scientific proof that formulas such as 4–16–16, and even 5–20–20, can be used.

But the tragedy is not alone that present fertilizer production and present fertilizing practices are as out of date as a 1925 automobile. The greater tragedy is that we are removing about twice as much plant food from our soil through cropping, erosion, and leeching as we are returning through fertilizers and soil-building crops. Even the richest man will soon face bankruptcy if he draws out of the bank twice as much every year as he puts in. This is what is happening to our basic natural resource, the soil—we're facing soil bankruptcy.

What can be done to halt this trend?

Your Farm Bureau Federation has prepared a fertilizer program based on scientific facts and proven experience. The key to this program is the national fertilizer bill. Senator BANKHEAD and I are cosponsors of that bill in the Senate. Representative FLANNAGAN is its sponsor in the House of Representatives.

I have confidence in this bill because your organization has given it all-out support.

I have confidence because it is based on the scientific experiments of the agricultural experiment stations.

I have confidence because it is based on the practical experience of some 40,000 test demonstrations sponsored by the TVA, following TVA's development of superphosphate and metaphosphate fertilizers.

I have confidence in it because every impartial agricultural research organization, including the American Farm Research Association, has sustained its basic principles.

I have confidence because it is based on the reports of findings of the Land Grant College Association.

Your organization has made great strides in educating farmers on the provisions of this bill. The October 17 issue of your Official News Letter was devoted to an explanation of the objectives of the bill, and the reasons why its passage is essential.

I shall not attempt to go into a detailed explanation of the measure here, except to point out its main provisions:

1. It provides for setting up a National Agricultural Fertilizer Policy Committee, on which there would be 12 representative farmers, who would serve with officials of agricultural agencies.

2. Provision is made for expanding research and experiment station programs in order that every farmer may have the soundest technical advice on fertilizing.

3. This provision is coupled with an expanded demonstration program along the lines of the present TVA test demonstration program. An average of 75 farmers in each of some 2,000 counties would be given an opportunity to demonstrate the best fertilizing practices as a means of educating all farmers. The over-all program would be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, through the Extension Service. An assistant county agent would devote full time to the program in each demonstration county.

4. To insure a sufficient lasting supply of phosphate and potash, deposits of these basic essentials would be set aside by the Federal Government for exclusive use in farm fertilizers.

5. To develop modern methods of production of phosphates and potash, two experimental plants would be built by the Government, one in the Gulf area and one in the intermountain area. These plants would be operated as experimental plants by the Government for a period of 5 years. At the end of that time they would be offered for sale to farm cooperatives, and if not purchased by them would be shut down.

Under this bill the goal would be to make it possible for you to buy the plant food you need for your own soil. It would modernize the formulas for farm fertilizers. It would eliminate the wasteful processing of unneeded inert matter. It would eliminate costly transportation of these unnecessary

elements. It would save the unnecessary labor involved in the present wasteful and outmoded system. It would reduce the cost per unit of plant food. It would make it possible through these savings and the educational phase of the program to increase the use of needed plant food and halt the trend toward soil bankruptcy.

It all seems reasonable, and simple. You would think that such a measure could be enacted immediately. It is certainly in your interest. It is certainly in the Nation's interest to protect our basic national resource, the soil. It is certainly in the interest of every man, woman, and child who eats a piece of bread, or meat, or drinks a glass of milk to increase the vitamin and mineral content of those foods.

Where is the opposition to this bill?

So far as I know, active opposition to this bill comes from only one source. That is, the National Plant Food Council, which is a fancy way of saying the commercial fertilizer manufacturers.

Let's take a look at some of the things this organization is doing and saying. Maybe there'll be some lessons in it for us. At least, it'll give us an idea of what sort of fight you and I are facing.

The fertilizer interests have hired one of the ablest and most effective Representatives in Congress to give up his place in Congress and lead their fight against this bill. He is a man skilled in debate. He is a man who knows the legislative processes. He is a man, finally, who knows all the cries and pleas.

What are the fertilizer manufacturers frightened about in this bill? The objective of the bill, the announced purpose of the bill, is to increase, indeed, to double the consumption of plant food in the Nation. You would thing that their organization and their spokesmen would be all out for the bill. But there's a hitch.

This bill doesn't say anything about increasing the sale of sand and inert matter.

This bill doesn't say anything about increasing the number of sacks and fancy brand names.

This bill doesn't say anything about continuing the old, out-moded formulas. Or the out-moded mixing and distribution methods.

This bill is about plant food only. Even so, the end result of its enactment will still be to increase the sales of commercial fertilizers. These same fertilizer interests opposed the TVA test demonstration program, but the net result has been to greatly increase the sale of commercial fertilizers in every neighborhood where there was a TVA test demonstration program. They should have begged the TVA to undertake that program.

But there are still old ways of thinking, and old cries. They've dusted off a familiar one now. "State socialism," they're crying with alarm. This is the same cry that those like them have used so often in this kind of campaign.

It's always "state socialism" when the Government tries to do something in the farmers' interest. But when any of these big fellows come to Washington and want something for themselves, it's a different story. Everything industrialists want is in the name of free enterprise. That's what the industrialists said when they asked for what amounted to huge subsidies in the return to them of taxes from war profits. That's what the industrialists said when they asked for guaranties that have permitted many companies to purchase Government-built plants at bargain prices. All that, plus profits, is what they asked in exchange for war production.

Farmers, too, have been producing for war. Just as in World War I, they were asked for all-out production for war—even though it meant mining their soil. And the farmers responded magnificently, as you well know. With 3,000,000 fewer people on farms during the war years, they increased production 25 percent. They produced enough food for our armed forces, and enough to help keep our allies in the fight. In addition, there was enough food so that per capita consumption among civilians in the United States actually was higher than ever before in our history.

The price which farmers have paid for all this production is further depletion of the Nation's soil.

The bill does provide for the construction of two plants which are essential to achieve its objectives. They're essential to develop knowledge of production and mixing processes—and essential to establish a yardstick for determining what costs should be. But the bill specifically provides that the Government will operate those plants for 5 years only—only a sufficient time to experiment. The know-how of production from those plants will also be available to commercial manufacturers.

You and I went through the REA fight, and won it. We won it against this same cry of "state socialism." In the end, what happened? Hundreds of thousands of farm families got electricity, with its labor savings and other advantages. Those who had fought the measure—the power companies—got new and increased markets. And at a profit.

But the commercial fertilizer manufacturers would rather hold onto outmoded methods, and ancient formulas. They claim there's already sufficient production of fertilizers. If this claim be correct, what it really amounts to is a claim that farmers are buying all of the present types of fertilizers they can afford to pay for. It means they're already buying enough inert matter; it means they're already buying enough sacks, and enough fancy labels. This is true. But the fact is that farmers are buying only half enough plant food. And the only way they're going to be able to increase the amount of plant food is to see to it that the whole system is modernized and put on a basis that makes sense.

The men the fertilizer interests have hired to "protect" them from this bill will not go to sleep. This spring and summer they will approach every candidate for Congress to find out how he stands on this issue. They'll be bombarding Members of Congress with letters. They'll be sending their friends and their friends' friends to see every Member of Congress. They'll be writing letters to the newspapers and magazines about the dangers of "state socialism."

In short, you and I have a fight on our hands. Whether it's to be a long fight, and perhaps a losing one, or whether it's to be a short and successful fight is going to depend on how skillfully we fight, and how hard we fight. Certainly unless every farmer in America understands what this bill can mean to him, we cannot expect that he will support us. That is part of your job—to continue the educational program which has been begun so well by your national organization.

We are all talking today about the atomic bomb and we are frightened by its existence. We know that our Nation could be destroyed by it. I tell you that our Nation will just as surely perish, albeit a bit more slowly, if we do not replenish and rebuild our soil.

Because we have been armed with the confidence which your support gives us, because we know of the importance of this bill to you, and because we know that the welfare of this Nation depends on its passage, Senator BANKHEAD, Representative FLANNAGAN, and I are determined that this victory will be won as quickly as possible.

The Housing Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address which I made on December 8, 1945:

Friends and neighbors in the Twelfth Congressional District, I am sure all of you have heard stories of the housing shortage in Washington. Many of you will remember when one of our freshman Senators dramatized his search for a home for his family by singing Home on the Range on the Capitol steps.

Yes; Washington is crowded—in fact, bulging with people—and the end of the war has not eased things. There are still far too few homes for the hundreds of thousands of workers who make the wheels of government go round.

This shortage of living space is true not only in Washington, or Detroit, or New York; it is true of every city and town, big and little, in America. We just don't have enough homes—or good enough homes—for all the families in the United States.

When the war started there was already a serious lack of housing Most cities and towns were already seriously overcrowded.

In the years since the last war, construction had failed to keep pace with the country's growth. So when America once again went to war. we had piled up a tremendous housing deficit that the war emergency made it impossible to erase. Nearly half the people in the United States were living in substandard dwellings—in fact, 46 of every 100 American homes needed vital repairs or lacked sanitary facilities such as toilets or even running water.

The energies of the whole Nation were, of course, turned to the job of winning the war after Pearl Harbor. In the 4 years after December 1941, we built only as many new permanent dwellings as should have been put up in one normal peacetime year. This at a time when the need for housing was greater than at any time in our history.

Now we are heirs to this legacy of poor housing, inadequate housing, and tremendous demand for housing—built up before the war and greatly augmented during the war years.

Every week that passes makes the problem more acute, makes the solution more necessary. Finding decent homes for American citizens is one of the greatest challenges of the postwar period.

One of the most startling phenomena of the whole war period was the great movement of population—the shift from old homesites in search of new ones. During the war, 4 out of every 10 workers joined in this great mass migration. More than 15,000,000 people moved from their prewar homes. Over 7,500,000 moved long distances.

Most of these movers were war workers and their families, on the move to find work in war industries. The families of millions of servicemen took up their belongings to settle down in new areas. Very few of these millions found anything like decent housing for their wartime homes. Abandoned shacks, condemned tenements, and trailer camps became their homes. Hundreds of thousands moved into already crowded homes of relatives and friends.

The end of the war has not meant the end of squalor, discomfort, and overcrowding for these millions of Americans. The end of the

war, the closing down of war plants, the return of servicemen has only aggravated and not alleviated the really tragic shortage of homes.

War workers are again on the move, looking for new jobs and looking for new homes—decent, permanent homes—where they can raise their families.

The veterans are coming home, millions of them, wanting to establish their own homes for the first time.

During the 4 years of the war, 1,500,000 new families were formed. One million five hundred thousand servicemen were married. It is expected that a like number will be married as soon as they leave the service.

This means that among veterans alone there will be at least 3,000,000 new homes needed.

A place to live in comfort and decency with his family would seem to be the least of the things a democracy should offer its citizens. A place to live, to start life anew, is the very least we should offer those citizens who fought for democracy in muddy foxholes all over the world.

I saw a cartoon in a Washington paper the other day, and although it was on the comic page, there was little comical about it. It showed a young man still in uniform with his wife, standing before an apartment house that carried the familiar sign, "No vacancies." The veteran is saying to his wife, "Well, at least I had a fox hole on Okinawa."

This is grim humor indeed, and the truth.

The need for homes is greatest among the workers and servicemen who together assured victory, but it is not confined to them. Their need is urgent and immediate, but is just a part of the whole picture of poor housing, bad housing, throughout all sections of the population.

To change this picture, to build the homes we need today and will need tomorrow for our growing population, means that all the skills and genius of American business, labor, and government must be combined. Housing is a No. 1 priority among our postwar problems.

There is another side to our housing problem, and that is the employment side. New building—home construction—can provide work for more people than any other industry in America. These jobs are not only in the construction industry itself, but in the industries which supply the raw materials for construction; in the industries which make the household equipment, the furniture and thousand and one consumer items that go into a new home. A vigorous, well-planned housing program could be the cornerstone of the full-production, full-employment economy we all recognize as our national goal.

Such a housing program has been put before Congress by Senator WAGNER, of New York. Public hearings on this legislation are now being conducted before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

This housing bill, designed as it is to meet the critical housing shortage and to contribute to the job needs of our economy, deserves the support of all groups. It has been enthusiastically endorsed by consumer groups, by labor organizations, and by progressives at all economic levels. It has bipartisan sponsorship in the Senate.

Very briefly, the broad purposes of the bill are these: First, it would assure construction of enough new homes to enable the building industry to make its vital contribution to full employment. Second, it would wipe out the long-argued deficit in housing and make provision for future growth. Third, and this is very important today, it would bring home ownership within the reach of moderate-income families as well as provide decent rentals at moderate prices for this economic group. The housing program envisioned in Senator WAGNER'S bill would also plan for the elimination of slum areas and for the rehousing of slum dwellers in decent environment. A long-range plan of city, town, and rural development also is called for.

Housing is, of course, primarily, a community responsibility. Local housing needs must be met by local planning and enterprise. Today, however, every community shares in the great national housing shortage. It is a national disgrace, and calls for correction at a national level—with goals and policies established through Congress.

Senator WAGNER has proposed that the national character of the housing problem be recognized through the retention of the National Housing Agency to coordinate the activities of all the Federal agencies concerned with the problem. In this role of coordinator, the National Housing Agency would aid in the integration of local programs. It would make studies of needs and recommendations as to remedies.

The Agency would serve the very important function of encouraging localities to study their housing needs and plan for community action. It would aid in the establishment of housing standards to prevent the blight of jerry-built homes so common to thousands of American communities.

Federal aid must be advanced to communities to assist them in the destruction of slums and the building of new dwellings to take their place. The Federal Public Housing Authority, which has done this work in the past, logically could continue in this program. Slum clearance, however, should be predicated on the proposition that the displaced families will have decent homes, at rents within their reach, into which they can move.

Housing in America has too long been based on the same practice which prevails in families with many children—the hand-me-down system. The well-to-do have gotten the new, good-condition homes. The middle-income group gets the home when it has deteriorated and its real-estate value fallen. Then finally, the low-income group takes over when the dwelling has become practically uninhabitable, substandard, and unsafe.

A good housing program will prevent this by enabling all income groups to have decent homes—through rent or purchase. A resumption and extension of low-rent housing projects and liberalization of FHA mortgage insurance laws to permit wider spread ownership of new homes, will work to this end.

Some of the poorest, most unsafe housing in America can be found in our rural areas. The slums of the cities are well publicized and widely deplored. The rural slums are little heard of—but actually they are much worse than their city counterparts. More than one-third of the rural homes are in need of major repairs—in fact, are unsafe to live in in their present condition. A system of loans, handled through the Department of Agriculture, could go far to help American rural families to rehabilitate themselves. The loans should be made contingent on conformity to housing standards established by the Secretary of Agriculture in cooperation with the National Housing Agency.

I feel very strongly that the veterans of World War II, millions of whom are in desperate need of homes, should be given top priority on housing. They should have first call on present housing, and should be given special consideration with regard to financing of new homes.

The program I have outlined is just a sketch of the housing legislation needed to meet our major domestic problem—the problem of homes for our citizens. It will call for the expenditure of millions of dollars—but such expenditures will be more than repaid in the prosperity to which decent housing is the key.

Outspoken Sympathy for General Motors Strikers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I quote extracts from several publications on the General Motors strike, which is gaining support from nonunion citizen groups and the noncontrolled press:

WHO IS STRIKING?

We are more and more inclined to wonder who is on strike, General Motors or its employees. Technically, of course, the employees are on strike, i. e., they walked off the job and set up a picket line; but, in reality, this action may be considered as a countermeasure to the corporation's refusal to meet the union halfway. We cannot see that GM has made anything like a serious effort, such as the collective-bargaining process implies, to answer the union's arguments for a 30-percent increase in wages with no hike in prices. (America, December 8, p. 254.)

EFFECT ON SOCIETY IGNORED

General Motors wants its profits, but perhaps more than anything else it is determined to conduct its vast operations protected from the public eye. * * * The men of the old school who have worked their way to the top of many of our large corporations still have a tendency to think of labor as an item in the accountant's ledger. * * * They think of a business as their own private business, regardless of how many human destinies it affects. (The Commonweal, December 7, p. 182.)

GM OFFICIALS NOT KINGS

The whole attitude of industrial management reeks of threadbare and regal arrogance, as out of place in the modern world as the divine rights of kings. It smells of moth-eaten ermine and musty prerogatives. This judgment is supported even by the choice of words used in corporation press hand-outs. A recent GM statement, for instance, said: "Abdication of management * * * is in essence what the union demands."

In using the word "abdication" the corporation dug down into its subconscious mind and came up with its real feeling. "Abdication" is a word which means, in common usage, the resignation of a king. Webster's dictionary says the word "applies particularly to the relinquishment of authority which is inherent or sovereign; as to 'abdicate the crown.'"

The managers of industry think they are sovereign powers; that is the real trouble. * * * They have flouted the sovereignty of the American people. They have precipitated costly strikes which have a ruinous effect upon the prosperity of the Nation. (The Wage Earner, December 7, p. 8.)

THE BOOKS MUST BE OPEN

What General Motors is most against is opening its books. It will not let unions know whether the company can pay. * * * You cannot keep from coming to the conclusion that General Motors should open its books. The stakes are too big to allow secrecy. (The Michigan Catholic, December 6, p. 10.)

Mail Service to Soldiers and Sailors Should Be Improved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Congress is about to recess for the Christmas holidays. I know that many of the Members are cognizant of the fact that on this first peacetime Christmas many of our boys are still thousands of miles from home, and will not enjoy the Christmas season as we understand it. Under those circumstances it seems to me that both the Army and the Navy could well afford to spend considerable time in an effort to see that these boys have adequate mail service from home. This is the situation at the present time. I include herewith a letter from a mother who is greatly concerned about her boys who have not been getting regular mail service in the far Pacific. This situation should be corrected:

RACINE, WIS., *December 16, 1945.*
MR. LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As you already know I have a son with the Navy anchored at Shanghai and one at Hong Kong, the only children we have.

The mail situation is pathetic. Mail as of December 3 tells us there has been no mail for the past 2 months, that is October's and November's letters.

We mothers resent being told (on the radio) to write, as the boys need mail as much as ever, when we write air mail every day and then hear that the service is worse than when the fighting was going on.

They won't declare the emergency over, and now when our eldest son with 3 years' service would be eligible next month, they freeze machinists' mates.

How can you expect anyone to reenlist under existing conditions? They are doing absolutely nothing and they're just anchored, and living amongst disgusting conditions. The Orient is no place for our boys.

When will they wake up and consider the voters, who have given so much, only to have lost all their courage in seeing how these patriotic youngsters are being treated.

I cannot sit by helplessly and just talk about it. I must express myself to those who can do something about it.

If it were not for a faith in God, who is still the Ruler of the universe, I would certainly be crushed under the load I have borne the past 3 years.

May God give you, our leaders, wisdom and courage to seek His will and do it, regardless of what pressure may be brought to bear.

Sincerely yours.

Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address given by former Mayor Howard W. Jackson, of Baltimore, at the meeting of the Lawrence Everhart Chapter of the Maryland Society of the Sons of the American Revolution at the Francis Scott Key Hotel, Frederick, Md., November 30, 1945:

I am very happy tonight to have this opportunity to speak to the Sgt. Lawrence Everhart Chapter of the Maryland Society of the Sons of the American Revolution. I can think of no more fitting occasion than this on which to discuss Americanism—for today marks the anniversary of the repudiation of the Stamp Act of 1765 by the Frederick County court. More, tonight at the Francis Scott Key Hotel, in this historic city so famed in patriotic song and story, so steeped in traditions that hark back to our freedom-loving forefathers, let's take the opportunity to turn on ourselves the merciless spotlight of truth. One hundred and eighty years ago the people of Frederick, with the people of Maryland and the other 12 Colonies, had the conviction and the courage to repudiate what they knew was a violation of their personal liberty. Perhaps we in 1945 can spare a few minutes to examine the state of our own personal liberties—that is, what is left of them—and decide whether or not the time has come for us to do a little repudiation of our own.

I could, quite properly, spend the next 15 or 20 minutes telling you the old, old story you know so well—the story of how the American colonists came to the wooded shores of America to escape government control and persecution. They were a virile, simple, dignified people, with one object in view—personal liberty. No doubt they had what we call today single-track minds. They knew what they wanted, and they took direct, decisive steps to accomplish their goal. You'll say the problems they faced cannot be compared with those we face today. Specifically they cannot, for that was a simple, agricultural society, where ours is complex and top-heavy; they were few in number, we are many. But basically their problem and ours have a similarity. The difference is not so much in the nature of the problem but in the people whom it confronts.

Just as those early settlers had to fell their trees, build their homes, and till the virgin soil, so did they have to chart their voyage in the New World politically. They had no blueprints to follow. They drew up their own. We have the results of their labor—the blueprints they drew on which to rely. Within the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States we find all we need in the way of guidance to find our way back through the maze into which we have been wandering for the past 15 years.

The colonists who fled European oppression were escaping from conditions which were imposed on them by a monarchy. But the more shame to us when we know that the encroachments on our freedom have been allowed to multiply under a democracy—and through the fault—not of kings and princes, but of ourselves.

Within our Nation there are three theories of government—two of them entirely alien to the one which gave us birth, which nourished us, and finally brought us to maturity and prosperity on such a magnificent scale that our country has been and is a tower of strength to the rest of the world.

One of the alien forms, as we know, is communism. It is a new form of Russian despotic statism. The other is fascism, and both of them were outcomes of the upheaval, the frustrations and revolutions that followed in the wake of the First World War. Communism is supported in the United States by a political organization, the Communist Party, which grew out of the labor unrest in America following the Russian Revolution in 1917. Fascism is represented by no openly organized party, but it is being carried on by above-ground and underground propaganda. Key members of both these systems are in places of influence in our own country. No matter what we call these two theories, they are alike in essential respects—the suppression of civil liberties, representative government, intellectual freedom; in regimentation of the people, in a throttled press, in the suppression of popular elections, and in the setting up of one despotic leader.

Both systems are old; they stem back to the time of the Pharaohs and beyond. Generation after generation has seen them fail, nation after nation has fallen to ruin under these theories; people after people have suffered and died under these systems. The blood of thousands of our own boys has been spilled in this global war because of them.

One of the principles of sociology is that "progress has not been the rule." And can we doubt it when we stand by and see nation after nation going back to an ancient system of government which has proved its weakness again and again? The burned child, they say, doesn't go back to the hot stove, but supposedly intelligent leaders and statesmen dismiss the recorded political experiences of the ages, and hail tyranny and dictatorship as a new idea—and the answer to the world's problems. What is more startling and even more horrifying is that they turned to such theories even as their own sons were fighting and dying in the battle against tyranny which threatened our shores.

Gentlemen, here within our country we face a common danger. We must realize that in times of depression, social dislocation, and unemployment dictator governments have given work to the idle, organized industrial production, and established order. The war has been won, but there is a noticeable and deplorable lack of enthusiasm and spontaneous joy in our people. There is instead a sort of weary resignation. The individual citizen is confused, tired, and prone to fall into indifference because of the scope of the problems which we must solve, if we are to survive as a democracy, are too ponderous for him. Now, if ever, we must exert vigilance if we are to save our republican form of government.

I ask you to recall the many, many violations of American liberty under the provisions of the Constitution which have occurred in the last decade and a half. The overcentralization of our Government has not even come gradually—it has been glaring, swift, and ruthless. Shall we blame it on the war? Try to remember the high-handed policies that left us gasping long before the war. Since then we have seen the Federal Government invade our States rights, our local communities, and our very homes. We let it happen. We murmured and complained but did nothing. Like a snowball rolled downhill, Federal governmental control has gained.

Naturally the aftermath of war leaves us with tremendous problems which must be solved. One of them is the question of unemployment. It's a serious problem and let me put myself on record now as stating that the Murray-Wagner-Dingell full employment bill isn't the answer. It does not seem likely that an unemployment crisis would come within the next 4 or 5 years. However, we must be prepared for it if it does come. There are too many bitter memories of unemployment in the 1930's for us to take the possibility of another depression lightly. Before we ask who or what can provide full employment let's ask just what is full employment.

In the Senate version of the Murray bill it is defined as a condition under which "all Americans able and seeking work have the right to useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment." That has a fine, noble sound—but let's think about it for a

minute. During the war millions of people wanted to work for high war wages or for patriotic reasons. Many of them don't want to work now. Some are too old to work. Some are mothers of young children who ought not to work. Others are boys and girls who ought to go back to school. Full employment ought not to be guaranteed to these millions.

There is another class of people who voluntarily work part time. Another group, who because of personal characteristics, just do not get employed. There is still another group described by Ralph E. Flanders, research committee chairman of the Committee for Economic Development. He classes them this way: "The largest single element in the group with personal handicaps consists of those with a strong 'leisure preference.' This group includes at its extremes both philosophers and bums."

We have been told that 60,000,000 jobs should be guaranteed to the American people. There are two things wrong with this. One is that 60,000,000 jobs are not needed; and two, the word "guarantee" ought to frighten every freedom-conscious American who hears it.

What we really want is a "high level" of employment. And we have three alternatives. Complete Government control. Complete control by free enterprise or free enterprise working in harmony with a Government which will release all the pent-up energy and productiveness of the system instead of locking it in. The third plan, gentleman, I believe is our answer.

Full employment cannot be guaranteed unless full government control is instituted. If that happens, then, we have a communistic form of government, no matter what other fancy name you give it. As we know, full government control means the death of all free-competitive enterprise, the end of the open market, the end of individual ambitions, and mark this well—the end of labor unions. When government is the employer, labor dare not strike nor bargain.

The American free-enterprise system can produce a high level of employment if—and it's a big if—it has the cooperation of the Government. Cooperation—not restraint. Cooperation—not strangling taxation. We know what happens when a business has to meet confiscatory taxes. There is no way to plow back earnings into the business, thereby creating more jobs. The business starves, finally fails, and unemployment has more recruits. We ought to remember that America's amazing industrial development took place when business could keep and reinvest most of its earnings and investors could realize a fair return on their investments. Let's have wise, just taxation and give the system which has served us so well, another chance. There is much more we could say on the dangers of the pending Murray-Dingell-Wagner bill as it stands—but, this is the important and urgent problem before us now. Gentlemen, the Murray-Dingell-Wagner bill must not be passed by the Congress if we are to continue on our American way.

I want to repeat here a statement made by Woodrow Wilson when the big government planners tried to impose wartime controls on peacetime America. He said, "I do not want to be taken care of by government, either directly or by any instruments through which government is acting. Give me right and justice, and I will take care of myself." This has been the backbone of Americanism. This is the first law of the American individual and of the individual States. Recently, we saw another startling example of the octopus of Government control reaching out to engulf the American medical profession.

In President Truman's message to Congress on a national health program we again face the danger signals. But we have reason to be proud of our own State of Maryland, which, characteristically, is a step ahead of other States and already has its own State health program for the indigent and medically indigent under way. Dr. Robert R. Riley, State director of public health, briefly sums up the whole idea when he says, "Maryland can take care of herself as to public health and insurance." Maryland's plan is a democratic plan, with each county appointing its own advisory council and its citizens free to choose their own physicians.

I wish I knew some effective way to impress on you the urgency of our domestic danger. It is for us as citizens to start stripping Government of its controls over us. It is for us to square our shoulders, roll up our sleeves, and pitch into the muddled mess and straighten it out. Not so many months ago the whole world was aflame. Do you, by any chance, suppose those fires are dead? They are smoldering dangerously, ready to burst forth again. We cannot afford to waste time. We must get our feet back on the ground. If it's representative government we want, let's make it work. There has never been an effective substitute for the Republic set up by our forefathers who believed that the dignity and personal freedom of man was the most valuable and important thing on earth.

Back in 1895 Henry Adams asked this question, "Are we in the midst of the last great centralization, with its overtones and undertones, with all its implications as a pattern of culture enclosing politics, education, and ethics?" What would his question be now?

Gentlemen, America stands alone in a world fast becoming socialistic. Americanism since 1776 has stood for all those characteristics which are important to the individual liberty, equality, personal ambitions, freedom of worship, freedom to stand up and speak our minds, freedom to pen the words we wish. These constitute the soul of America.

Is it not time to take inventory? Should we not go back 12, 15, or 25 years and assess the benefits of all legislation, theories, ideologies, Federal and Supreme Court decisions, creation of Government corporations, and policies of Government, many of which have encouraged the trend away from the fundamentals of government as conceived by our founding fathers and are leading us along the road of statism, socialism, or creeping communism.

Everybody seems to be worried about the atomic bomb and I imagine we should be. I hope we are going to keep ourselves better prepared in the future than we have in the past. We need spiritual, moral, military, and economic reconversion. When I think of what has happened in Russia, England, France, Japan, and other countries that could be mentioned, I haven't any more fear of an atomic bomb than I have of financial and economic bankruptcy. I am hopeful for the future. One of the ways to prevent national bankruptcy is for the Congress to become representative and see to it that the administration has a policy that will insure a proper tax system and an economical administration of governmental affairs based on the Constitution.

One hundred and eighty years ago your ancestors made the streets of old Frederick town ring with defiant cheers when they repudiated what they knew was a violation of their freedom. Repudiation of the encroachments on our personal liberties today seems to be in order. Let's get along with it, before it is too late.

Veterans' Benefits Under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act as Amended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, when the Servicemen's Readjustment Act was originally considered and discussed, the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, of which I am proud to be a member, told Congress and the public it was admittedly experimental. It still is. Changes have just been made—more possibly are in store.

Therefore, this occasion is taken to explain in a general way the benefits as they now exist under the amended Readjustment Act.

ELIGIBILITY

To be eligible for any or all of these benefits the veteran must have been released from service under conditions other than dishonorable, and must either have served not less than 90 days between September 6, 1940, and the end of the war, or have been discharged for a service-connected disability. Rank in service or age makes no difference.

EDUCATION

At any time within 4 years after discharge, or termination of the war, whichever date is later—provided that all such programs must be completed before 9 years after the end of the war—any eligible veteran may receive education for a period of 1 year plus the length of time he was in active service—between September 16, 1940, and the end of the war—with a maximum of 4 years.

To continue for the full period for which he is eligible the veteran must meet the standards established by the school or institution in which he enrolls.

The veteran may choose any approved school that will accept him, and the course he desires to study. He can go to school in any State, but the cost of transportation from his home to the school is his own expense.

The Federal Government pays for all books, supplies, and the customary tuition fees up to $500 per year. While in school he will be paid $65 per month, if single, $90 if married—or has dependents—for subsistence or living expenses. This is enough to help veterans help themselves, and there is no law or regulation against taking outside, part-time work.

This opportunity is not confined to ordinary schools or colleges. He may take short, intensive, more expensive, specialized courses, the maximum tuition, however, being limited to $500. He may elect to take vocational or apprentice training, in which case part of his maintenance will come from the employer.

Many veterans, while in service, learned the value of correspondence

courses. These courses can now be pursued after return to a civilian status, but in this case he does not receive subsistence allowances. The cost of any such course will be established by contract, with a maximum limit of $500.

Education may be commenced while on terminal leave, but no payment is allowed for living expenses until after the leave ends.

LOANS

A veteran may apply for loans from nearly every type of lending agency. His honorable discharge is his certificate of eligibility. Other discharges must be passed upon by the Veterans' Administration.

Property loans may be at the figure negotiated with the lending agency, with the limitation that they may not exceed the reasonable value of the property, or the appraisal of an experienced appraiser living in the community where the property is situated, employed by the Veterans' Administration.

Interest on loans is limited to 4 percent. Home loans may not run for more than 25 years, farm loans not over 40 years, and business loans are limited to 10 years.

There are conditions that property on which loans are to be made must be suitable for the purpose for which it is to be used—for a dwelling, for farming operations, or for a business location. It must also be shown in connection with loans for farms or for business that there is a reasonable likelihood that the veteran will succeed in his undertaking as a farmer or as a businessman.

When the loan is finally completed the Government guarantees one-half—50 percent—of the amount loaned, with a maximum guaranty of $4,000 on real-estate loans and of $2,000 on nonreal estate—chattel or personal property—loans. Thus a veteran is now eligible for the Government guaranty or an $8,000 loan on real estate or a $4,000 loan for business.

The veteran may obtain a loan for the purchase of property to be occupied as his home, or to make repairs, improvements, or alterations on a home he already owns.

The veteran may obtain a loan to purchase land, buildings, live stock, machinery, and supplies, if he anticipates engaging in farming.

The veteran who seeks to enter business may obtain a loan to buy land, buildings, supplies, tools, equipment, inventory, and stock in trade, or for the alteration of realty to be used in his business.

Many regulations by the Veterans' Administration must be changed, but no great delay is expected; and the new simplified procedure should speed up loans considerably and eliminate much red tape which has existed.

This does not mean that any veteran can go into any bank or to any lending agency and get a loan up to $8,000 merely for the asking. He goes in as any other person and makes his deal. Of course, the lending agency and the Government want some reasonable assurances of the soundness of the loan—of the ability to repay it and of the value of the security.

EMPLOYMENT

Assistance is provided in placing veterans on jobs, and in each State a veteran is on duty as placement officer to protect the interests of veterans.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

In the event a veteran, after complying with State law relating to registration for work, cannot obtain employment, he may receive $20 per week unemployment allowance—for not to exceed, however, 52 weeks. The period for receipt of this benefit is fixed by length of service—24 weeks for the first 90 days in service, and 4 weeks for each month of service beyond 90 days. In other words, 10 months or more of service entitles a veteran to the maximum.

Restrictions are rigid enough to discourage "gold-bricking" and prevent duplication.

If a veteran goes out as his own boss in business, a profession, or on a farm, an allowance is provided to bring his net income up to $100 per month, with a limit of 12 monthly payments. Application for this benefit must be made within 2 years after discharge or the end of the war, whichever is the later date.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

As amended, Americans who served with our allies may receive benefits hereunder if they now live in the United States and have not applied for or received similar benefits from the nation with whose army service was rendered.

The Veterans' Administration is given full power to obtain space by building, purchase, or lease.

Veterans needing artificial appliances can obtain them, with training in their use, and the payment of necessary travel in connection therewith.

Section 1505 of the original act provided that in the event any payment in the nature of adjusted compensation is later authorized, benefits and payments received, including payments made by the Government on defaulted loans, under the act were to be deducted from such compensation. This section has now been repealed. However, this repeal is not to be construed as a promise or assurance that, in order to avoid inequalities, such action may not be taken by a future Congress.

MISCELLANEOUS

At the time the Servicemen's Readjustment Act was amended, Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, which relates solely to veterans with service-connected disabilities, was liberalized. Veterans with service-connected disabilities, to whom we owe our greatest obligation, are given training and education to help them overcome physical handicaps and enable them to become self-supporting.

Payments for these men and women while in training have been too low. These disabled veterans will now receive—in addition to all training expenses—$105 if single; $115 with a dependent—wife, child or parent. Ten dollars per month is allowed for one child, $7 for each additional child, and an allowance of $15 for a dependent parent.

CONCLUSION

This presentation must necessarily just hit the high spots. For detailed information inquire of the nearest Veterans' Administration office, the local posts of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the Regular Veterans Association, Order of the Purple Heart, or other veterans' organizations, the Red Cross, or the State veterans' representative.

If you prefer, write ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, 316 House Office Building, Washington, D. C., who is in Washington to serve the veterans and their families.

Note: Have your discharge recorded and photostated.

Present-Day Departures From the Original Conception of State and Federal Governments

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, Governor Sparks, of Alabama, recently made a speech in which he clearly pointed out the changing and growing concept as to the proper relationship between State and Federal Governments. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this speech; also an editorial from the Anniston (Ala.) Star dealing with the speech:

PRESENT DAY DEPARTURE FROM THE ORIGINAL CONCEPTION OF STATE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENTS

(Address by Chauncey Sparks, Governor of Alabama, delivered before the Association of Attorneys General of the United States in Jacksonville, Fla., November 28, 1945)

The assigned subject is very difficult to handle because it involves considerable personal opinion as to the meaning of terms. Conceding that there was an underlying conception of the State and Federal units in the organization of our government, in order to discuss the question intelligently, we first must come to a definition of what we mean by "original conception."

It is safe to say, I think, that there were some basic remedies sought in the organization of the United States under the Constitution of 1787. History back of the formation of the American Union is familiar to most of us. Our Federalistic form of government grew out of unpleasant relations and experiences which made clear the need for some kind of umpire or over-all director of the destinies of the infant States. We know of the difficulties of the Confederation with regard to such matters as commerce, taxation, payment of debts, and maintenance and pay of standing armies and navies. The loosely jointed Congress of the Confederation had no authority which it could enforce and was constantly reproached by the spirit of independence prevailing among the separate States.

The delegation of authority to the Congress in the Constitution under section 8 of article 1 indicates the fields in which our

forefathers wanted the new United States Government to function. There are 17 distinct delegations of legislative authority. The Constitution provided that the Congress shall have power to: collect taxes, coin money, establish post roads, create courts, declare war, raise and support armies, provide and maintain a Navy, organize, arm, and discipline the militia under State regulation, exercise exclusive jurisdiction over the District of Columbia, regulate commerce, perform other enumerated acts, and make all laws necessary to execute the foregoing powers.

By examining this listing, we may conclude signers of the Constitution evidently had in mind that the Federal Government would apply only to regulation of relations between States and to the exercise of such functions as required uniformity over the Nation. The Federal unit thus became a limited Government, the authority of which was defined in the instrument of agreement. It is significant, however, to note that the exercise of related or incidental Federal powers was not restricted in any wise until the tenth amendment, which provided:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constituion, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Such limiation of authority of Congress, we must admit, arose in fear of a super government. Those who wrote the Constitution under which we now operate had been participants in the American Revolution, some of them in the continental line and others in governmental positions directly bearing upon the conduct of the war They were fighting for freedom. They were fighting to be liberated from an oppressive mother country. They were trying to rid themselves of a central government which sought to enact laws restricting their personal conduct and to tax them without representation. They were, therefore, afraid of any kind of central government. They were fearful of oppression, of absorption of local authority, of destruction of the States, of lack of freedom of action by the States, and of loss of the liberty which they had gained in long years of suffering and hardship. Naturally, therefore, we can conclude that our forefathers thought that the functions of the National Government should be very restricted.

At the same time, however, they felt the need for surrender by the States of certain rights in the interest of the common good. This is illustrated in section 10 of article 1, whereby certain powers of the States were taken away. Not only, therefore, was the Constitution a delegation of limited outhority to the central government, but it was also a restriction upon the authority of the States, which had been accustomed to exercise sovereign authority since the peace of 1783.

The fear of all government by our ancestors also is illustrated by the first 10 amendments to the Constitution. Such men as Jefferson recognized the experiment which the people were undertaking. In order that, by some basic statements, certain civil liberties might be guaranteed, they proposed through those amendments, to define, as nearly as they could, the fundamental rights of the citizen. The amendments, however, did not limit the general authority of the Congress to legislate within the field of its commission; but they did, both for the Congress and the States, prohibit interference with certain individual prerogatives and rights regarding such matters as the bearing of arms, the quartering of soldiers, unreasonable searches and seizures, former jeopardy, trial by jury, excessive bail and fines, and unusual punishment. Further, by amendment 9 it was provided generally that—

"The enumeration of the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

This idea of a basic conception of limited government, and particularly limited Federal Government, is borne out by the type of amendment subsequent to the first 10. Later amendments deal with civil rights such as voting, equal protection of the law, prohibition against the States in limiting franchise on account of color or sex, and declaring citizenship of the United States. Nowhere does it appear that these subsequent amendments have materially changed the basic conception of the original Constitution or largely expanded or contracted the functions of either Federal Government or the State governments.

What departures from this conception have the last 158 years brought? In order that we may successfully answer the question, or attempt to answer it, we must ascertain what we mean by the word "departure." To depart from a thing is to leave it, to go away from it, to have nothing to do with it. Certainly we wouldn't say that we have treated our Constitution itself in such a manner. Whatever departures there may have been certainly were within the Constitution and not apart from it. We have not gone off and left the original short, pithy document and created a new philosophy of government. On the contrary, have we not, frankly, builded to the framework as needs required, as conditions demanded, and as growth ordered?

There may be a field here and there, however, in which there appears to be at least a change in the conception of the duties and authority of the Federal Government through varying judicial interpretation of the Constitution. As Felix Frankfurter has so tersely put it, "The Supreme Court is the Constitution." We all have had similar experience, no doubt, with our State constitutions. Certain provisions, we thought, meant one thing, but the courts decreed they meant another Of course, the court was always wrong if the rights of our clients were involved; nevertheless, the court's ruling was still the law.

Each era of our history has taken its whack at the Constitution. We have had the old stand-patters. We have had the rigid and ruthless constitutionalists. We have had those who believe that the Constitution exists solely for the purpose of guaranteeing an individual the right of life, liberty, and property and should be construed in the narrowest sense to that end. And we have had the liberals, the wild-eyed progressives, and those who would make the Constitution what they think it ought to be. But through all this difference of opinion, we have come through with a rather well-construed Constitution which, by and large, retains intact the idea of a limited government, and particularly limited Central Government, provided by our ancestors.

The central theme of the Constitution seems to have pervaded much of our judicial construction and administrative interpretation. This central thought has been: there are two governments to deal with—one, the State, the other, the National—and that each has a separate field of sovereignty. Both have tremendously expanded since 1787 and have assumed functions other than those which were originally contemplated. Our problem today is to retain that distinction and yet not retard growth. Whenever it is necessary for the Federal Government, because of expanding needs and requirements, to enter a field of regulation, it should be done with the central theme in view that the Federal Government will not usurp certain functions which were left to the States and which the States themselves can perform adequately.

In some things there has been perhaps an expansion of, if not a departure from the conception of a limited Federal state. Here is where most of the cry and hue arise, especially from State officials. We might consider relative taxation as a measure of the central unit's growth. The Federal Government has become the largest collector of taxes of any of our many governments. For instance, in 1912, all taxes collected by governmental units in the United States were divided as follows: the Federal Government collected 28 percent; the State governments, 14 percent; the local governments, 58 percent.

Look at 1938 for a comparison. In that year, the Federal Government collected 41 percent; the States, 26 percent; the local governments, 23 percent—a reversal of the situation giving to the Federal Government nearly one-half as against one-fourth 26 years before, the State governments one-fourth as against one-seventh, the local governments one-third as against more than one-half. This shift possibly was demanded by the people, a right which they retained in the tenth amendment to the Constitution, in absolute agreement with the powers delegated to Congress.

"To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excise, to pay the debts and to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

This use of taxing authority by the Federal Government is certainly much broader than was the original conception; and the power has been used for many purposes other than those, and I think all of us can agree, which were conceived by the framers of the Constitution. That the growing Federal tax levy is legitimate, there can be no doubt. The only controversy in the past has been concerning whether the taxes were used properly. When we come to that question, then we must define very carefully the word "welfare."

Another field in which the Federal Government has gone further than was contemplated originally is in the matter of civil rights. These changes have been influenced by amendments to our Constitution. Around them has been centered much of the controversy in the last three-quarters of a century as to the proper application and construction of our Constitution. They are not a part of any basic conception. They are something which has been added by action of the people of the United States through their legislative bodies or in conventions.

Other matters, however, not involved in amendments to the Constitution, such as social insurance and relief, regulation of employer and employee relationships, and public health, have to do with the welfare of the individual citizen of the United States. Much of such legislation has been enacted under the assumed authority resting in the highly controversial public-welfare clause. Some of it has been rested upon the authority of the Federal Government to tax; other of it, upon the authority of the Government of the United States to do all necessary things to carry out its express or implied obligations.

Much of the so-called departures has arisen under what is known as the interstate commerce clause. This is the third authority delegated to the Congress, and is as follows:

"To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

Here we have another play upon words. The word "commerce" meant something in 1787. It meant another thing in 1860. And it means an entirely different thing, or a series of different things, in 1945. But the term is there used, and words, like individuals, grow. They grow in meaning and in application.

Under this commerce clause has occurred much of the apparent departure from the original conception which the Constitution makers may have had of the State and Federal units. Fine and technical distinctions relating to the commerce power often have been drawn in the light of then existing

commerce, industry, and social organization. No one can doubt that the construction of our Constitution has been very greatly influenced by the age in which it has been construed—by the experiences available to that age and by the condition of our social order and of our industrial and agrarian life.

There have always been two schools of thought among the American people regarding the relative importance of the Federal Government and the States. One is that the Constitution should be rigidly construed to restrict the field of operation of the Central Government. The other is that there should be a liberal construction in order that the Federal Government might carry out its duties and in order that the people of the United States might secure the blessings of a wisely administered national government rather than of often inadequate State government. Into this controversy over the meaning of the Constitution many factors add their influence. The psychology of the times no doubt influenced to a great extent any one generation's conception of the purposes of the Federal Government. Otherwise, there could not have been an emancipation proclamation.

Our early judiciary had a yardstick by which it measured the constitutionality of laws or actions. In fact, it made the Constitution, and under the principle of stare decisis this structure was used by subsequent courts, often perhaps pursuing the course of least resistance rather than courageously meeting the impact of a growing Nation. Such a procedure of judicial determination was not concerned with the needs. It simply said, "Does the law fit the Constitution like one part of a jig-saw puzzle?" If the law didn't, it was stricken down; if it did, it was upheld. This process is often called the judicial slot machine—you put the facts into a box of fixed principles, pull the lever, and out comes a printed answer.

The character of our courts made a greater contribution to the construction of the Constitution than did any particular environment. In fact, so pronounced was this feeling that in 1937 it was decided by the then authorities to pack the Court with liberals in order that the influence of the standpatters could be neutralized. That was a dangerous suggestion. However, no government has the right to stand in the way of the progress of its people. If the people wanted national agrarian relief, public works administration, public welfare and social legislation, regulation of wages and hours and of production and distribution, they should have had some way to achieve their desires.

Let us recognize that, since our Constitution was written, we have expanded into a great people—in area, in population, in culture, in industry, in social development, and in agriculture. So much have we grown, that even our material development has far exceeded the probable conception of our founders. They were looking at a small country, bounded on one side by the Atlantic Ocean and on the other by savage Indians. They were concerned with providing protection against these Indians and against foreign foes by a Central Government which had the authority to raise and support armies. Life at that time was simple, communication was almost impossible, and transportation was crude and ineffective. Quite obviously, the conceptions of the persons who wrote the Constitution were influenced by their own experiences, observations, and surroundings. If you had the Constitution to write today, would you write it differently and in the light of present environments? At any rate, I think one can reasonably say, none of us would have written as briefly and concisely as our forebears did.

In explanation of what we term "liberal" construction of the Constitution, we can point readily to those things which have influenced this character of departure. For instance, who in 1787 envisioned the radio, the airplane, the telegraph, the wireless, the telephone, the electric light, or the atomic bomb? We have achieved in the last 75 years large industrial development, equaled by no other nation, agrarian resources such as the world before has never seen, and a complex economic and social life not conceived by those who wrote the Constitution in 1787. The interdependence of our people has caused us no longer to live to ourselves, but among all others: the framers of the Constitution of 1787 emphasized the individualistic way of life.

Out of all these changes arose new needs, social and economic; protection against disease and distress, low, and impoverishing wages, and hard and destructive hours; security against industrial accidents and disaster; protection against the hazards of rapid transportation and modern inventions; extensive public education. Both the Central Government and the States had new obligations thrust upon them. Who saw this life 160 years ago, and who now sees our live 160 years from today? I think that none in this audience would say that the form of government we had today is the kind we will need in 2100 A. D.

Our expanding industrialization, our population growth and the development of large cities, our turn from the farm to manufacturing employment, our intensification of agricultural production, our rapid transportation and communication have all made a contribution to a new conception of the distribution and scope of functions of government. Particularly have our national obligations increased.

Had we stood idly by and let these things develop themselves, there would have been chaos. As in 1797 when the States reluctantly, and very reluctantly, came together to surrender a few of their rights in the interest of a common need which they individually could not fill, so would our people have had to have another convention of some kind to meet the demands of our expanding life. Government would be negligent if it did not provide control wherever necessary and regulation wherever required. No government can stand in the way of progress or refuse to lend its assistance toward the development of those things which make a better way of life. It fails utterly when it stands by and does not do that which is necessary.

We thus come to a postion where we ask ourselves, conceding that there has been a departure from our forefathers' conception of the roles to be played by the Federal and State Governments, whether this departure is wise or unwise. I am sure some of us will agree that in many instances it was unwise. I am sure some of us will agree that in other instances it was wise. And I am sure there are others who will agree that the Nation is on the way to ruin because all of our constitutional privileges and rights have been taken away. All I can say is that you and I must live in the days in which we were born and not wish ourselves in what we might think of a happier period. I would not live under the simple and scarce life of 1787 even if you would return to me all of my so-called lost rights, liberties, and freedoms and whatever may have been the original and basic conception of the framers of the Constitution. I would rather live with today's advantages and improvements and surrender some of those blessings.

I think we can say that our departures are more in the nature of growth than they are departures. As the child begins in simple conception of things and matures as his education advances, his experiences multiply; the same is true of government. The tree starts from a tiny seed and grows to towering height. Even so our State and Federal Governments began from simple things, but have grown, in the grace of God, to be the greatest on earth—and with their original conception largely retained but grown to manhood.

[From the Anniston Star]

SPARKS IS COURAGEOUS

Governor Sparks, of Alabama, made a most courageous stand in a recent address to the National Association of Attorneys General, when he said that States' rights notwithstanding Federal regulatic· has become increasingly necessary, "because of the expanding needs and requirements" of a growing nation.

It is not often in the South, which fought a war on the principle of States' rights, that men of vision summon the courage to speak so profoundly in behalf of their convictions. Such utterances, coming from a section of the country which needs to rise and broaden its scope, are indeed comforting. They reflect a trend of thinking that is strengthening and helpful.

Governor Sparks summe· up the need of Federal regulation in a most convincing manner when he so well said: "I would not live under the simple and scarce life of 1787, even if you would return to me all of my so-called lost rights, liberties, and freedoms, and whatever may have been the basic concept of the framers of the Constitution.

"I would rather live with today's advantages and improvements and surrender some of those blessings * * * Had we stood idly by and let these things develop themselves—growth in population, development of large cities, a turn from farm to manufacturing employment, intensification of agricultural production, rapid transportation and communication—there would have been chaos.

"Government would be negligent if it did not provide control wherever necessary and regulations wherever required. No government can stand in the way of progress or refuse to lend its assistance toward the development of those things which make a better way of life. It fails utterly when it stands by and does not do that which is necessary."

Federal regulations and controls now in effect in the United States augur for progress and development. Without them there would be disturbed and unsettled conditions that would work for disunity and an ultimate collapse of our governmental structure that excels that of any other nation.

The Nation has grown big and powerful, strong and substantial, under a system of regulations that have been applied as the need for them developed. And as they have been installed, the people have lost none of the freedom and liberties granted under the Constitution. If anything, there are more equal rights.

"Siam to You and I Do Mean You"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, anyone that has any intention

of voting for the Truman loan to Britain should read the following article and ask himself if he wishes to be a party to furnishing funds for such unworthy performances. The article in the December 19 issue of the Washington News by Mr. Peter Edson follows:

SIAM TO YOU

(By Peter Edson)

There is funny business in Thailand which will need a lot of explaining by the British Government and the United States Department of State, according to Americans recently returned and familiar with what goes on in that part of the world.

Two days after Pearl Harbor Jap forces moved into Thailand—old Siam to you—and took over. A month later the Japs forced the Thai Government to declare war on the Allied Nations. The British declared war right back, but the United States never accepted that declaration as expressing the will of the Thai people.

In Washington the hard-working Thai minister, M. R. Seni Pramoj, likewise did not recognize his country's declaration of war and he began organizing a Free Thai resistance movement. Twenty-one Thai students in United States universities were hand-picked, made officers in the Free Thai army, and turned over to Office of Strategic Services—Gen. Wild Bill Donovan's old cloak-and-dagger outfit—for training in guerrilla warfare and underground work. By March 1943 they were ready to sail for India, cross into China, and make their way into Thailand. Two were caught and shot, but the other 19 did legion service.

First they linked up with the Free Thai resistance movement organized inside the Jap occupation. This underground was so good that its head was Luang Pradit Manduharm, the regent who was technically the Jap's puppet ruler. In OSS code messages he was known as Ruth. The Japs never caught on.

Ruth's underground forces numbered 40,000 or more. In addition, the OSS boys trained 10,000 guerrillas. They built airstrips in the jungles, set up weather stations, operated radios, rescued American and British fliers, and in general operated one of the best spy and intelligence rings of the whole Jap war. All this while OSS and OWI were pumping propaganda into Thailand, telling the natives about the Atlantic Charter and what a bright new world this was going to be come peace.

When peace came, a delegation from the Free Thai Government was flown to Lord Louis Mountbatten's southeast Asian supreme headquarters at Kandy, Ceylon. The British proposed to move in an army of 20,000 to accept the surrender of from 70,000 to 100,000 Jap forces of occupation. That was all right, though the Thais felt they could have done the job themselves. Also, the Thailanders were willing to make good on damage to any British property and give back certain territory acquired under Jap auspices.

But along with these purely military terms, the British negotiators, led by Maberley E. Dening, British Foreign Office adviser to Mountbatten, presented a set of economic demands. These demands have never been made public. They were presented as being joint United States and British terms. Actually, United States officials in Ceylon or Thailand or Washington had never heard of them, as the Thai negotiators discovered when they backed off and asked the American pals what the pitch was. On American insistance, the economic terms were dropped—for the time.

They were brought up again when Thai negotiators came back to Kandy on September 25. According to Thai sources, these demands would have turned their whole country over to the British for an indefinite time.

Negotiations were broken off October 4 when Dening had to go to Java, where the British are also having trouble. Negotiations were resumed at Singapore on December 4, and may or may not be concluded this week. A new set of terms has supposedly been presented to the Thailanders.

Pramoj has been back in Bangkok for about 3 months and is now his country's Prime Minister. If he is forced to sign over his country to British occupation, instead of Jap occupation, that will probably be the end of him.

The question this raises for the United States Department of State is whether this country will let the British take over Thailand with the rest of the Malay Peninsula, or will stick to Secretary Byrnes' statement of last August 18, recognizing and backing up the new Thailand as a free, sovereign, and independent country.

Conditions in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, many men have visited the Russian-dominated areas of Europe and reported the atrocities visited upon the unfortunate peoples. Recently Edward J. Kerstein, of the Milwaukee Journal staff, visited Poland and wrote at length about what he saw. Mr. Kerstein is not a propagandist, but is a reporter in the highest sense of the word. His reports confirm statements that some persons have been inclined to pass off as mere rumors or propaganda of the opposition. I have personally know Mr. Kerstein for many years and can vouch for his integrity.

As a part of my remarks, I wish to incorporate a newspaper story reciting Mr. Kerstein's report on his visit to Poland, which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal of December 17, 1945:

TERROR GRIPS POLES, CHARGE

A Poland bowed in terror, sorrow, and hunger was described with stark realism Sunday by Edward J. Kerstein, of the Journal staff, speaking at the South Side Armory to a capacity crowd. Many in the audience were born in Poland or had relatives there. The meeting was under the auspices of the Milwaukee society of the Polish National Alliance. Kerstein, who speaks Polish and was able to get first-hand information from the people themselves, has just returned from a month's tour of Poland.

"The people of Poland today are afraid to speak, afraid to assemble, and afraid to protest against their wretchedness," Kerstein asserted. "The country has all the appearances of occupation. Secret police awaken the citizens at night and carry them off, never to be seen again. The press is strictly censored and book stores are forced to sell Communist pamphlets."

FIFTY A WEEK SHOT

People dare not venture into the streets after dark for fear of attack and 50 Poles a week are shot in gun battles in the streets of Warsaw alone, he declared. Russian soldiers loot stores and homes, rob and assault women on the streets, and shoot even Polish militiamen who attempt to defend civilians, he said.

When Kerstein and two other correspondents entered Stettin on a British truck they were halted by a mob of excited Poles, he related. The British major in command jumped from the truck with a machine gun and quieted the mob, then asked what they wanted.

They told him that a man had been shot and that they wanted to have him taken to a hospital. The major agreed to let the wounded man and four Poles on the truck. At the hospital they were told by the wounded man and his countrymen that he was a militiaman who had attempted to investigate when two Russian soldiers seized the purse of a woman, who was present to confirm the story. The Russians had told the Polish soldier to go away, and had shot him when he protested, they said.

TELL OF SUFFERINGS

Handkerchiefs blossomed out of pockets and purses in the hall as the speaker told of sufferings and oppression in city after city, town after town—Cracow, Szczecin (Stettin), Grodzisk, Lodz. The names struck deep, as many of the audience recognized their birthplaces and the homes of loved ones.

"Throughout Poland there is a heartsickening feeling, a soul-chilling feeling of antagonism toward the provisional government," Kerstein declared. "The Poles stretch out their hands to you. They want to be free. They would rather die than communize themselves."

They want five principal things which only America can help them to get, Kerstein declared: The evacuation of Russian garrisons; the honest distribution of UNRRA supplies; a voice in their government; an immediate free election; and the end of arbitrary and unexplained arrests by secret police.

The audience responded to an appeal for contributions to American relief for Poland by crowding to the platform with more than $600 in gifts, ranging from $25 down to a few cents. Building Inspector Leon Gurda, president of the Milwaukee chapter of the relief group, acknowledged the first few donations by calling out the names of donors, but soon had too many to acknowledge individually.

Dr. Joseph Rozmarynowski presided at the meeting. County Supervisor Henry Wagner introduced Kerstein, and Arthur Ehrmann, an assistant city attorney recently back from the Navy, gave an added appeal for relief funds.

The Sunshine International Air Route

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am today forwarding to the Civil Aeronautics Board a petition signed by 21 Representatives in Congress from 12 Western and Midwestern States. This petition is, in fact, a statement urging the Civil Aeronautics Board to give every consideration to the recommendation of its examiners that the route of Western Air Lines be extended from Great Falls, Mont., to Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.

Favorable consideration of this application will be in the best interests of the western and midwestern parts of the United States and Alaska. This route—the sunshine international air route—has proved itself to be the most successful for weather, terrain, and general flying point of view and its merit has been indicated by the use made of it by the Air Transport Command during the war and even after the actual cessation of hostilities.

The approval of this recommendation will provide the shortest and most direct route to Alaska and the Orient for 13,000,000 people of the intermountain region comprising 41 percent of the area of the United States. The people of this area should not be compelled to go either to the east or west when their most direct air route lies along the inland route already established and put into operation by the Army.

The Potsdam Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 13 (legislative day Monday, October 29), 1945

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials from the Christian Century, one of the leading and outstanding Protestant church papers of this country. One editorial begins on page 1247 of the November 14, 1945, issue, and the other editorial begins on page 1311 of the November 28, 1945, issue.

I have received from the Public Printer an estimate which indicates that the editorials will exceed by one-third of a page the two pages allowed under the rule for printing in the RECORD, and therefore, a statement of cost is necessary. The estimated cost is $121.40.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Century of November 14, 1945]

ARE WE MURDERERS?

The terrible consequences of the Potsdam folly are already beginning to appear. When that conference adjourned this paper warned that its decisions regarding Germany were worse than those of the Treaty of Versailles and would lead to more tragic results. We insisted that "the American people must dissociate themselves from the hypocritical pretension that this pattern of settlement is democratic in either its inception or its result, or that it can lead to 'a just and enduring peace.'" (See editorial, Treaty of Versailles Is Outdone, in the issue of August 15, 1945.)

It is now clear that Potsdam is creating chaos rather than any semblance of peace in Europe. Under its provisions millions are being robbed, raped, turned out of their homes, forced into slavery, tortured, starved, driven to suicide, killed. Responsible observers warn that in Germany alone, if present policies continue, as many as 10,000,000 are likely to die this winter of malnutrition and disease. These will not be the Germans whose brutality disgraced the invasions of Poland, Russia, Holland, France, Yugoslavia, and Greece. They will not be the Nazis who perpetrated horrors like Buchenwald and Belsen. They will be the old, the women, especially the nursing mothers, and the children.

I

"Children by the millions are in imminent danger of starving and freezing as winter comes to Europe unless immediate help comes. * * * Helpless children cannot survive much longer unless there is a united effort to save them. * * * Only by immediate and coordinated effort can a colossal catastrophe be avoided." Who said that? Not some sensation-hunting newspaper correspondent (although the correspondents, to their honor be it said, are beginning to cry out at what is going on in the regions they are permitted to visit). But that is a statement jointly issued last week by the World Council of Churches, the International Red Cross, the World Jewish Congress, the Save the Children International Union, and Catholic Charities.

"In some European districts no child born in 1945 is still alive." Who said that? A church leader respected for the sobriety of his judgment throughout American Protestantism—Dr. M. R. Zigler, of the Brethren Service Committee, now in charge of the relief work of that church in Europe.

"Thousands of bodies are hanging from the trees in the woods around Berlin and nobody bothers to cut them down. Thousands of corpses are carried into the sea by the Oder and Elbe Rivers—one doesn't notice it any longer. Thousands and thousands are starving on the highways. * * * Children roam the highways alone, their parents shot, dead, lost." Who said that? The bishop of Chichester, quoting a German pastor, and reflecting the terrible tidings that daily flood in on the Geneva offices of the World Council of Churches.

All such appalling reports are accompanying by appeals for help. See that UNRRA gets the money to keep the people of Greece, Yugoslavia, Poland, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Italy, and parts of Russia alive. See that the food England, France, Holland, Belgium, and Norway are trying to buy is made available. See that the occupying armies supply enough food, clothing, and shelter for the wretched people of Germany to prevent the most horrible tragedy of death and suffering yet to afflict Europe. See that church efforts to help are doubled and redoubled, and redoubled again. See that the governments are told that English, Canadian, and American Christians do not want their own food restrictions removed if that means that millions in Europe and Asia must starve. Already it is apparent that these appeals for help will come in far greater volume and with far greater urgency than in the days of the Hoover commission and the mercy-bearing Quakers that followed the First World War.

II

These cries for help must be heeded. No Christian can turn a deaf ear to them—not and remain a Christian. But the situation now developing in Europe is one which no appeal to humanitarian instincts can compass. The time has come to face the fact that the savage, vindictive, economically and politically unworkable vengeance imposed on Germany by the Potsdam Conference is creating privation, hatred, and despair on a scale no UNRRA and no private charity can deal with. This is no passing hatred, but one that will poison all European life for years while it ceaselessly nurtures the seeds of another war.

No help that UNRRA or the church bodies can give will offset the moral, mental, and physical destruction being wrought by the Potsdam policy. For this policy, first reducing Germany to a waste, will eventually spread economic chaos and famine all over Europe. The very millions who were despoiled by Hitler will find their recovery made all but impossible by the brutal and tragically shortsighted course the occupying powers are following in Germany.

The Potsdam decisions have been in effect for 3 months. They have had their chance to prove their worth. Instead, they have proved that they do not work and will not work, except to create chaos. At the same time it has become known that the United States is far more responsible for the Potsdam policy than the American people had believed. And accordingly, as horror piles on horror in the working out of Potsdam's ruthless measures, the United States finds itself a partner in what may, before the present winter is over, become nothing less than mass murder. The Nazis were murderers. Are we about to prove that we are murderers too?

The Potsdam policy is not working. The commission of economic experts appointed by General Eisenhower reported to the Allied Control Council that it could not work. Of course it couldn't. Its economic absurdity has been manifest from the start. What has it done? It has cut off from Germany 30 percent of its arable land producing 25 percent of its food, permitted the Russians to take its heavy industries as reparations, and to strip their own zone of light industries, railway equipment, and even the contents of homes and offices. On top of all that it has dumped into the "rump Reich" at least 14,000,000 refugees from the Sudetenland, Austria, Hungary, and the parts of Germany handed over to the Poles. In other words, it has crammed at least 68,000,000 into a war-ravaged area smaller than Great Britain which has been stripped of the means of supporting any such population. This is called retributive justice. It isn't retributive justice. It is an invitation to disease, famine, and exposure to kill millions of the very ones who have been least responsible for Nazi crimes.

III

Is this just a theoretically possible result of the Potsdam policy? Would that it were. But this is what is happening now, today. It is a situation that is growing worse daily. It caused Ernest Bevin, Britain's foreign minister, to say in Parliament the other day, as he described what he had seen in Berlin: "As I watched, I felt, my God, that is the price of man's stupidity and war. It was the most awful sight you could possibly see." And speaking of the Yalta decision, confirmed by Potsdam, to divide Germany into four zones, Mr. Bevin was honest enough to admit that "I think that probably, now looking back, it would have been better if we had not done it."

Any sophisticated reader, studying the careful words of General Eisenhower in his report made public on October 31, will find between the lines ample evidence that the American Army commander knows that the Potsdam policy is not working well, cannot work well, and if persisted in will produce a mass tragedy.

As for the newspaper correspondents, although most of them still reveal a lively sense of deference to the popular emotions released by the war, so appalled are they by what they see that more and more are daring to try to make the facts known to the American public, leaving their readers to judge what the consequences must be. As one example among many, we quote from a dispatch sent from Berlin to a syndicate of American papers by Donald MacKenzie:

"Children of this city are dying like flies from undernourishment. Typhoid is rampant * * * the shadow of approaching

death * * * gaunt faces of adults * * * slowly starving * * * a ration that supplies scarcely half of the minimum necessary to support life. * * * Worse is to come. * * * No coal or any other heating fuels this winter. * * * Tens of thousands will freeze to death before Christmas. * * * Coffins trundled on wheelbarrows * * * no lids * * * dead are tipped into graves and the coffins resold. * * * Overworked crematoriums cannot handle all the bodies * * * carted off to a common grave. * * * Sewers seeping into the drinking waters."

Nor is this by any means the most harrowing dispatch we have recently read. No wonder a newspaper editorial speaks of "the ferocity of the peace."

For thoughtful Americans, however, the most terrible fact about this horror is the proof, now documented, that the United States must bear so large a share of the responsibility. At the moment it is the fashion to blame the Russians. General Eisenhower varies this by blaming the French. It is true that the Russians have done appalling things in looting the parts of Germany which they occupy and in driving out the inhabitants of the parts that are to be turned over to their Polish satellites. It is also true that the French, by their recalcitrance, have sabotaged the Allied Control Council and so made the break-down of the Potsdam scheme the more certain and swift. But it must now be acknowledged that the United States has been more responsible than any other nation for Potsdam itself. If the policy which is now destroying Germany, killing millions, confronting all Europe with the prospect of economic chaos and illimitable human suffering is vindictive, inhuman, immoral, and un-Christian, it must be admitted that the United States proposed this policy, lobbied for it, voted for it, and has taken the lead in putting it into effect.

IV

The Potsdam policy traces straight back to Quebec. There, in September 1944, the President of the United States came with a scheme to break Germany up, to strip it of its heavy industry, to reduce it to the status of an agricultural and grazing society. This plan, which had been drawn by Mr. Morgenthau, then Secretary of the Treasury, was enthusiastically endorsed by Mr. Roosevelt and, according to reports from Quebec, at Mr. Roosevelt's urging received the approval of Mr. Churchill. However, revelation of its main features raised such a storm of moral condemnation and political apprehension in this country and in England that the notion was assiduously spread that the Morgenthau plan had been shelved. We now know that it had not been shelved. When Potsdam met, not only was the Morgenthau plan revived (in his new book Mr. Morgenthau boasts that Potsdam is the implementation of his proposals) but its capacity to murder was enlarged by taking away from Germany great agricultural regions in the east which even Mr. Morgenthau had never proposed to cut off.

Nor is that all the story. On October 17 the United States Government belatedly published the directive which, it is admitted, was sent to General Eisenhower as long ago as last April to govern the occupation and postwar rule of Germany. This long document, which must have been prepared under the direction of President Roosevelt, turns out to contain the whole Potsdam program for a vengeful peace, much of it in the very words of the later Potsdam agreement. So that when President Truman went to Potsdam last summer, he, like Mr. Attlee and Mr. Bevin in the later stages of the Conference, was operating within the limitations of understandings reached at Quebec and made specific in the directive issued to the Allied commander in April. The tragedy that is taking form in central Europe thus results directly from decisions made by the then President of the United States, at the prompting of his Secretary of the Treasury, in the fall and winter of last year and the spring of this.

There is no weighty opinion in the United States, or in any other part of the world, against the stern punishment of Germany's war criminals or against such measures of control in Germany as are required to remove forever any threat of renewed German aggression. But with Germany utterly prostrate, her cities rubble, her army, navy, and air force wiped out, there can be no excuse, either in statecraft or in morals, for the sort of vengeance now being wreaked.

Keeping the food supply at 1,200 calories a day, when it is admitted that 2,000 calories is the minimum required to sustain life, and that mining coal, farming, and other forms of heavy manual labor basic to a going economy require even more, is a slow form of mass murder. Herding millions from their homes into a partitioned country in which only 15 percent of the industry is operating, and that at only 5 percent of capacity, is nothing less than a death sentence for most of these unfortunates. And marching masses of men to forced labor in all parts of the Continent, under conditions that are believed to be even worse than those in the French labor camps which brought a protest from the International Red Cross, is simply adding to the atrocity.

The inhuman course now being pursued in central Europe will reduce that region at once to a welter of misery, and presently will spread to infect and paralyze countries all over the Continent. As a political and economic policy this is madness. As a moral policy, it is a betrayal of all the high purposes for which it was claimed that the Allies fought the war.

After the First World War the conscience of the West became convinced that the destruction of the high hopes of lasting peace for which men had died resulted in large measure, first, from an unjust and implacable peace treaty, and second, from an unintelligent and brutal treatment which left great masses of the German people—especially the young—without hope or opportunity. Today the Allies are not simply repeating the mistakes of Versailles; they are compounding them. They are now, in their occupation policies, producing a greater despair and a greater chaos in the heart of Europe than followed the last war.

V

It is time for the Christian conscience to cry, "Stop." Stop this torture of helpless war victims. Stop this economic and political folly. Stop this progress toward a peace of revenge. So far churchmen and church organizations have spoken with great circumspection, lest governments be offended and even the meager supplies now being distributed be cut down or cut off. It is time to drop this deference. The policy being followed in central Europe is ghastly. It is unnecessary. It is a repudiation of Christian charity and a defiance of Christian morality.

We are glad to see that Christians in England, in parliament, in the press, and in church bodies, are beginning to dare to protest aloud. Those shouts of "Shame, shame" which swept the benches of the House of Commons the other day when a member of Parliament said that he did not "care two rows of pins what happens to the German people, men, women, and children," were the most heartening sound that has been heard in this postwar world since MacArthur spoke at the Japanese surrender.

But Christians of the United States and Canada need to join with the Christians of England, not only in crying shame, but in demanding immediate and drastic revision of the Potsdam policy. And if it proves that our allies will not consent to such a revision, then British and American Christians should call upon their governments to spend their whole efforts on works of mercy in Europe while withdrawing entirely from all complicity in political and economic action which is murder scarcely disguised.

[From the Christian Century of November 28, 1945]

SHALL THE CHURCH BECOME AN ACCESSORY TO MURDER?

Silent concurrence by the churches in murder by starvation makes the church an accessory to the crime. As a result of the Potsdam decisions, millions of Germans are starving now. Before the winter is over, five times as many Germans will die as died in the recent war, according to Bishop Dibelius, of Berlin. By no stretch of the imagination can these doomed babies, their mothers, and the aged be called war criminals. They have had no trial. What is happening to them is, therefore, not retributive justice, but murder.

Is the church to remain silent while wholesale murder by starvation is committed? An individual who knows that a crime is being committed and who does not communicate that knowledge or go to the aid of the person in peril is held legally responsible for his silence. He is held to be an accessory to the crime. Will history try and condemn the Christian church as an accessory to the infamy of Potsdam? It will and should do so unless the churches cry out in the name of the compassionate Christ against this high crime against humanity. It will and should do so unless the churches immediately mobilize all their resources to aid this part of the world Christian community.

This aid can be given. It can be given by telling as much of the truth as the churches have been permitted to learn. It can be given by immediate, concerted and large-scale efforts to breach the wall of silence which is raised by Potsdam around the millions of dead and dying in central Europe. Public opinion in Great Britain has swung in the last 3 weeks against the Potsdam policy of mass starvation. The bishops of the Roman Catholic Church, meeting in Washington in their annual conference, have just denounced our treatment of the people of Germany, Austria, and Hungary "in a spirit of vengeance." They declare that "every report indicates that unless heroic measures are taken at once, millions will die from starvation and exposure during the coming winter. The feeding and clothing and sheltering of these suffering people is not a work which can be left to some future convenient date." They hold that Congress must promptly appropriate funds for this purpose and that private relief agencies must be freed to do their part. In this category they of course include church relief agencies.

We rejoice to hear Catholic leadership in America speaking to the Government in this unequivocal tone. How long will it be before Prostestant leadership summons equal courage?

Opinion will change here if the people are given the truth. The church dare not withhold what it already knows. Its mission is to speak for humanity. It is commanded to work for forgiveness and reconciliation. If it fails in this crisis, it has not only missed an opportunity to set its record straight before history. It has also betrayed its mandate from Christ who is its Head.

If every person in America should immediately start doing everything in his power to save the helpless victims of Potsdam, great numbers would die in spite of all that could be done. But the fate of even greater numbers depends upon the American people, and particularly upon the American churches. The churches are the conscience of the Nation. That conscience must now speak to President Truman. It must thun-

der through the quiet corridors of the Department of State. It must demand that the United States Government order the release of the 200,000 tons of Army rations which were sent to Europe for the use of soldiers who have now returned. It must demand that the ban which prevents all private agencies, including the churches, from sending food or other material relief into Germany, be immediately lifted.

In addition, the churches must use their own facilities with far greater intelligence and devotion than they have yet displayed. Nothing that is being done to aid the people in other countries of Europe should be stopped or diminished in volume. But the same Church Relief Warehouse in New Windsor, Md., to which shoes, clothing, and blankets are being sent for France and other countries can also take care of shipments for use in Germany when the way opens. So rapidly is public opinion changing even here that it is not impossible that Washington may relent before the churches are ready to act. On the other hand, the most convincing argument that could be used to change official attitudes would be the accumulation in New Windsor of a great stock pile of life-saving supplies ready for shipment. Every church in the country could and should take steps without delay to collect and ship to this warehouse its own sacrificial share of what is so desperately needed.

Funds for food for the starving, for shelter for the homeless millions who are freezing in the ruins of a shattered continent, for medicine and vitamins for the sick, can be sent to World Council Service, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York 10. Word has just been received in this country that the newly constituted Evangelical Church in Germany has appointed Bishop Wurm, fearless Confessional Church leader who stood out against Hitler throughout more than a decade of Nazi terror, to head a nation-wide relief organization. Every Protestant parish in Germany is united in this organization. It is already at work gathering up the pitiable crusts of bread and the clothing that Christian Germans can spare out of their poverty to help the millions of refugees who are wandering on every road in the country.

This relief organization is known to center its work for the American sector in Stuttgart, where Bishop Wurm is now located. Its headquarters for the British zone is Bielefeld. A document which has reached this paper from the director of Evangelical Church relief work for the British zone says that "the population in Bielefeld has no fuel at all." Evangelical relief is building there and elsewhere sheds "where the frozen population will be able to get warm." The town is overrun with refugees from the east. "In our railway-station shelter, where we have every night 700 refugees and returned soldiers, we have a terrible picture of the dying of a whole nation. There is hardly a complete family. As a result of an appeal made from the pulpit we have received for these refugees and ex-prisoners of war from Russia bread and other foodstuffs, so that we have been able to give each a piece of bread and butter. It is for us a wonderful thing to see how people who themselves have insufficient food can still give from their poverty for those who are even worse off. If only we could see that the Christian churches of the world have not forgotten us."

Shall this appeal fall on deaf ears? After the last war all ecumenical discussions were hadicapped for years by the German church's determination to argue the question of war guilt. The recent Treysa Conference settled that question in 2 days. There the leaders of the Evangelical churches fully confessed not only the wrongdoing of the German people but the church's own sin. They were thereafter accepted into membership in the World Council of Churches. Now it remains for the churches of other lands to demonstrate in deeds of forgiveness the restoration of ecumenical fellowship in the world-wide Church of Christ.

In what better way could the churches of America confess our own share in the sins which led to the war than by providing out of our abundance concrete symbols of assurance that the Christians of the world have not forgotten their brothers in Germany? How could we more effectively express our faith in the reality of the ecumenical principle? In what other way can we lift ourselves from the position of being an accessory to the crime of Potsdam to our rightful place as members of the body of Christ? A statement which recently reached America from the church at Hannover says: "It is the church toward which all hope is directed now. The only general body which enjoys confidence is the church. People set their hopes on Christians within and without. Come over and help us." Shall that last hope be betrayed? American Christians will give the answer.

American Legion Memorial Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, November 11, 1945, for the eleventh consecutive year, American Legion memorial services were conducted by the Rev. Dr. Paul Little in San Francisco. Dr. Little is now serving his twenty-eighth consecutive year as chaplain of the American Legion and is known and loved by veterans throughout the State of California.

This memorial service was attended by representatives of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, the WACS, the WAVES, officials of the State, county, and city, as well as diplomatic representatives and legionnaires from the various American Legion posts of the city and county of San Francisco.

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the permission granted, I submit Dr. Little's sermon, as follows:

Of One Blood

"God has made of one blood all nations of men." (Acts 17: 26.)

Over 1,900 years ago the lowly Nazarene preached and taught world units as the secret of God's Kingdom. He looked upon His kingdom as a world of unity, divinely governed and not a runaway planet. From this unity and the Fatherhood of God there flower certain logical implications, namely, that the earth is the Father's house and the five races are like five brothers, using and enjoying the noble mansion. Because there is a Divine Artist, there is going to be the blossoming of use into beauty. Because there is a Divine Architect, there is a perfect temple. Indeed, individuals and cities, states and races are all under divine guidance.

SCIENCE TEACHES UNITY

Mother Nature teaches us unity in all realms of thought. Astronomy echoes the note of unity. The earth goes round the sun not only for us in the Americas, but in Europe, Africa, and Asia. Geology insists upon the unity of the strata, and the layers of rock, sand, vegetable life to low animal, and finally to the era of men, are layers that are reproduced in the same order in all the continents. Physiology emphasizes the unity of the races. The heart is a pump and the blood circulates not only for white men but for mankind in general, be they brown, black, red, or yellow.

No matter to what race the artist belongs, there are seven colors in the spectrum, just as there are eight notes in the octave for all nations. There is no such thing as racial law of electricity, steam, or heat, because the chemical world is one world, the steam and fire always act the same way in all the continents. We have no racial axioms in geometry or mathematics. Two plus two make four in all the countries of the world. The continents are five in number, but the laws of light and heat and gravity are one. The savage has his stone altar, his clay idol, but with education he cries out, as did the cannibal Africanus to Dr. David Livingstone, "I felt Him in my heart; I saw Him in the sky, but I did not know what to call Him or what to say in my prayer." Eventually there is to be a world of unity, one Lord, one Father, one law of love, one golden rule, one hope of a life immortal where the incompletions here will be completed there.

MAN, THE GREAT EXPLORER

There is an explorer latent in everyone whose intellect is large enough to have interests outside of himself. It is this element of adventure in us which attracts us to discover or invent things which are now unknown to us. Man is the eternal seeker, the unknown fascinates and lures him on. Our interest centers not in achievement, but in prospect, not in the conquests made, but in the unexplored areas of life. Indeed, life has the charm of the unexpected.

Man has become a creator. He has actually invented a new eye (telescope) which now enables him to see hundreds of millions of stars, some of which are millions of light-years away from us.

Astronomy is an entrancing science; its vastness and infinite variety staggers the minds of the wisest. Now we no longer say "the universe" but rather the "island universes." According to Dr. Edwin P. Hubble, one of the world's great astronomers, the most distant nebluae we have yet photographed is 300,000,000 light-years away.

Of recent years through the medium of powerful telescopes the scientists discovered Antares, which has a degree of brilliance 630 times that of our sun. It has a diameter of about 420,000,000 miles and its distance from us is 370 light-years. As large as Antares is, in 1938 it dropped into second place because of the discovery of a new supergiant star by Dr. Otto Struve, Russian-born director of the University of Chicago's Yerkes Observatory at Williams Bay, Wis. This supergiant star has a diameter of 4,000,000,000 miles.

Man has created another new eye (microscope) through which he sees infinitesimal creatures invisible to the naked eye.

The newly discovered atomic energy is revolutionizing the thinking people. It is for bane or blessing of humanity. At the present the entire world is apprehensive in regard to the use of this mysterious energy. On the one hand, the proper use of it will no doubt raise the level of civilization, and on the other it may mean destruction and chaos.

There is no doubt but that these and multitudinous other man-made instruments have proven themselves to be quite beneficial to humanity. But, regardless of these beneficent influences what we need most in the world today is the fine art of seeing and knowing God. Millions of people have eyes but do not see the things that are visible to the spiritually minded people.

A cold and heartless critic, gazing on one of Turner's gorgeous pictures of the sky, in which God made "the outgoings of the morning and evening to rejoice," said, "I

never see such colors in the sky as you paint." Tenderly but emphatically Turner replied, "Friend, don't you wish you could?"

To some—

"A primrose by the river brim
A yellow primrose is to him
And it is nothing more."

To another—

"Every common bush or flower is aflame with God."

Yes; the most important instrument is the heart, "for out of it are the issues of life." The sublimest thing in all the world is a stainless, unblemished, and incorruptible life.

Nature's law asks no questions and makes no exceptions. Railroads charge most of their passengers full price, some half fare, while some others they give free passes. But there is no gradual scale in the tariffs of God's law. There are no half fares, no rebates, nor free passes. All must pay, and all must pay alike.

"Sow a thought, reap an act;
Sow an act, reap a habit;
Sow a habit, reap a character;
Sow a character, reap a destiny."

MUTUAL TRUST

Just before the war it was our privilege to take a vacation trip, visiting our missions in Alaska over the Arctic Circle tour, which also took us through the Canadian Yukon Territory. When we reached Whitehorse we met our Angelican priest stationed there. Being invited to the vicarage, we noticed that the door was partially open, and to our amazement we noticed that on the table there were several English pounds and coins of different value. Upon inquiry were told that the money was the Sunday's offering, and this was the middle of the week. The priest being a bachelor, he left the vicarage daily to make his parochial visitations and never locked the doors. Curiously enough, we asked him, "Aren't you afraid that someone may come and steal the money?" Calmly he answered, "Not at all. You see we trust people here." Is not that the secret of true brotherhood?

One of the most realistic examples of this mutual trust is the fact that for over 130 years we have been living together in peace with our neighbors to the north—Canada. Over 4,000 circuitous miles, over mountains and plains, rivers and lakes, there is not a single cannon pointing toward the north or the south. If two great nations can live together in peace for over a century and a quarter, why cannot other nations do the same? With our present-day knowledge of the atomic bomb, would we dare subject humanity to another holocaust? God forbid.

It was July of 1942 that we were auditing some lectures at Columbia University, New York City. One night with some friends we were walking on Broadway through crowds of restless people thronging the places of amusements in a vain attempt to escape the black-out, the war, and the thoughts of dismal tomorrows. From amid the crowd came strains of cheering music: When the Lights Go On Again, All Over the World. Coming closer we found the musician to be an old blind man who was making his way down the street as he played. How much greater was the black-out in his life than that of the others on the street, and yet what a difference of hope the inner light had made. How truly the Master said: "He that followeth Me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life."

From the war which we are just emerging, millions of lives have been sacrificed. Millions of others will be dying of starvation and disease. Mute though their lips be, they are speaking to us today to make their dying worth while for generations to come. Instead of bombs and bullets, let us try brotherhood the world over. Let us preach and teach the philosophy of Him who said "Peace on earth to men of good will."

At the close of the World War I, Earle T. Crooker wrote one of the most telling poems, the title of which is "The Dead Soldier to America":

"I was young, and O God! how I wanted to live!
The whole of my life lay ahead,
But my country was calling me—needed my strength.
I went. Seek me now with the dead.
I was young. All the world was a wine to be quaffed,
Fair love led me on with a smile,
But I died, and you living, who stand in my place
Battle on! make my dying worth while.

"My dreams I lay down on the Altar of Right,
The blood of my youth stains the clay;
Joyousness, music, hope, memory, love—
In an instant I cast them away—
Aye, cast them away with a song on my lips,
Away with a jest and a smile,
But the goddess I fought for is lost in the gloom;
Struggle on! make my dying worth while.

"I followed no laws, save the laws of my land;
My country I took as my bride,
My leader, my lover, the all of my all,
I wedded her, kissed her, and died.
To you who go forward from where I left off,
Though dark be the pathway each mile,
The torch I have lit will yet flame in the sky,
Carry on! make my dying worth while!"

Truly, "God has made of one blood all nations of men." Let us try to keep this God-given brotherhood.

Speech by Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson Stresses Importance of Enabling Farmers To Have Full Market for Abundant Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the speech by our former colleague, Secretary of Agriculture Anderson, which follows goes, in my opinion, to the very root of the economic problem not only of the American farmer but of our whole economy. Agriculture can and will, as always, produce an abundance. But the question is whether there will be correspondingly abundant industrial production and employment so that there will be a full and fair market for the farmers' crops. As the Secretary points out:

If scarcity should occur, it will start in reduced employment—reduced industrial employment—not in agriculture.

And the farmer will have to do the best he can to maintain a balance. But what the farmer wants is abundant production and consumption all around. His philosophy is the only one on which real hope for the future can be built. The Secretary's address to the Fiftieth Annual Congress of American Industry follows:

This opportunity to meet with the Fiftieth Annual Congress of American Industry is one that I deeply appreciate. I firmly believe that all groups in our country can benefit mutually by learning to know one another better. This, of course, has been said many times before, sometimes seriously and sometimes as a matter of form. But I mean it—right across the board—because I believe that never before has it been so vitally important for industry, agriculture, and labor to close their ranks and move ahead in a broad, coordinated attack on the problem of building a fully productive, expanding economy.

We are clearly at a time of decision. For we are moving, and swiftly, into a new era. In both industry and agriculture we have in our hands the instruments and techniques of tremendous increases in production. That fact is no news to you, and it is clearly seen by farmers. We have to decide—and now—how we are going to utilize that productivity. From the viewpoint of the farmer, the most urgent questions of the times are these: Are we going to have a full-scale production of food and other agricultural products, balanced with a full-scale industrial employment and output? Or are we going to have less than maximum industrial employment and activity, which in turn leaves the farmer no alternative but to achieve the necessary balance with industry by trimming and adjusting his production downward?

There is absolutely no question as to the direction agriculture wants to go. The farmer's main aim in life is to produce as abundantly as he knows how. It has been part of farm thinking in all times to weigh the goodness of the earth in terms of bumper harvests, livestock fattened for market, and well-laden dinner tables.

Agriculture has made the first tangible postwar move toward a full-production economy and a well-fed United States. National farm-production goals suggested to the States just a few days ago call for 356,000,000 acres of crops, somewhat less than the goal for last year, but five and a half million acres more than planted in 1945, and fourteen and a half million acres above prewar average plantings. Farmers are tackling their primary mission of providing plenty of food with all of their capacity and ability.

Full perspective of the hopes for agriculture, industry, and labor in the changing world ahead can be gained only if we look back on the amazing wartime achievements of the Nation. These open our eyes to the abundance that is now within reach.

Personally, I never get tired of listening to the story of the industrial miracles wrought during the war. And I love to tell people about the miracle that agriculture worked. It may have been less spectacular than industry's miracles, but it was just as fundamental. And in some ways it was more difficult.

While industry was adding millions of workers to its pay roll, agriculture suffered a net loss. Out of its 30,000,000 people, agriculture lost 5,000,000 to the armed forces and war industries. While industry retooled, agriculture was unable to get enough new machinery, and often not enough repair parts for its needs. While industry built thousands of new plants and expanded thousands of old plants, agriculture had to be content with merely making better use of its acres, animals, and equipment.

But in spite of the difficulties, farm output was stepped up by one-third. American farmers were able to send one-fourth of their total production to war and at the same time feed our civilian population better on the average than in peacetime.

I consider this a grade-A production miracle.

Now, how was it possible to accomplish this feat? Good weather played a part. So did hard work and ingenuity. I know what many farmers went through to meet the production schedule they had pledged the Government. They put in the toughest and longest workdays of their lives. They patched up old equipment that hadn't worked for years and

will probably never work again. And they not only delivered on their goals year after year, they surpassed them.

Talk about coming in on a wing and a prayer—there ought to be a song about it.

But there was another factor—research. Research that had been in progress for many decades paid off in better plants and animals, better control of pests and diseases, better understanding of soil management and use of fertilizers—in short, bigger and better production.

Let me cite a few examples. You have all heard of hybrid corn. For 40 years agricultural plant breeders have been trying to breed stronger, higher-yielding types of corn. They succeeded so well that the Corn Belt farmer was able to grow five ears of corn on the same land and with the same effort that formerly yielded only four. Here is the importance of that fact: Corn is the most important single basic source of food in this country. The meat, the milk, and eggs on your table consist partly of corn that has been converted by the animal nature of the hog, the cow, and the hen. It was that extra ear of corn produced by research in hybridization that helped the American farmer turn out year after year record-breaking production.

Research paid off big in livestock production. By selective breeding and improved care and feeding it has been possible to build better dairy herds, produce better beef, improve hog quality, and develop better poultry and eggs. Hens used to lay an average of only 88 eggs a year—now they turn out almost 120.

Conservation farming was another big help. This is merely the very practical business of treating every acre according to its individual needs and using it according to its capabilities. By plowing curving rows instead of straight rows on hillsides, by using cover crops, by making better use of lime and fertilizers, by better care of pastures, and other common-sense methods, farmers not only conserved the soil but produced bigger crops with less time and labor.

But the contribution of agricultural research to the war effort was not confined to increasing the production of food and fiber. New methods of dehydrating many kinds of foods were developed. This made possible larger shipments for war in the face of wartime shipping shortages. It played a big part on the Allied battlefields.

The research scientists of the Department of Agriculture developed the "aerosol bomb," a device that was highly important in preventing insect-borne diseases. The "aerosol bomb" is a metal container which emits a fine spray of insecticide that stays suspended in the air, bringing death to disease-bearing mosquitoes and flies. It is impossible to estimate the sum total of American lives saved by this invention, but we do know that 16,000,000 of these bombs were distributed to our armed forces in less than 3 years' time.

And then there was penicillin. Many difficulties had been encountered in producing the mold from which penicillin is made. At the Department's regional research laboratory in Peoria, Ill., were trained scientists to whom growing of molds was an ordinary part of their daily occupation. They found means to produce penicillin on the vast scale required for our military needs.

The farmer has advanced not only in the field of production but on many other fronts. Contrast agriculture today with agriculture after World War I of 1919 and after. The farmer had no Government organization through which he could plan and carry out Nation-wide land use adjustments. He had no Federal policy regarding his prices and income. His credit facilities were inadequate and poorly designed for the needs of farming. He had no soil-conservation policy or program. He was heading into a brief postwar boom—brief as far as agriculture was concerned—which left him with vastly expanded production, the wreckage of a land inflation, and little to show for it except the memory of some very high prices and a mountain of high-interest debt. While industry and business boomed along, for a while, the farmer's prices and income ebbed away. He become a weak spot in our whole economy.

The farmer is different today—far different. He goes into the postwar world of 1945 with his eyes wide open. He is acquainted with the economic forces that regulate his opportunities, and knows from painful experience what happens when agriculture gets out of balance with industry. He has learned to operate with considerable skill the Nation-wide adjustment and surplus handling machinery, built up and tested extensively during the past decade. A national policy of parity prices backs his products, and he has his Government's pledge that the prices of his war-expanded crops will be supported, if necessary, for 2 full years after the end of the war emergency. He has extensive low-interest credit facilities especially designed for different types of farming.

The United States farmer has changed economically, technologically, and financially. Today's farmer is one of the most power-minded enterprisers on earth. He has about 2,000,000 tractors and would like a lot more. His production per worker is twice what it was in 1910, at least one third more than it was in the years just before World War II. Farming has become a $90,000,000,000 industry, with a cash income from sale of products, not counting food consumed at home, now at the $20,000,000,000 mark. That compares with less than $5,000,000,000 of cash income for farmers in 1932. The farmer is using his dollars wisely. He has pared his mortgage debt to a record low of $5,333,333,333, less than half of what it was at the peak in 1923. Farm families have laid by a nest egg of $11,500,000,000 in bank deposits and cash, and nearly $4,000,000,000 in United States bonds.

The farmer is ready to become one of your best customers. He has tremendous unfilled wants—and the money to pay. Farm housing has been running down for more than a generation. Now farmers want to put at least $1,000,000,000 a year into new homes and barns, and on modernization. They want to buy around 200,000 tractors a year for several years to come. They want $1,000,000,000 worth of automobiles and trucks. These are just a few of the items for which they are eager to spend their earnings.

And as I pointed out the farmer has the means to produce, and he wants to produce.

Furthermore, agriculture has made plans to produce. We know what it will involve. We have drawn up production schedules which show how the farm would fit into a postwar economy that is running in high gear. This blueprint of possibilities—looks beyond the immediate transition, and toward what might be accomplished by 1950. It sets up "benchmarks" to measure the potential size of the farmer's long-range peacetime assignment. Thus, it indicates how the farmer should plan his acreage, his feeding schedules, his farm organization, if agriculture is to contribute its complete share to a fully-employed United States.

We know that the country will have changed considerably by then. There will be a population of around 144,000,000 people who will need between fifty-five and sixty million jobs to be fully employed, and who will need a lot more food, and different kinds of food, if they are to be well fed. Such an economy could produce a national income of $150,000,000,000 or perhaps more.

Agriculture would have certain broad objectives and responsibilities in such an economy. Here is a summary of them:

1. Production of plenty of food, at prices fair to consumers and fair to producers, to enable the United States to reach and maintain a truly high level of nutrition.

2. Greatly increased efficiency in production, processing, and marketing of farm products, for the benefit of the farmer, the consumer, and the country as a whole.

3. Accomplishment of a complete job of conservation of our natural resources in the farmer's custody—our soil, our water supply, and our forests.

4. Encouragement of an expanding, free-moving trade within the Nation and between nations, to broaden the base of our economy, provide larger opportunities for employment and consumption, and to aid in maintaining a busy, peaceful world.

We know, through our blueprint of possibilities, the great substance which can be built around these broad objectives. We know that attainment of these goals will require many fundamental adjustments in land use. For example, full employment in our towns and cities would automatically increase or maintain the demand for meat, milk, poultry, and fruits and vegetables. From war experience, we have gained a better idea of how much and what kinds of food workers will buy when they have jobs and good pay. There would be less emphasis on cash grain, oil, and fiber crops. We could expect prices for farm products to be profitable for farmers, but not unreasonably high.

Fortunately for the Nation, the adjustments in acreage necessary to reach our bench marks for 1950 are, by and large, the kind of changes in land use needed for control of soil erosion, in preservation of our watersheds and streams. Those adjustments would steady our aim toward a well-balanced, diversified agriculture that is easy on the land, yet is capable of a steady production of a high-nutrition diet for the United States.

The magnificent possibilities and opportunities in agriculture, like those in industry, augur well for the future. The production and consumption now possible are the seeds of future, long-range prosperity. But the seeds must be planted and nourished; the crop must be harvested.

From the viewpoint of agriculture there are just two alternatives for the future. The first—the one we are hoping and planning for—is that industry, labor, agriculture, and Government will plan and carry out a unified, balanced expansion of production. We want to go up that road that leads to abundance.

However, if the other sectors of our economy drift aimlessly into a defensive position, if they permit unbalanced situations to develop and to throw our national productive effort out of gear, then agriculture would be forced to retreat behind its economic barricades along with other groups. I most earnestly wish that this were not true. I wish that agriculture had only to concentrate on all-out production, without regard to nonfarm employment and industrial activity. But farmers face the cold hard fact that their markets are limited by effective demand, and the demand of unemployed is not effective. If we fail in a full production and full employment program in the cities, the abundance farmers are producing could soon become unmanagable surplus. Then agriculture has no recourse except to use the adjustment machinery it has developed—the same machinery that increased production to meet war needs—to throttle down its output, to seek balance with effective demand.

To do otherwise in a price economy, when the larger part of that economy is restricting, would mean only mountainous surpluses, ruinous prices, and a trail of wrecked farm homes, depleted lands, and blasted lives.

Now let me reemphasize. Agriculture wants abundant production. We are planning on abundant production. If scarcity should occur, it will start in the form of reduced employment, reduced industrial production—not in agriculture. If it should creep into our economy again, agriculture has no choice but to maintain the balance by which

it lives. Furthermore, it should be made clear that in any case, agriculture has to make many year-to-year adjustments to take care of seasonal changes in supply and demand. Even during the war we had to add a bit here or cut down a bit there to meet specific needs. These seasonal shifts should not be mistaken for economics of scarcity—when farmers cut down, say, cotton acreage, to produce more milk and meat, they are simply recognizing that we need more milk and meat and less cotton.

Another part of the farmer's economic machinery which will continue to be used is the ever-normal granary. It has been one of the most useful and successful implements ever devised for agriculture and for the Nation. Agriculture no longer gets the shakes at the prospect of moderate surpluses of various staple crops. We now have the means to handle them: Commodity loans to carry the surpluses over from season to season without depressing the farmer's price, and acreage adjustments to shift the production up and down as indicated. The ever-normal granary supplies of wheat and corn were life-saving in the prewar drought years. During the war they "saved our bacon"—and our beef, mutton, and poultry, too. We ran short of feed in the face of the greatest need for meat we have ever had. Fortunately, the ever-normal granary was full. We drew on it for hundreds of millions of bushels of grain, greatly increasing the output of eggs and meat, and milk. In peace and war, we need the reassurance of some grain in the bin against the time of crop failure or swiftly increasing demand.

In agriculture, we have set our sights high in accepting the challenge of the future. We don't talk about "reconversion" in farming, because we don't intend to go back to prewar yesterdays. We expect to learn much—and to apply it—toward producing foods that will contribute even more to a well-fed, strong America.

As we take stock of our industry and our agriculture, I believe we should be eternally thankful that we in the United States are concerned mainly with problems of plenty. Around the earth others are worrying because they don't know where their next meal is coming from, or how they can salvage an economy that has been utterly demolished or badly torn up. We have in this country fully half or more of the productive potential of the earth. It seems reasonable to believe that the progress and peace of the world will be stimulated mightily if we demonstrate that an economy of abundance is not idealistic dreaming, but a practical workable, common-sense way of doing things.

Corkscrews and Christmas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, during and immediately after World War I we witnessed a splurge on the part of consumers during the so-called silk-shirt era. Men were buying $10 and $20 silk shirts and $10 and $15 neckties. Men and women were indulging in many luxuries. Their enthusiasm to part with their dollars surpassed all common sense and reason.

Today, again, we find a similar situation in vogue. On New York's Fifth Avenue one can pay $32.50 for a child's linen suit, $150 for men's pajamas and matching robe, $95 for a nightgown, $155 for a woman's slack suit, $25 for a cocktail apron, $1,936 for a silver fish platter, and one store advertised a mink coat for a dog at $246 plus tax—see Pathfinder of December 19, 1945, page 10.

The surprising fact is that there are buyers for such items. There are more buyers than there is merchandise and the goods are gobbled up as fast as they are put on the counters.

In the meantime, however, such staple commodities like broadcloth shirts, children's common-sense suits and clothing cannot be found anywhere. Apparently material and labor for the manufacture of frills is available but the sorely needed necessities must stand by. It is suggested the reason the frills are available is because they are not touched by price ceilings, whereas the staple articles are under control in the legitimate markets.

This present spree of spending does not bode well for the future, and would indicate we have not profited from our experience of inflation after the last war. Unless we wake up to the situation ahead we are in for a jolt.

An editor of the Milwaukee Journal recently described his experience in trying to purchase a simple item like a corkscrew, and tells how he found people paying as much as $23 for this kitchen tool. The editor closed his story by saying, "If buying $23 corkscrews is a part of an American Christmas then 'God Bless America,' because we need it."

The editorial appeared in the Milwaukee Journal of December 6, 1945, entitled "Corkscrews and Christmas," and is as follows:

CORKSCREWS AND CHRISTMAS

This is about corkscrews, and it is a highly prejudiced comment because we have been looking for a good corkscrew for many months.

It seems that during the war the corkscrew makers were doing their bit (or bits) making things for the military. Anyway, there weren't any corkscrews in the hardware stores we visited. Finally, we found a corkscrew in a store 2,000 miles from here, but when we tried to use it the handle pulled off. It was a very poor corkscrew.

So we inquired at a nearby hardware store the other day, and the clerk cheerfully showed us a corkscrew. It costs $3.50. We thought we had heard wrong, but we hadn't. We said, "No, thanks! We'll boycott wine or smash the bottlenecks with a hammer before we'll pay $3.50 for a corkscrew."

Readers, we were just babes lost in these times. We didn't know what was coming. More recently we received through the mail, from a store that deals with the masses, a booklet containing Christmas suggestions. It offered a lovely corkscrew for $23.40. You heard what we said—$23.40 for a corkscrew! And there was an icepick for $7.80, a mixing spoon for $11.70, a bottle opener for $9, and a jigger for $15.

We began to feel like a little boy who got into Tiffany's by mistake, looking for a place to spend a penny. The wife turned a couple of pages and came to another jigger. It was priced at $153. That didn't make us feel any better.

We thought of the fact that individual war-bond purchases are lagging. We remembered that the Community Fund and War Chest did not go over a few weeks ago. We thought of the misery in the world, and in parts of our own country.

And we saw six volumes of Carl Sandburg's Lincoln set selling at $150, a cosmetic case for $114, a box of writing paper for $35, a pen and pencil set for $180.

We thought of people complaining of their taxes and the cost of the war. We showed the book of luxury items to six persons and they all reacted as we did. We showed it to a man just back from risking his life on warships in the Pacific and asked him if this was the American Christmas he had been fighting for.

We can't tell you what he said, because the Government would bar our newspaper from the mails. But it made us feel better to find that other people thought $23 corkscrews should be used, not on bottles but to bore into some American heads to find out what is the matter with us. If buying $23 corkscrews is part of an American Christmas, then "God Bless America"—because we need it.

The Johnson Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a statement made by the late Hiram Johnson, of California, with reference to the proposal to repeal the act of April 13, 1934, known as the Johnson Act:

RETAIN THE JOHNSON ACT

The purpose of the bill under consideration, S. 636, is to repeal the act of April 13, 1934, familiarly known as the Johnson Act. There is no doubt as to the intent of the bill, and there are no qualifications to the terms of repeal. An act which has been an important part of the basic statutory law of the United States of America for more than 11 years is to be completely repealed and eliminated as a part of the law of the land.

We are told that the Johnson Act must go. We are told that the act constitutes an effective barrier to the recovery of the world from the devastation of a terrible war. It is stated the nations of Europe and other areas must have American loans in order to restore their economies and that the Johnson Act stands in the way of providing American dollars and resources for world recovery. The revival of foreign trade is even said to hinge upon the repeal of the Johnson Act. The administration presses for repeal through its many spokesmen and is strongly supported by banking and investment interests and the metropolitan press. They would have us believe that repeal of the Johnson Act is a crucial step which must be taken so that the United States can play a dominant role in the postwar world.

To this proposition I cannot and will not subscribe. I care not what course others may take, but I will oppose repeal of the Johnson Act to the utmost of my strength and ability. I believe that repeal of the Johnson Act at this time is not only unwise and unnecessary but also dangerous to the welfare of the American people who must bear the terrific cost of our war effort. Those who would repeal the act disregard or pass lightly over the fact that its main purpose is to protect the American people from exploitation. The act provides the people a measure of protection, little as it may be, against the unmatched profligacy of an administration committed to apparently unlimited spending and distribution of our wealth and resources abroad and against the

greedy exploitation of international bankers and investment houses. With much of the world bankrupt, or on the verge of bankruptcy, this is not the time to let down such few bars as we have to protect the American people. If the principle of the Johnson Act was valid in 1934—the Nation was practically unanimous in support of it—then its retention is imperative today.

THE LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF THE JOHNSON ACT

In order to clarify the issue and elucidate my position further, I wish first, briefly, to review the legislative history of the Johnson Act. Only through a clear understanding of the origins of the act and the conditions which gave rise to it can we properly evaluate its purposes and value.

In 1930, I became greatly concerned about the consequences of the foreign-loan activities of this Nation in the 1920's. On December 10, 1930, I introduced a resolution calling for an investigation by this committee (the Senate Committee on Finance) of the sale, flotation, and allocation by banks, banking institutions, corporations, or individuals of foreign bonds or securities in the United States. That resolution was adopted by the Senate, and this committee conducted an investigation, with public hearings, in 1931 and 1932. The findings of such investigation I summarized on the floor of the Senate on March 15, 1932. The investigation developed the story of our foreign loans as a sordid tale, at once grotesque and tragic. It showed how the American people had been duped and exploited by the international bankers with the approval, express or tacit, of the State Department. It was brought out that from 1914 to 1930 nearly $7,000,000,000 of European securities, governmental and corporate, were offered in the United States. About $2,500,000,000 were outstanding, and upon them there was a depreciation of nearly $800,000,000. The American public had invested $1,684,437,000 in cash in the securities of 16 European countries; such securities had depreciated $742,003,000, or 43 percent. For Latin America the picture was worse. The American investment of about $1,600,000,000 in the securities of Latin-American governments had depreciated $1,175,538,032, or 73 percent. (See speech of Senator Johnson in Senate, March 15, 1932.)

It may be of interest to you that in his Presidential campaign of 1932 the late President Roosevelt spoke out boldly in criticism of an administration which fostered such loans. At Columbus, Ohio, on August 20, 1932, he said:

"It was already obvious even to the administration that the forced production of our industry was far too great for our domestic markets. The President had to meet this fact and he did meet it by an audacious and fateful suggestion. We were to sell what he called the constantly increasing surplus. We were to sell it abroad.

"But how could this be done in the collapsed state of world finance? He answered, 'It is an essential part of the further expansion of our foreign trade that we should interest ourselves in the development of backward or crippled countries by means of loans.

"Obedient to this suggestion, the United States, which had already loaned fourteen billions abroad, was lending overseas at a rate of $2,000,000,000 per year. Thus was produced, my friends, the crop of foreign bonds which American investors know to their cost today. The old economics had gone out of business. To the suggestion that mass and machine production ultimately destroys employment, the President simply observed, and again I quote his words, 'This is the reecho of a century ago.'" (The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, vol. I, p. 672.)

Again, at St. Louis, Mo., on October 21, 1932, he said:

"The next group of obligations comprises what are known as foreign bonds. This is an unsavory chapter in American finance. These bonds in large part are directly the fruits of a disastrous policy pursued by the present administration in Washington—none, other, if you please, than the policy of lending to backward and crippled nations.

"Flagrant instances of the abuse of American investors occurring under this system are well known. When, after my address at Columbus last August, the Secretary of State chose to come to the defense of the administration, his apology was smothered by irrefutable and devastating statements of fact by Senator GLASS, Senator BARKLEY, and many others. The administration has not since attempted to defend the indefensible fallacy of the Department of State with regard to these investments. If we were depending upon these bonds as an integral part of American finance we should be fearful indeed. But fortunately, or unfortunately, as you choose to look at it, the returns on the foreign-bond list have already come in. Many are in default. Others have lost the major part of their original face value. The best that can be said is that that danger is in great part behind us, and not ahead of us.

"I have already announced the policy of my own administration in this regard. My job will be to prevent a recurrence of this incident, to prevent the hard-earned dollars of American investors from being frittered away in foreign fields, with the encouragement of the Federal Government of the United States, and with profit only for certain international financiers whose greed exceeds their patriotism." (The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, vol. I, p. 826.)

With the convening of the Seventy-third Congress, I introduced, on March 22, 1933, a bill to prohibit within the United States the loan to, or the purchase or sale of bonds of, any foreign government, including any political subdivision thereof which such government or political subdivision was in default in the payment of its obligations to the Government and/or the people of the United States. In the meantime the European governments had largely not resumed payments on their war debts to the United States after the moratorium inaugurated in 1931 by President Hoover. The Senate Committee on the Judiciary reported out my bill favorably on April 6, 1933. Just let me read you what the Judiciary Committee has to say in its report:

"The bill thus reported favorably has been pending before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary for more than a year. It was introduced in the Senate during the last session by Hon. HIRAM W. JOHNSON, of California, immediately after the investigation held by the Senate Committee on Finance respecting foreign securities. That investigation was so recent, and its results so astonishing, that apparently nothing more need be done in demonstrating the necessity for legislation upon the subject than merely to remind the Senate of the disclosures. It is sufficient to say that billions of dollars of securities of certain foreign countries were offered for sale to the American people, with little thought of final payment, and in some instances, with sufficient knowledge on the part of the American intermediary, and the borrower also, that it would be well-nigh impossible for these securities ultimately to be paid. Sums of money to the amount of billions of dollars are now due to the American people upon the bonds and obligations of foreign governments, including political subdivisions thereof and municipalities which have defaulted not only in interest payments but which hold meager hope of payment of any considerable part of the principal.

"These foreign bonds and obligations, of course, in some instances were issued and were sold in good faith, while in some instances the testimony has demonstrated that they were issued by the borrower merely to obtain money, with little expectation of redemption, and were sold by the American financiers to make outrageously high profits, and both had reasonable cause to believe that the American public purchasing such bonds or other obligations would be the ultimate sufferer. The bill was introduced, after the revelations concerning the sale of bonds and other obligations of foreign governments by American financiers and bankers, to prevent a recurrence of the practices which were shown by the investigation to be little less than a fraud upon the American people. The bill seeks, therefore, to make it unlawful to loan money to, or to purchase or sell the bonds or other obligations of, any freign government, including any political subdivision thereof, while such foreign government, or political subdivision thereof, is in default in the payment of its obligations to our people or to our Government. It is a brief penal statute, protective in character. The investigation above referred to, regarding foreign securities, not only justifies the enactment of this bill, but demands it in behalf of the American public. Moreover, much that has occurred since that investigation, and subsequently to the introduction originally of the bill, in the matter of the obligations due to the United States Government from certain foreign governments, emphasizes not only the justice of the measure, but its necessity. It would be unjust to permit the further sale of securities of a defaulting government, the sale of whose securities heretofore in this country have brought distressing loss upon our people, or the further offering for sale of the bonds and obligations of a foreign country able indeed to pay its obligations to our own Government but repudiating its solemn agreements. Thus, because of the facts demonstrated by the investigation above referred to, and because of what has occurred since respecting the nonpayment of foreign debts due to the United States, the bill is appropriate. To curb the capacity of those engaged in the sale of foreign obligations, as an admonition to governments well able to pay but which nevertheless repudiate their written engagements, is its laudable purpose, and it is as well a measure of simple justice for the protection of the American investor and the American people generally" (S. Rept. No. 20, 73d Cong., 1st sess.).

The Johnson Act passed through Congress early in 1934 and was approved by the President on April 13, 1934. It passed the Senate on Janualy 11 but was reconsidered and passed over. At the insistence of President Roosevelt it was amended to drop out the provision about default to the American public so as to apply only to those governments in default to the United States Government, and furthermore Government corporations were exempted from its operation. In the amended form it passed the Senate on February 2, 1934, and the House, under suspension of the rules, on April 4, 1934.

The support of the Johnson Act was overwhelming. There was not even a roll-call vote in either House of Congress. Every step was taken with the knowledge and approval of President Roosevelt. The country was united in barring the American investors market to those foreign governments who would not meet their just obligations to the United States Government. Furthermore the Neutrality Act, beginning with the resolution of February 29, 1936, forbade the making of loans to a belligerent or the purchase of a belligerent's bonds.

Various proposals to amend or repeal the Johnson Act have been made before. In 1940 and 1941, in particular after the war broke out in Europe, the suggestion was made, but no serious effort was exerted, very likely because it was all too evident that the American people would not tolerate repeal. Lend-lease, Export-Import Bank, and RFC lending programs have not changed the restrictions of the Johnson Act, although the spirit behind the act was breached.

WHAT THE JOHNSON ACT IS AND IS NOT

There is so much popular misunderstanding about what the Johnson Act is and does that I think it would be well to point out, even to committee members, what the true facts are.

First, let me emphasize that the Johnson Act prohibits private loans to foreign governments and subdivisions who are in default on their obligations to the United States Government only. That means the nearly 20 foreign governments (Armenia, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Russia, and Yugoslavia) who are in default to the amount of about $11,750,000,000 in their payments to the United States.

Second, the strict terms of the act do not prevent the Government or governmental corporations from loaning money to foreign governments in default on their payments to the United States.

Third, the act places no limitation or restriction on the lending by private bankers, etc., to private persons, corporations, etc., in a country in default on payments due the United States.

THE CASE FOR REPEAL ANALYZED AND ANSWERED

Let us always remember that the basic purpose of the Johnson Act is to protect the American people and their savings from exploitation. For all too long we have been played for suckers by foreign governments and international bankers with the approval, express and tacit, of our Government. Foreign nations have taken advantage of our generosity and our credulity. During World War I and in the decade or so following we poured our money and resources into Europe and other parts of the world. Then came default and repudiation. In 1934 we erected a barrier to protect the American people from further exploitation by denying the American investing market to those nations who would not honor their legal obligations to the United States Government. For 11 years that has been our policy and law in both peace and war.

Now, we are told that conditions have changed and that we must again loan American money and resources to the "crippled nations" of the world and that private capital and savings are necessary in addition to the billions of lend-lease and other forms of Government aid. The recovery of the world, it is said, depends upon American money and goods and the Johnson Act stands in the way of achieving that recovery. The logic is persuasive and the movement for repeal has strong support although I have not discovered any ground swell from the "grass roots" demanding repeal.

What are the conditions that are so different today as to cause us to turn our backs and minds upon the experience of the last generation and repeat—in my opinion the costly mistakes of the past? Nearly everywhere throughout the world we find chaotic economic and financial conditions. It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that much of Europe it bankrupt or on the verge thereof. Assistant Secretary of State Clayton testified before the House Committee on Ways and Means, on April 18, 1945, on the Reciprocal Trade Act extension that for several years after the war most of the other countries will not even have the ability to pay us for anything we send, or have sent them, because they will not have their productive facilities reconstructed so as to produce any surplus goods beyond their own needs. Therefore, he says we must extend them credit so that they can "buy" our goods which they want (hearings on 1945 Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, pt. 1 (unrevised), p. 22).

Where do we stand in all this? Need I remind you that we have already spent $270,000,000,000 on war activities since July 1, 1940, and that the Congress has already appropriated $362,000,000,000 for war with the $400,000,000,000 mark soon to be passed? The members of this committee should be fully aware that the national debt has now amounted to $238,000,000,000 in sight. We may also note that our lend-lease aid to other nations now totals $39,000,000,000 with reverse lend-lease only $4,656,315,000. And I noted in the press a few days back that American casualties in World War II had passed the 1,000,000 mark with 227,097 killed.

In my opinion, all of this adds up to the sober conviction that this is the time for caution and restraint rather than plunging ahead with more spending and lending of American money abroad. I do not deny that it is desirable to continue lend-lease aid to England and China for the war against Japan—and to Russia if she will join the war. It may also be necessary for our Government to provide some aid for relief and rehabilitation to certain countries for awhile in the peace period. But let us face the fact that such aid will be gifts. We cannot expect that there will be much in the way of repayment, and we shall be only fooling ourselves if we treat such loans or credits as investments in the normal sense of the word. The decision of whether our Government should provide such aid or in what form and in what amounts can be made by Congress in the full light of publicity. But if we repeal the Johnson Act, there will be no adequate protection to the American public. The bulk of the foreign securities offered in this country to private investors will, in my opinion, be of highly questionable value, and default and repudiation will follow. History will repeat itself and the American people will be losers. With the enormous debt which we now have, neither the Government nor the American people can afford the outright loss of billions of dollars of our resources.

I am aware that it is contended that the Securities and Exchange Commission provides protection to the American investor. But it is clear to me that such protection is inadequate, to say the least, for, actually, the SEC provides no guaranty of the worth or risk of a foreign loan, and it is inconceivable that the SEC will provide much of a restraining influence when the administration is pushing foreign loans with vigor as a part of its postwar program.

It is becoming increasingly evident that the administration's postwar program counts heavily on a large volume of exports to be financed by loans for some years to come. We have the Bretton Woods proposals before us; we have been informed of a $2,000,000,000 long-term loan to France growing out of lend-lease; and we hear rumors of a proposed $6,000,000,000 loan to Soviet Russia, and a huge loan to China for industrialization and river development modeled on the TVA. The fact is that the administration has no answer to the problem of jobs except spending and making loans abroad. Is this not leading directly to a false prosperity similar to that of 20 years ago which burst and left us holding the bag? The world is worse off than a generation ago and grief and loss are inevitable unless we profit from past mistakes and come to our senses. What has happened to the policy announced by the late President Roosevelt in 1932 "to prevent the hard-earned dollars of American investors from being frittered away in foreign fields, with the encouragement of the Federal Government of the United States, and with profit only for certain international financiers whose greed exceeds their patriotism?" Did he not effectively point out the folly of trying to expand our foreign trade and solve our surplus problem by loans to backward or crippled countries?

It has been pointed out that the Bretton Woods program provides for the protanto repeal of the Johnson Act for the nations joining as members of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. To my way of thinking that fact is an argument against the bank rather than for outright repeal of the Johnson Act. No wonder so many countries are anxious to join the Bank, have their sins of default and repudiation absolved, and have access to American private capital. We say to the other nations regardless of the reasons why you default your debts, your credit is now good; come to the United States, persuade Americans to cash in their Government bonds, and invest in anything and everything abroad.

As to a $6,000,000,000 loan to Soviet Russia, I do not hesitate to speak my mind. Have you forgotten that the Soviet Government refused to recognize the debts of its predecessors, including a debt owed the United States Government? When our Government recognized the Soviet Government in 1933 it was agreed that existing claims between the two countries would be adjusted by negotiation. No adjustment on the debt situation has ever been made. On November 15, 1944, the total indebtedness of Russia to the United States Government alone—principal and interest—was $443,142,417. For myself, I want no part in an American loan program to Soviet Russia to rebuild and expand a Communist nation which now dominates and controls a very large share of Europe and Asia, and I believe that the American people should be protected against such a program. The Johnson Act provides some measure of protection.

CONCLUSION

My position on the question of repeal of the Johnson Act is clear and unequivocal. I am absolutely and unqualifiedly opposed to repeal. I am thinking of the interest and welfare of the American people. The Johnson Act provides a measure of protection to them and their savings. This Nation has apparently gone mad in its policy of distributing American money, goods, and resources throughout the world. The Johnson Act stands out almost alone as a protection to the American people from the give-away complex. Let us keep it there as at least one measure devoted to preserving our American birthright for the American people. If the time comes when the other nations of the world will recognize and acknowledge their just obligations to us, and make sincere attempts to repay them, then we should consider repealing the Johnson Act. But the conditions of uncertainty, disorder, distrust, and near bankruptcy prevailing today make retention imperative.

The Plan of Galilee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. O. BURGIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a little poem by Rev. W. L. Hutchins, of Lenoir, N. C., a friend of mine over many years, entitled "The Plan of Galilee." May I commend it to the membership of this House and to all of the faithful everywhere:

THE PLAN OF GALILEE

We've tried plans and pacts and charter—
We have watched the nations barter—
We've surrendered our convictions to the scheming of Big Three;
And still the dove is flying
O'er all capitols still sighing
Because we've never tried the plan of Galilee.

Unnumbered hosts are praying;
Fervent souls forever saying;
Guns and bombs and conscript soldiers cannot make a nation free.
We will hate and maim and slaughter
Valiant son and virtuous daughter
Till all nations try the plan of Galilee.

O Christ who came to guide us;
Come again and stand beside us;
Speak Thy word to wrangling nations: "Know My truth—twill set you free."
Let it sound like angels singing,
Christmas bells forever ringing,
Calling us to peaceful service through the plan of Galilee.

The President's Message on Merger of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I think the message of the President in regard to the merger of the various branches of the armed forces is most convincing and, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have reproduced the editorial on the subject which appears in the Washington Post of even date, as follows:

NATIONAL DEFENSE

The chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee a month or two ago said he did not know how the two armed services could merge. Three-quarters of a century ago the same wonder was expressed in connection with the problem of resuming gold payments. On that occasion an immortal answer came quickly: "The way to resume is to resume." Without further ado this country returned to gold payments. President Truman supplies a similar answer to the tearing hubbub over ways and means to consolidate the armed services. The way to merge is to merge—that is to say, create one department out of two, make one secretary instead of two. That is the start and the details of organization will follow as a matter of course.

The President's message to Congress asking it to legislate a single department is clear and cogent. In this case the facts spoke for themselves. Nobody is in a better position than Mr. Truman to know those facts. As chairman of the Senate War Investigation Committee, Mr. Truman had paraded before him instances of the waste in time, money, and lives entailed by divided command. No unity existed at the top, precious little of it in the theater commands, with the shining exception of General Eisenhower's. It was the demonstrated worth of the Eisenhower system that made this newspaper a proponent of comprehensive unity. Admiral King says the Joint Chiefs of Staff is unified command. With due respect to his former position as one of the joint chiefs, we beg to disagree. It was committee command—a very different thing. The committee came to most decisions by compromise and communicated with theater commands by a kind of hortatory presentation. In the field itself, separatism and a corroding jealously were rampant. Our command situation in the Pacific was so bad that in dealing with other services the theater commander had to transmit orders through the Joint Chiefs. In this respect, thank heaven, the interservice rivalry of our enemy was worse. Mr. Truman in a magazine article in August 1944, reviewing this state of things, concluded that "a divine providence watches over the United States."

There is almost a solemnity in the way that the President stresses the need in the dangerous days to come of a single department. Navy spokesmen plead that this would mean too much power lodged in one person. It is a specious argument. This country has one Secretary of State with enormous powers. It has one President with a power that has never been exceeded by any despot in any country. Mr. Truman gives the power argument short shrift. "The safety of the democracy of the United States," he says, "lies in the solid good sense and unshakable conviction of the American people." As long as we remain a responsible people, there is no danger in delegating responsibility. It is divided responsibility that we must guard against. It is responsibility to the entire Nation that we must insure. In this air age the committal of our national defense to two Departments, one for the Army and the other for the Navy, is a contradiction in terms. The national defense is one and indivisible. "When the Military Establishment is divided between two civilian Secretaries," as the President says, "each is limited necessarily to a restricted view of the Military Establishment." He becomes a partisan for his service. The interservice squabble over unification headed by the respective Secretaries stands out in proof of the President's point.

The scheme offered by the President is of necessity sketchy. But it profits, in our opinion, from the bitter debate that the country is witnessing. Under a Civilian Secretary of National Defense, there would be a civilian Under Secretary and several civilian assistant secretaries. The Department would contain three branches for land forces, naval forces, and air forces. Air, under the President's plan, would not swallow naval aviation, as the officers on the aviation side of the Navy have hitherto feared. It was a just fear, but the President would safeguard naval aviation by including it in the Navy branch. Nor does the President give any comfort to those extremists who want to see the armed services in one bastard uniform. There would still be differentiation, and the Marine Corps would still be continued as an integral part of the Navy. No traditions would be lost, no corps d'elite broken up. The integration would be at the top, as it should be, and there would be one Chief of Staff who, it is suggested, should be a rotating appointee from all the three arms.

With this blueprint we hope Congress will go to work. As for the armed services, the time has arrived for them to put away their shillelahs and cooperate in making a workable organization. Our national defense is entering upon a new stage as the result of the invention of new weapons. It requires new habits of thinking throughout the departmental structure, and these are possible only by the prior creation of a single Department of National Defense. Let us have it.

Poor Treatment of War Veterans by National Housing Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the National Housing Administration gives much talk and publicity covering housing for war veterans. It seems to be nothing more than lip service, for those who are employed by the National Housing Agency seem to care little for the wants of the veterans.

On October 3, 1945, I directed the following letter to the Administrator of Fairlington at Arlington, Va.

OCTOBER 3, 1945.

ADMINISTRATOR OF FAIRLINGTON,
Arlington, Va.

DEAR SIR: With reference to the above naval officer, who is married and has two children and who has just returned from a tour of duty of more than 19 months at sea, I would kindly ask that he be given priority in receiving accommodations in Fairlington. He has been unable to secure accommodations here in Washington since the latter part of July. Therefore, will you kindly give him the priority extended to those who are in the armed service in securing accommodations in Fairlington.

Will you advise me?

Sincerely yours,

ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Member of Congress,
Thirteenth Ohio District.

This housing project was built with Government money and under the jurisdiction of the Defense Homes Corporation, and all the stock is owned by the United States Government.

Yet up to this time the Government agency did not answer my letter for housing this war veteran. Those who are in charge of Government housing care little for the wants of veterans or anyone else. They are only concerned with their own comfort.

With such conduct by bureau officials, should Mr. Blandford, National Housing Administrator, be entrusted with housing for war veterans?

With no attention paid to veterans by public officials who have charge of houses erected with public money, what can the veteran or anyone else expect from further expenditure of the taxpayers' money for public housing, operated by Mr. Blandford and the National Housing Administration.

Building and Construction Trades Department, A. F. of L.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION
TRADES DEPARTMENT,
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., November 29, 1945.

Presidents, National and International Unions; Secretaries, State and Local Building and Construction Trades Councils Affiliated With the Building and Construction Trades Department, A. F. of L.

DEAR SIRS AND BROTHERS: During the war period the building and construction trades workers affiliated with the building and construction trades department of the American Federation of Labor rendered a service to their country that has been acknowledged by

high Government officials and the public in general.

Stoppages of work were held to a minimum and far below those of any other branch of our industrial life. Heads of the Navy and the War Departments have publicly commended us for the service we rendered. However, in spite of this service, we are in grave danger at the present time of being penalized through the efforts of those who have been consistently opposed to any form of organized labor. This danger lies in the enactment of legislation by Congress which would retard any benefits that we might obtain through our present right to strike.

To the reasonable and well-thinking people affiliated with organized labor, it has always been recognized the right to strike should not be used until after all peaceable and orderly means had been used and failed to result in settlement.

After World War I, those of us who were active in the labor movement at that time, realized the concerted effort that was made to tear down conditions that had been established by organized labor, after many years of efforts and sacrifice. The same thing is being attempted today by certain corporate and financial interests, but it is taking a different form. They have profited by their mistakes in the past and are trying to accomplish the same purpose by other methods at the present time. Those of us who were active in the building and construction trades department during the war period witnesses many instances where corporate and certain vested interests had their representatives in high governmental administrative positions. Some of these men were absolutely necessary and essential to the prosecution of the war. However, there were instances where they did, through the prestige of their position, hurt organized labor and further the interests of corporate business. These things are natural and will be repeated from time to time wherever the human element has a chance to exhibit itself. All we can expect to do is to curtail and correct such action wherever possible, as we are still under war emergency Government regulations.

Everybody realizes that during the war period living costs have increased far beyond the increase of hourly wage rates and those American workers who work on an hourly basis, after having their overtime pay income taken away from them, through the reduction of the hours of work, still have to meet that high living cost with a decreased income. This justifies demands for increases in wages.

The methods of obtaining such increases is a matter in which organized labor will have to exercise the greatest caution.

We in the building trades, through the functioning of the wage adjustment board, have been very fortunate. Whatever faults may be attributed to this board as a general over-all picture it has produced very good results under the conditions. This does not apply to other industries, such as automotive and steel. The recent trolley strike in the city of Washington is an example, when the public was informed that a labor organization had violated the terms of its contract. This strike was used to provide a demand for vicious antilabor legislation on Capitol Hill. Much of this legislation has been drafted, such as the Ball-Burton-Hatch bill, and there is much more antilabor legislation in the offing.

Daily we listen to the ranting of certain Members of Congress who have been consistently antagonistic to organized labor. This type of Member in Congress, who at the least provocation is willing to draft legislation and introduce it, would hamstring organized labor and restrict its right to strike. If the right to strike is taken away from labor, as the final protective right that we have enjoyed and the only one through which we have been able to obtain results and make any progress, then organized labor is doomed. It is for this reason that the greatest caution should be used in the exercising of our right to strike.

The only bad spot on the horizon, as far as the building and construction trades are concerned, is the age-old one of jurisdictional disputes in which our affiliated unions in many instances do not follow the machinery set up within the Department for the purpose of adjusting their disputes without a stoppage of work. No matter what the failings of our system may be, we urge upon all affiliated unions that they use every effort at this time to prevent any stoppage of work due to a jurisdictional dispute with other crafts. If this is done during the period of this unsettled condition throughout our country we will be able to appear before committees in Congress when hearings are held on these proposed antilabor bills and show that the building trades do not inconvenience the general public by jurisdictional disputes causing stoppages of work and, further, that we have always been and are continuing to live up to the provisions of our contracts with our employers. At no time in the history of our movement has the above recommended action been so necessary as it is at the present time. This can be easily verified through the representatives of international unions who are on the job here in Washington and who have their finger on the pulse of things that affect our interests.

Again may we reiterate that all affiliated organizations use every effort at this time to prevent any stoppage of work due to a jurisdictional dispute or stoppage of work that may be construed as a violation of any of the provisions of the contracts you have with your employers.

Fraternally submitted,

HERBERT RIVERS,
Secretary-Treasurer. By order of the Executive Council of the Building and Construction Trades Department.

A Soldier Opposes Military Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of ex-Staff Sgt. James F. Donnelly before the House Military Affairs Committee:

Mr. Chairman and members of the House Military Affairs Committee, today we hear from those advocating compulsory military service that it is necessary for the preservation of the American democratic way of life, for the future security of our country, and for the establishment of world peace.

The democratic ways of life must be preserved, but they are not the ways of the Army. It it's a choice between freedom of speech and Army regulations, freedom of speech will have to wait. Millions of soldiers and sailors cannot speak out openly in opposition to compulsory military training. And the violation of this constitutional right threatens to destroy the very foundation of our American way of life.

While overseas I heard of a great many speeches by high-ranking Army officers in favor of peacetime training. It seemed to me to be unnecessary and a very alarming and dangerous departure from American democracy. I decided to do what I could to oppose it.

As an American citizen, the very first thought that came to my mind was to write to my Congressman. After discussing this with one of the company officers I was told that according to Army regulations I could not write to any Congressman against the proposed bill of universal military training. Nevertheless, I enclosed an article written to the editor of the Christian Science Monitor in a letter to Senator HAWKES, of New Jersey. This letter was returned to me with the following rejection slip:

"This letter is returned to sender because violation paragraph 5 AR 600-10 dated July 8, 1944, which prohibits any person in the military service of the United States to procure personal favor through legislation.

"THEATER CENSOR."

COMPANY B, TWENTY-FOURTH MEDICAL BATTALION, APO 24, CARE OF POSTMASTER,
San Francisco, Calif, January 21, 1945.

Senator ALBERT W. HAWKES,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

You will find enclosed a copy of my letter sent to the editorial department of the Christian Science Monitor.

I feel rather strongly about this proposed bill of compulsory military service for the youth of America. Unfortunately these boys are now too young to speak for themselves. It is our responsibility to see that they have some kind of a peaceful world for the future.

Should the United Nations fail to cooperate with us we can always pass a military training law. But at this time it doesn't seem advisable.

Please give this your serious consideration.

Very respectfully yours,
Staff Sgt. JAMES F. DONNELLY.

P. S.—Will one of your secretaries kindly acknowledge the receipt of this letter if it arrives safely. My home address is 130 Chestnut Street, Boonton, N. J.

Staff Sgt. JAMES F. DONNELLY,
ASN 12029653, Company B, Twenty-fourth Medical Battalion, APO 24, care of Postmaster, San Francisco, Calif.

To the Christian Science Monitor:

On the fighting fronts of the Philippine Islands many of us are giving serious thought to the proposed legislation of compulsory military training of all young men during peacetime. We are at a loss to understand why this bill should be hurriedly enacted instead of taking its proper place at the postwar peace conference of Allied Nations.

This proposal of military conscription seems to be an admission of defeat of the very things we're fighting for and a basis for preparing World War III.

At the peace conference we can definitely decide whether or not our allies are planning to have military training service, before starting the old round of national military competition which makes another war inevitable.

We know from bitter experience that the United States cannot have peace without close cooperation with other nations. And it is now only reasonable to assume that this opinion is held by other peace-loving nations. They, too, are anxious after years of bloodshed to help maintain peace and some international order. Providing, of course, that we—the greatest Nation of the lot—are willing to set the example.

Some advocates of postwar military training are not content to wait—could it be that under the pressure of war emotions, they see the best chances for its quick enactment? Yet, I'm sure our representatives are not going to allow any pressure group with obvious interests in particular solutions to rush a conscription law that might jeopardize the future peace of the world.

If we are instrumental in starting this competitive armament race, of which mili-

tary training is undoubtedly a part, we might just as well scrap all our peace plans.

The loud cry of today is that Germany is even now planning a third world war—but this time Germany is not only to be defeated but also to be disarmed. Germany and Japan could not have secretly rearmed themselves if the Allied Nations had not supplied them with the necessary materials for their huge war machines. Prevent this accumulation of military power and you take the very heart out of war and make future acts of aggression impossible.

The future of our world must be fanatically devoted to the preservation of world peace, long before that peace or we ourselves are ever directly threatened. In other words, we must "Remember Pearl Harbor" by asking ourselves: "What caused Pearl Harbor?"

Let us first win this war before passing laws to conscript the youth of America for another war. Let us first definitely find out what plans our Allied Nations have for world-wide disarmament. We cannot approach the postwar peace conference with the law of compulsory military training and expect other countries to disarm—our allies, Great Britain, Russia, and China would have no alternative but to do likewise. The passage of this compulsory military training bill must definitely be postponed until after the war.

The office of the Judge Advocate General stated that in the future, under threat of court-martial, I could not write anything against compulsory military training according to Army Regulation 600-10, paragraph 5, which provides that "except as authorized by the War Department efforts by any person in the active service of the United States * * * to procure or oppose or in any manner influence legislation affecting the Army * * * are forbidden."

This paragraph and others of this regulation are subject to very broad interpretation by the Army. In fact, to quote from an Army newspaper: "The War Department Bureau of Public Relations has interpreted the term 'public presentations' to include letters to the editor. When Army personnel writes or talks for the public they (according to the paper) are representing the Army. Under no circumstances does the Army comment publicly on any controversial subject."

Besides an American daily paper carried an account which reveals the lack of freedom to speak on the part of Army officers. The New York Times of December 15, which reported the Army-Navy merger debate, said: "Mr. Hensel (Assistant Secretary of the Navy) said that he would not feel free to oppose it as a member of the administration, and that he did not think any officer in uniform could argue against the views of his commander in chief."

To mail my letter through regular Army channels was quite impossible. On the other hand, I was determined to get this letter through to my Congressman despite the therat of a court-martial and despite the fact that I was to be called up for questioning before the Army intelligence—G-2. First of all, I contacted one of our regimental chaplains, but he considered it "too hot to handle" and stated that the decision of the theater censor was final. I contacted another chaplain, who said that, insofar as he was concerned, the Army could not deprive me of my rights as an American citizen. He placed his censor's stamp on the envelope. Instead of sending this letter to the Senate Office Building, I mailed it to the Senator's home and simply addressed him as Mr. on the envelope. Otherwise this letter would have been again picked up and brought to the attention of the theater censor. This letter reached its destination, but only in this manner and not through regular Army channels.

This action of the Army is clearly a violation of all constitutional rights belonging to an American. Millions of GI's are deprived of one of the "four freedoms" for which we were told we were fighting. Many soldiers have from time to time voiced their opinions against this suppression of freedom of speech, but all to no avail. For the first time in my life I found out what it meant to be deprived of this right. And I vowed that if ever again I had that freedom I'd do everything to preserve it in America.

Our democracy affords the right of the common man to be heard—militarism denies that right. And now that I'm again a civilian I can stand without fear of Army regulations before you gentlemen, the Congressmen of the United States, and exercise this priceless heritage—"freedom of speech." This is what I fought for, and any true American would be proud to give his life for this freedom.

I sincerely believe that if this Army plan for compulsory military training, or any compromise plan, ever becomes a law, that sooner or later all Americans will be deprived of freedom of speech under the control of a military state. The Army will become a dangerously supreme authority, will dictate terms to our legislative bodies, and will eventually take over complete control of our Government. Before it's too late let us recognize this universal-training bill for what it is—the military leaders' bid for power. And it is much more dangerous than we can possibly imagine.

While in the combat area of New Guinea and the Philippines I discussed peacetime conscription with hundreds of fellow soldiers. The vast majority of them were against compulsory military training. In fact, when I wrote the article and the letter to my Senator that were returned to me, 93 percent of the men in my company would have gladly signed that letter if a petition had at all been possible—5 percent were undecided. As for the opposing 2 percent, they were made up of the officers in the company.

From everything that I've heard, and I have been in the Army among enlisted men for 4½ years, I'm at a loss to understand how any poll can report that the majority of veterans favor this proposed bill, when, in fact, they're definitely against compulsory military training.

While on the subject of polls, I want to suggest that I believe the Gallup poll is definitely partisan on this subject of conscription. Mr. Gallup himself stated on November 20: "In the House Military Affairs Committee the peacetime training bill has taken on a partisan aspect, a group of Republican members having last week moved unsuccessfully to delay consideration of the measure." While he criticizes the opposition, I have yet to hear him say anything against those supporting conscription. In view of such partisanship, we can do well to pay more attention to the Town Hall Meeting of the Air poll on the subject of universal military training—of the votes received through the mail—11 percent were in favor and 89 percent were against military conscription.

Basically, the veterans and the American people do not want conscription because when faced with properly worded alternatives they will vote for the alternative every time. There is more to public opinion than a "yes" or "no" answer to a question the poll experts have carefully worded. For example, Congress and the people should not be asked just the simple question, "Do you favor a year of military training for every young man?" But, with properly worded alternatives, such as, "Do you favor the world-wide abolition of military conscription?" and "Do you believe that it is better for security purposes to rely on world organization rather than on a conscript army?" This is the only way for the polls to find out definitely that the American people are against military conscription.

As Americans, it is the duty of each and everyone of us to preserve democracy. Democracy is not militarism. Compulsory military service is absolute militarism. The two cannot possibly exist together, for sooner or later one will destroy the other. We saw what happened in Germany, Italy, and Japan when the military leaders took over—when they no longer wished to be subordinate to the civil authority. It can happen here.

Militarism can grow to such proportions that we'll never be able to control or stop it. Why even today military leaders have grown so powerful that they no longer are satisfied with voluntary enlistments but dare to command that it shall be compulsory for all young men, and possibly very soon for all young women in America.

Before arriving at a decision on this dangerous bill of conscription, let us do everything possible to abolish compulsory military training throughout the world and bring about some form of world disarmament and international peace. The Martin resolution and the Neely resolution now before the House propose just this and should be given very serious consideration.

During the next 5 years at least we'll have the veterans of this war to make up a splendidly trained reserve—besides a large standing voluntary army ready for any emergency.

These 5 years can be devoted to all-out international peace efforts. During war the military leaders insist on all-out for victory; during peace we should insist on "All-out for peace."

America leads the world—if we propose to abolish compulsory military training throughout the world—it shall be abolished. If we choose rather to enact such legislation—it will mean inevitable war. Other nations will be forced to follow our example, and may further endanger our security by forming powerful blocs in efforts to equal our military strength in another mad armament race.

We can lead the nations of the world into the ways of peace or into the ways of war—the decision is for us to make.

I would like to ask the proponents of compulsory military training this question: "What objections they have against trying to abolish compulsory military training in all nations, before the consideration of such legislation?"

In conclusion, gentlemen, it seems to me that compulsory military service is not necessary at this time; it cannot exist alongside of our democratic way of life; it will jeopardize the future security of our country, and it will wreck the establishment of a just and durable peace for the world.

Farmers Should Have Their Former Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to say in the sale of surplus property former owners have been given preference in the purchase of ships and other property, but farmers have not been given such first right to get back home farm lands.

Thousands of farmers were forced to give up home farms for the use of war plants.

Now these lands are sold as surplus property.

Mr. Speaker, such former owners should have the first right to purchase back these home farms from the Government.

I have introduced the following bill:

A bill to provide that former owners of farms and other real estate shall have the first right to purchase their former homes now being sold by the Surplus Property Administration

Whereas the Government in prosecuting the war effort has taken by condemnation and otherwise large areas of lands throughout the United States;

Whereas these lands were the homes of farmers and other persons for many years; and

Whereas such lands are now being declared surplus: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the Government in the sale of surplus lands give the former owners the first right, opportunity, and privilege to purchase any such lands heretofore taken by condemnation or otherwise and used in the war effort, and now or in the future declared surplus.

A Postwar Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave heretofore granted I include the following editorial appearing in the Oregon Daily Journal December 15, 1945, in the extension of my remarks:

A POSTWAR PROJECT

High waters in the Columbia, Willamette, and their minor tributary streams bring yearly down from the hills and upland fields vast tonnages of Oregon's richest soil. The rivers showed yellow with their burdens of silt washed down by the early rains and sluiced into these main arteries toward the sea. We see this phenomenon year in, year out, with each succeeding season of freshet.

What becomes of this silt? What happens to the lands from which it came? The answer to these questions indicates one tragic thing—waste and destruction. The mountains are being brought low, the meadows and rich acres upon which the people depend for their sustenance are being trenched and gullied, eroded and laid bare—in some instances down to the bedrock.

The soil thus filched from the highlands is carried far away—ultimately to the sea, where it is dispersed along nameless shores or mixed with the coastal sands and built up into new bars or low capes that jut out from the mainland, to be scattered again by shifts of wind or ocean current—waste.

Now that war is ended, new efforts should be taken to control some of this destruction of the land. Limitation of logging in areas where tree roots once held the ground against erosion; more scientific contour plowing of farms so that furrows should not become down-sloping watercourses to carry off, rather than retain, soil; restoration to pasture of some of the once-great ranges on which millions of cattle grazed but which were made into dust bowls by long years of intensive cultivation—these would have the twofold blessing of creating employment and of checking destruction.

By the very nature of things, all erosion cannot be checked. No one could hold back the torrents that leap from mountain cliffs and gouge out pools and trenches in their downward rush. But by means of the great dams now being projected to hold back some of the waters in time of flood, the establishment of big and little lakes here and there, the control in the cutting of forests, the more intelligent methods of drainage and irrigation, some of these destructive forces which stem back to America's industrialization can be regulated in some degree. The longer these lands can be kept fertile and in full production the further away will be kept the danger of famine—for erosion means nothing less.

Not Unduly Exacting About the Law—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, several days ago, in calling the attention of my colleagues to two chief influences now affecting our basic concept of law, I noted that the most immediately powerful is the doctrine of "mass guilt," as accepted by Mr. Justice Jackson of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The second influence may, however, prove to have challenged more fundamentally our traditional belief that law is properly a protection for and a responsibility of the individual human being in his relations with his fellow men. This second influence, as exemplified by the Soviet theory of jurisprudence, is that law is based on shifting economic dogma, rather than on absolute moral principle. The Soviet conception is that a legal code is a device for the imposition of the theory that the state is superior to the individual in every act of life, and, that as against the state, no individual has recourse.

It is noteworthy that few of our informants about the Soviet Union, who plead that "we must understand the Russians," provide a clear picture of the legal aspect of Soviet life.

Legislators and lawyers, as well as many laymen, are, therefore, grateful to Mr. Charles Prince, of the Washington, D. C., bar, for his résumé of the history of Soviet jurisprudence as published in the November issue of the American Bar Association Journal.

THE EVOLUTION AND CRISIS IN SOVIET JURISPRUDENCE

(By Charles Prince)

(In this brief statement an effort is made to summarize the evolution of the Soviet concept of law during its various stages of development between 1917 and 1945, and to suggest probable reasons for the present theoretical crisis in Soviet jurisprudence.)

I. REVOLUTIONARY CONCEPT OF SOVIET LAW 1917–21

During the initial years of the revolutionary period the Soviet concept of law was postulated on the premise that the October revolution of 1917 completely destroyed the old economic, social, and political relations, and by substituting a new society for the old one, in virtue of the sovereignty of a revolting people, has transferred the state authority in Russia to a new (different) social class. By so doing it was deemed to have severed the continuity of all obligations which were essential to the economic life of the social classes which have disappeared.

Moreover, the initial Soviet concept of law was predicated on transitional socialism. Soviet theorists argued that the proletarian revolution had for the first time in history created a socialist state of workmen and peasants. In concert with popular propaganda, Soviet academicians glorified the Soviet regime as the highest type of state—"that of the dictatorship of the proletariat." During that period Soviet jurisprudence was permeated with this transitional character, namely, that the new form of state, the Soviet Republic, aims toward abolition of classes with their antagonistic interest, and that law will disappear as the state withers away. Soviet legal writers hastened to point out that the state of dictatorship of the proletariat will continue during the first phase of communism, that is, socialism. The withering away of the state per se will begin only in the second, higher phase—communism. Thus, during this transitional period from the revolution to socialism and onward to communism, there was no need to develop a socialist theory of law nor to codify cumulative experience.

Since Soviet legal institutions were of a transitional character, there was no need to establish continuity or any degree of permanence, so far as new socialist legal concepts were concerned. Consequently, the most important characteristic of Soviet socialist law was, and in a large measure still is, its revolutionary creative force. It should be noted that government by decrees is in the year 1945 still an outstanding characteristic of the dictatorship of the proletariat, of the Stalin regime, as it was in the early days of the October revolution when Vladimir Lenin guided the destinies of Russia.

II. THE NEP PERIOD, 1921–29

Lenin and his associates took cognizance of and soon recognized the urgent need for evolving a new civil code of law. This was evidenced by the decree of August 9, 1921—promulgating the new economic policy (NEP)—which was ushered in as a temporary method of reviving light industry and trade destroyed during the revolutionary period (war communism) and by the civil war. The NEP envisaged the temporary development of private industry and trade until the government should be able to supply the needs of the country. In fact, the NEP made certain concessions to the very principles against which the October revolution was directed; namely, individual control of means of production, individual profit from such control, individual employment of labor, and private trade for individual profit. The NEP also reestablished a new and reasonably stable currency, on the basis of which a comprehensive system of taxation was introduced. The greatest concessions of the NEP were made to the peasants for whom individual tenure and exploitation of the land were again permitted, with the right to trade in surplus production after the payment of taxes. Instead of having to sell all surplus products at state-fixed prices, the peasants paid a tax, first in kind, later convertible to currency, and finally paid exclusively in rubles.

* * * * *

Russian exponents of Soviet law contended that the Soviet Government is not seeking to abolish personal property, which is generally classified as consumers' goods, but is definitely opposed to private property. They are opposed to privately owned means of production which may be turned to the exploitation of labor.

Swayed by constantly dynamic changing conditions brought about simultaneously by external attacks, revolution, and civil war, Soviet legal theorists were confronted with the problem of how to find a common de-

nominator for the essentially divergent sets of social and economic relations. If the objectives of the NEP were to be materialized in any appreciable manner, Soviet legal institutions would have to be reoriented. Accordingly, the initial concept of Soviet law as an automatic reflection of given economic facts had to be temporarily discounted and substituted by the concept of law as an instrument used by the Soviet state with the object of transforming the existing economic relations. As a result of this politico-economic expediency, the "commodity-exchange conception" of law and the theory of the "immediate withering away" of state and law had to be temporarily dropped. This phenomenon made confusion all the more confounded among students and teachers of Soviet law alike. The usual question asked during tha period was: Why study law since it will be gradually discarded as the state withers away?

When the NEP period had achieved its purpose, it was ruled out of existence and by the decree of May 21, 1932, the NEP was finally abolished, specifically forbidding the opening of stores and shops by private traders.

The Soviet penal code

Characteristic of the Soviet concept of law (government by decree) was the Soviet penal code. The general principles of the penal policies of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (RSFSR) were brought into force by the decree of All-Union Central Executive Committee of November 22, 1926, and subsequent amendments up to December 1, 1932. In view of their significance during this period, reflecting internal activities of the Soviet regime, articles 6 and 8 of the penal code merit quotation:

"Art. 6. Every act or omission is considered socially dangerous which is directed against the Soviet regime, or which violates the order of things established by the workers' and peasants' authority for the period of transition to a Communist regime.

"Art. 8. If a particular act is a crime within the meaning of article 6 above at the moment when it is done, but by the time it comes up for investigation or trial it has lost its socially dangerous character by reason of a change in the penal law or in virtue of the mere fact of the alteration of the social-political situation, or if the person who performed the act cannot now, in the opinion of the court, be considered socially dangerous, the act shall not render the person who performed it liable to the application of a measure of social defense."

Of equal significance is also the decree of the Central Executive Committee of the USSR to to supplement the decrees promulgating the penal code of the RSFSR regarding crimes again the state (counter-revolutionary crimes and crimes against the administration which were particularly dangerous to the USSR) by articles of treason to the fatherland. "Death by shooting and confiscation of the whole of the offender's property" were characteristic provisions of this code which was announced on June 8, 1934. The study of Soviet criminology and the administration of criminal law seem to have always been very popular among students of law in the Soviet law institutes. Latest reports indicate that the basic task of Soviet criminal law appears to have remained the same; that is, the protection and development of socialist society.

Moreover, the peculiarities of Soviet jurisprudence are particularly prominent in the criminal law. This phenomenon stems from the fact that in philosophy and in methodology, and especially in actual administration of justice, the integrity and significance of the individual human being is subservient to the welfare of the state; more specifically to the governmental machinery of the regime. Hence, Soviet judges are not bound in any way by the written law nor by previously established principles of law, when passing judgment. In fact, Soviet judges may, when considering a case not foreseen by the criminal code, use their discretion in the widest sense. So far, Soviet jurists have not adopted the legal principle of nullum crimen, nulla poena sine lege (no crime, no penalty without law). They are candid in stating that law courts so far have been primarily political organs of the state. In fact, it was a former peoples' commissar of justice and president of the supreme court of the USSR, Peter I. Stouchka, who defined Soviet laws as "technical instructions," with no binding power over those who issue them. As promulgated and practiced, Soviet law courts have been enforcing not law per se but the political directions of the government, which, in turn, is controlled by the politbureau of the Communist party.

III. INHERENT CONTRADICTIONS IN SOVIET THEORY OF LAW, 1929–1938

Like many American jurists, Russian legal scholars were familiar with the writings of prewar German legal theoreticians. This phenomenon may account for the fact that the leading exponents of the Marxist proposition of the incompatibility of law with socialism were in reality giving new expression to the influence of German individualistic jurisprudence. That law per se is incompatible with socialism was the quintessence of the Soviet concept of law promulgated by Pashukanis and Krylenko, Soviet Russia's leading jurists during this period.

True, the Soviet regime is a dictatorship—government by decrees—hence there is no need of a theory of law. But as the Stalin regime entrenched itself in power and began to industrialize and militarize the Soviet Union at an unheard-of accelerated pace, the ruling political hierarchy of Russia has made clear in no uncertain terms that the Soviet State in its present structure has entered the stage of stabilization. Consequently, a radical reorientation of the basic tenets of a socialist theory of law had, of necessity, to be undertaken.

Soviet theoreticians postulated their arguments on the premise that all law is conditioned by conflicts between equals. They further argued that the legal subject of legal theory is the commodity procedure of political economy. Accordingly, the source and origin of all law is the exchange of commodities (trade). Following the individualistic German theory of jurisprudence, law is the system of ideas, rules, and devices which make the exchange of commodities possible, or settles the disputes which such exchange engenders. This theory takes for granted that in the relation by which law is conditioned, the parties should be equal to and independent of each other. Conversely, there is no place for law per se in any society where there are no conflicting interests requiring adjustment. The Soviets further argued that under socialism the whole national economy must become the private business of the state and therefore beyond law. The disappearance of law as an institution will follow closely the abolition of class conflicts and the eventual withering away of the state.

During the decade 1926–36, Eugene B. Pashukanis was the acknowledged leader of the Soviet school of juristic thought. As editor of Sovetskoe Gosudarstvo ("Soviet State Law"), he made the most authoritative formulation of Communist doctrines; and he was the recognized exponent of the Soviet interpretation of international law. Professor Pashukanis based his thesis on the Marxian dogma that the state will gradually wither away. Nevertheless, bringing his reasoning to its logical conclusion, he unwittingly adduced basic contradictions: "The enemies of the party are getting hold of the problems of withering away of law. If in the USSR, the capitalistic elements have been destroyed and a classless society has been built, why does the state still exist?" This view was so at variance with the "official" doctrine as to be regarded in the Kremlin as implacable heresy; and, true to form in "purges," the author was ordered to disavow his ideas. Shortly after the Stalin constitution was adopted, Pashukanis was "liquidated;" his textbooks were banned; he was declared an enemy of the people and berated for the ideas he had been teaching.

Similarly, Nikolai V. Krylenko, who was Commissar of Justice during the period 1931–37 * * * was generally credited with the "classical" exposition of the Soviet concept of law. He was one of the leaders of Soviet thought on criminal law, which corresponded to the interests of the "dictatorship of the proletariat" organized into a ruling class. Krylenko argued that Marxists understand very well the meaning of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and "we shall not tolerate any form of legal fetishism." Hence, Soviet jurisprudence denied the necessitv of formal legal guaranties in law proceedings.

* * * Krylenko maintained that in the struggle against social evils, the interests of the community shall be placed above those of individuals. Krylenko is also credited with the formulation of the Soviet principle that there is no distinction between the Ogpu (secret police of the Communist Party now known as the NKVD` and the law courts. * * * "The only difference between the law courts and the Ogpu is that the former are less liable to commit mistakes; and on the other, courts of law provide no more legal guarantee than the Ogpu and, therefore, there is no fundamental difference between a trial in the law courts or in courts of the Ogpu."

* * * * *

IV. CURRENT CRISIS IN SOVIET JURISPRUDENCE, 1939–45

In our attempt to appraise the current Soviet concept of law and its impact on internal and international affairs, several observations merit recording:

1. Many writers in America, England, France, and Germany, who have published various commentaries on and analyses of Soviet concepts of law, have relied almost exclusively on Marxian interpretations of dialectic materialism and upon the writings of Lenin. While it is true that Soviet writers especially during the early period of the Russian Revolution, have expounded the Soviet concept of law as an application of Marxian theory, yet in fairness to Soviet legal writers it should be stated that they themselves have undergone several evolutionary periods in their exposition of the Soviet concept of law.

* * * * *

* * * it is relatively unimportant what Karl Marx said or what Vladimar Lenin wrote concerning Communist concept of law per se; but what is of significance is what Stalin's spokesmen say now that the Soviet concept of law means. And, what is more important, the Soviet concept of law is best illustrated by the practice and application given to it currently by the legal exponents of the Stalin regime, who are now in policy-making positions.

2. A pattern seems to be discernible, reflecting an internal postwar stability of the present regime, the like of which Soviet Russia has not experienced throughout the 28 years of its existence. Similarly, this trend indicates that the German invasion of Russia on June 22, 1941, brought about a national cohesion of most of the dissident elements within the Soviet Union such as the Stalin regime was unable to achieve throughout the years it has been in dictatorial power. The gradual appearance, however, of a new generation almost completely loyal to the present Soviet regime may well augur a new concept of law which will bring a greater degree of continuity and perhaps even begin

to establish precedents—that is, a record of cumulative Soviet experience, case law—and the demand for a Soviet stare decisis would conceivably become greater as time marches on.

3. Soviet spokesmen have made it abundantly clear that political issues are the determining factors in contemporary world affairs as well as in internal problems. Lenin is generally credited with the statement to the effect that "There is no more erroneous nor harmful idea than the separation of foreign and internal policy." Hence military exigencies and political expediences have of necessity been the basic cores in the shaping of the Soviet concept of civil and international law. To illustrate: Soviet legal writers contend that international law as practiced by capitalist states in their relations among themselves is directed toward a consolidation of the ruling position of capital and is a reflection of class conflicts within each country to put their rule over the proletariat and over colonial countries, whereas the Soviet Union, from the very beginning of its existence, has developed its own forms and brought about changes in substance of both internal law and international law commensurate with the projected political factors as visualized by the present Soviet policy-makers. Obviously, they were and are unfettered in choice of forms and change in substance of their internal law and in their exposition of international law.

* * * * *

5. Both critics and apologists of the Soviet regime have rendered a disservice to the Soviet Union in either condemning the Soviet type of totalitarianism or apologizing for the type of democracy exemplified by U. S. S. R. The truth of the matter is that Soviet spokesmen have stated their position in no uncertain terms to the effect that the Soviet regime is first and last a dictatorship of the proletariat, and they insist that the outside world recognize the Soviet regime as such, even though their propaganda beamed to North America is couched in terms of democracy. The classical definition was given recently by the Soviet dean of jurists, Andrei Y. Vyshinsky, who is at present Deputy Vice Commissar for Foreign Affairs, in an address delivered before the Soviet Academy of Sciences on November 20, 1942. In discussing the stability and strength of the Soviet regime and to what degree it permeated all fields of scientific endeavor after the days of the revolution, Mr. Vyshinsky declared that:

"On the basis of this historical fact it was predicated by Lenin that the Soviet state, as a state of the proletarian dictatorship, must be a new type of a democratic state for the proletariat and for the propertyless persons generally and a new type of dictatorship against exploiters and oppressors."

It should be noted that this statement of policy was promulgated in the darkest hours of the Soviet people, when the German armies were at the gates of Stalingrad. Contemporary Soviet spokesmen have continually reaffirmed their abiding faith in the enduring character and resilience of the Soviet collectivist system. This phenomenon has more recently been translated into practice. When the Potsdam communiqué was issued, Stalin signed this document, not as Premier, but as Generalissimo of the U. S. S. R.

6. The constitution promulgated on December 5, 1936, known in Soviet literature as the Stalin constitution, including all the amendments as of February 2, 1944, specifically provides in article 126 that "the most active and politically most conscious citizens in the ranks of the working class and other sections of the working people unite in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), which is the vanguard of the working people in their struggle to strengthen and develop the socialist system and is the leading core of all organizations of the working people, both public and state."

A careful examination of all the 146 articles in the Stalin constitution reveals that few and far between are the provisions that have actually been effectuated prior to and during World War II. Since the end of the war Soviet newspapers and radio broadcasts are replete with glorified accounts of the major role played by the party in the defeat of Germany and Japan; thus identifying the military victories and resurgent Russian nationalism with the sagacious leadership of the party.

SUMMARY

To recapitulate, it is reasonably correct to state that the most important characteristic of Soviet socialist law is still its revolutionary creative force; laws are technical instruments with no binding power over those who issue them. This was especially so during the first decade of the Soviet regime. The law courts were, and in a large measure still are, primarily political organs of the state, organized to carry out the political directions of the government.

To be sure, since 1936 Soviet writers on jurisprudence have been using terms "Socialist legality" instead of "revolutionary legality." Their contention is that socialist legality reflects a greater degree of permanence and public interest in the administration of Soviet justice. In almost all instances, the interest of the whole and the duty to safeguard the social order of the Soviet regime have been the decisive criteria. Soviet jurists have always regarded the duties of the judiciary as identical with those of the governmental machinery, and a court has no specific duty differing from those of other organs of governmental power. Socialist law has therefore been regarded from the very beginning as an instrument of socialist reconstruction of the society; hence it is still in its transitional stage from socialism to communism.

Significantly, 28 years after its establishment (November 6, 1917), the Soviet Union appears to be emerging as the dominant political and economic power in Europe, in the Near East, and especially in the Far East. Moreover, it is a matter of common knowledge that the Soviet Union under the regime of Generalissimo Josef V. Stalin is now engaged in a program of far-reaching political and economic penetration in all of these areas. This has been evidenced at the United Nations Conference on International Organization at San Francisco and more recently by the Soviet delegation to the Council of Foreign Ministers in London. This phenomenon calls for a basic reorientation of socialist concepts of law; hence the present crisis in Soviet jurisprudence.

An examination of the writings of contemporary representative Russian legal students reveals that Soviet juristic thought appears to pay more heed to geopolitics and to economic factors than to the role of law in world order. Hence, they advocate collective security, universal peace, and friendly coexistence of nations, and validate the Soviet Government's course of action, however predatory, on legal grounds.

Palestine Jewish Homeland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD, I call the attention of the House to the fact that I believe we acted wisely yesterday in passing the resolution urging the President to use his good offices in requesting the British to liberalize the Jewish quota in Palestine, designed for the purpose of establishing a Jewish homeland in that part of the earth which gave them birth. I do not share the pessimism of other people of this Nation, whose opinions I respect and who I think are equally as honest as I am, that such a move on the part of the Congress will prove embarrassing to our Government.

The British Government and the British people have been the beneficiaries of a great and unlimited generosity on the part of the American people; a generosity to which countless thousands of Jewish people have made substantial contribution.

The British Government is a signatory to the United Nations Charter. If the British Government has a friend in the world today, it is the United States of America. How on earth can they possibly be offended if we ask them to fulfill a promise they solemnly made to the Jewish people? If such a request is untimely and unreasonable, the family of nations is in a deplorable condition.

America and the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLOS P. ROMULO

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, views expressed by American newspapers are a correct gauge by which to judge the trend of American public opinion. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting two editorials, one of the Times, of Bath, Maine, and another of the Boston Herald, of Boston, Mass. Their sympathetic attitude toward my people I must acknowledge with deep gratitude and I earnestly commend it to the attention of this Congress that will soon take up important legislation affecting the welfare and destiny of the Philippines.

These editorials are:

[From the Bath (Maine) Times of December 12, 1945]

THE PHILIPPINES

On our next Fourth of July the Philippines will become independent in accordance with acts of the Congress of the United States. Those acts were passed several years ago and ratified by further congressional authority on June 29, 1944.

The Philippines were one of our prizes of the Spanish-American War, and the first interest we had in the islands was Admiral Dewey's victory over the Spaniards in Manila Bay. We took them but we had a hard time holding the Philippines.

But in the last 47 years what might be called "a beautiful friendship" has grown up between the Filipinos and the American people. We aren't going to push them aside, and tell them to paddle their own canoe, and we are not going to withdraw our promise of independence scheduled for July 4,

1946. We had a pretty tough time in driving the Japanese out of the Philippines—but we did it.

Now, we are going to help the Filipinos establish their own government, and that program is progressing as rapidly as possible, supported by every branch of the United States Government. Such strong men as the leaders, President Osmeña and General ROMULO, are doing an A–1 job for their countrymen.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald of December 13, 1945]

FILIPINOS' VIEWS

Passage by the Filipino Senate of a resolution expressing sympathy for the Indonesians "in their fight for independence" reveals the extent to which American thought and action have been imitated in the Philippines. Concern over the affairs of other nations is an old American custom. Passing resolutions about them is a familiar practice.

The United States had hardly been established when the French Revolution became one of our political issues. On numerous occasions, as in the Greek war for independence, the American people have exhibited concern for the political underdogs of other lands, and many a European patriot has received a hearty welcome here. One European state—Czechoslovakia—was founded at Pittsburgh. Dr. Masaryk negotiated a Czech-Slovak unity pact there and issued the declaration of independence from Washington. The Philippines themselves have remained under American control as one result of our sympathy with the Cubans, who had suffered from Spanish misrule.

The political doctrines which the Filipinos have inherited from the United States will work both ways. When there is a sovereign Filipino nation its legislature and our Congress may not see problems eye to eye and the Presidents in Manila and Washington will have their little disagreements. But such a development is of negligible importance in comparison with the widespread benefits which will come to both nations and the world.

The American Veterans of World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include an address by Clyde M. Longstreth, M. D., of Atlantic, Iowa, State commander of American Veterans of World War II, over radio station KSA, Des Moines, Iowa, on December 1:

Thank you, Mr. Earl; good morning, ladies and gentlemen: What I have to say is primarily for the ears of the war veteran. Yes, veterans of Iowa, my message vitally concerns you.

It is my pleasure and privilege today to tell you something about the fastest growing organization of its kind in America. I refer to the organization known as the American Veterans of World War II—or, by its more familiar name, the Amvets.

If you are a veteran of World War II, if you are one of those who feel that the principles for which you fought should not be permitted to languish, if you are concerned, as most veterans are concerned, with the future welfare of our Nation, you will be interested in the program of the Amvets. I am happy to have this opportunity to introduce the Amvets to you and to explain something of its activities.

The American Veterans of World War II had its beginning as an organization long before the guns fell silent in Europe and in the Pacific. In Washington, D. C., in September of 1944—at the same time that Patton's spearheads were entering Chateau-Thierry, Belleau Wood, while six Allied armies were still poised for the plunge into the Siegfried line—a number of earnest veterans of this same World War were already engaged in forming the nucleus of the Amvets.

From the beginning, there was something different about the Amvets. This difference was the noticeable absence of Army brass and Navy gold braid. Former enlisted men of the services comprised the group that first met and organized in Washington. I mention this merely to demonstrate that the Amvets does not represent the interests of cliques or privileged groups. It is an organization that belongs to all those who served their country in this war, irrespective of rank or social status.

During this same time, other veterans' groups had been springing up spontaneously throughout the country. In Kansas City, in December of 1944, representatives of the Amvets and these other groups met and agreed to join forces. There emerged a new and greater Amvet organization with Nation-wide representation. Before the war had ended, a charter had been drawn up and presented to Congress for approval.

In its first national convention, held in the Chicago Stevens Hotel, in October of this year, the Amvets adopted a constitution and bylaws. It also adopted a declaration of principles. That declaration should claim the attention of all veterans of World War II who are interested in the development of a sound American program to promote the cause of perpetual peace and good will among nations. I shall speak of these principles in a few moments. At this convention the Amvets elected its first national officers. These officials form a representative cross-section of the entire United States.

Since its inception the Amvets has enjoyed the support and good will of national leaders and organizations. The support of the Disabled American Veterans organization was pledged by its leader, Milton D. Cohn, who attended the Amvets October convention. Senators and Representatives in Congress have expressed favor with the program of the Amvets. On one of his Sunday evening broadcasts, commentator Walter Winchell spoke approvingly of the Amvets as he warned veterans against joining disreputable organizations. The Amvets, said Winchell, are "a very respectable, reputable group of Americans."

Membership in the Amvets is open to any American citizen, male or female, without distinction as to race or creed, who served actively in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard on or after September 16, 1940. Membership is open to women who served with the WAC's, the WAVES, SPARS, Marine Corps, or Nursing Corps. In this connection it is significant to note that, under the constitution of the Amvets, at least one of the six national vice commanders must be a woman. Mrs. Beatrice Wade, of Reading, Pa., holds the office of third vice commander of the Amvets organization.

The Amvets lists among its members many prominent figures of World War II. Among these are Gen. Carl Spaatz and General Middleton, both of whom belong to the Louisiana organization. With more than 15,000,000 potential veterans eligible for membership, the Amvets promises to become the largest and most influential veterans group ever organized.

Here in Iowa, the growth of the Amvets has been especially rapid. It was my privilege to have been instrumental in organizing the first Amvet post in Iowa. We organized in Atlantic, Iowa, with 14 members in January of this year. Our membership at the present time is 240, and we are still growing. Our numerous other posts throughout the State report a corresponding degree of expansion.

The Iowa Amvets has been named for the five Sullivan brothers, in honor of the glorious fighting spirit and supreme sacrifice which they so willingly made in November 1942.

Next week, on the anniversary of the day that will live in infamy, the Iowa Amvets organization will hold its first State convention. The date: December 7, 8, and 9. The place: the south ball room of the Hotel Fort Des Moines in Des Moines. We urge all present members and officers of the Amvets to attend. We also wish to extend an invitation to all veterans of World War II who are interested in the objectives and functions of the Amvets to attend this convention.

Most veterans realize the logic and reasonability of becoming identified with an organization such as the Amvets. Most of the millions of veterans of World War II are convinced of the futility of war as an instrument of national policy. They have seen at first-hand the devastation, the indescribable suffering, the heartache, the anguish which attends armed conflict between nations. The veterans of this war are young men and women, for the most part. Theirs is not the responsibility for making this war. They paid and are still paying for the mistakes of an elder generation. They do not want to see those mistakes repeated.

Veterans today realize that there are tremendous problems facing our Nation in the days immediately ahead. A war does not end with the treaty of peace, the instrument of surrender. Wars never do. The struggle between armies stops but the effects of war go on working their destruction for generations afterward. The veterans of World War II comprise the major part, the youthful part, the vitally interested part, of a new generation. It is up to them to see that the objectives for which they fought and for which so many of their comrades died are carried over into national life and action.

Individually, the veteran can do little. In order for him to assume a proper and legitimate role in the rebuilding of America it is essential that he and his former buddies be organized—and organized strongly.

If social and economic justice is ever brought about, if wars and depressions are ever made obsolete, if the letter and spirit of the preamble to the United States Constitution are ever given their rightful place in our individual and collective lives, if a better democratic society is ever achieved, it will be achieved by these men and women who have carried into a later active life the aspirations and ideals for which they so valiantly fought. The instrument through which they can make their influence effective is an organization strong in numbers and strong in principles. Such an organization is the Amvets.

Permit me to outline briefly a few of the principles to which the Amvets is pledged. These were drawn up and adopted by the October convention in Chicago. I quote from a portion of the declaration:

"We pledge ourselves to develop mutual confidence and understanding within our Nation and between America and the other nations of the world to the end that all men may live in peace and be responsible members of an enlightened family of nations. * * * We rededicate ourselves to service to our Nation in peace as in war to insure that American ideals for which we and our countrymen

have fought and died, may be preserved for us and posterity."

Among the principles for which the Amvets stands, we may mention the following:

We believe in international cooperation in making the "four freedoms" a living reality.

We believe in equality of opportunity, without distinction of political views, races, faiths, and creeds, with a solemn pledge not to become a front for destructive movements or isms.

We believe in the democratic adjustment of industrial relations, with a charge to both labor and management to "clean house" and adopt policies and procedures which will most rapidly assure the attainment of our Nation's full potentialities.

We believe in freedom of the press.

We believe that our returnees are entitled to the fullest opportunity for speedy reconversion to civilian status so that they may once more become constructive citizens.

We believe that Americans should exercise the full rights and obligations of citizenship, to protect our democratic principles, and to promote honesty and integrity in public office.

These are a few of the major ideals to which the Amvets is pledged. I believe these are principles with which all thoughtful Americans, veterans or otherwise, are in complete accord.

The Amvets has no intention to discredit or to detract from the influence of existing veterans' organizations of previous wars. The American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans—these have all made their significant contribution to our American mode of living, and the Amvets, their counterpart of World War II, extends the hand of fellowship and cooperation on matters of mutual interest. Nevertheless, we do feel, as most veterans feel, that those who served in this greatest of all wars should have an organization of their own, a young organization, composed primarily of young hearts and voices, which will reflect the spirit and temper of a new generation.

For this reason, I earnestly beseech Iowa veterans of World War II to become familiar with the Amvets, to examine its objectives, to join it, and to support it. The various posts of the Amvets in Iowa stand ready to answer inquiries with respect to our organization and to receive new members. For those of you who are able to do so, we invite your attendance at the first State convention of the Iowa Amvets at the Hotel Fort Des Moines in Des Moines next week. There you will have an opportunity to examine at first hand and at your leisure the program of the Amvets, and to join in the fellowship of your former comrades in arms. The convention will open on December 7 and will run through December 9. We offer on the program such distinguished guests and officials as members of the staff of General Arnold, Chief of the Army Air Forces, Washington, D. C.; Gen. Omar Bradley's staff, who is Administrator for our veterans' affairs in Washington; Iowa's Sgt. Ralph G. Neppel, of Carroll; Col. Dennis C. Nickell, of Council Bluffs; the Sullivans' sister, Miss Genevieve, of Waterloo; and the chairman of the convention committee, Maj. C. W. Hoffman, of Des Moines.

American veterans, here is your opportunity, as American citizens, as the generation of tomorrow, to unite in fellowship and patriotism to the end that we shall be able to reconstruct a new world order out of the debris left by the war, an order founded solidly on the democratic ideals we have so long cherished and for which we have so earnestly fought. You can do this under the banner of the American Veterans of World War II.

I thank you.

Assistant Secretary of the Navy Disagrees With John Cowles on Single Department of Defense—Representative Randolph Disagrees With Secretary Hensel—Correspondence Is Presented

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith correspondence received from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable H. Struve Hensel, to John Cowles and myself and the reply which I made:

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY
OF THE NAVY,
Washington, December 14, 1945.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RANDOLPH: I am enclosing herewith a letter which I have today addressed to John Cowles, chairman of the board of Look magazine. I trust that both you and he will give it the same prominence that his statements were given. It is my honest belief that he made a number of erroneous statements of fact which I believe should be corrected.

This problem of national securty is so important to the country that all our conclusions should be based on supportable facts rather than guesses and unproved opinions.

Sincerely yours,

H. STRUVE HENSEL.

DECEMBER 13, 1945.

JOHN COWLES, ESQ.,
Chairman of the Board, Look Magazine,
New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. COWLES: I have just seen an article written by you entitled "We Must Unify Our Armed Forces," which was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 12, 1945, by the Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia. He described the article as splendid and convincing and pointed to your first-hand knowledge of the theaters of war.

Your article extends much further, however, than your actual experience in the theaters of war and endeavors to cover the field of procurement. In respect of procurement matters, your statements of fact are, in my opinion, in serious error.

I have in mind your statement that if the two services had been unified 10 years ago:

"Tens of billions of dollars would have been saved." That is an extravagant and unsupportable statement.

I realize that somewhat similar statements have been made by men in authority, but when challenged they have always avoided proof and have described their statements as "guesses." Furthermore, few of the men making such guesses have devoted themselves to procurement during this war. I am quite disturbed about misleading the public by these erroneous allegations of economy which cannot be proved and which, in my opinion, are untrue.

You also stated:

"The procurement services of the War Department and Navy Department at home bid against each other for supplies and equipment."

That is another statement which cannot be supported.

I have been engaged in procurement work in the Navy Department for the past 5 years. I have also discussed this matter with Secretary Forrestal, who, before me, was in charge of the procurement of material in the Navy Department. Neither of us know of any instance in which the two departments bid against each other for supplies and equipment, except a few instances very early in the war in respect of lumber. Such situation was immediately remedied by the creation of an independent purchasing agency for lumber. I would be very interested to know whether you had any instances in mind when you made your unqualified statement.

I was also interested in the fact that you based your conclusion as to the need for a single secretary on the assumption that one secretary would automatically provide unity of command in the field. Yet one of the disunities, i. e., the separation of the Army command under General MacArthur from the Strategic Air Force command under Generals Arnold and Spaatz occurred during this war under the eyes of a single secretary. If the appointment of a single secretary automatically provides for unity of command, why did the Secretary of War fail to achieve unity of command within the War Department? It seems to me that your criticism of that separation of command unconsciously proves that the appointment of a single secretary is not a guaranty of unity of command in the field—at least it was not such a guaranty in this war.

We are all aware that war is now total. The Navy program for unity of effort is a plan which provides for the unification of all governmental functions in the prosecution of the war. The Navy plan embraces the activities of the State Department and also brings into unified direction the conservation of natural resources, the mobilization of industrial capacity, and the utilization of our manpower. The appointment of a single secretary for the armed forces as urged by you is an unsupportable solution of only a fragment of the problem.

I believe we are all agreed on the importance of an efficient national security establishment and it seems to me to be doubly important that the decisions are reached on the basis of correct statements of fact and that guesses are prominently so labeled.

Sincerely yours,

H. STRUVE HENSEL.

DECEMBER 20, 1945.

Hon. STRUVE HENSEL,
The Assistant Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HENSEL: I have read carefully your letter of December 14, 1945, and the enclosed copy of your communication to John Cowles. In this letter you appear to accuse Mr. Cowles of having made erroneous statements, in his splendid article on unification of the War and Navy Departments which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 12, 1945.

I have looked further into the statements of Mr. Cowles which you criticize and into the merits of your own assertions—in accordance with my policy of sponsoring in the Congress only statements fully supported by the facts. My examination leads me to the conclusion that not only were Mr. Cowles' statements entirely in accord with the facts, but certain of your own indicate a lack of information or inability to interpret facts which, were it not for the heat of controversy in which you are engaged, would be surprising.

In your assertion that the command organization of the Strategic Air Forces in the Pacific is proof or evidence that unity of command in the field cannot be guaranteed by a single Secretary, you appear to be quite uninformed as to that organization and the strategic considerations which required it. According to my information, early B-29

activity of the Twentieth Bomber Command, Twentieth Air Force, involved operations in and over the Southeast Asia Command of Lord Mountbatten, the China-India-Burma command of General Stilwell, the Southwest Pacific theater under General MacArthur, and, to a lesser degree, the Pacific Ocean areas under Admiral Nimitz. When these operations were supplemented by the Twenty-first Bomber Command based in the Marianas, further operations and activities were, I understand, required in Admiral Nimitz' theater and the Southwest Pacific theater. It is apparent to me that the far-flung nature of these operations required that the Twentieth Air Force be directly under the control of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to assure coordination with the four theaters in question.

In the later days of the war, it appears that General Spaatz' headquarters was established at Guam to direct the operations of the entire Twentieth Air Force from the Marianas and the Eighth Air Force from Okinawa. In this stage also, operations were involved in the areas under direction of General MacArthur, of Admiral Nimitz, and, to a smaller extent, of General Wedemeyer.

Inability of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to establish a single unified command for the Pacific Basin was the factor which made it necessary to continue the strategic Air Forces directly under the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Had there been a single supreme command, the strategic Air Forces would, without doubt, have been placed under it. With command divided between Army and Navy, no alternative was possible except direction by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

In view of your concentration on procurement matters, for 5 years, it is doubtless inevitable that you should be unfamiliar with the strategic problems and considerations involved in the decisions to which I have just referred. It does seem to me, however, that, without such familiarity, you should refrain from publishing what are at least misinterpretations of this situation. Far from supporting the conclusion drawn by you, the inability of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to establish unity of command as between the Army and Navy was in itself the reason for the organizational position of the strategic Air Forces in the later days of the war.

I am rather surprised that in spite of your experience in procurement work in the Navy Department you label as "extravagant" and "unsupportable" the statements by Mr. Cowles that tens of billions of dollars would have been saved if the two services had been unified 10 years ago, and that during the war the procurement services of the War Department and the Navy Department at home bid against each other for supplies and equipment. I am reliably informed as to the former that an assessment of only a fraction of the field of hundreds of thousands of items used by the two services reveals that unification would have realized in the field of—

(a) Research and development: Considering an average 3-year period of the war only, savings of $372,067,000 in 17 items alone.

(b) Purchasing: Over the same period, considering 32 items only, a saving of $3,649,138,000.

(c) Facilities: In the 3-year period, a saving of $665,383,000, considering only 11 items.

(d) Supply and materials handling: In 3 years, considering 9 items, a saving of $3,378,729,000.

Thus, when one realizes that a survey of only a small portion of the field reveals probable savings under unification of some $8,065,317,000 over a 3-year period, Mr. Cowles' statement is not so "extravagant," or "unsupportable." Quite the contrary, it appears obvious to me that a comprehensive coverage of the entire field would result in figures completely justifying his statement.

As for the competitive bidding, I will give you only five instances of many which your preoccupation with lumber (the forests and the trees) may have prevented you from discovering.

(a) The Army and Navy both had placed orders for 3,000-gallon water tanks with the W. W. McFarland Co., Miami, Fla. The Navy was paying 10 percent more than the Army for essentially the same item, and therefore the manufacturer concentrated on meeting the Navy schedules.

(b) During 1944 the Army and Navy were engaged in scheduling engines and engine spare parts with manufacturers in the Detroit area. There was direct conflict between the services. Manufacturers could not meet both schedules and the War Production Board has to step in to effect coordination.

(c) The Haslett Chute & Conveyor Co., Oakes, Pa., was making M–4 ponton bridge parts for the Army and fighter aircraft wing tips for the Navy in January-May 1945. Strong competition existed for facilities and for labor, particularly for aluminum riveters, and as a result the production for both services fell behind schedule.

(d) Medical and drug supplies were purchased by the Army and the Navy with little or no coordination. Out of 266 contracts checked, 72 had been placed with the same contractor by the two services. It was not until 1945 that joint Army-Navy procurement of these supplies was organized.

(e) The Joint Army-Navy Procurement Agency was formed in 1945 only after an investigation and strong recommendation by the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. It is estimated that the joint agency saved $25,000,000 in the first 3 months of operations.

I heartily concur with your view that in this important matter conclusion should be based on supportable facts rather than guesses and unproved opinions. I confess that, in your letter, I find guesses and opinions not merely unproved, but readily disproved. I shall gladly ask leave to insert your communication, with enclosure, together with this reply, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

Federal Aid to Education—The Fight Must Go On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, educational opportunity for the use of the Nation received a severe set-back in the Nation's Capitol last week. The House Committee on Education, by the narrow vote of 10 to 9, turned down the Ramspeck-Hill bill to provide Federal aid to education. Those of us who have been active in sponsoring this legislation are, of course, disappointed. But we must not give up the fight. We will carry on and in the near future we will win. We will win because right and justice is on our side.

The vote in the Education Committee is the best showing we proponents of this bill have yet made in this House committee. We have formed a steering committee to continue to press for passage of this needed legislation. Some future Congress is going to realize that equality of opportunity necessarily carries with it equality of educational opportunity. Some future Congress is going to appreciate the necessity of passing this legislation.

The educational issue:

To people who do not believe that education is essential to the creation and maintenance of a high economic and social status for the people of America there is no need to discuss Federal aid or even State aid for education. To those who do not believe that the opportunity to attend a good school throughout childhood and youth is a right that should be enjoyed by all there is not much point to the discussion of devising methods of school finance to place a floor under a desirable minimum of educational opportunity for all American children and youth. To such persons it seems all right that educational opportunity should be left to the chance of being a member of a family or the resident of a community that possesses the financial means to pay for education. To them it seems all right that the children of the masses of the people regardless of talent, ability, and character should become the hewers of wood and drawers of water for privileged persons.

Equality of educational opportunity—American doctrine:

Fortunately a very large majority of American people accept equality of opportunity, especially equality of educational opportunity, as the birthright of every American child and agree that a legitimate function of democratic government is to sustain and make a reality of that birthright. The American people, by and large, believe that the kind, quality, and amount of education received by our people is a primary factor in their economic, political, and social welfare.

Education and national wealth:

We know that there is a direct relationship between the educational attainments of the people and a nation's wealth. Recently the Chamber of Commerce of the United States published a bulletin, Education Steps Up Living Standards, that reveals that the level of understanding and technical knowledge of all the people of a nation is an indispensable factor in national economic well-being. By comparison it is shown that some countries have great resources such as rich land, oil, minerals, low-cost electric power, and good climate, while at the same time they tolerate low standards of education and technical training and extremely high rates of illiteracy. Such countries, lacking the knowledge necessary to use these resources properly, have low income and extremely low standards of living. Other countries have poor soil, few minerals, no oil, inclement climate, short growing season, and poor sources of power, but high standards of education and technical training and illiteracy is practically nonexistent. Such countries have high incomes and high standards of living for practically everyone. "The lack of resources did not prevent the development of a high standard of living when the people had sufficient skill."

Education means high income:

Within the United States the evidence is replete that high education and high income and high standards of living go hand in hand. Average public-school expenditures in Nevada for 1910, 1920, and 1930 were $102 per pupil; in New York, $83; in Tennessee, $24; in Mississippi, $21. Retail sales per capita in 1940 in Nevada were $564; in New York, $414; in Tennessee, $208; in Mississippi, $129. The number of telephones per 1,000 population in Nevada is 175; in New York, 206; in Tennessee, 79; in Mississippi, 36. The circulation of 18

nationally known magazines per 1,000 population in Nevada is 509; in New York, 300; in Tennessee, 151; in Mississippi, 104. During the present war the rejection of draftees because of lack of education per 100 men examined in Nevada was 1.3; in New York, 1.4; in Tennessee, 9.1; in Mississippi, 12.4.

Federal assistance necessary:

Evidently education is an investment in people that pays enormous dividends in dollars and cents, to say nothing of the cultural advantages of an educated people as contrasted with an uneducated people.

Granting that education is essential to our national well-being, is Federal assistance in financing schools a necessity? This question has too often been answered by merely citing the tradition that the support of public schools is a State responsibility. It is a fact that under the tenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States the control of education is a power reserved to the States or to the people. But from the earliest days of the Republic the Congress has been upheld by the courts in exercising the right to grant financial assistance to the States to promote the general welfare. In so doing the Congress does not gain the right or power to take from the States the control of the activity or agency aided.

Merely citing the doctrine of State's rights and responsibilities does not remove the economic necessity for Federal participation in the support of public education. The economic necessity for Federal aid has been so thoroughly established and should now be so well known as to require no further discussion. In a nutshell it is this: There are great inequalities in the economic ability of the States to pay for education. These inequalities have been relatively constant for many decades. Furthermore, the States with the least economic ability to raise public revenues have many more children in proportion to adult population than the richer States. A few pertinent facts will illustrate the point.

In 1943 the per capita income in California was $1,429; in Tennessee, $649; in West Virginia, $688. The number of children 5 to 17 years old per 1,000 population in 1943 in California was 172; in Tennessee, 249; in West Virginia, 291 (the highest in the Nation).

Equalizing the burden:

These facts mean that in order to raise the same amount of money per child of school age in 1943, West Virginia would have had to make about three and one-half times as much effort, and Tennessee about three times as much effort as would California. In order to raise $105 per school-age child in 1942–43 (which was the average amount actually spent per pupil in average daily attendance in the Nation as a whole that year), West Virginia and Tennessee would have had to make two and eight-tenths and two and six-tenths times the actual national effort, while California could have raised the same amount per child with only eight-tenths times the national effort.

The inequalities of educational opportunity resulting from the unequal educational burdens and the unequal ability to pay for schools have for a long time been well known. The average expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance ranges from $35 in Mississippi to $179 in New York (Tennessee, $55). The average salary of teachers (1942–43) ranges from $654 in Mississippi to $2,697 in New York (Tennessee, $963). The average salary of a rural teacher in the United States is only $959, as compared to $1,955 per urban teacher. The percent of youth of high-school age actually in school ranges from 40 percent in Mississippi to 95 percent in Washington (Tennessee, 45.6 percent). These inequalities of opportunity constitute an intolerable situation in a democratic nation.

There is now pending in Congress legislation calculated to remedy the situation, the Thomas-Hill-Ramspeck bill (S. 181 and H. R. 2849). Hearings have been held and the Senate and House committees should lose little time in reporting them to the Senate and House for a vote. Without doubt, a majority of both Houses is favorable to such legislation.

A national problem:

The bugaboo of Federal control of schools should not be permitted longer to deny adequate educational opportunity to several million of our Nation's children. We can have Federal aid without Federal control. To deny that we can is to deny the successful operation of our form of government.

I believe that if the Federal Government has the right to reach into the most remote corners of the Nation and call youth to the defense of the country that same Government has the obligation to support a program of education that will enable them to perform such a duty well.

The heaviest burden for paying for this war will be laid upon those who are now the Nation's youth. I believe it will strengthen the faith of youth in their country's future if the National Government will guarantee the financial support of a program of education which will enable them to pay this debt.

I for one believe that the school teachers of America are the first and chiefest servants of the Nation, and that the laborer is worthy of his hire. Federal aid is necessary to adequate remuneration of our teachers.

Public education is a public necessity. Federal aid for public education is essential to an equitable distribution of the blessings of education among the children and youth of America.

Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED. V. IZAC
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the granting of my unanimous-consent request, I insert the following article taken from the publication American Federationist of December 1945.

The views of Archbishop McNicholas so clearly enunciated herein are, without question, shared by a large number of us here in the House of Representatives.

I direct especial attention to these words of the archbishop:

If justice prevails and labor is given its just share of profits, individuals and corporations will be limited necessarily to reasonable gains. Investors are entitled to a reasonable profit and nothing more.

If the people of the United States would simply sit down and calmly reason this out, they would find themselves in full agreement with that statement.

The conflict of views between management and labor arises over the size of the piece of pie each will get, using the dollar of profits as a nice round pie.

I recognize the church's stand is that labor's share must be sufficient to maintain the dignity of the individual and permit him to provide a decent living for his family. Anything less than that would be too small a share—too small a piece of that pie.

There is another fact Archbishop McNicholas could well have pointed out: practically all of labor's share goes right back into the financial blood stream of our country. But if too large a share is retained by the relatively few who make up management and capital, those excess gains are not turned back in anywhere near the same proportion, but are tucked away to swell the vast fortunes accumulated by the few.

This inevitably brings on the vicious cycle of lowered production and decreased consumption, which always ends in depression and economic collapse.

The article follows:

A CHURCH LEADER TALKS ABOUT LABOR—A CONDENSATION OF REMARKS ADDRESSED BY ARCHBISHOP JOHN T. MCNICHOLS TO RALLY OF THE HOLY NAME SOCIETY IN CINCINNATI

After this terrible world conflict, and after all that labor has done to win the victory, it is not surprising that workingmen should wish to take advantage of the hour to secure a justifiable share of recompense and profit for their labors in production.

The burden of taxation, which must be borne by the whole American people, will prevent in the future, let us hope, the amassing of fabulous fortunes by individuals and corporations.

If justice prevails and labor is given its just share of profits, individuals and corporations will be limited necessarily to reasonable gains. Investors are entitled to a reasonable profit and nothing more.

CORPORATIONS HAVE OBLIGATIONS

A corporation for profit is a social entity. It has social obligations. It depends on a group of the public to supply its workers. It depends on the public to use or to consume its products. The public has a right to know its transactions.

Labor, in the light of public knowledge, must not make unjust demands; capital must not selfishly take more than its share of profits.

Undoubtedly there should be a serious increase in wages for employees, unless there be a radical rearrangement of conducting business, but labor will make a mistake if in this hour it gives its whole attention to an increase of wages. Labor should examine the over-all picture; it should consider a long-time program. It is urgent that, besides the increase of wages, labor make other gains.

Labor and management should sit down regularly at the same conference table. Labor should have a voice and a vote in the meetings of the board of directors.

A certain substantial portion of the stock of a company should belong to labor—not, indeed, to individuals, but to the whole group which constitutes labor. This arrangement will allow succeeding members of labor to share in the profits of a corporation as their predecessors did.

Labor and management should be friendly colleagues, not enemies. Management should not assume the role of dictator or consider itself endowed with a human dignity which is denied labor. The dignity of labor was made sublime by the poverty and labors of Christ.

Just as there are degrees of physical perfection and intellectual keenness in human beings, so there are degrees of usefulness and capacity among men who labor. One man has one talent, another two, another five. The varied gifts of individuals and the varied quality of the work done by men make a hierarchy in the ranks of labor; which means that one man is recompensed more than another, and that one man has a greater share in profits than another.

There must, however, be a minimum standard. Every man is entitled to live ac-

cording to the dignity of a human being. He is entitled—by fulfilling his part of the contract with management—to the means to live in keeping with human dignity. He is entitled—by fulfilling his part of the contract—to security, to a family wage which will enable him to found a home and maintain a normal family.

NOTHING SACROSANCT ABOUT CAPITAL

The church must say that there is nothing sacrosanct about the present mechanics of capital, but the church will always insist on justice for capital.

Some will say that the church is radical. She must be sanely radical to expound the fundamental principles governing labor, management, and capital, and to secure justice for the man who toils.

Labor is coming into great power in our country; if not tomorrow, then the next day. It should prepare for that responsibility. Hundreds of capable young men with good judgment should be given opportunities to study profoundly the basic principles governing labor, capital, management, and economics.

House Resolution 462, To Provide Housing for Families of Servicemen and Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the housing shortage is estimated at between 12,000,000 and 13,000,000 homes. In looking at the national situation it is necessary for us to take into account the fact that during the 10 or 12 years of depression prior to the war few homes were built. When we became involved in the war only a limited number of homes could be built because of the shortage of critical materials. During the war thousands of families moved into and congested war-production centers. Many remained since the shooting ended. The housing shortage was made more critical during the war by a great increase in the number of marriages, which means more families looking for homes. The number increased from a general average of 1,320,000 a year in the thirties to 1,758,000 a year in 1942. It is expected the total will run to 2,000,000 in 1946.

It is estimated that approximately 1,200,000 new homes will be required to take care of our returning veterans. When you stop and realize that during our largest home construction year—1925—barely 1,000,000 homes were built, the immensity of the job ahead of us can be fully appreciated.

The legislation before the House provides the funds and it is not expected there will be any dissent to this request. However, in order to make the housing for which it provides a reality, it is necessary that steps be taken to make available a greater supply of lumber and other commodities so essential to home building. Further, whole and complete cooperation between builders and their employees, as well as manufacturers of housing equipment and their employees, is vitally essential to our building program.

In my home city of Milwaukee, where there is a very serious housing shortage and with thousands of returning veterans looking for shelter, we find that the completion of more than a thousand homes has been delayed for over 3 months as a result of a strike in the 15 principal millwork plants in the metropolitan area. It is said the workers affected by the strike have, for the most part, found employment in other industries so the biggest burden of the strike is thrown upon the unfortunate people who are waiting for materials to complete their homes. Housing for at least 5,000 persons would be made immediately available if these homes were completed.

Much construction of new homes has been, of necessity, indefinitely deferred because of the strike situation. Thus it is imperative that if we are to provide the housing authorized by this legislation before the House, greater harmony and cooperation between employees and employers must be cultivated and maintained.

Our entire reconversion program stands a good chance of bogging down as a result of disputes and difficulties between labor and management. If the jobs we have promised our veterans are to be ready for them upon their return we must proceed with the business ahead. It will require more than the mere appropriation of millions of dollars by the Congress to make a reality the homes and jobs for our veterans.

The Struggle for Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the power problem is of great importance to all of us in the Pacific Northwest, and I include in my remarks the following editorial on the subject which appeared in the Portland Oregonian, December 15, 1945:

THE STRUGGLE FOR POWER

Everyone in the Pacific Northwest should be informed that this region, a billion-dollar empire of dams, electricity, irrigation, and river development, is the prize in a tremendous struggle for power among Federal departments and bureaus. Private business interests, farmers, State governments, and just plain people are involved in this fight. The principal battles will be in Congress, and the skirmishes have started.

The outward manifestations of this struggle are numerous: The organized campaign to force an increase in the $17.50 per kilowatt year rate for Federal power from Bonneville and Grand Coulee; the fight over allocation of costs between irrigation and power for the Grand Coulee Basin project; the resolutions and agitation for and against a Columbia Valley authority, and the imminence of a revised bill for establishment of a CVA; the vote in the House appropriations committee which eliminated from the deficiency supply bill items for flood control by the Army engineers—because multiple-purpose dams in the Willamette Valley were involved.

Northwesterners cannot afford to stand idly by while a fight cynically abetted by the industrial East is permitted to jeopardize development of the region's resources. It is our empire that is at stake, our future that is being gambled in the game of power politics. The President of the United States should step in to control his Cabinet if the Secretary of the Interior is not disposed to keep two of his own bureaus in line.

One need not be an advocate of a CVA to recognize that hydra-headed development of the Columbia Basin has run into major difficulties. Congress is so confused by the conflicting pressures for funds and authority that it will be in the mood soon, if not already, to call a halt in Federal sponsorship of additional dams on the Columbia, Snake, and Willamette. Let's take one illustration:

The Bonneville Power Administration, an agency of the Department of the Interior, is charged by law with marketing over its own transmission lines the electricity generated at Grand Coulee, built and operated by the Bureau of Reclamation, also an agency of the Interior Department, and at Bonneville, built and operated by the War Department. BPA, which ran its revenues up to $20,000,000 a year in wartime, must pay most of the costs of Bonneville and Coulee, including the million-acre irrigation project of the Coulee Basin, yet has nothing to say about those costs.

Some months ago the Administrator of Bonneville, the Commissioner of Reclamation, and the President of the United States signed a memorandum stating what the final cost of Coulee Dam and the irrigation project would be, and pledging electricity to subsidize $270 of the $355-an-acre cost of irrigation. These figures went to Congress. Without consulting Bonneville, the Bureau of Reclamation subsequently revised its estimate of the cost of the Coulee project by adding $95,000,000. The Bureau insists that the Bonneville Power Administration now must contribute $335 an acre instead of $270, while the irrigation allocation remains at $85.

The change in estimate inevitably provided ammunition to those who seek to force an increase in Bonneville rates—and these include some private power competitors, certain reclamation groups, the customers of the Reclamation Bureau's Boulder Dam and other projects, and, it may be strongly suspected, the Bureau of Reclamation itself. It gave encouragement, further, to those few in Congress who have revived the old argument that the Government should sell its power at the bus bar and force the customer (meaning, in most instances, a private power company) to build its own lines to the dam.

Northwesterners need not be told that guaranteed low power rates are the principal attraction to new industry that this region has to offer, and that the threat of increased rates is a strong deterrent to new industry locating here.

It is no secret that the Bureau of Reclamation has never liked the idea of delivering its power at the bus bar to a separate agency for resale, and the suspicion is current in Government circles that the Bureau's goal is to absorb the Bonneville Power Administration. Friction between the agencies approaches open warfare. Why has Secretary Ickes not intervened? We think his sympathies lie strongly with the Reclamation Bureau, his first love.

The Missouri Valley Authority proposal, which became involved in a fight as bitter as that now developing over the CVA, evidently is a dead duck, so far as this Congress is concerned. If the CVA is brought to vote early next year and defeated, none of the frictions among the Federal agencies will have been

eliminated and the problem of management of a billion-dollar Federal program will be no nearer solution. It's something like the Army-Navy fight.

Judge Moscowitz's Fine Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle Tuesday, December 18, 1945:

JUDGE MOSCOWITZ'S FINE RECORD

The Eagle is happy to extend congratulations to Judge Grover C. Moscowitz on the completion of 20 years on the Federal Court bench in the eastern district of New York.

Appointed by President Calvin Coolidge, Judge Moscowitz has administered the important duties of his office with distinction. His native ability, his constant desire to render exact and impartial justice, and his complete fearlessness have combined to make his record of two decades one of which the people of Brooklyn may well be proud.

Above all, his fellow jurists, the members of the United States attorney's office, Federal jurors who have served in his court, and other Government officials whose duties brought them into contact with Judge Moscowitz realize fully the high caliber of his public service.

Black Hills Campaign for UNO Capital Brought World Capital to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article written by the editor of the Daily Argus Leader, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Mr. Fred C. Christopherson, and appearing in a recent issue of that important newspaper—the largest in five States in the South Dakota area.

The article follows:

BLACK HILLS DRIVE BROUGHT UNO SITE TO UNITED STATES

(By Fred C. Christopherson)

Whether the UNO selects the Black Hills for its capital or not, the committee out there can enjoy the rich satisfaction of knowing that its campaign was largely responsible for the decision to place the Organization's headquarters in the United States.

Those who know the story behind the story well appreciate this.

Other interested sites have put forth intensive campaigns to command attention, but it was only the Black Hills that stepped forward on the broader phase of insuring first a location in the United States.

The official steps in this respect—and I speak advisedly—were instigated and activated through the Black Hills committee.

GOVERNORS TAKE ACTION

The first was at Mackinac Island last July when Gov. M. Q. Sharpe induced the governors' conference to adopt a resolution urging the UNO to place its headquarters in the United States.

This was strictly and exclusively Sharpe's enterprise. No other governor had proposed such a resolution or, it appeared, even thought of it.

But Sharpe started to work on the matter en route with the governors by ship from Detroit to Mackinac. At first there was objection, some contending that the matter was outside of the conference's province. But with dogged persistence Sharpe kept interviewing governor after governor and soon had sold his idea. The resolution was adopted unanimously before the conference adjourned.

But there was still much question at London in November about the American location. One draw-back was the absence of an official invitation.

President Truman, in fact, had told the American delegation not to promote a site in the United States but to assume the attitude that if the UNO should want to come here, it would be welcome.

That, however, wasn't sufficiently affirmative. Paul Bellamy, of Rapid City, sensed this while he was in London and realized there was a strong likelihood that the United States would not be selected unless something in the way of an official invitation was immediately forthcoming.

INVITATION OBTAINED

So he went to work when he reached Washington last week. First Representative FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota's Second District presented a resolution of invitation to the House where it was adopted unanimously. Then Senator CHAN GURNEY, of South Dakota, offered the resolution to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and obtained its unanimous endorsement. A few minutes later, he presented the committee's recommendation to the Senate and it was approved without a dissenting vote.

BELLAMY CONFIDENT

So confident was Bellamy that this action would turn the tide in favor of the United States that he said so flatly in a statement he issued to The Argus-Leader for publication.

"This decides it," he said, "and I've just advised our delegation in London about the action of Congress. As soon as the delegation informs the UNO officially about it, they'll vote to place the capital in the United States."

And 2 days thereafter the UNO voted to place its headquarters in the United States.

It is quite obvious that without the persistence of the Black Hills committee, the UNO very probably would have placed its headquarters in some nation other than the United States.

Mr. Speaker, as pointed out by Mr. Christopherson's article, it was Governor Sharpe, of South Dakota, who brought the matter of locating the United Nations Capital in the United States before the governors' conference at Mackinac Island last summer, and it was South Dakota's Governor who introduced the resolution at the conference inviting the UNO to locate its capitol in this country. It was Governor Sharpe, also, who pressed successfully for favorable action on this resolution.

Following that action, my colleague from South Dakota, Mr. CASE, introduced House Concurrent Resolution 75, which sought to place the Congress of the United States behind the invitation advanced by the governors' conference. House Concurrent Resolution 75 reads as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the United Nations be, and hereby are, invited to locate the seat of the United Nations Organization within the United States of America. Both the House and the Senate approved this concurrent resolution, and last week in London the United Nations, by a vote of 30 to 14—more than the necessary two-thirds—decided definitely and finally to locate its capital in the United States.

During the fall and summer, both Congressman CASE and I extended personal invitations to the heads of over half the members of the United Nations, in their own capitals, urging the choice of the United States as the home of the UNO capital and calling attention to the special advantages and attractions offered by the proferred sites in the Black Hills mountain country of South Dakota, Wyoming, and Nebraska. It is interesting to observe that by far the greater percentage of the countries which we visited voted in favor of the United States in the decision reached in London last week.

Mr. Speaker, the supporters of the Black Hills UNO capital site are confident that upon inspection by the traveling commission of the United Nations Organization charged with responsibility of recommending specific locations within the United States, the Black Hills site will be favorably considered. The Associated Press story of last night quoting the British Government as "favoring a small town site—not too close to Washington, D. C." would seem to indicate that they would look with pleasure upon the selection of such a site as the Black Hills—midway as it is between the two coasts, free from any overshadowing influences of geographic, newspaper, or political bias, and protected by mountains and by location from atomic bomb attacks since it would thus be far from any military objective and close to convenient opportunities to establish such underground chambers as security dictated.

Amendments Suggested to National Service Life Insurance for Lump-Sum Payments and Endowment Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Monday, December 17, 1945, I introduced H. R. 5016, a bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to provide that the proceeds of the policy may be payable to the beneficiary either in a lump sum or over a period of years.

Under the existing law, these policies are payable over a period of years and are not payable in a lump sum, although

the policies held by veterans of World War I may be payable in a lump sum.

The bill also provides that the veterans of this war may convert their national service life insurance into any policy that a veteran of World War I was permitted to convert his life insurance into. In other words, the present law permits veterans of World War II to convert their insurance only into ordinary life, 20-payment life, and 30-payment life policies. The amendment as enacted will permit them also to obtain 20-year endowments, 30-year endowments, and an endowment at 62, the same as veterans of World War I were privileged to obtain.

One of the greatest benefits the veteran of World War II will receive out of his service will be his converted life-insurance policy. Some veterans are declining the policies because the proceeds are not payable in a lump sum, and some are declining because they cannot obtain endowment policies. The enactment of this amendment will correct both of these objections.

I am also inserting herewith the text of the bill:

H. R. 5016

A bill to extend the types of insurance into which national service life insurance may be converted, and to provide for payment, at the option of the insured, of the insurance in one lump sum

Be it enacted, etc., That section 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed. title 38, sec. 802 (f)) (relating to conversion and exchange privileges), is amended by inserting after "Ordinary life, 20 payment life, 30 payment life" the following: "20-year endownment, 30-year endownment, endownment at age of 62, 5-year level premium term."

SEC. 2. Section 602 (h) of such act, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 38, sec. 802 (h); Supp. IV, title 38, sec. 802 (h)) (relating to manner of payment of benefits), is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new paragraph reading as follows:

"(4) At the option of the insured, the insurance shall, in lieu of being paid in installments as provided in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), be paid in one lump sum."

McLean Gardens for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news articles:

[From the Washington Daily News of December 7, 1945]

HOMELESS VETS FAVOR BUYING M'LEAN GARDENS

Fed up with the lack of planning of public and private housing interests, 50 homeless veterans have already jumped at the plan of the local American Veterans of World War II to purchase the Government's McLean Gardens as a cooperative veterans corporation.

"This looks like the answer to our prayers," D. C. Dassford, Army officer on terminal leave and one of the 50, told the News. "My wife and I are so sick of being told we can't have an apartment because we have a 5-year-old child we're practically ready to decapitate all real-estate agents." Mr. Dassford, his wife, and baby have been living with his family since his return to Washington. "We'd like a place of our own for a change."

The plan to purchase McLean Gardens is one of desperation hatched last Saturday by Amvets' local post commander, Ray Sawyer, and their national legislative representative, Joe Leib.

TIRED OF RESOLUTIONS

"We just were tired of passing resolutions on the matter," Mr. Sawyer commented. "What good is a resolution that the Government should build 500 houses this year when 3,000 veterans applied to the war housing center and other public housing developments in the last month? They need houses immediately. Now that all the rosy promises of private enterprise and the Government have come to nothing, it's time for the veteran to get out and help himself—no one else is going to help him."

Mr. Sawyer, a lawyer with the Federal Communications Commission, has been back long enough to have purchased his own home, but he's willing to sell that and move into McLean Gardens to help the project get a start.

WAC BACKS PLAN

The 50 other veterans feel the same way. According to one ex-Wac who has been figurately slapped in the face with her own GI loan by almost every real-estate dealer in the city: "I can't see why a group of veterans couldn't work out a very good system of living together. We've been forced to cooperate with each other in many worse places under conditions that tried everyone's tempers. We certainly can get along well in a place like McLean Gardens."

NAVY MAN'S STAND

An ex-naval officer who is interested in the project has a family living in Chicago. "I spent a week with my wife and two kids when I returned from overseas, and 2 weeks when I was discharged. If I can't find a place here for my family, I might just as well be back on Guam." He particularly wants to see the project get under way within a month.

Although the plan has not yet crystallized, Mr. Sawyer hopes that all interested veterans will call the local Amvets' office, regardless of their affiliation with other veterans' organizations. "This isn't just an Amvet affair. It's something we think all of the homeless veterans around here would be interested in. Everyone who can obtain his Veterans' Administration guaranty of a $2,000 loan will have an equal say in the corporation and in electing the directors or appointing a manager for the project. But that must come later."

As it now stands, the counsel for the group, Col. William A. Roberts, formerly people's counsel of the District, will meet with the Veterans' Administration to discuss the plan, see if it is feasible, and iron out problems that may stand in the way of the veterans.

McLean Gardens cost the Government $11,000,000 to build. Private real-estate interests told the News it "is highly unlikely" the Government would "realize its investment upon sale." There is no official policy yet about whether a veterans' group such as this would have priority on the purchase.

Again, there is the problem of the current tenants, whether the corporation would include them, whether they could be evicted, or whether the turn-over is heavy enough to insure apartments for a large membersip in the corporation. Mr. Sawyer hopes to be able to put the plan in operation with at least 350 veterans. There are 723 apartments in the development, which also includes 9 residence halls.

[From the Army Times of December 8, 1945]

AMVETS SEEK MASS GI LOAN TO BUY HUGE GOVERNMENT PROJECT

WASHINGTON.—The most ambitious GI loan project yet to originate with veterans or a veterans' organization was proposed this week by the District of Columbia chapter of the American Veterans of World War II and contemplates the mass purchase of the multimillion-dollar McLean Gardens housing project in Washington and cooperative operation of the 723-family, 1,347-dormitory project.

Raymond Sawyer, post commander of the Amvets District chapter, said this week that 723 veterans each with a GI loan of $2,000 could make the required down payment of $1,446,00.

Under the preliminary plans under consideration by a committee of the Amvets, veterans of World War II would be eligible to participate without reference to membership in any veterans' organization.

Col. William A. Roberts, former People's Counsel of the District and a veteran of this war, said that he had agreed to represent the Amvets' group in untangling the many legal questions and problems which are bound to arise.

Colonel Roberts said that the veterans' group was very serious and that a committee has been appointed to work out the details of the general outline.

The first hurdle, of course, will be the Veterans' Administration certificate of eligibility under which GI loans are approved. In the event the VA could hurdle the legal questions raised and approved such a mass loan, the veterans then would face the problem of obtaining the actual money in the private lending market and arranging a low enough rate of interest to meet the requirements of the GI bill.

If these two major obstacles could be hurdled, the problems of management and operation then would be raised.

Off-hand opinion in Washington predicted this week, also, that the veterans will face tough competition from Washington realty operators in their attempts to buy McLean Gardens if the project actually progresses to that stage. Unless the Veterans' Administration should intervene to delay the sale of the huge project, it is more than likely that it will be snapped up by private capital at the earliest opportunity.

The Government announced during the week that it plans intensification of an effort to sell six war housing properties in the District of Columbia area which cost $56,000,000. The Defense Homes Corporation said newspaper advertising this week would offer the properties. They include 4,907 apartments and 2,302 furnished rooms.

Hon. Harry W. Bashore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a radio address made by Lloyd C. Thomas over Station KGFW, Kearney, Nebr., December 16, 1945.

My remarks concern Harry W. Bashore, who is retiring as Commissioner, United States Bureau of Reclamation. Harry Bashore believes in irrigation. He

started the Scottsbluff irrigation district in western Nebraska in the early 1900's. He started as a chain boy and now, after many years of service, he is retiring as head of the Bureau of Reclamation. He is going back to Mitchell, Nebr., where he first planted some seeds of irrigation. From his efforts, we now have, in western Nebraska, one of the finest and largest irrigation areas in the country. Harry Bashore will be missed as the Commissioner of Reclamation, but he will be most welcome back at Mitchell, Nebr., where he expects to retire and make his home.

EXCERPT FROM A RADIO TALK BY LLOYD C. THOMAS OVER STATION KGFW, KEARNEY, NEBR., ON DECEMBER 16, 1945

Another old friend is retiring from his important Government office at Washington and returning to his home in Nebraska to retire. Harry W. Bashore, Director of the United States Bureau of Reclamation, with headquarters at Washington, has announced his retirement from Government service, effective January 1, and is returning to his home at Mitchell, in the North Platte, to live. He will be succeeded by Michael W. Straus, President Truman announced on Wednesday. Mr. Straus, First Assistant Secretary of the Interior and a right-hand man for Interior Secretary Harold Ickes for the past 13 years, said the change will have no effect on the multi-million-dollar development program in the Missouri Valley, which includes this area.

Harry Bashore said he was satisfied that the integrated program of the Reclamation Bureau with the Army Corps of Engineers for development of the Missouri Basin will proceed smoothly under Mr. Straus' leadership. Many of you listeners and hundreds of irrigation boosters in central and western Nebraska met Harry Bashore when he, in company with E. B. Debler, of Denver, in charge of district 7 of the Bureau of Reclamation, visited this area on an inspection trip last June, and when they were heard over KGFW while at Kearney.

The World-Herald of last Thursday published an editorial on Harry Bashore that is so good that I read it to you today. It was headed "Harry Bashore comes home," and reads as follows, I quote: "For almost 40 years Harry W. Bashore has been a part of the Bureau of Reclamation. That is close to the life span of the Bureau itself. He has grown up with it, starting as an engineer and ending as Commissioner.

"Now Harry Bashore has reached the retirement age and is coming back to the house at Mitchell, Nebr., which he has for many years regarded as home. He will be welcomed as a friend, neighbor, and valuable citizen of Nebraska. Few men know more about irrigation, its problems, and its potentialities than does Harry Bashore. He is an engineer and an expert, a career man in his field, and never a politician. He got to the top the hard way, probably because he knew more about irrigation than anyone in the Government. Without fireworks before congressional committees, he has managed to get his job done. He has seen the doctrines and the works of reclamation spread throughout the West." That closes the quotation from the editorial.

But just because my old friend Harry Bashore has resigned from the top post in the Bureau of Reclamation and returned to Nebraska to live, it is no sign that his work is done. He may have the privilege of taking life out here in his home State a little easier, for he deserves that, but there is a big job to be done here in Nebraska, with water available for an additional million acres of thirsty farm lands which are seriously in need of it. There is a wonderful opportunity for Harry Bashore here in Nebraska to give us the advice, aid, and assistance that we need in putting this water to work, and quickly.

Nebraska's average combined October-November rainfall was thirty-eight hundredths of an inch. It was the second driest period on record, according to a report last Monday by R. A. Dyke, State weather bureau chief. The dryness was exceeded only in 1933. That condition, my friends, ought to awaken us to the imperative need for the development of irrigation in Nebraska to the extreme limit. With millions of gallons of water rushing down the stream channels of our State every week on their way to the Missouri River and on to the Gulf of Mexico, it behooves us to get busy and spread them over our thirsty farm lands and to store them in our reservoirs, and to provide additional reservoirs for their storage and for the development of electric power before they are used for irrigation.

We need a man of the ability, caliber, and experience of Harry Bashore to lead us in our efforts for more irrigation in Nebraska. We need a man who talks common sense, as does Harry Bashore, to help bring together the warring factions who for years have watched each other with wary eyes, ready to dash at the throat of the opposing faction when a move is made for development, while the waters in our rivers continue to flow eastward and southward on their way to the Gulf. Harry Bashore can lead us out of the morass of controversy and conflict and onto the broad plains of development and use of our waters.

I haven't much to offer Harry Bashore to induce him to step in and help us out—to do the job that is waiting to be done here in Nebraska. But I can make my contribution, and here it is: I hereby tender my resignation as first vice president of the Nebraska Irrigation Association, the office to which I was elected at the annual meeting at North Platte on December 7; I tender it to the board of directors, the executive committee, on the condition that it be tendered to Harry Bashore and that he will accept it, for it will give him an official status. It isn't much to offer, Harry, for a man like you; but it is made in good faith and I hope you accept.

Billions for Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the American taxpayer spent a billion dollars to build airports on British soil. Under the terms imposed by the British, our commercial planes will not be allowed to use these airfields after the war. Now, it is proposed to lend billions of our taxpayers' money to Britain—to do what? What use will Britain make of the proposed money if and when loaned? Why give the businessman of Great Britain better terms on a loan than our RFC would grant to a businessman in this country seeking a loan? When I say "loan," so far as money or credit to Great Britain is concerned, I mean an advance of money that will never be repaid. How many times must our people have their fingers burned by Great Britain and other foreign nations before deciding to resist these appeals for more and more of our taxpayers' money?

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an article which appeared in the Journal of Commerce, December 19, 1945:

UNITED STATES AIR LINES FACE BARRIERS TO EXPANDING ROUTES ABROAD—STATE DEPARTMENT CONCERNED BY TENDENCY OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES TO FORCE BILATERAL AGREEMENTS ON RATES AND TRIP FREQUENCIES

(By Marshall W. Berger)

WASHINGTON, December 18.—A number of barriers to the expansion of world air commerce are now developing and are directly traceable, in the opinion of State Department experts, to the failure of last year's Chicago Conference to set up a multilateral agreement for international air transportation.

Among these obstacles are a marked tendency toward bilateral agreements and disagreement between nations as to rates and frequency of trips.

Although a general commercial agreement is now being negotiated between this Nation and France, and while Great Britain and the United States are committed by terms of the proposed loan to seek an early understanding of their aviation problems, it is in this very scramble for bilateral agreements that Government officials foresee restrictive effects on overseas air commerce.

UNITED STATES DOMINATION FEARED

Basically, the obstacles to expansion are developing from Europe's seeming fear that America will dominate the skyways, with the result that the former is determined to protect her economies and markets from penetration by the United States, it was said.

At Chicago, in the words of one State Department source, "No agreement on rates or traffic was possible because American representatives reached too far and British representatives refused to acquiesce."

The effect was to place these matters into a bilateral agreement category, with the result that some areas of the world will suffer tight restrictions on air commerce, others will have partial expansion, and still others will have complete freedom of the air, the source disclosed.

At Montreal machinery was established last October under which private carriers agreed to negotiate on rates to eliminate a rate war. Pan American Airways afterward dropped its rate to London to $275, and thereby necessitated further Anglo-American talks covering various phases of air transportation.

The United States proposed a permanent agreement to embrace all aspects of international air commerce, and Great Britain countered with a suggestion for working out a temporary arrangement exclusively for rates and frequency of trips.

VOLUME LIMIT SET

When PAA, under the $275 rate, was reduced to two flights weekly, it raised its fare to $375 and is now permitted along with American Overseas Airlines, 250 passengers per week.

Although both AOA and PAA representatives are of the opinion that the maximum of 500 passengers is ample at present, they both object to the principle of limitation and stress the point that it may retard manufacturing development.

In all of these unsettled matters, Senator PAT MCCARRAN (Democrat, Nevada) has found more and more ammunition for his All American Flag Line proposal, which would set up a community company of all United States overseas carriers. Strongest evidence of this lay in a report made public by a majority of the Senate Commerce Committee, emphatically urging adoption of the chosen instrument principle. Hearings on the bill are due early next year.

Pan American is believed to have made two significant points, meanwhile, in the setting of its original $275 fare to London. It charged that:

1. Rate setting by the International Air Transportation Association "is illusory" because a unanimous vote must determine the organization's action and "either American Airlines or British Overseas Airways could block the fare reduction proposed by Pan American."

CITE LOWER RATE

2. PAA stated that the proposed fare was an 8-cents-per-mile rate, which is higher than the rate "which American Airlines quoted to the Civil Aeronautics Board a year ago," when seeking a certificate to operate to Great Britain.

Still undecided, the rate matter is not expected to meet with a solution until IATA convenes in January on the North Atlantic traffic conference.

The only potentially bright factor in prospect is that the House Postwar Planning Committee saw fit to observe, after a visit to Europe, that United Kingdom's opposition to freedom of the air handicapped the expansion of American civil aviation. The United States, it was said, should "insist upon civil aviation rights for American air lines in return for the concessions which we are affording other nations."

As a result of the committee's findings, Capitol Hill sources predict that further discussions of air commerce problems will be raised in the House when the British loan proposal is sent there for ratification.

Demobilization of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest to the leadership of the House that the first order of business, when we reconvene, will be to deal with two further questions of vital interest to our fighting men. The first is demobilization of troops, and the second deals with the question of terminal leave.

With respect to the first question there are a large number of bills now pending in committee. I introduced a bill on October 4, 1945, which I think is a good bill, but I have no special pride of authorship, and the problem is for the committee to take all of these bills, give them attention, and, if necessary, write a new bill combining the best features of them. Notwithstanding the reduction in points announced by the service this morning, a serious injustice is being done to a large number of men, whose service has been long, but who still are not eligible for discharge under the point system. Those of us who are interested in this legislation—and I think that includes a majority of the membership—should demand action on this subject.

On the question of terminal leave, the same situation prevails. There are a number of bills pending, none of which have been reported. It is so clearly un-American to discriminate between officers and the enlisted men, so obviously an unfair discrimination, that we have a right to expect action on this in January.

Mr. Speaker, some newspapers have seen fit to say that their Congress has been on a sit-down strike because all the legislation suggested by the President has not been immediately approved. Congress is not sitting down; Congress is being held down by our procedure, and particularly by the committee system. The events of the last 2 weeks, and particularly the last 2 days, very clearly shows that Congress can and will dispose promptly of legislation, no matter how controversial, if the leaders who control the calendar will bring the legislation before us. Members of this House are perfectly willing to stand up and be counted. You will find, sir, that if the committees report the legislation which the country needs, and the leaders put it on the legislative program, you will have no trouble getting action from the House as promptly as we have given it to you during the last few days.

Give us the chance to act on these two bills in January, and you will see how quickly the House passes them.

Silver Money—Eternal Misrepresentation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, why cannot the publications of the country tell the truth about silver and its use as money? Surely our leading newspapers and periodicals have a responsibility to their readers and the people of this country to tell the truth and give the facts in printing articles on this subject. The facts concerning money and the use of the precious metals, gold and silver, in the Nation's monetary system are available to anyone in the daily and monthly publications of the United States Treasury. The stability of the purchasing power of our money and the security of our national economy should transcend any financial advantage to be gained by any organized group, be it bankers, jewelers, or manufacturing jewelers. It is time that the patriotism of our publishers should bring them to the assistance of the Government and the Congress in working out and giving our country a sound, workable, and adequate monetary system. In this connection there is submitted herewith a letter from a former New Yorker, now of the West:

SPOKANE, WASH., *December 14, 1945.*
FORTUNE MAGAZINE,
New York City, N. Y.

To the EDITORS: Shame on you for using in your December 1945 issue that puerile and corny Hi-Yo Silver title, which was already worn out when Time magazine used it over 5 years ago in March 1940!

I realize the utter uselessness of trying to get your magazine or any other eastern publication to give the facts about silver. I also realize, of course, that many of your leading advertisers are primarily interested in a lower price for silver, which would give them a larger profit for their products. (I am well aware that the advertisers' willingness to take big ads is not supposed to influence the editorial and news columns, but human nature being what it is I know that it does so either directly or indirectly.)

Your Hi-Yo Silver article is full of inaccuracies, with at best a few half-truths. For example, your statement "It (the silver Senator's bill) would only swell the already mountainous stock of sterilized silver in the United States Treasury." What do you mean by the word "mountainous" as applied to the silver stock?

If it is now mountainous with only about 450,000,000 ounces (silver bullion), what was it when it amounted to nearly a billion and a half ounces? Incidentally, it is extremely fortunate that we had accumulated this silver to draw upon, otherwise the atomic bomb could not have been produced. Did you know that over 450,000,000 ounces of silver were utilized in the development of the atomic bomb?

You say "silver (is) a commodity that would not be genuinely short in a free market." Well, the answer to that is it was short toward the end and following the First World War when there was a free market in silver; and silver advanced to a high of $1.37½ an ounce and averaged around $1 an ounce for a period of about 4 years without any legislative help. This, also, occurred at a time when the United States, Mexico, Canada, and other countries were producing large amounts of silver. Morover, the industrial demand for silver at that time was very small compared with present industrial consumption and indicated future consumption.

You are also wrong in your assumption that present silver production is primarily due to a shortage of labor. Would you be interested in knowing what the real facts are? Mr. Ickes' Bureau of Mines could give you part of the answer, and I can give you the complete answer if you really want it. Fortune, why not set an example for other magazines and for one time at least give your readers a fair, unprejudiced article on silver? Even the devil is entitled to his due.

Very truly yours,

FRANK LILLY.

Address Delivered by Hon. Albert Rains, Member of Congress, Fifth Alabama Congressional District, to the Alabama Baptist State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Hon. ALBERT RAINS, of Alabama:

I am happy for this cherished privilege to address this great convention on the timely and paramount subject Factors That Will Make for Peace in the New World Era.

Victory over our enemies has come to us at the end of a bloody and horrible nightmare in our history. Our enemies in the holocaust just ended have found that the way of the transgressor is hard; that the wages of sin is death; and that he who lives by the sword perishes by the sword. To us, out of the tears and suffering of armed conflict, comes now the great opportunity for peace. Also appears the perplexing problems and complex situations which must be met and solved if we are to attain the goal for which we sacrificed so much in blood and treasure, an enduring peace. Out of the smoke and carnage of battles fought and

won by the might of American arms, comes also the unsought, but ordained role of world leadership for our country. But let us have a brief but true appraisal of the world situation—we have won the war, but do we have peace?

Nearly 6 months have gone by since the full and unconditional surrender of Hitler's evil and arrogant Germany, in a red brick schoolhouse in Rheims, France. Nearly 3 months have passed since the historic occasion on the battleship *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay, marked the unconditional surrender of the once proud, empire-stealing, imperialistic Japan. Yes, our enemies have been ground to dust, and yet the sword has not been sheathed. All over the world today may be heard the sound of clanging armor, the roar of military might. The dove of peace has settled in no land, and the olive branch is not accepted. We fought for a world in which justice, right, and reason would prevail; a world in which aggression and oppression would be no more.

Our hopes were high and our hearts were happy when the delegates of the nations of the world to the San Francisco Conference adopted the United Nations Charter, whereby the world was to be committed to peaceful methods of resolving disputes between nations and the rule of force and might was to be outlawed. But nearly 6 months have gone by since that momentous occasion, and only the United States and a few other liberty-loving nations have formally adopted the United Nations Charter. It leads all of us to anxiously contemplate the query I so often hear, Is this but an armed truce, or is it finally the beginning of the long-awaited era of peaceful relationship between nations? Surely a world torn to shambles by war should now know that an enduring peace can be built only on trust, confidence, liberty, and justice.

I hasten to say, then, what all straight-thinking men know, the one factor which will contribute more to the building of a peace in this troubled new-world era is trust and confidence, not oppression and overpowering military might.

Enshrined in the heart of every American soldier as he fought in battles all over the world was the firm belief that he was fighting for the "four freedoms" which were enunciated by the late President Roosevelt in his address to Congress on January 6, 1941, as the goal for which we fought—"Freedom of speech and expression; freedom of every person to worship God in his own way; freedom from want, which translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy, peaceful life for its inhabitants; freedom from fear, which, translated into world terms, means a world-wide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in position to commit an act of aggression against any neighbor."

It was the impetus of an unwavering belief in the justness of our cause which brought us victory. If then, my friends, our belief in and our love for the ideals of right and freedom and justice brought us to victory in armed conflict, it certainly follows as a logical conclusion that the operation of the same great principles will bring a solution now to the problems which beset the world.

David Lawrence, well-known journalist, recently said, "When a nation as a whole turns toward the spiritual, something of transcendent significance has occurred. We saw it happen on D-day. There was a distinct difference in the mood of the American people as between Monday and Tuesday, June 5 and 6," he said. "On Monday the Nation went about its affairs as usual. On Tuesday there was tension, anxiety, worry; and at night an extraordinary thing happened—the President of the United States led the people in prayer, communicating it to tens of millions by means of the radio networks. Back of that signal change of mood within 24 hours is the key to the future behavior of nations, the future steps that must be taken if the next war is to be prevented. For in that single day the Nation recognized the importance of spiritual help."

So must we, in this uncertain hour, rely on spiritual help.

The peoples of the world must come to know that to live in peace is to live in mutual respect, that peace comes from a fundamental regard for human rights, and a full appreciation of the dignity of the individual. To my mind, no greater or more essential basis for human cooperation and understanding was ever written or spoken by man than the statement from the preamble of the Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

In the bomb-wrecked, smoking, burning cities of Hitler's Germany, in the closing days of the war, I saw the complete wreckage not only of the material things of a nation, but of a people who had lost their faith in God. I saw them in their utter helplessness, in orderless thousands tramping the roads and highways of Germany, hunting in vain for a place of refuge from the evil god of war which they had erected and which they worshiped. I saw the awful suffering and the inhumanity which they wreaked on the helpless people in the horror holes, and rot-dens called concentration camps. I saw the degradation and destruction which follows in the wake of the disaster which always befalls a nation which forgets that righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any nation. I saw the starving, dying, and dead victims of intolerance—I saw Buchenwald. It is near Weimar, the home of Goethe, Schiller, and the birthplace of the first German Republic. My mind revolts now in the memory of the spectacle of literally hundreds of human beings in the last stage of dysentery and tuberculosis, and of starving people, raving with typhus fever. This particular death camp had a death quota a day of 80, and unless this number died of starvation, disease, the death rate was supplemented by hanging, crucifixions, beatings, and stabbings.

To recount as an eyewitness the unspeakable horror and cruelty of a German concentration camp could be of no benefit now except to emphasize the fruits of intolerance—the product of godless, cankered souls. Tolerance, a fundamental factor in achieving a lasting peace, cannot be attained at the peace tables of nations alone—but in the classrooms of the schools, the pulpits of all the nations, and in the secret places of the hearts of the peoples of the world.

Last week in company with a congressional committee, I visited Oakridge, Tenn., a place much in the news in recent weeks, for it was there that American scientists perfected the atomic bomb. Our scientists and technicians now tell us that the atomic bomb which completely obliterated Hiroshima and Nagasaki is but a firecracker compared to the ones now being developed.

Recently, in the House of Representatives, a Member of the Military Affairs Committee, in discussing the terrible and destructive possibilities of the atomic bomb, said: "It is impossible yet to estimate even on the basis of conjecture the ultimate effects of the gigantic blasting force and flaming destruction yet to emerge from the minds and laboratories of science and the mills and machines of manufacture. At this very moment, however, it is now possible to drop or to propel atomic charges into our large cities so as conveniently to kill millions of unsuspecting inhabitants in one operation."

"We have seen reports and photographs from both Hiroshima and Nagaski. We have seen reports from New Mexico. No further evidence should be necessary to shock the minds of men into realization that the diabolical inventions of war, once confined to Sunday newspaper supplements and comic strip cartoons, are now the grim realities of present day existence. For the first time in the history of this once isolated Nation we now live in the shadow of the fear of attack. Other peoples in other lands have tasted this deadly fear in their daily bread—those living on the borders of the turbulent nations of Europe or in the vast areas of the world where civil war and the ways of marauding and aggression had become the pattern of life. To us who have walked upright without fear the realization that our traditional ocean barriers of defense no longer separate us from potential enemies embodies a profound change in the deep rooted habits and convictions which have motivated our individual and national actions.

"In the event of another war, it is now probable that warfare will be waged by a mere handful of men on each side. Atomic bombs, radar, rockets, and robot airships would be directed against the urban centers, the industries, the communication and transportation facilities of a nation. The object will be to paralyze and to obliterate. Gone will be the maneuvering of troops, of gallant last stands of armies. There will be no skirmishing, no attacks and no counterattacks. There will be no diplomatic formalities, no declarations of war, no negotiations. There will be only sudden, unannounced, and devastating, death-dealing attacks—huge rocket-propelled bombs hurtling through the upper regions of the strathosphere at the push of a button."

I saw the devastation wreaked on London with the rocket and robot bombs. We have seen in this war the development of electronics, of which radar is one outstanding accomplishment. We know now the destructive power of atomic energy. It takes no prophet to imagine how easy it is now, and yet these terrible weapons are still in the pioneer stage, to send these explosives over oceans and continents and explode them with devastating accuracy on the other side of the world.

The consequences are appalling. What will be the result? The development of the atomic bomb means only one thing—civilization cannot survive another war. Fearful and horrible and terrible as it is, the atomic bomb is a compelling factor for peace in this new world era. This is the hour on the clock of time when the men and women of the world should know that wars are needless, and must now know that another war is unthinkable.

Because of our position of leadership the economy of the world is the concern of this Nation. Wars are born out of depressions. Except for panic, frustration, and uncertainty, an Austrian sign painter would never have become such a terror to the world. Hungry people are dangerous people. Cognizant of that fact, we cannot lightly consider, for that matter, we cannot fail, to share with the suffering, hungering, war-weary peoples of the world the products of this bountiful land of plenty. I do not mean to say we should recklessly and hastily extend loans to the nations of the earth who today are clamoring at the door of the United States Treasury. If we are to hold this world together, we must maintain not only our position of influence as a moral force but we must retain our position of affluence as a financial force. Once the United Nations Organization is a living, moving, working force for peace in the world, then we should consider long-term loans to the other nations. I recognize fully our duty and responsibility to assist wherever possible in the rehabilitation of the countries. I think it an important factor in the establishment of world peace for us to have the assurance of good faith on the part of the other nations by the full and complete acceptance

of the San Francisco Charter as a condition precedent to the extension of long-term loans.

I have been greatly disturbed by the refusal of the other United Nations to follow the lead of the United States in the adoption of the Bretton Woods proposals for the stabilization of currency and for a world bank whereby aid and financial assistance will be provided on an orderly basis to all. One noteworthy factor which will contribute to a sound economic condition in the world is provided in these agreements. I, therefore, point to the need and necessity for the full cooperation of all nations in the Bretton Woods Agreements.

As I stand here contemplating all the myriad elements which can contribute to the peace we so fervently want, my mind and heart keeps hearing the plaintive, moving plea of our honored dead. Surely the people in their quest for peace must feel and be motivated by the power and force of supreme sacrifice marked by the endless rows of white crosses.

There is an apt and significant story in II Kings, "Elisha died, and they buried him. And the bands of the Moabites invaded the land at the coming in of the year. And it came to pass, as they were burying a man, that, behold they spied a band of men; and they cast the man into the sepulchre of Elisha; and when the man was let down, and touched the bones of Elisha, he revived, and stood up on his feet." This story likely belonged to the folklore of many generations and was recited by the firesides of homes and in the market places of villages and towns.

Elisha was one of the truly great men of all time. He was a leader at the court of six succeeding kings. The enemies of his country feared him. When they were tempted to invade the land, they thought of Elisha and changed their plans. It was said that he was worth more than a thousand generals. The people felt secure as long as Elisha was near. Then, the day came when the great patriot of indomitable spirit died.

But enemy armies were still fearful of the land in which his body was buried, and his countrymen still believed that his spirit protected them. So, the story was told to friend and stranger of how a man was dead, touched the bones of Elisha, was revived, arose, and walked again. It was their expression of a great truth which the centuries have affirmed—the power and force of the noble dead.

Russell Davenport in his great book, My Country, writes of the immortality that belongs to those who die that wars might cease.

"On the shore where the stiff white crosses
work a design for eternity,
And the infantry of sleep is forever enrolled
in silence,
And the lives of men are but numbers, and
alien wind
Comes up to the beaches, caressing
The fallen sons of a distant country:
Here, at last the meaning of truth and freedom
Opens, unsealed, before the eyes of the
nations:
Where death has merged the memories of
Maine and Nebraska,
Of Indian fires in the desert, of bearded
live oaks,
The motion of Texas grass when the wind
is moving,
The dusty roads that lead to schools and
churches.
Here they merge like a stream—ranches and
orchards,
Court houses, banks, shops, railroads, and
factories,
Memories of faces, of lips parted with passion,
Of hands like sunlight on the nerves, of hair
fallen
Over the shoulders of someone beyond the
ocean.
Here in the name of freedom all have been
gathered
Into the perfect union of purposes united—
A brotherhood of men in the arms of death.
Let us live therefore, in the name of those
who have fallen,
That in our lives they may be resurrected:
Let us search for the light by which to find
them
Within ourselves and in our another."

Unmistakably the sacrifice of all the gallant men and women who died in battle is one of the great contributing factors to world peace.

Recorded in the musty annals of the Constitutional Convention, which met in Inpendence Hall in Philadelphia in 1798, is an incident which the statesmen of the world should ponder today.

The Constitutional Convention was deadlocked. Strong-willed and stubborn men were in constant disagreement. The Convention called for the purpose of writing a constitution for the young Republic, was about to break up in failure. The cause of a Union of free and independent States seemed doomed. When further progress appeared hopeless, wise old Ben Franklin arose. He concluded an eloquent plea for the resolvement of differences with these memorable words: "I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can arise without His aid?"

The delegates listened in bowed silence, then broke into applause. Franklin's speech and Washington's timely support, brought almost unanimous action for the pending motion and it was carried. After that God's assistance was invoked every day. Gradually doubts vanished, the light of understanding broke on the convention and a constitutional form of government never before equaled on earth came into being. From that day on down to the present it has been the same. No real American has thought himself too great to seek the aid and assistance of the Father of all men. And the world never needed to go to her knees more than now.

Finally the world must come back in repentant humility to God. There is no other way to an enduring peace. Out of the Book of Psalms comes the blessed assurance "He maketh wars to cease unto the end of the earth; he breaketh the bow, and cutteth the spear in sunder; he burneth the chariot in the fire. Be still and know that I am God: I will be exalted among the heathen, I will be exalted in the earth."

So true and in point are these lines by Esther Baldwin York:

"There is a Stranger in the council hall
Where nations meet to plan the peace
again.
He sits unnoticed by the farther wall,
His eyes upon the leaders among men.
His ears attend their clearly laid designs
For living in tomorrow's homes and marts,
As though beneath their spoken words and
lines
He hears the inner voices of their hearts.

"But when the delegates of all the world
Have cried their million wants, and lists
are long,
And after blueprints, charts, and plans are
hurled in varied protest at the core of
wrong,
He is our hope; He is the peace we seek.
O listen, world, and let the Stranger speak!"

My friends, I can close with no better words than the high hope expressed by Gen. Douglas MacArthur on the occasion of the Japanese surrender, "It is my earnest hope, and indeed the hope of all mankind, that a better world shall emerge out of the blood and carnage of the past—a world founded upon faith and understanding—a world dedicated to the dignity of man and the fulfillment of his most cherished wish—for freedom, tolerance, and justice."

Homeless Jews Need Assistance—Passage of H. R. 466 Will Be Helpful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Committee on Foreign Affairs for reporting this resolution. I feel certain that it will pass the House by almost a unanimous vote. I appeal to the membership to pass this resolution, as it is high time that we gave notice of the attitude of the American Congress in this matter.

No nation can escape its share of the dreadful responsibility for what has happened in Europe. Millions upon millions of Jews were killed, many after horrible tortures, for no reason whatsoever except their religious belief. It was impossible for us even to believe or imagine that such dreadful acts could be perpetrated on such a large scale by maniacs led by a diseased mind. Today, we plead for the lives of a hundred thousand Jews who are no more than living skeletons, whom we have liberated in Europe. They can find no peace in the places they once called home. Germany, the Balkan countries, central Europe are not places of refuge for them.

Surely the British Government, in the face of a necessity of the settlement of this problem and in the face of an expression of the Congress of this country, will grant the request of our President for increased immigration to Palestine.

Unification Neurosis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, with all due deference to the President's recommendations for the unification of our armed forces I wish to express the hope that on this highly controversial and extremely complex subject the Congress will make haste slowly. This is no time to go off the deep end only to emerge with an unwiedly and perhaps entirely unworkable millstone around our collective necks.

For most of us the primary objectives would undoubtedly be the elimination of costly duplication and waste, better coordination of command from top to bottom, and vastly improved efficiency. In seeking these highly desirable results, however, let's not take any action that

would break up the highly developed combat teams that were perfected while the last war was being fought. The spirit of competition that led to our superiority on land, sea, and in the air must not be dulled.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to my colleagues the following well-written and thought-provoking editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle of December 1, 1945. While I do not entirely agree with all the observations contained therein, I am profoundly impressed with the general tenor of the article:

UNIFICATION NEUROSIS

The pell-mell, hell-for-leather campaign the War Department has been waging to convince the Congress of the urgency of merging the Army, Navy, and Air Force under one command appears somewhat too purposeful. The Army's thesis—the dire need for enforced cooperation in planning, thinking, and execution in future wars—is too glib, too pat. The time for slam-bang action is behind us for the moment. While we're still in the planning stage, let's deal ourselves into the discussion. For it isn't the fate of the Army or the Navy that's being decided. It's the fate of the American people at stake in the upshot of this and a few other vital issues of the day, and it's up to the American people to view them squarely and make their own decisions.

So let's take a little time out and study this proposal. The Navy, opposing the merger and thereby acquiring the label of "obstructionist," has a good deal on its side of the dispute, and there are a few arguments strictly on behalf of the public which the distinguished witnesses of neither side have touched. No uniformed witness has yet said: "Let's put our own houses in order and see what happens." Probably none will. No housewife is going on the witness stand and admit she's a sloppy housekeeper. Nevertheless, it needs to be said, for there has been some sloppy housekeeping by the same people who are doing the loudest yelling about the other fellow.

ARMY PROPOSAL

The Army proposes, briefly, that a single Secretary of National Defense be created to supplant the present twin Secretaries of War and the Navy. This Secretary would have as his military chieftain a Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces, who would control the three principal sections: the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

The advantages from such a reshuffle, the Army holds, would be threefold: National security would be implemented by the streamlining of the command situation; money would be saved the American people by elimination of duplication of effort; and, finally, the Air Force would be given prestige and opportunity to develop, commensurate with the stature it achieved during World War II.

Counterwise, the Navy contends that we won the toughest war in our history with the present set-up; that in any unification, the Army, numerically superior, would emerge with a controlling interest, and that the Army, in its haste to push through a merger, has advanced a skeleton plan without thinking it through into the detail stage.

Around these basic arguments, each side has scraped together a mass of testimony aimed at bolstering its own cause. The Army has pointed the finger of horror at Pearl Harbor and said: "With unified command it couldn't have happened." It has paraded ex-Chief of Staff Gen. George Marshall to relate that under the present Joint Chiefs of Staff system, valuable time was wasted through bickering, even in wartime. It has pointed to great monetary waste—unquestionably the greatest peacetime consideration of a vote-wise Congressman.

Frankly, these arguments can be knocked down like tenpins.

FAULT LIES DEEPER

The Pearl Harbor inquiry has proved, to any unbiased observer, that the fault for the disaster lay far deeper than the military commanders. The inquiry has already traced the fault to the White House and the State Department, but it goes even deeper than that. The fault lay with the American people themselves. We sat by, almost every man jack of us, like a row of fat sparrows on a limb, twittering: "They'll never do it—they haven't got the guts." Then they did it—and we were dumbfounded. No; the fault does not lie primarily with Short and Kimmel. Practically all America had its head in the sand.

As for the present system, there seems little doubt that a lot of time was wasted in bickering and pettyfogging in high quarters while the war hung in the balance. But the bickering was by no means limited to interservice disputes. There were plenty of minor beefs between colonel and colonel, admiral and admiral, arising from heaven knows what trivial source, while the major war issues waited to be settled.

PRESIDENT'S STATUS

Would the superimposition of a single Secretary of the Armed Forces and a single Chief of Staff automatically correct the situation? It hardly seems likely. Consider, first the proposed Secretary. Who would he be? Well, he would be a political appointee of the President—whoever the President might be at the moment. The Navy has argued that the Secretaryship would be too big a job for one man—to which General Eisenhower, following the best Army thinking, replied, sarcastically: "Then it follows that no man has the capacity to assume the Presidency of the United States."

Such an assumption does not follow for one moment. The President is elected. The Secretary is appointed. When a man steps into the White House, whatever his antecedents or background, he steps into a position unique in all the world—a position which carries its own great heritage of tradition and obligation. These cannot but make themselves felt to the newcomer to the job—they are potent enough to pull him up by his bootstraps and impel him to submerge his own petty leanings out of sheer awe for the position he occupies and the job that confronts him. That is the Presidency of the United States. A Cabinet member, answerable to just one man, has no such ready-made heritage. There is a world of difference.

No; we can hardly assume that the Secretary of the Armed Forces is going to be in all cases a great statesman. It even seems possible that under some circumstances he might be simply a plodding politician who made good. Such men are seldom fitted to fill the shoes of a Solomon. The same possibilities exist, of course, in the selection of War and Navy Secretaries under the present system. But under the present system they balance each other, and there is the assurance that both viewpoints will be heard by the man elected to balance the viewpoints—the President.

ECONOMY DELUSION

Similarly, there is no assurance, under the Army plan, that the single Chief of Staff would be a totally unbiased individual. He might be an Army man or a Navy man or an aviator; assuredly, he would not be all three. The opportunities for prejudice are patent. Indeed, it is doubtful if the Army would be bringing anything like its present fervor to the dispute if it thought there was any chance of the Chief of Staff turning out to be a Navy man. And the Navy's bleak view of the proposal is admittedly flavored by its knowledge that the top dog will assuredly be a West Pointer.

As for the money-saving phases of the Army's proposal, we have seen no detailed break-down; nothing, indeed, beyond General Eisenhower's bland suggestion that under the proposed merger the defense of the Nation could be carried out with 25 percent less men. This is a rather picayunish item. The great money waste in the past war was not in the number of men employed in the services—it was in the material purchased and thrown away. The simple expedient of the installation of a trained civilian fiscal officer in each of the bureaus of each of the armed services could save more money than the dismissal of half of our fighting men from the Army and Navy.

Establishment of a separate Air Force has been urged since long before the war, on the ground that such a move would unfetter the airmen from the grasp of their more stodgy sister services.

It is not as simple as that.

Army Air Force operations consist of two functions—tactical and strategic. The strategic air force, with its more or less independent mission of softening up objectives and crippling production, could probably thrive as a separate unit without any great difficulty. In fact, it does right now. The tactical elements, charged with close support of ground forces, can never be separated from its earth-bound brothers, except in name only. The student can find this lesson in the war history of Britain's RAF.

The naval air arm, to an even greater degree, is inextricably entangled with the operations of its sister units on the surface. To wrench the two apart would be a step in precisely the opposite direction from that in which the unification forces claim they are moving.

Anyone who has watched at first-hand the wartime operations of carrier air groups in the Pacific knows the synchronization is such that ships and planes perform like appendages of the same well-trained body. The communications, the parlance, the systems of navigation, indeed, a great part of the training are common to airman and sailor alike. The naval aviator, flying hundreds of miles from his carrier, needs more than his briefing instructions to insure his safe landing. He has to know the skipper of his ship like a brother.

Maybe the Navy at large has been blatantly guilty of too much battleship thinking, but with it all the Navy has perfected in its air arm one of the most efficient weapons the world has ever seen. Let's give them the credit they've earned, and let them carry on their good work their own way.

MARINE ESPRIT

Given its head in the latter part of the war, the naval air arm performed wonders; so did that other semi-independent branch of the naval service, the Marine Corps. This highly specialized, hard-hitting, fiercely proud little band of fighting men has earned with its blood the right to special consideration in the high thinking going on over the future of the armed forces. The Army has kissed off the matter with an off-hand aside: The Marine Corps will go on functioning as it always has. But this could hardly be true in a situation which found the corps the underling of both the Army and the Navy. We hold the Marine esprit de corps a vital element in the corps' efficiency, because we have seen it at work. There was the company of marines on the Tarawa sands, fingers slipping from the ten-

uous hold on the precarious beachhead they had gained, brought abruptly back into the fight by the barked words of the commander: "Damn it, you're marines." They took that beach and held it, in the same spirit and with the same dash by which they accomplished every really tough amphibious mission in the entire Pacific war. We cannot well afford to throw away this spirit, forged through a century and a half of training and tradition.

NAVAL TECHNOLOGY

There are other more obvious factors which tend to bolster the Navy's insistence upon maintaining its own identity—differences in function, in ordnance, in transport. The Navy wants to answer to no Army man in its determination of how best to fight a sea battle or install a turret or run a ship, and it fears—with good reason—that it might run precisely into that situation. But deeper still is the fear that an Army-minded Chief of Staff and Secretary would not put forward the most convincing arguments, at some future date in a more complacent era, as to why the *Essex*, the *Bennington*, the *Yorktown*, the *Iowa*, the *Missouri*, and the *New Jersey* should not be scrapped in another wistfully hopeful cheek-turning gesture.

No one can quarrel with the basic aims set forth by both the Army and Navy in advancing their arguments. In this age of split-second warfare the best defense is none too good, and in this age of cosmic taxation any legitimate economy is not to be kicked around.

But somehow the whole argument about the means of effecting these aims has gone wide of the point. The expert witnesses being paraded before the congressional committee are necessarily biased, and unconsciously tend to argue for the best interests of their individual services rather than for the best interests of the Nation as a whole.

The real troubles are not going to be solved by a shotgun wedding of the armed services at the top. The wedding, like most such, would be a far from happy one.

For harmony, like genius, is born, not made. Liberalize the curricula of the service schools, bringing a little of the Navy viewpoint into the Army classrooms and the Army viewpoint to the Naval Academy—and the aviation viewpoint to both—and you'll have gone a long way toward promoting that harmony.

Next throw out the military promotion systems. No man can do his best work knowing that his wife's unthinking slight to his C. O.'s girl friend may curtail his career 10 years hence. The selection systems are as vicious as they are outmoded. Devise a system whereby merit is the sole basis for promotion—a system under which a military man can with impunity "take his finger off his number," and you'll step up the efficiency of the whole military organization.

And finally, in our liberalization policy, let's inject more international and scientific thinking into the services. At present there's no place for a physicist or a political scientist in the armed forces, and it looks as though these rather abstruse sciences are going to be suspect of the military for some time to come. In view of the fact that such men of science are going to determine in large part not only whether we get into a future war, but whether we win it, it would seem that a few of the stars should be reserved for their shoulders.

If the armed forces bethink themselves as earnestly about setting their own houses in order as they now appear to be thinking about the dwellings of their neighbors in service, unification will cease to be a label and become a fact—whether there is one top secretary or a dozen.

Palestine—Jewish Homeland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 113 which indicates to the whole world where the American Congress stands on the Palestine question.

In supporting this resolution I am not unaware of the complicated aspects of the Arab-Jewish problem in Palestine. I am convinced, however, that such differences as exist have been magnified by special groups and can be settled by compromise and cooperation if the big nations so will.

The commitments of the Balfour Declaration of 1925 should be carried out by the British Government.

But in our evaluation of the British attitude, let us not forget that we are asking the British to open the doors of a mandated territory while we citizens of the United States have consistently refused to open our doors to the persecuted minorities (particularly the Jewish refugees) and let us not in our smugness and self-righteousness cast the first stone. We are in no position to condemn England unless we play the hyprocrite with our tongue in our cheek.

Surplus Property for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to include therein resolutions adopted by Hollywood Post, No. 92, Hollywood, Fla., and by the D. N. McQueen Post, No. 103, of the State of Florida, American Legion, Punta Gorda, Fla. Similar information has come to me by letters, telephone, telegram, and resolutions and it is my desire that the Members of Congress know the situation as it exists in my State with regard to veterans being unable to purchase surplus property. I appeal to the Members of this Congress for their cooperation in bringing about a program to assure the servicemen of a priority and first opportunity to purchase surplus property.

The resolutions follow:

Whereas Congress has promised veterans of World War II a priority in purchasing surplus war property; and

Whereas millions of dollars worth of surplus war property has been sold in Florida to wholesale dealers; and

Whereas not one veteran of World War II in Charlotte County has been able to buy a single dime's worth of surplus war property, although many have tried for weeks to do so; and

Whereas the agencies charged with the responsibility of disposing of surplus war property in Florida have regularly given wholesalers lists of available property but have refused to permit veterans to see a list of vailable surplus property; and

Whereas wholesalers are permitted to inspect all war property offered for sale, and after inspection to purchase the better quality articles and the only property shown to veterans as salable property is property that has been rejected as undesirable by wholesalers: Therefore be it

Resolved by D. N. McQueen Legion Post, No. 103, the American Legion, of the State of Florida, That the commander of this post be instructed to call to the attention of each Member of the Florida congressional delegation the run-around being given Florida veterans in the disposition of war property in Florida, and that the Florida congressional delegation be requested to introduce such legislation and conduct such investigations as are required to remedy this situation; and be it further

Resolved, That the commander report to this post any response observed on the part of Florida's congressional delegation.

CLARENCE COLEMAN,
Commander.

Whereas Congress has promised, and thereby obligated itself to give to veterans of World War II, priority in purchasing surplus war property: and

Whereas surplus war property to the value of many millions of dollars has been sold and disposed of in Florida, to wholesale dealers without affording veterans a fair and reasonable opportunity to purchase such property; and

Whereas the agencies charged with the responsibility of disposing of surplus war property in Florida have regularly made available to wholesalers, lists of property to be sold and have by subterfuge or otherwise refused such lists of available surplus war property to veterans; and

Wholesalers are permitted to inspect any and all war property offered for sale, and after such inspection, are allowed to purchase the better quality articles before the veterans are afforded an opportunity to purchase, and thereafter, veterans are magnanimously offered the rejected and undesirable articles which the wholesalers have deemed undesirable and unfit for them to profitably purchase and have refused to buy; and

Whereas the methods of procedure and tactics of the agencies, charged with the responsibility of disposing of surplus war property, are patently and on their face contrary to the wishes and desires of Congress, as promised to veterans, and are seemingly to the interest only of those favored sons, whom such agencies desire to have the goods: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Hollywood Post, No. 92, American Legion, of Department of Florida, That the commander of this post be instructed to call to the attention of each Member of the Florida congressional delegation, in such manner as he sees fit, the existing condition of affairs and the ignoring of Florida veterans in the disposition of war property in Florida; further, that the Florida congressional delegation be requested to take such immediate steps as may be necessary and to introduce such legislation and to conduct investigations as may be required to remedy and to right this iniquitous and deplorable situation and wanton abuse of the privileges and rights given by Congress to veterans; be it further

Resolved, That the Florida congressional delegation be requested to introduce a measure, or measures, imposing a penalty upon those agencies and persons connected therewith who, after investigation, are found guilty of wrongdoing, discrimination, and abuse of their offices in the matter by not permitting inspection and purchase of goods by veterans, either single articles or in lots, and that they be indicted by our Government, and upon conviction be fined and imprisoned and branded as avaricious, greedy ingrates; be it further

Resolved, That legislation be enacted empowering and authorizing the punishment and imprisonment of purchasers of surplus war property where it has been established that such purchasers have knowingly bought property prior to said property first having been submitted for inspection and offered for sale to all veterans requesting the privilege and right to purchase, either single articles or in lots; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to each member of Florida congressional delegation and that the commander report to this post any response observed on the part of Florida congressional delegation.

FRED S. FENN,
Commander.

Trade Relations Between the United States and Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, December 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 19), 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject of trade relations between our country and Russia by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], delivered recently at a dinner of the American Biro-Bidjan Committee, at the Hotel Roosevelt, New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, honored guest, ladies and gentlemen, I welcome the opportunity to be with you at this gathering of the Industrial and Professional Divisions of the American Biro-Bidjan Committee in honor of Mr. M. M. Gousev, chairman of the Amtorg Trading Corp. It has always been my conviction that the development of close trade relations between our country and the country of our great ally, the Soviet Union, will contribute to the welfare and prosperity of both countries. At the same time they will support our joint efforts for consolidating the common victory over the Axis aggressors and establishing the United Nations Organization on a firm basis as the guardian of the peace and security of the world. For this reason I am happy indeed to extend to you, Mr. Gousev, as chairman of the major business organizations of Soviet Russia in this country, my best greetings and congratulations.

I know the American Biro-Bidjan Committee greatly appreciates your valuable assistance to their efforts in behalf of the Jewish refugee war orphans who have suffered so much from the bestiality of the Nazi enemy, and I join with the committee in expressing to you this appreciation.

I would like at this time to pay my compliments to the American Biro-Bidjan Committee for its splendid work in behalf of the orphans of Stalingrad and the Jewish refugee war orphans. This is a great humanitarian task which deserves the support of every man of good will of every faith and creed. I am glad to know that this work is being carried out under the inspiration and sponsorship of the great humanitarian and scientist who has recently become a citizen of this country, Professor Albert Einstein.

We are meeting here tonight at one of the most important periods in the history of mankind. The peace-loving nations of the world have just won a glorious victory over the power-hungry aggressors of the Berlin-Tokyo Axis. Through the unity we have maintained among the powers of the great United Nations coalition, we were able to triumph over one of the most dangerous aggregates of ruthless military might known to man. This victory was not easily won. We paid a staggering price in World War II—a toll in physical, moral, and human terms. We in the United States gave many of the best young lives of our Nation. We suffered the greatest casualties of any war in our history. Fortunately our land itself escaped the immediate ravages of war. Our soil remained inviolate, and our facilities for production remained intact. More than that, the genius of our Nation enabled us greatly to extend these facilities so that we did become the arsenal of all peace-loving peoples of the United Nations.

On this occasion, I think, it behooves us to remember that no nation has sacrificed so much in order to achieve the common victory as did our ally the Soviet Union. Recent press reports tell that more than 6,000,000 buildings were destroyed in the Soviet Union during this war, and 25,000,000 persons were made homeless. The total number of war casualties, soldiers and civilians, reached a total of 40,000,000. Let me note that the number of orphans in the Soviet Union greatly exceeds 1,000,000 and probably reaches 2,000,000. That is why it is really our obligation here to take care of those Jewish refugees and evacuee war orphans who escaped into Soviet Russia during the period of German invasion and occupation from neighboring countries of Hungary, Rumania, Poland, and others.

But to come back to the scorched earth of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics let me mention that according to an estimate of the Department of Commerce (as given in a recent address of Ernest C. Ropes, chief of the Russian Unit), "It will take 5 years to bring the Soviet Union back to where it was in 1940. After 4 years of almost continuous fighting, there are no stocks of anything left in the country." It is important to remember these grave facts when we consider our business and trade relations. There is little doubt in my mind that the efforts being made by the Soviet Union to rehabilitate and rebuild their homeland which was so ruthlessly destroyed by the Nazis and very frequently by the Russians themselves in their scorched earth sacrifice in order to stop the Nazi onslaught—that these efforts must find sympathetic understanding and support from this country. The sacrifices made by the Soviet Union were made on the altar of our common victory. Therefore, we must lend them every possible financial assistance to accelerate their reconstruction not only as a matter of justice and sympathy, but also in order to help develop our commercial relations for the benefit of both our peoples.

Let us remember that while the German-Japanese aggressors lie crushed and beaten to the earth, morally and in their own minds they are not yet completely beaten. We have been dealing with a cunning and relentless foe. We had to marshal all our human and material forces to crush the enemy on the fields of battle. We have an equal obligation to unite all the moral and material resources of the United Nations and especially of the great powers in order to safeguard our victory. Here let me utter a word of warning. In the course of my investigation as the head of a Senate subcommittee, I saw the vast range of Nazi penetration and infiltration in Europe. The Nazi conspiracy extended far beyond the confines of Germany—into puppet countries and neutral nations, even into obscure and distant corners of the earth. Nazi infiltration was so deep and clever that it requires unflinching will and effective organization to destroy their potential for aggression, both within Germany and throughout the world.

At Potsdam the three great Allies—Russia, Great Britain, and the United States—agreed upon a policy of military and economic disarmament which would destroy the Nazi network. But, I regret to state, some of our key representatives on the Allied Control Council have been very reluctant to carry out this policy. They appear to be unduly concerned about the German standard of living—incidentally the highest on the continent—and not at all concerned about the living standards and the economic development of Germany's victims, which can never go forward as long as they remain dependent on German industry. At Potsdam the Allies set the maximum beyond which the German standard used as a basis for industrial disarmament was not to rise. Some of our officials in Berlin, however, have preverted this to mean the guaranty of a minimum standard for Germany. They set this minimum at a high level, then use it to justify the revival of Germany's nazified heavy industry and foreign trade. These United States officials—and I may say parenthetically that their attitude is reported to parallel that of British representatives on the Allied Council—are in many cases connected with industrial and financial concerns who had close prewar ties with the Nazis. These men would doubtless like to resume commercial relationships with Germany, to rebuild a strong Germany as a counterbalance to Soviet Russia, to risk American lives for their own short-term profits.

I want to repeat that war-minded elements in Germany have not been liquidated by defeat. The Nazis and the groups they indoctrinated are planning and plotting for another attempt against the peace. They are still doing their utmost to sow mistrust and dissension among the victorious powers and especially between the Soviet Union and the United States. They are biding their time waiting and working for a rift among the Allies into which they can drive the wedge of aggression. Long before their final military collapse they planned this vicious strategy. A great soldier of our Ally, Marshal Rokossovsky, warned us that the Fascists are preparing for a third world war, and he appealed to the decent peoples of all countries to be on their guard. To ignore this warning would be suicidal.

Of course, the next attempt may not be called nazism, or the group who spearhead it Nazis. There may be variations in technique, in slogans, in the trapping and the symbols. But the basic philosophy, the basic objective—the exploitation of great masses of humans to appease the greed and power lust of the few, will remain the same. That is why we cannot merely remove a few top Nazis and outstanding war criminals and rest secure in the conviction that fascism has been banished from the world. No; the evil has roots which are deep and widespread. The seeds have been sown even in our own country. And what would it profit us to cut the words "fascism" or "nazism" from the human vocabulary if tyranny by some other name remains? If we are really to destroy this blight throughout the world and prevent its rebirth 10, 20, or 50 years hence, we must look to the soil which nourishes it.

For fascism, my friends, is not the exclusive creation of a Mussolini or a Hitler or

a Tojo. It is but the twentieth century adaptation of a primitive idea which goes back to the dawn of history. It is modern mass production techniques put in the service of ancient avarice, prejudice, and lust for world domination. Fascism—or its forerunners called by any other name—flourishes in scarcity, when the predatory few try to secure an abundance for themselves by despoiling the many. And they employ prejudice to divide and weaken those who would oppose them; they find allies in hate.

This was the mold in which early tribal society was cast. This was the way of the medieval robber baron who lived by plundering his neighbors. This, I may say, is the method of imperialism, which unfortunately has its noisy advocates right here in the United States today. The imperialists are trying to arouse mistrust, suspicion, hatred of other nations, in order to build support for a policy of encroachment upon those other nations. Though it might plunge a world in war, this is the method they choose for quick riches—robbing what is not theirs, keeping other peoples in subjection, keeping their own countrymen at a low level of culture and comfort. Call it imperialism, fascism, neo-fascism, or whatever—it appeals to the lowest of man's instincts. It is the antithesis of civilization. And ultimately it is self-defeating.

How can we combat this courage, this terrible block to human progress? By punishing the guilty? Yes; certainly. But more than that, by discouraging this irresponsible talk against other peace- and freedom-loving nations, by turning thoughts and energies away from aggression against others and directing them freely into productive enterprises unimpeded by the artificial restraints of cartels and monopolies. That is the answer; full development of resources spreading the benefits of industrialization to all people, expanded trade and commerce and free interchange of information among nations advancing in mutual prosperity and peace.

We must not permit the difficult problems of postwar rehabilitation and reconstruction to be used for dividing us from our great ally, the Soviet Union. There is no doubt that during the transition period, when numerous and troubled problems of the world will have to be settled and adjusted there will inevitably arise many serious differences between us and our allies. But we must not allow these differences to place in jeopardy that unity of the Anglo-American-Soviet coalition without which victory would have been impossible. That wartime unity among the Big Three—the United States, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain—can and must be preserved.

We have entered a new age—the age of atomic energy. Limitless prospects have opened up to the peoples of the world. By seizing these opportunities and placing atomic energy in the service of mankind for peace, not war, for reconstruction, not destruction, the leaders of the great nations will bar the way to a race of armaments, a race which will end in a terrible human holocaust and perhaps in the destruction of our entire civilization.

Fortunately for the world as a whole all the great powers are ardently devoted to safeguarding the peace. Certainly our Government and people wish nothing more than security and peace for ourselves and the world as a whole. Nor can any reasonable man doubt that the deepest aspiration of the Soviet Union is lasting peace. For only peace can allow them to devote the necessary energies and resources to the unprecedented task of reconstruction which confronts them. Only security and peace will make it possible for the Soviet people to heal the deep wounds they suffered in this war and to assure them a higher standard of living. We in the United States can aid them greatly in the fulfillment of these purposes. It is in our national interest, in the interest of a durable peace, that we extend to them such aid. It is my conviction that the people of the United States are determined to face the complex problems of reconstruction and rehabilitation, of safeguarding world peace not negatively, but in a positive atmosphere of mutual trust, confidence, and helpfuless. We are not unmindful of the danger signals ahead. But as General Eisenhower so aptly stated there is nothing that divides us basically from our ally, Soviet Union. There is no place where our national interests are really in conflict. These are sound and positive grounds for optimism, unity, and cooperation.

May I revert, at this point, to the laudable efforts of the American Biro-Bidjan Committee in behalf of the orphaned children of the heroes of Stalingrad and the 30,00 Jewish refugee war orphans whom you are arranging to settle in Biro-Bidjan, the Jewish autonomous region of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This is a truly noble achievement. I congratulate you on what you have already accomplished and I wish you well in your future efforts.

As one who has unreservedly fought anti-Semitism and condemned all concepts of racism and racial superiority in the United States and throughout the world, I applaud the help you are giving the Jewish refugee children to start life anew in the Jewish autonomous region. The achievements of Biro-Bidjan is self-government in the development of Jewish cultural life, of the Jewish language, schools, theaters, of Jewish agricultural communities and industries are a credit to the Jewish people. They will help these children grow up as self-sustaining productive citizens in a community where they enjoy full equality with all the other nationalities of the Soviet Union. Here certainly is one answer to some of the immediate and great problems of postwar reconstruction and rehabilitation of the European Jews, problems which are so agonizingly acute today. It seems to me that the efforts in Biro-Bidjan are complementary to those made by the Jews in Palestine. And both of these efforts equally deserve the help of all decent men and women of all faiths.

There is another far-reaching implication in the work you are doing in behalf of the Jewish autonomous region of Biro-Bidjan. The Japanese war lords have at last been forced to yield up their swollen ill-gotten empire. The role of Asia, where fully one-half of humanity lives, now appears in a new light. I am thinking at this moment specifically of Soviet Siberia. How many of us realize that our two countries, the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics are near neighbors, that up where the narrow Bering Straits separate North America from the Siberian land-mass, our two nations are only a few miles apart. Let us resolve to be good neighbors. Distinguished Americans have commented eloquently on the pioneering civilization they found in Soviet Siberia. They have compared it favorably to our own Far West in the stirring period of the nineteenth century expansion, the period of the winning of the West.

They have observed its rich natural resources, the vigor and pioneering energy of its inhabitants, its infinite possibilities for industrial and agricultural expansion, for heightened commerce and trade, for improved communications, and for multiplying contacts with our own country by sea, by land, and in the air. The late Wendell L. Willkie was enthusiastic about the boundless prospects he envisaged there. After visiting the Siberian town of Yakutsk, he wrote: "The town itself seemed, in many ways, like a western town in this country a generation ago. In fact, much of this life reminded me of our own early and expanding days—especially the hearty, simple tastes, the not too subtle attitudes of mind and the tremendous vitality." More recently, Secretary of Commerce Wallace struck the same note after his visit to the Far East. What has this to do with Biro-Bidjan? And with the work of the American Biro-Bidjan Committee? Simply this: That Jewish autonomous region is only 18 hours from Vladivostok, the leading Soviet port on the Pacific. It abounds in rich agricultural, mineral, forest, and soil resources. And it is right in the heart of a vast region that stands on the threshold of a brilliant future.

I ask you, therefore, to think for a moment of the glowing possibilities of Soviet-American business, trade, cultural, and human contrasts in that far eastern region. The Pacific Ocean can become a busy highway, a gigantic bridge of understanding, friendship, and mutual prosperity for our two countries. The potentialities are vast.

Let us do our utmost to strengthen the bonds of friendship between the U. S. A. and the U. S. S. R. I believe that the peace and future security of the world hinge on that relationship. Let us go forward resolutely and unafraid, undaunted by present obstacles or difficulties and tackle this problem in the spirit of American democracy as willed to us by our immortal leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Let us go forward to make one world the keystone of the future for all of us.

Homes for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 19), 1945

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, in view of the effort to reach an early conclusion of this session, I request permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement in connection with a bill to expedite making homes available for veterans at lower costs and in greater volume and speed by facilitating private industrial production of homes through the use of surplus plants and facilities and new types of materials.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Recently the Congress adopted Senate Joint Resolution 122 amending title V of the Lanham Act and authorizing an additional appropriation of $160,000,000 to facilitate the conversion of existing structures for an estimated 100,000 temporary dwelling units for veterans.

The Congress is to be commended for the promptness of its action in this emergency. Let no one suppose, however, that the creation of 100,000 temporary dwelling units will do more than scratch the surface of present housing needs, which, as the days go by, take on the proportions of a national catastrophe.

Senator MEAD, who sponsored this emergency appropriation, after taking into account the doubling up of veterans' families and projected construction of new units for 1946, stated:

"That still leaves 1,100,000 veterans' families to find accommodations in the presently occupied housing supply.

"Not a very encouraging outlook but a challenge which we can't ignore."

Today I am introducing jointly with Senator KILGORE a bill which proposes to meet this challenge by mobilizing the tremendous productive capacity, ingenuity, and resourcefulness of American industry and labor to achieve further increases in house production without interrupting, or interfering with, plans now being established for emergency housing. This bill, in other words, is not intended as a substitute for other plans or pending legislation. It will not divert or absorb materials, labor, or facilities required by these plans. Instead, it places primary emphasis on the utilization of surplus plants and facilities and on the use or adaptation of materials not customarily employed to any marked extent in house construction, such as aluminum, magnesium, alloys, plastics, wood products, and the like. It proposes to apply to these resources the mass production techniques and skills acquired in wartime industrial output.

Veterans who have good reason to know by actual use the amazing contributions of American industry and labor to the arsenals of war are asking why the same capacities and resources are not being turned to meet present housing needs. An excellent feature article, The Great Housing Shortage, appearing in the December 17 issue of Life magazine, sums up the attitude expressed by veterans in this manner:

"If this country can build an $80,000,000,000 war industry, make the atom bomb, and win the war, why can't it build enough houses?"

The same article goes on to say that enough houses can be built—but only by revolutionizing the archaic housing industry. If we had fought this war on the same level of efficiency which characterizes the building industry today, we would have used blunderbusses instead of atomic bombs.

The bill proposes four main ways in which the National Housing Agency can promote or stimulate an additional volume of privately produced housing for veterans at a cost within their reach:

1. By undertaking research in new housing techniques and extending technical assistance to manufacturers.

2. By acting as a centralized purchasing agent for local organizations which in turn will sell or rent this new housing to veterans. This service will enable large orders to be placed at one time, so that manufacturers can proceed with a production schedule.

3. By making loans to local organizations to assist them in financing purchases of houses for resale or rent to veterans.

4. By establishing a procedure whereby the Surplus Property Administration will give preference in disposal of plants and facilities to manufacturers who will produce housing for veterans or materials for such housing.

It should be clearly understood that the loan provisions of this bill do not require any ultimate costs to the Government for other than administrative and servicing expenses.

In stimulating new production methods, the Government will be creating new opportunities for business, including the many small enterprises that will spring up to take part in the production of the numerous components and materials going into the finished product. The Government will also be creating new opportunities for labor to secure steady year-round jobs instead of the seasonal and haphazard employment which has always been the curse of the building industry.

The housing crisis is so acute as to call for the same imagination and boldness of action that was shown by the Government and American industry and labor during the war. This bill strives to provide the means whereby such action can be taken. In my opinion the objectives which it proposes can no longer be deferred.

Why We Should Have a Department of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent of the House, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I delivered today over the National Broadcasting Co.'s national network as follows:

I am much obliged to the National Broadcasting Co. for this opportunity to present to its vast radio audience a bill I have introduced in the Congress to create a Department of Peace and Good Will, to state the reasons that prompted its introduction, and the arguments in support of it. I will read the text of the bill, as follows:

"Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established a new department of the Government of the United States to be known as the Department of Peace and Good Will, which shall have for its purpose the activating of the forces of good will and mutual understanding throughout the world and the fostering of amity among nations.

"SEC. 2. The head of the new department shall be Secretary of Peace and Good Will and he shall have the same salary and official status as other members of the President's Cabinet."

I have introduced this bill as a means of implementing the challenging speech of Gen. Douglas MacArthur when, on accepting the surrender of Japan, he spoke of the futility of war and said:

"We have had our last chance. It we do not now devise some greater and more equitable system, Armageddon will be at our door. The problem basically is theological and involves a spiritual recrudescence and improvement of human character that will synchronize with our almost matchless advance in science, art, literature, and all material and cultural developments of the last 2,000 years. It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh."

A CAMEO OF LITERATURE

In my opinion the speech of General MacArthur was one of the very highest of the high lights of literature. I place it longside Lincoln's Gettysburg address. When we consider its profound meaning and far-reaching implications in charting the course to permanent peace and mutual understanding among nations its meaning grows until it seems to me to be divinely inspired. I have introduced this bill in the hope of assisting the people of America to become oriented in thought and action to the sound thinking of the great commander, which in my humble judgment points the way to the salvation of the world.

We led the forces that won the victory in the recent cosmic conflict and in doing so we gave our solemn pledge that when the terrible travail of war was over we would lead in laying the foundation of everlasting peace. We performed our military obligations nobly but we are falling down lamentably in the performance of our peace obligations. Our great military and naval leaders and our great scientific inventors, in their appearances before the Appropriations Committee of which I am a member, have not even given a passing reference to peace. Their insistent plea is for more and more funds to perfect the instruments that kill and destroy. We seem unable to make the shift from war to peace. We have done nothing to encourage a great moral and spiritual resurgence which alone can bring about the salvation of the human race.

PICTURE IS SHOCKING

More than 4 months have elapsed since VJ-day and the world picture is shocking. We have our fighting men participating in the civil war in China, and for all I know they may be killing Chinese Communists at this moment. What business have we interfering in the internal affairs of another country? Is it our duty to police the world and to render armed assistance to internal factions? If so, we have cut out a big job for ourselves. Our men ought to be brought back to their homes and families. Our foreign policy is terrifically weak and impotent. We are exerting no resolute leadership for peace and order. Our two principal allies, Britain and Russia, are carrying on unilateral activities that grate on our sense of justice and conflict with the spirit and purpose of the San Francisco Charter. The world is fast sinking into the groove of power politics where wars are spawned, and I very much fear that by our inaction and fumbling we may be contributing to the making of another war. We hear it said that the race for armaments is on and that another world war is looming on the horizon. There are indications that every nation on earth that has any means of doing so is feverishly attempting to develop its own atomic bomb, so that it may get the drop on all other nations and wipe them out of existence. The world appears to be moving toward another atomic war and the atomic fever has risen several degrees since November 20 when the announcement was made that the United States is still manufacturing atom bombs. If the United States, the leader among nations, sees fit to continue the manufacture of atom bombs it gives an extra excuse to all nations to manufacture them and stack them up pending developments. And what kind of a "one world" will we be living in if every nation has its stack of atom bombs ready to use on other nations whenever a hair-trigger situation develops? The first thing to be done with the atomic bomb is not to manufacture more of them but to outlaw the use of the bomb in war by as tight an international agreement as can be made.

LIGHTS ARE FADING

The prospect for world peace is growing dimmer as the world loses sight of the lights on the highlands and slips back into the welter of militarism. My plea, and it is a very earnest plea, is simply this: Before we permit the psychology of the world to become hopelessly fixed as a war psychology, let us try General MacArthur's plan. That is the reason why I have introduced this bill for the creation of a Department of Peace and Good Will. I believe that such a department, staffed by the right sort of personnel, can be of incalculable service in carrying out General MacArthur's grand idea. The most confirmed skeptic must admit that we will be no worse off if we try MacArthur's plan, and conceivably it may open the way to the world's salvation.

MALFORMATION OF GOVERNMENT

With the war over and with a world of peace the central theme and hope of all mortals, and with the United States irrevocably committed to give its aid in the establishment of a peaceful world, it is evident on the very face of things that the maintenance of a full-blown Department of War and no Department of Peace is a malformation of government. We need to correct that malformation to keep peace with modern conditions.

Having led in the military leadership that brought about a successful conclusion of the war, we cannot now, if we are true to our faith and loyal to our promises, refuse to accept the moral leadership of the world

that must be relied on to convert the fruits of military victory into permanent and lasting peace. The world is looking to us for such leadership. We cannot escape our responsibility.

WAY TO DRAMATIZE PEACE

One way to help in winning the peace is to dramatize our purpose by the establishment of a department of peace and good will. Why not? With our Nation professedly committed to the creation by earnest efforts of a new world of peaceful relations between man and man all around the earth, we have no governmental agency to implement that endeavor—not one. Let us examine the scroll of governmental establishments and see what we have:

First. A War Department—function to destroy and kill.

Second. A Navy Department—function to destroy and kill.

Third. An Office of Scientific Research and Development—function to invent the instrument that destroy and kill.

And so on.

I would not eliminate or depreciate any one of these. In the present posture of world affairs we must have, and must continue to have until peace is secure, an adequate Army and Navy. But after we have committed our leadership, as we have in a thousand solemn ways toward bringing about a new and better world, patterned even though imperfectly on the plan of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, is it unreasonable to expect that we shall inaugurate this new era of peaceful endeavors and make our Government responsive to our professions by adding to the roster of our governmental activities a new department of peace and good will to protect and conserve the great human values?

WE NEED A FIGHTING DEPARTMENT

Some may ask, "What about the State Department? Why cannot it act as a department of peace and good will?" The answer is that the State Department will never serve the purpose. It operates along the lines of laissez faire, and no laissez-faire attitude is ever going to win the fight for world peace. If we want world peace, as I am sure all Americans do, we must be willing to fight for it. We need a fighting department that can bring more activity to the solution of the problem than the State Department can under its traditions and authority. We need a department that can and will reach out around the earth and propagandize for peace; a department with expert personnel and facilities to conduct research along all lines that will promote peace; a department that can and will get in touch with the moral and spiritual forces of the world; a department that can and will contact and activate and unify the forces in all lands, which alone by common purpose and united action can make the permanent peace of the world a blessed reality. It is a tremendous fight we are up against, but we must win it—or else Armageddon.

AT THE CROSS ROADS

We have reached the cross roads. The road to the right leads to peace; the road to the left leads to war. We face the tremendous responsibility of deciding which road we shall take.

What we need now is not military leaders but peace leaders. Building a vast peacetime Military Establishment is not in keeping with our motives for world cooperation. The military leaders have done their part magnificently. History will sing their praises until the last book is written, but it is now time for peace leaders to take over and carry on.

Let us call peace leaders into action under the aegis of the new department and then let us see whether these peace leaders can do their part as well as our military leaders have done theirs. If they can, the future of the world will be assured.

The problems of the future can best be solved by persons of a peace psychology instead of by persons of a war psychology. We need to cease talking in terms of implements of war that will most effectively kill and maim the most people and to begin talking in terms of hospitals and schools and churches, the things that elevate the spirit and lift humanity to a higher plane.

Those things and not wars will make for a better world.

THE GOOD NEIGHBOR

The passage of this bill by the United States Congress would be notice to the world that when we said we wanted to be a good neighbor in the family of nations we meant it. Other nations are reported to be much confused by our militaristic preparations and are finding it difficult to reconcile our plans for forced military training and regimentation with our protestations for peace. To those doubting Thomases in the family of nations the passage of this bill and the creation of this department of peace and good will would mean that we are going all out for peace and that we are not for peace with our tongues in our cheeks. I say again that in the recent war we voluntarily assumed leadership among nations in emancipating enslaved people from tyranny and oppression. Are we now going to fail humanity by refusing to accept the moral leadership that is necessary to translate the fruits of victory into a peaceful world of the future?

I hope that every person in America who wishes to do his part in ushering in a peaceful world will write to the Foreign Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., and request a favorable report on this bill, H. R. 4648, and at the same time send letters expressing interest in the bill to the Representative in Congress from his district and the United States Senators from his State.

SADDEST OF ALL SPECTACLES

Before long the hearts of our people will be wrung by the saddest of all spectacles in the aftermath of war—the mournful procession that will bring our beloved dead from their temporary graves in foreign countries to their final resting places in American soil. More than 274,000 of the finest in our land gave the last full measure of devotion fighting for our flag in foreign theaters of war, and the bodies of these men will be brought back and committed to the home soil of the communities from which they sprang—earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust. Funeral corteges will soon wend their sorrowing way to almost every locality in the United States, and all of the pent-up grief of fathers, mothers, wives, and sweethearts will break forth in a new deluge. The millions of our people who will be touched by the poignant grief of this panorama are going to say to the statesmen of our time, "We serve notice on you now that this must not happen again. We expect you to build firm foundations of enduring world peace and we will hold you responsible if you do not."

When we give our consideration to this bill to create a department of peace and good will let us not forget our obligation to keep faith with the heroic dead.

Disposal of Government Aluminum Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 19), 1945

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I request permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement reviewing the situation surrounding the disposal of the Government aluminum plants.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In view of the fact that the Senate has approved the very important stock-piling of metals which may be of great strategic need to our future economy, I want to call attention to the speed with which we are demobilizing the facilities for the production of that most important metal of this war and of the future—aluminum.

I want to call attention once again to the facts that men and women in the aluminum industry are out of jobs when they could have been working; that plants are lying idle when they could have been running; that public power is going to waste when it could have been harnessed to these plants.

This unfortunate state of affairs is traceable in large part to the plant-disposal activity or inactivity of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

By law and court decision and policy directives of the Surplus Property Administrator, the RFC is obligated to dispose of its aluminum plants to private producers other than the Aluminum Co. of America. Potential operators have made bids for lease of these plants contingent upon Government purchases of excess aluminum for a national security stock pile, in order to get a foothold in an industry dominated for half a century by the Alcoa monopoly and its high price, low production policy. But the RFC, by its narrow insistence upon terms that would absolve the Government from all responsibility for helping competitive enterprise get a start, has limited these offers to a point where the efficient, low-cost plants of the Northwest are thrown out into the cold.

The Reynolds Metals Co., negotiating with the RFC, was asked to present offers which precluded stock-pile purchases by the Government. Reynolds thereupon revised its original offer, and cut the Northwest plants out of its plan of operation. To prevent the RFC from closing the door on future operation of these Northwest plants, Reynolds was able to get a proviso into a lease contract for the Arkansas plants, reserving the right to make offers for additional plants when the Government would determine its stock-piling policy.

It is clear that the only hope of getting these idle aluminum plants into private operation depends upon a Government stock-pile program for aluminum. I have introduced a bill, S. 1612, specifically authorizing aluminum purchases for stock pile. This program would not conflict with any over-all stock-pile plan that may be subsequently established.

ALCOA: WHIPPING BOY WITH ALLEGEDLY FALSE WHISKERS

In this connection I wish to enlarge upon previous remarks concerning the problems of aluminum plant disposal.

It is high time that a fantastic myth be destroyed. This is the myth, created and carefully nurtured by the Aluminum Co. of America, that it is independent of the Aluminum Co. of Canada. Alcoa has friends inside and outside the Government, who try to peddle the same nonsense. The facts should be publicized because of the influence that Alcoa wields, particularly in the press, with respect to aluminum plant disposal policies.

It is not news to the Members of Congress that the majority stockholders are identical in both the American and Canadian companies, and that the Davis brothers are executive heads of these companies. Nor is it news that war agencies in the United States contracted with the Canadian firm for purchase of large amounts of aluminum, making an advance payment of almost $70,000,000 on

this purchase which permitted the construction of the so-called Shipshaw power project. This arrangement was made at a time when responsible officials in our Government were unwilling to effect the necessary expansion of available Federal power facilities in the Northwest and other parts of the country. Accordingly, today we are faced with a giant competitor in a neighboring country, beyond the reach of our antitrust laws, serving the interests of Alcoa, and able to produce at a low cost made possible by the generosity of some American officials in financing its power development. The effect of this producer upon the development of a competitive and independent aluminum industry in this country needs no elaboration. The details have been set forth many times on the floor of both Houses, and before a number of congressional committees.

When Secretary of the Interior Ickes explained at great length to the Senate Small Business Committee how the Shipshaw development, promoted by Alcoa, jeopardized the postwar economy of the Pacific Northwest, I. W. Wilson, vice president of Alcoa, countered with an indignant denial. In a statement reported in the Portland Oregonian of May 29, 1945, Mr. Wilson charged Mr. Ickes with "glaring misstatements" and "unfair criticism." He claimed that no member of the Alcoa firm knew of the contract until several months after its execution, and that these transactions were in fact detrimental to Alcoa's interest.

It is a great strain on the credulity of the average citizen to suppose that the powerful Alcoa monopoly, the only aluminum producer before the war, had no knowledge of, or played no part in, the Shipshaw deal. But that is their story, and they stick to it. Mr. Wilson, and other Alcoa representatives, have paraded their air of injured innocence before congressional committees and in a variety of bronchures circulated throughout the land.

Thus, when a subcommittee of the Senate Committee Investigating the Defense Program held hearings at Spokane, I, as chairman of the subcommittee, received the following reply by Mr. Leon Hickman of Alcoa to a question concerning Shipshaw: "Sir, we don't know as much about the Shipshaw matter as you do." At another point in the hearings Mr. Arthur P. Hall of Alcoa said: "We had no knowledge until after it was published in the paper by Jesse Jones."

In contrast with this claim, insistently repeated on every possible occasion, I would like to quote two paragraphs from the Attorney General's report on the aluminum industry, submitted to Congress September 14, 1945, pursuant to section 205 of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944. It states (S. Doc. No. 94, 79th Cong., 1st sess., p. 38):

"The most recent indication of the continued friendship between Alcoa and the Canadian company is revealed in Alcoa's attitude toward wartime expansion in Canada, especially the Shipshaw power project. If there were any likelihood that the Canadian company would be a bona fide competitor after the war, Alcoa would have feared the Shipshaw development, since it enables the Canadian company to produce aluminum very cheaply. Actually, Alcoa seems to have been favorably disposed toward it and to have aided in consummating the arrangements between this country and the Canadian company.

"During the spring of 1941 the Office of Production Management was exploring with the Canadian company the possibilities of getting a large supply of its aluminum. Arthur V. Davis, Alcoa's chief executive, undertook to negotiate with the Canadian company a metal-purchase agreement on behalf of OPM. If the relation between Alcoa and the Canadian company had been a competitive one, Mr. Davis could hardly have been of service in this negotiation. The role of Alcoa officials is further indicated by an OPM analysis of available power supply which listed I. W. Wilson as the source of information as to how much more Shipshaw power could be obtained for aluminum."

As further evidence that Alcoa knew about, or participated in, the Shipshaw arrangements, I want to read an excerpt from a memorandum in the OPM files, dated April 15, 1941. So far as I know, this memorandum has not been made public. On the subject of additional aluminum supply, Mr. C. W. Kellogg wrote to Mr. G. M. Moffett in part as follows:

"The purpose of this memorandum is to record results of conference yesterday on the above subject.

"Mr. Knudsen decided in conference with him that the additional annual supply during the maximum year now to be arranged for is 200,000,000 pounds of aluminum per annum.

"The sources from which this aluminum is expected to be obtained are as follows:

"1. From the Canadian Aluminum Co., 44,000,000 pounds between now and next April and 110,000,000 pounds annually thereafter. This is subject to two contingencies; first, the construction of the Shipshaw development on the Saguenay River whereby 375,000 kilowatts can be developed in about 18 months, and, second, upon the negotiation of a more satisfactory contract for the aluminum metal. The best offer so far has been a 3-year firm contract. The negotiation of this item is to be undertaken by Mr. A. V. Davis."

Copies of this memorandum, from which I have quoted, are listed as being sent to Mr. Knudsen, Mr. Batt, Mr. Fuller, Mr. A. I. Henderson, Mr. Holden, and Mr. I. W. Wilson, vice president, Alcoa.

Mr. Batt, who was responsible for a large part of the war-aluminum program, seemed to have shared the professed ignorance of Mr. I. W. Wilson, notwithstanding the fact that both of them received copies of the April 15, 1941, memorandum mentioning the Shipshaw development. Mr. Batt testified before Senate Small Business Committee in the spring of 1945: "I was never conscious that I had ever heard about Shipshaw until some time in '43." His answer to another query was partly as follows: "You indicated yesterday that you know more of the details of Shipshaw than I do." These two comments are curiously similar to the ones I quoted as coming from Mr. Hall, of Alcoa, in the later Spokane hearings.

Alcoa keeps pointing to the court decision in the antitrust case that the stockholding relationship between the American and Canadian companies was not a violation of the antitrust laws. But, as the Attorney General's report says (p. 38): "The prospective independent is interested in a much narrower fact: Are these two companies going to operate independent of each other, or as friends of each other, in competing against him?" To suppose that the same group of majority stockholders in both companies will arrange matters to secure a lesser rather than a greater net return to themselves is again a strain on the credulity of the average citizen. The Surplus Property Board in its report to Congress on aluminum plant disposal described a plan acceptable to Alcoa whereby it was assumed, among other things, "that imports from Canada and elsewhere would take place in volume that would bring Alcoa's domestic production below the percentage fixed by the court as constituting monopoly" (p. 48). In other words, Alcoa would use the Canadian company as a faucet, turning on some imports when it produced more than 75 percent of the domestic aluminum supply, shutting off such imports when its production was below this percentage. In rejecting the plan acceptable to Alcoa, the Surplus Property Board stated (p. 49):

"This plan assumes that most of the competition with Alcoa in this country would be furnished by Canadian imports. The Surplus Property Board cannot regard this assumption as a satisfactory solution of the competitive situation for two reasons: (1) Canadian aluminum and Alcoa aluminum are subject to the same stockholder control; and (2) this arrangement would deprive American workers of opportunities for employment in the aluminum industry."

In a letter of protest to the Surplus Property Administrator, dated October 15, 1945, Alcoa labeled the proposed program for disposal as "a cradle-to-the-grave program which, once started, can never be terminated." With the customary air of injured innocence, Alcoa shed great, big crocodile tears over the stated preference of the Surplus Property Board for competing independent producers in the acquisition of Government plants. Alcoa wrote at one point:

"We asked no subsidies as a purchaser. We were willing to pay cash for any of these plants that would be sold to us. We expected that the output of any plants so purchased would have to compete for markets in competition with the purchasers or lessees of the remaining plants, with Reynolds Metals Co. and Olin Corp., with Aluminum, Ltd., and other foreign producers, and with the output of our existing facilities."

Note that Alcoa defines competition upon acquisition of Government plants as including the Canadian company, in which the majority stockholders are identical, and as including even its own facilities in this country. Alcoa does not say, of course, that once it got the Government plants it wanted, the chances of getting new producers for the remaining plants are practically nil.

In connection with previous remarks which I made on the floor of the Senate about the aluminum plant disposal program, an editorial in the Portland Oregonian of November 26, 1945, accuses me of using Alcoa as a "whipping boy" to make political capital. The editorial states in part: "Now that the false whiskers have been removed there seems to be nothing but votes to be gained by continued belaboring of Alcoa." I think the reading public should be informed that this editorial appraisal of the proposed disposal program is lifted, without identification and hardly with any change of words, from Alcoa's letter to the Surplus Property Administrator. The whiskers sprouted by this precocious "whipping boy" are not false whiskers; they are very genuine.

To implement the aluminum disposal program of the Surplus Property Board and provide a practical means of getting governmental plants into the hands of private competitive producers, S. 1612 would authorize the RFC to purchase aluminum for stock pile from Government-constructed plants. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the two Senators from Oregon [Mr. MORSE and Mr. CORDON] have joined with me in sponsoring this bill. It is to be expected that Alcoa will strenuously oppose a stockpiling program of this nature. It has outlined its position to the Surplus Property Administrator as follows:

"It is proposed to create an artificial market for the operators of Government-owned smelting plants by stock piling aluminum ingot ostensibly for purposes of national defense.

"We do not criticize the stock piling of aluminum for national defense. But if this were the purpose of the proposal, it would be purchased on the open market at a competitive price and stock piled only in the amounts deemed desirable for defense. Such a program would be the function of the military authorities and would have no place in the surplus-property-disposal program.

"The proposal to stock pile surplus aluminum as a means of making operation of the Governments plants attractive is unnecessary and defeats its own ends."

Alcoa means, of course, that the stock pile proposal is unnecessary to Alcoa, and would defeat Alcoa's ends. That Alcoa's needs and ends are not necessarily those toward which the whole country is striving is evidenced in the Surplus Property Act and the court decision, both of which carry a mandate to break the monopoly grip on the aluminum industry.

If an aluminum stock pile is essential to national security, and the Army-Navy has so declared, good sense dictates that the stock-pile program be tied in with the aluminum plant disposal program, to accomplish two mutually desirable objectives of the Government. That is what the stock-pile bill proposes to do. Alcoa would have us believe that the virtue consists in keeping these program apart, so that one of those objectives, written into the law of the land by the Surplus Property Act, should be defeated.

The copious crocodile tears that Alcoa is shedding over Government subsidies must not be permitted to wash out the Surplus Property Act and to confuse the issues that present themselves. If a stock-pile program along the lines suggested by my bill had already been in effect, it is likely that the aluminum plants would now be in private operation instead of lying idle with attendant costs in maintenance, unemployment, and public power waste. The offers to lease made by independent producers, as I have said, were contingent upon such a Government purchase program. For that very reason the Reynolds Metals Co. excluded the northwest plants in its recent agreement with the RFC to take over the Arkansas plants. Unless the stock-pile bill is passed, continued idleness and unemployment are the prospects that lie ahead for the remaining Government-owned aluminum plants.

A Continuing Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 19), 1945

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Continuing Scandal," from the Commonweal, the issue of December 21, 1945. It deals with the subject matter which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] discussed in the Senate today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CONTINUING SCANDAL

In the Commonweal for November 2, 1945, we published an article by Elizabeth Ann Cooper on the subject of the Mexican workers brought to this country as maintenance-of-way employees on the railroads. The conditions reported in this article are at the present moment generally worsening all over the country, and unless the whole program is thoroughly investigated by Congress and effective steps are taken to effect radical improvements, we shall be faced with an even worse scandal than that described by Miss Cooper. The present situation is that most of these workers' contracts expire by the middle of this month; many thousands of contracts have already expired. Under the contracts the workers' return journey to Mexico is of course guaranteed. But the workers are now discovering that for one reason or another when their contracts expire they cannot get transportation home.

The result is that some 80,000 Mexicans scattered all over the country are becoming desperate. Scores of them have quit the railroad camps and gone to Washington under their own steam in order to present their grievances to Mexican and American authorities. They arrive in the Nation's capital with substantially no resources beside their ancient and battered suitcases and the clothes on their backs. Since the railway companies are not certain exactly how long the present situation will last, they are making no great effort to improve conditions in the work camps, or even to put in adequate supplies of fuel or food. One cannot help suspecting, moreover, that our railroads are perfectly willing to take advantage of the situation in view of the continuing scarcity of common labor all over the country.

It is difficult to assess the blame for this scandalous state of affairs. We are told that the Mexican railroads have not adequate facilities to handle any large number of returning workers on the other side of the border; we are also told that our own railroads are equally incapable of carrying the men to the border, the allegations coming from north and south of the border, respectively. Of course, we all realize from daily experience that the American railways continue greatly overtaxed, and reports from Mexico indicate that the Mexican lines are in shockingly bad condition, yet the fact remains that solemn contractual obligations toward the citizens of a friendly neighbor are being largely neglected, and that at the present rate of return it will be a year at least before all these unfortunate men can rejoin their families. In the meantime, since their contracts have expired and cannot legally be renewed, they can only continue to work for the railroads without any contractual protection or else risk everything by quitting camp and seeking redress from the authorities—a desperately difficult task in view of linguistic barriers and the meagerness of their resources. Prompt action in Washington is the only thing which can save us from national disgrace.

Our Foreign Service

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am asking unanimous consent that I may insert as part of my remarks a Christmas and New Year's message that the President of the United States and the Secretary of State are sending all over the world to our foreign service officers. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the House of Representatives would like to join with me in sending our good wishes and our thanks to the personnel of the foreign service who have carried on during the very difficult war days under tremendous handicaps and often without instruction from those in authority in the United States. They have done a magnificent piece of work by and large.

The messages from the President and the Secretary of State to the foreign service follow:

High tribute to the members of the American foreign service has been paid by President Truman and Secretary Byrnes in Christmas messages made public in the December issue of the American Foreign Service Journal just issued.

President Truman in his message stresses the contributions made by the American foreign service in the winning of the war and expresses himself as fortunate in having the support and counsel of all members of the service—the first line representatives of the American people at outposts throughout the world—in making secure the peace.

Secretary Byrnes lauds the foreign service for its significant contribution to the common victory and expresses appreciation for its generous cooperation and assistance. He voices his every confidence that the foreign service will meet its increased responsibilities and cope with the difficult and complex international problems arising everywhere in the future, as it has in the past, with loyalty, integrity, and singleness of purpose.

The text of the President's message follows:

"To All Members of the American Foreign Service:

"I am delighted to express to you my sincere best wishes for the Christmas season and to congratulate you upon your achievements in the year which is drawing to a close. At this Christmas, the first since victory, you may well feel proud of the contributions you have made to the winning of the war against the forces of evil.

"As emissaries of good will, and first line representatives of the American people at your outposts throughout the world, none knows better than you that victory is not enough. The despair which the liberation lifted from so many hearts will return unless we can help men to find food, clothing, and shelter, help them to trust and understand one another, and, through wise policy, create the conditions in which we may exchange our goods for the benefit of all. Thus can the peace be made secure.

"This is a task to which I pledge myself, and I know that I am fortunate in having the support and counsel of all of you in the foreign service of the United States.

"HARRY S. TRUMAN."

The text of the Secretary's message follows:

"To the American Foreign Service:

"Christmas this year is one of particular satisfaction and joy for all of us. We may rightfully take pride in a job well done, a victory well won. The foreign service made a significant contribution to the common victory and you may be sure that it has been realized and appreciated.

"We, in the Department, are well aware of the sacrifices made and the hardships endured by the foreign service during the war—without complaint and in good spirit. All of you have worked hard in the most trying circumstances, many of you have had prolonged assignments abroad without relief, some of you have been separated from your families for long periods. We hope that it will be possible very soon to remedy all that and we shall make every effort to do so.

"I should like to be able to say to you that, now that the war is over, the foreign service can relax its efforts and rest awhile on well-earned laurels, but I think that you realize, perhaps better than anyone, the enormity of the task before us. If anything, the foreign service will have to redouble its efforts in the forthcoming year to meet its increased responsibilities and to cope with the difficult and complex international problems arising everywhere. Let us make no mistake about it, the period before us will be arduous and demanding. It will test our judgment, try our patience, and challenge our perseverance. But I have every confidence that the foreign service will rise to the occasion in the future, as it has in the past, with loyalty, integrity, and singleness of purpose.

"In the year to come there will be changes in the foreign service, some of which may be far reaching in consequence. These are necessary if the service is to function as it should. The constructive and helpful attitude of the members of the foreign service toward the reorganization of the Department and the foreign service has been most gratifying because it demonstrates a clear recognition of the need of strengthening and improving our machinery, and a keen interest in seeing it done.

"I extend to each of you my sincerest wishes for a happy and successful new year, and I want to take this opportunity to thank you all for the generous cooperation and assistance you have already shown.

"JAMES F. BYRNES."

UNRRA Is Desperately Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the appropriation for UNRRA which was passed yesterday by this House, I ask consent to insert in the RECORD the following letter written by me to the editor of the Greenwich (Conn.) Review, concerning the reasons for the increased need abroad over and above the deficiencies created by wartime destruction and loss of manpower.

Also, I want to call particular attention to the relief situation in Italy and Poland as shown by included dispatches from C. L. Sulzberger, Milton Bracker, and Michael L. Hoffman. Together they show beyond contradiction that even what we have agreed to do will at best be palliative, and that we must continue such relief measures throughout the year of 1946 unless we desire to see epidemic disease and starvation sweep across all Eurasia on a scale never approached before, not even in the time of the Black Death which destroyed over one-third of the then existing human population.

The letter follows:

DECEMBER 20, 1945.

MR. DONALD CHAPMAN SPAULDING,
Editor, the Greenwich Review,
Greenwich, Conn.

DEAR MR. SPAULDING: Mr. Sheldon Abbott's letter in your issue of November 23 brings up several questions which have been asked by other corerspondents, and which should be answered.

It is often overlooked, or forgotten, that UNRRA is not an exclusively American organization but is subject to control by all the United Nations, with quotas fixed by international agreement at 1 percent of the annual national income.

The Senate and House have just appropriated the final installment of our contribution for 1945, and have authorized a further contribution of $1,350,000,000 for 1946. No actual appropriation has been made for this second contribution, and new legislation will be required before the fund can be made available for purchase of medicines, food, clothing, and other supplies needed to prevent epidemics and wholesale starvation in so many devastated areas.

Mr. Abbott is, in my opinion, entirely justified in urging that we take stock of what we have to give before obeying our national instinct for generous giving to the suffering peoples of other lands.

Today we have no longer the unlimited resources to play the lavish spendthrift among nations. The need abroad is urgent beyond any verbal description. It has to be met in a thoroughly responsible manner. No other nation has the supplies and the transportation facilities with which to meet it but ourselves.

Several weeks before Mr. Baruch demanded that a national inventory be taken, I asked for the same thing. It was last May, on my return from the still smoking ruins of France, Italy, and Germany, that I told Members of the Congress and of the press that our first step should be the appointment of a world rehabilitation administrator to find out and inform Congress and the public of the exact state of world deficiencies, what the United States would be expected to make good, and what we could afford.

No such comprehensive survey was ever authorized. Now it is too late to collect statistics when the winter's need is at its bitterest for hundreds of millions of hungry, shivering humans in Europe and Asia.

The present appropriation by Congress fulfills the American quota until February 1946, by which time a further appropriation, as part of the already authorized $1,350,000,000 quota for 1946, can be expected.

In administering these funds there is no doubt that there have been great abuses, and that in some quarters these faults still exist. Partly these have been caused by appeasement of other nations in order to feed and clothe populations in some areas. There is overwhelming evidence to prove that in Poland, Hungary, Austria, Yugoslavia, and some parts of Czechoslovakia and the Ukraine, livestock left by the Nazis has been taken from the inhabitants and herded eastward. Most Soviet Army units now occupying various areas of eastern and southern Europe are living off the land by organized forage, as that is the only source available in the chaotic condition of transportation there.

The amount of food and other supplies taken from an already impoverished population can be judged by looking at the present number of Soviet Army personnel reported to be garrisoning these areas at the end of November 1945:

	Soviet Army
Austria	700,000
Hungary	1,250,000
Czechoslovakia	900,000
Yugoslavia	450,000
Germany	2,000,000
Poland	1,500,000
Balkans (chiefly Bulgaria along the Turkish frontier)	1,550,000

The exact extent to which the Soviet Union has met its quota from UNRRA has not been officially announced. To date, practically the whole real contribution has come from the United States and the British Commonwealth.

However, the need is so desperate, that regardless of the abuses of UNRRA, or the inefficiency within the organization itself, which are being corrected, I feel all Americans must support UNRRA and I have always done so. Indeed, the following (enclosed) letter from the Director General of UNRRA shows how wholeheartedly I have done just that.

Sincerely,

CLARE BOOTHE LUCE.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND
REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., December 13, 1945.

MRS. CLARE BOOTH LUCE,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. LUCE: I want to thank you for your splendid statement endorsing the new UNRRA appropriations now before Congress.

Mrs. Jacob has undoubtedly informed you that 850 women commentators will carry your statement on their broadcasts today along with a statement from Mrs. Lafell Dickinson, National president of General Federation of Women's Clubs.

I am sure that your support both in Congress and on the air has directly contributed to the needs of suffering people in Europe and Asia.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Director General.

SURVEY SHOWS UNRRA VITAL TO EUROPE'S FEEBLE MILLIONS

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

LONDON, December 15.—Despite the agency's admitted ineptitude in some phases of its inaugural work, the continuation of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration is regarded as indispensable in large sections of suffering Europe, which face disease and starvation if Allied assistance is withdrawn.

On the basis of reports from correspondents of the New York Times in various countries receiving UNRRA aid, the following salient facts can be established:

In ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed Greece, UNRRA's contribution is believed to be imperative to recovery.

In Yugoslavia, whose entire economy was ravaged by the crisscross marching and countermarching of regular and irregular armies, 3,000,000 persons face starvation if UNRRA food shipments are not continued, and even then the food problem will be far from solved.

In Italy, which is slated to receive $450,000,000 in assistance next year if scheduled appropriations are implemented, UNRRA is considered the key factor in the national economy for the coming year.

In miserable Poland, still festering with disease, chaos, and the fevered meanderings of a bewildered population, the agency is virtually the only source of outside aid.

In Germany UNRRA is caring for almost all the 850,000 displaced persons still swarming in camps and depots, and has been largely responsible for the repatriation of more than 4,000,000 unfortunates.

It is obvious that UNRRA is fully aware of the torrent of criticism directed against it during the last few months. Efforts have been and are being made to rectify some of the causes of this.

There is little doubt that the world's greatest charitable enterprise suffered from two basic difficulties at its inception.

First, its initial operations were hampered by lack of a clean-cut character and directive and by the agency's dependence on the military in various theaters. It could not obtain its own ships or land transport and was forced to allot space to Army officers, as in Yugoslavia.

Secondly, UNRRA was a late-comer in its search for competent manpower and its drastic need for personnel, after millions of men and women had been drafted into military and semimilitary jobs, forced it to dip lower into the barrel of human reserves than it would perhaps have wished.

There has been incompetence and political and personal jealousy and bickering; some unrealistic and impracticable dreaming by insufficiently experienced welfare workers; some interference in local politics, and perhaps more than a modicum of black marketing and slipshod administration.

UNRRA has been aware of these faults. As Lt. Gen. Sir Frederick E. Morgan, who heads the administration's German operations, confined to the care of displaced persons, has observed, these personnel problems are being dealt with.

Similarly, liaison between the military command and UNRRA officials is being improved. In areas such as the Middle East, where the agency is drastically reducing its work with a view to complete termination, local inflation and shipping scarcity have added to such troubles as efforts of rival beneficiary nations to dip into the grab bag.

RECORD IN GREECE CALLED TYPICAL

In Greece the record of UNRRA appears typical: at its worst in the beginning and at

its most successful later. Initially there were reports that considerable UNRRA supplies were appearing in the black markets, and intramural bickerings and back-biting were at a peak soon after the Greek liberation.

After this period of growing pains, however, the agency has done so tremendous a job that it is regarded as indispensable. Its food, clothing, cotton goods, and building materials have helped a stricken country climb to its feet and its medical aid prevented widespread disease.

In Yugoslavia, although the critical food problem is far from solved, UNRRA complains this is the fault of the Allied allotment program. Nevertheless, the Organization is trying to save 3,000,000 in the western part of the country from starvation and to help supplement the diet of 4,000,000 others as well as providing special food for 1,000,000 undernourished children.

The paramount charge against the UNRRA administration in Yugoslavia is that Marshal Tito's huge army is entirely supplied through that agency and that only government supporters receive rations. The initial mistakes of UNRRA and the shortage of current supplies, however, probably are the basis of exaggerated attacks by the large opposition in that violently political country.

In Italy, despite intermittent government crises, the $50,000,000 spent by UNRRA since last March had undoubtedly helped enormously to avoid a truly critical state.

In Poland, full-scale UNRRA operations are just getting under way and substantial supplies have recently begun to circulate through the country: Food, medicine, clothing, and agricultural implements. The appalling shortage is slowly being relieved.

HOUSES FOR CZECHOSLOVAKIA

In Czechoslovakia, especially in the eastern part, UNRRA shipments of food and clothes and the construction of prefabricated shelters have speeded recovery.

UNRRA, being a joint Allied enterprise, naturally mirrors intra-Allied disputes. Thus, for example, the Russians openly frown on its displaced persons activities in Germany and Austria because of their contention that a DP is someone who is either too lazy or too disloyal to go home.

Almost all those DP's are citizens of areas claimed as Soviet or with pro-Soviet governments.

Regardless of such disputes and UNRRA's own difficulties, millions of Europeans are looking pathetically to it for help during the ensuing months.

POLAND HOPES TO SPEED RECOVERY WITH STIMULANT OF OUTSIDE HELP

(By Michael L. Hoffman)

LONDON, December 15.—Although the full scale of UNRRA operations in Poland are just getting under way, supplies are already reaching that stricken land in substantial quantities and UNRRA has become almost the only source of outside aid for Poland, according to officers of the organization's European headquarters in London.

Stressing the excellent cooperation received from the Polish Government and the enthusiastic reception their representatives are getting from the Polish people, UNRRA spokesmen are hopeful that Poland's shattered economy will react quickly to the stimulant provided by food, medical supplies, and agricultural and industrial equipment.

In discussing UNRRA operations in his country, Henryk Strasburger, Polish Ambassador in London, and Polish officials just back from Warsaw said that acute shortages of food, clothing, and medical supplies were being greatly relieved by UNRRA. Mr. Strasburger expressed the deep gratitude of the Polish people for this help and said that his Government was highly pleased with the manner in which the international organization carried out its mission to date.

POLES GRATEFUL FOR ANYTHING

"Our people are so poor that they are grateful for anything," said Mr. Strasburger, who described how he had recently found members of his own family, formerly wealthy Polish industrialists, without shoes for the winter.

The start of shipments to Poland was delayed by the absence of a government with which arrangements for the handling of supplies could be worked out and not until the end of July did the first UNRRA mission reach Warsaw. Shipments of supplies through the end of October totaled only 210,313 tons, compared with more than 1,000,000 tons to Greece by the same date.

October and November have seen steady progress and in December it is expected that more than 77,000 tons will be shipped to Poland by water and substantial additional tonnages in the form of trucks and locomotives by land.

More than half of the shipments to date consist of food with the rest distributed almost evenly among clothing, agricultural rehabilitation supplies, and industrial supplies. Medical supplies, though small in tonnage, are filling critical needs. Seventy entire hospitals have been shipped to areas in which almost no usable buildings are left standing.

An entire United States Army repair plant, capable of overhauling 3,000 trucks a month, has been moved from England to be reassembled in Poland and the 3,000 trucks already shipped in are being steadily augmented by convoys moving overland from American and British Army bases.

UNRRA in Poland faces to an acute degree the problems of shattered transportation systems, inadequate local facilities for distribution and shortages of trained local personnel that are common to all devastated areas of Europe. Officials just returned from a survey of the distribution of UNRRA supplies in Poland express admiration for the spirit and cooperativeness of all Poles and say that they have met none of the evasiveness, resentment at outside "interference" and stubborn insistence on following outworn administrative procedures that have been found in so many countries.

Maj. Gen. C. R. Stein, Canadian adviser on industrial rehabilitation, who traveled extensively in Poland between July and October, summed up his impressions in the statement: "One feels that these people will come back and come back quickly."

The great fear of UNRRA medical officers concerned with eastern Europe has been that typhus would ravage the land in the wake of the undernourishment and outright starvation suffered by the people during the war. Speaking with cautious optimism, Dr. M. M. Goodman, of UNRRA's health division, who recently returned from a tour of Poland, said that typhus was far less prevalent in Poland than had been feared and was much rarer than after World War I.

About 231,000 typhus cases were recorded in Poland in 1919, but only 13,800 were reported during the first 9 months of this year. Allowing for the fact that Poland has lost some eastern territory in which typhus would normally be relatively high and for the difference in the period covered, this is still, in Dr. Goodman's opinion, a much better record than had been anticipated.

LECTURES AID POLISH DOCTORS

Tuberculosis and venereal disease are the worst threats in Poland this year, he declared, but energetic measures against both are well under way. A unique feature of UNRRA's program for Poland is the organization of a series of medical and health lectures to local physicians, given by British, Canadian, and United States experts, to bring Polish doctors up to date on methods for combating disease.

Inquiries in UNRRA and Polish circles in London elicited no information or comments indicating that Soviet military authorities in Poland were interfering with UNRRA work or with Polish agencies distributing the supplies. The Russians, one UNRRA official said, are keeping hands off and frequently carry UNRRA personnel to otherwise inaccessible places in Soviet military planes.

When asked about plans for Poland, UNRRA spokesmen say that everything depended on the United States Congress. Most of what Poland needs can be obtained only in the United States.

If United States financial support is continued, UNRRA will carry on in Poland until the end of 1946. Otherwise operations will end next March.

NEXT YEAR'S RELIEF NEEDS IN ITALY DWARF ASSISTANCE GIVEN IN 1945

(By Milton Bracker)

ROME, November 30.—The Allied Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration's Italian mission has been administering since last March a $50,000,000 limited program under which specialized foods, medicines, clothing and services have been provided to needy Italians and to some non-Italian refugees.

About three-fifths of the supplies involved have already reached Italy and about one-third have already benefited the ultimate consumer. The difference is in the "pipeline"—a chain of warehouses and related installations that, according to plan, will be tapped more heavily during the winter months than heretofore.

The loss resulting from theft, spoilage, and all other causes is placed by Spurgeon M. Keeny, director of the mission, at less than 1 percent—beyond the calculated loss of all wartime cargo due to shipping conditions, etc., of up to 5 percent.

But everything that has been done so far is dwarfed by the prospects for 1946.

TENSE DAYS FOR MISSION

Italy's share in the UNRRA appropriation that has been before Congress is $450,000,000. On the prospect that the funds will be forthcoming and to assure a continuous flow of supplies, $61,500,000 has been made available in advance to bring UNRRA supplies for Italy at least to shipside in the United States.

Thus, it is obvious that these are tense days for the UNRRA mission here. They are also tense for those Italians who realize what the potential UNRRA program—or the lack of it—means to Italy.

Assuming that the Italian Government was able to effect a maximum import program for 1946—touching items such as wheat, coal, oil, medicines, and industrial equipment—the UNRRA would still be called upon with its $450,000,000 to meet 43 percent of basic requirements, including freight costs.

The point is that political and economic conditions affecting Italy are most unlikely to permit the Government to effect anything like a sound import program.

BIG FACTOR DURING 1946

The result is that the burden of the UNRRA becomes proportionately greater. It is plainly the key factor in civilian economy in the 12 months ahead.

Aware of this, the local UNRRA is doing its best to make its program so effective in 1946 that there will be no further need for the UNRRA in Italy in 1947.

There are a great many snags, and a basic one is the indeterminate international status of Italy. Without benefit of even an interim peace treaty, any Italian Government tends to be timid and unsure. Those who have a voice in negotiating with the UNRRA often do not agree on the most-needed items.

They have often failed lamentably to understand that items like seed potatoes are worthless unless on hand—and therefore ordered—in time for the planting season. They tend to think too often in terms of bulk

wheat which would guard against a politically dangerous cutting of the bread ration, and not in terms of materials that would stimulate the natural economy on which, in the long run, a nation must live.

ALLIED COMMISSION PROGRAM

One of the many key problems facing the UNRRA now is to assure a smooth "pick-up" from the Foreign Economic Administration's Allied Commission program, which will run out on December 31. This was based on $100,000,000 originally made available before UNRRA aid to Italy was first voted at the Montreal conference in September 1944.

The Allied Commission, through its economic section, has been handling all questions of supply and distribution. The economic section has now been reorganized with a view to integrating with the UNRRA as of January 1.

Harlan Cleveland, youthful head of the economic section, and two important aides will become deputy directors of the UNRRA mission under Mr. Keeny. The latter will expand his over-all personnel from about 300 to about 600, with the Italian authorities taking title to incoming supplies at dockside or at the warehouses, depending upon the nature of the shipment.

THEFT RISK SERIOUS

The risk of theft is serious all down the line. Recently "intact" crates of canned milk showed up with the cans turning out to have been slashed and filled with sand to equalize the weight.

Heretofore the UNRRA aid to Italy has been broadly restricted to child and maternal care, refugees, and public health. Thanks to the decision of the UNRRA conferees at London, it will become the sole channel for the funneling of nonprivate outside aid into this war-ruined country.

The UNRRA's record so far has been good; the Allied Commission has heard from Washington that the "Italian program is considered to be one of the bright spots in the UNRRA world picture."

But to enable it to keep pace on the basis of a full-scale program through a cruel winter—with a drought that caused a 2,000,000-ton wheat shortage darkening the outlook—two things would help greatly: First, a definition of Italy's status vis-a-vis the Allies, who, after all, are footing the bill for the UNRRA; and second, the stabilization of domestic politics under the elections of next spring.

Meanwhile the UNRRA Italian mission is hopeful.

I hope with all my heart that the women of America will back to the utmost the UNRRA program for feeding the starving in Europe.

The facts are that millions of European women and children will perish this winter unless Americans can get food, clothing, and medical supplies to them shortly.

I am, naturally as a woman, most concerned about the children and the mothers. There can be no peace where pregnant mothers and children are naked and hungry. The war is over but Europe's children will never believe you while they are dying for want of food and shelter. The whole peace of the world depends on the rapidity with which Europe and Asia now recover from the ravages of war. The recovery of human bodies comes first.

The UNRRA program will save hundreds of thousands of lives, and is the most important "peace legislation" that this Congress can pass.

Let every woman do her utmost to urge her local newspapers, radios, and Representatives in Congress to support it.

Youth in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me, I desire to call attention to an article "Young Blood in Washington," by that distinguished writer, Mr. Jack H. Pollack, which appeared in the December issue of PIC magazine. The article calls attention to the number of young men who are now administering important posts in Washington, and I am happy to call it to the attention of the Members. It follows:

YOUNG BLOOD IN WASHINGTON—GOOD OLD UNCLE SAM IS SHEDDING HIS WHISKERS AND STUFFED SHIRTS ARE STEPPING ASIDE FOR YOUTH

(By Jack H. Pollack)

Youth is "busting out all over" on the capital carousel. Though traditionally an oldsters' town, Washington is teeming with new, eager, young faces these days. Federal officials, in the springtime of their careers, are blossoming like cherry trees along the Potomac.

Uncle Sam is shedding his whiskers. Not since the early thirties when juvenile brain trusters flocked to Washington, has there been such an influx of young blood. The Truman administration is using father time's scythe to cut down the ages of its important policy-makers throughout the Government. This trend is evident in the hoary, old-line agencies as well as in the cabinet. President Truman—youthful in spirit himself—is being advised, directly or indirectly, by some of the best young brains in the country.

The prospect for enthusiastic young men in Government service looms even brighter in the months and years ahead. The future administrators of the Nation's laws will not be superannuated Federal hacks or frock-coated, top-hatted, boiled-shirts clinging to their sinecures for dear life. Rather, they are gradually giving way to a rising generation of new-fledged workers casting off khaki for Federal swaddling clothes. During the next decade, a new generation of Government employees, mainly World War II veterans, will be in Uncle Sam's driver's seat.

More and more, the capital city shapes up as a young man's town, especially a veterans' one, judging from the new Federal policy of hiring only exservicemen. Steady, good job opportunities, await those seeking to serve their country in peace—as in war. (The Civil Service Commission can supply details.)

Typical of the upsurge of Capital youth is the recent appointment of 33-year-old Col. Frank McCarthy as Assistant Secretary of State. The youngest man to hold a top State Department post in many years, McCarthy succeeded conservative, graying Brig. Gen. Julius C. Holmes.

Hailing from Richmond, Va., this one-time teacher, police reporter, and Broadway press agent for George Abbott's Brother Rat, is now really in the big show. Commissioned a first lieutenant in July 1940, this good-looking, blue-eyed chap won rapid promotions—as well as a Distinguished Service Medal. Virginia Military Institute alumnus, he became military secretary to Chief of Staff George C. Marshall, accompanying him to all Allied conferences including Casablanca, Cairo, Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. It was his quiet, capable work at these international parleys that attracted the attention of President Truman and Secretary of States Byrnes.

Asked how he liked his new job, McCarthy modestly replied, "I always thought I wanted to be a newspaperman, teacher, or Army officer; I had an opportunity to try all of them and wound up in something entirely different."

Another youthful Capital luminary is 30-year-old Edward F. Pritchard, Jr. One of America's keenest legal minds, colorful, roly-poly "Pritch" once was suspended from Princeton for staging a dormitory beer party. During the past few years, in quick succession, he has been law clerk to Supreme Court Justice Frankfurter, special assistant to the Attorney General, a top policy-maker in the Office of Economic Stabilization, Federal Loan Administration, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, and aid to Secretary of the Treasury Vinson.

Two years ago, it looked as if his Government career would be snafued when he was drafted. A 270-pounder who formerly tipped the beam at a cool 310, Pritch was rushed into a tent-like khaki uniform. Philosophically, he shrugged, "They've scraped the bottom of the manpower barrel—now they have to take the barrel itself."

Most of his Army career was spent in the hospital. "When I saw that obstacle course with the sewer pipe I had to crawl through," he recalls, "I was pretty sure I couldn't make the grade." (Avoirdupois note: Much as he loves to eat, the Army got "Pritch" down to 225 and he vows he'll reach 195 yet.) Kentucky-born Ed Pritchard has the senatorial itch these days, with his eye on Baseball Commissioner "Happy" Chandler's Senate seat, and may resign.

Likewise in the front row of the administration's reconversion battle is burly, broad-shouldered Robert Roy Nathan. At present, Deputy Director for the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, Bob replaces Maj. Gen. Lucius B. Clay, at present with the occupation forces in Germany. The tough-looking, indefatigable man now in one of the Capital's top posts, was born in Dayton, Ohio, 36 years ago and came up the hard way.

Nathan worked as a salesman, tutor, and at night in a factory to earn money for his University of Pennsylvania education. Joining the Department of Commerce in 1933, he rose speedily until he was one of the chief economic planners in our swing-over from peace to war. As two-fisted WPB Planning Committee chairman, Bob was a crusading civilian foe of Army miscalculation. Washington grapevine gossip had it that the brass-hats were tickled when he was drafted. It was while in the Army that he wrote Mobilizing for Abundance, a weighty book charting the path the United States should follow in returning to a peacetime economy. Now, even as he helped mobilize the Nation for war, Nathan is helping lead the way back to peace and prosperity.

One of the least known but closest confidantes of President Truman is 37-year-old Matthew J. Connelly. This shrewd New Englander is one of the most popular and influential young men in the Truman administration.

Born in Clinton, Mass., and a Fordham graduate, Connelly is proud of the Irish way his name is spelled. He was hired by Senator Truman to be the chief investigator for the famous Truman committee when it was exposing war racketeers. And before that, he was a crackerjack investigator for other leading congressional committees. He got his start in Wall Street.

Connelly was the executive assistant to Vice President Truman and today is appointment secretary and confidential aide to the President.

Another shining light on the capital kaleidoscope is brisk, clear-thinking, 39-year-old Paul Herzog, recently appointed Chairman

of the National Labor Relations Board, which passes on union representation. An expert labor relations troubleshooter with a chain-lightning mind, slim, sandy-haired Herzog was outstandingly successful as a member of the New York State Labor Relations Board from 1937 to March 1944 when he resigned to become a Navy lieutenant.

In 1933, he journeyed to Washington seeking a job. An ex-school teacher, with modest tastes, he asked for a $2,400 position. "That won't do," snapped Senator WAGNER, who was to father the National Labor Relations Act (the Wagner Act). "I need a $3,000 man. I'll give you that and if you're not worth it, I'll fire you."

Needless to mention, the ebullient Herzog was soon worth far more, becoming highly regarded by all labor factions. A proud father of two children, he puffed on one of his favorite briars and observed, "I would be a better father to them if the A. F. of L. and CIO would get together."

Urbane, quiet, 35-year-old Abe Fortas, Under Secretary of the Interior, is still another Capital prodigy. Harold Ickes' right-hand man has been a boy wonder in government for over a decade. At 23, Tennessee-born Fortas was a leading Agriculture Department official, acting as a negotiator between feuding fruit interests. Before that he won a scholarship from the Yale Law School, where he was graduated with honors.

He was a key man in the Agriculture Adjustment Administration, Securities and Exchange Commission, and Public Works Administration before coming to the Interior Department. When discharged from the Navy last year, President Roosevelt reappointed him to his present job.

Likewise, no Capital newcomer is Henry C. Iler, 38, assistant to the Federal Security Administrator. An Owensboro, Ky., native, Iler took a $25-a-week Government job in mid-depression. With a flair for getting things done, he found his niche when he became assistant to the National Youth Administrator, specializing in labor and congressional relations. Iler is a member of the Advisory Committee in the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation—which assists in rehabilitating physically handicapped veterans. A popular member of the Blue Grass delegation in the Nation's Capital, politics may yet claim this ace trouble-shooter.

Numerous other young men are in key Government positions. Federal Communications Commission Chairman Paul Porter, present policeman of the radio industry, is 39. So is soft-voiced Donald S. Russell, ex-Army major, now a special assistant to his friend, Secretary of State Byrnes. Even the most powerful man in the Truman administration, Postmaster General Robert E. Hannegan, is only 42.

Government is no longer the exclusive domain of stuffed shirts in their fifties and sixties. Confident, competent young men who never ran for office or met a pay roll are becoming increasingly conspicuous in the National Capital. They are fast becoming the leaders of today—and undoubtedly tomorrow.

Propose Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that H. R. 4717, an act to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration, was passed without amendment by the Senate on December 20, 1945, and will now be sent to the President for his consideration. While I should have liked certain amendments added, it was important to have this legislation passed. It has been my wish for years to have a Department of Medicine and Surgery.

This bill has been enacted to meet an urgent need of the Veterans' Administration for satisfactory organization of the medical activities and to attract necessary personnel, particularly doctors, dentists, nurses, and attendants. Legislation to accomplish this general purpose with the approval, in principle, of the President was recommended by both General Hines and General Bradley as being essential and vital. The act abolishes the Medical Service in the Veterans' Administration as at present constituted, and establishes in its stead a Department of Medicine and Surgery under a Chief Medical Director.

The bill incorporates broad provisions as to organization and authority. It provides specifically for certain positions with adequate salary stipulations, specified salary rates for doctors, nurses, and dentists, and a special salary range for attendants. It authorizes appointments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to certain professional positions without regard to civil service. The civil-service retirement system, however, will be applicable to all positions in the Department of Medicine and Surgery. Authority is provided to discipline or discharge unsatisfactory or disqualified employees in certain categories without the restrictions of the laws and regulations pertaining to civil service.

Section 1 of the bill, in addition to abolishing the medical service in the Veterans' Administration and establishing in its stead a Department of Medicine and Surgery under a chief medical director, provides that the functions of that Department will be those necessary for a complete medical and hospital service to be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Section 2 of the bill provides that the Department of Medicine and Surgery shall include the office of the Chief Medical Director, Medical Service, Dental Service, Nursing Service, and Auxiliary Service.

Section 3 of the bill provides that the office of the chief medical director shall consist of the chief medical director, one deputy medical director, not to exceed eight assistant medical directors and such other personnel and employees as may be authorized by the act. The chief medical director will be appointed by the Administrator at a salary of $12,000 per year; the assistant medical directors will receive a salary of $11,000 per year each, and the deputy medical director will receive a salary of $11,500 per year; the director of the nursing service will be paid a salary of $8,000 per year and the deputy director of nursing service will receive a salary of $7,000 per year. The chief pharmacist, chief dietitian, chief physical therapist, and chief occupational therapist each will receive a salary of $6,000 per year. The appointments will be for a period of 4 years, subject to removal by the Administrator for cause. Reappointments may be made for successive like periods.

Section 4 provides for appointment by the Administrator of additional personnel on two groups: (a) Doctors, dentists, and nurses; (b) managers, pharmacists, physical therapists, occupational therapists, dietitians, and scientific personnel and other medical and dental technologists.

Section 5 prescribes the conditions of eligibility for appointment to the Department of Medicine and Surgery. The first requirement is that any person so appointed must be a citizen of the United States. There are then provided the professional and other requirements for doctors, dentists, and nurses; and in the auxiliary service—managers of hospitals, homes, or centers—pharmacists, physical therapists, occupational therapists, dietitians, and other auxiliary employees. It is provided that persons may be appointed under the act while on terminal leave from the armed forces and may be paid for their services rendered under such appointment notwithstanding any law or regulation to the contrary.

Section 6 provides that the appointments of doctors, dentists, and nurses shall be made only after their qualifications have been satisfactorily established in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator and without regard to civil-service requirements. There is provided a probationary period of 3 years with provision for review of the employment records and separation from the medical, dental, or nursing services if the person is found not fully qualified and satisfactory. Provision is made for promotion of doctors, dentists, and nurses on the basis of examinations, and automatic promotion may be made within grade. Doctors, dentists and nurses in the present Medical Service will be continued in their present positions until their qualifications are determined. Civil-service reinstatement rights are protected in the cases of those who at time of appointment have a civil-service status and whose employment in the Department is not continued.

Section 7 establishes the grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions of doctors, dentists, and nurses. The Administrator is authorized to prescribe by regulation the hours and conditions of employment and leaves of absence of doctors, dentists, and nurses.

Section 8 authorizes the Chief Medical Director to rate any qualified doctor appointed under section 4, subsection (a), as a medical or surgical specialist, but no person may at any one time hold more than one such rating. It provides the conditions under which such rating shall be granted, its duration, and that the person so rated shall receive, in addition to his basic pay, an allowance equal to 25 percent of such pay, but the pay plus the allowance may not exceed $11,000 per annum.

Section 9 provides that persons appointed to the Department of Medicine and Surgery shall be subject to the provisions and entitled to benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended.

Section 10 provides for disciplinary boards and action on their recommendations affecting doctors, dentists, and nurses under section 4, subsection (a).

Section 11 provides for appointment of additional employees, other than those specified in section 3, subsection (a) of section 4, and section 14 of the act, as may be necessary. It is provided that employees in the Medical Service, as at present constituted, other than those provided in section 3, subsection (a) of section 4, and section 14, shall receive original appointments to the Department of Medicine and Surgery in their present civil-service status, upon proper certification therein provided. This section also provides that the per annum salary range for attendants shall be $1,572 minimum to $1,902 maximum.

Section 12 provides for a special medical advisory group, its composition and functions. Provision is made for regular calendar quarterly meetings and for the number, terms of service, compensation, and allowances to members.

Section 13 provides for the detail by the Chief Medical Director of employees under section 3 and subsection (a) of section 4 to attend meetings of associations for promotion of medical and related sciences. Authority is granted to place employees coming under the foregoing sections on duty for a period not in excess of 90 days in schools of the Army, Navy, and Public Health Service, and in civil institutions with the consent of authorities concerned, for the purpose of increasing professional knowledge or technical training. Payment of necessary expenses is authorized. Any person authorized to attend such course will be required to reimburse the Veterans' Administration the expenses thereof if he voluntarily leaves the service within 2 years after the completion of such course.

Section 14 provides for employment by the Administrator, upon recommendation of the Chief Medical Director, and without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, of doctors, dentists, and nurses on a temporary full-time, part-time, or fee basis, and others on a temporary full-time or part-time basis, at such rates of pay as he may prescribe, but no temporary full-time appointment shall be made for a period of more than 90 days.

This section also authorizes the establishment of residencies and appointment to such positions without regard to civil service or classification laws, rules, or regulations; the conditions of such employment; and the customary amounts and terms of pay during the period of such training. Residency training in most specialities would embrace training outside the hospital in connection with the school, part of the time not being spent on work directly productive for the Veterans' Administration. This authority is granted in order to retain uniformity with actual practice thoughout he Unied States in connection with residency employment because the average pay scales in residency employment are less than the scale for a minimum entrance salary of positions, such as doctor, junior grade.

Section 15 provides that the Chief Medical Director, with the approval of the Administrator, unless specifically otherwise provided, shall promulgate all regulations necessary to the administration of the Department of Medicine and Surgery and consistent with existing law, including regulations relating to travel, transportation of household goods and effects and deductions from pay for quarters and subsistence; and to the custody, use, and preservation of the records, papers, and property of the Department.

People's Champion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes from the Washington Daily News:

PEOPLE'S CHAMPION
(By Thomas L. Stokes)

President Truman showed rare perception when he selected Mrs. Roosevelt to be a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations Assembly which has its first meeting in London in January.

She will be more than a representative of the women of America, though she fills that role excellently.

There are other women who could have done that capably and with distinction. But Mrs. Roosevelt's designation means far more than that.

She, better than perhaps any other person, can represent the little people of this country and, indeed, of the world. She has been their champion. She has spoken for them when it took courage. Better than most, she has a feeling for them and their problems, despite the different strata from which she comes. She has their confidence.

She knows of their need and longing for peace and security in their lives and homes, and knows what happens to them in depressions and wars, which it is the purpose of UNO to eliminate. She understands the sacrifice of wars, for her four sons were in the thick of it.

Though she loved peace and was active in promoting it, she knew why it was finally necessary to fight. She knows why it is necessary to prevent another war. And her understanding of our war aims equips her to sit in the legislature of the United Nations, which must cope with the problems that stand in the way of these aims.

Mrs. Roosevelt is a controversial figure. That says something for her of itself. She has convictions, and she does not hesitate to fight for them. The New Deal era was richer for her influence in it. That influence was far greater than appeared publicly.

She has never been content to let things rest with mere pronouncement. She. as been active in organizations of people to get things done—in civic affairs, in labor, in politics. She was busily engaged in political activity the first time I had the privilege of meeting her, back in 1928, when she was working with the women's division in the 1928 Presidential campaign of Alfred E. Smith. Every day and all day she was at her desk in New York headquarters.

From an oddity in the White House, a woman who thought her own thoughts and lived her own life—and she was unique in this respect, certainly—she has won her way to a place never occupied in American life by the wife of a President, and perhaps never occupied by any other woman in our public life.

She suffered constant criticism, private and public, but it did not deter her. In this connection I can recall the criticism, particularly from men, I heard of her when I went back home to the South after the Roosevelts had been in the White House about a year.

What seemed to be troubling them was that she might be giving the women ideas. She might break down the pattern that the male liked to imagine for southern women—in the home, among the pots and pans and children, not bothering their pretty heads (properly tied up with a dust cloth) about what was going on in the world.

But the women seemed to like it, most of them. And so her influence with them grew, all through the Nation.

A scene comes back from the 1936 campaign. The Roosevelt special train was moving slowly into Columbus, Ohio, in a drizzling rain. Some of us were in the diner, looking out at the crowd massed on either side. There were many women among them. Mrs. Roosevelt sat at a table ahead of us. When the women spied her, as the train rolled slowly forward, up went their hands in an automatic salute. Their wet faces glowed. It was almost like a trained chorus, though it was a completely voluntary tribute, as the hands went up, one after another. There was the individual delight of spotting her.

That is what she takes to England with her.

How Much in Foreign Loans? To Whom? For How Long?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in view of rumors and reports that from 10 to 15 foreign countries in Europe, Africa, and Asia have reacted to the announcement that President Truman has agreed to a $4,004,000,000 loan to Britain at lower interest rates than American must pay to borrow the money to finance the loan, by preparing justifications in their own behalf for similar loans—some larger and some smaller—it is essential that before acting on any of the proposed foreign loans, Congress be supplied with a list of all of them.

It would be a reckless gamble with both America's solvency and her reservoirs of good will abroad if we were to deal generously with the first requests and then through force of circumstance be forced to close our coffers entirely to the requests of those submitting their needs less promptly.

Better by far to delay action on these stupendous foreign loans which may very well once again eventuate as outright gifts or uncollectible bad debts as in the very similar policies following World War I, until we have an opportunity to examine the full list of loan applicants and to measure them against our domestic financial conditions and our ability to meet all the requests of foreigners.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the following editorial

clipped from a recent issue of the Sioux Falls (S. D.) Daily Argus Leader:

HOW MUCH IN LOANS?

Perhaps it would be well for the United States to survey the entire picture before granting foreign loans.

We may be sure that the proposed credit to Great Britain isn't the only one that will be sought. Others will be asking for credit and their requests will be influenced to some extent at least by our general attitude.

The loan to Britain, in fact, will establish a precedent. Thus it appears that if we are to make loans we should comprehend the full prospects before embarking on the program.

From dispatches recently printed it appears that Russia expects to ask for $6,000,000,000, China $3,000,000,000, and France $1,000,000,000. This is a total of $10,000,000,000. Added to the $4,400,000,000 British proposal, we have a total of $14,400,000,000.

But, of course, that isn't the entire story. There are several lesser nations that might come to us with tin cups in their hands. These are likely to be sufficiently numerous to swell the total to $20,000,000,000.

So let's study the matter as a whole. Should we make these $20,000,000,000 in loans and, if so, where will we get the money?

Settlement of Disputes Between Management and Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WASHINGTON, IOWA, *November 24, 1945.*
DEAR MR. MEMBER OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C.:

Recent industrial developments warrant, in the opinion of this writer, this reminder to you on behalf of the American public. The growing disturbances between management and labor have now reached a point that our Government, including both the executive and legislative branches, must take some definite action to bring order out of this condition, if we make any serious pretenses that our system of government, that we so universally brag about, as adequate to serve the needs of the American public, be justified.

It is high time that our elected officials recognize the fact that they are by oath obligated to function for the benefits of the general public and that they are not in office to support the whims and selfish interest of special groups, including both management and labor. The fault no doubt is not all on one side. Both management and labor share in the blame. The most blame worthy of all is the government that tolerates the present lawless methods of settling disputes between management and labor.

The American people, slaphappy with all the economic and social novelties that have been foisted on them by their Government the past few years, have now exhausted their patience and can no longer tolerate being trampled on by selfish contending groups who display absolutely no interest in the general welfare of the American public. The public has served long enough as a guinea pig for these crack-brained social and economical experimenters in government. The public you are sworn to serve have had their interest shunted aside too long while Members of Congress and high executives cater to special groups for their own personal political gain. The public should not be expected longer to be subjected to hardships and inconveniences and loss by these growing strikes that now affect, not only privately owned business and their employees, but the public services as well, such as transportation and communication.

Even some of the strictly Government services have been interrupted and hampered by these strikes. Some orderly method must be established by law to settle these controversies between management and labor the same as other disputes, if we can seriously claim our democratic system to be adequate to serve our people.

The true test of whether or not an elected official is a statesman or just a politician, can be determined by his willingness, if he be a statesman, to work for the common good of all the American people, or if he be a politician, working for his own interest politically by catering to certain groups and supporting their interest regardless of the effect on the general public. Now is the time for you to measure yourself and determine which class you are in, whether you are a statesman or a politician, you will know the answer.

You know—any half-bright person must know—that the public interest can only be served by providing some other means than strikes to settle industrial disputes. This lawless method must be stopped and an orderly tribunal set up to dispose of these controversies if we are to survive as a prosperous and happy people or continue for any important length of time as a great nation. For this reason I ask you to give serious consideration to the development of some method to establish a tribunal that can settle these troubles and these strikes.

Very truly yours,

LOUIS J. KEHOE.

Crisis in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from an article by Charles J. V. Murphy from Life for December 17, 1945:

CRISIS IN CHINA

(By Charles J. V. Murphy)

As General of the Army George C. Marshall made ready to leave for China to be the new Ambassador, Secretary of State Byrnes suggested smoothly that American policy would of course continue to support the established government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek—"The most satisfactory base for a developing democracy."

To an American fresh from China this sounded about right, a nonweaseling statement of intent suited to the immediate emergency in Asia and American responsibility in the Pacific regions where our military power has smashed up the old balances. But it certainly was not the policy in October and November.

THE ARMY DECLARES A FURLOUGH

In October, American policy going into China met American policy going out. Thousands of soldiers, whose job (except for the small Air Force) had been to service and train the Chinese, jubilantly filled their barracks bags and crated their souvenirs. "Home by Christmas" was the password from the almost deserted flying fields of Chengtu, beyond Chungking, to the PRO offices in the Broadway Mansions on Suchow Creek in Shanghai. Except for air lifting four Chinese armies into north China, auctioning off the left-over equipment, setting up a small professional training mission and one or two other odd jobs, the Army figured its job was done. In fact its commander, Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, a fine officer, was not in China at all but in Washington, reportedly helping to reorganize the Army in China. Ambassador Patrick J. Hurley was there, too, debating whether to return to Chungking or resign.

* * * * *

While the Army was declaring itself a furlough, the First and Sixth Divisions of Marines, straight from the battlegrounds of the western Pacific and in full battle regalia, were moving into north China, at Tientsin, Peiping, and the port of Tsingtao in Shantung. Officially their job was to disarm the Japanese troops in north China. But in the back of their minds was the idea that they were also expected, on behalf of the Chinese Government, to maintain law and order—no fooling.

I visited the marines in Peiping, Tientsin, and Tsingtao in mid-October, and the contrast between their spit and polish and the Army was too glaring not to be noticed. Of course, they were combat troops, with a brisk, businesslike air. Many of their officers had served in China before the war and remembered it with love and, arriving from an ocean region devoid of ideological politics, they had escaped the rancor and cynicism that warped the judgment of so many Army men who knew only the quarrels, failures, and meanness of Chungking. The marines understood they were in China to finish a job.

In November I saw the marines again. Their morale was shot. They were fed up with the Chinese. They were interested in only two things: "When do we go home?" and "What the hell are we doing here anyway?"

It was hard to believe that the occasional crack of ancient German mausers in the Tientsin suburbs had produced this change overnight. The marines know a dangerous war when they see one and the splutter in the Chinese countryside scarcely raised an eyebrow. What unstrung the marines was the bewildering clamor back home to get the troops out of China and the crossfire of China's civil war. Marines get homesick, too, and when the erroneous report reached Tsingtao that even the New York Times wanted them out, they can hardly be blamed for thinking Americans had no business in China.

The unhappy fact is that just about this time the American Army commanders in China, at a down-to-brass-tacks conference in Peiping, discovered they were at a precipice. Unless they stopped the withdrawal or at least slowed it down, there would really be a civil war in China.

A QUEER BUSINESS

* * * * *

So far the total American casualties directly attributable to the civil war are two Marines slightly wounded by stray bullets and one killed. One young United States Army captain was shot down on a railroad platform 2 months ago by Communist troops on no apparent provocation. The Japanese, on the other hand, in 1,000 brushes a month with Communist guerrillas since the end of the war, have had nearly 3,000 casualties.

In short, the Japanese army in China, although much reduced, is still a going concern. * * *

But the conditions that produced this queer arrangement, once understood, help to explain the riddle of China—a riddle which this brief report cannot hope to unwrap.

Last summer the Communist trouble seemed under control. Chiang Kai-shek invited the Communist leader, Mao Tze-tung,

to leave his Yenan stronghold and come down to Chungking to try to settle their differences. For a long time the Generalissimo was loath to make the gesture. "Let him come to Chungking like any other Chinese citizen," he said. "Why should I have to treat the Communists as though they were a foreign power?" In the end, however, he unbent—"May I humbly invite you. * * * This involves our national welfare. Yours most anxiously."

* * * * *

In the course of the next 6 weeks Chiang and Mao met a number of times and when they were not meeting, their representatives were. The Communist leader proclaimed, "The war is over. We have entered the period of peace." His chief aide, Chou En-lai, said, "Mr. Chiang is not only the leader of China today. It is our hope that he will be the leader of China during the period of peace and national reconstruction."

By the end of September even the cynics in the Press Hostel, who had scoffed at the idea that Mao Tze-tung would ever come to Chungking or that, if he came, he would ever make terms with his enemy, had decided prospects were bright for a settlement.

* * * * *

WHAT THE COMMUNISTS WANT

* * * * *

What went wrong? Who started the shooting?

As to the issues: The Communists made a big point about popular elections, free speech, free press, punishing of traitors, freedom of political prisoners, and so on. China could certainly stand plenty of reform. But the Communists have no monopoly on democracy. Chiang Kai-shek and the government and the Kuomintang also want these fine things. The Communists and other opposition parties were accorded legal existence. Censorship was already abolished in Free China and practically nonoperative in the hitherto occupied area. In Chungking one of Chiang Kai-shek's former political prisoners, a left-wing professor who became a minor cause célèbre, boasted of his lecture audiences and press clippings. Chiang's cabinet, however grave its faults, made up of rich and poor, socialist and conservative, was and is the most liberal and honest in recent Chinese history. And the government, if the Communists had not asked for a postponement, last month would have called the long-promised constitutional convention to end the "political tutelage" (one-party Kuomintang government) and institute representative government. "The highest ideal of the national revolution," the Generalissimo cried on VJ-day, "is the participation of all people in national politics."

The real issues had nothing to do with the abstractions of democracy. As the price of participating in the government the Communists demanded absolute political control of five provinces north of the Yellow River (Shantung, Jehol, Hopeh, Chahar, Shansi) in addition to their so-called border regions of Shensi, Kansu, and Ninghsia, and the vice chairmanship in six others (Suiyuan, Honan, Anhwei, Hopeh, Kwangsi, and Kwangtung). This added up to working control of inner Mongolia and all north China north of the Yellow River, a strong minority position in the populous provinces between the Yellow River and the Yangtze. Moreover, they would be astride all the land approaches to Manchuria, in the government of which they demanded representation. On the military side, the Communists wanted the government to recognize an army of 48 divisions—nearly half the number which the government had earlier fixed as optimum for China's postwar force.

In 6 weeks of bargaining the government negotiators succeeded in cutting down the political demands by only one provincial governorship (Shansi) and six vice chairmanships (all south of the Yellow River), and the army demands by about half. The government was prepared to yield Mao Tze-tung three or four provincial chairmanships—but not in contiguous provinces—and with the proviso that the Communist choice would be a worthy and popularly elected administrator. It was further prepared to leave him with 20 divisions, but insisted these could not remain the standing army of the Communist provinces but must eventually enter the national forces. "To have done anything else," said Governor Chiang Chun, "would have meant setting up a special region in north China. This we could never accept. It would just be another kind of warlordism."

The Communists say that for them to give up their armies in advance of constitutional reform would be to invite annihilation by Kuomintang reactionaries. Hence, their intransigence can be partly explained by fear. But a power urge—no weaker certainly than they attribute to Chiang Kai-shek—would seem to underlie their granitic insistence upon political hegemony in north China apart from an adequate popular test. Plainly the major issues raised by the Yenan Communists have little to do with communism as political theory. And if they mean what they say about unification by any standards of political reasonableness they are fundamentally wrong when they insist upon a separate army. That can only lead not to one China but two—antagonistic in philosophy.

THE RACE FOR WEAPONS

Perhaps on this account the Chungking negotiations were doomed to fail. An air of unreality pervaded them from the start. Mao Tze-tung boasted of an army of 1,200,000 men and 2,200,000 militia; by Yenan's claim, the regions which its armies had liberated contained more than half of China's 400,000,000 people. Yenan claimed all north China, and in the Yangtze Valley its new Fourth Army was supposed to have the cities of Shanghai and Nanking surrounded.

But all the while the argument went on over control of China, it was plain to everyone that neither Government nor Yenan was in physical possession of the really important parts. The war's sudden end found the Government armies chiefly crammed in the west and south, ready to spring for the south China coast. The Communists, although spread over north China from the Yellow River bend to the sea, were actually diffused over the countryside. The Japanese had all the cities, ports, and railroads (which were then running); they had the Yellow and Yangtze River Valleys. And the Russians were in Manchuria.

With the Japanese control theoretically eliminated, a race developed for physical possession of these regions in advance of the final show-down. Another prize was also at stake—the weapons of the Japanese Army. The Japanese had about 1,100,000 troops in China—many more than was realized. They had, in addition to rifles, huge stocks of heavy machine guns, fieldpieces, trucks, signal equipment. These weapons were not indispensable to the Nationalist armies, 39 of whose divisions had been equipped or were being equipped with United States arms. What the Government mortally feared was that the Communists, who immediately demanded they be allowed to disarm the Japanese in north China, would reach them first.

Two moves were made by the Chinese Government, or on its behalf, to head off the Communists. General MacArthur in Tokyo ordered the Japanese to surrender only to Chiang Kai-shek's army. Then Gen. Ho Ying-chin warned Japanese commanders they would be held responsible for law and order in the regions in which they were garrisoned and for keeping the railroads open until the Government forces arrived. In other words, the Japanese were to hold on to the title deeds of occupied China until Government troops arrived.

Naturally, this arrangement was repugnant to Chiang Kai-shek and, with the idea of ending it as soon as possible, he asked the United States to help move his armies. Sometimes the Chinese demands seem crazy but that may be because these people think nothing is impossible for Americans. Chiang Kai-shek asked Wedemeyer to move 85 armies (about 3,000,000 men) by air. The American air staff, when it recovered from the shock, pared the number to four (about 92,000 men) and promised to complete the job by November 15. And the Navy, in addition to putting down the marines in north China, agreed to pick up several armies on the south China coast and move them by sea around the Communists to Manchuria and the Shantung Peninsula.

General Ho Ying-chin used the American air lift to pass four crack American-equipped and American-trained armies over the heads of the Communists into Shanghai, Nanking, Peiping, and Tientsin. He got them into all these cities without a fight. The much-advertised battle for the Yangtze never materialized.

DEVELOPMENT IN THE NORTH

Meanwhile, without American help, General Ho has pushed other armies, by rail and on foot, into the north. Their parallel movements he likens to the teeth of a comb. Four armies under General Sun Lien Tsung, following the Pinghan Railroad (Peiping-Hankow), have crossed the Yellow River and are within 200 miles of Peiping. There, for the present, they are stalled, partly by 100,000 Communists or so barring the way, and by most of the railroad track ahead being destroyed. To the east, along the Tsingpu (Tientsin-Pukow) Railroad, two more armies have pushed into Tsinan, capital of Shantung, and a third army, still farther to the east, has reached T'eng Hsian, in the same province. Compared to the United States sponsored divisions, these are all second-rate troops, but so far, considering the state of the railroads, they have done pretty well.

* * * * *

So far, despite their head start, the Communists have not achieved any notable successes in Shantung except to occupy Chefoo after the Japanese garrison departed and to rip up the railroad tracks. But the Japanese must be given credit for saving the province for the Central Government. So long as they were along the railroads and in Tsinan and Tsingtao, the Communists kept their distance, giving the government armies time to slip in.

* * * * *

North of the Great Wall the situation developed with the alarming twists and turns of an E. Phillips Oppenheim novel, and for a few anxious weeks Ho Ying-chin was afraid of losing not only Manchuria but two armies to boot.

Originally Chiang Kai-shek expected no trouble with the Russians in Manchuria. At the signing of the Sino-Russian pact in August, Stalin agreed to evacuate his army within 3 months after the Japanese surrender. There was no question then of the Chinese Communists getting in first, for none ever managed to crack the Japanese cordon.

The first unfriendly sign was noted in October when the Russians curtly refused to let government troops land at Dairen, whence a fine railroad runs to Mukden. Chiang Kai-shek decided not to make an issue of the rejection. With the Russians offering no objection, he made arrangements to go ashore instead at the smaller ports of Yingkow and Hulutao. But on arrival at Hulutao the transports were greeted by small-arms fire. The Red army, giving no notice, had departed and Chinese Communists held the port.

* * * * *

THE RACE FOR MANCHURIA

Denied Manchurian ports, the Thirteenth and Fifty-second Chinese armies put into Chinwangtao at the end of the Great Wall, brushed aside negligible Communist resistance and started up the coastal railroad to Mukden, 250 miles away. The withdrawal plan called for the Red army to be out of all Manchuria south of Harbin by November 25 and the rest by December 1. And from the first fear that the Russians might not want to leave Manchuria, the Chinese high command became alarmed they would leave too soon, allowing the Communists to slip in behind.

"If this business is to be done properly," a Chinese general complained, "the Russians must wait for us to catch up. I cannot imagine their being oblivious to the significance of their action."

With less than 70,000 men on the Mukden Road, Chiang Kai-shek took the only steps that would give him Manchuria without battle: He appealed first to his American friends and to Russia. From Wedemeyer he asked an extra air lift for another army as far as Changchun—a request which Wedemeyer had to refuse, his authority ending at the Great Wall. The Chinese asked for lend-lease air transports with volunteer American pilots—a transport version of AVG. While Washington was mulling over this proposal, Chiang Kai-shek took the only alternative left. He asked Stalin to hold the Red army in Manchuria a little longer. Stalin obliged—at a price, judging by Chungking rumors. The new withdrawal date is January 3.

If the situation below the Great Wall is weird, how much weirder is the one above, with the Russians holding the title deeds to Manchuria against their ideological cousins.

Many strategists think that Chiang Kai-shek has bitten off more than he can chew. It is argued that instead of trying to take north China and Manchuria simultaneously he should have been content with north China, moving up along the two railroads, clearing the country as he went, fastening his grip on Peiping and Tientsin, and gradually introducing the long-promised economic and political reforms.

Wedemeyer and McClure spoke up for the conservative approach, even at the expense of the temporary loss of Manchuria. But the Generealissimo, after weighing the alternatives, decided to try for both and his reasons, as paraphrased by one of his aides, went like this: "Militarily, it is dangerous to go into Manchuria. We may lose our two armies. Politically, we have no choice. Manchuria is part of China—and the restoration of our territorial integrity is one of our fundamental war aims. Not to attempt to take it back would be an admission of incompetence."

Moreover, the Government sees a special danger in Manchuria. A General Staff officer speculated, "Today the Communists are armed chiefly with rifles. They do not have many heavy machine guns. But Manchuria contains tremendous stocks of weapons, as well as one of the world's finest arsenals. Suppose the Communists should squeeze half a million men across the Great Wall. Suppose they should recruit half a million puppets. A million armed men, a first-class arsenal—it is something to think about."

The eventual outcome of the struggle for control of China is still in the balance, but the stakes the Chinese Communists are playing for are discernible. It is to build a military base around the Japanese-created heavy industry in Manchuria; to make a thick political and economic buffer out of North China; to keep the region between the Yellow River and the Yangtze as a friction area. "It is very simple," says General Hsiao Yu-shu, General Ho's chief of staff. "A castle, a wall, and a moat."

Chinese intelligence, admittedly scanty, places the present Communist strength, counting nonideological partisans, at about 600,000 men, collected in half a dozen big pockets; between 300,000 to 400,000 are armed with rifles of one kind or another. Since the Japanese surrender they appear to have collected between 50,000 and 150,000 rifles, as well as 30 or 40 Japanese field pieces, which were first put to use, to Chiang Kai-shek's alarm, in the little battle for the Suiyuan corridors. According to marine intelligence, they have also enlisted several thousand Japanese troops.

THE COMMUNISTS AND THE FUTURE

But over the long pull and in the absence of direct help from Russia, the Communist position is hopeless. The government has the prestige; it has the more experienced commanders, the better troops; its United States equipped divisions carry much more firepower than the Communists' best, and, of course, it has plenty of bombers and strafers which, in deference to American opinion, it has not used. On the military scoreboard the Communist armies have fallen far short of their advance billing. Despite their claims of having carried 69 percent of the weight of the Japanese Army during the war, they do not appear to have been any more than a nuisance, though a constant and nagging one, especially along the north China railroads, to the Japanese. (Okamura says total Japanese casualties in 7 years' skirmishing with Communist bands were only 25,000 killed and wounded.) In the so-called "civil war" their lack of military success so far seems almost queer. It is the same on the political side. The much-publicized underground armies in the cities are as yet inert; no deep people's note of defiance has sounded from the myriad villages in the Peiping plain although there are plenty of Communist soldiers around. The fact has somehow been overlooked that north China is not natively communistic; nor are the Communists natively north Chinese. In the last decade they have wandered all around the periphery of China—first the southeast, then the southwest and northwest to Yenan. Now once again they are folding their tents and moving into Inner Mongolia, another fortress.

This much seems clear: if we stop helping the government and if the Russians cut off Yenan, the government in time will finish the Communists, although the war would be futile and desultory. If we help the government over the crest and if the Russians meanwhile can be assured we seek no special advantage inside China, then the Communists will have to be reasonable or face a quick end.

Why assume we must clash with Russia over China and/or Manchuria? In this situation the Kremlin seems ready to do business with Chiang Kai-shek. It did so last summer, when T. V. Soong went to Moscow, and again last week over Manchuria. The logic favors the assumption that Russia desires peace in Asia—a peace impossible without a unified China. And it is quite possible that the Russians all along have been expecting us to do more; that the flurry over Manchuria was a hedging operation. And if meanwhile the international left-wingers keep after Chiang Kai-shek's head, the apparent inconsistency may only be a bargaining technique. The Yenan statesmen, with their talk of a 10-year war, of not needing or ever having any outside help, would seem to be discounting that possibility.

In the end, of course, if China is ever to be a great nation in a substantive sense, the Chinese must resolve this question of national unity among themselves, preferably without further violence. There is plenty of room for self-improvement. All China pulses with a pent-up desire for reform that neither the Kuomintang nor the Communists alone can satisfy.

American apologists of the Chinese Communists have painted a picture of a prosperous, happy agrarian democracy under popular Communist auspices based on popular government spreading through the Chinese villages. It is no longer possible to accept these pictures as wholly authentic. Instead, as the Communists make ready for battle, come tales of the wholesale killing of village elders, the ruthless impressment of young men, an apparently calculated program to rend the centuries-old fabric of the Chinese social life as constructed around the village and the family. They seem to have abandoned their interim war policy of a slow, deliberate communizing village by village. In destroying and blockading the railroads they have inhibited the paths of China's reconstruction; a terrible economic problem has been made nearly insoluble. Even so sympathetic a journalist as Mr. Tillman Durdin of the New York Times left the Communist region around Kalgan with an uncomfortable memory of scared, silent people and confident commissars.

But whatever happens to the Communists—whether they eventually enter the democratic state supposedly desired by all Chinese or whether by one of those peculiar accommodations common to Chinese politics they are allowed to persist as a splinter state—their impress will remain on Chinese life. As no other party has done, not even the Kuomintang of Dr. Sun Yat-sen's great hour, they have awakened the political consciousness of the Chinese peasant; in many parts of China they have broken the crushing grip of the rapacious landlord and the tax collector. At their best, the Communists introduced a genuine democracy into the bottom of Chinese life—the bottom where the hundreds of millions are. And the very fact of their survival, beginning with their epic retreat from Kiangsi and Kwangtung to Yenan, attests the strength of their human, if not their doctrinal, roots.

But the flaw in the Yenan case as regards democracy is the flaw in the Communist case everywhere; the Chinese Communists decline to submit to the first condition of representative government: the risk of a possibly disadvantageous majority. To be sure, the same charge has and can be made against Chiang Kai-shek. He, too, has postponed many, perhaps too many, elections. He, too, is on trial, not only in China but before the world. The fact that he has started down the path of reform leaves the Communists unmoved. They say he is too late with too little; too fearful of disturbing the ancient restraints of Chinese life. A wise old revolutionary who marched under Dr. Sun Yat-sen says: "Ah, but that is not the weakness of Chiang Kai-shek alone. It is the weakness of China." The point is that Chiang Kai-shek is prepared to put his Government to the trial of popular elections. And although Chinese politics extends over extremes as wide as those found in other countries, only the Communists refuse to take him at his word.

Statement on the General Housing Bill

By Ferd Kramer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 19), 1945

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from New

York [Mr. WAGNER], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very informative statement on the general housing bill, S. 1592, which was presented by Mr. Ferd Kramer before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on December 6, 1945. Mr. Kramer is president of the Metropolitan Housing Council, of Chicago, and a past president of the Chicago Mortgage Bankers Association. His views are based on many years of experience with housing problems, and I urge Senators to give his statement careful consideration and study.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My name is Ferd Kramer. I am in the real estate and mortgage banking business in Chicago. I am a past president of the Chicago Mortgage Bankers Association, and am now president of the Metropolitan Housing Council. The Housing Council is a citizens' group interested in all phases of housing and city planning in the Chicago area. It is a broadly representative body, including builders, labor, realtors, industrialists, mortgage bankers, sociologists, architects, and educators. I am here representing that organization.

Before discussing specific titles of the proposed General Housing Act, I would like to emphasize the extreme urgency of the early passage of a national housing bill. We are on the threshold of one of the greatest building booms in history. Without a bill like Senate bill 1592, that building will take place largely on the outskirts of our cities; the slum areas will be enlarged; and our cities, already rotten at the core, will face bankruptcy from ever increasing loss of taxpayers and tax values to the suburbs. The bill we are discussing will give cities the means to arrest that flight and plan and build stable communities.

It is true that at the present time, the shortages of labor and materials have been curtailing construction, but the great productive capacity of our country and the reservoir of manpower which the war's end is rapidly making available, will change this picture in a year's time. There is, therefore, no time to be lost in encouraging cities to acquire and clear their blighted areas to make them ready for redevelopment by private enterprise and by local housing authorities.

To take up the specific provisions of the bill, I should like to say that title I, which makes permanent the coordination of all Government housing activities is excellent as far as it goes. It would be a serious step backward to return to the time when 16 or 17 Government agencies dealt with housing without reference to each other. However, I would like to see the bill give more power to the Administrator. During the early days of war housing, when I was a part of the Division of Defense Housing Coordination, we learned that the power to coordinate was virtually no power at all. The bill charges the Administrator with the responsibility of an over-all policy. However, we have all seen that it is the action of the particular department involved that creates the policy, and that, therefore, policy control without direct administrative control may be futile. I should like to illustrate this point. The general policy of the Government is to hold the line against inflation. The Federal Housing Administration, one of the constituent agencies of the NHA, has been valiantly adhering to this policy. Their national appraisal system is doing its part in holding in check the wild inflation that is now going on in real estate. In contrast to the policy of the FHA, however, another constituent agency of the NHA, namely, the Federal home-loan bank, is following a different course. Although they insure the deposits of many savings and loan associations through the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, they are standing by while these savings and loan associations make their loans based on appraisals which are following market prices in many cases. Thus, you have two arms of the same agency following diametrically opposed policies. In other words, although the policy is to hold the line, the action of at least one of these agencies is not in accordance with this policy. If an administrator doesn't have the right to hire and fire, as well as budgetary controls, his operation can be largely thwarted. It seems to me that governmental agencies should be run along sound administrative lines just as is an efficient private corporation. It would be unheard of in a private corporation to have heads of different departments off on their own without any control from the head of that corporation.

Housing is coming of age. It is our second largest industry. The entire economic welfare of our country hinges on its smooth operation. I would like to see the Administrator of the National Housing Agency a position of Cabinet rank as is the Secretary of Agriculture, the only industry that is larger. I, therefore, urge that in the interests of efficient governmental operation and in recognition of the importance of housing that title I be strengthened.

I am heartily in favor of the provisions in title II. Research by the Housing Administrator to reduce housing costs will be of the greatest service both to the housing industry and the people who need houses. Aid to local communities for market analyses should again help both private industry and the public. We can still remember the situation in the twenties when cities were far overbuilt with dwellings for the upper-income brackets and private investors lost millions of dollars. With an accurate knowledge of the market, the builder will know where the demand is and gage his operations accordingly. It is self-evident that this information would be of incalculable value to mortgage bankers.

It seems to me that titles VI and VII offer the greatest contributions in this bill. These are "musts." There are people who oppose this bill on the allegation that it is a public housing bill. On the contrary, title VI gives private enterprise the greatest if not the first opportunity it has ever had to rebuild our decayed communities. I know from my own experience in Chicago real estate that the minimum cost of buying and clearing slum land is $42,000 an acre. I know of one project which cost well over $100,000 an acre; and yet, most builders figure they cannot afford to pay more than $10,000 to $20,000 an acre and still rent homes even as low as $15 to $18 a room per month. I am very much in favor of the assistance provided in title VI which will put thousands of acres of favorably located land on the market to be sold or leased to private interests at prices they can afford to pay.

Even with the kind of help provided in title VI, private enterprise cannot at the present time, build for those whose incomes are under $1,800 a year. Therefore, in my opinion, title VII providing aid for low-rent public housing, is most necessary. I am convinced that public housing does not compete with private enterprise. In my business, we have financed more than a thousand war houses. None of these houses could be built for less than $6,000. I have checked the credit reports of those who rented or purchased these houses. None of them had earnings of less than $2,300 a year. Again in the rental field, private enterprise cannot touch the $6 to $7 a room per month rentals which public housing can offer. When our cities are rebuilt, some of the land must be devoted to this type of housing and I am satisfied that the returns will be well worth the public expenditure both in human and property values.

It seems to me that the authors of this bill, in their desire to avoid having the bill considered just another public-housing measure, went too far in their efforts to weight it with aids to private enterprise. In my opinion, some of these so-called aids are unsound and highly inflationary.

To be specific—title IV, which provides for 95-percent loans is unnecessary. I think it is a mistake to liberalize financing at a time when both mortgage and equity money are available in the greatest amounts ever known in our history. The problem is not one of the availability of capital or the interest rate. During the last 10 years, the cost of money has declined 40 percent. The problem is rather one of the scarcity of labor, material, and excessive and uncertain construction costs. The Housing Administrator, with additional power and the ability to carry on research provided in this bill, can do much to solve this problem.

Another attempt to conciliate private enterprise which will be highly dangerous and an inflationary measure, is paragraph IV (b) of title III. This title would permit savings and loan associations to lend up to 15 percent of their assets on mortgages, without regard to type, location, or amount. If many of the savings and loan associations took advantage of this clause, the total amount of unsound loans being made would be large enough in total volume to become extremely unhealthy, and might force other unthinking lenders to reach for these loans in order to stay in business. This, of course, would be a powerful stimulus to the inflationary spiral. It would mean unsound loans and more foreclosures. We would soon have to be bailed out by another gigantic home owners' loan operation such as we had in the thirties. I think this is a dangerous further loosening of the already too loose controls of savings and loan associations whose deposits, after all let us remember, are insured by the Government.

I have confined my comments only to those portions of the bill which lie in my special field of competence and immediate interest. But, do not think that these criticisms indicate disapproval of this bill. I think it is a great step forward for this country, and I hope it will be passed without delay. It takes a long time to condemn, clear, and prepare land for rebuilding. I believe it has been 2 or 3 years since the first redevelopment bills were presented to the Senate. We have already lost much valuable time. I urge that housing be recognized as the industry of paramount importance, that it is by strengthening title I; that the unsound parts of titles III and IV be changed, and then that the bill be passed as quickly as possible. The time for talking about slum clearance is past—for the sake of the millions of people in this country who need homes and the tens of millions who will want jobs, the time to start is now.

Controlled Atoms or Controlled Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 19), 1945

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Controlled Atoms or Controlled Lives," by James H. McGraw, Jr., presi-

dent of the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., of New York.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTROLLED ATOMS OR CONTROLLED LIVES

Since August 6 when the first atomic bomb was released over Hiroshima, the American people have been subjected to a continuous barrage of pronouncements on the use and control of atomic energy. Some of this comment has been strident, and much of it conflicting. A considerable portion of it has been of sincere and constructive excellence. It has not been easy to separate the wise counsel from the merely noisy, and it is small wonder that the minds of many are troubled and confused.

However, the sheer mass of discussion poured into press and microphone has awakened us all to the gravity of the issue. In terms of any problem on which Americans ever have been called to exercise a judgment—This is it.

Even the dullest now recognizes that atomic weapons hang over modern civilization like the sword of Damocles, and understands in some measure how fragile and taut is the hair of political balance that holds it suspended.

From this point on, we need the coolest and most carefully considered judgment that can be brought to bear. Discussion highly charged with emotionalism will but increase the tensions both at home and abroad, and render wholly insoluble a delicately intricate problem.

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM?

The major outlines of that problem now are coming into focus in understandable terms:

1. The scientists have opened up a new and virtually unlimited storehouse of energy, and the engineers have discovered how to turn it into a military explosive incomparably more powerful than any we have known. We know that this energy may also be used to produce heat for useful power, and we suspect that the radio-active substances produced by the process in hitherto unimagined quantity may also have medical, industrial, and other constructive applications.

2. Terrifying as have been the demonstrations of the atomic bomb thus far, we know that they are as nothing in comparison with its potential destructiveness. The explosive force of individual bombs can be increased tremendously, and means for their effective delivery to predetermined targets in wholesale quantity already are at hand. The experts tell us that no practical means of interception can be devised, and that reprisal in kind probably will be the only answer to an enemy attack with atomic weapons.

3. So far as we can see now, even successful retaliation would be at best an answer of hollow effect. Any two nations each having wholesale stock piles of bombs could accomplish the practical destruction of each other. Since a first treacherous blow might well constitute an enormous advantage, a nation actuated by a ruthless urge to conquest or revenge might have the best chance of survival. But since the widest possible dispersal of bombs and launching units would be dictated by the strategy of atomic weapons, it is doubtful that one nation could destroy another without itself suffering destruction. On both sides the major centers of population could be wiped out, and the nation of least concentrated industrialization and commerce would suffer least. However, no one can be sure that the concentrated explosion of as many as 20,000 atomic bombs would not poison the atmosphere of the world to an extent that would be fatal to great masses of population, not only within the country bombarded, but perhaps in the country which launched them.

4. The problem is further complicated because, so far as we know now, any large-scale commercial use of atomic energy as a power source is more or less inextricably linked to a potential military use. It is true that, if atomic power becomes economically feasible (which is by no means certain for a long time to come), it would require only low-grade concentrates of fissionable material, which would need further elaborate and costly processing before reaching explosive potential. But the process of producing such low-grade concentrates constitutes perhaps two-thirds of the industrial effort required to make effective bombs. It follows, then, that if nations were to equip themselves to produce large quantities of low-grade concentrates for power generation, the effort required to develop large-scale bomb production would be materially reduced. Moreover, the maintenance of an effective inspection to police agreements not to produce bombs might be forbiddingly difficult if atomic power generation were allowed.

5. In addition to the major problem posed by the use of atomic bombs in international war, any nation which produces or possesses such bombs, or the fissionable materials with which they are loaded, faces still another in the danger of their falling under the control of paranoid elements in its own population.

WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO ABOUT IT?

We face the hard fact that we have produced a weapon capable of destroying whole nations—perhaps even the whole world. Although we were importantly aided in its development by the nationals of other countries, we, together with Great Britain and Canada, now must take the initiative in deciding what shall be done with it. We have only two choices. We can try to keep this weapon as a monopoly of our own, or we can try to place it under broad international control.

CAN WE KEEP IT TO OURSELVES?

If we know one certain fact about the atomic bomb, it is that it cannot long be held as a monopoly of those nations which produced it.

If Nazi Germany had succeeded in developing the weapon first, it probably would have attempted to achieve world dominion, with utter destruction as an alternative. Such a course is not within our range of choice. It violates every principle for which we stand.

Much reckless nonsense has been uttered concerning the inability of other nations to master the scientific, engineering, and industrial problems involved. It is the virtually unanimous opinion of those who worked on the project that several nations today are fully equipped in science, engineering, and industrial organization to produce atomic bombs and to provide the means for launching them. At least one of these nations, Russia, has also access to an ample supply of the necessary raw materials. The only debate is over whether it would take 3 or 5 or 10 years for her to marshal her resources to produce bombs in multiple thousands. Once such an atomic race were on, we have no reason to believe that Russia might not divert more resources to the task than we ourselves should be willing to put into it.

Additional nonsense is talked as to how we might attempt to cope with the problem of living in a world in which mutually suspicious or hostile nations faced each other, with stores of atomic weapons on both sides. We hear talk of dispersing our cities and even of moving underground. No one has seriously reckoned the difficulty or the cost of following such counsel of despair Still less has anyone appraised the neurotic effect upon men's minds of living by any such preposterous formula, under continuously mounting tension day after day, and year after year.

Certainly, if we could find no way to prevent the competitive production of atomic weapons, we should be driven at least to the selective dispersion of our bomb-launching facilities, of certain key industrial establishments, and of our centers of government and governing personnel. We should be forced, also, to change our traditional requirement that only Congress can commit us to active war. We should be forced to organize ourselves as a police or military state, with our scientists regimented and muzzled, with all of us under constant surveillance against the smuggling and planting of time bombs, and constantly alerted against attack through the air.

Before we commit ourselves to any such intolerable procedure, we should be mad not to explore all possible means for making it unnecessary.

THE ONLY FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVE IS EFFECTIVE INTERNATIONAL CONTROL

This cardinal principle has been recognized in the statement of November 15, issued jointly by President Truman and Prime Ministers Attlee and King. Their statement frankly concedes that against atomic weapons there can be no adequate military defense, that no nation can command a monopoly of such weapons, that responsibility for eliminating atomic energy as an instrument of war and for devising safeguards over its use for the advancement of science and other peaceful and humanitarian ends rests upon the civilized nations of the world.

They propose that a commission be set up at once under the United Nations Organization to make recommendations: (a) for extending between all nations the exchange of basic scientific information for peaceful ends, (b) for control of atomic energy to the extent necessary to insure its use only for peaceful purposes, (c) for the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and of all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction, and (d) for effective safeguards by way of inspection and other means to protect complying states against the hazards of violations and evasions.

Already criticism is leveled at the wording of the statement, at alleged omissions, at the wisdom of choosing the United Nations Organization as the medium through which to seek agreement in view of the weaknesses of the UNO Charter.

None of these issues should be crucially important. What matters is that an invitation has been issued in good faith for the nations of the world to meet and decide upon means for assuring the elimination of weapons, the existence of which no one can afford to tolerate.

The decision cannot be other than international; it will require the best thought of the best brains the world can muster. The smaller nations have an equal stake with the large, and from them may well come the most fruitful suggestions. But Russia now holds the key to the success or failure of our proposal. If she accepts our invitation, no other nation will refuse.

Alternatively, there will be an international armament race paced by atomic weapons. It will mean an end of free science, a severe policing and regimentation of international travel and trade, and innumerable restrictions upon those individual freedoms which we have just fought so desperately to preserve. This is the dismal prospect if we fail to arrive at a genuinely international accord on the control of atomic energy. But even this interval would promise to last only for an uneasy period, until someone started pressing the push buttons on the panelboards of extinction.

The only permanent solution lies in finding means to eliminate war itself. That we cannot hope to achieve overnight, but we can, and do hope that the nations will now agree to eliminate atomic weapons and their radio-active byproducts as instruments of war.

If they do that, we can move forward more surely to the constructive development of

the incalculably valuable resources that science has newly opened to our use. And we can hope also for a progressive improvement in international understanding.

Unless the nations can reach agreement on this paramount issue of atomic energy, it is difficult to conceive of any vital issue on which they might agree.

JAMES H. MCGRAW, Jr.,
President, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc.

Ten Million Silver Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I am transmitting for the consideration of my colleagues a letter from John E. Kelly, consulting mining engineer of Pittsfield, Mass., and an article by Donovan C. Brownfield, of Rialto, Calif., which was published in the California Mining Journal of December 1945, advocating the coinage of 10,000,000 silver dollars to commemorate the victorious conclusion of World War II and 10,000,000 50-cent pieces to commemorate Pearl Harbor. This seems to me a most excellent and timely suggestion, since they will neither tarnish nor lose value with the years, and their coinage will represent an important profit to the Government.

PITTSFIELD, MASS., *December 16, 1945.*
Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Chairman, Committee on Coinage, Weights and Measures, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHITE: I enclose herewith a page from the December 1945 issue of the California Mining Journal, and if you have not already seen it, beg to call to your attention the suggestion of Mr. Donovan C. Brownfield that silver coins in the denominations of $1 and 50 cents, respectively, be struck to commemorate the victorious conclusion of the war.

This seems to me a most excellent and timely suggestion. It is a patriotic gesture to which there can hardly be objection, and will provide a memento that will neither tarnish nor lose value with the years. The coinage in itself will represent an important profit to the Government and a further incentive will be, as Mr. Brownfield points out, that the coins will remain in the hands of the public, yet not in circulation, so that they will not prevent the issuance and use of the ordinary dollar and fractional silver pieces.

Hardly a month passes without the issue of commemorative postage stamps, while it is several years, since Mr. SOMERS was chairman of your committee, that a commemorative coin has been struck.

Trusting that you will find the suggestion of merit, I am

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. KELLY.

VICTORY COIN TO AID SILVER MINES

Total victory has been won. We are now entering the war against want. We are pledged to full employment and preservation of the free enterprise system. In this new war mining should play as vital a role as in the bloody struggle just concluded. Given a fair price and a large demand for metals, our mines can be operated at capacity. This will bring back the prospector, it will give employment to thousands, and will result in the development of much of the West which now is desert wasteland. This is true free enterprise. It is the type of enterprise which fires the imagination and plants the seed of determination within men. This is the spirit which has built our country and which will continue to improve it.

STABLE MARKET ESSENTIAL

For profitable operation most of our western mines depend upon silver and gold to supply an operating profit. This is not only true of our strictly gold and silver mines, it is also true of our copper, lead, zinc, and other mines as in most of these there is a by-product of gold or silver which in many cases spells the difference between loss and profit. Therefore it seems that, if the public is to have cheap base metals, that an unlimited market at a fair and stable price must be established for gold and silver.

At present most, if not all, of our marginal mines are operating solely because of the premiums which are now being paid for production of such metals by our Government. In other words, they survive only because of a Government subsidy. If this subsidy should be removed, they must shut down, and in doing so create further unemployment.

PRICE, SUPPLY, AND DEMAND

Gold is an international medium of exchange having a fixed price of approximately $35 an ounce. Silver is a commodity whose price in the world market is dependent upon the law of supply and demand. At present our Government is paying approximately 71 cents an ounce for it which is considerably above world price, but this could be changed or reduced at any time. Therefore, as silver is a commodity we must create a demand for it if we are to keep the price high enough to permit profitable operation of our western mines.

To me, it seems that anything which will increase the demand for silver should be given consideration and for that reason I am making the suggestion which seems would create a demand for millions of ounces of our silver at no cost to the taxpayer.

SURPLUS SILVER INTO COINS

In 1928 our Government coined 10,000 silver half dollars which are known as the Hawaiian Commemorative half dollar. At present these coins command a price from collectors ranging from $20 to $30 each. In 1892–93 our Government coined a total of 2,500,000 half dollars which were known as the Columbian half dollar. While these latter being issued in greater number command only a small premium the fact that one seldom, if ever finds one in circulation testifies to the fact that our people have a hobby of holding onto rare and unusual coins.

Certainly we have nothing greater which to commemorate than the conclusion of this war with total victory thereby making the four freedoms to which we are pledged, practical. Therefore, it seems that our Government should coin and issue for general circulation not less than 10,000,000 silver dollars commemorating total victory and referring to the four freedoms. In addition we should coin and circulate not less than 10,000,000 silver half dollars in commemoration of Pearl Harbor as it was this act which brought us into the war. If this should be done we would place in circulation approximately 12,000,000 ounces of silver which should go a long way towards taking up our surplus of that metal.

OTHER ISSUES LATER

If coinage of such a commemorative series of coins were limited to a definite number with the understanding that no others would be minted it seems probable that our people would take them eagerly as such a coin would be something to be prized in the future. In the past there have been many commemorative coins issued but all of these have been sold to the public at a premium and because of this, few other than coin collectors have purchased them. Should public interest and demand for such coins prove great the Government might later issue a series of four coins each commemorating one of the "four freedoms." Certainly there could be no better way of keeping these "four freedoms" in our minds than having them stamped upon the coins which are within our pockets or in our strong boxes.

In conclusion it seems to me that if we are to have a gold and silver base for our currency we must create a demand for metallic coins in our people. Commemorative coins should greatly aid in making our people money conscious and a people who are money conscious will not easily be led into debasing their money. With a public demand for hard money our mines should be able to do their part toward creating jobs and bring prosperity to the West.

Benefits to Veterans Under the Amended Servicemen's Readjustment Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARION T. BENNETT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, secured enactment of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, sometimes referred to as the GI bill of rights. For the first time in history, while war was still in progress, our Government undertook to make plans for readjustment to civilian life of its millions of potential veterans. Obviously, its efforts and decisions had to be based on estimates. It was an experiment. Not all factors could be anticipated. We have just amended that law, liberalizing its provisions. Other amendments will doubtless have to be made from time to time to correct inequalities. But, by and large, it is a good piece of work and is so recognized by all students of the question. Endorsements I have received and which my committee has received for its work from all veterans' organizations and from individual veterans and their dependents convince me that this law is both effective and appreciated.

I take this opportunity to point out the manner in which we have attempted to eliminate the "bugs" which have shown up in administration of the law.

ELIGIBILITY

To be eligible for any or all of the benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act the veteran must have been released from service under conditions other than dishonorable and must either have served not less than 90 days between September 6, 1940, and the end of the war, or have been discharged for a service-connected disability. Rank in service or age makes no difference.

EDUCATION

At any time within 4 years after discharge or termination of the war, which-

ever is later—provided that all such programs must be completed before 9 years after the end of the war—any eligible veteran may receive education for a period of 1 year plus the length of time he was in active service—between September 16, 1940, and the end of the war, with a maximum of 4 years.

To continue for the full period for which he is eligible the veteran must meet the standards established by the school or institution in which he enrolls.

The veteran may choose any approved school that will accept him, and the course he desires to study. He can go to school in any State, but the cost of transportation from his home to the school is his own expense.

The Federal Government pays for all books, supplies, and the customary tuition fees up to $500 per year. While in school he will be paid $65 per month, if single, $90 if married, or has dependents, for subsistence or living expenses. This is enough to help the veterans to help themselves and there is no law or regulation against taking outside, part-time work to supplement this assistance.

This opportunity is not confined to ordinary schools or colleges. He may take short, intensive, more expensive, specialized courses, the maximum tuition, however, being limited to $500. He may elect to take vocational or apprentice training, in which case part of his maintenance will come from the employer.

Many veterans, while in service, learned the value of correspondence courses. These courses can now be pursued after return to a civilian status, but in this case he does not receive subsistence allowances. The cost of any such course will be established by contract, with a maximum limit of $500.

Education may be commenced while on terminal leave, but no payment is allowed for living expenses until after the leave ends.

LOANS

A veteran may apply for loans from nearly every type of lending agency. His honorable discharge is his certificate of eligibility. Other discharges must be passed upon by the Veterans' Administration.

Property loans may be at the figure negotiated with the lending agency, with the limitation that they may not exceed the reasonable value of the property, or the appraisal of an experienced appraiser living in the community where the property is situated, employed by the Veterans' Administration.

Interest on loans is limited to 4 percent. Home loans may not run for more than 25 years, farm loans not over 40 years, and business loans are limited to 10 years.

There are conditions that property on which loans are to be made must be suitable for the purpose for which it is to be used—for a dwelling, for farming operations or for a business location. It must also be shown in connection with loans for farms or for business that there is a reasonable likelihood that the veteran will succeed in his undertaking as a farmer or as a businessman.

When the loan is finally completed the Government guarantees one-half—50 percent—of the amount loaned, with a maximum guaranty of $4,000 on real-estate loans and of $2,000 on nonreal-estate—chattel or personal property—loans. Thus a veteran is now eligible for an $8,000 loan on real estate or a $4,000 loan for business, with half of each guaranteed.

The veteran may obtain a loan for the purchase of property to be occupied as his home, or to make repairs, improvements, or alterations on a home he already owns.

The veteran may obtain a loan to purchase land, buildings, livestock, machinery, and supplies, if he anticipates engaging in farming.

The veteran who seeks to enter business may obtain a loan to buy land, buildings, supplies, tools, equipment, inventory, and stock in trade, or for the alteration of realty to be used in his business.

Many regulations by the Veteran's Administration must be changed, but no great delay is expected; and the new simplified procedure should speed up loans considerably and eliminate much red tape which has existed.

This does not mean that any veteran can go into any bank or to any lending agency and get a loan up to $8,000 merely for the asking. He goes in as any other person and makes his deal. Of course, the lending agency and the Government want some reasonable assurances of the soundness of the loan—of the ability to repay it and of the value of the security.

EMPLOYMENT

Assistance is provided in placing veterans on jobs, and in each State a veteran is on duty as placement officer in Employment Service offices to protect the interests of veterans.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

In the event a veteran, after complying with State law relating to registration for work, cannot obtain employment, he may receive $20 per week unemployment allowance—for not to exceed, however, 52 weeks. The period for receipt of this benefit is fixed by length of service—24 weeks for the first 90 days in service, and 4 weeks for each month of service beyond 90 days. In other words, 10 months or more of service entitles a veteran to the maximum.

Restrictions are rigid enough to discourage "gold-bricking" and prevent duplication.

If a veteran goes out as his own boss in business, a profession, or on a farm, an allowance is provided to bring his net income up to $100 per month, with a limit of 12 monthly payments. Application for this benefit must be made within 2 years after discharge or the end of the war, whichever is the later date.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Under this act, as amended, Americans who served with our allies may receive benefits hereunder if they now live in the United States and have not applied for or received similar benefits from the Nation with whose Army service was rendered.

The Veterans' Administration is given full power to obtain space by building, purchase, or lease.

Veterans needing artificial appliances can obtain them, with training in their use, and the payment of necessary travel in connection therewith.

Section 1505 of the original act provided that in the event any payment in the nature of adjusted compensation is later authorized, benefits and payments received, including payments made by the Government on defaulted loans, under the act were to be deducted from such compensation. This section has now been repealed. However, this repeal is not to be construed as a promise or assurance that, in order to avoid inequalities, such action may not be taken by a future Congress. It probably will be. The present Congress cannot bind a future Congress.

MISCELLANEOUS

At the time the Servicemen's Readjustment Act was amended, Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, which relates solely to veterans with service-connected disabilities, was liberalized. Veterans with service-connected disabilities, to whom we owe our greatest obligation, are given training and education to help them overcome physical handicaps and enable them to become self-supporting.

Payments for these men and women while in training have been too low. These disabled veterans will now receive, in addition to all training expenses, $105 if single; $115 with a dependent—wife, child, or parent. Ten dollars per month is allowed for one child, $7 for each additional child, and an allowance of $15 for a dependent parent.

CONCLUSION

This presentation must necessarily just hit the high spots of the amended law. It does not take into consideration the vast detail relating to other veterans' legislation for which my committee has been responsible. It does not enter into any discussion of veterans priorities for housing, surplus property, and so forth, which is not under the jurisdiction of my committee. For detailed information on veterans' problems the veteran should make inquiry of one of the numerous sources available to him. He can contact his local post of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the Regular Veterans Association, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, or some other recognized veterans' organization. He can take his problem up with the State service officer or his representatives in the various counties. Also, I have secured contact offices of the United States Veterans' Administration for the Sixth Congressional District. One of these is in the north end of the district at 521 Ohio Street, Sedalia, Mo. Another is in the south end of the district at Springfield. A third will serve the center of the district and will soon be established at Nevada. These offices are prepared to advise veterans on their numerous rights under the law. Within the next few months a subregional office of the Veterans' Administration will be established at Springfield to give even more elaborate service. The regional office of the Veterans' Administration for western Missouri is at Kansas City.

Many veterans of our various wars, and their dependents, prefer to write

their Congressman who is in Washington to serve them. These letters should be addressed to Congressman MARION T. BENNETT, 1037 House Office Building, Washington, D. C. The inquiry should contain the full name of the serviceman and his serial number. If he is discharged and now has a veteran status and a claim number established with the Veterans' Administration, the letter should contain that number so the file can be found and examined. It is not necessary to send a copy of a discharge unless requested. The wise veteran, incidentally, will have his discharge recorded and photostated. It is his passport to benefits from the Federal Treasury greater than those afforded the veterans of any other country in the history of the world. Veterans' benefits will be the largest fixed item of cost in Government for the next 50 years, exclusive of military preparations and service of the national debt. This is tough on the taxpayers, but it is part of the cost of war. America is grateful to her sons who have borne the brunt of battle and must not undertake to escape responsibility for their needs occasioned by such sacrifice.

Swayed by Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 18, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past few years I have been characterized as a labor baiter, cussed uphill and down by some labor leaders, labor politicians, labor racketeers, labor organizers, radio commentators, columnists, and editors, because of my advocacy of certain amendments to the National Labor Relations Act, the introduction of bills which would have protected employees not only against employers but against coercion, intimidation, and violence from professional labor organizers.

The Detroit Free Press has on occasion handed me not a little criticism, because I insisted that so-called labor legislation should be so framed as to insure employees and employers "equal justice under law." At last, at long last, the Free Press, having under its nose the latest example of the destructive effects of labor leadership, begins to see the light. When, from the floor of the House, I condemned the lawlessness and the violence practiced in the sit-down strikes, some of the Detroit papers were critical of my criticism of Gov. Frank Murphy, of the union's technique. They evidently thought the union could do no wrong.

Apparently, public sentiment has changed somewhat, for in the Detroit Free Press of December 13 there appears a cartoon showing Uncle Sam going after union leadership—irresponsible union elements with a razor strop. Uncle Sam shows on the back of his head a sizable bump and on his cheek a first-aid patch; his injuries evidently administered by union leadership.

When the Supreme Court, on the 2d day of March 1942 decided that the Federal antiracketeering law did not prevent members of the AFL Teamsters' Union stopping trucks, requiring the drivers to pay either $8.41 or $9.42—depending upon the size of the truck—for the privilege of driving the truck over a public highway, or, if their demands were refused, administering a beating, because the law contained a proviso exempting from its provisions usual and customary union practices, 2 days later, on March 4, 1942, I offered an amendment making the members of unions subject to the provisions of the antiracketeering act in the same manner as other citizens are subject to its provisions.

Neither the Detroit Free Press nor, so far as I know, any other daily paper advocated the passage of that bill. It is gratifying, extremely gratifying, to have the Detroit Free Press now, after the House has for the third time passed the Hobbs bill, which takes many words to accomplish the same purpose as the amendment introduced by me, call attention to the unjustifiable criticism of the Hobbs bill by union leadership.

The editorial, which was printed on the same day as was the cartoon to which reference was made, reads as follows:

CONTROL

Congress showed an inclination to proceed slowly and not imperil President Truman's labor-legislation program when the House "sidetracked" a measure to fix penalties against unions which violate "no strike" contract provisions.

Even the proponents of such a measure voted against bringing it up for action at this time, in order to provide more opportunity for study of the President's proposals.

But, at the same time, the House agreed to consider the Hobbs bill which has long laid dormant in committee. This bill would subject unions to severe punishment for interfering with interstate commerce through "robbery or extortion."

The Hobbs bill has no immediate application to the current labor situation.

Its only purpose is to make more effective the present Federal antiracketeering laws, and to plug the loophole which a 1942 Supreme Court decision left open for strong-arm tactics on the part of AFL teamsters.

Yet this proposed legislation is greeted by the AFL with loud wails of anguish and a promise to do everything within its power to defeat it.

"The Hobbs bill," the AFL declared, "would prevent unions from establishing union conditions with employers in the truck-transportation industry in cities throughout the country."

All of which is obvious hogwash, and offers only another example of how labor's irresponsible attitude is hurting its own cause.

In 1942 the Supreme Court upheld a New York court's acquittal of AFL teamsters who were halting produce trucks entering New York City.

Farmers, driving their own vehicles, and carrying their own produce, were stopped outside of the city by union representatives. They were offered the choice of joining the union by paying an exorbitant initiation fee, or of paying the union for permission to take their trucks into the New York market.

Those who objected were badly beaten.

Supreme Court Justice James F. Byrnes, who wrote the majority opinion, held that this practice did not come under the antiracketeering law, and therefore the union extortioners could not be prosecuted.

But, he stated, such activities "are not beyond the reach of Federal legislative control."

In other words, he ruled that the existing law did not cover the situation, but that new legislation could do so.

That is the only purpose of the Hobbs bill.

With the American people in the mood for regulatory labor laws, William Green and his AFL cohorts would be in a better position to fight unjust legislation if they would do something about the obvious flaws in their own set-up.

It is again the old story that if those who have messes in their own yards do not clean them up, the politicians will do it for them.

And in doing so the legislative process may go far beyond simple measures which the unions, or other groups, might themselves take.

The unions make a serious mistake in their blanket opposition to all regulatory legislation.

They are going to get laws, and they may even get something similar to the no-strike penalty bill which Congress did not kill but only postponed.

How much wiser it would be for labor to get together with the reasonable elements in Congress and themselves promote just laws which would protect themselves and head off punitive legislation.

William Green, Philip Murray, and John L. Lewis blast with blind rage against any criticism of labor. They turn their guns, for example, on the Ball-Burton-Hatch bill, but offer nothing as an alternative.

Circumstances force them to do this, for no moderate man who admitted a weakness within the union ranks could long hold his job. The wild-eyed, screwball elements, which bring most of labor's grief upon its own head, would see that such men were liquidated.

It is this selfish reason alone, even if the welfare of the public counts for nothing, which should impel labor leaders to suggest something constructive under which labor can flourish and still live with legal security and public respect.

Mr. Speaker, yes, as one or two Detroit publications have sneeringly written, I come from the sticks, the southwest corner of Michigan, one of the world's garden spots, where the people own their own homes, cultivate their own land, operate their own industrial plants and businesses, and—may I add—with apologies to the Detroit Free Press—think soundly, use common sense and good judgment.

The Republican Party and the Pearl Harbor Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM R. THOM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a review of the Pearl Harbor investigation by the well known political writer, John W. Owens, appearing in the Baltimore Sun:

CONFUSION AGAIN RULES THE GOP

(By John W. Owens)

The mystery is still a mystery. Why does the Republican Party, which long included in its ranks the larger part of the people of better education and certainly includes a very large part even today, tolerate leaders

and spokesmen who again and again muddle its affairs? The Pearl Harbor investigation is the latest example. Here was a military disaster of gravest magnitude. It occurred in Mr. Roosevelt's administration. For 4 years his opponents asked searching investigation, as they were entitled to do. After the end of the war they were accommodated. And what up to this time is the result? One can hear men who have been vehement to the point of violence, in condemnation of Mr. Roosevelt's prewar domestic policies, take the side of the Roosevelt administration as against the Republican inquisitors.

The inquiry has gone far beyond study of the causes of the fatal serenity about Pearl Harbor of our military and naval men. Apparently some of the Republicans have in their heads a belief that Mr. Roosevelt manipulated this country into the war with Japan as the consequence of secret commitments to Britain. Apparently some of them also have in their heads a belief that Mr. Roosevelt was responsible for some act which tipped the scales in Japan toward war. Probably such ideas derive by subconscious processes from the isolationism which afflicted large numbers of Republican leaders and spokesmen. They had long argued that the United States could be safe and secure if only it stayed within its own borders and "minded its own business." They had seen the United States drawn into a war costly and bloody beyond calculation. In such circumstances there is a natural human tendency to seek somebody on whom can be put blame for the failure of a dogma. In the collapse of isolationism the natural tendency of many isolationists was to seek an explanation, not in the facts of the world about them, but in the acts of Mr. Roosevelt and his diplomatic and military associates.

Now, the Republican inquisitors in this investigation have been unable, thus far, to prove that Mr. Roosevelt had secret commitment with Britain that led us into the war with Japan. They have been unable to prove that Mr. Roosevelt was responsible for an act which tipped the scales in Japan. Yet they have not known how to disentangle themselves from the beliefs that possessed them. Over and over and over, they thresh the same straw, until the universally respected counsel to the committee and his staff announce their resignations for lack of time to continue at the present pace. Indeed, the whole business threatens to become a bore.

To make the thing worse, the contrast between the Republican inquisitors and the witnesses heard up to the present can only be described as extraordinary.

Admiral Richardson hewed to the line. He stated in plain terms the causes of his disagreement with Mr. Roosevelt over prewar policy, respecting Pearl Harbor, but in equally plain terms he refused to tell the committee that Mr. Roosevelt had done wrong in relieving him. Quite the contrary. He said that, had he been in Mr. Roosevelt's place, he would have acted as did Mr. Roosevelt. Mr. Hull and Mr. Welles appeared. They had acute personal differences in the State Department. But there were no acute differences in their testimony. Both were clear and precise in testimony on the diplomacy that the administration developed before Pearl Harbor and they left with the committee the same evaluation of that policy. They gave no comfort to those who theorized on secret commitments or an overt act. Incidentally, they set forth the opposite argument to Admiral Richardson's contention to Mr. Roosevelt that the fleet should have been moved from Pearl Harbor. Taking together the testimony of Admiral Richardson and of Mr. Hull and Mr. Welles, the question as to whether the fleet should have been moved from Pearl Harbor emerged as one on which able, honest, and patriotic men could differ diametrically.

The military men appeared. Contrast with some of their inquisitors became more pronounced. General Marshall was, in his testimony, the man that this country has known well in the five dreadful years since the fall of France awakened Americans to their peril. He was the incarnation of moral integrity and moral dignity. He behaved exactly as men of unsnarled minds expected him to behave. He accepted his share of the responsibility for the disaster at Pearl Harbor. He answered questions on all points as clearly as any man could be expected to do. Yet for practically one week he was kept on the stand and, from time to time, badgered with repetitious questions, as though he were a reluctant witness in a bitter proceeding to construe a will. General Gerow, who also accepted his share of responsibility for Pearl Harbor, had an experience similar to General Marshall's though on a smaller scale.

Why cannot the Republican Party get on its feet and move in a straight course? Why cannot the intelligence that is in the rank and file of the Republican Party develop leaders and spokesmen who will know how to get on their feet and move in a straight course?

For years the leaders and spokesmen made an obsession of Mr. Roosevelt. Sometimes they surrendered to him and sometimes they stood out against him, but always he was an obsession. Long after Mr. Roosevelt had been analyzed until nothing was left to analyze, long after everybody in the country who could think at all had made his own judgment on the good and the bad in Mr. Roosevelt—long after analysis was complete, Republican leaders and spokesmen were still confining argument to Mr. Roosevelt and forgetting their duty to present the people an intellectually coherent alternative.

In the Pearl Harbor investigation, thus far, the obsession persists. And, as has happened before, old critics of the Roosevelt administration are now found among its defenders. The rank and file ought to take notice.

Letter From Members of the Sixth Marine Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Let us bring our marines home from China to prevent civil war and United States involvement in internal disputes. A group of United States marines, stationed in China, state why the United States Government should withdraw our soldiers from China:

WEAPONS COMPANY,
TWENTY-NINTH MARINES,
SIXTH MARINE DIVISION,
Tsingtao, China, November 29, 1945.

Honorable Mr. PATTERSON: We are members of the Sixth Marine Division and in drafting this letter we believe that we convey the feelings of a great many members of our division.

For the first time since our arrival in China we have finally read a news item which contained one ounce of truth. Up until now nothing but conflicting and apparently uninformed reports have been released. I am speaking of the resolution made by Representative HUGH DE LACY and yourself. It was met with spontaneous approval by the men who are here in China. I will now try to relate to you the facts of the run around we have been receiving since our arrival here.

We arrived here in Tsingtao, China, about October 15 under the pretense of accepting the surrender of the Japanese troops in the Shantung area. The extent of this was our attendance at the formal surrender ceremony. Not but a few days later we began to hear news reports on our radio to the effect that the marines would leave North China and that they would all be gone by December 5. Within a week we were showered with letters from our wives and families in America containing newspaper clippings which verified these reports. However, we, the marines of the Sixth Division, were in a quandary. The date was now about November 10 and here in China there was no visual indication that we were going anywhere, as a matter of fact all indications were quite contradictory. Instead of being engaged in the normal activities which would indicate an early departure we were doing just the opposite—cleaning up billets, building sheds in which to house our vehicles and guns, drawing clothing from the quartermaster, and above all starting on a new training schedule which was mainly dominated by such heretofore subjects as street fighting, riot control, and other associated subjects. Oh, yes; all this had us in quite a quandary.

On October 6 the Marine Corps headquarters issued an order which dropped our point score to 60 and then again later in October it went down to 50 points. However, the men who have the necessary points for discharge are still in China. Maybe transportation is the problem. But we do not think that that is the case. In this regard we can only offer heresay information.

The Tsingtao Harbor is crowded with ships of all kinds. Rumors galore. The commanding officer of the U. S. S. *Alaska* had offered to return to the States all high-point men but the division is said to have turned down their release. Believe me, all this had us quite perturbed.

With all this another story raised its head. The American equipped and trained Chinese Eighth Army was soon to arrive and take over the area. Sure enough they came in; disembarked from American troop ships, drive American equipment through town for 2 days and we have not seen any of them since. This took place about November 10.

But now the story has changed, both the radio and our own division newspaper, report announcements made by Under Secretary of the Navy Gates and the Secretary of State, to the effect that the marines would remain in China for some time to come, but only to repatriate the Japanese civilians and military personnel to their homeland. Up until now we have not seen any of these people or done any such duty. We have come to the conclusion that like our "December 5 departure" story, this is also something devised to pull the wool over the eyes of the American people at home.

We wholeheartedly agree with your resolution and believe we know what is actually taking place. Before long, total civil war should be raging in all of China. So far it is only our presence that has kept it away from Tsingtao. But how long will simply our presence be such a threat to the communist forces? Of course, if and when we are implicated in the actual figthing the excuse that we are only "protecting American lives and property" will be given. However, the Communist Government has repeatedly given us ample warning to leave. When the lid finally blows off our involvement will be the fault of the people in Washington who should know better.

Taking all this into consideration it is our firm belief that we should be withdrawn from China and returned home. This division has distinguished itself in battle. It deserves something more than exploitation now.

It is not only our desire to return home that actuates our feelings. We feel that it is an injustice to be drawn into the armed intervention of the affair of China. Only a portion of the people of China appreciate it

and we are quite sure that the average American is against any further hostilities which will involve American forces.

We wish you a great success with your resolution to Mr. Truman. Continuance of such appeals may cause our removal and forestall any further bloodshed of American lives.

Underestimating Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of December 12, 1945:

UNDERESTIMATING HAWAII

In the Pearl Harbor hearings at Washington, there has repeatedly come up a reference to the desire of General Marshall in 1941 not to alarm the civilian population of the islands.

This reference pertains to his instructions to the then commanding general of the Hawaiian garrison, Lt. Gen. Walter C. Short, to take such preparations for alerting the garrison as would not unduly disturb the people of the territory.

As is now well known, the type of alert that General Short set up was an alert against sabotage—precautions against attack from within. This is in distinction to an alert against attack from without—an assault by enemy force from sea or air.

If it was assumed in the fall of 1941, that the civilians of these islands would be unduly disturbed by precautions against external attack, somebody in Washington or Hawaii sadly misread the minds and hearts and make-up of the people of Hawaii.

We of Hawaii in fact were then preparing against possible external attack. The Red Cross had set up its motor corps and established its first-aid stations. The police department had enrolled its volunteer corps of husky young men to augment its own inadequate force. The medical and nursing organizations were enlisted and training for emergency. Other civil organizations and agencies were likewise preparing.

This community, while not precisely anticipating a Japanese attack, knew that it was definitely possible.

We read the papers, listened to the radio, knew that peace negotiations in Washington were not going well, knew that Japan was on the march in Asia, and heard that Japanese warships were moving out in Asian waters.

The people were not unduly disturbed by this. They were not unduly disturbed because they were relying on the military and naval commands to take the necessary precautions and believed those precautions were being taken.

The civilians expected, and were ready, to do whatever jobs the military and naval commands called on them to do as a matter of patriotic emergency.

There was no sound reason, so far as we know, for any belief here or in Washington that alerting the Hawaiian garrison and the Pacific Fleet against possible imminent attack would have unduly disturbed the people here.

We of Hawaii are not stampeded on the nearness of danger. By 1941 we had lived with World War II long enough to be able to face serious facts soberly and calmly, even though this war, principally in Europe, seemed far distant.

When the Japanese aircraft suddenly appeared over Oahu and rained a hell of bombs and torpedoes on military and naval installations, hangars and ships and Pearl Harbor, the civil population, though shocked with horror and indignation, was neither broken nor buffaloed.

The men and women and children of Hawaii, with few exceptions, took that day of infamy with admirable courage, and turned to their emergency tasks with speed and intelligence.

We do not know on what information it was concluded here or at Washington that a full alert would have unduly disturbed the civil population of Hawaii.

We are sure that had such an alert been ordered, the civilians of Hawaii would have responded, and responded well, to whatever duties and responsibilities the orders would have laid upon them.

It appears that the people of Hawaii were strangely underestimated by someone in 1941. Even though late, the error should be corrected now.

Legislative Program of Federated Women's Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the women of America are fortunate in the leadership of their largest civic organization. The resolutions adopted by the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs create an enlightened program of legislative goals. Under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I am inserting three sections of this program:

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs in meeting assembled December 1, 1945, reaffirms its endorsement of full participation by the United States in the United Nations Organization and in special agencies for international cooperation in fields, including education, health, relief, and trade; and be it further

Resolved, That the board of directors urges prompt ratification by the United States of—

1. Constitutions of such international organizations as may be established by the United Nations.

2. Adequate financial support for all such agencies.

3. Active participation in their work.

Presented by:

MRS. LAFELL DICKINSON,
President, General Federation of Women's Clubs.
MRS. WILLIAM DICK SPORBORG,
Chairman, International Relations Department.
MRS. STEWART SCRIMSHAW,
Chairman, Education Department.

LIVING MEMORIALS

Whereas it is the custom of the American people to develop and provide memorials to their war veterans, living and dead; and

Whereas living memorials, such as parks, playgrounds, pools, forests, outdoor areas, recreational grounds, and community centers are all of a character to serve both the present and future generations in building character and physical fitness, so essential for the preservation of the American way of life for which our servicemen fought; and

Whereas such living memorials will serve youth, returning veterans, and others of the community, day after day and throughout the years, thus keeping alive the memory and traditions of those who served in the defense of our country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges all member clubs to lend full cooperation in planning such living memorials to those who served in the present war, and that the local clubs and districts be designated to institute action in furthering the planning and developing of these living memorials; and be it further

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs be empowered to take appropriate action in securing the cooperation of national, State, and local officials and groups in carrying out the intent of this resolution.

Presented by:

MRS. THURSTON ROBERTS,
Chairman, Post-War Planning Department.
MRS. BERTRAM P. THOMAS,
Cochairman, Conservation of Natural Resources Committee.
MRS. OSCAR PALMOUR,
Cochairman, Conservation of Natural Resources Committee.

DECEMBER 1, 1945.

PRICE CONTROL

Whereas in no war in the history of the United States has the general public been protected so successfully from runaway prices and general and serious inflation as has been the case during the war just ended; and

Whereas the United States now faces graver dangers of uncontrolled inflation than during the war or at any time in its history: Therefore

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs supports continued Federal legislation for equitable wage ceilings and price control on basic commodities such as food, shelter, and clothing as being essential to the common good and to sustained prosperity during the period of readjustment.

Presented by:

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE.

DECEMBER 1, 1945.

Effects of Prejudice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by Hon. Abe Fortas, Under Secretary of the Interior, and published in the Washington Post of December 9, 1945:

EFFECTS OF PREJUDICE
A COMMUNICATION

The War Relocation Authority has announced that on November 30 the last relocation center for Japanese-Americans closed its doors. Most of the unfortunate people who were removed from the west coast

in the spring of 1942 have been relocated throughout the country. The Tule Lake Center, occupied principally by persons of Japanese ancestry who have been detained for security reasons, is still operating.

With the final liquidation of the activities of the War Relocation Authority now clearly in view, I take this occasion to express my personal thanks to the Washington Post for the leadership which it has provided in its editorial columns in the fight for decent, democratic treatment to Americans of Japanese ancestry. The Post has recognized the vital importance of this issue to the maintenance of American democracy. It is a dramatic part of the struggle for decency and individual freedom which cannot survive in a society which tolerates facial prejudice.

The consequences of racial prejudice are, of course, much greater than individual instances of gross injustice. Thoughtful people now generally recognize the debasement of character and the degeneration of civilized values which afflict a community in which racial persecution and discrimination are rampant. It is equally notable that racial fear and suspicion are apt to becloud the vision and distort the judgment.

I cannot escape the belief that one of the factors which contributed to the Pearl Harbor disaser was the groundless fear and uneasy distrust of the Japanese-Americans resident in Hawaii. You will recall that in December 1941 about 37 percent of the people of Hawaii were of Japanese ancestry. Of the Territory's total population of 423,330, about 157,905 were in this category.

The Japanese-Americans had for many years lived harmoniously with Hawaii's other Americans of many racial strains. In an imperfect world, indeed, Hawaii was about as good a model of racial living-together as one could find. Nevertheless, as tension between the United States and Japan mounted, uneasiness about the Japanese-Americans began to be felt even by people who had lived in Hawaii all of their years. And, of course, many of the continentals who were in Hawaii in those crucial days—both civilian and military—did not have to acquire suspicion and hostilty toward the Japanese-Amercans. They had it when they left our west coast, and they were not examined for it as they were for other contagious diseases.

The testimony before the Boards of inquiry into the Pearl Harbor disaster indicates that this community malaise had its effect upon our responsible military officials in Hawaii. There can be no doubt that they were bothered by the presence in Hawaii of so many Americans of Japanese ancestry. I would not contest the reasonableness, in the circumstances, of additional precautions against sabotage and espionage. But the evidence indicates that the suspicion of the loyalty of the Japanese-Americans was so great as to affect profoundly the judgment of some of the influential members of the Hawaiian community and even some of our own officials.

This was an important part of the reason, I believe, why the response of the Hawaiian command to an urgent warning of danger of attack was to order not a general alert, but merely an alert against sabotage. In our moment of peril, we mobilized our available man power and concentrated our attention upon a nonexistent menace to the neglect of the terrifyingly real menace that eventually dealt our naval power in the Pacific a crippling blow. We were mobilized in an alert that faced in the wrong direction.

The irony of this is that not a single instance of actual or attempted sabotage occurred at Pearl Harbor or anywhere in Hawaii. We have no evidence whatever that it was even planned or intended. Far from constituting a menace to us in the prosecution of the war, Hawaii's Japanese-Americans were responsible for some of the most glorious chapters of our war record: for example, the heroic exploits of the famed One Hundredth Battalion.

This is not the only time that racial prejudice—the fear and distrust of a group of people because their ancestry, the color of their skin, or their religion happens to be different from that of the majority—has misdirected the energies and attention of people, with disastrous consequences. It is about time that we learned that a racial minority is not the cause of insecurity or of economic difficulties; and that an alert directed toward the supposed menace which they represent will result in turning our guns in the wrong direction. It is about time that we came to realize the power of the American idea. We are too ready to doubt and mistrust the ability of our democratic ideals and institutions to command the loyalty and unswerving adherence of people who live under our flag, regardless of national or racial origin. The American way, as has been demonstrated time and time again, has the power to capture and hold the devotion and loyalty of people who have come to live with us from every part of the globe, from every race and nation.

The Japanese-Americans, as well as the German-Americans, the Italian-Americans, and many others proved, prior to Pearl Harbor and since that time, that their assimilation to American life and their attachment to our institutions are complete and durable. People who profcundly believe in the greatness and nobility of American ideas and methods do those ideas an injustice when they ignore their power to command and hold the loyalty of all segments of our population.

When we remember Pearl Harbor, I hope that we will not forget one of its lessons: that racial fear and hostility can insidiously blind us to realities, even military realities, and can endanger our national existence.

ABE FORTAS,
Under Secretary of the Interior.

WASHINGTON, *December 7.*

With Correct Government Attitude Private Industry Can Do Housing Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the American Lumberman, of November 10, 1945:

WITH CORRECT GOVERNMENT ATTITUDE PRIVATE INDUSTRY CAN DO HOUSING JOB

The Nation's critical housing shortage presents a bright future for all segments of the private building industry and at the same time offers an interesting challenge. This could be a definite asset to efforts of industry leaders to hurdle manpower, supply and price difficulties that are presently hamstringing the private home building program were it not for the steady encroachments of OPA, public housers, and professional bureaucratic career men in the Federal Government continually crowding in with their panaceas for relief of the situation.

After almost 3 years as a commander in the United States Navy, part of which was spent in Washington, dealing with various governmental agencies, the writer is of the opinion that private industry, given its constitutional rights under the system of free enterprise, can and will do a more economical and efficient job of housing the Nation than any Government agency or group of agencies. Therefore, it would be much more businesslike and profitable for Government workers to spend our money and their efforts to help private industry get under way with home building, rather than to concentrate on evolving ways and means to control our industry and take over a large portion of the job.

While our well-paid Government workers are lobbying and conducting a high-powered national publicity campaign to discredit the job private industry has done and could do now, all on our tax money, the huge building industry lies like a sprawling giant ready and willing to arise and go to work, except that the giant is being held down by hundreds of fetters that should be removed by the very Government careerists who are instead trying to create another giant of an entirely different nature and one that will never work for the good of private industry.

We would like to point out that regardless of what sort of a program the public housers propose, it will take from 6 months to a year to get it in operation, and, taking past records as criteria, we venture the opinion it will not be efficient nor economical in operation. Give private industry 6 months with the help, and not the hindrance, of Government and we will have enough houses built or under construction so that the pressure on the housing question would relax materially. The rising inflationary trend in values would halt and possibly start receding. Anxiety on the part of those needing new homes would be eased because with the housing industry active they would know it could be but a few months until they could get started on their own new homes. The majority of the arguments of public housers for their programs would disappear and they could either go to work for private business or stay in Government in some capacity that would conform more closely with our principles of what Government should do for business.

It is of the utmost urgency that all persons interested in the retail lumber business and building in general immediately act to convince our Government officials they should get back to their desks and start work immediately on a program to remove the problems that at present retard home building rather than continually snipe away at an industry held back because of a number of conditions that are largely within their power to remove. Private building can do the job—a bigger, better, and more economical job than any socialistic, monopolistic government program ever envisioned. We are ready and anxious to get started. Just let us get to work and we will deliver.

HERBERT A. VANCE,
Publisher.

Woodrow Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of a terrible global war designated as World War II, about 1 year ago today I called to the attention of the Congress the anniversary of the date of the birth of a great President, Woodrow Wilson, who was born on December 28, 1856, and being a great admirer of this World War I President, I am again reminded of the anniversary of his birth within

the next few days. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks a year ago, I called attention to the hopes and aspirations of Woodrow Wilson for world peace after World War I, and now that God has again blessed us and the world with a cessation and great and glorious victory for our Nation of World War II, I am again reminded of President Wilson and his message to Congress on January 8, 1918, when he proposed his famous "fourteen points" to us and the world, and oddly enough, I feel that it would be pertinent for the Congress and the leaders of our Nation to reread the message of President Wilson again, especially at this time, and Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I ask that President Wilson's address to Congress, of date January 8, 1918, be printed in the RECORD, as follows, to wit:

THE FOURTEEN POINTS

(President Wilson's address to Congress, January 8, 1918)

GENTLEMEN OF THE CONGRESS: * * * It will be our wish and purpose that the processes of peace, when they are begun, shall be absolutely open and that they shall involve and permit henceforth no secret understandings of any kind. The day of conquest and aggrandizement is gone by; so is also the day of secret covenants entered into the interest of particular governments and likely at some unlooked-for moment to upset the peace of the world. It is this happy fact, now clear to the view of every public man whose thoughts do not still linger in an age that is dead and gone, which makes it possible for every nation whose purposes are consistent with justice and the peace of the world to avow now or at any other time the objects it has in view.

We entered this war because violation of right had occurred which touched us to the quick and made the life of our own people impossible unless they were corrected and the world secured once for all against their recurrence. What we demand in this war, therefore, is nothing peculiar to ourselves. It is that the world be made fit and safe to live in; and particularly that it be made safe for every peace-loving nation which, like our own, wishes to live its own life, determine its own institutions, be assured of justice and fair dealing by the other peoples of the world as against force and selfish aggression. All the peoples of the world are in effect partners in this interest, and for our own part we see very clearly that unless justice be done to others it will not be done to us. The program of the world's peace, therefore, is our program; and that program, the only possible program, as we see it, is this:

I

Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.

II

Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas, outside territorial waters, alike in peace and in war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants.

III

The removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance.

IV

Adequate guaranties given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety.

V

A free, open-minded, and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims, based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining all such questions of sovereignty the interests of the populations concerned must have equal weight with the equitable claims of the government whose title is to be determined.

VI

The evacuation of all Russian territory and such a settlement of all questions affecting Russia as will secure the best and freest cooperation of the other nations of the world in obtaining for her an unhampered and unembarrassed opportunity for the independent determination of her own political development and national policy and assure her of a sincere welcome into the society of free nations under institutions of her own choosing; and, more than a welcome, assistance also of every kind that she may need and may herself desire. The treatment accorded Russia by her sister nations in the months to come will be the acid test of their good will, of their comprehension of her needs as distinguished from their own interests, and of their intelligent and unselfish sympathy.

VII

Belgium, the whole world will agree, must be evacuated and restored, without any attempt to limit the sovereignty which she enjoys in common with all other free nations. No other single act will serve as this will serve to restore confidence among the nations in the laws which they have themselves set and determined for the government of their relations with one another. Without this healing act the whole structure and validity of international law is forever impaired.

VIII

All French territory should be freed and the invaded portions restored, and the wrong done to France by Prussia in 1871 in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine, which has unsettled the peace of the world for nearly 50 years should be righted, in order that peace may once more be made secure in the interest of all.

IX

A readjustment of the frontiers of Italy should be effected along clearly recognizable lines of nationality.

X

The peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development.

XI

Rumania, Serbia, and Montenegro should be evacuated; occupied territories restored; Serbia accorded free and secure access to the sea; and the relations of the several Balkan states to one another determined by friendly counsel along historically established lines of allegiance and nationality; and international guaranties of the political and economic independence and territorial integrity of the several Balkan states should be entered into.

XII

The Turkish portions of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development, and the Dardenelles should be permanently opened as a free passage to the ships and commerce of all nations under international guaranties

XIII

An independent Polish state should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations, which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenent.

XIV

A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guaranties of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike.

In regard to these essential rectifications of wrong and assertions of right, we feel ourselves to be intimate partners of all the governments and peoples associated together against the imperialists. We cannot be separated in interest or divided in purpose. We stand together until the end.

For such arrangements and covenants we are willing to fight and to continue to fight until they are achieved; but only because we wish the right to prevail and desire a just and stable peace such as can be secured only by removing the chief provocations to war, which this program does not remove. We have no jealousy of German greatness, and there is nothing in this program that impairs it. We grudge her no achievement or distinction of learning or of pacific enterprise such as have made her record very bright and very enviable. We do not wish to injure her or to block in any way her legitimate influence or power. We do not wish to fight her either with arms or with hostile arrangements of trade if she is willing to associate herself with us and the other peace-loving nations of the world in covenants of justice and law and fair dealing. We wish her only to accept a place of equality among the peoples of the world—the new world in which we now live—instead of a place of mastery.

Neither do we presume to suggest to her any alteration or modification of her institutions. But it is necessary, we must frankly say, and necessary as a preliminary to any intelligent dealings with her on our part, that we should know whom her spokesmen speak for when they speak to us, whether for the Reichstag majority or for the military party and the men whose creed is imperial domination.

We have spoken now, surely, in terms too concrete to admit of any further doubt or question. An evident principle runs through the whole program I have outlined. It is the principle of justice to all peoples and nationalities, and their right to live on equal terms of liberty and safety with one another, whether they be strong or weak. Unless this principle be made its foundation, no part of the structure of international justice can stand. The people of the United States could act upon no other principle; and to the vindication of this principle they are ready to devote their lives, their honor, and everything that they possess. The moral climax of this, the culminating and final war for human liberty, has come and they are ready to put their own strength, their own highest purpose, their own integrity and devotion to the test.

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following edi-

torial and article from today's Washington Daily News:

STAND BY MACARTHUR

A deal is in the works at the Moscow conference for Russia to clip General MacArthur and take over a large part of the control of Japan, according to rumors. We don't believe our Government would be a party to any such thing. We can think of few worse calamities than such an arrangement.

It would play into the hands of the Japs by duplicating the chaos Russia has caused in the occupation of Germany. If there was ever any doubt as to the folly of the Berlin system of divided authority, certainly the sorry result of that experiment has removed them. We are already paying, and will continue to pay for a long time, for the mess that is being made of the German occupation.

In sharp contrast is the efficient job General MacArthur is doing in Tokyo. Not that he is dictating policy. He is following meticulously the Allied agreement of Potsdam as to surrender terms and how they shall be carried out. But the point is that he is carrying them out—in letter and in spirit.

It is a hard job. It is a job that cannot be done by committee method, by veto devices, by political jockeying in an international power game. The authority of executing policy must be vested fully in one man. That man, by Allied agreement, is General MacArthur.

He was chosen, first, because he was an American and America almost alone defeated Japan. He was chosen, secondly, because of all American commanders his long experience in the Orient and his brilliant war performance against Japan made him the ideal occupation chief. His record in Tokyo has exceeded even the high expectations.

Nobody in authority would deny Russia a place in the Jap settlement. She was urged by the United States and others to accept membership on the Far Eastern Advisory Council—her absence is her own doing, not ours. General MacArthur, for many weeks, has been offering cooperation to Russian staff officers in Tokyo, and has been waiting for a Russian division to take up its allotted position. But Russia wants to dictate the number of troops and their position.

It's the same old story. It's another warning of what would happen if Russia succeeded in replacing General MacArthur or dividing his authority.

President Truman must not let that happen—either at the Moscow conference or in the future.

WHY MAC'S POPULAR WITH JAP PEOPLE

(NOTE: A new Japan, in which the state is the servant of the individual and not the master of a nation of slaves, rapidly is being created by the Supreme Allied Command in Tokyo, the far eastern manager of the United Press, who has just arrived in the United States on leave from Tokyo, reports in the following dispatch.)

(By Miles W. Vaughn)

General of the Army Douglas A. MacArthur, in slightly more than 100 action-packed days since Nippon's war lords surrendered on September 2, has destroyed the ancient structure of Jap feudalism and rapidly has laid the foundation for the creation of a new democratic state.

The Supreme Allied Commander has achieved this by a series of far-reaching orders, some of unprecedented severity.

So stern, indeed, have been some of the general's directives that open resistance to them as feared by observers in Tokyo.

JAPS TAKE ORDERS

The Japanese, however, took every order with complete equanimity.

With every directive MacArthur's popularity with the Japanese people has increased rather than diminished. When the Supreme Allied Commander dissolved such great holding companies as the house of Mitsui, and imperiled the savings of millions of Japanese who had invested in shares of the so-called "Baibatsu," or great industrial companies, those whose funds were tied up joined with the masses of the people in approving the step as a measure unquestionably designed to prevent future wars.

So great, indeed, is MacArthur's popularity that it is a common saying in Tokyo that if Japan were a republic and if the General were to run for President he would be elected by a landslide vote.

SIGNS OF POPULARITY

Indicative of the popular attitude are these facts:

Crowds of considerable size gather in front of the entrance to the Dai Ichi Insurance Building to Tokyo daily to bow silently to the General as he walks down the steps from his office to enter his automobile to drive to lunch.

Dozens of letters are written to the General daily and most of them express complete approval of the MacArthur regime.

Leading Japs have gone so far as to state openly that they hope the Allied occupation will continue for 10 years or more, until the last vestiges of Jap militarism and ultranationalism have disappeared, and that MacArthur will continue as Supreme Commander throughout this period.

WHY HE IS POPULAR

Reasons for the General's popularity are manifold but appear to center chiefly around the following:

First, the mass of the Jap people, reared in the tradition of Asiatic military brutality, had expected that the victorious American troops would come ashore in the Nipponese home islands to loot, rape, and pillage. When the American soldiers showed exemplary discipline and offered Nipponese children chocolate bars rather than bayonets, the people gave MacArthur credit. A leader whose followers were good men must be great and good himself, the mass of the people soon decided.

The MacArthur program to develop democracy and assure the rights of the common man at first was received with some skepticism, but when words were followed by deeds the people were not slow to realize the benefits being conferred upon them.

HE IGNORES DANGER

The General's striking personal appearance and his obliviousness to danger also have played a part. The fact that he rides through the streets of Tokyo unattended, in contrast to the armed escorts who traditionally attend prominent figures, has not been lost on the Jap masses.

The general's popularity undoubtedly has been a factor in the success of his reform program, which has been carried forward with a speed far greater than the most sanguine observers thought possible at the time of the surrender.

WHAT HE'S DONE

Major steps that he has taken include:

Immediate establishment of the fact that the Allied command is the supreme authority in Japan. When the general wanted to see Emperor Hirohito he did not call upon him—the Emperor came to the general's residence.

A whole series of mass arrests of Jap wartime leaders who will be tried for war guilt. There is no indication that the Jap people resented any of the arrests.

The Jap armed forces, around which the whole life of the nation centered from the time of the Manchurian war to the surrender last September, have been disbanded and the once powerful ministries of war and navy abolished.

The huge corporate plutocracies which furnished the financial and industrial backbone for Jap militarism have been disbanded.

PENSIONS DISSOLVED

The vast military pension system upon which hundreds of thousands of Jap families depended for a part of their income, and which was used as a chief political weapon by the militarists, has been dissolved and the last pension payments will be made on February 1.

The once powerful network of political and military police, by which the militarists enforced "thought control" and complete national obedience to their policy, has been abolished. The number of ordinary civilian police has been decreased.

Freedom of speech, of the press, and of assembly has been established and is guaranteed by the supreme Allied command. The national educational system has been reorganized to eliminate the teaching of militarism and ultranationalism. Public schools now are classrooms in democracy.

The franchise has been widened and votes granted to women. General elections soon will be held to select members of a truly representative national assembly.

Canadian GI Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Sgt. Richard Douglass, published in Yank, the Army Weekly, for December 14, 1945:

CANADA'S GI BILL

(Our neighbors to the north have worked out a much more thoroughgoing program of rights and benefits for veterans than we have enacted.)

(By Sgt. Richard Douglass)

OTTAWA, ONT.—There isn't much oratory in this particular parliamentary chamber in Canada's capitol. Sixty-four of the eighty-odd committeemen present, all members of Parliament, are veterans of the First or Second World War. A few are still in uniform. Two hold the Victoria Cross, equivalent to our Congressional Medal. As a parliamentary veterans' committee, they are hearing proposed amendments to the postdischarge reestablishment order.

This is just a fancy name for the Canadian GI bill of rights. The Canadians plan to nickname theirs the Veterans' Charter. Right now, though, the committee isn't concerned with names. It is reviewing the Government's entire postwar program for veterans, most of which has been operative for 3 years, to make sure it's solid before it faces Parliament.

Few major amendments are anticipated. The program was liberalized as the war progressed until today the benefits afforded Canadian veterans are among the most generous offered by any country. The plan is a much broader and more comprehensive program than our own.

But Canada's far-reaching veterans' program is not the result of a nothing-is-too-good-for-the-boys attitude. It is, in part, a reaction to the Dominion's unfortunate experience at the close of the First World War, when the veteran and his government—unwittingly spurred inflation.

In 1918 and the years that followed, the Government loaned veterans money for land

settlement. Prices of farm land and equipment, already exorbitant, skyrocketed. Two years later the bottom fell out. Only 3,883 of the 24,793 veterans who accepted government loans have repaid them. All but 7,000 quit the scheme. Many veterans squandered their gratuities (bonuses) on nonessential consumer goods and luxuries. The whole program was something the government would rather forget—except as a lesson in how not to do it.

This time Canada started planning its postdischarge program within 3 months after the government, on September 10, 1939, declared war.

"Lots of people thought we were crazy," says Walter S. Woods, deputy minister of the Department of Veterans' Affairs (DVA), a job corresponding to General Bradley's in our own Veterans' Administration in Washington. "They said: 'Hadn't we better wait until the war is over?'"

Woods, a gunner (private) in World War I, didn't think so. He recalled the small clothing allowance which was just about enough to pay for a raincoat, and he remembered also the government's land-settlement fiasco. So, before 1939 was out, 14 subcommittees of volunteer citizens were planning an over-all program for the Canadian veteran. Without waiting for parliamentary action, the Privy Council made the veterans' benefits legal by emergency order-in-council. Result to date is something the Canadian GI, a first-class griper in his own right, thinks pretty good.

Upon discharge, the veteran receives (1) a cash clothing allowance of $100 and a priority suit certificate which gives him first crack at the available clothing stock (many clothiers have hard-to-get accessories laid away exclusively for veterans), and (2) a rehabilitation grant equal to 30 days' pay in his last rank plus dependents' allowances.

Before he leaves the district depot or separation center, the veteran makes application for his war-service gratuity.

The veteran receives a 'basic gratuity" of $7.50 per month for service in the Western Hemisphere and $15 per month while overseas. For every 6 months overseas, he gets a "supplementary gratuity" of 7 days' pay and allowances. This sum is paid in monthly installments, not exceeding the amount of the dischargee's monthly pay plus dependents' allowances. It is tax-free, and can't be attached.

The gratuity is payable to any veteran who served or volunteered to serve overseas. Under the National Resources Mobilization Act, soldiers were allowed to decide whether they would serve overseas or in Canada. Only 16 percent of the Army did not volunteer for overseas service. Several thousand of these nonvolunteers, known as Zombies, were sent across toward the end, however, and thus became eligible for gratuities.

Every serviceman from general to private is eligible for a gratuity. The basic gratuity is the same for everybody, but the supplemental gratuity (7 days' pay for every 30 days' service overseas) is based on rank. Canadian servicemen did not receive extra pay for overseas service.

Just as important as the veteran's gratuity is his reestablishment credit, equal in value to his basic gratuity.

Reestablishment credit may be used at any time within 10 years for the following purposes: (1) The acquisition of a home to an amount not exceeding two-thirds of the value of the property; (2) the repair and modernization of his home, if owned by him; (3) for furniture and household equipment not to exceed two-thirds of its cost; (4) as working capital for a business or profession; (5) for the purchase of tools, instruments, or equipment for his trade, business, or profession; (6) for the purchase of a business to an amount not exceeding two-thirds of the equity fund; (7) for the payment of premiums on Canadian Government life insurance, and (8) for the purchase of special equipment required for educational or vocational training.

The DVA estimates that the average veteran's gratuity plus reestablishment credit will total $900. So far, the average Navy gratuity plus credit is $1,122.

Thousands of dollars in gratuities (but not in reestablishment credits unless they settle in Canada) will be paid to the 13,611 Americans who served in the Canadian forces if they apply. Most Americans haven't applied yet because they don't know about the gratuity plan. The majority of those eligible served with the RCAF before transferring to the United States forces.

Lt. Col. J. H. Hogan, assistant director of reestablishment credits, says the veterans are in no hurry. Only 30,000 applications have been filed for a total of six and one-half billion dollars of credit. But about 500,000 of Canada's 1,000,000 servicemen and women are still in uniform.

Most veterans, including those in the women's branches, are using their credit to buy furniture. Thirty-eight percent of the credit applications have been for furniture, two and one-half million dollars' worth. Three Toronto girls—a supervisor, a cook, and an office worker—pooled their total reestablishment credit for $1,200 for furniture for their rooming-house business.

One veteran operated a side show in a prewar circus but sold his animals when he went overseas. It was the only business he knew. His credit application for a family of monkeys was approved. Another vet who had managed a miniature golf course wanted to get started again. He used to move his business southward by trailer as the weather got colder The DVA allowed him credit for a trailer, not as a home but as essential equipment. He got golf balls and clubs, too.

"Awaiting returns" grants to tide over the veteran who has started farming or gone into business for himself is another feature of the Canadian plan. These grants—from $50 to $70, depending on marital status, plus liberal allowances for dependents—are charged against the veteran's reestablishment credit.

A lieutenant commander in the Navy, a successful professional writer in civilian life, left a half-completed novel behind when he enlisted. He's getting an awaiting-returns grant for himself, his wife and child while completing his novel.

If the veteran decides to use his reestablishment credit for an education—either university or vocational—he is eligible for a living allowance of $60 if single and $80 if married, plus dependents' allowances as follows: First two children, $12 apiece; third, $10; next three, $8 apiece, or a maximum of $58 a month for six children. In addition, the Government pays tuition and incidental fees. The period of schooling is ordinarily limited to the number of months in service, although outstanding students, even if comparatively short-timers in uniform—may earn a degree and even do post-graduate work.

The back-to-school trend has already overtaxed the universities. Old war-plant facilities have been borrowed by Toronto and McGill Universities to provide housing and lecture space. DVA pays the universities $150 extra per student to help them meet the salaries of additional lecturers and the costs of classroom expansion. The University of Toronto has 3,200 vets; McGill, in Montreal, with three registration periods a year for veterans, has enrolled 1,400 in its college of arts, science, and commerce. Of the 123 first-year students at the Ontario College of Optometry in Toronto, 101 are veterans. If the course he wants is available at a Canadian university, the veteran must study here in Canada.

Veterans' Minister Ian Mackenzie says veterans attending universities are making "splendid progress." Only 45 of the 10,000 who enrolled between October 1941 and October 1945 dropped out for failure to meet academic standards.

"The veteran wants an education, not necessarily a degree," explained Dr. W. H. Hatcher, assistant dean of McGill's Arts College. "Our first class of veterans passed with an average of 70 percent, a magnificent performance in view of the slaughtering we do around here."

Under a training-on-the-job program, agreements ranging from 1 month to a year are signed between the employer and the Government. The employer pays the veteran at a rate that must meet with the approval of the Dominion Labor Department. In addition, the trainee receives the regular maintenance grants, but any earnings on the side exceeding $40 a month will be deducted from his living allowance. The veteran likes the training-on-the-job idea, because it is an easy step from this to a permanent job; the employer likes it because he has a chance to watch the man work before hiring him permanently, and the Government likes it because the program helps to relieve the overcrowded vocational schools.

The Veterans' Land Act offers the veteran a chance to go into full-time farming or to finance a suburban home costing up to $6,000. If his farming application is approved and he keeps up his time payments for at least 10 years, the veteran will receive approximately 25 percent of the value of the land and buildings free, plus a maximum of $1,200 for stock and equipment.

Some 3,500 farm properties have been purchased by the Government for sale exclusively to service personnel. More than 600 veterans have gone into full-time farming under Government auspices, but the Dominion is going slow with its farm program to leave a good selection of farms for men still overseas or just returning.

The other half of the Veterans' Land Act, under which dischargees may purchase suburban homes (so-called "small holdings"), is intended to give the veteran with a steady income in town a chance for a home in a low-income-tax area, where he can do gardening or stock raising.

Gordon Way, an ex-sergeant in a company quartermaster outfit (the position is equivalent to a supply sergeant), is one of 800 veterans already established on a small holding. Way, who landed in England with the second contingent of the First Canadian Division, in 1939, had $1,201 in gratuities coming to him when he returned in June 1944, leaving his English bride and baby.

"I started to look around for a job, not knowing exactly what I was looking for," Way said. "I intended to take a 4-year commercial course at Queens College, until a DVA vocational counselor pointed out that I would be competing with men 10 years younger than myself by the time I graduated. I realized he was right but no one had offered me a decent job." Then a civil service preference, by virtue of Way's time overseas, helped him land a job as chief clerk in the DVA public relations office.

It was months before Way found satisfactory living quarters. Meanwhile, Mrs. Way and their daughter had arrived. For a time they were compelled to live in a bungalow and share meals with their landlady; later they lived in a one-room tourist cabin. Answering an ad in the Ottawa Citizen, the Ways finally located a small holding. It is a 20-year-old two-story brick house on a half-acre plot, 15 miles from the capital. The price was $5,000. Way applied to the Land Act people for a loan. They investigated the property, interviewed Mr. and Mrs. Way to be sure they realized the inconvenience of country life, then approved their application.

Way made the required 10-percent down payment ($500) and signed a contract to pay $3,333.34 over a period of 20 years, in monthly installments of $19.25. Way received a grant of $2,000 from the Government. This

grant is as good as cash if Way keeps up his payments for 10 years. If he sells ahead of time, he must pay the total cost of the holding and equipment.

The Ways used up their household equipment credit of $250 by purchasing the owner's refrigerator and electric range. They spent $100 of their reestablishment credit for garden equipment and another $150 for nursery stock.

Way pays his commuting costs by using his 15-year-old Willys as a school bus, collecting a dollar a week from each student passenger.

Financial help to tide over the jobless veteran is available in the form of (1) out-of-work benefits or (2) unemployment compensation. The Government feels that the ex-serviceman shouldn't be obliged to take the first job offered. While he is looking around, he can apply for an out-of-work benefit. Payments are limited to 52 weeks or the veteran's maximum period of service and are the same as awaiting-returns benefits. Meanwhile, the veteran must be capable of and available for work.

After 15 weeks on a job covered by unemployment insurance, the veteran becomes eligible for the same benefits as a civilian who has been at work since Canada's Unemployment Insurance Act became effective in July 1941.

Health and insurance benefits are liberal. The veteran can take out a $10,000 Government life insurance policy without examination any time up to 3 years after discharge. He has 5 plans to choose from—policies to be paid up in 10, 15, or 20 years, or at the ages of 60 or 65. Policies have cash values after 2 years but no loan value. A widow or widower of a veteran is eligible as a policyholder.

Health benefits are not restricted to veterans with service-connected disabilities. Everyone is allowed free medical and dental care for 1 year after discharge.

The law guarantees the veteran his old job back if he applies within 3 months and assures him seniority. Veterans' preference in civil service is limited to overseas veterans and men receiving pensions. There are, incidentally, 22,436 pensioners plus 14,796 dependents of these pensioners who also receive payments.

By and large, Canada's postdischarge program appears to be working well. Gratuity payments, based on pay-book records, were slow at first. Now the veteran can expect his first gratuity check 6 weeks after discharge. Applications for furniture credit are usually O. K.'d within 4 days, but it may take several months before a veteran is settled on a farm or in business on Government credit. Volunteer citizens' advisory committees and district DVA supervisors investigate before these applications are approved. They must be satisfied these enterprises are worth while and the veteran is qualified to run them.

This caution is in the veteran's interest, because once he has used up his reestablishment credit to buy a farm, for example, he is not eligible for educational or other grants.

Benefits are now more generous than formerly. The clothing allowance started at $35, was increased to $65, is now $100. Out-of-work benefits have been upped $20 a month.

The Royal Commission on Veterans' Qualifications, after hearing representatives of education, trade-unions, and the military profession, recently made 82 recommendations to improve the program. Extensive changes also have been proposed to the Veterans' Committee by Canada's veterans' organization. The Canadian Legion, for instance, has urged that the cost of university and vocational training should not be charged against reestablishment credit, that students should be granted increased living allowances, and that surplus property from the War Assets Corporation should be available to veterans.

One of the veterans' big problems is shelter. Forty percent of married Army personnel, according to a late survey, have housing problems; between 10 and 12 percent definitely have no place for their families. The DVA is appealing to citizens by radio and newspapers to make available to vets any extra living space.

The Army, Navy, and Air Force have established extensive counseling services in Canada and overseas to help the veteran make a sound decision about his future. Brightly illustrated pamphlets in nontechnical language explain specific phases of the postdischarge program. Movies present the program to civilian and military audiences. "Good-bye, Mr. Gyps" is the title of one animated short showing how the vet may be swindled out of his gratuity. All three services have issued detailed vocational guides, to show employers what service-learned skills can be useful in civilian trades.

How the veterans' program will affect Canadian economy is anyone's guess. DVA officials hope there will be sufficient room for all the talent and know-how developed in university and vocational schools under Canada's GI bill.

"Our job," says Deputy Minister Woods, "is not to develop a special economy for the veteran. We can only make available certain opportunities to compensate him for his losses. As a result of our program, he should be a super Canadian."

Primary objective of the Canadian program is to assist dischargees to earn a living.

"It can only succeed," the Government tells service personnel in its Back to Civilian Life pamphlet, "to the extent that ex-service personnel are prepared to help themselves and to the extent that employers will provide opportunity. It cannot help those who have no desire to help themselves."

Some people may wonder if the vet is getting too much. Says Veteran Minister Mackenzie:

"We regard this expenditure as a constructive contribution to the future life of Canada. * * * These are the men who will return tenfold and a hundredfold in public service the small expenditure we may make now on their education and professional training."

A Criticism and an Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the following is a recent editorial from the Herald-Press of St. Joseph, Mich., together with my answer:

HEW TO THE LINE

Hurling invective and epithets is one certain way of not finding a meeting ground for labor and management. More and more people, realizing that evasion of the Golden Rule is the fundamental cause of the world's and the Nation's social, economic, and political ills, are experiencing a feeling of revulsion against the tirades that fill printed columns and the radio waves.

Not until the American people stop throwing verbal brickbats and attempt seriously to solve their problems will any progress be made.

An incident of the senseless recrimination now in vogue occurred this week when this district's Congressman, CLARE HOFFMAN, tried to give CIO Vice President Walter Reuther a going-over in the public prints. Representative HOFFMAN, who would rather battle the CIO than do anything else, arose in Congress to call Reuther a draft-dodger who "asked deferment on grounds of dependency, although he has neither chick nor child." Reuther came back with the assertion that he never sought draft deferment. He and Mrs. Reuther are the parents of one child, a second child having died 3 months ago.

Congressman HOFFMAN is entitled to his views toward organized labor, and Reuther is entitled to his. Both, like all citizens, have the right to express those opinions and views, but in this last exchange it would appear that HOFFMAN injured himself by the accusations he reputedly made, and that Reuther exhibited the greater poise and dignity.

The people are interested in facts, not oratory. Allegations such as those attributed to Representative HOFFMAN in his remarks about Reuther are serious and, if untrue, are malicious. It is immaterial whether the target of vituperation is prominent or unknown. Every man is entitled to respect, if he is sincere. Whether Reuther is right or wrong in his economic views, no one has charged him with being insincere—that is, not yet.

DEAR EDITOR: I quite agree with you that "hurling invective and epithets" has little convincing power, though sometimes an accurate description of a policy or an individual may throw light on the issue. Then you pan me and praise Reuther because apparently you read somewhere—and you repeated the charge—that I "arose in Congress to call Reuther a draft dodger who 'asked deferment on grounds of dependency although he has neither chick nor child.'" You continued, "Reuther came back with the assertion that he never sought draft deferment. He and Mrs. Reuther are the parents of one child, a second child having died 3 months ago."

What I did say—and you will find it under date of November 29, on page 11227 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I quote—was this:

"The UAW-CIO, through its spokesman, Walter Reuther—who, by the way, while a healthy young man, with a wage-earning wife, was deferred on the ground of dependency and remained during the war safely here in America, as the representative of the UAW-CIO—now demands that General Motors throw open its books to his inspection, apparently upon the assumption that he has the right not only to secure a fair wage for the members of his union, but to determine how the dollars received by General Motors from the sale of its products should be distributed as between stockholders, management, company needs for continuing the business, and the workers. The union also claims the right to limit the price at which motorcars should be sold."

You will note there is no charge of draft-dodging, no assertion that Reuther asked to be deferred; and if that statement is hurling invective and epithets, I'm sorry, but it will have to stand.

From a Government record, let me give you the following facts:

Reuther, in his questionnaire, did not state which class he considered himself to be in; he did not ask for a deferment. He listed as dependents his wife, May, who earned $1,000 per annum as a UAW employee (Reuther's confidential secretary), and his sister, Anna May, 17, to whom, he stated, he began to contribute $10 per week the September preceding his questionnaire. If Reuther was in ill health, if he had a child, his questionnaire did not disclose that fact, and he passed the physical.

R. J. Thomas, president of the UAW-CIO, and Reuther's superior, was the one who asked for Reuther's deferment, and that on three grounds:

1. That Reuther was a director of the union's General Motors' department.

2. That he was a member of the national subcommittee on training in industry of the National Defense Advisory Commission, and

3. That he was engaged in discussing plans for speeding up airplane production.

Mr. Reuther received two invitations from Uncle Sam, and his draft board, calling him for physical examination, denied the union's request that he be deferred because of his defense activities. The Office of Production Management asked him to join its staff. Reuther made no comment on either invitation. Previously he had stated that his job is with the union.

His draft board, No. 31, in April of 1941 held that Reuther had no dependents (the child came later). When R. J. Thomas' request for Reuther's deferment was up, Reuther stated that he would await his instructions from Thomas and Phil Murray, CIO president, before deciding whether to file an appeal. Thomas and Murray later announced that an appeal would be taken, and Murray, in a letter to the draft board, said that Reuther has direct supervision for the union on labor relations covering 79 plants and 173,000 workers. In May, Reuther was placed in class III–A by the appeal board, and the reason given by the board was that his wife was dependent on him. Again there was no mention of a child.

Your statement that I "would rather battle the CIO than do anything else" is in error. My first duty is to the people of the district, and if you want to come down, at my expense, and see whether I am on the job, I will be glad to have you. I want no quarrel with any powerful organization engaged in political activities, but I am not side-stepping any individual or organization which follows a course which I think detrimental to the welfare of the Nation or the people of the district. The CIO and its officers and its agents, over a period of years, have accused me of almost every evil thing from disloyalty down. Their charges have been false. I would be less than human if I did not on occasion reply, and I frankly admit that I have hurled more than one verbal brickbat in the direction of that organization and some of its officers. For the rank and file, I have the greatest respect. I know, because I know many of them, that they are just as loyal, just as honest, just as anxious to fulfill the obligations of a good citizen as you or I think we are.

You say Reuther is sincere. Granted. It does not follow that his philosophy is that of the people of the district or my philosophy, or that I cannot criticize it.

As long as we are on the subject, let me call your attention to the fact that a Government record which I hold in my hand as I dictate this states that on Wednesday evening, March 18, 1936, Walter Reuther was introduced as Comrade Walter Reuther at a meeting of the Young People's Socialist League, Masonic Temple, Flint. He was presented by Nordine Johnson who organized the women's brigade during the big strike. His topic was Russia's Economic Position Today. He said that he had spent 33 months in Europe. He proceeded to deliver an address praising European labor policies and workers' conditions. He was asked—and I quote from the record:

"Do you and the Soviet Union believe in religion and God or in science as a religion?"

The answer was:

"We do not believe in God but that man is god."

I do not subscribe to that doctrine, and, as you will note from reading the foregoing, I did not call Reuther any names, and if stating that he was deferred on the grounds of dependency when he was and when at the time his only dependent was his wife making a thousand dollars a year as his secretary is invective, then I indulged in the folly of using it.

The sentiments expressed by Reuther at the Flint meeting were similar to those set forth in a letter alleged to have been written by Walter Reuther and his brother, Victor, on January 20, 1934, from Abmozavos, Russia, and addresssed to Melvin and Gladys Bishop, friends of the Reuthers. George Addes, secretary and treasurer of the UAW-CIO, Detroit, handed out copies of that letter to the delegates attending the convention held in Buffalo, N. Y., in August of 1941, where there was a bitter fight between John L. Lewis and Sidney Hillman. Addes at the present time is a brother officer of Reuther in the union which is now on strike against General Motors.

When Addes handed out the letter, he stated that the Reuthers would undoubtedly deny having written such a letter, and when that statement was made, Melvin Bishop, the recipient of the letter, at Addes' request got up on the platform and stated he had received the letter from Walter and Victor Reuther and that it was authentic. It is only fair to state that Reuther did deny writing the letter. The point of the matter is that in that letter the Reuthers are alleged to have advised their comrades in Detroit to fight for a Soviet America.

In years gone by, there has been not a little violence connected with the strikes in Detroit—strikes in which Mr. Reuther had a very active part.

In the papers of December 15—and, I assume, also in Detroit papers, which you must have seen—there appears a partial stenographic report of the present union GM negotiations. In that part of the report given out by the union, Reuther, in answer to GM negotiators is reported (if the press quotation is correct) to have, among other things said:

"We are telling you frankly you are not going to make any automobiles until this is settled, and you can go through all the contract cancellations you want. * * * You are asking for a fight, and, brother, you are going to get it, and if it is the last thing we do, brother, we are going to sweat this one out to the bitter end. * * * You haven't lost a damn red cent, and we will take it right down to the last bitter inch of the road, and when the plants open up, remember, part of it goes back into the plants. Don't forget about that. We have just started to fight, since this is the way you have asked for it. You made that decision when you canceled the contracts; you asked for it, you will get it, you will get it with everything we have got and then we will break it off. * * * You asked for it, and you are going to get the damnedest fight you ever had. * * * You can get all the injunction you want, but Dean isn't going to make Chevrolets and Buicks."

Reuther also announced that the union would call out the "panzer" divisions. Just what he meant by that was not made clear.

Now, I hold no brief for General Motors. I do speak for employees who must work for their living, for many of them. I believe in unions. I believe in collective bargaining. But from the bottom of my heart I believe that we will never get anywhere until there is equal justice under the law for everyone.

When, last Saturday, December 15, the House Labor Committee, and an overwhelming majority of its members speak for union labor, voted 10 to 7 to refuse to give further consideration to President Truman's fact-finding bill, I was one of the 4 Republicans included in the 7 who wanted to go ahead and draft and submit a bill before Christmas.

If in opposing the policies of the leadership of the CIO, and if in stating the fact that Reuther, a healthy, physically fit young man, was deferred on the ground of dependency, when his only dependent was his wife and perhaps a 17-year-old sister, is invective, then I injured myself and will have to take the consequences.

May I humbly and respectfully suggest that it would be helpful if editors, like others would make an effort to ascertain the facts before "throwing verbal brickbats"?

Yours for more and better criticism,

CLARE E. HOFFMAN.

Radio Address Transcribed by Hon. Fred Bradley, of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast which I transcribed for delivery over radio station WMAM, Marinette, Wis., on December 30, Station WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., on New Year's Day, and Station WDBC, Escanaba, Mich., on January 2:

Happy New Year, everyone, and I hope it really is a happy and a prosperous New Year for you all.

Down here in Washington, when the Congress reconvenes, as you know, on January 14 all of us in the House are going to miss the jovial faces of four of our veteran Members who resigned effective December 31, and that brings up a very serious subject that I want to discuss with you today, because it is one, in my opinion, which is vitally important to you and one which you should view with considerable alarm. The question is, What of the future in this the world's greatest legislative body and one of the last freely elected truly representative legislative bodies in the entire world? It is up to you folks back home to decide what kind of Congress you are going to have in the future. The Congress is a mirror reflecting the type of people back home who send your various Representatives to Washington. If you want able representation, if you want outstanding men and women to truly reflect the greatness of your community and congressional district, it is up to you to select those men by your free ballot, and it is up to you as taxpayers to insist that your Government make it not only attractive but really worth while for those who serve you here in the Nation's Capital and back in your district.

We are losing, all told, four outstanding Democratic Members of the House of Representatives. The Honorable SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, of New York City, chairman of the extremely important Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, has resigned to accept a New York State judgeship at a salary of $25,000 a year, and which, I believe, is a lifetime appointment. No longer will Mr. DICKSTEIN have to campaign every 2 years at considerable personal expense; no longer will he have to maintain a home in New York and one in Washington; no longer will he have to travel frequently back and forth from Washington to New York to give personal services to his constituents. No; his will henceforth be a judicial life at two and one-half times his salary as a Member of Congress. Mr. DICKSTEIN began his present service on March 4, 1923, and so he served in this House a total of 23 years.

Representative SAMUEL WEISS, of Pittsburgh, Pa., who began his service on January 3, 1941, has resigned to accept a local judgeship at a 50-percent increase over his congressional salary. Mr. WEISS was an all-American quarterback when he captained the Duquesne University football team some years ago, and for the past several years has been an outstanding referee in the National Professional Football League and is extremely popular among athletes everywhere and among his colleagues in the House of Representatives. SAMMY WEISS, incidentally, whom I know very well, recently told me that while he expected to continue his pro football refereeing, there was no profit in it for him

and only the love of the game made him wish to continue. He told me that at the recent New York-Washington Redskins game he was paid $80 for his job as referee, but it cost him out of his own pocket $120 to supply tickets to his constituents—and believe me, only the referee could secure them, because Griffith Stadium was sold out for that game just as it had been for every other game Washington played here this year. But the gentlemen to whom I want to refer from now on in this broadcast are Representative CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, of Virginia, who likewise started his service on the date of March 4, 1923, and is resigning after 23 years of service in this body. Mr. WOODRUM has been one of the most outstanding legislators this Nation has ever known. He was the ranking majority member of the most important committee in the House in recent years, namely, the Appropriations Committee. He resigns to take a very important position in private industry, and, as he said in his farewell speech to the House, it will be the first time in all his life that he has not held some political office. The other gentleman to whom I wish to refer today has been one of my colleagues on the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, the Honorable ROBERT RAMSPECK, of Georgia, who began his service in the House on October 2, 1929, and thus has completed over 16 consecutive years of service. In his retirement he has given up the chairmanship of the extremely important Committee on the Civil Service, and for the past 3 years has been the majority whip in the House. It has been his job as whip to keep the Democatic vote in line, and as a Republican I can vouch for it—he has done a mighty good job. BOB RAMSPECK retires to become the executive vice president of the Air Transport Association, a position which undoubtedly carries with it a very handsome salary.

Now, quoting from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, just what reasons do Mr. WOODRUM and Mr. RAMSPECK advance for their decision to retire. I quote first from Mr. WOODRUM'S farewell speech and want you to give careful heed to these remarks because these very able gentlemen can tell you much better than I can the thoughts which activated and made imperative their retirement.

When Mr. WOODRUM said, "An English philosopher once said that there are two supreme pleasures in life. One is ideal, one is real. The ideal, he said, is when a man receives the seals of office from his sovereign. The real pleasure, he said, is when he hands them back." Referring to ardors of campaigning—which all have to undergo every 2 years in the House, he told a quaint story about a Virginia sheriff. In Virginia, as we do in Michigan, all candidates are required to file an expense account and a list of their campaign contributions. This sheriff filled out his formal papers and then decided that they did not tell the whole story so he turned the blank over and on the back side he wrote this: "I traveled 1,200 miles; I shook hands with 1,298 people; I plowed 27 acres; I joined 7 lodges; I was baptised 3 times, 1 by immersion; I kissed 74 babies; I made love to 16 old maids; I was bitten by 3 dogs; and I was defeated by 65 votes." Well, I will add the observation that that sheriff did not have 16 counties to cover like your Congressman does.

After reminiscing about the early days in Congress, Mr. WOODRUM went on to say this, "I have heard it said that being in Congress is a thankless job. I am sure that many of our citizens deeply appreciate the service rendered by Members of this body. But undoubtedly many of our citizens fail too often to take into account the back-bending, heart-breaking burdens that the conscientious Member of Congress is called upon to carry. I know and I could name scores of men in this body who labor diligently day in and day out, Sundays and holidays, in season and out of season, for the interests of the constituencies that send them here and their country which they represent.

"These men serve on and on and continue to serve oftentimes at their own physical and economic disadvantage. I have seen men come to this body in the heyday of hopeful youth and stay on under the blistering spotlight of public service until those once raven locks were frosted by the passing of many winters, until that agile step had been slowed and that eagle eye had dimmed, literally burning out in the service of their country." He went on to say, "If I had a voice that would reach the ear and the heart of every citizen who loves and appreciates his country, I would try to say to them that this fine variety of individuals who constitute the House of Representatives, even with its shortcomings and its failures, is yet the anchor to windward of the great ship of American state in the seas of a restless world. Deprive the House of Representatives of its individuality and its independence and there will quickly come an end to free government. Whatever may be said of the antiquity of its rules, it is a legislative body that is strictly and literally immediately responsive to the will of a majority of its Members, and that is democratic government." And then CLIFF WOODRUM went on to lecture us in this fashion, "Congress is entirely too hesitant and too timid about doing anything for its own welfare. Remember that nothing can be done for the Congress to ease its burdens or to help its Members unless you are willing to do it yourself; you can take action for the Government employees; you can take action for the judges; you can take action for the various departments and agencies, but if anything is done for the Congress they must do it themselves. You certainly should without hesitancy increase the pay of Members of Congress. Thoughtful citizens of this country do not expect Members of Congress to serve here without sufficient remuneration to permit them to live in Washington and to discharge the duties of their office in a manner and according to standards to which they are accustomed. I know many Members of this body who dip into their own private income to augment their congressional salaries; and this does not take into account one, and sometimes two, political campaigns every year."

And then Mr. WOODRUM advocated that the Congress adopt some adequate retirement plan. There is at present under consideration such a proposal but Mr. WOODRUM ridiculed it. He pointed out—and I quote him—"If I were eligible to come under this bill, after 23 years' service, and at my age, after 23 years' service in Congress, if I paid the minimum $2,500 that is to be paid in I could then draw retirement, $100 a month. That is what the committee says will attract the best brains to Congress and keep them there. Or, if I exercised my right to pay back the 5-percent all the way back for the 23 years, according to the report, I would pay in $13,619, if I could borrow that amount somewhere, and then I could retire on $175 a month. If I remained in Congress 35 years, and lived to be 62 years old, I could get $5,000 a year." And then lastly Mr. WOODRUM very aptly suggested that now that the war is over Congress should definitely limit the length of its session. I think he made a very good point because we all know that committees lag in their debates and in their consideration of important legislation—and so does the House and the Senate in its considerations on the floor when adjournment day is not proclaimed far in advance. As Mr. WOODRUM said, "Let us never forget this, that the country seldom suffers from the failure to pass legislation. It has often suffered from the passage of legislation." And so, CLIFF WOODRUM, let me say to the people of my district, over this microphone, your service and your accomplishments while here will always occupy a foremost place in the history of our beloved country. Every Member of Congress wishes you the best of success in private life.

In his farewell speech Mr. RAMSPECK made some equally pertinent observations. BOB RAMSPECK came on the Hill as a clerk in the post office in 1911. He later served as a secretary to a Member of the House and finally he was elected in his own right. He pointed out that back in 1925 the salary of a Congressman was exactly what it is today and he fails to find any other parallel in industry or public life where a man is working today for the same salary he received back in 1925. He said, and I quote him:

"Actually, what you are working for is less than $5,000 per year. That is a shame and a disgrace and the people of this country would not want it to continue, in my judgment, if they knew the facts, and they ought to know them * * * I say that every expense incurred by a Member of Congress in the discharge of his official duties should be reimbursed to him. We do that for the executive branch of the Government"; and then he cited a typical example of what we all go through. He said he had been called back home—as we all frequently are—to make a speech at a banquet. Then, he said, "A distinguished gentleman from Washington, who is head of one of the agencies here, made the principal address * * * he came in followed by three men who worked for the United States Government in the branch office of that agency in Atlanta. One of them was carrying a brief case, the other one looking after his travel reservations, and so forth. He had a book in his hand that he used to write out an order for a ticket. They do not need any money. The third one was driving him around in an automobile at Government expense"—and he went on to say, "Mr. Speaker, there I was representing a half million constituents, staying in a hotel room at my own expense, no secretarial staff, no assistants, not even anyone to help me answer the telephone which was ringing about as fast as it could." And that is one of the things we all go through. I am always glad to go back to my district to accept invitations to speak but what few people realize is that it costs me on the average of around $200 for every trip I make back in the district and this money all comes out of my own pocket and it is not deductible from my income tax—and that is another thing few people realize. Your Government speakers travel on a Government expense account but not your Congressman. They travel with aides and secretaries also on a Government expense account—but not your Congressman. And even when it comes right down to the speech; most of them have their speeches written for them by a ghost writer but not your Congressman. Most of the people do not know that we cannot even deduct our telephone calls or many other expenses of our office from our income tax. All of the young men and women in the armed services of the United States can write a letter to anyone in the world and write the word "free" in the upper right-hand corner of the envelope in place of putting a 3-cent stamp thereon.

Congressmen do have the same franking privilege for official mail only. But a Member of Congress cannot write a personal letter. He cannot write any letter—business or otherwise—that has a personal reference in it. He cannot send a Christmas card, for instance, unless he puts a 3-cent stamp on the envelope and that expense is not deductible from his income tax. As the majority leader of the House, Representative JOHN MCCORMACK, pointed out his telephone bill last year was $1,878; 98 percent of the amount was for official calls in connection with his work as a Congressman, but he could not deduct it from his income tax. And then Mr. MCCORMACK made this statement referring to Mr. WOODRUM and Mr. RAMSPECK: "They retire voluntarily due to economic pressure. There

are many other Members of this body confronted with the same problem. I may take the House into my confidence and say that I at the present time could resign from the House and accept a position paying each year a very substantial salary. It is a tremendous pressure when I realize that the journey of life is passing and that some time in the not too remote future my years of productivity will be over so far as a return to civilian life is concerned. We do not expect the salary or compensation that private employ can pay. Government should not pay that, and none of us expect it. On the other hand, it is for the best interests of the people of the country to see that Members of Congress, their public officials, are at least paid that compensation which gives them a reasonable minimum security in accordance with the position they occupy and the responsibilities devolving upon them."

Well, you ask, Why doesn't Congress do something about it? Surely from the letters coming to my office there are many people who realize that Congress should get more money and they advocate it. There is one vital reason why Congress probably will not vote any substantial increase in its own salary despite the fact that it has had no increase in over 20 years. The reason is that all over this Nation today there are strikes for more money. Wages have mounted by leaps and bounds throughout the war and yet organized labor is clamoring today for 30 percent more. The minute Congress votes itself an increase in salary it will be on record as condoning a corresponding wage increase for everyone else and a wage increase for everyone else, including Congress, must eventually lead to inflation, but the fact still remains that you are losing the service of patriotic, capable legislators. You are not attracting talented men to replace them.

And now I see my time is up, and so until next week at this same time may I remind you this is your Congressman, FRED BRADLEY, saying good afternoon and God bless you one and all.

Radio Address Transcribed by Hon. Fred Bradley, of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED BRADLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast which I transcribed for delivery over radio station WMAM, Marinette, Wis., on December 23; station WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., on Christmas Day; and station WDBC, Escanaba, Mich., on December 26:

Merry Christmas, everyone. I hope you all have a wonderful day, and I hope that the New Year will bring forth all the happiness and prosperity in the world for you. Then again I hope that all of you who had your sons and daughters scattered all over the world during our recent world-wide warfare have them back with you for this Christmastide, but if not, at least you can take great consolation in knowing that the shooting is over in most parts of the world, and you can feel reasonably certain that they are now safe. When we look back just 12 months ago and realize that some 4,000,000 of our fighting men were fighting out of foxholes all over the world, and millions more tossing on the seven seas, and unfortunately with many of them being carefully tended to by the superb flower of our young womanhood, who ministered to their injuries in our hospitals at the front or well behind the lines, we can truly be thankful that this year much of that has come to an end.

Yes; as we go into this Christmastide, we can be truly thankful, and we can enjoy the real Christmas spirit in a manner which has not been possible for the past 5 years, at least, and generally speaking has not been truly enjoyed in the real Christmas spirit for almost 15 years. I do hope you all enjoy a most pleasant Christmas and New Year and wish for each and every one of you a happy, a beneficial, and a prosperous New Year. As for Mrs. Bradley and myself—if you will pardon a personal reference—we shall remain right here in Washington until the Congress reconvenes on January 14. We feel that it would be unfair for us to occupy space on railroad trains which might displace some serviceman or woman trying to rejoin their happy families on this occasion, but there are other reasons which impel me to remain here in the Capital to watch developments which, to me, unfortunately, are alarming at this season of the year when our Maker sent onto this earth the Prince of Peace to spread good will and peace on earth among all mankind.

I have grave fears, as I had after the last war, that much that we fought for, much that the youth of this land spilled its blood for, may possibly have been in vain. I pray that my fears are groundless, but I have those fears in view of recent international developments. I do not wish to interrupt your revelry on Christmas with a song of gloom, but it seems to me it is well that we take stock of ourselves and that you join me in my prayers that some of the threatening events of the present do not flare into bonfires in the future.

Before Pearl Harbor, Mr. Churchill and the late President Roosevelt held a conference on the Atlantic at which time they were supposed to have drawn up the so-called Atlantic Charter which later actually proved to be nothing more than the expression of personal opinions as to what we might hope for idealistically after this war was over. They hoped that at the end of this war the world would find itself enjoying the well-known "four freedoms"—freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. The "four freedoms" thus enunciated proved to be a great battle cry and it is well to remember that a great battle cry, emanating from the mouths of statesmen or politicians, must be spread to the four winds to inspire men and in the past war our young women, too, to a fighting pitch which can lead but to victory. I pause to ask you what has happened to the idealistic "four freedoms"? Is there freedom of speech anywhere in the world today, except here in these grand United States? Is there freedom of worship in Europe or Asia today? Is there freedom from want anywhere in the world, outside of these United States? Is there freedom from fear in the Balkans—in the Baltic States—in India, in Malaya or Burma?

And I want to ask you this question, Are not we—the United States of America—fathered by an always benevolent Uncle Sam, being made into the world's greatest pawn on the same old international chess board of power politics? I have fervently hoped that the ground work so well laid in San Francisco for international cooperation to preserve the peace forever in the future would succeed. But it has always seemed to me that two of our late greatest allies would of necessity, and for their own preservation, join with us in the same spirit in which we approached this tremendous problem at San Francisco. Subsequent developments have proven that they have not—and seemingly will not—show that same spirit of cooperation and brotherly love and a sincere desire for world peace that we in this country hope for. They have gone further than that; while offending us, while bucking us openly and subtly behind the scenes they have, nevertheless, not hesitated to come over here and ask us—the American taxpayers—to foot the bills for them, today in money—tomorrow undoubtedly again in the lifeblood of our youngsters. For that reason I could not—and did not—support the congressional approval of the United Nations Organization. I knew when I cast my vote in opposition that it was futile, that our approval would be overwhelming in the House, but my conscience is clear and especially so from the defeatist attitude so frequently expressed to me on the floor by many Members who wanted to vote as I did but who felt the utter hopelessness of it. Well, some of you may say: "Do you not believe in international cooperation?" Of course, I do, when you get cooperation, but cooperation must be a two-way road as far as I am concerned.

Uncle Sam did his part in winning the last war. We poured out our sum and substance of this land to the tune of $30,000,000,000 and authorized an additional $35,000,000,000 to our fighting and nonfighting allies in the form of lend-lease, which when the Congress approved the program originally under duress from the administration, was supposed to be, at least partially, a two-way street. We were told then that we were loaning our arms and ammunition and other supplies to our allies for which we would receive from them in return either suitable materials in exchange for credit or eventual payment therefor. Today that's not only all being forgiven but the lend-lease balances heavily in our favor being completely wiped off the slate. All over the world, wherever fighting was going on or threatened for the future, we built gigantic airports and landing fields. In every instance we paid through reverse lend-lease for such local equipment and supplies and even rental of the ground that we found it possible to use. Today, we are forbidden to use these same fields for our commercial worldwide airlines that are owned by the same American citizens who had to pay the taxes to build those fields originally. In some of the southwest Pacific islands, that we took with the blood and guts of American youth, we have seen charged as reverse lend-lease so much per tree for every one that our artillery had to blast down in order that American troops could move forward in the defense or recapture of someone else's outlying possessions.

We built a bridge of ships—the greatest fleet the world has ever seen—to keep ourselves and our allies supplied all over the world, and then we leased these ships to our allies and in return had charged up against us reverse lend-lease for the expense of moving each of our fighting Americans to their fighting fronts. And, yes, even today some of our fighting allies are still using our own ships, rental free, to all practical purposes and are now asking us to continue that rent-free arrangement indefinitely in the future.

Well, you may say that all of these things are justified. You may even resort to the old argument of our debtor nations that they saved the war for us—that they held the line—until we were ready to fight. Well, I disagree with that argument. I doubt, for instance, that we would have had a Pearl Harbor if we would have had the 50 additional destroyers that we gave to Britain patrolling the seas around Pearl Harbor. General Marshall recently testified that had we not shipped the lion's share of our heavy bombers and fighting aircraft to the European theater before Pearl Harbor that bastion and the Philippines would not have fallen and thousands of those American boys would still be home with you for Christmas.

But to get back to the present. Let us see what is happening to lend-lease arms, munitions, and other fighting equipment right

today. Before we finished off the Japs we had in training in this country, at our expense, some 5,000 young Dutchmen who were trained by our Marine Corps in amphibious warfare at the American taxpayers' expense. After the war was over and while our own troops stationed in the Dutch East Indies were disarming the Japs and sending them home, our Foreign Economic Administrator received a request for $16,000,000 worth of equipment to outfit these Dutch for service in the Dutch East Indies. They got nowhere there, but they did through the Navy Lend-Lease Administrator. According to columnist Drew Pearson, under 5 Navy requisitions, labeled "NEN 10001 to 5," they received 450,000 gallons of 80-octane nonaviation gasoline, 25,000 gallons of lubricants, medical and surgical supplies, field rations, yard and dock materials—including pontoons for invasion landings and post-exchange supplies sufficient for a force of 5,000 men for 3 months.

Now you must remember that when the Japs filtered down rapidly through the Malay States down into Burma and in that whole area, they received a great deal of local cooperation from natives who had long been oppressed by European imperialism, by the Dutch, French, and British. They had been forced to work for many years at starvation wages, and they are now rebellious at going back under that same imperialistic iron heel. Those natives looked upon the United States as their savior and they counted on the "four freedoms." Today they feel disillusioned and fiery armed rebellion has broken out, and once again instead of realizing freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear, these natives find they are being ground under the imperialistic heel not entirely by British and Dutch troops but more especially by arms and ammunition that bear a stamp of U. S. A. And, therefore, idealists that we are—freedom-loving peoples that we are—we are being blamed for going back on our word as so widely proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter.

Recently our State Department consummated a deal with Britain for a so-called $4,400,000,000 loan. I am going to discuss that with you in the near future in detail. I intend to vote against it and possibly will speak on the floor against it. I have told you about the Dutch East Indies; I might add that British imperialism in Greece is another example of where the "four freedoms" have not worked, and let me remind you that in Ethiopia, where this whole last war started, the British have forced their way into occupation with their colonial troops of part of a nation which fought to the death against having the Italian troops invade their native soil. And lastly we come to the case of Siam. Siam had a record of 700 years of proud independence and when the Japs came in there the Regent of Siam, himself, was the head of the underground that cooperated so well with our own spies. And yet, the British are today using American-made lend-lease guns and tanks in the streets of Bangkok, the capital of Siam, and is it any wonder that the natives of Siam feel they have been double-crossed by the United States? Is it any wonder that we hear so frequently here in Washington from present world travelers that the British lion is making Uncle Sam despised all over the world.

Oh, my friends, as we here in this country enjoy our Christmas spirit, the privilege of having our loved ones back with us, should we not wonder whether or not our statesmen in Washington may not be this very day sowing the seeds for the planting of more American boys in the soil of foreign lands in order that European imperialism—and I must say American internationalism—may not perish from the face of the earth. I am opposed to it. I shall fight it as long as you send me down here to Congress.

I swore to uphold the Constitution of the United States when you sent me down here. Last week all but an immortal 15 Members of your Congress voted away one of the cardinal rights of your Congress—we delegated the power to send your sons to battle on foreign soil to an international tribunal—we hauled down the Stars and Stripes and raised aloft the new symbol of one world.

Until next week, then, I remind you this is your Congressman, FRED BRADLEY, saying good afternoon—a Merry Christmas to you all.

Critical Situation in Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me, I would like to call the attention of the House to the situation in Indonesia, particularly to the use of American lend-lease in the suppression of the liberties and freedoms of the peopes of that land.

I have had the privilege to receive a copy of a report by a student of Indonesia who was an eyewitness to the outbreak of the present armed conflict in that country. The report of this observer reveals several important facts which have not as yet been reported in the American press. Therefore, I have requested permission to reveal the contents of this report to Congress without revealing the identity of the observer. The request was granted, and I am most pleased to call it to the attention of the Members.

The report in full follows:

THE INDONESIAN INDEPENDENCE MOVEMENT

One of the most conspicuous trouble spots in the postwar world is Indonesia. Indonesia today is one of the greatest challenges to that new world of freedoms which the United Nations held out as a promise to all peoples during the war. The United States and Great Britain proclaimed to the world the principles of the "four freedoms" in the Atlantic Charter, and were taken seriously by subject peoples. VE-day and VJ-day have been achieved by untold sacrifices of the peoples and governments of the United Nations, yet 4 months after Japan's surrender, the United Nations witness, and are a party to, bloody strife because a people clamor for the right to aspire to be a nation.

The United States cannot remain aloof. In the meaningless statement issued by the State Department December 19 the United States asserts neutrality, yet the fact remains that American ships are transporting Dutch troops to Batavia and American lend-lease equipment is being used to crush a people's struggle for self-determination.

One of the main hindrances to enlightened opinion has been lack of adequate information on Indonesia and the present independence movement.

As a student of the Netherlands East Indies and an observer on the spot in the first critical month after reoccupation, I would like to answer briefly some of the questions the American people are undoubtedly asking:

1. Why don't the Indonesians welcome the return of Dutch tutelage which has been described as so beneficial; and why do they refuse to accept Queen Wilhelmina's offer of equal partnership in the Kingdom of the Netherlands?

The main Indonesian grievances against the Dutch before the war were:

(a) No civil liberties: The provisions of the Netherlands East Indies Penal Code effectively suppressed freedom of speech, assembly, press, and organization.

(b) Economic exploitation: Despite the fact that Indonesia is one of the richest areas in the world in natural resources, 98 percent of the population in its richest island, Java, lived on a subsistence level.

(c) Lack of educational facilities: The literacy rate in 1940 for the Netherlands East Indies was about 8 percent; for a population of 70,000,000 people there was only one university and two technical vocational colleges; what education there was was carefully devised to prevent the spread of modern social, economic, and technological knowledge. Most educated Indonesians studied abroad.

(d) No real participation in government: All key positions in the Government were occupied by Netherlanders. The People's Council was advisory and at most colegislative, and, moreover, nonrepresentative. Its membership consisted of 25 Netherlanders (of which 10 were appointed and 15 elected): 30 Indonesians (of which 10 were appointed and 20 elected from amongst Government-designated candidates); and 5 foreign Asiatics (of whom 3 were Chinese).

On the basis of past experience, the Indonesian leaders have no faith in general promises without concrete plans for their implementation. The crucial questions as to the extent and manner in which Indonesian interests and representation will be safeguarded in internal Government have so far remained unanswered. There are neither promises nor guaranties as regards suffrage, freedom of speech and assembly, nor concrete plans for Indonesian participation in economic enterprise.

2. Is the present Indonesian movement Japanese-inspired and are its leaders Quislings?

The idea of Indonesian independence and the fight for it has been growing in strength since 1908. By 1941, Indonesian political parties formed a federation, known as GAPI. At their 1939 congress, GAPI passed a number of resolutions, among which were the adoption of the present Indonesian red and white flag, the Indonesian national anthem, and the Indonesian national language. The principal aim of GAPI was eventual self-rule. Therefore, the present revolution is a logical continuation of the prewar struggle against colonial rule, but accelerated by the Japanese who utilized it to further their own ends.

It appears true that the Indonesian nationalist forces, of whatever shade, have been trained and armed owing to the presence of the Japanese. For this they are grateful to the Japanese, as even the most anti-Japanese among them freely acknowledge. The Indonesians maintain that the Dutch would not allow them to participate in the war against the Japanese, with the consequence that Java was at the mercy of the invaders and had to surrender in 7 days. The Indonesians hold the Dutch in contempt because the Dutch were unable to protect Java and are unable to reconquer it even from the Indonesians, unless ushered in by the Allies.

Most of the present nationalist leaders who formed the republican Indonesian Government, and support it, have a long prewar record of nationalist activity. Several among them, including Soekarno and Hatta, who on several occasions denounced the Japanese before the war, had been persecuted for their political activities and were imprisoned or exiled by the Dutch authorities. But also representatives of moderate political parties, which before the war hoped to achieve parliamentary representation by peaceful means, support the self-proclaimed independent Indonesian Government now. Suporting that Government also are active anti-Japanese resistance leaders who risked their lives under the Japanese occupation.

3. How representative is the nationalist movement?

Apart from the politically conscious leaders and party members, the nationalist sentiment has pervaded the broadest layers of the population, aroused by the simple slogan of freedom. It is obvious that the movement has united the most varied elements, including conservative native princes as well as radical left-wing parties and economically mined Chinese, and the reportedly apathetic Javanese peasantry. The American press has not given the true scope and strength of the nationalist movement in Java, testified to by observers in the field; rather, it has focused public attention on incidents, alleged atrocities and violence by "extremists," which are inevitable concomitants in any revolution and which are exaggerated as an excuse to crush the movement.

4. How did the present warfare develop and what does it lead to?

The Indonesian nationalists and their leaders were ready to cooperate with the British when the first contingent of the occupation force arrived on September 15. All civil administration and public utilities were in the control of the self-proclaimed republican government and functioned smoothly. On the strength of the official statement by the British Command, that their only aim was to disarm and intern the Japanese and evacuate the prisoners of war and internees, the Indonesian leaders pledged to the British full cooperation and assistance. Instead of considering this offer, the Allied (Dutch and British) authorities appointed the Japanese to maintain law and order. All orders to the Indonesians were given through the Japanese who thus remained in authority. (Thus, the ex-enemy of the Allies became an ally, and the potential allies were treated as enemies).

On September 18, Soekarno called a mass meeting in Batavia, at which he asked the assembled masses to cooperate with the allies, although the allies had ordered the Japanese to break up the meeting and to prevent Soekarno from speaking.

Far from taking measures to disarm the Japanese, the occupation command charged Japanese troops to "retake by arms" key cities like Badoeng which were controlled by the Indonesian civil administration. The Indonesians thus took to calling the allied occupation "the second Japanese invasion." At that time, no violence, except some cases against individual Japanese, had taken place or was threatened. During the first 2 weeks, the Indonesian leaders pleaded for opportunities to discuss the situation with the Dutch and the British. The Dutch would not, and the British could not, do it.

The Indonesians from the beginning made it clear that without preliminary discussions they would remain adamant in their opposition to the landing of Dutch troops. They also maintained that they had no quarrel with Dutch civilians or internees, nor even with the representatives of the Netherlands East Indies Government, provided these would sit down and negotiate with them. On the grounds that the Netherlands Government would not negotiate with "Quislings" the Hague prohibited any discussions.

Meanwhile, on October 4, some Dutch troops were landed at Batavia's port, Tandjong Priok. This provoked the first fighting between Indonesians and Dutch troops. Inconspicuously infiltrated into the city of Batavia, these troops took to patroling the streets in armed trucks (these trucks were marked USA), (the soldiers wore American uniforms with Dutch insignia). All neutral observers were agreed that they fired on Indonesians without provocation, and their actions seemed to pursue a conscious policy of provoking warfare. Soekarno ordered the Indonesians to remain off the streets after dark, to prevent their becoming victims of these provocations. This is how violence began. The Indonesians, striking back in self-defence, caused redoubled attacks, and from that point on the situation deteriorated.

Netherlands-inspired sources circulated many reports designed to alienate world opinion from the Indonesians. Besides, the world press in some instances received sensational news, which was false but which was never retracted. A striking instance of this was the so-called declaration of "holy war" on October 14 by the Indonesians against all Europeans, the report of which was based on no more than a leaflet delivered to news reporters. The leaflet bore the signature of the Republican Government, which in reality had never issued it. The Dutch press in Batavia did not carry a reference to this declaration of war, though it was headlined by the world press.

Meanwhile, subsequent events and ever-growing bitterness have produced a situation which has become a critical impasse. It is obvious from the scope and strength of the nationalist movement in Java that it will take full-scale military operations to crush it by force. In all appearances, this is a course that has been decided upon by the Dutch and the British, with no effective protest on the part of the United States.

5. Can the situation be resolved by peaceful means?

The Indonesians have consistently asked for consideration of their case by the United Nations, on the basis of the stated aims of the United Nations. They would be willing to abide by any decision made by the United Nations, including trusteeship status, even under the auspices of the Dutch, provided a definite date were set for their eventual independence.

Whatever techniques the United Nations will devise to handle this matter, it is clear that the United Nations as a body now must assume responsibility for the peaceful solution of the conflict.

The Honorable Robert Ramspeck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, nothing I can say in tribute to him will add to the genuine affection and high regard that his colleagues feel for BOB RAMSPECK.

Bob came up the hard way, but never missed a bet. He stored every bit of worth-while experience, collected on the way up, to use to his personal advantage and for the benefit of the country.

That he comes from Georgia and I from Vermont geographically separates us. Yet otherwise it is not so.

A fearless fighter for those things in which he believes, he has been a bad man to tangle with. When he said a thing was so and he knew it, contradiction fell flat on the ears of listeners, for Bob's integrity, ability, and perseverance for a cause were recognized. We shall miss him on our side of the aisle, for while he was a doughty champion he was a diplomat—and shrewd, at that.

I shall always treasure the memory of the years when he and I came together as whips for our respective parties. When he and I had made a canvass, we could well prognosticate what the political weather would be when the roll was called.

He was a fine man to work with, or against. You might always be assured that, though perhaps Bob might have no use for your partisan notions, that fact did not interfere with his regard for you.

The career of BOB RAMSPECK is an inspiration and a challenge to the youth of America. His life is one to be studied by those who are willing to work in order to achieve an ambition only to be realized by those who are willing to pay the price. There is no genius other than hard work. Ask the Honorable ROBERT RAMSPECK if that be not so.

More power to you, Bob. May you derive such satisfaction from your new fields of endeavor as is measured by the pride we feel in what you already have accomplished.

Britain Discriminates Against American Marine Insurance Underwriters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the effect of the loans now being made to foreign governments by the Export-Import Bank has been to divert a large volume of business from the American insurance market to foreign markets. This results from the fact that shipments which would ordinarily be financed by American manufacturers and exporters and insured in the American market are now paid for before shipment with funds loaned by our Government, and covered by marine insurance placed in foreign markets. Although the insurance may be placed in the first instance in the country of destination I understand that, by means of reinsurance, most of it finds its way to the London market. Consequently, a continuation of the present system will seriously cripple the American marine insurance market.

This seems to me a serious situation, in view of the fact that Congress has consistently indicated its intent that there should be in this country an adequate marine insurance market to serve our shipping and foreign commerce.

To remedy this situation I believe legislation should be adopted which provides that any loans made by the Export-Import Bank of Washington or any instrumentality of the Government for the purchase of United States products provision should be made that any marine insurance placed on such products should be placed in the United States, unless as to such products the Maritime Commission, after investigation, shall certify to the Export-Import Bank of Washington, or to such other instrumentality of the Government, that such insurance is not available in the United States at reasonable rates and on reasonable terms and conditions.

As the money lent by the Export-Import Bank has to be spent in this country, the American manufacturer and American labor are taken care of automatically, but this is not so with regard to ship owners or marine underwriters, although ship owners may be taken care of under United States Code, title 15.

Marine underwriters should be given some share of the protection extended to other American interests. Under the United States Code, aforesaid, shipments financed by the United States Government to foster the export of agricultural or other products are carried in vessels of the United States, whenever available, at reasonable rates.

Citizens of the United States have a perfect right to insure abroad if they wish to do so, but in the case of exports financed by our own Government, consideration should be given in favor of our marine insurance companies. Marine insurance companies do not wish to expand their volume of business, but wish to maintain the business they already have.

In the proposed loan to Britain, American marine insurance companies have no protection. Great Britain, undoubtedly, will do everything in her power to divert marine insurance of goods purchased in the United States with American money to the English market. This would be fatal.

When the British loan comes to the House, I shall make it my business to try to give some sort of added protection to the American marine insurance companies and underwriters. A condition precedent to that loan should be that goods purchased in the country with American money must be insured in the American market.

As is, the American underwriters are suffering from currency blocs and other forms of control by foreign governments, whereby their business is being diverted to foreign markets. All they wish to do is to preserve the historical pattern of their business. They are entitled to retain the same proportion of marine insurance business which they had in the past as long as they write it on terms and conditions comparable to those in other markets.

Furthermore, these American marine insurance companies are entitled to a fair proportion of the business that formerly went to our enemies, Germany, Italy, and Japan. They should have the right to compete with foreign markets for a fair proportion of this business. But if these foreign markets are given the edge by such devices as currency blocs. American marine insurance companies cannot compete fairly and squarely with the foreign markets. They will have two strikes against them before they go to bat. This is all the more reason why in case of purchases financed by the Export-Import Bank or United States Treasury, the marine insurance should be placed with American outfits.

Bottlenecks in Home Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, we are all deeply concerned over the bottlenecks in the building industry. Literally tens of thousands of veterans and servicemen are unable to find housing so that they may have roofs over their heads. The situation is becoming America's No. 1 problem. I am including in this brief discussion correspondence with the National Lumber Manufacturers Association and a letter addressed by it to John W. Snyder, Director, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, with respect to the critical building and lumber situation. Immediate steps should be taken to give the green light to the building industry so that homes may be provided for our people. The correspondence to which I refer is as follows:

NATIONAL LUMBER
MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., December 20, 1945.

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANGELL: The lumber supply situation is being described currently as one of the bottlenecks in the construction of small homes. While present production is more than sufficient to build the 400,000 to 500,000 homes the Government officials say is the maximum that can be built in 1946, adequate lumber for a million more new low cost homes would be available if production could be restored to the level it reached in the wartime year 1942.

To assure this plentiful supply of lumber the principal need is an incentive to produce. Mills which closed down during the war because of manpower shortages or as a result of the unrealistic price policies of OPA and those which are closing down now for the latter reason, cannot be expected to resume production when OPA continues to follow a policy which is designed to permit only 75 percent of the industry to break even or make a profit and dooms the other 25 percent to extinction.

We hope you will interest yourself in this problem, which is discussed in some detail in the attached letter to War Mobilization Director Snyder, and that you will do what you can to induce the OPA to help solve the housing problem by adopting a more realistic policy.

Sincerely,

HENRY BAHR, *Secretary.*

NATIONAL LUMBER
MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., December 18, 1945.

JOHN W. SNYDER,
Director, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, the White House, Washington, D. C.

THE LUMBER SITUATION

DEAR MR. SNYDER: Shortly after VE-day, the War Production Board pointed out in a public statement that the availability of lumber might be the deciding factor in the partial reconversion then under way.

Unfortunately, such a realistic and forward-looking viewpoint was not apparent in any other Government agency. Despite repeated, almost daily appeals, the Office of Price Administration, the United States Employment Service, and other Government control agencies, have failed to appreciate the basic importance of lumber in the restoration of a normal peacetime economy.

Last June, your predecessor, Judge Vinson, was cautioned in letters and in person that the industry alone could not solve Government-imposed production obstacles. Those cautions were not heeded, and the lumber industry, 4 months after VJ-day, is described as a bottleneck industry, with no important constructive steps being taken to eliminate the Government-imposed obstacles to increased production.

When the revocation of Construction Limitation Order No. L-41 was announced in September, your office established a six-point program for the stimulation of home construction and the production of materials. These objectives included increasing the supply of, and strengthening of price control over, building materials and the enlistment of industry support for these objectives.

If certain of the policies established to carry out these programs are not modified to permit practical solution of practical problems, we contend that they will defeat their purpose and that less housing, rather than more housing will be the result.

Lumber is a basic housing material. Without adequate lumber supplies the objective of adequate housing cannot be reached. Lumber is at present in short supply. So that you may better understand the current situation, and how present policies deter rather than encourage production, let us review briefly what has happened in the past several years.

When the war broke out in Europe, production of lumber was stepped up from the 1930–39 average of 19,800,000,000 board feet to 28,900,000,000 feet in 1940; to 33,400,000,000 feet in 1941; and to 36,300,000,000 in 1942. Since 1942, however, production has declined to 34,300,000,000 feet in 1943 and to 31,600,000,000 feet in 1944. The latest estimate of 1945 production is 26,700,000,000 feet, in spite of a loss of three-quarters of a billion feet because of strikes in two of the major producing areas. In one major area, the strike is still in progress after more than 3 months.

Wartime demands for lumber far exceeded production, and, as a result, stocks at the mills were reduced from 9,400,000,000 feet at the end of 1940 to 3,600,000,000 feet in September 30, 1945. Inventories of lumber yards throughout the Nation were depleted in about the same proportion.

Except for the past 4 years, when the industry was limited by war controls, lumber has always been in adequate supply. Construction has never depended on the availability of lumber. On the contrary, the lumber industry has always been limited by the size of the construction market. It will return to that condition when the Government gets out of the way.

On October 25, 1945, you, OPA Administrator Bowles, and NHA Administrator Blandford testified before the complaints subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee. The following is a composite of statements as to the home-construction situation at that hearing:

(a) "It is not likely that we can build more than 400,000 to 500,000 houses during the coming year." (Snyder and Bowles.)

(b) Scarce building materials include brick, clay sewer pipe, structural tile, cast-iron soil pipe, bathtubs, and cast-iron radiation, gypsum lath, and lumber.

(c) "In lumber, for instance, developments which have occurred since VJ-day make it very doubtful that the amount of lumber required for new construction will be forthcoming during the months ahead. Production is basically limited by shortage of manpower and strikes. * * * Unless the situation improves promptly, it will not be possible to build up stocks at sawmills and distribution yards to the point desired for handling the expected large construction demand next spring." (Snyder.)

(d) "It is conservatively estimated that American families will need 12,500,000 new dwellings during the next 10 years—an average of 1,200,000 new units per year. During the period from 1937 to 1942 only 515,000 units were built in the average year." (Bowles.)

Paragraph (c) above refers partially to the reason for the lumber shortage. It is true that manpower inadequacies and strikes have been partly responsible. But another and very real factor has been the stifling

effect of ceiling prices that did not provide cost protection to a large percentage of the Nation's lumber production. Your office has been supplied with factual data concerning this. The industry has time and again brought this fact to the attention of Government authorities.

In your memorandum to the President released on December 12 you state that "Nothing less than several years of peak production will really solve the housing problem."

We are in accord with that conclusion. To secure that peak production of housing, peak production of lumber is necessary.

The lumber industry has adequate timber resources, ample capacity, sufficient capital, and knows how to produce the required lumber. It does not have sufficient manpower, and the pricing policies of OPA are stifling production. As noted above, production of lumber declined from 36,300,000,000 feet in 1942 to less than 27,000,000,000 feet this year—a drop of more than 25 percent. That loss of production, if regained, will be sufficient to build a million small low-cost homes a year.

That production cannot be regained, however, as long as OPA continues its present policies. The lumber industry, with 40,000 producing units, is characteristically one with many "births" and "deaths." Thousands of mills operate only when conditions are favorable, when there is a real incentive to convert investments in standing timber into cash.

Present policies of the OPA do not encourage such operators. It is not reasonable to expect idle mills to get into production when OPA frankly states that its price ceilings are designed to permit only 75 percent of the industry to break even.

The other 25 percent of production must operate at a loss and is doomed to extinction. This formula results in progressive elimination because successive applications do not include that portion of the production which has been eliminated, and a lower average margin is provided for the declining segment of the industry which is protected.

Why is it not possible for OPA to increase to 90 percent or 95 percent their marginal break-even point and thus assure increased production?

Another policy of OPA which aggravates this situation is the practice of determining the financial situation of a firm manufacturing several products on the basis of its over-all profits from all products rather than in the basis of its margin on individual commodities. This policy has resulted in unnatural channeling of lumber into what are normally by-product industries. It has now been modified as it applies to some other industries. Is it to be changed for lumber and other forest products?

Finally, the delay in granting price relief, even when relief is justified under these unrealistic policies, has resulted in further substantial losses in production. In a period of rising costs, delays of from 6 to 9 months in reaching a decision and granting relief are serious. Throughout the war and since, OPA can well be characterized as the outstanding exponent of "too little and too late."

A new priorities system is being inaugurated to channel inadequate supplies of building materials, including lumber, to builders of low-cost housing. Even if this program could break the bottlenecks which are retarding house construction by channeling materials to low-cost house construction, it will of a certainty create bottlenecks in several other important reconversion programs. Farmers have been starved for lumber for several years and need lumber for housing and for many farm purposes. Industries, important in reconversion, also require lumber. As soon as lumber is channeled away from the farms and industries, new controls will be necessary to channel it back.

Government controls will not solve the problem. What is needed is increased production, and increased production can be achieved only by the removal of Government controls, especially price controls which are retarding production.

In view of the urgency of the situation, will you direct Stabilization Administrator Collet and Price Administrator Bowles to modify present policies to the extent necessary to enable the lumber manufacturing industry to do its share in solving the current housing problem?

Respectfully,

HENRY BAHR, *Secretary.*

Copies to Stabilization Administrator Collet, Price Administrator Bowles, CPA Administrator John D. Small.

American Democracy in Austria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the attention of my colleagues is invited to the following excerpts of letters received by me from an Austrian friend now overseas. This friend is also a long-time friend of American democracy and undisputed enemy of nazism. I do not vouch for the accuracy of the facts presented by these letters.

But that they are sincerely felt to be the truth by a highly qualified observer of Austrian postwar conditions, there can be no doubt.

They reflect a deep disillusionment with the workings of American democracy in Austria which cannot fail to depress all true friends of that country, and give us great cause for alarm concerning our present policies vis a vis this land.

Mr. Speaker, those of us in this House who are deeply distressed by our country's failure to practice what it preaches abroad, and by our continuing betrayal of the Atlantic Charter and so-called "four freedoms" in all quarters of the globe, feel doubly helpless when we receive authentic letters like the following, from a noted foreign friend of our country and its ideals. We do not know quite how to check these facts. We do not know how to correct these conditions if the facts should prove to be true.

All we can do, it seems, is to give such letters publicity, and hope that if they are the truth, the published truth will help somehow a little, to make and keep our Austrian friends free.

First. Translation of excerpts from a letter of December 10, 1945, from an Austrian democrat:

THE FINANCIAL REFORM OF AUSTRIA

Here are the secret and authentic facts about the Austrian financial reform, secret only as far as the intentions of the Inter-Allied Control Commission. You will remember that the financial reform was delayed by the veto of Russia, or by Russia attaching to the reform impossible conditions. Finally, it was agreed upon that on December 21 Austria was to return to the schilling currency. Five billion schillings will be printed. (Formerly Austria had 2,000,000,000 schillings.) The existing marks will be put on frozen accounts and each Austrian will receive the sum of 145 marks a month. These facts were made public.

However, what the public does not know (and what is kept secret by the commission) is that Austria will have to give on December 21 in cash to Russia as a gift the sum of 1,000,000,000 schillings and to the three other Allies the sum of 500,000,000 schillings.

The western powers have promised that this "gift" was to be used only for payment of their troops. This payment in some instances is quite a bit stretched, since, for instance, the French also pay from this sum vacations in St. Anton for civilians. (Note: I presume from the text that these civilians are government employees working for the French in Austria).

Russia has given no such promise. The result will be that after December 21 only the Russians will have any money left in their zone. It is obvious that it is impossible for the people to live with 145 schillings when 1,000,000,000 of the same currency is circulating in the zone. Therefore, the Russians will be able to buy whatever they want and people will be only too eager to sell them anything they have in order to have enough money to buy food. In the Russian zone there will, of course, be an inflation in a matter of days, where only the Russians will have the money. The Russians have decided that they would use this favorable situation to buy also from all other zones. Already a committee was set up by the Russians, composed of Austrians and Russians, for such purchases.

The Americans and the British, in order to avoid that, will close their zones watertight.

The result of the financial reform will, therefore, be that the free intercourse between the zones (which has really never quite existed) will be economically stopped and that Austria will be strangled worse than ever. The inflation will not be directed by nothing but the advantage of the Russians. Systematically Austria is killed off under the symbol of liberation. You cannot imagine how terrible it is to see all that and be in no position to help. Formerly the people called these methods Nazi oppression, and now?

Second. Remarks about the press in Austria—letter of December 5, 1945:

The situation with the press is very bad here, and the fault lies definitely with the Allies. The press preaches democracy, but that's where everything stops.

The first difficulty is to get a newspaper started. You need the authorization of the Allies, which you might get or not. I know all this because for 3 months we have now been fighting to get permission to publish one daily and two weeklies—and we simply cannot get permission. Once we were so far as to get the paper, but it was subsequently taken away from us and used for some entirely different purposes. It is purely arbitrary whether you get the paper or not. And those who give the paper always think in terms of possible reaction in their home country. In the French zone they told us frankly that if they authorize us to publish a paper the French Communists might protest.

In the American zone our difficulty lies in the fact that the officers who are to give the permission for publications are all PM left-wingers, and therefore would refuse the permission to papers of a political creed which is not their own.

As to the Russian zone * * *.

And, finally, in the British zone freedom of the press has not as yet been introduced.

So we are here, a powerful political movement in Austria, without the means to publish a newspaper, or even a weekly paper, simply because we cannot get the Allied permission to print for purely power-political considerations. It is just like in times passed—and certainly not like under the rule of the "four freedoms." And in this case the State Department is not at all responsible; it is the Psychological Warfare Division of the War Department.

But let us assume that we do get the permissions. Then the Allies reserve for themselves the right to distribute from the available paper supply. The system of distribution is as arbitrary as in a full dictatorship. One gets a lot, the other nothing. In Vienna the Communist paper gets enough to print 500,000 copies, the paper of the People's Party for 90,000, and the Socialists for 110,000 copies. The same system, in slightly different proportions is applied to the provinces.

And once you have obtained the paper (often after substantial bribes to some officers in charge) you are authorized to publish 2 pages 6 times a week. Before coming out of press you must pass a strict censorship. And this censorship does not only watch what you write, but also what you do not write. The censorship forces you to write articles in praise of the Allies, even if you darn well know that they are not true. The censorship naturally does not order it, but if you don't praise the paper gets held up tfil after your deadline or gets half of the contents censored. The idea is that the Allied commanders are very satisfied if they get the praise in the press and send it home as proof of the appreciation of their good government. And in that all four zones are identical. The praise must be lavish, byzantinian, almost like in times of the late Adolf Hitler. Everything the Allies do is wonderful, has the mark of the genius, each commander is so popular as no Austria statesmen has never been before him. Everything good is done by the Allies, who are infallible. And so it goes day in day out, with no one believing what is printed and jokes getting around about the Allies learning every day more from the Germans.

Well the paper writes a beautiful article about General Snooks, who comes from the greatest country in the world, was professor at the greatest university of our times (Mugford College in Mugville, Iowa) and now has made the great sacrifice to come to us poor Austrians to teach us democracy as well as how to drive a car and educate our youth. But after that's written the paper has to publish something for their readers and here the difficulty begins. When the freedom of the press was granted, it was stipulated that nothing could be written of a critical nature about the forces of occupation or countries occupying Austria, nothing about the behavior of the troops, nor anything that might promote disunity between the Allies. So what can one write about? Let us take the case of Iran; hardly anything was written here about it, as it shows disunity among the Allies. When Bevin spoke of Russia it was not published in Austria, but appeared in the papers published by the Allied Forces of occupation in Germany.

Let us take a case here in the French zone: When the world press became quite critical of the policy of the French occupational forces in Austria the French prohibited the entry into the country of foreign papers. One of the papers in Innsbruck listened in on the BBC broadcasts from London and published the news picked up from there. A few days later (that was about 2 weeks ago) the French police arrived at the paper seized the radio equipment and forbade the paper to have any more radio-listening service. All the news can only be gotten from the French Army News Service, which brings only news about De Gaulle and other generals. And that not only happens in the French zone, although it is somewhat better in the American zone.

We just don't have any paper worth reading, and no news from abroad. We must think of the fact that this is the only way people here can see Allied democracy, and we certainly can hardly blame them if they get cynical when they hear the announcement of high and lofty democratic principles from Allied capitals.

Third. Excerpts from a letter of December 7, 1945:

UNRRA IN AUSTRIA

This morning a communiqué over the radio stated that UNRRA would not have any shipping space available for Austria until March. Is that correct? I want to emphasize in this connection that what Mr. Lehman told about UNRRA only being criticized in America, this is by no means true.

UNRRA is criticized all over Austria for both her graft and her inefficiency. Many people say that the black market in Europe is fed by some UNRRA people. Again and again we hear of UNRRA employees having been arrested. Here in Austria the UNRRA crowd cost us a lot of money and nothing happens. They ask for a lot of things and don't give us anything. And if anything is given it costs us terrific prices. Why, for instance, did UNRRA leave in this country (Austria) the few Greek displaced persons who were hanging around for months and then suddenly they had all to be shipped by plane to Greece? Everybody wonders where the billions of dollars of UNRRA are going. As far as we are concerned we certainly have paid more than received.

Pearl Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it had been my profound hope that after the travail of 4 years of war, in which with our allies of the United Nations we had staved off slavery and brought catastrophe to victory, our own Nation might have continued in peace and good will, united in the bonds of common struggle against tyranny.

I had hoped that politics would be suspended during these important days of reconversion, when our Nation has the burden of insuring peace and plenty for 137,000,000 of our own people and hundreds of millions of human beings in foreign lands, whom we helped to save from serfdom, hunger, and even death. I had hoped we would accept our world responsibilities and the implications of the harnessing of atomic energy.

I had hoped in vain. There are some who, like the Bourbon kings, forget nothing and learn nothing.

A quarter of a century ago we fought and won another world war to make the world safe for democracy. Then we fought and lost a political battle to win the peace, sabotaged by an irreconcilable group of petty men led by the late Senator Lodge, who would rather see the world ravaged by war and death than part with one jot or tittle of their arrogant assumption of power.

That spirit is still alive.

America is not proud of the Pearl Harbor disaster. Our late President spoke of December 7, 1941 as "the day that will live in infamy."

I believe that history will show that the Pearl Harbor disaster came, not from carelessness, not from stupidity, but from the will of the American people, carried out through our leaders, to do everything in our power to avoid war. We did not move toward war; war moved toward us.

Now the isolationists, the beneficiaries of the international trade in death and carnage, have siezed with rabid avidity upon the tragedy of Pearl Harbor to try to prove God knows what, and the Republican Party, which shared in the conduct of the war just as every American citizen did, has not been above entering this shameful conspiracy.

Are Republican members of the Pearl Harbor Joint Investigating Committee trying to indict the Secretary of War, who has served the Republican Party and America stanchly and greatly for a lifetime?

Are they trying to indict the late Frank Knox of my own city of Chicago for his share in winning the war? Is there a Republican today, high in his party's councils, who has contributed as much to America and to his party? The great Secretary of the Navy served his party and his nation diligently and well, and he gave his life to his country as much as if he had been on the deck of an American warship in the darkest days of conflict.

Republicans have little to gain and much to lose by partisan conduct of this investigation. The fact that a former employee of the Republican National Committee sat on the right hand of Republican members of the committee and guided their questions exposed the bitter bias and retreat from reality of which a once great party has been guilty.

The untruth, the perversions, the distortions of fact, and the flights of pure fiction of which the isolationists and tories of this country have been guilty prove they have learned nothing. They want to turn the clock back a hundred years; they refuse to believe the evidence of their senses; they live in a dream world of wishful thinking.

I do not believe that Hitler or the Japs would have dared to move toward world empire without the loud encouragement of Americans who refused to believe facts before their eyes.

I favored this investigation. I believed when the resolution authorizing it was brought before the House that it was necessary to bring all the facts to light to settle the issues. But I believed then, and believe now, that it could have been done better and without injection of party politics and the ghoulish vaporings of the isolationists by forming a committee of men connected with no party organization. Such a committee, composed of outstanding citizens, armed with all the powers of Congress and of right, might have brought forth the truth unadorned without exposing to world knowledge the most important secrets of our war strategy and without betraying to world gaze the brilliant accomplishments of our Army and Navy intelligence branches.

Thus far the Pearl Harbor investigation has proved only that America won a war brought upon her against all reason or desire, sprung in the secrecy of international treachery, and nourished by treason at home.

Christmas 1945

REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, this Christmastide of 1945 comes to a world still in travail. A dreadful war has been fought. The most awful struggle ever to take place between men is not yet fully concluded. The most terrible destruction in the history of the world has been wrought to no end, except to the end of the impoverishment of mankind.

It is true that madmen who had turned into marauders have been subdued at vast costs in blood and money, but nothing has been solved. No answer to the great problem has been found in war.

The greatest grief the world has ever known has been visited upon the human race. More families in the world have sad memories of lost loved ones this Christmas than ever before in the history of man.

More men, women, and little children will be cold, hungry, and shelterless this Christmas than ever before in the history of the world.

We pause to rejoice, as well we may rejoice, over the advent of Jesus of Nazareth, Prince of Peace, Advocate of Divine Love, the Herald of peace on earth to men of good will. But we must devise the way to make world peace a reality. We should have learned, yet it would seem that some in the world have not yet learned, that peace is possible only to men of good will. Progress for the human race is possible only to men of good will. The spiritual, cultural, and material enrichment of the race is possible only in an era of good will. As we ponder the numberless dead and injured, and the vast multitudes of stricken, suffering, grief-ridden people, we can be thankful that through this night of war and destruction and hatred, through this orgy of ruthless cruelty and suffering, has continued to shine that wonderful beacon beckoning to humanity to come to the way of peace—the Gospel of Jesus of Nazareth.

The great need of this world today is to be at peace. The only peace possible is that peace which is inevitable to men of good will. That is the peace which comes as we turn to Infinite God and seek our guidance there.

There is no human answer to the riddles which led to this war or to the results which have flowed from the war. There is no justice in innocent men, women, and little children being cruelly abused, pauperized, denied the merest comforts of food and shelter and clothing, to say nothing of a sense of security.

There can be no sense of security in a world filled with fear. Until the world turns back to God there will be fear, because only that love which is God can cast out fear from the hearts of men. We in America want, of course, to do our full share for the suffering peoples in other parts of the world, but we realize that sometimes it is difficult to be charitable when we would be charitable. Also, we must always remain aware of the fact that the greatest help that men of good will—that we Americans of good will—can extend to the other peoples of the world is to help them to help themselves.

If ever there was a time in the history of the world when we should follow the precepts of the Nazarene, it is in this day when the world is still convulsed with the agony of the most terrible war in history, and the fear of what may lie in a future overshadowed by the atomic bomb, and the other modern scientific engines of destruction. We need, all over the world, to practice the Golden Rule, and yet the Golden Rule needs very clearly to be understood before it can be practiced. Mercy and charity must be intelligent as well as generous, or they are apt to fail in their purpose. It is not merciful, neither is it generous to take in a wild bird or a wild beast, and teach it to become dependent upon man, and then turn it loose again after it has lost its ability to fend for itself.

It is not generous but cruel for us to make extravagant promises to the peoples of other countries which we cannot possibly keep, and to bring them only the bitter disappointment which they will feel when their hopes are dashed. Sober thought tells all of us that it is better for every individual to help himself, and to appreciate any help extended to him to help him to help himself, than it is to encourage the countless millions of men, women, and children in other parts of the world to depend upon us to rebuild their countries, reestablish and mechanize their agriculture; clothe and feed them indefinitely. There is nothing in the Christian religion that teaches us to share poverty. The whole teaching of faith in God is the kind of faith that gives us the courage to progress, and to help each other to help ourselves in our problems and our dilemmas. We will have to help feed those countries which are short of food, but it would neither be generous nor would it be sensible for us so to deplete ourselves that we would go down in ruin.

One outstanding fact of the war, one outstanding fact of 1945, one outstanding fact of 1945 years of Christianizing influence, is that free government, free economy, free society, like the American system, is the most enlightened, Christian, and practical way for men to live.

Unless we can bring an era of peace and good will between men and nations, then those boys who sleep on those lonely isles of the Pacific and those who rest in the soil of Europe will have laid down their lives in vain.

Unless we can hold to our American ideals of individual freedom, the Bill of Rights, the Constitution, a government of, by, and for the people, I think, all of the countless thousands who have died, or who have endured grievous wounds, as they laid their all upon the altar of their country, will have died or suffered in vain.

We cannot approach this Christmas season in a spirit of levity or festivity. There are vacant chairs in too many homes. There is poignant grief in too many hearts. Almost no one who lives today has not in some way been touched in his personal life by this war.

There is a great solace of which we may partake. That is in knowing that since infinite God, divine intelligence, is life, then life goes on. It is not conceivable that a God of limitless wisdom, limitless love, limitless power, limitless justice, limitless harmony could create his creatures to live and to love and to have a brief span of 60 or 70 years, and then snuff them out and consign them to utter oblivion. The human span of three score years and ten is to eternity hardly the twinkling of a star for a night. It is hardly the time between the rising and the setting of the sun. Compared to eternity, the human span of three score years and ten alone would not be worth while.

Since we know, since all logic tells us, that utter absolute nothing could not suddenly resolve itself into something causing to be a human, or a planet or a universe, then all the logic of which humans are capable, all the evidence we can cite, points to the truth that was preached and lived by Jesus of Nazareth—that God was the prime mover; and as John said, that God made all that was made and behold it was very good.

I am conscious as I speak these words to you that the age-old problem of evil again presents itself. The age-old cry comes from the depths of the heart of the world; why can these evil things seem to be rising again at this Christmastide, as we try to take firm grasp upon our faith in a God of limitless wisdom, and limitless power, in a universe of limitless justice and limitless harmony? Philosophers have found no answer to that question. I think we will never find an answer on the human plane to that question, but I am convinced, as all men must be convinced who read the Scriptures intelligently, that there is an answer, there must be an answer. I do believe, as I think all logical persons must believe, that those men and women whose human activities were snuffed out by the war still live and still progress. I believe this is so because I cannot reconcile a twinkling of human intelligence in a night of war to be the eternal purpose of an infinite God.

Of all messages of consolation, hope, good will, that we can send to the war stricken peoples of the world, the greatest message is—lift up your eyes to the stars; hold onto your faith in the goodness of God; go to the infinite Father in prayer to find the healing for your wounds and the balm for your heart's agony. You will find it nowhere else; you can find it nowhere else. You will find it there.

If there is one resolution that a stricken world ought to make this Christmastide, it is to work and strive and spend for good will instead of malice; for mutual trust instead of suspicions; for friendships instead of

hatreds; for joy in the good of others instead of envy.

At this Christmastime, in this year of 1945, we are just beyond the portals of the entrance to a new world—the world of atomic energy. Man has dared to lay his hand upon the primal force of the material universe. He has used it as an engine for destruction greater than any engine of destruction heretofore discovered. We now know that the fate of the world is linked to atomic energy. It is entirely within the control of man whether atomic energy shall be put to work to make life richer for every human on the globe than he ever could have dreamed of being before, or to have it as a threat which sometimes will wreck the world and leave a third or a fourth of the people on the planet wandering in utter desolation amid death and destruction indescribable. It seems almost grotesque that we even have to ask ourselves: Shall we make atomic energy the means by which so to enrich the lives of men that no man will need to covet that which his neighbor hath, or will we continue to use atomic energy to destroy humans on this planet?

It would seem as though the very inner impulsions of men would drive them to want to turn atomic energy to the purposes of enrichment of life. It will be sheer insanity to do otherwise.

It is a strange thing—and perhaps not so strange—that despite all the new discoveries in the realm of medicine and surgery, human suffering still goes on. In spite of all the remarkable powers of production and distribution, human want seems to shadow the lives of all too many. In spite of all of our progress in the science of jurisprudence, we seem to be getting further away from justice instead of closer to it as a nation, and in the world. In spite of our educational system, and our free system of religion, agonized humanity cries out on this Christmas, "Why, O Lord, why must we suffer so?"

The answer, the only answer, is a deep faith in God Almighty and a deep purpose of every one of us to render our utmost in human service. Happiness is to be found in no other way.

And let me add: When death finally impends; when either through the passing of the years and the slowing down of human energy, or through disease, reckless driving, starvation, privation, fear and worry, the moment of the passing arrives there will be absolutely nothing in our life that will stand us in such good stead as the knowledge that we have done our utmost to help our fellowmen while holding fast—as fast as we can hold—to our faith in God.

So then I wish for you, for everyone in the world, peace of mind, peace of spirit, the peace of good will, that peace which surpasses understanding.

And I wish for those who have gone on that progress, that widened wisdom, that will make them know that death is but the portal to a new and greater aspect of life which never ends.

May God's peace be with you.

American "Serfs" and Professor Laski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the News-Palladium of December 15, published at Benton Harbor, comes the following editorial:

Prof. Harold Laski stepped out of character just before he stepped aboard a plane for England the other day and said a good word about the United States. That was unusual, for the voluble (if unofficial) spokesman of the British Labor Party seldom says a good word in public for anything except state socialism and the Soviet Union.

Probably the professor's momentary weakness was due to a feeling of well-being which on other occasions has sweetened even sourer rebels than he. The fact was that Professor Laski had eaten well. He admitted it. He said he hadn't eaten so plenteously in years. And he was specifically enthusiastic about American ice cream.

We're glad that the professor enjoyed his food. And we are glad to learn that his gloomy view of things in general doesn't upset his digestion even though his particular reason for coming here was to make a speech scolding us for our economic sins and predicting for us a frightful comeuppance.

The professor told us Americans that "free enterprise and market economy mean war." He told us that the American form of economy is "the direct road to serfdom." He had bitter things to say about our big business and big businessmen. You'd have thought he'd be so worked up by it all that he wouldn't be able to eat a bite.

But he was, and we're sorry that he hadn't eaten well in the last few years. We know that he and his fellow Britons wouldn't have fared any better during the war under a labor government than they did under Mr. Churchill and the coalition cabinet. We know that it's not the direct fault of their national social system that millions of Frenchmen, Poles, Russians, Greeks, Italians, and others are not faring so well these days, either.

And we are not smug about our ice cream and other delicacies. But Professor Laski ought to realize that even in peacetime the American serfs were also eating pretty well. Not always as well as they should, some of them, but better than almost all their neighbors in the world.

Much of the time their innards have felt as well as Professor Laski's did after a few days of American table d'hote. And it has always been hard to convince them, feeling that way, that their economic system was grinding them down to slavery and leading them to war. Even the most earnest radical is likely to doze off when he attempts to take a heavy Marxian harangue on top of a full stomach.

Incidentally, while Professor Laski was over here telling us what a moribund institution the American system is, the British financial commission was in Washington negotiating a $4,000,000,000 loan and also getting $26,000,000,000 in lend-lease to Britain written off by our Treasury as just another experiment in another world war which we never started and for which we have sacrificed a quarter of a million American lives, to say nothing of having accumulated a national debt that will burden the American people for generations to come. How do they get away with it?

Mr. Speaker, permit me to ask not only how do they get away with it, but how do the American advocates of unlimited gifts to foreign nations, get away with it? Perhaps one answer is that we have always been so prosperous, always as a people had so much for ourselves, that we think the supply is unlimited and that indefinitely and always we can give and give without in any way impairing our own ability to produce, restrict our own opportunity to have.

Problems of Naval Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered on December 19, 1945, at the section of criminal law of the American Bar Association in Cincinnati, Ohio, by Rear Adm. O. S. Colclough, Judge Advocate General of the Navy on the subject Problems of Naval Justice:

Mr. Chairman, members of the criminal law section of the American Bar Association, it is indeed an honor to be invited to speak to you. In that invitation I see an active interest in the administration of justice within your Navy. That is as it should be, in my opinion.

We in the Navy Department, and in my office particularly, have ample evidence of the increased interest in the Navy's court-martial procedures and in the disciplinary processes that follow conviction before a court-martial. Members of Congress through their constituents, and citizens in general throughout the country, have felt the impact of military law in greatly increased numbers as a result of the recent, greatest of all wars. This is so for the reason that never before in our history have so many of its men and women served at one time in the armed services and hence been subject to the Articles of War and the Articles for the Government of the Navy. These are two basic statutes which the Congress enacted years ago under the power to it given by the fourteenth clause of section 8, article I of the Constitution: "To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces."

The administration of justice in the Navy falls generally into two broad subdivisions—the application of military law to the maintenance of a high standard of discipline; and secondly, the application of sound principles of administrative discipline. The objective of the entire system is the same. In other words, a proper standard of discipline in war and peace is the hallmark of an efficient, successful, yes, victorious Navy. History testifies to the dire results that have come to military and naval forces that were unable, for one reason or another, to maintain this high standard.

I am addressing myself to the first of the two phases of the problem of the administration of justice, that of the practice of military law, although I am aware that the problems of administrative discipline is of equal importance, and is a topic of discussion set down for this meeting. Present this afternoon are other representatives of the Navy Department, better qualified than I to discuss it.

As many of you are aware, no doubt, the tribunals before which those who violate military laws are tried, namely, courts martial, are not parts of the judicial organization of the United States. There are some basic differences in procedure. For example, the fifth amendment to the Constitution excepts cases arising in the land or naval forces from the requirement as to presentment or indictment of a grand jury. Again, it has never been questioned that the sixth amendment does not require a trial jury in a court martial. The decisions of these tribunals, acting within their jurisdiction, both as to parties and the subject matter, are not subject to review by the civil courts.

In pointing out the status of military law, and its instrument of enforcement, courts martial, I do not want to be understood as suggesting a legal philosophy to the effect that naval personnel are hereby deprived of the constitutional guaranties. My purpose in making brief reference to these fundamental precepts is only to invite your attention to the necessity, in approaching the problem of the practice and procedures of military law, of keeping clearly in mind that this branch of the law is an adaptation of our basic principles of justice to the exacting formula of military discipline.

Before discussing present thinking with respect to our court-martial procedure, it may be of interest to you to have a quick résumé of the structure of our courts.

What might be termed the court of first instance is, in fact, not a court at all. It is the commanding officer's mast. In addition to investigating alleged offenses at most, to determine if further proceedings should be had, the commanding officer is empowered to prescribe certain punishments, such as limited confinement, extra duties, and deprivation of liberty for minor offenders. Next, a deck court is composed of one officer who arraigns the accused, examines the witnesses, and upon finding the specification—as the pleading is known—proved, passes sentence. Before trial by deck court the accused must agree thereto in writing. If he does not assent, he is brought to trial before a summary court martial which is a three-officer court, with a recorder to conduct the prosecution. The authority to convene deck and summary courts is vested in the commanding officer of a naval vessel and certain other officers in command, as prescribed by law or as specifically empowered by the Secretary of the Navy.

In the event that the commanding officer considers an alleged offense of sufficient gravity to deserve greater punishment than a summary court martial is empowered to prescribe, he recommends to the nearest naval official authorized to convene general courts martial that the accused be brought to trial before this highest tribunal, upon specific charges. Furthermore, general courts martial have exclusive jurisdiction over officers and in practice of certain major offenses.

A general court martial is composed of not less than 5 nor more than 13 officers, with a judge advocate to summon witnesses, conduct the prosecution, maintain the record, and advise the court of matters of law when requested. In peace, the punishments which can be awarded are limited with respect to specific charges by a schedule approved by the President. In war, these limitations are not applicable.

In all cases of trial by court martial the accused is provided with counsel of his own choice if the exigencies of the service permit. If this cannot be done, or the accused is unable to procure counsel, the convening authority will assign defense counsel upon request. Finally, if the accused is not represented by counsel, it is the duty of the recorder or judge advocate to protect his rights.

Prior to the last war the Navy's strength, including the Marine Corps, was about 330,000 men and officers. This represented a threefold increase in the 5 years preceding the war. The average monthly figure for courts martial of all types was then about 625. The naval population rose during the war to a figure in excess of 4,000,000, including the Coast Guard as well as the marines. The monthly average figure for courts martial for the war was nearly 14,000, with a peak of 20,000. I cite these figures to illustrate the magnitude of the problem.

From a geographical standpoint, prior to the war the administration of naval justice was roughly limited to the United States and its Territories, Cuba, Iceland, and the Philippines. When you consider that during the war it embraced not only Europe, the Atlantic, and the Pacific, but practically the entire world, you will recognize that the Navy was confronted, in addition to the tremendous problem of logistics for ships, aircraft, and amphibious forces, to a real problem of the logistics of naval justice under heavy stress and strain.

I am able to report that the administration of naval justice during this trying period is a source of satisfaction. In saying this I do not refer to myself, for I have only recently become Judge Advocate General and, in fact, was not a part of the organization charged with administration of naval justice during the war.

I do not mean to say that there were no cases of injustice. Such a claim would be absurd on its face. Navy courts are composed of human beings, and I need not tell you who have practiced criminal law that the problems of personalities and temperaments enter into such matters. There is direct evidence, however, of the success of our disciplinary processes. Not only did your naval forces attain a victory which bespeaks their discipline and morale, but a very practical yardstick is the fact that the percentage of naval prisoners rose only from the figure .173 in the prewar period to .183 during the war. This increase, I maintain, is insignificant when considered with the fact that during war the population of the Navy consists in a great measure of men who have not dedicated their lives to the naval service, who were not even volunteers, and hence might be expected to be less amenable to those limitations upon their personal freedoms which a military service must impose.

I would be less than just if, in taking credit unto the Navy, I failed to give credit also to you, who together with your sons, brothers, daughters, and sisters demonstrated again the magnificence of American character and its innate sense of fairness, justice, and patriotism. The magnitude and complexity of the problems in naval justice which this war brought forth can now be subjected to scrutiny. That is being done. Immediately upon the conclusion of the war, at the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, a realistic search was instituted to discover any weak links in the chain of naval justice, with a view to strengthening them. Research into our own system and comparisons with the systems of other navies was undertaken. The Secretary appointed a very able committee, headed by Mr. Justice McGuire, of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, which has submitted a comprehensive report.

The Judge Advocate General, my predecessor, obtained the services of a Naval Reserve officer, whose wide experience in the Navy as a priest and fleet chaplain and an equally broad experience in the law gave him a viewpoint of unusual scope. Commodore White, of the Navy Chaplain Corps, in peace the dean of the Catholic University Law School, in addition to assisting my office in the study of the basic articles for the government of the Navy, has made some valuable studies of the actual operation of naval justice by interviewing prisoners who have felt the full force of military law and its procedures.

Recently the Secretary has appointed a larger committee, headed by Mr. Arthur Ballantine, of New York, on which Mr. Justice McGuire, among others, will serve. This committee will meet shortly to consider the McGuire report and the recommendations thereon of responsible officials in the Navy Department.

Out of all this we confidently hope will come a draft revision of the Articles for the Government of the Navy which the Secretary of the Navy will find acceptable to submit to the Congress in a matter of months. Needless to say, a revision of these articles will be followed by a revision of the naval law manual, now called Naval Courts and Boards, which prescribes the rules of pleading and procedure.

I am not able at this time to be specific as to the details of any reforms to be expected from the extensive studies which are continuing. It seems certain, however, that in addition to a general streamlining, if I may use that term, of the articles, there will be a clearer specification of offenses, express provisions of the Bill of Rights will be spelled out, insofar as they are adaptable to the organization and operation of the Navy, the duties of judge advocate and prosecutor will be separated, or some equally effective method of assuring adequate legal advice to the court. In this connection I hope to institute a system of legal education for a sufficient number of naval officers to enable them to deal efficiently with military law, particularly the technique of pleadings and the rules of evidence.

Another phase of the problem which has been, and is now, receiving attention is the attainment of better uniformity of sentences. I feel sure that extension of the principle of review boards, which can approach this subject objectively, will be adopted.

There is a modern, healthy trend toward overhauling legal procedures without derogating from our concept of protection of the rights of the individual—in fact, strengthening that concept wherever that appears necessary or even desirable. The examination and studies presently being made, as I have roughly described, is in keeping with this trend.

You will note that I call it a modern trend and, if judged by tangible results, it is so, for I point to the fact that only now, after years of study and consideration, are we coming, in the civil courts, to such reforms as the Federal rules of criminal procedure, the substitution of an information for the cumbersome procedure of indictment by grand jury, and the adoption of pretrial procedure.

It may not be immediately apparent to some why the Navy does not follow without modification the trend of our criminal practice. I mentioned earlier that our problem is not quite the same. While the purposes to be served by criminal courts and the Navy's disciplinary system differ, the fundamentals are the same. Law in the military services, as elsewhere, is a vital aspect of the problem of human relations. Although military law is only one aspect of the human relations in the Navy, human conduct is the sole concern of that body of the law, as it is of criminal law with respect to civilians.

We are striving to perfect our system of justice in the Navy. In that effort, as in other fields of the law, human relations—including the rights of the individual—are complex matters. To balance those conflicting claims in such a way as to secure protection for the rights of the individual and to safeguard the interests of morale and discipline of a military organization—all that requires intensive study and a high degree of understanding, not solely by the legal profession, not solely by the military profes-

sion, but by an intelligent combination of the two. That is our objective, to the end that the high tradition of American justice in the United States Navy shall be sustained and strengthened.

Medical Corps in the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the Senate passed House bill 4717, "An act to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration," without amendment. We passed it here several days ago. The measure now goes to the White House and I am sure it will be signed by the President today or tomorrow.

This bill has been enacted to meet an urgent need of the Veterans' Administration for satisfactory organization of the medical activities and to attract necessary personnel, particularly doctors, dentists, nurses, and attendants. Legislation to accomplish this general purpose with the approval, in principle, of the President was recommended by both General Hines and General Bradley as being essential and vital. The act abolishes the Medical Service in the Veterans' Administration as at present constituted and establishes in its stead a Department of Medicine and Surgery under a Chief Medical Director.

The bill incorporates broad provisions as to organization and authority. It provides specifically for certain positions with adequate salary stipulations, specified salary rates for doctors, nurses, and dentists, and a special salary range for attendants. It authorizes appointments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to certain professional positions without regard to civil service. The civil-service retirement system, however, will be applicable to all positions in the Department of Medicine and Surgery. Authority is provided to discipline or discharge unsatisfactory or disqualified employees in certain categories without the restrictions of the laws and regulations pertaining to civil service.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Section 1 of the bill, in addition to abolishing the Medical Service in the Veterans' Administration and establishing in its stead a Department of Medicine and Surgery under a Chief Medical Director, provides that the functions of that Department will be those necessary for a complete medical and hospital service to be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Section 2 of the bill provides that the Department of Medicine and Surgery shall include the office of the Chief Medical Director, Medical Service, Dental Service, Nursing Service, and Auxiliary Service.

Section 3 of the bill provides that the office of the Chief Medical Director shall consist of the Chief Medical Director, one Deputy Medical Director, not to exceed eight Assistant Medical Directors, and such other personnel and employees as may be authorized by the act. The Chief Medical Director will be appointed by the Administrator at a salary of $12,000 per year; the Assistant Medical Directors will receive a salary of $11,000 per year each, and the Deputy Medical Director will receive a salary of $11,500 per year; the Director of the Nursing Service will be paid a salary of $8,000 per year and the Deputy Director of Nursing Service will receive a salary of $7,000 per year. The chief pharmacist, chief dietitian, chief physical therapist, and chief occupational therapist each will receive a salary of $6,000 per year. The appointments will be for a period of 4 years, subject to removal by the Administrator for cause. Reappointments may be made for successive like periods.

Section 4 provides for appointment by the Administrator of additional personnel in two groups: (a) doctors, dentists, and nurses; (b) managers, pharmacists, physical therapists, occupational therapists, dietitians, and scientific personnel and other medical and dental technologists.

Section 5 prescribes the conditions of eligibility for appointment to the Department of Medicine and Surgery. The first requirement is that any person so appointed must be a citizen of the United States. There are then provided the professional and other requirements for doctors, dentists, and nurses; and in the auxiliary service—managers of hospitals, homes or centers—pharmacists, physical therapists, occupational therapists, dietitians, and other auxiliary employees. It is provided that persons may be appointed under the act while on terminal leave from the armed forces and may be paid for their services rendered under such appointment notwithstanding any law or regulation to the contrary.

Section 6 provides that the appointments of doctors, dentists, and nurses shall be made only after their qualifications have been satisfactorily established in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator and without regard to civil-service requirements. There is provided a probationary period of 3 years with provision for review of the employment records and separation from the medical, dental, or nursing services if the person is found not fully qualified and satisfactory. Provision is made for promotion of doctors, dentists, and nurses on the basis of examinations, and automatic promotion may be made within grade. Doctors, dentists, and nurses in the present medical service will be continued in their present positions until their qualifications are determined. Civil-service reinstatement rights are protected in the cases of those who at time of appointment have a civil-service status and whose employment in the Department is not continued.

Section 7 establishes the grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions of doctors, dentists, and nurses. The Administrator is authorized to prescribe by regulation the hours and conditions of employment and leaves of absence of doctors, dentists, and nurses.

Section 8 authorizes the Chief Medical Director to rate any qualified doctor appointed under section 4, subsection (a), as a medical or surgical specialist, but no person may at any one time hold more than one such rating. It provides the conditions under which such rating shall be granted, its duration, and that the person so rated shall receive, in addition to his basic pay an allowance equal to 25 percent of such pay, but the pay plus the allowance may not exceed $11,000 per annum.

Section 9 provides that persons appointed to the Department of Medicine and Surgery shall be subject to the provisions and entitled to benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended.

Section 10 provides for disciplinary boards and action on their recommendations affecting doctors, dentists, and nurses under section 4, subsection (a).

Section 11 provides for appointment of additional employees, other than those specified in section 3, subsection (a) of section 4, and section 14 of the act, as may be necessary. It is provided that employees in the Medical Service, as at present constituted, other than those provided in section 3, subsection (a) of section 4, and section 14, shall receive original appointments to the Department of Medicine and Surgery in their present civil-service status upon proper certification therein provided. This section also provides that the per annum salary range for attendants shall be $1,572 minimum to $1,902 maximum.

Section 12 provides for a special medical advisory group, its composition and functions. Provision is made for regular calendar quarterly meetings and for the number, terms of service, compensation, and allowances to members.

Section 13 provides for the detail by the Chief Medical Director of employees under section 3 and subsection (a) of section 4 to attend meetings of associations for promotion of medical and related sciences. Authority is granted to place employees coming under the foregoing sections on duty for a period not in excess of 90 days in schools of the Army, Navy, and Public Health Service, and in civil institutions with the consent of authorities concerned, for the purpose of increasing professional knowledge or technical training. Payment of necessary expenses is authorized. Any person authorized to attend such course will be required to reimburse the Veterans' Administration the expenses thereof if he voluntarily leaves the service within 2 years after the completion of such course.

Section 14 provides for employment by the Administrator, upon recommendation of the Chief Medical Director, and without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, of doctors, dentists, and nurses on a temporary full-time, part-time, or fee basis, and others on a temporary full-time or part-time basis, at such rates of pay as he may prescribe, but no temporary full-time appointment

shall be made for a period of more than 90 days.

This section also authorizes the establishment of residencies and appointment to such positions without regard to civil service or classification laws, rules, or regulations; the conditions of such employment; and the customary amounts and terms of pay during the period of such training. Residency training in most specialties would embrace training outside the hospital in connection with the school, part of the time not being spent on work directly productive for the Veterans' Administration. This authority is granted in order to retain uniformity with actual practice throughout the United States in connection with residency employment because the average pay scales in residency employment are less than the scale for a minimum entrance salary of positions, such as doctor, junior grade.

Section 15 provides that the Chief Medical Director, with the approval of the Administrator, unless specifically otherwise provided, shall promulgate all regulations necessary to the administration of the Department of Medicine and Surgery and consistent with existing law, including regulations relating to travel, transportation of household goods and effects, and deductions from pay for quarters and subsistence; and to the custody, use, and preservation of the records, papers, and property of the Department.

Activities of the Civil Aeronautics Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on activities of the Civil Aeronautics Board signed by various Members of the Senate and House:

Whereas 18 Senators from 11 Western States have written to the Civil Aeronautics Board urging it not to adopt the recommendation of its own official examiners that an air route to the Orient be established from Chicago via the Twin Cities and Alaska, and urging it to establish the route via the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas this letter was sent to the Civil Aeronautics Board when it had the matter before it for decision more than a month after it had completed all proper procedural steps including extended public hearings, an official report by the Board's examiners recommending the Twin Cities route, service of the report on all interested parties, an opportunity for them to file exceptions and briefs opposing the recommendation, and then opportunity to present oral arguments before the full Board; and

Whereas we believe such action by the above-mentioned Senators constitutes interference in the proper functioning of the Civil Aeronautics Board which was established by the Congress to be an independent quasi judicial agency, and attempts to influence its decisions not by presentation of evidence in the proper manner but by powerful political pressure; and

Whereas such action jeopardizes the independence and integrity of the Board and will inevitably lead to loss of confidence in the unbiased character of its decisions:

Therefore, we Senators and Representatives feel compelled to protest publicly against this attempt by political pressure to influence the Civil Aeronautics Board to disregard the recommendation of its own examiners that the first air route to the Orient be established via the Twin Cities and Alaska, and

We hereby send copies of this statement to the press and to the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Senators: JOSEPH H. BALL, HENRIK SHIPSTEAD; Representatives: H. CARL ANDERSEN, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER, THOMAS S. GORDON, HAROLD C. HAGEN, ROBERT K. HENRY, WALTER H. JUDD, FRANK B. KEEFE, HAROLD KNUTSON, WILLIAM LEMKE, KARL E. MUNDT, JOSEPH P. O'HARA, ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, W. A. PITTENGER, CHARLES R. ROBERTSON, FRANK STARKEY, KARL STEFAN.

OPA's Rent Set-Up Fails To Consider Local Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE J. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a newspaper article from the Haverhill Gazette bearing on a recent survey which has been conducted on the housing shortage in that city. This survey was made by one of the key reporters as the result of a tremendous amount of public interest in the housing problem of that community. I inserted in yesterday's RECORD the first installment of this report, which has much to say in respect to the contribution that is being made to the housing problem by the unwise administration of the rent-control law. The rent-control law, during the national emergency, has played an effective part in stabilizing the rent situation throughout the country. Members of Congress, however, fully realize that in the administration of such a law that some hardship cases would develop that would need special attention. Congress, therefore, recognizing the need of adjusting rents to these special conditions, amended the rent-control law and inserted language that would permit a good deal of flexibility where the situation justified such action by the Rent Administrator. I am sorry to say, however, that proper consideration is not being given to these hardship cases, and the results are that the housing shortage is being further aggravated because of the unwillingness of the property owners to invest money in remodelling and otherwise bring about substantial repairs, where the administrators of the rent-control law refuse to let them know ahead of time the amount of rent they can charge and which would give them an opportunity to meet the expenses of such remodeling and permit, at the same time, a reasonable amount for profit.

I feel sure that the accompanying article, which I am inserting in the RECORD today, is written entirely from an unbiased standpoint and printed by one of our most reliable papers in the eastern area of the country. I trust that those in charge of the administration of rent control will see the error of their way and will show a cooperation in working out the problems of our property owners so that additional housing facilities will be provided at the earliest opportunity. It is such criticism as we find in this report on the administration of the rent control law that is responsible for the growing demands that Congress should do something about it. I feel certain that unless an improvement is made in such administration that Congress will at an early date take action to the end that the abuses in the administration of this law will be corrected.

OPA'S RENT SET-UP FAILS TO CONSIDER LOCAL PROBLEMS

(By Milton E. Connelly)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In Haverhill, as in nearly all parts of the country, one of the most serious problems is the housing shortage. There are several elements in this problem—shortage of materials, scarcity of labor, high cost, zoning, rent-control policies. The Gazette presents today the second of a series of articles on the element of rent control, a part of the general problem that is not talked about so much as other parts but one that must be solved and that can be solved.)

Haverhill had almost as many vacancies as occupancies in 1942 when OPA applied rent control, catching the city with its rents down and tying them with regulations made for places where homes were scarce.

If this policy is continued, and OPA's regional office in Boston has given no indication of a change, Haverhill will have to wait until conditions improve in 6 other cities and 27 towns before controls will be relaxed to let them improve here.

This policy creates a Federal control without enough consideration of local needs. It is causing concern among Haverhill businessmen, who are interested in ending housing shortage. The policy, they say, must be changed to help this city to solve its own problem.

The Gazette has gone down the line in talking to rent-control administrators. Its representative has interviewed William H. McCarty, director of the Essex County area rent control office; Edgar J. Driscoll, regional rent executive for New England; and public-relations officers in the Washington home office of OPA.

ATTITUDE TOWARD CONTROL

Interviews with OPA directors shows they think everyone who owns property is against rent control. Interviews with businessmen here and elsewhere prove this opinion in error.

A survey has shown that investors, realtors, and some landlords, as well as the big majority of tenants, agree with OPA that rents, which, next to food, make the biggest hole in the average American's pocketbook and should be controlled during wartime to protect families of servicemen from evictions and from too high costs.

The interviews also showed rent-control directors have not recognized the people complaining are not against control but against strict hewing to the line on directives without regard for circumstances.

Take, for example, the rent freeze in Haverhill in March 1942, when city rents were at a low point. The area rent office knew this, admitted it at protest meetings, but gave no relief. The office asked Haverhill men to show a loss on their property by comparing 1942 income with that in 1939, 1940, and 1941. They couldn't show a profit even in those years because rents were still subnormal. They might have if OPA had left them go back further, but OPA said 1939 was as far as they could go.

ONE MAN'S EXPERIENCE

Take another case, for example. A businessman bought a home for his own occupancy a year ago. A friend pleaded with him to rent it and set a price. The businessman agreed, reluctantly. The friend was a tenant for 6 months when the businessman learned, not from OPA but from another friend, that he should have registered the rent in Lynn. He wanted to obey the law and he registered. When he did, OPA investigated. His rent charge was cut $15 a month and he was forced to refund $90 to a tenant who didn't want the money.

There are many similar examples. There are others where rent control has refused to give a landlord possession of a tenement because of unsanitary conditions; where tenants have tricked innocent landlords into making repairs with the knowledge the extra rent they promised to pay would never have to be paid; where tenants have slipped landlords premiums for rentals, or, in other words, gone into the black market for rentals; where tenants who have rented the same house or apartment for years have been sold out by landlords who reaped a profit from the sale of the property.

The area rent-control office will admit some of these conditions but say the law is there and there is nothing that can be done about it. The regional office will concur in that opinion. And the home office tells the same story.

But the offices overlook the fact that in 1943 a special congressional committee set up by the House to investigate rent control, and headed by Representative HOWARD E. SMITH (Democrat, Virginia), held, in its report to the House, that there was elasticity in rent control.

RENT-CONTROL BASIS

The Smith committee pointed out, in effect, that rent control was to be set up on a fair and equitable basis, which meant making it flexible enough to meet different conditions. It charged, too, that the rent control administration had not consulted local advisory groups as suggested but had continued to follow directives too strictly.

Area Director McCarty and Regional Director Driscoll said there was nothing to be done about Haverhill's condition in 1942, when rents were frozen at a low level. McCarty said the situation was studied and a rent expert brought on from Washington, who described the condition here the same as it was in several other places.

Driscoll said Haverhill couldn't be left out from under the rent blanket for if it had, people would have been able to commute from here to Lawrence and the rent-control program would have been defeated.

There was no explanation of commuting from here to New Hampshire, which was not controlled by Essex County. There were no figures available to show an exodus from rent-controlled Essex County to other areas.

There was no explanation for the lack of knowledge property owners had of existing rules, especially registering new rents and increasing rents. Area and regional officers said there had been much newspaper publicity and radio talks and that if people didn't read the papers or listen to the radio, there was nothing they could do nor adjustments they could make, except adjustments permitted by regulations.

THE OPA THEORY

The general OPA theory during interviews in Lynn, Boston, and Washington was that rent control must be continued under its present set-up even though it was a war measure to protect war workers and families of servicemen and the problem now is not the wartime one of protecting homes but the peacetime one of providing more of them.

Rent control men have sold themselves on two points: (1) rent control is necessary to keep rents from skyrocketing; and (2) rent control is not delaying the construction program needed to meet the housing shortage.

There seems to be no dispute on the first point. Most advocates of change admit the needs, for the present at least, of continuing controls.

The challenge to OPA comes on the second point.

When asked to show what OPA was doing to help solve the housing situation, Regional Director Driscoll quickly pointed to the November directive for increases on new rentals and new conversions, taking into consideration increased material and labor costs.

"In effect this means at 20-percent rise on new homes and new conversions, taking into consideration increased material and labor costs.

"In effect this means a 20-percent rise on new homes and new conversions," he said, "for the maximum allowance will reach to about that point although it has not been set up on a percentage basis. We will examine plans and set up rents for prospective builders."

Advantages of the November directive are debatable.

LIMITED IN ITS EFFECT

In the first place, it applies only to new construction and new conversion. It will not help the present landlord to make repairs to his property already rented nor will it increase his incentive to invest in more real-estate holdings.

Although Driscoll mentioned a maximum of about 20 percent, the directive itself did not, for it said new rents shall be set on the basis of comparability plus increased costs. It did not mention a change in the March 1, 1942, basis for comparability over which Haverhill is vitally concerned and while an increase to the maximum of about 20 percent in another city, where rents were reasonably profitable when the 1942 freeze was made, might help, it does not hold that such a maximum would ease the Haverhill situation.

There was no hope held out in the directive that the pressing need of rent control would be met, namely, getting the entire program on a community or individual basis instead of continuing remote control under the present county or blanket basis.

Pressed for an answer on this point, which OPA could use as a progressive step to meet what is now a peacetime problem—a housing shortage—by creating local advisory boards to not only study but recommend specific relaxations and modifications to reach the objective of de-control, Driscoll said he couldn't give an answer because he did not have authority.

The Lynn office said it has been doing all it could to meet the acute housing situation by cooperating with agencies to help find homes for veterans and by putting the November directive in effect.

The Washington office's public relations department had a different answer to the question of rent control's effect on the existing shortage. It was: "Nothing. Anyone who says that should think first about the material and labor shortages."

CIO Appeal to British Startles Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Sears Henning:

CIO APPEAL TO BRITISH STARTLES WASHINGTON

(By Arthur Sears Henning)

The CIO Auto Workers' appeal to the Socialist British Government to intervene in the General Motors strike as the owner of a large block of General Motors stock startled official Washington.

The spectacle of the politically most powerful labor union in the United States invoking the aid of another country in the economic warfare it is waging seemed to many Senators and Representatives to be fraught with ominous implications and possibilities.

HAVE COMMUNIST SUPPORT

The CIO already has enlisted the support of the Communist Russian Government, which is exerted through the American Communist Party and the Communist and fellow traveler front organizations and press. It now seeks the influence of the British Government exercised through stock ownership in American corporations.

These holdings are of vast but unknown extent. In the single case of a loan of $390,000,000 obtained by the British Government from the RFC the collateral furnished consisted of British-owned stocks in 189 American companies now valued at $775,000,000.

This new development is likely to figure prominently in the consideration by Congress of the pending proposal to loan $4,000,000,000 to Great Britain for 55 years at 1.6 percent interest.

THOMAS WRITES ATTLEE

The appeal to the British Government to take a hand in the General Motors strike was contained in a letter addressed by R. J. Thomas, president of the CIO United Auto Workers to British Prime Minister Attlee. By way of combatting the corporation's rejection of the union demand to base a wage increase on prospective profits Thomas urged the British Labor Government as "a substantial owner of General Motors shares" to "make known to the management of General Motors Corporation your belief that profits are indeed the concern of the workers and the owners of any company." The British holding in General Motors is 434,000 shares.

Senator MOORE, Republican, of Oklahoma, who recently presented in the Senate the details of the collateral for the RFC loan, admitted that he had been startled by the import of the Thomas appeal to the Socialist Prime Minister.

"It is certainly out of place," said Representative REED, Republican, of Illinois, "to appeal to an official of a foreign government to settle a purely domestic American issue. I can't help but think of this situation in reverse. What would be the feeling of the British people if their Government asked President Truman to intervene in a purely British issue?"

IDEA CALLED FANTASTIC

"This is fantastic," said Representative SPRINGER, Republican, of Indiana, "it is indeed strange that Prime Minister Attlee

should be asked to take an interest in settling a matter that concerns only the United States."

In addition to the 434,000 General Motors shares, the British holdings include: American Thread, 1,197,375; Distillers Co., Ltd., 850,250; Shell Union Oil, 900,000; Standard Oil of Indiana, 315,000; Radio Corporation of America, 177,000; Dividend Shares, Inc., 3,665,550; Celanese Corp., 335,096; Standard Oil of New Jersey, 198,002; Amerada Petroleum Corp., 133,000; American Rolling Mills, 133,000; Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., 130,000; Standard Brands, 170,000; F. W. Woolworth Co., 247,000; U. S. Potash, 162,480; American Association, 151,844; Dunlop Tire & Rubber Co. 197,334; J. & P. Coates (R. I.), 144,991; Clark Thread Co., 179,991; Dentist Supply Co., 100,765; Newark Fire Insurance Co., 398,436; Eureka Security Fire & Marine Insurance Co., 199,994; Monarch Fire Insurance Co., 102,154.

Amendment to Public Law 134, To Provide Annual and Sick Leave for Classified Substitute Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which amends section 6 of the act of July 6, 1945—Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress—to provide that war-service substitutes shall be granted annual and sick leave. The amendment is short and reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act of July 6, 1945, Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress, is amended to read:

"SEC. 6. Postmasters and employees shall be granted 15 days' leave of absence with pay, exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, each fiscal year and sick leave with pay at the rate of 10 days a year, exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, to be cumulative. Sick leave shall be granted only upon satisfactory evidence of illness in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Postmaster General: *Provided*, That the 15 days' leave shall be credited at the rate of 1¼ days for each month of actual service: *Provided further*, That classified substitute employees and those substitutes appointed for the duration of the war or for a longer period shall be granted, under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, the same rights and benefits with respect to annual and sick leave that accrue to regular employees in proportion to the time employed in a pay status and 168 hours and 40 minutes of such employment shall entitled the employee to 1¼ days' annual leave and 6 hours and 40 minutes' sick leave: *And provided further*, That in no event shall a classification substitute employee or a substitute appointed for the duration of the war or a longer period be credited during a 12-month period with more than 15 days' annual and 10 days' sick leave."

Mr. Speaker, it was drawn to my attention that the existing law had been interpreted to deprive war service substitutes from participating in annual and sick leave as provided by Public Law 134, and there would seem to be no just reason why this should be done. I took the matter up with the United States Civil Service Commission and was advised that the Commission entertained the same views, believing that this unjust discrimination should be corrected. I ask the Civil Service Commission to submit to me a proposed draft of an amendment which would obviate this injustice and the bill I am introducing is in the language as proposed by the Commission.

I include as a part of these remarks a letter which I received from William C. Hull, Executive Assistant, United State Civil Service Commission, dated November 23, 1945, in which is discussed the interpretation which makes this amendment necessary. The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES CIVIL
SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., November 23, 1945.

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANGELL: I have your letter of November 5, 1945, in furtherance of our telephone conversation regarding the denial of leave privileges to war-service appointees in the postal service which was brought to your attention by Virginia E. Carr and Nella J. Nelson, of the Portland (Oreg.) Post Office.

Admittedly the situation is unfortunate and for your information may be explained as follows:

The act of April 30, 1940 (54 Stat. 171), which governed the granting of annual and sick leave to substitutes in the postal service prior to the Postal Reclassification Act (Public Law 134, 79th Cong., approved July 6, 1945), reads in part as follows:

"That hereafter substitutes in the postal service shall be rated as employees and such substitute postal employee in the classified civil service shall be granted the same rights and benefits with respect to annual and sick leave that accrue to regular employees in proportion to the time actually employed."

Following a decision of the Comptroller General dated July 15, 1944 (B-43138), the Commission was requested by the Post Office Department to determine whether or not war-service substitute employees are considered as "in the classified civil service" within the meaning of the act of April 30, 1940. The Department was advised on January 29, 1945, that the Commission has uniformly held that Executive Order 9063, under which war-service appointments are made, did not take the positions affected thereby out of the competitive classified civil service, but that by reason of the provisions of section 2 of the order the persons appointed solely by reason of any special procedures adopted under the order, to positions subject to the Civil Service Act and Rules would not thereby acquire a classified civil-service status. Although the appointments of war-service appointees are limited to the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter, such appointees are incumbents of positions which continue to be in the competitive classified civil service. It was stated to be the view of the Commission that substitute postal employees who received war-service appointments were incumbents of positions in the competitive classified civil service and were therefore entitled to earn leave within the meaning of the act of April 30, 1940, referred to above.

Section 6 of the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.) superseded the act of April 30, 1940, by granting leave to substitute employees in the following language:

"*Provided further*, That classified substitute employees, under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, shall be granted the same rights and benefits with respect to annual and sick leave that accrue to regular employees in proportion to the time employed in a pay status * * *: *And provided further*, That in no event shall a classified substitute employee be credited during a 12-month period with more than 15 days' annual and 10 days' sick leave."

It will be observed that the new law granted leave only to "classified substitute employees." Under date of August 27, 1945, the Post Office Department requested the Commission to determine whether war-service substitute employees may be regarded as "classified substitutes" within the meaning of the new law (Public Law 134). Although the Commission does not control the granting of leave to postal employees, it does have authority to determine whether or not particular groups of employees have a classified civil-service status. It was for this purpose alone that the matter of leave for substitute employees was referred to the Commission for an interpretation of the term "classified substitute" as it appears in the law.

The Commission was authorized by Executive Order 9063, February 16, 1942, to adopt special procedures to govern appointments during the war period. Section 2 of this order specifically provided that "persons appointed solely by reason of any special procedures adopted under authority of this order to positions subject to the Civil Service Act and Rules shall not thereby acquire a classified (competitive) civil-service status, but in the discretion of the Civil Service Commission, may be retained for the duration of the war and for 6 months thereafter."

The term "classified substitute," as used by the Commission and the Post Office Department for many years, means a substitute with a competitive classified civil-service status. Inasmuch as section 2 of Executive Order 9063 specifically provided that appointees shall not acquire a competitive classified civil-service status, war-service substitutes of the Postal Service cannot be regarded as classified substitutes.

In response to the Department's request to be advised whether war-service substitute employees may be regarded as classified substitutes within the meaning of section 6 of Public Law 134, on September 12, 1945, the Commission advised the Department as follows:

"A careful study has been made of the legislative history of Public Law 134, approved July 6, 1945, but nothing has been found to indicate the reason for the change in the leave law applicable to substitute employees. The Department, no doubt, has information concerning the purpose of the change in the law which is not available to the Commission. Regardless of the purpose in changing the leave law applicable to substitute postal employees, the fact remains that the new statute governing the granting of leave specifically applies to classified substitute employees. The term 'classified substitute,' as used by the Commission and the Department for many years, means a substitute who has a competitive classified civil-service status by virtue of having been regularly selected for probational appointment from a certificate issued by the Civil Service Commission for that purpose. Inasmuch as section 2 of Executive Order No. 9063 specifically provides that persons appointed solely by reason of the procedures adopted thereunder, 'shall not thereby acquire a classified (competitive) civil-service status' the Commission is reluctantly forced to the view that substitutes appointed under the War Service Regulations may not be regarded as having a classified status for the purpose of being entitled to leave benefits under the act of July 6, 1945.

"We regret that a more favorable decision cannot be made in this matter as we believe that the employees in question should be entitled to leave benefits. This is particularly true when there is nothing in the legislative history of Public Law 134 to indicate that Congress realized that the result of enactment of the new leave provision would be to deny leave benefits that had theretofore been available to war-service appointees. The Commission believes that it would be desirable for the Department to secure leg-

islation to correct the inequity which has been caused by the change in the language of the law granting leave benefits to substitute postal employees."

As indicated in the Commission's letter to the Department, the Commission regretted that it could not make a more favorable decision in this matter, because it believed that war-service substitutes should be granted leave in the same manner as classified substitutes. This is particularly true since these employees enjoyed the same leave privileges prior to July 1, 1945. You will appreciate, however, that the Commission was bound by the language used in the new law, and that the matter can be corrected only by an amendment of Public Law 134.

Sincerely yours,

W. C. HULL,
Executive Assistant.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will give this bill early consideration and report it favorably, so that it may be enacted into law and an injustice to these Federal employees removed.

Problems of Military Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered on December 19, 1945, at the section of criminal law of the American Bar Association in Cincinnati, Ohio, by Maj. Gen. Thomas H. Green, Judge Advocate General of the Army, on the subject Problems of Military Justice:

It is at the end of our wars—even victorious wars—that the Army hears most about its faults. It is then that those with grievances, and those with constructive criticisms as well, are able to make themselves heard. And this is, on the whole, a good thing. The Army learned long ago that the critic, the open forum of praise and censure which follows maneuvers or any other major military undertaking, is a most profitable source of plans for improvement. The lawyers in the Army are now finishing their task of administering justice for some 9,000,000 of our young men during almost 4 years of a desperate war. We are now prepared to receive their bouquets and their brickbats. We admit some apparent faults but think that, by and large, we have done a good job in harmony with American traditions of fairness and efficiency.

The court-martial system is, of course, primarily, designed to help our armies win our wars. The sanctions of military justice constitute an instrument of command. They form the strong right arm of the military commander in the maintenance of order and discipline within his ranks. Every officer and noncommissioned officer is taught, as his primary and continued lesson, that discipline, obedience in the interest of unity and teamwork, may best be developed through leadership, the qualities of intelligence and human understanding which inspire men to follow their leader and coordinate their efforts to the common end. But military men also realize that when they deal with a cross-section of our populace they deal with the weak individual as well as with the strong and with the recalcitrant as well as with the obedient. Punishments must be imposed in some cases if wrongdoing and defiance of authority are to be controlled. Justice in the administration of such punishment is a basic aim of the military justice system.

The revolutionary armies of the Colonies adopted the system of military justice they knew, that of their opponent, the British army. The British Mutiny Act was the pattern of our original Articles of War. The drafters of the Constitution recognized the necessity for a distinct system of military law when they gave to the Congress the power to make rules for the Government of the land and naval forces. And the fifth amendment excepted from the guaranty of grand jury presentment or indictment in criminal prosecutions, cases arising in the land and naval forces. The Articles of War as originally adopted and enacted by the Congress have been amended from time to time, the last major revision having been enacted in 1920. I can safely say that each revision has been designed as much to safeguard the rights of accused persons as to make the Articles effective in operation.

Basically, as they are now constituted, courts martial afford to accused persons the equivalent of all rights which our civil courts afford to defendants in criminal cases. No charge may be referred to a general court martial until it has been thoroughly and impartially investigated. Our investigations do not suffer by comparison with those conducted before the typical grand jury. The established rules as to double jeopardy, self-incrimination, reasonable search and seizure, speedy trial, right to information as to the nature and cause of the accusation, confrontation with witnesses, compulsory process and assistance of counsel, apply in court-martial procedure. Rules of evidence prescribed for courts martial are patterned on those of American criminal jurisprudence.

The eminent Prof. John H. Wigmore, while serving in the Judge Advocate General's Department, collaborated in statements of these rules. We have an advance statute on the effect of error in criminal trials, abolishing the antiquated rule of presumption of injury to the rights of the accused persons and substituting the test of actual injury. We do not have a trial judge and a trial jury in the usual sense.

In lieu of judge and jury we have in our court-martial of broadest jurisdiction, the general court-martial, a panel of officers of the Army in number not less than five, which includes one officer who serves as law member with powers concerning the reception of evidence and other interlocutary questions parallel to those exercised by the typical trial judge. Officers of the Army also serve the courts as trial judge advocates or prosecutors, and as defense counsel. Our law members are specially selected for their legal experience and common sense, as are the defense counsel and other officers of the court. We of the legal mind can, of course, always see room for improvement in the judicial qualities of these key officers. I think we all agree that with civil courts as well as with courts-martial the legal profession is never entirely satisfied with the skills of the judges. Although defense counsel before courts-martial may lack some of the special skills exhibited before civil juries, they traditionally act without sharp practice and the normal tendency is for them to move in straight lines toward disclosure of the simple truth. Because simple, prompt, and strong justice best serves the ends of discipline, courts-martial strive to be simple, speedy, just, and effective in their processes. To dispel any conception that our courts-martial are really hard-boiled in their dispensing of justice I may remark that a recent survey of several categories of our cases showed a fairness for which I do not believe we receive credit in the public mind. For example, of 345 prosecutions for murder during the fiscal years 1942 to 1945 inclusive, 107, or 31 percent, resulted in acquittals, and 92, or 27 percent, resulted in findings of lesser included offenses. Of 473 cases of manslaughter, 296, or 63 percent, resulted in acquittals and 39, or 8 percent, resulted in findings of lesser included offenses. Of 307 cases of rape, 160, or 52 percent, resulted in acquittals and 44, or 14 percent, resulted in findings of lesser included offenses.

During World War I there was developed administratively an effective system of appeals in the court-martial system. Upon the revision of the Articles of War in 1920 this system of automatic appeals applicable in all general court-martial cases was put in statutory form. Briefly, the law requires that no sentence involving death, dismissal, dishonorable discharge or penitentiary confinement may be carried into execution until the record of trial has been examined by a Board of Review in the office of the Judge Advocate General and, with the concurrence of the Judge Advocate General, held legally sufficient to support the sentence. The Board of Review and the Judge Advocate General, and in some cases the President and the Secretary of War, is given authority to set aside or vacate illegal convictions. Strict conformity with judicial processes are thus insured. The Boards of Review have developed a body of decisions covering the laws of evidence and procedure before courts martial which may well take position among other worth-while judicial pronouncements of American criminal law. During time of war the President may, through the Judge Advocate General, establish branches of his office, with Boards of Review, in distant commands, with appellate powers similar to those of the Office of the Judge Advocate General in Washington. These branch offices are autonomous both in legal theory and in practice. During World War II such branch offices were established in the European, Mediterranean, Far Eastern, India-Burma and mid-Pacific theaters of operations. The legal requirements fixed by the Congress have been administered with strict observance and with the will to make them effective and fair.

The sentences of courts martial are in time of peace strictly limited by maximums fixed by the President. In time of war, to the extent that sheer necessity seems to require, some of the limits are removed. Commanders in the field, at grips with brave, efficient, and tenacious enemies, find that severe sentences are sometimes required for their deterrent effects. Experience shows, for example, that some types of soldiers prefer skulking to facing the enemy—prefer a mild court martial sentence to the hazards of combat. And the well-intentioned soldier cannot understand why he should risk his life while the disobedient and the malingerer gets away with his skulking. Absence without leave, desertion, and disobedience of orders are other offenses which at times demand swift and strong punishments if campaigns and wars are to be successfully waged. It is not a cause of surprise to learn that the aftermath of war presents a considerable number of sentences by courts martial which appear to be severe for postwar purposes.

Viewed realistically a severe court-martial sentence of confinement is, however, only a form of indeterminate sentence, a form now popular with civil-law enforcement bodies. The executive officers of the Government, including the President, the Secretary of War, and high military commanders, have plenary power to reduce sentences and the Army systematically examines the cases of its prisoners with a view to the intelligent and just exercise of this power. I think there is no system in the world which insures to the persons in confinement a more thorough, a more level-headed, and a more just consideration of their rights and of the interests of the public, than our own military justice

administration. At present there is operating in the office of the Under Secretary of War an Advisory Clemency Board charged with the duty of examining for clemency the complete records of every prisoner who is still serving sentence for a serious offense. This board is headed by Justice Owen J. Roberts. It includes an expert civilian penologist and three officers of the Army, some with experience in combat and all with experience in the administration of military justice. It is the duty of this board to determine policies of punishment which are consistent with enlightened penology and the requirements of discipline, and policies which will return the prisoners to the civil communities as soon as may be feasible. A number of special boards operating under the general direction of the Advisory Board are conducting examinations in individual cases. Needless to say, these boards receive advice from The Judge Advocate General as well as from the administrative penal agencies. Final control of the program rests in the Under Secretary of War.

For many years the Army has realized that while some of its offenders are of the criminally inclined class, there are many others who have the qualities of intellect and character which fit them for honorable service in the Army. It has been assumed that one misdeed does not necessarily demonstrate unfitness as a soldier. It has been the practice, therefore, for the Army to make an intense effort to evaluate its prisoners with a view to their possible restoration to duty. This program has been implemented by the Articles of War which give military commanders the necessary powers of remission and suspension. Congress has also given to the Army the power to restore to duty soldiers who have been separated under dishonorable conditions. During peacetime our standards of restoration are strict but a very considerable number of men who have been sentenced to dishonorable discharge are nevertheless restored to duty prior to the expiration of their sentences. During World War II, as will, I understand, appear from the remarks of another speaker on this program, a liberalized and intensive effort to restore men was undertaken. Suffice it for me to say that the success of the undertaking is attested by the fact that roughly one-third of the prisoners sentenced to dishonorable discharge were restored to the Army to perform their duties as citizen soldiers. I am informed that the undertaking in this connection was particularly successful in some of the theaters of operations and that many men who once dropped by the wayside were rehabilitated and given the opportunity to serve in combat units.

In conclusion I wish to state that the Office of the Judge Advocate General of the Army welcomes suggestions for the improvement and the administration of military justice.

British Gloomy at Harsh Terms of American Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of December 15, 1945:

ABROAD—BRITISH GLOOMY AT "HARSH" TERMS OF AMERICAN LOAN

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

LONDON, December 14—A visitor fresh from the United States would have had the shock of his life listening to the 2-day debate in Commons on the American loan. It was a brilliant but gloomy debate, gloomier in some respects than those of the dark days of 1940 when a beleaguered but united Britain drew a certain exaltation from standing up to the enemy alone.

The 344 members who voted approval of the loan did so with unconcealed reluctance and misgivings. The Conservatives' decision to abstain, sharply criticized as an evasion of responsibility at a critical point in British history, did not prevent seventy members of the Opposition party from voting no. Described by some as an "economic Munich," by others as an "economic Dunkerque" and by all as a hard bargain, the loan was supported even by its chief advocates, Hugh Dalton and Ernest Bevin, only on the ground that it was the lesser of two evils and the only alternative to greater austerities than British people had suffered for 6 years.

The American visitor would be more surprised to find the man in the street taking the same attitude as members of parliament. Two workingwomen in a bus today agreed that they would rather continue living on bread and treacle than to be beggars to America. A businessman remarked gravely that acceptance of the conditions of the loan means exchanging British economic independence and stability for dependence on the "oscillating" American economy of booms and slumps. "But, of course, we sacrificed our economic independence to win the war," he added bitterly. "Our only hope now is that the United States is prepared to interpret her obligations as a creditor in a way to enable us to carry out our obligations as a debtor."

The truth is that an agreement that seems to most Americans generous in the extreme is regarded by most Britons as ungenerous in its recognition of their sacrifices and fettering in conditions it imposes. This is not to say that the people of this country are insensible to the heroic and munificent part the United States played in the war.

Nevertheless, they all share in some degree the feeling expressed by Col. Oliver Stanley when he said in the House that instead of a victorious people discussing the economic consequences of victory "a visitor from Mars might well be pardoned for thinking he was listening to the representatives of a vanquished people discussing the economic penalties of defeat."

Reports relayed here from the United States show Americans have no idea how the average Englishman feels on this subject. They don't realize how galling it is to have no choice but to accept terms that seem to him to interfere with empire trade and put him under financial tutelage to the United States for the rest of the century. Since so far he has enjoyed none of the expected fruits or relaxations of victory, this makes him wonder more than ever whether he really won the war. Press comments here make equally clear that the British on their side have no conception of the United States' problems or the United States' state of mind. They do not realize the burden of debt overhanging the United States or the prodigious difficulties growing out of overexpansion of war industries at the expense of others. Thinking in terms of a creditor nation of the nineteenth century they cannot understand the impact on American public opinion of the unprecedented demands for help from everywhere.

If two countries with a common language linked as closely by interest and tradition as the United States and Britain cannot understand each other better than this, the prospects for agreement between the Soviet Union and the western powers are pretty bleak. The saving and imperious truth is that for all of us there are no alternatives. The British are without illusions on this score.

But it is equally true that the United States has no alternative but to lend. Our economic life depends as much on the recovery of Britain as our physical immunity depended on her stand in the war. No one who has looked on what Churchill calls the tortured face of Europe and has seen at first hand the bankrupt world we live in can question for a moment the necessity of building up one sure element of health.

Some Englishmen believe the terms of the proposed loan represent an act of faith and courage on the part of the United States negotiators, and Americans who have surveyed the ruins left by war are convinced the loan is not big enough or would have been better from all points of view if given grant in aid. One of these suggested today that world conditions are so dangerous for us that it would have been wiser if the mutually irritating question of a loan had never come up.

I would put an end to all this argument about competitive tariffs and empire preferences by a bold proposal of a customs union between the United States and the British Commonwealth, he said. The idea may be premature and would be difficult in working out, but it is not utopian in the world as it is. Even as an idea, it would be the first step toward economic world order, without which a political UNO will never work.

This is a far-away solution, but it does not sound so unrealistic over here as at home. Face to face with the break-down of the world we have known, the question of methods by which it will be rebuilt or made over—by loans or gifts, partnerships or collective action—seem irrelevant compared with the supreme urgency of getting all hands to work.

Our Boys in the Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, we are approaching the Christmas season, and while the people generally, with charity in their hearts, are remembering their fellow men, I take this opportunity to again call to the attention of the Members of the House that we have millions of our boys who will spend Christmas Day in some foreign land, where they will not have the enjoyments of a Christmas Day at home. This is a sad approach to Christmas for those boys still in the service, and it is a sad approach to Christmas for their families, relatives, and their friends. In fact, every American—with probably a few exceptions—are saddened because our boys are not permitted to be at home this Christmas.

The Army and the Navy are, perhaps, the exceptions above referred to in these remarks. There remain in the service many men with families, many doctors with their offices closed during their ab-

sence and their home community in great need of their professional services, many lawyers whose offices have been closed for a long period of time, and their clients are awaiting the return of their lawyer in order to complete the settlement of an estate or to try some important question in court, and there are many of the younger boys who have not yet completed their high-school work and those who have completed their high-school course but who desire to attend college and prepare themselves for their future, and then there are so many of our farm boys in the service, some of whom have their farms and their implements, and some of whom have livestock, and they are eager to return to take up their work again; in fact, Mr. Speaker, boys and men of every walk in life are yet in the service of their country, stationed in the far corners of the earth, and every one of them are craving that day to come when they may embark on the journey back home. These boys have done their job—and they did a good job. They want to receive their releases and discharges, and they want to come home.

Mr. Speaker, there are several pending bills which relate to the early release and discharge of these soldiers and sailors, who are eligible for discharge, at an early date. Provision is also made for the discharge of all those coming within the "hardship rule," and to provide for the discharge of the boys who desire to complete their education. May I say here that I have signed each and every discharge petition now upon the Speaker's desk to bring each and all of those pending bills before the House for debate and vote, so quicker action may be had on all of those measures, and, in the end, to speed up the Army and Navy in releasing and discharging all of the men and boys yet in the service, and who have the obligations of a family, a profession, an occupation and an education before them.

So many of these men and boys are now worrying about their future. Some of these soldiers and sailors have had more than 4 years of service, and many of them have not been at home during a very large portion of that time. They have their own lives to live, and they have their future before them. They want to get started in their lives and in their professions or occupations. They want to get a job before all of the jobs are taken by others—they want a chance in life.

It is needless to say that there has been much lost motion in the discharge system following the end of this war. The boys know that fact, and the people are well aware of that situation. And at this Christmastime, when the millions of our boys are still in the service—stationed upon the far-flung islands and shores of the world—and many of them have ample points for discharge, and many of them have a great excess of points for discharge—they are usually advised by their superior officers that "there is no ship available for transportation," or "you are essential to the service," and there is little wonder that these boys are worried and despondent over their sad plight. There is very little charity in those responses at Christmastime when our boys want to return to their homes and to their home communities. But the Army and the Navy have the sole responsibility. Their orders control and dominate all these boys in the service, and they alone are responsible for this situation. Since VJ-day there has been a slow-down all along the line in the discharge system and it is interesting to know of the vast number of our ships and planes available for transport duty in returning our servicemen to this country that have been taken out of the service since victory was ours. Compare that condition with the huge number of ships and planes that were used to transport our men to the battlefront and you will have some very interesting history.

Mr. Speaker, our veterans of World War II are greatly disturbed over the slowness of their discharges, and their return back home again. Letters are coming to my desk from the far corners of the globe from these boys—all of whom desire to secure their release and discharge at the very earliest possible moment. Some of these boys are extremely bitter over their sad plight, and it is my confident belief that the service in both the Army and Navy may be impaired in securing enlistments in the future because of this extreme condition. These boys should not be penalized—they have served faithfully and well, they have brought victory to our country—but they should be given the consideration to which they are entitled to receive as the heroes of this war. These boys know that the voluntary enlistments into the service are great, and that those voluntary enlistments by those who want to make a career in the Army or Navy are now supplying the needed personnel, coupled with the Regular Army and the Regular Navy, to meet the demand for occupational duty in both theaters of the late war. So the knowledge of this fact simply adds to the discomfort of those American boys who are still in the service, all of whom want to come home at the very earliest moment.

Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of Christmas—in the Christian spirit—it is my hope that those in power, and I speak of those higher up in the Army and Navy, will adhere to the sentiment of the season—will realize that they, too, had their lives before them in the years ago—and will adopt a policy which will lead to the early releases and discharges of these home sick and despondent boys, so they may, too, have their chance in life before it is too late for them to rehabilitate themselves in the arts and trades of civil life. A chance is all they want—but as long as they are kept in the Army or Navy they will have no chance. Each month and each year they are forcibly retained in the service simply removes from them that much of their chance to go forward in their own rehabilitation.

Let the controlling officers, in this matter, speak to the boys—and I hope they will say—"A Merry Christmas" and a "Happy New Year," and that they will act by liberalizing their ironclad discharge system and make it humanly possible for our boys to return to their homes—discharged from the service—so they, too, will realize this to be a Merry Christmas and that the New Year will be the happiest one of their lives.

A Challenging Christmas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, December 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 19), 1945

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Christmas message prepared by me entitled "A Challenging Christmas."

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Christmas 1945 is a Christmas like the sweet Noels of old.

It is also a new Christmas, a challenging Christmas.

First, how is it like the Christmases of old?

One reason, the most important reason, is that we are once again celebrating Christmas while at peace. Those unforgettable words, "On earth, peace and good will towards men," hold living meaning for us today.

Another reason is that there has been for some time a trend toward things spiritual. Christmas 1945 accentuates that trend.

Still another reason is that our tasks and responsibilities now permit us to pause in fond memory of the past.

There are no recollections in our life sweeter than those associated with the Christmas holidays. We recall those days of childhood with parents, now long since departed, when we gathered around the blazing, crackling fire of logs in the grate. We recall those days when, as students in college, we wandered back to the paternal hearth; those days of mother's holiday dishes and father's generosity; and over all, the love and solicitude of parents and brothers and sisters; the tales our parents told of the Christmases of their youth; the loaded Christmas tree, the holly, the mistletoe, and the blazing hearth; the sleigh bells ringing out through the crisp air, the beauty of the midnight mass, and the singing of carolers.

We recall also those other Christmases when we as parents had our own little brood around us, the brood which is now grown to manhood and womanhood, with homes of their own—the gambols, laughter, and cheer of children.

Yes, Christmas awakens the strongest and most heartfelt associations of the past. It is a season uniting friends and kindred, a season of radiant spirits, blended with the most solemn and sacred memories; a season of open house, genuine hospitality, filled with joyous festivities.

And, too, with the home memories of Christmas, there are those associated with the church services—inspiring and hallowed. They tell the beautiful story of the Christ Child. There is the music of this season—choir and organ, with Christmas carols.

Yes, now again, there are the lighted Christmas trees, shining out upon the snow-covered earth. There are the Christmas delicacies, the gatherings with old neighbors

and friends. There are the shining heavens of Christmas. Truly it is a sacred and a joyous season. There is a fragrance about Christmas which no other season brings. There is the warmth of friendship, happiness of countenance, and joy of spirit.

But this Christmas is different. Today we live in the atomic age. The advent of the atomic bomb climaxed 50 years of the greatest period of invention and discovery that the world has ever seen.

Humanity is attempting to reach beyond these discoveries and to pierce the veil—to ascertain life's real meaning. There is a spiritual awakening among the peoples of earth. They desire a better understanding of God and man's relation to Him.

One thousand nine hundred and forty-five years ago, in a stable in Bethlehem, a Child was born. This Child grew up to manhood and was designated by the various terms of Master, Wayshower, Christ Jesus, the Son of God. Through Him there flowed the divine manifestation of God in greater completeness than in any other mortal.

He was also called the Light of the World—Saviour. Others before Him had manifested to the world great spiritual truth. Such were Moses, Nehemiah, Job, Isaiah, Daniel, and others. But Nazarene, as He was called, told men to seek and they would find.

He sensed man's unity with his Maker, so much so that He could say: "I and My Father are One." On another occasion He said: "I am the way, the truth, and the life." His job was to make truth understandable and workable—the truth which, when utilized and lived, would heal the heart of humanity.

The beautiful story of the nativity of Jesus, as found in the Bible, pictures the shepherds receiving the angelic tydings of the Saviour's birth. It pictures their going forth to Bethlehem, where they found the Babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger. But this Babe had to grow in stature and wisdom and in favor with God and man. That means He had to put off His swaddling clothes.

The challenge of that incident is plain to us this Christmas.

You will remember that I have called Christmas 1945 a challenging Christmas.

We have won the war. But have we put off our swaddling clothes, such as intolerance, hatred, lust, ingratitude, envy, criticism, and smugness?

When the Christ Child had grown to manhood, He gave of His spiritual wealth. He gave ideas which, if followed in individual, national, and international relations, would solve the problems of mankind. You remember He said: "Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God." He recognized that peacemaking was a matter within one. He made the dynamic statement that "the kingdom of heaven is within you." Very few have caught up to that statement.

He constantly preached to His followers the need of "fearing not, and rejoicing always." Was not that the message that the angels brought also? They chanted: "Fear not, for, behold, I bring you good tydings of great joy, which shall be to all people."

And so, my friends, let us resolve that this Christmas season—the first Christmas of peace in 5 years—we will not simply celebrate the advent of the Christ Child in the usual way.

Let us resolve that we will here and now rededicate ourselves to the job of bringing peace on earth and good will among all races of men. Let us bear in mind that Jesus was not only a teacher but a doer of the Word.

We must, if we intend to follow in His steps, recovenant that we will individually, nationally, and internationally get rid of the little foxes that destroy the vines of harmony and productivity. We must live the truths contained in the Sermon on the Mount. We must practice the Golden Rule and live as good Samaritans.

Christmas, 1945, is like the Noels of old. But it is also a new Christmas—a challenging Christmas—for us all.

I think that this Christmas the star of peace is shining more brightly than it has in many years. There are happy omens for those who have eyes to see with that peace, for which the race has longed and hungered, will soon be a continuing thing of reality.

We know that conditions are better between Russia, Britain, and ourselves. Contingents of Russian and Australian troops are going into Japan to serve under MacArthur. As a result, more of our boys are coming home. The crisis in the Near East appears to be clearing up.

There are signs that on the management-labor front in America both management and labor are sensing the fact that there is a third party in the picture—the public—which has rights and is entitled to consideration.

And so the Name, which is above every other name, comes to have greater meaning than ever before. The flame which the Saviour lit 2,000 years ago burns ever and ever brighter. It throws an everlasting light of hope and faith.

Guided by that light, we can do naught but triumph over our problems. We can do naught but be adequate to our challenges.

God is greater than any problem. The joyful spirit of Christmas is more enduring, more powerful, than any momentary setback or sadness or misfortune we may suffer now or in the future. Let us remember that fact always and take heart and courage from it.

In conclusion, dear friends, may I express on behalf of Mrs. Wiley and myself our warmest wishes of the season to you and yours and to the kind folks of this station who made this broadcast possible.

May all of us and all of humanity go on from this challenging Christmas to even more joyous Christmases to come.

May we all come to know that peace, spoken of old, as "the peace which passeth all understanding."

Guayule Rubber Gets the Run-Around

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in March 1942 this country embarked on a program for the production of domestically grown natural rubber from the much-discussed but little-known guayule shrub. It was carefully and thoroughly explained to the Congress at that time that at least 4, and perhaps 5, years would elapse before any substantial amount of rubber would be obtained from this rather slow-growing desert plant. Now, just a little over 3½ years since the inception of the program, Congress has voted to liquidate the entire project by the end of 1946.

What utter folly, what tragic short-sightedness; with natural rubber at a premium, and with our stock pile at an all-time low, we blithely authorize the destruction of 30,000 acres of guayule with a potential output of from fifteen to twenty-five thousand tons of rubber, depending upon the age which growing plants are permitted to reach.

Not with my vote, Mr. Speaker. I, for one, do not intend to bury my head in the sand like the proverbial ostrich and let the United States again become the international sucker for the notorious British-Dutch rubber monopoly. Have we no regard for the rubber consumers in this country? Are we again going to ignore the recommendation of General Eisenhower who, in 1930, said:

> If the guayule industry could develop to the point where approximately 400,000 acres were devoted to the growth of guayule, we would produce annually almost 160,000,000 pounds of rubber and have on reserve at all times not less than 250,000,000 pounds. The existence of these conditions would, in the event of a war where our overseas communications were interrupted, be of inestimable value to the Nation.

What a prophecy that turned out to be.

I know, just as every other Member of the House knows, that the Government management and administration of the emergency guayule rubber project has been costly, wasteful and uneconomic. Is that any reason for scrapping the two mills that have already been constructed and junking 25,000 tons of one of the most precious natural resources in our possession?

Now, to cap the climax. The following exchange of correspondence between the Rubber Reserve Corporation and the chairman of the California State Guayule Rubber Project Committee ought to win the fur-lined bathtub. Eighteen cents per pound for domestic guayule rubber, 31 cents per pound for an inferior product from Mexico and heaven only knows how many times that much for rubber from South America. Everybody passes the buck, our "good neighbors" get the dough, guayule gets the run-around and the American rubber consumer gets it in the neck.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE
CORPORATION,
OFFICE OF RUBBER RESERVE,
Washington, D. C., November 28, 1945.

CARLYLE THORPE,
Chairman, California State Guayule Project Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THORPE: This letter is being forwarded to you at the request of Mr. Parsons representing your committee, who discussed with the undersigned on November 27, 1945, several aspects of the proposal of certain interests in California to purchase from the United States Department of Agriculture the emergency guayule rubber project at Salinas.

Mr. Parsons was advised that under Civilian Production Administration Order No. R-1, as amended, no person is permitted to sell or to buy natural rubber, including guayule, without first obtaining authorization to do so from the Rubber Bureau of the Civilian Production Administration, Washington, D. C., which succeeded the War Production Board. This office acts as the sole importer and distributor of natural rubber, including guayule; therefore, it will be necessary that all guayule produced in the United States be sold to this office.

As explained to Mr. Parsons, this office is not in a position to make any commitment other than from day to day as to the price which it will pay for guayule rubber offered to it. The current price which this office is paying for usual good quality guayule is 19 cents per pound in less-than-carload lots, less freight to destination designated by this Cl-

fice, and 18 cents per pound in carload lots, less freight to destination designated by this Office. Such price represents this Office's domestic selling price for such guayule.

Although commitments have been made in the past to purchase guayule in foreign countries at a price in excess of the selling price in this country, such commitments were made entirely for the reason that the Japanese occupation of the far-eastern rubber sources made it imperative to pay whatever price was required in order to obtain maximum production. Obviously, this situation does not exist now that hostilities have ceased and the far-eastern rubber sources are again in the hands of our allies.

If there is any further information which this Office can furnish you, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD BAYBUTT,
Deputy Director, Office of Rubber Reserve.

CALIFORNIA STATE GUAYULE
RUBBER PROJECT COMMITTEE,
Los Angeles, Calif., December 5, 1945.
RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
Office of Rubber Reserve,
Washington, D. C.
(Attention Mr. Richard Baybutt.)

DEAR MR. BAYBUTT: Your November 28 letter has been given careful consideration by this committee.

As you are doubtless aware, Congress has just passed a bill requiring liquidation of the Government's guayule emergency rubber project during the year 1946 and, therefore, unless something is salvaged out of this industry by private enterprise, production of natural rubber in United States will be completely and probably permanently eliminated within 6 months or so.

Most of the farmers in the Salinas, Tracy-Newman, Colusa, and southern California districts, on whose land the Government has guayule leases, stand ready to form a cooperative organization for the purpose of purchasing and operating the Salinas rubber mill with the harvesting, baling, and transportation equipment assigned to that mill. They will then continue to care for their present guayule plantings to economic maturity, and when these plantings are harvested many of the cooperating farmers intend to replant and continue in the guayule-growing business.

Recent improvements in varieties which will produce 20 percent more rubber and 20 percent more tonnage per acre, with maturity about a year sooner than the presently planted varieties, together with improved techniques in growing nursery stock, in planting seeds directly in the growing fields, and in cultural, harvesting, baling, and milling practices, have convinced many of our farmers that in the future they can compete in a free and open market with imports of natural rubber and we would like the chance to prove it.

It is conceded that Government operation of the farms and the mills has been far more costly than under private enterprise. For instance, a preliminary study by those farmers interested in this cooperative undertaking indicates that we can mill the rubber for 6½ cents to 7 cents per pound and that we can harvest, bale, and transport the shrub to the mill at $6 per ton, or approximately 3 cents per pound for the rubber. But it costs something to care for the fields, and unless the farmers are given a reasonable profit for maintaining the guayule they will naturally turn to producing other profitable crops.

Your argument that the war emergency is over, and thus it is no longer necessary to pay any price necessary to obtain rubber, sounds logical until we give consideration to the existing supply-and-demand situation. Demand for natural rubber is now far in excess of supply, as is evidenced by the fact that if we were permitted to sell this guayule rubber on a free and open market we could contract a year's output for well over 50 cents per pound. One manufacturer has offered us $2 per pound for 100 tons per month.

Where in hell's the logic in the Government spending $9 to $15 per acre to eradicate the growing shrub from the existing fields when farmers are willing to take their fields over "as is" and supply badly needed natural rubber for not over half the price the open market is willing to pay? We would appreciate an answer to that one.

Again, why pay the low wage-earning, low-standard-of-living Mexicans 31 cents per pound for an inferior grade of guayule rubber and only offer us 18 cents, or half the price, for a far superior grade? This policy actually penalizes American producers as against foreigners. The existing Rubber Reserve directive seems to us to be good-neighbor policy with a vengeance.

We realize, Mr. Baybutt, that as long as the demand is in excess of the supply that it is logical to control rubber prices. But, by the same token, is it logical to destroy a potential production of 15,000 tons of rubber in the United States. And if the Government, in order to hold retail rubber prices down to prewar levels, sees fit to subsidize rubber-product manufacturers by selling its natural rubber to them at less than half the cost of importations, why shouldn't it pay domestic producers, with the highest labor and material costs, the highest taxes, the highest land values, at least the same price it pays foreigners?

All our people are asking is that the Rubber Reserve Corporation either give us the same contract that they have with the Mexicans or permit us to sell our product uncontrolled on the free and open market. This seems to us only fair, and, in view of the above arguments, we hope you will reconsider your first decision and favorably consider our request.

In view of General Eisenhower's report, per copy attached, do you think it is logical for the United States to be dependent upon a foreign source of supply, located 10,000 miles away, for so important a strategic material as natural rubber when an infant industry here in America is anxious and willing to pioneer its development in free and open competition with all comers?

We are confident that world prices for natural rubber will remain sufficiently high for at least the next 5 years to permit us to operate profitably until by experience and through trial and error we can prove to the world that we can produce natural rubber in America as cheap or cheaper than any place in this cockeyed world.

What do you say?

Sincerely,

C. THORPE, *Chairman.*

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, D. C., December 14, 1945.
Mr. CARLISLE THORPE,
Chairman, California State Guayule Project Committee, Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. THORPE: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of December 5, 1945, concerning the price at which Reconstruction Finance Corporation will purchase domestically produced guayule rubber.

In order to understand the position of this Corporation, you should bear in mind that the price at which this Corporation sells guayule rubber to consumers is fixed by the Office of Price Administration rather than by this Corporation and this Corporation cannot purchase same in excess of the established selling price unless it intends to subsidize domestic production of guayule rubber. This Corporation was specifically authorized by Congress to subsidize the production of natural rubber in foreign countries during the war emergency and similarly the Department of Agriculture was authorized to undertake the domestic production of guayule rubber, which was tantamount to a subsidy inasmuch as it was recognized that the sale of guayule to consumers would be at a price less than the cost of production. It is not the prerogative of this office to continue the subsidization of domestically produced guayule, particularly since Congress has only recently determined that the domestic production of guayule should not be subsidized any longer.

As to whether domestic producers of guayule should be, or when they will be, permitted to sell on the open market rather than to this Corporation is a decision which rests not with this Corporation but with the Civilian Production Administration, and until the present controls and restrictions are removed there is nothing this Corporation can do in the matter.

You state that you have received an offer of $2 per pound for 100 tons of guayule per month, but you did not indicate whether such offer was made by a manufacturer of permitted products or of nonpermitted products. Undoubtedly, manufacturers of nonpermitted products and black-market operators would be willing to purchase much more than 100 tons per month at almost any price. However, as long as the Office of Price Administration believes the over-all national economy is served best by a selling price of 17½ cents per pound for guayule, this office must abide by the decision of the Office of Price Administration. If you disagree with such decision, your recourse is with the Office of Price Administration or with Congress.

With regard to the price being paid to Mexican producers of guayule, I will only reiterate that such price is being paid solely because it was necessary as a war measure to agree to pay such a price through June 30, 1947, in order to obtain maximum production during the war period. Upon the expiration of such contract it is not contemplated that any further commitments will be made with Mexican interests at price above our domestic selling price.

Yours very truly,

RICHARD BAYBUTT,
Deputy Director, Office of Rubber Reserve.

Copy to Congressman ANDERSON of California.

Mr. Harry Bashore, an Outstanding Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harry Bashore, the Commissioner of Reclamation, is leaving the Federal service. Mr. Bashore, having reached the age of 65, is going to leave his desk in Washington and return to his home at Mitchell, Nebr. I know that I speak for every Representative from the West when I say that we are grateful for the long years of service that Mr. Bashore has rendered. We hope that he will enjoy many, many years of life and that many good things are in store for him.

Mr. Bashore graduated from LaGrange College in LaGrange, Mo., in 1899, with a bachelor of arts degree, and from the University of Missouri at Columbia, Mo., in 1906, with a bachelor of science degree in civil engineering. He joined the Bureau of Reclamation in 1906, when that agency was only 4 years old. He

was an engineering aide and later superintendent on the North Platte project in Nebraska and Wyoming. In 1927 he became construction engineer on a project to irrigate 32,000 acres in eastern Oregon. Three years later he was called to Spokane, Wash., where for 2 years he made the engineering investigations that preceded the building of the world's largest concrete dam—Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River to store water for irrigating more than a million acres of new land which will provide thousands of farms for returning servicemen and others. In 1932 he went to Sacramento to conduct preliminary investigations on another great multiple-purpose reclamation project—the 2,000,000-acre Central Valley development in California. The following year he became construction engineer and supervised the building of the Alcova and Seminoe Dams on the Kendrick project in Wyoming. From Wyoming to Washington was but a step for Harry Bashore after having given such an account of his administrative ability and capacity for thorough, careful workmanship. He was appointed Assistant Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation in 1939 and succeeded John C. Page as Commissioner in 1943.

Mr. Bashore's illustrious predecessor John C. Page was also a Nebraskan. Mr. Page was born in Nebraska, he graduated from the college of engineering at the University of Nebraska and served the Bureau of Reclamation with distinction for many years.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my remarks by including an editorial which appeared in the Lincoln (Nebr.) Star of December 17, 1945:

BACK TO MITCHELL

The Nebraska neighbors of Harry W. Bashore could be a little bit envious of the opportunities which this adopted Nebraskan has had as the head of the United States Bureau of Reclamation. It is the job of the finest creative activity. Each day of it brings the satisfaction justly arising from knowledge that America's natural resources are being restored.

Mr. Bashore entered the reclamation service in 1933, and his first responsibility was the North Platte irrigation projects in western Nebraska. He followed this assignment by supervising construction of the Alcova and Seminoe Dams in Wyoming, rising steadily until appointed Commissioner in August of 1943. Now, at 65, retirement age, Mr. Bashore confirms his devotion to the region where so much of his activities took place by announcing his intention to return to Mitchell to take up residence. He has the satisfaction of knowing that he was associated with the reclamation service in its period of the greatest usefulness.

All of Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 17, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Farm Journal of December 1945 by Wheeler McMillen:

ALL OF US

(By Wheeler McMillen)

All of us feel better this Christmas. Even those whose sons will not come back have the sad comfort of knowing war is over for their friends' sons, too. We shall not, on this Christmas morning, read of casualty lists. Headlines will not tell how many tons of bombs were dropped on an enemy. Many of the boys already will be home. We shall know that others will be on the way. The war is over. But has peace come?

If people were sensible, everyone would now forgive everybody else for the sins of the past. All people in all nations would treat others fairly. They would say, "Millions of men have been killed and hurt. Cities and roads and ships have been destroyed. The labors of long years have been wiped out. The world has been made poor. People who once lived happily are dead, or weak, or starving. No one of us is better off. The cruel, ignorant tyrants who started this war are gone or going. So now let us live and let live. Let us not quarrel. Let us not fight. Instead, we shall be kindly and be happy. We shall work and be well off."

Also, they would say: "From now on we live in danger. Never again can the world be the same. Man has cracked the atom! Nothing so truly awful has ever come about. A few evil, mad men can start war again, as such men have done before. With rocket planes they can shoot atom bombs against cities 10,000 miles away. They can push one button and vaporize a million people—turn to nothing by the act of an instant a whole city, all its people, and everything in it. A ghastly power, too horrible to think about—but true. We had better think about it. We must think what to do about it.

"On earth peace, good will toward men!" Never before were those words so filled with meaning; filled, too, with warning. Unless good will spreads among men there will be no peace on earth. Unless peace clothes the earth there will be no men. That can almost be true. The atom bomb has such power for ruin that it can blast away all the tools of civilization. An atomic war could leave only those few who escaped and were able to live as savages live. Our modern life depends upon tools, upon factories, railroads, wires, pipes, radio, cities, and machines. All these a few atomic bombs could destroy.

How sure can we be that people will choose to be of good will? Not sure at all. The Old World has always seethed with hatreds. Race has hated race. Nation has hated nation. Religion has hated religion. Some of these hatreds have lived for a thousand years, and they still flame. The cruelties of this war have added new fuel to these old hates. New causes for hate have risen. In the United States we have hate enough, yet we hardly know what it is. We have been free. Having been free, we have lived well. We have learned that a man who works and creates new wealth gets more than a man who spends his life fighting with others over a dollar, a crust, or an acre.

Unless we know how rare good will is among men, we can fool ourselves because we see so much of it at home. What other people pour out their money each year for Community Chests? What other nation gives so freely to the Red Cross? What other nation holds great drives to find clothes for the cold and food for the hungry and help for the stricken? Where else do men give hospitals and schools and art galleries and medical laboratories out of their own private pockets? Only in America are these things common. Only in America have many men been free enough to earn the means to give so generously.

So what can we do? What can you and I, as plain American people, do? How can we keep the atom from killing us? How can we spread good will among men? What can we do that there may be peace on earth? One thing, plainly, is to hold peace and good will in our own hearts. Peace and good will within our own families, and between us and our neighbors will help a little. They are mildly contagious, and will spread a little to others. But we are small ourselves—only a few among 2,000,000,000 people in the world. What else can we do?

Neither men nor nations gain advantage by being weak. We can insist that the United States shall be strong. The world being what it is, the strength of America must be such that it will be respected. Though the war is over, peace has not been made sure. Our scientists must always hereafter know more about the atom than anyone else knows. We must set free our men of the air, in the plane factories, and on the air lines, so that our air power shall be the strongest. We must set free our industries. It was the superiority of American industrial management and know-how that gave our fighting men the best arms first, and the most of them. We had that superiority because Americans have been free to invent, to risk, to decide, to plan, to make, to compete, and to sell. A strong America comes first of all.

Then we can insist that people everywhere shall be helped to help themselves. Hard as we may find it to believe, hunger and want are far more common than plenty. War has its roots in want. So, if people can be helped to raise and make what they want there is less danger that they can be stirred up to fight. American tools and American know-how will work any place. They will raise food, make goods, and haul things. In the long run they do not need to be given at our expense. They can be sold, for they will pay their way. Millions need American health know-how, too, so they can do more work. Certainly, one means toward peace and good will is to help people to work their way to plenty. The way may be long, but when they feel hope they will not find it too hard.

One other thing. America must not only be strong, but her statesmen will need to be tough. For a short time we hold the advantage of the atom. We can at least try to establish a world order that can settle disputes without war. We must be tough but not selfish—tough for our ideals. Our one national purpose among nations should be to prevent future fools from starting future wars. We know now that in modern war the victor loses, just as do the defeated. In future wars the whole human race will lose if, indeed, it survives.

"On earth peace, good will toward men!" Are human beings sensible enough to earn so high a reward? Will they ever choose leaders strong enough to solve national problems without wars? Will they ever learn that the Great Creator filled this earth with ever-renewable riches which man will harvest only if he studies nature's laws, and if he works in their obedience? Will men ever learn that the Golden Rule can bring both wealth and peace? What a glorious Christmas the world might enjoy were human beings truly practical!

Congress Should Move Speedily To Protect the Authorized Wearers of Service Buttons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on December 4 I addressed the

House on the necessity for imposing drastic penalties on individuals who are guiltly of wearing honorable discharge buttons to which they are not entitled. On the same day I introduced a bill, H. R. 4898, which would impose heavy penalties for the unauthorized or illegal wearing of discharge buttons and other service insignia.

As indicated by the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of recent date, there is an urgent need for passing the legislation referred to above. Let us put a stop to this unconscionable racket:

ANYONE CAN BUY SERVICE BUTTON

NEW YORK, December 17.—That little gold "ruptured duck," which the Nation's fighting men sweated out through years of war, can now be bought by any grafter, grifter, or IV-F who has the cash.

Current asking prices range from 35 cents to $25 in New York stores for the gold emblem which decorated Trajan's forum in ancient Rome and more recently was adopted by the United States as the token of honorable discharge from the armed services.

A reporter was able to buy a 35-cent sew-on emblem from one of the uniform outfitting shops with no questions asked about Army service. Another shop asked for discharge papers but was easily satisfied by a hasty glimpse of a driver's license.

That is to say there are no honest stores.

One shop required honorable-discharge papers, then a draft card, and finally apologized for being so strict.

"But we thought maybe you were an FBI man," the clerk said.

The Army public-relations office explained that stores are required to obtain a license from the Army Adjutant General's office in Washington in order to sell discharge emblems, and that the stores are supposed to ask to see discharge papers.

"Whether they do or do not is another question," a public-relations officer added.

One Manhattan firm is doing a rushing mail order business in "ruptured-duck" rings, in which there is no attempt made to check on the service status of the buyer.

Prices vary greatly from shop to shop, for there are no OPA price ceilings on this type of jewelry.

The Loafing Period

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, on December 4, 1945, there was published in the Standard-Star, of New Rochelle, N. Y., an editorial entitled "The Loafing Period," which, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE LOAFING PERIOD

It was to be expected that after the ending of wars on two continents, after an inspired national effort which admittedly called heavily upon our reserve strength, we should wish to rest a bit. Many deserve a little time to "sit it out" and catch up on lack of sleep and frazzled nerves and actually depleted physical reserves.

Then, too, there are many who are utterly unwilling to return to their prewar roles and for some this is thoroughly justified. The janitor or the elevator operator who rose in the ranks to a position of responsibility and command is not willing to go back to sweeping floor or running the elevator, and who is there to blame him for a desire to perpetuate his higher plane of livelihood?

Some, too, are shopping around, not with an intention of idleness for any extent of time but in a deserved leisure while they ascertain what the market offers for their best interests. Many who were upgraded in war industries now refuse to accept downgrading. And in the case of women, many who found independence and pleasure in constructive effort are disinclined to return to domestic service or clerical jobs of less prestige and consequence in the social and economic scale.

This is all understandable. But on the other hand, surveys indicate that there are hundreds of thousands more who are just plain loafing. They have their wartime earnings, they have their war bonds savings, and they want a good time before they put the harness back on. Some are drifting about the country, seeking vainly what they could not find at home, under the prevalent theory that the grass in the other pasture is always greener.

This may be pleasant for a time. It is good after an all-out exertion to sit for a while and rest, drawing upon the resources we have been fortunate to save, playing once more and learning again that life is not all blood and sweat and tears. But if we doze too long in the sun we tempt sickness; if we cultivate coma we may find it has turned into a catalepsy. Laziness is a vice which can become the master.

Isn't it about time we shook off this hypnosis of fatigue and get back to work? Let's quit waiting for George to do it. Let's recognize that reconversion means not only the making over of large industrial factories, but also of our own mental and physical structures, to the point where we can again find pleasure in hard work.

We have had our rest. Now the time for loafing has ended. Let's get back on the job.

Rank Injustice for Some Retired Federal Employes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have watched the progress of civil-service retirement legislation.

I have been conscious of the inadequacies imposed upon a group of Federal employees by the amended Civil Service Retirement Act of 1942. For that reason I was particularly interested in the editorial which appeared in the Washington (D. C.) Post on November 28. The editorial is entitled "Rank Injustice" and it should be of interest to all Members of the House.

It follows:

RANK INJUSTICE

The Senate voted unanimously last week to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended January 24, 1942, to Federal employees retired prior to that date. Previously, restrictions on the maximum amount of annuities payable had resulted in very inadequate proportional allowances to employees in the upper salary brackets. Presumably through an oversight Congress did not follow its usual practice of granting increased annuities to eligible employees who had retired before it approved the liberalizing amendment of 1942. Consequently, this group of annuitants could not qualify for the increased allowances now available to higher-salaried employees.

The gross and utterly indefensible discrimination caused by failure to include a retroactive clause in the 1942 legislation is strikingly revealed in numerous instances. For example, a District engineer in the Public Work Agency retired before 1942, after 38 years of service, who had had a salary of $5,600 was granted an annuity of $1,403—25 percent of his salary. After passage of the liberalizing legislation of January 1942, several employes with the same positions, salaries, and terms of service retired with annuities of twice that size.

The injustice done individuals who had the misfortune to reach retirement age a few months, weeks or days too soon, has been aggravated by the action of some retired employees who by good luck or political pull have been able to qualify for reappointment and to become eligible for increased annuities. Thus the Director of the United States Census, retired in 1941 on an annuity of $1,478, obtained in June, 1942, reappointment to a post carrying less than half his former salary. When he retired again 3 months later, he was granted an annuity of $4,530—more than three times his former one. During that 3 months he paid into the retirement fund 5 percent of his salary—$44.

The cases cited are typical of the inequities resulting from the carelessness or indifference of Congress. The pressure of wartime legislative demands may partly explain, but it does not excuse, its failure to enact remedial legislation long ago. Almost 4 years have elapsed since the mischief was done. Meantime many older annuitants have died and all of them have lost benefits to which they had a moral right and which they could have used to great advantage during a period of rapidly rising prices. Since the bill just passed by the Senate does not permit retroactive payments to be made—as it should in strict justice—a further delay on the part of the House in passing this pressing relief measure will add just that much more to the unacknowledged debt that the Government owes to a very unfairly treated group of its retired employees.

Edwin W. Kemmerer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the country was shocked to learn of the recent death of Dr. Edwin W. Kemmerer, noted economist and monetary expert. On many occasions Dr. Kemmerer has appeared before committees of Congress and has given valuable advice on monetary matters. He has at various times, acted as monetary consultant for 14 governments in reorganizing their monetary systems. Until his retirement in June 1943, Dr. Kemmerer was Walker professor of international finance and director of the international finance section of Princeton University. His death is mourned by many Members of Congress who have been helped by his many

publications and discussions on our domestic and international economic and financial problems. I include in my remarks the following editorial from the New York Times of Monday, December 17, 1945.

EDWIN W. KEMMERER

In the death of Edwin W. Kemmerer this Nation has lost one of its foremost economists. There was a time, indeed, when he was probably better known throughout the world than any other American economist, for he was successively called in as financial adviser to so many countries that it would be tedious even to list them here.

This record shows the wide recognition of his merits. He combined a broad theoretical grasp of the problems of money, banking and credit with the practical judgment that came from his unparalleled experience. He was a clear thinker and a lucid writer. He was forthright in his expression of opinion. He remained to the end an uncompromising defender of the international gold standard as the world's only protection against a chaos of domestically managed paper currencies. Perhaps more than any other economist in this country he has steadily warned in the last dozen years against the tendency toward inflation, and now that that danger is so close upon us, his analysis and guidance will be keenly missed.

Speedy Implementation of United Nations Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in January the United Nations Organization will be officially launched when both the General Assembly and the Security Council meet for the first time. Many immediate problems will demand attention and so great may be the pressure that the primary purpose for which the United Nations was conceived may be slighted or ignored. That primary purpose is clearly stated in article 1 of chapter 1 of the Charter: "To maintain international peace and security." This purpose must be carried out at once and with vigor. Today, therefore, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] and I are offering identical resolutions which call for speedy implementing of article 26, chapter 5, of the United Nations Charter. That article reads:

In order to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources, the Security Council shall be responsible for formulating, with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee, referred to in article 47, plans to be submitted to the members of the United Nations for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments.

The advent of the atomic bomb has magnified our needs to control the "diversion of the world's human and economic resources to armaments" beyond all powers of understanding when the Charter was drawn up last spring in San Francisco. Unilateral action would be dangerous folly, but without international controls, most of our resources will be drained off in armaments. Already our power is fortified by the greatest fleet the world has ever seen, as well as a stock pile of atomic bombs and yet in spite of appropriation cuts since VJ-day, obligations already undertaken, keep our armament spending at the appalling rate of six and a half billion dollars a month.

Russia, on the other hand, plans to build a great new fleet, and before long she will undoubtedly master the atomic bomb. Already she has a huge army, based on conscription. Britain, for the first time in her history, will continue compulsory military training. However reluctantly, the United States may be forced to follow suit.

Since national security depends on relative and not absolute military strength, the armament game is an explosive and competitive one. Each step leads to another. The air becomes poisoned with fear and war is easily kindled.

With our new powers of destruction, so vast and immediate, we have no time for fumbling. The ominous race must be halted at once by the organization which in war was conceived of as an agency to keep the peace. While success is uncertain, lack of international agreement, spells certain ruin for all. We risk nothing by attempting to limit the mad race. In fact, the speed and firmness with which the United Nations act, may determine the fate of mankind.

As the most potent nation in the world, it is proper that the United States, through its Congress, direct the attention of the United Nations to the immediate implementing of its Charter. Action should outlaw the use of the atomic bomb, abolish world-wide peacetime conscription, and set up adequate international controls and an inspection system. This, as the Charter promises, would release our resources for constructive purposes.

A Militant Champion for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Lee F. Soxman, pastor of the Cleveland Avenue Methodist Church, of Kansas City, Mo., has sent me a letter which in my humble opinion sounds a rallying cry that should activate every minister of the Gospel and every person who believes that Christianity has saving power to rescue humanity from the hatreds, wars, and strifes that are threatening to destroy the world. Mr. Soxman is an ardent believer in my bill, H. R. 4648, to establish a Department of Peace and Good Will and he is willing to do something more than express his sentiment. He believes in action. He believes that if we want peace, as nearly all Americans do, we must be willing to fight for it, and he would organize a fighting peace army of young people to propagandize for peace under the direction and guidance of the proposed Department of Peace and Good Will. In these critical times Mr. Soxman's letter should be read by all forward-thinking people, and I present it for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

CLEVELAND AVENUE
METHODIST CHURCH,
Kansas City, Mo., December 20, 1945.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: Permit me to congratulate you sir, on your efforts in Congress in behalf of peace and especially for H. R. 4648 to which you referred last week in your radio talk. Men like yourself, with concern and vision, backed by practical plans to meet the needs of this war-cursed world, are the only hope in the days that lie ahead.

Personally, I have felt the need for a long time, for a Department of Peace in our Federal Government. We certainly need in such a department, determined and aggressive leadership that will challenge this country and the whole world to do something heroic to stave off the disaster that certainly awaits us.

We need to learn to wage peace with the same spirit of sacrifice with which we wage war, and I believe our people can be aroused to do it. They can plainly see that everything else has failed.

If we could put at the disposal of a Department of Peace only a fraction of the resources and manpower requested by the War Department, who can tell what the results might be? If, instead of training our youth to kill and destroy, we challenged them to take a year of training for peace work and then go out under Government auspices as members of an army of good will, to help meet the desperate needs of men today, don't you think youth would respond? We have sent them out with guns and bombs, why can't we appeal to them now with even more enthusiasm to go out and wage peace by helping poor, ignorant, and fearful people to a knowledge of the better life and to achieve a standard of living that will bring to them contentment and happiness? When people are happy and contented, the warmakers will be out of a job.

Wouldn't it be a glorious day for this old world if, instead of launching another silly and disastrous race in armaments, we engaged in a friendly rivalry in doing good? If we could volunteer to China, for instance, the services of a group of trained engineers and soil experts to go there and help them in the control of their rivers and the use of their land, how many millions of lives would be saved from starvation and want? Isn't it reasonable to assume that England and Russia and other countries would catch the spirit and follow our lead by establishing unselfish and cooperative relationships with places of need throughout the world? The strong must learn to help bear the infirmities of the weak and ignorant. This is indeed one world. Now we must make it a brotherhood.

Most cordially and sincerely yours,
LEE F. SOXMAN.

Committee Appointed on St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, on December 17 I pointed out the status of the St. Lawrence project. My remarks will be found in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A5602. As indicated, 76 days had elapsed since the introduction of a bill providing for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. These remarks are merely to bring the subject matter up to date and to make a very happy report to the American people.

SUBCOMMITTEE APPOINTED BY SENATOR CONNALLY

On Wednesday, December 19, 1945, Senator THOMAS CONNALLY, of Texas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, appointed a subcommittee of leading United States Senators for the purpose of conducting hearings on the St. Lawrence project. This routine procedure of appointing a committee is of tremendous importance, and friends of the St. Lawrence project hailed it as a good omen. For nearly 1 year nothing has been done in the way of enactment of legislation in connection with the St. Lawrence project, and without legislation the project stands exactly where it stood 1,000 years ago. So the friends of progress and those American people who realize that tremendous advantages will come when the St. Lawrence project is completed will all have added cause to rejoice with the advent of the holiday season.

This appointment of a committee of leading and outstanding Senators will be welcomed by forty or fifty million people in the Middle West section of this country alone. These people have labored under a severe economic handicap: the lack of transportation which would add to their prosperity and to the prosperity of the whole United States as well as Canada.

But let the great molder of public opinion, the newspaper, tell the story. An account of this appointment of a subcommittee is contained in the Mesabi Daily News, one of the leading newspapers in my section, published at Virginia, Minn. Under date of Thursday, December 20, this paper contained an item by James C. Munn of the Associated Press, which item reads as follows:

SEAWAY LEGISLATION NEARING SHOW-DOWN—SENATORS NAMED TO CHART COURSE OF LEGISLATION

(By James C. Munn)

WASHINGTON.—Congressional action of the St. Lawrence seaway, stalemated by weeks of indecision, headed today for at least a preliminary show-down by early 1946.

That assurance developed late yesterday with appointment of a five-man Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee to chart the course of pending legislation which would authorize construction of the long-debated seaway and power development.

Senator HATCH, Democrat, New Mexico, the subcommittee chairman, indicated that hearings on the measure—a joint, bipartisan resolution—would start shortly after Congress reconvenes in January.

In addition to HATCH, the subcommittee named by Chairman CONNALLY, Democrat, Texas, of the Foreign Relations Committee, included Senators HILL, Democrat, Alabama; TUNNELL, Democrat, Delaware; LA FOLLETTE, Progressive, Wisconsin; and WHITE, Republican, Maine.

Authorization to name the subcommittee was given CONNALLY more than 2 months ago. His failure to act more promptly had caused several proponents of the development—particularly Representative PITTENGER, Republican, Minnesota—to charge that "high administration leaders" were attempting to delay action on the proposed legislation for which President Truman has urged "speedy approval."

PITTENGER, one of the seaway's most articulate supporters, hailed appointment of the subcommittee "a most encouraging step."

"That shows," PITTENGER said, "That TOM CONNALLY has got the Christmas spirit. I'm glad he's done what I have so repeatedly urged."

For the last 7 weeks PITTENGER has made what he terms "a weekly report to the people on the State of the Union regarding the St. Lawrence development."

The reports were made in the form of extensions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In them, PITTENGER has been extremely critical of delays to expedite the seaway legislation.

The latter calls for a simple majority of the Senate and the House to authorize this Nation's part in the seaway's construction.

However, instead of the so-called agreement method of dealing with the legislation, the Hatch subcommittee may decide that it should be treated as a treaty and, as such, require only action by the Senate.

The Senate in 1934 turned down the treaty proposal which requires a two-thirds majority for passage. The treaty was negotiated by former President Hoover—one of six Chief Executives favoring the seaway.

President Truman, in an October 3 message, urged the Congress to give the legislation speedy approval and termed it "one of the great developments of the world."

SUBCOMMITTEE HAS TREMENDOUS RESPONSIBILITY AND AN IMPORTANT WORK TO DO

Friends of the St. Lawrence project must realize that the responsibility for making a favorable or an unfavorable report on the bill introduced by Senator BARKLEY, Democrat, of Kentucky, on October 2, 1945, which bill is known as Senate Joint Resolution 104, rests upon these five members of the subcommitee. They will make a report after hearing testimony and after getting the facts and considering every bit of evidence that is presented to them. This subcommittee report to the full Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and that committee will then report favorably or adversely, as the case may be, to the Senate, or it will make no report at all. The important thing to know is that the friends of the project desire a favorable report from the subcommittee and a favorable report from the full committee, and affirmative action on the bill, with a favorable report by the Members of the Senate of the United States. If all of these things happen, the measure will then be considered by the House of Representatives.

WHEN SUBCOMMITTEE HOLDS HEARINGS

The American people who are familiar with the merits of this project will do well to remember that they will have to present facts to the subcommittee when it announces that hearings on Senator BARKLEY's bill will be held. The regular procedure for the friends of the project is to request the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator HATCH, for an opportunity to either give oral testimony or submit written testimony for the record, which the subcommittee will have printed when hearings are completed. You need not worry about the opponents of this St. Lawrence project. They will be on hand—they are already here. They are powerful and they will have unlimited funds at their disposal with which to fight it. That has been the history of legislative proposals dealing with this subject for generation after generation. If you want to know who these people are all you have to do is to go back to 1932 and 1933 when the Senate held hearings on this matter, and you will find every strong sectional interest opposed to the project. If you want to bring yourself up to date, you will turn to the hearings which were conducted by the Rivers and Harbors Committee in the House of Representatives in 1941 and those hearings will acquaint you fully with the opposition and its line of argument.

So it behooves the friends of the measure to make their interest known, either directly to the subcommittee or to those men and women who represent them in the Congress of the United States. No powerful groups representing untold millions of wealth and the influence which goes with it will be on hand to plead the cause of this worthy legislation. The American people will have to do that themselves if success is to crown the efforts of the friends of this measure.

When Is Surplus Surplus?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, many returning veterans are rapidly coming to the conclusion that so-called veterans' preference for surplus Government property is a snare and a delusion, with heavy emphasis on the delusion. A lot of previously able-bodied former servicemen will soon join the ranks of the amputees, having run their feet off in a hopeless search for apparently nonexistent surpluses.

When Congress was asked to pass and later to amend the Surplus Property Disposal Act, we were advised that there was approximately $100,000,000,000 worth of Government surplus property to be disposed of. So far, I am advised, only about $1,500,000,000 worth of surpluses have actually been sold. Where in heaven's name is the rest of it?

The following excerpt from a letter written to me by a good friend in California may be a partial explanation:

DEAR JACK: This is in reference to surplus commodities, which is the damnedest tangle of red tape and inefficiency I have ever seen. There are acres and acres of every conceivable type of product at Lathrop, Calif. Everyone admits it, that I have talked to, rows of trucks, tractors, farm equipment, pickups—many things in the original crates.

Our veterans go over there, see this equipment and try to buy it, only to find out that it is not surplus. When they do find something that is declared surplus, the tag and serial numbers already on it, they rush back to San Francisco, and after being shoved around for a number of hours, discover that it is being held for some Federal, State, or county agency, or that someone has purchased it ahead of them.

I spent the entire day in San Francisco last Friday, talking to the various men in the Veterans' Division of Surplus Commodities, men in the Department of Commerce, and the men in charge of Smaller War Plants. They are all about on the verge of resigning because almost daily they get conflicting orders from Washington on how to proceed. This information they pass on to veterans and other people who try to buy things, and it is Congress that gets the blame.

Now I do not believe that it is the intention of these gentlemen to blame Congress, they just blame it on Washington, but to the average kid, the only contact he has with Washington is his Congressman. These gentlemen I refer to would love to have a talk with you or some other Congressman, or would even welcome a congressional investigation.

The suggestions has been made, and it seems practical to me, that all power equipment, trucks, tractors, trailers, automobiles, etc., which will be shortly obsolete, be immediately declared surplus, and further that instead of giving governmental agencies the prior right to all equipment, it be broken down so that say one-third goes immediately to veterans, one-third to governmental agencies, and one-third to smaller war plants. If it is not disposed of within 30 days, or other time depending upon how often they make an allocation of surplus equipment, that the balance be declared open to dealers for the general public, and that the next batch of surplus equipment allocated then start through the same process. This would put us in a position where the veterans would have an opportunity to be taken care of on a certain amount of equipment.

As indicated by the above it becomes apparent that there just is not going to be much surplus property available as long as the Army and Navy and other Federal agencies hang on to what they have. The continued hoarding of automobiles, trucks, tractors, jeeps, building materials, and other essential reconversion commodities is becoming scandalous. I am preparing to introduce a resolution, when Congress convenes in January, to authorize a special congressional committee to investigate this unwarranted freezing of badly needed surplus property.

The Surplus Property Administration says that: "Any honorably discharged or released veteran who served in the armed forces on or after September 16, 1940, is entitled to preference in buying surplus Federal property." That is a flat statement, and I know that Congress intended it to be that way when the Surplus Act was originally approved. However, when a returning veteran writes me as follows, words and good intentions do not mean much:

I have made application to the SWPC in San Francisco for some equipment in order that I may start my former business. I had phoned, written, and called in person, but no luck. They say they do not have anything. This has been going on since October. I am 6,269 on the list which now numbers more than 25,000. From their vague answers it seems that we, the returning veterans, are not able to have any of these surplus goods. And there have been many rumors of auto dealers of SF buying huge lots of cars for something like $250 and selling them for $1,000.

I have just a small business with a potential of five or six employees. I need a vehicle, drafting tools, and such. All of that must be available; millions of men are being released and that equipment is no longer needed.

I spent nearly five long years in the service, from buck private to first lieutenant; spent 1 year in the Pacific and almost 2 in Europe. I fought for 10 continuous months in 5 European campaigns as an infantry-platoon leader, and all that time I have dreamed and planned and fought for my return to civilian life and the continuation of my former work, merely to design and build homes for Americans. You have heard this before, as far as I am concerned only you can supply the answer and the action necessary.

Mr. Speaker, this is typical of hundreds of letters that all of us are receiving every day. Congress is going to be blamed if something is not done soon to correct the situation, so let us get busy.

American War Dads Adopt Resolutions on Important Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I conferred with officials of the Minnesota branch of the American War Dads organization, including its able State president, Mr. R. S. Thornton, of Alexandria, Minn. Mr. Thornton also is national vice president of the American War Dads.

During that conference I was shown several resolutions that had been passed at the third national convention of the American War Dads held in St. Louis, Mo., on October 28 to and including October 31, 1945.

Because I feel that Members of Congress are anxious to know the views of the fathers of War II veterans, I am incorporating these resolutions and the aims of the splendid new national organization.

The resolutions committee report follows:

The American War Dads in convention assembled do hereby accept the challenge given to us by Gen. Douglas MacArthur, namely: "They are coming home—take care of them"; and realizing that the war is not won until the peace is won, we solemnly pledge to our service sons and daughters:

Adequate hospitalization and medical care for the sick and wounded.

A program of employment in every community.

Full support of their educational needs of every kind.

Every effort to help establish and insure a permanent peace.

To this end we submit the following resolutions as the objectives to be obtained as the militant program of the American War Dads:

"I

"Whereas the responsibility of our Nation toward our disabled veterans for their adequate hospitalization resolves itself into a single, clear-cut, paramount issue: That of providing facilities for the maximum restoration to health to the largest number of veterans in the shortest space of time; and

"Since the time has come for us to make available to these veterans not only the latest and most modern developments of the science of medicine and surgery, but also the services of the most skilled physicians of our country, especially the services of our veteran physicians. These indispensable services, however, cannot be provided if we continue to perpetuate the tragic mistakes of the past 25 years, which mistakes and practices have aroused the indignation of Congress and of every citizen of our country whose thoughts and prayers are for the tender and skillful care of those who have borne the brunt of battle: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That our sick and wounded veterans should have available to them, under veterans' privileges, America's most experienced and skilled members of the medical profession who shall be adequately compensated for such services in line with what they would receive in private practice. To this end we insist that the doctors and nurses of all veteran facilities be removed from civil service regulations. In order to secure the highest quality of professional skill for disabled veterans, the physicians and surgeons shall be selected upon a basis of training, experience, and qualifications for the particular field for which they are engaged. Preference shall be given, when possible, to those who have served with the armed forces of World War II; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That medical services and facilities be concentrated in metropolitan areas accessible to the majority of those who will require hospitalization, or near large medical centers; and that in the location of hospitals consideration such as precedent, politics, prejudice, and expense be eliminated; be it further

"*Resolved*, That each disabled veteran be provided the privilege of choosing the locality where he wishes to be treated; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress be requested to amend the GI bill of rights to accord with the recommendations made above."

"II

"Whereas under the Selective Service Act of the United States the reemployment rights of veterans of military service automatically expire within a comparatively brief period of time from the day of termination of hostilities as declared by the President of the United States; and

"Since experience has demonstrated that discharged veterans have not been able speedily to adjust themselves to civilian life, resulting in lapsing of the beneficial provisions of existing law: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the American War Dads*, That we request the Congress of the United States to amend the reemployment rights, privileges, and benefits of the Selective Service Act so that, as amended, said period shall be not less than 6 months from date of dis-

charge or date of termination of hostilities, whichever is later.

"III

"Whereas the Southeastern Athletic Conference in May 1945 adopted a regulation prohibiting our sons returning from the armed forces, who had previously been in college, from engaging in intercollegiate athletics at any school of the Southeastern Athletic Conference unless they had attended the same school before going into the service; and since many of our sons will wish to attend a different college from the one they went to before entering the service; and since we want our sons to be allowed to participate in the entire program of any institution they wish to attend upon their return from the service, regardless of what college or university they attended before going into the armed services: Be it therefore

"Resolved, That the members of the Southeastern Athletic Conference be urged to take immediate action to see that our sons, on their return from service, be allowed to participate in all forms of intercollegiate athletics for any school which they may attend, and that this rule discriminating against them be immediately rescinded.

"IV

"Whereas the Administrator of Veterans' Administration has issued regulations granting institutions of education the right to charge for each veteran enrolled under part VIII such customary tuition and incidental fees as are applicable to all nonresident students, provided that said charges are not in conflict with existing laws or other legal requirements. (Sections 2 (a) (2) V B Instruction No. 6, dated April 17, 1945); and since the American War Dads vigorously oppose the action of any State institution in charging, or seeking to charge, a veteran residing in the State of that institution, a fee applicable to nonresident students, on the grounds that it is an arbitrary and discriminatory act: Now, therefore, be it, and it is hereby

"Resolved, That appropriate action be instituted in each State, sponsored by a War Dad chapter in each said State, whereby in appropriate legal proceedings carried to the court of last resort in said State, if necessary or required, the legal right of said institution to make such charge is finally and definitely determined; be it further

"Resolved, That since the attorneys general in some States have ruled that this practice on the part of State-supported schools is legal, and since the legislatures in most States will not meet again until 1947, the American War Dads do hereby instruct the National Council to set aside sufficient funds to assist any one chapter of the American War Dads who will enter suit or legal proceedings against any State-supported school in the said State to eliminate this practice, this suit being for the purpose of recording a test case; be it further

"Resolved, That the results of the proceedings in this suit be given publicity to every War Dad through the medium of the American War Dad magazine within 6 months from the closing date of this convention.

"V

"Whereas State-supported schools in almost every State in the Union are taking unfair advantage of the GI bill of rights, known as Public Law No. 346, and the said schools are charging the Veterans' Administration on the basis of the nonresident fee, regardless of the fact that the veteran may live in the State, and since section 1505 of Public Law No. 346 provides that any benefits derived from the said bill shall be charged against and deducted from the veteran's compensation: Be it

"Resolved, That the American War Dads vigorously protest this discriminatory and unfair practice on the part of State-supported schools throughout the Nation; be it further

"Resolved, That we demand the Veterans' Administration shall not make a contract with any school wherein the charge would be greater than that which is charged a nonveterans under similar conditions; be it further

"Resolved, That we commend those State-supported schools in several States which are not charging the nonresident fee for resident veterans.

"VI

"Be it resolved, That there shall be no discrimination to veterans regardless of rank or branch of service in the matter of furloughs pending final discharge; that War Dad chapters in each State take proper action to assure veterans the privilege of having their discharges recorded wherever they desire and that all county clerks, city clerks, and town clerks be instructed to accept for recording the discharge of persons who reside or expect to reside in their community; and that all funds received by reason of being members of the armed services be exempt from income tax and tax refunds be made to those who served in World War II providing a maximum of $500 taxes due be forgiven on incomes received while serving in the armed forces of the United States.

"VII

"Whereas the men and women serving in the armed forces of the United States have not been and are not now covered under title II of the Federal Social Security Act, as amended, during such service; and the majority of those who have been or who are now in the service are losing the benefit of wage credits already credited to them and many of those who have been discharged have already suffered losses in wage credits; and in many instances the survivors of those men and women killed in the service of their country have been deprived of benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance program which they would otherwise have received; and

"Resolved by the American War Dads, That the Congress of the United States of America be, and is hereby, respectfully urged to speedily enact such legislation as would provide that the men and women who have been and who are now in our armed forces be given appropriate wage credits on their old-age and survivors insurance accounts for each quarter of the whole period of their military service; and that such legislation provide for extension of coverage under old-age and survivors insurance to all those occupations not now covered by the law in order to protect the old-age and survivors insurance wage credits to be granted men and women who have been or who are now in the armed forces of the United States, and who previous to their service had no such wage credits; and that all statutes of limitations be waived in the filing of claims for lump-sum, current, or full insurance payments, and that such payments be made, calculated from the first month to which the claimant could have been entitled by filing, regardless of the date of filing, in order to prevent loss of benefits and lowering of benefit amounts now occasioned by the provisions of the Social Security Act, as amended, and in order to assure that the insurance principles inherent in the afore-mentioned Social Security Act be fulfilled, and that Congress shall make adequate appropriations.

"VIII

"Be it resolved, That certain American-born citizens have, since December 7, 1941, declared their loyalty to a foreign government and have refused to pledge allegiance to the United States of America; be it further

"Resolved, That the American War Dads do hereby recommend the vigorous and immediate prosecution of such persons by the legal authorities of the United States Government, and that all such persons found to have renounced their American citizenship, after trial before duly authorized courts, shall be deported to the country to which they have declared allegiance.

"IX

"Be it resolved, That the national council be requested to take action necessary to promote a more strict control of the movements of conscientious objectors from time to time as occasion may justify; be it further

"Resolved, That the American War Dads go on record as opposing the release of conscientious objectors from camp until the time when service men and women of the armed forces can also be released contemporaneously therewith, in order that in common fairness to members of armed forces they may have an equal opportunity and a fair chance with that of the conscientious objectors in securing peacetime employment; be it further

"Resolved, That the fulfillment of the foregoing resolution will also have the effect of maintaining the morale of service men and women in the armed forces.

"X

"Resolved, That the United States Government be urged to continue careful and complete search of all the islands of the Pacific and other war areas for men missing in action, and that adequate ships and means be forthwith supplied for this purpose to the end that missing men be rescued before hardship and starvation bring death or permanent disability, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to each chapter of the American War Dads, each Congressman, and the President of the United States.

"XI

"Be it resolved, That the American War Dads take the initiative in organizing a servicemen's joint committee composed of the American War Dads and all recognized veterans' organizations of this war, or previous wars, to determine upon and present to the Congress appropriate legislation of vital interest to veterans, and that similar committees be organized to handle State or local problems in each State or community.

"XII

"Be it resolved, That an impartial board of review reconsider the cases of all men released from military service with discharges other than honorable, and that their findings be made final, subject only to action by the President.

"XIII

"Be it resolved, That a continuation of the means, facilities and commitments for military and naval research be urged upon the Congress.

"XIV

"Be it resolved, That by God's grace and the courage and sacrifice of our sons and daughters, the military might of the Axis forces has been crushed. The American War Dads do hereby call upon all citizens to make any additional sacrifices necessary for the consolidation of our victory, which has been won at such a terrible price, and for the establishment and maintenance of just and lasting peace, and to this end we urge:

"(A) Occupation of enemy countries and replacement of long-service veterans:

"That a firm but just policy be adopted and maintained in occupying and governing Axis countries in strict compliance with the terms of surrender, including the removal from power of their war-mad leaders and the prompt and just trial by allied courts of all

those who have violated the laws of God and international treaties. We urge that adequate military and naval forces of occupation be maintained for as long a period of time as may be necessary to achieve this end; however, we further declare that in justice to those men and women who have borne the hardships and peril of battle, they should be replaced as rapidly as this can be done without jeopardizing the victory which has been won at such cost, and that the discharge of men and women having 2 years or more service as of January 1, 1946, be made mandatory, and that such replacements should be made even though this may require the continuation of the National Selective Service Act.

"(B) Support of United Nations Pact:

"We further endorse and urge the fullest support of the United Nations Security Pact on the part of the United States and the fulfillment of all our obligations thereunder in the interest of permanent peace.

"(C) Demand strong national forces:

"We further declare that this country must maintain its own strong national forces in keeping with its opportunity and responsibility for world leadership.

"(D) Maintenance of regular armed forces:

"We further declare that the strength and the use of such forces shall at all times be only adequate to carry out policies as determined by the civil, executive, and legislative branches of our Government, and that all such policies should at all times be designed to encourage on the part of all nations the settlement of all differences by peaceful methods, with fair and just treatment of all peoples and all nations.

"(E) Methods recommended for maintaining adequate manpower in regular armed forces:

"We further resolve and urge that for the maintenance of such forces as may be needed under the preceding sections the following measures should be adopted:

"(1) There should be established scales of pay and other benefits designed to encourage voluntary enlistments in our regular armed forces.

"(2) But recognizing that such adequate regular forces may not always be obtainable through the volunteer system alone, we further recommend the continuation of selective service in a modified form, to be invoked only when necessary to maintain our forces at adequate strength.

"(F) Universal training for national defense:

"We further declare that it is contrary to American principles and traditions to maintain in time of peace professional or regular armed forces comparable to those needed in time of war; nevertheless, we recognize it to be essential at this time to our national safety and world peace that we do maintain a large reserve of physically able citizens who will be readily available for service under conditions of modern warfare should such a regrettable condition arise in spite of all our efforts to maintain peace. We therefore recommend a program calling for universal training for national defense on the part of all citizens, such program to be correlated with and be made a part of the regular school and college program throughout the land and to include the further training of citizens in camps during the summer months: *Provided further*, That all such training be under the supervision of Federal authority and at Federal expense.

"(G) National Guard:

"We further recommend that the National Guard and ROTC program be reestablished and expanded, with adequate pay, equipment, and supervision, as an integral part of our national-defense system.

"XV

"Be it resolved, That the American War Dads to hereby solemnly declare that all peoples of the earth should ultimately be united in a Federation of the World under one Federal Government, and to that end we hereby approve the principle of World Federation and request the Congress of the United States to empower the President of the United States to initiate the necessary procedure that this Nation may take the leadership in the establishment of a Federation of the World as an ultimate objective.

"XVI

"Whereas the present widespread disputes between labor and management curtail employment opportunities for returned veterans, and the resulting situation has a discouraging effect on the morale of returning veterans, in addition to being detrimental to the national economy, and the present situation is caused in many instances by improper leadership, and since ample employment opportunities for returned veterans are main objectives of the American War Dads, and the President of the United States has called a labor-management conference, with seven topics proposed for discussion, as follows:

"(A) 'General acceptance' by management of collective bargaining where workers want it.

"(B) 'Genuine acceptance' by organized labor of the right and responsibilities of management to direct the operation of an enterprise.

"(C) 'Utilization of machinery' of the National Labor Relations Act and similar State statutes.

"(D) 'Recognized and orderly procedure' in negotiating contracts, with provision for conciliation if talks are breaking down.

"(E) Inclusion of such provisions as these in agreements:

"(1) Procedure for adjustment of disputes and grievances during the life of a contract and in negotiating a succeeding contract;

"(2) No-strike, no-lock-out clauses;

"(3) When contract renewal negotiations fail, early use of conciliation, mediation, and possibly voluntary arbitration;

"(4) Settlement of grievances at the level where they occur;

"(5) Responsibility of both parties to live up to agreement;

"(6) Control of members by unions and of officials and supervisory force by management in conforming with contracts.

"(F) Lessening jurisdictional and interunion disputes; be it

"Resolved, That the American War Dads endorse the seven purposes outlined for the labor-management conference called by the President of the United States for an orderly settlement of labor disputes; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President and Congress of the United States and to the members of the labor-management conference, and all national labor, business, and industrial leaders, with the request that there be implemented, with appropriate legislation, the agreements reached at said conference, insofar as such decisions are in harmony with the avowed seven purposes set forth above.

"XVII

"Be it resolved at this 1945 national convention of the American War Dads, That it expresses its approval of the National Foundation to Honor General Dwight D. Eisenhower and the United States Armed Forces, Inc., as a living memorial.

"XVIII

"Be it resolved, That each chapter of the American War Dads be requested to devote one meeting of each year to each of the following major objectives of the American War Dads:

"(a) Hospitalization; (b) rehabilitation; (c) employment; and (d) education;

"and that the chapter secretary be requested to report on same to his respective State association.

"XIX

"Whereas, under present law, a widow or dependent children of a deceased veteran, who had a claim for pension denied under existing law, must file a new claim if the law is revised so as to include said dependent or widow within the scope of said law; and since many widows and dependent children are not aware that they are entitled to the benefits, and fail to file a claim for some: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That Congress provide that in the event any future law is enacted enlarging the benefits for widow and dependent children that any application on file by any widow or dependent children for a pension, under the provisions of any former law, shall ipso facto be deemed refiled as of the effective date of any new law enlarging the basis of pensions, and that the effective date of any allowances of pensions be dated from the effective date of said new law and the automatic refiling of said application for claim.

"XX

"Be it resolved, That the American War Dads urge the speedy enactment of Federal legislation and the apprporiation of sufficient funds to the end that any wife or parent who has a husband, son, or daughter killed in line of duty and buried overseas shall have the right to have the body returned to the United States for burial at Government expense.

"XXI

"Be it resolved, That the American War Dads go on record as insisting that American prisoners of war be given such promotions in rank and increase in pay as they would have received had they been in active duty for the time they were prisoners of war, and that they be awarded a suitable badge of recognition.

"XXII

"Be it resolved, That we do hereby approve and endorse suitable legislation authorizing the President of the United States to present, through our Representatives in Congress, to the mother and father of each member of the armed forces of the United States who has died or hereafter dies as a result of his or her service to our country during the present war, a button or ribbon of suitable design and composition which may be worn by each such parent to signify that his or her son or daughter has made the supreme sacrifice for the Nation in order that its sacred traditions and high ideals might be sustained.

"XXIII

"Whereas the women of America, including our mothers, wives, daughters, and sisters, have rendered services to our Nation over and beyond the line of duty in every branch of our services, and thereby replacing men who have gone into all branches of the armed forces and thus have greatly aided our war effort: Be it

"Resolved, That the American War Dads do hereby express our appreciation of these services, and do hereby accord them every honor along with the men in the fighting ranks; and be it further

"Resolved, That we now have the hope that these patriotic women who have contributed so much to our war effort will support the American tradition of the sovereignty of the home; and in these homes, particularly where there are children or where both parents are employed, that they will resume their positions as wives and mothers and thus greatly tend to prevent the juvenile delinquency rampant throughout the country.

"XXIV

"Be it resolved, That the American War Dads do hereby request our national officers to express our faith and confidence in Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, and do offer our wholehearted cooperation to the achievement of his highest goal."

Whence Come Federal Funds—Michigan Has an Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, just how foolish we are in thinking that money we get from the Federal Government for highways, welfare, schools, and other purposes are Santa Claus gifts is shown by the leaflet Michigan and the National Debt released by the Michigan Public Expenditure Survey. This leaflet, dealing with Federal taxes collected in Michigan in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, shows that this State contributed $2,370,646,239 to the National Treasury, which was $439 for every man, woman, and child, and $948 for every employed person. This compared to average contributions in the United States of $287 per person, and $618 per employed person.

But the significant thing brought out in the leaflet is that the two and one-third billions we of Michigan poured into the Federal coffers would have paid all of the expenses of the Michigan State government for more than 10 years, including the State aid extended to schools, highways, welfare and all else. That gives us something to think about.

Of course, the bulk of these moneys went to defray our war costs. We spent them willingly in supporting our fighting forces in their struggles to win victory—which came only at tremendous personal sacrifices and tremendous financial sacrifices. But now, when we are seeking to establish ourselves on sound foundations of peace, security, and prosperity it is well to look squarely at the cold dollars and cents factors in the situation. We cannot consider Federal spending as something apart from us personally. And that Federal spending is continuing—and must continue for some time—now that the fighting itself has ended. We must get a realistic perspective on that spending and must watch it if we are to avoid getting beyond our depths as a Nation, which calamity would involve us as individuals and as a State as well as a people.

We will have to pay stupendous interest charges in the years to come. Our national debt, as of June 30, 1945, was $258,682,187,410. That was $1,857 per person in the United States; it was $3,979 per employed person in the United States. But at the rate we in Michigan are called upon to pay Federal taxes, our share of the national debt was $2,826 per man, woman, and child, and $6,105 per employed person.

Michigan's total share of the interest charges on the national debt—based on what we pay in Federal taxes—was $213,403,000 as of last June. What we of Michigan contributed in interest charges alone would, according to the Michigan Survey estimates, "operate Michigan's entire State government, in all branches, for more than 11 months; or pay all State administrative, operational, and capital outlay costs for nearly 2½ years—excluding State aid; or retire the total public debt in our State—city, county, school, and so forth—in a little more than 2 years."

We think of the national debt as being far away from us, we think of Federal expenditures as coming from some mystic beneficient source apart from us, but the Michigan Survey leaflet is a reminder that we in Michigan are being held responsible for $2,826 of that debt per person; that we pay $40 per person in interest charges upon it every year. It is a reminder, too, that we are paying Federal taxes at the rate of $439 per person and at the rate of $948—nearly $1,000—a year per employed person. We, whether we realize it or not, are carrying the load—and more than our per capita share of the load.

The above language is taken verbatim from an editorial appearing in the Ann Arbor News and written by Mr. Arthur Stace, the editor. I am pleased to adopt Mr. Stace's words as my words on this particular occasion, because he presents the facts in such an understandable way.

The fact that so many demands are being made upon the Congress by the numerous municipalities, communities, and pressure groups makes Mr. Stace's editorial most timely.

Congressman Robert Ramspeck Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, friends of ROBERT RAMSPECK who retires as chairman of the Civil Service Committee of the House of Representatives, by virtue of his resignation, paid him honor at a testimonial dinner, Tuesday evening, December 18, at the Statler Hotel.

The dinner was held under the auspices of the following AFL unions: National Federation of Post Office Clerks; National Association of Letter Carriers; Railway Mail Association; American Federation of Government Employees; National Association of Special Delivery Messengers; National Association of Post Office and Railway Mail Service Mail Handlers; National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees; District No. 44, International Association of Machinists; National Rural Letter Carriers Association; Joint Conference on Retirement; Government Employees' Council, AFL; International Brotherhood of Bookbinders; International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions; International Typographical Union; International Plate Printers, Die Stampers, and Engravers' Union of North America; Washington Central Labor Union; Maryland-District of Columbia Federation of Labor.

National President James B. Burns, of the American Federation of Government Employees, acted as toastmaster.

One of the high lights of the evening was the reading of the following letter from President Truman:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 14, 1945.

Hon. ROBERT RAMSPECK,
Chairman, Civil Service Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOB: I do not know of a public servant more deserving of public honor than you. I wish I could join in person with the sponsoring unions who are tendering a dinner to you. It is a pleasure to extend to them and to you my hearty felicitations and warmest personal greetings.

The advances made in Government service during the decade of your chairmanship of the very important House Committee on the Civil Service have been steady and far reaching. Despite depression and economic transition, and upheaval of war, and now through reconversion to peace, the standards of public service have steadily been raised and made more efficient. No small part of the credit for this improvement is due to your vision and wise leadership.

I trust that you will find happiness and further opportunities for high service as you return to private life. I hope also that the union groups who are honoring you will continue to give their close attention and best thinking to the cause of better government.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Many Members of Congress and high Government officials were present, including Hon. Sam Rayburn, Speaker; Hon. John W. McCormack, majority leader; Hon. Joseph W. Martin, minority leader; Hon. Sheridan Downey, United States Senator; Hon. Jennings Randolph, Member of Congress; Hon. Thomas G. Burch, Member of Congress; Hon. Harry B. Mitchell, President, United States Civil Service Commission; Hon. Arthur S. Flemming, Commissioner, United States Civil Service Commission; Hon. Robert E. Hannegan, Postmaster General of the United States; Hon. George Meany, secretary-treasurer, American Federation of Labor; Hon. W. C. Doherty, vice president, American Federation of Labor.

Joining others in paying his respects to Mr. RAMSPECK was Hon. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor.

Secretary of Labor L. B. Schwellenbach, unable to be present, wrote in part to Mr. Burns:

His efforts on behalf of a sound civil-service system will have lasting results in increased Government efficiency. His active interest in improving the lot of the Federal

worker has not only contributed to this efficiency but has brought an increased measure of material reward to a group of sincere and faithful workers.

The Honorable James A. Farley, former Postmaster General, in a wire said of Mr. RAMSPECK:

BOB RAMSPECK has been a fine public servant and I had a real opportunity to observe that during the time I served as Postmaster General. He is one of the most sincere men I ever met in public life. Will you extend to him my hearty congratulations and best wishes for continued success, health and happiness?

One of the sincerest tributes came from Edward Keating, manager of Labor who wrote:

As a rule, the retirement of a Member of Congress is of no particular significance. That is not true in the case of Mr. RAMSPECK. He has industry, ability, experience, plus a breadth of vision rarely found among public men. While wishing him success in his new venture, every Progressive will regret his going.

Senator JIM MEAD, of New York, and Representative MARY NORTON, of New Jersey, both detained, paid compliment to the work of Mr. RAMSPECK during 16 years in Congress.

A handsome scroll and other gifts of remembrance were presented to the guest of honor. About 300 persons were present.

The British Loan—Articles of Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the plan which has been drawn up and agreed to by the responsible heads of our Government to further increase the national debt and the tax burden of the American people by making a loan of $4,400,000,000 to Great Britain is fraught with such serious consequences and so much uncertainty as to the future relations of our Government and the Government of Great Britain that the language of the agreement itself should be preserved for all time.

It should be preserved so that a thousand years from now future historians can turn to these pages kept in the National Archives and weigh the effect of this national folly on our country's destiny.

The text of the British agreement is taken from the New York Times of December 7, 1945:

JOINT STATEMENT REGARDING SETTLEMENT FOR LEND-LEASE, RECIPROCAL AID, SURPLUS WAR PROPERTY, AND CLAIMS

1. The Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom have reached an understanding for the settlement of lend-lease and reciprocal aid, for the acquisition of United States Army and Navy surplus property, and the United States interest in installations, located in the United Kingdom, and for the final settlement of the financial claims of each Government against the other arising out of the conduct of the war. Specific agreements necessary to implement these understandings, setting forth the terms in detail, and consistent herewith, are in the course of preparation and will shortly be completed.

2. This settlement for lend-lease and reciprocal aid will be complete and final. In arriving at this settlement both Governments have taken full cognizance of the benefits already received by them in the defeat of their common enemies. They have also taken full cognizance of the general obligations assumed by them in article VII of the mutual aid agreement of February 23, 1942, and the understandings agreed upon this day with regard to commercial policy. Pursuant to this settlement, both Governments will continue to discuss arrangements for agreed action for the attainment of the economic objectives referred to in article VII of the mutual aid agreement. The Governments expect in these discussions to reach specific conclusions at an early date with respect to urgent problems, such as those in the field of telecommunications and civil aviation. In the light of all the foregoing, both Governments agree that no further benefits will be sought as consideration for lend-lease and reciprocal aid.

3. The net sum due from the United Kingdom to the United States for the settlement of lend-lease and reciprocal aid, for the acquisition of surplus property, and the United States interest in installations, located in the United Kingdom, and for the settlement of claims shall be $650,000,000, subject to the account adjustment referred to below. This amount consists of (a) a net sum of $118,000,000 representing the difference between the amount of the services and supplies furnished or to be furnished by each Government to the other Government after VJ-day through lend-lease and reciprocal-aid channels, less the net sum due to the United Kingdom under the claims settlement, and (b) a net sum of $532,000,000 for all other lend-lease and reciprocal-aid items, and for surplus property and the United States interest in installations located in the United Kingdom and owned by the United States Government. The actual amounts due to the respective Governments for items included in (a) above other than claims will, however, be ascertained by accounting in due course, and the total sum of $650,000,000 will be adjusted for any difference between the sum of $118,000,000 mentioned above and the actual sum found to be due. All new transactions between the two Governments after December 31, 1945, will be settled by cash payment.

4. The total liability found to be due to the Government of the United States will be discharged on the same terms as those specified in the financial agreement concluded this day for the discharge of the credit provided therein.

5. In addition to the financial payments referred to above, the two Governments have agreed upon the following:

(A) Appropriate nondiscriminatory treatment will be extended to United States nationals in the use and disposition of installations in which there is a United States interest;

(B) Appropriate settlements for the lend-lease interest in installations other than in the United Kingdom and the colonial dependencies will be made on disposal of the installations;

(C) The United States reserves its right of recapture of any lend-lease articles held by United Kingdom armed forces, but the United States has indicated that it does not intend to exercise generally this right of recapture;

(D) Disposals for military use to forces other than the United Kingdom armed forces of lend-lease articles held by the United Kingdom armed forces at VJ-day, and disposals for civilian use other than in the United Kingdom and the colonial dependencies of such lend-lease articles will be made only with the consent of the United States Government and any net proceeds will be paid to the United States Government. The United Kingdom Government agrees that except to a very limited extent it will not release for civilian use in, or export from, the United Kingdom and the colonial dependencies lend-lease articles held by the United Kingdom armed forces; and

(E) The Government of the United Kingdom will use its best endeavors to prevent the export to the United States of any surplus property transferred in accordance with this understanding.

6. The Government of the United Kingdom agrees that, when requested by the Government of the United States from time to time prior to December 31, 1951, it will transfer, in cash, pounds sterling to an aggregate dollar value not in excess of $50,000,000, at the exchange rates prevailing at the times of transfer, to be credited against the dollar payments due to the Government of the United States as principal under this settlement. The Government of the United States will use these pounds sterling exclusively to acquire land or to acquire or construct buildings in the United Kingdom and the colonial dependencies for the use of the Government of the United States, and for carrying out educational programs in accordance with agreements to be concluded between the two Governments.

7. The arrangements set out in this statement are without prejudice to any settlements concerning lend-lease and reciprocal aid which may be negotiated between the Government of the United States and the Governments of Australia, New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, and India.

POSITIVE COMMITMENTS FOR UNITED STATES UNCERTAINTIES AND EVASION FOR GREAT BRITAIN

FINANCIAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED KINGDOM

It is hereby agreed between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, as follows:

1. Effective date of the agreement: The effective date of this agreement shall be the date on which the Government of the United States notifies the Government of the United Kingdom that the Congress of the United States has made available the funds necessary to extend to the Government of the United Kingdom the line of credit in accordance with the provisions of this agreement.

2. Line of credit: The Government of the United States will extend to the Government of the United Kingdom a line of credit of $3,750,000,000 which may be drawn upon at any time between the effective date of this agreement and December 31, 1951, inclusive.

3. Purpose of the line of credit: The purpose of the line of credit is to facilitate purchases by the United Kingdom of goods and services in the United States, to assist the United Kingdom to meet transitional postwar deficits in its current balances of payments, to help the United Kingdom to maintain adequate reserves of gold and dollars, and to assist the Government of the United Kingdom to assume the obligations

of multilateral trade, as defined in this and other agreements.

4. Amortization and interest:

(I) The amount of the line of credit drawn by December 31, 1951, shall be repaid in 50 annual installments beginning on December 31, 1951, with interest at the rate of 2 percent per annum. Interest for the year 1951 shall be computed on the amount outstanding on December 31, 1951, and for each year thereafter, interest shall be computed on the amount outstanding on January 1 of each such year.

Forty-nine annual installments of principal repayments and interest shall be equal, calculated at the rate of $31,823,000 for each $1,000,000,000 of the line of credit drawn by December 31, 1951, and the fiftieth annual installment shall be at the rate of $31,840,736.65 for each such $1,000,000,000. Each installment shall consist of the full amount of the interest due and the remainder of the installment shall be the principal to be repaid in that year. Payments required by this section are subject to the provisions of section 5.

(II) The Government of the United Kingdom may accelerate repayment of the amount drawn under this line of credit.

5. Waiver of interest payments: In any year in which the Government of the United Kingdom requests the Government of the United States to waive the amount of the interest due in the installment of that year, the Government of the United States will grant the waiver if:

(A) The Government of the United Kingdom finds that a waiver is necessary in view of the present and prospective conditions of international exchange and the level of its gold and foreign exchange reserves; and

(B) The International Monetary Fund certifies that the income of the United Kingdom from home-produced exports plus its net income from invisible current transactions in its balance of payments was on the average over the five preceding calendar years less than the average annual amount of United Kingdom imports during 1936–38, fixed at £866,000,000, as such figure may be adjusted for changes in the price level of these imports. Any amount in excess of £43,750,000 released or paid in any year on account of sterling balances accumulated to the credit of overseas governments, monetary authorities, and banks before the effective date of this agreement shall be regarded as a capital transaction and therefore shall not be included in the above calculation of the net income from invisible current transactions for that year. If waiver is requested for an interest payment prior to that due in 1955, the average income shall be computed for the calendar years from 1950 through the year preceding that in which the request is made.

6. Relation of this line of credit to other obligations.

(I) It is understood that any amounts required to discharge obligations of the United Kingdom to third countries outstanding on the effective date of this agreement will be found from resources other than this line of credit.

(II) The Government of the United Kingdom will not arrange any long-term loans from governments within the British Commonwealth after December 6, 1945, and before the end of 1951 on terms more favorable to the lender than the terms of this line of credit.

(III) Waiver of interest will not be requested or allowed under section 5 in any year unless the aggregate of the releases or payments in that year of sterling balances accumulated to the credit of overseas governments, monetary authorities, and banks (except in the case of colonial dependencies) before effective date of this agreement is reduced proportionately, and unless interest payments due in that year on loans referred to in (II) above are waived. The proportionate reduction of the releases or payments of sterling balances shall be calculated in relation to the aggregate released and paid in the most recent year in which waiver of interest was not requested.

(IV) The application of the principles set forth in this section shall be the subject of full consultation between the two governments as occasion may arise.

7. Sterling area exchange arrangements. The Government of the United Kingdom will complete arrangements as early as practicable and in any case not later than 1 year after the effective date of this agreement, unless in exceptional cases a later date is agreed upon after consultation, under which immediately after the completion of such arrangements the sterling receipts from current transactions of all sterling area countries (apart from any receipts arising out of military expenditure by the Government of the United Kingdom prior to December 31, 1948, to the extent to which they are treated by agreement with the countries concerned on the same basis as the balances accumulated during the war) will be freely available for current transactions in any currency area without discrimination; with the result that any discrimination arising from the so-called sterling area dollar pool will be entirely removed and that each member of the sterling area will have its current sterling and dollar receipts at its free disposition for current transactions anywhere.

8. Other exchange arrangements:

(I) The Government of the United Kingdom agrees that after the effective date of this agreement it will not apply exchange controls in such a manner as to restrict (A) payments or transfers in respect of products of the United States permitted to be imported into the United Kingdom or other current transactions between the two countries; or (B) the use of sterling balances to the credit of residents of the United States arising out of current transactions. Nothing in this paragraph (I) shall affect the provisions of article VII of the articles of agreement of the international monetary fund when those articles have come into force.

(II) The Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom agree that not later than 1 year after the effective date of this agreement, unless in exceptional cases a later date is agreed upon after consultation, they will impose no restrictions on payments and transfers for current transactions. The obligations of this paragraph (II) shall not apply:

(A) To balances of third countries and their nationals accumulated before this paragraph (II) becomes effective; or

(B) To restrictions imposed in conformity with the articles of agreement of the international monetary fund, provided that the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States will not continue to invoke the provisions of article 14, section 2 of those articles after this paragraph (II) becomes effective, unless in exceptional cases after consultation they agree otherwise; or

(C) To restrictions imposed in connection with measures designed to uncover and dispose of assets of Germany and Japan.

(III) This section and section 9, which are in anticipation of more comprehensive arrangements by multilateral agreement shall operate until December 31, 1951.

9. Import arrangements: If either the Government of the United States or the Government of the United Kingdom imposes or maintains quantitative import restrictions, such restrictions shall be administered on a basis which does not discriminate against imports from the other country in respect of any product; provided that this undertaking shall not apply in cases in which (A) its application would have the effect of preventing the country imposing such restrictions from utilizing, for the purchase of needed imports, inconvertible currencies accumulated up to December 31, 1946, or (B) there may be special necessity for the country imposing such restrictions to assist, by measures not involving a substantial departure from the general rule of nondiscrimination, a country whose economy has been disrupted by war, or (C) either Government imposes quantitative restrictions having equivalent effect to an exchange restriction which that Government is authorized to impose in conformity with article VII of the articles of agreement of the international monetary fund. The provisions of this section shall become effective as soon as practicable, but not later than December 31, 1946.

10. Accumulated sterling balances:

(I) The Government of the United Kingdom intends to make agreements with the countries concerned, varying according to the circumstances of each case, for an early settlement covering the sterling balances accumulated by sterling area and other countries prior to such settlement (together with any future receipts arising out of military expenditure by the Government of the United Kingdom to the extent to which they are treated on the same basis by agreement with the countries concerned). The settlements with the sterling area countries will be on the basis of dividing these accumulated balances into three categories, (A) balances to be released at once and convertible into any currency for current transactions, (B) balances to be similarly released by installments over a period of years beginning in 1951, and (C) balances to be adjusted as a contribution to the settlement of war and postwar indebtedness and in recognition of the benefits which the countries concerned might be expected to gain from such a settlement. The Government of the United Kingdom will make every endeavor to secure the early completion of these arrangements.

(II) In consideration of the fact that an important purpose of the present line of credit is to promote the development of multilateral trade and facilitate its early resumption on a nondiscriminatory basis, the Government of the United Kingdom agrees that any sterling balances released or otherwise available for current payments will not later than 1 year after the effective date of this agreement, unless in special cases a later date is agreed upon after consultation, be freely available for current transactions in any currency area without discrimination.

11. Definitions:

For the purposes of this agreement:

(I) The term "current transactions" shall have the meaning prescribed in article XIX (I) of the articles of agreement of the international monetary fund.

(II) The term "sterling area" means the United Kingdom and the other territories declared by the defense (finance) (definitfon of sterling area) (No. 2) order, 1944, to be included in the sterling area, namely, the following territories, excluding Canada and Newfoundland, that is to say—

"(A) Any dominion.

"(B) Any other part of His Majesty's dominions.

"(C) Any territory in respect of which a mandate on behalf of the League of Nations has been accepted by His Majesty and is being exercised by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom or in any dominion.

"(D) Any British protectorate or protected State.

"(E) Egypt, the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan and Iraq.

"(F) Iceland and the Farce Islands."

12. Consultation on agreement. Either Government shall be entitled to approach the other for a reconsideration of any of the

provisions of this agreement, if in its opinion the prevailing conditions of international exchange justify such reconsideration, with a view to agreeing upon modifications for presentation to their respective legislatures.

Signed in duplicate at Washington, D. C., this 6th day of December 1945.

For the Government of the United States of America,

FRED M. VINSON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,

HALIFAX,
His Majesty's Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary at Washington.

Mike Colalillo Receives Congressional Medal of Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Pittenger and I were privileged to witness the ceremony at the White House on December 18 when six young men from our armed forces, including one from our district, were presented with the Congressional Medal of Honor by President Truman.

Among those receiving this honor was Sgt. Michael Colalillo, of Duluth, Minn. This young man was an auto mechanic in civilian life and was honored for gallantry in action on April 7, 1945, in the vicinity of Untergriesheim, Germany. The Associated Press account of the White House ceremony states:

His company was pinned down until he jumped up and led the way. He shoved ahead behind a tank, firing as he went. Then he jumped onto a tank, and, with a machine-gun mounted on top, knocked out two enemy machine-gun positions and blasted three more. Altogether he was credited with killing or wounding 25 Germans.

A TYPICAL AMERICAN YOUTH

This young man is typical of the thousands of young fellows, not only from northern Minnesota, but from all sections of our country who have served in the armed forces. Like the other five young men who were privileged to receive this special recognition from President Truman, Colalillo gave the impression of being happy that the war was over and that he was privileged to return to civilian life. As we listened to President Truman recount the exploits of Colalillo and these other young men, everyone in the audience received added emphasis to the common knowledge that these young men and the other millions who participated with them in the gigantic task of winning World War II, measured up full stature when put to the test on the battlefield. They faced their responsibility and proved true to the highest traditions of our fighting forces. Michael Colalillo and others who have returned home after the end of World War II, and those who are now awaiting discharge from the armed forces, are entitled to the grateful plaudits and appreciation of the men and women of American. We can best show our high regard for these young men by making our main objective in public and private life the winning of the peace, not only in the internal affairs of America, but in its relationship to the rest of the world. The soldiers of peace will be needed. Strong men and courageous men must furnish the leadership in this Republic and our people must be eternally vigilant if American is to be preserved for posterity as a land of freedom and opportunity. Every citizen has that responsibility and that duty. Otherwise, the war that Sergeant Colalillo and his comrades fought to win has been but an empty gesture and an idle effort. The exploits of these young men and others like them all over the world challenge us to dedicate ourselves to the patriotism of peace and to emulate them in the building of a better and greater America, the heroism of these young fellows.

PITTENGER'S WASHINGTON NEWS COLUMN

After the ceremony, I issued the following statement to the people in northern Minnesota who joined with me in congratulations to Colalillo and his family on this event which so directly concerns the people of the Eighth Congressional District:

The approach of the holiday season could not overshadow important Minnesota news in Washington today when Sgt. Michael Colalillo, of Duluth, Minn., received the Congressional Medal of Honor from President Truman at the White House at noon today, December 18. The decoration was also conferred upon five other outstanding heroes of World War II. Sergeant Colalillo was decorated for gallantry in action on April 7, 1945, in the vicinity of Untergriesheim, Germany.

The ceremony was not a public affair and was conducted in President Truman's private office, where invited guests were assembled. Included among the Army and Navy Department officials were Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, Admiral Chester Nimitz, Gen. Henry Arnold, Secretary of War Robert Patterson, and many other high-ranking Government officials.

Sergeant Colalillo was accompanied from Duluth by his close relatives attending the ceremony. There were his father, Carlos Colalillo; his two sisters and his brother Pat and wife. Minnesota guests were Congressman and Mrs. William A. Pittenger; Miss June Cobey, of International Falls; Miss Rose Smilanich, of Buhl; Myrtle Watson, of West Duluth; also Gustaf A. Nordin.

Following the ceremony the newsreel operators and the photographers were busy taking pictures. This part of the ceremony did not bother Mike Colalillo who grinned broadly when he posed with President Truman for the photographers.

It is interesting to note that only 200 men in the armed forces in World War II have received the Congressional Medal of Honor. War Department records disclose that five Minnesota men have received the decoration in World War II; Cpl. Arthur O. Beyer, of Ogema, Minn.; First Lt. Willibald C. Bianchi, whose Minnesota address was not ascertained; Pfc Lloyd C. Hawks, of Fergus Falls, Minn.; Second Lt. Donald E. Rudolph, of Minneapolis, Minn.

Those receiving the citation today in addition to Sergeant Colalillo were Master Sgt. Vito R. Bertoldo, of Decatur, Ill.; First Lt. Frank Burke, of Jersey City, N. J.; Tech. Sgt. Vernon McGarity, of Evansville, Ind.; Lt. Richard McCool, of Norman, Okla.; Capt. Robert H. Dunlap, of Galesburg, Ill.

This ceremony, Mr. Speaker, had of course, a note of sadness, because the battlefields of Europe and the world are dotted with the graves of American boys who lost their lives in World War II. That is the grim side of war. As the New Year approaches, let us resolve to do everything we can to make a repetition of this ghastly catastrophe impossible in the years to come.

COMBAT LOSSES

What I have to say is rather forcibly told in a news item which points out that approximately 325,000 Americans were killed in this conflict, and all casualties, which include the wounded, run over a million men. The following news item from the Daily Journal of International Falls, Minn., points to the fact, without elaboration, that war is a grim and ghastly thing. It reads:

COMBAT LOSSES

A combat toll six times as great as in World War I and greater than that of the combined combat deaths in all previous wars the United States has ever fought is the cost in American lives in World War II. But our forces exacted a much heavier toll of the enemy.

In their review of America's combat losses in World War II, the Metropolitan Life statisticians estimate the total to be approximately 325,000. This includes an allowance for deaths among those wounded in action and for men still carried on the rolls as missing in action, who will eventually have to be written off as killed in combat or died as a result of enemy action.

About four-fifths of our losses, or between 255,000 and 260,000 were suffered by the Army and the remaining 65,000 to 70,000 were incurred by the Navy, including the Marine Corps and Coast Guard. Of the Navy's total, about 23,000 were in the Marine Corps and about 900 were in the Coast Guard.

"Relative to their strength, however, the combat losses for the Army and Navy were more nearly equal," the statisticians report. "The Navy, including the Marines, had a combat toll appreciably greater than the total losses for all American armed forces in the First World War. This toll in the recent war was more than 20 times higher than Navy and Marine losses in the First World War, and the Navy alone since Pearl Harbor lost about 100 times more men than in the last war."

Heavy as American losses have been in World War II, even higher losses were inflicted on the enemy. In his recent biennial report, General Marshall estimated that German and Italian dead in the Mediterranean area and on the western front totaled nearly 375,000 in land operations, while Japanese battle deaths, some time before the fighting ended, were estimated at more than 1,200,000, figures well above the losses suffered by all the Allies on these fronts.

Pointing out that the United States was the only major belligerent to escape severe destruction of life or property in its home territory, the statisticians conclude that "the very size of our combat losses should spur our leaders in their every endeavor to develop with other nations a permanent world organization for peace."

We will fail those who laid down their lives for their country unless we take heed of the responsibilities that victory has brought. As the New Year approaches it is well for us to decide that these men have not died in vain and that their sacrifices, with our efforts, will make for a better and a happier world.

Higher Education in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article on education in Russia, which appeared in the supplement of the magazine Science in its issue of Friday, November 23, 1945:

In Soviet Russia, 3,900 scientists were graduated from the colleges with the degree of doctor in the years 1937 to 1944; about 20,000 received a master's degree, according to Joseph Agroskin, vice chairman of the Committee on Higher Education in Moscow. The Soviet Government has been paying particular attention to the matter of training scientists because of the pressing need for teachers of technical subjects in the colleges due to greatly increased student body. In 1929, there were only 26,000 engineers with diplomas in all the heavy industries of Russia. But in the last 6 years, about 80,000 engineers were graduated. In prerevolutionary Russia, Vice Chairman Agroskin said, higher education was for the privileged few of the upper strata. In 1914, Russia had only 91 colleges with 112,000 students. The Soviet Government placed the entire system of higher education on new principles. Nationality and class distinctions were abolished. Education was free. All nationalities were permitted to teach in their own languages in colleges on the territory of their own national republics. Both universities and institutes were opened to all working people. As a result, there are now 772 colleges with 562,000 students.

Of these 132 are industrial institutes, 18 transport institutes, 87 agricultural institutes, 68 medical institutes, 115 pedagogical colleges, and 29 universities. In 1925, Vice Chairman Agroskin reported, there were only 17,900 professors and lecturers in all Russia's colleges. Now there are 40,000.

Speech of Dr. Raver, of the Bonneville Power Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, today as never before the West offers opportunities to our returning soldiers to make a home and build up a competence in this land of opportunity.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address by Bonneville Power Administrator Paul J. Raver before the twelfth annual meeting of the Inland Empire Waterways Association, Lewiston, Idaho, November 20, 1945:

Six months ago the Northwest, as well as the rest of the Nation, was concentrating on the postwar plan. Many plans were advanced; many of them seriously considered; some were adopted, to be put into effect the minute hostilities ceased.

The job which we are now faced is concerned with putting those plans to work or, if upon examining them in the light of present-day circumstances we find them wanting, revising them into workability. But the time for planning alone has passed. There is urgency in the present situation. Recognizing that we cannot solve tremendous problems overnight, we should have a basic pattern of relationships established upon which we can make a start.

Much has been said about the development of the Northwest. Probably there is much yet to be said. However, this development can no longer be treated as a phenomenon which we expect to see occur of its own accord sometime in the dim, distant future. If we expect our region to maintain the economic gains which it has made during the war, it cannot be left for the future. We must be ready to meet the acute interregional competition which has already begun.

The question is not one so much concerned with whether the Northwest is to be developed at all, but how. There are plenty of people in the East who are still only too willing to develop the Northwest, but upon their own terms. And I am not so sure that we are willing to accept their terms in all instances. I think we have already seen enough examples of the "cut out and get out" type of development.

Our success in shaping things as we wish to see them shaped depends upon several important "if's."

A CHANGING WORLD

There are those, I know, who voice the opinion that they want no change—they are satisfied with things as they are. The simple fact is—that attitude will no longer work. Tremendous changes—technological, social, economic—have already taken place—not only here but throughout the world. We can't stand still, or even coast along comfortably—we must keep pace with those changes. The rest of the Nation has far too great a stake in this region to permit the "go away and leave us alone" attitude to survive.

For those who see this thing realistically—those who want to be in on the ground floor to take advantage of the opportunities we know to exist in this region, I can only say that if this industrial and economic development is to come to pass, we must work for it together.

What is to be done? What are the real needs in the situation?

First, we must recognize that, although changes have taken place as a result of the war, our essential position is not greatly different. Despite the fact that new and basic industries have come into the region, our economy is still immature largely because existing industries are neither sufficiently integrated nor diversified.

The Northwest's light metals industry, for instance, is concentrated almost entirely in the production of raw metal. The aluminum reduction plants and the one fabricating plant that have been established in the region are far too great for existing regional markets or the present population to support. Development of the alumina plants to supply the raw material for aluminum production and development of extrusion, forging and casting plants to turn the raw metal into finished or semifinished products is needed to provide full integration of the industry if the region is to hold its place as one of the Nation's light metals centers.

The need for development along these lines was never greater. Wider and more diversified industrialization is the only answer. To hold the gains we have already made, it is essential that firm bases for immediate and permanent employment and for widened business opportunity—for free private enterprise—be established.

This question of industrial development represents a fundamental gap in our regional economy as much now as it has in the past. Both Government and private business have too much investment in the present set-up to risk not giving the matter the utmost concentration and cooperative attention.

First, the plant, energy, and skills which exist in this region—and I include the new plant, energy, and skills which have come here during the war years—must be kept at work. Those that have momentarily closed down with the war cut-backs must be returned to work and our industrial machinery must be rounded out by the addition of new correlative enterprise, in order to obtain full integration. This calls for unified effort—it cannot be done piecemeal with any hope of early success. There must be an exchange of ideas and interest, freely given and freely received.

THE EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRIES

What does an inventory of our present condition show? Historically, the extractive industries have represented the backbone of the Northwest economy. Unfortunately, although the monetary returns have been great, these extractive industries have been just what the name implies—a great deal going out with very little of permanent worth returning.

Generally speaking, the extractive industries are well developed—but even in these there is much that can be gained through diversification and wise conservation practices. With our minerals resource, for instance, traditional interest in the basic metals, gold and silver, and more recently in our nonferrous minerals for the production of copper, lead, and zinc, has overshadowed the basic need of the region for other industrial materials of mineral base. Because of the tremendous interest in these relatively high-priced minerals, too little emphasis has been placed on the more abundant sources of limestone, silicas, phosphate rock, and the like, which are basic to the development of large-scale industries in any region.

Our mineral situation can be summed up in these terms: the traditional sources of mineral materials which provided Butte with its pay rolls, the Coeur d'Alenes with mining camps, have reached a relatively low ebb because of exhaustion of the high-grade ores. The discoveries of large bodies of complex lead-zinc ores in both northern and southern Idaho may shift the center of these mining industries in the Pacific Northwest. There is little question that emphasis on nonmetallics such as those I have enumerated will create new types of mining enterprises in the Pacific Northwest. This, however, will be more akin to large-scale quarry and open pit mining than the traditional hard rock tunneling most familiar to Pacific Northwesterners.

In the forest industries, the present tendency is to make them less and less extractive in nature. The present concept of treating timber as a crop rather than as a raw material to be mined, is a healthy one and

will stand this region in good stead. Further, each year sees better integration of this industry, with more and more tendency to establish lumber remanufacturing plants in the region and proportionately less shipment of raw lumber to eastern manufactories.

In addition, there is a steady increase in byproducts industries, which may be expected to develop still further as technological processes for the use of wood wastes become available. Many of these developments have been devoted in the past few years to war purposes and the public has known little about them. But it is to be expected that they will account in the future for a good percentage of the total forest products output.

Agriculture, which employes more people than any other single industry in the Northwest, is also probably the best developed of the three major extractive industries, but there is still ample room for expansion and integration—particularly with the development of sprinkler and pumping irrigation, using the cheap and limitless power supplies now available, and by the development of our great phosphate rock deposits for fertilizer.

The related food-processing industries have only recently made any considerable strides. Previously, most of the raw products have gone to eastern points for packaging, processing, or refining; only to be returned to the West again in finished form—and the West has borne the freight both ways.

THE MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES

From all of this, it is apparent that in the second section of this inventory—the manufacturing industries—our greatest need for growth and development lies. Even with substantial wartime growth in certain of the heavy industries, this region is still far behind the Nation in manufacturing, and it is here that most of our relative immaturity exists.

Some of the heavy industries which have come here, in all probability, will remain; but there is good reason to be dubious about more of them unless we hasten to fill in the blank areas in the over-all industrial pattern. The region continues to lack light industries. It is upon these that much of our success in integrating the extractive industries within the region and the maintenance of the heavy industries will depend.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the need for building upon our resources, coupled with improving the situation for both heavy and light industries—since the end result of these developments will be new opportunities for business enterprises; for the advancement of science and technology and for the absorption of skilled labor into our economy.

THE SERVICE INDUSTRIES

Finally, there is the matter of service industries. Fundamentally, these are dependent upon an employment base provided by the extractive and manufacturing industries. A healthy, progressive development of our regional basic industries will, in turn, stimulate expansion in the service industries in tune with national growth and will thus contribute toward full employment and a rising standard of living.

This integration of industry of which I speak depends to a great extent upon another serious factor. That is, population. We may think, as a result of evident overcrowding in our congested production areas, that we are already over-populated. Actually, that is far from the truth. The new population which has come into this region during the war is probably one of our most valuable assets. The over-crowding we have seen has not resulted from the fact that the region cannot absorb more new people. More accurately, we were not ready to receive them when the emergency arose. From now on, there will be a resettling process which will relieve the congestion, but let's hope and pray that the resettlement takes place right here, not in some other part of the country.

There is no single factor which has more responsibility in maintaining and increasing the value of fixed investments of every type than a steadily growing population. We need these new people for their skills. We need the increased labor force we have accumulated during the war years in order to consolidate and retain the industrial gains which have been made during the past 5 years.

MARKETS BEGIN AT HOME

But, most important, we need these people because people mean markets—home markets. Any good economist will tell you that while export markets are wonderful to envision, a sound economy cannot be built unless home markets are first created. One of the great stumbling blocks to economic progress in the Pacific Northwest has been the relatively low density of population, with consequent lack of local or home markets.

The result of this situation has been literally to force us to ship our timber, mineral, and agricultural resources, largely in their raw state, to esatern markets. This will tend to decrease, if we can retain a major portion of our war-increased population and continue to add to that by attracting new population in the years to come. In so doing, we will have taken an important step toward creation of local markets commensurate with our natural resources and our ability to produce.

In the field of agriculture, the Pacific Northwest is in a particularly advantageous position. Although employment in agriculture throughout the country has for years been on the decline and will probably continue so as new mechanical devices are developed, we in the Pacific Northwest, with our emphasis on irrigated agriculture and the development of new agricultural lands, can confidently look for continued expansion, even in the face of rapid mechanization.

It is expected that in the Columbia basin project alone when it is completely developed an additional 75,000 farm workers can be taken care of. While the project is in the process of development, there will most certainly exist an important stimulus to manufacturing and the general economic development of the Pacific Northwest.

A region such as the Northwest does not change its basic pattern overnight. Thus it seems reasonable to suppose that in the immediate future we can expect approximately the same distribution of jobs that existed immediately before the war. At that time, manufacturing occupied 21 percent of the workers in Oregon and Washington; extractive industries, including agriculture, forest products, mining and fishing, occupied 19 percent, and the various service industries accounted for the remaining 60 percent.

We need feel less concern about the development of jobs in the service industries, if the necessary expansion in agriculture and the basic industries takes place. The major problem will be to open ever-widening opportunities for new workers in the extractive and manufacturing industries.

NEW POPULATION

That it is entirely possible to take care of these new workers is indicated in a report of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco Monthly Review for February of this year. A survey of Oregon and Washington manufacturers indicated that in 1939 they employed approximately 183,000 persons. Employment by this same group in 1943 reached a peak of 451,000 workers. They expect to employ in the immediate reconversion period some 246,000 persons. This means an increase of 63,000 employees over 1939. A proportionate increase throughout the entire region and continuing past the reconversion period can soon exhaust the immediately available labor pool.

Consideration of all the foregoing objectives—integration and diversification of industry, growth and spread of population and expansion of home markets—leads to the examination of still another step.

THE TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM

Our transportation conditions in general must be improved with an accompanying adjustment in the freight-rate pattern for the region. The existing general body of rates applicable in this region was developed to facilitate the shipment eastward of raw materials and semifinished commodities and the movement westward of manufactured goods. These, in turn, are distributed locally within the region by wholesalers and branch houses on a system of distributive rates. One point at fault in this system has been that the rates for wholesalers have not necessarily been built to fit the needs of manufacturers, since the latter generally wish to market over much wider areas than jobbers.

Modern water transportation on the Columbia River system can contribute its part to the needed adjustment by furnisning an improved type of transport service. We must recognize, however, that the influence of the water carriers should not be limited merely to river bank communities. Through proper interchange facilities and the establishment of joint-through routes and rates by water lines and land carriers, the benefits of navigation can be reflected to interior points and localities situated away from the river's edge.

The development of these new routes and rates must inevitably contribute to a greater diversification of industry and will afford the region an opportunity to make better use of its labor and raw materials.

Earlier I referred to a continuing lack of light industries in the region and indicated that these are essential to the diversification which will help us keep our heavy industries in operation. I would like particularly to note the lack of home-owned, home-operated light industries, as contrasted to branch plants. Studies now being made by the Bonneville Power Administration indicate that branch plants may be more favored by existing freight rates than indigenous industries. This is evidently true, because the branch plant will generally be established to conform to an existing rate pattern. When other market areas are to be supplied, additional branches will be set up to care for them. Conceivably, the locally owned, locally operated small industry might wish to market throughout the far West from a single plant located in the Northwest. Our studies indicate that existing freight rates, from this point of view, are not designed to aid in marketing over such a wide area.

It should be clearly understood that I have not raised this point to argue against the establishment of branch plants, the need for which and the reasons for which are quite generally accepted. It is our belief, however, that such industries should not have arbitrary factors working in their favor to the detriment of locally developed plans.

So much for the "if's."

WAYS AND MEANS

We have seen that if the three basic types of industry can be properly diversified and integrated, and if our population gains lead to expanding local markets, and if our transportation picture is corrected, we can be well on the road to a sound regional economy. For a few moments, then, I would like to discuss ways and means.

Most of us here, I am sure, are aware of the steadily increasing interest in industrial research. Time and again we hear that upon the development of our scientific technology the future welfare and the security of this country depend. We know that research and experimentation were largely responsible for the developments by which we were able to win the war. They will most certainly be no less important in winning the peace.

The basis of the scientific process is reproducible experiment. It is the accepted scientific method and when applied to obtain a particular understanding of our environment, it is called "scientific research."

The importance of scientific research has been well stated by Frank A. Howard, president of the Standard Oil Development Co. He has this to say:

"New industries and the advancement of old industries depend first of all on increase in the sum of human knowledge—and that, of course, is the function of scientific research. But they depend even more on the new application of existing knowledge—and that is development. The amount of scientific knowledge already available which ought to be applied to an industry, and has not yet been applied, is almost always far greater than the new contributions to human knowledge which any industrial research organization can hope to make. Therefore, industrial research is mainly development work. The third component of industrial research is invention.

"These three—scientific research, development and invention—are the components of technical progress in industry. It is the function of industrial research to harness the three components in a sustained common effort, and to keep the effort headed in the right direction."

This matter of industrial research is something in which private industry and government can share with profit—profit to industry in the ordinary sense of increased financial returns—profit to the Government in building an increasingly stronger national economy and hence an increased over-all national strength and security.

The Bonneville Power Administration, as a development agency of the United States Government, has entered into a limited program of cooperative research with a number of institutions of higher learning in this region. I would like to give you a few of the details of this program to illustrate my point.

Under basic cooperative agreements with Oregon State College, Washington State College, University of Washington, the State College of Montana, and Linfield College in Oregon, some 18 research projects are being undertaken. Some of them have to do with agricultural problems involving such things as sprinkler irrigation, farm refrigeration, and preservation of forage crops; others are concerned with electric house-heating methods of various types and one is exploring the possibilities in water treatment by ozone.

Further, the Bonneville Power Administration is encouraging research into industrial problems having to do with basic raw materials. For instance, we feel that one of our chief problems in the Pacific Northwest has to do with industrial carbons. Until recently, in this region, coal mining—for instance—has been relatively unimportant. Coal generally has been thought of as a domestic fuel rather than as an element for industrial and manufacturing operations. With increased industrialization of this region, there is need for a long-range research program into our carbon supplies so that low-cost, adequate materials will be available to sustain the industries we are urging to come here.

There is critical need for a comprehensive research program involving exploration, assaying, laboratory and pilot-plant testing for both the nonmetallic as well as the metallic resources of the region. Every citizen of the Northwest should demand and support further scientific exploration and development of our vast mineral resources. This region has been too long neglected from this point of view and both Federal and State agencies should expand their programs considerably if we are to lay a foundation for new industries in the Northwest. This is equally important in the field of chemicals, especially those concerned with the electrochemical industries.

A major interest of the Bonneville Power Administration in this encouragement of industrial research, in addition to its desire to see regional industrial development progress as rapidly as possible, lies in its obligation to the taxpayers of this country to do everything in its power to make the huge Federal investment pay out.

While we have not yet felt the full effect of the anticipated cut-backs in power demand, it is reasonable to expect that something in the nature of 600,000 kilowatts of power will become available for remarketing.

Therefore the problems which we, as a public enterprise, must face are in many ways similar to those which now engage those of you who are in private enterprise. And I firmly believe that the end we are both seeking is identical. We want a strong and prosperous Northwest and a strong and prosperous nation.

In the Bonneville Power Administration, we entertain no doubts whatsoever as to the ability of this region to work things out and to achieve that end. From our own point of view, on the basis of preliminary estimates, we believe that our cut-back losses can be completely offset within 5 years—even that additional capacity from new projects in the Columbia Basin will be sought before that time.

MULTIPLE-PURPOSE DEVELOPMENT

Actually the possibilities for future multiple-purpose development of the water resources of the region are nearly limitless. The entire program for the physical and economic development of the Northwest is based primarily on making the fullest use of the rivers of the region.

Multiple-purpose development of the water resources of the Columbia Basin will provide improved transportation facilities on the Columbia and Snake Rivers. It will provide irrigation water for the reclamation of several million acres of new land and it will provide almost unlimited quantities of low-cost power for use in the region's industries, as well as on farms and in homes.

But the basic physical development of Northwest resources and the related full development of a balanced industrial and agricultural economy depends primarily upon some form of over-all regional design for leadership, cooperation, and coordination of developmental activities. To be genuinely effective, all of the major development agencies of the Columbia Basin and the Pacific Northwest must be made to fit into this design without overlapping and without leaving gaps. Each should contribute according to the special skill or responsibility for which it was created and each must function cooperatively with the other agencies engaged in this development.

But mere cooperation is not enough—it is passive. Development must have some kind of management if it is to progress and to produce the highest results when they are needed and due. In other words, to get the job done and done properly it is first necessary to fix over-all responsibility; and second, to furnish the responsible organization with sufficient authority to carry out its program.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT IS REGIONAL BUSINESS

Regional development is, after all, regional business. It is, therefore, only reasonable to admit that in carrying out its functions the developmental organization must have business attributes and operate under some type of business or corporate character. Without management of some kind, given the necessary responsibility and authority, we can only expect a piecemeal type of development, producing totally inadequate economic and financial returns.

Granted that within their own limited fields of authority, existing agencies are producing with moderate effectiveness, it is still plain that for lack of concerted effort on the part of Federal bureaus, State agencies, and other institutions concerned, the real progress for which we are looking remains to be achieved. We must have a single, unified, and clear-cut set of objectives, based upon an integrated plan. Both Federal and State investments in the region must be calculated and sound to eliminate needless waste of the taxpayers' money. Construction must be both economical and timely and project operations must be efficient.

Without management of some kind the full force of our efforts cannot be realized because it is not a force moving steadily in the most desirable direction. Too often we find one component canceling or offsetting another. We cannot achieve the progress we desire when special interest is pitted against special interest in unnecessary conflict—with area against area, resource use against resource use, Federal and State Government, public and private enterprise, capital and labor interests alined against one another. Our strength must be united to move toward the common goal.

We must realize that Columbia-Snake River navigation is not in conflict with Snake Basin irrigation; that low-priced power is not inimical to low-cost irrigation anywhere in the Columbia Basin or in the Pacific Northwest; that it is not a matter of McNary Dam or Foster Creek Dam, but of both; that benefits of navigation, reclamation, power and other products of multiple-purpose development can be distributed equitably throughout the Pacific Northwest.

MACHINERY FOR COOPERATION

There must be machinery for cooperation—for action. This means again that there must be vision, leadership, and management. And by this I mean democratic management. The management must be seated in and accessible to the region, its States, its industries, its citizen groups, and its people at large. It must be responsive to their individual needs and aspirations. It must be situated properly to hear just such representative groups as the Inland Empire Waterways Association.

Here, however, I want to make particularly clear that such citizen groups should themselves maintain their own democracy; they should represent the common interest in their particular fields. They should not be taken into camp—as so often has happened—by the special interests that "join" them, help to support them, and ultimately exact the price of that support.

A POSSIBLE PROGRAM

The answer may be a "valley authority"—but one adapted to the peculiar strengths and needs of the Columbia Basin. At least, the valley-authority idea should not be ruled out by special interests before the people of the region have had adequate opportunity to study the problem and arrive at some conclusions of their own or some alternatives that will accomplish the same results. The answer, it is true, may lie in some other kind

of regional organization, but it must be an organization that will provide the desired democratic management.

At the Bonneville Power Administration we have our own ideas as to minimum and optimum requirements. We don't ask you to take them as your own. We do hope you will consider the problem in a positive and constructive way from the standpoint of your own interest in river development, the interest of the whole Pacific Northwest and the interest of the Nation. We hope that you will contribute your ideas and support to the kind of an organization that you believe can work for all of these interests.

We hope that you will focus on the real issue—of timely and profitable regional development through sound investment under efficient and democratic regional management, as opposed to uncoordinated and delayed development without central plan and management.

We hope, also, that you will focus on the real objectives of such regional development (1) to create new taxable wealth, (2) provide new jobs in new industries for new people, and (3) raise the standard of living of all.

If the Pacific Northwest will adopt this organized-development objective and move toward economic maturity, it will do so in the interest not only of its own prosperity and well-being, but in that of the Nation as a whole. Beyond that, it will have made a material contribution to the peace and prosperity of the whole world—which inevitably is depending upon the United States for the maintenance of world economic stability.

Let us look at our part of the problem objectively and work cooperatively to accomplish our objectives effectively.

Curbstone Lament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have brought to the attention of the House the serious crisis that exists in housing for veterans. I wish to insert in the RECORD a poem by Ye Old Vette which appeared recently in Army Times. I think it quite properly portrays the attitude of veterans on this very vital question:

CURBSTONE LAMENT

(Ye Old Vette in Army Times)

Ah, chill were the Normandy fox holes,
And bitter and dank was Attu!
But far more disturbing
Is life on this curbing,
Where the cold is fast turning us blue.

The housing committees are buzzing,
But though their proposals sound fine,
There's no satisfaction
In words without action—
It's shelter we need, me and mine!

My wife has turned suddenly frigid,
The winter winds wrinkle her face,
Her once-fetching dimples
Are lost in goose pimples—
Can't somebody find us a place?

The building authorities holler,
"Priorities keep our hands tied!"
And we've been unable
To locate a stable
Or Chic Sale that's not occupied.

All vets, states the FHA's Blandford,
Should "double up" now without fuss;
But letters from mother
And my younger brother
Say they plan to move in with us!

The landladies laugh at our misery,
The future's appallingly black,
And Christmas is coming;
We're plumb out of plumbing—
O Santa, please bring us a shack!

Four walls and a roof are sufficient,
Just cardboard—we don't hope for brick.
I've begged and petitioned,
For my wife's heir-conditioned,
And we've got to be off the streets quick.

Dear Congress, I'm not a brass monkey,
And I long to defrost my poor spouse.
Be assured my selections
For next year's elections
Will be men who can find me a house!

Proposed Columbia Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 19), 1945

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief statement by me relative to Senate bill 1716, proposing to create a Columbia Valley Authority. I also ask that a copy of the bill be printed in the RECORD. The statement is in explanation of the changes Senate bill 1716 makes in Senate bill 460, which was previously introduced by me and which likewise had for its purpose the creation of a Columbia Valley Authority.

There being no objection, the statement and Senate bill 1716 were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, S. 1716 supplants my previous bill, S. 460, and would create a Columbia Valley Authority.

Principal differences between the old and the new CVA bill include the following:

1. Sections 5 and 6 of S. 460 concerning the National River Basin Development Board and national coordination of CVA by the Board, have been deleted. S. 1716 would establish an independent CVA responsible directly to the President and to Congress in the same manner as the Tennessee Valley Authority.

2. The provisions for the creation of a Columbia Valley Advisory Council in S. 460 have been deleted, and in lieu thereof section 5 of the new bill authorizes the CVA to form advisory committees for regular consultation with labor, agriculture, business, and Government.

3. Section 10 (b) of S. 460 authorized the CVA to obtain a transfer of any project or property of the United States in the Columbia Valley region merely by requesting such transfer. Section 9 (b) of S. 1716 permits such transfers to be made only by the President.

4. Section 10 (f) of S. 460 required the CVA to operate through other Federal departments and agencies so far as practicable. This provision appears too restrictive and better results should be obtained if the CVA is free to determine whether a particular activity should be conducted by itself, through other Federal agencies or through States or local institutions. Section 10 (d) of S. 1716 leaves it optional with the CVA to conduct any activity either directly or through any agency, depending upon which will best achieve the desired result.

5. Section 1 (d) of S. 460 was intended to protect vested water rights and the existing system of appropriation of water under State laws. To remove the doubts of irrigation interests, section 1 (d) has been redrafted in S. 1716 and now conforms almost word for word with section 8 of the Reclamation Act of 1902, and it safeguards both existing water rights and State laws for the appropriation of water.

6. Section 12 of S. 1716 is entirely new and it substitutes for the corresponding reclamation provisions of S. 460, the Federal reclamation laws.

7. Section 13, relating to land settlement with preference for veterans, has been expanded to include a definite land program which was only handled generally in S. 460.

8. Section 20 of S. 460, relating to the regulation of river obstruction and stream pollution, has been deleted. No corresponding provision is included in the new bill.

9. Section 20 (a) of the new bill spells out in more detail the uses to which the CVA may put its revenues.

10. The first sentence of section 22 recognizes the right of the CVA to perform construction work by private contract, although the CVA is not required to use that method of construction exclusively.

S. 1716

A bill to establish a Columbia Valley Authority to provide for integrated water control and resource development on the Columbia River, its tributaries, and the surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the irrigation and reclamation of lands, the promotion of navigation, the providing of employment, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Columbia Valley Authority Act."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. In order to safeguard the navigable waters in the Columbia Valley region and to promote navigation, to provide for the control and prevention of floods and the reclamation of lands, and to encourage the fuller development and utilization of the resources of the region, all for the purpose of fostering and protecting commerce among the several States, strengthening the national defense, conserving the water, soil, mineral, and forest resources of the Nation, relieving unemployment, and promoting the general welfare of the United States, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States that—

(a) The Federal Government shall establish and maintain a broad program of integrated water control and resource development for the Columbia Valley region, consisting of that portion of the Columbia River, its tributaries, and watershed which is within the boundaries of the United States, those portions of the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho which are not within such watershed, and such additional adjoining territory as may be related to or materially affected by the development consequent to this act, and shall consult and negotiate, and, through the State Department, may agree with the Dominion of Canada or any Province or political subdivision thereof concerning the conservation, utilization, and control of the waters of the Columbia River Basin.

(b) The administration of such a multipurpose program shall be entrusted to a Federal regional agency.

(c) Such a regional agency—

(1) shall recognize the doctrine of beneficial consumptive use of water, and in the event of any conflict between the purposes for which the waters of the Columbia Valley region may be used, such waters shall be devoted to (I) domestic, irrigation, mining, and industrial purposes; (II) flood control; (III) navigation; and (IV) power, in that order of priority;

(2) shall acquire the electric or water system of any municipality only if such acquisition is agreeable to the municipality;

(3) shall make its power and water projects collectively self-supporting and self-liquidating;

(4) shall recognize and utilize to the fullest possible extent the authorities, advice, assistance, and cooperation of the people of the region and their public and private organizations—local, State, and Federal.

(d) No provision for works of irrigation in or under this act shall be construed as affecting or intended to affect or to in any way interfere with the laws of any State relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used for domestic, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes, or any vested right acquired thereunder, and the Corporation, in carrying out the provisions of this act, shall proceed in conformity with such laws, and nothing herein shall in any way affect any right of any State or of the Federal Government or of any land-owner, appropriator, or user of water in, to, or from any interstate stream or the water thereof: *Provided*, That the right to use of water acquired for irrigation under the provisions of this act shall be appurtenant to the land irrigated, and beneficial use shall be the basis, the measure, and the limit of the right: *Provided further*, That nothing in this subsection shall limit the authority of the Corporation to acquire by purchase, lease, condemnation, exchange, transfer pursuant to section 9 of this act, or donation, real or personal property, or any interest therein.

COLUMBIA VALLEY AUTHORITY

SEC. 3. (a) To carry out the purposes and policy of this act, there is hereby created a body corporate which shall be known as the "Columbia Valley Authority" (hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation") and it shall be an instrumentality of the United States. The Board of Directors first appointed shall be deemed the incorporators, and the incorporation shall be held to have been effected from the date of the first meeting of the Board.

(b) The Corporation shall maintain its principal office at a convenient place centrally located in the territory in which its activities are conducted. Upon selecting the location of its principal office, and in the event it later makes a change in such location, the Corporation shall file with the Secretary of State public notice of such selection or change.

DIRECTORS OF CORPORATION

SEC. 4. (a) The Corporation shall be directed and controlled by a board of three directors, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. In appointing the members of the Board, the President shall designate the chairman. All other officials, agents, and employees shall be designated and selected by the Corporation. All matters of policy shall be considered and determined by the Board of Directors acting as a board. Each member of the board, before entering upon the duties of his office, shall subscribe to an oath (or affirmation) to support the Constitution of the United States, and to perform faithfully and impartially the duties imposed upon him by this act. Each director shall maintain his residence in the Columbia Valley region.

(b) The terms of office of the members first taking office after the approval of this act shall expire as designated by the President at the time of nomination, one at the end of the third year, one at the end of the sixth year, and one at the end of the ninth year after the date of approval of this act. A successor to a member of the Board shall be appointed in the same manner as the original members and, except for instances in which subsection (c) of this section is applicable, shall have a term of office expiring nine years from the date of the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed.

(c) Any member appointed to fill a vacancy in the Board occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

(d) Vacancies in the Board, so long as there shall be two members in office, shall not impair the powers of the Board to execute the functions of the Corporation, and two of the members in office shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the Board.

(e) Each of the members of the Board shall be a citizen of the United States and shall receive a salary at the rate of $15,000 a year, to be paid by the Corporation as current expenses. Members of the Board shall be reimbursed by the Corporation for actual expenses (including traveling expenses) incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Board by this act: *Provided*, That they may receive a per diem of $10 per day in lieu of actual subsistence expenses. No member of said Board shall, during his continuance in office, be engaged in any other business, but each member shall devote himself to the work of the Corporation.

(f) No director shall, during his continuance in office, have a financial interest in any public-utility company engaged in the business of generating, transmitting, distribution, or selling power to the public; nor in any holding company or subsidiary company of a holding company as those terms are defined in the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935; nor in any business that may be substantially affected by the success of the Corporation.

(g) Any member of the Board may be removed from office at any time by the President or a concurrent resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives.

COOPERATION WITH STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES

SEC. 5. The Corporation, in carrying out the programs authorized in this act in accordance with purposes and policies set forth herein, and particularly section 2 (c) (4), shall develop formal and informal procedures by which the advice, assistance, and participation of the people of the region and their State and local governments and organizations, public and private, shall be obtained to the fullest possible extent to assist the Board of the Corporation in the formulation of policies designed to carry out the basic provisions of this act. To this end the Corporation shall establish procedures for regular consultation and interchange of views on matters of policy with one or more representatives of each of the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington (as designated by the respective Governors thereof), representatives of the business, agricultural, and labor interests of the region, appropriate officers of representative local and State agencies and institutions, with which the Corporation has cooperative arrangements, contracts, and agreements, and representatives of the general public of the region. Such designated representatives and officials shall receive the amount of $10 per day for subsistence expenses, and their actual travel expenses for the periods during which they consult with the Corporation away from their regular places of work.

CORPORATE POWERS

SEC. 6. Subject to the provisions of this act, the Corporation—

(a) Shall have succession in its corporate name;

(b) May adopt and use a corporate seal which shall be judicially noticed;

(c) May adopt, amend, and repeal by-laws;

(d) May sue and be sued in its corporate name and may settle and adjust claims held by it against other parties or persons and by other parties and persons against it;

(e) Shall have power to acquire, by purchase, lease, condemnation, exchange, transfer pursuant to section 9 of this act, or donation such real and personal property and any interest therein, including water rights, and may sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of any real and personal property and any interest therein, as in its judgment may be necessary or appropriate in carrying out the purposes of the Corporation under this act or under any other law of the United States, subject to the following:

(1) The provisions of section 355, Revised Statutes (40 U. S. C. 255), as amended, other than the provisions contained in the last paragraph of said section, shall be inapplicable to acquisitions by the Corporation.

(2) The Corporation may not acquire the electric or water system of any municipality through the exercise of the power of eminent domain if the municipality opposes such acquisition: *Provided*, That the foregoing shall not preclude the Corporation from exercising the power of eminent domain to acquire an easement for a right-of-way over, under, or across a municipal electric or water system or portion thereof for the electric or water transmission system of the Corporation, nor shall it preclude the Corporation from acquiring any such system or part thereof when the construction or operation of a dam or reservoir by the Corporation will render useless the system or the part thereof sought to be acquired.

(3) Except as provided in section 15 (e) of this act, the Corporation shall not dispose of any real property on which is located a permanent dam, hydraulic power plant, or munitions plant heretofore or hereafter constructed by or on behalf of the United States or the Corporation, or which has a value in excess of $1,000,000.

The Corporation may exercise the power of eminent domain in carrying out any of the purposes of this Act, except as otherwise provided in this section and section 13 hereof. All condemnation proceedings shall be had in the name of the Corporation. In connection with any such proceeding, the Corporation shall have the rights conferred upon the United States by the act of February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421), and upon the Tennessee Valley Authority by section 25 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 (48 Stat. 70), the provisions of both of which are hereby declared to be applicable to proceedings brought by the Corporation in its own name to the same extent as though it were expressly mentioned therein, except insofar as they are inconsistent with this section, and are declared also to be applicable to proceedings for the condemnation of personal property in the same manner as proceedings for the condemnation of lands, easements, or rights-of-way: *Provided*, That commissioners shall receive such compensation as the court deems reasonable, including a per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence expenses while away from their homes for time actually spent, and their actual traveling expenses incurred in performing their duties as commissioners: *Provided further*, That the court may order an

award in favor of a minor, insane person, or incompetent person to be paid to the natural guardian of, or directly to such minor, insane person, or incompetent person. Title to all property, with the exception of that owned by the United States and entrusted to the Corporation as agent of the United States, shall be taken in the name of the Corporation. Conveyances of real and personal property, or interests therein, shall be in the name of the Corporation or the United States of America, depending on the holder of the title, and may be by warranty deed, bill of sale with warranty of title, or otherwise, which may be executed by any director, or by such other person or persons as the board may designate, such designation to be filed with the Director of the Division of the Federal Register, the National Archives, and to be published in the Federal Register.

(f) Shall have power to acquire, without reimbursement, any properties defined as surplus under the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (Public Law 457, 78th Cong.), and to maintain, repair, alter, use, and operate such properties and any other properties which the United States may place in its custody, whether or not for the purposes of this act, until other proper disposition be made thereof.

(g) Shall have power to produce, transmit, sell, and dispose of electric power and water, as hereinafter specified.

(h) Shall have power to purchase and acquire such insurance as it deems necessary to appropriate to carry out the powers now or hereafter conferred upon it by law.

(i) Shall have power to enter into such contracts and agreements and to exercise such powers and do such things as it may determine to be necessary or appropriate to carry out the powers now or hereafter conferred upon it by law.

VENUE AND JURISDICTION

SEC. 7. The Corporation shall be held to be an inhabitant and resident, within the meaning of the laws of the United States relating to the venue of civil suits, of the judicial district in which its principal office is located at the time of the commencement of suit. The district courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction, without regard to the amount in controversy, over any proceeding brought by or against the Corporation. Any proceeding brought against the Corporation in a court of any State may be removed by the Corporation to the district court of the United States for the district in which the proceeding is pending, and, to effect such removal, it shall not be necessary that any other party or parties defendant join in the petition for removal. Except as otherwise provided herein, the procedure for removal shall be according to the applicable laws of the United States relating to removal.

SUBMISSION OF PLANS TO THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS

SEC. 8. (a) The Corporation is hereby authorized and directed, after giving due consideration to existing surveys and plans relating to water control and resource development for various purposes, conducting such additional surveys and investigations as it deems necessary or proper, and enlisting the advice and assistance of appropriate local, State, and Federal governmental agencies, educational institutions, and private organizations, to formulate and report to the President and Congress with the utmost expedition, and in any event not later than 2 years from the enactment of this act its recommendations for the unified development of the Columbia Valley region in accordance with the purposes and policy of this act. Such recommendations shall include a plan for the integrated control and utilization of the waters of the Columbia Valley region, which will reconcile and harmonize, as far as may be practicable within the policy prescribed in section 2 (c) (1) of this act, the requirements for flood control, navigation, reclamation, power, and other needs, and which will promote soil conservation, afforestation and reforestation, mineral development, preservation of fishing and game resources, and recreation and recreational facilities, in such a way as to secure the maximum public benefit for the region and Nation. Particular consideration in such a plan and recommendations shall be given to projects and activities which shall serve the following purposes:

(1) The control and prevention of floods which impair and disrupt navigation, the facilities of interstate commerce, the properties and functions of the United States, and agricultural and industrial properties and production, by, among other means, the storage, control, and disposition of flood and surplus waters, and the control and retardation of water run-off and the restoration and improvement of the absorption and infiltration capacity of the soil. Projects for such purposes shall include, but not by way of limitation, dams, reservoirs, levees, spillways, and floodways; improved methods and conditions of soil conservation, utilization, fertilization, and cultivation; and the conservation of forests and afforestation and reforestation of lands.

(2) The promotion of navigation by, among other means, the improvement of the channels of navigable rivers and their tributaries; the prevention of siltation of such waters; the regulation of stream flow; and the development and coordination of navigation facilities.

(3) The reclamation of arid, semiarid, swampy, wet, logged off, and cut-over lands by, among other means, the irrigation, drainage, or clearing of lands, and the advancement of their economic use through improved water-utilization and soil-conservation procedures.

(4) The safeguarding of navigable waters and their use by, among other means, the prevention and abatement of pollution of navigable streams and their tributaries, the provision of sewage-disposal and water-purification works and structures and facilities in connection therewith, and the adoption of other appropriate sanitation practices.

(5) So far as may be consistent with or necessary or appropriate for the control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation, the safeguarding of navigable waters, and the reclamation of lands, as provided in subsection (a), plans shall give due regard to the following, among other considerations: (I) The present and future development and conservation of water for power, irrigation, and other beneficial uses; (II) the prudent husbandry of soil, mineral, and forest resources and their conservation for recreation, the protection of wild game and fish, and other beneficial uses; (III) the preventing of irreparable waste of the Nation's resources from droughts, winds, dust storms, and soil erosion; (IV) the integration and interconnection of projects and activities, the development of their multiple purposes, and the equitable distribution of the benefits thereof; and (V) equitable contributions to cost by States and subdivisions and agencies thereof specially benefited by the projects and activities.

(b) The Corporation is further authorized, after following the procedure prescribed in subsection (a) hereof, to formulate and report to the President and Congress, at such time or times as it deems advisable, its further recommendations for the unified development of the Columbia Valley region in accordance with the purposes and policy of this act. Such recommendations may include additions to or modifications of the plan provided in subsection (a) hereof.

(c) The plans and recommendations authorized in subsections (a) and (b) hereof shall be in sufficient detail to provide the President, the Congress, and the people and institutions of the region with reasonably specific information as to—

(1) the water control and utilization policy and program which would be established and maintained;

(2) the nature, scope, and general location of the projects and activities recommended, and the estimated cost and benefits thereof;

(3) the order of preference and priority which should be followed in the construction and carrying out of such projects and activities in the light of postwar conditions existing and anticipated at the time of the report.

(d) The plans and recommendations authorized in subsections (a) and (b) hereof shall be forwarded to the President and to Congress while it is in session. The plans and recommendations shall lie before the Congress for its consideration for a period of not to exceed 120 calendar days during which Congress is in session. An adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain by either House or an adjournment of the Congress sine die shall interrupt the 120-day period, but in either case the remainder of the period shall begin to run on the first day on which both Houses are again in session: *Provided*, That if a resolution with respect to such plans and recommendations has been passed by one House and sent to the other, no interruption shall occur by reason of adjournment of the first House taken thereafter. If not affirmatively disapproved by the Congress by concurrent resolution within the 120-day period, each of said plans and recommendations shall be deemed to be effective at the end of such period, and the provisions thereof shall be carried out in accordance with their terms subject to the provisions of this act.

TRANSFER OF PROJECTS, PROPERTY, AND FUNCTIONS TO CORPORATION

SEC. 9. (a) On the first day of the third calendar month following the effective date of this act, or on the first day of the calendar month following the appointment and confirmation of the directors of the Corporation, whichever is later—

(1) the exclusive use, possession, and control of the Bonneville project, including the Bonneville Dam, the Columbia Basin project, including the Grand Coulee Dam, the Hungry Horse project, including the Hungry Horse Dam, the Umatilla project, including the McNary Dam, the Snake River project, including the dams contemplated by the plans submitted in House Document No. 704, Seventy-fifth Congress, as modified pursuant to the act of March 2, 1945 (Public Law 14, 79th Cong.), and the Bonneville transmission system, together with all real estate, buildings, powerhouses, hydroelectric and operating appurtenances (including the locks), books, records, and correspondence connected therewith, all tools and machinery, equipment, accessories, and materials belonging thereto, and all laboratories and plans used as auxiliaries thereto, shall be entrusted to the Corporation for the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That the Corporation may operate each such project or portion thereof through the agency from which it is hereby transferred, including the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers. At the same time the employees of the Bonneville Power Administration shall be transferred to the Corporation, and any employees of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers who are employed in connection with the foregoing projects and property may be transferred to the Corporation at its option;

(2) the unexpended balances of the appropriations of the Department of the Interior and the Department of War for the construction, operation, and maintenance of said projects and transmission system shall be

transferred to the Corporation and shall be placed in a single account with, and shall be available for expenditure in carrying out the purposes of this act in the same manner and to the same extent as, all other funds of the Corporation;

(3) the Corporation shall complete and administer the Columbia Basin, Hungry Horse, and McNary projects, and the Snake River projects authorized by the act of March 2, 1945 (Public Law 14, 79th Cong.), in accordance with the purposes and policies of this act: *Provided*, That the Corporation in completing and administering the irrigation and reclamation features of the Columbia Basin project shall be governed by the Columbia Basin Project Act (57 Stat. 14), except to the extent that it is inconsistent with this act, and all the powers and functions of the Secretary of the Interior as provided in said Columbia Basin Project Act shall be transferred to and may be exercised by the Corporation: *Provided further*, That the Corporation and the Bureau of Reclamation are hereby directed to work out such arrangements and schedules as are necessary to insure the prompt completion of the Columbia Basin project and to insure that construction will proceed as soon as materials and manpower become available.

(b) The President is authorized, whenever in his judgment the purposes of this act and the interests of economy and efficiency will be served thereby, to transfer to the Corporation the use, possession, control, and operation of any dam or water-control project, together with appurtenant works and transmission facilities, constructed, or under construction, or hereafter constructed by or in behalf of the United States or its instrumentalities in the Columbia Valley region, and of such other real or personal property of the United States, or any agency thereof, and any functions, duties, powers, and responsibilities conferred by law upon any executive department or agency of the United States which pertain to projects or activities within or affecting the region and which are within the scope of or related to any functions, duties, powers, or responsibilities conferred upon the Corporation by this act, as he may from time to time deem necessary or proper to carry out the purposes and policy of this act. All contractual obligations of the transferring department or agency pertaining to the use of such dams, projects, works, facilities, and other properties or to the disposition of the products thereof, including water for irrigation, shall be assumed by the Corporation. In connection with any such transfer the President shall make such provision as he deems necessary or appropriate for the transfer to the Corporation of unexpended balances of appropriations available for use in respect of such dams, projects, works, facilities, other properties, and such functions, duties, powers, or responsibilities, together with personnel, equipment, books, records, correspondence, and any powers, duties, and other obligations pertaining thereto. All such unexpended balances shall be placed in a single account and shall be available for expenditure in carrying out the purposes of this act in the same manner and to the same extent as all other funds of the Corporation.

GENERAL POWERS AND DUTIES OF CORPORATION

SEC. 10. (a) The Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to construct, operate, and carry out such projects and activities in the Columbia Valley region as will best serve to control and prevent floods, to safeguard the navigable waters, and to promote navigation and the reclamation of the lands. In order to effectuate such primary purposes with the greatest public benefit, to create employment, and, so far as is consistent with such primary purposes and the policy prescribed in section 2 (c) (1) of this act, to avoid the waste of water, water power, and other property of the United States, the Corporation shall have such powers as may be necessary or appropriate to construct by contract, force account or otherwise, operate, and carry out such projects or activities so as to accomplish the purposes of this act, including but without limitation, the power—

(1) to acquire, construct, operate, maintain, and improve dams, locks, reservoirs, levees, spillways, floodways, fishways, conduits, canals, roads, roadways, docks, wharves, terminals, sewage-disposal, water-purification, and other sanitation works, and recreation facilities, and structures, equipment, and facilities incidental thereto;

(2) to acquire, construct, operate, maintain, and improve such canals, conduits, powerhouses, steam-generating plants, transmission lines, rural electric lines and substations, and such machinery, equipment, structures, and facilities, for the storage and transportation of water or for the generation and transmission of electric energy as the Corporation deems necessary or appropriate to supply existing and potential markets;

(3) to develop and provide such methods and conditions of water and land utilization as the Corporation deems necessary or appropriate to prevent and abate floods and droughts.

In order to further effectuate such primary purposes in the construction and operation of dams for projects entrusted to it, the Corporation, insofar as practicable, shall make provision, in the construction of any dam, for such foundations, sluices, penstocks, and other works as may be necessary or appropriate to prevent the waste of water power at such dam and to make possible the economical future development of water power at such dam.

(b) The Corporation is authorized to negotiate, execute, and carry out contracts with States, counties, municipalities, and all State agencies and with railroads, railroad corporations, common carriers, and all public-utility commissions and any other person, firm, or corporation, for the relocation of railroad tracks, highways, highway bridges, mills, ferries, electric-light plants, and any and all other properties, enterprises, and projects, the protection, alteration, reconstruction, relocation, replacement, or removal of which may be necessary in order to carry out the provisions of this act. The Corporation is further authorized to exercise the power of eminent domain to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

(c) The Corporation is authorized to advise and cooperate in the readjustment of the population displaced by the construction of dams, the protection of watersheds, the acquisition of land, and other necessary operations, in order to effectuate the purposes of this act; and may cooperate with Federal, State, and local agencies to that end.

(d) The Corporation is authorized, if in its judgment the interest of economy and efficiency will be served thereby, to construct or operate any project or conduct any activity entrusted to it through, or in cooperation with other departments and agencies of the United States and through or in cooperation with States, counties, municipalities, cooperatives, individuals, educational and scientific institutions, or other bodies, agencies, and organizations, public or private. The departments and agencies of the United States are hereby authorized to participate in the construction or operation of such projects or the conduct of such activities on terms mutually agreeable to such department or agency and the Corporation.

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS ELECTRIC ENERGY

SEC. 11. (a) The Corporation is hereby authorized to sell and dispose of surplus electric energy generated by it, not used in its operations or for operation of locks and other works or in the case of reclamation projects for reclamation of public lands, to Federal agencies, States, counties, districts, municipalities, corporations, cooperatives, partnerships, and individuals, according to the policies hereinafter set forth; to provide for emergencies, break-down relief, increased stability and economy in operations, and conservation of stored water, the Corporation may enter into contracts or arrangements upon suitable terms with public and private power systems for the purchase or mutual exchange of electric energy, or both, and for reciprocal use of transmission facilities.

(b) To encourage the widest possible use of available electric energy, to provide adequate markets and outlets therefor, and to prevent the monopolization thereof by limited groups of localities, the Corporation shall acquire, construct, operate, maintain, and improve such electric-transmission lines, rural-electric lines, substations, and other structures and facilities as it deems necessary or appropriate to bring electric energy available for sale, from its projects to existing and potential markets, and to interconnect such projects with other public or private projects for the disposition, purchase, or exchange of electric energy.

(c) To insure the disposition of the electric energy developed at a project for the benefit of the general public, and particularly of domestic and rural consumers, the Corporation shall, in disposing of electric energy after meeting the needs of Federal agencies, give preference and priority to States, counties, and municipalities, including agencies, instrumentalities, or political or governmental subdivisions thereof or of two or more States (in this act called public agencies), and to cooperative and other organizations organized or administered not for profit but primarily for the purpose of supplying electric energy to their members as nearly as possible at cost (in this act called cooperative agencies). In the event of competing applications by public or cooperative agencies (whether or not formally organized) on the one hand, and other persons or agencies on the other hand, the Corporation, in order to preserve and protect the preferential rights and priorities of such public and cooperative agencies, shall allow to people and communities, when within such distance from such project as to render practicable the transmission of power therefrom, reasonable opportunity and time to acquire, purchase, or construct the necessary facilities for the use or distribution of such electric energy, including reasonable opportunity and time to create and finance such public or cooperative agencies under the laws of the several States.

(d) Subject to the provisions of this act, the Corporation may enter into contracts for the sale or disposition at wholesale of electric energy, whether for resale or direct consumption, to Federal agencies, to public and cooperative agencies, and to private agencies and persons. Contracts entered into under this subsection shall be binding in accordance with the terms thereof and shall be effective for such period or periods, including renewals or extensions, as may be provided therein, not exceeding in the aggregate 20 years from the respective dates of the making of such contracts. Such contracts shall contain appropriate provisions, to be agreed upon between the Corporation and the purchaser, for the equitable adjustment of rates at appropriate intervals. In the case of contracts with private agencies or persons who resell the bulk of the electric energy purchased, the contracts shall contain appropriate provisions authorizing the Corporation to cancel the contract, in whole or in part, upon 3 years' notice in writing whenever in its judgment there is reasonable likelihood that part of the electric energy purchased under such contract will be needed to

satisfy the preferential rights and priorities of public or cooperative agencies under this act.

(e) Contracts for the sale of electric energy shall contain such terms and conditions, including provisions to insure that resale to the ultimate consumer shall be at rates which are reasonable and nondiscriminatory, as the Corporation may deem necessary or desirable for carrying out the purposes of this act, and in case the purchaser shall fail to comply with any such terms and conditions, said contract may provide that it may be canceled at the election of the Corporation.

(f) Schedules of rates at which electric energy will be contracted for sale shall be published by the Corporation and may be changed, withdrawn, or added to from time to time. All contracts for the sale or disposition of electric energy other than for exchanges, shall provide for payment pursuant to a schedule or schedules so published. Subject to the provisions of section 14, the Corporation shall publish such rate schedules as it finds necessary or appropriate to provide adequate markets and outlets for electric energy and to encourage the widest possible use of electric energy: *Provided,* That its rate schedules collectively shall have regard (upon the basis of the application of such rate schedules to the capacity of the contemplated electric facilities of the Corporation) to the recovery of the costs of generating and transmitting such electric energy, including appropriate reserves for maintenance and upkeep and the higher of the following:

(1) amortization over a reasonable period of years of the capital investment allocated to commercial power, plus interest on the unamortized portion of such investment at an annual rate not less than the annual cost of money to the Treasury Department on Treasury bonds having a maturity date of 10 years or more issued during the period in which the unamortized investment was incurred; or

(2) amortization over a reasonable period of years of the capital investment allocated to commercial power plus the capital investment allocated to purposes other than commercial power but assigned to be repaid out of power revenues.

In order to distribute the benefits of integrated transmission systems and to promote the equitable distribution of electric energy, rate schedules shall provide for uniform rates, or rates uniform throughout prescribed transmission areas.

RECLAMATION PROVISIONS

SEC. 12. (a) For the purpose of stabilizing the agricultural economy of the region, making more secure the tenure of settlers on the land, and providing family-type farming operations on farms consisting wholly or partly of reclaimed lands, the Corporation may undertake projects for the reclamation of lands, including logged or cut-over lands, by irrigation, drainage, or land clearing in the region. Such projects shall be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Corporation, and reimbursement therefor shall be made by the water users or other beneficiaries in accordance with the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), so far as such provisions are consistent with this act and are otherwise applicable: *Provided,* That where a reclamation project has been included in a plan submitted to the Congress under section 8 of this act, no further report thereon, nor findings of feasibility with respect thereto, shall be required for the authorization of the project under the Federal reclamation laws.

(b) The Corporation shall establish the maximum size of farm units within each project for the reclamation of lands in accordance with its findings as to the area sufficient in size to constitute a productive, owner-operated farm or adequately to supplement adjacent grazing or dry farming lands. No benefits from any such project shall be made available to the owners of lands whose individual holdings exceed the maximum area so prescribed by the Corporation until and unless such owners shall have agreed for and in behalf of themselves, their heirs, executors, and assigns, by contracts in form, substance, and legal sufficiency satisfactory to the Corporation—

(1) that they will sell such part of their lands as may exceed the maximum area so prescribed by the Corporation at the appraised value thereof, as determined by the Corporation, without reference to or increment on account of the construction of the project; and

(2) that the Corporation shall have an irrevocable power of attorney to sell in their behalf any such excess lands, not theretofore disposed of by said landowners, at the appraised value thereof: *Provided,* That any sales by the Corporation pursuant to such power of attorney shall, unless otherwise provided in writing by the landowner, be only for cash and only upon terms that will require the landowner to surrender possession of all of his excess lands at substantially the same time: *Provided further,* That the provisions of this section shall not be applicable to the Columbia Basin project to the extent that they are inconsistent with the Columbia Basin Project Act.

LAND SETTLEMENT; VETERANS' PREFERENCE

SEC. 13. (a) For a period of 20 years following the effective date of this act, veterans shall have a 90-day preferred right of purchase with respect to lands made available for settlement by the Corporation on projects constructed, operated, or maintained by it. The Corporation shall advise the Veterans' Administration of the availability of lands for settlement; and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall inform veterans of settlement opportunities on such lands. As used in this section the term veteran means any person who served in the active military or naval service during a time of war and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable.

(b) The Corporation may acquire, but not by condemnation, such lands in the region as it deems necessary or proper for disposition to veterans and others desiring to settle thereon. Such lands shall be disposed of to such settlers in economic family-sized farming units determined in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of section 12 of this act.

(c) To expedite the settlement and use of lands transferred to the Corporation or acquired under this section, the Corporation may improve such lands and may erect and provide thereon such structures and facilities as may be necessary or desirable for the use thereof.

(d) Contracts for the sale of land under this section shall be on the basis that, in the judgment of the Board, will provide the return in a reasonable period of years of the appraised value of the land and the improvements thereon, including structures and facilities, as determined by the Corporation, consideration being given in such appraisal to the normal earning capacity of the property. Such sales of land as may be made by the Corporation for prices insufficient to recover total investments therein shall be listed by the Corporation in its annual report to the Congress.

ALLOCATION OF COSTS

SEC. 14. (a) The Corporation shall make a thorough investigation of the costs to the United States of each dam, steam plant, electric or water transmission system, or other similar facilities constructed or acquired by or turned over to the Corporation for its management and control for the purpose of allocating on a region-wide basis the unamortized portion of such costs among the various purposes served by the facilities—such as navigation, flood control, irrigation, commercial power, or other types of development, as the case may be. Costs of facilities serving only one purpose shall be allocated to that purpose. Costs of facilities serving more than one purpose shall be equitably allocated among such purposes in such manner as the Corporation deems proper.

(b) Costs allocated to purposes which do not directly produce revenues, such as flood control and navigation, shall not be reimbursable. All other costs shall be reimbursable and shall be assigned for reimbursement among revenue-producing purposes, upon a region-wide basis, in such manner as the Corporation deems necessary or appropriate to promote a sound national economy, to encourage the widest possible economic use of water for irrigation and municipal purposes and of electric energy for domestic, rural, and industrial needs, and to avoid the imposition upon any one purpose of a greater share of joint costs than such purpose can and should fairly bear. The Corporation shall also determine the appropriate periods and rates of amortization to be applied to the capital investment to be repaid by revenue-producing purposes. The allocation of costs, the assignment of reimbursement obligations, and the periods and rates of amortization so determined by the Corporation, when approved by the President, shall be final and shall be used thereafter in keeping the books of the Corporation.

(c) The Corporation shall, within 5 years from the date of enactment of this act, file with Congress a statement of its allocation of the costs and assignment of reimbursement obligations of all such properties constructed, acquired, or turned over to said Corporation and which have been completed prior thereto. The Corporation shall also file a statement of its allocation of the costs and assignment of reimbursement obligations of such other properties as have been constructed, acquired, or turned over to the Corporation and have been completed during any fiscal year in its annual report to Congress for the succeeding fiscal year.

(d) For the purpose of accumulating data useful to the Congress in the formulation of legislative policy in matters relating to the generation, transmission, and distribution of electric energy, and to the Federal Power Commission and other Federal and State agencies, and to the public, the Corporation shall keep complete accounts of its costs of generation, transmission, and distribution of electric energy and shall keep a complete account of the total cost of generation and transmission facilities constructed or otherwise acquired by the Corporation, and a description of the major components of such costs according to such uniform system of accounting for public utilities as may be prescribed by the Federal Power Commission, with such modifications as may be deemed by the Corporation and Federal Power Commission to be necessary or desirable by reason of the nature and character of the Corporation and its operations, together with records of such other physical data and operating statistics of the Corporation as may be helpful in determining the actual cost and value of services, and the practices, methods, facilities, equipment, appliances, and standards, and sizes, types, location, and geographical and economic integration of plants and systems best suited to promote the public interest, efficiency, and the wider and more economical use of electric energy. Such data shall be reported to the Congress by the Corporation from time to time with appro-

priate analyses and recommendations, and, so far as practicable, shall be made available to the Federal Power Commission and other Federal and State agencies which may be concerned with the administration of legislation relating to the generation, transmission, or distribution of electric energy.

(e) The Corporation may treat any two or more projects or any portions thereof, existing or planned, including transmission facilities, as a single unit, and it may credit the revenues derived from its integrated operations to the individual projects or portions thereof in such manner as it deems appropriate.

FACILITATING DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS POWER

SEC. 15. In order to facilitate the disposition of the surplus power of the Corporation according to the policies set forth in this act, to give effect to the priority herein accorded to public and cooperative agencies in the purchase of such power by enabling them to acquire facilities for the distribution of such power, and at the same time to preserve existing distribution facilities as going concerns and avoid duplication of such facilities wherever possible, the Corporaton is authorized—

(a) to assist and render services for any existing or potential purchaser of electric energy in constructing, acquiring, improving, maintaining, and operating the electrical distribution lines and other facilities of such purchaser or potential purchaser;

(b) to advise and cooperate with public and cooperative agencies and local groups desiring to form such public and cooperative agencies, situated within transmission distance from any dam where such power is generated by the Corporation;

(c) to extend credit to, and to assist and render services for, such agencies and groups in constructing, acquiring, improving, maintaining, financing, and operating (1) distribution facilities and incidental works, including generating plants; and (2) interconnecting transmission lines, or in acquiring any interest in such facilities, incidental works, and lines;

(d) to acquire, operate, maintain, extend, and improve electric utility systems, the principal facilities or operations of which are in the Columbia Valley region, or parts of such systems and properties and assets reasonably incidental thereto, or the acquisition thereof, and other generating, transmission, or distribution facilities, the acquisition of which will improve the operation of the Corporation's electric facilities in the region or facilitate the development of appropriate marketing outlets for the electric energy produced at any project under the Corporation's control: *Provided*, That before the Corporation consummates the acquisition of a utility system or part thereof, the Corporation shall file with the Director of the Division of the Federal Register, the National Archives, to be published in the Federal Register, a certification that public or cooperative agencies, or both, in a substantial portion of the area served by such system or part thereof, have expressed their desire, through existing State laws, to purchase the distribution facilities included in such system or part thereof which are located in the area served by such agencies, that in its judgment the operation of such system or part thereof will increase the Corporation's power revenues in an amount estimated to be sufficient to pay the operation and maintenance costs thereof and the principal and interest charges on the investment therein, and that the value of the acquired system or part thereof will be sufficient upon any sale or disposition pursuant to subsection (e) of this section substantially to repay the investment therein;

(e) to sell or otherwise dispose of and to convey any distribution facilities acquired pursuant to subsection (d) of this section, and any improvements thereof to public or cooperative agencies, and it is directed to do so as speedily as such sales or other disposition can reasonably be consummated, and it may sell or otherwise dispose of and convey to public or cooperative agencies such generating facilities and transmission lines acquired pursuant to the said subsection and any improvements thereof as it determines can be more conveniently and economically operated by such public or cooperative agencies. The Corporation may also sell or otherwise dispose of and convey any incidental properties or assets acquired by it when acquiring, improving, or operating a utility system pursuant to the said subsection. All such sales or other dispositions shall be upon terms which in the judgment of the Corporation are reasonable and advantageous to the Government. In managing such facilities and properties during the temporary ownership thereof by the Corporation, and in temporarily selling electricity at retail, the Corporation, notwithstanding any other provision of law, may adopt and follow such business practices, including bookkeeping, accounting, service, sales, and other practices as in its opinion are reasonable and are common and accepted in the utility business: *Provided*, That it shall keep the accounts of its electric operations and sales in conformity with the requirements of the Federal Power Act and the regulations issued pursuant thereto by the Federal Power Commission. In order to effect the continuity of operation and service during its interim operation thereof, the Corporation may employ and fix the compensation of the persons who were employed in operating the said facilities and property and in selling electricity at retail through the distribution facilities immediately prior to the Corporation's acquisition thereof, and such other persons who may be necessary, without regard to any of the laws applicable to the employment or payment of employees of the United States. The Corporation may also enter into leases or management contracts of not to exceed 1 year's duration, providing for the temporary operation, maintenance, extension, and improvement of the said facilities and properties for the sale of electricity at retail through the distribution facilities; and it may extend the said leases or management contracts for successive terms of not more than 6 months each.

FACILITATING DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS WATER

SEC. 16. In order to facilitate the disposition of the surplus water of the Corporation according to the policies set forth in this act, the Corporation is authorized—

(a) to assist and render services for any existing or potential purchaser of water in constructing, acquiring, improving, maintaining, and operating the water, transmission, and distribution facilities of such purchaser or potential purchaser;

(b) to advise and cooperate with States, districts, counties, municipalities, cooperatives, and nonprofit organizations, and local groups desiring to form such districts, municipalities, cooperatives, and nonprofit organizations within distance permitting practicable purchase and utilization of water stored and available for sale at any work or facility of the Corporation;

(c) to extend credit to, and to assist and render services for such agencies and organizations in constructing, acquiring, improving, maintaining, financing, and operating canals, conduits, laterals, pipe lines, ditches, siphons, and incidental works and facilites, or in acquiring any interest therein.

INDIAN LANDS

SEC. 17. The Corporation may exercise any of its powers under this act, including the power of eminent domain, on Indian lands, irrespective of the manner in which title to such lands is held. In the event of the Corporation acquires any Indian lands or receives by transfer any lands of the United States utilized for Indian purposes, the Corporation shall make available to the Office of Indian Affairs such sums as the Corporation, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, determines to be requisite for rehabilitating and relocating the Indians displaced by such acquisition or transfer, and for replacing facilities, the usefulness of which to the Indians has been destroyed or impaired through the operations of the Corporation, where the moneys paid for the lands would otherwise be inadequate to accomplish such purposes. The said sums, together with moneys paid by the Corporation for Indian lands acquired by it, other than lands individually owned without restrictions upon alienation, payments for which shall be made directly to the owner, shall be available, without further appropriation, for expenditure by the Office of Indian Affairs in rehabilitating and relocating the Indians so displaced, in replacing the facilities no longer useful to them, in acquiring for their benefit, by purchase or otherwise, lieu lands to replace the lands acquired by the Corporation, and for such other purposes as are authorized by law. Lieu lands so acquired shall be held in the same status as those from which the funds were derived and shall be nontaxable until otherwise provided by the Congress.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

SEC. 18. The Corporation, in order to encourage the preservation, discovery, and increase of natural resources, to promote proper resource development, to prevent soil erosion and floods, to encourage industry, and to stimulate the more efficacious use of the land, waters, and products thereof in the region, is hereby authorized with respect to—

(a) Research and scientific experimentation—

(1) to plan and to conduct economic, scientific, and technologic investigations, surveys, and studies, to establish, maintain, and operate laboratories, research facilities and pilot plants, and to undertake experiments and demonstrations, all for the purpose of developing new uses and new and improved techniques and methods for the discovery, extraction, production, processing, and use of the resources and products of the region, and of fostering the orderly and proper physical, economic, and social development thereof; and

(2) to sell any products purchased or otherwise acquired by the Corporation, or the products manufactured by the Corporation in the development of any process, as a part of its development program, and to make donations or other dispositions of any such products for experimentation, education, and introduction of the use of such products so as to obtain information as to their value.

(b) Fertilizers and chemicals—

(1) to acquire and make alterations, modifications, and improvements in existing plants and facilties, to construct new plants and facilities, and to operate and maintain such plants and facilities for the purpose of enabling the corporation to furnish chemical products for military purposes, and fertilizer components and products for agricultural purposes; and in connection therewith, the Corporation may utilize, with or without reimbursement, the mineral resources of the public lands in the region which are suitable for the purposes herein set forth;

(2) to contract with commercial producers for the production of such fertilizer materials as may be needed in the Corporation's program of development and introduction. Such contracts may provide either for outright purchase of materials by the Corporation or only for the payment of carrying

charges on special materials manufactured at the Corporation's request for its program;

(3) to arrange with farmers, farm organizations, and other bodies for large-scale practical use of fertilizers under conditions permitting an accurate measure of the economic return they produce.

(c) Agriculture, forestry, grazing, and soil conservation—

(1) to promote the use of and for the purposes for which it may best be suited, including but not limited to agricultural, forestry, and grazing purposes; to foster the most efficient agricultural, forestry, grazing, and soil-conservation practices; to assist in afforesting, reforesting, seeding, and reseeding lands best suited for forest or grazing purposes; and to promote soil conservation by the use of crops, grasses, trees, and other plants or by any other means;

(2) to arrange for the large-scale practical use of new or improved varieties of crops, grasses, trees, and other plants, and new or improved methods for growing, harvesting, processing, and marketing them during the initial or experimental period, under conditions permitting an accurate measure of the economic return they produce; and

(3) to sell any crops, grasses, trees, or other plants grown, or fertilizers purchased or otherwise acquired by the Corporation or the products manufactured by it, as a part of its program of development of soil conservation, or to make donations or other dispositions to be fairly and equitably distributed through the agency of experimental stations, county demonstration agents, agricultural schools or colleges, farmers' cooperatives, or associations of owners, users, or operators of lands or of processors of products therefrom, or otherwise, as the Corporation may determine, for experimentation, education, and introduction of the use of such items and products.

(d) Fish and wildlife—

(1) to provide for the conservation, management, and rehabilitation of all species of birds, fish, mammals, and other classes of wild animals through the development, protection, rearing, stocking, and management of such wildlife, the resources thereof and their habitat, the control of losses of the same from diseases or other causes and through minimizing damages from predators and overabundant species, but not in conflict with the provisions of the laws relating to the protection of migratory birds or the programs administered under such laws, which shall continue to be administered as presently provided by law;

(2) to provide in connection with impoundments, diversions, water-control facilities, and any other works suitable and necessary means, measures, and management areas to conserve, manage, rehabilitate, and prevent loss of and damage to birds, fish, mammals, and other classes of wild animals dependent upon the waters, lands, and habitat affected by such works; and

(3) to cooperate with, and give and sell fish, game, and other wildlife to, States, counties, districts, municipalities, and governmental subdivisions and agencies of any of them, and educational and scientific institutions.

(e) Recreation—

(1) to construct, establish, maintain, develop, and operate, in conjunction with any of the programs and activities authorized under this act, recreational areas and facilities, and to make such areas and facilities available for public use upon such terms and conditions as the Corporation may determine to be appropriate; and

(2) to assist cooperating organizations in developing and executing recreational and health programs.

PERSONNEL

SEC. 19. (a) The Corporation shall, without regard to any other laws, rules, or regulations relating to the employment or payment of employees of the United States except the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to the extent that it otherwise is applicable, employ and fix the compensation of such managers, assistant managers, officers, employees, attorneys, agents, and consultants as are necessary for the transaction of its business, define their duties, require bonds of such of them as the Board may designate, the premiums for which shall be paid by the Corporation, and provide a system of organization to fix responsibility and promote efficiency. Any employee of the Corporation may be removed in the discretion of the Board. No regular officer or employee of the Corporation shall receive a salary in excess of that received by the directors. Subject to the provisions of this act, the Corporation is authorized to deal collectively with its employees through representatives of their own choosing and is authorized to enter into written or oral contracts with such employee representatives.

(b) Employees of the Corporation shall have rights with respect to security of tenure comparable to those provided by the civil-service laws, and shall be protected to substantially the same extent as persons subject to such laws. Employees acquired by transfer from other establishments or agencies of the United States shall retain all pay, leave, and retirement credits which they held at the time of such transfer, and in case they subsequently are retransferred to positions under the civil-service laws, shall be credited for the purpose of seniority with the time spent as an employee of the Corporation.

(c) In the employment, selection, classification, and promotion of officers and employees of the Corporation, no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such employments and promotions shall be given and made on the basis of merit and efficiency. It shall be unlawful for the Board to make or assist in the making of or cause to be made any employment, selection, classification, or promotion of any officer or employee of the Corporation on the basis of or because of any political qualification or test, and if any director violates this provision he shall be guilty of an offense against the United States, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year or both. Any officer or employee of the Corporation who is found to be guilty of a violation of this subsection shall be removed from office by the Board.

(d) The benefits of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes", approved September 7, 1916, as amended, shall extend to persons given employment under the provisions of this act; and the remedies afforded by such act of September 7, 1916, as amended, shall be exclusive and in lieu of any other remedy for injuries or death against the United States or the Corporation.

(e) All persons given employment under this act, other than (1) laborers, mechanics, and workmen employed in connection with construction work or the operation and maintenance of the Corporation's properties and facilities to whom the act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 468), as amended, does not otherwise apply, and (2) employees retained or hired in connection with interim operations under section 15 of this act, shall be deemed to be "employees" within the meaning of that term in the said act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 468), as amended.

(f) Section 1426 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(k) Certain employees of Columbia Valley Authority: The term 'employment' shall include such service as is determined by the Columbia Valley Authority (hereinafter called the Authority) to be performed after December 31, 1946, by (1) a laborer, mechanic, or workman, in connection with construction work or the operation and maintenance of the Authority's properties and facilities, or (2) an employee retained or hired in connection with interim operations under section 15 of the Columbia Valley Authority Act, as an employee performing service for the Authority, but shall not include any service performed by such a laborer, mechanic, or workman to whom the act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 468), as amended, applies. The term 'wages' means, with respect to service which constitutes employment by reason of this subsection, such amount of remuneration as is determined (subject to the provisions of this section) by the Authority to be paid for such service. The Authority is authorized and directed to comply with provisions of the internal revenue laws as the employer of individuals whose service constitutes employment by reason of this subsection."

(g) Section 209 of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(q) (1) The term 'employment' shall include such service as is determined by the Columbia Valley Authority (hereinafter called the Authority) to be performed after December 31, 1946, by (1) a laborer, a mechanic, or workman, in connection with construction work or the operation and maintenance of the Authority's properties and facilities, or (2) an employee retained or hired in connection with interim operations under section 15 of the Columbia Valley Authority Act, as an employee performing service for the Authority, but shall not include any service performed by such a laborer, mechanic, or workman, to whom the act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 468), as amended, applies.

"(2) The Social Security Board shall not make determinations as to whether an individual has performed services which are employment by reason of this subsection, the periods of such services, the amounts of remuneration for such services which constitute 'wages' under the provision of this section, or the periods in which or for which such wages were paid, but shall accept the determinations with respect thereto of the Authority, and such agents as it may designate, as evidenced by returns filed by the Authority as an employer pursuant to section 1426 (k) of the Internal Revenue Code and certifications made pursuant to this subsection. Such determinations shall be final and conclusive.

"(3) The Authority is authorized and directed, upon written request of the Social Security Board, to make certification to it with respect to any matter determinable for the Board by the Authority under this subsection, which the Board finds necessary in administering this title."

(h) Section 1606 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The legislature of any State may, with respect to service to be performed after December 31, 1946, by (1) a laborer, mechanic, or workman, in connection with construction work or the operation and maintenance of the Authority's properties and facilities, or (2) an employee retained or hired in connection with interim operations under section 15 of the Columbia Valley Authority Act, as an employee performing service for the Columbia Valley Authority (hereinafter called the Authority), require the Authority, and any such employee, to make contributions to an unemployment fund under a State unemployment compensation law approved by the Board under section 1603 and to comply otherwise with such law. Such

permission is subject to the conditions imposed by subsection (b) of this section upon permission to State legislatures to require contributions from instrumentalities of the United States. The Authority is authorized and directed to comply with the provisions of any applicable State unemployment compensation law as the employer of individuals whose service constitutes employment under such law by reason of this subsection."

(i) Section 1607 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(n) Certain employees of Columbia Valley Authority: The term 'employment' shall include such service as is determined by the Columbia Valley Authority (hereinafter called the Authority) to be performed after December 31, 1946, by (1) a laborer, mechanic, or workman, in connection with construction work or the operation and maintenance of the Authority's properties and facilities, or (2) an employee retained or hired in connection with interim operations under section 15 of the Columbia Valley Authority Act, as an employee performing service for the Authority. The term 'wages' means, with respect to service which constitutes employment by reason of this subsection, such amount of remuneration as is determined (subject to the provisions of this section) by the Authority to be paid for such service. The Authority is authorized and directed to comply with the provisions of the internal revenue laws as the employer of individuals whose service constitutes employment by reason of this subsection."

(j) All contracts to which the Corporation is a party and which require the employment of laborers and mechanics in the construction, alteration, maintenance, or repair of buildings, dams, locks, or other structures or facilities, shall contain a provision that not less than the prevailing rates of wages for work of a similar nature in the vicinity shall be paid to such laborers or mechanics. In the event any dispute arises as to what are the prevailing rates of wages, the question shall be referred to the Secretary of Labor for determination, and his decision shall be final. In the determination of such prevailing rate or rates, due regard shall be given to those rates which have been secured through collective agreement by representatives of employers and employees.

(k) The Corporation is authorized to request the assistance and advice of any officer, agent, or employee of any executive department, independent office, or agency of the United States, to enable the Corporation the better to carry out its powers successfully. The executive departments and independent offices and agencies of the United States are authorized to make such officers, agents, and employees available to the Corporation with or without reimbursement upon terms mutually agreeable to such department, independent office, or agency and the Corporation. The Corporation may accept and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as it finds helpful in carrying out the purposes of this act; and in connection with the utilization of such services reasonable payments may be allowed for necessary travel and other expenses. The Corporation, upon the basis of such authorization or approval as the Board may determine, may pay the expenses for travel of an employee and for transportation of his household effects, in connection with a change in his official station.

FINANCE, AUDITS, ACCOUNTS, AND REPORTS

SEC. 20. (a) The proceeds for each fiscal year derived by the Corporation from the sale of electric energy, the returns from water contracts, and the sale of any products manufactured by the Corporation and from any other activities of the Corporation, including the disposition of any real or personal property, shall be used for the following purposes and in the following order of priority:

(1) For payment of the expenses of the Corporation for operation and maintenance of dams and reservoirs and for conducting its business in generating, transmitting, and distributing electrical energy; for the establishment and maintenance of reserves for such purposes in amounts determined by the Corporation to be necessary and reasonable; and for a continuing emergency fund of $1,000,000 to defray emergency expenses and to insure continuous operation: *Provided*, That the funds covering such reserves shall be used only for the purposes for which they are maintained and shall not be impaired by any other payments authorized by this act.

(2) For payments in lieu of taxes pursuant to section 23 of this act.

(3) Subject to the provisions of section 21 of this act, for payments of interest and the principal of all outstanding revenue bonds of the Corporation as the same may become due and payable according to their terms, and for any sinking fund payments and the creation of any reserves required by the terms of the said bonds, or of any indenture agreement or instrument executed in connection therewith.

(4) For covering into the Treasury of the United States annually the appropriate payment on the reimbursement obligations established by the Corporation and approved by the President pursuant to section 14 of this act: *Provided*, That in any fiscal year in which the Corporation's revenues are not sufficient to cover into the Treasury the said sum in whole or in part, the unpaid amount shall be carried forward as a continuing obligation of the Corporation to pay and shall thereafter be paid to the Treasury in the same manner as the annual payments herein provided for.

(5) Subject to the provisions of section 21 of this act, for purchasing and retiring before maturity any of the Corporation's outstanding revenue bonds and for covering into the Treasury for the purpose of making advance payments on the reimbursement obligations established pursuant to section 14 of this act.

(6) All remaining revenues shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States at the end of each calendar year.

(b) The Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account. In January of each year the Board shall file with the President and the Congress a financial statement and a report as to the business of the Corporation covering the preceding governmental fiscal year.

(c) Subject to the provisions of this section, the Corporation shall determine and prescribe the manner in which its obligations and expenses shall be incurred, allowed, paid, and audited: *Provided*, That in addition to such audits by others as the Corporation may deem necessary or desirable, if any, the Comptroller General of the United States shall audit the transactions of the Corporation at such times as he shall determine, but not less frequently than once each governmental fiscal year, with personnel of his selection. In such connection he and his representatives shall have free and open access to all papers, books, records, files, accounts, plants, warehouses, offices, and all other things, property, and places belonging to or under the control of or used or employed by the Corporation, and shall be afforded full facilities for counting all cash and verifying transactions with and balances in depositaries. He shall make report of each such audit in quadruplicate, one copy for the President of the United States, one for the Chairman of the Board, one for public inspection at the principal office of the Corporation, and the other to be submitted by him to the Congress: *Provided*, That such report shall not be made until the Corporation shall have had reasonable opportunity to examine the exceptions and criticisms of the Comptroller General or the General Accounting Office, to point out errors therein, explain or answer the same, and to file a statement which shall be submitted by the Comptroller General with his report. The expenses for each such audit shall be paid from any appropriation or appropriations for the General Accounting Office, and such part of such expenses as may be allocated to the cost of generating, transmitting, and distributing electric energy shall be reimbursed promptly by the Corporation as billed by the Comptroller General. The Comptroller General shall make special report to the President of the United States and to the Congress of any transaction or condition found by him to be in conflict with the power or duties entrusted to the Corporation by law.

(d) Nothing in this act shall be construed to relieve the treasurer or other accountable officers or employees of the Corporation from compliance with the provision of existing law requiring the rendition of accounts for adjustment and settlement pursuant to section 236, Revised Statutes, as amended by section 305 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 24), and accounts for all receipts and disbursements by or for the Corporation shall be rendered accordingly: *Provided*, That subject only to the provisions of this act, the Corporation is authorized to enter into such contracts, agreements, and arrangements, including the amendment, modification, adjustment, or cancellation thereof, and the compromise or final settlement of any claim arising thereunder, and of all litigation by or against the Corporation, and to make such expenditures, upon such terms and conditions and in such manner, as it may deem necessary and, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law governing the expenditure of public funds, the General Accounting Office, in the settlement of the accounts of the treasurer or other accountable officer or employee of the Corporation, shall not disallow credit for, nor withhold funds because of, any expenditure which the Board shall determine to have been necessary to carry out the provisions of said act.

(e) The Corporation shall determine its own system of administrative accounts and the forms and contents of its contracts and other business documents except as otherwise provided in this act.

(f) All funds required by the Corporation in addition to those derived and expended pursuant to subsection (a) hereof shall be provided by appropriation in accordance with the procedures of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 (42 Stat. 20), as amended, except as otherwise provided herein. All appropriations necessary to carry out the provisions of this act are hereby authorized.

REVENUE BONDS AND USE OF PROCEEDS

SEC. 21. The Corporation is authorized to issue and sell or exchange from time to time revenue bonds, revenue notes, and revenue obligations (all of which are hereinafter referred to as revenue bonds), and to use the proceeds thereof for the acquisitions authorized by section 15 (d) of this act, for providing funds for the rehabilitation of properties acquired pursuant thereto and working capital with which to commence operation thereof, but not more than 5 percent of the amount paid in any acquisition may be used for such purposes, and for purchasing, refunding, or redeeming outstanding revenue bonds. The interest and principal and other charges on such revenue bonds shall be paid only from the revenues from the Corporation's generation, transmission, and sale of electric energy pursuant to this act, and from the proceeds of the sales or other dispositions authorized by section 15 (e) of this act. The said revenue bonds shall express on their face that they are not direct obligations of the United States, and that the payment of the principal and interest on the bonds is not guaranteed

by the United States. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in such series and in such forms and denominations, shall mature within such period not more than 50 years from the date of their issue, may provide for redemption before maturity at the option of the Corporation or through the operation of any sinking fund in such manner and on such terms as may be stipulated therein, may carry such registration and conversion provisions, shall contain such provisions with respect to negotiability, may require the establishment of such sinking funds, shall bear such rates of interest, shall include such terms, conditions, and covenants not inconsistent with this act, shall be issued in such manner and amount, and shall be sold at such prices and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Corporation: *Provided*, That none of the properties or moneys of the Corporation or of the United States which are entrusted to the Corporation, other than power revenues and the proceeds of the sales or other dispositions authorized by section 15 (e) of this act, shall be pledged or mortgaged as security for any such revenue bonds or for any other purpose. The Corporation is authorized to execute such indentures, agreements, and other instruments as it may determine to be necessary to set forth the terms and conditions upon which revenue bonds are or may be issued under this act. Such revenue bonds shall be lawful investments, and may be accepted as security for all fiduciary, trust, and public funds, the investment or deposit of which shall be under the authority or control of the United States, or any officer or officers thereof. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Secretary of the Treasury in their discretion are authorized to purchase any revenue bonds issued hereunder, and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under said act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of the Corporation's revenue bonds hereunder. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Secretary of the Treasury may, at any time, sell any of the revenue bonds of the Corporation acquired by them under this section. All purchases and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of the revenue bonds of the Corporation shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States. The Corporation shall have the power to purchase such revenue bonds in the open market at any time and at any price.

PROCUREMENT OF SUPPLIES AND SERVICES

SEC. 22. The Corporation may cause to be performed by contract any construction work authorized by this act. All purchases and contracts for supplies or services, except for personal services, made by the Corporation shall be made after advertising, in such manner and at such times sufficiently in advance of opening bids, as the Board shall determine to be adequate to insure notice and opportunity for competition: *Provided, however*, That advertisement shall not be required when (1) the Corporation determines that an emergency or insurance of continuous operation requires immediate delivery of the supplies or performance of the services; or (2) parts, accessories, supplemental equipment, extensions, additions, or services are required for supplies, facilities, or services previously furnished, constructed, or contracted for; or (3) the aggregate amount involved in any purchase of supplies or procurement of services does not exceed $500; in which cases such purchases of supplies or procurement of services may be made in the open market in the manner common among businessmen. In comparing bids and in making awards, the Board may consider such factors as relative quality and adaptability of supplies or services, the bidder's financial responsibility, plant, equipment and facilities, skill, experience, record of integrity in dealing, previous record of performance and compliance with specifications, and ability to furnish repairs and maintenance services, and the time of delivery or performance offered.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

SEC. 23. (a) Subject to the provision of this section, the Corporation is authorized and directed to make the following payments in lieu of taxes:

(1) Payments shall be made in lieu of real and personal property taxes on any electric utility system or other property acquired by the Corporation pursuant to section 15 (d) of this act.

(2) Payments shall be made in lieu of business, franchise, excise, and other similar State and local taxes allocable to any electric distribution or related facilities acquired by the Corporation pursuant to section 15 (d) of this act and temporarily operated by the Corporation.

(3) Whenever the Corporation determines that the tax revenues of any State, county, district, or other taxing unit have been substantially affected by the acquisition of real or personal property or any interest therein by the Corporation other than property subject to clauses (1) and (2) of this subsection, and that the loss sustained thereby by such taxing unit has not been offset by gains derived by that unit from the operations of the Corporation, payment in an amount equal to the excess of such loss over such gains shall be made in lieu of real and personal property taxes on such property.

(b) As soon as practicable after the Corporation acquires property on, or by virtue of the operation of, which payments in lieu of taxes are to be made, the Corporation shall determine the average amount of the taxes paid or payable to the taxing unit by the previous owners on or by virtue of the operation of such property during the last 3 years, or such portion thereof as the property was subject to taxation, preceding the Corporation's acquisition thereof. On the date or dates on which each such tax is next due and payable according to law, or as soon thereafter as practicable, and at the corresponding time or times during each succeeding year, the Corporation shall pay such average amount so determined, or such lesser amount as may be required by subdivision (3) of subsection (a) of this section, to the respective officers or agencies to which said taxes would be paid had the property remained in private ownership, such payments to be distributed in the same manner and in the same proportions as the taxes in lieu of which the payments are made or in such other manner or proportion as the State legislature may direct.

(c) If the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof is required by statute or agreement authorized by statute to make any payments in lieu of taxes on any property, or to pay any portion of the revenue derived from any property, the use thereof or any products produced therefrom, transferred to the Corporation pursuant to section 9 of this act, the Corporation shall continue to make such payments after the consummation of the transfer. The payments provided by this subsection shall be in lieu of any payments otherwise authorized by this section.

(d) No payment authorized by this section in lieu of any tax shall be made on account of properties which the Corporation shall have disposed of prior to the date on which such tax becomes due and payable. For the purposes of this section property owned or acquired by the United States shall be deemed to have been acquired by and to be the property of the Corporation. The determination of the Corporation of the necessity of making any payments under this section and of the amounts thereof shall be final.

(e) The payments authorized under this section are in lieu of taxation and the Corporation, its property, franchises, and income are hereby expressly exempted from taxation in any manner or form by any State, county, municipality, or any subdivision or district thereof.

(f) The Corporation shall, not later than 5 years after the enactment of this act, submit to the Congress a report on the operation of the provisions of this section, including a statement of the distribution to the various taxing units hereunder; the effect of the operation of the provisions of this section on State and local finances; and appraisal of the benefits of the program of the Corporation to the States receiving payments hereunder, and the effect of such benefits in increasing taxable values within such States; and such other data, information, and recommendations as may be pertinent to future legislation.

USE OF PATENTS

SEC. 24. (a) The Corporation, as an instrumentality of the Government of the United States, shall have access to the Patent Office of the United States for the purpose of studying, ascertaining, and copying all methods, formulas, and scientific information (not including access to pending applications for patents) necessary to enable the Corporation to use and employ the most efficacious and economical processes in the course of its operations. Except as provided in subsection (b), any owner of a patent whose patent rights may have been thus in any way copied, used, infringed, or employed by the exercise of this authority by the Corporation shall have as the exclusive remedy a cause of action against the Corporation, to be instituted and prosecuted in the appropriate district court of the United States for the recovery of reasonable compensation for such infringement. The Commissioner of Patents shall furnish to the Corporation, at its request and without payment of fees, copies of documents on file in his office.

(b) Any invention or discovery made by virtue of and incidental to service to the Corporation by an employee of the Government of the United States pursuant to section 19 of this act or otherwise, or by any employee of the Corporation, together with any patents which may be granted thereon, shall be the sole and exclusive property of the Corporation, which is hereby authorized to grant licenses thereunder, and under any other patents owned by it. The Corporation may pay to the employee making any such invention or discovery such sum from, or percentage of, the income from the sale of licenses as it may deem proper.

STATE COMPACTS

SEC. 25. The consent of the Congress, subject to the provisions of this section, is hereby given the several States to enter into agreements and compacts between or among any two or more States (1) to further and supplement on behalf of the States the purpose of this act, and (2) to carry out on behalf of the States appropriate projects and activities in relation thereto: *Provided, however*, That no such agreement or compact shall become effective or binding upon the States parties thereto unless and until it shall have been submitted to the Corporation and ratified by Congress. The Corporation shall recommend the ratification of any such agreement or compact if it finds such agreement or compact and the projects and activities contemplated thereby, to be feasible, practicable, and appropriate to and consistent with the policies and purposes of this act, and shall, insofar as practicable, cooperate with and furnish information and assistance to the States for the purposes of

negotiating, entering into, and carrying out agreements and compacts pursuant to this section.

PENAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 26. (a) All general penal statutes relating to the larceny, embezzlement, conversion, or to the improper handling, retention, use, or disposal of public moneys or property of the United States shall apply to the moneys and property of the Corporation and to moneys and properties of the United States entrusted to the Corporation.

(b) Any person who, with intent to defraud the Corporation, or to deceive any director, officer, or employee of the Corporation or any officer or employee of the United States, (1) makes any false entry in any books of the Corporation, or (2) makes any false report or statement for the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

(c) Any person who shall receive any compensation, rebate, or reward, or shall enter into any conspiracy, collusion, or agreement, express or implied, with intent to defraud the Corporation or wrongfully and unlawfully to defeat its purposes, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

REPEALER PROVISIONS

SEC. 27. All acts or parts of acts in conflict herewith are hereby repealed, so far as they affect the operations contemplated by this act. Effective as of the date the transfers authorized by section 9 (a) of this act become effective, the act of August 20, 1937, entitled "An act to authorize the completion, maintenance, and operation of Bonneville project for navigation, and for other purposes" (50 Stat. 731), as amended, is hereby repealed.

SEPARABILITY PROVISIONS

SEC. 28. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

CONSTRUCTION OF ACT

SEC. 29. This act shall be liberally construed to carry out the purposes of Congress to provide for the disposition of and make needful rules and regulations respecting Government properties entrusted to the Corporation, provide for the national defense, improve navigation, control destructive floods, and promote interstate commerce and general welfare.

We Just Can't Afford the Brass Hats' Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of December 21, 1945:

WE JUST CAN'T AFFORD THE BRASS HATS' DREAM

If the armed forces are unified properly, the cost of national defense will be lowered materially. Even with wasteful duplication eliminated, however, the cost of adequate defense will be a heavy financial burden on the American people during the years to come.

Interest on the national debt of $260,000,000,000 will require an annual outlay of $5,000,000,000. Other fixed costs of Federal Government will be at least $11,000,000,000 annually. If the people embark on some addditional welfare programs, the cost will be greater. Some reductions must be made in the amount of national indebtedness if our well-being is to be safeguarded.

Without debt retirement, however, we seem destined to raise at least $16,000,000,000 annually for basic governmental requirements outside of national defense.

It is estimated that Federal receipts during the fiscal year 1946 will amount to $39,000,000,000. Congress already has reduced taxes for 1947 by more than $5,000,000,000, and the taxpayers expect greater reductions. The 1947 budget estimates about to be submitted to Congress are expected to call for expenditures close to $50,000,000,000—or at least $16,000,000,000 more than estimated receipts.

Drastic reductions in Federal expenditures are essential if we are not to continue piling up the national debt and, of course, the interest charges on the national debt.

Those responsible for national defense apparently have given little thought to such a possibility. They serenely go ahead making proposals for national defense which, in addition to showing little consideration of the implications of the atomic era and attempts to organize collective security, show singular unawareness of the financial limitations of even the richest body of taxpayers in the world.

Senator TAFT estimates the armed forces proposed annual budget at $9,000,000,000. Others compute the proposals as calling for annual outlays of $11,000,000,000. This, mind you, solely for postwar defense—not for care of the disabled of previous wars, pensions to dependents, etc.

If Senator TAFT'S $9,000,000,000 computation of armed forces' demands is added to the inescapable $16,000,000,000 basic expenditures, the demand on the taxpayers during the years ahead will be $25,000,000,000. And not a penny for debt retirement.

Senator GEORGE, one of the shrewdest members of the Senate Finance Committee, estimates that the most the Federal Government can raise by taxation during those years would be $18,000,000,000.

It does not require much statesmanship to comprehend that some things some folks want done are not going to be done by taxpayers in quest of a better life after the arduous years of war and its immediate aftermath.

When the Army awakens to the facts of life in peacetime, it will realize that the limitless resources and unquestioned compliances it rightly enjoyed during the crisis have come to an end. The people will give the armed forces a generous amount of money for national defense, but what they give will be a fraction of what was given to fight a war.

That money will be expected to provide a strong navy, a strong air force, a small but highly trained professional army, an effective national guard and Officers' Reserve Corps and continuing scientific research into new forms of warfare.

If intelligent use is made of these reduced funds, the defense of this country will be assured.

While peace seems assured, the armed forces must not count on more than four or five billions annually for total defense outlay. They may have to get along with half that sum.

The Army hasn't the slightest realization of this prospect. Instead of trying to shape a realistic defense program, it is daydreaming of what it will do with a full year of the time of every physically fit American male youth between the ages of 18 and 22 for all the years ahead.

When an unnamed Army officer recently was quoted as saying the War Department would compromise on the less costly, more politically possible 4 months' training program proposed by the National Guard Association of the United States, and the American Legion, the War Department officially repudiated the report. The brass hats in the Pentagon are still insistent on 12 months of universal compulsory military training in peacetime for every American youth.

Their proposal, it should be understood, has nothing to do with relief for veterans still overseas. The trainees sought by the brass hats would not be subject to overseas service. Replacements for overseas will continue to be supplied from selective service or volunteers.

Compulsory peacetime training as the War Department proposed it last February would add $4,500,000,000 annually to defense expenditures for Navy, Air Force, Regular Army, and research.

The War Department now says it could train 1,000,000 youths for 1 year at an annual cost of $1,720,000,000. No explanation is offered for such a drastic reduction in cost in an era of rising costs.

But the Nation hasn't even a billion and three quarters to spend annually for a form of national defense whose utility is disputed by many competent authorities. We want better value for our defense money, and we think we can more usefully employ the time of our youth from an educational standpoint. It's time for the War Department to come down to earth.

Leif Ericsson Statue Should Be Erected in Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, to the people of Norwegian descent, and many others, it has been a source of wonder why an appropriate statue of Leif Ericsson, the first discoverer of America, has not been erected in the National Capital.

On November 26 I introduced House Joint Resolution 279, authorizing the erection of a statue in the District of Columbia and providing an appropriation for the preparation of the site and the erection of a pedestal upon which to place the statue. A joint resolution also was introduced in the Senate by Senators YOUNG, SHIPSTEAD, MAGNUSON, and WILEY.

There has been considerable sentiment on the part of newspapers and individuals for the erection of this statue.

A recent editorial on the subject, which appeared in the Washington (D. C.) Star, dated November 18, 1945, follows:

LEIF ERICSSON MONUMENT

Four Members of the United States Senate have joined to sponsor a resolution providing for the erection of a monument to Leif Ericsson in Washington. If the proposal is approved, the first known European discoverer of North America will have an appropriate memorial in the Federal city where Christopher Columbus already is commemorated abundantly. The rivalry between the

partisans of the two venturers probably never will disappear, and there is no particular reason why it should. Dozens of men probably found the New World from Europe. The American Indians and the Eskimos—hundreds of thousands of both groups—came to it from the Orient perhaps as much as 10 millenniums ago.

Leif Ericsson's visit is interesting because it was convincingly recorded. He was a son of Eric the Red, the founder of the earliest Scandinavian settlements in Greenland. In 999 he went to the court of King Olaf Tryggvason, in Norway, and was commissioned by him to return to Greenland and proclaim Christianity there. Driven far out of his normal course by contrary weather, he came in the year 1000 to a shore of which he had previously had no knowledge—a place which he called Vinland, Vineland, or Wineland the Good. The name indicates the presence of grapes in quantity. Nobody knows certainly what area was meant, but it may have been southern Nova Scotia or even Rhode Island.

The saga designated numbers 544 and 557 in the Arne-Magnaean collection in Copenhagen tells how Leif Ericsson took samples of selfsewn wheat, more likely corn, and mosur wood and carried them in his ship to his father's home in Brattahlid in Greenland. Thorfinn Karlsefni, a scion of a prominent Icelandic family, 2 years later led an expedition of a hundred and sixty men and some women, including his wife and a daughter of Red Eric, to a country they described as Helluland from its large slabs of stone, theoretically Labrador, and subsequently to a thickly wooded territory they called Markland, maybe Newfoundland. Still later Thorfinn and his companions sailed south for a long time to the mouth of a river, conceivably the Connecticut or the Hudson, and attempted a settlement there. Skraelings, supposedly Beothuk or Micmac Indians, after a few weeks drove the colonists north to Streamfiord. Eventually, in 1006 the Vinland enterprise was abandoned and the survivors returned to Greenland.

But the legend survived the failure and it still makes good reading, especially as told by Maurice Hewlett in fictional form in Gudrid the Fair. No one, admittedly, knows what Leif Ericsson or Thorfinn Karlsefni looked like. If either or both of them are to be represented in the projected monument, the sculptor must rely upon his imagination. Even so, it will be fitting and proper for them to be remembered in Washington.

Why Take It to Congress?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted heretofore, I wish to extend in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial from the Oregonian, published in my district, in its issue of December 21, 1945:

WHY TAKE IT TO CONGRESS?

The National Constitution designates the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. The scope of his power in that regard has been passed upon a number of times by the United States Supreme Court. The ruling decisions hold that by virtue of his position he has undoubted power to establish rules and regulations for the government of the Army and Navy, or may modify or repeal or create them anew, and that such rules and regulations cannot be questioned on the ground that they are unwise.

This page is not opposed to coordination of the armed forces. We are for it. But it seems to us that in determining upon the manner in which coordination shall be attempted, the power of the President of the United States to establish rules and regulations and change them at will has in its flexibility a profound advantage over acts of Congress, which if found of poor or questionable workmanship can be corrected or modified only by convincing a majority of two Houses of Congress just what ought to be done about it.

Mr. Truman, in his message urging Congress to enact laws unifying the armed services, acknowledges by strong implication his own power to coordinate the Army, Navy, and Air Force. He argues that with other problems before him, the President cannot be expected personally to balance either the organization, the training or the practices of the several branches of national defense, but should be able to rely for that coordination upon civilian hands at the Cabinet level.

Granted. But we believe that the President has the authority, without sanction of Congress, to summon chiefs of staff and designated high commands into round-table discussions presided over by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of Navy, whichever he may choose, and with that Cabinet officer empowered in the President's name to umpire points of controversy, direct removal of duplications, establish change in practices and weigh claims for dominance in men and equipment of this or that branch of the service as the science of defense shall dictate.

The President can obtain reliance for coordination upon civilian hands at the Cabinet level without, in this period of fluidity of ideas on relative importance to offense and defense of the three armed services, basing it upon the rigidity of an act of Congress.

The Nation is at peace. There is no foreseeable prospect that it will soon be drawn into another war. It is a time that lends itself to exploration into the field of unification of the armed services. But if by unforeseen circumstances we should be drawn into war before an inflexible act of Congress has been given the test of trial and error we may find a less effective coordination than we had in the war that has ended.

The unification plan that has the presumptive endorsement of the President comes from the War Department. It is supported by the Army from top to bottom. It is opposed by the Navy from top to bottom. Each service has its friends and sympathizers in Congress. In so complete a split of opinion, one who is of open mind is prone to suspect that the scheme in its scope is founded in jealousy on the part of the Army and that opposition is founded in the pride and traditions of the Navy.

Since the founding of the Republic the Navy has been, in the sense of permanency, the Nation's first line of defense. We have never had a real army except in time of war. We have built up the Navy, and at times have sent it round the world to awe other nations. When it came home or made periodical visits we in ports received it with banners and bands and the blowing of whistles. It has embodied glamour and romance, and popular notice. But in peacetimes a skeleton army has been immured in mainland, Alaska, or island posts where nobody pays any attention to it except civilian neighbors. We have in consequence a navy puffed up with its importance and an army that in peacetime suffers an inferiority complex.

As we have said, we are for coordination, but we question whether, in this background, Congress will be able to act fairly and intelligently, and with a foresight that will provide unification equal to coordination by the direction of an Executive who can instantly correct flaws in the system if any shall develop.

"I Don't Deserve That Medal"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, at the Christmas season and at a time when mankind is trying new ways in the effort to achieve peace and good will on earth, we need to be reminded that the one organization that binds together people in all nations in ties that even war cannot break is the Christian Church. As one who was privileged to spend 10 years as a Christian medical missionary in China, including visits and study in Japan, I am including a most inspiring account of how the Christian faith changes the hearts of men in every land. It consists of extracts from a letter written by a teen-age soldier to a friend in his home church. The full story is in Fellowship for November 1945:

"I DON'T DESERVE THAT MEDAL"

You asked about my medal. I haven't told the story of it to anyone, and you will see why when you hear about it. I am not very proud of it, and yet there isn't a thing I can do about it now without revealing a story that would get my new friends into trouble. You may tell the story so long as my name is never attached to it. It is now 2 a. m. Tomorrow I go off to the battlefield. I may never get home again, and I want someone to know that I don't deserve that medal. I didn't earn it.

It happened this way: I was captured by the Japanese with five of my pals. We were marched along through the jungle with bayonets in our backs. As we marched toward the Japanese camp I had to see my comrades one by one killed, mutilated, torn limb from limb. As I watched them fall I knew that within a few minutes I, too, would be killed as they had been. But somehow at that moment my only thought was "the sooner the better." Life for me was over. I said the Twenty-third Psalm. I said the Lord's Prayer. And then I started to think things over. A good bit of the Yankee spirit stayed with me. Die I must, but I determined not to let my captor see my fear.

Trembling from head to foot, marching in mud up to my ankles, with a bayonet sticking in my back, I began to whistle the way I used to when I was a small boy and had to go through a dark street. So I whistled as loud as my trembling lips would let me. After a while, to my surprise, I realized that I was whistling—

"We gather together to ask the Lord's blessing;
He chastens and hastens His will to make known;
The wicked oppressing cease then from distressing,
Sing praises to His name, He forgets not His own."

Suddenly, from my reverie, I became aware that someone had joined me in my whistling. No, it couldn't be, but it was—my Japanese captor. He, too, was whistling the hymn. Soon we both broke into words, he in Japanese, I in English. "The wicked oppressing cease then from distressing. * * * He forgets not His own." Gradually the power of the hymn made me relax, and must have had the same effect on him, for soon I felt his gun fall into place. And still later he caught up with me and we sang, he in Japanese and I in English.

I was interrupted in my thinking by his words in perfect English: "I never cease to wonder at the magnificence of Christian hymns." Startled by his English, I jumped and we both laughed. Soon we were talking. I asked where he had learned to speak English, and he replied that he had gone to Christian mission schools. "Not Glory Kindergarten?" I asked. "Why, I started in Glory Kindergarten," he replied. "How do you know it?" Then I told him how in Sunday school we had studied about the Congregational schools and churches. We had raised money for Glory Kindergarten and had sent over gifts for them.

Then followed a conversation that is impossible to relate—one that few men have ever had with one another—when surface things are swept away and the soul stands out on top. We talked of war and how the Japanese Christians hate it; of Christianity and its power in the world, of what it would mean if people would ever really dare to live it; of the incomparable value of the missionaries; of Kagawa; of our own ideals, for our homes, our jobs, and our future families. And finally, at his suggestion, we knelt in the mud and prayed for suffering humanity around the world, for "His peace that passeth all understanding," and for peace again on earth with good will toward men.

When we arose he asked if I would take him back as a prisoner to the American headquarters. He said that this was the only way he could live up to his Christianity and thus help Japan to become a Christian nation; and on the way back he found in various fox holes other Japanese Christians, and they, too, joined me as we walked toward the American headquarters. I shall never forget the hope and joy that came into their eyes as my Japanese friend unfolded to them, one by one, as he met them, how we found each other, and why and where they were being taken. All the way back we talked of the Christian religion.

When we neared camp, by mutual agreement they put on poker faces and somber looks, and I, gun in hand, marched them into camp. After the war is over they will spend their lives keeping alive and spreading an ever-growing Christian community in Japan.

So, you see, I don't deserve a medal for the most wonderful experience of my life. You surely see now why I don't want to talk about my medal.

Deflating Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 19, 1945

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I am talking to you today on behalf of the farmers—about those who till the soil and feed the Nation. I am also speaking in behalf of the farmers' friends—the small businessman and the laborer. There is not a businessman or a laborer in our Nation whose prosperity does not depend upon the prosperity of agriculture—whose welfare is not linked and intermingled with that of the farmer.

The war is over. The farmer is again left holding the bag. On every hand, agricultural prices are tumbling. The farmer is not being deflated. He was never permitted to become inflated. He was urged not only to feed our own Army but the armies of the United Nations.

The sad thing is that Congress and the Nation have been led to believe that the farmer is rolling in wealth. Some Members of Congress do not understand that all the farmer has been getting from the Government is lip service. Up to 1946 no farm legislation has been passed that gives to the farmer price protection.

In 1932–33, and again in 1938–39, agricultural prices and income went into a complete collapse and our national income suffered in the same ratio—only the war saved the situation. Had a cost-of-production bill been passed, no such economic disaster could have overtaken our Nation.

The farmer himself, however, has become conscious of the fact that he is underprivileged. But he need not be underprivileged. If he had asserted himself he would long ago have gotten cost of production—100-percent parity.

I know the farm situation. I know it from boyhood experience, and more recently from contact and observation. I know it from the time that my father paid 12 percent interest and a bonus, and used to sell his wheat for 37 cents a bushel. I know it from the time that my mother sold eggs for 7 cents a dozen and butter for 6 cents a pound.

I know it from the time that taxes were $8 for 160 acres, shoes $1.50 a pair, and overalls 50 cents, and a binder cost less than $100. I know it from the time that the youngsters had to go barefoot because the family income did not permit shoes, and the mothers were kept busy patching the seats and knees of the youngsters' trousers. I know it from pioneer days and low prices—from the time that the prairie was ours for the taking.

I am aware that because of five abundant crops and war prices farm conditions have apparently improved. I know that the farmer realizes that these conditions will not continue. I know that the farmer realizes that he has been living in a fool's paradise. He realizes that in order to keep the armies going he had to wear out all his farm machinery, and work his children and old folks from 14 to 18 hours a day. If he had lived in a city he would have been arrested for violating the child-labor laws and cruelty to the aged.

He worked night and day to keep the war machinery supplied with food. His home and his buildings were permitted to depreciate—go unrepaired and unpainted. He kept his farm implements going until they fell to pieces. In many cases he worked in rags. This while our Government was supplying foreign civilians with the working clothes and the farm machinery that by right were his. He produced the crops necessary to win the war.

He lived on his past accumulations—on the accumulation of farm machinery, a home, granaries, fences, barns and other buildings, and improvements. Many of these must now be replaced and others reconditioned. He has to start from scratch. His accumulated wealth is virtually gone. The mortgage he paid off will have to be replaced. He will again be in the red unless he gets cost of production.

He knows that in 1939 the average net income per farm family in North Dakota was only $685. He knows that in the same year the net annual income per farm family in all but 8 or 10 States was less than $800. He knows that agriculture produces 82 percent of all new raw wealth; that the miner, lumberjack, fisherman, and others produce only 18 percent. He knows that industry, commerce, and finance simply process and distribute that which in the first place must come from the earth.

The farmer realizes that he is discriminated against and is not getting his fair share of the new wealth he creates each year. He realizes that there will again be lower prices, and that there will again be poor as well as good crops. He realizes that in order to measure his future prosperity, you must measure his income over a period of years. He knows that in considering his future welfare you must take the average and not select only a few favorable years.

The farmer knows that he never got over 75-percent parity. He knows that the Department of Agriculture shamefully kept agricultural prices down by juggling figures. He knows that the Department in 1934 and since, reduced his income by $2,000,000,000 a year. This was done under the excuse that a mistake of $2,000,000,000 had been made in figuring the farm income during the basic period of 1910–14. He knows that the parity scheme was proposed to resist the farm demand for cost of production.

Now that this cruel war is over, the farmer will again be made the goat. He will again be made the shock absorber, unless Congress assures him cost of production. For 30 years the Government has farm boarded, triple A'd, OPA'd, WPB'd, subsidized, parity'd, penalized and deceived the farmer. He has been rolled back and regimented by an ignorant bureaucracy. In the words of the world's greatest sculptor, Gutzon Borglum, "They are determined to make the farmer dependent in order to control the source of all independent thought."

These bureaucrats not only abused the farmer's patience but suppressed the truth and falsified the facts. They gave him a new deal, a double deal, with stacked cards, loaded dice and points. They compelled him to wear out his old tires looking for a second hand inner tube, and to use up his gasoline chasing AAA agents to get permits for this and that.

Then when he got the permit he discovered that the combine, tractor or drill, cream separator or egg beater, the hoe or pitchfork he was supposed to get was somewhere in Europe, Asia, India, Canada, or Africa. They limited and rationed him almost out of business.

I repeat in the past the farmer has been fleeced and made to believe that he was being helped. His production was curtailed and restricted. His hogs and calves were wantonly destroyed, and his wealth curtailed. Under the philosophy of the abundant life by scarcity a former Secretary of Agriculture told him what he could plant and what he could not plant, what he could wear and what he could not wear, that he could eat or consume, or that he could not eat or consume the products of his own labor.

He was penalized 49 cents a bushel for winter wheat planted 7 months before the law was passed. It became a crime for his wife to grind in a coffee mill a few pounds of wheat raised on their own farm and bake it into bread. Under this law the Department of Agriculture filched from the farmers over $20,000,000 in penalties. Some farmers burned their wheat rather than to submit to this extortion.

About 2 years ago the former Secretary of Agriculture bungled some more. He asked the farmer to increase his hog and poultry production 20 percent. Then the Food Administrator prohibited him from marketing these hogs. The loss in feed and dockage for overweight and underweight was the farmer's. The result of these blunders is a shortage of ham, bacon, and pork products.

Again, the farmer is still hounded by the Federal feed and seed loan collectors. The Government canceled the franchise tax of the Federal Reserve banks and the railroads. We are now asked to cancel $42,000,000,000 lend-lease for foreign nations. We are asked to cancel the $15,000,000,000 they still owe us from World War I. These nations now ask that we give—not loan—them billions more.

Great Britain now offers to settle by promising to pay $1 on every $60 of the $34,000,000,000 she owes us, provided we give her an additional $4,400,000,000 at 1½ percent interest. The truth is that she will promise, but she will not pay back even $1 out of $60 on the $34,000,000,000, or 1 penny on the $4,400,000,000. She will call us "Uncle Shylock" instead. The time has come for our Uncle Sam to regain his senses and cut out these foreign flirtations. These nations have neither virtue nor decency left. They are just gold diggers and bad company for Uncle Sam. They play him for a sucker.

But when the farmers ask the Government to cancel the old feed and seed loans they get the cold shoulder. So far we have not been able to get a majority of Congress to support a resolution to cancel these old loans. The Farm Credit Administration is opposing this cancellation. They claim that they collected—should be extorted—$10,000,000 on these loans.

Yes, they got their pound of flesh. In some cases where the husband died, they refused to allow the widow funeral expenses. In other cases, they garnisheed the farmer's wages long after they had taken his farm. I know of no buzzard that goes after his carrion with more zest than the Farm Credit Administration buzzard parading under the authority of the Government of the United States.

During the war one set of bureaucrats told the farmer when he could buy a tire, a stove, a washing machine, a cream separator, a tractor, a plow, or a combine. This so that they could give them to people of other nations—to bribe good neighbors with. Another set of bureaucrats drafted the sons and husbands essential to agriculture. They told the parents and the wives that if they, their grandparents, and little children could not do the work of their sons and husbands, that then they could substitute imported Jamaicans and Mexicans.

Then, in place of canceling the old feed and seed loans, Congress added insult to injury by raising the interest from 3½ to 4 percent on Federal land-bank loans. One and a half percent interest on foreign loans, that never will be paid, but 4 percent on agricultural loans. The Government's treatment of agriculture—the backbone of the Nation—is a sordid picture.

The farmers compose about one-fourth of our population. Ultimately, in self-preservation, they will unite solidly for justice. Why not now? If they ever organize with the same unity that labor has organized, then they will get what they are entitled to. Then they will get cost of production. The war has not solved the agricultural problem. There will again be deflation—a financial collapse. This unless Congress passes the cost-of-production bill. This bill, and this bill alone, can protect the farmer. It is the solution to the farm problem.

For this reason I again introduced the cost-of-production bill, H. R. 2861. This bill is the combined work of many Members and farm leaders. It was first introduced in 1933. Since then, it has been improved and reintroduced in every session of Congress. This is the final and streamlined twentieth revision and edition. This bill has had the support of over 600 Members of Congress since its first introduction. It, at one time, had as many as 186 Members sign a petition at the Speaker's desk, asking that it be brought up for final disposition on its merits.

The interest on our $300,000,000,000 public debt will have to be paid. This cannot be done unless the basic industry—agriculture—is prosperous. This bill when passed will taper off inflation—the $28,049,136,408 of new paper money that we printed for cost-plusers and lend-leasers. This is five times as much money as we ever had in circulation before. After the last war, we nearly wrecked the Nation by deflating our currency $800,000,000. This time, unless this bill is passed, there may be a deflation of five or ten billion dollars overnight.

This bill would give the farmer the average cost of production of 43 principal agricultural products. Such average cost of production would be determined after public hearings, participated in by representatives of farmers' organizations. It would include depreciation and soil depletion and all items of cost, including production expenses, interest, taxes, wages of farm and family labor, a return of 4 percent on farm property equity and compensation to the average farm operator equivalent to the average weekly earnings of the industrial workers, as found and determined by the Secretary of Labor. Can any honest person object to that?

At present nearly all agricultural products sell below the cost of production price. Under this bill, the farmer would get for choice and prime finished steers $22.61 per hundred pounds; for veal calves, $19.20; for lambs, $22; hogs, $22.25; milk, $5 per hundred pounds. He would get $1.77 per bushel for corn, $2.18 for wheat, $1.19 for oats, $1.28 for barley, and so forth. These are the minimum, average, year round, cost of production prices. They are the floor, not the ceiling.

There is nothing confusing about this. That does not mean a different price for individual farmers or individual steers. A choice steer is a choice steer in Texas, North Dakota, or Ohio. Under this bill the price would be the same plus freight differentials.

In order to prevent the passage of the cost-of-production bill, the ignorant bureaucrats offered the processor and the farmer subsidies. Subsidies are a fraud and a deception. Only the unthinking believe they can pull themselves up by their own boot straps. If these subsidies were paid out of present taxation, then for every 50 cents we receive, we would have to tax ourselves $1. The other 50 cents would go to the pay-rollers, to the pie counter brigade that collects and dishes them out to us.

But since we already are $300,000,000,000 in debt, subsidies had to be paid out of additional borrowed money. Now that our sons are returning they will be called upon not only to help pay the board bill of the "stay at homers," but to help pay the salaries and the board bill of the pay-rollers, together with interest.

Let Congress pass cost of production for the farmer. Then you will not have to subsidize anybody. The farmer is getting onto the hypocritical scheme of subsidizing and regimenting him. He is through with that ignorance. We are not going back to the Dark Ages. We are going forward to cost of production for agriculture.

Again, we are told by the bureaucracy that if we give the farmer what it costs him to feed the Nation, that then we will have inflation. Everybody but a mental defective knows that we have inflation. It was brought about by the Federal Reserve banks running the printing presses for the big boys—not for the farmers or the wage earners. It was brought about when we printed $28,049,136,408 for the cost-plusers and the lend-leasers—for foreign nations—where there never was over $5,700,000,000 before.

The only way to stop inflation is for the President and the Federal Reserve banking system to stop printing more money. Let them call in some of the surplus money they have issued. There is where inflation must be halted if you are going to halt it. Why should we cowardly argue all around the thing that needs correction and that needs watching?

Unless we get this bill passed and give the farmer cost of production, unless we get this bill passed which will prevent our Government from selling the farmers' domestic market to foreign horse traders, under the reciprocal trade agreements, there will again be thousands of foreclosures. There will again be trainloads of cattle and meat products—millions of bushels of wheat, corn, and flax—imported from Canada, Australia, and Latin America in competition with our farmers and ranchers.

Ultimately the farmers must unite for cost of production—why not now? Subsidies, roll backs, support prices, curtailment, and allotments are all side issues. They are a fraud and a deception upon agriculture. The farmer cannot continue to produce and feed the Nation for less than cost without enslaving himself and his family. Why should he permit bureaucrats with foreign ideologies to sell his domestic market to foreign nations? Why not demand cost of production and an embargo on all foreign importation and substitutes until cost of production, plus 5 percent, has been reached?

The fixed proportion of our national income and employment must consist of nondurable agricultural goods—food, clothes, fuel, transportation, and services that are destroyed through use each year. Otherwise we cannot continue to give full annual employment. Agricultural products built our railroads originally. The railroads did not build agriculture. Agriculture built steel—steel did not build agriculture. For all practical purposes, until recently, we were mainly an agricultural nation. Agriculture built our Nation as it stands today. Let us not destroy the goose that lays the golden egg.

Iowa at Ninety-nine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, a week from today the State of Iowa will complete its ninety-ninth year and enter upon its hundredth year of Statehood. In the centennial year that lies ahead much will be said, and properly so, in commemoration of what the good people of Iowa have done through 99 years of energetic and tireless effort to bring lasting benefits to the State and the Nation.

Nineteen hundred and forty-six will be a year devoted to retrospect. Very properly, the people of Iowa, to whom their motto "Our liberties we prize and our rights we will maintain" is so dear, will pay tribute to the pioneers who did the spade work. They broke the sod, built their simple homes, erected churches and schools, organized government, and bore with patience the burdens that must be borne by men and women who undertake to transform nature in the raw into fertile farms, busy cities, and the numerous business enterprises of prosperous farm and city life. The story of what has been accomplished in Iowa through 99 years is a truly great epic.

But 1946 will also be a year devoted to looking forward. Very properly, the people of Iowa will reaffirm their faith in the ideals of their cherished motto. They will renew their devotion to personal liberty, representative government and the American way of life. Iowa grew great in the inspiring atmosphere of those ideals.

Mr. Speaker, in the long stretch of years, a century is but the twinkling of an eye. Statehood began on December 28, 1846. But Iowa is still young; Iowa is vigorous; Iowa is enterprising. On December 28, 1945, the citizens of Iowa will look backward with pride to the accomplishments of 99 years. At the same time they will look forward to their centennial year with the determination that it shall be a banner year, and beyond that to another cycle during which other generations will move to even greater accomplishments because of the example set them by their forebears.

Our American Government—What Is It?—How Does It Function?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 20, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years I have prepared, with the help of others who are given credit in the foreword, a booklet on Our American Government—What Is It?—How Does It Function? in question and answer form.

One university ordered 30,000 copies of this booklet from the Government Printing Office and sent them to all its exstudents.

The booklet has received wide distribution throughout the Nation and is used in many schools as a textbook. Members of Congress have purchased the booklet by the tens of thousands and sent them to their constituents, because it contains information especially about Congress and the three branches of the Government that is not usually contained in the textbooks that are used in the schools and colleges.

NEW EDITION

In the early part of the next session I expect to ask that a revised edition of this booklet be printed as a public document. It will not in the end cost the Government anything, as the sale and distribution is a source of revenue and is not a loss.

Typical of the new questions and answers that will be in the revised edition are the following:

Question. How many times has Congress declared war?

Answer. Only 11 times has Congress passed acts which can be considered as declarations of war, as follows:

1. War of 1812, June 18, 1812.
2. Mexican War, May 13, 1846.
3. Spanish-American War, April 25, 1898.
4. War with Germany, April 6, 1917.
5. War with Austria, December 7, 1917.
6. War with Japan, December 8, 1941.
7. War with Germany, December 11, 1941.
8. War with Italy, December 11, 1941.
9. War with Bulgaria, June 5, 1942.
10. War with Hungary, June 5, 1942.
11. War with Rumania, June 5, 1942.

Question. How many Vice Presidents have succeeded to the Presidency by reason of a vacancy in that office?

Answer. Seven. John Tyler served all but a month of President William H. Harrison's term; Millard Fillmore served over half of Zachary Taylor's term; Andrew Johnson served all but about a month of Lincoln's second term; Chester Arthur served about 3½ years of Garfield's term; Theodore Roosevelt served about 3½ years of McKinley's second term; and Calvin Coolidge filled out about 1½ years of Harding's term. Vice President Truman succeeded to the Presidency less than 3 months after the commencement of President Roosevelt's fourth term.

Question. What was meant by daylight saving time and war time?

Answer. The device of arbitrarily moving the clocks forward during the summer, so as to take advantage of the early daylight hours, was resorted to in Europe during the First World War, and was adopted in the United States by an act of March 19, 1918. This was called daylight saving, effective between last Sunday in March and last Sunday in October. This Federal act was repealed August 20, 1919; but with the advent of World War II Congress again took action, this time without limiting the effect to the summer months. Popularly this was called war time; it was terminated at 2 a. m. on Sunday, September 30, 1945, by Public Law 187, Seventy-ninth Congress.

Question. What is the President's flag and seal?

Answer. By custom, going back to President Hayes, the President has prescribed and used a coat of arms and a seal, but not until 1916 did he prescribe a Presidential flag. The flag then adopted by President Wilson had four stars only, and this fact, among others, led President Roosevelt to consider a new design when Congress established the rank of five-star admirals and generals. As finally promulgated by President Truman on October 25, 1945, the new coat of arms (which is the basis of the seal and also appears on the flag) shows the eagle in full color instead of all white, with the head turned to his own right (as is customary in heraldry) instead of to his left, and has a circle of 48 stars around the edge. The number of stars corresponds to the number of States, without any single star representing a particular State; the number will automatically change, as in the case of the flag of the United States, upon a change in number of States.

Question. What and when was VJ-day?

Answer. VJ stands for victory in Japan, and VJ-day is August 15. On that day in 1945, President Truman announced to the world by radio that Japan had accepted the conditions laid down by the Allies on August 11—namely, that the Japanese Emperor was

to be subject to orders of an Allied Supreme Commander. The actual signing of the surrender papers took place on board the U. S. S. *Missouri* in Tokio Bay on September 2.

Question. What and when was VE-day?

Answer. VE stands for victory in Europe; VE-day is recognized in the United States as May 8, 1945. At 9 a. m. (eastern war time) on that day President Truman announced the signing of the surrender of all German fighting forces at General Eisenhower's advance headquarters in Rheims. This military surrender was followed on the next day by a formal ratification in Berlin.

Question. Who appoints the Librarian of Congress, and how many Librarians have there been?

Answer. The Librarian is appointed by the President with consent of the Senate. In 145 years there have been but 10 Librarians, including the present incumbent, Luther H. Evans, appointed by President Truman. Of these, three served over 30 years apiece; John S. Meehan, 1829–61, Ainsworth R. Spofford, 1864–97, and Herbert Putnam, 1899–1939.

Question. What is the origin of the Great Seal of the United States?

Answer. The seal is carried over from the Continental Congress, one of the very earliest acts of the new Congress (September 15, 1789) stating that "the seal heretofore used by the United States in Congress assembled, shall be, and hereby is declared to be, the Seal of the United States." The design was adopted by order of the Continental Congress June 20, 1782, after the matter had been pending for 6 years. The seal has been recut three times (in 1841, 1883, and 1902) but always in strict compliance with the original design.

Question. What is meant by a "rider" on a congressional bill?

Answer. A "rider" is an extraneous provision incorporated in an appropriation bill, with the idea of "riding" through to enactment on the merits of the main measure. The practice is very old; in 1837 a "rider" on the fortifications appropriation bill would have provided for the disposal of the surplus funds in the Treasury. Under the rules any item of appropriation in a general appropriation bill that is not authorized by existing law nor in furtherance of projects already in progress is subject to a point of order (this is often waived by a special rule in the House); and the same with any provision "changing existing law," unless it is germane to the subject and designed to retrench expenditures (the so-called Holman rule). Occasionally a "rider" becomes law, without the point of order being raised.

An example of a legislative rider was contained in the appropriation rescission bill, which was vetoed by President Truman. The rider, which was not germane to the bill and wholly unrelated to the subject matter of the bill, provided that the United States Employment Service would be returned to the States in 100 days.

President Truman, believing that this subject should receive separate consideration and entitled to be passed upon by him separate and distinct from any other legislation, vetoed the entire bill to get rid of the rider.

Question. What is meant by "classified civil service"?

Answer. This term (commonly shortened to "civil service") refers to the body of public employees who are under the merit system set up by the Civil Service Act of 1883, as amended. This act provides in general for appointment through competitive examination, permanent tenure, promotion on merit, etc. At first, it applied to 13,924 out of the 131,000 employees then in Federal service; but under its terms Presidents (and occasionally Congress) have gradually extended its coverage until now it includes all positions, whatever the function or designation, and whether compensated by fixed salary or otherwise, unless specifically excepted by Congress or the President. In general, positions now outside the classified service are confidential or policy-making positions, temporary employments, or a few designated independent agencies.

A director of a land-grant college said this about the booklet:

The information contained therein is very comprehensive and it will be quite interesting to members of our staff here.

An executive in a women's political club stated:

I think it is so splendid that I want 35 copies for the executive body of our club.

The document is strictly nonpartisan and nonpolitical.

A county school superintendent in the Southwest writes:

It should be in every public school in the country. Certainly, every school teacher should have one available for the purpose of properly teaching the class in government the functions of our legislative bodies. It is a very valuable document.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE COMMENTS

A former colleague of ours here in the House of Representatives, now United States district judge in the West, stated the following in a letter:

I am very anxious to have this document for free distribution with my compliments to the newly made citizens that get their naturalization papers through my court. In fact, I think the Government could well supply the document to all courts where naturalizations are held.

It is one of the most complete, concise, and easily understood statements concerning our Government that I have ever seen. I have made use of a large number of the first edition, and have about exhausted my supply.

Several United States district judges purchased them for the same purpose.

USED IN PROGRAM

A constituent wrote the following:

A friend of mine loaned me a copy of the booklet Our American Government—252 Questions and Answers, published in 1941, which you had sent her sometime in the past. I found it most interesting and based a DAR program on it.

MIDDLE WEST SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

A school superintendent in the Middle West wrote the following:

Since the pamphlets or booklets have quite a bit of information not found in our regular reference books, they naturally became quite useful to the civics student. They were used as reference material and in classroom discussion.

These booklets bring in a detailed form a summary of the working of our Government right down from Capitol Hill.

I consider them a good addition to our reference material in social science.

USED BY HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUBS

An instructor in cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics in a land-grant college stated the following:

I am hoping that you will send me copies to be used in helping the home-demonstration clubs develop programs that will lead them to be more efficient citizens.

The president of a large petroleum company in the Southeast stated the following:

It supplies the answers to many questions I have often wondered about.

IN NEW ENGLAND SCHOOLS

One college president in New England stated the following:

We would like to purchase 11,000 copies of this pamphlet for distribution in high schools.

Later, this same college president wrote the following:

The response to our offer to high-school principals to supply them free of charge with copies of Our American Government—What Is It? How Does It Function? has been so great that we find ourselves in need of a thousand copies to meet requests made on us.

We appreciate the opportunity, which you have afforded us of bringing this vital information to the students in our New England high schools.

These are a few of hundreds of letters commenting favorably on this document.

COST

The last one that was printed—House Document No. 228, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session—sold for 10 cents each by the Government Printing Office. Each Member of the House and Senate was allowed 150 copies for free distribution, which is sufficient to supply normal requests. Members of Congress were permitted to purchase these booklets for $17.50 a thousand if the order was placed in time for the printing to be done at the same time the Government Printing Office printed a supply for sale.

The new revision that is expected to be ready in the early part of 1946 will be the same size as House Document No. 228 and it is presumed that the cost will be about the same and may be obtained under similar conditions.

America's Problem in the Postwar World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of the Christmas season we can all rejoice and return thanks to Almighty God that the world is at peace for the first time in 7 years. With the ending of the war, many problems of great importance to the maintenance of peace are knocking for solution. The representatives of the leading nations of the world have had extended conferences and negotiations looking toward the adoption of definite plans which may keep the world at peace. The United Nations Organization is rapidly nearing the stage where plans may be put into effect which give promise of providing the mechanics for adjusting the dis-

agreements among nations by peaceful means rather than by force of arms. The world has learned through centuries of suffering, bloodshed, and death that force alone will not bring about peace on earth. Christmas this year should remind us of things that have not changed, and the terrible experiences of the past 4 years should have taught us that the abiding spirit of Christ brings the best, and the only enduring things in this mad world. More than ever, Christmas this year will be a sacrament of family fellowship, for the ties which the war has stretched across continents and oceans will be dearer than ever. As absent ones return, we should have happier homes now that we are realizing what home means. "On earth peace, good will towards men." For 1,900 years the world has tried other means and seen them all fail. Christ's way is largely untried, and unless Christian people speak and act now, it will be ignored in the shaping of a better, more Christian world.

Nothing except the ravages of the war itself has so roused the world as the discovery and use of the atomic bomb. It may well be said that we are now living in an atomic age. This great power now harnessed by the genius of man has not only revolutionized warfare but it has opened a storehouse of almost inexhaustible energy which scientists believe will be made available for civilian uses, making a great contribution to the welfare of the world.

There have just been concluded in Moscow conferences between the foreign ministers of the United States of America, the United Kingdom, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics which have resulted in reaching an accord between these representatives on many of the world problems now confronting us and which must be amicably adjusted if we are to win the peace as well as the war. Among the subjects considered at these conferences was the one having to do with the establishment by the United Nations of a plan and program for the control of atomic energy, outlawing it as an instrument of warfare and devoting its great powers to peaceful endeavors. On December 4, 1945, I introduced in the House a concurrent resolution having for its purpose a declaration by the Congress of the United States with respect to the control of atomic energy. The resolution reads as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery within the existing framework of the United Nations Organization for international control and reduction of armaments and weapons designed for mass destruction of human lives, especially those involving atomic power.

As was recently said in an editorial in the Christian Science Monitor:

Steps to harness atomic energy to peace will strike the deepest chord in popular sentiment wherever the potentialities of the atomic bomb are known. The secrets of the bomb are not going to be shared until a suitable agency to control the bomb has been developed, along with systems of inspection to prevent its clandestine manufacture by any country. The biggest part of this task is ahead, and it is fraught with enormous pitfalls, and even greater opportunities. But the bomb has been faced—together—by those whom it threatened to divide irrevocably and disastrously.

The text of the communique at the close of the Big Three Conference in Moscow with respect to the control of atomic energy is of great significance and of great promise to a distraught world. The text with respect to this control is as follows:

VII. The establishment by the United Nations of a Commission for the Control of Atomic Energy:

Discussion of the subject of atomic energy related to the question of the establishment of a Commission by the General Assembly of the United Nations. The Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America, and the United Kingdom have agreed to recommend, for the consideration of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the establishment by the United Nations of a Commission to consider problems arising from the discovery of atomic energy and related matters. They have agreed to invite the other permanent members of the Security Council, France and China, together with Canada, to join with them in assuming the initiative in sponsoring the following resolution at the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations in January 1946:

Resolved by the General Assembly of the United Nations, To establish a Commission, with the composition and competence set out hereunder, to deal with the problems raised by the discovery of atomic energy and other related matters.

I. Establishment of the Commission:

A Commission is hereby established by the General Assembly with the terms of reference set out under section V, below.

II. Relations of the Commission with the organs of the United Nations:

(a) The Commission shall submit its reports and recommendations to the Security Council, and such reports and recommendations shall be made public unless the Security Council, in the interests of peace and security, otherwise directs. In the appropriate cases the Security Council should transmit these reports to the General Assembly and the members of the United Nations, as well as to the economic and social council and other organs within the framework of the United Nations.

(b) In view of the Security's Council's primary responsibility under the charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security, the Security Council shall issue directions to the Commission in matters affecting security. On these matters the Commission shall be accountable for its work of the Security Council.

III. Composition of the Commission: The Commission shall be composed of one representative from each of those states represented on the Security Council and Canada, when that state is not a member of the Security Council. Each representative on the Commission may have such assistants as he may desire.

IV. Rules of procedure: The Commission shall have whatever staff it may deem necessary, and shall make recommendations for its rules of procedure to the Security Council, which shall approve them as a procedural matter.

V. Terms of reference of the Commission: The Commission shall proceed with the utmost dispatch and inquire into all phases of the problem, and make such recommendations from time to time with respect to them as it finds possible. In particular the Commission shall make specific proposals:

(a) For extending between all nations the exchange of basic scientific information for peaceful ends;

(b) For control of atomic energy to the extent necessary to ensure its use only for peaceful purposes;

(c) For the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and of all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction.

(d) For effective safeguards by way of inspection and other means to protect complying states against the hazards of violations and evasions.

The work of the Commission should proceed by separate stages, the successful completion of each of which will develop the necessary confidence of the world before the next stage is undertaken.

The Commission shall not infringe upon the responsibilities of any organ of the United Nations but should present recommendations for the consideration of those organs in the performance of their tasks under the terms of the United Nations Charter.

Mr. Speaker, the world is sick and troubled. It has gone through a long siege of bloodshed and destruction in which almost every nation on earth has participated at great cost in the lives of its people as well as its resources. We need reconversion, not only from war to peace but from brutality, selfishness, and greed to tolerance and charity. May we not hope, under the full fruition of the United Nations Organization, that we may establish liberty under law throughout the world as well as in our own beloved America. We have demonstrated that, through the great accomplishments of science and the energy and intelligence of our people, we can produce the necessities of life in abundance, far beyond the needs of our people. We need only to promulgate a working program by which the fruits of labor may be equitably distributed among our people in proportion to their contribution in order that all may enjoy the fruits of a beneficent providence. With the world at peace and the nations of the earth cooperating to maintain peace and a healthy exchange of products among themselves, we can look forward to an era of prosperity and well-being such as we have never witnessed before. Then we may say with Henry Van Dyke, in discussing the guideposts on The Footpath to Peace:

To be glad of life because it gives you the chance to love and to work and to play and to look up at the stars; to be satisfied with your possessions, but not contented with yourself until you have made the best of them; to despise nothing in the world except falsehood and meanness; and to fear nothing except cowardice; to be governed by your admirations rather than by your disgusts; to covet nothing that is your neighbor's except his kindness of heart and gentleness of manners; to think seldom of your enemies, often of your friends and every day of Christ; and to spend as much time as you can with body and with spirit, in God's out-of-doors—these are little guideposts on the footpath to peace.

As has been said:

Man is a selfish and self-centered animal, prone to concentrate on the acquisition of things for his own personal gratification. But by strange contradiction, man also has an

unquenchable realization that he is his brother's keeper, that there is a Golden Rule that must govern his actions if he is to attain and hold those things which he needs and craves; that there is no real happiness nor satisfaction in leading a narrow and selfish life.

Mr. Speaker, at this Christmas season so significant in world history, may we say with Charles Gordon Ames:

O God of purity and peace, God of light and freedom, God of comfort and joy, we thank Thee for our country, this great land of hope, whose wide doors Thou hast opened to so many millions that struggle with hardship and with hunger in the crowded old world.

We give thanks to the Power that has made and preserved us a Nation, that has carried our ship of state through storm and darkness and has given us a place of honor and power that we might bear aloft the standard of impartial liberty and impartial law.

May our altars and our schools ever stand as pillars of welfare; may the broad land be filled with homes of intelligent and contented industry, that through the long generations our land may be a happy land and our country a power of good will among the nations.

Congress Faces the Problem of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, it is hardly correct to say that there is one major problem that will face Congress when it reconvenes in January 1946. There are a number of problems which will demand attention. It is fair to say that inflation is one of those matters which we will hear a lot about, and in connection with which there will be many legislative proposals. It is not my purpose to define inflation, its cause, or its remedy, in these remarks. There may be many factors rather than just one development which will cause inflation. Different people have different ideas as to just what constitutes inflation, but one fact stands out and that is the fact that this country has the staggering public debt of $262,000,000,000. By whatever name you call it, the matter of Government finances is going to be almost at the top of the list of issues which will claim the attention of Congress. In this article I am going to submit an editorial and a couple of news items without making any argument for or against the statements they contain. I submit them to show what people are saying all over the country, because in almost every newspaper you will find some item dealing with the question of Government finances and you will always find that word "inflation" featured in some connection therewith. So, as we face the New Year, all of us will have forced upon us the fact that the Government has an enormous debt. Some say Government credit is badly broken, or bent, as the case may be. What do you think can and should be done?

The matter of a Federal financial policy, and its relation to this much-discussed word "inflation" is discussed in an able and interesting editorial in the New York Times for Friday, December 21, 1945, as follows:

THE REMEDY FOR INFLATION

Representative ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, can see no prospect of further substantial tax reductions until we have "a balanced Budget or a near-balanced Budget." He is not hopeful about the prospects: "You can't tell what Congress will do. If it keeps on making appropriations and increasing peacetime expenditures, we just won't have a balanced Budget. If we get expenditures down under twenty-five or thirty billion dollars any time soon, I'd be surprised. If we can't pay as we go, I don't know how we'll ever catch up."

Mr. DOUGHTON'S remarks point to the most important domestic issue today. As long as the Federal Budget remains unbalanced, as long as the Federal Government continues to finance its needs by heavy borrowing, directly or indirectly, from the banks, it will increase the amount of money in circulation and the amount of new bank credit. This pours a constant stream of excess purchasing power into the economy, lowers the value of the monetary unit, and increases the upward pressure on prices and wages. It is, in fact, the major cause of inflation. And every other economic problem that we face, including those of wages and strikes, is conditioned by inflation.

We can solve this central problem only by bringing the Budget into balance. But this is not a problem that can be solved merely by passing a single bill. It is a problem that arises with every appropriation that is proposed, with every plan that is put forward. None of these can be solved merely on its own merits. Each of them must be solved in relation to its bearing on the Budget as a whole.

In his statement yesterday, signing the reorganization bill, the President candidly pointed out:

"While I anticipate that this act will result in some reduction of administrative expenditures in the agencies affected by reorganization plans, I do not consider it probable that we will generally save as much as 25 percent, as suggested in the act. I wish to point out, also, that administrative expenditures are only a small proportion of the cost of Government. Substantial savings in Government expenditures can come only from reductions in the Government programs themselves."

In a few weeks the President will present his Budget for the new fiscal year. The country will then know how serious the administration is in its efforts to head off inflation by the only possible method that can succeed—a return toward a balanced Budget, accomplished chiefly by a reduction of expenditures. But even if the administration proposes the right road, the country will still have to learn whether Congress intends to follow it.

Not to be outdone by the New York Times, the Christian Science Monitor has a thought-provoking news item, where the word "inflation" is featured. The item reads as follows:

YULE BUYING SHOWS PERIL OF INFLATION—"SKY" PRICES LOOM

(By Richard L. Strout)

Inflation is still the big economic problem of Washington.

The Christmas buying rush has accentuated it. Not only has it cleaned out stores of many of their items of consumers' merchandise, but it has convinced millions of Americans that something queer is happening to their dollar.

Economists wonder if the situation that followed World War I is going to be repeated.

Congress, meanwhile, has voted to end Presidential wartime powers on June 30, instead of 6 months later, as the President sought. Unless otherwise extended, this will remove many of the remaining Executive economic controls.

AMENDMENT DEFEATED

An amendment was offered in the Senate to extend the controls for a year instead of 6 months, but it was defeated 31 to 30, with 35 Senators not voting. This may prove to be one of the most important votes of the year.

Rightly or wrongly it has been charged that consumer goods were being held back till after January 1, when the excess-profits tax expires.

Now a new deadline is set. If inflation is going to send prices up, producers have an incentive for holding back goods for higher and higher prices. The new date of June 30 seems to set a new deadline for possible inflation slow-downs.

On paper, inflation has been pretty well held, according to the figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Between August 1939 and October 1945 the cost of living has advanced theoretically only 30.7 percent, which is relatively little compared to World War I. From the time when Mr. Roosevelt issued the hold-the-line order, living costs have risen only 3 percent.

LABOR ASSAILS FIGURES

But labor has all the time denounced these figures.

It charges that the abstract statistics fail to give weight to quality deterioration. Also to the fact that sturdy, low-price prewar goods no longer are obtainable.

Millions of Americans visiting shop counters in the Christmas rush season have reached the same conclusion.

Prices have been held theoretically if you can buy the standard goods on which ceilings are placed, but try and find those goods!

Then, again, here and there price ceilings have been taken off. The price of citrus fruits doubled almost overnight, as one instance. The same jump occurred in other products. Housewives suddenly discovered what inflation restrictions had meant in their behalf during the war, and still mean in many products. Many shudder at the prospect of complete removal.

SNYDER WARNING

John W. Snyder, Reconversion Director, recently warned, however, that a feeling has grown up in the country that price stabilization will soon be repealed. In fact, the deadline of June 30, 1946, is now widely expected.

The demand for consumers' goods is nothing short of terrific. Some observers had thought there would be a buyer's strike if prices didn't come down and quality improve.

But the Christmas shopping drive seems to prove that the public, with a staggering amount of purchasing power behind it, will buy almost anything, no matter how shoddy the goods, no matter what the price.

Wholesale prices help tell the story.

Before Japan's surrender, wholesale prices were going down. They declined for a week thereafter.

But since then, according to Mr. Snyder, they have risen every week.

During the week ending December 1 the index of wholesale prices was at the highest in 25 years.

STEADY PRICE RISE

The raw-material price index also has been making a steady march upward following a short recession after VJ-day.

If America now has a good-sized inflation, nobody can say the public hasn't been warned.

It has been the one subject of economists' warnings and worries since the war started. Unlike World War I, the controls and restrictions to cope with it have been generally available. Against overwhelming odds, Chester Bowles, Price Administrator, has fought every step of the way.

But the demand for higher prices now—for a relaxation of controls—is at a new peak. Many observers regard it as doubtful whether Mr. Bowles' powers will be continued after June 30.

OTHER POSTWAR ERAS

At the peak inflation after World War I, the dollar had purchasing power of only 40 cents.

After the Civil War, it fell to 44 cents. After the Revolution, the dollar was worth only 33 cents.

At present, the equivalent purchasing power of the dollar, as compared to the normal just before the war, is 76 cents. Inflation already has nibbled 24 cents out of the dollar of fixed investments, pensions, life insurance, and the like. The economic pressures that caused the decline in the value of the dollar after World War I were feeble compared with the gigantic pressures now threatening postwar stability.

After World War I, public savings were only $27,000,000,000, today they are $145,000,000,000.

After World War I, currency in circulation was only $7,200,000,000, today it is $26,700,000,000.

Checking accounts showed balances of only $27,300,000,000 after World War I, contrasted to $69,100,000,000 today.

Nothing quite like the present inflationary prospects were known after the previous war. It is like the steel of a trap, just waiting to be released. If the right pressure is once put on the trigger, nothing can stop the inflationary trap from snapping.

One of the biggest dangers is that the public will lose confidence that the inflationary guard will be held. If everybody thinks prices are going up, then producers will hold back goods till prices do go up, and purchasers will scramble for goods quickly.

Mr. Bowles is the man standing in the breach, but it is doubtful what support he will get from Congress.

A final curiosity in the situation is the paradox of unemployment.

Forecasters had been making gloomy predictions of 5,000,000 unemployed at this time. Actually the number is less than half that. It seems very satisfactory—and is.

Mr. Speaker, the description of what has taken place during the Christmas season as outlined by Mr. Strout, deserves most careful consideration. You will note that he uses the word inflation in connection with his pointed comment.

"Line must be held against inflation, debt, says banker." With the above headline from another newspaper, the following report of a talk before a convention is of interest:

CHICAGO.—Holding the line against inflation and paying off the public debt are the two most important problems in domestic finance, John Clifford Folger, president of the Investment Bankers Association of America, declared at the IBA's annual convention here. Warning that inflation is here and has been here for some time, Mr. Folger said labor and business alike have a responsibility for its cure, adding that labor stands to lose just like everyone else.

You will note that Mr. Folger is very much concerned about what he calls inflation and this same line of comment will be found in numerous news items, addresses, and so forth.

PROBLEM OF GOVERNMENT FINANCES UNUSUAL

When Congress convenes in January, Mr. Speaker, it will have to deal with the financial structure of our Government, which is entirely different from anything we have ever had in the history of the country. In this discussion I mentioned the fact that we had a public debt of $262,000,000,000. Those were figures that had been determined by a columnist. The Library of Congress here at Washington has given me something a little different, but a few billions one way or the other probably does not matter. The Library of Congress has submitted to me the following figures:

Total and per capita debt of the United States

Gross public debt and guaranteed obligations, Dec. 11, 1945—U. S. Treasury, Daily Statement, Dec. 11, 1945	$278,173,584,518
Estimated population, including armed forces overseas, Jan. 1, 1945—U. S. Bureau of Census Release, Series P-45, No. 6, May 22, 1945	138,955,469
Average per capita debt—computed on basis of above figures	$2,002

No doubt all of us will now admit that we are in debt, although some persons may feel that they have sufficient funds on hand to meet their obligations. We know, however, that numberless other people are not so situated. In this connection, it is interesting to note that the franc has just recently been devalued and in connection with our problems, just what does that procedure mean? If we think back on how the French franc and the German mark lost their value following World War I, then we may want to define inflation in terms of cheap money. This is commonly known as printing press money. You need no argument to show what a tragedy would result in this country if our currency became valueless and people could then meet their obligations and pay their debts with that sort of money.

We need no argument either to establish the fact that savings accounts, life-insurance policies, and everything else would become worthless. So call it what you will, this problem of our country's finances and that somewhat uncertain thing called inflation, are going to be large matters when Congress reconvenes. Of course, there are other issues, such as the question of loaning money to Great Britain, Russia, and the rest of the world. Then, there is an acute housing shortage in this country which will demand immediate attention by Congress if existing Government agencies and private agencies are unable to cope with the situation. These are only a few examples of a long list of tremendously important things on the threshold of the year 1946.

Petition Recommending Changes To Improve Services Rendered Veterans at Hospital Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition submitted by Roy Grubstad, Spooner, Minn., and signed by 153 veterans of the Veterans' Hospital, Minneapolis, Minn., requesting that the Minnesota State Medical Association select a committee to visit the veterans' hospitals and interview patients and recommend to proper authorities beneficial changes which would improve the services being rendered veterans at hospital facilities:

NOVEMBER 19, 1945.

MINNESOTA STATE MEDICAL ASSOCIATION.

DEAR SIRS: The information appearing in national publications recently, as well as rumors and observations of patients in the hospital during recent months concerning the care and treatment of veterans in our veterans' hospital, has created doubt in the minds of the veterans here as to how we are being treated and just how such care might be improved.

These disabled veterans in the hospital and their families throughout the State are both interested and disturbed over the present and the future standards of hospital care to be offered the veterans of the State. For this reason we seek assurance from authority that we all recognize and have confidence in to see to it that the medical care provided for by Congress is being made available to the veteran as intended.

Therefore, in order to ascertain the type of medical care and treatment available to the veterans of Minnesota, we, the undersigned, in behalf of all Minnesota veterans and their families appeal to the Minnesota State Medical Association to—

1. Have a committee visit the hospital for the purpose of interviewing both patients and doctors concerning problems of medical care.

2. Recommend to the proper authorities the results of such visits where findings justify such action to assure our medical care to be comparable to the care given in civilian hospitals and sanitariums throughout the State.

3. Have a permanent committee to visit the hospital periodically to interview the patients and to confer with the doctors actually caring for the sick.

We do not make this request in a spirit of criticism or belligerency but rather to promote medical care to the veteran in such a way that his welfare is assured and his family is relieved of unnecessary worry.

We urgently request that our appeal to you be given consideration.

We the undersigned indorse the petition to the Minnesota State Medical Association concerning medical care and treatment of Minnesota veterans by the Veteran's Administration:

R. A. Winter, A. M. Hammer, Francis G. Johnson, Helmer Hammer, William Mindt, Leroy J. Johnston, Frank L.

Dwyer, E. R. Hagstram, Geo. W. Kennelly, Harold Peterson, Adolph Nelson, Peter Odegard, William J. Skelly, Albert E. Hemphill, Pete Mulroney, Virgil S. Kerr, Harry Holtien, A. H. Neumeyer, Chas. McKinney, Joe Stone, Andrew Bovitz, Warren A. Ekeroth, Edward G. Lickteig, Ralph O. Aune, Henry Kimmis, Roman F. Penkert, Andrew J. Glotzmaier, Albert W. Langer, Philip T. Welik, Kenneth C. Way, Ralph O. Young, James E. Gray, Stanley A. Mickel, Samuel Bernard, Carl G. Peterson, Palmer L. Evans, Charles Hay, Joseph A. Johnson, Clement D. Jensen, Mansueto Leonard, A. L. Schoetzon, Clair Carmpion, Walter W. Walrath, Frank A. Tibbetts, C. M. Murphy, Robert Matthew, George M. Goldsburgh, Frank Kobbe, Louis Peron, W. J. Kitterman, R. Nagle, Felipa Coles, Oscar E. Horness, Marion E. Henkel, Paul F. Grove, M. Hinsentruit, Roscoe Harris, L. H. Gabian, Lloyd O. Wieslander, Louis Ulch, Richard C. Selles, Hugo N. Pauls, Malen G. Todd, George D. Kinney, Wm. J. Murphy, Andrew P. Backlund, G. E. Lenmark, F. E. Artogast, Walter Cottrell, Geo. G. Miller, Albert J. Manning, O. H. Reidy, Elof Matson, William Yarlett, Clarence E. Murphy, H. H. Schuelling, Frank Lewis, Vincent Blandin, Arthur L. Willner, H. C. Proiloebl, R. L. Snyder, Martin Ericson, Chris Mathys, Bernard O. Grewell, J. H. Gillens, Roy Mott, Marvin Place, Clarence Amundson, Curtis Johnson, William L. Harper, John C. Redday, Raymond E. Hill, Sebastian J. Nys, Kenneth W. Gall, Gordon F. White, Lester Mayovski, Edwin Fuchs, E. Holland, D. D. Nowles, Robert B. Haas, Philip O. Lebak, John Chapp, Joseph A. Lopata, Freddie C. Sembrick, Francis W. Knight, Bill Jones, Alfred C. Keller, Roger L. Benson, Joseph Eide, Orville M. Hellie, Donald L. Anderson, Edgar Graupmann, Elmer J. Barchenger, Dale R. Haglund, Robert J. Hale, Lawrence J. Endicott, John T. Homre, Loren S. Vaubel, Wm. D. Johnson, Leslie W. Towne, Helmer T. Tetghe, Sidney La Batte, Don P. Conroy, George E. Cragan, Herbert Kowitz, Mauro O. Christianson, Roy Grubstad, Lloyd Delsart, Edward Eastwald, Leo Daniels, W. J. Nelson, R. A. Bovehect, Peter Loberg, Ploner J. Giraw, Paul J. Connell, Edward L. Krarisban, Henry E. Weatty, H. S. Felker, Paul John Wirke, Elmer N. Stromnsis, Nels Sonmor, B. A. Galbraith, John M. Dunn, Sherman Lindstrom, Emil F. Anderson, F. M. Hemmer, Leonard T. Higgs, Julius Nielsen, Paul Rudquist, J. Roger Bailey, Thomas W. Reece, H. E. Martinson, Dauwane M. Olsen.

Value of GM Books to Probers Questioned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 21, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave heretofore granted, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article by David Lawrence:

VALUE OF GM BOOKS TO PROBERS QUESTIONED—OBSERVER SAYS LONG STUDY COULD BRING WRONG DECISION ON PAY

(By David Lawrence)

On its face it would seem that if General Motors opened its books to the President's Fact-Finding Commission, someone could figure out whether the corporation might be able to pay a 30-percent increase in wages or a 15-percent or anything else. But is it as simple as that?

Who is going to take the responsibility for analyzing an institution as big as General Motors and deciding in anything less than a year of study whether the management of the corporation is right in its estimate of what it costs to make a car, how many cars will be sold, what the dealer's margins will be, and what factors will influence the total quantity of cars sold—especially competitive factors, such as the models of cars put out by other companies?

It would be difficult for any governmental body to reach any conclusions just by looking into the books. And if it did do so, then may it not be said that the Government is substituting its judgment for that of the management in deciding what ought or ought not to be paid?

RISK LOSING PERIOD

President Truman himself, in his much discussed wage and price message a few weeks ago, conceded that companies might not be able to make profits immediately but intimate that they should raise wages anyway in some instances and take the risks that sales would increase and costs would be met. Indeed, Mr. Truman went so far as to say that if the calculations proved wrong at the end of 6 months, the OPA would sanction requests for price increases.

This is but another way of saying that the Government doesn't know anything about what the future may bring but is willing for industry to engage in a gambling match, and, if the companies lose, they pay the bill for the previous 6 months and get some price increases for the next ensuing period.

Also, if the Government is to determine what wages are to be paid out by a company, by looking at its books, will it not establish a precedent for the reduction of wages the moment the sales fall off? Or would the Government then argue that other items might be cut and other economies might be effected first?

Plainly this process does not mean a free enterprise system at all but the beginnings of a controlled economy such as led both in Italy and Germany in the last decade into government management of business enterprises and finally the elimination of labor unions.

POLITICS WITH ISSUE

Unfortunately, a lot of "bunkum" is being passed back and forth between the Government and the unions and the management. President Truman is losing prestige by playing politics with the issue. One day he issues a statement that seems to help the management side. Then he evens it up with something to help the unions. His own Fact-Finding Commission was sitting judicially trying to solve the problem of how it should approach ability to pay when a reporter's question at a Presidential press conference was answered by Mr. Truman and thus the President decided for the Fact-Finding Commission a question which it presumably was trying to decide for itself.

Then when a reporter told the President the company might not continue in the fact-finding procedure if it was asked to open its books, Mr. Truman, without inquiring into the merits of the problem, promptly condemned the company and said it would be a bad thing for its reputation.

Actually, it would be a bad thing for the Fact-Finding Commission, and for the President, too, to allow the motor strike to be prolonged indefinitely by a statistical study of the books of the General Motors Corp., which company probably would have to bring its financial experts to explain the cost items, its system of pricing, and a thousand and one other details that certainly have little to do with the question of settling a strike.

DECISION FOR MANAGEMENT

Assume that the Fact-Finding Commission, which was not supposed originally to issue opinions or recommendations, decided that General Motors could pay the increase. Would this persuade the General Motors management that the Government's board knew what it was talking about? After all, unless confiscation of business property is to be the program of the future, management must take full responsibility for the decisions as to what it shall pay for labor or anything else

If General Motors can pay the wage increases, does this mean that the Government is going to force the rates of pay for all auto workers up to the same level, and isn't this going to put a crimp into the new companies being formed to compete with General Motors? And who is to say what is a fair profit or an adequate surplus to lay aside for the depressions that may come?

To look at the books isn't half so important as to look inside the minds of management and persuade them that the Government knows more about how to run the motorcar business than do the private managers. When that time comes, America might as well concede that fascism has become the national policy and Government control of everything is on its way.

The situation cries out for mediation and conciliation, and then proper bargaining. Everything else at the moment is irrelevant, including a 6 months' study of a thousand and one ledgers.